UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 89—PART 12

OCTOBER 15, 1943, TO DECEMBER 21, 1943

(PAGES A4333 TO A5700)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

The Liberated Nations and the New Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me entitled "The Liberated Nations and the New Order," appearing in the Free World of August 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERATED NATIONS AND THE NEW ORDER

(By CLAUDE D. PEPPER)

The attack upon Sicily which President Roosevelt has described as "the beginning of the end" brings us directly up against the question, with whom are we going to collaborate in the territory which the United Nations expect to occupy? I believe all will agree that this time not even military necessity must be allowed to throw us into association with any groups save those dependably and truly democratic. We cannot temporize with fascism anywhere in the world without compromising the great aims for which we fight throughout the earth. As soon as we have made any land safe for democracy, we must see to it that democracy begins to function there. This means, of course, that we must deal with those elements of the population that believe in democracy and are representative of it, and no others.

When Mussolini is overthrown and the odious Fascist system of which he is the apex is uprooted, there can be found, without a doubt, in Italy and among her exiles, men whose democracy can be counted upon and who are capable of setting up democratic institutions for the government of Italy. There must be men and women throughout Italy in whom the flame of liberty and Garibaldi has never been choked out even by the foul clutch of Mussolini. Surely, those noble and courageous men and women who have maintained the underground movement against Mussolini, and the exiles whom Mussolini has driven out of Italy but who have worked with this underground movement and have constantly labored for Italy's freedom, will be a stalwart and reliable nucleus around which virile representative government may be expected to rise.

Of course, one cannot say beforehand how soon after the United Nations occupy Italy or any other country such a government will come into being. This will depend upon the manner in which the freed people respond to the opportunity which will be theirs; the way they cooperate with their liberators; the responsibility and the capacity for self-government which they exhibit. For we must not forget that we shall be dealing with people in Italy, for example, who for nearly a generation have not known what representative government or democratic institutions meant. A generation of boys and girls have grown up not knowing the name of liberty, not having the experience of enjoying civil rights. The masses of the men and women who have grown to manhood and womanhood under Mussolini in Italy have never been able to write or speak their minds about public matters. Even the very means and media of forming public opinion have been emasculated or perverted.

In Germany, the suppression of individual liberty has been even more severe and complete, although the period of tyranny has not been as long as in Italy. In Japan, the situation is far worse, for political freedom, in the sense that we know it, has never existed in Japan, and there is no tradition of free institutions even so proximate as the rise of Hitler and Mussolini.

Here we have, then, the difficult problem of nurturing democratic institutions in a land where they have never existed or among peoples without recent experience with them. These peoples are really politically backward peoples. Basically our task, then, is the difficult one of political education. I should have said that our problem is to help these people to educate themselves. The means of public information must be restored and there must be set in motion all those multiple forces which give knowledge to the people and stimulate their opinions. There shall have to be a free press. The radio must be open to the dissemination of knowledge and the expression of opinions on public matters. It must be the forum for public debate. A similar opportunity is open to the motion picture, which has the rare advantage of teaching by both sight and sound. The American motion picture industry has a rare opportunity and responsibility in this field, for in what more dramatic and more effective way could the institutions and the manner of living of the American people or of other free nations be indelibly imprinted upon the consciousness of the liberated peoples than through the marvel of the motion sound picture? Religious freedom must be beyond question. Above all things, the educational system, giving both primary and secondary education, must become the fountainhead of democracy. One can imagine the magnitude of the task of purging from the educational system of the Axis countries all the poisonous influences that have perverted at least a generation of youth, and making such school systems the dispenser of sound knowledge and training and the support of free institutions.

What must be the characteristics of the government which we should allow to exist in these occupied lands? The question will immediately arise in the case of Italy as to whether a king will be acceptable, whatever his status; in Japan, whether we will permit an emperor. There might be even the question as to whether we would allow, to a people who wanted one, a fuehrer. It seems to me that the important thing is not the title which either the titular or politically responsible head of the state might have. Italy had a king before Mussolini. The Japanese from time immemorial have had an emperor. Britain has a king. The important thing is whether the government is chosen by and responsible to the people.

Surely any government entitled to be called representative must be a government sanctioned by the free choice of the people in a free election in which the citizens must be immune from any kind of intimidation either before or after the election. By free election, of course, we mean that before the election there must have been fullest opportunity for debate, for discussion in every public forum. There cannot be tyranny where civil rights and free elections are secure. If we find that a government is chosen by the people and that it respects the civil liberties of the people, then we cannot deny that such a government is democratic in character. Obviously, such standards deny the right of the government to gain or keep power by force.

It will not be an easy task to nourish representative governments into being or to restrain either the impulse or the natural circumstances which will pull us toward substitution of our will for the people's will, making such governments mere puppets in the hands of our political or occupying forces. We shall have to be wary of internal factionalism and the expected jealousies and rivalries which we shall encounter. It will take good sense and understanding and forbearance on our part to make these governments walk by themselves. We shall

ever be confronted with the temptation either to carry or to drive such governments.

II

Nothing will be more important than our relationship to the economies of the liberated lands. Our first task, of course, will be to see to it that such people get adequate food and nourishment. Then, we shall have to see to it that their economies are rebuilt, private enterprise reestablished, private initiative is restored. But if we disengage them from the Axis economy pattern, they will have to be fitted into the economy of the free world. They must be given a chance to live as an unregimented nontotalitarian nation. Naturally, they will be expected to help themselves, but they will be entitled to our help also. Private business will have to be reestablished; private initiative and enterprise stimulated again; the spirit and the genius of invention and discovery, stifled by the totalitarian state, must be aroused again. We must remember that the strong nations will be as much responsible for the economic survival of these freed peoples as for their political and territorial security. We shall have gained nothing if we rescue them from the tyranny of political totalitarianism and leave them the victims of world-wide economic chaos.

There was never a more vivid example of the penalty of selfishness, which led the western powers and ourselves to deny that we are our brother's keeper, than what we did in abandoning the Weimar Republic in Germany. We stood by as nations and saw this struggling child of democracy go down before economic forces against which it could not possibly survive alone. We saw it gradually crushed by the bitter opposition of those old autocratic forces which were, and are, the uncompromising enemy of democracy. We allowed the inflation and the mass unemployment and the economic chaos in Germany, out of the womb of which came Hitler. We all remember the bitter breakdown in the German economy after the war and the civil strife which followed it and made even Hitler palatable. How little it would have cost us all to have saved Germany! How much it has cost us to let her be torn apart! I hope we have learned enough to recognize that the family of nations can never allow a member nation to be wrecked again. It is not charity, nor decent sentiment, but enlightened selfishness which demands that we so order the affairs of the world that either weak or struggling new democracies may be able to live and move and have their being in it.

Let those who shall complain about a little trade concession or a loan or a grant, for that matter, to keep a nation alive and free, remember the immeasurable cost of our having let Germany collapse. We have established, through lend-lease in war, the principle that supporting another nation, helping it to survive, is a direct contribution to our own security and strength. This principle must be employed in peace as in war.

We have already made a start in this direction by the planning that is in progress for international currency stabilization to keep down destructive inflation after the war. The recent International Food Conference indicates that we are taking a world-wide point of view in respect to the production and distribution of food. There will come other conferences to deal with all the multiple materials which are the foundations of the world economy. There will have to be a sensible arrangement giving access to raw materials to all on an equal basis. There must be a way of financing public works in the areas that need to be repaired or developed all over the world. Health and housing and labor standards, intellectual collaboration, the curbing of crime, and the war against the causes of crime are, of course, all world-wide in scope. Machinery for the adjustment of all kinds of conflicts and disputes will have to be set up. Some points of clash and conflict will be juridical, some will be territorial, some political, some economic.

As nearly as possible the reconciliation of interests must come from private sources, from the recognition of sensible men in sensible groups that we have all got to "get on" with one another all over the world. But there will have to be public forums, tribunals, courts to the bar of which must come even nations with their complaints and claims. And, of course, there shall have to be some effective way of enforcing the decisions of such tribunals.

III

We cannot expect a lawful world without world law, and there cannot be a world law without a world court—a world judicial system. We have passed the point in civilization when we can continue to allow a nation to run amuck. We can no longer reliably depend upon the international posse to deal with international brigands. Surely, we will no longer expose ourselves to the humiliation of admitting that we cannot evolve a substitute for the institution of war. War is too destructive, too disastrous, as well as too revolting, to have a place in a civilized order. Yet we know that war has been resorted to by those who wanted things—from the tribe to the nation—because it was the only way or the best way to get what was desired. No citizen is safe in a lawless community. No nation is safe in a lawless world. Now, at last, we must stretch law over the boundaries of nations, as it has been drawn across the boundaries of communities, and establish a lawful world.

I do not want to overemphasize, however, an international police force. In fact, the clash of interests which makes wars can be resolved better by an intelligent adjustment of conflicts and claims, a sensible recognition of rights and duties, than by the mere repressive power of some sort of international force. The time to stop wars is before the pressure has become explosive, and the only way to do this is to have intelligent, enlightened, and sensible cooperation and collaboration among the powers and leaders of the world.

It was not the absence of an international army, police force, or air power which led the Japanese, the Italians, and the Germans, respectively, to launch their several campaigns of aggression and get away with it. It was the absence of a single will among the free nations and peoples, and the lack of determination on their part to keep down brigandage and banditry. If around the nucleus of the United States, Russia, and Britain there may be formed the free peoples of the earth with a will to keep the world safe, and the machinery for working effectively together is set up and maintained, the world will at last have not only become free, but the abiding place of permanent peace.

It is expected the United Nations will not only disarm the Axis Powers, but keep them disarmed so thoroughly that not even one cannon shall be forged to threaten the peace of any people. But more than that, it is my hope that all other peoples will be disarmed, too—at least to the point where every nation shall be unable to jeopardize the security of any other nation, however weak it may be. I mean that now the dominant members of the United Nations must rid the world of the vice of armaments and relieve all nations, save those who will remain guardians of peace—and later, even them—from the crushing burden of preparation for or against war. It will take the very best the world has to restore the broken earth, and no more "sweat, toil, and tears" must be squandered upon the means of making a war.

If there is an effective disarmament—say, such as is necessary to keep the world peace—then boundary disputes and all other differences will have to be settled by peaceful means. For almost any nation would be able to defend itself against a weaponless aggressor, even if the forces charged with the responsibility of maintaining world order took no hand in the matter. Again, if the United Nations make it a condition of membership in the world community that a government be not only the representative government of the people, but that it protect the decent civil liberties of the people, border and boundary will mean less, nations will be less determined to seek territory by change of boundaries. I mean that if a minority group is allowed to enjoy its civil liberties, it may not be so resolved to detach itself from one national entity and incorporate in another. While flexibility and change in boundaries, and even voluntary transfers of population, may have to be envisaged, there is relatively little danger of consequent international conflict or chaos if all peoples are allowed a fair place in the sun economically, and civil liberties and security are guaranteed to all. What I am suggesting is that the best way to permanent peace is through an affirmative working out of world affairs and problems, so that by keeping down the conditions which make for war, we shall keep down war.

There is a growing solidarity of world opinion due to the intimacy with which the people of the world live together. Yet no international organization can be without its own forum for the expression of a world opinion and point of view. I hope to see, as soon as possible in the organization of the United Nations, provisions made for a regular forum for public discussion. I can even foresee that the United Nations, if they maintain a forum for the free discussion of international problems, may gradually work out the organizational arrangement which experience might dictate, and we might be able to get on with the running of the world in a pretty satisfactory way even before we felt ourselves able to say with certainty just what the blueprint of the world order should be.

These are some of the ramifications of those problems which will confront us when the first territory is occupied, when the first liberated people become our wards. The way in which we shall meet these problems, the breadth of vision, the understanding, the very spirit we exhibit, will indicate how much we have learned—whether we are big enough and great enough to be the architects of that noble edifice for which so many have so long suffered, fought, and died.

Just Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this morning I chanced to come across an old poem, written by Edgar A. Guest, which brought home to me a truth upon which most men come to ponder during the course of their lives and that is, that of all the inspiring and constructive influences that come into our lives, those exerted upon us in our formative years by our public and church school teachers

are, often times, the most stimulating and the most profound.

I well remember the continuing and sincere interest which both my Sabbath school and particularly my grade-school teacher displayed in me—even after I had left the public school, at an early age, to work in the nearby iron and steel mill. It was largely through this interest that I was led to continue my education in later years and more nearly to qualify myself for those callings which were to come to me in the calendar of time.

Mr. President, I know full well that many millions of Americans feel the same sense of deep gratitude and appreciation for the teachers who have come into their lives. And so, I ask unanimous consent that this poem written by Mr. Guest be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a sincere tribute to the many teachers in the public and church schools of America who labor long hours in the cause of humanity and whose principal compensations are the joy and satisfaction they derive in creating within each succeeding generation of American youth that enduring spark of mature kindredness which makes of them that fine corps of citizens which guides the course of this Nation onward through the uncharted seas of time.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST FOLKS

(By Edgar A. Guest)

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS

Tribute to them all I'd pay,
Those now here and those away.
Tellers of the ancient glories,
Readers of the ancient stories,
Counselors of the Golden Rule—
Teachers of the Sunday School.

Little known and mentioned not
Much beyond the parish plot,
Tracing through the Bible's pages
Stories which have graced the ages;
Leading youngsters by the hand
To, and through, the Holy Land.

Parson, rector, rabbi gray,
Grown-ups hear the things you say,
But the minds too young for preaching
Volunteers for God are teaching.
Down in cloistered spaces dim
Children small they bring to Him.

Still today I can recall
Verses learned when I was small.
Here almost at life's December
Much they taught me I remember.
May their ardor never cool,
Teachers of the Sunday School.

Message From the Seventeenth Ohio District to Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, when Congress recessed I returned to my Seventeenth Congressional District of Ohio to learn what the folks back home are thinking about.

As had been arranged and publicized, I was at the courthouse of each county seat in my district for 2 days interviewing anyone who cared to call; then each night I held an open forum or round-table discussion in the courtroom. After this tour, requiring 12 days, I again covered my district, making 18 speeches to various civic organizations and visiting with my constituents, in an effort to learn their opinions on the various issues confronting Congress and the country.

During the time spent at the courthouses, I averaged 44 personal interviews a day. People came there to discuss problems of interest to them.

At the five open-forum night meetings held in the courtrooms the average attendance was 229. The average attendance at the 18 civic-organization meetings—12 open-forum meetings—was 237.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, having contacted approximately 6,000 constituents, I believe I am in a position to report to Congress what the people of my district are thinking about and to offer to you and to the Congress their recommendations:

My people, first, want to make every necessary sacrifice to win the war, but they are opposed to any unnecessary sacrifices.

Second, want Congress to retain its rights and be a legislative body, and not yield its control to any individual or group. They do not want a rubber-stamp Congress.

Third, want politics, jealousy, selfishness, greed, and profiteering taken out of our war program.

Fourth, want to know the truth about our war production, war policy, our gains and losses on the battle fronts. They want the news to come from our Government. They do not want to be dependent upon some of our allies for this information.

Fifth, want immediate dismissal of all on the Federal pay roll who are not needed and who are not giving performance comparable to their pay. Those not needed should be placed in armed service, on essential production lines, or on the farms.

Sixth, want the Federal Government to recognize State and local rights and the right of private and individual initiative.

Seventh, want policy-forming departments to be headed by individuals with practical experience; not theorists.

Eighth, want the right to work and the right to produce without unnecessary governmental red tape and interference.

Ninth, want Congress to establish a definite post-war policy, guaranteeing to the "boys and girls," when they return home, employment and a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with the above wants of my people, and I believe them to be the desires of the majority of the people of our Nation. I, therefore, respectfully urge and request that the leadership, as well as my colleagues in Congress, cooperate with me in every possible way in order that these wishes be fulfilled, all of which I am certain will be determining factors in bringing this war to an early and successful conclusion.

Tax Program for 1944

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill for 1944 should be based on certain principles.

No conscientious member of Congress will fail to reduce Government expenses whenever and wherever it is possible to do so. The Civil Service Committee of the House is now beginning to make its reports on Government personnel. On the basis of those reports, it is, I think, certain that Congress will take whatever action it can toward cutting down governmental personnel to the minimum necessary to carry on effectively the all-important work of the Government during this war period. The War Department has already removed over 100,000 people from its civilian pay roll in the last few months.

It is a deception of the people, however, to give them the impression that even if we cut out every dime of expenditure for ordinary expenses of government, even if we were to abolish the State Department and the Department of Agriculture completely, it would make any appreciable difference in the financial situation of our country. Only if we drastically cut war expenses themselves could we possibly remove the necessity of very heavy taxation indeed in this war period. I believe most Americans want one thing above all others and that is the speediest and most complete possible victory. And while there should be the most careful congressional scrutiny of appropriations for the Army and Navy and reductions whenever wise, those appropriations ought not to be cut one dime below the point of absolute safety from the standpoint of the most complete and effective prosecution of the war in the opinion of our military leaders.

The men in America's fighting forces are paying for victory right now in their own toil and sweat and sometimes in their own suffering and death. It is little enough, therefore, for us to make it a first principle of this tax bill that those of us who are left at home should come as close as humanly possible to paying for the war financially as we go along. The heavier the tax levies become, however, the more important it is that taxes should be levied in such fashion as neither to destroy as to any element in our population the basic standard of living which is necessary for health and welfare, nor to cripple in any way maximum production for the war itself.

Finally taxes are the one really effective way to prevent inflation. But they should fall upon those who really have excess purchasing power compared to the supply of goods and not on those who are far from having excess buying power do not even have enough to purchase a full share of the necessities of life.

With these facts and principles in mind I propose the following 10-point program for the 1944 tax bill:

A. FOR GREATER EQUITY AND FOR SIMPLIFICATION

First. Repeal the Victory tax.

Second. Increase the credit for children from $350 to $400.

Third. Remove all penalties for failure to estimate accurately the amount of income in any quarterly report as to income received in excess of that subject to the withholding tax and give taxpayers the option of either making these quarterly reports and paying taxes quarterly or of making one report on December 15 as is done in the case of farmers now.

Fourth. Plug the loopholes in the excess-profits tax.

Fifth. Otherwise leave business taxes where they are.

B TO PROVIDE NECESSARY WARTIME REVENUE, CHECK INFLATION, AND ASSURE LONG-TERM SAVINGS FOR ALL GROUPS AND CLASSES OF PEOPLE

Sixth. Provide now for improvement of the social-security program and its expansion to cover all groups of our people instead of only half of them. The Social Security System is a system of savings by the people which is already set up and in effect and which will make their savings available to them over a period of time rather than all at once right after the war. Thus it will provide a continuous support for the home market for American production in the future as well as give a fundamental hope to all people about that future. For this purpose increase social-security taxes as of January 1, 1944, to 6 percent on both employees and employers, at the same time extending those provisions to cover those groups in the population who do not now participate. This will yield approximately as much additional revenue as would the Treasury's proposed increase in the withholding-tax rates on the first bracket of the income tax.

Seventh. Do not increase income-tax rates in the first surtax bracket at all and do not increase withholding-tax rates except as provided under the expansion of the social-security program.

Eighth. Lower exemptions and increase the rates in the estate and inheritance taxes in order to prevent unfair advantage accruing to the heirs of present taxpayers as a result of the passage of the 75-percent tax-abatement bill.

Ninth. Exempting food, medical supplies, rent, and other necessities of life, levy a selective tax on luxury purchases generally so as to discourage unnecessary luxury consumption during this war period and so as to raise in the neighborhood of $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 in revenue.

Tenth. Increase income-tax rates in the brackets above the first surtax bracket sufficient to provide in addition to other sources of revenue in this program approximately the goal set up by the Treasury, and to provide such rates in the upper brackets as to put into effect a practical limitation on the amount of income that a person can keep and spend upon himself, after taxes, during this war period. That practical limit ought certainly to be no more than $25,000 and a figure considerably less than that would certainly be more in line with the principle of wartime sacrifice.

The Jump-Off Club—Workers at the Lake Washington Shipyards, Houghton, Wash., Donate Recreational Huts and Rest Centers for United States Armed Forces

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, for some time, the employees of the Lake Washington Shipyards, located at Houghton, King County, State of Washington, have been engaged in a noteworthy activity which deserves the attention and commendation of the American people. These employees voluntarily have formed a group called the Jump-Off Club, of which the chairman is Mr. Ed Marchant, and the secretary, Herb Hilscher, who is also the editor of the noteworthy official organ of the personnel of the Lake Washington Shipyards, which publication is known as On the Ways. More than $35,000 have been contributed by the employees of this shipyard, an average of $5 apiece from each worker, to date.

The purpose of this organization, known as the Jump-Off Club, is to outfit recreational huts and rest centers for the armed forces of the United States, including the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Air Corps, and related services in that area stretching from Seattle via the Aleutian Islands to the capital of Japan. A recreational hut has been provided for Fort Lawton in the staging area near Seattle. A completely outfitted recreational home for bomber squadrons has been sent to Adak, Alaska. Included in the Adak recreational home are 16 davenports, 25 writing tables, desks, and floor lamps, 300 different games, including ping-pong tables and balls. Lights, washing machines, and electric irons, a phonograph combined with a 17-tube radio, are included. A silex and a billiard table and a piano may be found among the equipment. Large supplies of stationery and 400 books are also included in the equipment. These are flown in to the widely scattered stations where our armed forces are stationed by the Navy.

In 20 isolated Army posts scattered throughout Alaska, where the boys are frozen in from October to the 1st of June, recreational huts have been outfitted completely. Likewise, 7 Navy posts on the Aleutians have been outfitted. Two recreational huts on Attu have already been fully equipped; also 2 huts have been provided for Kiska. An occupational therapy unit for boys returning from Alaska has also been provided as well as a recreational unit for 1 isolated Coast Guard unit. It is the avowed purpose of the enterprising and go-getting members of the Jump-Off Club to provide and furnish a recreational hut on each island for our armed forces from Seattle to Tokyo.

The Jump-Off Club officials have been told that there is no recreational hut in existence comparable with the two such huts established and equipped for the benefit of the enlisted men at Fort Lawton, Seattle.

The shipyard workers through the unique organization, the Jump-Off Club, have furnished subscriptions to newspapers and magazines throughout the country for each recreational hut. Every month these energetic, altruistic shipyards workers, through the Jump-Off Club, have been adding to the libraries in the recreational rooms which they have provided and furnished.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no finer organization to build up the morale and augment the patriotic spirit than the Jump-Off Club. I congratulate these men and women for extending the helping hand to their brothers and sisters in the armed services.

Such generosity and helpfulness rendered to their fellow citizens by workers in shipyards, is an outstanding example of cooperation which will inevitably draw closer together these two patriotic groups, both dedicated to a common objective of early victory.

The employees of Lake Washington Shipyards are doing worth-while things for men stationed in the treeless, windswept islands of the Aleutians and the lonely, frozen, barren, and remote posts on the Alaskan coast. It was in March of this year when the Jump-Off Club was organized. By the end of that month, $6,500 had already been donated. At the Jump-Off Club rally on March 15, Capt. Francis P. Borowsky, pastor of St. Valentine's Catholic Church in the Bronx, and chaplain in the staging area at Fort X, explained how much good a homelike recreational building would do. Contracts were thereafter let for the recreation building and on Monday, March 29, work commenced. In the April 3, 1943, number of On the Ways, appeared the following editorial:

TO YOU MEN IN THE OUTER ALEUTIANS

As you know, during the past 2 weeks we employees of Lake Washington Shipyards have carried on a campaign to raise a fund to supply you with a first-class recreational hut, on one of the islands pretty close to "Japanese Alaska."

We want to take this opportunity of thanking you for the privilege of doing something direct and concrete for you—that has demonstrated more than words can tell—the affection we have for you.

The knowledge that the furniture, the radio, the phonograph and records, the piano, the books, the washing machine, the games,

and all the rest of the stuff will make you a little happier, has done something for us.

When we read of the raids on Kiska, of the patrol flights in the Bering Sea and naval action off the islands, those dispatches will have definite meaning to us at Lake Washington Shipyards. We'd like to feel that when you return from your tasks, our coffee maker will supply you with warmth and the music from that big phonograph will carry your thoughts back home.

This experiment in shaking hands with our boys on a distant battle front has been thrilling to us. We want to keep it up. That recreation hut out there on your barren, wind-swept island is just as much ours as it is yours. And we want to keep it that way.

We'd like to hear from you. We'd like to know how you are getting along. Is there anything we can send you? You see, we plan to keep the "Jump-Off" pot simmering just a bit and believe us, fellows, you will make us awfully happy if you will call on us first.

We at the shipyards would like to feel that you out there and we here building seaplane tenders for the Navy have a definite bond of relationship.

Does the idea hit home with you? That's swell. Here's our hand in friendship and affection.

THE GANG AT LAKE
WASHINGTON SHIPYARDS.

Nard Jones, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, thirteenth naval district public relations officer, and in private life an eminent, internationally famous novelist, wrote to the Jump-Off Club in May:

I imagine you will find great satisfaction in knowing that your material has been in use for some time and has been helping our force on the Japanese front.

F. S. Udall, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, wrote to the shipyard workers a letter, from which I quote:

I wish to express the keen appreciation of every member of our squadron to every member of the shipyard for everything they have sent us. Words are inadequate to express the attitude of our men as each crate was opened. Then, if you could have walked in, seen the fun and recreation you have been instrumental in providing for us at the end of a busy day, I am sure you would feel the whole Jump-Off program was more worth while. We'll do our best to give a good accounting of ourselves on our present assignment.

Mrs. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., wrote a touching letter in relation to the Lake Washington Shipyard's activities hereinabove enumerated, from which I read:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *August 16, 1943.*

To the JUMP-OFF CLUB,
Care of Lake Washington Shipyards,
Houghton, Wash.:

The employees of Lake Washington Shipyards have the esteem and gratitude of the men in the armed forces of our country for what you already have done in giving them such wonderful recreational facilities at the staging area in Fort Lawton and at several advance bases in the Aleutians.

Your Jump-Off Club program is most commendable, and, if it meets with your pleasure, I should like to have the honor of being the first outside of your shipyard family to belong to the Jump-Off Club. And here are my $5.

Yours for a successful campaign,

MRS. SIMON BOLIVAR BUCKNER, Jr.

The Northwest Camp and Hospital Council likewise directed a self-explanatory letter to the shipyard workers which is interesting and informative and I take pleasure in reading it:

THE NORTHWEST CAMP AND HOSPITAL COUNCIL, AMERICAN RED CROSS,
Seattle, Wash., August 21, 1943.

ED MARCHANT,
Chairman, The Jump-Off Club,
Houghton, Wash.

DEAR MR. MARCHANT: The employees of Lake Washington Shipyards are making an enviable record in turning out ships, but I don't think enough people know of the grand contribution the men and women across the lake are making toward the comfort of the Yanks in the front line trenches.

Knowing of the exploits of your Jump-Off Club, I want to offer my warm congratulations.

In my position as chairman of the Northwest Camp and Hospital Council, as well as the Seattle War Athletic Council, I am in position to know how much the day rooms and recreational equipment are appreciated by the men in uniform. You folks over there should certainly feel proud of the splendid manner in which you are packing the ball for the soldiers and sailors.

You guys and gals are certainly doing a great job. Please call on me if I can help in any way to put over your forthcoming drive.

Cordially,

ROYAL BROUGHAM,
Chairman.

An interesting editorial appeared in the September 1 issue of On the Ways which I think well worth reading to the Congress and to the rest of the country:

L. W. S. HAS A HEART

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." How often, in the course of our years, we have done something for others that has returned to bless us a hundredfold.

It has not been with the intention of having our "blessings" returned to us that we at L. W. S. have initiated the Jump-Off Club.

It has been solely and completely an expression of our affection and faith in our boys doing a job for us that we have started the Jump-Off Club.

How many times have we been away from home and loved ones, and feeling a bit blue, when someone has put a hand on our shoulder, given us a smile, and a word of cheer and welcome. It has meant so much to us.

It is in this same spirit that we wholeheartedly have dedicated the Jump-Off Club to our boys in the Aleutians, to those in eight isolated snow-bound posts in Alaska, to those in hospitals and in psychopathic wards.

Money alone avails us nothing. It will not buy friendship or affection. But in the years to come we of L. W. S. can look back upon the Jump-Off Club as being one of our finest contributions to the war effort. In essence, it is our hand on the shoulders of our boys, it is our warm smile, it is our word of affection to those far from home, to those who wonder at times if perhaps they have not been forgotten.

To those who have been on the battle front, to those who have experienced the lonesomeness, the heartaches, and dreary vigil in the Aleutians, we give the recreation huts with our blessing, our good wishes and our Godspeed.

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you" is a Golden Rule of Life, and we of LWS have demonstrated that we have an abiding faith in our boys.

Good luck and Godspeed is an unwritten part of each contribution to the Jump-Off Club. And as we sit in our comfortable homes and enjoy the security we have, we can feel a glow in our hearts that we have done something directly and personally for the lads out there.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time of the Congress so that the Members of this distinguished body may be apprised of the fact that workers in war industry, though much abused and maligned by some of the press, are eager to give of their earnings for the benefit of the brave boys in lonely places carrying on the war against the enemy. In this case the public-spirited men and women of the Lake Washington shipyards, comprising about 7,000 in number, are devoting themselves to the welfare and recreational comfort of the men in the armed services who are far from home comforts and peacetime luxuries and pleasures which they all crave and enjoy. I am proud these workers are located in my congressional district and that they have voluntarily undertaken to relieve the monotony, to brighten the days, to shorten the long, dreary nights of our boys far from home. Too often, careless commentators have seen fit to carp at shipyard workers and to stigmatize them as malingerers. Promiscuously, captious critics have classed all shipyard workers as a grasping, greedy group whose sole interest in the war was to work as little and take as much in the form of wages as would be tolerated by management and Government. This is far from the truth. Shipyard workers as a group, with a few insignificant exceptions, are desirous to do a dollar's worth of work for a dollar received. They are highly patriotic. They are proud that the product of their muscles and brain is an instrument of war which will contribute to the destruction of the enemy. Their hearts go out in sympathy and fellowship to their fellow citizen in uniform. They are eager to do their part to assuage the homesickness of the boys out there. Through the Jump-Off Club, they are donating ineffably valuable recreational media for the armed services. May continuing success attend their activities in this field. All of us in Congress, figuratively speaking, grasp the hands of the good folks in the Lake Washington shipyards who, without fanfare, are carrying on so admirably to befriend men in uniform.

New York City Police and Fire Departments

REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the city of New York have been twice blessed in possessing as they do the world's finest police and fire departments. For the past 40 years, throughout this Nation the New York City police have been known as the finest, and our fire department has been known as the bravest. There is scarcely a city in this land that has not sent members of their

own police and fire department to New York to study the methods, customs, and traditions of these two superb groups. Truly, they have become two of the outstanding phenomena of New York.

We, who are citizens of New York, have long since recognized the dependability of these two splendid corps. We know that at all times that our lives and our property receive the maximum protection that human minds and courageous bodies can grant us. We know that nowhere else in the world have the two enemies of civilization, crime and fire, been so far suppressed. We have been proud in times of stress, in times of large public gatherings, in times of conflagration, and in commonplace times of everyday occurrences, of the service given to us by our brave, intelligent, resourceful policemen and firemen. Never have these men flinched, regardless of the odds. Never do they show the white feather of fear when their own very lives are in danger. Each year the list of men from these two departments who have died in the performance of their duty exceeds the ratio of deaths that armies ordinarily suffer in wartime. We have learned that these fine men on all occasions are willing to give their time, their efforts, and their initiative to every communal enterprise.

Thirteen years ago, the people of New York City, recognizing the loyalty and the talents of these departments granted them a minimum salary for first-grade policemen and firemen of $3,000. Never have our citizenry regretted their munificence. This salary was granted at a time when the cost of living was far lower than it is today and when something could be done to maintain a decent standard of living with a sum of that size. Today entirely different conditions exist.

Both Departments are considerably undermanned due to the war. Many of these men are now in the armed services with the result that their companions who have been left behind must in many instances do the work of two and three men. Working hours in the Departments have been extended. It is not unusual for these men to do 70 hours' work a week in the performance of their duties. The 20 percent withholding tax has reduced their salaries to an amount far less than it was the original intention of the citizenry to grant them. The greater majority of these men, despite the fact that they have homes, families, and other obligations, are putting aside 10 percent of their salaries for War bonds. Each successive drive by the Red Cross, the U. S. O., and other great agencies that are catering to and assisting the men in the armed forces, finds further reductions from the salaries of our policemen and firemen. They respond to every call and respond magnificently.

Eight hundred thousand citizens, recognizing their (firemen and policemen) financial plight, and further recognizing that if relief is not given many of our firemen and policemen will have to find more lucrative employment, have petitioned that a referendum be held on election day, November 2, to give these splendid public servants a bonus of $450 per annum for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind this is but justice and common sense. If the people of our city are to retain the services of these two splendid bodies, and if their morale and efficiency is to be kept at present standards, it is imperative that this bonus be given.

We Have Loved Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Times-Herald of October 11 comes the following of our love and hate record as compiled by one of the numerous organizations now sending propaganda to Congressmen. It reads:

1755 (French and Indian War): We loved the British and hated the French.

1776 (American Revolution): We loved the French and hated the British.

1799 (sea battles with France): We hated the French.

1812 (War of 1812): We loved the French and hated the British.

1846 (Mexican War over Texas): We loved the southerners and hated the Mexicans.

1861-1864 (Civil War): Britain aids the South; we hated the southerners and the British.

1898 (Spanish-American War): We hated the Spanish.

1899 (conquest of the Philippines): We hated the Chinese and the Filipinos.

1900 (Boxer uprising in China): We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese.

1904 (Russo-Japanese War): We loved the Japanese and hated the Russians.

1914 (Allies in World War No. 1): We loved the Japanese and the Russians.

1914 (marines land at Vera Cruz): We hated the Mexicans.

1914 (beginning of World War No. 1): We loved the British and French and hated the Austrians and Germans.

1915 (Italy joins Allies): We loved the Italians.

1916 (Pershing invades Mexico): We hated the Mexicans.

1917 (Allies in World War No. 1): (Russian Bolshevik revolution): We loved the Japanese and the Chinese, but not the Russians.

1918 (our troops invade Russia): We loved the Italians and hated the Russians.

1927 (United States bombards Nanking): We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese.

1935 (Italy invades Ethiopia): We hated the Italians.

1936 (Communists despoil China): We loved the Chinese and hated the Russians.

1939 (beginning of World War No. 2): We loved the British and French and hated the Germans and Russians.

1939 (Russia invades Finland): We loved the Finns and hated the Russians.

1941 (Russia fights Germany and Finland): We loved the Russians and hated the Finns.

1941 (war with Japan): We loved the Filipinos and hated the Japanese.

1941 (World War No. 2): We loved the British, Chinese, Dutch, Russians and hated the Germans, Italians and Japanese.

1942 (despite Vichy regime): We loved some French and hated others.

1942 (Allies in World War No. 2): We loved the Mexicans and other Latin Americans.

1943: We love the Chinese, try to love Russians, British.

1944 and afterward: Shall we continue our tragically fatal, shifting friendships and hatreds? Or shall be abandon our futile and suicidal opportunism and begin now to cooperate constructively with the peoples of all countries in building a better world together?

The list omitted Italy, which we are now expected to love, probably because it was compiled prior to Italy's surrender.

May I most humbly suggest that we begin to love America and that when we take the pledge to the flag, as we do so often, we mean it; that we remain constant in our love of America, loyal to our pledge to her.

The people of every other country think first of their native land. Some here in America seem to think first of every land other than the one in which they were born or which they have adopted—America.

Threatened Coal Strike Catastrophe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, aside from the threatened national catastrophe resulting from the coal strike to which Secretary Ickes refers in the press, he, through no fault of his own, faces another national calamity in a shortage of oil. The sit-down strike of the O. P. A., relating to an increase in the price of crude oil, is producing a national calamity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of October 18, 1943:

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND MINERS DEFY RETURN PLEAS—ICKES SEES COAL STRIKE "NATIONAL CATASTROPHE"

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., October 18.—The majority of Alabama's 22,000 soft-coal miners apparently defied today the back-to-work orders of the War Labor Board and union leaders.

As their walk-out in protest against the absence of a new contract and return of the mines to private operation entered its fifth day, report indicated that only a few of the miners would return to work in small commercial pits.

The strike has curtailed sharply the output of steel and pig-iron production in the war plants of Alabama.

FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE TO GO BACK

The 555 miners employed at the Woodward Iron Co. Mulga shaft were the only ones who were reported to have voted definitely to return.

The 1,050 miners at the Sayreton mines of Republic Steel Corporation, two of the

State's largest mines, even refused to meet yesterday to consider the appeal by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, that they resume production today.

The 1,196 men at the Wylam shaft of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., another of the larger mines, decided to continue the strike until the W. L. B. acts on a contract.

"To hell with the union and to hell with W. L. B.," one Wylam miner shouted. "No contract, no work, and this time that stands."

"CATASTROPHE," SAYS ICKES

In addition to the W. L. B. order and Lewis' plea, John J. Hanratty, U. M. W. international representative, appealed to the miners yesterday to "get on your muckers, return to work, and produce a record tonnage of coal."

Hanratty's appeal followed a warning from Fuel Administrator Harold Ickes that the strike threatens a national catastrophe.

Mines idle included the Docena, Wylam, and Hamilton mines of the Tennessee Co., which employ about 4,200 men; the two Sayreton mines, and all mines of the Sloss-Sheffield Iron & Steel Co., and the Aalabama By-Products Co.

Since the strike began more than 50,000 tons of coal have been lost daily forcing Tennessee and Republic to bank seven blast furnaces. Tennessee also closed five open hearth furnaces. The pig iron loss was estimated at 6,000 tons daily.

Alien Japanese Working on Lewis and Clark Highway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, anent the situation pertaining to alien Japanese under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization of the Department of Justice, a camp has been established in the State of Idaho that is a salutary example of a constructive policy in the utilization of internee labor.

About 200 alien Japanese volunteers are occupying a road camp in the Bitter Root range of the Rocky Mountains and are devoting their efforts under guard to the completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway through the national forest. This is a project that has been under construction for a long period, the completion of which will provide an avenue of travel through a primitive area and connect an isolated section of the Pacific Northwest with a network of highways to the east of the mountains.

In 1935 the Bureau of Prisons at my request established a work camp on the Lewis and Clark Highway which existed until last spring at which time the prison personnel diminished to a point where continuance was impractical. The camp was evacuated of prisoners and the buildings transferred to the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization which immediately pressed it into service for housing alien Japanese. An account of the camp, the personnel, the routine and the progress being made in completing the highway was published in the Lewiston Morning Tribune, Lewiston, Idaho, on September 26. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

ALIEN JAPANESE WORK ON LEWIS AND CLARK HIGHWAY

(By Tish Erb)

Repeated by the uninformed, fostered by antipathy for the race, and denoting a misunderstanding of the international regulations observed by the United States in the treatment of internees, rumor is rife that the Japanese aliens at the Kooskia internment camp are languishing in their mountain retreat with the construction project to which they are assigned suffering indifference. If the rumor were true, it would be an indictment of the integrity of officials of the Immigration Service, of the Department of Justice, and of the Public Roads Administration under whose jurisdiction and supervision the coffee-colored men live and work.

The Kooskia internment camp, converted from a Federal prison camp to its present purpose, is the first experiment in this country in the utilization of Japanese alien labor on Government construction. The satisfactory progress made in the short time the camp has been in existence gives evidence of the benefit to be derived from an expansion of the program to other internee groups or prisoners of war.

The officer in charge of the camp is D. A. Remer, who was the able supervisor of the Federal prison camp from its inception in September 1935 to its evacuation last spring, when he was transferred from the Bureau of Prisons to the Immigration Service for the new project. It was under Mr. Remer's supervision and direction that the camp group of neat, white buildings, nestling like a vignette of civilization superimposed on the primeval forest background, were constructed.

Walter C. Wood, a young man who has been in Japanese alien internee camps as an officer of the Immigration Service since they were established, is the assistant officer in charge of the camp.

The Immigration Service has the responsibility of the physical and spiritual welfare of the internees, and the Public Roads Administration directs the work that is being done on the Lewis and Clark Highway. In this connection, it is of interest to note that practically the same officers of the P. R. A. are directing the alien labor as were directing the prison labor, giving continuity to the efforts to complete the project.

There is no cause to extol the inherent industrious habits of the Japanese, all of whom lived in this country prior to the war and made their living by the sweat of their brow or the exercise of their intellect. Even if they were parasites of economic society, the Government regulations, and the camp routine would provide an impetus to industry.

VOLUNTEERS FOR WORK

Aliens of Japanese, German, and Italian ancestry, rounded up, separated from their families and placed in internment camps after war was declared, for the most part spent their time within fenced enclosures under heavy guard in idleness. After pronouncement by the State Department that the alien internees were subject to the same international rules as those observed by this country in the treatment of prisoners of war pertaining to work, rations, and wages, the Japanese were given an opportunity to volunteer for Government work at which they would remain under guard but would be given a chance to learn a trade and earn a wage.

Aliens cannot be compelled to work. There are those who will disagree with this tenet of the Geneva Conference to which the United States is a signatory and in their animosity will advocate slavery for enemy aliens or prisoners, but the conference agreement proposed the greatest good to the greatest number. When it is pointed out that Japan does not extend humane treatment to American aliens or prisoners, it must be remembered that Japan did not ratify the Geneva Convention and that Japanese living standards, both civilian and military, are inferior to those of Christian nations like America.

After enough Japanese aliens had been recruited as volunteers to make up a community group, the Lochsa Federal prison camp was evacuated of its small number of prison personnel and the alien occupants were established there to continue the work so well advanced by the prisoner regime on the Lewis and Clark Highway.

Some of the Japanese in the camp have been in the United States for more than 40 years, some are graduates of American universities, and some do not speak English. Their average age is 37 and their average residence here is 25 years. Their families are strung from Maine to Mexico. Their peacetime occupations ranged from the professions to exporter, restauranter, fruit grower, ju-jitsui instructor of police officers, mercantile operation on down to common laborer. Some of them are fathers of American-born sons serving in the United States Army with whom they correspond. All mail, incoming and outgoing, is censored at the camp.

BANK FUNDS FROZEN

No matter how affluent the aliens were before the war, they are now without funds other than the $55 per month they earn by working. Their property and bank accounts are frozen in the possession of the alien property custodian and the only withdrawals they can make are for payment of insurance premiums or State and Federal taxes.

Under the provisions of the Geneva conference agreement, the aliens have an internal organization, electing a spokesman and assistant spokesman and a board of four members to represent them in contacting the camp officers.

"You have come to Camp Kooskia, Idaho, and you may well feel a considerable degree of satisfaction because of your selection," Mr. Wood, assistant officer in charge, told the group on its arrival. "This is an honor camp, a small community of workmen designed to give you the opportunity to lead a normal life while here. You will be required to govern your conduct so that the common welfare of the entire camp will be promoted and insured. While we are on the subject of conduct, the word 'discipline' rears its head and you are warned that there are offenses for which you will be disciplined."

Mr. Wood listed as offenses, insubordination toward officers, camp authorities, or duly elected camp leaders of their own nationality; refusal to perform work; escape or attempted escape; conduct tending to disrupt the harmony of the camp or facility; malicious destruction of property and kindred offenses; serious infractions of the rules of conduct established for the camp.

NEATNESS REQUIRED

The daily routine begins with the crisp clang of a sounding gong cutting the clear, clean air. At the sound the aliens arise promptly, make their toilet and tidy their quarters. The instructions for the last operation state:

"In making your bed, you should tuck the edges of the blanket neatly under the mattress. The top sheet should be folded back from the head of the bed so that 10 inches of the sheet is showing. All extra blankets

are to be neatly folded and placed on the foot of the bed."

At the breakfast signal, the men march to the mess hall, a long building furnished with tables and benches manufactured by Prison Industries, Inc., and installed when prisoners occupied the camp. The Japanese line up at the steam table with their plate and cup and are served. The kitchen is a model of cleanliness, the same as other parts of the camp.

The Japanese are light eaters, preferring fish and rice to other viands. According to the Geneva Convention, they are entitled to the fare of a United States soldier at his base camp. During the month of June the meat consumption at the camp was so light that ration points unused would have purchased another 900 pounds of meat. Many of the vegetables used are grown in the camp garden tended at odd times by the aliens. A sample menu, picked at random, shows the meals served on July 22 to have included:

TYPICAL MENUS

Breakfast: Stewed figs, fried eggs, toast, butter, bran flakes, coffee.

Dinner: Meatballs with creole sauce, julienne potatoes, creamed new turnips, turnip-carrot salad, fruit jello, milk, and coffee.

Supper: Egg fooyoung with steamed rice, Army fried potatoes, head lettuce, apple, milk, or coffee.

At 7:25 the work call is sounded and the Japanese assemble into crews indicated by the Public Roads Administration officers for assignment to the day's duties.

A camp bulletin dealing with work assignments states:

"Suitable work will be assigned on the basis of recommendations of the officer in charge of work crews, and physical condition. Remember this is the opportunity to gain the work habit. The first step in vocational self-improvement is to get out of the idleness habit if you have ever had it. Good, wholesome, hard work within your physical capacity never hurt anyone. You will not be called upon to do anything which you are not physically able to do. Opportunities exist for you to learn the trades of the electric and acetylene welding, bit grinding, operation of jackhammers, motor-vehicle repairing and operation, tractor, bulldozer, grader, and Diesel-engine operation, etc."

RIDE TRUCKS TO WORK

The crews are loaded into trucks and leave with their guards and work supervisors for various points along the Lochsa River where they continue with the work formerly prosecuted by the Federal prisoners in the construction of the Lewis and Clark Highway.

Some of the crew are clearing brush and debris from new portions of right-of-way where the highway must be realined to meet the new Federal standard specification of 26-foot width. Some crews remove the shale slides that tumble down the canyon side onto the road; some are manning the jackhammers in preparation for blasting away rock points necessary to be removed before construction can continue. One crew is dismantling a building constructed by the W. P. A. during that agency's aid in furthering the highway construction. On the building is a Government placard bearing the information:

"The enemy is listening; the enemy wants to know what you know."

At 11:30 the work crews are recalled from the work and served the noon meal. At 12:25 the work signal again is sounded. At 4:30, having completed the number of hours of work permissible under the international rules the aliens return to camp. They go to their barracks and wash up for the evening meal served at 5.

RECREATION IN EVENING

After supper they may devote themselves to recreation or study. They play baseball, ping-pong, go swimming under supervision, walk within specified camp limits, cultivate flowers or pursue study courses.

The Geneva Convention provides for the observance of the Sabbath day. There is no chaplain in the camp. A Buddhist minister in the Japanese group is not permitted to hold services. Whenever possible, ministers are brought in from the outside for Sunday service, alternating between Protestant and Catholic. Not all of the Japanese attend the service but a goodly number listen attentively to the spiritual message.

"We did not think so much about religion when there was no trouble in our lives," said the assistant spokesman. "It is different now and we are comforted by going to a church service."

FAWN IS CAMP PET

The pet of the camp is a fawn named Mary, which was abandoned by its mother near the highway. Guards permitted the Japanese to capture the little creature, which shies away from white men but has become very docile among its keepers.

An inspection of the Lewis and Clark Highway project by someone familiar with conditions prior to 1935 when the road dead-ended 13 miles above Kooskia, so far as automobile travel was concerned, shows the vast amount of labor that has been put on the project under the Government program participated in by the Bureau of Prisons, which furnished the camp and personnel, the Forest Service which furnished construction funds, and the Public Roads Administration, which supplied the engineering and construction supervising crew. The W. P. A. also contributed a portion in furtherance of the project by construction of some two or more miles at the end of the present extension in Black Canyon.

Complaint is made now and then that progress toward completion of the project is too slow in comparison with the time a contractor would require to do the job. There is no denial of this allegation but it must be remembered that a contractor would not be limited to scanty equipment and small working crews, nor would he be restricted by rules and regulations that govern the working hours of Federal prisoners or alien internees.

COMPLETE ROAD TO STANDARD

This summer 2.4 miles of the highway in the Black Canyon has been widened to 26 feet and 4 miles have been built to standard. This fall the highway between Lowell and the Kooskia internment camp will be entirely completed to Federal standard. The 40 miles from Kooskia to the end of the present construction in Black Canyon is a very good road.

There remains only 3½ miles of construction in the canyon when the project will be out on the plateaus where heavy building problems will be eliminated and rapid progress toward completion can be made.

The Kooskia internment camp has a housing capacity of 200 occupants and the camp was brought up to nearly its full strength with the arrival of an additional group of 47 internees last Monday night.

Fertilizer Outlook for 1944

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the value of commercial fertilizers as a means of increasing food production is recognized by all people familiar with this food-production problem. The weather is beyond the control of man. The man-made factors of food production, such as manpower, feeds, fertilizer, and machinery, must have consideration and constructive support of Congress, through its governmental agencies, in cooperation with the farmers and farm organizations of our country. We should eliminate the confusion here in Washington by putting one man or agency in control of food production and work out a more satisfactory coordination of agencies at county and State levels.

One of the very important man-made factors of food production is commercial fertilizer. Around 8,000,000 tons per year of commercial fertilizer were used in the 1920's, and in 1930 even, over 8,000,000 tons were used. There was a reduction in the use of fertilizer in 1931 to 1936. In 1937 over 8,000,000 tons were used. In 1938, 1939, 1940, 7,000,000 tons were used. In 1941 and 1942 over 8,000,000 tons were again being used, and in 1944 it appears that some 10,000,000 tons will be available. Part of these fertilizers are byproducts of certain war materials, the increased production of war materials naturally resulting in an increased fertilizer supply.

During 1942, and the general situation existed in previous years, we find that four States, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida used about 40 percent of the fertilizer used in the United States. These four States produced less than 5 percent of the food crops and livestock and livestock product of our country in 1942. North Carolina alone used 1,257,000 tons of the 8,777,000 tons used in the United States in 1942, or about 15 percent of it.

The following excerpts from the W. F. A. report give the facts in connection with the fertilizer situation for 1944 and should be of interest to everyone working for increased food production for 1944:

FERTILIZER OUTLOOK FOR 1943–44

The supply of fertilizer materials available for food production during the year July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, is larger than in any previous year, except for potash. It is anticipated that the demand for fertilizer will be considerably greater than last year when the demand was in excess of the available supply of all materials.

The increased use of fertilizer is recognized a major method of increasing food production on the present acreage of cropland without increasing requirements of labor and farm machinery.

NEED AND SUPPLY

The Production Programs Branch of the War Food Administration estimates that 700,000 tons of nitrogen, 1,700,000 tons of phosphoric acid (9,400,000 tons of 18 percent superphosphate, and 877,000 tons of potash will be needed to meet all agricultural demands.

The total supply of nitrogen to be available in 1943–44 is 625,000 tons, or 33 percent more than the 460,000 tons consumed in 1942–43. The production of superphosphate, 18 percent equivalent, will total 7,000,000 tons in 1943–44, compared with a production of 5,800,000 tons in 1942–43, an increase of more than 20 percent. The supply of potash available for agriculture in 1943–44 will be about 560,000 tons, compared to a distribution to fertilizer companies in 1942–43 of 590,000

tons. The actual consumption of potash in the calendar year 1941 was 461,000 tons. Thus, the potash supply will be 20 percent more than the quantity used in the year before Pearl Harbor.

The following excerpt requires explaining:

The use of fertilizers will account for a minimum of 20 to 25 percent of total food production in 1944. The increased food production from the use of more fertilizing materials will be obtained by fertilizing a larger acreage of Group B crops at the usual rates per acre, and by fertilizing more acres of A crops at heavier rates per acre. Farmers are eligible to use fertilizers in 1943–44 regardless of whether they used it in previous years.

No doubt the use of fertilizers will account or could account for 20 to 25 percent of total food production in 1944 if the fertilizer was used for food production purposes in the right places on the right crops. The statement is subject to correction if the fertilizer was to be used on the crops it was in 1942. Iowa and Illinois, for example, produced about 20 percent of the foodcrops and livestock and livestock products in 1942, but used less than 2 percent of the commercial fertilizer used in the United States in 1942. In fact not much over 1 percent of it.

The A crops mentioned above are beans, dry peas, main vegetables including potatoes, most canning crops like tomatoes and corn where used for hybrid seed corn production.

The B crops are the usual field crops: corn, cotton tobacco, and victory gardens, or those not included in the selected class A. It is also recognized that the value of this fertilizer is also dependent on the weather conditions and rainfall that prevails in a particular area.

NITROGEN

The following excerpt as to nitrogen is here included:

Considerable changes in the proportion of the various types of nitrogen materials have occurred, as compared with previous years. The quantity of ammonium sulfate is expected to be the largest ever used. In addition to domestic byproduct material, considerable quantities of Canadian material is available for export to this country and increased quantities of domestic synthetic material will be produced.

The supply of ammoniating solutions is nearly double the quantity used in 1941, which was the largest quantity ever used in any previous year. The efficient utilization of this quantity presents some problems, but for the most part they have already been solved.

The table includes 345,900 tons of ammonium nitrate as available for fertilizer this year. Although considerable quantities have been used in the past in mixtures such as Cal-Nitro, Leunasalpeter, and nitrogen solution, it is practically a new material when used alone. Untreated ammonium nitrate cakes badly when stored, and in damp weather absorbs moisture rapidly when exposed to the air. These difficulties have been largely overcome by special treatments recently worked out. This involves manufacture in the form of pellets, which are then coated first with wax and secondly with clay. Ammonium nitrate is an excellent and economical source of nitrogen for use in mixed fertilizers and for top and side dressing. Its production in war plants will go a long way in helping to meet food and feed production goals.

SUPERPHOSPHATES

The following excerpt as to superphosphates is here included:

SUPERPHOSPHATE PRODUCTION AND REQUIREMENTS

At the end of the calendar year 1941, the total capacity for the production of ordinary superphosphate was estimated at 8,430,000 tons annually (basis 18 percent P_2O_5) under ideal conditions of operation. Since 1941, three additional plants, with a total annual capacity of about 125,000 tons, have come into production. Thus the total capacity as of July 1, 1943, was approximately 8,555,000 tons. Owing, however, to problems of transportation, labor, maintenance, etc., as well as to mal-location of much of the producing capacity with respect to consuming areas and to sources of sulfuric acid, it is not possible to make full use of the present facilities for superphosphate production.

In the year ended June 30, 1943, the production of ordinary superphosphate amounted to about 5,800,000 tons (basis 18 percent P_2O_5). The production in July 1943 was at the rate of approximately 6,100,000 tons per year. Through the construction of new superphosphate plants and the utilization of certain new sources of sulfuric acid, it is practically assured that by July 1, 1944, the production of ordinary superphosphate will be at the rate of 7,600,000 tons annually, or an increase of 1,500,000 tons over the rate in July 1943. These estimates are based on the assumption that transportation, labor, repairs, and maintenance will not be interfering factors. The estimate does not take into consideration increased quantities of acid that are expected to be produced at certain plants operated by the fertilizer industry, as a result of minor additions to and changes in manufacturing facilities.

The triple superphosphate supply is shown in the following excerpt:

It is expected that the 1943–44 production of triple superphosphate will be 275,000 tons, of which 152,000 tons has been allocated for shipment to the United Kingdom.

The potash-supply situation is shown by the following excerpt:

THE POTASH-SUPPLY SITUATION

American production of potash salts is at the present rate of approximately 700,000 tons K_2O per annum, the largest tonnage ever made available for American industries. This tonnage has been allocated by W. P. B. for use in 1943–44 as follows:

Approximate allocation of American potash production (700,000 tons K_2O) for 1943–44: 36,000 tons K_2O for United Kingdom; 35,000 tons K_2O for Canada; 85,000 tons K_2O for chemical industries; 4,000 tons K_2O for Latin America and other export; 540,000 tons K_2O for agricultural use in United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii.

This represents a new allocation of 36,000 tons K_2O for the United Kingdom and an increase of 17,700 tons K_2O for chemical and metallurgical use over the 67,300 tons delivered to those industries during June to May 1942–43.

Approximately 88 percent or 476,730 tons of the remaining 540,000 tons K_2O for agricultural use in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, have been allocated to the several individual fertilizer mixing industries for delivery to them during the 10-month period June through March 1943–44 (period II, the so-called contract season). These allocations are based on corresponding deliveries during 10-month periods of 1941–43.

I wish to call your particular attention to this excerpt from the release:

Farmers should make application for fertilizer to their local dealer or supplier as required in FPO–5 Revised, as soon as they determine their acreage of specific crops. The application must show the name of the crop or crops, the acres to be grown, the grade of mixed fertilizer or material desired, the rate of application per acre, and the total amount required. This assures farmers the quantity needed for their crop program for the year and prevents building up stocks of unused supplies on farms which will not be used this season.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions to be drawn from the information obtainable then are first that more nitrogen and phosphates and less potash will be available. If this fertilizer is used for food production, an increase in foods can be expected. People using commercial fertilizer should immediately contact either their fertilizer dealer or the agency from whom they wish to obtain their fertilizer requirements for the 1944 crops. The importance of fertilizer in production has a more apparent appreciation and realization than in normal years. The allocations of fertilizer for noncrop production have been reduced in an effort to increase the amounts for food production in 1944. It is hoped that the producers of our country are advised as early as possible as to the fertilizer situation so that they can plan their 1944 production operations in order to furnish the largest possible amount of food in 1944.

I wish to remind my colleagues once more that the food production of 1944 must be based on the allocations of the food produced, and the commitments that are being made for this food. For that reason we must think of our food-producing materials like fertilizer in terms of food needs, and not on the basis of the amounts of fertilizer that have been used when we had embarrassing surpluses of wheat, cotton, and corn in the warehouses and granaries of our country. With abundant food, the armed forces will continue to be amply supplied; the consumers of America will be afforded a deserved protection; and whatever food is needed for foreign use will be available in the amounts needed for the best prosecution of the war.

Servicemen's Dependents Deserve Adequate Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the complete hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on the important bill before us, S. 1279. It is my opinion that the committee bill, as presented, should be liberalized. The testimony given by recognized statistical departments such as the Cost of Living Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the entire scale of dependency benefits should be revised upward to furnish the families of the members of our armed forces a decent maintenance allowance. There will, of course, be the cry from some of the Members of economy, but I take the position today

as in the past—human rights are more sacred than property rights.

Certainly the rights of wives, little children, and aged parents to proper consideration by this Nation's Representatives on this subject is second only to the proper equipment and maintenance of our forces on the field of battle. The morale of our armed forces is directly involved in the assurance we can give them today that their dependent families will be properly and adequately cared for. To those who raise the familiar cry of "It will cost too much" I give this answer: "No nation can afford the ungrateful, parsimonious policy of forcing an indecent and insufficient standard of living on the dependents of its fighting heroes." We are not yet too far away from the depression years to realize the terrific toll which malnutrition exacted from the children of America's unemployed. Over a million of these single young men have been rejected from military service because of physical defects, traceable in most cases to inadequate diet during those depression years. If the children of the early 1930's had been properly fed, it would be unnecessary today to draft fathers for military duty. A nation's greatest asset is a healthy citizenry, and the children of this war era, the children of our fighting men, will be the citizenry of tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote today for the Sadowski and Clason amendments to liberalize the soldiers' dependency allowance bill, S. 1279, and I respectfully urge my colleagues to do likewise. I also ask permission to include with these remarks a table which graphically illustrates the liberalizing changes of the Sadowski amendment.

Sadowski amendments compared with House committee allowances

Dependents	Committee bill	Sadowski amendments
Wife	$50	$55
Wife and 1 child	75	90
Wife and 2 children	95	120
Additional children (each)	15	30
A child but no wife	42	42
Each additional child	15	30
A wife divorced but no child	42	42
A wife divorced and 1 child	67	77
Each additional child	15	30
Class B dependent or dependents (payable only while there is no allowance payable to any class B–1 dependent)	37	37
Class B–1 dependent or dependents:		
1 parent but no brother or sister	50	55
2 parents but no brother or sister	68	90
1 parent and 1 brother or sister	68	90
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
2 parents and 1 brother or sister	79	120
Each additional brother or sister	11	30
Brother or sister but no parent	42	42
Each additional brother or sister	11	30

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the final form of the bill should be as generous as this chart shows, if we are to adequately protect the health and welfare of the dependents, and convey to the members of the armed forces our assurance of our continued concern for their families' welfare until they return and assume again their peacetime responsibilities.

Slump in Production in West Coast Aircraft Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article from the Machinists' Monthly Journal, the official organ of the International Association of Machinists. The article is written by Earl L. Galbraith, a member of Lodge No. 727 of the International Association of Machinists.

The author of this article has been employed continuously in machine shops for a period of 44 years, the last 37 of which have been applied to tool and die making, tool design, tool engineering, toolroom foreman, routing engineer, and production trouble shooter. These activities cover a wide range of manufacturing in some of the largest and best-known plants in the United States.

He has held membership in the International Association of Machinists for 37 years, and at present is a member of Lodge No. 727, of Burbank, Calif. This man is one of the million skilled workmen who have put the United States of America in the front in the manufacture of the engines of war and death.

I was very much impressed by this article, which was called to my attention by Mr. E. C. Davison, the general secretary-treasurer of the grand lodge of the Machinists, and I think every Member of the United States Congress will be interested in getting the viewpoint of the man in overalls, who is doing a monumental job behind the scenes in this war.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, with the exception of paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 on page 485.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST COAST AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY—A FEW REASONS FOR SLUMP IN PRODUCTION

(By Earl L. Galbraith, Member, Lodge No. 727, I. A. of M.)

H. G. Wells, the historian, wrote immediately after World War No. 1: "This was a war of toolmakers and all future wars will be more and more wars of toolmakers. The country with the most and best toolmakers is sure to win." H. G. Wells was no toolmaker himself, but anyone who has analyzed the process of manufacturing will verify that he hit the nail squarely on the head.

The toolmaker is the man who makes the tools and machines that in turn make the tools of war.

It is by no means the numerical size of any army that counts, but the superior tools they have that makes for efficiency, as Hitler so conclusively demonstrated in the early stages of this war. His superior planes, tanks, and innumerable other tools enabled him to march without hindrance through all the supposedly impregnable fortresses of Europe. It was not until the Allies began to match his tools that he was stopped.

Today it is our superior planes, tanks, and guns that are taking Hitler apart. Our planes can outfly and outgun him, our tanks run through him, and he is outmatched in nearly all the other tools of war. And these tools of war were made possible by the ability of the American toolmaker to design and build these tools in the necessary quantity and quality and in the limited time to do the job.

The toolmakers cannot win a war alone, that's true, but it is a fact that our crop of toolmakers, those lowly unsung sons of industry who never get their names in print, have been from the start, and are right now, the vital cog in the war machine; for it is the tool making behind the factory walls that determines the quantity and in a great measure the quality of the tools of war.

A million able-bodied men and all the material necessary cannot produce a single plane if there is not the technical knowledge to select and the skilled training to shape that material into the intricate parts that comprise the finished product. The shaping of these materials is a problem so deep and complicated with all the demands for speed and accuracy that the life span of a toolmaker with 50 years' experience leaves him still groping for solutions of new problems.

Competent tool and die makers just don't come from the grocery stores, offices, and filling stations on a short 1 or 2 years' notice to meet a war emergency.

Henry Ford amazed the world when he recognized the importance of good tool making and applied the principle of better tool making to achieve mass production. At the peak of his first effort he was able to produce 8,000 cars a day with 140,000 men. A few years later by still applying the principle of better tool making, he produced 10,000 much more complicated and precise cars with about half as many men.

Ford was once asked to what policy he attributed his success, and he replied that he never had a policy, but that he was following a principle. Who can deny that the cardinal principle of Ford's success was his ability to tool a plant to save both manpower and material?

It is the genius of the trained tool designer and toolmaker that makes it possible for the ex-grocery clerk to pull a lever or step on a pedal and perform an operation that would otherwise take hours of tedious labor to do by hand.

Unfortunately, either through ignorance or selfishness, or both, this very important principle has been disregarded or entirely ignored by the management of the west coast aircraft industry, with the result that production has never been more than a trickle; and now at this critical stage of the war we are aghast at the spectacle of a partial collapse or slump in production.

War officials, Congressmen, and politicians in general are filling the press with arguments, views, and loud guesses as to what is wrong; and the factory management is busy dishing up silly alibis; but production has gone down and will not appreciably rise again until the basic ill of the industry is cured. That ill is the total disregard on the part of management for the importance of the highly skilled mechanic trained for key positions in factory management. The old master designer, tool and die maker, with a wealth of knowledge and experience behind him is just not to be found in any of the major aircraft factories because of the very simple reasons that he does not have to work for the highest wage they will offer him, nor tolerate the insulting attitude with which he is confronted when he seeks employment there.

The stupid policy employed in their so-called up-grading system as effectively screens out the highly skilled and experienced tradesman as a seine of a given size mesh will screen out the big fish. A gilt edged tool and die maker with 40 years of the most intensive training in the best shops of America is both surprised and insulted when he approaches their employ-

ment office to find himself regarded as if he were just starting to learn the trade, because he was starting for them and that he is expected to start in on the same footing as the boy who just left his job in a grocery when the war started and has had 6 months on a drill press and now comes recommended by himself as a tool maker. He is also given to understand there is no hope for him to aspire to any executive position or any scale of wages to which he has been accustomed unless he starts at the bottom again and works up.

At the employment office he is confronted with a questionnaire of nearly 600 questions which deal principally with psychology and not in the slightest degree with the applicant's skill or trade knowledge which is so vitally important. It never seems to have occurred to them that the man already at the top must have the mental qualities or he wouldn't be at the top. Also it follows that an organization staffed with competent foremen in the highly skilled trades will weed out the misfits and inefficient much quicker than any psychology tests yet devised to be applied at their entrance.

It is their boast that this test always picks the man with the right qualities. What they fail to mention is that the man with the one quality most vitally needed, experience, will not take the test.

No sensitive and highly educated artisan will swallow his pride and be led like a dumb cow through a whole day of red tape to get the opportunity to work for considerably less than he can get almost any place else.

Their system is based upon the entirely false premise that experience is not necessary and that tool makers can be developed overnight.

It is as inexorable as the law of gravity that the only result of this system can be to fill the executive positions in the organization with men who have just begun to learn the trade. It follows with logical rigor that it is the very lack of training that makes these men willing to start in at any wage and stay through the short period necessary to reach the top.

The system is designed and directed to build an organization out of cheap material and in this respect it is admirably successful. Cheap in every respect except in the blood of our soldiers and the money of our citizens who must have their product although it cost many times what it should.

The production of a factory like the effectiveness of an army is no longer a problem of mere numbers but it is a problem of tools—tools that will make these myriads of parts accurately and with a minimum of labor time; hence the importance of the tool maker to the war effort. Tools by tyros that will not make any two parts alike nor within the engineering specifications are not only a waste of time and expensive material, but they introduce an element of confusion that disorganizes every schedule of planned production.

There is no magic touch or vitaminized pill that can make a competent tool and die maker in a half dozen years. That mature judgment and "know how" only come with the years, gray hairs, and an abiding love of the game. But so long as these men with the "know how" are excluded from the aircraft factory by low pay and a half-baked system, our production will be bogged down in a morass of red tape and our boys will be fighting long after it should have been ended. It is well known that red tape will develop in any organization in exact ratio to the experience and ability of the personnel of that organization because of the basic law that if the individual is so poorly trained and incompetent that he cannot be trusted to use his own initiative or judgment in making a decision it becomes necessary to impose checks and restraints on his every move and establish set rules of procedure for his every act. These checks, restraints, and rules soon become so all-inclusive that every executive in that organization is so completely shackled that in time he will cease to struggle, and morale drops to that level so well and often expressed in that term "What the hell is the use!" This is about the plight of the industry today.

While our soldiers are poised at outposts all over the world waiting for planes that do not come, let us take a peek at a little drama behind the factory walls from which these planes are supposed to emanate, a drama being enacted over and over again and with a cast of characters that run as true to pattern as peas in a pod. The drama is essentially comic, but with the soldier out there it becomes a tragedy. It runs thus: Act I, scene I. A plane part or subassembly lies on a table around which are clustered some half dozen factory executives, namely, an engineer out of school 1 year, a production planner who left a laundry 18 months ago, a department superintendent who was an automobile salesman when the war started, a tool designer who took a little architectural drawing in high school, an efficiency expert who closed his gas station when rationing came in, a tool planner who cannot read a blue print and possibly an air corps official with authority to stop everything and start nothing. These go into a huddle; something is wrong and the part won't go into its place. What is wrong, how and when it got wrong is to them a mystery. Although hundreds of hours of labor may have already gone into this part by other actors of the same pattern, it has just been discovered that it is wrong. None of these actors have sufficient knowledge of mechanics to unravel the mystery. And here enters the villain red tape. The superintendent argues that the engineer's figures are wrong. No, says he, the figures have been double checked and approved. The engineer contends that the machine work is wrong and demands an inspection. The inspection department will take no orders from the engineering and refuses. The production planner thinks the tooling is wrong, and the tool planner is as certain that the inspectors have fallen down. Meanwhile, the part lies dormant and production stops at this point while they continue making these same parts wrong in another department.

Finally after a superficial examination, someone hazards a guess as to what the trouble may be, and if it does not reflect on anyone present they will all acquiesce, since this is one way to dispose of the embarrassing problem.

Accordingly a request for a tool or engineering change is now issued to make the necessary correction. This effectively buries the whole smelly mess in the cemetery of red tape for at least 3 weeks, for this paper must be okayed by several uncertain functionaries before anything can be done. Fearful of sticking his neck out and getting himself into a position from which he cannot pass the buck, the uncertain functionary will refuse an okay until he has investigated the mess, and accordingly he sends his staff of investigators, an extelephone man, a shoe salesman, an insurance collector, and an advertising man, to find out what is needed, and in due time they return, each with a divergent opinion, and thus the dizzy cycle goes round and round, ever becoming more inextricably wound up in red tape.

While these thousands of psychologically tested but inexperienced manpower units are going round in circles, the planes are not forthcoming, and the taxpayers' money is being poured down a rat hole.

* * * * *

The basic cause for all this confusion, slump in production and morale, unstable labor conditions, and general inefficiency has its beginning in the attempt to team up a "private enterprise" with a war effort.

While this travesty of factory management goes on with fewer planes and more men, when it should be more and more planes with fewer men, the Association of Manufacturers and kindred associations of employers are still running the show and making all the rules of the game.

This is that sacred institution "private enterprise" we hear so much about, principally being mouthed by the bigwigs of the employers associations.

These same employers will wrap themselves up in our flag and cry shame at the employee who lays off a day and "lets the soldier down," but they will ignore the production problem entirely and forget the war in order to establish a low maximum wage in their private industry. In looking back it is interesting to note just how private enterprise has gone along with public interest and good citizenship since the war started and from this record we should learn what to expect in the future.

It was private enterprise that was telling us at the beginning of the war that we had all the aluminum that we needed. It was private enterprise that said the same of steel and used every effort to block the development of steel plants in the West. It was private enterprise that arranged for keeping our cars in the garage for lack of rubber. It was private enterprise that sold those millions of barrels of high-test gas that Il Duce boasted he had bought from a leading American oil company. It was private enterprise that was selling carbide tungsten at $460 to us while Germany was getting it for $50, and they did not stop their private enterprising until the Government started suit to dissolve that private enterprise so we could have a little of it ourselves to help catch up with the German war machine. It was private enterprise that supplied Japan with scrap iron and also with practically all the machine tools to build their war machine while they ignored their home market because the Axis would pay them a higher price. It took a special act of Congress to stop that bit of enterprise, and if it had not been stopped, there would not have been enough new machinery in this country to build a pistol when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

The record of private enterprise is long and does not always emit the aroma of sweet perfume.

The same thing used to be called rugged individualism, but a few years back while millions of Americans were losing their homes and the "rugged" individuals had all the food, the term became slightly soiled and the new term "private enterprise" was adopted.

The west-coast aircraft industry is a private enterprise inasmuch as it chooses its own managers, formulates its own policies, and establishes its own system of operations. Its product being sold to the Government is subject to Army and Navy specifications and inspection. The cost both in lives and money is borne by the citizens, and as citizens we have both a right and a duty to see that the management is efficient.

The bare, bald fact that it is not efficient cannot be covered up with all the alibis and propaganda the management can foist on the public.

When wages were frozen we were told over and over again that we must all make personal sacrifices to win the war, but there is no valid reason why the whole Nation and, particularly the soldier, should make all the sacrifices to the end that a little group of manufacturers should be doubly prosperous.

The aircraft industry is making no sacrifice. This infant industry was cradled in an area of notoriously cheap labor dominated with an iron hand by the Manufacturers Association. When called upon to produce

airplanes, unlimited, overnight, what could be more natural than that they should try to perpetuate their strangle hold on labor by straining every effort to establish low maximum rates in this area. To this end they have sacrificed efficiency and now in this critical stage of the war, a condition exists that stinks to high heaven.

Meanwhile, some ex-bond salesmen, promoters, and an assortment of speculators who never spent an hour in their lives behind a factory wall, or an hour of serious study to acquire the fundamentals of factory management, have found themselves enthroned as managers of factories at salaries as high as $125,000 a year plus unlimited expense accounts and earnings on their stock. Some of these salaries measure up to about 3 times the salary of some of the active factory managers of some of the most efficient factories in the land and about 10 times as much as these men ever received before.

Millions and millions of dollars of the people's money are going into research and development of the plane, and if we follow the pattern of the other war, the millions of dollars' worth of equipment will probably be theirs for a mere fraction of its cost. Just where does this private enterprise make any sacrifice? If these managers on the west coast can allow themselves such salaries, then why can't they allow at least the same wages for the highly skilled crafts that they have elsewhere? Ford is not trying to build planes without trained men. Why should we have to try it here?

The old alibi that the plane is too intricate, accurate, and complicated to produce in any considerable quantity is just more bunk. If this were true, then common sense would dictate that the highest skill was an essential. No man in his right mind would try to manufacture watches with a factory staffed with plow fitters. Their policy is surely incompatible with their alibi.

We do not need any alibis; we need production.

Manpower alone will not do the job. Efficient management plus skilled mechanics trained for their job, minus politics, equals production. We should be satisfied with nothing less.

Truth About T. V. A. Rates as of Today

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the greatest economic issue of the post-war period will be that of developing the water power of the Nation, squeezing water out of the stock of private power companies, eliminating useless holding companies, providing electricity to the American people at rates they can afford to pay, and extending this service to every farm home in America, each Member of Congress is going to have to answer his own people on this all-important issue.

He cannot answer an intelligent constituent who is being burdened with exorbitant rates, or denied the use of any electricity at all, by merely parroting the propaganda of those special interests that have grown fabulously rich at the expense of the light and power users of the country.

In order that each and every one of you may be able to familiarize yourself with the great benefits the people of a city, town, or community may derive from reasonable light and power rates, I am inserting a most informative statement from the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn., entitled "As of Today."

The matter referred to follows:

AS OF TODAY—SAVINGS OF $10,850,000 ON ELECTRIC BILLS EQUALS PRICE PAID FOR CHATTANOOGA SYSTEM

As of today, October 12—exactly 4 years and 58 days after the purchase of the Chattanooga distribution system from private owners—customers of the Electric Power Board have saved (based on the average rates in 1938), through the low T. V. A. rates in effect, the full amount paid for the system on August 15, 1939—$10,850,000.

SAVINGS NOW AVERAGE $8,391 PER DAY

Now, due to low rates charged—over 37,396 residences (91 percent) use electric refrigerators, over 21,699 residences (52 percent) use electric cooking, over 9,016 residences (22 percent) use electric water heating.

The Electric Power Board is the largest municipal purchaser of T. V. A. power, and the average use by home owners of Chattanooga is among the highest of the Nation. Facilities provided by the board for payment of bills and for service of the system are among the most efficient and comfortable in the Nation.

While there is no shortage of electricity in Chattanooga, the Government asks that citizens curtail their use of electricity to the absolute minimum necessary for safety and conduct of business.

In its more than 4 years as a publicly owned electric utility, paying all expenses out of its income, the board has—

	Amount	Percent
Paid Tennessee Valley Authority for power for its customers	$7,623,068	42.4
Expended to operate and maintain its system	3,451,955	19.2
Set aside and expended to replace worn parts	1,474,273	8.2
Paid city and county taxes amounting to	1,150,652	6.4
Paid as interest to bondholders	1,420,335	7.9
Set aside and paid out to retire bonds	1,240,546	6.9
Set aside, expended to serve new customers	$1,150,652	6.4
Accumulated as surplus to guarantee its low rates	467,453	2.6

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD OF CHATTANOOGA

You will note that in a little more than 4 years the people of Chattanooga have been saved $10,850,000 on their light and power bills, which is equal to the price paid for their entire distribution system.

You will note that the average saving to the people of Chatanooga amounts to $8,391 per day.

You will note that 37,396 residences, or 91 percent of the residential consumers of Chattanooga, now use electric refrigerators.

You will note that 21,699 residences, or 52 percent of the residential consumers, cook with electricity; and that over 9,016 residences, or 22 percent of them, use electric water heating.

You will note also that this municipally owned power system has paid to the T. V. A. $7,623,068 for electricity. That is about 3.4 mills a kilowatt-hour.

Before the T. V. A. was created, the power trust was buying power at Muscle Shoals at less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour.

This power is being purchased by the city of Chattanooga at a profit to the T. V. A.

Note also that this publicly owned power system has paid city and county taxes amounting to $1,150,652, has paid the interest on its bonds, kept up and improved its properties, and set aside sufficient funds to retire those bonds as they come due.

What is being done in Chattanooga can be done in every other city, town, and community in America; and it will be done when those 32,000,000 users who pay electric light bills every month wake up and demand relief from exorbitant overcharges.

Here are the rates paid for electricity by the ultimate consumers of all classes of service in Chattanooga, the T. V. A. yardstick rates:

T. V. A. yardstick rates

RESIDENTIA.

Rate
- First 50 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 3c per kw-hr.
- Next 150 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 2c per kw-hr.
- Next 200 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 1c per kw-hr.
- Next 1,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 0.4c per kw-hr.
- Excess over 1,400 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 0.75c per kw-hr.

Minimum monthly bill: $0.75 per meter.

COMMERCIAL

Rate:
- First 250 kw-hrs. per month @ 3c per kw-hr.
- Next 750 kw-hrs. per month @ 2c per kw-hr.
- Next 1,000 kw-hrs. per month @ 1c per kw-hr.
- Excess over 2,000 kw-hrs. per month @ 0.8c per kw-hr.

INDUSTRIAL

Rate:

Demand charge (based on 30 minutes demand):
- $1.00 per kw. of demand per month—first 1,000 kw.
- .80 per kw. of demand per month—over 1,000 kw.

Energy charge:
- First 10,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 10 mills per kw-hr.
- Next 25,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 6 mills per kw-hr.
- Next 65,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 4 mills per kw-hr.
- Next 400,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 3 mills per kw-hr.
- Over 500,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 2.5 mills per kw-hr.

Charge for energy in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kw-hr. from the otherwise applicable rate.

While these rates are slightly higher than the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario, Canada, rates, they are so far below the average rates charged throughout the United States that if everyone in America who uses electricity got the benefit of these rates, the combined savings would amount to more than $1,185,000,000 a year.

In order to show just what those savings would amount to in each and every State, if the people enjoyed the benefits of the T. V. A. rates throughout the country, and what they would amount to if they enjoyed the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario rates, I am inserting a table giving that information for the year 1942.

Here are the total overcharges, by States, for all users of electricity in 1942:

Total electric sales, 1942

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	340,941	3,693,914,000	$37,163,600	$25,897,377	$11,266,223	$18,537,592	$18,626,008	$19,771,217	$17,392,383	$23,193,303	$13,970,297
Arizona	113,742	704,002,000	12,764,400	5,974,339	6,790,061	4,548,079	8,216,321	4,639,497	8,124,903	5,273,487	7,490,913
Arkansas	213,300	683,145,000	16,811,000	8,945,934	7,865,066	6,714,450	10,096,550	6,913,736	9,987,264	7,569,371	9,241,629
California	2,497,445	12,005,897,000	198,175,200	152,321,279	45,853,921	112,851,875	85,323,325	117,883,112	80,292,088	136,475,112	61,700,088
Colorado	278,002	847,821,000	21,959,700	11,927,125	10,032,575	9,302,540	12,657,160	9,302,764	12,656,926	10,466,249	11,493,451
Connecticut	541,938	2,418,832,000	53,930,900	29,062,632	24,868,268	22,209,702	31,721,198	22,600,944	31,329,956	25,488,797	28,442,103
Delaware	71,504	345,458,000	6,884,800	3,768,435	3,116,365	2,835,355	4,049,445	2,917,286	3,967,514	3,319,087	3,565,713
Dist. of Col	82,347	1,439,442,000	17,668,900	13,571,378	4,097,522	10,379,261	7,289,639	10,543,618	7,125,282	12,029,235	5,639,665
Florida	422,260	1,263,010,000	40,138,900	17,542,349	22,596,551	14,153,091	25,985,809	13,835,727	26,303,173	15,236,481	24,902,419
Georgia	450,990	2,512,867,000	42,543,700	25,719,092	16,824,608	19,847,155	22,696,545	20,054,170	22,489,530	22,621,335	19,922,365
Idaho	135,885	781,471,000	11,418,200	6,869,292	4,548,908	5,434,207	5,983,993	5,390,724	6,027,476	5,952,541	5,465,659
Illinois	2,181,707	10,397,217,000	205,524,500	113,204,822	92,319,678	86,452,015	119,072,485	88,081,536	117,442,964	99,591,295	105,933,205
Indiana	949,718	4,286,988,000	85,064,400	49,061,887	36,002,513	36,990,312	48,074,088	37,978,759	47,085,641	43,334,847	41,729,553
Iowa	619,019	2,017,295,000	46,735,900	25,741,659	20,994,241	20,391,965	26,343,935	20,198,504	26,537,396	22,571,652	24,164,248
Kansas	425,887	1,374,621,000	31,893,900	17,588,319	14,305,581	13,911,001	17,982,899	13,798,029	18,095,871	15,430,936	16,462,964
Kentucky	415,367	1,677,998,000	32,803,500	20,016,579	12,786,921	15,167,663	17,635,837	15,519,533	17,283,967	17,610,462	15,193,038
Louisiana	349,207	1,645,335,000	31,148,700	15,781,723	15,366,977	12,147,909	19,000,791	12,276,512	18,872,188	13,946,251	17,202,449
Maine	233,245	975,232,000	18,700,500	10,200,161	8,500,339	7,598,768	11,102,132	7,870,848	10,830,052	9,006,528	9,694,372
Maryland	571,500	2,472,084,000	45,660,400	26,682,888	18,977,512	20,121,336	25,539,064	20,646,802	25,013,598	23,738,596	21,921,804
Massachusetts	1,332,228	4,322,849,000	113,448,500	56,818,482	56,630,318	43,361,926	70,086,574	44,176,238	69,272,562	49,882,226	63,566,574
Michigan	1,529,583	7,097,806,000	134,278,800	76,671,788	57,607,112	60,392,419	73,886,481	60,095,281	74,183,619	64,930,762	69,348,138
Minnesota	666,033	2,239,736,000	55,011,100	30,673,578	24,337,522	24,191,831	30,819,269	24,023,999	30,987,101	26,736,316	28,274,784
Mississippi	193,379	666,511,000	14,783,300	8,027,803	6,755,497	6,135,609	8,647,691	6,227,306	8,555,994	7,086,303	7,696,997
Missouri	854,172	3,489,639,000	68,648,800	41,417,857	27,230,943	31,922,112	36,726,688	32,376,195	36,272,605	36,473,583	32,175,217
Montana	122,497	1,736,720,000	15,671,000	10,681,298	4,989,702	7,524,660	8,146,340	8,110,915	7,560,085	9,626,149	6,044,851
Nebraska	289,162	773,693,000	19,973,300	11,458,180	8,515,120	9,097,625	10,875,675	9,005,969	10,967,331	9,979,325	9,993,975
Nevada	31,433	154,729,000	3,277,100	1,711,755	1,565,345	1,355,265	1,921,835	1,341,357	1,935,743	1,506,825	1,770,275
New Hampshire	151,232	487,904,000	12,335,600	6,510,473	5,825,127	4,934,397	7,401,203	5,056,292	7,279,308	5,711,977	6,623,623
New Jersey	1,315,291	5,000,452,000	119,253,300	57,691,002	61,562,298	44,618,035	74,635,265	44,981,612	74,271,688	50,580,331	68,672,969
New Mexico	72,410	178,147,000	6,599,200	2,616,419	3,982,781	2,180,407	4,418,793	2,079,323	4,519,877	2,301,770	4,297,430
New York	4,129,219	18,429,737,000	361,418,600	175,957,175	185,460,625	138,065,184	223,353,416	137,950,572	23,468,028	154,810,100	206,608,500
North Carolina	511,254	3,499,721,000	52,173,000	34,808,548	17,364,452	25,353,706	26,819,294	26,683,810	25,489,190	31,125,957	21,047,043
North Dakota	95,700	180,278,000	7,008,200	3,235,239	3,772,961	2,667,353	4,340,847	2,569,444	4,438,756	2,806,416	4,201,784
Ohio	1,997,048	11,137,170,000	183,233,400	118,962,679	69,270,721	86,183,211	97,050,189	88,393,113	94,840,287	100,456,509	82,776,491
Oklahoma	280,418	1,261,583,000	30,359,900	16,315,747	14,044,153	12,399,531	17,960,369	12,664,416	17,695,484	14,383,057	15,976,843
Oregon	339,209	2,016,158,000	26,471,200	19,343,469	7,127,731	15,114,663	11,356,537	15,139,686	11,331,514	16,865,508	9,605,692
Pennsylvania	2,572,829	15,700,440,000	249,036,700	153,861,342	95,175,358	113,445,412	135,591,288	118,476,138	130,560,562	136,263,472	112,773,228
Rhode Island	213,769	807,095,000	20,096,400	10,352,704	9,653,896	7,658,563	12,347,437	7,973,372	12,033,028	9,169,391	10,837,009
South Carolina	246,160	1,685,051,000	23,770,300	15,944,865	7,825,435	11,643,935	12,126,365	12,224,426	11,545,874	14,237,935	9,532,365
South Dakota	99,509	223,137,000	7,832,500	3,641,292	4,191,208	2,940,830	4,891,670	2,567,343	4,965,157	3,180,128	4,652,372
Tennessee	451,398	4,833,695,000	40,183,000	33,781,545	6,401,455	24,894,082	15,288,918	26,013,948	14,169,052	29,981,789	10,201,211
Texas	1,174,940	4,716,867,000	95,196,300	52,673,271	42,523,029	40,508,028	54,688,272	41,000,468	54,195,832	46,597,633	48,598,667
Utah	155,343	1,117,518,000	15,351,400	9,432,423	5,918,977	6,982,342	8,369,058	7,270,988	8,080,412	8,340,508	7,010,892
Vermont	93,645	299,933,000	7,880,700	4,346,035	3,534,665	3,272,394	4,608,306	3,363,428	4,517,272	3,828,942	4,051,758
Virginia	491,229	2,203,554,000	43,664,000	25,109,110	18,554,890	19,366,064	24,297,936	19,587,338	24,076,662	22,035,033	21,628,967
Washington	584,004	6,253,201,000	55,289,100	43,153,856	12,135,244	32,599,283	22,689,817	33,446,006	21,843,094	38,135,506	17,153,594
West Virginia	335,986	2,752,822,000	37,641,700	23,274,974	14,366,726	16,469,776	21,171,924	17,731,493	19,910,207	20,909,918	16,731,782
Wisconsin	533,468	3,380,057,000	69,062,800	39,585,289	29,477,511	30,430,980	38,631,820	30,814,206	38,248,594	34,915,721	34,147,079
Wyoming	51,495	144,633,000	4,456,300	2,137,658	2,318,642	1,711,630	2,744,670	1,681,122	2,775,178	1,865,788	2,590,512
United States	32,209,247	158,333,465,000	2,850,307,400	1,665,073,726	1,185,233,674	1,267,015,929	1,583,291,471	1,293,549,122	1,556,758,278	1,467,580,843	1,382,726,557

Just how the people of the various States can continue to carry this unnecessary burden, while millions of people, and especially farmers, are denied the use of any electricity at all, presents one of the grave problems with which we are going to have to deal in the postwar period.

Catching Up With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of August 14, 1943:

CATCHING UP WITH CONGRESS

With Congress in recess and most of its Members away from Washington, President Roosevelt found occasion in his last fireside chat to deliver an implied rebuke to the legislative branch of the Government in the matter of demobilizing the veterans when the war is over.

"Among other things," said Mr. Roosevelt, "we are today laying plans for the return to civilian life of our gallant men and women in the armed services.

"They must not be demobilized into an environment of inflation and unemployment, to a place on the bread line or on a corner selling apples.

"We must, this time, have plans ready instead of waiting to do a hasty, inefficient and ill-considered job at the last moment. * * *

"I hope that the Congress will help in carrying out this assurance, for obviously the executive branch of the Government cannot do it alone.

"May the Congress do its duty in this regard."

The speech was promptly interpreted as a New Deal bid for soldiers' votes. And the facts seem to bear this interpretation out.

In anything that it said, the speech plainly indicated that Congress was neglecting the service men and women and that the administration was taking the initiative in their behalf.

Continuing along such a line, the President presented a sketchy program to give the returning warriors and auxiliaries mustering-out pay, unemployment insurance for prolonged idleness, vocational training opportunities, social-security credits based on periods of service, and adequate provision for post-war hospitalization and rehabilitation.

This had a familiar sound to informed persons on the Washington scene.

Among them, George Rothwell Brown, correspondent for the Hearst newspapers, consulted the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and produced documentary evidence showing that Congress had actually been 7 months or more ahead of the White House in formulating legislation covering all of the President's points and including some additional good proposals besides.

Mr. Brown reported:

"A congressional program, much like the President's plan, begun at the Capitol, as is right and proper, and not in the White House, has been in the making since this Congress first assembled in January * * *."

Among the bills under consideration when the President spoke are the bills of Representative VAN ZANDT (Republican), Penn-

sylvania; Representative PLOESER (Republican), Missouri; Representative GREEN (Democrat), Florida; Representative ANGELL (Republican), Oregon; Representative MURDOCK (Democrat), Arizona; Representative KEOGH (Democrat), New York; Representative KELLEY (Democrat), Pennsylvania; Representative HOLIFIELD (Democrat), California; Representative PHILBIN (Democrat), Massachusetts; Representative HOFFMAN (Republican), Michigan; Representative MURRAY (Republican), Wisconsin; Representative WICKERSHAM (Democrat), Oklahoma; Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican), Massachusetts; and Representative STARNES (Democrat), Alabama.

In the upper House, Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has a bill pending; while, according to Mr. Brown's careful survey:

Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, remains in Washington working on a very comprehensive plan to be presented to the Senate when it assembles in September.

"It goes far beyond the 6-point plan outlined by the President."

As to what will happen, and would have happened in any event, Mr. Brown predicts:

"Congress will take the best features of the various pending bills and write them into law before next spring."

With the bitter memories of the last demobilization behind them, the American people—to use a phrase of our good President—who by the way vetoed the soldiers' bonus bill after the last war—do not intend to "let the veterans down when the war is won."

Congress has made it evident that they will not let the veterans down—unless the President again vetoes the measures for the veterans' aid and relief.

There will certainly be no partisan opposition to sound veterans' legislation when Congress reconvenes.

And there should be none.

Justice to the men and women in uniform and in the Merchant Marine is a nonpartisan and nonpolitical duty, and the Administration will not be permitted to make a partisan or political issue of it in the interests of a fourth term for the New Deal—and then forget it after election.

True Facts About Business Failures—Effect of War on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusing impressions in the minds of many concerning the number of businesses being eliminated, I have gathered certain authentic facts which should clear up this situation. From data which have been obtained, as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, the year 1943 shows the number of business failures has decreased about 68 percent as compared with the averages for the previous 8 years from 1935 to 1942. Distribution is likewise showing progress.

This surprising picture contrary to the beliefs of many is contained in figures supplied by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., covering a period from 1894 to and including August 1943, the latest available data on the subject of business failures. For the first 8 months of 1943, the total failures reported by this authoritative statistical agency is 2,628. On this basis, for 8 months the total number of failures for 1943 will be 3,888. September failures were only 124, substantially lower than any month this year.

The lowest previous record of failures in 49 years was in 1919, when the total represented 6,451. At that time there naturally were less concerns in operation since the population July 1, 1919, of continental United States was 105,003,065, compared with 135,603,500 January 1, 1943.

In the First World War beginning in the first week of August 1914 and ending November 11, 1918, the average of failures in this period was 16,253. On the other hand, from 1938 when the war opened in Europe, to and including this year, the average business failures will be approximately 11,136 with a 35 percent increase in population, and naturally more business enterprises in operation.

The greatest number of failures occurred during the depression year of 1932, vith 31,822. The decade of greatest loss was from 1924 to 1933, inclusive, when the average per year was 23,980, whereas for the 10 years from 1934 to 1943—estimating failures for the last 4 months of 1943 based on the first 8 months—the average number is 10,963. These figures of Dun & Bradstreet show a decrease of about 59 percent in the last decade as compared with the previous 10 years.

LESS THAN HALF THE FAILURES PAST 10 YEARS

A clearer picture is provided in the following table showing the number of failures which has taken place in the past 10 years (last 4 months of 1943 estimated), compared with failures from 1924 to 1933:

1924	20,615
1925	21,214
1926	21,773
1927	23,146
1928	23,842
1929	22,909
1930	26,335
1931	28,285
1932	31,822
1933	19,859
Yearly average	23,980
1934	12,091
1935	12,244
1936	9,607
1937	9,490
1938	12,836
1939	14,768
1940	13,619
1941	11,848
1942	9,405
1943 (estimated)	3,888
Yearly average	10,796

Mr. Speaker, from these figures it will be observed that from 1932, the year of the greatest number of failures, there has been a steady decline in the number amounting to about 59 percent. In other words, there has been a decrease of 13,184 average in the last 10 years in comparison with the previous 10 years.

More remarkable, however, is the reduction in 1943 to the low point of 3,888, when conditions are supposed to have caused the heaviest business casualties. This record is all the more spectacular in view of the fact that there were more concerns in business of all kinds in the period from 1934 to 1943 than in the decade from 1924 to 1933.

LIABILITIES MATERIALLY REDUCED LAST 10 YEARS

What is true of the number of failures is likewise true of current liabilities. The first 9 months of 1943 these represented $41,424,000. On the basis of these figures, averaging about the same for the remaining 3 months, the total for the year will be $55,233,000. In 1942 they were $100,763,000. The lowest in any other 12 months in 49 years was $90,881,000 in 1899. The heaviest loss was $928,313,000 in 1932, which is also true for the years 1930 to 1931. In this 12-year period, the total liabilities were $7,012,705,000, or an average yearly loss of $584,375,000.

Since 1933, declines in liabilities have been the rule, culminating in only $55,233,000 in 1943. For the 11 years from 1933 to 1943, the liabilities reported by Dun & Bradstreet were $2,376,304,000, or an average per year of $216,028,000. This compares with $584,375,000 for the previous 12 years referred to above.

RETAILERS SHOWING SALES INCREASES

That the retail business is faring most satisfactorily up to August of this year is definitely proved from the figures of sales released by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Independent retailers, in most instances, are showing sales increases of a substantial nature for August, as well as for the first 8 months of 1943. This is best illustrated by the official figures supplied by this branch of the Government. The average increase in sales for all retail business combined has been 17 percent for the 8 months of this year.

The detailed figures for increases and those showing decreased sales for August over the same month of last year, and for the 8 months of this year, are as follows:

	August 1943 versus August 1942	8 months 1943 versus 8 months 1942
Average for all types of retailing	+0.11	+0.17
Department stores	+.13	+.21
Other kinds of business	+.10	+.14
Food group [1]	+.12	+.24
Grocery stores without fresh meats	+.14	+.25
Combination stores (groceries and meats)	+.12	+.23
Restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms	+.29	+.36
General stores (without foods)	+.11	+.18
Liquor stores (package goods)	+.07	+.10
Florists	+.30	+.32
Filling stations	+.01	−.03
Drug stores	+.21	+.26
Drygoods and general merchandise stores	+.20	+.31
Men's clothing and furnishing stores	+.07	+.19
Family-clothing stores	+.14	+.27
Women's ready-to-wear stores	+.25	+.41
Shoe stores	−.05	+.25
Sporting-goods stores	−.09	+.06
Jewelry stores	+.21	+.39
Motor-vehicle stores [3]	+.01	(2)
Furniture stores	+.01	+.06
Household-appliance stores	−.25	−.37
Radio, musical-instrument stores	−.15	−.14
Hardware stores	+.01	−.03
Lumber, building materials dealers	−.04	−.07
Heating-plumbing materials dealers	−.04	−.13
Miscellaneous	+.27	+.13

[1] Group total includes other kinds of business in addition to the classification listed.

[2] Less than 0.5 percent.

[3] Receipts for service, repairs, and parts represent an important part of the total sales of motor-vehicle dealers.

It will be observed from this table, Mr. Speaker, that only five types of independent retailing show a decline in sales for August of this year, and the same number a decrease for the 8 months of this year. Thus, despite the shortage of some types of merchandise, the preponderance of merchants in all lines are reporting sales gains for August and for the 8 months of this year.

WHOLESALERS REPORT INCREASED SALES

The wholesalers are no exception to the rule of showing sales increases. The latest report of the Department of Commerce shows August sales data for 38 different classifications and miscellaneous representing various other wholesale operations. The Department of Commerce figures are:

Automotive supplies	+.23
Chemicals (industrial)	+.6
Paints and varnishes	−.4
Clothing and furnishings, except shoes	+.43
Shoes and other footwear	−.6
Coal	+.45
Drugs and sundries (liquor included)	+.17
Dry goods	+.10
Electrical goods	−.23
Dairy and poultry products	+.10
Fresh fruits and vegetables	+.32
Farm supplies	+.29
Furniture and house furnishings	+.14
Groceries—full-line wholesalers [1]	+.7
Voluntary-group wholesalers	+.11
Retailer-owned cooperative warehouses	+.7
Specialty lines	+.23
Confectionery	+.9
Meats and meat products	−.7
Beer	+.5
Wines and liquors	+.14
Liquor department of other trades [2]	−.3
General hardware	−.3
Industrial supplies	−.2
Plumbing and heating supplies	−.15
Jewelry	−.1
Optical goods	+.30
Lumber and building material	−.3
Machinery equipment, supplies, except electrical	+.7
Surgical, medical, hospital equipment supplies	+.38
Metals	+.20
Paper and its products	+.41
Petroleum	−.17
Tobacco and its products	+.10
Leather and shoe findings	+.12
Miscellaneous	+.23

[1] Not affiliated with voluntary or cooperative groups.

[2] Chiefly of the wholesale drug trade.

It will be observed from this table 10 of the more than 38 types of wholesalers had decreased sales, while more than 28 show improved sales for August of this year over the same month of 1943, notwithstanding curtailment of products in many lines of wholesale operations.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this statement does not cover those retailers and wholesalers, manufacturers, and other concerns which retire from business. The Dun & Bradstreet records indicate that a lesser number of new enterprises are going into business than those which discontinue operations. This is contrary to past records and is understandable in view of the fact that it is now more difficult to obtain supplies with priorities required in many instances or scarcity due to rationing or short supply.

Aside from this, many companies are following the practice of distributing their supplies to customers who have regularly patronized them in order to keep them supplied instead of taking on new accounts. As a consequence, the number of discontinued businesses is now somewhat in excess of new enterprises.

Labor's Interest in Missouri River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a statement by the Honorable M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of the State of South Dakota and chairman of the Missouri River Eight-State Committee, on labor's interest in Missouri River development.

It will be remembered that the complete control of floods below Sioux City, Iowa, has been proposed in a report by the division engineer of the Army engineers, in response to a resolution adopted by the House Committee on Flood Control. That report has been approved by the Board of Engineers, and is now undergoing review by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal Power Commission.

Great interest is being taken in the report throughout the valley that has been tormented and damaged by floods year after year. It is only natural that the people who read the annual Year Book of South Dakota Labor are interested in this project and are interested in the attention which Congress is giving to the proposal that the floodwaters of the Missouri be converted from agents of destruction and disaster into forces for the conservation and development of the great Missouri Valley.

Governor Sharpe's remarks in the Year Book, therefore, are offered here for the consideration of all who deal with this matter. His statement follows:

The preview of the great Missouri River development plan recently released by Congressman FRANCIS CASE indicates that South Dakota would have four large reservoir structures and multiple-purpose dams along the Missouri River. North Dakota would have a similar development. The lower Missouri River States would have a continuous line of channel-control structures, principally levees, all the way from St. Louis up to Sioux City, Iowa.

The plan would take the Missouri River under complete control and convert its damaging floods into stores of still water which in turn would produce irrigated farm lands and a wealth of cheap electric light and power. In addition the plan would provide fully for flood control and navigation. The plan has been designed by capable engineers employed by the United States, and it has already received the approval of department heads to whom it was submitted. It is a scientific plan, designed by engineers as capable as any to be found anywhere.

Labor has as large an interest in this plan as any other economic group in the country.

The great Fort Peck Dam required about 6 years to build and during that time employed large amounts of common labor, skilled labor, tradesmen, artisans, and professional people. It furnished a useful practicable demand for great quantities of labor during the 6 years.

The plan now being formed would mean the construction of several Fort Pecks. It would simply multiply many times the demands for labor that Fort Peck produced. It would require 10 or 15 years to build. It would furnish a dependable long-term demand for labor. It would be a most beneficial kind of labor.

Labor would be producing a great internal improvement which in the years to come would continue to furnish demands for labor for operation and for maintenance. It would cause construction of thousands of miles of rural electrification transmission lines. It would be bound to produce new industries here in the center of the Nation where labor could exist and thrive under the healthiest and most favorable living conditions known any place on earth today.

The development will bring into existence millions of acres of irrigated farm land producing new raw materials for industry and furnishing a great increase of agricultural population which in turn will reduce the number of agricultural people now working in various manufacturing plants and also will furnish an increased demand for all the various products of labor in this country.

Labor really has a direct interest in this great development. It is in complete accord with, and appropriate to, all of the great progressive objectives of organized labor in this country.

President Versus Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of September 30, 1943, which contains considerable enlightenment as to the ownership and editorial policy of the New York Herald Tribune on internationalism, which seems to coincide with President Roosevelt's views.

I was amazed to find that the circulation of the New York Herald Tribune was the smallest of the 4 New York City morning newspapers, having less than 300,000 daily circulation which includes, I assume, my own district where, because the newspaper is supposed to be Republican, it has had in the past a considerable number of subscribers and readers.

The Daily News editorial makes very interesting reading for those who want to know about the background and ownership of the New York Herald Tribune and its international editorial policy.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT VERSUS PRESS

President Roosevelt at his Tuesday press conference attacked what has come to be called the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick press, though there is no connection between the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers.

A POLICY OF INTIMIDATION

The President's purpose, obviously, was double-barreled: (1) to intimidate the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers, and through them all the other newspapers and magazines in the United States, into obsequious subservience to his will; (2) to further his ambition for a fourth term. When and if he gets a fourth term, he will be our one-man ruler, our despot.

Mr. Roosevelt's method of belaboring the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers was funny and, we thought, inept. He took as the occasion for his attack some rumors printed in these papers about an impending transfer of Chief of Staff George C. Marshall to command of an Allied invasion of western Europe. These rumors, said the President in effect, gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

That, of course, is improbable. It can matter very little to Hitler who is chief of staff in Washington. What matters to him is how many United States troops are in the European war theater, and who commands them there. Nor can it matter much to Tojo whether Marshall or anybody else is chief of staff in Washington.

However, if it does matter, the President's rebroadcast of these rumors through the world-wide amplifier of a Presidential press conference must give the enemy far more aid and comfort than if the President had ignored the rumors. Further, his statement that he could not confirm or deny reports of a Marshall transfer for 10 days, 10 weeks, or 10 months is pretty sure to unsettle, we should think, the officers of the general staff.

"RESPECTABLE" HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. Roosevelt quoted with approval, thereby making them his own utterances, two recent editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, attempting to chide us for alleged divisionist and obstructionist tactics. This so pleased the Herald Tribune that it reprinted both of these editorials yesterday. The Herald Tribune, said the President, is a respectable newspaper.

Respectable, but not popular. The New York Herald Tribune is the smallest, as to circulation, of the four New York City morning newspapers. According to the latest Audit Bureau of Circulations statement, its daily circulation for the 6 months ending March 31, 1943, was 293,304; its Sunday circulation 546,705.

The paper is the mouthpiece of the New York-and-vicinity genteel moneyed crowd—the select coterie which feels that things British are superior to things American; that the noblest aspiration an American can have is to become the father-in-law of a British title; that American gentlemen in peace years should spend considerable time and money in Great Britain, clinging to the fringes of British high society.

The Herald Tribune is Republican; but it is for Wendell Willkie for our next president—Willkie being Roosevelt's alter ego on foreign policy and author of a book advocating United States surrender of independence to some sort of world superstate. Willkie wrote this book after a trip around the world aboard a United States Army bomber kindly furnished to him by Mr. Roosevelt.

How did the Herald Tribune get to be an Anglo-maniac newspaper? Well, its titular head is Ogden Reid, son of the late Whitelaw Reid and brother of Lady Jean Templeton Ward. Whitelaw Reid took over the New York Tribune in 1872, on the death of Horace Greeley.

Of Whitelaw Reid, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

"In 1905 Reid relinquished his active editorship of the Tribune, but retained financial control * * * In 1897 he was special Ambassador of the United States on the occasion of Queen Victoria's jubilee; in 1902 he was special Ambassador of the United States at the coronation of King Edward VII, and in 1905 became Ambassador to Great Britain. In 1881 he married a daughter of Darius Ogden Mills (1825–1910), a prominent financier. He died in London on December 15, 1912."

At this time he had been Ambassador to England for 7 years, under Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft.

This was the gentleman from whom Ogden Reid inherited the New York Tribune. These salient details from the life of Whitelaw Reid may throw some light on the question why today the New York Herald Tribune worships everything connected with Great Britain and the British Empire, is somewhat mortified by the Declaration of Independence, and feels no visible qualms about a reunion between the United States and the British Empire.

Address by Senator Wiley on the Five Imperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Five Imperatives," delivered by me over Wisconsin radio stations on Friday, October 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To those people who have lifted their sights—enlarged their horizons—there is unfolding a great drama of the nations, bringing far-reaching changes in the political, economic, and social affairs of the peoples of earth. The tempo of our life is quickening.

Our own boys are sailing these seven seas, hearing strange tongues, meeting new philosophies and ideas, getting acquainted with the world—not simply America.

The heavens above them at night are strange, and the vegetation, the climate, the food, the habits and the customs of the people are different. The thousand years of London, and the countryside of Scotland and England; the 2,000 years of Italy, Algiers and the hot sands of Africa, Morocco, the tropical isles of the South Seas, the ice isles of the Aleutians, Iceland, and Greenland; the sea lanes of the North Atlantic, the balmy Mediterranean, the trackless trails of the Pacific; the lands and peoples of Central and South America—all these, and soon more and different contacts with their root lands from whence our fathers came, will influence the thinking of our boys and through them the future of America and the world.

Then, there are the new horizons in invention and science, and the progress in spiritual vision—the barriers of intolerance and caste, race, and creed are being broken down.

In a stress-filled world our hearts go out to our boys of the armed forces who are defending our freedom and our welfare with their lives.

A new perspective is coming to all of us out of their experiences. The world has become smaller. The races and the peoples of earth are drawn together.

We are looking for a solution for war. We are being forced to find that solution because of the destructiveness of war. If we get rid of our sense of futility and frustration, we will find the way, and we will do the job that is up ahead for America in this changing world.

These much traveled and experienced boys of ours in our armed forces will be a big help to America with their broadened outlook and grasp on world conditions and affairs—a great help in this great adventure of finding the way to world peace.

We have talked about the effect upon our boys in their getting acquainted with the world and the peoples thereof. Now let us see what the effect upon the world will be in getting acquainted with our boys and the stories of the free America.

All over the world these boys of ours are virtual crusaders of the American ideal. Their initiative, their freedom of action, are bringing great thoughts into the closed minds of men in other lands.

This very exodus of 5,000,000 men by the end of next year—American men—will create an epoch and an opportunity for American ideas to sift into the minds and souls of the many races of men.

The highway that America has created in the last century and a half is extending now beyond her borders—the highway of the pioneer spirit, of the individualist, of invention and science. It is bridging all the oceans and stretching out through the continents of earth—the highway of humility and tolerance, and individual freedom. And over this highway and these bridges is traveling the finest group of American men the earth has ever seen—apostles preaching the doctrine that the earth must be made into a safe place to live, that justice must be established, domestic tranquillity provided, and that the general welfare of every nation is the concern of every other nation; that liberty and peace must be made secure for all those who desire it.

A few years ago there were those who were saying, "There are no more frontiers." What nonsense. Why, in America we have just crossed the foothills in a climb that must go on over countless ranges. A breath-taking view is up ahead for those who have perspective. Of course, we Americans have already crossed through to the Pacific. California, the Yukon, and the Northwest are behind us. And in making that march, conquering the continent, we also crossed over new boundaries in science and invention.

All this knowledge we are taking to the peoples of the South Seas and the backward folks of the Dark Continent, the people of India, and the world. All this constitutes a part of that world-potent yeast which will start these other peoples marching upward and onward.

Yes; all the world is looking to America for the sunrise—the sunrise of a better day. We are the most powerful and the most significant Nation on earth. Whatever we do will determine the direction of the peoples of earth for generations to come.

Before us there is a tremendous undertaking—to provide adequate world leadership. Nothing is impossible for America if we have faith. Faith, as you know, is contagious. These boys of ours are doing the impossible all over the world. With their aid, we'll continue the job.

We must know that we are laying the cornerstone for a permanent structure, which will, in time, house all the nations of earth, even our enemies of today. Let us hope and pray that in the coming conference at Moscow the larger view will be present in the

minds of the representatives of the United Nations and that they will act thereon.

As I see the present situation, five imperatives stand out very clearly.

They are:

1. The imperative need of appreciating the enormous task before us before the war is won.

2. The imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort.

3. The imperative need of working out now complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period.

4. The imperative need of America receiving title in perpetuity to the strategic air and sea bases in the Western Hemisphere which we have occupied and improved, and use of vital air and sea bases throughout the globe—we should work out reciprocal use of bases for commercial use throughout the world.

5. The imperative need of all Americans to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity, and to apply them ever increasingly now and in the post-war period.

Let us briefly consider the meaning of these imperatives.

1. The imperative need of appreciating the enormous task before us before we win through to victory.

This world is our battleground—the whole world. Our boys are on 27 fronts. Look at the globe and see where our boys are stationed. I believe each one of us should study the globe nowadays and get a true picture of our global combat—see how the airplane has shortened the distance between points. Take a globe and place a string on the spot where you are living, and then draw the string straight to any point on the globe, and you will learn geography anew.

We are in a large part the armory, granary, and manpower supply of this tremendous conflict. We have been furnishing 75 percent of the oil. We have been providing most of the transport. Our submarines, our aircraft, our battle wagons, are increasing in number, and are all over the earth. In 1 year we disposed of $13,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods.

Now take the globe and look at Germany. Unless her home front breaks, you can see that we will have a tremendous job before us to win through to Berlin. The cost in lives will be enormous.

Now look at Japan, and the land she holds, and note the task before us before we can reach her heart.

I recite these facts not to discourage, but that we may realistically appreciate our job and realize that we of the home front must not fall down on the job. We must have more and more production—no strikes—no lack of cooperation at home. We must apply the rule of first things first, and the first thing is to win through to victory.

Taking this position does not in any way lessen my convictions in relation to making sure that when the war is won, Government must release its strangle hold upon private enterprise, restore fredom of initiative, and put bureaucracy out of business.

The second imperative—the need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort—and the third imperative—the need of working out complete accord now between the United Nations for the maintenance of peace—we shall treat together. "Accord" means something more than mere mechanistic coordination. It means raising our sights and seeing the world's needs, and meeting those needs. The Senate can well state it is willing to collaborate with like-minded nations. This should be apparent to every thinker. In the midst of world complexities, we need wisdom from on high to clear the atmosphere. The nations must learn to work together for victory and peace.

To accomplish this very desirable end, we need do nothing which would interfere with the preservation and the protection of our own national interests.

We must make sure that no division creeps in now or in the post-war period. We must look out for the poisoned dart—Hitler's dart of divide and conquer. Surely the recent years have acquainted us with its diabolical nature. Selfish ambitions and antagonisms must be laid aside if we are to be fully responsive to our job for world building, and world reconstruction.

The fourth imperative—We must secure title in perpetuity to all strategic air and sea bases in the Western Hemisphere which we have occupied and improved, and use of vital air and sea bases throughout the globe—working out a reciprocal use of bases for commercial use. This would make for peace, and make America secure.

America is not imperialistic. The world knows that. But I believe America is now awake. She knows that the world has been made smaller. She will never forget the lesson taught at Pearl Harbor. Most of our planes now are flying the northern route from Labrador to Newfoundland, to Greenland, to Iceland, to the British Isles, and some planes are flying from Newfoundland to the British Isles. The islands of the Caribbean on which we have built bases to protect the Panama Canal, the islands in the Pacific on which we have expended tremendous sums, are outposts against any future invasion of this country. They must remain in American hands.

If some of our allies would say to us: "You have been a great aid to us. We would like to reciprocate. We want you to have these bases. They are necessary for your protection in case of any future world conflict." Such a gesture would be like the balm of Gilead to Americans.

The fifth imperative—the need of all Americans to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity, and apply them ever-increasingly now, and in the post-war period—this must be apparent to everyone.

There will be enough to frustrate us without our adding to our problems by failing to play ball together. The terrific problems of taking care of the wounded and the maimed of our soldier boys, providing jobs, reconverting our economy, seeking to make good the four freedoms in America, providing a fair standard of living for all who will work, will give us ample to do on the home front, without mixing up with intolerance, class hatred and lack of cooperation.

Fellow Americans, I have faith that there is for this great American pioneering spirit a great adventure up ahead, in proving ourselves equal to the task. I have faith that we will measure up to our responsibility.

Interview With Senator Brewster on Criticisms of Tour of Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with my distinguished colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times-Herald of October 18, 1943]

BREWSTER RAPS TRAVELER SLUR, SAYS BRITAIN IS GOING PLACES—F. D.'S ATTACK ON TOUR OF FIVE SENATORS WILL NOT STOP EXPOSÉ; HE DECLARES

(By Philip Warden)

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER (Republican), of Maine, said yesterday that he considered it unfortunate that the President should refer to congressional discussions evoked by reports from him and his four senatorial colleagues on their 40,000 mile trip to American war fronts as a damn nuisance.

He added that this does not affect our determination to see that these matters (waste and ineptitude in the conduct of the war, the neglect of American interest in lend-lease expenditures and overreaching of the United States by the British) are thoroughly explored.

APPRECIATES PUBLICITY

"I appreciate the publicity given us in the last three Presidential press conferences," Senator BREWSTER said, "although apparently the President spoke without accurate reports of statements we made for which, as far as I know, he never asked.

"Whether or not we wasted our time, whether or not our trip is going to pay dividends to the American public, must be determined by future developments and not by any attempt to laugh it off by referring to us as fellow travelers, by which I assume he meant Mrs. Roosevelt, who joined us on the circuit of the South Pacific.

"The British irritation at our discussion is difficult to understand because our criticism has been directed not at the British for looking out for themselves but at the failures of our own Government to look after American interests as a result of our inadequate representation on the diplomatic front and in the other civilian agencies now active in the foreign fields."

BRITISH "DOING WELL"

Senator BREWSTER said he thought "the British got us all wrong—we think they are doing a magnificent job. They are in a beautiful position to move into the post-war world in which commercial air transport will play a highly significant part," he said, adding that American development of huge airfields all over the world, many of which appear now will be reserved exclusively for British use, will be an immense aid.

"My hope is to see America do as well."

Senator Brewster enlarged upon his report that American oil reserves are being depleted rapidly to supply the British when they could just as well be getting more of their oil from their own fields along the Persian Gulf.

"This oil matter came to our attention first in the Mediterranean through American military and naval authorities," Senator BREWSTER said. He said these authorities told how they had sent a tanker to the Persian Gulf for oil and it had "never come back." The British had "taken it over," he said. Having lost one tanker on a trip to what would have been a more "efficient" source of oil, he said the Americans "didn't dare send any more tankers" because they "couldn't afford to lose them that way."

"NO LIMIT" ON OUTPUT

"When we got to the Persian Gulf we took the matter up there. Our information there came from the British authorities in charge. The British manager of the refinery told us that it would be possible to increase the output of refined products by about 40 percent with existing facilities. The refinery is one of the largest in the world."

Senator BREWSTER said the British manager informed him there was "no limit" on the amount of crude oil that could be produced. He said this information was gathered in August and "reported home with recommendations that steps be taken."

He said the Senators had been given "the whole story" about it being a shorter haul from the United States than from Persia but now "with the Mediterranean clearing up, we felt strongly that some changes were due."

He said they found that British and Russian oil reserves in the Persian Gulf area were three times as large as the American. He said practically all the increase in output in this area was made by American companies until today, percentage wise, "we are using our own petroleum reserves four times as fast as theirs."

SITUATION CURIOUS

"We found the situation very curious and unfortunate," he said. "I assume the President didn't realize it. The reasons for using more American petroleum than British are:

"1. The reason carried last week by the New York Times: 'Because we hadn't asked for it.' That is the position of officials in London, or

"2. The reason given me, but unofficially: The proposal was made to get more from Britain but the British refused to expand their facilities unless they could do it under lend-lease. The American companies offered to expand, using their own capital, and the military authorities evidently preferred this easier method."

Senator BREWSTER said that many things learned by the Senators on the trip appeared "pretty devastating of the administration." He said the party had been "very careful" about information of a military nature that it has made public and "would continue to be." He added that he had "several hundred pages" of stenographic reports of information gathered on the trip.

Address by Hon. Tom Linder at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by Hon. Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia, before the National Food Conference, held in Chicago on September 17, 1943. The title of the address is "Food With Democracy or Famine With Imperialism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the question of food, its production, distribution, and consumption is so deep-rooted and so intimately connected with the other branches of our national economy that they cannot be separated.

Ultimately, a nation's economy, its politics, and its form of government will each adjust itself to the other.

This immutable law was not made by man. We can no more change it than we can change the law of gravity or the length of the solar year.

In determining our policy of food production we will necessarily determine also what our form of government shall be in the future and what our world politics will be.

If we determine that we will be on an equality with other nations of the world politically, then we must accept the fact that we must also be willing to put ourselves on an equality with all other nations economically. Conversely if we determine to lower our economic condition to equal the economic condition of all other countries, then we must be willing to put ourselves on an equality with all other countries politically.

Should the United States enter into a world economy embracing all nations, it would inevitably be necessary for the United States and the other great powers to enter upon a course of imperialism such as would make all efforts at imperialism in the past fade into insignificance.

Such a system of global dimensions and extension, would require the services of at least 100,000,000 people. Nothing less than 100,000,000 people could possibly police 2,000,000,000 people on the earth's surface, tell every farmer on six continents and the islands of the sea how many acres he could plant, and what crops he could plant, fix and enforce price regulations on all crops and commodities in every land and under every condition, regulate transportation, manufacturing and distribution of these crops and commodities, supervise health and living conditions, and carry on educational facilities for 2,000,000,000 people.

As best I can estimate it the minimum cost of such a global government would amount to around $400,000,000,000 per year. This is twice as much money per year as the World War No. 2 is costing. Think of the prodigious effort that is necessary now in raising taxes and selling bonds to finance the carrying on of the war, then multiply that by two and you get an idea of the cost of operating a global or world-wide economy enforced by an international army.

Remember after this $400,000,000,000 per year has been raised that all the normal costs of national government, state government, and local governments of all the countries in the world, would still have to be financed by the taxpayers.

When you begin to visualize these things you will see that the Caesars of Rome were mere pikers when they sent Roman armies into Gaul, throughout Europe, into Africa, and back into the Indian Ocean.

Speaking of international currency. Caesar had it. Specimens by the thousands were picked up on the site of Carthage in north Africa by American and British soldiers a few months ago. Specimens can be found in England, France, Spain, Germany, Austria and all other European countries. Specimens can be found in all the countries of the Megiddo. From the Caspian Sea to the Red Sea, and from Egypt to the Persian Gulf.

The international bankers in the days of the Roman Empire changed the value of this international money and defrauded the people of that day to such an extent that Jesus plaited a whip and drove them out of the temple.

International bankers and money changers always have and always will thrive under any imperialistic regime where strong nations control the weak.

The emperors of Rome built an international army to prevent war in the future, but the culmination of imperial Rome was its sacking and burning by the vandals in the year 453.

The standard of living is not measured in the number of dollars in the pay envelope. The standard of living is not measured in silver and gold. The standard of living is measured in food, clothing, housing, free schools, electric lights, telephones, radios, automobiles and other necessities, comforts and conveniences.

The farmer in Georgia who goes to town to buy his meat and bread, feed for his animals, and seed to plant never has and never will make a successful farmer.

On the other hand, no one can criticize the farmer who goes to town to buy coffee, medicine, clothing, shoes, farm implements, and other things which he cannot reasonably be expected to produce on his own farm.

The same fundamental principle is true of nations. A nation cannot prosper if it goes to other nations to buy things which it should produce within its own boundaries.

Any effort to flood the United States with farm products which we can produce, with industrial products which we can produce, or with raw materials which we can produce, whatever may be the motive behind such an effort, the effort itself is calculated to help destroy our economy and our independence.

No one can find fault or should object to our buying from other nations such things as we do not have or cannot produce on a sound economic basis, but any attempt to extend our trade with other nations beyond our legitimate needs and beyond sound economic principle is calculated to work injury and detriment both to our economic and political life.

The spending of the taxpayers' money to develop the production of cotton and other crops, for which we have no need, in other countries is a crime.

The action of Congress in delegating to a Government official the power to make trade treaties, which will flood this country with products of peon labor, which products we do not need, is so amazingly un-American that it is difficult to realize that it has been done. We cannot help but think of it as an unpleasant dream.

The fact that an American citizen whose firm largely controls the market for spot cotton in the United States has been put in an official position in Washington is bad enough. And, taking this same citizen, who now largely controls the production of cotton in South America, and putting him second in authority of our Department of Commerce shows unmistakably that the present administration is launched on a program of world imperialism, and is without regard for the interest of the American people.

The forming of a committee for industrial development, committed to international economic and racial equality, with high governmental heads on that committee, is just another evidence that the present administration is traveling along the road of old imperialism, which has been attempted by every power in history since Nebuchadnezzar walked on the walls of Babylon.

We have before us two gates. We have our choice. We can take the gate which leads us farther away from our American form of government under the Constitution which our forefathers set up. We can return to individual liberty, individual initiative, and individual opportunity. We can return to ample production in all lines, which is only another name for security. Or, we can take the other gate into insecurity for a few years and then the decay and fall, which has been the end of every imperial empire in the history of the world.

To say "let's prevent future war" is a catchy saying. The idea of preventing war naturally appeals to the hearts and minds of good men and women everywhere.

The pity of it is that those in authority who advocate this know they are advocating the impossible. It would be nice if we could

prevent all future storms and all future earthquakes, but we are honest enough with ourselves to acknowledge that we cannot prevent storms and earthquakes unless we could change the laws of nature, which is impossible.

Equally true is the fact that we cannot prevent future wars because we cannot change the nature of unregenerated man. Even consecrated and earnest Christians sometimes become war-minded. This being true, how can we expect the unregenerated millions of the earth to refrain from resorting to the law of conflict which is in their very nature?

The fact of the matter is that what progress the world has made has been achieved through war. Without war there would have been no Magna Carta of England. Without war there would have been no Republic of France. Without war there would have been no Declaration of Independence, no Constitution, no Bill of Rights, no freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. Without war there would have been no Protestant kings, no Protestant churches, and no end to religious inquisitions or persecutions. Without war there would have been no separation of church and state.

As much as all good people deplore war, and as cruel as war is, there come times in human history when man is compelled to submit to slavery or else like the founding fathers of this Nation, appeal to the abatement of arms, putting their trust in Almighty God and asking Him for guidance.

The way to get ample food production, and the only thing necessary to get ample food production, is to turn the farmer loose, give him prices which will enable him to compete with war industries for labor. Give him ample supplies of farm machinery, equipment, and fertilizer, take the Federal bureaus off his neck and nothing but an act of providence can prevent him from producing all the food and fibre that we can use and much that we can carry across the seas so long as it is necessary.

When I was a boy the best farmer in the neighborhood was said to be the man who had his crib full of corn when it came time to harvest the new crop of corn. The farmer whose smoke house was filled with meat when the first frost of winter came and it was time to kill hogs again. The farmer who had cotton stored under the shelter, cotton that had been ginned 3 or four 4 years before. These men believed that a full crib, full smoke house, and a few bales of cotton represented security in the event of a short crop, sickness in the family, a death or an opportunity to buy another farm.

These men thought if they had a boy or girl to go to college it was a good thing to have a few bales of cotton stored away to help defray their college expenses. Only in recent years has the false theory been preached to farmers that security lay in scarcity and that insecurity lay in the production of plenty.

The life of any democratic government depends upon the intelligence, integrity, and independence of the people who vote. In any country where the people are not free to vote their own intelligent convictions, the democratic form of government cannot and will not endure.

The people are the voters, they are the directors of the Government. When the Government controls the people it controls the votes, and when elected officials control the votes a democratic government will not survive very long, because evils in the Government will never be corrected when the Government controls the voters.

In 1776 those Americans who gathered in Independence Hall were not afraid of anything on earth except the loss of liberty itself.

When the people of the Thirteen Colonies voted on the adoption of an American Constitution they were not afraid of any foreign power or combination of powers. Their only fear was of greed, ambition, and thirst for power of officials, cliques, and parties within their own borders.

We, today face the same perils and the same problems that were faced by the Continental Congress in 1776 and by the framers of the Constitution of our United States.

Let us free the American farmer. Let him produce every ounce of food he can without hindrance for the duration of this war. If he is not able to produce enough food for the Nation, for our armed forces, and for our allies, then let us buy as much more food as we need wherever it can be found. Whatever it takes to support the men overseas should and must be done without hesitation, equivocation or regard to cost. But, when those brave men in our armed forces have won the victory, when they return to America, those who are spared, it is our job to see that none of the liberties and rights, which they have under the Constitution in this country, have been taken away from them while they were absent, risking their lives and their all for you and me.

Work of Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "R. E. A. Builds for Victory and Post-War Opportunities," delivered by Hon. William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, on October 12, 1943, in Atlanta, Ga., at the meeting of the Rural Electric Cooperative Managers and Superintendents of Georgia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. E. A. friends of Georgia, I regard it as a privilege to bring to you today the greetings of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Claude R. Wickard, and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Hon. Harry Slattery. I want to salute the leaders of the R. E. A. cooperative movement in Georgia who are assembled here, and to congratulate you upon your great record in bringing central station electric service to more than 83,000 members in this State, thus placing your State second only to Texas in the number of R. E. A. Cooperative members.

My remarks are entitled "R. E. A. Builds for Victory and Post-War Opportunities," and as part of this theme I want to discuss with you the contributions being made by the R. E. A. Cooperatives of America to the food-production program of the Nation. Unquestionably the experiences of the 83,000 members in your State are typical of those of more than 1,000,000 other farm people in America who, except for R. E. A., would not today have the benefit of central-station electric service. Electric power to replace the men who have gone to war; the power requirements so necessary to enable our farmers to meet the record-breaking food-production level that has been achieved by American agriculture this year.

Today I want to give you an up-to-the-minute report on the work the R. E. A. cooperatives of the Nation have been doing, in cooperation with the War Food Administration and the War Production Board, in using the limited amount of critical material assigned for the purpose of bringing electricity to thousands of our better producing farms which had not been connected when war was declared. After months of careful study, the War Production Board authorized the so-called U-1-c program, effective February 1 of this year. From February 1 until September 30, R. E. A. had cleared 38,727 estimate work orders from the cooperative to serve 48,409 farmers who were certified by their county War Board to have five or more animal units. It is not the fact that 48,000 more of our farmers have received electric service that is of interest to an America at war, but, rather, what this service means in the way of increased food production.

In that connection, these figures will be of interest:

Livestock on hand	Number on hand	Individual value	Total
Cows	391,637	$99.61	$39,011,022
Cattle	494,991	69.66	34,481,112
Ewes	159,079	9.68	1,539,891
Sows	293,110	22.54	6,606,705
Hens	6,369,134	1.037	6,604,792
Turkeys and geese	1,313,886	4.46	5,859,934
Total			94,103,456

Estimated production	Indicated production	Individual value	Total
Cattle	494,221	$69.66	$35,427,500
Lambs	321,074	9.68	3,108,000
Pigs	3,385,647	22.54	76,312,500
Chickens:			
Not broilers	15,500,780	1.037	42,048,556
Broilers	25,047,779		
Turkeys or geese	2,969,250	4.46	13,242,855
Total			170,139,411

These 48,000 farmers had on hand livestock with a value of $94,103,456. Their estimated production for 12 months totaled $170,139,411 in livestock, and $40,395,000 in livestock products, to exceed $210,000,000 based on U. S. D. A. average production and prices.

Spot checks in representative areas have been made to determine the effect of the electricity on farm production among these newly connected farmers. These spot checks indicate that the benefit to livestock production through the ability of the farmer to maintain his present production with decreased labor, or increased production with present labor, is equivalent to 34 percent. The extensions to the 48,000 farmers authorized in the past 8 months represent $9,250,000 in labor and material. Compare this figure, if you will, with the resulting benefit to the food production of the Nation of more than $71,000,000—a ratio of better than 7 to 1 for livestock production alone, without taking into account the fact that the labor served by the availability of electricity may have been almost equally reflected in increased production of field crops.

In behalf of R. E. A., I want to take this opportunity to urge the representatives of every cooperative here to do their utmost, within the limit of the necessary Federal regulations, to see that electric service is made available to the presently unserved farmers of Georgia. Frequently, there are those who challenge the soundness of R. E. A.-financed cooperatives. You will be interested to know how the nearly 800 cooperatives which R. E. A. has financed are handling their affairs—where they stand financially—whether this approach to the problem of rural

electrification is sound. Since 1935 we have advanced for the construction of distribution systems, generation and transmission systems, acquisitions, wiring, and appliances, $169,152,562.

Repayment of these funds is scheduled over a 25-year period. As of July 31, 1943, the cooperatives had met their scheduled payments and, in addition to this, have to their credit in prepayments to R. E. A. $12,663,787.57, as compared with delinquencies of only $118,125.91. Here in Georgia you have reason to be proud because of the record which has been made by the 40 cooperatives of this State, to which $16,240,675 has been advanced to build 20,500 miles of line. In the latest figures available, there was not a single cooperative that was delinquent in principal payments to R. E. A., and the cooperatives have repaid to R. E. A., ahead of schedule, $741,924.75, and, in addition to their cash reserves, they hold in Government bonds more than $350,000. This spendid financial record is in keeping with what we consider to be a fundamental step in the development of a post-war program that has as its objective, making electricity available to every rural home in America. During this emergency period of the war every effort should be made by the cooperatives to bring their engineering work up to date, to establish the best management practices, and keep their financial house in order.

In addition to this effort to conduct your affairs prudently and to extend service to all farmers who qualify under present restrictions, we have the added responsibility of making plans for post-war rural electrification development. Here in Georgia, where you have brought service to the surprisingly large number of 83,000 rural families, there are yet unreserved, according to recent census figures, more than 340,000 farms and rural homes. In addition to the two and a half million farmers in America now receiving central-station service (served in about equal numbers by private utilities and R. E. A.-financed cooperatives) available data indicate that there are more than 5,000,000 farms and rural nonfarm residences and other establishments, nearly all located within the area of R. E. A. cooperatives, to which electricity should be made available as rapidly as possible after the close of the war.

That is the reason why R. E. A. is working with its borrowers in making the unelectrified farm survey. Congressional foresight provided in the R. E. A. Act authorization for the Administrator to make studies, investigations, and reports concerning the conditions and progress of the electrification of rural areas. Under this authority the post-war planning program is being conducted. A part of the program is a survey of the unelectrified farms in the United States. It may be well to point out that when R. E. A. first came into being less than 10 percent of the farms in the Nation were electrified. Today we estimate that 38 percent are receiving central station service.

R. E. A. financed systems conducting the unelectrified farm survey under our suggested procedures are receiving the cooperation of many county agents and interested organizations. This survey when completed is placed on a map showing the location of the unelectrified farm, as well as the location of the transmission and distribution lines of both private utilities and R. E. A. financed systems. To date approximately 450 counties in various parts of the country have been completed. Many of the progressive cooperative leaders are already planning to bring information on the unserved area in their territory up to the pre-allotment stage so that a construction program may proceed at once when victory has been won, and labor and material again become available. Second only to our interest in furthering the U-1-c program is our interest in seeing the unelectrified farm survey completed in every county in the land.

One of the principal objectives in R. E. A.'s plan for post-war rural electrification submitted to the Department of Agriculture at the President's request would enable R. E. A. to effectively cooperate with its borrowers in bringing the basic data of the unelectrified farm survey up to the preallotment stage.

This objective would achieve a twofold purpose. First, through the early availability of central station electrification to millions of rural homes it would provide the basis for a more profitable agriculture and richer rural living so abundantly deserved and won by the sons and daughters of these same families now serving the Nation in this world-wide conflict. Second, through a program of immediate large-scale construction there would be provided through direct construction activities and the manufacture of material and consumer goods for this new market opportunity for profitably private employment for thousands upon thousands of our returned soldiers.

I am happy to tell you that, although we are limited for funds and much of our St. Louis staff is working extra hours to give the necessary assistance to the cooperatives, we have a number of people who are devoting much time and thought to the development of a sound program for post-war rural electrification. We are not making plans to be able to make more plans after the war. We are making plans to be ready for action. While there is still considerable work to be done, our present studies indicate that with a minimum of expense and effort, R. E. A., its cooperative borrowers, and others, working together, can have available at a moment's notice a post-war construction program of well over $500,000,000 in the first 3 years. And it should be borne in mind that such a program will open a market for at least an equivalent amount of farm and home appliances.

This program of post-war rural electrification would have immediate benefits to labor that would otherwise be released from the plants now producing war materials. It would also include the work involved in mining, processing, transporting, and manufacturing poles, conductors, transformers, line, and generating equipment, as well as the processing and manufacture of the tremendous volume of electrical appliances and farm equipment that R. E. A. experience indicates would be purchased after the facilities were constructed.

There is only one other matter of which I wish to speak today, and that is the relationship between the Rural Electrification Administration and its borrowers. The funds which R. E. A. has at its disposal for the active program that it is now expected to carry on are very limited. Every effort is being made to use these funds to the best possible advantage. Even with this, if we are to get on with this program, it is necessary to have the best possible cooperation between our borrowers and this Administration. It is necessary to have the best possible cooperation between R. E. A.—a Federal Administration in the Department of Agriculture—and other administrations and bureaus within the Department. I know how close this program is to the heart of Secretary Wickard and to the President and I have every reason to believe that we are going to receive the best possible cooperation from all Federal agencies with whom we come in contact. I also know of the very great interest of most of the officials of your State—here in Georgia—and the part which they can contribute toward this program.

R. E. A.'s position in carrying out the mandate of Congress to bring electric service to rural homes is different from that of almost any other public agency. In a measure, our relationship to the cooperatives is that of a friendly banker loaning funds, but by reason of the fact that the building and managing of electric lines is a relatively new type of cooperative endeavor, we try to render a considerable variety of services that will ensure the successful operation of these lines upon which we have loaned money. I want to make this very clear, however, that it is not the desire of the Rural Electrification Administration to run the business of its borrowers. We recognize that that can be done much better by the local board of directors and the local manager than it can by anyone from Washington or St. Louis. You know what the problems are. You are constantly gaining experience, and with the assistance we are able to provide I am sure that if the sturdy farmers who make up these boards of directors cannot run these cooperatives, and make them up to our fondest hopes then no one else can. The record which I have already cited for both Georgia and the Nation proves that you're doing a good job.

I do want to point out, however, that when the Rural Electrification Administration, after attempting to interest the private utilities in furthering the rural-electrification program, established the policy of loaning to rural cooperatives, it in effect placed its faith in cooperatives to bring electric service to rural families of the Nation. For that reason I cannot but feel that you managers, directors, and members of successful operating cooperatives have assumed a moral obligation to make central station electric service available to every rural home that it is possible to serve. If R. E. A. performs its functions with efficiency and decisiveness I am confident that so long as member interest in the cooperative's affairs is maintained, and that so long as the officers and directors which they select exercise their best judgment as public-spirited citizens, the President and the Congress can be assured that as rapidly as conditions permit, dependable electric power will be made available to every rural home in America.

The Corn and Hog Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a public address on the subject The Corn and Hog Situation, delivered by William Yunglas, president of the Iowa Swine Producing Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Gannett, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with mixed feelings of pride, doubt, and terror that I appear before you to discuss so broad a subject as the corn and hog situation. The feeling of pride is shared on two scores, first, upon being asked to present this subject before such a distinguished group and second, upon being one of the thousands of producers of corn and hogs, who throughout this land have done what I consider a "bang up" job of producing two very vital munitions of war under tremendous handicaps. The doubt is concerning my ability to do justice to the subject and to

what the solutions of our problems are. The terror is from the thought of the indecision, and the cajoling, threatening directives of jealously competitive governmental agencies with which we have been and will no doubt continue to be blessed.

I realize that a discussion of the corn and hog situation is an extremely broad subject and can be approached from about as many different angles as there are individuals to approach it. Preferring to confine myself to the safety of the field with which I am most familiar I will therefore remain pretty close to the situation at home in the largest corn and hog producing State of the Nation, Iowa, and where I have had a part in the business of producing corn and hogs since big enough to holler "Sooweee" or replant missing hills of corn that had been removed by ground squirrels believing in individual enterprise and endeavoring to establish their own social security.

In spite of much publicity to the contrary, the great bulk of the corn and hogs of the Nation are produced by the hundreds of thousands of moderate size operators producing from 50 to 250 hogs and 50 to 150 acres of corn each year rather than by the few large commercial or corporate units that are more often publicized Practically all producers have astonished all estimators and even themselves in a battle of production against what has seemed like unsurmountable obstacles. Dating back 2 or even 3 years ago the competition of higher wages in war preparedness industries, military camp construction, etc., plus the call of Selective Service began their steady drain upon the manpower in the corn and hog producing area. High wages offered by holders of Government contracts being the chief offender. Closely following this manpower shrinkage came the curtailment of equipment due to priorities and W P. B. failing to realize the importance of food in war We regret that even many of our experts in-agriculture continued to "drag their feet" long after there was any sane excuse for limiting the production of feed grains.

During this time another new Government agency appeared which has won all the prizes in the development of log jams, bottlenecks, and general confusion in our food production picture. Dear old O. P. A. In my younger days I was naive enough to believe that economics was an exact science, that like 2 and 2 equaled 4, the various laws of ecopomics were exact and unchanging. For the past 10 years, however, we have been overhauling economics and throwing out all the old deadwood like such dodo birds as the law of supply and demand, diminishing returns, division of labor, etc. My, haven't we been having fun.

The ultramodern economist is given the answer first and he works the problem backwards to build a case for the answer. Says he, those old economic laws never amounted to much anyhow. That law of supply and demand was just an instrument of the evildoers. We make our own laws. Make scarce things cheap so more folks will want more of them so soon there isn't enough to go around without rationing. I must hasten to add that I am not inferring a blanket condemnation of all economists for we do still have a few who stand out as beacons in a storm and for them I am grateful. It is encouraging to learn that new leadership in O. P. A. has placed real businessmen in all policy-making positions and has dismissed their huge legal department just recently? This should help. Probably nothing has added so much confusion to our feed supply, tenseness to the corn-hog situation, and uncertainty among our producers of feed and food as have the maze of ceilings, floors, threatened ceilings, price differentials, etc., that the producer thinks of as governmental tinkering.

A hog producer in a feed deficit area may find that he can buy corn legally from a neighbor (if he has any corn) at 97 cents a bushel or from his local grain dealer for $1.05 if it was grown by his neighbor or $1.12 if it was shipped in. In all cases it is the same kind of corn and each will feed a hog the same length of time, but it is illegal for him to pay his neighbor, who might have corn, the price he would have to pay for the same corn if shipped in. If the producer has both his own corn and hogs he continues to feed the hogs so long as it is economically efficient to do so. With artificial forces in full command of the feed and price situation there is no way to bring about the usual adjustments between the different classes of livestock and segments of industry competing for the supply of raw materials.

In addition, no provision has been made for a seasonal variation in the ceiling price of hogs to assist in drawing them to market before the rush in the fall and winter months. Such failures to recognize the basic economic laws will reap a harvest of confusion and further directives as the normal season for heavy marketing approaches. Removal of the corn ceiling would make feeding to hogs less profitable and more hogs would be marketed earlier and at lighter weights. This would reduce the pressure of hogs on the slaughtering capacity when the peak season arrived and also reduce the number of hogs eating from the Nation's corn pile. Some may shriek "inflation," but to my thinking I doubt very much if the rise in corn price would be very great or for very long, for the marketing of hogs that needed it, would reduce demand and the approach of the rapidly increasing crop of new corn would hold the price in check. I don't expect to be taken too seriously in this matter for it sounds too much like the old-fashioned common-sense law of supply and demand. I am, however, willing to wager that before the present marketing season is completed, all concerned will wish we had done something.

I might add, with a low bow to Life magazine (July 19) that it is a peculiar line of thinking indeed that considers feeding corn to hogs a waste of corn. They might have made themselves of much more service to the Nation had they used their efforts to increase the production of corn and feed grains, for there will not be enough to produce the meat and fat needed. Hog producers, having done a record job in spite of exceptionally unfavorable weather, price confusion, disease, parasites, labor equipment, and protein-feed shortage, do not enjoy being held up to the public in scorn as "wasters of feed". It is refreshing to occasionally find the press willing to recognize some of the efforts being made by the producers of feed and food.

Passing on to a more cheering note, I am sure everyone interested in the well-being of our country will be happy to know that the September 1 crop report indicates that Iowa will produce an all-time record corn crop of 630,000,000 bushels. Only twice before has she exceeded 500,000,000. As for the crop for the entire Nation, 2,985,267,000 is indicated, which, although a little short of last year's record crop, is 600,000,000 larger than the 10-year average. To give some idea of the importance of the corn crop to hog production, I cite these figures for the 1942–43 crop year from the United States Department of Agriculture. These percentages are of the total feed grains in which all feed grains are reduced to their corn equivalent value. This total feed-grain disappearance for the Nation was divided among the various classes of livestock as follows: Dairy cows, 12.3 percent, poultry 18.6, beef cattle 12.2, sheep 0.4, horses and mules 8.7, and hogs 47.8 percent. You will note that nearly one-half of the total is used by the hog industry. The hog producer feels that from the standpoint of labor and equipment involved and the ability to turn feed grains into high-quality protein, vitamins, and fat that he must be highly efficient to warrant the use of so large a portion of the Nation's feed supply. To improve that efficiency in face of increasing numbers requires skill. Livestock production does not lend itself so well to speeded-up assembly-line production as do the products of industry. The problems of health, sanitation, parasites, labor, equipment, and transportation increase rapidly. I cannot refrain from one other comment on the above figures of feed-grain disappearance.

Poultry, over the entire Nation, used 18.6 percent or almost one-fifth of our total feed grain—and we talk rather slightingly of "just chicken feed." While we are happy to hear that our national corn production is at near record level, it does not mean that our feed situation is solved. Our livestock numbers in nearly all divisions are at record highs. This places the number of feed units available for each unit of livestock at about 15 percent less than last year. Thoughtful study and skillful leadership will be necessary to distribute the available feeds to these livestock numbers in such a way that the greatest production of food is obtained and roughages unsuited for human consumption are utilized by livestock.

As to leadership in the production of food in this crisis, I believe the one thing that most producers regret—and consumers should—is the fact that no central authority over the various phases of the food industry exists. High confusion between various agencies of production, distribution, pricing, labor and supplies has been and is our greatest handicap. Last spring with the appointment of Chester Davis as head of the War Food Administration the great majority of producers felt that at long last we would have an end to the confusion and that fair, sensible, businesslike administration of our many problems was at hand. Needless for me to go into the frustration of his attempts to end the chaos, his resignation, and the continuation of layer on layer of regulations and directives. I am still firm in the belief that until some such leadership is established that the confusion will continue.

Until such action is taken the best thing for those of us interested in food either from the production or consumption angle—and that includes all of us—is to get together and solve the problem. The livestock and meat industry in all its phases; producing, marketing, processing, and distributing has done perhaps the most notable job in this field. In national meetings which have brought together responsible representatives of all branches of the industry representing over a hundred recognized organizations was developed the livestock and meat council and while it is not entirely a corn and hog enterprise, I feel justified in going far enough afield to comment briefly on its accomplishment. In order that there might be sufficient meat for our armed forces, our civilian population, and our allies through lend-lease commitments, it was necessary that a sound program be developed. This program unanimously adopted by the industry is designed to:

1. Encourage livestock production. 2. Maintain adequate control of livestock slaughter. 3. Keep demand in balance with supply by: (a) satisfying the meat needs of the armed forces; (b) establishing an effective rationing the program to control consumer demand; and (c) determining the remainder of the supply and limiting lend-lease purchases to the available supply. 4. An over-all Government meat management administrator to coordinate all of the demand for meat with the total available supply. 5. Full and strict enforcement with an adequate educational program to enlist public understanding and support.

This program was presented to the administration early last spring and accepted. The establishment of the War Meat Board being

a direct result of the plan, which while not nearly solving the problem due to the overlapping authority of various Government agencies, which I stated earlier can be corrected only by a unified control, is a step in the right direction. I use this example merely to show that to solve a big problem it is necessary that all interested cooperate to get the answer. The sad feature of this problem is that in this instance every segment of the industry has cooperated except Washington, and to this day they have refused to let the meat management plan function with any authority.

This problem of the corn and hog situation with its relation to feed supplies, human needs, other livestock groups, geographical location of population and production, utilization of grass and roughages, our land resources, economic use of available labor, and so forth, will require the cooperation of countless groups and individuals. We must strive to maintain a sane approach to the problem and guard against our great American habit of jumping at conclusions. Rising politicians ever eager for a sensational horse to ride may suggest the execution of our pigs, confiscation of our corn, and radical changes in our diet, all of which must be analyzed for their true worth. One of the current solutions enjoying a temporary wave of popularity is the cereal and soybean philosophy or trade your pork chops for corn meal. Furtherance of this philosophy is a direct threat to the corn and hog producer because they make up so large a part of the livestock and feed industry. Much more serious is the threat it carries to the diet, health, economic and land resources of the Nation.

The advancing of the cereal-diet theory as a solution to our food problem received its greatest boost last spring when worried news commentators and well-meaning but ill-informed politicians feared the Nation was facing starvation. They argued that if a man on a desert island had 10 bushels of grain, a cow, a litter of pigs, and a flock of chickens that he would postpone starvation the furthest into the future by executing the pigs, eating the cow and chickens, and then make the grain last as long as possible for food. The argument was fortified with such statements as "it takes 7 pounds of corn to make 1 pound of pork, and with 7 pounds of corn you can make 238 corn muffins," or by eating 7 bowls of oatmeal you have the equivalent of a serving of meat. The versatile soybean, for which I have the greatest admiration and respect and produce many bushels, was elevated to the position of a universal food. Such sensational innovations in our diet naturally were welcome material for news and magazine writers.

I hope you appreciate the position of the corn and hog producer, who after a hectic career through the years of being alternately urged to produce, subsidized to reduce, and then again in this all-out war being called upon for a production exceeding any previous record and doing the job only to find that apparently he had missed the boat and the Nation didn't want meat after all. I have no quarrel with the promoters of the cereal philosophy if they state it for what it is worth, recognize its limitations and realize the importance of the livestock industry in relation to the total land and labor resources, health, and economy of the Nation. Let us approach the problem squarely and use the resources and labor available to their best advantage. Also the fertility of our soil is dependent upon a livestock system of agriculture. From the United States Census report of 1940, since which many fertile acres have been taken by Army camps, war industries, airfields, etc., the United States has a total land area of approximately 1,900,000,000 acres wfihich is divided into the following categories: grass 55 percent, mountain and arid 11 percent, cities, villages, roads, parks, beaches, etc., 12 percent, grain crops for livestock 14 percent, fiber crops 2 percent, crops directly for human consumption—vegetables, cereals, and fruits, 4 percent. In order to make an economic utilization of so great an area of grass land and to convert the roughages and byproducts from production of other areas, it is apparent that a livestock industry is fundamental. Livestock not only have the ability to utilize the grass and roughages but they can convert them and in addition much grain into foods having greatly superior health and nutritional values. Livestock is the machine which turns these feeds distributed throughout the land into concentrated foods and permits a great saving in transportation. Such products of the livestock industry as meat, lard, butter, milk, ice cream, eggs, and poultry not only make available a diet that not only tastes better but is better in nutritional and health values. Rather than cite a national authority on this matter, I would like to quote one who is experienced by the many years of solving the nutritional problems of our seven children and who to me at least is the world authority—my wife. When I ask her why meat was so important in our diet, this is what she said: "Meat is the thing which builds and repairs the human machines which are our childrens' bodies. Meat and meat products contain the complete proteins which are essential to the building and repairing of muscle and tissue. They also furnish much of the calcium, phosphorus, and iron for bones, teeth, and blood. The unique nature of the proteins, minerals, and vitamins in meat and meat products is such that they are readily available for the human body. Because of these properties the attempt by cereal diet advocates to compare meat and cereals simply on a caloric basis is both unscientific and unfair.

"Results of the addition of even limited quantities of meat and livestock products in the diet are well demonstrated by the increased stature and vigor of the northern Chinese, whose diet contains more of those products than does the diet of the southern Chinese. The increased stature of American-born Japanese children, evidenced in those families where American-type meat diets are followed, has been striking. As a war emergency with its great demand on our meat supply, we can and will use more cereal substitutes and extenders in our diet, but to the meat-loving, red-blooded American they are substitutes, not alternates, and speed the day when they can return to their first choice, meat. Meat is the food around which the most nourishing, most attractive, and best-tasting meals can be planned. It is meat that keeps our family eating, growing, and on its toes."

Livestock farming improves the stability of our agriculture and conserves our land resources by checking erosion and retaining, and even increasing, available plant food. It makes possible a better balance and effective use of the labor available and enlarges the field of managerial ability for the farm operator. These are some of the reasons why the corn and hog farmer, who makes up a large part of the livestock industry, feels that his business is sound.

In conclusion, then, the corn and hog industry is by no means facing liquidation. It has conducted itself well through trying times and is prepared to continue to produce its shore of the meat and fat necessary for the Nation's diet. The high ratio of livestock to feed units will require care and skill in feeding practices, and no rule of thumb for the correct market weight of hogs is possible for much depends on the plan of feeding used. Importation of greater amounts of blackstrap for industrial use and much larger reliance on huge national, Canadian, and Australian stocks of wheat for industrial use and livestock will relieve much of the pressure on our feed supply.

The main thing the corn and hog situation needs a lot less of is confusion in Washington.

Commissioning Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons as Medical Officers in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, testimony before the House Appropriations Committee shows there are many osteopathic physicians and surgeons now serving in the noncommissioned ranks of the Navy. They are serving as square pegs in round holes. Their professional training and professional services are wasted. A few months ago many of these same men were in the active practice of their profession, including the full scope of the healing art. Some of them were on the surgical staffs of civilian hospitals. Some of them were eye, ear, nose, and throat specialists. Others confined their practice to radiology. Others majored in obstetrics and pediatrics. Some of them were serving on the medical staffs of industrial plants.

Letters from them indicate their duties in the Navy range from dumping bed pans to cleaning floors.

Yet, Congress more than a year ago invested the Navy with specific authority to commission osteopathic graduates. Last June Congress reiterated and reaffirmed that authority by a specific provision in the Navy appropriation law, Public Law 92, for "commissioned medical officers who are graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy."

But those in charge of making naval medical appointments have not chosen to carry out the will of Congress in that respect. In defense of their failure to do so, they say the law is not compulsory.

This is no time for quibbling. The provision is a part of the law of the land, and it is not on the statute books just to fill up space. It intends osteopathic appointments, obviously.

In further defense, they say they have a rule that all commissioned medical officers must hold the degree of doctor of medicine, and they say this law did not change that rule.

Well, the law authorizes commissioned medical officers who are osteopathic graduates, and osteopathic schools confer the degree of doctor of osteopathy, not doctor of medicine. So the law certainly does change the rule. It makes doctors of osteopathy eligible.

This is not the first time Congress has indicated the degrees, doctor of medicine and doctor of osteopathy, are in the same category. In 1929, in a law regulating the practice of the healing art for the District of Columbia, Congress specifically provided that: "The degrees, doctor of medicine and doctor of osteopathy, shall be accorded the same rights and privileges under governmental regulations."

Yet, the physicians and surgeons of the osteopathic school of medicine are used

only in the noncommissioned ranks of the Navy in the same capacities as any other seaman, without regard for the 6 or 7 years' specialized schooling it took to make them physicians, and without regard for their years of general or specialized practice of the healing arts.

Congress has spoken, and I hope the people protest against this flagrant waste of professional manpower. I hope they will make themselves heard by the President, and that he will take immediate action to see to it that this deplorable situation is corrected.

Under leave granted me, I include as a part of my remarks two very timely extracts from the Journal of the American Osteopathic Association, Chicago, Ill., including a compilation made from the study of the curricula of the six approved osteopathic colleges and three accredited medical colleges. Osteopathic education consists of 2 years preprofessional college work and 4 years professional college work and a year's internship, the colleges and intern training hospitals being approved by the respective State licensing authorities and the accrediting agencies of the American Osteopathic Association.

[From the October 1942 Journal of the American Osteopathic Association]

	Recommendations of American Osteopathic Association and American Medical Association		Chicago College of Osteopathy (amended figures)		Des Moines-Still College of Osteopathy		Los Angeles College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons		Kansas City College of Osteopathy and Surgery		Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery		Philadelphia College of Osteopathy		Harvard Medical School		University of Kansas Medical School		Stanford University School of Medicine	
	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent
1. Anatomy, including embryology and histology	814	18.5	804	16.8	1,024	21	715	14	816	18.7	1,024	24	872	20	440	10.3	768	17	754	17.4
2. Physiology	264	6	306	6.4	432	9	231	4.5	252	5.8	288	6.7	392	9	232	5.4	320	7.1	269	6.2
3. Biochemistry	198	4.5	192	4	162	3.5	209	4	168	3.8	126	3	280	6.3	232	5.4	224	5	176	4.1
4. Pathology, bacteriology, and immunology	572	13	546	11.4	770	16	562	11	504	12.5	558	13	734	17	479	11	614	13.7	477	11
5. Pharmacology	220	5	150	3.2	168	3.5	198	4	192	4.4	108	2.5	80	1.8	129	3	209	4.7	200	4.6
6. Hygiene and sanitation	176	4	192	4	60	1.2	168	3.3	126	2.9	90	2	64	1.5	124	3	62	1.4	124	3
7. General medicine	1,166	26.5	1,547	32.4	1,290	26.6	1,573	31	1,320	30	1,242	30	1,070	24	1,219	28.5	1,301	29	1,123	25.9
8. General surgery	770	17.5	706	14.7	474	10	986	19	606	14	486	11.3	700	16	705	16.4	689	15.4	698	16.2
9. Obstetrics and gynecology	220	5	323	6.7	464	10	437	8.5	378	8.6	252	6	208	4.7	317	7.4	269	6	303	7
Totals	4,400	100	4,772	100	4,844	100	5,079	100	4,362	100	4,274	100	4,400	100	4,271	100	4,484	100	4,324	100

[From the September 1943 Journal of the American Osteopathic Association]

HOW LONG?

In April the Surgeon General of the Navy told the House Appropriations Committee that the health of the Navy was good At the same time he told them that the Navy would require 20,000 medical officers by June 30, 1944, but that he would be lucky if he had as many as 12,000 by that time. He stated the ratio of medical officers to the enlisted personnel of the naval forces should be 6.5 for each thousand At that time the enlisted naval personnel totaled approximately 1,450,000. There were 9,000 medical officers to serve them The ratio of 9,000 to 1,450,000 is 6.2, which approximates the proper proportion as estimated by the Surgeon General. With such a full strength of medical personnel the Surgeon General was able to report that the health was good and that there had been no epidemics.

Secretary Knox now (August 17) says that the naval forces will total 2,851,000 by January 1, 1944 At the ratio of 6.5 a thousand, that figure would require 18,726 medical officers. But the Surgeon General has said he will be lucky if he has as many as 12,000 by June 30, 1944 which is 6 months afterward.

If, as the Surgeon General indicates, it will require until June 30, 1944, to build the medical strength of the Navy up to 12,000 medical officers, and he will need 18,000 6 months before then, how long will it be possible under such circumstances to report that the health of the Navy is good?

The Surgeon General said that the medical officers will simply have to work harder. At the time he made that statement he had 6.2 a thousand. Does the Surgeon General expect that the increase in hostilities, with the resultant pyramiding of casualties, will require a diminishing ratio of doctors? If he needs 20,000 on June 30, 1944, and expects to have only 12,000, who takes the risk of that 8,000 deficiency? Who will be taking the risk of the more than 6,000 deficiency that will apparently develop by January 1?

With such inevitable deficiencies in medical officer personnel, how long will the Surgeon General continue to scrap the professional skills of the osteopathic physicians and surgeons now serving in the noncommissioned grades of the Navy?

On June 26, 1943, President Roosevelt signed the naval appropriation bill providing for the use of osteopathic physicians as commissioned medical officers in the Navy. How long will the Surgeon General neglect to implement that law?

The law says osteopathic physicians should be appointed. Organized medicine dissents. The law represents the voice of 130,000,000 people. Organized medicine speaks for a medical combination the indictment and conviction of which for interfering with freedom in medical practice was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States as recently as January of this year. It is not suggested that the Surgeon General is attempting to serve two masters but it is suggested that he avoid the appearance of such an attempt, and that he proceed forthwith to carry out the manifest intention of Congress that the professional skills of osteopathic physicians and surgeons shall be utilized, as provided by law.

C. D. SWOPE, D. O.

Don't You Know There's a War On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Don't you Know There's a War On?", writen by Emily Post, and published in This Week magazine of October 17, 1943.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DON'T YOU KNOW THERE'S A WAR ON?"—YES, AMERICANS DO KNOW IT—AND THEY HAVE BECOME WEARY OF THIS INSULTING QUESTION. NEXT TIME YOU HEAR IT, FOLLOW THIS ADVICE

(By Emily Post)

Regrettable and, I am afraid, increasingly typical is this episode which I encountered lately: Into a market came Mrs. X. Her children are all overseas—her sons, pilots; her daughter, a Navy nurse. Her husband, who is a consultant on chemicals, travels unceasingly from war plant to war plant. For one of his rare week ends, Mrs. X had been saving her meat coupons. So she asked at the butcher counter if she could get a roast—beef preferably.

"Well, lady," he said testily, "beef is something we haven't got; haven't had for weeks. We're sending it to our boys, you know * * * or maybe you don't know there's a war on."

Very quietly, Mrs. X looked at him. "Oh, yes," she said gravely, "I know there's a war on—quite possibly even better than you do."

There was a quality in her bearing and in her voice that impressed him in a way he would never forget.

I, too, would like to say quietly: Certainly we know there is a war. And we are willing to do everything we can about it.

But that phrase of rebuke and challenge, "Don't you know there's a war on?" seems to be replacing the old, old password of American merchandisers: "The customer is always right." Today's customers complain that they seem to be always wrong—just because they are customers; and that the war has bred unnecessary discourtesies and tensions between seller and buyer.

Never before—so far as I can remember—has there been anything like the epidemic of rudeness that now seems to be spreading among those hitherto most courteous of persons: managers, sales clerks, even proprietors.

My mail is heavy with appeals from customers who ask: "Will you please write something against this growing rudeness?" Customers—and we are all somebody's customers—say that they are literally beginning to be afraid to ask a waiter for the bread he forgot, or a sales person for ordinary household supplies. It is clear that this new discourtesy has been piling nerve strain on nerve strain.

A letter now on my desk tells me: "I dread having to go into a store because I have to ask, as though I were a suppliant: 'Could I possibly get—' whatever it is I have come for. I am quite ready to be told things are unobtainable because of the war; I also have a good deal of sympathy for the store owner who is unable to restock his depleted shelves. I am sorry. Yet it is no fault of mine, either, and what I resent is being made to feel like a beggar—if not a criminal—because I must at least ask if I can get what my family needs."

These are unwholesome conflicts that make the successful waging of our home-front battle more difficult. Their origin is twofold: Customers are often unreasonable; sellers are often unhelpful, or worse. So let us begin realizing that these are harassing times for all of us—sellers and customers alike. Rudeness will not help a proprietor to fill up vacant shelves or a buyer to procure what at the moment simply does not exist. But self-control and politeness will ease strain on ourselves and others * * * will constitute a real contribution to the war effort. It is that "little more" which we can and should give.

So, to customers I would say: Be mindful of the plight of the proprietor. He is handicapped by shortages as well as by the loss of trained employees. He cannot keep up the quality of his store or restaurant. He is often plagued with "sampling shoppers" who go from store to store * * * with others perpetually in a haze about which coupon should be used * * * customers all pleading: "Surely, Mr. Smith, you can get me this or that."

But he can't. And empty shelves intensify his private worries over family and finances. It is, perhaps, no wonder that he is jumpy, nervous, or even that he asks: "Don't you know there is a war on?"

But to proprietors let me speak one word of warning: Be careful how you use that easy, overworked phrase. Our sons and husbands and brothers—even our daughters—are in battle dress all over the world. Our very hearts tell us about the war every hour of every day. And we are grateful to the people at home who are kind and mannerly, who have the will to help even when they lack the means. As customers, we appreciate deeply those of you who are doing the best for us in every way they can.

Yes, we know there is a war on—our war. We can win it quicker if we all help each other with patience, with pleasantness—with courtesy.

Interterritorial Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on the evening of October 7 a meeting was held by a group of southern and western Members of Congress, on which occasion an address on the subject Interterritorial Freight Rates, was made by Robert E. Webb, who is Vice Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, the agency set up by the Transportation Act of 1940. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, the class rates within the South and West are higher than in the North, and, owing to the manner of making rates between territories, this condition is reflected in the interterritorial rates. These regional differences in rates are not justified by cost and transportation conditions. This situation is retarding the economic development of the South and West. It is generally recognized by all impartial parties who are familiar with the interterritorial freight-rate problem that the class rates should be adjusted. The matter has been under constant attack for over 70 years and in recent years has received much attention from those concerned with the national welfare. But Congress has never laid down any definite policy on the question. The regionalized system of freight rates which has developed over the years has become a part of the rate policy of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It would be easier for the Commission to change its policy and to work out a revision of the rate structure if it had a mandate from Congress to bring about uniformity to the extent that it is practicable.

Proposed congressional policy on the subject has been criticized by the railroads as legislative rate making. They have also represented to the shippers that an adjustment of the class rates would necessitate an increase in the commodity rates which move bulky raw materials, such as coal, iron ore, lumber and agricultural commodities. This criticism is not true of the board's recommendations which are limited to class rates that apply to high-grade commodities, such as manufactured articles. This is very clearly indicated on pages 443 and 445 of the report, which states:

"The extent, then, to which uniformity in commodity-rate levels is desirable depends upon the conditions and circumstances surrounding the production, marketing, and movement of the commodity in question. * * * Commodity-rate structures, therefore, should be dealt with individually as a result of comprehensive investigations by the Interstate Commerce Commission on a commodity basis."

The recommendations of the board do not call for legislative rate making but merely for a declaration of a policy. This distinction is plainly shown on page 441 of the report in these words:

"It is important, however, that any adjustments in rates be brought about through the established agencies of control. Direct legislative prescription of rates is fraught with many difficulties and should be avoided. It is entirely fitting, however, and consistent with traditional methods of regulation, that Congress declare what policies it wishes to be observed in the regulation of carriers."

The freight-rate structure is a complicated and complex matter but the basic principle involved is simple. There are three separate and distinct rate territories, with higher rates applicable in the South and West than in the North.

The interterritorial rates applying between these regions are constructed by a blending of the intraterritorial rates. The result is that rates from the South and West to the North are higher than they are in the North, and lower from the North than within the South and West.

For an illustration, if you use the average first-class rate in the North as 100, the average relation of the southern rate is 139 and the West which is divided into a number of subterritories with class-rate levels ranging from 128 to 184. To move an article rated first class within the North 100 miles, we might say that the first-class rate was $1, while in the South the same article moved the same distance would cost $1.39 and in the West from $1.28 to $1.84. For instance, if a manufactured commodity moved from Nashville, Tenn. to Terre Haute, Ind., a distance of 200 miles of which 100 miles was in each territory, you would add the charges of $1 and $1.39 to obtain the interterritorial rate. This created an interterritorial problem, for the Nashville shipper pays $2.39 to move his product to Terre Haute while a competitor in the North at Columbus, Ohio, would pay only $2 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Terre Haute.

An identical problem exists when a Nashville producer ships to Spartanburg, S. C., a distance of 200 miles. The Nashville shipper would pay $2.78 while the Columbus shipper would pay only $2.39 for a similar distance of 200 miles to Spartanburg.

Of course, this is a brief illustration and does not represent the actual mileage or actual rates, but it demonstrates the interterritorial-rate problem. Some concrete examples are shown on a statement distributed this evening.

These are illustrations of the rate structure that moves many manufactured articles. It should not be overlooked, however, that the South and the West have some lower freight rates than the North on low-grade commodities and even on a few manufactured or semimanufactured articles, but the general rate structure follows the historical pattern of higher rates in the South and West than in the East, which is reflected in the interterritorial levels.

In certain instances the railroads have granted a number of favorable rates to southern and western manufacturers to competitive markets in the North, but these have been confined to established enterprises. New industries must negotiate for lower rates and usually they are not obtained until the industry is actually established and can exert sufficient influence to obtain lower rates. The uncertainty in obtaining a lower rate in the South and West naturally hinders the development of new industries in cases where the prospective manufacturer contemplates selling in national markets.

We feel that the regional differences in class rates have affected the industrial development of the country, they are not justified by transportation conditions and costs, and that no sound reason exists for their continuance.

It is a matter of public policy whether there should be a regional rates structure. If congress is of the opinion that the existing policy is unwise and it is desirable to have class rates on a uniform basis throughout the United States, it would be appropriate for Congress to so declare and to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to adjust rates in conformity with that policy.

The Importance of Poland's Sacrifices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following article from the Tablet of September 4, 1943:

THE IMPORTANCE OF POLAND'S SACRIFICES

(By Rev. Andrew J Krzesinski, Ph. D., S. T. D.)

Never was the danger for Western culture so great as when Hitler started with his enormous military power to conquer Europe. Nations not yet aware of what nazi-ism meant in practice would easily be overcome by his military supremacy and succumb without resistance. Two free countries, Austria and Czechoslovakia, had already become its prey in this way. If other nations did the same, the darkest period of terrific tyranny and universal destruction would come for Western culture in Europe and for the whole world. It was then necessary to give an opportunity to the world, before the whole of Europe had been enslaved, to know how cruel and inhuman nazi-ism is and how inimical it is to the ideology of Western culture.

This opportunity was given to the world by Poland, the first country which heroically resisted the German invasion. It is the same country which through the centuries, with the blood of its sons, defended Christian Europe and its culture against the Asiatic aggressors. No other country in Europe has suffered so much for the cause of Christian Europe and the ideals of its culture. But all these sufferings together do not equal those suffered now under the Nazi yoke.

With unprecedented brutality and cruelty Nazi Germans tend to exterminate the Polish nation, disorganize its religious life, and completely destroy its national and Christian culture. In such a way they expect to establish the supremacy and domination of their race which is supposed in their opinion, to be destined to rule the whole world.

The policy and methods applied by the Germans in Poland are considered as the best ones and the most suitable for their purpose. They, therefore, would use them in all other invaded countries.

SACRIFICES WERE NECESSARY

The sacrifices of Poland and of all other nations, which inspired by Poland's example, have been defending themselves against Nazi tyranny, are extremely important for the future of Western culture. Revealing German tyranny, they facilitate the organization of defense and contribute to the complete destruction of nazi-ism and to the liberation of Western culture from the menace of Nazi ideology and practices.

At the same time these sacrifices show the whole world how important are the spiritual values of Western culture since the whole Polish nation prefers to live in the greatest misery, to be deprived of wealth, to die of starvation or in concentration camps, to be treated as slaves and to be exposed to mass murders, rather than to renounce them and accept in their place a new, purely materialistic ideology.

Religion and moral rules, which are the most important factors of those spiritual values, animate the nations with extraordinary strength, making them invincible and spiritually unconquerable. These factors properly developed constitute a spiritual bastion of such vigor that all material, political, and military strength, even such as that of Nazi Germany, is impotent against it and must break down. They are also the best assurance of personal and national freedom as well as a guaranty of continuous perfection of personality and of real progress.

The sacrifices made by Poland and other nations defending their freedom and their ideals are enormous, but they do not affect those factors which are the most important in western culture. Millions of representatives of this culture endowed with creative power may yet be killed, many monuments may yet be destroyed, but western culture, with its Christian ideology, will survive. Strengthened with ardent faith in its foundations, and hence, free from religious indifferentism and atheism, it will be able not only to replace, to some extent, the destroyed monuments and murdered scholars, artists, and clerics, but also to make a new and greater progress.

MORAL LESSON IS ESSENTIAL

Lessons given by heroes of Poland who lost their lives for the cause of freedom and the ideals of western culture must be well understood. The religious and moral factors, which during the Second World War have been so brutally assailed by Nazi Germany, must find their proper place in the personal, social, and political lives of nations, and constitute everywhere a cornerstone of education.

Nazi-ism and all other similar systems, which drag down their followers into an abyss of the greatest crimes, must be completely eradicated from human hearts. Therefore, nations which were poisoned with them should remain under a special international educational inspection until the new generations would be able to give guarantee that they would never repeat the crimes of their forefathers.

After the defeat of nazi-ism, however, the future of western culture is not yet completely assured. Russian communism, which is similar to nazi-ism in its destructive work with regard to European nations, always presents a great danger to western culture and to the independence of nations. Poland which suffered so much also from Bolshevist Russia and lost hundreds of thousands of her best sons, understands better than any other nation this new danger.

We hope, however, that this danger will also be removed, and that soon we shall see how important for the whole world were the sacrifices of Poland.

DR. KRZESINSKI'S CAREER

Prof. Andrew J. Krzesinski, whose article is in the preceding columns, was born near Cracow, Poland, studied Thomist philosophy and theology in the Theological Department, University of Cracow, 1906-1910, philosophy, psychology and anthropology in the Philosophy Department of the same University of Cracow, 1919-1923. There he obtained his Doctorate in Theology (1919), and Doctorate in Philosophy (1923). Then he continued his studies in Paris, London, Rome, Leipzig and Berlin. In October, 1924, he was appointed professor agrege of philosophy in the University of Cracow where he remained until the outbreak of the second World War, in 1939. From January 1925 to June 1928 he was a member of the faculty of the University of Warsaw, and was giving lectures on philosophy there.

Dr. Krzesinski is a member of various philosophical and scientific societies in Poland and the United States of America, member of the Polish Institute of Sciences, New York, of the Gallery of Catholic Authors, United States of America, and other societies.

In the second semester, 1943, he was visiting professor of philosophy in the Laval University, Quebec. Since June 1943 he has been a member of the faculty in the University of Montreal, and is giving lectures there in the Department of Philosophy.

In 1936 and 1937 Dr. Krzesinski made a scientific tour of the Far Eastern countries. He visited Japan, China, the Malay States, Thailand, Indochina, Burma, India, Ceylon, and Tibet, and studied the native religions and cultures of these nations. He also visited Palestine and Egypt. In India he met Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Pandit Nehru, president of the Indian National Congress, and other prominent personalities. He held lengthy conferences and discussions with them. In the countries of the Far East Dr. Krzesinski was invited to give lectures at many universities. In India, for instance, he was invited to lecture at 20 universities and university colleges, and in some Buddhist scientific institutions.

As philosopher, he represents a system of order and harmony comprising within it the external reality, the man and the whole spiritual world. Professor Krzesinski is the author of more than 20 scientific books and 120 articles in various languages. The greater number of these books and articles are philosophical.

Below are the titles of some of his books: "Reality, Knowledge, and Truth in the History of Philosophy" (Polish), 1924; "The Philosophy of Fictions of Vaihinger" (Polish) 1924; "In Defense of the Transcendent World" (Polish), 1927; "Une Nouvelle Philosophie de L'Immanence," Paris, 1931; "Problems of Culture" (Polish), 1934; "Modern Culture and Its Tragedy" (Polish), 1934; "Contemporary Unbelief" (Polish), 1935; "Study of the Culture of the Far East" (Polish), 1938; "Is Modern Culture Doomed?" New York 1942; "The Church and the National Cultures," 1943 (October); "The Dangers of the Nazi Culture," 1943; and "Heroic Poland," 1943.

Haitian Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of Saturday, October 16, 1943, by Virginia Prewett, entitled "Haitian Example":

HAITIAN EXAMPLE

(By Virginia Prewett)

The state visit of President Elie Lescot of Haiti to Washington has called national attention to the big contribution that that little nation is making to our war effort. The whole story of Haiti is one that Americans now weighing the merits of a cooperative foreign policy for this country should look into.

In our relations with Haiti is to be found one of many clear-cut examples that show how a constructive, cooperative foreign policy does not make this country a "sucker" nation, as short-sighted nationalists proclaim, but on the other hand is the clearest kind of enlightened self-interest.

Haiti is one of the smallest Latin-American nations, but it is by no means unimportant since it is one of the three Caribbean republics that straddle the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal. Since Haiti's independence, European nations have often meddled there and even made as if to move in. Haiti's financial dealings with them led to acute troubles before the First World War. In 1915, the United States took over their customs and financial affairs to try to straighten things out. We had to send troops in to maintain order.

DENSELY POPULATED

Haiti is one of the most densely populated countries in the Western Hemisphere, yet it is mountainous and has little good land. Since colonial times it has produced coffee, cacao, sugar, cotton, and bananas for export. The country imports large quantities of food and nearly all its made goods.

Competing with other producers in world markets and dependent on imports for food, Haiti has been barely able to exist. There has been no way for Haitians to amass capital or create national wealth upon which to draw for national improvements.

Wherever a nation is bound to an economic set-up that presses its people down and prevents all progress, politics are explosive. Our attempt to establish civil order in Haiti by force of arms ended in their turning on us. While we were fighting the World War No. 1, we had to meet an open revolt from Haitians.

Other upsets occurred through the 1920's. In 1929, President Hoover sent a commission of inquiry to Haiti. It advised that the policing of the country should be turned over to Haitians.

In the world crash after 1929, Haiti suffered extremely. Always on the edge of starvation, dependent on exports for money to import food with, they found it impossible to sell more than a fraction of their former exports. Anybody who expects a people to develop political stability under conditions like this ignores reality. Hungry people will always fight. No amount of policing can stop them.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

When the Roosevelt administration began the good neighbor policy in 1933, the first major economic instrument of it was the Hull trade agreements plan. An agreement signed with Haiti in 1934 began to breathe life back into the republic by giving it an outlet for its products. The marines were withdrawn.

France has been taking nearly half Haiti's exports, but did not renew its trade agreement in 1936. Rising exports to us could not avert economic depression. In 1938 an Export-Import Bank loan for public works was a temporary life-saver. But when war in Europe in 1939 took away more Haitian markets, it was obvious that some permanent solution had to be found for the country.

Two years of study by Americans and Haitians resulted in the solution—the Haitian-American Development Co., started in mid-1941 and financed by an Export-Import Bank loan. It undertook to develop for the United States market new noncompetitive products—rubber, fibers, and others—and thus reduce Haiti's dependence on traditional exports.

This plan, which I shall report more fully in a later article, was getting under way when the Japanese struck. Emphasis was at once shifted to rubber and fibers, and operations were greatly expanded. Haiti is now rapidly becoming a major source of these vital supplies. The island is humming. President Lescot has set an international example by stumping the country to urge more production.

The contrast with 1918 could not be more complete Then we had a fight on our hands because we were trying to impose order on a country that was speared on an extremely disadvantageous economy. In the late 1930's we began to try to help Haiti help herself out of this plight. Now Haiti is turning out supplies we need to fight with and there is peace in the Canal area.

For those who like to think that coperation with other countries always soaks the American pocketbook, it should be underlined that the development company is paying every dollar of Export-Import Bank obligations. Even if it did not, it would be cheaper than keeping an armed force there, as we had to before.

Good Old Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have charged this Government with entering into an agreement with Cuba to subsidize the expanding of the rice industry in that country, and further with furnishing farm equipment and farm machinery for the same, in competition with our own domestic industry, and when our own citizens engaged in agricultural pursuits were unable to secure the necessary farm machinery to grow and harvest our own crops in the United States. Our Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the rice-producing States joined together in lodging formal protests with all of the departments concerned in the transaction, and we pointed out the inconsistencies and unfairness of the proposal, especially establishing the fact that Cuba was unsuited to the growing of rice, all without avail, whereupon Mr. DOMENGEAUX of Louisiana, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, and myself introduced legislation to prohibit the carrying out of this proposal. The bills of Mr. DOMENGEAUX and myself dealt exclusively with rice; however, the bill of Mr. MILLS goes further and prohibits subsidizing and furnishing of farm machinery to any foreign country to produce any agricultural product in competition with our own American products.

In support of my charges I wish to include a letter published in the New Orleans Times Picayune (New Orleans, La.), of recent date by the Honorable Frank A. Godhaux, chairman of the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co. of Louisiana, to-wit:

CUBANS GET RICE FARMING MACHINERY

ABBEYVILLE, LA.

EDITOR, the Times-Picayune:

We quote from a letter which we have received from Cuba, from what we believe to be an authentic source, the following:

"For your information, the Cuban Ministry of Agriculture has on exhibition in Habana the following rice-farming machinery which was received in June and has been in storage until the present time:

"Forty-two single row seater drills.
"Fifty-three row seater drills.
"Twenty-seven John Deere 4-disk plows.
"Four Caterpillar tractors.
"Twenty-six International tractors.
"Ten large threshers.
"Four combines.
"Five binders.
"Eleven John Deere 6-disk plows.

"As we understand it, this machinery was bought by the ministry of agriculture with a part of a $300,000 loan made out of the Export-Import Bank credit of $25,000,000, from which there were to be more credits for the purchase of machinery, but evidently further purchases were stopped when one of the Congressmen from Louisiana introduced a bill in Congress some time ago to prohibit the supplying of foreign countries with machinery to develop crops in competition with American crops. Therefore, it is not expected that any more farm machinery will be shipped here under this loan.

"We have been advised that the ministry of agriculture has sold about 50 percent of this machinery to large rice farmers, and that the balance is to be rented out to smaller farmers on a cooperative basis. All of this equipment is brand new."

This would seem a rather strange procedure when we in the United States have been asked to increase our agricultural production, and at the same time cannot get the machinery to do it with.

I am giving you this information to use as you see fit.

FRANK A. GODCHAUX,
Chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Inc.

I also request permission to include herein an excerpt from the Washington Post of Washington, D. C., of September 2, 1943, by Drew Pearson, with further reference to this subject, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

President Roosevelt is about to tackle the most explosive piece of political dynamite in many years—encouraging food cultivation in Latin America.

The problem is being placed upon his desk by war advisers, including Leo Crowley of the new Office of Economic Warfare. They point to the tremendous drain on our own food resources and the fact that we are soon going to face the job of feeding the world. Only solution for this, they say, is to call upon our good neighbors to increase their own production of farm products.

This is bound to raise a tremendous storm on Capitol Hill.

Farm bloc leaders are certain to point out that only a few years ago huge wheat surpluses in Argentina, the United States, and Canada, caused a series of wheat conferences to try to curtail crops. Following this, the United States did curtail, but Argentina did not.

Farmers also remember the long, bitter dispute over the importation of Argentine food products. During the Hoover administration, Argentina exported to us a mere handful of about 1,000,000 bushels of corn along the Atlantic coast where it was used chiefly as chicken and pigeon feed. The ensuing howl from American farmers brought an increase in the United States tariff on corn.

During the Coolidge administration, Argentina exported to us large quantities of alfalfa seed. In order to check it, Coolidge's Secretary of Agriculture, William Jardine, ruled that Argentine alfalfa seed must be colored orange red an indication to farmers that it winter-kills.

ARGENTINE COW KICKED F. D. R.

Again there was F. D. R.'s own famous crack about the Argentine cow being better than the American cow, a remark which was seriously resented in many quarters and which hurt him among farmers.

Despite this certain political backfire, however, it looks as if military necessity would send the President squarely into the teeth of politics with a food cultivation program in Latin America, Argentina, not having broken with the Axis, is not a good neighbor, and will not be used. Nor will wheat and corn, two staples of which the United States has a normal surplus, be encouraged. However, other important crops will be pushed in Brazil, Mexico, Ecuador, Peru, Chile.

These crops include: Soybeans, peas, dried eggs, rice, and dairy products. The greatest need is foods rich in proteins.

Behind this revolutionary step against the President's own best political interests are some confidential figures on foreign food demands which are anything but encouraging These show that next year, the United States of America will have to send 10 to 15 percent of its food supplies to other United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, this article alleges that not only is this Government furnishing finances and farm machinery to Cuba to expand the production of rice, but that it is planning to do the same for nearly all of the other Latin American countries for other agricultural products in competition with our own domestic industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter, and it not only affects my district and my State, but all of the agricultural States of this Union, and I am again calling the matter to your attention, and to the attention of my colleagues in this Congress in the hope that

they will use their influence with a view of making an effort to prevent the carrying out of this scheme. We feel that it is totally unnecessary, unfair, inconsistent, and that if our American farmers are given the proper aid, especially allocating to our own farmers the farm implements and machinery which it is proposed to furnish to foreign countries, that we will be in a position to produce much more food and increase and expand our agricultural products to a much greater extent than these foreign countries.

I am again placing this matter before the Congress and if our representations are not heeded by those in authority, and the plan abandoned, urge that we enact the proper legislation to prohibit this unfair plan.

Mr. Speaker, I also request permission to include in my remarks a copy of an editorial from the Lake Charles American Press, of Lake Charles, La., of date October 15, 1943, pertinent to this matter presented, as follows, to wit:

RICE EQUIPMENT IN CUBA

Rice farmers of southwest Louisiana, working their best to try to harvest their bumper crop, have something to think about in a report forwarded by Frank A. Godchaux of the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co. He sends a copy of a letter from a person he believes is reliable telling of the arrival in Cuba of a fair shipment of rice planting and harvesting equipment. Included in the lot are four combines which southwest Louisiana farmers could certainly put to good use.

The amount of machinery shipped over to Cuba isn't much. It is understandable, in a way, that our Government even should finance the shipment of these machines. The Federal authorities are trying to stimulate over-all world production of food crops, and this is seen as one means to that end. But what we are not sure the Federal authorities have understood is that they may be now discouraging farmers of this area so much that next year their planting will be decreased as much or more than the amount of the Cuban increase.

Farmers have expressed to us their intention of cutting back their acreage next year. They are having so much trouble harvesting this crop that they aren't going to risk so much another year when labor may be even harder to obtain. It is really a disheartening thing to have the Federal Government send to another country through a Government loan, rice-farming equipment that could be used to such good advantage in this area. Without such equipment to replace labor, local farmers may have to reduce their acreage just as much as the Cuban acreage is increased by the shipment of equipment to them. There may be no net gain from attempts to expand production abroad.

Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Argentine, by its own choice excluded from the family of nations in the Western Hemisphere, has finally and definitely exposed itself as pro-Nazi in sentiment and practice, and for all intents and purposes it might be deduced that the present Pedro Ramirez government, even more so than its predecessor, is sentimentally and substantially, if not actually, an ally of Nazi Germany. The soul of the Government of Argentina, by its recent pronouncement in banning "all Jewish newspapers and magazines," has been exposed in all its hideousness as a depraved and cancerous growth affecting the southernmost extremity of our Western Hemisphere.

What more proof does the world need than to accept the voluntary action of the Argentine Government as a clear-cut indication of its adhesion to and communion with the barbaric Axis partners. Only distance and other handicaps stand in the way of physical union and the application of brute force which would place on a parity the government of the southern republic with the government of defunct Italy and the tottering and despicable governments of Germany and Japan. All Americans must deplore the degradation of the Argentine people by their bigoted Fascist government.

Health Conditions in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas for upward of a quarter century this society has closely observed and studied health conditions in Washington and has noted with gratification the lowered morbidity and mortality rates in the community since Dr George C. Ruhland was appointed health officer in 1935; and

Whereas his administration has built up and greatly improved the city's public health structure—notably the nursing, sanitary, laboratory, hospital, and infant and maternal hygiene services; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Senate District Committee has submitted a report recommending Dr. Ruhland's dismissal, despite the uniformly favorable testimony presented by the subcommittee's own expert, an experienced officer of the United States Public Health Service, whom they directed to study the Gallinger Hospital situation; and

Whereas despite the handicaps incurred by the health officer largely because of inherent weaknesses in the District of Columbia's present form of government, which have resulted in inadequate appropriations and support and their corollaries, lack of funds, personnel and facilities, Dr. Ruhland has been able so to guard Washington's health as to protect its greatly increased population:

Be it resolved, That we, the Executive Committee of the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia, do hereby urge the retention in office of this able public servant, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners, and the Washington press.

In conclusion we would call attention to the extraordinary health hazards now confronting the District because of its greatly expanded population, its crowded housing conditions, its high percentage of population particularly susceptible to certain communicable diseases, and its scarcity of private nursing and medical care because of Army and Navy needs. Surely this is no time for disruption of the District's public health machinery which has functioned so ably in recent years, as is proved by the low sickness and death rates.

We heartily concur in the subcommittee's recommendations to do away with Civil War buildings at Gallinger Hospital and to provide a more democratic form of Government for the District of Columbia.

HENRY H. HAZEN, M. D., *President.*
MRS. LAURA MARTIN,
GEORGE W CRESWELL, M. D.,
MRS. P. C. ELLETT,
DOROTHY BOULDING FEREBEE, M. D.,
RUSSELL J FIELDS, M. D.,
RAY H. EVERETT, Fellow.
American Public Health Association,
Executive Secretary.

Pan-American Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of Saturday, October 2, 1943, by Virginia Prewett, entitled "Pan-American Highway":

PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

(By Virginia Prewett)

Among the many New World cooperative projects that the Second World War has spurred, none is more important than the Pan-American Highway. Work on it is being rushed as part of hemisphere defense. In Central American countries this work has also served to take up employment slacks caused by ship shortage. But the highway, like any number of developments speeded up by war, will really come into its own when hostilities end and we start the shift to peace.

A line of communication connecting the New World republics by land is one of the oldest pan-American ideas. It was suggested at the first pan-American conference in 1889 that a connecting system of railways should be built to stimulate trade and friendship in the hemisphere. The fifth conference at Santiago de Chile in 1923 proposed cooperative action on a highway. First studies were begun that year.

In the early 1930's work on several sections got under way. The link best known to us, the 760-mile stretch between Laredo, Tex., and Mexico City, was completed in 1936.

LAND COMMUNICATION

The importance of land communications among the American republics has been stressed at every conference since 1923. In the middle 1930's the United States began to lend the small Central American countries modest sums to help along with the work. In late 1941, when war conditions made a land connection vital, the Congress appropriated $20,000,000 to rush the link with the Panama Canal Zone. Central American countries borrowed 10 million to put up for the work.

At the time of Pearl Harbor half of the South American part of the system could be traveled in all weather. Eighty percent had dry-weather surface. Work was slowly going forward on one of the two gaps in the route in southern Ecuador. Since obtaining Export-Import credits, Ecuador has increased the pace of construction.

Southward to the Panama Canal, three-fifths of the highway was ready for all-weather use. There were unfinished stretches in Mexico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Panama. Mexico had obtained export-import credits to rush work on her section.

As a defense measure, the United States after Pearl Harbor made arrangements for our Army to build a pioneer road along the route of the highway to span gaps in Central America. It was at first intended to complete them this year. Overseas offensives have slowed shipment of road machinery, however, and at present the work is scheduled to be finished in 1944.

Building the 300-mile link between the canal and the South American road has been put off till after the war.

SPUR OF THE ROAD

In South America a spur of the road begins at La Guaira, seaport of Venezuela's capital, and runs to Bogota, Colombia's capital. From there it runs to the capital of Ecuador and, lacking one 200-mile link, on to Peru.

From Lima there are two routes southward to Buenos Aires. One goes down to Chile's capital and across the Andes. It is closed by snow about 6 months of the year. The other runs diagonally across by way of Bolivia's capital.

From Montevideo, across the Plata from Buenos Aires, the road goes north to Rio de Janeiro.

When this great continental system is completed it will give the New World first of all a line of land communication in case we are caught short again by a war. It is the New World's Burma Road. As important as this, it will permit a tourist and commercial exchange that will tie all the countries closer together as nothing else can. It will help them hold among themselves the new trade that war has started. In addition, it will start internal development in backward regions of each country.

No better proof of this can be offered than the development in northern Mexico that followed quickly after completion of the road there.

Villagers and farmers living 20 to 40 miles back in the hinterland began to trace crude trails to the main highway. These became feeder roads as more and more people used them. A tourist industry sprang up in principal towns along the highway. Tourist demands began to raise sanitation standards. New sources of income made it possible for people living in the region to buy made goods, both imports from the United States and products manufactured in Mexico, that they had never been able to afford before.

This is the pattern for increased economic activity within countries where the highway runs and for increased commercial interchange among neighbors. Nothing could be more desirable for the prosperity and strength of the hemisphere.

Home-Front Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, nearly every factory in the country doing war work, especially the large ones have been given the Army-Navy E. Industries for completing contracts on schedule at handsome profits, and workmen for staying on the job 40 or 48 hours a week at the highest pay in the world's history, have been given special honors and awards by the Government. Now I understand the War Department is to give special service ribbons to paid civilian employees for a stated number of years of service.

In the first place, when compared with men in uniform, no one is deserving of any particular honor.

But if awards and decorations are to be given civilians, then our Government has certainly been doing a poor job in their distribution. Those most deserving of honor have been receiving it least, and those least deserving of honor have been receiving it most.

Mr. Speaker, the brightest spot in a rather dismal domestic picture is the work done by those who have served and are serving their country in various capacities without any financial remuneration whatsoever. First and foremost on this list are the local draft boards and the local ration boards throughout the length and breadth of the land. Draft boards have labored oftentimes under conflicting and confusing directives. Ration boards have labored most of the time under confusing orders and without adequate authority. These men have not sought any special recognition. They have been glad to serve without pay. Aside from the personal satisfaction of doing a sacrificial and patriotic public service, about the only compensation coming to most of these individuals has been the enmity and often the abuse of neighbors and friends whose favors they were unable or unwilling to grant.

Mr. Speaker, I believe every real American does his duty without artificial stimulus, most especially when his country is in peril. Nevertheless, if we are going to distribute pennants, flags, buttons, and ribbons to civilians, then some medal bigger and better than all the rest should be given draft board members, ration board members, and others who have made real sacrifices for our war effort on the home front. In service, like Abou Ben Adhem, their names lead all the rest.

The American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it has been a distinct pleasure to know Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of Washington, D. C., whose poetic inspiration has found expression many times in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Carlisle has recently composed two poems entitled "Old Glory's Birth" and "The American Flag."

I am pleased to include these poems as part of these remarks:

OLD GLORY'S BIRTH

When brave, resourceful Washington
  Was called on to design
An ensign—to live on and on—
  Approaching the divine,
He felt unequal to the task—
  So beautiful and odd—
Until in prayer he knelt to ask
  A blueprint first from God.

That night as Mercury and Mars
  And Jupiter withdrew,
He caught the vision—13 stars
  Upon their field of blue—
And, as he, looking skyward there,
  Prayed for still further light,
His mind conceived through further prayer
  The stripes of red and white.

Then Washington forthwith arose,
  And went straightway across,
And laid his plan, ere evening's close,
  Before skilled Betsy Ross,
Who in response to such a prayer,
  For so sublime a cause,
Made with her dainty fingers there
  The dauntless stripes and stars.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

THE AMERICAN FLAG

In the silent significance of her design,
  To the breezes of heaven unfurled,
Proud Old Glory, baptized in a beauty divine,
  Sets the pace for the peace of the world.
With perpetual motion instinctively hers,
  Changing always, yet ever the same,
She obeys, unawares, every zephyr that stirs
  In the splendor of Liberty's name.

But the bravest of blood that has ever been shed—
  For the noblest of causes yet known—
Has portrayed on the flag in the stripes of the red
  Love's complete sacrifice for its own;
And the purity, marking her purposes there,
  Symbolizing the just and the right,
Is as perfectly spotless and faultlessly fair
  As the unsullied stripes of the white.

While America, born out of chaos and wars,
  Was beginning her being on earth,
The original thirteen illustrious stars
  Furnished hope in the travail of birth;
And this number, increased by the birth of each State,
  Has enlarged with the progress of years,
Until now, in the field of the blue, forty-eight
  Gleam wherever Old Glory appears.

All the nations of earth, on both sides of the sea,
  Look for sympathy, succor, and aid
To America, land of the brave and the free,
  On whose arm they may lean unafraid—
For, whenever disturbances threaten the world
  With the rumblings and rumors of wars,
Peace and safety are sought 'neath Old Glory unfurled
  Thru the strength of the Stripes and the Stars.

While Americans view, with alarming surprise,
  The entanglements of the Old World,
They should never forget that their own safety lies
  In their keeping Old Glory unfurled—
And, while transocean powers may greatly abhor
  Young America's hatred for wars,
They are forced to respect her preparedness for
  Self-defense 'neath the Stripes and the Stars.

For, as long as the stars in the heavens shall shine
In the infinite overhead blue,
And as long as the stripes in the rainbow divine
With the promise of God shall ring true—
Yea, as long as the deep, daring oceans of earth
Shall be bound to their beds by their bars—
May all mankind rejoice in the beautiful birth
Of the Land of the Stripes and the Stars.
—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Will You Save a Human Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over the radio on October 15, 1943:

Everyone of my audience has the opportunity tonight to help save a human life. The time is now, and I am suggesting a very concrete program. A few days ago, I introduced a resolution in Congress to the effect that immediate temporary relief should be given to the victims of the present horrible oppression by the Nazi hordes in Europe.

I proposed that Congress adopt a policy to admit to this country such persons as will establish to the satisfaction of our authorities that they are religious or political refugees, who are seeking to enter this country temporarily for the purpose of escaping persecution.

To admit political or religious refugees to the United States is consistent with the highest plane in our national history. This country has always been an asylum for the oppressed. About 100 years ago, when revolutions against tyranny broke out in most countries of Europe, many political refugees were admitted to the United States, two of the most important being Garibaldi and the Hungarian statesman, Kossuth.

Later on, when Europe was again convulsed by anarchy and when massacres were the order of the day in such countries as Russia and Roumania, we again opened our doors to refugees from that terror and permitted many persons to escape death and find homes in America.

Again in 1917, when our immigration law was amended so as to impose a literacy test on prospective immigrants to these shores, we saw fit to put in a provision in the law to the effect that people escaping religious persecution should not be subject to the literacy test. Thus, we again proclaimed to the world our determination to aid persons who escaped from the bigotry of tyrants.

In 1917 religions persecution was confined to Jews and Armenians. At the present time religious persecution covers a more extensive area, in that not only Jews but Catholics, not only Catholics but Protestants, are ill-treated. In general, religious persecution today has developed into other types of persecution. Racial persecution is as potent a weapon in the hands of the Axis Nations as it was in the days of Czarist Russia, or when a benighted Turkey saw fit to prosecute Armenians and others for their beliefs.

The present scene of massacres in Europe defies all description.

Thousands of people are being slaughtered daily. They are beaten, tortured, and starved. The tyrant who dominates the European scene of destruction knows no mercy. As the Nazi legions retreat from various parts of the European Continent, their path is marked by scenes of destruction which are unparalleled in the history of the world. Friend and foe alike are engulfed. Thus when Hitler retreats from Italy he leaves behind him burned cities, a scorched earth, and the bodies of thousands of innocent people. The number of victims grows daily. The only way we can rescue some people from the clutches of the never-satisfied murder machine erected by Hitler is by moving them to some place of safety before it is too late.

Hitler has exterminated or is about to exterminate every non-German within his borders, except such people as he can use in performing slave labor for the Reich.

But there are other countries in Europe, which, while dominated by Hitler, have still retained some technical independence and are still able to maintain some contact with the rest of the world. I am speaking now of Hitler's satellite nations, the Balkans, and other countries situated on the continent of Europe but maintaining a certain amount of independence.

Hitler's satellites have not gone quite as far as he has. They have denied human and political rights to their minorities, they have trampled under foot any pledge they had made in the peace treaties to treat their minorities fairly, but they have not seen fit to exterminate their minorities by massacres and killings. There is, therefore, this ray of hope left. We may still rescue individuals who have fallen under the tyranny of Hitler's satellites, but who have been able to escape with their lives. In fact, some of these subject countries are willing to enter into a kind of bargain with their minorities. They will let them go, provided somebody else will undertake to receive them.

This gives an opportunity to every citizen of the United States and every person within the reach of my voice to do his share to save human lives from destruction. Think of the thousands of orphaned children—Catholics, Protestants, Jews—children whose innocent fathers and mothers have been killed.

I believe that the resolution introduced by me just a few days ago, will go a long way toward this purpose, the purpose of not only having the children, but also as many adults as can be saved. We cannot possibly expect to save every one of the many innocent people who will be murdered if Hitler and his cohorts have their way. but we may be able to save many thousands.

We do not expect the United States to stand alone in this matter. I am sure other nations which value human rights will join us in our program of rescue. I am sure Great Britain will do its share to help and I know that many neutral nations will likewise facilitate the rescue and survival of many, if we but point the way.

I cannot refrain, at this time, from mentioning the fact that Switzerland has already done a great deal to help the unfortunate refugees whenever it was possible for that little country to help, and I hope that Great Britain will see fit to abrogate its so-called "White Paper," which bars the Jewish people from entering their own homeland.

One shudders when one reads about the ghettos of Poland and other occupied countries—these filthy holes where thousands of people are forced to exist like animals—dying of starvation, contagious diseases, and brutal tortures. According to very trustworthy reports, 100,000 people are being killed each month by the German Government in these ghettos. Only recently the world was shocked by the description of what happened to the people in the ghetto of Warsaw. At one time this ghetto numbered 433,000 inhabitants. Five month ago, a battle was fought in which cannon and machine guns were used to drive the population of the ghetto to the north end of the city, along the Jewish and Catholic cemeteries. Then the machine guns went to work. A bloody battle was fought and almost the entire population of the district was wiped out.

It is true that the war has made us a bit callous to human sufferings. When one reads in the papers of the mass slaughter committed every day by the warring forces, one gets the impression that human life may be of little account in a world at war. But no matter how indifferent we might become, we surely cannot remain silent when women and children are being slain by the thousands. And we surely cannot remain silent if the opportunity is given to us to save from death many human beings who, without our help, are slated to die.

I am sure that every one of my listeners will ask himself this question, How does my Congressman stand on this matter? Is he willing to support this Dickstein resolution and put Congress on record in favor of the saving of human lives? I would appreciate it if the members of my audience would see fit to get in touch with their Representatives and have them contact me on this proposed resolution.

This resolution is not intended to break down our immigration laws or to change any of their provisions. It is only a resolution of temporary help to people who, without our help, will be killed by the cohorts and satellites of Hitler.

Shall we be shamed by little Sweden who offered to accept all Jews from Denmark who were able to escape from the Nazi terror?

What have we done to help the people who might be rescued from the hell of Nazi persecution? Our doors have remained closed. The Congress has not spoken. But the American people are beginning to realize their duty and are calling upon the Congress of the United States to do something to save as many human beings as possible. They know that it could be done if Congress would only say so, and give the green light to the State Department.

I do not want to dwell upon how it should be done. I am not seeking to open the doors to refugees to a point where they will take jobs away from Americans. I am not seeking to bring in these refugees for permanent stay. I speak for the millions of people of America who have sent me petitions asking that men, women, and children who can be saved from the Axis may be saved by letting them come to these shores for temporary haven only, and that we allow them to stay here until the war in Europe is over.

There are many fine American citizens who are willing to provide the food and care for them and take care of all necessary expenses to be incurred.

I hope that Congress, spurred on by their constituents, will pass my resolution. If we do not, we certainly cannot say that we have upheld the moral and religious values we all have proclaimed at one time or another.

Bear in mind, I am not only appealing for the Jews of Europe who are first on the list doomed to die but I am also appealing for the Catholics and the Protestants and peoples of all races and religions who are also doomed to die at the hands of Hitler. I am appealing for all human beings who can find a haven in this country, without harming us in any way. Let us not wait until it is too late. Let us act now.

Terry and the Pirates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have long been addicted to scanning the so-called comic strips that appear in our daily and Sunday papers. I have followed the careers of the characters, such as Uncle Walt and Skeezix, Little Orphan Annie, Sgt. Stony Craig, and others for many, many years. Among these characters the most interesting and exciting of them all are Terry and Flip Corkin.

On yesterday, Sunday, October 17, Milton Caniff, the artist, presented one of the finest and most noble of sentiments in the lecture which he caused Col. Flip Corkin to deliver to the newly commissioned young flyer, Terry. It is deserving of immortality and in order that it shall not be lost completely, I present it, wishing only that the splendid cartoons in color might also be reprinted here. The dialog follows:

Colonel CORKIN. Let's take a walk, Terry.

TERRY. Yes, sir, Colonel Corkin.

Colonel CORKIN. I'm going to make a speech—and it'll be the last one of its kind in captivity—so don't get a short circuit between the ears.

TERRY. No, sir.

Colonel CORKIN. Well, you made it. You're a flight officer in the Air Forces of the Army of the United States. Those wings are like a neon light on your chest. I'm not going to wave the flag at you—but some things you must never forget. Every country has had a hand in the development of the airplane—but after all, the Wright brothers were a couple of Dayton, Ohio, boys—and Kitty Hawk is strictly in North Carolina. The hallmark of the United States is on every aircraft. So you find yourself in a position to defend the country that gave you the weapon with which to do it. But it wasn't just you who earned those wings. A ghostly echelon of good guys flew their hearts out in old kites to give you the know-how. And some smart slide rule jokers sweat it out over drawing boards to give you a machine that will keep you up there shooting.

I recommended you for fighter aircraft and I want you to be cocky and smart and proud of being a buzz-boy * * *. But don't forget that every bullet you shoot, every gallon of gas and oil you burn was brought in here by transport pilots who flew it in over the worst terrain in the world! You may get the glory—but they put the lift in your balloon!

And don't let me ever catch you being high-bicycle with the enlisted men in your ground crew! Without them, you'd never get 10 feet off the ground! Every grease monkey in that gang is right beside you in the cockpit—and their hands are on that stick, just the same as yours * * *. You'll get angry as the devil at the Army and its so-called red tape. But be patient with it. Somehow, the old Eagle has managed to end up in possession of the ball in every war since 1776—so just humor it along. Okay, sport, end of speech.

When you get up in that "Wild Blue Yonder" the song talks about—remember, there are a lot of good guys missing from mess tables in the South Pacific, Alaska, Africa, Britain, Asia, and back home who are sorta counting on you to take it from here! Good night, kid!

Allowances to Dependents of Members of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, the House has the opportunity today to fulfill an obligation to members of the armed forces, and I trust there will be no delay in providing substantially increased payments for their dependents. Certainly the least we can do is to assure the service man that while he is fighting brutal and merciless foes, a grateful Nation will see that his loved ones are adequately cared for.

Drafting of fathers into the service, a step which military authorities insist is necessary in order to win the war, makes increased family allowances all the more necessary.

Of course we can never fully recompense those who are called upon to offer their lives in this terrible conflict, but at least we can do the just and honorable thing of protecting those dependent upon them. We all know that the rates of dependent pay have been too low, in view of the high cost of living.

The factor that will do more than anything else to promote the morale of our fighting forces is the knowledge that their dependent are receiving proper financial aid. Surely one who is offering his all for the preservation of his country and for the betterment of the world should be relieved of any unnecessary worry and strain over the welfare of those he left at home.

The Senate has approved the payment of $50 monthly to the wife of a serviceman, $30 for the first child, and $20 for each additional child. Certainly no less figures should be considered by the House. The serviceman, as in the past, would provide $22 of the total monthly payments, to be deducted from his pay. The Government would supply the remainder, which is only right and fair.

In addition to the increased benefits for wives and children of men in the service, it is also necessary that payments to parents of those in our fighting forces be raised. These should be at least $50 a month to one parent dependent on the serviceman for chief support and at least $68 as combined payment to two parents.

I am also heartily in favor of opening the allotment plan benefits to all seven grades of enlisted men instead of the provision which now limits payments to dependents of only the men in the four lower grades. Furthermore, I believe there should be payments to husbands of women in the service where proof is furnished that the husband is dependent on his wife.

The proposed increases are reasonable and in fact still less than are probably necessary in a number of instances. But they will help to a considerable extent and if conditions should later point to the necessity for further increases I would favor granting them.

I trust that the House will approve quickly, and without a dissenting vote, this assistance for the dependents of those to whom our people on the home front owe their lives and the preservation of their property. Let us show by action of the House today that our Government stands solidly and determinedly back of the forces that battle to maintain this Nation and all that it stands for. It is the least a thankful citizenship, through the medium of Congress, can do for the millions of men and women in uniform who are keeping the American flag flying.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial, and, a poem from the October 16th issue of The Ohio Farmer. There can be no doubt that if all of us would follow the example of those who work on farms we would have neither slow-downs, wage disputes, nor excessive profits. I know of one young farmer who works until midnight 6 days every week:

AND EAT IT, TOO

In childhood days we used to ponder the proverb often quoted by our elders that we couldn't have our cake and eat it, too. Time and experience finally taught us the meaning of it. Its truth has been proved times without number, yet we suppose that every individual must learn it for himself the hard way.

What is true of individuals is usually true of nations. Today we are witnessing an attempt by our own Nation to have a lot of cake to eat without paying the price. The program is to have ample food production so that everyone will have all he wants, but not pay any more for it. That will be nice work if they can do it, but unless Utopia has arrived, that cake will have to be paid for some time.

We believe in the ample production, in fact, tremendous production, but we also believe that the food we eat now should be paid for now instead of charging our daily grocery bills to future generations through subsidies or other ingenious devices.

SONG OF A FARMER

I rise at 5 most every morn,
I feed the horses hay and corn,
I milk the cows and feed them, too.
There really is a lot to do.
Tend the chickens and slop the hogs,
And following me are my faithful dogs.
I'm just about ready for breakfast now,
Then to the field with horses and plow.
The earth curls up by furrows long,
And I am singing the farmer's song.
With horses going a merry pace,
My dogs are following me in the race
Of getting the field ready for seed and grain
And hoping for sunshine to follow rain
We take a chance—you bet we do!
We're tired and weary when the day is through.
But there's satisfaction in our heart,
For we know that we are doing our part.
It may be very strange to say
That we never know just what's our pay.
But all of us who till the sod,
Should surely know that there's a God.

—*Faye E. Lacy, Mercer County.*

Grade Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the "leftists" or "pinks" in Government have advocated for a long time that grade labeling on foods supplant the present method of brand labeling. They contend, with much persistence, that the consumers would be protected if all brands are eliminated and the Government grade placed on each food product offered for sale. The plan is to have a representative of the Government classify and test all foods, after the packer has canned his products, into three categories, namely, grade A, grade B, and grade C. Certain specifications are fixed, and, if the products meet the requirement, a grade A label is placed on the goods. If the tests indicate the foods to be of medium quality, a grade B label is provided. If the foods are still wholesome, even though not up to specifications as to color, size, or for some other reason as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture, he labels them grade C. Under this system the housewife may feel that there is little danger in the merchant selling her inferior merchandise at a fancy price.

This scheme is un-American and intended to further regiment and control the American people from Washington and place additional thousands on the pay rolls. Of all the things this country needs; it does not need to increase the central government's power over the individual citizen but to return to him his individual freedom and initiative.

Under the present system the first rule is "Please the customer." In order to do this, the packer strives to excel and to produce a product better than his competitor. His reputation is at stake when his name and brand is offered to the public. He must extend himself in providing the best possible food for the money.

The housewife prides herself in serving the best meals possible at the most reasonable cost in line with her budget. She is complimented for preparing fine food. She chooses certain kinds of foods for paritcular purposes. She has been accustomed to buying Libby's or Del Monte or Heinz or Campbell's commodities. She knows what she likes and knows which brands make for the most successful menus. She uses her initiative, her taste, and her God-given right of choice and preference.

Under totalitarian grade labeling she would have to shut her eyes and hope that the grade A or grade B she is buying is the package she hopes for or desires. Some people prefer Campbell's vegetable soup to any other brand; others like Heinz better, yet they know from experience what to expect when the can is opened.

Under the present system, competition has caused prices to be reduced on many items. Baby foods, when first introduced, were purchased at 15 cents a can. Because of increased volume and competitive research, the same can of baby food retails for half what it had sold for originally. Under grade labeling the best quality that may be attained is that set by the Bureau. Under brand labeling the goods must come up to the desires of the purchaser and as a result we have constant improvement in the various foods. Through the medium of advertising trade names and brands and the resultant increase in the volume of sales, increased markets and mass production have lowered costs and retail prices of the finished products. Newspapers, magazines, and the radio could not exist without obtaining advertising from firms having particular brands of merchandise to sell the public. Few newspapers could survive; magazines would sell for $1 or more if published at all, and half of the radio stations would be compelled to leave the air if grade labeling were applied to foods and other consumer goods.

If it is mandatory that we have three grades of foods at three prices set by the Government, the next step would be to apply dictatorial Government grading to cosmetics, drugs, clothing, motorcars, and every other salable item in the land.

Voice of the Critics, Music to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill from the Boston Sunday Globe of October 17, 1943:

VOICE OF THE CRITIC MUSIC TO AMERICANS—WE FEEL EASIER WHEN SENATORS, COMMENTATORS, AND AMATEUR STRATEGISTS SOUND OFF FREELY WITH THEIR CONCEPTIONS OF HOW THIS WAR SHOULD BE CONDUCTED

(By Charles A. Merrill)

Americans must seem to foreigners sojourning among us and to enemy monitors listening in on our broadcasts the strangest, most baffling people who ever won a war or lost a peace.

In the most critical months of the war, our Government arranges and expedites a globe-girdling tour of observation for five United States Senators, permitting the Senators, who have no direct responsibility for the conduct of the war, to visit all the fronts. Upon their return, the Senators blithely tell the generals and admirals and combined Chiefs of Staff, who have spent a lifetime preparing for this crisis and who have at their command every last item of information, just where and how they are making mistakes. Our legislative strategists hang a global map on the wall, call in reporters and tell the world with a pointer their choice of routes to Tokyo and environs.

To be sure, the Senate takes the precaution of going into executive session when its five touring Members direct their attention to delicate questions of foreign policy affecting our relations with our allies. But it develops that there are sharp differences among the five, and soon they emerge from behind the closed doors to grand marshal their facts and argue their cases before that great jury, of which a Senator is ever mindful, the jury of public opinion.

QUESTION OUR ALLIES' GOOD FAITH

If Senators have no direct responsibility for conduct of the war, they will have a most important part in framing the peace. Foreign policy, it must be conceded, is emphatically their business, though it could be argued that some of them are taking this responsibility rather lightly when, before the war is ended and possibly hampering the prosecution of it, they openly question the good faith of our allies.

The assertion is made that, without giving credit to the United States, the British are parceling out to other countries lend-lease material received from us. Provocative questions are flung at the British. Why haven't they launched the offensive in Burma? What about those air bases we have built on British territory? What guaranties have we that we are to be given post-war use of them? A tremendous strain is being put on America's oil resources for the Mediterranean campaign. Why not tap the ample supplies available in the Near East? One Senator, on the very eve of the Moscow conference where an effort will be made to arrive at agreement on peace terms, a conference which, we are told, may determine the duration of the war, revives the question of Russia's refusal to open Siberian bases to Allied bombers and says bluntly it may cost 1,000,000 American lives.

The writer does not wish to imply that the Senators, right or wrong, qualified or unqualified, are necessarily rendering a disservice to the Nation or obstructing the war effort by airing their views. Criticism may be a wholesome check on administrative policy. And, after all, practical consideration will shape the policies of governments allied with us. If some American Senators ask embarrassing questions, it is pertinent to recall that spokesmen for the Soviet Government have needled the Anglo-Americans about opening up a second front.

PERPLEX FOREIGN OBSERVERS

But the point is that these differences among ourselves must perplex foreign observers. In no other country are the grave problems of war and peace under free and constant debate. When a Russian newspaper commentator takes umbrage because the Anglo-Americans have not opened a front in western Europe it is because Stalin has ordered him to do so. The American Senators, on the other hand, are attacking the policies being pursued by the executive branch of their Government, are accusing the latter of blundering in the conduct of the war and of permitting America to be imposed upon by her allies.

Puzzling though this may be to foreigners, it does not worry Americans. We are accustomed to it. Nor do Senators exercise a monopoly of the right to ask questions, express criticism, or circulate rumors.

A few weeks ago some publicist discovered a "plot" to "kick upstairs" the highly respected chief of staff of our Army. A small section of the press has sought repeatedly to discredit the war administration. In no other warring nation would this be possible.

Americans have been fed the most commentated war diet ever dished up to any people.

Every broadcasting company and every newspaper has its board of strategy. Men who used to produce fascinating detective yarns or were competent sports writers turn out to be military geniuses. A year ago this time some of our editorial writers were denouncing the stupidity of our strategists in not opening the second front. They were unaware that the biggest armada in history was being outfitted for just this purpose. They, as well as the enemy, were caught fast asleep on November 8, when the landing in north Africa eventuated.

THE AMERICAN WAY

But this is the American way. We feel safer with amateur strategists checking the professionals. Some professionals may look down their noses at the military expert who only yesterday was a sports writer. If so, it is relevant to recall that the late Heywood Broun jumped from the sports to the dramatic page, and that, when a celebrated actress, piqued by an unfavorable review, said Broun was only a baseball writer, somebody observed: "If dramatic critics wrote as pungently and candidly as baseball writers, the dramatic pages would be vastly improved."

All the inspired comment, criticism, and second guessing is in the best American tradition.

But imagine members of the Reichstag standing up and telling the Nazi general staff how to run the war.

Imagine editors in any dictator country informing the people that the dictator was not treating his head general right.

Can you picture any Moscow radio commentator or editorial writer counseling Comrade Joseph Stalin about grand strategy.

The British no doubt come nearest to understanding Americans. They have nothing to learn from us about free speech. But nowhere on British soil, save possibly in some of the dominions, Canada or Australia, is there anything resembling the American spectacle of an open forum for discussion of war policies.

Opposition parties are represented in the British War Cabinet. They all share responsibility for conduct of the war. All members of Parliament, to whom the Coalition Government is accountable, share this responsibility. Thus, attacks on the war administration from the legislative branch of the Government are reduced to a minimum.

When a few days ago in a Commons debate Mr. Churchill, evidently having in mind the stir caused in America by our returning Senators, referred to certain unnamed countries, "whose politicians are fighting at home while their soldiers are fighting abroad," his purpose was hardly to rebuke our politicians. He was adroitly using us as a horrible example in order to head off a bothersome little debate in his own Parliament over the British Government's handling of the coal mines.

Mr. Churchill said in effect: Thank Heaven, we are not like some countries where politicians divert energy from prosecution of the war by futile dispute over extraneous issues, such as the nationalization of coal mines. This basic change is hardly one that our Coalition Government, which is composed of men of various parties, all appreciating the necessity of teamwork, would consider unless it were deemed essential to the war effort. It is a political issue which will require approval of the people in a general election after the war.

Thus, Mr. Churchill satisfied Parliament and ended the debate, according to dispatches.

When Britain's War Government takes in the opposition parties, it takes in with them opposition spokesmen. Hence, there is no opposition press. The radio, of course, is government operated.

Our allies, however, will have to take us as we are. The battle of Washington may seem to them superfluous and wasteful of time and energy, but it has to go on so that Americans will not forget what it is they are fighting to preserve. War has greatly curtailed our individual liberties. We are submitting to many restraints. But the only infringement we will tolerate on the right of free speech must fall within the category of information of value to the enemy Other things may be rationed, but not this. We feel easier when the critics sound off because we are thus reminded that even in wartime the sovereign power is not vested in officialdom at Washington, but in the people of the United States.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune:

REPEAL CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

There can be no real objection by any good American to the proposal, now heartily indorsed by President Roosevelt, that the Chinese Exclusion Act be repealed. There may have been some economic reasons for the act when it was passed in 1882, but there are none now.

The requested action would make American citizenship possible for the small number of Chinese now resident in the United States and would permit the future immigration under our quota system of 150 Chinese a year. On the basis of the individuals it would affect, the proposal is a minor one. There can be no fear on the part of this Nation over the admission of 150 Chinese a year.

But the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act means more than that. To China it would mean her recognition by the United States as an equal in the society of nations, as a full brother in the alliance against the Axis. We make no claims on Chinese territory; we have dropped the obnoxious extraterritoriality under which we set up courts in China to try cases involving our nationals. Now we would be putting the Chinese on a basis with other nations as regards admission to the United States, dropping substantially our last discrimination against our ally in the Orient.

Despite the Exclusion Act and other past discriminations, democratic China consistently has looked upon the United States as its best friend among the nations. For the present the material aid we can give to the armies of Chiang Kai-shek is severely limited. If we can lift China's morale by such a step as repeal of the Exclusion Act, we ought to waste no time about repealing it.

A Rendezvous With Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Hampshire Review, Romney, W. Va. It was written by an eminent citizen and former Governor of our State, the Honorable John J. Cornwell:

KNOCK-ABOUT NOTES—A RENDEZVOUS WITH LIFE

(John J. Cornwell)

His wife and I awaited his coming. It was his last chance to come in from camp. He recently had arrived there from a camp in the West and, with several hundred other young officers, was waiting to be shipped abroad in a replacement outfit; to take the place of casualties on the fighting front. This was to be their last evening together. There was no discussion of that. More than 2 years in the Army had made of this quiet, gentle boy a hardened soldier. The conversation was of equipment, training, preparation, and what he had learned about them.

Finally I ventured to talk of the future, when he would come back home, and to suggest some plans for I had a suspicion that he had a fatalistic attitude; that there was a sort of resignation to the inevitable. I hinted at this. He replied: "That is not my psychology. I am a soldier but I am hoping again to be a civilian. I have a confession to make. Here it is:"

Then he proceeded to tell of Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1941. He was off Alaska. Darkness fell not long after midday. The nights were very long. There was much time for reading. At the Navy post nearby was a good library. He was able to use it and read many of the books. On this particular evening he was reading a volume of poems. He had just read Alan Seeger's impressive poem of the First World War, I Have a Rendezvous With Death, when the radio blared out the news of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Now we were at war. There might be an attack on the island outpost off the Alaskan mainland, where he was stationed, at any minute. He had gone to the Army in the first draft when, supposedly, he would have a year's training and return to civil life in accordance with the act of Congress then in effect, but now all was changed. It was war. How long would it last? On what front would he fight? What would happen to him? Could he live it out or would he, too, have a rendezvous with death?

These were some of the thoughts that raced through his mind as he meditated late into the Arctic night.

Then suddenly came the realization that he would be a soldier, if he lived, for a long time. What was the best psychology for a soldier? What was the best psychology to make the most efficient soldier? Slowly he reached the conclusion that it was the psychology of living, not of dying.

Once firmly convinced of this, he read again "I Have a Rendezvous With Death," then picked up a scrap of paper and set down his own philosophy. Here it is:

MY RENDEZVOUS

When Alan Seeger went to war,
The thoughts that filled his brain
Were of a rendezvous with death
Within some shattered town or plain.

He had no thought or sense of fear,
But of a job to do.
For our Freedom's holy sake
He gladly kept his rendezvous.

And now I, too, must go to war
To fight that fight again.
Please, God, may I gladly go;
May thought of Life my soul sustain.

Why let my thinking dwell on Death,
Which hovers ever near?
I would rather pin my thoughts
On Life, and all that it holds dear.

I swear to do whate'er I can
To win and end this strife
And when it's done, I must go home,
I have a rendezvous with Life.

—*John Cornwell Ailes.*

He had carried that paper in his pocket. It is his philosophy still. No one ever had seen it but his wife. I said: "That is the right psychology. It is something to fight for."

And now he has gone, I know not where—somewhere on the fighting front—but of this I am sure, whether or not he keeps his rendezvous, he will give a good account of himself.

Message to Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, in the September issue of their publication, entitled "A Message From Our President," I wish to make the following observations:

To me, this article by Mr. DeWitt Emery is, indeed, very timely and one which, in my judgment, should be read by every voter in America, regardless of his party affiliations. He very correctly points out that both the Democratic and Republican Parties will have selected their nominees for Congress before they hold their national conventions and write their platforms. Therefore, it behooves the people of the United States to see that their party nominees for Congress are men who have the intestinal fortitude to vote their convictions, and who will answer the call to duty in the fullest measure by fighting for the cause of Americanism.

Now is the time for all patriotic citizens and organizations to contact their political leaders in their districts and insist that men of integrity, courage, and ability are nominated for Congress at the coming primaries.

Make no mistake about it. The issue in the campaign of 1944 is clear cut. Are we as Americans going to sit idly by and allow these New Deal bureaucrats to continue their march toward saddling the people with a regimented, collectivist, Marxist, totalitarian dictatorship, or will the people realize these dangers and be willing to go out and fight to restore constitutional representative government?

I say to you in all sincerity that I am firmly convinced, from the facts I have at hand, that there is a deliberate plan among the New Deal bureaucrats in high places to change our form of government to one where the people are subservient to the Government rather than the Government subservient to the people, as set forth in our Constitution.

I am also firmly convinced that if the small businessmen of this country, who are still operating, do not heed the warning of Mr. Emery, they, too, will be forced into bankruptcy, as have already thousands upon thousands of merchants and small businessmen. When that happens it will be only a short step to nationalization and regimentation of all business in the United States.

I highly commend Mr. Emery for his very timely article and again trust that every citizen of the United States might be privileged to read it. His message follows:

To save our Republic—to save your business under it—we must win synchronous victories on our battle front and on our home front. To lose on either front makes a hollow mockery of any victory on the other.

Prompt, vigorous, and effective action on your part is essential now. The time in which to act is menacingly short. The place in which we must get definite constructive results in the American way and on established American principles is in the Congress of the United States—the Congress now in session and the succeeding Congress whose members will be elected in 1944.

We dare not wait until a few weeks or months before the election in the fall of 1944. We dare not wait even until the two major parties hold their platform-making and nominating conventions next summer. The first line that we must take and hold in the struggle to keep our form of government and its priceless freedoms under the Constitution is that of the primaries. In them will be chosen by all the parties the candidates for Congress from your district.

I make no call for partisan political action of any kind. That is contrary to the principles of our association. We are not concerned with the party affiliations of candidates for Congress. We are deeply concerned about making sure that those we send to Congress are men of integrity, courage, solidly grounded in basic Americanism, and determined to maintain at every hazard constitutional government as we have known it. It is men and character that count in this crisis, not labels.

If men of this type are nominated in the primaries, the election in the succeeding November will take care of itself, so far as Congress is concerned. It can then be waged on questions of party policies and proposals that do not sap the foundations of the Republic. If men of this type are nominated by both parties in the primaries we need not fear that our system of government or the business of our citizens under it will be destroyed on any pretext or by any subtle means.

I do not minimize in the slightest degree the importance of the Presidential election. But we must face the fact that the Presidential candidates will not be named until the party conventions meet next summer. Whoever is elected President, no matter how sound his own views and his party's platform, he will need the strengthening support of a soundly American Congress in the solution of the vast post-war problems that will confront him and them and us. Pressure groups will be active then as they are now. His stand against wrong or ill-advised proposals sponsored by such groups or his support of measures that they oppose, can be made effective only if standing with him is a Congress made up of men of the type we seek.

We seek no special privilege of any kind. We ask no right that is not extended equally to every other citizen. We seek only to retain the liberties guaranteed to all of us under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We ask only the continuance of those rights that have always been ours; the right to invent and manufacture and sell, the right to create and maintain jobs and pay rolls, the right of management and labor to combine their efforts to produce goods and services at constantly lowered costs to the consumer, the right of the consumer to pass on the value of those goods and services by buying or refusing to buy, and the right to use and invest and spend as we choose whatever we may save from our honest earnings. We seek to build a better and greater America, but not to "make it over."

Ours is the only system of government that has given the citizen full freedom to achieve his own security and comfort by his own efforts and initiative, without dependence on government and without the fear that what he builds and earns and saves is at the mercy of some bureaucratic agency or executive fiat. We hold that this American system can be best maintained by adherence to the faith and principles and the liberty under law that built us up from 13 struggling, debt-ridden colonies to this America of yours and mine that under God, has become the freest and mightiest Nation in all recorded history.

The method by which we strive to keep it intact is the one so clearly visioned in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States that flowered from it—the exercise of the people's powers through their chosen Representatives in the Congress. Both the scope and the methods of using the powers delegated by the States and the people to the Federal Government were carefully limited. The powers not specifically delegated were definitely declared to remain with the States and the people. Primary control of the public purse and the greatest proportion of the other delegated powers are vested in the House of Representatives. The makers of the Constitution did this deliberately because they knew that that branch of the Government would always be closest to the people.

It is on that principle that I urge you to act now. Your Representative in Congress cannot possibly know about all enterprises in our land and their methods, about your business and mine, nor about the delicate balances between the different divisions and departments of individual enterprises. His

judgment on legislative proposals affecting business and industry can be no better than his information. He needs to know the facts as he works in the Congress and on its committees to "promote the general welfare." So tell him about your business. He knows you. He knows your standing and influence in your community. You are "home folks" to him; we in the national offices of your association are not. So go to your Congressman, or write to him, and tell him the story of your business, how it works, and how existing laws or orders or proposals in Congress do or will affect it, the jobs and pay rolls you keep going, and the homes and comforts they make possible. Make clear to him your need for "seed money" for reconversion or expansion when the war is ended.

Then go to the candidates, avowed or prospective, in all parties in your district. Learn what they think about business and industry and the looming problems, plans, and proposals for both the immediate future and the post-war period. Strengthen them with supporting facts and figures when they are right; clear away their misunderstandings when they are in error. Post them now, frankly and fully, before they are subjected to the demands of pressure groups in the fields of politics or industry or finance or labor who seek some privileges or special powers that would curtail or trample down your own American freedoms.

Other groups and organizations are doing this very thing, sounding out prospective candidates for Congress. Some are grooming candidates to defeat present Congressmen whose courses of action they do not approve. Many examples could be cited, but I shall mention only one here. Chairman Sidney Hillman of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. stated to a three-State group meeting in Chicago on September 16 that it was proposed to organize "the broadest and most effective labor and progressive support of candidates, regardless of party affiliation" (Chicago Daily News, September 16, 1943), who would support the views and proposals for which his group stands. That is his unquestioned right. But do not let the field go to him by default, unless you agree with him. Tell your story, too, and in a way that will make it stick.

Do not stop your efforts after talking to candidates, active or prospective. Use the machinery of the respective parties—and especially that of your own party, whatever it may be—on the basis on which you would use available machine tools in your business. Get in touch with your precinct captain. Take up these questions with the party chairmen and leaders in your ward, your city, your county, and your congressional district. Give them an understanding of your problems. Exchange ideas with them. Let them know what you have done and what are your goals. Change your enterprise in their minds from a neon sign or an advertised name in newspapers or on billboards to a living entity continuously at work building community happiness and content and prosperity. Make it clear that it is not just bread or hardware or textiles or shoes that you are making, but jobs and homes and schools and America.

These party leaders and workers, like the candidates themselves, know you, your integrity, your standing, and influence in the community. Votes are the raw material with which they work just as you use steel or cotton or meat or groceries or leather. Political leaders have estimated that each public job holder can readily influence an average of three to five votes, even if no marked special effort is put forth. That estimate is conservative. If they can do that, how much greater will be your influence if you exercise it. All your work over the years, all you accomplished by dogged determination and clinging to your vision of service is at stake. Do not yield the field now without a struggle.

The marvelous record of American business and industry in its unparalleled war production achievement, with great plants and small ones working together in effective harmoney, has given the American people a new and rightful confidence in its post-war advancement. They have a clearer understanding now of what it was doing in peacetime to make this America of ours a surer vision of the higher living standards just ahead if we keep it and them free. Action now, before the primaries close too many doors, will save our heritage, will clear the way for the greater and better America, blood-bought once more, for which we sacrifice and toil.

It's impossible to overestimate the importance to you as a citizen, husband, father, and businessman, of the coming primaries. If only the right kind of candidates are nominated by both parties, what is there to worry about, so far as Congress is concerned, on election day? It's up to you—and I do mean you. Better get busy now.

DEWITT EMERY.

Congress and Our Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me at Winthrop, the South Carolina State college for women, at Rock Hill, S. C., October 7, 1943:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor and privilege to be invited to address this gathering today, though I must admit I hesitate to intrude my views where I am so overwhelmingly outnumbered by the gentle sex.

From the many letters I receive from our colleges—including many from the students of this great educational institution—asking about the functions of Congress and indicating an awakening of interest in post-war planning and in our future foreign policy, there came the thought that it might be interesting to talk to you on the subject Congress and our Foreign Relations.

I presume that you make good grades on your Government and that you know the Congress is made up of two Houses, the House of Representatives and the Senate. Recently there reached my desk a letter written by a Winthrop student and addressed to the Department of Congress. I am happy to say that Congress is not yet an executive department and is still jealous of its integrity as one of the three independent coordinate branches of the Government.

As the great shock absorber of public opinion and as the real link between the people and our Government itself, Congress, from the inception of our Republic, has been subject to the most violent criticism—and properly so. It is only through the avenues of free speech and a free press that representative government can survive. Only through these media can the people themselves be fully informed and able to impress their views intelligently upon their chosen representatives. And don't you think for a moment that the American people, including South Carolina, don't exercise the right of criticism today. If a man hasn't a mind open to constructive criticism or a tough enough skin to shed unjust abuse, he has no business in Congress.

To thoughtful minds, Congress is the protector of the democratic rights of the people and the reflector which mirrors public opinion. To some others, this representative body is a useless appendage to the body politic and the source of all national woes. To show you that Congress and Congressmen occupied a lowly status in the minds of some even a century and a half ago, I quote you a few verses written and published in George Washington's time:

These hardy knaves and stupid fools,
Some apish and pragmatic mules,
Some servile, acquiescing tools,
These, these compose the Congress.

When Jove resolved to send a curse
And all the woes of life rehearse,
Not plague, not famine, but much worse,
He cursed us with a Congress.

Then peace forsook this helpless shore,
Then cannons blazed with horrid roar;
We hear of blood, death, wounds, and gore,
The offspring of the Congress.

Again today through the affirmative action of Congress—for only Congress can declare war under our Constitution—this Nation is engaged in a death grapple with the enemies of human liberty, and again as in Washington's time "cannons blaze with horrid roar."

I stood that unforgettable day in December of 1941 and voted for war. I have cast my vote for over $100,000,000,000 in war appropriations and for the calling to arms of 11,000,000 men and women. Those actions are the bitterest and most serious obligations of a Member of Congress.

Never in the world's history has there been a war of such magnitude as this, and never has a nation had more provocation to wage war. Regardless of other criticism, there is none to say today that Congress should not have declared war against the Axis after the barbaric attack at Pearl Harbor in which the Japanese killed 3,000 Americans and temporarily knocked out every battleship and most of the aircraft in the Hawaiian area. Now our forces are deployed on battle fronts around the world, and there can and must be but one conclusion to the fighting, victory for us and our allies. Before this war is over it will cost this and coming generations the stupendous sum of $400,000,000,000. But that cost is small in comparison with the suffering to be endured and the losses of life. Already we have had casualties totaling about 120,000—with 25,000 killed. There have been perhaps 50 boys killed from our own Fifth Congressional District, and many wounded, missing and held prisoner, and there will be more casualties to come.

As the war goes on—and it will go on for months and possibly even several years—our people will be asked to bear regimentation, rationing, and shortages of the necessities of life such as we never have experienced before. Those are some of the prices we must pay for the liberty and democracy we profess to love and cherish so much. We are now waiting and watching for the Japs and the Nazis to crack up as did the Italians. But they in turn are waiting for our lines on the front and at home to slacken, waver, and fall. This is a contest which will prove whether or not the durability and the fighting qualities of democratic armies, democratic home fronts, and democratic ideals can outfight and outlast the strength of the totalitarian state on the home and battlefronts. Democracy's greatest test lies just ahead.

In full view of this world gone mad, of the flames and the bombs, and the sacrificing of human life everywhere in the maw of battle, the thoughts of those who care enough to

think, and particularly the thoughts of our college students, are feverishly seeking the genesis of this war and the means of preventing our involvement in the future. This, then, accounts for the awakening of public interest in the future foreign policy of the United States.

It is to your interests to know just how and by whom American foreign policy is shaped. There is a distinction between principle and policy here. Of course, in principle we all want peace. We all favor the application of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." But a foreign policy must go further. It is the sum total of our positive commitments and attitudes, our definite political and economic agreements, understandings, negotiations, and treaties with the rest of the world. Our foreign policy in the future will determine not only what our political and military alliances will be but whether we shall live in a peaceful or warlike world, whether your husbands and sons and brothers will be required to render military service, the freedom with which the great air transport systems may operate, whether or not you will have jobs and, to some extent, what pay you will receive, and what you can buy and sell to the world and at what price. These are evidences enough of the importance of our foreign policy to each individual American.

The leader in our foreign relations, the man empowered to speak for us and to some degree to bind and commit us, is the President. The Secretary of State acts only as his agent. The President may propose and negotiate to the point of ratification the most solemn and important treaties with foreign governments. But the founding fathers, keeping an eye on the system of balances and checks by and between the three coordinate branches of the Government, provided in the Constitution that no treaty signed by the President with a foreign state could be effective without the advice and consent of two-thirds of the United States Senate. The lower House of Congress, though it has joint powers with the Senate to declare war, wage war, impose taxes to meet the expenses of war, and to regulate commerce with foreign nations, has no say-so in regard to treaties.

By implication, the Constitution gave the President broad executive powers in the field of foreign affairs in addition to the power to propose treaties. In these he may act alone. The unusual brevity of the Constitutional provisions on this subject and the inevitable necessity of according them a liberal construction, provides an avenue for far-reaching executive action in this field.

Under this section of the Constitution the President can make Executive agreements with other nations which can prove profoundly important in our foreign relations. And, again by implication, his powers are assumed to be as great as those of the particular sovereign or foreign state with whom he is treating.

Generally speaking, the executive agreements which the Presidents have so far in our history made have been of three kinds: First, those covering details, such as an agreement concerning a diplomatic license tag for an ambassador's car in a foreign country. And in wartime military agreements with allies, such as the agreement to invade Sicily. Second, political agreements with no legal force, as the agreement among the United Nations. Third, those agreements authorized directly by law. For instance, agreements under the postal and trade-mark laws. In these Congress can limit the executive by repealing or amending the laws authorizing the agreements.

During the first 150 years of national existence, the Presidents put in force approximately 1,200 agreements with other countries without obtaining the two-thirds approval of the Senate. Texas, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Samoan Islands were annexed by Executive agreement which had only the endorsement of simple majorities in both houses of Congress. The Monroe Doctrine was formulated with the British and simply announced to Congress. The "Open Door" policy and the moves to establish security in the Pacific in 1908 and 1917 were based on Executive agreements. The exchange of 50 United States destroyers for British bases in the Pacific and Caribbean and the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and the United States were accomplished without reference to Congress.

The question as to which of our foreign commitments should be covered by treaties approved by the Senate and which by Executive agreements executed entirely by the President is a moot one. A treaty is a contract between two or more states or sovereigns which has been formally signed and ratified and is binding upon the states and their people until it is officially abrogated or expires under its own terms. It is the law of the land. By comparison, President Wilson held that many Executive agreements were merely understandings between states. They are the commitments of one man acting in his role as Executive, and, generally, they lapse when the particular Executive who effected them leaves office.

That the same field of accord may be covered by both an Executive agreement and a treaty in turn is demonstrated by actions taken by President Theodore Roosevelt. When the Senate did not approve his proposed treaty with Santo Domingo to provide for financial reconstruction of that country, Roosevelt simply put into effect an Executive agreement with the same provisions. And when it appeared that a treaty with the Republic of Panama did not adequately provide for certain contingencies in construction of the Panama Canal, Roosevelt covered these points by Executive agreement.

On many lesser issues—trade agreements, for instance—there will continue to be contention as to the line of demarkation between treaties and Executive agreements. But on major points, such as the allying of ourselves with other world powers, there probably will be no question as to the need for a Senate-approved treaty.

One of the great difficulties that the United States has had in establishing a clear-cut foreign policy may be traced to the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds ratification of treaties by the Senate. This check on all of our Presidents, along with our two-party system, has had a tendency to make our Executives cautious in international dealings and has caused foreign nations to hesitate in their dealings with us. There simply is no assurance that a treaty proposed by an Executive will meet the approval of the Senate; and in some cases it would be better never to have had a treaty proposed than to have had it rejected before the eyes of the world.

With our two-party system and its resulting partisanship, it always will be difficult to secure a two-thirds approval by the Senate of treaties, no matter how advantageous they may be. We like to boast that we are a people who on occasion have 130,000,000 different opinions, and it is hard to get the representatives of two-thirds of those 130,000,000 to agree on anything unless it be one of those rare unanimous opinions of ours such as the need for a declaration of war after a stab in the back. In my opinion, the Constitution should be amended to permit Senate ratification of treaties by a simple majority vote, and resolutions are now before Congress to set in motion the machinery to effect such a change.

When it comes to foreign relations, the British system of government is more effective than ours, because of the close union between the executive and legislative functions. In Britain the Prime Minister is the real head of the Government, the real executive and at the same time the leader of the legislative branch. His position in foreign affairs is perhaps comparable to the position which our President would hold were he also the leader of the majority party in the House of Representatives.

In Britain the Prime Minister and his Cabinet are themselves members and leaders of Parliament. They may take the floor in Parliament and explain and defend their policies—and then proceed to put them into effect. The Prime Minister may pledge his government in advance to a future course of international action or foreign policy. And so long as he and his Cabinet are supported by a majority in the House of Commons he may pledge the signing of a specific treaty even, and in effect may fix the direction of national policy with practically irresponsible power. Of course, if at any time a majority of Commons fails to support the Prime Minister he must resign. In the government of another people this might be a weakness and result in continuous interruptions of policy. But stability and aversion to violent change is characteristic with the British, and only infrequently must a Cabinet resign. Had we a plan like this our President would have lost his office when the bill to outlaw strikes in war industries was passed over his veto recently.

It has been said by one of our great statesmen and is generally admitted by students of foreign affairs everywhere that any nation's foreign policy is primarily interested in and must be based upon the vital self-interests of the nation enunciating that policy. Thus, based on the admonition of George Washington that we enter into no entangling alliances, the main pillar under the foreign policy of the United States since the formation of this Republic has been this attitude: "No alliances, no secret treaties, and no involvement in European affairs."

Converting that principle to policy, President Monroe announced the Monroe Doctrine as a basic element of our foreign relations. That policy told the world we did not intend to meddle in European affairs and we didn't intend to allow European nations to meddle in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. It came into existence because of the fear of Great Britain and the United States that the scheming and machinations of the Holy Alliance might extend its sphere to the United States, British dominions, and the smaller republics of the west. It was supported by the strong and aggressive foreign policy of Britain, whose fleet was prepared to defend her interests wherever they lay.

From time to time the United States added to its announced nonaggressive attitude toward the rest of the world by collaborating in and pledging its adherence to the rules of international law. For example, we contributed to and collaborated with the Hague Court and became one of the signatories of the Kellog-Briand Pact outlawing war.

But our belief in international law was shattered by torpedo blasts in the Atlantic, and we were drawn into the First World War.

After the war the far-sighted Wilson signed with our allies his treaty setting up the League of Nations, a step he hoped would prevent the recurrence of the tragedy of world war. But when this treaty came before the United States Senate, it failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote for ratification.

So the people of the United States went back to the isolation theory. They were wholeheartedly, almost unanimously, determined to stay out of the next world war, which appeared to be brewing. Insistence on our rights under existing international law had failed to keep us out of the first war, so the Congress decided to supplement international law by passing certain neutrality acts.

These acts circumscribed some of the rights of our own citizens when it came to dealings and contacts with warring nations.

The Neutrality Act of 1939 prohibited the travel of American citizens on ships of belligerent nations, because it was realized that some of these ships would be sunk and our people incited to war. It prohibited certain financial transactions with and the collection of funds from belligerents because it is often the case that where our money is there our hearts will be also. It prohibited the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents in order that war not be encouraged. It prohibited the use of American ports by belligerent vessels or their use as a base of supply in order to prevent the activities of war from being brought close to us. It prohibited our vessels from going into combat zones to prevent insult to our flag. It prohibited the arming of our merchant vessels that there might be no doubt of our peaceful intentions. In short, the neutrality act attempted to isolate us from warring nations anywhere.

Notwithstanding these precautions and safeguards, the battle of totalitarianism against democracy sounded around the world and awakened our sympathies. We soon realized that the destruction of the democratic ideal in Europe eventually would destroy it here. We heard the cry of peoples oppressed and liberties endangered, repealed the neutrality act and informed the world that our ships would carry munitions and supplies to democratic ports in spite of the Nazis, the Fascists, the devil, and high water.

The Axis, realizing this meant war with us, decided to strike before we were ready and while their statesmen were hypocritically negotiating for peace in Washington. Just as our belief in international law had been blasted by torpedoes in the Atlantic in 1917, our last hopes for neutrality died in the dust of Hickam Field and in the shattered hulks of our battleships at Pearl Harbor. You know well enough the story which has been written in blood during the past 21 months.

The size of the world and the vastness of its oceans have made our offensives in some areas slow and deliberate and unbelievably difficult. And the great number of creeds, cults, philosophies, religions, and languages of our allies have complicated our political understandings. But with all this most people are convinced that the nations of the world have been brought so close together that we can never hope again to be apart from any great war on earth.

In the First World War we depended on international law to keep us out and we were swept in. In this war we depended on neutrality legislation to keep us out and we were swept in again. There remains only one course. After this war we must form some kind of international organization to preserve the peace of the world. The only way to prevent our involvement in war is to prevent the occurrence of war anywhere. This Nation must abandon its historic policy of isolation and join in with the other nations of the earth in establishing an organization of law-abiding peoples to preserve the peace.

Behind this organization there must be a world police force to enforce its decrees. The United States must contribute to that police force. Even if it costs this Nation $5,000,000,000 a year to help maintain this police force, it would be insurance money well spent if it could prevent our spending five hundred billions and millions of lives in the Third World War.

Only a few days ago the House of Representatives, voicing the will of their constituencies, voted 360 to 29 for passage of the Fulbright resolution. It reads: "Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to prevent future aggression and to maintain law, order, and lasting peace, and as favoring participation by the United States therein, through its constitutional processes." This was a milestone in our history. It not only was an assurance to the people of foreign nations that America intended to take a share of the responsibility of preserving the peace in the future, but it was the first time that the lower House of Congress had so expressed itself on any issue regarding foreign affairs.

For the first time, in effect, the people of America had spoken directly on foreign affairs, stating a principle which may guide our Executive in future foreign policy. For the first time, American foreign policy is starting from the bottom and working up to the Executive, carrying with it the weight of public opinion. It is well that the people should continue to think of foreign affairs. It is well that they should speak out about foreign affairs. For in a democracy no foreign policy can be successful without the support of the people.

The House of Representatives, heretofore largely silent in the field of foreign policy, now feels that if its voice is so potent in declaring war and waging war, it should have something to say about the prevention of war, so that out of the tears and the blood and the agonies of this war, there may come a just and lasting peace.

These are our aims: To live in peace, to maintain our liberties, and to maintain our high standard of living. And toward that end we must insist that there be peace in the rest of the world, and that any acts of aggression be localized and dealt with before hey spread.

Behind us we have the solid support of the American people. We fully realize that the difficulties, the snags, international jealousies, selfishness, and the chicanery of some foreign nations must be met and overcome. But we realize too that to achieve one must dare. This applies to nations as well as individuals.

President Quezon's Message to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a message broadcast by President Quezon to the Philippines on October 15:

We are informed that the so-called Philippine Republic sponsored by Japan was inaugurated on October 14, and on the same day a Tokyo broadcast says: "The Tokyo Board of Information announced Thursday the signing of a pact of alliance between Japan and the Republic of the Philippines." The terms of the alliance as announced by Tokyo clearly show the real purpose behind the granting by Japan of a so-called Philippine independence, namely, to use the Philippines "politically, economically and militarily for the successful prosecution of the war of Greater East Asia."

I want to remind my people who for so many years have honored me with their trust and confidence, of the following important facts: First, that we are bound to America by ties of loyalty and gratitude; second, that America has pledged all her resources in men and material to redeem the Philippines, to expel the Japanese invaders from our land and establish and protect the Philippine Republic; third, that the Congress of the United States, upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt, is now considering the enactment of legislation that will not only recognize the independence of the Philippines even before July 4, 1946, but will provide for the future economic security of our people, and for the defense of the territorial integrity of the Philippines; fourth, this legislation will also provide for the financial and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines and the repair of all the damages caused by the war to the Philippine Government, to public and private corporations and to individuals, including the poor people who might have lost their small houses, their carabaos, hogs, etc.; fifth and last, the strength of America is now being gathered in the Pacific for the final blow at Japan. Already very significant victories have been achieved by General MacArthur in the southwest Pacific, where he has decisively defeated the Japanese and driven them out of Gona, Buna, Munda, Lae, Salamaua, Finschhafen, in New Guinea, and Kolombangara in the central Solomons, and only 3 days ago his air force scored a decisive victory in Rabaul where 177 Japanese planes were destroyed and 119 Japanese ships sunk, all in preparation for the reoccupation of the Philippines.

I will return with General MacArthur. And I hope and expect that the Filipino people, when that day comes, will fight on the side of the liberating forces and not allow themselves to be used by Japan, who is responsible for the thousands of lives lost, the hardships and sufferings of our people and the devastation of our country.

Filipinos, my beloved countrymen, keep your faith in America. Let us be with her in victory as we have been with her in defeat.

Neglected American Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following timely editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News for October 12, 1943:

NEGLECTED AMERICAN INTERESTS

Charges made by the bipartisan senatorial war committee, on the basis of its world tour of investigation, are too serious to ignore. The Senators praise our military effort, our troops, weapons, and equipment. They criticize certain Russian and British policies and our Government's failure to protect American interests.

These criticisms are too widespread among American troops abroad to hush up, even if this country were willing to suppress them—which it is not. In the interest of continued Allied cooperation, which is so essential to winning the war and the peace, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill should begin settling some of these growing conflicts.

The British are said to use our oil while they save their own, and to place British labels on our lend-lease goods. But the most disturbing charge concerns airfields, bases, and

communications. Apparently we have obtained no post-war rights outside this hemisphere to the global chain of airfields we have built at great cost, and no equality in cable and radio communications. In some Pacific islands, a British official moves in and plants the British flag as fast as our forces take over, it is said. The British Government is unwilling for us to acquire full post-war possession of Caribbean, Atlantic, and Pacific bases necessary for American defense.

There is also a challenge of British, Russian, and American military strategy. Senator LODGE says many American lives could be saved if Russia would fight Japan. Senator CHANDLER thinks the British could do more in the Far East, and that Washington should give General MacArthur more support. But it is obviously impossible for civilians to answer questions of global strategy—to say whether Russia is strong enough for offensives against Germany and Japan at the same time, or whether the MacArthur plan is better than that of the Anglo-American combined chiefs of staff.

As for the shortcomings of our own Government, the Senators are agreed that—

"The need for a clear national policy is strikingly apparent. With such a policy should go an American representation abroad in which our military, diplomatic, and business personnel work as a team, with appropriate international rank. We owe this to ourselves and to the world."

There is the rub. Our Allies are protecting their national interests, and we are not. Why should we blame the British for protecting their post-war position at our expense, if we are too naive and stupid to look after our own interests? We should be thankful that there is at least one English-speaking nation practical enough to look ahead.

Of course, it would be much better for us, and for the future peace of the world, if our Government could bargain as well as the British. For, unless Washington controls some of the global airfields built by American money, and unless Britain agrees to full American possession of the necessary Caribbean, Atlantic, and Pacific bases, the American people are not apt to support close Anglo-American collaboration after the war.

Man of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the presentation of a bust of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the University of Tennessee, President Manuel L. Quezon, of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, referred to that distinguished American officer as "the man of faith."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the address of President Quezon.

It follows:

Nothing affords me greater pleasure than to participate in this public tribute to one of the world's most outstanding soldiers—General Douglas MacArthur. That his bust is presented to the University of Tennessee by the people who have spontaneously contributed to make it possible is a token of faith in an American whose sterling qualities of leadership tested in Bataan, Corregidor, and Australia under the most trying circumstances, entitle him to the admiration and gratitude of his Nation.

It is indeed most appropriate that such a token should be tendered to one whose vision and courage are the offsprings of his own unwavering faith. For it is his faith in America that has made him shoulder tasks under which others would have quailed. It was his unfaltering faith in the Filipino people that made him undertake at my behest the organization of the Philippine Army, in the face of adverse criticism, confident that when the time came the Filipino soldier would show to the world that he is the equal of the best and inferior to none when he defends justice and freedom. And it is his constant faith in an Almighty God so evident in his public statements and even in his military communiques, that has given him and his men strength and power in their darkest moments of trial.

To such a man of faith, this tribute in the constructive ennoblement of a seat of learning, is most fitting. Universities are the repositories of faith, and in whatever front line Douglas MacArthur may be, he is there as the stalwart defender of all those ideals that in the hearts of all free men everywhere are the epitome of faith.

It was an arduous task that General MacArthur undertook when he accepted the post of military adviser to the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines. He was practically starting from scratch. But he had faith in the government and in the people for whom he was to work, and he gave of himself without stint, with passionate conviction and energetic zeal, to organize the Philippine Army. Hence it came to pass that when the hour of danger struck for the American flag in its far-flung outpost in the Pacific, at the head of approximately 100,000 Filipino soldiers, 19,000 United States Army troops, and 12,000 Filipino Scouts, General MacArthur kept the Japanese hordes at bay for more than 4 months and the epic of Bataan was written in the annals of history, side by side with Thermopylae, the Alamo, Chateau-Thierry, and other unforgettables in human heroism and sacrifice.

Outnumbered, ill-equipped, outgunned, starving, our Filipino and American soldiers repulsed assault after assault of the Japanese enemy because of their courage and because of the thoroughness of General MacArthur's planning and execution. It is the same thoroughness in planning and in execution that he has and is displaying in Gona, Buna, Munda, Villa, Salamaua, Finschhafen, in New Guinea, and Kolobangara, in the Central Solomons. In Bataan our lines held month after month against the numerically superior enemy because of the fighting power of our men and because we had superb generalship. In the Filipino and American soldier the Japanese soldier has met more than his match in courage and skill. In the brilliance of General MacArthur and his able commanders the Japanese military have met shining steel better tempered than their own.

General MacArthur had to leave the Philippines in obedience to superior orders to direct another battle, but the essence of his unwavering will and the potent body of his command remain in the spirit of our fighting soldiers who are upholding the American and Filipino flags in the hills, in the jungles, in the mountain fastnesses of the Philippines today, where resistance against the enemy continues with unabated vigor. Nor shall he be away from the Philippines for long. The Philippines and Australia are two decisive battles in the same war; one supports the other, and the winning of both is necessary to the winning of the war. The Philippines and Australia are two ends of the same bridge and we must hold both ends.

General MacArthur is the one man today who stands like a towering wall between the Japanese and total victory in the Southwest Pacific. He is standing in their way and blocking them, exactly as he stood in their way and played havoc with their timetable in the Philippines. He has won spectacular victories, one after another, with the limited means at his command. But there is only one victory that Douglas MacArthur, the man of faith, wants to achieve. He wants to redeem his pledge made upon his arrival in Australia from the Philippines more than 1 year ago: "I broke through and I shall return."

For to him Bataan is more than a symbol. Bataan is a fact—as large as life, as bitter as death. Bataan is a grim story of brave men fighting against terrible odds, of men who believed fiercely in the cause for which they were fighting, and in that faith were not afraid to die. Bataan is the story of men who gave of themselves in the fullest possible measure, and Douglas MacArthur is not forgetting them.

This bust, standing sentinel in the quiet academic atmosphere of the University of Tennessee, as Mrs. Quezon is privileged to witness its presentation today in representation of the Filipino people, is an earnest reminder to us of the historic words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt which we heard over the ether when we were still in the tunnels of Corregidor: "People of the Philippines, stand firm, your day is coming."

The Role of Palestine in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me Saturday, October 16, 1943, over Station WMCA at New York City:

In recent days a number of my friends have received letters soliciting their support for an organization known as the Red Mogen Dovid, or the Red Star of David, in Palestine. They have told me that they were fascinated by the remarkable story revealed in the literature accompanying the letters. But before sitting down to write a check, some of my friends have asked me whether I was familiar with the Red Mogen Dovid and what I thought of its activities.

I am grateful to Station WMCA for giving me this opportunity to answer publicly the questions posed by my friends. I do this in the conviction that the story of the Red Mogen Dovid is indeed a remarkable one which deserves to be broadcast far and wide among the people of America. It is a story that should have been told long ago, because it has far-reaching implications; it throws a vivid light upon the role of Palestine in this war, and it illumines brightly the heroic labors of the Jewish people to mold a new national life in their ancient homeland. This story is closely knit into the very fabric of Palestine's historical destiny, and that destiny concerns the American people no less than the destiny of any of the other countries that are allied with us in the titanic struggle now being waged against the ruthless enemies of civilization. Remember that Palestine, small as it is, has a tremendous strategic

importance on the political, economic, and military maps of the world. What will happen to Palestine after the war will constitute a measure of how successful the United Nations will have been in winning the peace as well as the war. It will be a yardstick of the good faith and the sincerity of purpose behind our solemn pledge to establish a new world order founded on democracy and freedom for all the peoples of the earth. Remember, too, that Palestine is still the Holy Land to the millions of Christians, Moslems, as well as to the Jews, throughout the world.

The Jews, for their part, have already given definite indication what shape the destiny of Palestine will have, if they are given the opportunity to resurrect their long-lost status of nationhood. That indication they have given most convincingly not through the pronouncements of their leaders, not through the speeches of their orators, not through the eloquent statements of their writers, but rather through the living deeds of the Jewish settlers in Palestine. These settlers have performed a miracle of pioneering in the face of untold hardships. They have brought with them an amazing store of zeal, courage, self-sacrifice, and idealism. They have plowed up the long-neglected soil, built roads where none existed before, erected modern factories, tapped the natural resources, and introduced modern methods of sanitation. They harnessed the waters of the Jordan and husbanded the soil that had been dried for centuries. The fruits of their skill, industry, and culture have brought immeasurable blessings to the whole land, benefiting Jews, Christians, and Arabs alike.

There is no finer example of the high idealism that has fired the spirit of the Jewish settlers of Palestine than the work of the Red Mogen Dovid, Palestine's official first-aid agency. The Red Mogen Dovid represents in Palestine what the Red Cross represents in other countries. It was founded some years ago by a group of Jews in order to educate the people of the country in the prevention and treatment of accidents and industrial injuries. The Red Mogen Dovid was the first agency to introduce ambulances in Palestine and those ambulances still continue to serve all the municipally owned and voluntary hospitals of the country. Its first-aid stations in every part of Palestine, its large corps of doctors and nurses, its thousands of well-trained first-aiders and its hundreds of volunteer blood donors have treated thousands of injured persons annually and have saved many from serious infections and possible loss of limbs. Side by side with the splendid hospitals of Hadassah and the fine workers' clinics of the Palestine Labor Federation, the Red Mogen Dovid has been responsible for the remarkable improvement in the conditions and standards of public health in Palestine.

With the outbreak of the war, the Red Mogen Dovid threw all its resources into the war effort on Palestine's home front. It organized the people of the country for civilian defense. It established air-raid shelters and built many new first-aid stations. During the series of bombings to which Palestine has been subjected by Axis planes, the Red Mogen Dovid directed the rescue work, and at the time of the Libyan campaign, many of its doctors, nurses, and first-aiders were commandeered by the British military for front-line duty.

Today the Red Mogen Dovid is held in the highest regard as Palestine's official first-aid and emergency war-relief agency. Through its canteens, recreation centers, and libraries it serves the wounded and convalescent United Nations' troops, including our own boys, soldiers of all faiths and races who are brought to Palestine from every section of the Near East and north Africa. It aids war refugees and distributes food and clothing among the needy people of the Holy Land. The Red Mogen Dovid maintains the only training school in first aid in the entire area of the Near East and the theater of operations of the United Nations. Many of the more than 5,000 men and women graduated from this school have joined various units of the British armed forces.

Now the significance of all this can hardly be overstated when it is borne in mind that the varied and efficient wartime services created by the Red Mogen Dovid were nonexistent before. Without these services, the United Nations would have been compelled to transport doctors, nurses, and medical equipment to Palestine from other sectors of the far-flung United Nations' fronts.

The work of the Red Mogen Dovid is not a merely localized affair but is an important part of the contribution which the Palestinian Jews have made to the United Nations' war effort in the Near East. This contribution includes 35,000 Jewish soldiers who, despite official disapproval of the Palestine administration, enlisted voluntarily in the British armed forces and distinguished themselves for their courage and gallantry in the line of fire in Crete, in Libya, and in the north African drive.

This achievement, important in itself, is all the more significant when we remember that the majority of the Jews in Palestine have settled there in the last two decades. Yet already these new pioneers have succeeded in rendering an eminent service to the United Nations' cause, a service distinguished for its spirit of devotion and far in excess of their numbers and their physical and material resources. Already this small community has demonstrated, in the ways that I have described, their deep-seated humanity, their desire and their ability to be concerned about their fellow men without regard to race or creed, and their eagerness to share with all other freedom-loving peoples the tremendous responsibility of fighting the common enemy of mankind.

Let me tell you that if Palestine is today regarded as the sole arsenal of democracy in the Near East that is due entirely to the determination and fighting spirit of the Palestinian Jews and their unflagging loyalty, in the face of official discouragement and even hostility, to the cause of world freedom and democracy. The leaders of Great Britain and the United States know how important this arsenal of democracy has been throughout the course of this war. They know it stood ready in those dark and fateful days of 1942 when Rommel's tanks and bombers were poised at the gates of the Suez, and they know that it stands ready today when the Nazis are attempting to forge an iron ring around Turkey with the aim of striking another blow at the Near East, to which the gateway is Palestine.

This is the story that has not been told. This is what a famous foreign correspondent meant when he said the other day that the Jews of Palestine are our "forgotten ally." No phrase could better describe the shameful truth, and no statement could more forcibly point an accusing finger at those who have prevented the story from reaching the American people.

In our war effort Palestine's worthy sacrifices in blood and treasure are high lighted by the fact that no country or nation in the Near East contributed even as much as a donkey or camel to the Allied cause. Quite to the contrary, some of Palestine's neighbors gave much of aid and comfort to the enemy.

There is a strong belief in some quarters that the story of how well the people of Palestine have served the United Nations' war effort has been censored out of public view because certain elements in control of foreign affairs are anxious not to encourage the Jewish claims to Palestine. If true, there can be no words to stigmatize adequately this outrageous injustice, this cynical and contemptible maneuver, this flagrant violation of all the noble pronouncements by the leaders of Great Britain and America.

But no one here and abroad will succeed in preventing this story from being told, and when it is told the American people will know how to appraise it. They will learn to appreciate the contribution of the Palestinian Jews to our war effort. They will learn to respect the Palestinian Jewish community which, despite every injustice, maintains its dignity, continues unflinchingly its sacrifices in defense of its rights and the cause of democracy and which goes on serenely in the pursuit of its efforts to cultivate racial good will in the Near East through such humanitarian activities as those of the Red Mogen Dovid. The Jews of Palestine ask only for an understanding attitude to their just demands and the same kind of fair play that is meted out to other people.

I am certain that when the truth about Palestine is made known, all friends in America, regardless of creed, will firmly demand justice for the Jews of Palestine, and I am certain that Americans of all faiths, regardless of their political views on the Palestine question, will unite in generous support of the purely humanitarian and non-partisan endeavors of the Red Mogen Dovid.

The Red Mogen Dovid urgently needs more ambulances, field hospitals, mobile kitchens, X-ray machines, and other essential equipment in order to meet its growing responsibilities under the stress of war conditions. By helping this life-saving agency, Americans will have the deep satisfaction of knowing that their aid will go to a community which, in the midst of a world convulsed by terror, hate, and destruction, steadfastly continues to build a way of life inspired by the ideals of democracy and the Biblical precepts of justice, decency, and brotherhood—the very ideals which the Nazis have sought to destroy.

My appeal is not only addressed to those of the Jewish faith, but to those of the Christian faith as well because the Red Mogen Dovid is the Red Star of Mercy that beckons to the maimed, the sick, and the enfeebled of all creeds. This shield of David protects Gentile, Moslem, and Jew alike.

Taking the Cent From Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the October 7 issue of the Iron Age, relative to the proposed freezing of the earnings of those receiving pay on a commission basis:

TAKING THE CENT FROM INCENTIVE

Stabilizer Byrnes is reported to be working on that line and to be about to issue an order.

Stabilization is a fine-sounding and impressive word, but if the act of stabilization is carried to an extreme another less pleasant word fits the picture better. That word is "strangulation." A strangled person is completely, finally, and definitely stabilized forever. And the proposal to regulate commissions on a basis of past performance would pretty definitely strangle selling incentive and

with it our hopes for maintaining post-war employment.

Object of the proposed new gadget for the already overgadgeted stabilizing machine is to keep down purchasing power. No one has as yet proposed the bright idea of cutting hourly wage rates or piece rates for the same purpose, and any politician who did so would face an outraged constituency. Yet this proposal to "stabilize" commissions is similar in nature. It is not aimed at stabilizing the rate of commission, but the total amount earned. Thus, a salesman working on a 10-percent rate who this year through working harder, longer, or better, boosted his sales volume 25 percent would find his rate cut by the stabilizing mandate to 7½ percent.

But this is not the half of it. Commissions are usually paid as earned, on a weekly, monthly, or quarterly basis. In most cases the money earned has already been spent or invested in Government bonds. Thus, a salesman or one in any commission-paying occupation who is unfortunate enough to be 25 percent ahead of last year by October 1, will either have to take a 3 months' vacation or else work during the last quarter for no pay. If he is doubly unfortunate in being 50 percent ahead of the "base" year he will have to do either one of these two things and also pay back a quarter year's earnings to his company.

It is estimated that fully 80 percent of our merchandising and service transactions are kept going by the commission idea in whole or in part. Now that we are on the threshold of releasing more and more materials to nonwar products it would be a silly and damaging thing to take the cent out of incentive. If you agree with me it would be well to let your Congressman know how you feel about it.

J. H. VAN DEVENTER.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very able editorial from the October 7, 1943, issue of the Columbia (S. C.) State:

TRYING TO BEAT THE POLL TAX

The national committee to abolish the poll tax (self-appointed) cites legal opinions of able men in its effort to get Congress to outlaw the levy in the eight Southern States where it still is in force. While we feel the conclusions of these men, learned in the law, are wrong when they say the poll tax is not a qualification for voting under the constitutional requirement that the requisite for voting be that of the more numerous house of the State general assembly, we nevertheless recognize that these men are able attorneys, whose attainments at the bar make their arguments worth reading, though, after reading them, we differ with the reasoning and think they have dodged the Constitution. But whoever compiled the committee's handbook, Why the Poll Tax Is a National Issue, shows such a lack of information, generally speaking, about conditions in the South that the booklet's persuasive value is nullified early in its reading.

Any person who knows the South knows that our small vote in the general election is not due to the poll tax. It is due to the one-party system. And the poll tax is not the crux of the one-party system.

Any person familiar with the South knows the poll tax has nothing to do with the amount of money spent by us on education. If the $1 poll tax were paid by every man, woman, and child in South Carolina, it would amount to less than $2,000,000 a year, or $1 per year per person.

Any person familiar with the South knows that the poll tax does not disfranchise 10,000,000 Americans. He knows that while it may be true, as the handbook states, that 10.6 million adult citizens did not pay their poll tax in 1940 and that they did not vote, the fact that the poll tax was not paid was incidental. They didn't vote, or qualify to vote, because of lack of interest in the general election, or for some other reason—not because 10.6 million of our citizens couldn't pay the small assessment. In fact, many people who pay poll tax don't vote in the general election. And we suspect that the 10.6 million figure cited by the committee includes many who had paid their poll tax but didn't vote because there was no real contest, or they had some other reason.

Any person knows that the reason there were fewer votes cast in the general election of 1942 than in that of 1940 in the eight poll-tax States was that 1940 was a Presidential year, while 1942 was an off year. And the fact that Congressmen have no opposition (another argument) is not due to the poll tax.

And any person familiar with the South knows that long tenure in office of certain southern Senators and Representatives is not due to the poll tax. Some of them have had the battle of their lives to get to the general election, the primary being the real test of strength down this way. The handbook cites the cases of SMITH, of South Carolina; MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; GLASS, of Virginia; and GEORGE, of Georgia—along with 12 Congressmen with 20 or more years of service.

By the same token it could be argued in reverse that Senator Norris remained in the Senate for decades, the La Follette family held the reins in Wisconsin, the Lodges have done well in Massachusetts, and numerous Senators and Representatives have succeeded themselves—all because there was no poll tax in their States.

Or the question might be raised as to what part the poll tax has played in keeping Franklin D. Roosevelt in office overtime. That would be an interesting point for debate. He has always received the vote of the poll-tax States.

In other words, if the poll tax is to be argued, let's confine our discussion to presentations such as the group of attorneys have made, and let's leave out fanciful, dire results—ignorance, crime, death, and poverty—such as this national committee handbook would have one swallow, hook, line, and sinker.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have progressed sufficiently in the preliminary American experiment in social security that I believe it is time to draw some conclusions from our experience, and to determine what changes and improvements in the system may be undertaken.

I believe it is generally recognized that the social security program as it is presently constituted is inadequate on a number of counts, and I believe it is agreed from all viewpoints that a number of changes can and should be made. In fact, a number of specific proposals have been offered in this Congress, and are awaiting consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I realize there is a natural disposition on the part of the committee to defer treatment of this problem, since we are already burdened with many other matters, all of them of the most urgent importance. But I believe it would be a serious mistake to pass over this problem of security on the assumption that it is a subject which can best be handled as a part of our general post-war planning. We ought to remind ourselves that if we wait until the war is over to attack the post-war problems, there simply will not be any planning.

Administration thinkers have already tossed into the arena of social security their cradle-to-the-grave program a vague formula by which a paternalistic Government may lead the American people into national socialism. I personally believe that the committee could scarcely do the country any greater favor than to examine this proposal thoroughly, and to expose its political and economic implications to the American people just as quickly as possible. If that does not happen, I think you can mark it down as a certainty that those forces which have been buying national elections with funds from the Federal Treasury and with glowing promises of greater dispensations to come will make this dangerous proposal a confusing issue in the campaign of 1944. I for one sincerely hope that this committee and this Congress will not permit that unfortunate eventuality.

If the present social-security program is inadequate in its coverage, as many have vigorously contended; or if the system is fundamentally wrong in principle or application, as has also been contended, whatever necessary changes as are indicated should be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

Among the proposals now before the committee are the Townsend plan and the general welfare plan, both specifically presented in the interest of our aged citizens, a group in no adequate way now protected or benefited.

If all the glowing promises to the common man which this administration has given in the past 10 years are anything more than hollow mockeries, why should we not at least hear and consider the claims of the worthy citizens? If we owe them any consideration and assistance at all, we certainly owe it to them immediately. As many of us in this Congress have pointed out repeatedly, they as a group are the first and most seriously injured victims of skyrocketing living costs. Remember that they must depend upon fixed incomes which in most cases provide little more than bare subsistence even in normal times. Mounting prices have already lopped at least one-third of the purchasing power off their dollars, and they have

no chance to supplement their incomes to make up this loss they have suffered.

In simple justice, therefore, I urge that we at least give sympathetic consideration to these people, and to other similarly harassed groups who have come to us asking attention to their problems and suggestions.

I urgently request the Ways and Means Committee, therefore, to take immediate action on this vitally important home-front problem.

West Coast Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
Seattle, October 9, 1943.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: The people on the west coast, and particularly in the State of Washington and the Northwest, feel that it is desirable and necessary to have a west coast highway which would connect with the Alaska Highway at Lower Post. There appear to be many advantages in the construction of this road, not alone to the Pacific coast and Northwestern States, but also to Alaska and to the Nation as a whole. Such a connecting route would save a great deal of mileage, provide an alternate route for military shipments, and greatly reduce the transportation expenses for military and other supplies.

To the people of Seattle and the State of Washington, a west coast highway seems the natural and logical route to Alaska. Puget Sound ports always have been the accepted ports of embarkation for Alaska, and it would appear most desirable and consistent to retain this territory as the terminus for land-borne transportation.

An investigation of the facts relative to distance, climatic conditions, costs, and savings seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that this connecting highway should be constructed.

I would appreciate it, and I know that the people of Seattle and the entire State of Washington would appreciate it, if you would give this matter your earnest consideration, and if your conclusions are the same as ours that you urge the National Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to construct the remaining portion of such a connecting highway. I shall appreciate any consideration you are able to give this matter.

Very truly yours,
WM. F. DEVIN, *Mayor.*

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, October 5, 1943.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have followed with much interest the program of the Pacific Northwest Trade Association, consisting of chambers of commerce of the States of Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia, to have built immediately a highway from Prince George in British Columbia to Watson Lake on the Alcan Highway, where it approaches the Yukon Territory.

This link of about 517 miles would provide a direct connection through existing roads in British Columbia to the highway systems of Washington, Oregon, and the Pacific coast.

Its military necessity is apparent. At present supplies for the vast military establishments in Alaska go by water except such as are moved by air and by the Alcan Highway which connects to the Canadian system at Edmonton by a circuitous route from Dawson Creek in eastern British Columbia.

Military necessity and the greatly accelerated activity to be expected in the Pacific warrants the immediate construction of another route connecting more directly with the Pacific Northwest military supply depots and manufacturing plants.

But beyond this would be its value in peacetime as a great developer of trade and as a continuing means of servicing military establishments which I feel sure will be maintained after the war in this highly strategic area.

I am following with much interest the progress of the North Pacific study sponsored by the Joint Economic Committees of Canada and the United States. Here in a great region lying to the north and west of us, heretofore almost unoccupied and devoid of modern transportation, astonishing changes are now taking place. Roads, airfields, barge transportation routes, oil pipe lines, and new towns are being built. Natural resources of agricultural lands, of minerals, fisheries, and forests are being inventoried.

It seems strange that already a more direct highway connection to the Pacific coast system is not now under construction.

I understand that the Province of British Columbia is prepared to expend $6,000,000 or one-third of the cost of constructing this link, that the Dominion of Canada is to be asked for a similar amount and the United States to supply another $6,000,000.

Alaska is now seeking statehood. Let her be connected with her closest neighbors with whom she is accustomed to trade by all means of transportation including highways.

I urge your best efforts to the consummation of this project.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR B. LANGLIE, *Governor.*

Hon. James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Scranton (Pa.) Times of October 2, 1943:

BECOMES BIDDLE'S AIDE

For those who have followed the political development in Pennsylvania or watched the work of our Representatives in Congress, the appointment of Representative JAMES P. MCGRANERY, of Philadelphia, as an assistant to the Attorney General comes as no surprise. Reports that Mr. MCGRANERY would be named have been current for weeks.

The Attorney General, the Solicitor General, and the Assistant to the Attorney General are the "big three" of Uncle Sam's law forces. Mr. MCGRANERY, therefore, makes two of these big jobs held by Quaker City lawyers.

Appointment of Mr. MCGRANERY to his new post will necessitate his quitting Congress. It is not expected, however, that his successor will be elected in November. The law requires that special elections are to be called by the Governor only if a vacancy occurs more than 30 days before the regular election. It is, of course, expected that such an election will be called some date later, as MCGRANERY still has more than a year and a quarter of his term to serve.

Mr. MCGRANERY has been in Congress since 1936. He is recognized as one of the most active and influential of the younger Members of the House. His legal knowledge has been a factor in bringing him forward. In his new post he will be the administration officer of the Department of Justice dealing with the Federal courts throughout the country, with United States attorneys and marshals. The salary is $9,000 a year, which is $1,000 less than he receives as Congressman. In addition he will have to give up his private law practice in Philadelphia, as his new job will require all of his time in Washington. We may believe that the sacrifice as regards salary and the giving up of his law practice was prompted both by urging on the part of Attorney General Biddle and a willingness by Mr. MCGRANERY to serve his country to the best of his ability. Incidentally Mr. MCGRANERY is a World War No. I veteran, having served in the Army Air Service as a pilot and later as a balloon section observer.

The United States Food Situation and Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of W. I. Myers, acting dean of the agriculture college of Cornell University, before the National Food Conference in Chicago on September 17:

The immediate causes of the present food shortage are generally known. Civilian demand for meat and other choice foods has arisen far above pre-war levels. The per capita consumption of meat in our rapidly growing armed forces is about double the civilian rate. The food requirements of our allies are increasing steadily. The combination of these three increased demands has overtaken even recent phenomenal production and has resulted in shortages which have been magnified beyond their real importance by uneven distribution of supplies arising from price control.

The basic reasons for our present food problem are more important and are not commonly understood. For more than 25 years prior to the present war United States food production did not keep pace with population. For the 4-year period 1935-38 just prior to the present war per capita production of all food was 8 percent lower than during the corresponding period just prior to World War No. 1.

This downward trend in food production was obscured by the long depression of the thirties. During that decade per capita food production in the United States was lower than in any other period in the present century. In no single year during the thirties

did per capita food production get up to the 1926–30 level. The public was told we had enormous food surpluses, but the real trouble was inability of consumers to buy rather than overproduction. We were struggling with a price problem, not a surplus food problem. When employment increased consumption rose and the so-called food surpluses disappeared quickly.

The people of the United States constitute the world's best market. In ordinary times they eat what food they want and then we export the remainder, if any. Hence, as per capita food production declined, food exports decreased, food imports rose, and for 16 years prior to the present war our annual food imports exceeded our food exports.

During World War No. 1, food exports increased from about 6 or 8 percent of production in the pre-war years to 13 percent in 1915 and 17 percent in 1919. About half of this increase came from higher production and the other half from reduced civilian consumption made possible by changes in eating habits. The present war has brought another increase in food exports but from a lower level. With 33,000,000 more people to feed here at home, our total food exports from 1935 to 1939 varied from 2 to 5 percent of production. In 1942, lease-lend shipments of food amounted to only 6 percent of our output, while our total food production was 16 percent above the pre-war level. In the present war, we have increased food production, but with ceiling prices and high wages we have raised our standard of living and eaten most of it up ourselves.

Farm families have done their best and will continue to do so in spite of unfair criticism and innumerable handicaps, regulations, and annoyances. They have increased the length of their already long working day to the physical limit. In many cases they are putting in two 40-hour weeks every 7 days without any so-called noninflationary provision of time and a half for overtime. However, agriculture is a biological industry. Food production is determined by the life processes of plants and animals which cannot be hastened. A delay of a month in a plane or a tank program means a month lost. A delay of a month in a food program may mean a year lost. Total food production cannot be increased quickly except by the chance of favorable weather; nor can violent shifts be made promptly in the production of different crops and animals required to meet war needs.

Our Government has planned generously for the armed forces and for munitions, ships, and planes, but, because of the erroneous belief that we had great surpluses of food, it has taken an abundant food supply for granted. Its actions on the food front have apparently been based on the assumption that production of all foods could be expanded to meet any needs that might arise without careful consideration and planning for agriculture such as were given to other vital parts of the Nation's war economy.

In recent months a number of constructive steps have been taken to remove some of the handicaps to full production of food but even yet there are few signs that the seriousness of our food problem is recognized. A man of nationally recognized ability and experience was appointed as War Food Administrator. However, since he was given responsibility without adequate authority, resignation was the inevitable result.

Another man of proven ability and broad experience in agricultural affairs is now serving as War Food Administrator. Although the present incumbent has been made a member of the W. P. B. and O. W. M., he, too, is handicapped by lack of authority in much the same way as his predecessor. Under the present fantastic administrative set-up the principal function of the War Food Administrator seems to be to accept public responsibility for decisions on food policy and operation made by the Director of Economic Stabilization and the Director of War Mobilization.

For these reasons, nothing resembling a realistic program of food production and utilization has yet been given to the American people. We are continuing to extemporize our food program from week to week in blind disregard of the dangers involved in such action.

OVEREMPHASIS ON PRICE CONTROL

The present chaotic food situation is in part the result of overemphasis on Government price control as the principal means of controlling inflation. With many more workers employed, higher wage rates and longer hours of work, total factory pay rolls are more than three times the average of the pre-war period, 1935–39. Since supplies of other consumer goods and services have decreased because of the war, this increased buying power has caused a sharp rise in the civilian demand for meat and other choice foods. In 1942, civilians ate substantially less than in 1935–39 of the cheaper foods such as potatoes, sweet potatoes, and dry beans and considerably more of the highly priced foods such as meat, poultry, eggs, milk and cream.

In time of peace such a change in diet would be highly desirable but in wartime it increases the pressure on a limited agricultural output because of the relatively large amount of land and labor required for the production of these concentrated foods. In this situation, efforts to control inflation primarily by the use of rigid price controls have tended to decrease production of many scarce foods, to increase their consumption and to induce evasion or black markets.

Inflation is caused by excess spending power relative to the supply of available goods and services. It can be minimized only by bringing spending power into balance with the supply of goods and services available. This can be done most effectively by increasing the supplies of food through maximum production and by reducing spending power through a vigorous tax and savings program.

RESTRICTIVE PROGRAMS HAMPERED WAR FOOD PRODUCTION

Another factor contributing to the present food shortage is that the steps taken by the Government to increase production were appended to agricultural programs established during the thirties and designed to restrict production in a period of low prices and widespread unemployment. In addition, these measures to increase production were administered by an organization whose employees were trained to carry out this program of limiting production. As a natural result, acreage restrictions were continued long after the need for full production became clear. Although modified, these restrictive programs still limit, directly or indirectly, the acreage of the best adapted crops that can be grown in many regions, thus preventing farmers from freely organizing their resources for maximum production of food. At long last, it has been announced that all acreage controls on food and feed crops will be eliminated in the 1944 food-production program.

PRICES AND FOOD PRODUCTION

The food problem of the United States is in part a problem of prices. There are two important considerations in the farm-price question in wartime. The question to which most public attention has been given is, What prices will give reasonable equity between the incomes of farm people and of other groups? The most important question in wartime, however, is, What prices are necessary to get the essential foods produced?

The principal cause of public misunderstanding of the farm-price situation is the failure to realize that the 1935–39 pre-war period is an unsound base from which to compute relative wartime increases in farm prices and in factory wages. In spite of considerable unemployment, the hourly wage rates of employed factory workers during this period were the highest in history up to that time. In striking contrast, farm prices for 1935–39 were still at depression levels, which caused suffering and loss to millions of farm people. During the thirties, city consumers became accustomed to food prices that were too low for national welfare and too low to be maintained in any period of active business which would provide alternative jobs for farmers and farm workers. The major part of the rise in farm prices since 1935–39 served only to bring them into reasonable adjustment with farm debts and costs, retail prices and the costs of living.

During World War No. 1, the per capita net income of the United States farm population increased more rapidly than that of the nonfarm population. Following 1920 the incomes of farm people declined and remained unfavorable in all except 3 years of the 20-year period from 1921 to 1940. In 1942, the per capita net income of the farm population again attained a favorable relation with nonfarm, as compared with 1910–14, although the actual per capita net incomes in 1942 were $389 for the farm and $1,023 for the nonfarm population.

Although retail prices of food have risen substantially from the low levels of 1939, they have increased less than the average per capita income of all the people in the United States. At present retail prices, the cost of a standard food budget takes 16 percent of the average per capita income, the lowest figure for any period in the last 30 years for which data are available and substantially lower than the range of 24 to 31 percent during World War No. 1. Actual average expenditures for food at present retail prices amount to 21 percent of per capita income, this higher figure being due to the larger proportion of choice foods being purchased by war workers at the present time.

With usual yields the present level of farm prices will result in average farm incomes which, while far below the earnings of industrial war workers, are favorable in comparison with farm incomes during the past 20 years. From the standpoint of long-time farm welfare any further marked increase in the general level of United States farm prices relative to farm costs is undesirable because it would increase the danger of inflation of farm land values. Furthermore, the families who remain on farms will do their utmost in food production at any level of prices. The vital question is not the level of farm prices that farmers want; it is the level that should be established in the real interest of consumers and of the Nation in order to permit farmers to retain labor, to meet increasing costs, and to maintain maximum production permitted by weather.

WHAT PRICES ARE NECESSARY TO GET THE ESSENTIAL FOODS PRODUCED?

Congressional insistence on the use of the "parity" formula in fixing ceiling prices of farm products was an attempt to prevent the general freezing of farm prices at depression levels which would restrict food production. While "parity" is a useful guide to the general level of farm prices necessary to maintain production, it cannot safely be used in the establishment of fixed ceiling prices for individual products, since it is based on historical relationships many of which have changed. The use of parity for this purpose is responsible for many of the maladjustments between the prices of individual farm products at the present time.

The first requirement of a wartime food program is to insure the production of the kinds and quantities of foods necessary to

meet probable needs. The only effective way to shift production is to adjust prices of the foods concerned to bring about the changes desired. If the War Food Administrator is responsible for food supplies, he should be able to establish the prices necessary to insure the success of his program.

In spite of this, during recent months our food price policy has been dictated by the general program of rigid price ceilings to keep down the cost of living and control inflation ignoring the effect of many of these prices in restricting production of needed foods. Little consideration has been given to the necessity for higher prices to cover the higher unit costs of short crops. Roll-backs have been ordered on the prices of meat, eggs, and other foods to reduce the cost of living to some arbitrary level without regard to their ultimate inflationary effect in reducting production and increasing the shortage. It is extremely difficult to convince consumers of this problem until an actual shortage occurs and then it is too late.

The greatest danger in the present food situation is the inflexibility of ceiling prices of individual products. Serious maladjustments in the farm price structure have been frozen there by inept and inflexible price-fixing efforts. Under ordinary conditions farm prices of food fluctuate constantly to bring about adjustment between demand and supply. Frozen prices prevent this corrective action and result in steadily increasing maladjustments the longer they are maintained.

For several months the price of hogs has made corn worth about $1.40 a bushel as feed for hogs. At the same time, O. P. A. has placed a ceiling price on corn sold in the open market at $1.07 per bushel at Chicago. The result has been a phenomenal rise in hog numbers and increasing difficulty for dairymen and poultrymen in getting corn for their cows and hens. Naturally, they cannot get corn at the ceiling price because the Government guarantees the Corn Belt farmer a higher return by feeding his corn to hogs and selling the hogs. These conflicting actions are so incredibly stupid that they would be laughable if the results were not so serious.

In ordinary times corn-hog price relationships change frequently in accordance with changing conditions of demand and supply. In the present situation these normal corrective price changes are prevented by Government price policies which have already jeopardized the supply of milk and eggs for cities, foods which are of critical importance in the maintenance of balanced diets. If Government price fixing is to be substituted for market prices in the guidance of farm production, it is imperative that changes in fixed prices be made promptly when occasion requires if disaster is to be avoided.

If we produce too little food or the wrong kinds of food, no rationing system can increase the physical supply nor change its composition. The first job is to be certain that we produce the needed quantities of the right kinds of food. The next is to see that the people get it who need it.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

Farmers, as well as farm organizations, are opposed to the general use of food subsidies. They do not like the arbitrary administrative controls that always accompany subsidy payments. Then, too, farmers feel that war workers are well able to pay the necessary price for food.

The argument that subsidies are necessary in preventing inflation ignores many factors. The actual cost of subsidy payments is increased substantially by the costs of administering such a program. Since these outlays are in addition to necessary war expenditures, the funds needed will not be raised by increased taxation nor War bond purchases but will be borrowed from banks, thus adding to the expenditures of government without reducing the purchasing power of consumers. The inevitable effect of such a program is to increase the inflationary pressure.

From the standpoint of the national food program, there is justification for the judicious use of some food subsidies. From this standpoint the logical place for subsidies would be to stimulate the consumption of economical and abundant foods, such as potatoes, flour, bread, soybeans, and dry beans by providing low prices, through subsidy if necessary. To use subsidies to reduce the prices of scarce foods like meat and butter on which we must economize severely doesn't make sense since it serves only to make rationing more difficult.

CAN TOTAL FOOD PRODUCTION BE INCREASED?

For 6 consecutive years, 1937 to 1942, the aggregate yields per acre of United States crops exceeded any year in history prior to this period. In 1942 the total production of all important crops was 28 percent above the 1923–32 average. While hybrid seed corn, improved production practices, and conservation measures contributed to this highly favorable result, the major factor was extremely favorable weather throughout the United States.

In view of these extremely favorable yields in recent years, the Nation will be fortunate if it can maintain crop production at the 1937–1941 level during the remainder of the present emergency even though all possible assistance is given to farmers. In spite of the steps taken, we still have critical shortages of skilled farm labor, machinery, fertilizers, and essential supplies.

While growing conditions have been generally favorable this year, the September forecast of 1943 crops shows a reduction in the overoptimistic early estimates of anticipated crop production. An unfavorable winter has reduced the probable size of our 1943 wheat crop about 15 percent below last year's record level. Wet weather caused serious delays in the planting of spring crops while floods destroyed considerable acreages already planted. There are serious drouths in some areas. The estimated total production of all food crops is about 9 percent belw 1942. There is no possibility of another bumper crop this year and the danger of a serious reduction cannot be disregarded until danger of frost damage is past.

The extremely rapid acceleration in livestock production (principally hogs and poultry) during the present war was made possible by a succession of phenomenal crops and was stimulated by the very favorable prices of livestock products relative to feed. The 1943 production of meat and other livestock products will be about 10 percent larger than the record output of 1942 because much of it is produced on last year's crops; but the supply next year will decline when the livestock population is reduced to available feed supplies.

Although the demand for meat and other livestock products is apparently unlimited the total production of these foods is determined by the total available feed supplies. The amount of each will depend on existing price relationships.

Under the stimulus of the Government program, livestock production has outrun feed supplies. The facts have been clearly evident for months. However, livestock production is continuing to expand in spite of inadequate feed supplies; because ceiling prices on feeds, especially corn, have prevented feed prices from checking the expansion of livestock at a point where all the animals could be fed.

The number of grain-consuming animal units on January 1, 1944, will probably be about 10 percent above last year and 30 percent above average. Based on the September forecast, feed supplies wil be about 8 percent lower than last year. Reduced pig production, marketing hogs at lighter weights, reduced production of choice grain-fed beef, reduced production of broilers and other poultry for meat, and less intensive grain feeding of dairy cows all will be necessary to meet this feed situation.

A continuation of present Government price policies will force those producers who run out of feed first to sell out regardless of the need for their product. If market prices are not to be allowed to keep livestock and feed in balance, it is imperative that a plan be developed for the orderly liquidation of livestock numbers and the equitable distribution of available feed supplies so as to provide feed for dairy cows and hens. The longer these readjustments are postponed, the more violent and wasteful the resulting liquidation will be and the greater the danger of a serious reduction in the supply of milk and eggs for cities.

FEEDING THE PEOPLE OF EUROPE

For all practical purposes United States peacetime food consumption has about equaled production with the exception of wheat.

Because of the probability of less favorable weather and the shortage of skilled farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and supplies, the chances of increasing total crop production above 1942 are extremely remote.

At the same time, the United States is faced with imperative demands for more food. The needs of our allies are growing steadily. Every country released from Axis domination will bring further increases in demand. Sicily and Italy are only the beginning. These requirements are certain to increase during the remainder of the war and will probably reach a maximum after fighting ends in Europe. At that time, most of the hundreds of millions of people who have been under Axis control will need some food until their own production can be restored and much of it must come from United States farms.

In view of this situation, it seems clear that the answer to the present food problem must be sought in the better utilization of our present food resources. The only way to save much food is to increase the direct human consumption of potatoes, bread, soybeans, dried beans and peas, and other crop products and reduce the civilian consumption of meat and animal products. These crops are of first importance in wartime because they provide many times as much energy and critical nutrients per acre or per man-hour as meat or livestock products.

Substituting direct consumption of crops for indirect consumption in the form of meat greatly increases the number of persons that can be maintained on a given quantity of crops. Animals are not efficient converters of grains and other concentrated feeds into human food although products richer in certain critical nutrients may result. In converting 7 pounds of corn into 1 pound of pork about 84 percent of the energy is lost. With other meats, the proportionate loss in energy is greater. In converting into livestock products the grain produced on United States farms in 194[illegible] about 86 percent of their energy value was lost without considering the hay, roughage, and pasture used as supplementary feed.

Any thought of feeding many additional millions of people on the diet to which we have been accustomed is utter nonsense. The 10 percent of our annual production to be used for lend-lease in 1943 would feed about 13 or 14 million people on a diet similar to our own. The same amount of concentrated foods would supplement the diets of a somewhat larger number of people. However, all told, the United States produced enough crops last year so that if all had been fed directly to human beings, they would have provided the energy requirements for a population more than three times our own.

If many additional millions are to be fed during the present emergency, it must be largely on wheat, soybeans, dried beans and peas, corn, and other crop products. Although such a ration is not as palatable nor as adequate nutritionally as one containing more livestock products, it will prevent starvation and provide a maintenance diet until European food production can be reestablished.

A drastic decrease in our civilian consumption of livestock products is neither practicable nor necessary, and only the direction of the change called for is suggested. The question of how far we can go without serious injury to health and morale is a question for the nutritionists to answer. The question of how far we are willing to go is a question for the people of the United States to answer. If we do not go quite a way, however, we shall not feed many people in addition to ourselves.

A WARTIME FOOD PROGRAM

1. Strengthen and clarify the powers of War Food Administrator so that he will have freedom and authority to plan and carry out a food program within the framework of policies laid down by Congress and the President. At the present time, decision on food policy and operations are made by officials who have neither adequate staffs nor public responsibility for their actions.

2. As the next step in a realistic wartime food program, the War Food Administrator should organize and carry out, in cooperation with the States, an intensive educational program to point out the facts of the present food situation and to emphasize the patriotic service of civilian conservation of food. It should include a clear statement of the importance of eating more crops and crop products but less meat and livestock products by civilians for the duration of the war. This is the only way to keep down the cost of a family food budget and at the same time provide prices necessary to maintain production.

Thus far, reliance has been placed largely on negative controls such as rationing to reduce consumption of choice foods, and threats rather than facts have been employed to make them effective. The public would respond willingly to an appeal which explains why this change in diet must be made as a necessary step toward winning the war and the peace.

An important part of this educational effort should be the guidance of the public in how good diets can be maintained with crops and available livestock products.

3. Establish guaranteed minimum prices of essential foods, well in advance of planting and breeding seasons, that will insure the desired production. Necessary prices to bring forth required production are the only sound guide in wartime price policy.

4. Increase the production of all important food crops to provide ample quantities to meet any possible need. We have already made a good start but we must go much further in increasing the production of such crops as potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry beans and peas, soybeans, peanuts, and vegetables.

5. Use the remaining crop acreage for the maximum production of the feed crops best adapted to individual farms.

6. Establish prices that will result in the use of available feed supplies for the production of the quantities and kinds of livestock products required to meet war demands and to balance civilian diets made up more largely of crop products.

7. Establish prices that will encourage maximum production of fluid milk and milk solids. There are two essential requirements in the maintenance of fluid-milk production, the assurance of an ample supply of feed and the establishment of a farm price of milk favorable to feed and other costs. The rapid increase in hog numbers has already jeopardized the feed supply and prompt adjustment is imperative to prevent a serious milk shortage.

8. Maintain the present skilled labor force on farms, and supplement it with necessary seasonal labor. Provide new machinery to replace worn out machines as well as repair parts, fertilizers, and essential supplies. If a serious attempt is to be made to meet the increased food-production goals announced for 1944, substantial additional amounts of skilled farm labor, new farm machinery, fertilizer and supplies will be required.

9. Maintain stocks of wheat, soybeans, beans, and other storable food at levels that will enable us to meet any probable demands for human food by European people at the end of the war. Additional wheat should not be fed to livestock until we are certain of the adequacy of the remaining supply to meet human needs. The wheat stocks of the United States and Canada are the only substantial reserves of human food that are available to meet any emergencies that may arise.

10. Give public recognition of the vital importance of the food problems and the patriotic service of efficient food production in winning the war and insuring the peace to follow.

11. Maintain the Victory garden program and increase it if possible. The need will be greater next year.

O. W. I. Pacific Coast Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. POULSON, Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion recently to come in contact with some of the activities of O. W. I. as applies to the radio on the Pacific coast. I find the administration to be of the highest caliber and a worth-while purpose is being served. In other words, the officials there attempt to screen out the unessential requests of the various departments for announcement of their activities, and furthermore, to condense and blend into the program the particular announcements which they consider necessary. They do attempt to definitely prohibit political propaganda. Therefore, I think it proper that I bring forth this information in fairness to O. W. I. as I heretofore have been one of those who voted to curtail its appropriation. I am speaking only for the Pacific Coast Division.

I am submitting herewith an address made by Mr. Cornwell Jackson, chief of that division, to the Writers Congress recently held on the campus of U. C. L. A.:

At an O. W. I. meeting last week, Col. Cliff Henderson told us that the only nourishment aviators have on their bombing missions is a large chocolate bar—so full of vitamins it is in his opinion throughly unpalatable.

It seems to me that radio comedy writers have succeeded where the nutritional experts have failed. For well over a year now, the comedy shows have dealt out entertainment in large and lavish portions, rich in comedy, yet brimming with vital Government information.

Listener ratings in radio have risen steadily and this could never have been possible if the programs had been lacking in entertainment value. A beautiful message, like a beautiful symphony, is worthless unless someone listens to it. Because the public does listen to comedy shows, these shows offer the best possible way to explain the Nation's problems to the largest possible portion of the Nation, and to make clear the urgent need for everyone's cooperation.

Two thousand years ago Horace could hardly have had radio in mind when he wrote, "A man learns more quickly and remembers more easily that which he laughs at." Yet this is particularly true today when we have seen in campaigns on the home front the staggeringly successful results of the radio comedian who, through his pungent wit, has prodded the lazier citizen into action, added impetus to the eagerness of those who are always willing to do what is asked of them, and exposed the excuses of the habitual shirkers.

It has been our task in O. W. I. to use our research facilities to assemble the facts—and they are facts without any political doctrines whatsoever—and supply them to the writers. How a writer uses this material—if he uses this material—is entirely his own affair. There is no compulsion; he is under no pressure from the Government. We see to it that he is informed of the Government's needs and policies—his—the American citizen's—needs and policies—and we feel that the writer's familiarity with his cast, the format of his show, makes him the best authority as to how he can take these facts and shape them into the architecture of his own program.

Now it is true that in the early days, we frequently had complaints from the writers—for writers, like soldiers, cab drivers, salesmen, actors, farmers and bureaucrats—love to complain—and the writers would often protest against the subject assigned their show. We'd explain, first of all, that if the writer couldn't handle the message he should forget about it. While it did throw the allocation schedule out of line, we certainly didn't want him to attempt anything that would destroy the entertainment value of his show. Perhaps we'd suggest that he give the appeal to his announcer. But this was usually shunned because the indefatigable Kay Kyser has exposed this lazy and ineffectual method to public ridicule. Finally, we'd try to help the writer find some way to incorporate the message into his script. This was usually like showing him a picture of your baby. He'd retaliate with a picture of his own baby. In other words, he was so scornful of our suggestion that he'd top it with a brilliant treatment of his own.

But now complaints are almost nonexistent. Shows vie with each other in their attempts to tell the Nation its needs and problems in an entertaining and witty fashion. I don't have to tell you which writers do the best shows, or how well they're done by practically everybody. Just turn on your radio this afternoon or tomorrow—no; you'll be here attending the lectures. Still, the next time you do listen, you'll hear what I mean.

The O. W. I.'s Radio Bureau is not my topic, but one point concerning it does seem worth emphasizing here: We are not a censorship bureau. We do not censor comedy or any other type of writing. That is the function of the Censorship Bureau. If a script contains something that we consider harmful, it is our job to show the writer and the producer that it is harmful—first to his country, but also to his product and to himself. If he cannot be convinced, and if it is not contrary to network policy, it goes on the air.

As the O. W. I. Radio Bureau came into being at the request of the radio industry—and survived last summer's congressional storm because the radio industry came to its support—we work as much for the industry as we do for the Government. You'd be

surprised how often we have to urge the programs to cut down on Government material.

But still, I don't want to give the impression it's all sunshine. Naturally, there are jokes written and broadcast that are harmful Laughs aren't easy to find, and comedy is extremely difficult to use in favor of anything, just as it is all too easy to use it as a weapon of ridicule. So the easy method, with time, the star, the sponsor, and all the rest, bearing down is to extract a laugh from the nearest source. And that is where the writer must exercise judgment and restraint.

There has never been a time in radio when the daily life and experience of all of us have been so wide open for humor—never has the writer been given a wider field of topical jokes. Now, often these jokes are a healthy release and we're all for that. But jokes that cause antagonism and dissension can only bring harm to all concerned. There's nothing funny about the black market and every time a writer grabs a laugh from this fertile field he is aiding the treasonable racketeers who are responsible for its existence. It's easy to joke about the lady welder, the draft or ration board official, the second lieutenant, and at times, it's even desirable to joke about them. But when the humor becomes ridicule it keeps women away from the war plants, it makes those officials devoting long hours to tough jobs without compensation ludicrous, it makes the parents of a private uneasy about the ability of the man who is leading their son into battle Then I think, the radio writer is not only misusing the magnificent weapon that he possesses, but is actually performing a disservice to his country

Many of the "don'ts" (or I'd rather call them "you shouldn'ts") are familiar to all writers. They sometimes fade into the background and become vague, unheaded whispers of a conscience groggy from overwork, the conflicting demands of employers and that red hand racing around the clock. Fortunately, this sort of thing is becoming less and less prevalent. Practically all radio writers have adopted our informational policy and have done it beautifully.

This is the first war in which radio has been universally employed. The American radio industry is the most vital and alert in the world. Obviously, this has to be true since it is the product of a system of free enterprise where the people, by their favor or disfavor, exercise over it the ultimate control.

Writers can and do contribute magnificently to radio and to their country's welfare by translating the cold facts and figures of the Nation's needs into warm and human messages that bring home to every citizen what he, or she, can do to help win this war.

There is an old saying—he who laughs last, laughs best. Thanks to our radio humorists, I think the people of America laugh best—and we who laugh best, will laugh last.

Fair Consideration of Finland's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution on behalf of fair consideration of Finland's case, signed by A. Haapanen, president of Suomi Synod, Hancock, Mich., and 35 others.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution calls attention to a very significant fact; namely, that certain small communistic groups, claiming to represent Finnish-Americans in this country, are urging that we declare war against that country. These groups are by no means representative of the patriotic Finnish-Americans living in this country who are completely loyal to the United States, but who wish also to see the democratic government of Finland remain intact. The policy of this country in dealing fairly with Finland should not be interrupted by this insignificant group of Communists among the American-Finns.

I have said before and I repeat it again, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty not only to deal fairly with Finland during the course of this war, but to see to it that her democratic government and the integrity of her borders are preserved following the peace. Certainly no foreign nation, large or small, ever dealt more honestly with this country than has Finland.

The democratic government of Finland is now and always has been friendly with this country. We would be ungrateful indeed if we let them down in their present hour of peril.

HANCOCK, MICH., *October 8, 1943.*

The Honorable SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

Whereas the Associated Press, on September 20, 1943, dispatched a news item stating that an organization calling itself the Finnish-American Trade Union Committee, claiming to represent 300,000 Finnish-American C. I. O. and A. F. of L. members, had sent a telegram to the President urging a declaration of war "against the Nazi-dominated Mannerheim government" of Finland; and

Whereas their claim of representing 300,000 Finnish-Americans in the C. I. O. and in the A. F. of L. is palpably an untruth because various estimates of the Finnish-American population place the entire working and non-working, young and old, at 300,000 to 500,000; and

Whereas the above-mentioned committee is in no way representative of the entire Finish-American population in the United States but is a small, purely Communist-inspired propaganda committee; and

Whereas we the undersigned are representatives of Finnish-American religious groups and constituents totaling approximately 150,000; and

Whereas there are in this country Finnish-American labor groups larger than these purportedly represented by the above committee who are not in harmony with its program; and

Whereas we the undersigned believe that our President and also our Secretary of State have not been apprized of the true sentiment prevailing among the Finnish-Americans, through the committee above mentioned, since it is not a truly representative group; and

Whereas we the undersigned fully realize that our Government is laboring under tremendous difficulties and therefore may be misinformed by an aggressive but small minority group: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully remind our President and our Secretary of State of the fact that Finland is a democratic state, patterned after ours, and that the relations between the two states have always been most cordial and honorable; and be it

Resolved, That we solemnly urge that Finland, despite the fact that the vagaries of war have forced her into her present situation, will not be deprived of the sustaining friendship of our great Nation; and that the exigencies of war will not cause our Government to swerve from our avowed democratic principles; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators of the State of Michigan, and to the Representative of the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan.

Pacific Northwest Aluminum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the brilliant and profound editor of that enterprising daily newspaper, the Tacoma News Tribune, has recently written another editorial in connection with the proposed construction of a test or pilot plant for making aluminum from local clays. Congressmen from the three Pacific Northwest States have been vitally interested in persuading Government officials, particularly the Metals Division of the War Production Board, of the need for proceeding with the location of a test or pilot plant in the Pacific Northwest.

The editorial speaks for itself and is as follows:

The dodging and buck passing by Government officials about the aluminum situation in the Northwest resembles the good old childhood game of "ring around Rosie." Three facts stand out in the present confusion. They are:

1. Aluminum is vitally needed by this country especially in the Pacific Northwest and on the Pacific coast where an immense quantity is going into airplanes.

2. There are large deposits of clays in the Pacific Northwest which can be used for making aluminum by an electric process already in successful use. The employment of this northwest clay would remove the necessity of transporting bauxite (from which aluminum is now made) great distances when transportation problems are so acute.

3. The aluminum industry has been controlled by a combine for years. This is made possible by control of deposits of bauxite.

The natural conclusion of the whole matter is that the successful development of northwestern clays for the purpose of making aluminum would disturb the combine's control of the industry. This is the real reason for the delay and excuses which have been made in blocking the plan to build a test plant here in the Northwest to use these clays.

The combine does not show its opposition openly but uses its powerful influence at Washington, D. C., to bring forth multitudinous objections to the establishment of alumina-from-clay industry in the Pacific Northwest. A while ago there was talk of a manpower shortage and the project was opposed from that angle. However, when it was proven that this small plant could be located in an area with no labor shortages, a change of front was made. Then Government officials said that stock piles of bauxite have

been accumulated in this country that will guarantee aluminum production for 3 years more.

Another Washington official now says that the new plant could not be in production for 18 months and "that would be too late to aid in the war effort." Apparently, this official believes that the war is to be of short duration, as opposed to Army and Navy officials' declaration that we may have 3 or 4 years of conflict.

This is all camouflage. There is every indication that the Aluminum Trust does not want such a plant here in the Northwest to disturb its hold on the post-war aluminum market. The Northwest must take this fact into account and wage the fight for the new plant accordingly.

At a recent meeting of the Production Executives Committee of the War Production Board, with members of the congressional delegations from the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, it was brought out by questioning of Dr. Bunker, Chief of the Light Metals Division of the W. P. D., that the Aluminum Co. of America and its affiliate, the Aluminum Co. of Canada, control 75 percent of the bauxite deposits in British and Dutch Guiana and, likewise, the major portion of the remaining bauxite deposits in the State of Arkansas, in this country. It would appear, then, that the Aluminum Trust stands to gain by the insistence of Federal agencies upon complete and exclusive dependence upon bauxitic material for the manufacture of aluminum. I can envision only too vividly the predicament of this country at the time when the bauxite is exhausted within our own borders and we are compelled to depend upon bauxite from Latin America, controlled by the Aluminum Trust, for our production. We will be at the mercy of this combine as to price, quantity, and quality of bauxite.

Recently there appeared editorials in Pacific Northwest newspapers bearing on the subject of the authorization and erection of an experimental pilot plant for the creation of alumina from clay. These editorials vigorously express the sentiment entertained by the overwhelming majority of the residents of the Pacific Northwest on this topic.

The editorials are as follows:

Portland, Oreg.: From an editorial in the Oregon Journal:

"One of the most important war industries of the Nation and what may well become the most important industrial development in the entire Pacific Northwest—the Columbia Metals Corporation alumina-from-clay plant—is being held up by a theoretical shortage of manpower.

"The plant can prove and make available for the war effort at least 100,000,000 tons of aluminous clay in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It can become the means of making us independent of far-away foreign bauxite and supplement the almost exhausted domestic supply. It can feed aluminum to hungry Pacific coast warplane plants and become the center of a new chemical industry. It can be built and be in operation in less than a year, if started immediately. It should be immediately. Precious months already have been lost. Further delay represents actual obstruction, either witting or unwitting, to the war effort."

Wenatchee, Wash.: From an editorial in the Wenatchee Daily World:

"This whole aluminum tie-up by which aluminum clay is being discouraged comes from the monopoly boys down east. It was these same monopoly boys who got Jesse Jones to dig up $69,000,000 of Government money to build the Shipshaw power and aluminum plant in Canada.

"It was the monopoly boys who for years opposed the building of the pulp and paper industry in the Northwest. This is now a $150,000,000 industry in the Northwest. It is the monopoly boys who are opposing the construction of any alcohol plants in the West. The whisky men have control of the alcohol production at the present time. It was the monopoly down east who fought the development of Boulder Dam and subsequent construction of Grand Coulee. But Grand Coulee itself is going a long way toward forcing the development of Northwest industry."

Portland, Oreg.: From an editorial in the Portland Oregonian:

"If the region is beaten in this effort to obtain an alumina-from-clay plant, it might as well put aside any hope of obtaining other new war industries, possibly including a bauxite plant. And no one knows what difficulties will arise if we wait until the war ends before taking steps to protect and preserve the industries we already have."

The Pacific-Northwest Alumina Committee has also directed the attention of the Government to certain statements made by officials of the Northwest relating to the same subject matter. These statements are as follows:

Portland, Oreg.: From a wire to Dr. C. K. Leith, consultant on minerals for the War Production Board at Washington from Earl K. Nixon, director of the Oregon State Department of Geology and Mineral Industries:

"Understand W. P. B. is to review subject alumina plant for Northwest. Would sincerely appreciate your presenting if possible following points to proper authorities: (1) Manpower situation outside metropolitan areas Seattle, Tacoma, Portland not critical as evidenced statement by Stoll, director Oregon W. M. C. reading: 'Manpower situation in and around Canby area can definitely fill all labor requirements of such a plant locally. People from this area travel 30 to 40 miles daily to Portland area, using gas and tires as well as being 3 to 4 hours on road, causing absenteeism in Portland shipbuilding yards. There is no critical labor shortage in war industries in that area. Statement refers to alumina plant location. (2) Pacific Northwest aluminum plant outlay not great and if successful should have far reaching effect on economy of Northwest and future safe position of country in aluminum ore tonnage reserves. (3) As war is not yet won and end not definitely in sight, in view of changing developments, the alumina plant still rates in war necessities category. (4) Alumina plant is justified on basis its possible favorable effect present and future on utilization electric power from installations in which Government, therefore taxpayers, have tremendous investment."

Olympia, Wash.: From letter to Secretary Harold Ickes of the Interior Department from the Washington State Planning Council.

"This council believes that failure to establish the alumina operation in the Northwest now will seriously jeopardize its long range development of light metals, a program in which the Federal Government has already played so large a role through development of low-cost power.

"The council urges careful consideration be given requests of the Pacific Northwest Alumina Committee for establishment of the alumina-from-clay plant in the Pacific Northwest now."

The Pacific Northwest Alumina Committee, of which Roe Shaub, of Tacoma, is president, and A. J. Ritchie, of Seattle, director, made this recent important announcement:

Washington: Possibility of a congressional investigation into the peculiar chain of circumstances that has been blocking the establishment of a Pacific Northwest alumina industry loomed today. Following a meeting of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California delegations, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, requested that the War Production Board defer final decision in the alumina matter and intimated he would demand a congressional investigation to find out the reason behind the failure to give the project the green light.

Addresses Before American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include some addresses made before a meeting of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club on the evening of July 9, 1943. These addresses were made by Dr. Andrew S. Beshore, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the physically Handicapped; Mr. Lewis Hines, of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Monroe Sweetland, of the C. I. O. War Relief Commission; Mr. N. P. Alifas, president of District 44 of the International Association of Machinists and legislative representative of the Metal Trades Council; Mr. Paul Sifton, of the National Farmers' Union; and Mr. Lawrence Q. Lewis, executive director of the National Society for the Blind.

Mr. STRACHAN. The chairman of the meeting is Dr. Andrew S. Beshore, of Pennsylvania, who will now take over. Dr. Beshore.

Dr. BESHORE. This is the second time that I have had the distinction of appearing before this group. I am glad to see a large number of us here, and know there would be several hundred more, if there was not the omnipresent necessity of a war to win. Some of us are in there "pitching" on night work on the production line. They would like to be here, but they cannot fail the call to duty.

I am not going to take much of your time, because you have some real speakers here tonight, and I am sure that you are all anxious to hear their messages, and I am sure that those here tonight will have a message that will assure promotion of the interests of this great organization, and I trust that each individual in this group will do his utmost to advance this organization. Since last being with you, I have sacrified much, on several occasions, to promote this federation, and we have several lodges in Pennsylvania with more to come.

I am happy to note that we have on the platform tonight Lewis Hines, former secretary of labor of Pennsylvania. I want to say that I never had a finer friend than Mr. Hines. He did everything he could to advance vocational rehabilitation in Pennsylvania, and particularly to see that I remained in

charge of that program, but it was not possible, and I finally resigned. I regret that step—not because I have not been able to earn a good livelihood since that time, but because I feel that I could have helped the physically handicapped materially.

During those years back there I discovered one thing, however, and that is that one can get nowhere without organization. In order to accomplish things there must be organization. The American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations—all of them started with a nucleus. I want you to think of those things, and to bear that in mind. We are just beginning, but we can, and will become one of the most powerful organizations in the country. There are some 23,000,000 handicapped in the United States, potential members to become affiliated with us. I hope all of you will do your utmost to advance our cause, and build up our organization.

We have a fine example set for us. Take, for instance, our present President—he is 75 percent physically handicapped, and many, many times I am amazed to see what he can do, and how he can carry on. It amazes me, too, to hear persons say that they cannot afford the three or four dollars that it may take to affiliate with an organization. Paul, among other disabilities, is totally deaf; he has been, at various times, representative of labor and other organizations; he is the most dynamic individual that I have ever known. But without the cooperation of others, he nust, eventually be bogged down. Sometimes I am even ashamed that I cannot do more. I have the distinction and honor of presenting to you, the national president of the A. F. P. H., Mr. Paul A. Strachan.

Mr. STRACHAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, friends, and fellow members, we are here tonight to give recognition to an idea—that is, that the physically handicapped have a right to be a part of the social and economic life of this Nation. I believe what we have done, in the brief space of 1 year, has been exceptional. We have succeeded in having focused upon the handicapped, the necessity of their utilization in the war effort; we have succeeded also in establishing the value of the handicapped in everyday problems.

I am certain that the program of this Federation will be the greatest forward movement for handicapped people that has ever been started. I am not going to dwell upon the details of that program—most of us know it—but I will say that there is going to be a determined effort to impress upon Congress and upon the public what we are trying to do. However, we cannot expect people to do for us unless we are willing to do for ourselves. In other words, we must intensify our efforts and continue the fight for greater recognition and wider opportunities.

The following telegrams were received:

The welfare of the physically handicapped is indissolubly linked with the welfare of the Nation. Success to our mass meeting.

JESSE D. GROSS,
First Vice President,
A. F. P. H., Canton, Ohio.

For 25 years I have been intimately connected with the problems of the handicapped, and I am sure that the program projected by the A. F. P. H. is the greatest advance in the solution of those problems. Best wishes to all speakers, members, and attendants at meeting.

CHESTER C. HADDAN,
Second Vice President,
A. F. P. H., Denver, Colo.

Although I am now in the hospital, I assure you no mere operation will remove my enthusiasm for A. F. P. H. We have already made wonderful progress in bringing new hope to the handicapped. Good luck to you.

Miss AUGUSTA B. WEAVER,
Seventh Vice President,
A. F. P. H., Sapulpa, Okla.

Speaking for the deaf in A. F. P. H., we assure you of our continued interest in all efforts to ameliorate the conditions of the handicapped. Let us all join in the Victory march.

AUGUST F. HERDTFELDER,
Ninth Vice President,
A. F. P. H., Silver Spring, Md.

Nearly 23 years ago the first Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act was placed upon the statute books. I remember it well, because I was on the legislative committee of one of the affiliated labor organizations seeking enactment of that measure. I know, therefore, that organized labor has a great interest in vocational training and rehabilitation generally, and affords me a real pleasure to introduce to you Mr. Lewis Hines, former secretary of labor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who is here tonight representing the American Federation of Labor, and that organization's president, Mr. William Green.

Mr. HINES. Mr. Chairman, Vice President WALLACE, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen who go to make up this splendid group of my fellow Americans:

I am primarily here tonight to represent President William Green of the A. F. of L., who asked me only this afternoon to indicate to those of you here tonight that we are 100 percent behind your program, and that we are going to support it, and will urge Congress to do so, because after a study of that program, we are convinced that such a program is going to have a tremendous appeal, and that as time goes on, the problem of the handicapped is going to be a tremendous problem.

I do not have to tell members of the Disabled American Veterans, some of whom are here tonight, anything about such a problem. They have had some little experience along such lines. Some time ago we set up a unit within the State of Pennsylvania to handle employment of disabled veterans. We did not get very far, and really nothing has been done since that time in that direction.

This is a problem that properly belongs within the United States Employment Service. I feel that there should be something done along that line to develop full measures of the obligation to provide assistance for the disabled within that group. There will be more and more disabled from now on due to the war, and due to the fact that the accident rate is increasing more and more each day. I know what it means to the disabled man to be able to follow a gainful occupation, and to support himself and his family. And, while some steps have been taken in the direction of assisting these men through vocational training, we have only scratched the surface.

I do not want to take up the time of this gathering here tonight, but I do want to say that we will aid you in the program you have outlined, because such aid as this is in line with the program of the A. F. of L., and support of the Kelley resolution is strictly a humanitarian and economic necessity.

Also I want to say, if at any time our organization can be of assistance to you, do not hesitate to call upon us. I thank you.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Mr. Hines.

I have been reliably informed that there are more than 300,000 members of the C. I. O. who are now handicapped in one way or another. That organization, therefore, has a very keen interest in what we are trying to do, and I am very glad to present to you its representative here tonight, Mr. Monroe Sweetland, director, C. I. O. war-relief commission. Mr. Sweetland.

Mr. SWEETLAND. Mr. Chairman, Vice President WALLACE, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, what I have to say to you in these few minutes can be expressed in a few words. The C. I. O. is interested in this cause of yours, and in enactment of House Resolution 230, and other similar proposals. Why are we interested? Why is the C. I. O. concerned about this?

We are concerned, first, because, as your President has just told you, we have about 300,000 members of our organization at the present time who are handicapped. Thousands of others may become so. Thousands so handicapped but who, given proper training and an opportunity to work, would be self-supporting. Many such persons are members of the C. I. O., and many others are members of the families of C. I. O. members.

We are interested in maximum production during this war. Such maximum production lags through the necessity of such retraining programs for the handicapped who might be able to step in and take a place in the production line.

We are interested, also, because we have only begun to face this problem. Very few Americans realize that more persons have been injured or diseased—handicapped in one way of another—in industry and labor than there are veterans. Now, I submit to you that these men and women who lose their lives, or are injured, are as much entitled to assistance as are the men in the armed forces. And, as the war continues, steps must be taken so that we will be able to face these problems—which are identical. We are interested in a program for all Americans—one that will enable them to support themselves and their families within this great United States of which we are all a part.

Just few years ago the C. I. O. met under the same circumstances as you are meeting here tonight—a confederation of organizations and individuals getting together for mutual benefit. Only those who have faced similar problems realize how essential it is to be organized; how essential it is to have friends like Congressman KELLEY, and President Roosevelt, and other friends who care. But they are helpless and crippled to do anything in your behalf without your organized help—not just the help of one handicapped group, but all of you.

Do not let those with heart trouble be against those who are deaf or hard of hearing—or those who are tubercular be against those who are crippled, and so forth. Most of your problems are common problems, and your chances of winning will be far greater if you are working together than in diversified directions.

When you face the post-war readjustment period you are going to face problems which even the able-bodied will find difficult, and the most powerful ally you will have—if you are to succeed—will be the great American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railroad brotherhoods in getting a program of full employment for all Americans so that they may earn their own livings.

You are starting late—I—we—only hope that you will be overwhelmingly successful. I am here to tell you you have friends—powerful friends. If you will organize, together with these powerful friends, you can win this fight for the handicapped. I thank you.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Mr. Sweetland. I am sure we will give you no peace until the program for the handicapped has been put over.

I always take pleasure in presenting good friends and old friends, and in the case of the next gentleman I have fought with him for some 28 years. I know that he has always been on the side of the underdog and that

he is regarded on the Hill, and elsewhere, as an extremely capable legislative representative. I take pleasure in presenting Mr. N. P. Alifas, president, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, and legislative representative of the Metal Trades Council. Mr. Alifas.

Mr. ALIFAS. Mr. Chairman, Vice President WALLACE, President Strachan, honored guests, and friends, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to come here tonight, in furthering the great cause for which you will organize. And when I say that I really mean it. Had I not been pleased to come here tonight, I would not be here.

Your President is a man of great force of character, and I predict that every Member of the House and Senate, if not in this mass meeting, know well his energy and ability, and that the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the machinists, and others will do their full part in getting this program across.

I happen to have been in this work a good many years. Even at the time of the passage of the first legislation for vocational rehabilitation, I was representing a similar organization. The first board was composed of six members—the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and one representative each from agriculture, labor, and business interests. From that time on, many acts have been put on the statutes. The Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation is even now acting in an advisory capacity to the United States Office of Education, still operating, particularly on behalf of the physically handicapped.

Why are the machinists so interested in this act? Aside from the fact of always being altruistic, we are always in favor of uplifting the under dog. The National Safety Council recently announced that 4,700,000 workers had been injured to the extent of becoming permanently physically handicapped. This gives a person an inferiority complex, and is not only not good for the individual, but also tends to hinder our total production. Rehabilitation, so that a man may support himself and his family, gives that man a sense of pride at taking a part in the world's work, and I believe that rehabilitation of the handicapped individual is absolutely necessary and should be an obligation of our Government. We believe that House Resolution 230 should be enacted into law, and wish you success in this worthy effort.

I know that you are waiting to listen to a very distinguished speaker, and I shall close my remarks by saying that we are behind you in your present program, and will do what is in our power to help your very able president, Paul Strachan.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Mr. Alifas. I hope that the machinists will take their wrenches and tighten up all the screws in an effort to put over the passage of House Resolution 230.

Labor is not the only group represented here tonight, for it is not the only group that is interested in the rehabilitation and placement of the handicapped—which affects every segment of our population. In agriculture, for example, the National Safety Council reports that the past year 1,500,000 farmers and farm workers were injured, of whom 18,000 were killed, and 75,000 became permanently disabled.

It gives me pleasure at this time to present to you Mr. Paul Sifton, national legislative representative of the National Farmers Union, who, incidentally, has had considerable personal experience with vocational rehabilitation work as a former official in New York State. Mr. Sifton.

Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I shall make my remarks here tonight very brief. The head of our organization, the National Farmers Union, Mr. James E. Patton, has authorized and directed me to say that we are pushing for your program, and for this bill, now before Congress.

We understand the needs as to the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped in this country, and we understand that the purpose is to provide proper training for the handicapped so that they may be equipped to do their full share of the work to be done, and to receive equitable payment therefor.

We can support such a movement quite naturally because of the purposes of our own organization, and in this period of total war the need is even greater, for we are forced to do much which we do not have to do in time of peace.

The National Farmers Union will be fighting for you.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Mr. Sifton. It is a pleasure to know that the farmers of this Nation will leave no furrow unturned to help us in our future battles.

We have with us tonight a man who is a charter member of the A. F. P. H., and who represents one of the most important groups in the handicapped movement. I now present Mr. Lawrence Q. Lewis, executive director, the National Society for the Blind. Mr. Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, Vice President WALLACE, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: What I am going to say is very brief, but I hope to the point. Most of us do not know that in these United States there are some 300,000 blind persons, and that it is estimated by the experts that only about 20,000 of them are employed in normal occupations, and that another 75,000 or 80,000 receive some social security aid or pensions of one sort or another at an average rate of $21.68.

Rehabilitation of the physically handicapped is certainly a step in the right direction. Therefore, the National Society for the Blind has been greatly interested in the so-called Barden-La Follette bill to furnish vocational rehabilitation to the physically handicapped, and also in House Resolution 230 because this resolution calls for a complete study of this whole problem.

It is a pleasure to know that we have friends like Mr. Kelley who will press for legislation to help the handicapped of this Nation to regain their rightful places in the social and economic structure of this great country.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

Mobilization of Scientific and Technical Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the Mobilization of Scientific and Technical Resources, made by the Vice President before the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Committee on October 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to support your interest in one of the most urgent problems before the American people today—the full use of our technological resources to win a decisive victory and to build an enduring peace. In our struggle to translate the total capabilities of this Nation into an effective striking force, we have every reason to be proud of the splendid achievements of science, both in industry and in government. We must realize, however, that in reality we have only begun to marshal the inventive skills and energy of the American people on the scale required for the tasks which lie ahead.

There is a new and vital power at work in the modern world. The constant and rapid evolution of science and technology is a force changing the lives of all men. The dynamic pressure and stimulus of technology have already altered the structure of society beyond the furthest vision of our ancestors. Yet we know that these developments are still in their early stages. The profound transformations in the economic and political basis of society resulting from technological change have posed inescapable problems to democratic governments.

If advances in science are to bring corresponding advances in well-being, freedom, and opportunity for growth to the people of the world, democratic governments must assume their share of responsibility. To facilitate broad and fruitful research, to cope with the adjustments which must be made, and to explore those areas of science which directly concern national welfare, it is essential for government to offer both guidance and assistance to the creative ability of our people. One of the most priceless possessions of this country is the inventive ingenuity of the American public. To give free play to this creative urge and to provide support and encouragement for its expression, government must cooperate with industry and with individual inventors.

The purpose of this bill S. 702, as I understand it, is to unleash the energies of the American people by full use of labor, resources, and technology. The method is to foster scientific research and make it available to all people. The possible results are beyond computation, but I would estimate that each dollar of Federal money spent in such an enterprise would return in a few years many dollars of increased income—more than enough to compensate the Federal Government for any Federal outlay.

Total war is primarily a contest for superiority in the quantity and quality of equipment. It is therefore essential that we summon every atom of ability we possess to provide our fighting men with the best weapons that can be made. There is no surer way to reduce the cost in lives of our soldiers than to give them arms with more deadly efficiency than the enemy can match. To this end we must make certain that every avenue of research is completely explored—that every improvement of worth is brought to the attention of the Army and Navy, and that every necessary technical facility is made available for our armed forces.

The winning of the war, however, is only the first step in the job we have to do. If scientific discovery is to be used to repair the ravages of war and to create a society in which full employment and full production are maintained, we must open the door to technology for all our people. This war has given us an insight into the potential scientific and industrial developments of the future. In aviation, in housing, in medicine, and in a whole range of new industries we shall have the chance to find new opportunities, to create better conditions of living, and to release the dynamic energy of democratic society.

To stimulate new enterprise, technological freedom, no less than political freedom, must be safeguarded. It is the responsibility of government to see that no artificial barriers are placed in the way of these developments. We must utilize our wealth of scientific skill to guarantee a constant flow of new ideas and industries into our economy.

Out of our laboratories, both government and private, are coming a flood of discoveries. When the veil of secrecy imposed by war is lifted our people will stand amazed at the array of inventions. A new world is being fashioned in our laboratories. Developments of new airplanes and helicopters, light metals and plastics, television and radio, new foods and medicines will open vast industrial frontiers. Those must be turned to achieving full employment of labor and full utilization of our productive resources. Without the fullest play of the principle of free private enterprise we shall fall short of this goal.

But free enterprise will be shackled and restrained if research is dominated by a small number of large corporations and cartels. This control has already barred small businessmen from many of our industrial developments, as the hearings before your committee, as well as other congressional committees, have demonstrated.

The application of modern science should not be the exclusive domain of great corporations and cartels who can, if they desire, restrict and suppress new inventions and scientific information to suit their own interests instead of the public interest. Unless the little man has access to the bounties of technology, free enterprise will suffer, to the detriment of full employment of labor and our resources.

Small business cannot support the large and costly laboratories which are necessary for modern industrial research. To fill this need Government must make available these facilities. The lack of scientific and technological resources in small business institutions has hampered the mobilization of small business for the war effort. Evidence before this committee has indicated that most of our present research is concentrated in about one hundred companies. This concentration, which inevitably results in the restricted dissemination of scientific information and know-how and the restricted utilization of the benefits of science, must be replaced by the broad basis proposed by S. 702. The philosophy of this bill will give to the big man as well as the little man opportunity to make his contribution to the maximum employment of labor and greatest utilization of our natural resources.

There is one field of research with which I feel that I am quite familiar. For more than two generations the Government has taken an active part in conducting, sponsoring, and coordinating research in agriculture. In fact, by far the greater part of all research done in agriculture has been initiated or aided by the Government. I do not wish to detract from the credit which is quite properly being given to the farmers, food handlers, processors, and distributors for the amazing job which is being done in feeding and clothing a large part of the world. I believe that they should receive all the credit which we have been giving them and more. I don't believe anyone will seriously dispute with me the statement that their ability to do this grand job is very largely due to the vast number of improvements in crop production, handling, and processing which the years have brought.

In colonial times it required 19 families on the land to produce food for themselves and for 1 family in town, whereas today 1 family on the land raises for itself and for 4 families in town. For every acre the average farmer cultivated in 1850, he now can cultivate 3 acres with greater efficiency.

It is only because of the extraordinary technological discoveries of the United States Department of Agriculture and the State experimental stations in soil management, cooperative breeding, and livestock feeding that we in the United States have been able so far this year to ship food abroad at an annual rate of about ten billion pounds, and at the same time give our own consumers the best diet they have ever had.

The Department of Agriculture, the State experiment stations, financed jointly by the Federal Government and the States, the four great regional laboratories, furnish abundant and conclusive evidence that Government research can lead the way.

I read this bill, S. 702, with the background of my association with the agricultural research program. I know full well that there are great fields of necessary research which cannot and should not be entrusted to the sole control of private companies whose primary aim and responsibility is to further the interest of their stockholders. These companies, particularly the larger ones, are doing a fine job of industrial research and a very large percentage of our advancement in that field is, of course, traceable to work in large commercial laboratories. However, one needs to focus attention not upon the advancement which has been made, but rather upon that which might have been made and was not, and upon what should be and may not. In some cases the blame for lack of advance may be put squarely on the shoulders of private interests whose selfishness has blocked advance. In a far larger number of situations, the failure to move forward is not the fault of any single company nor of any group. It is due to the lack of an over-all agency which is so constituted as to take the long view and so equipped as to do something about it. Public supported research has done exactly that in the field of agriculture.

The primary objective of S. 702 is to enable government to do the same thing in industry as it has already done in agriculture, but on a broader scale. It would provide a supplementation and coordination of existing research facilities, both public and private. It would extend to all technology something similar to the benefit which has come from coordinated effort in the field of agricultural research.

I believe that the small manufacturer is in a position not unlike the owner of the family-size farm. In each case there is lacking the money, the personnel, the time, and the facilities for conducting adequate research. The defeat and elimination of either a family-size farm or a small manufacturer may be a momentary victory for a powerful competitor, but as a rule society is the loser. The Nation cannot allow its small farmers to suffer discouragement and defeat. The extensive agricultural research program has been a real contribution to free enterprise.

I have spoken on behalf of releasing our human and natural resources for victory and for peace—on behalf of unleashing the energies of the American people by the full use of labor, resources, and technology for the benefit of all. We are well on the march to victory because we have marshalled the irresistible power of cooperation between science, government, and all classes of our people. We shall not fail in securing a peace commensurate with the awful price we have to pay for victory if we perpetuate this spirit of cooperation—if business enterprise, statesmen, and governments here and in other lands make resources and technology and the fruits of labor and ingenuity fully available to the many.

The ingenuity of our men of science, both in Government and private enterprise, and the direction given through our democratic form of government, have overnight created vast new industries. We have diverted most of our enterprises to war purposes, but much of what we have done in the interest of speedy victory will be economic distortions in peace and will call for speedy correction. The task of converting the new plants and facilities and putting both public and private inventions to useful work will be great and complex. We will succeed if we fix our eyes on the simple rule of wise government and of truly great enterprise, namely, the greatest good to the greatest number.

Other peoples, their governments, their scientists and their private enterprises face even greater problems than ours. Many of them have had their resources not only distorted to war purposes but actually destroyed by the ravages of war. Some of them fear that their post-war markets for their resources have been placed in great jeopardy by the sudden rise of substitute industries elsewhere. Great as is our need for the full release of our scientific discoveries so that none of our regions, none of our occupations, and none of our industries be plagued with joblessness, even greater will be the call in other countries upon the power of government and technology because of the dual need for rehabilitation and for creating new uses for their raw materials and labor resources. If we or any other country find it necessary in the general interest to retain the newly created industries that deprive other countries of their pre-war markets, the living standards of other countries need not be undermined if modern science has a chance to put itself to work in the interest of the general welfare.

Science and technology, like goodwill, have no natural bounds. They can now counteract the maldistribution of the world's raw materials, and make nations less dependent upon distant sources of supply. They have also demonstrated another fact of tremendous import, namely, that natural resources are transmutable, interchangeable, and capable of multiple uses.

Increasingly, technology has become a concern of statecraft. The abrupt impact of science often produces maladjustments in our own economy and in the economic life of other countries. Government must be competent to deal with such situations, and to work out fair and just solutions. To meet such needs, government requires sufficient technical resources and information to formulate and to carry out sound technological policies.

It seems clear to me that this committee, in investigating the mobilization of scientific and technical resources, is working on one of the most important factors in winning the war and creating a secure, prosperous peace. The welfare and safety of our Nation depends upon a rapid growth of our sciences and techniques. But it also requires that the scientific findings be used to the benefit of all sections of the Nation. Both wartime and peacetime experience shows that, to insure this, advances should be made along the lines of S. 702. The most important in my opinion are:

1. There should be set up a central technical authority of the Federal Government. This authority should coordinate the increasing activities of the Government in scientific fields. It should not dictate the methods to be carried out by existing Federal scientific bureaus, but should serve as a clearinghouse for these organizations. It should help their understanding and willingness to work together as a team.

2. Every business and institution should have full access to all patents and research findings which have been developed at Government expense. The Congress has provided large sums of money, which are being poured into Federal, university, and industrial laboratories. It is the intention of the Congress that this money be spent for the benefit of the general public, not for the exclusive benefit of a few corporations.

Likewise, those enemy patents seized by the Alien Property Custodian should become the property of the Federal Government and be made available to all businesses. These patents should not be turned over to a few corporations or returned to their former alien ownership. The compensation should eventually be made to Axis nationals under procedures prescribed for all types of seized enemy property.

3. Federal support of research has achieved remarkable results in this war. This support should be continued in the post-war period. Today large corporations hold a virtual monopoly over laboratory facilities engaged in applied research But there are many fields of research which are not fully covered by existing laboratory set-ups There are a number of fields which require Federal support. I believe that Federal funds should support especially (a) fundamental science, the mother of applied science, with whom the welfare and prosperity of the Nation rests; (b) research and development wherever it affects national interest, such as in national defense, public health, public housing, and the balanced regional development of the entire Nation. The Federal Government could see to it that the results of this research be distributed throughout the South as well as the North, the West as well as the East. There should be no concentration of benefits in specific institutions or areas.

4. Small business is in drastic need of technical information. Each State should have a technical information center. This center could distribute existing information which is in the hands of Federal agencies. But, more important, it could initiate research projects which are of special importance to the local area.

I can see no reason why the Federal Government cannot conduct the above activities while the Nation at the same time continues to benefit from private research. It can even assist industries which have up to now not realized the value of conducting their own private research. The balanced growth of all industries is of great importance to the progressive economic development of the country in the war and the post-war period alike.

If we use the catalytic, that is the stimulating power of government to aid private enterprise to serve the economic needs of the common man; if we cooperate with other governments to direct the good will that is in all of us and the genius that burns in the real men of science and enterprise toward a common goal; and if that common goal is abundance, security, and happiness, the present hell of war will be more certainly succeeded by the happiness of peace.

Shipping for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Shipping for Victory," delivered by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], over the Columbia Broadcasting System on October 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American shipping is vital to winning the war. It can help win it faster, it can bring our boys home from the battle fronts sooner—if it is better mobilized. I am not carping when I say that our shipping can be mobilized better. A country at war must work for perfection. We must constantly change and change and change our tactics until we have the best method to do the job. And we must remember that the job in shipping is to get the greatest possible tonnage of war materials to the fighting forces at the earliest possible moment. We must deal in maximums. Minimums and averages have no place in the prosecution of a war. There must be no diversion of ships or the men that sail them from war shipping and there must be no diversion of war shipping from the most effective use to a less effective use.

The Subcommittee on War Mobilization, of which I am chairman, has just issued a report on the shipping resources of our country. I am happy to say it is optimistic. We have today 3,000,000 more tons of shipping than we had expected for 1943 This windfall has come to us because of the sharp drop in submarine sinkings, coupled with a record-breaking output of new ships. The Allied navies and our shipyards have done a remarkable job and have pushed the war closer to a victorious end.

What does this mean in respect to changing our military outlook?

It means that we now have an unexpected increase in valuable shipping facilities instead of the shortage which crippled our effort during the first year of the war. It means that we can deliver the decisive blow in Europe this year, that we can fulfill the orders of our Commander in Chief and strike at the enemy's heart.

However, we cannot accomplish this task without fully mobilizing these shipping facilities for military use. We cannot dissipate this shipping on peacetime commerce. We must load every ship swiftly, and pack it to the last pound and to the last cubic foot.

The United Nations have at their disposal 50,000,000 tons of shipping of all kinds. With this gigantic merchant fleet we can concentrate our striking power as dictated by the changing strategy of global war. With it we can support any concentrated offensive to come.

We are interested in seeing that the world-wide military strategy laid down by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and the Combined Chiefs of Staff is carried out with the greatest possible efficiency in the shortest possible time.

The Subcommittee on War Mobilization cannot, and has no desire to lay down policies of military strategy. That is a matter for the executive heads of the Allied Nations and their military staffs. They choose the fighting fronts which are to be struck and issue the orders for the advance against the Axis. It remains for us behind the lines to devote our energies to seeing that these orders are carried out; to see that they are carried out promptly and in a way that will insure success.

Our report is aimed at increasing the efficiency of this transport fleet, as girding it to meet the increased job it will be called on to do. It recommends specific measures to increase the striking effectiveness of our shipping.

I have said that our shipping windfall gives us an unexpected increase. But it must be emphasized that there can never be too many ships for all-out offensive warfare. Shipping will always be a bottleneck unless careful planning is made to use all the cargo space to the fullest extent. Although the shipping goals for 1943 are being met, we are still sending troops overseas at barely half the rate achieved during the last war when our shipping supply was far less than it is now. The conditions are now such that we can soon reach this peak. We can achieve the War Department goal of 5,000,000 men overseas 6 months ahead of schedule. This can mean setting our fighting schedule ahead. The war can be won more quickly. Fewer lives will be lost in winning it.

An all-out offensive takes ships, ships and more ships. We have the ships to support limited offensives in several theaters of war. Or we have the ships to support one supreme offensive aimed at a knock-out blow and maintain our other offensives on a mounting basis. Today such an offensive is mounting in Europe. Our troops are on a successful offensive that clears the Mediterranean and makes an attack in Europe easier. The report points out that to divert ships now from the European theater would be to choke our greatest offensive in midstream and thus endanger the whole prosecution of the war.

The die has been cast for all-out war in Europe. To change that strategy now would prolong the war and cost innumerable lives.

All available shipping must be used for the benefit of the armed forces of the United Nations. The needs of our military forces must hold unquestioned precedence over civilian needs The increased number of ships, coupled with decreased sinkings, have led some to believe that peacetime trade could be renewed on a limited scale. The facts show a different picture. Production of guns, planes and tanks is still greater than our shipments. This stockpile is growing. Lend-lease commitments have been cut repeatedly for alleged lack of ships. Russia, for example, has been allocated only two-thirds of the munitions and food promised under protocol. The further Allied armies push into enemy territory, the greater is the call for shipping. There will be no surplus of ships until the enemy is defeated.

Divided responsibility is causing a failure in the full utilization of our shipping resources. Two million deadweight tons of dry-cargo American shipping is administered directly by the Army and Navy. Seven million tons is run by the Army and Navy under allocation by the War Shipping Administration. Another 7,000,000 tons is controlled directly by the War Shipping Administration. Thus, we have in reality three merchant fleets operating independently. Both the military and civilian administration have a hand in deciding what cargoes are to be carried. The necessary balancing and blending of cargoes is lacking

Effective shipping, calls for vessels that are fully weighted down and with all cubic space utilized. Experienced stevedores claim that unused weight capacity can be reduced to an average of 1 percent, and unused cubic capacity to less than 15 percent. Ships run by the Army on the north African run have averaged between 20 and 30 percent of unused space capacity and have frequently run between 30 and 50 percent of unused weight capacity. Although this can be partially explained by the demands of speed, it is also indicative of imperfect coordination and planning.

The Port of New York Authority states that only one-third of the available export ground storage capacity in New York is now in use. This bank of cargo should be maintained at twice this level. It would take but a few days to completely drain the depleted cargo banks in our ports if immediate shipments to support an all-out offensive got under way. A sufficient quantity and diversity of cargo should be maintained in

port to provide for prompt and full loading of ships.

The subcommittee believes that unified control of American merchant shipping, including control over the flow of cargo from the factories, could save from 15 to 25 percent of available cargo space. Unified civilian control of shipping is of the utmost necessity for the efficient use of our ships. This has been accomplished in England under the Ministry of War Transport. As a result fewer British ships have sailed with substantial unused space. We feel that merchant shipping should be centralized under the War Shipping Administration. A shipping allocations committee should receive all claims for shipping and adjust the employment of our merchant fleet to the needs of our offensive strategy.

Our investigations have shown that lack of central direction is impeding the loading and discharging of ships. Harbor facilities are not being used to the best advantage. The port of New York is the worst offender in this respect. Inland carrier capacity is the primary factor in the New York situation. There are eight major railroads coming into the city. Each handles its own lighters and its own freight. There is very little pooling of facilities. The result is that loads are averaging 110 tons per lighter, while the Port of New York Authority estimates that 200-ton loads are possible. The lessons to be learned from the situation in New York are obvious. Centralized control of the port facilities are essential. A port facilities committee should be set up to allocate facilities in such a way that the port will be equal to the strains imposed by the demands of our offensives.

On the east coast there has been no action by a centralized agency to assure a steady supply and quality of longshore labor. There have been no steps that keymen are not drafted, or that replacements are recruited. There is no central agency which moves longshoremen from one port to another as loading operations vary. Peacetime practices in longshore labor are the rule. Except on the west coast, longshore labor is still completely casual. The result is that shipments from east coast ports are still well below peacetime levels. This is true despite an over-all surplus of longshoremen. Once again the answer must be found in better, more centralized mobilization of available, but poorly used, resources.

The job of manning our ships with merchant seamen has been conducted on a successful basis so far in the war. This has been accomplished with the finest cooperation between management and labor. The maritime unions have made suggestions, recruited seamen, and maintained discipline at sea. There have been no strikes. The War Shipping Administration has done a good job with its training and recruitment program. However, here again the need for greater centralization and planning are needed in the light of coming offensives. An over-all program is needed.

As long as the battlefronts are in far-off lands, shipping will be a key factor in our prosecution of our part in the war. It is natural that so important a matter as shipping should be fraught with problems. It is natural that those who are concerned with the war would have strong opinions about shipping.

The Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee on War Mobilization, of which I am chairman, is concerned with shipping and has issued a report dealing with the subject. It is natural that this report should meet with praise in some quarters and criticism in others, so vital is the topic. This report is comprehensive. It deals with efficiency of shipping operations, effective use of shipping space, military shipping requirements, use of harbor facilities, longshore labor, the manning of the ships, and other aspects of the problem. This report has been characterized by one of Washington's newspapers as—and I quote—"a model of its kind * * * the first comprehensive assessment of our shipping resources which has been made available to the public." The New York Herald Tribune has said: "The core of the committee's findings commands respect." Other newspapers and columnists have made similar remarks. We are grateful for these kind remarks for we, too, feel that the report directs public attention to matters of vital importance to the welfare of the Nation at war.

Resolution of the Democratic Women's Club of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following resolution adopted by the Democratic Women's Club of Kentucky:

Be it resolved by the Democratic Woman's Club of Kentucky in convention assembled at its sixteenth annual meeting, Louisville, Ky., on the 5th day of October, 1943—

1. That we who compose the Democratic Woman's Club of Kentucky do hereby declare that at this time and upon this occasion we have a greater reason than ever before to renew our allegiance to the principles of the Democratic Party, and that we with greater fervor than ever before enthusiastically endorse the present national administration and its policies under the leadership of that great Democrat, Franklin Delano Roosevelt;

2. That we commend and pledge our loyal support to the present Democratic Governor of Kentucky, Hon. Keen Johnson, and his administration for the progressive and constructive program in the handling of our Kentucky institutions, in the clearing our State of its indebtedness, and in assisting the aged and the blind, and in all other efforts in making our State a better place in which to live. We are indeed thankful for the progress and growth of Kentucky, brought about through the efforts of this present administration—one that is in harmony with the national administration.

3. *Be it further resolved*, That not only to our Chief Executive and the present State administration but to our Congressmen, to our military leaders and members of our armed forces—both men and women—at home and in foreign lands, and to all people who through unity of interests and action will save us from destruction and bring everlasting peace, we do pledge the unanimous support of our club and endorse a peace founded upon a solidarity of interests—a peace that will stand for all time. Such a peace will be built upon the unselfish interests of all peoples, upon the prayers of Christian nations, composed of our national and State administrations, and of all Christian peoples.

To our leaders, our armed forces, and to all loyal citizens of our country, we appreciate your work and sacrifices, and we are thankful we live in a Christian country, led and directed by the hand of God, whose spirit will direct and establish an everlasting peace to all nations.

While the immediate purpose of all good citizens is to win first the war, and then the peace, we must not and cannot be unmindful of the First World War; for it is not in such a world we are destined to live and it is not to such a world that men and women will return to take up their pursuit of happiness with their loved ones.

Today we are asking our men to lay down their lives if need be, to give up their homes and loved ones, to sacrifice ambitions for our peace and security. Therefore, it devolves upon us to see that the life we preserve shall have some security from future wars; and when our men march home, blood stained, battle scarred, but victorious, that our records and our actions shall show that they were not forgotten at home, and that they have not fought in vain.

4. Therefore, be it further resolved that the Democratic Women's Club of Kentucky in this convention assembled, as we stand on the threshold of tomorrow, is ready and willing to share with the rest of the nations their responsibilities, the greater obligations, and the higher opportunities which will attend the dawn of a new day in the world when peace again comes to earth and good will toward all men.

5. To this program of the incoming Democratic State administration, led by Hon. J. Lyter Donaldson, the Democratic women of Kentucky pledge their support and prayers, and stand ready to share the responsibilities of the progress and growth of our State; be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread at large upon the minutes of the Democratic Women's Club of Kentucky, and that a copy thereof be furnished to the Women's Democratic Journal, to Gov. Keen Johnson, to Hon. J. Lyter Donaldson, and to the President of the United States of America and our Representatives in Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on resolutions: Miss Blanche Mackey, Edmonton, chairman; Mrs. Emma Guy Cromwell, Frankfort; Mrs. John Nash, Versailles; Mrs. George Lewis, Lexington; Mrs. Elmer Graham, Louisville; Mrs. C. K. Stacy, West Liberty; Mrs. R. L. Durham, Greensburg; Mrs. Curtis McGee, Burkesville; Miss Linnie Brady, Covington; Mrs. Allie Young, Sr., Morehead; Miss Mary Q. Covington, Richmond; Miss Sara Mahan, Danville; Mrs. Middleton, Shelbyville; Mrs. Irene Chandler, Corbin; Miss Gertrude Black, Barbourville; Mrs. Roscoe Huntsman, Scottsville; Mrs. J. W. Brooker, Frankfort; Mrs. Geo. L. Evans, Frankfort; Mrs. L. H. Veale, Frankfort.

Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, all citizens receiving income should contribute to revenues for the war. With income and estate taxes already levied to the limit, there remains only one type of taxation to round out the Federal tax system. That type is a sales tax.

It is said that a sales tax will increase the cost of living. It is objected to on the ground that it is a tax on consumption. The same opposition could be made

to all taxes. In effect, all taxes increase the cost of living. This is but another way of saying that all taxes increase the cost of any business, industry, or vocation.

Contributions to the church and to charity increase the cost of living. If the objection to a sales tax obtained, there would be no contributions to church or charity. The Bible teaches tithes for all, whether rich or poor. If the argument against a sales tax obtained, there would be no tithes or donations.

TAX INCENTIVE

The Treasury's proposals for $10,500,000,000 in new revenue are wholly unsound. They provide for increased income taxes, especially in the higher brackets. They disregard or overlook a fundamental principle in revenue. There is a point beyond which taxes result in smaller rather than large revenues. Incomes result largely from incentive. What incentive is there for the citizen to excel and to earn if the taxes on his earnings of $50,000 leave him no more in net income than the citizen earning $10,000? Taxes that eliminate private incentive and that destroy the gain or profit motive will result in less rather than more revenue. There is a vanishing point in taxes.

TWO PURPOSES

During war it is said that taxes are levied to provide war revenue and to prevent inflation. The highest income and the highest profit taxes in history have been enacted. There is an increase in the national income. The increase will be greater in 1944. It is urged that goods are not available for the increased national income, that inflation will result, and that increased taxes are necessary.

If this view be sound, and I find no fault with it, the situation can only be remedied by taxing those who receive the additional incomes. At present 45 percent of the direct tax burden is being borne by 4 percent of the people and by 20 percent of the national income. The increases in income are in the lower income groups. It is estimated that four-fifths of the national income goes to persons earning $5,000 a year and less. The great bulk of the inflationary pressure, therefore, lies in the smaller incomes. If the pressure is to be removed, taxes must be levied on such incomes. Taxes in the higher brackets have already been increased. The principle of taxation based upon ability to pay already obtains. The rates in the higher incomes are graduated and progressive. They are based upon the ability to pay. Taxes have been levied to the limit. The sales tax will not violate or eliminate the principle, but it will reach the reservoir formed by the war wages and salaries. If inflation is to be prevented, the reservoir must be tapped. There is no better way to reach the group receiving the money that will promote inflation than by levying a sales tax.

AMOUNTS

It is said that a 10 percent sales tax would produce $6,000,000,000 in 1944, while a 5 percent sales tax would yield approximately three and one-half billion dollars. The administration asks for ten or twelve billion dollars in increased taxes. Approximately one-half of the amount can be raised directly by a sales tax, and the other half of the amount can be eliminated by reducing unnecessary Government expenditures. It is believed that five or six billion dollars can be subtracted from the annual expenditures of the Federal Government without impairing any essential services. Taxation is not the only way to prevent inflation. Price control has been enacted for the purpose of preventing inflation, but price control alone cannot do the job. Control must be supplemented by taxes on the higher wages inasmuch as the supply of goods is not available to reduce the spending of consumers receiving the higher wages and salaries.

TEST

Taxes must meet at least two specifications. First, they must raise substantial revenue at reasonable costs. Second, they must draw the taxes from that part of the spending stream which is now the chief source of inflationary pressure. The group receiving less than $5,000 a year, the larger percentage of which is made up of persons earning $3,000 a year or less, compose the strata where the bulk of the spending power exists. The sales tax meets the test.

OBJECTIONS

One of the chief arguments against the sales tax is that it discourages spending. That argument no longer obtains. To prevent inflation, spending must be discouraged. Another objection is that a sales tax is difficult to enforce. This objection is without merit. Sales taxes have been levied for years in 31 of the States. They obtain in England, Canada, and Australia. A sales tax would be far less complicated than existing Federal taxes.

Spending is not compulsory. Within certain limits the citizen can either spend or not. Sales taxes would deter inflation. Any objection that the sales tax is regressive could be met by reasonable exemptions. Feed and fertilizer to increase food production could be exempt. The sales tax is deflationary. It would be far less costly in the long run to the low-income groups than the inflationary prices that the sales tax will prevent.

REVENUES IN PEACE AND WAR

Tax revenues are imperative in war, but they are essential in the peace that must follow the war. Funds for production during the war must be followed by funds for production after the war. If those providing for employment now are taxed to the vanishing point, no provision will be made for employment then. Present income taxes make reserves for future expansion and unemployment difficult. If the rates are increased as proposed by the Treasury in the higher brackets, the profit motive would be destroyed and free enterprise will disappear. There must be maximum production in both war and peace. Victory must preserve our country, our way of life, and our form of government.

SACRIFICES

All taxes are burdensome. Every change in taxation bears differently on different classes of people. It is difficult to levy taxes that are fair, just, and equitable to all, but through the years those who give are those who deny, and those who sacrifice are those who support churches and charity. I recall but few instances of the lower-income groups who have always contributed to church or charity that have become public charges. Citizens in the lower-income groups, especially in the war, desire to support the Government that provides the munitions of war for their sons to fight. All patriotic citizens want to do their bit. They desire to pay their taxes. They are willing to be taxed to preserve America for Americans. Patriotism is not promoted by coddling. Sacrifices are essential to the development of the highest and noblest instincts of man. Citizens who support their Government will love their country.

REDUCED EXPENDITURES

There is not only need for the elimination for waste in Government expenditures, but there is also need of a drastic reduction generally in Federal expenditures. A sales tax will make all citizens tax conscious. I know of no better way to promote economy in government.

THE FUTURE

War comes first, but in war we must prepare for peace. We cannot consume the total assets, or the total incomes, of citizens in war and achieve a peace that will preserve free enterprise and our way of life. We cannot hope to be masters and servants of the future unless we are masters and servants of the present. If we destroy free enterprise in war, we will certainly destroy free enterprise in peace. We must learn to check the fever of inflation and to cure the palsy of depression. We must learn to utilize our vast resources for the good of all. We must keep men from unemployment. We must learn to reconcile the conflicting interests of labor, business, and agriculture. The war must lift us to higher ground. When the war is over, we must not return into an economic and political morass from which we cannot escape. Taxes should prevent inflation. They should stimulate and promote production in war and in the peace that is to follow the war. They should promote national unity.

Investigation of Federal Communications Commission

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Cox Methods Continued."

In my opinion, this editorial was untimely and premature and it reeks with the bias and prejudice that it seeks to criticize. In referring to the first meeting of the F. C. C. investigating committee under the committee's new chairman, the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, the editorial states, in part:

The brief session was given over entirely to the dumping of star-chamber testimony into the record.

That statement is absolutely false, as proven by the fact that the testimony was not placed in the record last Thursday but was considered by the entire committee in executive session yesterday. On yesterday the committee met to consider methods for procedure and also to decide the question as to whether or not the testimony referred to should be received in the committee records. After considering the admissibility of this testimony, the committee reached the conclusion that only testimony taken in the presence of a member of the committee is admissible and decided to reexamine the witnesses whose testimonies were not given at a hearing at which an authorized member of the committee was present.

These are the facts, Mr. Speaker, and they refute entirely the editorial referred to. Those of us who have served in Congress with the gentleman from California have a high regard for his honesty, his fairness, and his ability.

In my opinion, the Washington Post owes CLARENCE LEA and his committee a public apology.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1943.

The EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: It seems to me you prematurely judged the work of our committee on the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission in your editorial this morning.

The determination of what should be done with the statements presented at the Thursday meeting of our committee for the investigation of F. C. C. was left for the future action by the committee in executive session. In the meantime, the statements were withheld from publication.

What action the committee takes is yet to be determined in an executive session in which, among other things, the future procedure of the committee is to be determined.

Your comment on the matter, by the omission of an essential fact, failed to present a true picture. You treated the matter as if the statements were finally received in evidence and embodied in the public record.

The open record of the Thursday meeting shows that the chairman made this statement:

"In this type of investigation there must be a liberal range, and the rule is much more liberal than in the courts. The committee has to use its discretion as to what goes in, and in a case of this kind, where the hearings were private, I think we will take an interest in seeing that the testimony was appropriate under the circumstances involved. The committee will consider that after we go into executive session, or before this is sent to the printer."

The same course was pursued as to three letters which had formerly been offered at a public hearing of the committee before I became chairman.

So to what extent this information goes into the record of the committee hearing yet awaits committee determination in executive session.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS INVESTIGATION—STATEMENT BY CLARENCE F. LEA, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 18, 1943

The House Committee for the Investigation of the Federal Communications Commission held an executive session today for the purpose of passing upon the admissibility of certain statements taken at New York and also determine certain matters of policy to govern the deliberations of the committee.

All of the members of the committee, including Mr. LEA, Mr. HART, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. MILLER of Missouri, were present.

After a 2-hour session, the committee unanimously agreed on matters covered by this statement as follows:

ADMISSIBILITY OF TESTIMONY

As appears from the record of the open session of this committee, held in Washington on the 14th of October, the written transcripts of statements of four witnesses, taken on an investigation into short-wave research at New York during August and September, were requested to be embodied as testimony in the permanent record of the committee hearings. As it further appears from the record of such hearing on the 14th of October, a question was raised as to the propriety of receiving this evidence on the ground that it was not taken before a member of the committee. Thereupon, it was asserted that the committee would use its discretion as to what part of such testimony would be received in evidence where hearings were private. It was then decided the committee would consider the matter in executive session, and before such evidence was sent to the printer.

Pursuant to this understanding, this committee met today to consider methods of procedure of the committee and also the question as to whether or not the offered statements should be received in the records of the committee. After looking into the matter, it appears that part of these statements were made in the absence of any committee member and at a private hearing.

After considering the admissibility of this testimony, the committee has reached the conclusion that under House Resolution 21, as adopted by the House of Representatives, and under which this committee is operating, hearings can be conducted only by a member of the committee, and the presence of such member during the whole of such hearing must be regarded as within the intendment of the resolution.

It appears that the statement of two of these witnesses was taken without the presence of any member of the committee at any time, and that in the case of one of the other witnesses a committee member was in attendance only part of the time.

The committee has decided as a matter of policy to admit testimony taken in the presence of a member of the committee in charge of the hearing, and to reexamine the witnesses whose testimonies were not given at a hearing at which an authorized member of the committee was present.

The witnesses whose testimonies were not given at a hearing in charge of such a member will be brought before the committee for further interrogation, after which any question of the admissibility of the testimony of such witnesses will be determined.

After consideration the committee finds that the three letters offered in evidence and marked "Exhibits 21, 22, and 23" for identification are relevant to the issue involved and properly admissible. The letters are, therefore, received in evidence.

PROCEDURE

All hearings of the committee shall be presided over by one of its members.

All hearings shall be open to the public, unless, because of military secrets or other public interest, the committee shall determine to meet in executive session with a quorum present.

The Federal Communications Commission shall be notified in advance of all hearings.

Oaths shall be administered to witnesses by the presiding chairman of the committee at any hearing.

All witnesses shall testify under oath.

It is the purpose of the committee to allow the Commission full opportunity to present, in due time, any facts relevant to the subject matter of the hearing.

METHOD OF PREPARING ANALYSIS OF TESTIMONY

The committee has arranged for an analysis of the testimony taken at the hearings to be made. Under this plan of analysis, citations will be made under three general headings as to each substantial accusation made against the Commission or its personnel.

The first head will include what are regarded as substantial accusations made against the Commission or its members.

Under the second head, the citation will be made to the various sections of the hearings which are claimed to support the accusations.

Under the third head, citations will be made to evidence in the record embracing denials, explanatory, and exculpatory matters in reference to such accusations respectively. Under this head the Federal Communications Commission may likewise make such citations.

Surrender at Yorktown, Va.

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, 162 years ago at this hour the army of Cornwallis was marching out as prisoners of war to lay down at Yorktown, Va., their arms to the American and French allied forces. They marched to the tune of an old British march bearing the appropriate title "The World Turned Upside Down."

Sixty-two years ago, this speaker was privileged to be present at the centennial celebration of the surrender of the great event, and 50 years later or 12 years ago to participate in the sesquicentennial celebration and to enjoy that celebration when there were present Americans, British, French, and Germans.

On the occasion of the sesquicentennial celebration there was unveiled and dedicated at Yorktown a memorial tablet bearing the bust of Lord Cornwallis, who had surrendered at Yorktown 150 years before. The tablet was presented by the Virginia Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission on the outer wall of former Governor Nelson's home, which was the headquarters of Lord Cornwallis immediately preceding the surrender.

The tablet was unveiled by Mr. Arthur G. Humphreys, a direct descendant in collateral line of the father of Lord Cornwallis.

The memorial was unveiled in the presence and with the sympathetic approval of a direct descendant of General Rochambeau, the commandant of the French force.

The response to the speech in dedication of the memorial was delivered by the then Lord Cornwallis.

Concluding his remarks, Lord Cornwallis said:

Gen. George Washington is recognized as one of the greatest figures not only in the history of this country but in the history of the world, and the fact that my ancestor had to yield to him in honorable defeat was no disgrace. To yield was considered no disgrace by Cornwallis' countrymen at the time, and it is not considered so today. Later Lord Cornwallis was again called to high office.

Although I know what your country owes to General Washington both as soldier and administrator, yet even he could not have won the victory without the untamable spirit of British freedom. To that my forebear had to yield.

I have attended the centennial celebration. I have attended the sesquicentennial celebration and, while I again call attention to that surrender, in the usual course of human events I shall not participate in the bicentennial anniversary. I hope it may be celebrated under the auspices of this Congress in commemoration of a reunited world and in memory of those principles of peace established in the long ago and by that time recognized as the freedom of the world.

I hope that eventually this celebration may be an annual event, and become a celebration of rededication, reconsecration, and devotion anew by all nations of the world to those principles upon which everlasting freedom may be preserved, and that all who attend will reconsecrate themselves to universal peace.

Today may we be not citizens of so many States, but Americans all. May we be no longer Republicans, Democrats, or Progressives, or parties, but all Americans, filled with the spirit of the stirring words of the closing stanzas of the Battle Hymn of the Republic:

In the beauty of the lilies, Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free;
While God is marching on.

He is coming like the glory of the morning on the wave;
He is wisdom to the mighty, He is succor to the brave;
So the world shall be His footstool and the soul of time His slave;
Our God is marching on.

The Chinese Exclusion Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the House considers the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, I think it will find in the origin of that act and the local agitation more than 60 years ago, the strange political interest that was manifested by both major parties, as recited in their platforms, in 1884, 1888, 1892, and up to 1896. The literature of agitation will be found also in some of the poetry of Bret Harte, and it will be found to be an interesting part of that discussion. It did become a great political issue, but of course the origin and the basis for the original Exclusion Act does not exist today. I favor its repeal.

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was John Sutter who brought John Chinaman. When Sutter discovered gold in California in 1849, the gold rush soon developed a need for labor and Chinese coolies were contracted to come to the United States. Low living standards made low wages possible and soon brought protests in the form of local legislation, which was declared invalid. California citizens then appealed to Congress to exclude Chinese, stating that they were an inferior race in morals and physique, they would not be assimilated, they worked for a pittance, they were dominated by the six large tongs, and that they became a secret government within a government.

FEDERAL ACTION BEGINS

In February 1879 Congress passed a bill limiting the number of Chinese who could be brought to the United States on any single ship, but the bill was vetoed by President Hayes as against our treaty obligations, and the effort to pass it over the veto failed. In 1881 a treaty was negotiated with China giving the United States the power to limit or suspend immigration of Chinese laborers but not to completely prohibit it. This bill also protected those Chinese already here. In 1882 Congress passed another bill prohibiting the immigration of Chinese to the United States, but this measure was vetoed by President Arthur. Later, the bill was modified, passed, and approved. In July 1884 this act was further amended to suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers for 10 years and to require all other Chinese to have certificates. Since then the matter of Chinese exclusion has continued in a controversial status.

HOW MANY ARE HERE

As early as 1860, there were 34,933 Chinese in the United States. The number increased until 1890, when it reached 107,488. Since then, it has declined to 77,504 in 1940, and, of this number, 40,262 were born in the United States and 37,242 in China.

THE LITERATURE OF AGITATION

Popular literature can have a devastating effect in developing a certain conception of other peoples, and no author was more influential in this field than Bret Harte, the California author and poet, whose quaint verse had wide currency. It was he who wrote in 1870:

When I wish to remark—
And my language is plain—
That for ways that are dark
And for tricks that are vain,
The heathen Chinee is peculiar.

EXCLUSION BECOMES A POLITICAL ISSUE

To exclude or not to exclude Chinese soon became a political issue, and all political parties adopted platform planks on the subject. As early as 1884, the Democratic national platform stated that "American civilization demands that against the immigration or importation of Mongolians to these shores, our gates be closed." The Republican platform in the same year denounced the importation of contract labor and recited that "We pledge ourselves to sustain the present law restricting Chinese immigration and to provide such further legislation as is necessary to carry out its purposes." For many years, virtually every political party carried similar planks in their platforms.

THE SITUATION IN 1943

More than 70 years have gone by since the agitation to exclude the Chinese first began. Things have changed. China is now a Republic. She is now our ally in a world-wide war. We have supplied her with lend-lease goods valued at hundreds of millions of dollars. Japanese propaganda has sought to weaken Chinese devotion to the United Nations by pointing out that under United States laws, Chinese are still excluded from this country. It is effective propaganda. All this brought about a new interest in the Chinese exclusion law and produced a bill for its repeal so that China will have an immigration quota somewhat like that of other nations. The number who could be admitted under the new act would be about 107 persons per year.

OBJECTIONS

Some labor organizations are opposed to the bill. Perhaps it should be pointed out that the original reason for the Chinese Exclusion Act was that coolies were being brought to the United States as contract labor and that there are very rigid statutes on the books today which deal with all forms of contract labor. The Exclusion Act should be repealed.

Congressmen Should Read This Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., September 30, 1943:

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD READ THIS SOLDIER'S LETTER

Eighty-odd Governors and Members of Congress are Rotarians, the larger percentage being Congressmen. This newspaper hopes they will see to it that all Members of Congress read an article in The Rotarian magazine by Paul G. Hoffman, a Rotarian, of South Bend, Ind. He is chairman of the committee for economic development which,

by the way, is doing a splendid work in planning for the critical post-war period. Hoffman also is executive head of a big automobile manufacturing plant which formerly was the Nation's largest wagon builders.

Hoffman's magazine article quotes part of a letter from a private on one of the battle fronts, and it is this letter particularly Congressmen should read.

"As we see it," the latter states, "the gist of the post-war planning consists of planning for 10,000,000 jobs. The jobs we are thinking of are not hand-outs from a grateful country. They are not regimented jobs. Two or three years in the Army is enough regimentation for one generation of privates. We want the kind of job with a going and growing outfit where you can dig in and plow your way to the top according to your brains and guts. We want to work for concerns with enough vision, genius, and usefulness to make money so we can make money. We want to take a big, profitable part in the big job of rebuilding this big country. We want success.

"So here is a friendly warning which had better be heeded. When we come home, be mighty sure that we find business and industry in vigorous health and raring to go, not hamstrung, discouraged, and choked. We want to find a lot of that old pioneering energy and daring that built our railroads, farms, and factories. We want to find big ideas and big opportunities. We want to see a green light to go ahead. We want to come back to a life where every man who is any good will be hard at work making worthwhile things so that he and his may have the price to buy worth-while things."

Yes; every Congressman should read and ponder this letter, and act accordingly. Hoffman says we cannot solve this problem if too high a percentage of our post-war employment is on public works—businessmen should lay the plans now; and it may be added that business and industry should be prompted and encouraged to that end.

The Battle for Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the battle for Rome means more than the capture and destruction of another city. Its value should not be measured in terms of military strategy or the treasures of priceless art. Rather it must be regarded as the heart of Christendom. As such, Rome, the Eternal City, should and must be the deep concern of all peoples and all nations.

I am sure every man, woman, and child with a love of God in his heart is fervently praying that a way will be found to preserve for posterity that city, so accurately described by Nathaniel Hawthorne as "the city of all time and of all the world." We are confident, too, that similar thoughts motivate our able military commanders in that theater of war, to which theater are turned the eyes, the hearts, and the hopes of our people.

In its editorial which follows, the New York Times, in its usual competent and objective manner reviews the problem and suggests a seemingly practical solution, namely, "to encircle Rome."

THE BATTLE FOR ROME

Having broken through the formidable German line along the Volturno, the Anglo-American Fifth Army is now pouring across that river in a two-pronged drive to force the road to Rome. Meanwhile the British Eighth Army, which has already reached a point on the Adriatic coast somewhat north of Rome, is stabbing into the Apennines for a pincer movement on the Italian capital. Rome is still 95 miles away, but the battle for it has begun.

Though the Germans are in retreat, they are putting up stiff rear-guard resistance, and the mountainous terrain is in their favor. There is heavy fighting ahead for the Allied armies. It took them 3 weeks after the landing at Salerno to capture Naples, and it took nearly another 3 weeks to force the Volturno line. The crossing of that river was in itself an epic battle, won by the bravery of combat engineers who rowed and swam across it under a heavy artillery barrage to build pontoon bridges for the troops and tanks and guns to follow. There is at least another river position, that of the Garigliano, 18 miles to the north, which might have to be forced in the same way. Whatever happened to German morale in the final stages of the battle of Tunisia, the enemy is fighting in Italy with skill and courage. He is also fighting with his usual ruthless barbarity; for in Italy, as elsewhere, the path of the German armies is being marked by murder and arson, by rape and pillage, and by the senseless destruction of irreplaceable treasures belonging to all western civilization. Of these, Rome holds more than any other city in the world.

This raises the question whether it is possible to encircle Rome and thereby not only avoid a frontal battle for, and possibly within the capital, but also to trap the German forces in central Italy. The battle of Salerno set a pattern of amphibious operations for which the long Italian Peninsula appears to offer special opportunities. In fact, according to some reports, the original allied plans provided for a jump not merely to Salerno, but all the way to Leghorn, although these plans had to be abandoned. Now, however, the allies control all the sea lanes along Italy. They also control Sardinia and Corsica, whose capture provided both air and troop concentration bases for further amphibious operations. And there are at least two armies, the British First and the American Seventh, which have not been heard from for some time.

We may be sure that the allied command is fully aware of both the opportunities and the difficulties presented by this situation. The layman can hope that the opportunities outweigh the difficulties, and that another bold stroke is impending which will not only capture territory from a retreating enemy but also serve to destroy him.

To the first citizen of the world, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, I have dedicated this poem which was published, on last Saturday, in the New York Journal-American:

THE VALIANT SHEPHERD

He raised his voice and rallied to the Rock
  The wandering ewes, the wolf-bewildered sheep:
Pavilioned in his peace, the harassed flock
  Securely slept; the shepherd could not sleep;
His eyes roved south and north and west and east
  On constant guard against the rushing forth
Of that unclean abominable beast
  Whose tongue foams terror west, south, east, and north.
Vicar of Christ, His fortress, His defender
  From all obscene disciples of the sword,
He would not budge an inch of holy splendor
  To seek the treacherous respite he abhorred,
Nor bargain with a Caesar, nor surrender
  The solitary anguish of his Lord.

—*Martin J. Kennedy, M. C.*

"Racism"—The Foe of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the theory of totalitarian philosophy is not bounded or limited by geographical boundaries. This brutal philosophy is founded in twisted ideas from the warped minds of evil men. No geographical area, be it ever so isolated, is free from the insidious infiltration of these ideas. Wherever twisted minds are found, there is also found the ground wherein the seeds of totalitarian philosophy will grow. Such minds are found in every nation under the sun, and our own beloved country is not exempt from this curse. These twisted, malicious or ignorant minds which are so receptive to totalitarian ideas are found in every walk of life. These benighted people are in the wealthy classes; they are found in the middle classes; they are found in the poorer classes, and they are found in our colleges, high schools and grade schools. In our public schools we frequently find children and in our high schools young men and women who are practicing in many cases without knowing it, one of the most vicious tenets of totalitarianism. The practice I speak of is that of racial discrimination and its accompanying trait, minority group persecution.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS THE MELTING POT

In the high schools and grade schools of my district there are many different races represented. Some of the larger of these groups are: Mexican, Jewish, Russian, Polish, Negroes, Italian, Armenian, and others. The children of these groups attend the same schools, participate in the same sports, and receive the same academic instruction from the same teachers. In most instances this great melting pot of Americanism, the public school, which was so dear to the heart of Thomas Jefferson, is producing broad-minded Americans who realize that character is the only criterion by which a fellow human being should be judged. This has been the greatest force in the breaking down of the age-old prejudice of racial hate.

PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND COMMUNITY NEWSPAPERS STRENGTHEN DEMOCRACY

In some instances, however, there have been attempts to stir up racial hatred and to divide the students of public schools into antagonistic groups and to twist their young minds into a

pattern which will be receptive to the totalitarian philosophy. I want at this time to pay tribute to the continued defense of the American philosophy by the teachers of our public school system in their everyday practice and guidance as they combat the insidious infiltration of racial prejudice. I want also to pay tribute to those community newspapers, who, although limited to local circulation, still convey in their editorials both to the children and their parents, the vital principles of true American democracy. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a typical editorial from one of these community papers published by Mr. Al Waxman in the Eastside Journal, an editorial which takes up a community problem and presents an American solution to the boys and girls of the schools in my district:

GOOD NEIGHBORS AT HOME

School has started and there is trouble in the air again. Seems as though the good-neighbor policy is not being carried out at home.

If we can't have it in our own back yard, how can we expect vast governments to fulfill such agreements? True, there is a program in the air to disrupt good relationships at all times. Now that we are at war the enemy nations have their elements at work here. That is to be expected, but it must be overcome.

So thorough is the job of the enemy agent that youngsters are being made aware of "racism" here. We have had an example already at a local junior high school.

On the first day of school a group of youngsters, obviously born in this country, of Mexican and Mexican-American parents, attacked several boys of Jewish descent. Nothing serious came of it. There were some sore knuckles and chins, but that is to be expected among boys a school.

The sad part was the fact that the fight began with one boy asking another if he was Jewish, and when he received an affirmative reply began to slug. Ask him why he did it and he would be at a loss for an answer.

There is an answer, though. It is simple. Somewhere at, or near his Mexican-American home, he came across the enemy agent. It might have been the spoken word or the written sheet of propaganda. He has had his first lesson in hatred and that hatred has been directed at a scapegoat. In Germany the youth was trained to hate. "Get them young" is the byword of the Nazi.

It falls upon the shoulders of the school to begin teaching these youngsters that to hate one must have a reason. If he finds a legitimate reason he should hate; if he can't find a reason he should begin to suspect his hatred teachers.

The United States and Mexico are on very friendly relationship now, more than ever before. Citizens of both countries and their descendants must remember that and respect the wishes of their nations. The good neighbor policy must be carried out wherever and whenever the two meet.

Fights, reprisals and retaliation is not the answer to the local situation. For boys of Mexican descent and boys of Jewish descent to line up on opposite sides and fight it out is exactly what the enemy agent wants. Once that comes about his mission will have been accomplished. "Divide and conquer" is their rule. We must learn to live together and share alike in our problems, be they joyous or sad

Only this week we received a letter from a Mexican-American boy, Frank Luna, who is in the armed services of this Nation, his country. We were impressed with one sentence in his letter. It read: "I met a kid named Kaplan in Sacramento and let him read my Eastside Journal."

Here are two youngsters who have been thrown together by the war. Both are wearing the same uniform and fighting for the same principles. Both are from this area where they would be fighting against each other if they succumbed to the enemy agent's wishes. Instead they have learned their lesson and are living together, working together, fighting together, pulling together.

We wish it were possible to print our complete list of subscribers. It reads like a League of Nations roll call: Cohen, Desatoff, DeCameron, Dimaggio, Hernandez, Horn, Gearhardt, Gomez, Reynolds, Murphy, Shoranian, Swenson, Jones, Bonnet, DuVal, Kuykendall, Zbikowski, Lupescue, Kim, Wong, MacTavish, etc. These people are all living in this area as good neighbors and are all interested in the welfare of the community.

Let's respect them as American citizens and as fellow men. We must defeat the Axis agents at work here.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere desire that every boy and girl who reads this editorial will appreciate the deep fundamental principle which is involved in this discussion and upon which our democracy is founded. This principle was so eloquently revealed by Thomas Jefferson in the immortal Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And it is upon this principle that the many races in America have been welded together to form our great united democracy. As long as this principle is supported by our people, our democracy will endure. When we allow an alien philosophy to supplant it, we remove the foundation from the edifice of democracy.

Washington Reports on Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last Sunday there was broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co.'s facilities a program entitled "Washington Reports on Rationing," consisting of an interview with Deputy Petroleum Administrator Ralph K. Davies by Ernest Lindley. The script of this program contains valuable information for the benefit of the Senate and the country, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LINDLEY. And now, Mr. Davies, what can you tell us about the chances for civilians getting more gasoline?

Mr. DAVIES. First of all, Mr. Lindley, let me emphasize the fact that the Petroleum Administration for War is not responsible for gasoline rationing. Rationing is in the province of another governmental agency—not P. A. W. My office is charged with the duty of so directing the operations of the American petroleum industry, at home and abroad, as to produce and deliver where needed all the oil that is required by the military forces, by industry, by agriculture, and by the civilian.

Mr. LINDLEY. In other words, P. A. W. has the job of providing the supply and determining the amounts available in the various parts of the country; others have the responsibility for parceling it out.

Mr. DAVIES. That is correct. And, of course, as to gasoline and heating oil the supply has not been sufficient to meet the full civilian demand. What with shortages, first, of transportation due to the loss of our tankers, and now a shortage of oil itself, it is just a physical impossibility to satisfy the total requirement. Not that the production of oil in this country has fallen off; quite the contrary. We are producing today in the United States at an all-time high—4,350,000 barrels per day, or about 15 percent more than produced in 1941 before the war. But the military demand has increased enormously and today, producing all the oil we can, we have not sufficient to supply the full civilian demand; not after supplying the armed forces with all they need. And, of course, the military demand comes first; it is the civilian who must suffer restriction. But I venture to say no American citizen would want the order of preference the other way around.

Mr. LINDLEY. We all know that the armed forces must use colossal quantities of oil, Mr. Davies, but can you give us any definite figures on military consumption?

Mr. DAVIES. Much of the information, of course, is necessarily cloaked in military secrecy, but there are a few facts that can be told.

The military requirement for petroleum products, in total, has climbed already to more than a million barrels per day or approximately 25 percent of all the petroleum produced in the United States.

The military demand for gasoline alone is 600,000 barrels or 25,000,000 gallons per day. That is one-third of all the gasoline we can manufacture from all the crude we can produce Next year this military demand will be even greater, climbing probably to more than 40 percent of our total gasoline output.

Mr. LINDLEY. With the Army and Navy requiring such tremendous amounts it is pretty clear that the civilian must get along with less. But you say these military demands are further increasing. That being so, is the civilian supply likely to be still further reduced in the future?

Mr. DAVIES. The supply that is available for the consumer is, as I say, dependent always upon the size of the military demand, and military demands cannot be foretold with precision—obviously. We do forecast the future as best as this can be done in time of war and plan ahead so far as humanly possible, but no forecast can be certain. So qualified, I should say in answer to your question that the programmed supply of gasoline over the rest of this year for civilian use is not likely to be less than at present. The prospect for next year is less distinct, of course. We know the military demand will be greater. We know production in the United States has about reached its limit under present economic restrictions. These two facts by themselves would mean inevitably that the civilian would get less next year. But there is an offsetting factor. Our tanker position is improving and, with increased transportation, we can obtain more relief from foreign sources.

Therefore, as to next year, it looks now as though increased foreign production would offset increased military demand, leaving us in about the same position as to civilian gasoline supplies in this country as we are today.

Mr. LINDLEY. Your mention of relief from foreign sources is interesting. What about these reports that the vast oil fields of the Middle East are being conserved by the British while our oil resources are being expended?

Mr. DAVIES. There is no substance to the suggestion that the British have been unwilling to use their own oil resources, none whatever. The fact is that British and American oil resources over the world have been employed jointly from the very beginning of the war. And in this connection, let me point out here that the oil reserves of the Middle East—the Persian Gulf area—are by no means exclusively British, the American oil interest in this part of the world is also great.

With more tankers available today we are able to use more oil from this foreign source—British oil and American oil. In the months past these sources have been drawn upon to the full extent that tankers have been available, and the same policy will obtain in the future.

Mr. LINDLEY. I presume that means that the very few tankers available up to now had to be used on the shortest possible runs—principally from the east coast of the United States to the United Kingdom and north Africa.

Mr. DAVIES. That is exactly right, and with the opening of the Mediterranean and the greater number of tankers, some relief is forthcoming. We should bear in mind, though, that refining capacities abroad are limited and if we had ample shipping we would still only be able to relieve our domestic burden to an extent.

Mr. LINDLEY. Very interesting. I would judge from what you say, Mr. Davies, that the American motorist will not be able to fill his tank at will for a long time to come.

Mr. DAVIES. That, Mr. Lindley, is definitely the prospect. I realize it is not a satisfying one, but it is an inevitable concomitant of war. The civilian, in all his inconvenience for lack of gasoline, can, though, derive satisfaction from the knowledge that he is making a genuine contribution to winning the war; that he is lending vital home-front support to the fighting forces of the Nation. And if there be any who begrudge this sacrifice, I say, let them visit the nearest military hospital—the Walter Reed in Washington, for example—and see what real sacrifice for one's country means in war.

Post-War Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday afternoon there appeared a very able and interesting article by Mr. David Lawrence relating to post-war peace. I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE ISSUE LEADERSHIP SEEN FOGGY

(By David Lawrence)

There is as yet no assurance that the post-war "peace" to follow this war will be any more enduring than that which followed the World War. Leadership on this issue is still foggy and timid, though over the last week end two notable speeches—one by Wendell Willkie and the other by Sumner Welles—revealed significant trends of thinking by international cooperationists in both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Although somewhat similar in approach, the chief differences between the two is this: Mr. Willkie would have Great Britain, Russia, the United States, and China make a "declaration of intention" now looking toward a world organization in which all nations, including the defeated, would ultimately be admitted, while Mr. Welles, though favoring the same four-power pact as an immediate necessity, feels the matter of world organization should be left to a series of agreements to be made gradually during the "transition" period after the armistice.

Mr. Willkie rightly insists that the relationship between these four powers and the rest of the allied world be defined now. Mr. Welles, since he last spoke, recognizes the dangers of too much emphasis on the authority of Great Britain, United States, Russia, and China and wisely begins to mention the addition of the Fourth French Republic. He suggests also that some of the smaller nations might serve on the executive committee of the United Nations—a concession to recent criticism of the proposed four-power alliance idea.

WEAKNESS IN PROPOSALS

Both Mr. Willkie and Mr. Welles vehemently denounce alliances and while Mr. Welles speaks of the four-power arrangement as a temporary alliance, he warns it must not overreach itself. To a large extent Mr. Welles hitherto has been reflecting the Roosevelt-Churchill concept of a temporary trusteeship by the four big powers to serve during a cooling-off or transition period.

The real weakness of both the Welles and the Willkie proposals and the Roosevelt-Churchill plan to experiment and drift through a transition period is that all seem to ignore post-war psychology. They forget that Woodrow Wilson really lost his leadership and his leverage among our allies of World War No. 1 when the armistice was not yet 6 months old. The psychology of returning soldiers during demobilization and job hunting was not merely antiwar, but it sometimes becomes bitterly antiforeign. This disillusionment is due in no small part to wartime mistakes in the behavior of our allies.

The seed of the same thing are being sown today. Prime Minister Churchill blundered last week in treating flippantly the criticisms brought back by five American Senators from areas in the world where the British are supposed to be cooperating with us. Charges of this kind breed isolationist votes and Mr. Churchill can do more to remove the basis for isolationism in America by exhaustive inquiry as to the facts than by assuming that the American Senators are merely being political.

The time to assure an enduring peace for the years after the war is during the war. The time to clear up misunderstanding and to put selfish commercial interests in Britain and America and elsewhere in their proper place is during a war and not afterwards when the reaction sets in against those who would exploit the victory in a resurgent nationalism.

LEAGUE COVENANT LIVES

It is now when American resources and American lives are being sacrificed that the President of the United States has his maximum power to influence our allies including Russia, Britain, and China. The talk about a new world organization "eventually" means deliberate delay. The League of Nations covenant still lives. It is embodied in the treaty structure of 44 nations. It handles well the problem of giving voice to small as well as large nations. It preserves the sovereignty of every nation. It is not a superstate. It conforms to the American Constitution. It depends first on moral force and reason, but it rests in the final analysis on the concerted power and physical force of all nations. It has a provision which means an international police force. It is in fact a splendid constitution for world peace. To try to write another constitution means endless bickering while the peace of the world waits. The covenant of the League can be improved in detail and clarified but the framework is there already.

Now is the time for the Democratic Party to keep faith with President Wilson who signed the covenant and for the Republican Party to rectify the mistake made by Warren Harding who, though as a Senator had twice voted for the league with the so-called Lodge reservations, declined when elected to the presidency to submit the League Covenant to the Senate even with the Lodge reservations.

Mr. Harding misconstrued the mandate of the people in the 1920 election as a rejection of the League despite the fact that 31 prominent Republicans, including former President William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes in a public pre-election statement had told their fellow Republicans that a vote for Harding was "a vote for the League with reservations."

Rationing, Pricing, Processing, and Distribution of Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made at the National Food Conference held in Chicago on September 16, 1943, by Mr. Lou Maxon, former Deputy Administrator of the O. P. A.:

I'd like to make it clear at the outset, that I do not speak as an ex-Washington food expert. I merely want to outline and briefly discuss what might be called a layman's conception of an over-all, realistic food program.

Any questioning of the present program will be looked upon in some quarters as destructive criticism, a phrase which seems to be gaining popularity in Washington. I assure you that my purpose is to be helpful and occasional reference to the current handling of the food situation is unavoidable.

I realize the need of encouraging production, and the increasing problems of the farmer. That phase of the program can best be discussed by people who are close to it. I do, however, want to stress the somewhat obvious fact that food production is more than just a farm problem. So I'll confine my remarks mainly to the rationing, pricing,

processing, and distribution of food which today is the number one war problem. Unfortunately, it cannot be solved as speedily as was the demand for munitions and armaments. Nature, time, and the seasons restrict and rule at the source. Overtime and night shifts can't help much. The food program requires long-distance planning and organization. We have not faced a food crisis but can readily and rapidly reach that point if sound and sensible planing isn't forthcoming from those in Washington who have this responsibility before them.

In every battle zone, food will take priority over tanks and planes as it already has in our lend-lease shipments to Russia.

Food is not only a weapon of war, but the greatest single expedient toward peace in invaded countries.

There is certainly no greater aid in invasion than the rumor that the Americans will bring food.

Food is rapidly becoming more important than guns. Yet, the problem has been given secondary treatment up to now.

Long-term commitments are essential to the production and distribution of food. These are impossible under today's uncertain food set-up.

After 20 months of war, we must face the fact that we do not have a complete, workable, realistic food program.

Here are 14 suggestions which I believe deserve consideration in the construction of a badly needed, sound food program:

1. AN OVER-ALL FOOD HEAD IS NEEDED

We can never have a satisfactory food program while the various authorities and responsibilities are divided among Government agencies.

Voluntary cooperation between Government bureaus on a problem as great as food has proved and will continue to prove to be impossible There is a great mother love in all Government agencies, and the struggles for position and recognition would sometimes embarrass the hammiest of actors.

Food has continued to be a problem divided among many men. Today the division of authority is twice as great as a year ago. And not one of the five men now handling the food problem has the qualities or the background necessary to do the administrative job that is obviously required.

The food situation is a bad stew with too many cooks whose fumbling indecision and political outlook is spoiling the dish.

The present food set-up is so complex that only a strong, over-all, single head with complete authority can make it function.

Changing horses isn't enough. The job needs a tough, hard roughrider who will demand, get, and exercise the authority needed to make the food plan a workable reality. The food program cannot succeed under political leadership or direction. It needs a courageous man who has the ability and the will to make decisions unmindful of what any group of voters will think. The food situation suffers from too many agencies, too many compromises, too many professors, too many lawyers, and too many politicians. It is crying for a hard-working, independent food czar or dictator or whatever you care to call him. His authority should be complete and unhampered. It should extend over every agency connected with any part of the food program even to the field of manpower and it must be absolute and final. The appointment should be definitely nonpolitical.

The best type of administrative executive should be chosen strictly on his record of getting things done. The food program has suffered sadly from lack of management. The problems involved demand the utmost in a courageous, decisive, hard-fighting man. The food program, in fact, needs another Bill Jeffers.

2. LET EXPERIENCED FOOD MEN HELP

The most costly mistake to date in the food situation has been the unwillingness to deal intelligently with the people involved in the production and distribution of food. This has discouraged and prevented the best brains and experience from being helpful and actually forced an attitude of antagonism and distrust among those whose cooperation is vital to the success of any food program.

I'm not suggesting that the food problem be turned over to big business or little business or any group or interests. It, however, needs the experience and knowledge and cooperation of people who know the intricate problems of all those concerned with the production and distribution of food. Up to now we have had too many food experts whose only food experience has been obtained with a knife and fork.

A successful food program must respect the common procedures and practices in the food business. In the past the young men of Washington have often dreamed up "better ways" out of their inexperience. But when these "better ways" came smack up against actual usage they just didn't work.

Much time and temper and confidence has been lost in senseless and costly experiments. Men of experience in every phase of the food program should be consulted, their know-how put to use, and they should have a part in working out the rules and regulations they must live with so that no part of the food-producing chain will be forced to undergo even a mild revolution at a time when all energy should be devoted to maximum production.

3. TAKE POLITICS OUT

Politics should be removed from the food program as clearly as they were removed from the rubber program. They are very evident in the appointment of the men to whom parts of the food job have been entrusted. They shadow many moves, such as the promised price roll-back which just happened to get all-important about the time John Lewis marched on Washington. The food plan should not be based on any temporary expedient, political or economic. It must be a long-range effort that will not be altered or used for any purpose except the production and distribution of food.

The food program needs administrative, not political, talent. It is a hard job of management and demands top men experienced in getting things done rather than men who promise readily and produce little—except more promises.

4. LIMIT PRICE CONTROL TO BASIC ITEMS

Attempts to put price ceilings on all foods are futile, and can easily bring the entire price-control system into utter disrepute.

Price control should be limited to basic cost-of-living items and all efforts should be confined to these basic items. Chain store men tell me that 90 percent of their business is done in less than 20 items. There's the place to direct both price control, rationing, and production effort. Plentiful foods need no control because the law of supply and demand has not been repealed as yet. Luxuries can be left to find their own levels. What canned mussels, artichoke hearts, and caviar cost is of no great importance in our food picture. Today price control covers over 700 food items, more than 600 of which make up less than 10 percent of our food purchases.

5. CONTROL PRICE AT ALL LEVELS

Price control must be arrived at intelligently with all the factors of production and distribution carefully considered.

The price policy must start with a clear conception and complete understanding of the problems and costs of the producer. In the past it has started with the price paid by the consumer and tried to work backward, but it has often failed to operate because of a lack of courage or too much political consciousness. The small processor, the small packer, wholesalers, and retailers, have taken a merciless squeezing that could have been avoided with decisive and sound over-all planning. Price control can't work at one level if it isn't applied to all levels. Price control was never intended to make it impossible for small merchants to stay in business. But by its hit-and-miss yet arbitrary application it has worked against an increased food supply by forcing hundreds of small packers and processors and thousands upon thousands of retailers and distributors to the wall.

6. SIMPLIFY PRICE AND RATIONING REGULATIONS

Price control and rationing regulations should be simplified and made completely understandable to the smallest retailer—to every link in the food chain. The regulations today are fantastic jungles of words with their understanding smothered in involved, muscle bound, legalistic terms, and style. If O. P A. insists upon hoarding young lawyers then certainly the regulations could be translated into plain grocery store English so the average merchant could read a 12-page pamphlet and know how to proceed without fear of transgressing. I read the other day that one of the regulations had been simplified and that the simplification required only 47 pages of type. The fruit-cake regulation was a classic example of what I mean—it, also, has been revised and simplified. Here's an actual paragraph from the revision:

"All commodities listed in appendix A are those known to the trade as such excepting therefrom such thereof, if any, while subject to another regulation."

7. ELIMINATE GRADING OF STORES

There should be but one retail ceiling price. Under today's set-up the independent merchant is branded as a high priced, inefficient operator by the needless system of grading stores and assigning them separate price ceilings.

The men who conceived this plan did not take into consideration that the chain is a volume operator and it must attract more customers and from a wider area. It also competes with other services such as credit, delivery, etc., offered by the independent. And to do this it must undersell whether it wants to or not. One ceiling set at the independent level would automatically set lower ceilings for chains without needlessly and officially branding the independent merchant as a costlier place to buy.

8. SIMPLIFY THE RETAILER'S JOB

The problems presented by rationing and price control to the average retailer are in many cases close to overwhelming. A study of these added burdens has been made by many chain operators and simplified procedures suggested. Up to now these recommendations have fallen on deaf ears. Today merchants and chain-store managers often are forced to enlist the aid of their entire families at night simply to sort and count ration stamps. These stamps could be averaged and weighed very accurately at a saving of millions of man-hours each week. This is only one of the many steps toward simplification that should find a place in a sound food program.

9. KEEP FOOD PROCESSORS AND DISTRIBUTORS IN BUSINESS

The number of small businesses that have been forced to the wall is appalling, but our Washington bureaucrats shrug this off as casualties of war. This is a wrong and dangerous attitude. I do not believe a food program that permits, let alone forces, small packers and processors to close their doors at a time when we are seeking to increase our

food supplies, can hope for success. Provision must be made to keep every link in the producing and processing and distribution of food active and healthy, and, instead of a let-'em-die attitude, we need a determined keep-'em-healthy approach, looking to the expansion and fullest production in every step and with every factor in the food-producing chain.

10. MORE AUTHORITY TO DISTRICT OFFICES

The true eventual measure of rationing and price control's effectiveness is in the strength that can be passed on to the local boards and district offices. Certainly, those people who are serving patriotically and well throughout the country are in a far better position to interpret food regulations locally than anyone in Washington.

The power of these boards should be increased as well as the authority of the district offices. Interpretation of all regulations in the broadest sense should be entrusted to State offices. Because they are in close touch with local situations, given the green light on price, rationing, or production, they will eliminate the red tape and delays that under the present set-up often force processors to actually withhold foodstuffs from the market for as long as from 6 to 10 months.

11. USE RATIONING TO INCREASE PRODUCTION

Rationing should be used not just to distribute a diminishing supply of any commodity but as an indication of public need. When a commodity is in demand, then let that demand set in motion the processes by which more of that commodity can be obtained in the future. Thus in due time the ration point value of the product can be reduced, to concur with the needs and wants of the public, instead of increased to guard a shrinking quantity.

12. SUBSIDIES

On this subject I expect a hearty disagreement but I remind you I am expressing only my own views. I do not like the principle of subsidy. I realize the danger of greater encroachment upon private industry by Government regimentation through the use of subsidy and the possibility of its misuse as a political influence. But with a political type of leadershp and under existing conditions, I do not see how some form of subsidy can be avoided.

I believe in the policy of a firm price line. The theory of letting prices rise until they reach a certain level is like letting a few floors of a building burn until we're ready to put out the fire.

Some form of subsidy under today's conditions is necessary in my humble opinion not only to help hold a firm price line but also to permit an over-all, realistic, workable plan that would encourage the production, processing and distribution of food by relieving the squeeze which arises from mounting costs over which processors and producers have no control. Remember, you cannot force people to produce, pack, or sell at a loss and we cannot continue to drive little businesses to the wall in the appalling numbers of the past 6 months.

Perhaps subsidies could have been avoided with the proper foresight and politically courageous action. But we must face conditions as they now exist.

13. AVOID RADICAL REFORMS

This is no time for idealistic experiments. The problem calls for an expansion of the food channels, not restriction and discouragement through the impractical dreams of the new thinkers who see in the patriotism of the people a chance to put over some of their pet theories under the guise of wartime necessity. These continuing efforts, coupled with the obvious distrust of practical food knowledge and the lack of balance in the men who have had a hand in many of the senseless regulations imposed on the food industry, have caused the food people to look upon the bright young men in the Washington bureaus with well-earned suspicion. Grade labeling is one of the moves of this type. It's not new. It's been a pet of the so-called consumer groups for years.

There is a strong group in Washington who believe that the manufacture, standardization and distribution of all essential products should be placed under the arbitrary control of the Government not just during wartime but from now on and grade labeling is the keystone of their effort.

If grade labeling were to become effective, the next step is a flat price to cover each grade. And when that flat price is set low enough, that will be the end of competition, of food research, of food progress, and the beginning of a regimented, standardized, rationed world. In those two simple steps there can be the end of brand names, and the end of a free press, and the beginning of the end of quality backed by a manufacturer's reputation. And the grade labelers definitely say they want grade labeling so they can have flat pricing so there's no doubt about step number two—they have already declared themselves on that.

No manufacturer objects to truthful, informative labeling, but they do object to this grade leveling that masquerades under the name of labeling.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' study shows that approximately 4 percent of the individual's expenditure for food is for canned fruits and vegetables, against 16 percent spent for fresh fruits and vegetables. About four times as much money is spent by the average wage earner and salaried person for fresh fruits and vegetables as is spent for canned fruits and vegetables.

During the first 14 months following the issuance of G. M. P. R., all food prices, taken as a group, advanced 24 points. Retail prices of canned foods during the same period advanced only 10 point or, in other words, less than one-half as much as the increase in the price of all foods. The price of fresh fruits and vegetables during this period advanced 84 points, or 8 times as much as canned foods.

Every study shows that canned goods have had the lowest percentage of price increase of any foods, and also presents the least problem in price control, because it shows fewer violations in every check-up made. Now add all these facts together and wonder, if you will, just why grade labeling or grade leveling is so vital and whether or not it isn't the keystone in a move to destroy brand names and bring about complete Government regimentation of this vital food business.

The food program should not be handicapped with this continuing effort to inflict Tugwellistic theories on the industry on one hand while asking them to cooperate enthusiastically on the other.

14. GAIN THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

One of the prime essentials in the success of any food program is the confidence of the public and the confidence of the food producers, processors, and distributors. This can be had only by a soundly conceived, common-sense plan that follows through from producer to consumer and that bears the stamp of thorough and sensible thinking. The public and the food industry must have full knowledge of the plan and must believe it workable. Then and only then will we be on the road to a sound and lasting solution to our growing food problem.

The public is entitled to the facts and until they feel they are being kept informed and not being kidded, any food program will work against an insurmountable handicap. People are willing to help do the job but they want to know "how" and "what" and "why," and they must be taken into the Government's confidence. Take the sugar situation as an example. You have undoubtedly heard one of your neighbors say they understand there's plenty of sugar and that rationing could be lifted tomorrow. You have seen the newspaper pictures of warehouses jammed with sugar. We know that coffee can now be shipped from South America. So just what is the sugar situation? Is there enough? Can sugar rationing be ended? Why not give the public the facts so they will have greater confidence in the food program and will make their sacrifices in the spirit of informed and understanding citizens.

In Government agencies, dealing with the Nation's food, there seems to be an "Alice in Wonderland" attitude about the food problem. Many Government agencies concerned with production and distribution lack the tools to adequately do their job. They have no over-all policy that can possibly make it all come out even in the end, nor can they conceive one without encroaching upon other agencies.

The men who have had the reins of the food program in their hands know that it has not taken practical form even after 20 months of war, they admit it publicly by promising that a new version will soon be presented. They realize a practical over-all food program can be had only if they are willing to risk the estrangement of powerful groups of voters. They have the answers to some of the problems but they have hesitated to put them into effect because they may not be politically palatable.

In discussing the present food program, or lack of it, let's not get confused about who is patriotic and who isn't. No political party and no group of bureaucrats have any patent on patriotism. Criticism is too often met by an appeal "to stick together boys and follow on, we're at war, and so forth." But we need more than flag-waving phrases. Food is the most vital problem confronting the country and it increases in importance every day. It's time for us all to put our thinking together and hope that out of it comes the sound, workable program we must have. There can be no more patriotic effort than helping crystalize that plan by thorough discussion and frank criticism.

The food problem has not been met squarely and realistically. It is problem No. 1 today and it will obviously increase in importance as we progress in Europe. It can reach alarming proportions unless a courageous, realistic, over-all food plan is conceived and put into action. This will be true whether we plan to attempt to feed the world, as some blandly promise, or whether we merely fulfill the basic and most conservative needs of successful invasion.

We are assured that all is well on the food front. A good harvest is coming in. Prices of green vegetables are down as a consequence. But let's not be like the man who didn't repair the roof because the sun was shining. The demands upon our food suppliers will be greater and greater and it's one essential that can't be pulled out of a hat or tripled in production by adding factory shifts. My own field men tell me that food wholesalers' stocks are down and that store stocks are at extremely low ebb. Let's not delay longer the conception and the declaration of an over-all, workable food program that takes into consideration every phase of production, processing, and distribution. The public and the food industry will get behind that kind of a program with confidence and understanding and enthusiasm and that's what it takes to make it tick.

Address Before American Federation of Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address made by me at the meeting of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club on the evening of July 9, 1943, and some very kind remarks about the address by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped:

Mr. STRACHAN. I am happy to have the opportunity of introducing to you tonight a Member of Congress whose sympathies are with the handicapped. When first I discussed the matter with him, I found that he had had a lifelong interest in the subject, and was eager to cooperate in any way possible. I know that he is a real friend of the handicapped because, when he introduced House Resolution 230, he proved that he would not only say something about the matter, but he would do something about it as well.

I am not going to dwell unduly upon this gentleman. I will, however, acquaint you with the fact that he has five sons—all of them now in the military service to help fight and win this war for you and me and all of us—and I think, thus, that he has a right to speak as a good American.

Without further ado, I have the honor to present to you, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. I am glad to be with you tonight, and to have the opportunity to talk about some of the problems of the physically handicapped.

I have always been interested in the affairs of the underprivileged, particularly the sick and disabled. These make two appeals—one is humanitarian, the other is utilitarian. It would seem that the humanitarian appeal should be sufficient to create an interest strong enough to unite full public support for aid. Sad to say, this is not true. So, we will approach the problem from the viewpoint of utility.

Today in the search for available manpower, the physically incapacitated become a reservoir of immense resource. It took a national crisis to direct our attention to the vast potentiality hidden in our physically handicapped. Perhaps this need for manpower will teach us that in normal times this reservoir of the physically handicapped can be converted from a liability to an asset. As a Nation we cannot afford to neglect this group—either from the standpoint of humanity, or from the standpoint of utility.

As a Congressman, I am interested in developing every resource of the Nation, to hasten the successful termination of the war. Here is a vast, potential source of manpower—so badly needed today—that can be developed for service in industry and in agriculture.

To achieve this end, the Government should proceed now to put into effect a comprehensive, intelligent plan for the rehabilitation and regeneration of the physically handicapped.

As we understand, there are now more than 20,000,000 of these, of whom it is estimated some 2,000,000 have already registered in the various Federal-State rehabilitation and employment agencies—and perhaps another 5,000,000 not yet registered—who stand in need of either medical treatment, prosthetic, orthopedic, hearing, sight, or other devices, education and training, and, above all, suitable placement in employment which would enable them to become active partners in our economy, rather than charges upon their families, their communities, and the Nation—with no return whatsoever.

There are, in my opinion, too many agencies dealing with the handicapped problem. That is self-evident when it is considered that approximately 17 different agencies have a part of it. There is a lack of coordination of effort, a notable lack of over-all national policy, a lack of trained specialists and personnel to treat or deal with the handicapped. This cannot be achieved if governments—both Federal and State—are shortsighted or penurious and persist in regarding the matter as coming within the purview of public charity. To rehabilitate and regenerate the handicapped is not charity but the most enlightened self-interest.

Any plan projected today must have the full support and understanding of the Congress and the Chief Executive and the public. Therefore, it is doubly necessary that the means chosen shall meet the critical analysis of public opinion as to the need and method to be applied.

Upon mature reflection it seemed to me that the proper approach would be to have a committee of the House of Representatives authorized to delve deeply into this matter and study every phase. Therefore, I introduced House Resolution 230, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local Governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation, etc., etc."

This is, in my opinion, comprehensive, and, although I am somewhat modest, I am compelled to admit that it is intelligent. The plan begins, where it should begin, by making a complete and thorough study of all problems relating to the physically handicapped, their needs, and the remedies to apply. It calls for the separation of the various classes of the handicapped—a study and evaluation of their talents and abilities—the blind, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the amputees, the tuberculous, the cardiacs, the victims of infantile paralysis, and the many others afflicted.

In several instances studies have been made of special groups, but so far as can be determined, the surface has not been more than scratched. We need to coordinate the information so that each group may fall into its proper classification, so that we may know the needs and the remedies to apply.

As stated, House Resolution 230 seeks to "conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the handicapped." We must begin now, if we are going to gather the desired information soon enough to enable us to devise and apply constructive and corrective remedies, to make the handicapped available in this war period.

Second, the resolution proposes to "study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped." At present one has to search through every nook and cranny to ascertain what benefits may be available to the handicapped, and even then it is very difficult to learn with any fair degree of accuracy the exact situation.

Third, and perhaps most important of all, the resolution proposes to ascertain "employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto, which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation." The importance of this is self-evident. Of what use would any program be, unless it is designed to fit people to become self-supporting? And how may they become self-supporting unless they are placed at some work well within their capacities?

For many years to come we shall need the services of every American citizen who can perform any kind of useful labor. We know that the manpower needs for war purposes alone are constantly rising. A recent statement of the War Manpower Commission reveals that an additional 3,600,000 workers are to be employed in war industries.

As never before in our history, the individual becomes important. Now we must consider the necessity of dealing not only with the welfare of the individual for his own benefit, but, for the greater need and purposes of saving the Nation itself.

Let us further consider that experience has shown, for example, that the average cost today of rehabilitation of a handicapped individual approximates $300 per person. Pursuing that thought further, we find that the average handicapped, once rehabilitated, is able to earn from $1,000 to $1,200 per year, or more, and thus become wholly or partially self-sustaining.

It is wasteful and uneconomical to let men and women remain helpless merely because the Nation fails to provide an adequate program of treatment, training, appliances, and suitable placement.

I believe we can enable these citizens to earn their own way, to say nothing of removing the burden of their support from their families, and communities. Even though it does require spending a little money to put these people in position to earn their own living, the failure to spend that money is a senseless form of waste. And the money spent must be spent in a manner that does not fall short of the goal of providing the handicapped with a means of making themselves self-sustaining.

Obviously, we cannot bear our share of the load if we are physically unable to work, or, if we are discriminated against, and prevented from working and earning simply because we are physically handicapped. Doubtless other millions are to be added to the 23,000,000 handicapped through injuries or disease incurred in war or war production. There can be no question but that it is not only the duty of the Government to devise and put into motion an ameliorative program, but it is a positive necessity.

I do not mean that we should neglect those who cannot be rehabilitated, because of incapacity through hopeless illness or injury. No indeed. To those helpless, who number, as I understand, approximately 3,000,000, I believe that there should be additional Federal-State aid extended, when and where necessary.

But I am addressing myself primarily to the problem of those handicapped who may

now, or later, be available for rehabilitation, whose illnesses or injuries are wholly or partially curable, or remedial. If we can, by boldly seizing this opportunity for needed public service, add from 2,000,000 to 10,000,000 workers to our population, then we shall not only have achieved a great humanitarian purpose, consonant with divine command, but we shall, also, provide the needed sinews and men and women to help us in the tasks of war and peace.

I therefore firmly believe that immediate passage of House Resolution 230 is necessary. I believe that the Congress should go into this matter, not half-heartedly, nor yet accepting too much hearsay evidence as gospel, but actually to learn the facts for itself. Let each of us strive to the best of his or her ability to preserve this Nation in all its pristine splendor as a land of golden opportunity. I believe that once Congress gets all the facts, in such an investigation as is proposed by this resolution, a national program for the physically handicapped on a comprehensive scale may be undertaken.

As I have said, I have approached this problem from the viewpoint of utility. I have purposely refrained from dwelling upon the purely humane aspects. I do this, not from lack of knowledge or sympathy, but because the problem now has a powerful appeal to everyone from a practical point of view, whereas it would not reach so many by an appeal to their emotions.

I realize all too well the plight of those who, being handicapped, are and have been in the unhappy position of feeling that they are not wanted, or are of no use; that there is no place for them in the economic scheme or in the social system of our country. All too many examples have come to light in my own experience of handicapped who have been denied the opportunity to put their talents and abilities to work simply because industry, or Government, or corporations, or some individual had laws, restrictions, or adverse opinions concerning the employment of handicapped as a matter of policy. We must change that condition.

We must see that the handicapped, instead of being plunged into the depths of despair, are given that priceless boon of hope. We must see to it that their faith in God is equalled by their faith in their fellow men. We may bring this about through universal practice of the Golden Rule, "do unto others as ye would that they do unto you." We must see to it that in this, our beloved country, no man or woman lacks opportunity.

We must not despair when we face the unpleasant facts of today and contemplate the troubles of tomorrow. I have faith in the iron determination of the American people and their ability to surmount all difficulties. I am sure that, once this scourge of war has passed away, we shall again take up the march toward a better civilization. I know that the spirit which animated our pioneer forefathers and mothers is not dead, but has been handed down to our generation. The American people can lick any problem, once they unite upon a solution.

In conclusion, my friends, I wish to say that I shall do all possible to improve the condition of the handicapped, believing, as I do, that they are entitled to a full life of usefulness and happiness, and that they are important factors in our national economy.

I ask that you give support to the program announced here tonight, as I am sure that it is one which is needed, and is practical. It is one which, given full opportunity for development, will not only play an important part in winning this war, but in preserving the peace thereafter and creating a happier world for us all.

Mr. STRACHAN. Thank you, Congressman KELLEY, and may I say to you on behalf of this federation, that we are very sure that you will continue to do your utmost until House Resolution 230 is enacted.

Air Transport Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been honored recently by the visit here of several distinguished members of the House of Commons of the British Parliament. Among those very distinguished members is the Honorable Ronald Tree, who is acting as chairman of an informal committee of four Conservative members of the House of Commons concerned with civil aviation. Mr. Tree has furnished me with a copy of a statement on air transport policy made by his committee of the Parliament, a statement which is worthy of the attention of every Member of this body. It reads as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The committee believes that the British objective in the matter of air transport cannot be better put than in the words of Dr. Warner, Vice Chairman of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board:

"The first and fundamental concern of air transportation is to render genuine public service to the largest number of people. Air transportation is making the whole world one neighborhood. Hopes for the future must be based on the presumption that air transportation is a good thing and that the whole world needs to share its benefits. There must be no return to the evil days when it was administered in paltry doses with the authorization to operate internationally being parsimoniously doled out."

In accordance with this objective, as well as on the merits of the case, the study of the future of air transport must not be dominated by considerations of security. If security can be achieved by international action, it will be by international control of military aviation and air armaments, not by control of air transport. This committee assumes that the measures necessary for security will be taken by the United Nations and confines its proposals to the optimum development of air transport for purposes of commerce.

2. INTERNATIONAL OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION

This committee has reason to think that a world air transport system internationally owned and operated would not be acceptable either to the U. S. A. or to the U. S. S. R., and that it would not command general support in the present House of Commons. It is not, therefore, practical politics and should not be allowed to stand in the way of attainable objectives. The latter in the view of this committee include:

(a) An international convention embodying the principles laid down in paragraph 1 above, to which the British Empire should adhere.

(b) An international authority for the technical regulation of air navigation.

(c) Agreed machinery for the promotion of air transport and air commerce between nations.

3. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES

International machinery presupposes, and should be constituted from, corresponding authorities for nations or groups of nations.

This committee believes that the British Government should:

(a) Expand the functions of the Air Registration Board in the United Kingdom on lines similar to the United States Civil Aeronautics Board to include the general duty of planning air routes, hearing applications of would-be air-line operators, and deciding between them.

(b) Invite the dominions to do likewise and join with the United Kingdom in constituting from the British National Authorities an Empire Air Board. The committee sees every reason to hope that such an Empire Air Board would find it possible to act together on major questions affecting the development of Empire air transport, including international questions, without infringement of the domestic liberty of each dominion (including the United Kingdom) on air transport matters.

4. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION

This committee believes that an Empire Air Board should advocate an international convention including the following points:

(a) The "right of innocent passage" and of emergency landing should be absolute and universal, and the practice of establishing "prohibited areas" should be forbidden.

(b) The operation of air lines between two points in the same country or related geographical area is a matter of domestic policy for that country, e. g., New Guinea would be regarded as a "related geographical area" of Australia.

(c) The operation of air lines between two nations or groups of nations is a matter for arrangement between the countries concerned on a basis of reciprocity or agreement, which agreement the signatories to the convention would undertake not unreasonably to refuse (e. g., in the British Empire freedom of airport use and of air commerce would be unconditional for British operators and would be granted to foreign operators in exchange for reciprocal privileges or otherwise by agreement). A partial limitation of this provision affecting intra-European air lines is made in paragraph 7 below.

(d) Sovereign rights over airports should rest with the governments of the countries in which they are located. The signatories to the convention would undertake not to exercise their rights exclusively or by way of flag discrimination in favor of or against any nation enjoying reciprocal agreements on the lines proposed in paragraph 4 (c) above.

5. INTERNATIONAL REGULATION

The international adoption of standards of aeronautical practice in all technical matters affecting aircraft, air personnel, airports, and air navigation, and so forth, is essential. This committee believes that an international authority responsible for these matters should be constituted on the lines of I. C. A. N. expanded to include the whole world. This authority should also establish regional conferences of operators in the principal areas to establish orderly schedules of operation, and freights and fares, and to see from the disclosure of costings that no unjustifiable subsidies are being enjoyed.

6. MACHINERY FOR THE PROMOTION OF INTERCONTINENTAL AIR TRANSPORT

Within the framework of the convention and subject to the regulation of the interna-

tional authority, the development of air transport would be insured by national enterprise in the following way:

(a) Applications would be received by the United Kingdom board to run an air line from the United Kingdom to a foreign country in another continent.

(b) The U. K. board would decide between those applicants in consultation with the Government qua air mail contracts.

(c) The U. K. board would negotiate with the foreign country for the establishment of an air line by the preferred operator in return for some reciprocal arrangement.

(d) The service offered by the British operator would be submitted to the appropriate regional conference of the international regulation authority for regulation.

The committee believes that an effective sanction against breaches of the convention, or defiance of the regulations of I. C. A. N. or its regional conferences, would exist if the signatories undertook to refuse all air transport facilities, for as long as the offense, even by a single air line, continued, to all air lines of the offending nation.

7. EUROPE

This committee believes that special arrangements will be necessary in addition to the foregoing for air routes within continental Europe. The fundamental principle governing such arrangements must be the necessity for a single European authority, for the control of trunk routes throughout the Continent, on the lines successfully followed by the Federal authority in the United States.

This presupposes international agreement by the nations of continental Europe, which in turn can only follow the restoration of popular governments after the liberation. Such agreement may be expected to develop organically from the interim air transport service which will undoubtedly be instituted by the United Nations in the period of relief and reconstruction. It would be appropriate if the Allied Governments were to prepare, as a model, alternative methods for participation in European air transport on the assumptions of:

(a) A European air transport company in which each nation would be interested on an equal basis to operate European routes;

(b) A European air board whose license would be required by would-be operators within continental Europe.

This committee believes that a European air transport company on these lines would prove a successful precedent for international cooperation in Europe in other fields.

European nations with overseas possessions would be free to run air services between such possessions and the mother country.

European nations (excluding the Axis Powers so long as they are debarred by the United Nations' settlement) would be free to develop air services to foreign countries in other continents on the reciprocal basis laid down in paragraph 6 above.

8. CONTROL OF BRITISH AIR TRANSPORT

This committee is convinced that it is essential that responsibility to Parliament for United Kingdom civil air transport should be transferred from the air ministry to a civil transport ministry. The United Kingdom board of aeronautics should be appointed by the civil transport minister.

9. PRINCIPLES OF BRITISH AIR-LINE OPERATION

As regards British air lines, this committee believes that the following principles should be adopted:

(a) Not more than one air-mail contract should be awarded for any route.

(b) No single chosen instrument should operate more than one trunk route.

(c) Shipping, railway, road transport, and other interests should not be debarred from tendering for mail contracts or from participating in or managing such routes.

(d) In times of Empire emergency all operating lines should pass immediately under the control of the governments concerned. All flying personnel should be in the air forces reserves.

10. SUBSIDIES

This committee believes that it is necessary to distinguish clearly between the various kinds of payment which have in the past been termed subsidies.

(a) Mail surcharge. The superior speed of air-mail delivery has an economic value which can be determined by ascertaining by trial and error what the traffic will bear. The difference between such charges and ordinary mail charges is not subsidy, but the proper additional economic value of air mail service.

(b) Public assistance to airports and air navigation. Air transport operators should not be expected to find the capital cost of airports and navigation services any more than shipping lines are expected to build harbors and lighthouses. In both cases operators should pay reasonable dues for the use of such facilities. The wise expenditure of public money for these purposes is at once justifiable in the national interest and the best form of subsidy for air transport on an equal basis to all operators.

(c) Subsidies for infant air routes. Most main air routes after the war should be self-supporting. But it may be desirable for the promotion of commerce, or for the development of backward areas, to subsidize certain air lines. Such routes should be operated by a chosen instrument of the Government, and their costings and subsidies should be disclosed to the appropriate regional conferences of I. C. A. N.

(d) Special subsidies in transition period. The committee recognizes that special subsidies may be necessary in the transition period to air lines which are obliged to use uneconomic aircraft until such time as economic air transport planes are available.

The undersigned Conservative Members of Parliament have for the past 6 months devoted intensive study to the problem of post-war air transport.

During that time we have had the opportunity of discussing these problems with many prominent authorities, British and foreign. We have also gained much help and guidance from the many excellent documents and pronouncements dealing with this subject which have recently appeared in the United States of America and this country. The similarity of views expressed in the best of these is very heartening.

In particular we have been impressed by the arguments advanced by Dr. Warner in his recent article in Foreign Affairs, which have satisfied us that air security can be achieved by appropriate ad hoc measures without hampering the development of civil air transport.

Following the debate on air transport in the House of Commons on June 1, 1943, this informal committee decided to make public the result of its investigations. For the sake of speed and brevity, and having regard to the availability in printed form of the principal facts and arguments, this statement is confined to our suggested solutions of the main problems of post-war air transport.

We believe that the peoples of the British Commonwealth and Empire are now fully alive to the vital part which air transport must play in their future—a part in modern circumstances complementary to and no less vital than the part which sea transport has played in the past. We therefore feel that no apology is needed for the persistent efforts we are making, and shall continue to make, to direct attention to the difficulties, national and international, which stand in the way of air transport development and to contribute, as far as it lies in our power, to their solution.

In conclusion we wish to record our thanks to the Political Research Centre, which has placed its office facilities at our disposal, as well as the services of Mr. Robert Spicer, who, as secretary of the committee, has assisted us throughout our deliberations.

RONALD TREE, *Chairman.*
W. R. D. PERKINS.
J. A. CECIL WRIGHT, A. F. C.
ALFRED BEIT.
ROBERT SPICER, *Secretary.*

HOUSE OF COMMONS, *August 4, 1943.*

Career in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I request leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article entitled "Career in Politics" written by Miss Eve Garrette which appears in the November 1943 issue of the Woman With Woman's Digest, reading as follows:

CAREER IN POLITICS—SUCCESS IN THIS FIELD DOES A WOMAN, HER COMMUNITY, AND HER COUNTRY HONOR

(Eve Garrette)

In a war-torn world of today American inventive genius is efficiently planning a miracle world of tomorrow. Super-speed laundries, "unified" cooking ranges with transparent ovens—and such improvement in every known variety of housekeeping equipment that the word "drudgery" is doomed. Every forward-looking housewife is already thinking, what shall I do with my new-made leisure? One answer is obvious. Turn to a career that is a natural for women. In other words, go into politics.

I say politics is a natural for women on two counts. One, she is capable of service. Life in politics literally can begin at forty, as CLARE BOOTHE LUCE will tell you. The dean of Congresswomen, MARY NORTON of New Jersey, is 68, Senator HATTIE CARAWAY is 65; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, is 61, and Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the United States Mint, 63. Able, patrician-faced EDITH NOURSE ROGERS makes no more secret of her birthdate, 1881, than pretty WINIFRED STANLEY, the youngest woman in Congress, of hers, 1909. In politics, it's just a case of being your age; in the truly adult sense of the word.

A political career for women is a natural on count 2, because nature and life itself have generously endowed them with the qualifications necessary to a successful career therein. Women possess the splendid character qualifications of (1) a realistic approach to life's problems, (2) a shrewd knowledge of human nature, with special emphasis on man's nature, (3) moral courage, (4) ability to fight against darkest odds, (5) intuition, (6) tact, (7) sheer efficiency. I submit that the modern housewife is America's greatest efficiency expert, her talents turned to public service would revolutionize government—be it local, State or Nation-wide.

Women already in public service give the living lie to the man-made taboo that a political career for women is "unwomanly." Even her worst enemy concedes to CLARE LUCE a devastating womanliness. Looking as attractive as possible is as much part of a woman's stock in trade in politics as it is her everyday stock. If anything, more so. And if she makes the most of her femininity as regards fastidiousness in speech and conduct, she will find nothing offensive in her exposure to "dirty" politics, except possibly the chivalry of dirty politicians, who will "lovely lady" her to death in the fond hope that flattery will blind her to their machinations.

What are the practical steps by which a woman enters politics? Where does she begin? What offices are open to her?

Like every other career, the customary starting place is at the bottom. And in order to qualify for either party or public office it is necessary to be a registered voter in the political party of her choice. This is a wise and far-reaching provision, since ours is a government of political parties, with the parties out of power a loyal opposition. Our democracy would be puny, if not nonexistent, without a vigilant loyal opposition.

Having registered with the party of her choice, a woman affiliates with the political club in her assembly district or community. Political-club membership is essential because the club is the basic training school for political endeavor. It is the primary school of politics itself. It is where the novice learns the tricks of the trade and develops latent capacities for political leadership.

The election laws of most States vary, so in outlining the structure through which women advance politically it must be borne in mind that the general scheme is the same throughout the Union. Sometimes the difference in procedures consists only of a difference in names.

In New York State, for instance, the basic legal political unit is the assembly district county committee.

If there is only one assembly district in a county, the assembly district county committee is also the county committee. Many counties contain numerous assembly districts. New York County (Manhattan), for instance, has 23 assembly districts. Each assembly district elects its own State committeeman (one man or woman), its own chairman, vice chairman, secretary, and treasurer. The assembly district organizations elect the officers of the county committee.

Within each assembly district are a number of election districts or precincts. An election precinct, of which there are over 250,000 in the United States, is the smallest political division of the party organization. It is also the most vital since it is the real source of strength of the party machine. So write it down; learn to know your own precinct politics.

Each assembly district has a male and female State committeeman. These party officials, sometimes called district leaders, are designated by vote of the members of the county committee; but this designation must be confirmed by the vote of those regularly enrolled in the party at the primary election.

A woman who wants to scend the political ladder will aspire to be a county committeeman. To be elected a member of the county committee, she must circulate party petitions to the regularly enrolled party voters in her district. The number of signatures needed to give her a place on the ballot varies in the different States.

The ambitious, qualified woman who has been a good member of the county committee will, in time, be mentioned for State committeewoman of the assembly district. Or she may be elected vice chairman of the assembly district county committee or secretary of the committee, or aspire to the vice chairmanship of the entire county. The State committeewoman's post is preferable because it brings her into immediate and intimate contact with all of the State leaders, male and female.

If the woman becomes a State committeewoman, she is then established as a party factor. There are only two higher party offices she can achieve. One is to become vice chairman of the State committee. For that post she must have rendered outstanding service and have become a State-wide figure in her party. The State vice chairman—always a woman—is elected by the other members of the State committee. Her election does not need ratification at the polls. The only other higher party office open to her is that of national committeewoman. There is one of these women for each State. The election of the national committeeman and national committeewoman has a technique all its own. The two members of the national committee are elected by the delegates of a State delegation to the national convention during the national convention. The election carries for 4 years.

The highest strictly party office a woman can hold is that of vice chairman of the national committee of her party. The vice chairman of the national committee becomes, in effect, the first woman of her party in the country. Nellie Tayloe Ross, who was made Director of the United States Mint in 1933, at an annual salary of $8,000, was formerly vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. She is a premier example of the successful political-career woman. The fact that she married a man who became Governor of Wyoming (on his death she succeeded him in office for 2 years) in no way detracts from her distinguished party record. Men have also been known to marry propitiously.

Party posts, with the exception of the vice chairman of the national committee, carry no salary. In fact, most of those who travel the party post road will be out of pocket. It is, of course, true that they can receive some remunerative political appointment since, in politics, the spoils actually do belong to the victor. Therefore, although party office, as such, does not pay salary, an efficient and popular woman is frequently appointed to a paying position in the office of a county clerk, treasurer, auditor, or judge of her own party. In fact, there is scarcely a public office that does not have women on the pay roll as reward for having worked hard for the party in their own village, town, city, county, or State. Nearly all of the women one finds in Washington governmental positions can point to a home town political background.

As for the women who win public office at the polls—not by appointment—two outstanding examples are clever, college-bred, modern-minded JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois and WINIFRED STANLEY of upstate New York, who played for high stakes—a $10,000 seat in Congress—and won. Blonde Miss SUMNER was defeated in the primary for State's attorney when her smart chapeau was first tossed into the Illinois political ring in 1932; but by 1937 she had acquired sufficient vote appeal to be elected county judge, quickly followed by election to the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and now Seventy-eighth Congresses, where she sits on the Republican side of the aisle. Miss STANLEY won her spurs at the age of 29, as assistant district attorney of Erie County, New York, and in 1942 was elected to Congress.

The women who have been elected county auditor, county treasurer, county clerk, and so up the ladder to State legislative office, number in the thousands. Many are known to you in your own community. Many are your next-door neighbor or friends, and your vote doubtless put them where they are.

Certainly the fact that there are women secretaries of state in Connecticut, New Mexico, Washington, and South Dakota, and women superintendents of public instruction in Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Washington, as well as 5 women holding office in the New Jersey State Assembly, and 29 in the New Hampshire House of Representatives—this is something of a record—can be attributed to the feminine vote.

Such being the case, is it not high time you sat down to seriously appraise your own political potentialities? There is room for thousands more of you in this no longer man-made world. There is room, not to say a critical need, for women of character and ability, women actuated not by the "what's in it for me" motive, but by the selfless desire to serve their country well; to give the best that is in them to public service. The fact that many women who so desire are under the necessity of earning their living should not deter them from earning that living under the aegis of a political career. It is the motivation that counts, and nobility of motive that crowns a career in politics with success.

Barrelville Address, 1943, on the Dedication of the Soldiers' Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable William A. Gunter, of Cumberland, Md., at the dedication of the Soldiers' Honor Roll, Barrelville, Md., on Sunday, October 17, 1943:

Eightscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great global war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a home front battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a permanent resting place for the names of those who have left here to give their lives that the Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who were born and lived here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say over here, but it can never forget what they did over there. It is for us, the living, the well fed, the well paid, the fortunate here, to be here dedicated to the unfinished work which they who are fighting over there have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here at home dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from our honored dead, in unknown and unseen graves over there, we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here at home highly resolve that these American soldiers shall not have fought in vain—that this Nation, under God, and all nations so conceived and so dedicated, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

The Fifth Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on October 5 Carl A. Norgren, of Denver, Colo., made a constructive, able, and thought-provoking address before the Manufacturers Association of Colorado on the subject of the fifth freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from this address, which I feel will be of general interest and value to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fifth freedom, freedom of enterprise, which we have taken for granted in these United States for 150 years, is in grave jeopardy. I propose now that we defend that freedom and relentlessly fight those forces which would trespass upon that God-given right of American freemen.

The concept of this freedom is so fundamental that it cannot be considered alone. It is the very warp of our business and economic life. Woven through it is the woof of high living standards, world social and economic leadership, the very fineness of character and beauty of color that is American life. It is the lifeblood of labor and capital, of industry and agriculture, of business and the professions. It is America!

Since our primary concern now is the importance of the preservation of this concept of free enterprise in post-war America, it is essential to enunciate two corollary concepts which inevitably must function with our primary freedom if it is to endure. Therefore, I hold these truths to be self-evident:

1. That freedom of enterprise is fundamental to, and the very essence of, American industry, agriculture, social, and economic progress.

2. That the United States of America is, always has been, and always must be a capitalistic democracy if we are to retain what we have come to think of as "the American way of life."

3. That optimum employment of all who desire work is essential to domestic peace, security, and progress.

* * * * *

I have said that our free enterprise system is in jeopardy. This grave situation has not come about in a moment. We think now predominately in terms of the devastating effect of the present war upon our post-war economy. We must remember that the basic causes of what we now face have their roots in the aftermath of the last war, culminating in a demoralizing depression, combined with a dust-bowl drought which brought economic ruin to half the Middle West, urban as well as agriculture. We had gone a long way in our decadence toward the bureaucratic jam we are now in during the decade from 1930 to 1940. Mr. Norgren should have included the decade 1920 to 1930 as a part of this "decadence" period. For the first time in modern mass production history there was suddenly no market for our production. In retrospect it is not so difficult to see now what happened and, to a degree at least, see how it could have been avoided.

* * * * *

If we are to preserve the free enterprise system we must, then, begin by reasserting our determination to solve local problems locally, to tax ourselves for the payment of our own State and local bills independently of the Federal Government, and to resist the pandora lure of Federal funds to be matched for local benefit. We must again think and act with the courage of the individualists who fashioned the wonders and the wealth of this Nation out of a wilderness with the tools of unbounded self-reliance, vision, and horny-handed toil.

Now that the successful termination of the war is certain, if not actually in sight, planning for the future is the most popular sport of the day. That is as it should be. If, however, business does not come forward as a whole with a clearly formed plan of over-all industrial progress that will lay the ground work for reconversion of our mammoth war industry back to peacetime production, on a scale that will absorb all who wish to work, bureaucratic planners will take over permanently, and democracy, as we think of it, will be finished. Democracy simply cannot exist in an atmosphere of decrees and directives conceived, imposed, and enforced by agents or agencies who are not elected by, and therefore are not responsible to, the people.

The "experts" have their plan already to shoot. It covers everything from the cradle to the grave. If you think that business, States, or even local political subdivisions will long remain free under such a plan, as self-determining bodies, you have a shocking awakening coming.

* * * * *

The present attitude of indifference to the mounting Federal debt has influenced the thinking of those responsible in Washington to a point where the only answer to the question of the financial needs of business is more loans and more debt. There is a growing attitude in government that the sole function of profits in business is to produce tax money.

Someone is forgetting that the continued flow of profits, like milk from a cow, can only continue so long as the cow or the business is fed.

* * * * *

If we are permitted to retain some of our own harvest of profits to plow back into new ideas, developments, expansion, inventory, and operational needs, the flow of profits is maintained or increased, and more work is made for more people. If, however, the profits are taken for tax purposes beyond the bare needs of maintenance, business can only continue to grow by buying its capital feed in the market, which only increases its burden of interest and tax deductible load, and proportionately reduces its income. The farther this process goes the less the profit available for either taxes or capital return.

* * * * *

Public officials are already sounding the brass, "If industry does not employ the returning soldiers, Government will." Obviously, if industry does not provide optimum employment, Government must. But we have already demonstrated during the last decade that the Government-make-work program was crushingly expensive, low-level, ambition-killing subsistence employment. Government absorbs wealth. Government does not create wealth. Government spends the income of others but creates no profit to sustain it. The longer deficit spending is maintained, the greater the public load, the less the profits of private enterprise available for either taxes or creative work. Employment goes down further, and Government has to make more work. It is a vicious circle that has but one end—complete defeat of individual initiative, freedom of enterprise and the ultimate death of democracy itself.

* * * * *

The coming post-war period cannot be compared with the period following the last war. There are many factors now that are conducive to justifiable optimism. This time the public has both money and an enormous appetite for peacetime goods. We have the material for success at hand in new enterprises, and new products for many new industries. An innumerable list of essentials and luxuries fill the categories of accumulated civilian needs. The only way we can muff the ball is to fail to recognize these fundamental truths, or, having recognized them, fail to do something about them now.

Therefore, I propose that we, here, now resolve with greater determination than ever before in our political history that we shall stoutly defend those freedoms which have made America great among the nations of the earth, and that government of, by and for the people shall return again to this land we love.

The Livestock Industry in Wartimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial prepared for the Denver Post by Mr. F. E. Mollin, secretary of the American National Livestock Association. It states very well the attitude of livestock producers, not only toward the present ineffective way the Government is handling the livestock problem through regulation and restriction, but the worry over future developments and prices after the war.

The editorial follows:

THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY IN WARTIMES

(By F. E. Mollin, executive secretary, American National Livestock Association)

It has been said that in a short war the military comes first in importance, with transportation second, and food third; in a long war, food comes first, transportation second, and the military third. No doubt, the military arm of the Government would disagree with this statement, but it is beyond question that as a war progresses the importance of food is more generally recognized

Our military officials planned, and no doubt wisely so, for a long war; but the authorities dealing with the allocation of materials and supplies unfortunately did not, in the beginning of our major war effort, fully recognize the importance of the food industry. Instead of planning to aid it fully to meet the greatly enlarged requirements for war, lend-lease, and civilians, they imposed such severe restrictions as seriously to handicap its war effort.

The armed forces, through selective service, have taken each month their manpower requirements for military purposes. War industries, through their ability to pay high wages and pass on the cost, have been able to attract labor for their increased production. But in the field of agriculture the

cream of its workers was drained away by selective service and by the war industries before there was sufficient recognition of the need for increased food production. True, selective service officials, even early in 1942, promised that essential farm and ranch workers would be deferred; but the local draft boards were told to fill their quotas, and it was only after thousands of the best men had left the farms and ranches that an adequate policy of granting deferments to essential agricultural workers became Nation-wide in application.

In looking over the record of food production for 1942 and 1943, it seems almost miraculous that agriculture, operating under these handicaps, could have so risen to the emergency and made available to our armed forces, our allies, and our civilians two of the greatest crops ever produced in this country. This has been possible only by perfectly heroic effort on the part of farmers and ranchmen. It means that old men long since retired have gone back to the farm and that older ranchers who had largely given way to a younger generation have swung into the saddle again; it means that women have taken men's place on tractors, in the saddle, and in practically every kind of agricultural endeavor; it means that young folks, little more than children, have done their best to take a man's place wherever needed; but, more than that, it means that we have been favored with physical conditions that have made possible this record production in time of our greatest need. We should recognize the fact that production in the future on anything like the present scale will be most difficult to maintain. Further inroads upon the labor supply, further breakdown of scarce equipment, increasing difficulties in transportation, to say nothing of the increasing burden of governmental regulation, all point the other way.

In spite of the fact that production has been so greatly increased in almost every line, consumers have heard much about shortages and scarcity and have not had a full appreciation of the increased production. Part of the shortages has been due to poor distribution brought about by the great strain placed upon our transportation facilities; part has been due to stupid regulations issued by policy makers in Washington who knew little about the problems with which they were dealing. Price ceilings were imposed in many instances only because of a desire to keep prices low and little, if any, thought was given to the question of whether or not they would permit production on the scale needed.

There was full discussion of these problems at an unusually large livestock conference held in Kansas City on September 2. Mayor LaGuardia of New York came by plane to attend that conference in order to get first-hand information on the meat situation. I quote from his remarks to the conference on the subject of the consumer interest in low retail prices and production and the subsidy roll-back program which was extolled as a measure for the special benfit of consumers:

"A great deal was said today about the roll-back, and its cost, $1 or so a hundredweight, I believe. I am sure that was brought about with the best of intentions. We thought you (the livestock producers) were getting the benefit of it, now you tell us you were not, and let me tell you we are not getting the benefit of it. * * * It seems almost unbelievable, but its is true, with the exception of pork and pork products, there is very little meat sold in the East at retail ceiling prices. * * * Insofar as New York City is concerned, retail ceiling prices don't mean anything."

So it would seem that the consumer is more interested in buying real meat at a fair price than he is in a theoretical program of nonexistent meat at low ceiling prices.

Because of all the talk of scarity, it is not generally realized that the livestock industry under most difficult conditions has greatly expanded production. In 1940, for the first time in the history of the industry, the total meat production exceeded 18,000,000,000 pounds, reaching almost 19,000,000,000 pounds. In 1941 production was increased to a total of about 19,500,000,000 pounds. In 1942 it was again increased to approximately 21,500,000,000 pounds, and this year when there has been the most talk of meat scarcity, official Government estimates indicate a total meat production in excess of 23,000,000,000 pounds. There has been bad distribution and there have been black markets which have siphoned meat away from normal channels of distribution; but there have also been adequate supplies for the Army, enormous shipments for lend-lease, and, as detailed above, the greatest production in the history of the country.

In making this great contribution to the war effort, producing far above normal demands, the livestock industry—and, as a matter of fact, practically every branch of agriculture—is assuming far greater risks than are taken by most manufacturing industries. You cannot lock the door on a livestock production plant when the war is over and the demand for the product drops back to normal. It takes a long time to liquidate such a producing plant. In the case of cattle, liquidation back to a normal basis may well take a period of several years. It is therefore of great importance in the midst of war, with every effort being made to keep production up and supply the meat so badly needed here and abroad, that we should likewise have an eye to the future. We need an intelligent program for livestock and agriculture that will help to carry producers through the critical post-war days to come without the chaotic conditions that followed the last war. Farms and ranches belong to the producers and not to the Government as so many of the war plants do. They cannot be turned back to the Government except under foreclosure, which all should wish to avoid. Some relief may be afforded in the liquidation process through the export of meat and possibly some breeding animals for feeding and restocking occupied countries. At best, this is only a temporary expedient. This outlet will be available only as long as we are willing to provide the product free, and, when the war is over, taxpayers will not be willing to continue long in the role of Santa Claus. We should not forget that at the close of the last war in spite of predictions that markets abroad would absorb our surpluses for years to come, the outlet dried up quickly—within a year or two.

The first move taken by civilian populations and disbanding armies when peace comes is to grow something to eat. We should not forget that many other countries have likewise expanded their production to meet the war emergency and that their surpluses, too, will be crowding upon the world market. In the long run, despite every effort to increase foreign trade, which will be easy so long as we continue in the role of giving, the future of agriculture depends largely upon the home market. No possible post-war program that does not contemplate giving agriculture reasonable protection in that market, which has been and will be the greatest and richest in the world, can be sound. The record of the past shows that when the readjustment comes every country in the world will be looking out for No. 1, and if Uncle Sam fails to do just that the agricultural producers of this country will be the first to suffer.

Agriculture cannot bear the brunt of greatly increased foreign trade if it means that the export products of our manufacturing plants are to be paid for with imports of raw agricultural materials. Labor as well will find that it cannot expect to maintain anything like the present high-wage scales on any other basis than that of a protected market in this country, not only for agriculture but for industry as well. Stability in world trade will be better assured by a reasonable tariff policy than by a free-trade policy which fails to recognize differences in standards of living which cannot be suddenly resolved in arbitrary fashion. Furthermore, how can we even service the great national debt we are accumulating without keeping national income on a high level? Those theorists who have had visions of a world at peace, with brotherly love in evidence on all sides, and with greatly expanded foreign trade on practically a free-trade basis have had a long inning because of the war emergency and the ability of the markets of the world to absorb everything offered from any place at high prices; but when peace comes it will be seen that to bring about such a happy state we must do it not by raising the standards of living of the people of the world to the basis of our standards, but by lowering our standards toward the level of the millions in India, Asia, and elsewhere. Agriculture does not want that, and neither, I think, does industry, labor, or the country in general.

Steve Majewski, the War Bond and Stamp Salesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute and extend my sincere congratulations to a little fellow who is doing a big job, selling War bonds and stamps in my home city of Detroit.

Steve Majewski lives in Hamtramck, Mich. He is too old to fight in the Army, but he is just as eager to do his part as any soldier. He is a war worker, a tool maker and tool grinder at the General Motors plant in Detroit. Every minute of his time that can be spared from his war work is used to further the sale of War bonds and stamps.

Steve was born in Poland, his family were there at the time of the invasion. Two of his brothers were killed by the Nazis in 1939, while trying to defend their native country from the Nazi invaders. Whether his mother and the rest of his family are still living, Steve does not know.

Steve is an American citizen. He loves his adopted country and recognizes his citizenship as a great privilege. To show his appreciation of this privilege he is doing all that he can to help the United States to win the war, and as a minute-man in the War bond sales campaign he is without doubt the champion in the State of Michigan. Steve goes from store to store, from restaurant to night club, barber shop and beer garden, hawking his

wares, posting Treasury Department cards and banners in windows and in showcases, urging all who are within range of his voice to buy stamps and bonds. Although Steve's English is none too good, and his accent is decidedly foreign, he is, nevertheless, understood by everyone. His heart is in his work, his sincerity of purpose rings in his voice, and when he talks his eyes sparkle, and his pride in his American citizenship shows in every motion and in every word that he speaks. He is a one-man organization, a one-man army, crusading every minute of his time for victory, and a crushing defeat for the Nazis. Steve has sold nearly a million and a half dollars' worth of War bonds and stamps in small denominations. The people whom he has contacted and spoken to would run into hundreds of thousands. The minutemen's slogan, "Don't stop buying while our boys are dying," is heard wherever Steve goes.

America is proud of her Steve Majewskis.

The Late Hon. Edward W. Creal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. GREGORY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, having for many years enjoyed to the fullest extent an intimate association and deep friendship with the Honorable Edward W. Creal, of Kentucky, I feel that the thoughts expressed in the poem presented to me today by Horace C. Carlisle are most appropriate and descriptive of the character, the sincerity of purpose, the intelligence, and the genuine worth of this distinguished son of Kentucky who has gone to his reward.

It is a privilege to submit this poem to the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVE CREAL

A man of the people was Congressman Creal—
Yea, for them he labored and by them he stood,
And to them he trustingly made his appeal
For help to lift higher American-hood.
From near the log cabin where Lincoln was born,
Not far from the sweet southern home which inspired
The song, Old Kentucky Home, whose tones adorn
Its words, came this statesman, beloved and admired.

The Fourth District, which Representative Creal
So well represented, is sitting today
In sackcloth and ashes—her citizens feel
A sorrow and grief that can't soon pass away.
Among all their many great men that have gone—
And they've produced many—Kentuckians feel
That, high up among the best that have passed on,
Deservedly, stands Representative Creal.

His district, his State, and his country have lost
A statesman, a thinker, a scholar, a friend,
Who, when duty called, never counted the cost,
But stepped to the task, and remained to the end.
He "died in the harness," as he wished to do—
In many hard battles, he signally won—
In glory the dreams of his heart will come true,
For he prayed one prayer, "Not my will, Thine be done."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Resolutions of the Iowa State Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the very effective farm organizations in the State of Iowa is the Grange. It is composed of farmers and their wives whose aim is first and always to work for the betterment of agriculture. In extending my remarks in the RECORD I desire to call attention to the resolutions adopted at the 74th annual session of the Iowa State Grange held in Manchester, Iowa, September 28, 29, and 30.

Whereas Iowa agriculture is tied up so closely with the producers of meat, milk, poultry, fruits and vegetables, oilseeds, and feed grains; and

Whereas the Iowa farmer is vitally interested in the war food production of these commodities. Our farms and equipment are geared to produce these things: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose efforts of governmental agencies to change the dietary habits of our people to consume the grain rather than the meat or other products it creates. And further we feel that any price control and support prices deemed necessary on foodstuffs should be under one head and that such head be held responsible for food production as well. Farmers have had no assurance up to this time whether the support price announced for hogs, for example, is to be based on daily, monthly, or seasonal prices, or how such support will be accomplished. Therefore, we believe the law should provide that no ceiling price should be placed on any commodity below the support price for such commodity. As such action would necessitate subsidy payments, a further drain on the Treasury. Therefore, we are opposed to any form of subsidy.

Whereas livestock production is the basis of Iowa agriculture—

Resolved, That more consideration be given to the available supply of protein supplement in order that a constant flow of meat, poultry, and dairy products be maintained. We insist that the producer of soybeans should have priority for what bean meal he requires as protein supplement.

Resolved, That we urgently require the War Food Administration and the War Meat Board to give more consideration to all facts and existing production capacities of the Corn Belt in shaping the food program to avoid taking action which will permanently injure our livestock industry.

Resolved, That we oppose ceiling prices on farm commodities unless farm prices, labor income, industrial prices, and transportation costs are established and maintained on a basis of equality.

Resolved, That the Grange is not in favor of discontinuing the oleo tax.

We favor amending the Constitution of the United States to give legal right for all citizens of compulsory military age the right to vote.

Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I extend my remarks, including herewith an article from the New York Times magazine of October 17, 1943, concerning the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., recently appointed Under Secretary of State, entitled "Diplomat From Industry's School," which contains much information about one who has been a very able administrator in the Government since the beginning of this war:

DIPLOMAT FROM INDUSTRY'S SCHOOL

STETTINIUS, PERSONA GRATA TO RUSSIANS AND CONGRESS, BELIEVES IN TOTAL COOPERATION TO WIN THE WAR

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON.—Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., brings to his job as Under Secretary of State a new type of diplomatic experience—that of an industrial diplomat. As vice president of General Motors and later as chairman of the board of United States Steel Corporation, Mr. Stettinius was primarily a good-will builder, and there are few top-flight corporate executives who would deny his skill at making friends and influencing people.

As a creator of industrial good will it was his function to see that corporate interests were well represented, that policies and methods were clearly understood by the public and employees, and that cordial relations were maintained with other corporations. What better qualifications could there be for diplomacy?

Mr. Stettinius always has had to combat the adverse criticism that he is "a rich man's son" stemming from Wall Street and Virginia and riding high toward success on his father's coattails. His father was a partner in the J. P. Morgan firm and, incidentally, set his son an example of wartime service by acting in World War No. 1 as purchasing agent in the United States for the Allies. Mr. Stettinius, Sr., spent three billion Allied dollars in this country for war supplies purchased by foreign governments in commercial transactions. His son already has shipped $15,000,000,000 worth of goods charged to his World War No. 2 lend-lease account, some of which will be paid back in cash, some in goods, some not at all.

Most of the doubts as to the capacities of the new Under Secretary come from cynics who emphasize his family, charm, graciousness—and youth; he won't be 43 until Friday. There was such skepticism in Russia when Mr. Stettinius became priorities director and, in January 1941, Administrator

of Lend-Lease. But this skepticism vanished as did that on Capitol Hill when he applied to his enormous task of furnishing matériel to our allies, and especially to Russia, his ability to get things done.

As Lt. Gen. William Knudsen, his former colleague on the National Defense Commission, put it, "that fellow Stettinius can run the bases faster than any man I've ever seen." He had the sensitive and sometimes suspicious Russians in his back pocket after he hit one home run for them in the urgent matter of 5,000 tons of barbed wire. The Russians reported to President Roosevelt in the fall of 1941 that they were suffering from a critical shortage of long barbed wire for military usé. Mr. Stettinius was told that a ship would be held waiting and that he had 10 days in which to put 5,000 tons of wire aboard it.

The United States Army then was short of its own supply and Mr. Stettinius was able to pick up only a few hundred tons from warehouses. He telephoned a steel official at Cleveland. There was no time for a formal order replete with customary Government red tape and ordering ritual, but would this man's company forget the red tape and cooperate to fill this urgent need? Without specifications or orders, on Mr. Stettinius' say-so, the manufacturer ran his mill night and day until the wire was produced, making the boat within the dead line.

The same directness in his dealings with Congress, which lately has established something of a reputation in balking at Roosevelt appointments, won him equal cordiality on Capitol Hill. In January of this year, just before he flew to Casablanca, the President told Mr. Stettinius to go to Congress first for his lend-lease appropriation, and then later to go back and get an extension of the Lend-Lease Act. In the meantime the House leadership decided to move right in on lend-lease, getting both the extension and appropriations out of the way immediately.

Mr. Stettinius' marching orders from the President being different and the "Boss" beyond reach, what was to be done? Mr. Stettinius decided to cooperate with Congress—he spent a solid month testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Like the Russians, the committeemen were disarmed by his directness. They reported the bill unanimously, the House passed it 407 to 6, the Senate approved 82 to 0, and the Foreign Affairs Committee said, "Mr. Stettinius has been most helpful and forthright in his endeavors to supply the committee with information requested of him. The members of the committee have been impressed with the integrity and ability of Mr. Stettinius and feel that his selection as Administrator of Lend-Lease was a distinctly meritorious choice." A clear-cut victory for the Stettinius brand of "industrial diplomacy."

It paid full dividends 8 months later when the Senate committee unanimously approved Mr. Stettinius' appointment as Under Secretary of State without bothering him with the routine cross-examination most Presidential nominees are forced to undergo. The Senate underscored the committee's action with another unanimous vote.

Mr. Stettinius' success with Congress is attributed to the characteristic which seems to win him universal acceptance. That is his natural manner, which somewhat surprises people who are awed by his reputation. Congressmen always look for an air of superiority in the bureaucrats who come before them, but they never found it in Mr. Stettinius. When he started his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee this interchange took place with CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, ranking Republican committee member:

"Mr. EATON. Why does this bill call for an extension of only 1 year?

"Mr. STETTINIUS. It was felt that would be best because it was impossible to ascertain at the present time what world events would be, and that the Congress, perhaps, could have a second look.

"Mr. EATON. It was due entirely then to a consideration of the feelings of Congress?

"Mr. STETTINIUS. It was entirely, sir.

"Mr. EATON. Thank you. That is quite unusual."

Mr. Stettinius apparently adheres to President Roosevelt's concept of America's role of leadership and collaboration in the coming years of peace, else the President, who demands strict allegiance where matters of high policy are concerned, would never have picked him for either Lend-Lease Administrator or Under Secretary of State. Probably only Mr. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and a few of Mr. Stettinius' intimate friends have ever heard him express his views of foreign policy, either for the present or after the war, since he rarely does any public speaking.

Mr. Stettinius has probably done as much as any one man in the Government to pave the way for international cooperation after the war by developing through lend-lease the habits and forms of cooperation which will be counted on later to assure a working partnership among the countries of the world.

"If we look back over the part that lend-lease has played in the war and its relation to the United Nations' battle against the Axis powers," he told the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "we realize that a principle has been hammered out in a time of crisis. That principle is the principle of total cooperation among the nations in the waging of war—cooperation in the interest of each, and for the benefit of all, the only principle on which a war of alliance can be successfully waged."

And his friends are convinced that he is keenly aware of the analogy which that principle holds for the post-war period.

If Mr. Stettinius has the broad, progressive view of international relations, he is no less adaptable to changed conditions in his views of the function of industry in the modern world. No New Dealer, he is nevertheless a social and political liberal. In some of his infrequent addresses he has put himself on record that:

"No longer can industry plow a single furrow toward a single strictly commercial objective; instead, it must manage its affairs with due regard to the whole field of human relations.

"Our instruments of production, land, transportation, factory, and office shall in the future be conducted with more statesman-like emphasis on the welfare of all involved—employees, stockholders, consumers, and public."

How did Mr. Stettinius get this way? An outstanding industrialist holding the confidence of a New Deal President and of Communist Russia and of a slightly cantankerous Congress and of big business. And of the professional diplomats of the State Department who welcomed his appointment to a job some of them might have claimed through seniority and experience. His friends and critics alike credit his success to the one impelling motive that marks his life and all his personal and professional actions; a wish to do good for other people, coupled with personal integrity.

No one can study the man without being impressed with a certain humility which stems from a deep-seated faith. Mr. Stettinius says that when he is in a tight spot he prays "and then everything is all right."

Even as an undergraduate at the University of Virginia young Ed had the wide social vision that later permitted him as the $100,000-a-year chairman of United States Steel to be understanding and sympathetic to those New Deal purposes which he believes most desirable. He was a Wall Street rich "damn Yankee" serving as president of Virginia's campus Y. M. C. A., doing missionary work in the Ragged Mountains, teaching Sunday school, and conducting a student self-help bureau to aid needy students in finding jobs.

It was the latter activity, not his father's reputation, that attracted the attention of John Lee Pratt, a Virginia alumnus and vice president of General Motors. Pratt and Stettinius, Sr., persuaded him to abandon his current "call" to the ministry and turn to industry as a vehicle for doing good for others.

After working in the shops of the Hyatt Roller Bearing Co. for 40 cents an hour, he moved from this General Motors subsidiary to a vice presidency of the parent corporation, in charge of employee relations. He was soon handling general public relations and early in the depression played a major role in the pre-New Deal "share-the-work" program. Under the National Recovery Administration of the days of the blue eagle, Mr. Stettinius practiced industrial diplomacy as liaison officer between the N. R. A. and industry.

His bent for social service naturally led him to these quasi-governmental positions, and when the depression was succeeded by war prosperity and war planning, he again came to Washington to serve as chairman of President Roosevelt's War Resources Board (1939), on the National Defense Advisory Commission (1940), as director of priorities division, Office of Production Management (1941), Lend-Lease Administrator that same year, and now as Under Secretary of State in one of the Nation's and the world's most critical periods of international diplomacy and economics.

Mr. Stettinius tells his friends that he has no political ambitions; that he considers himself drafted for the State Department job in a time of national emergency just as he was drafted for the Advisory Commission in 1940. If what seem to be his present intentions are fulfilled, he will get out when he thinks the big job is done.

But, with such a vista of major problems ahead in American diplomacy and in view of the Stettinius vitality and eagerness for public service, it is hard to visualize him as a retired country gentleman for many years to come.

The Late Nathan S. Jonas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle on the death October 17 of Nathan S. Jonas, retired banker, philanthropist, and a leader for many years in the cultural and civil life of Brooklyn:

NATHAN S. JONAS

In the death of Nathan S. Jonas at the age of 75, Brooklyn loses a citizen who was for years one of its leading bankers and philanthropists. His death occurred in the Jewish Hospital which he had founded and helped develop into one of the finest institutions of its kind in the country.

Mr. Jonas was always a leader, a man full of ideas in whom others naturally had confidence. His success in banking was phenomenal. First he founded the Citizens Trust Co., then by a series of mergers and purchases, built up the Manufacturers Trust Co., with branches all over the city. He

retired from the chairmanship of its board in 1931.

Mr. Jonas was always deeply interested in Jewish communal affairs, and in addition to founding the Jewish Hospital he will always be remembered as the "father of federation" under which numerous Jewish charities were linked in one organization—an idea which is now extended to all of New York City.

He was a most public-spirited citizen and a great philanthropist, but above all he endeared himself by his qualities of heart and mind to thousands of friends throughout Brooklyn.

About Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, one of the real dangers now before the American people is the rapid progress being made toward a completely socialized state. It is true every time the opportunity has been presented the American people have voted almost unanimously against communism, socialism, or any other form of collectivist government. And yet in spite of that fact we are day by day being led down the road which will eventually end in the loss of representative government and human liberty.

One of the most dangerous proposals before us is that of socialized medicine, as set forth in bills such as H. R. 2861.

Under our system of free government and individual enterprise we have built up standards of medical and dental care higher than in any other country on earth.

I trust the American people will think this matter over very carefully before they permit these great professions, which are so near to all of us, to be placed under political domination.

In accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include an excellent editorial written by Earl Hall, of the Mason City Globe-Gazette of Mason City, Iowa. Mr. Hall is also a member of the Board of Education of the State of Iowa.

The editorial is as follows:

ABOUT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Because we believe free enterprise can do almost everything better than government can (there are some things government must do, we concede), we are disturbed by the apparent trend toward socialized medicine. We hold the hope that the conditions which make such socialization plausible in the average mind will be sought out by the medical profession itself and that earnest effort will be made by the medical profession to direct the solution of the problem.

Foremost among these is the fact that major surgery or protracted illness, involving hospitalization, is major fiscal tragedy for the average household. The cost involved has the effect of throwing a family budget out of balance for months or even for years.

Another factor of importance in the general picture is that, despite the progress made in recent years, medical service is not yet widely enough diffused. Too many Americans are not receiving maximum benefits from the medical science. And that goes for dentistry too.

At least that's the way millions of people feel about it. And that's what counts so far as widespread receptivity to suggestions of socialization are concerned.

The situation calls for some earnest and constructive thinking on the part of leaders in the medical profession. A program can and should be developed in the profession to deal with these two most commonly held complaints.

Herein, it seems to us, is the best hope of closing the door on a further extension of socialism.

Treasury Program of Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate in counting among my friends a gentleman who has accepted every opportunity presented to him to serve his country in peace and war. I refer to Col. Millard D. Brown, president of Continental Mills, Inc., manufacturers of textiles, in Philadelphia. Continental Mills is by no means one of the largest textile manufacturers. It is, however, one of those business organizations which, begun in a very modest way, has survived the years and has become one of the organizations contributing substantially to the economic welfare of the city in which it is located.

I am in receipt of a letter from Colonel Brown in which he reviews the history of his company. It has been a most interesting experience. It is, I believe, typical of the experience of many business organizations in this country which have been successfully developed from a very modest beginning.

Colonel Brown's experience and his philosophy of life together with his deep and abiding confidence in the things which have made this country what it has been in the past, are such as to intrigue the interest of every Member of this House. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit his letter for the RECORD:

CONTINENTAL MILLS, INC.,
Philadelphia, October 4, 1943.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: As I read the Treasury program of taxation as reported in the newspapers Sunday, and noted the program of the labor unions to restrict the earnings of all persons to $25,000 a year, I reviewed the past and decided I would send you the results of my ruminations.

My father lost whatever he had accumulated in the panic of 1907. In 1909, Mr. Bowers—whose name appears on our letterhead—and I entered business together, each contributing $500 of borrowed money for our capital. Over the years we lost our entire capital several times. Each time we repaid our debts 100 percent.

We are not rich men, but we have a well-established business and feel that our success has been in the confidence we have been able to build up in our relations with our employees and customers.

We divide our profits with our employees yearly. We pay the highest rates of wages of any firm in the textile industry of the United States. Our employees either own their homes or have savings or investments. They have protection against sickness and death, all on a cooperative basis. These things they had long before the New Deal thought of taking from the earners to provide security for the benefit of those whom no incentive could inspire to produce.

I mention these things not to glorify myself, but as a background for what follows.

The good old American thought that the rewards of industry belonged to those who produced, inspired our entire organization. We would never have been able to build up our capital and organization had the tax laws and other restraints of the last 10 years existed in the early days. Julius Caesar, whose bread and circus policy and other extravagances laid the basis for the fall of the Roman Empire, and King Midas were both pikers compared with the New Deal.

I am not objecting to the enormous expenses of our armed forces in the war. This war must be won at all costs. You and I served in France in the last war. My only son is in the Navy in this war. We must back up these sons of ours or we will never have the chance to bring liberty back to the America that we love.

A dollar saved is much better than a dollar taxed, and therefore I do protest the enormous extravagance in our civil administration of our National Government. Anyone who has to do business with this enormous bureaucracy realizes that the civil business of this country could be conducted with one-half the present employees. Over 3,000,000 civil employees are now on the Government pay roll. The salaries alone of these civil employees must be $6,000,000,000, which is one-half the increased taxes desired. Many have little to occupy their time. The lack of knowledge of their jobs and the procrastination of the heads of sections is so great that the war efforts are delayed and production hampered. I know of cases that this bureaucracy has mulled over for more than a year that could have been decided in a month.

The many foolish projects in which millions of dollars are wasted are the talk of every community.

The complicated program of taxes on income suggested by the Treasury is ridiculous. Complicated tax formulas are invariably misunderstood, causing many errors in tax returns, which in turn causes much unnecessary waste of time on the part of the taxpayer, expert accountants, and Treasury employees. Tax laws should be as simple as possible and so designed that each earner contributes his just share of income. I believe that he who earns more should pay a greater percentage.

The idea of complicating a life-insurance policy with a withholding tax is the device of a government that is afraid to face stern reality. It is only postponing the evil day. Furthermore, I do not favor tying social legislation to income taxes. Social legislation should be considered separately and its cost clearly understood.

The suggestion of the labor unions is short-sighted and un-American. It is another effort to cut men down to one level. A country where all men are not allowed to grow will never progress. If we are to progress as a Nation there must be incentives for individual accomplishment. There should be no limit to what a man should earn. That is not the American way. All of our big businesses of today were once little businesses, started by individual men. A man had an idea that would give better or cheaper service to the public. As he succeeded he would

accumulate capital and eventually establish a large institution, employing thousands of employees at better wages than they otherwise would have known. We must have a lot of little fellows starting in business every year if we are to have a continuation of progress. The little fellows are the recruiting squads of our future advances. Such legislation is killing off the recruiting squad.

These fellows of the New Deal do not seem to realize that their ideas are reactionary, instead of liberal; that all their New Deal thoughts express a defeatist attitude; that all their ideas are as old as the hills and have never worked out except to the ruin of the economy adopting such ideas. They say our economy is mature and therefore must be under Government control. No absolute state has existed for long.

I merely want to state that no economy ever reaches maturity, where men are free. Freemen never cease developing because they know that they are entitled to the fruits of their labors. Government control robs them of their rewards; incentive dies; and the world gets a setback.

Liberty and freedom is the only liberal ideology that will never grow old.

Pardon my verbosity. I had to unburden myself to someone and I selected you as the one who could use my thoughts to the best advantage of our country, if any of them happen to be worth consideration.

Hope you continue in good health and that God will strengthen your hands for the work ahead. Christianity can only exist under individual liberty.

Sincerely yours,

MILLARD D. BROWN.

It Will Take Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of October 15, 1943:

IT WILL TAKE MONEY

It is doubtful whether many industries have any accurate means of determining how much it will cost them to convert their facilities to peacetime operations. Some of the larger concerns which keep accurate figures on depreciation costs and similar expenses perhaps have a fairly concrete idea of what they will have to expend. Most of them are building post-war reserves to cover anticipated expenditures. It goes without saying, of course, that even among the larger companies it is impossible to provide sufficient reserves for all possible contingencies. For example, the head of one large automobile corporation noted recently that if it retained all its wartime employees for a period of 4 weeks after war contracts were canceled the entire post-war fund it has accumulated would be completely wiped out. Post-war reserves which appear huge when considered by themselves may actually prove inadequate.

It's the smaller manufacturer, however, who will probably experience the greater difficulties in financing his conversion program. For the most part he is finding it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to put aside enough for that rainy day. He has no elaborate system for determining what his post-war financial needs may be; yet he must justify to the Government any funds he sets aside as a reserve. If he is principally engaged in subcontracting his operating costs probably fluctuate over a wide range, particularly if he is being constantly required to shift from one job to another. In short, he has little margin to carry him over.

Those conditions are generally recognized, though little enough has been done as yet to offset them. Members of Congress and Federal agency officials have suggested that provisions be made for advancing loans to small concerns to tide them over the conversion period. But that hardly seems an adequate solution to the problem. Nor does it appear quite fair. The cost of restoring a plant to peacetime production is as legitimately a wartime cost as was that of converting the plant to wartime production in the first place.

Let's look at it another way. Actually the Government, for the purpose of war production, has borrowed the plants and their facilities. It ought, then, to assume, in some way, the responsibility for turning them over to the owners ready for use. Two ways of doing that immediately suggest themselves; one is to provide for the establishing of adequate post-war reserves—though it may be too late in many cases to do that now—and the other is to set up a Federal fund to finance the reconversion.

We are spending billions to fight the war. Our sole purpose is to maintain our freedom and protect our way of life. But unless the continued existence of our "industrial plant" is assured after the war the very fabric of our system will disintegrate. We ought to be willing to spend a little to keep that system intact. The speed with which the reconversion is accomplished and the extent of industrial expansion depend on the financial condition of industry. If either program falters the inevitable result will be endless relief appropriations; in the end the cost will have proved greater than if industry had been given the needed financial assistance. Given those two alternatives, the choice is obvious.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I submit herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, in the issue of October 14, 1943, relating to lend-lease, which expresses my views with reference to the operation of lend-lease:

LEND-LEASE

To all those who recognize that we are engaged in a coalition war it will be good news that our lend-lease food shipments to our allies have been 50 percent greater thus far in 1943 than they were in 1942. More than a billion pounds of food and other agricultural commodities were delivered to shipside in August for export to Allied fighting forces. In other words, we are beginning to make good on our pledge to serve as the larder of democracy. Yet, we have given up for lend-lease purposes only 9.2 percent of our domestic food supply.

This is the sort of thing which so upset our five peripatetic Senators and caused Senator ELLENDER, after hearing them, to observe that "We have been the sucker in the *n*th degree." One is at a loss to figure out what the Louisianan means. We could, of course, let the British eat cake and advise the Russians to withdraw their men from the Dnieper in order to cultivate their own food supplies. Would this, we wonder, be deemed shrewd and hard-headed by the men who look upon lend-lease as pure philanthropy?

If we were to pursue this course our allies might reasonably be expected to stop supplying foodstuffs to our forces overseas. During 1942 Australia furnished American troops in the South and Southwest Pacific with the bulk of their food supplies. This meant that civilians in that Allied country went without potatoes, citrus fruits, pork products, and other staples of their diet. New Zealand contributed similarly. Our Army in England received 38,000,000 pounds of fresh food last year through reciprocal lend-lease. If supplies of this sort were not made available to us by our allies, our shipping problem would be insuperable.

But these are aspects of lend-lease which our senatorial tourists apparently did not notice when they were abroad. Perhaps this is because they have wholly failed to grasp the meaning of the lend-lease program. It is a program for the prosecution of a United Nations war. It involves a pooling of resources for the achievement of a common goal—a contribution by each member of those things which it can most effectively produce. This may not be the smartest sort of horse trading. But it is the most effective way to win a global conflict.

Robert Butler—A Shipbuilder With Spurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the war is won and the peace is written there are some men in America who will stand out above all others as contributing to this victory. In the present rush of events and fast-moving developments we look upon such men now with mere commonplace. We look upon them as men who are merely performing their patriotic duty. In this more or less usual vein, we overlook genius and we overlook unusual achievement. To master production is one thing. But to master production in a most unusual and outstanding manner is a thing of much greater importance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to a man who has mastered production to a most unusual degree of success. This man is none other than Robert Butler, president of the Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., of Superior, Wis. Robert Butler's contribution to our victory will go down in history as the greatest from the standpoint of achievement in production of ships. You can talk all you want about your Higginses and Kaisers—for a record in real achievement I will take Robert Butler—a shipbuilder with spurs. Bear with me, gentlemen,

and permit me to point out his record as a shipbuilder.

Less than 2 years ago Robert Butler took over a city dump in the city of Superior, Wis. Mind you gentlemen, this is less than 2 years ago. Today this ex-city dump is without doubt the smoothest operating shipyard in America. This ex-city dump in less than 2 years has not only been converted into the greatest producing shipyard, but has already produced ships beyond human imagination. The figures I am going to give are hard to believe. These figures stagger one's imagination when we consider that less than 2 years ago this yard managed by Robert Butler was a city dump.

To date, Robert Butler and his organization at this Superior, Wis., shipyard have launched and delivered 18 oceangoing cargo ships for British lend-lease. Let me call your attention to the fact that these 18 oceangoing cargo ships have been delivered, not only launched. This means that these 18 oceangoing cargo ships are already carrying food and implements of war to our boys on the fighting fronts. In addition this shipyard, which was a city dump less than 2 years ago, under the leadership of Robert Butler, has launched 12 frigates and has already delivered one of these, which means that today this frigate is in action providing a life-line to our boys on the fighting fronts.

Today Robert Butler is working toward a goal. His organization of 5,000 men are driving hard to get the remaining 11 frigates already launched delivered to provide action and a life line to our boys at the front. The goal Robert Butler is driving hard to achieve is to get these remaining ships into action before the freeze-up of the harbor. And gentlemen, it really freezes in northern Wisconsin. So to beat the frost, Robert Butler's organization is driving hard, day and night, to meet this challenge. I am betting that he will make it.

In spite of the fact that this yard was a city dump less than 2 years ago, Robert Butler is the first shipbuilder on the Great Lakes to build and deliver a frigate, a real battle wagon of the high seas if there ever was one. So today this unusual organization headed by a shipbuilder with spurs is driving hard. They are giving everything they have got to beat Mother Nature. They are expending every ounce of energy and ingenuity at their command to deliver 11 more frigates before the winter ice sets in. They want our boys to have the protection of these ships before winter comes—otherwise they cannot get them until next spring.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of being at Superior when the Maritime M Award was given to the Robert Butler organization last August. This shipyard I want you to know, really earned this award—earned it for outstanding achievement in the production of ships. This organization earned this award because the men who lead it and who work in it could not be stopped by wind, rain, or frost or winter's cold. They made every minute count in putting ships into actual combat. To Robert Butler and his men a ship is not a ship until it goes into actual combat.

I wish that all of you could visit this yard. I wish you could get a glimpse of the feeling in this yard among its workers. Absenteeism? Why these workers do not know the meaning of the term! There is no absenteeism at this yard. Even feet and feet of snow blocking the streets and roads—even 30° and 40° below zero weather does not keep these men from their jobs. They are determined to build ships and nothing stops them from their determination. Strikes and stoppages of work? This is never even dreamed of in this yard. Slowdowns? Why, the feeling among these men is so patriotic that no person would even dare mention the word slowdown. What a healthy condition we would have in America today if this feeling existed in every war plant and shipyard in this country.

Robert Butler is making history. His record of real production has no equal. The feeling between his leadership and the men who work under him has no equal. Their determination to produce regardless of climate has no equal. The record of absenteeism has no equal. Every ship launched and delivered is a challenge to them—a challenge to do the job faster and better on the next one. The fact that this yard less than 2 years ago was a mere city dump—makes Robert Butler a shipbuilder with spurs.

Recently Robert Butler was given a contract for 28 oceangoing cargo vessels by the Maritime Commission. By the time these are finished more records will be broken and I venture the prediction that these will be launched and delivered ahead of schedule. Thirty degree below zero weather, sleet, frost, snowbanks or ice or storm will not deter them one iota. The men and leaders behind Robert Butler won't rest a minute until these 28 cargo vessels are in action providing a life-line for our boys who are risking their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time because I feel with all that is in me that any man who can take over a city dump and in less than 2 years turn it into one of the most efficient shipyards of our country and deliver 18 oceangoing cargo ships and one frigate and launch 11 more frigates during so short a time deserves praise. When the victory is won and the peace is written it will be men like Robert Butler who will stand out as America's greatest contributors to that victory and peace. We in America owe much to men like this. We in America owe much to the kind of labor and labor leadership that has joined hands with him to achieve such unusual success.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to Robert Butler—a shipbuilder with spurs. Thank God we have men in America like him to meet the challenge of production. He is not only building ships—he is building America. He is setting an example all of us could well afford to follow.

America's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times of Davenport, Iowa:

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

The banquet audience which greeted Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, at Hotel Blackhawk last night was an eloquent expression of the appreciation of this section of the type of leadership which he has given not merely his organization but business interests generally in this time of crisis.

Swelled by business and civic leaders from nearly a dozen nearby cities in Iowa and Illinois, one of the largest crowds ever to pack the gold room, numbering more than 500, was inspired by his vision of what the future holds for this dynamic Nation.

The attendance was more than a compliment to the distinguished visitor. It complimented those who made up the audience, since it revealed not only their awareness of the Nation's mission but their eagerness to applaud the leadership of a man who would fulfill America's destiny in the typical American way.

A former marine captain, who has been something of a Horatio Alger hero in the Northwest, by virtue of his meteoric rise as a successful manufacturer and business leader, Johnston has every confidence in the future of this country if it keeps alive the spirit and principles which builded this great empire.

He scoffs at those who tell us we must stop growing because there are no new frontiers. He sees many new frontiers of the mind which are just opening up vast new worlds, such as that of the air. He envisions a sweeping revolution in American standards of living as many new inventions and processes are utilized in the post-war period.

If American trade and industry is to expand in a manner to absorb the returning soldier, our foreign markets must be greatly expanded, the speaker emphasized.

He would achieve this, not by economic imperialism which inevitably leads to war, but by increasing the purchasing power of the so-called backward peoples of the world. This he would do through the development of the resources of these countries, by establishing industries within them, which will increase the buying power of the native population.

His formula, however, is not to renew the old-time foreign exploitation through loans which cannot be collected except as we levy upon their customs or employ other devices. He is equally opposed to pauperizing them with loans which we do not expect to be repaid.

What he proposes is that American money go in partnership with the money of these countries, backed up by American technological and other talent, to industrialize or otherwise develop in a stable manner these areas.

Mr. Johnston does not fear the effect of this competition on American trade and industry, since as more Bolivians, and this can be applied to 30 other countries, are gainfully employed they will be able to buy great

quantities of the things their country would never manufacture.

He pointed out that England, before the war, with 65,000,000 people purchased many times the amount of goods which we sold China with its 400,000,000, a vast majority of whom survived merely on a subsistence level.

Johnston sees America as the crossroads of the universe enjoying a position which compels us to play an important role in the world of tomorrow, whether we like it or not.

He discerns America to be on the threshold of a great adventure, a conquest of new worlds, not by force but by the precept and example of the American system of free enterprise.

Goods and services are the handmaidens of peace, he in effect told his audience.

If America is to achieve its high destiny in the bright new world ahead it must be achieved by peace and cooperation at home.

When Mr. Johnston took his place as the head of the United States Chamber of Commerce he was a voice crying in the wilderness. His liberalism disturbed, if it did not shock the hierarchy of big business for many of his advocacies were economic heresies according to the code of the old school.

His vision is becoming widely shared today even in these high places of privilege. It is coming to be generally recognized today that if America is to find its rightful place in the world of tomorrow, a sense of partnership must be developed at home, between labor and capital, worker and management, if we are to become partners in the larger drama of human advancement.

Problems of Gold Mining Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, California gold mines have made a great contribution to the economic history of this country. It is peculiar that every gold-producing country allied with us in this war has continued up to this moment in their gold-mining operations. Under orders issued by the War Production Board, in this country, however, gold mining has been practically stopped.

It is absolutely necessary that this order of the W. P. B. be modified to at least restore gold mining to such an extent as will permit the protection of the mines and the maintenance of overhead costs. If this is not done, these mines will be ruined.

In line with this thought, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a letter from the president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Ernest Ingold, and a resolution adopted by its board of directors:

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
October 11, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELCH: Without aiding the war effort to any great extent, the closing down of the gold mining industry as the result of the War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 has adversely affected many western communities. The economic welfare of California and other western States will be damaged unless steps are taken to relieve the problems of gold mining companies during the war period.

The mining committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has carefully considered the problems of the gold mining companies. As a result, the board of directors of the San Francisco chamber has adopted resolutions proposing ways of relieving the situation. Copies of the two resolutions are transmitted herewith.

We are requesting the War Production Board to amend its order L-208 to allow mining companies to operate sufficiently to derive enough income to meet carrying charges. If we are not successful in securing amendment of the order, legislation to permit operation of the companies to a degree sufficient to meet carrying charges may be requested. Inasmuch as it will not be practicable for some companies to meet carrying charges out of limited operations, it is hoped that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make loans available to companies which can give security in order that they may meet their carrying charges and be in a position to operate after the war—again contributing to our general economy and affording post-war employment.

Any steps which it is possible for you to take in making it possible for the gold mining companies, which so desire, to operate to a degree sufficient to meet their carrying charges, or to assure secured Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans for maintenance purposes during the war period will be deeply appreciated.

July figures have just come to hand and indicate that whereas California gold production even in 1942 averaged $2,181,000 a month, it dropped to $547,505 in July 1943, and it is our understanding that there has since been a further substantial drop. No other industry, as such, has been so adversely affected by orders which had been expected to be helpful to the war effort.

Thanking you in advance for your helpfulness in this matter, I am

Very truly yours,
ERNEST INGOLD, *President.*

RESOLUTION FOR LIMITATION ORDER AMENDMENT

Whereas the War Production Board, by issuance of order L-208 has directed and enforced the closure of gold mines throughout the United States, including those in California, subject to permission to said mines to keep open merely on a maintenance basis without producing any ore which requires a skeleton crew in any event; and

Whereas a number of gold mines in California are very deep and have very extensive workings, and the maintenance cost of keeping said mines pumped out, timbered, and in condition that they can ever be worked in the future causes a great drain on the treasuries of the companies operating the same; and

Whereas if due to the inability of companies to indefinitely finance the maintenance of such mines it should become necessary to close the same entirely and allow them to cave in and fill with water, it would be probably impractical and uneconomical to ever open and operate the same; and

Whereas the loss of such mines as an economic venture to the owners thereof and to the communities in which they operate would be irreparable and a death blow to many communities of this State which rely entirely upon gold mining for their economic existence; and

Whereas it appears to the chamber of commerce from the statement of competent mine operators that it would be possible for these deep mines to be kept open, unwatered, and in repair, provided that their owners be allowed to mine and extract enough ore therefrom to pay the actual maintenance expenses without profit, and that such limited operation could be carried on with materials on hand and with labor which under no circumstances would be employed in strategic metal mines. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the interests of this State and of the city of San Francisco, its principal mining metropolis, demand that some provision be made by the War Production Board to allow the production of ore in gold mines to an extent sufficient to finance the cost of maintaining the same in condition for future operation; and be it further

Resolved, That this chamber believes that War Production Board order L-208 can and should be amended to permit gold mines closed by reason of its provisions to mine and extract enough ore to pay the cost of maintenance of the properties in an unwatered and timbered condition for future operation; and be it further

Resolved, That this chamber believes that such limited gold production can be carried on with such strategic materials as are at hand in the mines and without the employment of labor which would be available either for military use or for employment in strategic metal mines; and be it further

Resolved, That if the War Production Board declines to meet the repeated requests from such properties for permission to operate on said limited basis, the matter should be made a subject of congressional action and such statutes enacted as will afford the requisite relief to gold mines in the premises; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all legislative Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, with the request that they cooperate affirmatively in insuring relief to the gold mines which are threatened with destruction, as above stated.

The Future of Economic Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of October 18, 1943:

THE FUTURE OF ECONOMIC NATIONALISM

Recent statements of the President and of some of his advisers reveal that the administration still lacks any consistent post-war economic policy with regard to international relations. The policies so far indicated have clearly not been the subject of careful thought, and are in some cases in direct contradiction to each other. We may choose as examples the policies with regard to rubber and the policies with regard to shipping.

At his press conference last Friday Mr. Roosevelt repeated what he had said the evening before at a dinner in the White House for the President of Haiti:

"I hope that when I am out of the White House—I might get beaten on it otherwise—that Congress won't put some kind of tariff on rubber for American automobile tires just to keep some synthetic plants going.

"That would mean that every man in the United States who owned a car would have to pay 50 percent more for his rubber. I believe in cheap tires, and more of them; and the only way to get that is to use the tires that are made by nature, whether it be rubber, guayule, or cryptostegia."

Now the general case against tariffs is a strong one. If the President had advocated a further general lowering of our own tariff wall, and had said that he hoped that any post-war tariff on natural rubber, if found necessary, would be transitional and temporary, his position would have been consistent. But while saying nothing about our existing tariff wall, still high in spite of the Hull agreements, the President chose to oppose a tariff on the very product for which an exceptionally strong case for one exists.

Unless we are able to build a cooperative post-war world in which peace seems far more secure than it has in the recent past, we shall have to protect ourselves against once more being cut off from a supply of rubber, a commodity vital to war. We are now creating a supply of synthetic rubber only after dangerous delay and at huge expense. Hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and some private capital have been invested in this undertaking, much of the latter in response to patriotic appeals. Assuming that natural rubber would enjoy a substantial competitive advantage over this in the immediate post-war period, are we going to allow the great bulk of this synthetic rubber investment and production capacity to be carelessly destroyed? Or shall we give it enough protection, if necessary, so that we are not completely dependent on far-away natural supplies that may again be cut off?

In the case of shipping, if Rear Admiral Vickery speaks for the administration, the announced policy is the opposite of that with regard to synthetic rubber. "Yes; and I told them (the British) we intend to become a maritime nation and intend to stay one. I said we would do it by cooperation, but if they didn't want to cooperate we'd stay one anyhow." Here is a policy of economic nationalism, announced in an inexcusably belligerent form. If Admiral Vickery was not speaking for the administration he had no right to speak in this way at all. But his statement will be accepted as administration policy until it is unmistakably repudiated by the President.

Now there are strong reasons for our maintaining a powerful merchant marine after the war. They are the same kind of reasons, in fact, that might favor a tariff on rubber. We need a strong merchant marine as a naval auxiliary in war. But we should not shut our eyes to the fact that such a strong merchant marine will be a great expense. H. Gerrish Smith, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, is authority for the statement that it costs us between 50 and 75 percent more to build ships than it does abroad. Our competitive disadvantage in operating these ships with American crews under American wage standards, American union rules, and American official regulations would probably be as great or greater. We could therefore only build American ships and keep them on the seas by heavy subsidies, and we should have to do this when our Government fiscal problems were already enormous.

The two examples of rubber and shipping indicate that neither inside nor outside of the administration have we yet given to post-war international economic problems the careful thought that they must have if we are to avoid disastrous policies. We must shun, on the one hand, economic nationalism or economic imperialism. We must do what we can to prevent a resumption of trade wars and to restore active international cooperation. But without accepting the logic of autarchy, we must be realistic enough to protect our minimum economic needs for national defense after the war. Such a course will often require a delicate balancing of one consideration against another. The problem, certainly, is not one that can be solved either by chauvinistic appeals or by doctrinate slogans.

Protein Feeds Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a statement received from the farmers and stockmen of the cattle-raising counties in Nebraska.

On several occasions we have had reports to this Congress and the country that basic protein feeds are not available. From the Fourth District in Nebraska numerous urgent requests have been received from the stockmen that they are desperately in need of protein feeds if they are to keep their foundation herds intact.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that too large an amount of the protein has been given to the commercial feed processors. The cost of the commercial feeds plus freight makes it prohibitive for the ranchers to buy.

I called the Agriculture Department this morning and they informed me that one reason there is a shortage of commercial feeds is that the cotton producers are taking their seed back home and thus there is no cotton cake available.

A ruling from the Department of Agriculture prohibits the commercial feed processor to have more than a 2-week supply of protein meal on hand. There are other regulations which have had a tendency to produce a feeling of panic among those who must have protein feeds.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that unless something can be done to relieve this acute shortage of protein feed that there will be a further liquidation of the normal carry-over in the number of cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry. This will mean a shortage of meat very soon.

The statement follows:

At a meeting held in Ogallala, Nebr., October 15, 1943, there were farmers and stockmen from the following counties present: Lincoln, Perkins, Keith, Arthur, Deuel, and Chase.

Under normal conditions, large quantities of basic protein feeds are used in wintering and fattening cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry, and in the production of dairy products. For over a year these basic protein feeds have been practically unavailable in this area.

The protein cost in commercially mixed feeds, plus freight, makes such protein costs prohibitive locally. Apparently the mixed feed processors are getting ample supplies of basic proteins because ample amounts are available.

The farmers and stockmen that are here assembled request you to demand an equitable amount of basic protein for this area or a serious curtailment in the production of all livestock and livestock products will result. Unless more of the basic protein concentrates such as cotton cake, linseed meal, soybean meal, and tankage are released for this area, there will be a serious depletion of foundation herds.

We also feel that corn ceiling prices are responsible for the maldistribution of feed grains which has an adverse effect on the distribution of basic proteins to our area. We recommend that corn ceiling prices be investigated and a change made to correct this condition.

G. B. COCHRAN,
Sutherland, Lincoln County.
GEO. ARMSTRONG,
Big Springs, Deuel County.
W. F. LEONARD,
Ogallala, Keith County.
JAS. F. SIBAL,
Lemogne, Arthur County.
H. H. SCHRODER,
Grant, Perkins County.
JAY A. PERSON,
Wauneta, Chase County.

A Western View of the Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following timely and thought-provoking communication from the directors and commissioners of agriculture in seven Western States:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *October 2, 1943.*

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE JONES: This letter is written you jointly by the directors and commissioners of agriculture of the following Western States: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, California, and Colorado.

The undersigned State representatives have just concluded a 2-day conference, held in Salt Lake City, and have discussed at some length numerous factors which are of major importance, in our estimation, in the present food program. We are particularly appreciative of having had with us for the 2 days your representative, Mr. Lafayette Patterson. Most of us have known Mr. Patterson for a number of years, and we know that he will convey to you many additional matters of interest which for purposes of brevity we have not included herein.

May we take this opportunity collectively and individually to express to you again our appreciation and gratification for your action of August 12 last in requesting each of us to thereafter become formal and official members of the respective U. S. D. A. State war boards? We have for some time past been sincerely convinced that we could make a real contribution to the activities of such

boards, and see in your recent action a concurrence with that view. We pledge our full cooperation in this new work, and will be of every assistance possible within the limitations imposed upon us by State laws, which do govern our actions.

Our discussions during the 2-day conference covered a wide variety of subject matter and involved rather wide differences as to specific details in each of these several Western States. Certain matters, however, we found to be common to this entire area. We have set forth in numbered paragraphs below a few brief comments relative to what we consider to be the major and most important of the numerous ideas and situations which we found to be common to the seven States:

1. SUBSIDIES

The seven men signatory to this letter have in recent months personally contacted a large number of farmers and ranchers. Upon the basis of those contacts, as supplemented by representations made to us by farm and commodity organizations, it is our unqualified conclusion that virtually all farmers and ranchers in this area are definitely opposed to subsidies. The reasons given for such opposition are surprisingly uniform and represent a body of public opinion which we in all sincerity believe you and the administration cannot afford to ignore if full and adequate production is to be secured. Included in the reasons advanced are the following: A real fear of further Federal domination and encroachment, the large purchasing power now available, of which the percentage used for food is less than usual, the uncertainties of production because of doubt as to amount of subsidy or length of its operation, and the fact that agriculture would appear under a subsidy in a negative position, whereas in fact the consumers would be the ones being subsidized.

2. LOCAL PARTICIPATION

It is our definite conviction that basic to any food program which may be undertaken by the Government of this country is the need for a widespread use of the advice and full participation of local government and farm industry representatives. Many of the mistakes of the past would not have occurred had more of the decisions as to specific details been made in the field rather than in the District of Columbia. Much of the present unhappiness and criticism now current in agricultural circles would not have arisen had the foregoing thought been adopted and practiced by your predecessors. The job at hand is so big and the time so short that it would appear to us an obvious necessity for you and your subordinates to draw upon every available source of aid and advice, confining the activities of the central office to the making of decisions upon broad policies.

3. MEAT

Government statistics indicate that available feed supplies per animal unit may be as much as 15 percent less than those for last year, which itself was not a year of good balance between livestock and feed supplies. This situation is of particular significance in the West, from which the greater part of our livestock is marketed as feeder stock. The unavailability of feed and the situation relative to meat rationing coupons have resulted in a drastic backing up of feeders in this western area with an attendant depletion of ranges, improper utilization of scarce feeds, and a partial disorganization of the livestock industry. Accordingly, we conclude and recommend:

(a) Our immediate problem is to secure such changes in governmental policies, prices, and regulations as will enable and facilitate the movement of substantial numbers of feeder livestock direct to slaughter.

(b) To facilitate such movement, meat ration coupons will have to be appreciably lowered in point value, or perhaps suspended entirely for such period of time as may be required to bring the situation into proper balance again. Under existing supply and demand, as conditioned by coupons available, packers need not and do not pay the full price for feeder animals.

(c) Animals currently at hand cannot longer be held without a substantial loss in weight, depreciation in quality, and an unnecessary drain upon scarce feed supplies, not to mention the very probable financial loss to the producers.

(d) Our supply of hides and other livestock byproducts, as well as our meat stocks, can be materially added to by enabling the movement of feeder animals direct to slaughter.

We suggest the desirability of substantial price increases in hides and other byproducts as additional means of encouraging such movement without placing additional burden or pressure upon meat prices.

(e) The existing meat-grading system would appear in need of changes and simplification, if only for the duration. Particularly significant are the wide price differentials as between the best and poorest grades. To facilitate animal movement and to ease the pressure upon feed, we urge the combination of the present A and B grades of meat, with the resulting combination grade receiving the present price for grade A, with comparable price increases for C and D. grades.

(f) If feeder operations are desired by the Government, an increase in price for finished animals is a first prerequisite.

(g) We are of the firm conviction that the slaughter quotas should not be reimposed, as they served no useful purpose and confused the industry.

4. CEILING PRICES

Present ceiling prices are in many instances resulting in unncessarily high prices to consumers, while at the same time returns to producers are inconsistent with the objective of obtaining full production. We therefore recommend a single ceiling for each commodity on which ceilings are found necessary with such ceilings to be at the consummer level only, but based on parity to the producer plus reasonable processing and handling margins determined on a historical basis. We further recommend that the Government establish a floor price to producers, based on true cost of production, for all of the food commodities deemed essential.

5. MILK

The undersigned consider the milk situation to be one of our most acute agricultural problems. Various remedial measures are currently being discussed by you and the Congress and it is our urgent plea that a decision be made and announced immediately. Throughout this western area the dispersal of dairy herds and the slaughtering of many of them has become a distressing problem.

6. FEED

Our analysis of the food situation here in the West leads us to the conclusion that the feed situation is the most explosive and dangerous factor in the entire picture. The Federal Government has not had, nor do we feel that it now has, a definite policy with relation to feed. As we understand it, the feed situation has become so desperate that it may be obligatory for the Government to establish certain measures of control over the allocation and utilization of our reduced feed supplies. The failure of the Federal Government to recognize the necessity of a proper balance of supplies of feed grains to livestock production, and to establish an adequate and equitable series of price relationships between feed and livestock, threatens to seriously curtail future production of both feed and livestock. We urge a correction of the price situation, together with a vigorous Government program designed to encourage farmers to substantially expand their acreages of feed crops. Our comments in No. 3, above, relative to meat obviously have a definite bearing upon this feed matter.

7. GOALS FOR 1944

We cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for an early announcement of the acreage goals and other program details for the 1944 crop year. We know that you have this matter very much in mind but because of its importance we do wish to emphasize it. We are sincerely interested in removing from the picture every uncertainty which can be contemplated, seeking a simplification of the food program which will enable our farmers and ranchers to direct all of their energies and facilities in the direction deemed necessary by the Government after full consultation with local officials and farm representatives as to production possibilities and potentialities.

8. FARMER MORALE

Our farm population is determined to produce the food and fiber necessary for a complete and final victory. Our farmers are further determined, even in the face of extreme handicaps and obstacles, to see that our citizens are well and adequately fed. However, they do not have the confidence in the pronouncements of the several Federal agencies dealing with the food program which they had a year ago. Many factors have contributed to this unhappy situation, amongst which may be cited the extreme uncertainty and indecision in Government, some of which is admittedly inherent in wartime, the frequent absence of a specific program, misleading information distributed by Government agencies, the frequent absence of consultation with farmers and other local people prior to the development and announcement of plans for a given crop, and the sharp inequities which have developed and bid fair to be perpetuated by current price ceilings and policies.

9. TOOLS OF PRODUCTION

It is respectfully urged that the Federal agencies give increasing and positive attention to the procurement of far more adequate supplies of machinery, equipment, repair parts, fertilizers, insecticides, containers and packaging materials, general farm supplies, labor, and transportation in order that our farmers and ranchers be enabled to fully meet the food and fiber needs of ourselves and our allies, with due attention to the elimination of the red tape now required of farmers in order to secure even partial supplies of the several essential tools of production.

The directors and commissioners of agriculture of these Western States are sincerely desirous of being of every assistance possible to you in your tremendous job. Each of us has at times been critical of actions and policies established by the Federal Government. May we here assure you that we have in the past and will continue as best we can to confine our criticism to those of a constructive nature. Certain of the foregoing comments will apply to agencies of Government other than the War Food Administration and we will appreciate your communicating them to the appropriate individuals for consideration and response.

It is sincerely hoped that you will favor us with a reply to this communication. For your convenience, may we advise that Director George Schweis of Nevada functions as a

spokesman for these seven State departments of agriculture. It may be that you would prefer to address a response to him with the thought that he would communicate copies thereof to the rest of us.

Very sincerely,

E. L. PETERSON,
Director, Oregon Department of Agriculture.
HARVEY SCHWENDIMAN,
Commissioner, Idaho Department of Agriculture.
GEORGE G. SCHWEIS,
Director, Division of Plant Industry, Nevada Department of Agriculture.
TRACY R. WELLING,
Commissioner, Utah Department of Agriculture.
ARTHUR E. COX,
Director, Washington Department of Agriculture.
W. C. SWEINHART,
Director, Colorado Department of Agriculture.
W. J. CECIL,
Director, California Department of Agriculture.

Would He Accept the Democratic Nomination?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Moline (Ill.) Daily Dispatch:

WOULD HE ACCEPT THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION?

Wendell L. Willkie recently announced that he would support the Republican Party either in the ranks or as a candidate if the party would adopt a liberal program. He neglected, however, to suggest a liberal platform which the party would have to adopt before he would consent to serve as a nominee. He suggested some planks for a platform, but none of them could be described as primarily liberal—if we judge liberalism by what liberal parties have done in the past.

Since then—even though no liberal platform nor platform of any kind has been written by the Republicans, Mr. Willkie has tossed his hat into the ring for nomination. Apparently he has decided not to wait for the liberal platform to be written.

It is pertinent at this time to ask whether, if the party were to adopt a liberal platform (or any other sort) Mr. Willkie would adopt it as his own and pledge himself to carry it out. And if he made such a pledge, whether he would fulfill it. The question arises from some quotations which were attributed to Mr. Willkie in the April 7, 1942, issue of Look magazine.

Referring to the Presidency in that interview, Mr. Willkie is quoted as saying:

"That is the only political office through which fundamental ideas, national and international, can be made effective."

Further, Mr. Willkie said:

"Any leader who wishes to make his ideas effective wisely attempts to use the machinery of one of these two parties (Republican or Democratic). Franklin Roosevelt's political ideas were radically different from the accepted principles of the Democratic Party. He knew, however, that the best chance of putting them in effect was to use the machinery of the Democratic Party and then mold it to his ideas.

"Probably we shall continue to operate for some time under the two-party system, even as to names. But the principle of those two parties will be molded and remolded by their respective leaders."

Judging by that quotation, it doesn't make much difference what kind of platform the Republicans adopt, liberal, progressive, reactionary or whatever; if Mr. Willkie is nominated, he might use the machinery of the party to put his ideas into effect. And we don't know, as yet, all the ideas he may have developed.

They might be radically different from the accepted principles of the Republican Party.

Praise for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I reprint here a very interesting statement which appeared in the October 1943 issue of Reveille, the official publication of the G. O. 40 Association and of the American Defenders Association. Reveille is published in Los Angeles and its editor is Capt. Tony Siminoff, who is also president of the G. O. 40 Association. The publication has a wide circulation and is held in high regard.

The October issue to which I have just referred contains a statement of the accomplishments of the office of the Assistant Secretary of War since July 1, 1937. During this time it has been under the direction of Col. Louis Johnson and the article is a well-deserved tribute to his administration. The editorial follows:

During the last 10 years it has often been necessary for me to go to Washington, D. C. Having an avid interest in our national defense I have always called at the War Department on these trips to the Nation's Capital. If I were asked, "What single office or agency has contributed the most, since July 1, 1937, toward strengthening the defense of the United States?" without a moment's hesitation I would emphatically reply, "The Office of the Assistant Secretary of War." Under the vigorous, able and intelligent leadership of the Honorable Louis Johnson, this office has, by record, accomplished more since July 1, 1937, in providing the sinews of war in the event this country is again forced into hostilities, than any other public office.

Let the record speak for itself. On assuming office, Colonel Johnson made known at once his conception of the objectives entrusted to his office, either by statute or by custom. It is his office that has supervision over the current procurement activities of the War Department.

We are almost half way into the third year of Colonel Johnson's tenure as the Assistant Secretary of War. The accomplishments of his office have been growing in size and scope so that today he is personally supervising the procurement of the largest peacetime armament orders in the history of the United States

During the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year, the War Department, under Colonel Johnson's supervision, spent approximately $450,000,000 for equipment. This was more than was expended for the prosecution of our war with Spain. This year he will direct the orders for spending $373,267,832 for fighting equipment alone.

The Assistant Secretary of War is essentially the business manager of the War Department. In this capacity he insists upon efficiency and economy. He is determined that every dollar spent by the War Department must bring a dollar's value in return toward a more adequate national defense. That spirit permeates his whole organization.

Colonel Johnson holds the view that there is no substitute for first-hand knowledge and information gained from personal contact with operating facilities in the field. Since he took office he has traveled nearly 100,000 miles by air and 35,000 miles by rail. His missions on these journeys included visits to industrial plants, Government arsenals, airfields, and airplane factories, from coast to coast.

To familiarize our citizens with aims, plans, and objectives of his office, Colonel Johnson has delivered almost 200 formal and half a hundred impromptu speeches. His efforts in this respect have awakened the country to the realities of the purposes and objectives of industrial mobilization as well as the necessity for cooperation between labor, capital and industry, if we are to be successful in the defense of America.

If I had to single out an example of his most significant accomplishment, I believe I would elect the subject of the educational orders. For nearly 20 years the War Department has been advocating the use of educational orders to help the Army's quest for what it needs, at the time and at the place needed. Colonel Johnson gave special and intensive effort toward the enactment of this program. During the closing days of the Seventy-fifth Congress, an act became law authorizing the placing of educational orders of $2,000,000 for 5 successive years.

On July 1, 1939, Congress appropriated $14,250,000 for educational orders for the current year which closes next June 30. To quote Colonel Johnson, "I regard this feature of our program as a significant milestone in our quest for adequate industrial preparedness. A civilian industry, trained to produce our needs in an emergency, will save us from great sacrifices in treasure and, what is more important, precious lives—the lives of American young men no money can buy."

The importance of the airplane as a war weapon is being constantly brought to our attention in a war-torn world today. Last year the President urged, and Congress authorized, a special expansion of the Air Corps to an airplane strength of not to exceed 6,000 airplanes. This was a jump of 3,700 airplanes over previously authorized figures. Who had to buy those airplanes? The Air Corps is buying them today, but it is under the watchful and guiding direction of Colonel Johnson.

Continued conferences with the aircraft industry have developed a production capacity that will permit completion of this Air Corps augmentation not later than June 1941.

When the special $50,000,000 appropriation became law it was only a matter of hours before awards were announced by the office of the Assistant Secretary of War for the airplanes to be purchased. Such efficiency is not developed overnight. It is the result of the painstaking direction and leadership of Col. Louis Johnson.

Finally, in the field of industrial mobilization, the Assistant Secretary has awakened our Nation to a much clearer and certainly a

more definite understanding of the close association of military and economic factors. Cooperation with industry; that has been his keynote. Not control of industry.

To the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, with the Honorable Louis Johnson at the helm, must go the major share of the credit for the considerable progress made in our national defense program—dollar for dollar procurement of our peacetime requirements and the assurance of adequate provision for the prompt and effective mobilization of essential national resources in event of an emergency.

Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include here an address made by my colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS] at the national convention of the Air Transport Association of America in Denver, Colo.

The address follows:

A unique conception of air power has been demonstrated by America in the last 18 months. It is a conception which harnesses military and civil aviation as a powerful team in the great task of victory.

But however unique the conception, it is not new with us. On the contrary, we are simply applying plans which our military and civil aviation leaders worked out years before Pearl Harbor bound our Nation in determined unity. Those plans represented a theory of air power, consisting of an integrated military and civilian effort, which Congress had approved not once but repeatedly prior to December 7, 1941.

In summary, our theory is that civil aviation not only is a necessary adjunct of the national defense, but also becomes an essential part of our over-all military machine when emergency demands, and is to be fostered, guided, and regulated with its direct military utility at all times clearly in mind.

This military utility is not confined to a single phase of the civil aviation industry, nor is it limited to a single type of military activity. The American theory recognizes that all our civil-aviation resources can be made into a multipurpose instrument of military power without parallel among any other civilian activities.

First, we recognize that a general stimulation of knowledge of and skill in civil aeronautics gives us a miscellaneous civilian reservoir of men and women who can be drawn upon in an emergency to perform many essential duties in addition to actual combat flying. The ferrying of planes is only one among many examples of such duties which can be performed by both men and women of a wide age range.

Second, we recognize that a large group of private flyers well trained in the basic requirements of safe civilian flying under diverse conditions can be readily organized into a civilian corps to perform such military missions as coastal patrol and messenger work.

Third. We recognize that experienced and responsible fliers and private training organizations can, when properly used, become the seed from which thousands of military pilots and ground personnel can be cultivated in a relatively short space of time.

Fourth. We recognize that various types of civilian craft, available in sufficient numbers, can be used in military and semi-military activities, such as training, patrol, transport, and even reconnaissance, often without any substantial conversion.

Fifth. We recognize that the extensive and complicated paraphernalia of ground aids to civil air navigation, such as radio range stations, can be made to serve as indispensable military highways. And, unlike any other type of civilian highway, these aids can be moved from place to place, even from continent to continent, as military traffic may require, and frequently on very short notice.

Sixth. We recognize that a well-planned and adequately maintained program of civil-airport development can provide the air harbors which can assure the necessary power of mobility and of concentration and the necessary protection and bases without which the most powerful military air force would be as helpless as a fleet without a port.

Seventh. We recognize that a soundly organized and properly coordinated civil air-transport system, both within and without the United States, can furnish speedy and dependable commercial transportation which is the sine qua non for maintaining the quickened tempo of the civilian economy in a nation at war.

Eighth. We recognize that the civil air lines' shops and facilities provide the best possible source of technical work in connection with conversion, modification, and repair of military aircraft and in connection with many other specialized functions which must be performed if an aerial military machine is to be kept in top condition.

Ninth, we recognize that the civil air transport system constitutes an auxiliary best able to provide the transport service which must be furnished, particularly in global warfare, to every theater of conflict. Indeed, as our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives stated in a recent report, our civil air lines constitute our merchant marine of the air. As such their organizations can be employed—as in truth they are being employed—in providing special transport service for the military wholly without regard to the location of their normal services, wherever air transport is needed, whether in Arctic or equatorial regions.

And tenth, we recognize that in the maintenance of an adequate and diversified market for our civilian aircraft factories in peacetime we can make instantly available in war the production nucleus which will gurantee the multiplication of our military forces at a rate to bewilder, confound, and overwhelm our enemies.

This 10-point program for civil aviation's employment in war, planned years ago, and given the necessary implementation by successive Congresses, is actually being carried out today. In its successful execution is to be found the explanation of many of the seeming miracles which a relatively unprepared nation has performed in the year and a half since a Hawaiian sunrise was eclipsed in the smoke of battle. I have said that the conception is unique. No other nation in the world has grasped it so clearly. No other nation in the world has realized so fully the enormous power latent in civil aviation. Even the Italian Douhet, the greatest of the prophets of air power, failed to visualize completely the role for civil aviation which our own civil aviation industry is carrying out today.

There are several reasons for America's unique accomplishment. The most notable is our insistence upon keeping civil aviation separate both from military control and from any control by civilian interests which might not be wholly intent upon the fullest possible development of the industry.

It may seem paradoxical to assign freedom from military control as a reason for the success of our civil aviation as an instrument of warfare. Yet it is perfectly logical. In certain other countries an apparent appreciation of the military significance of civil aviation led to a large degree of military control. The result was a distorted and even crippled civil aviation. The military, in long years between wars, often becomes sluggish. In fact it is one of the necessary virtues of the military mind to be cautious, even conservative. And in many countries, including our own, the military is quite properly forced, in peacetime, to become acutely conscious of its budget. In any event combination of factors has made military control or influence in the civil aviation field in many other countries a blighting force, frequently myopic, almost never imaginative and daring.

Fortunately our own military leaders have been at pains to keep hands off. As early as 1926 the Morrow Board admonished that complete separation between military and civil aviation should at all times be maintained. With this separation as our consistent policy, civilians have forged ahead with new ideas which sometimes appeared absurd, initially.

Many an amateur enthusiast, in all probability quite unconscious of the significance of his action to the national defense, had contributed to a bounding growth in our civil aviation resources. The pioneer of early America, who acquired skill with the squirrel gun in his peacetime pursuits, became a deadly soldier. Our President said, not long ago, that young Americans should be encouraged to acquire skill in the use of aircraft just as did those pioneers with their squirrel guns.

But our civilian development of aviation has not been altogether of the unconscious, squirrel-gun variety. On the contrary many of the leaders in the civilian industry have very deliberately encouraged steps in the course of the industry's development which have proved of incalculable importance in this war. The civilian-pilot training program is an outstanding example of a civilian-inspired and civilian-executed activity without which our military force today would be far less than its present strength. And in the development of the air-transport industry there have been extremely vital steps taken in peacetime under civilian leadership—many of them still secret—which have been life-saving at critical moments in the last 18 months.

The importance of maintaining control of civil aviation free from civilian interests which might not be wholly intent upon its fullest development is more obvious. As the Denver Rocky Mountain News pointed out the other day, one policy toward air transportation reflects the doctrine that "where an older form of transportation tries to dominate another newer form of transportation, the older tends not to develop the newer but to throttle it, control it, remove it as a source of competition to the facilities in which it has already invested its larger capital and has its greatest interest."

In certain other countries, this doctrine has not been so carefully followed, and the consequences to their civil aviation have been ill. America's air transportation, which has been developed to a point where it is without peer anywhere in the world, has largely escaped stultifying control by other forms of transportation. With only one or two exceptions, early efforts by certain surface interests to enter the air field were soon abandoned—perhaps because such interests were not willing to do the work of pioneer-

ing which is so necessary, and is still necessary, in order to build aviation. And in 1938 in the Civil Aeronautics Act Congress adopted a policy modeled on what it had applied in the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, and prevented surface carriers from controlling air carriers except in very restricted circumstances. The Civil Aeronautics Board has vigorously applied that policy and the Department of Justice has announced that it will vigorously enforce the law.

Now that air transportation has demonstrated its ability, surface carriers are seeking permission to enter the air-transport field. Some of the railroads and some of the motor carriers whose railroad connections, antedating the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, are well known, are particularly interested, apparently, in conducting air-transportation operations. Upon the outcome of their applications will depend in considerable degree whether American transportation is to move toward integration of the different competing modes of transport into huge, monopolistic combines in which the surface interests, due to their greater capitalization, will inevitably play a dominating part. A system of such combines has been strongly advocated by powerful and well-financed groups, as the Department of Justice has recently disclosed before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is inconceivable that, had any such system been in effect in the years preceding Pearl Harbor, we would have had the extensive air-transport industry which has been of such critical importance to our air power in the world conflict.

Now let us look forward to our future program for civil aviation as a civilian arsenal for military purposes.

First and foremost we must be on guard against the truly dreadful tendency to assume that the next war, if there is one, will be fought with the methods and the weapons of the last. That tendency has been nearly fatal to the world's democracies in two great wars. We may not survive a third if we do not resolutely resist that tendency in the years to come.

It is perfectly certain that in the next war, if there is one, the air will be the principal theater of combat. It is even possible that it may be the only theater, in a brief, devastating clash. It is perfectly certain that masses of aircraft, of various types about which we can only guess, will be employed on a scale rivaling the scale on which ground forces are employed today. I suspect that, if some of the snatches of information reaching the press can be believed, the aerial combats now going on in Russia may foreshadow the type of warfare for which we must prepare in the future.

Such preparation calls for increased emphasis upon civil aviation's development in the immediate future. Only through a great stimulation in civil flying of all kinds can we hope to develop the means to defend ourselves.

If we are to face the kind of warfare I have envisaged we will have to have aircraft which can do almost anything in the air. We will have to have great bombers that can stay aloft far longer than anything now conceived of. We will have to have fighter planes that are highly maneuverable and very fast but with long range. We will have to have aircraft that can perform the tricks of the helicopter. We will have to have safe, dependable, and efficient gliders and tow-planes. In other words we will have to have an air force which bears about as much resemblance to present air forces as our modern mechanized ground divisions bear to the puny groups of tanks on the western front in 1918.

The aircraft development necessary to accomplish the purpose can come only through extensive experimentation and long, hard usage in all sorts of conditions. A certain amount of this can be accomplished through peacetime work by the military. But most of the development and the reliable service testing must come through the varied and large-scale usage that can be secured only through civil aviation. Civil air lines developing cargo-carrying gliders, if they prove feasible, and various types of helicopters, if they prove practicable, will build air power, and the methods of air power, more completely and satisfactorily than could be secured in any other way. Commercial enterprise, competing sturdily for traffic, creating new means for exploiting the air, operating in all kinds of weather to points near and far, will give us military strength. And with the commercial air lines the private flyers showing how new types of puddle jumpers—mayhap, the air jeep of the future—can come in on a dime, will be a most valuable proving ground.

All this requires intensive, aggressive planning and long, hard work. It will not be too soon if it is begun on the very day that peace is declared. That is why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives is now considering extensive amendments to our civil-aviation legislation. We must be ready as soon as possible to go forward with a post-war development which will keep us in the van of world-aviation progress.

The legislation being considered seeks to give concrete application to the lessons we have learned in the last 5 or 6 years, and to confirm and elaborate our civil-aviation program for the national defense as we have seen it successfully demonstrated since Pearl Harbor. It includes provision for further stimulation of private flying, aviation vocational training, and aviation education. It includes also provision for more extensive Federal development and a more complete scope for Federal jurisdiction in order that there may be the necessary degree of coordination on a Nation-wide scale. It contains a more specific recognition of the national defense role for our merchant marine of the air—the air-transport system. It contains provision for a continuing airport development program coupled with measures to assure protection of airport approaches so that airports may be safely used despite emergencies. And it continues our policy of maintaining control of civil aviation separate from the military and from surface carriers. The more complete scope for Federal jurisdiction is, of course, of particular importance for there must be proper coordination. For example, there must be an agency able to authorize exeriments with new developments in air-transport equipment and methods at any place or time that may be desirable, and empowered as well to specify the conditions pursuant to which such undertakings shall be carried out.

Traffic conditions, safety requirements, equipment specifications—all the complicated phases of carrying on this great civilian effort—must be subject to a coordinating head, and to strengthen that coordinating agency, the new legislation would change the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Civil Aeronautics Commission, and make it an independent agency of Government.

In what I have been saying of civil aviation, I have dealt only with its military significance. However, I do not want to leave the impression that I regard civil aviation as solely an instrument of military power. It has more positive qualities. In its rapid development and in the full realization of its great potentials there will come untold benefits to enrich our lives as a peace-loving people. We will open a new era for trade and travel, new opportunities for employment, new outlets for investment. The prospects are stirring, and we in the Congress join you in the industry in the fervent hope that we may push ahead with all speed in the inspiring conquest of the air for the pleasure, prosperity, and protection of our people.

Farmer Fights Against Odds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield, well-known author and farmer, from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of October 16, 1943:

FARMER FIGHTS AGAINST ODDS—NO ONE IS DOING BETTER JOB, FEW AS GOOD, WRITER DECLARES

(By Louis Bromfield)

Most good farmers are religious men. They are good farmers because they love the earth they till and the animals they raise. That in itself is worshiping God and so they couldn't be otherwise.

I don't mean by religious that they are churchgoing. A good farmer will not hesitate to plow a field or make hay on Sunday rather than to let the abundance given us by God be wasted through laziness or stupidity, or false reasoning.

I have just come back from a trip through the rich Middle West and found a lot of good farmers praising the Lord. Their attitude was explained by the direct statement of a neighbor.

"The Lord seems to be on our side in this war," he said yesterday. "It looked pretty bad for us last spring with cold and rain and floods. We finally got in some crops late and not too well planted. If we had an early or average frost, the corn and soybeans wouldn't have had a chance. But we had a good hot summer and the frost held off and it looks now as if we'd do pretty well."

Then he paused for a moment as if preparing the sting in the tail of his speech. "God knows," he said, "after all the troubles put in the way of farmers, this year we need the Lord on our side. That's about the only thing could have saved us."

WE'LL EAT MORE

Behind this speech lies a fact of great significance to workers, city dwellers, and all the people living outside America who are dependent upon the American farmer for food. It means they are going to have considerably more to eat than they might have had.

City people are beginning for the first time in history to have an interest in where food comes from and for the first time they are beginning to understand that a good farmer's life isn't a simple one and that he has to contend with labor, price regulations, filling in forms, taxes, insurance, and God knows what. Most of all, perhaps, he has to contend with the weather. Not only can it ruin him but it can make a whole nation go short on food.

We've been lucky in this country since our very beginning. We've had too much land, too little population, a great variety of climate, and all the things which go to prevent the kind of famine great countries like Russia, China, and India suffer periodically. For

the first time in our history we're beginning to feel the kind of pinch many millions of the people of other nations take for granted.

LORD IS ON OUR SIDE

If we have more food than we hoped for this year it's because we were lucky to have the Lord on our side to cancel out the folly and lack of providence for which we ourselves have been responsible.

The news isn't all good. In large areas of the South and West drouth has ruined crops and pastures. In certain restricted areas of the Middle West, heavy rains and late spring ruined prospects of oats, corn, and soybeans beyond repair.

The actual harvest of corn, soybeans, sugar beets, and potatoes still lies ahead and how much of that we shall reap as food available to nonfarmers depends not upon luck and the Lord but upon the amount of labor and machinery available. There is infinitesimally more machinery available this year and even less skilled labor than last year. The border between the abundance provided by the Lord and the amount of food lost through man's bureaucratic stupidity will be great, perhaps as great as the vast losses in unharvested food last year.

CHILDREN RUN TRACTORS

Meanwhile, the good farmer continues to work hard and place his trust in the Lord, which is about the only place he has been able to place it up to date. Children and grandmothers are running tractors. Cattle are breaking down fences because there isn't enough labor or material to repair them. So-called victory implements and materials are high priced and so shoddy they are scarcely worth buying.

The farmers' sows eat their pigs because no meat-scrap supplement is available. Other supplementary feeds for dairy herds and poultry are either unavailable or so high in price that they leave no margin of profit. In short, life for the farmer today is one long headache. He has barely met one emergency when another confronts him. It is almost impossible for him to plan ahead.

A good farmer has to know more than men in any other profession in the world. He has to be a veterinarian, an agronomist, a biologist, a botanist, a mechanic, a weather diviner, and plenty of other things. In the get-rich-quick era of industrial development Americans forgot that their whole economy rests upon the land, its fertility, and the men who handle it. In the past the American farmer hasn't had a high enough opinion of himself.

Today no American citizen is doing a better job than the farmer, and very few are doing as good a job. He has gone right ahead plugging at feeding the people in the towns and cities. He doesn't talk about patriotism any more than he talks about religion because that's not his way of doing things. He is a very poor politician. But he's doing his job and a magnificent one it is. And don't let them tell you he's getting rich because he isn't, or that he has any very big share of the $40,000,000,000 of uncontrolled inflationary money churning about in this country. He needs the Lord on his side. Up to date he hasn't had much else.

Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from newspapers in various States of the Union:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of October 14, 1943]

COUNTERPROPAGANDA

We hope that Congress acts promptly to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws as requested by President Roosevelt.

His special message pointed out that Chinese resistance depends not only on military force but "is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies."

We owe it to the Chinese, the President said, to strengthen that faith by placing China on a quota basis like that of our other allies—a basis that would mean admitting 105 Chinese a year.

Nations, like individuals, make mistakes, he said, but "we must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and rectify them."

The Japs are assiduously cultivating the Chinese, as they are other far eastern peoples. The International Settlement in Shanghai has been turned over to the Japanese-sponsored puppet government at Nanking. Chinese police guard the settlement, replacing Japanese soldiers and British Sikhs of prewar days.

The House Immigration Committee has voted to report the repeal favorably.

Congress should quickly take the offensive in this propaganda war and repeal the laws that insult our only ally on the mainland of Asia.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 14, 1943]

NEWS ACROSS THE SEAS

The international sponsorship of China's first graduate school of journalism and the careful selection of its faculty and students are in sharp contrast with its plant—a small auditorium in Chungking, now used by foreign correspondents, and nine typewriters. It is not a new contrast in war-torn China—great cultural and intellectual enterprises carried on against odds which would daunt a less tenacious people, but carried on by men and with men whose spirit is unquenchable. We wish the new school well, confident that the men chosen for the American faculty, under the leadership of Dean Harold L. Cross, professor of journalism at Columbia University, burn with the same unquenchable fire. Their 200 students will be a selected group, including 6 women, of college graduates who know English, and many of whom are already working news gatherers. The plan is to prepare them not only for reporting and editing news but for government informational and diplomatic services.

Two anonymous gifts totaling $75,000 to the trustees of Columbia University have made possible this school which, although sponsored by Columbia, will be a Chinese institution attached to the Central Political Institute. The school's opening coinciding with President Roosevelt's special message asking Congress to correct a historic mistake by repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act, is auspicious—auspicious as the warrant of the developing understanding and working alliance between the two countries, auspicious as a symbol of continuing cooperation and understanding.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of October 13, 1943]

JUSTICE TO CHINA

President Roosevelt's appeal to Congress to allow Chinese immigrants to be admitted to this country on the quota basis applied to Europeans recognizes the favor with which the Chinese are regarded in the United States. The Chinese exclusion law singled out China as a nation whose people could not be admitted to United States citizenship. The President is not asking that the Chinese be allowed free entry, but only that they be treated as the equals of Europeans.

In dealing with this question, as with Philippine independence, the President takes notice of "distorted Japanese propaganda." The Japs have capitalized on the racial prejudices of many white settlers in the Orient. Our Pacific enemy has found the ill feeling created by this condescension of whites toward the colored races is a bar to our attempt to arouse Oriental peoples against Japanese aggression. The President is seeking the most effective way to remove this obstacles to cooperation with eastern allies.

China is a good place to begin revising our attitude toward Orientals. Had the Chinese people not resisted the Japs when the enemy started aggression the American road to Tokyo would be far longer than it promises to be today. Even now we are greatly dependent on China's holding out until Hitler is beaten. China's services entitle her to full and equal treatment from Americans.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer of October 12, 1943]

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT REPEAL IS PROPOSED

The proposal has been made that the Congress repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, which prohibits people from China from entering this country.

"Chinese, fighting one of the most important and effective fronts of this global war, are forbidden by our law to enter the United States," says the Atlanta Constitution. "The Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in 1882. World conditions and American conditions, too, have changed vastly in the 60 years since then.

"There is a movement, gaining force, for repeal of that Chinese Exclusion Act. There are sound reasons for such a repeal.

"In the first place, there is the obvious reason that repeal would be extremely pleasing to our Chinese allies and, surely, they have contributed so much to the cause of Allied victory that we should give long and careful consideration before rejecting anything we can do to increase the friendliness now existent between our two countries.

"Secondly, with the immigration quota laws which apply to all countries, enacted long after 1882, in effect, letting down the bar to the Chinese would not mean so much to our immigration statistics anyway. On the quota system, repeal of the Exclusion Act would allow a total of 105 Chinese to enter this country annually. Surely a negligible number.

"The Exclusion Act was originally passed because of American fear that Chinese labor, able to work longer hours and willing to accept smaller pay than American labor, would reduce wages and lower living standards in this country. But 105 Chinese could have no effect on economics in a country of 130,000,000 people.

"It would, further, be good business to repeal the Exclusion Act.

"After this war is done China will be one of the greatest markets for many varieties of manufactured goods in all the world. China looks forward to modernization and industrialization of her vast land. She will require immense quantities of manufactured material for railroad construction, for road building, for the establishment of industries. Her people will provide an almost infinite market for consumer goods.

"It would be simple business wisdom for the United States to remove every possible obstacle to the continued friendship between the two nations so that this country shall hold preferred status with Chinese Government and Chinese enterprise when the goods China must have are to be hold to her.

"Repeal of the Exclusion Act and resultant permission to 105 Chinese to enter this country annually is an infinitesimal price

to pay, little more than a gesture, to enhance the friendship which China already feels toward us."

It would seem that the admittance of 105 Chinese into the United States would have little effect on the economics of this country. And the point is made by the Constitution that China will be a post-war market for many varieties of goods.

Perhaps, too, it would be a good idea to make a gesture of friendship to the Chinese, who are fighting so courageously against the Japs.

[From the New Haven Journal-Courier of October 11, 1943]

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT INIMICAL TO AMERICA'S FUTURE

Within the next week or two, a bill repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act and putting Chinese immigration on a quota basis will be brought before the House of Representatives for a vote. Last Thursday the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization favorably reported the bill out of committee. The issue involved is not—as A. F. of L. President William Green tried to insist 2 months ago—whether the Chinese shall be allowed to flood the country with cheap labor, the issue is whether we shall accord a great nation and a military ally the same treatment we give other countries.

The reasons for passing the Chinese Exclusion Act in the first place are reasons that do not obtain today. In the post-Civil War days many Chinese coolies were imported to build the railroads of the West and to do other heavy labor that was necessary in developing the country. Lest Chinese immigration flood the United States with cheap labor, a series of laws and Executive orders were set up, the best known of which was that of 1882, generally known as the Exclusion Act. These succeeded in cutting off the stream of laborers from China, and since that time only students, diplomats, and other special groups have been permitted to come at all, and then only as visitors. The Chinese already here were, of course, permitted to stay.

The proposed change in the law would not conflict with the desire of American labor groups to protect themselves and their standards of living. The new law asks that the Chinese be brought under our general immigration laws which determine admissions on a quota basis. This would permit 105 Chinese to enter this country annually and, as in the case of immigrants from other countries, the United States consular officials would have the right to select those considered worthy of being admitted. Character, skills, and ability to be self-supporting would enter into the selections.

Supporting this change is the basic reason of simple justice, for China deserves the same consideration that we grant other nations. But our own self-interest also urges the change. America and China are going to have a common destiny, for generations perhaps, in the Pacific basin. We need her as a friend and a customer. Removal of the discrimination would help to make her both of these.

Many Americans are straining to get their teeth into post-war problems. Here is a post-war problem right before us, and its satisfactory solution will have more to do with our future than many of the more enticing issues involving Europe.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 11, 1943]

TO PROVE OUR GOOD FAITH

President Roosevelt today called upon Congress to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act immediately as a too-long delayed sign of good faith toward our partner in conflict. China's epic resistance in her war—and our war—against Japan "does not depend alone on guns and planes and attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air," the President said. "It is based as much on the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies." He was confident, he added, that Congress will "correct an injustice" and admit the Chinese to quota immigration and citizenship. "We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and correct them."

Yesterday HENRY WALLACE addressed earnest words to the Chinese people on the thirty-second birthday of their Republic, emphasizing the stoutest links in our alliance with China to put down the "totalitarian plot against the world." This war, he said, "is a mutual action of the nations of the world who believe in the sovereignty of the people." It is action toward the sort of peace, "as a positive way of living," that the United States was first and China second to advocate as a nation's path to progress, rejecting the long-accepted European concept of war as an instrument of growth and policy.

The President today, and yesterday HENRY WALLACE, expressed the honest feelings of all civilized Americans toward a comrade in arms and in traditions. Repeal of the obsolete acts must come from Congress by a heartening majority.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of October 9, 1943]

EXCLUSION REPEAL

The House Committee on Immigration in an unexpected action Thursday voted 8 to 4 to report favorably a bill repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act and putting the Chinese, like other nations, under immigration quotas.

It is to be hoped that the House and Senate will act promptly on this measure, correcting a long-standing injustice to one of our finest allies. The material effect of the repeal would be slight, since China's quota would be something like 105 immigrants annually. The moral effect would be enormous, for of all the things the oriental peoples hold against the United States, this is perhaps the greatest—our exclusion of their races from citizenship in the United States.

Nothing Congress could do would be more effective in establishing Sino-American cordiality than the repeal of the exclusion acts which lost any pretense of reasonableness when over-all limits were imposed on all immigration into the United States.

[From the Toledo Blade of October 9, 1943]

BAN SHOULD BE LIFTED

Repeal of Chinese Exclusion Act has been approved by the House Committee on Immigration and is expected to be before the House next week. An identical bill has been introduced in the Senate. The measure would repeal the laws dating back to 1882 which bar entrance of Chinese and would put them on the quota basis of the Immigration Act of 1924. This would allow entrance of about 105 Chinese annually by the present quota schedule.

The legislation is approved by the Department of State and by citizens generally who lament that this discrimination has stood so long against a great nation and a stanch ally. Action by both Houses of Congress should be prompt and favorable.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Call of October 9, 1943]

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

There is little doubt that Congress very quickly will repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and thereby express in a very practical way the feeling which the American people entertain toward our brave oriental ally.

It is a known fact that much of the hatred which Japan developed for the United States before the war and before her ambition for conquest led her into the war grew out of refusal on the part of this country to accept the Japs as immigrants on the same basis as that enjoyed by white nations. That action was interpreted as insult to the entire Japanese people. We can understand this attitude if we think what our feelings would be if a neighbor were to say: "Don't ever come into my house." Now we might never have entertained the notion of making a visit, but the prohibition would nettle us no end. That in effect was what we said to the Japs and to the Chinese.

Of course, we stand firmly on our attitude as to the Japs who are off our calling list for an indefinite period of time. In fact at this time we feel that if we never see or hear anything of the Japs from this time on it will not be too long.

As to the Chinese it is different. While hundreds of millions of Chinese will never wish nor be able to come to this country, we are going to tell them that they are going to be welcome upon a quota basis such as prevails for the nationals of other countries. It will be a nice gesture, similar to that of the neighbor who invites you to call at any time and in the invitation makes you feel that he means it. You may not accept the invitation but you will feel very kindly to that neighbor.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of October 7, 1943]

OPINIONS WANTED

The Senate Immigration Committee has asked the opinions of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General on the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and permit immigration of 105 Chinese a year to the United States. An objective view of this snag in our Pacific relations should lead them to support the measure.

As more people are realizing the value of our present Chinese Exclusion Act to Japan, for her propaganda in Asia, they see that the matter calls for action now. Repeal of the act, House Majority Leader John W. McCormack reminds us would be "not only an act of justice, but also decidedly in our interest."

As if to confirm that, Chungking reported yesterday that Chinese troops have thrown the Japanese out of Fanchang, which the Japanese confidently entered 3 days ago. The enemy is trying desperately to stamp out guerrilla resistance and conquer territory where bases might be established for aerial attack on Japan.

We shall need those bases. We need China, her friendship and her fighting spirit, now and in the future, just as China needs us.

The Paper Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent showing what one of our New Haven industries is trying to do to be helpful in solving the present paper shortage. Here is the latter:

NATIONAL FOLDING BOX CO.,
New Haven, Conn., October 12, 1943.

Hon. RANULF COMPTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMPTON: In war-torn England it is a punishable offense to burn or otherwise destroy even the smallest piece of paper.

Envelopes are being reused as many as 60 times, newspapers have been cut down to four pages, and if "Mrs. Great Britain" fails to bring a box or bag to the store she takes home unwrapped her head of cabbage or suit of underwear she has purchased—because paper has gone to war.

Fortunately, we in America need not yet go to these extremes, but we are facing a severe paper shortage. While we are in better shape than many, I know that many board mills have less than 5 percent of their annual requirements of waste paper on hand and are forced to either run on exceedingly limited schedules or have shut down completely.

Within the next few weeks our salesmen will contact every one of our customers, explaining the urgency of the present paper shortage and pledging them to save and sell every bit of their waste paper to regularly established waste-paper dealers. No doubt many of you have stocks of obsolete boxes on hand which would make many additional tons of much-needed boxboard for essential military and civilian needs. If you have any hesitancy about releasing your obsolete folding or corrugated boxes to waste-paper dealers, simply notify us of the weight you have accumulated, and we will give you shipping instructions and pay the top ceiling price of $14 per ton f. o. b. point of shipment.

May I ask your full cooperation with our salesmen in this effort, for truly paper is essential war material.

Yours cordially,

WALTON D. LYNCH,
Vice President.

The Cattle Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on October 6 I asked and obtained permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Cattle Situation," delivered by C. J. Abbott, of Hyannis, Nebr., at the National Food Conference, held at Chicago, September 16, 1943. I find that the address exceeds by one-half page the length permissible under the rules to be printed in the RECORD. I have since received an estimate from the Government Printing Office of cost of printing the address, which is $112.50.

I renew the request that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here to discuss the food problems of the Nation. I am very appreciative of the distinction that has been accorded me by being asked to address so eminent an audience.

The ranches and farms which our family operate and which I manage produce hundreds of head of the three principal meat animals, hogs, cattle, and sheep. We also sell quantities of chickens, eggs, and cream. I am telling you these facts, not only to warrant the part that I have accepted on this program, but also to emphasize that the production of eggs, meat, and milk, which we may speak of as livestock products and which constitute about two-thirds of the farm income that produces exchange with industrial producers, are an interdependent group of food products, both price-wise and production-wise. A great many farmers and ranchmen produce a preponderance of whatever item is at the moment the most profitable.

Everyone is a consumer of both food and industrial products. Farmers are producers of more food than they consume. Their surplus is exchanged with industrial and other producers, who likewise produce more products than they consume. I am pointing out this simple fact only because there has been so much propaganda directed to consumers with the object of convincing them that they are in some way a separate class.

Another qualification which should lend some authority to what I have to say, is the ownership and operation of a small slaughterhouse at Hyannis. Our annual quota is about 150 head of livestock. For the benefit of any other large packers that happen to be present and as a warning to other farmers who as yet are not fully regimented, my number since becoming a packer is 6-49-029-L.

Food is a prime munition of war, of morale, and of health itself. Most of us will agree that our program of food production has been improperly handled and that some drastic changes must be made if we are to increase food production in a great many lines, notably meats. An astonishing fact seems to be that some of the bureaucrats in the Government want us to decrease beef production. A release of the Department of Agriculture on August 16, quotes the findings of a subcommittee of the food advisory committee, as follows:

"The most immediate and impressive gains can be made through better use of existing resources of land, labor, and equipment, and through shifting resources from certain crops and livestock enterprises to others. In general, foods for direct human consumption yield more nutrients for the resources employed than livestock enterprises; and dairy enterprises are usually more efficient nutrient producers than meat." It would appear that one group of experts, who fashion our regulations and prices, desire to reduce the production of meat, while another group of experts in propaganda try to convince meat consumers and others that cattlemen are purposely withholding supplies from the market.

My subject is the general cattle situation. I might have more listeners among consumers if I were to say the general beef situation. What is wrong? Why are there more cattle on the range with the result that less beef is in the butcher shop?

In order to understand what is wrong and how the situation might be improved, it is necessary to comprehend something about the production of beef. First of all, let us understand that there are more than 6,000,000 farms in the United States, the majority of which produce some kind of meat. The dairyman in New York or California, as well as the midwestern ranchman, is a cattle producer. His cattle product is a milk cow's calf, or the milk cow herself when she reaches the age of retirement. Too many of us think of beef as steer meat. Calves are divided almost half and half as to sex; when you eat a piece of any kind of meat there is one chance in two that it is from a female. All beef is good beef, the tenderest heifer and young steer. Not many calves are butchered; mostly they are grown to sizable animals on grass or grain before they are slaughtered. It is here that the complications regarding the regulation of beef production begin to set in, for the man whose cow produces a calf may sell it to another who buys it because he thinks it will be profitable to bring it to greater weight on grass, who in turn may sell it to yet another. Quite often we see cattle in the West with as many brands on them as a steamer trunk, many of them having journeyed from the Rio Grande to the Canadian border, someone always buying them because of the possibility of profit.

The slowness of beef production and the complexity of the part that specialists play in it seem to be most difficult for the consumer to understand. Steers gain about 750 pounds per year on grain and about 250 pounds per year on grass. Heifers somewhat less. A good early steer calf in the sandhills of Nebraska, will weigh about 400 pounds at weaning time; if wintered on hay and good grass by the next fall he will weigh about 650 pounds, the following fall he will weigh about 900 pounds as a 2-year-old, and as a 3-year-old 1,150 pounds. Steers are hardly ever carried until they are 4 years old; however, we usually have a few in our section and they weigh around 1,350 pounds. It is necessary to feed a calf a year, a yearling about 9 months, a 2-year-old about 6 months and a 3-year-old about 90 days, in order to have a finished beef. Consequently the younger the cattle the higher the finishing cost to the feeder and the higher the selling price of the cattle as meat. Cattle do not reach maturity until they are 5 years old, when they have what is termed a full mouth, but they get very fat on grass at 4 and produce excellent beef. However, as grass beef is choice only for a very short period, just before frost, all the beef for the balance of the year must be fed grain so as to have a continuous year-round supply. Let me emphasize that the only reason that the beef business is not more seasonal is because we have distribution between grass cattle producers and grain finishers. There is absolutely no hoarding, as has been charged.

From my foregoing remarks you can readily see that the beef industry is very complex, with an everyday adjustment of prices between grades and kinds The ranchman is a specialist in the production of feeders, often producing calves in the dead of winter when each cow and calf must have a separate stall; the feeder is a specialist in fattening, while at the markets there are hundreds of specialists in grading and selling animals. The fine steaks and roasts, that are now somewhat of a memory, come from an animal that was properly bred from a good sire and a good beef-type dam; the mother had good care before its birth and while she suckled; when it was weaned someone trained it to find food and water, for weaning time is one of the most critical times in an animal's life. Cowboys watch over the weanlings, giving them every care, and 2 years later if it is a heifer, or 3 if it is a steer, on our ranch, it is either sold to a feeder or shipped to our own feed lots in Iowa, where it receives further finish. When it is finished and when we think the market is right, it is again carefully shipped to a point where some packer buys it and expertly slaughters it, finally shipping the carcass to some consuming center. The butcher who buys it from the packer must himself be an expert in ripening and cutting meat. When the beef is prime it is taken out of his box and sold to a consumer, who in turn must be an expert to cook it properly. In the end if everyone has done a skillful job, you have the most palatable, the most economical and the most nutritious of foods; that food which an English king dubbed "sir loin of beef."

The meat industry of the United States is the largest in the world. Millions of people are engaged in producing, marketing, processing, and otherwise distributing meat animals. On the average, 40,000 head have been slaughtered daily, 6 days a week, during the past year. Notwithstanding the complexity of an industry whose product is so highly perishable, where thousands of traders, both at wholesale and retail, trade daily, where competition is so intense that there is always livestock for sale and where livestock

can instantly be converted into cash, a marketing system that is so sensitive that prices balance demand against supply almost to the single animal, a marketing system where every packer buys as cheaply as he can, a marketing system that is the envy of every other country in the world—I say—notwithstanding the existence of this perfect machine of production, so delicately balanced, O. P. A. simply hauled off and tossed a monkey wrench into its vital mechanism. Only a bureaucrat could be stupid enough to destroy this perfect machine or willful enough to fix retail price ceilings during Lent, when there was as much as 10 cents per pound difference between the cities of Boston and Philadelphia. This is exactly what was done, and ever since then, markets have not followed the pattern with which all producers are familiar, that of supply and demand, but instead have depended upon the regulations, news, and propaganda from Washington.

As a result of all of this, the official estimate of the cattle on feed August 1, as set forth by the Department of Agriculture, is 11 percent smaller than it was August 1 last year. But this report fails to point out that the number of cattle on feed August 1 last year was only 81 percent of the number on feed the year before. Thus we find by official estimates that only 72 percent of the cattle were on feed this August 1 as compared with 2 years before.

Fear of live-anima. ceilings has been a bugaboo of the livestock industry ever since that dastardly gremlin—price control—began its nefarious activities within our ranks. To place ceilings on cattle would fill our cup of woe to the brim. Here's the way I size up the situation: We already have a ceiling that is exactly as effective as to price, as the ceilings which a Government agency might concoct.

If it's illegal to sell the various cuts of dressed beef above a certain price, isn't this an effective ceiling above which prices cannot legitimately go? This ceiling must be reflected in the cost of the animal itself. Therefore, beyond the spawning of a few thousand more bureaucrats in the regimentation of all industry pool, I have not considered that the result would be any different than the present declining production.

The number of cattle moved into the feed lots during the past month and a half has been much smaller than a year ago. Every indication seems to point to a much smaller supply of beef from the feed lots this winter and next spring than during last winter. There are a number of reasons for this, and, in order to explain them clearly, I should like to discuss first the economics of cattle production; second, fiscal and monetary policies that are retarding the production of beef; third, the uncertainty of the feed situation; and, fourth, the effect of the Government's roll-back and subsidy programs.

The economics of cattle production have changed from the old days of the 4- and 5-year-old grass-fat steer to a condition such that at the opening of this war very few breeders carried their steers on grass past the time that they were yearlings and many sold them to the feeders as calves. The housewife brought this about by demanding a highly finished small cut of beef. This demand was so insistent that feeders would at times pay as much as 5 cents per pound more liveweight for calves than they would for heavy 3-year-old steers. Consequently the few ranchers who have grown cattle on the ranges to heavy weights have done so at a penalty. Price ceilings have changed all of this; the heavy steer is now the animal that is at a premium simply because it requires a minimum of costly grain to finish the older and heavier animal.

Let me illustrate this by telling you of a drove of steers that I weighed last week. They were ordinary 3's and averaged 1,150 pounds in weight. They were sold at 12½ cents per pound, costing the feeder $143.75 per head. One of these cattle fed about $40 worth of grain and concentrate should sell on the present market for about 15½ cents per pound, and should gain about 200 pounds in weight, making him bring $209.25, thus giving the feeder a gross profit of $65.50, from which must be deducted the shipping and labor costs and other items of expense. In the same yards were a drove of yearlings that weighed 700 pounds and cost the feeder 13½ cents per pound or $94.50.

It will require $75 worth of feed to make them weigh 1,100 pounds. If they sell under the same ceiling as the larger steers they will net $170.50. The original cost of the yearling steers, plus the feed cost, totals $169.50 or just one dollar gross profit per head. This transaction would result in a loss of at least $10 per head to the feeder by the time he paid for two shipments and other expenses. Thus we see that at times big cattle can be highly profitable in the feed lot when small cattle can be fed only at a loss.

Price ceilings have brought about another condition that is even more difficult to explain. The price being paid for cull cattle is nearly as high as for the best ones. Bulls and cutter cows were very high a month ago in comparison with fancy classes. I hesitate to say anything about this for fear that another bureaucrat will issue another regulation. But it is a factor that is retarding production and holding up the price of good feeding cattle, simply because the tendency among producers is to sell the product that is out of line and hold the part of their herd which has growth.

We had some bulls that had injured themselves on the range, which we shipped to Omaha not long ago. They sold for 13¼ cents per pound. Perhaps it was because of their globologna possibilities that they brought so much, but to us cattlemen this seems like paying more for overalls than it does for Sunday suits.

The charge of hoarding, among other accusations, has been leveled at the cattlemen by the propagandists of the Government, notwithstanding the report of the food advisory committee, which I quoted, and which in my estimation is the real policy of the Government. While I think that this committee is wrong in its advice to shift from the production of livestock, yet there is considerable to be said for the utilization of all of the grass. If the war is to be a long war we had better be well prepared with plenty of cattle grown to heavy weights for use in the future. But if there is a reasonable certainty that the war will be over in 2 or 3 years, then it will not be necessary that people eat grain, and we should bring about an acceleration of the cattle feeding process. Production of beef would seem to be advisable, because no other animal has the ability to grow on grass and produce such a large quantity of meat with such a small proportion of grain feeding.

With these illustrations, I have tried to show that under the present governmental policy, the natural course for a producer to follow is to increase the cattle population for a time at least by carrying every immature animal for a longer period on grass.

The fiscal and monetary policies of the Government which are retarding the production of beef are: (1) The extremely high surtax rates, (2) the excess-profits tax on corporations, and (3) the belief by many that the paper dollar will steadily diminish in value.

So far as I know, every large commercial feeder is out of business. They can hardly be blamed for not taking great risks for the little profit that would accrue to them under the present extremely heavy taxes. For them, each time that they buy a drove of cattle it is a new enterprise which involves a considerable amount of capital. We have all seen that it was necessary for the Government to assume the risk of ownership of new war plants in order to get industry to produce enough munitions of war. There is even more reason for a feeder to hesitate to invest his money in a feed lot full of cattle than there is for an industrialist to put his capital in a larger factory, because the feeder is at the mercy of the market. The history of his business in so-called normal times has not been such as to give him much confidence, and present regulations make his dealings even more hazardous

Those operators whose businesses are incorporated face about the same set of conditions, except that their tax is either a flat 90 percent on profits greater than they can establish as being formerly earned on the average by their corporation or above an 8-percent return on their capital invested.

So much for the tax situation as it applies to the feeder. The large range operator is confronted with about the same problem, plus the problem of paper profits if his inventory is conservatively valued. He can sell only a part of what he would otherwise sell each year because taxes will practically confiscate his property.

The shrinkage in the value of the dollar is not the subject of this address. However, it is a matter of common knowledge that its gold content has been reduced and that gold dollars are no longer freely coined or allowed to circulate. The best index of a paper dollar is the amount of labor that it will buy. It is natural for the farmer or the laboring man who has no debt to discharge to speculate as to the keeping qualities of this kind of money just as his wife speculates as to the keeping qualities of the vegetables that she has canned for future use. Paper dollars can be printed, but you can't print a cow and a calf.

Not so long ago, I pointed out these facts regarding taxes and money to a group, and someone said that a cattle producer was no different than anyone else in this respect, in fact that they were making money out of the war. To make myself clear on an important difference, I want to tell this story which belongs to Sam Pettengill and myself. Sam used the story to show that no one was getting rich out of the war. I am using the story to illustrate this point and also to show that taxes to a cattleman can be a capital levy, which take away his machine of production.

Here is Mr. Blank, let us take him as an example. Let us say that he has cows for sale in Illinois. One day a Government purchasing agent comes to him and says, "Mister, we have decided that your contribution to the war is 100 cows with which to feed our soldiers; we realize that the value of these cows is about $100 apiece. That is $10,000." But the Government purchasing agent continues, "Mr. Blank, we are not going to pay you for those cows." Mr. Blank says, "You can't do that to me. You can't take private property for public use without compensation." The purchasing agent replies, "O. K., here is your check for $10,000." Mr. Blank accepts the check and takes it home to his family and they rejoice in the good day's work that he has done. The purchasing agent for the Government drives down the road with the 100 cows. The next morning, bright and early, there is a knock at the door and who is there but the internal-revenue collector. He says, "Mr. Blank, we have decided that your contribution to this war is $10,000, and if you will endorse the check that was given to you yesterday, we will mark your account paid." Mr. Blank then awakens to the fact that he has given his steers to the Government, that they are gone and that he has received nothing for them.

Uncertainty as to the cost of feeds, and whether or not proteins such as cottonseed cake, soy-bean cake, or linseed will be obtainable are a third factor which is retarding the production of meat. Meat cannot be produced economically or efficiently in the feed lots unless the feeder can obtain sufficient protein concentrates to balance his ration. Carbohydrates fed without protein in the correct proportions are more or less wasted.

The growth of cattle on the range can be greatly accelerated by feeding small amounts of protein. When grass is green it contains enough, but when it cures in the fall it loses this protein content. Two pounds of protein cake fed to grown animals supplies this deficiency and makes the range much more productive.

The feed and protein situations become knotty problems when someone attempts to control their selling price. Anything from ground fish heads and tails, including evaporated fruit, sirups, and every kind of grain are used for cattle feed. It is unusual, but I have seen thousands of cattle fattened on prunes and dried peaches with fish meal as the protein supplement. It is impossible and unnecessary for the bureaucrats to try to control the costs of feeds and their meddling is only adding to the confusion rather than correcting it. It is my opinion that when rigid ceilings are substituted for the fluctuating costs of feeds in a free market, or when the distribution of any product is interfered with by regulation, the dead hand of government is placed on the throttle of production.

Let us now consider the roll-back or subsidy program which the Government is so vigorously prosecuting at the present time, because it, too, has influenced the cattle situation. This is the program by which the Government proposes to roll back retail prices to the level of September 15, 1942, for the purpose of guaranteeing to labor that the ratio of wages to the cost of living shall be maintained in the exact relationship that existed on the date when the so-called Little Steel companies negotiated wage contracts with their employees. This is appropriately called the "Little Steal Formula" by the propagandists, who would have us think that unless these exact economic relationships are maintained inflation will result.

Inflation like paper money is also not the subject of this address; but let us make a few comparisons.

In 1914 a dollar would buy 2½ hours of skilled labor in the packing house and 10 pounds of hog, live basis.

In 1937 a dollar would buy 1.2 hours of the same skilled labor and 10 pounds of hog, live basis.

In 1943 a dollar and fifty cents will buy 1 hour of skilled labor, and 10 pounds of hog—the 10 pounds of hog is parity.

In order to propagandize, by the method of the roll-back, the Government started paying a subsidy to the packers more than a month ago. Regardless of the fact that at the time the proposal was first made wholesale prices of pork cuts were under the September 15, 1942, levels and beef prices at the frozen levels, the Government reduced the wholesale prices that they had previously established by approximately 2 cents per pound and started paying the packer an offsetting subsidy on the live animals purchased. Think of the confusion and loss that this has brought about on inventories in the packing industry. It brought about the same amount of confusion and loss in the farmers' feed lots, and is the "jitter bug" of the moment in meat production. How the patriotic processors and manufacturers, the workers and farmers have managed to carry on in the face of all of the abuse that has been dished out by the bureaucrats in this war is the marvel of the age.

The livestock and meat industry last spring recognized the problem which now confronts the industry and set about to correct the chaos which they anticipated would result from the application of the screwy theories of the cap-and-gown boys in Washington. This work crystallized into the meat-management plan. It was presented to the Government agencies charged with the responsibility for the control of food during a wartime emergency. They accepted it, in part, and the War Meat Board was created to administer the plan.

I won't take time to amplify this meat-management plan because you are all familiar with it. You're also familiar with the fact that immediately after the War Meat Board was established right here in Chicago, the respective hands of its practical and efficient personnel—gentlemen who still believe that 2 and 2 makes 4—were so entwined with impractical restrictions that they were considerably hampered in administering the sound economic principles of meat management.

This plan, in its original form, would bring about exactly the results desired by the administration. It recognized the basic needs of the country—the need for adequate meat for our armed forces, for our home front, and for lend-lease requirements. It recognized the need for preventing inflation. It is the only program which will permit the Government to avoid the disaster that impends because of ill-considered and impractical regulations now in effect. Is it too much to hope that the brisk air of autumn may awaken our Rip Van Winkle dreamers to an awareness of need for action on the livestock and meat front.

If the Government subsidy program and the roll-back were really designed to curb inflation or increase the production of meat, or if it could have an appreciable influence on the cost of living, it would have some justification. It has none. It is simply a delayed-action tax bomb. But it is only a "little steal" formula to propagandize, by those who think that if a catchword or a phrase is repeated often enough that it will be accepted as a truth. If uttered abroad, they dignify it by calling it psychological warfare; if in Washington, campaign oratory to catch the sucker.

Out on the ranch the boys have an expression with which they characterize this sort of propaganda. They call it "heifer dust."

It is with a great deal of regret that I am compelled to report to you that these are the conditions in the cattle industry, and that they are generally true of the entire meat industry. What has O. P. A. accomplished through price ceilings, when the true condition of the market is revealed by a statement made by Mayor LaGuardia at the Kansas City conference when he said, "The marketing service of the Department of Agriculture publishes two retail price guides for my town; one is the O. P. A. ceiling price and the other the price you must pay in the black market if you want to eat beef."

The meat producers of America want to do a job. We are not asking for higher prices. We can double the tonnage of beef production in the next 12 months. But production will continue to decline unless the confidence of the millions of farmers can be restored.

In my opinion it would be constructive to abolish O. P. A. for the general welfare of our country on both fronts.

The control of perishable commodities should be divorced from any price-fixing program.

Price fixing when resorted to should be done by Congress. The price and production of perishable commodities should be guided by one man, schooled in the industry, similar to the tried and proven method of the Food Administrator in the other war.

Most of us farmers of America have had a fair education in barnyard economics; the dumb did not survive. In my opinion we realize the dangers of inflation and understand the cause of it better than any other class. We feel that it is time that the responsible people of America do something about it.

The 9-Hour Shift at the Boston Navy Yard

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States navy yard in Boston, Mass., has been an integral part of this country's magnificent shipbuilding program. Utilizing the highly developed skill of many thousands of expert technicians and tradesmen in the great metropolitan area of Boston, the navy yard has made an unsurpassed record in production. Of this record we in Massachusetts are proud.

However, this extraordinary productive achievement is now being threatened by a change which was probably designed to increase production. The change is based on the belief, which long ago was proven fallacious, that an increase in working hours to 9 full hours a day can increase production. Now we know not only from scientific studies of stamina and fatigue, and from comparative studies of production records, but also from the indisputable testimony of workers themselves, that an hour added to an already arduous working day, and repeated day after day, will substantially reduce production over a period of time.

There is another significant factor which demands attention as the result of recent change to two 9-hour shifts a day now in effect at the yard. Workers travel daily to the yard by train, bus, and car from cities as distant as Lawrence, Haverhill, Lowell, and many other cities more than 30 miles away. Thus men are commuting 60 to 70 miles every day in addition to working steadily for 9 hours at rigorous and exacting labor. This is an impossible situation which cannot persist long without grave consequences.

The United Mine Workers have raised the issue of portal-to-portal pay, which means that they claim right to compensation for time spent in going from the entrance to the mine to the place of work. I do not pass on the justice or equity of this claim. But I would call attention to the fact that welders, shipfitters, carpenters, electricians, and innumerable other workers are spending 2 hours a day and more going to the place of work. These workers are not claiming compensation for such travel time, but they are protesting, with reason, against the imposition of a 9-hour workday. Nine

hours of exhaustive work supplemented by more than 2 weary hours of travel must be supported by at least 8 hours of sleep. With but approximately 4 hours a day remaining it is apparent that we are literally accomplishing the reduction of man to a mere machine. What becomes of family life under these circumstances? What diversion, what necessary recreation is available to the men? Even more important is the grim warning that this war will probably continue for some time to come. What constitution, however determined the spirit may be, can bear up long under these extremely grueling hours?

Ladies and gentlemen, the transportation system of Boston, which was synchronized with the former schedule of three 8-hour shifts at the navy yard, has been disrupted and the result has been a dangerous confusion and a wasteful loss of time. The workers realize the impossibilities of the situation and have protested. A scheme similar to this proved thoroughly inadequate and wasteful at the neighboring Portsmouth Navy Yard. I earnestly hope that those responsible for this unnecessary and profitless change will soon take steps to return to the former shifts before too much damage is done.

Peace Plan

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a great country. While we are engaged in a global war and should be actuated by one purpose, to win that war, we seem to be able to carry on several wars here at home. War against our allies, war against the administration, and war against the general conduct of the war by our generals and admirals. No other country on earth is as versatile as the United States.

Several months ago Members of Congress, the Senate in particular, worked themselves into a white heat about the kind of peace we were going to have. It apparently did not occur to these Members that the war had not yet been won. For myself, I can say that I did not want this war, but when once in we should keep our mind on just one thing—winning the war. If all these grand plans to be written into the peace had been confined to our own domestic situation after the war, it would have been in order. To plan what the peace will be without consulting England, Russia, and China, our partners in the war, is on the face of it gaining no point at all, but merely expressing a wish. We shall have plenty of time to discuss the peace terms when we get that far, but in the meantime it might be highly advisable to get busy and keep our mind on the war.

All of this agitation about what kind of a peace we shall have has not even had the result of crystallizing any particular and definite sentiment in this country except to find fault with our allies and indirectly cripple the united war effort.

A lot of people are afraid Russia will want too much out of this war—so we attack the Russians. Some think England wants to annex the United States so we fly at Great Britain. When the Fulbright resolution was passed, which merely suggested to other nations that we should build a force to prevent wars in the future, many people rose up in their wrath and said: "There you are, you are delivering this Nation to Great Britain, or Russia, or China." There is not a word in it that suggests our annexation to England, but thousands of people have that impression. We merely said to the world: "We should try and arrange some plan of united action that will prevent wars in the future." Those countries, our allies, have not even endorsed our proposal.

Many people write in letters warning us against turning this country over to Great Britain, and I have seen nothing yet to indicate anyone's intentions of doing or even suggesting such a plan.

"No foreign entanglements," many say. Well, we did that after the last war. We refused to form a league of nations, and now we have this war. Those who want no entangling alliances have had their way and another war is upon us now. What possible objection can these same people have to an attempt, at least, to prevent another war? If we can be called out every time there is a prairie fire in Europe to spend billions in dollars and millions of dead and disabled men, it would seem that the majority of the people would be willing to try to stop the fire before it gets a headway. What objection can there be to plowing a few firebreaks and backfiring a little to stop a devastating conflagration?

We do not give up any of our own powers of government or our sovereign prerogatives in uniting with others to stop these fires. We do not ask other governments to change their form of government. We just decide to all go together, each nation being what it is, and formulate plans to stop this death and misery. That is all we have in mind, and that is all the resolution states.

What good can be accomplished by jumping on Russia rough shod, because we fear Russia will ask too much out of this war. If any nation has a right to be heard at the peace table it is Russia. How valiantly they have fought is admired around the world. No one ever dreamed that the Russian Government, a communistic state, had such unswerving loyalty and devotion on the part of the peope behind it. For Russia the communistic government has been a good thing—and are we not pledged to let every nation have the kind of government it wants? Stalin has shown the best leadership of the war. He has kept away from conferences, said nothing, and has fought hard and nothing more.

Many people can be found who say "If the Russians would only give us air bases in Russia we could knock the Japs out." These people do not stop to learn that if Russia took this step, she would be involved, over night, with a war with Japan and would have two fronts instead of one to defend. Stalin has studiously kept away from these allied conferences for that very reason. It seems to me that Russia has had a heavy burden in this war, and why some of our people want to add more to Russia's load I cannot understand.

There are many things about this war and the strategy of it that seem strange to me. I am sure if MacArthur had bombers representing 2 days' losses over Europe, he could blow the Japs out of the Solomons. It seems to me that if we could arm the 20,000,000 Chinese soldiers with guns, who now have nothing but knives, we could drive the Japs into the sea. But in this war we have a Commander in Chief, we have able generals, and able admirals—probably the best in the world—and these men do not agree with me. What am I to do? If I cannot conduct my office here to the satisfaction of the people of North Dakota, what kind of reception would I get if I were directing this war? What kind of success do you suppose we would have if I were directing it? I do not know a thing about war maneuvers and war strategy. I must trust someone who does. I must trust the Commander in Chief, because he is the only Commander in Chief we have. I must trust our generals and our admirals—they know their business and have been trained to do it. Under these circumstances I think all this hollering about our mistakes in strategy and maneuvers is entirely out of place. My job is to support the war effort in the only way I can, and that is to attend to my own job as a Congressman, and not attempt to tell those directing the war effort the way to conduct the war.

In this great war effort, I cannot see any politics in the situation. I know we are intensely interested in politics in the United States and, in normal times, demonstrate this fine quality. My action here in Congress during this war is not interpreted by me to contribute to the success of the Republican or the Democratic Party—my desire and only desire is to contribute my small part to the good of this Government in its hour of peril.

Many people are concerned about what kind of a plan the Allied Nations will set up to prevent future wars. We cannot definitely plan any world program of preserving peace without getting the approval of England, Russia, and China. There is one thing, however, we can do without talking the matter over with any other power, and this action is most effective in stopping wars, and that is to be prepared at all times to defend ourselves.

But to try to amble along among the powers of the world without an army, without a navy, and without a super air force can mean only one thing, and that

is that we shall, because of our weakness, be brought into every disturbance on the face of the earth. In the present conflict if we had been prepared, no attack would have been likely made against us by Japan.

I am ready to admit that I did not agree with the President several years ago when he wanted a stronger army and a stronger navy; but I did agree with him on a strong air force. That is the only redeeming thing to my credit in the program of preparation advocated by the President long before we became involved.

Whatever the plan may be to stop future wars which is set up by the Allies and the United States, we must be practical and not waste our time with visionary prophecies. When the war ends, our men will be on the ground.

As fast as we liberate countries held under the Nazi yoke, our men, along with Allied men, will be on the ground. While this country at least is committed to the principle of allowing each nation to choose a government of its own, do the people of the United States wish to have our men withdrawn the minute the fighting ends? Evidently they do not. These men, being on the ground, will necessarily have to preserve order until the released people have an opportunity to organize a government. This applies to all countries—friends and enemies alike. Germany—that is, the people in Germany—must have the right to exist under a government of their own choosing. Until that time arrives, will we not have to maintain a force in Germany? As soon as the German people demonstrate that they have established a government of their own choosing, and a government which is devoted to government instead of the conquest of territory belonging to other peoples, there will be no need of our maintaining a force in Germany.

The real key to peace of the world lies in the lifting of economic barriers. People everywhere have the right to live; there is plenty of everything for everybody, and the people everywhere will get what they need unless some nation decides to strangle trade and assume command over the necessities of life to that nation's own advantage. This spirit must be given up by all nations, allies as well as enemies, if we are to have a lasting peace. No matter how many men we station in any particular nation, no matter how many guns we have trained on them, just the minute these people cannot get the necessities of life and get hungry, there will be revolution, murder, and war.

We do not need to be told this because the pages of history are open before us. We need, however, to remember this history and from it avoid those cardinal mistakes that foment war. All nations should have the right to trade throughout the world, and no nation should be permitted to have any special privilege in the control of this trade. There should be absolute freedom of the seas to permit all nations large and small to carry their goods anywhere they can find a market.

This time the United States should take the lead in this philosophy, and when the time comes to write the peace, these principles will be written in the document, and whatever is written in that document should be submitted to the people of the Allied countries for ratification or rejection. If that kind of peace is written, it will receive the enthusiastic endorsement of the people of the United States.

The people of every nation, after this war, will be more determined to bring education to their people than at any other period in the world's history. The bringing of nations together in a few hours by air has stimulated a desire for information. Education can do more to preserve peace than standing armies and fast-moving navies, and this Nation should recognize no country unless that nation has provided free education to the children of that nation. This world has been so accustomed to war, and war has been based so largely upon the ignorance of the people, that a new era is at hand.

I would say, therefore, that education, free to everybody, and a peace written that proposes economic freedom to all nations, will be the means by which the peace of the world may be maintained. The mass mind of the world then will want peace and not war. Any violation of this philosophy will result in other wars just as surely as there is a sun in the heavens.

Editorials Urging Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials urging repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of October 11, 1943]

ROOSEVELT MESSAGE ASKS CONGRESS TO LIFT BAN ON CHINESE—UNITED STATES SHOULD CORRECT ERROR, GRANT CITIZENSHIP TO THOSE HERE, HE SAYS

President Roosevelt today called on Congress to enact pending legislation to lift the immigration ban against the Chinese and make them eligible for citizenship, declaring this step "important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace."

The President referred to the Chinese exclusion laws as "anachronisms" and said their repeal would "correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda."

"Nations like individuals make mistakes," the President said in his message. "We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them."

The House is expected to act this week on the repeal of legislation voted out last Friday by the Immigration Committee. The ban on the Chinese was voted in 1882. Under the quota provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 the country would be entitled to the admission of 105 nationals annually.

STRESSES CHINA'S ROLE IN WAR

The text of the President's message follows:

"There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

"China is our ally. For many years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle aaginst very great odds.

"China has understood that the strategy of victory in this World War first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies, but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan—in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

MORALE OF CHINESE IS VITAL

"But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

"Nations, like individuals, make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

"By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants on a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

HELD ENTITLED TO PREFERENCE

"The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

"I feel confident that Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other people."

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of October 5, 1943]

REPEAL CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

It would have been something more than a fine gesture, when the wife of Chiang Kai-shek appeared before each House of Congress many months ago, if the House and Senate had joined in repealing on that same day the Chinese Exclusion Act, passed in 1882. The next best thing will be its repeal in the near future. Of this there now seems a good prospect. Not only has such a bill been introduced in each of the two Houses, but there is backing for it from representatives of the Pacific Coast States in which hostility to

Chinese coolie labor 60 years ago led to the original passage of the act.

In the last session, Representative MAGNUSON, from Washington, introduced such a bill in the House. Representative MAGNUSON is one of the younger and more liberal Democrats. It was reported to have been his protest against the outrageous conduct of the investigation of the F. C. C. which recently led to the long-overdue resignation of Representative Cox, of Georgia, from the chairmanship of that committee.

Representative MAGNUSON'S bill has behind it not only the influence of one of the more highly regarded Members of the House, but at the time of the Republican post-war policy meeting at Mackinac Island, Governor Warren, of California, expressed his favor for such a measure. It was from California that the chief pressure for the Exclusion Act originally came. In addition to his post as California's chief executive, Governor Warren is now frequently mentioned as the possible Republican Presidential nominee next year.

More recently, since the reconvening of Congress, Senator ANDREWS, of Florida, has introduced in the Senate a companion bill to that of Representative MAGNUSON. Both of these bills would substitute for the Chinese Exclusion Act the operation of the quota system of immigration which, except for the Chinese Exclusion Act and the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924, applies to immigration from all countries.

Under the quota system, with its percentages based on our present population of various national strains, the Chinese would be permitted only 105 immigrants a year, aside from doctors, ministers, and students who were exempted under the exclusion act. It would be ridiculous to suppose that the annual admission of 105 Chinese, even of the coolie class, would offer any menace to labor standards in this country. When Senator ANDREWS offered his bill in the Senate, he paid tribute to the "heroic accomplishments" of the Chinese people in the present war, adding that China should be treated "on a par with other nations."

As for the Japanese Exclusion Act, in the passage of which the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge had a large share, that, too, is regarded by many people as having been a mistake. But this is obviously not the time to agitate for its repeal. Governor Warren, of California, in favoring repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act expressly coupled his statement with the provision that there be no change whatever in the Japanese Exclusion Act, repeal of which California would steadfastly oppose.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of October 4, 1943]

END THE DISCRIMINATION

The fight to repeal Chinese exclusion laws has moved to the Senate with introduction of a bill by Florida's Senator ANDREWS to allow Chinese to enter this country on a quota basis.

It will be a fortunate day when the bill becomes a law and gives to our Asiatic ally a status it has certainly earned.

Here is no effort to open the doors to a flood of oriental immigration, since the quota law of 1924 makes it certain that no more than approximately 105 Chinese would be permitted to enter the United States each year; but it is a move toward giving a status of equality which would go far toward cementing the ties of our democracy with a nation and people whose courage and steadfastness will, in the pages of history, be credited with a major role in protecting the cause of freedom.

The respect and admiration we, as a people, have for China could not be better demonstrated than by removing the barriers which have the effect of branding it as an inferior country.

It is not the number of nationals admitted to the United States which interests the Chungking government. Rather it is the manner in which they are given entry.

As a matter of right rather than of expediency the exclusion laws ought to be repealed.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of October 4, 1943]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE CHINESE

Chinese, fighting one of the most important and effective fronts of this global war, are forbidden by our law to enter the United States. The Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in 1882. World conditions and American conditions too have changed vastly in the 60 years since then.

There is a movement, gaining force, for repeal of that Chinese Exclusion Act. There are sound reasons for such a repeal.

In the first place there is the obvious reason that repeal would be extremely pleasing to our Chinese allies and, surely, they have contributed so much to the cause of allied victory that we should give long and careful consideration before rejecting anything we can do to increase the friendliness now existent between our two countries.

Secondly, with the immigration quota laws which apply to all countries, enacted long after 1882, in effect, letting down the bar to the Chinese would not mean so much to our immigration statistics anyway. On the quota system, repeal of the Exclusion Act would allow a total of 105 Chinese to enter this country annually. Surely a negligible number.

The Exclusion Act was originally passed because of American fear that Chinese labor, able to work longer hours and willing to accept smaller pay than American labor, would reduce wages and lower living standards in this country. But 105 Chinese could have no effect on economics in a country of 130,000,000 people.

It would, further, be good business to repeal the Exclusion Act.

After this war is done China will be one of the greatest markets for many varieties of manufactured goods in all the world. China looks forward to modernization and industrialization of her vast land. She will require immense quantities of manufactured material for railroad construction, for road building, for the establishment of industries. Her people will provide an almost infinite market for consumer goods.

It would be simple business wisdom for the United States to remove every possible obstacle to the continued friendship between the two nations so that this country shall hold preferred status with Chinese Government and Chinese enterprise when the goods China must have are to be sold to her.

Repeal of the Exclusion Act and resultant permission to 105 Chinese to enter this country, annually, is an infinitesimal price to pay, little more than a gesture, to enhance the friendship which China already feels toward us.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of October 11, 1943]

EQUALITY FOR CHINA

The House of Representatives now has before it a simple proposal to put Chinese on a parity with other peoples under our immigration laws. It would repeal the ugly and antiquated Chinese Exclusion Act—which serves no purpose save as propaganda fuel for our Japanese enemies who persistently hold it up before the Chinese people as evidence of American racial prejudice. It would give the Chinese no special privileges. All that it would do would be to put them under a quota system for immigration—the same system that applies to Frenchmen, Norwegians, or Russians. At most, 105 Chinese would be permitted to enter this country in the course of a year.

The House cannot fail to pass this bill without dealing a serious blow to one of our allies—and thus to ourselves and the whole United Nations cause. If the bill is enacted speedily and overwhelmingly, as it should be, it will do much to cement the good relations between China and the United States and to spur the war effort in the Far East. These are considerations which, of themselves, should insure its prompt passage. Beyond them is the important fact that the bill would at last expunge from our national record a piece of wanton discrimination which has always been a source of shame.

[From the Miama (Fla.) Herald of October 9, 1943]

CHINESE EXCLUSION

Sunday is Double Ten Day in China—that country's Fourth of July. It commemorates the founding in 1911 of the Chinese Republic.

It had been hoped by advocates that repeal of the 1924 Chinese Exclusion Act could be effected before that day. They saw in such action by Congress a great gesture to cement friendly relations between our nations and to salute China for her valiant struggle with the common enemy, Japan.

The repealer, which would admit approximately 107 Chinese yearly after the war and when transportation is available, will not have become law in time for the Chinese national observance. There is, however, comfort for our allies of the Far East in the knowledge that the House Immigration Committee, by a vote of 2 to 1, favors the measure which is scheduled to come to the floor next week.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of October 5, 1943]

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Introduction in the United States Senate of a companion bill to a measure previously introduced in the House, providing for repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws and allotment of an annual immigration quota to the Chinese, raises hopes of decisive action on legislation which is long overdue. Reports that the Roosevelt administration will press for repeal indicate increased possibility of passage.

Few Americans, fully appreciative of China's well-earned place as one of the Big Four—the one who in number of years has contained our common enemy the longest—can be satisfied with the amount of aid the United States has been able to extend to her. Transportation difficulties still make it impossible to get more than a minimum of aid to this Ally, but removal of the stigma placed upon her nationals by repeal of an outmoded, unjust exclusion law, can go far toward expressing something of the debt to and admiration for the Chinese people.

Under the quota system, a maximum of 105 Chinese persons a year would be permitted to enter the United States—surely no serious threat to American labor with its millions. Yet the fears of labor were largely instrumental in bringing about the exclusion more than 50 years ago, and are still operative in balking revision.

Americans are fighting, among other things, for the abolition of race prejudice. Here is an opportunity to prove they mean it.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of October 5, 1943]

CHINA'S POST-WAR AIMS

The reasonableness of China's post-war claim, as outlined recently by Foreign Minister Soong, is in line with what might be expected. The Chinese are not seeking anything that does not rightfully belong to them.

They are not after conquest or territorial aggrandizement. They want nothing from Siam except the assurance that the Siamese, not the Japs, shall be in control of the country. It is their determination that the Japanese and Japanese influence shall be rooted out of all that is and should be China.

Minister Soong says the Japanese have been bombarding Chungking with proposals for peace. They are willing to get out of everything that is China, excepting Manchuria and Formosa. Apparently the Japs do not consider Korea as in the list of things that should be given up, but the Chinese have a different idea. They do not ask Korea for themselves but will insist that it should be an independent country. It was a sovereign kingdom more than 3,100 years before it was annexed by Japan in 1910.

More than 30 years of occupation has not made Korea Japanese. The natives are hostile and would revolt at a moment's notice if given an opportunity. As for Manchuria, now Manchukuo, that is a feeble pretext at being an independent nation. It was taken over by Japan in 1931. A puppet government was set up at Harbin. It is just as much a stooge of Tokyo as anything could be. The people are as hostile as they were the day the conquering army from Japan took them over.

Formosa also formerly belonged to China and, Minister Soong says, should again be a part of that republic. He and his countrymen have no idea of trying to take over what is known as Indochina. They do not want anything that does not belong to them, that is not essentially Chinese and a part of China. They are ready to keep on fighting until they get what they want, and the prospect of success becomes better every day.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of October 6, 1943]

A JUST DUE

The apparent decision of the administration to press for repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws and for admission of a limited number of Chinese as citizens makes for humanitarian justice and good will and is a fair and just recognition of the contribution of the Chinese people to the victory in which the United States has such a stake.

The exclusion laws were never wise. They were always a source of irritation to the Chinese people. They never made for peaceful and harmonious relations. To some persons they were even a denial of some of this country's most fundamental concepts of the brotherhood of man.

But now in view of the courage displayed by the Chinese and their sacrifices for the common cause of the democratic peoples everywhere, there is an extra reason for repeal of the laws which discriminated against them.

Law Revision Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Brooklyn Bar Association committee on Federal legislation, in support of the bill, H. R. 78, which I introduced and which I believe provided a much needed improvement in the art and science of legislative drafting.

The report follows:

H. R. 78, introduced by Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, is intended to amend the act of March 2, 1929, relating to the United States Code, by adding a provision creating the office of law revision counsel in the House of Representatives. The author of the bill has been for three terms chairman of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws, which is charged with the preparation and editing of the official United States Code and District of Columbia Code, and is consequently in a position to be more familiar with the needs and shortcomings of the present mode of legislating in Congress than any other Member of the House or Senate.

The functions of the law revision counsel, as provided in H. R. 78, would be to—

"(a) Examine all the public acts of Congress, commencing with volume 1 of the Statutes at Large, and submit recommendation to such committee for the repeal of obsolete, superfluous, and superseded provisions of law contained therein;

"(b) Prepare and submit to such committee a complete compilation, restatement, and revision of the general and permanent laws of the United States, one title at a time, which shall conform to the understood policy, intent, and purpose of Congress in the original enactments, with such amendments and corrections as will remove ambiguities, contradictions, and other imperfections both of substance and of form, with the view of the enactment of each title as positive law;

"(c) Advise and assist the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives whenever called upon to do so."

It is obvious, from a quick reading of these duties that the initial undertaking of such an office, as provided in (a) and (b), would be an all inclusive study and revision of all the Federal laws enacted to date.

Your committee is of the opinion that such an undertaking is desirable and necessary and that the enactment of H. R. 78 is the best way to bring about a long-needed reform in Federal legislation.

Under the existing method of enacting Federal laws, unlike that in New York State and a majority of the other States, there is no permanent structure, similar to New York's consolidated laws, containing a systematic arrangement of the positive law which can be amended directly. The only arrangement of the positive laws since 1874 is a strictly chronological one consisting of the Statutes at Large which are analogous to New York's session laws. Members of the bar who are accustomed to the subject-matter arrangement of the chapters of the New York consolidated laws can hardly appreciate the deficiencies of the cumbersome and unscientific method of legislating in Washington. Except for the laws relating to internal revenue which were codified by Congress in 1939 the lawyer must frequently have recourse to numerous volumes of the Statutes at Large for all the positive laws on any given subject.

There is, of course, the United States Code, which contains the general and permanent laws of the United States arranged according to subject matter and reflecting the amendments to the basic acts but this code is only prima facie evidence of the law and not the positive law. It would be the duty of the law revision counsel to prepare a positive code of laws which would be the only law on the respective subjects.

The Internal Revenue Code which was enacted in 1939 was the first attempt in recent years to codify a substantial portion of our Federal laws, and lawyers who have occasion to use the Internal Revenue Code will agree that such a code is far superior, mechanically, to the old system of citing the various revenue acts with all of their ramifications. However, when the Internal Revenue Code was adopted Congress did not specifically repeal the then existing laws affecting internal revenue, with the result that there is a possibility of confusion as to whether there are still some laws outside the code relating to internal revenue which are still in force. Furthermore, there have been bills introduced in Congress since 1939 which purport to amend one or several of the various Revenue Acts instead of the Internal Revenue Code itself.

The law revision counsel provided for by H. R. 78 would be charged with preserving the code structure once it has been erected and would examine all bills introduced to see that they conformed to such code structure.

The author of H. R. 78 has personally introduced four bills, each designed to codify and enact into positive law four separate titles of the present prima facie United States Code. The Committee on Revision of Laws of the House of Representatives is also commencing work on a revision and codification of the Federal laws relating to crimes and criminal procedure and Federal courts and the judiciary.

It is the opinion of your committee that if this work in Congress is to result in the adoption of six titles of a positive code of laws, unless there is some office such as the Law Revision Counsel provided for in H. R. 78 whose duty it will be to preserve such code structure, the good thereby accomplished will be short lived.

Your committee believes that lawyers engaged in Federal practice or familiar with the status of Federal legislation will agree that a complete codification of Federal laws is needed. It seems unfitting that the laws of the United States of America are not up to the standard of the majority of the States.

In 1874 Congress adopted the Revised Statutes which were a codification of the general and permanent laws enacted up to that time and contained in 17 volumes of the Statutes at Large. Today there are 56 volumes of the Statutes at Large and aside from the United States Code the first edition of which was adopted in 1926 and which, as has been said, is only prima facie evidence of the law, there has been no complete codification of the law since 1874.

A little more than 30 years ago Congress also enacted the Criminal Code and the Judicial Code but no serious attempt was made to keep those codes as the basis of future legislation with the result that many of the laws on the statute books today are redundant, superseded, or obsolete.

Your committee is in favor of the enactment of H. R. 78 as perhaps one of the most progressive steps in modern Federal legislation which has been long needed and which should be a source of great benefit to the Federal bench and bar and the public in general.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT N. GILMORE, *Chairman.*

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following letter and petition:

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., October 19, 1943.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: I am enclosing herewith a petition addressed to the Congress in which it is recommended that our immigration and naturalization laws be modified with respect to China so that natives of that country, otherwise admissible, may enter the United States under the existing quota system and become citizens on the same terms as immigrants from nonoriental countries.

Appended to this petition are 800 names of religious leaders from all parts of the country. The representative character of the petition speaks for itself.

Faithfully yours,

WALTER W. VAN KIRK, *Secretary.*

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Whereas our immigration and naturalization laws affecting orientals are based on discrimination on account of race; and

Whereas such racial discrimination does violence to the Christian view of one humanity under God, is contrary to the democratic principles upon which this country was founded, and to proved scientific fact;

We, the undersigned, express the hope that the Congress, taking into account these principles, will take immediate steps to modify these laws with respect to China so that natives of that country, otherwise admissible, may enter this country under the existing quota system and become citizens on the same terms as immigrants from nonoriental countries.

Dr. Harry W. Chase, chancelor of New York University; Rev. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Dr. C. A. Dykstra, president, the University of Wisconsin; John Foster Dulles, chairman, Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches; Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Riverside Church, New York; Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College; Prof. Ernest Hocking, of Harvard University; Dr. Rufus M. Jones, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia; Dr. John A. Mackay, president, Princeton Theological Seminary; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, editor, Christianity and Crisis, New York; Rev. G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston; Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, of Union Theological Seminary, New York; Dr. Luther A. Weigle, dean of Yale University Divinity School; Dr. Mary E. Woolley, president emeritus, Mount Holyoke College; Rev. Bradford S. Abernethy, director, Commission on the Church and Minority Peoples of the Federal Council of Churches; Dr. Robert A. Ashworth, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Dr. R. B. Atwood, president, Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Ky.; Dr. John C. Bennett, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Dr. Arlo Ayres, president, Drew University, Madison, N. J.; Dr. William Adams Brown, chairman, American Section Universal Christian Council, New York; the Right Reverend A. J. Burke, president, St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa; James W. Butler, executive secretary, Goldsboro Chamber of Commerce, Goldsboro, N. C.; Dr. Donald J. Cowling, president, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; Chancelor Harvey W. Cox, Emory University, Georgia; the Right Reverend James Cannon, Jr., Richmond, Va.; Dr. Everett Case, president, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Dr. Robert C. Clothier, president, Rutgers University; Dr. Herbert Davis, president, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Dr. Stephen J. England, dean, Phillips University, Enid, Okla.; Dr. Paul N. Garber, dean, divinity school, Duke University; Dr. Georgia Harkness, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. Hamilton Holt, president, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.; Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, dean, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.; Rev. William Lloyd Imes, president, Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.; Dr. John M. Nason, president Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; the Right Reverend G. Ashton Oldham, Albany, N. Y.; Rev. Albert W. Palmer, Chicago Theological Seminary; Dr. Benjamin F. Schwartz, chancelor, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. F. W. Schroeder, president, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills, president, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine; Rev. Luman J. Shafer, secretary, board of foreign missions, Reformed Church in America, New York; Guy Emery Shipler, editor, the Churchman, New York; Bishop John S. Stamm, Evangelical Church, Harrisburg, Pa.; Channing H. Tobias, secretary, colored men's division, National Council of the Y. M. C. A., New York; Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, secretary, Department of International Justice and Goodwill, Federal Council of Churches; Dr. Ernest H. Wilkins, president, Oberlin College; Dr. Henry M. Wriston, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

Address of Vice President Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Vice President of the United States made at a meeting of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped at the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., July 9, 1943; a resolution introduced at and adopted by the meeting is also included, and an address by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, and vice president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

Mr. Rice is introduced by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the A. F. P. H.

Mr. STRACHAN. Brother Archie E. Cole, of Washington Lodge No. 2, is recognized to present a resolution. The following resolution was presented and unanimously adopted by a rising vote of all present:

"Whereas the immediate needs of our Nation for increasing manpower necessitate full utilization of the skills and aptitudes of our physically handicapped citizens, who now number approximately 23,000,000, and a very large number of whom could, with treatment, training, and suitable placement, be fitted into the war production program, and

"Whereas the increasing number of handicapped, approximating 1,500,000 yearly, due to injuries and disease incurred in military, naval and industrial, and agricultural services, demand attention by Congress, and the public, and require early attention looking to establishment of an adequate program to meet this problem: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this mass meeting held under the auspices of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., and in which the District of Columbia Department, Disabled American Veterans, participated—the A. F. P. H. including in its membership the blind, the deaf, the hard-of-hearing; cardiacs, tuberculars, victims of infantile paralysis; amputees, and other groups of injured, or diseased, calls upon all Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to take favorable, immediate action upon House Resolution 230, introduced by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania; which provides establishment of a House committee to investigate, survey, and develop an adequate program for all the physically handicapped, and, be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress, the daily press, and all interested organizations and individuals."

Mr. STRACHAN. Some of you have had the pleasure of having heard Vice President Millard Rice when he appeared before us on a previous occasion, but I am happy to again present him because to me he represents one of the real leaders in this organization. He is one of the very few with whom I "fight," continually, but work with just as continuously. His very great ability and comprehensive knowledge of the problems of the handicapped is second to none, and I would go so far as to say that much of the legislation written during the past 7 years dealing with the problems of the handicapped, particularly as to disabled veterans, has emanated from him. I am, therefore, proud that he is one of us, and I have delegated to him tonight the high honor of introducing the Vice President of the United States.

I now present Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director, Disabled American Veterans, and vice president of the A. F. P. H., Mr. Rice.

Mr. RICE. Fellow Americans, it is a pleasure for me to be with you again tonight. I have been interested in the A. F. P. H. since prior to its inception. In fact, I think that I had something to do with its beginnings—for Paul Strachan and I have long been interested in the social and economic problems of the less fortunate of this country, and Paul has sacrificed much, and has been a real aid to the A. F. P. H.

I happen to be the national service director for the Disabled American Veterans, which is an organization of war-disabled veterans. That organization, congressionally chartered, came into being some 23 years ago. It was the realization on the part of such war-disabled veterans from World War No. 1 that they must be organized if they were to get what they believed a generous public intended them to have that brought about the D. A. V.,

as the organization is commonly referred to.

The same situation is true as to other physically handicapped. They, too, have been neglected. As one of our previous speakers has said, during this time of war, when total production is so important, many physically handicapped have been found to be employable, and are now employed in jobs previously handled by able-bodied persons. More of the handicapped will be found to be so employable with vocational rehabilitation and training, and if the proper program is developed and the American people convinced, it is not unlikely that they may continue to be employed in time of peace.

Right after the First World War we of the D. A. V. found that American employers—even our Federal Government—were reluctant to employ disabled or handicapped persons. And even in those days we felt that the battle for the proper employment of such disabled veterans would have to go on. That is true not only as to disabled veterans but as to disabled Americans generally and because of the fact that the future will bring more and more handicapped, we are inexorably bound to help each other to the end that our fellow Americans who are physically handicapped—in the interest of America itself—shall be restored to employability not only temporarily during time of war but for all time.

I think that sometimes we forget that all the great wealth of this Nation was created by labor, and employers must be convinced that the handicapped are not liabilities, but, assets, and that they can bring something worth while to the Nation. Because of that realization, the D. A. V. has been extremely interested in the problems of the returning disabled veterans of this war, as well as those of past wars, and in the problem of disabled civilians as well. It is true that we have insisted that those who have incurred disabilities as a result of war service should have laws administered separately, by an agency set apart from the agency responsible for civilians generally. We believe that is desirable, not only because we believe it is warranted as to disabled veterans, but also because it helps to lead the way.

Looking back a little way, I think we can safely say that social security benefits came into being largely as a result of comparison as to what had been done for disabled veterans, and it was finally decided that Americans—generally speaking—should all be extended some assistance when aged or disabled.

You, who are members of this organization, are engaged in the pursuit of an ideal, and that is to make yourselves useful and to be gainfully employed. You need some assistance, some encouragement—possibly some form of vocational rehabilitation and training, to the ultimate end of placement in gainful employment. If we all work together, we shall unquestionably attain these goals.

We are fortunate in having with us tonight, as our esteemed guest, the Vice President of the United States, who is a practical idealist. It is an unusual pleasure and a distinction for me to present to you, the Vice President of the United States—Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. President Paul Strachan, Vice President Rice, ladies and gentlemen, the American people reserve their supreme admiration for those who have used their physical handicaps to broaden their minds, to intensify their wills, and to vivify their sympathies. That is one reason why we have one of the physically handicapped in the White House today. That is the reason that, 40 years ago, he who most stirred the ambitions of the rising generation was another President by the name of Roosevelt, who had overcome the grave physical handicap of a weakly youth.

But, if the American people reserve their supreme admiration for those who have used their physical handicaps to extend their minds and intensify their wills, then, also the American people reserve their supreme disdain for those who have used their abounding health and great wealth to narrow their minds and to contract their sympathies.

In a somewhat lighter vein, I am reminded of a paper prepared by a great cartoonist of Des Moines, a man of rare gifts, entitled "Why Beautiful Women Have No Brains," to the effect that those who gain admiration by physical appearance do not find it necessary to develop their minds. Perhaps we could look around here, tonight, and find that such a thesis could not always apply, although there may be a kernel of truth in the observation.

I believe that this verse appears something like six times in the Bible, probably not in exactly the same words each time, but at least once in the Old Testament, and five times in the New Testament: "The stone that the builders cast aside has become the headstone of the temple." I have liked also to think of that verse as representing those in the world who have not been treated squarely—the underprivileged, the lame, the halt, the deaf, and the blind.

I am reminded, also, of the fourth chapter of Micah, in which, summed up, is the story of people somewhat underprivileged for centuries, who are feasted, and also in the fourth chapter there is reference to all nations "flowing to the mountains of the Lord, and to the halt and the maimed." So I would covet for your organization not merely the means to see that something is done in Congress, but also stimulation for others who cannot now imagine how much is possible of accomplishment, with everyone working together.

The ingenuity of man in the United States has made it possible to produce more and more, and in those years of war, when we are turning out more and more, it is not done by those who are able-bodied alone, but they are assisted by those who, although handicapped, are skilled in one way or another.

The American people, for 150 years, have lived with abundance, with the more fortunate borrowing from your strength of will and your power for that which must be done. Developing our resources is a real challenge.

Today, more than 10,000,000 men trained in the United States armed forces will leave that service having skills they never before had. Abundance is theirs. We must continue to develop our resources, to train the handicapped who are employable, and permit them to become self-supporting. If we do this, we can carry our present load as easily as we did in 1929.

This can be done, but it must be done with the same determination, as a nation, and as individuals, as you have worked in overcoming your particular handicaps.

Why Food Subsidies Are Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, inflation is today the most important and pressing of all home-front problems because it is one which affects directly everyone who buys a loaf of bread, every taxpayer, every buyer of a Government bond, every holder of an insurance policy—in fact, every patriotic American.

Don't let anyone obscure the threat of inflation and the difficult problem of how to combat it. I think the best practical method for stabilizing prices so far devised is the use of subsidy payments, a method as old as the Government itself. This question should not be decided by political groups or emotion. It must be decided upon a basis of sound business sense in this war period.

The first act of general legislation passed by the First Congress, which was held something over 150 years ago, was a tariff act, which, in fact, subsidized the small and struggling American manufacturers of that day. Every tariff act ever written into law, and we have always had a tariff law, while it has produced revenue, has really been a protective tariff and has provided one or more subsidies designed to promote the growth of American industry and costing the American people up to $4,000,000,000 a year. The use of subsidies as now proposed as a wartime measure is likewise a protective measure; but, unlike the tariff, it does not protect one group alone. It protects the producer and the consumer—in fact, all the people—and, as a safeguard against inflation, it is a protection to the whole business structure of the country.

The Postal System of our country has always been subsidized, still is, and probably always will be. So then, our American way of life has used subsidies constantly because it has been good business for us to do so. It is believed by many of us in Congress who sternly oppose inflation that the proper use of subsidies for the purpose of stabilizing prices of those products which we must have to win the war and of those true cost-of-living items like the food we all eat, is the only sound, feasible, and businesslike method we know of to use today.

Just what is a Government subsidy? It is a money payment on a fair basis to people who produce what is needed at a higher-than-average cost so that we, all of us, will not have to pay a great deal higher price for all that we buy. It is a payment to keep people producing what we need, who otherwise would have to stop producing because of a constant loss to themselves, which would ruin them and thus really destroy their production ability. And, let me reiterate that it is paid only for products we need and must have to fight and win the war and for all of us to live, and is paid only in such amount as is necessary to get production and keep the cost of living down. Some, or insufficient, production is just as dangerous as inflation. We must have every pound of production we can get and we must have it without inflation.

It is poor business during this period either to keep raising prices all the time, or to pay subsidies to any producer who doesn't show the positive need for Government help. There is where the difference lies between subsidies and general price increases. Public money used for subsidies spreads a smaller extra cost amongst us all. Remember subsidies are paid only to the relatively few who need them to produce what we must have, but price increases affect everybody's pocketbook. We in the Congress and the Government who believe in subsidy payments have no intention of drafting and passing any legislation which will enrich anyone. We have no intention of setting up any subsidy which does not actually save us taxpayers much more money than the subsidy costs.

The Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives, by a vote of 16 to 10 adopted an amendment to a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which would stop all Government agencies and the Commodity Credit Corporation from using any funds to take any loss or pay any subsidies. The only exceptions would be payments or losses on competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats, and oil seeds. The 10 Democratic members of the Banking and Currency Committee, who voted against this amendment, believe that the effect would be immediately inflationary to the extent of greatly increasing the cost of living.

If Congress passes this bill with this amendment in it, then I am convinced that the price of bread will have to go up immediately. The figures are that a $70,000,000 subsidy will save us all $350,000,000 in a year in buying bread. In my arithmetic, this is getting $5 for every $1 spent. I think that is good business. Multiply that one item of bread over and over on all the other food items alone and what we all save is very large, probably running into some billions of dollars a year. But we won't make this saving if Congress lets the amendment stand.

When a very few people paid the taxes toward the support of the Federal Government it could have been properly insisted that a subsidy to keep down consumer prices, paid out of Federal funds, would be causing the few people who paid the Federal taxes to help pay the bills for those receiving the benefit of subsidy payments. Now, however, this cannot be consistently argued, since all people pay taxes to the Federal Government in one form or another. Therefore, if the people of the United States can use $70,000,000 of their money to save themselves $350,000,000 it will certainly be a good trade for them. The cost of living will thus be held down and demands for wage and salary increases successfully answered. Why is it wrong for all taxpayers to permit a part of their tax money to be used by their Government to keep down their food bill, if it will save them $5 for every $1 so paid and will at the same time prevent ruinous inflation?

Congress in the passage of the Second Price Control Act, which became effective October 2, 1942, not only authorized but directed the President of the United States to stabilize wages, salaries, and all things entering into the cost of living as of September 15, 1942, insofar as practicable. At the same time authority was given the President to correct gross inequalities and inequities. The President has been trying to carry out this positive mandate of Congress and accordingly April 8, 1943, issued what is called the "hold the line" order, and all agencies of the executive department have been trying to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, on prices, wages, and salaries. Now, if the Congress passes another law that will compel the President to increase the prices of things that go into the cost of living, the President will no longer be able to hold salaries and wages where they are. There will be a race between wages and salaries on one side and the price of goods on the other. The result will be just like putting a match under a thermometer—prices will go out the top, the sky will be the limit, and we will be faced with unbridled inflation.

The President has repeatedly said that if Congress will suggest another way to hold down the cost of living without subsidies, and at the same time give the farmers a fair and sufficient price to encourage production of needed foods, he would gladly accept any alternative that would get the job done. Instead, Congress has offered no substitute and is offering no alternative, but in this bill would compel the President to immediately put into effect regulations that will cause runaway inflation.

It is contended that people are making more money than they ever made and therefore should pay increased prices for foods and other items. Probably about half the workers in the country are receiving much more than they ever received before, but the other half of the workers are not receiving any more than they received before the war; and besides there are 14,500,000 people who are dependent on old-age assistance, veterans' benefits, compensation and allowances, and other fixed incomes that have not increased at all. These people will be the first to feel the increased cost of living.

Those who proclaim that they are opposed to the Government paying any part of anyone's grocery bill are perfectly willing to pay certain subsidies. For instance, certain Congressmen oppose taking off the subsidy on fuel oil to the New England States, which amounts to several hundred million dollars a year, thereby placing themselves in the position of saying it is all right for the Government to pay part of anyone's fuel bill, but wrong for the Government to pay any part of the grocery bill. Furthermore, our same illogical friends are in favor of subsidized housing which results in all the taxpayers paying a part of the rent bill for each family who resides in one of these houses. So the net result is they are not against all subsidies. They are just against some subsidies.

If subsidy payments are good for the farmers producing peanuts, cottonseed, soybeans, and other such fats and oils as provided in the amendment supported by our Republican friends, why aren't they just as good for our farmers who grow other things?

The dairy farmer has found himself in a squeeze. The prices of his feed have been going up but the price of his milk has remained stationary because of the effort being made to stabilize the cost of living. The War Food Administration has recently inaugurated subsidies that will give the equivalent of about 1 cent a quart in the form of a subsidy to the producer. It was contended that this should be made in the form of an increased price of 1 cent instead. If it had been, maybe the producer would have received it and maybe he would not, as it would have necessarily gone back through several hands before reaching the producer. The farmer is entitled to and must receive a good price, but I am sure he will not object if a part of that price is paid in a subsidy if it will give him just as much money and at the same time protect him against ruinous inflation.

Let me give you an example of how a subsidy is working for the taxpayers' benefit. Copper is a critical war material. Some mines have a high cost in producing copper—maybe 10 percent of them. But we need all the copper we can lay our hands on. Would it have been good sense to have increased the price of all copper high enough so that high-cost mines could come out even? Certainly not. The Government subsidized by paying a few mines a higher price for their copper. Thus, no mine made either a loss or a "war baby" profit, the Government got the copper and the taxpayers have had to pay about $80,000,000 by way of subsidy and have saved about $1,000,000,000 by way of over-all price, or about twelve and one-half dollars to every $1 paid in subsidy. That's good business.

This is a very serious situation and one which you of the radio audience can rightfully "view with alarm" because it affects you directly. You have every right—yes; you have a positive responsibility—to let your Congressman and Senators know that you are opposed to inflationary measures of this kind.

Opposed to Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been considerable agitation for a 10-percent Federal sales tax. I sincerely hope that no such measure is recommended by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Just a few days ago rather modest sums were provided for the dependents of military personnel. There was considerable question raised as to whether or not the sums provided were in line with the high cost of living. Now, is it to be proposed that we reduce these modest allowances by and through a 10-percent sales tax law? If so, I cannot go along with such a proposal. In further support of my opposition to a Federal sales tax, I cite the following statistics that have been presented to the House of Representatives by the Honorable A. J. SABATH, viz: There are 2,000,000 aged persons on State and public assistance rolls; 1,000,000 disabled veterans and their dependents; 158,000 retired firemen, policemen, and disabled State and municipal employees; 53,000 blind persons; 700,000 retired workers, widows, and young children receiving social insurance payments under the Social Security Act; and 400,000 persons who are drawing fixed annuities for which they have saved for many years. All these, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the dependents of 9,000,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men and auxiliary members of our armed forces, I made reference to at the outset.

Food Production Today Should Be Considered in Its Relation to Set-Asides, Allocations, and Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many people in high places whose opinions have considerable influence on the war food program appear to be under the delusion that the food production totals of the United States in the peacetime years are the basis of wartime needs. While the per capita consumption of food is some 3,200 or 3,300 calories per day, and whereas the per capita consumption of 2,800 calories is deemed sufficient by the experts, a few people in our country seem distressed to think that our people have more than the 1,500 calories obtainable by some of the other peoples of the world even when the

extra food cannot be transported to the areas with the low per capita food consumption.

We have the land and with average weather conditions we should be able to produce sufficient food if provided the manpower, feed, fertilizer, and machinery to produce it.

Our armed forces, whether in foreign lands or in the camps in the United States, should be provided an abundance of the best food products of the land. Efficient distribution will guarantee the needed quantity and quality of sufficient wholesome food for these armed forces, and for our domestic population. We must realize that a large percentage of our people is working long and strenuous hours to furnish the sinews of war. Abundant food production will make the controlling of food prices a simple problem. It is the safest and fairest method to follow. Up to this time we hear too much talk about price, and not enough constructive action as to production.

While some self-anointing individuals would like to take the credit for the production of 1942 and 1943 we should realize that the large food production has been largely the result of weather conditions which were much above the average in the large food-producing States. These large food-producing States like Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Kansas, Wisconsin, Ohio, Missouri, and Nebraska, have had exceptional weather conditions. The man-made factors have contributed, but the important reason we have our present food supply is the favorable weather that prevailed. What would our present food situation be if these States had experienced the floods and the droughts that Oklahoma has had in 1943, for example?

The man-made factors as to food production should be given our consideration at the earliest opportunity. The manpower in producing food is becoming more serious each day. Machinery and machinery parts appear to be less of a problem than in 1943. Fertilizer is more abundant and this increased fertilizer supply should contribute to still greater production. No more fertilizer than is necessary should be diverted from the war food program.

The following table shows the estimated butter production and set-aside allotments for this year. You will note that the civilians will have some 1,500,000,000 pounds if it is produced. The set-aside must be a rather constant commitment:

Creamery butter: Production, set-aside quantities, and supplies for civilians, February 1943 to January 1944

[Millions of pounds]

Month	Estimated production	Estimated set-aside quantities	Estimated quantities available for civilians
February	122	35	87
March	140	40	100
April	150	43	107
May	190	90	100
June	202	96	106
July	181	86	95
August	152	43	109
September	126	23	103
October-January	477		477
Total	1,740	456	1,284

Other food products, especially livestock products like powdered skim milk, cheese, pork, and beef products, and poultry products must be considered in the light of what is left over after necessary commitments.

We must all realize more fully every day, the waste, inefficiency, and confusion in food production, that is due to a lack of concentration of authority in one agency and one man in our war-food program here in Washington. This concentration of authority here in Washington and a needed coordination of agencies at county and State levels are two constructive steps that should be taken.

Catholic Preamble and Statement on a Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following preamble statement:

CATHOLIC PREAMBLE

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the following postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

STATEMENT ON A JUST PEACE

1. The moral law must govern world order: The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

2. The rights of the individual must be assured: The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

3. The rights of oppressed, weak, or colonial peoples must be protected: The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

4. The rights of minorities must be secured: National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

5. International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

6. International economic cooperation must be developed. International economic collaboration to assist all States to provide an adequate standard of living for the citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and States.

7. A just social order within each State must be achieved: Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual States, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

Important representatives of the three religions of the United States have issued an identical seven-point plan for peace, accompanied by a separate preamble for each of the groups.

The text of the other preambles are as follows:

PROTESTANT PREAMBLE

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of goodwill. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the following proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.

JEWISH

The American Synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the following principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the kingdom of God." The Synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

The representative character of the signers is clear but as their names have already been written in the RECORD I shall not do so again.

The content of this statement is admirable. Let me call your attention to points five and six of the statement. Point five declares as a part of the basic and fundamental moral law that international institutions should be organized to develop international law, guarantee the faithful fulfilment of international obligations and revise them when necessary, and assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, by compulsory arbitration

and adjudication of controversies and by the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

This is the fullest brief statement of the matter that I have seen and it is of immeasurable importance to the country and the world for so many religious leaders at this critical moment in our national life and in world history to make this forthright declaration in favor of international organization. They are alive to the moral responsibilities of our citizens and our Government in this generation of crisis.

Point six is no less emphatic upon international economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for all their citizens. Such economic collaboration for such a purpose is of probably equal importance with direct cooperation to keep the peace.

The other points declare the sovereignty of God over the nations separately and jointly, the fundamental rights of men and peoples and the imperative need of internal order and prosperity in each of the states of the world.

This, I believe, is the fullest and farthest reaching brief statement on world peace that has yet been issued. It merits close and favorable consideration by all of the citizens of the country.

Voted for Clason and Sadowski Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 18, I had the pleasure of voting for two constructive amendments to the House committee measure providing for increased dependency allotments to military personnel. The first of these amendments, known as the Clason amendment, raised the amounts agreed to by the committee to those amounts agreed to in the Senate, and was adopted by a vote of the House. The second of these amendments, known as the Sadowski amendment, raised the amounts provided for in the Clason amendment to an extent more closely approximating the cost of living these dependents will be confronted with. I sincerely regret that the House did not see fit to adopt this amendment. I am happy to be able to say that I voted for the Sadowski amendment. It may be that the sums provided for in the Clason amendment will be adequate to furnish the women and children of our servicemen with the necessaries of life in a manner we can all be proud of, but only time and experience can tell us this now. However, until experience can unfold for us the effect of our provision for these dependents, some educational program should be conducted with respect to the benefits, these folks are entitled to under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1942. I therefore ask permission to include in my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for Monday, October 18, summarizing the benefits of the latter act for the edification of the fathers of America:

CIVIL RELIEF ACT GUARDS RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF PREWAR FATHERS BEING INDUCTED INTO SERVICE

So you're going to be drafted, dad.

How about the family financial obligations while you are away? Those payments on the house and the automobile? And your insurance premiums?

Think you can keep all that up on a buck private's $50 a month, plus the comparatively small amount Uncle Sam will kick in to keep your family going while you're fighting?

With the drafting of prewar fathers an actuality, Members of Congress are being asked by worried fathers with low draft numbers to furnish the answers to those questions.

The answers, or most of them are down in black and white on the law books. Generally speaking, they should save some gray hairs for anxious dads.

CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1942

More than a year ago, when it began to seem inevitable that men with families would be called to the colors, Congress went to work to ease the financial blow.

Recognizing that the average draft-age father has had his nose to the grindstone so long buying shoes and clothes for his kids that he hasn't been able to save up enough to survive a long period of reduced income, Congress last year enacted the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1942.

Representative JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama—he is a father—intended it to be the answer to a drafted father's prayer when he headed a military subcommittee that wrote it.

It amends a similar 1940 law, and was planned to give relief to servicemen of this war along the same lines as provided during the World War. It should not be confused with the Allowance and Allotment Act under which the Government adds to payments a serviceman makes to his dependents.

FOR LIVING EXPENSES

Where the Allowance and Allotment Act furnishes the money, the Civil Relief Act is intended to see that the money is retained by the dependents for living expenses.

The law applies to all members of the armed services, regardless of rank, and, in general, to their dependents.

It doesn't cancel any obligations or debts but is a type of moratorium providing for suspension, in proper cases, of the enforcement of a serviceman's civil obligations. It maintains the status quo until the soldier comes back from the wars and has a chance to get on his feet financially.

Here are some of its high spots:

Your family—assuming you are a serviceman—cannot be evicted for nonpayment of rent, if the rental does not exceed $80 monthly, without permission of a court. The court may suspend execution of an eviction order for 3 months, even though no more rent is paid, or may make "such other order as may be just."

Just what "such other order" may be is a matter on which the courts haven't agreed. One court has held that a stay of execution for longer than 3 months is allowed.

MORTGAGE PROTECTION

Similar protection is given against foreclosure for nonpayment of mortgage installments on a home. In a mortgage case the court may order a sale or it may grant a stay of foreclosure. The property owner, or mortgage holder, is protected by being allowed to apply for relief from payments for taxes, insurance, and so on, if he depended on the serviceman's payments to meet these obligations.

As in the case of other obligations, the court must take cognizance of the serviceman's ability to pay.

No foreclosures on automobiles, furniture, or other personal property being bought on the installment plan may be made without a court order, and when such an order is granted, the forecloser must make an equitable settlement with the buyer, based on an appraisal made by three disinterested parties.

Payments on notes, loans, etc., to banks and loan companies may be suspended for the duration and 3 months beyond the date of discharge of the payer if the debtor is a serviceman—and makes application for relief.

Interest accrues at not to exceed 6 percent a year. Relief also may be obtained by a comaker or endorser.

INSURANCE PAYMENTS

The Government guarantees payment of premiums on a serviceman's private insurance up to an insured value of $10,000, the policy to be restored to good standing within 2 years after discharge. This protection does not interfere with the man's right to buy up to $10,000 of Government insurance.

At any time within 6 months after his discharge, a debtor may apply to a court for additional relief in the form of extension of the time for repaying accrued obligations.

The act gives the courts wide discretion in handling cases of servicemen.

Either because of ignorance of their rights or because of ability of debtors to reach agreements with their creditors without resort to it, the act has not been resorted to as extensively as one might expect in view of the millions of persons eligible.

Creditors who helped Congress write the law report that most debtors are known to be good risks when a loan is made, and try to work out an agreement with the debtor before invoking the law.

"Accounts that were good before military service will be good after induction, but some adjustment may be necessary to meet reduced income," a spokesman for one large organization told Representative SPARKMAN recently.

"Character does not change when a man lays aside his civilian clothes and puts on a uniform."

Veterans of Foreign Wars Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the forty-fourth annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was held recently at the Commodore Hotel in the city of New York. This encampment adopted some highly important resolutions, many of which are of general interest to the Nation. I have picked out three of them, the first dealing with the prosecution of the war, the second with the post-war 10-point veteran welfare program, and the last with post-war national security. As the last named originated in my own State of Louisiana, I am, of course, personally interested in its contents; but since all were adopted

by the encampment unanimously, I am setting them forth in full:

CONDUCT OF THE WAR AND POST-WAR POLICY

Whereas members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have met, and are meeting, armed enemies in the far corners of the earth under the American flag to defend and preserve the sovereignty of the United States of America and the American way of life; and

Whereas by such service in the armed forces of the United States, members of the V. F. W. have rendered more than lip service to the cause of freedom and democracy and thereby earned the right to voice their wishes and ideals with reference to peace terms, world cooperation, and post-war rehabilitation and relief; and

Whereas because of the confusion and divided opinion existing among leaders in American life and among the people themselves with reference to the policy of the United States in these matters, it is desirable that this great organization of veterans state its position publicly: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Forty-fourth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we advocate the following policies:

CONDUCT OF THE WAR

We demand a relentless and unremitting conduct of the war against our enemies until complete victory is achieved. To that end every citizen of this country, whether in or out of the armed services, should give everything necessary to bring about this result.

PEACE TERMS

We favor nothing short of unconditional surrender. We demand nothing less than a complete disarming of our enemies when victory has come. We favor a sufficient delay in the final settlement of peace terms to enable those who will dictate them to be sure of the soundness of the plans they present.

We believe that those who have fought in war should have a voice in the terms of peace. Therefore we advocate that on a commission representing the United States at the peace table there be included not less than one commissioned officer and one enlisted man from each of the War and Navy Departments who has seen combat service, and some representation from veterans' organizations recognized by Congress, including one national officer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

WORLD COOPERATION TO MAINTAIN PEACE

We believe that the United States should freely participate in the creation of an association of sovereign powers, the purpose of which will be to maintain a lasting peace and which will be implemented with authority to utilize force, if necessary, to accomplish this result. In the creation of this organization due regard should be had to our constitutional processes and our national interest.

WORLD COOPERATION ON REHABILITATION AND RELIEF

We believe that this great Nation, where the need arises, should help other nations to help themselves. We favor the sharing of any of our surpluses of food, clothing, and machinery among nations actually in need and the lending of technical experts, engineers, industrialists, and agriculturalists to assist backward nations and those who have suffered disruption and destruction from invasion and occupation. We oppose, however, impractical and purely visionary charity by which we shall undertake without limit to support and maintain other countries. We recognize that our primary duty is to the people of this great Nation and the maintenance of the standards of living which have been developed by the American people through its industry, ingenuity, and thrift, which have been accomplished by our devotion to the ideals of peace, rather than to preparation for war.

(Submitted by war service commission to committee on resolutions. Adopted by the national encampment.)

TEN-POINT POST-WAR VETERAN WELFARE PROGRAM

1. Continuation of pay, within certain limits, for a period of 6 months after honorable discharge at the close of the present war for all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States.

2. Educational aid by Federal Government to honorably discharged veterans of the present war whose educations were interrupted or prevented by military or naval service.

3. Adequate Veterans' Administration hospital facilities for medical treatment and hospitalization of honorably discharged veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition, who have had at least 90 days' service.

4. Pension and compensation payments to be established and maintained on a fair and reasonable cost-of-living index.

5. Effective, workable veteran preference in employment on Federal, State, county, and municipal jobs.

6. All supply and construction contracts between the Federal Government and private firms or contractors to contain clause that 3 employees of every 10 or major portion thereof of said private firms or contractors, shall be honorably discharged veterans.

7. Pension entitlement to widows and orphans of honorably discharged deceased veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition, where said veteran had at least 90 days' service, regardless of service-connected disabilities.

8. Pension entitlement to honorably discharged veterans of any war, campaign, or expedition, who had at least 90 days' service and who are: (1) unemployable; (2) unable to secure gainful and sustaining employment; and (3) disabled to a degree of 10 percent or more regardless of service connection of said disability.

9. Special recognition for honorably discharged veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition who served on foreign soil or had sea duty in hostile waters, by a special allowance of 20 percent above standard rates for compensation, pension, and retirement pay, and a five-point addition above standard additions in veteran preference on classified civil service examination grades.

10. Continuation and expansion of the Veterans' Administration as an independent Federal agency with full jurisdiction over vocational rehabilitation for service-connected disabled veterans; medical treatment, hospitalization, pensions, and compensation for all eligible veterans; and continuation and expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service to render special assistance to all honorably discharged veterans in need of or seeking employment.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has for many years been vitally interested in a permanent program of national defense and is concerned that this Nation may lapse into a condition of unpreparedness as followed the First World War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Forty-fourth National Encampment of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we go on record and memorialize Congress in the post-war program to provide for the safety of our Nation as follows:

1. That this Nation must have a permanent Navy, second to none in size in the entire world, and sufficient to completely protect the United States from all invasion as well as to guard our sea lanes adequately;

2. A permanent standing Army of sufficient size and strength to completely protect our coast lines and guarantee this country that there shall be no repetition of a Pearl Harbor disaster;

3. That some form of national defense program involving universal service and training for a stated period of time of all youths within a certain age bracket be approved by our Congress as a basis of a permanent well-balanced national defense program;

4. That in order to properly protect our coast line and our cities from bombing attacks, as well as defend our outlying possessions, our Air Force shall be permanently maintained without any equal in strength of planes and trained personnel, to that of any other nation or possible combination of hostile nations in the world; and

5. That following this war the United States shall enter into no agreement to destroy or scuttle its Navy as was the case after the First World War, unless similar action is taken by every other power in the world simultaneously.

(Submitted by department of Louisiana to committee on war service and veteran employment. Adopted by the national encampment.)

Crop Summary as of September 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of food in connection with the war—on the war front as well as the domestic front—is making us more food conscious every day.

We must realize that up until 1942 the United States was on a food-importing basis. In fact during the past few years we have some years imported twice as much food as we exported. The American farmer has now been called upon to perform a task that has been executed in a manner that has been as striking in its performance as has the splendid contributions of industry and labor. The American farmer has been asked—and up to this time he has responded splendidly—to feed the people of the United States for the first time in many years; he has been asked to furnish the food for our armed forces wherever they were located; he has been asked to furnish food for our allies through lease-lend; and he has been asked to furnish additional food for distribution in occupied countries.

Right here I want to point out as forcefully as I can, that we cannot be wholly guided by the production figures of the

past years, because the food requirements and obligations of today present a much changed picture. With the requirements and obligations assumed, we may show a marked increased production of a crop or a product, and still not have a sufficient amount of the crop or product to meet the wartime demand. For example, lease-lend may not take but 6 percent of our total acre production, but might take 25 percent of some particular food product. In other words, the 10-year average production should not be the guidepost for the present demands.

The following official table shows the production of 1942, estimated production of 1943 and the 10-year averages of the leading crops of our country:

Crop	Acreage (000 omitted)			Production (000 omitted)			1943 production as a percent of—		Unit	Yield per acre		
	1943 (preliminary)	1942	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−) of 1943 acreage compared with 1942	Sept. 1, 1943, forecast	1942	10-year average, 1932–41	1942	10-year average		Indicated, 1943	1942	10-year average, 1932–41
Corn	94,297	89,484	+5.4	2,985,267	3,175,154	2,349,267	94.0	127.1	Bushels	31.7	35.5	24.9
Potatoes	3,363.1	2,711.1	+24.0	460,512	371,150	363,332	124.1	126.7	Bushels	136.9	136.9	116.9
Tobacco	1,471.2	1,378.9	+6.7	1,371,604	1,412,437	1,349,896	97.1	101.6	Pounds	932	1,024	878
Oats	37,944	37,899	+.1	1,145,060	1,358,730	1,018,783	84.3	112.4	Bushels	30.2	35.9	28.1
Barley	15,106	16,782	−10.0	333,282	426,150	243,373	78.2	136.9	Bushels	22.1	25.4	21.4
Rye	2,875	3,837	−25.1	33,314	57,341	38,589	58.1	86.3	Bushels	11.6	14.9	11.4
Winter wheat	33,859	35,666	−5.1	533,857	703,253	550,181	75.9	97.0	Bushels	15.8	19.7	14.3
Durum wheat	2,035	2,109	−3.5	36,387	44,660	26,992	81.5	134.8	Bushels	17.9	21.2	10.1
Spring wheat other than durum	13,989	11,689	+19.7	264,713	233,414	161,240	113.4	164.2	Bushels	18.9	20.0	11.7
Flax	5,843	4,402	+32.7	54,720	40,660	14,226	134.6	384.6	Bushels	9.4	9.2	7.3
Buckwheat	493	378	+30.4	8,472	6,687	7,029	120.7	120.5	Bushels	17.2	17.7	16.6
Tame hay	60,489	60,211	+.5	85,112	92,245	73,277	92.3	116.2	Tons	1.41	1.53	1.29
Wild hay	12,432	12,533	−.8	11,357	13,083	9,675	86.8	117.4	Tons	.91	1.04	.79
Pasture										[1]73	88	[1]64

[1] Condition Sept. 1.

For example, we have produced over 4 bushels of potatoes per capita in some previous years, and 3.4 bushels per capita in 1943. We could still see a shortage of this great food.

I think as we analyze these figures we should keep in mind the facts involved as related before, and also realize that a nation engaged in war with a high percentage of the population working, has a higher food requirement than under normal times.

We note that in 1943 we had 5 percent more acres of corn than in 1942, with 6 percent less corn than in 1942. Potatoes showed a 24-percent increase in acres and the same increase in production. Oats, in 1943, showed 0.1 percent increase in acreage and a 15-percent decrease in yield. Barley showed a 10-percent reduction in acreage and 21-percent reduction in production; rye showed a 25-percent reduction in acreage and 41-percent decrease in production. Flax showed a 30-percent increase in acreage and a 34-percent increase in production. Winter wheat showed a 5-percent decrease in acreage and a 24-percent decrease in production, while spring wheat showed a 19-percent increase in acreage and a 13-percent increase in production. We must balance and consider the production with the demands. These figures show that acres planted do not determine the amount of food produced.

What are the prospects for 1944? We can be confident that the American farmer will continue to do his part in his patriotic desire to furnish the food to win this war. We must realize that though only about 25 percent of the population, the rural people raise nearly half the children of the Nation, and no one could deny the statement that the rural sections are proportionally represented in the combat zones of this war. The casualty lists are definite proof of this statement.

The manpower problem in 1944 may or may not be more embarrassing and no one can answer that question with certainty at this time. The machinery problem should be improved over 1942. The fertilizer supply, from present indications, will be more adequate. Occupied and Allied countries may require and obtain additional fertilizers, which might change the amounts that are available for domestic use.

The weather is the most important factor in connection with food production. The man-made factors can, however, receive our timely attention so that the 500,000,000 acres of available cropland of the United States can be best used for the war food program.

The food-crop production is not as serious as is maintaining the production of livestock and livestock products. Here we have an additional manpower problem. We must have manpower, not only to produce the crop but the manpower problem of transferring the crops and converting these crops into livestock and livestock products. We should all cooperate to adjust the food crop and the livestock and livestock products programs so that we have the best war food program in operation in 1944 we can possibly obtain.

A very constructive step to take would be to concentrate the authority in one man and one agency that would control food from the time the seed is planted and until this food reaches the consumer's table. Confusion here in Washington could be eliminated and much more efficiency would result from such a procedure. If this could be followed by a coordination of agencies at county and State levels, better results could be expected and beyond doubt attained.

Steagall-Bankhead Commodity Credit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD A. O'NEAL

The farmer needs support or floor prices at adequate levels to get production. That need is met in the new Steagall-Bankhead (commodity-credit) bills which we are strongly supporting.

The farmer is bitterly opposed to subsidies because the Government hand-out system is neither economic nor conducive to production. He wants to get fair prices in the open market the same as other folks. And he is just as opposed to using War bond money to pay subsidies to the consumer at a time when consumer income is breaking all records. Just to show the senselessness of subsidies—if the Government paid the entire farm cost of the consumer's grocery bill through subsidies, it would mean for the average consumer only a reduction of 17 percent in the cost of living.

June 1943

Average annual income per person	$1,041
Total spent for consumers' goods and services	$678
Amount spent for food (retail prices)	$200
Amount received by farmer	$114
Percentage of consumer expenditures represented by farmer receipts	17

Agriculture is the only industry I know of that is producing more with less. In the past 3 years this industry has lost more than

40 percent of its skilled manpower to high-wage industry and to the armed services. The partial replacement of this loss with women, children, older men, and townspeople of less skill and capacity does not solve this problem. Remember that agriculture is a skilled industry. So the farmer is doing the only thing he knows how—he and his family and his hired help are working longer hours than ever. As a result, with fewer and less skilled and experienced workers, he is planting more land and producing more food, and next year he is asked to step up his output still more.

Obviously, this situation calls for more machinery to offset the manpower which is unobtainable. Yet, our reports from 17 States indicate that in recent months only 32 percent of farmer requests in these States for harvesting machinery—corn pickers, binders, etc.—have been granted. Verbal and paper machinery will not do. The equipment is needed in the fields before it is too late.

Public debt of the United States

1939	$41,000,000,000
1943	143,000,000,000
Increase	102,000,000,000

Farmers as a percentage and income of farmers as a percentage of total population and income

United States population	132,000,000
Farm population	30,000,000
Percentage of farm to total population	23
United States national income (1942)	$118,600,000,000
Farmers' net income (1942)	11,200,000,000
Percentage of farm to total income	9.4

Thus, while comprising 23 percent of the total population, persons living on farms received only 9 percent of the national income in 1942.

[All figures in billion dollars]

	1917–20 average	1939	1942	1943 (estimate)	Increase, 1943 over 1939
National income	62.7	71.5	118.6	145.6	74.1
Net income to farmers	9.0	5.2	11.2	12.4	7.2
Income to non farmers	53.6	65.1	105.5	131.4	66.3
Salaries and wages		45.7	79.9	100.0	55.3

Salaries and wages before and after "stabilization"

Third quarter 1942 just before "stabilization"	$20,800,000,000
Second quarter 1943 after "stabilization"	$25,100,000,000
Percentage increase in salaries and wages since "stabilization"	20.7
Annual increase in salaries and wages since "stabilization"	$17,200,000,000

Weekly wages, hourly earnings, and cost of living before and after stabilization

	September 1942, before stabilization	August 1943, after stabilization	Increase
Weekly wages of industrial workers	$37.80	$43.43	*Percent* 15
Hourly earnings of factory workers..cents..	89.2	96.5	8
Cost of living index	117.8	123.2	4.6
Retail food cost index	126.6	137.2	8

Murray-Patman Act Saves Automobile Dealers—Ban Surplus-Goods Speculators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter dated October 13 from Mr H. J. Shorter, president of Harry Shorter Automobile Dealers, Inc., as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, advising of the substantial help the Murray-Patman Act has been to that industry.

In my opinion—

To quote from that letter—

the Murray-Patman Act of 1942 saved the automobile dealers from almost certain extinction. Operating under its terms we have been able to maintain our operations at high level, and to continue essential service to our large number of automobile and truck owners.

No doubt this is also true—

Mr. Shorter continues—

of the entire automobile-dealer body, as it is estimated that between 90 and 95 percent are still in business and maintaining essential establishments, which are daily growing in importance.

New cars and trucks are now pretty well liquidated, and we are now in a position to aid in the disposition of surplus Government consumer items; also, the number of dealers who can continue their service operations without some assistance from the sales department and still maintain an even keel are in the minority.

By using dealers for this purpose, two things can be accomplished:

1 Dealers in large numbers will be able to continue their essential service establishments.

2 The Government will obtain an orderly outlet for the disposition of consumer surpluses.

Originally there were some 44,000 dealer establishments throughout the country. Even if that number were reduced to 30,000, it would still leave available for the orderly disposal of surpluses a large number of well-organized and well-financed outlets with ample storage facilities.

Your bill to establish a custodian of surplus property indicates interest in the matter. Perhaps we can fit into the picture.

RECOVERING THEIR EQUILIBRIUM

Automobile and tire dealers, Mr. Speaker, suffered materially when their market was shut off following Pearl Harbor when the sales of new automobiles, trucks, and tires were frozen and no new cars or tires could be manufactured for civilian use. Under the Murray-Patman Act, sponsored by the House Committee on Small Business, a safety cloak was placed over their businesses.

They have been able to finance their operations through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and thus maintain a supply of new cars and trucks. They were permitted by the Office of Price Administration to make an additional charge for warehousing through which they have been in a position to make a legitimate charge to cover such service. By this means they were able to maintain a stock of new cars and trucks on display to fill orders from those who could qualify.

Thus these dealers have been given an opportunity to have an inventory of their merchandise including parts to carry on their work in keeping cars and trucks rolling. This service has been highly important in transporting goods and providing transportation for war and other workers during the strain on public transportation facilities. In spite of the blow to their business through having production of their chief sustaining merchandise cut off for almost 2 years, sales figures for this year, including August, show they are just about breaking even. For months, however, they suffered heavy declines in their sales volume. Tire dealers experienced the same difficulties but they have been materially helped by the Murray-Patman Act in rejuvenating their business following the first shock and the enactment of this act.

Automobile dealers have been able to get better recovery prices on used cars. Cut-throat competition has been practically eliminated notwithstanding the depressed condition in which they found themselves with their new market shut off. They have been helped, too, because of the service necessary in keeping used cars and trucks on the road.

SURPLUS PROPERTY NEW FIELD

A new field should open to them following the close of this war when the armed forces will no longer have need for certain equipment such as passenger automobiles, trucks, and even jeeps. Being specialists in this field they will be able to fill the niche until manufacturers can reconvert their operations to peacetime pursuits again.

Many of these Government-owned automobiles, trucks, and jeeps can be used to supply industry, farmers, and others with trucks and jeeps and even automobiles no longer required for the armed forces. Automobile transportation that needs repairs will find its way to these dealers for servicing. Parts of abandoned cars and trucks can be used to equip or repair others. In this manner the automotive dealers will continue to operate and at the same time supply a want on the part of the public pending the manufacture of new cars, trucks, and parts.

The Government will benefit from this likewise as the surplus Government auto-

mobiles, trucks, and jeeps can be sold to better advantage to established dealers at better prices than to throw such supplies on the market and permit speculators to purchase them at bargain prices. This was done in the first World War and the result was chaos in industry, market prices dropped precipitately, causing many business concerns to go into bankruptcy while many others were financially crippled.

MUST PREVENT SPECULATORS

The speculators reaped millions of dollars in profits while legitimate industry suffered. Surplus products in the last war were dumped on the market by the Government. With business generally depressed, loaded with inventory which was rapidly declining in value, they were in no position to take on any more. This gave the speculators their opportunity. Salable merchandise was bought for a song. They reaped millions of dollars in returns and at the same time injured regularly established businesses.

We should profit by these past experiences, Mr. Speaker, and see to it that the same tragedy to business does not happen again. Aside from this, the Government will own billions of dollars worth of property, much of which will be consumer goods. We should be concerned over this so that the Government will obtain as much money in recovery as is possible. Surely this will be more readily possible through distribution of this surplus by regular trade channels than interlopers whose only motive is to capitalize enormously at the expense of the Government and legitimate business.

This does not apply alone to automobile and tire dealers but every type of retailer and wholesaler, since the Government has supplies of every nature and description in the way of consumer goods, as well as machinery and tool equipment. Whatever such products may be, the Government is vitally interested in receiving the best possible prices for such surpluses. The debt due to the war will be heavy enough without adding to it in the way of losses through depressed prices.

The grocer, baker, and candlestick maker are just as much concerned with a stabilized market as is the Government in obtaining a fair market price for what it may have to sell after this war is concluded. It is highly important to industry as a whole that its interests be safeguarded to the fullest extent to avoid the sad experiences of the last war.

OFFICIALS FAVOR LOCAL BUSINESS

The House Committee on Small Business, Mr. Speaker, has held several hearings on the subject of disposal of Government-owned property whether civilian goods, tools, equipment, or plants. The committee is continuing to explore this serious problem in the interest of small business. Under House Resolution 18 establishing this committee, we are instructed to consider "the need for a sound program for the solution of the post-war problems of small business."

Secretary Jesse H. Jones of the Department of Commerce has testified before our committee that the Government has an investment of $7,029,000,000. This does not include merchandise of a varied character which will be on hand at the end of the war in plants, equipment and materials of various kinds. In answer to a question regarding disposition of Government property, Secretary Jones said:

I think in every situation that the local people should have the first call on the property or on the plant, and where they could show sufficient capacity to operate it and probably furnish some equity money to justify it, that they should have, certainly, first call on it. I do not think we ought to permit the war, in causing all these plants to be built, to further concentrate our economy in the big units. I think the country is better off with smaller units, and I am heartily in favor of that.

When Under Secretary James V. Forrestal of the Navy testified and was asked if he had any suggestions as to how this surplus property should be disposed of when the war is over, he made this answer through Mr. Frank M. Folsome, Assistant Chief of Office of Procurement and Material of the Navy, as follows:

It would be a real tragedy if, after the war, your clothing and other stores, which include hand tools and small equipments of that type, were thrown on the market. I have no recommendation as to exactly how it should be done but under any circumstances it would really be a tragedy to your whole domestic set-up if you immediately threw on the open market your clothing, your textiles, unfinished goods, and your hand tools and all your small stores, because it would just simply upset your whole market and it would hurt everybody, big and little alike. I think that legislative action should implement some set-up so that doesn't take place.

He added furthermore:

After the last war, one item, woolen underwear, was on the market for 20 years, and the last lot was disposed of in the late 1939. That was always disturbing to that particular industry.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out here today, H. R. 3070 is a comprehensive, well-drawn bill, embracing the basic principles of several bills dealing with the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts introduced by various Members of Congress who have for some time keenly felt the injustice of our present immigration laws relating to the Chinese.

Although the bill bears my name, I want it understood that the legislation embodies the thoughts and desires of many Members. It is a matter to which we all have given great consideration for many months.

The purpose of each section of the bill is well analyzed in the majority report of the committee. I am sure that all those in this body who agree with the basic objective will find no fault with the language of the various sections. Of necessity much of the contents is of a technical nature. This is because laws relating to the exclusion of the Chinese from the United States date from the act of May 6, 1882, the basic Chinese Exclusion Act, on up to the act of June 23, 1913, embracing some 15 distinct public laws relating to this complex question. The rule provides for open amendments. I therefore hope, for the sake of clarity of the issues, that Members will not attempt amendments which will go to the technicalities involved in the repealing and clarifying of 15 public laws, because I know the opposition to the bill here does not deal with these technicalities, but rather is an opposition to the basic problem involved.

The majority report well states that the Chinese Exclusion Acts have been a great source of misunderstanding in the relations between our two great nations for over 60 years. I cannot say that they have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people, because the Chinese are a proud, tolerant, patient race. It is not in their make-up to be resentful. However, I can say that these acts have been a great source of humiliation, disappointment, and hurt to the Chinese character.

I think the Chinese people know that the original act of exclusion was not born of ill will toward them. Its motive at that time was exclusively economic. But I do believe that all intelligent Chinese and Americans must agree that profound changes have taken place in those 60 years and that the economic basis has long since been removed. In fact, a close analysis of world relations today and in the future could reveal that the shoe might be on the other foot. For our economic salvation, in any event, I think this House should immediately dispel from their minds any discussion or misunderstanding insofar as both countries are concerned as to the motivation of the original law. This House should approach this question today as a problem of today and of the future, and as an international problem of today and the future alone. It would be almost needless for me to again call attention to the extraordinary qualities and character of the Chinese people. Those of you who know them agree. Those of you who do not know them have had ample occasion to reflect upon this question.

Their resistance of a common enemy by blood, sweat, and tears in the past 7 years is only one more evidence of that character that many of us have known for many years. I need not call attention to the millions of lives they have lost, to the slaughter of their women and children, nor to the literal rape of China by barbaric Japan. That is one of the bloodiest pages of all history. There is not a man or a woman in this House who dares attack the character of China.

But cut of the chaos a new China is arising and only last week the Chungking government celebrated the 32d anniversary of China's alliance to democratic ideals and the overthrow of its ancient monarchial form of government. It is therefore proper and fitting that we discuss the bill at this opportune time.

In the new world to come, after the war, only a few short years stand between the Chinese people and the full use of their vast resources. The United States has always, as pointed out in the majority report, stepped to the aid of China in her struggle against encroachment. We are now fighting side by side with her in that cause.

It is my belief that much of the doubt that has been raised regarding this bill is more due to a lack of complete understanding of what we are trying to do than from any basic feeling against these people. For instance, I read with great interest the minority views of the committee, submitted by the gentleman from Michigan. They first say that no basic immigration policy should be changed in time of war and that this bill would change a policy that 30 Congresses did not see fit to alter. That status quo attitude has been the plague of all progress. The minority decision does not discuss the question of whether or not a portion of that immigration policy for 60 years has been inequitable and unfair. In my opinion, all the legislation does is continue the basic policy, make it stronger, righting a historic wrong of 60 years' standing dealing only with a very small segment of our immigration policy, but trying that segment with the basic principle underlying our act.

I note, further, in their objections that they say, "It would be desirable to await the return of our soldiers from all battle fronts before embarking on a radical change in our immigration laws."

Is it unreasonable for Congress to assume that those returning military who have fought side by side as brothers in arms with the Chinese, who have learned to respect and admire them, would return with any other idea than a repeal of any discriminatory action against their race? I can tell this Congress that those servicemen, rather than wanting us to await their return, would probably rise up in wrath upon that return because the Congress had not definitely met this inequality.

There is also some reference to the fact that one of our greatest post-war problems will be our general immigration policy. With that I entirely agree. However, it has nothing to do with this bill. I hope by this legislation to have the Chinese included like all other nations in that post-war discussion. This is the least we can do for them. Should this bill not pass, the Chinese would be practically excluded from any fair discussion of our post-war immigration problem. In other words, they would still be out in the cold regardless of what we thought would be to the best national interest regarding all nations. They would have less standing than the Germans, Rumanians, Bulgars, and many other nationals who have not lifted a finger to help the Allies in their gigantic struggle. In fact, they are our enemies. I can tell you now that the Chinese will have no cause, should this Congress, when the war is over, or even now, decide to remodel, limit or expand our immigration system. All they want is to be considered with other nations in that process and the stigma of exclusion removed.

The other objection raised is that all Asiatics are now excluded and that the repeal of the act in respect to China would place that country in a favored position against other Asiatics, including the Hindus and Indians, and I suppose the minority did not mean it, but I suppose they would also have to include the Japanese. They pose the question, "If we admit the Chinese, on what valid ground can we refuse to accord similar treatment to others?"

In the first place, no specific exclusion acts exist against the other Asiatics. We merely do not give them quotas by law. We have singled out the Chinese as undesirable by name.

This Nation is engaged in its greatest struggle for existence in its history. So desperate has it become that it was doubtful, in my mind, whether in the beginning of the struggle any one ally could have survived alone without the assistance of another ally. Churchill once said in those dark days, "He who is not with us is against us." If we owe any consideration to any Asiatic race, our first consideration is to the Chinese. As a matter of fact, when the history of this war is written we probably will owe more to the Chinese than to any other nation in the world. I shudder to think of the blood that would be spilled, the lives that would be lost, of the long and tedious struggle that would have occurred should the Chinese have fallen for the cunning Japanese "Asia for the Asiatics" policy. We would then be fighting the Japanese with either Chinese assistance or Chinese apathy for many years.

I further note that the minority pose another question, "How can we then deny that we are not discriminating against every other friendly Asiatic people?" The trouble here in Washington is that too many people who know nothing about it have some rough idea that all Asiatics are anti-Japanese, when the cold, hard fact is that many of them are pro-Japanese, apathetic to Japanese barbarism and in some cases out and out anti-British and anti-American. I do not indict the peoples of these nations, but I am speaking of the governments. I cannot see where anyone would have any cause to say we are discriminating against other Asiatics when some of those Asiatics are even now playing into the hands of Japanese. If we consider the question on this basis we might just as well say that we can be accused of discriminating against the Japanese people because they are Asiatics. Consider that all of the Asiatics in the Far East are under Jap domination except India and she is not an independent country. All the other area could not be dealt with at this time in any event.

We have talked a great deal in platitudes and generalties, both in Congress and out, regarding our feelings toward our allies and how the Allies are going to rebuild this world. This is the first time since the war began that we have an opportunity to do something concrete about it, and toward the most valiant ally of all. This bill is, in fact, a challenge to put into practice what we preach. And I entirely agree with the minority that before we begin to evaluate the debit and credit side of these other Asiatics who have not been proven to us, one way or the other, to wait until after the war to determine their immigration policy. We have a war on now and China needs every encouragement.

I note with great amusement that another point raised by the minority report is to the effect that "this bill simply extends the Chinese a few crumbs." I wonder if those in opposition do not really sincerely believe that it is just about time we gave them at least a few crumbs. Maybe a full understanding of this entire problem will convince these that we probably should have gone even further in this bill. So many are always measuring values in material things. This is no "crumb" to the faith and spirit of China. This costs nothing in dollars, but as a matter of principle it means untold billions to the Chinese spirit and faith in their allies.

But, seriously, the bill is more than a crumb. It goes deep into the very heart of the Allied war effort against Japan and into the very guts of our post-war policy.

I note that the minority report says that they believe Congress is on dangerous grounds when it assumes the task of legislating enemy propaganda out of existence. Let me remind them that enemy propaganda today in the Orient is a potent force of enemy strength. Let me further remind them that the basis of this enemy propaganda originated here in this House, back in the eighties. They talk about dangerous ground for Congress, let me remind them that the most dangerous ground for Congress is to fail in its duty to do everything possible to knock the wind out of the enemy sails, regardless of whether it be propaganda of mind or of materials. And in respect to this particular legislation, the propaganda of the enemy is not built upon a straw man, but based upon a solid fact of short-sightedness by this Congress over 60 years ago in an actual law on our statute books.

The opposition says that this legislation is of no material benefit to China. I should like to take them into the vast reservoir of bewildered Chinese. Four hundred and fifty million of them starving, freezing, torn by war up and down their nation, and show them the danger of a desperate reaction to a cunning Japanese propaganda machine that says, in effect, why are you going through all this when we, the Japanese, of your same color, will help you reestablish and build a new China for the Asiatic race? Why do you fight and die with America who for 60 years have said you are not even fit as individuals on equality with other nations to walk across their doorstep? I have information that that sort of stuff is even being broadcast by Japanese

propaganda machines today on their Children's Hour programs.

The other day on the west coast I listened to a Japanese broadcast beamed to the Philippines, monitored as it came over the air, wherein the Japanese were telling them that there was to be a celebration this very week in the Philippine Islands commemorating their independence and that how much greater and more benevolent they, the Japanese, were than despicable and civilized United States, who had been promising them independence for many years and that they, the Japanese, in all their goodness, had given them their independence immediately. And in the same broadcast, mentioning the fact that they could not understand why the Chinese race and the Chungking government did not look at it the same way, and saying that as a good example of what they meant, even this coming week the Congress of the United States and for many weeks has been wrangling over the fact as to whether or not they, the Chinese, were desirable people.

I would like to take these people who misunderstand the effect of this propaganda throughout the south Pacific and show them bales of pamphlets telling the same story and dropped by airplanes in every section of China. I would like to take them just to spend 1 day in Chungking with Chiang Kai-shek and his ministers, fighting for their lives with one hand and with little or no material or equipment, and have them watch them be diverted at every opportunity in their efforts to keep a fluid China strong and united in this fight, where every week some group waivers and stands on the brink of falling for this insidious information peddled all over the Orient by the Japanese.

Further, I would like to remind this Congress that China is fighting on spirit and in some cases on spirit alone. And no one can stand up and say that the sort of thing we will do here today will give no aid to that spirit. It is stupid to say that men and nations fight by materials and materials alone. In the main they fight for ideas and causes, aided and abetted by materials. We could send all the armies and ammunition at our command to the Chinese, and without their devotion to the cause we both now espouse, they would mean nothing. I am surprised at a statement which intimates that all we need to do for our allies is send them materials. This is the something else that makes a gun effective. This is the one thing that has stood between our relations with China for many years. Its elimination will be of more benefit materially and spiritually, insofar as the Chinese are concerned, than any other one act this Congress can pass during this war. This will be the eyes and ears of the powerhouse of war materials we are going to hand to not only the Chinese but to the American soldiers and the Chinese fighting together against the Japanese.

It is sometimes amusing, in looking at our international history, to note our relations with other nations, particularly Europe. We have been off and on the British at least 20 times in our history, and I suppose the same could apply to them. We have been anti-German and pro-German. We have been for Italy and against Italy and for Italy. And so on down through the list of nations. All other nations have been the same toward us over the centuries. Insofar as I can ascertain, only one nation and one nation alone has been the friend of the United States and never wavered, and that nation is China. And, Mr. Speaker, we have fundamentally been the friend of China.

BOXER

This bill goes far above and beyond its present war necessity. If any one position of our foreign policy should be clear in the post-war world it should be this, that we need in the Orient, democracy needs in the Orient, a strong Allied nation, practicing the same principles of democracy that we intend to keep. Without such a strong nation it does not take much intelligence to visualize what might come out of the great cauldron mass of millions of Asiatic peoples. Without the clear leadership of such a democratic Asiatic nation as China, with our help, alliances could form and other Japanese types of destructive empires could arise that would make the present island empire look like a dwarf. Those of you who bring up the racial question on this legislation might well ponder on that fact for a moment.

MINORITIES

The greatest and clearest conception out of the mass of international possibilities existing today for this country is that we keep our hands clasped as tightly with China and she with us as possible. That handshake can never be sincere without reservations as long as such laws as these exclusion acts exist.

Coldly and practically, the reservoir of China and its possibilities for future development for the benefit of its millions of people remains today and in the post-war world the greatest economic opportunity of all producing nations. I do not particularly like to bring this up today, but unless we commence to be realistic about our foreign policy we might as well quit—surely other nations are being realistic—either the great producing factories of the United States benefit and participate in that great development or one or two other producing nations I know, without mentioning any names, are ready and willing to take over. And I do not know but that if China is not treated as she feels she should be, then some future Chinese government might quietly embargo us.

There has been a great deal said in the discussion on this legislation for many months regarding the number of Chinese that would be allowable. I guess we have now arrived at a figure of 105 a year. Some of the opposition seem to be afraid of these 105 Chinese. Of course, I appreciate that no one believes that 105 Chinese will make any serious dent in the economic picture in the United States. I do have a healthy respect, however, for the sincere apprehension on the part of some that this may be an opening wedge in the door. However, it must be admitted by them, and I again call their attention to the fact that our quota system has surely and effectively controlled the immigration problem ever since its inauguration. Frankly I do not know of any reason why I should believe that it will not control as to the Chinese as well as it has controlled the other nations. In the first place, the Chinese are not a migratory people; and in the second place, they are practically, or were practically Shanghaied and brought over to California in order to cheaply build the railroads for the so-called robber barons of the sixties. And again being practical and realistic, the opposition to the poor 105 Chinese reminds me of some of the old advocates in prohibition. It is kind of a secret, but seriously, Members of this House, in normal times they smuggled at least 105 over the border every month. Common knowledge that this goes on the world over.

Abraham Lincoln Said: "God Must Have Loved the Common People, for He Made So Many of Them"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the gentleman from Connecticut, Hon. J. D. MCWILLIAMS:

Fellow voters of the town of Norwich, as we again stand on the threshold of a town election, it gives me great pleasure to visit for a few minutes with you, my fellow townspeople, in the serene quiet of your homes.

I do so to promote the election of Theodore J. Richard for the office of first selectman.

First, however, I would like each and every one of you to know how deeply I appreciate the great honor you bestowed on me in electing me to the office of first selectman for four consecutive terms. To those stalwarts who stood by me through thick and thin, through storm and sunshine, through three floods and one hurricane, my heart shall never fail to be thankful, nor shall the memory ever become dim in my mind.

Serving you in the capacity of first selectman has not only afforded me one of life's most pleasant experiences, but it became the very foundation upon which my condidacy for Congress was built.

You may well recall that I retained the office of first selectman when I was elected to Congress, because a special election would have occasioned an expenditure of $7,500. With the unanimous approval of the town board of finance, I appointed Mr. Richard to act as chief clerk in the selectman's office. With that arrangement, the town was put to no expense, but was thus saved $7,500.

My appointment of Theodore J. Richard was well considered. He had served under

me as sealer of weights and measures, doing an outstanding job and winning for himself State-wide recognition.

Being an energetic person, Mr. Richard was not content when not occupied. Therefore, when my duties as first selectman became too onerous, I sought his assistance. He was true and faithful and the extra work I assigned him developed into a steady stream. Thus when it became incumbent upon me to relinquish many of the multitudinous tasks attached to that position, Mr. Richard was preeminently qualified to assume them. And let me state right here and now, your employees in the town hall are as faithful and industrious a group of workers as it has ever been my pleasure to serve. Needless to say, one of my greatest disappointments in going to Washington was my separation from these splendid, patriotic citizens who do not at times, I fear, get the credit they so justly deserve. Before telling you more about Mr. Richard, I think I should answer the so-called six-point program of the Democrats, inasmuch as most of these points are barbed and poisonous arrows aimed directly at me.

Pledge 1: First, they pledge a government which will give the people of Norwich the services they want at the least cost; town salaries and wages based on present-day conditions, and wholehearted cooperation with every effort to aid our country in the progress of the war.

Let's discuss this first promise. Does it differ in any way from that of the present administration? Certainly you citizens get what you want for the least possible cost because, as you have repeatedly been reminded by me in the past, the finance board and not the selectmen make up the budget. So, regardless of whom you elect, the situation will not change.

Has the Democratic Party forgotten so soon that I raised town salaries through savings in excessive interest rates while the city administration was quibbling over an increase of minor importance? The last part of the pledge—"whole cooperation in the war effort." Doesn't the Democratic party realize the quickest termination of this war is nearest and dearest to every American's heart?

Pledge 2: They propose an economical, businesslike government on a common sense, practical basis to effect savings and eliminate inefficiency without sacrificing any necessary services.

Well, little does the Democratic Party realize how small are the sums in the budget over which the first selectman has any control. For instance, with regard to education, the first selectman has no more to say than any ordinary citizen. The budgets for both the public schools and the Norwich Free Academy are submitted directly to the finance board and voted upon by the electors themselves.

In the past few years increases exceeding $100,000 have been voted for the public school and N. F. A. budgets. Was mine the blame in the past, and should the blame now be Mr. Richard's? And let us not forget that the citizens, in a duly warned town meeting, voted a large sum of money for a Norwich trade school, the interest on the bonds and note amounting to over $20,000 last year. Can Mr. Richard be censured for this? Would the Democratic Party change this and neglect education?

Would it be presumptuous of me to remind the citizenry that the money voted for the trade school remained idle in a bank drawing no interest until I had it invested in United States War bonds? Did not my foresight back the attack before any other municipality in the country? Do you not remember that it was I who brought about a teacher pay-roll system, investing in the town treasurer instead of the superintendent of schools the power to make out the checks on a personal checking account?

Does anyone wish to overlook the fact that I initiated compensation and public liability insurance for town employees? Do you wish to forget that it was I who engineered the financing of the construction of the lower Preston Bridge and the Eighth Street Bridge, so that these two structures, costing approximately $300,000, were secured for our town at a cost to local taxpayers of less than $22,000?

These are but a few instances and I would challenge the Democrats to refer to them ever again as "unbusinesslike."

Pledge 3: The Democrats offer a thorough reorganization of the selectman's office. They would, they say, bring it back to the people and thus bring to an end the assumption of unwarranted executive authority by the first selectman, installing in its stead a system of records as recommended by the town auditor.

What do they mean? Do they mean that they would not have been the humanitarian I was? Do they mean that they would not have, in the very depths of depression, fed the hungry mouths and clothed the cold bodies before instituting investigations? Do they mean that they would not have aided old-age pensioners in dire distress? Do they mean that they would not have aided the widows and orphans until the State stepped in? Do they mean that they actually would have allowed those cruel circumstances to have remained status quo? Surely, you and I have misunderstood this pledge of theirs.

This recommendation of an accounting system should be referred to the finance board, as it alone has the authority under the general statutes to prescribe the method by which and the place where all records and books of accounts of the town shall be kept.

Pledge 4. They promise better police and fire protection, better street lighting, and highways.

You can only have better police and fire protection by increasing your taxes. The town appropriates less than $2,000 for police protection and, until this year, but $3,000 for fire protection. More protection means higher taxes. Our street lighting now costs over $10,000 per year. Better lighting means increased taxation. With respect to highways, we have been maintaining them, in relation to other towns, at half the cost per mile. I believe that those who live outside the city limits will say that those of the town compare favorably with those of the city. In fact, I resent the insinuation that they are poor, as I have taken pride in them and many times have received compliments on their splendid condition. I would state further that in my administration our improved road mileage has been increased by 25 miles.

Pledge 5. They promise adequate planning for the post-war period; establishment of a long-range program for reemployment of those in the armed forces, public works improvements, placement of defense workers, vocational training, retention of present industries and the securing of new ones. I have no quarrel with this line of thought. Let me remind you I have already brought industry to your town to provide necessary employment.

Pledge 6. They pledge every effort to effect proper facilities for air transportation. I concur with this commendable idea because I, unlike the Democratic Party, am aware of the fact that Norwich has already set up a committee for this very purpose, and the town has long since allotted $500 toward its expenses.

So much for their so-called six-point program.

With reference to the proposed increase in the tax rate, I assure you that neither Mr. Richard nor I can take any responsibility whatever. That matter lies entirely within the province of the board of finance. In criticizing the proposed tax rate, let us not lose sight of the fact that you will be paying for the additional services you yourselves seek. For instance, you voted in town meeting to create child-care centers. The finance board has placed this item in the budget because you desire it. You ask for further fire protection. Provision has been made therefor. You wished and voted for the temporary trade school. This is in the budget.

With respect to the town deposit fund which was depleted over 50 years ago by one of my predecessors, I know the State of Connecticut has for years urged the town of Norwich to clean up this item of $13,000, but to no avail until this year. Reading the minds of the board of finance, I presume they thought, with relief costs down and every able-bodied citizen employed, this would be a good year to write off this item. I would rather reach this conclusion than that the board were motivated by politics.

Now if you take the cost of all these added services, which you yourselves seem to want, and consider the cash balance on hand at the end of our fiscal year you, as well as the board of finance, will see it amounts to nearly $80,000, or two mills on the grand list. If we are to be fair, these responsibilities certainly cannot be attributed to inefficiency or poor management on the part of the selectman's office, but rather to what the electors themselves have voted for.

Now let us analyze for a moment the two men seeking office.

The Democrats have selected as their standard bearer a gentleman who traces his ancestry back to 1659. These antecedents are not essential for the requirements of the office. When you consider that the first selectman must cater to the masses, and must deal especially with the unfortunate and underprivileged, you must realize that it takes a man who has carved his own career to cope therewith. I doubt seriously whether the Democratic candidate has the faintest realization of the manifold and perplexing problems of this office.

Now let us examine the Republican candidate. In a current smear campaign, Mr. Richard is being referred to as a mill hand. I proudly admit that Mr. Richard was once a mill hand. A great many men with humble origins graduated, through ambition and initiative, into more responsible fields of endeavor. It is a proud commentary on our form of government that a man like Mr. Richard should now be allowed to seek public office against one who, by the grace of God, can trace his ancestry through 284 years. But thank God in this country it isn't what your ancestors did that counts—it's what you do. And I want to assure the voters of the town of Norwich that I have had ample opportunity to guide and view the work in the first selectman's office as performed by Mr. Richard, and he has never failed to come through with flying colors. He has not only mastered the intricacies of the office and outside routine, but has solved trying civilian defense problems. You need only to note the work he performed in the victory garden program this past summer to realize how many added burdens can be imposed upon this office, especially in time of war.

Yes; Mr. Richard was a mill hand. Yes; he has had handicaps. But he has always known and admitted them and finally mastered them. He is one of the common people of whom Abraham Lincoln said the Lord must have loved, because he made so many of them. Mr. Richard has worked hard achieving his success over seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Everyone, rich and poor, high and low, enjoys his confidence and trust. To them he gives loyalty, faithfulness, and a safe harbor in time of storm. The office of first selectman seeks such a man—a humble, unassuming, common, ordinary man.

In this little talk I have tried to tell the truth as I see it. I want you to weigh the evidence presented and vote as your conscience dictates. If you do, I'm sure you'll vote for Theodore J. Richard.

Thank you.

Army and Navy E Awards in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of the monthly publication Industry, published by Associated Industries of Massachusetts, has just reached me, and I find a goodly portion of it devoted to Army and Navy production awards—the E pennants and the E pins, symbolic of highly efficient performance of war contracts. These awards are much coveted. They are not easily won. The right to them is carefully determined by a board of Army and Navy officers sitting here in Washington. Every plant displaying an E pennant and every employee wearing an E pin justly may be proud.

According to the article in the publication I have mentioned, there are approximately 76,400 establishments in the Nation engaged in the production of war supplies. Of this number 1,910 thus far have been awarded the Army and Navy E—just 2½ percent. Of the 1910, 141, or about 7⅓ percent, are establishments within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and it makes me very proud, indeed, to call attention to that enviable record of the industrialists and the workers of my home State.

During the recent recess it was my privilege to attend the ceremonies incident to the award to the J. F. Fitzgerald Construction Co., of Boston. Governor Saltonstall was there, as was Mayor Tobin of Boston, and there were many other distinguished guests. I think it fitting to repeat here the remarks of the president of that concern, Mr. James F. Fitzgerald, on that occasion. He said:

It is indeed a pleasure and a very great honor to receive, in behalf of all of the men and women in our organization and for the Fitzgerald Construction Co., the award of the Army and Navy E. Because of our excellent performance to date, Army officials have seen fit to honor us with this distinctive award of merit. I am sure that it will be an incentive to all of us to complete the job at the earliest possible date.

It has been a privilege to work with the Corps of Engineers under the leadership of Colonel Gillette, commanding officer, New England division, and Lieutenant Colonel Rindlaub, district engineer. We deeply appreciate the splendid cooperation which has been extended to us at all times by the officers and men of the district and division offices.

I would like to take advantage of the opportunity which this occasion presents to pay tribute to a few of the many who have assisted us in this work. Captain Chapin, Captain Vassalotti, Bill Kerns, the resident engineer, and the members of his staff who have been tireless in their efforts to complete the work in record time. Phil Murphy, the auditor from the district, and Mr. Allen, the chief engineer, and his assistants are but a few of the many loyal workers I would mention individually if time permitted. Nor can we forget the splendid work of the subcontractors and material men who have played such an important part in achieving this success: Bill Moore, of the J. P. O'Connell Co., Charlie Cornell, of the Boston Sand & Gravel Co., Hooper Electric Co., Babcock-Davis Corporation, McKenna Plumbing Co., Boston Filter Co., Boston Pulley Co., Philip Carey Co., Franklin Park Co., and the many others who have supplied us with material—all have made their contribution of effort in achieving this E award.

And now I come to the boys, who are very close to me, men who have played an important part in winning this award, Frank Delaney, our project manager; Charlie Alger, our splendid general superintendent; Pete Tyrell, our assistant superintendent, a real piece of dynamite; Harold McLaren, our very able general carpenter foreman and his assistants, Clarke, Pittman, Squibb, and Weatherbee; McKenzie, our master mechanic, who keeps all the wheels rolling; Charlie Bush, with his foremen, Patten and DiNardo, their crew really know how to tie up reinforcing; Al Jacobs, our very efficient labor foreman and his assistants; Charlie Kewer, our office engineer; genial Clayton Havey, our purchasing agent; and grand old Dave Morris, our office manager; Littell, Dolan, Tobin, Williams, Phair, Tiffany, MacKenzie, and of course the girls in the office—these, the key personnel of the J. F. Fitzgerald Construction Co., are the ones to whom great credit is due. Of course, time will not permit me to name each individual man on this project, but I do wish to say that each and every one of you have done a grand job, and I welcome this opportunity to express, personally, my thanks to you.

I thank you, Colonel Farrell, for this Army and Navy E. We, of the Fitzgerald Construction Co., will see in this banner a challenge to our best efforts in the months that lie ahead; and I feel confident that even higher standards of achievement will be attained before the completion of this project.

Valuable Service on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in these days of far-reaching and world-changing events which are daily brought to our attention by the headlines of our newspapers and in the stress of great fund-raising events such as the Third War Loan and community-war-fund drives, we are sometimes prone to overlook the underlying foundation of morale which forms the basis for the success of these larger projects. But when the Members of Congress return to their districts, they are confronted on every hand with the tremendously valuable part that the ordinary American citizen is taking in community activities without which we would lose our morale and the greater projects would become impossible.

On my recent return to my district during the summer recess, I visited every community many times. In these communities I found not only the Third War Loan being enthusiastically pushed, but every community had numerous other projects of tremendous value to the war effort. Among these were salvage drives, all phases of Red Cross work, including the highly important blood-bank program. Victory gardening, home-canning projects, civilian-defense activities of all kinds, and in almost every community the local citizens have taken the initiative in preparing servicemen's centers or "hospitality houses" as they are sometimes called, which are rendering a distinct service to the boys who are on furlough or passing through the respective communities.

It would take many pages for me to recount in detail the fine work our civilian population is doing along these lines, and it would take many pages for me to give credit and accord honor to the many individuals in each community who are cooperating in this unselfish work, but I realize that space and time are prohibitive. I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD a report which I received this morning from the Huntington Park Navy Mothers Club No. 252. This report is a record of this organization's service to the community since its inception in March 1942. The membership of this club, as you know, is composed of wives and mothers of our Navy men. In addition to sending their loved ones into the war zones, these fine women are exemplifying their devotion to their country by giving cheerfully and unselfishly of their time and money on the home front.

The record of achievements of the Huntington Park Navy Mothers Club No. 252, which I am appending hereto, is an inspiration to me in my daily work as their Representative in Washington:

The Huntington Park Navy Mothers Club No. 252 was organized in March 1942 with 17 charter members. The membership has now increased to 113.

Present officers of the club include: Pearl Leight, commander; Frances Roberts, first vice commander; Alluy Spencer, second vice commander; Lena Blackburn, adjutant; Peggy Irwin, finance officer; Myrtle Moore, chaplain; Mattie Barr, judge advocate; LaVon Bishop and Leah Agney, matrons at arms; Agnes Olsen and Olivia Monaghan, color bearers.

Since its inception the club has made and delivered 1,500 articles of clothing to Navy relief; 75,000 surgical dressings, 350 surgical cases, 180 towels, 16 abdominal binders, and 5 wool afghans to the Navy Hospital at Long Beach.

The club has adopted a ward at the Long Beach Hospital, and Frances Roberts and her committee make two visits per month, taking the men treats of home-made cookies, candy, gum, smokes, and toilet articles. For this work the club has expended approximately $100.

To the Norco Hospital, 34 wool afghans, several hundred coat hangers, wastebaskets, scrapbooks, cross-word puzzles, games, playing cards, home-made cake, ice cream, and candy have been delivered.

Other contributions made by the club include: Pearl Harbor fund, $21; welfare sewing materials, $190; Navy relief, $40; South Gate Hospitality House, $72; Tri-Cities Servicemen's Hospitality Center, $45; Huntington Park Servicemen's Center, $127; Norco Hospital magazine fund, $10; Norco Hospital motion picture fund, $15; American Red Cross, $17.50.

Seventy-five dollars has been given Frances Roberts to buy Christmas gifts for the men in the club's adopted ward in the Long Beach Hospital; $100 has been set aside to purchase house gifts for each of the three local hospitality houses, viz: Huntington Park Servicemen's Center; South Gate Hospitality House, and Tri-Cities Servicemen's Hospitality Center.

Charge of the Huntington Park Servicemen's Center is in the hands of the club every other Saturday and the second and fourth Sundays of each month, under the chairmanship of Edith Brookhouser. The club is also in charge of the Tri-Cities Servicemen's Hospitality Center 1 day per month, under the chairmanship of Ada Kerr.

Friday is Navy Mother's Day at the Bond House, of which Mattie Barr is chairman and has made a very enviable record.

Several of the members give 1 day per week to the surgical-dressing unit of the American Red Cross.

The club has two business meetings and 1 sewing day each month.

The making of surgical dressings for the Long Beach Hospital has had the enthusiastic support of the club ever since the opening of the hospital, a number of members having opened their homes for this work in addition to 3 weekly dressing days, which includes: Monday at the home of Virginia Shannon, Wednesday at the home of Edith Brookhouser, and Thursday at Religious Science Church, where business and other meetings are held.

"Never a dull moment" is the motto of the ways and means department, under the direction of LaVon Bishop and Alluy Spencer. Card parties, waffle breakfasts, rummage sales, raffles of four War bonds and free-will contributions from other organizations and individuals have kept the treasury in a healthy condition.

Three thousand tags have been ordered for National Tag Day, which is on Navy Day, October 27. Members had their names in early to sell the tags and are looking forward to swelling the treasury with the proceeds.

The last big project for the year will be a bazaar to be held the first week in November. A great deal of preparation has been made for this during the past several months and it promises to be an outstanding success.

MADALEINE CUMMING,
Chairman, Publicity,
Huntington Park Navy
Mothers Club, No. 252.

Personal Report by Senator Mead of Observations on the Fighting Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Personal Report of My Observations," delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] on October 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the return of our overseas committee there have been inserted in the press and otherwise brought to public notice statements that I came back an isolationist and an American Firster. I realize the meaning of the term "American Firster," and while I am, of course, for my country first, I am not an American Firster, in the ordinary curbstone definition of that term, nor am I an isolationist. I am now more convinced that it is necessary for us to participate in an international effort to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent a recurrence of the bloody and devastating catastrophe which has been forced upon us. I am stronger than ever for the leadership of the President and those who with him are directing the Nation's war effort.

During our trip we spent 53 days on the ground. It was sufficient time to afford us an opportunity to learn something about what is happening in other parts of the world, how well the war is progressing, and what contributions our agencies, civil and military, are making in order that we may more successfully prosecute the war.

I want this remarkable trip to go down in history as one which will yield helpful and beneficial results. I lived too close to the war. I saw too much of the suffering and the dying, to do anything other than to add my contribution to the tremendous tasks our boys are shouldering on the battlefields of the world today. I desire to make the record clear insofar as my observations and conclusions are concerned.

Standing out among the recommendations of our committee, according to the press, was:

(a) The matter of Siberian bases; and

(b) The question of placing the Pacific theater on a standing comparable with that of the European theater.

It was the directive of Chairman Truman of our committee that we abstain from participating in matters pertaining to military strategy, and as a member of the Truman committee I followed that direction but now by reason of the fact that press reports linked my name with these recommendations, and the fact that the adoption of such a program involves matters of production supply, it becomes appropriate for me to discuss these subjects.

There were a number of other recommendations presented by our committee, and for the most part they concerned our civil agencies. Again according to the press, they included:

1. The question of air bases and our postwar policy with reference to the use of those bases;

2. A more equitable distribution of the United Nation's petroleum production;

3. A study, and perhaps a revision of our lend-lease policy;

4. An inquiry into the informational programs of O. W. I. (there being substantial support, as I recall, for the psychological warfare activities of O. W. I.); and

5. The coordination in the foreign field of our various civil agencies.

These recommendations seem to me the most important of our reports made to the Senate.

At this point I want to say I did not make the statement that the establishment of Russian bases would save a million lives.

I talked with men in the military of our Government, and of other governments with reference to the Russian bases. I was told that it might be a simple problem for Russia to give us such bases, but such action would involve a declaration of war between Japan and Russia, and it would also involve the protection and defense and supply of those bases. Either the Russian Government or the American Government would have to tackle that difficult problem.

I was told, and which I fully realized, that the Soviet Army has a tremendous task on its hands, and that it was amazing the military world by the determination with which it was driving the invader out of Russia. For Russia to tackle another strong power, making it necessary for supplies to be transferred five or six thousand miles over Siberian wastes, would imperil the war in Europe, and, therefore, I was informed that Russian bases were out of the question at this time.

I was also told that if we could go right by the front door of Japan, through the Sea of Japan and establish bases, and supply them, we could just as easily land on the shores of China and establish a bridgehead and bases there. The fact that we have not done so indicates the difficulty of the task. The willingness of China to give us the bases exists, but the military possibility of putting the plan into effect is indeed another problem.

I believe that the strategy in the Pacific theater has been carried out correctly, and I doubt very much the wisdom of weakening the European front by diverting matériel and supplies needed to combat the armies of Hitler to other theaters right at this time. We should, of course, send all the men and matériel we can to the Pacific, and that I believe is being done.

In the early days of 1942 we were worrying about the success of the three-point program which Hitler proclaimed his victory program. That program included (a) the U-boat campaign in the Atlantic; (b) Rommel's conquest of Africa; (c) control of the oil of the Caucasus. For a time the situation was most critical.

However, the day of apprehension is now over. The anxieties which filled our hearts are no longer there. The U-boat menace has been minimized. We are building more ships by far than are being sunk today. The great stand made by Montgomery at El Alamein, supported as he was by the American Army, has driven Rommel across the Mediterranean, or into the sea. Africa is now on our team. The Mediterranean is our lake. The long voyage around South Africa, requiring weeks of precious shipping time, is no longer necessary.

The French Navy, once a potential enemy, is no longer fighting us. Many of its units and thousands of its personnel are on our side. The strong Italian Navy recently steamed into Allied ports, and now we have a decided advantage.

Beyond that, the small nations, which refused to be knocked out of the war and who remained in, perhaps, because the United Nations' proclamation gave them a voice in the council of the United Nations, and also gave them the fighting materials required through our lend-lease, are all helping us hasten the day of victory. They are now in a position, with their maritime strength, to help carry materials, men, and equipment to every battlefield in the world.

The supply problem in the Pacific is simple now compared to the situation which faced us in the gloom of 1942. In Europe we are closing in upon the enemy, everywhere the initiative is in our hands, and the enemy is on the defensive and will remain there until victory comes to us.

I have not criticized the war effort of any one of our allies. I have praise and admiration for the work being done by every one

of the United Nations. The smaller nations likewise are doing great work, materially assisted by our lend-lease policy. They have earned the lasting gratitude of our people, and they deserve a place high in the councils around the press table when the war shall be ended.

Patient China, fighting with her back to the wall, and at times with very little to fight with, has carried the brunt of battle against Japan for years, and is today stronger than she has been at any time since the invader came to her soil. United China, supporting loyally and with confidence the generalissimo of the armies of China, merits our praise, and all the sympathy, help, and cooperation we can give.

The indomitable Russian people, that great fighting force which amazed the military experts of the world, which fought on a 3,000-mile front under the most adverse climatic conditions known to man, is writing a glorious chapter which will always stand out in the history of this war. Russia, too, deserves our praise.

We saw the devastation of Plymouth, of London, and other fair cities in the United Kingdom. We have a high appreciation of the courage and heroism of the people of England. We know the sacrifices they have and are making, for days we lived with them and saw those sacrifices. We remember the stubborn stand of Montgomery at El Alamein, and how he fought the strongest and most cagey opposition that Hitler could send to that desert land. We know how that little island fought to keep the invader out and to help win the battle of the Atlantic. Surely we have nothing but praise for the British war effort.

With reference to our own war effort, today we have the toughest, the finest, the best trained Army in all the world—boys who are over there in the jungles or in the desert, up in the mountain fastnesses of the Aleutians or in the foxholes of the Solomons or New Guinea, or fighting their way up through Italy. Wherever they are, on land, sea, or in the air, they are giving a great account of themselves. We can be proud of the rich tradition they are living up to in such an exemplary manner. It is our greatest Army. It is our best conducted war. Those boys by comparison are well cared for. They have the finest medical attention. Their equipment is the most modern. Their supplies are the best.

Not only do we have a good Army and a good Navy, with all the other components, but our military organization is well officered and well directed. We can rely with confidence upon America's military leaders.

Beyond the excellent job done in the recruitment, the supplying, the direction of our military, and the strategy under which it fights, there is another vital matter which should be given consideration. In this the biggest military task in all the history of the world—the biggest single job we have before us today—we have a harmonious and an efficient integration of our several military services which work together like clockwork; we have also the most efficient and most cohesive interallied combat force that was ever put together.

The nation which rightfully enjoys a high degree of confidence and faith in its chosen leadership is a favored nation in time of war. We have every reason in the world to have confidence and faith in the man and in the men who lead us in this great conflict for human decency.

We have in America, guiding our destinies as the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, the most influential leader of any government on earth. The oppressed peoples of every nation in the world look to the leadership of America, respect the leadership of America, and believe with all the faith in their hearts in the leadership of America. The most important observation which I have to report is this: We have every reason on earth to have the fullest confidence and faith in the President of the United States.

Praise is due the name of Churchill, whose energy, drive, and leadership brought England out of the lethargy in which it found itself, and made of it a great fighting force, serving with us in this struggle against Axis aggression.

There is abundant evidence of loyalty and confidence in the leaders of the Russian Government as exemplified by her heroic armies and also by the faith the Russian people have in the righteousness of her cause.

In China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is, of course, the outstanding figure. He is the symbol for which China fights. Behind him there is a united effort, difficult and beset with obstacles, but nevertheless, China is in the fight to stay, and she deserves the continued help of the United Nations in attaining that freedom and democracy to which she is justly entitled.

Flood Control and Navigation—Address by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., to wit:

This is the third time it has been my privilege to address the Mississippi Valley Association. The trend of events at the time of each of these meetings has been significant. We hold many objectives in common.

I was on your program first in the fall of 1941—soon after my appointment as Chief of Engineers. That was shortly before the full impact of war burst upon us at Pearl Harbor. We evaluated then our joint peacetime efforts on the Mississippi and its tributaries. We found our work, though incomplete, had well provided the waterways to help bear the heavy shipments of defense matériel. Since then, we have seen the proverbial proof of the pudding. The waterways have upheld our expectations. Their capacity has been limited only by the amount of floating equipment available.

I was next on your program during June of the current year. We were then meeting just after extraordinary floods had occurred in several tributary basins of the Mississippi River as well as on the upper river itself. We then realized more emphatically than ever before that floods in wartime are dangerous enemies. At that critical time, it was agreed that we would go ahead with repairs as rapidly as possible. With wise foresight, Congress had already authorized $1,000,000 annually for use in just such emergencies. This gave us a running start. Knowing the extent of damages from these recent floods, Congress upon our request promptly appropriated an additional $10,000,000 for rehabilitating the levee systems that had been destroyed. Today, it is gratifying to report that all the repairs are well along or have been completed.

Now we are here for another timely conference. And, I am, of course, very happy to be with you. The war with the Axis Powers has reached its more aggressive stages. We are sobered with the realization that the major losses and bloodshed—the hardest battles—are still ahead. But we look forward to ultimate victory when again we may engage in constructive peacetime efforts.

The Constitution provides for control over rivers and harbors by the Federal Government. The policies with respect to Federal improvements in the interest of navigation have been formulated through laws enacted by Congress over a span of years. It was recognized early in our history that such improvements were national in character and therefore were proper subjects of national appropriations. This policy, limited at first in scope, has grown and broadened from year to year with the westward advance of the Nation's population. Over these many years, navigation improvements have shown definite benefits and savings to the public. Their cost as well as the policy of keeping them for the free use and benefit of all the people stands fully justified.

A few years ago, the Congress recognized that the control of damaging flood waters on the streams of the country was another proper activity of the Federal Government. In doing so, the Congress specified that comprehensive investigations of all streams should be undertaken and reports thereon be submitted. These reports have been submitted.

The experience of more than a century of legislation in these fields has become a magnificent tribute to the wisdom and long-range foresight of Congress—to the national policies designed by Congress to develop our rivers for the maximum beneficial use of our people and the economic life of the country.

Here in this vast and fertile valley—the now proved "arsenal of the democracies" as well as the "food basket of the world," thousands of miles of improved channels extend as navigable thoroughfares to all sections of the area. They provide outlets to the Great Lakes and to the Gulf of Mexico, on which to float our agricultural and manufactured products.

In normal times the commerce of the Nation moves quietly and efficiently over our diverse but integrated land, water, and air transportation system. But the present world upheaval has transformed this systematic flow of peacetime goods into a torrential flood of war materials. Water transportation has played its part by relieving our highways and railways of bulk freight—thus helping to expedite shipments of supplies requiring more rapid delivery. Recent reports show that our inland waterways are carrying far more tonnage than at the outbreak of the war in Europe. Specifically, the Nation is collecting dividends from developments your association nurtured in calmer days. Even now the capacity of our waterways has hardly been approached.

Not only are our waterways supplying transportation of bulk commodities but they have made it possible for the shipbuilding industry to decentralize and take advantage of available manpower and materials in our inland areas. There are developments of this type along the main stem of the Mississippi, along its tributaries, and on the Great Lakes. Water-borne commerce that otherwise would be confined to the Lakes is now reaching the Gulf by way of the Illinois-Mississippi waterway. Untold tonnage of ore moving freely

across the Great Lakes is processed and fabricated in areas far removed from our exposed coast lines, and the products of this ore are moving readily to the sea over the Mississippi system and the New York State Barge Canal.

The proposed navigation improvements for the Nation as a whole constitute a potential post-war program of over a billion dollars, and if the partial authorizations included in this program should be made complete authorizations, and be supplemented with additional plans for which studies have been made, the program could be quickly expanded to $2,000,000,000.

Now, let us take a look at how the books stand in connection with flood-control projects In the Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, and 1941, Congress authorized a large number of projects. Included are comprehensive plans of improvement for flood control, development of hydroelectric power, water conservation, and other beneficial uses in a number of our principal river basins. These comprehensive plans are, of course, based on surveys which developed the economic feasibility of the recommended projects. Our program was well under way when work of this type not directly connected with the war effort was stopped. To initiate and prosecute comprehensive plans which need no additional legislation except for money, and to complete the approved plans and projects recommended since the passage of the last Flood Control Act, give us a potential post-war flood-control program amounting to $2,600,000,000. Combined with the navigation program—and translated into time-proved, sound benefits and direct and indirect manpower employment—these stand as splendid already planned post-war projects.

Past experience will be valuable in our program after the war. The alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi has served as a full-scale laboratory in which we have applied practical flood-control methods. As a matter of gradual growth, flood protection has turned a vast, annually flooded wilderness into an area of stable civilization and high agricultural and industrial development. This great lower valley, embracing some 20,000,000 acres and including some of the world's most fertile and productive land, has an ugly flood record dating back to 1541. In that year, De Soto and his companions saw the river for the first time, and found it overflowing its banks. Periodically, the tragedy of floods has harrassed the area. The 1927 floods, for all practical purposes, severed the Nation from Cairo to New Orleans—inundating the continental highways and railroad lines which follow the valley. All east-west communication was broken for days. It is not pleasant to reflect what the result would have been if the 1943 floods had followed this pattern—how it would have spelled tragedy to our war effort.

Three-fourths of this rich area is now fully protected and the threat of flood has been reduced for most of the remaining area. The application of the Jadwin plan, as modified, from Cairo to the sea, indicates the kind of comprehensive flood-control program that can be worked out in other basins. The approved projects in the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Arkansas, and the White Basins are well started. Plans of similar scope are now available for the Missouri Basin.

We know the importance of having long-range plans that are both provisional and flexible: provisional, because their execution may be interrupted by emergency situations or changed conditions; and flexible, because they must be implemented in stages over a period of years. Step by step, the projects that are practical and can be executed during any period are developed in their relationship to a better and more comprehensive program. To harness the floods, and to use the waters to the maximum benefit of mankind, over and over on their way to the sea, is our goal. And this becomes more feasible with each completed project.

We have accumulated more detailed information on our water resources than has any other nation of the world. The comprehensive basin reports made several years ago have been kept up to date. They take into account important changes in economic factors as they occur and show additional stream-flow records and other factual data. Thus we are ready to initiate any or all of these projects at any time.

The several Federal agencies charged by Congress with responsibility for their respective phases of the water development program are experts in their own fields. The Corps of Engineers works in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, the United States Geological Survey, and other Federal bureaus through which there is a continuous and friendly interchange of information and ideas. This cooperation eliminates duplication of effort and loss of efficiency. It brings to the solution of complex problems the best thought of many experts in the fields involved. These friendly contacts with other Federal departments, and with State and local agencies, are among the most important activities in our work on river basin developments.

In carrying out our responsibilities for navigation and flood control, it has been essential that we present to Congress comprehensive plans for basin-wide development. In some instances, these plans touch upon the broad range of other water uses. The fact that we present, and in some cases recommend, projects that go somewhat beyond navigation and flood control stands as a tribute to the cooperation and close accord in which all our Federal agencies are working together—seeking always the maximum utilization of the national wealth represented in our water resources.

We here today, typical of Americans, are men of peace. Through the years we have labored together to build good works for the benefit of mankind. The pursuit of such works has lately been interrupted—interrupted by a trio of international gangsters who interpreted our love of peace for what they labeled "democratic decadence." They have since received the shock of their lives.

Hitler set out to prove that this is an engineers' war. We have no disagreement on that score. We agree. But the tables have now been turned. The American construction industry performed miracles in operations which dotted the land and the offshore bases with camps and airfields, ports, plants, and other facilities to the extent of $11,000,000,000. American engineering organizations of industry have turned out tractors and 'dozers and planes and guns and ships. Construction has now moved overseas and so have the products of the engineering production lines.

From Britain to Buna, from Kiska to the Kasserine Pass, from Iceland to Italy, surprise airfields have based our fighters and bombers. Incredible road and bridge building and repairs have cleared the way for MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Buckner. So, as General Marshall recently told the American Legion, "preparations have now been practically completed—now, at last, we are ready to carry the war to the enemy, all overseas, thank God, with a power and force that we hope will bring this conflict to an early conclusion."

We have turned from the defensive to the offensive—yes; turned from defensive operations like Midway, the Coral Sea, Kiska, and the early New Guinea battles—to well-defined strategic attacks. The first of these attacks saw Mussolini tumbled from power, his empire gone, and Sicily, Sardinia, and a third of Italy safely in the hands of the men of Eisenhower. Without the fallen Benito Italy has now declared war on Germany.

Hitler, already seeing red in his strategic eastern nightmare, glances furtively toward England, toward the Middle East, toward the Balkans, toward Norway's hidden fjords, toward the sky, not knowing when and where the next blow will come.

In the Far East, too, there is pattern. Heretofore protected by time won at Pearl Harbor, Tojo sees a still unbeaten China in the war. In a circle about him he sees, counterclockwise, Stillwell, MacArthur, Nimitz, and Buckner, of Alaska.

There is pride in this transition from defensive to offensive—and here and there we hear the Yankee boast. But, my friends, never, never let us forget who bought the time to let us make this transition. Shall I mention China, who has hung on literally by her fingernails? Shall I mention Britain, who for 1 solid year stood alone between the Nazi and this Nation? And shall I mention Russia, whose share is written in her dead millions with her rivers running red? I think you will agree to honorable mention for all three.

In this coalition war, in which misunderstanding among the Allied Nations is a constant threat, we should heed well the lines of Noel Coward, published some days ago in the New York Times:

"All our past errors,
All our omissive sins must be wiped out.
This war no nation wins.
Remember that when you are over here.
Also remember that the future peace
For which we're fighting cannot be maintained
By wasting time contesting who has gained
Each victory. When all the battles cease then,
If we've learned by mutual endurance, by dangers shared,
By fighting side by side, to understand each other,
Then we'll forge a pride, not in ourselves,
But in our joint assurance to the whole world, when
All the carnage ends, that men can still be free
And still be friends."

The roads to Berlin and Tokyo are still closed to Allied traffic, closed in some cases by forces superior to those we have yet been able to array against them. The enemy still has the manpower and resources to carry on war for months; yes, for years. Never dare we forget that we are fighting a cold, calculating, cunning enemy, an enemy steeped in brutal traditions of war, an enemy who can understand only the language of fire power, manpower, and work power.

Even in the sobering realization of the tremendous task ahead, we must still be concerned about the post-war world. Through lack of preparedness, we must not jeopardize the future we are fighting so desperately to make secure. Confidence in the future is the torch of hope for the man or woman at the lathe, for the fighter in a fox hole. This faith in the post-war world, and this faith alone, can generate the energy required to get today's job done faster and better.

When a peacetime dawn dispels the dusk of war, America will know which way to go. We will prepare for that time as surely—with as much foresight, determination, and judgment—as we are putting into the cause of war. Then the enormous resources of this country, material and human, will be united in the cause of peace. Our rivers will be harnessed for their beneficial use. Our farms and factories will produce not for the insatiable maw of war but to give more of the good things of life to more people. Our swift, skilled labor, our genius for organization, the marvelous courage and fighting stamina of a young, free people, will be united to preserve and to improve the lot of man.

Report of Navy Department Price Adjustment Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, as chairman of Navy's Subcommittee on Appropriations, and in conjunction with the splendid gentlemen who are serving on my committee, I have from time to time presented to the membership of the House large appropriation bills for Navy's operations under the necessity of a wartime program; and the Members of the House have been most cooperative to Navy's wartime program when these presentations have been made. Consequently, I feel it is incumbent upon the members of my committee, and myself as their chairman, to report from time to time to the membership of the House Navy's activities as they pertain to those appropriations.

The general public does not know, in many instances, how the taxpayers' funds are being handled and, if my mail is indicative of public sentiment, the public concept is limited to its knowledge of large expenditures without definite understanding of how that money is being spent or credits derived.

With your indulgence, I want to place before the membership of the House and the public one of Navy's activities which has to do with the Navy Department Price Adjustment Board. At this point in the RECORD I incorporate a breakdown showing the activities and accomplishments of the adjustment board from the inception of this board to September 30, 1943:

Report of Navy Department Price Adjustment Board, Sept. 30, 1943

Cases assigned to the Navy Department as of Aug. 31, 1943	3,673
Cases assigned to the Navy Department Sept. 1 to Sept. 30, 1943	249
Total cases assigned to Navy Department as of Sept. 30, 1943	3,922

Schedule No.	Schedules	Estimated renegotiable business	Refunds	Price reductions	Total refunds and price reductions	Number of contractors	Percent of total assigned cases
1	Settlements completed	$4,927,879,000	$506,505,000	$614,485,000	$1,121,990,000	312	
2	Settlements pending	1,319,707,000	177,193,000	69,360,000	246,553,000	63	
3	Clearances granted	2,104,622,000				933	
4	Contractors not subject to the act, screened out or reassigned (not attached)	262,047,000				405	
	Total as of Sept. 30, 1943	8,614,255,000	684,698,000	683,845,000	1,368,543,000	1,713	43.7
	Total as of Aug. 31, 1943	8,065,137,000	669,151,000	665,137,000	1,334,288,000	1,386	
	Difference	549,118,000	15,547,000	18,708,000	34,255,000	327	
5	Contractors with whom renegotiation is proceeding:						
	Cases in transit	193,330,000				130	
	Cases awaiting requested preliminary information	3,341,983,000				1,499	
	Cases awaiting period end figures	174,757,000				78	
	Cases awaiting accountant or panel auditor reports	4,774,091,000				409	
	Cases awaiting field renegotiation	41,648,000				93	56.3
	Total	8,525,809,000				2,209	100.0

I feel this division of Navy has accomplished a very fine work to date and has been responsible for the return to Government millions of dollars due to its past activities and, undoubtedly, more millions which will reflect its future activities. The return of these funds to the Treasury is naturally reflecting beneficially to the taxpayers of this Nation.

Some people question as to why contracts were ever let that permitted excess earnings. At the time of our declaration of war, everyone who was familiar with our military activities realized we were not prepared to meet the impact that, of necessity, must follow a declaration of war. While we are the greatest industrial producing nation in the world, nevertheless, we had to call upon industry to fabricate instruments of war in which industry, as such, was not familiar and in a large percentage of our production requirements there was no yardstick of cost that was established. Consequently, many contracts were placed at rates which were above what later developed as necessary. In order to recapture these excess funds, Congress in its wisdom passed a law which resulted in the creation of the Price Adjustment Board and its activities. I am most pleased to report that the judgment of the Congress in enacting this law and the operations of the Price Adjustment Board have definitely been justified and certainly are beneficial to the taxpayers of this Nation.

The Connally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Connally Resolution" by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post on October 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator CONNALLY'S subcommittee has taken a long time about it and has seemed to need a lot of urging. This has given the impression that the Connally resolution is a weak compromise which falls short of the proposals of the pioneers in Congress—of Messrs. BALL, HATCH, BURTON, and HILL in the Senate and of Mr. FULBRIGHT in the House.

The impression is, I think, mistaken, and I believe it can be shown that Mr. CONNALLY'S resolution is sounder and wiser than Mr. BALL'S and that it is more complete than Mr. FULBRIGHT'S.

The second paragraph of the Connally resolution remedies the main defect and weakness of the Fulbright resolution. Mr. CONNALLY says plainly that he proposes to organize the peace by cooperating with our "comrades in arms"—that is to say, with the United Nations. Mr. FULBRIGHT, on the other hand, left it much vaguer and more general as to who, as a matter of fact, was to have the practical initiative and was actively to assume the responsibility. His resolution speaks only of "the nations of the world."

Though there is no doubt that Mr. FULBRIGHT himself, in fact, believes that the Allied Nations in the present war should become the founders and primary guardians of the future peace, it is highly important that the Senate should say so definitely.

The defect of the Ball resolution is that it implies, though in ambiguous phrase, a well-meant but, I think, unwise, undesirable, and unconsidered proposal to establish an international army. His resolution speaks of "a United Nations military force," but what Mr. BALL means by this is—and I am sure he would confirm this because these are his own words—"a true international force, representing not individual nations but the whole community," a force in which the officers and men would not be "under their national flags."

He is, in other words, proposing to police the world, not with forces supplied by agreement among the member nations but with an army recruited and commanded by an international world government. This whole conception is, it seems to me, impossible and undesirable. If such an international armed force were created, it would have to be stronger than the armed forces of any nation or combination of nations. Otherwise it could not police them. Does anyone seriously think that the British, the Russians, the Chinese, the Americans, or any of our other allies will consider disarming themselves and then entrusting to an international army, composed as it would have to be of professional mercenaries, the power to

coerce them? The proposal is so unconsidered that to continue to press it can only obstruct and confuse practical measures to combine and concert national forces to maintain peace.

This proposal for an international army is the substantial reason why so many feel they must, as the Connally resolution does, reassert the principle that the new "international authority" is to be composed of "free and sovereign nations."

We should not hesitate, I believe, to reaffirm this principle. What we should insist upon is that in all discussions of it sovereignty be defined in the historic American, which is also the civilized European, sense of the word. The founders of the Republic, who established the sovereignty of the United States in the period from 1776 to 1789, were men deeply grounded in the civilized tradition of the western world. As long as we adhere to their conception of sovereignty we shall stand on solid ground.

They never imagined for a moment, and they rejected utterly, the notion, which Hitler has revived, that a sovereign state is a law unto itself, and that it has the right to do whatever it has the power to do. The rights of a sovereign, or, as they called it, of a free and independent state, were derived from and were limited by "the law of nature and of nature's God," and the rights of a people had to be exercised with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

The laws of nature and nature's God were, as they understood them, the underlying principles which reasonable men discerned and conscientious men acknowledged in the body of the common law, in the customs and precedents of the law of nations, in documents like the Bill of Rights. Nations and individual men were free under these universal laws, and the Constitution, all statutes, all policy were, as they saw it, valid and binding only if conforming to this universal tradition of civilized law.

This is the conception of sovereignty which Hitler and his confederates have challenged, and we must not fall into the grave error of imitating him.

Nor must we continue to ignore the plain words of the men who, because they established American sovereignty, are the highest authority on what sovereignty means. Thus it is often said by some who seem never to have read the Declaration of Independence to its conclusion that to contract alliances—a plain honest word which the squeamish find too blunt—is to surrender our sovereignty. The fact is that the leaders of the American Revolution declared that the "full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances" is the essential mark of a sovereign state.

Their real view, which they made as plain as words can make it, was that a sovereign state is bound in all its actions by a higher law than the passing whims and notions of its government; but if its purpose is lawful in the full civilized meaning of the word it may in order to achieve its purpose make war, make peace, contract alliances, and enter into all necessary agreements.

The World and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The World and the War" from the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, October 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD AND THE WAR

Standing before a map of the world, Senator A. B. CHANDLER talked and answered questions for 2 hours yesterday. No thoughtful person could hear Senator CHANDLER and make light of the serious purpose of the five Senators who flew to Army installations all over the world on a trip of observation and inspection.

As to the purposes and necessity for the trip, Senator CHANDLER is absolutely convincing. The Senate must ratify all treaties with foreign countries, during war or peace, and it could by vote easily require the submission of far more agreements with other nations than it has thus far. We think that the Senate has been very wise in delegating such authority as it thus far has granted to the Executive in this regard, in the interest of more effective prosecution of the war. The Senate also, and especially the Military Affairs Committee, must pass on appropriations for military installations. Senator CHANDLER says that he knows that he is better able to vote intelligently on the spending of billions of dollars for military purposes than he was before he visited the combat areas. Of this we do not believe there can be any doubt.

We hope that Senator CHANDLER is wrong in his grave fears that American support for the Pacific may be "too little and too late" to prevent heavy losses and prolongation of the war, and sincerely pray that he may be wholly mistaken in the fear he so frankly expresses that England, once victory is gained in Europe, will not be as free in her support for the efforts of the United States in the war against Japan as this country has been in supplying Russia and standing beside England in Africa and Europe.

However strong that hope and belief on our part, wishful thinking will not win wars or reduce its sacrifices, and Senator CHANDLER is certainly right in saying that the strength of Japan has been continuously and consistently underestimated up to now.

When one is brought face to face with the perilous situation in the Pacific and the slow and painful paths to prospective victory in any or all of the four plans that he outlines as those possibly to be taken toward Tokyo, there is an appalling realization of the grimness of the struggle that lies ahead.

Any military information of a secret or a confidential nature that could possibly give any tip or advantage to the enemy ought to be strictly safeguarded, but there is good reason for open discussion of the conduct of the war. Without this there cannot be the support for the Government and for the armies that is so essential.

Senator CHANDLER gravely fears the consequences of a frontal attack across the channel against the fortress of Europe, as evidenced by the Dieppe raid. He has high hopes for the success of the pulverizing raids on German production centers, and this anticipation on his part has been based on having seen Bizerte, after it was laid ruin by Allied guns and bombs.

At least we believe that it may be said that thus far, in the north African and European theaters, every effort has been made to safeguard to the utmost the safety of the American soldiers and the steps taken have been calculated to accomplish as much as possible with as little loss of life. The north African invasion certainly was based largely in major design upon a calculation, in lives, of the risk involved in comparison with any other approach to Hitler's European fortress.

We hope that no breach develops over the war policy of the United States Government. We think it would be a calamity to have a political repudiation of the policies of the administration while the issue of war is yet hanging in the balance.

But certainly unity must come from knowing and facing all the facts, from weighing the possibilities and being convinced of the necessity for the sacrifices that lie ahead.

There stands before us a winter to try men's souls. We must face it with all the devotion to our country, with all the patriotism and lack of prejudice and antagonism, political or otherwise, that we can muster. We are not trusting in others to shape our destiny for us, nor even wholly in the might of arms and resources. The courage and faith of the American people are equal to this grave challenge.

The Farmer and R. E. A. Meet the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Farmer and R. E. A. Meet the Challenge," delivered by Eugene Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, at the Georgia State-wide meeting of R. E. A. cooperatives, Atlanta, Ga., on October 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fight for freedom is being fought on the farms of America no less than in the air, abroad, and on the seas throughout the world. No class of citizens has shown more patriotism in the face of difficulties than our farmers. The record crop production of 1942 and 1943 proves their mettle.

American farmers have set a magnificent example of self-sacrifice and devotion to duty in these trying times. Though handicapped by loss of many of their sturdy sons to the fighting forces or to war industries, they have done little complaining. Lack of farm equipment is another serious draw-back, though as long as the supply of baling wire lasts many a farm implement will be kept in fair shape to do its part.

Only three States have more cooperatives than Georgia. Georgia, I believe, has 43. You took the lead early in the program and you have consistently maintained that leadership to this day. It is a tribute to the intelligence and progressiveness of your farm people. You recognized early the tremendous advantages that could come simply by modernizing your farms through electricity.

Because of what you did, you are today producing more cotton for the various war uses than could have been done without electricity. You are recognized as one of the great poultry sections of the Nation and that industry owes its success in no small degree to electricity. You are recognized as one of the outstanding fruit sections of the Nation. Electricity has made possible better production and preservation of those fruits. You produce tremendous quantities of vegetables. Electricity again, through refrigeration, has played its part. You have made great progress in dairying and livestock production.

Rural electrification has been helpful in that field.

In your State leader, Steve Tate, who has gone on to even greater honors as president of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, you have produced not only a great and true Southern gentleman, but an individual of vast ability, integrity, and stamina. All are needed to combat the pernicious factors opposing you today.

In Washington as your executive manager is Clyde Ellis, who ranks along with Senator Norris as a co-father of R. E. A. What is perhaps even more important today is his position as defender and protector of your great organization. Clyde lives and breathes R. E. A., and I assure you your interests are as safe as America's gold at Fort Knox in his able and experienced care.

The Rural Electrification Administration, now serving more than a million farm homes, has proved itself a great creative force in peacetime and has established its true worth as a great force of production in the present struggle.

In every trial of strength that this Nation, or any nation, undergoes, the final test inevitably resolves itself into a test of the capacity of the farm people to supply the armies with food and other items as farms produce for war. Great military leaders throughout history have paid tribute to the fact that wars are won with the full belly of the soldier. Guns, bullets, tanks, and planes; these are the front-line weapons, but a basic necessity to keep them in action is food and more food.

Georgia farmers today are truly on the war production line as much as are the great airplane factories of the west coast, Kaiser's shipyards, and the vast munitions plants of Michigan. This year farmers throughout this country earned their E in their battle of food production. Next year again the pennant for extraordinary service must symbolically float from the gable end of every barn throughout this land if our sons, and brothers, and wives, and daughters will have the necessary food to persevere and win.

From living with its soil, farmers know a love of country perhaps richer and deeper than any other group of men. Never in any time of strife and struggle in this country's history has their patriotism been found wanting or their answer to the challenge imposed by the struggle proven inadequate. So, once again with less machinery, with less manpower, with less fertilizer, they gear themselves to meet the challenge of more and more production for our war machine. "Food for freedom" was one of the earliest watchwords of the war, and it met with immediate response.

No one could have foreseen the great result to this Nation in its rural electrification program in 1935 when it was established. All thinking men knew that farmers should, in fact must, adopt the principles of production of the twentieth century if they were to be able to take their place in our economic life. And yet today we still have those who think of the farm and its relation to production in terms of the ox and the cradle. This is doubly unfortunate. Unfortunate for the Nation, which is now calling for the greatest all-out production that this country has ever produced. And unfortunate in the days to come in its insistence that the farmer be something different from his neighbors by depriving him of that essential element of production—electric power—that is basic to a high standard of living in this twentieth century. But I do not believe this to be true. Democracy calls for equality and mutual advantages. I have enlisted in that democratic army, and I pledge my services for the duration in this economic war against special privilege.

It is fortunate, however, that we had the great progress in rural electrification during the past 7 years—without it the Nation's food problem today would be far more critical.

In 1937 an editorial in a big midwestern newspaper expressed the opinion that in the construction of great dams by the Federal Government we were creating millions of kilowatts of power which would never be used by the people. I wonder what the writer of that editorial thinks today when he realizes—if he does—that without these millions of kilowatts of power the great arsenal of democracy would have produced merely an anemic trickle of arms and food, instead of an American productivity that no one has ever had the boldness to imagine.

I wonder if he knows now that without these millions of kilowatts of power—brought at cheap rates to the American farms through the medium of the R. E. A.—it would not have been possible for the American farmers to feed our own Army and Navy, to feed our own families, and to help feed the fighting men and some of the war workers of the United Nations.

I wonder if he understood what President Roosevelt meant when he said a short time ago that "In spite of the handicaps under which American farmers worked last year, the production victory they won was among the major victories of the United Nations in 1943. Free people everywhere can be grateful to the farm families who made that victory possible."

Truly, when the President by Executive order established the Rural Electrification Administration in 1935, he had his eyes on the future of the Nation. On a strictly materialistic basis, he knew that its cost would be returned to the people of the United States many times over in the cheapening of electric power and the distribution of this power to hundreds of small farms and communities. But the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration expressed, in a sense, those principles for which the common men all over the world are fighting today.

The Rural Electrification Administration has meant the widespread availability of electricity in its innumerable forms. The Rural Electrification Administration has meant a higher standard of living. In its 7 years of operation R. E. A. has encouraged, financed, and provided technical help for the electrification of rural America. It has made possible the cheaper production of many items, including milk, butter, eggs, and pork. It has been responsible for developing a higher quality of many farm products. It has reduced drudgery in farm work and in the farm kitchen. It has made life pleasanter for the farm household. It has engendered a powerful community spirit, which, I assure you, in times like these is all important.

You publicly owned suppliers are way below the average cost of the privately owned; 2½ mills on this amount of power means a lot of money. A very significant figure is the average cost for 1942, which has now shaded 1 cent. Inasmuch as in 1936 and as late as 1937, private power companies were crying to the public that any wholesale rate below 2 cents was almost confiscatory, to me this seems real accomplishment on the part of farm cooperatives in their wholesale rate bargaining. I need not tell you, of course, that the thing that has really forced down these rates has been the threat by these cooperatives to build their own generating plants, and then, of course, the public plants built through agencies of the Government.

But there is so much more to be done. Today 60 percent of our farms are without electric power. It is, indeed, tragic that these millions of farmers are deprived of the electric service they need for war food production and for meeting labor shortages.

That is why I would like to add another freedom to those that we are fighting for. Freedom from drudgery. The members of this association, through the aid of its Government, have found a new way of living. A way of living that has, as I said before, immeasurable benefits in times of peace and uncalculated help for the Nation in time of war. During the critical days ahead it seems to me that R. E. A. must pledge that every mile of line, every electric appliance, every kilowatt-hour of energy will be dedicated to our fighting men and women on whatever battlefield they may be. The battle of production on the food front must be won in spite of all the handicaps which the nature of our duties presents to us.

The creation of your National Rural Electric Cooperative Association was indeed timely. It came not only with the normal resurgence of the reactionaries, but coincidentally with a planned and disreputable attack upon you by those interests who voted against your conception, attempted to smother you at birth, and aimed to deprive you of every sustenance in the 7 years of your rangy and healthful youth.

There are those who thought that the war would stifle—yes, and destroy—the forward march of rural electrification. They reckoned not on the organized power of the farmers and the rural electrification cooperatives. They underestimated the strength of a good hearty kick from a healthy, sturdy, modern Georgia mule.

As you all know, the War Production Board has eased its rules against new electrical connections, thus making it possible for short extensions of existing rural distribution lines to be made when the extension is needed to operate specified farm production equipment.

This is indeed bad news for those who would strangle you. And on the other hand, it is certainly a tribute to your association and your leaders. It is, of course, one of the first major victories in which your association has taken part.

I can warn you, however, that the forces of darkness are still at your heels and only the complete solidarity of your membership can assist and protect you now and during those years to come when prosperity may blind some of us to the real purposes of the selfish interests.

Today you are on guard. I say to each and every one of you to pledge to yourselves as sentries in the service of public power and to remain on guard.

Then, when this job is done and peace once again comes to this land of ours, R. E. A. must be found carrying the banner for those farmers now without electricity so that the day will come when twentieth-century America meets the challenge of peace as well as war with twentieth-century farms.

Make no mistake—this war is bigger than any of us, and what have been our concerns for years are swept away in each sea, air, or land action. In every American city and town, the children of all the races of the earth are bound together as one people, driving ahead on all the lines which make up the war effort of a country like ours. It is our duty to serve that people, not only the segment of one particular group but the whole people. These 21 months of war have told a story of democracy and the unity of the most diverse people on the earth as no other event in our history. It is the duty of an association such as yours to serve that unity. Well might each cooperative take as its slogan, "Yes; we must, indeed, all hang together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately."

Before the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress, many editors, and speakers, and a large number of other citizens recently received from the State Department a bulky book entitled "Peace and War 1931–1941." Under leave granted me by the House, I am incorporating herewith in the RECORD an editorial based on this book which recently appeared in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Daily Argus Leader, the largest daily newspaper in five West Central States. It is an editorial which merits careful reading.

Some there are who have referred to this voluminous tome as "the alibi album of the State Department." Certain it is that the large collection of letters, reports, speeches, and documents contained in this volume come in very sorry contrast with the attitudes and actions of the Roosevelt administration as publicly exemplified during the interval covered by the book.

The editorial entitled "Before the War" brings to mind a few of the many inconsistencies which exist between the campaign promises, the public utterances, and the stated policies of President Roosevelt compared with what the State Department now purports to be its "We knew it all the time" position. It would appear that the evidence gathered so painstakingly in "Peace and War" presents a rather clear-cut indictment of the failure of the Roosevelt administration to suit its words and action to what it now claims was its knowledge.

There is little excuse for any administration to fail to utilize the evidence which is its exclusively and to which it alone has access in the files of the State Department. Such evidence to be of any value should be used as the basis for action rather than the material for alibis.

The editorial follows:

BEFORE THE WAR

The self-called omniscient Department of State now says that it knew all the time that we were going to get into a war and it produces voluminous documents from its files to support the contention.

Letters and reports are one thing, however. Action is another.

The administration's case goes back to 1933—the year in which the New Deal assumed power. Since that time, the current report contends, it was deeply conscious of impending war and the strong possibility that the United States would become involved.

It now contends that it could do no more than it did because the people as a whole were noninterventionist in their thinking.

It is true, no doubt, to say that the majority of the American people sought to refrain from intervention in disputes elsewhere. But this does not mean that they were opposed to a strong defense.

And it is on this point that the case now presented by the administration falls flat.

The Republican Party, as a matter of historic record, has been the party of military preparedness. It has urged the development of a strong Army and Navy.

But the faction that withheld action in the years following 1933 was the New Deal administration. It was more concerned about the expenditure of money for the W. P. A. than it was for preparedness. Emphasis, too, should be placed on the fact that the New Dealers were in complete control of Congress for several years following 1933. And the Democratic Party—the President's party—is still in control. At any time it really wanted substantial appropriations for military purposes, it could have obtained them. But it didn't ask for them. In truth, the Congress went beyond the official requests in many particulars to swell the military establishments. And the Republicans were among the leaders in these movements.

Attention also should be directed to the fact that the America First committee included among its most important planks a statement urging the strongest possible military establishment. It wasn't a pacifist organization.

STATE DEPARTMENT ATTEMPTS TO CONFUSE

If one would care to do so, he could compile a voluminous report as well showing the attitude of President Roosevelt in 1940. If he were conscious then that we were about to be involved in a world war, he was guilty of double dealing in countless statements which he made.

Little purpose would be gained now in reviving the President's statements of 1940 if it were not for the fact that his Department of State is trying to confuse the record. As a matter of public understanding, however, the President's remarks should be reiterated.

Among his speeches was the one at Boston on October 30, 1940. That was after the war was underway in Europe and in Asia—after Hitler had invaded surrounding nations and the Japanese had entered China. Roosevelt then said:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Here is another excerpt from the President's speech in Boston in 1940, delivered just a few days before the people were to mark their ballots:

"We know that we are determined to defend our country and with our neighbors to defend this hemisphere. We are strong in our defense. The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war."

If the die were cast then—if he knew as he was speaking that our participation in the war was inevitable—then what justification was there for the statement indicating that he was still trying to keep us out of the war?

What is of the past is of the past. Mistakes have been made. We are now at war and we must deal with its realities. The assumption, however, that the noninterventionists were all wrong and the interventionists were all right isn't justified. Both made errors in their thinking.

It is proper, however, to protest when Roosevelt's Department of State now comes forth with an allegation that it knew everything well in advance, that it was prepared, that it expected war and our involvment. President Roosevelt's own statement indicts either that contention or his own desire to deal fairly with the American people.

Chinese Exclusion Laws

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this means of calling the attention of the House at this time to a petition from more than 800 American citizens residing in the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws.

The petition carries the names of people who hold positions of leadership in virtually all walks of life in these important islands. It comes from residents of all the principal islands, including Oahu, Kauai, Maui, and Hawaii.

The petition carries this statement:

We, the undersigned American citizens, being in the Pacific war zone and having intimate knowledge of the Chinese people through our close association with them, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States of America to legislate the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and other discriminatory laws which, however desirable and necessary they may have been when passed, have no further reason for their existence and which only tend to needlessly hurt our friends and allies who have so long and so valiantly been fighting our common enemy, who is losing no opportunity to use them against us.

We believe that this proposed repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act is of a similar nature and in keeping with the policy of our Government in voluntarily surrendering its treaty rights of extraterritoriality.

The petition is of special significance because it comes from people whose association with the Chinese extends over a long period of time.

There is no section of our country in which the Chinese constitute as relatively large proportion of the population as they do in the Territory of Hawaii. The number of Chinese at present residing in the United States as a whole is 106,000. Of these, 29,000 reside in the Territory of Hawaii. All but about 5,000 of those residing in the Territory of Hawaii are American citizens. Some of them are in the third and fourth generation of their residence in the islands. They hold positions of leadership in all fields of endeavor—religious, professional, commercial, and governmental. They are held in high regard by all elements of the community for the important part they have played in the development of these islands.

Their contribution to the war effort has been a significantly large one. There are many young Americans of Chinese ancestry who are serving in the United States Army and not a few of them who hold commissions. A great many are employed in vital work at Pearl Harbor, the Hawaiian Air Depot, and in other important installations.

In requesting repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts and the treatment of China on a basis of equality with other friendly powers the people who have signed this petition speak from a long experience and close association with the Chinese, and a deep sense of the importance of this measure to the fight against Japanese aggression, and to the establishment in the future of peace in the Pacific.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that not only should Congress enact this bill to help win the war but to help in the reconstruction of China as the strong and independent nation that she must be if we are to preserve the peace of the Pacific following the destruction of Japanese military power.

Milk Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, it has seemed my duty from time to time during the past few months to call to the attention of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration that unless the dairy producers in my district and in Connecticut had some relief from the conditions under which they are trying to produce milk the community would be faced with a milk shortage.

The serious lack of feed, particularly of corn content, the high price of labor and the ceiling price to the consumer were such that the dairymen were producing this essential commodity at a loss.

In consequence over the past few months dairymen, large and small, have been disposing of their herds, some no doubt to be slaughtered.

Specific instances have been called to the attention of these administrative agencies without any relief. Recently the Commodity Credit Corporation granted an unwanted and insufficient subsidy in Connecticut amounting to 50 cents a hundredweight on milk. This is about 1 cent per quart and is insufficient to keep the milk producer going, as I have repeatedly pointed out.

There comes to me in my mail today a letter from one of our small producers with only 160 head telling me that he has already begun to dispose of his herd as he had told me several months ago he would of necessity be required to do. For the RECORD I include herewith a copy of this letter from the Fairlea Farms.

The Fairlea Farms have had a famous herd of Ayrshire cows and the owner, Wilson H. Lee, started this herd some 40 years ago. Both Mr. Lee and the manager, Mr. Demarest, who writes, have told me repeatedly how reluctant they were to reduce this herd but it was necessary to curtail the number of herd in order to reduce their losses. Here is the letter:

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

HON. RANULF COMPTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You may possibly have seen in the New Haven paper the account of the sale of some of the Fairlea stock. I am sending you herewith the register showing the pictures of the sale and a couple of the animals sold. We sold 60 out of 160 head and we are keeping the other 100 to see if conditions improve so that we can go along with them after next spring. If not, we will dispose of the rest. It is not possible to continue to farm on the scale we do and lose money. The price of milk should be at least 2 cents higher so that we can break even. I know that you have done considerable work on this as well as some of our other Representatives and Senators. If the number of disposal sales is any indication of what is happening the shortage of milk is going to grow to proportions not yet propounded by the O. P. A. The pinch is already on and I hate to forecast what will happen but I am sure it is well on the way to being worse.

I just thought this might be a little definite indication from your own district of what is happening.

Cordially yours,

JOHN R. DEMAREST,
Manager, Fairlea Farms.

Relief of Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by Bagley Camp, No. 41, Department of Illinois, United Spanish War Veterans, Chicago, Ill.:

BAGLEY CAMP, NO. 41,
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
August 4, 1943.

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Congressman, Second District, Illinois.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a regular meeting of Bagley Camp No. 41, Department of Illinois, United Spanish War Veterans, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas there is a bill pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress introduced by Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York, known as H. R. 2350, asking benefits in legislation for the relief of the veterans who served in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, during the period April 26, 1898, to July 4, 1902; and

"Whereas upon entering the service it was understood that we were to receive similar treatment accorded the veterans of the Civil War; and

"Whereas the average age of the Spanish War veteran is 69 years and many of our comrades are solely dependent upon their pensions now being received for their support and maintenance; and

"Whereas due to the increase in the cost of living their pensions are wholly inadequate to provide shelter, food, and proper raiment for our comrades; and

"Whereas H. R. 2350 will grant $75 a month to all Spanish War veterans on the rolls at the age of 65 years because of total disability, instead of the $60 now payable. It would grant widows $40 at the age of 65 years instead of the present $30. It would grant $50 if they were the wives of their soldier husbands in service days. It would extend the marriage date to January 1, 1938, in lieu of September 1, 1922, the present delimiting date; and

"Whereas H. R. 2350 is the bill sponsored by our national legislative committee and endorsed by our national encampment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Bagley Camp, No. 41, Department of Illinois, United Spanish War Veterans, go on record as favoring immediate passage of H. R. 2350 in order to relieve our needy and suffering comrades and their dependents."

ARTHUR HUFTON,
Chairman, Past Department Commander of Illinois.
WILLIAM A. FORTUNE,
Commander, Bagley Camp, No. 41, Department of Illinois.
HENRY WINKELMAN,
Adjutant, Bagley Camp No. 41, Department of Illinois.

Unprecedented Potato Harvest in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I am to deliver later in the day on the steps at the east front of the Capitol to a group of potato pickers from Kentucky, who are returning to their homes after a trip to Maine, where they assisted in harvesting the unprecedented crop raised in response to the appeal of the United States Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the approaching season of National Thanksgiving, Maine's citizens are profoundly grateful for an abundant harvest and particularly in our great agricultural crop of white potatoes.

This year Maine potato growers responded to the appeal of the United States Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration with the unprecedented planting of 192,000 acres.

Divine providence cooperated with nature in furnishing most favorable conditions for growth and the yield reached the record total of 370 bushels to an acre.

Four hundred and seventy million bushels of potatoes are coming from the ground to fill the call of Americans everywhere for calories to win the war. Seventy-one million bushels are coming from the great potato empire of Aroostook County in northeastern Maine.

Maine people are grateful to be able to make this contribution to the feeding of the Nation and the world. Our armed forces will take 18 percent of the entire national production of 470,000,000 bushels, or approximately the contribution of the State of Maine.

I feel privileged to express for the people of Maine our profound thanks to the thousands of workers who came into our fields to help us harvest this gigantic crop. The harvest season by virtue of our northern location and frost and freezing conditions limited the harvesting season to about 5 weeks beginning the last of September. War conditions and the lack of home workers made harvesting a seemingly insurmountable problem. Some 35,000 workers were required—including men, women, and children. Maine was obliged to make its appeal for a huge number of out-of-State workers. Over 5,000 people came to Maine to help us dig our Maine potatoes. Some 1,600 farm workers came from the States of Kentucky, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and West Virginia. These workers were recruited by the Agricultural Extension Services in these 4 States and were transported to northern Maine at Government expense by the Office of Labor of the War Food Administration and placed on the farms by the county agents in our State.

In addition large numbers of college and high-school students came in from our neighboring States and great numbers of Boy Scouts helped out.

All this neighborly assistance from all over the eastern United States was finally supplemented by the coming of 800 soldiers from units in the New England area furnished by the United States Army in this crisis at the request of the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, and the War Manpower Commission.

Some 500 workers from the States mentioned, the largest number coming from Kentucky, are now returning to their homes. Today they are enjoying a brief stop-over in Washington. Here the State of Maine joins the State of Kentucky in paying tribute and giving thanks to these workers.

Notable among the workers of this Kentucky group is Mrs. Alice Davis, a 71-year-old widow from Lovely, in Martin County, Ky. This woman truly typifies the spirit of American womanhood in demonstrating her prowess by picking 63 barrels of potatoes in a single day. This was her record. She averaged 55 barrels for every day that she labored to help win the war by a more ample food supply. Mrs. Davis came to Maine with three nephews and three cousins and there found the happy association of service in Maine farm homes. Mrs. Davis herself is a farmer and owns and operates a 10-acre farm in the mountains of Kentucky. She is now going back home to dig her own patch of potatoes and harvest her corn and then to plant her winter crop of vetch and clover which she will have plowed under in the spring as a foundation for another crop. America may well pause to pay tribute to this personification of American womanhood as we renew our faith in the ability of our women to carry on for a total victory and a lasting peace.

The harvesting of this bumper crop produced many problems—notably that of storage. In order to meet this problem Maine producers began to ship run-of-the-field potatoes to the open markets. Federal and State agencies joined in offering road machinery with which to dig earth pits for the purpose of storing potatoes. This is the first time that such a form of storage has been resorted to in Maine. The transportation services of our country have responded to the task of shipping these Maine potatoes all over the United States. Seventy-five thousand cars will be required for this purpose, and from now on most of these cars must be protected from the cold by insulation and heating. This is but another phase of the tremendous problem facing Maine producers and our transportation and marketing facilities in supplying 73,000,000 bushels of potatoes to American consumers.

It is also interesting to note that Maine potatoes will be sent to practically every battle front where American boys are engaged. These potatoes will go forth in dehydrated packs. Our small and bruised potatoes will be used to produce some 95 percent of all the potato starch used in the United States. Potato starch is in great demand owing to the lack of foreign imports.

Realizing that there must be immediate shipments of potatoes to save them from freezing—we have already had a heavy frost in Maine, and Idaho has had a 5-inch fall of snow—Federal agencies are joining in one of the greatest marketing programs in our entire history. Immediate shipment to consumers provides the easiest and most direct method for storage. The Marketing Report Division of the Food Distribution Administration has harnessed up every available agency in the country in this effort.

Every food store is featuring Irish potatoes. Practically every radio station is carrying messages day by day urging immediate purchases to help in the storage of potatoes. The entire food trade of America is being organized to make this early potato purchase program a success. The organizations who have been requested to participate in this movement are the National Retail Grocers Association, the Independent Grocers Alliance, the Supermarket Institute, the National Association of Food Chains, the National American Wholesale Grocers Association, the National Voluntary Groups Institute, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, and the American Meat Institute.

The National Restaurant Association is having its membership feature potatoes as the victory food selection for this season of the year. The Association of Dining Car Superintendents is also participating. Then come the organizations of women, the women who manage the food buying of America. They include the American Legion Auxiliary, the auxiliaries of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., the National Association of Negro Women, and hundreds of powerful federated women's clubs. All are participating in this early purchasing and storage campaign. Also participating in this unprecedented campaign is the American Gas Association, the Council of Electric Operating Companies, the Edison Electric Institute—all have promised and are giving the fullest support of their advertising and contacts with consumers and their own service departments.

The railroads, banks, and other agencies that serve the people and have a great influence over their buying and home-making habits have lent the force of their advertising to this campaign. This is true also of the transit companies, the telephone companies, the electrical-equipment manufacturers, such as the General Electric and Westinghouse. Then comes the drugstores and myriad other agencies—all cooperating in a gigantic effort designed to enter every home in America.

Between the 5th and 18th of October there has been shipped from Aroostook County 5,350 carloads of potatoes. Last year, during the same comparative period, 2,788 cars were shipped to market. In 1941 this early period shipment was 1,565 cars, and in 1940, a nominal potato year, 849 cars. This to my mind is a splendid tribute to the railroads of the Northeast, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to the Office of Defense Transportation, which have bent every energy to provide cars for rushing our banner potato crop to the markets of eastern United States.

Maine expresses thanks to all who have contributed to producing, harvesting, and marketing the largest single crop of potatoes ever produced in a single county and a single State within the borders of our country.

More on Columbus Day, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include a masterful address, delivered by Judge John J. Freschi, of the court of general sessions in the city of New York, on the occasion of the celebration of Columbus Day.

Judge Freschi is one of our outstanding jurists in New York City and is rightfully recognized as able, erudite, and an assiduous student of the law. Indefatigable worker though he is, he, nonetheless, finds time to take a deep interest in subjects divorced from his court work but close to the hearts of the people. His opinion is much valued by his fellow New Yorkers and he is constantly called upon to give the benefit of his advice on many important questions.

His address follows:

The Columbus Day citizens' committee, of which Mr. Generoso Pope is chairman and grand marshal, has given through the splendid cooperation of his honor, the mayor, this year's celebration a character that serves to emphasize the importance of the day, and we have witnessed a magnificent and most interesting parade up Fifth Avenue to Columbus Circle. We are about to hear the talks on this occasion of his excellency, the Governor of New York, and of the mayor, and it is fitting that this vast audience here gathered take to heart their messages. We rejoice with them over the achievements and victories of our armed forces looking to the liberation and welfare of all oppressed peoples and for a day of stable, peaceful, and just governments by the people of every land for the preservation of home, faith, and democracy.

In that spirit and with such a firm determination, we pledge allegiance to our flag and the Republic for which it stands, and with unswerving loyalty and wholehearted support give to our country and to our Commander in Chief, and all the armed forces, every help, aid, and comfort of which we are capable.

The beautiful and patriotic music of our national anthem is a reminder of the lessons of our American history—and is, indeed, always most thrilling.

In accordance with the proclamation of the President of the United States we have gathered at the foot of the well-known landmark in New York, the monument of Christopher Columbus, to celebrate today the four hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the discovery of this continent by the stalwart and intrepid mariner who, with his brave band of sailors, ventured over new paths of the sea to prove to the world of that day in 1492 that the world was round and that there was a new avenue by which to reach Asia. The discovery of America has an even greater significance in these times than ever before. It

made possible, not alone the opening up of a new world, but it also made possible the establishment of a new country for us—a country which has so grown in population, strength, and wealth that in these times it serves, as President Roosevelt has stated, as the arsenal of democracy of the world.

Well might we wonder what Columbus would do or say were he among us at this critical period of our existence. Surely, the spirit of that great man would lead us to enlarge our determination to preserve by all means the freedoms we enjoy for ourselves and for posterity, and to help other peoples of the world acquire similar freedoms in a dawn of new liberties. He would preach, no doubt, the object lessons of sacrifice and their value, urging us to dare and risk our all, our personal resources, among other things, for an even better world in which to live as neighbors and friends. He would enlist us in the cause for democracy's sake and for the happiness of mankind. He would lead the way against the foes of an enduring government of, by, and for the people. He would uphold human rights and the dignity of man. He would guide his own countrymen to follow the Allies in their course to uplift the downtrodden of the earth and for those freedoms which have been promulgated in the Atlantic Charter—a modern bill of rights for all humanity to enjoy if they so will. If he were alive today, surely he would subscribe to those principles and sentiments which we embrace and take to our hearts, and would oppose those who would subjugate peoples against their will and destroy the traditions of the past. He would have this a free world, under law and with justice, wherein man is sovereign and human rights are the jewels of life.

Our people and their allies are fighting to preserve and vindicate those rights now in this war. The "expression of the American mind" is symbolized in the valor and heroic deeds of our men and women, of all races and creeds, living and dead, and the creed of our Americanism is the maintenance of the charter of freedom and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all alike.

Those of other countries who receive us as friends will reap with us the harvest of our liberties.

For the public good, the people of Italy, as others should do, have thrown off their government which betrayed them, and they are joining of our efforts "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, pledging to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." Those immortal words express the American mind and the minds of the men and women of the United Nations better than any other. Like them, we appeal to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, and in the language of the Declaration of Independence, we hold those who are opposed to us "enemies in war, in peace friends."

China, Democracy's Hope in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Asiatic menace or the "yellow peril" is a subject of great importance to the people of the Pacific coast. This problem of Asiatic immigration originated on the Pacific coast. The great transcontinental railways imported the bulk of the original Chinese in order to obtain cheap labor and when those railways were completed, they heartlessly discharged these laborers to starve. But these Chinese were tenacious of life and they dug the ditches, washed the dishes, washed the clothes of the miners and performed the other menial tasks which the white man refused to do. When periods of unemployment swept over our Nation, the old, old appeal to racial hate and prejudice was used and popular opinion made the "heathen Chinee" the scapegoat.

Their rights as human beings were denied. They were accused of crimes and petty misdemeanors without justification and, in thousands of instances, were wantonly murdered in cold blood. Their murderers were never tried or punished by the meager courts of those days. The Chinese Exclusion Acts were conceived during that period and became the law of the land.

We on the Pacific coast stand in the path of a potential invasion from the Asiatic Continent, and we realize how necessary it is that we break down the present attempt of the militaristic Japanese leaders to unite the more than 1,000,000,000 members of the yellow race in a holy war against the white race.

The Members of this House, just yesterday morning, were privileged to hear our great Chief of Staff, General Marshall, and the head of the Army Intelligence, General Strong, testify as to the military problem in the Pacific and the importance of China's continuous war against Japan. We realize that land bases near enough to bomb the heart of the Japanese war machine will be necessary before this Axis power can be destroyed. If China capitulates, where will these bases be found? A cooperative, anti-Fascist China is the logical place for our military and aviation bases, and their great Christian leader, Chiang Kai-shek, has promised them to us.

How can we prevent the union of over a billion Asiatics with its potential danger to the white races both now and in the centuries to come? The obvious answer to that lies in the future political form of China. The destiny of the white race may depend on our treatment of China, on our recognition of her dignity as a nation, on our wholehearted support of her present struggle toward democracy. The history of our treatment of China and its nationals is not one of which we can be proud. In this hour of our Nation's peril in the Far East we need desperately the continued cooperation of a fighting China. We can, if we rise to the challenge of history, cement the good will of a China which stands on the threshold of democracy. We can clear the record of our past mistakes and break the back of the "yellow peril" for centuries to come. We can do the thing which is morally and spiritually right. The nation that becomes too proud to admit its mistakes and rectify its wrongs consigns itself to oblivion.

The passage of H. R. 3070 is a gesture of recognition to China which she has well earned by her 6 years of opposition to the Japanese armies. China, alone and unaided, fought Japan for over 4 years while we turned aside our faces from her tortured cries of anguish. It is estimated that approximately 18,000,000 of her people perished during that time by the scourge of war, famine, and pestilence.

The passage of H. R. 3070 will not let down the bars to unrestricted Asiatic immigration. If it did, I would oppose it. It specifically and definitely limits the entry of those of the Chinese race to 105 per year. It further requires compliance with all the regulations of our voluminous immigration safeguards.

The number of Chinese which may enter under this quota cannot affect the economic status of 130,000,000 people in our country, but it will be a great psychological force in the minds of the leaders and people of China. Not only will it be of great value in wartime, but in the post-war era it will assure us of their good will. With the awakening and development of the 400,000,000 people of China into a modern democratic society, who can measure the value of their friendship in the field of world trade, in establishing a stable world economic level, and in the maintenance of world peace?

Preservation of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include therein a splendid address made by the Honorable Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, before the twenty-fifth anniversary luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association held in New York City. I consider this address one of the most powerful and constructive I have ever read. This address should be read and analyzed by every person:

I am particularly glad that these first words which I am to speak as a private citizen, after more than 10½ years, are to be spoken at this twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the Foreign Policy Association.

No one can recognize any more fully than I the outstanding worth and significance of the work which has been accomplished during the past quarter of a century by the association. Together with similar or allied organizations in other parts of our country, the Foreign Policy Association has consistently and effectively enlightened and informed public opinion in the United States with regard to the basic issues in our foreign relations, and has made it easier for all of us to see clearly how directly the individual interests of every citizen are affected by the foreign policy which his Government pursues. It has done much to foster constructive study of international affairs in thousands of homes.

I can think of no more valuable public service which any private body could perform. I trust that the Foreign Policy Association will celebrate many more similar anniversaries, with continued success, and

with ever-increasing response on the part of our fellow citizens.

There was never a period in the history of this country of ours when it was more essential that the people of the United States understand fully all of the implications in the problems in foreign relations with which their Government is confronted. Unless they obtain that understanding, unless they are enabled to see at least the pattern of what their Government proposes, how can they intelligently determine for themselves what this country should strive in its own interest to see achieved after the war is won—how can they decide what responsibilities this country should assume, likewise in its own interest, in the years that lie ahead after the victory of the United Nations?

URGES ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP

It seems to me that now more than ever it is the obligation of our Government, both in the executive and legislative branches, not only to give the people light, but also boldly to assume leadership by urging the adoption of that policy which in its considered judgment will most fully respond to the need of our Nation for security, social progress, and prosperity in the post-war years, in order that our citizens may study and pass upon it.

I for one cannot subscribe to the philosophy which some maintain that a policy cannot be initiated after the people themselves have brought pressure to bear for its adoption. That philosophy would seem to be the very negation of the best constitutional tradition in our representative form of government.

None of us can ignore the fact that in the midst of this most widespread and cruel of all wars our Government cannot safely divulge the details of confidential negotiations with its military allies, nor jeopardize the successful conclusion of our campaigns by publicly raising controversial issues with our associates among the United Nations which involve no immediate question of basic principle. But surely the time has come when in the interest of the people of the United States themselves they should within these necessary limits be told what our major objectives are, and what it is proposed this country must undertake to do in order to prevent a recurrence of this consuming conflagration through which we are now winning our way.

For we cannot overlook the fact that each step in the field of foreign policy which we take today will determine our Nation's course in the months and in the years to come.

HAILS SUCCESSES IN WAR

In none of the foreign wars in which we have been engaged since we won our independence have the determination of military strategy and the direction of our armed forces been so brilliantly successful as has been the case in the present struggle under our Commander in Chief and the great military, naval, and aviation leaders to whom he has entrusted authority. Our records in the production of matériel for ourselves and for our allies has been truly miraculous. As a result of this magnificent accomplishment attained under the leadership of the President, although we are now entering the gravest stage of this contest, and although the struggle may yet be far longer and far more bitter than many of us believe, we can look forward with conviction and with confidence to the day of ultimate victory.

Are we as yet prepared for that day? What would the policy of this Nation be if the unconditional surrender of Germany or of Japan came to pass sooner than we have believed possible? In such event could we—as we have so often done in the past—afford to trust to instinct or intuition, or dare to improvise? Should not the people of this country be afforded the opportunity before that moment of determining the road they will follow when the day of victory comes?

In the reaching of this determination we possess one great asset. In more than a hundred years of our national history there has been no President so superbly fitted to undertake his constitutional responsibilities of conducting our foreign relations as Franklin Roosevelt. Through his profound knowledge of American and of world history, through his long experience in and consummate understanding of international affairs, through his grasp of where the true and the ultimate interests of the United States lie, and through his love for his fellow man, no American could be more fully qualified than he to shape this country's foreign policy in these days when our national destiny must be determined. The people of this country look to him once more for that inspired leadership of which he is so supremely capable and of which he has given such convincing evidence on so many occasions in the past.

Many thousands of us are asking ourselves what our objectives should be. What—to use the Palmerstonian phrase—are the "eternal and perpetual interests" of the United States which must be secured in the new epoch which we are approaching? What may be the surest way of safeguarding those interests?

May I, solely as one American citizen, who is not entitled in any way to speak for our Government, outline to you what I myself believe to be at least a partial answer to those questions?

I believe that it will be the consensus of opinion that the irreducible minimum of what should be obtained by the United States as the outcome of the victory in which it will share must be the practical certainty that in the world of the future the United States will be secure—safe from the threat of successful attack by any power, or by any combination of powers; fully assured that its own free institutions will suffer no jeopardy from foreign sources; and enabled, by reason of peace, prosperity, and political and social stability in the rest of the world, to develop its own national resources and its trade in such a manner as to make possible that advance in social conditions and that rise in living standards which the vast majority of our people seek. For we have, I believe, at long last, learned the lesson that we cannot grow richer if the rest of the world becomes poorer; and that the surest guaranty of our prosperity is the prosperity of others.

From the standpoint of our political, economic, and strategic vital interests it is likewise indispensable that if we are to achieve our own security every nation of the Western Hemisphere must also obtain the same ample measure of assurance as ourselves in the world of the future.

Those, it would seem, are the "eternal and perpetual interests" of the United States.

URGES OUR PARTICIPATION

It seems to me clear that these interests can never be safeguarded unless the United States participate with the other nations of the earth in creating that kind of free world organized under law, and made safe by armed might when necessary against lawbreakers, which men and women have envisioned for centuries past, and which they have so far fruitlessly sought to attain.

What are the alternatives? There can be but two, granted the state in which the world will find itself when the present hostilities are over. Either widespread, sporadic, and interminable chaos and anarchy, or a precarious and temporary system of balance of power, with resultant armament expansion, and a policy of rank imperialism on the part of all the major powers, including the United States, which will pave the way as surely as night follows day, for new and still more devastating wars.

What steps, then, can the United States now take to impel the establishment of that kind of world order which alone can guarantee the security we seek?

Under existing conditions the very concept of such an order implies the agreement of the major military powers among the United Nations that in their own interest such an order must be created. Unless the British, Soviet, Chinese, and United States Governments arrive jointly at a clear-cut and specific agreement in the near future upon certain basic principles, the hope of the creation of a stable world in the post-war years must necessarily be all but illusory. No stability, no opportunity for effective social and economic reconstruction can be forecast unless the great armed powers can now agree that they will wholeheartedly cooperate in the spirit and within the framework of the Atlantic Charter after the Axis Nations have been forced to defeat.

CARDINAL POINTS LISTED

Such an agreement between these four powers as that proposed must surely include such cardinal points as the following:

That they will jointly undertake the task of keeping the peace of the world in the post-war period, in accord with and in conjunction with such other members of the United Nations as are qualified to take part in such endeavor, notably certain of our neighbors of the New World and what we all hope will be the Fourth French Republic; and that they will presently define the nature and method of provision of the armed contribution which each under its own authority will make available for this common undertaking.

That they will now agree upon the machinery to be set up by common consent which will in the years after the close of the present war provide for progressive reduction of armaments as between themselves, and as among other nations.

That they will agree upon a common policy of realistic justice to be pursued by them toward Germany and the other conquered Axis Powers so as to render these nations permanently incapable of renewing their assault upon civilization and the liberties of independent peoples.

That they will jointly agree not to take independent action which affects the sovereign rights of any other nation save with the concurrence of the other three powers.

That they will jointly pledge themselves to further and to perfect, as rapidly as post-war conditions may make possible, the establishment of a universal world organization in which, when it is ultimately established, the proposed agreement between them would be merged.

It would be ingenuous to underestimate the material and practical difficulties involved in finding the way toward an agreement upon these fundamental requirements. The very fact that the Soviet Union is not at war with the common enemy of Great Britain, China, and the United States in the Far East presents formidable political and military problems.

POWERS WITHIN THEIR RIGHTS

Each one of the four powers is rightly concerned with regard to its individual security and is entitled to present its contentions and its demands to the friendly and understanding scrutiny of its associates. But the truth remains that over and above all individual requirements for security to be derived from territorial rectifications towers the security to be obtained by each one of them through common agreement upon the points above set forth.

And we must clearly realize that the longer the effort to find such an agreement is postponed the more difficult the task will become.

We enjoy today a closer and more comprehending relationship with the peoples and governments comprising the British Commonwealth of Nations than we have ever previously possessed. Our traditional friendship with China has been enhanced.

What we must imperatively strive to secure is that same full measure of understanding with the Russian people and their

Government. I know of no point where the long-range interests of the Soviet Union are antagonistic to our own. I am firmly convinced that the understanding for which I hope, will greatly inure to the advantage of both our peoples. Certain measures of far-reaching significance recently enacted by the Soviet Government have done much to facilitate mutual comprehension. Reciprocal recriminations and the engendering of popular suspicions can only be beneficial to our common enemies. Both peoples can in their own interest best afford to emphasize the many points of accord between them and minimize such differences as may appear still to exist.

In that spirit I am confident that an agreement can be found.

Nor am I concerned, insofar as the best interests of the United States are involved, by the fact that such an agreement constitutes a temporary alliance. For it would be an alliance destined, by insuring the maintenance of peace in the world in the immediate post-war period, to expedite the creation of a stable world order, founded upon justice and freedom, which would safeguard the permanent interests of the American people; not an alliance to insure our participation in world hegemony, nor an alliance to maintain a balance of power.

Should it be possible to secure an agreement of this character it would constitute the very solid foundation upon which there should immediately be constructed the first rudimentary structure in what later would be the expanded and perfected edifice of the ultimate international organization.

Were a four-power agreement of the kind proposed to be all that this country envisaged, even if the powers participating in such an agreement operated by general delegation from the other members of the United Nations, such an accord would necessarily tend to stimulate the assumption by the four powers of the rights and prerogatives of world dictators. It would constitute the very negation of international democracy. It would be suspect in the minds of all of the lesser powers as an instrument in derogation of their own sovereignty.

We, and the other major powers likewise, require the indispensable support and confidence of all of the peoples of the United Nations, and of many of the remaining neutral states as well, if we can hope to expedite the reconstruction of this torn and shattered world and to hasten the day when there may exist a stable international order.

For these reasons I believe the second step which should be taken by the United States as soon as the proposed four-power agreement is reached is to urge the formation of an executive council composed of representatives of the United Nations, which should remain in permanent session, with power to resolve such political or other questions as may be referred to it by the United Nations, and which do not impinge upon the military conduct of the war, involve the right of the powers which are doing the actual fighting to determine freely the military strategy to be pursued, nor impair the provisions of the suggested four-power agreement.

To be effective this suggested United Nations executive body should be small in number. I would suggest that it be composed, in addition to delegates of the four major military powers, of representatives elected by the states of each region, and existing associations of states, in a proportion and by a method to be determined by the United Nations.

This executive council, which would eventually become the executive branch of any perfected international organization, should be granted supervisory jurisdiction over all desirable international agencies—such as the International Labor Office or the Food and Agriculture Committee—which may already have been created, and should be also charged with the duty of organizing such further standing agencies as the United Nations may from time to time deem necessary or desirable, and for formulating recommendations for submission to each one of the United Nations covering such fundamental requirements as a world court and other necessary permanent international bodies.

I am a convinced believer in the efficacy and in the need for the permanent continuance of the existing inter-American regional system which has been brought into being by the free will of the 21 sovereign American republics.

In their consideration of the kind of future world organization which will be best calculated to meet the high objectives which the great majority of us are seeking, governments and peoples might well study the desirability of instituting regional systems, conforming in their general pattern to the system evolved by the New World, but all of them coordinated under an executive body of the nature which has been above proposed, representative of every region. In such an organization each region would be primarily responsible for regional peace, and only in the event that a regional conflagration threatened the general peace would wider action become necessary.

Many months ago I expressed the belief that upon the cessation of hostilities we must contemplate the need for a transition period during which many readjustments of many kinds would have to be undertaken before any attempt could properly be made to set up any permanent world organization. That is more than ever my belief. One can draw an infinite number of invaluable conclusions from the experience which was had in 1919 when the unsuccessful attempt was made to obtain rigid compliance by all nations with the detailed and perfected covenant of the League of Nations. Would it not be a wiser and more practical approach, in the new effort which I hope and which I believe will be undertaken to secure a workable international organization, to start with the necessary basic agreements and mechanisms, and then, during the transition period, agree upon the perfecting elaboration of those agreements and mechanisms as changing conditions and experience may show it to be expedient or necessary? Surely, at the commencement of this transition period all peoples must agree that manifold questions should advantageously be postponed for later adjustment and accommodation, when the passions of war have cooled, and a greater wisdom in their determination can be achieved through a longer perspective.

I can see no advantage to be gained at this moment by any general and theoretical discussion of the advantages or disadvantages obtaining to the United States by the limitations upon its sovereignty which it might undergo were it to participate in an international organization. Such a discussion, it seems to me, can only benefit those who are opposed to our taking part in any form of international cooperation and who desire, by confusing the real issues, to engender public doubt and prejudice. Until we have determined exactly what form of world organization we believe should in our own interest be instituted, how can we tell what, if any, limitations such an organization might impose upon our sovereignty? As has so often and truly been said, any treaty to which this country is a party necessarily limits our sovereignty. I can conceive of no manner by which this Nation can participate in an international organization save through its adherence to an international agreement, or series of agreements, which would necessarily be subject to the approval of the legislative branch of our Government as provided by our Constitution. Would it not be wiser before entering into any impassioned debate upon the abstract question of sovereignty to wait and see what each proposed agreement involved, and then weigh the advantages to be derived by us from such instruments against any attendant limitation upon our national freedom of action?

I most earnestly hope that when the time comes for these decisions to be made the voice of the American people will be raised in the demand that in any new world organization that may be created, two great moral principles be for all time established by it.

The first of these is what should be the inalienable right of all peoples to enjoy the freedoms of religion, of speech, and of information. No greater bulwark for peace in the future can be built than through universal recognition of these freedoms as human rights. Every nation which becomes a member of the international organization to be set up should be obligated, as a condition of its adherence, to show that its citizens are guaranteed these rights by its national constitution.

And the second great principle likewise involves the question of human freedom. More than a hundred years ago the moral force of public opinion in Great Britain compelled the British Government to abolish slavery within the territories of the Empire and a great British Prime Minister led a valiant and successful fight for the abolition of the international slave trade. Eighty years ago the American people proved the eternal truth that this Nation could not survive half slave and half free.

Can the peaceful, the stable, and the free world for which we hope be created if it is envisioned from the outset as half slave and half free? If hundreds of millions of human beings are told that they are destined to remain indefinitely under alien subjection? New and powerful nationalistic forces are breaking into life throughout the earth, and in particular in the vast regions of Africa, of the Near East, and of the Far East. Must not these forces, unless they are to be permitted to start new and devastating inundations, be canalized through the channels of liberty into the great stream of constructive and cooperative human endeavor?

We all of us recognize that it will take many generations for some backward peoples to be prepared for autonomy and self-government. But I am persuaded that any international organization should establish the basic principle that no nation has the inherent and unlimited right to govern subject peoples; that all nations which possess jurisdiction over other peoples must recognize in effective fashion that such control is to be exercised primarily for the purpose of preparing these alien races to undertake the responsibilities of self-government as soon as they are capable thereof, and that until they are fitted for autonomy the administering power, as a trustee, must hold itself responsible for its administration to world public opinion as represented in the international organization.

LIBERTIES TO APPLY TO ALL

The right of all peoples to their liberty must be confirmed as the moral force of public opinion long since established the right of man to his individual freedom. I do not believe in the doctrine of a superior race. The enjoyment by peoples of the right of self-determination is not limited by divine warrant, nor for that matter by the Atlantic Charter, to the white race. Peoples capable of autonomous government should be possessed of that right whether they be yellow or brown, black or white.

We have heard it said in recent months that we should presently refrain from declaring what our desires and aspirations are in the field of post-war settlements, and that we should rather wait before formulating our own policies in that regard until we have been told what other powers seek.

And I sometimes ask myself, What is this country of ours? Are we a puny or a senile nation? Are we so impotent, and have we

played so inferior a part in the present struggle that we must still our own voice until we are told what other powers seek? I believe in national modesty. I do not believe in a national inferiority complex.

We are a young and vigorous people. In armed might and in material resources we are second to no power of the globe. We are the greatest democracy in the world today. We covet no inch of territory, and we possess no imperialistic ambitions. We have entered this war to preserve our own liberties, and to join with our allies in utterly destroying the most villainous tyrannies which modern man has seen, and which, had they triumphed, would have made life intolerable for us all.

By the blood which our fellow Americans are shedding for our country; by the treasure which we have expended for our own war effort and for that of our valiant allies; by our own moral and material force in the world of today, I submit that we possess not only the right but the duty to declare to the United Nations and to the world at large what we believe should be the foundations upon which the world of the future should be constructed, and what we are prepared to contribute to that end, so that this country of ours shall not again be plunged into war. Thus—and only thus—can we hope to obtain compensation for those bitter sacrifices which we will have made when the last gun has been fired.

Carlyle once said, "It is singular how long the rotten will hold together provided you do not handle it roughly * * * so loath are men to quit their old ways; and conquering indolence and inertia, venture on new."

We have lived and we are living in a rotten world. We now are paying the penalty for the lack of courage and of intelligence of which we and all other nations have been guilty. Only by handling the old structure roughly—only by conquering our inertia—only by daring to venture on new ways—can we hope to see a better day.

The United States must vigorously assert its willingness to assume leadership. We have every moral and material advantage on our side. We have as our leader the man who because of his brave vision and his wisdom is rightly regarded throughout the world as the paladin of the forces of liberal democracy. If we avail ourselves—in time—of the opportunity which fate has granted us, an American can truly say in the years to come:

"Not only have we by our efforts saved ourselves, but we have with God's help guided the feet of suffering mankind into the paths of peace."

The War Labor Disputes Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the War Labor Disputes Act delivered by Raymond S. Smethurst, counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, before the American Management Association, New York:

For 3 months an organized campaign has been in full swing to discredit and repeal the War Labor Disputes Act of June 1943. In its first stages the campaign was an open political attack by a united front of the major labor organizations against Members of Congress who supported it. There are no indications yet that this phase of the campaign is meeting with any great success. More recently, however, this has been implemented by a more subtle attack, an attempt to obtain management support for repeal by emphasis on misuse of the law by certain labor groups to the detriment of employers.

This argument is supported by the attractive plea that management cannot look to the law for a solution to its labor difficulties; that these difficulties can only be settled privately with the leaders of organized labor. While there is very little evidence that management is being misled by this second phase of the campaign, it behooves us to become better informed on the substance and purpose of the War Labor Disputes Act in order to distinguish between defects in the law and shortcomings in its administration, and, above all, in order to keep before us the real nature of those abuses which are cited now as justification for its repeal.

Before reviewing the law and its administration, may I recall two conditions effective at the time the law was passed. First, employers generally were not enthusiastic about the War Labor Disputes Act. On what theory of justice should management be dispossessed or property seized or operated by Government because of irresponsible labor strikes in time of war? The onus of guilt is not removed merely because occupation is temporary. Even more important, Government seizure in itself provides no deterrent to strikes, so long as management, not labor, is punished.

Nor were employers enthusiastic in their support of new legislative powers for the War Labor Board, an agency largely dominated by four public members whose ideas of labor relations have so far received very little popular acceptance. Whether policies of the W. L. B. indicate bias toward the interest of labor leaders, or whether large numbers of employers merely think so, is immaterial to establish the fact that the vast number of employers lacked confidence in the W. L. B. and, therefore, did not embrace a law which added to its powers.

Second, the War Labor Disputes Act was almost exclusively the product of the Congress and was enacted without any constructive help from executive and administrative agencies of the Government. It was even enacted over the veto of the Chief Executive.

The attitude of these administrative agencies was disclosed in the famous "round robin" letter addressed to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee on May 15 by the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the N. L. R. B., the public members of the War Labor Board, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Secretaries of War and Navy Departments, and the Chairman of the War Production Board.

What suggestions did these agencies of government offer to a Congress faced with a public demand to deal quickly with the coal strike, then in its first critical stages? These agencies responsible for war production were "unanimous in their judgment that some sections of the bill * * * would tend to interfere with production by stimulating industrial unrest." The agencies of the Government concerned with "maintenance of orderly industrial relations" concurred in that view and believed that the bill "would impair the effectiveness of the existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes." While recognizing "the gravity of the coal mining situation," the letter refrained from suggesting "what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation."

Although the legislation was reported from the committee on May 15, action was delayed and, at the request of these agencies, further public hearings were held on June 1 and 2 to permit them to submit their views. While the committee pried a reluctant approval to particular sections of the bill, the net effect of the complete testimony was that the Government preferred to rely on the voluntary no-strike pledges to meet the critical situation then confronting it.

I ask you to recall this background, not only because it throws light on administrative developments since enactment of the law, but also because it may help an appraisal of industry's real interest in this statute.

For the purpose of this discussion, the War Labor Disputes Act can be divided into three major parts: (1) Provision for Government operation of plants in which war production is obstructed by strikes; (2) requirement of a strike notice, 30-day waiting period and strike vote; and (3) conversion of the War Labor Board into a statutory agency.

PLANT SEIZURE

For 2 years before enactment of the Smith-Connally Act the Government asserted the power to take private property by force to compel management to accept decisions of the executive branch of the Government. Even before our entry into war, it was alleged that adequate authority existed in the war powers of the Chief Executive. The threat of plant seizure even then was held as a constant dagger over management to force many unreasonable and unfair concessions.

Section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act gives definiteness to this doubtful and ambiguous power. It authorizes plant seizure in labor disputes only when "there is an interruption of the operation of such plant * * * as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance" and only when the President finds that the war effort "will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption."

This section also provides that any plant so taken or operated "shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable but in no event more than 60 days after the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking of possession."

I would be the first to concede that plant seizure is at best an unfair, unsound, and superficial expedient in preventing strikes or securing compliance with governmental labor policies. If such an expedient is to be used, and we must agree that it has, then, as a lawyer I would much prefer to see that authority established, defined, and limited by law and not left to the whim or discretion of the executive branch of government. Management, in turn, should not overlook the probability that return of the coal mines to private control would have been greatly delayed without the so-called 60-day provision of the Smith-Connally Act. The protection afforded by this clause is not perfect, but management should think twice before giving it up by joining any movement to repeal this law. Repeal of this law would not bring an end to plant seizure.

There is another aspect of this problem which should receive your attention. Prior to enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act plants could be taken over and operated even though management was in no way at fault. Since no penalties were imposed on labor for striking or provoking plant seizure, radical or irresponsible leaders or groups were encouraged to threaten strikes to precipitate Government seizure or operation. The War Labor Disputes Act did introduce a deterrent to these agitators by seriously restricting their conduct if and when the Government should take over the plant. These restrictions appear in section 6 of the act, and while union spokesmen condemn the law for other reasons it is no secret that their major attack stems from these prohibitions.

Critics of the law will probably agree that in theory this section should serve as a real deterrent to strikes intended to provoke plant seizure, but they question whether it will be enforced. This point cannot be minimized. It presents the question of fair and effective administration, and I will return to this problem later.

STRIKE NOTICE—STRIKE VOTES

One of the most controversial sections of the law is that requiring written notice of an intended strike, to be followed by a 30-day waiting period and a secret strike vote among employees. The law does not prohibit a strike after the ballot is taken, no matter how many or how few employees support it. However, a right of action for damages is created if any strike is called without complying with these procedures.

While the waiting period and strike vote is no guarantee against strikes, there is nothing inherent in this scheme so revolutionary as to explain the consistent and bitter agitation against it.

Labor spokesmen complain that it legalizes strikes and weakens their no-strike pledges. This argument erroneously assumes that strikes were illegal before enactment of the law. Equally specious is the contention that the law weakens labor's no-strike pledges. Government agencies, and organized labor as well, have constantly emphasized that the voluntary no-strike pledges had been remarkably successful in keeping wartime strikes to an unusually low level, and that violations occurred in a relatively few instances where impetuous leaders or minority groups precipitated unauthorized strikes before the influence or pressure of national leaders could be brought to bear. We are constantly reminded that these national leaders cooperated completely in breaking these unauthorized or "quickie" strikes.

It is obvious that Congress wrote this section of the law giving full faith and credit to these explanations voiced by labor and Government. The waiting period was prescribed so that the War Labor Board, which enforces the no-strike pledge, would have notice of any intended strike in time to bring this influence of national and international officers to bear on those responsible for the strike notice. It was to implement—not supersede—the no-strike pledge. Otherwise, it is safe to assume that Congress would have prohibited strikes, at least when not supported by a majority of the employees participating in the strike vote. When considered in connection with these sections of the law strengthening the War Labor Board, it is obvious that Congress intended the waiting period and strike vote to fit in and harmonize with the system which labor and Government had assured Congress was working close to perfection. Of course, if the no-strike pledge is now inadequate, or if organized labor and the War Labor Board together are unable to cope with these strikes, that would suggest a strengthening of the law, not its repeal.

Other arguments, allegedly based on experience with the law, are now advanced for its repeal. It is said that the law is being misused by labor and reference is constantly made to the recent case involving the Allis-Chalmers Company and similar instances where strike votes are used to upset established bargaining relationships or to exert pressure on employers or the Government to make special concessions.

These are difficult and troublesome cases, but they are the result of causes far more basic than any technical defect in the War Labor Disputes Act. This is evident from the Allis-Chalmers case, a typical instance in which the strike vote has been misused to the detriment of war production.

In that case the company had entered into a valid agreement with a local affiliate of the C. I. O. following certification of the C. I. O. by the National Labor Relations Board. A year later, when this contract was renewed, a rival union affiliated with the United Mine Workers also claimed a majority of the employees, but its petition to the National Labor Relations Board for an election was rejected. District 50 thereupon served notice of an intended strike, the strike vote was held, and a majority of the employees voted in favor of striking. The result of this vote clearly indicated that District 50 did represent a majority of the employees. The company, already a party to a valid contract with the C. I. O., was precluded by law from recognizing or bargaining with District 50 even though it did muster a majority in the strike vote. The company then was faced with a strike which could only result in plant seizure. The case is now before the War Labor Board.

The War Labor Disputes Act has been blamed for this confused and unfair result. Perhaps it would be more realistic to suggest that some extremists in labor are reviving these tactics to discredit the law. However, let's analyze the facts and the law affecting these cases.

The War Labor Disputes Act requires "the representative" of the employees of a war contractor to give notice of an intended strike and the conduct of the strike vote follows from that notice. In the Allis-Chalmers case, the C. I. O. was the certified bargaining representative and was the party to a collective agreement. Since District 50 was not the certified representative of employees, why was the strike vote held? While this case was pending the Attorney General gave an opinion holding that the term "the representative" of employees meant "any" employee representatives, whether certified or not, and that a representative of minorities, even though barred from exercising bargaining rights, was nevertheless "the representative" of employees for purposes of the strike vote.

With the doctrine of exclusive bargaining or majority rule established in the National Labor Relations Act, it is difficult to understand how the phrase "the representative" could be interpreted to cover a union which was seeking to replace a bona fide bargaining representative. However, in support of his construction of the law, the Attorney General commented:

"The legislative history shows that the Secretary of Labor, the Acting Secretary of War, and the Acting Secretary of the Navy pointed out the possible disturbing effects of taking strike ballots in plants where labor relations had been stabilized by collective bargaining agreements and by the no-strike pledge. The President in his veto message on the bill gave a similar warning. Notwithstanding these warnings the Congress enacted the legislation, and in so doing expressed the congressional policy that the taking of secret ballots would tend to retard strikes and to prevent serious interruptions of war production."

By this opinion, the War Labor Disputes Act has become a new weapon of rival unions to upset established contracts.

These tactics are not new. Strikes and boycotts have long been used to upset established agreements or to force recognition or other concessions without use of the orderly procedures provided by law for the adjustment of such disputes. Congress recently made a superficial effort to attach some measure of stability to labor agreements by restricting use of N. L. R. B. appropriations to prosecute complaints affecting the validity of established contracts. That policy, of course, is made ineffective by misuse of the War Labor Disputes Act, but a mere restriction on the use of funds does not go to basic causes.

The real difficulty arises from a basic defect in the Wagner Act itself. While that law protects individuals against employer coercion, it gives no protection to individuals or minorities against discrimination or oppression by a majority, thereby stimulating discontent and the organizing efforts of rival unions. In addition, it results in inadequate protection to employers or to certified bargaining representatives who have established satisfactory relationships by valid agreements. Either the principle of majority rule must be abandoned for some form of proportional representation, or rival unions must be prevented from interfering by force or coercion with a duly certified representative. If the War Labor Disputes Act is to be criticized, it should be not because it created this problem, but only because it did not undertake to resolve it.

THE WAR LABOR BOARD

In your sessions yesterday, I hope you were duly impressed with the important role this agency (W. L. B.) is performing in molding your labor policies for the future. My purpose here is to discuss only those major policies or practices of the Board which relate to the War Labor Disputes Act. (Incidentally, this law probably saved the life of the Board during those recent months when it entered a stormy period reminiscent of those days of the captive coal dispute preceding the demise of the old Defense Mediation Board. Many of you will think that a sufficient reason in itself to seek repeal of the act. I respect and to some extent share your feelings, but I am not optimistic enough to believe some other unknown agency might not have replaced the W. L. B. if John Lewis had been permitted to knock his second board out of the park.)

There are two very important activities of the War Labor Board directly related to the War Labor Disputes Act:

1. The Board's assertion of power to act as final maker and interpreter of the law, and

2. The Board's recent program to obtain enforcement of its decisions.

Each of these must be approached with full realization that we are still at war, and that during war "rights" must to some extent be sacrificed in the interest of an early victory. It is equally important, however, that we do not exaggerate or become hysterical in demanding unnecessary sacrifices, particularly when they may destroy the very liberties we fight to preserve.

LIMITATIONS ON BOARD'S AUTHORITY

The War Labor Disputes Act directs the War Labor Board to conform to the National Labor Relations Act, the wage and salary stabilization law, and to "all applicable provisions of the law." In a recent decision, the Board (with the industry members dissenting) has given birth to a doctrine of Federal power which can only be justified as an outburst of hysteria.

The case before the Board (Greenbaum Tanning Co.) involved an alleged conflict between the Board's maintenance of membership clause and a provision of the Wisconsin labor law. This same issue, of course, has arisen under the Wagner Act, but the requirements of that law are not as specific as the Wisconsin act.

In its decision the Board presented a convincing argument for the supremacy of War Labor Board orders over State laws deemed to be in conflict. Marshalling every other conceivable point to support its conclusion, the Board mentioned once, without discussion, that pertinent provision of the War Labor Disputes Act directing the Board to conform to "all applicable provisions of law."

I wish time permitted a number of quotations from this opinion to disclose the cavalier manner with which vital issues were dismissed or sidetracked. Normally such legal innovations could be immediately tested

in the courts, but the War Labor Disputes Act makes no provision for judicial review, and the Board has shown every disposition to thwart attempts to obtain review by the ordinary nonstatutory proceedings.

This issue is an important one not only today but for years to come. Recently several States have enacted their own code of labor law. Some represent experiments which some day may find wide acceptance. True, organized labor has launched a campaign to have these laws declared invalid. They will be spared this time and expense if this W. L. B. doctrine of Federal supremacy is permitted to stand. This decision of the Board is a warning that no State law can take precedence over its directive orders. It is amazing legal doctrine and clearly contrary to the letter and spirit of the War Labor Disputes Act.

This is not the first time the Board has engaged in lawmaking activities. It has circumvented the Wagner Act by attempts to impose industry-wide bargaining, by compelling bargaining with unions representing small minorities, and has attempted to make ineffective even that limited judicial review which the Wagner Act allows. But all this ranks small in comparison with its recent nullification of State law. The full import of this recent action can only be fully appreciated by recognizing that this Board claims jurisdiction over the butcher, the baker, and any other employer, however small, on the theory that a labor dispute would seriously affect war production. These statements are not extreme. Every one can be supported from the Board's own record.

COMPLIANCE WITH BOARD ORDERS

The War Labor Disputes Act provided no penalties or other sanctions for securing compliance with orders of the W. L. B. In fact, the Board was unanimous in recommending to Congress that no legal sanctions be provided. When the legislation was in conference, it was reported that the House and Senate conferees had agreed to an amendment allowing limited judicial review of Board orders. On June 9 the W. L. B. addressed letter to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee opposing this reported amendment, stating:

"This record of compliance indicates that no legal change in the status of the Board's orders is necessary. These orders are in reality mere declarations of the equities of each industrial dispute, as determined by a tripartite body in which industry, labor, and the public share equal responsibility; and the appeal of the Board is to the moral obligation of employers and workers to abide by the no-strike, no-lock-out agreement and in conformance therewith to carry out the directives of the tribunal created under that agreement by the Commander in Chief.

"Since the bill does not, as we understand it, permit the Board to seek enforcement of its orders in the court, the Board's orders are to remain, as we think they should remain, without specific legal sanctions. This being the case, it would seem to us inconsistent to extend to losing parties the privilege of delaying the outcome by taking the case into court for review."

The amendment to permit judicial review was eliminated from the bill.

On August 16, following extended discussion in the Board and with the President, a broad list of new penalties was announced by Executive order and in a letter from the President to Chairman Davis of the W. L. B.

In the case of noncomplying employers, these sanctions or penalties include the withholding or withdrawal of priorities, Government contracts, fuel or transportation facilities, in addition to possible plant seizure. When a union is recalcitrant, the plant will still be taken over, and in such cases the Government may withhold checked-off dues or other benefits accruing to the union under the contract. In case of individual noncompliance, use of selective service and manpower controls were authorized.

While management might applaud this first indication that penalties will be applied to unions which fail to comply with Board orders, we should recognize that we embrace a dangerous expedient. It is nothing more or less than a revival of the use of indirect penalties which can be imposed by administrative action without legal accountability. It was the basis of the "Blue Eagle" phase of the N. R. A. It was later adopted by the N. L. R. B. until checked by congressional exposure and opinions of the Comptroller General.

On June 9 the Board advised Congress it needed no sanctions other than "the moral obligation of employers and workers" to carry out the Board's directives. Even then it had numerous cases of noncompliance but apparently preferred to keep this problem away from the lawmaking branch of the Government.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

In reviewing the War Labor Disputes Act I suggested you differentiate between the law itself and its administration. In appraising the law, no one will deny that many imperfections exist. Nevertheless, I think you will agree that the important sections of the law fit together into a relatively simple pattern consisting of three parts:

1. Continuation of the War Labor Board to settle disputes pursuant to the voluntary no-strike agreement;

2. Control of unauthorized strikes by requiring notice and a waiting period within which the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board could be asserted to prevent an actual strike; and

3. Government operation of any plant in which a strike actually occurs, with the strike becoming unlawful during such operation.

This rather simple pattern has become confused, coercive, and seemingly inadequate. In my judgment it is due almost entirely to its administration and interpretation. There are many examples to illustrate:

1. The opinion of the Attorney General allowing minority groups to use the strike vote as a substitute for certification proceedings under the National Labor Relations Act has resulted in an open invitation to constant attack on established bargaining agencies and collective agreements.

2. The War Labor Board, after urging Congress to provide no penalties for enforcement of its decisions, has adopted a set of hand-made penalties for which no legislative authority exists.

3. In spite of an express provision of the act requiring adherence to the National Labor Relations Act and to "all other applicable provisions of law," the War Labor Board has nullified provisions of Federal and State law regulating labor disputes, thus stimulating more disputes and delaying prompt settlement of those for which legal pattern already exists through State and Federal law.

Two additional examples can be cited, equally indicative of the current administrative attitude, although bearing only indirectly on the administration of the War Labor Disputes Act:

1. The ruling of the N. L. R. B. interpreting the so-called Tabor amendment restricting use of appropriated funds to proceed with complaints involving the validity of collective bargaining agreements when such agreements have been in effect for longer than 3 months. Although the amendment denies use of funds in connection with any complaint cases, the board has interpreted the law as barring all complaint cases except those involving charges that the organization having the contract is company dominated. In other words the board has interpreted the amendment to permit continued prosecution of the very type of case it was designed to restrict.

2. Recent modification of the N. L. R. B. regulations governing run-off elections to be held when the first vote results in no choice of bargaining representative. These rules disclose a purpose which can only be viewed as a deliberate attempt to favor the big national and international unions and to complete the disenfranchisement of large numbers of unorganized employees.

I refer to these examples of prejudiced administration, not because they are uncommon, but merely to suggest that repeal of the War Labor Disputes Act will not relieve management of unworkable rules or of labor excesses, so long as administration of labor law or policy is slanted to entangle management or to twist the law to secure every possible advantage for those now controlling and directing our large labor organizations. Remove the War Labor Disputes Act and every one of these abuses will continue. Even more, such repeal would become the signal that labor's political attack had succeeded, and the headstrong and radical leaders and groups within organized labor would become even more demanding and uncontrollable.

In urging an understanding of the War Labor Disputes Act, and recognition of the part unwise administration has played in bringing the law into disrepute, I am neither apologizing for the law nor am I suggesting that any law can alone rebuild an atmosphere in which fair and sound labor policies can bring management a better understanding and more efficient production. Nevertheless, law and bureaucratic rule have encouraged development of powerful labor combinations and have vested tremendous powers in their leaders. History shows that such powers will not be willingly laid aside. Experience demonstrates that men backed with such powers are not receptive to friendly negotiation and compromise. Common sense should convince us that it takes new law to change the bad.

While the War Labor Disputes Act represents only a small beginning, that law, even with its administrative shortcomings, does represent a start in the direction of a balanced legal structure. That start, however slight, should not be lost by a blind acceptance of arguments based on a combination of slanted administration and ingenious organizers. Instead of lending your support to repeal of this law, let me urge that you give to this problem of formulating a sound public policy the same intelligent and human consideration you have given to wartime labor relations in your own plants. Means must be devised to convert collective bargaining to a businesslike venture, not a maneuver in which to experiment with strategy. Means must be found to end this constant attempt by a few irresponsible labor leaders to attain their goals by coercing government, local or national. Devices must be developed to protect individuals and minorities against the oppression of majorities, just as these bona fide majorities must be safeguarded against constant warfare of irresponsible minority groups. A fair and just solution to these basic problems will pay large dividends to our entire Nation in the years ahead. The results call for your best efforts.

General Casimir Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American on October 15, 1943, on General Pulaski Day, paying homage to that great general and to Poland:

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI DAY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Columbia! He died for thee,
Cheerfully and for liberty.
Honored forever more
On this Atlantic shore,
Palms for Pulaski! Palms!"

Today is General Casimir Pulaski Memorial Day

We salute the soldier and patriot, the friend of Washington and companion of Lafayette.

A dauntless defender of liberty, he was a martyr to the cause of American freedom.

He was a crusader for the dignity of man; a son of liberty whose zeal for American freedom will forever abide in the hearts of our countrymen.

He was, in essence, a character of commanding force and genius.

The loftiness of his ideals, the manliness of his heroic deeds are firmly anchored in the bedrock of humanity.

Not self, but service to our country was his life's creed.

He gave his life at the age of 31 at the siege of Savannah.

He died as he had lived—a hero, but an arch enemy to tyranny.

Much can be said about the Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War, but it is singularly expressed in the four lines composed by the American poet, John A. Joyce:

"Polish heroes in their might,
Fought in freedom's holy light,
Brilliant as the stars at night,
To maintain the pure and right."

In rendering our tribute to General Pulaski, let us bring into focus the stirring saga of Polish contributions to our country.

They sprang from a stock which gave us Copernicus, Mme. Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Kosciusko, and other illustrious men and women whose names are crowned with the halo of immortality.

As we turn back the clock of time in our Nation's history we find that there were 400 Polish settlers in the colony established under the leadership of Capt. John Smith.

Even before the arrival of the *Mayflower* the Poles had raised the question of political liberty and equality and were successful in the first encounter for this cause on American soil.

It was a Pole who founded the first high school in the United States.

It was a Pole who was the first engineer to map the coast to New England.

It was Radziminski who helped establish the border line between the United States and Mexico.

And it was Krzyzanowski, appointed as the first American governor of Alaska.

In the Civil War 4,000 Poles served gallantly under the banner of Abraham Lincoln.

In World War No. 1 the first American soldier to die was Sgt. John J. Czajka; the first German soldiers to surrender to the Americans yielded their arms to men of Polish origin.

Recently our Nation dedicated a 5-cent postage stamp commemorating Poland's resistance to the Axis. There is a classic symbolism to the phoenix represented on the stamp.

The ancients believed that this bird, after living for centuries, would be consumed in its own ashes. At the right side of the stamp there is a kneeling woman, with outstretched arms from which the shackles have fallen. It is between these figures representing immortality and freedom that the emblem of Poland waves.

Poles have contributed to the advancement of American commerce, industry, art, science, and education.

Today the intrepid descendants of Pulaski are battling with unabated fury for the liberation of oppressed mankind.

They are indeed fighting for a sublime destiny.

The Polish people were the first to suffer the depredations of Hitler. The whole world opened its heart in unrestrained admiration to the heroism of Poland, which chose to die rather than to live as chattels. For the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the nation constitutes the fundamental charter of Poland.

Their national heritage dates back to the tenth century. They had their own magna carta, the compact of laws, proclaimed to the world on September 17, 1347.

Their first great constitution is ranked with our own Declaration of Independence. Today the Poles echo the words of their historic charter:

"More than life and personal happiness, we value external independence and internal freedom."

Poland is old in tragedy and sorrow, but young with hope and life.

It is the land of the rainbow—the rainbow of hope after the storm, of living color and romance.

They are a happy people.

They carry a song in their hearts.

The world will listen again to the lilt and swing of the polka, to the music in the laughter and happy clamor of their youth.

Liberty is on the march. The sinister doctrines which the gangster governments seek to impose upon the world will soon be obliterated.

Their evil works will be buried in the dust.

And those who have endured the inhumanities of this dark hour will emerge triumphant to sustain the eternal light of justice.

Poland will be resurrected from the ashes of her tragedy—restored among the jeweled nations of the earth.

"While we live she is existing
Poland is not fallen;
We'll win with swords resisting
What the foe has stolen.
Poland! Shall the foe enslave thee
Sadly and forever;
And we hesitate to save thee?
Never, Poland, never!"

O. P. A. Versus Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article dated September 27 written by Mr. E. T. Eide, of Spooner, Minn., relative to the situation in which the dairy farmer finds himself in respect to producing butterfat and butter for the American armed forces, our own American public, and our allies.

More farm auction sales have been held in my district of northwest Minnesota in the past 2 months than even in the depression years.

Farmers are selling off milk herds which took years to build up. Why? Because some Government bureaucrats are more concerned with saving the consumer only 60 or 65 cents in a year than with the production of an adequate supply of one of the Nation's most essential foods—butter.

Unless this policy is changed, the dairy farmer faces ruin, and this administration will not be able to live up to its commitments to our own armed forces and to the soldiers of our allies.

The excellent article entitled "Butter Prices" by Mr. Eide follows:

The O. P. A. has found it necessary to raise the point value of creamery butter. The reason given is that there is not enough to go around. It is perhaps a little late now to try to remedy this deplorable state of affairs; but there may still be time to keep the situation from getting worse, if effective measures are taken at once.

In putting the present ceiling prices on butter it is assumed that a farmer's working time should be based on the values of the 1909–14 period, instead of the present time. Some farmers have awakened to the fact that they can sell their time at several times the value of the 1909–14 period, and consequently have sold out and left the farm to work in other industries. Nearly 20 percent of the farmers of our county have left their farms and no one has taken their place. Vacant farms do not produce butter or any other farm product, no matter how good the farm may be. The reason these farmers sold out is that they can make so much more money, with less effort, in industry than on the farm, without taking the chances of crop failures and other hazards of farming.

At this time I will try to analyze what effect a 20-cent per pound raise in butter prices would have on the dairy farmer as well as the consumer. Most of the farmers who sold out had a rather small farm set-up. The average would perhaps be a 10-cow farm. Over 60 percent of the dairy products of the United States are produced on such farms. If we have an average of 200 pounds of butter per cow yearly such a farm would produce 2,000 pounds of butter annually. An increase of 20 cents per pound would yield the farmer $400 per year more for his work and would very likely have kept most of the farmers on their farms. Our local papers are still full of notices of farm auctions, therefore a raise of 20 cents per pound might stop this farm evacuation before it gets worse.

Let us now consider how a 20 cents per pound raise would affect the consumer. The allotment of butter per person seems to be about 13 pounds per year. An increase of 20 cents per pound would amount to $2.60 per year per person, or 4 hours' labor at 65 cents per hour. With the largest number of persons gainfully employed on record, this extra $2.60 per year should not cause any hardship. If in special cases it should be a hardship, a special butter stamp could be issued, so no one need be deprived of this, the best of all foods. If butter had been priced according to what it is really worth, that is compared with wages paid industry, for producing it, no rationing would have been necessary, as we have the capacity of producing at least 50 percent more, if it paid for the effort to do so.

This has been brought to the attention of our Government by real farm leaders time and again, but they chose to take the advice from persons that probably could not tell the difference between a cow and a bull. Could it be possible that the manufacturers of "bull butter," otherwise known as oleomargarine, had a hand in this? Can it be possible that by pricing butter below the

cost of production so that the small farmer is compelled to leave the farm, thereby creating a shortage of cow butter, a market is created whereby these manufacturers can palm off their inferior, substitute goods? If that is the case, they have made a splendid job of it.

With all his faults, we must give Hitler credit for understanding the part the farmers play in total war. With his devilish cunning, he knew that the only way he could get the farmers to produce to the limit of the capacity of the country, was to pay them enough for their produce so as to give them as much, or even a little more, than they could make at other work. The same rule applies to the occupied countries. The people best off, as compared with the rest of them, was the farmer. His same cunning told him there was no way of supervising the individual farm. The driving power must come from the farmer. He will have to be assured that he will receive pay for his work, and that it will be on a par with what he could earn with his skill and long hours at other work.

The claim that higher food prices will cause inflation is just so much "hokum." The fact is, it would prevent inflation by siphoning excess buying power and put it where it is most needed, namely, with the debt-burdened farmer. Of course strict supervision should be exercised over the spread between what the farmer gets for his products and what the consumer pays. If too large a spread is encountered it should be checked by men who have business experience instead of lame-duck politicians. Have heard that butter prices are reaching 75 and 80 cents per pound on the west coast, if you can get it at all. A job for the O. P. A. right there.

This war will end as other wars before have come to an end. The shock absorber for a post-war period would be a prosperous farming industry to take up the slack until industry can get into position to absorb the excess labor, caused by the shut-down of defense plants and soldiers discharged from service. Almost every one of the 6,000,000 farms will need thousands of dollars worth of machinery, building and fence repairs; farmers returning to the farm from work in the cities will want to modernize their homes and farm set-up; their neighbors will try to "keep up with the Joneses"; all this if the money is there to do with. Millions of dollars worth of labor and material will be needed to do this work, giving employment to millions of men for a long time. Let us not make the same mistake as was made after World War No. 1, namely, overselling the farmer by mortgaging everything that he owns to get the things he needs; but rather pay him for his produce a price that will enable him to pay cash for his purchases, and stay solvent. No one gains anything from a bankrupt agriculture.

E. T. EIDE.

SPOONER, MINN., *September 27, 1943.*

War Spirit in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been affected deeply by several letters recently received from a young man in my home State of New Mexico, and I wish to insert two of the letters in the RECORD, because they so clearly exemplify the patriotic spirit of the people in that State—the spirit so nobly demonstrated by those New Mexico boys in the Philippines—at Bataan and Corregidor.

This young man has a slight physical disability which, thus far, has prevented his acceptance by the armed forces, and he has repeatedly written me in regard to his desire to serve his country. He asks no special favors. He does not request a commission, nor does he want a safe, well-paying desk job. All he desires is an opportunity to do his bit, to serve his country, wherever Uncle Sam can use him.

The letters read as follows:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *May 5, 1943.*

Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of May 1, 1943, with reference to my entering the armed forces of the United States was received. I wish to inform you that I have not filed application for a commission in the service. All I desire is a chance to serve my country as a soldier and take my chances for promotion on my merits.

My desire to be in the service of the United States is not limited in any way to any one branch. I will gladly accept induction in any branch of the service.

I want to express my sincere thanks for your prompt attention in my behalf.

Very truly yours,

LEO ROMERO.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *May 21, 1943.*

Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of the letter I received from the San Antonio Office Procurement District.

Evidently I was misunderstood. As much as I would like a commission, my application was not for one. I am only trying to get in the service of the United States, where I know I can be of some help in the prosecution of the war. I realize that I am not highly skilled in any technical field, but I have my life to give for my country if need be.

Failure of acceptance in my country's armed forces will not induce me in giving up hope. If I am refused that chance, I will try my luck in joining the British Army or any other of our allies.

I hope that my efforts will not end with failure once again.

Very truly yours,

LEO ROMERO.

Eso Naranche—American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, a former student and friend of mine at Montana State University, an outstanding athlete, and a real American boy, has given his life for his country. Eso Naranche was his name, and, while he no longer lives, his memory will always be with us. His generosity, kindness, and understanding will always be remembered. His home town, Butte—the richest hill on earth—has seen fit to name the high-school stadium in which he played so often Naranche Memorial Stadium. No finer gesture could have been made by Butte in honor of her beloved son.

Eso came up in life the hard way. He worked in the Butte mines to finance his education, and everything he received he earned himself. While Butte claims him as her son, Montana honors him also. We are proud of Eso; we are sad that he is no longer with us; and we salute him for his courage, his sacrifice, and his fine Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point an editorial about Lt. Eso Naranche which appeared in the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., on October 16, 1943:

NARANCHE MEMORIAL STADIUM

Eso Naranche typified the American way of life. He was born on Butte's cosmopolitan East Side. His father died when he was young, leaving his mother the responsibility of a large family. He attended Grant grade school. He became popular among the students and teachers of Butte high school, both because of his athletic prowess and his friendliness. He worked in the Butte mines and at other jobs to finance his way through Montana State University. Throughout his scholastic career he was a good student.

When his country entered the war Eso Naranche went to its aid. The work he had done in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps qualified him for a commission as a second lieutenant in the United States Army. He went overseas and participated in one engagement with the enemy in which he displayed courage and leadership, successfully leading his men from a trap designed by the enemy. In the second engagement in which he participated he was killed.

Letters from his commanding officers to his wife attested to his devotion to duty, his humaneness.

Lieutenant Naranche died that other young men might have the opportunities he had for advancement in the world. He loved life, but he gave that life willingly as a sacrifice when it became necessary to defend his way of living. He had struggled hard and against long odds to reach high goals of achievement.

Yet, he willingly gave up his life when it became a question of many, many other generations of American boys and girls having the same chances he had had.

The life of Eso Naranche will remain a shining example to the many, many future generations of boys and girls who enter the now sacred portals of Naranche Memorial Stadium.

Eso Naranche would have liked the unforgettable ceremonies of dedication naming the stadium as a memorial to his life and his heroism. He would have liked knowing that the game is still being played in the good old American way.

Perhaps knowing these things will help to ease the pain in the hearts of those close to him and the many others who knew him as a friend.

Jennings Jack Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 3505, which

would authorize the President to present a Congressional Medal of Honor to young Jennings Jack Bennett, a heroic sailor residing in my district, near Chehalis. For the information of my colleagues, and because it is a story that certainly bears repeating and also because it is a saga of sea heroism fit to rank with the finest similar feats in our history, I would like to recount briefly here the deeds of this young man. I feel sure that, when you have read of them, you will agree that Jennings Jack Bennett deserves the highest honor which his country can bestow.

On July 16, 1942, the tanker *Humphries* was steaming through the South Atlantic when it was attacked by a German raider. Young Bennett, a coxswain in the armed guard, was in charge of a gun crew on his tanker. He had just come off watch, and was sitting in his bunk removing his shoes when the first enemy shell struck his ship. He rushed on deck to find that his gun crew had already pumped one answering shell into the raider's bow. Bennett took charge, and in the space of seconds, the gun crew had fired two more shells into the raider. Before they could fire again, the raider's heavier guns were pounding the tanker. One of these shells struck near Bennett, and pieces of the exploding metal hit the sailor in the right heel, right leg, left leg, and left elbow, and tore off the third finger of his left hand. The same shell killed one of Bennett's crew members, and put his gun out of commission. Despite his wounds, hardly even aware of them, in fact, Bennett obtained life jackets for the remaining members of his gun crew and helped them to the rail and overboard. Then he went back and obtained about a dozen more life jackets and threw them over the rail to fellow seamen struggling in the waters far below.

You would think that this young man already had done enough in the line of duty. But Bennett did not think so. He recollected that there were certain confidential papers in his cabin which should be destroyed. So he made his way below and obtained the papers and also had presence of mind enough to place them in a weighted bag. Just as he left his quarters, another enemy shell struck the ship's bridge and Bennett barely escaped being trapped as the ceiling of his quarters caved in. Reaching the deck again, he fought his way to the rail, leaving his blood upon the deck from his multiple wounds, and tossed the bag and its precious burden into the sea.

Again, one might figure that Bennett had done more than his part already. But he did not. He noticed a member of the ship's crew and another from the armed guard attempting to lower the port lifeboat aft, and he went to help them. As he worked with them, another enemy shell struck nearby. It killed the armed guard member beside Bennett, and mortally wounded the merchant seaman also. One large piece of exploding metal went through Bennett's already injured left arm. When he attempted to rise from where the explosion had flung him, Bennett found that the hot metal had pinned his arm to the deck. As he tried to jerk the arm loose from the deck plate, another shell hit nearby and jarred his flesh clear. He arose, staggered to the stern, and rolled off into the water. Wounded as he was, he managed to swim toward a raft. Two enemy torpedoes tore through the water within inches of him, but he made the raft, and, just before losing consciousness, he remembers being transferred to a lifeboat.

He was "out" for 9 hours. The boat floated for 7 days, and then the survivors were picked up by a Norwegian merchantman. Three days later they were put ashore in South Africa.

Bennett since then has been returned to the United States, and has undergone long treatment for his many injuries. For his gallant conduct in that deadly fray in the South Atlantic he already has won the Purple Heart and the Silver Star. He also holds a Good Conduct Medal.

A naval lieutenant commander who interviewed the survivors of this action in a hospital at Freetown, South Africa, has recommended Bennett for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

A writer for Our Navy interviewed young Bennett when he was returned to America, and, after detailing the nine wounds he suffered, this writer quotes the intrepid sailor as follows: "I want to go back into the armed guard service. I've got plenty left for a few goods cracks at them yet. Just get me on a ship again."

Bennett's one present fear is that the wounds to his left leg will leave him unfit for active service.

I believe that the heroism, above and beyond the call of duty, which this fine young American showed in that terrible battle in the South Atlantic in July 1942 and the indomitable spirit which he then showed and still possesses is deserving of our highest reward. That is why I have introduced this Medal of Honor bill.

National System of Local Air Transportation Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is unavoidably absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A National System of Local Air Service Is America's Great Transportation Need."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF LOCAL AIR SERVICE IS AMERICA'S GREAT TRANSPORTATION NEED

It is axiomatic that nations prosper in direct ratio to the case, speed, and cost of transportation.

Likewise, the security of the people and their social and cultural advancement are dependent, in no small measure, upon the standard of the transportation and communication systems.

From a world point of view the United States, through the years, has been out in front in the development of improved transportation facilities.

But study of the transportation pattern within our Nation brings to light a serious flaw, which must be corrected after the war, if we are to retain our position of leadership.

My purpose today is to direct attention to one fundamental weakness in our air transportation system, which was apparent even before the war, and which is likely to persist after the war unless our Federal Government exercises vision and sound judgment in correcting it.

That weakness is the absence of local air transportation facilities.

That weakness is not a byproduct of the war which suddenly transferred aviation from a civil to a military instrumentality. It is a weakness inherent in civil air transport, as we have known it to date.

This conclusion is drawn from the operation records of the commercial air lines and from accurate data on the travel habits of the American people.

AIR-LINE OPERATIONS ALWAYS LIMITED

From air-line records we learn that only 6 percent or 240 of the 3,646 cities with a population of 2,500 or more persons had the benefit of scheduled air-line service before the war.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration reports that there are only 40 authorized air-line stops in the 15,675 incorporated American cities and towns of 10,000 population or less. The service for towns under 2,500 population has been infinitesimal.

And yet 43.5 percent of the total population, or nearly 58,000,000 people, live in incorporated towns and villages of less than 2,500 population and in the rural areas, and all have been virtually without scheduled air service.

SHORT-HAUL AIR TRANSPORT UNDEVELOPED

Paralleling this deficiency has been the lack of air-line facilities for what is known as the short-haul field of transportation, which makes up the great bulk of American travel.

In the experience of one Nation-wide ground transportation system 80 percent of all passenger travel is for distances under 100 miles, while only 5 percent of the total passenger travel is for distances greater than 250 miles.

The Public Roads Administration, in an article published in 1942 by the National Resources Planning Board, reports that 83.9 percent of all motor travel is for distances less than 100 miles, while the Association of American Railroads reports that most railroad trips are under 100 miles.

These data bring into sharp relief the fact that most American travel is for short distances.

Charles I. Stanton, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, has said publicly:

"There is no alternative to the development of the short distance travel market as a means of expanding air transport.

"It is my opinion that the main cost difficulties revolve around the efficiency of the aircraft designed for short range air service."

It is clear that airline operations have not been adapted to the travel habits of the American people, when we consider that the average trip length of all commercial airline passengers in 1942 in this country was 420 miles.

REASONS FOR SHORTCOMINGS

Financial and operating limitations have restricted the air lines to large cities and long-distance travelers.

Even with heavy Government subsidies in the form of mail contracts, weather service, and other navigation aids, and in many cases the free use of airports, existing air lines have not been able to provide service for small communities and short haul traffic.

NEW ENTERPRISE HOLDS KEY

How then are we to establish a local air service for the 43.5 percent of the 131,669,275 people living in these United States—the nearly 58,000,000 people who live in rural areas and small urban centers who have not had air facilities in the past?

What can the Congress do after the war to provide this great section of our population and this vast area of our country with local air service? And by local air service I mean mail and express as well as passenger facilities.

Shall the Congress appropriate huge sums of money to build big airports at every hamlet and crossroads point and then subsidize the air lines to carry on unprofitable operations?

The answer is "No." There are many forces at work which convince me that such steps are unnecessary even though the Government could afford them; and we know the Government cannot afford them.

Competent authorities have proven to me that the helicopter or similar aircraft which will not require airports, but, rather, only small landing areas, are definitely feasible for commercial air operations.

And many private businesses already have indicated their willingness to undertake the financing and development of a local air system.

Mr. Stanton has suggested the possibility of developing a plane for this type of service which would have top efficiency at low altitudes, short range of perhaps 300 miles, inclusive of reserve fuel, short take-off and landing runs, high maneuverability on the ground, lower cruising speeds than those of long-range planes, smaller pay loads, light weight and adaptability to cross-wind landings.

The helicopter appears to meet these specifications, and, according to Igor I. Sikorsky, its inventor, the helicopter will probably prove to be entirely practical for use in commercial air transport.

MUST SAFEGUARD PUBLIC INTEREST

It is the responsibility of the Congress and the Federal Government to see to it that this new local air service is developed in the public interest.

We should not set up arbitrary restrictions that would stifle free enterprise.

The public interest will be served by permitting those private industries to enter the field of local air transport that show they can do the job the most economically for the greatest benefit of the greatest number of people.

We know when private business develops a new transportation system that the costs are passed on to the public in the form of tariff rates, unless the Government shares part of that cost by direct subsidy.

Therefore, it is of public concern as well as the concern of the Government that consideration be given to private business that is soundly financed and thoroughly experienced in the field of local transportation.

INTEGRATED AIR-GROUND SYSTEM—THE ANSWER

While the communities to be served directly by the helicopter or similar aircraft will provide air transport facilities for millions of additional people, the population of many communities along local air routes is not sufficient to justify air service.

Only by integrating the air service with a ground transportation service will the full potentialities of the helicopter be realized.

By such integration, the towns and cities which have scheduled helicopter service can be connected by ground transportation with the hundreds of smaller communities adjacent to them. In this way a sufficient reservoir of potential air business can be tapped to make the local air service economically possible.

In short, air and ground transportation schedules should be completely integrated to permit interchange of service and maximum flexibility of traffic movement.

Thus, all of the people served by the ground transportation system would have either direct or indirect connections with the local air system.

Moreover, the organization and physical properties of the ground transportation system could be utilized for the local air system to keep the capital outlay for the air service to a minimum. In this way the public interest again would be served by economical operations which in turn means a reasonable fare.

NOT A COMPETITIVE SERVICE

Would an integrated air-ground transportation system duplicate existing transportation facilities, either on the ground or in the air?

First, let us consider ground transportation.

Local air service in the short-haul field simply will provide faster transportation than is possible on the ground for those who wish to pay more for the faster service. Air-line transportation has functioned the same way in long-distance transport between large cities.

It would be foolhardy to deprive one large segment of our population living in rural areas of transportation advantages that already have been granted to another segment living in the populous areas.

Would integrated air-ground transportation for local communities and rural areas compete with existing air lines?

Many highly competent transportation authorities agree that the new air-ground transportation would help rather than hurt air-line business.

Air lines using large ships can operate only from airports, and the trend is toward vastly larger ships and airports. It is uneconomic to attempt operations on this scale except where big reservoirs of potential customers and business are present. The only points where these conditions can be met are the large cities.

So the local air service is a completely new phase of air transport. By providing air-transportation facilities, either directly or indirectly, for some 58,000,000 American people who heretofore have been forced to rely entirely on ground transportation, a Nation-wide local air system unquestionably will generate much new air business.

And a sizable percentage of this new business will feed directly into main air-line channels.

Local air transport must be coordinated with ground transportation to be economically sound and in the public interest. It therefore becomes a separate operation from through air-line business, although local air schedules, by all means, should be coordinated with through air-line schedules.

FREE ENTERPRISE NECESSARY

Post-war advancement in civil aviation, in the final analysis, will be dependent upon the Government allowing competition by free enterprise, insofar as that competition does not work against the public interest.

Private initiative and private capital must be given a freedom of expression, and that will not be possible if the Government favors one form of transportation over another form.

Chinese Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed an intensive visit to my California district on the shore of the Pacific Ocean, fronting China.

During this visit I spoke before a score of representative groups of sincere and awakened California people—businessmen, professional men, veterans' organizations, women's groups, labor organizations, and service clubs With all of them I discussed the fact that Congress would soon consider the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

I want to report to you in the Congress that all these California groups greeted with thunderous applause the proposal to repeal this Chinese Exclusion Act.

California realizes keenly that in no small measure its post-war employment hangs in the balance with today's vote. Only if we build a great Pacific trade can our vast west coast industrial machine be operated at capacity after the war. Our industry and working millions need the trade and raw materials of China, as China needs our manufactured articles. Today's vote can bring us closer together or it can push us further apart.

China will lead the Pacific trade with the United States. The harbor of Los Angeles can become as busy as New York's.

The repeal of this act will not only help us win the war by cutting out from under Japan one of her most potent propaganda weapons, it will also help us win the peace by setting the stage for cooperation and a great Pacific trade.

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of October 15, 1943:

THE FOURTH TERM

Willkie's avowed devotion to liberalism, Dewey's indisposition to leave the office of Governor of New York, the need of MacArthur in the Japanese theater of war, the decline in the stock of Governor Bricker of Ohio, and the geographic handicaps of Stassen of Minnesota and Warren of California—these are matters which lead us to believe a fourth term for Roosevelt is probable.

Politically, Roosevelt is growing weaker. As an oracle of war he is eclipsed by the more astute, more experienced, and more dramatic Churchill. The New Deal has spent itself, and the pendulum is swinging backward. The income-tax load is now bearing heavily on tens of millions who never paid income taxes before. The political damage done by that silly tax declaration in September is costly. Too much red tape, too many blanks to fill, too much regimentation (even if the war has made it necessary), too much bureaucracy—all of these are provoking public indignation. The country is getting weary of it all.

Roosevelt has stayed up a long time. He has been the No. 1 man in the public eye for 10 years. Circumstances have contributed to this tenure—the bank holiday, the depression, the various New Deal panaceas, the support of labor and the farmers in 1936, and labor and the Negroes in 1940—all these have served to keep him where he is. But luck does not last forever.

There is still charm in the Roosevelt radio voice but it no longer weaves a spell. Its theatricalism has palled. Ordinarily the people would tire of any President, no matter how popular, after two terms. Roosevelt has had three and he may have a fourth, but this will only be because the country has not yet found a man to take his place. So long as the war goes well there will be no particular effort to displace him.

But make no mistake. America is not insensible to the dangers that are looming up. Internationalism has grown in importance. America is again spending her blood and substance to save other nations from militaristic enslavement. But playing first violin in war and second fiddle in peace is resented. It is galling to see other nations reap the fruits of victory we have made possible. Our people are wondering if Roosevelt has driven a hard enough bargain.

All of these militate against a fourth term. A terrific task faces the United States when peace comes. The people are fearful that the same maladroit technique which Roosevelt applied to the depression will be applied to the work of reconstruction. And the annoying thing is that when the head of any government is not himself great, no greatness will be developed under his tutelage.

Roosevelt, if he runs next year, is likely to be elected by default. That is, if he runs. The President is getting tired of his job and his reforms. He is beginning to see the stark possibilities for evil of the forces he has created. He is losing many of his juvenile fixations, and the sense of responsibility which comes with age and experience is getting him down. And Roosevelt is too good a politician to wait until the crowd yells "Throw him out."

Civilian Fighters for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress I had an opportunity to observe what the civilian population of the Seventeenth District of Michigan is doing as its part of the prosecution of this war.

This war is being waged not only by our armed forces but by civilians whose labor and sacrifice serve to sustain the striking force of our service men and women. Success in all-out warfare cannot be attained without, as Kipling phrased it, "the everlastin' teamwork of every bloomin' soul." My observations convince me that our civilian fighters are doing a magnificent job.

There is no general attitude of complacency, so often charged by many in high places, but rather there is a spirit of dead earnestness and grim determination.

Throughout the Seventeenth District, the most populous in the State of Michigan, the people not only have cooperated to the fullest extent in civilian war projects outlined and sponsored by officials charged with the prosecution of the war, but in many instances their resourcefulness and enthusiasm have created new civilian functions that have been definitely helpful to our war program. In some respects their desire to serve has pushed them ahead of official leadership.

Many communities in Oakland County and in that portion of Wayne County within the Seventeenth District of Michigan have developed unique and successful methods in their bond drives, victory garden projects, salvage collection programs, and various other civilian war activities.

The people of Pontiac, Royal Oak, Ferndale, Birmingham, Berkley, Clawson, Farmington, Hazel Park, Pleasant Ridge, Lake Orion, South Lyon, Clarkston Holly, Milford, Oxford, Rochester, Northville, Plymouth, Northwest Detroit, and all other district communities are doing everything within their power to hasten the war to a successful conclusion. They are buying bonds according to the utmost of their financial ability. They are saving fats for ammunition. They are saving waste paper for packing that ammunition. They are salvaging scrap metal to feed the steel mills of the Nation. They are regularly saving their tin cans for victory. They are conserving in every possible way, making things do for longer periods of time. Their victory gardeners are numbered in many thousands, adding huge quantities to the food supply of the Nation. They are carrying on various types of Red Cross work and performing countless tasks essential to our war program. They are contributing their share toward providing entertainment for service men and women on furlough.

The farm population of the district is pushing production to the ulmost, despite many handicaps, to provide ample food for our fighting forces and our civilian population. Many other worthwhile functions might be mentioned, so vast and varied is the participation of our civilian population in our drive to victory.

There is no element of complacency among people engaged in such worthy wartime works. The people know we must win this war. They fully realize the consequences of failure. They are anxious to win this war as quickly as possible that their fighting sons and daughters may soon return to them and the normal peaceful pursuits of life. That is why they are doing everything within their power to hasten victory. There can be no failure when we have such a gallant spirit of fight in our civilian population.

It was my opportunity to observe the way in which one group of citizens, living in a populous section of a large city, mobilized their fellow citizens into a powerful civilian war factor. I refer to the Northwest War Council, a voluntary organization composed of community leaders residing in Strathmoor, Redford, and Brightmoor, in the city of Detroit.

The Northwest War Council serves as a rallying point for the civilian war activities of much of the twenty-second ward of Detroit, one of the populous areas within the boundaries of the Seventeenth District of Michigan. Frequently the Northwest War Council embraces Redford township residents in its activities and its influence is felt beyond the borders of its nominal area of action. I mention its work particularly because I feel that the Northwest War Council can serve as a model for other large metropolitan centers as a means for coordinating civilian war activities in community-minded intracity areas.

More than 100 organizations participate in the activities of the Northwest War Council, which is headed by a veteran of the First World War, Dr. Frank R. Bates. The council provides an elastice framework which enables it to undertake and successfully execute diversified projects for civilian participation in the war effort. In short, it furnishes local leadership.

Its executive committee, in addition to its chairman, consists of: George E. Smith, past president of the Strathmoor Business Association, a banker and a lawyer; George Alder, the director of the Brightmoor Community Center; Floyd W. McGriff, publisher of the Redford Record and other community newspapers; Morrison T. Wade, director of the Society of Good Neighbors; Earl R. Laing, district principal of the Detroit Public Schools and president of the Michigan Educational Association; Clyde V. Fenner, a former member of the Michigan State Senate; Mrs. Phillip Beckman, clerk of Redford township; Frank M. Hill, of the Brightmoor Exchange Club; and Owen Emmons, principal of Cooley High School, Detroit.

Among the service clubs and business associations participating in the activities of the Northwest War Council are: The Brightmoor Exchange Clubs, the Northwestern Business and Professional Women's Club, the Strathmoor Business Association, the Redford Exchange Club, the Detroit Automobile Club, the Redford Improvement Association, the Strathmoor Civic Association, the Rosedale Park Civic Association, the Strathmoor Kiwanis Club, and others.

Veterans of the First World War are represented by: Wolverine Post, No. 171, and Post No. 1519, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Post No. 490, Redford-Detroit Post, Northwest Detroit Post, Carl E. Stitt Post and Groves-Walker Post No. 346, American Legion; and the Canadian Legion.

The council has the cooperation of all schools and churches in the area, as well as of numerous parent-teacher, church, and lodge affiliated groups. State, county, city, and township officials aid the Northwest War Council in every possible way.

Among the first projects undertaken by the Northwest War Council was a gigantic "Win the War" parade, in which 4,000 persons participated and which was viewed by more than 30,000 people. Gov. Harry F. Kelly reviewed the parade in company with Army and Navy officers.

Then the council organized the Junior Commandos to carry on a continuous salvage campaign. The Junior Commandos are boys and girls organized into teams to produce a constant flow of scrap and their operations result in a thorough combing of the homes in their territory. Already more than 250,000 pounds of salvage have been collected and sold, with each Commando being rewarded in cash according to his efforts. Steps are now being taken by the Northwest War Council to greatly expand the work of the Junior Commandos.

Three bond auctions sponsored by the council, held in Strathmoor, Redford, and Brightmoor have resulted in the sale of more than $1,000,000 in War bonds.

This spring the council planned and executed a Victory-garden project that resulted in the planting of more than 3,000 gardens in northwest Detroit. Undoubtedly thousands of individuals, spurred by the council's drive, added to the total number of gardens. The council's figure includes only those plowed under the direction of the council's garden committee. In order to accomplish this magnificent task, the Northwest War Council obtained the use of tractors from Mr. Henry Ford's experimental farms. The project was successfully completed despite the most adverse spring weather conditions experienced in Michigan for many years.

The Northwest War Council then followed through with a series of three fall festivals in September, in Strathmoor, Redford, and Brightmoor. Each festival included a flower show, Victory garden vegetable exhibits, canning exhibits, a hobby show, and a baby show, in addition to a war show consisting of artillery, jeeps, tanks, and other war matériel. These festivals, like the Victory garden project, were very successful ventures.

The Northwest War Council is now engaged in preserving a record of northwest Detroit's personnel in the armed forces. Also, suitable memorials for those who must pay the supreme sacrifice are now being planned and financed. The activities of the council are many and varied and its establishment has provided a focal point for community mobilization.

The Northwest War Council intends to continue as a volunteer organization to assist the war effort by stimulating all important phases of home-front activity until peace comes.

I present this review of civilian war activities in the Seventeenth District of Michigan in recognition of work well done by citizens working jointly in a common cause. America is strong because its civilian front is imbued with a spirit of grim determination and a will to succeed. Our civilian fighters for victory deserve a salute. They are serving with distinction on the home front.

Gallinger Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 19, 1943.*

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Your interest in the recent report of the subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, in connection with the Gallinger Hospital investigation, has come to my attention through the public press.

Formerly a patient in the tuberculosis ward at Gallinger Hospital from August 1940 until March 1941, during which time I underwent treatment for spinal tuberculosis, including spinal surgery, I have nothing but praise for having been restored to health in that hospital.

It seems to me that to send this information to you is a duty I should perform, as I would undoubtedly have been unable to do so had such recuperative facilities not been available.

Your continued constructive interest in this problem of Gallinger Hospital will be appreciated by all persons who are concerned with the proper administration of this municipal institution. Should you desire any additional information, I am at your service.

Very truly yours,

ANNE FAGUE.

Arms, Not Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, in the peaceful little village of Helenville, Wis., there lives a loyal, patriotic family by the name of Gruennert. Sorrow has entered their quiet home. Their beloved son, Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, was killed in New Guinea, giving his life in the service of his country and sacrificing himself in a heroic effort to save his men.

This boy's selflessness has been appropriately recognized by the War Department, which wrote the parents of this American hero, inviting them to Washington. The reply of the parents is such a striking demonstration of patriotism that I feel it should be perpetuated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I include the article, clipped from the front page of the Washington Post:

ARMS, NOT TRIPS—PARENTS BALK AT U. S.-PAID TRIP HERE FOR SON'S MEDAL

(By the Associated Press)

HELENVILLE, WIS., October 20.—An elderly couple sat in a modest home here today, fingered a Congressional Medal of Honor, and slowly read and reread a letter from Secretary of War Stimson.

The medal and letter had come in the mail to Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert because they had wanted it that way and so had written the Secretary of War. It had been awarded in death to their son, 20-year-old Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, who was killed in New Guinea last Christmas Eve.

"The spirit of unselfishness, understanding, and sacrifice which breathes through your letter has deeply impressed not only the President, who requested a copy for himself, but all of us in the War Department who have been privileged to read your letter," the Secretary of War wrote in answer to the Gruennerts.

"We stand humble in the face of such a demonstration of patriotism as yours. * * *"

The War Department had asked the Gruennerts to come to Washington to receive the medal from the President. They didn't believe they should. Instead they wrote to the War Department. It took a long time to write, but this is what it said:

"We feel honored indeed to receive a Medal of Honor for our departed son, to be delivered to us personally by the President of the United States.

"Under present conditions, however, we cannot help but give expression to some of the following thoughts which race through our minds day and night.

"We are now in the midst of the Third War Bond drive. We believe every cent of money subscribed should be used to supply our boys with the necessities of war and not spent for trips that do not directly help the war effort.

"Only this last week, thousands of other parents lost their loved ones on the battlefields of Italy, all brave boys that were loved by their parents as much as we loved our own. These parents cannot all converge on Washington, and because of the common bond we have with them we feel we shouldn't either. The loss of our brave boy is still too fresh in our memory for us to make this trip, even though it would be in his honor.

"Will you please convey our regrets to the President? Will you please ask him whether it would be possible for him to put whatever message he may have for us in writing, so it may be delivered to us along with the Medal of Honor and we will ever cherish and treasure them both in the memory of our boy."

In Washington the War Department said the medal had been awarded for "leadership so outstanding that it placed victory above the life of the leader himself."

Gruennert was killed when he advanced alone ahead of the platoon of which he was second in command and made it possible for the platoon to split the Japanese position on the beach near Buna.

In the course of the fighting Gruennert knocked out one enemy pill box single-handed and drove the occupants of another into the open where they were routed by his men. He was shot by enemy snipers before the platoon could reach his advanced position.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article recently published in the Jersey Journal by Helen L. Manning on juvenile delinquency. At this time, with so much discussion over the country on the cause and cure of juvenile delinquency, it may prove of value.

I am very proud of the fact that in my district we gave this very important matter consideration many years ago and as a result have had little or practically no increase in juvenile delinquency during the war period.

YOUTHFUL DELINQUENCY RISES DURING WAR, BUT NOT IN JERSEY CITY

(By Helen L. Manning, secretary to New Jersey Juvenile Delinquency Commission)

Statistics all over America reporting an increase of juvenile and adolescent crime are not reflected in the police records in Jersey City, which show a decrease since Pearl Harbor.

In his recent report to Mayor Frank Hague, Dr. Thomas W. Hopkins, director of the Bureau of Special Service of the Jersey City Board of Education, reported that police complaints in Jersey City had dropped and that there was no increase in juvenile delinquency.

There is no increase in adolescent crime in Jersey City for two reasons. The first is because of the sound program of handling juvenile offenders, who are straightened out in their formative years and who grow up to be law-abiding citizens.

The second reason is because Mayor Frank Hague, who organized the bureau of special service more than 12 years ago, has kept his interest in the work and has constantly supervised the activities of the bureau.

More than 3 years ago, when World War No. 2 was in progress overseas, Mayor Hague enlarged the facilities of the Bureau of Special Service to take care of the adolescent boy and girl who gets into trouble for the first time and whose offense is of such a nature that there is hope of restitution and reclamation. Mayor Hague did this because he knew if America should enter the war there would be an increase in crime.

Because of Mayor Hague's program letters come daily to the Bureau of Special Service from boys who 3 years ago got into minor difficulties and who are now taking part in the battle for democracy.

Excerpts from two letters received by Inspector William V. McLaughlin, in charge of the police unit at the bureau, follow:

"Here I am away out in the Far East," writes one boy, "and only for Mayor Hague I would be in jail, without the opportunity to be a real man.

"I never realized, until now, what Mayor Hague has accomplished in giving boys and girls who get into trouble, an opportunity to do better. I got a letter yesterday from an old pal of mine who lives outside Jersey City. He is now in a reformatory. That might have been me, had it not been for Mayor Hague."

Another letter, from a marine in California, says:

"NOW I REALIZE HOW DUMB I WAS

"Well, Inspector, the real reason for this letter is to thank you and Mayor Hague for all you did to help me. I know I was a pretty smart guy and now I realize how dumb I was.

"The principal of my former school has my name on the honor roll, and am I proud of it. You know, I get letters from the principal of the school and from my school teacher."

The cause for the increase of adolescent crime in many American cities might be traced back to the time the offender was a juvenile.

Many cities make mistakes in handling juvenile offenders and make the same mistakes in handling the adolescent. In altogether too many cities juvenile offenders are brought into courts and given records, thus paving the way for further misdeeds.

Oftentimes the adolescent offender only needs a helping hand over some seeming insurmountable barrier. Other times only a referee is needed in the troubles and misunderstanding at home.

If, however, the offense is so flagrant it cannot be overlooked, legal action must be taken, but in most cases of adolescent offenders in Jersey City the complainant is satisfied, restitution is made, and the public security is protected by an alert and firm police department under Commissioner Daniel Casey.

The Jersey City Bureau of Special Service, which handles the juvenile and adolescent boy and girl, might well be compared to supplemental parental supervision.

"HEADACHE"

Mayor Hague has preached to police officials and school authorities that the work of the special service bureau is oftentimes a "headache." He has counseled the officials of the bureau never to lose confidence in a boy or girl and to follow every problem through even though sometimes it might not seem worth while.

"A good parent loves his child, but if necessity arises he will adopt a rigid discipline to create respect for parental authority," says the mayor.

The special service bureau works with every agency interested in the child, the parent, the church, and the school. Clergymen of all faiths work with the director of the bureau in an effort to help. The clergymen do an effective job by drawing the boys and girls into the activities of their churches.

A program continued day after day, week after week, with friendly interest, brings the boy or girl to the realization of the error of their ways.

Judge Thomas H. Brown, of the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, in a recent news release points out the rise in crime as reported by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both men quote striking figures.

Judge Brown says, "Public security comes first, and the public is entitled to protection."

WRIGHT BILL

The jurist referred to a bill in the New Jersey Legislature introduced by Senator Ray Wright, of Essex County, increasing the age in which boys and girls could be handled in juvenile court from 16 to 18. There is a Federal law, passed in June 1938, which defines as a juvenile a person 17 years of age or under.

NOT JERSEY CITY FIGURES

Judge Brown is right. The public is entitled to protection, and in Jersey City the public is protected. However, the figures quoted by Judge Brown and J. Edgar Hoover do not refer to Jersey City.

Several months ago Judge Brown had standing before him in court one morning a diminutive little miss of 19.

The girl had been placed in jail for failure to support her baby born out of wedlock. Judge Thomas J. Fleming, in one of his first days on the bench, had dismissed the charges against the girl and she was before Judge Brown to see if the alleged father of her child could be apprehended and brought to justice.

Judge Brown's face became livid with anger as the story unfolded and he immediately set the machinery in motion with Prosecutor Daniel T. O'Regan to have the young man brought to trial.

Subsequently the case was settled, everyone working together in the interest of the girl and her baby. Today—8 months later—the girl is married to a schoolboy sweetheart, the baby's father pays its board and is serving his country overseas, and in her new home, happy and contented, a grateful young woman appreciates the work of Judge Brown, Prosecutor O'Regan, Poormaster Martin Faber and the bureau of special service, whose kindly help straightened out her difficulties.

The program of an intelligent approach to the handling of juvenile and adolescent delinquency has more than justified the faith and confidence Mayor Hague has in the youth of his city.

Office of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette on the Office of Civilian Defense:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The Office of Civilian Defense is apparently devoting its energies to the task of self-preservation. A flood of correspondence from officials high and low reveals their agitation. Volunteers down in the ranks, it seems, are getting the idea that their services are no longer needed. The Nation is not now in danger of attack, if, indeed, it ever was, but holds the military initiative everywhere, whether or not it chooses to exercise it. Many of the precautions taken in the early stages of war—air raid, for instance—no longer have meaning, and it is not the way of the American to go through waste motion. He is looking to other things.

O. C. D. says this is thoughtless, if not subversive. That is a poor way to hold citizens to a voluntary service, but it hardly exceeds the argument. One is that the military threat to the Nation is not ended and will not be until war itself ends. The other is that the demands of internal security dictate a continuing organization to cope with such situations as floods, riots, airplane crashes, fires, and other emergencies.

If the argument is accepted, O. C. D. is here to stay, as obviously it intends, and one is left to wonder how communities ever got along with no more than their ordinary protective agencies.

O. C. D. was set up to meet an emergency, though set up under a political sponsorship

that almost wrecked it before it got well started. It has been accorded a full measure of support by the people, particularly as its activities became more localized, and it has performed some desirable services. Numbers of men have spent a good deal of time equipping themselves to serve as auxiliaries in police and fire departments, and here in mid-continent, where an air raid represents a far longer chance even than destruction by lightning, many not believing in it, have gone through all the air-raid precautions training, while communities have put up with blackouts.

It adds little to good temper to be told much of this was for the purpose of public discipline and that more is contemplated. People are willing to do whatever is necessary or helpful but are not in a mood to be disciplined by O. C. D. or any other administrative agency. Disciplining amounts to softening or conditioning for a role assigned, which is subserviency. That has nothing to do with war or even civilian defense.

Essential services must be maintained and to the extent that war has drained off regular personnel, volunteers must carry on. They will do so. Balking at foolish things merely strengthens the effort along serious lines.

Repeal of Chinese Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greeley (Colo.) Daily Tribune of October 18, 1943:

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION

This Congress will probably take some action on Chinese exclusion, even if it does no more than to refuse to amend the present law. The Chinese are essential to an American victory in the war in the Pacific, unless defeating the Japanese is to cost tens of thousands more lives and billions of dollars more money than it would cost with their aid. The Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in 1882 as the result of the importation of Chinese labor for the gold rush of 1850 and intervening years. The Chinese are singled out specifically as undesirable residents of the United States to be barred from admission. They are not subject to the quota restrictions placed upon European immigrants.

If China were put on the quota system only 107 Chinese per year would be admitted. The writer has heard the question debated with the proponents of exclusion always ignoring that pertinent fact.

If the Exclusion Act is not repealed, to the Chinese it will be an ever-present proof they are fighting a war in Asia merely for the perpetuation of western imperialism east of Suez.

A continuation of the Exclusion Act will serve to stir the Orient into a race war inevitable unless the western powers mend their ways. China now is the main obstacle to turning the entire Orient against the West. Repeal of the Exclusion Act, far from being an idealistic notion, would be probably the most selfish declaration of foreign policy the United States has ever adopted—selfish and far sighted at the same time.

We heard a Congressman support exclusion wholly on a selfish basis, ignoring the last three decades of history, especially the last decade, and tying his argument to the Chinese common labor importation of the last century. He was, as we said, admittedly selfish in behalf of America, but the difficulty was he was unable to see past the microphone squarely in front of him.

The President's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, The President's Responsibility, taken from the October issue of the Washington News Digest, is so concise and to the point that I offer it as food for thought to my colleagues. It contains a discussion of the food question that today worries the American people and comments upon our promise to feed the world. I thoroughly agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

When the history of this war is written, one of the most shameful pages will describe the mess into which Washington's bureaucratic bungling have brought us through their complicated and inept administration of the vital problem of feeding the American people. We can thank God that the war front is in the hands of experienced men and not in the hands of politicians.

Not only has the O. P. A. gone beyond the bounds of common sense; but what makes it even worse, the lavish promises, so smacking of political oratory, that America proposes to feed the world, is bound to injure future relations between ourselves and the peoples of Europe. The President himself seems to show a tendency toward too much promising. We cannot feed the world. Such an impression should never have been given for we have not yet adequately solved the problem of feeding our own people.

A confidential report to Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, by a committee of Government food specialists says, "The United States has never been and cannot become the food basket of the United Nations * * * surplus cobwebs have got to be brushed from many an official brain on the subject of food."

The American people are accustomed to discounting political promises. They know politicians of great promise often end up merely as great promisers. But the people of Europe are likely to assume that if we promise to feed the world, we will do just that; and be bitterly disappointed.

Let's not becloud the issue by specious generalities about humanity. We are willing to feed the hungry to the limitations of our capacity. We have always been generous as evidenced by our never collecting the billions of dollars of war debts in the last World War and to now burden our returning fighting men and their children for years to come with repayment of the enormous debt incurred in our generous lend-lease gifts.

It is the President's responsibility to provide his own people with an efficient food administration and not, to further quote Mr. Wickard's committee of experienced food experts, have American civilian food needs, "be considered as leftovers to be satisfied after all other claims are met."

Failure of O. P. A. To Make Price Adjustments on Coal in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution recently adopted by the Governor's Conference Committee on Mining for the State of Iowa:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Governor's Conference Committee on Mining for the State of Iowa that there are inconsistencies in the ceiling prices on Iowa coal; and

Whereas said committee, which consists of representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, district No. 13, Iowa; Iowa Coal Operators Association; Appanoose County, Iowa, Coal Operators Association; and officers and directors of the Iowa Coal Institute; and Iowa State Mine Inspectors, has made a definite check of the various ceiling prices set on Iowa coal; and

Whereas said group has been advised that for a period of more than 2 months requests have been made to the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C., for rectification of such prices, and definite promises and admission of errors having been made by the representatives of the Office of Price Administration, with grandiose assurance that consistent changes would be made, but to no avail: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Governor's Conference Committee on Mining for the State of Iowa, That the attention of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, his first Assistant, and likewise the Iowa Representatives in Congress, including the two United States Senators, be called to the fact that no price adjustments on the sale of Iowa coal have been forthcoming, and as a result of the failure on the part of the Office of Price Administration to make such adjustments many Iowa mines are unable to dispose of coal, although there is a definite need and a prospect of an acute shortage of coal in the State within the next 20 days; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor's Conference Committee on Mining go on record protesting the failure for such price adjustments to be made, and urging that something be done forthwith to correct such inconsistencies, so that all connected with the coal industry in Iowa may have assurance that they may proceed in a businesslike and orderly manner to produce and market the State product; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to Hon. Thomas E. Martin, Hon. Henry O. Talle, Hon. John W. Gwynne, Hon. Karl M. LeCompte, Hon. Paul Cunningham, Hon. Fred C. Gilchrist, Hon. Ben F. Jensen, Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa Representatives in Congress; Hon. George A. Wilson and Hon. Guy M. Gillette, Iowa United States Senators; Hon. Prentiss Brown, Administrator

of the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., and Hon. Clyde L. Herring, Assistant Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON MINING,
JOHN M. DRABELLE,
Chairman, President, Iowa Coal Institute, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
GEORGE HEAPS, JR.,
Vice Chairman, Secretary, Iowa Coal Operators Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
GEORGE FILLIMAN,
Second Vice Chairman, Board Member, United Mine Workers of America, District No. 13, Des Moines, Iowa.

Attest:

HUGH W. LUNDY,
Secretary, Iowa Coal Institute, Albia, Iowa.

Passed and approved this 8th day of October A. D. 1943.

Butter Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to a situation that needs correction and without protracted delay. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter from a constituent may be included in these remarks. It is a most timely letter and cites a situation that now prevails throughout our Nation:

JANESVILLE, WIS., *October 15, 1943.*
Mr. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Congressman from the First District of Wisconsin,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Raising of the ration points on butter to 16 points a pound makes me feel very much like a mother who sees a bomb coming down on her children and no air-raid shelter available. I think the O. P. A. has failed in its promise that we shall have adequate, nourishing food. I have two school-age children and to keep them healthy I must buy 2 pounds of butter a week (before the war we ate 3). That takes just half of my ration points and leaves me just enough for meat twice a week. My husband works hard and needs meat once a day but it is not possible to have it or even get cheese to help out. Before rationing we ate a pound of cheese a week. Now we cannot even buy it as we have no points to spend that way.

My children are not as healthy as they were before the rationing. My 11-year-old son's health check-up last week showed him to be 10 pounds underweight. This is due to the fact that we cannot buy sufficient healthful food. Before rationing we ate about 80 cans of processed food a month. Now the most I can buy is 10. The markets are so poor that we cannot buy enough fresh vegetables to make palatable meals.

I think the administration is punishing the farmers by raising the butter points and I think it is unfair to the health of American children to allow the administration to venge its grudge against a certain bloc by penalizing children with inadequate food.

I wish you would protest against butter rationing. I think 8 points a pound is a just price.

Very truly yours,
(Mrs. Alonzo) DOROTHY L. POND.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, express your appreciation to the man at the front, who is written about the least.

The new version of "getting the mostest there fustest" is getting the newest in scientific development and getting it there as a surprise in abundance.

While war is a wicked waste, it stimulates a nation to its highest effort. Courage is supplemented with a superresearch spirit as well as surprising sacrifice.

Going "over the top" in this war is leaving in a bomber to fight your way to where you drop eggs in Germany or on Japanese. It used to be a raid; now it is a fight.

This is about the third anniversary of "I tell you fathers and mothers again, and again, and again," and "Elect me, for R. will lead us into war." And they called it a race.

The fact that for three Sunday nights Walter Winchell has advertised a new book, Under Cover, which smears certain Members of Congress, gives rise to the certain knowledge that he is a co-author.

General Marshall, as a second lieutenant at 21, was in charge of one of the Philippine Islands and he exercised "discretion with abandon." This soldier is rugged, serious, comprehensive, and human.

The "duck," the amphibian truck, is one of the most remarkable performers of the war. It rides through the waves, not on them, always staying upright, and meets the shore as uninterruptedly as the daylight meets the dawn.

An exchange between two American planes in a battle sky was as follows: "At home someone says we can whip the Japs in 2 weeks, 1 week to find them and 1 week to lick them," says A plane. B plane replies, "Let us shorten it a week by telling them where they are."

The Committees on Ways and Means and Appropriations are together this week on one thing: Both have finished hearings on proposed bills. Thanksgiving Day will tell what the harvest will be for spending, while it may take Christmas to decide for the former what the planting shall be.

A small regiment of the crop corps, 500 men, women, and children recruited from Kentucky and Arkansas, visited the Capitol Thursday. They were returning home from northern Maine, where they had been taken to pick potatoes. While largely illiterate, with neglected physical care, they all spoke our language, as their fathers and grandfathers had done for a hundred years—good Americans.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of October 16, 1943:

INVESTIGATING LEND-LEASE

Lend-lease is a colossal operation, unique both in scale and kind. That its administration is a matter of legitimate concern to the American people goes without saying. Therefore, the reported agreement by the Senate Appropriations Committee to investigate lend-lease in conjunction with the Truman committee is in itself not out of the way.

But it is to be hoped that both the Senators involved in the investigation and the public which will hear their report will never forget the basic difference between lend-lease and an ordinary commercial transaction. Lend-lease is a means of making the highly developed resources of this country fight for American safety to an extent which the Army and Navy, great as they now are, cannot do. The present function of lend-lease is to make the British, the Russians, the Chinese, and the rest of the United Nations more efficient in the job of killing Germans and Japanese. It aided in this purpose before American military, naval, and air strength could be brought to bear against the common enemies. And no summation of things American expended under lend-lease arrangements will carry conviction to our allies unless it includes that great intangible, which is so real to them now but has just begun to loom large upon the American consciousness—the lives expended on the same account.

There is another, more technical consideration of the investigation which might also be borne in mind. It has been pointed out that the globe-girdling Senators would have performed a real service, with far less friction, if they had gone to top officials here to check their data on conditions abroad. Similarly, the Truman committee could correct many production evils without scattering confusion if it took its complaints to responsible officials before making public denunciations. The lend-lease investigators should bear in mind that they are called upon to aid in the efficient functioning of a national policy, not to make personal capital out of sensationalism or to cater to that curious colonial frame of mind which delights in lacerating itself with thoughts of how able and tricky foreign governments can be.

Seventh Annual Observance of Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include an interesting article on the seventh annual observance of Pulaski Day, October 11, 1943, in New York City:

THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND AMERICANS OF POLISH ANCESTRY MARCH IN THE SEVENTH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF PULASKI DAY IN NEW YORK CITY

NEW YORK CITY, October 11.—Thirty-five thousand Americans of Polish descent from New York and New Jersey marched down Fifth Avenue paying tribute to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski who died fighting for American liberty in the Revolutionary War.

The parade was started with a command given by Mayor F. H. LaGuardia. "The defense of Warsaw," said the mayor, "was one of the greatest epics of the war. It deserves more than admiration. The people of America say we are coming with our Army, and then with our cooperation we'll help to rebuild, and a new Poland will arise. Forward march."

For 3 hours, more than 2,000 Polish organizations passed in review before Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador to the United States; Anthony S. Gadek, grand marshal of the parade on the reviewing stand facing the New York Public Library. The parade was also reviewed by the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York; Auxiliary Bishop J. Francis McIntyre, Auxiliary Bishop Stephen J. Donohue and members of the Polish clergy headed by the Reverend Monsignor S. Dworzak, Msgr. J. Szudrowicz, and Mr. M. Szubinski, who stood before St. Patrick's Cathedral.

The Pulaski military band heralded the approach of the parade by playing the Star-Spangled Banner and the Polish national anthem, "Jeszcze Polska nie zginela." Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski and Grand Marshal A. Gadek passing in review before St. Patrick's Cathedral approached Archbishop Spellman and kissed his ring.

Among those who took part in the celebration were Rear Admiral Lamar R. Leahy, Vice Admiral T. T. Craven, Capt. T. P. Morgenstern, Manhattan Borough President Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., Col. W. Onacwicz, Lt. Gen. William N. Haskell, hundreds of nurses aids, C. D. V. O. workers, national war fund floats, and an open truck showing the operation of a Polish servicemen's canteen.

Offering messages of enccuragement to fighting Poles, Governor Dewey, Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski, and Minister Sylvin Strakacz, Consul General of Poland in New York, spoke briefly over station WHOM during the parade. "We are fighting, working, and sacrificing to preserve the dignity and freedom of freemen," Governor Dewey said, "We are fighting again, as did General Pulaski, for a just cause and we honor ourselves in pausing today to honor him."

Following the parade a dinner in honor of Ambassador Ciechanowski was given by the General Pulaski Memorial Committee at the Waldorf-Astoria, Representative T. Wasielewski, Hendrick Willem Van Loon, and George E. Sokolsky were the principal speakers. Mr. John A. Pateracki, who was toastmaster, received the Order of Polonia Restituta from the Polish Ambassador for services rendered to Poland.

Dr. Stephen M. Babcock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that tomorrow, October 22, is the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Stephen Moulton Babcock.

Dr. Babcock was born in Bridgewater, N. Y., on October 22, 1843. He was graduated from Tufts College, received a Ph. D. from the University of Gottenhain; LL. D. from Tufts; was an instructor in chemistry at Cornell University in New York; was a chemist at the New York Agricultural Experiment Station; and professor of agricultural chemistry at the University of Wisconsin. He was awarded the bronze medal by the Wisconsin Legislature in 1899, the grand prize at the Paris Exposition in 1900, the grand prize at the St. Louis Exposition in 1904, and was a member of the jury of award at the Buffalo Exposition in 1901.

Dr. Babcock died in Madison, Wis., on July 2, 1931, and perhaps no better eulogy was written at the time of his passing than that by the late Dr. Glenn Frank, who was the president of the University of Wisconsin at that time. It is as follows:

EULOGY BY DR. FRANK

Expressing the mood of myriads of men and women throughout the world, who have known the boon of his spirit or the beneficence of his science, the University of Wisconsin today bares its head and bows its heart before the memory of Stephen Moulton Babcock.

Inventor of a device and a formula that emancipated the dairy farmer from the injustice of the rule of thumb that long prevailed in the market place.

Trail blazer in the crucially important field of vitamin research.

Symbol of the best that the pursuit of science generates in the scholar and gives to the state.

Joyous comrade.

A friend beloved beyond measure.

A GREAT INSPIRER

Inspirer incomparable of the vast army of young scholars serving as acolytes at the altar of science.

Like the great seminal minds of the Renaissance, this grand old doctor of science was himself greater than anything he did, and thus, in death, he gives to us the legatees of his spirit, a goal toward which to point the education and science of our time.

This merry man of many years was made of the stuff that gives mankind its saints and its martyrs. But he was a saint without seriousness, and he could have gone to martyrdom, without a murmur of self-pity, as part of the day's work.

For his was a casual greatness.

He pursued the most painstaking research as if he were playing a game. He brought to his tasks that gayety of spirit which authentic greatness can afford. His spirit never surrendered that incorrigible playfulness which so often marks men of power. He brought laughter into the laboratory, for there was about him that deceptively careless air which creative spirits have as they go about their business.

HIS WAS CREATIVE HERESY

But there was toughness to the fiber of his mind.

He was a teacher who scorned the tyranny of the textbooks, and he did not think it impertinent to doubt the authorities. Each morning he met the universe with a question. His was the creative heresy of an insatiable curiosity. The cleansing winds of the critical spirit swept freely and forever through his mind.

He belongs to the apostolic succession of the great pioneers of research—Pythagoras, Aristotle, Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Harvey, Newton, Lavoisier, Dalton, Faraday, Helmholtz, Darwin, Pasteur, Gregor Mendel, and Einstein—for, like them, he was an adventurer into the unknown to whom research was an intellectual passion rather than an institutional ritual, to whom creative thinking was more important than elaborate equipment, and for whom there was no barricaded frontier between pure and applied science.

In an age when scholars all too often hasten to publish, even before they prove their findings, he was content to let his greatest work speak for itself, for perhaps the most illuminating fact of his career is that he never published so much as a word about his part in the discovery, definition, and defeat of that "hidden hunger" from which man and beast might die while eating their fill.

In an age smitten with the passion of publicity, he forgot himself into immortality.

And in the midst of the sickness of an acquisitive society, his spirit remained unsullied by legitimate personal considerations.

Scholar of a great university.

Servant of a great State.

Shy benefactor of mankind everywhere.

Laughing saint of science.

Being dead, he yet speaks.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of Dr. Babcock is further reflected in the contributions which his colleagues have made in following his footsteps. They include Dr. H. L. Russel, formerly dean of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. E. B. Hart, whose work in nutrition, agricultural chemistry, and vitamins is nationally recognized; Dr. E. H. Farrington, who made additional scientific discoveries in dairy science; Prof. R. A. Moore, well known for his plant development work; and Prof. K. L. Hatch, whose duty for over a quarter of a century was to carry the discoveries of the Agricultural College of the University of Wisconsin to the 185,000 farms of the State.

It is most fitting that the University of Wisconsin should hold memorial exercises tomorrow in honor of their adopted son, Dr. Stephen M. Babcock. It is equally fitting that the press of Wisconsin, on the birthday of this great man, is giving him the editorial comments which he so richly deserves.

The Grain-Feed Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the grain-feed situation is serious, if not alarming. Some days ago I had a conference with F. E. Boling, vice chairman of the Feed Industry Council, and others. As the Feed Industry Council has made a rather extensive investigation into our feed situation, I asked Mr. Boling to reduce to writing his findings and recommendation. I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks by including therein a letter received from Mr. Boling and the findings and recommendation of the Feed Industry Council. I am sure that those interested in the feed situation will be greatly interested in reading the findings of the Feed Industry Council and the recommendation made by the council. The recommendation, in my opinion, is worthy of serious consideration by the Congress.

FEED INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., October 21, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: Mr. Woolman and I wish to thank you very kindly for the time you gave us last week to consider together the very serious problem of corn and its relation to the other grains and the whole food-production program.

We have tried to condense the facts into a brief statement, copy of which we are attaching and copies of which we are sending to Mr. FULMER and Mr. HOPE.

We have also endeavored to suggest a solution to the problem which we believe is feasible and in the national interest.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this problem as it affects the food program, and if there is any way that we can be of assistance to you, we trust that you will call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

F. E. BOLING,
Vice Chairman.

MAXIMUM PRODUCTION OF EGGS, MILK, AND OTHER DAIRY PRODUCTS DEPENDS ON BALANCED GRAIN PRICES

A. THE PRESENT SITUATION AND OUTLOOK FOR THE YEAR 1943–44

1. Our total animal population is reported to be 10 to 11 percent greater than last year.

2. Our feed crops this year are smaller than last year.

Total production

[In thousands]

	1942	1943	Percent
Corn	3,175,154	3,055,605	−3.8
Wheat	981,327	835,816	−14.8
Oats	1,358,730	1,148,692	−15.5
Barley	426,150	330,212	−22.5
All sorghum grains	107,245	101,013	−5.8

3. The 1943 hay production will be about 9,000,000 tons less than 1942—a reduction of 6 percent.

4. Government reports indicate that we will probably have about 12 to 15 percent less feed per animal than we had during the past 12 months.

For every seven animal mouths to be fed in the country we could with good distribution feed only six. Every day we continue permitting the seven animals to eat out of the feed trough shortens the period that the feed supplies will last, and we soon reach the time when we can only feed five or four or three of the animals. The consequences, of course, are tremendous.

B. WE CANNOT HOPE TO CARRY THE LOAD ON WHEAT

With hay production down 6 percent, oats off 16 percent, barley off 22 percent, grain sorghums off 6 percent, and corn off about 4 percent and wheat also off about 15 percent, it is obvious that we cannot hope to make up our feed grain deficiency through the unlimited use of wheat. To do so would be to invite the possibility of a bread shortage before the year is over. Moisture conditions in the Wheat Belt are reported to be very unsatisfactory.

1. It is important to bear in mind that we are just entering the heavy feeding season, which will last through next April. This is the time when navigation on the Great Lakes is closed, and, due to the tight situation with boxcars, we can expect little help from Canada during this time. We, therefore, will have to depend on our own feed resources. The country pulled through this heavy feeding season last year with corn. The supply of corn did not dry up until May of 1943. Even so, the Government reports that we have used 470,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed during the past 12 months. Most of this wheat has been used since May 1943, when the corn situation became acute.

It is quite clear that the Government estimate of 390,000,000 bushels of wheat to be fed during the next 12 months (80,000,000 bushels less than the last 12 months) will not begin to take care of the feed requirement during a full year of heavy feeding with an increased animal population of 10 percent. If we are forced to rely on wheat instead of corn there will not be enough wheat in the country to supply the demand.

2. The present market prices on wheat, oats, and barley, being used as substitutes for corn, reflect the true value of corn. (The supply of Commodity Credit feed wheat is intermittent and dwindling and no longer capable of supplying the demand. Feed mixers have been forced to go into the open market to buy large quantities of milling wheat.)

Please note the following price comparisons on cash grains at Chicago October 18, 1943:

No. 2 hard wheat, $1.63 per bushel, equals $54.33 per ton.

No. 2 white oats, 86 cents per bushel, equals $53.75 per ton.

Feed barley, $1.24 per bushel, equals $51.67 per ton.

Corn (practically unavailable to feed mixers), ceiling price, $1.07 per bushel, equals $38.21 per ton.

Corn, if priced at $1.45 per bushel, equals $51.79 per ton.

Feeds would be improved through the use of more corn.

C. GRAIN PRICES SHOULD BE EQUALIZED TO PREVENT AN INCREASE IN THE COST OF LIVING

1. The wheat market has shown great strength because feed mixers and distillers have had to enter the open market to purchase large quantities of wheat. If the wheat price continues to advance, as it surely will unless the demand for wheat is reduced by making corn available, the higher wheat price will be reflected in flour and bread prices, and in the cost of living, unless compensated for with new subsidies, new taxes, and more Government borrowing.

2. It is most important that we conserve our diminishing wheat supply to avoid the possibility of a bread shortage in case we have a poor wheat crop.

CONCLUSION

The above facts, all derived from Bureau of Agricultural Economic Statistics, show that immediate action should be taken in the national interest to equalize the prices of all of the grains being used for feed, to make corn available in order that we may maintain maximum production of eggs, milk, and dairy products, and avoid a disastrous liquidation of livestock.

Such action is essential also to conserve our remaining wheat supplies for human use, and avoid an increase in the cost of living or additional demands for subsidies that will result from higher costs for flour and bread brought about by the lack of corn.

RECOMMENDATION

Experiences of the past 5 months show that relief from the frozen corn situation can come only through congressional action. The present situation has been brought on by a series of Government orders issued by the present administration. Congress can and should restore the balance and claim the credit.

It is recommended that both Houses of the Congress take favorable action on the following resolution:

"*Resolved, etc.*, That in order to prevent an increase in the cost of living due to the continued extensive use of milling quality wheat for animal and poultry feed at a rate that is reducing the supply of milling wheat below a safe level.

"The prices of the several feed grains should be adjusted to the present cost per ton of open-market wheat."

Colorado—Its Mountain Beauty

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the October 25, 1943, issue of Life magazine, Colorado, Its Mountain Beauty, is delineated in a graphic and impressive manner. I quote part of the story:

Colorado is a beautiful State. It has mountains of immense grandeur, valleys of quiet loveliness, canyons with walls of many colors and high plains of purpling sage. Like a very beautiful lady, poised and confident, Colorado often seems aloof. It is interested in what goes on in the world but mostly in a detached way. Colorado's geography breeds this sense of self-sufficiency. Half a continent lies on its east while strong mountains wall it in on the west. And Colorado's economy—farming, mining, ranching—encourages a feeling of lonely independence which pervades both political parties. Whichever way it turns, Colorado exercises a quiet but firm influence on the other Mountain States. Now Colorado is getting ready to welcome the world. It has begun to insist that Denver should be a main hub for the world-girdling airways that will come after the war.

This war has become very real to Colorado. Grand and glorious as are its mountains, rivers, gorges, valleys, plateaus; its farms, mines, cities, and beautiful homes, yet all this pales into insignificance when the deeds and the valor of the sons of Colorado are related in the history of our great Nation. In this same issue of Life I read that up until October 18, 1943, only 55 Congressional Medals of Honor had been awarded in World War No. 2—25 of these posthumously. Sons of Colorado had been awarded 2 of the 55.

From a careful reading I discover both of these boys are from my own town—Fort Collins, Colo.—a small farming community near the base of the great Rocky Mountains, with a population in the city of less than 15,000. This record is not equaled by any community in the entire United States. I want to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for future generations to read and appreciate, the brave deeds and the valor of the young men of the great State of Colorado. I quote from the article Congressional Medal of Honor:

(P. 49)

Donald K. Ross: This Navy machinist, only 31 but a veteran of 12 years' service, when his station in the forward dynamo room of his ship at Pearl Harbor became almost untenable due to smoke, steam, and heat, forced his men to leave the station, performing his duties until he was blind and unconscious. Rescued and revived, he returned to another dynamo room where he again fell unconscious. Upon again recovering consciousness he returned to his station where he remained until he was directed to abandon it. He is now a lieutenant, junior grade. Home: Fort Collins, Colo.

(P. 57)

Harold Bauer: Lieutenant Colonel Bauer was commander of a fighting squadron in South Pacific which was credited with bagging 92 enemy planes. He volunteered to pilot a fighter plane and sighted an enemy squadron attacking the U. S. S. *McFarland*. He fought them singlehanded and brought down four Jap planes before his failing gas supply forced him into the sea. He is missing in action. Home: Fort Collins, Colo.

Beef and Beef Cattle

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year the livestock producers and the feeders of livestock have been resisting the efforts of the "Kitchen Cabinet" to place ceilings on livestock. They have done this from patriotic motives for they know it will have only one effect—a reduction in the production of food.

For the past few days conversations have again been held and now at the insistence of this Harry Hopkins "Kitchen Cabinet," with its hair-brained and irresponsible personnel who prefer to dabble in social experiments instead of actual realities, are insisting that ceilings be placed upon live cattle. It is my understanding that Mr. Vinson, the economic stabilizer, has the order on his desk and if he has not already done so, will sign it very soon. He is doing this against the advice of Marvin Jones, the Director of the War Food Administration in the Agriculture Department. It will be signed against the best judgment of feeders and livestock producers of the country. It is against the best judgment of the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress. Such an order, with its complicated formula, will do great harm to the industry and further reduce the production of meat in this country.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the O. P. A. and the elite inner guard of this administration have made about every mistake in the book. Is it any wonder that men like Prentiss Brown and Lou Maxon have resigned from the Office of Price Administration? The "Kitchen Cabinet," led by Harry Hopkins, whose residence is still at the White House, has done more harm to the production of food than any other group in the United States. Their impractical directives and theoretical gymnastics have caused so much discouragement in the production of food that we may well see stark hunger stalking the streets of our cities within another year. There is only one redeeming feature in this state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the voters of this country have become so aroused that the administration with most of its cohorts will be thrown out of office come November 1944. The swing is on. I dare say that a week from tomorrow the elections in New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky will point the way to vacant seats on the majority side of the House and Senate. You gentlemen on the majority side, who do not come back, may thank the New Deal inner guard for causing your defeat.

There has been an irresponsible abuse of power by the inner guard. Their efforts have so bedeviled and demoralized agriculture by continuously whipping it around that they are causing a terrific shortage of meat, cream, and milk. The New Deal fiddlers have been on a dance of death for 11 long years. They are now running down. Their boogy-woogy tunes are recognized now as the output of wild-eyed pied pipers that are leading the individuals of this Nation to regimentation and complete oblivion. The people of the country, the voters, must pay the price of their dilly-dallying boondoggling practices.

The War Food Administration, one of the eight or nine agencies which have been muddling and bedeviling food production, has suggested that the livestock producers reduce their herds by a million six hundred thousand cattle. This is in order to conserve feed. Many of these will be dairy cows.

The administration continues its foolish whipping of the livestock industry around the stump of subsidy schemes and ceilings on live cattle, which actually discourage production.

These subsidy schemes and roll-back practices are merely a new form of the New Deal's old formula of trying, by the use of public funds, to buy political support from labor groups on one hand and from the farmers and livestock producers on the other. It is paying a bonus out of the Public Treasury. It borrows the money from the public and pays it back to the public in the form of subsidies.

With all of these roll-backs and various schemes comes a flood of Government regulations. Regimentation and regulation does not produce food. It actually discourages the farmers and the stockmen. The New Deal is trying coercion and intimidation to get more votes. It does not want the farmers and the stockmen to have fair prices. The New Deal's subsidy and regimentation program is a diversion of war funds to political use to cover up its own ineptitude. It is a resort to political bribery. The inner guard, by its meddling incompetence, is creating a food crisis.

The New Deal is resorting to many offensive acts, one of which includes the perversion of public funds for political purposes.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that these are sharp words and some Members of the House may say they are intemperate and should not be uttered by a Member of Congress. I cannot, however, sit idly by in this House and see these terrible mistakes being made without raising my voice in a protest.

If the act of putting a ceiling on live animals would prevent inflation and encourage production then no one would be against such a move. The actual result is the opposite effect. With the Agriculture Department against these ceilings, with the livestock producers and feeders opposed to ceilings and subsidies and with Congress expressing an overwhelming vote against the use of subsidies and ceilings on live animals then it would seem that the Inner Cabinet, which includes Mr. Vinson, ought to take heed and follow their considered judgment. It seems, however, they expect to snap their fingers at Congress and the best advice and judgment in the country and put into operation this unworkable scheme. If this was not wartime, Mr. Speaker, the individuals responsible for the reduction of the meat supply when it is so sorely needed on the American table and by our allies would be brought to the bar of justice and there made to pay for the ghastly crimes against the American public. The blame for the shortage of meat which will certainly follow can be laid at the door of this New Deal elite "Kitchen Cabinet."

This group is not responsible to the American people. They are not elected by the voters. The only way the citizen can reach them is by voting for a new face as Chief Executive of this country. He, after all, is responsible for his appointed officials.

Jeeps—Automotive Vehicles Have Peacetime Value

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems of the post-war era will be the orderly and equitable distribution of surplus military supplies, which can be utilized in our civilian economy. Information and testimony given before the Truman committee and the Small-Business Committee in recent weeks indicate the need for consideration of this problem. I realize that there are many facets to this great problem, but I submit to the Members of Congress that the prime considerations should be, first, orderly liquidation and, second, maximum recovery for the taxpayer.

Among these surplus military supplies are many items of automotive equipment which have a definite value in our post-war economy. Automobiles, trucks, bulldozers, and other types of tractors, grading and leveling machinery, and many other types of automotive equipment, including the remarkable and adaptive quarter-ton truck—4 by 4—popularly known as the "jeep."

Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a resolution designed to give the members of our armed forces preferential purchase rights to all such military vehicles which shall be designated as "surplus" and offered for sale following the termination of this great war. Although all items in the category of this bill have a tremendous value in the post-war civilian era, I want to comment particularly today on the qualities and uses both actual and potential of the versatile jeep.

MILITARY USES OF THE JEEP

The jeep has captured the imagination and admiration not only of our military but civilian population as well. This admiration is founded on a basis of sheer utility and adaptability. We Americans admire and respect any person or machine that gets results and the jeep under every test conceivable has gotten results. Its military uses are so varied that any attempt to list them must of necessity remain incomplete because as new needs are encountered the jeep will take them in its stride.

Dispatches from correspondents in every zone of action and the statements of servicemen convalescing in this country read like a citation of valor for the tiny scout car. They say it is used by privates to run errands and by generals to run battles. With a few additions, it makes an excellent ambulance that will haul four wounded men. It will pull a 37-millimeter antitank gun without a groan, and can be carried on the back of a truck like a papoose, or inside a plane like a baby kangaroo. In bombed areas, they report, the jeep has been outfitted as a self-contained fire-fighting unit for defensive use against incendiaries. It has been equipped with a snow plow to clear military roads and landing fields. Doubling in brass, it has seen duty as a field telephone unit, a portable radio station and a mobile searchlight mount. These observers agree that if the vehicle retains even half of its front-line versatility when it dons civies, it will be assured of steady employment in the post-war era.

CIVILIAN USES OF THE JEEP

The potential civilian uses will be limitless. The Department of Agriculture has recognized this factor and with the cooperation of the Army, has conducted valuable preliminary tests. These tests were limited by time and funds and in my opinion the necessary funds should be allocated for complete and exhaustive tests in the near future.

At the conclusion of some of the tests held at the Department of Agriculture's tillage machinery laboratory near Auburn, Ala., Mr. R. B. Gray, head of the Farm Equipment Research Bureau, pronounced the mechanical midget to be highly useful in plowing, harrowing, and other field work. During one experiment conducted by the Department, the jeep pulled a 7-inch furrow in an acre of cotton bottom land in 1.72 hours per acre, using 2.32 gallons of gasoline. The Government farm experts later tested the jeep on their dynamometer, which shows the draft of various plows in different soils, and its 63-horsepower engine with 4-wheel drive pulled as much as 1,300 pounds without wheel slippage. The scout car was also used to cultivate and harrow a 24-acre field in one operation, repeating the performance three times. This experiment required only 6 hours, and the jeep consumed only 2.125 gallons of gas per acre. From the results of this test and others, it does not take a Claude Wickard to conclude that the jeep has a great deal of farm blood in its mechanical veins. With a few changes it can also be converted for the operation of milking machinery; it can be utilized for cutting wood, clearing land, herding cattle. Its dual role of either tractor or automobile makes it the ideal all-purpose vehicle for a small farm. After unhitching the plow or power take-off, the farmer's son—not to mention that perennial favorite, the farmer's daughter—can use it to go to town.

How many times have you heard a soldier or civilian, whether he be city man or farmer, say, "When the war is over, I'm going to buy one of those jeeps." Mr. Speaker, the jeep has a rendezvous with post-war America. If my resolution becomes a law, the boys who are using them to win the war will have priority purchase rights in peacetime America.

Training Within Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent which has been granted me, I am presenting for printing in the RECORD a communication from Mr. Dale Purves, vice president of the John B. Stetson Co., a nationally known manufacturing firm whose plant is located in my district, together with my reply to him. I thought his views were interesting and constructive, and I am inserting his letter in the RECORD, in order that the expressions therein might be brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

JOHN B. STETSON CO.,
Philadelphia, October 5, 1943.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: Like all businessmen, I have followed with both interest and concern the course of so-called bureaucratic government in Washington and its effect upon the problems of managing businesses like the John B. Stetson Co. I know that there are administrative bureaus which vastly complicate business problems. On the other hand, as one of your constituents, I would like to go on record and give credit where much credit is due to certain other bureaus which have been a great help to us.

In the first place, the Training Within Industry program (T. W. I.) of the War Manpower Commission in its threefold program of helping manufacturers with their training programs of instruction, method improvement, and labor relations is, in my opinion, rendering to American industry a service of incomparable value. I have specialized for years in labor relations and personnel problems, and I can say in complete honesty that I know of no program that has ever been offered by any organization, private or public, which is in a class with these three governmental programs. I doubt if the public will ever realize to the full extent the real part which these programs are playing in America's extraordinary industrial effort. As you might know, the programs have been prepared by the top men in American industry and are being made available through the services of experts. I cannot think of an adequate way to express the appreciation of the value of these services.

I might be slightly prejudiced because of my position as an associate member of the National War Labor Board, representing industry, although I have not been active in this field of work since January of this year (much to my regret). Since I was active in the work regional boards have been established, and I write of them not as an associate

member of the board but rather as an ordinary citizen coming under the jurisdiction of the third regional board here in Philadelphia. Our experience in this company with the Board, both in Philadelphia and Washington, leads me to state that here again a Government bureau is performing eminently expert services with competent staffs. In a period of crisis much criticism is directed at this and similar bodies, but I firmly believe that when the history of this war is written the national and regional boards will appear as having made extraordinary contributions worthy of commendation of both business and labor.

I have written you about these two agencies and no doubt there are others. I think it is high time that we citizens coming into contact with the agencies should let our elected representatives know from our first-hand experience of the good as well as the bad. Frankly, as a student of history as well as a business executive, I think the bad has been overemphasized and the good utterly neglected.

Sincerely yours,

DALE PURVES,
Vice President.

OCTOBER 6, 1943.

Mr. DALE PURVES,
Vice President, John B. Stetson Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. PURVES: I read with great interest your letter of October 5, in which you commented so favorably upon the Training Within Industry program of the War Manpower Commission and of the activities of the National War Labor Board. Frankly, I was gratified to learn that you feel these and other agencies have made a contribution to industry and to the country as a whole. I agree with you that occasionally some complications are caused by overlapping bureaus and governmental agencies, but I think you are right also in saying that the tendency has been to overemphasize the failures and minimize the accomplishments.

Your letter impressed me to such an extent that I intend placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I am anxious that my colleagues in Congress should have the opportunity of reading the views and comments of an executive of a great industry in my district, and I hope you will have no objection to my doing this.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. BRADLEY.

O. P. A. Mileage Allowances to Traveling Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is from the Ritchie Grocer Co., wholesale grocers at Monroe, La. It explains not only the plight of the Ritchie Grocer Co., but of every other wholesale distributor of food, fertilizer, and farm equipment in my district. I represent 14 parishes—counties—in the northeast corner of Louisiana comprising 19.2 percent of the area of Louisiana, running more than 100 miles along the southern border of Arkansas, and 200 miles along the Mississippi River. This is a rural section with very limited, in fact inadequate, rail and bus transportation facilities to serve the population of 318,000 persons. The people of my district are largely dependent upon the cross-roads country store for their needs in food, clothing, fertilizer, and farm equipment and supplies. Distances are considerable, and due to the rationing of gasoline and tires many a farmer finds himself without the necessary means of transportation to go to town and purchase his merchandising needs. Further, these small country stores have neither the clerical or bookkeeping help to enable them to keep up with the multitude of Government regulations and red tape, and so are forced to lean heavily for information and assistance on the traveling representatives of the jobbers.

These traveling representatives are much more than salesmen, they are servicemen and morale builders. Their efforts save the Government, particularly O. P. A., untold difficulty and personnel effort in carrying out efficiently and satisfactorily the war-rationing program. The O. P. A. and the war effort need the capable services of these servicemen and I earnestly request that the Members of this Congress join me in pointing out to Mr. Chester Bowles, General Manager of the O. P. A., that in applying their rules and regulations governing so-called salesmen they must give due consideration to the peculiarities and differences in both distance and available transportation facilities of the several sections of this great Nation. The people of districts such as mine do not have available busses, interurban cars, and railroads that run every hour. In fact, the back country can only be reached by automobiles or trucks. Yet, this very back country, this rural farming, livestock raising section is the very one that we are depending upon to produce the much needed food with which to feed our soldiers, our sailors, workers in industrial industries, and our allies across the seas. Farming and livestock raising, food production if you please, is an essential war industry and if it is to succeed, if we are to meet our food quotas; the people throughout the Nation, you Members of this Congress, Government officials, bureaucrats, and city dwellers alike must realize that these food production workers must have all the help, guidance, and assistance possible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge full consideration of the following letter with a view that the O. P. A. will immediately reclassify and establish new and proper available transportation to these servicemen of the Nation who are servicing the workers in one of our most important war industries—the production of food on the farm—I quote the letter:

RITCHIE GROCER CO.,
Monroe, La.

Hon. CHARLES E. McKENZIE,
Member of House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McKENZIE: I am not going to impose on you by calling your attention to the low mileage allowed our salesmen, and the fact that it is impossible for them to render the service which they have always rendered in their territories as I am sure this problem has already been brought to mind. Your knowledge of the facts in the case makes it unnecessary for me to point out in detail why a total of 480 miles per month would be inadequate for a salesman working the country territory for a period of 30 days.

It seems the unfortunate thing that has caused this condition is that all salesmen have been thrown into one category. I will admit that as far as sales force to sell what merchandise we or anyone else can get is needless, but the service rendered to our customers by our sales force is certainly very vital in the distribution of dry groceries and fresh fruits and vegetables as their time is very largely consumed in familiarizing the retail merchant as a distributor of food to the consumer with the Government program which affects the distribution of that food.

While I know you very largely understand the thing I am pointing out, I doubt if you realize the magnitude of this service unless you could see for yourself the amount of ration points, checks, certificates, and other data that is collected daily by our sales force. This requires technical knowledge which a colored truck driver would be unable to acquire.

Won't you take whatever step that is within the grasp of your power to get some relief for the food distributor's serviceman (not sales)? As you know, we handle a large stock of dry groceries as well as distribute quite a large volume of fresh fruits and vegetables, which we operate through our produce department distributing this merchandise largely between the Ouachita and Mississippi Rivers from the Arkansas line to Jonesville. It would be impossible to make an equitable distribution of merchandise over this area without the service of these men. It is true we could dispose of what merchandise we can get here in the city of Monroe, but it is our understanding that Washington wants an equitable distribution maintained. The only way we can do this is through our sales services.

Any assistance you can give us in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

E. N. THOMPSON, *Manager.*

Increase of Pay of Railway Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the railway workers of America are in a peculiar position. They received an increase in pay late in 1941, based on the railway revenues of 1940. Then the Little Steel formula was later promulgated, which had the effect of freezing their wages for the duration, unless inequities should be recognized and an adjustment made. The railroads are breaking all records in carrying freight and passengers. No one ever dreamed that they could haul so much with the equipment they have. The workers get no one and one-half for overtime until after 48 hours have passed. The employees have performed an almost superhuman task in working with management to handle the great volume of traffic. The railway system of the United States is the nervous system of our whole industrial plant. Without

the railways we could not get our war materials and our men where they are needed to help us win.

These workers asked for a modest increase in their wages. After a prolonged hearing held under the auspices of an Emergency Board, the board recommended an increase of 8 cents per hour, although they stated that the evidence justified a 20 cents per hour increase. The 8-cent recommendation was made as being "noninflationary." This award was reduced by the Economic Stabilizer, Hon. Fred M. Vinson. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of Mr. George M. Harrison, the president of the railway clerks, which ably presents their viewpoint and the far-reaching effect of the ruling above-mentioned:

RAIL CLERKS' CHIEF RECITES LONG FIGHT FOR SQUARE DEAL—DECLARES "RUN-AROUND" HAS CREATED CHAOTIC SITUATION, WITH WORKERS DESERTING INDUSTRY; A. F. OF L. LEADERS PROMISE TO BACK UNIONS IN ANY STAND TAKEN

Blistering denunciations of the administration's wage-freezing policies, particularly as they affect the Nation's railroad workers, highlighted the closing session of the American Federation of Labor's annual convention in Boston last Thursday.

President George M. Harrison of the Railway Clerks started the fireworks. Fresh from a conference at the White House, where the railmen were again turned down on their wage demands, Harrison literally seethed with indignation as he told the assembled 600 delegates of the raw deal given the men who keep the "Iron Horse" rolling.

Harrison started from the beginning of the long battle by 15 cooperating railway labor organizations to get a square deal on wages for the million workers they represent.

He told of the 44 days of hearings conducted by an emergency board, consisting of two noted economists and an outstanding attorney, at which the unions, at a cost of $100,000, presented impressive evidence justifying an increase of 20 cents an hour.

BOARD RECOGNIZED INEQUALITIES

Finally, in May, the board reported its recommendations to President Roosevelt. On the merits, a 20-cent boost would be in order, the board said, but to comply with the stabilization program, it awarded only 8 cents an hour as a minimum, noninflationary raise, Harrison pointed out.

The rail unions were profoundly disappointed with the meager award, but at the urgent appeal of President Roosevelt, decided to accept, Harrison said.

"As good citizens in time of war, anxious to do all humanly possible to contribute to the successful defense of our Nation, we capitulated and accepted the request of the President and regarded the controversy as closed," Harrison declared.

"But, lo and behold! Out of a clear sky on the morning of June 23, when we were to assemble in the conference room with the carriers and execute the contract, Judge Vinson (Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson) issued an edict setting aside the 8-cent increase—with no notice, no conference, no previous indication that any such action would be taken."

This came at a time, he said, when "the railroad corporations are making the greatest profits in the history of our Nation."

"Last year the railroads wound up with a clear profit of a billion and a half dollars," he pointed out. "Yet we are told that 3,500,000 persons, the railroad workers and their families, cannot enjoy part of their own creation to relieve the terrific pressure exerted against them to make both ends meet in time of rising wartime prices.

ONLY INFLATION WOULD BE OF EMPTY STOMACHS

"We are told that if the money remains in the coffers of the railroad corporations it is noninflationary, but if it is distributed to the families of a million-plus railroad workers, it is inflationary. It may be in one sense—it would inflate the stomachs of these poor workers on the railroads, but that's all.

"I don't know where we are going when one man, without examining a scintilla of evidence in the case, without hearing or previous warning, presumes with a stroke of a pen to hold that it would upset the national economy if the workers were permitted to enjoy an adjustment of a gross inequity that everybody admits."

Harrison warned that such method of dealing with workers, if persisted in, would destroy orderly, democratic collective bargaining. He let it be known that since June the union chiefs have been battling at conferences with President Roosevelt and administration officials to get a fair deal, but so far without result.

"Our situation is desperate, or I would not be here before you today," he said. "Our people are revolting. Thousands have left our industry. We are on the verge of a most chaotic condition in railroad transportation. Our turn-over has reached a rate exceeding 100 percent of the working force.

"Railroads have tried to meet the critical manpower shortage by hiring 14- and 15-year-old school boys and importing Mexicans, and now they're trying to get prisoners of war—anything, rather than pay decent wages.

"You can't operate the Nation's railroads with school children or Mexicans who know nothing of our methods," Harrison asserted. "Certainly, you can't do it with enemy prisoners. I can't get the reasoning of those who would turn loose a Nazi soldier, skilled in demolition practices under the Fuehrer, to run amuk on the Nation's railroads."

WILL CONTINUE BATTLE FOR JUSTICE

The rail clerks' chieftain added that "our people are demanding we put out a strike ballot." He assured the convention that railmen will "do nothing to obstruct the Nation's war effort," but he made it clear the unions would fight for justice by every method available.

"We are suffering," he concluded, "from one of the greatest injustices that has ever been perpetrated upon a large group of patriotic and loyal citizens in a most vital industry in time of war. Unless this condition is rapidly corrected, chaos impends."

When he finished, President William Green of the A. F. of L., in a voice that shook with emotion, declared he supported every word uttered by Harrison.

"I could be arrested for what I think of the man who rendered this decision against the railroad workers," he cried. "The money for these workers is earned; it is flowing into the treasuries of the railroads, but, according to Judge Vinson's ruling, it must all go along only one route—into the pockets of the owners of the railroads, and not a single penny into the wages of the workers. It is an outrage.

"We protest against that outrageous decision; we protest with all the vigor at our command. I will say to George Harrison and those he represents that, whatever they decide to do in order to offset that injustice and that decision, the American Federation of Labor will stand with them and support them."

MEANY'S EXCORIATION OF CZARS

An equally scathing condemnation of the administration's wage shackles came from Secretary-Treasurer George Meany of the A. F. of L. He accused the administration of outright violation of the agreement made with organized labor after Pearl Harbor.

Under that pact, labor made a no-strike pledge in return for creation of a National War Labor Board, composed of labor, industry, and Government representative, that would have a free hand in settling disputes on their merits.

However, one Presidential Executive order after another stripped the W. L. B. of its authority, put it under rigid regulations, and placed "czars" over it, Meany said. "We no longer have a free board," he declared.

He blamed the administration for writing ironclad Little Steel formula into an Executive order, thus making it impossible for the Board to grant wage increases to keep step with the rising cost of living.

"There is no cure for the troubles that beset the Board except to restore its power to act, the power it possessed when it was originally set up," Meany maintained.

He insisted that super agencies—that is, the offices of "Czars" Vinson and James F. Byrnes—"must be removed from the backs of the Board." The convention voted unanimously to request President Roosevelt to take such action.

DELEGATES CONDEMN COMPULSORY METHODS

In a similar mood, the delegates condemned the trend toward use of compulsory methods by the Government over manpower and demanded a return to voluntary processes.

"There are powerful interests seeking to discredit efforts to solve manpower problems by voluntary cooperation. They seek an excuse for enactment of a compulsory-service law," the convention declared.

"No outside authority could be entrusted with control of human lives without the most meticulous protection of rights of workers and assurance of fair conditions, and even then involuntary servitude is not justified."

The convention wound up by reelecting President Green, Secretary-Treasurer Meany, and 15 vice presidents. This will make Green's twentieth term as chief of the A. F. of L.

Farmers' Union Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to Hon. James G. Patton, president, National Farmers' Union, by the President of the United States, together with a statement issued by Mr. Patton following a conference at the White House on October 19, 1943.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 18, 1943.

JAMES G. PATTON, ESQ., *President,*
National Farmers' Union,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTON: Like you, I believe that farmers should receive the return for their crops and livestock which is necessary in order to enable them to produce to the maximum. The War Food Administration is now holding

conferences in each State on the 1944 food-production program. At these meetings farm officials and leaders will state their views on the loan and support price arrangements necessary to enable farmers to produce to the limit in 1944. With the knowledge thus gained, and with early action by Congress to provide the needed authorizations and funds, we should be able well in advance of the production season to give farmers the price assurances required to see them through an all-out production program.

I am glad to know that the farmers you represent appreciate that our farm-support programs should be operated in a manner which will not only insure maximum production but will hold down the costs of the family food basket. I am convinced that opposition to the use of limited and judicious subsidies for this twofold purpose is not in the best interest of the American farmer.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. Patton's statement follows:

A year's campaign to nullify the Economic Stabilization Act is on the verge of success. An unholy coalition of spokesmen for big agriculture, processors, distributors, and the United States Chamber of Commerce has worked without let-up to this end.

This coalition would prevent price stabilization by insisting on prices "rising to their natural level in the open market" and opposing the use of subsidies, insisting that higher farm prices, some of them necessary to get production in the kinds and quantities needed, be passed on in higher prices to consumers. At the same time, this coalition has opposed wage adjustments to meet higher living costs and at least some of its members are now on record in favor of a 10-percent sales tax, which for low-income farmers and wage earners amounts to a straight wage cut. All this has been advocated with full knowledge that scrapping of the Economic Stabilization Act and adoption of this program would invite inflation.

As a result we now face an outbreak of national disunity, name calling, and weakening of war production, both in industry and on the farms. Labor, having waited more than a year for prices and profits to be stabilized, and facing living costs officially 6 percent above September 1942, is pressing for wage adjustments in coal mining, transportation, and other industries. The House Banking Committee has recommended a new prohibition against subsidies. Nothing effective in the way of limitation of war profits is being considered. We are on the verge of a disaster on the home front that would be as valuable to our enemies as a major military defeat of our armies.

It is high time the American people recognize that the use of subsidies is now the only practicable alternative to spiraling increases in prices, wages, and profits. Let's draw a new anti-inflation line, fair to all, and stick to it. Let's stop political jockeying for 1944. We still have a war to win and a peace to organize.

Farm prices should yield the farmer at least parity; prices actually necessary to get production should be paid; when such prices require, subsidies should be used to prevent increases in consumer prices. The cost is infinitely less than the immeasurable damage of war and post-war inflation and deflation.

The average working farmer knows that he gets all of a subsidy and that processors and handlers take a cut of every price rise. He knows that subsidies come from the General Treasury and thus are paid by those best able to pay them, i. e., the income-tax payers. He knows that spiraling prices will add much more to the national debt than a moderate subsidy program. That is why most real farmers favor such a program. That is why the pro-inflation coalition is against it.

I am convinced that working farmers would much rather have known prices written into standard war-food production agreements than to gamble for higher and higher prices leading to a collapse such as threw 1,000,000 farmers off their farms after World War No. 1. Such agreements should, like industrial war production contracts, include credit, advance and prograss payments, technical assistance, priorities in feed, seed, machinery, fertilizer, and labor. With such a program, war-food production can be increased 20 percent by enlisting in maximum production more than 1,300,000 farm families now under-financed, under-equipped, and therefore under-employed.

Working farmers and labor have been told this is a peoples' war. They have sent their finest men to fight it. It is high time it be made a peoples' war here on the home front in all-out production at stable prices, stable wages, and stable profits.

Iraq-Palestine: Answer to Military Attaché of the Royal Iraqi Legation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat unseemly for the attaché of a foreign embassy to rush into public print to air views that might stir up controversy in the country to which he is accredited. Maj. Chefik Haddad, military attaché of the royal Iraqi legation, has done so. His immunity departs. He cannot complain if, figuratively speaking, he gets his knuckles cracked by a Member of the House who respects the attaché's position but violently disagrees with him.

In this connection I herewith append a letter which I have addressed to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, under date of October 20, 1943:

OCTOBER 20, 1943.

The EDITOR, THE HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: The statement by Maj. Chefik Haddad, military attaché, Royal Iraqi Legation, which appeared in your valued paper Sunday, October 17, cannot remain unchallenged. The statement is more important for what it omits and for its manipulation of evidence to suit a pre-fixed conclusion than for what it includes.

While I have great respect for the distinguished major, I feel he is woefully in error, and, unwittingly or wittingly, gives an erroneous picture to the American public of conditions in the Near East. We cannot possibly agree with Major Haddad's contention that the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jewish people is the stumbling block in the way of Arab unity.

There are no insurmountable obstacles that would prevent the Jews and the Arabs from achieving complete unity in all their relationships. There has never been any internal, concerted effort within Palestine to create strife between the two; that is to say, a national uprising by the Arab fellahin or peasants against the Jews in Palestine. The evidence is crystal clear that the intermittent clashes were deliberately fostered by outside interests—interests that could only retain control by disuniting two peoples. The power politics of the British colonial office and the selfishness and the failure to encourage enlightened and higher standards of living of the fellahin by the effendis share the blame for the sporadic uprisings rather than, as Major Haddad would have us believe, the glorious expression of the Arab people seeking self-determination. Had there been marked objection to the Jews in Palestine, the success of the colonization of Palestine by the Jews would have been dubious, to say the least, instead of the fait accompli it is today.

The Jews husbanded the arid soil of Palestine and made it rich in the fruits of the earth; they built hospitals for the Jew and Arab alike; they brought the lamp of learning to the desert with schools and the world-renowned Hebrew University; they brought music and science to a world that had been left behind in civilization's march. All this for the Arab and Jew alike.

That which was uncultivated and considered uncultivable by the Arabs has been cultivable and cultivated by the Jews. The sands of Rishon le Zion, the swamps of Hedra, the rocks of Motza, the stony hills of Hanita, and the largest malarial area in Palestine, the Huleh Basin, which has been classified not only by the Arabs but also by the British Government as uncultivable land, are now being turned into the most prosperous and productive land of Palestine. They had to reclaim, drain, reforest, fertilize, and irrigate; they introduced modern and intensive methods of cultivation, modern machinery, new breeds of cattle and poultry, new plants and seed rotation of crops. In 1937, the Peel Royal Commission stated: "12 years ago the national home was an experiment; today it is a going concern."

There has been since then further expansion. New industries have been started, textile, chemical, wood, metal, electrical, food, building, clothing, which supply the home market and the Near East as far as India. In 1941, alone, over 200 new Jewish industrial undertakings were established.

Nor has the immigration and settlement of Jews in Palestine been at Arab expense. The increase in the yield of the land has made it possible not merely to provide for additional settlers, but makes it possible for the old settlers to enjoy a higher standard of living. The Arabs have chosen, as a matter of fact, to live in the greatest numbers in the neighborhood of Jewish settlements, and the increase in Arab populations has closely paralleled the Jewish increase, not only through the lowered death rate, but also because large numbers of non-Palestinian Arabs have seeped into the country to enjoy the highest standard of living in the Near East.

It is most pertinent to ask whether such development had been possible if there had existed any real animosity between the two peoples.

Major Haddad professes, by what authority I do not know, to speak for all of the Arabs.

There had been another spokesman for the Arab people. Emir Feisal, official delegate of the Arab people at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, had approved Zionist aspirations in a historic letter which he addressed in February 1919 to Felix Frankfurter, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. "Our deputation here in Paris is fully acquainted with the proposals submitted yesterday in the Zionist organization to the Peace Conference, and we regard them as moderate and proper," he wrote. Then he added: "We will do our best, insofar as we are concerned, to help them through; we will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home." With complete objectivity, can it not be asked why was not this viewpoint represented in Major Haddad's statement which poses as a representation of a total Arab view?

The major presents the Zionists as extremists and directly implies that they stand in

the way of Pan-Arabism. He goes on to give his own version of such unity. One would look in vain for any foundation of Pan-Arabism or Pan-Islamism. It did not exist 25 years ago when Arabia was liberated from the Ottoman yoke. It does not exist today. Col. T. E. Lawrence, better known as Lawrence of Arabia (if ever there was an expert on matters pertaining to Arabia, it was he), said:

"The Arabic-speaking peoples are as diverse as the English-speaking and equally distinct. From Morocco to Mesopotamia is as far, spiritually, as from San Francisco to Aberdeen. Further, there is a world between the Bedouin of Azrak and the peasant of Amman—though the journey is only 50 miles. Only a criminal would wish to make them all alike.

"When people talk of Arab confederations or empires, they talk fantastically. It will be generations, I expect—unless the vital tempo of the East is much accelerated—before any two Arab states join voluntarily. I agree their only future hope is that they should join, but it must be a natural growing-together. Forced unions are pernicious, and politics, in such things, should come after geography and economics. * * * The nearest approach to an Arab empire at present is Ibn Saud's. It is a figment built on sand. Nothing static will rise in the desert, which has seen hundreds of such tyrannies as his, all cemented with blood. It will pass."

Aside from the medley of races to be found in the Arab peoples, we find tremendous religious differences in Islam. There are the Sunmites and the mystic Shiites, the Wahhabi or Senusi brand, and scores of other sects and schisms. In addition, there are the political ambitions of Arab pashas and caliphs. Yesterday it was Hussein, Sherif of Mecca. Today it is Ibn-Saud of Arabia. We again repeat the words of Lawrence of Arabia. Any kind of Arab unity "is a figment built on sand. Nothing static will rise in the desert, which has seen hundreds of such tyrannies as his, all cemented with blood. It will pass."

Again, that there is no such unanimity is reflected by the number of diverse political organizations (leaving out, of course, the by far larger number of Arab peasants who are inarticulate). There are the Istiklal, founded in 1932, the Palestine Arab Party, founded in 1935 by the former Mufti (Haj Amin el Husseini). The Mufti, it will be remembered, was instrumental in organizing an Arab legion which was destroyed by the Red Army while fighting for the Axis on the Russian and African fronts. He now resides in Berlin, having alined himself with the Nazi group. He likewise was instrumental in organizing the pro-Axis revolt in Inraw, Major Haddad's country, in 1941. Still another Arab party is the National Defense Party, founded in 1934 by Ragheb Bey Nashnashibi. There are those Arabs who favor collaboration with the Jews on the basis of a permanent Jewish minority of about 40 percent in a binational state, and still others who see no reason why Jews and Arabs cannot each within his own state live amicably side by side.

It is not seemly for the major to speak of the Arab sacrifices and contributions to the Allied Nations when we remember that when Rommel and his Afrika Korps were ready to leap from El Alamein to Cairo and then seal the fate of the Allies in the Near East by closing up the Suez Canal, the lately avowed friend of America and Britain, King Ibn Saud, had not a word to say, could not spare a single trooper, camel, or donkey for Britain's use. More British troops were required to patrol the doubtful Arab areas and cities, especially in Egypt, than there were actually facing Rommel's Afrika Korps in the Libyan Desert, Pierre van Passen, distinguished writer, reports. While talking of Arab contributions, the major, if not so intent upon escaping the facts, might have made mention of the contributions of the Palestinian Jews to the war effort. It is now widely known that Jewish Palestine is democracy's arsenal, its granary and storehouse in the Near East. Thousands of factories, small and large, are turning out essential supplies and war materials, which, together with the food raised on Jewish farms, would have had to be transported thousands of miles were they not produced on the spot. This was of inestimable value to the cause of the United Nations, especially so at the time when the Mediterranean was closed to Allied shipping. In addition, more than 32,000 Palestine Jews, out of a total of 550,000, have voluntarily enlisted in the British Army and that enlistment continues. This is more than 6 percent—equivalent to an enlistment of 8,000,000 in the United States. What men and what resources were placed at the feet of the Allied Nations by the Arabs when the hour of need was greatest?

When Major Haddad talks of the dangers of the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, the reader is troubled with visions of hordes of Jews pouring into the land of the Arab without so much as a leaning post left for the dispossessed Arab. The fact is that Palestine is but a mere strip of land, having an area (without Transjordan) of 10,429 square miles. In area its size is comparable to that of the State of Vermont. It is well and decidedly in point to consider a view of the facors pertaining to the other Arabian lands.

To the east lies Iraq, which has a territory of 115,000 square miles and a population of about 3,000,000. Iraq is governed by the boy King Feisal II, the great grandson of Hussein of Mecca. After the pro-Axis revolt led by its Premier, Rashid Ali, in May of 1941 against Britain, with whom Iraq had a treaty, the British occupied the land. In January 1943 the new regime officially joined the United Nations. The incumbent Premier is Said Nuri. More than two-thirds of the population are Moslems.

To the north of Palestine is Syria, comprising 58,000 miles with a population of 3,500,000. Until the outbreak of the present war it was a French mandated territory, but on September 27, 1941, the Fighting French General Catroux declared Syria an independent republic. Two months thereafter Lebanon, to the west, formerly part of Syria and with a population of 905,000, more than half of which are Christians, was recognized as an independent republic.

To the south of Palestine is Saudi-Arabia, or the Kingdom of Hedjaz, largest of the Middle East territories, with 900,000 square miles, a great part of which is desert. It has a population of some 4,500,000. It is an independent state ruled by King Ibn Saud. He heads the fanatically militant Moslem sect called Wahhabis.

To the south of Saudi-Arabia lies Yemen, an independent state of 75,000 square miles and a population of 3,500,000. It is governed by Iman Yahya, who was friendly to the Fascist Italy until Britain reconquered Ethiopia.

On the Persian Gulf there is Oman, comprising 82,000 square miles with a population of 500,000 and having treaty relations with Britain. There are also a number of lesser principalities on the fringe of the Arabian Peninsula.

Egypt, with its population of 17,000,000, is numerically and in other respects the most important of the so-called Arab lands. The people of Egypt, however, proclaim themselves to be Egyptians rather than Arabs.

Arabic-speaking peoples of diverse racial stock are also to be found throughout north Africa, in Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco.

Finally, it must be remembered that a long internal struggle has been in progress for many years between the nomadic elements and their primitive ways and the settled population striving to establish a modern way of life. The land for most part is owned by feudal landlords. It is also well to keep in mind that the only relative stability has been achieved by forceful conquest, as in Saudi Arabia.

Not wishing to be trapped by the convenient generalization so artfully employed by Major Haddad, I have deliberately set for the multiple facts to emphasize, firstly, the absurdity of speaking of Palestine as a stumbling block to Arab unity, and, secondly, to point out the vast differences existing among the Arabs, the differences in culture, pursuits, political idealogy, the fanaticism of varying religious sects. Then, too, to ignore the British, French, German, Italian, Turkish, and Russian interests, mandates, and controls in the Near and Middle East in speaking of the possibility of Arab unity is to choose to build a chimera.

Surely Major Haddad has made a study of the problems, but he makes mention of no barrier save that of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. That is a staggering burden to place on a little strip of land that is Palestine, 10,429 square miles as contrasted with the hundreds of thousands of acres of land that the Arab peoples can claim as home.

Nor does he take the pains to disclose that for every inch of land the Jewish people possess in Palestine they have paid for. There was no forcible entry. The land was bought from the Arab landowners, every bit of it, at excessive prices. They paid even in excess of arable land values and received desert values of lands dry and barren.

It is not difficult to discern how wholehearted is the major's approval of the MacDonald White Paper, though he is very careful not to make mention of it by name. The British fumbling stewardship of Palestine culminated in the gross MacDonald White Paper which limited Jewish mass immigration into Palestine to the sum total of 75,000 for the 5-year period, from 1939 to 1944, thereafter to be stopped completely, dependent upon the will of the Arab majority. The further facts that the mandate was approved by 52 nations which approved the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine and that a convention was signed by the United States and Great Britain, prohibiting the denial of entrance into Palestine because of race or religion are all deemed unmentionables by the major. It may be that mention by him of such pertinent facts would imply his approval of the violation of treaties and his sanctioning of the betrayal of pledges. Nor does he mention the fact that the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations not only refused to approve the MacDonald White Paper, but denounced it. It probably is a bit unpalatable for him to tell us that Winston Churchill called the MacDonald White Paper a "breach of faith."

The continuous historic association with Palestine of the Jewish people is further denied both directly and by implication throughout his statement, a point of view completely contrary to the Balfour Declaration, the Mandate of the League of Nations, the 52 nations ratifying the mandate and the approval and consent of the United States both by way of convention and congressional resolution.

In addition, Major Haddad may as well know, first as last, that the American public before and after the famous Balfour Declaration and up to the very present moment wholeheartedly supported the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. They do not want the Balfour Declaration impinged upon. At the same time, the American public sympathizes with

the aims and aspirations of the Arabs, consistent with the maintenance and perpetuity of the Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

The American public, indeed, will not permit Palestine to be sold down the river. In his despatches to his home government, let Major Haddad emphasize that scores of Congressmen and Senators entirely disapprove of the sentiments he expressed concerning Palestine; that, on the contrary, they have gone on record and will go on record again for free and untrammeled immigration of the Jews into Palestine—their ancient homeland.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Adopting Chinese Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, for a political party that believes in war and has never failed to get us into war when in power, it would seem to me that it would have some regard for the feet of the little ones who will be called upon to defend the new world order if and when we are called upon to police the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of October 9, 1943:

ADOPTING CHINESE MISTAKE

It would be preposterous for the United States at this late date to adopt the old Chinese custom of compressing the feet, but according to the Greater Buffalo Shoe Retailers Association, it appears that the rationing rules concerning children's shoes are working in that direction.

It seems that additional shoes can be obtained for children if the parents visit the rationing boards and apply for additional stamps, but tedious waiting in line is necessary and many parents are reported to have given up the task rather than go through the burdensome procedure.

There appears to be plenty of evidence to substantiate the contention that two pairs of shoes a year for children are insufficient. Health Commissioner Fronczak pointed out in a letter that "it is impossible, having fitted a child's foot correctly, to have that fit last for 6 months. It is said that this rationing order was put into effect to prevent hoarding of shoes, but the result is that children, instead of wearing well-fitting shoes and having perfect feet, are definitely the losers."

Convincing testimony was offered by Miss Lucie K. Browning, foster home department supervisor of the Children's Aid Society, who said: "You cannot fit children's feet for 6 months in advance without crippling their feet."

Forcing parents of children to spend hours standing in line at ration boards every few months to obtain additional shoe ration stamps places an unfair burden upon them. Mothers of large families cannot easily leave home for such unnecessary errands, and it is well known these days that many fathers are employed during hours which make it impossible for them to visit rationing boards.

As an additional argument, we might point out that unnecessary trips to rationing boards and hours of standing in line wears out the shoes of parents at a faster rate and thus to that extent defeats the shoe rationing program. The association's recommendation for a specially designated ration stamp for children only seems to be a good solution. A similar plan worked well in the case of providing war workers with safety shoes.

China began many years ago to discard the practice of compressing the feet of girls into unnatural form and dimensions, and there is no reason why this country should enter upon the custom now and apply it to both sexes. The Government owes it to the children to let them buy wearable well-fitting shoes; they do have to get their feet on the ground in normal fashion in order even to try to succeed in life these days. And that regardless of President Roosevelt's promise of some years ago to the effect that "I will not let the people down."

The Late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast made by Phillip Keyne Gordon over Mutual network from WJW, Akron, on October 11, 1943:

There is a bill before this session of Congress which I would like to recommend to your consideration.

It is a measure which doesn't cost the people of the United States one cent except the time of their elected Congressmen, and that they pay for whether they get it or not.

It doesn't ask for an appropriation, nor, so far as I know, does it have any special political significance.

It proposes only that a certain action of 18 years ago be declared a mistake and that the arbitrary fact created by that action be altered.

Do you remember Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell? Do you remember how, at the close of World War No. 1, he started on a one-man crusade to tell the "brass hats" of the Army and Navy what the airplane would do in future wars?

The general got himself in hot water. He quarreled with his superiors. He attacked strategy, military organization, and the efficiency of officers who were making the military policy of this Nation.

He fought for an air corps.

He was awarded much public attention, and much unfavorable official notice. You will perhaps recall that he prophesied the possible sinking of big ships by airpower alone, and that his theories were given something of an opportunity at demonstration. I do not know how far Billy Mitchell peered into the crystal of the future 20 years ago. I don't know whether he foresaw a bomb sight that would hit a barrel head from 20,000 feet, or dreamed of a swift plane carrying a deadly torpedo. Perhaps he could envision an airplane diving at 700 miles an hour, or in level flight at 450. Perhaps he only foresaw that there would be developments and that the airplane as a weapon of war was not then even on the threshold of the efficiency it would achieve.

If you are old enough, I know that you will remember the difference of opinion which followed his demonstration of attack bombing.

I know that you will remember how that difference of opinion grew into an acid and violent controversy which resulted in public court-martial proceedings against General Mitchell for insubordination. Those proceedings resulted in his conviction on the charge, and a sentence that he be degraded to a colonelcy and suspended from duty for 5 years.

The officers of the court martial knew Billy Mitchell, and they knew he would never accept the verdict—that his resignation would follow. I doubt if they realized that his crusade would never end until death had stopped him in his determined career.

During the years which immediately followed, I used to see General Mitchell every once in a while. He was always ready for an interview renewing the fight, always ready with some new and effective statement about the warplane of the future. I remember back in—I think it was 1932—he told me one day that in a war to come the airplane would be the principal vehicle across the Atlantic; that it would be the most effective antisubmarine weapon, and that it would, alone, sink the biggest ships on the sea if they were not rearmed to meet its threat.

Pearl Harbor was a fulfillment of his prophecy. The hulks of the British *Repulse* and the *Prince of Wales* are evidence of the accuracy of his judgment.

In retrospect it seems that had we taken General Mitchell as seriously as we should, had we believed in him just enough to take precautions against the things he foresaw, we might have been a year further along with this war.

The bill in the Congress of the United States—the bill which I mentioned at the start of this broadcast—proposes that posthumously, for General Mitchell has been dead for about 8 years now, the President of the United States shall restore to him the rank of brigadier general in the United States Army Air Force.

It is a little thing. It doesn't cost any money. It recognizes that Gen. Billy Mitchell was a great American. And he was.

There is a collateral set of facts that seems to apply. The Army's "brass hats" made a colonel out of General Mitchell on the records. That was as far as they could go. They couldn't degrade him in the minds of the American people. To most of us he was still General Mitchell. I think, maybe, it's time to set the record straight. Some of the general's friends want to have the bill pass before December 20, which would have been his sixty-ninth birthday, had he lived. I think he would like that, and I'm asking my Congressman if he won't vote for the bill.

The Same Old Sucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extremely interesting and realistic editorial from the Idaho Statesman, published at Boise, Idaho:

THE SAME OLD SUCKER

Neither ten nor a thousand rebukes of the globe-trotting Senators would mean anything to us except that there is a lot of fire in the smoke. In trying to dodge the truth or crush it the President has always called persons liars or traitors or said they were giving comfort to the enemy. It is our candid opinion that Mr. Roosevelt's notion

of truth is nothing more, and has never been anything more, than the very personal prejudices through which he looks at the world.

And in the present squabble between Roosevelt and the five Senators who, after a look at affairs abroad, decided that the public ought to know more about this war, it is well to remember who those Senators are. For CHANDLER we've never had much admiration; but LODGE is one of the ablest and most honest men in the Senate; and MEAD, we shouldn't forget, is a New Deal wheelhorse. Now let's have a look at what the Senators LODGE, RUSSELL, and MEAD had to say.

Of the 17 separate conclusions which they arrived at, we haven't space for more than a few. MEAD fetched clippings from Australia and Great Britain purporting to reveal a strong anti-American bias. We can skip that. There are newspapers in this country with an anti-British bias. Far more serious is the charge that Great Britain and Russia are hoarding their petroleum supplies, while we, who have only 12 percent of the world's total, are contributing 70 percent to the United Nations' war effort. That we can easily believe because we are still the same old sucker.

The Senators declared that we are piling up endless problems by our "silly propaganda abroad indicating that this Nation will feed and clothe the world in the peace to come." They warn us (who but fools need the warning?) that the task is impossible, but that failure to feed the world will, nevertheless, cause hatred of us in many countries. That is what we have said in this column more times than once. If we continue to go the Roosevelt way we are heading for one hell of a bust.

They said—and remember that a new dealer concurred in this—that "lend lease supplies sent to Great Britain are being distributed by the British as their own products, breeding good will for the British at the expense of this country and laying the basis for future British trade." It is assumed that Churchill in a recent speech took a slap at the Senators. If the British are using our goods, given away, to build future trade, no wonder Winnie didn't like to have us know about it.

In regard to any of these matters we don't have to depend wholly on the word of the Senators. Raymond Clapper, a New Dealish commentator, declared in Thursday's Statesman that Churchill still has a "stand-pat empire position. The British will hold everything. They will hold Hong Kong. Stalin will hold the Baltic states, and God knows what else * * * I am at a loss to find any suggestion from London or Moscow that advances the cause of collaboration. There is not the faintest sign of any conclusion."

That is Clapper speaking. And in the same issue Mallon called to our attention the book by Kenneth Crawford, a topflight reporter, which deals with our fighting men in north Africa and elsewhere. It is Crawford's opinion that our men will come back believing that "only complete isolation from the rest of the world is a good national policy." Put that statement side by side with one made by the Senators, namely, "that a need for a clear national policy for this country is strikingly apparent."

Even for a moron these facts are evident: (1) That if the British persist in holding on to every single bit of their Empire, and if the Russians persist in violating small nations in the interest of what they call national safety, then (2) the peace will be lost, and (3) we shall have again fought a war for other nations and will be left holding the bag. That seems to be the road we are traveling now with the Great Indispensable; and instead of hushing the Senators, we want them to be allowed to tell all the truth except military secrets. If we pursue a blind and blundering way, squandering our wealth, making preposterous promises, and playing the sucker to statesmen looking out solely for their own national interests, we shall fetch up in cynical disillusionment again and the revulsion will throw us into an isolationism more extreme than any we have ever known.

We hope you did not miss the very significant statement by Pravda, the official Stalin mouthpiece. While British and American envoys were on the way to Moscow, Pravda declared that the Russians do not intend, at the forthcoming conference, to discuss frontiers or the status of any peoples bordering on Russia. They don't regard such a matter as any more relevant than the status of California. But we—we, the idealists, the world crusaders, the noble knight-errant fighting for the downtrodden and dispossessed—we have promised, in a little document known as the Atlantic Charter, as well as in Presidential blessings elsewhere, that after the war all peoples will have the privilege and right of autonomous self-government, precisely to italicize that the President has recently asked the power to grant independence to the Filipinos.

How are we going to make that promise stick? We aren't, and in words as plain as words can be Pravda has served notice that we'd better get the notion out of our mind. Stalin will ask Hull when that second front is coming across the channel; and Hull will ask Stalin how about the Baltic states and Finland and the Balkans and Turkey; and Stalin will say again, "How about that second front?" and Mr. Hull, a little wiser than when he went, will come home.

And if you ask us, "So what? Aren't we doing our best?" the answer is this, that the President, listening to the crackpot remakers of worlds who surround him, has committed us to a program which was doomed to failure from the first. We can't feed the whole world, we can't change the prejudices and habits of people, we can't give self-government to those not ready for it. The time to have got concessions out of Churchill and Stalin was when they were desperate and ready to listen.

It's too late now to get by threat or force what we are unable to get by reason. We entered the war on the long end, but now we are on the short end because we have the Japs on our hands. We must go ahead with the Pacific war no matter what the others do—and the others know it. From here on out two realists across the Atlantic are in a position to do the tough talking and we—like it or not—will have to listen.

Squandering Is Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain Journal of October 22, 1943:

SQUANDERING IS SABOTAGE

In times like these, a government at war naturally tends to pour out money like water, especially if it is operating the richest country in the world.

In Lincoln's time he operated on the principle that the essential thing was to preserve the Union at whatever cost. Likewise now, with American involvement in the present world crisis, it is essential to defeat the gangster governments and preserve the free nations, at whatever cost.

But the mode of operation is subject to review and criticism, by Congress and the public. There have been many comments lately to the effect that too much public money is being spent carelessly on the war effort.

All too many people have personal knowledge of instances of waste. They can hardly escape the conclusion that if there is spendthrift expenditure of the public's money in the few cases they know about, there must be needless squandering in the thousands of cases they do not know about.

Some laxity may be inevitable. There is bound to be waste in a vast war effort which covers the world and necessarily supports the fighting men and also their dependents in many countries. Fair-minded people realize, too, that time is "of the essence," in attacking the enemy wherever he is found and in whatever form.

Nevertheless, it is important not to throw money and materials about recklessly.

Every evidence of squandering is a blow at the war effort. Needless expenditure is just as much sabotage as destruction to war property and equipment. More than that it is a blow at morale, far more damaging than enemy propaganda. Outright sabotage makes people mad, increases their zeal to win. But unnecessary carelessness and extravagance on the part of those who have been entrusted with spending of the people's money is bound to be a depressing influence.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, for 10 days the Banking and Currency Committee of the House held hearings on the bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill was finally voted out forbidding subsidies to keep down retail food prices. The bill continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from December 31, 1943, to July 1, 1945, but does not grant the extra $500,000,000 borrowing power asked for.

It was my belief that the committee had exhausted the field of argument, pro and con, for the use of food subsidies. I was mistaken. Under leave granted me by the House, I am incorporating herewith in the RECORD an editorial recently published in the Green Bay Press Gazette, Green Bay, Wis., presenting a new angle on the use of food subsidies. I believe this editorial should receive the careful attention of every Member of the House. The editorial follows:

FOOD SUBSIDIES

A House committee has voted against extension of food subsidies beyond the close of the year.

That does not necessarily mean that the House, or the Congress, will approve the action of the committee.

The President and his advisers are of the opinion that if the subsidy is withdrawn from butter, cheese, dry beans, sugar, canned

vegetables, and pork products, wnere it is now applied, dangerous price increases in those products may ensue.

It is possible that some of the House committee voted against subsidies in order to bring about such price increases. It is likely that others voted as they did because opposed to subsidies on principle.

The trouble is that during war we must occasionally abandon principle; and it is obvious that this should be done rather than face steep price increases.

There are few rules in wartime that can be laid down rigidly just because the conditions that generally make rules dependable either do not exist or are altered violently because of the abnormality of our lives.

There are many strong reasons against subsidies. There is one strong reason in their favor. Against them it may be said that the soldier fighting in New Guinea on small pay will return after the war and be taxed to pay up these very subsidies. And that is an argument that is very hard to meet because it cites an obvious injustice.

The subsidies, however, will help to hold price rises in check. They are like the springs upon great vehicles. They absorb the shock. They soften the bump. They delay the hurt.

We are dealing with a perversion that appears in all wartime conditions—sudden and unreasonable price rises. And we know from the experience of other nations and ourselves that a country can simply be racked to pieces if it permits the absence of its men at the front, the lessened production of goods at home and the greater demand occasioned by the fullness of employment to work without check in distracting and demoralizing the people.

We are going to have some inflation. It is simply unavoidable. But its harm will be minimized in proportion as it is restrained.

This is going to be a long war. And we will take it better and fight it more efficiently the sooner we learn that there is no profit in it for any of us. Banishing the delusion of war profits would banish also most of this argument against subsidies.

Confession of Paul McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Monday, October 18, 1943:

CONFESSION OF PAUL M'NUTT

Speaking before the American Federation of Labor convention in Boston last week, Chairman Paul V. McNutt of the War Manpower Commission asserted that objectives toward which every action of the Commission is directed are: To see that every worker on a war job stays on the job; that workers in nonessential industries transfer to jobs of higher war priority; that every employer and labor group cocperate fully to eliminate practices wasting manpower; that needs of the armed services be filled without disrupting vital war production.

Later in the same speech, Mr. McNutt lists some of the things the War Manpower Commission still has to accomplish. We quote:

1. Turn-over has not been solved.

2. Transfers from nonessential to war jobs are not progressing at the rate demanded a year ago by the Management-Labor Committee.

3. Productivity per worker needs to go up.

4. We are not getting and holding the people we need in the hot, stuffy, unglamorous, disagreeable, and relatively less paid jobs.

5. We are not getting enough women workers. The ones we get quit too often.

Those are verbatim admissions of the manpower chief. They are frank enough. Mr. McNutt contends the Commission has made long, progressive strides. Yet he confesses that in most of the purposes for which the War Manpower Commission is designed, it has not succeeded.

He thinks labor pirating has been whipped. But needed transfers to war jobs and problems of worker productivity have not been solved. Turn-over has not been eliminated. Manpower is being wasted in war plants, in some cases prodigally. The needs of the armed services are being filled and vital war industry still keeps up its record output. True, but inroads are being made in ranks of fathers now, while inept manpower control allows many thousands of young men, not indispensable, to remain in war plants.

On the basis of Mr. McNutt's own statements, it is difficult to see just what the War Manpower Commission has accomplished of significance.

Revolutionary Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain Journal of October 23, 1943:

REVOLUTIONARY LEGISLATION

While war commands the attention of the people, a bill of revolutionary social consequences for all of us has been started through Congress.

It is a bill that calls for a broad expansion of social security—an expansion that would increase social-security taxes upon workers from the present 1 percent a year on earnings up to $3,000 a year, to 6 percent, plus a like amount from employers. This adds up to a special tax of 12 percent on practically every pay roll in the land, in addition to income taxes, or sufficient to raise an estimated annual revenue of $12,000,000,000.

Here is something that in normal times would be a subject of Nation-wide discussion and debate, but because of the war little has been heard of it.

Some of the provisions of the bill are undeniably desirable, such as protection of social-security rights of those in the military service, and unemployment allowances for war veterans in the immediate post-war period.

The same can't be said for other features, especially a health and hospitalization provision that would regiment the medical profession and make virtually every hospital in the land a branch of the Government at Washington.

Of the new social-security taxes, it is claimed that some $600,000,000 would be earmarked for administration of the medical care department, enough to pay every physician in the country $5,000 a year and to buy every bed in every non-Government hospital at $5 a day.

It is this provision that has been the focus of the all too little attention the measure has received. It has aroused the American Medical Association, caused a national physicians' committee to issue a number of alarming statements, and resulted in numerous newspaper editorials under such headings as "Socialized medicine," "Regimenting health," "Totalitarian medicine," "Dictated health," and "Communized medicine."

This has caused such publications as the New Republic, previously lukewarm toward the bill, to rush its defense charging dirty work by the doctors.

Backers of the plan say it is designed to offer adequate medical care to the American people at minimum cost and that opposition comes from reactionary Roosevelt-hating, anti-New Deal forces.

On the other hand, opponents of the plan charge it will completely revolutionize medical practice, help enslave the individual to the state, put doctors and hospitals under political domination, and cause us to call a "ward heeler" when we get sick.

The truth, probably, is somewhere between.

The family physician commands the respect and confidence of the average citizen, a place he has won by service, faithfulness, and integrity. The public has no desire to see his place taken by a political wheelhorse. However, this doesn't mean that all this respect and confidence extends to the American Medical Association. Nor does it mean that the average citizen is convinced that our medical system is all that it should be.

The fate of this bill will depend in great measure upon the reactions of the middle class upon whom sickness now puts the greatest financial burden. The rich and the poor get good care under the present system of medicine, but a serious siege of illness is apt to bring a middle-class family to the verge of bankruptcy. We believe that the medical profession should remedy this. If it doesn't, the Government will try to. The Wheeler-Murray bill is such an effort on the part of the Government.

It isn't good, because it goes too far when it sets up a Federal agency that would hire doctors for us, set fees, say who is qualified as a specialist, tell people what hospitals or doctors they must go to, and tell doctors how many patients they may serve.

We believe that some form of health insurance is desirable and hope that the medical profession will be able to offer it to us without injury to the high medical standards enjoyed in America.

More than that, however, we believe there should be a moratorium on such revolutionary social legislation until after the war. Such measures cannot receive the attention they deserve while our attention is centered elsewhere.

Also the 10,000,000 men in service, including many thousands of doctors, have a right to be heard. The rules should not be changed in their absence.

Federal Employees in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, while I was home during the recent congressional recess, I found a great deal of interest taken in the subject of Federal employment. There was a general feeling that the Federal Government is employing a

very large number of people in civil activities and that this number should be reduced.

Interest had been aroused by the report that the Federal Government had some 10,000 employees in South Dakota, which was far in excess of the number of State and county employees.

Believing that it would be helpful to know how such a number were employed I ask the president of the Civil Service Commission for a report on the matter. He replied as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: I have your letter of September 30, 1943, concerning statistics on Federal employment in the State of South Dakota.

The following tabulation from a recent survey conducted by the commission gives the number of civilian employees in various executive departments and agencies in South Dakota, as of the second quarter of calendar year 1943:

Total Federal employment in South Dakota	10,000
War Department	5,100
Office of Price Administration	300
Office for Emergency Management	300
Post Office Department	1,700
Agriculture Department (estimated)	800
Treasury Department	500
Veterans' Administration	300
All other agencies	1,000

Further break-downs by classification or employment groups were not obtained in this survey of the geographic distribution of Federal employees in field establishments. It is not possible, therefore, to determine how many of these employees have war service appointments, permanent appointments, etc. Also, only the grand total for the Agriculture Department (including A. A. A.) is available; no civilian employees of the Navy Department are located in your State.

I trust that this information will be of value to you. If we may be of further assistance to you please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

It will be noted that 5,100 of the 10,000 reported Federal employees are employees of the War Department. Most of these presumably are at the following major military establishments:

Black Hills Ordnance Depot, Provo; Army Air Base, Rapid City; Air Force Technical School, Sioux Falls; Fort Meade Military Post, Sturgis; Rapid City Satellite Field, Pierre; Sioux City Satellite Fields, Mitchell and Watertown.

The bulk of the employees are doubtless at the three largest installations at Provo, Rapid City, and Sioux Falls.

It will be noted that the letter from the Civil Service Commission does not break down the employees for the Agriculture and Treasury Departments and does not list the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior does have a great many employees in the activities of the Indian Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, United States Geological Survey, and General Land Office. Presumably, these are covered in the 1,000 employees listed for "all other agencies."

The people of South Dakota, Mr. Speaker, share in the common demand throughout the country for a reduction in Federal employment. They want the war prosecuted vigorously but they do not want manpower wasted, either in military activities or any other activity of the Government. While we appreciate having these activities of the Federal Government in South Dakota, neither there nor elsewhere do we want Federal Government to employ more personnel than is needed for the efficient and effective prosecution of necessary activities.

New Deal and States' Rights Clash on Insurance Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Raymond Moley from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Wednesday, October 20, 1943, as follows:

NEW DEAL AND STATES' RIGHTS CLASH ON INSURANCE REGULATION

(By Raymond Moley)

Even in wartime the New Deal is intent upon its revolution. In the field of insurance regulation one of the boldest of invasions of authority of the States has been going on for more than a year. In this it is easy to see one of the major fourth-term issues of 1944.

Senators BAILEY and VAN NUYS have introduced a bill to keep the regulation of insurance in the States. The fight over this bill is just beginning. State Governors, whose recent conferences have opened new chapters in statesmanship, are coming to the support of the bill. But we may expect a full-dress New Deal attack upon it. If this succeeds, the door will be opened to almost limitless invasion of the States, not by authority of Congress but by bureaucratic manipulation of judge-made law. Because it is a back-door entry, it is high time to turn on the lights.

THE ATLANTA CASE

Back in 1938 the Temporary National Economic Committee, well-padded with New Deal staff lawyers, made a major attack upon life insurance. The companies did well in meeting this effort, but it was clear that the next attack would be on fire insurance. The war intervened, however, and a less direct attack began. The Justice Department in August 1942 brought about the indictment of more than 200 companies and individuals in the Federal district court of Atlanta. The case made by the Government was elaborate. It displayed vast erudition. Its real object was quite obviously to bring about a legal revolution in the traditional rights of States to regulate insurance.

The point was that if the Government could get the courts to reverse the law of 75 years and to declare insurance to be commerce they could, through criminal antitrust proceedings, bring the control of insurance under the Department of Justice and throw State laws into confusion. The effort would be to make criminal certain actions of the business of insurance which, under State laws, were practically compulsory.

DOUBLE-EDGED ISSUE

Judge Underwood of Atlanta threw out the indictments, declaring that "The Supreme Court decisions must be followed by this court." The case now must go to the new Supreme Court, and, in light of the tone of that court's recent decisions, there is a good chance that the sought-for legal revolution may be declared there.

Only Congress can make sure that the States can be saved from this further loss of power. The Bailey-Van Nuys bill is short and to the point. Insurance, it declares, is a matter for State regulation. There is no need for the displacement or encumbrance of the States by a Federal bureau or otherwise. And since long experience has justified State regulation, the Federal antitrust laws shall not apply to the business of insurance.

Here is a double-edged issue. Is wartime a proper moment to bring about a legal revolution? And are States, at a moment when Federal bureaucracy is creaking in every joint, to be further reduced in importance? The answers lie with Congress.

Summaries of Bills, Reports, Committee Views, and Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE D. WILLEY
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a constituent making certain suggestions with reference to the simplification of legislative action for the better understanding of the public. The ideas expressed are well stated and seem worthy of consideration, hence my request to insert a copy of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under extension of remarks, so that all Members who desire may study the proposals contained therein:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *October 9, 1943.*

The Honorable EARLE D. WILLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some of our recent noon-hour discussions have concerned the American form of government. It seemed to be generally agreed that most of us need to show more interest and concern in the work done both by the administrative branch and by Congress—interest and concern which would be made manifest in intelligent suggestions and advice to our lawmakers and administration and in intelligent voting during elections and not simply in grumbling and complaining to each other. I therefore made this suggestion: That committee reports and laws passed by Congress be summarized in nontechnical terms and given wide circulation. I should like to elaborate on this suggestion.

Each bill reported by a committee shou'd be accompanied by a 1- or 2-page summary

which would include these sections: First, a brief statement of the objective of the bill; second, a list of the essential features of the bill; third, a statement of the committee majority explaining why they believe the objective is a worthy one and how this bill will achieve that objective; fourth, a statement by the minority stating their objections; and fifth, a list of the committee members in favor of the bill and of those opposed. The first two sections must be so written as to be acceptable to the entire committee. This summary should be printed and sent to all Congressmen, all administrative officials who would administer the law if the bill were passed, all newspapers, radio stations, and all libraries. I do not believe Congress should request newspapers to publish all these reports—I am sure that each paper would gladly print such authoritative and responsible statements concerning the bills most vitally related to the interests of the people in its area of circulation. We, as individuals, probably could persuade our local newspapers to provide regular space for listing reports by number and objective so that we could find and study those of greatest interest to us. Such a summary would allow us to express our opinions to you in Congress at the time when it would do the most good, i. e., before the bill is passed.

Secondly, when a bill is passed and becomes a law, a similar short summary of the law should be prepared. This summary should include the statement of the objective, the revised list of essential features, and the recorded vote of Congressmen on the final bill. This should be given the same wide circulation, with additional copies made available to individuals who request them.

The reasons for my suggestion are these. First, such summaries would be the best way in which you Congressmen could report to the folks back home. Present newspaper reports do not give the information so concisely or in an unbiased way. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not serve the same purpose, for we have to wade through pages of debate and discussion to find just what our representative did or said, if that appears at all. Certainly not many of us would study the entire bill or law, for it would either take too much time or else be phrased in too technical terms. Second, such summaries would be the best way for us voters to check up on our own Senators and Representatives. We would merely have to leaf through the summaries to see whether their pattern of votes showed a consistent understanding of and adherence to a given general policy that appealed to us. This would be very easy for us, and it seems to me that to make Americans take an active interest in our Government it would have to be easy. Nevertheless, it would be very difficult for a candidate to mask his real record in Congress. Third, such summaries might also be very helpful to Congressmen. I'm sure that it must be impossible for them to read and study every bill in its entirety. These summaries might make it easier for them to express their opinions or to ask their questions about issues that they don't have time to study thoroughly, and therefore make it possible to learn whether a yea or a nay would better fit their general plan of action.

I realize that this suggestion has been applied only to the legislative branch. I have no doubt, however, that some similar system of regular reports from the executive branch would also be worth while.

I would greatly appreciate your opinion of this suggestion. If the idea behind it seems to have any merit, I would appreciate knowing which Congressmen might be willing to study it and recommend action on it.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BLOMQUIST.

Resolution of the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association on Price of Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I insert the following resolution, adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association.

There are two problems with which this Congress must deal if we are to avoid serious shortages: One is the milk price and the other is the price of crude oil.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the various governmental agencies such as the O. P. A., W. F. A., and so forth, have demonstrated their inability to hold the line on labor, feed, and other costs of producing milk; and

Whereas the same governmental agencies have frozen our milk prices at Pearl Harbor levels, thus squeezing us between constantly rising production costs and frozen milk prices; and

Whereas as we predicted as early as last January, more of our members each week are being forced to give up and sell off their herds, and milk production in Connecticut continues to decline to the extent that there is now not enough milk to supply even the restricted amount consumers are allowed to purchase under the new Government limitation orders made effective last Sunday; and

Whereas the Government has attempted to approach a solution to this situation by means of a direct subsidy to be paid to milk producers, even the amount of which is entirely inadequate to meet our needs; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association, That the Association realizes that, due to the above Government controls, our members will be forced by economic pressure to accept these inadequate subsidies as a temporary expedient, but that members can be assured that in line with the previously adopted policy of the association and after continued study and survey of the situation, the officers, directors, and management will continue to fight with every means at their command for a living price in the market place for the members' milk, and for the discontinuance of the whole unsound subsidy program as a substitute for fair prices.

United States Policies Seen Aiding British Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star:

UNITED STATES POLICIES SEEN AIDING BRITISH TRADE

(By David Lawrence)

Recent comments in the British Parliament on the alleged views of American Senators concerning British policies overseas indicate clearly that even Prime Minister Churchill does not fully understand the criticism which is being made here of the lease-lend program and its implications.

Nobody is criticizing the British policy, but there is plenty of criticism of the American attitude, which is described as ranging all the way from carelessness in the matter of keeping records to an indifference to allocations of raw materials which can be better supplied from overseas sources than from our own.

In due time our congressional committees will make their reports on these subjects and the criticism will not be centered on the British or any other foreign government. It is most unfortunate that emphasis of that kind has been given to the reports of the returning Senators.

What basically is involved is a difference of viewpoint here and in Britain toward business abroad.

The British Government, for instance, believes in encouraging and upholding British commerce throughout the world. The United Kingdom must have world trade, and it is of paramount interest that shipping and trade routes be developed to the most profitable point possible. Hence the British instinctively think in terms of trade and post-war uses of wartime facilities.

NEW DEAL COURSE DIFFERS

The American Government, on the other hand, particularly under the New Deal, takes just the opposite course. The present administration has carried on a crusade against business and businessmen. The Vice President of the United States is an example of the New Deal habit of devoting time even during a major war to crusades which tend to undermine confidence in the private enterprise system and to propagandize instead a system of government ownership or control.

The administration here started during the present war a campaign against American participation in foreign cartels. The recent smear upon the oil companies which had made agreements to share trade in the foreign field in prewar days and even in days to follow the war is an example of the administration's point of view. Yet that very type of contract is quite common in Britain and the British will be making cartel arrangements everywhere after the war whenever they can.

The administration's idea plays into the hands of British commercial interests. American business is to be kept from participation in agreements for the handling of trade outside the United States, and consequently the British will be able to step in and obtain this opportunity lost for American producers.

The same thing may happen with respect to airplane routes, air bases and ports for shipping. Because the Roosevelt administration does not believe in upholding the interests of American business abroad—it has already scuttled American investors in Central and South America and permitted confiscation of American property—it is quite natural for the British to begin to think in terms of the far-flung opportunities which will be forfeited by America.

HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION

Not long ago in a discussion with some naval experts, the hypothetical question of what to do about certain islands in the

Pacific arose. The British viewpoint, it was suggested, would be that since America is not an imperialistic nation, the islands needed for our defense in the far Pacific should not be annexed by us, but that since the British are admittedly imperialistic, it would be proper for England to acquire all such islands.

This illustrates the divergent views which have hitherto prevailed—England looks for business opportunities and the upbuilding of her commerce. America's New Dealers look for opportunities to demolish American business and to discourage American investment abroad.

All this may be changed when the soldiers come back—for they will demand not leaf-raking W. P. A. jobs but real opportunities. Unless America becomes international-minded in an economic sense and asks for her fair share in world trade, Britain will take not only the trade that America had but also the trade that Germany and France had.

That's why discussion of a post-war merchant marine for America, international aviation routes, and bases on the cultivation of good will for America in the smaller countries now getting lease-lend aid is a very pertinent subject of debate. It doesn't involve in the least criticism of, but undaunted admiration for, the British leaders who look out for their businessmen and are rightly concerned with the job opportunities of their soldiers and sailors.

Federal Aid to Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, October 22, captioned "Legislative sabotage."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE SABOTAGE

The Senate, on Wednesday, strangled to death the bill for Federal aid to education by the device of recommitting it to the Committee on Education and Labor. It was not even an open and honest act of strangulation by men willing to stand up and be counted. Instead it was accomplished deviously, from behind, by legislative trickery. The pious gentlemen involved did not care to leave any fingerprints. First they amended the bill to make it fit their accusations. Then they applied the garrote.

The bill, sponsored by Senators THOMAS of Utah and HILL, of Alabama, sought to appropriate $300,000,000 for grants-in-aid to the States, two-thirds of which would be used for the payment of teachers' salaries. The principal objection to the bill expressed in the course of Wednesday's debate was that it would impose Federal control upon local school systems, this despite the fact that the bill's first section explicitly forbade "any agency or officer of the United States to control the administration, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials of instruction." The safeguard, incidentally, is one we applaud. But instead of endeavoring to improve or strengthen this section, opponents of the Federal-aid measure chose to nullify it by supporting a needless and irrelevant amendment of Senator LANGER, forbidding discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the administration of Federal funds or of "State funds supplemented thereby."

This amendment of Senator LANGER'S was denounced as sheer obfuscation by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It was vehemently opposed by the American Teachers' Association, an organization including Negro teachers. It served no purpose save to make the bill as a whole intolerable. A number of Senators who voted for this amendment promptly turned round and voted to have the legislation as a whole recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. Senator TAFT, who supported the amendment, rose as soon as it had been passed to make the motion for recommittal. As Senator GEORGE forcefully pointed out to his colleagues, "Every intelligent Negro in this country will definitely understand that Senators who voted for the amendment were voting against the Negro's interest, because they have killed the proposed legislation."

The fact is that they were voting against the interest of whites and Negroes alike. In the whole of this Union there are only three States or Territories which do not have teachers receiving less than $1,200 a year, More than half the States have teachers who are receiving less than $600 a year. Such stipends do not draw high-caliber instructors to our public schools. They have been responsible for a wholesale abandonment of the teaching profession. During the 1942–43 school year, 112,000 teachers left our public schools. An additional 105,000 are expected to leave during the current year.

True enough, the causes of this situation are local. But the consequences are national. Inadequate education in any part of the country makes itself felt in national affairs, is reflected in the laws under which all of us must live. And it cannot be remedied locally. For the situation embraces a vicious circle. Inadequate education breeds poverty; and poverty makes adequate education impossible. If this is not a fit sphere for Federal aid, then we are no longer a Union but a mere confederacy.

Effect of S. 637 on Teachers' Salaries in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by me to Mr. Paul Sifton, of Washington, D. C., and a telegram with reference to it from Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. The correspondence has to do with Senate bill 637, and its effect on teachers' salaries in Colorado.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

Mr. PAUL SIFTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: Thanks for your letter expressing the interest of the Farmers Union in the enactment of S. 637.

I have made so many public statements on behalf of the absolute necessity for economy in the Federal Government that I do not see how I can consistently support any program calling for increased Federal expenditures for anything at this time.

As a matter of fact the status of the Federal Treasury is downright alarming. We are facing certain bankruptcy. History discloses the fact that when governments undergo bankruptcy they usually have dictators as their receivers. It is perhaps too late to do much about it but I do not want to be guilty of driving another nail in the coffin of this republic.

I do not want my vote on S. 637 to indicate, however, that I am satisfied with teachers' salaries in Colorado, because I know they are shamefully inadequate. Colorado has a surplus of over $4,000,000 in its general fund that was taken directly from the school funds by the Colorado Legislature, and no emergency exists in Colorado that cannot be remedied by Colorado itself.

As one personally deeply grateful to the teaching profession, and devoted to Colorado's public school system, I regret that I cannot see my way clear to support S. 637.

Sincerely,

E. C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator, Colorado.

TRENTON, N. J., *October 22, 1943.*

Senator ED JOHNSON,
United States Capitol, Senate Floor,
Washington, D. C.:

I cannot agree with either the premises or the conclusions of your letter to Paul Sifton regarding S. 637. It seems to me that it will behoove any of us from the West to oppose a bill that would rectify a historic injustice to our region. For years our farmers have borne the whole burden of rearing that most precious of all crops, their children, only to see the great urban centers reap much of the benefit from it. As to expense, I cannot agree that this country cannot afford to spend a few million dollars to offset the disastrous impact of war upon rural school systems, when it is spending, in a single appropriation bill $69,000,000,000 for war, billions that will place additional millions of profits in the wealthy States that should be taxed to equalize educational opportunity for all American children. I hope you will insert your letter and this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

Which Way, America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Which Way, America?" delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon of Kansas, on October 22, 1943, at the University of Kansas Debate Institute.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here we are at one of the great critical hours in the life of the Nation and the world.

A heavy obligation rests on everyone not to indulge in futile and petty criticism. We must contribute to building a positive policy for America. It goes without saying that the purpose of this round-table discussion is to help in that direction.

Our ideas may differ as to the policies nations must pursue in their avoidance of making a hash of the post-war world.

But such a meeting as this helps clarify our thinking. That to me is about the most important job confronting us.

We are confused by the very multiplicity of plans for erecting the structure of world peace we all so devoutly desire.

So I propose to discuss some of the factors interfering with the building of institutions of law and order for the settlement of international disputes that might lead to war.

I believe I can contribute more here by clearing some of the underbrush that is interfering with our having a comprehensive view than by discussion of the forms of the institution for world peace.

Those who favor some form of international organization to maintain world peace have not had any leadership in the White House. Whatever else may be said of Woodrow Wilson, he was a leader.

The only foreign policy the administration has approved, and that by indirection, is the old discredited theory of a balance of power alliance. Alliances tend to separate the nations of the world rather than to pull them together. Especially is that true of the proposed exclusive alliance.

A comprehensive compact of all important nations with due sympathy and fair consideration for the rights, and aspirations of and simple justice to small nations and backward peoples ceases to be an alliance and becomes a league of nations, if you choose to call it that.

However the alliance before us is no such a comprehensive proposal.

I submit that the proposed British-American alliance is joint isolationism.

World collaboration and cooperation should mean all nations.

A mere alliance with one imperialist country means a partnership of the strong against the weak. There is no more world cooperation in an Anglo-American alliance, which would inevitably put the rest of the nations against us, than there is in a partnership of the rich against the poor.

There are those who are either deceiving themselves or deceiving others when they talk in one and the same breath in favor of world cooperation and of an alliance that excludes two-thirds of the world's population.

I don't believe the brotherhood of man means simply the brotherhood of Anglo-Americans. That leads us nowhere. It is destructive in its exclusiveness.

Another factor interfering with the expressions of our responsibilities in the world is hallelujah thinking. Throughout our national history our foreign policy has been weakened by general public indifference or an emotional boogy-woogie approach. Neither has left much opportunity for realistic thinking.

Today our thinking about our foreign policy is being confused by starry-eyed plans to make the United States the big brother to all the world, and by an inferiority complex that causes some Americans to say, "Excuse me, sir," every time another nation pushes her interests against ours.

If Americans do not realize the influence of America in world affairs and assert it properly no one else will.

Personally, I think imperialism is a greater threat to world peace than nationalism.

My concern with Russia is not her theory of property. I have always said if it works better than ours, it will and ought to be O. K. If it doesn't, I am glad to have Russia do the experimenting.

My concern with Russia has been her encouragement of treasonable activities on the part of American citizens in supporting Russia as against the policies of our own country.

But Russia has announced that those almost belligerent activities will terminate. That removes one of the seedbeds of future wars. I am willing to assume her good faith until events prove the contrary. As I have said before, we must work with her.

We must work with Britain, too. We have more in common with her than with any other country. Britain says she intends to retain "as is" her imperialistic empire. World cooperation requires concessions on the part of all nations.

I am not so much concerned regarding the forms and beginnings of the institutions of law and order in the world as I am to reduce and to eliminate as many of the seeds of future wars as possible.

I don't think we can do that all at one stroke. But we must examine the possibilities so that we will be better prepared to assume intelligently our responsibilities. I don't believe in reform after marriage. I think a start at least should be made before.

Nothing to my mind can be more fatal to the future of the world than sugar-coating the problems involved in collective security. Yet some earnest and enthusiastic souls are doing just that. They think the question of world peace can be settled in the familiar terms "we ought to have a law."

While I believe we must think in terms of removing the evils that cause wars as much as possible, we must approach with sympathy and understanding the problems of Russia and Britain, China, and all other nations, great or small. We must not attempt to force our own ways on them.

That's another bit of underbrush in the way of clear thinking. To illustrate, I said once that all the world does not like ice cream sodas. A friend of mine—a graduate, by the way, of the University of Kansas—said, "I wish you wouldn't say that." "Why," says I. "Because it isn't true," says she. "They do like ice cream sodas."

So we need faith and understanding and realistic patience.

We move toward the day when we must erect a house of world peace wherein the peoples of all nations may hope to dwell in concord and in unity.

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

Which can mean only one thing—that there must be justice and fairness toward all nations. There must be respect and dignity for all peoples regardless of their numbers, race, or creed.

Such a peace can be built for all time, reviewing and adding to its strength as the world grows in grace and moral strength.

The challenge is not for men of small heart or little faith. If humanity can now reach that highroad it justifies all our sacrifices and suffering.

Sales Tax and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Sales Tax and Subsidy," delivered by Mr. Maurice Lynch, financial secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, at the regular meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor October 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALES TAX AND SUBSIDIES

(Talk delivered at the regular meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, October 17, 1943; as well as over the WCFL Irish Hour, on the same date. On motion made and carried unanimously, this talk was ordered specially featured in the Federation News and also transmitted to all affiliated unions together with an official request for compliance with the suggested line of action as outlined therein.)

(By Maurice Lynch, financial secretary, Chicago Federation of Labor)

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, this is a talk I have prepared to deliver this evening over WCFL.

In many of my radio talks, I have spoken of the sales tax, about which much is being said recently, in and around the Capitol in Washington and elsewhere. I know that many have shown an interest in the subject of sales tax; but everybody should be interested; as it is everybody's concern. Those who should be most interested, are the low-paid workers; and of those, believe me, there are plenty. (The fact that some war workers get unusually good wages, does not at all help the man who has to raise his family on $30 or $35 a week.) The wealthy minority, the great corporations, and their well-to-do friends, are also interested, but for a very different reason. This thing of which I have spoken so often, is here now. The maneuvers for the show-down are taking place. The battle is on. The same old fight. The rich and powerful want to be richer and more powerful at the expense of those who are already overburdened. Arrayed on opposite sides, are the "privileged" and "under-privileged." The "privileged" are not idle nor asleep. Rogues never are. The "underprivileged" are, for the most part, negligent, and may get a rude awakening.

How would you like to have to pay $50 a year per person, in sales tax on your necessities; your food and clothing and heating, in addition to what you now pay? Well; that is what will happen, if a Federal sales tax is made the law of the land.

The ever-alert and resourceful beneficiaries of special privilege, are marshaling their forces to prepare the way for their well-planned schemes. President Roosevelt and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau have been able to stave off the sales tax for several years, but now, it looks as if the intended victims will have to do some helping for themselves. The malefactors of great wealth and their agents want to raise $6,000,000,000 in sales tax. They want to save the huge inheritances from tampering. Eighty percent of the 6 billions would be collected from the workers. The worker with a wife and 3 dependents would pay $250 a year in Federal sales taxes, in addition to the present State sales tax, if he could buy enough to feed and clothe his family. The worker and his family require more substantial food, so as to properly exist, than do the families of the idle rich. The job of getting the necessary things done, devolves on the worker; not on the drones of opulence. The worker and family have better appetities than the pampered plutocrats of "gold coast." But, believe me, the workingmen's families' appetites will be whetted and sharpened, if and when the Federal sales tax goes into effect. The workingman and his family need no appetizers; but the carousing, debauching patrons of the gilded and exclusive night clubs, who

never hear the ring of an alarm clock, could not think of doing a thing so vulgar, as eating without a bracer.

The Treasury has asked for $10,500,000,000 increase in revenue. The overstuffed parasites, their friends and proteges, say, such a levy is impossible. They say six billions is enough, but, let us take those six billions from the overpaid workers, by way of a sales tax. Friends, that's just the proposition, in a nutshell.

They were successful in enacting into law their slightly modified Ruml forgiveness tax plan a few months ago. They are encouraged with their success; and now for the sales tax. Friends, the forgiveness tax plan, or what might be called the modified Ruml plan, did not affect us common folk to any noticeable extent. We could scarcely discern any benefit. But it certainly benefited big business. Do you see? Big business, before the Ruml plan was enacted, used to set up reserves for income taxes during the current operating year and pay them the next year. Let me cite an example: We read in the papers that a New York corporation had paid $42,000,000 on March 15 last as a quarterly installment on its 1942 income tax. (That was before the Ruml plan was enacted.) That means that the whole year's tax for the year 1942, for that corporation, would be $168,000,000. This amount had been charged to operating expenses for the year 1942. Well, the Ruml forgiveness plan eliminated the necessity for setting up a reserve for 1943 income tax. The forgiveness plan forgave 75 percent of the total tax; so that one particular corporation saved $126,000,000 in 1 year, because of the suggestion of Mr. Ruml and the forgiving dispositions of the kind-hearted lawmakers. Try to imagine the billions that all corporations saved. You and I, individuals, do not set up any reserves for income tax; so, as I stated, we saw no appreciable benefit from the famous windfall, the Ruml forgiveness plan.

But the beneficiaries of the plan are not satisfied; they now want to dodge any further increase in income taxes by substituting a sales tax and thereby shifting the burden onto those least able to bear it, the workers, with their average of less than $45 a week. They want to keep the burden away from inheritances. Those billions accumulated in inheritances must be held inviolate for the heirs and heiresses yet unborn. The widows and their fatherless broods and the orphans can go ragged and barefooted, cold and hungry, if they can't pay the sales taxes on the food and clothes and shoes and coal they will need so badly.

Yes, friends, those stony-hearted, self-styled 100 percent patriotic Americans, are the same free enterprising rugged individuals whose philanthropies are so widely publicized. What do they care about having to pay three or four or ten hundred dollars a year, or $5,000 a year, tax on their necessities, or on their luxuries? It would not be a drop in the bucket for them. Why—they would spend three times $5,000 on one night's carousal. But two or three hundred dollars a year sales tax could be a crushing, back-breaking load, on the worker and his dependents.

The humane Roosevelt and Morgenthau have been able to prevent those ruthless plutocrats from carrying out their inhuman designs; but, it would seem that, with their constant intriguing, scheming, planning, with their inexhaustible resources, with their high-priced legal minds, with their pliant tools; the time seems to be here now, when the people, who are to be the victims of their diabolical manipulations, would have to rise from their lethargy, and assert themselves. It will be too late to wait for the next election. The harm might be done then. Now is the time. Write to your Congressmen, both Senators and Representatives, and let them know you are awake, and that you will also be watchful, to see how they will behave regarding the much-talked-of Federal sales tax. Your Representative can be reached by addressing him at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Your Senator can be reached by addressing him at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Whether you workers are Democrats or Republicans, it is to your best interests, to prevent this vicious sales tax from becoming law.

You probably noticed this past week, that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House took action to prevent subsidies. Well, an antisubsidy law is a twin brother to a sales tax law. Both of them bleed the common people, and help the wealthy to get wealthier, or at least, to stay just as wealthy. We plain folk cannot expect much from a committee with the name "banking and currency."

Again, I urge you, wage earners, who have the slightest regard for your own and your families' welfare, to write your Congressmen, both Senators and Representatives, and tell them that you are watching their actions in Congress. Tell them, point blank, that you want them to be against sales tax and antisubsidy legislation. Don't you think it is worth your effort to write to them? They'll want your votes when election comes around. They are surrounded and buttonholed, constantly, by the satellites of the vested interests The only way now to act, is to caution them that your interests must be looked after.

Phases of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Miss Helen Essary writes for the Washington Times-Herald a column headed "Dear Washington." Yesterday I read an extremely interesting production from her pen. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

Washington is simmering down these days. Not that there isn't something cooking in every front office in town. But the kettles aren't boiling over as they did in the first frenzy of this second war to save democracy.

Fighting the enemy has lost its thrill. Stopping the Axis has become what it always was—a mean, long, hard job. We continue to zip about in the theatrical Washington way. But we realize now that the uniforms and the titles are simply another way of being dressed—to kill—or be killed.

I don't mean to say that behind the routine of winning the war there isn't a powerful lot going on. There is probably more than in the sputtering period.

For example, although the latest visit of the Duke and Duchess of Windsor has been accompanied with little fanfare, yet many people are saying, since they left, "Why not use the duke and his American wife as Anglo-American propaganda?"

Relations between the United States and Great Britain have struck their lowest level since the war began.

Britain needs to be sold again—to the United States, this time. Mr. Churchill should dispatch the former King and his American wife on a personal good-will tour.

Another international subject being talked about in the Capital is the sudden effort of the small nations to make themselves heard.

Naturally, the limelight is on Russia, the United States, England, and China. The small nations continue, meanwhile, to do the best they can to win the war. Lately they have begun to demand attention from their big allies.

I do not think, however, that all their new "how about me" efforts are wise. Last week the Norwegian minister of supply and reconstruction announced quite clearly that it is the duty of the United States and Britain (meaning, naturally, the duty of the American pocketbook) to reimburse Norway and the other occupied countries for the damage done by the German invaders.

Very stupid diplomacy, this. It was not the fault of the United States or of Britain that Norway or Denmark or France let the enemy in. Minister Frihagen must have been badly advised when he made that statement. Somebody should have told him that the American taxpayer, already faced with the struggle of providing the money with which to support a national debt of about $300,000,000,000, is beginning to look sharply at lend-lease.

The days of squandering are over.

I also doubt that the brave people of the occupied countries want to be treated as paupers. There are billions of dollars worth of frozen foreign money waiting in the United States to be thawed out for rehabilitation and relief. The people who have endured the invasion of the enemy undoubtedly want that money to be used for rehabilitation. I can't believe they wish to seem beggars before the world.

If I were a citizen of an occupied country fighting at home for my daily existence, I should do away with my government-in-exile—come the happy day of peace.

I'd fix up my part of the post-war world for the comfort, not of the runaways but of the stay-behinds who met disaster heroically on its own ground.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the October 15, 1943, issue of the New World.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE DESK

Most of us are vitally concerned with freedom of the press. Newspaper copy has always been in the midst of a struggle to survive as an instrument to convey the truth to the people. Since the time of the Caesars, dictators have tried to throttle the right of editors to express their views. Occupied Europe is grim testimony of nations enslaved,

without the possibility of challenging by word or script the tyranny which grinds them under. Happily, we still enjoy freedom of the press. There is no possibility of losing it, unless strong attacks are launched through legal channels. Therefore, it is our duty to be forever alert against any official thought which might strike at a structure which can be rightly called a cornerstone of our liberty. The colonists who fought and died for constitutional rights established barriers against any overbearing power in Congress which might stifle the voice of the people.

History records endless discussion on the subject of regulation of the written word and the fight against the idea that speech or copy could be put in the same category as commerce, thus falling victim to a thousand so-called protective measures. The wise Mr. Madison, in proposing 12 amendments to the Bill of Rights, concentrated heavily on this issue. Excerpts from his fourth and fifth amendments need no explanation.

"The people shall not be deprived or abridged of their right to speak, to write, or to publish their sentiments; and the freedom of the press, as one of the great bulwarks of liberty shall be inviolable * * * No State shall violate the equal rights of conscience or freedom of the press or the trial by jury in criminal cases."

Up to this era, there has been no serious threat to the sound philosophy of the Bill of Rights. So it was greatly disturbing thus to see a precedent, which might get violently out of hand, unless recognized immediately as a threat to free speech. In the case of the Attorney General of the United States against the Associated Press, in the Federal Court of the southern district of New York, a strange decision was reached. Two out of three judges agreed with the Attorney General that the A. P. is a monopoly, because it denies its news reports to newspapers outside its own membership.

The arguments of the judges are cloudy and therefore dangerous; for instance, "It is only by cross lights from varying directions that full illumination can be secured." It was hastily explained by the court that the judgment does not intend to interfere with the type of news reports printed, but that it would compel the members of the Associated Press to make their dispatches accessible to others.

After stumbling through a maze of legalism, it seems that the A. P. would no longer be a monopoly if the element of exclusion of news dispatches were eliminated. "The A. P. would then be only a collective effort of the calling as a whole."

The word "illumination" has us completely on the ropes. It seems that the free "collective effort" was urged in order to scatter "illumination" in sunburst fashion over the public mind. It opens the door for untold developments.

The Associated Press, like labor unions, and church organizations, are free associations enjoying bylaws and the exercise of freedom in choosing their particular modes of membership. For instance, the Roman Catholic Church can deny membership to anyone who will not subscribe to her fundamental doctrines. An atheist can be refused Communion at the altar rail.

In a different sphere, newspaper copy is as sacred as a theological thesis from a pulpit. So far, no one has dared to challenge the Church's right to issue copy, a sermonette, or the communication of religious news and intelligence through proper media over State lines, so long as it does not involve sedition or jeopardize the public good.

What are the possibilities if said copy can be controlled by court order, to force its transfer from a free association, which actually owns it, to the public at large, with the argument that all this must be a "collective effort" toward the "illumination" of the public?

If the Associated Press or any other free association can be compelled to change its bylaws by Government order, newspapers, churches, and other organizations enjoying freedom of association might some day be controlled by laws of commerce. This would mix up one of our great fundamental freedoms in the same crate as tomatoes or pecans being trucked over State lines from the Southwest.

George Washington, presiding at the birth of a free nation, asked that "the characteristic rights of freemen should be impregnantly fortified." He spoke in the light of tremendous power over commerce in the hands of Congress. The founding fathers made clear the distinction between the communication of the will of the people to their Congress and the control of commercial intercourse between States. Not until the twentieth century, when the United States seems in danger of losing some hold on century-old principles, has the freedom of expressing oneself according to conviction and conscience been so discussed. An "illumination" can bring down a black night on a land of freemen.

The reverence Americans hold for the written word and the bylaws of free associations seems greatly technical. But reduced to bare foundations, they can represent the difference between freemen and slaves. And, too, we have always believed with the Supreme Court that the right of free speech, free press, and worship are the "preferred rights" of our Commonwealth; and if one is threatened, they all are; sufficient reason certainly for our alarm.

So the case is obviously important even as far as religious freedom is concerned. No matter how the collective doctrine of the Catholic church might illuminate the mind of an agnostic, governmental pressure should not be able to force the church to accept him, unless he subscribes to the theological demands of our communion. It would mean the elimination of freedom to exercise doctrinal discipline according to the dictates of our religion.

Certainly no stronger argument can be brought into the picture than the Bill of Rights, which guarantees that freemen may communicate freely to and about each other, to and about government, and to and about God; and that none may impose any restraint on their communications en route to their destination. Freedom of conscience, of the press, and of association were the very foundation of this rock of liberty. Any violation of its spirit must be viewed as an attack on the democratic institutions for which we fight.

Playing Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by former Secretary of the Navy and former Ambassador to Mexico, Hon. Josephus Daniels, appearing in the Raleigh News and Observer under the caption "Playing politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING POLITICS

The Senate played politics by shelving the educational measure. In recent years many Negroes, who formerly voted the Republican ticket, have renounced their slavery to that party and become independent voters. Many voted for Roosevelt. They have learned by long experience that the Republicans give them nothing but lip service. Even when a staunch Republican, Senator Blair, wished funds from the Federal Treasury to aid in the education of Negroes, they defeated the proposal, some Democrats aiding. It was the duty of the Federal Government, which freed the Negroes, to contribute to their education. Instead they imposed the burden on an impoverished South. And now, when Negro leaders and southern white leaders unite to secure better schools, Republican Senators (a few Democrats aiding), in order to defeat it, attached a rider that would require Southern States to quit having separate schools for the two races. They were not willing to meet the issue squarely, but as usual found a way to oppose any practical aid to the Negro. They know—as everybody knows—that separate schools for races, wherever there are large numbers of both, will be demanded by the people. They knew their vote would deprive the Negroes of better educational advantages. When the Negro asked for bread they gave him a stone, as has been the practice since reconstruction.

The South pays proportionately more for public education than any other section out of the lowest bracket income. Nearly all the money comes from white taxpayers. They think, and so do broadminded northerners, that the cost of education in the South should be borne in part by the whole country. But the Republicans in the Senate say by their votes: No such aid will be given unless separate schools for the races are discontinued. That was the lip service they gave the Negro. They knew that rider would kill the proposal, and the northern Republican Senators played that trick because they do not wish to appropriate any money that helps the South.

When the election comes on next year, the Republicans will again ask for the vote of Negroes, whom they rob of educational advantages by the political amendment. Their plea will be, "We demanded the end of separate schools for the races," which they know is out of the range of possibilities. For 50 years the Negro voters went to the polls and voted the Republican ticket because Lincoln freed them. The Republicans deny the poor better schools, still regarding the Negro as political slaves. Democratic Leader BARKLEY opposed the destructive amendment because, as he said, "I was not willing to play politics with the subject of education."

No measure comes up in Washington that does not find the Republicans seeking to play politics. It worked in 1920 and that fact largely accounts for the present war. They think such action will enable them to win in 1944, when they find another Harding.

Answers to Questions, by Lewis Haney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a column which I clipped yesterday from the Washington Times-Herald. It is written by Mr. Lewis

Haney, professor of economics at New York University. In this article certain questions which were asked are answered by Mr. Haney, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME QUESTIONS OF READERS ANSWERED

A Chicago reader asks: "Doesn't it seem that Government subsidies to encourage the production of food are the best way to stimulate farmers to make larger crops?"

Answer: I don't think so. Neither do most farmers, and they ought to know something about their own business. In fact, most farmers are so disillusioned and disgusted concerning Government control over farming operations and prices that it might well be that the adoption of a subsidy program would have an effect opposite to stimulation.

The fundamental economic weakness of subsidies is that they can't be adjusted to allow for all sorts of differences and changing conditions. These thus fail to give the maximum incentive to production. In order to get the largest output, it is most important to stimulate the producers who have the best farms and make the most profit. They are the ones who have the greatest possibilities of increased production. Big profits and rents when earned by superior productivity are essential to big production. But the only way to get this result is to have one price for each product of the same grade, and let it go high enough to stimulate each farmer to push his cultivation to a point where he gets the highest yield per acre that is economically possible for him on his farm.

Subsidies encourage waste. They are the joy of bureaucrats. They give politicians power and control over spending, thus encouraging political machines and destroying democracy.

New York city asks: "Isn't heavier taxation the best way to fight inflation?"

Answer: That depends largely on the kind of tax.

If taxes are made to rest on spenders, and actually operate to reduce spending, they may help to check the effect of inflation on prices.

This is especially true then the taxation does not restrict production or encourage waste. An artificial and unnecessary limitation on the supply of goods available tends to encourage inflation. Taxes that take away the motives of individual enterprises or laborers to produce, are bad.

It is easily possible that increased taxation may increase inflation. If increased taxes go to increased Government spending, and if the total spending exceeds the revenue, then inflation will grow.

Cut down the spending at the same time that you increase the taxes (and thus reduce the debt), and you will get somewhere.

Pasadena, Calif., asks: "Why can't labor union members realize that they are now worse off because of all the taxes and deductions from wages? Don't they realize that their leaders may be taking more than the members get in benefits?"

Answer: I believe strongly in labor organizations and collective bargaining. I agree with you, however, to the extent that labor leaders and politicians have turned trade unions into rackets. This, I believe, has been done in some cases. The general drawbacks attaching to membership in trade unions are: Cost of officers salaries and dues, unnecessary strikes, forcing up labor costs so as to cause unemployment, and opposition to higher pay for superior skill or strength.

More legal responsibility, and information about conditions within unions, are desirable.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the article which I have just submitted, and which the Senate has granted consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD, mentions certain countries of the world requesting that we provide them with funds with which to pay for the damage done by the Axis Powers in their respective countries. In other words, some of the countries which have been invaded by the Axis Powers are now demanding that we pay for the damage done by the Axis Powers in their countries, regardless of how the Axis Powers got within their borders. In line with that I wish to call the attention of the members of this body to the fact that we are today fortunate in learning that Uruguay has done us the favor of accepting $500,000 from us. I ask that a brief article from a Washington paper regarding this matter be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URUGUAY ACCEPTS $500,000 FROM UNITED STATES

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY, October 23.—The Uruguayan Government announced acceptance today of a $500,000 gift from the United States Office of Coordination of Inter-American Affairs to be devoted to sanitation work and health measures.

The Jews in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL ELLISON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD I include therein an extract from an address made by Watson Thomson on the subject of the Jews in Europe:

Today many of us have taken part in the celebration of one of the great Christian festivals, centered around the mysteries of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.

That being so, there may be a value in our taking time out for these few minutes to look at events in our own day which constitute nothing less than the crucifixion of a whole people—the Jews of Europe. The most terrible act in all the long drama of man's inhumanity to man is being written before our eyes—did we choose to turn our eyes that way. And, make no doubt about it, the essentials of the story stand out irrefutable, authenticated, confirmed over and over again. You can't deny it—but you can still do what we have in fact been doing this long time—excuse ourselves and pass by on the other side.

It began—like perhaps all the things that have led us to the immense world-convulsion and tragedy of the present day—a long time ago and in small ways, very like things we know of among ourselves. In Berlin—as in many a Canadian city—there was, long before Hitler, this vague, unclarified thing called anti-Semitism. Psychologists have no great trouble identifying its origins—the need for national self-flattery (especially amongst the more frustrated egotists in any national groups) by branding some other group as inferior; envy of the success of some members of the "inferior" group in some direction, such as making money, in which they were themselves ambitious; picking, for a scapegoat, on the most defenseless minority, the stateless people, the Jews.

Of course, there were, and are, things about the Jews which invited all that. They tended to expect persecution and to regard their martyr destiny with a strange deep self-righteousness—and wouldn't we if we had their centuries of pogroms and hostile discrimination, and their great religious tradition? They were often poor, ill-mannered (by our standards), grasping, and fearfully intent on self-preservation—and haven't other peoples been so (including perhaps our own forefathers) when they first emerged out of brutal misery, oppression, and ignorance? In the interdependence of all things human, how can you point to one group and say: "There is all the blame, and all the evil."

So it was in Berlin yesterday—not so different from here and there in Canada today. But then came Hitler to power, and with that event all this poison of mean instinct became a fixed element in the policy of the German state. The storm troopers' brutality was exercised and thrived upon the persecution of the Jews. National vanity was inferentially flattered by deliberately inflamed contempt of the Jews. National disappointments were diverted and national disillusionment postponed by wreaking more and more active and bloody vengeance on the sons and daughters of Israel.

Then, just over 9 months ago, the order went forth—"The Jewish problem must be solved once and for all by the extermination of the Jewish race." No use pausing to meditate on th mystery of how such a thing could even be said. The thing we have to concern ourselves with is the fact that they meant it and have been acting just that way. We are confronted with ghastly deeds.

And here I have to pause. All through this past week I've been reading accounts of these incredible, unspeakable happenings in Europe; so that I can say with Macbeth, "I have supped full with horrors." But how to tell you, not just so that you are shocked (that is comparatively easy with such facts at one's disposal) but so that you and I may be stirred and shocked and stimulated to action about it—that is a terribly hard task, maybe beyond me.

Some of my friends have said "Let the facts speak for themselves." But facts don't speak for themselves, they take on meaning only as they link up with something in our own lives, only as we are therefore sensitively concerned. And you—have you seen even one murder? Have you seen human beings dying of slow starvation? Have you ever watched a fellow creature tortured? Have you had your husband or your wife torn from you and sent to an unknown destination which you knew was either slavery or death? Have you had your children flung into one train while you were pushed into another to be carried apart forever?

Let's go back to the bald facts. Since the Nazi terror began, 2,000,000 of the 7,000,000 Jews of Europe have died and the killing still goes on. Some have died of starvation or disease, the others by every form of execution including being machine gunned in large groups, gassed in specially prepared extermination centers, electrocuted in masses, killed at the rate of a hundred an hour by the injection of air bubbles into the blood stream, packed into a wooden barracks and burned to death, locked 700 together in a rabbi's house and bombed by a low-flying plane. Out of the Warsaw ghetto went 7,000 a day for months, the young and fit to forced labor gangs, most of the old, the children, and the sick to sudden death. Those left behind there

and in the other ghettos of eastern Europe are left to slow starvation in the perpetual presence of death and the fear of death. The armed guards surrounding the ghetto walls have a standard rate now of 100 zlotys, for which price they will consent to give a Jew the privilege of being shot at his own request.

That's just the bare outline of the story. Let your own heart and imagination tell you the rest. I want now to pass to the real question: What do we do about it? Let's think about it first simply as a practical political problem of refugees, immigration quotas, and so on. What have the great democracies so far done or said or proposed through their official leaders and governments?

As for the first—what we have officially done—the answer is, so far as this continent is concerned—just about nothing.

But our leaders and spokesmen have said a few things, and we should note them. Both President Roosevelt and Mr. Anthony Eden have made moving pronouncements of horror and sympathy. There is also the manifesto of the United Nations which ends: "The above-mentioned governments and the French National Committee condemn in the strongest possible terms the bestial policy of cold-blooded extermination. They declare that such events can only strengthen the resolve of all freedom-loving peoples to overthrow the barbarous Hitlerite tyranny. They reaffirm their solemn resolution to insure that those responsible for these crimes shall not escape retribution, and to press on to the necessary practical measures to this end."

That is the tenor of all these official statements and they have this curious feature in common. All of them speak passionately about retribution to be exacted from the criminal—none says anything about immediate action to save his remaining victims. Why is this? Is it because there is nothing we could do? It certainly is not. As we shall see in a moment there are a number of things we could do. Is it because we care more about defeating and punishing Nazis than saving Jewish lives? I think it is. Strange that our governments, governments of Christian democracies, place as much emphasis on that Old Testament value of justice and retribution, so little on the New Testament virtue of a love transcending reason and a mercy transcending justice.

But you may say: What is it we can do? Well, I'll tell you. It's perfectly straightforward and simple and if our governments don't do it, it is because they don't believe their people would back them—and that means you and I.

Jews can still be gotten out of Europe, including occupied Europe. They can slip over into one or other of the neutral countries—Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, or Turkey. The only thing that prevents their acceptance into these countries is the doubt as to whether they will become the permanent responsibility of these neutral countries or not. In other words, we have never said we would supply food for them, money to pay their passage to a new country, shipping to convey them, and help in starting a new life. Above all, we have never said we wanted them ourselves. Neither Canada nor the United States has shown the slightest willingness, in face of all this agonizing human tragedy, to modify the rigid exclusiveness of their immigration laws. A few children have been specially admitted but even that has been hedged around with such officiousness as to make it in effect an inhuman fiasco.

All these things are things within our power to do. These are immediate things, to save hundreds of human lives. Right now there is an intergovernmental conference meeting at Bermuda to discuss the whole question. You can write or wire our own leaders, the Prime Minister, the Department of External Affairs, or your own Member of Parliament, demanding an immediate change of policy toward Jewish refugees and immigration, in such ways as we have just outlined.

Incidentally, and significantly, the Bermuda Conference is officially said to be exploratory only. In other words, don't expect any decisions for immediate action, unless you and I and the other plain citizens of our democracies start pressing hard upon our governments with our demands.

But perhaps you feel like Mr. Herbert Morrison, who said in the British House of Commons that no alteration of policy could have any substantial effect. How many Jewish lives saved, I wonder, would count as substantial effect? Have we forgotten that one human life, yes, one Jewish human life, may be incalculably precious. For, after all, one Jewish life may be one Einstein, one Spinoza—or one Jesus.

All these centuries ago, as we remember at Easter time, a man glorified by the idea of God he felt in his own being, was crucified while other men looked on and none raised a finger to save him, and his own friends were silent and afraid. Must all that be repeated as now a whole people are crucified, a people who also have been glorified among peoples by the idea of God and of righteousness which was born in their souls and given to all humanity?

Why don't we face up to this? Is it that at heart we condone the Nazi's policy and feel that the Jews are a problem, and one of the nicest things to happen to a problem is just that it disappears off the face of the earth—especially if somebody else will do the dirty work for us of bringing about that disappearance?

As for me, I would like to say just this as to where I stand. I believe that there is something actually more important than winning this war, and that is having that in us—of human understanding and courageous deed in accordance with that understanding—which makes us deserve to win this war. To meet that test we are challenged in our attitude and deeds toward sick people, old people, poor people, in our own midst—and in our attitude and deeds toward such abused peoples as the Negroes, Indians, and Jews. Retribution toward the Nazi criminals is certainly not enough; any pagan, any Nazi storm trooper, can do that thing. Upon us is a higher and harder obligation. Not to pity the Jews, not to sentimentalize over them, not to pass resolutions about them. But to rise up and act with all the passion of an awakened human conscience, and save Jewish lives. Save them—not to send them to Eritrea or Madagascar, but to live with them ourselves, learning to say what we like and what we dislike about them as those may who desire understanding and reconciliation, learning to listen to what they have in ancient grievance against us; so that the past may be eaten up into a tolerant present and carried forward into a creative future of living together.

God send us the grace to do so. We must act now or face the awful accusation of these lines of verse, written by a Jewish woman to a Christian friend:

"There is something between us now:
The cry you did not raise.

"You have washed your hands again.
Put down the pitcher.
This water will flow between us.

"Give me back Jesus;
He is my brother.
He will walk with me
Behind the gray ghetto wall
Into the slaughterhouse.
I will lead him into the lethal chamber;
He will lie down upon the poisoned stone;
The little children pricked with the death-bubble
Will come unto him.

"Return to him the yellow badge.
Give me back Jesus;
He is not yours."

Rationing Is Doing Its Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there appeared in yesterday's New York Times a very interesting article entitled "Rationing Is Doing Its Job," written by Mr. Chester Bowles, Acting Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. Because the article is so clear, because the matter is so important to the public, and because I think publication of the article will contribute to the clarification of a Nation-wide situation which at times has been aggravating, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I should like to add, Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Texas will permit me, that I have been informed that Mr. Bowles has been nominated to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of our former distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. Brown. I wish to pay my respects to Mr. Brown, who is a great American and who took office at a very trying time, and assumed an almost impossible task; and at the same time pay my respects to Mr. Chester Bowles, who was formerly O. P. A. administrator in the State of Connecticut. In the very short time he has served as Acting Administrator and General Manager of the Office of Price Administration he has earned and received the applause of many persons in Washington and millions of people throughout the country. I hope that his article will be widely read. It shows that the Office of Price Administration is distributing fairly among all the people of the country what foodstuffs and other products are available. Rationing is sharing, and Mr. Bowles, or rather the O. P. A., is endeavoring to treat all people fairly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RATIONING IS DOING ITS JOB"

THAT'S THE VERDICT OF CHESTER BOWLES, OF O. P. A., WHO CITES THREE MIRACLES TO SUPPORT HIS OPINION

(By Chester Bowles, General Manager of the Office of Price Administration)

One night last May, a man by the name of Harry Hull helped me make up my mind about rationing. Harry is a painter and decorator in Ridgefield, Conn., and is the chairman of his town's war price and rationing board.

I remember that night because I was pretty discouraged about rationing and the O. P. A. and especially all the confusing statements and the complicated regulations that were causing so much trouble.

It was the night before the pleasure-driving ban on passenger cars went into effect. At the time I was the O. P. A. director for Connecticut and I had come down to Fairfield County to talk over our problems with the 424 volunteer members of the 28 local boards.

I had just heard from the national office that the pleasure-driving ban was going into effect the next day. I felt it was bad ration-

ing, even though it might be effective for a brief emergency period.

We spent the evening learning the regulations, and it gave my morale quite a lift. These men and women were giving up their spare time to learn more about a difficult task. They didn't stop to think it might make them pretty unpopular with the folks back home or that they'd have to put in more nights and Sundays down at their little board offices. They just kept jumping out of their seats and asking, "How can we handle this in our town? Are we too strict or too lenient?" Trying to get the feel of it so they could go home and make it work.

When the meeting broke up Hull took me down to the train in his car. We had about a half hour wait till train time and we sat in his car and talked about the war and how things were going here at home.

It was mostly shop talk. We started by agreeing that the regulations were too complicated, and that some were actually silly. Harry told me a few amusing stories—the stories everyone knows. And we talked about all the red tape and needless delays and the local boards' struggles with the lack of clerical help, how they always got things at the last minute.

I must have sounded pretty discouraged because Harry turned to me and said: "The funny thing about rationing is that it really is working."

"Do you really think so?" I asked.

"Sure it is," he said. "You know how I can tell rationing is working? Everyone in our town is able to get what they need. And they couldn't get it without rationing."

On the train ride home I thought about what Harry Hull had said and it grew on me. He knew what he was talking about because he was actually doing the rationing.

If you really want to know whether rationing is working, go to any one of the 5,500 local War Price and Rationing Boards and get a front-line look at the battle of supply as it is being fought in America by 76,000 local board members and their 100,000 volunteer assistants.

All over the country these men and women are serving without pay, without glory, and usually without thanks. Theirs is one of the biggest untold war stories. They have no bureaucratic budgets, yet they somehow managed to get desks and phones and some kind of filing equipment. They don't have the most efficient filing system in the world, but they have a filing system. They don't answer all their letters as promptly as they should, but they do a pretty good job of it. They have the ingenuity and resourcefulness of a volunteer army that gives everything it has got to a cause that must succeed.

You'll find this spirit in every local board. It's the first miracle of rationing. It's the thing that made rationing work and it has never faltered. In the darkest days of the O. P. A., when our Dunkerques came one on top of another, these volunteer boards provided the cohesive force that held the O. P. A. together.

They don't regard their work as dramatic and I doubt if many could say why they stick at it, but the fact is they're close enough to rationing to know that without their dogged determination to get on with the war in their own way, their families and their neighbors might go cold and hungry, and some would not be able to get to work. To them "share and share alike" is more than a slogan—it means operating the machinery of war at home.

Most of rationing's troubles come from the fact that so many people don't understand how rationing actually spreads out scarce supplies. As we get deeper into the war, people are getting a better understanding of why we ration than of how we ration some of the necessities of war.

I wish we could use some skywriting to explain that the Office of Price Administration itself has no authority to undertake the rationing of anything. All that the O. P. A. can do is divide the supplies allotted for consumer use by the proper Government agency. The O. P. A. not only is told how much it can ration—it is told when to ration, and, as in the case of gasoline, in what part of the country.

Actually the O. P. A. is only the consumer's representative at the ration cupboard. Take canned goods, for instance. Rationing of canned foods starts when the War Food Administration sits down with all the Government agencies whose war work requires food and divides the total pack. To such a meeting come representatives of various Government departments with estimates of their essential food requirements. All of these requests for food are urgent; each is vital to the winning of the war.

Glance down this list of agencies which get food rations from the same source as the O. P. A. Remember that rations are being supplied and you get a better idea of how well rationing is working.

United States civilians

War Food Administration.

United States military and war services

Army supply programs.
Army rations.
Army post exchanges.
Army procurement for others.
Navy.
Navy ship's service departments (United States).
Navy commissaries and their ship's stores.
Marine Corps.
Marine post exchange.
Veterans' Administration.
War Shipping Administration.

Exports and shipments

Lend-lease countries.
Liberated areas.
United Kingdom.
British service overseas.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
Other lend-lease countries.
Government purchase.
Commercial.
Red Cross.
Canada
Friendly nations.
Latin-American republics.
Other friendly nations.

United States territories

Alaska (Government, commercial).
Hawaii (Government, commercial).
Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands (commercial, Government).

Naturally, our armed forces and United States civilians have first call on our food stocks, for much of this food is tagged for the thousands of American military kitchens all over the world and your own table. After these requirements are met, supplies are set aside for lend-lease. In this way we help sustain the fighting men of the United Nations who have so long held our common enemy at bay.

When we at the Office of Price Administration learn how much is available for consumer use our supply is divided in the fairest possible manner. But by the time the O. P. A. receives its orders to start rationing civilians it has itself been rationed.

As soon as we understand this first and most important step in rationing, several amazing changes take place in our entire attitude toward wartime rationing.

Rationing really means that because our total supply has been spread out for war use the Army and Navy are getting the stuff they need and that some American boy will come home after the war because we were able to get gasoline to French soldiers fighting by our side in Europe.

As soon as we realize that all the tremendous demands of war are being met and that we at home are able to do our war work without being deprived of the things we really need—well, then, we understand that rationing has done and is doing its job with spectacular success.

This is the second miracle of rationing.

In fact, I feel that on the basis of results—since only results can count in the battle of supply—rationing is one of the most successful things in America today.

Along about here I expect you to ask, "But how about gasoline rationing? Surely you could hardly say that program was working well?"

To that I'd answer, "Yes; I think I can." In many ways, gasoline rationing has been the most successful of all the ration programs—not that we aren't working hard to improve it, because we are. But from the standpoint of accomplishment it is doing its job—to make limited stocks available to everyone who needs gasoline.

The simple arithmetic of rationing easily explains this belief. Practically everyone knows the gasoline supply was pinched early in the war primarily because only certain ships, special trains, and trucks can bring it from the refineries to your service station. Much of this shipping equipment was put into military use and the enemy singled it out for special destruction.

In addition to transportation problems, the war has greatly accelerated the use and speed of everything that works by gasoline.

As with other scarce supplies, the O. P. A. does not determine how much shall be allotted to each of the armed services or to civilians. Those difficult and thankless questions can only be decided by the Petroleum Administrator for War. The realities of the supply-and-demand picture require the Petroleum Administrator for War to tabulate the huge requirements of our jeeps and tanks, boats and planes all over the world. To this he must add incredible amounts used by industry, including war plants which didn't even exist a year ago. Add to this the gasoline used for mechanized farming, working at capacity production, and for all the undreamed of miscellaneous civilian war activities which demand gasoline that peacetime refineries never had to fill.

Before long the sponge that quickly soaked up every drop of gas as it came from the refineries seemed to develop an inner core that just couldn't be saturated. Hundreds of thousands of men and women who had not worked before the war entered all sorts of new war jobs. They had to get to work. Because public transportation had reached the saturation point, thousands of cars which formerly had been used only for Sunday picnics became vehicles of war, bearing their owners and their neighbors to work.

Now, when the Petroleum Administrator for War added up all total requirements there was just not enough to go around. Not only was the country unable to fill the tanks of passenger cars—it had to take some out.

You hear a lot about the befuddlement in Washington over the gasoline situation, but I want to tell you that some of the smartest Americans I know have stayed up long nights tabulating great columns of figures, trying—desperately trying—to find gasoline for the country's passenger cars. As much as any bank teller we wanted to make those figures balance, but where unbalanced bankbooks may result from mathematical error, in our case it just wasn't there—we had thrown it at Hitler.

Now here is the amazing thing: The armed forces are getting the gasoline they need, and war industry, agriculture, and war workers are being supplied because passenger-car consumption along the eastern seaboard has been reduced 65 percent below pre-war levels. This fact becomes more spectacular when you learn that in the East 70 percent of the workers get to their jobs in automobiles.

Gasoline rationing doesn't need any bouquets any more than it needs brickbats to

make it do its job. But if a job is to be judged by results, this one has a record of outstanding success. And the American people have made it the great success it is by adjusting themselves to rationing far better than they realize—even when it came to such a disagreeable restriction as the pleasure-driving ban.

That is the third miracle of rationing.

Even after people learn to judge rationing by its results—by the fact that it is enabling us to fight the war through precise distribution of scarce supplies—some people will question the idea that America has made an outstanding success of rationing.

Rationing has been so severely criticized that even we at the Office of Price Administration were surprised when a recent public-opinion poll actually showed that 93 percent of the American people approved food rationing and think it is efficiently and effectively handled.

I do not see any more big rationing programs on the horizon, and now that we are getting our second wind, this is a good time to take a backward glance to see why this misunderstanding developed. I think rationing has a bad reputation largely because the O. P. A. failed to explain it so that people could understand it easily. It is true that the O. P A. was an emergency war agency laid out overnight. It is also true that in war you have to improvise and that a general can't always explain why he goes around a hill rather than over it because at first he is too busy taking the hill and later he is too busy crossing the stream on the other side of the hill.

We Americans started out with the feeling of tremendous surpluses in this country, a feeling we'd always have everything we needed, that the war wouldn't touch us deeply. Our big job would be to produce for others and send some soldiers and sailors abroad, but the job wouldn't be too hard.

We didn't understand. One reason for the pinch is that we never did have enough of everything. The reason we seemed to have a surplus before the war was that a lot of people went hungry. Our standard of living was always much too low among many millions of people, a standard of living I hope we will never accept after the war is over.

Now suddenly, against that background of seeming plenty, we told the people there wasn't enough and I don't think we explained it properly.

Of course most people have a lot more to do than study economics, even the economics of war that affect their personal lives. You can't blame a man who gets home from a hard day's work if he has time only to read the war news before going to bed. It's only natural that on the way to work the next day he'll hear that Joe's wife couldn't get his favorite meat, those fellows in Washington want you to eat corn flakes for supper, it's that O. P. A., again.

It's only natural because the little annoyances in life are the things that people will talk about. But more than that—if the little gripes make good small talk, forecasts of impending famines always make dramatic headlines.

I do not quarrel even with the few who felt it was good sport to throw rocks and make faces at the OPA because they thought it was fashionable to do so. It's a good old American custom to want to kill the umpire. There are a number of things I don't like myself. All of us have personal problems, but do any of us want to go back to the days when we stood in line and then couldn't find anything when we got to the counter? Do we want to go back to that? I think not.

The poor opinion of rationing which we sometimes hear is not due entirely to the past weakness of the O. P. A. in explaining the country's supply problem. It is partly due to the fact that we are a nation of perfectionists. We have actually been trained to look for flaws and reject anything that's less than perfect. Rationing is never perfect. And that's one reason why it will be abolished once it has done its emergency job.

There are other reasons why you and I get the impression that people feel rationing isn't working. People were just afraid of it. No one was more afraid of it than I was. I remember the time, last fall, when rationing of canned fruits and vegetables was being planned. The first point-value books were being printed and the advance samples I saw seemed terribly difficult. As a consumer I didn't look forward to shopping with those blue stamps.

And the day last spring when the newspapers first announced the amount of canned goods available for each person, the entire country was greatly disturbed. In Connecticut, as everywhere else, complaints poured into every local board and my office at State headquarters was swamped. Some people were bitter; everyone—including myself—was shocked.

Looking back, it is amazing how well the program worked out. As it was put into operation, the mail slowed down, and today it is only a trickle. The food trade took on point rationing as a serious wartime job and made it work in half a million grocery stores. Local boards worked long hours to help their neighbors to live with war ration book 2, and when people began to use it they found it wasn't so bad after all. The things we are most afraid of almost never happen.

Although the hardest part of the war is still ahead of us, there's very little pessimism about the fighting war today, because the momentum of defeat has given way to the momentum of victory. Not many people realize that rationing has already turned its corner. Before long, I think, it will be apparent to all Americans that a lot of honest, hard work has brought the battle of supply its own momentum of victory.

A few months have given us enough perspective to see some startling paradoxes in our reactions to rationing. I think that after the war we'll look back on the trouble we had and say it wasn't so bad.

And I think some of the better jokes about rationing will find a permanent place in American humor.

Federal Bureaucracy and the Disappearing States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very learned article written by one of Oregon's foremost citizens and an illustrious leader of the bar of that State. This article is entitled "Federal Bureaucracy and the Disappearing States." In my opinion, it is very timely, and I desire the Members of the Congress and the Federal Government to have the advantage of reading it.

The Public Printer estimates that it will make 3 pages at a cost of $135.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon State Bar Bulletin of October 1943]

FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY AND THE DISAPPEARING STATES—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ALFRED E. CLARK, SEPTEMBER 2, 1943, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE OREGON STATE BAR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This speech was delivered by Colonel Clark at the annual meeting of the Oregon State Bar in Portland, September 2, following which there was such a demand for copies that the Bulletin decided to print it in full.)

The recent emergence of the executive department and executive bureaus as the major governing power in this country is one of the most dramatic and disturbing developments in our history.

Today, in very real sense, the American people are no longer governed by law. They are governed by regulations, orders, and directives issued by one or the other of our multiple Federal bureaus. I am not now referring to war regulations and the like, but to conditions existing before the war, and which, unless the trend is checked, are likely to continue and to intensify after the war is over.

This has been accomplished, to a very large extent, through a new and, in many aspects, a startling interpretation of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution, which is now being used to obliterate the States and convert our system into a highly centralized form of government, exercising uncontrolled police power in every State, over all, or nearly all, local affairs and industries.

Lately the new and expanded construction of the commerce clause is being supported by a doctrine at first vaguely stated, but now taking definite form. This doctrine is that Congress has the right, without any constitutional limitations whatsoever, to legislate on, and to regulate any and every matter affecting our way of living, if done with the asserted purpose of promoting the general welfare.

The executive bureaus usually draft their own basic laws, secure their passage by a pliant Congress; they promulgate, under color of authority of these laws, a torrential flood of regulations, orders, and directives, having the force of law, and, in the main, and with the approval of the courts, interpret and enforce them.

Running parallel with this growth of bureaucracy is the diminishing dignity and jurisdiction of the Federal courts, the impairment of the independence of Congress, and the destruction of the powers of local self-government.

The obvious trend of national legislation under the impact of Executive and bureaucratic pressure, and the obvious trend of judicial decisions in upholding and construing this legislation, is to expand Federal control so as to embrace almost every phase of the social and economic life of the American people.

STATES LOSING POWERS

As a necessary consequence the power and jurisdiction of the States in relation to their internal affairs are being whittled away to the vanishing point. More and more the States are being reduced to the status of geographical designations. Their constitutional and historic powers are being absorbed by the Federal Government, and these functions, as well as all other governmental functions, more and more are being carried on by Federal bureaus.

In 1930 Mr. Roosevelt, when Governor of the State of New York, expressed much concern about the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the jurisdiction of the

States. He vigorously opposed it then. He said:

"To bring about the government by oligarchy—masquerading as democracy—it is fundamentally essential that all authority be centralized in our National Government. We are safe from any departure from the principles on which this country was founded just as long as individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger."

During the past 10 years the type of oligarchy thus described has been pretty well fastened on this country.

When the proponents of the new order speak of a powerful and centralized government they mean a strong executive department exercising the real powers of government through a Federal bureaucracy, a submissive Congress, and what has been described in high places as a cooperative and sympathetic Court.

Under such system of government, the executive department and its bureaus map out governmental programs and draft the laws to carry them into effect. Congress enacts these laws, the courts uphold them, and the bureaus interpret and administer them. This philosophy of government was imported from continental Europe, where it flourished, but now, in major areas, seems to be fading away before the impact of bombs and bullets.

A totalitarian state is one in which the powers of government are largely exercised by one person, or by a small group of persons, functioning through boards and bureaus appointed by and accountable to the governing oligarchy. In that form of government the legislative and judicial departments are appendages of the executive department. That form of government until recently had, and may still have, a good many admirers in this country.

The difference between a highly centralized government, so-called, and a totalitarian state is only one of degree and not of quality.

The first great effort to hand over to the executive department and its bureaus the powers of government was the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, based on the commerce clause.

The act was pronounced unconstitutional in its main features in two decisions of the Supreme Court (*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan*, 293 U. S. 388, 79 L. ed. 446, decided Jan. 7, 1935; *Schechter Poultry Corporation* v. *United States*, 295 U. S. 495, 79 L. ed. 1570, decided May 27, 1935) upon two grounds: First, that there was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the President; and second, that there was an attempt to regulate, to an unconstitutional degree under color of authority of the commerce clause, intrastate commerce and the local and internal affairs of the States.

N. I. R. A. ACT CITED

The N. I. R. A. was almost as complete an attempt at surrender of the powers of government to the executive department, within the field of its operation, as was the action of the German Reichstag in 1934, when it voted to suspend the Weimar constitution and vest in Chancellor Hitler the powers of the state upon the ground that in this way the general welfare of the German people would be best promoted. The difference between the action of the American Congress in passing the N. I. R. A. act and the action of the German Reichstag was one of degree only.

The act affected all industry. It undertook to vest in the President practically all the powers of government in the field of American industry. These powers were to be exercised by him, or by such bureaus, boards, and the like as he might set up, and by such methods as they chose to adopt.

You need not take my opinion as to the scope and the purpose of the act. What was said by the Supreme Court in the Panama Refining Co. and the Schechter cases will bear me out. In the Panama case, section 9 (c) of the act was directly involved, which vested in the President and his assignees uncontrolled discretion to regulate, indeed to prohibit, the movement in commerce of petroleum and the products thereof. Violation of any order made by the President, or anyone to whom he assigned his powers, was punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Describing the grant of legislative power to the President the Court said:

"If par 9 (c) were held valid, it would be idle to pretend that anything would be left of limitations upon the power of the Congress to delegate its law-making function. * * * Instead of performing its law-making function the Congress could at will, and as to such subjects as it chooses, transfer that function to the President or other officer or to an administrative body."

The Schechter case arose under section 3 of the act, which was described as the heart of the legislation.

It seems to have been contended by the Government that there was an economic crisis which called for extraordinary remedies, and that, in the face of this situation, constitutional restraints should be disregarded. Answering this contention the Court said:

"Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power. The Constitution established a national government with powers deemed to be adequate, as they have proved to be both in war and peace, but these powers of the National Government are limited by the constitutional grants. Those who act under these grants are not at liberty to transcend the imposed limits because they believe that more or different power is necessary. Such assertions of extra-constitutional authority were anticipated and precluded by the explicit terms of the tenth amendment."

Analyzing the nature and extent of the law-making authority conferred upon the President the Court used this language:

"As already noted, the President in approving a code may impose his own conditions, adding to, or taking from what is proposed as 'in his discretion' he thinks necessary 'to effectuate the policy' declared by the act."

* * * * *

"And this authority relates to a host of different trades and industries, thus extending the President's discretion to all the varieties of laws (embodied in Presidential orders) which he may deem to be beneficial in dealing with the vast array of commercial and industrial activities throughout the country."

* * * * *

"The discretion of the President, in approving or prescribing codes, and thus enacting laws for the government of trade and industry throughout the country, is virtually unfettered."

ROVING COMMISSION GRANTED

Judge Cardozo, in a concurring opinion in the Schechter case, said:

"Here, in the case before us, is an attempted delegation not confined to any single act, nor to any class, or group, of acts identified or described by reference to a standard. Here in effect is a roving commission to inquire into evils and upon discovery correct them."

He also pointed out that the codes and the asserted authority to make them embraced all industry, and remarked:

"The extension becomes as wide as the field of industrial regulation. If that conception shall prevail, anything that Congress may do within the limits of the commerce clause for the betterment of business may be done by the President upon the recommendation of a trade association by calling it a code. This is delegation running riot. No such plenitude of power is susceptible of transfer. The statute, however, aims at nothing less, as one can learn both from its terms and from the administrative practice under it."

These decisions, and others to which I will later refer, were decided prior to 1937. I think that most of you will agree with me that the National Industrial Recovery Act was born 4 or 5 years too soon, and that if a similar act should come before the courts today it likely would be sustained.

I recall reading of an incident in the reign of James II of England. He asserted the power to dispense with the execution of the laws of the realm. A majority of the judges of the high court disagreed with this view. He appointed several new judges, and the reconstructed court had no difficulty in holding that the King could dispense with the execution of the laws of the realm.

Ours is a dual system of government, often described, but not recently, as an indestructible union of indestructible States. This is the system set up by the Constitution.

For nearly a century and a half the American people, the States, and the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government understood, and acted upon the understanding, that it was the design and true intent of the Constitution that—

The Federal Government should be supreme within the domain of its constitutionally limited and enumerated powers;

The States should be supreme within their well understood and often defined constitutional domain;

The people should be supreme in the domain of constitutional changes.

All this was supposedly taken out of the field of debate by the tenth amendment adopted in 1791.

The commerce clause of the Constitution is now pressed into service as the basis for asserting the power of unlimited control and regulation of all local and State affairs.

The dividing line between interstate and foreign commerce, on the one hand, and intrastate commerce, on the other, often has been marked out and many judicial monuments erected to mark this line.

It is true that cases arose from time to time that fell into what may be called a twilight zone, a zone of uncertainty.

STATES PREVIOUSLY IN CONTROL

However, by an unbroken line of decisions, down to and including the Schechter case in 1935, the Butler case in 1936, the Carter Coal Co. case, also in 1936, it had been held that agricultural production, manufacturing, mining, and all their related activities were subject to State regulation and were not interstate commerce. The same line of cases held that commodities were not in interstate commerce until they had begun their interstate journey. It had also been uniformly held that Congress could not, under the commerce clause, or upon other constitutional ground, indirectly control agriculture, manufacturing, mining, or other industrial activities in a State by denying interstate transportation facilities to commodities, useful in themselves and not harmful to the public health and morals, because not produced under conditions that Congress might lay down. The three cases referred to a moment ago were the last stand of a majority of the Supreme Court against, what seems to me clearly to be, the seizure of the constitutional powers of the States by the Federal Government, and its assertion of uncontrolled jurisdiction over every form of economic and industrial activity within the States. You will recall this was about the time the movement was begun to reconstruct the Supreme Court.

The Butler case (*U. S.* v. *Butler*, 297 U. S. 1, 80 L. ed. 477) arose under the Agricultural

Adjustment Act of 1933. Again, in this case, it was vigorously contended, in support of the validity of the act, that the Federal Government should have all the powers it deemed necessary to promote the general welfare. The court said:

"The question is not what powers the Federal Government ought to have, but what powers in fact have been given by the people. It hardly seems necessary to reiterate that ours is a dual form of government; that in every State there are two governments, the State and the United States. Each State has all governmental powers save such as the people, by their Constitution, have conferred upon the United States, denied to the States, or reserved to themselves. The Federal Union is a Government of delegated powers."

The act contemplated and authorized the use of the taxing power, the giving of bonuses, and the imposition of penalties to persaude, or compel, citizens and industries within a State, engaged in local enterprise, to conform to the conditions laid down by Congress—the asserted purpose being to promote the general welfare. The Supreme Court held this could not be done, saying:

"Until recently no suggestion of the existence of any such power in the Federal Government has been advanced. The expressions of the framers of the Constitution, the decisions of this Court interpreting that instrument, and the writings of great commentators will be searched in vain for any suggestion that there exists in the clause under discussion, or elsewhere in the Constitution, the authority whereby every provision and every fair implication from that instrument may be subverted, the independence of the individual States obliterated, and the United States converted into a central government exercising uncontrolled police power in every State of the Union, superseding all local control or regulation of the affairs or concerns of the States."

* * * * *

"It seems never to have occurred to them (the framers of the Constitution), or to those who have agreed with them, that the general welfare of the United States (which has aptly been termed 'an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States,') might be served by obliterating the constituent members of the Union. But to this fatal conclusion the doctrine contended for would inevitably lead. And its sole premise is that, though the makers of the Constitution, in erecting the Federal Government, intended sedulously to limit and define its powers, so as to reserve to the States and the people sovereign power, to be wielded by the States and their citizens, and not to be invaded by the United States, they nevertheless by a single clause gave power to the Congress to tear down the barriers, to invade the States' jurisdiction, and to become a parliament of the whole people, subject to no restrictions save such as are self-imposed."

FIRST STEP HELD DANGEROUS

Again in the *Carter Coal Company case* (298 U. S. 238, 80 L. ed. 1160) in which the commerce clause was involved, the court said:

"The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to preserve, complete and unimpaired, State self-government in all matters not committed to the general Government is one of the plainest facts which emerges from the history of their deliberations."

* * * * *

"The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States."

"Every journey to a forbidden end begins with the first step; and the danger of such a step, by the Federal Government, in the direction of taking over the powers of the States is that the end of the journey may find the States so despoiled of their powers, or—what may amount to the same thing—so relieved of the responsibilities, which possession of the powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to little more than geographical subdivisions of the national domain."

"It is safe to say that if, when the Constitution was under consideration, it had been thought that any such danger lurked behind its plain words, it would never have been ratified."

All these decisions have now been tossed overboard as so much judicial rubbish. Congress may now, with the approval of the Supreme Court, deny to any commodity, produced in any State, access to interstate transportation facilities for any reason, or indeed, for no reason whatever. The power to exclude any goods from commerce is now declared to be unlimited.

Each State may now, at the will of the Federal Government, be compelled to become an isolated, self-contained, economic unit, cut off from any commerce with other States or foreign nations, unless it yields complete control and regulation of its industries to the Federal Government. Agriculture, mining and manufacturing are now held to be in interstate commerce, and all phases subject to Federal regulation.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938. It is based on and purports to regulate interstate commerce. It was sustained in the Darby case. (*U. S.* v. *Darby*, 312 U. S. 100, 85 L. ed. 609, decided February 3, 1941) and its validity assumed in other cases. It will be recalled that up to 1936 at least agricultural production was not considered interstate commerce. The definition of agriculture contained in the act makes it clear that Congress now asserts the right to assume complete jurisdiction over every phase of agriculture. Section 3 (f) reads as follows:

"'Agriculture' includes farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer, or on a farm as an incident to, or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

Agriculture as thus defined is, by the terms of the act, made subject to many of its provisions. It is exempt from the provisions relating to maximum hours and minimum wages. But these exemptions are given as a matter of legislative grace, and not because of any lack of asserted constitutional power. It is a matter of common knowledge that strong pressure groups now have a program on foot to wipe out these exemptions.

Subdivision (j) of the same act defines what the word "produced" means in relation to interstate commerce. It reads as follows:

"'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof, in any State."

It will be observed that to produce, manufacture, mine, handle, or in any other manner work in any such activities in a State are within the plain language of the act. But this subdivision does not stop there. It says that the employee is in interstate commerce if he works in any process or occupation necessary to the production of goods for commerce in any State.

RULE AFFECTED BY HOPES

Let us see how these provisions have been and are interpreted.

Paragraph 2 of Interpretative Bulletin No. 5, issued by the Department of Labor in 1938, and revised in 1939, in part reads:

"The wage and hour provisions of the act are applicable to employees 'engaged in (interstate) commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.' Employees are engaged in production of goods for commerce where the employer intends, or hopes, or has reason to believe that the goods, or any unsegregated part of them, will move in interstate commerce."

Section 5 of this bulletin points out that a person may be engaged in interstate commerce although he may not ship in commerce any goods produced by him, or hopes or intends to do so. He is engaged in interstate commerce, so it is said, if he sells his products to someone else who may in turn sell them in interstate commerce, either in their original or converted form, and to illustrate this point it is said:

"Thus, if a manufacturer of buttons sells his product within the State to a manufacturer of shirts (within the State), the shirts being shipped in interstate commerce, the employees of the button manufacturer are engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and, if a lumber manufacturer sells his lumber locally to a furniture manufacturer who sells furniture in interstate commerce the employees of the lumber manufacturer would likewise come within the scope of the act."

I read to you a moment or two ago subdivision (j) of section 3 of the act of 1938, which includes among those employed in interstate commerce anyone who works "in any process or occupation necessary to the production" within a State of goods for commerce. Section 11 of the bulletin interprets this clause. By way of illustration it points out that if a person was engaged in the manufacture of tools, dies, etc., within a State, which were sold to others within the State, he would be engaged in interstate commerce if the tools were used within the State by others, in the production of goods, any part of which were shipped in interstate commerce. The same would be true if the ultimate purchaser of the tools used them directly or indirectly in the production of goods, a part of which he hoped or intended to move in interstate.

Under this interpretation a person who manufactured a crosscut saw in Portland would be engaged in commerce if he sold it to a dealer in Portland, who in turn sold it to some individual logger, who, sometime and somewhere within the State, used it to fell a tree, which was afterward cut into lumber, and this lumber, or some of it, moved in interstate commerce, or it was hoped or intended at the time of manufacture that it, or some part of it, would move in interstate commerce.

The Supreme Court of the United States has gone, I think, even further than the Department of Labor did in its interpretative bulletin. I will refer to a few recent cases.

In the Kirschbaum case (*Kirschbaum* v. *Walling*, 316 U. S. 517, 8 L. ed. 1638, decided June 1, 1942) the question was whether persons employed in a building in Philadelphia were engaged in interstate commerce. The employees were elevator operators, janitors, charwomen, and the like. Some of the tenants in the building manufactured articles, part of which moved in interstate commerce. It was held that the employees of the owner of the building were engaged in interstate commerce.

COURT'S REASONING RECITED

The case of *Warren-Bradshaw Drilling Co.* v. *Hall* (87 L. ed. 99) was decided December 9, 1942. The Warren-Bradshaw Co. owned a rotary drill. It made a contract with the owners or lessees of land in Texas to drill holes in Mother Earth in search of oil. It was to drill holes to some point short of possible oil sands, when another drilling concern would take over. The court held that the employees of the contractor were engaged in interstate commerce. The reasoning of the court may be thus summarized: The employers were engaged in a "process or occupation necessary" to the production of oil. The owners or lessees of the lands, who had contracted for the drilling of holes, hoped to strike oil and there was some grounds for the belief that this hope might be realized. It was possible that if oil was found it would be produced; that if it was produced it would be sold, and that if sold, some part of it would pass into interstate commerce, therefore the driller, and his employees, were engaged in interstate commerce. In a dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Roberts said that the decision ignored all practical distinctions; that it was but the application to practical affairs of life of a purely philosophic and wholly impractical test. It was but to repeat in another form the old story of the pebble being thrown into the ocean and the theoretical infinite extent of the resulting waves; and Judge Roberts continued:

"The labor of the man who made the tools which drilled the well, that of the sawyer who cut the wood incidentally used, that of him who mined the iron of which the tools were made are all just as necessary to the ultimate extraction of oil as the labor of petitioners. Each is an antecedent of the consequent—the production of the goods for commerce Indeed if petitioners were not fed, they could not have drilled the well, and the oil would not have gone into commerce. Is the cook's work necessary to the production of the oil, and within the act?"

Let me carry the reasoning of the Supreme Court and the theory of antecedent causative forces, back along the line of unimpeachable logic The drillers had to be fed. The farmer who grew the crops from which the food came had to plow the land in order to grow the crops. For this purpose a plow was necessary. In order for the farmer to get a plow someone had to make a plow, and back of that someone to furnish the materials out of which the plow was built. Someone, indeed, had to mine the ore which finally turned up in the form of plow shares. All of these persons, according to the implications of the interpretative bulletins, and the reasoning of the Supreme Court, would be engaged in some process or occupation necessary to the ultimate production of oil. I have given some thought to how far back this chain of causation may be carried. Certainly it goes as far back as the creation of the world. No doubt the creator intended and hoped that the earth would bear fruit in abundance, and that the fruits thereof would be consumed, bartered, and moved about. Obviously the work of creation was a process or occupation necessary for the production of goods for commerce.

ALL FARMING AFFECTED

We now come to examine two cases which fix the status of agriculture in the scheme of Federal control and regulation.

United States v. *Wrightwood Dairy* (315 U. S. 110, 86 L. ed. 726) decided February 2, 1942, arose under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937. The Secretary of Agriculture promulgated regulations relating to price, production, processing, and distribution of milk in parts of Illinois and parts of adjacent States. The Wrightwood Dairy was a small distributor in Illinois. It bought all of the raw milk handled by it in Illinois and sold it in the immediate vicinity of its place of business in Illinois, there to be consumed. No milk handled by it was intermingled with milk which came from other States. Obviously it was engaged in a purely local enterprise as commonly understood. Based upon the premise that the milk sold by the Wrightwood Dairy came into competition with, or might come into competition with, other milk from across State lines, or that it come into competition with, or might come into competition with other milk produced, sold, and consumed in Illinois, but which might come in competition with milk from across State lines, it was held that the operations of the Wrightwood Dairy was subject to Federal control. Of course, upon this theory, everything produced in a State, even though sold within a State at the point of production, and there consumed, may have some effect upon interstate commerce. The doctrine of the case leaves no farm activity beyond the power of regulation by the Federal Government.

The later case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (87 L. ed. 57) decided November 9, 1942, carried the doctrine further, if possible. It arose under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1941. Filburn operated a small farm in one of the inland counties of Ohio. He raised some grain, some chickens, and kept a few cows. He sold in the vicinity of his farm some milk produced from his cows, and also occasionally sold some poultry and eggs. For years it had been his usual practice to raise a small acreage of wheat, to sell some locally, to use some in making flour for home consumption, to keep some for seed, and to feed the balance to his poultry and livestock on the farm. In 1940 he was given a wheat acre allotment of 11.1 acres, with a specified yield of 20.1 bushels of wheat per acre, or a total of 223 bushels. Apparently the Secretary of Agriculture undertook not only to specify the acreage which Filburn might sow, but also to specify and regulate the number of bushels per acre which the soil was permitted to produce. Filburn in fact sowed 23 acres and produced something like 240 bushels in excess of his allotment. The adjustment act provided that the producer should pay as a penalty upon his excess production 49 cents a bushel, this excess being called a marketing excess. The court held that Filburn could neither sell, nor use upon his own farm, nor hold unused on his own farm, any part of the excess production without paying the penalty of 49 cents a bushel. It further held that it was quite immaterial that no part of what he raised went into interstate commerce, or that the products of the poultry and cows to which he fed the grain went into interstate commerce. The argument of the court runs along these lines: Filburn raised wheat. True, it was raised principally to meet his own needs, but if he had not raised the wheat he might have to purchase wheat in the market for his needs, and thus increase the market for what was produced by others. If he did produce to that extent he lessened the sales of other producers. If he held unmarketed his excess production this surplus or overhang might affect the market. In either event his act would affect interstate commerce to such a degree that his operations would be subject to Federal control.

So, we finally reach the point where the Federal Government may, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, fix the quantity of any agricultural product which a farmer may produce, or in fact prohibit him from growing any except under penalty, fix the prices at which he may sell his products, prescribe the conditions with respect to hours, wages, the type of crops he may grow, the use to which they may be put, and in fact, regulate everything relating to the farmer's economic life.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE DEFINED

From some of the judicial opinions I epitomize the description of the chain of causation to be followed in determining what is interstate commerce.

"Any disturbance, however slight or unimportant, of any part of the total structure of our intricate, complex, and delicately balanced system may, by the centrifugal forces, be propelled outward to the peripheral boundaries and the repercussions of centripetal forces, thus react upon all integrated parts."

This may sound to you like a soporific nursery rhyme. Not so. On the contrary it is modern judicial logic.

According to this test the shepherd following his flock on the slopes of the Blue Mountains, the housewife gathering eggs for the breakfast table, the farmer planting his family patch of potatoes in the dark of the moon, or milking his lone cow to serve the family table—they may not dream that they are in the flow or current of interstate commerce, but within the modern doctrine they are important instrumentalities of interstate commerce. They are so because their simple acts may set in motion centrifugal forces which may push out to the peripheral boundaries of our economic structure, and thus cause repercussions that may send tremors throughout the totality of its integrated parts. Indeed, if Junior decides to emulate Popeye and insists upon a double portion of spinach at the supper table, thus increasing the demand on the market, and lessening the supply to meet this demand, his act may so affect interstate commerce as to bring him within the ambit of Federal control.

Now, where does the responsibility rest for these great and, I believe sinister changes in our system of government. The President has few constitutional powers. He has no constitutional powers which relate to the matters today discussed. Most of the powers exercised by the President, certainly all relating to the creation of bureaus and the making of regulations, orders, and directives, affecting the social and economic life of the American people, are based upon acts of Congress.

Bureaus are not of spontaneous growth. In political biology, there is no such thing as a self-producing or reproducing bureau. Every bureau is created by or under color of an act of Congress. It is supported by congressional appropriations. The powers that any bureau asserts or exercises are based upon laws enacted by Congress. Neither the executive department nor its bureaus, technically at least, pass laws, levy taxes, or appropriate money. In recent practice they only issue directives to our Senators and Representatives, who do these things for them.

So, if the bureaus are burdening and regimenting the people; if, from day to day, they are further extending their control over the life of the American people; if they are taking over control of State and local affairs; if the executive department and its bureaus have become the major governing force in this country—and I believe all these things are true—then it is because those who represent us in Congress are selling the States and the people down the river.

The people of this country have the right to adopt any form of government they wish. If, in the opinion of the people, Congress or the executive department should have greater powers than they now possess these additional powers may be granted by constitutional amendment. The people, if they choose, may repeal the Constitution and set up a new constitution, or wholly discard constitutional government. When a constitutional construction has been followed and acquiesced in for a century and a half it

may be reasonably presumed to have been in accordance with what the people understood the Constitution meant and means. Otherwise amendments would have been proposed. I do not object to amendments by the people. What I do object to are amendments by stealth, by indirection, by usurpation, which are working fundamental changes in our system of constitutional government—changes which are camouflaged by colorful slogans and masses of pleasing verbiage about promoting the common good, and well designed to obscure and conceal the direction in which we are going. History refutes the claim that the common good ever has been or will be promoted by handing over the powers of government to a bureaucratic oligarchy.

Let me read to you, in conclusion, what was said by Mr. Justice Butler in a dissenting opinion in the *Fainblatt case* in 1939 (306 U. S. 601; 83 L. Ed. 1014):

"The present decision and the reasoning offered to support it will inevitably intensify bewilderment. The resulting curtailment of the independence reserved to the States, and the tremendous enlargement of Federal power, denote the serious impairment of the very foundation of our federated system. Perhaps the change of direction, no longer capable of concealment will give potency to the efforts of those who apparently hope to end a system of government found inhospitable to their ultimate designs."

Millions Must Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Saturday Evening Post of October 23, 1943, entitled "Millions Must Starve," by Hallett Abend, as follows:

MILLIONS MUST STARVE

There are more than 300,000,000 human beings in occupied and enemy Europe, 232,000,000 in Germany's subjugated and bludgeoned allied nations, and 72,000,000 in the Reich itself. At least 10 percent of these people, almost all of whom look confidently to the United States for food relief, are already doomed to die of starvation or of diseases resulting directly from malnutrition.

While the United States and its allies have been chanting the slogan of "freedom from want" for all mankind, our own and the world's food reserves and productive capabilities have been shrinking. People everywhere, but especially inhabitants of the Nazi-occupied countries, continue to envisage gigantic argosies of food ships awaiting surrender day in our harbors, all ready to sail eastward to fill Europe's famine-shrunken stomachs.

There will be no such vast argosies. Food for these colossal relief projects does not now exist, and cannot be grown and husbanded against the coming of peace, unless the war lasts for 4 or more years.

The prospect for Europe alone is so grim that the mind refuses to face it. Most of a whole generation of children there are already foredoomed to rickets, bad teeth, and all the ills of maturity which inevitably result from malnutrition in youth. To shift from Europe to the Orient, Japan now rules more than 400,000,000 human beings. India, already short of food, has a population of 388,000,000 more. The extent of hunger in Asia will probably at least equal that in Europe.

The victorious armies of the United Nations may bring freedom to people now in slavery, but they cannot at once bring "freedom from want." Instead, the liberating armies, themselves well fed, will probably on that account be regarded with envy and bitterness. History affords no parallel to the broken promises and disappointed hope which will follow the surrender of the Axis Powers. With the best intentions, based upon the false assumption that the United States could be the bread basket of the world, we face a tragic victory which will bring to those now under Axis tyranny a dubious political freedom, hunger, and a death toll from starvation.

The causes of this impending tragedy are many. More than half of them are man-made—miscalculations, overoptimism, duplication of agencies, jealousies between contending bureaus, and official shortsightedness. Conceding that our rash promises to feed the world could never have been fully kept, recent official revelations show that, except for bungling, they could have been much more nearly fulfilled than they will be.

In Washington today no one knows who should shoulder the final responsibility for the feeding of liberated peoples. No one even seems to know who has the power to go ahead and plan relief measures. When plans are made by one agency, they are soon negatived by another. For instance, the A. M. G. has loomed large in actual relief accorded to the 4,000,000 people of Sicily. And A. M. G. has done a fine job there, and did an equally fine job before that in Tunisia, Algeria, and French Morocco.

President Roosevelt has defined A. M. G.'s job as that of preventing anarchy—in other words, keeping or restoring order, establishing local authorities, preventing pestilence, suppressing the clashing of rival groups eager to seize power, and, above all, feeding the destitute.

Much of this work, it has been expected, would be carried on by the O. F. R. R. O., or Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations, headed by Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York State. But military necessity stepped in. The Army announced, with perfect reasonableness, that restoring order and feeding the destitute in the first period of military occupation was primarily a military job. It was agreed that the A. M. G. should do the work for the first 90 days, and that then the civilian O. F. R. R. O. should take over. Later, the period of military control was extended to months, and there it stands today.

The Army, prodigal with relief measures, is a generous-minded victor. In Tunisia, and later in Sicily, A. M. G. relief, in the main, consisted of full Army rations—the same food per day per person that is given to our fighting men. Alarmed civilian food authorities immediately raised the warning cry that this lavishness could not be continued—a cry inspired not by parsimony, but by the fact that if A. M. G.'s policies were continued, food would run short. After all, it was argued, it was a grievous mistake to feed the Sicilians on a scale that could not possibly be maintained in all of Italy after capitulation.

This Sicilian example immediately precipitated a crisis in Washington. O. F. R. R. O. can purchase only such food as is allocated to it by another agency, the W. F. A., or War Food Administration. It happens that the W. F. A. had allocated enormous supplies to O. F. R. R. O. for the year beginning July 1, 1943. These included 116,000,000 pounds of cheese, 104,000,000 pounds of dried skimmed milk, 150,000,000 pounds of meat, 250,000,000 pounds of evaporated whole milk, and proportionately large consignments of edible fats and oils, canned fruits and vegetables, dried beans, peas, and various soybean products.

These allocations were made to O. F. R. R. O. on the supposition that this civilian organization would begin feeding liberated peoples soon after the first phase of military occupation. When it was discovered that the A. M. G. would continue to function for half a year, W. F. A. canceled these large allotments—in fact, said it must do so or be forced to reduce food allocations to Britain and Russia, and also cut civilian consumption in this country to a degree not before contemplated.

Unhappily, A. M. G., W. F. A., and O. F. R. R. O. are not the only powerful Government agencies concerned in this dispute. Lend-Lease representatives also want a word or two to say, as do those of the Office of Economic Warfare, the Treasury Department, the Navy Department, and finally the Office of Foreign Economic Coordination.

This last, the O. F. E. C., is actually the agency of the State Department, which has named Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, as chairman. The State Department contends that it must have a controlling hand in relief activities in liberated areas. This means that the State Department does not want any organization giving out food to or through native political factions which do not enjoy the approval of State Department policy makers. Baldly stated, this indicates a desire to use food as an instrument of international policy, to force starving millions to climb onto such political band wagons as Washington approves—or go hungry.

Nothing could be more cunningly calculated to postpone indefinitely the era of mutual trust and cooperation which is supposed to follow a United Nations victory.

Governor Lehman's handicapped O. F. R. R. O. has been effectively teamed with a similar organization in Britain, headed by Sir Frederick Leith-Ross, but now it is proposed to supersede both these organizations with an international United Nations agency having a central council composed of representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, and a large general committee on which each member nation will have one representative. It is proposed to call this over-all agency the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or the U. R. R. A., and to make Governor Lehman director general. It is still doubtful, however, how much freedom of action U. R. R. A. will be granted over the conflicting activities of A. M. G., W. F. A., and, above all, over the State Department's O. F. E. C.

Sicily has already afforded a frightening example of the extent to which sweeping promises of relief have aroused false hopes amongst Axis-dominated peoples. Even before the fall of Messina the Sicilians made it evident that they were expecting the import and free distribution of huge stocks of food, clothing, and building materials. They even anticipated a lavish financing of rehabilitation projects.

A. M. G. quickly won undeserved hostility by using the Sicilian press and radio to convince the Sicilians that the United Nations do not intend to play Santa Claus. When A. M. G. announced that existing taxes would be continued, and that tax revenues would help to pay for relief, the Sicilians felt themselves basely betrayed. Some conception of our probable difficulties may be gained from the fact that the population of Sicily is less than 1.5 percent of the population of all of the European countries which must be freed from Axis misrule.

The announced preamble of the draft for organizing the proposed United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration had this to say:

"Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that prepara-

tion and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes, for the resumption of agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services, to the end that peoples once freed may be preserved and restored to health and strength for the tasks and opportunities of building anew."

No wonder the peoples of Europe and of east Asia have high expectations. We have made solemn promises, and they have been taken at face value.

Actually, the food situation in this country, as well as in the other United Nations and the important neutral countries, will not permit the fulfilment of these lavish promises. Governor Lehman has issued a public warning that food rationing here "will continue for a year or two after the war ends." In Britain, realistic Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor, has announced that "price control and coupon rationing will have to be maintained for 4 or 5 years after the war ends."

OUR THINNING LARDER

The United States itself is in danger of serious food shortages. Already many cities and States have suffered scarcities of meat, butter, milk, potatoes, onions, and poultry. This year's wheat crop will be at least 20 percent below normal, and October will probably witness the exhaustion of our "ever-normal" grain reserves.

There are several man-made reasons for the food shortage in this country. Chief among them are the facts that even while farmers were being urged to raise more food, the W. P. B. cut production of farm machinery to 23 percent of normal, and at almost the same time the Selective Service was stripping the farms of trained labor. The farm machinery manufacturing quota was later raised to 49 percent of normal, but this larger production cannot be achieved before the middle of 1944.

With conditions of this kind at home, what hope have we of feeding the peoples of Europe? Consider the list of European-occupied lands or European participants in the war, alphabetically arranged:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Rumania. These 19 nations have a combined population of 188,000,000. To this appalling total must be added 41,500,000 in mainland Italy, and Germany's 72,000,000 inhabitants—a grand total of 301,500,000.

POST-WAR BREAD

Already we are sending Russia important quantities of food, and these shipments will have to be continued on a large scale after the final collapse of the Axis. Great Britain, with 46,000,000 people, is never self-sufficient as to food, nor is Ireland with another 4,250,000 population. Spain with 25,000,000 people is already hungry, and Portugal's 7,250,000 inhabitants are on a restricted diet. Sweden which had a population of 6,406,000 in 1942, is today moderately well fed, and can buy what she needs.

An indirect warning against eventual world-wide famine conditions was issued when the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture met at Hot Springs, Va., earlier this year. The declaration, issued at adjournment, said in part:

"There has never been enough food for the health of all people. This is justified neither by ignorance nor by the harshness of nature. Production of food must be greatly expanded; we now have knowledge of the means by which this can be done. It requires imagination and firm will on the part of each Government and people to make use of this knowledge."

Apparently, both the imagination and the will have been lacking, for on August 15 representatives of half a dozen Federal agencies concerned with food made a confidential report to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard assailing the failure to establish a world-wide food program.

This committee, including representatives of the Office of Economic Warfare, Department of Interior, War Department, State Department, War Food Administration, and Office of Lend-Lease Administration, says that only by a careful production and conservation program can the United States have food enough by the end of 1944 to feed 40,000,000 people in addition to our own population and our own Army overseas.

Seemingly, there is much that the committee report leaves unsaid, for it urges the Government to "take the public into its confidence and tell the whole truth promptly and effectively," and it also cautions against policies which regard American civilian food needs as "left-overs to be satisfied after all other claims have been met."

"The painful realization," says the report, "that our food supplies are low and must remain low until at least 2 or 3 years after the war, is one that must be faced," and a warning is then issued that with further bungling we can "easily sink to the level of downright hunger."

How, then, can this country and its allies feed starving Europe and Asia? And if the liberated areas continue to starve, how can bitterness be avoided?

The United Nations were lucky in north Africa. The fighting there wrought little destruction in important crop areas. The weather was favorable and the harvest was good. Moreover, hidden reserves of olive oil, dried fruits, and livestock were brought from the isolated mountain valleys to the population centers when the Axis obviously began to lose. No repetition of such luck is expected elsewhere.

In peacetime Italy was nearly self-sufficient in matters of food, but the Italian people have been undernourished for 2 years, and it is a certainty that the Germans will strip the land before they abandon it. France has suffered more seriously than Italy, and both are experiencing a new pinch since the loss of their north African possessions.

FALSE RAINBOW

Food reserves on this continent could not adequately feed the French and Italian peoples next winter without seriously curtailing food shipments to Britain and to Russia. And even if we had plenty in our water-front warehouses, which we have not, the continuance of military operations against the Axis would not leave us enough shipping to take to Italy and France sufficient food to stave off famine.

If the Axis collapsed tomorrow and the 300,000,000 undernourished people of enemy and occupied Europe were to hold out food bowls to us with weakened and shaking hands, we could not fill those bowls sufficiently to restore their health and strength.

Unthinking optimists say that all we would have to do would be to feed Europe through one winter, then furnish seed grains and replace their ruined farm machinery. Seed we could manage, yes; but since our factories are today not producing enough agricultural machinery to keep our own farms at the top of efficient production, the hope of furnishing Europe with tools and machines is entirely illusory.

The brightest part of the whole relief picture is that having to do with medicine. Already in the warehouses of this country the O. F. R. R. O. has a backlog of $40,000,000 worth of drugs and medicines, bought and paid for. Another $10,000,000 worth has been ordered and paid for out of appropriations which became available before June 30 of this year. A second appropriation of $50,000,000 is now available in the new fiscal year, and orders are now going out, and being accepted, which should double the medicine and drug reserves on hand before midsummer of next year. The prospects are that our relief agencies will be able to meet early and conquer quickly the pestilences expected to follow the close of the war in Europe.

But when it comes to food, the bald prospects are that in most of the newly liberated lands there will be a full diet only for nursing and expectant mothers and for essential labor. The young, the old, and the nonessential elements will have to forage for themselves.

More than a dozen years ago, it was my unpleasant assignment to make a trip of investigation into a famine area in northwestern China where nearly 5,000,000 people were reputedly dying of famine. In this area American philanthropy had financed an irrigation project, watered from the Yellow River. But the local war lord had forced the peasants to plant opium poppies and sell him the opium, in return for his own issue of worthless paper money.

WHAT FAMINE CAN MEAN

I left the railway about 300 miles northwest of what was then Peking, and headed west into the desert. Our caravan consisted of 20 camels, 22 Chinese, and myself, and we took with us not only our own food for the round trip but enough fodder to sustain the camels until we could get back to the railway.

The third night out, we camped just outside an old walled town which 6 months before had boasted about 10,000 people. Only 3,000 were left alive, and many of them would already have been dead had they not resorted to cannibalism. We pitched camp inside a ring of the tethered camels, but no sooner were our fires burning than our camp site was surrounded by most of the 3,000 famished survivors. They begged and wept, seeking food. We had not a pound to spare, if we ourselves were to survive and return to tell the outside world of the district's plight. Indeed, even if they had eaten all our food, our camels, and us besides, the combination would not have afforded one full meal for each of those 3,000 hungry men, women, and children.

When the dusk deepened, they formed to rush us; we fought them off. There was no need to use firearms; even in the mass, the 3,000 hunger-weakened survivors could not overwhelm us. We fought them off with long rawhide whips, sticks, and camel prods. We beat them to their knees, and on their knees they remained, moaning for help—too weak to rise. Most of them cried the night through. But some fell silent. And many of the silent ones died during the night, and we had to leave them unburied there when we rode away just before sunrise.

That is what famine can mean to 3,000 people in a little Chinese town. It may mean something shockingly similar to many millions in Hitler's Festung Europa when that continent has been reduced to ruin and surrender.

This Is a Commendable Way To Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of October 23, 1943, entitled "A Desert Blossoms."

It is the purpose of our foreign policy to aid in feeding our friends and allies

in this global war, rather than the opposite policy followed by our enemies in starving the inhabitants of occupied countries. The more food we can enable our allies to produce abroad the better it will be for them and the easier it will be on the strained productive capacity here at home, and the less cargo space will be required, which could be used for other purposes. Besides aid given to the civilians to become thus productive, I would also favor the use of war prisoners near the spot where they are taken, to minimize the amount of food necessary for us to ship abroad in the war effort. The editorial is as follows:

A DESERT BLOSSOMS

The story of the economic transformation of north Africa after its reoccupation by the Allies is one to gladden the heart. Here was an area which the Germans, during the period of Vichy rule of north Africa, had systematically and thoroughly looted. Its grain and fruits and phosphates and other products were siphoned out to the Reich. The result was that when our troops arrived they found a despoiled and hungry land.

North Africa is that no longer. President Roosevelt reveals that in the period preceding the victory in Tunis the United States and Great Britain shipped to north Africa 80,000 tons of flour, 6,500 tons of wheat, 2,800 tons of potatoes, 1,800 tons of dried beans and peas, as well as varying quantities of other supplies. In addition, we sent seeds, agricultural machinery, fuel oil, fertilizers, and other essentials. All this was required to put north African agriculture back into full production. That has now been accomplished. Last June north Africa produced a bountiful harvest, which made it possible for the Allies to reduce shipments of food to the region and finally to suspend them altogether. Indeed, north Africa has again been able to turn exporter. It has become a source of food supply for our troops, for the French Army which is being built up there, and for the civilian workers and for the British and American forces in Sicily and Italy. Most encouraging of all, the French authorities, in collaboration with the combined food board, have begun to accumulate food stocks for use in France after its liberation.

What has happened in north Africa during the past 11 months is an example of international economic statesmanship at its best. To be sure, it occurred in circumstances far more favorable than those we are likely to encounter in other liberated areas. At the same time the model cannot be gainsaid. It should be followed when we have wrested other regions from the German despoilers.

Do You Want To Buy Some Corn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, volumes have been written and spoken in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in reference to the ceiling price on corn. Day after day, Members from nonproducing corn areas have plead for the chance to purchase some corn.

If those same gentlemen can make the wise boys in the O. P. A. straighten the situation out a little bit, I think they will get some corn. President Roosevelt's appointees in charge of corn ceilings insist that the country elevators make 17 cents a bushel when these elevators only want to make a profit of about 4 cents, maybe 5 cents. The individuals whom President Roosevelt has placed in charge of corn ceilings refuse to make an adjustment, even though in so doing it would not raise the cost of corn to consumers. It is a part of their policy to rule and ruin private enterprise and to break down the production and distribution of food in this country so that the Government might take over.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a telegram received by me from a farmers' elevator in my home town of Minden, Nebr. The telegram is as follows:

Grain dealers and farmers in area 7 are not at all satisfied with the present corn ceiling. Farmers ceiling price 92 cents; our track ceiling $1.09½. We are asking your help in trying to adjust this difference in their ceilings as farmers are not willing to sell corn giving the elevators such an abnormal profit of 17½ cents whereas our normal margin is 4 cents.

FARMERS COOPERATIVE GRAIN & SUPPLY CO.

Think of it. Here you have a business concern—a farmers' elevator—protesting because the Roosevelt administration insists that they make 17 cents a bushel on corn when they only want to make 4 cents profit. The elevator would like to pass this additional money on to the farmers to encourage and add to the production of foodstuffs, but the administration will not let them.

This situation is not peculiar to my home town but exists over the greater share of Nebraska. I have received many wires and letters. I wish to include a wire that I received from a farmer, which is as follows:

I farm 480 acres, 270 in corn, yielding 40 bushels. Present O. P. A. ceiling in area 7, Nebraska, 92 cents to producer, ceiling $1.09¾ track to elevators. I am opposed this 17 cents per bushel margin of profit to elevators. Can you please help us?

RAYMOND THORELL.

The local Commercial Club, at Loomis, Nebr., in attempting to serve both businessmen and farmers, has wired me as follows:

Use every effort to adjust price ceiling on corn in area 7. Our farmers feel 17 cents profit is too much for elevator and will withhold sale of corn. We fear the creation of a black market.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable demonstrations of patriotism and love of country that I have ever known is evidenced by the attitude and conduct of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert, of Wisconsin, who refused to come to Washington to receive at the hands of the President of the United States the Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded posthumously to their deceased son who had lost his life on the battle front, because they felt that the expense that would be incurred should be invested in war bonds and the gasoline and transportation charges that they would be out should not be spent in this way.

I commend them as genuine Americans, and desire to include in my remarks the article referred to.

PARENTS BALK AT UNITED STATES-PAID TRIP HERE FOR SON'S MEDAL

HELENVILLE, WIS., October 20.—An elderly couple sat in a modest home here today, fingered a Congressional Medal of Honor and slowly read and reread a letter from Secretary of War Stimson.

The medal and letter had come in the mail to Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert because they had wanted it that way and so had written the Secretary of War. It had been awarded in death to their son, 20-year-old Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, who was killed in New Guinea last Christmas Eve.

"The spirit of unselfishness, understanding and sacrifice which breathes through your letter has deeply impressed not only the President, who requested a copy for himself, but all of us in the War Department who have been privileged to read your letter," the Secretary of War wrote in answer to the Gruennerts.

"We stand humble in the face of such a demonstration of patriotism as yours * * *."

The War Department had asked the Gruennerts to come to Washington to receive the medal from the President. They didn't believe they should. Instead they wrote to the War Department. It took a long time to write, but this is what it said:

"We feel honored indeed to receive a Medal of Honor for our departed son, to be delivered to us personally by the President of the United States.

"Under present conditions, however, we cannot help but give expression to some of the following thoughts which race through our minds day and night.

"We are now in the midst of the Third War bond drive. We believe every cent of money subscribed should be used to supply our boys with the necessities of war and not spent for trips that do not directly help the war effort.

"Only this last week, thousands of other parents lost their loved ones on the battlefields of Italy, all brave boys that were loved by their parents as much as we loved our own. These parents cannot all converge on Washington, and because of the common bond we have with them we feel we shouldn't either. The loss of our brave boy is still too fresh in our memory for us to make this trip, even though it would be in his honor.

"Will you please convey our regrets to the President? Will you please ask him whether it would be possible for him to put whatever message he may have for us in writing, so it may be delivered to us along with the Medal of Honor and we will ever cherish and treasure them both in the memory of our boy."

In Washington the War Department said the medal had been awarded for "leadership so outstanding that it placed victory above the life of the leader himself."

Gruennert was killed when he advanced alone ahead of the platoon of which he was second in command and made it possible for the platoon to split the Japanese position on the beach near Buna.

In the course of the fighting Gruennert knocked out one enemy pillbox single-handed and drove the occupants of another into the open where they were routed by his men. He was shot by enemy snipers before the platoon could reach his advanced position.

Transportation for Members of the Armed Forces on Furlough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn. I believe the action of this body is very commendable and worthy of utmost consideration. The resolution is as follows:

To His Honor, the Mayor, and Common Council of the City of New Britain:

The undersigned recommend that the following be accepted and adopted:

"Be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of New Britain: That it is the sense of this body that members of the armed forces of the United States should receive free thansportation to and from their homes while on leave or furlough; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk to the Senators from Connecticut, the Representative from this district, and the Representative-at-Large."

W. G. Gibney, H. L. Connor, Kenneth A. Larson, Frank W. Chase, J. J. Storey, John J. Borselle.

Attest:

W. G. GIBNEY,
City Clerk.

Correspondence Incident to Resignation of Prentiss M. Brown as Price Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix the letter of resignation submitted to the President by Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, and the President's reply. Mr. Brown's letter sets forth in detail the major achievements of price control under his administration. I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the American people regret his resignation, and agree with the President's statement that Prentiss Brown performed a difficult task with intelligence, courage, and integrity.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. BROWN'S LETTER

OCTOBER 19, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit my resignation as Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

On September 22 last, I advised Justice Byrnes of my desire to leave and understand he told you of it. The policy of price control is now well defined in the law and in your orders. The main task from now on is administrative. I would not leave if I thought the office would suffer. We have greatly improved our organization and I believe it is in competent hands.

We in price control face a difficult task in public relations. We are the expendables in the war on the domestic front. Many of the accomplishments of the present, particularly the change from an upward trend in living costs to a downward trend, are due in part to the efforts of executives who have left. The men now in our chief executive positions are experts in administration, and that is our prime task.

Thank you for the expression of your desire that I remain. When I took office it was my hope to leave when the appropriation bill for the remaining life of the agency was passed. I could not then do so because I had not yet found the men who would carry on. Now we have them.

Price control is not only successful but is appreciated by the country. Below I give a few outstanding examples of our accomplishments. The country, contrary to what one might think from what he hears in Washington, is for price control and rationing as administered. Recent public surveys show it.

CORDIAL ATTITUDE CITED

I have made speeches in New York, Milwaukee, Omaha, Boston, and Chicago. I found the most cordial attitude and the newspaper and other public comment was excellent. The same general approval was expressed by numberless callers. The drive against O. P. A. before House committees last spring was intense.

It undoubtedly injured the agency in the congressional mind but the recess and visits home improved the attitude toward us. I have had many expressions from Members of the Senate and House that are most encouraging.

A few outstanding facts are these: The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested. Taking the September 15, 1942, level as a basis, by May 1943 there was a 6.2-percent rise. Soon after the effect of dollars-and-cents prices, control of fresh vegetables, generally better enforcement, and the effect of your April 8 order began to be felt. June showed a reduction to 5.9 percent; August to 4.6 percent.

It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue shows that the increases are mainly in those items, such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitation or the commodity had only recently reached parity.

GIVES EXAMPLES ON PRICES

A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows:

Item		Price	
		Oct. 16, 1943	Oct. 17, 1942
Wheat	bushel	$1.94¾	$1.47⅛
Corn	do	1.21⅛	.95¾
Coffee	pound	.09⅜	.09⅜
Sugar	do	.0560	.0560
Creamery butter	do	.42½	.46½
Lard	do	.1392½	.1392½
Iron	ton	25.84	25.84
Steel	do	34.00	34.00
Copper	pound	.12	.12
Cotton print-cloth	yard	.08971	.08971
Hides	pound	.15½	.15½
Gas (tank wagon)	gallon	.1060	.1060
Crude oil	barrel	1.11	1.11

The great bulk of commodities are the same. The principal difficulty, as you know, has been with fresh vegetables and fresh fruits which we are getting under control.

The price level and relationship of 1926 is generally looked upon as a reasonable base. The September 15, 1942, level was almost exactly at the 1926 level, being 99.4 percent of it. Last spring this index rose to 103 plus. It has been reduced to 102 plus percent and the trend is still downward.

BASIS FOR COMPARISON

To me the best basis for comparison has always been the percentage of price increase in the First World War against the percentage of increase in the Second World War. We use August of 1914 and September of 1939 as the bases because those are the dates in which the wars in Europe began, and the pressures on our prices commenced. The latest available figures are those after 49 months of war. I give below the percentage of increase:

Item	August 1914–18 World War No. 1[1] (percent price increase)	September 1939–43 World War No. 2[2] (percent price increase)
Cost of living, total[3]	50.3	24.9
Food	63.9	46.7
Clothing	85.3	28.5
House furnishings	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total	96.1	37.5
Raw materials	102.1	69.5
Semimanufactures	131.3	24.7
Furnished products	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities[4]	92.4	21.2
SELECTED MANUFACTURED ITEMS		
Steel plates (tank)	187.4	0
Plate glass	76.1	0
Wool blankets	164.7	[5] 50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's)	132.3	[5] 71.9
Blue denims	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities	91	119
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods	78	116
Prices paid by farmers for commodities	[6] 71	34

[1] July 1914 to July 1918.
[2] August 1939 to August 1943.
[3] Rent and fuel, not available by months.
[4] All commodities other than farm products and foods.
[5] To May 1943, the latest available.
[6] 1914 to 1918, not available monthly for World War No. 1 period.

PRAISES THE ADMINISTRATION

On the basis of our entrance into the war, prices increased 29½ percent in the first 19 months of the First World War, while prices have increased by 12 percent in the first 19 months of this war.

A couple of important commodity price comparisons might be of interest. Copper sold for 37 cents a pound during the First World War and sells for 12 cents now. Steel plate sold for $180 a ton in the First World War. It sells now for $42 a ton.

It is my deliberate judgment that as a result of your messages to Congress and the passage by Congress of the Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and the subsequent Executive orders of October and April, in the most complicated and intricate task of price control in the world (because our problems are greater than those of any other nation) in a period of tremendous increase in our national income, your administration has succeeded to a remarkable degree in alleviating the evils of rising prices and consequent inflation.

It was perfectly obvious that bitter complaint would be made, some of it justified, because no administration could hope to delve into the intricacies of the business structure without causing dislocations, distress, and dissatisfaction.

REPORTS MANY HARDSHIPS

I know that many real hardships have occurred. Regulation has been hard for our businessmen to take. It is getting easier. Individual casualties are most unfortunate, and

in many lines of effort they have occurred all too frequently; but the over-all picture is what the Nation views.

The net income of the farmer is 90 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. The average weekly wage of the American laborer is 33 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. Corporation profits, after taxes, are 15 percent higher than those earned in 1941, while prices are but 12 percent greater than they were on December 7, 1941, when the Senate took up the subject of price control, resulting in the act of January 30, 1942. Business mortality is at the lowest figure on record.

Price control does not claim credit but these results were achieved during the period of price control. Controls certainly did not prevent material gains for farmer, laborer, the businessman. During that time the Government of the United States and the citizens of the United States have saved tremendous sums of money over what would have been the cost to them if prices had followed the pattern of increases during the First World War.

VAST SAVINGS REPORTED

It is estimated by the research division of this agency that the Government will have saved over $67,000,000,000 by the end of 1943 and the saving to consumer and the general public is given as $22,000,000,000, a total of over $89,000,000,000.

These things have been done with a substantial reduction in the number of employees in the central office at Washington, D. C., the drop being from 4,800 last January to 4,200 at the present time. The rationing program has required larger employment in the offices outside of the Capital, the rise being from 39,000 to 49,000 in the field. We not only stayed within the congressional limitation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, but we were able to get along without an additional $23,000,000 that was provided, and we rather stand out as the agency which turned back money to the Government.

While I think the Congress cut us too much for the current fiscal year and eliminated some necessary expenditures, I take comfort in the fact that two appropriation committees, to whom we were able to present our requests in person in hearings, gave us substantially what we asked and that the reduction was made on the floor of the House of Representatives by those not as well informed as were the committee members. However, we have cut our cloth to the pattern.

DRAFT DEFERMENTS DENIED

Speaking of personnel, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that recently in the House of Representatives on the drafting-of-fathers issue it was implied on the floor by the gentleman who represents the Twenty-sixth District of New York that a sizable addition to the Army might be raised from those unfairly deferred in the Federal service, particularly in the Office of Price Administration.

I was somewhat surprised at this, as I had issued an order shortly after coming into office last January preventing the employment of any physically fit persons within the draft age, and directed that deferment should be requested only in the most extreme cases. I said, "There is no irreplaceable man in O. P. A."

I checked and found that out of 4,206 employees in Washington, only 5 within the draft age are now deferred, and that out of approximately 49,000 in the field there are only 2 of draft age deferred—7 out of 53,000. These 53,000 employees are only a part of the great organization we have built. There are 131,000 volunteers in our organization, making a grand total of 184,000 who are helping in this great task. They are a loyal and valiant army, and against rather heavy opposition are winning the battle for sharing what we have at a fair price.

This is the status of price control as I leave it.

SUPPORTS SUBSIDY PROGRAM

As I view the immediate future of the inflation struggle, I see two major problems for the Administration:

1. The subsidy question. Without a subsidy plan the price structure cannot be held, and wages will be forced upward. No thinking person can deny that the increase in prices and wages if we reject subsidies will greatly outrun the cost to the Government of the subsidies.

If it were merely a question of the subsidy money against the increase in price, it would be of little consequence. The danger lies in the impetus higher prices give to the wage demand. Without subsidies butter would sell at 60 instead of 50 cents. Add to that the increase in the price of meat, milk, and other commodities that would follow the rejection of subsidies, and you encourage, even justify, higher wages. It is this momentum to the wage demand, the inevitable twirl to the inflation spiral with its devastating result, that should cause the Congress to continue the program and reject crippling amendments to the Commodity Credit and R. F. C. legislation.

2. The matter of renewal of price control after July 1, 1944, when the law expires by limitation. The greatest danger is in the post-war period. There must be controls after June of 1944. I would advise a year's renewal with subsequent consideration by the Congress as to further renewals.

On these two problems, if as a private citizen I can aid by presenting my views to the appropriate committees, I will be happy to do so.

In closing, I express to you and through you to Justice Byrnes my appreciation of the unfailing support given in our effort to carry into effect the intent of the acts of Congress and the Executive orders.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

DEAR PRENTISS: When Justice Byrnes told me of your desire to resign I asked him to urge you to reconsider. I did so because I knew you had possibly the most difficult task in the service of the Government and you were doing a grand job.

However, I recall that when I asked you to accept the appointment you advised me how you had neglected your private affairs while you were serving in the Senate and of your desire to return to Michigan at the earliest possible date. But you generously yielded to my request to take charge of O. P. A. temporarily until you could find someone to take over the task. When you tell me now that you have found men capable of carrying on and feel it your duty to leave, I cannot insist upon your remaining and with reluctance I must accept your resignation.

The story of the Office of Price Administration recited by you in your letter is a story of which you may justly be proud. I get great comfort from the opinion you express that the people of the country appreciate the accomplishments of the organization. The administration of the law required interference with the business and with the lives of the people. It is an interference justified only by the necessities of war.

It was inevitable that a few men would be so anxious to increase their income that they would resent the Government's preventing them from increasing prices. I believe with you, however, that the vast majority of the people realize that under war conditions price restrictions are necessary, and even though their profits are less, they recall the far greater sacrifices made by our boys in the armed services and loyally support the organization.

You have performed a difficult task with intelligence and, above all, with courage, and you have my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Food Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from The City Woman Feeds Her Family, by Miss Rachael Reed, Director of Consumer Relations, New York, given before the National Food Conference, Chicago, September 17, 1943:

Consumer morale would be improved if there were a more general understanding of the factors which have contributed to food shortages during a period of record-breaking food production. These factors are many and diverse. In the dairy industry, which is the field with which I am best acquainted, the demands for products have been abnormally the largest in history.

As with most food items, the demand for dairy products generally increases with rising incomes, whether during wartime or peacetime. So today, with vast increases in total consumer-purchasing power, we could logically expect a gain in the demand for dairy products. But this was further intensified by much sharper price increases for most other foods.

In normal times, this demand would have brought about gradual price increases as it became more difficult to fill, thus discouraging further increases in consumption. However, price ceilings were established making this traditional economic device impossible, and so the demand for milk grew larger and larger.

These factors alone would have created a big demand for milk, along with them, it must be remembered that the dairy industry had another customer—its largest single one—Uncle Sam.

With demands increasing in such rapid fashion, the next logical question that is asked by the consumer is, "Why haven't the dairy farmers increased their production of milk?" That's another big question, and one to which nature holds more clues than does economics.

The basic reason why the farmer can't go ahead and produce more milk is because the cow is not a machine. It takes about 2½ years before a new-born heifer calf can start paying her owner back via the milk pail. Over a long period, herds can be increased, but adding to the cow population now provides no immediate solution to the present shortage of milk.

A better idea seems to be to increase the individual production of the mature cows that we already have. And that is exactly what the Government and the dairy industry have been trying to do through an educational program for dairy farmers. Feed a cow a better ration and more of it, and she will give more milk. Simple? But just when we would like to pile the cow's dinner plate

high, along comes a shortage of protein feeds and feed grains.

In normal times, since milk production tends to drop when the pasture season is over, farmers have received higher prices during the fall and winter months as an incentive to try to hold their production as high as possible. Under a fixed price ceiling from the distributor to the dairy farmer, distributors are not able to offer this encouragement this year. Thus all these factors combined have a depressing rather than a boosting influence upon milk production.

The curtailed food supply besides making it more difficult to serve taste-appealing meals also presents the serious problem of supplying well-balanced meals. One of the most difficult problems in planning well-balanced meals today is to include adequate amounts of protein needed in both proper quantity and quality by everyone. That various proteins differ in nutritional value is well-established fact. Milk, cheese, meat, poultry, fish, and eggs contain what are known as "complete" proteins; that is, they contain all the factors needed by the body to build its own proteins. The people of this country have always been large users of meat, a rich source of protein.

When meat supplies became scarce many people turned to cheese to supply their protein needs. Today many housewives are finding the low-point dessert cheeses helpful in stretching their ration points and insuring adequate amounts of proteins in their family meals. Others have turned to milk as their last line of defense of unrationed foods to safeguard against protein deficiencies in their diets. Because milk is also the best source of the mineral calcium, excellent source of the mineral phosphorus and vitamin G and a good source of vitamins A and niacin as well as containing vitamin B_1, this choice by consumers was a wise one. As milk is the most nearly perfect food we have, the use of adequate amounts of it in the diet will do much toward preventing serious nutritional deficiencies from occurring in our curtailed wartime diets. It is for this reason that many nutritionists oppose the rationing of fresh milk. Even with the present all-time high consumption of fluid milk in this country the per capita consumption of milk and milk products is considerably under the minimum requirements urged by nutrition authorities who recommend the consumption of 1 quart or its equivalent daily for children and a pint for adults. Thus, many nutritionists believe that if milk is rationed now, it will undermine the years of educational work that have been done to encourage the use of milk to promote health and vitality.

The lack of adequate amounts of fat in our wartime diets is not quite so serious as the protein problem, but it is one the city homemaker must guard against. We know that fats are valuable in the diet to supply energy and delay hunger pangs. But our scientific knowledge of the full need for fats is not so thoroughly known as for proteins. Early in 1943 there loomed on the horizon a definite fat shortage. At that time there was a definite and critical Nation-wide shortage of butter, due partly to earlier Government efforts to send more milk into the evaporated and cheese manufacturing channels, for which there was then great demand for lend-lease. Also, with butter prices held low by O. P. A.'s price ceiling it was a very attractive buy in the food market, so people bought. These combined factors caused the Government to step in with an order to the larger butter manufacturers requiring them to set aside a sizeable portion of their make for war use, the amount varying according to production in relation to existing supplies and demands. In an effort to then make sure that all civilians would have a fair chance at the remainder of the butter, rationing of this product was instituted the latter part of March.

Curtailed food supplies, family food preferences, dislocations in food distribution, more time required in planning, preparing and shopping for food, curtailed deliveries. These are just a few of the many problems the city homemakers have had to meet recently. However, it is inevitable that the exigencies of this war have adversely affected each and every one of us, some to lesser degree than others, perhaps, but still, all of us have had to make adjustments. I am convinced the women of our country realize this. They know, too, that food has gone to war and so recognized they must make adjustments, just as must the producers, processors, and distributors of food. The women are willing and want to do everything they can that will help win this war. But naturally, and rightfully so, they do not want to be called upon to make unnecessary sacrifices. When they have complete knowledge and understanding of why the things they are asked to do must be done, as a whole, the homemakers give it their full-hearted support. The record of consumers has been most commendable.

Everyone recognizes that the homemakers of this country have been asked to fill a big order. At the same time that these new food problems have been thrust by the war, all their other household tasks have been made more difficult. They must do everything the hard way these days. However, due to adjustments which everyone must make now, I have jotted down a few ways in which I believe consumers can help themselves individually and at the same time help improve the national food situation. They are:

1. Learn the simple, basic nutrition facts which will aid in planning well-balanced meals adapted to fit the supply of food products available in your community.

2. Plan meals and prepare a market order before shopping for food but don't be too rigid in your planning so that necessary adjustments can be made at the store.

3. Don't hoard.

4. Budget ration points carefully so as to secure the highest returns in nutritional values and to spread them over the entire rationing period.

5. Don't waste any food.

6. Plan shopping hours to avoid the rush periods.

7. Make the foods you serve as attractive and tasty as possible.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on Commodity Credit Corporation bill:

The National Lawyers Guild unequivocally condemns the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in voting to prohibit all subsidies on foods after December 31, 1943. By adding the subsidy ban to a bill which would extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation the committee has vitiated the effect of the extension while threatening the country with the specter of run-away inflation. This attempt to kill the administration's program to keep the cost of living down is a surrender to the lobby representing large corporate farm interests. It must be defeated by congressional action providing $500,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy program, in addition to other funds needed for subsidies.

The interests which oppose the use of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government agencies know full well that unless subsidies are employed to strengthen the bulwarks of price control the stability of our economy will be threatened by constantly increasing prices. We are assuming the military offensive on a world-wide scale, and we cannot afford to endanger our war effort by allowing the disaster of inflation to create the chaotic conditions at home which will be the enemy's most important weapon. It is imperative that production workers be assured of an adequate food supply at prices they are able to pay.

When the result of a sharp increase in the cost of any product is a price rise the effect of that rise on subsequent stages of production and distribution are immediately evident. Price increases must therefore be avoided at all costs. The National Lawyers Guild is wholeheartedly in accord with those win-the-war Congressmen who are convinced that subsidies equal to the need to absorb excessive production and distribution costs are indispensable concomitants to any adequate price-control program. The British and Canadian experiences have illustrated effectively the advantage of adequate subsidy and farm production incentive programs. They have shown that the cost of any subsidy to the Government is always immeasurably smaller than the cost of a comparable price increase. By absorbing excessive production and distribution costs subsidies provide a method through which the costs of increased war production are equitably distributed and borne by the people as a whole rather than by that segment of the population which can least withstand the drastic effects of ever-increasing food costs.

The recent announcement by the War Food Administration of a program to protect dairy farmers against increases in the price of feed above the September 1942 level, although not adequate, is nevertheless highly commendable. Its purpose is to obviate the necessity of a Nation-wide increase of 2 cents a quart in the price of milk. Since milk is the most important single commodity in a production worker's diet, such a price increase would have a vital effect upon the living cost of each wage earner in the United States. The action of the Banking and Currency Committee, if adopted by Congress, may mean a 2-cent-per-quart increase in the price of milk after December 31, 1943.

The minority members of the House committee have warned that the death of subsidies will mean that consumers will pay 5 cents per pound more for butter and 4 cents per pound more for American cheese. They indicate the prices of bread, pork, bacon, beans, canned vegetables, sugar, raisins, prunes, fuel, fuel oil, gasoline, and other commodities will rise sharply unless the subsidy ban is eliminated and adequate funds for subsidies provided. The minority members have estimated that without subsidies the cost of living will be lifted at least by $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000. In such an event would anyone challenge the rights of workers whose tables are thinly spread to receive compensatory wage increases? On October 1, in a radio address, Economic Stabilization Director Fred N. Vinson answered this rhetorical question when he indicated that a price increase in one basic food commodity gives rise to requests by producers and distributors of other commodities for similar increases and leads to demands by wage earners for wage increases to combat higher living costs. The net result is disaster.

Merely curbing prospective increases in price, however, is not enough. The President,

on May 8, stated that prices of cost-of-living commodities must be rolled back to the levels of September 1942. This has not yet been, and without the use of subsidies cannot be, accomplished. Further delay will be fatal. The roll-back will not, however, impede necessary food production. Congress must face squarely the primary responsibility for increasing food production while decreasing consumer prices. Such a program can be successfully completed by providing adequate funds for each type of loan, subsidy, incentive payment, and crop insurance plan which is needed to insure maximum production of food supplies, including loans to small farmers for equipment, seed, fertilizers, and other necessary provisions. Congress must also make provisions for subsidies equal to the need to absorb excessive production and distribution costs. Should Congress fail to act it must face the wrath of the 9,000,000 dependents of men in the armed services, the 2,200,000 aged on State public assistance rolls, the 2,000,000 disabled veterans, retired workers, and widows and children receiving pensions, disability compensation, and social insurance payments or annuities for which they have saved many years. These and the balance of the 20,000,000 persons with low-fixed incomes, as well as the army of war-production workers have called upon Congress to roll back the excessively high commodity prices; have demanded and will continue to demand that Congress take the steps necessary to stabilize the cost of living. To these voices the National Lawyers Guild adds its own.

The National Lawyers Guild urges that Congress, in answer to the demands of the people, and with the full knowledge that such action is essential to victory, must defeat the subsidy ban and enact legislation which will (1) extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to December 31, 1945, and (2) provide the $500,000,000 in subsidy incentive payment funds needed by the Commodity Credit Corporation to help prevent inflation.

The Great Food Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address given by Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Saturday, October 23, 1943:

My fellow Americans, very little was said about food waste in the days of the W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A., when everyone knew there was enough food to go around. But now that we are feeding conquered lands beyond the seas, are eating more at home than ever in our history, and are supplying the greatest Army and Navy in the history of our Nation, we know that every pound of food is needed. It is criminal to waste food today.

Yet, the sad fact remains that the same inexperienced New Deal bureaucrats who wasted money and manpower on boondoggling projects, have wasted food produced by patriotic farmers, as well as having hampered the production of needed food by farmers. It was this serious waste that prompted me to introduce the resolution in Congress to investigate the wasting of food.

The American farmer did a splendid job of food production in 1942. He has tried to do a better job in 1943, notwithstanding the New Deal restrictions placed upon him. Processors and distributors need not take any blame for the food shortage, for private traders have done their best within the limitations set up by the Washington know-it-alls.

Right now many cities are without oranges, many more are short of butter, some are rationing fluid milk, and a number of our citizens are doing without foods that they should have. Why? The whole blame can be located in one small area of our Nation—Washington, D. C. Here rule the men who believe they can tinker with the Nation's economy, like a crank inventor tinkers with a perpetual motion machine. Here rule the men who hope to make over America. Here rule the men, who drawing high salaries for many years and used to the luxury of governing others, have forgotten that America is the land of 134,000,000 persons, each of whom is as valuable as any Federal administrator. Here rule the men who want to give orders to the voters rather than take orders from the voters.

When the administration turned its back on the program of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, to give full control of the food program to a single administrator, it closed the door of opportunity for an abundant food production. For this, the bungling bureaucrats must assume the full responsibility for food shortages. It is tragic to think that so many key men connected with the food program know little or nothing about food production and distribution.

The principal factors which are causing the food shortage are not only frosts, floods, and droughts, but also low price ceilings, the New Deal philosophy of scarcity, dumping and wasting of food, scarcity of farm labor, farm-machinery shortages, too much regulation and red tape from Washington, subsidies instead of fair prices, and the administration's lack of confidence in the patriotism of food producers, processors, and distributors.

The Roosevelt administration elected to use the subsidy system, nothwithstanding the opposition of Congress, farm organizations, food processors, distributors, and every American citizen who feels that it is his duty to pay his own grocery bill. The subsidy program is a complete admission on the part of the O. P. A. that it is unable to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments. The roll-back of food prices will not effectively stimulate food production. On the contrary, it will have the opposite effect. These so-called roll-backs—which roll back the taxpayer and are designed to rally fourth-term votes—are introduced at a time when the consumer is most able to pay. They are unfair because they are paid from borrowings at the expense of our fighting forces and future generations. Subsidies lead to inflation because they increase available purchasing power, increase Federal expenditures and contribute to a loss of confidence in the financial stability of the Government. Inflation is brought about by scarcity. The only way to avert inflation is through increased production. An abundant production is our only guaranty against chaos. Subsidies are economically unsound and vicious. They lead to regimentation and political control.

Briefly, the so-called roll-back program means three things to every citizen:

(1) More bureaucrats; (2) more power in Washington; (3) more taxes.

Under our enterprise system, both in agriculture and industry, our people will not produce an article of food or fabric unless they believe there will be a market to cover the cost of production. Does the administration in purchasing war materials expect industry to produce tanks, planes and guns at a loss? It does not. The Government not only offers a price, but, in addition, offers a profit. Then why does the O. P. A. set a price on butter, milk, and eggs which does not cover the cost of production? These low prices lead to a diminishing supply for consumers with the miseries of rationing, red tape, and restrictions.

Just what kind of a game is being imposed on the American people? What we want in this country is production and more production. An adequate supply of goods will always adjust the price. As long as the bureaus manage production so there is a scarcity—the people will have to eat out of the hands of bureaucrats and be content with the administration's formula of adequate nutrition.

Fair prices should replace subsidies. An increase of 1 cent per can on the 1943 vegetable pack would have produced maximum results. An increase of 1 cent per quart on milk would have solved our milk problem. I might add at this point, that an increase of 35 cents per barrel on oil will increase our oil and gas supply. If the administration insists on the subsidy program and the hold-the-line order, we can expect serious shortages and more rationing this winter.

The Department of Agriculture tells us that we will have plenty of food next year. I hope this is true, but the American Dairy Association tells us that the current milk shortage will become acute unless corrective measures are taken immediately. On the other hand, the Livestock and Meat Council forecasts a serious shortage of beef unless quick remedial steps are taken. Many farm auctions are being held daily in the Midwest. Crops are rotting in the fields and warehouses because some bureaucrat, who acquired his knowledge of agriculture by eating three square meals a day, has imposed some impossible regulation somewhere down the line. The canning industry has lost part of the 1943 pack because of labor shortage, "red tape" and bungling by the O. P. A.

A few weeks ago the American housewives were finding it difficult to purchase potatoes on the market at any price. But at the time potatoes were selling at 75 cents a peck the Federal officials were actually dumping great quantities of potatoes on city dumps and railroad sidings throughout the country.

On the evening of August 4, I was notified that the Administration was dumping potatoes at Vincennes, Ind. The next day I went to Vincennes and viewed the partially rotted potatoes. I was informed that previous to the time of storage, these potatoes stood on a railroad siding in St. Louis for many days. I saw potatoes loaded into Army trucks and hauled off to the city dump. I immediately made a trip to the city dump and watched them in the process of dumping. The man in charge said that he was making money by letting the people pick out good potatoes at 25 cents a bushel, or he himself would have them washed for $1 a bushel. I immediately wired Marvin Jones, the Food Administrator, to investigate the dumping of 37 carloads of potatoes at Vincennes. On the following Monday they stopped the dumping and erected sorting racks to sort the remaining carloads. The city fire department furnished hose to wash the potatoes. The good potatoes were sent to Indianapolis to be processed. The balance either went down the sewer or was dumped at night. The New Dealers tried to whitewash this blunder by giving out a release that there was only 1½ carloads lost but the War Food Administration finally reported this week that there were 22 carloads lost at Vincennes. According to the testimony of the Food Administrator before the Banking and Currency Committee, Federal officials purchased

9,000 carloads of potatoes and lost 475 carloads.

If the criminal waste of potatoes was an isolated mistake it would be bad enough, but actually it is only one example of how New Deal blundering is paving the way for a severe food shortage in the Nation.

Fresno, Calif., reports that one grower abandoned his 200-acre pea crop and invited the public to help themselves. The first day 300 automobile loads of pickers were in the fields helping themselves to a free supply. It was a case of give them away or plow them under. The owner said that he would rather give them away.

In Zanesville, Ohio, Boston and Worcester, Mass., several carloads of milk were allowed to spoil.

In Toledo, Ohio, 19 carloads of beans spoiled this week.

The Commodity Credit Corporation lost $745,000 on the sale of 26,000 head of cattle.

Henry Taylor, over Station WJZ, reported that Federal officials allowed 17,000,000 cases of condensed milk to spoil.

In New Jersey 1,900,000 pounds of rolled oats spoiled.

Other places report the waste of tons and tons of carrots, squash, spinach, cabbage, and tomatoes.

Many carloads of potatoes have been dumped or wasted in New York, Indiana, Ohio, Virginia, New Jersey, Michigan, California, and Pennsylvania.

The potato loss is just one indication of things to come, which will continue to happen with increasing magnitude, if we do not immediately reverse the administration's trend toward socialism. America is drifting. America is a strong, wealthy country, and has been able to stand all the weakening blows that have rained on our system from within the Roosevelt administration. How long this can continue no one can say. The New Dealers think the Nation can stand it indefinitely, but the taxpayers are beginning to doubt it.

It is impossible for the Government to be as efficient in handling the entire economy of the country as it is for millions of American citizens to manage their own business. A private owner would not let 475 carloads of potatoes rot and would not throw them away half bad and half good, because it would be his own money, not the money of a few million taxpayers whom he would never have to face.

The efforts of millions of victory gardeners should not be booted down the sewer in one kick. I believe that those of you who have sweated over a hoe, along rows of potatoes, in the hot sun to help your country, feel as I do. You want everyone to be on the job. You want those potatoes to go to our fighting men. Our people have complied with every call to sacrifice and I know they will continue to do so, but we expect the Government to do likewise.

I know the New Dealers will tell you that a few million dollars worth of potatoes, a few million cases of condensed milk, a few million dozen eggs and a few million dollars worth of other fruits and vegetables do not amount to much. But you people who are paying the 20-percent withholding tax will have to pay the bill. They even want to increase the withholding tax to 30 percent. We are all learning that when the bureaucrats spend, we pay. There should be no new taxes as long as the New Dealers continue this spending and wasting spree.

If our boys in the armed forces and our civilian population are to be adequately fed this winter, the American people must demand that some sensible food policies be adopted by the administration. We must insist that the New Deal philosophy of scarcity be abandoned; men must be placed in charge of our food program who know something about such problems; farmers must be given the necessary machinery and tools to do the job; enough men and women must be retained in food production and processing; fair prices must replace subsidies; and we must insist that full control of the food program be placed in the hands of a single food administrator as proposed by the Republican Food Study Committee.

Let's stop the wasting and hoarding of food and give our men in the fighting forces and the people an opportunity to secure more food. Let us remain free; that is what our men are fighting for on the battle fronts of the world. Our big job is to win the war against our enemies. We must do our part to win the battle on the home front and keep America free.

Resolution of the Church Federation of Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution recently adopted by the Church Federation of Los Angeles reaffirming their previous stand as expressed to the Dies subcommittee in Los Angeles on June 15, 1943. The nine points in that statement are as follows:

1. While we, as churchmen, worked hard during the times of peace to secure an international order which could preserve the peace, we recognize the fact of war and the military necessities incident thereto and are concerned for the quickest success of those efforts by which war may cease.

2. Regarding the evacuated Japanese, we do not seek nor do we know of any sizeable group of people who seek the return of the Japanese to the Pacific coast during the war. While under the American Constitution except for martial law and military requirements the American-born Japanese probably have legal right to return, we hold that it would be most unwise for them to do so.

3. We hold no particular brief for the War Relocation Authority as such, certainly not as a political football; but we have been impressed that its leaders have undertaken to do a constructive job by which to save and encourage the Americanism that existed among the Japanese. We believe that honest evaluation should be made of those policies and procedures and that when found to be good they should not be disrupted for political or ulterior reasons. Particularly, do we believe that criticism or attack on the W. R. A. should not be for the purpose of perpetrating undiscriminating severity of treatment upon Japanese who may be desirous of proving themselves to be good Americans.

4. We fear that the agitation regarding the American-Japanese is much in excess of the facts; that too much of it arises from a spirit of hatred and racial animosity which is un-Christian and un-American and directly in kind with the sort of thing which we are attempting to curb on the part of the Axis nations. We have suggested, as indicated by attached documents, that these are organized groups engaged in fostering ill will. We believe such agitation can cause a wasteful diversion of public attention from the more important business of winning the war.

5. We believe there should be no pampering of our American-Japanese people for they must bear the hardships of war along with all the rest but we do not believe that the conditions under which most of them now live can be considered by any stretch of the imagination as pampering. We believe that any other policy which might be based upon animosity, unnecessary harshness, or abridgement of civil rights where there is no military necessity means a disappointing denial of American principles and a deplorable failure to apply Christian and American standards in behalf of a constructive solution of an unhappy situation.

6. It has been our privilege to know many of the Japanese who are now under evacuation. Many of them have been members of our Christian churches. We know their desire to be worthy citizens of the United States, even on the part of those who were denied citizenship because of our laws. We believe that distinctions can be made (within the requirements of national safety) between the loyal and the disloyal. We believe that a policy of confinement of the suspected disloyal is proper; and that the loyal ones, especially the American born who are products of our American school system, should be encouraged and aided in finding places in civilian or military life by which to advance their Americanism. We believe that such a constructive policy will reveal that these people have something of value to contribute to our national life and that such treatment will prove an encouragement to peaceful international relations in the future whereas a policy of hatred and harshness will generate bitterness and be a cause for international ill-will and future wars.

7. We have had impressive evidence of a strong antiwar party in Japan prior to the war, led by Christian people; and that these people are praying for the termination of the war and the establishment of an international relation based upon good will and cooperation. We believe that unfounded agitation is short-sighted and detrimental to both the present and the future well-being of our country and to our international relations.

8. We believe that now is the time for sanity in our approach to this matter. We believe that the Government should be diligent in ferreting out disloyalty; but we believe that this process should go on persistently and quietly and without agitation of the public with false issues to the detriment of wartime industry and social well-being. Let us get on with the main job.

9. We believe that the question of the location whether in California or elsewhere of the American-Japanese should be set aside until war is over and tempers have cooled. It is quite possible that the question will largely solve itself. We know many of these people realized after it was too late that they should not have settled as a group. We believe that a dispersal will take place naturally with each succeeding generation. We believe that an understanding policy, marked by cooperation and appreciation will produce a solution that will be sound, valuable, and happy.

Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there will shortly come up on the floor of the House a bill, H. R. 3477.

This measure, designed to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is by reason of the language in section 3 of the bill, one of the most brazen attempts on the part of farm organizations to bludgeon the Congress of the United States into a position in which it would supinely ignore its own legislative directive to the President of the United States to stabilize prices and wages. This language seeks to accomplish the voiding of its own legislative directive by the tricky device of depriving the President of the only means available to him to carry out that legislative directive, selective subsidies.

The language of section 3 of this bill is as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

It is a hypocritical measure in that while this section of the bill prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from paying any subsidy, directly or indirectly, in the next breath it light-heartedly provides for a direct subsidy to peanuts, soybeans, and cottonseed, carefully camouflaged as "competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed."

If this vicious section 3 remains in the bill, all hope of holding the line on food prices is lost. Food prices will necessarily advance sharply, the cost of living will advance sharply, wages and salaries will have to follow suit and the vicious and destructive spiral of inflation will be off to a flying start.

If that is what the Congress wants, retain section 3 in this bill. It is the shortest and surest road to an orgy of uncontrolled inflation. It is in fact a potential threat to the war effort now. It also assures the destruction of our whole post-war economic structure.

Let me say in all seriousness that we as a responsible legislative body vote this bill at our peril. If we do, we open the floodgates to a torrent of inflation that can end only in a major economic disaster.

For God's sake do not force our boys on the fighting front to win a military victory while we at home permit an economic defeat.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago this House passed a bill, by a unanimous vote, to increase the compensation paid to dependents of the soldiers in the service.

That was a noble gesture. One that we all could sanction. But, let me warn you, ladies and gentlemen, if the Steagall bill, with section 3, passes, that noble gesture will have been completely nullified.

The increase in the price of foodstuffs, the main factor in the cost of living, will advance so rapidly, that the additional grant to servicemen's dependents will be promptly wiped out.

If the House wants to indulge in this kind of hokum, it is O. K. by me, but ladies and gentlemen, my solemn advice is to stop, look, and listen.

Ownership of Property by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, both before and since the war began, the Federal Government has been engaging in an extensive housing program. The effect this is having upon the taxing systems of the States has become a matter of serious concern not only to the States themselves but to many of their subdivisions, to say nothing of the taxpayers generally.

As this subject was recently under discussion by the National Association of Assessing Officers, I am including as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by that organization at a meeting held in Chicago on October 1, 1943. I am also including an illuminating address made at that meeting by the Auditor of Hamilton County, Ohio, Mr. George Guckenberger, on the subject Strict Enforcement of Exemption Laws With Reference to Public Housing Projects.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the ownership of property by the Federal Government restricts the tax base from which local governments draw the bulk of their revenues, and thereby affects the financial stability of counties, cities, school districts, and other political subdivisions; and

Whereas property owned by the Federal Government is not distributed uniformly over the country, but frequently is concentrated in particular areas which in turn results in serious inequalities as between different local governments; and

Whereas property owned by the Federal Government generally required the same services of local government as does property owned by private citizens; and

Whereas the beneficiaries of Federally owned property are the people of the entire Nation and not merely the residents of areas where Federal property is situated; and

Whereas Congress is investigating the problems arising out of Federal ownership of property, and has indicated a willingness to enact corrective legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the consensus of the membership of the National Association of Assessing Officers—

1. That when Federal agencies acquire property for temporary use, such property should be leased rather than purchased in order to peserve necessary revenues to local governments.

2. That Congress be urged to enact legislation authorizing the taxation of the following specific types of Federally-owned property:

(a) Property withdrawn from local tax rolls for temporary purposes, military or otherwise.

(b) Property used for housing and resettlement projects.

(c) Real and personal property used for manufacturing and industrial purposes.

3. That, in providing for the taxation of Federally owned property, Congress require that such taxation be applied to the same extent and in the same manner as privately owned property is taxed.

ADDRESS OF MR. GUCKENBERGER

Perhaps a better title would have been "Abuse of our tax laws."

The subject I wish to discuss will be "My experience with public housing projects."

To say that public housing, as these programs are conducted today by our Federal Government, are a menace to our taxing system would be putting it midly indeed; the real fact is that unless this sort of thing is stopped and unles we can make the Federal Government pay taxes, on certain types of housing projects just like any individual owner of a large apartment building, we will all find it necessary to abolish our present system of real estate taxation and devise something new to take its place.

Quite naturally when the Government undertakes to help one group of persons, this must be done at the expense of another group of persons, and it necessarily follows that if the public housing program is permitted to grow, we will eventually have the majority of our people living in Government-owned property and the individual real estate owner will be sitting out on a limb.

The Federal Government cannot build these housing projects any cheaper than an individual can, and the main reason that they can afford to rent these units for less than an individual owner is that they are not paying in real estate taxes their proportionate share of the cost of maintaining the community in which they are located. This produces unfair competition and a cruel injustice to the individual property owner who must pay not only his full share of the taxes, but in addition thereto, an amount to provide a subsidy to the occupants of the housing projects in his community. Therefore, in my opinion these housing projects, as the Federal Government operates them, are economically unsound and completely unjust. It is unreasonable to assume that the Federal Government can afford to give the people something for nothing, and I think, this organization should take a strong stand against continuation of any program along the lines of Federal Public Housing, unless the Fed-

eral Government can be made to assume its just and proportionate share of the burden of maintaining the community in which the project is located.

In Cincinnati we had our first introduction into the question of taxes on public housing on the 18th of May 1938, when the United States Housing Authority, through its administrator, applied for exemption ffom taxation of a project known as Laurel Homes. We could not see any justice in exemption of property of this character and, therefore, rejected their application. The Housing Authority then appealed to the Tax Commission of Ohio, who, in turn, sustained our contention that the property was not exempt from taxation under the laws of Ohio.

The Federal Government has since taken this case into the Ohio Supreme Court, and it will probably be heard there in the very near future.

When our Cincinnati Laurel Homes case first came up for consideration, we thought we had a tremendously important proposition on our hands, in view of the amount of taxes involved on property worth approximately $6,000,000, but since then five similar projects have been completed and the matter has become a great deal more important. The value now involved has grown to more than $33,000,000.

Unusual public interest was shown in the Laurel Homes case, as we received numerous letters from business people, and others, particularly real estate organizations, voicing their disapproval of exemption. In fact, some of the organizations took an active part in supplying arguments against exemption at the hearing before the tax commission.

Before filing our brief with the tax commission in support of taxation of the Laurel Homes projects, an intensive survey was conducted and many interesting disclosures were made. For instance, while the purpose of his low-rent project was elimination of slums, we found that less than 5 percent of the people who had previously lived in the district are permitted to live in Laurel Homes. In other words, only those who have sufficient income and can guarantee payment of the rent qualify as tenants. There are some 21 stores in the project, none of which face the residential units of Laurel Homes, but are fronting on streets surrounding Laurel Homes and facing privately owned property. These stores are rented indiscriminately to the highest bidder for any kind of a legitimate business. It is significant to note that one of the stores is rented to an old established building and loan association, which moved from its former location, simply because it could obtain cheaper rent in Laurel Homes.

We found people living in Laurel Homes who had moved in directly from other States, some from Indiana, Kentucky, and some from as far away as Alabama.

We also found considerable land space utilized by the tenants—they claim former slum dwellers—to park their automobiles. There were so many automobiles used by tenants of Laurel Homes that the parking space was inadequate, and an inspection of these automobiles revealed that many of them were new and of expensive makes.

Furthermore, while under the rules established for entrance into Laurel Homes, the prospective tenant must be living in substandard housing, we were able to procure photographs of the former houses of many of those considered qualified tenants showing they were modern with gas, electric, water, bath, and so forth.

From these facts, we felt that it must be concluded that the Laurel Homes project was similar in character to a privately owned large apartment-and-store building and that the project is doing nothing for the tenant that any private individual could not do if he were permitted to have tax exemption.

Under our Ohio laws, public property used for a public purpose is exempt from taxation. We claim, however, that despite the fact that the legal title is in the United States of America, the use is not a public one. It is renting the property for a consideration to be paid to it by the lessees, and the United States assumes the character of landlord and should, we think, be treated just like any other landlord with respect to taxes.

Another housing project of great interest to us, because of its similarity to Laurel Homes, was Poindexter Village in the name of Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority, and located at Columbus, Ohio.

In this case we joined with a group of Columbus people and helped to carry it through to a successful conclusion in the Ohio Supreme Court.

The difference in the two projects being only that in Columbus we were dealing with the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority and in Cincinnati we are dealing directly with the United States Government. Then, too, in Columbus, it was a matter only of dwelling units, whereas in the Cincinnati case we also have the matter of stores which, we think, helps to strengthen our case against the Government.

In conclusion, I should like to say that I have watched closely the progress of our Government's Federal Housing program, and my observations and study of these matters cause me to conclude that projects such as Laurel Homes and Poindexter Village are grossly unjust to the private property owner on whom we depend so greatly for the support of our necessary governmental functions.

The principles of Federal low-rent housing are unsound and unfair and a complete departure from our American way of life, providing benefits to some at the expense of others.

Therefore, in my opinion, every effort should be made to make Federal low-rent housing projects taxable.

Resolution of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a resolution of the commissioners of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, covering the dangerous situation surrounding that river.

Only a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD a resolution of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce which pointed to the specific flood danger that now exists and menaces the counties of Sandoval, Bernalillo, Valencia, and Socorro. I could have listed as well the total investment which the Government has in this project and surrounding it.

At a later date and in a more appropriate manner, I hope to ask this House for assistance in the solution of the problems of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and of the entire Rio Grande watershed. Pending that time, however, it should be of interest to see what the board of commissioners are saying as to their problem and the situation of the river.

Following is the resolution adopted by the board of commissioners at its regular meeting, October 19, 1943:

Whereas the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, at its meeting held the 27th day of September 1943, duly adopted a resolution requesting immediate Federal aid for flood emergency in the middle Rio Grande Valley in the counties of Sandoval, Bernalillo, Valencia, and Socorro; and

Whereas the middle Rio Grande conservancy district board is aware of a grave and immediate state of danger from floods; and

Whereas the middle Rio Grande conservancy district is not financially in a position to repair and restore damages done by previous floods and to prepare for adequate protection against future floods; and

Whereas the middle Rio Grande conservancy district board is heartily in accord with the action taken by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce in their adoption of the following resolutions:

"ALBUQUERQUE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION AS OF SEPTEMBER 27, 1943

"Whereas the levee flood control system along the Rio Grande within the conties of Sandoval, Bernalillo, Valencia, and Socorro, has been severely damaged by floods during the past several years and its present effectiveness so reduced as to be entirely inadequate to control flood waters of this river, and thus seriously menace all property within this valley; and

"Whereas this situation has become increasingly grave from year to year, due to rapid aggradation of the river channel, so as to cause said channel to shift continuously and to shift the current of this stream with each succeeding flood, so as to seriously threaten destruction of the entire levee system and other flood protection works along the river within this area; with resultant imminent danger of heavy losses of property, destruction of large areas of highly productive lands, and even loss of lives; and

"Whereas present levees and other flood-protection works so threatened with destruction constitute the only protection for a modern irrigation and drainage system serving 125,000 acres of highly productive and thickly settled farming areas; the central business district of the city of Albuquerque and a large portion of its residential and suburban area, wtih a population of approximately 75,000 within a radius of 5 miles of the Albuquerque post office; as well as numerous towns and villages within the area above defined; the population of the counties above named according to the 1940 census being 114,956, or 21.6 percent of the population of the entire State; and

"Whereas there pass through this area main lines of the Santa Fe railroads running east and west and north and south; and also main highways for motor travel, the uninterrupted operation of which is vital to the national safety at this time; and

"Whereas there are located in the city of Albuquerque two important air bases: Kirtland Field and Albuquerque Air Depot Training Station; which are dependent upon the above-mentioned railroad and highway traffic lanes for movement of supplies, equipment, and men in the military service; and

"Whereas the area above defined is subject not only to seasonal floods in late spring and summer, during the run-off of melting snows in the high mountain areas of the Rio Grande watershed, but also to even more dangerous "flash" or sudden floods caused by heavy rains or cloudbursts in such mountainous areas; and

"Whereas such seasonal flood periods occur every year, always with resultant heavy

damage; and such "flash" floods may occur at any time with grave danger of a disaster of major proportions; and

"Whereas the property owners of the counties above-named and of the cities and towns therein are without funds adequate to construct permanent flood protection works; and

"Whereas existing irrigation, drainage, and flood-protection works within said area were constructed with funds derived from a bond issue of which more than $8,000,000 are now outstanding; a major portion of which outstanding bond issue is owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and

"Whereas a devastating flood, such as is likely to occur at any time due to the conditions above recited, would not only destroy productive lands, city and town property, and transportation systems now vitally needed, but also would destroy the sole security upon which said outstanding bond issue is based; and

"Whereas the Rio Grande is an interstate and an international stream, and the Government of the United States is bound by its approval of treaties between the States of New Mexico, Colorado and Texas; and between the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico to allocate and deliver specific portions of the normal and flood-water flow of said stream to irrigated areas within said States and the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas by reason of its interstate and international character and the existence of the treaties above referred to, proper control of the floodwaters of this stream is within the power of the Government of the United States to provide: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, That a grave and immediate state of emergency exists within the Rio Grande Valley in the counties of New Mexico above named and that the said Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce is prepared at any time to demonstrate the existence of such danger and present emergency, through reports of competent engineers and other comprehensive data such as will convince any agency of the Federal Government that immediate relief is necessary; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, properly certified by their officers, be forwarded immediately to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH and the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, Members of the United States Senate from New Mexico; and to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, Members of the House of Representatives from New Mexico, with our urgent request that they present to the Congress the critical situation described in the above resolutions, with the further urgent request that they prepare, introduce and seek enactment by the Congress, at the earliest possible time, emergency legislation which will provide for the construction of permanent flood protection works within the area herein defined, and that funds for such construction be appropriated in such amount as the Army engineers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, or such other agency as the Congress may designate, may find necessary.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE ALBUQUERQUE CHAMBER OF COMMETCE,
Sgd. CLYDE ODEN, *President.*

"Attest:

"Sgd. JOHN P. MURPHY,
"Secretary.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, That the resolution adopted by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce as herein above set forth, be and the same is hereby in all respects ratified, approved and accepted as to all conditions and stipulations therein contained; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution by the Board of Commissioners of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, properly certified by their officers, be forwarded immediately to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH and the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, Members of the United States Senate from New Mexico; and to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, Members of the House of Representatives from New Mexico, with our urgent request that they present to the Congress the critical situation described in the above resolutions.

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT,
By A. G. SIMMS, *President.*

Attest:

JOHN T. VARNEY, *Secretary.*

Price Ceilings on Live Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RICHARD M. KLEBERG, representing the Fourteenth Congressional District of Texas and ex-president and ex-officio president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association and a long-time member of the American National Livestock Association, made the following statement with reference to an announcement carried in October 23 newspapers to the effect that the Office of Price Administration is proposing the establishment of price ceilings on live cattle:

I am wondering whether this indicates the trial of a case titled "The O. P. A. vs. Food Production" or a revivification of the famous Schechter sick chicken case of the days of the departed N. R. A. I am likewise perturbed, as I stated in a recent radio address over a national hookup on the subject of more red tape than red meat, as to whether this may not mean a question to be decided as to whether the Nation is expected to subsist on red tape rather than red meat as a central basis for the food requirements for our armed forces, our war workers, the civilian population of the United States, and our allies.

Since the announcement in the press I have discussed the portent with members of the various branches of the beef cattle industry and of Congress. Judge Joseph Montague, chief counsel of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, discussed at length the many efforts that have been made looking toward the establishment of ceiling prices on live cattle. The record shows that no one has yet been able to write a regulation or a law on this line susceptible to enforcement or, more important still, to compliance by members of the industry. Personally, I know that the various segments of the livestock and meat industry have seriously and patriotically studied this question. They have made most conscientious efforts to aid in the preparation of a workable order or regulation that would fix ceilings on live cattle. Representatives of cattle producers, organized and as individuals, made this effort, and over a year ago filed a statement of their conclusions and recommendations. These conclusions were to the effect that no such order could ever be written. Their conclusions were, that the best efforts along this line made by representatives of the Federal Government, by producers, and distributors, together with the processors were neither possible of enforcement nor compliance.

The packing industry, realizing that O. P. A. officials had, in preparing and promulgating MPR. R. 169 (price ceilings on meat) failed in their attempt to set up regulations valid in the work of the industry, thereafter made an exhaustive study of the problem involved in fixing ceilings on liv cattle. So, like the producers, the packers and processors concluded that no one was wise enough to write a workable order to accomplish the end. Thereafter the entire livestock and meat industry jointly studied this problem and reached the same conclusion. The O. P. A. was advised of the work of the entire industry and the conclusions it reached. All of the industry, patriotically inclined and willing to cooperate in the solution of this vexatious problem, were present in the considerations just mentioned.

On each occasion when O. P. A. officials announced that live ceilings were to be established, and these have been manifold, authorized representatives of producers, packers, and distributors have contacted these officials and sought to give them the benefit of their studies and conclusions. In February of 1943, O. P. A., through responsible and representative officials in charge of the meat section, definitely and unequivocally stated that before any decision would be reached on this question of live ceilings that the industry would be given opportunity to be heard on the question and public hearings would be held. I have this on the advice of Judge Montague and other authorized representatives of the industry. To date no such hearing has been held. The industry has not had the promised opportunity and yet the press announces this morning (October 23) that all plans have been worked out, determinations reached and decided upon in the O. P. A. This bureau and its bureaucratic personnel have either forgotten or definitely decided to ignore this direct overt promise given the industry. Judge Montague tells me that this promise was not forgotten because one of those involved in the making of the promise, Mr. C. M. Elkinton, is still in the identical position occupied in O. P. A. when the promise was given. For my part, it is impossible for him to have forgotten, for I have knowledge that he has been reminded.

Just a month ago, in Chicago, the advisory committee on livestock and beef was called. This was the committee appointed by the Government to the War Meat Board. At the meeting between this committee and representatives of O. P. A., Mr. Jean Carroll was introduced as the official in charge of meat regulations in O. P. A.; that he had come to this meeting to study the problems involved and especially the problem of price ceilings on live cattle. Judge Montague and others with whom I have talked were present at this meeting. The committee gave Mr. Carroll unstintingly its ideas on the subject of live ceilings. Following this, Mr. Carroll told the committee that no live ceiling program would be saddled on the industry without first giving the industry an opportunity to be heard on the subject. Mr. Carroll was quite emphatic on this point, according to my informants whom I not only know but accept as reliable. The advisory committee referred to is Government appointed and can by no means have ascribed to it the representation of the entire industry. Certainly the memory of man will not permit 30 days to constitute such a period as not to be embraced vividly in memory, at least by those present. For my part, I represent not only the meat-producing industry, but in addition thereto and in equal relative importance, every citizen of the Fourteenth Congressional District of Texas and of the United States and its insular possessions. It comes with terrific impact to me as such a Repre-

sentative that neither I nor the people can continue to have faith in the spoken word of high-ranking and responsible Government officials.

I recently made a speech on public confidence in an address which included food and inflation. This report of the O. P. A. decision in disregard of promises, has had a shocking effect on me. I recognize that the most important thing above all in this war effort is the preservation of the public confidence of these United States in its entirety.

As a humble citizen, charged in public office with high responsibility, I frankly cannot stomach the idea of the flower of American manhood and womanhood pledging their all on 14 savage battlefronts to support the American way of life while here at home its fundamental principles are disregarded. This Nation was built on the primary statement that "In God we trust." We rely on His teachings and we know the distinction between truth and falsehood. We are likewise determined to preserve the American way of life, which was not built on shallow promises. If this is the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, this situation must be remedied, and speedily.

Every American, be he or she a member of the armed services, a livestock producer or packer, a butcher, a war worker, or a civilian in any of the walks of life, he or she is patriotically determined to do his or her duty and meet every demand presented by the exigencies of this tragic period.

The producers of live cattle have increased their production to an unprecedented degree. The packers are working overtime and short-handed and despite this, have earned the commendation of the Nation; despite the confusion constantly thrown by bureaucrats, like the monkey wrench, into the machinery of doing business the accustomed American way.

After long and conscientious study all elements of the producing industry submitted to he Government their views and recommended plans on handling the meat problem. The plan contained was officially approved by Prentiss Brown, then Administrator of O. P. A.; Chester Davis, then War Food Administrator; and General Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States. This plan, despite approval, has never been put into effect. Partial acceptance is here and there, it is granted, but in the main the plan has been sabotaged by the bureaucratic control of O. P. A.

The stubborn refusal of the Office of Price Administration and failure to cooperate under our established American system with either the best interests of the majority or the recommendations of the industry involved, has created the greatest confusion ever known to the livestock and meat industry and the inexplicable shortage of beef while, at the same time the greatest livestock population the Nation has ever known roams its pastures and ranges. For 6 months of this year the armed forces have failed to receive even 50 percent of their requirements of beef. The live animal is not beef, but beef can only be made from a live animal. Ceiling prices on live animals, fixed without knowledge of the tremendous complexities involved, have barred the gates of the feed lot and the packing plant to live cattle. Ceiling prices on live animals, as stated before, cannot be fixed by regulation. God, the elements, together with the variations of all related matter, together with the vagaries encountered in the minds of over 6,000,000 producers and feeders of cattle are responsible for this. Briefly, unless the feeder can buy from the producer the live cattle and buy from the farmer the corn or other food and pay the labor incident and then sell to the packer at a price which covers his cost, the packer cannot get, unless these problems are met, the cattle into the packing plant. Until the cattle are in the packing plant they cannot be converted into beef, and until they can be converted into beef the soldier and the housewife cannot obtain it.

The Office of Price Administration ignores the fact that live cattle are not beef. They ignore that before cattle can be economically slaughtered they must be fattened and before they are converted into beef they must be slaughtered and hung on the rack.

The Government controls the feed supply and their efforts to control this essential factor has been so poorly conceived and administered that, taking all of these matters into consideration, we have a literal famine of beef in the midst of plenty. The end is not yet here. Feeders of cattle are so confused and afraid of the constantly changing mind of O. P. A. and the threat of new regulations and restrictions, that cattle have not been put on feed. The normal movement under the customary operation of the industry has been too long delayed and regardless of what course, there will be a serious shortage, if not a famine, of beef this winter and next spring. Plenty of cattle and no beef and more red tape. The entire industry—cattlemen, feeders, packers, and butchers have emphatically disclaimed to me any and all responsibility for past failures and the inevitable future disaster which impends.

To my way of thinking, O. P. A., those responsible for it and its operations, have the dubious honor of this major and tragic accomplishment. I am informed by reliable sources that many reasons beyond those which rightfully occupy that realm have been introduced as responsible for this recent hurry-up order.

As a Member of Congress and as an American, I am concerned and rightfully so with the decimation in the production of food, which today is a basic and vital essential and when every move of the bureaucrats in charge of the meat program further stifle its production, it is time for me and all other Representatives to raise our voices in vigorous protest.

This present move cannot be born of the exercise of American reason based on the knowledge of the time-honored American way and system. The announcement that live ceilings will be placed on cattle will have the worst effect on industry it has yet been confronted with. As one who knows this business, the production of beef will fall off even more than it has been indicated to the Government by the industry. The morale of the producer will cease to exist when he learns that the Government does not want his cooperation and will not keep faith with him.

May I repeat the question: Are we to have enough red meat or are we to insist upon or permit more red tape? Our fighting forces, our war workers, and our civilian population are entitled to an answer to this question now, and I don't mean maybe.

Subsidies and Roll-backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to Mr. A. V. Lundgren, president, Kansas State Federation of Labor:

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

Mr. A. V. LUNDGREN,
President,
Kansas State Federation of Labor,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MR. LUNDGREN: I am in receipt of your letter of recent date in which you advise that petitions signed by members of the Kansas State Federation of Labor and others, urging the enactment of legislation relating to subsidies, have been sent to Senator CAPPER. Senator CAPPER has kindly supplied me with a copy of the language contained in the petition. I am also in receipt of your letter of the 16th, addressed to Senator REED, in which you take issue with the statements contained in an interview which he gave to the press on the subject of food subsidies.

I have delayed writing to you partly because I have been exceedingly busy, but more particularly because I didn't want to reply to your letter until I had an opportunity to bring myself fully up to date on the latest figures concerning prices, wages, and the cost of living. I had informed myself very fully regarding these matters when we had the question of the roll-back subsidies up for consideration last June. I thought perhaps there might have been some change in the situation in the meantime.

I am glad to have your viewpoint on these matters as expressed in the petition and your letters, but frankly, after going into the matter most carefully, I am unable to see any justification at this time for food subsidies of the type advocated.

There may be some merit in the proposal to roll prices back as far as possible to the level of September 15, 1942. I have felt from the beginning that we would have been much more successful in our price-control program if we had simply frozen all prices and wages at the beginning of the program. This might have worked some inequities but there could have been a provision for the adjustment of such. With that thought in mind I supported the so-called Gore amendment to the price-control bill. This amendment, however, was opposed by the administration, by organized labor, and by the farm groups, and of course, with that opposition, it never had a chance. I think there were only about 60 of us who voted for it.

If I understand your position correctly you would like to have prices pushed back to the September 15, 1942, level, and the method which you suggest is through the use of subsidies paid by the Government, either to processors or producers. You do not, however, in your petition or letter, say anything whatever about pushing wages, salaries, and profits back to the September 15, 1942, level. It would seem to me that if we are going to put prices back to the level as of that date that in all fairness we should also fix wages, salaries, and profits, as of the same date. In view of the fact that I supported the Gore amendment and have always felt that we should have been more successful in price control, if it had been adopted, I think I could consistently go along with a movement to fix all prices, wages, salaries, and profits, on the level at which they existed on September 15, 1942. I assume, however, that there would be considerable opposition to this, especially on the part of spokesmen for organized labor, because the figures all show that wages, both hourly and weekly, as well as salaries, have increased more rapidly since September 15, 1942, than has the cost of living.

I have just procured through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, figures which compare full time hourly earnings, straight time hourly earnings, and weekly earnings, in all manufacturing industries from September 1942 to July 1943, the

latter month being the latest for which figures are available. I have also secured figures showing the total manufacturing pay rolls including both wages, and salaries, for the month of September 1942 and the month of August 1943, the latter month being the latest for which figures are available. I have als been furnished with indexes of the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower salaried workers in large cities of the United States as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. Now, what do these figures show? They show that the earnings of labor, the average full time hourly earnings, which includes overtime rates, in September 1942 were 89.2 cents per hour; for July 1943 they were 96.3 cents per hour, or an increase of approximately 8 percent. For straight-time hourly earnings, which, of course, does not include overtime, the figures were 84.4 for September 1942 and 90.3 for July 1943, an increase of 5.9 cents per hour, or in round numbers, 7 percent. The item of weekly earnings or "take home" pay was $37.80 for September 1942 and $42.76 for July 1943, or $4.98, or approximately 11 percent.

The figures as to total manufacturing payroll show that the total amount paid in September 1942 was $2,752,000,000 while in August 1943 it was $3,466,000,000, or an increase of $714,000,000.

What do the figures show as to the increase in the cost of living? They show that the index for all items based upon the 1935–39 figures was 117.8. In August 1943 the index stood at 123.2, or an increase of between 4 and 5 percent. Of course, the increase of some items was larger. For instance, the figures on food were 126.6 in September 1942, and 137.2 in August 1943. The increase in this item was the largest of any, but even on a percentage basis, the increase is not as large as was the percentage increase in "take home" pay. When it is considered that only 21 percent of our average income is spent for food, it can readily be seen that that item is only one of many entering into the cost of living.

If the Federal Government should, as you suggest, continue present subsidies and add others relating to food, it would mean an increase in our national indebtedness which would eventually have to be paid by the younger people in our present generation, including the men now serving in the Army and Navy, and perhaps all members of the next two or three generations. In view of the fact that salaries and wages have gone up more rapidly than the cost of living since September 1942, it seems to me that it would be very poor policy, indeed, to ask our returning soldiers and future generations to pay a part of our present-day food bill. More especially, since the figures show that we are spending the smallest proportion of our national income for food than we have ever expended in our history. Do you as a good citizen feel that this is a sound national policy?

However, if your program contemplated pushing all wages, salaries, and profits back to the level of September 1942, I can see that some advantage might accrue to the country as a whole and future generations, because in that case a large proportion of the amount saved would directly accrue to the benefit of the Federal Government because more than half of our total production at this time is being purchased by the Army and Navy and other governmental agencies. Therefore, Uncle Sam could afford, if necessary, to pay subsidies in order to keep the price of food at the September 1942 level, because he would save much more than the amount of the subsidies in direct reductions of war costs. The idea, however, of expecting the Government to pay the increased prices due to wage, salary, and profit increases since September 1942 and then turn around and borrow money to pay subsidies to consumers to make up for increased food costs since that time appears to me to be about the height of absurdity. How could you or I or anyone else go before the people generally and defend any such proposition as this?

Such a proposal would be definitely inflationary. It could not help but be Our greatest danger from inflation at the present time is our excess buying power, something like $40,000,000,000 this year. The effect of food subsidies on this buying power will be to increase it still further. It will give the people more money to spend but nothing more for which to spend it. While these subsidies are not paid directly to consumers, the effect is just the same as if they were. Suppose that instead of paying subsidies to processors and producers and reducing retail prices by that amount, the Federal Government said to consumers, "We are going to pay a certain percentage of your grocery bill each month and we will give you a check at the end of the month for your share." Could anyone contend that this would not increase the purchasing power of the consumer or that it would not be inflationary? Yet, that is exactly what we would do if we followed out the program which you advocate.

For these reasons I cannot see how I could possibly support the proposals which you advocate unless you couple with them a rollback of all wages, salaries, and profits to September 15, 1942.

With best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Member of Congress.

Labor Proclaims Its Opposition to Conscription of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, three organizations identified with the American Federation of Labor, and comprising all of the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. in the Seattle area, have agreed upon a resolution which is self-explanatory.

I find that the vast majority of the members of organized labor subscribe to the sentiments contained in this resolution. I recommend its reading to all who are desirous of becoming conversant with the attitude of labor relative to Federal agencies.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the present labor stabilization program, both in the shipyards and construction and building industry, has been working as satisfactorily as possible considering the removal of men by Selective Service; and

Whereas the proposal by some agency, in which labor has no voice, to break down present stabilization plans is demoralizing both labor and management in the morale and efficiency of the worker; and

Whereas the duplication and confusion to workers by the dispatching by some agency other than the labor organization to which the worker is affiliated, based on a priority established by some agency not familiar with the needs of industry, will and is creating a chaotic condition and breaking down of existing and satisfactory agreement of long standing; and

Whereas the threat of cancelation of contracts and the attempt to establish regimentation of labor; since forced labor is not and should not be permitted in a free country based on the principles on which our Constitution and country has been established—is hindering the recruiting of workers of this area and creating a greater labor turn-over; and

Whereas the fact that authority to cancel contracts now lies in the hands of the Federal Procurement Agencies—together with the authority of the War Production Board to limit hiring through control of materials; and

Whereas this will in itself cause a natural flow of labor from plants whose products are, for the moment, less vital to the war effort to those whose products are more essential; and

Whereas the flow of labor under private management has, of necessity, always been controlled—and we believe it still can be—making the proposed regimentation of labor by directive totally unnecessary: Therefore be it

Resolved, That until all capital and all other resources of our entire Nation are fully and completely regimented and conscripted by legislative action—that labor stand opposed to any program which would encroach upon and quickly destroy the rights of men and women to live and work as a free people in accordance with the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we are opposed to any agency usurping the prerogatives and functions of organized labor in the allocation of manpower or the dispatching of the same based on a system wherein labor is not fully represented.

SEATTLE CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
By C. W. DOYLE.
SEATTLE METAL TRADES COUNCIL,
By FRED KRUSE.
SEATTLE BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,
By FRED SMITH.

Aviation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD the text of a radio interview on the subject of post-war aviation, in which some significant questions relating to that subject were answered by the gentleman from North Carolina. [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The interview was heard over radio station WSB in Atlanta, Ga., and Mr. Ralph Smith, Washington correspondent of the Atlanta Journal, questioned the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Text of the interview follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, you have read a great deal about post-war problems, domestic and foreign, relating not only to the future peace of the world but to development of a nature that are world-wide in

their sphere of influence on human progress and economic relations. One of these great fields concerns aeronautics in its broadest sense—the expansion and regulation of airplanes, airplane routes, landing fields, and transport by air of passengers, commerce, and mail.

It is this subject that Maj. Alfred L. Bulwinkle, of Gastonia, N. C., is going to discuss presently. The major is a ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives and chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, which has drafted legislation aimed to regulate and stimulate aviation in America.

Question. Congressman BULWINKLE, on behalf of the committee you have, I believe, reported a bill to the House on civil aviation, H. R. 3420. Does that bill deal with a post-war development of the civil-aviation industry?

Answer. It certainly does, Mr. Smith. Our committee has been deeply concerned about the post-war prospects, and for many months has studied the need for legislation in order to provide a sound basis for the growth of civil aviation. The bill is a result of this study.

Question. What is the outstanding need of the civil aviation industry in the immediate post-war period?

Answer. Unquestionably it is the need for preventing deflation in the aircraft manufacturing industry. Aircraft manufacturing is the keystone of our national defense. The inability of France to produce airplanes in 1939 spelled its doom. The ability of England to produce airplanes in 1940 saved the civilized world from ruin. The ability of our country to produce airplanes is winning the victory.

After the last war our aircraft manufacturing industry scarcely turned a wheel for years, due to the lack of any sustained demand. The same thing must not happen again after this war.

So first of all we must be concerned about maintaining our ability to produce.

Question. But surely after this war there will be widespread demand for aircraft, will there not?

Answer. There will be such demand. But there will be thousands of second-hand aircraft on the market. Unless flying is kept at a level requiring high standards of safety and unless commercial operations are required to be on a reasonably sound economic basis, much of the demand could, for years, be satisfied by patched up, converted, worn-out planes produced for military purposes. That is exactly what happened after the last war

Question. Then does your new bill seek to raise standards of safety and other operating standards?

Answer. Ralph, that is one of its most important objectives. We want to encourage in every possible way all kinds of flying—commercial and pleasure—but we want to have the legislation which will insure against flying worn-out equipment beyond its time, against cutthroat irresponsible operators, and against loose practices which can only hurt the industry and the public in the long run.

Question. You speak of encouraging flying. Does not the law in force today do that?

Answer. Oddly enough, the present law does not expressly recognize the need for promoting and encouraging noncommercial flying. Our committee studied that matter with particular care. We came to the conclusion that civil aviation is going to be so important to our country's welfare in the future—both in peace and in war—that we ought, before this war is over, not only clearly recognize the need to encourage all branches of civil aviation but also take specific steps to that end. Then when the young men who have learned to fly in this war come back home they will have new opportunities for putting their wartime training to practical application not only in the regular air lines but in scores of other aviation activities.

Question. How does your bill accomplish that purpose?

Answer. In a number of ways, both directly and indirectly. In the first place, we clarify and expand our declaration of policy. We make provision for a permanent program of aviation training for pilots, mechanics, and other technicians along the lines of the Civilian Pilot Training Act which is now only a temporary law. We provide that such training must be done under contract with private agencies. That will have the dual effect of maintaining aviation schools and similar activities and at the same time assuring that vocational training can be continuously given to successive classes of young men and women with high standards of instruction. We provide for assisting the State school systems in giving aviation education courses which should go far toward keeping our youngsters aware of aviation's possibilities. We also provide for encouraging voluntary organizations of private flyers, such as glider clubs. An expanded program of airport development, to be continuously maintained on a coordinated Nation-wide basis is called for. We take steps to assure that the States and municipalities can properly zone the approaches to airports so that airports can be safely used and will not be unreasonably choked off, but with full compensation to property owners who may be affected. We give a secure economic basis for the conduct of contract carriage by air, so that miscellaneous air trucking can develop on a sound foundation. The bill provides measures to forestall the creation of trade barriers by State laws which would impede aviation's development. In these and many other ways concrete steps are taken toward real and constructive promotion of civil aviation.

Question. There has been some concern expressed about the possibility that the new bill may impair States' rights so far as aviation is concerned. Is that the case?

Answer. The bill will give the States and municipalities a larger and more constructive job to do than ever before. It does give the Federal Government the power to regulate the safety of all flying everywhere. But that is a practical necessity which no one seriously questions. The air space is 1 air space, not 48. There must be uniformity in the regulation of flying through it, because in a matter of seconds an interstate flight and a local flight can come into collision unless each operator knows the rules the other is following. This bill also gives the Federal Government the power to regulate the economics of point-to-point transportation by air for hire everywhere. We must have a coordinated transportation system by air available at all points for both interstate and intrastate traffic. And because of the speed and the cost of air transporation the intrastate traffic will inevitably be intermingled with the interstate and will be relatively minor in amount. The need for such Federal regulation has been recognized and approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at its annual meeting this past summer.

But the bill leaves ample powers to the States and municipalities; indeed, it recognizes new responsibilities for them. They may regulate intrastate private flying where not inconsistent with the Federal safety rules. They will have the very important problem of airport zoning. Theirs will be the task of aviation education and promotion. Their power to build and administer airports, and to regulate airport operators, is not impaired. The bill has new provisions for consultation and cooperation with them on many problems. They have a vast and highly important role to play.

Question. Does the bill have the support of those in the civil-aviation industry?

Answer. Yes. The manufacturers, the private fliers, the air lines, air-line labor, aviation training schools, the National Aeronautics Association, every branch of the industry supports it.

Question. Thus far, you have not mentioned any international questions. Does your bill deal with international aviation problems?

Answer. It does in part. It strengthens our Government's powers in several respects in order to assure that we can adequately control our international aviation in the public interest. It likewise reaffirms and strengthens the declaration of our national sovereignty in our air space. However, it must be remembered that our international aviation policy will necessarily depend to a considerable degree upon treaties and other international arrangements which will have to be made at a later date. The bill goes about as far in this field as it is possible to go at this time. But our committee is about to institute a thorough investigation which undoubtedly will encompass many questions relating to our international problems. One matter, for example, which we will study is that of developing the Arctic regions, since the great international air routes will in all probability have the North Pole as their hub.

Question. Looking ahead a few years, is it likely that air transportation will supersede surface transportation in whole or substantial part?

Answer. There have been wild prophecies to the general effect that railroads, trucks, and ships will be run out of business by the airplane. There is no evidence to sustain any such statements. And no responsible person has ever made any such prophecy. The fact is that the airplane is still in its infancy. Its high cost of operation, its dependence upon and heavy consumption of gasoline, the failure to develop satisfactory Diesel engines for use in airplanes, the tremendous complexity of the whole technology of aviation, all point to the impossibility of fulfilling the wild prophecies which the uninformed have made. In other words, our problem is still a problem of encouraging development, and it will remain so for years. Much of what the airplane has done in transportation during this war has been miraculous—but at enormous cost, which would be out of the question under normal commercial conditions. So what we need is down-to-earth sanity about aviation; we should not let our judgments be colored by the false assumption that we are about to see all railroad traffic, or even a large part of it, take to the air. If we are deluded by any such assumptions we will do great harm to aviation.

Question. What are, then, the post-war prospects for civil aviation?

Answer. A great development which, if properly guided, promises to open new opportunities for jobs and for the talents of our young men. It will make substantial progress in the more expensive type of traffic and will generate—particularly in the hauls of several hundred miles—much new traffic because speed in transportation always creates new needs and new demands for the use of transportation. Pleasure flying in light planes will become an easily afforded luxury for thousands of us. The air-mail system will undoubtedly be greatly extended and many communities not now served will be brought into the system. And air transportation, more than any other force, will promote a much closer community of interest especially among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. These are the prospects which have inspired our committee in framing the bill we have reported. We have diligently sought

to prepare for a development during the post-war years which will redound to the benefit of every citizen and the United States Government. And in my opinion, H. R. 3420 should be enacted into law.

Silver Demand Will Continue After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, of October 14, 1943, on silver:

SILVER DEMAND WILL CONTINUE, EDITOR STATES

Commenting on the world position of silver after the war, Harry C. Chellson, editor of the Mining Congress Journal, predicts that governments and industries throughout the world will be competing in the open market for silver soon after the cessation of hostilities.

"Post-war adjustments," says the magazine, "will demand a more extensive use of both gold and silver than has ever occurred before in the history of the world.

"Silver will be by far the more useful of the two precious metals because of demand for monetary circulation and industrial utilization. It will be used to supplant subsidiary paper money of extremely doubtful value.

"Silver coinage will continue to increase during 1943. As our troops are sent abroad in greater numbers they will require greater amounts of small denominational coins.

"Silver and gold will be used concurrently in rehabilitating and stabilizing the currency systems of the impoverished nations and will act as a tonic in reviving their commerce and restoring their international status.

"Gold will probably be confined largely to the settlement of international balances and to the function of backing for indirectly redeemable paper money, while silver will circulate both as a coin and be held in bullion form for the redemption 100 percent of paper money backed by silver.

"Those economists who insist on managed currencies as a basis for conducting world trade are doomed to disappointment and failure. No managed currency system has ever succeeded.

"The people of the world will demand both gold and silver and their appropriate utilization, for which no satisfactory substitute has been found since time immemorial."

S. O. S.—Save Oregon Scenery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a group of people in my State in a voluntary association, known as the Oregon Roadside Council, which has for its purpose the preservation of roadside scenery and carrying on an educational program to secure the beautification of our roadsides and country side and eliminate unsightly buildings, roadside shacks, and other similar structures which mar the beauty of the landscape along our highways. They also are carrying on a program for the preservation of our forests to the end that the great forest areas of our country may not be depleted and become ghost areas but may be reforested and preserved to yield an annual crop of forest products for future generations.

Jessie M. Honeyman and her associates in this outstanding movement for civic welfare have done such a remarkable work in our State that I deem it of sufficient importance to all the Members of Congress who have forest areas and roadside development in their districts to call to the attention of the House the program which is being carried forward by the Oregon Roadside Council in my State.

I include the report of the council, issued under date of September 10, 1943, setting forth an outline of the work of the organization with the program for the coming year. The report is as follows:

OREGON ROADSIDE COUNCIL—S. O. S., SAVE OREGON SCENERY

Our first defense work was to make sure that there would be no slums around Camp Adair. Before construction began, we appointed a strong central committee in Corvallis to find workers in all the four counties to take care of the highways surrounding Camp Adair.

The members of the committee visited every property owner along the roadsides and told them that there was no zoning law to prevent their doing as they pleased, but that it would benefit them if:

No new buildings were erected near enough to the right-of-way to obstruct the tremendous traffic to come.

No dirty, unsightly shacks disgraced the roadsides.

No disorderly conduct were allowed in dance or beer hall after the camp were opened.

This placing of the responsibility on each individual owner had the effect of establishing the high standards now prevailing.

We worked with the main construction committee to make the best regulations. No girl can go to any dance, inside the camp or out, without the written permission of the parents, and the college authorities demand the same before giving their permission.

Camps with water and sanitation are provided for all trailers. The health commission has a law penalizing them if they disobey the rules. Any unemployed women with them must register.

Our next defense project was to make the young people of Oregon fire conscious along the rural highways—to each them to detect and to extinguish the small fires which, if neglected, lead to great conflagrations. Thus we can enlist their cooperation with the United States and the State Forest Service in their wonderful plans to save Oregon's forests.

Thousands of leaflets were sent out in 1942–43, telling the youngsters what to do and how to do it near their own homes and at a minute's notice.

The Keep Oregon Green Association was our wonderful coadjutor and worked with us enthusiastically.

The department of public instruction contacted all the public schools. The colleges of education requested a leaflet for each of their students.

Leaflets were sent to all the independent schools, to the Jewish Community Center, and to the Latter-day Saints.

The young people's groups all received their quota: the Boy and Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, the Girl Reserves, the Hi-Y Boys, the Oregon Green Guards, and the 4–H Clubs.

We did not neglect our regular work, however. The Columbia Gorge was watched lest industrialism should destroy its beauty. Timber strips along the highways were not depleted because of war demands. The unequaled myrtle groves were protected. We have worked to save the historic Knapp House for a national monument. It will be a drawing card for tourists on the Coast Highway.

PROGRAM FOR THE COMING YEAR

Project I (major project)

To continue (beginning in October) the education of our young people in forest values and knowledge, building on what is taught in the school.

With the cooperation of the Oregon State system of higher education, we shall contact the students of the universities and colleges for the first time.

Distribution will be the same as in the past. We shall stress:

1. Value of forests in Oregon and in the United States.

2. Possible depletion of Oregon's forests because of war demands.

3. Information about the United States and State lumber interests in regard to reforestation and the sustained yield.

4. The story of the first community forests, and forests in Oregon and in the United States.

5. Community planting: the responsibility of young people, and what they can do.

We shall use the John B. Woods book as a foundation and shall be sure to verify every statement.

The Catholic and other private schools will give their hearty cooperation.

Project II

This year we had no Clean-up Week, because of the collection of salvage. This has left a disgraceful condition all along the roadsides. This can be remedied now after the baling machines have compressed the metals for transportation.

The council will now unite with Mr. Sersanous and his corps of salvage committees for a joint clean-up campaign all over the State. You will all be called on to lend a hand, so expect to hear from us about it.

Project III

A roadside control bill, with zoning for its principal feature, is being prepared for the next legislature. Our lawyers are studying what is being done in other States.

Project IV

At its annual meeting in October, the council will organize the Oregon National Resources League, which was voted last year. The commercial and aesthetic administrators and users will unite to protect those natural resources with which Oregon is so abundantly blessed. Post-war conditions will be studied and the league should be a mighty force to help preserve Oregon's prosperity in the chaos which will follow victory and the return of peace.

Last, but not least, since God has blessed Oregon with marvelous beauty, which is in danger of being despoiled, the council will ask Gov. Earl Snell to proclaim a Sunday of Thanksgiving on which to glorify Him for the natural beauties of our State, and to consider the responsibility of all our churches for their preservation.

Against Surface Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Miami, Fla., Chamber of Commerce, has in my opinion very wisely gone on record in a resolution, as favoring a continuation of the policy now in effect which prevents surface carriers from acquiring control of competitive air carriers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the resolution setting forth the position of that body on this important subject.

The resolution follows:

Whereas by report of the special committee on international transport of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States it has been recommended that the existing policy of the Federal Government with respect to the operation of air lines in international commerce be modified so as to permit the ownership and operation of airplanes in international commerce by steamship lines; and

Whereas such policy will be contrary to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which act follows a long-established policy of our Government of prohibiting one form of transport from dominating or controlling a competitive form of transport; and

Whereas this Chamber of Commerce feels that such established policy is a sound one and that it would be detrimental to the development of a strong international air transport system to permit surface carriers to acquire control of competitive air carriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Miami disapprove this proposal made by the special committee on international transport, and recommend that the policy now in effect, under the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which prevents surface carriers to acquire control of competitive air carriers, be continued in effect.

Adopted by board of directors, Miami Chamber of Commerce, October 18, 1943.

Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a splendid address delivered over radio station WIBW at Topeka, Kans., on the birthday anniversary of Christopher Columbus by John Towle, State historian of the American Legion, prominent civic leader and grand knight of Topeka Council No. 534:

In the biographies of history there is no man whose life and achievements should be so attractive and so edifying to all people as Columbus.

Were it not for Columbus and his unconquerable spirit which inspired him to set sail from Palos in the month of August over 450 years ago without stopping to compute the cost, without weighing hardships and sacrifices, with sublime patience, perseverance, courage, and faith which carried him over vast and uncharted seas, never losing confidence in himself or the ultimate success of his project through days and weeks and months, which finally ended on October 12 of that year, the entire New World would not be as it is known today.

By his discovery another world was opened to the lovers of freedom where they could, and did, unite in constructing a free state. Our nation at its birth three centuries later welcomed those from the oppressed countries of the world. It was founded on the promises that on her soil were to dwell no kings, were to rule no dictators. Every settlement was to be the home of liberty and every settler a foe of tyranny. Columbus gave to the world a vast land which was later to be the home of freemen, where nobility was to be cast aside upon entering her shores, where dukes and princes were to be unwelcome as such, and where dictators and rulers were to make way for the servants of the people. Royal families were to cast off their regal robes and the man behind the plow, the man in back of the counter, and the man laboring in the industrial plants were to be the equal of every other citizen—a country where every new-born babe was to have equal opportunities with the inherent rights and privileges endowed upon all men by their Creator—our founding fathers kept faith with Columbus. They gave to the world a sanctuary for the oppressed, a haven for the many, not a palace for the few.

The Knights of Columbus on Tuesday of this week, will commemorate the achievements of the man in whose honor the Order was named, and with all our fellow citizens, will pray that our leaders be humble in the sight of God and the people, that they receive the same humility that marked the entire life of Columbus—that they be given the wisdom that inspired Washington when he became the first President of our vast and glorious country—that they be given the foresight of William Penn who warned "Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants."

We give honor to Columbus for his great discovery, and we do not detract from that honor when we also give recognition to others who followed him.

Only a few short years after Columbus' death, another outstanding character in the world's history first saw the light of day—Columbus' faith and courage gave to the world a new land, but the man who lived shortly after, gave to the world the teachings of the Church on the rights of governing powers and of those governed—Robert Bellarmine, a noted theologian and controversalist, should share in the honors given those who were responsible for framing and giving to us our Constitution and Bill of Rights—Washington and Jefferson and all those who helped to create a new nation, founded on the rights of every individual, should share in the honor. The oppressed never receive the rights due them without battle—they must always fight for their liberties and our country was born in a blood bath, but after having won, it had no assurance that the victory was permanent; it had to continue its fight for those rights—only two decades after it won over oppression and tyranny it was again necessary to give of its citizens in order to perpetuate those rights. The battle was never won and is not now won; it continued through the years; almost a century later the people were again forced to wage a war against oppression and for the sacred God given rights of a minority—but again a man was given the people who was big enough to carry the battle to victory. Lincoln—that other great American, saw that the heritage given every American in our Declaration of Independence was more than an empty phrase. He declared that the Nation could not exist half free and half slave and again all the people were given the freedom which was their heritage.

Lincoln's challenge in 1860 must continue or all the previous victories will be in vain—as a nation we cannot hope to exist half free and half slave any more today than at that time.

We, therefore, today not only pay homage to that obscure Italian who made his memorable trip through the help of Isabella of Spain, one of the most momentous in all history, but we recognize the greatness of those who followed him through the centuries—a vast and glorious array of personalities who stand out among the world's great—Columbus the discoverer, Washington, Jefferson, all their stanch and courageous supporters and cooperators in the creation of a new nation in a new world—a Lincoln who saw that the Nation was to continue as founded. We need today men with the fortitude of Columbus, the knowledge of Bellarmine, the determination of Washington, and the greatness of Lincoln—men who in the future will take their rightful places along with those men whom history will accord the honor of perpetuating in our land the heritage given us by their predecessors.

As the grand knight of Topeka Council, No. 534, I am proud that I am a member of a council and live in a community favored with men who have won not only local, but national and international fame for their love of country. Men who insist that the Stars and Stripes never give way to the flag of a foreign power—men who have the ability and are sacrificing themselves today to see that this calamity never occurs—Alf M. Landon and Harry Woodring are men which our community may well be proud of. They have and are rendering outstanding service in behalf of our Nation today.

As Catholics and as members of the Knights of Columbus we fully recognize and pay homage to Columbus, and to those who made our country what it is today and we know they would not have accomplished what they did if they had not been of faith, men who believed in God and therefore believed in the rights of their fellowmen. These champions of freedom came from all countries of Europe: Von Steuben, of Germany; Kosciusko, of Poland; Lafayette, of France; and Carroll, of Ireland. They had one purpose in common. They were all exponents of the rights of mankind. Milt Tabor, of the Topeka Daily Capital, stated editorially only recently that "Our country was founded on Christian tenets," and it would not have been had not those who founded it believed in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, believing in that principle they could never accept the theory of a government by and for the few.

Those who discovered our hemisphere and those who founded our Nation came from the obscure; one of the men most responsible for the voyage of Columbus was a humble and saintly Spanish Franciscan friar; those who founded our Nation came from the ranks of the unknown. Proud and arrogant rules are already tottering in the world and we will not allow their kind to transplant their tyranny to our beloved country.

A new day will dawn for mankind when it submits to God, realizing that though the destroyer does not respect life, the Creator does. God, who made each separate existence, knows its true worth; the dictators, the

modern Herods and Pilates of today, do not respect life. To them man's worth may end when he falls in battle, but Christ, who valued fragments, will gather these broken lives in his arms, "Lest," as he said, "anything should be lost." Columbus fully believed in his Saviour, and by his discovery he was rewarded with the knowledge that he gave to Christ those souls who were later won to Christianity.

Today we stand in awe of these heroes of history and we accept the responsibility that is ours to see that what they discovered, what they founded, and what they fought and died for does not die because of our indifference to our heritage.

Let us preserve our priceless legacy of patriotic and broad-minded service to our country untarnished; yea, more, let us hand it down with added glory to future generations, supporting our institutions, furthering our country's great and lofty principles, and rearing a monument of good deeds more enduring than brass and marble.

Greek Patriots Want True Democracy in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the eminent foreign correspondent and radio commentator Johannes Steel is a profound student of the democratic process and thoroughly conversant with sentiments entertained by the oppressed peoples in occupied countries of Europe.

The heroic Greek people, with amazing intrepidity, resisted the excruciating hardships caused by the occupation of the Fascists. They are opposed to the restoration of a dictatorship under King George II. They feel very deeply about the matter.

In a war avowedly being fought to assure the preservation and extension of the so-called "four freedoms," so apotheosized in the American press, it would seem patent that the United Nations should assure our courageous Greek friends that the form of government prevailing in Greece after the war will be of a type to which the Greeks can subscribe unreservedly.

Mr. Johannes Steel recently wrote a column in the New York Post which graphically describes the sentiments and convictions of these people, with reference to current developments and future plans.

The article is as follows:

GREEK PATRIOTS APPEAL AGAINST ENEMIES AT HOME

(By Johannes Steel)

The leader of the Greek underground struggle against the German invaders, Elias Tsirimokos, who is now in Cairo, has addressed a passionate appeal to America for support of the democratic aspirations of the Greek people, warning solemnly of the civil war in Greece that will inevitably be the result if the Allies continue in their policy of forcing King George II down the throats of the unwilling Greek people.

This appeal was sent by Mr. Tsirimokos, who was a member of the Greek Parliament and who is at present the general secretary of the Union of Popular Democracy, which comprises all Greek political parties and the authority of which the Greek guerrilla armies recognize, to Mr. Basil Vlavianos, the editor of the Greek National Herald of New York.

The letter was brought by a secret messenger from Cairo because Mr. Tsirimokos and other representatives of the Greek underground movement and Greek guerrilla armies now in Cairo are apparently held incommunicado by the Greek Government of King George II in Cairo. In this the unwanted Greek King apparently has the assistance of British authorities who have clamped down a blanket censorship on all news of the political demands which the Greek people have made through Mr. Tsirimokos and his associates upon the Greek Government.

DEMANDED KING WAIT

The general secretary of the Union of Popular Democracy writes to Mr. Vlavianos as follows:

"Representatives of the National Liberation Front and of all other combatant groups of the party of National Liberation arrived, with the help of British secret service agents, in Cairo in August.

"They were asked to submit their opinions as to what the Greek people felt about the return of the King of Greece, before a plebiscite had been held, on the question as to whether Greece should remain a monarchy or return to its traditional republicanism.

"On August 17 the representatives of all political parties signed a joint letter to the Greek Premier, Mr. Tsouderos, declaring that 'for the sake of national unity, which alone insures the success of the national struggle as well as for the sake of the normal political development of the country, it has become imperative that it be formally announced that the King will not return to Greece before the people have spoken on the form of government they want after the war.'"

WILL BALKED BY BRITISH

Mr. Tsirimokos in his letter to Mr. Vlavianos concludes by saying that Mr. Tsouderos and the Greek Government accepted that declaration, unanimously indorsed its contents, and informed the King accordingly.

As Mr. Tsirimokos points out in his letter correctly, this reflected a rare political unanimity which no doubt impressed the King considerably. Before acting, however, the monarch in exile informed Mr. Churchill of what happened. Thereupon, the British Government, in order to help King George II to sidestep the issues, advised him to issue a declaration to the effect that a plebiscite would be held in Greece after the King's return.

This declaration was made over the protests of Greek Prime Minister Tsouderos, who has threatened to resign unless the King yields to the political demands of the National Liberation Front and pledges himself not to return to Greece until after the Greek people, themselves, have decided whether they once more want to be ruled by the monarch who was responsible for the Fascist dictatorship of General Metaxas.

WHY AMERICA GETS APPEAL

This is where the matter stands now, except that the political as well as the guerrilla leaders of the Greek people who arrived in Cairo in August are practically being held incommunicado, and a ruthless censorship prevents any news from getting into the international press of a situation which, if not solved in a democratic sense, will lead to a great political disaster after the war.

Kings in the Balkans were always the tools by which the great powers have imposed their will on the peoples. That is why the people of Greece and the people of Yugoslavia are now appealing in passionate earnestness to the people of America for help not only against the foreign aggressor but against the domestic enemies of democracy and liberty as well.

Anna Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper account of the visit of Mrs. Roosevelt to Australia, written by a Missouri soldier, Capt. Robert Mitchell White.

Captain White, a graduate of Washing and Lee University, and employed by the United Press before joining the Army, traveled with the First Lady as a representative of Gen. Douglas MacArthur on her flying trip through the South Pacific.

Captain White is the son of Editor L. Mitchell White, former president of the Missouri Press Association, recent recipient of the distinguished journalism award from Missouri University, and last week elected president of the Inland Press Association at its Chicago convention, in absentia, while a patient at the university hospital in Edmonton, Alberta, where he was stricken with sudden illness on a trip through Canada and the Northwest.

Captain White's article is a notable contribution to American history and literature and, while actually a letter to his wife, is carried in the Ledger as follows:

CAPT. ROBERT M. WHITE SAYS YANKS IN AUSTRALIA WERE GLAD TO SEE MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

(Captain White, who is a public relations officer attached to General MacArthur's headquarters, accompanied Mrs. Roosevelt on her tour. He sent the following story to his wife at Columbia, S. C., and she forwarded it to the Ledger.)

(By Capt. Robert M. White II)

It's a hell of a way to kill Japs, I thought, when they ordered me south to handle the press for Mrs. Roosevelt's tour of Australia.

As far as I was concerned, Mrs. Roosevelt or anybody else could come and go from Australia at will, but what I didn't like was having to leave my post to accompany them. Over a year ago I told my bride goodbye and traveled 10,000 miles away to fight Japanese and do what I could to end this war, not to travel around Australia with brass hats.

Mrs. Roosevelt arrived September 3 and during the next 2 weeks I followed her 3,000 miles through stops at Canberra, Melbourne, Sydney, Rockhampton, Cairns, Townsville, MacKay, Brisbane, and undisclosed points. At each stop her wake led through a galaxy of United States hospitals, camps, Red Cross centers, and a polite handful of Aussie installations.

Mrs. Roosevelt is certainly one of the most brilliant and competent individuals I ever met. I no longer think of her as the wife of the President, but rather as a highly efficient and perfectly competent public official.

Yesterday we had breakfast with Mrs. Roosevelt and her party, and then rushed into a 14-hour day of visiting everything from munitions factories to service installations. It was all topped off by a reception by the lord mayor followed by a meeting of several thousand women in the Town Hall, with Mrs. Roosevelt speaking.

The Aussies rightly called her Public Energy No. 1.

Wherever Mrs. Roosevelt went she wanted to see the things a mother would want to see. She looked at kitchens and saw how the food was prepared. She insisted on eating with the men. And when she chatted with the men she said the things mothers say. Little things that men never think of and couldn't put into words if they did. Her voice was like a mother's too. Most of us have talked with American nurses or Red Cross girls, but none of us had heard in such a long time the soft, modulated American voice of a middle-aged American mother.

Mrs. Roosevelt went through hospital wards by the hundreds. In each she made a point of stopping by each bed, shaking hands, and saying some nice, motherlike thing. Maybe it sounds funny, but she left behind her many a tough but battle-torn G. I. blowing his nose and swearing at the cold he had recently picked up.

She made speeches to thousands of men. We had sort of expected political talks on women in war work, or something, but not so. At each camp she made the same speech:

"When I left, my husband, the President, asked me to give you a message. He said to tell you that every day he goes down to the map room in the White House and notes on the maps where you are and what you are doing. He said to tell you that you have done and are doing a wonderful job. He wants me to give you his deepest admiration and gratitude.

"And now that I have given you his message let me add mine. When I was in Britain last October I learned for the first time what it means to live in a country where war is on your very doorstep, I learned what it means to go to work in the morning not knowing if your family will still be alive when you come home that night. I learned what you men have kept from America. So you see, I know that it is you who have made it possible for us in America to concentrate on production and to work unfettered by the constant dread that lives in countries where war is near. You have made it possible for America to become the greatest production unit in history. That production, as you know, has now turned the tide of the war. You have made that possible so let me also express my gratitude and tell you that everyone back home misses you as much as you miss them and that we are living for that wonderful day when you will come back home. Goodbye, and good luck."

We liked this speech. Her sincerity permeated every word. As speeches go it may not be a great speech, but I can tell you that a year of listening to nothing but bassooning top sergeants and officers, it was good to hear a kind lady saying nice things.

A majority of the troops Mrs. Roosevelt saw in Australia have been overseas more than a year. When we arrived over here we expected to go right into combat and after killing off the Japs and ending the war with the usual American dispatch, return home. We should have known better, but our wishful thinking had the best of us. Instead of immediate combat we were thrown into extensive jungle training. After a few months of training we were finally baptized at Buna. Even though it was a pretty rough show, Buna didn't end the war. Back we came for reconditioning and more training. There have since been other actions, but always they are followed by more training. Now, finally, we understand the cold facts of the case: This war isn't going to be won by killing a few thousand Japs here or there. We are going to have to kill a whole hell of a lot of Japs in a whole hell of a lot of places, and we are now barely started.

Since this means we are not going home for a long time—and a long time is any chosen length of time—we naturally lean heavily on our memories and the solace of the day dream. Even if we wanted to we couldn't break clean with our home ties. After more than a year of this day-dreaming business we have come to realize how far 10,000 miles is. America to us has evolved into a distant dreamland where wonderful people like mothers and wives write letters in houses called homes. Houses, why many of us haven't been in a civilian house since we left the States. You probably can't believe that.

And the letters we receive. We live for them. That is, they are the nearest thing to that kind of living we do. Yet no matter how wonderful our letters may be we have found they leave a man heart hungry. No written word on paper can substitute for the real nearness of those we love.

In short, we are lonesome. We don't admit it. We like to cover it up with fast chatter, quips, bravado, and the saga of adventure that pulp writers find in war, but underneath we all know the truth.

Into this general picture arrived Mrs. Roosevelt. The word of her coming hadn't caused much of a stir. We had expected the wife of the President, the First Lady of the land, the woman who writes a column called My Day, a Washington socialite. She may be all of these things, but over here she was something more—something none of us had seen in over a year, an American mother.

On the day she left Australia I was standing with a crowd of GIs watching her plane take off.

"Damn, she's fine, ain't she," a Guinea yellow (from Atemrin) sergeant said to nobody in particular.

"Yes," I answered straight from the shoulder. "And I hope she comes back."

Dovetailing Our Tax and Social-Security Structures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the presentation made on October 14 before the Ways and Means Committee by Arthur L. Johnson, national executive and legislative secretary of the General Welfare Federation of America.

Mr. Johnson's presentation had to do solely with the tax phase of the social-security problem and it brings out in bold relief the need for dovetailing our tax and social-security structures, a problem to which the Congress should be devoting more of its attention, following the lead of the Ways and Means Committee, which voted last week to integrate the victory tax into the income-tax structure. I hope that every Member will not only read Mr. Johnson's timely remarks but study them and then act to remedy the situation.

Such action can be had either through the tax bill now being evolved by the Ways and Means Committee or by means of the Discharge Petition No. 4 I have filed at the Speaker's desk, which now has 112 signatures, I urge the Members to sign it in order that this entire subject may be taken up for floor discussion.

The bill I have introduced on the subject—known as the General Welfare Act, H. R. 836—which now has the written support of 150 Members of the House, remedies the defects brought out by Mr. Johnson. It goes further and takes care of the defects in our present old-age-pension system as well. These defects are too well known to the old people and the Nation in general to need mention here, but my bill remedies most of them. I would suggest to any who are interested that they procure a copy of this bill (H. R. 836) and study it. They will learn just how practically all the main defects in the present old-age-pension system that has grown up in this Nation are taken care of.

Mr. Johnson's presentation, having to do with just the tax and annuity features, was as follows:

Chairman DOUGHTON. The chairman would like to observe that Mr. Johnson has been around Washington for a long time, representing the General Welfare Federation of America. He has been diligent, faithful, and able in the discharge of his duties and has been loyal to his organization. He has always been a gentleman. He has attended to his business faithfully, and has never tried to embarrass Members of Congress by misrepresenting anything.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on May 12, 1941, and again on April 17, 1942, before this committee, and on August 14, 1942, before the Senate Finance Committee, I advocated a 5-percent tax somewhat similar to the Victory tax later adopted and suggested that 40 percent of it be refunded in post-war social security annuities. The arrangement that was finally approved provided for a post-war cash refund instead, and this is still the law. I understand that the Victory tax is now on its way out, but this does not alter the principle involved and I am here today to suggest the setting aside of the proceeds of a 3-per-cent-income tax, as a substitute for the Victory tax, for a refund in post-war social security annuities, the money to be placed in the social security reserve fund and borrowed by the Government to use in the war effort, just as is being done with the pay-roll tax money today.

I desire to call the committee's attention to the fact that Secretary Morgenthau in his presentation of October 4 suggested a refund in life insurance and that when Economic Stabilization Director Fred Vinson was asked while before this committee a few days later as to the possibility of a refund in annuities he stated, "That would be all right."

We therefore have a trend in official thinking toward the proposition which the General Welfare Federation of America has been advancing for the last 3 years of a refund in social security annuities.

For the third time, I beg your committee to give some thought to this suggestion. It would solve many a problem in the tax field and it would be a first big step toward overhauling our Federal tax and social-security structures and dovetailing them into one solid mass that will sustain the weight that is to be placed upon them in the years that are to come.

Your committee is now at the crossroads. You are hesitating as to whether to turn to the right on a road marked "Federal Sales Tax", which will lead through the squalid warrens of the poor to the bramble-tangle of chaos, or to keep straight ahead toward the goal of simplification, certainty, equity, and financial security.

In considering the problem of the financial security of the Nation we must keep in mind the closely-related problem of the social security of its people. This has been kept in mind by this committee in the past and a bill introduced by your revered chairman over 8 years ago has brought social security to one-half of our people.

You have, however, forgotten that our Constitution guarantees to all our citizens the "equal protection of the laws" and for 8 long years you have permitted a condition to exist in this Nation whereby one-half of our people are denied the right to the social security granted to the other half. We, as a national benevolent institution interested in the general welfare of all of our people, again protest against this discrimination and respectfully urge your honorable committee to grant the equal protection of the laws in the social-security field by the simple expedient of granting to all who pay the 3 percent income tax you contemplate imposing in lieu of the Victory tax a refund in post-war social security annuities maturing at the age of 65 and not conditioned upon retirement.

Such an arrangement would automatically extend to the greater part of the adult population in this Nation the social security of which one-half of such population has been deprived for the last 8 years in one of the most glaring inequites of all time, under which 2 groups of our population—the office workers and industrial workers—get 4 different kinds of protection under the Social Security Act while 14 large groups that are not covered at all—the farmers, farm laborers, casual laborers, housewives, domestics, nurses, teachers, church employees, employees of nonprofit institutions, government employees of cities, counties, and States, professional men, businessmen, and self-employed and the unemployed—get no benefits whatsoever, although they help to pay, in passed-on taxes, four-fifths of the present 5-percent pay roll tax.

Surely the time has come to cure this great inequality. The present tax program offers an ideal opportunity for so doing. This committee need not wait for the hearings next year on the complicated and controversial Wagner-Dingell bill and then be faced with the proposition of levying a 6 percent pay-roll tax on the farmers and housewives of the Nation without giving them an ounce of protection in return. It has before it right now a proposal by the Treasury of the United States which, with the modification approved by the Director of Economic Stabilization, would solve the whole difficulty in a most equitable manner and in a way which would satisfy the American public with the tax program adopted by this committee as no other action you could possibly take would do.

A sales tax upon the poor certainly wouldn't be popular, but few would complain of an increase in their income tax if it will buy for them personally an annuity which will insure them against privation and want in old age.

In this manner your committee could bring about practically all of the objectives of the Wagner-Dingell bill without the imposition of any new tax upon the American public, for if security against privation and want in old age is granted through a refund of a portion of the income tax paid, the ultimate 9 percent pay-roll tax which Congress has already imposed upon the employers and employees of the Nation could easily, by a proper and fair readjustment of equities, be relegated to its proper sphere of protecting employees against the various hazards of life which face them while they are such employees and while their employer is still interested in them as such. This could include coverage for sickness, other disability, and hospitalization, as contemplated by the Wagner-Dingell bill, with the Government merely paying the bill at a private hospital if Congress wants to avoid the issue of socialized medicine, which is already stirring up considerable controversy.

In any event, the ultimate 3-percent pay-roll tax on employees and 3-percent pay-roll tax on employers, plus the 3 percent imposed upon employers in most States for unemployment compensation, if used to protect the employees against unemployment, sickness, and accidents, and to protect their families in the event of their death, should be sufficient for these purposes.

This would result in the employer paying a 6-percent pay-roll tax and the employee paying a 3-percent pay-roll tax for protection against life's hazards while an employee, plus a 3-percent income tax on the employee for protection against privation and want in old age, which is common to all groups. This would mean that the employer and employee would each pay in effect a 6-percent pay-roll tax, which is the goal of the Wagner-Dingell bill. The only difference would be that no new taxes whatever would be necessary under this arrangement, as all of these taxes have already been imposed by Congress although some of them are not effective as yet, the pay-roll tax being scheduled to rise in 1949 to a total of 9 percent, that is, 3 percent on the employee and 3 percent on the employer, plus an additional 3 percent on the employer for unemployment compensation. In fact, the whole thing could be accomplished by a reduction of taxes, since the present 5-percent Victory tax under its new name would be reduced to 3 percent.

This should interest the proponents of the Wagner-Dingell bill as a means of accomplishing their objectives without a new tax during wartime or even after the war. Their task of trying to raise the pay-roll tax to 6 percent for the employer and 6 percent for the employee during wartime is indeed a stupendous one, and the suggestion I am making here is at least worthy of their study, especially since it would result in real social security to most of the people of this Nation, while their proposal would leave out many large groups, such as the farmers, casual laborers, housewives, nurses, ministers, and the unemployed, and would bring in farm laborers and domestics only by taxing their employers without giving any protection whatever to these employers, who would be forced to pay directly a 6-percent pay-roll tax in addition to the indirect pay-roll taxes they now pay.

As a means of bringing all under the protection of the old age annuity system we here suggest, based upon a post-war refund, in annuities, of a 3-percent income tax, we would recommend that the income tax exemption be removed as to this 3 percent of the tax, and that anyone with an income of less than $300 per year be required to pay $2 per calendar quarter, which is 66⅔ cents per month or a little over 2 cents per day in order to be eligible to share in the benefits of this annuity system.

It has been suggested that this contribution of $2 per calendar quarter be on a voluntary basis in order to avoid administrative difficulties in collecting this small amount, but I prefer the mandatory basis, for then, if any fail to come in and pay the $2 each quarter, no one but themselves will be harmed in particular and they would lose credit for that quarter toward their annuities. I believe that a provision would have to be made that anyone with an income of less than $8 per year would be liable for no tax, in order to avoid any constitutional objection that the tax is a capitation tax, but most people will see to it that they get an income of $8 per year in cash if they get a benefit by so doing.

In fact, such a tax as we here propose, carrying a benefit in the form of insurance against privation and want in old age, would be a most popular tax and very little evasion of it would be bad. The tax collector's popularity would increase tremendously and, incidentally, so would the popularity of the Congressmen among their aged constituents, who are becoming more and more numerous as time goes on.

If this suggestion of ours is given consideration, we would commend to you the schedule of annuities set forth in H. R. 836, known as the General Welfare Act, now supported in writing by over one-third of the Members of the House. This schedule calls for a minimum annuity of $30 per month plus $1 per month for every full $2 above $5 per calendar quarter that is paid as a tax by any individual for at least one-half of the quarters such individual is subject to the tax, with a maximum of $85 per month, which maximum we would be willing to see raised to $120 per month in conformity with the Wagner-Dingell bill.

Such, in brief, is our proposal. We hope that it will merit the serious consideration of this committee and that the committee will not under any circumstances jump from our present sound Federal tax base of "ability to pay" to a sales tax, which could not under any circumstances support an annuity system geared to what is paid in, which is the only sound basis for an annuity system and which is the American way.

Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Associated Press carried a series of three well-written, informative articles dealing with the provisions and working of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. These articles were written by Mr. William F. Arbogast, a competent member of the Associated Press staff assigned to Capitol Hill. His clear manner of explaining the provisions of this highly technical law bears evidence of his industry. I commend the careful reading of these articles to everyone. They follow:

LAW PROVIDES FINANCIAL RELIEF TO HELP DRAFTED DADS MEET BILLS

(By William F. Arbogast)

WASHINGTON, October 17.—So you're going to be drafted, Dad.

How about the family financial obligations while you're away? Those payments on the house and the automobile? And your insurance premiums?

Think you can keep all that up on a buck private's $50 a month, plus the comparatively

small amount Uncle Sam will kick in to keep your family going while you're fighting?

With the drafting of pre-war fathers an actuality, Members of Congress are being asked by worried fathers with low draft numbers to furnish the answers to those questions.

The answers, or most of them, are down in black and white on the law books. Generally speaking, they should save some gray hairs for anxious dads.

Recognizing that the average draft-age father has had his nose to the grindstone so long buying shoes and clothes for the kids that he hasn't been able to save up enough to survive a long period of reduced income, Congress last year enacted the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1942.

Representative JOHN SPARKMAN (Democrat, of Alabama)—he's a father—intended it to be the answer to a drafted father's prayer when he headed a military subcommittee that wrote it.

It amends a similar 1940 law and was planned to give relief to servicemen of World War No. 2 along the same lines as provided during World War No. 1. It should not be confused with the Allowance and Allotment Act, under which the Government adds to payments a serviceman makes to his dependents.

It doesn't cancel any obligations or debts but is a type of moratorium providing for suspension, in proper cases, of the enforcement of a serviceman's civil obligations. It maintains the status quo until the soldier comes back from the wars and has a chance to get on his feet financially.

Here are some of its high spots:

Your family cannot be evicted for nonpayment of rent, if the rental does not exceed $80 monthly, without permission of a court. The court may suspend execution of an eviction order for 3 months, even though no more rent is paid, or may make "such other order as may be just."

Just what such other order may be is a matter on which the courts haven't agreed. One court has held that a stay of execution for longer than 3 months is allowed.

Similar protection is given against foreclosure for nonpayment of mortgage installments on a home. In a mortgage case the court may order a sale or it may grant a stay of foreclosure. The property owner or mortgage holder, is protected by being allowed to apply for relief from payments on taxes, insurance, and so on, if he depended on the serviceman's payments to meet these obligations.

No foreclosures on automobiles, furniture, or other personal property being bought on the installment plan may be made without a court order, and when such an order is granted, the forecloser must make an equitable settlement with the buyer, based on an appraisal made by three disinterested parties.

Payments on notes, loans, etc., to banks and loan companies may be suspended for the duration and 3 months beyond the date of discharge of the payer if the debtor is a serviceman and makes application for relief.

Interest accrues at not to exceed 6 percent a year, and the unpaid principal remains an obligation against the serviceman. Relief also may be obtained by a comaker or endorser.

The Government guarantees payment of premiums on a serviceman's private insurance up to an insured value of $10,000, the policy to be restored to good standing within 2 years after discharge. This protection does not interfere with the man's right to buy up to $10,000 of Government insurance.

At any time within 6 months after his discharge, a debtor may apply to a court for additional relief in the form of extension of the time for repaying accrued obligations.

The act gives the courts wide discretion in handling cases of servicemen.

Either because of ignorance of their rights or because of ability of debtors to reach agreements with their creditors without resort to it, the act has not been resorted to as extensively as one might expect in view of the millions of persons eligible.

GOVERNMENT PROTECTS INSURANCE OF YANKS

WASHINGTON, October 16.—Under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act and the National Service Life Insurance Act, a member of Uncle Sam's armed forces may carry as high as $20,000 in life insurance at an average cost of about $7 a month during his period of service.

The $7 monthly represents what he pays for his service insurance, which he may purchase up to $10,000.

PRIVATE INSURANCE

It costs him nothing during his service period to carry $10,000 of his own private insurance, but he must arrange to catch up on past-due premium payments, or to restore the policy to good standing, within 2 years after his discharge. Under a provision of the Civil Relief Act, the Government protects this insurance up to $10,000.

In the event of death of the insured before the premiums are repaid, the amount due is deducted from the amount payable.

UNPAID PREMIUMS

Failure of the insured to restore the policy to good standing within the required time, or to reach some agreement with the insurer, may result in termination of the policy with the Government paying the insurance company the difference between the amount guaranteed and the cash surrender value. The serviceman then would owe the Government for the amount paid.

To be eligible for protection under the act, a policy must be on the level-premium, endowment, or legal-reserve plan, or in the nature of life insurance arising out of membership in a fraternal or beneficial organization. A premium must have been paid before October 6, 1942, or not less than 30 days before the date the insured entered military service.

PROTECTION OF POLICIES

A policy is entitled to protection regardless of the amount of loan that may be against it, but cannot be protected if it contains a provision excluding or restricting liability for death arising from military service.

Except by a court order or by consent of the insured, no assignee of a policy (except the insurer in connection with a policy loan) may exercise any right or option by virtue of the assignment.

The act does not protect premium payments on national service life insurance issued by the Government. However, the premium rates on this insurance are low, the cost for $10,000 (the maximum allowable) of 5-year-level-premium-term insurance for a person at age 25 being $6.70 a month. At age 30 the cost is $7.10, and at 45 the charge is $9.90.

EXAMINATION NOT NEEDED

Government insurance may be applied for without the requirement of a medical examination within 120 days after a person enters the service. After that period, proof of good health must be furnished.

The insurance is granted in multiples of $500 and is payable in event of death to a designated beneficiary within the relationship of wife, child, husband, parent, brother, or sister.

After the insurance has been in effect at least 1 year, and within the 5-year term period, it may be converted into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life insurance.

WAIVER OF PAYMENTS

It contains provision for waiver of premium payments in the event of continuous total disability for 6 months or longer.

Proceeds of the insurance are payable in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of face value if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age at the time of the insured's death. If the beneficiary is over 30, monthly installments are payable during the remaining lifetime, with a guarantee of 120 months.

ALMOST AUTOMATIC LAW PROTECTS SERVICEMEN

WASHINGTON, October 19.—Congress made protection for the serviceman almost automatic when it wrote the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

It required him to do very little to avail himself of the law, wrote in penalties for creditors who proceeded against him in disregard of the act, and stipulated that "any doubts that may arise as to the scope and application of the act should be resolved in favor of the person in military service involved."

RELIEF AFTER DISCHARGE

Then it went further and set up the machinery for a serviceman to obtain still more relief after his discharge.

Generally speaking, a serviceman must take the initiative in only two instances to obtain the act's protection.

If he holds a lease on a home, he may break it by giving 30 days' notice to the landlord, the 30 days to begin from the date of the next due rent payment.

If he wants to avail himself of the life insurance protection, he must fill out a form and file it with the Veterans' Administration, which will protect his private life insurance up to a value of $10,000 for the duration of the insured's period of military service and for 2 years thereafter.

PROTECTION AUTOMATIC

Otherwise the serviceman automatically receives protection without doing anything, and the law provides for a stiff fine and a prison sentence for any creditor who ignores the law.

If a serviceman is sued, the court may suspend the proceedings or, if it decides that the action may proceed without detriment to the serviceman, it may appoint an attorney to represent him. If the final judgment goes against the serviceman, the court may suspend execution of the judgment. Plaintiffs, before entering judgment for want of appearance, must file an affidavit in court to the effect that the defendant is not in military service.

Seizure, sale, and sacrifice of a serviceman's property in payment of debts must receive judicial authorization. In the case of an obligation already due in full, the serviceman may obtain postponement of enforcement of a judgment for a period equal to that of his period of military service.

Experience with the law, Congressmen say, has indicated that in most cases creditors have cooperated generously.

In those few cases where a serviceman finds himself in need of legal aid, it's available free of charge.

To enable a person in military service to obtain relief from the impact of all the postponed liabilities within a short time after his period of military service, the act provides for extended relief after discharge.

During his period of service, or within 6 months thereafter, a serviceman may apply to a court for help, and the court may extend the maturity date of obligations for a period equal to that of the debtor's military service.

Statement by War Department on Administration of Prisoner-of-War Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, some days ago the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] had something to say with reference to the number of officers in charge of prisoner-of-war camps. As a result of the remarks which he made, I have received from the War Department a statement with reference to the prisoner-of-war camps at various military stations and elsewhere throughout the United States. The statement gives the facts in regard to the policy of the Department and the number of officers and enlisted men detailed for duty at such camps. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Reference is made to statement by Senator WHERRY in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 4, 1943. In the absence of more specific information, it is presumed that Senator WHERRY visited a prisoner of war camp located off a military reservation and with a capacity of 3,000 prisoners of war. Probably it was prisoner of war camp, Scottsbluff, Nebr.

2. Camps of the Scottsbluff type, not having the facilities of a military post, are forced to operate as small military posts and necessarily require an increased overhead over that required for one located on a military installation. The following is the table of minimum requirements:

3,000-man camp (off of post)

	Overhead	
	Officers	Enlisted men
Military police	8	73
Medical	8	20
Quartermaster Corps	2	19
Detached enlisted men's list	19	6
Engineers	1	10
Chaplain	1	
Total	31	128
	Guards	
3 prisoner of war escort guard companies	9	405
Grand total	40	533

3. At camps located off a military installation it is necessary to construct adequate hospital facilities to provide proper medical care for prisoners of war as required by the Geneva Convention. From past experience, the Surgeon General has set 4 percent of the total population as the bed-capacity requirements for the normal sick rate. However, increased bed capacity is required at a prisoner-of-war camp since among the prisoners of war being received are battle casualties who require hospitalization. It is the policy to treat the maximum number possible of prisoner-of-war battle casualties at hospitals in prisoner-of-war camps, thereby freeing the general hospitals for our own sick and wounded. It is also the policy to utilize to the maximum extent the services of captured medical personnel on the care of their own nationals and as they become available the number of our own personnel so engaged will be reduced.

4. The flow of prisoners of war to the United States is determined by the theater commander. No accurate forecast of the maximum number of prisoners to be shipped to the United States can be made, nor can the dates of arrival in the United States be predicted, since shipments of prisoners depend entirely upon available ship space. There have been instances of large shipments of prisoners arriving at the ports of embarkation on a few hours' notice. This is inevitable. In view of the above, the War Department has been forced to construct housing, provide the necessary overhead and guard personnel to receive and care adequately for the large numbers of prisoners on very short notice.

5. On June 3, 1943, 728 prisoners arrived at Scottsbluff from overseas. There were transferred from Camp Carson, Colo., 1,124 prisoners on June 24 to Scottsbluff. This intercamp transfer was made to alleviate the critical labor shortage in the beet fields in the vicinity of Scottsbluff, which was called to the attention of this office by Senator WHERRY and others. On August 8, 1943, 418 prisoners were transferred to Scottsbluff from the eastern seaboard. On August 15, 399 prisoners were transferred to Scottsbluff to bring the camp, with several other small additions, to its present strength of 2,719. The procedure in filling a prisoner of war camp is, in general, similar to that of sending troops to a Regular Army Establishment. It is imperative to establish, prior to the arrival of any prisoners, the necessary supply, overhead, and security measures. The next step is to send in a small contingent of prisoners to enable the camp to operate and its personnel to become entirely familiar with the problems of administration, guard, and security. The last step is to fill the camp with complements of 500 or 1,000 prisoners at intervals to avoid any undue burden or strain on the supply or administrative system.

6. Until Scottsbluff was filled, it was of course true that the number of military personnel was out of proportion to the number of prisoners interned. However, since the camp was constructed for 3,000 prisoners and now contains 2,719 prisoners, this disproportionate number of military personnel was not unjustified. It should be pointed out that, during the interim period, the excessive number of guards operated to the maximum advantage of the State of Nebraska since larger work details could be furnished by the military personnel without call for other assistance. That is what Nebraska desired.

7. Prisoners of war are enemies of the United States and were captured in armed conflict with our forces. Security is of paramount interest to the whole of the United States. It is not believed to be sound to trust an enemy soldier who so recently was exerting his best effort to bring about the defeat of this Nation.

8. Personnel of the military police escort guard companies is on duty for 24 hours each day, 7 days a week, and 52 weeks a year. Each day is like every other day, and the duty on holidays and Sundays, with the exception of work details, is exactly the same as for the week days. The military police escort guard companies consist of 3 officers and 135 enlisted men, but actual guard, exclusive of overhead, consists of 4 sections each of 29 enlisted men. Of necessity, because of the guard details required during day and night, there are actually only about 39 guards per 1,000 prisoners at any one time at the camp. Although this ratio is considered adequate, it is believed that the military personnel has been limited to an irreducible minimum.

Address by Senator Murray at Annual Meeting of Independent Tire Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the annual meeting of the Independent Tire Dealers, held at New York City, on October 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends, and independent small businessmen of the tire industry, I am very glad to have this opportunity to meet with the independent tire dealers and tire retreaders of America. First, let me congratulate you on the splendid record you have made in maintaining the motor transportation system of this country on rubber during this crucial war period.

No one in America has been in a better position to appreciate this job you have done than Mr. William Jeffers, former National Rubber Administrator. Before our Senate Small Business Committee recently, he paid you a tribute in such glowing terms that I cannot find words to improve upon what he said. That tribute, I think, is worthy of repetition here. He said, and I quote:

"In the present emergency had it not been for the independent tire dealer, so-called, we might have found ourselves in a lot of difficulty in this country because of the urgent necessity of recapping, retreading, and repairing so much tire equipment. I think it is important and imperative that the independent be permitted to operate."

The Senate Small Business Committee also appreciates the tremendous job that the independent tire dealers have done in keeping our vitally necessary motor transportation system in operation wherever rubber has been concerned. Rubber tires have been a serious bottleneck in this war. The major credit for breaking this bottleneck is due the small independent tire dealers, tire service stations, and tire retreaders. You know perhaps better than anyone that America's motor transportation system would probably have collapsed long before this if it had not been for the early pioneering that you have done in repairing, retreading, and servicing of tires, and the extensive investment you have collectively made in machinery and equipment for this purpose.

It seems a crying shame that there appears to be an element in your industry that would seek to destroy you through ruthless price-cutting practices and insatiable ambitions to monopolize all the rubber tire business of this country. The destruction of the investment and profit opportunities of the small independent tire dealer is not the only consequence which follows in the wake of these monopolistic practices. We are beginning to realize throughout this Nation that if the

small businessman is destroyed, we undermine the very fundamentals of our American system of free private enterprise. With the disappearance of our small and intermediate sized industries, the foundation of our whole democratic system of government will crumble.

I believe that the small businessmen in the tire industry have probably been a little more fortunate than those in a good many other industries, which are affected by similar monopolistic trends. You have been fortunate in a leadership which has been able, tenacious, and persistent. You have presented your case to the public and to the Congress ably. If it had not been for your effective work, I doubt very much whether we would be today as far along toward the solution of your problems as we are.

You are pioneering in the effort to preserve free private enterprise against the destructive inroads of monopoly in your industry. You may recall that Thomas Jefferson exchanged a number of letters with James Madison in which he pointed out what he felt to be certain serious shortcomings of our Constitution. Two of these shortcomings, in his opinion, were the failure of the Constitution to prohibit slavery and to prevent monopoly in trade and industry. The slavery question was finally settled only by a long, costly, and destructive civil war among our people. Monopoly is as dangerous a thing as slavery. It is within our power under established legislative process guaranteed by the Constitution itself to block monopoly without the necessity of resorting to strife. But we must be diligent and alert in asserting our political rights.

Thanks to the cooperation and support of the independent small businessmen in the tire industry, our committee in the Senate has sponsored and hopes to put through the Congress, remedial legislation which, if enacted, will establish the independent tire business of the country on a sound and firm basis. The Congress has spent a great amount of time and given earnest effort and serious consideration to your problems. To you is due the credit for appearing before our congressional committees and supplying evidence of practices leading to the destruction of your industry. Without this support and without this factual information, of course, nothing could be accomplished. It is important that you continue to give such cooperation and vigorous support to this remedial legislation now pending in the Congress until the struggle is won.

This evidence which you have presented to the Congress demonstrates the necessity of Senate bill S. 1122. It amply proves that legislative action is needed to save the independent tire business. Without this legislation the independent tire dealer is doomed.

Thus, having proved your case, we want to avoid the necessity and expense of additional public hearings. In order to do this, however, it is necessary to bring to the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee, in a forceful manner, all the proven facts, conditions, and circumstances upon which this legislation is founded.

The efforts which you have made this summer, both individually and collectively, in educating the country, and focusing the attention of our citizens upon these vital facts, have been extremely helpful in bringing about an intelligent understanding of this legislation.

The great value of your educational program cannot be discounted. In this way, you are keeping the facts constantly before the Congress. In this manner, you are also assisting in getting public support for the preservation of free competition. In a democracy, this method of presenting your case is appropriate.

I have just read with interest a reprint in your National Independent, of an article by Mr. Bob Beiser, automobile editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, which is one of the oldest and most reputable newspapers of the Middle West. Mr. Beiser there records that he has read all the hearings before our Senate Small Business Committee. He not only compliments the work our committee has done, but pays a tribute to the independent tire dealers of the country for the cooperation they have given the Senate committee. It is on the basis of these hearings that Mr. Beiser is induced to comment that it is apparent to all and sundry individuals acquainted with what is going on that there are some things in the tire industry that need correction—and right now.

It was not so long ago that a very reputable merchandising paper, Tide, commented in much the same tone with respect to tire-company-owned stores branching out in the sale of wallpaper, clothing, bicycles, dishes, cooking utensils, furniture, luggage, electric stoves, phonographs, and a score of other items of merchandise.

These major companies are not limited in their ambition to monopolize the tire business, they are now reaching out to compete with the independent clothing merchant, the hardware store, the sporting-goods store, the electric store, and the department store. They are thus contributing to the destruction of the small merchants in many other lines, who are now faced with serious difficulty due to the lack of goods on their shelves resulting from our wartime restrictions upon the production of civilian goods. Only recently, the Washington Post denounced this practice of the tire-company-owned stores in an editorial entitled "Chiseling."

Still more recently, the conservative investment banking house of Kidder, Peabody & Co. placed a considerable share of the responsibility for the poor earning records of the major rubber companies on their entry into ownership and operation of company-owned retail stores.

It has recently been reported that one major rubber company marked off $10,000,000 as a loss on the operation of its retail stores. We all know that the profit margins of the big tire companies have been substantially augmented by the tremendous volume of war contracts which they have enjoyed. The question which comes to my mind is whether or not losses of this character have been absorbed and canceled out in the renegotiation of war contracts. If this is true, it simply means that the American people through our tax system which is the source of payment of war contracts are subsidizing the destruction of small business.

I would like to close now with just a few words about the present status of S. 1122. Of course, you know that there is powerful opposition to this legislation.

Those who oppose this legislation are making a strong effort to convince the Congress that it should be defeated. They are marshalling their side of the case with great energy and skill, and it behooves those interested in the preservation of the independents in the tire industry to see that their side of the question is just as effectively presented. This is the democratic process.

I think the independents are entitled to win this struggle on its merits. It is a question which strikes at the very roots of our American system of free enterprise. In my judgment, the Congress will recognize the justice of your position.

The destruction of the independents would be another step in the march of collectivism in the United States. This march must be stopped if we are going to maintain our American system of free competition and democratic way of life.

As I said earlier, with your very able assistance, we have established such an abundance of supporting factual information it should not be necessary to bring you again to Washington for another Senate hearing. This should be avoided if possible. I feel satisfied there is a substantial sentiment in the Congress in support of this bill and there should be no necessity for another hearing.

We expect a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee very shortly, at which time decision of the question of a hearing will be made. Of course, if that committee feels an additional hearing is necessary, I am sure we can look to you for the same kind of cooperation you have given us in the past.

Patriotism Plus

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] paid tribute to the patriotism of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert of Helenville, Wis. The Gruennerts had been asked to come to Washington to receive from the President the Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded in death, to their son, Sgt. Kenneth E. Gruennert, who was killed in New Guinea last Christmas Eve, for "leadership so outstanding that it placed victory above the life of the leader himself."

The gentleman from Kentucky seemed to be under the impression that the Gruennerts sacrificed this trip, as well as the honor and distinction of a personal audience and presentation by the President, because in this national emergency of scarcity, they considered it unpatriotic to burn their own rubber, gas and oil for such a mission.

Even if such were the fact, they deserved all and more than the praise accorded them. However, this concept not only fails to do them justice, but entirely misses the real spirit of sacrificial patriotism, as well as an epic on national economy which motivated these great Americans. They reveal a virtue of which our people are in direct need if this Nation is to survive after our victorious fighting forces come marching home.

May I again insert the letter? It is worth rereading time and again by all Americans:

We feel honored indeed to receive a medal of honor for our departed son, to be delivered to us personally by the President of the United States.

Under present conditions, however, we cannot help but give expression to some of the following thoughts which race through our minds day and night.

We are now in the midst of the third War bond drive. We believe every cent of money subscribed should be used to supply our boys with the necessities of war and not spent for trips that do not directly help the war effort.

Only this last week, thousands of other parents lost their loved ones on the battlefields of Italy, all brave boys that were loved

by their parents as much as we loved our own. These parents cannot all converge on Washington, and because of the common bond we have with them we feel we shouldn't either. The loss of our brave boy is still too fresh in our memory for us to make this trip, even though it would be in his honor.

Will you please convey our regrets to the President? Will you please ask him whether it would be possible for him to put whatever message he may have for us in writing, so it may be delivered to us along with the Medal of Honor and we will ever cherish and treasure them both in the memory of our boy.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from this letter that the expense of the Gruennerts' trip to Washington was to be paid by the administration. This is shown by the third paragraph of their letter:

> We are now in the midst of the third bond drive. We believe every cent of money subscribed should be used to supply our boys with the necessities of war and not spent for trips that do not directly help the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, no real American can comment upon the underlying appeal in that message without the realization that he stands on holy ground. Nor could any such American, who has not himself experienced the poignant grief of sacrificing a son upon the altar of freedom that this Nation may live, rebuke the President for spending the people's bond and tax money in paying for a trip to Washington for those who have made such sacrifice and bear such sorrow.

But the Gruennerts have spoken from the altar, and I understand that the President immediately gave orders to discontinue the practice. But unless the President goes further, much further, this response is but a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. The Gruennerts, made of the sterner, sterling, stabilizing stuff that constitutes America's greatness, realize that economy can be accomplished only at the cost of real sacrifice. In this era of unequaled Government spending and waste, debt and taxes, their epic plea should cut to the very quick and cause the administration to pare expenses to the very bone, "using every cent of the people's bond and tax money to supply our boys with the necessities of war, and for nothing that does not directly help the war effort." Economies which are much more urgent and effective than these trips to Washington can and must be accomplished. Members of Congress as well as thinking men and women throughout all the country, alarmed over the staggering debt of hundreds of billions, and the back-breaking burden of taxes, have pleaded for this economy year in and year out with little avail. The unnecessary spending continues without abatement. May we hope that this epic plea for economy from the Gruennerts, who typify the American spirit which spares no sacrifice necessary to win the war but insists on every cent being used for that purpose, will stir the President to action. Not Members of Congress, but the President under his tremendous war powers, is the only person in the United States who can, by economy, preserve this Nation from the slavery of debt.

The Pacific Coast in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific coast feels that it has a distinct place in America's future; that destiny intends that the Pacific coast shall play an ever increasingly prominent part in the post bellum development of the United States. We who are from that favored area, the Pacific coast, "where nature smiles a thousand miles," are somewhat hurt that among civilian war agencies few men from the Pacific coast have been chosen as administrators or as officials to fill posts of a policy-making nature. Among many easterners there is very little real appreciation of the potentialities of the Pacific coast area. Too few of them have ever traveled west of the Rockies.

Recently, an editorial appeared in the San Francisco Examiner which summarizes the situation succinctly and makes pointed suggestions and comments. This editorial reads as follows:

THE GREAT INDUSTRIAL WEST

For a generation and more, farsighted men have realized that the West is destined to become the most important part of the United States and that its leadership will be apparent in every phase of human affairs.

Almost overnight, under the goad of war, a substantial part of this vision has become reality.

Industrially, the West has arrived. The integrated industrial empire of which modern pioneers have dreamed since the turn of the century is here—now.

For the first time, we have industries that are complete from top to bottom—industries that function as western entities from ore to finished product.

This new civilization that has shot up in our midst is a civilization of fuel and raw materials of metals, transportation and power, of population, payrolls, and production lines. It is a vital part of the gigantic total mobilization against the enemies of democracy.

It must be remobilized for peace if our new hard-won industrial empire is to be saved.

The bitter alternatives to realistic thinking and courageous planning today are industrial ghost towns, chaotic unemployment, doles, and demagogues, tomorrow.

Until a few years ago the Western States as a whole comprised an export market. We produced raw materials from a vast storehouse of natural resources, and sent most of them elsewhere for processing. So far as manufacturing was concerned, the West was undeveloped.

Then, with explosive suddenness, the war made basic changes in our western economy.

It gave us the tools of production to transform our raw materials into finished products; it opened enormous sources of such basic raw materials as coal and steel, the magical alloys, and the revolutionary light metals; and it brought us, by the hundreds of thousands, the population to operate our new tools and to provide a future market for their peacetime output.

For all time to come, whether we like it or not, the spacious and leisurely economy of the old West has gone. We cannot go back to what we had. We must go forward with what we have.

This integrated industrial empire of the West is so new that few of us have seen more than a tiny portion of the whole, and so gigantic that we have as yet grasped only the fringes of its possibilities.

Here is a region containing 27 percent of the total area of the United States, more than half its valuable natural resources, yet only 9 percent of the population. A century ago almost all of it was wilderness. Millions of acres remain a wilderness today.

Along the seacoast are the maritime centers of population—San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Eureka, Portland, Seattle, Tacoma—looking out across the Pacific, where the tide of destiny is sweeping.

Back from the sea are mountains and deserts stocked with the mineral and chemical wealth planted there by the Creator, agricultural valleys of incomparable fertility, endless aisles of towering forest, plateaus dotted with countless herds, cities and towns to serve the people.

Here and there in this vast domain are industries—many of them giants as man-made projects are reckoned, but none more than a pinprick against the majestic natural panorama of the West itself.

Yet all this is little more than a beginning "We have not yet seen what we shall be," and the surface of our material and social development in the West has barely been scratched.

Now the approach of peace, which cannot be long delayed in terms of years, confronts this emerging industrial economy with an immediate challenge.

Our new position as an integral, balanced economic unit must be welded together so firmly by the steel of mutual interest that the disturbances of the post-war period will surge against our bulwarks in vain.

Many agencies already have tackled the problem, some on a regional basis, others within the various States, many along community lines. Much of the ablest political, business, and labor leadership of the West is represented on organizations which are seriously planning for the new era that will be ushered in by the armistice.

But industry planning, or State planning, or city planning, is not enough. These groups must continue and intensify their specialized work—but they can perform the greatest service to the West and therefore to themselves by viewing the problem on a broad regional basis, and by forming an over-all organization that can speak and act for all the West.

Here is an opportunity for the Council of Western Governors when it meets in Denver September 17 and 18. It is no less an opportunity for the western regional representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Industrial West Foundation, the General Contractors, and of the myriad agricultural, labor, and industry groups that are vitally concerned.

Such an all-western council, composed of broad-gage men imbued with the progressive and independent spirit of the Nation's last great frontier, might at this crisis in human affairs help chart a new course for all the world.

The time to start it is now.

Wages of Railroad Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, an extremely serious situation has arisen in

this country by reason of a controversy between the railroad workers of the United States and the administration, represented by Mr. Vinson, Director of Stabilization. The railroad workers in September 1942 served notice for an increased revision in their wage scales. These requests were for from 20 cents to 70 cents per hour. Mediation hearings were held. The President under statutory authority of the Railway Act intervened and appointed a commission to investigate the merits of the controversy. Hearings were held before the Board for a period of about 40 days. Railroad workers and managers testified. Then on May 24 the Board filed an award for an increase of basic wage rates of 8 cents an hour. As I understand it, the Board also reported 8 cents an hour was the minimum noninflationary increase the Nation's railroad workers were entitled to receive and that many of them were working under substandard living wages and that furthermore railroad workers had not been able to progress as rapidly as other employees during the war period. The railroad workers and the companies accepted the award and assumed the controversy was closed. Then on June 23, Judge Vinson, as Stabilization Director, issued an order setting aside the 8-cent increase and declared the increase was inflationary and should not become effective, although he would approve a 4-cent increase, which apparently would not be inflationary. This decision has created a very serious and, in my judgment, an unnecessary situation in this country. I believe the 8-cent increase should have been approved without further discussion and delay. The railroad men followed the procedure laid down under the authority of the Railway Labor Act and were willing to comply with the order of the Board appointed under that act. Unless it could be shown that this order was unreasonable, I hardly see why the Stabilization Director should, on his own volition, change or modify it, especially when it had been agreed to between railroad men as well as the operators.

Mr. Speaker, the railroad men of this country are not receiving wages comparable with those employed in other war industries in America. The average paid to the industrial workers is an average of 20 cents per hour more than is paid railroad men. For example, machinists in the railroad service who receive $1.05 an hour get as much as $1.55 per hour in the shipyards. Similar differences can be found all the way along the line. Mr. Speaker, let me say again that I do not believe the 8 cents per hour increase for men in the railroad service should be considered inflationary or out of line when employees in war plants with far less experience are receiving so much more pay for their services. To say that the 8 cents per hour is inflationary is hardly reasonable when other increases were allowed without question. Not many months ago millions of employees in Government service were granted increases in wages with a minimum of 15 percent. Of course, most of them were required to work 8 hours for 6 days a week, but nevertheless the incomes of such employees were raised from 15 to 22 percent. Government authorities did not on that occasion seem to regard the move as inflationary. Mr. Speaker, we have a crucial situation in this country. Railroad employees as a group are among the most patriotic of American citizens. They have done a marvelous job in the transportation and the movement of our soldiers, our munitions, and our food. They have done it under unusual and trying circumstances. Their contribution to the war front cannot be estimated. They also are working under handicaps that most of us know little about. Mr. Speaker, I submit the railroad employees in acceding to the small raise of 8 cents per hour have been more than fair. Since the increase was authorized by the President's Emergency Board set up for that purpose, it ought to stand. Furthermore, the increase is not out of line with wages paid to employees in war industries who are doing comparable work. There are thousands of men and women now employed in war industries who are receiving much higher wages and with experience that does not begin to compare with that of those who are employed in the railroad service. I trust those in authority without further delay, will see fit to comply with the order of the Emergency Board.

The Corner Druggist Completes a War Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. DURHAM Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Connery:

THE CORNER DRUGGIST COMPLETES A WAR JOB—QUININE FROM THOUSANDS OF SHELVES IS ON ITS WAY TO THE FRONTS

(By George Connery)

One war-born agency is closing its books on a task well done; an uninteresting task, but an important one.

And the man who did the job is a well-known, prosaic individual, the corner druggist.

A few days ago it was announced that the national quinine pool, sponsored jointly by the Defense Supplies Corporation, War Production Board, and the American Pharmaceutical Association, had completed its work. The work was the collecting and sorting of quinine compounds that were in the hands of retail druggists.

Like so many other home-front efforts, this had its origin in the Japanese occupation of Java.

For more than 300 years the world has been blessed with knowledge that quinine is effective in treatment of malaria—even now the most effective treatment. In 1941 Java produced 90 percent of the world's quinine, and the United States got practically all of its supply from that island that is so favored with natural resources.

THE GREATEST HAZARD

The history of quinine production set the formula for that of rubber which followed it. Enterprising Dutch East Indies traders years ago began cultivation in Java of the cinchona tree, source of quinine, getting it from South America.

So successful were the Dutch with their domesticated cinchonas that the wild South American product was driven off the market as was the wild rubber later.

Malaria is by all odds the greatest disease hazard for troops in Burma, New Guinea, and the Solomons. So when the Allies lost Java, and knew they wouldn't regain it for at least several years, there was one obvious thing to do about quinine. It was done April 4, 1942, in the form of conservation order No. M 131 (now a byword with pharmacists), which forbade the sale of quinine, in any form, except to malarial patients.

That would conserve the supply. But, worried Army and Navy people began to ask, what about surplus quinine on the shelves of our 54,000 drug stores? Can't we get at this?

THE SITUATION

Here the American Pharmaceutical Association, the druggists' own organization, moved onto the scene—and stayed there until October 15 when it pronounced its work completed.

When the quinine collection campaign started, this was the muddled situation:

1. In 18 States malaria is prevalent, and the demand in them for quinine is constant. So there could be no thought of getting any of the critical drug from the 18,000 or so pharmacists in these States.

2. In the remaining 35,000 stores there were hundreds of thousands of minute amounts of quinine; in pill, capsule, and powder form; in opened and unopened cases and in opened and unopened jars and boxes.

3. No money was appropriated to pay for this quinine, and even if it had been the detailed task of making payments would be enormous.

4. There was no telling how the druggists, beset with hundreds of more immediate demands on their time and energy, would respond to such an appeal.

5. It wasn't just a matter of getting the drug sent in. Unopened containers could be forwarded to Army and Navy as received, but no chances could be taken with opened jars and bottles; the compounds in them had to be reprocessed and the quinine salvaged.

METHOD SELECTED

The last problem was one of the most difficult. An examination of the country-wide stocks of cinchona drugs led to a discussion among leaders of the medical and pharmaceutical groups as to the best method of salvaging broken stocks and packages. One method was finally decided upon.

The lower floor of the American Institute of Pharmacy Building at 2215 Constitution Avenue NW. was cleared and made ready to receive the boxes, crates, and barrels that were to roll in by the thousands. An estimate was made that 100,000 ounces would be received, and the pool was staffed with this in mind. When final reports are in this figure may be doubled.

The drive started the middle of last January.

Every media was used to reach out to all drug stores with the campaign's appeal—direct mail, newspapers, professional magazines, the radio.

Druggists who contributed their surplus stocks were given an insignia to paste in their windows.

Most of the pharmacists must have received the message and acted upon it. Quinine arrived by every medium of delivery conceivable. Many druggists in this vicinity brought in their contributions in person. Other shipments arrived by mail, express, air express, special delivery.

A TEDIOUS JOB

The Pharmaceutical Association had to ask for help, and it got hospital corps men from the Army and pharmacist's mates from the Navy. The work was detailed and tedious, but there was no other way to accomplish this vital salvage task.

Every shipment had to be receipted for, estimated as to volume or amount, and this preliminary information recorded. Pharmacist's mates opened and inspected each package. Every item it contained—bottle, tin, or envelope—was carefully scrutinized and the nature of the contents noted, whether pill, tablet, capsule, powder, or liquid, and the quinine value in terms of grains, grams, or ounces estimated.

Then contributions were carefully arranged and grouped according to the identity of the quinine derivative.

Daily and monthly records were kept which showed total number of packages opened, total value in grains of the various derivatives, total in ounce-bulk for the month, and total cumulative figures since opening of the pool.

July's record is an example of the task involved. During that month, 617 packages were opened and they averaged 6.9 ounces per package.

Along the walls of the room where the work was carried out were an arrangement of barrels used for bulking the more commonly received quinine items. Each had a label: Sugar-coated pills, sugar-coated tablets, chocolate tablets. Then there were tablet and capsule barrels for quinine sulphate in 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-grain doses. Nor was that all. Quinine hydrobromide, quinine hydrochloride, etc., each had its own barrel.

Into these barrels were bulked the contents of broken packages until they were filled. Then off they went to the processors, and other empty barrels took their place.

The original unopened packages, of course, avoided this stage. They were merely recorded and shipped on as received.

Among the 17,390 packages received were many odd gifts. Some of the items were manufactured in Peru, Ecuador, and other South American countries; in France; in Switzerland; in Italy. A great many were from Germany. A note of international friendship was sounded by a package from the President of Peru to President Roosevelt, designed for Mr. Roosevelt's own personal use. The President immediately forwarded the gift to the pool for the private use of our boys.

When the ordeal was over, there was comfort for the pharmacists in knowing that they had collected, sorted, and sent on the equivalent of more than 11,000,000 five-grain doses, which was enough to give 5,000,000 malarial patients their first dose of quinine, usually 10 grains.

There are other antimalarials now coming on the market in greatly increasing volume, but quinine was and is needed. Not all malarial patients react favorably to synthetics or substitutes.

Assistance to Members of the Armed Forces While on Furlough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, among the unpleasant and untrue rumors being spread by Axis propaganda, in order to lower the morale and create disgruntled feeling among our boys in the armed forces and their families, are rumors to the effect that the public, especially in big cities, is utterly indifferent to the boys' welfare. That when the boys are on furlough in big centers of population, such as right here in Washington, D. C., or in New York City or on the coast in San Francisco, these servicemen have no place to turn. Much has been said and much has been printed to the effect that they have no place to sleep, no place to get a bite to eat, no place to freshen up, and so on. So much has been said and written of this type of harmful propaganda that it has had its reaction in lowering of morale among the boys and their families.

I think it is time that it be pointed out that on the contrary, the public at large, the volunteer organizations, and private industry have stepped in and done a wonderful job in this respect in generally holding out the hand of friendship through providing places, comforts, conveniences, by giving, at private expense, facilities and conveniences that the Government cannot provide for men on furlough. Right here the War Hospitality Committee and Recreation Services, Inc., with all its affiliated groups, the Y. M. C. A.'s, the U. S. O.'s, the churches, the Red Cross, and other organizations have taken over and remodeled entire buildings and thrown them open for the free use of servicemen. One organization alone, the Pepsi-Cola Co., has donated and maintains completely at its own expense a large center here in Washington, D. C., at Thirteenth and G Streets, as well as two similar centers on Times Square in New York City and at Mason and Market Streets in San Francisco where 7,000,000 servicemen a year are taken care of.

While the operating staff—bus boys, dishwashers, and so on—are paid by the company for this work, it is the women of the community who help keep the centers going, and also other centers like the Stage Door Canteen, and so forth, by volunteering hours of their time every week to act as hostesses to the boys. They serve them hamburgers and soft drinks, mend their socks, sew on loose buttons, play the piano and sing with them, play checkers and card games or just talk, and keep the boys from getting homesick.

I maintain that our people have given thoughtful consideration and wise action to the problem of the servicemen on furlough, and that this side of the story should be brought out rather than the harmful tales to the contrary.

Water Comes First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune:

WATER COMES FIRST

Delegates to the Mississippi Valley association's convention in St. Louis heard encouraging accounts of the manner in which the great inland waterway is contributing to the war, and of plans to keep the waterway as a great industrial artery and the heart of a shipbuilding and shipping industry after the war.

Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, of the Maritime Commission, warned the inland waterways will have to carry a lot of freight after the war and counseled against allowing the inland shipbuilding industry to decay.

Questions of flood control to protect the valley's agricultural lands, and of a deep-water harbor at its mouth, in New Orleans, were also raised.

All of these matters have an important bearing on the future prosperity of the Middle West, and the wise counsel given at this meeting should be respected and followed. But ships cannot float without water, nor can they be built or launched without it.

All the Federal money that could be spent on dikes, dams, revetments, and lock houses will avail little if the diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois River is restricted to the present flow. If the diversion necessary to alleviate an epidemic is refused, how much water can shippers and shipbuilders expect in the name of commerce? Before any more Government money is spent on the inland waterway, and before any more ambitious post-war plans are made, there should be a real effort to get a larger quantity of water diverted into the Mississippi system.

Connecticut River—Enfield Dam Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 19, a hearing was held before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on the so-called Connecticut River-Enfield Dam project. At that hearing Gen. John J. Kingman testified that the War Department was buying power for Bradley Field, an air base in Connecticut, for 17½ mills from the Connecticut Light & Power Co. Today I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Robert H. Knowlton, executive vice president of the Connecticut Light & Power Co., from which I quote as follows:

For the year ending with September 1943 we furnished Bradley Field with a maximum demand of 893 kilowatts and 4,078,800 kilowatt-hours for which we billed the Government $55,951.20. It will be seen, therefore, that the average rate was 1.37 cents and not 1.75 cents as the newspaper reports the general testified. Also, contrary to his testimony, we own the substation at the Bradley Field site.

According to Colonel Bragdon's testimony on page 3 of the March 1941 hearings the estimated cost of the project to the Government was $12,410,000 and to local interests $683,000, based on 1937 construction costs. Based on estimated post-war costs, the cost to the Government of the project will be 10

percent higher than the 1937 estimate, or about $13,651,000 exclusive of transmission facilities necessary to deliver the power to Bradley Field. Assuming the accuracy of General Kingman's figure of a 4-mill-per-kilowatt-hour cost for Bradley Field power if secured from the Enfield project, the cost of power to Bradley Field for the 12 months ending with September would have been about $39,000 less than the charge by the Connecticut Light & Power Co., which would hardly justify the expenditure of $13,651,000. It is interesting to note, too, that all but about $7,400 of this $39,000 difference will be recouped in any event through the present Federal tax laws.

Mr. Speaker, I am also in receipt of a letter from Mr. Samuel Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co., in which he comments on three items of testimony presented to the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. I quote from Mr. Ferguson's letter:

1. Testimony: That the Hartford Electric Light Co. had previously bought Government power at 5 mills and was now selling to the Government at Bradley Field in wartime at 17.5 mills.

Facts: The Hartford Electric Light Co. has never bought Government power for 5 mills or at any other price. The Hartford Electric Light Co. is not selling power to Bradley Field at 17.5 mills or at any other price.

The Connecticut Light & Power Co. is selling power to Bradley Field but not at 17.5 mills. This figure is 30 percent higher than the actual figure of 13.5 mills covering all power used in the 12 months ending September 30.

2. Testimony: That the rates in Hartford are the highest and those in Holyoke are the lowest in the Massachusetts-Connecticut area.

Fact: We have made a careful and detailed study to find the effect on our revenue if we should adopt Holyoke rates in place of those now in effect. The result of such a change would be to increase our revenues by considerably over a quarter of a million dollars per annum.

3. Testimony (Gen. John J. Kingman): That Bradley Field was leased from the State for 25 years.

Fact: The lease is on a year-to-year basis with automatic termination at the end of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to insert as part of my remarks a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Sunday Courant of October 24, 1943, entitled "That Enfield Dam Project." I have such confidence in the good judgment of the members of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee as to feel certain that this proposal will not be favorably acted upon by that committee.

The editorial follows:

THAT ENFIELD DAM PROJECT

Congressman MILLER expresses confidence that the Enfield Dam project will again be defeated, either in committee or on the floor of the House. Nothing new has been said in behalf of this proposal to put another dam in the Connecticut at Enfield, construct there a hydroelectric plant and provide theoretical navigation to Springfield, all at an estimated cost of $14,000,000. Nothing new can be said. It is a project that cannot stand on its merits, representing as it does an utterly unwarranted expenditure of public funds.

As a power development it rates no better than a joke. According to the testimony of Army engineers, less than 6,000 kilowatts could be generated under the most favorable conditions, and there is not the slightest need to augment the more than 600,000 kilowatts now available to Connecticut consumers. It is not contended by anybody that there is either a present or prospective power shortage here.

The only possible excuse for the project is that it would provide a yardstick with which to measure the cost of supplying electrical energy. That excuse has no validity. The public utilities commission of this State already knows all that is to be known about the cost of producing electricity, either by water power or steam power, what it costs to transmit the current generated, and what is a fair charge for it. All of this is a matter of record, and it is as senseless as anything could be even to talk about this proposed Enfield development as a yardstick.

On the basis of the Army engineers report it will cost $7,732,000 to produce 5,900 kilowatts of power from this proposed Enfield development, or $1,310 a kilowatt. Yet at a total cost of $4,200,000, the Hartford Electric Light Co., has installed a steam power unit producing 45,000 kilowatts—a cost of only $93 a kilowatt. That in itself explains why no private utility company has ever thought it worth its while to harness the little power available at Enfield. If it is not good business for a private utility to spend nearly $8,000,000 to get 5,900 additional kilowatts, when for half that expenditure it can get 45,000 kilowatts out of a steam plant, it is certainly not a good business for the Government to engage in at the expense of already hard-pressed taxpayers.

As for the navigation tie-up with this hydroelectric scheme, no commercial demand exists for extending the river channel above Hartford. To provide a 12-foot channel with two locks to enable navigation to reach Springfield would entail a cost, so the Army engineers report, of close to $6,000,000. It is admitted that about the only possible use to which navigation could be put would be for the transportation of petroleum products. But pipe lines now carry oil from Providence to Springfield and Hartford storage plants and, should they need additional pipe lines, they are in a position to install them. No, there is nothing to the navigation end of this Enfield foolishess. It does not justify a single cent of Federal expenditure, which means, of course, an additional expenditure by the taxpayer.

With these facts fully available to Congress, Representative MILLER of Connecticut merely pays tribute to ordinary common sense when he predicts that this Enfield hydroelectric and navigation humbug will once more be kicked out.

Post-war Foreign Policy Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Post-war Foreign Policy Resolutions, by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today a debate began in the United States Senate which is of supreme importance to every citizen in America, if not to every person in the civilized world.

The part the Senate plays today and in the days which shall immediately follow is ably set forth in a splendid editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning. I quote the first paragraph of that editorial:

"The Senate has an opportunity this week to make its voice heard around the world. What is more, it can make its voice ring down through the corridors of history, for the Senate is undertaking to tell mankind what will be the attitude of the United States toward the maintenance of peace when this greatest of all wars has been victoriously concluded. Senators who rise from their seats to discuss this issue may well be staggered by the responsibility that is theirs. Their words and votes will in large measure shape the fate of the Nation, involving as it does, the lives, welfare, and happiness of millions of citizens."

Determined that the Senate should take its proper place and exercise its constitutional power to advise, four of us introduced a resolution nearly 8 months ago, by the terms of which we sought to have the Senate declare strongly and without evasion for the establishment of machinery and procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. In that resolution we also suggested a military force. We strongly believed then the only hope the world has for peace is in some method and means to settle disputes and differences peacefully without recourse to war.

Without adequate means of settling disputes among nations, except by force of arms, unending wars are inevitable. They will continue with all the horrors, bloodshed, and death. To provide some substitute for war, we urged in our resolution and we urge today through amendments which we shall offer to the resolution now being considered, that our own country take the lead and, in cooperation with other nations, set up that necessary machinery and procedure to settle differences according to law and justice and not by military might and power.

Those of us in the Senate who insist upon laying foundations upon which a world structure for peace may be built are not alone in our efforts. Great peace organizations in this country work constantly in behalf of such a program. Many other organizations, civic groups, fraternal associations, and even political committees have strongly endorsed the principles for which we contend. According to every poll and every expression of public sentiment possible to obtain, the people of America have overwhelmingly voiced their approval of such procedure.

Only recently the three great religious groups—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—joined in a statement of principles to which every nation in the world should subscribe. May I read you the fifth paragraph of that declaration? In a few brief words it sets forth our own aims and purposes:

"An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

Believing steadfastly in the immortal principles announced in the joint declaration which I have just read, it would seem that I and others of like mind would be immensely pleased with Senate Resolution 192 recently submitted to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Unfortunately, such is not the case. We had hoped for a much clearer and stronger expression from the Senate committee, which should be the leader in all matters relating to foreign policies. The Senate resolution, after declaring for complete victory in war and for a just and honorable peace—statements with which no person would disagree—the committee resolution says, and I quote:

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Frankly, the language I have just quoted appears to be so vague and indefinite that many of us are puzzled and perplexed as to what it means, and are profoundly disturbed at implications which may be drawn from it. Now is no time for vague and indefinite statements. Senators should know just what is proposed; the people of America and the nations of the world have a right to know clearly just what is meant. Its meaning should not be left to interpretation or construction.

Eliminating just now from this discussion the words "constitutional processes" and also the words "free and sovereign nations," let us examine the words which pretend to give life and meaning to the language of the resolution. If life and meaning appears anywhere, it must be in the words "establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The words "to preserve the peace of the world" are so broad and general they add but little, if anything, to the resolution. Germany and Japan both solemnly assert that every action they have taken has been to preserve the peace of the world. Then we are left almost exclusively to the words "establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression." These words seem to some the whole substance of the resolution. Manifestly they are subject to almost any kind of interpretation. They may mean all or they may mean nothing. The interpretation and construction placed upon them will depend altogether upon the viewpoint of those who construe them. This may well account for the fact that 20 out of 22 Senators on the committee voted in favor of the resolution. Each Senator must have interpreted the resolution according to his own point of view and what he wanted it to mean, for on that committee will be found men of widely different and violently opposed views as to our relations with other countries.

Such ambiguity and lack of definite statement constitutes a real danger at home and may well provide genuine misunderstanding abroad. For instance, not a word is said about peaceful settlement of disputes. "Power" is used as the vital word. While the word "power" has many meanings, the ordinary concept raised in the minds of most people is might, force, and strength. Before me now I have three closely typed pages setting forth various definitions of the word "power." Included in those many definitions can be found almost any meaning desired. Doubtless, some members of the committee believed it general enough to include force, peaceful settlement of disputes, and even organization of nations. Therein lies the vice of the resolution. Almost any meaning can be read into this language. We fear that every definition will be found and will be read into it. Not only our own people, but peoples of the other nations may rely upon their own interpretations and constructions and that reliance may not be well founded.

In that sense the resolution may have the effect of being downright deceptive, although it is not so intended. Those who believe in a strong international organization may embrace these words and claim the resolution as the full realization of every fond hope and dream. Those who believe in a political and power alliance alone may with equal enthusiasm and with just as much, if not more, reason, also embrace the same identical language and say, "Here at last is the declaration I have long hoped my country would adopt." And those who want nothing at all can say that it is only a meaningless jumble of words, and, therefore, anyone can safely vote for it.

If only ordinary matters were involved, this indefinite language might not matter greatly. But the consequences now are too many, the effects too great, to permit such confusion to exist. The committee resolution should be clarified. It must have purpose, aim, and direction; otherwise this country, which ought to assume leadership in a straightforward, forthright manner, may actually lead our own people and the peoples of other nations around and around in an endless circle of fog and uncertainty, perhaps into confusion and disaster.

To clarify the committee resolution, we propose an amendment which would provide for "an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The words we use are plain words; they are plainly spoken; they cannot be misunderstood.

Sons of America bravely face bullets and death on the battlefields of the world; dare we be less brave in a battle of words and phrases, but behind which may rest the peace and security of the whole world in the years to come?

Texas Natural Gas Should Be Kept and Used in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Texas Natural Gas Should Be Kept and Used in Texas," by a very distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. W. N. Blanton, executive vice president of the Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposal to transport to the Appalachian industrial area an enormous quantity of natural gas daily from the State of Texas is the most specific and dangerous threat to Texas' industrial future yet suggested. The project is a menace to the economy of Texas from a variety of angles, among which the following are outstanding:

A. The huge daily withdrawal of natural gas will inevitably reduce ground pressure to the point where oil wells will fail to produce because of the withdrawal of the element that forces petroleum through the oil-bearing sands to developed wells. Reduction of pressure will cut down production. Eventually the flow of oil will cease and oil production in affected fields will become a matter of history. This situation has been frequently demonstrated to the point where gas pressure and oil production are so intimately associated as to be inseparable. Diversion of great quantities of natural gas has the implications of a State and National catastrophe.

B. Another vital factor lies in the menace of severe reduction in Texas' fuel supply. This State depends on natural gas for domestic and industrial gas, having no deposits of commercial quality coal. On the contrary, the Appalachian industrial areas are in immediate proximity of huge reserves of bituminous coal. To take natural gas from Texas to the Tennessee area for use in place of coal simply robs Texas of irreplaceable fuel supplies for the benefit of another area which possesses huge deposits of fuel. This proposal is uneconomic in maximum degree.

C. A primary asset of Texas is its natural gas reserves. Any proposal to export this asset to another area, already amply provided with fuel of excellent quality and in huge quantities, is economically absurd, a distinct threat to the future of this State and unfair in all its implications.

Inasmuch as the servicing of the Appalachian area with natural gas from Texas is likely to eventually involve the investment of large sums of public funds through Government loaning agencies, the anomaly will be presented of the State of Texas paying in part for a project which will seriously menace its industrial development and threaten its status as a petroleum-producing area.

Assembling the factors entering into this subject, the picture is as follows:

The gas reserves in this area are quite limited and by no means comparable in size to those in the Panhandle area.

At least one-half of the gas reserves in the Gulf Coast area are associated with oil, a situation entirely different from that of gas reserves in the Panhandle and midcontinent, which are largely unassociated with oil. From the standpoint of conservation, gas associated with oil cannot be considered as available for present sale except incidentally to the orderly production of oil.

The addition of another 200,000,000 cubic feet per day of gas withdrawals in the south Texas area to the rapidly increasing demands related to war work of local industries will inevitably hasten and increase wasteful use of gas, which will result in a loss in ultimate recovery of oil, as well as gas. Demands for natural gas in this area have increased greatly within the past year, due to the expansion of refinery operations to manufacture petroleum war products and the construction of large new chemical and magnesium plants. Tremendous further demands will result within the next few months due to completion of many synthetic-rubber plants and expansion of the aviation-gasoline program. There are indications that the industrial demands for gas in this area will continue to increase in the post-war period and will require the full volume of gas that can be produced without waste in adjacent fields.

The Texas Gulf Coast area is highly dependent upon petroleum and gas as fuel for industrial and civilian uses. Excessive withdrawals of these resources will lead to waste and hasten the day when the area will become dependent upon imports of high-cost

fuel substitutes such as coal. This would be a serious handicap to the industrial life and economic future of the region.

The waste of gas and oil is a matter of particularly serious concern now, because it appears that the limited reserves are being depleted very rapidly. The situation is such that Government officials have given support to projects for the development of processes to manufacture gasoline from coal. In view of the importance of gasoline to our economy, and the limited supplies of crude, it is necessary to consider the future sources and cost of providing substitute gasoline.

The petroleum industry considers gas as part of its oil reserve, which will ultimately be used to meet gasoline demands. The president of the American Chemical Society has estimated that motor gasoline can be made from natural gas at 6 to 9 cents per gallon, only slightly above the present cost from crude oil, and only 40 percent of the cost from coal. Therefore, from the standpoint of national welfare it will prove much more advantageous to conserve existing gas resources for primary use in order to prolong the period in which low-cost motor gasoline can be made available to the public.

Passing of Monarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial from the New York Journal-American of October 23, 1943, entitled "The New Monarchs," and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW MONARCHS

One of the most interesting byproducts common to both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 has been the progressive deterioration of the institution of royalty. With little more than passing notice families and hierarchies which for centuries claimed to rule by divine right have dropped from the head of the procession to places of almost complete anonymity in the passing parade. One form of monarchy has almost faded out of world consciousness under the impact of the doctrine that all men are created free and equal and that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. Simultaneously, however, a new type of despotic monarchy, masquerading under the forms of democracy and paying lip-service to the people as the source of power, has been and is spreading over the earth at an alarming pace.

Less than 30 years ago, William of Hohenzollern, addressed as the all highest, issued the imperial edict launching the attack on Belgium and France. Czar Nicholas, of the House of Romanoff, gave the order for the Russian legions to cross into East Prussia. Franz Joseph, of the Hapsburg line, had already sent his Hungarian and Austrian hussars across the borders of the dual monarchy.

Today, the Hohenzollerns, the Romanoffs and the Hapsburgs scarcely rate a paragraph in the news. The Bourbons of Spain are trying to lobby their way back into power; the House of Savoy in Italy must await the verdict of the people at the conclusion of the war; Carol of Rumania haunts the night clubs of Mexico City while his son leads a precarious existence as a puppet; assorted refugee monarchs wonder what the future holds. This is but the European scene.

In Egypt, ancient Persia, and India the native kings and princes occupy their thrones by sufferance and during good behavior. Good behavior is exemplified by a prompt and complete compliance with instructions from alien authority. In Asia, the King of Siam and the Emperor of Manchukuo furnish a secondary comic relief to the great Oriental farce in which Hirohito, the Son of Heaven, blinks owlishly as he carries out the instructions of the military autocrats kow-towing before him.

Only in those lands in which the royal house has long since surrendered any right to interfere with the processes of popular government does the occupant of a throne enjoy any prospect of continued tenancy.

This amazing panorama, coupled with a widespread ignorance of the meaning of the word monarchy, has led to almost universal acceptance of the idea that the people in the respective nations control their own destiny.

In his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Gibbon pointed out that wherever the command of the army and control of the public funds are actually exercised by the same person, such a state is a monarchy notwithstanding it might be given some other designation.

No informed person will question the fact that Mussolini, Hitler, Tojo, and Stalin have been monarchs in the real meaning of the term, even if they pretend to hold power and govern in conjunction with a Grand Council, or a Reichstag, or a Diet, or a Congress of Soviets. In connection with these figures the interesting fact is that even they have deemed it necessary to keep alive the fiction that they are responsive to the people.

However, the most insidious undermining of popular government is not taking place in the domains of any of these rulers but in the homelands of democratic principles.

Several years before the issue of bureaucracy became acute in the United States, Lord Hewart of Bury, the Lord Chief Justice of England, who occupied his exalted office from 1922 until his death a few months ago, published a book entitled "The New Despotism."

When it is recalled that Lord Hewart was a member of the Liberal government of Lloyd George, this remarkable volume should command the respectful interest of all people who believe in freedom and are fighting to preserve it.

In his treatise on the growth of the power of bureaucracy in England, Lord Hewart wrote in 1929:

"That there is in existence, and in certain quarters in the ascendant, a genuine belief that parliamentary institutions and the rule of law have been tried and found wanting, and that the time has come for the departmental despot, who shall at once be scientific and benevolent, but above all a law unto himself, needs no demonstration.

"The bureaucratic despot we already have."

With reference to the methods used by the old kings and the new despots to get power, he wrote:

"In those days the method was, defy Parliament—and it failed. In these days the method is to cajole, to coerce, and to use Parliament—and it is strangely successful. The old despotism, which was defeated, offered Parliament a challenge. The new despotism, which is not yet defeated, gives Parliament an anesthetic. The strategy is different, but the goal is the same. It is to subordinate Parliament, to evade the courts, and to render the will or the caprice of the executive unfettered and supreme."

Thus spoke the late Lord Chief Justice of England in relation to a bureaucracy which was meek, humble, and law-abiding in comparison with its American counterpart. He might have been discussing the current situation in this land of the free when he wrote the observation:

"Much toil, and not a little blood, have been spent in bringing slowly into being a polity wherein the people make their laws, and independent judges administer them. If that edifice is to be overthrown, let the overthrow be accomplished openly. Never let it be said that liberty and justice, having with difficulty been won, were suffered to be abstracted or impaired in a fit of absence of mind."

Let's Fight the Axis Instead of Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months our armies have made tremendous progress toward the winning of the war. We have won Italy over to our side. German cities have been severely damaged. The Japanese are beginning to get theirs in the South Pacific.

But here at home, folks have been spending their time condemning our allies. If we spent half the energy trying to resolve our differences which we are spending in magnifying them, they would disappear.

Right now is the time for us to stop criticizing the British, the Russians, and the Chinese and to start working together. Right now is the time for us to quit the subtle process of back-biting and fault-finding directed against England, Russia, and China, in favor of a real effort to understand and sympathize with our allies.

The thousands of words attacking British imperialism, Russian communism and so-called Chinese reactionaries, are neither winning the war nor contributing to peace. The sly propaganda which tends to undermine our united front may cost thousands of lives by driving us apart.

In one word, this is the time for us to fight the enemy and stop fighting our friends. The sooner our intellectuals and our hatemongers stop their private war, the sooner we shall win the real war and begin to build a worth-while lasting peace.

What America Needs Most Is a Thorough House Cleaning in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered last night over the National Broadcasting Co., entitled "What America Needs Most Is a Thorough House Cleaning in Washington," and that a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 86 bearing on the subject be printed immediately following my speech.

There being no objection, the address and Senate joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. and its affiliated radio stations for making this radio time available to me. I also want to say that I believe the people of the United States as a whole and the Congress of the United States, both Republicans and Democrats, have given and will continue to give 100 percent support to those who are charged with providing the leadership to fight the war in which we are now engaged to a successful conclusion. I believe the President of the United States has, from the people and from the Congress, 100 percent support in carrying forward our war effort. I think the people of America are satisfied with the strategy that has been adopted and carried out by our armed forces and, thank God, the war is being conducted by the generals and not by the Washington bungling bureaucrats. But I also want to say, very emphatically, that I think the people of this Nation are very much displeased with the way the bureaucrats are handling our domestic affairs. I shall therefore confine my remarks this evening to a discussion of the muddled conditions on the home front. I think the controversy which is now raging throughout the United States about conditions on the home front has been brought about because of the fact that we have in high places in Washington a bunch of Communists and "fellow travelers" who are trying to use the war effort to camouflage their main objective, which is to convert the domestic economy of our Nation into a communistic or socialistic state. And bear in mind, this centralization of power has not all been done on account of the war. It started about 10 years before we got into the war and they are using the war emergency as a guise to finish the job of centralizing power and communizing America.

When this Nation was plunged into war, these fellow travelers and Socialists did not have to come to Washington, they were already here. Many of them were occupying key places in the Federal Government. When war was declared the people of the United States had already begun to realize that they had been blindfolded and led into national socialism and a small reaction had already started in the Congress reflecting the disapproval of the 10 years of gradual growth of socialism, communism, and collectivism in our Federal Government. These smart fellow travelers, who hover around the throne in Washington, were quick to sense this reaction of the American people; these governmental termites sought to bore deeper into strategic places where the domestic economy of this Nation was being handled, and while the leopards have not changed their spots, they have tried to camouflage their spots. Under the guise of war emergency we have seen efforts started in almost every field of domestic activity to use the war effort as a means to entrench in power these governmental bureaucrats who thus far had been unable to make a finished job of selling America on the ideas of communism and socialism. So today the battle is on, and it is a real battle, being fought by constitutional American citizens to recover and preserve for ourselves and our posterity the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States. It is a battle designed to reestablish in America a government of law by the people instead of a government of edicts by bungling bureaucrats. People are beginning to ask: "What shall it profit us if we destroy dictatorship abroad only to establish dictatorship here at home?" It is my deliberate opinion that unless the people of the United States rally to the cause and unite on a campaign of a thorough housecleaning in Washington the time is not far distant when through the power of the vast Government boards and bureaus, backed up by the power of the public purse, State government will be destroyed, local government will become a meaningless term, free enterprise will be a thing of the past and we will become the directed and regulated slaves of a highly centralized Federal Government. We will have in America the type of dictatorship which we are now fighting to destroy in Europe.

I think the time has come for the American people to get back to the fundamentals of Americanism, as set up by our forefathers, and declare themselves most emphatically that in our domestic affairs there is no place in America for communism, socialism, or any of the other foreign "isms" built around collective dictatorship. I say to you it is my opinion that the only hope for this country is to reestablish in America, government in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Constitution of the United States where the powers of government are exercised by the three departments of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. It is my most sincere belief that unless this be done, and unless it be done now, your children and my children will never know what it is to live as free American citizens, each to carry his or her own responsibility in the affairs of life. This disease of communistic bureaucracy which has been slowly spreading like creeping paralysis over the free institutions of this Nation, is a deadly disease and the patient faces a crisis. It is time to use drastic remedies and I therefore propose drastic remedies, but the remedies which I propose are in line with the sound and tested principles upon which democratic government is based. The very foundation of this Government was laid on the principle of a Federal Government with limited powers, a government not built around men, but a government built around law, based on fundamental principles. United States history is full of solemn warnings of our wise ancestors proving that it was never presumed when the present Constitution was adopted that the time would ever come in America when the people of this Nation would elect men to public office and keep the same ones there the remainder of their lives. With a rapidly expanding population which has grown until it is now more than 130,000,000 people, with the facilities of education developed as never before developed in any other nation in the world, surely we are not so short on good men that we must allow the same old cronies to stay in Washington year after year and term after term, almost perpetually and eternally as do the kings of dynasties in the old country.

Now, my friends, I say to you that the people of this Nation have left the control of the affairs of government so long in the hands of pussyfooting politicians whose constant thought is reelection, reelection, and reelection, until the banner of reelection has almost superseded the Star-Spangled Banner. The dangerous disease of Communism, Socialism, and collectivism has secured such a strong foothold that we do not have time now to begin slow treatment of all the symptoms; what we need to do now is to apply a good strong dose of the principles of constitutional government directly to the source of the disease. If the people will do this, then through the orderly processes of the three departments of government as originally framed in the Constitution of the United States, all of these various and sundry evils under which most of our people are suffering today will be corrected. I express to you as my considered judgment that the greatest remedy to bring about this corrected condition is to limit to 6 years the term of service of each and every Member of the United States Senate, of the House of Representatives, also the President and the Vice President. I have introduced in the Senate such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. My friends, I am not criticizing the present occupant of the White House nor am I criticizing any man now serving in the House of Representatives or in the Senate. This constitutional amendment which I am proposing would place the same limit on me regarding reelection as a United States Senator that I am seeking to impose upon all others who are serving. I have studied the situation here in Washington carefully for 2 years and I think I have put my finger on the sore spot. I am convinced that if you leave any man in Washington long enough, he will lose contact with the people whom he is supposed to represent; he will become subservient to the bureaucrats who are the dispensers of hundreds of thousands of Federal jobs; he will constantly have in his mind not how he may best serve the great rank and file of the people, but his one thought will be how he may gesticulate and gyrate so as to insure his reelection, reelection, and reelection.

We have developed in Washington a situation where the executive department of Government through the use of Federal patronage and taxpayers' money has made the Congress of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives, its subservient slaves, and you are not going to reestablish real, true, and tried democratic government in this country until this system is broken up. And there is only one way to break it up and that is for the people of this Nation to break up this Washington dynasty club by limiting to 6 years the term of service of every elected Federal official so as to guarantee that nobody can stay here long enough to help build up and become part of any ruling clique or class in America. This will positively prevent a condition from developing where the bureaucrats and the public officials will look upon themselves as the masters and upon the people as the servants, as they now do. It is time to get back to the kind of government provided for in the Constitution of the United States, where the people are the masters and the public officials are the servants, and I warn you, you are not going to get back to that kind of government until you conduct a thorough house-cleaning in Washington at the polls in 1944. I say to you that if the people of the United States will retire to private life the President, the Vice President, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives when they have served as much as 6 years, they will break up this system of bureaucratic bungling and patronage dispensing which is destroying the very heart of our democracy. It is absolutely necessary that this correction be made if we hope to salvage any of our great democratic Government before it is entirely beyond re-

demption, and it is my honest opinion that this is the only way it can be accomplished. You will never solve the problems which this Nation faces by electing to public office either all Democrats or all Republicans, but you can solve the problem by electing individuals regardless of whether they claim to be Democrats or Republicans, who believe in the fundamental principles of the Constitution and who are willing to fight for those principles, and then not permit them to stay in office long enough to team up with each other and create a powerful ruling dynasty.

Now, friends, of course the present Members of Congress may not approve my constitutional amendment and thus disqualify themselves for reelection, but if the people of the United States will retire to private life as rapidly as they come up for reelection every man who has served as much as six years, and elect new members of Congress committed to writing into the Constitution a permanent inhibition against elected public servants serving more than six years, I will guarantee that it will not be long before you will begin to have government of the people, by the people, and for the people, instead of having government of, by and for the professional politicians, the patronage dispensing bureaucrats, and the permanent officeholders, all of which constitutes the great Washington, D. C.—meaning Washington Dynasty Club. In closing let me sound this solemn truth: We have in America today more than 130,000,000 people, we spend money by the billions to educate our citizens and have the best educational system of any nation on earth. If it be true that out of this 130,000,000 people we cannot, every 6 years, find just one person who is competent to be our President, and only 531 persons who are competent to fill the places in the House and the Senate, then we should admit that democratic government is a complete flop, and that the people are not competent to rule themselves. If you do not want conditions to go on in Washington as they have been going, and as they are now going on, then let us have a thorough house cleaning in Washington in 1944. Let's give the present Washington officials an opportunity to go back home to civilian life and try to make a living under the laws they themselves have passed I would like to hear from all you folks who are interested in this subject. Your views will be greatly appreciated. As long as our supply lasts, copies of this speech will be mailed to all who write me. I will broadcast on another network Thursday night at 6:30 p. m., eastern war time. This is Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, speaking from your Nation's Capital. Goodnight and may God bless each and every one of us.

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the tenure of office of President and Vice President of the United States and Members of Congress to 6 years and imposing limitations on the appointment or election of certain persons to office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The term of office of each President of the United States and of each Vice President of the United States elected after the date of this article takes effect shall be 6 years; and no person who shall have served as President or Vice President shall be eligible for election to the office of President or the office of Vice President.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be eligible for election or appointment to the office of Senator or Representative in Congress for any term which, if served by such person, would cause the aggregate service of such person as a Member of either or both the Senate and the House of Representatives to exceed 6 years.

"SEC. 3. Nothing contained in section 1 or section 2 of this article shall be construed to prevent any person who may hold the office of President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative in Congress, during the term within which this article is ratified from holding such office for the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States who holds, or who shall have held within 5 years next preceding the date of such appointment, the office of Senator or Representative in Congress or of judge of any court under the authority of the United States, but nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the appointment or assignment of a person who holds the office of judge of a court under the authority of the United States, to the office of judge of any other court under the authority of the United States.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The Connally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We Are On Our Way," by Barnet Nover, from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

(By Barnet Nover)

Like a rubber blanket, the Connally resolution regarding American post-war policy is capable of being stretched to cover a great variety of strange bedfellows, but is too cold and clammy to warm any of them.

It bears the name of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is anything but an isolationist; but it also has the approval of certain Senators who are nothing else but.

It can mean all things to all men. Properly implemented, it can prove to be, as Senator CONNALLY says it is, a "forward step" significant of an "advanced and responsible attitude toward foreign relationships." As it stands today, however, it is a draft on a bank unendowed with funds.

The Connally resolution consists altogether of only 65 words, of which 36 in all have to do with post-war policy. The third paragraph reads:

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

If this sentence is read hurriedly its meaning appears to be clear, namely, that if the committee's recommendation is carried out the United States will form part of an international body capable of suppressing aggression.

But a closer study of the resolution creates doubt whether this sentence must necessarily be interpreted in this fashion.

First of all, there is the stipulation that the United States act "through its constitutional processes."

What does this mean? Does it merely mean that before the President or anyone else can commit the United States to any specific program of action in international affairs, the Senate will have to give its approval?

If that is all that the clause was intended to mean, then it was unnecessary to include it. Obviously, any treaty or covenant the Chief Executive makes with foreign powers will be subject to the Senate's constitutional authority to approve or disapprove.

Or is the clause merely a pointed reminder that while the Senate is willing to be on its way, it doesn't yet know where it is going; that while it is willing to talk generalities of post-war cooperation, it is unwilling or unready at this time to commit itself beyond generalities?

If that is the meaning of the "constitutional processes" clause, then we are obviously back where we started from. For it will always be possible for a third of the Senate plus one, to say that while they believe in American participation in a program of enforcing peace, they are opposed to the particular plan that may be worked out.

This, in fact, is precisely what happened in 1919.

Only a handful of Senators at that time were opposed to a league. What more than a third of them were opposed to was Wilson's league.

Thus, on January 29, 1919, one Senator declared:

"I am very frank to say that if the President can return to the United States with a league of nations which does not relinquish our sovereignty and which in reality will be a preventive of future wars, I shall welcome most gladly and enthusiastically this great accomplishment."

The Senator who said that was, believe it or not, HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, who was so soon to discover that the league which Wilson brought back from Paris was not what he, JOHNSON, had had in mind at all.

Remembering the great to-do the Senate made about sovereignty in 1919, some will be excused for viewing with suspicion the clause in the Connally resolution which speaks of the United States joining with "free and sovereign nations."

Obviously since only free and sovereign nations can form part of an international order, the emphasis given on this clause in the resolution suggests that no arrangement must be made which restricts the freedom or impairs the sovereignty of the United States, the Senate, of course, determining whether it does or not.

Finally, the question arises as to just what is meant by "power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

This seems like full and complete abandonment of isolation. It may mean just that, although the rejection by the committee of the more precise and clear-cut Pepper and Wagner amendments raises doubts on that score.

It is obvious that in the effort to achieve unity the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sacrificed clarity. The suspicion will not down that the Senate resolution merely expresses Senate irresolution.

Army, Colleges, and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial from the New York World-Telegram, issue of Saturday, October 23, 1943, entitled "Army, Colleges, and Communism." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY, COLLEGES, AND COMMUNISM

Intelligent Americans have no doubts, we think, as to the need and purpose of the War Department's Allied Military Government School which aims to prepare Army officers for problems they may meet in taking over territory recaptured from the Axis.

But it is somewhat startling to hear that at the University of Pittsburgh A. M. G. School, an ardent pro-Communist writer and speaker was recently permitted to go so far as to tell commissioned officers of the United States Army that they must not "go into liberated lands with the idea of stemming people's revolutions already taking place."

This pro-Communist admonisher of American Army officers, as revealed yesterday in an article by Frederick Woltman, World-Telegram staff writer, is a columnist whom the Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, calls one of "the leading New York commentators." He has been a sharp critic of United States Army occupation policy. He is on the Communist forefront.

We hope the A. M. G. is thoroughly awake to the need of correcting and counteracting this sort of thing by strong, constant emphasis on the strictly factual, objective instruction in foreign ideologies and politics which is what Army officers should have most of, rather than propaganda, if they are to carry out the policies and orders of the United States Government to which they owe their sole allegiance.

It may do them no harm to listen occasionally to Communists, even Browder himself, provided they are made clearly to understand that such speakers are mere incidental "object lessons" in Communist doctrine and zeal, in no wise representing influence to which they, as Americans, need yield or direction they are expected to obey.

Something similar applies to the conditions disclosed by Mr. Woltman at Cornell University where Army cadets have complained that they are not only taught Communist principles but also indoctrinated therewith by the instructor in charge of all Russian area teaching in the Army special training program.

The propagandizing of this instructor, a follow-the-party-line pro-Communist, must be serious indeed, we think, when the Army course director deems it necessary to issue a warning that "the teaching staff has as its first responsibility the protection of the loyalty of Army men" and that instructors who "feel it necessary to express burning convictions about Russia or Badoglio or China" should at least explain "the personal and controversial nature of their views" to their trainees.

All of which shows that, in schools and everywhere else, we must be more than ever on our guard against propaganda masquerading as objective teaching.

Present intensified study of Russia is not only natural and legitimate but necessary. We need to be instructed. Nevertheless, we should be fools indeed to let the Communist Party take advantage of this to take possession, slyly but steadily, of the instruction.

Progress of the War and the Soldiers' Right to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secretaries of State, at the Coronado Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., on October 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most striking truth, looking at the world events of the hour, is the grim and tragic fact that everything in which we believe, everything we inherit, the problems of yesterday, the problems of today, and the problems of tomorrow are cast into this holocaust of war. This is the hour when every American should be conscious of cooperation and teamwork. Unity at this hour is priceless. Under no circumstances should that unity be destroyed by shallow words, partisan zeal, or selfish aims. If we can overlook local irritations even though some come through the mistakes of others, if we can forget the past and look this problem square in the face with a loyalty to God and country that knows no bounds, if we will continue to have faith and confidence in those who lead us in this global conflict, we shall shorten the war, we shall save the lives of thousands of American boys, we shall aid in limiting our national debt. We shall produce a victory in war and peace that will cast its beneficent shadow down through the ages.

I am pleading for the boys who are suffering and dying in the Arctic regions of the north, the jungles and infested swamps of the southwest Pacific, the deserts of Africa, and the highways of Italy, as they all march to that inevitable victory which must be ours.

I respectfully urge that the American people do not undermine the value of this conflict with some irritating, skeptical gesture which can only give comfort to our common enemy. I undertake to say that the entire world is watching the people of this Nation and our democratic methods. The friendly nations look to us in our way of life as a guiding light of the future; the enemy is anxious to exploit any of our weaknesses, and the more we quarrel on the home front, the greater opportunity it gives Goebbels and his propagandist group to raise the hopes and morale of the German people.

While today we still look into a precarious future, we have an ever-increasing faith in our final victory. Our problems are those of a gigantic effort in wartime. It should never be forgotten that we had no 20 years in which to prepare, as did the Germans and the Japs. We still count our war preparations in terms of short months and not in long years. But, even so, we have achieved a miracle in national cooperation for the winning of this savage conflict. Never in our national history have we as a people achieved such united strength for a single purpose—to defeat those who would seek to bring us slavery and servitude.

Since Pearl Harbor, that fiendish event which made Americans finally realize our unpreparedness, the forces of democracy were marshaled to carry the fight to all the battle fronts around the world.

We have recently backed the Attack in the Third War Loan. The goal was fifteen billions. But in these times we don't care for set goals or quotas. We fight to win. The Third War Loan will be in excess of eighteen billions; it may very well reach in excess of nineteen billions.

This Nation is giving its fighters the necessary ships and guns, the planes, clothing, and food. With all our home front trouble, our war production exceeds that of the combined production of our enemies. Our war equipment is of the highest quality and production records increase from month to month. We have not yet reached total heights. But the day is not far distant when a startled world will see almost impossible, or better, unbelieved heights reached.

Our men and women in the factories and on the farms are providing miracles.

Our labor in the main is loyal and both men and women of skill are working the long necessary hours to produce the matériel for war. Our farmers, too, continue to produce the necessary food for our fighting forces and our allies wherever they are fighting on this globe.

President Roosevelt has never dodged the problems of peace or of war. His warnings previous to Pearl Harbor, that the enemy would some day strike, and at that time too often challenged as mere guesses, are now seen in their true light. The American people do hate war, but we have come to realize we cannot withstand an enemy by remaining unprepared.

He still speaks to the Nation in a determined spirit to bring an end to those forces and personalities seeking to divide us, weaken us, and utterly destroy our liberties. Everything we have accomplished since the Japs struck is an indication of our determination to see this war through to victory.

Unconditional surrender means exactly what it says—that men shall be free to bring their voices and ideas to bear upon national and international problems. There shall be no more Hitlerized plebiscites where an individual has the fatal choice of either voting a "Ja" for a dictator or going to a concentration camp or before a firing squad. We are fighting for the right to express ourselves at any time and in any place. This is the freedom which democracy holds forth to humanity and is the reason why millions of our young men are fighting to maintain this freedom.

Since the earliest times, this Republic has looked upon the right of franchise as a citizen's first responsibility. We cannot help but take pride in remembering that in 1870 an amendment to the Constitution was adopted which reads:

"The right of citizens of the United States shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Let the nations now trying to defeat us point to anything within their own dictatorships which gives as great an opportunity

to humanity and for civilization. Of course they have no thought of this human endeavor. They are content to kill and to enslave.

Our schools and universities have taught democratic traditions and the youth of America in every generation is instilled with democratic principles Our way is to teach the increasing need of humanitarianism and decency, to carry civiliaztion forward. That of Germany and Japan teaches the direct opposite. Who can think of a more vicious, sadistic act than placing a time bomb in the Naples post office, where innocent people come to bring letters for their loved ones? If this building had any military value it could have been blown up. But that was not done; a time bomb had to be set so helpless people would feel the wrath of Hitler and the insane treachery of nazi-ism and fascism. Here was the kind of tragedy in which fiends delight.

Fortunately your shores have been free from these invaders, and we catch, from time to time, their deluded sympathizers. But nothing shall stop us in bringing destruction to those who would bring us even their time bombs in the form of "divide and conquer" tactics. We are a Nation of people at work with one will—the will to win.

Today we have millions of our younger men under arms. They are living and fighting in every part of the globe. Many are giving their lives for the freedom we all so highly cherish They are fighting in the swamps, the foxholes of the south Pacific, in the deserts, in the heat, and amidst the snows and ice of the far North. Wherever they meet the enemy, whether on land, in the air, or on or under the sea, our men are fighting to safeguard decency and democracy for this Nation whose people live by principle and goodness.

Our troops overseas and in the camps throughout the United States have all been taught the responsibilities of citizenship. In home, church, and school these men received the fundamentals on which this country was founded. No matter how far they are from home, or if they are in preparatory training, their voices must be heard. They are citizens under arms. Their ballots must be counted. Their decisions must be recognized. Patriotic mothers and fathers who are sending their sons into the armed forces are equally as determined that these men shall exercise their right of franchise.

There is no question of the right of these citizen soldiers to vote. This matter was settled at the time of the birth of the Republic It is said that every man who votes should bear arms; surely every man who bears arms shall have an opportunity to vote. Our problem today is to set up facilities so this voting opportunity is made possible. Any who see this problem in any other light are lacking in patriotic insight and judgment. We must not allow any obstacles to be put in the way of our work.

There can be no compromise with our democratic principles. Many of our younger men, who have reached the age of 21, anxiously await their first opportunity and privilege to help make decisions with their ballots. We cannot disappoint them. We must seek but one thing—a solution to facilitate the soldier to vote in a legal and efficient manner.

We face a national election in 1944. There is no time to lose in the individual States and in the Congress. We must not stand accused of disinterest. No soldier in these days hears or believes in anything like a job not being able to be done. He realizes somewhere there has been failure.

We all know that in September 1942 Congress passed a law which gave our soldiers means to vote. But this law was not effective. In many cases the election was over before a soldier's application was received. Many votes were received after the election was over. Likewise, we all know that millions of soldiers and sailors had no opportunity to vote at all.

I warn again that this same condition will exist in 1944 unless each and every one of us seek successful legislation and constructive methods to make voting possible.

Yes; I have heard the evasions put forth. The general view was "The time was insufficient. The soldiers were too far away." Now understand that these were reasons given by the Army and the Navy. Both of these hindrances can be taken into account. They are surely not insurmountable obstacles to a nation achieving results which we read about every day.

These are only a part of the larger problems dealing with the legal and physical facilities to permit a full vote at home and across the seas in 1944.

It must be evident to us all that in 1942 our armed forces were denied the right of a voice in the Government they were defending. I shall give you three reasons why the Nation has failed to give soldiers this opportunity:

1. The Congress of the United States was dilatory in the passage of this law.

2. The provisions of the 1942 act totally and utterly failed to give the man in the armed forces any real opportunity to cast a ballot for the candidates of their choice.

3. The officers of the Army and Navy were unsympathetic to the legislation, and therefore failed to cooperate with the men under their command in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Some months ago I broadcast to the Nation over the Blue network on this very problem. The result was letters, telegrams, and editorial comment demanding that Congress take action, that the Army and Navy become conscious of demands made by public opinion, and that election officials cooperate and do their utmost so there will be no repeated failure in 1944.

From the soldiers' letters I can summarize them all with the statement of a young corporal, who says: "I hope that you will make every effort to see we servicemen get a chance to vote. See to it for us, please."

One mother, the representative of millions of mothers who have given their sons to the service, wrote: "I hope you keep up your fight so that our boys have a chance to vote. You are right when you say we need greater cooperation on the part of Congress and the officers in the Army and Navy."

The officers do not cooperate. One boy has written that his commanding officer would give him no encouragement.

Of the many newspaper editorials which have reached my desk, this one from the Illinoian-Star, Beardstown, Ill., states it pointedly:

"Certainly it becomes the duty of the Government to do all in its power to give the service people their right to vote, and certainly the duty devolves upon these men and women to vote, to register their valuable opinions upon the important question of how their Government shall operate.

"Few will deny that the men doing the fighting to preserve a government require an equal voice in the conduct of the Government for which they stand ready to give up their lives."

We could spend hours in speculation, but we know the reasons why voting facilities were not made possible. We have had one test. It has failed to bring success. We need a working program. It is being demanded by public opinion, and we cannot dodge our responsibility. It is up to us to take the initiative.

With a full realization of the importance of making democracy work in time of war as in time of peace, the Honorable THEODORE GREEN, United States Senator from Rhode Island, and I introduced last June an amendment to the basic law which we deemed more efficacious in allowing the soldier, wherever he is, a better opportunity to vote.

In the introduction of the amendment, I specifically stated that those interested should send any constructive suggestions either to me or to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in order that nothing would be left undone in obtaining the proper mechanics to make this bill work. Following this, many suggestions came, the results being the amended bill which is now before every member of this convention.

Under the new draft of the bill which is now pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the United States Senate, and upon which hearings will open tomorrow in Washington, there will be established a United States War Ballot Commission composed of five members, including at least two Democrats and at least two Republicans, appointed by the President of the United States. The commission would be charged with the duty of generally supervising the administration of the Federal absentee balloting machinery established by this bill.

As originally introduced last June, the bill provided for V-mail balloting by those outside the United States. Studies show that the massing of a large number of ballots might clog the V-mail facilities, and thus prevent many ballots from being returned on time.

In addition, the charge was made that such legislation might be unconstitutional in that the secrecy of the ballot was voided. With this contention I could never agree. However, we have eliminated all of these contentions by stating that as the ballots are cast outside the United States they will be transmitted by airplane with a priority tag thereon. These ballots will come direct to the commission, who in turn will transmit them to the secretaries of States, who in turn will segregate and transmit them to the proper election officials in the county where the voter resides.

The bill as written today provides for distribution of simple write-in ballots to members of the armed forces outside and inside the United States. It is mandatory upon the officers in the camps wherever our soldiers are located to see that these boys receive a ballot and have an opportunity to mark it, seal it, and return it to the officer, who in turn certifies the number of ballots voted and sends them on to the commission.

It is important to note that the amended bill permits noncommissioned officers as well as commissioned officers to administer and attest oaths of electors. This provision will make the soldier feel more like voting; he has an opportunity to use the sergeant of his company as one who will attest his oath.

It should be remembered that this bill in nowise affects the State laws now in effect regarding the qualifications of voters. It does not in any degree keep the soldier from making application to his respective county clerk in the county where he resides for his absentee ballot. If the soldier should follow the latter method, obviously any other ballot cast for Federal officials only would be void, and the bill so provides.

It is well to remind you that the bill is extended to the members of the United States merchant marine and civilians outside the United States who are attached to the armed forces, or who are officials or employees of the United States.

My thought is that both political parties must be represented fully, adequately, and honestly on every ship, every island, every continent, wherever our boys carry the Stars and Stripes.

These men have been called from their peaceful pursuits of life. They have enlisted

in the emergency that threatened the security and sanctity of their home. They are fighting to keep the property of the American home from desecration and pillage. They have offered their all in the interest of free government. These men fall in a different category from professional soldiers. These men are citizen soldiers, ready to return to their homes and families when the bloody work of war is ended and victory is ours.

These men of the armed forces are scattered throughout the universe. Men from every State make up the various fighting divisions. No one is more interested in the future welfare of this Nation than those who fight for a cause that shakes the foundational stones of civil law and order. They are now absent from the polls of their several towns and precincts. They are beating back the power of those who would destroy the right to hold an election and to have the results respected and obeyed.

Gentlemen, if these citizen soldiers defending the Republic are denied a part in the civil administration of this Government, it is time to inquire, who is worthy of it? Most of these men are world-wise. They have seen other nations and their peoples at first hand. Their opinions and conclusions on social, political, and human problems are being molded through the ordeal of a global war. These men will soon control the destiny of this Nation. They should not, under any circumstances, be disfranchised in the most important national election since Abraham Lincoln was elected in 1864.

In conclusion I submit that under the Constitution there is no question but that the Congress of the United States has complete power and authority to enact legislation proposed in both of these measures. No doubt we shall hear the old question of State's rights raised in these issues. No one feels more keenly about the protection of the rights of States than I. I undertake to say, however, that the State's rights issues have been subordinated many times in the past for less worthy causes. If we are going to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare, it is the duty of those who enact legislation to see to it that every voter, regardless of the location of his post of duty, be permitted to vote.

And, gentlemen, you who represent a great administrative branch of Government in your respective States can do much to aid in this common cause. That the bill will pass is, in my opinion, a certainty. We of the Congress invite you, urge you, and respectfully request that you who are distinguished political leaders in your States take the lead in cooperating with the Federal Government and seeing that the soldier in 1944 has an opportunity to vote.

Address by Senator Robertson Before Pro-America Organization of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] before the Pro-America Organization of Women at Newark, N. J., on October 14, 1943. For all who are interested in the preservation of the American system of freemen, there is much food for thought in the address of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I come from a State which is known as the Equality State, and it is called the Equality State because ever since Wyoming was admitted to the Union there has been equality of suffrage in the State. You will therefore understand that women play a very important part in the political and economic life of that State and it is therefore a great pleasure to me to be here today as a Representative of the Equality State to speak to such a fine group of American women.

If this country is to save its American way of life, its constitutional form of government, and the free enterprise system on which that form of government rests and has grown and prospered, it must have the wholehearted cooperation of the women of the United States.

If we are going to save that "American way of life," it is necessary that we all take our coats off and go to work. You have gone a long way in bringing about a powerful and efficient organization. It is essential that you, who are interested, must have a unity of purpose on fundamental principles. You must waive all petty differences. It is true the hour is late, but it is not too late. If the American people can be brought to a realization of the necessity of this great and important duty, there is still time.

If this is a representative form of a democratic republic, then there is nothing more important in the lives of any of those present here today than to give sufficient time to the selection and election of representatives who believe in the United States of America—believe in our way of life—and who believe in the free enterprise system. If the free enterprise system is destroyed—as it will be unless you come to its defense—then the things you have known as human liberties will fade out of the picture. There is no case on record in the world where the free enterprise system has been destroyed if the people have retained their full individual freedom.

Let us not forget that liberty is freedom, but freedom is not free. Freedom is the most expensive thing in the world—and there is a reason why the people of the world are willing to pay the high price demanded for freedom. That reason is that it is the most precious possession of the human family. Where people have lost the freedom they had, they have been willing to pay almost any imaginable price—up to the sacrifice of life—in order to regain it. Let us not stand by and see it slip through our fingers.

There is so much to talk about in connection with your activities that it is impossible to touch on much of them in these few short minutes, but I would like to say that I hope pro-America means to you just what the words mean to me. They mean to me pro our "American way of life." Pro our form of government. And when I say this, I believe they differentiate between government and administration. There may be times when they are not pro any administration, but are still pro our form of government. Government is presumed to be permanent, and, under our system, administration is presumed to be only temporary. Pro-America agrees with Abraham Lincoln, and many other of our greatest men, in that they believe sound, sane criticism of administrative acts and course of direction is always proper in the interest of supporting, protecting, and making permanent our form of government.

Pro-America means to me pro our free enterprise system. It means pro corrections that are necessary to make that system work and continue fairly in the interest of all the people.

Pro-America can do its greatest work by not being partisan in politics. I am a Republican. I was elected to the United States Senate on the Republican ticket. I sit on the Republican side of the aisle, but I want you to know that if any Democrat stands up in the United States Senate and speaks for the things that I am speaking of to you, today, and believes in the things that you and I believe in, then I will support him. I believe that there never was a time in the history of this Nation when all the people should stand first for Americans—and then for party politics.

A two-party system is necessary in our representative democratic Republic, but we must support only those in either of our parties who believe in sustaining our American form of government and way of life and the free-enterprise system which has given to this Nation the highest living standard ever attained in the world for all the people who perform their full part under that free-enterprise system.

With eight other men, I was elected to the United States Senate last November, and with them I took the oath of office on January 6 of this year. We nine sit on the Republican side of the Senate. I am satisfied that there is not one who does not believe first and foremost in the things that you and I believe and the things of which I am speaking today, and that is why we are in the United States Senate today. Last November, the people of this Nation had come to a realization that our American way of life, our free-enterprise system, was in danger. Please don't think for one minute that because I mention to you nine men who sit on the Republican side of the Senate that there are not men on the other side, the Democratic side, who think as you and I are thinking today. There are. And among them are men who have the courage to get up and say so, who place their Americanism before party politics. Sincere men who place the winning of this war first and, right up with it, the winning back of our free-enterprise form of existence.

One of the ablest of these new nine is my colleague, your junior Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES. When I speak of the nine, I did not refer to them as Republicans but as sitting on the Republican side of the Senate. One of these nine—and I have the very great privilege of sitting next to him in the Senate—is the Honorable EDWARD H. MOORE, United States Senator from Oklahoma, a life-long registered Democrat, an American through and through, and a believer in every principle of constitutional government and the free-enterprise system of life.

How can we insure that those things we seek are preserved. The only way that we can make those things safe is at the polls. I am not going to make you a political speech, as I do not care whether you elect a Republican or Democrat, provided that the man or woman whom you elect to office, and no matter how humble the office, gives his or her pledge that, if elected, they will stand for and promote the things which you and I are talking of today.

Meetings of this kind are splendid. They are necessary, in order that you, who are the leaders in your States and communities, can get together, exchange views, organize and plan your campaigns, but the actual work, the work that tells, is in your precincts. As evidence, I want to tell you that in the last election in two States in the Rocky Mountain area, two votes, two extra votes, or the changing of one vote in each precinct of those States, would have meant the election of two men who think as you and I do

I don't need to talk to you women of organization. You probably have forgotten more about organization than I know, but I do want to impress on you the absolute

necessity of starting on the lowest rung of your political ballot and seeing that you vote for no one, Democrats or Republicans, who does not pledge himself to support the American way of life and free-enterprise system. This is necessary in your city elections, it is necessary in your county elections. It is of vital importance in your State elections and of transcendant importance in your national elections. You must, and I must, get the people thinking as we are thinking, and we need have no fear as to the result.

"I believe that the present system of administrative bureaucratic Federal control of every phase of our life is the main objective of our attack. In my State, small in population; but 220,000 in the entire State; it is a good State in which to live, and I say it is a good State in which to live, because it is well governed—a well organized State. It has been run by successive administrations—regardless of the political affiliations—in a businesslike manner. Our State government costs and expenses are not unreasonable. We have many fine institutions. Our educational system is one of which we can all be proud, from our country and grade schools to our high schools and to our fine university at Laramie. Our highway system is one which every citizen of Wyoming has a right to be proud. In order to take care of all these various functions of State, we—that is—the State—employ approximately eleven hundred people—1,100 people. I want you to bear this figure in mind because I am going to use it for comparison and to me it is an almost unbelievable comparison. The figures I am going to give you are those reported to the United States Senate by Senator BYRD's committee and are therefore reliable. The comparison is, that while we have a total of 1,100 State employees, there are, in our State, 6,200 Federal employees. What do they do—what possible necessity is there for such a number?

Some of these 6,200 Federal employees are necessary and are fine men and women. We have our Federal judge—we have the Internal Revenue Department—Land Office and Post Office and other essential Federal operations. My remarks do not refer to these people. They are fine people and good citizens in the towns in which they live, but they are a small minority in the 6,200 to which I refer.

It was never the intention of the framers of the Constitution that hordes of Federal bureaucratic snoopers should invade the sovereign States of the Union.

You will recall that during the last session of Congress, the presidential veto of the Connally-Smith bill was overridden. It was my great privilege to cast my vote for the overriding of that veto. After the vote had been taken and the Senate had overridden the veto, I went to Senator CONNALLY of Texas, who was the father of the bill, and I said, "Senator, I want to congratulate you on the result this afternoon and tell you that I am proud and happy to be in the Senate at such an historic moment. It was historic in that it was the first time in the history of the Nation that a presidential veto had been overridden when the Nation was at war." Senator CONNALLY said to me, "Senator, I am happy and proud that you are here. I appreciate your vote and I want you to know that but for you nine men we could not have attained the result we have."

Labor leaders and labor politicians are reported to be starting a campaign to defeat Senators and Representatives who voted to override the presidential veto of the Connally-Smith bill and who are up for election in November 1944. Labor leaders and labor politicians are just one division or class of our people. During the last 10 years they have become a privileged class of the administration. They have obtained many special privileges and through their special privileges are trying to control the Government of the United States. I have the utmost respect for and I honor the laboring man who works and toils for his living, whether he belongs to a union or not.

As long as I am in the United States Senate, I shall place my vote against the control of the Government by any special interest, regardless of whether it is the labor leaders, the big corporations, the power companies, or any other special interest or bloc.

We nine, and I'm again referring to the nine new Senators who were elected last November, are the outward and visible sign of yours and of the people's determination to rid the country of a privileged type, to rid the country of the countless unnecessary bureaus and their personnel. You sent us to the United States Senate at Washington to do these things. You sent us to the Senate to get rid of the countless college professors and inexperienced lawyers who clog the whole Government set-up with their impractical ideas. You sent us to Washington as a protest against the billion-dollar Government by directive set-up—and remember that is your billion dollars—your hard-earned cash—every cent in the United States Treasury is your money—every dollar—every hundred dollars—every million dollars—every billion dollars—that this administration wastes or uses for its own political advancement is your money—your hard-earned cash—and they are demanding more and more of your money. Drive up Constitution Avenue in Washington some afternoon between 5 and 5:30 and see the crowds and crowds pouring out of every door of the big Government buildings. You would think that a World Series ball game had been going on in every building. Our only hope—your only hope—of ever stopping this mad scramble—this mad scramble for power and money—is to send to the United States Senate in November 1944, not 9 new Senators, but 19; all dedicated to the common ideal—a sane Government—a responsible Government—a Government of and for the people's interests—an American Government of free enterprise. We must eliminate every type of man whose concept of Government seems to be give and give away everything we have, everything we stand for, so that by so doing he can be perpetuated in office.

Well you may wonder, well you may ask, Where is all this leading up to? Where are we going? How long can our Nation stand this? Where is the end? What is the answer? I cannot tell you. No one can tell you where all this is leading us, no one can tell you how long our Nation can stand this, no one can tell you where the end of it all is, but I can tell you how you can stop it and the only way it can be stopped. It must be stopped, first, in the small precincts away out in the country where there are only 10, 20, 30, or 50 votes cast. You women in these outlying precincts must see to it that no one is elected to office who does not pledge himself or herself to oppose—tooth and nail—every Government wasteful expenditure in existence today—your brother, sister, your mother and father, your sons and daughters must do the same whether they are in the country precinct or in a small or large city. Once you have accomplished this in your county, then you must turn to your State. You must see that all the elective officers of your State whom you decide to elect give their most definite assurance and pledge, and I don't care whether they are Republicans or Democrats, but if you want to end this mad era we are living in, they must give their pledge that if elected they also will do all in their power to end for all time the reign of this incompetent tribe now holding Federal office.

Having taken care of your precinct, your county, and your State, you have laid the foundation to see that the National Congress you send to Washington is what you intend it to be—I know and you know, Americans of New England, Americans on the Atlantic coast, Americans in the Middle West, Americans in the South, Americans in the Rocky Mountains, Americans on the Pacific coast, Americans in Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and Puerto Rico, you know that if this country is to survive you must send to the United States Senate and to the House of Representatives those men and women who will work with us, who think as we do, who are determined to recapture for the Congress the rights and duties delegated to it by the Constitution. Send men and women to the Congress who care not whether they are ever reelected; it matters little whether they are Democrats or Republicans provided they will pledge themselves to a course of action which will return to Congress those powers which belong to Congress, and that if elected by the people, their interest will be the public interest—the United States' interest—the constitutional form of government and the free-enterprise system.

I wish you every success in building your organization to the point of strength where you can reach the understanding and cooperation of every patriotic American woman. I hope you will always see wisely in a broad way, and be able to avoid the pitfalls of differences on minor matters as related to the great fundamentals which are now occupying our attention.

We look to you American women to bring together in pro-America all those who are deeply interested—interested in the preservation of those sacred rights and privileges for those who follow us and for the millions as yet unborn.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors by Foreign Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the sale of intoxicating liquors by foreign groups, as proposed by Senate bill 1338. This statement was presented at a public hearing before the District of Columbia Committee on October 2, 1943, by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, superintendent of the International Reform Federation, who published it in the October issue of his magazine, Progress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we wish to express our appreciation for the courtesy extended in granting the organizations here officially represented, and the distinguished individuals who speak in opposition to a favorable report and passage of S. 1338, whose purpose is stated in its title: "The granting of beverage licenses in the District of Columbia to service clubs of other United Nations."

What we shall say here in opposition to the bill under consideration is said without prejudice to the United Nations or their citizens

included within the scope of this bill. If the act proposed was to extend similar privileges as those enjoyed by American citizens to deal in any other commodity, or to open additional outlets in our Capital City for the sale of groceries, dry goods, clothing, shoes, food, milk, meat or bread, we should raise no objection as we are constantly patronizing citizens of other nations, and buying goods when obtainable from the countries they represent.

Imported goods have always commanded a higher price in American markets, and so popular are they with American consumers that we have built a tariff wall around the Nation to keep them out, so as to induce our people to buy goods of American manufacture. If the object of S. 1338 were to promote the sale of either food, drink, or raiment of a recognized healthful and helpful character, there would be no objection, unless there already were an overplus of stores offering such commodities for sale, as is the case with liquor.

POISON VERSUS PEOPLE

It is neither the nations to be favored, nor their unnaturalized citizens which leads us to object to the bill under discussion, but the increase of a single additional place for the distribution and sale of intoxicating liquors, regarded by the laws of every nation, and the courts of every land, as in a class by itself, upon which high taxation and repressive legislation are imposed, and special police inspection and surveillance is required.

The sale of liquor, and places where it is sold, is not regarded as a municipal asset in any community. Officers are assigned to watch them for the protection of their patrons, and they impose a high rate of taxation upon any community in proportion to their number and lawful volume of trade in contrast to the great department stores covering an entire city block and reaching up to ten or more floors filled with necessary accessible merchandise. They employ a floor walker but have no need for a bouncer. They are not policed by the city nor are they a source of poverty, misfortune, broken homes, and crime.

THE BRAND OF CAIN

As for the liquor traffic in any form or wherever sold, the Supreme Court has said, "By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dram shop. The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than to any other source. It is a business attended with danger to the community. It is not necessary to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism, and crime which have their origin in the use and abuse of ardent spirits. Liquor in its nature is dangerous to the morals, good order, health and safety of the people and is not to be placed in the category with the ordinary commodities of life. We do not suppose there is a more important factor in keeping up the necessity for asylums, penitentiaries, and jails, and in producing pauperism and immorality throughout the entire country than liquor."

WASHINGTON WETTEST

We believe that with over 2,000 places where such intoxicants are now being sold, Washington has reached the point of saturation. The official Internal Revenue figures for 1942 show that the per capita consumption of distilled spirits in Washington is four times as great as it is in the country at large, and higher than in any other State in the Union. The frigid State of Maine stands lowest in the consumption of spirits with 1.11 point gallons, Massachusetts has 1.66, Utah 1.54, Wisconsin 1.37, and our neighbor, Virginia, 1.36. These are among the lowest.

Among the highest are Illinois 1.71 decimal; Delaware 2.09; Connecticut 2.62; Nevada, which stands at the top, being 3.54, until we reach the District of Columbia, where it reaches an all-time high of 4.42 per capita. The same holds good for beer, with Missouri 14 decimal, Illinois 18, New York and Nevada 21, Maryland 22, and District of Columbia 25 gallons per capita.

This is also proven by the number of arrests for intoxication. Where the consumption is highest, the arrests for drunkenness are greatest. The police figures per 100,000 of the population in 1,206 cities in 1941 were 1.716, and for Washington 2.805 in 1941, and 3.474 in 1942.

During the fiscal year of 1942 the Washington police records show a grand total, including arrests for drunken driving, of 31,045, including 2,136 drunken women, the worst showing of any American city. Of total commitments to the District jail of 20,905, 13,449, or over 65 percent were for intoxication.

It would seem that we have both a sufficent number of liquor outlets, per capita consumption, and arrests for intoxication without adding to their number any foreign liquor-selling clubs where servicemen of all countries, including our own, could buy additional intoxicants.

GOD HAVE MERCY

This would be true if our country were enjoying peace, and is doubly true when we are engaged in the greatest war of the ages, which we are told by military experts may continue for 4 or 5 years more, while the bill proposes to extend this special foreign license for 6 additional months after the termination of the war, "as determined by the President or upon such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate." God have mercy on us if we should have a wet Congress and a wetter President "after the termination of hostilities."

A WICKED WASTE

And this waste of food grains and money is proposed in the midst of the greatest war the world has ever known with our allies undernourished, and reported by Herbert Hoover as starving by the hundred millions, not only in the occupied territory, which we are sworn to liberate, millions in Greece, millions more in Poland, millions more in Great Britain, 50,000,000 now suffering from famine in India, and 100,000,000, ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed and dying in the city streets and hinterland of China. It seems like mockery to every claim of fighting for freedom from want, and freedom from fear, to add to our own waste of food, coal, gasoline, labor, and transportation by issuing to the nationals of those suffering countries permits to open up liquor-selling clubs where they can spend their substance in riotous living, and their labor for that which satisfieth not.

FOREIGN LIQUOR CLUBS

If there is a demand for these intoxicants there is a sufficient number of places now in operation where their appetites may be gratified and their thirst quenched which are conducted by Americans and their naturalized countrymen, and sold to all who are able to pay the price. No other one of the United Nations would think of issuing such liquor permits to citizens of the United States, or any other foreigners.

We have been told that there are only a few clubs who are making an application for a liquor license under this bill. One Senator wrote me yesterday only three or four, which is three or four too many, and we have no guaranty whatever that additional clubs will not be organized by the citizens of these countries of all South America—except Venezuela—Europe, Great Britain, Asia, and Africa, for the sole purpose of selling intoxicating liquors, and in all probability to create a market for such liquor to be imported by citizens of said foreign nations as proposed in H. R. 160, introduced in the House at about the same time as S. 1338 was introduced on the first day of the session of the Senate, one to open the gates to foreign-made liquor and the other to provide a market for their sale.

SCOTCH EXEMPT FROM SUBS

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, we do not need any additional importation of liquors from the United Nations. The largest single item of export trade from Great Britain to the United States at the present and for some considerable time has been Scotch whisky. Despite the shortage of shipping and the fifteen to twenty million tons of American shipping sunk by enemy submarines since our entrance into the war, we are importing 15,000,000 gallons of Scotch per year into the United States, every gallon of it consumed by Americans paying $15 into the English Treasury and costing the people of the United States at present retail prices over $250,000,000 per year. Costing us $10 per quart for what it cost 50 cents to manufacture. We would be $250,000,000 better off if the entire cargo were sent to the bottom of the sea. Instead our reciprocal Tariff Commission actually lowered the import duty.

SUBS AND SUDS

So far as we know, or have ever read, not a gallon of it, or a vessel loaded with it, has been sent down by German submarines. They would rather we would drink it than sink it! They know that every gallon of it consumed helps them to win the war. The English seem to have no difficulty in obtaining sufficient tonnage to export their whisky to the United States, while the exportation of refugee children ceased for lack of transportation facilities, and English fabrics are out for the duration.

Let us have a bill to stop the importation of Scotch for the duration and 6 months thereafter rather than to open the gates for individual foreign importation to be sold in licensed clubs under privileges denied to citizens of our own country, as these Siamese twins, H. R. 160 and S. 1338, propose jointly and with malice aforethought to do. Their joint conception, introduction, and promotion constitute a subversive conspiracy against the United States.

WET PARTIALITY

Mr. Chairman, what has the Senate Military Affairs Committee done in the direction of "further study" of S. 860, now the O'Daniel bill, and the Johnson radio bill, and the Capper advertising bills? Nothing! They lie in your Senate committees as dead as the mummies in the pyramids of Egypt. But this wet bill for which we are told there are only three or four applicants, by unidentified telephone, is introduced without notice on the opening day of Congress, reported out favorably the second day, and put on the calendar the third day! Why all this haste?

A VOTE OF THANKS

We deeply appreciate its return from the calendar to the committee, where we hope and pray it will lie in state until the day of judgment. To pass it in view of the embalmed dry legislation now in the Senate refrigerators would be adding insult to injury.

Subsidies and Roll-Backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein a speech delivered by me to the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O., on Sunday, October 24, 1943, at McKeesport, Pa., on subsidies and roll-backs:

Mr. Chairman, abroad the armies of the United Nations are fighting the Battle of Italy. Every day we read of acts of heroism which add to the glory of the American soldiers. Brave men are dying so that ultimate victory will be ours and the forces of fascism will be beaten to the ground.

While our boys are battling for every inch of Hitler-held ground, on the home front we are fighting another battle—the battle of subsidies. To some of you this may sound like double talk because you remember we had a battle of subsidies early this summer, just before the Congress recessed. The strange thing about that battle was that we—who fought for the use of subsidies to keep down the cost of living—we won. You will remember that Congress originally passed a bill which would prohibit the use of subsidies. The bill went to the President for his signature. He refused to sign it and returned it to Congress with a strongly worded message. The same group of selfish people, who originally sponsored the bill, tried to override the President's veto. After a bitter fight, they were defeated. And the subsidies they fought are still in effect. That is why the price you pay for meat and for butter today is a lot lower than it was this spring.

Now we have to make that same fight all over again with the same people who are using subsidies as an excuse for not only keeping the cost of living where it is now, but to increase it.

Let me tell you just what will happen to your cost of living if the President's fight and your fight and my fight for subsidies is not won. Bread will go up a penny a loaf; butter will increase a nickel; milk a penny. Your bacon and your beef, pork chops, your hamburger, will go up 10 percent. A can of corn, a can of peaches, will cost 25 percent more. A pound of American cheese will go up 4 cents, sugar a penny, and potatoes 2 to 5 cents.

Some people in Washington say, "Why worry about a few pennies more in the cost of bread or milk or canned fruits or meats? War workers are making plenty of money. They can afford to pay a little more." Well, you know the answer to that one as well as I do. But far too many people have the idea that people who work in war plants are turning into multimillionaires overnight. They have forgotten the Little Steel formula and they don't know how strictly that law is being observed. The folks who say, "Why worry about a few pennies more in the cost of living," also forget that there are more than 20,000,000 people—maybe several times that number—who are actually making less money today than they did when the war started. Don't forget that every time a man is inducted into Uncle Sam's Army his family has to live on a pretty small income. The allotment paid to the families of our soldiers is so pitifully small that none of these people can ever afford a penny's increase in the price of bread.

So here's the picture: If the cost of living is way out of line, the only way to bring it down without hurting the production of food is through the use of subsidies. The organized pressure groups, the lobby boys in Washington, say, "The hell with subsidies; the hell with the cost of living; let's have inflation."

Why do you suppose there is all this worry about subsidies now? Subsidies are not new. They are almost as old as the Republic. Our merchant marine was founded on subsidies. The railroads were subsidized for generations. Why, even the second-class mailing privilege enjoyed by the magazines and newspapers of the country is a subsidy. Farmers have been subsidized for years, and you don't hear farmers complaining about those subsidies. In Washington right now there is a big fight on to provide subsidies for the publishers of weekly newspapers in the form of paid Government advertising. Everybody in the newspaper business admits this is a straight out-and-out subsidy. We have the ridiculous situation of the very people who are fighting for subsidies for newspapers fighting against subsidies to keep down your cost of living.

But we are not interested in subsidies for the railroads or for the newspapers or for any of these other things. What you and I are interested in tonight is the cost of living and how to keep it in decent relationship to our pay envelope.

Just why do we have to have subsidies so that we can bring the cost of living down? Last year when the Congress passed the price-control law (which, incidentally, also controls wages) Congress said the Office of Price Administration must do three things: First, they must roll back the cost of living to the levels of September 15, 1942. Then Congress went on to say that while the O. P. A. was doing this it could not interfere with normal business profits or mark-ups. And further, Congress stipulated that while the O. P. A. is lowering the cost of living, they could not interfere with the price of farm products until those prices had reached certain high levels. In other words, Congress said, "We hereby order O. P. A. to bring the cost of living down," and then proceeded to tie one of O. P. A.'s hands behind its back. How can O. P. A. reduce the price we have to pay our grocer for food if O. P. A. hasn't anything to say about what the producer of that food charges the grocer for it? Take bread as an example. Congress says O. P. A. can't touch the price of wheat until it reaches a certain level. Congress also says that O. P. A. cannot interfere with the mark-up charged by the flour miller or the baker. The wheat grower passes on his high price to the flour miller, who in turn passes that price, plus a profit, on to the baker and finally, you are asked to pay a penny a loaf more for your bread. The only possible way to observe the law as Congress has written it, and to keep the cost of living down to the level Congress has ordered, is through the use of subsidies.

Don't let anyone tell you that subsidies are something the New Deal has created or that the long-haired professors at O. P. A. have cooked up. The fact is that subsidies are necessary to carry out the wishes of Congress which, we must assume, are the wishes of the majority of Americans. The sound, experienced businessmen who are running the O. P. A. are back of the subsidy program as is the War Food Administration. Every experienced business economist is back of it. These businessmen know that without subsidies, the cost of living will increase. They know that when the cost of living goes up, wages must go up. If wages go up, it naturally follows that the cost of the war is increased. You can better understand this when I tell you that food subsidies will actually save the United States Government $5 for every dollar paid out that way. That's a good sound, hard-headed business proposition and I am all for it.

Some of the people who are fighting against subsidies say "Why should the Government help pay your grocery bill?" My answer to that is, Why should the Government say how much wages I can take home in my pay envelope? That's exactly what the Government is doing in the Little Steel formula. The American people and organized labor certainly do not want the Government to pay their grocery bill. But the Government says, "Mr. Worker, your wages are frozen, and by law no employer is allowed to pay you more money."

Then, if the cost of the things you must buy with your pay envelope is allowed to skyrocket, the Government must come to your help. They can call that paying your grocery bill, or whatever they choose. But I have not heard any suggestions made in Washington or anywhere else for doing the job more efficiently than through the use of subsidies. The President has, time and time again, asked those who oppose subsidies to suggest a practical, workable substitute. Not a single suggestion had been proposed up to the time I left the Capitol on Thursday evening.

Now, what are we going to do about this fight? American labor—and that means every member of the rank and file, as well as the leaders—must become a soldier in the army waging the war against the rising cost of living. You can do it in the good old American way—through the ballot box. It is no secret in Washington that the very people who are keeping up the cost of your food are the ones who came into office because organized labor permitted them to be elected. The 13,000,000 members of organized labor could have prevented the election of the reactionary element who today say, "Let the cost of living go up and up—who is going to make us stop it?" American labor can stop it, and will stop it in the voting polls this November and next November. We resolve that no Congressman, no Senator, no municipal official, who doesn't pledge himself to do everything within his power to keep down living costs, is defeated for election. American labor must make the men on Capitol Hill—every Senator and Congressman—realize that. A vote to defeat subsidies is a vote to defeat him, too! Let no one belittle the strength of organized labor on election day. In the city of Detroit, this was proven with dramatic emphasis just a few weeks ago. The United Auto Workers, C. I. O., sick and disgusted with the wishy-washy tactics of the present mayor, nominated a candidate of their own. In the primary the U. A. W.'s candidate received an overwhelming majority. What was done in Detroit can be done in every city in the land where there is a strong unionized people.

There are some who may say that this is unfair—that organized labor should not interfere, or enter the political battleground. To them I say—and I know this from personal experience—that those who oppose our efforts to keep down the living costs are not playing fair. No punch is too low, no blow is too foul, no statement too false for the pressure groups and the lobbyists who seek to raid your pay envelope.

My friends, this is a big fight and a bitter fight. It is a fight in which defeat means strife and trouble for you and your families—for every man, woman, and child in

our United States. It is a fight where, if we are victorious, it means we can all devote our time to the winning of the war, to the task of routing out the enemies of all that we hold near and dear in our great American democracy.

Win the Peace While Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statemen by A. D. Quaintance, a prominent attorney of Denver, Colo., with respect to the organization of the United Nations of the world.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the last World War, and every other war, the leaders have all advised "Let's win the war first before we talk about the peace." But when the war is won, and no further help is needed, it is too late. We have to wait 20 years for another war and they need help again, and then they say the same old thing.

Let's fool them this time. Let's tell them now "We're tired of these world wars every 20 years." This is the second time we've been mixed up in a world war. The next time we must have something to say about it.

Let's do what our founding fathers did—invite all the United Nations to send not less than two nor more than seven delegates to Philadelphia, where at Independence Hall we will work out a constitution for the world, following the pattern we worked out there for ourselves 150 years ago. It has had a pretty good trial with us. Maybe it will work as well for the world. It is worth trying. Prime Minister Churchill referred to a congress as a satisfactory means of getting together.

We're not seeking to divide up any spoil or booty, nor are we for aggression. We regard every human race and being as our equal and brother, and on this basis we may be able to work out something, even if it takes 100 years.

It worked for 13 colonies with divergent interests who kept right on fighting among themselves for 10 years after they signed the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation.

They said our plan of representative government would never succeed. It has succeeded through one World War and will survive this one. It took us 10 years to work out the finest plan of representative government that the world has ever known. It is the only pattern that will breathe the breath of life into the name "United Nations."

In time we will come, under this plan by a process of education, to understand our brothers around the world and they will come to understand us, and the congress of the United Nations of the world, with God's help, will succeed in writing a constitution for the United Nations of the world, as our forefathers did for us.

In the meantime we will have a cooling-off period during which old hatreds can all be forgotten.

Global matters will be under the jurisdiction of this congress, with each nation having its voice and vote.

Imperialism, chaos, and anarchy can be avoided, each nation's sovereignty over its own affairs maintained, conditions stabilized, and we will have law and order in the world the same as we have in each city, county, State, and the Nation.

With the congress of the United Nations of the world meeting in our own land, with three-fourths of the United Nations necessary and concurring for any global action, with an army, navy, and air power unequaled, with open debate and decisions openly arrived at, with the unobstructed power of public opinion, the United States of America will be able to lead the world into the ways of peace, law, and order.

Our plan envisages no Utopian dream, but hard work, constant vigilance, and statesmanship of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and Lincoln all combined.

A. D. QUAINTANCE,
Denver, Colo.

Comment by Dorothy Thompson on the Vice President's Transportation Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column of Dorothy Thompson which appeared in yesterday afternoon's Washington Star, October 25, 1943. The column is captioned "On the record," and the article deals with the speech delivered by the Vice President at Dallas, Tex., a few days ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, says that HENRY WALLACE in his speech at Dallas, "rattled dry bones of ancient prejudice" in his attack on the rate-fixing practices of railroads and other means of transportation, and on cartel and monopoly practices in general.

Mr. Pelly did not answer Mr. WALLACE'S charges, but rather waived them aside loftily. Mr. Pelley trotted out the old answer when he said that American freight rates are the lowest in the world. I should certainly hope they would be. No other politically unified, free trade area, all parts of which are accessible to each other by rail, has anything approximating the industrial production and internal trade of the United States. If, therefore, American freight rates were not immensely lower than freight rates anywhere else, could only be due to monstrous graft and speed.

Mr. WALLACE presented some specific figures regarding the transportation costs to specific products in comparison with all other costs. He said, for instance, that manufacturers of milk bottles at Santa Anna, Tex., "have to absorb freight equal to one-third of their net profit margin in order to sell in the St. Louis market in competition with producers in Elmira, N. Y.

The point that Mr. WALLACE made, and which is true, was that freight rates grossly favor producers in certain areas over producers in others, and the result is to prevent the widespread distribution of wealth, energy, and population throughout the reaches of the Union. Mr. WALLACE attributed this to cartel practices amongst the various transportation interests.

CITES PATENT EXPERIENCE

That such practices exist, not only in transportation, but throughout industry as a whole, cannot be answered by calling them discredited statements. Every knowledgeable person knows that literally innumerable inventions are kept off the market for years, because their introduction would upset other commodities for which a market has already been established. Every knowledgeable person knows that patents are purchased for no other reason than to keep others from having them and thus rendering an established product obsolete.

Synthetic rubber interests with the oil process are beginning to clamor for a postwar tariff on natural rubber. But they are moving heaven and earth to prevent competition between various rubber processes and their own. So far no one has produced a synthetic rubber that has elasticity equal to that of natural, and apparently no one is going to be allowed to do so unless he works hand in glove with the interests that have an effective monopoly on processes. The synthetic rubber we have is of superior heat resistance to natural, but the best use that can be made with it is still in combination with natural. As for competition to create a thoroughly satisfactory all-around product, at a cheap price—well, try and enter this field of private enterprise.

The dry bones of ancient prejudice that HENRY WALLACE is rattling, are, I greatly fear, dry bones. For HENRY WALLACE is bucking the course of developments, not only here, but throughout the world. Mr. WALLACE is fighting for the old American way, for the grass-roots American radicalism, and for the only thing that morally justifies the capitalist system—its power to provide equality of opportunity in creative enterprise. Mr. WALLACE thinks it the business of Government to prevent people from hogging more than they can earn by the sweat of their brows, the ingenuity of their brains, and fair and equal competition of their products. That, my friends, is the American private-enterprise system, that we hear so much about all the time, and that fewer and fewer Americans in positions of power either believe in or practice.

PRAISES WALLACE'S FIGHT

The real idea of American big business—what they call private enterprise—is a closely organized, integrated, controlled, and strictly regimented economic system, geared to keep the wheels turning with the least possible friction and risk, with the elimination of the "inefficient"—meaning the ones who won't play in, in a humble role. That's the direction we are going in; that is the direction the whole world is going in, and that is the direction toward socialism, as sure as I sit at this typewriter—unless it's the direction toward economic fascism.

In setting his face against this trend, Mr. WALLACE is entering the lists for what President Conant, of Harvard, recently called out for in the Atlantic Monthly, a return of some old-fashioned American radicals. Mr. WALLACE advocates what most folks want from the migratory worker in Mr. Steinbeck's, Of Mice and Men, to the last doughboy fighting for the American way on the beaches and in the jungles of the globe, namely, the chance for independence, freedom and equality, equality for Alabama and Georgia and Texas, equality for alcohol and

oil, and equality for the small manufacturer and the big one.

But I doubt whether Mr. WALLACE will win. The American dream is, it seems "dry bones of ancient prejudice."

You are fighting upstream, Mr. WALLACE. Fighting against the new, glossy prejudices of both the right and the left. Fighting against the open and the subtle imperialisms. But fight on anyhow.

Another age may remember you and remember with nostalgia.

Freight-Rate Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 26 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. C. E. Childe, member of the Board of Investigation and Research, Transportation Act of 1940, which complies with the request I made to him for an analysis and discussion of certain pamphlets issued by railroads and others who are opposed to the passage of measures directed to the elimination of freight-rate discriminations, which are enumerated in the letter. I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate, which indicates that the cost of printing will be $135.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION
AND RESEARCH,
TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940,
Washington, October 21, 1943.

Hon. TOM STEWART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STEWART: This is in response to your request for an analysis and discussion of pamphlets recently issued by the railroads opposing the passage of bills to eliminate freight-rate discriminations mentioned in the recent annual report of this Board (pp. 17 and 18). These bills are:

S. 947, by Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, April 2, 1943.

S. 1124, by Senator HILL, of Alabama, May 24, 1943.

H. R. 2378, by Representative PRIEST, of Tennessee, April 2, 1943.

H. R. 2391, by Representative BROOKS, of Louisiana, April 5, 1943.

H. R. 2435, by Representative FULMER, of South Carolina, April 8, 1943.

H. R. 2436, by Representative BOREN, of Oklahoma, April 8, 1943.

H. R. 2519, by Representative BRYSON, of South Carolina, April 16, 1943.

H. R. 2645, by Representative MILLER, of Nebraska, May 6, 1943.

H. R. 3172, by Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, July 7, 1943.

H. R. 3183, by Representative NORRELL, of Arkansas, July 8, 1943.

H. R. 2547, by Representative PATMAN, of Texas, April 21, 1943.

S. 1030, by Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, April 30, 1943.

S. 1370, by Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, September 24, 1943.

Senate Joint Resolution 46, by Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, March 30, 1943.

Senate Joint Resolution 75, by Senator STEWART, of Tennessee, July 8, 1943.

Most of these bills were introduced after the Board of Investigation and Research filed its summary report on interterritorial freight rates with the President and Congress (H. Doc. 145, March 30, 1943) and are inteded, as I understand it, to carry out the Board's recommendations that railroad freight classification and class rates be uniform throughout the United States, except where departures from uniformity may be clearly justified. In this discussion, I shall confine myself largely to the Board's recommendations. It is understood, of course, that the views stated herein are my own, and are not an official expression of the Board.

The terms "freight classification," "class rates," "exceptions to classification," "commodity rates," which appear in this letter and are commonly used in discussions of freight rates, have the following meaning. The "freight classification" is a publication of the railroads, which classifies for rate-making purposes all articles shipped by freight into a limited number of groups, or classes. There are three separate and unlike classifications of freight, each containing a different number and arrangement of classes; one of these is applicable in eastern territory, another in southern territory, and still another in western territory These classes are generally designated by numbers or letters, as "first class 1" or "class 1," "second class" or "class 2," etc.; or "class A," "class B," etc. "Class rates" are the rates published by the railroads on each of the "classes" named in the freight classifications. The levels and relationships of these rates, as well as the number of classes, differ in each of the three territories, the lowest rate level being in eastern territory, with varying and much higher levels in southern and western territories, respectively, for hauls of similar length In each territory, the class rates vary according to the length of haul and are therefore frequently referred to as "mileage rates," or rates "based on distance." In addition to the "class rates," published in the manner described above, applying between all stations and on all articles, the railroads also maintain rates on a great many individual commodities, which are lower than the class rates. These lower special rates are called "exceptions to the classification," when they bear a fixed mathematical relationship to the class rates, and they are called "commodity rates" when no such definite mathematical relationship to the class rate is indicated. "Commodity rates" and "exceptions to classification" are published by the railroads to meet competitive and individual situations, and as concessions below the class rates on articles moving in heavy volume. At the present time the great bulk of the traffic moves on "commodity rates" or "exceptions to classification," and only a small proportion on "class rates." Nevertheless, the class rates are important, because they represent the highest levels of freight charges the railroads collect and the shippers pay, and are so much higher in the South and West than in the East that they handicap the development of southern and western industries compelled to pay such high rates.

The railroad pamphlets referred to are entitled "Freight Rates to Fit Needs, Not Theories," issued by the Association of American Railroads and the American Short Line Railroad Association; "The Menace of Legislative Price Fixing," issued by the southern railroads; and "Politics in Rate-Making Legislation Now Pending Which Will Require the Interstate Commerce Commission to Establish Uniform Freight Rates and Classification. (Distributed for Information of Railroad Representatives)," issued by western railroads. The arguments in these pamphlets are similar. I shall discuss them in the order in which they appear in the publication Freight Rates to Fit Needs, Not Theories, stating first the railroad argument and then my comments:

I. Railroad argument (p. 1): The vast commerce of the United States is due to the fortunate combination of soil, climate, resources, people, political institutions, opportunity for business enterprise, plus an adequate system of railroads and a flexible system of freight rates, designed to meet the almost infinitely varying needs of commerce, help the producer reach the widest possible markets, give the consumer the widest possible choice of supply. It is proposed to change all this by act of Congress fixing freight rates in a rigid pattern determined by mileage alone.

Comment: This statement is incorrect in the following respects: (a) The bills introduced to give effect to the recommendations of this Board do not propose to fix freight rates in a rigid pattern determined by mileage alone. They would simply require equality of treatment to shippers in all parts of the country in the classification of freight and in the levels of class rates, except where the Interstate Commerce Commission may find that inequalities are justified by differences in transportation conditions. (b) Our present freight rate system falls far short of being flexible and meeting the varying needs of commerce. (c) Not only railroads but other forms of transportation are essential to the needs of commerce. Discriminatory railroad rates are not necessary for the maintenance of an adequate transportation system.

II. Railroad argument (pp. 1, 2): Distance is only one of the facts considered in the making of rates, and not the most important one. If freight rates were made on distance alone, the people of the United States would be deprived of the fruits and vegetables of the Pacific coast, Texas, and Florida; the grain and livestock of the West; they couldn't live in houses built of brick from a dozen States, lumber from the West and South, glass from Oklahoma or West Virginia, shingles from the Pacific coast, roofing materials from Georgia or New Jersey, plumbing and hardware from Alabama, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, or Illinois; lighting fixtures from Connecticut, Mississippi, Virginia, or Indiana, equipped with furniture from North Carolina, Tennessee, or Michigan; and stoves or furnaces from Alabama or Ohio.

Comment: There is no foundation for the statement that, under the proposed legislation, freight rates would be made "on distance alone." Nor is there any foundation for the statement that the traffic would be unable to move. The fruits, vegetables, brick, lumber, shingles, grain and livestock of the South and West; and roofing materials and furniture of the East and South move on special commodity rates, which would not be affected by any changes in class rates or freight classification. Not a single increase in rates on any of the commodities mentioned would be necessary to comply with the Board's legislative recommendations.

III. Railroad argument (pp. 2, 3): American freight rates have been made to meet the actual needs of producers and consumers. Under the pattern of freight rates proposed to be established by act of Congress, rigidly based upon distance alone, this would no longer be true. Instead of having freight rates tailored to fit the needs of commerce, as they now are, commerce would be compelled to reshape itself to fit an inflexible system of rates made on an unworkable theory.

Comment: The congressional bills carrying out the Board's recommendations do not propose any change in the patterns of freight rates made to meet the actual needs of producers and consumers. They do not propose the elimination of special commodity rates. They would simply require uniformity of class rates, except where exceptional conditions

may require exceptional treatment. The class rates now in effect are based upon mileage scales, but the rate for a given distance in the South or West is much higher than for the same distance in the East. This in no respect conforms to the theory of rates "tailored to fit the needs of commerce." It is inconceivable that the needs of commerce are promoted by rates in the South 39 percent higher and in the West 25 to 85 percent higher than the rates in the eastern territory. If, instead of having these differences in the present class rates, the rates of the South and the West are put on the same levels, mile for mile, as the rates in the East, how could this be any more "an inflexible system of rates made on an unworkable theory" than the present mileage rates?

IV. Railroad argument (p. 3): Freight rates are the result of consultation and cooperation between the shippers and the railroads. The shippers tell the railroads what rates are necessary to make the traffic move; the railroads go as far as they can toward meeting the needs of the shippers; the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State commissions act as umpires to see that, in their desire to do business and make the commerce move, the railroads and the shippers of one section or one community do not discriminate against other shippers and carriers under similar circumstances and conditions. The whole purpose of freight rates is not to fit some theory, but to make commerce move. That's what the railroads want, that's what the shippers want, that's what the consumers want. That, by and large, is what all three get in America—the widest possible movement of the goods and things people need and use.

Comment: The class rates in the several rate territories are not the product of consultation and cooperation between the railroads and shippers. They were first fixed by the railroads themselves and were later revised by the Interstate Commerce Commission, in each region separately, without any attempt to harmonize regional differences. They do not in any way resemble the picture, painted by the railroads in the above paragraph, of rates designed to make commerce move.

V. Railroad argument (pp. 3, 4): True freight rate uniformity consists of a whole body of rates high enough to sustain an adequate system of transportation, but not too high for the traffic to move—rates that are right for the particular commerce involved. Such rates come nearest to insuring development of the best possibilities of any industry, community, or section, and contribute more to national welfare than would rates made on some theoretical scheme of national uniformity. Conditions change and rate adjustments must change with them. If by a miracle all the rates in the United States were to be perfectly adjusted today, they would not be so tomorrow. Instead of the present system of adjustable freight rates, worked out after conference and responsive to actual commercial conditions, it is now proposed to set up by act of Congress a new, untried, and rigid pattern of rates, based solely on mileage in complete disregard of the varying needs of commerce.

Comment: This does not describe the class rates in effect in the several rate territories today. These rates were established more than 10 years ago. They are based on mileage. They were not made to fit actual commercial conditions of the past 10 years. The bills now before Congress do not propose a more rigid pattern of class rates than exists today, but simply that the class rates be made uniform in the several territories to give equality of treatment in each section, unless good reason is shown for departure from uniformity.

VI. Railroad argument (pp. 4, 5): The proponents of this new scheme of rate making are not, for the most part, shippers or producers. Most of them are without experience in such practical matters. They look at the subject from the standpoint of theory or hypothesis, and think they have discovered that "the rates on certain products which are not largely manufactured in the South and the West discriminate against those sections in favor of the northeastern part of the United States."

Comment: No new scheme of rate making is proposed. The Interstate Commerce Commission would fix the rates, as it does now, but would be given a definite mandate from Congress to enforce the law's fundamental purpose, equality of treatment. It is not correct to imply that uniformity of freight classification and class rates are demanded only by theorists, rather than by men of practical experience. Leading rate experts of commercial and shippers' organizations of the South and West, as well as individual shippers and the State railway commissions representing the general shipping public in many of these States, are complaining against the present discriminations and demanding that the class rates in the South and West be made uniform with those in the East.

VII. Railroad argument (p. 5): They have taken little or no account of the whole body of rates in any section of the United States, including the rates on raw materials, many of which are of vastly more practical importance to the manufacturer than the mere rates on his out-bound products, many of which are lower, mile for mile, in the South and West than in the North and East. They have taken no account of the rates on products manufactured in the South and West, which are as low as, or lower than, the northern and eastern rates. They have simply looked at the printed schedules of class rates and have found them higher in the South and West, disregarding the other rates on which more than 90 percent of the freight moves.

Comment: It is true that class rates apply on a small part, probably less than 10 percent, of the total traffic of the railroads. However, as the railroad pamphlet itself states, on page 11, "raw materials and agricultural products, as well as manufactured articles, move on class rates," and, in a footnote on page 7, "important traffic of every sort, both manufactured goods and raw materials, may be found moving in commerce on rates published in each one of the three types of freight-rate tariffs"; that is, class rates, exceptions to class rates, and commodity rates. The total traffic on which class rates are charged, while it may be less than 10 percent of the whole, nevertheless is substantial, and the freight charges on this traffic amount to several hundred million dollars annually. The special importance of class rates lies in the fact that they are charged on whatever traffic has been unable to secure a more favorable special commodity or exceptional rate. Class rates are charged on less-than-carload traffic and carload traffic moving in relatively small volume. The burden of high class rates falls upon industries, shippers, and localities that have not enough traffic or influence to obtain lower commodity rates, and upon the higher-valued manufactured products, which the railroads think are able to stand relatively high freight charges. Small shippers and industries, which have to pay the high class rates, have difficulty in establishing themselves against older-established, larger industries which have been able to obtain lower special commodity rates. The fact that some shippers are given lower special commodity rates does not help the shipper whose product must pay the higher class rates. The purpose of the proposed bills is to provide greater opportunity for industrial enterprise in the South and West, as well as in the East, by making class rates uniform in all sections.

VIII. Railroad argument (p. 6): This theoretical or political approach to the making of rates is quite different from that of the practical manufacturer. Rates on his out-bound products usually are the last and least considerations in the location of a new plant. The manufacturer is more interested in the cost of assembling raw materials * * * the whole of his transportation costs, in-bound as well as out—and in many, if not most, cases the in-bound is the more important.

Comment: Class rates may apply on the in-bound freight or the out-bound freight, or both, of a manufacturer. They may constitute a part, or the whole, of his transportation costs. To whatever extent they enter into the cost of production or distribution of his products, freight rates are important to the manufacturer, whether they be called class rates or commodity rates, and whether they be in-bound rates or out-bound rates.

IX. Railroad argument (p. 6): An example is given of a manufacturer locating a new industry in Tennessee, who obtains as raw materials a chemical from West Virginia, clay from South Carolina, a wooden article from Vermont, a crude material imported through a Gulf port, a reclaimed produce from Ohio, a mineral from Virginia, other items from Louisiana, Texas, and Indiana. It is said he found the class rates satisfactory on his out-bound products, except to some points to which he needed and obtained adjustments. This is cited as what is meant by "fixing freight rates to make commerce move—the truly uniform and equal way of making rates."

Comment: I have requested the Association of American Railroads to give me complete particulars about the raw materials and finished products of the manufacturer referred to, so that an analysis may be made of his in-bound and out-bound freight rates. Apparently, this manufacturer was able to obtain special rates from the railroads, which relieved him from the burden of paying the high-class rates.

X. Railroad argument (pp. 6, 7): For that flexible, workable system, it is now proposed to establish, by act of Congress, a new theory of rate making which will look to distance, and to distance alone, to determine what the rate shall be. Underlying all the bills * * * there is the same common over emphasis on distance alone as the proper measure for the making of freight rates.

Comment: This statement is incorrect. The bills which carry out the Board's recommendations do not provide that rates shall be determined "by distance alone." The Commission would be free to use other measures of the rates than distance, and would be authorized to allow departures from uniformity where such departures were shown to be justified.

XI. Railroad argument (p. 7): While most of the bills propose to apply the distance measure only to class rates, it is obvious that * * * the same sort of political processes and pressures would bring about its application to other rates. * * * It is not expressly proposed to establish distance uniformity of rates on the carriers other than railroads, but if such a theory is proper for rail rates, there is no reason why it should not be applied to rates by truck and by boat. * * * The proponents of making class rates on a mileage basis uniform throughout the country may think that is all they are proposing, but if, by political pressure in Congress, they get what they seek, they will have started something they won't be able to stop—political rate-making by counting votes in Congress.

Comment: The present class rates, which were established by the Interstate Commerce Commission, within each territory upon a mileage basis, have not brought any of these dire results. If the regional mileage scales now in effect have not forced other rates into the patterns predicted by the railroads,

if the present rates based on mileage scales are not considered political rate-making—and they are not—then, by what process of reasoning can it be said that the removal of the present discriminations in the southern and western class rates would have the harmful results claimed?

XII. Railroad argument (pp. 8, 9): The Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created more than 50 years ago to regulate rates, has prescribed or approved most of the class rates in the country. It now has before it proposals to establish uniform classification and uniform class rates, as well as the proposals of railroads and shippers who oppose uniformity. Proponents of the distance-uniformity theory have transferred the subject to the arena of politics by introducing and pressing for passage in Congress numerous bills aimed at such uniformity by legislative fiat.

Comment: The primary purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act is to wipe out discriminations. This has often been pointed out by the Supreme Court and by the Commission, e. g.:

"It is apparent, from the legislative history of the act, that the evil of discrimination was the principal thing aimed at." *Houston E. & W. T. Ry. Co.* v. *U. S.* (234 U. S. 342).

"The great purpose of the act, while seeking to prevent unjust and unreasonable rates, was to secure equality of rates as to all and to destroy favoritism." *New York, N. H. & H. R. Co.* v. *I. C. C.* (200 U. S. 361).

"The purpose of congress was to cut up by the roots every form of discrimination, favoritism, and inequality." *Louisville and N. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467).

For reasons too lengthy to explain here, the Commission has not succeeded in wiping out interterritorial discriminations in class rates. But the Commission has frequently urged, in its annual reports to Congress, that Congress should enact legislation requiring uniformity of classification as a step toward obtaining greater uniformity of class rates. If Congress should now enact the legislation recommended by the Board, it would in the Board's opinion, aid the Commission—not hinder it—in establishing such greater degree of uniformity.

XIII. Railroad argument (p. 9): The immediate effect of the passage of the proposed bills would be a tremendous unsettling and upsetting of the rates upon which commerce is built and to which it is adjusted. No one would know what his rates were going to be. It would take years to establish the new rates. In the meantime, rates would be in a state of suspended chaos while business was facing the uncertainties of the post-war world.

Comment: The class rates and freight classification are now before the Commission for readjustment. There is more uncertainty now as to what they will be than would be the case if Congress should pass a bill declaring a definite policy. Business enterprises, making post-war plans, are entitled to know as promptly as possible whether the present discriminations will be continued, or whether they will be eliminated. Action by Congress now would give them this information, for which they would be compelled to wait indefinitely in the ordinary processes of rate readjustments.

XIV. Railroad argument (pp. 9, 10): A more serious long-range effect would be the establishment of the principle of making rates by direct action of Congress, rather than leaving it to the established, nonpolitical regulatory body. If rates are established by the preponderance of votes in Congress, those sections in which a minority of the population lives would in the long run lose more than they might gain. Already, repercussions are appearing in the North and East which do not conduce to a calm and reasoned consideration of questions of rate making on their merits.

Comment: The bills to carry out the Board's recommendations do not propose direct rate making by Congress. They provide that Congress shall lay down the policy and leave to the Interstate Commerce Commission the making of the rates. This is what Congress has done ever since the Interstate Commerce Commission was created. The bills propose nothing new, other than that the policy of Congress be more definitely stated for the guidance of the Commission. It is true that certain interests in the North and East are agitating against the passage of the bills, but their arguments are that the East would lose its present freight-rate advantages over the South and West, and that manufacturing industry would then tend to locate to a greater degree in the South and West, rather than in the East. If this is true, then obviously the arguments of the railroads cannot be correct that manufacturing industry in the South and West would be injured or destroyed. Legislation to bring equality of opportunity is not, in any proper sense of the word, sectional in character, and should not be abandoned for fear of sectional opposition. In the long run, the railroads and shippers throughout the whole country will benefit if all parts of the country are given full and equal opportunity to grow and prosper.

XV. Railroad argument (pp. 10, 11, 12, 13): Manufacturing has gone forward faster in the South and the West than it has in the North and East during the past two decades.

Comment: This is incorrect. In the 20-year period, 1919–39, manufacturing declined in both the East and the West. The decline was greater in the Western States than in the Eastern States, measured in wages, and smaller measured in value of products.

In the South, there was a moderate increase in wages (9 percent) and value of products (21 percent), 1939 over 1919. Complete figures are not available for years later than 1939, but a report issued by the Bureau of the Census in 1943 shows that, since 1940, there has been a shift of workers, in which California and some of the Eastern States were the principal gainers; on the whole, the South and the West lost to the East and the Pacific coast. However, a truer understanding of the comparative lack of manufacturing in the South and West, as compared with the East, is gained by comparing the volume of manufacturing in each territory. In 1939 the Eastern States, with an area no larger than the South and with natural resources no greater, produced nearly 9 times as much manufactured products, measured by value, and paid nearly 10 times as much wages to factory workers as the South. The Western States, with an area nearly 5 times greater than the East and with vastly larger natural resources, produced in 1939 less than a third of the manufactured products and paid less than a fourth as much factory wages as the East.

XVI. Railroad argument (p. 10): One of the reasons for manufacturing growth in the South and West is that the carriers have tried to work out with the shippers rates, in-bound and out-bound, which would enable each particular industry to manufacture and sell its products in the competitive market it wanted to reach. Many in-bound rates paid by manufacturers in the South and West on raw and semifinished materials, fuel, etc., are lower mile for mile than the corresponding rates in the East. Manufacturers and shippers in the South and West are not seeking upsets of the freight-rate system.

Comment: Some manufacturing industries have grown in the South and West during the past 20 years—it would be strange indeed if this were not true. But the only industries which have grown are, generally speaking, those which have been given special rates. The industries which have favorable rates naturally are not complaining. It is not true, however, that industries which have been compelled to pay class rates on their raw materials, or to competitive markets on their finished products, have achieved any considerable success in the South and West, and it is not true that such industries are generally satisfied with the present discriminatory class rates.

XVII. Railroad argument (pp. 14, 15, 16): Raw materials are not drained from the South and the West for manufacturing in the East.

Comment: No one now knows accurately the extent to which southern and western raw materials are shipped east for manufacturing or manufactured products are shipped back from the East to the South and West. There can be no doubt, however, that, since the great preponderance of production of raw materials is in the South and West and the great preponderance of manufacturing is in the East, the general flow of raw materials is from South and West to North and East, and the general flow of manufactured products is in the opposite direction. The Board of Investigation and Research is making a study of this subject now and will report its findings to the President and Congress within the coming year.

XVIII. Railroad argument (pp. 16 to 19): Freight rates cannot be placed on a strictly cost basis. If this were done heavy basic commodities, farm products, etc., could be shipped but short distances and national development would be impossible. If cost figures of Dr. Ford K. Edwards, head analyst of the cost section of the Interstate Commerce Commission's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics should be accepted as correct, rates on numerous commodities listed in the railroad pamphlet would have to be raised by percentages varying from 10 percent on cattle, to 122 percent on logs.

Comment: No evidence has been presented to the Commission showing that, if freight rates were placed on a cost basis, they would have to be raised by the percents stated by the railroads, or in fact by any percent. It is not true that, if rates were made on a cost basis, heavy basic commodities and farm products could be shipped only short distances. The rates on the heavy basic commodities, on the whole, yield the railroads greater profits above cost than the rates on light-loading commodities and less-than-carload freight. The general rule is the lighter the load the less the profit. Less-than-carload freight is being hauled generally by the railroads at a loss, whereas motortrucks can carry it profitably at rates as low as, or lower than, present levels. The railroads are losing far more money in wasteful competitive practices, which they could eliminate to the advantage of the public, than any losses which could possibly be incurred by them from establishing uniform class rates throughout the United States. Uniform class rates can be established in harmony with cost principles without any increases in special commodity rates or revenue losses to the railroads. In fact, greater profits will accrue to the railroads from the maintenance of reasonable rates which will encourage and develop the commerce and growth of traffic on their lines, than from the charging of discriminatory rates which discourage traffic.

XIX. Railroad argument (pp. 19, 20): Levels of freight rates are different in one section than in another because conditions are different. Those seeking uniformity of class rates should remember the legend of Procrustes, who stretched or cut down his victims to make them fit his iron bed.

Comment: There are no conditions, transportation or otherwise, which justify the maintenance of class rates in the South 39 percent higher or in the West 25 percent to 85 percent higher than in the East. Such differences are not justified by any territorial differences in cost of transportation, composition of the traffic, or commercial and competitive conditions. Shippers compelled to

pay such high rates cannot freely compete against traffic enjoying the lower rate levels. Lowering freight rates which are too high, and allowing commerce to expand which has been unduly restricted, would not be the painful Procrustean process which the railroads imply, but would simply be applying to freight rates the basic American doctrine of equality of opportunity.

Yours very truly,

C. E. CHILDE.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a series of recommendations made by Illinois merchants through the Federation of Illinois Retail Associations with reference to simplification of the Office of Price Administration:

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY ILLINOIS MERCHANTS WITH REFERENCE TO SIMPLIFICATION OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

NOTE.—The writer was asked to sample the thinking of Illinois merchants doing up to $250,000 annually with reference to the way in which the price order is affecting them. The answers to the questions proposed are as follows:

1. Question. Can over-all regulations be made to fit all or most stores and thereby eliminate many specific regulations?

Answer. Preponderantly yes; by the utilization of the historic mark-up applied to the cost of the goods received by the retailer.

2. Question. Is the present base period of pricing satisfactory?

Answer. Preponderantly, no. One merchant reports 474 regulations, and the M. G. P. R., 15 supplementary regulations, 443 orders, 105 price schedules, 32 temporary regulations, and 13 procedural and export and import regulations * * * 53 general regulations and 85 miscellaneous price orders, together with interpretations and amendments. Of the latter, this merchant reports, for example, 61 amendments to supplementary regulation 14. All reports indicate the confused, sometimes bitter, and always regretful remarks that O. P. A. has gone much too far and relied too little on fundamental laws of supply and demand and competition.

3. Question. What commodities are out of the market because of price limitations?

Answer. The answers usually stressed cheaper items where labor factor is high and replacement costs reflect unequal time element in freezing of labor costs and commodity costs. Listed were men's, women's, and children's apparel in the lower-price lines; shirts, low-cost fur coats, low-priced jewelry, garden hose, diapers, watches, curtains, bedspreads, etc.

4. Question. What price lines are out of the market because of price limitations?

Answer. Here the inequities of MPR 330 are apparent because the answer was universally low end merchandise of all types. The situation is obviously very critical and equally critical for the consumer who enjoys no increased earning power.

5. Question. Can regulations be made self-enforcing?

Answer. Yes, if historic mark-ons are used. Check could be made and actual mark-up soon. Over-all "break through" in any given trading area or region would be immediately discernible and check-up at trouble spot made by far, far fewer enforcement agencies than are now busy.

6. Question. Would voluntary compliance work?

Answer. Some doubt if retailer now has time to do the job. Others feel that such voluntary enforcement should not be at local level. Others believe there could be sufficient simplification to permit price rise checking by agencies set up before the O. P. A. came along—such as the Labor Statistics Bureau.

7. Question. What are the present evils of price control?

Answer There were many answers. Chiefly they are:

1. The squeeze on retailers forced by the manufacturers' price rise on new items made new by new numbers, labels, etc., without corresponding increase in retail prices.

2. Store classifications which permit larger units to buy for less than smaller units. Permission to sell for more is meaningless and ludicrous in a competitive market. Stores do not like designation of high mark-up and low mark-up features, believing such designations are not in line with facts as to service, costs, etc.

3. Flexibility given to manufacturers' prices with none given to retailing. Similarity to No. 1.

4. Utter complexity of multiplicity of orders and counterorders.

5. "Higher price line" rule with reference to store's own position and ability of new stores to go into competition in higher price lines. Also danger of drying up low end market.

6. Too much emphasis on the little things that will take care of themselves anyway.

7. Not enough recognition of laws of competition, particularly for the stores which have their prices competitively set in every way.

Mr. Speaker, in addition thereto there is submitted herewith a list of suggestions submitted by Illinois merchants to Mr. J. T. Meek, executive secretary of the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations:

1. Recognition of the fact that it is impossible to regulate and control each minute commodity transaction in this country.

2. Recognition of the fact that in thousands of cases it is quite possible to depend upon the laws of supply and demand and competition for rule.

3. Abandonment of the principle that a "hold the line" program must be rigidly adhered to the point where the line is all that is left and the goods are not even on the market.

4. Recognition of the fact that prices will slowly rise in this country and that our best hope is to keep this price rise orderly and utilize it, when absolutely necessary, to bring needed goods onto the market which are now unprofitable to produce.

5. Adoption of a broad, simple pricing formula which will permit the retail merchant to mark merchandise which he receives on the basis of his own historic mark-on experience with that base period set by the Office of Price Administration itself.

6. Segregation of the food problem. Provisions for 1 Food Administration instead of nearly 30 and provision for a regional maximum price for such standardized products, thus eliminating store classifications, dollars-and-cents fixed prices, et cetera.

7. Segregation of all other specific cost-of-living items in a separate list of commodities. These commodities to have a direct relation to actual existence and to be selected from those groups of items now under fire by cost-of-living specialists.

8. Provision for a regional maximum ceiling for such cost-of-living items at a sufficiently high point to insure production of such critical items as well as to insure proper distribution of such goods.

9. Immediate attention to provisions which would insure manufacture of such low-priced lines to prevent a complete abandonment by manufacturers such as has occurred under the higher-price-line provision of MPR 330.

10. Systematic roll-back or realinement of manufacturers' prices in these lines to permit taking up the slack between prices and labor and raw commodity costs. Consideration of manufacturers' costs—rather than retail costs—in line with the policy of really freezing as far back from the retail level as possible.

11. Adoption of the principles of supply and demand and competition in reference to perhaps 90 percent of the merchandise sold today which is not defined as "cost of living."

12. Pricing of this vast majority of items at the manufacturers' level with the retailer permitted his own historic mark-up on manufacturers' costs readjusted with proper consideration for a "hold the line" policy that is elastic enough to bring goods on to the market.

13. Recognition of the fact that while the great majority of stores may not have a systematic historic mark-on, these stores, while very important economically, are not sufficiently important from a price-control angle to place all distribution under a complex set of regulations. Competition will take care of the prices in this class of stores.

14. Abandonment of all special rules and regulations and interpretations which have resulted from attempts to price everything at the retail level. This will automatically occur if (1) due attention is given to strictly cost-of-living merchandise on one hand and (2) to systematic readjustments in manufacturing costs and adoption of a retail historic mark-up for the great majority items not in the cost-of-living category.

15. Abandonment of the principle of regulating profits and actual business procedure. Stopping inflation is the real task of O. P. A.

16. Abandonment of the store-classification and fixed-price regulations which do not recognize variations in business practice and variations in business costs. Such abandonment would come about automatically through adoption of the pricing methods discussed and recommended herewith.

17. Readjustment of the higher-price-line limitation to permit either stores to buy into the higher price lines upon proof that the lower price lines are not available or to provide that manufacturers of such lower-priced lines get back into the market and are given the incentive for so doing.

18. Recognition of the fact that the major complaint of retailing today is the system which permits producers to introduce lines, renumbered and considered new by O. P. A. but construed as old by both O. P. A. and consumer as far as the retail level is concerned. Utilization of the historic mark-up principle would take care of this. It must, however, go hand in hand with a careful examination of the manufacturers' cost problem to insure a fair base price there.

19. Continued cooperation with all lines of business with the assurance that this cooperation actually means just that. Better public-relations policies designed to indicate that the vast majority of merchants are intelligently trying to do a job and are not law evaders and chiselers.

20. Revision of legal provisions within the price order or simplification to the extent that such provisions are meaningless. Adoption of voluntary policing of the industry but not on a local basis—rather on an industry

or State-wide basis and then only if simplification in the pricing structure comes.

ADDENDA.—Recognition of the fact that the merchants we have interviewed, at least, are now pricing on the mark-up basis suggested above. They can adopt no other method because they have given up entirely on the more than 1,000 rules, regulations, and procedures which have engulfed them. It follows that either the historic mark-up will work—or that control at the retail level can and does come from the laws of supply and demand and competition.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is the custom and practice of Hon. Joseph J. Moriarty, judge of the District Court for the Eighth Judicial District of Minnesota, to hold appropriate ceremonies in connection with the naturalization proceedings of his court.

I am indebted to Hon. O. L. Lundstrom, clerk of the district court of Carver County, Minn., for forwarding to me the splendid address delivered by Rev. W. P. Kramer of Young America, Minn., on this important occasion, held on October 11, 1943, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Reverend Kramer's address:

Your honor, Judge Moriarty; clerk of court, Mr. Lundstrom; especially you, Mr. Laege; and all friends and citizens assembled here, we are gathered here today in the county seat of Carver County, in this county courthouse, in a truly American and truly patriotic duty. We are today witnessing and observing another naturalization celebration of new American citizens.

To become and be a full-fledged American citizen of these our beloved United States is really and truly something very great, something very important, and something far reaching. Especially this terrible war, in which our beloved land is now engaged, brings out the beauty and the glory of American citizenship in glaring and beautiful colors. This war has been brought about and forced upon us by obstinate and ruthless men, who do not believe in the American way of life and the American philosophy of life. We have been plunged into this bloody whirlpool and into this bloody mess by men who like to rule peoples and nations in a tyrannical and ruthless manner. And this war gives us all a chance to go into our private prayer room to consider once again what America really stands for and whether we really understand and appreciate America.

Our Nation stands for freedom and liberty—freedom and liberty in all its beautiful and far-reaching forms and shades—freedom of mind, freedom of heart, freedom of the soul, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and especially that greatest of all freedoms—freedom of religion. Our forefathers and our foremothers who passed through the horrors and sorrows of the early primitive colonial days, and who then in sincere Christian faith and hope formulated and wrote the Declaration of Independence, and then fought out that terrible and at first seemingly hopeless bloody Revolutionary War, believed wholeheartedly and sincerely in true American principles, and with firm faith in God and with firm faith in justice for all citizens wrote our beautiful American Constitution. Millions of American men and boys have fought for this American way of life; millions of American women and children remained at home and during these American wars have hoped and prayed and worked for this American liberty on the home front, and have kept the home fires burning in order to continue this beautiful American way of philosophy and these beautiful American forms of liberty and justice.

Millions of American men and boys in past wars have put on American soldiers' and sailors' uniforms and have marched away into battle to fight and to risk their very lives for these, our American freedoms and liberties. Yes, thousands and hundreds of thousands of American young men, in the bloom and prime of their young healthy lives, have sacrified their very lives for this beautiful American freedom. All this added together was a mighty force operating against the evil powers from north and south, from east and west who meant to destroy this liberty and rob these freedoms. Today these our United States have become a real world power, yes, we might say, the world power among all the nations of the world. We stand in the midst of this great bloody whirlpool, a symbol of human liberty and human freedom. Look at the harbor of New York. There stands our beautiful well-known Statue of Liberty, which each visitor to our land sees first when he comes nigh to our friendly shores. It stands there solid and firm, in the midst of turbulent waves and yet anchored and based securely on a solid foundation. It calls and beckons and invites millions of souls who are yearning for and seeking a land of liberty. It has its hand raised high in firm and bold confidence which none can rob. It holds its hand high above the turbulent waves and the wrecks of time, showing man the torch of liberty and freedom. The Statue of Liberty is a symbol of America, of American liberty and freedom. From its silent lips comes the wonderful message, "Here is the greatest and grandest country and nation on the face of the earth. Here is the land of the free and the home of the brave. Here is the land of men and women and children of all nations of the world, welded and molded into one solid body, who have won liberty and freedom by their fervent prayers, by their own stout hearts, by hard work and the sweat of their brows, by their brave soldiers and sailors, by their firm and unshakable convictions, and last but not least, by the help and assistance of a merciful God. Here is a land where everyone can serve his own God in his own way, according to the dictates of his own conscience. Here is a land where no one will be molested and curbed and disturbed and hindered but everyone can worship in his own church in his own way, according to his heart's desire. Here is a land where everyone is permitted to work in honest labor and earn his own daily bread in the honest sweat of his brow. Here is the land where the weak grow strong, the faint-hearted are encouraged and strengthened, where hungry souls find peaceful rest."

You, my dear friends, who have applied for membership and citizenship in this great Nation, are here today to take your vows and confess your convictions and make your promises and thus become full-fledged members of our American Nation. You are today being adopted into the American family, into this blessed family of these United States of America, who has in years gone by adopted people from all nations of the world. What a blessing! Think of a rich and kind-hearted and good-hearted man. He has a beautiful home which offers all the blessings and advantages and conveniences imaginable. His children have clothing and shoes, meat and drink, house and home, money and goods, all the blessings and advantages and conveniences that kind-heartedness can give and that money can buy and supply. His children are sent to a Christian school and attend church on Sundays. They learn how to be and remain good and worth-while citizens of this land and good and worth-while citizens of heaven. They are safe and secure against the wiles of wicked men. Now, this good-hearted and kind-hearted man opens his doors and takes a child from the street, a little homeless and hopeless and helpless wanderer, who has no home, no father, no mother, and who has been a homeless little stranger. Surely, such a homeless little stranger adopted into such a family by such a kind-hearted man is surely lucky and fortunate. He becomes rich in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. All the riches and advantages and blessings of this fine home are poured into his lap. He shares and enjoys all the blessings of this beautiful home. Yes; he falls heir to all this wealth and all these comforts. Hereafter his life is secure and peaceful and he can enjoy these blessings to his heart's desire.

Now, my dear friend, when you today become a full-fledged American citizen you are experiencing all this. You are today being adopted by a rich and kind-hearted uncle—our own Uncle Sam, the United States. You are today being adopted by a kind-hearted, good-hearted nation in which you will be privileged to enjoy untold and unnumbered blessings and gifts and advantages too numerous to mention. As soon as you become a naturalized citizen of these United States, you enter the home of a kind-hearted and generous nation. You become a member and child of the greatest and grandest nation in this wide, wide world. If you had the money to take a long trip and visit and study all the nations of the world carefully, you would not find another land on this revolving globe in which you can enjoy—in which all can enjoy—so many and so manifold blessings and advantages. You become a member of a nation which stands for liberty, whole liberty, and nothing but liberty. You become a member of a nation which stands for all the beautiful freedoms that can be found in the world. You become a member of a nation which does not like to fight against anybody, but which can and does fight fanatically and boldly and courageously and victoriously if it is attacked and driven into a fight; a nation which does not like to strike, but which strikes fiercely and with telling blows when somebody strikes it first and tramples our beautiful and honored flag into dust and dirt. You become a member of a nation where a person can boldly express his opinions and ideas as long as they do not infringe upon the sacred rights of somebody else; a nation where you can write and put into print any opinion which is not subversive—an opinion which tends to improve the welfare of all; a nation where you can even at times criticize, if your criticism is not destructive but constructive; above all, a nation of churches and church denominations of all kinds, where each one is privileged to worship his God in his own church and in his own way according to the dictates of his own conscience. You today become a member of a nation in which the Holy Bible of God—this heavenly and God-given Book of the Ages—is still the highest authority and the best lawbook. Therefore, this day on which you are adopted into our American family is the luckiest day of your earthly life. This is a real red-letter date on your

calendar and in your life's history—a never-to-be-forgotten day of your life here below. As long as you live, this 11th day of October 1943 will be your American birthday, which you ought to celebrate every year on your bended knees.

But, let us not forget, this our beloved American Nation is today on trial upon the bloody battlefields of a global war. We are today engaged in a long and horrible, bloody and destructive and decisive war of life or death. We have been plunged headlong into a bloody whirlpool of war in order to test out, as President Abraham Lincoln said during the Civil War in his famous Gettysburg address, "whether that nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." The Almighty God of heaven and earth, our dear Heavenly Father up yonder in the skies, has permitted war to come upon us for good reasons and good purposes. He has hurled our Nation into a fiery furnace which today is seven times hotter than ever before, in order to test us and in order to purify us. God is testing us to see whether we really and truly appreciate our Nation and our liberty, whether we appreciate it so much that we are willing to pay for it, and pray for it, and if need be to fight and suffer and bleed and die for it. God wants to purify our Nation, burn away the dross in this fiery furnace so that only the pure and shining gold remains. Millions of our boys, your boys and my boys, are gone away into the various military camps and fields and training stations and schools of our land; many of them are today out there on the wide-open oceans, up there in the endless air, and over there on foreign soil in distant lands. Millions of our American boys are today out there and over there and up there for only one reason: to fight for our American freedom and liberty. These young men, all of them in the bloom and prime and springtime of their life, are out there because they, too, believe in our Nation and want to keep it safe and sound and solid as it always was in days gone by. More than a thousand boys have gone out from Carver County.

Forty-seven of these are from my own congregation at Young America. My own two sons, Elwood and Richard, are also out there, and the third one may be called at most any time. These boys are bringing a great and terrific sacrifice. They have left their homes, their fathers and mothers, their little brothers and sisters, their friends and sweethearts, and some their own dear young wife and perhaps a little helpless child, to go and fight for America because America is worth fighting for. They are willing, if need be, if it is God's will, to bring even that supreme sacrifice, to suffer and bleed and die for their American fatherland, the land of bold and courageous men and of stanch women and of noble children. That's what those boys out there are so bravely and courageously, so successfully and victoriously, fighting for, as my oldest son, a sailor on one of our destroyers in the Pacific, who has seen repeated action up there in the cold Aleutians, wrote home in one of his recent letters: "My homefolks and friends have certainly all been kind and wonderful to me. All these deeds of love and kindness and friendship is why we servicemen are where we are—to keep things that way, to keep our beloved land of the United States of America with life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness." May God guide and guard and keep and protect all these noble boys out there, and when victory has been won, bring them all safely to our arms and hearts.

And let me, in closing, say yet this one thing: Let us here at home, on the home front, also strive to keep our Nation solid and safe and firm. Let us get down on our knees in our private prayer room and ask God for forgiveness in Jesus' name for all our past sins of commission and omission. Often we have done things which we should not have done, and have left undone what we should have done. May God wash these sins away in the blood of Jesus, our Saviour. Let us repent and henceforth try to do better, because God says in the Bible, "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, that He will not hear you."

And again the Bible says very emphatically: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." One day during the gloomiest days of the Civil War President Abraham Lincoln sat in his office, sad and gloomy and depressed and worried. Things were not going so good. A friend came in and said to him, "Mr. President, you need not be so gloomy. We shall win. God is on our side." But the President looked up and said: "That's not the thing, whether God is on our side, but the thing is rather this, are we on God's side? God can be on our side only if we are on God's side." How true that is: Only then can God be on America's side, if America is on God's side. Let us carefully consider this, and then act accordingly. What America today needs is not more schools, but more Christian schools; not more education, but more Christian education; not more poolhalls and dancehalls, but more churches and Bibles; not more homes, but more Christian homes; not more broken homes, but more sound, solid, Christian homes; more men and women and young people and children, faithful and true to the principles which God has laid down for us in the Christian religion. That, and that alone, will make America safe and secure, solid and stable. That, and that alone, is the very best and most necessary part of our great war effort. There is a beautiful saying which says, "The devil trembles when he sees a praying Christian on his knees." If our American people would all become and be praying Christians on their knees, then we would be so strong that no tyrant would dare attack us, and no power could overthrow and defeat us. If our Christian faith would be at least as big as a little mustard seed, we would be able to uproot trees and remove mountains. If we Americans would all be Christian men and women, young people and children, then our Nation would ever be and remain a mighty Gibraltar towering over the wrecks of time.

"God bless our native land,
Firm may she ever stand,
Through storm and strife!
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do Thou our country save
Through Thy great might!"

Let us close this speech with the fervent sigh:

"God, bless our men, in air, on land, and sea!
Full well we know how dear they are to Thee!
Where'er they go, whatever they may dare,
God, keep them in Thy gracious care!

"God, guard our men, by night as well as day,
For we at home for them will ever pray
That war and strife and enmity may cease,
And Thou wilt send us soon again sweet peace.

"God, guard our men, oh, keep them ever near!
Make strong their faith and drive out all their fear!
Give them a vision of Thy saving love,
That nothing in this world can ever move.

"God, guard our men, and though just now they roam,
Grant us our prayers and bring them safely home.
God, bless our foes, and cause all eyes to see
That peace, true peace, can only come from Thee!"

Mr. Speaker, during the naturalization proceedings an outstanding citizen presents to each of the new citizens the flag of our country. On this occasion flags were presented by the Honorable C. H. Klein, of Chaska, Minn., former State senator and one of the State's most distinguished men.

Mr. Klein's patriotic remarks follow:

The Honorable Judge Moriarty, Clerk of Court O. L. Lundstrom, ladies and gentlemen, it affords me great pleasure to salute this flag. This is my flag. It is the flag which I cherish and honor. It is the flag that is the emblem of my country which I love so dearly. Yes; this is the flag to which I owe my allegiance and may Almighty God lead and guide me so I will perform my duties in full to this flag, to protect it, and to defend it, and if need be, to sacrifice my life.

Ladies and gentlemen, I now have the distinguished honor, and I consider it a great privilege, to present to you this glorious flag, the flag of the United States of America.

Post-War Employment in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the effort to plan for full employment at the end of the war, we can derive much encouragement from the intelligent and systematic planning by voluntary nongovernmental groups now under way throughout the country. Among the various types of planning groups, it seems to me that none is more important than those which represent a cross-section of our economic life.

An inconspicuous but highly important service in this respect has recently been rendered by a group of citizens in my State which met in response to an invitation of the Arkansas Policy Committee—a nonpartisan association interested in promoting the public welfare. The group issued a splendid statement on the problem of post-war employment which will be of interest not only to the people of Arkansas but to others who are interested in discovering effective means for local action.

The citizens who prepared this statement are connected with industry, labor, the professions, the press, and Government service. Individual members are not committed to the entire statement, but it represents substantial agreement upon some of the important principles to be kept in mind as we prepare for post-war conditions.

The meeting at which this statement was prepared was presided over by the distinguished dean of Hendrix College, Dr. T. S. Staples, and was reported by Mr. Randall Falk of the United States Employment Service, Little Rock. Other participants were: C. T. Carpenter, attorney, Marked Tree, Ark.; R. H. Dickenhorst, banker, Morrilton, Ark.; Matt

Ellis, president, Henderson Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark.; K. A. Engle, publisher, the Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark.; Brooks Hays, Member of Congress, Little Rock, Ark.; Curtis Hurley, publisher, the Morrilton Democrat, Morrilton, Ark.; Clyde Hussey, assistant to the president, Arkansas Power & Light Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.; Nolan Irby, president, Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway, Ark.; J. Ed Keene, State vice chairman, C. I. O., Benton, Ark.; W. C. Langston, M. D., University of Arkansas Medical College, Little Rock, Ark.; Charles Measel, Farm Security Administration, Little Rock, Ark.; D. Palmer Patterson, United States Employment Service, Little Rock, Ark.; John G. Pipkin, State director, public welfare, Little Rock, Ark.; K. W. Vance, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Little Rock, Ark.

The statement follows:

The meeting was opened with agreement that the interests of the State are inextricably interwoven with those of the Nation as a whole; members felt that in placing major emphasis on post-war activities in Arkansas they were by no means losing sight of the general problem of the economy.

The basic assumption of the meeting was contained in the statement that nobody wishes to see history repeat itself by allowing conditions to develop that would make the Government have to step into Arkansas or any other State after the war with a glorified W. P. A.

It was generally agreed that one of the fundamental economic lessons learned in our experiences after the last war was the importance of protecting Government investments in the course of conversion back to a peace economy. Individuals and private business should obviate the necessity of continuance of Government operation of business activities that are properly the privilege and the obligation of private enterprise.

One of the primary lessons learned from past mistakes is that for conversion and readjustment to be sound and lasting, they must be made with due regard to establishment of wage structures that will provide a decent standard of living for the workers.

Planning is currently in bad repute in some places, but it does have a vitally important place in the solution of the problems facing us. The trouble with planning is that it has too often been imposed. To be successful, fullest emphasis in planning should be based on public participation. Among the major difficulties facing all planning, particularly that involved in the present discussion, are the many uncertain quantities, of which one of the most unpredictable is the development of mechanical devices that can be used to displace human labor.

NATIONAL SETTING

In July 1943 we had 54,300,000 employed persons over and above the 9,300,000 in the armed forces, or 63,600,000 all told. July 1944 it is anticipated that the armed forces will require 2,000,000 additional personnel, and the war industries a comparable number; thereby raising this peak further. We had 50,200,000 employed at the time of Pearl Harbor.

Undoubtedly a certain number of housewives, aged, and others will withdraw from the labor force with the ending of the emergency; but even if half of the workers who have gone into industry during the war retire, we will start the peace with a group of unemployed, if planning and American industry do not make provisions for utilizing their available services, comparable to that of some of the years of the recent depression. Such an unemployed group, as a starting point, can readily be visualized as a pestilential beginning that could spread into a national panic. One member estimated that with the millions in the armed forces returning to civilian employment, with more than 25,000,000 workers in war production who must change to some nonwar job, and the incidental changes that will be necessitated by movement of these two major groups, the readjustments following the end of the war will require finding different jobs for more people than the total number comprising the national labor force in 1929.

Offsetting the staggering proportions of these problems was the optimistic outline of a tremendous backlog of unfilled needs, with the potential capacity to absorb this available manpower: A 3-year backlog of demand for automobiles, 1 to 1½ years for clothing, shoes and other non-durables, 1½ years for washing machines and electric refrigerators, and 2 years of a substantial replacement business. It was estimated that at the end of the war there will be more than $60,000,000,000 worth of surplus military goods and equipment to be converted and utilized.

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

The limitations of capabilities and capacities of thousands of the individuals who will be looking for post-war employment, and the substandard levels of living and education of many must have fullest consideration. The forces of education must plan and carry on continuously a dynamic program. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on their responsibilities in the total problem.

* * * * *

The responsibilities of business expansion in Arkansas are * * * a challenge to every citizen of the State and are everybody's business. Three thousand individuals are needed for the planning preliminaries—everyone should participate in an enthusiastic cooperation to effectuate those plans. Business must hire the right type of engineers and take the initiative in a program of action to concentrate on the problem of 100,000 dislocated Arkansans, who will be needing and looking for jobs following the war. Government-owned property and equipment should be taken over and operated by private industry—much of the cost can be paid for out of profits. Local people should control operation in the peace economy of the plants necessarily owned and operated by Government in the war emergency. Whenever operation can be made to pass from absentee capital to local enterprise, it is constructive advancement for the State. One member cautioned that there will always be a proper place for outside capital and probably even for Government financial assistance, and that outside leadership should also be attracted to Arkansas to augment local individuals and activities, but all agreed that both should augment, rather than dominate, local enterprise and capital.

MIGRATION

During war production thousands of workers have gone to other States, where they felt they could make greater contributions to the war effort or where they were attracted by the lure of higher wages. There is every indication that most of these workers will come back to their home State if the opportunities for work here are reasonably attractive. Of the many workers who have inmigrated from other areas for war work, most are expected to return to their former homes at the end of the emergency.

Although Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi had 50,000 surplus families before the war, a large number of Jamaicans and Mexicans have been imported for the emergency; sound readjustment will require the early exodus after the end of the war of these immigrants brought in to meet an unnatural condition.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture supplies 57 percent of Arkansas employment, so fullest consideration must be given to the problems in this field. One member stated that tenants on farms are no more productive than 10 years ago, and that agriculture cannot absorb more workers than it has at present.

Another, however, answered comments on the limitations of tenant farmers by citing the official record of progress for the year 1942 to prove what improvement can be accomplished and advances made through intelligent and sympathetic cooperation with this underprivileged and underfinanced group that has always constituted one of the State's most serious problems.

A principal difficulty in the State's agricultural outlook was thought to be the large amount of marginal land good only for grazing and pasture, not good enough to produce row crops; such land is of no practical value in the manpower problem as one man can ordinarily take care of a thousand such acres. The suggestion was made here that much of this marginal land might be utilized to help make Arkansas realize its potentialities as the playground of the Nation. Proper development of parks and playgrounds would attract a profitable tourist business and utilize lands and people that are marginal for agriculture.

One member wanted more attention and investigation devoted to the possibilities of general increases in agricultural production by more extensive irrigation.

PROCESSING PLANTS

The majority of suggestions for advancement of the cause of agriculture came in the discussion of packing plants, canneries, quick freeze, cold storage, and dehydration. If better markets were made conveniently available, thereby assuring quicker and easier sales and better prices, farm operators would be stimulated to greater effort and wider diversification. The success of the canning activities in the northwest section of the State were cited as an example that well might be followed in all sections; the purchasing power of these canneries furnishes a fine stimulus to production of bean, tomato, spinach, and other profitable food crops. A particular advantage in the food-processing field in that it provides an opportunity for profitable operation of numerous small industries, all with a ready cash market and with a minimum probability of overproduction in their line. Poultry and egg profits in several sections have demonstrated possibilities that can similarly be developed extensively throughout the entire State. One member said that location in the State of an adequate-sized plant of one of the major packing-house operators would stimulate cattle raising to the point of greatly increased volume and profits, and would result in furnishing additional employment. There is a tremendous potential home market for the products of a local packing plant using locally raised cattle. Livestock in the State increased between 3 and 5 times in 1941–42 over 1937–38, with almost unlimited room for further expansion. Several felt that cotton production has always been overemphasized in this section—that the profit in cotton raising and the probability of profitable years in farm operation could be greatly increased if cotton were used as one of several farming activities rather than planted as a one-crop gamble.

CONVERSION OF WAR PLANTS

Everyone agreed that proper planning plus prompt and vigorous action to convert war

plants into economic and employment assets for this State at the conclusion of the emergency is a major responsibility. Recognition of the potential possibilities of this new available resource for Arkansas' industrial advancement is up to business leaders. Three hundred and fifty-seven million dollars of Federal funds have been put into the erection or expansion of war industries in Arkansas; though this is the next to the smallest amount in any of the Southern States, it is nevertheless considerable capital. Arkansas' rank in these expenditures was deemed to be, paradoxically, an advantage, in that it will be more practicable to convert this reasonably proportionate amount of new potential, than it will be in the case of other States where investments for war activity are so tremendous as to be top-heavy in the State's economy; this much new capital should be within the reasonable capacity of Arkansas business to retain, convert, and control.

Considerable preliminary progress has been made by the State economic council, which has established a research division and appointed a full group of committees, to work on conversion of war industries and give them a place in the reemployment programs. It is felt probable that in some instances the better approach will be to break a large activity down into several separate operations and allow several different operators to take over rather than for one organization to take over in size out of proportion to its capacity.

* * * * *

Lack of adequate supply of cheap power has always been one of the most serious impediments to industrial progress in this State, but one of the members assured that abundant cheap power is now available. He said the problem has now changed from one of being able to obtain the power needed to one of being able to solve the question of what to do with that which is currently available. Further investigation and study must be made of the conversion and utilization of the vast investment in the army camps. National trends will of course direct the course of commercial aviation, but consideration of the greatest value that can be derived from the numerous aviation schools, flying and emergency landing fields, now functioning in the State should have a proper place in all studies and planning.

RAW MATERIALS

Considerable emphasis was placed on the short-sightedness and resultant economic loss to the State of producing raw materials, only to dispose of them at minimum prices to out-of-State industries, thereby allowing all the more attractive profits to accrue to foreign industry. The selling prices for manufactured wood products make the money received by sawmills for the lumber going into these products look ridiculously small. Mines receive 2½ cents per pound for bauxite as it is mined—the processed metal sells for 15 cents per pound; the products manufactured from aluminum sell for notably more for each pound of the fabricated article. One line of development that would be of most value to the profit and employment opportunities offered by the State's natural resources would be plants for the manufacture of articles ready for public consumption fabricated near the sources of supply of aluminum and other mined products, lumber, cotton, and other growing crops—vast quantities of all of which are readily available. One member placed particular emphasis on the opportunities that the State's natural resources offer in the field of plastics.

Several factors have combined to cause the retardation of development in this direction in the past, and these impediments must be overcome by an alert and an aggressive leadership. Discriminatory freight rates are a man-made impediment that is not based on any principle of fairness or logical reasoning—they must be equalized to afford a fair opportunity for advancement to all sections of the Nation. Noncompetitive levels of taxation as between States have frightened both local and outside capital; readjustment of the Arkansas tax structure to make it competitive with other areas in the Nation must be undertaken if the State is to attract and convince intelligent, analytical investors. * * *

Our laws and public attitudes regarding monopolies must be improved. Under present conditions, there is too much justified fear that if the small investor takes a chance on participating in a new enterprise that must necessarily start small, such enterprise is foredoomed to absorption or freeze-out by monopolistic groups as soon as it attains a moderate degree of success.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION

Particularly during the early months of post-war adjustment, we should take special account of the neglect of road and bridge construction and maintenance during the war period; also of the constructive values in such other public improvements as the erection of needed public buildings for replacement of obsolete structures or addition to present overtaxed facilities. This same field would include levee construction, dams, parks and playgrounds, soil-conservation projects, and forestation. Such programs should provide productive opportunity for utilization of manpower that might otherwise be a drag on the market. * * * The trail of mistakes in our past experience must be avoided—building solely as a vehicle of employment rather than for the attainment of objectives that constitute worth-while economic gains for the community and for the Nation.

The field of electrification offers opportunities for sound advancement, economic improvement, and the employment of labor, with special emphasis on the possibility of extensive activities in a program for rural communities.

Most careful thought and planning must be devoted to improved housing for low-income urban and rural families. The needs are limitless. A realistic approach requires fullest consideration of the capacity of low-income groups to appreciate, fully utilize, care for, and finance these developments; it was felt that a program that would fall far short of being self-liquidating is not the answer. A vigorous educational campaign, well-rounded planning, recognition of sound business principles, and application of intelligent administration could be coordinated to overcome many of the obstacles that stand in the way of activity in this direction.

The same problems, possibilities of progress, and possible solutions arise in connection with a program of expansion in certain types of community recreational, educational, and cultural facilities.

LABOR

It was generally agreed that the attitude of the development program toward labor would have a great influence on the solidity and the permanence of progress made. With full realization of the many complexities involved in providing work for tens of thousands of unemployed people, we cannot leave out of our thinking the fact that if the solutions are built on substandard wage structures, substandard working conditions, and unsound labor-relation policies, they will be merely temporary palliatives and the building will not be permanent.

The ingenuity and organizational capacity of the community must be directed to an industrial structure that will give workers a wage figured to maintain American standards of living, allow reasonable profits, and at the same time enable the products to enter world competition.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Our No. 1 problem is to provide employment for an anticipated unemployed labor force of 100,000 Arkansans, composed largely of returned soldiers and former war workers; the solution must be ready to start functioning immediately upon completion of the war. This employment must be on a sound basis, with full consideration given to the assurance of its permanence.

2. Planning is essential to the solution of the problem. The best engineers available should be utilized in this planning program. Every business leader in the State must participate in it. Every employer and worker should interest himself in it and do what he can to contribute toward it. It is everybody's business and everybody shares the responsibility and the opportunities.

3. The problems are so extensive, and so many individuals are involved, that we must fully explore every agent and every agency that can contribute toward the solutions. We must not let our personal interest in one phase of the problem or one of the approaches to solutions blind us to the importance of the many others.

4. There is the ever-present danger of unsound approach in the relative emphasis placed on Government contribution, with resulting Government controls. Local capital, local industry, and local leadership must be our first line of offense. With these as a solid foundation, outside capital, industry, and individuals can better be attracted. A careful sense of balance must be maintained in consideration of the advantages of supplementation by Government finance and Government subsidies compared with the dangers of resulting Government domination.

5. Fullest consideration must be given to the fact that Arkansas has always been predominantly an agricultural State. Planning should be primarily based on its natural resources, its soil possibilities, and its climatic advantages. Industrial development should be used as an adjunct and a supplementation to these natural advantages.

6. Legislation must be strengthened to protect the small investor against absorption and other dangers of powerful monopolies. Legislation must also be strengthened to protect Federal Government investments in industrial facilities against such dishonest and selfish interests as many of those that were active in the conversion, liquidation, and adjustment following World War No. 1.

7. Legislation must equalize freight rates. Legislation must place Arkansas in a competitive position on local taxes.

8. As an integral part of an expansion prospectus, there must be a dynamic program of education to increase the desire, ability, and capacity to consume at higher standards and in greater quantities.

Message of President Manuel Quezon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I have the honor of including in the extension of my remarks the message to the Mexican people from His Excellency Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Philippines, on October 22, 1943.

The centuries old friendly relations between Mexico and the Philippines is strengthened more than ever upon the acceptance of the invitation of the Club de Las Americas by His Excellency Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Philippines, to send a message of greetings to the Mexican people and to their illustrious President on the celebration of La Noche Mexicana, a program dedicated to Mexico, on the evening of October 22, 1943, in the Department of the Interior Auditorium, in Washington, D. C. The significance of the occasion was to commemorate the forty-second anniversary of the Second Pan-American Conference which was held in Mexico City.

Dr. Francisco Banda, president of the Club de Las Americas, and Mr. Maximiano Marmito Villareal, a Philippine member of the Little Congress of the United States, led the club in arranging the program regarding the participation of the Philippines into the Mexican Night celebration.

Due to his inability to appear in person the Philippine President sent a representative in the person of Col. Manuel Nieto, who delivered the presidential message in its original version in Spanish before the presence of His Excellency Francisco Castillo Najera, Mexican Ambassador to the United States, and other distinguished members of the Latin-American Diplomatic Corps and Government officials.

The text of President Quezon's message is as follows:

Dr. Banda, Mr. Ambassador, ladies, and gentlemen, with the pleasure I have always felt in connection with anything related to Mexico, I have gladly accepted the invitation of the Club de las Americas to send a message of greetings on the occasion of this festival commemorating the forty-second anniversary of the Second Pan-American Conference, held in Mexico City on October 22, 1901.

To speak of Pan-American Conference without mentioning, even though in the manner of a dutiful innovation, the one held in Panama in 1826, under the auspices and inspiration of the great liberator, Simón Bolivar, beginning of the first movement toward the confederation of the states, the forerunner of international arbitration and of the organization of the nations would be irreverent, particularly because in that congress was born the igneous force by which the solidarity of all the Americas has been forging ahead.

Furthermore, because of that movement, the world is today witnessing a success without precedents attained in the policy of good will among the American nations, united today in a common effort for destroying the forces of tyranny and totalitarianism.

The commemoration of this congress in Mexico, the seat of culture which is kin to Philippine culture, united by the spiritual bands of one language and one faith, makes doubly pleasant my participation in the commemoration of this highly important basic event in the history of peace and agreement of all the Americas.

One cannot speak, without being unfair, of pan-Americanism without making known a central figure of this movement, and it is: The man who has given birth and significance to the good-neighbor policy, a policy for forging the solidarity of the Americas, both North and South, same dynamic leader and far-seeing statesman to whom the Philippines owe our act of liberty—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I shall always remember pleasantly my visit to Mexico in 1937. How can anyone forget the warmth and generous hospitality of that great people? I had the good fortune and honor of meeting His Excellency, General Don Manuel Avila Camacho, who was then the Minister of War and today your illustrious president, a statesman of unsurpassable vigor, the far-seeing guide proving in this hour that his is one of the countries most jealous of its liberty, as is so clearly witnessed by its revolutionary past, an honor of which the Mexican people can well be proud, and which we who are lovers of peace and liberty should recognize.

The revolutionary past of Mexico, as a contemporary writer well states it, "is somewhat like a liberal school of political constructors of other republics" and its moral leadership has not been able to help it but to exercise their moulding influence in the maintenance of good will between the United States and the countries of Latin America.

And what can be said with regard to the beauty of Mexico, the unsurpassable jewel of nature—always alive in the remembrance of anyone who has enjoyed the bewitching paradisaical panoramas of Xochimilco, Monterey, Cuernavaca, etc.? What about the strong, tanned beauty of its women, the spruceness and gallantry of its men, the exotic melody of its dances and songs, the lyricism of its poetry, and the drama of its folklore, which are not known to all of us?

There was a time when the Philippines were governed by a Spanish viceroy from Mexico, Acapulco was the terminal of the galleons which ran betwen Mexico and Manila. Is it strange then to behold that there is a spiritual affinity, which has stood the proof of time, between Mexico and the Philippine people? Or, that they are joined in the struggle for the same ideals and principles of liberty? My country is no longer governed by a Mexican viceroy nor are there any galleons to negotiate between Acapulco and Manila, and therefore, Mexico and the Philippines are better identified than ever, since they are engaged as an integral part of the United Nations in a fight which binds us indissolubly. Victory will be necessarily ours, since the cause for humanity is invincible.

In the name of the Philippine people it is my pleasure today to send my most cordial greeting to the Mexican people and to their illustrious and worthy president, His Excellency Manuel Avila Camacho.

Keyman of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News of October 8, 1943:

KEYMAN OF THE ARMY—RECORD OF GENERAL SOMERVELL IN SPEEDING WAR SUPPLIES TO ALL FRONTS—PROSPECT THAT MARSHALL SHIFT MAY INCREASE DUTIES OF CHIEF OF SERVICE FORCES

The urgent new tempo of the war and plans to use Gen. George C. Marshall in a broader field of command have set off a dispute over the future control of the Army. Undersurface rumblings are reaching into the open. The name of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, head of the Army Service Forces, is dragged into stories of Army cabals. A cry of politics in the Army, raised in Congress, is only half beaten down by the protests of President Roosevelt and General Marshall.

At the bottom of these stories is the old friendship of General Somervell for President Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins. General Marshall says the stories are harmful to Army morale and grossly unfair to a great American officer. He says General Somervell is his keyman, and that the appointment, assignment, or promotion of any Army officer is without political consideration. The President acts upon the recommendations of General Marshall and Secretary Stimson in making such changes.

The real situation is this: When General Marshall goes to a new assignment with the duty of directing the use of United Nations troops in the big assault upon Germany he must have a competent supply man in Washington to keep the goods of war flowing to him in the field. That is the big job left on the home front. And that is the work that General Somervell has been doing. He has streamlined and whipped into shape the organization that supplies the soldier with everything he uses, except his brain and body.

But in the development of his organization General Somervell has trodden upon many toes. He has paid little heed to red tape. When he needed material to hurry supplies he grabbed it. Congressman or manufacturer who got in the way of the general's doing what he regarded as his job was likely to get pushed around.

The cry of politics is directly related to the friendship of the general with Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hopkins. In the early days of the New Deal General Somervell, then a major, was executive officer for the National Emergency Council, the planning body for the depression. He worked on the Florida ship canal, was an engineer consultant for the Works Progress Administration, and ran the W. P. A. in New York. When the war started he began a spectacular rise.

General Somervell was a lieutenant colonel in 1940 when called to Washington to straighten out a mess in Army housing. He did the job so well he got a medal. In a year and a quarter he shot up four grades over scores of officers to become a lieutenant general. Even then, his permanent rank in the Army was only that of a colonel until last week when he was raised to a permanent rank of major general. Yet the breadth and scope of his powers are second only to those of General Marshall. His leap upward created enemies in the service. He rearranged the War Department and reshuffled many of the old-line agencies. Some older officers resented his changes.

Resentments grew. General Somervell was spoken of as a political general. His White House connection was magnified. Among some groups, he was spoken of as Harry Hopkins' man in the Army. The word spread that a new War Department reorganization was under way to give him a closer personal command over the Army's spending program, taking authority away from procurement officers in the field. There was even a rumor that he was being considered as a running mate for President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

The President denounced the story when it emerged in print. General Marshall protested against the spread of such rumors. He praised General Somervell highly.

The job General Somervell has done has put him in line, if not at the top of the list, for running the Army when General Marshall moves on. For he has widened the stream of America's munitions flow from a driblet to a mighty river.

This year, the services under his command are spending $21,000,000,000. Ordnance alone is getting $17,000,000,000 worth of goods. The Corps of Engineers has built enough highways in the last 2 years to girdle the globe. The Quartermaster Corps gets for the Army enough shoes every month to put a pair on every man in Illinois. It would take 80 Empire State buildings to store the supplies that the Army Service Forces now hold.

These goods are pumped out to the 2,000,000 men overseas at the rate of 272 shiploads a month. They go to Alaska to be hauled over its railroad into the frost-bitten wastes, to Sicily, and to fill the supply dumps of the South Pacific.

To keep the goods coming will be the top job that General Marshall will leave behind. The war strategy already is set. The forces are moving steadily into spots from which to deliver the knockout blows against the Axis. But the goods with which to do it must arrive on time. That is the job General Somervell has been doing all along. An irked W. P. A. worker in New York said about the then Colonel Somervell that he supposed the man who built the pyramids was efficient, too.

New Steal by New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the record of the past 12 nerve-racking years to indicate that New Deal economics are either orthodox, sound, sensible, or prudent. Consequently, it is not as surprising to Americans as it must be to economists of other countries to find the White House and its obedient tub thumpers now proclaiming with straight faces, but strange reasoning, that food subsidies are a means of preventing inflation. It is, of course, obvious that the exact opposite is true, but it has never been the habit of the Roosevelt New Deal to adhere to the obvious when it is possible to affiliate with the occult.

Never was the perversity of congenital new dealers to proceed in the direction precisely opposite to the destination which they preach more apparent than the present high-pressure effort to sell food subsidies to America on the basis that they are anti-inflationary. Should they succeed in this attempt, patent-medicine peddlers for generations to come will study their technique and alchemists will come out of hiding with hope revived that the market for gold bricks is again active.

Telling John Q. Public that the way to curb inflation is to store up vast excesses of purchasing power by paying today's board bills from tomorrow's taxes while private money goes begging for something else to buy is like prescribing whisky as a cure for drunkenness or sugar-coated candy as the remedy for diabetes. It is sadly reminiscent of earlier New Deal programs to make food available to the hungry by plowing under growing crops and paying subsidies for killing little pigs.

A fair price for a full crop remains today, as always, the best stimulus for increased production. Farmers know this and fair prices are all they ask. Most emphatically, therefore, the onus for deferring the costs of today's groceries by adding them to the crippling taxes, which even now must be levied upon the soldiers returning from this war, must not fall upon the American farmer. If President Roosevelt and his star-gazing puppets succeed in forcing the quack program of price roll-backs and food subsidies upon the American public, let them assume full blame for its consequences. The stigma must not fall upon the farmer. For every farmer who would like to fatten his purse through easy Government subsidies, rather than through receiving a fair price for the products of his acres, there are a hundred farmers who oppose the New Deal food-subsidy scheme and abhor the idea of being forced to accept such payments in lieu of proper and equitable prices.

Farmers are wise enough, also, to realize that behind the program of the President and his subsidy strategists is a thinly hidden plan to remove the subsidies when the emergency is over and thus once again force the farmer to become dependent upon Government hand-outs for a decent livelihood. Finally, the farmer realizes the desire of this administration, as demonstrated so many times before, to continue a pipe line of public money from the White House to the farmhouse in order to exercise controls and enforce directives which curtail the independence of the farmer and tend to make him subject to Government directives and directors.

A fair price for a full crop, once established as public policy, assures the farmer of his American right to earn an honest living by following the dictates of his own judgment and the practices of his own experience. A program of dependency upon Government subsidies is at best a hand-to-mouth existence for the farmer and prevents him from planning his future or arranging his affairs with any security or certainty.

What the farmer wants is a fairly predictable opportunity to sell his annual products at parity prices, not a fanciful panacea depending upon annual payments appropriated by Congress and paid for out of the toil and sweat of future generations who are already facing the greatest public debt which any nation in the world has ever had.

It has been held that paying for today's board bills by taxing future generations is stealing from tomorrow's children to pay for the food of today's citizens. An important metropolitan newspaper published in New England, the Boston American, recently carried an editorial entitled, "New Steal by New Deal," which strikes home to the point and which is well worth the careful study and contemplation of every American both in and out of Congress. By authority granted me by the House, Mr. Speaker, I conclude these remarks by incorporating that editorial as a part of the RECORD. It is reprinted from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Gazette along with some pertinent comments by its editor, Mr. L. W. Robinson:

NEW STEAL BY NEW DEAL

It is interesting, occasionally, to get the slant of citizens of sections of the country other than our own. Problems of the New England States are, in many instances, different from those of the Northwest; and yet there is an interrelated problem common to both. One such appears to be the New Deal.

Note, for instance, the following editorial in the October 13 edition of the Boston American, under the caption "New Steal by New Deal":

"The New Deal's subsidy program has been represented to the public as something almost miraculous. It pretends to be a program which will support farm prices without inducing inflation, and which will hold down the cost of living for wage earners without increasing taxes.

"In fact, it is only a new guise of the New Deal's old formula of buying political support from labor groups on one hand and from farmers on the other by use of public funds.

"Through its O. P. A. the New Deal establishes 'ceiling' prices.

"However, farmers cannot produce foodstuffs at low enough costs to meet these arbitrary prices, especially in view of the shortage of manpower and machinery caused by the New Deal's blunders in managing war production.

"This condition impels farmers to curtail production—and to vote resentfully against the New Deal.

"And the New Deal wants them to do neither.

"So the New Deal devises a scheme, somewhat like its discredited A. A. A. program, to pay farmers a bonus out of the Public Treasury.

"To do this, the New Deal must use money, and the New Deal has no money of its own.

"Hence the New Deal proposes to borrow the money on the public credit and to pay it out again in subsidies.

"To get its proposal through Congress, the New Deal asks that the 'borrowing power' of its Commodity Credit Corporation be increased by $500,000,000 to provide the money which will be used to pay farmers to sell foods at less than cost.

"Right here the deception begins. The labor organizations are demanding, not $500,000,000 but $2,000,000,000—four times as much—for subsidies, and of course the New Deal will yield eventually to the labor groups.

"The $500,000,000 first proposed is only the camel's nose under the tent of subsidy spending.

"At the same point, the subsidy plan becomes inflationary also.

"In order to borrow the money and have it available for disbursement, the New Deal must borrow it from commercial banks, setting up 'credits' for itself in these institutions.

"This will result in currency inflation as soon as, and to the extent that, the Government pays the money out; for the money then goes into circulation, increasing the total amount of money which the public has to spend without increasing the total supply of goods for which the money can be spent.

"The effect will be greater scarcities of goods, and either higher prices authorized by the Government or else uncontrollable black markets.

"And likewise, eventually it must become evident that the subsidy plan means more taxation instead of less, since the Government must repay its loans or add them to the Federal debt and pay interest on them.

"The inflationary effects will not be felt immediately.

"Nor will the tax burden be felt immediately.

"They will be deferred long enough for the New Deal to get by the 1944 election.

"That makes the subsidy plan wholly advantageous for the New Deal.

"Meanwhile, the farmer will be caught in a vise. He will have to submit to Government regulation—regimentation—to get his subsidies.

"Should the subsidy be withdrawn from him or suspended by some politician, with market prices held below the cost of production by Government fiat, the farmer would be quickly ruined.

"Obviously, then, the subsidy plan includes coercion of the farmer's vote—by and for the New Deal.

"The simple, honest program—and one which every honest farmer, honest Congressman, and honest consumer must prefer—is to let the farmers have fair prices and to adjust consumer prices accordingly.

"But in that case the farmer would be an independent citizen again, and might not need to vote for the New Deal, and the labor groups would be antagonized and might vote against the New Deal."

For the information of the Boston American and its eastern readers be it said that a "simple honest program" that will "let farmers have fair prices," with "consumer prices adjusted accordingly" is just what South Dakota farmers are contending for.

As to the South Dakota farmer's relation to the New Deal, the eastern newspaper may be interested in knowing that South Dakota is the most preponderant anti-New Deal State in the Union, as witnessed in the last general election when the highest per capita Republican vote of any commonwealth was registered here.

Here's something for Massachusetts to aim at in 1944.

A Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence from the United States News:

A STEP FORWARD—PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT STAFF OF TECHNICAL EXPERTS FOR SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IS A WELCOME MOVE—IT WILL HELP CHECK EXPENDITURES AND KEEP FAITH WITH THE LENDERS OF MONEY TO THE GOVERNMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Congress has too long been trying to write legislation without possessing the necessary information and background for the job.

Members of both Houses are expected by their constituents to be experts in business, agriculture, labor, taxation, finance, social welfare, and even war-making.

The public often expresses itself critically about Congress, and the impression too frequently created is that the executive departments and agencies know more about the kind of legislation that should be passed than do the legislators.

Under the present administration, the trend has gone far in the direction of drafting or preparing bills for passage by Congress. Strictly speaking, where, as in parliamentary governments, the executive and legislative functions are merged, it is customary for the executive officials to prepare legislation and accept the responsibility for adoption by parliament.

But under our system, where the legislative and executive branches are coordinate, we have been inclined to forget that the legislators are not always equipped to write or analyze proposed legislation because they do not have the time and sometimes the background to make thorough studies.

Even the testimony of investigating committees which is often valuable and instructive is not read by all the Members of Congress, and yet they find it necessary to vote on the merits of the bills that sometimes emerge from such inquiries or surveys.

The simple truth of the matter is that the average Senator and Representative today is trying to do an impossible task—to perform the errands and chores which his constituents impose upon him and to keep up with the legislative side of things.

EACH MEMBER OF CONGRESS NEEDS A LARGER STAFF

The Senators and Representatives do not have the staffs to handle the immense amount of correspondence which flows their way and, apart from clerical help, they need assistants with an economic background to help digest the many valuable letters they receive containing proposals or suggestions or criticisms of needed legislation.

This writer a few years ago urged that each Member of Congress be provided with an adequate staff of aides. There have been abuses, of course, in the past in the matter of putting relatives in clerical positions, but this should never have postponed the solution of the more important problem of furnishing the desk room and staff needed by the Members of both Houses at a time when dependence on the legislative body should be increasing instead of diminishing.

But if more staff for the individual Member is not provided, there is no reason why congressional committees should any longer be deprived of assistants.

EXPERTS SHOULD HAVE NO TIES WITH POLITICS

Last week Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, introduced a resolution with the support of the entire Appropriations Committee of the Senate, including its chairman, Senator GLASS, of Virginia, namely, that $30,000 be provided for experts to assist in analyzing the appropriations desired by executive agencies of the Government. The Senate unanimously adopted the resolution.

The reaction of the public to this splendid idea will not be one of doubt as to its desirability but of genuine surprise that something like this has not been done before by the Senate. It is true the House Committee on Appropriations has provided itself with technical assistance, and so has the Joint Committee of the Senate and House on Internal Revenue Taxation, but the reform is relatively recent and has not gone far enough.

For one thing the addition of permanent staffs to the important committees will prevent the subject from becoming involved in personal patronage, and it is to be hoped that these experts will, like the drafting clerks, be kept outside of politics and that their services will be available to majority and minority alike.

The American people have for many years felt that expenditures by their Government have not been properly checked. The establishment of the office of Comptroller General back in 1921 came at the same time that the Office of Director of the Budget was created. While many valuable benefits have come from both, the plan has serious defects.

In the first place, the Budget Director's office, while for a time incorporated in the Treasury, has lately become too much under the political sway of the White House and the governmental departments. It is not an independent agency. It is too easily influenced by department heads or by the President himself. But if such an office is to be a part of the executive branch, it doubtless must remain under the President's control as to policies to be pursued.

The office of Comptroller General, on the other hand, is independent. It is the creature of and reports directly to Congress. But it presents serious complications because most of its auditing and checking is done after the money has been spent. There is really no way to apply preventives except by rulings which relate to past transactions and not to moneys to be spent under statutes of widely different phraseology and under new and unprecedented circumstances.

Both the offices of Budget Director and Comptroller General should be retained, but Congress should establish the check which the Constitution specifically stipulates as the function of the National Legislature. Congress should decide before it appropriates money what the executive agencies should be permitted to do with it, and if they abuse their discretionary powers, limitations should be placed in the very next appropriation bills to prevent recurrence.

The power of the purse is an ancient prerogative of legislative bodies. Under our system of government, wherein the Congress is coordinate with the Executive, the tendency has been to accept executive leadership without setting up any corresponding measure of responsibility. And as long as we elect Presidents for rigid 4-year terms and do not avail ourselves of the opportunity to check the executive power overnight and make it responsible to the electorate always, we must devise better checks as against executive abuse of legislative appropriations.

USE OF PEOPLE'S MONEY SHOULD BE SCRUTINIZED

One vital method of checking is to provide Congress with the experts who can delve constantly into governmental expenditures and make suggestions for economy without running the risk of being dismissed by departmental heads or by the President himself. Oftentimes the matter of an appropriation raises a serious question of policy—whether the activity in question should be carried on at all. Congress alone should finally decide this, and yet so well entrenched is the departmental or bureau personnel that it seems almost impossible to terminate any governmental agency once its employees feel they have a vested right in the continuance of such a department or bureau.

We are appropriating $100,000,000,000 in these days of wartime necessity, but the congressional staffs which must deal with these huge sums are just the same as they were when the Federal budget was $6,000,000,000 a year. There is a distinct danger in neglecting this important phase in spending the public's money. With the people buying bonds in greater numbers than at any time in our history, it is desirable that the people's representatives concentrate as never before on a study of what actually happens to the money the people lend their government.

WE MUST GUARD RIGHTS OF BUYERS OF WAR BONDS

To spend $30,000 to find out what has been done with the billions we have spent is to make but a feeble start. If the Congress spent even as much as $1,000,000 a year in employing technical help to assist in writing legislation it would pay huge dividends to the American people, for the Government belongs to the people and not to the bureaucrats, and the Government, moreover, owes nobody a lifetime job in administrative work.

Our forefathers wrote into the Constitution that there should be a strict accounting of

all moneys spent. But how can the Executive be brought to book for what he or his associates do with public moneys each year if the Congress makes lump-sum appropriations and then doesn't take the trouble to find out what the lump sum has been spent for? There is no suggestion here of corruption but a criticism of something sometimes worse—extravagance and stupidity in spending the people's money. The Constitution says:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

What is a "regular statement and account"?

Certainly any private business which issued a financial statement with as little information in it for the stockholders or bondholders as the statements issued by our Government would find itself in difficulties with the so-called "truth in securities" law and the regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The action of the Senate in giving its Appropriations Committee a permanent staff to work all the year round in studying expenditures by the executive agencies is a step forward—a step necessary if we are to keep faith with the citizens who are being asked every day to subscribe to the bonds of their Government.

Feed-Service Men Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks I include an editorial, "Feed-Service Men Needed," from the October 16 issue of the newspaper Feedstuffs.

FEED-SERVICE MEN NEEDED

Restrictions that are being placed upon traveling salesmen of all kinds, and which are extended now to include feed-service men, in regard to gasoline allotments are so stringent that they force virtually the discontinuation of such efforts. Limited to 480 miles a month—less than 15 miles a day—in most instances, neither a salesman nor a serviceman can much more than get out of town. He cannot render any help to customers in relation to the value of services he performed previously.

GASOLINE RESTRICTION AN ADDITIONAL HANDICAP

We do not know any more about the country's gasoline situation than we have read in the newspapers, and that information has been so confusing and variable that the only conclusion to be reached is that no one is very well versed in it. No one can say certainly and indisputably that the stringent restrictions are or are not necessary. Secretary Ickes should know the country's supplies and requirements, and his word probably would be accepted if it were not for the fact that many honest and conscientious men give Mr. Ickes a vote of no confidence based on some of his past performances and statements. Other men within and without Congress who are in position to have or to obtain accurate information contend that gasoline rationing does not need to be as severe in all cases as it is.

But, pleading lack of knowledge as to the extent of the gasoline shortage, we think it is fair to comment on the value of certain feed-service work to the wartime food-production program and the importance to the country of maintaining those services to as great an extent as it can possibly be done. Forcing the cessation of activities that are designed to increase food production is no more a help to the country's military efforts than would be similar handicaps placed upon munitions production.

It is probable that the reduction in gasoline allotments to feed servicemen has its source in a misunderstanding of the functions and achievements of that group. A mistaken idea prevails in Washington and in local ration boards that, the actual selling of feeds being no longer a problem, any sort of activity which entails traveling to see customers is superfluous. The only way that such an idea can be corrected is to make a specific and impressive showing, both to Washington and to local ration boards, of the benefits to food production that result when experienced and skilled men consistently can give advice on the use of feeds for most efficient production, on the elimination of wasteful feeding practices, and on the general management of poultry and livestock.

Generalizations along this line will do no good, but it should be possible for feed men to compile such a mass of specific evidence on the value of service activities that the industry's pleas for more gasoline cannot be ignored.

The great need for such service to be furnished by someone at this time—and the feed industry is in the best position to do it—was brought out clearly by a survey conducted this summer by the Ralston Purina Co. The method employed was personal interviews with 9,500 representative feeders, both large and small.

MUCH POTENTIAL FOOD PRODUCTION IS BEING LOST

A summary of the results of this survey showed that, among poultry raisers, 97.2 percent of the flocks needed some correction that would increase production, 66.4 percent were producing at less than 60-percent efficiency when investigated, 50.4 percent of the flocks had too little housing space and 31.1 percent had too much, 82 percent had too little feed and water equipment, 39.4 percent of the flocks had disease or parasites, 24.3 percent of the flock owners took too long to bring their pullets into production.

As for dairymen, 99 percent of the herds needed some correction which would increase production, 22 percent of the herds were having udder trouble in more than 10 percent of the cows, 13.9 percent were having retained afterbirths in more than 10 percent of the cows, 48.3 percent had too many dry cows, 11.5 percent of owners let their cows stay dry too short a time, 84.4 percent of owners did not clean up the cow or give her a clean, bedded stall at calving, 41 percent reported trouble from scours in calves, 60.4 percent of owners never weigh each cow's milk as a guide to feeding.

Among hog raisers, it was found that 97.7 percent of the herds needed some correction which would increase production; 15.9 percent had no farrowing house; 17.8 percent did not have enough farrowing pens; the pens were too small in 23.4 percent of the cases and 49.8 percent of them had no guard rails; 59.4 percent of the owners did not wash and disinfect the sow and pen at farrowing time and 46.6 percent did not keep a man with the sows at farrowing time; 48.2 percent of the owners do not vaccinate and 52.3 percent do not worm pigs; 28.6 percent do not feed supplement to sows and pigs and 24.7 percent do not feed supplement to hogs; 29.6 percent of the owners reported trouble in their herds from such diseases as anemia, scours, cholera, necro, flu, erysipelas, or abortion.

The particular feed company that made the survey immediately turned its sales and dealer organization to the job of trying to correct these conditions that constitute such a handicap to maximum food production. The Ralston Purina Co. is by no means alone in such an effort. The feed industry as a whole has developed a service consciousness which is of vast importance to the country's wartime program if it is allowed to continue. It can't continue to any great extent, of course, if its value is not recognized by the O. P. A., the War Manpower Commission, and other similar agencies that set the rules.

FEED MEN MUST PLEAD THEIR CASE

The specific facts on what feed-service men accomplish and what they can accomplish in increasing food production and in minimizing the effects of feed shortages should be brought strongly to the attention both of local and national authorities. It is up to individual companies to present their cases locally, but nationally an industry presentation should be made. The Grain and Feed Dealers National Association has taken steps to do this, but its representatives cannot get far without concrete support from its members. It needs positive, specific information on all such activities and the benefits that result from them.

The feed industry is going to have to tell its story and sell its value if it is to overcome such obstacles as gasoline curtailment. It will have to offer direct and indisputable proof of its essential character, and it will have to champion itself.

Reproof by the Greeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a very timely editorial on Greece which appeared in the Peoria Journal Transcript, Peoria, Ill., on October 21, 1943:

REPROOF BY THE GREEKS

Resignation of the Greek Government in exile is one of the most regrettable incidents of the war.

For Greece, brave little Greece, was a sacrifice on the altar of democracy. Its land was ravished, its people are starving because they had the courage to stand up against Hitler while the rest of the world was wringing its hands. The Greek patriots who made up that government in exile, feel they have been slapped in the face by United Nations by the alliance with the Badoglio and the Victor Emanuel government.

The people of America will do themselves and the world a great disfavor unless they understand the reason for the protest and sympathize with the anguish of the dissenting Greeks. Their hope is not alone for victory, but for a world in which democracy—the best fruit of early Greek civilization—becomes a reality in the relationship existing between countries, as well as between men. They cannot see real democracy in the acceptance, by England and the United States, of the Emanuel-Badoglio combination. They may be in error. General Eisenhower accepted the Victor Emanuel government with Badoglio as its premier at a time when none

could foresee the results of our Italian invasion. Those results have been good—from a military standpoint. Politically, it may be that the effect of our collaboration with these two men will injure us at the council table. Greece is not a very big nation. But the character of a man is revealed by the way he treats little people, as well as by the way he treats big ones. It is manifest that Russia may feel we are a bit hair-trigger on "making deals" as a result of what has happened in Italy, illuminated by the resignation of the Greek government in exile.

Americans of good will cannot fail to hope this is not the case. Practically, our strategy in Italy has been justified. Politically, it is still suspect. Therefore it devolves upon us now to prove our good will and our high determination toward democracy in our future acts. We have been reproved by the Greek resignation.

We must justify our course, not only by winning the war, but by seeing to it that the peace gives to Greece the security and honor to which it is entitled because of its splendid service to our cause.

Address of National Commander Warren H. Atherton of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has been a strong, vibrant force in our national life for 24 years. Recently a fellow townsman of mine, Warren H. Atherton, was elected the national commander of the Legion. He delivered his first major speech as national commander to the convention of the American Federation of Labor on October 8, 1943. Commander Atherton will carry the torch for the Legion into all parts of the Nation during this year and I can assure you from my long intimate acquaintance with him that he will do a good job. We must remember that whenever he talks he is merely expressing the thoughts, the hopes and the ideals of the more than a million members of the Legion.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include herewith the speech above referred to:

I am indeed happy to be with you at this meeting because to me it represents an opportunity to get two great organizations of this country—two great American organizations of this country—in the harness together to work for the best interests of this country. I feel personally a deep obligation to organized labor because I worked as a switchman for 3 years, in 1909, 1910, and 1911. The money that I obtained at that time enabled me to complete my education. I was appreciative enough of the things that I obtained through my organization to remain an active trainman from 1911 to this date. I come before you today as the head of the American Legion, and of course in presenting our honest views and convictions to you I will do my best to present them as the Legion would have them presented; but I present them also with a deep understanding and sympathetic consideration of a man who has worked and is proud of the fact that he is a member of an affiliated labor organization. Before going into the words I wish to say to you today I want to announce that at our recent convention I was authorized to set up a committee to consist of three members of organized labor and three members of business and one man with no affiliation with either business or labor—for the purpose of considering the problems of employer and employee and to make available the influence of our organization in attempting to bring them to a practical solution. And I want to announce my first appointment to that committee today. Mr. J. R. Burns, a fellow Californian, a long-time friend—the national president of the Federation of Government Employees.

I noticed in the press yesterday that one of the resolutions you have for consideration here is a matter upon which we acted in Omaha. Perhaps you have not yet acted upon that resolution. I will tell you what our action was. It was to urge that the abuse of the franking privilege by Members of Congress be stopped. We think it is poor consideration to the postman to break his back carrying around loads of lousy propaganda and sweet stuff for gaping geese. At the Omaha convention 1,250,000 surviving soldiers of World War No. 1 pledged themselves to service before self. They didn't waste any time asking for pensions or concessions for themselves; instead they renewed their pledge of service to God and to country and backed that pledge with the offer of money and manpower. They went all out for buying bonds, putting blood in the blood banks, collecting scrap and in mobilizing manpower for universal service in winning the war, and in doing everything that is humanly possible to keep a flow of food and medicine and ships and guns and tanks going to your sons and our sons who are fighting at the front and in making provision for collaboration with other nations after this war in order that this catastrophe may not visit the world again within our lives or if ever at all.

We considered and renewed our position on the subject of universal service. I am sure every one of you here is familiar with the fact that for 20 long years we have asked to have introduced into the Congress of the United States a measure which in the event of a crisis in this Nation would place at the service of the President, as its Commander in Chief, every man, woman, and child, and every pound of material, and which would freeze every price on a basis of a 4-year average preceding that emergency, until the emergency was over.

The men who wore the uniform in the last war thought sure that if war should come again to this country that it could be more efficiently won; that the cost in lives and in money would be very much less, that on M-day the President could command the services of every American and that he could freeze as of that day every price.

I think it has been our experience during the last 2 years that there would have been greater justice done to every group in this country, there would have been a lessened burden upon the back of generations yet unborn if prices had been fixed on Pearl Harbor Day. Sometime ago in a meeting at Chicago, I served with a representative of your organization from Kansas City, and we were considering then the possibility of inflation coming to this country, and this man said it has been a historical experience that in the event of inflation wages never rise as fast as the cost of living. I think that has been proven in the past 2 years, so I urge upon you serious consideration of the Austin-Wadsworth measure now pending before Congress, in order that we may fill the gap that yet remains in placing governmental control upon every activity within the border of our Nation for the duration of this emergency.

Today there are in the hospitals of this country 120,000 soldiers and sailors who have been wounded in this war. Those men have been to one of the many fronts in the steaming jungles or the freezing cold. They have faced an enemy. They have paid a terrible price to protect you and me. I am sure that you will agree with me that the service of every organization in these United States should be placed at their disposal. They have suffered terribly on the field of battle. Many of them have lost limbs or suffered other serious handicaps. Every one of them should be helped, should be trained for jobs, should be given a chance, or the price of war will make them unfit to carry on the things they knew before they left this country. We must train them to do the things they can do. We must make it possible for them to have a job and a home and a useful place in their community so that they can go down Main Street with their chin up and the feeling that they are respected and useful citizens who can meet the world and whip it and take their place with you men in the economic life of this Nation. We ask your assistance, your aid in backing every measure for the rehabilitation of those men that is now pending before the Congress of the United States and that will be placed before the Congress of the United States, so that everything that is possible within the great heart of this Nation can be done to restore their lives, as nearly as possible as it will be to restore them, to them.

Twenty-seven years ago, when President Wilson warned the Kaiser to cease his attacks upon our ships and to respect the United States as a Nation, his warning fell on deaf ears, because the Kaiser knew we had no Army, no Navy, and no reserves, and that we were weak. So the Kaser kept on his merry way and there are over 10,000 crosses on Flanders Field to mark the price of America's weakness. Four years ago President Roosevelt warned the international gangsters not to precipitate a world war, but his words, too, fell on deaf ears and little Schickelgruber knew President Roosevelt had no Army, that he had an ancient Navy, and he had no reserves. And because we wanted peace, we were weak. And we were again plunged into international warfare. Now there are thousands of crosses at Oran and in New Guinea and Pearl Harbor, Casablanca, Sicily, and Attu which mark the price of our weakness when we wanted peace.

Since we took off those uniforms of khaki and blue 23 years ago we have said to you and to the American people and to Congress that we should have a settled policy of preparedness on the part of this Nation; that there should be provision for universal military training, so that every young man and woman who grows up in the United States would know that the privilege of American citizenship entails an obligation, the obligation of maintaining this Government of ours and, if need be, of defending it. Such training would give stronger bodies, would teach the value of sanitation, would teach the working of our Government, and would promote governmental discipline which, I believe, we could use to advantage in this country of ours, and it would build a solid wall of reserves behind the armed forces of the United States, and the little Schickelgrubers of the future would respect us, so that when our President said, "Let's keep the world at peace, let's obey the Biblical injunction of brotherly love, let's sit down around the table and thrash this out with justice to nations, no matter what their size or their beliefs," those words would be heeded and this world might then look forward to an era of peace and security and good will and international progress.

The Gurney-Wadsworth bill is now before Congress to declare as a principle of the United States that we should have universal military training. We of the Legion respectfully urge your serious consideration in supporting that bill, in order that we, who fought a war a quarter of a century ago, and whose children are fighting another war, might not see such a catastrophe again threatening as it would the very life of civilization. We at Omaha voted that this Nation should collaborate with the other nations of the world in preventing a recurrence of the present tragedy. We said, however, that America should place this first reliance upon its own strength and not rely too much upon the promises of others. Let's be ready to back our position and let's keep that position always one of desiring peace and justice among nations.

I want also to tell you about the Americanism Foundation that the American Legion proposes to further. Almost our first act, 24 years ago, was to pledge ourselves to support the Constitution of the United States and to maintain law and order, and to promote the ideals of Americanism. We began by the awarding of medals in the schools and by sponsorship of Boy Scout troops until we were furnishing leadership for 3,000, fostering and promoting oratorical contests upon the subject of American history and good government, and by opposing those who would tear down the machinery of this Government. And so we have decided that there should be in this land of ours an agency that will make it its business to impress upon the mind of every person who has been fortunate enough to come to this land of ours in the past, and upon the mind of every individual who is lucky enough to get that kind of an invitation in the future, and upon the budding manhood of every young American that grows up, that government by town meetings, city councils, town boards, State legislatures and the administration of that government by constables, mayors, sheriffs, governors and the President is the kind of government that is designed to protect the rights of individuals, to guarantee our personal freedom and all the privileges that we enjoy in this great land, that the kind of government that has picked us up and moved us farther and farther ahead over a century and a half, until we have surpassed the progress made by all other nations, in all time is a worthy kind of government to keep and to better and to perpetuate forever and ever.

The I. W. W. and the Communists in the past year have spent huge sums of money to tear down America. We propose to start a fund to build it up. We are going to allot the raising of that fund to the 48 States. We are going to put a maximum on the gifts that can be given, but no minimum. Every American who loves his country will be invited to join. The fund will be administered by persons from every walk of life, including those who are making the greatest sacrifices of all, in New Guinea and Italy, to manage it for the best interests of America, for studying American problems, for suggesting remedies to better this Government of ours by orderly means within the framework of the Constitution of the United States of America. I know that is a problem in which you and I and all the members of our great organizations are going to have a very, very deep interest.

Our country is in pressing need of manpower and womanpower, and in order that the materials of war may be supplied to the men who fight at the front and in order that we may continue to be the arsenal of democracy, children who have not finished their education, mothers and other citizens have left the school, have left their homes, and have left the fireplace to respond loyally to their country's needs. Today they stand at the bench and at the machines, hammering out the shells and the machine guns and the things that are winning this war. I take my cap off to them. I pay them a tribute for their loyalty and for their splendid performance, and at the same time I want to pay a tribute to all American labor that is doing so much to make it possible to win this war. This organization, time after time, has gone on record against child labor, as has the American Legion. I think that both of us believe that the sacred place of a mother is with her family at her knee, and I think that all of us are committed to give our elder citizens the security that will enable them to retire in comfort in their declining years.

Many of those are now in business and in industry. They are members of organized labor. They are paying dues to you. In future days, millions of returning citizens will come back to take their places in the business and economic life of this country. I hope that you believe with me that those who are now abnormally in business and in industry should go back to the school and to the home and to the fireplace. I hope that you agree with me that service should be given to American soldiers first. Those will be trying days of transition. It will call for the understanding and the loyalty of all good Americans, and I hope that our organizations can stand together in finding an orderly and a just means of reestablishing the economic balance of this country so that our boys who come back, bloodied and battered, from war will be able to have jobs, will be able to establish homes, will be able to take their part in making the provisions that will make it possible for those children to continue in school, for those mothers to have happy homes, and for those older citizens to have fireplaces.

Now I want to speak very plainly about the greatest problem which faces the Nation as a whole. When your president came to our convention, where he is revered and respected, and was received as one of our most distinguished speakers, he gave it to us straight from the shoulder. That is the way we like it. I hope that is the way you like it. I want to present objectively to you the Legion's viewpoint on the need for continued production; the need for the prevention of stoppage in war industry—and today that means the prevention of stoppage in anything and in any and every industry because every single thing we are doing is having some bearing on the fight on the other side.

Of course labor and the American Legion have much in common. We stand for the maintenance of American Government, we have fought against attacks by subversive elements. We both want to improve the plane of living of every American. We both want to make the highest kind of democracy possible for all the people of the world. To do that requires understanding and cooperation. You are one of the great organizations of this Nation. We have opened our ranks to those who are fighting this war. Many millions of them. We want them to become Legionnaires, regardless of their creed, regardless of their occupation, regardless of their affiliation. If they come in with us we will become as great in number perhaps as you. Together we will represent the strongest influences in American life, if we understand each other, if we work together for the preservation of this country we love, we can make a great contribution to that country, to our children, to the future of the Nation.

Today the subject of strikes is a very controversial one. I think that men who call strikes or who participate in them under present conditions are rendering labor a very great disservice. It was my privilege to go to South America and to north Africa in the spring of this year. I talked to many hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of men in the ranks over there. Since my return I have talked to men in hospitals everywhere throughout this country. At Omaha it was my privilege to interview in the audience a corporal—Corp. Alfred Martin. He was but lately returned from Africa He was one of those men who sailed from England to land on the shores of north Africa at Gibraltar, he was put in a cutter with about 100 other men, and they were sent to break a boom across the harbor of Algiers. As they got almost to the boom, French artillery opened up on them and sunk the cutter and 89 percent of them were lost. Martin swam ashore, and as he reached shore he heard one of his buddies struggling and calling back in the inky black waters. He swam back and found him wounded and pulled him into shore and saved his life. For that Martin was given a Silver Star. The two were captured then and put in a French prison camp for 3 days. They were then rescued and released and rejoined their units, and they were at Gafsa, Faid Pass, and at Kasserine Pass and at Maknassy. For 3 long months he was up there on that high plateau where they suffered the worse kind of cold—where for 3 months they were not relieved, and were under constant fire.

At that time the Axis had air superiority and enemy planes were strafing and dive bombing their position continually. And he saw the men with him carried away on stretchers every day and saw men blasted to bits, and finally the day came when shrapnel burst near him and 3 pieces entered his arm, and now 6 months after, he is still carrying that arm in a cast. His chances for complete recovery are not good. He is the son of working parents in the Middle West. He is just an ordinary average American boy. After his experiences on the other side, when he came home, he just couldn't understand, he said, how people seemed to be leading natural lives; that they seemed to be carousing about and having just as good a time as though they were at a county fair. The people did not seem to be much inclined to sacrifice—that is sacrifice until it really hurt, after he had seen men go through day after day, all the suffering and tortures of the damned, and sacrifice beyond almost that that we would feel the right to call upon anyone to suffer or sacrifice. He felt he said, that surely the people over here should be ready to act differently and to do without things, to work harder, to buy more bonds and to pay more taxes. He couldn't see how we could go along as we were—that we must alter our lives, that we must get along with less, until we get through shooting the billions of dollars that represent American energy and that is today going into destruction. He said "I don't see how the fathers of sons who are fighting on the other side can stop their work that affects the production in this country."

General Arnold said a couple of days ago that we had barely enough air at Salerno. To you men who have been in uniform, you know what that means. If there had been 10 less planes perhaps we would have lost the Salerno beachhead, and we would have lost thousands and thousands of men, and later we would have lost tens of thousands more when we tried to land again That is pretty close; that is figuring it too close. And there will be more Salernos, unfortunately There will be more beachheads, and if at that Salerno of tomorrow—if at that beachhead of tomorrow—there is barely enough air, God help the boys that are there.

In my own home State, just 2 weeks ago, a group of men who work on the Pacific Electric stopped work. I don't know why The great American public doesn't know why. But they stopped. They are serving the shipbuilding plant and the plane factories of the Los Angeles area, as crucial a spot as exists in all the United States today. In production we lost more planes and ships in those few days than the enemy knocked down that week, and maybe that difference in produc-

tion could have been the difference in air superiority at the beachhead of tomorrow. That lack of air superiority might mean the death of one of my two sons or might mean the death of one of your sons, or it might be the difference in whether or not the son of George Danfield, who was reported missing at the Omaha convention, is found or not. It is that close to us. I don't know anything about the merits of my brother trainmen's demands. I am perfectly willing to concede that they were absolutely just. That isn't the point. This administration, professedly friendly to labor organizations, has established machinery for the settlement of labor disputes during this war. They have a forum or a court where both sides can be heard. In the instance of the trainmen's case that forum made a decision—it might be that they made a wrong decision—I don't know, but when the umpire calls a man out, he is out. Sometimes he is wrong, but he is, nevertheless, out and vice versa.

Those things about even up in the course of men's lives. If we stopped to fight it out on the ballground every time an umpire made a decision, there would be no ball game, there would be no World Series. If we stopped and got a gun every time a judge or a policeman made a wrong decision, there would be no law and order. If every time the tax collector made a mistake in our bill, and we didn't pay our taxes, we would either lose our property or go to jail. That is the American system, and so long as there is a forum to decide a question of that kind there is where it shou'd be decided—once and for all. And loyal Americans, whether they are in your organization or mine are under a bounden duty to support the Government of the United States and its lawfully promulgated order. I understand that that is the position of your organization. If it isn't correct, inform me, but President Green and your officers have said to the United States of America that labor will support it in the winning of this war—that labor will obviate stoppages in defense industries.

Apparently then, in spite of all that President Green can do and you can do, something is haywire, because the Bureau of Labor Statistics told me just last week that there had been 1,855 strikes, authorized or unauthorized—men didn't go to work, since the first of 1943, and that it affected 1,900,000 men in that period of time—and that isn't hay, to use a popular expression. It represents a great loss in production. And that includes the strike of the coal miners, and you men know, you have read of the number of thousands of tons of steel that was lost by that interruption of production. I say to you as a man who believes in labor organizations that the general public does not understand how that can be, if the heart of every American workingman is in support of his country and in winning this war. I believe that it is. If it is, then your organization and our organization are to work together shoulder to shoulder—to cure this haywire stuff that is causing these disruptions, that is giving labor a black eye, that is putting labor in a position of interfering with the country's war effort—and here and now, President Green, I tender the services of the American Legion and join with you in taking any step that can be taken to prevent those things which are keeping the guns from the men who need them to save their lives. If it is treason for the man at the front to refuse to use his gun, then, too, it should be treason for any person fortunate enough to be here on the home front, to do things that keep him from getting that gun.

We are a long, long way from Berlin. The war is not won. Our sons are beginning to win it, by their courage and their sacrifices. They can only continue to win if they get an uninterrupted flow of food and medicine and guns and ships and planes. In order that they may have that it necessarily follows that profits, wages, and comfort must be sacrificed to continue that flow. We must put every ounce of strength, every pound of material, every heartbeat in our bodies into the service of the men who are fighting and dying in New Guinea and in Italy. Every American must continue to be willing to give his all if need be, until the forces of oppression and dictatorship are buried in the ruins of Berlin and Tokyo.

We ask you to join us in service to God and country. Let us continue to buy bonds, let us continue to put our blood into the banks, let us continue to sacrifice until it hurts and hurts more; let us live our daily lives, let us perform our daily tasks so that we can look the legless and the armless and the maimed in the face and say, "I, too, am doing my part."

President Green and members of this convention, I thank you for the privilege of addressing this convention. Your members believe in the ideals of organized labor; you have made it your life work. I have made the Legion my life work, as have a million others. We stand for those ideals, we love those organizations, but above and beyond them there is a bigger organization—the United States of America—and, President Green, I invite you and your great organization to go down the road of life shoulder to shoulder on the road of "America First."

Defeat of Federal-Aid-To-Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Robbing Children of Their Birthright," written by Richard L. Strout and published in the Christian Science Monitor of October 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBBING CHILDREN OF THEIR BIRTHRIGHT

The Senate this week, with the aid of a political device, killed the bill for Federal aid to education, but left the problem as acute as ever.

What happened was that an amendment raising the racial issue was first added to the bill, over the protest of Negro organizations which it was ostensibly designed to protect, and then the whole matter was scrapped through the procedure of sending it back to committee. Many of the Senators who first voted for the amendment, like Senator Taft, then voted for the bill's recommittal.

The problem of the inequality of educational advantages in America, however, will not down. In some areas it is becoming more acute because of the war. But year in and year out it represents one of the saddest failures of the ideals and hopes of the great democracy; one of the most distressing gaps between reality and the American dream.

There are certain States in America, mostly in the South and Southwest, which are too poor to sustain schools at the level with the richer States, or even the average of the country as a whole. A child born in Mississippi or Georgia does not have the same educational advantages as one born in California, New York, or Massachusetts. He is, in effect, discriminated against because of the accident of birth.

Nor can the easy-going conscience be satisfied by the thought that the difference is only a minor one. The gap is broad and deep. Under economic circumstances as they exist today there seems little opportunity of bridging the gap. And although the causes of this situation are local, the effects are national. In the richest country on earth shameful educational handicaps are imposed on a whole section of the Nation—not only on Negroes but whites as well.

"The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country," the President's Committee on Education reported in 1938.

In 1940 Mississippi was able to spend only $24 per pupil enrolled, while New York spent more than five times that amount. But mere statistics do not tell the story. One has to see with one's own eyes and actually compare a new up-to-date, consolidated county school in up-State New York, center of community life and inspiring alike to young and old, with the makeshift, pathetic, wooden equipment in Alabama, Mississippi, or almost any one of a group of Southern States, to get the emotional impact of what it means to rob bright-eyed American children of their birthright.

There are other aspects of the situation. There is today a clear discrimination against farm children in favor of city children. The average rural teacher now gets only $900, and more than half the States have teachers who receive less than $600 a year. The school term of rural schools averages out 3 weeks shorter than for urban schools. Your son or daughter is penalized 3 weeks' schooling just because you live on a farm.

Those not familiar with this situation may take the easy course of saying nothing can be done, since the Federal Government cannot intervene in a State matter. But this is quite incorrect. In the first place the Southern States, most vocal in defense of States' rights, have urged just such bills as the Senate rejected this week. Then, from the earliest days of the Republic, the Federal Government has made financial contributions—direct and indirect—to States for education.

There is not much hope of the situation correcting itself. Enormous growth of industry has concentrated taxable wealth in some States and reduced it in others. Only Federal intervention seems capable of redressing the balance.

Finally this says nothing of the immediate war problem of underpaid teachers everywhere. They are now leaving the schools in flocks. And why not, when statistics reveal that 40 percent of them get less than $1,200 annually, and 8 in every 100 get less than $600?

Post-War Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of an interview printed in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator on September 19 with our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. The West welcomed the visit

during August and September of Mr. KIRWAN, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], all members of the appropriations subcommittee handling Department of the Interior appropriations.

The significant feature of Mr. KIRWAN'S interview, to my mind, is the broad view he and his colleagues on the committee took of the opportunities and need for jobs during the post-war period for the development of the Nation's last frontier—the West. If every Member of the House, whether he represents an industrial or an agricultural district, were privileged to see the same things of which Mr. KIRWAN spoke, I am sure they would return with the same highly favorable impression of the value of irrigation. It is clear that irrigation developments in the West are a certain means of providing additional war-food production in the national emergency, jobs in the post-war period for returning servicemen and demobilized industrial workers, farm homes on irrigated land which will increase the purchasing power of the West and assure an enlarged market for the products of eastern industry.

It is my honor to represent a district in Washington State, where Federal irrigation, together with the foresight and ability of the farmers in the Yakima Valley have transformed sagebrush into a prosperous, highly developed area. It was with pleasure that I noted the comments of the gentleman from Ohio on the Yakima Valley and of the excellent results anticipated from the development of the great Columbia Basin irrigation project, which is also in my district.

The interview referred to, together with the headlines, is, in part, as follows:

KIRWAN PREDICTS PLENTIFUL POST-WAR OPPORTUNITIES—DESERT LAND IS FRONTIER—TELLS OF UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES SEEN ON WESTERN TOUR

Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, back home from a 30-day tour of virtually every important Federal Government project in the far west, is convinced there will be plenty of opportunities for Americans in the post-war era.

He made his trip to study the need for maintaining large Government jobs into which hundreds of millions of dollars were poured by the Federal agencies in the last decade.

"Western United States still provides us with a frontier, with undeveloped resources and with great opportunities for future development," KIRWAN said.

"I was convinced of these facts on my trip with two other members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department, through all parts of the West. It was my first trip to the Pacific coast in 33 years. The great changes and vast improvements I saw in 1943 are but hints of what can be done in the next 30 years.

"We visited Boulder Dam, Shasta Dam, Bonneville Dam, and Grand Coulee Dam. They are all new and are just now beginning to do their part in the building of the West.

"Although they are new, these great Federal improvements are responsible for one-half or more of the war production of the west coast. The power from these makes aluminum for one-third of our airplanes, powers the great aircraft, shipbuilding, and metallurgical plants from Canada to Mexico, where nearly half of our ships and planes are put together, and operates chemical and light metals plants of many types, all new and all doing war work.

"The few millions of dollars put into these great dams have made the difference in the West between being able to do a great deal toward winning the war and being able to do nothing.

"Great as is the contribution of these projects to the war, however, the thing that intrigued me most about them was the possibilities they have opened for future development. They will irrigate land and make new homes for half a million people.

"One has only to drive through, as we did, the tens of millions of acres of deserts to understand how important it is to use the western water to irrigate land and make homes. That is our new frontier, that and the new industrial development of light metals and chemicals and plastics that is bound to follow the great developments in the West.

"I saw what those irrigated lands will do. Forty or 80 acres will produce a good living for a farmer. At Yakima, Wash., we saw them growing beans, potatoes, and alfalfa on land that was still in sagebrush on March 1, 1943. They are making a real contribution to the war-food needs of this country.

"I measured a peach from an irrigated orchard near Yakima and it was 13½ inches in circumference. We saw vineyards and asparagus fields and apple orchards, and towns and cities, all developed through irrigation in an area that 40 years ago was not inhabited by anything but jack rabbits and rattlesnakes.

"Then we drove across the Columbia River to Pasco, Wash., and there began a trip 110 miles long, straight north to Ephrata. All the time we were driving through dry land, some of it typical desert That is the land that Grand Coulee Dam will irrigate.

"It is as good land as there is outdoors, but it is dry, and now produces nothing except a little wheat around the edges. There are 1,200,000 acres of first-class irrigable land in this Columbia Basin, and on that land, which will be divided into 40-, 60-, and 80-acre plots, will be opportunities for settlement and home building for tens of thousands of boys who will come home after the war, and for thousands and thousands of farmers who have turned shipbuilders and aluminum workers for the duration of the war."

The Necessity of Air Feeder Service by All Forms of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement of Thurman W. Van Metre, economist and professor of transportation, Columbia University, at the recent hearing on feeder air lines before the Civil Aeronautics Board:

There is no doubt that after the war is ended the United States, and the rest of the world too, will witness an extensive development of transportation by air. In some respects the conditions under which air transportation will develop will be different from the conditions under which our older modes of transportation reached maturity. Perhaps the most important difference is that the growth of air transportation will be guided, directed, planned, by the authority of government.

For several years the Congress of the United States has been assuming a greater degree of responsibility for the control and direction of our transportation industry. In successive measures it has dealt with railways, motor vehicles, aircraft and domestic shipping. In the several laws which the Congress enacted, it gradually evolved a policy with respect to transportation. At first it confined any expression of policy largely to the particular kind of transportation under immediate consideration. It had a policy for railroad transportation, a policy for water transportation. Its policy for air transportation found its first complete expression in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

During the years when new forms of transportation were being developed and, as a result, new regulatory laws were being enacted, the fact slowly emerged to light—though it had been present all the time—that there should be no separate policy in the United States for various forms of transportation, but a policy for transportation as a whole. This idea probably found its first clear expression in one of Mr. Eastman's reports, as Coordinator of Transportation, when he suggested that Congress should declare its policy to be "to promote, encourage and develop an adequate national transportation system embracing all necessary transportation service and facilities for the efficient handling of the commerce of the United States and for the national defense; to deal fairly and impartially with each mode of transportation, whether by rail, by water, by air, by highway motor vehicle, by pipe line, or by any combination of any two or more of the several modes of transportation; and to foster and preserve all such modes of transportation to the extent consistent with the development of an adequate national transportation system."

In the Transportation Act of 1940 the Congress explicitly adopted a national transportation policy. While only three types of carriers were specifically subject to the provisions of that law, the Congress made clear that its declaration of policy had to do with a genuine national transportation system, composed of all kinds of transportation agencies. This national transportation policy is:

"To provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions; all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense."

To give effect to this broad, general policy, the Congress has laid down many statutory rules and regulations. The administration of these rules and regulations is entrusted to certain boards and commissions which the Congress itself has created. While these boards have a large measure of administrative discretion, they observe the statutory rules which the Congress has enacted, and

in their administrative acts they proceed in conformity with the transportation policy which the Congress has adopted.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, realizing that air transportation will unquestionably be greatly expanded after the war is over, has wisely undertaken a comprehensive study of the industry. It is making a survey of fact and of opinion, in order that it may have a proper basis upon which to plan a program to give effect to the will of the Congress, as stated in the declaration of transportation policy. This particular inquiry has to do with the future development in our domestic air commerce of what is termed local service, feeder service, and pick-up service. It is my understanding that the Board is making exhaustive studies of other phases of the aviation industry.

I understand that there has been filed with the Board a large number of applications for the certificates of convenience, by which it formally authorizes the establishment of air-transportation services. This inquiry, I understand, is not for the purpose of developing facts which will enable the Board to pass upon the merit of these individual applications, but is directed rather toward an exploration of the general considerations involved in reaching conclusions with respect to all applications.

The Board does not have much in the way of precise and specific guidance. For the most part its action must be controlled by its conception of the "public interest." The Congress, of course, in its power to regulate commerce, has the right to say definitely what the public interest may be under any and all conditions. In some regulating laws the Congress has been specific, and has definitely prohibited certain acts which, in its opinion, would not be consistent with the public interest. But in general the practice of the Congress has been to lay down a broad policy, or a body of principles, which administrative boards observe, and with which they conform, though the exact determination of what constitutes the public interest, under particular circumstances, is left to the administrative agencies themselves. Under such conditions, it is only necessary that the administrative agencies' acts be acts consistent with the policy or principles adopted by the Congress. To take action clearly inconsistent with such policy or principles would be tantamount to a declaration by an administrative agency that the Congress had acted contrary to the public interest.

There are many subjects which the Board will be asked to consider, as it formulates a program for the development of air transportation. I am here, primarily, to discuss one of those subjects. That is the matter of the control of the proposed, so-called, feeder, local, and pick-up services. If the Board should deem the establishment of services of this character to be feasible and compatible with the public interest, what agencies should be permitted to provide these services? Or, to put the matter a bit more bluntly, perhaps, but more plainly: Should the establishment and operation of these services be considered the exclusive prerogative of existing air transportation agencies, or of agencies yet to be organized which will devote themselves exclusively to the business of air transportation, or shall other carriers, surface carriers, by rail, or by highway or by water, be permitted to participate in their establishment and operation?

As I understand it, there is no statutory prohibition of the operation of air services by a surface carrier, comparable to the section of the Panama Canal Act which flatly prohibits a railroad company to operate a competing ship through the Panama Canal. Under the present laws the Board clearly has the authority to permit a surface carrier to operate an air service if it deems it to be in the public interest to do so.

The Board also may have the authority, in its discretion, to say that it is not in the public interest for surface carriers to participate directly or indirectly in air transportation. I say "may have the authority," because there may be some technical legal questions here, with respect to the construction of the language of the statute, as well as with respect to constitutional limitations upon administrative authority. I am interested solely in the economic aspects of this inquiry, and have neither the ability nor the desire to enter into a discussion of legal matters of a possibly controversial nature. If the Board has the necessary power, and if it should decide to deny surface carriers the right to operate aircraft, simply because they are surface carriers, that would end the matter, with regard to all applications for certificates which surface carriers have filed with the Board, until the Board should change its mind, or until the Congress should intervene and expressly direct the Board, under prescribed conditions, to adopt a different practice.

My purpose in being here is to say that I do not believe the Board should adopt such a sweeping rule as the one just suggested. It is my belief that the Board should consider all applications on their individual merits. If a surface carrier should make a proper showing of public convenience and necessity, and if the Board, in the exercise of its discretionary authority, should deem it to be in the public interest for that surface carrier to extend its operations to the air, the Board should then give the necessary authorization.

Furthermore, I want to state why I believe the Board might find it to be in the public interest to give favorable consideration to applications of surface carriers.

The chief reason why I believe that it would be in the public interest for existing surface carriers, under certain conditions, to enter the field of domestic air transportation is that I believe it would often serve to give effect to the national transportation policy which the Congress has adopted. I may say, incidentally, that I believe that policy to be a good one.

The arbitrary exclusion of surface carriers from participation in the development of air transportation might interfere with the establishment of a genuinely national transportation system, and it might conceivably interfere with the proper development of civil aviation itself.

In times past, the Congress has shown a considerable degree of solicitude for water transportation and has passed laws designed to protect it from what was deemed to be unfair competitive practices on the part of railroads and to keep water transportation out of railroad control. But it should be noted that there has seldom been an arbitrary prohibition. The door was almost invariably left open for the consideration of those special circumstances which might, in the public interest, justify a departure from the general rule. For example, never since the Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887, has the fourth section arbitrarily barred relief from its full application. While the Panama Canal Act of 1912 forbade railroads to operate competing vessels via the Panama Canal, it provided that elsewhere railroads might operate competing water carriers if, in the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest justified such operation. Under this exception, the Southern Pacific Railroad was permitted to operate the Morgan Line, and various other railroad-owned steamship lines were permitted to remain under railroad control.

It was once a widely held belief that under no circumstances should railroads be permitted to engage in highway transportation, that the two kinds of transportation should be compelled to remain forever in strict competition with each other. In the early days of modern highway transportation, it must be said, the railroads were somewhat scornful of the motor vehicle as a potential rival, and skeptical of its value as an adjunct to rail operations. They were stubbornly dilatory in adopting it for their own use. They learned a rather severe lesson, let it be said, and eventually came to see the desirability of using the motor vehicle to supplement rail services. Fortunately the railroads were not unconditionally forbidden to engage in motor-vehicle transportation, and some of the best motor-vehicle transportation in the United States is now afforded by railroads, under conditions which permit the inherent advantages of both carriers to be utilized by the public.

Public opinion in this country does not favor monopoly, and the Congress has, I believe, wisely enacted measures designed to prevent the establishment of a complete monopoly in a field of endeavor in which there is a strong tendency in the direction of what has been termed a natural monopoly. On the other hand, the fact cannot be escaped that competition may be carried too far for the public good. Competition is one of the greatest driving economic forces. More than any other force, it provides the incentive which makes for technological and managerial progress. It is unthinkable that under a system of free private enterprise its destruction or complete elimination should be permitted. But this does not mean that all competition is good, that competition, under any and all circumstances, is invariably in the public interest. The Congress has recognized this to be true in its authorization of the express monopoly, in its legislation with respect to railroad consolidation, in its regulation of the relationship between railroads and other surface carriers.

Administrative agencies, in the exercise of their discretionary authority, have followed the example set by the Congress in dealing with the question of competition and monopoly. There has been no slavish worship of the one, nor unconditional condemnation of the other. They have given first consideration to their conception of the public interest. This was illustrated only recently when, by the authorization of the Federal Communications Commission, the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph systems were amalgamated. In all those instances in which railroad companies desirous of continuing their control of competing water lines were required to secure the permission of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the fact that more competition would result from a separation of the properties was admitted. But it frequently happened that the Interstate Commerce Commission permitted control to continue, because by doing so it believed that public convenience would be better served. It was obviously the belief of the Commission that when practical gain in the form of better transportation service could be obtained by doing violence to an ancient theory, it was the part of wisdom to disregard the theory, however much it might be sanctioned by traditional belief and former practice. In the administration of the law with respect to railroad control of carriers by motor vehicle the Interstate Commerce Commission has frequently found it to be in the public interest to permit railroads to make extensive use of highway carriers, which, operated under separate ownership, would without doubt have provided a higher degree of competition.

Leaders in political and economic thought, men of practical affairs, and the public as a whole have modified the opinions almost universally held a generation ago with respect to the entire problem of monopoly and competition, particularly in the transportation industry, and in other public utilities which, like transportation, are said to be "naturally monopolistic." In part this has been due to the wide acceptance of public regulation of

such industries, an acceptance which is now shared by the regulated industries themselves. With regard to the transportation industry, the change of attitude and opinion has been due also to the fact that invention—technological progress—has made the establishment of a complete monopoly impossible. The old ideas concerning competition and monopoly in transportation were formed in a day when the steam railroad was virtually the sole agency of commercial transportation in our domestic trade. The development of the motor vehicle—of the automobile and the truck, equally capable of private use, and of public, commercial use—destroyed for all time any possibility of a complete transportation monopoly by the railroad. If the current prognostications of air transportation enthusiasts are correct, we may be equally sure that there is no danger whatever of a commercial monopoly of air transportation, for they say that within a score of years after the war has ended privately owned and operated airplanes will be creating a traffic problem of the air, compared to which the control of street traffic at such points as Times Square or Forty-second Street and Fifth Avenue will be something in the nature of mild relaxation.

Some monopolistic practices have come to be regarded as tolerable, economical, and even respectable. Many people now hold strongly to the belief that there is entirely too much competition in the transportation business, and they vigorously insist that the public interest would be more adequately served if some of the present competition between existing surface carriers, particularly in various terminal districts, should be greatly restricted. In other words, there are places where competition in the transportation industry should be enforced; and there are places, not only where its elimination should be permitted, but where it should not even be tolerated. The public interest lies not in the maintenance of the most vigorous competition possible, under any and all circumstances, but in the establishment of a sound, healthy, efficient, and economical national transportation system. If the development of such a system can be helped by the elimination, here and there, of a measure of competition, and the substitution of cooperation or consolidation or other practice of a monopolistic nature, under such regulation that abuses cannot take place, by all means the change should be made.

When we come to examine the various features of the declaration of national transportation policy which the Congress adopted, and consider them in connection with the matter of the control of projects for the development of civil aviation, it becomes reasonably clear that circumstances will be found under which the operation of an air transportation service by a surface carrier would be entirely consistent with that policy, even though it might involve the operation of one type of carrier by a competing type of carrier.

First of all, it is the desire of the Congress that the inherent advantages of the various modes of transportation be recognized and preserved. It is hardly to be expected that a surface carrier would endeavor to embark upon the business of air transportation with the object of destroying it, even if it were possible for it to do so. An idea of some such nature may have prevailed in certain transportation circles in days gone by, but that time is long past. The record which railroads have made in recent years in the development of highway freight and passenger services offers ample evidence that whatever railroad managers once thought of motor vehicles as transportation facilities, they are now making excellent use of their inherent advantages. In so doing they are not only improving the transportation services of the railroads, but by healthy competition, in many areas, with independent highway services, they are making a genuine contribution to the further development of efficient highway transportation.

It is a part of the policy of the Congress "to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient" transportation service, and to foster sound economic conditions in the transportation business.

Surely nobody will claim the existing surface carriers would have any desire to provide unsafe air transportation to the public. No other industrial establishments in the country have a better safety record, or have done more to foster and encourage, by precept and example, the "safety first" movement, than our great surface transportation companies, operating on both land and water. It goes without saying that they would carry the same ideas and ideals of safety, both for patrons and for employees, into any air services they might operate.

As to the adequacy of any air services which surface carriers might provide, for the most part they have the financial strength and stability necessary to insure adequacy of service during the period when financial returns will be low or altogether wanting. If existing surface carriers, after careful consideration and study, choose to establish certain aviation services, and are permitted to do so, it is reasonably certain that from the beginning the service will be adequate, and that it will be permanent.

With respect to economy of operation, the present surface carriers are likely to be in a position to provide such services as are under consideration in this inquiry at a lower cost—both a lower capital investment cost and a lower operating cost—than they can be provided by any other agency, by reason of the fact that both railroads and motor vehicle carriers already have, in virtually every community large enough to have air service, the necessary terminal sites, a trained agency personnel, the facilities for the maintenance and repair of equipment, and in many places a trained mechanical personnel. They are in a better position, financially and from the standpoint of physical equipment and personnel, to do the pioneering in local air services, a work which is necessary, but which does not yield a revenue sufficient to make it self-supporting. When the war ends, there is going to be a need and a demand for economy of expenditure by Government in this country, and it is my belief that public opinion will be strongly opposed to very large expenditures in the way of direct subsidies for air transportation or for any other form of transportation. It may well be that because of the economies available to existing surface carriers, they will be the only agencies capable of establishing and sustaining the air service now under inquiry.

The creation and maintenance of sound economic conditions in the transportation industry will be one of the objects which surface carriers will have in view in seeking to supplement their present services with service by air. They already have a stake in the transportation business; they would not want to do anything which would jeopardize the safety of the investment they have already made. There is doubtless some danger that speculative operators may endeavor to do what was done after World War No. 1 in the shipping business—buy some unused, surplus equipment from the Government at low bargain prices, and operate it with an eye solely to immediate profit, knowing that when the bargain equipment is worn out there will be insufficient funds for replacing it with new equipment. Nothing could do more to cause the development of an unsound condition in the aviation business, and in the transportation business as a whole. Surface carriers entering civil aviation would not want to establish their new business as a short-run enterprise; they would build for economically sound conditions of a permanent nature.

The purpose which the Congress had in mind in making a declaration of transportation policy is summed up in the declaration:

"To the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense."

What I have said before has had to do with the possible help which surface carriers might give in the way of developing a national transportation system, by promoting the development of our latest, and what so many people believe will in time be our best, kind of transportation.

I believe that the surface carriers have it in their power to make an even greater contribution to the coordination and preservation of a national transportation system.

The word "coordination" has perhaps been a bit overworked in connection with the transportation business for the last 25 years, and often it has not been exactly clear what was meant when the word was used. I believe that, by and large, most people have the idea that it has to do with the effective, cooperative use of two or more agencies to accomplish a common purpose more efficiently and more economically than that purpose can be accomplished without cooperation. We are having some good examples of coordination in the war, as airplanes, ships, trucks, tanks, and infantry combine daily to achieve a common purpose, the defeat of a stubborn enemy. In transportation, the goal of coordination is to employ all modes of transportation in such a way that we shall have the most efficient, the most convenient, the most economical, the safest, and the speediest transportation service possible for the movement of persons and property throughout the length and breadth of the country, and all over the world.

The Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, persons prominent in the operation and regulation of transportation facilities, and persons possessing a thorough knowledge of the economy of our country, have repeatedly called attention to the desirability of a coordinated transportation system. Mr. Eastman probably stated the matter as well as it has ever been stated, when he said:

"Clearly there are certain things which each type of carrier can do better than any of the others, and the ideal system would be one which would utilize them all accordingly, emphasizing cooperation and coordination and avoiding wasteful uses, but at the same time retaining a very considerable element of competition."

Many statements in Mr. Eastman's reports, made when he was Coordinator of Transportation, testify to his belief that more should be done to develop a larger measure of cooperation among our various modes of transportation. In various reports and in numerous decisions, the Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed to the necessity of cooperation and coordination in the interest of improved transportation service and of greater economy. Committees of the Congress, in their reports on proposed legislative acts dealing with the transportation industry, have frequently called attention to the desirability of coordination in the industry. The Congress itself has gone on record in declaring that a coordinated transportation system is one of the objects of its policy. Even the Supreme Court, in a recent decision, gave by implication its approval to coordination in transportation when it said:

"The Commission, in determining the precise territory which may be served by a particular carrier, cannot be unmindful of its responsibility to coordinate the various transportation agencies which constitute our

national transportation system" (*United States* v. *Carolina Carriers Corp.*, 315 U. S. 475.)

It is my belief that often circumstances are such that the coordination of various types of carrier can be more easily and simply effected when the carriers are under the control of a single agency. I do not mean to assert that this is true under all circumstances, for, pushed to a logical conclusion, that would mean favoring the amalgamation of all commercial transportation into a single giant enterprise, and the complete extinction of competition. But I do believe that there may be instances in which the coordination of railroad and motor vehicle transportation has been facilitated by the railroad ownership of the highway carriers. It was the belief that the operation of highway vehicles, boats, and other means of transportation by railroads would lead to a greater coordination of transportation, and thereby a greater efficiency of service, which led the National Transportation Committee, of which Calvin Coolidge was chairman until his untimely death, to say in its report of February 13, 1933, that railroads should be permitted to own and operate competing services, including water lines. Alfred E. Smith, who was a member of the committee, in a concurring statement declared:

"They [the railroads] must use trucks and busses, eventually air transportation and, if necessary, waterways and pipelines as a supplement or substitute for rails wherever these new forms of transportation are more economical."

As I have said before, I believe the railroads have been too slow in effecting the coordination of transportation facilities. But they have made substantial progress in recent years, and I believe their present attitude with respect to air transportation development presages even more rapid progress in the future. They are in a position to take the lead in giving the United States a completely coordinated transportation system. In most respects they are the carriers best fitted for the task.

As a matter of fact, the railroads have been instrumental in organizing the only Nation-wide coordinated transportation service which we have. I refer to the express business, conducted by the Railway Express Agency, owned jointly by railroads of the United States. This agency employs railroads, boats, motor vehicles, and airplanes in its far-flung service. Air transportation already owes a debt to the railroad-owned express agency, for it has enabled the existing air lines to engage in the transportation of commodities to a much greater extent than would have been possible without the vast surface distributional organization which the express agency was able to place at the disposal of the air lines.

I come now to the last point in the declaration of transportation policy by the Congress, and I believe it to be in some respects the most important point of all. This is the matter of preserving a national system of transportation. In this connection, I am speaking primarily of only one of our surface carriers, the railroad.

If we are to have a strong, efficient national transportation system, the railroad must be preserved. Until some type of carrier is developed which can do all that the railroad now does, and do it as well, as efficiently, and at as little cost, the railroad must continue to be what is called the backbone of our domestic transportation system. We have recently had and are still having a salutary demonstration of the present indispensability of the railroad as a necessary factor in our national defense. This is not said in disparagement of other forms of transportation; they, too, have been of vital importance to the war effort. But everybody knows that the railroad is by far our most important beast of burden; everybody knows that it has been required to carry a vast amount of the traffic which other agencies formerly carried, but which they could not continue to handle, because of exigencies of war, over which we had no control; everybody knows that it would have been physically impossible for any other type of carrier yet developed, whatever its inherent advantages, to have performed the transportation service which the railroad has performed during this war; everybody knows what a magnificent job the railroads have done, carrying the largest volume of traffic they have ever been called on to transport, with an amount of equipment considerably less than what thy possessed at the time of their previous peak load.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the railroads of the United States have not done so well in recent years. Confronted with the competition of vigorous new rivals; severely regulated, while their competitors for several years were subjected to virtually no regulation whatever; suffering in a much greater degree from the economic depression because of high fixed charges arising largely from the fact that they owned and maintained their own highway, the railroads have had to fight a grim, and too often a losing, battle for survival. Tracks have been abandoned, stations discontinued, trains cut sharply in number, thousands of employees reluctantly dismissed, and many railroads have become bankrupt.

Not infrequently attempts to preserve the "inherent advantages" of all modes of transportation have resulted in highly uneconomical transportation to public and severe losses to the railroads. It frequently occurs that a branch railroad and a competing highway carrier are to be found carrying the traffic for which each has the proper "inherent" advantage, in a mechanical sense, when it is perfectly obvious that it would be much more economical to permit one of the two carriers to haul all the traffic. Under such circumstances the railroad is the chief sufferer, because it has by far the greater fixed charges. Confronted by a condition of this kind, the railroad company often tries to abandon the unprofitable branch line, only to find that public opinion, supported by regulatory authority, forces it to continue its losing operation.

In many cases railroad companies have found it possible to check their losses, in part at least, by supplementing their rail services with services of another kind. While such supplementary operations have increased their direct costs, they have often been conducted without any substantial increase of overhead operating costs, the added traffic has been a source of considerable net revenue, and by coordination of the supplementary services with rail service they have been able to increase their total rail traffic.

I believe that railroads should be encouraged to develop operations of this nature, and not hindered, provided always, as Mr. Eastman suggests, that a considerable element of competition be retained. In common with many other persons, I have long believed that railroad management has too long concentrated its attention upon the railroad business and not upon the transportation business. Now that they have seen the light, they should not be compelled to do the thing which previously they have been roundly condemned for doing.

I believe that getting into the transportation business in its entirety offers the best promise for the preservation of the railroad business in the immediate future. I believe also that the preservation of the railroad business is an indispensable condition of giving effect to the desire of Congress to develop, coordinate, and preserve a truly national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means.

Why Is Butter Being Piled Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, our butter stocks are piling up at a disturbing rate. If the present rate of increase in butter stocks in storage is continued it will be difficult to find sufficient storage space to take care of the accumulations. From September 1 to October 1 this year there was an increase of nearly 111,000,000 pounds of butter. The Government is not buying it and does not need it, but the people do want butter and need it. However, the very evident desire of the Government to promote oleomargarine at the expense of butter is manifested by the requirement of 16 ration points for a pound of butter and only 4 points for a pound of oleo.

The following editorial appeared in the Capitol Times of Madison, Wis., and is worth reading:

WHY IS BUTTER BEING PILED UP?

The present butter-oleomargarine controversy brings to light some important questions in the field of wartime food distribution.

The thing that stands out particularly is the darkness in which the people of the country seem to be with regard to the availability of butter for domestic consumption.

Although butter production estimates for this year are slightly less than for the record production year of 1942, butter stocks are unusually high.

On September 1 of this year, butter stocks were 231,543,000 pounds, 79,345,000 pounds above 1942 figures, and 59,390,000 pounds above the 5-year average, 1938–42.

On October 1, 1943, butter stocks had increased to 232,435,000 pounds, 110,836,000 pounds above last year's figure, and 68,447,000 pounds more than the 5-year average, 1938–42.

In most years a decline of butter stocks has occurred from September 1 to October 1. This year, in contrast, there is an increase of nearly 1,000,000 pounds in butter stocks between September 1 and October 1.

The Government bought during each of the months of August and September only 20 percent of the butter production, and is not buying any butter in October.

In connection with this situation we are reminded that for the past few years a vigorous oleomargarine sales campaign was conducted by a few powerful concerns which have a practical monopoly of the manufacture of oleomargarine.

There is an evident effort on the part of commercial interests to drive out butter and make the people eat oleomargarine for the sake of the tremendous profits which are made on oleomargarine as compared with butter.

It is interesting to note that one of the most energetic oleo sales campaigns is conducted by a firm which is a subsidiary of one of the largest butter concerns in the country.

A powerful assistance to the oleomargarine interests is furnished by the Government regulation which allocates to oleomargarine 4 ration points, whereas butter is shot up to 16 points.

This fact is developing into an invaluable assistance to oleomargarine in its competition with butter. It is paving the way for the oleomargarine interests in replacing butter with oleo in the diet of the American consumer.

So far, the Federal agencies dealing with the matter have not condescended to explain to the satisfaction of the people the reasons for this abnormal situation. They promulgated their ration-point regulations without previous consultation with the agricultural agencies of the dairy States.

The public is in compete ignorance as to the facts of the situation and is wondering about the sudden disappearance of butter off the market.

What we want to know specifically is whether the enormous stock pile of butter reported by Federal agencies is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, or whether the present war emergency is utilized to replace the use of butter by a product which affords greater possibilities of profit to private commercial interests?

Further Thoughts on Motor Transportation—Pacific Coast Aspects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, this year, I made an address on the floor entitled "Transportation—Road to Victory." At that time I criticized the War Production Board and the Office of Defense Transportation for permitting our highway transport system to disintegrate. I lugubriously predicted a break-down in such highway transportation system. As a result of the pressure exerted by me, by the industry itself, and by some of my colleagues, the W. P. B. did modify its previous ruling with respect to repairs for trucks. But, the situation is far from ideal.

Recently, an editorial appeared in The Timberman magazine of October 1943, in which the editor prognosticated various difficulties in the months ahead for the owners of motortrucks. Countless myriads of motortrucks are being retired from the highways for lack of parts every month. Every automobile owner knows the almost insuperable difficulties of securing parts for his motorcar when such parts wear out.

The quotas for new trucks which have recently been set for the first two quarters of 1944 are so niggardly that the average truck operator has but little chance of getting a replacement order filled.

Out in the far West, the majority of communities depend wholly upon motor transportation for all freight movement. This is because of the relative scarcity of railroad facilities.

I recommend the reading of the editorial to those who wish to have something done to mitigate congestion in freight transportation in the United States. Is it not about time that the administrative heads of governmental agencies recognize and appreciate that our civilian economy will crumble unless a basic minimum, below which we dare not go, be accepted and provision made therefor? In other words, Mr. Speaker, a quota below which we dare not go should be determined and ratified. How can we proceed with the war or maintain morale effectively if we destroy the means out of which taxes are paid or dry up motor transportation, which is the indispensable artery of business and home activity throughout our country? In these areas where railroads are few and far between, and highways are, by comparison, excellent and frequent, it is imperative that adequate provision be made for an ample supply of motortrucks and parts, for the exchange of goods, foodstuffs, manufactured products, and so forth, not only in the interest of the vigorous prosecution of the war, but of taking care of the actual needs of the people at home.

Here is the editorial:

CRISIS IN MOTOR TRANSPORT

Now the real pinch of war is beginning to be felt in the motor-transport field and whatever hardships truck operators have complained of during the past 18 months are as nothing compared to the grief that lies ahead, unless steps are taken at once to provide for more adequate maintenance and replacement of units now in service. Untold thousands of motortrucks are going out of commission every month for lack of parts. Some freight units on the west coast have been kept on the road through the desperate expedient of cruising repairmen who patrol the routes in motorcars.

Quotas of new trucks set for the first two quarters of 1944, on the basis of national requirements, are so small that the average truck operator's chance of getting a replacement order filled is almost microscopic. And quotas mean little when it is learned that scarcity of vital parts that go into a truck has left certain manufacturers still struggling with allotments supposed to have been completed and delivered in the second quarter of 1943.

The crisis in motortruck transportation becomes of greater concern to the West than to any other section of the country. East of the Mississippi River, it is calculated that the average farm is not over 7 miles from a railroad. In the extreme West many communities must depend wholly upon motor transportation for every pound of in-bound and out-bound freight. Thus, it should be plain that any blanket formula governing the allotment of trucks and truck parts is not going to meet the situation. On top of it all, two prominent Pacific coast manufacturers of heavy trucks, the kind needed by the logging industry, have been requested to move their plants east of the Rocky Mountains so they will no longer compete in the labor market with aircraft builders and shipyards. One has struck a compromise and expects to transfer its operation for the duration to a point in central Washington; the other has found no suitable location as yet. These moves mean disruption of production schedules extending over periods of many weeks.

Pacific coast trailer builders and loggers who depend upon these auxiliary vehicles for log transportation are faced with the same dilemma. For the first two quarters of 1944, trailer builders have been assigned a quota of 314 units, whose delivery depends upon the ability of the purchaser to find vehicles to which to attach them and the ability of the makers to get enough axles, springs, and tires. In normal times, the tandem axle trailer builders had no difficulty in disposing of over 1,000 of these special units a year. In 1941, for example, something over 1,100 units were sold. The logging industry employs about 3,500 tandem axle trailers, a quarter of which should normally be replaced every year, a figure which does not take into account the growth of the logging industry. Logging trailer builders obtained releases on only 162 units in 1942. This year, the quota was 328, of which 120 represent a carry-over into 1944 because of delays in the delivery of materials needed in trailer construction.

With the major theater of war destined to be transferred to the Pacific coast, bringing with it a vastly increased strain on existing transportation facilities, both trucks and rail, the time has come for serious planning for ways and means to meet the crisis. Increasing quantities of logs and lumber are certain to be demanded from an industry already creaking with worn-out equipment and desperately in need of relief.

A council of war comprised of truck and trailer builders, general freight and log haulers, Government officials and representatives of the armed forces, should be called at the earliest possible date to survey the problem and devise ways and means to avert a complete break-down of motor-transportation facilities in this region.

The Jew at the Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Blue Network, Friday, October 22, 1943:

I say this: Unless we take the abstractions of our war banners—liberty, democracy, justice, the four freedoms, the Atlantic Charter—and give them the muscle and sinew of living significance, we shall have betrayed the profoundest vision entrusted to us by those who have died in defense of those very banners.

It is said nations blunder into war, but never blunder into peace. The contemplative mind cannot reduce to simplicities the multiple facets of the peace problem, not least of which is the fate of the Jew in the post-war world.

For 2,000 years the Jew has wandered, homeless, settling and dispersing, offering to the countries of his adoption his labor and his loyalty, his virtues and his frailties. The Jew is neither more nor less than the next mortal, but the corallary of his homelessness is suffering and indignity, massacre and torture. For centuries, he has been the ever-present scapegoat, serving to blind the oppressed to the real purpose of the oppressor as in Inquisitorial Spain and Tsarist Russia. He has been likened to the gulf stream that will not mingle with the waters of the ocean. He has not very much to say in the matter when confronted with the "tables reserved" or "standing room only" signs of the world.

Today, of the 16,000,000 Jews in the world, one-half are in the clutches of the Nazi executioner. Three million are dead only because they were Jews. The remaining living, if living it can be called, are crushed into ghettos and concentration camps, subject to all the inhumanities fiendish minds can devise, slow starvation and slave labor, among them. In Germany, brave Hitler called upon 65,000,000

of his "Herrenvolk," his "supermen" to fight against 600,000 defenseless Jews.

The plight of all minority peoples encircled by the Nazi ring is horrible to contemplate, but the Jew alone has been singled out for extermination, anti-Semitism in Germany has been accorded the unenviable distinction of being raised to an official state policy. The conclusion is thus inescapable; the special problem of the Jew compels special treatment. As the Jew met his death as a Jew, so, as a Jew, must he take his place at the victory council, at the table of peace terms.

It is too late to ask that he be spoken for; he must speak for himself. The tragedy that overtook the Jew in Germany was regarded by the world as a purely internal affair. "Too bad" said the onlooker, "but what can he do about it? If my neighbor beats his wife, I shut my windows." But was it an internal affair? Let Hitler speak for himself—he knew. He said, "Anti-Semitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable medium for the extension of our political campaign. You will see how little time we shall need in order to upset the ideas and criteria of the whole world simply and purely by attacking Judaism." By the petard of anti-Semitism, the Nazi regime rose to power, on the anvil of anti-Semitism and forged the fifth columns, destroying unity and softening resistance to onslaughts of the Wehrmacht. Can it then be said that the Jew is a Jewish problem? They are residents, remember, of countries professedly and overwhelmingly Christian. Never can too much emphasis be placed on the realization that the Jewish problem is a world problem. President Wilson once pointed out, "Nothing was likely to disturb the peace of the world more than the treatment which might under certain circumstances be meted out to minorities."

Let me consider in necessarily summary fashion the intricate tasks to be faced by the peace conference in the rehabilitation of the Jew. When we shall have done, it shall remain with you to conclude how delicate, how manifold are the problems.

How many Jews will remain after the war is gruesome to speculate, but those remaining do represent a public trust in honor and decency. The very quality of civilization is involved in the solution. The staggering total of all uprooted European Jewry is 4,150,000, a careful survey of the International Labor Office reveals. The question of resettlement alone is fraught with bristling difficulties.

It is no simple matter to tell them to return from whence they came. Many will remain in the countries to which they migrated, many will return from whence they came. Many will hesitate to return to the scenes of former degradation and suffering. Still others whose property and homes had been confiscated will have nothing to return to since there will still remain the festering sores of wresting their possessions from the new possessors. Beyond that, it is not reasonable to believe that an assiduously cultivated anti-Semitism will evaporate with an Allied victory. Smarting under the wounds of defeat, the conquered peoples will not take easily to a people they hold responsible for their ills. Nationals in eastern Europe and in Germany, in their certain struggle to gain a secure economic foothold in a war-destroyed economy will not welcome competition of returning Jews in the trades, crafts, and professions.

Well-intentioned suggestions have been made that the uprooted Jew be colonized elsewhere. Explorations have resulted in the naming of such possibilitie sas Argentina, Canada, the Kimberleys in Australia, British Guiana, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Alaska, Kenya, northern Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Uganda, Angola, and Madagascar. How fruitful are these suggestions is revealed by the attitude tersely explained by the statement of the Australian representative at the Evian Conference for Refugees. "Gentlemen," he said, "we in Australia have no racial problem, thank God, and we do not intend to have one started." The summation is brilliant in its brevity and finality. Shall the Jew be transplanted and start new spreading pools of anti-Semitism? Few people truly like strangers and still rarer are those who do not weary of them. Democratic western Europe and the Americas have closed their doors by statute to mass immigration. What answer will the peace conference give to hands of the driven Jew knocking at closed doors? Yet temporary havens and even permanent havens must be found in Palestine and elsewhere.

We will write into the peace treaties, some compassionates say, an international bill of rights. We will frame a guaranty of equality for minority peoples. The realist will agree citizen rights can be legally enumerated, but what will they signify in practice? A minorities guaranty was promulgated after the World War. The League of Nations was charged with the duty of seeing that minority peoples received equal rights and opportunities with the majority population. Only the eastern European countries were included, specifically Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Greece, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland. Germany and western Europe were not included. The east European countries complained bitterly against this, as they termed it "discriminatory treatment." Its ineffectuality was testified to by the numerous clauses that followed, that is, the restrictions in the number of Jews that could enter educational institutions, the technical and professional schools, and civil service. It by no means eradicated the ghettos.

Moreover, these States considered disloyal for an individual to complain to the League of Nations against it. Of course, a German in Poland, let us say, could bring charges without social economic repercussions. He could count on the mother country for support. No one stood witness for the Jew. The advantages of the minorities guaranty existed merely on paper. For all its effectiveness, it might just as well have been a mirage in the desert.

Let us admit of the difficulty but not of defeat. No one answer admittedly can be given to cover these perplexities, but one answer must not be shied away from—the realistic approach that is Palestine.

The continuous historic association of the Jews with the Holy Land has never been broken. The age-old yearning among them for the redemption in Palestine has never found surcease in the thousands of years of wandering.

On November 2, 1917, Arthur James Balfour in a letter to Lord Rothschild stated, "His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object. * * *" It was that famous historical document, later to be known as the Balfour Declaration. In 1922, 52 nations approved the British Mandate of Palestine and signified consent to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jews. The Congress of the United States joined the consenting nations by a resolution of approval. In 1924, Great Britain and the United States signed a treaty wherein each signatory agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion, nor were the terms of this treaty to be changed by one without the consent of the other, it was further agreed. Yet today, all the approvals, declarations, pledges, treaties are still but sound and fury signifying nothing.

When England was given the mandate over Palestine, it was given a trusteeship, for that is in the very nature of a mandate, be it remembered, is not ownership. And so it is asked by what moral and legal right did Britain issue her infamous MacDonald White Paper in 1939, restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 until the late spring of 1944, and thereafter making further Jewish immigration into Palestine dependent upon the will of the Arab majority? It is so clearly an abrogation of the Balfour Declaration, the terms of the mandate, the treaty of 1924 with the United States, that the stricken Jew must often listen in bewilderment to the dripping oratory of sympathy issued with monotonous regularity by the officialdom of the United States and Great Britain.

Using the pretext of Arab objection to cover its own colonial policy of divide and rule, the British colonial office has set its face sternly against the utilization of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. This, despite the condemnation of the MacDonald White Paper by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, by such previous spokesman as Lloyd George, General Smuts, Lord Wedgwood, and Winston Churchill himself. As late as 1937, the Royal Commission, headed by Lord Peel, found that the Arabs had gained materially and substantially from the presence of the Jews in the country and further declared that "unquestionably the primary purpose of the mandate as expressed in its preamble and its article is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home."

The Convention between England and the United States in 1924 reaffirmed not only our interest in Palestine but our desire to see to it that Great Britain did not take the Holy Land and fit her snugly into her own waterproof vest pocket. The Convention emphasized clearly that the mandate over Palestine is a trusteeship and does not carry with it all the right, title, and interest of ownership. By deliberately partitioning Palestine, England disregarded the solemnity of our treaty with her. She filched Trans-Jordan and fixed the boundary lines of Palestine to that area west of Jordan.

Is it not passing strange that the United States was not then in 1937 apathetic and silent when England neatly sliced away part of Palestine? The American Government took official recognition of the British plan for the division of Palestine as established by the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. Ambassador Robert W. Bingham in a note to the British Foreign Office referred to the Convention of 1924 and reminded Mr. Anthony Eden that no change in the government of Palestine can take place without the previous consent of the Government of the United States. The British Government gave answer, using devious arguments in defense of her position. Palestine was nevertheless partitioned.

Yet, today, when the MacDonald White Paper so drastically contradicts the terms of the Convention, our State Department maintains its silence. Why does it not today raise the question of the legality and morality of the White Paper which so viciously destroys the hope for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jews? Are we to follow slavishly the policy of the British Colonial Office? Shall Americans make no protest against the rape of Palestine? What political pawn is Palestine that it must be twice betrayed?

To talk of the Jew displacing the Arabs is to talk without either knowledge or recognition of the facts. Western Palestine has an area of only 10,429 square miles. Arab territory in the Near East and Asia comprises about 1,200,000 square miles, while in northern Africa, Arabic-speaking people have additional hundreds of thousands of square miles. Palestine without Trans-Jordan is

comparable in size with that of Vermont. The Jews have only one home. The Arabs have seven: Trans-Jordan, Syria, Yemen, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

The Peace Conference cannot ignore, as does England today, Palestine as a solution, if only partial, to the trying problems of rehabilitation and resettlement of the Jew.

At the peace conference, the United States will take its rightful place, but, there can be no rightful place without a willingness to share in rightful responsibilities. What the United States called its splendid isolation following the World War was, in reality, a shirking of duty, the shrinking of an adolescent from the responsibilities of manhood. Witness its gratuities to Japan in the Pacific—the Marshall Islands, the Carolines, the Marianas. The danger that stood in the offing we failed to realize. Their fortification and utilization by Japan contrary to the mandates which she so gladly took and we shunned are costing thousands of American lives.

Let the United States consider how shabbily Britain has kept its trust in its mandate over Palestine. Let the peace conference decide in face of all the bitter testimony whether such mandate can continue, whether the dictates of world peace do not demand that Palestine be placed under a joint mandate or, say, the United States, Great Britain and China, or the United States, France and Great Britain. It would not do to place the mandate in the hands of a large and a small nation, for instance, since the larger could override with ease the smaller. At any rate, the United States must share in such mandate because hers has never been nor ever will be the role of brandishing the imperialist scepter. At best, the British have made the rights of the Jews in Palestine again a debatable question. We can never more entrust Britain with the trusteeship alone of Palestine.

England has been our outer bastion of defense. She is a valiant ally. But even a husband can criticize a loving wife—even a fly may sting a stately horse. My heavy strictures upon England does not lessen my high regard for her saintly sacrifices, her fortitude after and during Dunkerque, but, remember, a halo need slip but a few inches to become a noose.

What course the United States will pursue in the question of the Jewish homeland is not at present known. The silence is ominous, a portent of evil undercurrents. Surely, it would not be amiss for the administration to set forth its formulated policy. It would not run counter to the principles of decency and promise of a better world to come if the officials of state would declare its opposition to the declared policy of the British as set forth in the ugly MacDonald White Paper—a black paper, indeed. The failure of the administration to declare its hand involves tragic forbodings. It gives rise to the suspicion that we may be co-conspirators with the British Colonial Office in applying to Palestine and the Levant power politics and the policy of divide and rule. The silence of the administration encourages the ugly rumor that it will accept the MacDonald White Paper, the death knell to Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. There is only one way to scotch these ominous conclusions and that is for the President and Secretary of State to make a forthright statement. Theirs is the silence that breeds despair. On the plains of hesitation lie the countless bones of millions.

The opening of the doors of Palestine, mind you, does not preclude the opening of other doors. Jewish citizens of other countries, all countries, must be permitted equal rights with all others. The loyalty of the American Jew or English Jew or Scandinavian Jew is not placed in jeopardy by the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, no more than is the loyalty of a citizen of Irish or Danish or Polish descent brought into question.

To the chosen delegates at the peace conference, the Psalms have a pointed meaning: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Preservation of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks which I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the night of October 15, 1943, from New York, on the subject The Preservation of Free Enterprise. At that time the war conference of the New York district of Kiwanis International was being held in New York City. That organization is devoting itself to keeping for all Americans their personal liberties as citizens of the Nation. A number of outstanding citizens of the country were present, including Governor Saltonstall, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], Mr. George E. Stringfellow, of New Jersey, Mr. O. Sam Cummings, of Dallas, Tex., and others.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight, in most of the homes of this country, the deep, personal thoughts of those who are there, are of young men who have been sent into the armed services here in time of war. Those men and boys who have been called upon to fight a foreign enemy have met their duty with honor, with everlasting glory to themselves and their people, and with success. Many have died in the name of their country. Many have been badly wounded.

As has been said time and again, and as we must continue to say and feel until this war has been won, the first duty of all the people and of their Government is to win the war.

That first duty is a policy that is fixed and immutable with this country, regardless of any turn in events affecting our course and regardless of who may be chosen to direct the affairs of the country.

To those of us, who through circumstance have not been called into the armed service, there is another high duty equal in importance to the defeat of the foreign enemy, and that is the preservation here of the liberties and rights that we inherited as free-born American citizens and which were established by our fathers through their wisdom and their use of them.

Even in time of war the people and their Government cannot forget the fundamental rights of citizens if we are to remain a Nation of free people, as we have heretofore known the meaning of freedom.

Freedom can be lost through domination within a country as well as by domination from a foreign ruler.

In fact, a review of history from ancient times to the present time will reveal that people have been oppressed more often by those who dominate them within their own boundaries than by some foreign conqueror.

Naturally in a world conflict the people are prone to think today in terms of world relations, or relations with other countries. That subject is, always has been, and always will be, an important one, because we live in a world of separate nations. Undoubtedly it has become more important as progress in human invention has shortened time and space in our relationship with other countries and has drawn us closer to them and has caused us to deal more frequently with them. The subject of foreign relations is one that commands serious thought and planning. The part that we shall take in the affairs of the people of other countries is a grave subject that must be met fairly and realistically. But in seeking to be helpful to others, we must not forget those who still live here and are our own, nor must we forget that our own warriors should return to a land where opportunity is open to them.

America will be great in the world and a great benefactor to the world as long as she is a strong, healthy, wealthy country. She will be great and strong as long as she preserves for the people of this country the natural wealth that God Almighty placed here and preserves to them their individual liberty to turn that wealth into useful things. If America ever becomes an impoverished Nation, which can happen through exhaustion of her resources or the destruction of free enterprise and the stultification of the liberties of her people, she will be dropped by the world as quickly as gold diggers drop a penniless friend. Worse still, she will then be the prey of some stronger nation that has preserved its strength.

So the time has come for those in Government to plan the internal affairs of America as well as her affairs in relation to the other nations of the world. And the time is at hand when we must not only plan but act toward the accomplishment of a sounder Nation internally. If America is to contribute to the betterment of the world, she must be richer than the gift she makes. If she is to be a world leader, she must be strong and have her own house in order.

Among the personal liberties and rights to which every American has fallen heir has been the right to live his own life under laws based upon a long-accepted sense of morality, which right we have called free enterprise. In this country the citizen, through generations of custom, has felt it to be his right to go about making a living for himself and his family without interference, so long as he does not encroach upon the right of his fellow citizen to live likewise. He has been entitled to gain the rewards of his effort and ingenuity and to achieve improvement for himself without limit upon his efforts. Perhaps this right has contributed more to the greatness of America than any other privilege which the citizen of this country has enjoyed.

America has become a strong nation out of two fundamental blessings that came to her people: First, a rich endowment of natural resources by Almighty Providence; second, a form of government that permitted men to develop and use those resources through their labor and industry without limit upon or strangulation of their efforts.

This created an incentive that brought forth new creations from year to year; an incentive that caused the resources of the land to be transformed into useful wealth for man's enjoyment and betterment. Not only did it create for us a more comfortable way of living, but it made us a materially strong Nation.

Many other countries have been blessed with natural riches; some even more so than America. But through restrictive and oppressive governments their citizens were deprived of the liberty to develop their wealth, to make the most for themselves. Restrained

by their own governments, they were deprived of the initiative that comes with earned reward, and, with wealth beneath them and all about them, the lived in poverty and stagnation and in national weakness.

When we speak of free enterprise we speak of a personal right. It is the right of every individual to choose his lawful work and to make a living, and through his own enterprise to gain without limit the friuts of his own work. Free enterprise is the only sound foundation upon which creative work is built, and the only method by which opportunity for work may be assured. It is the right of the citizen to establish his store, his shop, his own place of business, to better his job, and then to strive to improve it, without interference by his government.

Free enterprise is the antithesis of State control—or domination of business and labor by government.

It is an undoubted fact that in this country today there are persons who advocate a paternalistic control, through the powers of government, over the affairs and enterprise of our people. This means a strong regulation of our very lives. This paternalism has found its way into and has now become entrenched in the Government of this country. There are those today active in the administration of government who appear wedded to the idea of directing the lives of our people and the enterprise through which the people seek to live and better the condition of themselves and the Nation.

Those who advocate that policy may believe that through such a control they can by directive and order give the citizen better government and a happier life. I do not believe so.

By whatever name such a method of government may be called, it is, in essence, tyranny. It has no place in America.

State control of the farmer as to what he shall plant and how much he may raise and what he may sell, control of the factory and the mine as to its output, control of the worker as to where he shall work and for whom he shall work—are controls that will end freedom in America.

It may be argued, with some merit, that in time of war there is need for an economic organization different from that needed in time of peace. But this Government threat to freedom of enterprise in America had birth long before war came. And I venture to say to you that we will be face to face with the same problem, still, when peace has come. Its advocates will not want to lay aside the idea even then.

A high duty before the American citizen today is to see to it that these controlling measures, now excused by war, are not continued when war has ended.

When we once more set out upon a sound internal policy for this country, the road must be left open for free enterprise.

In normal America we want no more of Government price fixing, or allowances on food, or allotment of materials, or Government control of what we may have to eat, or when or to whom we may sell the product of our labor.

Even though the idea of price regulation be justified by war, the manner in which it has been administered cannot be excused by war. Indeed, the people have been made to know, through unnecessary oppression and harassment, that Government regulation of private lives and private enterprise has no place in this country.

We want the fields of business and work left in the control of the citizens, not for operation by Government from Washington.

Enterprise and industry must be encouraged. That is the only sound and healthy way to provide work for men and women. We must begin even now to turn again to those principles that nurtured America into greatness. When every citizen shall be protected in his right to maintain his own home and live his own life under sound Government. When men shall have the right and the freedom to work without obeisance to anyone and without the necessity of paying tribute or toll involuntarily to any person. When he shall be secure in receiving his just part of the wealth that he produces. When a premium is placed upon thrift and production and not upon indolence and waste.

When free enterprise shall be encouraged and not crushed through Government edict and molestation. When the population of America shall rule America and no group, whomever they may be, shall seize the power of Government for its own ends. And when Government shall exist for the people and not attempt to dominate the people.

Whether this shall be accomplished depends entirely upon the courage and wisdom of the citizens of this land. It depends upon whether they are going to work and strive and vote for America or whether they shall act for some selfish interest at the command of some group leader.

This challenge was so clearly stated in a recent editorial appearing in one of the magazines, from which I quote:

"How are we going to behave and vote: As members of small groups, farmers, unionists, merchants, manufacturers? Or as citizens of a great Nation, intent upon the common good?"

We hear much said about what shall be done for the boys that we sent into this war, when they return home. No one can deny the fact that we owe them more than we owe any other people of our country. It will be all right to give him a sum of money to help him through the transition period, when he must change from the man of battle to the citizen of a country at peace. But it seems to me that that alone would be a very tawdry gift to him.

We owe to him, and to those who come after him, a sound America with the open road of opportunity for him and for every boy and girl who desires to accomplish something in this world. We owe to them all, the freedom to exercise their enterprise without closed and locked gates across the paths to the success they may gain through their effort and their industry.

If the people of America really want to do something for those who have faced the enemy in the name of the country, they will see to it that no limit shall be placed upon their opportunity to rise in good achievement and in service to mankind; that all shall have the reward of their labors. This we owe to every child reared under the flag of this country. Only in a free America—an America of free enterprise—can we hope to realize this life for our people.

In conclusion, let me extend my congratulations to the Kiwanis clubs throughout America who today are holding their war conference in the city of New York and who have devoted themselves to the high purpose of keeping for the people of America that precious right to live free, unmolested, unregimented lives. Unless that purpose be accomplished, this country will no longer be the sanctuary of liberty-loving people.

Letter of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a newspaper article which quotes the recent letter to the War Department of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert, parents of Master Sgt. Kenneth Gruennert, who died a hero's death in New Guinea:

HELENVILLE, WIS., October 20.—Master Sgt. Kenneth Gruennert, 20, who died a hero's death in New Guinea last December, was awarded posthumously his country's highest decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Gruennert, were invited to Washington at the Government's expense to receive the medal from President Roosevelt.

But they declined, offering these reasons in a letter to the Adjutant General's office:

"Only last week thousands of other parents lost their loved ones on battlefields, all brave boys who were loved by their parents as much as we loved our own. These parents cannot all converge on Washington, and because of the common bond we have with them, we feel that we shouldn't, either."

The letter went to the desk of Secretary of War Stimson. He wrote the Gruennerts:

"We stand humble in the face of such a demonstration of patriotism as yours. The spirit of unselfishness, understanding, and sacrifice which breathes through your letter has impressed deeply not only the President, who requested a copy for himself, but all of us in the War Department who have been privileged to read your letter.

"You have lost a son; the Nation has lost a son; we all grieve together."

The Gruennerts received the medal by mail.

To my mind, this letter and the reply by Secretary Stimson is an epic not unlike Lincoln's letter to the mother of five sons lost in battle.

Let's Talk Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks I have traveled considerably and by request of patriotic Americans have spoken to a good many groups in Vermont and elsewhere.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am including as a composite manuscript a compendium of the speeches I have delivered:

During the years immediately preceding Pearl Harbor, and since, I have visited Army and Navy Establishments of about every name, nature, and description on this continent, and some as far away as Honolulu. I have had intimate and close contact over the years with the Secretaries of War and Navy and with practically every officer of high command who is today directing the war effort. I have said this much only in order to qualify myself to say that one who comprehendingly reads history must repeatedly be struck by the analogy between all old wars and this, the biggest of all wars, insofar as congressional interference with the military and naval authorities is involved. We are running true to form.

There are those today in Congress, as there always have been in every war, who assume to know much better how to run the war more efficiently from a naval and military and strategic standpoint than any or all of

those military and naval experts who have given their lives to the study of how to meet and to solve such problems as now confront us.

If war in itself were not such a terrible tragedy, this effort, so often indulged in by those so absolutely incompetent, to try to direct the strategy for the determination of our destiny would be funny. As it is, it is a sad commentary on the lack of good judgment shown.

Those who have the burden and responsibility of determining how and when and where, at the least cost in sweat and blood and treasure and tears the war may be quickest won, should not be embarrassed by those whose superficial knowledge, exploited, has at the most only a nuisance value.

There is too much politics already in this war. Why not let the competent military and naval leaders determine the strategy, and then hold them responsible?

I have the greatest confidence in General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Leahy, Admiral King, and others in the high command. I know them to be brave and fearless and wise. I know they will not hesitate to insist that their plans for operations shall be carried out if they are to be held responsible to the American people therefor.

Therefore, I have supported the war program of the Commander in Chief 100 percent and principally, I admit, because the program was made by the men to whom I have referred. No country was ever more fortunate than we are in the type and character of the men who are at the head of and directing our military and naval departments and the operations on the far-flung fields and across the seven seas. We may have confidence in their conclusions.

If the President only had equally as competent advisers as to the policy to be pursued on the home front, and if he would follow such advice, which he probably would not do, we could sleep once in a while at night without fear of having our last liberty stolen from us.

I will say that in Messrs. Byrnes, Vinson, and Jones the President has belatedly acquired three of the ablest men in the country at his right hand. I have served with these men close to 10 years and know them intimately. How long they will last in their present jobs nobody knows for they are not "yes-yes-ers," and the President will not tolerate opposition or give to any man the necessary authority to act independently, unless he is consulted and approves. The truth is the President has himself largely to blame for the bad organization of the war agencies and the awful mess internally and economically on the home front. Each department is trying to grab some power or authority or to deny responsibility for its exercise. There is too much political and too little war consciousness in the selfish power-seeking group which surrounds this administration.

You do not have to take my word for it. Walter Lippmann said some time ago that our domestic affairs were in such a state as must cause every American to blush when he compares it with the devotion and the sacrifice of the men in our armed forces. And everybody who knows the truth and dares state it realizes that it is not by reason of good judgment but only by the grace of God that we have been saved national disaster up to date.

There must be and will be a change, for the people are too smart to commit national suicide to establish in office a royal family in perpetuity.

But, as I say, I think that under the circumstances the people have done magnificently, but they have a right to be thoroughly disturbed at the manner in which the administration "muddles through" internal affairs. I confess I do not see how we have done as well and as much as we have in view of the conflicting orders and edicts which have been issued without authority of law to establish de facto a course to be followed.

I am, of course, also concerned with respect to our alleged policies for peace toward which we are drifting in a state of definite unpreparedness similar to that which obtained with respect to our lack of preparation for war before Pearl Harbor.

What bothers me and troubles me more, however, is the fact that the President has repeatedly evidenced his incompetency as an Executive. He lacks the elemental and necessary qualifications. What we shall need most of all after the shooting war is over is an Executive competent to administer the problems of peace, for after all they are based on Government organization. Such Executive competency is not to be found in Franklin D. Roosevelt. His political enemies assert it and his friends admit it, privately.

You know as well as I do that even in victory the end for which the war is being fought could easily be lost because of the incompetency of leadership and unpreparedness for the peace to come. It must not happen. We can win the war and lose what we are fighting for.

After all, what is the end for which the war is being fought? Let me answer the question by referring to a letter from a soldier overseas, which tells the story better than I could were I to try. He said:

"We're headed straight for the open doors of hell, and when we get inside they'll slam 'em shut and lock 'em. Maybe I'll come out alive and maybe I won't.

"I'll take that chance. I'll take it because I know, now, what I'm playing for over here. And it isn't marbles.

"I'm not fighting for the right to wait in line for my daily bread.

"I'm not using a bayonet and a knife to carve myself a hole where I'll hide in fear for the rest of my days.

"I'm not betting my life out here so anyone back there can tell me where and what and how to worship.

"I'm not outguessing madmen with machine guns in their hands for the privilege of being told what to say and when to say it.

"I'm fighting for freedom!

"I'm fighting for the things that made America the greatest place in the world to live in, that are going to keep America the greatest place in this world to live in!

"Don't anybody tell me there's no future any more in America. Don't anybody tell me there's a ceiling on my opportunity to make a million or be President.

"Don't anybody tell me there's a bridle and bit waiting for me with my name on it!

"That's what took the humanity out of the men I'm up against now. And I don't want any part of it!

"I want to come back to the same America I left behind me, where our way of living has always brought us new and better things, and always will; the America where there's clean, hard work to do, where there's freedom and justice and opportunity for all; where, if you can think and plan and act on your own, there are no limits on how high you can rise, how far you can go.

"That's what I'm fighting for.

"That's America to me, Mr. PLUMLEY.

"Keep it that way until I come back!"

That is a pretty big order but that is just the way I feel about it and what I shall try to do. I have been fighting to keep faith with the boys abroad and the people at home and to keep America as it is.

The time has come for the American people to know the truth that it may set them free.

The red tape with which bureaucracy is tied up involves, slows down, and struggles while such bureaucratic procedure is an almost insurmountable obstacle in the path of speed and effective war effort on the home front. We have done a lot, but nothing compared with what might have been done under a different organization and administration.

Whether some people like it or not, it is a fact which is generally admitted, that the so-called New Deal, as a social and political experiment, is definitely on the way out, because the people will have it so. Its most active opponents of this day are the men who once were numbered among its most ardent and active supporters. If that be partisanship, you will have to make the most of it, for it is so. And a man must be partisan these days in order to be an American.

As Daniel Webster once said, so should all of us say today:

"I was born an American; I will live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard of personal consequences. What are personal consequences? What is the individual man, with all the good or evil that may betide him, in comparison with the good or evil which may befall a great country in a crisis like this, and in the midst of great transactions which concern that country's fate? Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless. No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffer or if he fall in defense of the liberties and Constitution of his country."

That was the creed of Daniel Webster, a great American, and it is good enough for me!

The time must end when agencies spend their energies battling to build up empires of power. It is time to reassert the fact that this is the people's Government.

The people have a right to demand that there shall be no waste of time, no bungling or lost motions, for these things mean loss of lives. We have no lives to waste or time to lose.

Serious food shortages may cause actual hunger this winter right here in Vermont. Such shortage is directly chargeable to manpower and machinery shortage on the farm, bad weather, and an attempt on the part of impractical theorists and bureaucrats to circumvent the will of the people as registered by Congress, and to beat the inexorable laws of supply and demand, free enterprise, and other economic laws.

I have been connected with legislative bodies since I was 19 years of age and have had what I believe is an unusual opportunity to observe the functioning of government under the checks and balances established by our forefathers. I have resented all the attacks on Congress superinduced by those who would change our form of government.

I have resented such attacks as I would resent and fight against a move to do away with our State legislature in order to lodge all authority in the Governor. Your Congress, as is your legislature, is the voice of the people. It should not be stilled nor silenced nor circumvented.

In this connection it is interesting to recall what happened in the Federal convention when it was proposed that there should be a national legislature in which the American people instead of the American States should be represented—an assembly elected directly by the people with its members apportioned according to population. If, said John Fiske in 1887, the day should ever arrive (which God forbid) "when the people of the different parts of our country shall allow their local affairs to be administered by prefects sent from Washington, and when the self-government of the States shall have been so far lost as that of the departments of France, or even so far as that of the counties of England—on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever."

The attempt to do away with congressional elections was deliberately premeditated as an effort to break down the leg-

islative and to build up the executive department. The people were not fooled. On the contrary, it was a boomerang and one of the reasons why there are fewer "yes-yes" men in Congress today.

There is no partisanship in the statement that the food, farm, and fuel situations have been awfully bungled.

The administration is responsible for its own misguided and unworkable policies. Nobody but the executive branch of the Government is responsible for the shortage of gas and oil, and meat. Congress provided the money and urged that action be taken long before Pearl Harbor to prepare us for such an emergency as now exists. Jealousy, politics, incompetency, delayed action, an attempt to build up a political organization and to carry on as usual, taking advantage of the war to do it, are black marks which cannot be erased, for they indelibly brand those who are responsible for them.

The people, fed by inspired propaganda—published at their own expense, if they only realized it, and spread for the purpose of and with the intent to induce lack of confidence in a coordinate branch of government, namely the Congress—have unwisely criticized Congress for acts of omission or commission for which administrative, and not legislative, incompetence and inefficiency are to be held solely and directly responsible. The executive department has deliberately tried to cover up the mess of its incompetency and to distract attention therefrom by starting a backfire directed at Congress.

I admit with pride that I opposed the enactment of the act to establish the O. P. A. I opposed it for many reasons, principally because I saw in it an attempt to resuscitate the Blue Eagle and to fly high and wide the banner of the resurrected N. R. A. I am no prophet and it didn't take second sight or prophetic vision to see that what has happened was bound to occur. I get a little mean satisfaction out of saying, "I told you so."

When the United States court in Illinois found itself helpless to afford relief to an injured citizen because jurisdiction over O. P. A. is specifically withdrawn from the established courts, leaving the O. P. A. itself to be the judge, jury, and executioner I said, as you may see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "I told you so."

Under one of its provisions, no court, Federal or State, has power to consider the validity of any regulation of the O. P. A. or any price schedule.

I agree, as you must, that there never was a more cunning device contrived to deprive the citizen of his rights in court.

It is both vicious and un-American; it defeats the purpose of our fighting to win the war; suspends democracy, and is a flagrant and arrogant violation of the traditional constitutional American right of the individual to "petition the Government for a redress of grievances." It should be repealed. There is no justification for it in America.

Until the people waked up to realize that the palladium of their liberties and the only remaining anchor they had for their freedom was being sabotaged the efforts of the bureaucrats and the administrative link boys were successful. The last election, however, was evidence of the fact that the people were commencing to be aroused to a realization of the seriousness of their predicament.

For the resurgence and rejuvenation of Congress, its attempts to recapture its prerogatives, its assertion of its independence the peple have themselves to thank. Encouraged by what they have already saved for themselves, they should purge the body politic of the disease which has weakened its system and settled in its bones during the last 10 years.

I have been opposed to the insidious attempts to take advantage of the war to establish and to carry on a glorified W. P. A. and to magnify the socialization of the world, for which the report of the National Resources Planning Board was a blueprint, and was to me what a red flag is to a bull. Concerning it, the day after it was filed as a document I said on the floor of the House:

"I have read and studied history all my life. Honestly I never read such a declaration as the National Resources Planning Board report drawn so insidiously to destroy the individualism of a people.

"In one fell swoop it is proposed to go back to the age of feudalism. State lines are wiped out with the mop of Federal supervision and gratuity. Industry and labor are regimented. The taxpayer is made a serf and the axiom is ages old that corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.

"The report is an example of theory and idealism gone mad in a practical world. Somewhere I have heard or read that those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

I said a lot more and meant it and still have a right to be concerned.

All of us are rightly concerned as to what the world of tomorrow shall be. Certainly one has only to lift his eyes from the ground to see that the path which the Government should follow lies open before it and away from the roads which led us into this Second World War.

Every person knows today, whatever he thought yesterday, that the foreign policy of the United States has been based on isolationism, or was till our hands were forced by Japan.

That such policy has failed utterly and miserably is a foregone conclusion, and as Sumner Welles declared the other day, had we been willing to play our part in keeping the peace of the world since the last World War, the cost to us in life and treasure would have been an infinitesimal part of the cost required of us today.

We should have learned and we are paying a terrible price to be educated to know that we cannot run away from our destiny.

Selfishness, fear, and ignorance wrote the treaty of Versailles, kept us out of the League of Nations, prevented a lasting peace, and are responsible for the holocaust of today. It must not happen again.

To some people it seems that the League of Nations is the natural point of beginning for that reorganization and readjustment which experience has shown to be essential to make it the center of some form of that federal union which most certainly will have to be set up.

Others are opposed to the league on the ground that it is and would be at best a league of governments and not of peoples. Such people favor an international confederation of nations to be regulated by international law enforced by an international police force.

All of us are resolved to win the war and to achieve a genuine and enduring peace. How to establish a free world after the victory at arms is accomplished is a question which deserves the best thought of the most profound thinkers of the age, yet it can only be established and maintained by, and most largely will depend on, the leadership and the policy of the United States. We cannot dodge our responsibility.

"All people of the earth
Share but one common birth,
One destiny;
One sun shines o'er us all,
Alike we rise and fall,
One night will spread its pall
Eternally.

"Great God of all the earth,
Lead us to know the worth
Of sympathy;
May fellowship increase,
May all contention cease,
O may we dwell in peace
And unity."

Most of the plans for peace start with the idea that the problem is one of power. That is a sound assumption. How to apply the power is the problem. Some believe that the maintenance of peace depends on some form of economic action—international cooperation, removal of economic restrictions on world trade, and equal access to raw materials. Others emphasize social justice and social security. Another group stresses the importance of psychological and spiritual forces, education, creation of world opinion, development of international morality, revival of religion. Still others pin their faith chiefly to institutions of democracy, the growth of law and respect for it, or wider recourse to arbitration and conciliation. Many think that peace can be assured by special measures applied to Germany as the most dangerous actual or potential breeding place of wars.

As the old fellow used to say at the Dog River Valley Fair, "You pays your money and you takes your choice," for there are over a dozen tentative plans which have been promulgated and 28 different groups working on post-war planning. What we must bear in mind, as I see it, is that we must not be diverted from our objective which is to win the war at the earliest possible moment and at whatever the cost.

We must insist upon the preservation of our old freedom, keep our standard of living, and our American way of life, to the fullest possible extent. Then bend every effort to lead or to cooperate in creating a law-abiding, war-free, just society. This is the mission which America has in the world and we should and shall fulfill it in God's good time.

It is no time for a blueprint. As the Negro preacher said, we may "argufy and spectify" to our hearts' content but we cannot specify until we know for example, what Russia's peace terms will be, or what plans China has for her own development—or until, in fact, our partners have had a chance to examine and to approve the specifications and the articles of association on the basis of which the partnership is to be established. But seeing the world in shambles, business destroyed, homes broken by the millions, millions sick in body and mind, and other millions whose careers have been interrupted, everywhere the peacetime pursuits of more than a billion people transformed into war effort, while the total war bill rolls on and up and will reach close to half a trillion dollars, the American people will not undertake to stop historical evolution, avoid, evade, or escape their destiny or to shirk the responsibility of their mission.

Said Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War, as if he were talking to us as of today:

"It is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuits for all; to afford all an unfettered start."

He spoke of freedom with the true vision of freedom, and in his words, uttered when men fought to free slaves, there is a credo for today.

If this war can be considered worth its cost, then, in the end, the hands and hearts of men must be free. Tyranny, enslavement, and restriction of rights must have no part.

But this war is not won even on the sea or by land or in the air. Do not be too confident. We are just now about to be put to the test. The Battle of Italy has just commenced. The war is far from won on that front. It will take much of sacrifice of blood and brains and matériel before we can stop working to win for a moment.

No, my friends; the war is not won. We have just commenced to fight. The casualty lists will multiply terribly in the near days to come. We have a long and weary winding road ahead of us to follow to victory and unconditional surrender of our enemies.

This is no time for complacence just as it is no time for defeatism.

We must daily reassert our will to win the war. That is our first and compelling responsibility. From it we must not be diverted and we must not shirk it to take time out for post-war planning prematurely. So the war is about won? That is not so. As somebody said the other day:

"Brother, don't say that to him. Not to this kid. Remember him? He's the kid that used to deliver your groceries—the kid that used to take his .22 and track rabbits in the woods when the snow fell.

"Right now he's wallowing in a stinking, insect-ridden New Guinea jungle swamp, waiting to pick off a Jap sniper. He doesn't know the war is about won. All he knows is the bitter, bloody fight for every foot gained—sweltering days and shivering cold nights for God knows how long. He knows the Japs are no push-overs—knows he's still 2,000 or more miles from Tokyo.

"Better not tell him the war's about won. Better not say it to anyone, because the kids on New Guinea, and at the Italian front, have still got a long, hard way to go. Better just keep pitchin' with all that's in us—like they're pitchin' with Garands and tank busters and the cannon in P-38's. Better stay on the job every hour we can. Better not buy things we can do without.

"We can win the war fighting along with that kid—he in the jungle, we on the home front. Let's not risk his losing faith in us until this war is completely won on every front. When the war's over, we'll all know it."

So, saving the best we have and can, we will go ahead to build a new and a better social, political, and economic society, nearer to our heart's desire, based on American leadership, maintained by American power, and dedicated to freedom. We must be willing to pay a price for freedom, for no price that is ever asked for it is half the cost of doing without it.

But do not be too optimistic. This is a fight to the finish that we are in. We are surrounded right here at home by clamorous political experimenters, social uplifters, and vigorous radicals who have little respect for the past, and whose chief concern for the future is to make it as different as possible from the present. Their aim is to tear up everything by the roots, to destroy all that has been done and to begin all over again.

Such a program as they advocate both openly and insidiously is as un-American, unintelligent, and as impractical as it is dangerous.

If we let the world be turned over to them it will for an indefinite period be a regimented and Government-controlled world, ruled by force, either economic or military, or both. The choice of today will determine the character of the world tomorrow.

True it is that the forces of freedom are on the march, the power of evil is faltering, the day of retribution comes closer every sunset and dawn, but we should redouble our efforts to speed that day.

The United Nations stand before the altars of common cause—intent, not upon punishment, but on seeing that justice is done, which is the essence of what we are fighting for. Retributive justice, if you ask me.

In that connection may I say, as Herbert Hoover said the other day, "A muddled conception of international law and humanity must not be used as a shield to protect people from punishment for their crimes. It is only by a tremendous stretch of the imagination that many of these misdeeds can be described as political. The ruthless seizure of private property, the machine-gunning of refugees, the shooting of hostages, the execution of prisoners of war, the extermination of the Jews, the excesses against the civil population of Hong Kong, Nanking, and the like, are fiendish crimes. Furthermore, they were deliberately and systematically organized, which aggravates them by premeditation. And the criminals include not only the hired hands who committed such crimes but the men who commanded the crimes to be carried out and those in authority who refused to intervene to stop the acts."

And "the time will come," said President Roosevelt, "when they shall all have to stand in courts of law and answer for their acts."

But, lest we forget, let me remind you here and now that the madness of German and Japanese ambitions leaves no place for individual freedom in nations built and organized like communities of modern barbarians. For them there is neither organized international collaboration nor dealings with groups of peoples as between equals and equals.

Such concepts are outlawed from their thought and speech. On the other hand the United Nations, great and small, are fighting for the right for all to live industrially, independently and peacefully. Peace will be indivisible for all of them.

Victory in this war should be a human triumph. The sacred rights of all peoples to choose their forms of government should be forever established as the foundation of free society, based on the promise of independence and the restoration of the right of self-determination.

The promise to respect the right of all peoples to choose their form of government must and can only be interpreted and construed to be an expression of that underlying faith and hope in mankind which in days gone by produced the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the declaration of the rights of man as our forebears set it forth in our Bill of Rights.

It expresses the profound hope we hold that our dream of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" the world around may at long last come true.

The free men and women of the world propose this time to weld and rivet together the gains they make and are making at the cost of so much in blood and sweat and tears, needlessly, but because of which they intend to see to it this time that such a world catastrophe shall not recur—shall never happen again.

They have not come so far on the road to victory as they have come only to be cheated out of their determination to establish for themselves, their children, and those generations yet unborn a peace that shall be enduring.

That is what we are fighting for, but our responsibility will not be lightened nor lifted nor ended—

"Till the lights come on again
All over the world."

Old First Reformed Church, Passaic, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Old First Reformed Church of Passaic, N. J., this week celebrates 250 years of continuous service for God and man. Historians recall how women of the church went out with their baskets to feed Gen. George Washington's weary troops when they were encamped by the Gregory Avenue Bridge, and the Passaic Herald-News contributes the following editorial on the life of this old church:

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS OF LIFE OF OUR HISTORIC OLD FIRST CHURCH

This week is an occasion of great interest to the pastor and people of the Old First Reformed Church, one in which all the residents of Passaic and vicinity share their interest with them, extending sincerest felicitations and best wishes.

For it is now two centuries and a half since the first recorded religious service here was held in the home of Elias Michelsen (Vreeland) at what now is the corner of First and South Streets and was the first house built in Passaic County. Michelsen was one of 14 God-fearing heads of families from Holland who in 1679 purchased from the native Lenni-Lenape Indians 5,520 acres of fertile land (including the present cities of Passaic and Clifton and a large part of Paterson) at the price asked, which we are told was several coats, blankets, muskets, handfuls of powder, and strings of wampum, which honorable purchase was confirmed in 1686 by the Acquackanonk Patent granted by the English Crown.

It may be that services were held before June 12, 1693, but that is the earliest date in any existing record. On that day the collection amounted to the sum of 18 stivers, or the equivalent of $1.80. Thus the story of this first church parallels the life of the city of Passaic from the beginning down to the present moment, a story which Mrs. Harriette V. A. Doremus has brought together so well in the interesting pamphlet published by the parish to commemorate this venerable anniversary.

Whatever the exact date of the first getting together for religious worship, we know that the villagers held services in Michelsen's house until the time of the building of the first little log church, in 1702, on the site in River Drive where the congregation worshipped for 200 years. For 132 years there was no other church here, it served a radius of 30 miles, and for 123 of those years its ministry was conducted in the Holland language exclusively. First known as The Low (Nether) Dutch Reformed Church at Achquechnonk on March 23, 1795, it became officially the Protestant Reformed Dutch Church at Acquackanonk, which has remained its name to this day.

From the beginning, when the men took their guns with them to service and a guard was maintained against surprise attack by Indians, the "Old First" has ministered to the religious and educational needs of the community. For long it maintained the only secular school, the Reverend Guillaume Bertholf (1694–1724) being the first village school teacher as well as the first pastor.

It is remarkable that the services of 14 pastors should have sufficed for 250 years. Only a nonagenarian could have known more than five—the Reverend J. Paschal Strong, the Reverend Dr. John Gaston, the Reverend Dr. Ame Vennema (builder of the present church at the turn of the century), the Reverend Dr. Edward Dawson, and the Reverend Millard M. Gifford, S. T. M., the present pastor.

Many old residents recall the old church (the third, replacing one of rough field-stone built in 1760) which stood on the historic site close to the first parsonage, built in 1713, and which later became the historic "Tap House on the Hill" where General Washington spent the night of November 21, 1776, when his harried troops rested after crossing the river and the old bridge had been destroyed to hold back the advancing British. This fine old edifice was erected in 1829 and served the congregation until the present beautiful structure was dedicated on June 22, 1902. It was a great loss to the community when the old church, where the revered Dr. Gaston (1869–1925) ministered so long, was destroyed by fire, March 17, 1930, but the memories of its 101 years of usefulness live on in the new edifice of sim-

lar Dutch colonial architecture erected soon afterward by the present owners, the Polish National Catholic Congregation of SS. Peter and Paul.

All able to do so will attend one or more of the observances of this historic occasion, which will be held on Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday.

Few of us may expect to be here on the three hundredth anniversary, but we may be sure the "Old First" will be here, doing good, then, and in the time of the latest generation of men and women of Passaic.

The Two-thirds Rule of the Senate and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered over the radio last Thursday evening by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the subject Does the Two-thirds Rule of the Senate Impede United States Foreign Policy?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Does the two-thirds rule of the Senate impede United States foreign policy?

The answer to the question is, emphatically "Yes."

By a malign and perverse trick of fate, an amendment offered by James Madison in the constitutional convention excepting treaties of peace from the two-thirds rule, although it had been adopted without objection on September 7, 1787, was eliminated the next day. As a result the last 50 years have told the story of the frustration of the hopes and the will of the American people that this Government would lead the world to permanent peace.

Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have been defeated in their efforts to effectuate this hope because the two-thirds rule has become an instrument in the hands of an irreconcilable minority to prevent the majority from effectuating its policy.

It was the two-thirds rule that prevented Grover Cleveland from obtaining a treaty of arbitration with Great Britain. It was the two-thirds rule primarily which rendered ineffective the efforts of Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft to carry out the same policy of arbitration with Germany, France, Great Britain, and seven other countries.

It was the two-thirds rule which, under Woodrow Wilson, defeated the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of America by preventing our adherence to the League of Nations. It was the two-thirds rule which, in 1935, prevented our becoming a party to the World Court.

It is the two-thirds rule which now lies across the path of progress as the greatest obstacle to the winning of world peace as the fruit of the terrible sacrifices of this war.

The Cleveland treaty with Great Britain was carried in the Senate by a majority vote of 43 to 26, yet it was defeated because it lacked two-thirds. Although the Hay arbitration treaties obtained the necessary two-thirds vote, the power of the minority was so strengthened by the rule that a resolution was attached of such deadly effect that both Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft declined to proceed further. Theodore Roosevelt declared that he would not be a party to what he called a sham and Taft abandoned all further effort to substitute arbitration for war.

The Covenant of the League was approved in the Senate by a vote of 49 to 35, 7 votes short of the necessary two-thirds. The World Court, supported though it was by 52 Senators as against 36, also failed by 7 votes.

Thus the record is clear. The painful progress of the people toward world peace through half a century has been delayed and defeated by the provision of the Constitution which, as James Wilson of Pennsylvania expressed it upon the floor of the Constitutional Convention, "puts it into the power of a minority to control the will of a majority."

I undertake to say that 10,500,000 young men of America are under arms today fighting in a global war on every continent and on every sea, from Iceland and Alaska in the north to the Solomon Islands and the Indian Ocean in the south because this rule has prevented America from taking the position of world leadership which destiny has thrust upon it. Because of the rule we were unable to achieve peace by peaceful means and we have been driven to war.

The rejection of the League of Nations was the victory of 17 Senators over 78. These 17 concentrated their efforts upon seducing the Republican majority to attach reservations which they fondly hoped would kill the treaty and then, when the reservations had been attached, they voted solidly against their handiwork.

Surely it cannot now be said that anything was gained by the defeat of the League Covenant. The argument against it was that the United States should isolate itself, that it could stay at peace though all the rest of the globe were engulfed in the flames of war. We know now that that was impossible.

The defeat of the Treaty of Versailles did not keep us at peace. On the contrary, it made war more inevitable. Because the defeat was the denial of the hopes of America, we turned to ineffective substitutes. For lack of a League Covenant we had a disarmament conference. We scrapped a fleet that was second to none in all the world and we put the feet of the Emperor of Japan upon the ladder of world power by permitting him to build up a navy while we were tearing ours down. Thus, because of the tragic error of 1920 we turned our backs on the straight road to peace, we weakened ourselves in the face of the oriental power which, a quarter century later, frankly announced its purpose—a vain one, thank God—to make an aggressor's peace in the White House at Washington.

If the two-thirds rule which has effectively prevented us from achieving world peace had applied to the passage of the Lend-Lease Act on February 8, 1941, that law would not have been enacted. Germany by this time would have overrun England, and Russia, for lack of our lend-lease aid, would be reeling before the Nazi armies and we would be carrying on the Japanese war alone. Lend-lease was approved in the Senate by the overwhelming vote of 60 to 31, but it lacked 2 votes short of a two-thirds.

The two-thirds rule was an inheritance from the Articles of Confederation when, because there was no Executive and the Colonies had not yet been welded into an indissoluble Union, it was provided that foreign relations should be conducted by a two-thirds vote of the delegates. It was an inheritance from the days when the scattered settlers upon the Mississippi River were fearful that that stream might be bargained away to the French. It was an inheritance of the days when the inhabitants of New England were fearful that their fishing rights in Newfoundland might be sacrificed. It has hampered our foreign policy and upset the proper relationship between the executive and the legislative power. It has placed in the hands of an irreconcilable minority an instrument to defeat the will of the majority. It has created an opportunity for the narrow spirit of partisanship to make war upon the national good and it has operated to expand the powers of the Executive at the expense of the Senate by steadily broadening the field in which foreign relations are conducted by Executive agreement rather than by treaty.

The abolition of the two-thirds rule would reopen the door to peace and would reestablish a desirable mutual confidence between the Executive and the Senate in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Competition of Government Lending Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a condensation of an address delivered by Claude F. Pack, president of the Home State Bank, Kansas City, Kans., before the State bank division of the American Bankers Association, in New York City, on September 13, 1943.

This article supplements recent remarks made on the floor of the House and is the result of an exhaustive study of governmental interference with free enterprise; it exposes subsidized competition; and it demonstrates the phenomenal growth of bureaucratic agencies.

The address follows:

The American people are yet only half conscious of the fact that, in the short period of a decade, a great banking system largely owned and sponsored by their Government and operating under Government subsidy has come into existence alongside our private banking system. A few years ago most people complacently took it for granted that the Government's going into the business of lending money was a temporary episode, due to a great emergency. But the emergency is long past; the railroads are doing a land-office business and are now largely independent of the R. F. C.; distress real estate not only is a thing of the past but a great real-estate boom is actually under way; and the American farm is experiencing a prosperity such as comes only once or twice in a lifetime. The emergency is past but the activity of the Government as a money lender—especially in fields competitive with country banks—continues to grow.

* * * * *

Naturally, the question arises: What has been the cause and what is the driving force responsible for the phenomenal growth of this Government money-lending business? The Federal Farm Loan banks go back to 1916, but it must be evident to anyone that most of the Government lending agencies are a byproduct, first, of the agricultural distress following the First World War and, then, of the great depression. In one sense, the great depression represented the final liquidation of the First World War. The

economic wreckage following in its wake was unparalleled. The state of affairs became such that it was the considered judgment of the American people that the Government must step in and support certain weak situations. Government credit was made available to railroads, banks, owners of urban real estate and farmers. Conditions had come to such a pass that private lenders—operating with other people's money—could not deal with the situation. The result was that we emerged from that experience with the Government more deeply involved in the money-lending business than ever before known in American history. In this sense this new Government activity was the product of the First World War and the economic distress that followed it.

It is sheer nonsense for anyone to attempt to say just what Congress had in mind when it created these agencies. The bureaucrats now running them say that it was the intent of Congress that they should be new and permanent lending agencies—not just measures for emergency and relief. There are many people in this country who believe in the nationalization of credit; that is, that the Government should do all the money lending. Naturally, the difficulties in the credit system at the bottom of the great depression presented an opportunity made to order for those who believe in the nationalization of credit and these people were quick to see the opportunity and make the most of it. But it proves nothing to point to speeches made in Congress, or phraseology in the various laws, to substantiate the view that Congress intended to create a new banking system. The facts are that most of these agencies got a firm lease on life in a time of great national emergency and they owe their great vitality today to the critical days between 1930 and 1934, as well as to the believers in socialized credit. Once these agencies were set up their great competitive advantage due to the element of subsidy together with the well-known vices of bureaucracy, accounts for their ever-expanding activity in a time when abounding war prosperity has taken the place of the great emergency to which they owe so much.

The people who run these agencies are human beings like ourselves and work for a living. Each man knows that his job and his advancement are at stake. It is only human that he strives to make a showing by increasing the volume of his work and the number of persons under his direction. You and I would do the same thing. Raymond Moley, in an editorial in Newsweek for July 19, quotes as follows from a letter of a man who had recently "entered the colossal Federal machine":

"Each section head is obsessed by the Federal psychosis of fearing that he really isn't as important as he thinks he is and that some day his work and his section's work might diminish. Therefore, he argues to himself, I must get more work all the time, take over more duties, create new duties which I must convince my superior are essential. It never occurs to such people that their work might be diminishing because they are finishing the job they were hired to do or conversely, that they aren't getting less busy because they haven't been going after their particular job in a straightforward manner."

It is small wonder that everyone connected with these agencies has convinced himself that Congress intended them to be permanent institutions. "Bureaucracy gone to seed" accounts for representations of the R. A. C. C., the F. S. A. and the Production Credit System scouring the country, drumming up new business, bombardment of the air waves with propaganda and the use of movie films telling their story to the farmer and the attractively illustrated literature, printed in the Government Printing Office, designed to convince the farmer that these Government lending agencies are peculiarly adapted to meet all of the farmer's credit needs. All these subsidized activities are the ripened fruit of bureaucracy—not the design of Congress weighed down with the responsibility of meeting a great emergency.

Competitive advantages of Government agencies have been an important factor in helping the bureaucrat expand his activities. Today, we are interested primarily in the competition of these agencies with commercial banks; and among commercial banks, the competition is most acute in rural communities. * * * It is in a set-up such as the P. C. A. that the small bureaucrat has taken a leaf out of the sales manual of the life insurance agent, when it comes to ferreting out prospects for loans.

Let us examine a few cases that illustrate the difficulty of a typical country bank in meeting this competition. A country bank is a unit institution and operates in a restricted territory. Sound management demands that its loan rate conform to risk and cost factors. But the Government agency, operating over the whole country, tends to standardize its rate and this means that, in specific cases, rates do not reflect to the full these risk and cost factors.

A good illustration of this is the data given publicity recently by the American Bankers Association, dealing with operating results of 14 P. C. A.'s in Kansas and the same number in Missouri. Of the 14 P. C. A.'s in Kansas, 6 failed to have sufficient income from loans in 1942 to cover expenses and in only 3 of them did the Government own less than half of the stockholders' equity. In one case the average rate needed to pay expenses was 8.4 percent while the average rate actually charged was 5.6 percent. In this particular case 10 percent would have been required to pay operating expenses and allow 2½ percent on the taxpayer's capital which the Government is donating. This was the extreme case, but in 9 of the 14 Kansas P. C. A.'s the average rate actually charged was insufficient to pay operating expenses and 2½ percent on the Government investment. And, of course, we must not forget the borrower's own capital which he must commit to this enterprise and on which he gets no return. In Missouri the situation was even worse. Last year the Government was furnishing 68 percent of the capital of the 14 P. C. A.'s operating in that State and 9 of these 14 agencies did not collect enough interest to cover operating expenses. While an average rate of only 5.5 percent actually was charged, an average rate of 6.4 percent would have been necessary to cover expenses and pay 2½ percent on the Government's contribution. Only 1 of the 14 P. C. A.'s in Missouri had sufficient earnings to meet operating expenses and provide such a return on the taxpayer's investment.

Since Kansas and Missouri are great agricultural States and the Production Credit Association deals almost wholly with farmers and stockmen, these Kansas and Missouri figures are, no doubt, representative of the general situation which country banks face. But, how can a country bank meet such competition? A bank has to meet its operating expenses, including taxes, and it must earn a reasonable return on the capital investment. And, more important still, the bank must set up out of operating income—free from subsidy—reserves to meet inevitable losses. None of these things are required of the P. C. A. But this is only a part of the story. The country bank is a community institution and as such it pays taxes and performs a hundred and one free services. The country bank supplies its community with the currency needed; it helps the farmer with his income-tax statement, it handles ration coupons, it sells Government bonds and collects Federal income taxes gratis for the Government. And last, but not least, the local bank must participate in all campaigns for charitable and benevolent funds. The figures just quoted show that, if the P. C. A.'s had to do only one of these things, namely, earn 2½ percent on the capital the Government is donating, more than half of them in Kansas, and all but one of them in Missouri, would be in the red and survive only because of the long-suffering taxpayer's subsidy.

A subsidized loan rate and a complete freedom from taxes and the costs of any community service provide a perfect set-up for advertising that the country bank—working alone—cannot meet. A small country bank—working alone—cannot afford to buy radio time and make extensive use of movie films; but these Government agencies can and do—telling the farmer how they are equipped to care for his every credit need. Neither can the country bank—working alone—afford to print and circulate beautifully illustrated literature among farmers telling them its story. There are two pamphlets prepared by the Farm Credit Administration for distribution among farmers and printed by the Government Printing Office. These circulars are masterpieces of persuasive writing and the printer's art and have been printed by the United States Government itself, why should the farmer not be impressed?

One is entitled "A B C's of Credit for the Farm Family." This 20-page pamphlet is produced on expensive magazine print and attractively illustrated throughout. One section bears the caption, "Shopping for credit," from which I quote verbatim:

"If you are sure you will be better off if you borrow, shop for credit, just as you would shop for any other purchase. Each lending agency offers terms and other services that are adapted to the special needs of one or more types of borrowers. You will want to ask yourselves such questions as these: What kind of lending agency will best suit our family needs? Is the agency financially sound? Is it reputable? What are the costs of obtaining a loan from it? What are the interest rates? How long do the loans run? Will we be forced to refinance before we have the opportunity of paying the debt in full?"

Notice how skillfully these questions tend to suggest that the various agencies of the Farm Credit Administration offer the best bargain to the shopper for credit, and at the same time may easily raise doubts in the mind of the reader as to whether other sources of credit, including banks, are "financially sound or reputable." Farmers are generally skeptical of highly colored advertising mediums. They are usually quick to detect statements that are misleading or contain a double meaning. However, when one of these attractive pamphlets is handed to a farmer by a representative of a Government lending agency and is plainly marked "United States Government Printing Office," he assumes, in good faith, that the integrity of his Government is back of such printed word and that he can accept its contents at 100 percent face value.

The second circular is of most interest to commercial banks, for it is called Short Term Credit: A Good Farm Tool. This pamphlet, too, is beautifully done, and also is printed by the Government Printing Office. * * * This pamphlet is a clever piece of advertising and American business firms that have been hauled before the Federal Trade Commission on the charge of unfair and dishonest advertising would be interested in it.

This pamphlet does a very neat job of getting over to the farmer the idea that Government lending agencies are better able to take care of the farmer's short-term credit needs than any other set-up. It lists and comments on the various kinds of lending institutions. For instance, it says that "commercial banks, as the name implies, are primarily banks for trade and industrial business." This pamphlet is written for farmers

and the inference is clear that the country bank—the only bank that the farmer knows—is not well suited to a farmer's needs. The ground for this inference is the subterfuge that a country bank—being, technically, a commercial bank—is primarily for trade and industrial business. It further says that since deposit funds are subject to immediate withdrawal and because of State and Federal regulations, a large part of commercial bank loans must be self-liquidating in 30 to 90 days. The pamphlet also states that "varying money market conditions and unstable local situations sometimes have required commercial banks to modify loan policies and discontinue granting renewals." We are not saying that these statements are actual falsehoods: A half truth is, technically, a truth; but the net effect of it is a falsehood. The idea planted firmly in the mind of the farmer is that the country bank must make short-term loans and that it may not grant renewals. This point is driven home with the following statement: "It is better never to own a binder than to depend on it and have it break down beyond repair at harvest time. Likewise, it is better to forego using credit at all than to base farming plans on using it and then find the lending agency unable to supply funds." You would think from this that country banks do not make loans to farmers for more than 90 days, or ordinarily do not grant renewals. Anyone knows that country banks do make a practice of making loans for more than 90 days. * * * But the clever pamphlet of the Farm Credit Administration is mysteriously silent on these matters. A statement of all the facts wouldn't help their case.

In speaking of interest rates charged by commercial banks the pamphlet says "interest rates vary widely, the range being from 5 to 10 percent. Other charges may or may not be added." In connection with the discussion of the Production Credit Association the following statement is made about interest rates: "The rate now is 4½ percent and is uniform throughout the United States. The member borrower pays the cost of inspecting the security as well as the fees for recording chattel mortgages when these are necessary." That 4½ percent rate, standing alone as it does, looks good to the farmer and is fine for advertising. The incidental additional costs mentioned look trivial, but candor would seem to demand that the farmer's attention also be called to the fact that the incidental expenses, together with 2½ percent on the taxpayer's money involved, would have raised the rate last year to an average of 5.7 percent in Kansas and 6.4 percent in Missouri, and if the farmer's own required investment were taken into account, the average rate would have been even higher. These agencies, with their desire to do good would, no doubt, be greatly shocked if someone were to raise the question whether their attractive literature is altogether fair advertising or raise the question of the ethics of using the taxpayer's money for this kind of public education.

* * * * *

Let the Government lending agencies pay taxes, earn a fair return on the capital invested, charge rates in every community that cover risk and cost factors, set up a reserve for inevitable losses out of operating income—free from subsidy—handle ration coupons, sell Government bonds, collect Federal income taxes, contribute in terms of dollars and hours, all of the community services now performed gratis by banks—and their fate is sealed. No Government agency can compete with private enterprise when favoritism and subsidy are eliminated.

The program of the American Bankers Association has focused the spotlight of publicity upon the unfair, unethical, and unsound practices of the R. A. C. C., the F. S. A., and the P. C. A. by assembling and presenting factual data relating to the uneconomical operations of these agencies to committees and leaders of Congress. * * * The hearings conducted by the Byrd committee paved the way for the bill introduced by Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, providing for the elimination of the R. A. C. C. This bill will be acted upon in the forthcoming session of Congress. The program is definitely directed toward the elimination of the present subsidy of the P. C. A. system, represented by the $120,000,000 of cost-free capital donated by the Government, which, when eliminated, will compel the P. C. A. system to pay its own way.

* * * Attention should be directed not only to the waste and extravagance of the promotional policies but also to the fact that they contribute little or nothing in the way of taxes to the community, the State, or the Federal Government. Neither do they share in a multitude of community responsibilities willingly shared by country banks. The public must come to realize that the P. C. A.'s exist only because of the long-suffering taxpayer's subsidy. This subsidy should now be stopped.

In many localities interest rates charged by banks still need to be adjusted to a basis that will be fair both to the borrower and the lender. Maturities should be studied in each individual case so that the loan will extend over the production period and allow for orderly marketing of the crop or livestock involved. Banking must continue to be alert to the ever-changing needs of business, including agriculture, and gear its operations to meet the demands of each new period.

Country banks may well be able to learn something from the aggressive merchandising methods used by the P. C. A. * * * Good use may be made of the slogan—"Bank credit is the best farm credit."

As bankers, we must look ahead and plan for the post-war era and the part which the chartered banking system must be prepared to undertake. When the war is over some way must be found to insure full production and maximum employment. Only in that way can we avoid serious social consequences and provide a tax base that will support Government expenditures that appear inevitable. With a public debt that may easily approximate $300,000,000,000, the Government will be in no condition to continue pouring out vast sums to stimulate employment. Reliance must be placed on private business and industry to give employment. Necessary incentives must be provided to encourage private business to launch out aggressively into new frontiers and to assume the risks that are inherent in an expanding economy. Hand in hand with such an aggressive private business system must go a virile banking system that can assume the risks of necessary financing.

The real issue, as I see it, is to maintain an ever-expanding business economy and a sound banking system to finance full production, provide maximum employment, re-create the wealth destroyed by war, and lift the standard of living of our people to ever-higher levels. Only an atmosphere of American free enterprise and individual initiative can be depended upon to release the creative potentialities of the human spirit that alone can meet and solve the colossal problems of the period which lies ahead. We may well keep in the forefront of our thinking the immortal words recently uttered by the inimitable Winston Churchill, when he said:

"We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges."

San Francisco: City of Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, employer and employee cooperate in San Francisco. For years my home city has taken the lead in demonstrating how labor and capital may work together harmoniously.

In extending my remarks I include an editorial entitled "San Francisco: City of Industrial Peace" published in the Daily Commercial News of San Francisco on October 22, 1943. This article is further evidence of the loyal patriotic sentiment in the city by the Golden Gate.

SAN FRANCISCO: CITY OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE

San Francisco has been remarkably free of labor-management conflict since the middle of last May, a period of 5 months, it was announced yesterday by the San Francisco Employers' Council. This is the best record of industrial peace established in the city since the council began operating in February 1939, and for some years previous to that date.

Altogether, for the first 9 months of 1943, ending September 30, only four strikes were brought to the attention of the council, two of them lasting 4 days and two only 1 day each. With no strikes on the horizon, there is reason to believe that labor and management in San Francisco will end the year 1943 with the best record in peaceful labor relations since 1932.

Last year there was a total of 13 strikes, a drop of 31 from a total of 44 in 1941. This put San Francisco near the bottom of a list of 29 American cities in the number of 1942 strikes—the twenty-sixth—although in population it ranks twelfth. Provided the relations between organized labor and management continue on the present even course for the remainder of the year, it seems safe to predict that San Francisco will win national recognition as the white spot of industrial peace among large American cities on which the United States Department of Labor reports industrial disputes.

War pressures, of course, were and are mainly responsible for San Francisco's falling strike records, but another important reason is the fact that relations between labor and industry here are organized collectively between employer groups and labor unions to a greater extent than any other comparable community in the United States. The significance of such industry-wide collective bargaining in the stability of our labor relations is indicated by the report of the Secretary of Labor showing that more than 75 percent of all the strikes called in the United States in 1942 were against individual industrial business establishments, rather than against employer industry groups. These individual strikes last year involved 59 percent of all workers affected by strikes throughout the United States.

While strikes and controversies dropped during the first three-quarters of 1943, wartime services of the council increased enormously in representation of its members under War Labor Board and Manpower Commission procedures. From January 1 to September 30 the council served its members in 385 individual cases in these categories. These services involved the gathering, analysis, preparation, and submission of data, particularly to the War Labor Board, in behalf

of members, both in wage disputes with labor organizations and in voluntary agreements for which War Labor Board approval was necessary.

In addition to these special wartime services, the council handled a total of 116 labor controversies during the first 9 months of the year, including the negotiation of 70 collective labor agreements covering wages, hours, and working conditions of 17,505 employees in 701 San Francisco industries and business establishments.

The third quarter of the year was marked by the appointment of President Roth of our council as an industry member of the National War Labor Board to succeed Roger D. Lapham. Mr. Roth's appointment may be considered by all of our members as national recognition by large employers throughout the United States and by the national administration of the work of the council in the field of labor relations and a compliment to San Francisco.

Depletion of Our Oil Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said, much has been written about the grave peril facing the United States from depletion of our oil reserves. Let us face the facts. Our supplies are running low. As Congressmen we will be remiss in our duty unless we constantly give the people the true picture. They want to know exact conditions. No use minimizing the seriousness of the situation. To increase production, the price of crude oil should be raised at least 35 cents per barrel. California is one of the major oil producing States, and I include an article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner, Friday, October 22, 1943:

HOUSE TOLD UNITED STATES FACES OIL FAMINE BY 1945—PRICE RISE DECLARED NEEDED TO BOOST WILDCATTING FOR NEW RESERVES

(By David Camelon)

WASHINGTON, October 21.—Unless American oil reserves are immediately-enlarged the Nation is taking a life and death gamble with its chance of victory in the war, and with its future, Ralph K. Davies, deputy petroleum administrator for war, told the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee today.

Davies informed the committee that in 1944 the Nation will face an actual shortage of oil—below essential military and civilian minimum requirements—of one-third of a million barrels a day: A total shortage of at least 121,000,000 barrels for the entire year. He said:

"It is obvious that the deficit must be supplied from sources outside the United States."

Oil production in the Caribbean area, he said, may be increased from the present daily output of 688,000 barrels to a maximum of 1,000,000 barrels. But that will be the peak of production, while American production will continue to decline. He said:

"But even the Caribbean oil is not sufficient to enable us to supply an unlimited demand, or to guarantee our future beyond next year."

NOT ENOUGH OIL IN UNITED STATES

And in any event, Davies pointed out, it is an extremely uncomfortable position for the United States to have to depend upon foreign oil. He said:

"It is because we cannot afford to take chances with our ability fully to meet essential civilian and military demands that we are attempting in every way possible to augment our domestic crude oil supply.

"This is essential in order to provide a cushion against the failure of any part of the foreign program during 1944, because of the occurrence of events over which we have no control, and to provide sufficient new productive capacity for 1945 and subsequent years.

"This is something that has given us many sleepless nights in P. A. W.

"I believe that our only conclusion can be that we stand today at the point where we do not have enough oil in the United States to go around."

The answer to the American problem, he said, is an increase in the price of crude oil. The P. A. W. twice has recommended such an increase to the Office of Price Administration, and twice has been turned down. It is now on appeal to Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson. Davies went on:

"If he should reject it, we could carry the matter to Mr. Byrnes, and from him, I suppose, technically we could go to the President, though I doubt if the P. A. W. would care to go that far."

A price increase today, he said, would be reflected in increased production a year from now when it will be badly needed. He continued:

"Unless exploratory efforts yield greater returns and new fields are opened, the productive capacity of the Nation will continue to decline slowly but surely.

"An increase in price today is critically important."

Davies declared that, unless the prices of crude oil are increased now, the country will see shortages of gasoline and heating oil which will send the prices for those commodities soaring in the near future. On the other hand, he said, an increase in crude prices now would have only a minor effect on gasoline prices, and would result in the discovery of ample stocks.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have on a previous occasion called attention to H. R. 3477, introduced by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and which is a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and for other purposes, the other purposes chiefly being to permit higher prices on certain foods and thus to encourage an increase in living costs.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak plainly on this subject.

This bill, passed out of the Banking and Currency Committee, unless it is drastically amended by this House, will certainly defeat the President's effort to hold the line against inflation, in spite of the fact that Congress has specifically directed him to do just that.

If the proponents of this measure were determined to put a stop to subsidies, why did they permit the last proviso in section 3 of H. R. 3477, beginning on line 23, page 5, and ending on line 1, page 6, to remain in the bill?

This proviso specifically exempts competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed, which in plain language means that subsidies, and substantial subsidies at that, are to be continued to be paid to growers and processors of soybeans, peanuts, and cotton seed.

Is the House honestly opposed to subsidies? If so, how can this House vote for this bill, H. R. 3477, which, while ostensibly banning subsidies, brazenly retains subsidies on three specific products?

If the full Republican membership of the committee which supported this bill will explain this ridiculously illogical stand it will be most enlightening.

The thing that makes me wonder most is, that the Republican Party which supported subsidies for the railroads—direct treasury subsidies—which later subsidized the Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust, and all the other trusts that we know about, should suddenly become allergic to the subsidizing of food for the consumer.

Specifically, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been preventing rises in the price of milk, butter, and other essential foods, through the use of subsidies. Thus the cost of living has been kept down. These subsidies benefit the common people. They do not benefit the great trusts, the friends, protectors, and fosterers of the Republican Party. This is a people's subsidy, therefore it is anathema to the Republican Party and unfortunately to a few Democrats who in trying to benefit certain interests in their own districts fail to realize the adverse effects on all the people.

The worst feature of the situation is that a little group of farm lobbyists, representing the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the so-called cooperative farmers, have practically bludgeoned the committee into accepting a formula that spells inflation and ruination.

I do hope that Congress will not permit this iniquitous measure to pass.

Why Agriculture Honors Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Mr. M. L. Wilson, Director

of the Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture, before the Mu Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi, Washington, D. C., on the subject Why Agriculture Honors Jefferson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agriculture honors Jefferson as the scientific leader among our farmer Presidents, who called those who labor in the earth "the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people, in whose breasts he has made the peculiar deposits for substantial and genuine virtue—its focus in which he keeps alive that sacred fire which otherwise might escape from the earth." Agriculture and Jefferson are inseparably conjoined. Jefferson, more than any other American, laid the foundation of scientific agriculture in the United States As an international figure in the field, he was honored by the English Board of Agriculture, the Royal Agricultural Society of France, the Agronomic Society of Bavaria. His certificate from the Agricultural Society of Florence, Italy, hangs on the wall at Monticello. He was a member of the Agricultural Society of South Carolina. He was a correspondent of the Philadelphia Agricultural Society. A record of his contributions on agriculture may be found in the publications of our oldest scientific society, the American Philosophical Society. Farm magazines, both here and abroad, published his thoughts and suggestions. Last, but not least, he was the founding spirit of his own county's agricultural society, that of Albemarle, Va.

LIFELONG INTEREST IN FARMING

Jefferson was born in a farm house and grew up on the farm where, throughout his life, his hopes and thoughts were centered. During all his years of public service it was to Monticello that his mind returned. "Monticello," he wrote while minister to the French court, "where all my wishes end." A visitor to Monticello in the 1790's found him in the fields directing the harvest. His garden book and farm book are records of the change in seasons—the first song of the birds, the plants he raised at his hilltop home, and the crops which grew in the broad acres at the base of Monticello. As his Presidency drew to a close, he stated that soon he would be "safe in port." Then, said he, "I shall look at my friends still buffeting the storm, and wish you all safe in port also. No occupation," wrote Jefferson several years after his retirement, "is so delightful as the culture of the earth, and no culture comparable to that of the garden."

Some 30 years of almost uninterrupted public service stretched between Jefferson's election as Delegate to the Continental Congress to his retirement from the Presidency in 1809. Yet, forced by the circumstances of his public career to be away from home much of the time, he appears a better practical farm manager than his brother, Randolph Jefferson, who was a dirt farmer down on the James. Randolph frequently borrowed equipment, seeds, and other things from Thomas. He seems to have been rather wasteful of seed, and one day Thomas sent him Gardiner & Hepburn's The American Gardener with the suggestion that it be followed closely. The list of subscribers for this book, published here in Washington in 1804, is given on one of the pages. It is headed by Thomas Jefferson; second on the list is the name of Aaron Burr, then Vice President of the United States. The names of other subscribers then follow. Included among these are members of the Federal judiciary and representatives from both Houses of Congress.

SCIENTIFIC AGRICULTURE AND EDUCATION

The contributions of our Chief Executives are integral parts of our rural heritage. We cannot forget that our early Presidents, Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and others who followed, all had farms. In honoring the Father of our Country, we remember that he was a good farmer and a practical farm manager. The pictures of Washington and Jefferson hang side by side in our agricultural schools and the meeting places of farmers today. Both men were products of our fertile soil. Both were experimenters in its culture. Jefferson had a fundamental training of such type as to enable him to grasp the basic scientific concepts and techniques upon which the agricultural revolution is based. He was, moreover, so able with his pen that he could clearly communicate his experiments and observations widely.

Jefferson's contributions lie in a combination of the qualitative with the quantitative aspects of science. His powers of accurate observation are apparent throughout his agricultural writings, which deal in part with agricultural theory, in part with agricultural practices. They range from formal presentations such as his essay on plow construction, through informal observations such as the notes on European methods, and include his personal records of activities at Monticello. Many details in his Farm Book and his Garden Book, kept from young manhood until within 2 years of his death, reveal his scientific bent. In his twenty-fifth year, for example, he sowed, in February, two varieties of peas. Exactly 2 months later, "the forwardest variety came to table." But that is not all; 500 of these peas, it is noted, weighed 3 ounces; 2,500 of them filled a pint measure.

In the larger concepts with which he dealt we can see his contributions clearly. Jefferson visioned with clarity the importance of applied science to cultivation. As the father of scientific agriculture in the United States, he termed the field a science of the very first order, counting among its handmaids chemistry, natural philosophy, mechanics, and like fields of human endeavor. As the constant advocate of agricultural education, Jefferson stressed its scientific aspects. During his first term as President he wrote David Williams, the planter and publisher of South Carolina, his belief that every college and university should have a professorship of agriculture. Young men, he stated, would then have the opportunity of closing their academic careers with agriculture as the crown of all other sciences.[1]

JEFFERSON'S MANY CONTRIBUTIONS

Jefferson's many contributions to agricultural development in the United States include plant introduction, the improvement of agricultural implements, and emphasis on the opportunities, the worth and the dignity of the agricultural way of life. "The greatest service which can be rendered any country," Jefferson believed, "is to add a useful plant to its culture." His records show the great number of plants from abroad which were grown at Monticello. He had a very practical interest in plant introduction and improvement. Constant planting of tobacco and other staples during his absences had helped to exhaust the soil of Monticello. Jefferson was particularly interested in soil-restoring crops such as legumes. He shared an interest in the development of feed crops for livestock with George Washington. In 1817 he wrote that with regard to the field culture of vegetables for cattle he had found the Jerusalem artichoke best for winter and the chicory for summer use. The seed of the latter had been brought from France to England by the great English agriculturalist, Arthur Young. Young sent some of it to Washington, who in turn passed on a portion to Jefferson. Jefferson found it "as productive as the Lucerne, without its laboricus culture, and, indeed, without any culture except the keeping it clean the first year."

The importance of soil conservation and the development of agricultural machinery were stressed by Jefferson. Soil erosion was a menace to Jefferson and his neighbors. When the heavy red Davidson soil of the area slipped away, the Rivanna ran red with the life blood of the farming community. Jefferson combatted this evil by contour plowing. In following this practice, a hillside plow, designed by his son-in-law, Thomas Mann Randolph, was used. In a letter to the American Farmer published in 1820, Jefferson states that contour plowing had spread far to the south and west of Monticello. Of the many improvements in agricultural machinery which engaged Jefferson's attention, that of the plow is foremost in importance. Jefferson wrote in 1798, "If the plow be in truth the most useful of the instruments known to man, its perfection cannot be an idle speculation." After a decade of thought and experimentation with plows, Jefferson, at this time, presented a full paper on the theory of plow construction. He was to continue his work in this field of agricultural engineering for more than 20 years. His observations on the plow were printed many times both here and abroad. His essay on plow construction is referred to, today, as a classic of agricultural engineering.

Throughout Jefferson's whole social philosophy runs the theme of recognition of "the dignity of the agricultural way of life and a deep appreciation of the satisfactions which accrue, through science, education, and faith, to the farm family and the rural community." As an advocate of local agricultural societies, he believed the filling out of report forms by members to be very important. Good practices were to be reported for imitation; bad practices for avoidance. "The choicest processes, called from every farm," he believed, "would compose a course probably near perfection." He was a believer in county libraries which he thought should consist of "a few well-chosen books to be lent to the people of the county under such conditions as would insure their safe return in due time. These would be such as would give them a general view of other history and particular view of that of their own country, a tolerable knowledge of geography, the elements of natural philosophy, of agriculture, and mechanics." His advanced concept of scientific agricultural education was realized for the country as a whole when the Land-Grant College Act of 1862 made it possible for each State to establish agricultural colleges whose faculties have done so much toward perpetuation of the ideals of our Nation.

JEFFERSON TODAY

The plants which Jefferson once raised are green today. Their seeds this coming year and all the years thereafter will bring forth abundant harvests. His ideas, and the ideas stimulated by his methods, are in use through all our country. Generation after generation of college students, trained not only in the techniques of agriculture, but, in line with Jefferson's spirit, in courses of broad

[1] On Jefferson, scientific agriculture and agricultural education, see Thomas Jefferson—Farmer, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, vol. LXXXVII, No. 3 (July 14, 1943), p. 216; Jefferson's Interest in Farming and Scientific Agriculture, Virginia Extension Division News, vol. XXV (July 1943), p. 1; Thomas Jefferson and Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Engineering, vol. XXIV (September 1943), p. 299.

import, have moved back to the farm from our land-grant colleges and universities. The good of man can never die. Young men today, inspired by the example of those who cultivate our land of old, look forward to new fields. In this they pioneer with Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson stands immortal in history as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, for his services as a citizen of Virginia, as President of the United States, and for his abiding passion for human liberty and the sacred rights of the common man. We recall that in his first administration as President of the United States the national domain was enlarged by the acquisition of a great farming area, the Louisiana Purchase. We are conscious that "throughout his entire career he remained preeminently and above all a farmer, devoted to the cultivation of his farms and the improvement of agriculture."

A resolution which is now before Congress provides for a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee, whose duties include encouragement to appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture at farmers' meetings, at the meetings of the scientific agricultural organizations, in the rural schools, the agricultural high schools, the land-grant colleges, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Today the manhood of our Nation, on the land and beyond the seas, is engaged in struggle for those ideals which Jefferson held fast. In honoring him as our leader in the field of scientific agriculture we reaffirm that day, when, as long prophesied, "old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions."

General Casimir Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 27 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Casimir Pulaski Day."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI DAY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Columbia! He died for thee
Cheerfully, and for liberty!
Honored forever more
On this Atlantic shore,
Palms for Pulaski! Palms!"

Today is General Casimir Pulaski Memorial Day.

We salute the soldier and patriot, the friend of Washington and companion of Lafayette.

A dauntless defender of liberty, he was a martyr to the cause of American freedom.

He was a crusader for the dignity of man; a son of liberty whose zeal for American freedom will forever abide in the hearts of our countrymen.

He was, in essence, a character of commanding force and genius.

The loftiness of his ideals, the manliness of his heroic deeds are firmly anchored in the bedrock of humanity.

Not self, but service to our country was his life's creed.

He gave his life at the age of 31 at the siege of Savannah.

He died as he had lived * * * a hero, but an archenemy to tyranny.

Much can be said about the Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War, but it is singularly expressed in the four lines composed by the American poet, John A. Joyce:

"Polish heroes in their might
Fought in freedom's holy light,
Brilliant as the stars at night
To maintain the pure and right."

In tendering our tribute to General Pulaski, let us bring into focus the stirring saga of Polish contribution to our country.

They sprang from a stock which gave us Copernicus, Mme. Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Kosciusko, and other illustrious men and women whose names are crowned with the halo of immortality.

As we turn back the clock of time in our Nation's history we find that there were 400 Polish settlers in the colony established under the leadership of Capt. John Smith.

Even before the arrival of the *Mayflower* the Poles had raised the question of political liberty and equality, and were successful in the first encounter for this cause on American soil.

It was a Pole who founded the first high school in the United States.

It was a Pole who was the first engineer to map the coast of New England.

It was Radziminsky who helped establish the border line between the United States and Mexico.

And it was Krzyanowski, appointed as the first American Governor of Alaska.

In the Civil War 4,000 Poles served gallantly under the banner of Abraham Lincoln.

In World War No. 1 the first American soldier to die was Sgt. John J. Czajka; the first German soldiers to surrender to the Americans yielded their arms to the men of Polish origin.

Recently our Nation dedicated a 5-cent postage stamp commemorating Poland's resistance to the Axis. There is a classic symbolism to the phoenix represented on the stamp.

The ancients believed that this bird, after living for centuries, would be consumed in its own ashes. At the right side of the stamp there is a kneeling woman, with outstretched arms from which the shackles have fallen. It is between these figures representing immortality and freedom that the emblem of Poland waves.

They have contributed to the advancement of American commerce, industry, art, science, and education.

They have truly enriched the culture of our land.

Today the intrepid descendants of Pulaski are battling with unabated fury for the liberation of oppressed mankind.

They are indeed fighting for a sublime destiny.

The Polish people were the first to suffer the depredations of Hitler. The whole world opened its heart in unrestrained admiration to the heroism of Poland which chose to die rather than to live as chattels. For the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the nation constitutes the fundamental charter of Poland.

Their national heritage dates back to the tenth century. They had their own Magna Carta, the Compact of Kassa, proclaimed to the world on September 17, 1374.

Their first great constitution is ranked with our own Declaration of Independence.

Today the Poles echo the words of their historic charter:

"More than life and personal happiness, we value external independence and internal freedom."

Poland is old in tragedy and sorrow, but young with hope and life.

It is the land of the rainbow—the rainbow of hope after the storm, of living color and romance.

They are a happy people.

They carry a song in their hearts.

The world will listen again to the lilt and swing of the polka, to the music in the laughter and happy clamor of their youth.

Liberty is on the march! The sinister doctrines which the gangster governments seek to impose upon the world will soon be obliterated.

Their evil works will be buried in the dust.

And those who have endured the inhumanities of this dark hour will emerge triumphant to sustain the eternal light of justice.

Poland will be resurrected from the ashes of her tragedy—restored among the jewelled nations of the earth.

"While we live she is existing,
Poland is not fallen;
We'll win with swords resisting
What the foe has stolen.
Poland! Shall the foe enslave thee
Sadly and forever;
And we hesitate to save thee?
Never, Poland never."

Some Forget—Labor Remembers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, at the sixth annual convention of the Michigan State C. I. O., many matters of major significance to the Nation were considered and deliberated. But to the delegates and officers assembled there was presented a petition, and it was duly signed. Mr. Eugene J. McCann, executive secretary of the Michigan State Council of Brewery Workers, C. I. O., was designated to bring this petition to Washington. He deposited it in my office for proper presentation to the Congress of the United States. Accordingly, I am submitting this petition that the country may know the attitude of the leaders and delegates of this labor organization as to H. R. 2082, which would impose prohibition upon the Nation.

Some there are who have forgotten the fact that the saloon of prohibition days was moved into the kitchen of the home. Some there are who have forgotten the speakeasies and the racketeers; the debauching of youth and the immorality, all the result of underworld power with which authority eventually confessed it was unable to cope.

Some there are who have forgotten the injustice to the farmer, the birth of the bar in the home, the wrecking of industry, much of which was to please the hypocrisy of some who voted dry but drank wet.

It is well on an occasion of this kind to admire the frankness and the honesty of those who subscribed their names to this petition, and who in their wisdom warn that the errors of other days should not now be repeated. The signatures on this petition number about 750, but in a

large suitcase in my office are additional petitions, signed by about 60,000 other citizens of the State of Michigan. These likewise bear evidence to the alertness of the people to a proposal that augurs no good, it was once tried under the slogan of "the noble experiment." I shall present these petitions at a later date.

Perhaps it would be well for me to conclude with the words of a little song, whose popularity assisted to repeal one of the most unpopular and disrespected laws that was ever placed on the statute books of the land:

Prohibition, Volstead's edition,
We've had enough of you,
Prohibition, with our ambition,
Your expedition is through.
Power of evil, mocking liberty,
Foe to the farmer, scourge of industry.
Home-breaker, racketeer maker,
We've had enough of you.

Yes, I Am Proud on This Birthday of My Son David

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the little western Missouri town of Ridgeway, Harrison County, Mo., on October 27, 1913, as I hurried to my classroom, Charley Stoner, president of the school board, greeted me with a firm handshake and said, "I've heard the good news. You must be a proud and happy father today."

Said I, "Well, Mr. Stoner, it is a fine baby boy, and we are very happy to have him, and I think you may say I am a happy father. If, in the years to come, the boy grows up to be what we hope for him, I will then be a proud father."

That was a pedantic remark, for through the years, as I remember, each recurring birthday has brought an increasing pride in that boy as he grew to manhood, up to this day the thirtieth anniversary of his birth.

By a strange coincidence, Mr. Speaker, on David's thirtieth birthday, which is today, I received from the War Department for him the Purple Heart, awarded "Lt. David N. Murdock for military merit and for wounds received in action resulting in his death on August 11, 1943."

Yes, today is the cap sheaf of all the pride I have ever known for the boy David, but mingled with that pride are two conflicting emotions. I pleasantly remember his athletic championships, his musical accomplishments, his scholastic recognition, and the human touch which won him only friends. I suffer through his 2 years of war as I recall his coming up "the hard way" from the rank of private, almost to a captaincy, all on his own merit and worth, without asking or permitting any effort at any kind of pull in his favor. Mr. Speaker, I never knew what the expression "coming up the hard way" in a military sense meant until it was exemplified by my own son.

As I look at the Purple Heart today I suffer again through his African campaign and the Sicily campaign, with all the beach landings under fire, and the desert and mountain warfare which taxed even David's magnificent physique. My pride is again uppermost as I recall his leadership, whether as corporal, lieutenant, or company commander.

From one of his sergeants, now in Walter Reed Hospital with shrapnel still in him, I got the story. Said the sergeant, "Lieutenant Murdock was tops as a commander. He was always looking out for his men, and when me and my buddies went into battle facing death we could always do it with more courage when Lieutenant Murdock led us on."

Our David met his death by a spray of machine-gun bullets, and missed the captaincy he had earned "the hard way." Yes, the Purple Heart on this birthday brings to me pride, memory, suffering—but his friends furnish comfort:

"Your son and thousands like him have formed a barrier with their bodies in order that we here may live in peace and security."

"David died while serving to preserve our free institutions. What greater sacrifice could he make?"

"David's was a hero's death. There can be no greater honor than to die for one's country and the things it stands for, as we believe in our country's aims, for the principles of freedom and justice and liberty and equality for all mankind."

"David gave his life a glorious sacrifice that human liberty might endure. It is an unutterable tragedy that such sacrifice must be, but a transcendent triumph that men there are who are willing to make it."

Lake County, S. Dak., Leads Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it affords me genuine pleasure to report to the House and the Nation that my home town and my home county out in South Dakota led the entire State in the percentage by which they overtopped the quota assigned them in the Third War Loan drive. This is especially noteworthy due to the fact that South Dakota was one of the States which emphatically oversubscribed its bond quota and was, in fact, one of only three States in the Union to oversubscribe its quota of E bonds. Lake County, S. Dak., paced by my home town of Madison, purchased 191 percent of its quota of bonds in the bond drive recently concluded.

It is impossible to single out any limited number of public-spirited citizens and give them credit for an outstanding success such as I have herein recorded. However, much praise is due Albert M. Parker, of Madison, who served as the Lake County chairman for the bond drive, to Ernest Fredrickson, who was chairman of the bond drive in the city of Madison, and to J. F. Stahl, publisher of the Madison Daily Leader, which contributed so effectively to the success of the bond drive by its editorial support and the public interest which was created by its handling of news stories on the bond drive. The business and professional people of Madison also aided greatly by supporting a sustained advertising campaign throughout the period of the bond drive.

Practically all of the counties in South Dakota oversubscribed their quota of bonds. For the permanent RECORD, I am inserting, herewith, a list of the 10 highest ranking South Dakota counties in this great patriotic endeavor; it will be noted that 3 counties are tied for tenth place.

Final ranking by counties:

Rank	County	Purchases	Percent of quota
1	Lake	$1,000,784	191
2	Todd	58,067	181
3	Shannon	52,493	163
4	McCook	405,466	140
4	Ziebach	85,585	140
6	Hamlin	489,688	137
7	Deuel	466,619	136
7	Minnehaha	8,305,897	136
9	Roberts	660,348	133
10	Stanley	115,215	132
10	Hughes	735,054	132
10	Charles Mix	666,621	132

Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the renegotiation of war contracts in industry penalizes efficiency in management and tends to discourage increased production. If the principle of renegotiation were applied to the farmer, it would mean that Uncle Sam would pay the poor farmer who raised 30 bushels of corn per acre on his poorly cultivated soil $1 per bushel for his corn, allowing him an income of $30 per acre. Uncle Sam would then pay the good farmer who raised 60 bushels of corn per acre on his well cultivated soil just 50 cents per bushel for his corn, allowing him also an income of $30 per acre. Would this renegotiation scheme if applied to the farmer bring about increased food production? When applied to industry do you think it tends to bring about increased production of tanks, planes, guns, and so forth, at lowered per unit cost, the great objective of efficient industrial management?

Mr. Speaker, because this subject of renegotiation is a very live subject, and

because it has more than one angle to it, I submit the following correspondence and article on the subject of renegotiation for the serious consideration of my colleagues:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, October 8, 1943.

THE LINCOLN ELECTRIC CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Subject: Renegotiation under section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended.

DEAR SIRS: The Price Adjustment Board has advised me that it has been unable to reach a voluntary agreement with you with respect to the excessive profits realized by you under section 403 for your fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. The Board has recommended the issuance by me of a unilateral determination with respect to the $3,250,000, plus such amount of the costs for such fiscal period recorded on your books which are eventually disallowed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, of excessive profits found by the Board to have been earned by you for such fiscal period.

Before doing so, however, I wish to grant you a full opportunity to submit any additional information and to present any contentions deemed material by you in determining the excessiveness of said profits and the renegotiability of the contracts and subcontracts giving rise thereto.

If you wish to be heard with respect to the determination of excessive profits for your fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, please advise me not later than October 21, 1943. Otherwise action will be taken to eliminate such excessive profits for your fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, by directing the withholding of payments otherwise due to you by the Government and by prime contractors with the Government.

Very truly yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

OCTOBER 18, 1943.

Mr. JAMES FORRESTAL,
The Under Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Renegotiation under section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of October 8, we have refused and must continue to refuse to accept this decision of the Price Adjustment Board covering renegotiation.

The reason for this refusal is the fact that renegotiation as it is now being administered, penalizes efficiency and rewards inefficiency in the manufacture of war products. It has already tremendously interfered with war production, and its iniquitous effect in this regard is rapidly increasing.

The only hope that we have for a quick ending of the war is the ability of American industry to outproduce and outinvent the Axis producers. If this is not done, the human losses to win this war will be appalling. It is because of the deadening effect of renegotiation on war production that every patriotic American must resist it.

The supporting evidence covering the above statements follows. Our workers, because of the fact that they own the company and share in its profits, are producing at a rate of more than four times that of any of our competitors. Hence our cost plus our profit, and hence our selling price, is less than the cost alone of any competitive manufacturer. However, renegotiation recognizes profit only, not savings to the Government by efficiency. Hence the miraculous production of our men is penalized while competition's lack of efficiency with its higher sales prices is not.

That is not all. Since competition makes no profit on its welding products but has other lines with large profit, the margin on these no-profit items is written up by renegotiation to the profit allowed on the entire output on that company. In this way their lack of efficiency is rewarded by an increase in their profit in these lines by an average of more than 15 percent, while our efficiency which recovers a profit from a cost which represents loss to them is penalized. If we should allow our men to be penalized for their efficiency, then their production rate probably would drop to that of industry generally. That cannot be countenanced in wartime.

The iniquity of this law, in our case, is only partially stated in the above. Because of our high efficiency, the selling price of our product has been reduced to approximately one-third of that at which comparable items are sold to Government by other companies. Because of this reduction in selling price which we have produced, there has been a saving to the United States Government in its war effort on our type of product alone of more than $200,000,000. This efficiency is fined $3,250,000.

If our efficiency were general in war industry, there would be a comparable saving in the production of all war material. This would mean that no new taxes would be necessary; that, instead of $100,000,000,000 being appropriated for this year's war production, less than half of that would be necessary, and we would enter the post-war era with a much smaller debt and with much greater chance to continued employment.

There are two other points which, since our meeting with them, have been charged by the Price Adjustment Board. The first is the statement made that any manufacturer should make no objection no matter what is done to him by government because the soldiers are giving their lives for their country.

I wish to merely say that the top command of the American industry have already been killed by the unholy pressure of war in a much larger proportion than the men in uniform. The fact that the interference and ineptitude of the bureaucrats in Washington has contributed to a very large extent to these casualties does not make the American people generally any more content with the result.

The second statement which I call into question was the statement that only 5 percent of the stock in this organization is owned by the workers.

I do not see that this statement has any bearing on the subject but since it is diametrically opposed to the facts, I want to get the record straight. Eighty-four percent of the stock of this company is owned by the people who work in it; the other 16 percent is held by the people who originally worked in it but who have been superannuated.

Liberty under law rather than duress under man is the reason for our country's participation in this war. We shall not win that liberty abroad and lose it at home.

Very truly yours,

J. F. LINCOLN.

"OR ELSE"

(Prepared by the Lincoln Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio)

In the process of renegotiation of war contracts there is shown a further application of the doctrine of bureaucratic terrorism which during the past 10 years has reared its ugly head in this country. That doctrine is that private citizens, business, and labor as well, can and will be coerced into any sort of conduct and molded into any pattern which the administrators may desire.

This new bureaucratic power, exercised most largely by a horde of appointed officials, simply says, "You must do as we say—or else."

Regardless of time-honored laws, this "or else" doctrine is now cloaked with the sanctity of war, and the victim is made to feel reprehensible in the eyes of people whose sympathies naturally are easily aroused for support of such conduct.

Nevertheless, it is government by terrorism. It is not practiced nor permitted in England. Nor has it any real precedent in this country.

This country separated from England to escape the terrorism of her control.

England had imposed taxes upon the people of this country without their participation or representation. She had quartered her troops upon the people of the Colonies; sent foreign governors to direct their government and foreign judges to administer the law.

Our forefathers were familiar also with the cruelties and the arbitrary conduct of other countries, such as Prussia, Austria and of France. The terrorism of governmental control, whether exercised by kings, emperors, prime ministers, or governors of a country which had produced for itself a Magna Carta and a Bill of Rights, were all of one piece when they produced terrorism, and hence our people decided to have none of it.

Our people decided to separate from England to escape terrorism and to live a free life under a country of laws and not of men.

Terrorism is not limited to jails, hangings or to the guillotine, as it was most frequently practiced in those days. Those are but some of its manisfestations, a physical, brutal part but only a part. Other kinds of terrorism can be just as destructive to man's freedom of mind and spirit as hanging is destructive of his physical existence.

Terrorism is used for the purpose of coercion and it can make no difference whether it be brutal in its form, or whether it creates suspicion, hatred, unjust anxiety, or any other material or financial condition which but for such coercion, would not exist. So long as it compels one to do the bidding of the terrorist, it is unlawful coercion. It is un-American.

The pointing of the finger of ridicule, contempt, hatred, or unjust accusation, to race, creed, position—high or low—or to riches or to poverty is but another example of terrorism. Its object is to compel action in favor of the fingerpointer and to prevent freedom of action to the one pointed at. The agitator begins with charges of contemptuous conduct, and then moves on to unjust accusation; then to the stirring of the passions of hatred, and soon fans that hatred into a flame that devours its object.

Government terrorism produces its effect upon the guilty criminal, the innocent accused, as well as upon those whose offense is merely to disagree with the Government terrorist.

The uncontrolled bureaucrat thus becomes, in sequence, the agitator, the demagog, and finally the Nero, the Hitler, and the Tojo. And the world once again trembles, and freedom must once more struggle upward, Phoenixlike, from the funeral pyre of the victims of man's unbridled power.

Nor is terrorism confined to the direct objective of destroying liberty. It often is used by those who proclaim their loyalty to it but whose every act shows a Machiavellian purpose or profound ignorance of the effect of such conduct. And so we have men in a democracy misusing its sacred machinery which was dedicated to the preservation of liberty of the spirit and to freedom under law impartially administered, for the purpose of compelling and coercing others to do their bidding.

We may readily agree that the criminal is entitled to bear the terrors of government. We may believe that the innocent accused will have his innocence established, but the application of the terrorist method to those who merely disagree or who would repair to the portals of justice for their defense from its power, shows a depth of baseness which is not reconcilable with a democracy.

The present reign of bureaucracy has used terroristic methods to stifle opposition to its acts.

1. It sought to control in peacetimes by the N. R. A. the everyday life of the people, setting business against business, employee against employer, and heaping opprobrium upon those who refused their consent to its demands.

2 It coerced Congress to adopt the "must" measures proposed by the Executive.

3 It sought to coerce favorable action of Senators and Representatives by means of a political purge.

4 It indicted companies under the Sherman Antitrust Act in places hundreds of miles distant from the scene of their alleged offense.

5. It deprives companies of the right to have a copy of the proceedings before the appointive officers of the S. E. C. and by the coercive power of public funds and the establishment of Government competition compels them to do its bidding.

6 And now, under the Renegotiation Act, an act placing in the hands of bureaucrats, without that definitive instruction heretofore held to be necessary for all laws, purports to give to them the power at their whim or under their ignorance or under their passion or prejudice, to take from the manufacturers whatever amount the bureaucrats determine to be excessive profits, and to deny them the right to appeal to the courts. But, further, boldly it announces to such manufacturers that they must do as the administrators say—"or else" their contracts with the Government will be canceled, all payments of moneys stopped, and newspaper publicity used to smear them before the country.

Food for Victory and Jobs for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Food for Victory and Jobs for Peace, delivered by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by Food for Freedom, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on October 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I want to talk mainly about two things. First, about food for victory during the war and, second, about victory on the home front during the peace.

When we talk about feeding other nations, four things should be made clear.

1. We in the United States cannot do the job by ourselves—in fact, we are not now and will not after the war ends, be a major source of food exports to overseas countries.

2. We do not propose to feed a single person anywhere in the world who is not willing to produce to the extent of his ability. We have no more use for a "gimme" nation than Capt. John Smith, of Virginia, had for a soft-handed, lazy cavalier. But it is also part of the American tradition that we will not willingly stand idly by in the midst of preventable starvation.

3. By cooperating with Canada, Latin America, Australia, and Africa to produce food to the limit the United States can make one of her finest contributions to the war effort and the world-wide triumph of democracy during the first 2 years of peace.

4. We are proud of the food contribution we have made to England, Russia and occupied Italy. We know this food has been vitally needed and effectively used and we propose to send more food in 1944. But to do so will take real planning and the cooperation of everyone in the United States. We shall not do this work effectively unless we are thoroughly sold on the good our food is now doing and must do in the future.

Take a look at Britain, the country we have helped most. She has increased her own food production by 60 percent, but even so still has to import one-third of her food. The 4,000,000,000 pounds of food we are sending to England yearly is doing far more to shorten the war than would that same food kept here in the United States. Germany cut England off from the vast quantities of poultry, dairy, and pork products she used to get from Denmark, Holland and Poland. And so it was up to Canada and the United States, the two nearest neighbors in position to export, to send everything possible. Our food has contributed to the vitality of British workmen. And they have needed vitality because they have worked long hours at top speed for a long time. I think of one group of British workmen in a vital war activity which has worked 80 hours a week for many months with never a Sunday off. They had to do it because the work was there to be done and there was no one else to do it. I would cheerfully skip a meal a week to help keep those men at work.

Then I think of the Soviet Union, where the only people who really eat decently are those engaged in actual fighting. Russians have always lived on simple food, mainly black bread, potatoes, and cabbage. Today, their civilians get far less than pre-war diets, with scarcely half the calories per day our civilians consume. We would understand what the Russians face in food shortages if the Germans had occupied our whole Mississippi Valley bread basket and were still fighting to hold St. Louis. In spite of our efforts in Italy, the fact remains that the Russians are doing three-fourths the land fighting against the Germans. This fighting has saved and will save many American lives. The more food we can put in Russian stomachs the more American blood will be saved. Thus far, Russian recapture of territories has added more to her population to be fed than to her current supplies of food. The hard year for Russia will be 1944. We must make certain she has enough food to continue her present magnificent fight so she can get her rich Ukrainian farm lands producing again.

Next after the indomitable British and magnificent Russians I think of the starving millions in Europe which we shall liberate in 1944. We shall not have much food for them but surely we can manage somehow so as to make certain that many millions of them can be tided over until they can get to producing for themselves. The little food which we can furnish will mean the difference between life and death for tens of millions. Think of them as you eat here in the United States. Think of them as you plow and plant and harvest. They have felt the print of the conqueror's heel on their starved bodies for long years. We must plan it so that the hundreds of millions now under Axis slavery will have at least as much to eat during the first year of freedom as they had during the last year of slavery. Normally, continental Europe produces 90 percent of its own food. We must see that that vital production is restored promptly, and fairly distributed. We and the other United Nations must shoulder the superhuman job of carrying them over the hard time until they can harvest their own crops without robbery.

The Allied food problems in 1944 will be far greater than in 1943 but, great as they may be, our food outlook is infinitely brighter than that of the Axis. So far the Axis has lived by robbing food from the weak. But these days are now coming to an end and the depleted Japanese and German manpower will find it will be increasingly difficult to feed the Axis peoples.

Food will be the dominant world problem in 1944. The United States cannot solve this problem by herself. All the United Nations will do their share. If we could spare the ships to move it, the United Nations could this year export 60,000,000 tons of food to our allies abroad and to liberated areas. Only 6,000,000 tons or one-tenth of all this would come from the United States, though probably more than one-third of protective foods, such as dairy products, meat, and eggs would come from us. We can help furnish leadership to encourage expanded production everywhere in this hemisphere and in Africa. Our own farmers have already increased food output 25 percent. Their production can be increased still more as soon as everyone knows how exceedingly important it is to cooperate in doing a real job. Last year the Government said it wanted more carrots and less watermelons but the way things worked out the watermelon farmers made money and the carrot farmers lost money. Surely this situation will be improved in 1944 so that the farmers who help the war effort most will profit most. Surely we shall produce more of the crops which use land and labor efficiently and less of the foods which are wasteful in their use of land and labor.

The farmers of the United States should not only expand their acreage of regular grains by fifteen to twenty million next year, but they should produce more soy beans, dried beans, peanuts, Irish potatoes, carrots, tomatoes, and sweetpotatoes. But the farmers will not increase their production of these crops as much as they should if they do not have the machinery to do the harvesting, the bins and warehouses for storing, and finally a market which will pay them a decent price. If consumers, Government, and distributors cooperate to make it practical for farmers to grow more of such crops they will all help greatly in winning the war and saving millions of lives.

One of the easiest and most certain ways of increasing farm production in the United States is through giving the small farmers a chance. These farmers are only partly employed To do a real job of farming they need capital and leadership. The Farm Security Administration has proved that when these small farmers have both capital and leadership they step up production amazingly. In 1942 the Farm Security Administration clients increased milk production ten times as much as would have been expected. In 1943 they are doing even better. The small farmers have a great reservoir of labor which is crying to be used. The Farm Security Administration knows how to provide small farmers the facilities to put their unused labor to work, and it has done a masterful job.

But no matter how fine a job we do on all fronts in the United States, the output will not begin to meet the overwhelming demand of 1945. Therefore it is supremely important to plan now to expand production in Africa, in South America, in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and to prepare all necessary steps to maintain and increase production in the liberated areas. The Government of the United States cannot do this job alone, but by participating in the United States Relief and Rehabilitation Administration we can help work out a practical plan which will unleash productive resources and build up stock piles which will assuredly be needed in either war or peace. Such stock piles will shorten the war and make the peace secure.

To fail to do a job on this front is to invite disaster.

We must remember that from 1918 to 1924 there was more misery and probably more lives lost in Europe than during the war itself. Lack of food was one of the root causes of the terrible evils of that day. In those days of hunger and revolution were planted the seeds of desperate totalitarianism which produced Mussolini and Hitler. Unless there is the most careful planning, the hunger of 1945 will plant in Europe seeds which again will ripen into a violence which will shed the blood of our children and grandchildren. Starvation in Europe tomorrow means trouble in the United States the day after tomorrow.

When complete victory comes, as we hope it will next year, the problem of reconversion will be on us at once, first in industry and a year or two later in agriculture. Within a few weeks tens of billions of dollars of war contracts will be canceled and the factories will scramble to get back to work producing autos, radios, refrigerators, and washing machines. There can be jobs for everyone provided there is the closest cooperation between labor, business, and government. But we must plan to produce 40 percent more peacetime goods than we ever did before. We will have at least 3,000,000 new workers, even after wives return to their homes and students to their schools. The average worker today turns out 25 percent more than in 1936. Unless we use this increased productivity to produce much more than we did before the war, ten or twelve million workers will be without jobs. We must put both our new workers and our new-found efficiency to work producing such a widespread standard of comfort and happiness for the people right here in the United States as we have never known before. Whatever comes we must keep busy producing to the limit and never again fall into the slough of stagnant unemployment.

The farmer is vitally interested in all this because when men are without jobs in the cities he is in danger of mortgage foreclosure, tax sale, or bankruptcy. He remembers what happened in 1921 and 1932. When industry lacks courage, when government fails to provide leadership, when 10,000,000 workers are walking the streets hungry, then hog and butter and cotton prices may be cut not merely to one-half or to one-third, but even to one-fourth what they had been. But the farmers find their interest rates, railroad rates, and taxes are just as high as before. They find that while the production of automobiles and farm machinery has been cut to less than one-third of normal, the price has been reduced scarcely at all. The farmer can never feel safe until industry, cooperating with government and labor, has proven its ability both to produce to the limit and to prevent depressions and unemployment.

Once the war comes to an end, the problem of reconverting our agriculture will face us more rapidly than most people realize. Within a couple of years after the fighting stops the farm lands of Europe, provided there is ordinary weather, will be producing crops remarkably well. The greatest problem will be to furnish the necessary machinery and fertilizer, and in some areas seed and livestock. Many of us remember how a couple of years after the end of hostilities in the last World War certain of our people were eager to advise farmers here in the United States to expand their production of certain crops just a few months in advance of the time when prices broke wide open. The older farmers remember well how the Government urged them to expand production in World War No. 1 and then forgot all about them 2 or 3 years later when they were suffering from an overproduction which they could not market except at ruinous losses.

To meet the needs in the next 2 or 3 years, it is right that the United States and the governments of all the United Nations should do everything possible to bring about maximum production of those agricultural products which are most needed. It is a question of life or death for millions. But as we urge farmers in the New World, Australia, and Africa to produce to the limit, we must also prepare for the time when millions of bushels of food might be rotting in the fields because of lack of markets. The governments of the United States, England, and all the other industrial nations must plan with labor and industry so there will be no unemployment. But even if there is full employment, there will still be a tremendous job of reconverting farming in all the countries which have been exporting large quantities of agricultural products during the war. Within 2 years after the war ends it will be wise for the farmers of the United States to put back to grass again the millions of acres of farm land which were taken out of soil-conserving crops and which ought never have been plowed except under the spur of an acute emergency. Soil properly enriched by grass and legumes and so farmed that it cannot be destroyed by wind or water erosion is the Nation's most precious material asset. We in the United States in the future intend to build a civilization, not on the principle of gutting and passing on but a civilization based on the rock of sustained yield which can endure, not for a hundred years but for thousands of years.

We are no longer a debtor nation. A few years after this war is over there will be no need for us to sell our fertility abroad for little or nothing. For the next few years we are going to ship all the food possible abroad simply because we know that is the shortest way to end the war and win the peace. But at the earliest possible moment we will stop that. We shall train the people overseas to feed themselves because we know that if they learn to provide themselves with a high standard of living by their own efforts, we in the United States are just that much safer. When we get the people overseas trained to feeding themselves again, we must again strengthen our agricultural adjustment, commodity credit, and price-support machinery so as to protect agriculture from a collapse like that of 1921 or 1930. We must again refill our ever-normal granary so as to be ready for all emergencies.

The planning which really excites most people here in the United States is that which looks toward laying a foundation for plenty of food and plenty of jobs for every State in the Union. We can eat better after this war is over if we really plan for it. Most of us didn't get enough to eat when we were young. We know that because so many of our children are 2 or 3 inches taller than we are. Many of us lack ambition and energy because we are not eating the food which gives us the right kind of vitamins. As a rule, the food which contains the most vitamins costs the farmers more to produce than the food which is poor in vitamins. Many of our people before the war had so little money that they tried to get by for the most part on potatoes and bread and just a little meat. After the war they must have good enough jobs so that they can afford to buy plenty of dairy products, fruits and vegetables, and more meat. We are finding ways of preserving and preparing food which make it more tasty than it has ever been before. Whether the chemists ever find it or not, I am sure that there is a vitamin T, the taste vitamin, and a vitamin H, the happiness vitamin.

There are new inventions which can be put into the homes of the United States after this war which will increase our stock of T and H vitamins enormously. Within a few years after the war ends, I hope practically every family in the United States can have the advantage of a quick-freeze machine in the home. By producing and selling such gadgets in volume at a low price to the common man we shall help prevent unemployment, furnish a market for the farmer, and make it easier to pay the interest on the national debt.

In all planning I hope we keep in mind not merely the factory worker, farmer, and businessman, but also the white-collar workers and employees at fixed salaries who have suffered more from the war than any other group. The cost of living has gone up but their income for family living has gone down.

The end of the war will unleash competitive forces which have long been held in check. Dammed up supplies will begin to flow. People who were greatly needed during the war will no longer be needed at their old jobs. But we can and must find new jobs for them. The question is: Are we willing to take the peace as seriously as we took war? It will take much more ingenuity to defeat Lieutenant General Unemployment than it will to overthrow Hitler. The trouble is that our people are too willing to appease Lieutenant General Unemployment. Some businessmen like to have him around in times of peace so as to scare labor, not realizing that he is an even greater enemy of capital than he is of labor.

My conclusion is that the biggest immediate job for the United Nations is to go all out on the production of those foods which use land and labor most efficiently.

Second, many American citizens not able to be in uniform may want to make a direct personal sacrifice to help win the war. They can do so by living more simply, eating less meat, dairy, and poultry products and freeing more of these scarce foods to maintain morale among the populations nearer the fighting fronts. Most of us could still keep perfectly healthy by shifting our diets temporarily toward using more vegetable proteins in place of so much animal food. It might even be worth while for the churches to enlist people by the signing of pledges to do their part in their daily eating to release food for the hastening of an early victory and a lasting peace. The time will soon be here when food will be a more persuasive argument than airplanes.

Every American not directly in the war effort wants to feel he or she is making a personal sacrifice of some kind. It may be hard to change old food habits voluntarily, but if you do it in a way which helps win the war and build the peace without harming your health, why not go beyond the compulsion of Government rationing and have the satisfaction of making your own contribution in your own way. Growing children, nursing mothers, and those who are underweight or subject to tuberculosis, as well as those who are engaged in exceedingly heavy physical labor, should not try much voluntary change in their diet even if they think such change is helping win the war. But most of the rest of us can make changes which will not harm our health but which will save hundreds of thousands of lives.

Third, there must begin definite planning for reconversion, not alone of industry, but also of agriculture. Most of the planning for reconversion should be done by labor, industry, and agriculture, but it cannot be successful unless there is positive leadership by Government. Business by itself was totally incapable of making the necessary complete conversion from a peace to a war footing. It will be equally incapable of making that type of reconversion which furnishes complete employment. No one business or combination of businesses is in position to take the necessary action to ensure complete employment. And so it is also with farmers. No group of farmers can carry out the necessary shifts in acreage that will be necessary

to prevent waste and losses in the post-war period. Of course, we want the maximum of free enterprise, but to get it we must have, until full employment is stabilized and agriculture is reconverted, very definite leadership by Government. It would not help free enterprise for Government to stand idle while business post-war anarchy threw 15,000,000 men out of jobs and cut farm prices to one-third what they were. We can have much more free enterprise if Government helps business and labor on the road to full employment and guides agriculture through the shoals of a changing world demand.

Let us firmly resolve that we shall each do his part to put into action an adequate victory food program followed later on by an adequate job program. Food and jobs are two of the foundation stones of the century of the common man.

Collaboration for Post-War Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the question now pending in the Senate. The address was delivered by me last night over the National Broadcasting Co. network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The battle to win the peace, to prevent world war No. 3—win or lose, for there can be no draw—has begun. Here in Washington the first salient of this world-wide campaign, on which the future well-being of our country and all others of the earth must stand or fall, is already formed. Within the next few days, on the floor of the United States Senate, but before the eyes of the world, the first command is to be given, the first decision made.

In such a venture we know what the stakes are. We know that the cost of the First World War was 20,000,000 human lives—those that could be counted—and the destruction of property worth $350,000,000,000. And we know that the cost of the Second World War will be greater still.

Today, even while the bullets, the shells, and the bombs are heaping up those vast tolls, we are brought face to face with the question, Will there be a third world war? We are confronted with the demand for our part of the answer to that question before we have reached the breathing space of a military victory in the present conflict.

Are we able to give our answer? Are we ready with our decision? There are some who say "No." They would have us keep silent. They have no confidence in Amer'ca, in our ability to hold our own at the peace table and in post-war agreements with other nations. But wars and the threat of future wars do not wait for men or nations merely because they are unprepared. War has begotten war while men remained silent. Whether we are ready or not, whether we speak out or not, the time for us to decide has come. It is an hour when silence itself says much.

Realizing this, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a resolution which reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate of the United States*, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved;

"That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace;

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

This is the answer that the Members of the Senate are asked to approve that the people of America are asked to support, that the other peoples of the world are asked to accept and trust.

Now, let us analyze this attempt to dispose of the question, Will there be a third world war? Let us take it apart and look at it carefully—as we may be very sure the peoples and governments of other nations will do; and as we may be equally sure that our own conscience, our pride as a people not given to evasions, to weasel words, will likewise force us to do. Let us take it in hand and try its weight, and let us place it on the scales of history, too, for history—great or mean, bright or tragic—is now in the making.

With the underlying principle as stated in this resolution—the principle of international cooperation to prevent future aggression—the people of America have no quarrel. On the contrary, they demand it, and it is in answer to their demand that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has acted.

But is it enough to restate the principle? I do not know of any war that was ever prevented, of any street brawl that was ever stopped, by this means. In 1931 Japan attacked Manchuria. She got away with it because the major powers in the League of Nations had been unwilling, a dozen years before, to go beyond the mere subscription to a set of noble principles. Today those principles are still noble. Their objective is the hope of the world. But they do not mean much to the millions of corpses in mass graves that newly dot the soil of two continents.

But, the sponsors of this resolution argue, it would go beyond that. It would commit us to join other countries in the "establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression."

Yes, it would commit us to do this if somehow, from somewhere, that international authority were to drop down out of the sky and sit there waiting for us to come and join it, and if that vague term "authority" had any definite meaning. But that kind of authority does not just grow. And the proposed Senate resolution does not commit us to joint leadership in setting it up. It does not commit us to work side by side with our allies of the United Nations in peace as we are fighting side by side with them in war. It does not give that vague, nameless, nonexistent authority the proper credentials to work among men of good will nor does it specify how it shall express itself when defied with force of arms by men of ill will.

When we take it apart, then, and look at it carefully, we find that this resolution actually offers our people no real hope of security, no specific, tangible means of attaining it, no straight line to follow in the search for it. And if it fails to offer to our own people this little, it offers something less to the peoples of the world.

Are they looking to this Nation for brave words, high-sounding phrases, which may or may not be the cover for equally brave purposes? It would be childish and beneath the dignity of the United States Senate to assume that words, empty words, are what our neighbors in the community of free nations will be waiting for. And it would be very foolish, indeed, to think that they might fail to see through them.

To lead the world in a fight for peace is a duty that cannot be discharged with fine words. Neither can it be dodged with them. If, among my colleagues in the Senate, there are those who feels that they have discovered an "out" in this masterwork of studied ambiguity, then I can say only that they are underestimating their own and their country's responsibility to its people. The bullets and bombs that may menace our children and grandchildren cannot be stopped with an adjective. The aggressing armies of the Hitler or the Tojo of 1960 cannot be split with an infinitive. And I might also remind these Senators that the freedom which they enjoy today was won by the exercise of courage, not verbiage. Never before in history has Uncle Sam tried to hide behind the skirts of his grammar. The studied ambiguity of the Connally resolution offers an excellent device through which the timid Senators and those of strong isolationist tinge may give lip service to international cooperation without committing themselves to anything at all.

And yet when amendments were offered to strengthen this resolution now before the Senate to make it mean something specific, to make it workable, these amendments were voted down by the membership of the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, and later by the full committee. That is why I am speaking to you now. I want this resolution, if we are to have it say anything at all, to say something real. In the fight for a lasting peace I want this beginning to be an "in" for America, not an "out."

One of the amendments of the group of 14 Senators of both parties, from all parts of the country, would change the wording to state specifically that we are to join "the other United Nations, and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted"—the United Nations, an existing entity, not just any, unnamed, free, and sovereign nations, as in the Connally resolution. By this change, instead of trusting to luck that some nation, somewhere, would start things moving for an international authority, we would be telling the world just who is to start it, and in that group would be ourselves.

The other change would substitute something definite for the abstract, indefinite "international authority with power to prevent aggression." In place of "international authority" we would write "an international organization"—something like the League of Nations—"to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Thus by these two changes we would make it clear, first, that the United Nations shall be the nucleus of a post-war community of nations dedicated to the preservation of the peace; and, second, that it will be the duty of that entity, ourselves included, to function in international affairs.

It would function in three ways, under these amendments: One, in meeting and grappling with all kinds of international problems, economic and political, in such a manner as to "promote cooperation among nations." Two, in settling international disputes peacefully—a world court, if you please. And three, peaceful methods failing, in serving to suppress the military aggressor with military force.

For the task that must be met, such a resolution, even as strengthened by these amendments, is little enough. Yet these are the changes that the Committee on Foreign Relations would bar, and which we

are fighting for on the floor of the Senate. Because the future of our own Nation along with others depends on a lasting peace, I think the American people have a right to ask why this more forthright wording has been opposed. Why, if we are not attempting to hide in generalities, are we not coming out in the open with a statement that means something?

My fellow Senators and I feel so strongly that this revision is a "must" job—to be done now, not when it is too late—that we are going to fight this matter to the end. We are also taking the fight to you—the American people—because we are convinced that the resolve to outlaw war is deeply felt by the people of this country. We do not think the American people want to dodge this issue. We do not think that in a matter directly concerning the lives and happiness of their children, the preservation of their freedom, and yes, the very existence of their democracy, they are willing to say, "Well, yes and no."

In closing I should like to quote the words of a man who fought long and hard for the outlawing of war, a man who said what he meant and meant what he said. I quote:

"When I think of words piled on words, of debate following debate, when these unspeakable things that cannot be handled until the debate is over are happening in these pitiful parts of the world, I wonder that men do not wake up to the moral responsibility of what they are doing. Great peoples are driven out upon a desert, where there is no food and can be none, and they are compelled to die, and then men, women, and children thrown into a common grave, so imperfectly covered up that here and there is a pitiful arm stretched out to heaven, and there is no pity in the world. When shall we wake to the moral responsibility of this great occasion?"

Those words were not spoken yesterday, or last week. They are the words of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, spoken on September 6, 1919.

Now is the challenge to the United States Senate which defeated the League of Nations and failed under four Presidents' recommendations to adhere without unacceptable reservations to the World Court, to let our fighting men, our people, and the world know that we will not again betray the dead and blast into despair the hope of mankind.

Cooperation, Tolerance, Industry, and Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech delivered by me on October 27, 1943, over Mutual Station WOL, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Several weeks ago the subject of our discussion over this station was The Five Imperatives. They were: (1) The imperative need of all of us appreciating the enormous task before America, before the war is won; (2) the imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort; (3) the imperative need of working out, now, complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period; (4) the imperative need of America receiving title in perpetuity to the strategic air and sea bases in the Western Hemisphere which we have occupied and improved; (5) the imperative need of all America—all of us—to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity, and to apply them ever increasingly now and in the post-war period.

I want to discuss briefly with you tonight some of the implications that flow from this fifth imperative—the imperative need of all America to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity. It might be phrased briefly this way: If we are to come through this world holocaust sound at the core we must learn to play ball together. There will be enough post-war problems to frustrate us without our adding to our problems by being blind to the fact that we are all in the same boat. And if that boat is going to clear the shoals and the rocks we will have to pull together and not in opposite directions.

As you all know, we have converted much of our peacetime industry into wartime industry. There will come a time when we will change our industry back to peacetime jobs. How long, you ask, will it take to bring about that change—the change that will take care of some 50,000,000 employables—our returning soldiers, our war workers, and others.

Well, the first thing we must realize is that accomplishing that change is some job in itself, and unless management and labor and all of us cooperate we will just delay the job. There are many industries that will be able to convert quickly. There are others that will take some time. If in the near future a certain amount of steel can be made available so that the toolmakers can begin to retool America for peacetime industry, the conversion won't take as long. The tools will then be ready when peace comes.

Right now everyone is guessing when the war will cease. No one knows. It is generally thought it will cease in Europe first, and then we will have to handle the Jap. If this conclusion is correct, there may be a longer period provided for a change-over. It will not come all at once.

When the war is over the Government will have in the neighborhood of $50,000,000,000 or more in goods and plants on its hands. These goods the Government should handle with extreme care, use the same in foreign trade, in rehabilitation of foreign countries, and distribute the balance through regular channels in this country. This is necessary in order that we will not fall into a dumping program such as occurred after the last war. Wherever it is possible plants should be turned back to private ownership so that Government will not extend its field of competition with its own citizens.

The demobilization of 8,000,000 of our men from the armed forces will also be some job. They will not all at once be turned loose to flood the labor market, but one can see the need now of making it so that industry will be prepared to absorb them as they are demobilized. There probably will be retained in the armed forces for some time after peace something like 2,000,000 men.

If the war should cease suddenly, and our vast industrial war machine were to stop suddenly, it is readily understandable there would be a severe shock to our economy. We must provide shock absorbers hoping they will not be needed. There will have to be, undoubtedly, a scheme of dismissal wages; public works will have to be started on a great scale. Therefore, I feel that the suggestion I made recently that in the next tax program there should be a provision for conditional reserves in industry, so as to provide for reconversion charges and labor's wages in the post-war period if industries go into the red—I believe that such a provision would be very beneficial.

Yes; we must play ball together in order that America will be economically prosperous. I think that as soon as it is feasible, after the war stops our tax laws should be revised to stimulate investment of risk capital.

During this war period, we have developed a great many new products; new ideas have been born, new inventions have come into being; but in order to stimulate investment and so that we shall reap the benefit from these new products, ideas, and inventions provide employment, and aid the economic health of this country, provision must be made so that once again investments can make a reasonable return.

Of course, taxes will have to stay high for a long time because we will have a debt of something like two hundred and fifty billions or more, and it will take a large national income to pay that interest charge and the cost of government. However, the way to get taxable income in peace is to make it interesting and worth while for capital to venture.

I anticipate that if we use our heads and really apply the lesson of cooperation, we can have following the war, full employment in America. Why? Capital will be available. America will need a lot of goods, and the world will need a lot of goods, and we have the plant capacity to produce those goods, and we have competent, trained employees, and we have the raw material and the American people will have, because of their investment in war bonds and their other savings, a great purchasing power.

Now, if we in America learn to play ball together we will not let these conditions produce a runaway boom. We will work together, harness our power, and use it temperately.

In my last week's talk I said that there was arising in Washington a sincere conviction that when the war is won Government would be compelled to release its stranglehold upon private enterprise, restore freedom of initiative, and that bureaucracies would be put out of business. I believe this conclusion is correct.

I think that in the post-war period Government will play an important part. If the right leadership is here it will stimulate and encourage the American citizen instead of hamstringing the enterprise thereof, and Government will be the servant—not the master.

As I look into the future, when the war is over, I see America blossoming out in many new industries. Why, our present electrical-appliance business, vast as it is, is just beginning of what will take place. We will see the automobile revolutionized. We will see the airplane in greater and greater use, both commercially and for pleasure. We will see light metals and synthetics, prefabricated houses, and a thousand other new things come into being.

I expect to see our foreign trade expanded. There are millions of underprivileged peoples throughout the globe who need the goods we can produce. Why even in America if we met the needs of our underprivileged people, it would keep our plants going constantly.

We have a problem in distribution. I feel we shall be adequate in that respect. Our foreign trade will result from two sources. First, other countries produce goods and material we do not produce, such as coffee, tea, manganese, cobalt, precious stones, tin, etc. For these we can trade our own goods that these countries will want and which they need.

Secondly, the war-torn countries will provide jobs for American workers and demand for American goods. There will be a great opportunity for rehabilitation, furnishing

machinery and material. Part of the financing of this job will have to be done by private capital. Therefore, the need of Government taking a friendly attitude toward private enterprise and stimulating the same—and making sure that capital gets a "break."

With the world getting smaller, foreign trade will probably be more significant in our economy than ever before. A little country like Britain of 45,000,000 people previous to the war, purchased many times the amount of merchandise from the United States than China did, China having a population of 450,000,000. Now, if out of this war China raises her living standard, one can readily see what effect that would have upon the economy of the world. It would not be superoptimism to feel that out of this war not only China's but other nations' living standards will be raised and our increased industrial facilities might not even be adequate. This may seem to some to be a rosy view but I believe there is plenty of justification for it.

Our great concern should be to keep our home front solid, and see to it that no division creeps in, that no element of divide and conquer comes through our bastions, no selfish ambitions and antagonisms split us, no intolerance or class hatred is permitted. I'm sure our opportunity for world leadership will not be lost. We will remember that "righteousness exalteth a nation."

I have faith that just as our sons on the 27 battle fronts of the earth are proving themselves equal to any emergency that when they come back to us we and they together will fully measure up to our responsibility and perform the job that is to be done. Americans in the past were never defeatists. They will not be now.

Utilization of Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Col. Miles Reber, of the Corps of Engineers, who is the division engineer of the Missouri River Division, stationed at Omaha, Nebr., delivered at the Mississippi Valley Association meeting in St. Louis, Mo., October 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the Mississippi Valley Association, it is certain that all of us here appreciate fully that the utilization of our rivers and streams has played a major role in the economic and social development of our great Nation. An individual, a municipality, a county, a State, and a Nation, must consider the conservation of their assets and plan for their development if they are to survive. It is clearly apparent that if we are to continue the progress that has given our Nation preeminence we must plan now and press with vigor and purpose in the post-war era the development and the fullest economic utilization of our water resources.

One of the very few major basins of this country where that development and utilization have not progressed very far beyond the planning stage is the Missouri Valley. You heard yesterday his excellency, the Governor of South Dakota, describe with great clarity the proposed plan for the development of the Missouri and show, beyond any question of doubt, the broad benefits which would accrue not only to that basin but to the heart of our Nation, the Mississippi Valley as well.

Just a month ago this week I had the great privilege of becoming division engineer of the Missouri River division. Of course the first thing that was on my mind at that time was to push vigorously to its most rapid conclusion the war work assigned to me. That, we all know, is the first task of all of us these days. As soon, however, as I had an opportunity to look at the Missouri I did so and discovered that a broad comprehensive plan, taking into full account all of the water resources of that great basin, had been prepared by my predecessor, Col. Lewis A. Pick, and had been submitted by him to the Chief of Engineers in Washington early in August of this year. I know that you are all familiar with the present status of this plan. It is now receiving the final appropriate review of the other Federal agencies responsible for various phases of water development under existing law. We all sincerely hope that that review will be completed in the near future so that the report may be transmitted to Congress for such action as our chosen lawmakers may see fit to take.

Although, as you all know, I cannot discuss in detail at the present moment the contents of that plan (and I should like nothing better than to do just that), I am sure that you would like to know how that plan was prepared. On May 13, 1943, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives requested the Corps of Engineers to review the 308 report on the Missouri River (H. Doc. 238, 73d Cong., 2d sess.) and certain other reports, with a view to determining whether any modification should be made therein at this time with respect to flood control and allied purposes. Within 3 months Colonel Pick had completed that assignment and had set up a broad framework for the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley so as to utilize these resources to the fullest practicable and economic extent for the benefit of man, in place of the uncontrolled destruction which the river has wrought through past ages. In less than 4 months from its initiation the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors completed its review and the Chief of Engineers is now awaiting the comments of the other Federal agencies.

The question may arise very naturally as to how Colonel Pick was able to finish such an enormous and important task in such a short time. The answer rests on just one fact—since 1927, in compliance with wise, specific directives from our Congress, the Engineer Department has been engaged in preparing full and complete reports on the navigable waterways of this country and their tributaries, to include navigation, flood control, power, irrigation, and other related water uses. The first of these reports on the Missouri, the so-called 308 report, was submitted to Congress in 1932, as I have just said, in House Document 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session. This report contains the complete, full background of all the factual information available at that time on the water problems of that basin. During the past 11 years since that date, the Department has also submitted to Congress numerous navigation and flood-control reports on the Missouri and its tributaries, including the development of the great Fort Peck project. The Platte, the Kansas, the Republican, the Grande, the Osage, the Big Horn, the Yellowstone, and other important tributaries have been surveyed in strict compliance with congressional directives.

In 1935 Congress, in the River and Harbor Act of that year, directed the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to take such steps as might be appropriate to keep up to date the data collected in connection with our 308 reports. That great responsibility has been accepted and carried out. Thus, when Colonel Pick started to review the Missouri River he had at his fingertips a tremendous volume of vital data collected over a long period of years. It was only necessary for him to correlate and evaluate these data and to develop them into a workable, efficient, and far-seeing plan of operation. In the preparation of this plan he had the entire resources of our Department behind him and he reached out and employed some of the most prominent engineers in this country as consultants. Thus he developed what, in my opinion, is a truly comprehensive plan for the Missouri, taking into account all of the water resources of that basin, their effect on adjacent basins, and the economy of their coordinated use. This report is frankly a framework and when considered in that light it can be easily seen that the details will be filled out by the coordinated efforts of all Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with the use of those water resources.

This experience reminds me very definitely of what happened in the Ohio Basin in 1937. While the flood waters of that great river were still inundating thousands of acres of valuable land and many cities and towns in Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, Congress called upon my Department to review its previous plans for flood control and submit a report thereon. In April 1937 such a report was transmitted to Congress to form the basis of the authorizations for the Ohio contained in the Flood Control Acts of 1937 and 1938. Many of those important works are built today and many more were under construction when we had to stop operations due to the vital necessity for conserving manpower and materials for our war effort. They will unquestionably be continued when the war is over.

Let us stop for a moment to realize the enormous quantity of water with which we are dealing in the Missouri. It has been estimated that during the period 1890 to 1942, 1,250,000,000 acre-feet was the potential inflow into a comprehensive system of multiple-purpose reservoirs in the upper Missouri Basin, had such a system been available in those years. That is an average of more than 23,000,000 acre-feet per year. That's a lot of water in any man's country. It must be converted to the beneficial use of man. How can we do so?

In Colonel Pick's broad outline, he proposes approximately 73,000,000 acre-feet of storage in the major reservoirs in the basin, well distributed among the four essential items of flood control, navigation, reclamation, and power. I could give you at this point the various tentative allocations to those four purposes, but that would not tell the entire story because there is a definite joint use for a large part of this storage. For example, the water used to augment the stream flow for navigation can also be employed to develop power. In definite areas, storage allocated to flood control during the flood seasons can be utilized for reclamation and conservation after those seasons are over. The space set aside in each reservoir for silting will definitely assist in developing head for power. Thus, the entire system is flexible and capable of enormous good from sensible, well-planned operation, which has in mind the benefits which will accrue to the entire valley and not to any one particular use.

The flood of 1881 was estimated to have contained more than 5,000,000 acre-feet of water

at Sioux City, Iowa; that of 1903 is estimated to have produced a run-off of more than 10,000,000 acre-feet at Kansas City, Mo. Imagine what the large storage of Colonel Pick's plan—about 73,000,000 acre-feet, as I have just said—will do in reducing the peak flows and the high stages of those catastrophes and others. Fort Peck is assisting us today in maintaining satisfactory navigation flows to permit the Navy, the Army, and the Maritime Commission to float down our rivers essential vessels for our war effort. How much better will these navigation conditions be when all of the major dams contemplated in the plan are in operation. At the same time, thousands and thousands of acres of potential irrigable lands are found in the headwater region of the basin. All they need is water to grow food. That water is available in enormous quantities and that food will certainly be needed after the war. It has been estimated that the main dams of this comprehensive plan could produce several billion kilowatt-hours of energy per year. Think of what this power will do in augmenting industrial development, in aiding on the farms, and in the homes of the Missouri Valley in the years to come. Then, too, there are other large benefits such as improved water supply, abatement of pollution, vast recreational advantages, and preservation of wildlife.

Last June Colonel Pick spoke to the association about the disastrous 1943 floods, that were even then still taking their toll in damaging the homes and farms of this basin and in hampering our war effort. At that time a vital question before your convention was the matter of repairing the numerous private levee units that had been damaged, in order that the industry and farms protected by such structures could resume full production. Now, let me take a few moments of your time to tell you what has been done. On July 12, 1943, Congress, fully recognizing the needs in the Missouri Basin and elsewhere in the country, voted $10,000,000 for emergency repairs to levees damaged in the widespread floods of this year. We got our just share in the Missouri Valley and we went to work immediately. We are repairing or have repaired 230 levee units in that valley under this authority. These levees protect some 475,000 acres of highly productive farm lands. It is a pleasure for me to report, at this time, that this repair program is now about 70 percent completed and will be finished by December 1 of this year—well before the next high water can be reasonably expected.

I have not yet referred to our greatest resource of all—our manpower—which will be utilized and benefited by this plan. The successful conclusion of this war will bring the necessity for gainful employment of the many thousands no longer required by our war effort. While we are furnishing this necessary useful work to the returning members of our armed forces and to our war workers, we are spending your money on work which will return in benefits received more than dollar for dollar.

A definite illustration occurs to me at this point. Many years ago, when we first started on the Mississippi River, our predecessors, though farsighted, probably did not envision all of the broad plans for navigation, flood control, and other uses that have since been put into effect. Is there anyone today who can sanely criticize the cost of this plan, when weighing it against present and future progress and development?

There is enough water in the Missouri Basin to answer the major demands of all users, provided that it is used sanely, efficiently, and with broad vision for the good of the entire valley rather than that of special interests. Our work to date is only in the planning stage and the broad framework of those plans has been completed. We must get into the "doing" stage—the working stage—as soon as world conditions will permit. There is a place in that stage for all of us—Federal, State, and local. To carry these plans from their present broad framework into ultimate conclusion by definite structures on the ground, utilizing the waters of the river to the best advantage for all, demands many things. It demands sound engineering, sound economics, hard work, common sense, clear thinking, and unselfish cooperation. This is the American way of getting things done.

Gentlemen, I am convinced that the great benefits which will accrue from the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin fully justify all that we can give in the way of our very best efforts.

Foreign Trade in the Air Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and outstanding address on the subject Foreign Trade in the Air Age, delivered by the Hon. Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American Airways, at the World Trade Dinner of the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention, on the occasion of the presentation to Mr. Trippe of the Captain Robert Dollar Award "for his distinguished contribution to the advancement of American foreign trade." The dinner was held in New York City on October 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accepting the Robert Dollar Award for 1943, I speak not only for myself, but also on behalf of the many thousands of men and women of the Pan American Airways System. Tonight, they are at their posts in the United States and in 60 foreign countries and colonies. It is the teamwork of many, at home and abroad, in the air and on the ground, which has brought about whatever contribution Pan American has made to American foreign trade.

Tonight as we are gathered here at the world trade dinner, two thoughts are uppermost in the minds of all of us. Frst, to win the war as speedily as possible. Second, to expand our system of free enterprise—our American way of life—in order to provide jobs at decent wages for the millions of fighting men who will return, as well as for the many who now are employed in strictly war industries. Everyone agrees that this is our most pressing post-war problem.

At least 10,000,000 new jobs must be found—jobs that did not exist in 1940 when but 46,000,000 Americans were gainfully employed and some 6,000,000 were on work relief. This is the challenge we shall face. Should we fail, we would be confronted with the staggering total of 15,000,000 or more out of work. The end of an economic tailspin on such a scale could mean only regimentation for us all, and the end of democracy as we know it.

Every sector of our domestic economy can be counted on to do its share in meeting this challenge. Important study groups and committees appointed in the Congress and by our great national business, agriculture and labor organizations are already hard at work. But they are, for the most part, directing their efforts in the domestic field.

Their efforts will produce results and will all contribute. But the opportunity to create most of the 10,000,000 new jobs, in my opinion, lies in a wide expansion of our foreign trade. Those of us in foreign trade can visualize this. To the average American, however, such a thought is still fantastic. The great bulk of Americans who live inland know little of foreign trade. They do not realize that even our relatively small pre-war foreign trade affected their individual lives, whether or not they themselves were personally engaged in it.

There is an obvious reason for this. For the past hundred years, foreign trade has been only a minor item in our Nation's balance sheet. In 1938, the last normal year, exports amounted to but 5 percent of our national income. Only one person in five among our employed population was directly or indirectly engaged in foreign trade.

In most countries, on the other hand, foreign trade is the keystone of the national economy. For example, foreign trade has been the lifeblood of Great Britain for centuries. In 1938, England's foreign trade was over 20 percent of her national income. Three out of five of the population directly or indirectly gain their livelihood from foreign trade. If we here in the United States, with our resources and productive capacity, increase our foreign trade so that it directly or indirectly employs two workers in five instead of one in five, we will have created 10,000,000 new jobs.

There are those who may argue that this is an impossible task—that the United States simply is not a foreign trading Nation. They forget that has not always been so. A century ago we were one of the world's great trading nations. Our population was concentrated on the Atlantic seaboard. Our famous Clipper ships had built up a vast world commerce. In fact, foreign trade produced most of the wealth used to open up the continent. When we crossed the Alleghenies and started moving west the interest and energies of our people turned inland. We lost interest in foreign trade. We concentrated on domestic development. That job was big enough to keep us occupied for a hundred years. With an energetic people, great natural resources, and freedom for the individual to rise as fast as his abilities would carry him, we built a great nation, and provided for our citizens a standard of living higher than anyone ever before dreamed of.

In this great transcontinental development transportation and communications had a leading role. First came the railroads to link our scattered settlements. Then came our highways, automobiles, and trucks to bring the trade of the Nation to the door of the most remote farmhouse. Finally, domestic air transport, making the most distant points in the country but an overnight journey. And this has all been made possible by our domestic communication facilities—our privately operated telephone and telegraph systems, which are the envy of the world.

Thanks to domestic transportation and communications, our 48 States are a neighborhood. New York and San Francisco are closer in time than were New York and Philadelphia a hundred years ago. And today, having accomplished all this in our own country, we can play our part in accomplishing the same thing throughout the world.

Man now stands on the threshold of the age of flight, the air age, when not just single nations or single continents, but the entire globe will become one neighborhood—when San Francisco and Shanghai, New York and Moscow, Miami and Capetown, will be figura-

tively just across the street. Land areas heretofore isolated by oceans, mountains, and jungles will be as accessible as any others.

I will not dwell on the tremendous implications of the air age. I am sure it must be obvious to you all, however, that the coming of the air age will inaugurate a new era in world trade. Within our own history, we have seen how high-speed transportation and communications developed our domestic commerce to the hundred-billion-dollar level. Who can foretell to what level world trade will rise in the air age?

We in the United States should get our fair share of this vast future commerce. We must maintain our political and economic position in the world. Only by becoming once again a great world trading nation can we do this. Only in this way shall we be able to provide the millions of new jobs which must be found if our democracy, our system of free enterprise, our American way of life, is to endure.

How are we then going to reestablish ourselves as a leader in foreign trade?

Those of us in foreign trades know that if we sell abroad we must also buy abroad—that if our ships and planes are to go out loaded they cannot come back empty. We know we must encourage with our own capital the development of industry in backward countries. We know we must enlarge the reciprocal trade agreements program and gradually revise our tariff wall downward and, finally, we know that we must begin to train our youth as commercial ambassadors. In fact, I believe you will all agree with me when I say we must change Horace Greeley's old slogan, "Go West, young man" to a new slogan for the air age, "Go abroad, young man."

Fortunately, most informed Americans are beginning to agree with us. They are every day becoming more foreign-trade minded. But the majority do not yet appreciate the importance of overseas shipping, communications, and air to a nation's foreign trade. Would not America do well to investigate what the successful trading nations of the world have done, what they, through long experience, have learned?

What, for example, have the British done to become so eminently successful in foreign trade? What are they doing today to make a bid for leadership in the air age? We should examine the answers to these questions so that we will be ready for the peace, when world competition for trade will be resumed.

It is to be expected, with three out of five Englishmen directly or indirectly engaged in foreign trade, Britain should have a different outlook. Britain is world-minded. We have been mainly American-minded. Britain thinks in terms of ships and cargoes, of foreign trade and commerce. Young men are taught the economics of world trade. They are taught foreign languages and foreign customs. They look forward to careers in foreign trade. They go out to the far corners of the world to learn the techniques of commerce.

Today, they are being trained in the modern geography of the air age. They are being taught to think of time and distance in terms of world air transport. Foreign trade is England's life. Britain knows that she cannot be strong and healthy unless millions of Englishmen are employed in foreign trade. Britain knows that her future depends on securing her share of the greater world commerce of the air age. Britain will do this, and we Americans shall be glad of it. A strong Britain will be a cornerstone of world peace.

In preparation, the British already have provided their foreign traders with the tools they will need. They have consolidated their separate cable and radio communications companies in one great system—British Cables and Wireless, Ltd. From London, this great British communications network stretches to every corner of the globe, providing swift, low-cost universal communication. No such comprehensive or direct system is available to traders of any other nation.

By establishing this common front Great Britain has made it impossible for foreign countries to play off one separate British communications company against another. One single community company negotiates all her foreign communication franchises.

In the same way, the British Government has concentrated all overseas air transport in a single strong community company. Formerly, there were four British international air lines competing with one another and with foreign air lines as well. When the other foreign-trading nations consolidated their overseas air lines to better meet world competition, the British followed suit and merged their international air lines. Now Britain has one single powerful unit—the British Overseas Airways Corporation. Behind this great air-transport company is the full power and prestige of the British Government. The air liners of British Overseas Airways, manned by British crews, will fly all the post-war trade routes of the world. In dealing with foreign governments, British air transport enjoys the same advantages that British communications has had since Cables and Wireless was created.

I do not mean to imply that only the British are preparing to effectively compete for world trade in the air age. Far from it; all the trading nations will be in a strong position. World air transport in this air age will be truly a battle of the giants. The Dutch are represented by their K. L. M., the Russians by their Soviet Air Trust, the French by Air France, Sweden by their S. I. L. A., Canada by Trans-Canada Air Lines, South Africa by South African Airways. If Germany, Italy, and Japan are permitted to operate at all, we will have also the Lufthansa, Ala Littoria, and Dai Nippon. Many of these international systems are government-owned monopolies. Some are privately owned and function under government regulations as great public utilities.

Let us, in light of these facts, consider the American position. With respect to shipping, we shall come out of the war with more merchant tonnage than any other country. But our foreign traders will be greatly handicapped unless we have a unified communications system, providing an efficient worldwide service. Today, Western Union, R. C. A., I. T. & T., Mackay Radio, and several smaller American companies are all competing with each other as well as with foreign monopolies. The State Department and the Federal Communications Commission are in accord that the American position can only be preserved by unification. The officials of the companies themselves have testified that a common American communications company is the one best solution if America is to compete on equal terms with foreign nations.

In favorably reporting out a bill to carry out this program, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee stated, and here I quote:

"Our competing American companies engaged in international telegraph service have to deal abroad with foreign monopolies, usually government owned or government supported, with the result that the foreign monopoly plays one American carrier off against the other. The goal to be achieved in the field of international telegraph service is that of a strong unified telegraph carrier under American control."

Congress should promptly approve this pending bill so that all United States communications facilities abroad can be merged into a single company—a company privately owned and operated but subject to proper Government regulation. The outstanding service rendered by the Bell System in our domestic field, in comparison to the government owned telephone systems in foreign countries, proves that a privately owned monopoly under government regulation best serves the public where unified operation is needed. The recent Government approved merger of our domestic telegraph facilities is a further recognition of this fact.

Equally important, our Government should now formulate a national policy with respect to international air transport. While we invented the airplane and while we are today the greatest military air power in the world, we alone among the trading nations have no official policy to guide our overseas air transport effort in the air age.

What shall we do? Shall we have 10 or 15 separate American air lines each competing with the other as well as with powerful foreign monopolies? Shall we have 3 or 4 air lines—each restricted to a separate zone? Britain, France, Germany, and Japan tried this scheme for several years and then abandoned it in favor of the single-company system. Or shall we have 1 strong American international air line, strong enough to compete on even terms with the great foreign-flag air-transport monopolies—a community company—owned and controlled, not by any one aviation interest, but by all American transportation interests able to contribute, under an organization plan approved by the Government.

In reaching a decision the Government should not consider the position of any one air line or any group of air lines. The problem is too big for that. It is a national problem affecting the future, at home and abroad, of all American transportation. It will affect the future jobs and livelihood of millions of Americans. It will affect our foreign trade. It will even affect our national defense. The policy must only be determined by what is best for our country as a whole.

Right now the most important thing in the world is winning the war. But when the war is won our country must have those 10,000,000 additional jobs. Increased foreign trade in the air age under our private-enterprise system is the best single opportunity to provide these jobs. We need to move and move quickly. If we fail, we will deserve reproach from those now fighting and future generations of Americans to come.

"An" Becomes an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "'An' Becomes an Issue," published in the New York Times of October 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"AN" BECOMES AN ISSUE

For the better part of 2 days the Senate has been debating a two-letter word. The question is whether "an" shall be put into the Connally resolution on post-war policy, immediately before the words "international

authority," so that instead of merely pledging the United States to join "in the establishment and maintenance of international authority" to preserve peace, the resolution will pledge us to join "in the establishment and maintenance of 'an' international authority" for that purpose.

We can understand the position and the arguments of the Senators who have been making this fight for the two-letter word. They think that "an international authority" is a much more definite phrase, carrying much stronger implications of American membership in a new league of nations, than the blank words "international authority." We agree with them. And yet, as a newspaper which consistently advocated American membership in the present League of Nations over the whole period of 20 years between the two World Wars, we doubt whether the point they have raised is important enough at this time to risk delaying action by the Senate.

For the question at issue now is not how to organize a post-war peace. The Senate itself is in no position to do this; the President must lead the way, and the question cannot become a real issue until he has consulted with the heads of the nations which will be our partners in such an effort and then presented to the Senate the plan on which agreement has been reached. The only real issue now is whether the Senate shall choose this moment to encourage the President to proceed with such negotiations.

We think that it should, and that the important thing is not the precise language in which it says so, but the broad purpose expressed in its resolution and the speed and good will and degree of unanimity with which this resolution is adopted. We would rather have a general resolution adopted by an overwhelming nine-tenths majority of the Senate at the end of a single week's debate than have a specific resolution approved by a narrow squeak at the end of a month's struggle. For strong approval of the main principle of international cooperation is what matters now, and we are not afraid that the Senate will backslide later unless it is committed to something definite. There will be no backsliding this time. The American people are going to demand adequate protection against the outbreak of another major war, and the American Senate is going to heed their demand. Of that we can be certain.

Carlos Finlay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that the name of Carlos Finlay should grace and identify an institution designed to promote research in medicine throughout all the Americas. His life was given to research and the practice of medicine, and to him, above all others, the Americas owe the blessing of protection against a scourge that formerly ravaged their cities and destroyed their peoples. But for Carlos Finlay, yellow fever might still be a blight upon one of the fairest regions of the New World. Through the efforts of the medical profession in the United States, in Cuba, and in the other American republics, and especially through the personal efforts of Dr. Benjamin Salzer and Dr. Edgar Mayer, of New York City, the spotlight of public recognition is being focused on the memory of this great benefactor of mankind.

A study of the life and work of Carlos Finlay restores our pride and faith in humanity. It reveals a man whose sympathetic heart inspired an intellect of extraordinary range, penetration, and power. It throws light upon the career of a modest physician who, by his own acumen and industry, discovered one of the most subtle secrets of nature and applied his discoveries to the saving of millions of human lives. This study shows also how heedless mankind brushes aside its benefactors, little knowing that under the cloak of everyday drudgery lives an immortal whose achievements are to bless humanity for all time.

What was Carlos Finlay's crowning achievement? In a word, it was the discovery that yellow fever is transmitted from man to man by the bite of a mosquito that has previously sucked the blood of a yellow-fever victim; that the disease is contracted in no other way, and that a particular kind of mosquito is the vector or carrier of the disease.

Now that the world knows that yellow fever is transmitted by the bite of a certain kind of mosquito the fact seems to be simple enough, so simple that everybody should have known it from the first. But other discoveries seem simple, too; the discovery of the New World, for example, or the discovery of a method of human flight. We forget that Columbus was scorned and derided by the wisest men of his time for daring to assert that he could find a continent by sailing westward from Europe. The Wright brothers, even after they had devised a machine that actually carried them through the air, were regarded in Ohio as half crazy by their matter-of-fact neighbors, and the universal comment was, "Those boys will break their necks yet; you see if they don't. They think they can learn to fly."

Ridicule and contemptuous scorn constituted the only public notice given to Carlos Finlay for nearly 20 years after he had the hardihood to disclose his theory of mosquito transmission of yellow fever. His idea ran counter to popular tradition and belief, just as Columbus' theory contradicted the opinions of his day, and just as Morse evoked derisive laughter when he proposed to transmit intelligible messages by means of electric wires stretched from one town to another. Finlay's experience was the well-nigh universal experience of theorists who offer new ideas to mankind. To our chagrin we must admit that mankind even in our day is reluctant to accept newly discovered truths.

Happy is the discoverer who lives to see his theory proved true, and thrice happy he who reaps the credit for his discovery. Poor Columbus died at Valladolid in obscurity and discredit, and the name of another explorer was given to the New World which Columbus found. The man whose discovery banished the curse of yellow fever from the New World, whose genius enabled the United States to build the Panama Canal after the French had fallen victims to the yellow pest—this man lived to see his theory confirmed, but not long enough to reap full credit from mankind. Even now, after a lapse of 40 years, it is not generally known in the United States that Carlos Finlay was the true conqueror of yellow fever. The lion's share of the credit has gone to others; not because they willed it so, but largely because their spectacular verification of the validity of Finlay's theory, followed closely by the eradication of yellow fever at Habana and Panama, attracted more attention from Americans than the phenomenon of Finlay's detection of a secret of Nature. Another factor which prevented the diffusion of Finlay's fame in this country was that his writings were published chiefly in the Spanish language, which made them literally a closed book to Americans generally.

The institute that now comes into being will aid in extending the fame of Finlay, which already shines so brightly in Cuba and throughout Latin America. And as Finlay's renown spreads, the fame of Walter Reed will be enhanced, as will that of all the others who shared in the honor of confirming Finlay's theory and putting it into practice.

CARLOS FINLAY THE MAN

Before sketching the course of Finlay's labors in developing and proving his theory, let us glance at the life story of the man himself. He was born at Puerto Principe—now Camaguey—in Cuba, on December 3, 1833. His father Edward was a Scotsman, born at Hull, England, in 1795, and educated at Edinburgh and in France. While still a medical student, Edward sailed with a brother for South America to join a British contingent fighting under Bolivar for the independence of Venezuela. They were shipwrecked and Edward found himself at Port of Spain, Trinidad, in 1826. He was admitted to practice there, and married Eliza de Barrés, a girl of French descent. They removed to Cuba in 1831, settling at Puerto Principe, where Carlos Finlay, the subject of this sketch, was born. The family moved to Habana in 1834, and the father practiced medicine there until his death in 1872.

Carlos Finlay was a student from childhood. He learned to speak English, French, and German, as well as Spanish, in his boyhood. In 1846 and again in 1848 he studied in Germany and France, intending to qualify in medicine at Rouen and Paris but an attack of typhoid in 1851 caused him to return home to Habana for convalescence. He was now well versed in languages, the classics, history, literature, and physics. Still inclined to follow his father in the practice of medicine, Carlos went to Philadelphia and began his studies at the Jefferson Medical College under the instruction of John Kearsley Mitchell. Dr. Mitchell's son, afterward famous as S. Weir Mitchell, was at that time assisting his father, and a strong friendship sprang up between him and young Finlay of Cuba. This friendship was of lifelong duration.

Finlay was graduated as a doctor in medicine in 1855. Instead of settling in

New York, as S. Weir Mitchell suggested, he returned to Habana. He pursued medical studies in Peru and at Paris, practiced for a time at Matanzas, Cuba, and finally settled at Habana for his life work. In 1865 he married Miss Adele Shine, an Irish girl, whose father, a native of Cork, had settled at Port of Spain, Trinidad, where she was born. She was educated in a convent at Cork. After the death of her father and mother she lived with a sister, wife of James Murphy, a businessman whose interests in the West Indies led to the permanent residence of the family in Habana.

Three children were born to Carlos and Adele Finlay, the eldest being Carlos E., who was educated in New York City as a physician. He followed in the footsteps of his grandfather and father as a medical practitioner in Habana. This son, urged by admirers of his father, wrote the book Carlos Finlay and Yellow Fever, which was issued by the Oxford University Press, New York, in 1940. It is a charming volume, in which a distinguished son sets forth with dignity and modest pride the story of Carlos Finlay and the facts concerning yellow fever and its conquest.

Although Carlos Finlay presented his mosquito transmission theory to the world in 1881, it was not until 1900–1905 that skeptics were silenced by indisputable confirmation of the theory and by eradication of yellow fever from Habana, where it had taken toll of human life without intermission for 140 years.

Dr. Finlay continued his researches and labors in this field. In 1902 he became head of the Department of Public Health of Cuba, and held that post until 1909. He lived in retirement thereafter until his death on August 20, 1915, at the age of 82. The Cuban Government paid tribute to its famous citizen by directing the funeral honors with which he was laid away.

Finlay's name is perpetuated by the Finlay Institute of Cuba, dedicated principally to the study of tropical medicine; by the Finlay Order of Merit, established in 1928 by the Cuban Government to reward exceptional work in the field of public health; by honors from governments and scientific societies in both hemispheres; and by the writings of historians dealing with medical subjects in connection with the discovery and settlement of the New World.

THE STUDY OF YELLOW FEVER

From a period long prior to the time of Columbus down to the present day the mystery surrounding the nature of yellow fever has continued. Its ravages in Yucatan were recorded by the Mayas before the white man was known. It periodically depopulated the region around Veracruz, Mexico, and the Aztec monarchs sent in fresh colonies to replace those who had succumbed. The disease was known to the Aztecs as cocolitzle. After 1492 one expedition after another of white men was stricken with a disease which, because of the high percentage of fatal cases, is believed to have been yellow fever. The epidemic of 1648 in Yucatan was terrible in its sweep. Successive epidemics devastated the white settlements in the Spanish Main.

Yellow fever became endemic in Habana in 1762, and thereafter that city was never free from it until Finlay's discovery led to its extermination.

Although there is reason to believe that the population of the Mediterranean region was held down for centuries by visitations of yellow fever, predominant scientific opinion classes yellow fever as a disease originating in tropical America. Years of test by the best qualified students have failed to isolate the parasite, bacillus, or micrococcus which causes yellow fever.

In his early research, Carlos Finlay studied the climate of Habana, on the tentative theory that the alkalinity of the atmosphere might have much to do with the presence or spread of yellow fever. He labored long in this direction, only to find that his experiments were fruitless.

Research went on in many places, year after year, and Finlay kept abreast of all work done. In 1879 a yellow fever commission, of which Dr. Stanford E. Chaillé was chairman, was sent from the United States to Habana. Finlay was attached to this commission by appointment of his government. The researches of this commission developed information which caused Finlay to abandon his first hypothesis and take up a new line of study. This resulted in his discovery of the part played by the mosquito in the transmission of yellow fever.

FINLAY'S DISCOVERY

The idea broached by Finlay was novel and revolutionary. No one had ever suggested that any disease could be transmitted from man to man through an intermediate agency. Still less was it supposed that yellow fever was communicable only by the agency of a mosquito. Finlay first made public his theory at a session of the International Sanitary Conference in Washington on February 18, 1881. Two other delegates had proposed that the conference provide for a scientific investigation of yellow fever, and Finlay supported the proposal. The pregnant portions of his remarks were as follows:

I consider it urgent that this Conference should adopt a resolution favorable to the scientific investigation of yellow fever * * * without entering into technical considerations, which would be out of place, and simply as an example which shall render, so to speak, palpable the interest of such an investigation * * * I beg to remind my colleagues here present that the sanitary measures now generally recommended against yellow fever are founded upon a mode of preventing the disease which is completely at variance with a considerable number of observed facts. We have on one hand the contagionists and on the other the noncontagionists, each endeavoring to deny the importance of the cases brought forward by the contrary parties. * * * Well, gentlemen, I declare that it is impossible for an impartial mind to look into the stated facts without arriving at a conclusion that many of the proofs cited in favor of each of these apparently contradictory opinions must be accepted as perfectly authenticated facts, which conclusion necessarily leads to this other consequence, that we must admit the intervention of a third independent condition in order to account for these two orders of facts.

It is my present opinion that three conditions are necessary in order that the propagation of yellow fever shall take place:

1. The presence of a previous case of yellow fever within limits of time counting from the moment we are now considering.

2. The presence of a person apt to contract the disease.

3. The presence of an agent entirely independent for its existence, both of the disease and of the sick man, but which is necessary in order that the disease shall be conveyed from the yellow fever patient to a healthy individual.

It will be objected that this is a mere hypothesis, and, indeed, it is only as such that I give it. But I believe that it is a plausible one, which has at least the merit of explaining a certain number of facts which have hitherto remained unaccounted for by the current theories. I do not ask for anything else, and my only object is to show that if my hypothesis, or some other analogous to it, should be realized, all the measures which are now employed to check the progress of the disease would turn out to be without effect, inasmuch as the principal effort should have been directed against the third condition by endeavoring to destroy the agent of transmission or to divert it from the path that it follows in communicating the disease.

You see, therefore, gentlemen, how important it is that this question should be thoroughly studied if we do not wish to be led upon a false track while recommending particular measures against the propagation of the disease.

Six months later, on August 14, 1881, Dr. Finlay read a paper before the Royal Academy of Sciences of Habana in which he developed his theory that yellow fever is communicated from man to man only by the agency of a mosquito. Not only did he make this daring statement, but he went further and identified a particular kind of mosquito, called by him Culex, and generally known later as Stegomyia fasciata, as the only one that conveyed the poison. He had reached this conclusion after months of experiment and patient observation. The novel facts he had learned regarding the habits of the stegomyia were fully confirmed by later naturalists. In this historic paper Dr. Finlay said:

In this paper I shall not concern myself with the nature or form of the morbific cause of yellow fever, beyond postulating the existence of a material transportable substance, which may be an amorphous virus, a vegetable or animal germ, a bacterium, etc., but at any rate constitutes something tangible which requires to be conveyed from the sick to the healthy before the disease can be propagated. What I propose to consider is the means by which the morbific cause of yellow fever is able to part from the body of the patient and to be implanted upon that of a healthy person. The need of an external intervention apart from the disease itself in order that the latter may be transmitted is made apparent by numerous conditions, some of them already pointed out by Humboldt and Benjamin Rush since the beginning of this century, and now corroborated by recent observations. Yellow fever at times will travel across the ocean to be propagated in distant ports presenting climatic and topographic conditions very different from those of the focus from which the infection has proceeded, while at other times the disease seems unable to transmit itself outside of a very limited zone, although the meterology and topography beyond that zone do not appear to differ very materially. Once the need of an agent of transmission is admitted as the only means of accounting for these anomalies, it is evident that all

of the conditions which have heretofore been recognized as essential for the transmission of the disease must be understood to act through their influence upon the said agent. It seems unlikely, therefore, that this agent be found among the microphytes, for those lowest orders of animal life are but little affected by such meteorologic variations as are known to influence the development of yellow fever. To satisfy that requisite it was necessary to search for it among insects. On the other hand, the fact of yellow fever being characterized both clinically and (according to recent findings) histologically by lesions of the blood vessels and by alterations of the physical and chemical conditions of the blood suggested that the insect which should convey the infectious particles from the patient to the healthy should be looked for among those which drive their sting into blood vessels in order to suck human blood. Finally, by reasons of other considerations which need not be stated here, I came to think that the mosquito might be the transmitter of yellow fever.

He then detailed the natural history of the different varieties of mosquitoes found at Habana and set forth the reasons why he fastened upon the Culex (stegomyia) as the only mosquito that transmitted yellow fever.

Then followed 19 years of study on Finlay's part, and with almost no encouragement from scientific men. His theory was almost universally derided as visionary. Sir Patrick Manson had discovered the indirect transmission of filaria by the mosquito, a fact which he published soon after Finlay had found that the mosquito was the only vector of yellow fever, but this additional evidence that disease is communicated by insects did not seem to impress either scientific men or laymen.

Instead of taking up research along the lines pioneered by Finlay, American research for the most part was concentrated upon efforts to find the specific bacillus or virus of yellow fever.

Finlay's further experiments confirmed his theory of mosquito transmission of yellow fever. He cautiously inoculated nonimmune individuals by means of infected mosquitoes and developed mild cases of yellow fever; but his studies had warned him that fatal results would follow under certain conditions, and he refrained from risking the lives of persons who submitted to his tests. Hence it was claimed that his experiments were negative in character.

GENERAL GORGAS' TESTIMONY

Then came the Spanish-American War and the occupation of Habana by the Americans. What followed is well told by Gen. William C. Gorgas in his book, Sanitation in Panama, which was published in 1915. He was in charge of the sanitary department of Habana after the occupation. He tells how a commission had been sent to Habana in 1899 by the Public Health Service of the United States to study yellow fever; how it reported that the micro-organism discovered in Brazil by Professor Sanarelli, of Italy, and by him called bacillus icteroides, was the cause of yellow fever; how Surg. Gen. George M. Sternberg, of the United States Army, doubted this finding and brought about the appointment of a board of Army medical officers to investigate yellow fever at Habana; and how this board, composed of Drs. Walter Reed, James Carroll, Jesse Lazear, and Aristides Agramonte, began its work. The board spent several months in investigating Sanarelli's organism, and proved beyond doubt that it was not the cause of yellow fever.

It was then believed that yellow fever was a filth disease. But a thorough cleaning of Habana under the direction of Major Gorgas failed to reduce yellow-fever cases.

In spite of all this work and care—

Writes General Gorgas—

yellow fever had been steadily growing worse ever since we had taken possession of the city, and in 1900 there were a greater number of cases than there had been for several years. The Cubans twitted us with the fact that all our cleaning up and expenditure not only had not bettered things, but had even made them worse. They called attention to the fact that the very cleanest and best-kept portions of the city were by far the worst sufferers from yellow fever, and the evidence was so starlingly before our eyes that we had to acknowledge the truth of what they said.

This frank confession by General Gorgas is of special interest when compared with a statement made in 1881 by Carlos Finlay in the memorable paper announcing his mosquito transmission theory:

I feel convinced that any theory which attributes the origin and propagation of yellow fever to atmospheric influences, miasmatic or meteorologic conditions, or filth or to the neglect of general hygienic precautions, must be considered as utterly indefensible. I have, therefore, been obliged to abandon my former ideas, and shall now endeavor to justify this change in my opinions.

Had American scientists listened to Carlos Finlay from 1881 onward, they could have saved thousands of lives and millions of dollars lost through yellow fever in the southern portions of the United States. But they persisted in the notion that filthy conditions propagated yellow fever, and that superior American sanitation would eradicate the disease at Habana.

The health authorities were at their wits' end—

Writes Gorgas.

We evidently could not get rid of Habana as a focus of infection by any method we then knew.

He refers to the commission of medical men appointed by the Sanitary Department of Habana, to whom all cases of yellow fever were referred for diagnosis. Gorgas was a member of the commission, and the other members were Dr. Carlos Finlay, Dr. Antonio Albertini, and Dr. John Guiteras. The Reed board was in touch, naturally, with this commission.

WORK OF THE REED BOARD

Gorgas then tells how the Reed board after wasting months in futile experiments along other lines, turned to Dr. Finlay for advice and information:

Dr. Carlos Finlay, of Habana, the physician just mentioned as being a member of our Commission, had ever since the year 1831 been investigating, thinking of, and writing about the relation of the mosquito to yellow fever. He had convinced himself that this insect was the means whereby the disease was conveyed from person to person. * * * His argument from the then known facts with regard to yellow fever, showing from these facts that it was probably the mosquito that conveyed this disease, was most beautiful and logical. But a still more beautiful piece of reasoning was the induction that it was the stegomyia mosquito, out of the six or seven hundred species of mosquitoes, that conveyed yellow fever.

After contending that Finlay had never conclusively demonstrated the validity of his mosquito theory, and ignoring Finlay's own statement that he had refrained from experiments with infected mosquitos under conditions which probably would have been fatal to the inoculated individual, Gorgas proceeds:

Reed says of Finlay: "To Dr. Carlos Finlay, of Habana, must be given, however, full credit for the theory of the popagation of yellow fever by means of the mosquito, which he proposed in a paper read before the Royal Academy in that city at its session on the 14th day of August 1881."

The Reed board, after many months of inconclusive work in other directions, turned their attention to Dr. Finlay's theory. Dr. Reed discussed the matter with Dr. Finlay a good deal before he commenced his mosquito work, and was thoroughly familiar with Dr. Finlay's arguments and ideas on the subject. Indeed, we all knew Dr. Finlay well, but were rather inclined to make l'ght of his ideas, and none more so than I. * * *

Dr. Reed got from Dr. Finlay the eggs from which he raised the mosquitoes used in his experimental work. * * * Dr. Reed says, in his paper, The Etiology of Yellow Fever, Preliminary Note: "We here desire to express our sincere thanks to Dr. Finlay, who accorded to us a most courteous interview and has gladly placed at our disposal his several publications relating to yellow fever during the past 19 years, and also for ova of the species of mosquito with which he had made his several inoculations * * *."

After consultation the Reed board determined to experiment to see whether the mosquito really did convey yellow fever. But it was necessary to have a good deal of money and sufficient authority before starting in. The board had come to Cuba for entirely different investigations, and had not been supplied with sufficient funds for these experiments. Fortunately for the cause of science and of humanity, we had as Governor General of Cuba at that time Gen. Leonard Wood, of the United States Army. General Wood had been educated as a physician. * * * Dr. Reed outlined to General Wood the course that he expected to pursue, and General Wood was so convinced by Dr. Reed's argument that he authorized the expenditure from Cuban funds of a sufficient sum and gave Dr. Reed ample powers as to the method of expenditure. * * *

Dr. Reed wished to make his demonstrations as convincing and spectacular as possible. It was an entirely new idea, and his conclusions excited a great deal of adverse comment and criticism. This theory was so contrary to what most men thought had been their practical experience that it was received with scant consideration. * * * The conclusions announced by the board were as follows: "That yellow fever is conveyed from man to man only by the bite of the female stegomyia mosquito." * * *

These discoveries have been of enormous benefit to mankind, and upon them has been based the sanitary work against yellow fever which has been so successful.

FINLAY'S PLAN OF ERADICATION

After Finlay had satisfied himself that the mosquito was responsible for yellow fever he gave thought to practical plans for eradicating the disease by breaking

the chain of infection. Years before Gorgas began his sanitation of Habana, Finlay had pointed the way. He outlined his ideas at Chicago in 1893 and at Budapest in 1894, when he addressed the International Congress of Hygiene. On the latter occasion he said:

The special measures which might be adopted against the propagation of yellow fever through mosquitoes must be left to the criterion of those who accept my theory, but the principal precautions must be: 1. To prevent those insects from stinging yellow-fever patients. 2. To destroy as far as possible the mosquitoes that have been infected, bearing in mind that in close spaces a temperature of 50° C is sufficient for that purpose. 3. Finally, to consider any place unsafe so long as the mosquitoes which have stung yellow-fever patients may be alive in it, 35 to 40 days being the term of their existence under the most favorable conditions.

In 1898, after the United States occupied Cuba, Dr. Finlay offered to American Army and Navy officers his detailed plan for stamping out yellow fever, in which he said:

Why should not the houses, in yellow-fever countries, be provided with mosquito blinds such as are used in the United States as a mere matter of comfort, while here it may be a question of life or death. The mosquito larvae might be destroyed in swamps, pools, privies, sinks, street sewers and other stagnant waters, in which they are bred, by a methodical use of potassium permanganate, or other such substance, in order to lessen the abundance of mosquitoes. But the most essential point must be to prevent these insects from reaching yellow fever patients and to secure the proper disinfection of all suspicious discharges in order to forestall the contamination of those insects. Well-ventilated hospitals should be built upon high grounds with no stagnant waters or marshes near their vicinity; doors and windows protected by mosquito blinds; a good system of drainage and sewerage; and facilities for destroying any mosquitoes or larvae which might be found within the buildings; only the upper stories should be occupied by the sick and none but yellow fever patients and such malaria patients as are considered immune against yellow fever should be admitted. The examination for admission might be carried out in a separate building and in a separate department devoted to the suspicious cases under observation.

With such hospitals at hand, and an efficient board of health, which would see to the proper arrangements of patients who could be left at their homes, and general sanitary improvements within and around the principal cities, there could be no doubt that yellow fever might be stamped out from Cuba and Puerto Rico and malaria reduced to a minimum. It would then be the business of the port and quarantine officers to prevent the introduction of fresh germs.

LOOKING FORWARD

The foregoing data illustrate the breadth and precision of Finlay's studies in regard to yellow fever. His researches and experiments in other fields were of great value also, but they cannot be detailed here. By pointing the way to eradication of yellow fever Finlay earned perpetual renown, and it may well be that he will be regarded as the greatest medical benefactor of this hemisphere.

The story of Finlay's long and patient toil is an inspiration to others who are eager to discover the secrets of nature. His example tells them to stick to their task in spite of neglect and ridicule. His triumph is a message to science, warning it not to close its mind to the claims of reputable investigators, however obscure they may be. His writings reveal that his mind was always hospitable to truth, wherever it appeared, and prompt to acknowledge error in his own inferences.

We are still confronted with diseases of deadly character which might be eradicated if another Finlay should appear. Let us bear in mind his career, in order that investigators who may even now be unlocking the secrets of cancer, infantile paralysis, and other scourges may not suffer the discouragements that attended Finlay's work.

The field that opens before the Finlay Institute of the Americas is one that invites exploration by devoted young men. It calls for arduous labor, tenacity of purpose, and serenity of soul. The goals are noble, and the rewards bestowed upon the discoverers are glorious, being nothing less than the divine honor that was accorded to Abou Ben Adhem.

Radio Address in Connection With Third War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a radio address made by me in New York City on October 4, 1943, over radio station WWRL, in connection with the Third War Loan drive:

Victory on parade is truly significant today, for our troops are marching forward in victory on every front on which they are engaging the enemy, and our folks at home have just gone over the top for a smashing victory in our Third War Loan drive.

The going may be hard for our troops because the enemies' forces are seasoned veterans of war and have been preparing for over a quarter of a century to bring devastation and grief upon a peace-loving world. But in the hearts of our fighters flows the blood of freemen ready and willing to lay down their lives if need be for the preservation of those liberties which our forebears have handed down to us.

What one among us can shirk his duty to his country in this saddest hour of our history? What one among us can live even with himself if he is not contributing in some measure to this victory which surely some day, and I hope and pray it is soon, will be ours? Whether he thinks about it or not, when these brave heroes of ours come home they will ask their neighbors: "What have you done on the home front while I was away fighting on the battle front?" The man who cannot answer it stands forever marked as a moral slacker who was willing to cheer but unwilling to sacrifice.

It is not too late. Right now the least service could one render is to buy War bonds and by so doing the individual helps himself as well as his country. Your money will makes the implements of war which our Senators who have toured our fighting fronts state are so sorely needed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, my old commander in the Rainbow Division.

During the past summer I spent many weeks as a patient in the Halloran General Hospital on Staten Island for an aggravation of a war injury I met up with in the Argonne Forest while serving with the Fighting Sixty-ninth of New York. This is a 4,000-bed hospital equipped to take care of our wounded and sick soldiers. It cannot be surpassed in all the world, and I say it advisedly for I served for 10 years as an administrator of the great chain of municipal hospitals in our own city. As a matter of fact, Dr. William Jacobs, superintendent of Bellevue Hospital, visited me while there and after a tour of inspection with Col. Ralph DeVoe, the commanding officer was warm in his praise of the modern up-to-date hospital methods employed.

Here I met men wounded at Guadalcanal, Tunisia, and other fronts in Africa. It seemed no different than in the days of 25 years ago when I was recuperating in an Army hospital. The attitude and lightheartedness of the men was just the same. They made light of their sacrifices and were warm in the praise of their treatment. They told of the different engagements in which they served and extolled their officers who led them. There is never a dull moment at Halloran, for public-spirited citizens provide entertainment and relaxation and I know that this condition prevails in every Army and Navy hospital in our country.

There is one thing that concerns the men and that is:

"What is to become of them after the last shot has been fired and victory is ours?"

They know what the veterans of the First World War went through when they came home, and they don't want that to happen to them.

They don't want a bonus march on Washington. They don't want to sell apples on every street corner of every large city throughout our land. They don't want the medals they fought and bled for to be adorning the windows of the "hock shops" instead of their breasts which they bared so bravely to the enemy's fire. They don't want unemployment.

They want jobs. They want security. They want to settle down and enjoy the home life of their family and friends.

This Congress has before it many plans and suggestions for the rehabilitation of the serviceman. All plans are worthy of serious consideration. Last March Congress passed bills which were immediately signed by the President granting benefits to the men of World War No. 2 as are in operation today for the veterans of World War No. 1.

In my opinion the situation is vastly different today in veteran affairs as it is in the affairs of every situation in the light of these more modern times. The veterans' organizations such as the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veteran societies have the answer before anyone, for they have lived with it for this past quarter of a century.

The major problem, as I see it, is to have jobs ready for the serviceman when he lays aside his uniform to return to civilian life.

There must be no let-down of 6 months before he finds gainful employment. The leaders of industry who converted peacetime industry into war machinery must be kept on the job to convert war machinery back into peacetime machinery.

Education after World War No. 1 was made available only to the wounded who wished to take advantage. It afforded me the completion of high school and law school. However, today it should be made possible for all veterans of this war who want to complete the education their fathers and mothers had planned for them before the

Hitlers and Tojos started on their world conquests. The world of tomorrow will need men of brains and vision. Coupled with the sacrifice made for his fellowman the veteran with his educational background will form a composite phalanx for the future and well-being of America.

During the past month I had the honor to attend and address the annual conventions of the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars held here in New York.

Never before in the history of these organizations has the spirit of comradeship manifested itself to such a degree as was evidenced by the overwhelming response to the call of the conventions. The bonds of friendships made 25 years ago in our country's cause has been reborn when we realize that our younger generation is doing the same thing again to preserve the integrity of our land. These young soldiers, sailors, and marines belong to us almost as they do to their families, and we are glad to carry their torch as they were glad to carry ours, which they are doing all over the world at this very moment. Sprinkled among them are the men of 1917-18, while those of us on the side lines can only hope and pray.

The great discussion in Congress for the next few weeks will center on the drafting of fathers. It has been stated by our military and naval leaders that it is essential that more manpower be called to arms. Far be it from me to question our leaders in war, for it would be a terrible calamity if they underestimated our needs rather than overestimated them.

I have urged that immediate consideration be given to releasing Government employees otherwise available but not in uniform because they are called essential employees. If they are so essential for the war effort, put them in uniform at the same rate of pay the serviceman receives.

By the same token, I believe that the desk soldiers, sailors, and marines who are able should be sent into the field and let the fathers who are drafted take these desk jobs at stations near their homes where they could see and be near to their children. In every case that I know, as soon as the father goes to war, the mother will have to go to work if she is to keep her home together at the same standard in which she has been living. Therefore, now, more than at any other time, will the children need the guidance and closeness of the father.

War has taught us that no one is indispensable. That goes, too, for the elected public official who beats his breast at every patriotic rally, telling of the deeds our boys are doing in action, but himself staying out of the fight because his position safeguards him. Oh, yes; he loves a fight, and hell and high water can't stop him! But not the fight where you lie in foxholes in mud and slime, crawling on your belly to reach your objective, having yours hands and head torn by barbed wire. He likes the political fight where he tells from a platform his accomplishments, but lacks the courage to do his deeds on the battle front.

I say to these men in every community throughout our land, the mothers and fathers whose boys are in service will remember it, and when the boys come back they will know it, and, just in case they don't, we veterans will see to it that everyone knows it, for the man will be measured by the yardstick, "If you were able, why didn't you serve?"

In this crisis of our Nation the highest position a man can hold is in the uniform of our country.

We still revere the memory of great men in our American way of life. By their example they are an inspiration to their fellow Americans. Those of us who had the good fortune to serve in the last war with the old Sixty-ninth of the Rainbow Division cherish the memory of our great soldier priest Father Duffy. At his monument on Broadway at Duffy Square, thousands of servicemen gather each day in respect and admiration for a great man. Last July, together with the members of the Father Duffy Chapter, Rainbow Veterans, of which I have served as president, I sponsored the proposal to name a Liberty ship after Father Duffy. I am happy to state that on October 14, at Baltimore, the *Father Duffy* troopship will be christened.

We know that his spirit will guide our young soldiers, sailors, and marines through calm or stormy waters on their most important journey in life. Victory.

Our people are united as one in closer harmony than ever before in our history. They are united in prayer for victory, for Hitler long ago threw out God and His teachings. Only yesterday 75,000 men of the Holy Name Society of New York heard in a public demonstration His Excellency Archbishop Spellman utter prayers for peace.

Our people are united in one common effort, to beat our enemies and to leave them so prostrate that they will never recover to lift their slimy heads in a world which is to be governed by righteous men.

Petition of Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution submitted to me by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, adopted at the annual meeting held in Philadelphia, Pa., September 23 and 24, 1943:

Whereas under the terms of the compact establishing the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, which was assented to by the Congress of the United States under Public Law 539, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 4, 1942, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was designated in article 7 of such compact as "the primary research agency of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission cooperating with the research agencies in each State for that purpose"; and

Whereas the work of this Commission during the first year of its existence has developed the need for such continuous cooperating research to determine the most effective ways of rebuilding our fishery resources to their one-time abundance; and

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has cooperated effectively and wholeheartedly with this Commission as contemplated by the compact within the funds available to it; and

Whereas the curtailment of cooperative research work will be disastrous to the joint effort undertaken by the States of this Commission with the approval of the Congress; and

Whereas it now appears that funds for such research work in the contemplated budget of the Service have been drastically reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commissioners of this Commission representing 12 of the 15 Atlantic coastal States do most earnestly urge their Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence in every proper way to bring about the restoration of such research and the appropriation of funds necessary to permit the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to function as the primary research agency of this Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the considered opinion of the commissioners representing these States that such research is vitally necessary at this time to provide the facts on which the States concerned may develop sound public policy for the remainder of the war period and in particular for the post-war adjustment period, when it is expected that a great increase in fishing intensity will ensue to the great damage of these fishery resources unless on the basis of current and future research the several States concerned can determine the wisest policy to pursue to avoid such overintensive fishing in the post-war period. At no time in the history of the fisheries has the continuation and expansion of such basic research been more important than at present. It is for this reason that this Commission requests the help of the Senators and Representatives of the States concerned in avoiding the disastrous effect of such curtailment of funds and in providing adequately for the continuance and reasonable expansion of such indispensable research; and be it further

Resolved, That, for the purposes above stated, this Commission ask the Senators and Representatives of these States to support the pending deficiency appropriation bill authorizing and appropriating the funds, $200,000, required by the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries to carry out its functions in the war program already authorized by Executive Order No. 9204 (Coordination of Federal Activities Affecting the Fishing Industry), in order that these functions may be performed effectively while still permitting the continuation of at least the minimum essential research functions and services of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service which are necessary to provide the basic information required by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for its guidance in developing and maintaining coordinated State action on the marine-fisheries problems common to the Atlantic States.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, "I wonder how many of you realize the rate we are liquidating our national resources for destructive purposes," says Rickenbacker.

The are two men, and only two, in the United States of America who are acting like we are nearing the end of the 1944 campaign for the Presidency.

There are not only the "four freedoms" promised the world, but the Budget's O. K. for an item of considerable size for foreign cultural relations.

Young Mr. Gilbert, who is most responsible in O. P. A. for the subsidy idea, was handed down to us by Harry Hopkins when he headed the Department of Commerce.

Tuition for soldiers as well as an after-war policy planning debate probably will not have any effect one way or the other on the Russian drive across the Dnieper River.

"Ceilings on live animals," says Representative KLEBERG, "brings the showdown between red tape and red meat"—meaning that the former will be lengthened and the latter reduced.

The special message on "food," defending the use of subsidies, promised in 2 days on October 19 from the White House has not yet arrived, although live cattle ceilings have arrived.

They are proposing to bring 40,000 natives from Puerto Rico to the States to help the manpower situation. This has no connection with continued appropriations for the decade-old hurricane relief.

Why not send the Notre Dame football platoon to Rome for a New Year's Day game to play the best of our Army and Navy there and declare a truce so that Germans, Italians, and all could attend, in the famous amphitheater mingling like the blue and gray did at Spangler's Spring at Gettysburg?

We now know why Kiska was evacuated. The Japs carry a tradition of dread about the falling of a certain leaf. The Americans, they say, manufactured that leaf and dropped it on Kiska and the Japs left their foxholes like drowned ground squirrels, and the island. This justifies the psychological warfare of the O. W. I., in the minds of some.

Fly Uses Licensing Power To Censor Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

FLY USES LICENSING POWER TO CENSOR RADIO

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—When Justice Frankfurter, often regarded as a liberal, wrote perhaps the most reactionary decision of the century on the subject of freedom of speech in putting radio speech under the control of Government bureaucrats, he probably reasoned that the fears of the critics would in practice prove groundless.

But, unfortunately, evidence has just been adduced showing that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, James L. Fly, is actually undertaking to dictate what the policies of a radio network shall be, and he is using the licensing power of the Commission to enforce his viewpoint.

On September 21 Edward J. Noble, who has just purchased the Blue Network, was ordered by the Chairman of the F. C. C., in a public proceeding, to state what his policy would be toward the sale of time on controversial issues. Not accepting the oral statement of Mr. Noble, the latter was asked by the Chairman to put his views in writing.

RESTRICTION ON FREE SPEECH

Mr. Fly declared at the hearing that the policy which Mr. Noble had under consideration was "a restriction on the mechanics of free speech" and asked for a written statement of the general attitude of Mr. Noble and "what the policy of the Blue Network is planned to be in terms of the expansion of the mechanics of free speech."

Mr. Fly has no power under law or under the first amendment to the Constitution to constitute himself a policeman on the mechanics of free speech. Congress never delegated such power to him, and even if Justice Frankfurter's opinion did say that Congress had a right to control the business of the networks, there is nothing in the statute or in the debates which preceded its passage to justify any inference of such intent by the legislative body.

Mr. Fly is, of course, criticizing the code of the National Association of Broadcasters, which is a self-regulatory set of principles adopted by the broadcasting stations themselves a few years ago, and the code does prohibit the sale of time to any organizations or groups for the purpose of discussing controversial issues.

It so happens that Mr. Fly is absolutely right in his criticism and he takes the same position which this correspondent took when the code was first promulgated. But the remedy for the unwise use of the radio is in the hands of the public and not in the Government, unless the laws of fraud or morality are being transgressed.

LAW FORBIDS RADIO CENSORSHIP

Mr. Fly has as much privilege as any other citizen to make speeches criticizing the broadcasters' code. But when he undertakes, as a part of an official proceeding, to determine whether a commercial sale of network property should be permitted to a new owner, what the general attitude of that owner is, and to indicate his disapproval of a given policy, he is in reality using the licensing power of F. C. C. to intimidate the broadcasting stations of America. He is in truth making himself the judge of what is or is not a proper policy on controversial issues, and this is not the function of any governmental agency, because censorship is expressly forbidden by the radio communications law.

Mr. Fly has stepped beyond the line of his legal authority and is subject to impeachment for his wrongful use of governmental powers. But the issue is impersonal and the Congress has the greater responsibility of passing an amendment to the existing statute forbidding the misuse of the licensing power to propagate the social or economic views of the present or any other administration. The F. C. C. should be confined to the regulation of the wave lengths from the standpoint of allocating physical facilities to given areas and to prevent collisions in the air as between mechanical facilities. It should neither be given nor usurp power to tell licensees what views they may or may not hold in order to get or hold a radio-station license.

Post-War Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass., of Monday, October 25, 1943:

POST-WAR MERCHANT MARINE

The United States will end this war in position, theoretically, to dominate the ocean shipping of the world. Our merchant marine will be perhaps twice as large as that of Great Britain, and will dwarf those of all other nations. But most of our enormous tonnage will be in Liberty ships.

Far be it from us to disparage the Liberty ship, which is enabling us to win the war. But any expert will tell you that Liberty ships cannot hold ocean cargo trade in competition with the craft that Great Britain and other maritime nations will start building as soon as they can catch their breath after peace returns.

For a few years our enormous tonnage of usable shipping will give us control over world trade. In the long run we shall have to work out an intelligent, belligerent shipping policy or we shall drift once more into the maritime background.

Much of the merchant fleet with which we shall compete for post-war business will have to be built after the war. How great a proportion will depend somewhat upon the extent to which it proves possible to shift from Liberty ships, our war mainstay, to Victory ships, which would be useful in war and competitively capable in peace.

Except as to what may remain of our pre-war fleet, and as to whatever craft with permanent competitive value we may find it feasible to build during the war, we and the British, at least, will start the race to rule the oceans on something like an even footing so far as tonnage is concerned.

In other ways, however, this country will be in a preferred position.

Even if new wartime yards, notably Henry Kaiser's, cannot or do not participate, we still shall possess, as a result of wartime expansion, both the physical facilities and the technical skill to build any kind of merchant fleet we shall need.

A Minnesota Republican Looks at Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

A MINNESOTA REPUBLICAN LOOKS AT WILLKIE

OCTOBER 18, 1943.

EDITOR, STAR JOURNAL,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: Those of us who agree with Mr. Willkie's declaration at St. Louis that "long continuance in power is hazardous to the perpetuation of free government," find it difficult to suppress a shudder at the prospect of again having to choose between him and that other showman whom he calls "the champ."

About the only apparent difference between them is that Mr. Roosevelt is a finished actor who ably recites lines written for him by professional playwrights and speech writers, while Mr. Willkie is a ham who writes his own. Both talk down to us from behind the shimmering clouds of high ideals that nearly everybody can endorse, but both leave us in the dark as to how these objectives are to be attained. The result has been to turn

over planning and formulas to crackpots and sociological experimenters. They have foisted upon us a number of things we did not bargain for—especially expenses. Are we now being asked to drive one comic opera troupe from Washington, only to replace it with another?

One would think from the fanfare of publicity following in the wake of Mr. Willkie's speech that it had been a triumph—that he had really answered the specific questions put to him by the Missourians with a set of specific, concrete proposals. That he had told us his plans by which international cooperation, peace, trade and stability, on one hand, and sound domestic economy and restoration of free enterprise on the other, were to be attained.

Unhappily, such was not the case, as all who heard him can testify. He gave us the same strings of long words—as quoted above—the same generalities, the usual catering to the farmer, the unions, and the small businessman. He appealed for international cooperation as though this country had not been trying to cooperate for 150 years. He did not suggest that other countries try a little cooperation. Which is Mr. Willkie's brand? The American people have a right to know, if he wants to go to Washington to live. If it isn't some kind of an alliance with England (which seems inevitable), what is it? We have had enough of improvising and quarterbacking—after election. All we've got out of that is a nice war.

He promises to extend the power of union labor. More than 75 percent of the American people have indicated they want some curb on that power.

He would widen social security, although he would put it on an actuarial basis. The actuarial basis will come in any case. But maybe we who have to pay for it don't want it widened. He might ask us. How does he propose to widen it—by taxing the same people more, or by taxing more people? If he aspires to the White House, he should tell us.

He proposed to cut down Government spending. That's what he also said in his campaign oratory in 1940. But he did not tell us then and he does not tell us now which of the hundreds of alphabetical bureaus he is going to cut down or cut out.

He gives us the old line about restoring free competition to the small fellow. Just how does he propose to do this? We have a right to know. Does he plan to dismantle the Ford plant and deliver a piece of it to every mechanic who has a yen for going into business? Would he cut up General Motors, General Electric, du Pont, American Bell Telephone, and the Equitable Life Assurance Society and pass the pieces around? Abundance for all is something we are all for, but we are getting just a little fed up with campaign oratory.

Why this boom for Willkie? He cannot win. By this time it should be apparent to the newspaper people who are sponsoring him that he has little except a flare for publicity and showmanship, backed by a burning desire to live in the White House. He polled his maximum vote in 1940. He lost because he exuded much froth but very little substance. In spite of his various devices for keeping in the limelight—his trip, his book, and hundreds of speeches, defense of Communists, etc.—he has not registered more than 41 percent of the vote in any Gallup poll, although the present Republican strength is shown to be 46 percent, including the solid South. Even Mr. Dewey, who isn't even running, consistently polls 45 percent and over.

Mr. Willkie definitely and forever shut the White House door in his own face when he confessed before the Senate committee that his 1940 declarations were just campaign oratory. Just when are we supposed to begin to believe that he is in earnest?

CLAUDE EFNOR.

Subsidies Endorsed by Dairymen's Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following letter, which is self-explanatory:

WESTERN COOPERATIVE DAIRYMEN'S UNION,
Fresno, Calif., October 25, 1943.

Congressman PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: The Western Cooperative Dairymen's Union, with its 2,500 members, and an organization which is strictly a cooperative selling to cooperative creameries, has adopted the following resolution:

"We do hereby resolve to support and stand back of the fight to prevent inflation by allowing funds from Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for providing cost of production to dairymen through subsidies when necessary."

We also thank you for your fight to retain the subsidy provision of the C. C. C. and support you in the anti-inflation stand.

Yours very truly,

WESTERN COOPERATIVE
DAIRYMEN'S UNION,
By FRANK CORREIA, *President.*

Farmer Friends and Friends of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Farmer Friends and Friends of the Farmer," written by A. G. Pace, of Monroe, La., who has worked for the betterment of agriculture. The article reads as follows:

FARMER FRIENDS AND FRIENDS OF THE FARMER

Would you like to see the farmers of Louisiana have another money crop? Sure you would.

Alright then, we can have it. Then you say, pray tell us how. It is very simple and easy when I tell you how.

First. I have said and have written several articles on it, that if we farmers ever made a success raising hogs and cattle that we had to have them handled faster, cheaper and better than in carload lots, and we have seen that very thing come to pass, thank God, in spite of all the high taxes and restrictions put on our motor transportation by our lawmakers to prevent them, thereby giving our Wall Street foreign-country and big-money-owned-and-operated railroads a monopoly on our freight hauling. The motor truck has made our livestock industry a howling success. Stop the motor trucks from hauling livestock and you kill the industry as dead as a hammer.

Second. Now, friend farmer and friends of farmers, we can have a bigger and better money crop in the spring of the year for our early vegetables and produce and will get more money for them than we are getting for our hogs and cattle if we can get these trade-barrier laws repealed that won't allow the trucks to come into Louisiana and buy this produce. And, too, we need this gas-tax money to help build and maintain good roads. Just because Arkansas does not want or need our trucks in their State to pay gas tax to help build and maintain good roads, should be no reason for us to refuse their money.

Now, in order to get this tax money and a market for our produce it is only necessary to vote against every candidate for State office who is not in favor of repealing this law, and to vote for every candidate who is in favor of it. We have tried and tried to make some money by shipping in carload lots and we came out at the little end of the horn every time.

Now, with these sale barns all over the State and with good men to handle our produce at a reasonable price, we can have sales at these centers every day in the week instead of half day. So you see we farmers would be getting lots of money for our thousands of dollars worth of early vegetables that go to waste every year.

Senator O'DANIEL put a stop to that kind of foolishness when he was Governor of Texas, and today the farmer is enjoying having two money crops instead of only one, and, too, they have one of the best road systems in the United States of America, and a much lower gas tax than we have, and believe it or not, thousands of our Louisiana dollars are going to these Texas farmers for their produce every day.

Then why should we put up with this kind of foolishness, and if Arkansas won't let our trucks come in their State, we won't let theirs come in ours? That looks sort of like a smoke screen to give that big shot a monopoly on our freight hauling.

And again I say, if we ever make any money raising produce, we must have it hauled farther, cheaper, and better than in carload lots.

Now, just look at the hundreds of small towns and country stores that trucks could sell, that are passed up in carloads from here to Chicago and St. Louis.

Then, if you favor having this money crop, vote against every candidate who talks like or looks like he is not in favor of us farmers getting this money crop.

Then, too, we will have thousands of good trucks at the end of the war to do the job and to give every one of our boys a good job if—If our lawmakers will allow them to haul our freight instead of giving it to the big shots on Wall Street.

A. G. PACE,
Monroe, La.

Resolution for Post-War Collaboration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again the unfortunate specter of narrow nationalism masquerading under the false title of "Progressivism" has raised its ugly head in Wisconsin.

I introduce for the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of October 19, 1943. This editorial, with which I wholeheartedly agree takes to task an article appearing in the newspaper Progressive with which I thoroughly disagree.

The greatest crime in history will be perpetrated upon a freedom-loving people if the men of our Nation die to win a war in which the peace is lost.

Like the people of the other 47 States, the people of Wisconsin insist that when the war is won every effort be exerted that it does not happen again. The Wisconsin Sergeant Gruennerts who died at Buna Gona, and the many other fronts in this war, did not sacrifice their lives so that a generation hence, the whole sorry business will have to be done all over again.

Our ultimate victory will be for naught if under the spell of selfish patriotic slogans we succumb to isolationism, nationalism, call it what you will. This false philosophy cannot remain unanswered, lest silence in its face imply its acceptance. The same voices which in 1918 lost the peace, are at it again—talking the same language. We must not make again the same mistake of following their misguided leadership.

As a citizen and Representative of the great State of Wisconsin, I feel it my duty to state the judgment of the Wisconsin people as I see it, and to bring before the House the dangers which even now are stirring in the fight to have us win the war—and then lose the peace. This is a global war and its victory to be worthy of the sacrifice must bring global peace.

LA FOLLETTE'S HOPELESS PLAN

Senator LA FOLLETTE was ill at Madison when the Senate subcommittee approved a resolution promising international cooperation for peace. His vote, by proxy, was the only one against the resolution which seven committee members supported.

Now Mr. LA FOLLETTE has approved an article by Morris H. Rubin in the La Follette family publication which states the Senator's views. The article must come as a shock to those who have believed the La Follette movement liberal. It must come as a blow to every father and mother, to every American, who believes that the ending of this war should bring collaboration with other nations to preserve the peace.

Negation and Hopelessness are the keynote of the La Follette position. The Rubin article warns Progressives not to "become addicts of these phony peace cures." But it has no remedy for war. It conjures up bogey after bogey:

"Shall America, child of revolutionary democracy, spill the blood of her men to keep India under the British yoke?" "Will Americans consent to stand guard over a new partition of Poland?" "Will Americans be asked to shed their blood to preserve unpopular and reactionary monarchies?"

So the tirade continues for columns. That Americans have shed their blood and are shedding their blood that freedom may be defended and restored is entirely ignored by the author of this article, as it seems to be ignored by the man whose views the article sets forth.

After the World War neither the La Follettes nor the other isolationists had any plan to restrain future wars. We turned away from what hope there was, and presently we were fighting again—not to set up tyrannies and defend slaveries, but to defend our own America.

"We must resist every effort to make the peace treaty a vehicle for the restoration of dynasties." This sounds good, and it is in fact exactly what the real liberals, the real workers for peace whom Senator LA FOLLETTE attacks, have in mind.

"We must work affirmatively for world cooperation, if there can be world agreement on peace terms consistent with our principles." The "if" is the important word. How "affirmative" is it to spend paragraph after paragraph attacking and inviting distrust of nations which fight by our side?

Finally, comes the impossible barrier to any world cooperation: "We must put our own economic house in order and make our own democracy a model for all mankind before embarking on any global assignment to reform the rest of the world." That is, we must achieve the millennium before we can work for any improvement abroad. What a vicious absurdity! It is the old cry of the reactionary. It is the cry the elder La Follette had to face when 40 years ago he demanded domestic reforms.

Why should Wisconsin be cursed with this effort to put it into the ranks of reaction and isolation? The people of this State contribute their share of money and lives when war comes. But they have to hear that it is hopeless to work with other nations, whose blood has been shed more than our own, to prevent war.

This negation, this hopelessness, is bottled up and labeled "progressivism" by the heir of a movement that once was progressive. As though it ever could be progressive to stand up and argue that we must take the wars when they come because we must not try to collaborate for peace until perfection has been attained and collaboration is not needed!

Col. Walter J. DeLong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, we are giving much credit to the miracle men of production. I think it time to give both credit and appreciation to some of the miracle men of administration, and I am therefore pleased, under leave to extend my remarks, to have reprinted in the RECORD a story from the Northwest Farm News which is a factual tribute to our director of selective service for the State of Washington, Col. Walter J. DeLong.

Colonel DeLong had the tremendous task of handling the selective-service work in a State with perhaps the most trying manpower situation in the entire Nation. He has not only handled his work there in such a way as to invoke the good will of all concerned within the State, keeping production up and Washington's portion of the military effort at top strength, but he has also contributed much to the solution of the selective service problems of the entire Nation.

It is the work of such men as Colonel DeLong that make the tributes we are paying to the miracle men of production possible.

DELONG WIDELY ACCLAIMED FOR VIGOROUS STAND TO PUSH FARM PRODUCTION—WASHINGTON STATE SELECTIVE SERVICE CHIEF CREDITED WITH OUTSTANDING JOB IN WORKING OUT SATISFACTORY ALLOCATION OF MEN TO VITAL WAR INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, ARMED FORCES—PLACES FOOD FIRST

That the State of Washington's director of selective service, of all the Nation's 48 State draft administrators, has had the toughest and most critical job guiding the division of an always insufficient supply of manpower, and that he has met a staggering situation of continuous emergencies since Pearl Harbor with clear vision, great wisdom, and timely action is a considered view that comes from many informed quarters, as well as from within the selective service itself.

From the 7th of December 1941, this State, with its large area but not large population, became suddenly a highly diversified war-production district, a military and airplane training ground, an intensive food-production field from one border of its 350 by 300 miles to the other.

Flying-fortress factories; great naval shipyards; huge aluminum plants to use the Nation's biggest power development; gigantic logging, lumber mill, and plywood operations; the world's largest salmon fisheries; a wide-spreading, diversified agriculture, all called for men and men and more men. And, meanwhile, the State's full quota of the Nation's biggest military force of all time had to be raised.

ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN NEEDS

Simple, of course, for the State's 76 draft boards to draw its military quotas, month by month, from the man supply in its 1,750,000 population. But not easy to draw those quotas by mere rule of book without stopping or seriously hampering the war work which was ever expanding, with ever-increasing demands for labor and skills of every kind. Essential civilian needs, increasing by a constant influx of newcomers, could not be disregarded without curbing the war effort.

In a country burdened with farm surpluses it was inevitable that special attention to food production would be the last thought of in national plans.

But not so in the State director's unelaborate office at Camp Murray in the State of Washington. With all other calls for deferment of men for industries to support the war, Colonel DeLong, with remarkable understanding, was quick to remember the farms where food must continue to be produced and production ought to be greatly increased. Quick, too, this man, to take all action he had power to take to check the heavy drain from the farms which was occurring.

Farm boys rushed to enlist after Pearl Harbor. Farm boys and men had been among the first to man defense plants and projects which have scarcely yet ceased building. Farm boys were in demand; they knew machinery. And, meanwhile, the farms were being drawn on by the draft boards the same as any other civilian source.

CHAMPIONED FARM LABOR

The various steps which Colonel DeLong took in continuous succession to avert a total manpower disaster on the farms in his State have been reported in this paper during the past 2 years. Again and again he went the rounds of the 76 local boards, going over the situation with them, calling to their attention the manpower picture as he saw it whole. He appealed for national recognition of the farm labor situation.

In plain language of the street and roadside, he explained broadening regulations, he persuaded at first hand, sent out letters and bulletins with recommendations, urged

fullest consideration of farm appeals to keep needed men so essential production could be maintained.

The raising of armies would be futile, he declared over and over, if the industries to supply and maintain them were thereby deprived of manpower. Food production he put at the head of the list of industry to support the war and assure final victory.

Colonel DeLong evidently sees much in the same vein with his chief at national headquarters, General Hershey, judging from items quoting the National Selective Service head in the press. Statements by DeLong, whether public or private, bearing on selective-service administration, have borne a striking parallel on many occasions, especially relating to consideration for the difficult situation of farmers.

A tireless worker, Colonel DeLong is up early, up late, the first down to breakfast, the last to quit at night, say assistants on his staff. On visits to draft board offices, he often gets there before the door is unlocked in the morning.

HAS HAD NO VACATION

No one on his staff, including himself, has had a vacation or regular leave since he took his present post in May 1941. "The men on the firing line have to give all there is in them," the colonel likes to point out. "The best we at home can do is the same," he declares with the earnest, outspoken sincerity that has won him loyalty all down the line.

Very simple in his wants and desires, Colonel DeLong believes the war places on everybody the duty to dispense with every unnecessary thing and put the war effort above all else. In keeping with this belief, he has his home close to his State headquarters at Camp Murray, 3 miles north of Fort Lewis. Here he is devoted to two children and a charming wife, rich in rural background of which he is very proud. One son, about 19, is in officer's training at West Point.

Colonel DeLong is self-made, says he was "knocked out" of the last half of his schooling by World War No. 1 when he was 2 years overseas. Later he finished growing up in the National Guard, becoming lieutenant colonel of infantry, always highly popular with other officers and men. "No lead in his pants," they said of him.

SAVED STATE MUCH MONEY

An insistent economizer, DeLong turned back to the State treasury a tidy saving of $168,946.33 as head of the Washington State National Guard. The biennial appropriation was $482,300. To have any considerable sum unexpended was beyond the memory of National Guard men who could think back over a good many years.

One of his first acts after his National Guard appointment by Gov. Arthur B. Langlie was to dispense with seven guardeners. "Even phone calls," it is said, "he thinks about twice."

For most of his decisions, DeLong relies largely on good common sense. "Just use common horse sense," is one of his stock admonitions. A philosopher natural born, he reduces all problems to terms of common understanding.

Subordinates say of him: "He has the energy of a man in his early thirties, with the wisdom of a man in his sixties after years of experience in administrative affairs." One of the most direct of men, he doesn't beat around the bush. But generous in spirit, he is one of the most modest; he blushes when paid a compliment.

CALM, FIRM IN CRISIS

In a crisis DeLong is sincerely earnest, becomes unflinchingly firm. When new regulations were introduced sometime ago dealing with occupational deferments, many draft board members opposed the change, some boards talked of resigning in a body. At one meeting, with 115 local board members and an aide from General Hershey's staff present the atmosphere was tense as DeLong carefully explained the purpose and necessity of the new ruling.

It appeared that wholesale resignations were coming as one chairman in heated tones declared his board would have to quit if the regulation was not suspended.

With great earnestness, DeLong grasped the psychological moment to say with regret but with utter firmness: "Well men, in that case, I shall have to accept your resignations." No one resigned.

DeLong is cooperative but has shown no lack of self-reliance. He has daring with great wisdom and foresight. On an occasion when a large number of men about to be inducted from the Boeing plant at Seattle would have checked the output of Flying Fortresses, he ordered postponement of the inductions, notwithstanding that they were needed to fill the Army quota, going beyond his real authority to do so. He was not, however, court martialed. His act was later fully approved by General Hershey.

ASKED FARMER COUNSEL

At another time when the labor drain from the farms was at a desperate point and local draft boards seemed unable to find any yardstick to use in deciding a man's necessity to food production, DeLong called in a representative group of farmers and with their help worked out a guide or yardstick of his own. This gave the number of cows, chickens, acres, etc., which would justify the the rating of a man as a necessary worker in farm production.

This was in October 1942, well in advance of the now well-known farm deferment guide sent to local draft boards from National Selective Service headquarters in January 1943. Farm representatives from this State who were at the National Capital at the time were of the belief that the preliminary Washington State deferment yardstick of DeLong's had something to do with the national guide that followed.

It was known, however, in October that some means to determine whether a farm worker was entitled to deferment was being planned at Washington, D. C. DeLong, nevertheless, recognizing the emergency in his State, didn't wait.

TOOK LEAD IN NEW POLICY

In like manner, Colonel DeLong was in the forefront of the changing policy toward farm deferments which gradually issued from National Selective Service headquarters. He early announced: "We can expect little help from outside the State in the solution of our agricultural manpower problems." His recommendations are believed to have been instrumental in the gradually broadening succession of national headquarters' regulations which finally ended in what was called a virtual blanket deferment for necessary agricultural workers.

As early as the winter of 1942, Colonel DeLong issued a memorandum to local draft boards, calling attention to the shortage of labor for that year's farm operations. In July he met with farm leaders of the State and joined in attempts to bring the situation to the attention of national officials. "The farmer is as willing as the good old farm horse," he declared in one statement. "But," he added, "we must beware not to work a willing horse to death."

Wheat and apples did not appear in regulations defining essential food production justifying deferments in 1942. Yet, Colonel DeLong referred often to the Bible story of Joseph and the Seven Lean Years in Egypt, and gave the same consideration to the producer of grain notwithstanding the Department of Agriculture policy still in effect of restricting wheat acreage. Very seriously he said when "Washington caught up" with him about wheat as the war needs developed, he felt sure no one would criticize him if the bins were full in his State while in others they were low. Apples, he said, would also be needed, and he gave the same consideration to the apple growers.

Yet withal, the State of Washington is not behind in its contribution to the armed forces. Enlistments and inductions total up to a most creditable showing. While not at the top, this State, despite huge drains for war production, one of the most heavily called upon of all States, is well toward the top in proportion of men furnished the armed forces out of its population, being thirteenth in its percentage of manpower in uniform, according to last figures available.

Aviation Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution unanimously adopted by the Mississippi Valley Association—the midcontinent association of industrial, commercial, and agricultural interests—at its 1943 annual meeting:

We favor the full economic development of air lines in the United States, including feeder lines and intensification of trunk-line services. We recognize as a fact that aviation will play a vital part in foreign trade. Our country must necessarily permit, encourage, and support competition in foreign air services on the part of American nationals. This association believes that statutes and regulations impeding ability of Americans to compete equally in foreign trade and travel should be repealed or amended. American services must develop and expand in serving such foreign commerce by air.

It Is Time To Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Julian M. Drachman, which was published in the September issue of Opinion:

IT IS TIME TO SPEAK

(By Julian M. Drachman)

America, will you be silent still
And watch that martyred people climb the hill
Of skulls, beaten and prodded, one by one,
Up to the cross—their doom—against the sun
Blood-red with coming night? Will you not speak
In your true voice and raise your powerful fist

To smite the fiend who kills the old, the weak,
The humble, and the broken? . . . Rend that mist,
That thick, foul fog of prejudice and doubt.
Of double-dealing and uncertainty . . .
(. . . ". . well, yes, there may be something, after all . . ."
". . . besides, they're strangers . . " . . " . . . and you know, some say . ."
". . . I can't be bothered . . " . . " . . what a time to call! . ."
". . . Too bad! Too bad! It shouldn't be that way—")
Tear through that cloud; let in the light of day
And see this:—men are dying, men like me
And you, women and children, just like yours
Or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours,
Butchered with every beastliness that man
With devil-taught science can invent, that pours poison upon the innocent, that makes
An art, a skill, an epicurean relish
Of blood and cruelty, that would embellish
Itself with tiger's claws and fangs of snakes.

And you stand by, my country, quietly
Going your sensible, indifferent way,
Preparing rations, talking of victory
For the year after next or after that
When our vast future force at last gets going—
At last: that means forever and a day
Too late—too late; our brothers' blood is flowing,
Ebbing away. Rise now. Strike now, and save,
With your great power, this people from the grave.

America, you were not always so,
So unconcerned, so deaf. Remember Spain
And how the wrongs of Cuba fired your brain
To action? Oh, remember Belgium?
Remember Tripoli? And once again
Be what you know you are. Say not, like Cain,
"Am I my brother's keeper?" Let the doom
Of your determined justice thunder across
The highways of the sea, so that the foe—
Your foe and Israel's, man's enemy—
Baffled and stopped and suddenly at a loss,
Snarling, but foiled, will drop his mangled prey
From frothing jaws, to creep somehow away
To live, perhaps, and reach a happier day.

Send forth those ringing accents that men know,
That vile men dread and that inspire the just;
Command the beast to let his victim go
So powerfully that he will know he must.
Oh, be your true self—you that freed the slave,
That rescued France, the generous self that gave
Unto the world its faith in common man.
Save or we die; you must—you will—you can!

Streamlined Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, with the ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayers and the prospects of additional taxes, it is imperative that we take immediate cognizance of leaks, inefficiency, extravagance, and waste that prevails throughout many departments of Government.

We are engaged in a global war, fighting on 35 fronts. Our boys and girls are in all parts of the world. They must and shall have the very best it is possible to obtain for them to efficiently and expeditiously bring an overwhelming victory, with the least possible loss of life and suffering. To that end we are willing that everything we possess shall be freely given but to freely give we must bear the brunt of certain sacrifices of essentials on the home front. This inevitably means we must eliminate waste, extravagance, and inefficiency, and must coordinate every resource we possess to the end that it shall be furnished our armed forces.

We have not yet seriously felt the impact of the war. Life has been pretty near normal for the average American. Were it not for the bungling and inefficiency in the handling of our resources the average American citizen would be living a normal life almost free from any effect of the war. We will feel the effects of this war. Except for those who have had their loved ones taken, most Americans have not yet felt any serious consequences of the most tragic conflict the world has ever witnessed.

It is definitely ascertainable that we can cut at least 300,000 employees from the Federal pay roll without in any manner whatsoever impairing any of the essential governmental functions. It is now time to do this very thing—not tomorrow or next year—immediately, must we set to work to accomplish this. Now is the time to give immediate constructive study to the elimination of those bureaus and commissions and to the consolidation of essential bureaus that overlap with other bureaus performing like functions of government.

Many departments and bureaus of government are overstaffed. With more than 3,000,000 persons upon the Federal civil pay rolls, it is certainly reasonable to assume that we can have an all-over cut of at least 10 percent—possibly even 20 percent. This is no time to be playing politics with the fate of America. On the contrary, it is the time to test patriotism and willingness to give rather than to get. Our country with all that it stands for is undergoing a crucial test—undoubtedly the most serious in its entire history. To be unconscious of this and to fail to contribute every possible iota of support to the Government in that it shall be strong and solvent is a manifestation of lack of patriotism.

We certainly have the best form of government that was ever devised by the mind of man. Innumerable tributes by statesmen and scholars from all parts of the world evidence this. Our economic system, while not perfect, has resulted in a comparative short period of time in the building of a strong and prosperous Nation. Certainly this is the best evidence of what we possess. Millions of boys and girls, with enthusiasm and courage, are willing to endure indescribable hardships and give their lives, that these shall be preserved. What are we actually giving or what hardships are we enduring?

It is certainly not asking too much that every American who is worthy of that name lay aside petty politics, the clamor for power, and insatiable greed, and resolve to give of everything that he or she possesses in aid of this. Nothing less than this contribution will do, and while this resolve must be made by all worthy citizens, there is an equally high and sacred duty upon the leaders—the executive and legislative departments of Government—to use their best intelligence and ability to streamline our Government, to effect immediate and drastic economies, to require greater effort and efficiency, to recognize that every dollar spent by every Government employee and every dollar received by such employee for services, comes from the toil of the masses of hard working, patriotic, and conscientious citizens.

The time is passed when we can talk about the number of hours that we devote to work or the number of dollars that we receive in return. There is something involved far above either of these elementary considerations. It is the love of God and love of human being, a society of men and women, children of all races, creeds, and political faiths, who shall firmly resolve that we shall emerge from our present conflict unified in thought, word, and action, and that our Government shall be fairly and economically administered, and that opportunity for the citizen shall not be impaired; that he and she shall enjoy everything guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, and likewise shall have opportunity to achieve individual independence and economic stability.

Draft Board Quits Because of Government Deferments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an Associated Press report from Fredericksburg, Va., dated October 27, 1943. Before doing so I desire to make certain comments and observations. Following closely on the heels of the President's letter, read in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, October 26, denouncing as groundless and irresponsible reports that the Federal Government was a haven for draft dodgers, all three members of the Fredericksburg, Va., selective-service board sent in their resignations protesting "the allowance of preposterous claims made by Government agencies for the deferment of men has been, and is, just more than the board is able to swallow." I do not know any members of this board, but

I doubt if any of them are Republicans or are in any way motivated by political or partisan reasons.

It is my conviction that the 84,000 official deferments that have been granted at the request of Government departments or agencies are 84,000 too many. Practically none of these positions are essential and almost all could be filled by older men, veterans of World War No. 1, women or disabled men. In addition, there have been 30,000 other deferments granted to Federal officeholders upon their own insistence. There are 3,000,000 Federal employees, and every single and married man without children, of draft age, holding a safe Federal job, should be screened or reclassified. If this were done—and it should be—at least 200,000 eligibles would be made available for our armed forces. I do not believe in any deferments for Government employees while families back home in my district and others are called upon to give 2 or 3 of their sons to our armed forces. From top to bottom, from the highest to the lowest paying jobs, let us insist that all single and married men without children—many with wives also on the Federal pay roll—be driven out of safe Government foxholes and dugouts into Army and Navy uniforms. I hope the criticism in Congress has expedited action to accomplish this result. I wonder who is right—the Fredericksburg draft board or President Roosevelt?

The following are two Associated Press reports and speak for themselves:

FREDERICKSBURG, VA., October 27.—All three members of the Fredericksburg Selective Service Board have tendered their resignations to Governor Darden in a letter stating that "the allowance of the preposterous claims made by Government agencies for the deferment of men has been and is just more than this board is able to swallow."

The board, consisting of Cecil L. Reid, chairman; D. William Scott, and William W. Jackson, asked that the resignations be effective at 5:15 p. m., November 6, or earlier.

The letter of resignation was mailed Monday, but no acknowledgment had been received at the board's office today.

AGENCIES CRITICIZED

The board criticized the attitude of Government-operated agencies in relation to the draft, saying that "they accept men for employment whose induction is imminent and when they know, or should know, that they have already been classified in I-A or after they have been examined and are ready for that classification. This program is protecting childless men who are without dependents in fact."

The board cites the case of one such man employed by a Government agency in which the local board refused to grant extended deferment, but was overruled by State headquarters.

This is declared by the board to be "unfair to the other registrants and hastens the time when pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will have to be called after adequate provision is made for the maintenance of their families and this board feels that it is their duty to protect the registrants from unfair treatment just as it is their duty to see that the Government receives the men as needed and that it also is properly protected."

YOUNGER MEN SOUGHT

The board said it "has in its files information that one of the offending governmental agencies has asked men over 45 years of age who had more than 15 years' experience in their line of work to resign so that younger men could replace them and the younger men be deferred.

"Under these conditions," said the board, "we feel that we can no longer be of service to our Government in our present positions."

STATE BOARD BLAMES NATIONAL POLICIES

RICHMOND, VA., October 27.—Col. Mills F. Neal, State director of selective service, said today the criticism offered by members of the Fredericksburg Selective Service Board in tendering their resignations was, in effect, a criticism of national policies.

The three objected to deferments allowed under the replacement plan, Colonel Neal said. There has been no differences between the board and Governor Darden or between the board and State headquarters, he added.

"Both the Governor and the State headquarters," he said, "would regret to lose their services. The board is an outstanding board and we are writing the members to reconsider their action."

The Governor was out of the city today.

No Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include an excerpt from a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Valley Association at the annual meeting in St. Louis.

The excerpt follows:

We note, at this time, a resurgence of agitation for amendments to the Panama Canal Act and other statutes to permit railroads to operate all competing forms of transportation, including bus and truck lines, water transportation and air lines. We regard such an agitation as inviting a domestic monopoly of transportation inimical to the public interest.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

IMMIGRATION

One of the resolutions adopted by the American Legion convention last month expresses, perhaps unconsciously, the very essence of isolationism. This resolution urges that "All immigration be barred from the United States from the date of the end of hostilities of the present war until unemployment has dropped to less than 1,000,000." In the course of the House debate on repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, Representative ALLEN of Louisiana offered an amendment embodying the Legion proposal almost verbatim. The effect of his amendment would have been to put China on a parity with other nations by making exclusion universal. Happily it was ruled out of order. It remains sublimely ironic, however, that Mr. ALLEN chose to tack on to this particular piece of legislation a proviso designed to erect a Chinese wall around the United States—a wall of the very sort which for centuries was intended to keep out the Tartars.

This idea of barring all immigration runs directly counter to the contemporary currents sweeping America into larger participation in world affairs. We have long been a potent factor in international economics and are now readying ourselves for a prime part in the world's politics. We have been proclaiming loudly that we mean to have a dominant position after the war in the skyways and the maritime trade routes of the earth. We are talking already of post-war markets and sources of raw materials. We are looking forward to a vast program of reconstruction both at home and, with assistance from us, in the countries ravaged by the war. In the face of all this ebullient progressivism, it is essentially ludicrous to think of locking our gates against foreign ideas, skills, and energies.

The American Legion resolution is based on a profound economic misconception. Its aim, as Representative ALLEN phrased it, is to "protect the American worker and the American veteran from the influx of aliens" and to guarantee that "American jobs after the war will go to American workers." But immigrants do not merely take jobs; they also create them. They are consumers as well as workers. Like natives, they spend as well as earn. And what they spend goes into the pockets of other workers to be spent in turn and to invite more production. It is a fallacy to suppose that we can enhance prosperity or diminish unemployment by limiting the number of workers available for jobs. The contrary is the case. The greater the number of consumers, the greater is the incentive to produce.

The American Legion approach is essentially defeatist. It assumes a stagnant economy and a contracting market. If we were to follow its implications to their logical end, we should not only ban immigration but also prohibit procreation. For if an expanding population means unemployment, then obviously the younger generation must be a handicap. But what nation has ever prospered through a declining birth rate? A people grows in strength and rises in its standard of living as it grows in numbers.

We shall have enough to do in America when this war is ended, if we have the wit to do it, to provide endless work for many more hands than we possess. Even now, the greatest impediment to our war effort is a manpower shortage. After the war, we shall have a tremendous pent-up consumer demand to satisfy. We shall have to produce food and industrial commodities for those far-flung foreign markets we hope to supply. And we shall have an immense job of building and rebuilding to do at home—roads and schools and hospitals and houses and airports and a thousand other developments to enrich and improve our national life. We shall need fresh blood to carry forward all this work. We shall need the kind of energy which for three centuries has brought a stream of immigrants from the Old World to the New—immigrants seeking freedom and opportunity. They have made America. We can use more like them.

Our Sugar Producers Should Have a Larger Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend and amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

In 1937 the Congress passed what is known as the Sugar Act of 1937, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; to raise revenue, and for other purposes. Provisions of the 1937 act, as amended, will expire December 31, 1944.

The present sugar act provides a method of determining the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers and for allotting 55.59 percent of our consumptive requirements to domestic producing areas and 44.41 percent to foreign countries. The foreign country allotment is subdivided with 15.41 percent of our total requirement going to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, 28.60 percent to Cuba, and 0.40 percent to other foreign countries. The Philippines are being guaranteed their quota until they become independent on July 4, 1946, as provided in the Philippines Independence Act. I desire to point out that the total domestic and Philippines allotment is 71 percent of our requirement.

In the subdivision of our domestic quota 23.19 percent goes to domestic beet growers, and 6.29 percent to mainland cane growers; thus our mainland cane and beet growers are only guaranteed the right to produce 29.48 percent of our consumptive requirements, and this is the reason why our farmers and growers on the mainland have not built up a strong domestic industry; it is the reason why we were obliged to ration sugar when submarine warfare interrupted the flow of sugar from offshore islands and foreign countries.

We are beginning to do post-war planning and one of the first things we should do is take the necessary steps to assure ourselves that we will never again become dependent for an essential food that can be successfully produced on the mainland. Our soil is just as productive as land in foreign countries, and it requires no more man-hours to produce sugar on the mainland than it does elsewhere; therefore the question of where we obtain our sugar resolves itself into whether we will grow one of our most essential foods with well-paid American labor or whether to save a few dollars we will produce our sugar in lands paying low wages to labor.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the position that we must immediately begin producing all the sugar we consume, but I am proposing that we raise our mainland quota to 37.65 percent and our total domestic quota to 71 percent of our requirements. I propose to make these increases possible by transferring the Philippines quota to domestic areas. I am chiefly concerned in seeing that we are never again caught without a strong domestic sugar industry with sufficient farm equipment, factory capacity, and other facilities needed to meet our minimum requirements in an emergency.

To build a strong domestic sugar industry we must plan in advance and for a term of years. It is not feasible for a grower to make changes in his farming schedules, purchase farming equipment needed to grow cane and beets, or for processors to construct the necessary plant facilities to manufacture sugar other than on a term basis.

Provisions of our present Sugar Act will expire December 31, 1944, and this makes it desirable for Congress to consider legislation at this time to assure cane and beet growers that they may continue to produce the quotas established by the 1937 act and also plan to increase their production beginning with 1946 through to 1950.

Let us fill a little larger share of our American sugar marked with a product grown and manufactured with well-paid American labor. To be a good neighbor should not make it necessary for a man to tear down his own house, or plan to live by eating food produced by low-priced labor. Let us plan that when the next emergency overtakes us, we will be able to supply our needs for essential food.

Food Production and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Mrs. R. M. Kiefer, secretary-manager, National Association of Retail Grocers, at the National Food Conference, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1943:

Many other speakers who have appeared before you are much better informed and much more able to present the actual food supply picture than I could possibly be. However, we have learned much of the wartime problems of production and distribution. They are of particular importance to the grocers of the Nation, and it is of them, and what the grocers believe to be their solution, that I wish to talk today.

The slogan "Food will win the war" is a good one, but under current conditions, it might be more correct to say that "more food will win the war." As in the case of ammunition, food must be produced in sufficient quantities and efficiently distributed to points of need and use, in order to fulfill its purpose. We must have a "Maximum production policy" on food, just as we have a similar maximum production policy on machines of war.

Insofar as food is concerned, we must never lose sight of the fact that we are producing food for consumption now in quantities undreamed of in peacetime. That production must supply the boys in the armed services, first, and their supply must be most generous. Secondly, there must be available supplies for civilian needs so that home front production facilities can be maintained, and so that home front morale may be kept at a high level. Third, we must produce for many millions of other people throughout the world, if food is to be used to "write the peace." War Food Administrator Jones has recently stated that we must send food to our boys and our Allies on 60 fronts, and to the conquered countries, which gives at least a sketchy picture of the tremendous supplies of basic, healthful food necessary during the months, and possibly years ahead.

Therefore, we have a major basic objective which must at all times be in the forefront of our planning. It is to encourage maximum production. There then follows necessity for the orderly distribution through legitimate trade channels of the available food supplies for civilians at reasonable prices, the elimination of black markets, the preservation of existing distribution machinery, the control of inflation, and the rationing of scarce but essential food.

Not so long ago the National Association of Retail Grocers, the Food Industry Advisory Committee to the Office of Price Administration, and the Food Industry War Committee proposed a program to realize all of those objectives. That program included the following point:

1. Establishment of basic prices at processor levels on necessity foods in such relationship as to encourage adequate production and distribution for the needed amount of food of each kind. Common sense tells us that workers in every branch of the food industry must receive reasonable compensation, and certain it is that in the production, processing, and distribution of food products, no essential operation should be denied an opportunity to make a fair and reasonable compensating profit. I might say here that the food industry does not dispute the necessity for Government price control on essential commodities, as an emergency war measure for the sole purpose of preventing the development of inflationary spirals in the cost of living. The food industry can assist Government in this inflation control program, but it cannot do so as long as it is squeezed between a rising floor and a stationary ceiling, and so long as the Government's attitude toward the industry is one of suspicion and distrust.

It should be emphasized here that the rank and file of the food industry—all the way from production through distribution—wants to put brakes on runaway inflation, to destroy all incentive for black-market operations, make rationing work, preserve orderly processes in our domestic economy, combat fear and hysteria, hold public morale at a high level—but its ability to do these things depends upon reasonable freedom of operation and its ability to stay in business, free from forced pressure to radically change established methods of operation.

At the moment some in the audience may conclude that the food industry is merely selfish in its request for "reasonable freedom of operation," or "reasonable compensating profit," or "desire to stay in business." Well, let me ask any of you who feel this way what you personally would do to maintain the health and well-being of your family if it were not for the producing farmers, the

processors and manufacturers of foods and food commodities, the wholesalers, brokers, and retailers of food supplies? If your family were not able to secure its needed food supplies all gathered together in one retail establishment, would that family be able to continue to make its maximum contribution to the war effort? Basically and pointedly and down to the "meat and potatoes" language we understand, of what value is the beef steer running around on the range a thousand miles away, or the potatoes, the tomatoes, the corn, or the wheat, hundreds of miles away, without the processors, wholesalers, and distributors to bring it to you in edible form?

2. Establish margins for distributors—or maximum ceiling prices—for cost-of-living commodities only, at a level which will enable efficient distributors of all types to remain in business. If maximum ceiling prices are to be established on cost-of-living commodities, then only one maximum is necessary and the enforcement problem as well as the consumers' and retailers' compliance problem would be simplified if consumers were told by O. P. A. that in no type of store should they pay more than the advertised maximum price. The cost of doing business which must be considered in establishing either margins or maximum advertised prices is not related to ownership, and is only partly related to volume, despite the fact that all present O. P. A. regulations affecting retail distributors establish margin and price control on basis of volume of business in retail establishments. For example, it matters not whether the store renders credit and delivery service, if that store is in the same volume classification with a strictly cash-and-carry warehouse market, both stores are permitted only the same margin or the same maximum price. Price control should be limited to cost-of-living commodities or the major items of diet. Of what difference is it to the average American whether spiced and pickled fruits, mushrooms, artichoke hearts, and similar luxury items are covered by price-ceiling regulations?

3. Restrict regulations to conform to the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the intent of Congress. At the present time, many O. P. A. regulations affecting the food industry are at variance with that provision of the act which prohibits the application of price controls so as to compel changes in established business practices. Another provision of the act which seems to be ignored is the requirement which contemplates that O. P. A. shall, whenever practicable, consult with representatives of industry in the preparation of regulations.

4. Adjustment of enforcement methods to abolish the one-man courts, discontinuance of public propaganda branding all retailers as unpatriotic and seeking to overcharge the public and discontinuance of snooping methods and playing on sympathy of retailers: We refer here to the consistent public propaganda that consumers should carefully watch their retailers, with the implication at least that all of them are seeking to overcharge the public. One-man courts in certain sections of the country do not permit of actual presentation of retailer's case, nor is retailer required to be confronted by accuser. Practice of certain one-man courts of instructing retailers to post signs branding them as a violator is decidedly un-American. Snooping methods of checking baskets or packages of consumers leaving retail stores, along with the practice of checkers or snoopers playing upon the sympathy of retailers by asking, then begging, and then pleading for commodities wthout ration stamp or offering to pay more than ceiling price is another unethical practice which should be discontinued.

5. Elimination of black markets: The activities of black markets in certain areas and on some commodities reminds one of the old bootlegging days. For legitimate retailers to secure certain meats and fresh fruits and vegetables is a physical impossibility without the use of the old "$20 bill and bottle of whisky" method. As commodities become in short supply—for example, recent situations in butter—all sorts of bribes, promises, and threats must must be resorted to if the legitimate outlet is to have its supplies available for consumers who have ration stamps with which to purchase the commodity. The Office of Price Administration has guaranteed through price ceilings that consumers will not have to pay higher than published ceiling prices in legitimate channels. It has issued to consumers ration stamps for certain commodities. Unfortunately, however, O. P. A. has failed to assure that those commodities shall be available in the legitimate channels with the result that consumers find it necessary either to patronize black markets or seek other methods of supplying their needs. And these black market operations have grown to tremendous proportion, as, for example, 15 operators in the meat black market who were fined $500 each, left the courtroom bragging about the fact that they had made over $300,000 in 3 months, and went cheerfully on their way to continue their black market operations as usual. Black markets in poultry became a public scandal a short while ago when the Army had to actually highjack the poultry trucks on the highways in the eastern territory, take the poultry off, pay the trucker the ceiling price, and take the poultry back to the Army camps so that the boys could have their usual Sunday dinner.

6. Simplification of rationing: Rationing, as originally announced by O. P. A., was supposed to cover only essential goods which have become scarce. Again we say, of what difference does it make to the great American people to have spiced and brandied fruits, or mushrooms, or similar luxuries on the ration program. Of course we need rationing of goods that are needed for the war effort, or for the health and well-being of the American people, but the removal of luxury and semiluxury items from the complicated ration program cannot in any way impair the war effort.

You might be interested to know that the mere counting or computation of ration stamps represents an actual expense to retail grocers of approximately 1 percent of their gross sales, and consumes nearly 2,800,000 man-hours, despite the attempt at simplification in both meats and processed foods rationing. Retailers, too, need a reasonable period of time to change point values on merchandise—rather than expecting the change overnight or in one business day. These details could be simplified materially by a more concentrated ration program to cover only foods of an essential character.

7. Essentiality declaration for food industry: Not only must production and distribution of food be assisted to maintain itself for reasonably effective service, but certain normally essential functions in warehousing, transportation, refrigeration, and market clearance, as well as distribution, must continue to operate efficiently to prevent waste and excessive cost. It takes trained personnel, for example, to do an efficient meat-cutting job in a retail store, and to avoid extreme waste in the produce departments of both retailers and wholesalers. Efficiently trained personnel is required in certain key positions in manufacturing plants, in transportation facilities, and so on. For these and other equally valid reasons, the food industry should be declared an essential war industry for both the War Manpower Commission and the War Food Administration now has in its files indisputable evidence proving the seriousness of the manpower shortage in the entire food industry.

8. Simplicity of regulations and orders: This is extremely important insofar as the many hundreds of thousands of small businessmen in the distributive field are concerned. If compliance is to be improved, it is essential that orders and regulations be simple, direct, and understandable. Certainly there is no need for the Pricing Division of O. P. A. to have issued more than 7,500 pages of regulations, approximately 2,000 words to the page, including something like 160 regulations, revisions, and amendments. The rapid issuance of the multitude of amendments has been most disturbing and depressing and it becomes impossible for any operator—small and large alike—to know whether they are actually living within regulations or not.

9. Decentralization of authority: It is hardly to be expected that any man or group of men sitting in Washington can write either pricing or rationing regulations which can effectively govern the mining areas of Idaho, the livestock-producing section of Texas, the cotton areas of Mississippi, and the metropolitan city areas of Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, and so on. Nevertheless, that is the practice followed now and to effect any changes in the regulations to cover local conditions, in practically all instances, the local, State, or regional O. P. A. executives must constantly refer these changes to other headquarters, finally reaching Washington, resulting in delays which are oftentimes disastrous not only to production and distribution but to the community and its welfare. As an example, let me point out that where any adjustment is sought for the Baltimore area or for any Baltimore establishment, the matter must first be referred to New York, then back to Washington, and the answer must be returned to New York and then to Baltimore. All this, despite the fact that Baltimore is less than 50 miles from Washington. As another example, problems in northern Idaho are referred to the Spokane office of the O. P. A., from there to San Francisco, then to Washington, and back through the circuitous route from Washington to San Francisco to Spokane, and to Idaho.

May we go back to the original request for maximum production and point out again that the best of all inflation controls is more abundant supplies distributed under normal competitive conditions. Furthermore, Government seems to have forgotten its original acknowledgment that "wartime economic controls are made effective by popular support and participation," though it is plain to see that many wartime food controls are not effective now simply because they do not have popular support and participation. If these controls are not effective, then we cannot have production in sufficient quantity, nor can we have efficient distribution. We must all remember that efficient food distribution is preferable to confusion and chaos and such heavy casualties in the ranks of food retailers that the orderly marketing of food will no longer be possible. We must remember that food on the farm is not food on the table. In the interest of the fighting front, the home front, and the prosecution of war, maximum production and efficient distribution must be reestablished.

Gasoline for Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the individuals whom President Roosevelt has placed in charge of gasoline rationing either do not understand the problem or

else they are so enthused about a system of state socialism where we will need no salesmen, that they deliberately want to put the salesmen out of business. In fairness to them, we will assume that they do not understand the problem.

The salesman today is a public servant. The individual retailer depends upon the salesmen for guidance in rationing, in price marking, and in compliance with the many Federal regulations now imposed upon business. If our home economy is going to continue, there is an essential place for the salesmen.

In the wide-open spaces of Nebraska, a salesman cannot make his territory by train or bus or streetcar. Our distances are great. We have lost many of our branch railroad lines. The shortage of manpower makes it necessary that these salesmen cover their territory in as efficient a manner as possible. To deny salesmen sufficient gasoline to visit their territory does not save any gasoline for the war effort, because the local merchant must secure gasoline from his rationing board to go to the wholesale market. It is much more saving upon gasoline to send a salesman to see 10 retailers in a day than to have 10 retailers drive to see the wholesale dealer.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a resolution adopted by the Holdrege Council, No. 213, of the United Commercial Travelers of Holdrege, Nebr. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas traveling salesmen are engaged in performing essential work in explaining rationing regulations, ceiling prices, coupon values, periods of validity, helping small merchants in the preparation of reports required by rationing and many other services made necessary by regulations brought on by the war; and

Whereas the territories served by traveling salesmen in this section of the United States are large, the towns are far apart, and public transportation is not available; and

Whereas the existing regulations fail to provide opportunity for traveling salesmen to explain their work, its essential character, the distances involved, the lack of public transportation; and

Whereas the local war price and rationing boards do not have the power to use discretion in the allocation of mileage coupons but are required to follow the arbitrary rules laid down by officials who are unacquainted with the needs and problems of traveling salesmen in sparsely settled areas; and

Whereas some local war price and rationing boards are following the rules and others are not, which leads to different rules in different communities; and

Whereas all traveling salesmen are aware of the necessity of preserving their automobiles, tires, and gasoline, in order to further the war effort, and are in accord with the purposes of rationing in all its phases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Holdrege Council No. 213, United Commercial Travelers of America of Holdrege, Nebr., That we are in accord with rationing insofar as it benefits the war effort; that new regulations be adopted by the Office of Price Administration with regard to mileage rationing to traveling salesmen so that their essential work, the territories they cover and the lack of public transportation, may be considered by each local war price and rationing board and that the issuance of mileage coupons be equalized so that traveling salesmen in each locality will be on an equal footing; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the local war price and rationing board, the district O. P. A. office at North Platte, the Governor of the State of Nebraska, and to all Congressmen and Senators from Nebraska.

Adopted at a regular meeting of Holdrege Council No. 213, United Commercial Travelers of America of Holdrege, Nebr., on October 20, 1943.

TED FOLK,
Senior Counselor.
JOHN W. BERRY,
Secretary.

I wish also to include in my remarks a statement of the Chamber of Commerce of Lincoln, Nebr., which is as follows:

THE LINCOLN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lincoln, Nebr., October 20, 1943.

Congressman CARL CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: At a meeting of the wholesale committee of the chamber of commerce, the matter of reduced gasoline rations on B and C ration coupons was thoroughly discussed. It was agreed by the entire group that every effort possible should be made to cooperate 100 percent with the all-out war effort. In so doing, it is felt by this group that the severe reductions in gasoline allotment materially affects this all-out effort.

With this reduction it has been found that many retail distributors are coming into the markets to do their buying in the absence of representatives of the wholesale distributors calling upon them. For example, one representative of a wholesale company could call on a large number of retailers using gasoline for only one car where in the absence of this service 12 to 15 or more retailers drive into the shopping centers to make their purchases and obtain the answers to the many questions with which they are confronted.

Distributor representatives today are more than order takers or salesmen. Many of the smaller communities have lost manpower with technical qualifications to develop and work out problems in connection with pumping, heating, electricity, and so forth. In most cases these shopping representatives are qualified to give information so sorely needed in many of these smaller communities—information which is difficult to obtain through correspondence.

With the multifarious regulations regarding Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, War Labor Board, and so forth, which are issued, it has become a part of the distributive representative's equipment to know of these regulations. Obviously, these agencies could not possibly maintain a personnel large enough to contact all of these persons affected. As a result jobbers' representatives are performing a definite service along these lines.

In view of the distances to be traveled, present public transportation facilities and manpower shortage, it is felt that gasoline allotments should be increased in an amount sufficient to permit coverage of territories by these representatives. It has come to our attention that every possible effort has been made by the "man of the road" to consolidate traveling facilities in the coverage of these territories. Under the present restrictions, this traveling is impossible.

Any effort which you may lend to the solution of this problem would indeed be a contribution to the war effort and definitely a contribution to the people of the State of Nebraska.

Your favorable consideration of the thoughts above presented is of the utmost importance and action to obtain more favorable gasoline allotments may help to solve many problems as stated above.

By order of the wholesale committee.
Respectfully,

FRED A. WIREN,
Secretary, Wholesale Committee,
Lincoln Chamber of Commerce.

Future of Air Lines Is Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Troy (N. Y.) Record of October 19, 1943:

Post-war utilization of the military aviation radio and electronics devices, such as automatic pilots and altitude indicators for the direction and control of commercial flying, is envisaged by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, following a tour of several European theaters of operation to see the work which commercial aircraft are now doing to maintain military supply lines.

All these war-developed, secret weapons of communication have admittedly made aerial combat and transport something fantastically different from anything contemplated a few years ago. Colonel Gorrell can appreciate this difference, perhaps better than almost anyone else in aviation today, for he was chief of air staff for General Pershing in World War No. 1, and he has watched and had a leading part in the development of military and civilian flying since that time.

"Today," says Colonel Gorrell, "great aerial battles are commanded 'long distance' by an officer sitting in a map-covered room hundreds of miles from the scene of the conflict. The development of new devices almost literally permits the commander to follow his own forces into action."

FUTURE OF AIR LINES

Applying this development to post-war commercial air-line operations, Gorrell foresees revolutionized civil air transportation, regulation, and operating methods, all in the interests of greater safety and efficiency.

A divisional traffic superintendent in an office in, say, Omaha may a few years hence be guiding the landing of an air transport carrying passengers between Wichita and Topeka. The problem of the air traffic dispatcher in many respects will be similar to the problems of the commander now directing bombers over Germany. For the bombing of Germany is nothing more nor less than the transportation of cargo as speedily and efficiently as possible under all conditions of weather over long distances and on split-second schedules.

This is precisely what will be involved in creating tomorrow's civil air transport system. The cargo will be different, and instead of being concentrated in a few channels over enemy territory, it will be spread over the entire world.

UNIFORM LAWS

Colonel Gorrell uses this increased intensity of post-war flying and its real need for every technological aid in communication between ground and plane and the control

of planes from the ground to drive home a plea for uniform regulation of air traffic.

Under present law, there is nothing to prevent an individual State from regulating air transport movements in the space overlying that State. In fact, some States have actually imposed air codes of their own.

If such local regulation is permitted to grow, consider what it may do to the division air traffic superintendent above referred to, sitting back in Omaha. If he has to consult and comply with Kansas regulations for every loading or take-off he is directing in Topeka or Wichita, and those regulations differ from the operations over Nebraska or Iowa, his task will be hopelessly complicated, and he will need a lawyer at his elbow at all times.

Pending in Congress now is the Lea-Bailey bill, which would provide for Federal regulation of all air transportation, and which would prevent regulation by the individual States. All aviation interests are backing this provision as a sound foundation for the development of post-war civil air transportation and for adjusting legislative provisions to the tremendous technological developments such as the radio and electronics devices which have been developed during the war.

How About Dependents of Other Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week this Congress raised dependency allotments to dependents of World War No. 2. This was done to meet increased living costs. But the cost of living increased just as much for dependents of other war veterans and we have failed them. They are just as entitled to increases as are the dependents of the present war. An editorial appearing in last week's National Tribune entitled "The Voice of the Veterans of the United States" states the case very clearly. I ask leave to have it printed in the RECORD. This editorial points out a very evident discrimination which I hope this Congress will remedy before it adjourns. We owe it to these people and we ought to take immediate action.

The editorial follows:

Last week the House passed a bill granting increased allowances to the dependents of service men and women of this war. The vote was 389 to 0. Less than 2 weeks earlier the Senate had upped the rates by a vote of 69 to 0. That bill should receive Executive approval at about the time we go to press.

Veterans have no objection whatever to the payment of these increases, nor to the liberalizations in the new act. They believe the Congress was motivated by the need to relieve distress among dependent families of our men and women who are devoting themselves in uniform to winning the war, not by political considerations, and war veterans know well the necessity of keeping high the morale of our fighting forces, which was another objective of this new legislation.

On the very day that the House voted unanimously to hike these allowances, it also turned thumbs down on two proposals that are supported by the veterans. Those bills would have increased the pensions of service-connected veterans, would have given a little boost to World War No. 1 widows of service-connected veterans who died from other causes and would have increased the rates of non-service-connected totally disabled veterans. A few others would have benefited also, but these are the principal classes of beneficiaries involved.

If we limit ourselves in this editorial to a comparison of the treatment of two classes of women, both closely related to the Nation's war efforts, it is only because the two House actions provide a contrast that proves a rank discrimination. The arguments apply equally as well to the veterans of prior wars, and of World War No. 2, and they also apply as to legislation that will be coming before the Congressmen very soon in behalf of other classes of veterans and dependents.

All contentions for the passage of the dependents' allowance bill last week were based on the high cost of living and its application to family men serving in the armed forces. Wives of servicemen who are childless were not increased above the existing $50 a month because it is believed that nearly all of them are gainfully employed, not because that any sane person believes a woman these days can live properly and in decency on that income. Wives with one child were allowed an additional $30 a month and $20 was allotted for each child above one. Children without mothers were given liberal added incomes, and there were hikes for parents and brothers and sisters substantially dependent upon the support of those in service. The eligibility requirements were broadened, and even divorced wives who have been receiving $42 a month were allowed added benefits if they are caring for servicemen's offspring. Added costs are nearly $700,000,000 a year—which is all right and proper in wartime and under existing living conditions.

Now, let us take a look at these increases which the Congress voted without a single dissenting voice. They run from about 80 percent for a parent with a class A dependent to 150 percent for a couple of children. If in the latter case the mother's allowance is included, the income of a family of three is boosted 40 percent by our Government.

An hour or so before this bill was debated, two lone Congressmen objected to consideration of the Rankin bills which asked for only 17 to 22 percent increases for World War No. 1 widows whose ages are at least twice those of World War No. 2 wives and who could not under any circumstances compete as satisfactorily in industry. As a matter of fact, all of these widows now receive far less in pension than is payable to World War No. 2 wives who have lost their husbands in this conflict. Comparisons are not very nice at any time. We are loath to use them, but it is the only way we have to bring out the fact that any widow who spent the afternoon of October 18 in the House gallery would have been amply justified in standing up to shout, "How about the dependents of previous wars? Why the discrimination?"

Hardly a day passes in these times that one cannot pick up his daily paper and read about the struggle now going on to control living costs, and about the efforts being made to defeat inflation. To most of us, it does not make sense. We fail to see, for instance, how subsidies being used and being further demanded to force the cost of living back to levels of last September are going to help much. The consumer pays the tariff now or in the long run no matter how you look at it. We read of efforts to "hold the line" according to the Little Steel formula, and then see that the President is willing to reconsider whether or not it is fair to the laborer. It is all very confusing, but none of it can alter the fact that veterans and their dependents are being called upon to pay more and more for everything they need to keep them alive, and that they have less and less to do it with.

The veterans and their dependents who would benefit by those Rankin bills, by other legislation more recently out of committee, and by bills still to be considered, know this much—they know that all they need costs more. They know that nothing has yet been done by the Congress to add to the pensions awarded to them years before the present tough living conditions arose. And they know that even though the Little Steel formula and other Government-inspired means of relief have helped in some measure almost every other class of citizens in this country, they have not seen done one solitary thing to help them meet the same problem. And more and more they are coming to see that they are suffering from rank discrimination.

The warriors of past wars, and the dependents of those of them who have answered to the call of the Supreme Commander, are perfectly willing that their cause be debated fully by the Congress. The legislators have always demonstrated their generosity for sacrifices made during the crises through which this country has moved in the past. They have no doubt now about the justice of their cause. The Congress can take any set of figures it desires and from them determine that the cost of living has advanced far beyond any added amounts that disabled and aged veterans and their widows seek by way of relief. But to that relief they are entitled now—not later on, if, and when.

So far those who have fought in past wars—and their loved ones—have not been unduly impatient. They are confident their time is coming, and soon. But as discrimination piles upon discrimination, they are forced to ask—why?

Reclamation and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 28 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in Denver, Colo., this week, western leaders of water conservation are meeting at the twelfth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association to discuss ways and means by which Federal reclamation can be made to expand its usefulness as an agency for the development of the West and as a benefit to the Nation. The head of that organization is the Honorable Oliver S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont., who has been largely responsible for the present high state of effectiveness which the association has maintained for more than 10 years.

A high light of the convention is the address of Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, who was appointed to that position by the President last July on the retirement of John C. Page, who had served efficiently as Commissioner for 6½ years. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bashore's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The people of Montana, while regretting that Mr. Page's health compelled

his resignation as Commissioner, are pleased that he will remain with the Bureau as consulting engineer. They are also pleased at the appointment as Commissioner of Mr. Bashore, an outstanding engineer in the service of the Bureau for 37 years.

Under the subject The Reclamation Program Today and Tomorrow, Commissioner Bashore shed considerable light on the plans of the Bureau to transform the water resources of the West into useful channels for irrigation and power production. I am gratified that the Bureau of Reclamation is directing its attention toward the formulation of a post-war public-works program that will provide employment for returning servicemen and demobilized industrial workers. The projects the Bureau will build will make permanent contributions to the stability of the West through the settlement opportunities the irrigation developments will create. The power the projects will create will turn the wheels of new industries that will assure permanent employment.

It is important to note that while the reclamation projects are located in the West, the construction expenditures benefit the entire country through the use of materials and equipment. The construction will serve to cushion the impact of the transition from a wartime to a peace economy. When the projects are in operation they will serve to increase the purchasing power of the communities and add to the national wealth.

I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the printing of Commissioner Bashore's address will exceed by one-third of a page the two pages allowed under the rule, and that the cost will be $105.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can tell you what the reclamation program is today.

But I am neither a prophet nor a seer, and I cannot tell you precisely what that program will be tomorrow. You will have to take my word that the Bureau of Reclamation will go the limit in preparing for any task that is proposed for it. It is ready and willing to undertake a big job.

The first job of each of us is to make a 100-percent contribution to the war. That reclamation is doing by providing large quantities of food, huge blocks of power for war industries, and municipal water supplies for vital areas.

As for the reclamation program of tomorrow, I can speak of our aspirations for serving the West and the Nation. When the clouds of war are rolled back, we anticipate participating in a vast post-war construction program which will be designed to cushion the impact of the transition from a war- to a peace-time economy.

A primary consideration of this program will be the prompt employment on construction work for a substantial number of the 2,900,000 men from the 17 western irrigation States who will be demobilized from the armed forces and war industries. It will be equally important to provide settlement opportunities for tens of thousands of these men and their families who are entitled to a chance to establish self-sustaining farm homes on irrigated land. Many other thousands must be given permanent employment in industries which will be powered by electric energy from reclamation dams.

Already a Senate committee has called upon the Bureau to produce a post-war public-works program. We are at work on a preliminary outline that tentatively calls for an expenditure up to $3,000,000,000 for the conversion, over a period of 5 to 10 years, of western water and land resources into the most useful channels. The development of this program is subject, of course, to limitations of funds and manpower. Before considering in greater detail the reclamation program for the future, let us examine what the Bureau is doing today.

As this is my first appearance before your association as Commissioner, I refrain from pointing with personal pride to the achievements of reclamation over a period of two-score years. I will, however, take this occasion to commend the splendid service of my friend and former chief, John C. Page, who laid the foundation for the reclamation program today, and paved the way for what we can do tomorrow.

In the 6½ years that Mr. Page served as Commissioner, he supervised the expenditure of more money for the upbuilding of the West than was laid out by all of his predecessors in the preceding 34 years of the Bureau's history. I challenge a comparison of the record of jobs well done, that stands as a monument to the ability and vision of John Page, with that of any other public official.

Today, the investment of the Federal Government in facilities for the conservation and use of western water resources is at the high-water mark of $870,000,000. The money thus expended, by itself, means little. The great dams that have been completed, the hundreds of miles of canals, and the fine power plants with their whirling generators, are excellent examples of our engineering skill, but in judging their final worth more vital considerations are involved.

What does count is what these great facilities are doing for the country in the national emergency. And what registers in the long run is what reclamation projects will do for the West and for the people who will pay the bills and whose lives will be enriched because of this work.

Today, the Bureau's 52 operating projects are providing irrigation, power, or municipal water to western areas with a population of nearly 5,000,000 people.

The long-term objectives—farm homes where western families can be self-sustaining—are reflected in the 80,000 irrigated farms. These embrace 4,000,000 acres of land once desert.

Near practically every project is an airfield, a military encampment, or war factories. These activities have been made possible in a very large measure by the reclamation developments in the West.

Many of the military centers that have sprung up in the region since 1941 are located near our projects and these soldiers must be fed. The three-quarter million war workers employed on the Pacific coast, many of whom migrated from the Middle West and the East, have greatly increased the demand for food. The armed forces in the Pacific and the lend-lease requirements in the Far East have taken their share.

In the face of these greatly enlarged food demands, the production on reclamation projects takes on added significance. The potatoes grown this year will provide for the annual needs of 17,500,000 persons. The beans produced will serve 32,000,000, and the alfalfa, when translated into meat and milk, means a 12-month supply at current ration values for 9,000,000 persons.

Reports from our irrigation projects in operation show that reclamation farmers have gone to war in a real sense. Their activities in the production of three major crops illustrate the contributions they are making. The acreage of potatoes this year is 44½ percent greater than in 1942. The mean acreage shows a gain of 26 percent. Flaxseed, also a vital commodity, is up 42 percent.

The Bureau is and has been prepared to extend irrigation facilities to serve several million additional acres, but—and it is no secret—it has been hampered considerably by the diversion of critical materials to other war uses. Two years ago some people were convinced that the country's agricultural plant, as it then existed, was adequate for any emergency. My friend, John Haw, predicted at that time that the day would come when the Nation would clamor for increased foodstuffs from the irrigated land of the West. Not only has this prediction come true, but the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has just announced that the food supplies for civilians will be less in 1944 than in this year.

Only recently we were given the green light on 13 projects through which we can extend irrigation service to nearly 800,000 acres by 1945, and to more than a million acres by 1946. If the Bureau is given clearance promptly on additional projects, it can serve, in 3 years, double the acreage now approved.

I desire at this point to emphasize that the Department of the Interior under the leadership of Secretary Harold L. Ickes has been thoroughly alive to the possibilities of increasing war food production by accelerating reclamation construction. The earnest cooperation of the Secretary has been responsible for much of the recognition this program has been given in Washington.

The dams, which are storing water for irrigating the productive land on our projects, have an aggregate capacity of more than 64,000,000 acre-feet—80 percent of the storage in the West.

These structures, in addition to helping to meet the urgent need for additional food supplies, serve another vital purpose. They made it possible in 2 years to double the installed capacity and triple the output of hydroelectric energy in reclamation power plants.

The total capacity of our 30 powerhouses today is nearly 2,000,000 kilowatts. During this calendar year these plants will generate more than 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy—an output exceeding that produced by all the utilities in the entire country in 1912—little more than 30 years ago.

The transformation of the waters of the Columbia, the Colorado, and other western streams into pulsating electric energy spells more bombers over Berlin, greater fleets of warships in the south Pacific, and more tanks and munitions in Italy and Russia.

As in the field of war foods, the Bureau has been limited in extending its power facilities. It could add another million kilowatts by 1946 if new generators should be found necessary. Under present restrictions we are limited to making available an additional 450,000 kilowatts by October 1944.

Reclamation's contribution to the war from the standpoint of power and food has been highly significant, but I also call your attention with pride to the Bureau's service flag, which shows that 1,428 of our employees have joined the colors. Thirteen have made the supreme sacrifice on the field of battle, are prisoners of war, or have died in active service. I pay my tribute to their patriotism and extend my sympathy to their families.

The loss of the services of these men and women to the armed forces has hampered our activities, but we have asked for the deferment of only 68 of our remaining 6,046 employees—only 1 percent. The deferred men are engineers, powerhouse operators, and other skilled technicians.

The Bureau has persevered. The investigations of western land and water resources are continuing to bring in new projects either for war-food production, or for inclusion in the post-war reserve.

The reclamation program today is a double-barreled affair. While our activities are focused today on winning the war, we are also fortifying ourselves for tomorrow.

The recent decentralization of the Bureau of Reclamation is an important step toward meeting tomorrow's challenge. The previous organizational set-up was established when we were in swaddling clothes, so to speak. In the early days, the annual expenditures for construction, operation, and maintenance, and investigations averaged less than $10,000,000. In the past 10 years, the outlay for construction alone has been at the rate of $60,000,000 annually.

The acreage served prior to 1934 is less than half of the 4,000,000 now receiving water from our systems. The number of projects in operation was less than 25 while now there are 52. The problems incident to the operation of this vast enterprise are of increasing magnitude. We face added complexities in completing some 20 projects where construction was halted or retarded by the war, and in initiating new projects for construction now or in the post-war period.

I heartily agree with the appraisal of the decentralization made by Secretary Ickes in announcing the program to the press on September 13. I quote him, in part, as follows:

"The increasing number of interrelated and complex problems arising from the construction and operation of the many Bureau of Reclamation projects for irrigation, power, and related purposes makes it imperative at this time in the interest of maximum efficiency to establish area offices to coordinate the organization's activities in each of six areas.

"The plan, developed by the Bureau under former Commissioner John C. Page, will bring the Bureau in closer touch with the people affected by its functions. It will provide for a more thorough understanding of area problems and of the needs and potentialities of each area than has been possible heretofore through the Washington, D. C., headquarters and the Denver engineering office. Close coordination of Bureau operations and a full consideration of local expression, essential in meeting the Bureau's wartime responsibilities and in the preparation for post-war needs, will be realized."

Great care was taken in selecting the men to serve as regional directors and as heads of the four branches in Denver who will furnish technical advice and service. Upon these leaders the success of the reorganization will depend. They must translate the plan into action and results. I considered it of paramount importance that a regional director should possess a thorough knowledge of local needs and potentialities. In each of the six areas you will find that the man named to lead the Bureau activities is expertly qualified to fulfill his assignment. Each is a man in whom you can have faith. Each is an authority on the water and land resources of his area.

From the standpoint of the man with his boots in the irrigation ditch, you ask, How will he be affected by the decentralization of the Bureau? My answer is this: It will place near him a representative of the Bureau of Reclamation equipped to speak with authority. As Secretary Ickes said, the regionalization will provide for a more thorough understanding of local problems. Each new regional director is, and will continue to be, your next-door neighbor.

Each regional director, according to the organization chart, will be given "extensive latitude for independent action." In language understandable to me, that means he will be allowed to make decisions affecting you on the ground, instead of having to run clear across the country for approval of every move he makes. Of course, the Commissioner's office will retain a certain amount of control of Bureau functions in the field, but only insofar as is necessary to develop and guide along a uniform pattern the policies in the various areas.

Those of us in the Bureau of Reclamation who fully understand the decentralization program have confidence in the success of the plan. In effect, it streamlines the organization to meet more efficiently and expeditiously the problems brought on or aggravated by the war and the many problems which are constantly confronting the water users. You will understand, of course, that time will be required for the transition from the rather highly centralized operations of the Bureau to the new regional organization. The regional offices must be set up and staffed and many other details worked out before the plan can be made fully effective.

Repayment contracts, for instance, will be negotiated by the men in the field. They will keep their doors open to you and your neighbors.

Each of these men is strictly accountable to me for the reclamation in his region. He is on his own, and I will support him when he is right.

This regionalization should not stack added costs on the water users. That part of the regional office costs which relates to operation and maintenance and to the development and utilization of our projects should be, and I believe we should insist that it will be, nonreimbursable, just as are the expenses of the Washington office and the Branch of Operation and Maintenance. These offices otherwise would have to be staffed more heavily.

The United States, as I have pointed out, has more than $870,000,000 invested in reclamation projects. It is important that the Federal Government keep in touch with its clients to make sure that its investment is safe. Therefore the expense of this administration should fall on the Federal Government. The water users will benefit as a result of suggestions and programs made by the regional offices, and the public generally will benefit as well.

The water user and the power user will be expected to pay their way. I sincerely believe that the regionalization will make it easier for them to do so and will make it surer that they will do so, because it will keep the Bureau and the people it serves closer together. Problems can be solved to a very large degree as they arise. Delegations will not have to go to Washington to make their needs clear. The plan will save us all time and money.

The regionalization of the Bureau of Reclamation, I firmly believe, will help it do a better job for the West. I ask you to support it on the basis I have outlined.

The regional directors face their first real test in getting war food projects into operation as soon as water is available. It is their responsibility to see that the land is ready for use and that the representations made by the Bureau in securing clearance of these projects are translated into food. They will need the cooperation of this association and that of the landowners, the water users, and the other local interests.

Most gratifying has been the interest of the agricultural representatives of western railroads. They have undertaken studies which will be of material aid to the Bureau in its presentations of war food projects to the War Food Administration and the War Production Board. The regional directors and the Bureau as a whole welcome the cooperation and the suggestions of all western interests that are concerned with the effective use of irrigation water for food production.

In addition to its war food problems, the Bureau is faced with another huge task. It challenges the imagination, ingenuity, and ability of all of us. And when I say "us," I mean the National Reclamation Association, the various State organizations, and each and every group which is concerned with the future of the West and of the country as a whole.

We have been called upon to formulate a giant post-war public works program that far surpasses in scope any other program the Bureau of Reclamation has attempted in its 41-year history. Employment must be provided for the millions of service men and emergency industrial workers who will be out of jobs at the end of the war.

The importance of being prepared to face this crisis was brought to us a few weeks ago by Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona when he addressed a group of our officials in Washington. Senator Hayden spoke as chairman of a Senate Subcommittee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. He is giving his attention to the roads and reclamation features of this subject. The objective of his committee is to find ways and means of providing post-war employment for the 14,000,000 demobilized men in the country as a whole. The Senator pictured the economic chaos that has followed each war in which the United States has been engaged.

Impressed by the emphasis the Senator placed on this potential employment crisis, I secured figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics which carry startling implications so far as the 17 irrigation States are concerned. Nearly 3,000,000 men in this region will be demobilized, 1,700,000 from the armed forces and 1,200,000 from war industries.

The relative severity of the post-war demobilization for each State depends on the size of its "excess" labor supply during the reconversion or reconstruction period in relation to its pre-war capacity to provide employment. The impact of the transition from war to peace will be most severe on the Pacific coast. In the State of Washington, the number of men to be demobilized will be 45 percent of the total number employed in the State in 1940. This high percentage is second only to Connecticut. In California, 30 percent of the men employed in that State in 1940 may expect to lose their jobs or be discharged from the armed forces at the end of the fighting. In Utah, the percentage is 35 and in Kansas 40. Colorado, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas face almost as grave a problem. Only slightly less severe will be the impact of the demobilization in South Dakota, North Dakota, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Arizona.

It is reasonable to assume that the soldiers, sailors, and marines will return to the States of their enlistment or induction and that the industrial workers who will lose their jobs in the Pacific coast shipyards and airplane factories will remain in the area. Consequently the West will face a problem that calls for heroic measures.

The Bureau of Reclamation is determined to help meet this crisis which is fraught with dangers almost as far reaching as those which confronted the Nation before the tide of war was turned in its favor in Africa and the south Pacific. I say to you that we have set the wheels in motion.

Because the Bureau has been stripped for action since 1941, when thunderheads of war were gathering, it has a backlog of authorized but uncompleted projects as a nucleus for a substantial post-war construction program. At pre-war prices the remaining work to be done on these facilities would cost more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. From a reservoir of surveys, investigations, and reconnaissance, which have been carried on as rapidly as funds and manpower permitted, a shelf of potential new projects is being developed. Our plans call for designs and specifications to be ready on a sizable number of projects so that contracts can be let promptly after the war ends or after the go-ahead signal is given.

As I remarked in opening my talk, our tentative goal is a post-war program involving an expenditure up to $3,000,000,000.

In addition to irrigation, these projects will provide facilities for power production and municipal water supplies and, in areas like the Missouri River Basin, they will provide flood control and navigation benefits. Our post-war reservoir will include projects where costs will be reimbursable through repayments by water users or from power and other revenues, and also projects where costs can be allocated to flood control, navigation, or other nonreimbursable uses.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not remind you that construction costs of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects are rising. On many projects which may be proposed in the post-war program the reimbursable costs, as now defined, will be beyond the ability of the beneficiaries to repay under existing law.

In the normal course of events where the estimated cost of a project exceeds the value of the direct benefits, both reimbursable and nonreimbursable, a report is submitted to the Congress as provided by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and further action then rests with the national legislators. When it can be shown that indirect regional or Nation-wide benefits will accrue from the project, the legislators may act favorably on these reports.

There are unquestionably many measurable benefits of this character, including the spread of employment, increased purchasing power, better standards of living, and other factors. The extent that we can take these into account bears directly on our ability to undertake projects in the face of increased costs, and may be the most important factor in determining the scope and extent of the Bureau's activity in the post-war period. I am having information on this problem brought up to date and expanded.

For the immediate future in connection with the war food program, the increased construction costs would be met through the enactment of the so-called wartime reclamation bill now before Congress. The problem has been met with respect to the water conservation and utilization program through the greater latitude provided by the act of July 1943. These legislative measures, however, do not offer solutions of the long-range problem.

Through post-war construction, employment will be provided not only at the site and in factories in the West, but also in the industrial plants to the eastward. Work will be distributed to the steel mills of such States as Indiana and Pennsylvania, the equipment factories of Michigan and Illinois, the power machinery plants of New York, Virginia, and Wisconsin, and to the many manufacturing enterprises of many other States. Raw materials and processed goods, including agricultural products, will be supplied by practically every State.

Our records show that about half of reclamation construction expenditures finds its way to the States east of the Rocky Mountains.

In planning and executing the post-war program for employment benefits, we are keeping in mind the necessity for the most economic use of the land and water resources of the West. Although it is of the utmost importance to provide immediate work for returning soldiers, it is equally vital that the qualified veterans of World War No. 2 and the demobilized industrial workers shall have opportunities to become self-sustaining on western irrigated land.

As we go forward with plans for post-war projects we are seeking ways and means to make the facilities we build do the greatest good for the greatest number. On the Columbia Basin project in Washington, the Bureau will have ready a definite development and settlement pattern that will pave the way for a new agricultural empire covering an area as large as the State of Delaware. On the Central Valley project in California, we are also giving attention to human and economic considerations. On the Yuma mesa of the Gila project in Arizona, experiments are being conducted which will contribute to war-food supplies and will help meet the demand for settlement opportunities on the large areas of public land in Arizona and California. Examination of the agricultural and other economic possibilities of the Missouri River Basin is being considered. Field work in the Colorado River, Columbia, and other basins is under way.

The present-day requirements necessitate a reexamination of our concept of a balanced reclamation program. For that reason increased emphasis is being placed on the land use, agricultural and settlement phases of reclamation, on irrigation developments and on the marketing and influence of reclamation power output on the future of the West.

From the review I have made you can see we face a grave responsibility at this juncture in the career of Federal reclamation in the West. We must be prepared to shoulder our share of the burden of the post-war readjustment. If we are not, extension of irrigated agriculture, power, and municipal water service, so vital to our western prosperity, may be set back many, many years.

I look upon this twelfth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association as one that offers great opportunity for focusing attention to the need for arming the Bureau with financial and other implements that will enable it to drive ahead. Never before has teamwork between this organization and the Bureau of Reclamation been so essential. To solve, for the good of the Nation, the problems of increasing food production and those of providing post-war employment and settlement opportunities, we must pool our energies. We must not fail to reach our goal.

Is the Tariff a Dead Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., entitled "Is the Tariff a Dead Issue?"

Free trade is one of the foundations of that international philosophy of government so popular at the moment in some American quarters. It is one of the few doctrines of the Democratic Party retained by the New Deal. It is perhaps the one policy of the Roosevelt administration which makes official life in Washington tolerable for a conservative, old-line southern Democrat like Cordell Hull.

The trade agreements program, fathered by Secretary Hull and vigorously extended by him in the pre-war days, was a cautious approach to free trade which the astute Washington politicians knew was repugnant to Americans in the mass. Only the advent of the war, with its complete disruption of international trade, prevented this program from revealing its true nature to the American people.

We may rest assured, therefore, that when the war is over, those who gave us so-called trade trading will, if they remain in power, take up where they left off the drive toward completely free trade. Indeed, they may be expected to step up their program, since internationalism has become a more definite and important part of their scheme of public administration.

In this connection, it may prove worth while to examine the possibilities of this application of the free trade doctrine as it applies to just two industrial activities in this country.

One of the worst sufferers from the free-trade tendencies of the Roosevelt administration in the pre-war days was the ceramic industry. Heavy imports of chinaware and companion goods from France, Czechoslovakia, Japan, and in the early days from Germany, made it extremely difficult for American manufacturers, paying high wages, to compete. The result was depression throughout the industry. This was a practical condition which pottery workers and others dependent on the industry understood. They felt it. It hit them where it hurt.

The war cut off all these imports save a trickle from England. The war also increased tremendously the demand for ware, both for the armed forces and for the domestic trade, where green and inefficient help ran breakage up to record levels. Today every pottery in the country is booming. Old potteries have expanded. New plants have opened.

What's to happen to this industry if, when the war is over and foreign producers go after international markets again, tariff protection is removed entirely or kept at a point where American pottery must come into price competition with foreign ware produced by men and women working long hours for low wages?

Then, take synthetic rubber. Mr. Roosevelt went on record within the past week as opposed to a tariff on crude rubber designed to protect the American synthetic rubber industry.

Here we have a potentially great industry, built up quickly to meet a national crisis created by dependence on a foreign source of supply. Are we to scrap this industry, to sacrifice the tremendous investment in it, to abandon the limitless possibilities from its development all in order that foreign nations may sell rubber to the United States?

Of course, the way Mr. Roosevelt states the case his position is not so extreme as that. The specific opposition he expressed was to a rubber tariff that would make the American people "pay through the nose" for tires. He asserted that a tariff "just to keep synthetic plants going" would make it necessary for every American automobile owner "to pay 50 percent more for their rubber."

If we accept the President's premise, most of us will go at least part way with him. But how does he know that synthetic rubber always will cost 50 percent more than natural rubber? Synthetic rubber manufacturers, if given the opportunity, can produce in time a better and less expensive tire than can be produced from the natural plant. But they can't do it if they aren't given the chance to sell their output. Besides, there are many other uses for rubber, and already the synthetic product has proven itself the equal if not the superior of natural rubber for some of these nontire uses. Beyond all of this, and of greatest importance of all, is the matter of national defense. Are we to place ourselves again at the mercy of foreign rubber for the sake of an international dream?

Apply the free trade doctrine to other American industries, weigh it against the reemployment problem which will face this country in the post-war period, compare the American living standard with that prevailing anywhere across the seas, and ask yourself if the welfare of the American people can be safeguarded and advanced under a doctrine of extreme internationalism such as the present National Administration has espoused.

Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last night the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] made a speech before the Christian Mission for World Order, at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. I ask unanimous consent that the speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You who are gathered here tonight to launch this Christian Mission for World Order have enlisted in the greatest crusade since Jesus sent his 12 disciples out to preach the brotherhood of man. It is your task to remove the scales of fear and cynicism from the soul of America so that our people may undertake confidently, with courage and vision, the building of a world order in which justice and reason, and not brute force, prevail. On the success of your efforts, and those of other groups working toward the same end, depends the survival of those cultural and spiritual values which we prize most in our democratic society. For unless we and the world find the way to stop these recurring wars of ever-increasing magnitude and destruction, those values will be destroyed.

Twenty-five years ago the United States fought in a great war "to end all wars." Victory in World War No. 1 was to "make the world safe for democracy." Our arms were victorious in that war, but our cause—democracy and peace—was lost in the blind reaction and muddled diplomacy of the twenties and thirties. Our youth did their share on the battlefields, but the peoples and governments of the democracies, our own included, failed to accomplish their share of the task.

Because of that failure we are fighting today in another and greater World War No. 2. Again it is a war for democracy and peace and against tyranny and aggression. Again our fighting youth, at a far greater price in lives and treasure, are winning on the battlefield. They are buying with their lives the military victory that will give to us another chance to assure victory in the world for our cause, democracy and peace.

There is one very striking difference between the attitude of America in this war and in World War No. 1, both among the people and among the men in service. The slogans "make the world safe for democracy" and "war to end all wars" were everywhere during World War No. 1. We at home believed them implicitly. From my contacts with them, I think most of our men in service believed in those slogans. They and we had no doubt about the rightness of our cause, and no doubts about our ability to see it through to ultimate victory, both on the battlefield and in post-war international arrangements. We went to war on the crest of an emotional wave of faith that we were going to set the world straight for the future, and it was reflected in all our actions. Perhaps it was an unthinking, unreasoning faith, but it was there.

That faith, that confidence, is not here today, at least on the surface. The men in our armed services regard the war as a tough, dirty job, and "let's get on with it." Many of them are thinking about what comes after Berlin and Tokyo, but their thinking so far consists mostly of questions, not conclusions. To a large extent the same attitude prevails among the people. One finds no unshakable faith or confidence that we and the world, once the war is won, are going to see that it does not happen again.

We do find everywhere a growing realization of the terrible cost of war, of the urgent necessity of developing international machinery to prevent it from destroying civilization, accompanied often by a great questioning as to how it is to be done, doubts and fears as to whether we and the world can do it.

We in America went through a great wave of disillusionment in the twenties and thirties. Building a brave new world turned out to be a more difficult task than we had anticipated, and we turned to the easy solace of cynicism. The fault lay not in ourselves and our own efforts, but in our aims. We had been idealists, and a hard, tough world had no use for our ideals, or so we told ourselves. Some of our leaders even sneered with impunity at the ideals for which men had given their lives in faith. We were told over and over again that we had been tricked into fighting, that our cause—democracy and world peace—was a phony cause, an ideal impossible of attainment.

America very nearly lost her soul during those cynical decades. Even the brutal aggression of Japan and the callous seizure of Ethiopia failed to lift us out of our preoccupation with our own immediate affairs. It was not until Hitler began to snuff out the lights of freedom in Europe with terrifying rapidity that we finally began to awaken to our peril.

I believe that America is finding her soul again, and our people are more and more recognizing that we do have obligations and responsibilities to our fellow men everywhere. The great ideal of a peaceful, democratic world, governed by law and justice, does have validity, and is possible of achievement. We recognize that unless after this war we move in that direction, and over the years build a durable international peace, the very foundations of our democratic system are imperiled.

This meeting tonight attests the awakening of the American public. The six pillars of peace proposed by the Federal Council of Churches, the joint Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant declaration on world peace issued recently, and the activities of literally scores and hundreds of organizations on this issue are evidence that the American will and determination to do all in our power to solve this age-old problem of war is crystallizing and will be a great force in the post-war world.

We recognize that it will not be an easy task and that it will be many generations, perhaps, before we even approach closely the ideal which we set as our goal, let alone achieve it. But we are determined that now and in the months and years immediately ahead, we of America and our Government shall take the first steps toward that goal.

Sumner Welles is exceptionally qualified to discuss what should be the exact nature of those first steps. His clear thinking and courageous leadership are a beacon of hope to a muddled world. But there is one decision, one clear break with the past which I believe we must make before we can consider intelligently the various proposals for initial action.

International relations in the past have been built on the concept of some sixty-odd completely sovereign nations, free to do as they pleased in the international field, regardless of what might be the repercussions of their actions on the world and its peace. That kind of concept includes the right of an individual nation, if it has the force and wants to use it, to embark on a course of military aggression and war to achieve what it wants, either in the way of territory or commercial opportunities.

With that concept we must break and break completely, if we are to progress toward the ideal of a peaceful, stable world. We must accept in the United States, and prevail upon other nations to accept, the concept of an international order based upon a few civilized rules of conduct among nations, in those spheres where the acts of individual nations may lead to war. All nations, it seem to me, should agree not to take unilateral action which may affect the peace or welfare of other nations without giving full consideration to the international implications of its action, even in certain fields requiring some form of international conference before action. Finally, we should deny to all nations, ourselves included, the right to wage aggressive war, and set up the machinery to enforce that rule.

To fail to make this break with the past in our conception of the sovereignty of nations, to fail to recognize that there are for every nation obligations to the world community and the peace of the world which transcend national sovereignty, is to build any structure for peace on a foundation of sand. Obviously, any international machinery to give life and vitality to this changed concept will evolve gradually. But I believe we should have in the beginning a clear conception of the goal toward which we believe it should evolve to give mankind the best hope for permanent peace. It is my conviction that only through an organization of nations, potentially universal in membership, can the overwhelming desire and will of the people of this country and of other nations for a lasting peace be given effective implementation. It may be that in the beginning we will have to accept more limited agreements, but I think we should insist that any such agreements be strictly temporary in character, to prevail only pending the creation of the democratic organization of nations which we seek.

This idea and these conceptions are not new, and neither are they the creation of any one individual or political group. They were summed up in one eloquent sentence by President Wilson in his magnificent speech of July 4, 1918:

"What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

Along with a number of other members of Congress, I have advocated for many months a specific commitment by Congress, particularly the Senate, to participation by the United States in an organization of nations having the clear authority to settle international disputes by peaceful means in accordance with agreed-upon principles, and also having at its command the force necessary to stop future attempts at military aggression and to make the rule of international law truly effective.

It is our conviction that the specific commitments we have advocated are the minimums which would give to this country and the world the very best hope of solving this age-old problem of preventing war. Whether those specific measures or others be taken, I think it is absolutely essential that we and our allies in this war, preferably before it is over but certainly as soon as it is won, take the first steps down the road of international collaboration to maintain peace and justice under law, and that the United States be a full partner in that effort.

The tragic possibility that the United States might repeat its mistake of 1919, and we must admit that with the present complexion of the Congress it is a possibility, brings me back to the purpose of this mission, which is to enlist the individuals of the church in the task of building a durable peace. Ladies and gentlemen, the fabric of that peace will be decided finally in the

field of politics here in America. It must be ratified and implemented by appropriations passed upon by the men and women whom you help to elect to the Congress and the Presidency of the United States. It is well to remember always that in 1919 every analysis of public opinion showed the people of the United States overwhelmingly in favor of our participation in the League of Nations, and yet the League was defeated in the United States Senate. That must not happen again.

I realize as you do that religious organizations must stay out of politics. But if you determine to make your efforts finally and fully effective, then you as individuals must take part in politics, which means simply in the original selection, nomination, and election of the men and women who represent you in Congress and the White House.

I know that sometimes we in America sneer at politics and regard it as rather a sordid business, but actually politics is the business of the American people and their government, and it is vitally important to every one of us today. It is one of the shortcomings of our democracy that all too often a small minority of the people, sometimes as low as 10 or 15 percent, participate in the party conventions or primaries where the candidates for public office who will finally decide great issues are selected. The elections next year and in 1946 and the fundamental philosophy of the candidates nominated and elected in those elections will determine whether this Nation moves forward on the road of international collaboration or whether we do as we did 25 years ago and turn back to isolation or a narrow nationalism. If the 60,000,000 church people of America participate actively as individuals in the selection, nomination, and election of those candidates, making sure that they select men and women of integrity, courage, and vision, then I have no doubt in my own mind of America's position or that we will provide our share of leadership in building a just and peaceful world order.

You can help today on the resolution concerning our post-war foreign policy now being debated in the Senate. The important paragraph in that resolution as reported from committee reads: "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

As it now stands, the resolution fails to even mention the United Nations, which are united to win this war and should remain united to maintain peace. Ignoring completely peaceful settlement of disputes or other forms of collaboration, its whole emphasis is on naked power, the very thing we fight against. And finally, the resolution contains two "rubber" words, "authority" and "power," capable of such widely varying definitions that both irreconcilable isolationists and strong internationalists can support it on the basis of their individual interpretations of what it means. In other words, as it now stands, the resolution pretends to make a commitment which in reality it does not make.

A dozen of us have proposed an amendment to clarify and strengthen the resolution by making it read: "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

The two Senators from New York, JAMES M. MEAD and ROBERT F. WAGNER, are both for that amendment, but a message of support from each of you would hearten them and strengthen the amendment.

Our greatest obligation here at home is to keep faith with those young—and they are so terribly young—men of ours who are fighting and dying that we may remain free. Their sacrifice, whether they themselves realize it or not, is the ultimate act of faith—faith in the future—in America; faith that out of this horror there will emerge a better and braver world, free of the curse of war; faith that we at home will not fail them; faith that they will not die in vain.

Alfred Noyes wrote a prophetic poem, The Pact, on Armistice Day, 1923. I wish my reading could grave it on the heart of every American:

"They have no pact to sign—our peaceful dead;
Pacts are for trembling hands and heads grown gray.
Ten million graves record what youth has said,
And cannot now unsay.

"They have no pact to sign—our quiet dead;
Whose eyes in that eternal peace are drowned.
Age doubts and wakes and asks if night be fled;
But youth sleeps sound.

"They have no pact to sign—our faithful dead,
Theirs is a deeper pledge, unseen, unheard,
Sealed in the dark, unwritten, sealed with red;
And they will keep their word.

"They have no pact to sign—our happy dead.
But if, O God, if we should sign in vain,
With dreadful eyes, out of each narrow bed,
Our dead will rise again."

The Navy and Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Navy and Indiana," delivered by myself at Peru, Ind., on October 27, 1943, in observance of Navy Day.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Navy Day was established on the birthday of that great fighting President, Theodore Roosevelt, to honor his interest and devotion to the American Navy. Today we pay renewed homage to that worthy patriot, and likewise do we pledge anew allegiance to the Commander in Chief of the American Navy today—Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has manifested a similar interest and devotion to this great force for defense of our freedom and security.

On the occasion of Navy Day 1943, the second commemoration of this day with our country at war in seven oceans, the people of the Hoosier State have a right to feel more than the usual interest.

Although far from the smell of salt, the name Indiana has a great tradition in seagoing annals, yesterday and today. There have been three battleships in American history christened the U. S. S. *Indiana*. Each of these three battlewagons has been a symbol of a significant stage of development in United States naval power. The *Indianas* span practically the entire modern naval history of this country.

The first U. S. S. *Indiana*, authorized in 1890, was the heaviest armed and armored battleship in the world at that period. Her construction was a milestone in our realization of the importance of sea power. As part of Admiral Sampson's squadron, the *Indiana* was in the Battle of Santiago Bay—the important action which destroyed Cervera's hopes and virtually ended the Spanish-American war. Her historic career ended on a note of future developments in 1921. The Navy, well aware of the possible reverberations of the airplane and submarine upon sea power used her as a target ship to test the effect of dummy bombs and torpedoes on battleships.

The second U. S. S. *Indiana* illustrated another phase of public thought—the confused idealism which followed World War No. 1. She was built in 1920 and was scrapped by the Government when over a third completed, by the terms of the Washington Treaty.

Late in November of 1941, the third U. S. S. *Indiana* took her place in history. Launched at Newport News 6 months ahead of schedule, she was the heaviest battleship ever to slide down the ways in a United States shipyard. By a strange coincidence, pictures of that launching appeared in the Sunday papers of December 7, 1941, a never-to-be-forgotten date. Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox spoke at that launching, a week or two before the Jap sneak punch at American sea power. "The U. S. S. *Indiana*," he said, "symbolizes this Nation's will to survive in a world at war."

The subsequent movements of the U. S. S. *Indiana* are naturally in what is termed the "secret" classification. I asked before I came up here: "Is it all right for me to make a general statement that the U. S. S. *Indiana* is out there fighting with our fleet?" The answer I received from a man of the Navy was terse and colorful. "Well," he said, "she's certainly not in mothballs."

I, in turn, am positive that when this war is won and the complete story can be told, the U. S. S. *Indiana* will have given a good account of herself. I can say that about any ship of our Navy and be "doggone" sure I'm right.

From the largest aircraft carrier, majestically under way, to the lightning-swift PT boat, the ships and men of the United States Navy have been slugging it out with the enemy on every possible occasion.

Our sea-fighting force suffered a staggering blow at Pearl Harbor—a blow that set it back on its heels. But the intrepid courage and the fighting spirit of Americans was not dismayed.

Audacious thinking and doing a job with what was at hand enabled our Navy to stop the Jap in his path of conquest. The battles of Midway and the Coral Sea may have actually prevented our west coast from being invaded. We, here in the Middle West, fully realize today that in an air-borne world, that action, far out in the reaches of the Pacific may well have saved us from heading for Wyandotte Cave to evade enemy bombers. In this fast-shrinking world of ours, distance from a sea coast no longer provides sure protection.

The dawn of Navy Day of 1942, not yet a year after Pearl Harbor, saw the United States Fleet swing from the defensive to the offensive. On the night of October 26 our carrier task force intercepted a Japanese task force bent on retaking Guadalcanal. The battle that ensued is now known as the Battle of the Santa Cruz Islands. A sister ship of the *Indiana*—the U. S. S. *South Dakota*—chalked up 32 Japanese planes in that action.

Two enlisted men from Hebron and Indianapolis received the Distinguished Flying Cross

for their extraordinary heroism in the Battle of Midway. At Santa Cruz a young ensign, whose home is in this State, piloted his dive bomber so that he scored a direct hit on the flight deck of a large enemy carrier. Plane damaged by gunfire, he still landed safely aboard his carrier—and also received the Distinguished Flying Cross for this feat.

The men of Indiana have always been in the thick of things, and they're not stopping now.

The Battle of Santa Cruz was only one in a series of major actions which foreshadowed the Navy's slogan for Navy Day of 1943: "Your Navy—spearhead of victory."

On November 8 a move was made that electrified the world—the invasion of Africa. Landing craft which have been constructed in this very State were used there—in Sicily and Italy. Later, we had news of another Hoosier, from Marion. He won the Navy and Marine Corps medal when his ship, the U. S. S. *Hugh L. Scott*, was sunk off French Morocco. Douglass A. Murch assisted in getting rafts over the side and encouraging the crew as they left the stricken vessel. Twice he dived overboard and rescued men struggling in the water.

The Pacific didn't remain quiet while eyes were trained on the Mediterranean. At Tulagi, torpedo planes, PT boats, light and heavy cruisers and destroyers dueled with the Japs. Indiana thrilled again at the news that Gunner John C. Livezey, born in New Castle, had won one of the highest awards the Navy has to give, the Navy Cross. His citation read: "For extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty as pilot of an airplane of a torpedo squadron against Japanese forces at Tulagi and in the Battle of the Coral Sea. His spirit of determination and persistence in the face of heavy antiaircraft fire contributed to the sinking or severe damaging of another carrier, and at least eight other enemy vessels."

Indiana's not only building the ships and planes—her men are fighting them. They're lined up with men from every State in the Union, with thousands of gallant men from other nations, fighting against a common enemy. We here today are naturally prejudiced on this score—but our boys are certainly not falling away behind when it comes to courage and the ability to dish it out.

The attacking spirit of the United States Navy continued through 1942 and 1943. In the spring of this year, there was great concern about shipping losses in the Atlantic from German U-boats. How that menace was licked by Allied convoy methods, destroyer escorts—the sleek new ships that came off the production lines for that special purpose—aircraft patrol, baby "flat-tops" (the small converted aircraft carriers) and armed guard crews, we now know in part. We also know that the U-boats will continue to be a threat in the Atlantic for the duration of the war with Germany—but they have not accomplished their purpose. Our shipping lanes are still open—and troops, supplies, guns and equipment of all kinds are going across in increasing number.

More recently, Portugal came through with the Azores as bases for the allies. We're glad to hear that the British have moved in, to close a gap in the patrol, which will save many more ships from a watery grave in the Atlantic. Our bridge of ships will operate with greater efficiency, due to this move, in spite of the new U-boat campaign which burst with renewed but waning fury, in the middle of September.

Before I get away from the subject of the Battle of the Atlantic, I want to mention a few more native sons of Indiana who have carried on the fight. I can't mention all of them—time would not permit—but I don't want to overlook the work of the armed guard, those courageous gun crews on merchant vessels that have fought off sub attacks and plane attacks to bring in the material needed by our Armies and by our allies.

An entire gun crew of a merchant vessel won public commendation recently for standing at battle stations 12 hours at a time, during repeated vicious attacks by a large number of submarines. In addition, they repelled German aerial attacks 21 times, forcing well-aimed bombs to miss their ship. Even when a nearby bombed vessel threatened their imminent death, they refused to give up their posts. On another occasion, this same crew disregarded burning gasoline and exploding ammunition in order to extinguish a dock fire in the midst of an air attack. One of the men in that armed guard, Navy gun crew, was Edwin Junior Hasty, a seaman second-class from Rennselaer, Ind.

The Navy and Marine Corps medal went to another member of an armed guard unit, this time the commanding officer, Lt. (Jr. Gr.) John P. Brown, of Indianapolis. The merchant vessel upon which he served was torpedoed and set afire. Lieutenant Brown and a cadet broke down the door to a flame-filled room and rescued a trapped boatswain whose clothes were ablaze. In spite of painful injuries, Lieutenant Brown later manned a life raft and continued to look after his gun crew. Our debt is large to men like that.

While our men are fighting enemy subs in the Atlantic, our own submarine service has been doing a terrific job of sinking Japanese ships. Secretary Knox announced a couple of months ago that more than a third of the Jap merchant fleet of about 7,500,000 tons has been sunk since Pearl Harbor, with 77 percent of enemy tonnage losses being the result of American submarine action.

Yes; Indiana men are in the silent service, too. A Navy and Marine Corps medal went to Paul C. Morton, of Terre Haute, Ind. While in a submarine on its fourth war patrol he participated in the sinking of 31,700 tons of enemy shipping.

Now, I hope the out-of-Staters present here today will not think I am trying to prove Indiana is winning this war single-handed, but we are justly proud of our contribution. Leading the battle of the Atlantic is Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, of Laporte, son of the former Admiral Ingersoll, who is commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet. The sorrow of the loss of his own son in this war is with him in this fight for the freedom of other men's sons. Vice Admiral Jonas H. Ingram, of Jeffersonville, is commander of the south Atlantic force. Vice Admiral Arthur B. Cook, of Evansville, commandant of the Tenth Naval District, is training our seamen in that most important station in the southern part of the United States. Other Indiana men in active leadership service are Vice Admiral Raymond Spruance, of Indianapolis; Rear Admiral Edward John Marquart, of Valparaiso; Rear Admiral William Sims Farber, Frankfort; Rear Admiral Sydney M. Kraus, Peru; Rear Admiral Ralph F. Wood, Goshen; Rear Admiral Howard Harrison Good, Warren; Rear Admiral E. H. Campbell (retired), South Bend, and Rear Admiral Henry Maston Mullinix, Spencer, Ind.

Of course, I cannot mention all of our valiant leaders—time would not permit; nor would they want their fortune of leadership to lessen in any way our debt to the great body of the gallant 45,000 Indiana men and women in the United States Navy today. That gives us a great stake in past and future battles.

Civilian Indiana has its daily contacts with the Navy and we are glad and proud of it. It pleases us to know that right here in dry-land Indiana several factories are turning out boats and ships for the Navy, one less than 25 miles from where I stand. At least half a dozen colleges and universities, which make Indiana famous for education, are sponsors of naval training programs, their campuses teeming with men in blue. Indiana is the home of a great naval armory and of the vast munitions storage depot of the Atlantic Fleet. Shells, guns, and hundreds of items in the service of the Navy pour from our native State in an unbroken stream of munitions. Thousands of Hoosiers are employed patriotically in making them.

The very land of this State combines with the minerals and resources of other States to build the ships with which these men fight. Our coal and coke, oak lumber, pumps, and motors are used in the Navy. Men and women here are helping to build landing craft, life rafts, machinery, and many other necessary ships and accessories. We've helped to make our Navy the greatest fighting fleet in the world today, with over 14,000 ships and 18,000 planes.

Near this very city is the United States Naval Air Station of Bunker Hill. A little over a year ago that huge naval base was 2,350 acres of pasture land and cornfield. Now it's one of the most important training centers for naval pilots in the United States. Peru and other nearby cities watched the building of that air station. You've become acquainted with the air cadets who are future fighting pilots of the Navy. You know the staff and you've seen the members of the Women's Reserve arrive to take over shore jobs, so that more men could be released for duty with our growing fleet.

And let's not forget the women of the Navy today from this State and the other 47. We have had to man the largest fleet of our entire history. Already 70,000 WAVES have released enough men to man a good-sized task force of the Navy, and officials high and low have complimented them on the efficient job they're doing. President Roosevelt said of them, "In their first year the WAVES have proved that they are capable of accepting the highest responsibility in the service of their country."

On Navy Day of 1943 we salute these women in Navy blue who stand beside our men, volunteering their services so that this war may end in victory. Every member of the Women's Reserve knows that her work will hasten the day the men of our Nation return to enjoy the fruits of peace. We'll need more WAVES in 1944.

What lies before us in the coming year of war no one can predict. Initial victories have been heady wine to many of us. The people of the Nation forgot that Berlin and Tokyo were still far-off goals—that the first good news in the papers didn't mean the war was over.

It was then that military men and ranking officers in the Navy warned that these victories were only opening skirmishes, and the road ahead might be long and difficult before we gained the only acceptable terms: "Unconditional surrender." If we give the enemy a "breather" now, we'll find ourselves fighting a war that will last many years. Relaxing in building, in fighting, in buying War bonds would give Germany and Japan additional time, and they're not licked yet. Don't forget for a moment that Germany still holds the territory she has conquered in the many years since 1939. At her disposal are still millions of men and women, employed as slave labor. Our boys in the Army can tell you, too, that the German soldier is still well equipped, fighting strongly, and certain of eventual victory for the Reich.

In the meantime, Japan has gained an empire which furnishes her with all she needs for carrying on the war, in men, needed war materials, and food. This empire is dependent upon sea lanes of communication. The war in the Pacific is, therefore, bound to be a big job for the Navy. To date the Japanese Navy has refused to fight it out. They don't want to take the risk. The task awaiting our Navy in the Pacific is to meet that Jap Fleet and destroy it. The coming fight will dwarf any previous naval battle in

the history of the world—you can be sure of that.

Our enemy in the Pacific is ruthless and cruel, almost beyond belief. Hidden behind well-fortified islands, secretly armed during long years of pretended peace, the Japanese Navy waits and grows stronger.

Behind them, their own people are working frantically—and beneath their rule are more than 151,000,000 people of conquered countries—a population greater than the whole United States. The American territory, alone which has been conquered by Japan is greater in size than the combined States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland—regions rich in minerals and food.

Before American forces can get near to the front lines of Japanese defense of its conquered territory, powerful strongholds must be taken. The Navy struck at Rabaul during the past 2 weeks, destroying 177 Japanese planes and 119 ships—a sizable number, we'll admit. But even Rabaul is only an intermediate base, built since the first of 1942. The real, heavily developed powerhouses are in the mandated Carolines, under Japanese development for 20 years. No one knows what awaits us at Truk, 800 miles north of Rabaul. Truk, a cluster of 245 islands with a lagoon 40 miles across, is surrounded by a coral reef and has facilities for shelter to the whole Japanese Fleet, in addition to base facilities for a mighty invasion army and air force.

The development of Truk has been one of Japan's most closely guarded secrets, and is to Japan what Pearl Harbor is to the United States. You'll hear more of Truk before this war is won.

It is easy to understand, therefore, why Army and Navy leaders "blow their tops" when the foolish predict the "war will be over by Christmas." They know first-hand what we still must accomplish on land, on sea, and in the air. The men who are in command aren't trying to spread gloom. They merely want the people of this country to know the truth—and the truth is that our biggest battles are still before us.

Those of us here at home must be prepared to keep on building and working as we never have before. "Back the attack" isn't a pretty phrase to serve as a slogan; it's a hard, cold plea with sense behind it. We must build more than the 18,000 planes and 14,000 ships we now have—supply equipment and guns, food, and the million implements of war—to realize another slogan, "Your Navy—spearhead of victory."

The officers and men of the United States Fleet have done a great job in the past year, which in no part is shadowed because there are more difficult jobs in the future.

In the past year, in review, we've seen the recapture of the Aleutians—a magnificent job of convoy in the Battle of the Atlantic—the Pacific offensive, and landing operations on fortress Europe. The builders of America have turned out the ships and planes needed, to reaffirm the miracle of our production lines. With the spirit of attack dedicated to us by our forefathers, we cannot lose.

Our gratitude and trust is with our men and women in navy blue—the 45,000 from Indiana, and the more than 2,000,000 who pilot the planes, sail the ships, and fire the guns.

The glorious traditions of our American Navy are being carried forward. Russia, Great Britain, and China have proved worthy allies. The ships of many Allied Nations—Dutch, French, Russian, South American, and British—are with us at sea and our flag joins with theirs in the battles ahead. Good luck to our fighting men at sea—and a sincere pledge of continued support from those at home. May those men soon be sailing straight into the harbors of enemy nations—the spearhead of attack on Berlin and Tokyo.

Today, Navy men rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom—offering their lives and young strength to bring the Stars and Stripes home in triumph. Our prayer is that we may be worthy—that our work during the coming year may help and put them well on the way, over the sea lanes to victory, on Navy Day next year.

And to our enemy, wherever he may challenge us, on any of the seven seas, let us on this Navy Day, 1943, hurl the words which America's first great sea fighter, Capt. John Paul Jones, sent 164 years ago to those asking his surrender: "We haven't yet begun to fight."

Problems of the Soybean Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. J. E. Johnson, president of the American Soybean Association, at the National Food Conference held at the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An invitation from the National Food Conference is in itself evidence of the importance of soybeans in the food and feed program in our national economy. As president of the American Soybean Association, an organization including growers, processors, manufacturers of foods, scientists, and others, I want to extend to you our highest appreciation of this privilege and opportunity to speak a word for one of our newest crops which has grown beyond the fondest dreams of those who introduced it into the Corn Belt within the past 35 years.

The National Food Conference is most assuredly a sound and constructive step in the right direction by men and women willing to assume individual responsibilities—coming at a time when the seriousness of the food and feed situation is now a grim reality. This was emphasized at the annual meeting of the American Soybean Association held at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, September 5, 6, and 7, by Walter S. Burger, member of the National Food Industry Counsel, Des Moines, Iowa. In a most accurate and convincing manner, this group representing many States were again presented with the reality that we now have the largest population of livestock and poultry on record, due in a measure to a program placing stress on increasing this source of food, and apparently overlooking the equally important factor that there should be a balance of feed to maintain and convert this population into the maximum of food for human use. We now face a situation where we have a record livestock and poultry population, with an estimated 80-percent supply of feed to convert this population into finished food for human consumption. The trend now is for a shift from the livestock side to the feed side; this should be done through a systematic reduction, one that requires outstanding ability and the best of judgment.

Then we have experienced the constant attempt to convince the American public that we had ample food resources, when those who have the know-how and who had the sincerest interest and welfare of the war effort and the national economy at heart, knew that this was not the situation as we now know, certainly a most embarrassing position for our United States, which is destined to feed the world. Then to further aggravate this serious situation, those elected to positions carrying heavy responsibility, and others who may have volunteered, have visited our allied nations with the promise of food that may never be produced. In this connection may this suggestion be respectfully submitted—that this conference go on record as disapproving this type of effort and that from this time some person or persons leave the food situation to such groups as are here assembled working with other groups who have a sincerity of purpose and a determination to meet the challenge, one of the most serious ever attempted, and with but one objective—that of the mutual interest for the common good. To be sure we are very much interested in world affairs. However, we know that no utopia can ever be created as may have been suggested by well-meaning people. Foods are not produced by promises, but by performances. Take it this group is here for no other purpose than that of performance and performance only.

Obviously, this group is more interested in the present status of the soybean crop, rather than in the growth of the crop over the past years. You doubtless know the 5 large producing States are Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, and Missouri. The acreage goal for these 5 States for 1942 was 10,010,000 acres and it was met. The acreage goal for the 1943 crop for the same group is 10,843,000 acres and it will be met. In 1942 the estimated total United States soybean crop was 211,000,000 bushels, part of which was lost due to an unusually unfavorable harvesting season. The estimated total United States crop for 1943 at this time is 200,000,000 bushels with a fair outlook of harvesting the greatest part of the crop.

What does this mean to our national income in dollars and cents? In round numbers for the sale of the soybeans alone, $350,000,000—taking the State of Illinois, the largest producer in the large-producing State group, having an estimated acreage for commercial use of 3,500,000 acres. This to Illinois with an estimated State yield of 22 bushels per acre would be a State crop of 77,000,000 bushels, having a value of around $150,000,000. Incidentally, Illinois produced 73,794,000 bushels in 1942. Let us take Champaign County, the county in which the College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, is located. Estimated acres, 225,000, with a yield that should yield about 25 bushels per acre; this will bring this country in round numbers $6,000,000 from the commercial sale of soybeans, giving no credit for the acreage that will go into valuable feed for livestock in the form of hay. This gives you a partial picture from the financial side of this rapidly growing crop that came from the country of China, now our ally and who before the war supplied a large tonnage of the soybeans for industrial uses.

No doubt you are waiting to hear about the problems. Sure, we have them and in abundance. However, I want to say to you that this group represents that type of American genius and ingenuity that believes problems are in their final analysis, just opportunities, or stepping stones if you please, to greater accomplishments. Present problems, No. 1: For the years of 1942 and 1943 we were asked by our Government to increase production to meet the war effort. I need not tell you that in this request we were being called upon to produce more and more with less and less. Again it is to be regretted that positions carrying such tremendous importance as that regarding farm equipment was delegated to those who had little, if any, conception of what it was all about, and we

trust that we are reasonably correct when we say, cared little, living so far from the actual need. Notwithstanding this handicap, the soybean growers met the request and came through with the required acreage, but due to shortage of harvesting machinery failed in getting the entire crop harvested without a heavy loss. 1943 presents a similar situation; a small number of combines have been added to the harvesting equipment, which will offset the wear and tear on the combines used in 1942. Then the matter of transportation is more acute. Many trucks that were serviceable in 1942 are no longer in use and again, thanks to the creative ability of the American farmer, we must create and provide some method of moving the crop to market, that soybeans will be readily available for uses for which they are so well adapted. No, farmers are not complaining. Neither will they complain nor strike, even in the face that "the administration has shown a stiffening attitude toward demands of the labor politicians; despite the fact that wages have continued to increase twice as fast as prices." No; you will find the farmer pitching in without frills, fanfare, or favors to meet the food situation in winning the war and also winning the peace.

Problem No. 2. In an effort to secure a high protein food our Government requested that 1,750,000,000 pounds of soya flour be made from the 1942 crop for lend-lease and other purposes. At this point permit me to quote from Dr. H. W. Miller, International Nutrition Laboratory, Mount Vernon, Ohio. "There is no greater yield of protein than the soybean, which is sure to triumph for it has so much of intrinsic value." Dr. Miller spent several years in China where he observed the favorable effects of the soybean diet on the Chinese people as compared with that of the rice-eating sections of this vast country. May it be said here and now that we need recognize that a period has been reached where we are reasonably sure to see a trend from the meat proteins to the vegetable proteins. This perhaps may be the clue to those objecting to soybeans as food either conscientiously or selfishly.

The latest objection comes from the Pure Food and Drug Administration who, in the face of this request for the vast tonnage of a high protein food by our Government, have a decree whereby soya flour can be used as a bleaching agent only, and if more than one-half of 1 percent is added to the loaf by the baking industry, it cannot be called bread. This has come at a time when the diet of the Nation is suffering from lack of protein. To be sure we have registered our objections. This type of procedure seems so ridiculous and apparently discriminating it is reasonable to believe that this will be corrected by those responsible for such corrections, and without delay. At any rate you of the Food Conference most certainly have an interest in seeing that we make use of any food product that has merit.

In conclusion permit me to present the position of the American Soybean Association through a resolution adopted at the recent meeting without one dissenting vote or unfavorable comment; from the records, "The American Soybean Association in national annual convention at Cedar Rapids on the 5th day of September, 1943 defines its interest in soybeans for human food for the following purposes:

"1. Supplementing deficient human food supplies.

"2. Enriching foods in vitamins, protein and other nutritional values.

"3. Fortifiers of foods needing such fortification.

"4. Encouraging of vegetable soybeans as new sources of worth-while foodstuffs.

"5. Sources of foods to meet certain dietary problems of deficiency.

"6. Encouraging the use of soy foods wherever they show equal or superior food value to an established food product."

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we fully appreciate that soybean food products are going to have to live with other foods. However, now that 75,000,000 people have eaten food during the past year that contained soybeans in some manner, soya protein is here and here to stay. Thank you again for this opportunity to appear before this group of people interested in foods, a group with a firm conviction that great public causes are won by the perseverance and the leadership of a few determined individuals. May I extend you a most cordial invitation to attend the 1944 American Soybean Association Conference, College of Agriculture, Urbana, Ill., September 13, and 14, 1944.

Finally, accept this pledge from the soybean growers, man for man and acre for acre we must and will produce as never before.

British and American Activities in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the pen of Mr. Constantine Brown, appearing in the Evening Star of Tuesday, October 26, 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Reports from India that an average of 1,000 persons are dying daily from starvation are causing great concern in Washington.

Leaving aside humanitarian considerations, the administration is extremely interested because the famine offers a perfect propaganda argument to the Japanese against the British and Americans in the Far East.

The amiable and sincere efforts of the United States Government to bring about a settlement of the Indian problem have not succeeded. We were told that it was a matter concerning the British exclusively and we had to let it go at that.

British explanations as to why the situation could not be remedied at the present had to be accepted at face value; they appeared to be logical, and, furthermore, there was nothing we could do after having been told, politely and firmly, to keep out of the Empire's business.

The mission of Ambassador William Phillips, of India, was a complete failure. The most suave of the American diplomats was treated with all the consideration due a person of his rank. He was dined and wined and saw some of the Indian leaders—though not Mohandas Gandhi—but returned to Washington empty-handed.

FAMINE ALTERS SITUATION

The administration decided to let matters rest until after the war, when the British are expected to reach an agreement with the various factions in India.

But the famine now sweeping Bengal has placed an entirely different light on the problem, which is beginning to involve all members of the United Nations.

The British, who are the trustees of India, have allowed—through no fault of their own—a condition which has brought about a famine in one of the most important provinces of the Empire. That province, unfortunately, happens to border on Burma, where the Japanese are in control.

The Tokyo Government gave a "paper" independence to Burma several weeks ago. We know that the gesture does not mean the independence of those people any more than the newly granted independence of the Philippines means freedom for the Filipinos.

The people of the Far East, however, are likely to be impressed when they see one of their own citizens—although he is a Japanese stooge—in control of their affairs.

To top this comes the report of the deaths in India which the British censorship could no longer stifle, it appears, and that Britain, in spite of lease-lend arrangements with the United States whereby it can draw food from this country and send it to any part of the Empire, is doing nothing to alleviate the sufferings of the Indian people.

UNAWARE OF PROBLEMS

We know what difficulties Britain must encounter to transport food from this country to India, but what we know is not necessarily known to the people of the Far East, and the fact that thousands are dying, although they are protected by the wealthy British Empire, is one of the best propaganda weapons Japan could have hoped for.

The Quebec agreements provided for an early campaign against Burma. This campaign should begin in the next few weeks. The commander in chief of the Allied forces, Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten, and his British-American staff have arrived at New Delhi, where they are making preparations for the forthcoming operations.

The campaign may include a large-scale invasion or only major commando raids. It all depends on what naval and air support the cousin of the King of England has been given by London. In any event, in his operations he must depend on the good will of the people of the territory he intends to invade.

The Burmese have never been very fond of the British. But it was hoped that the presence of the Americans and a good deal of intelligent propaganda on our part might gain the support of at least a portion of the population of the formerly British-controlled territory.

The news of the starvation in India has made a deep impression not only on the Burmese but also on the Chinese and the people in the other territories where the western powers formerly were in control.

The Japanese point out that under their administration no such things are happening. The conclusion the Tokyo propagandists are drawing is that the Asiatics had better stick to each other because the selfishness of the westerners is now too evident. On the eve of the Allied offensive in Burma the famine in Bengal may be the equivalent of several divisions.

Post-War Immigration Policy

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post attacks the American Legion for a resolution adopted at its recent national convention appealing to Congress to prohibit immigration to the United States entirely until the war is over and our unemploy-

ment figure gets down to not more than 1,000,000.

The Legion's resolution not only reflects the views of the ex-service men, but, in my opinion, it reflects the views of the American people as a whole as well as the views of the men in our armed forces all over the world. They are fighting for this country, and we must save it for them to enjoy when they return.

I dare say that if everyone in our armed forces could be here to vote on this resolution and it were left entirely to them, it would carry by 10 to 1.

This measure would not discriminate against any country, but would operate in favor of the American people and in favor of these boys who are going to be coming back here looking for employment when this war is over.

It would help to save America for those Americans who are now fighting our battles.

Conflict of Rival Yugoslav Factions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 29 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch in the Evening Star of October 25, 1943, entitled "Rival Yugoslav Units of Mihailovich and Tito Reported Battling." In asking that the dispatch be printed in the columns of the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish again to say that I think it is extremely unfortunate that factions in Yugoslavia, who have as their common enemy the Axis Powers, are fighting each other, whereas they should be fighting the common enemy instead of making destruction of one another.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIVAL YUGOSLAV UNITS OF MIHAILOVICH AND TITO REPORTED BATTLING

LONDON, October 25.—Rival Yugoslav forces of Gen. Josip (Tito) Broz and Gen. Draja Mihailovich have clashed in a bitter battle in the hills of Montenegro. Tito's free Yugoslav radio announced today as his Partisans continued to engage the Germans in other parts of Yugoslavia.

The fighting between Tito's Partisans and the forces of King Peter's war minister was said to be particularly heavy in the Matsevo and Mont Cakor areas where, the radio declared, General Mihailovich's Chetniks had joined the Germans.

TWO THOUSAND NAZIS CAPTURED

An earlier communique, which announced that the Partisans had stormed two German strongholds in western Bosnia and captured 2,000 officers and men, said the Nazis and Chetniks were attacking without success at Matsevo and so far they have lost 300 killed.

Tito repeatedly has accused General Mihailovich of aiding the Germans.

Freedom To Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at Boston, Mass., on September 28, 1943, by Mr. James Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The address was delivered before the Advertising Club of Boston.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with real pleasure that I meet with you here in Boston today. For some time past I have been concerned with the freedom to listen. It is a propitious circumstance that enables me to speak of it in Boston—cradle of freedoms.

For the moment, let's pretend. In recent years a good deal of new radio legislation has been proposed, but I do not think the proposal I have in mind has been broached heretofore in this country. Permit me to introduce the following bill for your consideration.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That on and after the effective date of this act it shall be illegal—

"(a) To possess a radio receiver or receiving device capable of hearing any radio transmitter not programed by the United States Government.

"(b) To listen to any radio program not originated by the United States Government.

"(c) To manufacture or sell any radio receiver capable of hearing programs not originated by the United States Government."

And suppose our bill might provide further that it shal be illegal "to manufacture, sell, possess, or listen by means of a radio receiver which does not have affixed to it a Government approval stamp. Such Government approval stamps will be placed upon radio receivers only if they meet the following specifications:

"(a) They must be capable of receiving the programs of two stations which broadcast the Government's programs.

"(b) They must not be capable of receiving any stations other than those listed in section (a) above.

"The appropriate Government agency shall jam by means of artificial static devices all programs not originated by the Government.

"Listening after 10 p. m. is forbidden. Listening in groups of more than three is forbidden, except for specific programs to which listening is compulsory.

"Free reception at public receivers will be provided for all programs to which listening is compulsory.

"Violations of this act shall be punished by fine and imprisonment, except violation of the provisions relating to reception of prohibited stations. The punishment for listening to such stations shall be death."

Is such a statute unthinkable? Weird? Fantastic? No, let me assure you. The counterpart of almost every one of those provisions, or equally onerous restraints, can be found in one part of the world or another now under Axis domination. Such edicts as the above are not vain imaginings applicable only to existence on another planet. They are in forcé in our own contemporary world.

Consider the practices in Germany. The state controls the manufacture of radio receivers so that it is impossible to obtain a set capable of receiving a short-wave signal. Furthermore, the standard broadcast range is limited to the German propaganda centers. Not willing to give the German people a sporting chance to sneak a listen to the ideas of the rest of the world, Goebbels makes doubly sure and jams any verbatim utterances as they occur.

The will to listen dies hard and the mechanical precautions have had to be strengthened with legal sanctions. An inhuman German statute provides the death penalty for persistent "black listening." Those people guilty of one act of "black listening" are merely thrown into a concentration camp A wife with guilty knowledge of her husband's "black listening" goes to the concentration camp too. The Japanese militarists go a step further than their German colleagues; they kill and torture Japanese people for what they call dangerous thoughts. Such fear and tyranny stagger our imagination so that we can hardly imagine that we would be taking our lives in our hands for thinking of turning on our radios.

Such moral darkness is a breeding ground for suspicion. There can be no understanding when people are shrouded by the ideas only of the Fuehrer, no matter who he may be. The end product for these benighted people is a pathological conviction that war against their fellowman is a noble thing.

In the face of this world (or half-world) chaos, can we safely say that our imaginative bill is wholly outside the realm of imagination?

Freedom to listen, at least so far as radio in the United States is concerned, is so elementary a concept that it sometimes escapes attention altogether. In this hemisphere, as well as this Nation, people are encouraged to listen to the voices of all their neighbors; many of us listen to our enemies; we are confident that freemen can appraise the wheat and the chaff and that the dictators will be unable to alienate citizens of these democracies from the governments they themselves control. We take it for granted when we sit in our homes, throw the radio switch, and turn the dial, that in this gesture at least we, as listeners, are completely free. We take all of this as a matter of course and all too seldom articulate our underlying confidence that democratic government depends ultimately on a truly informed citizenry.

I would suppose that the first reaction to my fanciful bill would be that our Constitution protects us. Whether this bill violates due process or due substance or even the commerce clause, I leave to the Harvard Law School professors. I leave to the Harvard law professors, too, a further constitutional problem that would appear, at least at first blush to bear on this statute. This is the guaranty of the right to assemble. Millions each night assemble on the various wave lengths; without freedom to listen those assembled are as effectively deprived of their constitutional right as if, assembled in Boston Common, they were ridden down by the police and clubbed into dispersion. For my own part, I want to orient my thinking on the subject in terms of free speech. To most of us, in a deep emotional sense, freedom of speech is a basic right. I venture to suggest that the freedom to listen is an essential counterpart of freedom of speech.

In the days when Sam Adams was able to rally the people of a colony by forming "committees of correspondence" for the writing of letters, and when James Otis was able to stir even the illiterate by his fiery addresses in the Boston town meeting, freedom of speech was fairly effective. Today, for all we know, a hundred Sam Adamses and a hundred James Otises may be writing letters or addressing small corner gatherings with little or no effect upon the vast force of public opinion. All too often today free speech supplies by itself only a mental catharsis for the speaker.

It must be borne in mind that however much the individual has personally enjoyed his freedom of speech there were always serious limitations. How many people could he reach by speech; how many by leaflets, over what distances, through what machinery, and at whose expense? Whatever therapeutic aid to his nervous system he may have enjoyed, there were various limitations in the means of achieving his own purposes as an individual. But there has always been the important need of the democratic nations to create and maintain an enlightened and informed public opinion based, as it must be, upon the facts fully and fairly presented.

The chief interest of the founding fathers, I suggest, was not freedom of speech merely for its own sake or for the sake of the speaker. They, to, had a concern for freedom to listen—for Whitman's "ears willing to hear the tongues." Their philosophy of free speech and press was based in large part upon the beneficial impact upon the people at the receiving end. True democratic government, they wisely felt, rests upon the capacity for self government which, in turn, is founded upon the unstinting diffusion of knowledge. Thus Jefferson said, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like spirits at the dawn of day." James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, stated it even more bluntly. He said, "A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy."

Such is the overtone of a recent Supreme Court opinion, which states:

"The authors of the first amendment knew that novel and unconventional ideas might disturb the complacent, but they chose to encourage a freedom which they believed essential if vigorous enlightenment was ever to triumph over slothful ignorance. This freedom embraces the right to distribute literature, and necessarily protects the right to receive it."

Our history is rich with battles looking toward a sound basis for democracy, in effect for the informed electorate; and in practical effect for the freedom to listen. What was significent at the beginning of this democracy is emphasized in the modern world. Listening has become one of the vital functions of our modern civilization. A vast amount of public information, public enlightenment, public news, and even public education—not to speak of entertainment—now reaches our people via the air waves. Radio has provided the mechanical means for attaining the founding fathers' ideal; a great responsibility lies upon those in control.

Do you remember how Woodrow Wilson described the radio revolution? Although radio was still in its infancy then—this was September 1919—President Wilson prophetically foresaw its immense global potentialities. He said:

"Do you not know that the world is all now one single whispering gallery? Those antennae of the wireless telegraph are the symbols of our age. All the impulses of mankind are thrown out upon the air and reach to the ends of the earth."

What Wilson foresaw is coming to pass in greater measure. The listening people demanded and got only entertainment from radio in its formative stage; today and for some time past they have demanded, and demanded successfully, that in addition to amusement, radio shall carry a full budget of news and discussion. Despite modern transport, our millions of people, widely dispersed or metropolitanly congested, cannot be reached through town meetings. National and world problems today completely overshadow town and colony problems. In this environment the old soap-box methods lack any real persuasive force.

It is a fortuitous circumstance that modern science has provided the means for the first adequate realization of free speech. With the advent of radio, audiences have become Nation-wide and even world-wide; their interests national and international. With innumerable listeners, the duty of the speaker to subordinate his interests becomes clear. Few may speak, all may listen. From the very limited nature of the facility it is at once apparent that the paramount interest is not in the single speaker—but in the millions of listeners. Therefore, those who control this mechanism of free speech must treat free speech not as a right but as a duty. They must hold this mechanism of free speech in trust for the people—the listeners.

We have a culture developed in part by radio. It is a common source of information and ideas. This wide country with its divergent groups is becoming aware of itself through radio. Sectionalism is fast disappearing; the unity, the harmony, and the understanding—all these things must rest upon a proper use of this medium of knowledge.

Over four decades ago, Dicey came from England to Harvard Law School to tell its students that "freedom of discussion and the disintegration of beliefs are so closely interconnected that they may well be considered as two sides or aspects of one phenomenon." Dicey stated the interrelation well. And, in the radio network world today—a day of mass communications—130,000,000 people provide an excellent sounding board to test the validity of beliefs.

Radio appears to have come all the way, but in reality it has only approached the cross roads. Radio is a living thing; it must grow and expand as people grow and expand. Despite its achievements we dare not be too smug about it. Restriction, constriction, and exclusion must give way to a broader and more democratic approach as to the persons the listening public may hear. Likewise, complete freedom to listen demands that divergent views must be aired. In the market place of ideas diversity of opinion enables us intelligently to sift the sound from the unsound.

The warnings from abroad that prompted me to offer you a mythical statute have been drastic. There are significant, though certainly far less aggressive, restrictions on the freedom to listen on the home front. Simply by careful selection of what is broadcast the freedom of the listener can be tightly restricted. The listener's freedom is thus inextricably bound up with freedom of speech over the air. There is no need for restriction. Our own Professor Chafee has well said:

"Unremitting regard for the first amendment benefits the Nation even more than it protects the individuals who are prosecuted. The real value of freedom of speech is not to the minority that wants to talk but to the majority that does not want to listen."

There should be no rule of thumb set up to hide behind whenever any group requests time on the air. The free radio can become a powerful instrument for the protection of freedom of opinions. A democracy is in many ways like a kettle of boiling water. There must be an open spout for the outlet of steam. Men must be guaranteed their right to express their opinions and ideas. As Justice Holmes once told a friend, "With effervescent opinions as with not yet forgotten champagnes, the quickest way to let them get flat is to let them get exposed to the air." The radio is a perfect outlet for such exposure to the air.

In the post-war world, international broadcasting will stand on the threshold much as our domestic radio stood in the days when Woodrow Wilson foresaw its great possibilities. As the domestic radio has played a large part in welding one nation, so international broadcasting should provide the free flow of information, and generate the tolerance for beliefs and an appreciation of cultures and thought patterns. Radio is that necessary catalyst upon which we shall rely to bring about a more sympathetic understanding among peoples. It would be harmful beyond prediction to have world radio restricted either by hiding behind a restrictive world policy or by allowing any individual national to go further and adopt restrictions of a more mechanical kind. I cannot but feel that the future peace and security of the peoples of the world must rest in large measure upon enlightenment. If we are to have an enlightened world, it must function on the basis of enlightened principles. The thoughts of men must be expressed freely and openly or thinking dries up. Any substitute for the free communication of ideas that may then rush into this vacuum is bound to be dangerous. Witness what we are fighting today.

We are primarily engaged in a struggle for freedom. From the idea of complete freedom itself have sprung many phases of more particularity. My own particular interest is, of course, in communications; and truly transmission is nothing without reception. But I suggest to you a development of this point along broader and deeper lines. All of us must be deeply concerned with bringing this freedom to those we are seeking to liberate and to further expand it for ourselves. I suggest that the principle is fundamental and must be guaranteed in the post-war world. The growth of international broadcasting and the prospective development of international television demand it. It is inevitable that for good or evil, closer relations will exist among nations, races, and religious groups. We must strive to make it for the good.

It is also true that no relaxation in the pursuit of the freedom to listen can be allowed to take place when the war is over. Eternal vigilance and undeviating regard for this and comparable principles must be observed if we are to have a lasting peace. Let me remind you again that freedom to listen encompasses more than the ability to spin the dial without fear. With only general policy safeguards the transmitters of all nations must foster a free and complete exchange of thought and the optimum diffusion of knowledge. The right to hear new ideas is part of the freedom to listen and is as much a burden of my theme as is the inadequacy of free speech in the absence of effective mechanisms, and in the absence of ears to listen.

I, therefore, leave with you this fundamental conclusion: That there must be universally accepted the freedom of all peoples to listen without fear and without restraint.

Letters From Servicemen About Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer for the RECORD extracts from a few letters received by me commenting on H. R. 3200, the bill I introduced, known as the Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act. I have continued to receive a considerable number of letters on this bill, and following are a few excerpts which might be of interest to

those who have an interest in such measures as I have proposed in H. R. 3200:

The Army will have a surplus of automotive equipment, cars, jeeps, trucks, and garage equipment, after the war to be disposed of. That probably will be put on the market for civilian use, as everyone will want a jeep. If it could be arranged for us veterans to get the agency in our home towns to sell this equipment on a commission or percentage basis through channels somethink like an army-store set-up, with an agency available for financing purposes, all we would have to have is a garage building and parking lot to be set up in business. This would be helping the veterans, and the equipment wouldn't be disposed of to some broker who can make a handsome profit for himself on a resale. (Sgt. C. D. Cavender, Fourteenth Ferrying Squadron, Army Air Field, Long Beach, Calif.)

I have noted with more than usual interest the bill you have introduced in the Congress to provide demobilization benefits for servicemen, and to dispose of surplus war material. May I assure you there is a great deal of interest in these matters among men of the services. They are especially interested in the proposed plan to allow a furlough period with pay prior to final discharge. * * * I observe your bill provides for a furlough of 3 months' duration, during which period the serviceman "shall receive pay and allowances at the same rate as that to which he was entitled immediately prior to the beginning of such period, except that he shall not for such period be entitled to pay at a rate in excess of $100 per month."

I should like to inquire what the word "pay" means as used in the quoted section. The base pay of a chief petty officer in the Navy, permanent appointment, is $138 a month. Does your bill mean that this pay would be reduced to $100, plus 20 percent if the man is at sea or on foreign station, plus housing allowance of $37.50 in the case of a family man, totaling $157.50 a month, or does it mean that base pay, sea pay, and housing allowance must not together exceed $100 a month? * * * I am of the opinion that your limit of $100 is an unwise restriction, and wholly unwarranted. Let me give you my reasons for this opinion. The purpose of your measure and any other similar piece of legislation is to cushion the economic shock brought about by the discharge of millions of men from the armed services. These men are now, and will so continue while in the service, to gear their economic lives and the lives of their families at home to the total of their present income from the service. For hundreds of thousands of men this individual income exceeds $100 per month. You propose to give them a period of 3 months in which to adjust themselves to a peacetime economy, to find jobs. Yet, at a time when they will require every dollar of income to aid them in locating jobs—a pursuit which may well entail travel expenses, and so forth. * * * Don't add to his economic burdens. Let your bill provide a real cushion * * * I have an insurance allotment and an allotment for the support of my wife and children of $129 a month, the maximum under the circumstances. This is not sufficient to care for them; it must be supplemented each month by additional amounts forwarded by me. A limit of $100 for the 3 months' period would not only sharply reduce my income from the service, but would involve a reduction in my allotment to my family from the Cleveland office of the Navy which handles allotment and allowance checks, with attendant danger of a month's check being delayed or missed. This would not only work a hardship on my family, but the entire procedure would require endless forms to be filled out and filed and endless bookkeeping for the already overburdened disbursing offices of the Navy and, of course, the Army in the case of soldiers.

I write this letter wholly in a desire to be helpful. But in providing a furlough (leave) for servicemen, I cannot urge too strongly that you make it a real furlough; do not burden it with a pay cut for all men in pay grades 1, 1A, and 2, as well as in other pay grades if your limit of $100 is all-inclusive. (C. E. Mills, C. Prtr., U. S. S. *Wyoming*, Fleet P. O., New York, N. Y.)

Instead of selling all the dental equipment that the Government will be in possession of and which would be sold, as I have witnessed, for 10 percent of its cost, give all dentists being discharged first crack at the bargains. Let them equip their offices and, if necessary, give them time to pay off. (Samuel S. Cohen, 320 Stuyvesant Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.)

Taxation and the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering legislation dealing with the most vital problem effecting the welfare of the American people and the stability of our Government in formulating the taxation policy of the Federal Government. The solution of this problem calls for the best thought of the Congress and the American people.

For the consideration of the Members of Congress there is submitted herewith an analysis of the tax situation in its effect on the welfare of the Nation by Mr. Earl Murphy, secretary of the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce:

POSITION OF THE IDAHO STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON TAXATION

Every person now living in the United States, as well as generations yet unborn, has a personal financial stake in the Federal tax policy now under discussion in Congress.

The very fact that as individuals we shrink from the task of analyzing the tremendously complex fiscal pattern of our National Government imposes upon organizations such as ours an added responsibility to attempt in some measure to clarify the picture.

It would serve no good purpose to recount in detail the rapid increase in Federal expenditures during the years immediately preceding World War No. 2, and the almost astronomical sums disbursed by Government since that date. At the same time, unless we deny the theory that there is a relation between the cost of government and the ability of citizens to meet that cost, we should give at least passing thought to the greatly oversimplified balance sheet as of a recent date.

Our Federal debt at the end of 1943 will exceed $200,000,000,000, or well above $1,500 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, including those in the armed forces at home and abroad.

State and local governmental debt of approximately $15,000,000,000 will bring the total public debt to about $1,633 per capita, or approximately $3,385 for every person gainfully employed in the entire Nation.

Our organization still believes that the ability of a nation, like that of an individual, to assume additional financial burdens must be measured, first of all, in the light of its present outstanding obligations.

The second test is ability to pay, or the relation of current income to fixed charges. Let us look at the record.

For the first 7 months of this year the total national income of our people averaged about $11,500,000,000 each month.

During the 3 months ending September 30, the Federal Government expended for all purposes, including war, a total of about $22,000,000,000.

In other words, the entire national income earned in 57 days was expended by the Federal Government in a period of 90 days.

What was earned during the remaining 33 days of the 3-month period was available to our citizens with which to meet living costs, education, State and local taxes, life insurance, savings, medical care, wealth producing enterprises, investment and other private financial obligations.

To once more oversimplify for the sake of emphasis, approximately 63.7 percent of our entire national income during that 90-day period was irrevocably assigned to the use of the Federal Government. Worst of all, $20,000,000,000 of the $22,000,000,000 total, was for the waging of war, an almost totally destructive wealth-destroying enterprise.

In the light of these facts it must be glaringly apparent that there is need for a complete about-face in the Federal fiscal policy of our Nation.

We have passed the point where we can dismiss the crushing impact of the steadily mounting tax bill with the platitudinous statement that "the war must be won at any price."

We are approaching the point where the combined cost of winning the war and maintaining our elaborate structure of Federal Government has reached a level close to that at which the price of these combined activities may destroy the structure we are seeking to preserve.

Until Government, as the applicant for funds, submits to its bankers—the American people—a crystal-clear statement that it has pared the cost of its activities, including those of winning the war, to the minimum consistent with victory, it is more patriotic to oppose added tax burdens than to support them. To blindly dole out our substance merely because we have been told that is the price that we must pay, is to merely speed the cycle of self-destroying financial folly in which we are reveling.

It has been truly said that to thus destroy the foundations of the Nation we now defend on many fronts, is to make a grim parody of the tragic sacrifice which war entails.

It is therefore the opinion of this organization representing the agricultural, commercial, and industrial activities of the State of Idaho, that Congress should first of all determine a basic fiscal policy for the Nation. Such a policy should be based upon a long-range view of how the wealth-producing factors of the Nation can best be husbanded, since it is apparent that even the present national debt will strain our tax-paying ability for generations to come.

A prosperous nation can pay generously for government but an impoverished country can be destroyed in its efforts to maintain even a minimum of government.

A basic fiscal policy for the Nation would fearlessly face the fact that ability to pay is the first measure of equity in taxation.

Under this test, all who enjoy increased net incomes arising from wartime activity would contribute their increased share of the cost of Government, whether the additional net income was the result of their labor, their investments, sales of their assets, or appreciation of values.

Such a fiscal policy should include a fearless scrutiny of the costs of Government not directly related to the war effort.

Of the $22,000,000,000 spent by Federal Government during the past 3 months, $2,000,000,000 was for nonwar activities. How much of this could have been eliminated, the Congress is in a better position to determine than we. However, from almost any street corner in Idaho governmental activities not essential to the war effort can be plainly seen. Many of them, in our humble opinion, were not even essential to peacetime Government.

A Federal fiscal policy must encourage the production of goods and services since there is no other source of wealth from which to maintain Government in perpetuity.

A sack of potatoes in an Idaho field will not pay a Federal tax bill until it has been converted into dollars. All of the mineral wealth of Idaho's mountain ranges will not pay for one round of machine-gun bullets. until enterprise and labor have combined their forces to change some of it into money.

Accordingly a fiscal policy that is not conductive to the expansion of wealth-producing activities, or that gives preference to the expenditure of public funds in the post-war period over encouragement of individual, private enterprises cannot be considered sound from any standpoint.

It would be presumptuous for us to undertake to formulate the details of a revenue program that will meet all of the requirements of a national economy as diverse as that of the United States.

We have no hesitation, however, in urging that a determination of a sound fiscal policy must precede the more or less technical and mathematical problem of fixing rates, deductions, allowances, exemptions, and the like.

We repeat that Congress should first determine the irreducible minimum cost of Government in a period of global war. This should be defensible against the most searching scrutiny and the most relentless attack; it should be realistic and based upon a courageous realization that there is no justification for any governmental activity that serves only to provide employment for individuals who might better be employed in prosecuting the war effort.

Having thus arrived at a true picture of what Government expenditures must be, as distinguished from what agencies of Government believe they should be, the total tax bill can then be computed.

We endorse what seems to be a rather general feeling in our State that this point has not yet been reached by Congress in its thinking, although some noteworthy progress appears to have been made in recent days.

The common error that a general increase in national income necessarily means that all individuals and corporations have been thus blessed should be avoided. An analysis of the distribution of this added income will disprove the assumption, as a moment's reflection will suggest individuals within our own circle of acquaintances who have not so benefited.

It is probably much less important in the final analysis whether a tax levy is to be $1 or $5, as it is to determine the severity with which the tax falls upon the individual taxpayer. We cannot escape the conclusion that it is possible to destroy a nation through taxation, just as it is possible to wipe out a business, a farm, an industry, or a herd of livestock.

Taxation as a weapon to effect social reform, increasingly evident in recent years, deserves the critical attention of Congress.

To exact a tax for prosecution of the war, when its purpose is plainly indicated, is a defensible governmental act.

To levy a tax of the same severity under the guise of providing for the social security of the citizens, borrow the funds so garnered for the waging of war, and secure the loan with a promise to pay at some later date out of funds to be raised at that time by another tax is utterly indefensible.

It is based upon the false and ridiculous assumption that a majority of our people are selfish enough to prefer to pay a tax labeled "insurance for me" rather than one plainly marked "to wage war for us."

In conclusion, it is our opinion that our citizens in all walks of life will gladly meet an equitable tax program levied with full recognition of their ability to pay, that can be shown to be needed solely for the purpose of maintaining the irreducible minimum of government while we are engaged in a global war and that will permit the maintenance of a sound economy in the Nation with sufficient reserves to meet the impact of readjustment and conversion at the end of the present war.

EARL W. MURPHY,
Secretary, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce.

National Cemeteries Should Be Established in Every State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE D. WILLEY
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a recent conference with Members from the various States in which no national cemeteries have been established, it was the general view that legislation should be enacted at an early date so that plans can be made, sites acquired and prepared, architectural plans drawn, and work begun in order that these national shrines will be in readiness to meet the demands of the nearest relatives for the return of our dead to their native States immediately upon the conclusion of hostilities. In order to aid the accomplishment of this purpose I have today introduced a bill, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretaray of War is authorized and directed to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in each State in which there is not situated on the date of enactment of this act a national cemetery, a suitable site at or near the State capital for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in States (including the District of Columbia) having a population of 500,000 or more, and in the Territories, and possessions of the United States, (1) suitable sites for the establishment thereon of such additional national cementeries, and (2) land adjoining existing national cemeteries for the extension of such national cemeteries, as the Secretary of War may determine to be needed for the burial of war veterans.

SEC. 3. Upon the acquisition of such land by the United States, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish thereon national cemeteries, and to provide for the care and maintenance of such national cemeteries.

SEC. 4. The act entitled "An act to provide for a national cemetery in every State," approved June 29, 1938 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 24, sec. 271a), is hereby repealed.

Mr. Speaker, the attention of Members is also called to remarks which appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4266, which contain more detailed information upon the subject.

No part of our war effort is closer to the hearts of the fathers, mothers, relatives and friends of our servicemen and women than that of providing suitable burial shrines for those who must pay the supreme sacrifice in this global conflict.

Daingerfield Steel Plant—Recentralization of Steel Plants in United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an effort is being made to obtain approval through the War Production Board of a steel mill at Daingerfield, Tex., in the district I represent. Our people, the Lone Star Steel Co., have already constructed the coke ovens, 78 in number, and also a blast furnace, and we are now endeavoring to obtain approval of the steel mill to start the production of steel.

Mr. Speaker, when in the spring of 1940 the course of the war in Europe, culminating in the downfall of France, made urgently necessary a great speeding up of the national defense program, a decision was made by our Government to provide an expansion of 10,000,000 tons in the productive capacity of steel. The money cost of this expansion program was estimated to be about $1,000,000,000.

The leaders of the steel industry contended that no such expansion was needed. They protested vehemently against it. They failed to realize, however, how tremendous the demands for steel would be in accomplishing our rearmament.

STEEL NEED URGENT

How great the need for steel still is, is shown by the following extract from a dispatch to the New York Times from Pittsburgh, dated October 10, 1943:

Raw steel output for the country last week increased one-half point to 100.5 percent of rated capacity. This marks a new high for the war. Indications already are that this experience will be matched or exceeded this week.

Steel-ingot output in the Pittsburgh district likewise increased last week, moving up one-half point to 102.5 percent of rated capacity. This experience matched the high point reached a few weeks ago. The percentage of operation figures for the country, as well as this district, are all the more significant because of the recent increase in rated steel ingot capacity.

While raw steel production was gaining last week, there appeared to be no abatement in the tremendous volume of fresh steel orders. As has been the case for weeks, the pre-

dominating steel products were plates, sheets and bars.

The plate and sheet situation last week became tighter than ever, and was forcing the War Production Board to advise steel mills to accept a greater volume of plate orders than has heretofore been the case.

As matters stand now, the substantial volume of unscheduled, but properly certified, plate and sheet tonnage will be put on mill order books, even though this tonnage causes the acceptance rate to be greater than 110 percent of the W. P. B. directive.

STEEL BRANCH ESTABLISHED

Very wisely, in spite of all their protests, the Government authorities persisted in carrying out the expansion program. To guide and direct it an Iron and Steel Branch was set up in the Office of Production Management. Experienced steelmen from all the big companies were drafted to serve on it; many of them were and still are on a dollar-a-year basis.

The pressure for more steel became so great that the primary object came to be to get it as quickly as possible. To the members of the Iron and Steel Branch the quickest way to get more steel appeared to be to expand existing plants. It is just possible that their affiliations with the big companies may have had some influence on their views. Be that as it may, the course adopted was to add new steel-making capacity to existing plants in the congested northern area.

STEEL INDUSTRY CONGESTED

Few people realize how great the geographical concentration of the steel industry actually is. Before the war nearly 90 percent of all the steel produced in the United States was made in four or five States north of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi.

This was a bad thing for the country. In the first place, virtually the entire industry was dependent upon one source of ore. That ore had to be transported a thousand miles or more from mines to mills, over a vulnerable shipping route closed by ice 5 to 7 months every year. Interruption to that supply of ore, which might result from one of a dozen causes, would shut down almost the entire steel industry of the country.

In the second place, the great concentration of plants increased and intensified difficulties of manpower and other problems.

Third, the long hauls of finished products to war industries all over the country placed a tremendous and very unnecessary burden upon the already overloaded transportation systems of the country.

DECENTRALIZATION OPPOSED

These are only a few of the many reasons why such a concentration of steel-making facilities was a bad thing. Nevertheless the members of the Iron and Steel Branch—and later, those of the successor organization, the Steel Division of the War Production Board—did nothing and they intended to do nothing to alleviate this situation.

Only through strenuous efforts and extreme pressure was authorization reluctantly granted to construct a steel plant at Fontana, Calif., another at Provo, Utah, and a blast-furnace plant at Daingerfield, Tex. A few smaller expansions were authorized for plants in the South and West, but control of all of them was retained in the hands of the big companies.

BIG COMPANIES CONTROL

Remarkable as is the geographical concentration of steel-making facilities, the industrial concentration is even more astounding. If you name seven or eight big companies you will name practically all the steel producers in the United States. Here they are: United States Steel, Bethlehem, Republic, Jones & Laughlin, American Rolling Mills, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, National Steel. The others, great and small, are mostly subsidiaries.

Deliberately or not, the steel-expansion program was designed and executed in such a way that most of the increase went to these same big companies. Every effort was made to avoid awarding any of it to newcomers in the field, the excuse being that these had neither the organizations, the facilities, or the know how to get quickly into production. Peculiarly enough, it is the very plants built by these newcomers that have come first into operation or are nearest completion. In spite of many handicaps and much opposition, the Kaiser plant at Fontana came into production well ahead of many of its competitors; similarly, the Lone Star Steel Co.'s blast-furnace plant at Daingerfield—the stepchild of the expansion program—will be finished no later than similar or smaller plants being constructed by big steel companies. Furthermore, it is being built at lower cost per ton of annual capacity.

BIG COMPANIES FAVORED

The facts speak for themselves. On a dollar basis, the steel-expansion program has cost about $1,250,000,000. Of this, approximately 75 percent has been awarded to the eight big companies. According to the Mead report (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 4, 1943), 53 percent has been awarded to three companies—United States Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and Republic Steel Corporation.

On a tonnage basis the total expansion in steel-making capacity for the United States as a war measure is, in round figures, as follows:

	Tons
Gross increase	9,750,000
Net increase	8,000,000

The difference of 1,750,000 tons is partly due to a decline in bessemer steel productive capacity—about 750,000—and the rest is due to various causes regarding which accurate explanation is not yet available.

Of the net increase of 8,000,000 tons, the following went to six big companies:

	Net tons
Open-hearth furnace increase	5,341,275
Electric-furnace increase	1,617,900
Total	6,959,175

This is equal to 87 percent of the net increase, and to 71 percent of the total increase.

The increase in open-hearth capacity distributed to five big companies was as follows:

	Net tons
United States Steel, 71 percent	3,894,275
Armco	597,000
Bethlehem	420,000
Republic	360,000
J. & L.	70,000
Total	5,341,275

The increase in electric-furnace capacity distributed to four big companies was as follows:

	Net tons
Republic	1,215,000
Carnegie-Illinois (United States Steel)	230,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	120,000
Armco	52,900
Total	1,617,900

TEXAS PLANT POSTPONED

The proposal for a completely integrated steel plant at Daingerfield was submitted to the Iron and Steel Branch of the Office of Production Management on October 22, 1941—over 2 years ago. There was every reason for prompt approval of this application. The raw materials—iron ore, coal, limestone, manganese—had been proved to be there or close at hand, adequate in quantity and of the highest quality. The need for steel to supply war industries was there; it was very great and constantly increasing; the transportation saving were obvious, the great advantages of location needed no demonstration.

Nevertheless, approval of this plant has been postponed again and again. It has not yet been granted, though authorization for construction of several similar plants has been extended to the big steel companies since the application was filed. It is true that, urged on by the desperate shortage of scrap and pig iron, approval was given for the construction of the blast furnace plant at Daingerfield in the spring of 1942. Later, however, a determined attempt was made to cancel this plant—an attempt thwarted only by the far-sighted vigilance of Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

BIG STEEL PROTESTS

The proposal for establishing a steel plant at Daingerfield has aroused loud and lusty protests and complaints from the representatives of the big steel companies. Every comment they have made has emphasized their profound ignorance concerning the need for decentralization of the steel industry and of the conditions in the South and West that favor such decentralization. Their attitude can be summed up as follows: steel plants built anywhere in the West or South or by anyone but the big companies are economically unsound and a waste of money and materials. Even if it were economically sound to build such plants, they would still be opposed to doing so with Government funds. In other words, in their opinion wartime

expansion at Government expense is all right for the big steel companies in the North and East, but for new, independent companies in the South and West, it is all, all wrong.

This attitude is not only selfish but it is also thoroughly unsound from the point of view of broad national interest. It is not in keeping with that high type of industrial statesmanship which hitherto has contributed so much to making America great. If the United States is to take and maintain the commanding position in world affairs to which it is entitled, its industrial leaders must reexamine their attitudes and principles in the light of their responsibility to the welfare of the Nation.

NATIONAL WELFARE AT STAKE

The welfare both of the country and of its people cannot be served by favoring one section over another, or by refusing to permit the development of our natural resources, wherever they may occur. This war, as is well known, is wasting those resources at a tremendous rate. The higher grade iron-ore reserves of the Lake Superior region are being depleted rapidly. Within a very few years, unless new deposits in other parts of the country are developed, only scattered high-grade deposits will be left in that area—most of the ore supply will then have to be derived at higher cost from beneficiated low-grade reserves. High-grade ores, if so situated that they can be cheaply mined, can stand the cost of being transported long distances from mines to furnaces as they now must be to supply northern mills. To transport low-grade beneficiated ores long distances, however, will inevitably result in an increased cost of delivered ore and consequently a higher cost of the iron and steel produced from it.

This situation demands, therefore, the development of high-grade deposits in other parts of the United States and the shifting of iron and steel plants to locations close to the sources of ore and coal.

The high-grade deposits of coking coal on which northern furnaces depend are likewise being depleted. The movement of coal to ovens is now long and complex, and is becoming more so. New sources of coal must be developed and new plants must be established to take advantage of them.

It is an old fallacy that it is not economical to move coal to the ore; that the ore must always be moved to the coal. This is far from correct. The controlling factor is the location of the market. Either the ore or the coal can be moved if it is moved toward the market. Moreover the market follows the supply of iron and steel. This is one of the axioms of industry.

EDITORIALS QUOTED

I should like to include here two editorials from a mouthpiece of the big steel interests, the American Metal Market, regarding the proposed decentralization of the steel industry, and also replies which appeared in the editorial columns of the Dallas News and the Dallas Times-Herald, as well as some comments of my own concerning them. These are arranged in chronological sequence.

[From American Metal Market, New York, of October 9, 1943]

STEEL BLOC—POLITICAL BUNCOMBE

An interesting item in the Washington news this week concerned a meeting of 74 House and Senate Members for the purpose of organizing a steel-industry decentralization program to work toward creation of steel works outside the present centralization in the East and the Great Lakes areas. Formation of a steel bloc for that purpose was approved by the gathering, and a resolution was adopted calling for appointment of steering committees of both Houses to do the preliminary work.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, Texas Democrat, told the meeting that the W. P. B.'s Iron and Steel Section is "owned and controlled by big industry" and that "every man in the iron and steel section is out of some big company—and they don't want any more steel." As for the first quote, the statement is purely categorical piffle; as for the second, the Senator is talking through his 10-gallon hat. Of course, there is the question, Just what is a big company? Almost any steel company today is a big company, for the making of steel is, if we may remind the Texas Senator, necessarily big business.

How the Texas Senator got into the gathering is, of course, an interesting phase of the story. It seems, according to Mr. CONNALLY, erection of a steel plant at Daingerfield, Tex., was approved only after W. P. B. Chairman Nelson overruled his subordinates (presumably on the Iron and Steel Section of the W. P. B.). Now, the Senator moans, the W. P. B. refuses to approve allocation of steel needed to build the mill. But we didn't read that the Senator was aware that the Texas plant alone was not singled out on that score; a sweeping directive of the W. P. B. halted all war-plant construction that could not be finished by a certain deadline.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Nevada Democrat, sponsor of the steel-bloc plan for the decentralization of the steel-producing capacity in the East and Great Lakes areas, warned the members at the meeting that the W. P. B. will be a major adversary in any program to develop industries in new areas. He asserted that W. P. B. officials have "a cramped and prejudiced viewpoint."

All of which sounds like so much political buncombe.

The plan of a steel bloc to set up steel mills in the present industrially starved areas of the country, instead of post offices, boils down to simple fundamentals. If, in the post-war period, we are to operate under a Government-controlled economy, then the steel industry can shelve its worry over what a steel bloc might do to its normal growth, for it won't have anything to say about its own affairs anyway. But if, in the post-war era, we are permitted to return to a free economy it is our guess that any politically sponsored steel mill erected in an out-of-the-way economic spot will languish in rust. It might be a gentle reminder to the embryonic steel bloc to recall that in normal times it is cheaper to make steel in the East and to lay it down on the west coast than it is to make it right on the consuming grounds. The same would be true of Texas, which can take steel via water delivery.

Is it the plan of the steel bloc to erect steel plants that will necessitate (1) long hauls of raw material; (2) imported and relocated labor; (3) long hauls of the finished steel to distant large-consuming centers? If we may once again be fundamental and brief in summing up the present growth of the steel industry, we would suggest to the steel bloc that the present set-up of the iron and steel industry is the result of economic rather than political developments.

As for the contention of the politicians from the west coast and the South that the steel men on the W. P. B. have thwarted any plans for expansion in other than already established steel centers, there are arguments galore to break down such allegations. In short, the advent of war called for the speediest expansion of steel capacity possible, and the common-sense approach was to expand, wherever possible, existing capacity where there already was integration of facilities that could more quickly fit in with the new capacity—not to speak of existing brains, experience, and manpower.

It appears to us that the members of the steel bloc would seek partly to build their case by besmirching the members of the steel industry who have been serving on the W. P. B. Some of the allegations that have been presented suggest that the steel industry has stood in the way of the prosecution of the war. We would venture that there is more nationalism and less sectionalism among leaders in the steel industry than there is in the entire steel bloc.

Economically, the steel bloc hasn't a leg to stand on. If it is to be purely political, akin to the Senate-born, Senate-manipulated silver bloc, then we would urge some of our other Congressmen to rise up in strong protest.

But we doubt if the steel bloc is much more than political buncombe, for which there should be little time these days in the busy Halls of Congress. The steel industry is too busy making steel, perhaps, to worry about the plan of the group. But if the steel bloc should persist in its plans to make a political jigsaw puzzle out of our steel empire, then we might urge our eastern and midwestern Congressmen to start a hot-house orange bloc to initiate the growing of oranges in the industrial East and Midwest that will be faced with serious dislocation of labor if the steel bloc, by political hook or crook, should really get somewhere—which is dubious.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News]

SOUTHWESTERN STEEL

The American Metal Market of New York (generally accepted as the mouthpiece of the steel industry of the Nation), in its issue of October 9, jumps on Senator TOM CONNALLY for his recent statement that steel-industry representatives in the War Production Board have opposed the erection of a steel mill at Daingerfield, Tex., out of selfish interests. Particularly does Metal Market take exception to the Senator's statement that "every man in the Iron and Steel Section (of W. P. B.) is out of some big company—and they do not want any more steel." This, it states, is the Senator "talking through his 10-gallon hat." It continues: "Almost any steel company today is a big company * * * making steel is * * * necessarily big business." Thus Metal Market belittles the Senator's statement, and then winds up by substantially admitting the truth of it.

The editorial goes on to state that "the plan to set up steel mills in the present industrially starved areas of the country, instead of post offices, boils down to simple fundamentals." These fundamentals are given as "(1) long hauls of raw material, (2) imported and relocated labor, and (3) long hauls of finished steel to distant consuming centers." The facts are that the hauls of raw material to the Daingerfield plant will consist primarily of ore coming from territory within 5 miles of the plant and coal coming from southern Oklahoma, an average distance about 25 percent as great as that of the big steel industry of the North.

As for the "long hauls of finished steel," Metal Market might be interested to know that the production of the east Texas steel

mill running at year-round capacity will be less than 20 percent of the demand of the southwestern oil industry alone. The "long haul" is the one that is now necessary because the steel must be brought to the Southwest from the northern mills. It seems to be the naive assumption of Metal Market that a steel mill in Texas would have to ship its ore and coal from Minnesota and West Virginia, and sell its steel products in the Illinois-Ohio-Pennsylvania region. As for "relocation of labor," it is true that there must be some relocation of skilled labor. This will be true in all decentralization of industry.

Upon the basis of these "fundamentals," the editorial concludes: "If, in our post-war era, we are permitted to return to the free economy, it is our guess that any politically sponsored steel mill erected in an out-of-the-way economic spot will languish in rust." Plainly, either Metal Market has no conception of southwestern economy or it assumes that its readers have none. For its information, Chairman Donald M. Nelson himself has gone on record with the statement that the steel mill ought to be built at the Daingerfield location to serve the economic needs of the region.

Indeed, Metal Market's ignorance of the entire situation is illustrated by its statement: "Erection of the steel plant at Daingerfield, Tex., was approved only after W. P. B. Chairman Nelson overruled his subordinates. Now, the Senator moans the W. P. B. refuses to approve allocation of steel needed to build the mill." The facts are that Chairman Nelson overruled his subordinates to permit the construction of a blast furnace and coke ovens which have been completed and are now going into operation. The same representatives of the steel industry in W. P. B. who originally recommended against the blast furnace have now recommended against the companion steel mill that is needed. Chairman Nelson, who is now in Europe, has not finally ruled in this last matter.

The Metal Market editorial ends with a mighty blast. As a retaliatory move it threatens that "we may urge our eastern and midwestern Congressmen to start a hothouse orange bloc to initiate the growing of oranges in the industrial East and Midwest." A facetious remark, yes; but if there is honest basis for even a facetious comparison between growing hothouse oranges in Pennsylvania and the production of steel from the millions of tons of good Texas iron ore and Oklahoma coal, then we southwesterners will pull in our horns and call it quits. You, reader, be the judge in this matter.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald]

OPENING OF A NEW PERIOD OF GROWTH

The address which was made by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, when work was started on the iron plant at Daingerfield, included the following paragraph:

"Every section of the United States should use its natural resources and try to make itself independent of other sections. We down here are just beginning to find that the natural resources of our State are so vast and so varied that we have only scratched the surface. All those natural resources we can, as if by magic, turn to some of our needs and make our section prosperous and self-sufficient."

As one of the highest officials in the Government in Washington, it is necessary for Mr. RAYBURN to think in terms of the welfare of the Nation as a whole. Although he spoke at Daingerfield as a Texan, he was national in his viewpoint, whatever the northern and eastern industrialists may think.

In the established and highly developed manufacturing areas, Texas and other dominantly raw material States, who are trying to build up their industry, are thought of as breaking away from their logical role in the national economy.

Those regions take the position that the Nation has reached economic maturity, that experience has determined the role that each State should play, and that any attempt to change the pattern is out of order. But Mr. RAYBURN is too farsighted a statesman to accept this theory. His remarks apply, not only to Texas, but to any other State that is trying to balance its economy. Every raw-material State that is building up its manufacturing is contributing to the future growth and prosperity of the Nation as a whole. Any group, interest, or region that is fighting such development is an obstacle in the path of the national progress.

A reading of history will show that growth of the United States has not been steady and gradual, but has been by leaps and bounds, so to speak. As new discoveries have come and as barriers have been overleaped, spurts of new and rapid development have occurred.

The growing of tobacco in Virginia was among the first causes of rapid development. After that came national independence and this has been followed by the opening of the Middle West, the spread to the prairie region, the annexation of Texas and other western areas, the California gold rush, the building of the railroads and the telegraph, and, more recently, the emergence of the automobile and the discovery of vast oil fields. Scores of other factors have contributed to this development.

The Nation has spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Each of its periods of rapid growth has been preceded by a lull that caused many persons to think that maximum growth had been reached, and each leap that the Nation has taken has been viewed with alarm by older sections and the more established interests.

Today the most significant tendency in this country is the decentralization of manufacturing. It is a tendency that presages another of the periods of development which have characterized our national history. States which have attained maximum development along raw material lines are taking a new turn. The era of log cabin pioneering and horizontal expansion has ended, but a new era of vertical growth is opening.

The tendency is being resisted as have been those of like significance in the past. But resistance will be futile, in the long run. The most that the opponents of this new factor in our national progress can do is to cause delay and make more difficult the task of farseeing men like Speaker RAYBURN, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Senator CONNALLY, and John W. Carpenter, who have aided in the Daingerfield project, and other leaders in Texas and other parts of the country who refuse to accept as final the economic pattern that now exists.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of October 19, 1943]

SOUND INDUSTRY

Opposition to granting priorities on materials for the erection of a companion steel mill to the new blast furnace in east Texas is principally upon the allegation that such an enterprise would have wartime economic justification only, and that it would be forced to suspend operation under normal conditions. To this end, some of the spokesmen for the opposition have had much to say of "the long hauls" necessary for operation in such an "uneconomic" situation. In its final decision the War Production Board can be depended upon to heed concrete data, but seemingly some Texans have been listening to the adverse arguments.

Data compiled recently by the Lone Star Steel Co. for its brief before the W. P. B. show irrefutably that the east Texas enterprise will have both the supplies and the market to produce more economically than the large steel industries of the Nation as a whole. Most of the iron ore of the industry of the Pennsylvania-Ohio-Indiana-Illinois area comes from northern Minnesota, though there are smaller sources in isolated areas, notably in upper Michigan, eastern Pennsylvania, and northern New York. The coal supply lies primarily in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and Kentucky. The average coal and ore haul to Gary, Pittsburgh, Bethlehem, Youngstown, and other large steel centers is several hundred miles. Much of it goes by cheap water transportation over the Great Lakes, but a great portion is by rail, some of which is through difficult terrain. As against this, the Texas enterprise has sufficient ores for 50 years' operation within 5 miles and a source of coal a short distance away in southern Oklahoma.

The Texas enterprise will have a market in the Gulf Southwest several times greater than its capacity. On the basis of present rates, steel shipped to principal Texas consuming centers from outside industry would average $16.30 a ton, whereas the average rate from Daingerfield, Tex., would be $7.89. It is estimated that the new mill would save southwestern consumers more than $4,000,000 annually in freight rates alone.

If there are any basic data in opposition to the Texas enterprise, they have not yet been presented. Priorities for the construction of the mill should be granted.

Following is the principal part of the editorial in the American Metal Market of October 22, 1943:

The Dallas Morning News published in Dallas, Tex., by the A. H. Belo Corporation which is shown on the masthead of that paper as the oldest business institution in Texas takes strong exception in its issue of October 14th to some of the statements of our editorial Steel Bloc—Political Buncombe in our issue of October 9. But unfortunately the venerable Texas journal performed a bit of selective dissecting of our whole editorial presentation, with the result that its own conclusions were somewhat astigmatic.

It is, of course, quite understandable that any Texas paper, especially one so long identified with the history of Texas as the Dallas Morning News should take up the cudgel for home industries. That is the proper spirit of enterprise that has contributed to the whole of our national progress. But we as a national paper regret that the Dallas editor allowed his deep-rooted attachment to his home State to seize upon our contentions solely from a local viewpoint.

Our editorial of October 9th dealt primarily with the proposal of a steel bloc in Congress to launch a program of steel-industry decentralization from the East and the Great Lakes area. We cited the interest of Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, in the program as stemming from political pique over failure of Texas interests to get final approval of a proposed steel mill at Daingerfield.

We took exception to his remarks before a meeting of 74 Congressmen interested in forming the new steel bloc when he asserted that "every man in the Iron and Steel Section of the War Production Board is out of some big company—and they do not want any more steel." We stated that the Texas Senator was talking through his 10-gallon hat, and in spite of the Dallas paper's editorial effort to poke a finger in our critical eye we still insist that the Senator, not we, was ambiguous when he remarked that the War Production Iron and Steel Section is monopolized by big-steel-company men. In our editorial, we went on to say that his remark might, in effect, apply for steel making is a big business and most companies engaged in it could be called big.

But the essential point of the dissenting voice from Texas was that so far as Texas is

concerned, our strong criticism of the program of the steel bloc to decentralize the steel industry does not apply. We hasten to assure Texas that we did not single out that State to prove our point, but we'll stick to our guns on the general premises of our editorial of October 9 that you can't overlook certain economic fundamentals such as the availability of raw materials, labor, and consumer market.

The Dallas paper asserts that we might be interested to know that the production of the east Texas steel mill running at year-round capacity, will be less than 20 percent of the demand of the southwestern oil industry alone. The paper states further that hauls of raw material to the Daingerfield plant will consist primarily of ore coming from territory "within 5 miles of the plant and coal coming from southern Oklahoma, an average distance about 25 percent as great as that of the big steel industry of the North."

To these assertions we can only reply that after the emergency demands of the war are fully met and more steel is available for other purposes, let Texas go right ahead—with private money, mind you—and set up steel-making capacity if it can interest private money in the expectation that the investment will stand the impact of competition, which is the spur to private enterprise. To Texas and every other State in the Union, however, we strongly point out that any attempts to set up a "pork barrel" program to erect steel mills, with public money, should be summarily opposed. If Texas or any other State can through the initiative of its industrial leaders develop latent resources toward sound industrial expansion, we will champion such efforts. But so long as any expansion program, especially in times of emergency like those we are passing through, smells of political "pork barrels," we will continue to try to air such smells in our editorial column.

The Texas paper admits that, in a program of decentralization, it is true that there must be some relocation of skilled labor. "This will be true," the Dallas editorial states, "in all decentralization of industry." From the latter comment, we gather that the Dallas newspaper, product of the oldest (and we assume, private) business institution in Texas, is in favor of decentralization of industry. This view, of course, is usually held by sections of our country that have no industrial empires to make them as self-contained as they would like to be.

Meanwhile, Texas seems to have recently enjoyed a fairly proportionate share of steel-capacity expansion. In 1938, Texas had a total annual capacity of raw steel of 3,860 gross tons. As of January 1, 1943, Texas had a total annual capacity of 219,660 net tons. In 1938, the Nation's steel ingot and castings capacity was 80,185,638 net tons, versus 98,743,170 tons on January 1, 1943. Thus, it may be seen that the expansion of steel capacity in Texas in the war years has been eminently greater than the average expansion for the Nation—and this despite the fact that the accessibility of economical iron ores and good coking coals has never before been exploited by Texas to a noticeable extent prior to regulation of capacity expansion by the War Production Board.

The Dallas paper points out that War Production Board Chairman Donald Nelson himself is on record with the statement that "the steel mill ought to be built at the Daingerfield location to serve the economic needs of the region." Mr. Nelson may have sufficient reasons at hand for that contention, but with all due regard for Mr. Nelson we fail to see the argument for any steel mill to be erected on such general premises before the war's end is in sight or so long as there is an emergency need for steel.

Following is an editorial appearing in the Dallas Morning News on October 27, 1943, entitled "Politics and Steel":

Recently American Metal Market, of New York, a daily newspaper of the steel industry, charged Senator TOM CONNALLY with "political buncombe" because he interceded on behalf of the petition before the War Production Board for priorities to build a steel mill at Daingerfield, Tex., and especially because Senator CONNALLY said that all members of the facilities review committee of the War Production Board "are out of some big steel company—and they don't want any more steel." Now, in reply to an editorial in the News defending the stand of Senator CONNALLY, Metal Market sums up its opinion as follows:

"To these assertions we can only reply that after the emergency demands of the war are fully met and more steel is available for other purposes let Texas go right ahead—with private money, mind you—and set up steel-making capacity if it can interest private money in the expectation that the investment will stand the impact of competition, which is the spur to private enterprise. To Texas and every other State in the Union, however, we strongly point out that any attempts to set up a pork-barrel program to erect steel mills, with public money, should be summarily opposed. If Texas or any other State can, through the initiative of its industrial leaders develop latent resources toward a sound industrial expansion program, especially in times of emergency like those we are passing through, smells of political pork barrels, we will continue to try to air such smells in our editorial column."

By "pork-barrel program" reference is obviously made to the application of Lone Star Steel for a Defense Plant Corporation loan of some twenty or thirty millions. Does Metal Market know that the big steel companies whose policies and interests it now defends have borrowed more than one-quarter billions from R. F. C. and D. P. C. for expansions since the war began?

The Metal Market editor also states that "if Texas can through the initiative of its industrial leaders develop latent resources toward sound expansion, we will champion such efforts." Then, will the editor consider these claims:

1. There is enough good iron ore within 10 miles of the Daingerfield plant to keep it in operation for 100 years.

2. There is excellent coal for making coke in southern Oklahoma only a short distance away.

3. There is a Gulf Southwestern market for several times the potential output of the mill, and on basis of present rates, consumers of this area would be saved more than $40,000,000 annually in freight alone. Steel can not only be made more economically at the Daingerfield plant, but it can be shipped to its logical market more economically.

The foregoing are indisputable facts. The Daingerfield plant is projected solely upon the basis of merit. Not a single claim made for it has been disproved by those on the Facilities Review Committee of War Production Board (made up, as Senator CONNALLY said, of representatives of the big steel industries) who have been opposing it. That is obviously the reason why Chairman Nelson reversed the committee's original adverse recommendation in the matter of the blast furnace and coke ovens that have now been constructed and are going into operation. That is the reason that Texas people believe that War Production Board will also reverse the committee's findings against the proposition to build the urgently needed companion steel mill.

COMMENTS UPON THE EDITORIAL IN THE OCTOBER 10 ISSUE OF THE AMERICAN METAL MARKET

Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Steel Bloc—Political Buncombe" which appeared in the October 10 issue of American Metal Market betrays more plainly than anything else has yet done, the profound ignorance of the leaders of the northern steel industry concerning the conditions favoring the establishment of steel plants at Daingerfield, Tex., and at other points in the South and West. The editorial itself lends emphasis to the statement of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, that representatives of the big steel companies on the War Production Board "have a cramped and prejudiced viewpoint."

This publication, claiming to be the leading market authority on the steel and metal industries since 1899, would be assumed to be devoted to the progressive development of steel manufacture irrespective of the fortuitous circumstances which have led to such a degree of concentration that 90 percent of the steel industry is dependent upon the iron-ore reserves of the Great Lakes.

EDITOR PREJUDICED

The abusive tone of the editorial raises a question as to the objective attitude of the paper and suggests advocacy on its part of established institutions rather than an open mind in respect of meritorious projects that might in some degree provide new sources of competition.

The editorial states that "if in the post-war area we are permitted to return to a free economy, it is our guess that any politically sponsored steel mill erected in an out-of-way economic spot will languish in rust." The entire tone of the editorial indicates that its author is doing exactly what this sentence states he is doing—that is, he is guessing about the whole subject. He presents no facts with which to support the conclusions which he draws.

ABUNDANT ORE NEARBY

For example, it is stated in the editorial that it is the plan of the steel bloc to erect steel plants which will necessitate, first, long hauls of raw materials; second, imported and relocated labor; third, long hauls of the finished steel to distant large consuming centers. Is this statement in accordance with the facts of the case? The situation at Daingerfield, Tex., can be taken as indicating how far it actually is from the truth. Here the steel plant is to be erected in immediate proximity to the ore. Sufficient ore to supply the plant for half a century or more occurs within 10 miles of the plant site. Compare this with the average haul of from 750 to 1,000 miles or more by rail and water over a route closed by ice several months every year, by which iron ore is moved from the Lake Superior iron-ore mining districts to the northern mills.

The ore delivery to northern plants must be crowded into a 6 months' shipping season, resulting in a seasonal freight congestion and the storage of ore to operate northern plants during the winter months. No such problem, with

all the investment and operating costs involved, exists in Daingerfield.

COAL FROM OKLAHOMA

At Daingerfield, Tex., the coal is transported by a simple, direct route from two mines in eastern Oklahoma, only 225 miles from the site of the steel plant. Compare this with the long complex movement of coal to northern coking plants and furnaces. Apparently not even the leaders of the steel industry themselves realize how extremely complex this movement of coal in the North is.

All in all, the assembly cost of raw materials to produce a ton of pig iron in Daingerfield is less than one-half that applying to northern plants. The assembly cost taken in conjunction with the freight to consuming points is the true measure of an economic steel-plant location. From such a point of view there is no plant in the North so favorably situated as Daingerfield, which is perhaps giving the steel industry some concern.

LONG HAULS IN NORTH

As for the movement of the finished products, the distance from these northern plants to reach southwestern markets is as follows:

	Miles
Chicago	936
Pittsburgh	1,345

The entire production of the proposed Daingerfield plant will not supply more than a small part of the demand in the four southwestern States.

The fundamental strength of the Daingerfield location arises from the fact that its market area comprises 10 percent of the population of the United States, while the proposed steel capacity is less than 1 percent of the entire industry.

LABOR BENEFITED

Establishing a steel plant at Daingerfield, Tex., will give employment to capable, reliable, native American workers in the immediate vicinity of the plant who will be greatly benefited by this opportunity to make a better living than they have to the present enjoyed. It is true that the establishment of this plant would make necessary the importation of a certain amount of trained and skilled labor, particularly in the supervisory classifications. This, however, far from being a disadvantage, would be an advantage inasmuch as it would relieve the perplexing labor problems which have arisen in the overcrowded and congested manufacturing areas in the North. No doubt many of these men would welcome an opportunity to move their homes and their families to the Southwest and West.

No one familiar with the unwholesome congestion of labor in the northern steel industry can argue successfully for its continuance and growth. The distribution of labor on a healthier basis is an outstanding reason why a redistribution of industry should be encouraged.

There is a manifest desire on the part of important key men to become associated with enterprises free from the discouraging atmosphere in overdeveloped steel companies. Lone Star will have—in fact, already has—a large list from which to select the few key men that will be required.

SOUTHWEST MARKET LARGE

As for the long haul of the finished steel to distant consuming centers, careful market studies have shown that the southwestern market can absorb several times the production of the proposed steel mill at Daingerfield. What the "steel bloc" is demanding is not the establishment of steel-making centers in the South and West which will ship products to the North but only for the establishment of such productive capacity as will partly satisfy the needs of the areas in which the proposed plants are to be located.

It is stated in the editorial that the present set-up of the iron and steel industry in the United States is a result of economic rather than political development. This is only partly true. The present great geographical concentration of the iron and steel industry is not a desirable situation. It is in part the result of accident; in part it is the outcome of ignorance concerning the existence of extensive deposits of raw materials necessary for steel making in the South and West. The average steel man in the North knows nothing whatever about the occurrence of iron ore, limestone, coking coal, and other basic raw materials in other parts of the country. His attitude is that such deposits cannot exist since they are not located in the territory with which he is familiar. Like the farmer who first saw a giraffe, he insists "there ain't no such animal."

WILL REPAY COST

The steel plants which are proposed for the western and southwestern parts of the United States are, contrary to the assumption made in the editorial, the very ones which have the best chances of continuing in production and of repaying to the Government the cost of their construction after the war is over. The saving in assembly cost of raw materials and of transportation costs on the finished product are so great as to give these plants every assurance of being able to continue in profitable operation in normal times.

The statement in the editorial, "that in normal times it is cheaper to make steel in the East and to lay it down on the west coast than it is to make it right on the consuming grounds and the same would be true of Texas, which can take steel by water delivery" is one taken by the author wholly out of thin air. It is apparent that this statement was made in complete ignorance of the cost of producing iron and steel in Texas or on the Pacific coast. There is no steel plant in the North that can produce steel and deliver it to consuming points in the Southwest as cheaply as can be done from Daingerfield. To contend otherwise is to start a controversy with arithmetic.

But if the steel bloc—

The editorial states—

should persist in its plans to make a political jigsaw puzzle out of our steel empire, then we might urge our eastern and midwestern Congressmen to start a hothouse orange bloc to initiate the growing of oranges in the industrial East and Midwest that will be faced with serious dislocation of labor if the steel bloc, by political hook or crook, should really get somewhere—which i dubious.

If as good a case can be made out for an orange bloc as for a steel plant in Texas, by all means it should be encouraged. Nature has provided the raw materials in abundance for the manufacture of steel in Texas. The enormous amounts of oil and natural gas now being sent from Texas and surrounding States to the North should be retained at least in part to build up a permanent local industry and not be diverted exclusively to build up distant facilities the products of which ultimately find their way back to the Southwest.

NORTH HAS PROBLEMS

The steel industry in the North has been confronted with many problems which are well recognized by all those who are faced with the necessity and obligation of increasing steel production. These problems have been intensified greatly by the policy of putting new steel plants in the same congested area in which they have thus far been concentrated. Theoretically, it may be true, the most rapid increase in the output of steel could be obtained by adding facilities to existing plants, but practically this is far from being true. Dependent as they are on a single and declining source of ore, upon a manpower situation which is daily becoming more difficult, upon obtaining coal from mines in which conditions of great uncertainty exist, and upon the transportation of materials over railroads which are overburdened almost to the breaking point, the northern mills can give less assurance of continuous and uninterrupted increase in production than new mills established in newer and less crowded sections of the country where abundant raw materials are available and readily accessible.

The underlying strength of the Daingerfield project will be evident to anyone having the experience and ability to evaluate the economics of a steel enterprise.

The subject cannot be disposed of by such uninformed statements as are contained in this editorial and, parenthetically, in similar articles appearing recently in a number of technical publications, whose editorial staffs could not have given serious study to the subject.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY WRIGHT PATMAN, M. C., AT DAINGERFIELD, TEX., OCTOBER 5, 1943, AT A CEREMONY PRECEDING THE LIGHTING OF THE 78 COKE OVENS AT THE LONE STAR STEEL CO. PLANT

We are gathered here today for a birthday party—to celebrate the arrival of a new industry in the State of Texas. Fittingly, the occasion is the lighting of the 78 coke ovens of the Lone Star Steel Co. here, just outside the city of Daingerfield, which is already well along in the construction of its first units, representing an outlay of more than $20,000,000. The buildings, the battery of coke ovens, the smokestacks, the railway spurs, and the great furnace itself, taking final shape before us constitute a heartening spectacle.

TEXAS HAS GROWN

In the career of this State, there have been a number of turning points—events which have molded the character and progress of Texas for future generations. I need recite only a few of those pivotal dates here, because Texans know well the history of their State.

We might say that Texas began—as an extension of pioneer America—when Stephen Austin established a colony of American families in the year 1821. We all know what happened in the strenuous year of 1836. Then, the first links between the young railroads of Texas and the transportation lines in the rest of the United States were laid in 1873, and the vacant spaces of the State began to fill up more rapidly.

Another upsurge in the population and the economic growth of Texas came in 1901 with the discovery of Spindletop, the State's first really great oil field. Petroleum and its by-products, and the wealth that flowed from oil, directed the eyes of the Nation to the possibilities of Texas as an industrial region.

Although the pace of industry in the State accelerated thereafter, today Texas produces only 2.6 percent of the value of the Nation's manufactured goods, although it contains 4.9 percent of the population of the country. The income of its people largely comes, as of old, from its crops, its cattle, minerals, and forests—in short, from its raw materials, not from its processed goods.

PLANT MARKS PROGRESS

But the autumn of this year of world war—1943—marks the entrance of Texas into the Nation's basic industry—the manufacture of iron and—we hope in the near future—steel. It marks the beginning of success after years of struggle to break the concentration of steel production exclusively in Pennsylvania and the Great Lakes States. For decades the steel masters have fought against the decentralization of their industry, the weakening of their monopoly. If the Daingerfield project is the entering wedge, helping to spread the manufacture of steel more normally throughout the country as a whole, its backers can lay claim to rendering a service to the Nation at large, not just to a State or a group of States.

To what can we credit the Government's recognition of the iron resources of Texas and the advantages of a steel industry to be located here? The answer is: To the desperate wartime needs of the United States for greater output of metals and to the loyal, far-sighted efforts of a few men of Texas.

Let us take up these points one at a time. What is the relation of the Daingerfield project to the production of the machines of war? It is not news to say that our country is in great need of vital metals, including iron and steel products. Railroads of the North are overburdened in hauling raw materials and munitions on crowded lines. If the construction of a plant in a new location will more evenly distribute the load on our railroads, that fact is of itself a powerful reason for building it.

EASES TRANSPORTATION LOAD

A steel plant here at Daingerfield will save 80,000 carload-days a year. Another reason the Government approved the project here is safety—geographical safety. Ninety percent of the iron ore smelted in the North passes through the Soo Canal, cut of Lake Superior. The strategic menace of this shipping bottleneck is recognized by our military authorities. Just 1 month's shut-down of the canal locks, by enemy action, would neutralize the entire national program of increased steel capacity. A portion of the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s ore formerly was imported from Chile, but submarine action early in the war has almost put an end to this movement.

In the present pattern of the steel industry, transportation costs keep the prices high, not only in this part of the country but even near the mills. Ores from Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin must be hauled as far as eastern Pennsylvania. Coal for making coke travels hundreds of miles to many of these mills. In fact, one huge company is importing coke from Great Britain. These very ovens that are being lighted today will greatly relieve the critical coke situation in the United States, thereby making an immediate contribution to the war effort.

RAW MATERIALS ACCESSIBLE

What is the situation with respect to raw materials at the plant of the Lone Star Steel Co. at Daingerfield? Gathered here today we are practically standing on deposits of over 50,000,000 tons of iron ore, enough to provide for a production of 1,200 tons of pig iron a day for as long as any of us are likely to live. Another 150,000,000 tons can be mined at other points in northeast Texas, according to an estimate of the United States Geological Survey.

Steel is formed by the interaction—at white heat—of iron ore, coke, and limestone. Coal, of the special types needed in making coke, is found in abundance in southeastern Oklahoma, only 225 miles by rail from Daingerfield—and there are numerous deposits of pure limestone within 200 miles of the plant. The importance of these facts on raw materials is just this: That the assembly freight charge entering into the cost of a ton of pig iron here is $2.25, as compared to $6 to $8.50 in the case of northern plants. A steel plant at Daingerfield will help win the war.

The blast furnace section of this enterprise was approved by the War Production Board early last year. The completed project, which is being pressed for early approval, contemplates the construction of steel furnaces with an annual capacity of 500,000 tons of steel. The estimated cost to complete the project—to include the steel-making facilities—is $35,000,000 making a total investment of about $55,000,000 or $60,000,000 here when the steel plant is completed.

The War Production Board at Washington has stated that essential steel requirements for guns, tanks, and other military and essential civilian goods now more than absorb the entire steel-making capacity of the country. To think that only 2½ years ago the experts of the steel industry reported that there was plenty of steel capacity for any possible demands of war, on top of our normal civilian consumption! Manufacturers of guns, planes, and tanks today cannot forecast their production—upon a knowledge of which our military strategy depends—because they simply don't know from one day to another whether they'll be able to get the raw materials that they need.

TEXAS PLANT NEEDED

Those two statements explain the vital need of our country for the products of the Daingerfield plant—now.

But iron and steel production in Texas is much more than evidence of a passing wartime boom. It is more than a war-time mobilization of the iron and coal and other physical resources of this part of the country. It is more than the construction of just another blast furnace making pig iron or another steel plant. It means the creation, in this State, of a permanent great industry, plus the future development of secondary manufacturing plants, which will utilize for consumers' goods the low-cost iron and steel products to be made at Daingerfield. It signalizes the dawn of a new industrial empire in the southwest.

Five States in the Southwest will share in the benefits from this local industry. One saving will be in freight rates. This region has been paying close to $15 a ton on finished steel products from the North, which is easily two to three times the estimated delivery costs from Daingerfield. These five States have a total population of 13,500,000, about one-tenth of the population of the country—and they are growing rapidly. Their yearly consumption of steel is far in excess of the capacity of the Daingerfield plant, as presently planned. For instance, the oil industry alone consumes annually five times the contemplated capacity of steel pipe, which ultimately will be one of the principal products of the Lone Star Steel Co. There are more than 200 foundries in these States, potential customers for the coke and iron from the blast furnaces of Daingerfield. In other words, this vast region provides an ample market for the iron and steel to be produced here, in peacetime as well as war.

In addition, the expanding markets of Central and South America and the islands of the Caribbean Sea may well become a permanent outlet for American producers in this area, creating new business for the seaport cities of Texas.

In summing up I would say that four factors indicate the future expansion of the Daingerfield enterprise and its usefulness to Texas and her four sister States of this part of the country. The first is low costs of production; the second is proximity of the markets, which eases the traditional burden of high freight charges paid by this area on commodities manufactured at distant points. The third factor is the nearby reserves of cheap natural gas for fuel purposes, and the fourth is the abundant supply of intelligent native labor.

TEXAS CITIZENS CREDITED

Of course, a great achievement such as the introduction of the steel industry to the Southwest could not have been brought about without the vision and the untiring work of public-spirited leaders. Twenty years ago John W. Carpenter, of Dallas, president of the Texas Power & Light Co., became interested in the possibility of developing the ore deposits of east Texas. He has continued his efforts in that direction ever since. What you see in its infancy here today is largely due to the unselfish expenditure of his energy, his money, and his time in studies and investigation. No man ever worked harder or more intelligently in the interest of the development of the resources of the Southwest than Mr. Carpenter. He has seen his dream of the twenties become an actuality. Mr. Carpenter, I am glad to say, has accepted the presidency of the Lone Star Steel Co. W. W. Lynch is also entitled to a large share of the credit for his unceasing efforts assisting Mr. Carpenter.

I should emphasize today, too, the forceful efforts of W. O. Irvin, of Daingerfield, who is also one of the directors of the company, as well as Dr. G. H. Anderson and Dr. John V. W. Reynders.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senator TOM CONNALLY have been active in bringing the advantages of this project to the attention of officials in Washington, particularly to Donald Nelson, chief of the War Production Board, who gave his indispensable support after the proposal had been thoroughly analyzed.

As a Member of the Congress, it has been a keen satisfaction to me to work with Mr. Carpenter and other Texans for more than 2 years in gaining consideration of the plan by the War Department and other agencies of the Government. But without the necessary spadework, the proof of the soundness of the project through an accumulation of surveys, maps, cost estimates, and other engineering data, our efforts would likely have been in vain. This exhaustive preliminary work was initiated and pushed forward through Mr. Carpenter and the officers and directors of the Lone Star Steel Co.

SHOW PIONEER SPIRIT

These men are the living proof—if any were needed—that the spirit of the pioneer lives on in Texas. This State has had a

thrilling history, but exciting days are still ahead. What promises to be a revolution in our economy appears to be just over the horizon. The roar of the blast furnace, the clamor of the steel mills, join the chorus with the song of the cotton-picker and the harvesting machine, the sawmill, the oil refinery, and the cattle on the range. The economic self-sufficiency of this, the greatest of States, is being advanced by at least a quarter of a century. And more important, soon American tanks, armored with Texas steel, will plunge into the enemy lines.

Today our soldiers are defending themselves or attacking on 55 battle fronts of the earth. We listen anxiously on the radio and scan the papers for a scrap of news on how the battle goes. Most of us have sons or brothers at the front or on their way.

So perhaps it's too soon to dwell much on the post-war reconstruction job, and the future of our State, when we have just begun to batter our way to victory over a ruthless enemy. The urgent thing now, for each of us, is to aline himself 100 percent in the ranks of real Americans—buying War bonds, cutting down our expenditures to prevent inflation, collecting scrap and other precious materials, working in the war industries or training for a job there—accepting gladly all the slight sacrifices and inconveniences of the rationing and price control programs—and bearing the increased load of taxes without complaint. We must make ourselves hard and fit and ready, worthy of our fliers over the South Pacific islands and our infantry, digging in, prepared to advance. We must pay the price for maintaining our free government and traditions. Liberty cannot be purchased at the bargain counter.

POST-WAR IMPORTANCE

But through all the turmoil of war some leaders—within the Government and without—are trying to plan a blueprint for the future to cushion the dislocations in industry that will come in the period following the war in the transition to our normal manner of life. We need some planning for the restoration of peacetime security and employment for all—with as little strain as possible to our national structure. We want to avert any internal danger to our democracy while we are concentrating on its defense from an external foe.

Two days after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt said: "When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward the ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers—we are builders."

The President does not lose sight of our ultimate goal. The war promises to be a long one, but even now more than a dozen Government agencies and a great many private orgapizations are studying the problems of the post-war period. The purpose is, first, to meet the immediate questions of the demobilization of soldiers and war workers and the reconversion of industry back to peacetime needs; we must prepare for the return of our servicemen by making plans that will assure them jobs and business and professional opportunities. Second, it is to lay out a course of long-range planning to reach and maintain full employment, to develop our national resources, to redevelop and improve our rural and urban areas, and to foster our foreign trade. Every element of our industry, our labor, and our agriculture is represented in these groups. Government and private business are cooperating, with good will and mutual confidence.

When the time comes to put these plans into execution, the Southwest will be better prepared to take its part in the forward march, because it will have a new fundamental industry, based firmly on the natural resources of this area, on its inherent economies of production, and on the market demand for its products. The challenge of the future must find us ready, if dynamic Texas is to take a place of leadership corresponding to its size, its material advantages, and the historic fiber of its people.

That is what we hope to offer the Southwest and the Nation—leadership on the road to greater abundance, the conquest of scarcity and the maintenance of America as we have known it. Our service will not end with victory over the aggressors.

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF THE LONE STAR STEEL CO. OF DAINGERFIELD AND DALLAS, TEX.

John W. Carpenter, president; W. W. Lynch, executive vice president; W. R. Montgomery, secretary; Viviene Redlich, assistant secretary; Nathan Adams, treasurer.

Directors: Nathan Adams, George H. Anderson, Tyree L. Bell, Gus S. Blankenship, John W. Carpenter, L. T. Carpenter, J. N. Edens, Fred F. Florence, E. B. Germany, Raleigh Hortenstine, W. O. Irvin, R. M. Kelly, E. L. Kurth, W. W. Lynch, Charles R. Moore, Wright Morrow, John V. W. Reynders, George M. Sonfield, Gus F. Taylor, R. L. Thornton, W. C. Trout, Walter Wortham.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by me on the occasion of the lighting of the coke ovens recently; also editorials from newspapers relating to the steel-mill project and some other statements and information pertaining thereto.

The First Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I broadcast over the Wisconsin radio stations on October 29, 1943, on the subject The First Imperative.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In our first talk of this series our subject was the five imperatives, namely—

1. The imperative need for all of us to appreciate the enormous task—the big job—before America before the war is won;

2. The imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort;

3. The imperative need of working out now complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period;

4. The imperative need of America receiving title in perpetuity to the strategic air and sea bases in the Western Hemisphere which we have occupied and improved; and

5. The imperative need of all America to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity, and to apply them ever increasingly now and in the post-war period.

This fifth imperative was discussed last week in our second talk. This evening I want to discuss briefly the first imperative, to wit, the imperative need of all of us appreciating the enormous task—the big job—before America before the war is won.

America, since Pearl Harbor, has done a magnificent job. Pearl Harbor woke us out of a complacent dream. We went to work as one man, and we performed a miracle. We did in 2 years what it took Hitler 10 years to do. We did it because we had to do it. If we had not performed as we did we might today be an enslaved people, like those of Norway, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Holland, and Belgium.

For sometime now on the war fronts things have been going "hunky-dory," as the boys say. Italy surrendered her fleet and left the Axis; MacArthur has been winning battles in the South Pacific. We licked the Japs at Midway and in the Coral Sea. We have recaptured Guadalcanal and part of New Guinea. We have taken Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, and part of southern Italy. We have destroyed many German production plants and much Japanese shipping. But this destruction and these victories, important as they are, constitute only a small proportion of what must be accomplished before total victory is achieved.

Recently it was my privilege to attend a conference presided over by the Secretary of War and General Marshall. They showed us the world picture—a grim picture. We had talks, we had diagrams, we had moving pictures, we had statistics. The talks were by General Marshall and other officers, as well as by the boys who were back from the battle fronts of the war. There was demonstrated to us the enormous problem before us—the need for not slowing down in our production of foodstuffs and war materials; the imperative need of keeping the homefront unified. There came to all of us a new realization of the enormous task confronting America before the war can be won.

I do not believe that we Americans have to see bombs falling on our soil before we fully realize the seriousness of the job ahead of us before this war is won. I do not believe there is going to be a let-down in the production of foodstuffs, or in our factories producing the munitions and sinews of war. If there is any indication anywhere of such a let-down, let us arise as we did after Pearl Harbor, and stamp it out. We must not let it get a foothold—not an inch.

I fear that some of us have been getting the impression that the war will be over in a few months. Every time we gain another mile or win another victory, we hear someone say, "Well, it will soon be over."

Now what are the facts? Let us take the European situation first.

While our men are pressing northward toward Rome, and while the Russians are forcing the Germans back in Russia, Hitler is contracting his lines. It has been definitely stated that Hitler's army today, in spite of his losses, is as big and as well-equipped and as efficient as it was when he entered the war. His airplane production has not been seriously impeded. He has over 300,000,000 people to draw his workmen from. Our bombing of his cities has, to date, not destroyed over 5 percent of his capacity. His food supply is adequate—far better than it was in 1918. The morale of the German people is excellent. There is no evidence of any civilian break. The German soldiers are among the best fighters in the world. They are well equipped, disciplined, and show no evidence of lack of fighting morale. Hitler has increased his production of synthetic gasoline to the point where he now has an adequate supply for his fighters. The number of workers employed in war industries in Nazi-dominated territory has risen from 23,000,000 at the start of the war to a present total of 35,000,000 and the weapons they are making, are in some cases better than any which the United Nations have. One of their new weapons, a rocket gun, weighs less

than 1,800 pounds; yet it has a fire power equal to 6 heavy field howitzers weighing 9 tons apiece. Their 60-ton tiger tanks are appearing in increasing numbers on the Italian mainland and on the Russian front. There are also a number of heavy, new, self-propelled guns to guard the defenses of Hitler's European fortress.

Once the United Nations forces have reached the lines on which the Germans have determined to make their stand in defense of their homeland, the days of inexpensive victories for the United Nations will end. Further advances will be contested yard by yard and foot by foot, and by well-trained, veteran troops.

While we have partially met Germany's submarine menace, we have to be constantly on the alert because of his development of new weapons. We expect to increase our bombing capacity and hope to do more damage to Hitler's production plants in the future than we have in the past. That is our big hope toward breaking the morale of the German people. But, as I said, there is now no evidence of any break in German morale. We also hope to take over sufficient air bases in Italy to bomb Hitler's cities and war plants from there as well as from Great Britain.

It must be remembered that Europe is Hitler's fortress, and that outside of a portion of Italy, he stands absolutely supreme in Europe. Russia has recaptured only about one-half of the land that Hitler occupied in her territory. We have advanced 21 miles in 21 days in Italy; General Eisenhower warns us to expect a long and bitter war, and he is certainly in a position to know.

Now, if in the course of the next year, we succeed in bringing a sense of frustration to the German people, by means of bombings and by Russia pushing Hitler's armies back, so Germany will repeat what took place in 1918 and give up, then we will still have on our hands the job of licking Japan, and this will be an even more difficult job than licking Hitler. That is the judgment of some of the best military and naval experts.

We have now been in the war 2 years, and we have recaptured from Japan, Guadalcanal and a part of New Guinea, Kiska and Attu in the Aleutians. Geographic factors give Japan's position tremendous added strength. The Solomons are only an outpost, more than 3,000 miles from the heart of the empire. We have yet to reach any main line of resistance, or any point at which they are apparently determined to hold at all costs. Kiska is approximately 2,000 miles from Tokio, and New Guinea about 3,000 miles. The Japs still have all of Burma, the East Indies, the better part of China and the Philippines, with all their mineral wealth and oil, and rubber and tin.

The Japanese still have some 2,000,000 men of military age who have not yet been called to her colors because they have not been needed, and they have as many more in the 17 to 20 age group who are not now subject to the draft. She is building planes faster than we are destroying them, and the pilots' training program has been stepped up to keep pace with the accelerated production schedule.

Vast distances greatly handicap our transportation program; Japan and Germany both have the advantage of being able to move in a few days troops and equipment which we can transport only by consuming many weeks and months of time. A further complication of the transportation problem consists in the enemies' destruction of roads and railroad facilities as he retreats, making necessary reconstruction or building of entire new roads. And that, of course, means construction equipment and supplies in great quantities.

All that I have said has but one objective, and that is for us to become aware—thoroughly aware—of the enormity of the task before us. It is always better to know the facts—to know what is required. Then, and only then, can we tackle the job adequately.

I have no idea of creating a sense of defeatism. I have no such feeling. My object is to make sure that we understand the scope of the job we have to do, and make ourselves adequate to it, like those boys of ours—those wonderful boys who are demonstrating their adequacy all over the world. We cannot let them down. We must see to it that they have ample food, ample war equipment, and ample support from us on the home front.

Of course, on the home front, in places where there is reckless spending, where there is negligence in any department of government, any mismanagement—it should be quickly corrected. Where there is waste of manpower in our factories, that should be immediately corrected. Where there is needless expending of the Nation's resources—money, property, labor—in any direction, all that should be remedied whether it be in lend lease, in manpower, in war contracts, or in the civilian ranks of government. This calls for better administration by the Executive.

But we must ever bear in mind the important job before us before the war is won. The home front must match the miracles of our boys on the battle fronts. We must clean up the slacker and the racketeer, the chiseler, and the waster.

By doing these things, and by making the best possible use of all our resources, attaining the maximum production of foodstuffs and war materials, we can show that we do indeed appreciate the enormous task—the big job—ahead of America before the war can be won.

The New Cattle Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely pertinent and timely editorial entitled "The New Cattle Order," relating to the recent O. P. A. order. The editorial was published in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of October 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW CATTLE ORDER

In the very midst of the season for planning feeding operations comes the new cattle and beef order under which prevailing uncertainty within the industry becomes crushing confusion. The over-all effect cannot fail to reduce returns to the producer, and the order sets up conditions under which the feeding industry cannot function with profit. Production costs have steadily advanced and will advance still further. Again the beef producer is being ground under heel, and that is impossible to understand, with the beef-cattle industry so essential in the national economy, and with beef the real foundation of the diet of men in the armed services.

The order is as full of holes as a sieve and is subject to any desired interpretation. It undertakes to shape both production and buying by the employment of subsidies, which run to the advantage of the slaughterer, and which will benefit the producer not one iota. Final adjudication is to be based on carcass grading, for which competent men are not available, not at least in the vast numbers that would be required to cover the country. It is the most absurd piece of business that our food industry has yet encountered. It did not have the approval of a single practical man of the producing or packing end of the business.

It is a hasty and desperate attempt to patch up a poorly constructed program that had been projected to check inflation in the meat industry, a program that was threatening to break down. This was admitted before the House Agricultural Committee by O. P. A. officials who said that the beef ceilings, in the opinion of O. P. A. heads, were illegal, and the entire beef ceiling program was "shaky."

The new cattle ceilings also are full of unfairness and just as illegal, but it will be some time before they can be put to a test, as was being done in the case of the beef ceilings, in court. That is what government officials had in mind when they grabbed at this straw to save face. They were bidding for time.

Farmers are not yet prepared to go into the courts as packers have done to prove that the ceilings are a violation of the Price Control Act. Packers were all set to accomplish this, and O. P. A. heads reluctantly admitted yesterday afternoon that they were going to be able to do it. It would mean that drastic changes would have to be made, and O. P. A. would have to give ground. Rather than do this they have resorted to a far more complicated ceiling arrangement, one that will for a time confuse the markets from the farm to the retail stores—exactly what the price administrators need and want to catch their breath.

In time farmers will prove in the courts of the land that these ceilings are unfair and illegal, but by then you can bet the boys in Washington will pull another one out of the bag to rock the industry back on its heels again, in order to gain another breathing spell.

They are fighting against illegal markets, but so far have been able to hold their line only through violations of the law themselves.

The Price Control Act provides for a fair margin of profit. If action by the O. P. A. eliminates this to anyone, it is illegal and by law must be thrown out or altered to allow this margin. Packers were ready to prove this beyond any doubt. So sure were heads of the O. P. A. of this that one official before the House committee admitted that Prentiss Brown had declared that beef ceilings were illegal.

In time, heads of the O. P. A. will be forced to admit that the new cattle ceilings also are a violation of the law, because they eliminate a fair margin of profit to cattle feeders. Heads of the O. P. A. made the mistake of admitting this yesterday when they explained the ceiling action to newspapers.

The ceilings were arranged to encourage the feeding of good cattle to heavy weights, but would discourage the extra feeding of cattle into choice and prime condition. There is only one way to discourage such feeding and that is through price penalty

and lack of the fair margin of profit provided by the price act.

Let cattle feeders band together and bring this before the courts of the land. They have a case, and as American citizens are just as much entitled to their fair margin of profit as any group of packers.

Milk Production in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

QUINT COUNTY COOPERATIVE,
Mangun, Okla., October 22, 1943.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: As you know, we still have had no rain in southwestern Oklahoma, and so far as the dairy industry is concerned, a rain now would be too late to help us much in our winter-feed situation. Production is continuing to drop daily, both in the receipts of whole milk and sour cream. Our volume of whole milk has dropped from 40,000 pounds of milk per day on the 30th of July to less than 15,000 pounds of milk per day now, and the end is not in sight. We have been forced to cut off an account of furnishing the Gate City Creamery at Childress, Tex., who, in turn, was supplying the bomber training school there with milk. To date, as far as I know, they have not been able to find an available supply anywhere else. We have also had to reduce our supply of milk going to Oklahoma City and Wichita Falls, Tex.

You will remember I talked to you about the feed situation when you were home, and we knew at that time that there was not sufficient feed available in the United States to supply the livestock and poultry industries with enough feed to take care of the animals on farms at that time, but we did not know just which branches of the livestock industry would be considered more essential to the war effort. Since that time, however, we have been informed that we need all the dairy and poultry products that can possibly be produced and that feed would be limited to a certain extent for beef and pork. There has already been shipped into Oklahoma considerable quantities of soybeans for crushing into meal, and I understand that several thousand tons of peanuts will be processed into protein feed for this area, and these feeds, along with the cottonseed that will be processed, will perhaps tide us over on proteins.

Joe Scott has announced that there will be several million bushels of oats and barley and several thousand tons of prairie hay shipped into this area, but I understand that Commodity Credit deny that they have made any commitments with the exception of soybeans.

Victor, you are minutely familiar with the progress of the dairy industry in southwestern Oklahoma, and especially the Seventh District and Greer County. In the last few years we are all proud of that progress because we know that during the dry years when crops failed, that the farmers who had dairy cattle were able to maintain their farms and pay their bills, and those who did not have dairy cattle could not do so. For the last 6 months, and especially the last 60 days, the dairy cows in this section have been moved out and sold to an alarming extent. In my opinion, fully 25 percent of our dairy herds have gone to market. You only have to check the cattle receipts in Oklahoma City and Kansas City on last Tuesday, October 19, to see how great this movement has been.

We are faced with a situation, that is to a certain extent local, and is more serious in the 11 counties comprising your district, due to the fact that some other sections of the State have received some rain and do have some pastures for dairy cattle now, while a rain in our area within the next 30 minutes wouldn't give us any pasture before the last of February or March.

I have done considerable talking without coming to the point as to what we need. I attended a meeting in Oklahoma City on September 24, of all the cooperative creameries in the State, comprised of plant managers, directors and producers, and a reasonable estimate by all of those present, of the cost of producing a pound of butterfat at that time, was $1 a pound. I attended another meeting yesterday, in Hobart, comprised mostly of producers from five other counties in your district, and their figures showed that it was costing from $1 to $1.20 per pound to produce butterfat at the present feed prices. Of course if we had pasture this cost would be cut down considerably, but that possibility is already past.

Here is what we need to produce butterfat at the present prices, including the subsidy already announced. We need oats at $1.70 per hundredweight, barley at $1.50 per hundredweight, bran at $1.70 per hundredweight, cottonseed meal at $2.40 per hundredweight, and hay at $15 per ton. The old A. & M. formula for a dairy ration of two oats, two barley, two bran, and one cottonseed meal is considered to be about the best and the most economical for feeding cows in this area, and this mixture, at the prices listed above, would cost $1.74 per hundredweight. The average cow needs 10 lbs. of grain per day, and 20 pounds of hay. This would cost 32.4 cents per day per cow. The average cow in this area produces 0.7 of a pound of butterfat per day, and this butterfat at the present price of 49 cents per pound, plus the subsidy of 6 cents per pound, would be 38½ cents per cow per day. This would give the farmers 6.1 cents per cow per day for the milking and taking care of them, and to take care of death loss and veterinary bills. If we could get feed at the prices I metioned above, the farmers would be glad to continue producing on this break-even proposition until next spring. However, here are the present prices of feed, if we can get them, oats, $2.90 per hundredweight; barley, $2.80 per hundredweight; bran, $2.35 per hundredweight; cottonseed meal, $2.70 per hundredweight, and hay, $30 per ton. At these prices it costs the farmers 56.9 cents per cow per day for feed alone, and his returns being only 38.5 cents per day, gives him a loss of 18.4 cents per day per cow. The average dairy producer here tries to keep about eight head of dairy cows. On these eight head he is losing now $1.49 per day, or almost $45 per month.

I believe I have given you a picture of our situation and I believe I have told you what we need. Briefly, we need now dairy feeds and at a price that we can afford to pay and still produce dairy products, which are so essentially needed by civilians, defense workers, our armed forces, and our allies abroad. We will appreciate any and all consideration and cooperation that you can give us, and urgently prevail upon you to help us to hold on to our dairy herds, so that we may continue producing dairy products.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. LEWIS, *Manager.*

The Connally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by me on the March of Time on the Air program on October 28, of this year.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Isolation is not dead in the United States Senate. The Connally resolution is a new Munich in the making—a concession to keep Senate peace, not world peace. It is a political umbrella for those Senators who may need to escape the rain of public indignation.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, fearing the isolationists in the Senate, dares not to offer a resolution which will definitely and positively commit the United States to a full and fair share in molding world peace and in mending the broken earth. We who know the language, the authorship, and the history of this resolution know that it is intentionally obscure, purposefully noncommittal.

We want to make it mean, to all the world, one thing, not to all men, internationalist and isolationist alike, all things. We propose that we shall join with other United Nations and with such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted to establish not just some vague international authority but an international organization—a new league of nations, if you please, with no doubt about it—

First. To promote cooperation among nations.

Second. To settle international disputes peacefully—a world court.

Third. To suppress military aggression, if need be, by military force.

Is not the Senate at last penitent? Cannot a body which bears so large a part of the responsibility for World War No. 2 at least assure its courageous leadership to prevent World War No. 3? Let us honor our dead. Let us covenant with the living that the Senate of the United States will this time dare to do right.

Equal Rights for Women on Senate Floor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, yesterday in the Washington Post there appeared a very fine, timely, and sensible article from the pen of Hope Ridings Miller entitled "Wanted: Equal Rights on Senate Floor While Calendar Carries Equal

Rights Amendment." I invite the attention of Senators to the article, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: EQUAL RIGHTS ON SENATE FLOOR WHILE CALENDAR CARRIES EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Hope Ridings Miller)

I'm not a militant feminist, never have been and never expect to be. Equal rights? Of course I want them * * * for men. For women? Special privileges, if you please.

Yet I can't sit by idly, year after year, and see an entire feminine contingent continue to be victimized by a moth-eaten custom—particularly at the same time the Senate calendar carries a joint resolution proposing an amendment to grant equal rights to men and women.

Here is the story:

As antiquated as the snuff boxes in the Senate Chamber is the custom that keeps women who are secretaries of Senators off the Senate floor. Male secretaries have the run of the place; go in and out as they please and stay there, if they wish, during any special session.

Women secretaries stand outside the door and communicate with their Senators by messenger. At a special session to which their male contemporaries have admission to the Senate floor without question, they are granted standing room in the galleries.

There's no rule governing all this. Fact is, the only one touching the subject (rule 33, p. 38 of the Senate Manual) sidesteps the sex issue from start to finish. It simply states that "clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in actual discharge of their official duties—to be admitted to the floor must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate each week."

For years those rolls have carried names of women secretaries along with the others. Yet no woman secretary has ever yet walked on to the Senate floor. Other women, besides the obvious ones—those who have served in the Senate, Mrs. Huey Long and Mrs. Bibbs Graves and Senator Hattie Caraway, who is there now? Yes, of course, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, a woman Member of the British Parliament, and one or two others. But even on the days when they were welcomed with open arms into the senatorial sanctum sanctorum, members of their sex who served as Senate secretaries viewed the scene from the galleries * * * while men holding the similar jobs, had a close-up from the vantage-ground of the Senate floor.

To the credit of at least a few Senators, however, it must be recorded that steps have been taken in the past to correct the situation * * * even though they didn't get very far. Back in January 1941, while some of the more courtly types of southern Senators were figuratively kissing the hands of the women secretaries and giving their cause lip service in sirupy accents that meant exactly nothing, Senator BILBO ("The Man") charged in to take up the cudgels for the feminine sex.

Specifically, he submitted the following resolution:

"That it is the sense of the Senate that no person of the female sex who has the privilege of admission to the floor of the Senate under the provisions of rule 33 of the standing rules of the Senate should be denied admission to, or should hesitate to enter upon, the floor of the Senate because of any tradition or any so-called unwritten rule of the Senate with respect to the admission of females to such floor."

Well and good. So what happened? The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules * * * and hasn't been heard of since. Why? Nobody seems to know. Maybe it's because the women secretaries didn't push for themselves through the medium of a powerful lobby. Maybe it's because their male contemporaries were hotly against it—since the custom of keeping women secretaries off the floor is a great selling point in their favor. Anyway, the one measure that could correct the highly unfair situation died a-borning * * * and the women still wistfully wait outside the door, while their male contemporaries coast on by and enter the Senate Chamber whenever they choose.

Meanwhile, however, with increasing fervor the ladies are letting it be known they don't like it. Spirited Miss Bertha Joseph, one of the ablest Senate secretaries—woman or man—ever to negotiate a job on Capitol Hill, has said more than once that if at any time, a split second makes a difference when she has business to transact with her boss, Senator RADCLIFFE, she's going to walk right on the Senate floor and discharge her duty * * * and after that, the chips may fall where they can. "I refuse to have anybody say I have to be a man to perform my duty," she said. Furthermore, she has already assured herself of proper backing, if she ever has to take the fatal step. Charles L. Watkins, parliamentarian of the Senate, has said to her, in effect: "If you ever have to go in and I'm asked to rule about it, you can count on it—I'll rule with you."

"Now don't get me wrong about all this," Miss Joseph said yesterday with a twinkle. "Personally, I like it if I have to wait outside the door for my Senator. That gives me a chance to talk to all the other Senators as they pass by * * * and I love that—especially sometimes." "But," she added in a more serious vein, "we women secretaries would like to have the privilege of going on the floor when it is necessary. And it sometimes is."

Proof that the discrimination wrought by a dog-eared custom has worked against the women on more than one account is borne out in several instances. For example there's the case of a woman assistant clerk to a committee. Three times she has been in line for head clerkship, and she has been passed up in favor of a man—because men secretaries can go on the Senate floor.

It's high time the Senate gets busy and corrects that situation. If they don't, you never can tell—that august body may wake up one fine morning and find a bevy of women secretaries defying the custom that keeps them out * * * and invoking the rule that admits them to the Senate floor.

Address by Capt. R. D. Kirkpatrick Before the Comte de Grasse Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Capt. R. D. Kirkpatrick, United States Navy, retired, commanding officer, United States Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va., before the Comte de Grasse Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the anniversary of Yorktown Day, Tuesday, October 19, 1943, Old Customs House, Yorktown, Va.:

Madam Chairman, Madam President General, members of the Comte de Grasse Chapter, ladies and gentlemen, coming to Yorktown today to participate in the celebration and commemoration of the great victory won by the Americans and their French Allies on October 19, 1781, gives me great pleasure. I am particularly reminded of my personal participation in the Yorktown Day celebration of 1929, when, as a lieutenant commander I had the honor of commanding an infantry battalion from the battleship *Arkansas*, which marched in the parade on that occasion.

As an officer in the Navy and one, therefore, who by profession may naturally be assumed to give much thought to the accomplishment of our armed forces October 19 has great significance to me. I should therefore like to pay a special tribute to the Daughters of the American Reveloution and, especially, to the Comte de Grasse Chapter and its regent, Mrs. Chenoweth, for their untiring and unfailing leadership in keeping alive the observance of this historic event.

The great interest of your organization, and more recently the action of the Federal Government in the establishment of Colonial National Historical Park, have guaranteed for all generations to come the preservation of the Yorktown Battlefield as a great national shrine. Certainly the results of the victory at Yorktown cannot help but bring fresh hope and energy to free peoples all over the world.

We of the Navy have always considered the Battle of Yorktown not only as one of the decisive battles of history, but also as a military operation in which naval power and strategy was definitely a decisive factor. You, too, have recognized the importance of naval might in this campaign by naming your chapter in honor of Comte de Grasse, that brilliant French admiral whose rightful place in American history has been too often neglected. No other individual in the campaign played such an important role as did De Grasse had not his fleet effectively prevented any active assistance to Cornwallis by the British Fleet, the British Army might well have received reinforcements sufficient to turn the tide of the battle or else the bulk of Cornwallis' army might have been evacuated to fight on another field.

So, with your kind indulgence and license, I would deal today with the naval aspects of the Yorktown campaign.

The year 1781 was the beginning of a new era for the Allies. In the fall and winter of 1780 Cornwallis began his fatal march toward the North after a campaign in the South, mildly successful except for the Battles of Kings Mountain and the Cowpens. Bewildered by Greene's superb strategy, he retired in April 1781 to Wilmington, N. C. Greatly weakened by the campaign, Cornwallis sought as the best escape from his predicament an invasion of Virginia.

In early May, Washington conferred with Rochambeau regarding the employment of French and American troops in a campaign that would at last bring the war to a sudden successful conclusion. Two possibilities were considered: First, attacking the main force of British troops under Clinton in New York, or, second, attacking Cornwallis in Virginia. Of the two plans of action, the attack on New York was early given precedence even though Clinton's forces were indeed formidable. However, because of repeated detachment of troops to the south in aid of Cornwallis, Clinton's forces were somewhat depleted, and Washington therefore felt that the moment was opportune for attack before Clinton realized the necessity for stronger forces in New York.

Yet, until the destination of Admiral de Grasse's fleet could be ascertained complete plans had to be held in abeyance. Although it was known that De Grasse, with a considerable force, was leaving Brest, France, for the West Indies, it was not known whether he contemplated sailing north to our coast. As early as May 1781 Washington wrote Chevalier de la Luzerne, the French Minister at Philadelphia, requesting in his name and in the name of Rochambeau, the French commander, that he exert all his influence in bringing the admiral to our coast in time to start offensive operations. At the time both Washington and Rochambeau were in complete accord that the French Fleet should run for Sandy Hook, in the Bay of New York, there to be given such information as was at hand so that effective naval assistance could be rendered immediately. Such opinion was to be transmitted to De Grasse by Luzerne. Pending word from De Grasse, training commenced for a projected independent siege on New York. On June 13, in a letter to Washington, Rochambeau informed him that De Grasse would arrive in American waters by midsummer. At approximately the same time word was received from Lafayette that indicated Cornwallis was on the march in Virginia and carrying all before him.

Indeed, Lafayette had used his personal influence to urge Washington to proceed himself or dispatch immediate aid to Virginia. Such appeal was strengthened by Jefferson and Lee, who insisted that immediate relief be sent to that State. Strong as were Washington's ties with his home State, he concentrated his judgment on the one question: "How can the expected French Fleet combine with land forces to relieve the burdened South, and at the same time secure a permanent advantage for America?" To him, a siege of New York was the answer, for if it were successful, it was to be reasonably expected that Cornwallis would come to the aid of Clinton.

A dispatch carried by the frigate *Concorde* was sent to De Grasse in which Rochambeau gave details of the two possible plans suggesting that De Grasse enter the Chesapeake on his way north, as there might be an opportunity for striking an important stroke there, and then to proceed immediately to New York, ready to cooperate with the Allied Armies in an attack on that city. In the meantime, the Allied Armies would begin their part in the intended operations. On June 28, a surprise attack in the north by Major General Lincoln, aided by the Duke de Lauzun, was repulsed, but the enemy retired and the action was not renewed. No immediate tangible results were obtained, but as subsequent events proved, indirect results were well worth the effort. As expected, Clinton was compelled to call for reinforcements from the Chesapeake, and thus Cornwallis was further weakened.

On August 14 news was received from De Grasse, news that was to change the course of the war and speed the conclusion of military operations. Instead of announcing his approach to New York, as was anticipated, he informed Rochambeau that he would sail for the Chesapeake Bay direct, on the 13th of August, to undertake and facilitate operations in that quarter. In addition, De Grasse indicated that he would have to return to the West Indies by the middle of October. In view of De Grasse's decision, Washington gave up all ideas of attacking New York, and instead detached the French troops and a part of the American troops to force the issue in the South.

I shall not dwell on the march from the Hudson to the York. Certainly, however, it ranks as one of the most brilliant and daring marches of the war—a problem of supply and support comparable with the march of the British from Egypt to Tunisia in the present war. Suffice to say, this march alone was sufficient to mark Washington as a truly great general.

On September 6, Washington was informed that De Grasse had entered the Chesapeake and was ready to cooperate in a joint venture. Naval cooperation—that was to be the decisive factor. From the beginning of the war, and in spite of the valiant efforts of John Paul Jones and the American Navy, Great Britain had enjoyed rather complete control of American waters. Now in the crucial period in the war, naval superiority was to pass to the French. Whether it was complacency or ignorance that caused the failure of the Admiralty to send sufficient forces to resist the French Fleet, the undisputed fact remains that the French Fleet, as it appeared in American waters in September 1781 was vastly superior to anything the British held in readiness. Although in 1781 the British Navy had some 80 ships-of-the-line in commission, and hence were superior to the French Fleet, they were far inferior to the combined navies of France and Spain who were then in alliance. In addition, Great Britain, then, as in the present war, had to protect many far-flung outposts which meant that the available ships had to be widely dispersed. One fleet covered Gibraltar. Admiral Darby, with 30 sail-of-the-line watched the English Channel. Sir George Rodney, seconded by Sir Samuel Hood, cruised in the West Indies; while Admiral Arbuthnot, who was soon succeeded by Admiral Graves, guarded New York with 8 ships. Before the arrival of De Grasse, the French Fleet in American waters consisted of 8 ships under the command of Admiral de Barras. When Admiral de Grasse appeared on August 31 in Lynnhaven Bay, outside of Hampton Roads, he brought with him a flotilla of 28 sail-of-the-line and 6 frigates, his own flagship being the *Ville de Paris*, carrying 120 guns, the most powerful fighting ship of the day.

With the French Fleet in position, a complete blockade of Yorktown was effected. The next logical move was to cut off Cornwallis' possible line of retreat up the peninsula from Yorktown. To accomplish this, 3,000 troops brought by De Grasse from the West Indies were landed at Jamestown Island, on the 5th of September, moving from there in conjunction with LaFayette and Wayne to take up a strong position across the peninsula at Williamsburg, thereby cutting off one of the enemy's possible lines of retreat. Another line of retreat, or possible avenue of reinforcements, the York River, was effectively covered by De Grasse. Perhaps Cornwallis' fervent expectation that sooner or later De Grasse's blockade would be raised deterred him from the difficult task of breaking through the line at Williamsburg. If such was his hope, he was doomed to disappointment. The blockade was never broken.

The task of immobilizing the French Fleet in American waters fell to Rodney, and he sought to warn Arbuthnot and his successor, Graves, in New York. When Rodney learned that De Grasse had repaired to Cape Francois, he promptly sent a dispatch to Graves warning him of the danger and recommending that the two unite in Virginia waters. This dispatch was never received by Graves—a failure of communications that was to have a disastrous result. In the meantime Rodney returned to England, at his own request, because of ill health, sending Hood north to join Graves and to head off De Grasse. Hood, finding no French ships in the Chesapeake on August 25, and no word from Graves, continued his course with 14 sail-of-the-line, 6 frigates, and 1 fire ship to New York, reporting the situation to Graves. This was the first Graves knew of the approach of De Grasse and the danger to Virginia. Immediately weighing anchor, he assumed command and proceeded under full sail toward the Chesapeake.

He arrived too late, for De Grasse had only been 5 days behind Hood on his way from the West Indies, and entered the bay while Hood was sailing to New York. The initiative was with De Grasse, but the English admirals were determined that he was to be dislodged and the blockade lifted. On the 5th of September, at the time the 3,000 troops from the West Indies were disembarking at Jamestown Island, the 2 fleets came in sight contact. Immediately De Grasse weighed anchor and sailed seaward to obtain more maneuverability. His force numbered 24 ships-of-the-line, carrying 1,700 guns and 19,000 seamen. In contrast, Graves was able to muster only 17 ships-of-the-line, with 1,400 guns and 13,000 seamen. The 3 divisions of the British Fleet were commanded by Hood, Drake, and Graves, while the French divisions were commanded by De Bouganville and De Monteil. The action began at a quarter past four and was over in less than 2 hours and 15 minutes. Although English losses included only 90 men killed, 246 wounded, 16 guns out of action, and 2 or 3 ships badly damaged, Graves felt that no favorable advantage could be gained by further contact. He retired to New York—the Chesapeake belonged to De Grasse.

De Grasse, master of the Chesapeake, a month and 14 days before the surrender of Yorktown, sealed the fate of Cornwallis and his army. How important was this naval engagement, and yet so neglected has it been in the history books of our great Nation. De Grasse and his fleet had assured victory at Yorktown before the armies of Washington and Rochambeau marched down from Williamsburg on the 28th of September. What blunders Cornwallis and Clinton may have made in the Yorktown campaign had a negligible effect on the outcome; the fate of Yorktown had been sealed by De Grasse's naval victory.

The remaining events of the campaign, the opening of the first and second parallels, the storming of redoubts Nos. 9 and 10, the attempts to evacuate to Gloucester Point, the meeting of the commissioners at the Moore House on the 18th, and the surrender on the 19th, are well known to every American. One of the decisive battles in history had been won, and active resistance by Great Britain was at an end. The Colonies were free; the burning principles of freedom that had forced the issue were to be incorporated into the Bill of Rights. A new era was opening in world history, the reign of freemen. It was a victory well worth the struggle, but the fruits of that victory would not endure without future bloodshed. The institutions of liberty and freedom have been challenged many times since 1781. They have never been as seriously challenged as they are today. The forces of despair, of despotism, of chaos, and of destruction have again threatened us. But we shall never compromise with our ideals. Our Bill of Rights, the "four freedoms," are so cherished by the American people that they are again willing to sacrifice their lives on the battlefields of the world "that freedom shall not perish from the earth."

Our Navy is making and will continue to make an all-out effort every minute of every day until victory is achieved to see that those ideals of the American Republic are not compromised. In this war, as in 1781, the Navy, in cooperation with the other armed services, is forcing the attack to the enemy wherever and whenever he can be found.

Let me state some of the accomplishments of the United States Navy to date. At the beginning of the present war the effectiveness

of the battleship as a weapon of war was seriously questioned. There was Pearl Harbor, of course, and then the *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* were both sent to the bottom also in December of 1941 by Japanese torpedo planes and bombers. But remember that in December of 1941 no warship in the world carried adequate antiaircraft armament to defend itself against marauding planes. To afford proper protection and to instill faith once again in the warship, increased antiaircraft defenses were recognized as of paramount importance. I am pleased to be able to tell you today that the ships of the United States Fleet and of our valiant allies now carry that added antiaircraft protection. More than a thousand enemy airplanes have been shot down by crews manning antiaircraft guns in United States ships. These were the guns on Captain (now Admiral) Gatch's ship, the U. S. S. *South Dakota*, and on the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, which knocked out Jap aircraft at the rate of one a minute. Yes; the ships of our Navy are definitely winning the battle against the airplane.

In addition to firepower, our Navy needed ships. Contrast De Grasse's fleet of 24 ships of the line and Graves' 19 ships of the line on the 5th of September 1781 with the 1,076 vessels displacing 1,875,000 tons in our Navy of 3 years ago. Of that fleet, 383 were warships; that is to say, battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. During the intervening 3 years the Navy has lost 58 warships—a battleship, 4 aircraft carriers, 9 cruisers, 32 destroyers, and 12 submarines. In addition, we have transferred or converted into noncombatant vessels 129 other warships. And yet, in spite of the losses and transfers, today the United States has the mightiest fleet in world history. As against 383 fighting ships in 1940, we now have 613; as against 1,076 vessels of all types, we have today 14,072. Today the United States Navy is the mightiest navy in the history of the world, fully equipped and manned to tackle any strategic problem at the opportune time.

Yes, the United States Navy has full steam up and is pursuing the enemy on the seven seas. Rest assured we have all been called to battle stations, not to retire until victory. I do not know where or when the "Battle of Yorktown" will be fought in this war, but I am certain that the decisive battle will be joined, and we shall again emerge victorious.

I say we shall emerge victorious—but I assume one all-important factor—just as complete and unstinted contribution to the war effort by those of you on the home front as is being given by our men on the fighting front. This is no time for complacency, for overoptimism, or for jubilation. To paraphrase Mr. Churchill, we have reached the end of the beginning, and now may well be at the beginning of the end. But the road to victory is still very long and arduous, and to achieve our goal, much bloodshed, sacrifice, and sorrow lies ahead for everyone of us. Not a minute must be wasted, not an idle move must be made, victory must be achieved at the earliest opportunity. That extra hour before victory may mean that one of your loved ones, or mine, will never return home. Nothing but 100-percent participation by every American will suffice. Our gallant fighting men on the fighting fronts of the world are doing more than their share, and I, and all other members of our armed forces, are counting on you, Daughters of the American Revolution, and other patriotic societies like you, to see that the home front does not fall short in its effort.

Let us then end this most pleasant occasion with the solemn and sagacious words of Washington in his order to the Army at the beginning of the Yorktown campaign, "Nothing but want of exertion can blast the pleasing prospect before us."

Atlantic Monthly Article Discusses Free Speech and the Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since giving my talk in the House on October 18 entitled "Needed: A Code of Radio Good Behavior," I have been both surprised and impressed by the number of letters and visitors I have received indicating a much wider interest in existing radio problems than I had formerly realized.

At a little later date I shall have a report ready for the House growing out of correspondence and conferences which I have had with members of the Federal Communications Commission and others. Happily, there seems to be a determined and dispassionate desire on the part of those in authority to eliminate the tendency of certain radio outlets to practice the worst features of yellow journalism over the air. Where the desire is definite it is always possible to find a method for implementing that desire.

Under leave granted me by the House, I herewith incorporate in the permanent RECORD an article appearing in the November issue of the Atlantic Monthly, discussing the same provocative radio problems which I brought to the attention of the House on October 18. It appears that the points on which the author of this article, Quincy Howe, and I are in agreement far outnumber the points on which we are in disagreement. Be that as it may, I believe that all those interested in the preservation of free radio through helping the industry to maintain the confidence of the public by eliminating propaganda, paid lobbyists, and prejudice peddlers from its regular programs will be interested in the inside point of view expressed by Mr. Howe in his article entitled "Policing the Commentator: A News Analysis," and appearing in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

POLICING THE COMMENTATOR: A NEWS ANALYSIS

(By Quincy Howe, author, editor, and news commentator. Quincy Howe spends his mornings in the inner sanctum of Simon & Schuster and his afternoons and evenings in the news rooms of C. B. S. In this article he is expressing his personal views, not necessarily those of the network he serves)

I

American radio is trying to promote four freedoms of the air for four different sets of interests. Our Government promotes the freedom of the public to listen to the widest possible variety of radio programs. The radio industry promotes the freedom of the broadcaster to go on operating under the existing system of competitive free enterprise. Radio sponsors promote the freedom of the advertiser to sell his products, services, and general ideas. And the radio commentator or news analyst promotes the right to speak his mind.

Some sections of the broadcasting industry have argued that the news commentator has no right to express personal opinions on the air. Most news commentators insist they must not and cannot withhold their own views from the public. The Government has expressed concern lest some sponsors use commentators to slant the news their way. The sponsors to date have made no public statement.

Twenty years ago, in the early days of radio, hundreds of stations began going on the air, changing their wave lengths arbitrarily, jamming each other's programs, and producing total confusion for the listening public. In 1927 Congress, with the backing of the radio industry and the Coolidge administration, therefore passed an act setting up the Federal Radio Commission—a body appointed by the President with power to allocate wave lengths to different stations and to give and take away licenses "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity." This Commission had little difficulty stabilizing the better stations then in operation, and it tended, on the whole, to act as the traffic cop of the air waves, renewing licenses automatically and letting the radio industry develop in its own way. Then the Federal Communications Commission, which came into existence in 1934, took over these functions.

But in 1938 the Federal Communications Commission began to take stock, and held a long series of hearings on broadcasting operations. These hearings revealed, among other things, that C. B. S., Mutual, and the two N. B. C. chains did almost half the total business of all stations in the United States and either owned or controlled practically all the most powerful nighttime broadcasting facilities. The F. C. C. therefore issued a series of rulings, the most important of which ordered all networks to cease the practice of tying affiliated stations to exclusive contracts that forbade these stations to take programs from any other network. N. B. C. and C. B. S. appealed the ruling to the Supreme Court, which sustained the Commission in a 5 to 3 decision, handed down on May 10, 1943.

The F. C. C. has not, however, confined itself to fixing business practices in radio. Its able and energetic New Deal chairman, James L. Fly, has indicated that it may have something to say about program content, especially of news broadcasts.

"I heard a so-called news program last night," he said in Washington on September 13, 1943. "Through the months it has been tending more and more to get away from the news of the day to the philosophies of the particular sponsor. Things like that are done in a somewhat subtle if not oversubtle manner. Only by careful listening do you discover that he is not giving you news or comment on the world news, but is peddling ideas to you from company headquarters." Mr. Fly, therefore, made the suggestion that "it may well be that there ought not to be any sponsorship of news or comment," adding that he did not care to take a position on the matter and indicating that it was up to the radio industry to clean house.

Some stations and networks have already regulated themselves, perhaps with a view to avoiding the drastic solution that Mr. Fly suggests. The National Association of Broadcasters, trade association of the radio industry, has adopted a code which reads in part: "News shall not be selected for the purpose of furthering or hindering either side of any controversial public issue nor shall it be colored by the opinions or desires of the station or the network management, the editor or others, engaged in its preparation, or the person actually delivering it over the air, or in the case of sponsored news broadcasts, the advertiser. * * * News commentators as well as other news-

casters shall be governed by those provisions."

The Columbia Broadcasting System has gone further than any other network in putting these principles into effect. Paul White, head of the C. B. S. news department, says: "The public interest cannot be served in radio by giving selected news analysts a preferred and one-sided position in the realm of public controversy." Controversy has its time and place on the radio. The forums, debates, and political campaigns in which all sides get a fair hearing take care of that. But the function of the news analyst, says Paul White, "is to marshal the facts on any specific subject and out of his common or special knowledge to present those facts so as to inform his listeners rather than to persuade them. * * * Ideally, in the case of controversial issues, the audience should be left with no impression as to which side the analyst himself actually favors."

Mr. White admits that this sounds like the counsel of perfection. But he is not asking for the moon; he is criticizing other networks and stations when he speaks of certain broadcasters who "are permitted to present unsupported gossip as fact, to lay claim to 'inside information' which could not possibly be known to anyone outside the highest military and political circles and indeed in wartime should not be known to anyone outside those circles." Whereas Mr. Fly criticizes broadcasters who slant the news to suit their sponsor, Mr. White urges the industry t. reexamine the "inside dope" broadcasts—not in terms of sponsor or audience appeal, but "in terms of the harm they are doing and will continue to do. They are the very antithesis of responsible journalism."

Mr. Fly sees the sponsors slanting the news; Mr. White sees the sponsors encouraging sensationalism in order to develop a wide audience. Mr. Fly urges the industry to police itself and get rid of the sponsor who hires a broadcaster to twist the news to suit his interests. Mr. White also urges the industry t< police itself, but he fears the sensation monger more perhaps than the special pleader—since the sensation monger gains a wider audience.

II

Radio depends on sponsors even more than newspapers depend on advertisers. It gets no revenue from any other source. But the radio industry has become so rich, so powerful, and so experienced in its field that it has also become increasingly independent of those who buy its time. After all, sponsors want a big audience and lots of goodwill—and that's what radio has learned how to deliver. This state of affairs puts a premium on the big entertainment shows which have wider audiences than any news show and which likewise lend themselves to more effective commercial exploitation. It also means that the sponsor tends to judge news shows largely on the basis of audience appeal—which in turn puts a premium on sensationalism.

Nor is this all. The serious news broadcaster with some gift for analysis and some opinions of his own finds himself under heavy pressure from two quarters. On t'e one hand, he is tempted to play up to the widest possible audience. On the other, he is tempted to slant his interpretation the way he thinks his sponsor might like it to go.

News broadcasters make their share of mistakes in interpreting world developments, but they know the score in their own game. They have read the Gallup Poll figures showing 57 percent of the public opposed to social change after the war. They know, if anyone does, the trend of opinion against the New Deal. In recent months they have seen more than one network replace liberal commentators with those who take a conservative view. And they have seen the sponsors snap up the news programs with a conservative slant as they never snapped up the programs with a liberal slant.

The liberal commentator had to prove himself—and he did not have too much difficulty, because up through 1940 most Americans approved of most of the New Deal. But with the tide now running against the New Deal, the conservative commentator gets a sponsor first and an audience afterward. For the sponsor—the man who pays all the radio industry's bills—not only wants to reach the widest possible audience; when he buys a news show he will tend, 9 times out of 10, to prefer the kind of analyst who at least does no violence to the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Federal Communications Commission and its New Deal chairman therefore have many more bones to pick with the sponsors of news programs than they have with the news departments and news broadcasters of the networks. The big wartime profits of American industry and the popular trend away from the New Deal sharpen these conflicts. Sponsors are consequently feeling their oats. They are not only exerting more indirect pressure; the radio public and the news broadcasters who appeal to that public are responding to that pressure. Insofar as commentators do slant their news, those who slant it away from the New Deal have found favor with sponsors and the public alike. Those who take the New Deal line, so popular a few years ago, now find they get into trouble with their sponsors, if not with their audience or with the stations or networks over which they speak.

III

Just as the Government works through the F. C. C.; just as the radio industry has its National Association of Broadcasters; just as American industry has its National Association of Manufacturers, so the radio commentators have banded together in self-interest. A year and a half ago, under the leadership of H. V. Kaltenborn, about a dozen radio commentators connected with network and independent stations in New York City organized the Association of Radio News Analysts to promote the general welfare of their little sector of the radio industry. Their constitution restricts membership to commentators who "do not voice what are commonly known as commercials." A. R. N. A. has also adopted a six-point code of ethics which brought it into a head-on collision with the radio industry. The second point in A. R. N. A.'s code of ethics reads: "The association expects and requires of the radio news analyst the exercise of sound judgment and good taste and the avoidance of sensationalism in both the substance of his broadcast material and the manner of its presentation." So far, so good. But point six—the one that gave some sections of the radio industry conniption fits—reads: "The association opposes all censorship of broadcast material except insofar as duly required by Government authorities in the interest of public safety during a national emergency."

The second point of A. R. N. A.'s code goes along all the way with the policy of Paul White and C. B. S. Although humor and rumor, prediction and inside stuff, exhortation and denunciation, cracker-barrel philosophy, and sensationalism attract wide audiences and therefore appeal to the undiscriminating sponsor, they have less than nothing to do with logical, factual, analysis of world affairs. But A. R. N. A. also takes the position that the conscientious commentator has the right and even the duty to express his own opinion on controversial issues, and that neither the sponsor nor the station over which he speaks has any right to edit his copy.

Commenting on the code, Mr. White admitted that A. R. N. A.'s insistence on judgment, taste, and accuracy and its opposition to sensationalism took care of the worst dangers in news broadcasts. But he added: "Where we may be apart is over the question of whether the network has the right and, indeed, the duty to censor or edit material prepared by the analyst. Just as I believe that no news reporter should go on the air until his script has gone over the copy desk to be checked for errors of fact, grammar, and news judgment, so do I feel that no news analyst should broadcast without editorial supervision of his script."

Mr. Kaltenborn then came back at this and other criticisms of A. R. N. A.'s code in a prepared talk before the public relations and news committee of the National Association of Broadcasters. Just as Paul White admitted that there is no such thing as complete objectivity, so H. V. Kaltenborn said: "The radio news analyst cannot and should not function night after night as preacher or soap-box orator. He cannot constantly make himself the medium for passionate expression of personal or minority opinions. By and large his statements should not offend the majority of his listeners." But he wound up his talk with a spirited appeal to the radio industry not to "hamstring the great cause of free speech on the air by adopting a rigid code of rules to govern all radio commentators." He then gave this advice:

"Hire the best men you can get for the money you can pay. Tell them frankly what you expect; what you are trying to do with your station or network. And then give them their heads. If they get out of line, correct them. If they continually violate what you deem to be an essential policy, fire them. But don't pretend that you are going to be able to prevent a commentator worth his salt from expressing his personal opinion. Every competent news analyst has opinions, and they are bound to come out in the way he selects his material and puts it on the air."

Perhaps it is the last thing that some members of A. R. N. A. expect, but the general adoption of the policy recommended by Mr. Kaltenborn would appeal much more to the big-money sponsors than to Mr. Fly and his Federal Communications Commission. For it is the big-money sponsors who pay top prices to put news analysts on the largest networks at the most desirable times. Now and then a sponsor with liberal opinions or a sponsor with no opinions at all, who simply wants to reach the widest possible audience, might hire a liberal commentator. But the average big-money sponsor is more likely to prefer the views of the National Association of Manufacturers to the views of the new dealers and their liberal friends, and his taste in commentators will reflect this preference.

Moreover, the whole radio news industry—from the commentators up and down—has a professional interest in maintaining certain journalistic standards. The sponsors have no such direct interest. If the sponsors can enlist the radio news industry to spread their opinions through the voice of a popular commentator, they can hardly be blamed if they proceed to go to town. In consequence, the honest concern of the commentator for free speech can lead to the one-sided exercise of that right by those whose opinions command the biggest money.

IV

In the field of radio news we thus see four separate groups struggling for power in the name of freedom of the air. The past quarter century has witnessed a vast increase in the power of the Federal Government, in the power of the radio industry, in the power of big business, and in the power of the men and women who interpret news over the air.

To exercise power one must also have freedom. But the exercise of power and the enjoyment of freedom likewise impose heavy responsibilities.

Give Government its head, and radio becomes a Federal monopoly. Give the radio industry its head and you get more and more power concentrated into fewer and fewer hands. Give the sponsors who support radio their heads and radio becomes the voice of private American industry. Give the commentators their heads and you get either a babel of irresponsible voices or—much more likely—a concerted drive on the part of privileged groups to promote their special interests in the guise of free speech and opinion.

F. C. C. Chairman Fly may be on the right track. He probably goes too far when he suggests forbidding all commercial sponsorship of all news shows. For instance, the news reporter who gathers his own material, usually overseas, seldom editorializes. He cannot color his news to suit his sponsor; also these valuable overseas news reports cost a great deal of money. They need as well as deserve commercial sponsorship. And the straight newscaster who simply summarizes the day's events does—or can be made to do—a sufficiently impartial job to rate commercial sponsorship. So do the military and other experts.

But the news analyst is something else again. Here Mr. Fly has something, and the radio industry might be well advised, in its own interest, to develop a new feature—the unsponsored, nonsensational news analyst who gives his own opinion on controversial issues, speaking at regular, convenient hours with judgment, accuracy, and good taste. The industry should also see to it that various points of view get expressed.

As for the excess prophets, the gossip merchants, and the peddlers of inside dope, they should go right on operating—preferably without sponsors. But just as the Pure Food and Drugs Act requires the manufacturer to state on his label what ingredients go into his product, so those radio broadcasters who specialize in prediction, rumor, and sensation might carry labels, too, defining them for what they are. Likewise the news analyst should be presented as giving a frankly personal, opinionated, unsponsored interpretation of the news. His network or station would vouch for his accuracy, taste, and judgment. It would take no position on his opinion beyond saying that it believed his views deserved to be heard.

What price, then, freedom of the air? First, there is no such thing as freedom of the air for everybody—at any price. There is not even any such thing as freedom of the air for sponsors, commentators, or the radio industry itself—not unless and until one of these groups seizes complete control of the air and operates the radio industry as it alone sees fit. Nor is there any such thing as freedom of the air for the Government. The F. C. C. simply lays down the rules under which other people operate in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

But if there is no such thing as freedom of the air for anybody or everybody, there are such things as responsibility, tolerance, diversity, and honesty on the air. And what concerns us on the air and everywhere else is not freedom as an abstract ideal, but freedom as a way of life which allows for give-and-take, which calls things by their right names, which sets the public interest higher than any group interest, which limits one man's freedom in order to give another man some chance.

It is useless to seek a final answer to all the questions pertaining to radio. The best we can hope for is to give tentative answers to single questions, one at a time. And Chairman Fly has at least suggested an approach to the question of freedom of the air insofar as it affects the radio news analyst. Can the radio industry, the radio sponsors, and the radio commentators rise to the occasion that confronts them?

Victory Is a Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a condensation of an article from the November issue of the Woman's Home Companion entitled "Victory Is a Woman," by Congresswoman CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, my colleague from Connecticut:

VICTORY IS A WOMAN

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Congresswoman from Connecticut)

Faith, Hope, and Charity, pictured by the artist, always appear as women. Patience, Tolerance, and Mercy and Justice with impartial scales, are also generally painted as females. Our own Statue of Liberty is a goddess. And the Winged Victory of Samothrace was also a woman. Apparently when men sit down to personify those abstract notions, ideals, or concepts which they consider wholly good and wholly desirable in mankind, almost invariably they use womankind for their models.

Today once again there is a sensible practical reason to confirm the aesthetic choice. For now, in the midst of the first truly global war, it would be absolutely impossible for the United States to supply the needs of its own armies, and those of its allies, except for the vast unprecedented movement of American women into our wartime industries and services. Thus in stern reality the winged victory of World War No. 2 is a woman. To be sure she is not clad in flowing Greek draperies familiar at Samothrace and even today on posters. She wears the trim slacks of a factory worker, the overalls of an agricultural worker, or the uniform—blue or khaki or white—of one of the auxiliary services.

Every woman in the WAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, the Marine Corps Auxiliary, has voluntarily entered a life of rigid military discipline to release a man from clerical work for front-line service with a gun. The Army and Navy nurses are performing their duty on the global battle fronts of this war—a grueling, heartbreaking duty which often requires them to work steadily for hours or even days at tasks the mere thought of which would have made women of a Victorian age collapse over the smelling salts. * * *

American women are justifiably proud of their sisters and they like to be told, which is no more than the truth, that if they had not stepped into these fields, victory would be, if not impossible, many long and bloody years in coming.

But American women do not like nearly so much to be told that although millions of women have done a superb job, hundreds of thousands are still holding back in the war effort. They do not like to be told that today every able-bodied woman without small children or helpless dependents who is not doing an essential job in the Nation's economy, is just as much of a slacker as any able-bodied man in the community without children who avoids an essential war job or wearing the uniform of his country. This, however, is the fact. For every hour that some woman idles, by that very hour is the day of victory postponed for America.

The manpower shortage is still acute. Today we face the bleak prospect of the passage of the Wadsworth-Austin bill, a national service act designed to conscript every adult citizen on a wartime basis and thereafter to place him or her in some job where a wartime worker is needed. If this bill passes, however necessary it may be or however much it may accomplish, it is certain to play hob with the family life of the Nation. It might result in a great wave of juvenile delinquency, loss of family morale, dislocation of the foundations of thousands of homes and other social consequences that could plague us for several generations. But the passage of such a bill may be unavoidable unless in the next few months about 3,000,000 more women voluntarily go into industry to keep up production.

There need perhaps be no Wadsworth-Austin bill and possibly no large-scale conscription of fathers, if all the nieces of Uncle Sam would do their duty as well as all the women of Russia and China and Great Britain have done theirs. * * *

Even the most optimistic prophets put the earliest date for the end of the war at 1945. By the end of this year any girl or woman in good health, with her education completed and no family to wash for and cook for and no children to get off to school, who has not taken some job in our civilian war economy richly deserves a white feather from the first soldier she meets when she ventures outdoors. * * *

And yet—having scolded—I wish as a woman to offer some excuse for the women who have not yet taken part in the war effort. To a large extent I believe it is because the men who are in command of the war program, out of misplaced chivalry, bad psychology, or mere inefficiency, have not made the urgency of womanpower shortage or the nature of American women's duty sufficiently clear.

For example, take many of the Government-sponsored brochures and appeals that are supposed to lure women into war plants. Most of them make the jobs seem incredibly glamorous and attractive. They seem to promise the woman who goes into them the sort of time she might have if she joined a community dance festival training program. And the inevitable implication is that if she doesn't have the kind of time promised she may be justified, after all, in chucking it.

Now, I would be the last to say that any of these jobs is harsh and unendurable. But, however well paid a worker may be, it requires not mere strength but patience and will power to turn the same screw, inspect the same part, or wind the same kind of wire, hour after hour, day after day. War jobs are jobs for women with the blood of patriots in their veins and the courage and stamina of their pioneer or immigrant foremothers!

I believe that today in America few men of fighting age, even when they are in essential war jobs at home, do not feel a sense of uneasiness—almost unhappiness—because they cannot answer the dreadful and yet heroic challenge to defend their country on the battlefield.

Nevertheless, today some four or five million American women still do not seem to realize that their duty also is to defend their country on the home front and that they are shirking it. And one of the reasons why so many of them do not realize it is precisely

because too much of the national appeal to them has been done on a "glamor-cum-dough" basis. For one thing, any girl in her right mind knows that no matter what she reads she is more glamorous and alluring in an evening dress than in the best-cut pair of slacks; and, for another, far too many girls just don't need the "dough" anyway. * * *

If the appeal were made in realistic terms to the deep patriotism of American women, I believe that not many months would pass before few women would be left in America who were not playing their part, too, toward justifying the conception of the Winged Victory of Samothrace and the Goddess of Liberty—as women.

I do not believe that men can, or will, make such an appeal to women. On the record, men will never willingly lead women into battle. No, not even into battle on the home front—if they can help it. Only women will really lead women into danger—and hardship—if that way lies their duty. On my own committee in the House, the Military Affairs Committee, I have seen how stubbornly some of the members fought the incorporation of the WAC's into our armed forces.

For example, the WAC's had no father; they had a mother, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, who fought tirelessly for their right to serve their country in uniform—and won it.

The Winged Victory of Samothrace was a woman—and a headless one. We know, of course, that this lovely statue lost both its head and its arms in one of those nameless accidents which have afflicted works of art throughout the ages. But the American Winged Victory of World War No. 2 is also, perhaps, somewhat headless, either because up to now in this total war women have not demanded their head or because the men have lopped it off them. There is, in short, a dearth, either man-made or woman-made, of woman leadership of women—the kind which is most effective.

Not long ago Dr. Minnie Maffett, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, cited some startling figures about the absence of woman leadership in Government. Here are her figures, brought up to date as I write:

On the all-important War Production Board, among 170 listed officials there is not 1 woman. In the Office of Price Administration—120 top men, 3 women. In the Office of Lend-Lease, 141 men, 4 women. On the National War Labor Board, dealing with the problems of management and labor, 38 officials, no woman. In the Office of Civilian Defense, 35 officials, no woman. Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 22 officials, no woman. On the War Manpower Commission, which must recruit women workers for industry, 50 top-ranking officials, 2 women, and 66 men regional officials, 16 women. Today in that Bureau, 1 of these women, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, regional director of the War Manpower Commission, is doing as much, if not more, to solve the woman-power problem than any half dozen of her male colleagues.

Could it be that the men have failed to solve the womanpower problem because they have not understood the psychology of women? Or because, being American men and indulgent with women and protective toward them, they have both consciously and unconsciously avoided any measures which might interfere with their happiness? These are provocative questions and all over America women should ask them and demand that they be answered.

Equally provocative is the thought that among the hundreds of statesmen accused now by history of having mishandled the peace of the world since Versailles, the statesmen who have involved the world in one long diplomatic mess after another, who, in short, brought World War No. 2 on us—there was not one woman.

I do not hesitate to say that if women had been as largely represented in international statecraft as they are in population, this war might not have happened. * * *

If the Government really wants to get women all-out for the war as well as the peace, it is high time that it began to put more and more able women into the bureaucratic and administrative end of things in Washington. Women can and do most effectively call women to the colors. Women can and do organize women most successfully. Women can, if they are given the chance, get the 3,000,000 women still needed for victory.

And when victory comes, what then shall become of the women who helped so overwhelmingly to win it? What shall the women in war work do then, when the men are coming home from the battlefields and looking for their old jobs or for new jobs in civilian economy? The answer is simple: All patriotic women who are now holding down soldiers' jobs in factory or field or office, who do not need their wages for self-support or the support of dependents, will return to their most essential peacetime job: the resolidifying, expansion, and strengthening of their war-disrupted families.

They will go back to their homes and their families—their real jobs—with a new vision and a new purpose: to raise and educate more and better Americans. They will inspire in their sons a foresighted love of country and a sense of duty and a willingness to participate fully in the political life of their community and Nation, which will keep them aware of what their fathers forgot—that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. And they will inspire in their daughters an equal desire to play, up to the very limits of their talents, a rich and useful part in the intellectual and spiritual and political life of the Nation.

Above all, the woman who goes from the factory to the home in the year of the Winged Victory will demand that her daughter take as active a part in the winning of the peace as her mother took in the winning of the war. And no mere man is going to talk her out of this idea, either, although plenty are going to try to.

The Glory That Is Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Glory That Is Greece," made by me to the National Herald, Greek daily of New York City, and published in the issue of October 28, occasioned by the third anniversary of the Italian invasion of Greece.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the parchments of antiquity to the printed word of contemporary life, the tomes of historical records are replete with commentaries on the struggles of mankind toward the hallowed goal of human freedom. Upon every field where the arms of liberty and tyranny have met to determine the issues of human rights, and along every path of lofty effort to keep men free, may be found the monuments of Hellenic action and achievement against the forces of evil. The glorious victory of Marathon and the gallant defense of Missolonghi were but reminders to the ambitions of any future aggressor that the Greek Nation never has and never will cringe in the presence of any threat to its ideas of justice and right.

Anyone but an enemy of man would consider it the highest of honors to contribute even a phrase of commendation to the men, women, and children of modern Greece and to their kinsmen in America, on this, the third anniversary of the invasion of their homeland by the armies of destructive might. In the living we have that confidence born of a knowledge of past performance, and to these and to those who have fallen on the sacred battleground of honor we say with the Cuban poet, Joaquín Luaces:

Revenge, oh Greeks! Missolonghi in ruins
To Ibrahim fell with all her brave;
Let the Moslem find within her walls
The Greek a corpse but never a slave!

Economic Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 28, 1943:

ECONOMIC DIPLOMATS

Slowly but surely order is being built out of the confusion in the administration of our war economic agencies having to do with foreign affairs. Now these agencies are to be combined into one big organization. It is, as Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, says, "the most far-reaching consolidation of Government agencies in the war." Whether to make this radical transformation was Mr. Crowley's main problem when he was given this over-all assignment. He might have maintained the separate identities of the constituent agencies: Lend-Lease, Office of Economic Warfare, Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, Foreign Procurement Division of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Office of Foreign Economic Coordination of the State Department. In that event Mr. Crowley would have been merely a coordinator. His decision to be administrator is, we believe, a wise one. Obviously, with these agencies doing very much the same type of work, overlapping would have been perpetuated. One organization will save not only duplication; it will make for coherence abroad and economy of administration at home.

It has taken Mr. Crowley some time to make up his mind. Perhaps the alternative of maintaining the separate agencies and keeping himself as a coordinator had some merits which do not seem apparent. Or maybe Mr. Crowley wished to reconstruct his immediate staff before he announced his decision. But the fact is that the delay must have been harmful to the morale of the staffs in the constituent agencies. As to the reaction

upon the economic representatives abroad, that may be easily imagined. For weeks they have not known who was their chief, and there must have been a good deal of treading water by these bewildered agents. With some bearings now established, Mr. Crowley can proceed to build on the new organization and unify the work abroad. If he chooses his agents in foreign countries with the same care as he has chosen his immediate staff, the Senators who grumbled about our diplomatic weakness abroad may change their tune.

The Truth About the Plaquemines Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an address entitled "The Truth About the Plaquemines Situation," by L. H. Perez, district attorney of the Twenty-fifth Judicial District Court of Louisiana, comprising the parishes of Plaquemines and St. Bernard, delivered over a State-wide network of radio stations in Louisiana and Mississippi. Mr. Perez spoke from the studios of WNOE in New Orleans, Tuesday night, October 19, 1943.

Nation-wide news and editorial comment was evoked on Saturday, October 9, when Gov. Sam Jones, of Louisiana, in his effort to place his appointee, Walter Blaize, in the sheriff's office of Plaquemines Parish, declared a state of martial law to exist in that parish as a result of alleged insurrection, rioting, general disorder, and rebellion.

At this time I believe Mr. Perez's address will clarify whatever wrongful impressions may have resulted in the minds of the Congress and the country regarding this incident.

I believe this address will enable the Congress to obtain a background of information regarding the controversy over the sheriff's office in Plaquemines Parish, La., which is, and has been, the subject of litigation in the State courts of Louisiana. It must be borne in mind that arms, ammunition, troop-carrying trucks, scout cars, bomber planes, and miscellaneous Army equipment, the property of the United States Army, were provided by military authorities, and used by Louisiana State guards against the officials and citizens of Plaquemines Parish for the sole purpose of installing the Governor's political choice in the quarters assigned the sheriff in the Plaquemines Parish courthouse.

All of this was done, according to Mr. Perez, despite the fact that the dispute over the sheriff's office has been and is still pending in the State courts, and in utter disregard of a court order dated October 6, restraining the officers and members of the State guard from interfering in the matter pending the judicial outcome of the controversy.

Following is Mr. Perez's explanation of the controversy:

Friends and fellow citizens, so much false propaganda has been spread throughout the State by the large daily newspapers about the situation in the parish of Plaquemines resulting from the unlawful declaration of martial law against the people of our parish by Governor Jones, that the parish authorities requested me to talk to the people of the State over a State-wide radio hook-up to give the true facts of the situation.

The newspaper propaganda has charged the people of the parish of Plaquemines and their officials with having resisted and set themselves against a decree of the State supreme court recognizing Walter Blaize, Governor Jones' appointee, as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines, and with open rebellion, rioting, insurrection, general disorders, and law violations.

All of this, of course, is false.

On June 1 of this year our elected sheriff died, thereby a vacancy was created in the office of sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines. Under our State constitution, the parish coroner became the acting sheriff with all right and title to that office and the State revenue collector became the acting tax collector until such vacancy should be filled according to law.

Dr. Slater is the duly elected and qualified coroner of the parish of Plaquemines and, therefore, he became the acting sheriff on June 1.

On June 1, Dr. Slater as acting sheriff and the president of our police jury both notified State Collector of Revenue Fontenot that, under a provision of the constitution, he became acting parish tax collector and that he should delegate an agent from his department to take over the tax-collector's office and records and that he would receive the full cooperation of all parish officials in his collection of taxes in the parish of Plaquemines.

However, Revenue Collector Fontenot failed to take over the tax collector's office.

Governor Jones, on June 11, appointed Walter Blaize as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines.

Now, Governor Jones knew that he had no right to appoint a sheriff for the parish of Plaquemines.

Our State constitution provides that in all cases where the unexpired portion of the term of a sheriff's office is less than 1 year, it shall be filled by appointment by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the senate; and in all cases where the unexpired portion of the term is 1 year or more, the vacancy shall be filled by special election to be called by the Governor and held within 60 days after the occurrence of the vacancy.

I say that Governor Jones knew he had no authority, under the State constitution, to appoint a sheriff to fill the vacancy created by the death of Sheriff Dauterive on June 1, because Governor Jones had tried unsuccessfully to appoint Campbell Palfrey criminal sheriff of the Parish of Orleans just before the last city election in December 1941; and in a suit over the right to that office, the State supreme court held that the Governor had no authority, under the State constitution, to appoint a sheriff, even though there was less than 1 year left in the term, without the advice and consent of the State senate.

All of you who read the New Orleans newspapers then will recall the great hullabaloo made by them both in their news columns and in their editorials condemning Sheriff Williams who had been appointed by the Orleans criminal district court judges for resisting with force the attempt of Palfrey, as the Governor's appointee, to use force to take over the Orleans sheriff's office.

It is a habit of the New Orleans newspapers to publish propaganda and false editorials to influence the decisions of the State courts in cases of public interest; that is a fact only too well and generally known.

There was more than 1 year left in the unexpired term of the sheriff's office on June 1, when measured by every decision of the State supreme court handed down since 1839, which held that each succeeding 4-year term of office commences and ends on the same corresponding day in cycles of 4 years. The first term of the Plaquemines Parish sheriff's office under the 1921 State constitution commenced on June 9, 1924, and expired on June 8, 1928, and, therefore, each succeeding term of the Plaquemines Parish sheriff's office began on June 9 and expired on June 8 in cycles of 4 years. The present vacancy occurred by the death of the sheriff on June 1, 1943, and since his term would not have expired until June 8, 1944, there was 1 year and 8 days remaining in the unexpired portion of his term of office.

So, I repeat, when Governor Jones appointed Walter Blaize as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines, he is bound to have known that he had no authority under the constitution to make that appointment, because if there was less than 1 year left in the unexpired portion of the sheriff's term of office, under the decision of the supreme court in the Palfrey-Williams case, he could not appoint a sheriff without the advice and consent of the State senate and everybody knows the State senate has not been in session since August 1942 and could not have consented to the Blaize appointment.

If there was more than 1 year left in the sheriff's term of office, the Governor was required to call a special election so that the people of the parish of Plaquemines would elect their own sheriff, as their constitutional right.

However, in order to get around the provisions of the constitution, which prohibits the Governor from making the appointment of Walter Blaize as he did, a so-called friendly suit was filed in the Baton Rouge district court in the name of Walter Blaize, the Governor's appointee against State Supervisor of Public Funds Jerome Hayes and State Collector of Revenue Rufus Fontenot, all of whom were the Governor's appointees. They were represented by several attorneys on the State pay rolls, including James I. Smith, the Governor's executive counsel, as attorney for Blaize.

The Blaize Baton Rouge suit was only to mandamus or order Hayes as supervisor of public funds to deliver to Blaize the books and records of the tax collector's office and to enjoin Fontenot, as collector of revenue, from interfering with Blaize as tax collector for the parish of Plaquemines. Both Hayes and Fontenot admitted in their answers to the suit that they had no right or title or interest to the office of sheriff or tax collector for the parish of Plaquemines.

The State pay-roll lawyers representing both sides of the case wrote up a judgment and together they requested the judge of the Baton Rouge court to sign it several days before the date when the case was fixed for trial; and the Baton Rouge judge accommodated them and signed their judgment, without a single witness having taken the stand and without a word of evidence being submitted that Dr. Slater as parish coroner had filled the sheriff's vacancy and was acting sheriff for the parish of Plaquemines.

In this connection, it will be recalled, that the New Orleans newspapers published a report, that the reason why this suit was filed in the Baton Rouge district court instead of in the Plaquemines Parish district court was to prevent any parties from Plaquemines Parish getting into the case.

The office of sheriff for the parish of Plaquemines is the office at stake and, as everyone must realize, the Baton Rouge district court did not have any jurisdiction or authority to render any judgment affect-

ing the sheriff's office in the parish of Plaquemines, or affecting the right of Dr. Slater as acting sheriff for the parish of Plaquemines, who resides in the parish of Plaquemines and who was not even a party to the case.

Over 800 citizens and taxpayers of the parish of Plaquemines, the police jury of the parish of Plaquemines as its governing authority, and the deputy sheriffs serving under Dr. Slater as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines, all filed petitions of suspensive appeal from the judgment which had been collusively and fraudulently secured from the Baton Rouge district court in favor of Blaize and against Hayes and Fontenot, the State supervisor and collector of revenue.

The State law grants the right of appeal not only to those who were parties to the cause in which a judgment has been rendered against them, but also to third persons not parties to such suit, when third persons show that they have been aggrieved and affected by the judgment.

However, the Baton Rouge district judge unceremoniously denied all of them their right of appeal.

The next step in the Baton Rouge case, was when the State pay-roll lawyers for Hayes and Fontenot applied to the supreme court for writs to order the Baton Rouge district judge to send up the record of the Blaize-Hayes-Fontenot case for review and for decision by the supreme court.

Now, most of you who read and follow the New Orleans newspaper propaganda, I am sure, have read time and time again that the supreme court rendered a final decree in favor of Walter Blaize, recognizing him as the duly appointed and qualified sheriff for the parish of Plaquemines.

But the truth of the matter is, that the only order which the supreme court rendered in that case, was to refuse to grant any writ or order to the Baton Rouge court to send up the record of the case for review, and, as a matter of fact, the record of the Baton Rouge district court case filed in the name of Blaize against Hayes and Fontenot, was never sent up to the supreme court for review or decision.

Now, I ask all of you, my friends and fellow citizens of the State of Louisiana, and especially you who are lawyers or judges of any court in the State—have you ever heard of any court passing judgment on a case, or rendering any decree on the merits of a case, without even having had before it the record of the case?

You know that the supreme court and no other court in the State can or would render a judgment on the merits of a case without even having before it the record of that case.

After the supreme court denied the writs the more than 800 citizens and taxpayers of the parish of Plaquemines, the parish police jury, and the several deputy sheriffs serving under Dr. Slater as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines all applied to the supreme court for a rehearing to have their right of appeal granted by law from the Baton Rouge court judgment.

On October 5 the State supreme court refused to grant their applications for rehearing, the court stating as its reason for so refusing that under the rules of the supreme court an application for a rehearing will not be considered where the court has refused to grant a writ of review or supervisory writs, even when an opinion is rendered explaining why the writ was refused. The opinion rendered by the supreme court as its reason for refusing an order or writ is no judgment or decree of the court. The only expression of a court which can be enforced is its order, judgment, or decree.

The New Orleans newspapers particularly seized upon the action of the supreme court in refusing to grant a rehearing and misrepresented to the people of the State that the supreme court had rendered a final decree holding that Walter Blaize was the duly appointed and qualified sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines.

There was not a single word in the court's refusal to grant a rehearing which could honestly or legally be interpreted as a judgment or a decree in favor of Walter Blaize as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines.

Our State laws provide how court judgments should be enforced, but no State law grants to the Governor as chief executive or commander in chief of the militia the right to declare martial law or to call out the State guard under the guise of enforcing a court judgment.

The State law, article 915 of the Code of Practice, provides that no execution shall issue on the judgments of the supreme court, but that supreme court judgments shall be sent back for their enforcement to the district court.

Under our law, when a district court judgment is sought to be enforced in a parish outside the judicial district a certified copy of that judgment must be filed with a petition in the district court of the parish where it is attempted to be enforced. That is the judicial process provided by our State laws for the enforcement of judgments.

In this case, therefore, if Walter Blaize, as the Governor's appointee, or his State lawyers, including the Governor's executive counsel, thought they had a judgment which could be enforced against Dr. Slater as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines they would have had to file a certified copy of that judgment in the district court for the parish of Plaquemines, and they should have secured an order of execution or writ of possession from the judge of the Plaquemines Parish district court againt Dr. Slater.

Nothing of this kind was ever done.

And I can tell you the reason why they did not attempt this legal procedure through the State courts.

Governor Jones and his lawyers knew that if they attempted to enforce the Baton Rouge district court judgment against Dr. Slater in Plaquemines Parish, Dr. Slater, under the State laws, would have had a right to enjoin the execution of the Baton Rouge court judgment against him for two very good reasons.

In the first place, Dr. Slater could have proven beyond any doubt that that judgment in favor of Blaize and against Hayes and Fontenot was secured from the Baton Rouge court by collusion and fraud and, therefore, under our law, it was an absolute nullity; and, in the second place, Dr. Slater would have had a perfect legal right to prevent the enforcement of that Baton Rouge judgment against him because he was not a party to the case, nor was he cited to appear, or answer in that case.

On that subject, our State supreme court has held that it is an elementary principle running through all law and jurisprudence that no one is bound by any judicial proceeding affecting his property rights, where he is not a party to such proceedings.

The United States Supreme Court has decided many cases on the same subject, holding that it is a principle of general application in Anglo-American jurisprudence, that one is not bound by a judgment in litigation in which he is not designated as a party, or to which he has not been made a party by service of process, and any judicial action enforcing such a judgment against him as an absent party to the case is not that due process of law which is guaranteed to every American citizen by the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution.

Now, all of these authorities were cited in a printed brief furnished to the lawyers representing Blaize, including the Governor's executive counsel. They knew and the Governor knew, that if regular judicial process had been followed in an effort to enforce the Baton Rouge court judgment against Dr. Slater as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines, he could have successfully resisted the enforcement of that collusive and fraudulent judgment in the courts of the State.

Therefore, Governor Jones, following the false and vicious propaganda of the New Orleans newspapers, did their bidding and issued a proclamation of martial law against all of the people of Plaquemines Parish in an unlawful effort to place Blaize in the sheriff's office by force.

In order to declare martial law a state of open rebellion or insurrection or imminent danger must exist.

Such was not the case in Plaquemines Parish. The only dispute was over the right to the sheriff's office held by Dr. Slater and claimed by Walter Blaize, who had brought no legal proceeding against Dr. Slater to test the right or title to that office as the law requires.

NOTHING MORE

However, in order to declare martial law in their attempt to forcibly take the sheriff's office, because they could not get the office according to law, they had Governor Jones' Quisling, Walter Blaize, send him a false telegram representing that there was a condition of widespread lawlessness, insurrection, rioting, and open rebellion and disorder throughout the parish of Plaquemines—a false, libelous statement if ever a false statement was made. But, Governor Jones deliberately included that false statement in his declaration of martial law against the people of Plaquemines Parish.

Our people are peace loving, law abiding, and patriotic.

They had just oversubscribed our Third War Loan drive parish quota more than four times—from $119,200 to over one-half million dollars.

All of our young, able-bodied men and some of our young women are engaged in our country's armed forces, fighting on foreign battlefields and in our Navy throughout the world against our foreign enemies to protect and preserve our American freedom and liberty and our constitutional form of government, which is now being so flagrantly violated by Governor Jones under his attempted military dictatorship in true Nazi fashion.

Our able-bodied men and many of our women are working in shipyards and factories, in our parish sulfur mine and oil fields, and on their fishing boats and farms to produce vital war material and war supplies in our all-out war effort.

Our people, as free American citizens, were shocked beyond expression when they learned that our parish was being invaded by 1,000 members and officers of Governor Jones' State guard, transported in scores of brand-new United States Army troop trucks, armed with hundreds of Army rifles with fixed bayonets and scores of machine guns and led by several Army armored cars with mounted heavy-caliber machine guns with Walter Blaize accompanying the commanding general in the middle of the convoy and all supported by two bomber planes on reconnoitering duty, all of which Army equipment was manufactured and paid for by our American people on the home front.

What a shameful spectacle to make of the American way of life for the preservation of which our own boys are making the supreme sacrifice.

Governor Jones' proclamation of martial law against the people of Plaquemines Parish was issued as commander in chief of the State militia. The Governor is no more commander in chief of the State militia than either you or I at this time, because under the Constitution of the United States the President is Commander in Chief of the

militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

All of you know the Louisiana State Militia was called into actual service more than 2 years ago and will be in the actual service of the United States until after this war is over.

Therefore, Governor Jones not only usurped the civil power of our State courts, in violation of law, but also usurped the power of the President of the United States.

The State guard was created to be used in the absence of the State militia while in the actual service of the United States as a home guard against invasion, insurrection, or imminent danger thereof to protect the people of the State of Louisiana against foreign enemies.

No doubt Louisianans not subject to military service in our country's armed forces who joined the home guard did so through patriotic motives without any idea that they would be called out as a military force for political oppression or to seat a Governor's political appointee.

Hundreds of State guardsmen have been taken from their homes and their war work at considerable loss not only to themselves but to our all-out war effort and at a tremendous cost of many hundreds of thousands of dollars to the taxpayers of the State.

The people of Plaquemines Parish, as God-fearing, hard-working American citizens, have been outraged. While the members of the State guard are only carrying out orders, the spectacle of armed men stopping them at all times, day and night, and searching them and their cars as though they were all outlaws, make them feel as though they are living in one of the Nazi-occupied countries of Europe.

In the land of the "four freedoms" such things should not happen.

The newspapers and Governor Jones make false claims that the people of Plaquemines Parish and their officials disregarded a supreme court judgment, which, as I have shown, is absolutely false.

On the other hand, the Governor and the officers of his State guard absolutely trampled on a State-court restraining order which prohibited the carrying out of the unlawful declaration of martial law against the people of Plaquemines Parish in his unlawful attempt to seize the sheriff's office.

On the morning of October 6, 3 days before the State guard invaded Plaquemines Parish, leading officers of the Jones' State guard were served personally with State-court restraining orders which prohibited them from coming into the parish of Plaquemines or the courthouse to forcibly and unlawfully seize the sheriff's office or from committing any other unlawful acts.

The restraining order has been treated with the utmost contempt by the Governor and the officers of his State guard.

It remains to be seen whether, as provided in the State constitution, the military shall always be in subordination to the civil power of the State, or whether Governor Jones and his State guard officers can violate court orders and the State constitution with impunity.

When the Jones' State guard invaded the courthouse, the Plaquemines Parish grand jury actually was in session—and they will come back in session until their final report is filed. Our court also was in session several days during the same week of that Saturday invasion day.

In this connection, let me read from a decision of the United States Supreme Court, when it held that:

"Martial rule can never exist where the courts are open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction. It is also confined to the locality of actual war."

And in that case the United States Supreme Court also held just what is applicable today as it ever was, that no doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by wit of man than that any of the provisions of the Constitution can be suspended. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence.

To the people of Plaquemines Parish, let me say that their constitutional rights will be vindicated and that proper legal proceedings are being filed both in the Federal and State courts to set aside the unlawful declaration of martial law and to prevent the subordination of the civil power to military force, contrary to our State and Federal Constitutions, and to prevent the unlawful interference with Dr. Slater in the exercise of his duties and functions as sheriff of the parish of Plaquemines by Walter Blaize with unlawful aid of the State guard acting under an unlawful order of martial law.

And to the people of the State of Louisiana, we say that the parish of Plaquemines has a record in its public business administration and in the character of its citizens as good, law-abiding, hard-working, patriotic American citizens of which we are justly proud, and they will not be intimidated or yield to depotism or Nazi military rule.

My friends and fellow citizens of Louisiana, after we have rid ourselves by legal proceedings of the Gestapo methods employed by Governor Jones and his State guard officers, our parish police jury says come to Plaquemines Parish and you will find as industrious, hospitable, and fine a people as you have ever met anywhere.

The War in the South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Rear Admiral George D. Murray, commandant of the Pensacola Naval Base, a fighting admiral from the South Pacific. The address was delivered before the Grand Lodge of Missouri, Free and Accepted Masons, on September 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, to be invited to appear before this great body of the Masons of Missouri is a signal honor and one which I have accepted with a deep feeling of appreciation.

When I wired my acceptance of the gracious invitation of your grand master of Masons, I confess I permitted myself to be swayed by somewhat personal motives.

My acceptance meant, I hoped, that my visit to this great metropolis of the Middle West would afford me an opportunity once again to see an old shipmate of mine—my former captain in the Navy, now one of your outstanding citizens—Mr. Charles Belknap, president of the Monsanto Chemical Co.

Such an opportunity I would not forego, no matter how frightening the prospect of making a speech before this great gathering of Missouri Masons—or are the Masons different from the Missourians who say, "You've got to show me"?

A few days before leaving Pensacola, I happened to be passing the time of day with one of my good chaplains—a fine upstanding figure of a man, if ever I saw one. "Well, Father," said I, "What would you say if I told you I was going away on a trip to make a speech before a lot of Masons?" "Oh," said the good father, "I'd say it'll do them a lot of good."

Thirty years ago Mr. Belknap, then a lieutenant in the United States Navy, was the commanding officer of one of our destroyers—U. S. S. *Ammen*—named in honor of Rear Admiral Daniel Ammen, United States Navy, who served in the Navy in a bygone day.

I served in the U. S. S. *Ammen* and Captain Belknap was our skipper—my captain.

You know it is an old custom and tradition in the naval service for the commanding officer of a ship to be spoken of and addressed by all officers and men attached to his ship as "Captain." Hence the Lieutenant Belknap I knew and served with 30 years ago was Captain Belknap to me then—and he is still Captain Belknap to me now.

Destroyers of those days were not unlike the destroyer escort type of vessel of the present war in speed and displacement; whereas, destroyers of the present day have been developed into much larger, more powerful vessels than the destroyers of the *Ammen* class.

Present-day destroyers displace twice the tonnage of our *Ammen*, and require more than double the *Ammen's* complement of officers and men for their operation.

Our destroyer had a complement of 4 officers and less than 100 men. It was a great ship.

The success of any organization, civil or military, depends, in large measure, upon the qualities of leadership of the head of the organization.

We in the *Ammen* were singularly fortunate. The example and inspiration set by Captain Belknap greatly colored and influenced the lives of the three young officers who served with him, for 30 years later all three had become flag officers of the Navy. The three were the late Rear Admiral Norman Scott, who lost his life in the naval action off Guadalcanal November 13, 1942 (may God rest his soul); Rear Admiral Charles A. Pownall, who commanded the task force that raided Marcus Island a short time ago; and myself.

Thirty years ago the term "fleet" signified combatant ships of various types—the first-line battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and noncombatant types of auxiliaries, such as supply ships, repair ships, colliers, tankers, and tenders.

Today when the term "fleet" is used, its connotation is entirely different.

Today the fleet comprises combatant ships and their necessary auxiliaries and, in addition, great numbers of aircraft squadrons attached to and based upon aircraft carriers, tenders, and bases.

To be sure, surface craft and submarines of today are of vastly improved types over those of 30 years ago, but more important is the fact that the major offensive weapon of the fleet today is the aircraft carrier with its embarked aircraft.

Aircraft carriers now in the fleet range in size from 35,000 to 10,000 tons. And each week additional aircraft carriers, large and small, additional aircraft tenders, and other combatant types required for their support and protection are being commissioned.

Aircraft comprise such a major offensive arm of the fleet today it is impossible to exclude this essential component from the fleet and yet have one.

Nowhere are the changes in the pattern of modern warfare more marked than at sea

where the aircraft carrier has supplanted the battleship as the backbone of the fleet.

Naval successes throughout the vast reaches of the Pacific are being written around the heroic performances of carrier-based aircraft. At Coral Sea, at Midway, in the Solomons, all across the Pacific, from the the Aleutians to Australia, shore- and carrier-based aircraft have gone roaring out to attack and sink the enemy task forces.

During the infancy of naval aviation and almost until it reached maturity, it played a subordinate role in naval strategy and tactics. Now its role is the dominant one in fleet operations.

Hence, within the memory of living man, the composition of the fleet has undergone significant and fundamental change.

Is it unreasonable to assume, therefore, that so long as fleets continue to exist, their composition will continue to change?

Yet, whatever changes the future may bring, we know from experience that surface craft and aircraft are so mutually dependent upon each other that maximum fighting efficiency of the fleet can be assured only if these elements are welded into one homogeneous, inseparable whole.

Today, the fleet is very largely composed of task forces. Insofar as the major elements of the fleet are concerned—that is, aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers—task forces built around the aircraft carrier constitute the main striking force of the fleet. Such task forces vary in their composition, depending upon their mission. For example, a task force may be composed of a small carrier and a few destroyers. Another task force, however, may be composed of two or more large carriers, supported by battleships, cruisers, and a sizable number of destroyers. In both cases the carrier constitutes the heart of the task force organization.

The operations and tactics of the carrier task force are developed so that aircraft squadrons, adequate in numbers and type, based on the carriers, can successfully carry out offensive missions against the enemy. Adequate defensive strength is assured by assigning powerful surface-craft units to the task force—that is, battleships, cruisers, and destroyers in sufficient number to afford maximum protection to the carriers—for the carrier is the most vulnerable to attack of all surface craft and is the principal target the enemy seeks to destroy.

To illustrate how effective the carrier task force has become, the operations of the *Enterprise* may be cited because certain information has been released to the public with respect to its operations which illustrates my point. During the period December 7, 1941, to November 1942, *Enterprise* and her attached air group participated in four major battles, three major raids against enemy land objectives, and the occupation of Guadalcanal. During this time *Enterprise* and her air group, exclusive of destruction of hostile shore installations throughout the combat area, sank or damaged a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shot down 185 Japanese aircraft. That record can be and will be exceeded by other carrier task forces in the days to come. I, therefore, say it is purely a matter of time when the Japanese Fleet will be destroyed and her sea-borne commerce bottled up or eliminated.

These results will be achieved as increasing pressure is brought to bear against the enemy in the form of large numbers of carrier task forces working in conjunction with other naval task forces, the Army Air Forces, and combined Army and Navy amphibious forces.

The organization of the fleet into carrier task forces and other task forces provided with aircraft support, renders the fleet a much more mobile one that the fleet of 30 years ago. Then, the concentration of the fleet into one large unit was considered so necessary, its movement became a rather ponderous and relatively slow operation. Now, although we have not lost sight of the long-established military principle that concentration of adequate force at a given point is vital to the success of any military operation, today, a far greater degree of flexibility is achieved by the organization of the fleet into large numbers of task forces, so that it is possible to employ one or more task forces on a given mission and, at the same time, employ other task forces on other contributory missions, in distant theaters, in accordance with strategic plans. Thus we see that naval operations today are more fluid than those of the days prior to the ascendency of aircraft. Hence, task forces employing large numbers of aircraft squadrons, can deliver powerful offensive blows over wide sea areas against enemy ships and other objectives, in minimum time without even being sighted by the enemy. In this war, many actions have taken place when surface craft of opposing forces have been separated 100 to 200 miles.

In the old days, fleets necessarily had to be within visual sight and gun range of one another before battle was joined. Defense against air attack is provided by an umbrella coverage of fighting planes over one's own force supported by the antiaircraft fire of the surface craft of that force. Depending upon the fighter strength that can be provided and the effectiveness of antiaircraft weapons, in many cases, measures for the defense of a force are extremely effective in countering the attack of an opposing force.

Week by week, while additional fighting units are being added to the fleet in increasing numbers, a flight training program, tremendous in scope, in comparison with our pre-war program, is operating at maximum output capacity.

This flight-training program is integrated with the material program, so that, as additional aircraft and aircraft carriers become available, adequate numbers of well-trained naval aviators are ready to man them.

Our current naval aviation training program represents a many-hundredfold expansion of the training program in effect a few years before the war. Then we trained pilots at the rate of a few hundred per year—now we are producing pilots at the rate of several hundred per week.

Long before Pearl Harbor, the Navy realized the imperative necessity of greatly expanding its naval air arm. A program was evolved to develop the best fighting pilots in the world—pilots who could outfly the enemy, who could shoot straighter, could hit harder, and who were tougher and stronger.

Our flight-training program requires more than a year of intensive, formalized training before a cadet is ready to join an operating squadron or to proceed to a combat area.

In broad outline the flight-training program is divided into three phases, each requiring more than 3 months to complete.

During the first phase, the flight student literally does not see an airplane, much less fly in one. At four large preflight schools they are mentally, physically, and militarily indoctrinated in the rigors of modern warfare.

Following this phase, cadets learn to fly at any one of a dozen Naval Reserve bases, scattered throughout the country. At these bases they are taught the fundamentals of flight and are carried to a stage of training when they are ready to fly planes of a more advanced training type.

Upon completing this phase of their training they proceed to either one of the large training establishments at Pensacola or Corpus Christi where they receive sufficient training to qualify as naval aviators. At the same time they are commissioned, either as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

Following this period of their training, they receive specialized operational training in combat aircraft before actually joining the fleet.

The present naval aviation training program calls for 30,000 pilots this year and every year until the war is won. Currently, we are producing pilots at this rate.

Where do our young flyers come from?

Prior to my visit here, I examined our records and found that at Pensacola alone, we have about 20 young flight students from St. Louis plus 80 from the rest of Missouri. A corresponding number of flight students from Missouri are at Corpus Christi. Hence, I estimate that 500 to 600 young men from this State will have qualified as naval aviators during the current calendar year and will report for aviation duty with the Navy in all parts of the world.

The American aviator whether he be a naval aviator in the Navy or Marine Corps, or a pilot in the Army Air Forces, is a tough, well-trained, well-disciplined young American. Because of his native talent, which is highly developed by sound indoctrination and training, our aviators very quickly have established superiority over the enemy in all theaters of operation. That they are achieving greater and greater success and that more and more effective combat types of aircraft are being made available, in all combat areas, must be known to the entire American public. At the present time, I am directly connected with the naval aviator training program, and I can assure you that our flight-training standards are as high as can possibly be achieved. We know that our pilots are receiving better and more thorough preparation and training than the pilots of our enemy and therefore are superior to the enemy. The destruction of the enemy is the principal concern of all of us; that his destruction is inevitable no one will deny. What we are trying to achieve, more than anything else, is that destruction at the earliest possible time.

CONCLUSION

The personnel of the Navy has greatly expanded since Japan struck without warning on December 7, 1941. Many scientific and technical developments have sprung into being under the impetus of the war. Yet, in a country such as ours, much depends upon the response of the individual citizen, his aptitude and talent, who overnight finds himself in uniform, determined to learn all he can as quickly as he can, so that he may contribute his full share to our ultimate victory over the forces of evil and oppression that would completely debase the human spirit.

Of the greatest importance in both the Army and the Navy has been the necessity to develop attributes of self-reliance, integrity, responsibility, and a high sense of duty, which in varying degrees exist in the minds and hearts of the majority of young American men but which have not been stressed in the home during the early training of many of these young men as much as they might have been.

Prior to our entry in the war I felt that a cross section of our enlisted strength, from our senior C. P. O.'s to the youngest apprentice seaman still undergoing recruit training, provided an accurate and authentic index of young America no matter from what part of the country he might come. I assure you there is nothing wrong with young America.

Take, for example, a big ship, such as any one of our aircraft carriers, with its crew of more than 2,000 men.

Regardless of the size of any ship built to fight, when you total all the space required for military purposes other than for eating

and sleeping, very little is left for these essential human activities. In other words, every naval vessel is always crowded, some more than others. Therefore one of the first things every Navy man must learn, and learn quickly, is how to get along with his neighbor, who is always at his elbow.

Before Pearl Harbor the discipline in the Navy was of a very high order. Young Navy men, being human, are exposed to the frailties that all human flesh is heir to. Yet through the medium of intelligent educational methods, strict discipline, and fair and impartial justice the standards of conduct, of integrity, and of honor maintained by the great overwhelming majority of the enlisted men of the Navy could well be emulated with profit by every community in this land.

What happened after Pearl Harbor? I can tell you so far as the *Enterprise* and many other ships of the fleet are concerned. I can also tell you what the conditions are today at Pensacola and Corpus Christi, where more than 50,000 officers and enlisted men are required to carry on our flight-training program at these centers.

During more than 7 months, after Pearl Harbor, I cannot recall a serious disciplinary case occurring in the *Enterprise*. Regardless of the frequency of the watches, in spite of continuous watches for long periods of time, every man in that ship's company felt his responsiblity and contributed his full share to the common cause—to defeat the enemy wherever he might be found. Our feeling was, "kill or be killed" a simple motto easy to visualize.

At Pensacola and Corpus Christi, where so many thousands of young men are required to perform a great many different duties and tasks, in order to keep our vast training program functioning day and night, the conduct of these young men, and the standards of discipline which they maintain, are on a par with those found in our ships in the combat areas. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our enlisted strength are a source of any trouble to us. And, of that number, the majority become involved in trouble (1) because they are extremely young (17–18 years old), have never been away from home and become homesick, which in many cases leads to absence without leave; and (2) other cases develop due to a misconception on the part of the individual who commits a military offense, such as absence without leave, thinking, by so doing, he will be sent to sea and will thereby be given a chance to do what he wants to do—lick the Japs.

Again I say, there is nothing the matter with young America.

Readiness to endure any hardships, to be prepared to meet any threat of danger or death, itself, unflinchingly, are naval traditions. This is the result of generations of men who have devoted their lives to an ideal, the service of their country. The bonds of mutual confidence, respect and trust which flow throughout the whole fabric of the naval service, culminating in a devotion to duty beyond life itself, cannot but lead to one conclusion—the utter destruction of our enemies.

From the highest to the most lowly, our naval personnel is contributing its best efforts to the common cause, and each one is aware of the part he is taking.

Just the other day I heard of the perfect example.

For some time I've had a colored boy with me—what we call a steward's mate. Aboard ship he took care of my cabin and my clothes and served my meals. He was with me in the *Hornet*, and I now have him at my quarters. He says he is always going to stay with me, and I hope I'll never lose him. He is a fine, honorable young man.

One evening, a few weeks ago, one of our civilian employees was returning to the station when he spied a very trim sailor figure just beyond a curve in the road. He was much surprised, upon stopping and calling out to the individual he had picked up in his headlights, to find that he was just as black as the ace of spades. However, he told him to jump in if he wanted a lift to the air station. The naval reservation is quite extensive, so after they entered the gate the civilian told the boy he was going to such and such a building and he would drop him off near whatever barracks he lived in. "No," said the boy, "I'll get off at the admiral's quarters." This quite mystified the civilian, who said, "What do you mean, the admiral's quarters?" "Yes, sir," said the boy, "me and the admiral was in the *Hornet* together."

Government Encroachment Upon Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Thursday, October 28, 1943. The subject of the speech is Government encroachment upon private enterprise threatens the destruction of American democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I thank the members of the Military Suppliers Association of America for inviting me to their meeting here tonight and giving me this opportunity to speak to them, and by radio to the people of this Nation on one of the most vital issues before the American people today; namely, "Government encroachment upon private enterprise threatens the destruction of American democracy." The members of the Military Suppliers Association of America, representing one segment of private enterprise in America which has been serving this Nation since the earliest days of our history, have just now run head-on into a Government ruling which disfranchises around 7,600 of their 8,000 members engaged in retail business from continuing certain services they have been faithfully rendering for all these years. That constitutes Government encroachment upon private enterprise. I need not speak of the plight of these merchants exclusively. Thousands of other small and medium-sized businesses throughout this Nation have been forced to close their doors and quit business, and others, small and large, see the handwriting on the wall, as tax-free Government agencies move in on them as competitors. So my remarks will cover the subject generally, and applies equally to all types of private enterprise in America from the smallest corner grocery to the largest corporation. The shoe cobbler in one room of his home is conducting private enterprise. The lady who operates a beauty shop in a smaller corner room is in private enterprise. The grocer, farmer, and all others who transact business are all engaged in private enterprise. Some of these small business enterprises grow until they do business amounting to millions and sometimes billions of dollars annually, but small, medium-sized, or large, they are all in the same category, namely private enterprise. So I will speak on the fundamental principles of private enterprise.

May I express it as my most definite opinion that we cannot continue to have democratic government in this country unless we continue to have free private enterprise. We cannot have freedom of the individual as comprehended in the Constitution of the United States unless we have free private enterprise. We cannot have freedom of religion in this country unless we have free private enterprise. We cannot have freedom of education in this country, freedom to think, freedom to act, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech unless we have free private enterprise. When you give up free private enterprise, you must give up all of our other freedoms * * *. Whenever the time comes that the Government owns and operates the railroads, the public utilities, the life insurance companies, the banks, when it controls the credit of the country, when it owns, controls and develops our natural resources, when it regiments agriculture and controls it, then you will have placed in the hands of Government the responsibility for operating the whole business machine of America. What other lines of business are then left in the retail field and in small manufacturing establishments will be helpless to do anything except as it be done with the permission of the bureaucrats in Washington. Free private enterprise will then be gone * * *. If free private enterprise is abolished who will pay the taxes? Free enterprise produces the taxes that maintain our public schools. How can these schools be maintained as free institutions if we do not have free enterprise and free citizens to pay those taxes? The churches of America are maintained by the dollars contributed by free citizens who have earned their money in free enterprise. How can these churches be maintained if we no longer have free citizens and free enterprise? The American home has been built from the fruits of free enterprise. When you destroy free enterprise, you destroy the very economic foundations of the American home, and when you destroy the American home you destroy the very foundation of the Nation * * *. Here is something that I think most people know but are very prone to overlook and that is, democratic government is always, even at its best, inefficient. Nobody denies that truth. By the very nature of things democratic government is inefficient and will always be inefficient, but the history of this Nation has proved beyond any question of doubt that if you will operate government under the limited powers and under the limited responsibility which was intended in the Constitution of the United States and if you will allow the people to operate private enterprise, under proper regulation, that combination makes the best system of government ever known to mankind. We had that kind of government for 145 years, why should we permit the Washington bureaucrats to continue to tear it down and destroy it? * * * Our forefathers who framed the Constitution of the United States knew very well what they were doing when they sought to limit the power of the Federal Government, when they said that all of the power that was not delegated to the Federal Government remained with the States or was reserved to the people. They knew that the kind of government they were setting up, if it sought to deal with economic affairs, would be totally inefficient; therefore, the Constitution was framed with the thought that the Government would stay out of the field of economic affairs, and free private enterprise thereby was reserved to the people with the profit incentive as the impelling motive causing men to work.

And I say to you that I believe they were 100 percent right then, and I think it is 100 percent right now. Conditions may change, but fundamental principles do not change.

Now, my friends, it is easy to see that whenever you put all of the business affairs of the country in the hands of government, where inefficiency runs rampant and all individual profit incentive is removed, one of two things is going to happen: Either we are going to go broke and become a bankrupt nation, or the Government must assume the authority to force everybody to work. In other words, whenever you destroy the profit motive which causes people to work you must substitute something else that will cause them to work, and that something else always has been, throughout the annals of history, dictatorial brute force of government. I think no one will contend that it is impossible to operate government under the principles of fascism, communism, or national socialism. Russia is today an outstanding example of the fact that you can set up a communistic government and under that system you can develop a tremendously efficient war machine; you can develop the natural resources of the nation. Hitler took Germany in a state of almost complete bankruptcy and by the application of the principles of national socialism he completely abolished unemployment; he guaranteed every man a job; he provided adequately for public housing; he built in that nation a great system of military highways; and he built the greatest war machine ever seen on the face of the earth up to that time. Yes, my friends, you can make those foreign isms work, but the objection I have to communism, socialism, and all of the other foreign isms is not that they will not work but that I do not like the enormous price that must be paid of throwing the people into absolute servitude under the rule of a dictator in order to make them work. Yes, the price in human misery, war, death, and destruction is too high.

In contending for the recovery and retention of the system of private enterprise in America, I insist that it must be conducted honestly and properly under fair and definite rules and strict government scrutiny. We have had for years "milk and cider" on and off enforcement of the antitrust laws, and it has been mainly off and not on. I believe that government should write the rules by which business is to be operated. I do not believe that government should play in the game. It should be the umpire, and I think it should see to it that the rules are enforced. Here is another important thing—you cannot have the business affairs of this country operated partly on a communistic or a socialistic basis and partly on a basis of free private enterprise. Some businessmen have overlooked this fact and have been very enthusiastic about the idea of the Government taking over the railroads and operating them, as they say, for the welfare of the country and not for private profit. These people may be for it because they believe they will be able through various political maneuvering to get their freight hauled cheaper and pass the bill for the hauling along to the taxpayers by means of subsidies. A great many businessmen become enthusiastic about the Government going into the public-utility field because they believe they can pass the tax bill, which utilities are now paying, on to some other area to pay and that, in turn, as a result of that they can buy electrical current cheaper. Many people are enthusiastic about various and sundry schemes developed by the Government to create agencies to buy and to distribute merchandise in competition with the retailer because they believe it will result in enabling them to buy merchandise cheaper and, therefore, it will help them in their particular enterprise.

Now, let me be frank with you people who are listening to me at this time, if you want to stop this tremendous flood of Government encroachment upon private enterprise, which is fast leading us into socialism and communism, then you must accept it as your full responsibility to fight every move that is made by the Government to enter into the field of free enterprise in competition with our citizens. If businessmen and if citizens generally are interested in fighting this drifting into socialism only when it encroaches upon their particular field, then I say to you now that the battle is lost. The strategy of the bureaucratic dynasty in Washington is to divide and conquer. You retail merchants cannot join in a campaign today to have the Government take over the public utilities, because you think it will give you lower rates and then come back to the Government tomorrow and ask them to stay out of your business, because tomorrow your customers will be demanding that the Government take over your business to give them lower prices on the products you make or sell. You cannot urge Government ownership of railroads in one breath and free enterprise in the next. You cannot join with the rabble-rousers who want the Government to take over the life-insurance companies today and ask them to let the manufacturing establishments alone tomorrow. You farmers cannot accept subsidies today for yourselves and then complain about the Government running your business after you have accepted the subsidy. You manufacturers cannot beg for protective tariffs in one breath and oppose subsidies to farmers in the next. We must be either for or against free private enterprise. It is one of the great fundamental principles of Government. It is not a subject on which there can be any compromise. Let me close what I have to say with this thought: The freedom of the individual to live his own life, to educate his children, to maintain his home, to have freedom of religion, and all other freedoms to which free men are entitled, all depend on free private enterprise. It is a fundamental principle worth fighting for. Let me remind you in all sincerity that freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom from all individual responsibility, is guaranteed today in America by our Government to the inmates of all our penitentiaries. Within those cold gray prison walls, for the inmates, there is no private enterprise, there is no profit motive, work is compulsory—and democracy is dead.

Yes, my friends, these social objectives, if they can be called social objectives, can be had, but bear in mind—the price we must all eventually pay is very, very high. I would like to hear from all of you folks listening who are interested in this subject. I am a great believer in democracy and I solicit your comments. As long as our supply lasts, copies of this talk will be mailed to all of you who write me. Address Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Washington, D. C.

Good-night, and may God bless each and every one of us.

The Past To Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Providence Visitor of October 28. The editorial impresses me as being both timely and admirable.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PAST TO GUIDE US

Twenty-five years ago, come November 11, America woke up thrilled with the joy and happiness of victory. Today it is with irony that we repeat an historical truth—World War No. 1 was fought to end all wars, to make the world safe for democracy.

Ten years ago Adolf Hitler came into power. World War No. 2 is now being fought, more savagely and more indiscriminately for civilian populations, because we thought we could have peace merely by winning World War No. 1.

History records the epic struggle in the United States Senate after World War No. 1. We pay in blood and suffering today because peace was not achieved after the last war. So now, during World War No. 2, the United States Senate is engaged in another epic struggle, with millions of Americans still living who remember that winning World War No. 1 did not bring peace, but did bring World War No. 2.

The past is there to guide us in our national and international thinking. Whereas those who failed to work out some lasting peace, after the last war, still live, they had no experience at the time to guide them—no great World War experience within a generation. Today the picture is different. We have World War No. 2, the incubator of aggression the same empire which sought in World War No. 1 to make illegitimate the Christian ideal that peace among peoples is only the flowering, on earth, of the Divine law. The world suffered a lost generation after the last war; we should beware lest history repeat itself.

The responsibility resting upon the United States Senate is more sharply defined today, because of our experience since World War No. 1. History shows that a majority of the Senate favored the forging of an international weapon to wield against aggression. But America, responding to the 1920 political appeal to remain separated from internationalism, accepted ultimately the veto of the Senate minority, a veto which blocked ratification of the treaty to which Woodrow Wilson dedicated his idealism. What happened then cannot be changed, nor will speculation on the basis of what should have happened, and did not happen, alleviate present conditions. We think now for the future.

We are heading for the only democratic election in the world, among the big nations. It is yet a year away, by the calendar, but it is here with us now. It is an old American tradition, not suspended because of the delicacy of war and its challenging issues. The normal functioning of our election machinery, even in contrast to England where national elections have been suspended for the duration, stamps the United States as the leader, as the beacon light for those oppressed and conquered peoples who see in our democratic form of government the pattern for their ultimate national well-being. It is with this background—the impending Presidential election—that we must follow the debate in the United States Senate.

There must be a charitable approach in the appraisal of the contending forces, for all the Members of the United States Senate cherish their America and her traditions. But there will develop a sharp difference of viewpoint, some by the politician and some by the statesman, over the most appropriate course for the United States to pursue in foreign policy, in world relations, and in post-war rehabilitation.

As patriotic Americans, we will immediately and logically think, in national terms, for the welfare of the United States, but, in the thinking, we may come to recognize that national well-being means international commitments. We must assume, and rightly so, that the peoples of Britain, Russia, and China, will likewise think first in national terms, for their own welfare. The duty of statesmanship—the obligation owed the civilized peoples of the world—is to resolve these natural nationalistic attitudes into an enforceable world program, infused with the informing spirit of tolerance and compromise. Geographically, we are far removed from the horrors and devastation of war—our allies know these horrors and that devastation—awful experiences which, it seems, should make it easier for them to bring resolution to the post-war conferences.

All Americans sincerely wished we could have kept America out of war, but a Nazi system organized for war drew us into its orbit of destructive influence. Organizations for war, based upon a thirst for aggression and conquest, must be destroyed. World War No. 1 proved these systems are not necessarily destroyed—that victory in 1918 did not bring peace in 1941. We shall hear all these propositions explored in the United States Senate—the better for the American people because now, in the midst of war, they will become better acquainted with the views and attitudes of the United States Senators who may decide the length of the victory we are surely achieving on the battle front—whether we get peace by winning the war.

"When the Chips Are Down—"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid editorial entitled "When the Chips Are Down—" containing a powerful message, appearing in the issue of October 9, 1943, of the Take Off, a weekly publication for the enlisted men of the Fifty-eighth College Training Detachment, Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., of which publication the staff consists of Walter F. Gallagher, Jr., the editor in chief; Henry De Marco, the copy editor; Roger O'Conner, the news editor; and Daniel Gooden, the feature editor. This publication is edited under Capt. Richard J. Congleton, commanding officer, and Lt. Edmund J. Kelly, public relations officer.

This publication is the first college training detachment paper in the United States.

Publications of this kind among those who are serving in our armed forces should be encouraged. Splendid editorials of the kind included herein should also be properly recognized, and future editorials conveying other powerful and constructive messages encouraged.

"WHEN THE CHIPS ARE DOWN—"

We were inspired to write this article after receiving a visit from an army air pilot who has just returned from the South Pacific after 58 engagements with the Japs. In one engagement he dropped 5 miles before pulling his rip-cord, which is still a record, and we asked him what his thoughts were when death seemed imminent. His revelation did not differ from those most of us have heard before as applying to the doughboy. His thoughts were of God.

His experiences were indeed no exception but rather the rule, when any soldier advances so close to solving the mysteries of life and death. Yes, men in the front lines do get down on their knees in supplication to the Supreme Being, for they find that all man and all his material works are hopeless in the approaching rendezvous with death. Spiritual strength is essential in a good soldier. The modern parable of Captain Eddie Rickenbacker and the seagull should not be forgotten. In some of us religion is latent, in some it is predominant, but from front line reports of this war, it is universal. The fox hole, like the parachute, eliminates the atheist and the agnostic.

Why then the need of our spiritual leaders or our weekly or daily practices of religion? Well, their teachings enable us to approach more perfectly that last rendezvous with a real sorrow for our sins and a prayer for forgiveness or help.

The falling pilot or the fox-holed doughboy suddenly realizes the impotency of man-made things. The unobtrusive member of our armed forces in the training camps, the chaplain, grows in importance as the soldier nears the battlefront. He offers a solace that no other earthly being or thing can provide for the man in battle—hope for the hereafter.

Corn for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, Members from the New England States are very properly worried over the failure of their dairymen and poultry raisers to obtain adequate supplies of feed corn. The answer to their question appears in a bulletin issued by Pickell-Daniel, consulting price analysts, of Chicago, Ill., under date of October 23, 1943. The statement is as follows:

CORN FOR NEW ENGLAND

Two gentlemen from the New York Agricultural Commission were in the office Friday asking the question, "Can the New England States get the corn they need this year from the Central Grain Belt, and at what price?"

We explained the central-belt situation as follows:

"1. The seven Central States which normally supply the industries and New England with corn, have enough that they could use as much this year as they did last and still have 10 percent of their supply left.

"2. Shipments of feeder cattle from Kansas City, Omaha, St. Paul, and Chicago during the past 20 weeks have been 88 percent of last year and the 1930–39 average. However, the reduction has been mostly in calves. Shipments of steers weighing 500 pounds or more have been 96 percent of last year since July 1, while shipments of heifers have been 105 percent. Total tonnage shipped has been nearly equal to a year ago. But the biggest feeders both in the Central States and in Nebraska and Colorado, who normally provide a market for a huge quantity of surplus corn, are not feeding nearly so heavy this year. They do not know what the price will be, whether or not they can get corn, or supplements, or labor.

"3. The tendency also is to cut down on hog feeding. More sows are being marketed by far than last year. And farmers will desire to market just as many hogs weighing between 200 and 270 pounds this year as they can, to take advantage of the promised floor for those weights, at $13.75. If they market the normal percentage during the last quarter of the year, they will send 19,800,000 head to market for slaughter under Federal inspection. But this will leave them with about 98,000,000 head compared with 73,600,000 last year after they had marketed 16,000,000 in that last quarter. Furthermore, slaughter of 19,800,000 in the 3 months would mean that in 6 or 8 weeks the 27 largest markets would have to kill over 1,000,000 head a week. In June prices slipped below the floor at $13.75 when slaughter ran to 930,000 head a week. Yet if the farmers are compelled to hold the hogs, they will gain in weight to above the top at 270 pounds, and the floor at $13.75 will not apply. And holding them will use up the corn so urgently needed by the New England States. Price will not enter.

"The only solution we see is for the O. P. A. to eliminate point rationing and slaughter restrictions, permitting killers everywhere to kill, and buyers everywhere to buy in any quantity they desire. If this is done, the huge supply of hogs can be taken at desirable weights, the consumers will get pork to replace the vanished beef, and farmers who raised the hogs at Government behest, will get the floor price. Then the Corn Belt can send New England the corn it needs."

Next Year Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Midland Daily News, Midland, Mich.:

NEXT YEAR TOO LATE

Just where we are going on the newsprint supply of the country still seems to be a mystery. As we take it from what we have been able to gather in recent weeks there are several things which must be done and done promptly if we are to get print paper on which to publish the Nation's newspapers.

These steps include: 1. Elimination of waste all along the line, particularly in unnecessary Government releases. 2. Change in the present system in the United States to encourage rather than discourage the production of pulp wood. 3. Cutting down of the bulk found in the heavy Sunday editions of all the big city papers, which are magazines rather than newspapers.

An interesting report just received from Paul Kellogg, acting president of the Newsprint Association of Canada, says in part: "Canada will ship this year nearly 350,000 tons to the United States in excess of what she shipped in 1939 or 16 percent over the shipments of that year * * * United States mills in 1943 will ship 146,000 tons or 15 percent less than in 1939."

The United States policy of putting a ceiling on pulp production while putting a floor under wages has resulted in wood choppers being able to make more money cutting lumber, hence the lack of pulp production here. Those who produce pulp and those who work in the woods are finding it more remunerative to do something else. So our pulp production drops off and forces Canada to carry the load.

Big papers have made no serious effort to conserve print as witness the bulky magazine sections put out on Sunday. The saving on one or two of these would print every small daily in Michigan.

We think it is time that W. P. B. hot shots wake up and do something now instead of waiting until next year when it will be too late.

Eisenhower Coming Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in view of statements made by me recently and later challenged by administration apologists, I desire to include in my remarks an article which appeared in today's editions of the Washington Times-Herald. This article, Eisenhower Coming Home, was written by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, able and well-known columnist.

EISENHOWER COMING HOME?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

General Eisenhower will come back to America as a sitter-in for Gen. George C. Marshall, at the Chief of Staff's desk here, when Marshall goes to London as boss of the war against Germany, according to the Army & Navy Journal, the trade magazine of the fighting forces. The Journal is not an official publication of the Government, but on its first page it carries the slogan, "Spokesman of the services since 1863," which is just about correct.

It is the one publication to which generals and admirals will tell their secrets and sentiments. Not secrets of strategy and tactics, of course. But secrets of Army and Navy politics, gossip, the inside battles of personalities which go on among warriors just as they go on among preachers, politicians, professors, gangsters, and probably even between mice.

The publisher of the Journal is John Callan O'Laughlin, a former First Assistant Secretary of State, and a major in the last war. O'Laughlin is careful never to get the Journal into party politics, but he does lobby in a dignified and sometimes forceful way to protect the military against Presidential and congressional tinkering, especially when the majority of the Army's general staff or the Navy's general board has taken a stand in secret that cannot be stated officially in public.

The business about Generals Marshall and Eisenhower is an excellent example of the way the Army & Navy Journal speaks for the services.

In the issue of October 30, 1943, the Journal backs into that hot one as follows:

"Army circles are confident that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower will be selected by the Commander in Chief to direct the Office of Chief of Staff of the Army when General Marshall leaves to establish his headquarters in London.

"The assignment will be a reward for his fine accomplishments in the Mediterranean theater, but, more than that, will be a recognition of his special fitness to collaborate with General Marshall in the government of the Army and Navy and as an adviser to the President on matters of global strategy."

That, when you know the background, is a skillful way of telling a story full of Army tabasco in such a way that nobody's pride is wounded.

Generals are touchy people, especially when they get up there in the stratosphere with three or four stars on their shoulders.

In past wars our Presidents kept the three- and four-star generals down to an absolute minimum, but in this one we already have 4 four-starred generals—Marshall, MacArthur, Arnold, and Eisenhower.

Of these General Marshall is top man because he is Chief of Staff of an Army on global operations.

More powerful than any field commander, he sits here in Washington with his foot on the manpower and supply gas pedal.

Early this year a move was started to pry Marshall away from that gas pedal and send him off to a fighting front. Some say that is what Marshall wanted.

Some say he didn't. Among those opposing the move of Marshall from here to command of a field operation were Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President; Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations; and this aforementioned Army and Navy Journal, the justly respected "spokesman of the services since 1863."

There developed a great deal of public name-calling, led by Mr. Roosevelt, after the reports of the attempts to promote or oust Marshall got around.

But nobody singled out the Journal for any of the bawlings-out, though it had been downright harsh in denouncing the plot to get Marshall.

And the Journal has kept right on printing the news and the so-called gossip, which isn't gossip at all but is the information fed out by high Army and Navy officers who dare not let their names be tied to the facts for fear of court martial.

Well, now, the Journal story of October 30, translated in view of all this, may be summed up as follows:

Marshall is going to London to command the invasion of Europe, but he isn't taking his foot off the gas pedal back here.

He is putting in the youngest four-starred general of the league as his "collaborator" and as "director of the office." (In military organization, "collaboration" means "I'm the boss, you just sit in my chair." There is always a boss when two Army men get together.) Marshall is still boss back here in the vital spot of the war organization.

Thus we are moving on toward a public climax of the most important and at times most dangerous behind-the-scenes military struggle of 1943 on the Allied side.

Some day, when the history books are written, you will read the evidence that General Marshall was in early 1943 bound for a gilded ashcan and that the combined maneuvers of his friends and admirers in the Army and Navy, and out, saved him that.

And if he turns out as crushing a combined field fighter and staff boss as he has shown himself a wise central planner of military organization, it may yet be acknowledged that the fuss was worth the fury.

American War Dads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted at the Greater St. Louis Council of the American War Dads, as follows:

Resolution 1

Prisoners of war

Whereas there will be a large number of war prisoners in this country after the present war who will want to remain in this country; and

Whereas such prisoners would have to become American citizens who would be given preference over the present quota of immigrants; and

Whereas such persons would make an additional unemployment, which will be detrimental to American labor and a hindrance to post-war plans applying to our own servicemen and women: Be it

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, of St. Louis, Mo., go on record requesting to have a bill passed by the Congress of the United States that war prisoners interned in this country be returned to their respective native land as soon as practicable after the end of hostilities and allowing not more than 1 year for such return with no exceptions; be it further

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, recommends that such persons who have been returned to their native countries may return to this country under the regular immigration quota.

Resolution 2

War bonds

Whereas numerous complaints have been received regarding the exceptionally slow progress made in having War bonds purchased by men and women in the armed forces delivered to them, their parents, or coowners; and

Whereas such bonds purchased by them have not been delivered to them or their homes in quite a number of instances, as far back as 1 year and more; and

Whereas such service-connected men and women are entitled to have such War bonds purchased by them sent to their respective stations or homes more promptly: Be it

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, of St. Louis, Mo., go on record in requesting our national body to investigate and require correction and improvement in the delivery of War bonds purchased by persons in the armed forces, so that parents or other guardians designated, may have a record thereof and notify the owner of their receipt.

Resolution 3

Food and refreshments prices

Whereas it is evident and proven that numerous merchants in the city of St. Louis, Mo., as well as elsewhere, are overcharging men and women in service uniforms, especially when they are making purchases of food in restaurants or drinks; and

Whereas such persons have no recourse but to pay the price requested: Be it

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, go on record requesting proper city authorities to investigate and control the prices of

merchandise, especially food and drinks, sold to persons in the armed service, and have violators properly prosecuted and fined.

Resolution 4

Post-war planning

Whereas the article appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat under date of August 15, 1943, written by Al Schindler covering Post-War Plans for St. Louis, Mo., is a logical solution for St. Louis business to follow;

Whereas the War Dads Chapter, No. 38, feels that this organization should be represented on the committee by a representative member of the War Dads Council of St Louis, Mo.: Be it

Resolved, The War Dads Chapter, No. 38, suggests and recommends that a representative be chosen by the War Dads Council of St. Louis, Mo., for representation on the committee for Post-War Planning, as suggested by A. Schindler; be it further

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, hereby endorse in its entirety the plans as outlined in the above-mentioned article and commend Al Schindler for his far-sightedness and interest in furtherance of post-war plans.

Resolution 5

Seing-eye dogs

Whereas there will be no doubts many service-connected men and women who will have lost their sight;

Whereas such persons can be greatly helped in their plight by the assistance of a seeing-eye dog: Be it

Resolved, That War Dads Chapter, No. 38, of St. Louis, Mo., go on record to have the Congress of the United States pass a law authorizing certain parties to raise and train the seeing-eye dog: Be it further

Resolved, That such seeing-eye dogs be presented, without cost, to service men and women who were unfortunate to lose their sight in the service.

Words Versus Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Journal-American of September 16, 1943:

WORDS VERSUS DEEDS

On July 29, 1943, President Roosevelt delivered a fireside chat, one portion of which was relayed to the men in uniform by the Army News Service.

That portion was a six-point statement of what Mr. Roosevelt intends to do, or to have done, for the discharged service men and women when the time for demobilization shall have arrived.

It was quite a coincidence that this propaganda—for of course it was nothing else—went out at the very time when arrangements were being put under way to organize and garner in the "absentee" soldier and sailor vote, which may amount to some 10,000,000 prospective ballots in the forthcoming elections.

It was also noticeable that Mr. Roosevelt plausibly put pressure upon Congress by saying:

"May the Congress do its duty in this regard."

The obviously implied idea was that if the veterans of this World War should be discharged as penniless men and women "into an environment of inflation and unemployment, to a place on a breadline or on a corner selling apples," that would be strictly the fault of their Senators and Representatives.

Mention was not made of the fact that the present Congress was already quietly at work on veterans' legislation.

As for himself, Mr. Roosevelt unctuously said:

"I have assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war is won."

It is therefore perfectly proper that two questions be plainly asked—and as plainly answered:

What has been the record of Mr. Roosevelt in regard to the veterans of the first World War?

Does that record of his give anybody any sound reason for having any confidence in what he promises now?

The facts upon which to form a just judgment are fully presented on this page.

The fact is that every official action that was taken to help the veterans of the First World War, to reestablish themselves in civil life, or to care for their disabled comrades—to set up insurance funds and pension systems for them, or to assist them financially in times of distress when thousands of them were jobless and their families were in want—every such action was taken either by Republican administrations which preceded Mr. Roosevelt's, or by the Democratic Congresses of Mr. Roosevelt's own administration in actual defiance of Mr. Roosevelt himself.

The fact is that when Mr. Roosevelt assumed the Presidency in 1933 he found the Nation willingly caring for its faithful First World War veterans, according to their needs, at a cost of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, and that Mr. Roosevelt, in the guise of fulfilling a campaign pledge of economy in government, coldly deprived the First World War veterans of nearly half of this.

The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt went even further back than the First World War in his opposition to veterans' benefits, and deprived American soldiers who had fought in the Spanish-American War of $125,000,000 a year which their country had been gratefully providing to them because of their services and their sufferings.

The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt went still further back than that, under arbitrary powers unwisely delegated to him by his first Congress, and cruelly reduced the scanty pensions being paid to aged men who had answered Lincoln's call when the Union was in danger of destruction in 1861.

"WE ARE COMING, FATHER ABRAHAM, ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND STRONG"

The fact is that, when Congress in 1935 passed an adjusted compensation (bonus) bill for the benefit of veterans of the First World War, President Roosevelt vetoed the bill and caused its final defeat in the Senate by eight votes.

The fact is that when Congress in 1936 passed another veterans' bonus bill President Roosevelt again exercised his veto power, and the bill became a law only because Congress repassed it over the President's veto.

The fact is that during his Presidency to date President Roosevelt has vetoed no fewer than 18 bills passed by Congress for the benefit of veterans, and it has been Congress and not the President that has put any of these bills into effect.

All that would be a doleful record for a politician to recite in seeking soldiers' and sailors' votes for a fourth term.

So naturally Mr. Roosevelt ignored his own record in blithely saying he had "assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war has been won."

Part of his statement was manifestly true.

Neither the American people nor the American Congress will fail their returning soldiers and sailors in this World War, and the soldiers and sailors may be confidently assured of that.

For the people and the Congress have made their record in the matter of veterans' legislation, exactly as Franklin D. Roosevelt has made his own.

And it remains everlastingly true that actions always speak louder than words.

FILES OF CONGRESS SHOW NEW DEAL'S RECORD ON VETERANS' LEGISLATION

When the history of the New Deal is finally compiled, the subject of veterans' legislation will make a crowded chapter.

It was one of the first subjects to receive the personal attention of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

A little more than 10 years later, with the Nation desperately embattled and with nearly 10,000,000 men in the armed services, Mr. Roosevelt has reverted to the subject, presenting to the prospective veterans of this war a program of promises of what will be done for them when they return from the world-wide campaigns.

During the last 10 years, however, Mr. Roosevelt established an absolutely unequaled record of adverse performances with regard to veterans' welfare, and these performances cannot in justice and proper precaution be overlooked.

To begin, Mr. Roosevelt was first elected to the Presidency in 1932 on a positive pledge to reduce the expenses of the Federal Government at least 25 percent.

Having won the election upon these representations, Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated into the Presidency, under the old law, on March 4, 1933.

And, in view of his repeated declarations, neither the Congress nor the people was surprised when, in the same month, President Roosevelt submitted a so-called economy bill as one of the very earliest measures of his administration, with insistent demands that it be passed immediately.

On March 20, 1933—exactly 16 days after Mr. Roosevelt's inaugural—the bill received his signature and became a statute.

And not until then, when the deed had been done, did the real character of the 1933 Economy Act become generally realized.

The act provided for a total reduction of more than $500,000,000—half a billion dollars—in the annual expenditures of the Federal Government in all departments.

But approximately four-fifths of this total reduction was made at the expense of the veterans.

And pension reductions inflicted upon Spanish-American War veterans alone were equal in amount—$125,000,000 each—to the total pay-roll reductions imposed upon the civil list, which, of course, included all of the political patronage there was in the Federal Government.

But even that is an understatement of the brutal facts.

Pensions which had been paid for years to the few remaining gray-haired veterans of the Civil War and of other conflicts previous to the First World War were arbitrarily reduced 10 percent.

In addition, the President obtained power to make new regulations and to fix new limits, for pensions, compensations, etc., still further reducing veterans' allowances.

"This clause," the Associated Press reported, "will remove thousands from the rolls and will prevent the addition of thousands more."

Literally, the effect of these hard-hearted restrictions was to outlaw from benefits vet-

erans who had become invalids after the First World War—even though they may have been delayed war casualties because of gas attacks, or shell shock, or hardships and privations in foreign battlefields.

THE VETERANS' CAUSE

The net result of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first action with respect to America's heroes was to reduce total expenditures for veterans approximately $450,000,000 a year from a previous total of about $1,000,000,000 while saving a paltry $150,000,000 a year in the politically useful branches of the Federal Government.

However, President Roosevelt's palpably political program of economy at the expense of the veterans while spending otherwise to purchase political favor had at least one quick result which he, with all of his political acumen, probably did not foresee.

That result was an upsurge of public sentiment in the disabled veterans' behalf that was quickly reflected in Congress.

Historically impressive, there was the month of March 1934—just 1 year after the President had signed his bill to denude thousands of veterans.

In that month, Congress completed action on an Independent Offices appropriation bill, which included the Veterans' Administration.

Regretful of the hardships and persecutions which the 1933 Economy Act had, as applied by the President, imposed upon veterans, Congress chose to make an incomplete redress in this bill.

Knowing this, the President let it be also known that he was opposed to the bill insofar as it would benefit the veterans.

Considering the billions which Mr. Roosevelt was then spending, this bill was more than moderate.

It would have restored $103,000,000 of the half billion which the President's Economy Act of 1933 took away from the veterans.

It would have affected about 29,000 World War veterans—so-called presumptive cases of sick men whose pensions or aid had been cut off—and a group of Spanish-American War veterans.

The bill was passed by Congress on March 26, 1934.

On the day following, the bill was returned to the House of Representatives with the President's veto message which had been awaiting it—prepared in advance.

In that message, Mr. Roosevelt set forth unequivocally and for all time his personal and official attitude toward veterans' pensions:

THE PENSION PRINCIPLE

He quoted the following paragraphs from a speech made by him to the American Legion in October 1933, just 5 months earlier:

"* * * No person, because he wore a uniform, must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens.

"The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his Government a benefit which no other citizen receives.

"It does not mean that because a person served in the defense of his country, performed a basic obligation of citizenship, he should receive a pension from his Government because of a disability incurred after his service had terminated, and not connected with that service."

In further reaffirmation of his position as he had openly declared it to the veterans themselves, Mr. Roosevelt informed the Congress:

"I am wholly and unequivocally opposed to the principle of the general service pension."

E. A. Hayes was the national commander of the American Legion at that time.

Commander Hayes addressed a reply to the President in the form of a letter to Representative Browning, of Tennessee, to be read on the floor of the House.

"I think you gentlemen will recall," he said, "that during the debate on the Economy Act a year ago it was repeatedly stated in the Congress that nobody planned and nobody desired that the veterans who had been admittedly disabled by their World War service should have one cent taken away from their disability compensation.

"Yet we now find that substantial amounts have been taken away from the war disabled.

"The Legion does not believe, nor have we ever believed, that it was the desire of the American people or the American Congress to reduce the Government's payments to the admittedly World War disabled."

Within a few hours after the Presidential veto had been received the House of Representatives repassed the independent offices appropriation bill over the President's veto by the paralyzing vote of 310 to 72.

On March 28 the Senate also overrode Mr. Roosevelt's veto by a vote of 63 to 27, with 29 Democrats voting against the President and with 27 New Deal Democrats voting obediently but vainly to sustain him.

In the Seventy-fourth Congress the contest continued between the President and the lawmakers over veterans' legislation.

The President used his veto four times to defeat the will of Congress and each time he succeeded in doing so.

One of these occasions was made truly memorable by the President himself.

Congress had passed an adjusted compensation bill, also called the veterans' bonus bill, introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a Democrat, of Texas.

On May 22, 1935, President Roosevelt—"setting a historical precedent," in the language of the New York Times—appeared in person before a joint session of the two Houses of Congress and read aloud his veto of the Patman bill before a crowded gallery and in an atmosphere of public excitement.

No President had ever before vetoed a congressional bill in this way.

An hour later the House of Representatives overrode the veto, 322 to 93, with 248 Democrats voting against the President.

But in the Senate the President won.

Fifty-four Senators voted to defeat the veto, but 40 others voted with the President, giving him 8 more votes than he needed on the minority side.

The struggle between the President and the legislators was accordingly carried over into the next session of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

Another adjusted-compensation bill to convert the veterans' paper bonus into cash was introduced and passed by the House of Representatives.

The Senate then passed it on January 20, 1936, by a vote of nearly 5 to 1—74 to 16—with amendments which the House accepted 2 days later by 346 votes to 59.

President Roosevelt vetoed it on January 24, 1936, in a message that said:

"On May 22, 1935, in disapproving a bill to pay the bonus in full immediately instead of in 1945, I gave in person to a joint session of the Congress complete and explicit reasons for my action. * * *

"I respectfully refer the Members of the Senate and of the House to every word of what I said then.

"My convictions are as impelling today as they were then. Therefore, I cannot change them."

This time the friends of the veterans prevailed again over the President's stubborn opposition.

Within 45 minutes after the veto message had been read the lower House repassed the bill, 326 to 61.

On January 27 the Senate also overrode the veto, and the second bonus bill—providing for an exchange of negotiable "baby bonds" for the noncashable service certificates—became law against President Roosevelt's will.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE

In the Seventy-fifth Congress President Roosevelt made use of pocket vetoes to defeat six separate veterans' bills passed by Congress.

Yet the conspicuous feature of the Seventy-fifth Congress as regards veterans was not the President's use of pocket vetoes, but his positive—and unsuccessful—veto of a much more important bill.

Veterans had come out of the World War with a program of governmental life insurance.

This program allowed them to carry "term" insurance policies at low cost, mandatorily convertible after 5 years into permanent insurance at higher rates but with more benefits.

Because many veterans were financially unable to convert and were faced with loss of their policies, the original term was three times extended: in 1927 for 1 year, in 1928 for 5 years, and in 1932 for another 5 years.

In 1937—when the "Roosevelt depression" was deranging many lives—Congress voted another 5-year extension to save some 23,000 veterans from loss of policies.

On May 28, 1937, President Roosevelt vetoed the bill.

On June 1, 1937, with all term policies expiring as of that date, Congress repassed the bill over the President's veto—the House by 372 votes to 13, the Senate by 69 votes to 12.

Deductions of Tax-Exempt Donations to Charitable Institutions Should Be Allowed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles V. Vickrey, the able and energetic president of the Golden Rule Foundation, has recently completed a careful analysis of the provisions of H. R. 3472 and H. R. 3473, companion bills which were theretofor introduced by Representative CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and myself, an analysis which, because of its timely importance, should be given the widest possible circulation. That that may be accomplished insofar as it is within our power to insure it, I ask unanimous consent that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The document referred to follows:

Congressman CURTIS, of Nebraska, and Congressman GEARHART, of California (a member of the House Ways and Means Committee), have introduced identical bills, H. R. 3472 and 3473, respectively, "To permit the amount of charitable contributions made or to be made to be taken into account in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld on wages."

The Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, as enacted by Congress last June, requires that every employer, after deducting the employee's family exemptions, shall take out of the employee's pay and remit directly to the United States Treasury 20 percent of his

wages or salary. But previous well-established law provides that 15 percent of that wage is exempt from income taxes if given to incorporated charity organizations. The present withholding or current-payment act of 1943, therefore, both levies and collects a 20 percent tax on a tax-exempt portion of an employee's wages.

The proposed bill will not only save for current gifts to charity, the tax now collected on the tax-exempt charity portion of the income, but, more important, it will remind every taxpayer when he fills out his family exemption blank that "the American way" assumes that every citizen will contribute voluntarily according to his ability for the support of basic religious, educational, character-building, and philanthropic institutions.

A decision of the United States Supreme Court states that "The official documents of American history * * * affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation."

Free religious, educational, and philanthropic institutions are basic in our American life. Anything that weakens their financial support, weakens our Nation and the world civilization of which our Nation is an important part.

During the past 15 years our income taxes have increased more than 1,200 percent while our contributions to church and charity have decreased 31 percent.

The favorite, and in some instances valid, alibi for not maintaining or increasing gifts to church and charity is "I am bled white by taxes"—"I can't give another cent to charity"—"The Government is taking the money which I once gave to charity. Let them do my charity work for m."

Our Government has long recognized officially that, by and large, a dollar given for public welfare through private philanthropy, up to a reasonable limit of 15 percent of income, accomplishes more for the public good than the same dollar will if paid in taxes and appropriated by Congress. Senators and Congressmen fully agree that private philanthropy enlists more of volunteer, unpaid, sacrificial cooperation, closer scrutiny, greater economy of expenditures, and more effective sympathetic service than is possible under even the best semipolitical Government administration.

The taxpayer, as he fills out his personal-exemption blank for his employer, will be encouraged, if not required to give some advance thought to his benevolent budget for the year. If he determines in advance a fixed percentage of his income for his benevolences, even remotely proportionate to the percentage which he is paying for taxes, his total gifts for the year will invariably show an increase over what he now gives by the prevailing haphazard "catch-me-if-you-can" method.

Even more important than the very substantial immediate increase of contributions to church and charity will be the opportunity which this will give to all national, religious, and welfare organizations to engage in a cooperative program of education for higher standards of stewardship.

The Government has prepared the way for this educational stewardship advance by training the public (a) to pay systematically in taxes from 20 percent to 90 percent of income, and (b) to submit to compulsory collection of 20 percent for taxes at source by the employer from the employee's pay without the employee ever receiving or seeing the money.

Our estimated national income for 1943, even after paying the full toll for taxes, will still be at least $25,000,000,000 more than it was last year, $70,000,000,000 increase over what it was in 1939, and more than $100,000,000,000, a threefold increase over what it was only 11 years ago—in 1932.

In 1940, the last year for which officially analyzed figures are available, our percentage of giving as related to income, dropped to 2.04 percent of our income. This percentage has not risen in proportion to the increasing national income of 1941 through 1943.

Large contributors who are pleading inability to give on account of taxes, should be repeatedly reminded that 15 percent of income is entirely exempt from taxes if given to charity. When every citizen is called upon to give 20 percent of his net income at source, he may well consider the possibility of giving some definite businesslike percentage of his income, 5, 10, or 15 percent, which is tax exempt, for church and institutions that minister vitally to the spirtual welfare and happiness of his home.

A new post-war civilization demands a new era in philanthropy. We are not only living in the midst of a global war, but we are dealing with a new principle in income tax collection never before attempted by our Government.

We are also facing the greatest call and opportunity that the world has ever had for lifesaving, Good Samaritan ministry, and for statesmanlike constructive, peace-building international philanthropy.

If our church and philanthropic agencies are wise and energetic enough to join in a cooperative educational program for higher levels of stewardship and devotion to religious and character-building institutions, they may introduce a new era of systematic proportionate giving, for the better support of all religious, educational, character-building, and welfare institutions.

The appeal and the motive should not be for the sake of the money or the institution, but for the sake of the man, the woman, the child, our new civilization, and an enduring world peace.

Decision of National War Labor Board in Illinois Coal Mine Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 1 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the dissenting opinion of the labor members of the National War Labor Board in the matter of the Illinois Coal Operators Association and United Mine Workers of America and District 2, United Mine Workers of America.

I also ask to have inserted on the same subject an article from the United States News entitled "Miners Against W. L. B."

There being no objection, the dissenting opinion and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD—IN THE MATTER OF ILLINOIS COAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION AND UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA AND DISTRICT NO. 2, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA—OCTOBER 28, 1943—(CASE NO. 13-279) (REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN AGREEMENT)

DISSENTING OPINION OF LABOR MEMBERS

The labor members dissent from the position taken by the majority, because they believe there is one basic principle about which there can be no compromise; the workers should be paid for the work they do. The opinion of the majority on the portal-to-portal issue is a compromise of this principle.

The labor members see no reason for the mental, legal, and arithmetical gymnastics indulged in by both divisions of the majority. Starting from the same premise that travel time is work time, and, therefore, compensable, the labor members accept the test proposed by the majority:

"Does the proposed wage result in the workers receiving more money for the same amount of work?"

The answer to this question is definitely "no" if the Illinois agreement were approved in full. The logic of the Illinois agreement is clear. All travel time is work time. All work time is productive time. The miners are to work 8½ hours per day. Within the first 40 hours of the week each hour worked is to be paid for at the base rate of $1 per hour. Each hour worked in excess of 40 hours is to be paid for at one and one-half the base rate. For the 51-hour workweek they are entitled to receive $56.50.

The facts in this case related to the portal-to-portal issue are clear. Guided by a previous decision of the Board, the two parties in this case—the Illinois Coal Operators Association and the United Mine Workers of America—successfully bargained collectively and arrived at an agreement which included a genuine portal-to-portal method of compensation for the mine workers.

In this agreement, the parties have jointly proposed that the historical workday of 7 hours be lengthened to 8½ hours, and that the former 35-hour week be increased to a 51-hour week. The new workday was to include travel time. Finally, it was agreed that overtime was to be paid for all hours in excess of 40 hours per week at the rate of time and one-half.

In terms of dollars and cents, the agreement meant that instead of earning $1 per hour for 7 hours per day, the miners would now earn $8.50 for an 8½-hour day at straight time. The increase in daily earnings would be commensurate with an increase of 1½ hours more work per day.

A majority of the Board has seen fit to deny this wage adjustment, not because they do not believe the method of determining portal-to-portal pay is not genuine; not because they do not believe that travel time is not work time; but they have rejected this agreement because they do believe that travel time should not be paid for in full.

There is apparent unanimity among the majority that travel time is work time. Specifically, the statement is made that the Board recognizes that the method of determining portal-to-portal compensation is genuine and that the Board has, therefore, only to pass upon the amount of compensation to be paid. Precisely how the amount is determined is a point of difference between not only the majority and the minority of the Board in this case, but also between the members of the majority.

In the majority decision, as described by Chairman Davis, the determination of the daily pay for 8½ hours at straight time raises the question of how much per day is paid for the three-fourths of an hour of travel time. If the former basic hourly rate of $1 per hour is continued in this contract, then travel time within the statutory 40-hour week is paid for at half time (7¾ hours at $1 per hour and three-fourths of an hour at half time). If the three-fourths of an hour daily travel time is paid for at a full straight-time rate, then the miners have had their basic hourly rate reduced from $1 per hour to approximately 95½ cents per hour.

In a special concurring opinion some members of the majority are more specific in their answer to the question of how much pay is granted for travel time within the 40-hour straight-time period. The position taken by these members of the majority is that no pay is to be granted for the travel time which

occurs within the first 40 hours worked. Travel time will be paid for only after 40 hours have been worked, and then at the time-and-one-half rate.

In both the majority opinion and in the special concurring opinion there is unanimity on the point that travel time is work time. There is, however, a difference in the explanations of just when travel time is paid. In the majority opinion, there is no forthright explanation of when travel time is paid for; the bald statement is made that $8.12½ is to be paid for 8½ hours at straight time per day for hours worked the 40-hour period. All hours in excess of 40 are compensated for at a time and one-half rate. Precisely how travel time is paid for is left to the reader's mathematical approach.

In the special concurring opinion, by way of contrast, travel time is definitely not paid for if it is worked during the first 40 hours of the week.

It is our considered judgment that the miners should receive $8.50 for each straight time 8½-hour day worked. For the work-week of 40 hours at straight time and 11 hours at time and one-half the total take-home should be $56 50.

Neither of the two divisions of the majority group are willing to concede that in dollars and cents travel time is genuinely work or productive time. By limiting the amount of the daily earnings to a total of $8.12½ for hours worked within the 40-hour period, the majority opinion essentially limits travel time to half-time pay. The special concurring opinions does not pay for this productive time at all until after 40 hours have been worked on the legal ground that the Fair Labor Standards Act does not require it. Then time and one-half is paid for travel time.

The inability of both divisions of the majority to concede that travel time is productive time that should be paid for in full, whenever it is worked, contravenes the basic principle that pay is due for all time worked. The labor members are forced to dissent, also, because the right of the workers to full pay cannot be explained away by half-time pay or the limitations of legal requirements.

This decision of the majority adds another to the list of decisions of this Board which have been determined, not on the basis of merit, but rather by the attitude of the individuals and Government agencies who dominate the actions of the public members of the Board.

GEORGE MEANY.
MATTHEW WOLL.
ROBERT J. WATT.
MARTIN P. DURKIN.

[From the United States News of November 5, 1943]

MINERS VERSUS W. L. B.

In rejecting the proposed contract between Illinois mine operators and the United Mine Workers, the War Labor Board offers an alternative wage proposal which, it estimates, would boost the average pay of an Illinois miner to $60 a week, an increase of approximately $10 This boost would come, not from an increase in basic hourly wage rates, but from paying the miners for time spent in traveling from the portal of the mine to their work, and back again.

But the Board's proposal draws fire from John L. Lewis, the Mine Workers' president. He accuses W. L. B. of offering the miners a wage reduction in hourly pay rates. This is how these conflicting points of view are reached:

W. L. B.'S CLAIM

Under their present contract, miners receive base pay of $1 an hour for a 35-hour work week. By working a sixth day of seven hours, they could earn $45.50, the sixth day being paid for at the rate of time and a half.

The portal-to-portal plan proposed by W. L. B. would increase a miner's hours of work at the face of the mine by 4½ hours a week, making a total workweek at the face of a mine of 46½ hours, or 51 hours including his travel time. This would increase the miner's total wages by $10 a week. That would bring the basic minimum pay to $55.50 a week. But W. L. B. contends that most miners earn more than the base pay, and that the average man would get $60 a week.

MR. LEWIS' CLAIM

War Labor Board's proposal calls for payment of $8.12½ for an 8½-hour day in which travel time is included, with payment at time and a half of this rate for all hours over 40. Since the miners now receive a basic rate of $1 an hour for a 7-hour day, Mr. Lewis argues that the proposal to pay $8.12½ for an 8½-hour day would give the miners only 95½ cents an hour. So, he says, acceptance of the plan would give the miners a reduction of 4½ cents an hour.

To this, W. L. B. replies that Mr. Lewis is wrong in his figures, that he does not consider travel time as working time when he bases the present rate at $1 an hour, but does include it as working time when he says the Board's rate is 95½ cents.

Out of all this confusing mathematics, however, one certainty emerges, W. L. B. has accepted the principle that travel time is working time, and, as such should be paid for under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It does not consider such payment an increase in wage rates. By approving this principle, the Board realizes that it has laid itself open to demands from unions in other industries for travel-time pay.

Union leaders, looking around for new ways of adding to the pay of their members who would not be eligible for hourly rate increases, can be expected to grab eagerly at this new method. So the door is open for travel-time demands from unions in such industries as steel, aviation, and others involving large plants.

The Control, Disposition, and Sale of Government-Owned Surplus Property—Report of Committee on Small Business of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the text of an interim report of the House Small Business Committee on the subject The Control, Disposition, and Sale of Government-owned Surplus Property.

It will be noted that this committee has been making a study of this vital question and has sought and received the opinions of such men as Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones, Under Secretary of War Patterson, Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and others.

It will be further noted that this committee has voted by unanimous vote that it holds this problem to be the Nation's No. 1 post-war problem.

The urgency of the problem cannot be denied nor can the responsibility of the Congress to provide both the machinery and the policies for the orderly and fair handling of this matter be long postponed. Our investigation continues.

The text of the committee's report in full is as follows:

THIRD INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE CONTROL, DISPOSITION, AND SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SURPLUS PROPERTY (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 18)

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

Acting upon the request of several trade associations, numerous small business firms and Members of Congress, the House Committee on Small Business recently initiated a series of hearings on the subject The Control, Disposition, and Sale of Government-owned Surplus Property.

The members of the House Committee on Small Business are as follows: WRIGHT PATMAN (Texas), chairman; J. W. ROBINSON (Utah); EUGENE J. KEOGH (New York); HENRY M. JACKSON (Washington); ESTES KEFAUVER (Tennessee); CHARLES A. HALLECK (Indiana); LEONARD W. HALL (New York); WALTER C. PLOESER (Missouri); WILLIAM H. STEVENSON (Wisconsin).

The first of these hearings was held on September 27 and 28, 1943. At that time testimony was given by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, and by officials of the National Automobile Dealers Association.

On October 21, the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, expressed the viewpoint of the War Department. The following day Admiral Emory S. Land spoke on the subject in his capacity as chairman of the United States Maritime Commission and as War Shipping Administrator.

The testimony given to the committee has been supplemented by a number of able briefs submitted by other informed persons from the ranks of industry.

As a result of this testimony, the House Committee on Small Business has concluded by unanimous vote that this subject might well be classified as the Nation's No. 1 post-war problem, and, as such, should be given immediate consideration by the Congress.

There are now pending before the Congress certain bills which, although relating to this subject, would have the net effect of postponing any affirmative action on this matter by the Congress for a period of as long as 6 months. In the opinion of this committee, the allotment of such a long period for the sole purpose of study and investigation of this subject is far too long an interval in which to keep industry, labor, and the interested Federal agencies in a state of uncertainty as to the ultimate wishes of the Congress on this vital question.

In support of this belief, the following statements are submitted:

I. MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

At the conclusion of the First World War the Government found itself in the possession of surplus war materials which were estimated to have cost the Government between six and seven billion dollars.

If the same ratio of surplus materials to total cost of war expenditures holds true at the expiration of the present conflict, the Government will find itself in possession of at least $75,000,000,000 worth of plants, tools, equipment, fabricated and unfabricated materials.

The liquidation of the various surpluses after the conclusion of the First World War consumed approximately 6 years. On this basis, it may be assumed that between 10 and 15 years might easily be required to effect an orderly and equitable distribution of these

goods at the conclusion of the present emergency.

It is generally conceded that the Government had no well thought-out plan for the disposal of this merchandise at the conclusion of the last war and it is also felt in many informed circles that the haphazard methods utilized in the handling of these surpluses at that time directly contributed to the general business depression which took place in 1920 and 1921.

Surpluses of facilities or materials are expected to exist in a major way in such varied lines as airplane manufacturing, machine tools, auto trucks, textiles, food, steel, and nonferrous metals.

Comment: Immediate need for Congressional action on this matter is clearly indicated by the testimony of Under Secretary of War Patterson, who stated that more than 10,000 contracts have already been canceled by the War Department which, of necessity, automatically creates an emergency problem in respect to the disposition of surpluses left over from these contracts. Furthermore, several sales of this type of property by the War Department, under the terms of Procurement Regulation No. 7, have resulted in the property in question being sold without wide publicity to dealers in scrap and junk. Testimony given to the Committee was to the effect that the materials involved in these sales could have been immediately utilized by other agencies or by war contractors and should not therefore have been disposed of through scrap dealer channels because of their intrinsic value.)

II. NEED FOR CENTRALIZED AGENCY TO HANDLE MATTER

All witnesses testifying before this Committee recommended that there should be unity of action and a uniform policy which would apply to all agencies alike in respect to the disposition of their declared surpluses.

It was generally agreed that an attempt should be made, as is now the case, to utilize surpluses within the agency itself before other actions are taken leading to disposal of same. Failing in that, other agencies should be given a refusal of the property. In the absence of any takers within the Government, it was felt that sale should then be made to private industry, provided that any sale made should not be made in such a manner that existing business were harmfully affected in their own operations by such sale.

All witnesses recommended that one central board or person should be established through congressional action to hold, manage, and dispose of all surplus property, subject to the recommendations of qualified representatives from the private industry group most directly affected by the particular transaction in question.

III. NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF POLICY TO GOVERN ACTIONS OF ANY AGENCY OR AGENCIES SELECTED TO HANDLE SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

In the opinion of this committee and the witnesses who appeared before it, it will not suffice alone for Congress to establish a central agency for this purpose. Such an agency, if created, must be given a clear-cut declaration of Government policy to guide its actions, not alone as to the disposal of assets but also as to the management of same while title still remains in the Government.

It is the considered opinion of this committee that there will be thus vested in the Government's hands, by virtue of the ownership of this vast store of surplus property, an economic force of sufficient weight so great that the handling, or mishandling, of these assets by these Government managers or selling agents may well determine the degree of economic prosperity which this Nation, and other nations, enjoy for many years to come.

For that reason, this committee feel that it is immediately incumbent upon the Congress to establish a policy governing the ownership, management, and ultimate sale of these assets which will take into full consideration the inherent rights and needs of the following groups of persons:

1. The manufacturers who normally produce the product in question.

2. The distribution firms which normally handle the sale of the product in question.

3. The returning servicemen who will seek either employment or the means for establishing their own business enterprises after the war.

4. The employees of firms now enjoying war business who may expect to be forced to seek other employment at the conclusion of the war.

5. The taxpayers who will rightfully expect their Government to realize as high a price as is possible, all other factors taken into consideration, for the products which the Government will hold as surplus at the end of the war.

The fabrication of such a formula need not wait upon the compilation of large volumes of statistical information. The question involved at this time is one of principles, not of statistics. Any agency, thus created, must be given some degree of latitude of action and cannot be bound by too complex a set of procedures. It must, however, be supplied with a set of basic principles or policy rules which will afford ample protection to the five groups mentioned above.

SUMMARY

The House Committee on Small Business therefore respectfully urges upon the Congress the need for giving immediate consideration to the following:

1. The Congress should not pass any legislation which will have the net effect of delaying for a long interval the establishment of some central agency to handle the management and ultimate disposal of Government-owned surplus property.

2. The Congress should immediately pass adequate legislation creating such a central agency.

3. The Congress should provide the agency, thus created, with a specific declaration of policy to govern its actions, which will provide the maximum degree of protection and encouragement to—

(a) Manufacturers now in business.
(b) Distribution firms now in business.
(c) Returning servicemen.
(d) Persons currently employed in all lines of industry.
(e) The taxpaying group.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of studies being made by other congressional committees on this vital question, the House Committee on Small Business proposes to continue its present investigations and to report further and in greater detail to the Congress in the near future, and probably have ready in the near future a proposal which will be presented in the form of a bill for passage.

If We Believe in Democracy, Let's Practice It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by one of my constituents, Mr. L. J. Kehoe, as follows:

The American public is becoming increasingly conscious of the fast-growing programs of governmental controls put forth by the administration to bring almost all individual activity, under the exacting supervision of some governmental agency. The public is also growing more skeptical as to the necessity, and even the value, for war purposes of some of these agencies. The public, for the most part, are just as patriotic as most of our misguided leadership and are making far greater war sacrifices. They are therefore justified and have a right to question the wisdom and reason for many of the present-day restrictions and regulations.

The American public is asked and must expect to be asked to raise billions of dollars to finance the country, both for our military needs and also to care for the magnified civilian government costs. However, the public has a legitimate complaint, when they see hundreds of millions of this money used in programs that are a hindrance rather than a help in the war effort, and are producing unnecessary and costly confusion in our economy, rather than insuring increased efficiency.

Probably the most outstanding example of these governmental misadventures, is the O. P. A., with all its offensive and worse-than useless regulations and directives. It is causing a degree of confusion in business circles and degeneration in the honesty of the people, never before experienced in this country. Under their ill-advised regulations, private business concerns are going out of business at a constantly increasing rate, unable to continue under the arbitrary restrictions of the O. P. A. Under the silly rules and regulations, 75 percent of the people, as a rule, honest and patriotic, have developed into lying chiselers spending a considerable part of their time seeking to evade these restrictions and dodging the American gestapo that has been set up to enforce these rules on them. The public is in a constant state of panic and indecision after listening to the wild forecasts of scarcity by the self-styled economic experts operating in this O. P. A. set-up. These boisterous calamity howlers have done more to cause hoarding and waste than any other factor in our present situation. They, and nobody else, are to blame for the so-called black market operations, operations that are increasing in the same ratio as the operations of the O. P. A. increases, and will decrease only, when and if that vicious governmental set-up and similar agencies are eliminated.

To criticize this program is not to say that it may not have been established with high motives or to challenge the American patriotism of its sponsors (however, in some instances their motives are open to grave suspicion); their intentions may have been good, but that makes it no less mischievous in its operation and in its effect on the people.

The progressed purpose and intent of the O. P. A. as often announced by the executive department, is to provide a fair distribution of consumer goods and to control prices, and by doing both of these increase our production.

Let us examine the facts and see just how much good this program is accomplishing, and also observe what harm is being done, and what had best be done about it.

Let us examine first the rationing program under this O. P. A. set-up, and see how well it is not working.

In the opinion of the writer, excepting only auto tires and gasoline, and even that to some extent, the rationing program has been and is a failure and is doing much more harm than good, and in support of this position, I respectfully direct your attention to the following, which I am certain you can verify in practically every locality in the country.

Let us consider first foodstuffs on the ration list in the order in which some of the principal items were placed on the list.

A. Sugar: Information received from some sugar refineries is to the effect that some of last year's crop could not be processed because of lack of space to store sugar that could not be moved under O. P. A. regulations. Only part of home canning of fruits has been done because of restrictions on the amount of sugar allowed to the people, which has resulted in an increasing demand for commercially canned fruits. Investigation revealed that sugar and coffee were about equally situated. If sugar were taken off the list, the result would be like coffee when it was removed, the normal demand could be adequately cared for with the existing supply, and like coffee, when sugar is released people will not buy it in a volume equal to what they do now.

B. Canned goods: In our community, people are buying commercially canned goods who never bought this type of merchandise before. The only reason dealers can give for this is that since the purchase is restricted people want this merchandise more than normal; also that some folks feel that they are being left out of something if they don't use all their points, and still another reason, that because of sugar restrictions they were unable to can the normal volume of home canning. The net result of sugar being on the restricted list has produced waste instead of a saving on these commodities.

C. Butter: According to the O. P. A. announcement, butter is becoming increasingly scarce and required higher point value. This in spite of the fact that production reports show a substantial increase over the normal production. This shortage is caused, according to officials of this agency, because of the need for butter for our men in service. In this connection the writer calls to your attention the fact that these men now in service are not added population, but only some of our population changed into another type of life. They ate butter before they went into service, much more than they do now. Talking with more than 50 men from camps all over the country and some from overseas, the writer has been told they are not getting butter in any volume. They have much less per man than they had at home. In many camps they get butter about once each week. So apparently the service is not getting this butter. We have long exported butter to other countries in peacetime, no doubt to an extent in excess of our present ability, yet, we have these regulations and restrictions growing more severe all the time. This does not make sense, and if these restraints are being applied, as seems to be the case, for the purpose of increasing Government stores of this commodity to be used to curb prices of dairy products in the future, such a program is not warranted. With butter, extreme restrictions will increase the popular demand, rather than lessen the burden on our production.

It too should be removed from the ration list and the Government ballyhoo artists might do well to talk less about an imaginary scarcity.

D. Shoes: Dealers say their sales of shoes have increased since this item went on this list, so like the rest of the rationed goods, the results produced have been the opposite to what was intended.

E. Meat: Since meat went on the ration list, we have had more complaint about unlawful marketing, than we have heard since the old bootleg liquor rackets. Under the mischievous regulations now existing little saving has been accomplished, and the principal result produced is that many butcher shops have gone out of business, and the legitimate business formerly done by them is now done by the meat bootleggers. Removing this from the ration list and abandoning the harping about future scarcity, will allow the meat production to reach normal and the distribution to be effected in a legitimate way. If there be a shortage, or one should develop, much more will be accomplished by an appeal to the people to have one or two meatless days each week, same to be in effect in restaurants as well as the homes. More meat will be saved for war purposes in that way than ever will be under the present program. If that plan were substituted for the present regulations, 95 percent of the people would comply with a patriotic enthusiasm that could be expected of a people, in whom the Government demonstrated some confidence. There would be a few chiselers, but they would be quickly disposed of by the contempt of their neighbors. Most people, under such circumstances, would not be seen in a restaurant serving meat on these meatless days. Restaurants who attempted to violate the meatless days would be out of business in short order by action of local citizens, who would be outraged at their lack of patriotism, and we could dispense with the services of the expensive O. P. A. agents who now are making such a mess of enforcing these unenforceable regulations, and we would not be developing a type of law enforcement, that is foreign to our concepts of government.

One would indeed be innocent, if he failed to note the increased patronage of restaurants and other public eating places since meat went on the ration list. Thousands are now eating a meal or more each day at public eating places to save their meat and butter coupons for more generous use at the meals they do have at home.

F. Farm machinery: The same condition exists with farm machinery as with the other items above listed. Since restrictions on sale of farm equipment have been set up people who had no intention of purchasing new equipment now are demanding certificates to permit their purchase of new and more elaborate equipment to do the same work they have been accustomed to doing in the past with older type of equipment.

If an appeal were made to their honor to make the old equipment do where at all possible, instead of these many regulations and constant harping about possible shortages, many of these farmers would limit their demands without complaint or loss. These regulations have effectively changed their attitude. Now, if there is any chance for them to qualify under any one of the many regulations for new machinery purchases they make an application and try their best to get it through. This attitude is complicating instead of helping the present situation.

G. General marketing regulations. Many of these regulations for marketing of production are absolutely impractical and obviously are either the result of conclusions arrived at by inexperienced and incompetent personnel in the employ of the O. P. A. agency, or as it sometimes seems to be, a scheme developed to provide an opportunity for some people working in league with or at least protected by the O. P. A. to get a commission out of the marketing operations that would otherwise not be possible. Insofar as this is practiced, this O. P. A. marketing program is a vicious thing and should be stopped without further delay. An example of this practice is found in the handling of dressed poultry, particularly that delivered to the Government on Government contracts. In filling these contracts, margins of profit in substantial amounts are paid to groups of persons who never see the poultry and have no interest in it other than to collect their percentages. This results in the Government paying upward of 3 cents a pound on the dressed poultry for absolutely nothing. Those engaged in this practice, and the O. P. A. that makes such a practice possible, are robbing the Government just as much as a sneak thief who would break into the post office. This is practiced on a scale that would shock the public if they were permitted to know the facts and would shock most politicians who hadn't grown calloused by long experience in such practices. The activities of these wartime thieves are hidden behind a veil of secrecy made possible by the O. P. A. fronting for them and making pious patriotic speeches to deceive the public, whom they are supposedly protecting against themselves.

H. Price ceilings: The O. P. A program of price ceilings is probably one of the most complicated and offensive activities of this bureau. On the pretext of preventing inflation and curbing the cost of living, this agency has set up an extensive and arbitrary scale of prices for the exchange of consumer goods, that has caused thousands of small independent business concerns to go broke and quit business. This agency has commenced a practice that constitutes our greatest departure from democratic government by its arbitary price decrees and has its counterpart only in the totalitarian types of government that are to be found in Europe. Under this vicious setup stock feeders on the farms cannot buy corn from their neighbors at prices they are willing and able to pay, and can pay with a profit after feeding out their stock. They are prevented from handling their feeding operations in a way that experience has shown to be profitable and productive, by the excuseless and oftentimes silly regulations of this agency. Arbitrary price ceilings have been placed on corn, and these ceilings fluctuate on a complicated scale set up by theorists and bureaucratic planners who have little or no practical knowledge of this type of business, and then, if a farmer sells his corn for a few cents a bushel more than the price fixed by this agency he is haled into court as a felon and subjected, not only to a criminal prosecution, but also has a civil judgment entered against him for treble the amount involved. If this isn't legalizing extortion it would be hard to conceive of anything that would. How such prostitution of power can be justified is hard to believe, yet, it becomes comparatively simple when concealed behind the lying protestations of patriotism and pious assurances by Government officials that all this is done to win the war and save the country from inflation. No greater fraud was ever conceived than for the Government to pretend that this agency is saving the country from inflation. Inflation is here. This agency has done nothing important to prevent its arrival. It has done much more to encourage it by the ill-advised publicity programs sponsored by the Government, that have made the people inflation conscious. Their only accomplishment has been to bring inflation on in the middle of the war, rather than after it, as would normally happen. If you look back to 1918 you cannot escape the truth of that statement.

If we are loyal to any of our traditions as freemen; if we have any regard left for the ordinary decencies of freemen or have any respect left for freedom and democracy, Congress should eliminate this vicious agency without further delay. An outraged people will sooner or later discard this monstrous innovation in our democratic way of life when it's revealed in its true light, so why wait longer to rid ourselves of this mischievous set-up that constitutes more danger to our democratic institutions than our enemies on distant battlefields. These political fanatics are more dangerous than our foes to our way of life.

After all, this is our war. It is not only a conflict in which the President and a comparatively few of his close associates are interested. Is this victory when it is won

our's (the people's) triumph, or is it to be only a triumph for the President and his associates, as a monument to his masterly skill in driving us to victory under the lash of his dictatorial agencies, of which the O. P. A. is a very typical example? None of our historical American triumphs in the past were obtained in this way. That is the European style, and not the American way, as was understood by the people in the past, people who made our country great. If, Mr. President, and you Members of Congress, you do believe in democracy as you profess to, then why don't you demonstrate your faith in it? Why not try it? If you hate totalitarian government to the extent that we must make war when it is practiced in other countries, why do you recommend it for our own people here? Why not give us a chance to be Americans like our forefathers were? They did not need a governmental "Simon Legree" like the O. P. A. to lash them to be patriots or to enlist their sacrifices and cooperation in time of war, and we don't need it now.

We can thank God that our men in service enjoy more confidence in their superiors than we in civil life enjoy from our superiors. If they didn't have any more love and respect for democracy and faith in the people back home than our political leaders appear to have, they would have little to fight for or to die for.

Communist Camouflage—New Labels for Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two articles which appeared in the Tablet, a Catholic weekly, on October 23, 1943, showing how the Communists in America are attempting to hide their identity in various organizations and publications, and to carry on Communist propaganda behind false or hidden fronts.

The American people are entitled to know the facts and to be informed of the Communist attempts to deceive them by spreading their un-American propaganda through Trojan-horse methods and organizations. There can be no compromise between the double-headed hydra of communism and dictatorship, and Americanism and free institutions in the United States. If the American people are informed, and see through In Fact and other camouflaged Communist magazines and such camouflaged Communist organizations as the American Youth for Democracy, and innumerable others, there will not be much chance of Communism spreading in America. However, it is the insidious use of false fronts, deception, and camouflage that beguiles and fools loyal Americans into reading and supporting Communist propaganda and activities in our own country without knowing that they are doing so.

The following articles expose the hidden hand of Communism in the American Youth for Democracy and In Fact, and other magazines. It is the same old story of the Communist changing labels in order to deceive the American people as to their real aims and objectives:

CALLS "IN FACT" COMMUNIST PAPER—PROTESTANT MAGAZINE ALSO DESCRIBED AS A RED FRONT

The newssheet In Fact and the Protestant magazine are described as part of the camouflaged Communist press and as false-front journals by Frederick Woltman, staff writer of the New York World-Telegram, in the current issue of the American Mercury.

Mr. Woltman describes the Protestant as a pious exponent of liberalism in religious circles which has followed the Communist Party line without swerving. He also notes that the Protestant took up the defense of the Soviet Union after the executions of the Jewish socialists, Ehrlich and Alter.

He describes In Fact as the most successful of the camouflaged Communist press and a perfect object lesson in camouflaged assaults on public opinion by the Communists. The circulation of the sheet is 100,000, according to Mr. Woltman, in spite of the fact that it is only a four-page, poorly written and printed leaflet. Most of its readers, he adds, would be astonished, even horrified, if they knew that the inside information in In Fact is known to all who read the Communist press.

George Seldes, editor of In Fact, is revealed by Mr. Woltman as one of those who somersaulted when the Nazi-Soviet pact was ended by the invasion of Russia. Before that break, Mr. Seldes called Wendell Willkie the closest thing to a native American Fascist and when the latter returned from Russia and called for a second front, the editor of In Fact applauded him highly.

* * * * *

COMMUNIST LEAGUE HAS ABANDONED OLD LABEL—UNDER GUISE OF "AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY" REDS WILL MAKE EFFORT TO DECEIVE CHRISTIAN YOUTH

Anyone on the watch for organizations of young men and women devoted to the spread of the atheistic, totalitarian theories of Karl Marx must now look to the guiding genius of AYD—American Youth for Democracy—and not for the Young Communist League. At the convention of the young Reds in Manhattan last week end, the new label was formally adopted. The AYD—American Youth for Democracy—was considered more attractive to gullible students and innocents who do not follow closely the party line and who accept organizations according to their labels alone.

The names of the officers of the re-labeled Young Communist League were likewise well chosen: Sergt. Bob Thompson, Winifred Norman, John Gallo, and Robert McCarthy (who refers to himself as an Irish Catholic). In the key position of every Communist-dominated organization—the executive secretary—however, an old stand-by has to be picked and in this case it is Carl Ross, chairman of the New York State Committee of the Young Communist League.

Although the AYD was formally organized only on Sunday, it is expected that it will shortly have 30,000 members, with New York, Detroit, and the west coast most strongly represented. On the national council of 80, 19 have been active in strengthening Communist domination in unions and 17 are Negro youth leaders. The term "youth" is, of course, relative.

Chief among the policies adopted at the convention on Sunday was the advocacy of obligatory and universal military training after the war. It was admitted by convention speakers that this was a reversal of the pre-war policy of the Communists, but they maintained that it was necessary to build up a people's army to drive out Fascists, or anti-Communists, from the United States. It is recalled that one of the reasons given by Communists for their failure in the Spanish revolution was that the radical youth and workers were not trained and equipped with arms. The newly adopted policy would make it possible for this training to be given and the arms furnished by the government.

ADHERES TO PARTY LINE

The rest of the program was strictly according to the Communist Party line, such as demanding the immediate opening of a second front—in Europe, that is, and not against Japan—the cementing of closer friendship with the Soviet Union, the defeat of fascism in this country, etc.

About 400 delegates from every part of the country were able to attend the convention in spite of travel restrictions. Local Communist students and young workers brought the attendance to almost 5,000 at the opening session on Friday night at Manhattan Center. Speakers were Earl Browder, national secretary of the Communist Party (which has not as yet changed its label, but is expected to do so in the near future); Ferdinand Smith, national secretary of the National Maritime Union; Dr. Harry F. Ward, who was active in enlisting the support of American clergymen for the Red regime in Spain during the civil war, and Max Weiss, retiring president of the Young Communist League.

Addressing himself to what he termed Christian youth in the audience, Dr. Ward advised them to "pay no attention to the sickening, maudlin arguments of our decadent liberals." He emphasized the importance of bringing religious youth into the new Communist A. Y. D.

Browder warned that delay in opening a second front (in Europe) is tending to corrode and undermine the morale of the American people. He attacked several of the neutral and allied leaders, including General Mikhailovitch of the Jugoslav patriot army, and criticized the American Government for dealings of supposed expediency with them.

Max Weiss admitted that the A. Y. D. was being formed to permit the Communists to collaborate with other youth groups, but he assailed defeatists who would call the A. Y. D. a Red front. He especially directed his criticism at two deans of City College, Dr. John L. Bergstresser and Dr. Morton Gottschall, who labeled the A. Y. D. as not open or honest in any sense.

Mr. Weiss went so far in his attempt to whitewash the Y. C. L. as to assert that that organization is not, if we wish to speak accurately, a Communist organization. A large part of the Y. C. L. is not socialist in its belief or outlook. Adding that the A. Y. D. would likewise not be Communist, he demanded, however, that it would militantly champion the rights of Communists to full citizenship in our democratic life.

A. Y. D. CALLED A BOOBY TRAP

The statement of Dr. Bergstresser, who is dean of students at City College, was made public just prior to the opening of the convention. At the same time the City College campus paper, the Campus, in a front-page editorial, described the as yet unnamed A. Y. D. as a booby trap. Dr. Gottschall, dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at City College, expressed full accord with the following statement of Dr. Bergstresser:

"Communists are not noted for altruism. By disbanding they do not intend merely to help the war along, but to convert thousands of college men and women through manipulation of the new organization. They are united and disciplined as liberals can never be. These two traits will enable them to take over, no matter how small they are in number.

"Additional proof that the Communists are preparing to rope in the students is this statement by Max Weiss: 'All Communists will naturally hope that thousands of youth who will join the new organization will also later join the Communist Party.'

"I have never attempted and will never attempt to dictate the political views of the students. I have always upheld the right of the Communist students to have their own open club on the campus as long as it conforms to our rules and regulations. But this step is not open or honest in any sense. The Reds are trying to fool the students into believing that they will have a strong win-the-war central organization. The only thing that will be created by this move is a new Red front. It is an attempt to expand the Y. C. L. and pull in non-Communists in the hope that they will later become true believers."

The liberal elements at City College were warned to be wary of the A. Y. D. in a statement issued on Wednesday by Dr. Harry N. Wright, president of City College, who declared that "Increasingly, liberal organizations all over the country are finding it necessary to disassociate themselves completely from Communists in order to preserve the integrity of their groups and their work."

Timber Valuation and Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by Judge Harley Langdale, president of the American Turpentine Farmers Association Cooperative, of Valdosta, Ga., made before the House Committee on Ways and Means, in connection with timber valuation and taxation:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is H. Langdale, Valdosta, Ga. I appear as president of the American Turpentine Farmers Association Cooperative. Our association represents by volume more than 85 percent of the entire production of gum naval stores (turpentine and rosin) in the United States. Our members, located in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, are owners, timber growers, and operators of forest lands for the production of naval stores, lumber, cross ties, pulpwood, piling, poles, and other forest products.

I have heard the able presentation by the Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation and the facts with the reasons why relief from taxation standpoint should be granted to the timber owners and operators, and I thoroughly agree with and subscribe to their statements. I will not burden the committee with repetition of the facts and reasons set out by the gentlemen who have just preceded me.

I do particularly desire to bring to the attention of this committee a situation that applies in the southeastern States and that may also apply in oher States. There is a great demand for timber products, particularly naval stores, lumber, pulpwood, and cross ties, and our members are trying to meet this demand. However, under the present interpretation of the income-tax laws, a great many of our members are finding that to continue to furnish these materials in volume amounts almost to confiscation, in that where a timber owner, who is cutting his own timber which he has been growing for many years, finds that, due to the fact that he can show only a low book value, his income from the sale of these products, computed from ordinary income-tax standpoints, runs so high that he has very little left after paying the tax; so that in numerous cases they have slowed down or stopped cutting the timber which is so badly needed now in connection with the war effort.

I do not say that any of our members are not patriotic, but if they go ahead and continue to dispose of their timber in volume, the timber will be gone and they will have practically nothing left, with no reserve funds with which to reforest their lands, protect and grow additional timber, and to pay local taxes an interest.

We have another situation which should have relief. As heretofore pointed out to you, it takes many years to grow timber, and during those years when there is no income, State and county taxes, fire protection, protection from theft and other hazards, as well as other expenses have to be paid, which expenses are written off each year. This necessitates the use of funds, and in order to procure those funds the landowners have had to borrow money, continuously increasing their indebtedness. Then, after many years when the timber is ready for market, they owe large indebtednesses with low book value—that is basis for depletion—and the income taxes are so high as to be almost confiscatory. There are numerous cases where an owner cannot afford to cut and utilize his timber for the reason that the payment of the income tax as now interpreted, together with the mortgage indebtedness, would take the entire proceeds and leave him no assets and nothing for his long years of work and effort. Some relief from a taxation standpoint should be granted in situations of this kind; otherwise the incentive to grow timber is destroyed.

We have millions of acres of land in the southeastern States which are more suitable for growing timber than for any other purpose. The owners should be encouraged to grow timber on these lands. We all know that timber is becoming more and more essential to the welfare of the entire Nation, and we feel that it is incumbent upon the people and the Congress to encourage the growing of timber and that the present tax discrimination against the timber growers should be properly adjusted. In the majority of cases the growing of timber is a lifetime undertaking, and up to now it appears that it has been looked upon as a more or less unimportant, hit-or-miss proposition.

I thank you for your attention and for permitting me to appear before your committee.

New Deal Can't Spend What Is Not There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following timely editorial which appeared in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette, of October 27, 1943:

NEW DEAL CAN'T SPEND WHAT IS NOT THERE

Well, a few taxes have finally been approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, but the Treasury's ten and a half billion dollars in tax proposals have been killed. The committee objects. It objects to almost every kind of tax recommended by the administration.

There will be no six and a half billions levied on personal incomes. There will be no increase in estate and gift taxes. Only corporate and excise levies remained, and action has been started by approval of higher postal rates and some additional taxes on some luxuries. But this will raise only a small portion of the new wartime revenues.

It looks as though the Congressmen and Senators are not convinced either that it is necessary to raise ten and a half billions or that this gigantic sum can be raised by the Nation.

What is the alternative? No doubt, some of it will be raised by new taxes. What of the balance which Mr. Morgenthau says is essential to the prosecution of the war? It is the business of the Treasury to recommend ways of raising the money required for Government use. It is the duty of Congress to provide the moneys which it deems essential. Budgets may be pared or enlarged.

If Congress does not appropriate the sums recommended by the Treasury, there will be less to spend. Many Representatives and Senators are convinced that several billions of dollars can be saved in Government spending, that waste in a great many bureaus and departments can be eliminated.

Senator BYRD is leading the way toward economy. For months he has worked diligently as head of a committee to reduce Government spending. Even during the summer recess, while other Members were scouting the home front, Senator BYRD and his colleagues, together with experts, were digging into Federal expenditures, uncovering waste.

Congress now has before it the specific means of forcing the New Deal to spend less, to waste less. There is ready admission from many sources that waste is inevitable in giant projects required by such a global war. Let the Congressmen expose it and force savings of the taxpayer's dollars. Harry Hopkins, the most profligate spender, and others who do not appreciate and never will use common sense in Government spending can be curbed.

If Congress does not provide the taxes to raise ten billions the spenders will have less to spend and will somehow find ways to eliminate the superduplicating bureaus that become leeches on the public purse. Economy will save billions and Congress is finally becoming convinced.

Revision of the Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I submit herewith copy of a letter sent to Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee from the Real Estate Owners Taxpayers League, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y.:

REAL ESTATE OWNERS
TAXPAYERS LEAGUE, INC.,
Buffalo, N. Y., October 30, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Members of the Ways and Means Committee and Members of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MOST HIGHLY HONORED PUBLIC SERVANTS:

Under our representative form of American

Government we are privileged to address you once again on the all-important subject of taxation. This we have been in the habit of doing the many past years, and as before, want you to know once again, that the membership of the Real Estate Owners Taxpayers League, Inc., is made up of real property owners, residing in one or two family homes, individuals owning their own businesses and real property, plus farm home owners residing throughout western New York. In addition we also have many other citizens throughout the territory who are in sympathy with our various objectives.

We have no corporation affiliates, want none, nor do we accept any funds from such source. We have no paid officials, and all services in connection with our league management is offered gratuitous by our officers, directors, and committees in the interest of all. Legal advice is also offered free.

We are unitedly opposed to the administration's demand for additional taxation as proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury, approved by the President, for the sum of $10,500,000,000, especially at this time, considering the fact, that at present a sum of $203,000,000,000 of unexpended balance now rests in the United States Treasury. Really, it's preposterous even to think of it.

Kindly remember the power to tax is the power to destroy. Yes; it has ever been so. We also know the raising of taxes increases demand for tax-free securities, which encourage bond issues, which increased taxes, and add to our already overburdened tax load. However, the real explanation to many of our troubles is the theory that a man needs no training for his job if he works for John Q. Public. We admit neither party has a monopoly on incompetence and corruption. Either begins to smell if it isn't kicked out doors every so often. Is that period of time approaching Washington now?

Not only are we opposed to the new taxation, but demand economy all down the line in all governmental agencies. This applies to the Army and Navy also.

We are unitedly opposed to a sales tax and welcome the assistance of the administration in helping to bring this about. Both the President and the Treasurer are on record against it, and have been for quite some time.

May we remind you, and your committee, that any system of government which is based upon the tax slavery of a part of the people for the benefit of the balance, cannot endure. A system of taxation, under which real estate which is less than one-third of the wealth, and produces less than one-tenth of the income, pays more than four-fifths of the total taxes levied in this State (the home of President Roosevelt and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau) is nothing more or less than confiscation by taxation or let us call it legalized robbery. Grossly disproportionate taxation, as practiced here, means the destruction of whatever of value there is in the ownership of home.

Not only is taxation burdensome for the home and farm owner, but he is also troubled with a 6-percent mortgage problem held by various interests. Due to the depression days of the past, unemployment, illness, and other diverse conditions brought about through no fault of his, he is truly the forgotten man. These are real facts, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and the Congress, worthy of your most careful consideration.

We herewith take the liberty of offering the following suggestions to you and your committee, in the revision of the present tax laws, suggested by our committee on taxation, and approved by our board of directors. We respectfully request same be presented through you to the entire Ways and Means Committee promptly. May we rely upon you in granting us this request?

1. American maintenance tax for support of Government, shall be paid by every inhabitant of America, and of its possessions, who has reached the age of 18 years and upward, and who is employed. The tax payment shall be levied at the rate of $1 per month, $12 per annum, collected at the source.

2. Present tax exemptions should be increased on net incomes of $1,200 for single persons, $2,400 for married couples, with $400 allowance for each dependent. They shall not, however, be exempt of paying the American maintenance tax of $12 annually. Filing of income-tax report by this group shall not be necessary.

3. The Victory tax law should be immediately repealed.

4. Direct tax payment to be levied on the basis of all income, after payment of taxes, and reserves set up according to law, so that no individual can retain any income in excess of $25,000 net a year. Both President Roosevelt and Secretary Morgenthau favor such a change in the law.

5. Income and surtax rates on corporations and business organizations above $50,000, after payment of taxes and reserves according to law, should be increased from 40 to 60 percent.

6. All bonds hereafter issued, including local, city, county, village, and State, to be made taxable at once.

7. Joint income tax payment returns between husband and wife living together, and not legally separated, should be made mandatory at once.

8. Estate taxes. Exempt wife or husband to $25,000, children to $10,000 each. Tax above sum to be at the rate of 25 percent. When bequests are made to persons outside of immediate family, tax to be levied at the rate of 50 percent.

9. Inheritance tax law should be corrected to prevent from escape millions of dollars in losses to the Federal Government. As an illustration, take the case of Marshall Field 3d who on September 25, 1943, received the last untransferred portion of his grandfather's estate, about $75,000,000 plus having received about $93,000,000 previously. This enormous fortune passed to the heir virtually tax free, due to the laws of 1906, which the absentminded Congress neglected to modify. Had it been subject to the Federal inheritance tax (as it should have been) in effect when Field 3d received the $46,000,000 payment in 1938, the Government would have taken 30 percent as its share. In times like these, when the whole world is engulfed in warfare, retroactive legislation should provide the tax remedy to cure the evil.

10. Tax exemption foundation law is also sadly in need of revision. Another illustration of how your Uncle Sam loses out through the perpetuation of some individual's hobby, whereby he hopes to keep his name from extinction, at the expense of course of the average American citizen and public. We call your attention to the recent death of Edsel B. Ford who left an estate at upward of $200,000,000, the bulk of it bequeathed to his hobby, the Ford Foundation, an inheritance-tax-exempt organization. Both this and the Field estate were made possible through the spending generosity of the American people who as a whole should now share in the proper tax contribution, and neither of them should be permitted to escape through the foundation route. A modification of the foundation law applying to all existing foundations is urgently requested. Why hesitate? Do it now.

11. Gift taxes. Present law to be amended, and a new tax of 50 percent to be levied on all future gifts.

12. All manufacturing and business-profit corporations, after taxes and legalized reserves, to be limited to a profit of not more than 4 percent. Stockholders' dividends limited to 3 percent.

13. The present law, republication of names of some few large income-tax payers should be increased, and Secretary Morgenthau and his Department required by law to publish all names with incomes of $5,000 and upward.

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE recently publicly stated "the rich and well to do almost to the constitutional point of confiscation must be taxed," and if labor is drafted she favors drafting capital, profits, and war plants, too. Yes, Congressman, so do we. Again she said, "Everybody in Washington is playing politics, from the President down to the lowliest officeholder and bureaucrat." Truly said; however, everybody in America already knows that.

We have noted your committee has been at work making new suggestions. Few of them as published in the press impress us very much. We offer the above as a substitute for any and all they offer of a similar nature. We believe our proposals are far more workable and hit right where the money spots are located and where it can be readily obtained, with little extra effort and trouble. Ability to pay, plus the golden rule, should be kept in mind.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. J. KUNZIE,
President.
MRS. LENA BURNMARK,
Secretary.
EDWARD A. SMITH,
Chairman, Taxation Committee.

Letters on the Great Food Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, following my talk over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday evening, October 23, entitled "The Great Food Muddle" I was both gratified and pleased at the large number of letters I received from all over the country endorsing my stand against the wanton waste of food in wartime. To date I have received letters and messages of commendation from 26 States. I believe the Congress will be interested in what a typical cross section of the American people think about this most important problem, and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein excerpts from a few of the letters which I have received commenting upon the broadcast:

KALAMAZOO, MICH.

Hon. GERALD W. LANDIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard your splendid radio address, and congratulate you upon the service you have rendered the American people by clearing up the rumors about the dumping of potatoes in Vincennes this spring.

On the whole, it was a fine speech, and a real service to our country. Keep at it. We do not want food wasted now. I know there is no economical war, but we do not have to stand for wanton waste of food, money and labor in this way. Keep on keeping us informed.

Yours very truly,

J. B.

UNION CITY, N. J.

DEAR SIR: I, together with my family, listened to your talk on the radio Saturday night, and wish to commend you highly for your wonderful explanation of the situation involved. Certainly more men should do this, and inform the people of the circumstances.

I would greatly appreciate a copy of your speech, as I wish to keep it for my collection.

Very truly yours,

F. W. B.

JOHNSTOWN, PA.

MY DEAR SIR: Your radio speech of Saturday night was one of the bright spots of recent months. This country can be glad that we still have some sound individuals who have the courage to spread the truth in the face of present-day obstacles.

A speech such as you delivered must be far reaching in its effect, and I sincerely hope that more of them will be heard. They are necessary if we are to preserve the very things for which our boys are now giving their lives.

Very truly yours,

J. W. W.

[Telegram]

CHICAGO, ILL.

Just thanks and appreciation for your moral courage in expressing your views. Never compromise with your principles. There are millions behind you if you only knew.

Mrs. K. M.

[Telegram]

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Let us have more talks like yours of tonight.

S. M. R.

ALTADENA, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: Keep up your fight for increased production and fair prices and no subsidies. Fight to oust the O. P. A. with its law clerks and inexperienced college professors, who have created lack in a land of plenty. They may be useful for voting purposes and for the New Deal.

The law of supply and demand is still a good one. I admire the stand you have taken.

Very truly yours,

M. H. A.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANDIS: I want to congratulate you on your recent radio talk on the subject of subsidy and roll-back and to say that it was not only a fine talk but made a lot of sense. I certainly hope that this talk was listened to by a few million people who are paying this bill for these so-called imaginary savings in funds which, in reality, is a New Deal way of attracting labor votes and piling up items of expense that is usually twice the amount of the subsidy given, due to red tape and support of bureaucrats.

Sincerely yours,

S. D.

DAVENPORT, IOWA.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: I wish to say amen to all you said over the radio the evening of Saturday, October 23.

Very truly yours,

R. N. C.

MONTICELLO, FLA.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: I was listening to your radio speech Saturday night, which interested me very much. Now I am a Democrat but cannot stand for what is going on today under this Democratic administration. I surely will not vote the Democratic ticket this time, and I am not going to be alone down here, either. There will be plenty of them doing the same thing.

You know it is terrible to tell a man what he can get and what he cannot get, then find out so much has been wasted and thrown away. Same as when they killed all of those cattle and hogs and plowed up those crops. You know that was not right, and we haven't forgotten it.

Very truly yours,

F. A. M.

HOUSTON, TEX.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: It was my privilege to listen to you on the radio last night, and you gave some interesting data about the inefficiency and bungling of one of our bureaus that resulted in loss of untold quantities of potatoes and other foodstuff around Indiana.

Though a congenital Democrat, born in Tennessee, I refused to follow that gang that is now parading under the alias of democracy in the White House. If we do not blast out the efficient, political bungling bureaus we are sunk. By "we," I mean Democrats and Republicans alike; I mean the people of the United States.

I was interested in what you said. Could you send me a copy of your speech? I want the data it contains. I am an old has-been athlete, and I realize we must train and train hard to win a fight. There is going to be some fight in the fall of '44, and I believe we should organize and begin training now.

Yours very truly,

R. C. P.

MEMPHIS, TENN.

DEAR SIR: I listened Saturday night with intense interest and wholehearted approval to your radio address. With that address as your platform, you could be elected to Congress from the rock-ribbed Democratic State of Mississippi, where I hold my citizenship.

I would appreciate being placed on your mailing list for addresses, for you speak my language. Again congratulating you on your radio address, I am

Yours very truly,

L. T. B.

CENTRAL FALLS, R. I.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you for the courage and honesty you showed in your talk over the radio Saturday night, in telling us about the wasting of foods and other items of living which is very scarce in Rhode Island. Especially butter, eggs, and meat. Will you please send me a copy of your speech or as many as you can.

Yours truly,

T. L.

TOMBALL, TEX.

DEAR SIR: I heard your talk last evening over C. B. S. Our patriotism has restrained our speech but its high time to call it just what it is. We admire your courage.

The South—solid South—is waking up too. Let's go back to America.

Yours,

E. W. H.

BARTON, MD.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my heartiest congratulation for your wonderful speech over Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday night. Surely the American people need more such truths and facts concerning such vital questions as you presented. I was so impressed. If available, I would appreciate a copy of your outstanding speech.

Very truly yours,

K. R. M.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO.

DEAR SIR: I was very much interested in your radio talk this evening and cannot help but wonder why such facts as you related do not rate complete newspaper publicity throughout the country. It seems to me that it is front-page information that should be given where no one can fail to see it.

If you have any copies of the talk for distribution, I should be very happy to receive one and I will have a hundred or so copies mimeographed.

Very truly yours,

E. H. K.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

HONORABLE SIR: Fortunately I tuned in a radio station last Saturday night, presenting you as speaker having to do with the food shortage. I was so impressed that I am writing to ask for a copy of this address.

Yours very truly,

A. D. D.

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.

DEAR SIR: Quite by accident my radio dial was turned in such a manner that I heard the latter part of a speech you were making last Saturday night.

Your comments were so revealing, pertinent, and forceful that I cannot resist the temptation to ask you for a copy of the speech in full.

Yours very truly,

F. E. J.

MERIDIAN, MISS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: If consistent with your wishes, I would be most happy to have a copy of the marvelous address you made over C. B. S. from Washington last Saturday night. Messages like this make business men think, and several of my associates in discussing your address with me state that they did not get all of it for some reason.

Thanking you in advance for this favor, I am

Yours very truly,

J. J. F.

CROWN POINT, IND.

DEAR SIR: Saturday evening I chanced to tune in on your radio address. To say that my interest was greatly aroused is putting it mildly. I believe that our country needs just such courageous statements as those made by you.

May I have a copy of this address. I shall enjoy reading it.

Sincerely yours,

M. C. M.

MANKATO, MINN.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: Heard your talk on the air, Wasting Precious Food, and enjoyed it very much. I would like very much a copy of this speech if at all possible.

Thanking you, I am

Very truly yours,

H. W. S.

KENNEBUNK, MAINE.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: Permit me to congratulate you on your radio address of last evening. I hope the investigation of the whole lend-lease program will be a thorough one.

Very truly yours,

C. P.

WITTENBERG, WIS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANDIS: I agree with you wholeheartedly that the bungling bureaucrats must assume full responsibility for the serious condition which now exists throughout this country of ours. I note your reference to the loss of hundreds of cars of potatoes, and knowing Wisconsin as I do, you

are also aware of this being a great dairy State; citizens of Wisconsin at this time cannot purchase butter they need for their families, and yet I find from Government statistics that there is more butter in storage than at any other time in all our history. Bungling is the word, and from what I am able to gather, this has been the program since 1932.

If it is not asking too much, I would appreciate having a copy of your radio talk and urge you to continue the fight as you have carried on ever since you have been in Congress.

Yours very truly,

J. W. G.

Mid-Shift Meals in Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal factors entering into the large turn-over of labor and absenteeism in many of our shipyards, particularly on the Pacific Coast, has been due to the lack of proper and adequate feeding facilities.

Because of the war we are demanding greater and greater effort on the part of war workers to increase production. No single item can contribute more towards increasing this production in the latter half of workshifts than a good warm meal at the middle of the day or the middle of the shift. To provide this it is necessary that in-plant feeding be resorted to in many of the shipyards of the country.

This problem is so important that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has unanimously adopted a resolution which I presented insofar as the shipyards and shipbuilding plants under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission are concerned. The Maritime Commission is now carrying forward the recommendations included in this resolution.

My information is that in all shipyards the maximum time allowed for midday or midshift meals is 30 minutes, and in some yards it is only 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, during the Congressional recess I visited every major shipyard in the State of California, and they are located on San Francisco Bay, at Los Angeles, and San Diego. In some of these yards I found it was necessary for employees to travel as far as a quarter of a mile from the place of their work to obtain this mid-shift meal. When it is remembered that approximately 20 percent of these employees are women, one wonders how it is possible for these loyal American workers to continue their production records in the latter part of a shift when it is necessary for them to bolt a cold meal from a little paper box container, travel a half mile and be back at their work in 30 minutes. I found that in inclement weather these employees had to run for shelter to eat their meager meal, sometimes in a boiler or under a shed.

We cannot expect to increase production and eliminate labor turn-over and absenteeism under such conditions.

With a view to eliminating this situation, I have today introduced the following resolution in the House:

Whereas persistent reports received by various Members of Congress indicate the necessity for prompt and thorough action being taken to provide adequate and proper food to workers in shipyards and shipbuilding plants engaged in naval construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, with a view to minimizing labor turn-over and absenteeism, That it recommend to the Secretary of the Navy that he give immediate, full, and thorough consideration to the solution of this problem and take such steps as are necessary to provide or cause to be provided, adequate and proper food, including hot meals, by in-plant feeding at such shipyards and shipbuilding plants under his jurisdiction, except at those yards and plants where, after careful investigation, it is found that adequate facilities with hot food are now available by out-of-plant feeding at places within a reasonable distance from the working places of employees, and at prices comparable with in-plant feeding.

I sincerely trust that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives will give the same consideration to this humanitarian resolution as was given by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to its companion resolution. I further trust that the Committee on Naval Affairs will consider it immediately.

How To Lose the Siberian Air Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent extended by the House, I place in the RECORD an article on How To Lose the Siberian Air Bases, written by Hon. Vicente Villamin, and which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on October 17, 1943.

Mr. Villamin is a Philippine lawyer who has been a resident of this country for 20 years and is a practising attorney at Los Angeles.

For many years Mr. Villamin was economic adviser on problems affecting the areas bordering the Pacific Ocean. He is richly endowed with knowledge of economic and political conditions in the Pacific and particularly as to the Asiatic countries along its western shoreline.

I am sure the article of Mr. Villamin can contribute to a better understanding of this situation by the American people. The article is as follows:

HOW TO LOSE THE SIBERIAN AIR BASES

(By Vicente Villamin)

The agitation for the immediate opening of a Siberian second front to permit the use of air bases in eastern Siberia by the United Nations against Japan is the most dangerous disservice to the cause of the United Nations imaginable.

Those who are engaged in it in good faith must be forgetting or disregarding one supremely vital fact, to wit, that a premature declaration of war by Russia against Japan—and that is what the agitation seeks to lead to—would be a plain case of doing the right thing at the wrong time and with the most disastrous result, which is the likely loss of those bases to Japan.

At present Japan is in a position to overrun eastern Siberia and take possession of the very air bases which the United Nations expect to use in the future for bombing operations against Japan. It is generally conceded that she has in close proximity to the Siberian border a much larger land and air force than the Russian establishments in that section. They are there for blitzkrieg purposes.

Vladivostok, the chief city and port, is less than 300 miles from the Japanese coast and is much nearer to Japanese-dominated Korea. And Tokyo is only 649 miles away by air.

A DARK PICTURE

Against this positional advantage of the enemy, Russian reinforcements from the European front, if they can be spared at all at this time, will have to move over 6,000 miles on one railroad. And to add to the despair of the situation, any substantial aid from the United Nations would be too late to save the air bases from being captured by the Japanese.

According to an article by Edgar Snow in last week's Saturday Evening Post, wirelessed from London, the Russian forces in Eastern Siberia consist of an army of 200,000 men, a navy of 60 submarines, a small air squadron, several hundred armed river boats, and some torpedo boats. At various times it has been reported that Japan has at least 1,000,000 men and thousands of planes for immediate service in Eastern Siberia.

The Japanese are not asleep as much as they want their enemy to think so. The Siberian second front agitation here is a positive aid to them because it puts them on notice when to attack and even justifies them to attack before a formal state of war exists. Therefore, it is clearly to the best interests of America and her allies that the "public opinion" here in this matter be quieted down and the decision left with both the President and the General Staffs, who have all the facts of the situation, and the Russian high command, which is cooperating with the United Nations. In the meantime, it can reasonably be expected that Eastern Siberia is being prepared for the time when Russia can safely go to war against Japan.

FIGHTING FORECAST

It is a certainty that Russia will fight Japan because it is to her great and abiding advantage to do so. When could she be expected to take that action? When the German attack has spent enough of its force to render it justified to divert a substantial part of her forces from the European front to eastern Siberia. That time would be hastened by the state of preparedness of eastern Siberia itself, and by the accelerated and expanded activities of the United Nations in the entire Pacific, especially near Japan proper.

Brutally practical as she is daily proving, Russia will be present and participating when the United Nations undertake the final destruction of the Japanese military machine and convert Japan to a semiagricultural nation to make her harmless as an international menace. In the first place, Russia has the strong, long-felt urge of avenging her defeat at the hands of Japan back in 1905. In the second, she has plans of economic and territorial expansion in eastern Siberia, and if she does not cooperate in eliminating the

common enemy she might not have the influence that she needs in the post-war settlements in the Pacific and in east Asia. In short, Russia will be there to help give both the body blow and the finishing blow to her natural and historic enemy.

A SYNTHETIC PACT

The Russo-Japanese neutrality treaty negotiated in 1941, that keeps the parties at peace today, will not stand in the way when the time to declare war against Japan comes. That treaty was fabricated out of synthetic friendship between them and rests on mutual military expediency. Its real aim was to commit the parties from warring against each other at the wrong time. It was fully expected that, at the propitious moment, either party would scrap the treaty unceremoniously and start hostilities. It is rationally obvious that it will not be public opinion in America, but Russia herself, in consultation with the responsible leaders of the United Nations, that will determine the precise and advantageous moment to scrap that treaty and start a shooting war.

America's supreme interest is to end the war as soon as possible with victory on her side. She is not fighting alone. She is associated with other nations whose interests must be considered and correlated to secure the maximum collaboration. Mutual suspicions and recriminations work effectively against themselves, singly and collectively. The present agitation for a Siberian second front with its acrid words and divisive thoughts would serve to rip the ranks of the United Nations to the benefit of the common enemy.

The Farmer in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, there will be no quotas for control programs next year, except on tobacco. While there will be no control on cotton, wheat, corn, rice, potatoes, and so forth, certain goals have been asked of the farmers on a purely voluntary basis.

The goal for cotton next year is 22,000,000 acres, as against an acreage this year of 21,995,000. On cotton we had a carryover of 10,500,000 bales, with an estimated yield this year of 12,500,000 bales. While we have a comfortable surplus of cotton on hand, there is an increased need for cotton, cottonseed oil, cottonseed meal, and cake. Next year's goal for corn is 100,000,000 acres, as against 96,000,000 acres harvested this year. On wheat there was 54,000,000 acres harvested this year, and the goal for next year is 68,000,000 acres. For sweetpotatoes the goal is 1,000,000 acres, as against 923,000 acres this year. The present prospect is that a good price may be expected for sweetpotatoes, due to the increased demand and the enlarged facilities for dehydrating and canning sweetpotatoes. The goal for Irish potatoes for next year is 3,500,000 acres, or about the same as was harvested this year.

There will be support or floor prices under all crops in 1944. For the basic crops of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts there will be loans of 90 percent of parity, and for all other crops the Price Administrator will, in December or January, announce the support prices adequate to secure the necessary production. Exactly what these prices will be cannot be indicated at this time and will depend somewhat on the enactment of legislation now pending in Congress to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, has reported out a bill to increase the loans on cotton from 90 to 100 percent, and this bill is now ready for consideration by the House. The present price of cotton is not in line with prices which farmers must pay, nor is it on a fair comparative basis with other farm commodities. In fact, cotton should be bringing 30 cents per pound, and cottonseed $100 per ton.

One of the most serious problems facing the farmer today, in my opinion, arises from the fact that there has been an enormous increase in the cost of farm labor, and no part of this increase is taken into account in the calculating of either parity or ceiling prices. The cost of farm labor represents 32 percent of the cost of production. The official records show that the farm-wage rate is now 2.72 times what it was in 1909, and yet parity and ceiling prices are still calculated on the basis of what was being paid for farm wages in 1909. The city papers give wide publicity to the fact that the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that the index of prices paid by the farmer is 165, and the index of prices received by farmers is 193. This makes the public believe that farmers are receiving much higher prices than they are paying; but, as stated above, in prices paid by farmers there is not included the farm labor cost. If this farm labor cost is included, then the index would be—prices paid by farmers—199, and prices received by farmers, 193.

We have passed in the House H. R. 1408, which is a bill to require inclusion of farm labor costs in the calculation of parity and ceiling prices. In fact, this bill has passed the House twice—once last December by unanimous consent, and once this spring with very little opposition. But it has been held up in the Senate, and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

The farmers of the Nation will face a most critical situation at the end of this war. Efforts will be made to put us on a competitive basis with the rest of the world, and I am sure the farmers face the fight of their lives in trying to protect American agriculture. In view of this situation, the logical thing for every farmer to do today is to pay his debts, make all necessary repairs and improvements, and get on solid ground for the future.

Address of President William Green of the American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, at the sixty-third annual convention of the American Federation of Labor on October 8, 1943, in response to an address delivered by Warren H. Atherton, commander of the American Legion, on the same date:

First of all, may I extend to Commander Atherton in your name and your behalf, our sincere thanks for his visit to this convention and for the address which he delivered. He was right in his conclusions when he stated that we welcome a frank discussion of all subjects and all questions affecting the American way of life and affecting our economic, social, and industrial interests. In fact, the American Federation of Labor conventions are open forums of discussion. We speak with frankness. We act in the same way. We face all issues courageously. We proclaim our virtues and we admit our faults.

It appears to me that I can with perfect propriety point out to the commander that those who seek perfection in an imperfect world are doomed to disappointment, but he who follows the pathway of logic and reason, looking above and beyond the inconsequential faults of a small minority, will realize that after all we are making a fine record in a most imperfect world.

The American Federation of Labor did not hesitate or wait a moment. Immediately after receiving over the radio, through the press and otherwise, information that the Japanese had treacherously attacked America at Pearl Harbor we stepped out and acted at once. A conference of the representatives of this great movement was assembled to meet in the city of Washington. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor met at the same time and there, after solemnly, seriously, and carefully considering the whole situation, we announced our pledge to the President of the United States of cooperation and support. That came from the honest hearts, frank consciences of those men, representing as they did the heart and conscience of American labor. And then in conformity with the program there developed, we pledged to the President of the United States a no-strike policy for the duration of this cruel war. That was made voluntarily, and you must understand the real value of the use of the strike weapon in order to understand the pledge that American labor made to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In other words, the mobilization of our economic strength and its use, after all, is the last resort, the protection of labor, the means that it uses to lift its standard of life and living and to protect its own interests. It is the weapon it uses in defense of its interests, and when it agreed to place that behind the door and leave it there until the war was over it honestly pledged itself to support the Government to the bitter end.

Now, Mr. Commander, what has been the record? Examine it, will you please? The President of the United States, who keeps the record and studies it carefully day by day and month by month, has spoken to us in a convincing and eloquent way and said, "Men you have kept that pledge 99.9 percent in the United States of America." [Applause.]

And that pledge was kept by imperfect men. I maintain that it is an amazing record made in an imperfect world.

We hold business management and those connected with business, Mr. Commander, in high regard. We feel that business as a whole has made a good record during the war—and in referring to business I mean the owners and managers of industry. We do not denounce industry as a whole at any time because of the sins committed by some manager or some directors of a corporation or the owners of some industry or a minority of industry. Consequently, we do not denounce industry as a whole because some steel corporation in America supplied our Government during this emergency with defective armorplate. Nor do we denounce industry as a whole because some wire corporation supplied the Government with inferior wire. Nor do we denounce industry as a whole because some greedy employers of labor have sought to make profits that are unreasonable out of this war emergency. We say to such individual employers, "You have sinned against the Government, but industry as a whole does not approve of what you have done."

Is this a world without sin? Do the members of the church always live up to the high standards set for them? Do the fraternal organizations maintain their standards of righteousness always? Do you find perfection in family life, the most sacred organization in America? I will venture to say that there are sinners in the American Legion.

The American Federation of Labor has never officially ordered or approved a strike of 1, 5, or 10 men, or a hundred men since the dastardly attack was made upon us at Pearl Harbor. We have kept the faith and we are keeping the faith. We are producing the planes, the guns, the tanks, the ships, the war material so necessary in order that our brave men on the battlefields of Africa, in the southern Pacific, in Italy, and wherever the war is being fought may be adequately supplied.

And, Mr. Commander, it might be of interest to tell you that since Pearl Harbor—since Pearl Harbor—while the soldiers of production represented here in this convention have been giving their skill, their lives, their training, their genius, and their American service in the production of materials in order to make this war a success, 80,000 of them have been killed and we have buried them, many of them in unknown graves. Seven million have been injured. Does that mean that we have measured up, or have we not? I have repeatedly referred to that fact—we buried them—80,000 killed—killed while serving as soldiers of production in the mills, the mines, and the factories of these United States. Does that count for anything or does it mean anything? No workers in the world have ever made such a record as American workers have made in the United States of America since Pearl Harbor.

I ask you, Mr. Commander, to look high, look above the petty things, look above the human imperfections, the incidental things of life, and behold portrayed like the new day's sun before your eyes the virtues of American workers. They are the best in the entire world. We are proud of them. They have done wonders and they will do more.

Now, may I say that we are in accord with many of the objectives you outlined here this morning—the protection of the children, the return of those who have temporarily been permitted to leave the school rooms and the homes to work in the mills and the factories. We have supported the regimentation of workers during this war in a very large way, because the winning of the war stands over and above every other consideration. But we intend to work with all like-minded people in bringing about a reconversion and a readjustment when the war ends. The children must go back to the homes and to the schools. The wife and the mother must take her place in the home as a wife and mother. We are opposed to the exploitation of women workers and children during normal times. We will stand with you in carrying out that program.

Then, Mr. Commander, there are 2,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor in the armed services of the Nation. We have planned and are planning for their return, as well as for the return of others who are serving on the battlefields. It is our firm determination to see that the seniority rights of all these members of our great union are protected when they come back to America, and if necessary we will compel employers to give them their places back where they were before they went away.

Then we shall serve in a like capacity in trying to find the way by which every man who enlisted in the service of the Nation may find an opportunity to resume his normal life, to live in the American way, working and serving his family and society and the Nation as well.

I have spoken in response to your address, Mr. Commander, in a sincere and honest way. I have spoken to you in the kindliest manner. I want you to get our point of view. It is my wish that we may all see this situation as it is. Perhaps when Gabriel blows his trumpet in the morning and the dead shall rise from the earth, and those who are living shall be assembled as Holy Writ tells us, for the purpose of ascending into heaven, we may then construct a perfect world out of imperfect material. But until then, Mr. Commander, we must deal with the imperfections of human nature and serve as best we can.

The Alcoholic-Beverages Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of October 26, a mass meeting of Christian forces was held in Constitution Hall here in Washington. A large and enthusiastic group assembled on the occasion for careful consideration and discussion of the alcoholic-beverages problem with special reference to its influence on the war program.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Inasmuch as it is the considered sense of this meeting:

That the easy accessibility and use of beverage alcohol is a major factor in juvenile delinquency, both through lowering the quality of family life and lessening the sense of responsibility of parents toward their children, and because it presents a direct threat to the morals of juveniles themselves and lowers the tone of community recreation;

That it is a considerable factor in absenteeism and the lowering of production standards in industry;

That its sale in the vicinity of camps and its use within the camps is harmful to the health and morale of many in the armed services, and is creating increasingly serious stresses in camp-community relations;

That in a time of great food scarcity there can be no excuse for the consumption of grain and fruits for its manufacture, or the waste of rubber, gas, and shipping space for its transportation; and

That the manpower released from nonessential purposes by the discontinuance of the beverage alcohol traffic would greatly help in solving the present industrial crisis, and avert the breaking up of homes, which intensifies the juvenile delinquency problem.

Resolved—

1. That we petition the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, to issue orders to stop the sale of beer in military camps, and the sale of all intoxicating beverages in the vicinity of such camps.

2. That we recommend the suspension of the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, and exportation of beverage alcohol for the duration of the war and for the postwar period of demobilization; and that we urge upon Congress the passage of all restrictive measures now before it, including the bills against alcoholic beverage advertising, S. 860, and particularly the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082.

3. That we appeal to the people of the United States to refrain from the use of alcoholic beverages and thereby help to conserve food, materials, and manpower, and thus hasten the day of victory.

Prayer Day of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, last Fourth of July, the Catholics of China, numbering some four-million-odd, paid this Nation of ours a most gracious tribute.

They offered public and private prayers for the spiritual, moral, and physical well-being of all American soldiers battling against the forces of evil. This widespread and mighty plea for heavenly intercession was arranged by the Catholic Student Mission Crusade and the Chinese Catholic Cultural Association—organizations which number among their members the chief leaders of Catholic China, both clerical and lay.

Here in Washington, the day was marked by an impressive requiem mass in the Shrine of the Sacred Heart, with His Excellency Bishop Paul Yu-Pin, vicar apostolic of Nanking, presiding. Similar masses were said wherever Chinese could gather in worship on the other side of the Pacific.

October 10 was Double-ten Day among these forthright, hard-fighting Allies of ours—the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the young Chinese Republic. Everywhere, east of the International Date Line, they paused in their labors to solemnly celebrate what to them is the equivalent of our own Fourth of July.

Not unmindful of the Christian courtesy paid to our own soldiers and those who loved them on our own national holiday by the people of China, His Eminence Cardinal Dougherty and other high dignitaries of the church, arranged that October 10 would be set aside in Catholic churches throughout America as a special prayer day for China and her people. This ceremony was carried out—proof in part that America is truly appreciative of this gallant, long-suffering ally and ever ready to reciprocate with sincere supplications to the Almighty for mercy to her people.

One of the highlights of these special services held throughout America was a short, special prayer composed by His Eminence Cardinal Dougherty, of Philadelphia. Because it is heart moving and deeply significant, I ask to include it here. In honor of those indomitable, courageous Chinese allies of ours, I wish mightily that His Eminence's stirring words could well forth from every American heart and that all the people of ancient Cathay could truly feel that the American people are with them and for them, not only on their independence day, but for so long as honest men can stand together and share a common ideal.

The cardinal's prayer follows:

SPECIAL PRAYER COMPOSED BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL DOUGHERTY FOR THE PRAYER DAY OF CHINA, OCTOBER 10, 1943, THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCEPTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Heavenly Father, Whose mercy shines above all the other divine attributes, have compassion on Thy millions of Chinese children, whether at home or abroad; but especially protect and bless Thy Chinese children now passing through the terrors, the sufferings, the anxieties, and the sacrifices of a long and cruel war. Have pity upon the tears of bereaved mothers, of orphan children, and of soldiers who are giving their lives for their Fatherland.

Through the intercession of the Mother of Thy Divine Son, and through the prayers of so many Chinese martyrs, who shed their blood for Thy sake, put a speedy end to the suffering of so many millions of Thy children, grant them peace and prosperity, and bless them for the sake of Thy Divine Son.

Bring good out of evils that have beset China during so many tragic years and bestow upon her the light of the Gospel of Thy Divine Son. Bring them into the fold of Thy Holy Church and protect them from all evil. Amen.

Midwest Farm Leader Opposes Federal Subsidies on Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the October 28, 1943, issue of the Hillsboro (Ill.) Journal with reference to a speech made in that city on Monday evening, October 25, by Mr. Earl C. Smith, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association and vice president of the American Farm Bureau, on the subject of subsidies on food and other problems relating to American agriculture.

I believe that Mr. Smith's remarks, as well as the interpretative article concerning them prepared by Mr. Sam Little, editor of the Hillsboro Journal, should receive the serious consideration of every member of this body since the House of Representatives will take up the subject of subsidies on food on November 10, or shortly thereafter.

The article follows:

It was appropriate to have Earl C. Smith, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association and vice president of the American Farm Bureau, as guest speaker at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Montgomery County Farm Bureau which was held Monday night at the Hillsboro Community High School. On account of the prominence of the speaker and the demand for reservations for the dinner, it was found necessary to limit attendance to members of the Farm Bureau and one guest for each member. At that the old gymnasium where the meeting was held was crowded to capacity, several tables having been spread in the balcony of the gymnasium.

The speaker, a veteran in farm organization experience, said he well remembers in the old days that it was customary for the farmers to blame the railroads, Wall Street, the big insurance companies, or some other powerful influence for all of the ills which beset the farmer and agriculture until someone suggested that "we do something about it for ourselves" and the organized farm movement was conceived. He added that the farmers over the Nation are now doing things for themselves. He outlined briefly the benefits which had accrued to the farmers as a result of organization.

The speaker defended the Agricultural Adjustment Act which was supported by farm organizations and said he did not believe America would have had the vast stores of cotton, corn, wheat, and other basic farm products at the beginning of the present war if it had not existed. He said that at any rate these vast stores of crops needed for food for America and its allies in the war were still in the hands of the many at the beginning of the war while otherwise, if they had existed, they would have been in the hands of a few.

Mr. Smith said it is his honest opinion that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is going to be more sorely needed at the end of this war than ever before. He stressed that the A. A. A. never was intended to be used by anyone for political purposes but added that he often sees a desire to do so cropping out, not so much in Illinois as in some of the other States. He said: "It is so important that it must be kept clean to save it for the future."

"I do not believe the world will see such a great era of prosperity at the end of this war as some are predicting," he said. "I am not an optimist and I am certainly not a pessimist, but I am a realist." He reminded that at the end of World War No. 1 everyone was of the opinion that a great era of prosperity was just ahead. He recalled that many prosperous farmers who were doing fine with the land they had but they went into debt for more land (because they felt they could not possibly lose on account of the anticipated prosperity) and they lost not only the land they bought but also their original holdings.

He cited that in the United States there are now many more millions of dollars invested in factories than ever before, that men and women are receiving high wages for producing the machines and the goods which are being manufactured in these factories, a large proportion of which is being used in the war or to assist our allies in the war. He cited how many things the average civilian wants as soon as he can get them. He pointed out that America had the gold, the silver, the industries, and the skilled labor to produce millions of dollars worth of merchandise which we will want and that the peoples of other countries will want. But he said he could see the farmers of other nations producing vast quantities of beef, corn, wheat, and cotton at a cost far lower than any American farmer, under his present standard of living, can possibly produce it.

He predicted that the people of many of these other countries will have nothing to exchange for the industrial products of America excepting agricultural products. He did not mention in any way, the protective tariff which during the period America became great and prosperous, was the safeguard of American agriculture and industry. Nor did he suggest anything which could be done to protect American industry and agriculture under the recent administration proposals for a world-wide partnership of allied countries to bring about perpetual peace and incidentally world-wide prosperity.

Mr. Smith remarked, however, that "It is time for farmers to organize to perpetuate our agricultural industry" and added that it is absolutely essential that our agriculture be perpetuated on a solid foundation to insure a continuance of a sound democracy.

As he swung into his attack on the administration's theories of subsidies to pay farmers more for producing crops, dairy products, etc., and still keep down the cost of living, he cited that the class receiving the highest wages is still wanting cheaper food. He cited that while other countries (after the war) can offer cheaper wheat, corn, cotton, etc., our majority wants cheaper food than the American farmer can produce. He declared the most serious domestic problem before the country today is the pressure of billions for a subsidy paid by the Government to producers of foods so that the price of these foods to the consumer will be held down. "If we take money out of the Treasury to subsidize food producers what can we (farmers) look forward to in the future?" he questioned, and added "Are we going to sanction a practice of this kind in America?"

In comparing the labor of farmers with that of those engaged in all other work in the country, he said the farmers are the hardest working people of America and among the lowest paid. He declared that the farmer has no fight with other labor in the United States but needs a parity price for products of the farm. He defined parity price as a rule for the price of farm products so that 100 bushels of corn (and other farm products in proportion) will buy as much now and in the future as 100 bushels of corn bought in the period between 1910 and 1914. He cited that period as a time when the comparative price was the fairest to labor, industry, and agriculture of any period known. He declared that there never was a time than now when it took a smaller percentage of the workers' wages to pay the food bill of the consumer.

"If we ever adopt a subsidy (for farm products) the average farmer will pay far more back in taxes than he can ever save in the cost of living," he stated. "People with fixed incomes are to be considered," he mentioned, "their interest will not be served by saddling on them a great tax bill to get a small

roll-back in the cost of living." He questioned what our men now overseas fighting for democracy will think when they come home if they find saddled on them billions of dollars in debts to pay a subsidy to slightly roll back the cost of living to wage earners who are now making high wages in industries.

The Importance of Highway Construction in the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Galveston News of August 13 last stressing the importance of highway construction in the post-war period:

HIGHWAY BILL

This country would be fortunate if all proposals for Government post-war spending were as clearly meritorious as the bill to authorize the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 for highway construction in each of the 3 years immediately following the war. Chairman Gentry of the Texas Highway Commission, who is also president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, announces that hearings on this bill will be held as soon as possible after Congress reconvenes this fall.

Money wisely spent on highway construction and reconstruction after the war cannot fail to return worth-while dividends in public prosperity and contentment. It would provide employment and stimulate the automobile manufacturing and related industries. But above-normal highway expenditures should not be regarded solely as an economic shot in the arm. Wartime expenditures have been far below normal, with consequent neglect of maintenance and lapse of new construction schedules. Putting existing highways back in the condition they were before the war alone will be an expensive undertaking.

The Federal highway bill should have the unanimous and energetic support of Texas Congressmen. Texas has a greater highway mileage than any other State, and the system is still far from complete. Scores of Texas counties have important highway projects in abeyance until the end of the war.

Smaller Air Lines Only Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in presenting the minority views on H. R. 3420, the civil aviation bill, the minority took occasion to quote a sentence from an address delivered by Mr. C. Bedell Monro, president of the Pennsylvania Central Airlines, in what appears to be a rather strained effort to support minority claims that the committee bill would foster monopoly.

In order that Mr. Monro's real position on this very vital question might be made known and made a matter of record, I desire to include here, under leave granted to extend my remarks, a letter from Mr. Monro to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who is chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter follows:

OCTOBER 25, 1943.

Hon. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR BULWINKLE: The entire air-transport industry, the smaller lines as well as the larger lines, is unanimously and strongly in favor of the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) just reported by a large majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It has come to my attention that a minority report on this bill cites some remarks recently made by me. This citation is apparently intended to support the minority's argument that the Lea bill deliberately fosters a monopoly of domestic air transportation on the part of the four largest domestic air lines.

The fact is that the inequality in the relative positions of the smaller and the larger air lines, which I referred to in the remarks cited, resulted from the chaotic conditions antedating the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act corrected those conditions and contained specific provision to guard against monopoly. The only hope of the smaller air lines lies in the wise administration of that act in the spirit in which it was framed by your committee in 1938.

One reason that the smaller air lines so strongly favor the new Lea bill is that it strengthens the Civil Aeronautics Act and extends its very wise principles—calling for sound competition in air transportation—to all air commerce.

The minority report favors the Reece bill. It is a source of amazement that the minority cry out against the dangers of monopoly but at the same time advocate the removal of present restrictions against surface carriers going into competitive air transportation. The minority even suggest that surface carriers should provide feeder air service to the trunk air carriers, as well as engaging in trunk air service. No greater disaster could befall the small air lines than a development such as the minority espouses. The smaller air lines would then be hopelessly caught between the present powerful large air lines and the even more powerful surface carriers. Our only salvation—if any—would be a forced sale of the modest assets which we have so diligently tried to build up. The Reece bill is leveled with deadly aim at the very heart of free enterprise in air transportation.

I have read your majority report attentively. It is a statesmanlike, far-sighted discussion of civil aviation's problems, reflecting your long and arduous study. It and the bill you have framed are landmarks in the progress of civil aviation. May I respectfully express earnest hope that your bill will be approved by the House.

Sincerely yours,

PENNSYLVANIA-CENTRAL AIRLINES CORPORATION,
C. BEDELL MONRO, *President.*

America's Stake in World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Hon. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, on America's Stake in World Trade, delivered at the thirtieth national foreign trade convention in New York on October 25. As most everyone knows, Mr. Clayton is a Texan and one of the Nation's outstanding businessmen. Prior to severing all of his business connections in order to contribute his talents where they might be best employed in the present war emergency, Mr. Clayton was generally recognized as one of the world's greatest cotton authorities. His knowledge of world trade makes his address worthy of special consideration.

It may be interesting to speculate for a moment on what history will say about our part in this war.

Judging by the familiar criticisms which we hear on all sides, one might expect that much attention will be given to the mistakes, the extravagance, and the confusion here at home.

But since history has a way of measuring great events by objectives and results, it is probably safe to predict that these delinquencies, typical of every war, will play a very minor role in the story of this one.

Instead, heavy emphasis is almost certain to be laid on the wise timing of those early critical decisions which placed us in a position of semibelligerency; on the bold conception of the magnitude of our war-production job, once we were in the war; and on our immense output of the implements of war.

Failure in any one of these crucial steps could have lost the war for us.

The production of goods and services in the United States promises to reach an annual rate of $200,000,000,000 by the end of this year. This is double the 1940 production.

Stated differently, we are now expending more energy exclusively in the prosecution of the war than was put forth 4 years ago to keep the entire peacetime economy of the country going.

Our war production is already 50 percent greater than that of all the Axis countries combined, despite their many years of preparation.

This huge production, added to that of our allies, guarantees that the fighting forces of the United Nations will, in due course, completely overwhelm our enemies everywhere and dictate the terms of peace.

The conclusion of peace will find the United States in a world position of vast prestige and power, the full significance of which is perhaps better understood abroad than it is here.

One wonders what history will say of our part in the peace.

Will we be wise enough to understand and grasp the immense opportunities which will lie before us?

Will we be big enough to meet heavy responsibilities which only we can shoulder?

Impelled by the events of the last 4 years, a revolution has taken place in the thinking

and understanding of the American people regarding the physical position of the United States in this shrinking world.

Most of us now recognize that the two oceans which have served as a basis for so much of our complacency no longer afford adequate protection in the modern world.

Popular polls show that we are now prepared to collaborate with neighbors who share our ideas regarding peace and the rights of others.

It is perhaps natural that the popular conception of this collaboration centers in political and military arrangements.

But it is quite impossble to obtain collective security through military arrangements if economc warfare as it was waged throughout the world in the inter-war period is to continue.

As someone has well said: "The greater the economic significance of political frontiers, the greater the danger of war; and the greater the facility with which all nations may secure through commerce the basic necessities of national life, the greater the prospects of peace."

This expression finds full recognition in the declarations of the Atlantic Charter and the lend-lease agreements.

These documents unequivocally declare that the trade and raw materials of the world shall be accessible on equal terms to all states, great or small, victor or vanquished; that all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce shall be eliminated; and that tariffs and other trade barriers shall be reduced, to the end that improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security may be had for all.

That this platform is essential to world peace and a rising standard of living no one can successfully deny; that it will be vigorously opposed by selfish minority pressure groups here and elsewhere is unfortunately certain.

The great danger to democracy now, as in the past, is in the pressures of organized minorities.

To understand the broad over-all economic problem which will face the world at the end of this war it is necessary to examine the present situation.

The world today is passing through the greatest economic expansion of all times.

With the possible exception of certain Asiatic areas, employment and production are everywhere at an all-time high.

Throughout the British Empire everyone is working.

In Germany ten or twelve million foreign workers have been brought in.

The occupied countries in Europe must be working to capacity.

In Mexico, Central and South America, Africa, and the Middle East—areas which supply a great part of the exportable minerals and raw materials of the world—production and employment are at peak levels.

In the United States we will soon have about 65,000,000 people employed, including the armed forces. This is 20,000,000 more than we employed in 1940.

Throughout the world millions of women are now working for the first time in factories and offices.

And still shortage of manpower is almost universal

The output of the world's mines, factories, and farms was never greater.

War devours all and calls for more.

In war only military frontiers obstruct the free movement of goods; mere political frontiers have little or no significance.

Will the coming of peace re-endow political frontiers with the same economic significance they held in 1939?

If the answer is "Yes," it probably means another war in the next generation; it certainly means that the world must expect, after a period of reconstruction and reconversion, a great shrinkage in economic activity, back to or below the 1939 levels.

In terms of our domestic economy this would give us an unemployment problem more serious than that of 10 years ago.

As has been pointed out by Paul Hoffman, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, if we are to avoid serious unemployment in the post-war period, we must plan for a production of goods and services of at least $135,000,000,000, or, say 35 percent, over the 1940 rate.

To do this, we must operate our productive facilities at or near capacity. This will inevitably mean that we will produce a great deal more of some things than we can consume and a great deal less of other things than we require.

To displose of this surplus production, great new markets must be developed abroad. To receive payment for our goods, we must import more than ever before, and we must invest abroad more than ever before.

There is already a revival of the talk so prevalent at the end of the last war of the competition of foreign labor, working at starvation wages, and of the necessity of protecting our high standard of living.

Neither real wages nor the standard of living is raised by keeping goods out; both are improved by letting goods in as payment for other goods which labor and capital produce in surplus.

If a substantial part of the world's millions of new workers can be kept employed producing and distributing peacetime goods, a rising standard of living in the post-war period becomes automatic.

This is an attainable end to which all nations must work.

There will be much that must be done.

Great areas must be reconstructed. Other areas must be developed, opening up resources, raising living standards, and providing new markets.

This will call for substantial capital exports by the richer countries.

Unless we are prepared to take our proper part in this program, our town domestic employment problem will become acute.

No amount of post-war planning on a national level will provide productive employment in private undertakings for our millions of new workers if the rules surrounding the international exchange of goods continue so restrictive as to deny buyers the means of payment across political frontiers.

The world has now shrunk to a point where we can no longer sit in a small corner of it hugging our insularity and our riches to ourselves, unobserved and unmolested.

We have to decide now whether we will take our proper place in the world, politically and economically. The alternative is to turn our country into an armed camp, police the seven seas, tighten our belts, and live by ration books for the next century or so.

This is no preachment of imperialism; no one thinks any longer in terms of territorial aggrandizement.

It is simply a choice we cannot avoid—a choice made inevitable by the world revolution through which we are passing.

America's stake in world trade means much more for us than a great expansion in peacetime production and employment; it represents a great new hope of peace for America and the world.

Who Are the Snoopers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including articles from the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald, indicating that O. P. A. rent investigators, apparently named in such numbers that they are with difficulty identified by the offices under which they are presumed to be working, are equipped with keys which afford them access to rental properties for interior examinations, even in the absence of occupants.

These unlawful entrances violate, not only the sanctity of homes, but also amendment IV of the Bill of Rights; and are analagous to the unlawful entries by officers of King George III which did more than taxation without representation to bring about the Declaration of Independence.

Americans should adopt a new Declaration of Independence—independence from invading bureaucrats.

The articles follow:

[From the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of October 9, 1943]

O. P. A. MUDDLED ON IDENTITY OF INSPECTORS

That confusion sometimes reigns in the O. P. A., the left hand never knowing what the right is doing and what's more, the left hand never knowing the right, is illustrated by the following incident which took place in Ottawa yesterday and today.

ENTERED HOUSE ON ASH

Yesterday afternoon an O. P. A. representative with all credentials identifying himself as an O. P. A. investigator from the rent control office in Topeka came here to investigate the house at 409 Ash Street, owned by C. L. DeTar and rented by Frank Brown. Brown was not at home and the investigator got a neighbor to enter the house with him while he looked over the furnishings. The woman said he entered the house with his own key.

The lady said the investigator had all the proper credentials for his position, and the picture on his credentials tallied with his appearance. From the card she remembered his name was Chambers.

MAYOR INTERVENED

Brown, the occupant of the house, came later in the afternoon and said he found the house had been ransacked and everything in disarray, but missed nothing. He reported the incident to police. Mayor L. C. Geiger, who has been interested in the rent control efforts in Ottawa because of his position in the real-estate business, took the matter up. He called the rent-control office in Lawrence and learned that there is an investigator named Robert Chambers working out of the Topeka office.

ANOTHER INSPECTION HERE

Meanwhile, another O. P. A. inspector out of the Wichita office, R. D. McKay, stopped here this morning on a routine visit and learned of the incident. He called his office

in Wichita to determine whether there was such a person as Robert Chambers working for the O. P. A. The Wichita office said no such person was known. McKay called at the Herald office, desiring to make it known publicly that the investigator here yesterday was an imposter and said that the O. P. A. does not do business in this manner. He did not know at the time that Mayor Geiger had called the Lawrence office.

Best part of the whole incident was the fact that the O. P. A. office in Wichita did not know who Inspector McKay was and the inspector had considerable difficulty establishing his own identity with his own office before he could find out anything else.

Local officials were getting quite a chuckle out of the entire incident this morning.

[From the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of October 12, 1943]

OTHER REPORTS OF O. P. A. MAN CRASHING HOMES

The story in Saturday's Herald concerning an investigator for the O. P. A. rent-control division entering a home here Friday without the knowledge of its occupant has brought to light the fact that several such instances have occurred here recently. At one home it is reported that the investigator entered while the man of the house was away and his wife was still in bed. The investigator entered, looked around, and walked out without saying a word, it is reported. A few days later the owner of the house received orders to reduce the rent on the house.

Local residences have raised the question as to how the investigator can legally enter a home without a search warrant, a privilege local law-enforcement officers do not enjoy.

Presidents Before George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take the opportunity in this historical month of November to ask a superduper $64 question of the Quiz Kids and our fellow Americans generally: Who were our first Presidents—before George Washington?

History as it has been taught in our schools has hurried over 8 years of experimental government in the "united" American Colonies with the result that the fact has been too long lost from us that the Father of his Country, who was not, literally, the first President, was the eleventh—though he was the first President with important powers. The history of the Government of the United States began not under George Washington and the Constitution, in 1789, but, actually, in 1781 under the Articles of Confederation, forerunner of the Constitution. The first Cabinet was organized and the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation designating the final Thursday in November was issued not by President Washington but by President John Hanson, the fourth elected President.

A resolution has just been introduced in Congress for a John Hanson Day, permanently on November 15, the anniversary of the first full-term President, whom General Washington, as the commander in chief of the Army, frequently wrote for instructions and whom Washington congratulated, in a letter November 30, 1781, addressing him as "Your Excellency," "on your appointment to fill the most important seat in the United States."

IT WAS HISTORY MAKING, THAT PERIOD BETWEEN THE LATTER-DAY BATTLES FOR THE WINNING OF OUR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND THE FIRST INAUGURAL OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

If we are versed in the history of our country since, but do not understand its history during those formative years—we do not know American history.

The first attempt by the Thirteen Original States at national self-government, after they had become temporarily united in the revolt against oppressive foreign rule, was made under that first feeble constitution, the Articles of Confederation. The articles did not provide for an executive position, but when the Continental Congress, an expedient of the Revolutionary War years, was succeeded by "The United States in Congress Assembled"—which was the language of the Articles—the new Congress, electing a presiding officer, gave him the title "President of the United States in Congress Assembled." He had none of the powers of our Presidents under the present Constitution. However, he did speak at times for the Nation, as, for instance, when President Hanson, in the name of Congress and of the Confederacy, welcomed General Washington back from the war and commended him and his Army upon their victory.

The articles stipulated that the Federal year should begin on the first Monday in November, and the articles being made effective early in 1781, the old Continental Congress continued to meet under the new articles until the beginning of the first Federal year and chose a total of three interim Presidents; and thereafter a new President was scheduled to be elected and to assume office every year, according to a principle of rotation, in November, when Congress—delegates annually appointed by the legislatures of the States and paid by their States—convened.

Like the President, the Congress of the 13 States lacked strong powers. In fact, this first union of the States was only a "firm league of friendship." Congress was only an advisory body to the States. It was not entrusted with the power to tax. Soon Congress discovered that it could not make its laws or orders effective. The States busied themselves with their own concerns, to the disregard of their common and larger interests. They feuded with each other. The small States feared that their larger neighbors might absorb them. It was too loose a national union, threatened by jealousies, insurrection, commercial barriers between the States, the inadequacy of the authority voted to Congress and represented by the Presidency. Finally, the country was in such chaos that a second attempt at a national government—the writing of a new Federal charter and reorganization under stronger provisions—was made to save the infant union of the States.

Those were years in which the Nation was being builded; yet most historians, surprisingly, have passed hastily over the record of what was as significant in the life of our Nation as our individual childhood years have been to every one of us. The lessons of trial and error learned then served the fathers of our country as experience upon which they erected the sturdy Constitution.

PREDECESSOR PRESIDENTS OF OUR FIRST PRESIDENT

In the interval between ratification by the States of the Articles of Confederation and the first Federal year under the Articles, Congress elected as President Samuel Huntington, of Connecticut, the very last of the Presidents of the wartime Continental Congress, who was continued in office until he resigned July 9, 1781; and then Samuel Johnston, of North Carolina, who declined the office the very next day, so that election of a third interim President was necessitated, Thomas McKean, of Pennsylvania and Delaware, who held the position from July 10 to November 5, and who upon retirement was congratulated by General Washington "on a release from the fatigues and trouble of so arduous and important a task."

HERE NOW FOLLOWS THE ROLL OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

During the Federal years of 1781 to 1789 and here also is an outline of some of the acts of the Congress during the Presidency of each, so that it may be judged how really consequential were these Presidential terms, during which the Presidents were influential in the acts of the Congress:

John Hanson, of Maryland, November 5, 1781, to November 4, 1782: Post Office Department, Consular Service, and first national bank organized; first census directed; first treaty—with Holland—ratified; offices of Superintendent of Finance, Minister of War, Secretary of Foreign Affairs established; great seal of the United States adopted as selected by John Hanson.

Elias Boudinot, of New Jersey, November 4, 1782, to November 3, 1783: Provisional peace with England accepted; appeal made to France for a loan—public debt, $42,000,000—resolution adopted for making of treaties with Indians. (Congress, characterized "the grand Sanhedrin of the Nation, responsible for everything and unable to do anything," became a "prisoner" of mutinying soldiers at Philadelphia, appealed to General Washington for troops for the defense of Congress, then decided to quit Philadelphia and move to Princeton. The Commander in Chief was summoned and consulted in the formation of a permanent standing army. Congress next moved to Annapolis.)

Thomas Mifflin, of Pennsylvania, November 3, 1783, to November 30, 1784: Peace treaty with England ratified; cession of Virginia's western lands accepted. General Washington, given an audience in Congress so that he might resign his commission, was honored with "an elegant public dinner" and ball, and

after the customary 13 toasts and the discharge of 13 cannon, George Washington retired, as he said, "from the great theatre of action" and took "my leave of all the employments of public life."

Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, November 30, 1784, to November 23, 1785; Seat of government moved to New York City; land ordinance adopted as foundation of western land policy; cession of Massachusetts' western lands accepted; commissioners appointed to proceed to western settlements of Kaskaskies and Illinois to preserve order and good government.

John Hancock, of Massachusetts, November 23, 1785, to June 5, 1786: Delinquent States urged to pay Confederacy's requisitions for money.

Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts, June 6, 1786, to February 21, 1787: Cession of Connecticut's western lands accepted.

Arthur St. Clair, of Pennsylvania, February 22, 1787, to January 22, 1788: Convention authorized to render the Federal charter "adequate to the exigencies of government and the preservation of the Union"; Northwest Ordinance adopted for the government of the territories; cession of South Carolina's western lands accepted; report received from constitutional convention and transmitted to State legislatures.

Cyrus Griffin, of Virginia, January 22, 1788, to March 4, 1789: Resolutions adopted to make the new constitutional Government effective, set the date for the States to appoint electors who were to choose a President, and provide for New York City as the Nation's capital. (For the final 6 months under the Articles of Confederation the country was without any national Government, attendance at Congress having so run down that after October 21, 1788, Congress did not try to meet.)

SOMEBODY SOME DAY OUGHT TO WRITE AN AMERICAN HISTORY WITH A PROPER PERSPECTIVE

For the 8 years in which the founding fathers, quite differently from acting by inspiration alone to produce the great Constitution which has stood for 154 years while governments have risen and fallen all over the world scene, actually struggled, like typical human beings—with wisdom and with bad judgment both, with foresight and eventually with hindsight, in error and in truth—to establish a lasting national Government.

Navy Day Address by Admiral Ernest J. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Navy Day address delivered by Admiral Ernest J. King, United States Navy, commander in chief, United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations, at Indianapolis, Ind., October 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Schricker, ladies and gentlemen, it is reasonable to assume that you who compose this audience are here primarily because of your interest in the Navy—which gives us at least one interest in common. We also have in common the fact that we all pay taxes to support the Navy as one of the essential functions of our Government. In addition, we share the common conviction that while there is life in our own bodies and in those of our children this country shall remain strong and free to choose its own way of life and its own form of government—against all comers.

These Navy Day meetings go a long way to remind the sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen, as well as their feminine counterparts in the naval services, that you are interested in them, that you are back of them, and that you are proud of them.

Navy Day has grown in importance and public favor until today, on its twenty-first birthday, October 27 is recognized throughout the whole country as the occasion on which all citizens of the United States may join in demonstrating their interest in the continuing welfare of the Navy as a fighting force.

The Navy League had its beginning in the days of the Spanish-American War, but during the great majority of its life it has been a peacetime organization. It has, during those years, frequently stood alone in its belief that the maintenance of world peace could be more certainly assured by the coincident maintenance of a strong United States Navy. For the 20 years following 1918 we, along with many other nations, lived in an atmosphere of unreality and unwillingness to contemplate the possibility of war. During that long period when the stock market, the depression, and the repeal of prohibition were occupying the minds of so many citizens, and when it was fashionable to believe that other countries would gladly follow our example of disarming ourselves—then it was that the Navy League fought almost single-handed to bring our thinking back to reality.

Those theorists who professed to believe that peace could be assured by disarmament seem to have forgotten the significant fact that October 27 is the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt, who is credited with that trenchant remark, which it behooves us never to forget for the future—"Speak softly, but carry a big stick."

For the time being, the normal way of living of all Americans is suffering interruption. I need rehearse neither the background nor the details of the war now in progress, but I do feel that some sort of pronouncement as to its progress is expected of me. When I speak of the Navy, remember that I include the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. I therefore offer this thought, which is based on some of my firmest convictions: the officers and men of the Navy—as representative Americans—have no lack of confidence in their ability to deal with the enemy on anywhere near equal terms. At the beginning of this war, for a variety of reasons, those terms were decidedly unequal and in favor of the enemy. Not being a warlike nation, we had not undertaken to maintain a large Military or Naval Establishment, and we had not, like our enemies, been at war previously. Thus we did not have the seasoning that comes only with action.

This is a day and age of specialization, and it is duly exemplified in the armed forces—in the Navy, in surface vessels, aircraft, submarines, and in amphibious forces; in the Army, in the ground forces, the armored forces, the parachute troops, and the air force.

This is a day of mechanization—when we look so largely to machines to enable us to win our battles—and to live our lives. But we must not fail to realize that machines are as nothing without the men who man them and give them life. War is force—force to the utmost—force to make the enemy yield to our own will—to yield because they see their comrades killed and wounded—to yield because their own will to fight is broken. War is men against men—mechanized war is still men against men. Machines are mere masses of inert metal without the men who man them.

When I came into the Navy, from your neighboring State of Ohio, some forty-odd years ago, we had already long reached the period when it was a common saying: "The days of John Paul Jones were the days of wooden ships and iron men; now we have iron ships."

But the records of this war show clearly that the days of "iron men" have been revived, if indeed they ever passed. Who are these "iron men" of today? They are your friends and neighbors, yours sons and relatives—for the Navy is made up of a cross-section of our own people from all parts of this country—city, town, village, and farm—and from every walk of life—the professions, the factories, the stores, the trades, and agriculture.

Indiana has her representatives in high places in the Navy—among them Admiral Ingersoll, of La Porte, who is commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet; Vice Admiral Cook, of Evansville, commands in the Caribbean; Vice Admiral Spruance, of Indianapolis, commands in the Central Pacific; Vice Admiral Ingram, of Jeffersonville, is doing a sterling job in the South Atlantic; Rear Admirals Farber, of Frankfort, and Good, of Warren, are in key jobs under the Chief of Naval Operations; Major General Rockey, of Columbia City, is assistant commandant of the Marine Corps. Rear Admiral Norman Scott, of Indianapolis, was killed in action in the Solomon Islands area.

We cannot have a war without loss of life, but we can see to it that our sons and brothers, hubands and fathers do not die in vain. This can be accomplished by two means: (1) By making the Germans and the Japanese pay so dearly for this war that they will never start another; and (2) by keeping ourselves so strong after the war that no one will want to challenge us. These are harsh words for peace-loving Americans to use, but they are the only language our enemies will ever understand.

You will appreciate, I am sure, that I do not overlook the immense value of the support we have received from the Nation, the Congress, and the builders of ships, guns, and aircraft when I say that my greatest pride is in the fighting personnel of the Navy. No body of men has ever shown greater courage and daring in the face of great odds than the Navy in the early days of this war. From the pre-war dangers of escorting merchant ships across the Atlantic right down to the Battle of Midway the Navy was fighting with its back against the wall. You all know the many stories of individual heroism that have characterized the actions of officers and men of the Navy in combat; stories of selflessness and devotion to duty that have added new luster to the glorious traditions of the naval services.

Action reports in recent months and weeks have been no less stirring than those of the early days. They show that in barely 2 years more than 2,000,000 citizens have become the

men of the world's finest navy—your navy. This is something in which all of us can take pride. Never before has so large a group of men been trained in new and exacting duties in so short a time.

While we are on the subject of personnel, I wish to say a word of thanks and appreciation to the women who have made it possible for nearly 60,000 men in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to be used in combat areas. These WAVES, MARINES, and SPARS, by their intelligence, industry, and willingness, have made themselves indispensable to the naval service in time of war. The Navy is proud of them.

Our strategic plans for the Pacific need not be disclosed in order to give you the general picture of the Navy's part in the war. I can tell you that we plan to follow the Japs very closely on their return trip to Japan. In fact, we propose to speed them on their way. We will strike fiercely and hard wherever we can find the enemy—whether it be on the rim of their newly acquired empire or whether it be upon the coasts of Japan proper.

We are fighting a tough and wily foe whose disregard for his own life is exceeded only by his fanatical hatred for us. He is still convinced that he can wear us out, and his known long-term strategy is to keep us at arm's length from his important concentrations. The Navy's job is plainly outlined. We must continue, through all means at our disposal, to break up his lines of communication, to strike his naval forces whenever we can make the opportunity. Note that I say make the opportunity.

The weight of men and material on our side is steadily mounting and the eventual outcome is certain. We must not, however, relax for a moment in our efforts. Every minute lost in pressing home our attacks may add a month to the length of the war. This applies not only to the Navy and the Army, but applies equally to all civilians engaged in any sort of war production, food production, and the production of raw materials. This is truly a people's war in which we as a Nation, not just as an Army and Navy, are fighting the Japanese and German people

The 12 months that have passed since the last celebration of Navy Day have been among the most eventful in the history of our country. In October of last year, the invasion of Europe was, for the general public, a matter of speculation. Today, as we celebrate America's second Navy Day at war, the invasion of Hitler's stronghold is under way. The successes of the Nazi U-boats against our shipping have been radically diminished and Italy has joined the battle against nazi-ism. In the Pacific, we have forced the Japanese back in the Solomons-New Guinea area, and we have made them pay dearly in maintaining their 6,000-mile supply line from Burma to the Gilbert Islands. The Aleutians, too, have been freed and now not we, but both the Japanese, and the Germans, are on the defensive.

To American mechanical and industrial enterprise is due much credit for our successes. In July 1940 the Navy received 5 newly constructed ships. In June 1943—the latest figures I can reveal at present—we accepted almost 1,200 vessels. Since July 1940 the Navy has received 2,200,000 tons of ships and added 23,000 planes to its air arm. At the time of Pearl Harbor the Navy had only 6,500 pilots; today there are more than 24,000 well-trained naval aviators, many of whom are war-experienced veterans. Our fighter planes now fire in 1 minute 5 times the weight of projectiles their 1940 predecessors fired; today a battleship's antiaircraft fire power is many times what it was 3 years ago; our torpedo production last month alone equaled the production during the whole of World War No. 1.

The United States Navy, during the past year, has had many difficult tasks to perform. I propose to briefly discuss three of these. First, it has been our constant endeavor to seek out the enemy and fight him whenever we could make contact, either at sea or at his land bases; second, we have had to keep shipping lanes open so that supplies could be carried to our own troops, and to our allies; and third, we have had the responsibility for transporting American troops to Pacific outposts, to Africa and the Mediterranean, and to our bases in the British Isles.

As for the first objective, I can report today that up to October 1 our submarines alone had accounted for 313 Japanese ships, including 24 troop transports—many of them loaded—and 62 combat vessels. Our ships and carrier-based planes have destroyed more than one-third the total merchant tonnage Japan had at the time of Pearl Harbor. The guns of our warships have wrecked numerous Jap shore installations, our fighting planes have inflicted plane losses on the Japanese at a ratio in excess of 4 to 1.

In fulfilling the second objective, that of carrying supplies to our allies, the Navy has guarded more than $3,000,000,000 worth of food and war materials to Russia alone. From May through August this year the Navy escorted more than 4,000 United Nations ships across the Atlantic with losses from enemy submarines and planes of less than one-half of 1 percent. Incidentally, we have been able to seek out and to "kill" an imposing number of Axis U-boats.

In carrying out the third objective, the current invasion of Hitler's so-called impregnable continent, and the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who have been safely transported to European and African battle areas is convincing proof that our convoy system has been successful. No less important has been the transport and guarding of troops and supplies in the Pacific theater.

The landings on Sicily constituted the greatest naval invasion in history. It was not accomplished without losses. During the first 12 hours of that operation, in which we shared equal responsibility with the British Navy, naval losses were greater than those of the other branches of the armed services taking part. These operations employed a large force of landing craft, many of which were commanded by young officers who a little more than a year ago had been lawyers, engineers, insurance salesmen, or even students in our colleges and universities, some no doubt from the city of Indianapolis. Under this baptism of fire they showed the typical coolness that has carried other Americans victorious through battles since the days of Perry, Lawrence, Decatur, and Farragut. They got the Army there on time and landed their cargoes of men and equipment while carrying on a continuing fight against the land and air forces of a capable enemy.

All naval operations are joint operations; that is, all arms and all branches are employed together. Unity and teamwork is the basis of the Navy's fighting doctrine. It is the Navy's aim to strike the enemy at any given point with all arms that can be brought to bear, synchronized and coordinated in overwhelming assault. Understanding and comprehension, by those who handle any arm or weapon, of the problems of those who handle other naval components, together with some knowledge of the limitations and capabilities of such components, is an essential part of naval training.

It is the particular business of the Navy to gain and to keep control of the seas for the support and execution of our national policies. In this task we have employed and shall continue to employ every weapon available. The requirements of the particular mission will dictate how many and what types of weapons shall be used and in what proportion. But in whatever proportions they may be combined, it shall ever be the Navy's doctrine that they work as a team, each of whose members understands the part played by the others. One for all—and all for one.

By this integration of all our fighting arms in one competently directed, flexible, fighting organization, we have attained success to date. By the same means—integration—we shall go forward, playing our part in the realization of the inevitable victory.

We are fighting the hardest war this Nation has ever been called upon to fight. It is not yet won, in spite of all the ships we have sunk and all the ships we have built and all the men we have trained. Certainly there will be more "blood, sweat, and tears" ahead for all of us for some time to come for there is no cheap way to victory. We cannot sit back and wait for inventions or miracles to win the war for us for wars are not won that way.

Ever since the day that cave men discovered they could dispose of their opponents more expeditiously with stones or clubs than with bare hands, warfare has become increasingly complex. Every war in history has brought forth new developments to be countered by other developments, and this war is only different from previous ones in the increasing number and complexity of new weapons and the improvements of old weapons that it has been necessary to develop. It has been impressed upon us that in order to strike hardest and most effectively against the enemy we must have battleships, cruisers, carriers, aircraft, destroyers, submarines, and a multitude of other type vessels.

There must be a perfectly coordinated team for one is less effective without the other and most naval operations are multiple type operations. We, in the Navy realize full well what the late Knute Rockne meant when he said, "You may be the best ball carrier in the country or the best player or kicker, but if you can't block you can't play on my team."

We are going to need all the team play we are capable of developing, for we in the Navy are determined that the year ahead shall be recorded as "Our year of attack." Nothing in past history can be used as a comparison with what is to come, for nothing has taken place in the past that can equal the magnitude and the intensity of effort which must be expended to gain victory.

You people here in Indianapolis and the people of this State have given our Navy splendid backing, both in men and materials of war. Now that you and the millions of other citizens of our country are giving us the ships, the planes, and the other implements of war, we in the Navy are not only confident of victory, but we are determined that the defeat of our enemies shall speedily be accomplished.

Your Navy will not fail you.

We have just begun to fight!

I have a postscript for my Navy Day speech to you.

Now, I have, quite naturally, been talking to you about the Navy, because it is Navy Day.

I would not have you think for one moment that the Navy considers itself other than one member of a team; the other part is the Army, with whom we work closely throughout the world against our common enemies.

Evidence of the fraternity that is a real and powerful force in the armed forces of the United States is conveyed by these two letters:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
October 26, 1943.

DEAR KING: I wish to go beyond the customary formal greetings of Navy Day this year to express to you the grateful appreciation of 2,000,000 and more soldiers now in far combat zones, and their families at home, for the superb protective convoying of the Navy.

Cooperation between the Army and the Navy has made possible the great successes of the past year. My congratulations go to

you and the sailors of the Navy and Coast Guard who have contributed so much to the success of the hazardous amphibious operations of the past year.

I salute the most powerful Navy in the world with the admiration and respect of the entire Army, air and ground.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS OF COMMANDER
IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES FLEET,
October 26, 1943.

DEAR MARSHALL: I have your kind letter with its Navy Day greetings, and particularly appreciate, on behalf of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, the special character of the message you convey in the name of the entire Army, air and ground.

The cooperation between the Army and Navy, which you speak of as making possible the successes of the past year, will serve to make known to our friends and to our enemies that we, the Army and Navy, together and forever, are united in the service of our flag and our country.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. KING.

Navy Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Navy Day address by Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, the Chief of Naval Personnel, at Chicago, Ill., October 27, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be with you on Navy Day, in the center of a region so important to the Navy's growth and continuing success.

Under the auspices of the Navy League, we celebrate today the genesis of our Navy in 1775. Yet, this is not really a celebration. It is rather a rededication to the purpose for which the United States Navy was established.

In years past the Nation has paid its respects to the Navy and its heroic officers and men who have given their lives in the service of their country. Now, in time of war, these gatherings on Navy Day take on added meaning as we go forward in our determination to achieve full and complete victory over our enemies.

Your Navy today is the largest, the most formidable, the best equipped, and best manned in the history of the world. In the midst of war, the United States has built its Navy into the greatest sea-air power on earth. Its size is dwarfed only by the size of the task which confronts it.

The growth of the Navy in the last 3 years has no parallel in history. In the 3 years between July 1, 1940, and July 1, 1943, there were completed 15,376 new ships of all types, aggregating 2,200,000 displacement tons. This new construction comprised the following: 23,000 planes, 333 combatant vessels, 1,274 mine craft and patrol craft, 151 auxiliaries, 654 yard and district craft, and 12,964 landing craft.

These ships and planes were built with remarkable speed and with great economy of man-hours. The 45,000-ton battleship *New Jersey* was built in 33 months, as compared to the 45 months required to build the 35,000-ton *Washington*.

Many such instances of constant speeding up of our shipbuilding program could be cited. In total, they mean that, for example, we were able to build in the month of June alone, this year, approximately as many vessels as were completed in the first 18 months of the defense program. In aircraft, in ordnance, and in facilities, the same kind of progress has been made.

As you can imagine, such phenomenal growth of our Navy in ships, equipment, and facilities has necessitated a corresponding growth in personnel. The total of naval personnel on active duty increased more than 13 times between July 1, 1940, and September 1, 1943. Compared to 161,000 3 years ago we now have in total personnel, including officers and enlisted men, well over 2,000,000 on active duty. This is 4 times the maximum strength of the Navy in the last war.

Included in the total of 2,000,000 are the WAVES, which have grown to approximately 38,000 since its inception in July 1942. By comparison, the Navy had 11,275 yeomanettes in the last war.

The WAVES have proved invaluable to the Navy. They have attracted the finest type of young American womanhood. They are a decided credit to the service. Both officers and enlisted personnel of the WAVES are serving a highly important purpose in taking over certain duties, thereby releasing men for front line service. They are doing these jobs efficiently and well. We hope that many more will join their ranks, thus releasing even larger numbers of men for sea duty.

This growth in naval personnel has called for tremendous expansion and development of facilities for training the men and women who have entered the naval service since the emergency began.

It is the responsibility of the Bureau of Naval Personnel to conduct the programs of training and off-duty education authorized for all naval personnel. In this activity we have been fortunate that the educational institutions of the country have come forward with such generous provision of their facilities for this important work. To these institutions will go no small share of credit for the winning of the war. They are making possible the rapid and thorough training of thousands of men and women for both the Army and Navy.

At the outset I said I was happy to take part in this Navy Day observance in a region so important to the continuing growth and success of the Navy. I meant just that, for here in the Middle West a very substantial contribution is being made to the development of our whole Naval Establishment—in shipbuilding, in manufacturing, in recruitment, and in training. From nine States in this part of the country have come an estimated one-quarter of our total enlisted naval personnel.

In this region also are dozens of colleges and universities cooperating in the Navy's vast training program. Northwestern University has one of the four Naval Reserve midshipmen's schools, a Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit, and medical and dental students pursuing their courses under the Navy college program, V-12. The University of Chicago is cooperating in officer training for the Women's Reserve, officer technical training, service school training for enlisted personnel, and also has medical and dental students studying under the Navy college program. The University of Illinois, Loyola University, and others are cooperating.

Nearby is the Great Lakes Naval Training Station where thousands of enlisted men are pursuing a variety of training programs to fit them for duty in accordance with needs of the service. This training station has a capacity of approximately 75,000.

In the other States of this region, as in every part of the country, the same cooperation is being given by colleges and universities—the University of Indiana, Marquette University, the University of Notre Dame, the University of Minnesota, Iowa State Teachers College, the University of Wisconsin, to mention a few. There are many, many others.

Near these institutions the people have become accustomed to men in the uniform of the Navy about the streets. Although they have become a familiar sight, I wonder whether you realize that they form a constantly changing picture. The uniforms are the same—the men are not. They are with you for a short time, then they move along to take their places on the battle fronts of the world.

Think for a moment not of the boys you saw today but of those you saw a few months or even a few weeks ago. They are on our fighting ships, a part of the great organization which is the Navy, patrolling the sea lanes, seeking and accepting battle with enemy fleets, convoying thousands of merchant ships to supply the needs of our armed forces abroad, participating in the bold invasion of enemy territory.

Most of these men are not of the old-line, Regular Navy. By far the great majority of officers and men in the Navy today are the Reserves—those who are in it because we are at war and because they chose this particular service in which to do their part. They are intelligent, eager to learn, and in deadly earnest about doing their duty. And they are giving an exceptionally fine account of themselves.

Our records contain thousands of entries concerning commendations, citations, and decorations awarded to the officers and men of this "land lubber navy"—these boys who came off the prairie farms and out of the factories and shops and offices of the Middle West. The records likewise, I must add, show the numbers who have given their lives in the performance of their duty.

Such men took part in the invasion of Sicily—the greatest undertaking of its kind in military history. A war correspondent covering that operation aboard a naval vessel wrote of its crew: "After being with them through this operation, I must say my respect for the Navy is great. The personnel for this great task had to be built as quickly as the fleet itself. There were 1,000 officers staffing these new-type invasion ships, and less than 20 of them were Regular Navy men. The rest were all erstwhile civilians trained almost overnight into seadogs."

The war correspondents lived with these men through the invasion experience. They found out how they reacted to the preparation period, the hour of setting sail, the first experience under fire, the arduous task of pushing through to finish the job. They have told the story in words and pictures, and I hope everyone is familiar with it. Americans can be proud of their citizens—the clerks, the theater ushers, the lawyers, the farmers, the mechanics, the salesmen—who have shown the world how to fight.

These men know that this is a big war and a tough one. They have tested the mettle of the enemy and they know his caliber. They have a realistic view of the war and its progress.

I do not mean that our fighting men are not confident of the final outcome of the war. They are. They know that the people back home are giving them and will continue to give them what they need in ships, guns, and equipment to carry the fight to a successful conclusion. They are sure of our power to force victory. But they know that there is a long and bloody road to travel before the final knockout is delivered to the enemy.

It is barely short of miraculous that the Navy we possess today grew to such size from its pre-war condition. It is fortunate, indeed, that we were able within a few months to provide ourselves a fleet large enough and strong enough to fight a global war.

We scrapped a large part of our Navy after the Washington disarmament conference of

1921, when we seemed more interested in an ideal than in our own preservation. Our ideal was to end the naval building race, thus further insuring peace for a war-torn world.

We promised by treaty not to fortify islands in the western Pacific. We voluntarily scrapped a substantial number of our capital ships then built and building. Later, at the Geneva conference we sought to extend the principle of disarmament to cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, but this move was blocked by Japan. Nevertheless, we continued to champion the cause, and at the London conference of 1930 we gained an extension of the disarmament program, although at the cost of increasing the Japanese ratio. We even went so far as to hold our own construction actually below the strength prescribed in the program.

Japan did not wait long to show what she thought of such good faith. The invasion of Manchuria in 1931 touched off the conflagration which engulfs the world today.

The men who are fighting in our new Navy are determined that the American people will not follow such a course of altruism in the future. The mission of the Navy is to defend this Nation, its people, and its institutions, against aggression. That mission cannot be performed with mobilization blueprints carefully filed away in Washington. It can be performed only with ships, guns, planes, and trained men—a complete and adequate naval establishment—ready to spring into action the moment attack comes from any quarter.

But we of the Navy must have help in this.

There must be a civilian organization outside the Navy but closely tied to it which must at all times keep before the Congress and the people the need for a powerful Navy. Such an organization exists today; the Navy League of the United States.

I beseech you of the Navy League—build strong your organization so that the needs of your Navy may not be neglected.

When this war is over it will be the task of the strongest nations to see that the peace is not broken. The United States must do its part by maintaining sufficient force of arms to make aggression against us or against our interests a most risky thing for any other nation to attempt. The Navy is an instrument for the purpose. Let us determine to keep it strong to do that job. But, most important of all, let us pledge the full faith and strength of America to the Navy and all of our armed forces whose task now is to bring victory at the earliest possible hour.

Down-Trend of Gray Iron Castings Output Magnifies Critical Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

MANPOWER PROBLEMS AND SHARPLY INCREASED OPERATING COSTS SERIOUSLY CURTAILING IRON CASTINGS VOLUME, THREATENING OTHER WAR PRODUCTION — WHY ROLE OF GRAY IRON FOUNDRY CASTINGS FOR WAR WAS "UNAPPRECIATED" BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, NOT PERMITTED TO "FILL IN" IN FACE OF KNOWN STEEL SHORTAGE — PROMPT ACTION NEEDED TODAY TO KEEP THIS GIANT OF SCATTERED LOCAL SMALL BUSINESS UNITS ON WAR PRODUCTION LINE—ANSWER TO CHALLENGE: HOW IS THE LITTLE FELLOW IN BUSINESS TO PROGRESS AND HOLD HIS DUE RECOGNITION?

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is no longer restricted military information that this Nation, fighting an intense, far-flung war demanding steel and iron in vast abundance, faces a large and critical shortage of these vitally important materials. This shortage is not a prospect—it is a grim, stark-staring reality, revealed by the War Production Board and known to the public. It is not only a threat to war production, but to the reconversion of industry and jobs for returning soldiers and war workers.

During the past 3 months our steel mills reportedly ran steadily close to 100 percent of rated capacity. Steel production during that period, however, was some 6 million tons short of the requirements of our Army, our Navy, our shipbuilding program, and other war needs. Figured on the annual tonnage basis, our steel shortage is staggering and challenging. This is the same industry that has enjoyed vast generosities, exceeding a billion dollars in Government funds, handed out to expand and to modernize antiquated iron and steel plant facilities.

OVERWHELMING STEEL AND IRON PRODUCTION NEEDED TO TIP SCALES OF WAR DECISIVELY

That this shortage arose is one of the mysteries incredible to those who recall the famous Gano Dun report and other bland assurances of the steel industry that there would be no shortage of steel, assurances given so freely as the Nation began its production for war. Today that shortage is accompanied by a decline in iron-foundry production—a decline in the face of a marked growth of booked orders.

It is apparent to the most casual observer that steel and iron are vital to victory and that a persisting shortage of these materials stands like a mountain between victory and defeat, between freedom and slavery. Only with an abundance of iron and steel can our Army and Navy fight the way to victory and peace. This shortage is certain to slow up the drive of our armed forces and prolong the struggle, at the cost of human suffering.

The United States still produces more steel than the Axis. The enemy, however, has a tremendous transportation advantage. So to tip the scales of Mars definitely toward a swift, conclusive victory we must produce enough iron and steel to overwhelm any enemy advantage.

MANPOWER DRAIN, RISING COSTS, PLAGUE IRON FOUNDRIES

Can we attain that superiority, that advantage, while we waste vital steel in applications which could well use other material? Are we attaining it when we needlessly overdesign our war equipment that requires vital steel in quantities beyond steel-mill capacity? Can we achieve overwhelming superiority in steel without at the same time crowding our numerous iron foundries to step into the breach created by our steel shortage with all its power?

It was my great privilege, some weeks ago, to participate in a war council of the gray-iron industry, its second wartime and fifteenth annual conference, held in Cincinnati.

That meeting, attended by hundreds of foundry operating executives—big and little concerns alike—from every section of the country, focused sharply the bedeviling, near-crisis-stage problems of manpower and rising costs that are largely responsible for the downtrend of iron-foundry production, for the declining output that magnifies our steel shortage to alarming proportions.

ROLE IS ESSENTIAL—BUT NOT APPRECIATED

Both manpower problems and sharply rising production costs are common today, of course. We cannot build a striking force of 11 million men without creating manpower problems. But should these problems be permitted to disrupt an industry so vital in the arming of these men?

Although its function in war, as in peacetime, is highly significant, this industry of widely scattered local foundries appears to have been unappreciated by war production planners. Obviously, the industry was not considered essential, as essential as it appears today in view of the inability of our steel mills materially to increase their output.

Perhaps those whose responsibility is war production were overly impressed with the notion that modern warfare is a conflict in which equipment is subjected to great stresses and strains.

But most severe usuage can be reliably measured, just as the molten casting metal can be made of a particular composition or given the treatment for acquiring the strength needed. Such data are reducible to understandable specifications. Much of this humble material is in this war. It is found in our war equipment. It is carrying on nobly. Sometimes, however, it is identified under other names.

Or perhaps facts brought to the attention of a committee of which I have the honor to be chairman—facts indicative of the ability of the gray-iron industry to adapt itself to many phases of the steel-shortage situation—were not impressed early enough on Government agencies when war production was being planned. Certainly they were not fully appreciated.

HOUSE IRON AND STEEL SHORTAGE INVESTIGATION CONCERNED OVER CRITICAL FOUNDRY PROBLEMS

Perhaps the early presence of more influential interests explains the neglect of this essential industry, which has resulted in a gradual decadence in its labor supply, with a deterioration of margins to a critical no-profit status and an output level at which it is now too crippled to meet the tonnage demands made upon it.

The congressional committee investigating the steel and iron shortage situation is deeply concerned over the condition and problems of the gray iron casting industry. It is aware that victory depends on an adequate, constant supply of steel and iron for an ever-increasing output of all the implements of war. Every ton of steel replaceable by this or any other material releases just that much vital steel for application in which steel is indispensable.

Mr. Speaker, our committee is making a thorough inquiry into the reasons for the situation which has been permitted to develop in the gray-iron industry during this critical period.

Permit me to suggest the essential character of this industry, to picture this giant "small business" industry, and to outline its major problems.

A VETERAN OF MANY WARS

The gray-iron industry in America, which is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, of capital-goods industries, has its roots in antiquity. Primitive armaments, as well as plowshares, were among its early products. Its fascinating science, its adaptability to new situations and mechanical change, its almost unlimited usefulness have evolved through centuries. And, though it has run the gantlet of war demands and peacetime progress through the ages, its product remains today a basic material in manufacture, in transportation, in daily use in ever-expanding applications.

In America this industry is credited with a history of achievement equaled by few basic industries. It numbers nearly 29 hundred small enterprises, scattered in every State of the Union. Its aggregate of about 5 thousand cupolas produces in a normal year over 9 million tons of castings, with a value exceeding $1.5 billion. While the average foundry provides work for about 80 employees, 2 thousand of them employ an average of but 28. This is decidedly the small-business end—the neglected and unappreciated end—of our most basic industry on which all other mechanical production relies for iron and steel.

EXTENSIVE USES REVEAL ITS ADAPTABILITY TO CHANGING WAR STRATEGY

"While ages old," the progressive foundry-practice counselor, A. J. Edgar, reminds us, "this industry is traditionally American. In it there remains great freedom of enterprise and room for the pioneer and the resourceful business mind to enter and forge ahead."

Here I find the forces of monopoly have made no significant headway. This industry impresses me, as it will impress you, Mr. Speaker, with its mystery, its colorful record of real achievement and its creative genius.

In peacetime, gray iron, one of the oldest cast metals, takes almost infinite variety of form. It would be extremely difficult to name a product or a service essential to our economy which does not use this metal. These castings facilitate production of food and manufacture of clothing, as well as provide most of the necessities and luxuries of life. It is employed in mining and milling, in construction, in transportation and shipping, in agriculture, in the automotive, chemical, rubber, paper, printing, and hundreds of other industries, in production of oil, in thousands upon thousands of machines, implements, gears, and gadgets.

Gray iron is pistons, shafts, motor blocks, Diesels. It is machine frames and working parts, caustic pots, cooking utensils, glass molds. It is dies, housings, furnaces, brake mechanisms, marine hardware, manhole covers, valve bodies, bearings, paving blocks—thousands of other things. You will find this omni-present metal in locomotives and in toys, in radios and waffle irons, in stone crushers and sun dial supports. You will find it in drop hammers and excavators, in burglar alarms and bulldozers—in just about every phase of modern life in this machine age.

OUTPUT OF GRAY-IRON CASTINGS EQUALS NEARLY FOURTH OF NATION'S FINISHED STEEL TONNAGE

It is hardly conceivable that an industry so important to war and peacetime progress could have been so overlooked in this crisis.

Nevertheless, this industry is frowned upon in the bureaus. When relief from half-baked regulations is requested, it is not uncommon to hear its pleadings dismissed with the inconsiderate bureau observation that "It's a low-profit industry, anyway." You see, Mr. Speaker, they are small but they are honestly competitive.

Although gray iron has not been officially assigned a great or important place in wartime production, it nevertheless is performing a great and important wartime role.

As in all small business, the operators in this industry have responded nobly, wherever allowed. These thousands of foundries are fighting for victory and peace without ballyhoo. Though permitted to increase their tonnage output but a little over a total of 5 million tons of castings, the employees and management of only three gray iron foundries are found to have been recognized by the much coveted Army-Navy E award for war production.

In 1942 the industry, thoroughly wrapped in limitation orders, produced 14.5 million tons—mind you, tons—of castings. That 1942 output is more than 50 percent greater than pre-war tonnage. It was six times that of steel castings. If permitted to work at plant capacity, the industry is still capable of meeting vastly increased demands for both military and civilian requirements.

In what uses did we find these new millions of tons of gray-iron castings? To help win a global war, of course. A great part of the 1942 production of this metal was also home-front production, for it continues to perform, day in and day out, countless essential civilian functions in many of the important applications that were its role in days of peace.

This important material is still helping to produce food, clothing, shelter, comfort; it is still the traditional material for machine-tool frames and parts. Yes, it is still providing marine engines, liners, cylinders, bearings, and braking parts. It is still a widely used engineering material—admittedly or not.

IT'S JUST LITTLE BUSINESS DOING A BIG AND IMPORTANT JOB

From the first day of the defense program, gray-iron foundries have been producing for war. And, although this is a war of terrific stresses and strains, this metal is at the battle fronts, as it is in the supply line and on the home front. Were it not present, our other war industries would find it difficult indeed to produce the mountains of supplies necessary to send along with 11 million men.

For an industry that is small business, that is not invited for advice or called upon in shaping policy and determining practices, that has no representatives in key Government posts, and that is made up of little units scattered throughout the land, it has made a gigantic contribution to the war.

True, these small-business people have not maintained lavish headquarters from which to high-pressure Washington bureau executives. The result is evidently a loss to the Nation's war production. Though we are admittedly short of critical steel, these foundries have been permitted to deteriorate into a condition that is depriving us of millions of tons of iron castings.

LIKE SITUATION EXISTS IN MALLEABLE IRON, BUT NOT IN STEEL

The gray-iron industry, as I have said, has been experiencing a gradual deterioration in the quantity and quality of its labor supply, until the situation has become acute. The output is expected to decline from the 1942 total of 14.5 million tons of castings to 12 million tons or less this year. And this is not the result, now, of a shortage of orders.

The same situation appears in the Nation's 113 malleable-iron foundries. Recent information indicates a progressive tonnage decline in malleable-iron castings from 77 thousand in March to 66 thousand in July. Evaluation of labor supply and production in steel foundries, however, is more difficult. Since the drastic cut-back in the arms program, there has been a shift from certain military types to nonarmament castings. The Nation's 450 steel-casting foundries report, however, that they are experiencing great difficulty in meeting quotas.

LABOR COSTS GOING UP

Against the fall in production, labor costs are rising in the gray-iron-foundry industry. Man-hours-per-ton of good castings and average wages per man-hour are rising. The man-hours-per-ton index is affected by:

First: Loss of skilled and competent unskilled and semiskilled workers;

Second: Inferior quality of new employees;

Third: Inability to hire common labor to fetch and carry for skilled workers; and

Fourth: High rates of turn-over and absenteeism.

Procurement and retention of competent common labor are reported to be the most serious of this industry's labor supply problems. This is frequently attributed to the higher wage rates obtainable elsewhere and to the greater attractiveness of jobs in "clean" industries. The average wage per man-hour is rising because of:

First: Upgrading, some of which is "artificial";

Second: Adjustments between high- and low-wage employees of the same class;

Third: Necessity of using skilled workers at unskilled tasks during regular and overtime periods; and

Fourth: General increase of overtime.

DISORGANIZATION ENDANGERS WAR EFFORT

The impact of all this on the 29 hundred gray-iron and the 113 malleable foundries is resulting in rising total costs, declining profits, losses, and, eventually, desperation and disorganization—disorganization dangerous to the war effort.

Steel foundries, however, are not suffering as much as gray-iron and malleable foundries. Their labor situation is better, for wage rates were relatively higher before the wage freeze. And their profit position is particularly good as the result of an unexpectedly favorable price structure on military items.

The price implications are perfectly clear. Hence, the committee has been urging better bureau understanding on the manpower and cost-price problems of the iron foundries. It continues to urge relief cooperation strongly.

INDUSTRY FORCED TO REFUSE WAR ORDERS

At the Cincinnati conference of the gray-iron industry a foundry executive, speaking from the floor and addressing a War Manpower Commission executive, stated:

It has come to the point where we have to refuse to accept any more of that (Government) business because of the critical labor shortage.

We produce,

He said,

Many, many thousands of tons of castings for synthetic rubber and for 100-octane gas. We had just about completed a 10,000-ton order when we were confronted with a 15,000-ton order, which we had to refuse because of a shortage of unskilled labor. Since last October our force has dropped from 500 to 367, with an actual working force of 310.

We did what we could—and probably a little more. We made welders and casting grinders out of husky girls; but we ask ourselves: If we make chippers out of those girls, won't the tank and other plants in our vicinity take them away, take them into Government-subsidized plants and pay them 30 or 40 cents an hour more than we can pay, since the wages we pay are frozen?

We must have unskilled labor. Manpower Commission representatives have been in our plant trying to figure out something we could do to give the Government gray-iron castings needed in cracking plants throughout the Southern States, in Russia, and in some places over in the Pacific, too. It has come to the point where we have to refuse any more of that business.

TYPICAL BUREAU ATTITUDE

And to that statement the War Manpower Commission executive replied:

The question covers a very broad field. In my mind, unskilled labor, as such, will not get on the critical list of occupations. Rather, we have instructed the local selective service boards in localities of acute labor shortage or in plants having peculiar requirements to give the highest consideration to the factor of replacement.

And that is the treatment that we think and we hope we will give you, so that you will get some measure of relief.

You have a sort of Damocles sword hanging over you to see if you can get along without these strong backs.

A NEAR-CRISIS SITUATION IMMINENT

These words, Mr. Speaker, present more strikingly than mine the manpower situation in the gray-iron-foundry industry: "It has come to the point where we must refuse any more of that business." Let that statement run through your mind a moment.

Multiply it a hundred, a thousand times, for the manpower problem has become the common problem of this entire industry. Fathom its implications. We are short of manpower; we must refuse any more of that business. "We did what we could—and probably a little more."

If the future of our war production must be measured in those words, Mr. Speaker, they have an ominous sound.

Is the only answer to the present critical manpower problem of the iron foundries—a problem aggravating the steel shortage situation—the answer given by this W. M. C. executive?

You have a sort of Damocles sword hanging over you to see if you can get along without these strong backs.

SHARP-EDGED SWORDS OF DAMOCLES

The manpower situation is truly a sword of Damocles. And rising total costs in the industry, operations at a loss, the threat of demoralization, failure of the Government to appreciate the gravity of the situation and its end cost, remedies by and by, delays in granting relief, labyrinthical procedures, multiplicity of forms—these, too, are swords of Damocles hanging threateningly over the industry and over our program of production for war, swords sharp-edged enough to cut us off from victory, to cut us off from freedom. Must they continue over their heads?

It is plain enough that we need mountains of tanks, planes, ships, guns, vehicles to win this war. It is equally obvious, or should be, that all iron foundries must be kept on the production line operating at capacity and efficiently, if we are to deliver armament, food, and other necessary supplies in mountainous quantities and good quality to our Army, Navy, and allies.

WHAT EXCUSES CAN BE OFFERED?

Is there an acceptable excuse, then, for failure to take immediate steps to remedy a situation which forces our iron foundry management—men as wholeheartedly determined to win this war as our armed forces—to say:

We must refuse any more of that business.

Shipments of gray-iron castings continue to decline. There are frantic calls, day after day, for engine-block castings. There is a growing shortage of these castings of many forms and for many purposes. Our bureaus have permitted a situation to arise which forces foundry management to say: "It has come to the point where we must refuse any more of that business." What are the excuses for this situation?

TIME FOR ACTION

Surely, this is the time for action, the time to determine what is essential and what is nonessential—not on the basis of bland bias or pressure, but on the basis of common sense and a full appreciation of war requirements.

Our committee encourages allotment of the limited steel supply to uses for which a good substitute cannot be found. It urges thorough, immediate study to determine the full extent to which gray iron and other materials may be substituted for vital steel and thus relieve steel capacity. It urges action—prompt, intelligent, resultful action—on manpower, prices, and the supply of raw materials problems of the iron-castings industry.

FULL USE OF EXISTING PLANT CAPACITY IMPERATIVE

Men thoroughly familiar with the problems, the possibilities, and the wide uses of this industry's products should be placed in key Government positions immediately. The Washington bureaus that deal with steel, rubber, oil, chemicals, and aluminum show ample precedent. Every possible measure must be taken to stress the essential character of the industry's employees. We must bring gray iron in to fill the steel shortage breach for both war and mounting civilian requirements as all metal industries begin their reconversion to postwar production.

In my address to the war council of this industry, I pointed out that, since this metal may relieve a part of the burden of the steel supply, it is important that Congress inquire into the reasons why such iron castings are not more widely used in this war. It is our business to know the answers. Such an inquiry remains worth while.

COMPETITORS CONTROL ITS MATERIALS SOURCES

Mr. Speaker, I stressed that the output of critical pig iron, which the gray-iron industry must have in great tonnage, has been for decades efficiently controlled by the steel industry, its producers. Pig iron, vital to the very existence of the small-business units producing these castings, is the product of the very same steel industry that sells finished sheet steel, the industry whose sheet products are pressed into the "stampings" which invade the iron castings market in many items.

ROLE OF THE LITTLE FELLOW IN RECONVERSION

To that war council I emphasized that almost every producer of rival materials has been closely associated in trade groups for years. Some of the groups are adequately financed. Others are vigorously led. They serve their common good by underwriting research, technological development, trade and market expansion, sometimes employee training. In recent times trade associations have lent able leadership in dealing with mounting problems of Government relations.

Uncle Sam is a prime customer today, so it becomes intelligent sales management for producers of a like product or service to cooperate with fellow producers to see that they receiye full recognition in the scheme of our war and peacetime economy.

I consider it merely intelligent business, Mr. Speaker, for every foundry operator, however small or isolated his business, to register his pride and his interest in the future of his industry and the confidence he has in his wonderful product, by meeting regularly in the voluntary congress assembled for his industry. Here he can help to formulate pol-

icy in the democratic fashion and learn to assist his fellow producers in meeting common problems.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, through intelligent cooperation in his local industry led by a strong national program, such independent business interests may permanently be assured of their right of free enterprise.

Benjamin Franklin once counseled our bedeviled forefathers to work together for their common good. For the little fellow today faced with powerful combines and influential competition, I see no other way for him effectively to anticipate and, if need be, to resist unfair encroachment.

WHY WAS GRAY IRON SLIGHTED?

Industries unified and equipped with an effective program got in on war production early in this crisis. Their counsel was eagerly sought by a Government which approached the war in bewilderment. Such industries were invited to loan executives to head key Government posts and to help shape policy. I am a firm believer in seeking such intelligent guidance, especially where the executives so appointed are selected from every segment of the people whose industry is to play a leading role.

In the early days, when war production was being planned, the gray-iron-foundry industry was slighted, however, for reasons all too apparent. Perhaps because time had outmoded the cast-iron cannon and cast-iron shot and bombs of other wars, our war-production planners concluded, shall I say, in innocence that this metal is too weak a material for war service.

However, such trusted bureau executives should have known, whether told or not, the history of gray iron. They should have been aware that it is a far cry from cast-iron kettles and cannon to the qualities of iron castings that foundries are today producing.

They should have studied its record in the great war of 1914–18 and become aware of the demands made on it then and the service it rendered. They should have known of the giant strides in progress made by the industry in recent decades.

They should not have been forced to now redesign war implements to use gray iron; they should have known from the outset this industry's ready capacity, and the accomplishments of modern gray iron.

They should have known the tonnage output this industry was instantly capable of without delay and without the usual Government factory grant handouts known to competing industries. They should have been mindful of the fact that vital castings for rubber, oil, the shipbuilding industry, for guns, machine tools, for all the war industries cannot be produced on schedule by foundries short of essential manpower and plagued by rising costs of operation.

All this may, in fact, have been known. Certainly, however, it was not appreciated. There may even have been some discrimination. Every citizen is interested in knowing why this vital industry is so shackled.

LITTLE FELLOW WILL SURVIVE BY COOPERATING

Like the small business interests that have given America its real greatness, this industry is capable of aggressive cooperation. But blame for the situation cannot be placed on the 29 hundred scattered local foundries for failing to finance a lobby to enlighten Washington bureaus. That is the job of our bureaus entrusted with planning production for war. It is the responsibility of Government officials to know what is important to war service and what is not important. Officials surely are able to make decisions on the basis of known facts, but possibly they were unwilling to incur disfavor—in the presence of pressures exerted by producers of rival materials. This is their duty.

To this promising American industry I stressed that from my 40 years in business I find that to get business and to secure yourself in what you have attained it is necessary to be on guard constantly, and ready to fight if need be.

The industry whose individual members are intelligently cooperating, those who are pledged to a sound program, with leadership ready constantly to meet this changing world—and the gray-iron-foundries are capable of such leadership—is the industry which advances in this progressive age, and both its employees and operators prosper.

Had these scattered foundries such an aggressive leadership the efficiency of both the war effort and the reconversion of all industry ahead would be materially bettered.

GENUINE RECOGNITION OF SMALL BUSINESS IMPERATIVE TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE

America has attained a manufacturing volume nearly 100 percent greater than that of the boom year 1929. In dollar value, production of American factories may reach one hundred and forty billion, as compared with sixty-eight billion in 1929 and fifty-seven billion in 1939.

Our war needs this year are estimated to be upward of one hundred billion. We have attained new heights, but we shall not hold them unless we really appreciate the genius of industry that is truly American.

Various polls of public opinion indicate a marked shifting of interest to post-war planning, post-war job security, and the future of small, independent business. It must be remembered that industries, such as these gray-iron casting producers, are expected to continue to place sizable pay envelopes in the hands of local residents who a few years ago were on relief.

Hope for continuance of such full employment is necessarily a powerful urge, for hand in hand with freedom of enterprise for small business is recognition of man's right to earn a decent living.

To realize that hope, it is necessary to appreciate the possibilities of such humble, unglamorous but essential local industries. The Congress must help them battle for their rightful position in both war and peacetime planning and prevent disorganization.

The sincerity of our concern here over the little fellow—the backbone of our American economy—is seriously in doubt if we fail to expedite relief where it is so badly needed.

The Transition to Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover, relating to post-war problems:

Our first task today is victory in this war. But we must also prepare for peace.

What does America want from this war? We want no domination over other nations. We want no colonies. We want no special economic privileges. We can secure no consequential indemnities. We have just one great interest. We do not want our youth sacrificed again. We do not want our whole economic and social progress set back another quarter of a century by the aftermaths of another total war. What we want is a lasting peace.

This is the first of all our post-war problems. It is the most difficult of all. Given lasting peace, the business world can restore employment. We can lift the standards of living of the American people to heights of comfort and security beyond men's dreams. But if there are to be world wars every 25 years civilization itself will be destroyed—our own included.

Our people in every village and our men on every front are discussing the problems of peace as never before.

When I listen to the vast ferment of peace discussion in public addresses, when I read the news in the daily press, and the constant output of books, when I study resolutions and the debate on them, I am impressed with a certain lack of reality. And our language is gloriously equipped for mass production of nebular words.

The world has for 5,000 years failed to make lasting peace. And with the birth of total war the problems of peace have been infinitely multiplied. I am convinced that we must abandon old formulas of peace making and adopt a new approach, to this gigantic problem.

Beginning some 18 months ago I have urged that instead of a long armistice and a general peace conference we should definitely organize a transition period of a few years under the leadership or trusteeship of the leading victorious nations.

I am glad to see that these ideas, under varied terms, are making headway among leaders of thought.

They offer a common ground upon which Americans of divergent views could work more effectively toward real peace.

I propose tonight to explore further with you the makings of lasting peace. And to do this exploring with our feet on the ground.

There are inevitable shapes in the world to come which must be taken into our national thinking. Some of them are already beginning to emerge, even in the darkness of war.

NATIONALISM

Among those shapes is nationalism. And that is the most powerful of all forces in international relations. Within it lies the freedom of peoples, their independence, their sovereignty, and their equal rights.

And nationalism is a shape which profoundly affects the organization of lasting peace. It is a problem of legal interpretations, of frank realism, and of deep human emotions.

In the field of realism it should be obvious to all Americans that many of the United Nations have already proclaimed nationalistic objectives for which they are fighting. Mr. Stalin has not hesitated to indicate with positive frankness territorial expansion for Russia over previously independent peoples. Mr. Churchill has stated categorically that the British Empire will not be liquidated notwithstanding critics in the United States. Mr. Chiang Kai-shek has been unhesitating in stating that China will restore her ancient boundaries with all foreign squatters evicted. Holland says she will recover her colonies.

Sixteen nations enslaved by our enemies are trusting in the assurance of the Atlantic Charter, that "sovereign rights and self-government be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." And other submerged peoples are clamoring for freedom and sovereignty to govern themselves.

Aside from these practical evidences, the emotional basis of nationalism is no less a potent force in the shape of things to come.

The furnace of war heats and hardens nationalism. Each nation has again laid its dead upon the altar of its country. These died with their national flag before their eyes and their national hymns upon their lips. The pride of race has swelled from their suffering and sacrifice.

Nationalism rises from the deepest instincts and emotions of mankind. It springs from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice, and pride in achievement. Nationalism can run to excesses. It can be either a cause of wars or a bulwark of peace and progress. It can run to greed and domination over others or it can bring the thousand blessings of freedom.

Americans can test this upon themselves. Does not the word "America" stir something deeper within us than mere geography? Does not the suffering and the sacrifice of our forebears who fought for our independence flash in our minds with every mention of that word? Was it not our independence which gave the most expansive release to the creative spirit of mankind in all history? Was it not the release of intellectual and spiritual freedom on this continent that gave the moral strength and the self-reliance which penetrated these plains and forests?

I am not impressed by the idea that America has grown great by the benevolence of any other government. In 300 years our people have forged new concepts of life. We have departed greatly in our thinking from the many nations from which we sprang.

It was the freeing of the minds of men from the restraints of the Old World that stirred the initiative which brought into being these inventions, these discoveries of science, these great industrial tools, these farms, these homes, these magnificent cities, these schools, these churches. It was this release of spirit that developed a higher devotion to the welfare of man than the world has ever seen.

Indeed the word "America" has become an expression of the spirit. It does not mean isolationism. For just as we have valued our own independence, we have fought for the independence of other peoples

We are told that we have had no foreign policy. Perhaps future historians, studying this last 130 years, will say that America had the most powerful of foreign policies That is helping other nations to gain freedom and independence and protecting those who have secured it.

Those historians would point to the Monroe Doctrine which protected and preserved the independence of the nations in the Western Hemisphere. They would point to the war with Mexico to free Texas and California, securing to them self-government within our Union. Again the historians would point to the war with Spain to free Cuba and the Philippines. They would point to World War No. 1 to establish the independence of nine new nations in Europe. They would point to the present World War where our men are fighting to preserve the independence of Britain, France, Russia, China, and 16 little nations.

And has not the United States been the actuating inspiration of freedom for all nations through all these years?

If this is not a foreign policy it certainly is a century-long crusade. Generations of Americans have died for it.

Other nations, also from their traditions, their trials, and their triumphs have developed a nationalism which runs no less deeply than our own. They too feel more than geography in their words—Britain, Russia, France, Belgium, Poland. They are equally proud of their countries. They are equally determined to die if need be to maintain their independence.

Whatever may be said of nationalism, it is real and it is a part of the shapes to come after this war. If we scan either history or the declarations now being made we must conclude that other nations will be little inclined to surrender their independence or any part of their sovereignty to anybody. That is an inevitable reality from which there is no escape. Lasting peace will not be built upon any surrender of the independence or sovereignty of nations but that it must be built upon the collaboration of free peoples.

Certainly I do not believe that peace can be built upon any sacrifice of the independence or sovereignty of the United States.

Therefore, I suggest that planners of peace incorporate into their thinking the idea that nations will maintain their full independence and their full sovereignty. And it is only upon such a common ground that we must and can build a lasting peace.

TOTAL WAR REVOLUTIONIZES PEACE MAKING

Another unreality in some of our national discussions is a belief that peace has arrived when firing ceases and a treaty is signed. Peace does not even begin for years afterward.

We must bring into our national thinking the realization that total war has changed the entire basis of making peace.

The whole nature of war and its aftermaths was changed when total and global war first came to the world 30 years ago. Old methods of making peace have been as much outmoded as have the old methods of making war.

For over a century wars had involved only two or three nations at a time. They included only a small segment of the world. The consequences were not so far reaching. The healing processes were not so difficult. But the last total war, and in the present war, 40 nations with 90 percent of the people in the world are involved with all their multiple conflicting interests and aspirations.

In old wars civilian life was not much disturbed. Total war not only involves total civilian energies during the war, but involves great loss of life, social and economic destruction, but new channels of thought and action are driven deep within the minds and souls of men. The aftermaths of total war are upon the scale of the war itself.

If we take an over-all view we know now that the gigantic upheaval of the last total war generated destructive forces which lasted for years in economic dislocations, revolutions, conflict of national interests, threats of war, and finally degenerated into renewed world war.

MAKING PEACE AFTER THE LAST TOTAL WAR

After the last war the world rushed to a great peace conference with thousands of delegates from 40 nations, thinking that the signing of a piece of paper could quiet the forces which had been set in motion.

There was idealism at that conference. But idealism died in the inevitable conflicts of purpose among desperate peoples under the war heat of nationalism. The paper they signed stimulated instead of quieting many of the underlying causes of conflict in the world.

But whatever the sins of omission or commission, whatever the mistakes, we now know that mortals at "cease firing" cannot appraise the depths of the wounds of the world from total war, or the violences that have been turned loose, nor the direction these violences will take. They cannot know the changes from ideas and inventions to come out of the war. Mortals cannot devise a paper contract in advance which will stand the shocks and the aftermaths of total war.

Following the last war the unexpected forces which arose and from the inadequacies of the peace document itself, nations drifted into crisis after crisis and conflict after conflict. The hastily made treaty itself at times handicapped the nations of good will in dealing with these problems. The age-old sores and the wounds of war were not healed.

MAKING PEACE AFTER THIS TOTAL WAR

Time does not permit me to explore the political, social, or economic shapes which are rising out of this war. Nor to examine the dim shapes of revolution that have already begun to emerge; nor the problems of extreme nationalism, of suppressing militarism or the ambitions of imperialism; nor the multitude of problems of disarmament, famine, trade, exchange, boundaries, conflicts of interest, hates, and revenge that inevitably will descend upon the world.

I, therefore, suggest for American thinking that we must accept the fact that a period of disturbing years must inevitably elapse after the next victory over our enemies.

Whether this transition period results in degeneration and a third world war, or whether it becomes a period of transition from war to lasting peace depends upon what we do during that period.

And peace-making is not merely a negative process of stopping military aggressions. It must be a dynamic elimination of the causes of war, the creation of good will and cooperation between nations to advance prosperity and the rule of law.

Yet American thinking and American discussion today assumes that another general peace conference—"the peace table" like Versailles in 1919—will be assembled immediately after this war to settle all these gigantic problems. Different pressure groups in the United States are already demanding seats upon the delegation. And there would be 1,000 delegates from pressure groups of other nations.

Do we believe the conflict of interests and the problems are less than before?

Do we believe that men are greater today than in the past, or that they can see further into the dark than they have done before?

No matter with what pomp and circumstance such a treaty be constructed, the unknown and the forces of change would put it again in the waste basket.

I therefore suggest that in view of what we now know of the consequences of global

war, no agreement or treaty can be evolved when firing ceases which will hold against its aftermaths.

THE NEW APPROACH

Do not all these shapes of things to come, all this experience of the last total war, and all this need for a healing process and dynamic action demand a new approach, a new departure from these paths so strewn with failure in the past?

For these reasons we, 18 months ago, proposed the definitely organized transition period from war to peace under definite leadership.

In order to make the plan workable, the trustees or leaders, executive committee—whatever they are called—should at once, when firing ceases, impose without argument certain urgent necessities of disarming the enemy and certain measures for restarting the political and economic life in the world.

Then the mind and the determination of the world must be set toward one goal—the making of a lasting peace. And the trustees, in cooperation with the United Nations, should guide the world through the deserts and swamps of the transition period until we can arrive at the promised land of some world-wide institution to preserve peace.

This plan of a transition period has been referred to as a cooling-off period. That is a misnomer. Its purpose is far greater than this incidental, yet great benefit.

MILITARY ALLIANCES

Nor can the transition from war to peace be organized through military alliances. That is another age-old idea from the grooves of past thinking. That is re-creating a world psychology of repression and domination, not turning the mind of the world to peaceful method and cooperation.

And by military alliance I do not mean short-term alliances but long-term commitments. Such military alliances always imply that nations agree to go to war at some future time against unknown nations for some purpose, good or bad. Mr. Gibson and I are discussing this subject at length in tomorrow's Collier's Weekly, but I may say here that inevitably such alliances create fear in other nations. Sooner or later they breed counteralliances. Armies and navies at once begin to pyramid in size.

There is a further fatal defect of all military alliances as an instrument to preserve peace. They at once begin to fall apart under the chafing of peoples against the danger of being involved in war. Inevitably world currents change, interests shift, a new generation arises, and some ally concludes not to go to war despite any agreement. Military alliances never endure for long.

Never has a military alliance produced peace, but many of them have produced war. Certainly they are no bases of enduring peace.

One of the suggestions which has been advanced is some sort of legal ties between the United States and Britain. The proposals include common citizenship, common currency, free trade, and military alliance.

Would not such an act at once raise the fears of all other nations that this is a step to world mastery by the English-speaking people and thus promptly generate organized opposition among the other 90 percent of the human race?

Whatever the merits may be, it is a divergence from our main purpose which must be unity with all United Nations to victory and to build peace.

Moreover, will not such a marriage involve us in all the problems of the British Empire, and, conversely, will not the British Empire be plagued with all of the problems of the United States?

Would not the inevitable discussion about these relatives by marriage lead to many frictions and ultimately to bitter divorce?

I am one who believes that collaboration and cooperation between Britain and the United States is the first necessity for peace. But collaboration does not require amalgamation. The practice of cooperation increases friendship.

For common ground in national thinking we should discard all proposals of military alliances as an instrument of peace.

WORLD INSTITUTION TO PRESERVE PEACE

Nor can this transition period from war to peace be organized by quickly setting up some world-wide institution, council, or world authority to preserve peace. We must make peace before we preserve it. Such a world-wide institution or authority should be the last phase of peace making, not the first.

I believe we must have such an institution. I believe it can be built without destroying the independence or sacrificing the sovereignty of nations. But we should not only have the experience of collaboration in the transition period but also the time to lay some foundations before we can effectively design any such world institution.

And if it is to succeed, it must be launched under conditions which favor its survival. We shall be throwing it to the wolves if we set it up to grapple with the violent forces in motion at the end of this war. That would repeat again one of the greatest of handicaps under which the League of Nations labored. It was thrown into the violent aftermaths of post-war and required to deal with the storm. That experience should amply prove that institutions for the long view are wholly ill-fitted for the problems, attributes, and emotions of the transition period.

It has been said that unless we first and quickly form some sort of world-wide institution, the people will have lost their enthusiasms and relapse again into isolationism. This is a notion that we can set up a lasting peace while we are groggy which will bind us when we have sobered up.

On the contrary, it is essential, if such a world institution is to have permanence, that it be rooted in acceptance of the United Nations' peoples themselves. If this is a people's war, it must be a people's peace. And there can be no people's peace unless the people have experience and time for understanding and acceptance.

ORGANIZING THE TRANSITION PERIOD

I therefore suggest for American thinking that we discard these ideas of a long armistice, of an initial and general peace conference, ideas of military alliances, or ideas of premature formation of a world-wide institution to preserve peace.

The alternative is an organized transition period. The campaign for peace during the transition period must have as much leadership as a campaign for war. A few principal nations have given leadership in war. Why should they not at once be openly appointed by the United Nations and charged with the responsibility before the world to direct the transition period from war to peace?

Out of this war will come a few transcendent centers of power—America, Britain, Russia, and China. By their open responsibility to build peace, would this not turn the whole mind of the world toward the goal of a real peace?

Whether we rush in and sign a document after firing ceases or not, the principal victorious powers in the world will continue to dominate the world. They have done it mostly in secrecy after every other world war.

Would not the world be better if its power politics were out in the open where the people of the world could test the every action of these centers of power on whether it contributed to build lasting peace?

Would it not give a sense of unity, solidarity, and purpose to the United Governments if it were done now?

And as nations will maintain their independence, the trustees and the United Nations must operate by collaboration as free nations. Today they are successfully carrying forward one of the most difficult of all human tasks—a joint war. A few powerful nations are giving leadership in this gigantic undertaking. They advise and consult with the smaller nations. We are doing this huge job by collaboration in the problems which arise from day to day. We are doing it without written agreements or treaties. Our bond is our common interest. Our declared purpose is to rid the world of the menaces to civilization, to free men and to free nations.

If we can collaborate to make war, can we not collaborate during a transition period while we lay the foundations for peace? Does this period need more of a contract than a declared joint purpose? Is not that common purpose to make a lasting peace this time?

Nations can be more tightly bound by common purpose than by chains, and in the unknown shapes to come, is not the transition period necessary for experience and development of foundations?

You can be sure that nations will strive to preserve their independence. If we cannot collaborate among independent free nations during a few years of the transition period to build a lasting peace, then no signed papers, no agreements, no world institution is worth anything. What counts in the long run is not paper documents but the attitudes of nations.

And inherent in all these attitudes will be the need for American patience and more patience lest we lose heart and faith.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we must now prepare for peace. We must do better than last time. Our chances for a lasting peace are better. For out of the furnace of this war there is a yearning for peace far more potent than ever before. Mothers, fathers, and wives in every nation, as never before, are praying that such a calamity may not come again to the world.

Despite all that has happened in 1900 years, the Sermon on the Mount has thundered down the ages. And it now thunders anew.

Feed Situation in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOBART, OKLA., *October 22, 1943.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: The dairymen and livestock producers of Kiowa County and eleven of the southwestern counties of Oklahoma would like to call your attention to the very critical feed situation now existing and urge that immediate effective action be taken. You do not need to be told it is dry out here. When you were here you saw how the feed and cotton were burning and it hasn't rained since you left. All of Oklahoma has been designated as a drought area except the Panhandle counties.

Kiowa County has some 60,000 head of cattle according to information submitted by farmers this spring, of which over 16,000 are dairy animals. Assuming that 4,000 of these are heifers not yet in production and further assuming that only 70 percent of the remainder are in production, we estimate 8,400 head of cows which might reasonably be considered as being in production. Of course, the other cattle must be fed too. Maintenance of all types of cattle is of course very essential and necessary to the war effort. We wish particularly to call your attention to the dairy needs.

Feed is a very short item out here. It is also a very expensive item right now. Dairymen and milk producers today are faced with a very momentous decision. Here is what they are up against. The average price of sour cream is 49 cents a pound. The recent War Food Administration subsidy brings this to 55 cents per pound. The prevailing price for whole milk at the processing plants is approximately 70 cents a pound, basis butterfat content. The subsidy will pay 50 cents per hundredweight whole milk. An average cow cannot be expected to give over 2 gallons a day over a 10-month period. In fact, most of them won't hold up to this. The big part of Kiowa County milk and southwestern Oklahoma milk is sold on the sour-cream market. On this basis, a 4-percent cow will average approximately 0.7 pound butterfat per day for which the 55 cents per pound (average market price plus subsidy) would yield 38.5 cents income per cow. The cost of hay has increased over 100 percent with most of it selling for more than $30 per ton. Ground barley is bringing $2.80 per hundredweight; oats, $2.90; cottonseed meal, $2.70; and bran, $2.35. Corn can't be bought and feed wheat must be used very sparingly in dairy rations. Wheat pasture is apparently out of the picture which means that cattle will have to be dry fed until spring.

A dairy cow needs 30 pounds of hay per day but figuring on the basis of 20 pounds of hay per day and 10 pounds of grain mixture composed of 2 parts barley, 2 parts oats, 2 parts bran, 1 part cottonseed meal, we find that the average cost per day will be 57 cents. How long could you stay in business on this kind of basis? How long will the average milk producer do it?

Farmers and dairymen are very much aware of the important part they play in the war effort and are just as patrictic as anyone. It does not appear fair, however, that they will be called upon to continue to produce or even increase production when it is a losing game with no relief in sight. No other group is expected to do this.

Joe Scott has indicated that sufficient feed will be moved into Oklahoma to take care of the needs. We hope this is true. However, we would like to point out that in order for this feed to get the job done, it will have to start moving at once and it will have to be available to farmers and dairymen at a price they can afford to pay and at least break even on the product they produce.

Yesterday, representatives from a number of southwestern Oklahoma counties met here at Hobart to discuss the situation. We pointed out at the outset that other counties are in the same shape we are. One thing is very evident, namely, either the price of feed will have to be reduced or the ceiling price of milk and cream will have to be increased to where the cost of production and the income from the item produced will at least balance. Most farmers and ranchmen don't want subsidies. The best solution would be, of course, raise the milk and cream prices in this area to a figure which would allow producers to break even during this critical period.

Based on present prices, the price of butter fat should be at least .813 cents per pound. If the present ceiling price absolutely cannot be increased, the only alternative is to put the needed feed in this area at prices within reach of their incomes. The dairymen and others present yesterday worked out a reasonable ration as shown above and from it they figured the price at which feeds will have to be made available to the farmers as follows: Oats, 54 cents per bushel; barley 72 cents per bushel; bran, $1.70 per hundredweight; cotton seed meal, $2.40; hay, $15 per ton. A mixture of this feed at the rate shown above will cost $1.90 per hundreweight. A minimum of 20 pounds of hay and 10 pounds mixture per day per cow would cost 34 cents per day. Based on the better cows' production as shown above this would be hardly above a get-by basis. The average cow in production would probably about break even. This does not include labor costs of approximately 10 cents per day per cow, lights, transportation, veterinary, and death loss costs. Someone may say that most farm cattle can browse around and pick up a good part of their sustenance over the farm. You are a native of this country and I know will not let anyone persuade you how much good a cow can get browsing around over farms in this part of the country during dry years. Farms out here are pretty well browsed over right now.

Here is what is actually happening in this part of Oklahoma. It is happening in every county represented yesterday. Commercial dairymen are either dispersing their herds or reducing them. One dairyman here at Hobart has already reduced his herd 50 percent and another plans to reduce it to 33 percent of its former size. Wright's Produce tell us that they are about 1,000 quarts of milk short daily even after releasing the Frederick Army air base contract. Wrights had a call from the mayor of Frederick requesting that 400 or 500 quarts of milk be delivered them daily because their last large dairy folded up. The cheese plant here is short. George Parks of the cheese plant has been driving the country to get new customers. So have Wrights. So has the Coop. Creamery at Mangum. They all tell the same tale.

Farmers with small herds are selling part of their herds and turning calves with the rest. They reason that a good dairy cow on very little feed might support a calf but would certainly not pay for the feed it takes to produce milk, let alone having anything left for labor and other expenses.

The War Food Administration is asking for increased production of dairy products. Kiowa County and southwestern Oklahoma started out exceptionally well to meet their goals in 1943, but it is very probable that the last 4 months of 1943 will cause us to fall considerably. To ask for increased production now means just one of two things—either the price of the product must be allowed to go up to care for the cost of production or the cost of the feed must be brought down to match the price of the finished product. We all know dairy products are very essential. The people of Hobart are already beginning to wonder where the supply of milk for Hobart will come from. This is just one town.

The whole issue isn't wrapped around dairymen making money. There is the consumer's side and the health of the general public is to be considered. It is conceded that foods from dairy products are perhaps the most healthful and nourishing. The situation is critical now. Just how much more critical it will get depends on what action can be taken now before it is too late. If a big part of the dairy animals go to town now and the big part of the remainder are turned with calves, it is too late to expect to get production. To get anywhere near maximum production, it is necessary to start out that way when the cow is fresh.

We are asking that assistance be given to the dairy farmers of the severe drought-ridden counties referred to, and at once get quantities of feed into this territory that will sustain what cows are left and at a price low enough so farmers can and will continue doing business. Action is what is going to count. If you need further information or assistance, let us know. If you need help up there, let us know. The war effort has a lot at stake. It is up to all of us to do the most we can.

Yours very truly,

E. E. Coalson; Harry L. Bretch; C. C. Baker, dairyman; E. W. Sanford, dairyman; Willis H. Morgan, dairyman; Sid Barnes; V. J. Rowsey, chairman, Kiowa County War Council; Ted Stinson, secretary, Hobart Chamber of Commerce.

Discriminatory Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing the South and West is that of unfair and unjust freight rates. We have been discriminated against for years and I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will, at an early date, report a fair bill to the end that legislation be passed on this very important subject.

I extend my remarks with a very interesting and informative letter from the manager of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce:

WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Abilene, Tex., October 23, 1943.

MR. ERIC JOHNSTON,
President, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Coming to our attention is a pamphlet entitled "Legislative Rate Making," authorized and published by the directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce for furtherance of the chamber's policy.

This brief pamphlet is devoted to condemning the various bills, now before the Congress, seeking to prescribe a national policy for the establishment of an equal and uniform system of freight rates for all sections and territories of the United States, and recommends "that railroad freight rates should be as closely responsive as may be both to the varying needs of commerce and the revenue requirements of the carriers, that rates should continue to be initiated after discussion between the shippers and carriers, and that the final authority to pass upon their lawfulness and propriety should continue to be exercised by the nonpolitical public regulatory bodies created for the purpose, without the prescription by Congress of a rigid and inflexible uniformity based on distance, regardless of the varied and changing circumstances and conditions of commerce."

To the West Texas Chamber of Commerce which serves that territory described in your London speech as "that great empire within itself," comprised of 132 west Texas interior raw-material-producing counties and 145 affiliated cities, and to our freight rate equality federation with its 140 affiliated local and regional organizations, having over 400,000 members, this United States Cham-

ber recommendation, when we recently have been so greatly admiring the work of the United States Chamber under your inspired leadership, is most disheartening. We are prone to say also that this recommendation will tend to alienate from the United States Chamber the people of all the Southwestern and Southern States, and many of the Western States. To all of us the recommendation appears to be one wholly failing to give consideration to the discriminatory freight rates under which our producers and consumers suffer, and one dictated by predatory interests as a means of perpetuating these discriminations against us in order to retain for themselves and their territories undue advantages in distribution, commerce, and trade.

The first premise for your committee recommendation is that "freight rates should be closely responsive to the varying needs of commerce, and to the changing circumstances and conditions of commerce." Our class freight rate structure, on an equal haul basis, when compared with the official zone, is from 40 percent to 60 percent higher, and we had wondered what need or condition of commerce, in the judgment of your committee, substantiates a rate policy requiring this territory to pay for equal haul 40 percent to 60 percent more than another territory. Many of our commodity rates on livestock, wool and mohair, and other commodities in which we excel in production are higher on an equal-haul basis than other territories having even less production, and we likewise do not understand what "varying need of commerce" requires this disparity. A flour mill in Fort Worth, Tex., can ship to Milwaukee for 51 cents per 100 pounds, while the Milwaukee mill ships to Fort Worth for 41 cents per 100 pounds. A shoe factory in Fort Worth, for an equal amount of money, can ship its products many hundreds of miles less distance than the shoe factory in Boston. In fact, we had a little milk bottle factory in Santa Anna, Tex., close its doors because its competitor, at an equal distance point, had a 21-cent per gross advantage because of freight rates. What, may we ask, is the varying needs of commerce that justifies a rate-making policy enabling these actual discriminatory conditions to prevail. Your committee has by no means made that clear and has presented no facts or evidence whatsoever showing why rates made responsive to our commerce are so much higher than rates on like commerce elsewhere. We feel there is no basis for such a condition and this argument, after all, is a 50-year-old railroad argument conceived in the Harriman "public be damned" days, now again being used by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The second premise of your committee, namely, that "freight rates should be closely responsive to the revenue requirements of the railroads," we believe to be sound. There are none of us that want to deprive the railroads of sufficient revenues to adequately maintain their property, pay depreciation and dividends, and pay adequate wage and operating costs. We all want the railroads to continue in business and in private ownership as our major national system of transportation, and therefore we want the railroads to have adequate rates commensurate with their revenue requirements.

We submit, however, that the needed revenues of the railroads should be proportionately paid by all territories of the United States and that one territory should not be required to pay 60 percent more proportionately than another territory. We think also that 50 years ago there was a spread in the railroads transportation costs and density of traffic in different territories which perhaps justified varying levels of freight rates. This 50-year-old condition, according to all authorities except the railroads, has long since ceased to exist and now the railroads' argument about cost of transportation and density of traffic is outmoded. As far as this territory is concerned, I submit it to be a fact, as established by Dr. Ford K. Edwards, of the I. C. C., that the cost of transportation in the Southwest is approximately the same as it is in the official zone—and yet we pay much higher rates. As far as this territory is concerned also, I submit as a fact and can show that during a period of time when our development and density of traffic increased 358 percent, our rates, instead of decreasing in accordance with increased traffic, increased 109 percent. Naturally, we, therefore, look with some misgivings on the railroads' "density of traffic" and "transportation cost" arguments for substantiating a higher level of rates for us, and we are surprised to see the United States chamber fall for these arguments without more complete investigation.

The third premise of your committee, namely that rates should continue to be "initiated after discussion between the shippers and carriers" is a position we think to be wholly unfair and monopolistic in its results. This is again an old sterotyped argument of the railroads used to keep the light from being thrown on the old dark chamber railway procedure of fixing, according to Vice President WALLACE, 99 percent of the freight rates by agreement between themselves and subsidized shippers without hearing or review by any tribunal. To say that rates should be a matter between the shipper and carrier is saying that the matter is of no concern to the man who pays the bill. It is the consumer, not the shipper, manufacturer, or distributor, who pays the freight bill on all the consumer's goods. It is the producer who likewise pays the freight bill, because he has it deducted from the price of the things he sells. The public, therefore, has the major and predominant interest in this freight rate-making problem, and you will find that the Supreme Court of the United States and many of the recent I. C. C. decisions have so ruled. Since the public is the principal party in the freight-rate deal, we cannot prescribe to any doctrine leaving the rates wholly to the shipper and carrier, and, therefore, we believe it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to protect the interest of the unorganized public on freight rates.

Based upon the above premises which we think are railway inspired and enunciated by your committee, your United States Chamber of Commerce naturally concludes to again be the mouthpiece of the railroads and oppose all legislation in Congress having to do with bringing about more uniformity in freight rates as within and between the various regions of the United States. It is this recommendation coming from the United States Chamber of Commerce which is so disheartening to us, and we hope you will not think us presumptuous when we say that, in our opinion, your committee has erroneously analyzed the purport of this legislation and has, therefore, recommended counter to the welfare of two-thirds of the territory of the United States, as well as the national welfare.

In the first place, we cannot agreee with the assumption that freight rates are none of the business of the Congress of the United States. It is the duty of Congress, as we understand it under our Constitution, to regulate the commerce and to define the policies, powers, and duties of all the agencies it may create. This the Congress did in 1887 when it created the Interstate Commerce Commission. Repeatedly since that time, and recently in the Transportation Act of 1940, the Congress has supplemented the policies, powers, and duties of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Among the powers granted by Congress, from the very beginning, has been the policy and mandate to the I. C. C. to make rates "just, reasonable, and free from discrimination," and there have been many other mandates from Congress requiring the making of rates without "undue discrimination and unreasonableness." It happens that the I. C. C., when created in 1887, found in existence different levels of freight rates in the various territories of the United States, and it happens that the I. C. C. has perpetuated these different levels ever since. The Commission apparently feels that these differences are not "undue discriminations." A great portion of the United States thinks these varying territorial levels of rates are "undue discriminations," and the entire purport of all recently proposed legislation is for the Congress to tell the Commission that such ungodly differences as 60 percent higher class rates in Texas than in the C. F. A. territory must hereafter be considered by the Commission as "undue discriminations." With Congress, under the Constitution, being delegated the power to regulate and control commerce and the power to represent the public in so doing, we cannot help but feel that the Congress would be derelict in its duty unless it further defines "undue discriminations" in conformity with present conditions and establishes a policy for the removal of these discriminations.

In the next place, we think you will find that none of this legislation abolishes the Interstate Commerce Commission, but instead is only a directive to the I. C. C. In no sense of the word does the legislation contemplate having the Congress make freight rates, and all the legislation has to do with having the I. C. C. make the freight rates in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down by the Congress. I think you will also find in many of the proposed bills provisions empowering the Commission to take into consideration the present cost of transportation (and not 1887 cost) in making freight rates. I think you will also find in some of the bills where the Commission can make exceptions to any established uniformity policy, so as to assure adequate transportation service in any particular area.

For reasons such as the above, we cannot refrain from saying that in our considered judgment the report of your transportation and communication committee on "legislative rate-making" is ill-considered and unfounded. When it is so flagrantly counter to the interests of the majority of the territory of the United States, it most surely is ill-advised. It is a report, in our opinion, counter to the welfare not only of the Southwest and South but of the entire Nation, for the reason that it restricts and makes monopolistic commerce and trade instead of aiding the equal and free flow of commerce and trade.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the "legislative rate-making" report of your transportation and communication committee be withdrawn as a policy of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and that before announcing any future policy, the United States Chamber take into consideration the interests of all regions of the United States in securing the privilege of an equal and free flow of commerce.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. BANDEEN,
Manager, West Texas Chamber of Commerce and Freight Rate Equality Federation.

Attest:

ED P. BYARS,
Traffic Counselor, West Texas Chamber of Commerce and Freight Rate Equality Federation.

Courageous Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Chicago Tribune of October 30, 1943, paying very high tribute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGEOUS SENATORS

The country now knows precisely what Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, told his colleagues in executive session. Mr. RUSSELL was chairman of the committee of five Senators who returned recently from a world tour of the battle fronts. They reported an appalling neglect of American interests by our Government, and a no less appalling subservience to our allies, particularly Britain.

Because the speeches were given originally behind locked doors, only the gist of them was made public. Immediately the New Dealers, the Tories, and the Communists in this country undertook to smear the members of the committee. A few days later Mr. Churchill, in Parliament, joined the attack. Meanwhile, the British press, with characteristic unanimity, had fallen upon Senator RUSSELL and his colleagues. They were caricatured as monkeys and denounced as small-minded political hacks.

Mr. RUSSELL has replied to all this billingsgate by entering the full text of his report in the Senate's public record, excepting from publication only the sentences which might have given the enemy military information of value to him. It is to be hoped that the other Senators will do likewise.

If there ever was any doubt about it, the fact is now apparent that Mr. RUSSELL directed his criticism not to the Allies, but to the Government of the United States. Our Government, he showed, was not defending our country's interests. It was allowing our oil reserves to be depleted needlessly. It was permitting our lend-lease aid to Russia, to neutrals, and to liberated peoples to be masked as a British contribution. It was not taking steps to assure our position in international commercial flying after the war. It was not moving for possession of sea and air bases that we know are needed for the defense of our continent.

The smear brigade here and abroad regard comment in that vein as blasphemy. Americans are supposed to make endless sacrifices and to expect nothing in return. We are to do as we are told, to use the servants' entrance, and never to resent impositions. We are to forget that without our help the Allies would have been defeated. We are never to think of America, and we are to be guided always by the advice of those who wish us either to return as a colony to the British Empire or to promote the spread of the Communist Empire.

To all such people Mr. RUSSELL made answer when he said:

"What I saw was through American eyes. I weighed, observed, and reported as an American who properly holds the future welfare of these United States above all other considerations. I would regret if any word of mine should cause dissension or ill feeling between the United States and any of our allies, but if that word be necessary to protect our legitimate interests, either during this war or in the post-war world, I would still feel duty-bound to speak."

Those were the words of a patriot. They gain added significance from the knowledge that they were spoken by a lifelong Democrat who had never before earned the wrath of the New Dealers. Americans everywhere will applaud Senator RUSSELL for his courage in rising above partisanship to serve the whole Nation.

It is encouraging to find that he is by no means alone in the fight in which he is engaged. His colleagues on the world tour are with him to a man. Senator CHANDLER of Kentucky, another Democrat, is proving a tower of strength. The remarkable speech on the Connally resolution, made by still another Democrat, Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, in which he insisted on the acquisition of adequate bases for the protection of America, was a striking contribution. Like Senator MCKELLAR, Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, had also favored American membership in the League of Nations, but he, too, is now found resisting the internationalists' demand for a blank check to maintain any kind of a peace, anywhere, at any time, with American men and wealth.

The expressions of all these Senators, and of many others who might be mentioned, are welcome evidence that the plot to sell America down the river is meeting with an opposition that is growing from day to day in strength and determination. The truth is that the Communists and the Tories together speak for only a tiny fraction of the American people. The vast majority put America first and will always do so. Senators and Representatives who don't know this are destined to find it out when the voters get a chance to express themselves next year. With such Democrats as RUSSELL and CHANDLER playing an outstanding part for America, it behooves the Republicans to see to it that none of their number works against the interest of our country in response to foreign control.

Tribute to Judge J. F. T. O'Connor, by Hon. William Lemke, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, of my State, one day last week issued a public news release paying tribute to a former resident of North Dakota, now a district judge in California, J. F. T. O'Connor, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOINGS IN CONGRESS

(By Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE)

Every now and then a man or woman appears with a great human soul—a soul that understands the trials and tribulations and suffering of the less fortunate. Occasionally such a person appears in high places where one generally would expect misunderstanding, arrogance, and ignorance. When such a person appears, it gives renewed hope to those of us who struggle to make this a better world and better place to live in for our having been here.

Such is the case with one of our own former citizens. He is none other than J. F. T. O'Connor, former Comptroller of the Currency of the United States Treasury. Mr. O'Connor at present is judge of the United States District Court of Southern California.

Recently some hard-boiled individual attempted to defeat the purpose of the Frazier-Lemke moratorium. The case came up before Judge O'Connor, and here is a quotation from his decision in that case, a decision that has spread throughout the Nation like wildfire because it contains the germ of kindness, of understanding with those who struggle to feed the world.

We quote: "The Frazier-Lemke Act came from the throes and agony of depressed farmers, who were being dispossessed of their farms through no fault of their own, but because of economic conditions, unfavorable weather, or insects which destroyed their crops. One or two years of crop failures and the farmer without adequate reserves, because seldom did any year yield more than sufficient to pay his expenses and living costs, found himself in the bankruptcy courts with the labor of the years lost. This remedial, beneficial, and just act did not forgive nor cancel the debt of the farmer, but merely postponed the date of payment, giving to the debtor an opportunity to pay his creditor and save his home for himself and his family. Most corporations can set aside reserves for profitless years, or stop paying dividends, but the farmer has no such advantage."

In this decision Judge O'Connor sets forth the struggle of the farmer. He understandingly compares their profession with that of other industries. He shows that his years in North Dakota have put into his heart the milk of human kindness. Through this decision he has overnight become one of the leading judges of the Nation. He has brought honor upon the State of North Dakota from which he hails. He will be remembered long after those who can only see the creditor's side, who have no mercy for the wife and children who help the husband feed the world are forgotten and rotten dust.

This decision comes at a time when baiting the farmers by the Federal land bank and cheap politicians seems to be popular. The Frazier-Lemke moratorium has saved over 250,000 homes in this Nation. Judge O'Connor has given it new vitality and life.

The People and the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times entitled "The People and the Navy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE AND THE NAVY

It would be well if the many observances this week of annual Navy Day could have turned somewhat more toward informing the

people of the difficulties of self-preservation and self-maintenance which the Navy has faced in past years and which it may have to face again when this war ends.

After the last war this Nation scrapped most of the striking power and much of the defense power of its Navy. True, it did so in accord with other nations, but the United States then went to sleep while other nations kept awake. The eventual result was that the scrapping of the Navy after World War No. 1 was permitted to degenerate into disintegration of national defense itself.

If we start scrapping the Navy unnecessarily after this war, the step again may prove to be movement along a new path to a new war instead of along the road to preservation of peace.

What is essential to remember now is that the Navy scrapping after World War No. 1 was not simply a political administration policy, but a political response to an overwhelming wave of public demand for reduction of cost (taxes) of armaments which swept from coast to coast and eventually played right into the hands of aggressor nations. Misinformation and lack of information among the people not only encouraged too great a scrapping, but led to failure to save even the scraps.

Such a wave of opinion may well get started again after this war. The way to stop it is not to wait until it hits, but to prevent it from arising by providing a constant stream of information to the public on what happened in the past and why it happened; on what may happen in the future and why it must not happen. It is for this reason that some of the Navy's present policies of administration, particularly as to propaganda, may be headed along the wrong line. The recent boasting by Navy officials of increase in the number of Navy vessels from some 1,300 to more than 15,000 since Pearl Harbor is good as ballyhoo, but it is not constructive when not explained and might well prove a boomerang. Such figures include motor boats, landing boats, and many very small vessels of mass-production type, but to the public navy vessels bring a vision of big warships booming away at sea, launching clouds of planes, etc. A public impression of thousands and thousands of Navy warships can easily lay a groundwork for demand for considerable scrapping when peace comes. No doubt many vessels will be scrapped, but the public should be fully informed on the need for maintaining a strong, active, well-admistered Navy as essential in prevention of future wars—regardless of financial cost.

The Navy has had two big sags in its maintenance and consequently in its over-all fighting potentiality since World War No. 1. The first was in the post-war disarmament period in which Secretary of State Hughes (in the Harding administration) tried to institute a more sensible international scrapping program than the one adopted but found it impossible to overcome American public clamor for disarmament. Then, England did some balking, too, the American public clamor helping her considerably in obtaining her own ends. Hughes quickly found he and the administration could not buck a shrewd England, a future-looking Japan, and American public demand for general disarmament as assurance of future peace.

The second sag came around the 1932-36 period in the early years of the Roosevelt administration. Again public opinion opposed heavy tax expense for armament in a seemingly peaceful world—although official State Department records recently revealed show that the Roosevelt administration, from the start, was aware fully of the war clouds gathering. But this time the administration simply sat back and did nothing—seeking neither to rebuild the Navy, to inform the public, nor to give it anything on which to mold logical opinion.

Thus both sags were political response to public opinion on the surface, but actually to public lack of opinion when the full picture is seen. The difference in the background was that in the early 1920's the administration did try to buck public opinion while in the early 1930's it did not try.

At the end of World War No. 1 the ratio of naval strength between the 3 large naval powers was Great Britain, 10.6; the United States, 10; Japan, 6. Under the disarmament agreement it became 10-10-6, which mathematically is the often-mentioned 5-5-3 ratio. For some years the United States Navy was at or near the disarmament-agreement strength, although its actual fighting power had been lessened by technical sections in the agreement, but then it was allowed to sag below the 5-5-3 ratio. From 1933 on, Japan began fortifying Pacific islands. The United States kept its agreement not to fortify in the Pacific, but made no move to compel Japan to keep her agreement. Japan openly launched a navy building program, but the United States Navy was not even kept up to the disarmament-agreement strength. Late in the 1930's a big Navy building and rejuvenation was launched by the United States—far too late.

Thus, while the disarmament agreement of the early 1920's may not, by itself, have been the cause of later Navy difficulties, the blindness which surrounded the disarmament and the blindness which followed through the years provided a course nearly always in a wrong direction. This was not the Navy's fault; it was the fault of Government administrations and a result of leaving the public uninformed and misinformed.

One real difficulty throughout was the willingness of the United States to disregard its own side of the agreement in a negative way, and to let Japan disregard it in an affirmative way. Japan armed beyond the agreement while we disarmed below it.

Public knowledge of these things, in full detail, is what the Navy itself needs—and what the public needs, too.

Canadian Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week several Senators had a discussion on the floor of the Senate with reference to the status of certain commonwealths of the British Empire. I have had sent to me an editorial clipped from the Toronto Mail and Empire of October 27. I call attention to the closing sentence of the editorial, which reads:

Alone of the dominions, she lacks the power to amend her own constitution, which is still embalmed in the British North America Act, a British statute, and when amendments become necessary her Government forwards to the British Parliament a request for them. This is never refused, the procedure being a mere formality.

Then this is said by the person transmitting the editorial, from Brantford, Ontario:

The Crown originated the British North America Act and still holds it as a means of acquiring any part of an adjoining territory which wishes to be an integral part of the British Empire.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

The controversy which has developed in the Senate of the United States over the right of the British Dominions to be classified as free and sovereign nations revives an issue which arose at the end of the last war. Under the circumstances some recapitulation of bygone history connected with it would be apposite.

Before the peace conference met at Paris, a decision had been reached by the Imperial war cabinet that in its proceeding the British Dominions should be represented both on a British Commonwealth panel and separately. Later, when the preliminary arrangements for the conference were being worked out, it was proposed that there should be 17 delegates from the British Commonwealth and Empire, with each of the Dominions contributing two. But both President Wilson and his Secretary of State objected to this proposal. Wilson did not oppose separate representation on principle but Lloyd George reported to Premier Borden that he was very tiresome and that Lansing had been arrogant and disagreeable. However, Borden, Smuts, Botha, and Hughes, at a conference, agreed that they would insist upon representation for their countries equal to that of the other small powers. A further discussion between Wilson and Lloyd George resulted in a compromise under which each Dominion was given one representative. Sir Robert noted in his diary:

"Wilson's strong point was as to united representation of the British Empire. He agreed to special representation for each Dominion and India."

The President of the United States thereby acknowledged the separate nationhood of the Dominions, but at Washington his senatorial opponents, "the band of willful men," as he called them, who wrecked the peace settlement and prevented their country's entry into the League, made a continuous outcry in their campaign against arrangements which would leave the United States, with one vote, in a position of very inferior influence in the League compared with that of the British Commonwealth with its six votes. This complaint seemed well founded to many Americans and helped to mobilize popular support for the obstructionists.

At that time, however, there was more force than now in the point, because there had been no formal registry of the advance of the Dominions to full national status, which had been achieved during the war. This registry did not occur until the Imperial Conference of 1926, when the famous document known as the Balfour Report, unanimously endorsed by the delegates present, set forth that Britain and the Dominions were "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate to one another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs."

Here was an unequivocal ratification of the national status of the dominions, and it was given legal authority by the passage of the Statute of Westminster, which came into operation in 1931.

If practical proof of the complete freedom of the dominion is required, it can be found in the fact that in 1939 four of them entered this war as belligerents of their own free will after a vote in their parliaments, and no protest was made against the decision of

a fifth to take the path of neutrality. Again the Dominions have their own diplomatic services, negotiate their own treaties and exercise the other prerogatives of sovereign States.

The only reasonable pretext that Senator GILLETTE and other complainants could make for their objections is provided by Canada. Alone, of the Dominions, she lacks the power to amend her own constitution, which is still embalmed in the British North America Act, a British statute, and when amendments become necessary her government forwards to the British Parliament a request for them. This is never refused, the procedure being a mere formality.

A Defense of Sidney Spear, Brilliant Young Attorney for Federal Communications Commission, Who Was Stigmatized in His Absence by Special House Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings recently held in New York City by the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission, a memorandum was read into the record dealing with the activities of Sidney Spear, a former Commission attorney who is from my State. This memorandum, prepared by an employee of the Office of Censorship, Robert K. Richards (also a former employee of a radio station), dealt with a conference on August 25, 1942, held with Spear regarding the cooperation of the two agencies in the foreign-language radio field. According to the memorandum, Spear is alleged to have admitted that the Federal Communications Commission had entered into an arrangement with O. W. I. to make station owners fire foreign-language radio performers whom the O. W. I. found detrimental to national wartime interests. The Federal Communications Commission's part in this so-called conspiracy, according to this memorandum, was to put the station on a temporary license at the time it applied for a renewal of its license until the command of O. W. I. had been obeyed. Richards quoted Spear as saying:

> This was a little extra-legal, I admit, and I had to wrestle with my conscience about it, but it seemed the only way to eliminate this kind of person, so I did it.

Now, let me say at the outset that Spear left the Commission's employ on September 3, 1942, 8 days after the alleged conference with Richards. At the present time he is Pvt. Sidney Spear, stationed at Camp Fannin, Texas.

I have known Spear for a number of years, and I can say without equivocation that he is a fine, loyal citizen, and the type of a public servant that is a credit to our Government.

I do not know that any such arrangement as is alleged to have existed would be more than a good example of cooperation between two Government agencies. O. W. I. was at the time keeping an eye on foreign language broadcasting—until the Office of Censorship was given the job. It would seem only sensible to me that the Commission should not give a station a regular 2-year license when such action would completely nullify the efforts of the O. W. I. to prevent subversive propaganda from being broadcast over the radio. Be that as it may. In any case, since several newspapers chose to indulge in editorial criticism of Spear's alleged statements, I have looked into the matter. And I have a letter from Private Spear in which he denies the statements that were attributed to him.

That is enough for me, but in order to check further on whether Spear is right, I asked the Commission for a list of radio stations whose regular renewal licenses had been withheld because of foreign-language programs. The memorandum of the conference on August 25, 1942, you will remember, indicated that the so-called conspiracy between the Federal Communications Commission and O. W. I. to remove persons from the air by withholding the station's regular license was already in effect. Here is what I find:

Since the outbreak of war and up to the present time, out of 170 stations now carrying these foreign programs, only 10—I repeat, only 10—have ever been on a temporary license because of these broadcasts. Incidentally, I might say in passing that none of these stations has had its license revoked or its application for renewal refused. And here is the most significant fact of all—up to the time that Spear left the Commission on September 3, 1942, only 3 of these stations had been placed on a temporary license and their regular licenses withheld.

One station was placed on a temporary license on June 1, 1942, in connection with an application which was pending for the transfer of control of this station. No charge is made by the committee that there were any firings in this case at O. W. I.'s suggestion.

The second station was put on temporary license in August 1942. Counsel for the select committee has charged that in this case a German broadcaster named George Brunner was put off the air by the O. W. I.—in June 1942—but at that time, the station was operating on a regular license. Obviously the so-called conspiracy could not have operated in this case.

The third and last case is a station alleged to have been forced to remove three Italian broadcasters in order to get a renewal of its license. But do you know when the station dismissed these individuals?—in November 1942, 3 months after the conversation reported in August and almost 3 months after Spear left the Commission. The question of the suitability of these performers to be on the air had not even been raised in August. Certainly, in this case no conspiracy between F. C. C. and O. W. I. could have existed in August 1942, or at any other time.

I think that the information that I have just presented is a forceful illustration of the harm that can result by passing judgment before both sides of the case have been presented. To me it is an outrage that Spear's reputation should be besmirched in this way while he serves his country in this crisis—besmirched without an opportunity to reply and give the facts from which a fair judgment can be made.

Bureau of Reclamation War Food Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news release recently issued by the Bureau of Reclamation which carries a summarization of projects in the war food program of the Bureau of Reclamation which have received clearance from the War Production Board. The report from Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore upon which the Secretary's announcement is based is of considerable significance to the irrigation interests of the West, and particularly my own State of Utah.

The projects in Utah included in the war food list are Provo River and Newton, both of which were under construction when work was ordered stopped about a year ago. In addition to its contributions to war food supplies, the Provo River project is important from the standpoint of assuring a supplemental municipal water supply for Salt Lake City. The vast military and war industrial developments in Utah have resulted in a material drain on the existing sources on which the metropolitan water district of Salt Lake City must depend. The work on the Salt Lake Aqueduct, mentioned in the announcement as authorized, will not be adequate in the event of an emergency arising from low rainfall and run-off from the mountains. I have urged and will continue to press for completion of the Salt Lake Aqueduct as well as the entire Provo River project.

On the war food front it was my honor to serve as chairman of the House group of western Congressmen who met last spring to press for recognition of the contributions to the war that Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects could make if construction were resumed. Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, headed a similar committee from the Senate, and rendered, as always, able and effective service to the cause of reclamation and irrigation.

I believe we succeeded in impressing on the War Food Administration and the War Production Board the fact that these agencies were overlooking a real

source of increased war foods by failing to give prompt clearance to Bureau of Reclamation projects. I regret that the time which was taken by these agencies to study the possibilities of the projects presented by the Bureau has delayed for at least a year the ability of the projects to make greater war food contributions.

The record of the Bureau of Reclamation on the war food program is clear. I call particular attention to Commissioner Bashore's statement that—

The Bureau has presented data to the War Production Board or War Food Administration on more than 50 projects which would enable it to make further substantial increases in the acreage to be served. Many of these projects could be put into food production in 1944 and 1945.

The text of the news release is as follows:

War food production will be increased materially by 1945 through the extension of irrigation service to nearly 800,000 acres of land on 13 Bureau of Reclamation projects in 8 Western States, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today.

The Secretary's statement was based on a report from Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore which summarized the results expected from recent clearances by the facilities committee of the War Production Board. The committee approved the resumption of construction on four projects in addition to nine which previously had been given clearance. The four projects are Anderson Ranch Dam of the Boise project in Idaho; Coachella Canal of the All-American Canal project in California; the Deschutes project in Oregon; and the Provo River project in Utah.

These 4 projects, as well as 8 of the 9 previously approved, were recommended to the War Production Board by the War Food Administration. Favorable recommendations have been made by War Food Administration on 13 additional projects.

Work was halted in the winter of 1942-43 on practically all irrigation construction on Bureau projects by the diversion of critical materials to other war uses.

The irrigation facilities to be extended by the Bureau on the 13 projects approved will increase the service to 200,000 additional acres in 1944, by about 793,000 acres by 1945, and by a total of more than a million acres in 1946, Mr. Bashore said. Already 4,000,000 irrigated acres on 44 projects in 15 States served by Bureau facilities are making large contributions of war food.

The Commissioner explained that the Bureau will expedite in every way the construction on all projects approved and will make every effort to obtain clearance on other projects which have been recommended. The Bureau has presented data to the War Production Board or War Food Administration on more than 50 projects which would enable it to make further substantial increases in the acreage to be served. Many of these projects could be put into war-food production in 1944 and 1945.

The complete list of irrigation projects which have been given clearance by the War Production Board is as follows:

Arizona: Gila.

California: Central Valley (Friant Dam and Madera Canal only), All-American Canal (Coachella Branch).

California-Oregon: Klamath-Modoc.

Colorado: Colorado-Big Thompson, Mancos.

Idaho: Boise (Anderson Ranch Dam).

Oregon: Deschutes.

South Dakota: Rapid Valley (restricted to the use of civilian public service labor).

Utah: Scofield, Newton, Provo River (enlarging Provo Reservoir Canal and section of Salt Lake City aqueduct).

Washington: Yakima-Roza.

On the Gila project facilities to serve 8,500 acres were approved in connection with a dust control program for protection of the Yuma air base. This new area will also produce alfalfa for livestock feed. Scofield Dam was approved primarily for flood control but also will benefit irrigation.

The construction of the Anderson Ranch Dam (Idaho) will provide a supplemental supply of water by 1945 to the highly productive land in the Boise area, where 340,000 acres are now wholly or partially served by bureau systems. Added storage capacity in the reservoir by 1946 will extend the supplemental service to additional acreage. The War Production Board approval covers completion of construction of an earth and rock fill dam 440 feet high with a crest length of 1,350 feet, an outlet tunnel, and a concrete lined open channel spillway in the left abutment. The work not approved by the committee includes construction of a power plant, the penstocks and related facilities, and the installation of permanent outlet valves.

Because of the manpower shortage, not more than 450 workers may be employed until the middle of 1945 other than those which may be secured from war-prisoner camps, Civilian Public Service, War Relocation, or similar camps. Thereafter not to exceed 600 men may be used.

The approval of the Deschutes project includes the installation of fish screens on the headworks structure on Wickiup Dam, construction of a wooden flume crossing Crooked River, excavation and lining of two tunnels each about 3,400 feet long, excavation of an additional 12 miles of canal, construction of bridges, drops, and a distribution system to serve 20,000 acres of new land by 1945. Not more than 100 workers, other than those which may be secured from war prisoner, Civilian Public Service, War Relocation, or similar camps, may be employed. A small amount of construction by Civilian Public Service labor has been in progress on this project.

A similar employment restriction will govern the construction of the Coachella Canal, a branch of the All-American Canal which receives its water from the Colorado River through the Boulder Dam system. Not more than 175 men, other than war prisoners, Japanese evacuees, or conscientious objectors, may be employed at one time. The approval for this project includes the extension of the Coachella Canal for a distance of 27 miles, and the construction of canal checks, storm-drainage overchutes, drops, and the necessary turn-outs and distribution systems to bring by 1945 a full supply of water to 10,000 acres of new land and a supplemental supply to 16,000 acres faced with shortages.

The irrigation authorization on the Provo River project, Utah, permits enlarging the Provo Reservoir Canal for a distance of 22 miles. The added capacity will make it possible to provide a supplemental supply of water by 1945 to an additional 19,300 acres of land. Use of manpower on this feature of the project is limited to a minimum of 200 men, exclusive of labor obtainable from war prisoner, War Relocation Authority, Civilian Public Service, or other camps.

The office of War Utilities of the War Production Board approved installation of an additional 13,200 feet of 69-inch reinforced concrete pipe of the Salt Lake City Aqueduct. This structure when completed will bring a supplemental supply of municipal and industrial water to Salt Lake City. Military and industrial activities have increased the population of this region by 50 percent. Although the rainfall in recent years has been above normal, construction of the aqueduct is a precautionary measure to protect the water supply for the city and its vital wartime installations. No employment restrictions were ordered on this construction.

Good Old Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and much has been said about the failure of our Government officials in not looking to the protection of our own United States of America by building air bases, docks, installations, and so forth, all over the world without any restrictions or obligations on the part of the recipients, and it has been charged we have neglected our own American interests in a grand "spree" of giving away anything to anyone anywhere in the world at the expense of the American taxpayers, when we here, in our own country, are in dire need of many of the things which are sent haphazardly all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have particular reference to steel, which is allegedly under the control of the War Production Board. In order to build our own industry, and to increase food production a limited part of the steel produced is essential. I have called the attention of Congress to the fact that Cuba was allocated steel for the manufacture of farm equipment and implements when the American farmer was unable to obtain tractors, and so forth, to grow and harvest our own crops for food. Last week the War Production Board refused to allocate enough steel to complete a steel plant in Texas, notwithstanding the appeal of congressional delegations from all of the Southwestern States, with you, Mr. Speaker, as our leader. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe, but we have in the United States about 30 or more airports which have not been completed, made necessary, so said, as a result of the discontinuance of the Work Projects Administration and lack of critical materials.

We are building airports and air bases all over the world, and yet we are neglecting our own country when airports are so necessary to our own defense and progress. In this connection, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article by the Associated Press from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of date November 1, 1943, which speaks for itself, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID TO REBUILD SOVIET HELD AIM OF NELSON VISIT

Discussion of plans for American aid in rebuilding the Russian industrial machine is suggested as the reason for Donald M. Nelson's visit to Russia. The War Production Board Chairman is expected back in Washington any day.

Associates of Mr. Nelson say it would be "logical to suppose" that he discussed with Moscow officials the provision of machine tools and industrial machinery to rebuild an economy in the ravaged lands recovered from the Nazis.

The rapid and sustained Red Army advance makes it evident, these sources say, that the work of reconstruction can be begun before Germany falls. It is indicated that American machine-tool capacity, vastly expanded for war purposes and now facing a sharp decline in orders, might be brought into play to aid the restoration.

Mr. Nelson, who left Washington about 6 weeks ago, with London his announced destination, turned up in Cairo and in Moscow after his visit in England.

America's Uniqueness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of October 29, 1943, entitled "America's Uniqueness":

AMERICA'S UNIQUENESS

A report from Fifth Army headquarters, making special mention of Japanese-Americans fighting against the Nazis in Italy, serves to remind us that we are unique as a Nation.

Japan cannot say to its people that American battalions are in the Japanese Army fighting against America. Nor can Germany make a similar claim. No country in the world, in fact, can say what we can say.

All races, all colors, make us up. And when wars like the present one engulf us, all races and all colors take up arms for America. When we strike back at our enemies, the American kin of those enemies do the striking—Americans of Italian extraction, of German extraction, even of Japanese extraction. We are of almost every extraction conceivable, black, white, and yellow, and so we are tied together not by any mystical philosophy of blood or common ethnic traits, but solely and simply by an idea—the idea of democracy, of individual freedom, of liberty under law, of a justice before which all of us stand equal.

Name off the nations of the world, and not one of them will be able to say, as the United States can say, "we are the synthesis of the world's peoples." None of them can say, as we can, "in our factories, on our farms, in our armed forces, are men and women whose ancestral ties run back to some village in Asia, to some dark corner of Africa, to the soil of every part of Europe, to islands as remote as the remotest sea." And it is only the idea of freedom that holds us together—the idea plus the opportunity to live and prosper within its political and economic framework.

Of the Japanese-Americans, fighting in Italy, the Fifth Army says that "they obviously believe in what they're doing and look calmly secure because of it," and the same can be said of every other national extraction represented in our Army and Navy. They believe in America, in the American way of life, and they have the patriotism which that belief inspires, and that is why so many of them are fighting and dying now against the very lands that gave birth to their fathers and forefathers.

That America is thus composed of so many different elements living together under one idea, that it has diversity and unity at the same time, gives it a strength peculiar to itself, politically, militarily, and otherwise. It is helping us now, among the people of Italy, and it will help us later when we open new battlegrounds. In this sense, no other country possesses what we possess, for no other country has our kind of citizenry, a citizenry whose origins are as numerous as the nations themselves.

As much for this reason as any other, all peoples look to us with special interest and respect. Taken together with our size, our wealth, and our productive power, this uniqueness makes us a great international makeweight, not only in time of war, but during peace as well, so that in spite of ourselves, since we are such a cross section of mankind, we cannot ever successfully live apart from the world.

Lo, the Poor Customer!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison:

LO, THE POOR CUSTOMER

There is a sign in an east Texas store, "Be kind to our clerks. They are harder to get than customers." It reflects one of the queer changes that the war has brought to merchandising. The absurdly high wages in war factories have drawn heavily upon employees of civilian business and have destroyed all sense of values among wage earners or wage getters. Many factory employees are getting far more than they are worth and some are forced to lay off occasionally to find time to spend their surplus. This abnormal purchasing power is draining stores of goods and creating a scramble among purchasers. But these are the days, in most cities, when customers get pushed around and trampled upon in a mad sellers' market and orgy of wartime spending.

Discourtesy and indifference among clerks, waiters, and waitresses, and those who serve the public in many lines are so common that the poor customer is pleased when he finds an old friend behind the counter who will be considerate of his feelings.

Labor is in the saddle. Worried, harassed employers who are tired telling customers that they are out of this and that and developing headaches over "green" help, are afraid to fire employees who need a good firing for fear they can't hire anybody else. This class of surly, inefficient, ill-mannered, overpaid, and spendthrifty labor will be in the front rows of mass meetings after the war, demanding another Federal Government relief program, their high wages spent and their war-plant jobs gone.

Many wise employers and really big men in business realize that these lush days of free spending will not last always and that there will come a day when they will be looking for customers again, bowing them in at the door and extending them special courtesy. They are continuing their advertising to keep their names and brands before the public for the time of normal merchandising. They are working long hours themselves to try to keep up their standards of service. Some short-sighted merchants, restaurant keepers, and others are taking advantage of wartime alibis to raise prices on things not affected by war and cut down on services unnecessarily. They answer all customers' complaints with the stock expression, "There's a war on." This reminds us of the French shrugging phrase during the other World War with which they explained everything, "C'est la guerre!" (It is the war).

Employees should realize that it is the normal year-in-and-year-out customer who provides his job for him.

Lo, the poor customer! Be kind to him. You may need him some day.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

EAST TEXAS, *November 1943.*

Which: A Service Institution or a Revenue Collecting Institution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I see by the papers that the Ways and Means Committee of the House in their search for new sources of revenue for the depleted Treasury of the United States proposes to change the United States Post Office Department into a revenue-collecting agency for the United States Government. In case the Members of Congress do not realize the implications of this proposal, let me call your attention to the fact that the Post Office Department has for 150 years been a service institution, not a revenue-collecting institution, giving service to the American people at or near the cost of maintaining that service. The proposal of the Ways and Means Committee if adopted by this Congress will discard a precedent of 150 years' standing by changing the outstanding service institution of the Nation into a revenue-collecting institution. Does the Congress want to take this step? Is it wise to change a policy that has stood for 150 years, one that has given such universal satisfaction, one that has become a vital part in our American economy?

Because this proposal by the Ways and Means Committee is such a drastic departure from the accepted customs and beliefs of the American people and because its implications and results will be so far reaching, we should give this suggested change very careful consideration before we act upon it. In order to throw further light upon this matter, I include an excellent editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune, Friday, October 29, 1943, and recommend its thoughtful consideration:

POSTAL RATES

The increase in postal rates, which the House Ways and Means Committee has approved, raises a question and poses a problem in the field of economics rather than politics.

It is improbable that the question occurred to the Congressmen, whose only interest at the moment is in getting more revenue. So far as they are concerned, the postage increase is a relatively painless method of accomplishing that end.

Postage, however, is not a tax. The post office is a public utility. It is the starting point of a good many of the arguments of the public-ownership fanatics. Postal service, it is repeated, is a utility just like the telephone or telegraph service, and differing little from electric power or public transportation.

Other utilities have on recent occasions had their requests for increased rates denied by the O. P. A. on the ground that increases would contribute to inflation. The theory was that the increases would contribute to the general rise of the costs of living and thus stimulate demands for wage hikes. The Congressmen, in boosting the rate for mail service, appear to have been oblivious to this argument.

Another noteworthy feature of the postal increase is that there was no one on hand from the Post Office Department to insist that the increase was necessitated by rising operating costs. The post office is doing very well. It is probable that it is in the black for one of the few times in its history, even without any bookkeeping allowances for the thousands of tons of New Deal propaganda that it distributes free. If one may judge by the more or less agonized protests of its employees, it has not been particularly hurt by wage increases such as private industry has been forced to bear.

The increase is not to pay the cost of postal service but to bolster the general revenues of the Government, and therein lies the warning. The Post Office, it can be repeated, is a public utility operated by the public. It might be expected that it would render its service at cost, but that is not the present intention of Congress. Instead, it is to be made a revenue producer to make up the deficits of other Governmental operations. That is something for people to keep in mind when the New Dealers propose that the Government expand its operations into other fields of business.

Let the Government stay in the airplane business through its investment in the present plants, and we can expect that the price of airplanes will not be confined to their cost of manufacture but may include a surcharge to make up the deficits of the T. V. A. Put the Government into the coal-mining business, and we can logically expect, when we buy coal, to pay a surcharge on each ton designed to support post-war lend-lease or a revived National Youth Administration.

When the Government gets control of any monopoly, it immediately evades the one control that makes any monopoly bearable, namely: Regulation and limitation of profits in the public interest. When it comes to charging what the traffic will bear, the bureaucrats are strictly economic royalists.

There is one increase in the postal rates that newspapers should support without reservation. That is the increase on second-class mail. For decades the bureaucracy has contended that the newspapers and magazines were getting special benefits from the Government in the form of low second-class rates. No self-respecting newspaper wants something for nothing. Newspapers are willing to pay their own way, but they should not be required to defray postal deficits resulting from the free distribution of Elmer Davis' propaganda. If Congress wants to place second-class mail on a cost basis, it should have the support of the country's newspapers in doing so.

No Fetters for Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an excerpt from a statement made by Robert F. Black, president of the White Motor Co. The statement appeared in a booklet entitled "War Uses and the Future of Motor Trucks, Busses, and Trailers."

It is encouraging to examine here the opinion of a man who is widely experienced in the motor-vehicle transportation field with reference to air transportation. Mr. Black sums that opinion up in the following sentence:

May it (air transportation) be allowed to grow without chains or fetters.

The excerpt follows:

So we must say that it is of immense importance, not just to truck producers and truck users, or to the millions dependent upon truck transport for a livelihood, but to the country as a whole, that the future pattern of regulatory law shall be based exclusively upon factors of public safety and road safety, and not upon any theory of handicapping one form of transportation, or one group of transporters or shippers for the protection and benefit of another.

AIR TRANSPORT LUSTY INFANT

We feel this so strongly that we hope to see new, competing forms of transportation allowed to develop without artificial handicaps.

For example, air transport today is a lusty infant. It is growing phenomenally under the prod of war. There has been much speculation and prediction that air transport will take over many types of transportation now profitably performed by highway vehicles.

We have no fear of air transport. Whether it takes away present business from other carriers or not, it is certain to develop new business both for itself and for the others. Its competition will be a spur to land and water carriers, effectively preventing slackening of progress. May it be allowed to grow without chains or fetters.

Republican House Group Forms Drive-for-Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD, herewith, a copy of a news release which we have just gotten out for publication in the newspapers of November 3 or after. The news story is self-explanatory.

A number of us have long felt that the time has come for Congress to assert itself in definite terms and with vigorous action in an effort to correct some of the deficiencies and evils which are hampering our war effort both at home and abroad. We propose to do our best to see that Congress is given the required opportunity to take corrective action.

All Members of Congress who are like-minded with us in this objective and who desire to join with this drive-for-action committee may do so by signing his name to the statement of policy and the program for action which is available from any of the members of the executive board of this committee.

The names of the executive board will be found in the body of the following article:

REPUBLICAN HOUSE GROUP FORMS DRIVE-FOR-ACTION COMMITTEE—PROPOSES TO PREVENT ADJOURNMENT OR RECURRING RECESSES UNTIL ACTION IS TAKEN ON PENDING PROBLEMS

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 2, 1943.—An informal group of Republican House Members announced tonight the formation of a drive-for-action committee, which proposes to hold the House in session every legislative day, to prevent a prolonged holiday adjournment, and to take all other steps "within its power" to compel the Democratic leadership to bring up for legislative action pending bills destined to improve conditions on the home front and advance the war effort. Spokesmen for the committee said, "Winning the war is America's No. 1 job. A well-fed, busily working, productive home front can contribute greatly to the shortening of this war by setting forward the date of victory. It can thus do much to alleviate the suffering and sacrifices of the soldiers on our fighting fronts. Economical government and efficient administration combined with judicious legislation at this time can step up our war effort and scale down our war costs. It is our purpose to drive for action along these lines."

The committee announcement stated, "In reviewing the record of the past 6 weeks of congressional sessions we have reluctantly been compelled to recognize that apathy rather than action has been the keyword of the party in power since the termination of the summer recess. The Democratic leadership, which in cooperation with the President's advisers determine which bills are to come up for action on the House floor or in the committees, has permitted very little of consequence to come up for consideration since September 14, on which date Congress reconvened. Of late, the leadership has even taken to asking for 1- and 2-day recesses as a matter of habit in an apparent effort to tide over the time until the year-end rush of affairs makes deliberate consideration of measures impossible. While we who are members of the minority party cannot compel the Democratic leadership to bring remedial legislation to the floor for action we can at least prevent a continuation of the long week-end recesses and the recurring skipping of sessions in the middle of the legislative week and this we propose to do.

"We shall endeavor to hold the House in continuous session hereafter and in these daily sessions we shall do our best to press for action on matters demanding early attention if the war effort and the home-front economy are to function at maximum efficiency. We shall point out to the public the problems which need legislative attention by Congress. We shall offer constructive suggestions. We shall make corrective proposals. We shall urge action by both the Congress and its committees on problems of vital importance. In every manner within

our power we shall try to compel the Democratic leadership to act without further unnecessary delay. Daily sessions of Congress will provide an opportunity for such action and if it is not forthcoming these sessions will permit the public to learn the awful truth that the Democratic leadership is stalling and delaying decisions in a manner which weakens our home front and retards our war effort."

Among the problems listed by the committee as appropriate subjects for immediate action by Congress are the following:

1. The necessity of acting promptly once and for all to dispose of the food subsidy question so that farmers will be able to plan for their next year's crops and so that progress can be made in stimulating maximum production by providing farmers with fair prices in the market place without regimentation. This should be coupled with the naming of a single food administrator to bring order out of the chaos which is doing so much to aggravate our serious food situation.

2. The need to take action to increase the production of crude oil so that existing gasoline and fuel oil shortages may be relieved.

3. The double checking and careful investigation of all appropriation measures to be sure that economy becomes a working policy of government rather than merely a pious political promise. We vigorously oppose all expenditures and bureaucratic actions which are contrary to the expressed will of Congress.

4. The passage of legislation to provide citizens an appeal through regularly established judicial channels from any bureaucratic directive or regulation.

The drive-for-action committee stressed the fact that the four-point program announced last night is not a complete analysis of legislative jobs which are begging for action. Additional points will be added from time to time.

The following Members of Congress were announced as comprising the executive board of the drive-for-action committee:

1. KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota.
2. GERALD W. LANDIS, Indiana.
3. ROSS RIZLEY, Oklahoma.
4. HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho.
5. THOMAS WINTER, Kansas.
6. BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa.
7. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Minnesota.
8. CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio.
9. BARTEL J. JONKMAN, Michigan.
10. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Illinois.
11. CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska.
12. WILLIAM J. MILLER, Connecticut.
13. MARION T. BENNETT, Missouri.
14. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin.
15. A. C. SCHIFFLER, West Virginia.
16. LEONARD W. HALL, New York.

The executive board is comprised of 16 members from 16 States scattered across the country.

Committee spokesmen stated, "Our present membership list is not complete or exclusive; we expect that many other Members of Congress will join us in this drive. We have no political axes to grind, no candidates to promote, no special groups to protect or attack. We simply are insisting that Congress be given an opportunity to measure up to its responsibilities as a coordinate branch of government in this Republic. We want the Democratic leadership to take off the brakes and let Congress function as freely and fully as the executive and judicial branches of government. The House of Representatives is the voice of the people. We feel the time has come for this voice to be heard."

The statement issued by the executive board of the drive-for-action committee stated that the group had been organized after consultation with the minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., and that the movement has his approval.

Beware of a Superstate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Edward J. Meeman, the very able editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. The editorial is entitled "Let's Cooperate to Enforce Peace, but Beware of a Superstate: Let Nations Stay Free," and was published in the Thursday, October 28, 1943, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S COOPERATE TO ENFORCE PEACE, BUT BEWARE OF A SUPERSTATE—LET NATIONS STAY FREE

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

Let us beware lest our search for world peace through collective security lead to the building of a too-powerful international superstate.

Let us remember that the majority of the nations of the world today are not democratic, and that, therefore, any superstate they would erect will not be democratic. Let us be slow, therefore, to promise to submit our democracy to the edicts of a superstate. We can never return to isolation, our part in international affairs is permanent, but it should be planned thoughtfully.

Thomas Jefferson taught us that that government is best which governs least. We have not always remembered that lesson. Let us remember it now when we frame our international policy. Let us have only the very minimum of international government. That world government will be best which governs least.

Let us have nations free to do as they please in all respects except one—they will not be permitted to make war. Let every other matter be one of voluntary agreement between nations. Let there be but one compulsion—to keep the peace.

The world has been deluged with sentimentality, but the truth is that no nation can ever have a grievance that is intolerable except the use of force by another nation. Every other grievance needs but time and patience to be settled by voluntary agreement. Does a nation lack raw materials? Then let it make a trade agreement to obtain them. Does a nation have too many people? Then let it limit its population to what it can support over and above the immigrants which some other nation will voluntarily accept as desirable. The cry of so-called have-not nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan—was a phony one. They were not shut off from raw materials. Germany deliberately shut off foreign trade in order to become self-contained and ready to make war on other nations so as to dominate them. Sweden has demonstrated that there is nothing to prevent a have-not nation from importing raw materials and selling the manufactured product.

The cry of "overpopulation" was likewise phony. While Germany and Italy were crying for more living space, their dictators were also pleading for more babies.

A nation needs but one international guaranty—that it will not be attacked by any other nation or forced by another nation under threats of attack to accept its goods or its immigrants against its will. No nation has any need which cannot wait for time and the conscience of the world to see that it is met. If once we admit that by threat of war a nation can compel international arbitration of its dispute with another nation, with a resulting compromise that compels the threatened nation to yield something, we may have aggressors imposing on their neighbors peacefully as successfully as they have hitherto done by war.

I suggest an international organization of great simplicity:

1. Ever-growing liberalization of trade through reciprocal trade treaties.

2. Encouragement of the International Labor Office to raise working conditions by international voluntary agreement, thus permitting wider trade by removing fear of the competition of substandard nations.

3. A binding agreement among nations to suppress any armed aggression.

More than that, I believe, will be too much, and lead to the loss of national freedom in exchange for national security, which I believe would be a sorry bargain, and one which it is not necessary to make.

Whatever our course in international affairs, we should draw closer to the British Commonwealth of Nations. No other great power speaks our language; no other great power protects individual freedom and is governed by the democratic process. Britain and ourselves are such close relatives that we sometimes become irritated with each other. We should never allow those irritations to divide us or to hide from ourselves the need we have for each other and the profound respect and affection we have at heart's bottom for each other.

If either of us were threatened with conquest, the other would come to the rescue; why not, then, stand firmly together in the international councils of peacetime?

Importance of Connally Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able article by Mr. Gould Lincoln on the subject which has been under discussion in the Senate for several days. It is printed in his column The Political Mill, and appears in the Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Importance of Senate action on the Connally resolution for international collaboration to maintain peace in the future cannot be exaggerated. The resolution has been under fire in the Senate for more than a week from those who wish to "strengthen" it and from those who would have none of it. There has been much emphasis placed on the phrase "acting through constitutional processes," included in the Connally resolution.

This is the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's way of saying that any agreement entered into with foreign nations for the maintenance of peace must be submitted to

the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote of that body. In other words, a minority of the Senate will be in position to reject such an agreement, if and when it is submitted, even though a majority of both Houses of Congress and the Chief Executive favored the agreement.

Strict adherence to the constitutional provision which gives the President authority to negotiate foreign treaties, but makes them ineffective unless ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, killed Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations Covenant. On two later occasions entry of the United States into the World Court was similarly prevented.

COULD BLOCK COLLABORATION

The result of the Senate vote on the League of Nations Covenant drove this country into its isolationist position, which lasted from the close of World War No. 1 until Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor. It is clear that a similar minority of the Senate could, if it so desired, block any future effort for international collaboration for the maintenance of peace, and place this country in the same position it occupied in the 1920's and 1930's.

Two courses to meet such a situation, or to prevent its arising, have been suggested. The first is an amendment to the Constitution, providing for ratification of treaties with foreign nations by concurrent action of the two Houses of Congress, by majority vote of each, or for ratification of treaties by the Senate by a majority vote.

The other is to make an international agreement by legislative action of Congress by a majority vote. The supporters of the second suggestion maintain that Congress can, by legislation, accomplish the same result as would be accomplished through the submission of a treaty to the Senate and its ratification by that body.

The argument is advanced that Congress has full authority to act on international agreements, and this authority runs concurrently with the treaty-making power. Further, Congress has used this authority in the past. Two of the most celebrated cases are the admission of Texas into the Union and the annexation of Hawaii.

The annexation of Texas was first submitted to the Senate in a treaty signed by John C. Calhoun, Secretary of State, and by the representatives of Texas, then an independent republic, on April 12, 1844. The Senate rejected this treaty by a vote of 16 ayes to 35 nays.

President Taylor asked action by Congress, since he could not get it through Senate ratification of this treaty. He said: "The power of Congress is fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished." The Congress of that day agreed with President Taylor, for a joint resolution was introduced in the House to take the place of a formal treaty. Later it was passed in the House by a vote of 132 to 76 and in the Senate by a vote of 27 to 25.

In this case it was found that the treaty power could not work—to accomplish a desired end. A more democratic procedure, within the bounds of the Constitution, was invoked. It did work. It would be difficult today to find anyone who would say that because the Senate refused to ratify a treaty, Texas should not have become a part of the United States when it did.

An agreement, entered into between the Executive and the representatives of Hawaii, for the annexation of those islands by the United States was rejected by the Senate. But that did not stop the annexation in 1898, when a joint resolution, offered first in the House, was passed by both Houses, and Hawaii was annexed.

RECALLS LEWIS' ARGUMENT

Former Representative David J. Lewis, of Maryland, Democrat, argued the question of international agreements through joint action of the two Houses of Congress at length before the House Foreign Affairs Committee back in 1932. Mr. Lewis gave in detail the many precedents, including those of Texas and Hawaii, to support his contention that this country not only can but has on many occasions entered into international agreements through other processes than treaty making with senatorial ratification by a two-thirds vote.

The Senate can, and probably will, by an overwhelming vote adopt the Connally resolution favoring international collaboration for the maintenance of peace. Such a vote would be regarded as notice to the world that the Senate would, in due time, approve a treaty for such collaboration. It is easy to see, however, that the Senate in the future could decline to accept a treaty, and by a minority vote. The Connally resolution merely agrees to the principle of international collaboration. A future Senate, or the same Senate, would be in a position by a minority vote to reject a detailed treaty of collaboration on the ground that it did not approve one or more of its provisions.

It may become necessary to find some way of meeting this problem, if it arises.

Conditions in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Washington Daily News of yesterday, Monday, November 1, under the headline "Nazis stir up rival factions—Yugoslavs may turn on invading Allied army."

I commend this article to the attention of the Members of the Senate, as I have commended similar articles pertaining to the same situation, in order that we may well appreciate the fact that we shall soon be indulging very deeply, I shall put it, in what is known as power politics, one of the most dangerous things Uncle Sam has ever read about or ever heard about, and which, incidentally, interests itself primarily and fundamentally in things to come, matters after the war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAZIS STIR UP RIVAL FACTIONS—YUGOSLAVS MAY TURN ON INVADING ALLIED ARMY

(By John A. Parris)

NEW YORK, November 1.—Allied soldiers may find Yugoslav guns turned against them as a result of civil war in that land if and when the Balkans are invaded.

A source connected with the partisan group backing Gen. Josip (Tito) Brozovich's Liberation army made that clear in a talk I had in London only last week.

Anyone who lands on Yugoslav soil to support mainly the forces of Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch, guerrilla chieftain and war minister in the regular Yugoslav Government, would not be welcomed by Brozovich's group, he said flatly.

NEW DAY DAWNS

"The People's Liberation army represents the people of Yugoslavia and has their support," this source said. "And we won't have the present Yugoslav Government back on our soil * * * we are determined to fight anybody who attempts to impose on us any persons representing former Yugoslav Governments. A new day has dawned."

The statement showed clearly how deep the fighting between the rival factions has struck. Young King Peter backs Mikhailovitch. He also has been aided by the Americans and British. Brozovich, until recently a mystery man, has Russian sympathies.

But there is no doubt the Germans have had something to do in playing off faction against faction, using the old Serb versus Croat hatred that has torn the land for generations.

While the Allies have representatives in both camps, little has been done to solve the situation and the big Allied Powers never have publicly taken a stand. It took a year for the story of the presence of military advisers on the Mikhailovitch side to creep through censorship.

Reliable sources tell me that Mikhailovitch has been asked to hold his fighting strength in abeyance until it can be used to aid an invading army of British and Americans. Partisan sources say, however, that Brozovich was urged by the Russians to go ahead and fight. He did, pinning down thousands of Nazi and satellite troops.

Each side accuses the other of being a camp of traitors and aiding the Germans. Tito holds no love for Yugoslav royalty, having been sent to exile in Switzerland and Russia by King Peter's father.

No one has yet made clear how the matter will be worked out so as to avoid the possibility of it endangering Allied operations in the Balkans.

New Personal Devil—Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by my friend and colleague, the Honorable GEORGE E. OUTLAND, of California, on bureaucracy. This article appeared in the New Republic, October 25, 1943:

There is a new whipping boy in America today, one that has succeeded "the interests," Wall Street, the railroads, socialism, and all the other time-honored favorites of politicians and public alike. This new focal point of attack for all the ills of the body politic is bureaucracy personified in the unfortunate individual who happens to be the bureau's director, the bureaucrat. The floors of both Houses of Congress have been ringing with increasing denunciations of this scapegoat; he is responsible for all the lacks in the war program, all the deficiencies in our domestic life, all the ills of our social and economic system. Someone has to be blamed: Blame the bureaucrat, because he does not have to run for reelection, and, anyway, he has not been properly respectful to those who do have to run.

It seems trite to say that any large nation must have many administrative bureaus; the larger and more complex the civilization, the

more bureaus are necessary for efficient governmental functioning. The War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department, are all bureaus in the large sense of that word, with each in turn subdivided into many smaller bureaus. These are accepted with very little question by the great majority of the American people; why, then, the increasing attack on bureaucracy? It is our purpose here to attempt to point out the reasons for this attack and to suggest several possible remedies. If the American people are to have the unity and the national understanding so essential to an effective program of war or of peace, it is imperative that we comprehend the role of administrative bureaus in our Government.

BUREAUS ARE, IN ESSENCE, CONTRARY TO THE INDIVIDUALISTIC SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

To a Nation that has been busy killing Indians, conquering a vast continent, and developing the resources of that continent, increasing control of individual activity is most distasteful. Now, however, our great natural frontiers have gone. Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett would seem incongruous indeed in contemporary urbanized America. The tremendous developments in transportation and communication have made the United States of 1943 much smaller and more interrelated than were the Original Thirteen Colonies. Increasingly has it become necessary for each American, for his own protection and liberty, to limit his traditional freedom of action out of regard for the rights of his fellow Americans. This has meant increasing regulation and control, and, as a result, increasing bureaucracy.

Depression brought an intensification of this trend; and stepped up the tempo even more. It is only natural that the landlord who has always charged all the tenants would bear for his house or apartment should bitterly resent rent control by the Office of Price Administration. "Damned bureaucrats back in Washington!" The farmer who has counted on buying some new machinery whenever the crops brought in enough to warrant the expenditure runs smack up against the regulations of the War Production Board, which tells him that he cannot buy a new tractor, no matter how much extra money he has this year. "Damned bureaucrats back in Washington" are responsible again. Limiting of individual freedom of action, so contrary to tradition but so essential to an all-out war effort, is the first reason advanced for the onslaught on our Federal bureaus.

MUCH OF THE ATTACK IS AGAINST THE NEW DEAL

It has been mentioned that bureaus multiplied in number and increased in importance with the national attack on depression, and still more with that on fascism. Both of these steps took place during the Roosevelt administration; consequently the attack has not only been on bureaus as such but on New Deal bureaus. This phase, incidentally, has not been limited to the Republican Party; its strength has been increased by the help of many Democrats, lukewarm toward the New Deal to begin with and now bitterly in opposition. The combination is well illustrated by the alliance of Republicans and certain Democrats against the domestic branch of the Office of War Information, the first element gleeful at the killing of another Democratic agency, the latter incensed by a publication of that agency which disturbed the traditional racial stratification. Now, with the increasing possibility that Mr. Roosevelt will run for a fourth term, the opponents of his domestic policy are redoubling their efforts to discredit the many bureaus established during his three terms, in the hope that the American people will thus refuse to return him to office.

BUREAUS OFFEND SPECIAL-INTEREST GROUPS

It is a truism that vested interests always oppose social change. This statement might be projected even further: far-seeing vested interests oppose even the thought of a change which might menace their interests, and they oppose any governmental agency that has the appearance of stepping into their own particular province.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was thus certain to face the strong opposition of real-estate interests the country over. The Farm Security Administration was equally sure to run up against large farming interests throughout the nation. When the Office of Price Administration suggested that the American people should know what they were buying, and mentioned grade labeling, the advertising interests from Seattle to Miami bellowed "Communistic." The Securities and Exchange Commission naturally was bitterly fought by banking and investment interests, and now it appears likely that the latter was winning the battle. It is somewhat incongruous, however, to see the final stab given to the dying National Youth Administration by educational leaders throughout America.

PART OF THE OPPOSITION IS CONGRESSIONAL RESENTMENT AGAINST INCREASED EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY

This is closely related to, but not identical with, certain phases of the two preceding points. Congressional resentment toward Presidential power is not by any means a partisan proposition. Nor is it necessarily just an anti New Deal manifestation. Many serious and thoughtful Members of both Houses have been concerned by what they honestly fear is a break-away from our traditional check-and-balance form of government. When they see some administrative bureaus assuming unauthorized power, this fear is intensified. A less worthy motive is that many legislators have been unable to have their patronage ambitions satisfied by bureau heads.

This cleavage between executive and legislative branches of the National Government is, of course, not new. It has existed in many administrations, especially during the latter years of those administrations. Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Hoover all faced this situation, albeit reluctantly. President Roosevelt was granted increasing emergency powers first during the depression, and then again after Pearl Harbor. The inevitable reaction has been setting in, and the poor bureaucrat has been forced to suffer as a result.

GENUINE BLUNDERS AND MISTAKES OF THE BUREAUS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE ATTACK

Governmental agencies, like all social institutions, have certain inherent weaknesses. They tend to magnify their respective jobs and to overexpand as a result. They tend to perpetuate themselves rather than to emphasize the jobs which they were originally created to do. They build up their own vested interests in the form of employees who naturally wish to maintain their positions. They have a tendency to lag behind the times. There is always present the danger of losing personal touch and becoming mechanistic and ritualistic in performing their functions. These weaknesses are inherent in all human institutions, religious, economic, and educational, and political ones are certainly no exception. Many honest critics of our bureaus today have seen these weaknesses of governmental agencies without taking into consideration their need and their accomplishments.

Emergency and wartime agencies have all the above weaknesses plus some additional ones. Many of them were established in great haste, without a clearly thought-out policy and course of action. This has made for duplication of effort, for slowness of action, for inconsistency, and for waste in certain instances. Moreover, many square pegs have found their way into round holes, and poorly placed personnel has furnished a most advantageous point of attack for critics, honest and otherwise.

The question naturally arises, "What are we going to do about it?" Bureaus are necessary, in spite of the clamor of cheap political opposition, narrow sectional opposition, and blind ignorant opposition. However, neither partisanship, sectionalism, nor ignorance should prevent us from doing our best to cure these evils without killing the patient. They are absolutely essential to the all-out war effort; the guns and planes and tanks will be of little avail if we have unchecked inflation, undirected use of manpower, squandering of our resources, and limitless profiteering on the home front. Even victory itself will be hollow unless we have preserved the essentials of the democracy which we are fighting so hard to save. What, then, are we going to do about it?

I should like to suggest the following steps, not by any means as a complete program but as a starting point from which we can work to make our National Government function more effectively in this crisis. Many other steps will immediately suggest themselves, but these would appear to be the first ones.

1. There should be constant and continual congressional evaluation of the many administrative bureaus. Such evaluation should be individual in nature and not part of a mass attack on bureaucracy. Insofar as possible (and it may not be possible), this evaluation and ensuing action should be nonpolitical in nature, with partisanship being subordinated entirely to the best interests of the American people. The mechanics for working out this suggestion pose many problems; however, unless the trend is in this direction, increasingly serious consequences will follow.

2. When an agency has fulfilled the task for which it was created and when that task no longer faces the Government, the bureau should be immediately abolished. On the other hand, when it has been conclusively demonstrated that there is a need for the expansion of an agency, that need should be portrayed and adequate appropriations made for such expansion. The job to be done should be the sole criterion for action, whether that action be liquidation or expansion.

3. The merit system should prevail throughout all administrative bureaus in the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of personnel. If this steps on time-honored political prerogatives, so be it. Ability rather than partisanship should hold sway. Where investigation reveals abuses, the responsible personnel should bear the brunt, no matter whose toes are trodden on in the process. Incompetent personnel should be weeded out without regard for sentiment, service to the party, or any other consideration. It is hardly necessary to go so far as to demand 5 years' previous experience in the field of work involved. The much-maligned professor may be better trained for a particular administrative job than the much-praised businessman, heretical though it may be to say this.

4. Constant consultation between bureau heads and congressional committees would probably lessen much of the friction and misunderstanding which now exist. There is little doubt that in the past many agency executives have been careless on this point. This is not to suggest that such a relationship should be political or in the nature of soothing congressional feelings; simply that a working relationship, based upon cooperative understanding, will be for the best interests of all.

5. In the evaluation of old bureaus and the creation of new ones there should be rigid delineation of authority and a full and accurate understanding of the duties to be performed. Without this, duplication is inevitable, with resulting conflict, jealousy, and waste. Much of the criticism that has been heaped upon our bureaus during the past 6 months has been caused by this duplication, and yet it is one of the easier problems to eliminate.

6. Federal bureaus inevitably mean increased centralization of authority. This trend, however, should not be permitted to develop without adequate consideration for the many sectional and local differences and diversities in our national life. Where regional offices are established, extra care should be devoted to see that, so far as possible, that office has autonomy to cope with problems peculiarly local in character. Furthermore, the personnel should be thoroughly familiar with local conditions, although it need not necessarily be chosen only from local applicants.

These steps, I submit, while general in character and while certainly easier to suggest than to put into effect, constitute a minimum program for making our governmental bureaus function more efficiently. Bureaus we must have; all of their evils are by no means inevitable. A democratic form of government will continue to have its three broad divisions of executive, legislative, and judicial; this form will be dynamic, however, necessitating constant efforts at preserving equilibrium, not of preserving the status quo. The importance of national administrative agencies will increase, not decrease; we shall not go back to the good old days of laissez-faire, no matter how much the reactionaries would like us to do so. Those of us who are interested in liberal and progressive government have an important and difficult task ahead; the task not to criticize only but to help our form of government to function at its optimum. In this functioning, bureaus will be important; let us work to see that we have as many bureaus as we need, but no more; that we have as much personnel as we need, but no more; that that personnel be as well trained and efficient as possible, that we counteract partisan and selfish attacks on these national agencies by positive action, not negative.

Distribution of Farm Income and the Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles, one entitled "Farm Income Unevenly Distributed," and the other entitled, "Boxcar Shortage Hits Co-ops," published in the G. T. A. Digest of September–October 1943.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME UNEVENLY DISTRIBUTED—HALF OF FARMERS STILL RECEIVE LESS THAN $1,320 A YEAR

The increase in farm income in 1942 over 1941, the greatest in any year in the Nation's history, brought the aggregate net cash farm income of operators to the highest point ever reached.

But half of the farm operator families in 1941 received less than $760 net cash income from all sources, including net receipts from the operation of the farm, earnings from employment off the farm, rents, pensions, and other income. In 1942, the middle income point was moved to $1,320.

Thus families at or near the middle of the income scale had nearly a 75-percent increase in net cash income on the average, a gain which was only in part offset by a rapid rise in prices paid by farmers for commodities used in family living.

For the families above and below the middle range, the data in table 1 indicate the estimated increase in the income received in 1942 over 1941. Hardly less striking than the general rise in level for each tenth of the families is the great increase in spread of families over the income scale. Whereas the middle 60 percent of the families in 1941 received incomes varying within a range from $260 to $1,670, the corresponding range in 1942 was from $430 to $2,740. Thus while the level of each group was increased, the absolute differences in income among the income groups were greatly widened.

LOWER INCOMES INCREASE MOST

Although there was a greater income spread between farm families of the lowest group and those of the highest, the percentage increase in the income of the lower groups was greater than in the income of the upper. While the lower half of the families received 15.4 percent of the total income in 1941, they received 17.9 percent of the much greater aggregate in 1942. In fact, all groups save the upper 20 percent received a larger share of the 1942 income than of the 1941. Although its absolute spread was increased, nevertheless the 1942 distribution of income appears to have been more favorable to the lower-income groups.

PER FAMILY INCOME CLIMBING

The direction of changes in distribution of total net cash income held also for the distribution of income derived from farming alone (table 2) and, in general, each tendency was emphasized. The median family income derived from farming more than doubled, increasing from $440 to $980. The income range from $65 to $1,310, including the middle 60 percent in 1941, increased to a range of $380 to $1,815 in 1942. Most striking of the changes is in the proportion of the total farm income which went to the lower 50 percent of the farmers. In 1941 this group received only 7.9 percent of the aggregate net cash income from farming, while in 1942 it is estimated that their share more than doubled, reaching 16.4 percent. During both years these families received a greater proportion of their income from nonfarm sources than did the upper 50 percent. Income from nonfarm sources represented a considerably larger percentage of their total net cash income in 1941 than in 1942, although its absolute value was greater in 1942.

Some of the general upward shift in per family farm income may be explained by the decrease in the number of farm families from 1941 to 1942, although the primary factors were the sharp increase in prices and sales of farm products. A larger than proportionate share of the decrease in number of families probably occurred among families at the lower end of the income scale. Competing employment opportunities led a relatively larger number of the smaller operators to give up farming for nonfarm jobs. Some of them left their farms and moved to towns or cities, resulting in many cases in consolidation or abandonment of farming units. In other cases the operation of smaller units was discontinued when the operator took on a full-time nonagricultural job, even though the farm home continued to be the family's residence.

The changed income situation is unquestionably favorable to the welfare of farm families as a whole. The income of every group increased by a greater percentage than the increase in farm family living costs and the income of lower groups increased proportionately more than that of higher groups. The situation affords no basis for complacency, however, as to the present income situation of farm families. Half of the families of farm operators still receive a total net income from all sources of less than $1,800, even when some $400 is added to net cash income as an estimate of the value of housing and food provided by the farm. In spite of certain changes favoring the lower group, the upper 10 percent of the families received 37 percent of the aggregate net cash income from farming in 1942, while the lower 10 percent received only 0.6 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Income from all sources: Share of aggregate net cash income received by each tenth of the Nation's farm operator families, 1941 and 1942*

Proportion of families (tenths)	1941		1942		1942 income as percent of 1941 income
	Income range	Share of aggregate	Income range	Share of aggregate	
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Highest	$2,325 and over	39.3	$3,730 and over	37.0	150
Ninth	$1,670 to $2,324	16.5	$2,740 to $3,729	16.2	156
Eighth	$1,280 to $1,669	12.1	$2,140 to $2,739	12.2	160
Seventh	$985 to $1,279	9.5	$1,660 to $2,139	9.6	161
Sixth	$760 to $984	7.0	$1,320 to $1,659	7.1	161
Fifth	$575 to $759	6.3	$930 to $1,319	6.4	164
Fourth	$405 to $574	4.2	$705 to $929	5.9	190
Third	$260 to $404	3.0	$430 to $704	3.8	196
Second	$120 to $259	1.8	$130 to $429	2.1	202
Lowest	Under $120	.3	Under $130	.6	328

TABLE 2.—*Farm-derived income: Share of aggregate net cash income received by each tenth of the Nation's farm operator families, 1941 and 1942*

Proportion of families (tenths)	1941		1942		1942 income as percent of 1941 income
	Income range	Share of aggregate income	Income range	Share of aggregate income	
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Highest	$1,950 and over	45.0	$2,660 and over	36.9	140
Ninth	$1,310 to $1,949	18.8	$1,815 to $2,659	15.5	141
Eighth	$920 to $1,309	13.5	$1,480 to $1,814	12.0	152
Seventh	$660 to $919	8.4	$1,220 to $1,479	9.5	193
Sixth	$440 to $659	7.0	$980 to $1,219	8.7	212
Fifth	$295 to $439	3.9	$780 to $979	6.0	262
Fourth	$175 to $294	2.5	$590 to $779	5.4	354
Third	$65 to $174	1.1	$380 to $589	4.0	571
Second	Under $65	.4	$185 to $379	1.6	----------
Lowest	Net loss	----------	Under $185	.4	----------

BOXCAR SHORTAGE HITS CO-OPS—G. T. A. LEADS FIGHT TO END DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FARMERS AND THEIR ELEVATORS

A crisis confronts the grain producer and his cooperative elevators. It arises out of the shortage of boxcars and the resurrection, by the American Railway Association, of an antiquated and discriminatory regulation which has not been used for 20 years.

The American Railway Association is made up of the Nation's major railroads. So those who run the railroads make the rules. Whatever the intent—and it is questionable at best—and whatever the purpose, the net result can only be this—to place the farmer and his cooperatives at the mercy of the private grain trade.

GRAIN MOVEMENT AT PEAK

First, let us review what is happening. The movement of grain from the farms to the country elevators and from there to terminal markets, is rapidly reaching a peak. Because of the wartime demand for boxcars, the shortage of cars to move grain is worse than it has been for many years. In many instances grain elevators are filled to capacity and plugged. Farm storage capacity is taxed. In Montana and North Dakota the condition already is so bad and storage space so limited that many farmers are just piling the grain on the ground. They have no other choice.

To all appearances, certain interests appear to be taking advantage of the car shortage and the heavy crop, to attack, weaken, and cripple the cooperative elevators and to make a killing off the grain crop. Farmers who have battled for years to set up their own marketing organizations know of the close alliance that existed between the railroads and the banks and the grain interests. Why shouldn't it be that way when it helped these interests grow rich and powerful? It is still not uncommon to find bankers serving as directors of railroads and grain people sitting on the same railroad boards, making policy.

TWENTY-YEAR-OLD REGULATION

Call it what you will, a conspiracy or a gentleman's agreement, or business in the grand manner of the 1929 boom days, the facts are that the railroads have resurrected from the dead and dusty files of 1923 a ruling that gives all the breaks to the private grain trade. This certainly is of no advantage to the farmer. At best this A. R. A. order is the result of sheer stupidity. At the worst, it can only be construed as part of a conspiracy.

Here are the facts:

First, for years and years, during the grain rush, boxcars have been allocated to all country elevators on the basis of historic volume of business. By this we simply mean that boxcars have been distributed on the basis of past business. For example, if a cooperative elevator handled 100,000 bushels of grain in one town and a private elevator in the same town handled an average of 25,000 bushels of grain, the distribution of cars would be 4 to 1—4 for the co-op and 1 for the private elevator. Perhaps there were not enough cars, but the point is that there was a fair and equitable distribution of all the cars that were available.

DISTRIBUTION UNFAIR TO CO-OPS

Now, what has happened? This brings us to the second fact. In August the railroads suddenly resurrected Circular CSC No. 10 of the American Railway Association. This order is not a law but just a decision by the railroads themselves. For no valid reason, it throws out their former method of distributing cars. No longer is there any prorating of cars on the basis of grain that a country elevator handled.

The way it operates now is that one car goes to each elevator, no matter how much grain these elevators have shipped in past years.

What is actually happening? Let us give you some examples. In the town of Williston in western North Dakota, there are four grain elevators. One of them is the Williston subterminal which holds 225,000 bushels. That's right—it holds a quarter of a million bushels. The combined capacity of the other three elevators in that town is not more than 100,000 bushels. The Williston elevator is filled to capacity, is plugged, padlocked, because there are not enough cars. Grain is diverted to the other elevators. The railroads, under this resurrected law of 20 years ago, say one boxcar to each elevator—no more and no less—and call it justice.

FARMER HAS NO CHOICE

And in other towns in Montana and the Dakotas, there are co-op elevators with the same capacity as the line company buildings. But four to five times as much grain moves through the co-op grain elevator as at the private grain elevators because farmers are smart enough to know that it pays to patronize their own cooperatives. In past years, the boxcars were distributed on the basis of volume of business. Now it is one boxcar to each elevator, no matter how much business.

If the farmer wants his grain moved, he has to go and sell it to his rival, the private elevator company. Someone is going to make a killing, and it will not be the farmer.

This ruling freezes the efforts of any railroad employee who is trying to keep cars moving on a basis that is fair to everybody. He is tied down by this 50–50 regulation. There is nothing he can do about it, no matter how intolerable and unjust it may be.

BATTLE AGAINST CO-OPS

The cooperative grain movement has been fought by certain elements in the private grain trade and by certain elements in the private grain commission business with all the weapons at their disposal. Could it be that they inspired this railroad order because they see the chance in this war emergency to tear down the growing volume of business of co-op elevators? Could it be that they see in this, the opportunity to regain some of their lost business at their own terms because farmers have no other alternative, no other choice, than to go to them?

Whatever the facts, they will make a killing. And if they succeed this year, this same order will go into effect next year and every other year, when a car shortage develops.

Now, what can be done about it? The railroads can rescind this order and go back to the fair practice of distributing cars on a basis of historic volume of business. They will say they cannot, but they can. And if they do not, the Office of Defense Transportation can and should act.

O. D. T. CAN CLEAR MUDDLE

The O. D. T. is a war emergency body and it can act on a moment's notice. If enough farmers act and if enough farmers' organizations step in and demand action, they'll get it. As a matter of fact, one can question as to whether or not this American Railway Association order does not violate the spirit of the Interstate Commerce Commission rulings that there can be be no discrimination against public warehouses.

Years ago, the farmers rebelled against the practices of the private elevators and their absentee owners. They organized their own cooperative elevators in order to market their grain and to get a fair and a decent price for it. They entered the market place to sell their products. And now, because of the A. R. A. order, because somebody has blown the dust off an antiquated order that has not been used in 20 years, farmers must haul their grain to an old-line rival who takes his toll.

WHAT PRODUCERS CAN DO

The I. C. C. was not set up to protect the railroads. It was set up to protect the people, the farmers. Now, the next question is, What can be done about it? What are farmers going to do to save themselves and their own cooperative elevators?

Here are some things which can be done. Every co-op elevator manager should wire to the two Senators of his State. And every elevator board should call a meeting and send telegrams to their two Senators. And farmers who are forced to haul grain to their competitor's house because the railroads fail to furnish the boxcars in which to ship grain, should also send letters or telegrams to their Senators and Representatives.

OUTLINE THE PROBLEM

The whole story should be told about the situation around your local elevator. Go into detail. Tell how this order discriminates against co-op elevators—how it diverts business to a rival to the detriment of all cooperatives. Senators should be urged to get in touch with Senator WHEELER, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ask him to investigate this procedure at once.

Ask the Senators to have the O. D. T. act. Joseph Eastman, who is chairman of O. D. T., is a fair man and one who will act promptly when the facts are given to him. In North Dakota, write or wire to Senators NYE and LANGER. In South Dakota, write or wire to Senators GURNEY and BUSHFIELD. In Montana, write or wire to Senators WHEELER and MURRAY. In Minnesota, write or wire to Senators SHIPSTEAD and BALL.

Your G. T. A. is already doing something about it. A strenuous objection has been filed in behalf of the cooperatives by M. W. Thatcher, in his capacity as general manager of Farmers Union G. T. A. and president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives which represent over 350,000 grain producers in the Nation.

AFFECTS ALL CO-OP ELEVATORS

Every cooperative elevator is affected. This circular which the American Railway Association resurrected from its files of 20 years ago and brushed off, can be the death warrant of cooperative elevators if it is not killed for once and for all. Every cooperative elevator, whether it is affiliated with G. T. A. or not, is affected by this order.

The G. T. A. here in the Northwest, and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives on the national front, are fighting the battle of every grain producer. They are the only organizations with the backing and the experience and the relations which can force this matter to the attention of the Senate and responsible people of O. D. T.

Your Navy Ashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Rear Admiral B. Moreell, (C. E. C.) United States Navy, at the Navy Day Dinner sponsored by the Maryland council of the Navy League of the United States and the Propeller Club

at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Md., on October 27, 1943:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, back in 1931 in the good old days of "calculated economy," I made my last Navy Day speech, prior to this one. The unfortunate circumstances which attended that occasion were so discouraging that it required just 12 years to recover my spirit and to venture another Navy Day speech.

I was, at the time, Public Works Officer of the Thirteenth Naval District with headquarters at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, at Bremerton, Wash. The chamber of commerce of the fine city of Tacoma, Wash., had invited me to address them on the occasion of their Navy Day luncheon. Thinking that I could contribute to the common good by bringing to the attention of a group of representative citizens the need for energetic action in building up our naval forces, I accepted, and I prepared what I thought was an effective appeal to common sense and public interest. I devoted a lot of time to that speech, and I thought I had done a good job.

The day before Navy Day we received at headquarters what is known in the Navy as an alnav, a message from the Secretary to all ships and stations. This alnav stated, in effect, that the President had directed that Navy Day speakers must not exhort their listeners to support expansion of our naval forces and bases, must not tell them what the Navy wants and needs, but should confine their remarks to statements relative to the history of the Navy and the traditions of the Navy. This took the wind out of my sails. The very next day, at noon, I was scheduled to speak, and since I was not too well informed on naval history and naval traditions, I was in a precarious position. In addition, my morale and enthusiasm were at low ebb. I went to Tacoma not knowing what to say and unable to collect my thoughts. When, finally, the toastmaster called on me I arose in fear and trembling, having no prepared speech and no well-defined ideas.

So I decided to do what is always best when you get into a tight spot, whether at home or in your business dealings, tell the truth, lay the cards on the table, and let the chips fall where they may. This is what I said: "Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, up until yesterday morning I had prepared what I think would have gone down in history as one of the great oratorical masterpieces of all time. It was my Navy Day speech which I was going to present to you. Yesterday morning we received a message from the Secretary of the Navy to the effect that the President had directed that Navy Day speakers were to confine their remarks to statements relative to the history of the Navy and the traditions of the Navy. Ladies and gentlemen, the history of the Navy is glorious; the traditions of the Navy are inspiring; having said which I now propose that we all join hands and sing one verse of 'London Bridge Is Falling Down.' I thank you."

The repercussions of those immature and ill-advised remarks reverberated with such disastrous effect upon my standing in the naval community that, to this day, I had never succeeded in gathering sufficient courage to try another Navy Day speech.

But the fine hospitality of the city of Baltimore which I have enjoyed on numerous occasions, and my many friends who are numbered among your citizens, and who are here tonight, have encouraged me to try again, in the hope that whatever I say will be regarded with a generous and a forgiving eye.

Speaking seriously, there is a definite connection between our policies in 1931 and our present status. At the end of World War No. 1 there began a movement, motivated basically by considerations of economy, to strip our armed forces to the bone. Not only did we suspend construction of new naval vessels, naval equipment, and naval bases, but we initiated a program of shrinkage, which flowed from the 1921 disarmament conference, and which resulted in the scuttling of a fleet destined to make the United States the greatest maritime Nation the world had ever seen.

From that time on, until 1933, when the present national administration undertook a modest initial expansion of our Navy afloat, our competitive position among the naval powers of the world deteriorated each year until we reached finally a position where our ability to support our foreign obligations was probably less in proportion to the magnitude of those obligations than that of any other world power. In the 4 years prior to 1933 we had failed to authorize the construction of a single naval vessel; such few vessels as were constructed represented carry-overs from authorizations under previous administrations.

You might well ask what has this to do with the subject of this address, Your Navy Ashore. I will answer, in part, by quoting from a memorandum which I prepared in the summer of 1939 for the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral H. R. Stark, who had just been appointed to that great office. Admiral Stark had requested that in the light of my experiences and studies of required expansions of the naval shore establishment I present to him my views with respect to a policy of naval-base development in Asiatic waters.

It should be recalled that at the time Japan was in complete control of Manchuria, had occupied a large and vital part of China proper, and had, by implication at least, served notice on the world that trade with China would be carried on only at the pleasure of Japan. In Europe there were rapidly accumulating evidences that Germany was poised to launch its initial drive for world domination, in complete disregard of her previous agreements and of international honesty. A madman was on the loose; his evident ambition was to establish a slave society.

Under date of August 15, 1939, I sent Admiral Stark the following:

"The following memorandum is written in compliance with your request that I prepare a brief statement giving my views on naval base development in Asiatic waters.

"The requirements of the United States for naval bases in the Far East may be determined from a consideration of certain fundamental questions, as follows:

" 'Can we, as a great nation, depend for the regulation of international order upon anything but force?'

"The answer, in the light of the present world situation, is emphatically 'No.' It would appear that international agreements are binding only as long as it is nationally expedient to keep them; they cease to exist when they conflict with national interest.

" 'If international order can be preserved only by the use of force, or the threat of force, must we not choose between a policy of enforcing international order insofar as it affects our welfare, or of living in a state of isolation? And, if we choose the latter, will our people, in the years to come, be content to exist in such a state?'

"Having developed the highest standard of living in the history of the world, our people will not be content to lower that standard, as must inevitably occur if we cut ourselves off from the good things of the earth which are produced in other countries, nor will we be content to accept the dictation of some other nation as to what countries we may trade with. We must be prepared, then, if need be, to enforce our right to our proper share of the earth's bounties.

" 'How can we enforce that right?'

"We must have at strategic locations, such facilities as are needed to support our armed forces. The issue is too vital to depend upon improvisation of facilities as they are needed. We must not wait for the fire before we organize a fire department. One cannot improvise a battleship and, in the same sense, one cannot improvise coastal defenses, drydocks, shops, piers, fuel storages, air bases, submarine bases, ammunition depots, supply depots, hospitals, etc.

"How shall we guarantee that our fighting forces shall have that support essential for the performance of their functions with a minimum of expense, a minimum outlay in human life, and the greatest assurance of success in combat?

"We should, at the earliest practicable date, complete the development of Pearl Harbor as a first-class fleet base. I have already reported in detail to the Chief of Naval Operations on these requirements. The estimated cost is $150,000,000. From Pearl Harbor we should progress westward and establish a complete fleet base at Guam. The estimated cost is $225,000,000. And, finally, we should develop at Cavite a properly fortified major fleet base which will serve as our outpost in Asia. The cost would be $225,000,000.

"In this manner, we would have a chain of great naval bases leading from Asia, which is a bountiful source of raw materials and the greatest potential consuming market of the world, to the greatest producing center of the world—the United States.

"Our present fleet facilities in Cavite and Olongapo are small and expansion is not warranted unless we are willing to protect them.

"When we consider that the total cost of these three major naval bases approximates the current cost of running our National Government for a period of about 3 weeks, the modesty of the sum involved is evident. The maintenance and operating costs of these bases would be a permanent burden, but their existence would enable us to reduce, to some extent, the costs of operating our present continental bases.

"It is my belief that as long as nature breeds ambitious men of ability and without scruples, and provides them with millions of willing followers, just so long will we have the elements conducive to international disorder. Our only protection is a willingness and ability to maintain our rights by force, so that this great Nation shall not be dependent for the security and happiness of its citizens upon the personality of the leader which the whim of fate has placed at the head of some other nation. To do this, we must be prepared to go in wholeheartedly and energetically; halfway measures are of no avail, and, in some cases, worse than worthless. We should get in or get out."

But, you may ask, what is the significant importance of naval bases, your Navy ashore, with respect to the support of the active fighting forces? Why must we have on shore buildings and other naval structures to complement the striking forces, i. e., the ships and airplanes, in order that these may be made fully effective?

Every naval ship or aircraft, of whatever type, is dependent upon shore-based facilities for its maintenance. Roughly in proportion to size, a ship may be regarded as self-sustaining for longer or shorter periods of time. The capital ship, that is the battleship or battle cruiser, with its living accommodations for a large crew, its considerable resources in machine shops and other repair equipment, and its storage spaces of repair materials, may be said to be self-sustaining as regards mechanical maintenance, except drydocking, for about 18 months. At the end of that period the accumulation of repair or alteration work which is beyond the capacity of the ship's force or the resources of the fleet

repair ships requires recourse to the facilities of a navy yard for general overhaul.

Large cruisers have practically the same qualities of self-maintenance as capital ships, although between periods of general overhaul at a navy yard they require comparatively more assistance from the repair ships of the fleet.

A destroyer is, ton for ton, the highest powered and most heavily armed type of ship that exists. It has habitable accommodations for its crew but only for a crew of the size needed for the actual operation, under wartime conditions, of its intricate and powerful armament. Machine shop and other repair equipment, as well as storage space for spare parts and other consumable supplies, is severely limited. For much of the routine work of mechanical adjustment and minor repair of delicate machinery, arising from ordinary wear and tear, the destroyer requires the services of a repair and service ship, known as a tender, with its specially trained crew of artisans, its extensive machine ship equipment, and its considerable storage resources for special materials and spare parts. Given the support of a tender, a destroyer may be considered as self-supporting to about the same extent as a cruiser. Periodically, however, a general overhaul at a navy yard is necessary.

A submarine may be likened to a destroyer in the intricacy of its mechanism, but because of even more severe limitations of space it is not possible to provide a submarine with repair equipment, or with the personnel required to make use of it, comparable to even those reduced facilities installed on destroyers. A submarine in active operation may be said to be self-sustaining only during the periods when it is at sea. For the ordinary work of mechanical upkeep it is dependent either upon the resources of its tender or upon some shore establishment. Periodically the submarine, in common with other types, requires major overhaul at a navy yard. In this type of ship we find an additional limitation upon self-maintenance in the matter of habitability. In our newer and larger submarines it is possible, in a temperate climate, to berth and mess the crew on board for protracted periods without intolerable demands upon their physical stamina, provided that they have access to a food and water supply, either from a tender or shore establishment, which the submarine is not fitted to carry in sufficient quantity. In the smaller types, however, and in any type when stationed permanently in the Tropics or in very cold climates it is necessary to provide living and recreational accommodations for the crew when not actually at sea, either upon a tender or on shore.

As regards the problem of self-maintenance, an aircraft of any type may be regarded as an exaggerated case of the submarine. It is self-sustaining only during the time it is in flight. Routine inspection and minor repair work for correction of wear and tear is of the most exacting nature and must be performed by specially trained mechanics. Engines are completely disassembled and overhauled after a specified number of hours of flying time. Periodically, at intervals differing for the different types of planes, a major overhaul corresponding to the navy-yard overhaul of a surface ship is necessary. The actual crew of the ship can assist in this work only in minor degree; most of it must be performed by ground crews housed at shore bases.

It is obvious that this upkeep work must be carried out at a place from which planes can operate, at which they may arrive and from which they may depart under their own power, whether of the landplane or the seaplane type. Such an establishment may be termed either a fleet air base or a naval air station. Since no naval plane contains living accommodations beyond the bare necessities during flight, every such base or station, in addition to its mechanical equipment, needs to be provided with living quarters for both the flying crews and the ground crews of the planes it is required to support.

These are the requirements for the direct or first-line services to the fighting forces; but back of these first line services there is a vast establishment that is backing up the line, a great productive and service organization that must see to it that the striking forces shall have in personnel and matériel what they need when they need it, all designed for direct services to the striking forces or to back up the line for replenishing the personnel and matériel of those forces. This explains the reason for the tremendous expansion of "Your Navy Ashore" during this present war emergency. This expansion represents a total from July 1, 1940, to date of some $7,000,000,000 distributed to approximately 1,150 localities all over the world, and comprising every conceivable type and character of construction ranging from the most primitive straw-thatched huts in the South Pacific to monumental structures such as the great Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md. It comprises shipbuilding and ship repair facilities, including shops, power plants, floating and graving drydocks, harbor facilities, air bases and stations, ordnance factories, ammunition depots, supply depots, training stations, schools, radio stations, hospitals, operating bases, and many unique structures. When consideration is given to the fact that prior to 1937 the total shore establishment of the Navy was valued at only $400,000,000 and the total expended for naval shore facilities during the First World War was $189,000,000; the significance of the expenditure of $7,000,000,000 for "Your Navy Ashore" in this global war is striking.

I would like to be able to tell you that all of these things which are needed to support our fighting forces were available and ready in good measure when the hour of destiny struck. Unfortunately, I cannot do so. We had, indeed, made a start on our Asiatic requirements but in the Philippines, in Guam, and at Wake we were too late with too little, with the tragic consequences of which you are aware. Elsewhere, we were more fortunate, in particular at Midway. Beginning in August 1939 with practically a barren island, we had succeeded in building up a major air base so that on June 3, 1942, when the enemy attacked, we were able to provide ample support for our shore-based aviation, which achieved a major victory.

When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor we had already succeeded in providing major fleet facilities which proved of inestimable value in subsequent actions. At Johnston and Palmyra Islands and at other islands in the South Pacific we have substantial developments. In the Atlantic, in the Carribbean, in Iceland, in the United Kingdom, in north Africa, our naval forces are adequately supported by shore facilities.

The most valuable instrument with which we have had to work in the accomplishment of these great tasks in distant places has been our organization of Seabees, the Navy's construction battalions, composed of working and fighting Americans, many of whom have given up lucrative jobs in civilian life to devote their energies and their lives, if need be, to this arduous servce. There are some 225,000 of them distributed over the face of the earth wherever the naval fighting forces are engaged.

All of these naval shore works have been bulit to support the operations of great fleets of surface vessels and aircraft, in being or in prospect. The end of the war will find this country with the greatest naval force in ships, aircraft, and bases in the history of the world, complemented by the greatest merchant marine, probably some 50,000,000 tons of shipping.

What is the significance of these forces with respect to our present and post-war positions? This great country with its tremendous war-developed productive capacity must have, in open and fair competition with the other countries of the world, free access to the great potential consuming populations and the great sources of raw materials. One would think from the comments which I submitted in my memorandum of 1939 that there is nothing to be gained from cooperative action among the nations to enable us to reduce our tremendous armament burdens when this war is ended. This is not correct.

The basic function of the United States Navy is to uphold our national policies and interests; but, conversely, national policy should be determined in the light of the limitations of our ability to support it by our diplomacy and by means of our armed forces. There is, therefore, an interdependence between national policies, diplomacy, and our armed might which requires that all three be weighed simultaneously and brought into proper balance in determining the character and extent of the commitments for each. The interdependence of national policies, diplomacy, and armed force may be likened to the relationship between the apexes of an equilateral triangle which require, for stable equilibrium, that all be solidly supported at their respective elevations. An appreciable raising or lowering of any one apex immediately unbalances the other two and jeopardizes the security of the whole. If, by substantial and reliable alliances with other nations we can strengthen our foreign position, corresponding adjustments in our foreign obligations and in the magnitude and distribution of our armed forces would be warranted. The triangle is in a state of dynamic equilibrium, like a man riding a bicycle. We cannot stand still and be in equilibrium. We must constantly shift our balance with the changing forces of world events, and this requires a constant state of "alert" to adjust the emphasis on each of the three primary elements as the exigencies of world events demand. However, as has been pointed out by our great Secretary of State, we should bear in mind always that, in the ultimate analysis we, in concert with our Allies, must be prepared to exert our armed might to assure the continued existence, under acceptable standards of living, of our great people. In other words, we must be willing and able to exert sufficient force, if need be, to support and make effective the obligations which we have assumed under our national foreign policy.

You have heard much recently of post-war planning. Some have said that too much emphasis has been placed on post-war planning, that it detracts from our energies devoted to winning the war. To me, every individual American has acquired, whether he wills it or not, two great personal obligations which he cannot escape. These are, first, to win the war, and, second, to win the peace. We are busily engaged in discharging the first of these obligations. We must not neglect the second. While the planning of the peace cannot and must not supersede or detract from our efforts in accomplishing the winning of the war, the former must not be neglected, because without a winning of the peace the winning of the war will be without value.

Let me here emphasize the fact that the war is far from having been won. Our Secretary of the Navy has recently visited the European battle fronts, and he has warned us that we are in for a long, hard war. This opinion is in agreement with those of other responsible officials. But, while concentrating our major energies on the winning of the war and permitting no interference with

that objective, we must, also, give some thought to what we will do with the victory when we get it.

We must plan now to discharge our debt to those who are offering their lives in order that we may continue as a great and free nation. To do this we must establish a stabilized society with an opportunity for all to live as free Americans, each with his share of the good things of life, provided he is willing to work for them.

It would appear to be obvious that the thesis which I have expressed hereinbefore, namely, that we must seek an outlet for our great industrial production, will be even more important when this war is over than it was when I wrote my memorandum in 1939. We have ceased to be primarily an agricultural nation; we are now the greatest industrial nation that the world has ever seen. One of the major effects of this war has been to bring about an acceleration of this change in our basic economy. Before the war we were already a preponderantly industrial nation, but the war demands for industrial production for ourselves, for our allies, and for our friends has activated the process of transition so that today, and hereafter, we are, and will be, completely dependent upon the continued operation, at a high level, of our great industrial productive machinery.

Let us not assume that once the war is won the organizing of the peace will be an easy task. When one considers that our total production for war purposes alone will in the near future, reach a rate of $75,000,000,000 to $80,000,000,000 per annum and that, even with due allowance for a normal shrinkage in production when the war pressure has been removed, there must be found profitable and permanent outlets for a large proportion of this productive capacity, the magnitude and complexity of the task becomes apparent. We cannot ourselves consume this great industrial production; we cannot live off our own fat indefinitely. We must trade in order to obtain basic raw materials for our own consumption and to dispose of our surplus production.

On the credit side of the ledger we have the vision of a nation with the greatest productive machinery in men and material that the world has ever seen; a great merchant fleet which it has been estimated will reach the total of 50,000,000 tons; and a great navy with supporting bases at strategic points throughout the world. We must make the products of our industry available to others for a consideration; the consideration being that we shall receive in return those things which are necessary and desirable for us.

Again, I say that in order to implement such a program and to make it realistic, we must have available the naval forces with which we can, when necessity demands, police the highways of the world, and to make those forces effective they must be supported by "your Navy ashore" throughout the world.

Let us always have before us the obligation and the privilege which each one of us, individually, has had conferred upon him to plan now for the future security and happiness of our fighting men and of American posterity. To do this will require the utmost in devotion and loyalty and earnest effort. Our men who are on distant shores and on the seas are unable to plan now for themselves. They are engaged in a task which does not permit any diversion of their effort. We must match their devotion to the task of winning the war with our devotion to the obligation of supporting them and to the task of winning the peace. When they come back they will be tired and worn and, in many cases, greatly discouraged. They will look to us for leadership. We must not fail them, as they have not and will not fail us. The meek shall inherit the earth, but they must be led by the noble in spirit.

The Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement on yesterday of the conclusions reached at Moscow will put many troublesome questions at rest. This is the most far-reaching victory yet won by the United Nations. The decision must be heartening to everyone but the leaders of the Axis and their followers. As far as the war goes, there seems no justification for any doubt about the determination of the key United Nations to carry the war to unconditional surrender of the enemy. The decision also removes any doubt as to whether the key nations on the Allied side can cooperate in keeping the peace after victory has been won.

The Nazis can no longer hope, nor deceive their people into hoping, that a wedge can be driven between Britain and the United States, on the one hand, and Russia on the other. This hope has been the mainstay of German propaganda for many months. Dr. Goebbels may not have believed a split was possible, but he has used this hope as a device to make the German people believe they had a good reason for carrying on the war.

The thanks of the people of all of the United Nations go to the three principals in this conference, Messrs. Hull, Eden, and Molotov. The American people can be truly proud of their representative for the part he has played in ironing out some of the most difficult and far-reaching problems facing the United Nations. He has contributed greatly toward an early victory, and he has contributed to the peace and security of the world for generations to come. The people of Tennessee are especially proud of the great part toward world freedom and security as being played by our native son.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of November 2, as follows:

We leave for the time being discussion of the special section regarding the future government of Italy and also the meaning of the dramatic inclusion of China in the concert of powers and come to the special contribution of the United States to this remarkable joint outgiving.

Our spokesman at the meeting was, of course, the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull. Mr. Hull is, in origin, a Tennessee mountaineer, an American provincial. Mr. Stalin, Rusisa's spokesman, is a Russian provincial. He is the son of a cobbler from the mountains of the Caucasus. Mr. Hull reached his eminence via the hurly-burly of American politics, a school where ruggedness of mind and character are the basis for permanent achievement. Mr. Stalin reached his eminence in the school of revolution, where strength of mind and will are essential but where, also, ruthlessness and even deliberate cruelty must be at the command of the man ambitious to lead. There are likenesses here, of course, but the likenesses are overshadowed by the contrasts. That there were deep-seated suspicions on both sides of the table we cannot doubt.

Yet somehow the two men, aided by the personable and experienced Mr. Anthony Eden, managed to agree to overlook for the time being some of the issues which divide them and to concern themselves with those which are immediate and pressing for both their countries. They had to agree, for instance, not to press the issue which Poland represents. They had to agree not to press the issue which Finland represents nor the issue represented by the future status of the three small Baltic states, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. The United States, it is true, has no immediate material interest touching these countries, but there are principles involved which cannot be lightly passed over by a man of Mr. Hull's stamp.

From the point of view of our immediate interests, the main issue between Russia and the United States is perhaps the question of Russia's relations with Japan. It was no small achievement to evolve an acceptable formula which would not bring this issue to the fore and which would at the same time admit the existence of the difficulty and permit, also, an agreement in which China could be a legitimate partner.

It is precisely in negotiation of this sort that Mr. Hull's special abilities are to be found. His method, beyond a doubt, is to admit the difficulty, not seek to ignore it. To be honest rather than clever is his technique, if it can be called a technique. Confronted by this method, connivers and contrivers have often been defeated in the past. Straightforward men find that it lessens their difficulties and makes their task easier.

Mr. Hull knew in advance the issues which must be faced immediately. He knew also the issues which could not successfully be faced at this time. We can be certain from the outcome that he was completely willing to limit the agenda to those matters now susceptible to agreement and that he knew precisely where he stood on those issues.

On his part, Mr. Stalin must have found the frankness and the directness of Mr. Hull a reassurance, for Mr. Stalin also shows signs of knowing what is feasible and what is not feasible.

Thus the two men were able to meet on common ground of remarkable extent and to reach an agreement on matters of great scope. That there are issues yet to be faced and that some of these issues are difficult and could be disruptive, no thoughtful man will deny. But the agreement as it stands is an achievement of tremendous importance both for the present and for the future.

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a radio address delivered today, as follows:

The most sensitive nerve in the human body is not the sciatic nerve, as the doctors sometimes tell us, but the nerve to the pocketbook. That delicate and responsive nerve has been subjected to some excruciating twinges during the last 2 years. Congress has appropriated more money since the war

began than was appropriated in all the previous years of the Nation's history, from the first administration of George Washington down to the last administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, inclusive. In addition, we are now spending between seven and eight billion dollars a month on war activities alone. And it is conservatively estimated that by the close of the war the national debt will aggregate something like $300,000,000,000.

It is difficult for the average layman to estimate the value of $1,000,000,000; and the extent and purchasing power of $300,000,000,000 is, generally speaking, absolutely beyond the comprehension of the human mind.

But we can "sort of sidle up" to it, so to speak, when we are told that it exceeds the total assessed value of all the property in the United States. In other words, we will owe, by the close of the war, considerably more than we are worth.

Now, an individual owing more than he is worth would be considered rather a poor risk at the local bank. But even at that he would be in better financial condition than the Government. For it is within the range of possibility that the individual might go out and make enough to pay his debts. While the Government has no means of making money. Its only recourse is to take it from the pockets of the taxpayers, and that is where the $300,000,000,000 will come from. It is coming out of your pocket, or at least your share is coming out of your pocket. The pro rata share of the $300,000,000,000 is about $8,000 for every family in the United States. If your neighbor does not pay his share you will have to pay it for him, or if you do not pay your share your neighbor, or somebody else, must pay it for you, and then take it out of your standard of living, for some generations to come. So you are going to pay it sooner or later, one way or another.

No wonder the Nation is becoming tax conscious. And tax conscious means appropriation conscious. For unless the Government spends money it will not need taxes. And the more it spends the higher the taxes. The two go together. They rise and fall together. High expenditures—high taxes. Economy in expenditures—low taxes. Very simple. And yet a great many people do not seem to understand it.

A great many people seem to expect Congressmen to vote for all the appropriation bills and against all the tax bills. Or at least to vote for all the appropriations benefitting their industry or their section of the country

For example, Congress, in response to urgent demands from the country, recently discontinued appropriations for the Work Projects Administration, the W. P. A. Yet only this week there was a barrage from all parts of the country demanding appropriations to complete numerous abandoned W. P. A. projects. And the astounding feature of these demands is that most of them are from people who just as urgently and vociferously demanded abolition of W. P. A. And the same is true of practically every other distress and emergency agency abolished. They want to discontinue the agency but continue the expenditure of Federal money on their own local projects.

The Committee on Appropriations has just concluded hearings on the last general appropriation bill for this calendar year. It will be taken up on the floor Thursday, the day after tomorrow. In response to Nation-wide demands for economy and lower taxes we have cut the estimates in this bill drastically. Now, in view of the widespread demands for economy, you would think these reductions would meet with general acclaim. But, strange as it may seem, of all the letters and telegrams received since these reductions have been announced, there is not one letter or telegram approving the retrenchments or asking for further reductions. On the contrary, all mail coming in on the bill, without exception, protests the reductions and demands increases in the appropriations. And the less connection the appropriation has with the war effort, the more stentorian the demands for more money. All talk economy and low taxes, and all demand larger appropriations regardless of taxes.

Now what course shall the committee take? Shall we adhere to a policy of consistent reduction of expenditure and report the bill to the House next Thursday as originally written? Or shall we yield to importunities and appropriate the money requested?

Of course each pressure group insists that it is objecting—not to the policy of retrenchment—but to the judgment of the committee in selecting its particular project for retrenchment.

But the only way to cut is to cut. And that is the course the committee has been following—especially with relation to nonwar items. Nonwar expenditures were cut to the bone in the last session, and now we are taking part of the bone. For example, whereas we spent at the peak, for relief alone, at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a year—to be exact, $2,981,000,000—all such expenditures have now been reduced to the vanishing point. Of all the relief agencies created during the distress period, N. Y. A., W. P. A., C. C. C., F. S. A., etc., only Farm Security remains, and it has so demonstrated its value, even in times of comparative plenty, that we have felt warranted in continuing it. All other relief agencies have been abolished and all nonessentials have been pared down to the irreducible minimum.

The war expenditures fall within a different category. So much has been at stake in providing war appropriations—the outcome of the war, the perpetuity of the Government, the lives of millions of men—that we could not afford to take chances for the sake of mere economy. We are throwing vast levies of men into the uttermost parts of the earth, surrounded by ruthless and resourceful enemies. They must not lack for munitions or supplies. Failure to get weapons, rations, and ammunition to them promptly—and in ample quantities—means their destruction and the enslavement of the Nation for a thousand years to come. When the call comes for tanks or planes in the crisis of the battle—whether at Bataan or Salerno—5 minutes late is too late. And when a thousand rounds of ammunition are ordered up on the front line, 999 rounds are too little. The French Army gallantly holding the Maginot Line repelled the first panzer attacks of Hitler's armored division. But when the diving Stukas began to drop thunderbolts from the skies, the agonizing appeal flashed back to headquarters, "Send us planes. For God's sake, send us planes." The planes never came. There were none to come. They died under their guns, not outfought, but outarmed. We can't take any chances like that with our boys. No American soldier must find himself without everything he needs at the crucial minute when the tide is turning on any battle front in Europe or Asia.

There will be vast quantities of surplus war material left on our hands at the close of the war. But better waste a few billion dollars more than is needed than lose a million men and see them driven across the bloody beaches of Italy or France into the sea, for the want of a few more dollars' worth of armament. The committee is scrutinizing every estimate for war expenditures as closely as for nonwar expenditures. We are eliminating every item it is safe to eliminate. But with this alternative before us—we propose to resolve every doubt in favor of too much rather than too little. Delay in supplies and transportation delay the close of the war. Ample supplies and prompt delivery shorten the war. On November 10, 1918, the day before the armistice, thousands of men died in battle and thousands more were wounded. Had the armistice come on November 10 instead of November 11, they would have been saved; they would have come home to their families safe and sound. Every day this war continues means that much and more. And that is what we have in mind in making these appropriations—to save as many days of slaughter as we can, to bring the armistice as near as it is possible for appropriations to bring it.

But, contrary to general impression, such expenditures have no direct connection with the question as to whether the Committee on Ways and Means reports out a tax bill before the holidays. Our total budget for the present fiscal year approximates $100,000,000,000—to be exact, $104,000,000,000—of which $97,000,000,000 is for war expenditures. I confidently expect our war expenditures to be five to seven billion dollars less than this estimate. And, of course, nonrecurring construction items are dropped automatically. No one has to cut them out. But we must proceed on the assumption that the full one hundred and four billions will be required.

Our revenues over the same period aggregate—under existing law—about $39,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of $65,000,000,000. In other words, our income is less than half our expenditures—in any event. Whether we save or spend $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000, more or less, on the war during the year cannot affect the need for additional revenue. Our policy is to pay half the cost of the war as we go along and raise the other half through loans—by the sale of bonds. And even if we should reduce our war budget $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 we will still be falling far behind our announced intention to pay half the cost of the war out of current income. All talk of reducing war expenditures sufficiently to obviate the need for additional revenue this fiscal year is wholly beside the point. There is no relation between the two. We must either enact legislation providing additional revenue this year, when wages and income are higher than they have ever been before in American history, when the national income is topping all records, when there is more money than there will ever be again, or we must leave it for the lean years, leave it for the boys who have been making $50 a month in the hell holes of the war, leave it for the service men to pay in depression, the years that are to come, and for their children and children's children to eke out of their depleted standards of living.

May I summarize.

First, we have drastically reduced non-war expenditures. We need your support in holding these retrenchments in the bill next Thursday and in the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year.

Second, we must be guided by expert military strategy and opinion. We cannot afford to cut the war appropriations to a point where lack of material or delay in delivery will endanger the lives of our men or prolong the war.

Third, there should be prompt enactment of legislation providing sufficient revenue to pay at least half the expense of the war as we go along, instead of saddling it on the returning servicemen and future generations.

There are no more vital considerations than these three propositions before the American people today. Upon their early and effective disposition depend issues reaching too far into the future for the eyes of this generation to follow.

Post-War Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine by John Foster Dulles, chairman of the committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ to study bases of a just and durable peace, at the opening of the Christian mission for world order on October 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This meeting opens the churches' national mission on world order. By that mission we seek to revive in our people a sense of destiny in the performance of a great work of creation. Upon the success of our effort, with parallel efforts by others, depends the future of our Nation. For we are at one of those critical periods that can readily mark the end of our greatness.

We have been a people of vision and self-confidence. Our founders, though a mere handful of colonists, from the start conceived of their task as of world-wide import. They say a great prospect and were filled with a great purpose. The opening paragraph of the Federalist Papers reads:

"It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide whether societies of men are capable of establishing good government."

Failure on their part, it continues, would be "the general misfortune of mankind." Moreover, they did not see their experiment as something to be conducted under the conditions of a laboratory. That would have meant little to others than themselves. They had the courage to launch their principles into the world. The Thirteen Colonies did not form themselves into a closed political unit. They adopted a Constitution which was an open-end instrument, designed to bring more areas and more people into federal union. By the operation of this provision the original States and their citizens quickly became a minority. They had disdained subtle formulas for perpetuating their own control and fearlessly entrusted their destiny to the inherent soundness of the structure they had conceived.

Not only was their society designed boldly to expand into the world but it was designed to absorb from the rest of the world. Millions were welcomed here from other lands, to share equally the opportunities of the founders and their heirs.

Under the impulsion of that creative and courageous spirit, the original vision assumed reality. Within a few generations there existed here an area of spiritual, intellectual, and economic vigor the like of which the world had never seen. Americans had, I know, their share of human defects. But their dominant qualities were creative.

The best proof of that is the judgment of others Throughout the nineteenth century the American accomplishment was everywhere recognized as outstanding and no land is without institutions inspired by our example.

Another objective test of our achievement is the security we enjoyed. We had no Army and only a small Navy. We were the least militarized of any western nation. Yet for a century we were not endangered. No foreign people sought to destroy the great American experiment which they admired and in the fruits of which they shared.

Then something happened. We lost our vision. We no longer conceived that we were creating for the benefit of mankind. We lost our courage. We doubted that we could any longer endow our society with the capacity to expand and to absorb. We closed, de facto, our political orbit. This was not because we had achieved a higher order of morality which judged the growth of federal union to be evil. It was because we were afraid. We dared not allow more resources and more people to come into equal sharing with us. "America for the Americans" became our slogan. To keep what we had became our basis for action. On all fronts we began to build barriers—higher tariffs, severe restraints on immigration and increasing exclusion of foreign capital.

When we had to decide whether to join the League of Nations, we refused. Some good reasons could be found for that action. But the reason that was decisive was a bad reason; it was fear.

I know that there are always prophets of evil and that to them the past always seems glorious and the present pallid. But sometimes they are right. The fact of our fallen estate can be proved by the same objective tests that proved our greatness. Half of the population of the world—1,000,000,000 people—will face tomorrow the task of rebuilding their economic, social, and political order. All of their established institutions will have been swept away. Where will they turn for guidance, example, and inspiration? One hundred years ago, 50 years ago, they surely would have turned to us. But they will not do so as we are today, for we present the spectacle of a people who have lost confidence in themselves.

A further proof of our changed condition is to be found in the dangers from without we have had to meet. It is no mere accident that we have now had to fight two great wars in quick succession—wars to parry the first real menaces to our national life. We had become rich and materially powerful, but we were no longer a life-giving society. Daring nothing, we endangered all.

What has happened is grave. It means that our children and grandchildren will not breathe an air suffused with the elixir of creative effort. They will grow up in a sordid atmosphere of quarreling about the division of what former generations created. The shadow of danger will be upon them. It will be a danger that neither armament nor alliances can avert, for such externals never compensate for lack of spiritual power.

There comes a time in the life of every great people when its work of creation ends. Perhaps that hour has struck for us. But it need not be so. Essentially we are still vital and capable of great endeavor. Our youth are not soft or fearful of peril; they crave adventure. Our tradition and our heritage are not forgotten. No forces that we cannot master compel our national decadence. If, however, we are to avoid that fate and recapture the spirit that made us great, we must first diagnose and then cure the malady that attacks us. Something has happened. What is it that has happened and why?

We have had to meet the severest test that can come to a people, that is, the test of prosperity. We have failed to meet that test successfully.

It was said by Christ that material things would be added unto those who seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. But when that happens, then comes the great trial. For, as Christ warned, those material things can readily become the rust that corrodes men's souls.

Thus there often occurs a typical cycle. Men who feel a sense of duty to some higher Being strive here to do His will. Because of their faith, they have power and virtue and simple wisdom. They build not only for the day, but for the morrow; not merely for themselves, but for mankind. A society so founded will, when Nature favors, produce wealth and luxury for many. When those byproducts come, they seem so good that they become promoted to be the all-sufficient end. Men are drawn away from long-range creative effort They struggle to get and to hold material things.

When that happens in a national group that nation loses its soul. That is what has happened to us, and today we face the problem of how to regain that soul.

For guidance let us turn to Jesus Christ, who revealed to men not only the way of spiritual salvation, but how to create a fellowship on earth. For that He sought for men four simple and very practical qualities: to see, to understand, to reason, and then to act.

Christ wanted men to see, to see far and to see truly. To get that kind of vision, He pointed out, requires avoidance of hypocrisies and group prejudices, which distort the vision and make men imagine they see what is not really there.

Christ wanted men to have hearts that comprehended the human significance of what is seen. That kind of heart requires, He pointed out, avoidance of material self-seeking which makes men hard and indifferent to all that cannot serve their selfish ends.

Christ wanted men to reason clearly and serenely. That requires, He pointed out, avoidance of evil emotions such as hatred and vengefulness, which inflame men's mind and distract them from the real problems that confront them.

Christ wanted men to act. He did not teach a purely contemplative religion. "Go" and "do" were his constant injunctions. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works."

If individuals today will follow these four simple precepts, then they will have found a way to lift themselves out of the state to which they have fallen. He who sees clearly, in whatever be his environment, who comprehends the human significance of what he sees, who thinks serenely what to do about it, and then does it, will find his action fruitful, probably far beyond his expectation. He will sense the power of creation and a satisfaction which far surpasses that of possession. He will become a person of righteous and creative faith.

If that happens, in sufficient numbers, then and only then can we as a Nation resume a creative role in world affairs. Without that we are doomed. For the harmonious association of men is not achieved by treaties, or councils, or armies. These things may help. But the essential is that people find the way to do together works of creation. That way can never be found and followed by a nation unless it has first become the way of the individuals who make that nation's policy. There is no national being apart from you and me who can dream and hope and aspire. That is for men and women and children possessed of qualities unique to those whom God created to be but little lower than the angels. So if we would be a nation of creative faith, we must be individuals of creative faith.

Thus there devolves on every citizen a personal responsibility to develop in himself the qualities which we want to be characteristic of our Nation.

When that has happened, our Nation will again be a nation of vision. With that

vision we shall see a world in which most of humanity has been torn away from all established institutions. Almost everywhere a new society must be built. This is not only a calamity, it is an opportunity, the like of which men never saw before. So, if we see, we shall see the greatest challenge of all time.

We shall, as a nation, be comprehending. We shall hear the cry of multitudes that a way be found to save them and their children from the death, the misery, the starvation of body and soul which recurrent war and economic disorder now wreak upon man. We shall be so moved by that cry that we shall resolutely dedicate ourselves to find that way.

We shall, as a nation, think out the way to advance our purpose. The broad principles which need to be incorporated into the new world are not obscure. They involve practices which are widely followed as between men who live in personal contact with each other. Such practices now need world-wide application, because the world has grown so small. Our commission has set out these political principles as six pillars of peace. Our statement has been widely accepted both here and abroad and by church and secular groups. To devise political machinery to implement these principles presents no insoluble problem. It needs only that we give our best thinking to that instead of to making some passing gain or satisfying some hate or prejudice.

Finally, we will act. We will not merely see the challenge, feel the sympathy, think out the way. We will act. We will embark, in company with others, on the next great adventure, that of building a fellowship that is world-wide in scope. Out of the perils, the difficulties, the accomplishments of that task will come again the joy that is reserved to those who seek here to create in God's image.

The Future of Aviation Is Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 2 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Future of Aviation Is Your Business, delivered by Charles I. Stanton, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The address was broadcast on October 29 over a national hook-up of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every citizen from coast to coast has a vital stake in the future of American aviation, and has suddenly become air conscious as never before. Because of this the air is filled with prophecy about the role of aviation in the post-war world.

As you all know, the airplane was born just 40 years ago, December 17, 1903, on the bleak sands of Kitty Hawk, N. C., where the Wright brothers achieved a flight of 59 seconds, a thousand feet long.

Twenty-five years ago, May 15, 1918, the United States Post Office commenced scheduled air mail flying on a route between New York and Washington. From this humble start grew the world-wide network of commercial air routes which has shrunk our globe to a 125-hour circumference. (It took more than 90 hours just to go from New York to San Francisco in 1918.)

Only 5 years ago our Congress, recognizing that air transportation was destined to become a vital factor in our economic and social progress, and aware of the evils which beset other forms of transportation in their formative and unregulated beginnings, passed the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This act provided for economic control and regulation of air transport in the interest of the public, and prevention of destructive competition.

The Bureau of Air Commerce, in its previous 12 years of existence already had built the world's outstanding system of air-navigation facilities, air communications, and air traffic control; and had formulated an equally outstanding code of safety regulations for aircraft and airmen, which was consistent with the healthy development of general private and commercial flying.

This 1938 legislation accelerated the already rapid progress. Today our American commercial air lines annually are flying a total of 150,000,000 miles a year, carrying 5,000,000 passengers, 50,000,000 pounds of mail, and 25,000,000 pounds of express. But this is by no means all, for the Air Transport Services of Army and Navy are flying many times these totals in miles, passengers, mail, and cargo. There is little doubt that the commercial air lines will fall heir to a large portion of this war-created traffic when peace comes.

The part our combat air forces are playing in this war is too well known for discussion here. Suffice to say that they are fulfilling the most optimistic expectations of their builders. They are the difference between winning and losing.

We have come a long way in a short time, so no wonder every American is eagerly inquiring as to what lies ahead in peacetime flying, for every American realizes that aviation will materially affect his own economic and social life. The simple answer is—an enormously greater and more rapid development of aviation. Yet this advance will bring with it a host of problems, which will tax our national ingenuity to solve.

Now, what are the factors essential to this great advance?

On the basis of our studies they are:

1. People—those who want to fly and those who know how to fly.

2. Ability to produce aircraft that are useful, safe, and economical.

3. Airports and air navigation facilities which will serve flying as our highway system serves our motoring and our lighthouse system serves our shipping.

4. Commercial transportation services—swift, safe, reliable, and inexpensive—connecting all populous communities.

Let's consider them in order—people first. Do you know anyone who doesn't want to fly, either as a pilot or passenger? If there are such under age 40 today, they are but a handful. Certainly all the youngsters want to fly—know they are going to fly—and already know considerable about flying.

We in C. A. A. estimate the immediate post-war pilot potential as follows:

There were 100,000 certificated civil pilots before the war; and today there are approximately 150,000 civilian student pilots. The Army- and Navy-trained pilots at the end of war will total some 350,000. Thus we will have in this country about 600,000 qualified pilots.

Certainly all these will want to continue flying either for business or for fun.

In addition to the trained pilots there will be approximately two and a half million men in the service air forces trained in other aviation duties. At least one-third of these—800,000—will seek to round out their experience by learning to fly—if only as non-professional pilots on the home-town airports.

Whenever the war may stop, I anticipate that 100,000 youngsters who have been accepted for flying training in the Army and Navy—youngsters waiting their call to serve—also will want to make their dreams come true even if the war wouldn't wait for them.

Last school year there were 250,000 students in 14,000 of the country's high schools gaining the theoretical knowledge required for a private pilot certificate—and a great many more this year.

So, we have a pilot potential of almost 2,000,000. And even if a great many are unable to actually undertake or complete training, this still is enormous compared to anything heretofore.

Now, our second factor: How about our ability to produce aircraft? This year we planned to produce $20,000,000,000 worth—and we actually are exceeding that figure.

But next year's quota is scheduled to be more than $30,000,000,000 worth. Compare this with our automotive production—just under $4,000,000,000 in its best year.

Of course, peacetime flying cannot reasonably be expected to absorb any such volume of aircraft immediately after the war.

Many manufacturers of other commodities are pinch-hitting in the aircraft program. Even without these, our regular aircraft producers have the capacity to make more than all the aircraft we shall be able to use, and all that the rest of the world will want to buy from us.

The future civil airplanes will be of three general types. First, the conventional type, similar to those which were in general use before the war but greatly improved in reliability and performance because of the lessons learned in wartime production. These, outside the air liner class, will range from two to eight in passenger capacity, will develop from approximately seventy-five to six or seven hundred horsepower, with speeds from 90 to 200 miles an hour, and should cost from $1,000 to $20,000.

Of course, the vast majority will be in the lower price levels. But they will not be inferior in reliability and safety.

The next general type will be what we term the "armchair" airplanes. These will have somewhat less performance and maneuverability but will have features making them extremely simple and even safer to fly. They will appeal to family folks who can't spend too much time practicing the art of flying but want to take to the air on week ends of vacations. Such planes probably will be available in from two- to six-passenger capacity, priced from $1,000 to $10,000, powered from 75 to 400 or 500 horsepower, and with speeds from 90 to 150 miles an hour. Safer because they will not stall and spin, they also will be simpler to take off, fly, and land because of their tricycle landing gears and two flying controls instead of the conventional three.

Planes of this type were developed and tested before the war and are bound to be increasingly popular.

The third general class includes the "dream children" of the aircraft designers—helicopters and roadable airplanes or flying autos with folding or detachable wings.

The helicopter has a great field of usefulness denied to other aircraft because it can go straight up, come straight down, and land and take off from spaces only a little larger than its own dimensions.

It is fascinating to visualize what that can mean to explorers and vacationers who seek the wild, inaccessible places; how it can be applied in forest patrol and in rescue work.

It is not unreasonable to see the helicopter performing an air taxicab service between our suburban transport airports and the nearby communities served by the airports.

The much discussed combination auto and airplane which can shed its wings at the airport and be driven on to ultimate destination by road is intriguing to anyone imaginative. However, I fear the combination can be neither a first-class automobile nor a first-class airplane. Probably the objective can as well be achieved by a supply of drive-it-yourself automobiles for rent at each airport.

So we feel that we are on the conservative side in planning for 300,000 aircraft within 3 years following the war, and half a million by 1950. The latter number would only be 1 to every 280 people.

Which brings us to the third factor—air-navigation facilities and airports. There we already have achieved outstanding progress. Our far-flung Federal airways system of 35,000 miles in the United States is so integrated with that of Canada and our Alaska network that it forms one continental system extending from the Caribbean to Bering Sea.

Fortunately, our air-navigation facilities have been designed for mass traffic. Our radio and traffic control equipment is of the best, and our scientists and inventors can be counted on to keep them so. We recently have installed four intercontinental super-radio stations on our shores which, in their combined range, blanket the world—providing direct communication with American planes in flight almost anywhere on the globe.

In 1940, by congressional direction, the C. A. A. made a Nation-wide survey of airports and prepared a national airport development program to meet the country's then immediate needs. At that time we estimated that some 4,000 airports of various categories would do the job. Work has gone forward on a number of these under the national defense airport program.

Owing to the war, concentration has necessarily been upon the development of larger fields capable of handling the heaviest military craft in considerable numbers.

So today, we have approximately 3,000 approved airports—1,000 short of our pre-war goal.

C. A. A. studies reveal we shall require twice that number for our post-war needs. Continental United States contains 6,670 communities of 1,000 people or more. All of which want to be accessible by air. Some closely grouped communities can jointly use one large airport. Big metropolitan centers, however, will require multiple airports. Thus there is an early post-war need for a national total of 6,000 airports of various sizes.

Who is going to pay for these airports? The Federal Government? The States? The local government units? Or a combination of all three?

A major question of policy is involved here, one to be decided by the citizens, speaking through their duly elected representatives.

I suggest that the Federal Government and the State governments become partners in building the Nation's post-war civil airport system in general accord with principles worked out in building our national highway system—admittedly the best in the world. If the President and the Congress authorize a Federal-aid airport program, funds could be apportioned to the States by the C. A. A. upon the basis of some accepted formula. Such a formula, we believe, should take account of four factors: (1) the area; (2) population; (3) number of registered aircraft, and (4) the existing number of accredited airports, in each State. As in the Federal highway system, each State would have to match a specified percentage of its quota of Federal funds.

Airport improvements or construction projects would be selected and carried out by the State's own aviation agency. Only projects fitting the National Airport Plan would be eligible for Federal aid, and C. A. A. standards for location, layout, and construction for the class of airport proposed would have to be met.

Some will contend that Federal aid be extended only to airports having interstate significance. How can you say which airports have interstate significance? The airplane, by its very nature, makes even the smallest airport a base for interstate operations.

Whatever the solution, it cannot be delayed too long if we are to keep up with events.

This system of airports and facilities is also a vital necessity for the fourth factor, commercial transportation services. Great as it is, the present scale of transport operations is but a good beginning.

Every day new routes are being pioneered in all parts of the world, and with the coming of peace many more will be opened up for the transport of cargo and passengers.

The day is not far distant, I believe, when all first-class mail will go by air, with pick-up and feeder services tying the smaller communities to the great trunk air lines. We have scarcely scratched the surface of the air traffic potential. In proportion to its population, Alaska has 100 times as many air planes as we in the United States proper, and Alaska's planes fly 20 times as many passenger-miles, 75 times as much air mail, and almost 1,000 times as much air express and freight. Alaska has its own peculiar transportation problems, of course, but her achievement makes quite clear what can be done, what we may well anticipate elsewhere.

Thus, I have sought to present briefly the four factors which are basic to the development of post-war aviation.

We have the people who want to fly and know how to fly; the aircraft production capacity; airports and air-navigation facilities well started; and the nucleus of a swift, reliable, and inexpensive air-transportation service.

If nothing else, the experience of recent years should have taught us one thing: In the modern world no nation can survive, let alone prosper, without air power.

The basis of such air power rests on a vast, sound, civilian flying activity.

To keep its place in the world, America must become a nation on wings, as it already has become a nation on wheels.

Europe—American Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most important job before us is the prevention of future wars. We have tried treaties and disarmament and pacts. In the history of the world we have had more than 8,000 treaties and pacts. Yet we have had one war after another. There is something basically wrong otherwise we would have had more success in stopping wars. I think we have discovered what that basically wrong thing is. Leathem D. Smith, of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., outlines this trouble very pointedly in his pamphlet, Europe—American Style. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this pamphlet printed in the RECORD so that all of us who are looking for a solution might read it and study it.

The pamphlet follows:

EUROPE—AMERICAN STYLE

(By Leathem D. Smith)

Except for the intervention of the United States all of the European countries and their colonies would be under the domination of the Nazis. The United States is in a position, because of its sacrifices in men, material, and money, to require and insist that realistic steps be taken to remove permanently, so far as possible, the causes of war. Individual refugee governments, jealous of their own authorities but who have been powerless in this war as in the past to prevent domination by the Nazis, cannot be considered when their interests are in conflict with any practical general security plan.

Planning should be primarily on behalf of the subject peoples to prevent their periodical engulfment in the horrors and sufferings of war.

There are two major causes of war which any planning should seek to minimize and prevent. The first is the nationalistic spirit and rivalries of different nationalities and countries which are so easily appealed to and exploited by gangster governments. The superrace appeal used by the Nazis seems to us, with our amalgamated nationalities, to be the dumbest kind of philosophy, but it has been used effectively by the Hitler government to create war fervor.

The second cause of war, of equal importance, is the rivalry between the so-called haves and have-nots, caused by the unequal division of the territories and resources of the globe held by the overpopulated but economically advanced European countries.

Discussing first the problems which must be overcome to combat the first cause of war:

Ancient and continuing wars, which breed nationalistic hatreds, have been played up by these governments to create war spirit. Differences in languages have created in effect a Tower of Babel, preventing the unification of Europe and the coordination of their outlooks toward real self-interest. Border barriers between countries, both artificial and natural, were probably originally responsible for these divisions, and they have been maintained to perpetuate this condition. Restrictions on international travel between countries have obstructed progress toward mutual understanding. Differences in money and mediums of exchange, as well as custom duties, tariffs, and other trade barriers have kept these peoples apart and made them susceptible victims to war propaganda. Government-fostered industries in competition have helped to maintain the cleavage between nations.

In the American democratic experiment, next to the premise that all men are born free and equal, the second great venture was the admitting to citizenship of immigrants of every country and nationality in Europe. The American melting pot is the living proof that these peoples do not have to be at each other's throats in war but can live and work together, intermarry, and assimilate into a unified nation. The crossing of these nationalities in marriage works toward a stronger race than the pure-strain superman of the Nazi ideology. Any American statesman who does not propose or foster a similar solution for the war-torn peoples of Europe stamps himself as an apologist for this great American success.

At the end of World War No. 1 the suffering peoples of Europe, knowing through their relatives and friends who had emigrated to this country the success of the American experiment, looked to the American President, Woodrow Wilson, to lead them out of the

chaos of periodical warfare. Instead of viewing the European problem in the same light as the problem faced in this country in its melting-pot experiment, Woodrow Wilson propounded his theory of "right of self-determination" for the war-tortured countries of Europe. None will deny the high-minded theory behind his pronouncement, but the tragedy of this attempted solution is that it was really a war breeder, for it tended to accentuate the divisions between nations and nationalities and opened up causes for arguments in mixed areas with active minority groups.

Hitler used the "right of self-determination" to move into the Sudetan to free the "oppressed German minority" and cloak a real attack on Czechoslovakia.

It should be apparent to any American with pride in the success of the American melting-pot amalgam of these European nationalities into peaceful, friendly American citizens that the only real deliverance for the peoples of Europe can be attained by attacking their problem along the same lines. The American Nation has sacrificed too much in blood of her sons in World War No. 1 and now in World War No. 2 to hesitate to use practical means to rebuild Europe on a new basis that will eliminate this prime cause of conflict and bring permanent peace and hope to its embittered peoples.

Consideration for refugee governments of conquered countries cannot stand in the way of such a solution. They have been unable to cooperate with each other to resist aggression, and, but for American assistance, they would be permanently deposed and their peoples enslaved by the Nazis.

The second great cause of war is the rivalry between nations for colonies, territory, lebensraum, and natural resources. Any solution for the European problem must work toward correction of this unbalanced situation.

It is obviously impossible and unworkable to get the many rival nations, particularly those who have suffered so terribly from Axis aggression, to adopt any policy of sharing with these would-be oppressors the hard-won fruits of victory, but if a solution of these economic inequalities is not reached further wars are unavoidable.

For one with an American background the only logical solution to the European mess is the application of the American system to the warring countries of Europe—a United States of Europe. Admittedly, the problem is great and the difficulties much greater than we had to face in forming a new country with the gradual assimilation of many nationalities, but the reward for its success is so tremendous that difficulties must not deter the effort.

A rough draft of this proposal is as follows:

Analyzing the problem of the various European nations, it would seem that the Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark—had worked out enlightened self-governments and economic independence and could retain their pre-war status. Turkey learned much from World War No. 1 and is progressing steadily and surely toward permanent stability. Spain and Portugal have not been embroiled in this conflict and can be left out of immediate consideration. The British Empire has a tremendous problem to work out by its slow but humane policy of evolution under law and order toward self-government for its polyglot races. Russia has tremendous resources within its own boundaries and a prospective internal development even greater than this country has gone through during the past century. We know from our experience that, during this period of internal development, we had little active interest in foreign affairs, and we may expect the same attitude on the part of the Russian people and government because of their preoccupation with internal development.

The remaining continental European countries are the ones that, because of their geographical positions, can only hope for permanent peace by being welded into one nation. We have proved in America that their nationalities can assimilate with benefit to all. Toward this end stress must be placed on all features that will help to remove the old antagonisms and causes of discord.

The general proposal is as follows:

All Allied countries would be admitted into this united nation as states, with full states' rights. These nations would comprise initially France, Holland, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, and Luxemburg, with some of the larger countries divided into two or more states to insure equitable representation in the national congress on the basis of population. The Axis countries and satellites would be placed initially in the status of territories with no immediate direct representation in the national government. Germany would be divided into several territories, with Austria as a separate one. Admission of these territories as states would depend on their progress toward conformity to the new order. Austria and some of the other subdivisions of Germany would undoubtedly qualify for admission long before Prussia. Some of the countries forced into the war on the Axis side, like Rumania, would probably not wait long for admission. Switzerland, because of its truly neutral atmosphere, would render a great service to humanity by acting as a state or "District of Columbia," with the national capital at Geneva.

The English language, possibly of the simplified basic type, would probably meet with least resistance if adopted initially as the governmental language in the national congress. The impediments which wrecked the Towel of Babel must be gradually removed. Private property confiscated by the Axis must be returned to its owners. Axis manpower and taxes must rebuild the war damage in the Allied lands.

Trade barriers between states must be removed and Maginot line construction replaced by a great program of highway construction to remove the natural barriers to travel between countries. Cheap automobile and other transportation must be developed to encourage travel between states, to help create the better relations resulting from human contact and acquaintance. Intermarriage should be encouraged. The removal of national antagonisms would be gradual, but the effort toward it by education must persist.

To remove the second cause of war, the unequal division of wealth and territory, all of the colonies, held chiefly by the Allied countries, would become the joint holdings of the new united nation. Trade with or immigration to these colonies would be open without restriction to citizens of all states and territories. None could complain of a lack of lebensraum or resources.

The peoples of Europe have developed sufficiently in the scientific and mechanized arts to make them conscious of the higher standards of living available to all by exploitation of the world's resources. They cannot be permanently deprived of them without creating unrest.

The holding of the French and Belgian African colonies, Libya, the Dutch East Indies and other colonial lands for the benefit of the peoples of United Europe would assure them of fields for settlement and development and raw materials for all their needs.

Regarding the mechanics of operation of the new nation, there would be a constitution and bill of rights similar to ours. The states would have senatorial and congressional representation, with improvements suggested by our experience. The territories would be ruled by a governor appointed by the national president and policed by a military force of troops of the United States of Europe.

Definite standards for qualifications for admission of territories as states would be set up, mostly along the line of educational effort to stamp out the perverted doctrines of nazi-ism, fascism, and other isms antagonistic to democratic principles. No territory could be admitted for 5 years, and then for a 5-year probationary period, during which they could be relegated to territorial status by a vote of the congress for noncooperation.

The United States of America, through an appointed commission, would sit in with this national government in an advisory, judicial, and supervisory capacity. Any tendency toward groupings or coalitions aimed at upsetting the national unity would be promptly suppressed by the United Nations forces to ensure the new nation a real trial period of peace to work out its internal problems and amalgamation.

Hitler, unwittingly, in setting up his new order of force in Europe, has paved the way for the new order of democracy. The drafting of labor from the occupied countries has brought these peoples in contact with each other. The terrible sufferings of the concentration and military prison camps have pooled these various nationalities as companions in misery, making at least the citizens of the Allied Nations and occupied countries receptive to a cooperative effort to prevent a repetition of the horrors of war. These are the peoples who will elect the new state and national governments. Those elected must have the vision to realize that even their bitter enemies, the Axis people, must be given a chance, through good behavior and cooperation, to join in the effort to prevent war.

It should be our country's privilege, duty, and responsibility to see that the new United States of Europe survives. While we have twice fought the Germans in war, we have no national antagonisms and no material interest in their territories.

All of the plans advanced so far for postwar international settlements advocate that the United Nations, dominated by the big four, equipped with air, naval, and military force, police the global areas.

The recognition that force is necessary indicates that the causes of war will not be removed and that force will be necessary to maintain the inequities, antagonisms, and national exploitations of the present national and colonial set-ups.

With Japan defeated and under control, I can see no international problem threatening world peace if the two causes of war among European nations are eliminated through the founding of the United States of Europe.

There is nothing experimental or impossible in the proposal. Our country is the laboratory in which the amalgamation and assimilation of the European nationalities has been tested and proven.

We fought a heartbreaking civil war to preserve our Union for our people; in view of our sacrifices in these two world wars, why should we hesitate to use our strength to give the same type of union to the peoples of Europe and prevent their political mad dogs from again running amok?

The dissemination of such a proposal, backed by American governmental action, among the peoples of Axis and satellite countries would do much, I believe, to weaken their war effort, shorten the war, and bring a ray of hope to their people, even through the bestial, perverted fog of Nazi teachings.

A Free Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very informative address entitled "A Free Radio," delivered last night over the radio in this city by Mr. T. A. M. Craven, a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The Printing Office has estimated that the cost of printing will be $112.50.

I believe the address will be found well worth reading by every Member of the Senate who is interested in the problems involved in the radio as a means of spreading knowledge and information. The address deals with certain controversial questions, but in a very constructive way. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After nearly 25 years of splendid service to the Nation, broadcasters are again faced with controversy concerning free speech over the radio. This controversy centers upon rights of minorities to be heard, as well as upon other radio aspects of free speech. Many persons fear that the power of the purse will control the dissemination of facts and opinions to such an extent that the views of minorities cannot be presented adequately to the public and hence that the public will be deprived of the benefits of all facts and opinions. Others fear potential abuse of power by broadcasters, while still others fear that radio will become solely the voice of government. Some demand that radio be free of Government control, and these are opposed by groups advocating more extensive Government regulation.

Various panaceas are offered, such as freedom to listen, freedom of access to the microphone; freedom to hear and be heard; needed, a code of radio good behavior; free speech—an exploration of the broadcaster's duty; and a free radio. All of the panaceas which have been offered require analysis and orientation before they can be evaluated properly in terms of free speech. Many of these panaceas are contradictory to one another, in spite of the fact that all of the proponents thereof intend to defend the Bill of Rights.

As one who has been intimately associated with the development of radio for over 30 years, I am keenly interested in the future of radio broadcasting as a medium of free speech. Therefore, I offer a few thoughts for consideration in the hope they may be constructive. I do this, not in the spirit of criticism of those advocating specific philosophies, but merely to make certain that all phases of the subject may be considered so that the goal which we are all seeking may be attained in fact rather than theory.

DEARTH OF FACILITIES NOT A CONTROLLING FACTOR IN THE SOLUTION OF RADIO'S PROBLEM

Many of the philosophical panaceas for radio are influenced by the present-day dearth of radio facilities. It is alleged that this scarcity is the principal cause of some of our most difficult radio problems. In spite of the fact that in most cities today there are more radio stations than newspapers and that less capital investment is required to establish a radio station than a modern newspaper, emphasis is laid upon the alleged lack of opportunity to enter the radio field as compared with the so-called free opportunities to establish a newspaper.

While it may be true that today there does not exist the same free opportunity to establish a radio station as there is to establish a newspaper, the ultra short-wave frequency modulation radio developments of the war have made it possible to expand radio's opportunities to a considerable degree. Thus, the day need not be far removed when there will be sufficient opportunity for any number of persons with sound business judgment to establish a radio broadcasting enterprise in any community in this country. Thus, the future opportunities may even favor radio in comparison with newspapers. However, it must be made clear that even with the developments arising out of the war, it is difficult to visualize sufficient radio channels to afford every inhabitant the luxury of a radio transmitter. Thus we must content ourselves with the assurance that whatever deleterious effects exist today because of the lack of opportunity to establish radio stations, the lack of facilities will have much less effect in the future. In any event, we can be assured of free competition within the natural limits of prudent economics.

Unfortunately, however, while these expanded opportunities for competition will alleviate one phase of the present situation, such expansion will not of itself constitute a complete solution of the most vexing of today's radio problems. It will not accord unlimited access to the microphone. It may even create other problems. The future danger may well be that too many radio stations in a community will impair the real value of radio as a service to the public. To illustrate this danger, let us assume sufficient radio facilities to accommodate 100 national radio networks. While the business public could not give adequate economic support to such a vast number of networks, the general public nevertheless would have an opportunity to choose from 100 programs. Certainly in all of this confusion the chances are that most people would restrict their choice to just a few of the 100 networks. Perhaps there might be 100 different groups of listeners in each community. In either event, radio would be practically valueless to anyone desiring to reach the entire Nation or even a particular community at any specific time. The audience would be divided so greatly as to impair the value of radio as a medium for reaching the entire public. Thus, while we could have an abundance of facilities, we find that this very abundance becomes a handicap rather than a solution to the problems of radio.

Hence an unlimited number of radio facilities does not appear to be even a controlling factor in the cure of "limited access to the microphone." Therefore, something more than mere lack of radio facilities must be the cause of today's radio problems.

FREEDOM TO LISTEN

The doctrine "freedom to listen" has been advocated recently as a cure for today's radio troubles. This doctrine indicates a misconception of present radio problems insofar as it implies that listeners do not now have the freedom to listen and that a person desiring to use radio for the dissemination of his philosophies to the public has the right to compel listeners to make the choice of either listening to a specific speaker or else turning the dial off or to another station. "Freedom to listen" should not be so confused. "Freedom to listen" was established centuries ago, both in America and in England. Thus, this right was already the listeners' right when radio was discovered. The fact that radio is the newest instrumentality for carrying the voice to greater distances than was possible centuries ago, is no reason for proclaiming at this late date that this freedom exists in America. The people of the United States of America have always had the right to read or to listen to anything they desire, whether by the papers, by radio or by any other means. They have always had the right to listen to the voice of minorities. This is a part of our democracy. This does not mean, however, that anyone has the right to compel people to listen. Therefore, from "freedom to listen" does not follow an inalienable right to be heard, or in modern parlance, "freedom to listen" does not convey of itself "freedom of access" to the microphone.

On the other hand, it is true that in enemy countries there is no Bill of Rights. Consequently, in these countries there is no freedom of any kind. That is why the Atlantic Charter proclaimed the "four freedoms." The alleged new "freedom to listen" is not a new or even a fifth freedom for the peoples of the world. It is inherent in all of the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter.

Therefore, it must be obvious that the solution of the radio problems of today cannot be found in the application of the doctrine "freedom to listen." This right already exists and in spite of this we have controversies raging over rights of access to the microphone. The application of the doctrine "freedom to listen" cannot provide free access to the microphone.

FREEDOM OF ACCESS

Many persons advocate the doctrine of "freedom of access" to the microphone as the solution to today's radio problem. This doctrine likewise indicates certain misconceptions of radio, because without equal opportunity of access for everyone in the country, we cannot achieve freedom of access. A simple calculation should demonstrate that equal opportunity of access is impractical. For example, if every individual in the country operated his own radio station, his station would be valueless to the public as well as to himself. The public would be confronted with a veritable Babel of radio orators. None of these orators could compel persons to listen. Again, assuming that we have a superabundance of 100 national networks, and that everyone has an equal right of access to the microphone, we would discover that the last of the present-day population could not exercise that right for at least 37 years. Actually, unless all of the 100 networks were devoted to speech making for 24 hours every day, and each of the 130,000,000 inhabitants of this country was limited to 15 minutes of talk, it would take longer than 37 years for the last of today's inhabitants to secure his or her access to the microphone.

While most of us wish that minorities with meager pocketbooks could have the opportunity to express their views to the public by radio, it seems obvious that the doctrine "freedom of access" is not the solution of the radio problems of today. No one can even guarantee that all minorities can be heard adequately at opportune times even if all broadcast facilities were made available exclusively for speech making.

BROADCASTER'S DUTY

There are persons who advocate that the broadcast licensee should have the sole responsibility for curing today's radio evils. While this doctrine has much merit, it is possible that it alone will not solve the problems. Under this doctrine the licensee would be required to adjudicate whatever rights any

person may have to use the microphone. Unfortunately, even if Solomon were a radio licensee today, he would be subjected to severe, and perhaps apparently just, criticism in the operation of his broadcast station. He would have to satisfy all the proponents of "freedom of access," "freedom to listen," and "free speech." It is impossible for a radio broadcast licensee to exercise his responsibility in accordance with the concepts of all the proponents of these ideals, because each proponent has a conflicting concept of what rights should be conferred upon anyone desiring to use radio and some do not even understand the practicalities of radio.

Everyone desires that radio be a useful medium for the dissemination of information of interest to the public. In this connection it has already been made unlawful to utter profane or obscene language by radio. Likewise it is illegal to use radio as an adjunct for lotteries. No one desires radio to become solely a medium for the dissemination of the personal views of the licensees or of any particular group. Likewise no one desires that radio be utilized solely as the voice of government. Neither does anyone desire radio to be used as a vehicle for incitement to riot, sedition, or the stirring of religious or racial animosities or hatreds. Nor does anyone desire radio to be utilized as a vehicle for slander, libel, or unfair criticism, or false or misleading information. Moreover, no one believes that unfair discrimination against the dissemination of views should be permitted in radio. And finally, it is not right that the use of broadcast facilities be reserved solely to those who have adequate funds to purchase time. Thus it seems obvious that broadcasting should not be used indiscriminately to exploit private viewpoints.

On the other hand, while radio broadcasting is cloaked with a public rather than a private interest, it cannot become a common carrier and still be useful to the public. It is impossible, from a practical standpoint, to accord everyone a right to use a radio broadcasting facility for the simple reason that there will never be enough time available in which such a right could be exercised.

Certainly, under these conditions it must be obvious that the broadcast licensee has a responsibility to see to it that radio shall be utilized in conformity with the desires of the public. This means that he should not violate ethics or otherwise abuse power or privilege. He should attempt to make his facilities available for a fair and impartial dissemination of information and opinion. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the broadcast licensee cannot exercise his responsibility to the full satisfaction of the entire public. It is unreasonable to expect a broadcaster to adjust to the satisfaction of the entire public the desires of good citizens who conform to good ethics and yet who apply for radio time to voice their views before the public. Some minorities are bound to be dissatisfied, in spite of the impossibility of attaining unlimited access to the microphone. Thus, the solution of radio problems does not reside solely in the hands of today's broadcast licensees.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF RADIO TRAFFIC

We now come to those who advocate that radio licensees must be regulated by the Government with respect to the composition of their radio traffic.

Proponents of this doctrine advocate that rights of freedom of access, freedom to listen, and free speech should be adjudicated by the Federal Communications Commission which is likewise charged with licensing radio stations. The advocates of this doctrine fervently believe that this will solve the alleged evils of today's radio. In my opinion, this so-called solution of the problem is probably founded upon the worst conception of radio yet advanced. This solution jumps from the frying pan into the fire and nullifies all freedoms, including whatever rights may be transmitted to radio from the freedom of the press.

Everyone familiar with the reasons underlying the Bill of Rights knows that freedom of speech and freedom of the press are, in simple terms, merely freedom from fear of Government reprisals for what is said or printed, or for what is not said or printed. In other words, the real freedom of the press guaranteed by the Bill of Rights is freedom in the true sense to criticize Government without fear of reprisal. Thus, if the Bill of Rights is to mean anything for radio, it should mean, first of all, freedom from fear of Government reprisals or pressures administered by the radio licensing authority, namely, the Federal Communications Commission.

Likewise, anyone familiar with the history of the development of a free press knows that the public has always rejected a press which was merely the voice of Government. Therefore, freedom of the press likewise means freedom from the necessity of becoming in any way the voice of Government. This includes freedom from compulsion, pressure, or influence to print what Government officials want printed. If the radio of today is to become as free as the press, a prerequisite condition is that radio should have freedoms such as the press enjoys under the Bill of Rights.

Therefore, regardless of whether the judgment of the Federal Communications Commission would be correct as to the composition of radio traffic, it must be remembered that if this regulatory power is combined with the radio licensing power, the Communications Commission could exert startling influence upon radio licensees. It is inevitable that radio licensees would recognize this power and consequently would interpret mere opinions of members of the Commission as edicts and possibly would curry favor by presenting views which conformed to the desires of Government officials. Such a condition means that radio inevitably would become the voice of Government. This is not a free radio. Consequently, Government regulation of the composition of radio traffic does not constitute a solution to the radio problems of today.

A FREE RADIO

There are differences between the media of radio and the press, but these differences are not sufficient to warrant the assumption that the principles of freedom of the press should not be extended to radio, in spite of the fact that radio must operate on channels which belong to the people. The principal differences between the two media are due to the difference between the eye and the ear. Radio of today utilizes aural methods, and consequently there is no record of what is said, and in addition the presentation at any particular time by a radio station must be consecutive rather than simultaneous, as is the case with newspapers. Consequently, the lack of time available to a station or network during the day is a factor which gives rise to many of the radio problems today. However, we should not overemphasize this difference between radio and newspapers as a justification for denying to radio the principles of a free press. Neither is the fact that in the early days of our history the pamphleteer had certain advantages which radio does not afford today a valid reason for refusing to extend to radio the principles of the Bill of Rights. If we project the pamphleteer's original advantages into comparison with radio of today, we should likewise recognize the disadvantages of the modern pamphleteer system. In fact, the modern pamphleteer system does not have the same value as it did centuries ago as a medium available to an individual desiring to reach the entire public. Even if such an individual possessed the cash, we could not expect the American family to read his pamphlet if everyone else exercised the privilege at the same time. Imagine the average American family trying to sift through 130,000,000 pamphlets in a day or even in 37 years. And in this connection we should remember that it would take 37 years for the last one of us alive today to secure access to the microphone even if we had 100 networks all devoted to speech making for 24 hours every day of the entire period. Thus, in this aspect at least, there is not such a great difference between the radio and the pamphleteer system or even the press as some would have us believe. While we must recognize that potential abuses can exist in radio, the same kinds of abuses can exist in the press. Therefore, if freedom of the press is a good thing, it should likewise be in the public interest to extend this principle to radio. It should be all the more valid because in the future the advent of radio facsimile and radio television will still further minimize the differences between radio broadcasting and the press.

Nevertheless, in spite of the statements just made, it appears necessary that we recognize radio broadcasting as a public service, not in the sense of common carriers, but in some quasi-public utility category. This would imply that neither the licensee nor anyone else has rights which are paramount to those of the public. Such a philosophy need not be an encroachment upon freedom of speech or a free radio in the true sense of the Bill of Rights.

Experience has taught us that radio must be licensed so that technical chaos caused by radio interference between stations may be obviated. This licensing in itself need not constitute an encroachment upon a free radio. Such coordination is essential before an effective medium for the dissemination of facts and opinions can be obtained. This type of regulation, therefore, is required in the interest of the public and it need not impair a free radio in any way.

No one desires monopoly in broadcasting. There is no curtailment of a free radio in requiring radio licensees to comply with the laws of the land in exactly the same manner as the press or anyone else is required to adhere to the law. Moreover, in the future more radio channels can be allocated to broadcasting. The very fact that there will be more opportunity for competition will contribute greatly to a free radio. The ever-present threat of competition can be an automatic weapon in the hands of minorities to correct abuses by radio licensees.

On the other hand, after having provided an effective radio medium by licensing applicants for radio stations, the regulation of the composition of the traffic or the business affairs of those licensees by the Federal Communications Commission could very easily become a curtailment of a free radio. Consequently, such a concentration of power may be contrary to public interest for the simple reason that such regulation must inevitably delve into the realm of freedom of speech. It must be obvious that when the radio licensing agency also regulates the business affairs and the composition of the radio traffic of licensees, radio can no longer be free in the sense of freedom of the press. Since the traffic and economic regulatory power is combined with the licensing power, the total authority is a potential Sword of Damocles which could be applied to force licensees to comply with the social, political, and economic philosophies of an administration in office. Thus, the combination of licensing power with the authority to regulate the composition of traffic and the business affairs of licensees into a single bureau of Government, could spell the doom of a free radio regardless of what men consti-

tute the Communications Commission and this, in spite of the fact that commissioners will be imbued as they are now, with the best of intentions in behalf of the public.

Above all things, the public will demand a free radio. The only way this can be secured is for the public to retain control of the dial and demond that its representatives in Congress refuse to delegate this power to anyone. This power, combined with free opportunity to compete, is the most effective control yet devised to correct abuses of privilege in radio.

COURSES OF ACTION TO SECURE A FREE RADIO

We should recognize that final answers to all of the problems caused by radio today cannot be discovered overnight. Indeed, we need not seek final answers today. However, we can and should discard panaceas or irrational solutions which bear no real relation to the fundamentals of democracy and which do not recognize the practical realities of radio. Instead, we should approach the solution of radio's problem in the atmosphere of our Constitution.

It seems clear that we cannot solve the difficulties of radio until we first agree to make radio free in the full sense of the Bill of Rights. Until this is done, radio cannot become truly useful to the public. It is only after having made this concession, can we think of steps tending to eliminate potential abuses arising out of the inherent limitations of radio.

Another constructive contribution to a free radio can be achieved by providing more opportunities to establish radio stations. This can be accomplished by allocating more radio frequency channels to the service of broadcasting. The radio developments of the war will make this possible. Such an increase of basic facilities would more nearly approach the condition of free competition. The prudent businessman would not be so limited in his opportunity to establish a competing radio station in a community as he is today. With reasonable opportunities for competition, we need not have much fear of potential abuses by radio licensees. Minorities could utilize the weapon of competition to facilitate their opportunities for access to the microphone.

Legislation may be required to serve as guideposts to insure a free radio in the fullest sense and, at the same time, constitute a protection against potential abuses. For example, one potential abuse is the concentration in a single Government agency of the licensing power and the power to regulate the business affairs as well as the composition of the traffic of the licensees. The present law already prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from censoring programs but a recent Supreme Court decision seems to imply that the Commission has power to regulate the composition of traffic as well as to make certain rules and regulations governing the contractual and business relations of broadcast licensees. This situation should be clarified by legislation which prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the composition of radio traffic or in any other way, directly or indirectly, promulgating any regulation or fixing any condition which would interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communications.

This suggestion for new legislation does not mean that broadcast licensees should be immune from the application of other laws of the country. Neither is it suggested that the Commission should be deprived of power to determine whether licensees are disqualified to operate radio broadcasting stations because of violations of laws not specifically within the jurisdiction of the Commission. It does mean, however, that these licensees should be free from the necessity of having the Federal Communications Commission determine, directly or indirectly, whether licensees are guilty of alleged violations of law, other than those specifically placed within the jurisdiction of the Commission. It also means that radio licensees will have the same rights as any other person to the judicial processes guaranteed in the Constitution.

A procedure could be established whereby the Commission, in determining the qualifications of licensees, could consider violations of law not within its jurisdiction. For example, the legislation could provide that the Commission may consider such violations when there is evidence of guilt adjudicated by courts of competent jurisdiction. This procedure would afford both due process and at the same time protect the public interest. However, the Federal Communications Commission should not be permitted to revoke a license merely because an official of a licensee corporation violated some law and such violation had no relation to the operation of a broadcasting station.

The present law accords to candidates for public office limited rights of access to the microphone. However, I believe it should be realized that today there are at least two schools of thought with respect to this phase of the radio problem. One group advocates the extension to all people of legal rights of access to the microphone as well as freedom from censorship by radio licensees. The other group advances the doctrine that no person has an inalienable right of access to the microphone and that the broadcast licensee not only has the responsibility of determining who may use his radio facility but is also responsible for what is uttered by any person using the microphone. The latter group relies upon the weapon of competition to insure access to the microphone to minorities. This assurance has not been satisfactorily effective in the past but as indicated hitherto the weapon of competition could be made much more effective in the future.

The only limitations upon free speech in the present law are the prohibitions against utterances of profane and obscene language and prohibitions against the use of radio in conjunction with lotteries. Naturally, these are not unconstitutional limitations. As indicated hitherto, there is a requirement which compels licensees to accord equal opportunities to opposing political candidates if a licensee makes his facility available to any such candidate; but there is no requirement that he shall make his facilities available to political candidates. Likewise, there is a requirement respecting the announcement of names of sponsors. Finally, there is the requirement to operate radio according to public convenience, interest, and necessity. The latter can be enforced on license renewal proceedings and, for certain specified offenses, by revocation of licenses.

Thus, until recently, the present law accorded broadcast licensees considerable latitude in the operation of radio stations.

Nevertheless, broadcasters have been subjected to severe criticism for attempts at censorship of news commentators and for the manner in which the licensees accord access to the microphone. This criticism has inspired action on the part of the Federal Communications Commission. For example, a recent decision of the Federal Communications Commission prevents licensees from using their broadcasting facilities solely as a vehicle for the dissemination of their personal views. The code which many broadcasters have adopted, governing the practice of licensees with respect to the methods of making radio facilities available for the dissemination of facts and opinions, has been severely criticized by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, as well as by others. Finally, the Supreme Court, in a recent decision, implies that the Commission has the power to regulate the composition of the licensees' traffic. With such an interpretation of the present law governing communications, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Federal Communications Commission may soon proceed further into the realms of regulation of the composition of radio traffic.

The criticism of some aspects of broadcasting is so persistent today that Congress may feel compelled to specify what steps broadcasters may or may not adopt in meeting the demands for access to the microphone. Nevertheless, it is difficult for me to visualize how positive equal rights of access to the microphone could be exercised in practice, even though a new law should accord such rights to all the people. The best that could be achieved in practice in this respect is to make more opportunities to establish competitive radio stations and the enactment of legislation prohibiting broadcasters from imposing harsher conditions upon opponents than upon proponents. Extreme care must be taken that any new legislation does not give advantages to proponents with large cash reserves to the disadvantage of minority groups having little money to spend. Moreover, if the broadcaster is to be prohibited from censoring, he should be relieved from responsibility for libel or for other violations of ethics which he is not empowered to control. If we desire to hold the licensee responsible for what is uttered over his station, we must concede that he should have the right to control such utterances. On the other hand, if it is desired to limit such control, it would seem only fair that the licensee's responsibility be limited in proportion.

I believe the time has come for Congress to settle these controversies. No one else can adjust the matter without either usurping power or else invading the realm of free speech, or both.

As both a member of the Federal Communications Commission and a citizen of the United States, I urge the Congress to enact legislation which guarantees to the public of this country a free radio.

Secretary Hull and the Moscow Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Moscow Agreement—Hull's Contribution," written by Mark Sullivan and published in his column in the Washington Post of today.

Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with what was accomplished by the Moscow Conference, and I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the able and distinguished Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and to congratulate him and the Nation on the highly successful completion of the difficult and delicate task which was assigned to him. He has rendered a noteworthy service to his country and has

demonstrated qualities of wise and far-seeing statesmanship which should cause his name to be placed high in the list of the great men who have occupied the position of Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW AGREEMENTS

(By Mark Sullivan)

HULL'S CONTRIBUTION

In the American comment on the Moscow agreements, one of the most pertinent was that of Acting Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, who said in effect that the world owes a debt to Mr. Cordell Hull. The debt does not lie merely in what was done at Moscow—for that the world is indebted to all three participants. The special debt to Mr. Hull lies in what led up to Moscow. It lies in the patient thought Mr. Hull has long given to the problem of world peace and a practicable means of achieving it. The sum of this thought, Mr. Hull put into two radio addresses to the Nation, one delivered last September 12, the other in July the year before. Examination of those addresses now will show how much of Mr. Hull's thought went into the Moscow agreements. It will show also that of all the Americans thinking about post-war world organization, the contribution of Mr. Hull turns out now to have made the largest approach toward practicable reality.

It is not possible to take the Moscow agreements apart and identify the sources of the ideas. Nor would it be fair to give one person credit for ideas that may have been held by more than one, nor to make fine-spun allocations of credit as between the value of proposing an idea and the equal value of generously assenting to it. But these things can be said: The Moscow agreements contain nothing that is contrary to Mr. Hull's judgment as expressed in his two radio addresses already referred to. They contain so much that was in Mr. Hull's addresses as to make it possible to say the Moscow agreements parallel the thought Mr. Hull had given to the world.

Specification of the principle of sovereign equality, on the part of nations entering into a world organization, is identical with Mr. Hull's thought. So is the specification of the purpose of the world organization, the maintenance of international peace and security—which by implication negatives the additional purposes that some enthusiasts have envisaged. Likewise identical with Mr. Hull's thought is the assumption, inherent in the Moscow agreements, that nations and peoples shall have such form of government as they choose. One touch in the agreements is so associated with Mr. Hull that one infers he must have urged it on the Moscow conference. This is the statement that while Austria is to be independent, she should by her conduct now help pay for her liberalism. The idea that nations and peoples should be responsible for helping to preserve their independence is a thought that Mr. Hull has expressed frequently, in the negotiations that brought the Latin-American and other countries into the common front against the Axis.

That so much of Mr. Hull's beliefs are in the Moscow agreements, and that nothing is in them contrary to Mr. Hull's beliefs, will help to get support for the agreements from the American people and from Congress. In the world of foreign relations, much of Congress is willing to accept on faith what Mr. Hull recommends.

The very holding of the Moscow Conference is a triumph of patient diplomacy on the part of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and presumably in the end Marshal Stalin. During more than a year, something like the Moscow Conference was needed and desired, either a conference of foreign ministers such as has just taken place, or a conference of heads—Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin. During the period, two of the heads, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, met six times, sometimes for weeks. At none of the six conferences was Mr. Stalin present. That Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill wished a meeting with Mr. Stalin was publicly stated by Mr. Churchill, in a radio address last August. He said that "nothing is nearer to the wishes of President Roosevelt and myself," and that if such a meeting "has not yet taken place, it is certainly not because we have not tried our best * * *."

There was no meeting of heads and no meeting of foreign ministers. In the lack of that, statements about purposes alleged to be entertained by the Russian Government came to Washington through the medium of the Moscow press. Some of the statements were disquieting.

In the face of this indirect long-distance sort of communication, we now have the foreign ministers of the three countries directly across a table. This has wholesomely ended the uncertainty—and because of uncertainty, disquiet—that formerly existed.

Votes for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an item taken from the magazine known as Liberty, the issue of October 30, 1943, under the headline "Ballots as well as bullets for fighting men."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALLOTS AS WELL AS BULLETS FOR FIGHTING MEN

A year from now we are going to elect a new President. It may seem premature to talk seriously now about an event a year away, but time rolls by rapidly and there is one aspect of this coming election upon which we have to take action now—otherwise it will soon be too late.

The last time we voted for a President about 50,000,000 ballots were cast. Next election day approximately 10,000,000 men, or presumably one-fifth of the electorate, will be in the armed forces. According to General Marshall, 5,000,000 of these will be overseas. These fighting men certainly ought to have their say in an election which will determine the sort of world for which they are risking their necks.

Undoubtedly the problem of registering qualified voters among our servicemen and handling their ballots is a terrific one. But even if it verges on the impossible, we must solve it. The Army Service Forces, which already have licked insuperable problems in supplying fighting forces on a global scale, can work out methods of dealing with this one. It is important enough to make special effort.

It has been said the boys in service, particularly those overseas, will hardly be in a position to know who is running for what and on what platform. The fear has been expressed that the boys won't have enough information about candidates and issues, particularly in regard to local affairs, on which to base their decisions. We can dismiss this because it is a fact our boys in the service get the same news we do and practically at the same time. They listen to our news broadcasters. They get spot news practically as soon as we see it in our home-town papers, through the medium of the Army Service News, which daily cables it to almost every point in the world where our armed forces are stationed. There it is printed and distributed. They read newspapers and magazines, and these are not so very old when they get them, either. As far as local home-town information goes, you can be sure the boys are pretty well aware of what is going on.

They get letters from the folks back home and will be in quite as good a position as those on the spot to decide whom they want for mayor or dog catcher.

The military authorities are now trying to work out some method of handling the votes of servicemen. But the peculiarities of many State and local election laws place obstacles in their path. These obstacles must be removed—and the boys in the service depend upon us to remove them. State election officials and legislatures should start now to cooperate with the military authorities in whatever steps are necessary to give voters in uniform their say in the 1944 election. If such plans are not already in the works in your community, see what you yourself can do to get them started.

PAUL HUNTER.

The Moscow Declaration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moscow Declaration," published in the Providence Journal of Tuesday, November 2. This is a penetrating and enlightening editorial dealing with the results of the Moscow Conference. It gives expression, I believe, to what is in the minds and hearts of most Rhode Island citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOSCOW DECLARATION

In 1919 Woodrow Wilson returned from Paris with the complete Covenant, or constitution, for the League of Nations—an internationally accepted legal basis in minutest detail for the future government of the world. But the spirit of international cooperation was lacking. That was made evident in the political rivalries compromised at Versailles.

From the Four Power Conference at Moscow yesterday came no covenant, no suggestion of a legal basis for world government. But if words mean anything, the Moscow declaration was alive and vibrant with a spirit which, if it be not killed by man's stupidity, is full of promise that our children and our children's children may live in peace.

As the declaration stands, it is an achievement, both for the prosecution of the war and for the hope of peace thereafter, far beyond expectations. We have always believed that the chance for peace after this war lay in agreement to preserve the peace between the four great powers which can in colaboration weld together a dominant aggregation of manpower and economic strength against which no power on earth can prevail.

When, therefore, the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and China agree to press this war jointly against the Axis aggressors "until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender" and bind themselves thereafter to act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of the enemy, to the fulfillment of terms of surrender, to the establishment of a general international organization for all peace-loving nations, large and small, and finally, and most importantly, not to employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the maintenance of international peace and security and after joint consultation between the four powers, the day of a new order of collective security appears, indeed, to have dawned.

We are all conscious of the profound change in American public opinion during this war from isolationism to resolute and responsible action for the preservation of world peace. What we probably do not realize as well is that in 1939 Russia was, if anything, more isolationist than the United States. The Soviet Union began this war suspicious of her allies, denying them information of her military operations and giving little ground for hope that true cooperative action, either during the war or after, could be achieved. The Moscow declaration is an amazing change on the part of the Soviet leaders.

It is true that the declaration does not deal with the unavoidable problems of Russia's position with regard to Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, and Rumania, nor with British and Soviet interests in the Balkans. These omissions, furthermore, are given added emphasis by the joint declarations with regard to Italy and Austria. Yet, it is as reasonable to construe such omissions as evidence that Soviet Russia has subordinated her claims in eastern Europe to the greater goal of international collaboration as it is to suspect that there is some hidden design in thus leaving the agreement silent as to eastern Europe.

The declaration gives no hint either of the character of government sought for Germany by the Allied Powers. But this circumstance seems to give particular significance to the agreement that none of the powers, after the armistice, is to use its military forces in any territory outside its borders except after consultation and for the peaceful purposes avowed in the declaration. Such provision surely would seem to be utterly inconsistent with any agreement at Moscow based upon a division of Germany, or of Europe, into spheres of Russian or Anglo-American influence.

Throughout the declaration the intention to adhere to cooperative action in both Europe and Asia seems to be stated without equivocation. The honest fulfillment of any such agreement must bring the world collective security.

It is, of course, true that no agreement is worth more than the faith of the good parties entering into it or than their action in fulfillment of its terms. But, at least this is the first time in the history of the world that mankind has progressed beyond the security of alliance to the security of a concert of powers representing the overwhelming military force of the world. The League of Nations might have become such a concert had not the United States withdrawn and had Russia and Germany successfully participated in it on that basis. But that was never the fact. The League was never more than an Anglo-French alliance so far as power politics were concerned. The Moscow declaration is of an altogether different nature. Here the power for collective security is mobilized first and the legal machinery is to come afterward.

For what this agreement means in the prosecution of the war we will, for the most part, have to await the unfolding of strategy on the battlefield. We are given assurance that agreement upon military plans was achieved. Upon whatever basis that agreement was built, it is bad news for Germany that her enemies are now an indivisible unit against her.

The agreement to demand unconditional surrender of Germany's armies and to order back not only every Nazi but every German officer and soldier who has been responsible for acts of barbarism in any occupied country for punishment and trial under the laws of that country and at the hands of its people will unquestionably strengthen Herr Goebbels' propaganda of desperation with certain elements in Germany. Those Germans who are threatened with such punishment must be expected to stiffen in their resistance and to fight to the last like the rats in a corner that they are. But, at the same time, this threat and the unity of the Allied Powers will make German resistance more hopeless than ever. What sort of war morale can Goebbels build out of desperation without hope?

Outside of Germany in the satellite Axis countries, in Finland, Hungary, and Rumania, particularly, the declaration should be a powerful weapon against German influence. Those countries now will fight a hopeless war ranged alongside Germany, and they will have as the alternative to that the prospect of participation in a world organization under the tutelage of the four great nonaggressive powers of the world.

Finally the declaration should lift morale in the United States, in Britain, Russia, and China to the highest point. Have we ever during this war been quite able to lift ourselves above the suspicion that this war was just a dirty mess which had to be fought through to the end, but which promised little for the future peace of the world beyond the destruction of German power? The Moscow declaration should give all of us the positive hope for an order of peace to the days of our children and our children's children, and by the grace of God, even beyond.

The Moscow Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and appealing editorial on the Moscow Conference agreement, published in the Chattanooga Times of November 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOSCOW MIRACLE

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace."

The Moscow documents issued yesterday, we may be sure, will travel on mankind's mysterious lines of spiritual communication to the far reaches of the earth, wherever men long for peace and understanding. On a certain day when Woodrow Wilson set foot upon the soil of France the shepherds in the far Himalayas and the inarticulate masses in Asia knew about it. It was an augury of the sort of new day mankind had prayed for. And so it will be with these statements from Moscow, those almost unbelievably good tidings.

The United States, Great Britain, Russia and China sign an agreement to follow this thing through together until the enemy has surrendered without conditions. And upon the wreckage which the Nazi scourge has left upon the face of Europe, these mighty powers agree, shall be erected a general international organization for maintaining peace and security. And all peace-loving nations, large or small, shall be admitted to that international peace organization.

The bogey of a separate peace with Germany, a fear for which no sensible basis ever really existed, is swept away like mists before the sun, for the powers agree that those of them at war with a common enemy (Germany) will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

All the problems besetting worried minds are not solved in the Moscow documents. The question of whether Russia will help us against Japan is of course not mentioned, since Russia is not at war with Japan. The question of Russian borders after the war is left untouched, as is the question of English borders and United States borders.

For the promises which it brings for ultimate world peace the Moscow Conference, in which the dominant figures were Cordell Hull, of Tennessee; Anthony Eden, of England; and Vyacheslov Molotov, and, in the background, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Josef Stalin, may well go down in history as one of the most important ever held.

Its flood of relief and joy to enslaved Europe, however, will not await history, but is immediate and complete. Liberty is assured all those peoples caught in the Nazi tide when Hitler swept over the face of Europe like a thunderbolt. Even Austria is to be delivered from the yoke and all those nations which were engulfed after Austria will assuredly know their day of freedom. This is the definite promise of the Moscow Conference and with it goes a surprisingly liberal promise of the freedoms of speech and religion which will enable the small nations to work out their own destiny.

Terrible in its implication is the Moscow statement dealing with atrocities committed by the Germans, but implacable justice is the keynote of that declaration. The criminals must answer before the bar of justice, and they are to answer in the countries which they have so ruthlessly mistreated. Those who actually committed the atrocities and those who consented to them will be made to pay.

Upon the granting of an armistice, these war criminals shall be taken into custody. Then, the Moscow agreements stipulate, Allied armies shall watch over the conquered countries, using their military strength only to see that there is no violation by the conquered peoples of armistice terms. This is a promise that Allied armies will conduct themselves in peace as armies, in accordance with the humane rules of military occupation, are supposed to conduct themselves in a civilized world.

Order having been restored in Europe, the international peace organization, opening its doors to all men of good will, shall be established and put into force.

The new League of Nations shall be "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states," and the use of the word "sovereign" should soothe such United States Senators as have been sincerely worried on that score and may cause those who have been insincerely using the word "sovereign" to scurry around and find some new basis for obstructionism.

The war is yet to be won. This Moscow Conference hints at complete plans for the final conquest of Germany and says that the Allies are in agreement on the methods. There shall be many anguishing days, perhaps, before the Nazi hierarchy will consent to deliver themselves to the tribunals of justice.

Allies who lost the peace once before are under no delusions as to the post-war problems which will arise. They know from cruel experience that international peace organizations are not merely wished into being, but must be fought for. But the magnificent accomplishment at Moscow is to certify to enslaved men that the liberators are united, and that they will go on together to win the war and shall remain together to win the peace.

Many questions may be still unsettled, and there will not be lacking critics to seek out these minor flaws and to parade them before public opinion.

But the only real worries left are the tasks still facing us before the hated foe is beaten to his knees, and the difficult task of translating into reality the inspiring ideal of a real international peace organization which has been stated by Hull, Eden, and Molotov.

This time the world will profit by its errors of the past 25 years. When 15 nations gathered their brightest figures around the table in the Hall of Clocks in Paris to sign the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war, Aristide Briand had a foreboding which was only too abundantly a prophecy. He said: "Peace is proclaimed. That is well; that is much; but it still remains necessary to organize it. In the solution of difficulties right and not might must prevail. That is to be the work of tomorrow."

This time we may dedicate our peace, when and indeed if we win it, as Briand dedicated that fruitless pact, and this time we shall mean it: "As there is not one of the nations represented here but has shed the blood of her children on the battlefields, I propose that we should dedicate to the dead—to all the dead—the event which we are going to consecrate together by our signatures."

The Soldiers' Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Soldiers' Vote," from the New York Herald Tribune of October 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

The bill introduced by Senators GREEN and LUCAS, providing for the taking of soldiers' votes in Federal elections is interesting in that it would set up a direct Federal electoral system. The present act, adopted in September 1942 does little more than facilitate the soldiers' access to the established State electoral machinery and has proved somewhat inadequate. The Green-Lucas bill would create a Federal machinery under a Federal war ballot commission, empowered to prepare and distribute ballots for Presidential electors, Senators, and Representatives, and to receive the votes. The actual canvass of the returned ballots would be left to the State officials, but the States would be required to count and certify these Federal ballots.

Something of what this might imply is suggested by the provision which forbids the exaction of a poll tax as a condition of voting. The same provision occurs in the present act; it seems not to have raised any question, and it is indeed difficult to see how the soldier vote could be taken if poll tax and similar requirements had to be observed. But it is an interesting assertion of Federal authority over State electoral laws. Some other provisions of the bill seem ill-advised. It sets up a five-man commission instead of the usual evenly divided bipartisan commission, which ought to work well enough in so routine a function; and it uses loose language which might be construed as authorizing the commission to indulge in electioneering among the troops.

In general, however, it provides a simple, direct system for taking the soldier's wishes in regard to Presidential and congressional candidates with a minimum of technicalities or flummery. We learned in the last war and after how desirable it is not to disfranchise the fighting man; this system for taking his ballot directly under the Federal authority has a directness and common sense about it that might be suggestive even in peacetime.

Secretary Hull and the Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent, and a portion of an address delivered by me, both dealing with Secretary Hull and the Moscow Conference.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

Secretary of State Hull seems a very inconsiderate man, indeed, to his critics. His habit of ignoring their violent attacks and proving them wrong by deeds without words is becoming increasingly exasperating.

The whole record of his Moscow mission is an especially offensive example of the Hull method of handling his detractors.

For example, before he went to Russia the left-wing assailants of Mr. Hull—who also can be identified as the most vociferously articulate of those who insist that an "irreparable loss" has been suffered by the Nation in the retirement of Sumner Welles—asserted first that Mr. Hull could not go to the Moscow Conference because he was afraid to travel by air; second, that he was much too old to make the trip; third, that he was too feeble and in too bad health.

Then it was declared that he is practically senile and, anyhow, has no conception of foreign policy and no knowledge of foreign affairs. Also, that he was bitterly anti-Russian and that Premier Stalin was bitterly anti-Hull and that, under the circumstances, for Mr. Hull to go to Moscow would be to insult the Russians and insure complete futility for the conference before it convened. The dreadful allegation was also made that Mr. Hull was not a "true liberal."

CRITICS WRONG ON ALL COUNTS

These were the counts made against the Secretary before the conference took shape. This is how he replied to them:

First, he went to Moscow by air and deeply enjoyed the trip; second, his health seemed as equal to the strain as that of any other member of the delegation; third, so far from seeming senile and without any knowledge of foreign affairs, he appears to have impressed both the English and the Russians alike with the keenness of his mind, the soundness of his judgment, and the extent of his knowledge; that so far from being unfriendly to Russia and Russia unfriendly to him, he was received by Mr. Stalin as a real friend of Russia and ended the conference with a high personal regard for Mr. Stalin, which, from all reports, was reciprocated.

As to the results, instead of being futile, the conference agreements, as revealed in the official communiqués, exceed the most sanguine expectations of those who believe not only that full victory over our enemies but the hope of civilization, after their defeat, hinges upon the continued and sustained understanding and cooperation, in peace as well as in war, among Russia, Great Britain, the United States, and China.

There, of course, will be some to pick flaws and make complaints, but, so far, none of these has been worth serious consideration, and the overwhelming belief is that the agreements reached constitute a great constructive step forward; that the confidence of each of the United Nations in the good faith and good will of all the others has been strengthened; that the end of the war has been greatly accelerated, and the prospect for intelligent and effective post-war cooperation immensely enhanced.

NO MISTAKES OR MISUNDERSTANDINGS

When the separate points of the Moscow agreement are surveyed, it is difficult to see how much more could have been achieved. There was ample opportunity at this conference for mistakes and misunderstandings. They were all neglected. No mistakes were made and no misunderstandings exist. Instead, the former misunderstandings seem largely cleared up; the basic essentials have all been accepted, the cordiality among the three nations increased and general esteem heightened.

It does seem that Mr. Hull has treated his critics pretty shabbily. It is not surprising that they are aggrieved. Senile? Feeble? Futile? He just has not lived up to those specifications. Incidentally, they were the same specifications that, until recently, the same people used to describe Mr. B. M. Baruch. Senile, feeble, futile were the adjectives employed in his case, too. And he did not live up to them, either. Just a couple of mean old men who won't admit their critics are right. It's just too bad.

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

(Portion of speech of Hon. Ralph O. Brewster, of Maine, before Advertising Club of Boston at luncheon at Hotel Statler, Tuesday, November 2, 1943)

The hopes of people everywhere for a peace that shall endure find vast encouragement in the message from Moscow.

Cordell Hull seems destined to crown his distinguished career by guiding America through the dangerous waters of international diplomacy to a new vista of an enduring peace.

Without disparagement of the credit due Britain, Russia, and China for their part in this great achievement, America may well be proud of the part played by Cordell Hull.

Out of the unprecedented difficulties under which for some time he has been compelled to carry on the tremendous responsibilities of his high office as pilot of our ship of state amid all the storms of a world-wide conflict involving so many nations, Secretary Hull has emerged with far greater gains than we had any right to expect in America's great quest for a peace that shall last beyond a generation.

Those who have known best about the situation have realized the tremendous handicaps under which Mr. Hull has been obliged to carry on amid all the kaleidoscopic changes of alphabetical agencies mingling in our foreign affairs.

The Senate seems likely by an overwhelming vote to set the seal of their approval upon American participation in the keeping of the peace.

Approval of a resolution declaring Senate endorsement of international collaboration will reflect the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

American mothers may well be heartened by the news from Moscow.

The Hull victory for international collaboration assures a far earlier ending of the war and the creation of a world order that will permit our sons to devote their abounding energies to the building of a better world.

The Hull interview pointing out the vices of the Versailles Treaty indicates his awareness of the dangers ahead. The Hull insistence in this day of triumph upon the failure of both parties in recent years to recognize the realities of the situation is heartening evidence that politics in his opinion ceases at the water's edge.

America may be assured that in this next year under the guidance of Cordell Hull, American foreign policy will follow American devotion to the ideal of a place that shall endure.

Federal Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles by me appearing in the New York Post, October 25 to 29, inclusive, explaining the health insurance provisions of the social security bill (S. 1161), introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, and by Mr. DINGELL in the House. The articles developed out of an extensive interview by Mr. Oliver Pilat of the New York Post, Washington Bureau.

I also ask to have printed the text of my statement dated October 30, on certain editorials appearing in the last two issues of the Journal of the American Medical Association, together with an exchange of correspondence I had last June with the Committee of Physicians For The Improvement Of Medical Care, comprising many leading members of the profession.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

OUR PEACETIME WORKERS

What are the average American breadwinner and the average American soldier thinking about chiefly these days, in connection with the post-war world?

I don't have to guess; I know they are wondering where they will stand, what sort of jobs will be open to them, what chance they will have of building something in peacetime life. They are worrying less about this or that European or Asiatic political issue than over what will be their own personal measure of post-war security.

How do I know? From my mail, from talks with acquaintances ranging from the barber and the corner grocer to the man who sells me newspapers on Eighty-sixth Street when I am in New York, from encounters in trains, hotels, and homes. A very recent Gallup poll confirms my opinion.

TREATIES NOT ENOUGH

Most people agree on the absolute need for international collaboration, backed by armed force, to keep the peace; but the "man in the street," as well as the man in uniform, goes one step further. He knows that agreements and armaments alone can't bring economic security; they simply give each country the freedom to improve internal conditions.

We are pretty well agreed these days that poor economic and social conditions have been a major factor in international upheavals. You don't stop the spread of Communist or Fascist ideas by drawing a line on a map or licking one set of dictators.

That's why I am concentrating on these economic and social matters. We must get down to brass tacks. We have had too many planning groups and agencies throughout the country, and no action to speak of.

WILL FIGHT FOR SECURITY BILL

The war effort will be helped, not hindered, by serious work now on some of the post-war security problems which weigh so heavily with our civilians and fighting men. Because I know this, I am not too concerned over the barrage of criticism raised against the bill for a broader, stronger social security system, introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY (Democrat of Montana) and myself and in the House by Representative DINGELL (Democrat of Michigan).

The chief provisions of the bill include:

A 6 percent pay roll tax on both employers and employees to bring social security benefits to 25,000,000 persons not now covered or protected, including returning servicemen.

A Nation-wide system of employment offices, to help civilians and returning servicemen find jobs in private industry.

HEALTH INSURANCE INCLUDED

Insurance against wage loss when the worker becomes ill or permanently disabled.

Increased old-age benefits.

A uniform national unemployment insurance, with increased benefits and broader coverage than under 48 different State laws.

Insurance for health and hospital care.

The entire plan for a unified social insurance system has won endorsement from a host of liberal and labor organizations and approval in every recent poll of public opinion. Introduced last June, the bill is awaiting hearings before the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees.

Curiously enough, the part of the bill about which people I meet are most keen, is the one drawing the greatest fire in certain quarters: its health and hospital insurance provisions.

PROPAGANDA FOES BUSY

A political propaganda committee, miscalled the National Physicians' Committee For The Extension Of Medical Service, has distributed millions of pamphlets calling such insurance political medicine, totalitarian and un-American. Even the American Bar Association has been enlisted in a letter-writing campaign against it.

While many doctors and laymen are for the measure, some doctors and other groups are writing me unpleasant letters, and a few friends are beginning to say:

"Gee, Bob, aren't you going too far this time?"

That's always the way. Every deeply needed social measure I've advanced, starting with workmen's compensation in New York back in 1913, has met the same reception.

How mistaken they were then! I was a young legislator and they kept after me all the time. They said:

"You are trying to transplant European ideas into the United States. If your workmen's compensation bill passes, we will all move out of New York State."

EXPERIENCE PROVED VALUE

Some of my friends said: "Gee, Bob, aren't you going too far?"

Well, the bill passed, and they never moved, friends or foes. A few years after that, they would have fought repeal, because experience showed it was a fine thing.

It was the same with unemployment insurance, railway pensions, Federal unemployment relief, slum clearance and public housing, the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

I suppose I made a lot of trouble for myself. During the labor act episode, I wished more than once I'd stayed on the bench.

And now the opponents of medical insurance, which the people want and need, claim it is "un-American." Do you suppose any of them would be interested in the fact that Congress in 1798 adopted a marine hospital service for American seamen which was among the first compulsory health insurance systems in the world?

II

HEALTH SECURITY IS NO HAND-OUT

A political propaganda committee, with headquarters in Chicago and plenty of money to spend, has distributed millions of pamphlets throughout the country declaring in its very first sentence:

"Senate bill 1161 (the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill) makes provision for free general medical, special medical, laboratory medical, and hospitalization benefits for more than 110,000,000 people in the United States."

Except for that word "free," the statement is accurate. But the services are not free, or a Government hand-out in any sense; that's the whole point.

A PAY-AS-YOU-GO PLAN

One-fourth of the total social insurance contributions by employers and employees under the bill are set aside for medical and hospital care, and an additional 1 percent of pay roll is expected to cover weekly cash sickness benefits.

Actually, the health insurance plan is a pay-as-you-go proposition. Its chief features are as follows:

1. The insured employee would have protection against wage loss in time of illness, getting the same weekly amount as he would receive if he were unemployed because there is no job for him.

2. The amount of weekly benefit would increase according to the number of dependents. For example, among those earning $30 a week, a single man would get $10.50, while a married man, with a dependent wife and two or more children, would receive $24 a week.

The waiting period is 1 week, the maximum duration of benefit is 26 weeks, and the maximum benefit is $30 a week. In addition, married women workers would be entitled to weekly benefits for a maximum of 12 weeks' maternity leave.

PERMANENT DISABILITY BENEFITS

3. If a worker became permanently and totally disabled, he would receive a regular monthly retirement benefit for life.

4. The bill rests upon free initiative and private medical practice as it has been developing in the United States. Rejecting any plan of "socialized" or State medicine, the measure brings doctor and patient closer together because the bills are paid by the insurance fund.

5. The insured worker, and his dependent wife and children, would be entitled to all needed general practitioner's services. At the doctor's recommendation, he would also receive specialists', consultant and laboratory services (including X-ray, appliances, and eyeglasses), also necessary hospital care.

YOU MAY PICK YOUR DOCTOR

6. Hospital care would be limited to 30 days a year, with a possible extension to 90 days if the funds are large enough.

The benefits do not include dentistry, home nursing, private hospital rooms, or medicines bought in drugstores, on prescription or otherwise.

The bill allows any doctor or any hospital to come in or stay out of the insurance system, to accept or reject a patient. Each doctor could have private as well as insurance patients and engage in individual or group practice. The insured person would make his own choice of doctor and hospital.

Professional aspects of the program would be handled by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, aided by a medical and hospital advisory council.

ENJOYS CRITICISM

This council idea has been criticized by some on the theory that sooner or later it will be packed by medical reactionaries. Another critic, a distinguished science editor of a leading metropolitan newspaper, recently criticized the entire health-insurance plan in the bill because, in his view, it represented "a manifest victory for the American Medical Association."

I enjoy a measure of criticism from the left as well as from the right; it convinces me my own course is moderate.

III

HEALTH PLAN WOULD ELIMINATE FATHER DRAFT

The United States would not have been forced to draft fathers at this time, had there been in full operation a comprehensive pre-war national health program to take care of the remediable defects of those now of fighting age.

It was because Selective Service found so many IV-F's among single men and married nonfathers that it is now obliged to break up so many American homes.

From one-quarter to one-third or more of those classified IV-F, it is estimated, could have been made fit for general military service by proper and timely care and treatment over a comparatively short period of time.

FIFTY PERCENT REGISTRANTS REJECTED

These painful results from the accumulated health neglect of a whole population indicate why I am particularly interested in comprehensive national health legislation and in the medical insurance part of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill to enlarge and strengthen our national system of social security.

From November 1940 through September 1941 some 3,000,000 registrants were examined by local selective-service boards.

Health defects accounted for the rejection for general military service of about half of those examined.

The chance of reclaiming many of those rejected for health defects even at their adult stage of life was so clear and so startling that at various times plans for remedial treatment were advanced by such experts as—

Col. Samuel J. Kopetzky, chief of the medical division of the New York City Selective Service.

The Federal Security Agency's Commission on Physical Rehabilitation, headed by Dr. George Baehr, of New York City.

Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, head of the Selective Service System.

SAYS BILL IS THE ANSWER

What's become of all these plans? Why haven't they been carried through on a broad, Nation-wide scale?

While I'm asking questions, let me answer one that is frequently asked me: Does the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill do anything concrete for returning servicemen?

It does. Broadly speaking, it provides paid-up benefit rights for the returning serviceman and his family for a full year after his discharge from the armed forces, under all phases of the enlarged social-insurance plan. It also protects them against loss of rights under existing programs.

In other words, the bill assures the serviceman that he will not fall behind in any civilian social-insurance rights to which other insured workers are, or may become, entitled.

The new health-protection benefits under the bill for returning servicemen are in addition to the lifelong use of veterans' facilities assured all veterans by law.

IV

ILLNESS ROBS UNITED STATES OF THOUSANDS OF PLANES AND TANKS

Two million or more workers are taken off America's production lines on an average day because of temporary illness.

Think what that means in time of peace! In time of war it is even more striking.

The absence of workers in the United States from jobs because of sickness (disabilities of less than 6 months' duration) totals an annual loss of 600,000,000 work days. This is equivalent in production to 29,000 heavy bombers, or 144,000 fighter planes, or 375,000 light tanks, or 725 destroyers, or 86 battleships.

IT CAN BE PREVENTED

For every man or woman actually unable to report for work there are probably at least two with productive powers cut as much as 50 percent by illness.

Adequate care could prevent at least one-third of this entire loss of working time and productive efficiency.

Premature deaths are another drain on our productive capacity, since thousands of lives are lost annually which might have been saved by prompt and adequate care.

I could go on citing figures on preventable illness and loss of life among mothers, babies, and school children.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, agitating for a keep-fit program, speaks of "the $10,000,000,000 annual tax nobody gets"—the monetary burden which physical disability lays on America's war effort and national economy.

Recall some of those figures when somebody argues that the United States cannot afford to add medical and hospital insurance to its social security system.

It is obvious that distribution of medical care has not kept pace with the great strides of medical science in the United States. When the wage earner gets sick, staggering medical bills frequently hit the family at the very time its income is cut off. Debt and dependency is an all too frequent result.

A study by the American Medical Association submitted to a Senate committee in 1939 conceded that all families with incomes up to $3,000 a year needed a varying measure of economic help to meet illness and hospital costs. On the basis of the national income at that time, this included 90 percent of the population, and fully 75 percent of those above the relief level.

This problem strikes home in the experience of most American families. The common sense way to meet it is to help the working population pay-as-it-earns for all needed medical and hospital care, under a national plan geared to private medical practice and combined with needed preventive and public health services.

V

SECURITY PLAN IS BEST

Every time I have introduced a new piece of social legislation, the cry has been raised: "Why not let private enterprise do the job?"

Back in 1935, when I sponsored the original social-security bill, the same argument was made. The fact was that only about 500 employers—chiefly large industrial concerns—out of several million in the United States, had their own pension plans. Many of those plans were weak, and they offered no hope of Nation-wide development.

Now that Senator MURRAY (Democrat, Montana) and I in the Senate and Representative DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan) in the House have introduced bills calling for national medical and hospital insurance as part of a wider social-security system, we are again urged to let private industry do the job. A suggested model is Henry Kaiser's plan for medical care.

EIGHTY-FIVE PERCENT LACK MEDICAL STAFF

I respect the liberal approach and fine results of the west coast shipbuilder and his medical staff. Similar prepayment group health plans have been operating in all too few plants or communities in the United States.

But let's face facts: More than 85 percent of factory workers are normally employed in small plants lacking organized medical service staffs of any kind.

How could the Kaiser plan reach domestic servants, white-collar people in trade, and small business, farmers, and the self-employed? What about the families of the workers? And what happens after the war, when the workers in plants, large or small, change their jobs or become unemployed?

Only 3 percent of Americans have insurance protection for medical and hospital care, by the most optimistic estimate I've heard—and even that figure is padded with all kinds of inadequate coverage under private insurance companies and medical indemnity schemes.

NATIONAL INSURANCE BEST

This is no issue of "Government competition with industry" or "interference in medicine." Health protection has been a major concern of Government since George Washington's time.

National medical and hospital insurance is the most effective and practical means of bringing together the best efforts and contributions of labor, industry, and the public, the medical profession, and the voluntary agencies and hospitals.

That's the whole idea of social security in a democracy—to provide high-quality protection for all who contribute, at the lowest possible cost, by Nation-wide cooperative means.

There are twice as many voluntary industrial pension plans today as existed when Federal old-age insurance became law. Likewise, in health security, there would be ample scope for the voluntary agencies.

Every insured person would be free, under the measure, to select the voluntary hospital of his own faith or persuasion. Group health and hospital plans would doubtless wish to do their full part by offering their members the basic services financed by the insurance fund. They could also offer supplementary protection, as their membership desired. Such administrative arrangements with group plans could be readily worked out under the bill.

Some doctors oppose national health insurance, but I view such opposition in perspective. Workmen's compensation, really a limited form of health insurance, was bitterly fought at first; today four out of five New York doctors have voluntarily registered and qualified for practice under it.

STATEMENT ON EDITORIALS IN JOURNAL OF A. M. A.

Readers who have followed my daily articles on health insurance in this week's New York Post will judge for themselves the blatant inaccuracy of the Journal's charge that the bill proposes a complete revolution of medical practice in the United States.

Over 10 years ago the Journal hurled virtually the same cry—"socialism and communism; inciting to revolution"—at the report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. This committee's study had been made and the report prepared under the chairmanship of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, past president of the American Medical Association and a member of President Hoover's own Cabinet. That report, be it noted, did not even go so far as to recommend compulsory health insurance.

I have often expressed my full recognition of America's great advances in medical science and the important role of the medical profession in those advances. But this is a far cry from the attitude of the Journal in denouncing as "revolutionary" every departure from the status quo, or as "political bureaucracy" every improvement brought about with Government aid, sponsorship, or guidance. As an example, the very issues in which these editorials appear, contain on other pages discussions of the importance of Government action in improving maternity and infancy care and in achieving the splendid health record of the armed forces.

The great strides made by medical science, cited in the Journal, have themselves made high quality medical care more expensive, to the point where it is beyond the means of millions of Americans who are otherwise self-supporting. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill leaves medicine to the doctors, and it leaves hospital administration in their present capable hands. The bill is simply addressed to economic problems, the methods and the means of paying for medical and hospital care. The issue was well stated just the other day by the distinguished dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Columbia University, Dr. Rappeleye, who said: "The close relationships between income and sickness, both as cause and effect, suggest that the problems of medical care cannot be divorced from those of unemployment, old age, income, living conditions, and other features of social security. For large elements of society the problems of illness can be met only through collective provisions for medical care which aim to distribute the costs over a large group of the population and over a long period of time."

The same great advances in medical science which I have mentioned have likewise given rise to another major economic problem—the need for more funds to encourage extensive medical professional education and research, in the prevention, care, and cure of disease and disability. Grants to nonprofit institutions for such worth-while purposes can be made by the Surgeon General, under the bill, but only where the need is shown, only on the request of the institution itself, and only with the advice of the Medical and Hospital Advisory Council.

Contrary to the Journal's charge, this provision involves no revolutionary changes or any shifting of present control of medical education. Public funds are already used to support many of the leading medical schools of this country. Certainly no sensible person argues that this has led to bureaucratic control or hurt the progress of medical education. It is only fair that the people, who would benefit greatly from improvements in medical education and new progress from medical research, should be willing to assign a small fraction of social insurance contributions to the support of sound and needed professional education and research projects. That is the only aim and the whole effort of this part of the bill.

To be consistent, the Journal would also have to oppose Federal aid, as recommended in the President's message, for returning servicemen who wish to continue or extend their medical education. Is that the A. M. A. policy on this vital issue?

In the solution of all these economic problems, through the cooperation of all concerned, the public has a right to expect of the Journal the same standards of scientific accuracy, common sense, and calm appraisal as it exercises so admirably on professional issues It is greatly to be regretted, and hardly in the interest of the public and the profession, that this attitude of fair appraisal is not evinced by the editorials in question. I have never claimed that the bill is perfect; it was introduced as a basis for study and as a means of stimulating bona fide public discussion. Let us avoid name calling and get on with the job. The goal is well worth working for—a healthier, happier, more productive America.

COMMITTEE OF PHYSICIANS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF MEDICAL CARE, INC.,
New Haven, Conn., June 14, 1943.

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: The Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care wishes to congratulate you on the presentation of S. 1161, the Federal Social Insurance Contributions Act. The medical features of the bill seem to the committee broadly conceived in a spirit of service. With its general provisions the committee is in accord. It reflects evidence of long and careful study of the subject. It provides a framework and a basis for discussion from which it is sincerely hoped that a program for improved medical and health care of the American people may be developed. The committee is especially gratified that provision has been made for an advisory health council, a measure that it has consistently advocated.

The medical profession should accept the challenge. Its members have the expert knowledge required to implement the measure. This knowledge should be placed unreservedly at the disposal of the legislature. The committee hopes that it will be given an opportunity to participate in the discussions of the bill and to offer its advice and suggestions.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. PETERS, M. D., *Secretary.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1943.

Dr. JOHN P. PETERS,
Secretary, Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc., New Haven, Conn.

DEAR DR. PETERS: I am greatly pleased to have your letter of June 14, on behalf of the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care.

When Senator Murray and I introduced the bill (S. 1161) to broaden and strengthen social security, we were well aware that protection against the costs of medical care and assurance of necessary medical services are among the most important needs facing the people of the United States. Also, from years of study in the progress of national health, we realized that the subject has many complexities. It is, therefore, especially gratifying to have this letter of commendation from a committee which includes so many physicians who are distinguished for their professional attainments and their interests in the improvement of medical service.

So long as we are working on sound principles, we can be confident of devising sound details and of producing a plan that will contribute to the public welfare. This is especially true because through this social insurance plan, we intend to foster freedom of medical practice and participation by the profession; to safeguard the quality of care, coordinate the services, encourage prevention of disease and disability, and aid the continued advancement of education and research.

I hope the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care will continue its study of the bill, will keep us informed of the results of such study, and will be prepared to participate when hearings on the bill are arranged by the committees of Congress to which the bill has been referred.

You declare that the medical profession should accept the challenge of the bill, placing their special knowledge at the disposal of Congress. Your committee has aready accepted that challenge. We are confident that all physicians, medical, and hospital organizations, and other interested groups will likewise study the bill carefully and make available to us in Congress their best constructive advice toward improving the proposals for medical services and for insurance against medical costs which are included in the bill.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

The Russell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Russell Report," appearing in the Washington Evening Star of November 1, 1943,

and commenting in very favorable terms on the statement recently made in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUSSELL REPORT

A reading of the text of the report filed with the Senate by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who headed the special senatorial committee which recently toured the battle fronts, should convince anyone that the statement is neither anti-British nor calculated to drive a wedge between any of the United Nations.

When the committee first returned to Washington its members reported verbally to the Senate in executive session. And, as is often the case with these executive sessions, a portion of what was said was permitted to "leak out." Unfortunately, however, these disclosures in the main were confined to portions of the report which, when published out of their context, gave the impression that the whole statement was a harsh indictment of the British and a somewhat severe criticism of the Russians.

Actually, the whole report, which was published in yesterday's Star, affords no basis for any such interpretations. It is not anti anything. On the contrary, it is an exceptionally well-rounded, restrained, and intelligent comment on the conduct of the war from the American point of view. Such critical statements as it contains, when read against the background of the full report, are of the type of fair comment which, instead of giving rise to resentment, actually constitute the best approach to a genuinely good and lasting relationship among the Allied partners. Certainly, if this relationship cannot withstand honest and temperate criticism of details, there is little hope for the future.

If the text of this report had been available at the time of the executive Senate session, it is extremely unlikely that there would have been any bad feeling anywhere. It was not available, however, and in consequence a strain on Anglo-American relations was permitted to develop. Yet this unfortunate experience can be useful if it serves to underscore the inadvisability of forming conclusions on the basis of incomplete information. This, to be sure, is a human failing, but it is capable of working a great deal of harm and should be vigilantly guarded against.

Rehabilitation of America's Physically Handicapped Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 3 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has recently come to my attention that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], addressed the annual convention of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City on October 6, 1943.

The address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, who served as Secretary of Labor under three Presidents, dealt with the problem of the rehabilitation of America's physically handicapped citizens—a problem to which the Senator, both as chairman of the Federal Board of Vocational Education and as Senator of the State of Pennsylvania, has devoted more than 20 years of his life.

Mr. President, I believe that this problem of rehabilitation is one which will command the increasing attention of the American people, and I feel that the remarks of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will prove of considerable interest to those who are concerned with this problem.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address which the Senator from Pennsylvania delivered at that convention and certain introductory remarks by Mr. McCarthy Hanger, past president of A. L. M. A., and president, J. E. Hanger, Inc., and a response by Mr. Chester C. Haddan, president, A. L. M. A., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a resolution, bearing upon the problem of the physically handicapped, which was adopted by the assembled convention.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF HON. JAMES J. DAVIS, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, BY M'CARTHY HANGER, PAST PRESIDENT ASSOCIATION OF LIMB MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA

Mr. President, fellow members, and guests, on the occasion of the banquet of the Metropolitan New York Council of the A. L. M. A., attended by the national officers of the association and a representative gathering of manufacturers of prosthetic appliances throughout the United States and Canada, it is my privilege to introduce to you tonight our honored guest who will speak to us on a subject close to his heart and the hearts of all of us—helping others to help themselves.

For years I have admired his work for the advancement of mankind and the good of our Nation. His aim has always been service to his fellow man. He is still helping to guide the Ship of State on the right course. He is devoted to true Americanism and to the recently forgotten principles of free enterprise which are responsible for our growth from a handful of scattered colonies to the greatest Nation—economic and political—in the world today.

He has preached and practiced the doctrine of fellowship and fraternity. He was almost solely responsible for the founding and growth of that great fraternal organization the Loyal Order of the Moose. In 1907 he became director general of this splendid fraternity. He takes pride in having continuously held that office from that day to this.

He is a man of rare charm and winning personality, yet forceful and outspoken when he takes up the cudgel to battle for the good of humanity—a role he has consistently and successfully filled. His zeal for the common man was no doubt born as he landed on our shores an immigrant boy, inspired by his faith and pride in a democracy which offered equal opportunities to all.

Many honors have come to him. Degrees have been bestowed upon him by leading universities. He has served in the Cabinets of three Presidents as Secretary of Labor and Director of Vocational Rehabilitation. For three terms he has represented one of the really great Commonwealths of the Nation in the Senate of the United States.

Yet with all his honors and accomplishments he remains a simple man. He has never lost contact with the plain people. It is significant that from his present eminence in State and Nation, he is still proud to own the title he acquired as a lad in the steel mills, "Jim the Puddler."

It is a very genuine pleasure to present to you, ladies and gentlemen, my friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JAMES J. DAVIS.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I very much appreciate the kind remarks of my long-time friend, Mr. McCarthy Hanger, who has long been recognized as one of the outstanding business executives in my home State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am more than pleased at this opportunity to meet with you at this, the annual convention of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America, and to discuss with you one of the most serious and pressing problems of our time—the rehabilitation of America's physically handicapped citizens.

You, whose life's work has been devoted to reclaiming the maimed and to giving mobility and strength to the stricken, are well aware of the tremendous scope and nature of this problem. And you are likewise well aware, I presume, of the uncoordinated, inconclusive, and inefficient manner in which this problem is now being handled.

Today the United States is confronted with the most serious manpower shortage in all its history. The type of war in which we are now engaged requires vast numbers of men—not only for the armed forces but for those numerous other activities which are necessary to sustain and strengthen our forces on the fighting fronts.

Everywhere throughout the Nation, manpower is at a premium. Yet in the midst of this unprecedented demand, there remains within this Nation a huge reservoir of manpower which is virtually untapped.

I speak now of more than 23,000,000 physically handicapped American citizens—the vast majority of whom are now being denied the right to play that full and vital role of which they would be capable—if only their Government would extend the hand of sincere and friendly cooperation.

Up to the present time, notwithstanding the grave aspect of the emergency which we now face, this Government has failed to come forward with any sound, coordinated, or effective plan to rehabilitate these millions of physically handicapped people and to restore them once again to the status of self-sufficient and productive American citizens.

Our present efforts along these lines are indicative of the uncoordinated zeal and the unproductive waste of Federal administration. At the present time, such efforts as our Government is making to cope with this grave and serious problem are being undertaken by 17 different Federal agencies—each with an ill-defined authority—each with a comparable degree of independence—and each without benefit of any over-all coordinating policy or procedure.

A situation such as I have just described to you would be without any defense or justification, even in peacetime. But the continued existence of such conditions as these in an hour of national crisis represents an unwarranted and ominous threat to the very security of this Nation.

A thorough and careful review of present conditions has convinced me that the only way in which we can cope with this problem effectively is through the establishment of a definite, Nation-wide rehabilitation program which will be placed under the complete supervision and control of a single administrative agency.

In accordance with these conclusions, I recently introduced into the United States Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 43, which provides for the establishment of a "Division for

the Physically Handicapped Within the United States Employment Service." This measure was developed after close consultation with a number of outstanding leaders in this particular field. One of those men, Paul A Strachan, president of the American Federation of Physically Handicapped, is here with us tonight, and he is actively pressing for the early enactment of this bill.

There are many aspects of this problem of rehabilitation which have never been properly approached in this country:

1. The first of these centers around the matter of registration and statistics.

My years of experience as Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Federal Board of Vocational Education convinced me that before we could even begin to do an effective job in this field, we must compile a full and complete registration of all the handicapped. But more than that, we must establish a continuous and accessible means of contact between the handicapped and the Government.

Both of these essential features are completely lacking in our present rehabilitation efforts. I am convinced that this Government has no definite information about, or contact with, more than half of its handicapped citizens.

Since the United States Employment Service will, in all probability, be a continuing agency, and since its branch offices are to be found in every section of the country, I believe that the most effective results of any contemplated registration program could be achieved through the facilities of the more than 1,600 local offices of the United States Employment Service.

2. The matters of medical care, training, and placement with respect to the physically handicapped have never been properly coordinated or systematized in the United States.

With the establishment of the division for the physically handicapped which I recommend, each case can be properly and individually treated with, on the basis of the material compiled during the course of the previously mentioned registration.

This would be a continuing and a coordinated process, under which all the steps necessary to the complete rehabilitation of any individual, could be carried out fully and logically within one organization.

3. The employment of skilled and properly qualified experts to carry out the various aspects of such a program.

With all due respect to the high-type personnel which can be found in the various levels of our Federal service, there still remains a grave need for the employment, in this area, of trained men who understand the psychological and practical physical problems which beset the handicapped.

If such a staff as this could be developed, it would represent a tremendous step forward in the entire field of rehabilitation.

4. The development of reciprocal relations with those agencies and industries which are in a position to give employment to qualified physically handicapped individuals.

Needless to say, private industry has done much more effective work in properly utilizing the skills of the handicapped than has the Government. Your own industry, which employs so many handicapped workers, is an outstanding example of what private industry has done in this area.

The maintenance of effective relations with these principal users of manpower would go far toward the establishment of a sound system of placement for qualified handicapped workers. And it would also prove most instrumental in gaining continued and valuable information as to what types of training would yield the best and quickest results for the handicapped worker.

This, then, is the essence of the program which I should like to see put into effect by this Government to fully and properly meet the manifold problems of America's physically handicapped citizens.

My contacts with these less fortunate people have taught that they resent relief and charity, regardless of the title under which they are presented. What these people want is the opportunity to become independent and self-sufficient American citizens. They want the right to work, to earn their own way, and to manage their own affairs.

This Government, if it be a truly responsible and representative government, must inevitably come to recognize the fact that some such plan as I have outlined here must be adopted and put in motion.

Every year, aside from war casualties, more than 700,000 American men are being cast upon the human scrap pile, largely because we have not taken any constructive steps looking toward the effective rehabilitation of those who have been partially disabled through accidents and illness.

How long will this profligate waste of American manpower continue? How long will the physically handicapped citizen of America be denied by his Government the right to take his full and productive place in American economic and political life?

It is to the ultimate advantage of our society that America find useful and productive work for all its citizens. It is to the ultimate advantage of our society that America take definite and sincere action to achieve these necessary and vital ends without delay.

Knowing the members of your association, knowing your deep sincerity of interest in this problem, I am confident that you will join forces with me and those many millions of other American citizens who are sincerely interested in reclaiming the physically handicapped citizens of America—and in building up a more productive and a more progressive order of living not only for the handicapped but for all America as well.

RESPONSE BY CHESTER C. HADDAN, PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF LIMB MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC., TO AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAMES J. DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE REGIONAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION AT THE HOTEL BILTMORE, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 6, 1943

Senator DAVIS, it is my privilege to thank you, on behalf of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America, for the splendid address you have just given us.

We are particularly grateful to you, because we know just how busy you are in Washington; we know of the tremendous responsibility that rests upon your shoulders as a United States Senator; we know that you would not have taken time away from your important duties in our Nation's Capitol were it not for the fact that you, too, recognize that those of us who are engaged in this important business of supplying missing parts of the human body with artificial substitutes are being called upon to play an increasingly important role in the war effort. I assure you, Senator, that it is our determined purpose to play whatever role of service to the American people we may be called upon to play in this great drama to the very best of our ability.

I also assure you that the members of this great humanitarian industry have met and will meet every demand that may be made upon them, provided they are given opportunity to do so, and are afforded proper cooperation by our Government.

It is a well-known fact, Senator, that the United States leads all the world in the making of fine artificial limbs and orthopedic appliances. It is a well-known fact that hundreds of thousands of persons in America are today employed in every vocation known in our great Nation, who have lost one or more of their limbs, yet are able, with the aid of the ingenious products of our profession, to work side by side and compete with their fellow Americans who are not so handicapped on an equal basis. I personally know that at least 20 of the Members of the present Congress are walking about on artificial legs. I know at least one Governor who walks on one artificial leg; a half dozen or so nationally famous movie stars; many leaders in business and industry, and even sports participants of national fame, such as Monty Stratton, of the Chicago White Sox, and many others wear these ingenious devices. Even our own President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, would be almost completely helpless without the devices developed by those represented here tonight.

Why has this record not been equaled any other place on earth, Senator? The answer is, Not alone the ingenuity of the American limb and brace maker, it is the sytem of free enterprise, the competitive system that has flowered and grown in America as no place else on earth. It is the system under which every man strives to outdo his neighbor in the perfection of his products; it is this system that has made it possible for America to lead all the world in the excellence of its artificial limbs and other orthopedic devices.

May God grant us the strength and the wisdom to protect and nurture this system; to keep it intact for our sons and brothers who are this moment fighting, dying, and losing their legs and arms and eyes and ears—yes; even their minds—to preserve this very American way of life. They will have lived more in a year or two than most people will live in a lifetime. They will have suffered more hardships, withstood more pain, strained longer hours, lived through more horrors, displayed more courage than you or I will ever know, all for $50 a month, but really for preservation of their country.

We must fight just as hard on the home front as he who is fighting on the battle front to keep alive the American system of free enterprise, individual initiative, equal opportunity, and progress.

May God grant us the courage to correct the false starts, the greed, the stupidity that has been all too general on the home front. May He give us the strength to match with unselfishness and moral courage the splendid sacrifices and heroic intrepidity of our fighting men on every battlefield.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY WALTER R. SIEVERS, VICE PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF LIMB MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA, INC., AND UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED

Resolved—

That this meeting, representing the artificial limb and orthopedic appliance manufacturers of America, unanimously agrees that it is the duty of the Nation as a whole to do its utmost toward the rehabilitation of the maimed men and women who have emerged, or may emerge, from the active military and industrial fronts of this war, so that they may again assume their rightful places in the social and economic life of our country; and, accordingly

That it is also resolved to impress upon all members of this, the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America, Inc., our desire and the wisdom of making an immediate study to set up a program for the purpose of further cooperating with all agencies of the United States Government for the making, supplying, and technically correct fitting of artificial limbs and orthopedic appliances for the crippled and maimed veterans of this and previous wars, and war-disabled civilians;

That it be resolved by the membership of this association as a whole that in making such study and research all necessary steps will, and must, be taken to supply such veterans and war-disabled civilians with the means to again enter into active participation of our social and economic life at the

lowest available cost to them, or to the said Government agencies; or in cooperation with such agencies as shall be determined by the Government, as was the case in 1917; and

That it be further resolved that we are aware, as an organization and as individuals, that it is our duty to produce such artificial limbs and orthopedic appliances for Government and other uses at the lowest possible cost, we pledge that we will do this, recognizing at the same time that we have never failed in responding to official calls upon our industry, and unequivocally stating it to be our belief that we are eminently qualified and equipped, and ready to make available thus our experience, abilities, and facilities in this field, better than any other group or agencies could possibly do.

Be it finally resolved that we are ready to assume, in conjunction with others at interest, a program that will rehabilitate the veterans and war disabled, both physically and mentally, and endeavor to teach them, if need be, to think and act normally, without exploitation and with a view to perpetuating the humanitarian principles of our association and entirely apart from any selfish consideration whatsoever.

Our past record confirms our sincerity and good intent.

Incredible Folly of Starving Our Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a part of chapter 5 of the book by Howard E. Kershner, entitled "One Humanity":

We are winning the war but losing the peace, for we are allowing the freedom-loving peoples of the occupied countries to be decimated by starvation while the Germans are being well fed. No matter what the terms of peace, a well-fed Germany will have a great post-war advantage over the tubercular, starvation-reduced victims of malnutrition of the occupied countries. Neither well-populated cemeteries nor misshapen, undersized children with subnormal minds and twisted personalities are fit material with which to reconstruct democracy in Europe.

"Too bad," you say, "but we must win the war." I agree, and I would not advocate child feeding if it would prolong the war or lessen our prospects of winning it. On the contrary, from long first-hand experience with feeding in Europe, I am certain that it can be done without giving the slightest aid to Axis economy. From close observation, it is my considered opinion that substantial feeding operations would shorten the war.

It cannot be argued that the Germans became a strong race after a severe period of undernourishment during and following the last war, for at the very worst period the German children were receiving twice as much as large categories of children, women, and unemployed people in France and Belgium are receiving today. Who will say that the period of German undernourishment may not have been at least partly responsible for the twisted mentality which is so evident now in that country? When we stop to realize that the people of the occupied countries are getting only half what the Germans got, and are suffering from starvation through a very much longer period of time, we can see how great the deterioration may be.

The people of the occupied countries are definitely on our side, and want to help us, but there is danger that we may lose a large measure of their gratitude if we refuse to send them such assistance as may be within our power. Many Frenchmen have said to me, "We love America. We want you to win the war, and we will help you, but we know, and you know, and we believe the governments in Washington and London know, that you could save at least some of our children without in any way assisting the enemy, and we will never forgive you if we see our children die before our eyes when you could have saved them."

Military necessity might require the starvation of these friendly people if by doing so you could starve the enemy. But you cannot do that in any case. You can only starve your allies and friends, the people who want to help you, and that will prolong rather than shorten the war. Nothing could be more shortsighted, it seems to me, than to deprive your friends of the means of helping you.

Why can't we be as farsighted as General Franco was when he gave us permission to send food through his blockade to the children on the opposite side of the Spanish civil war? He responded readily to my argument that keeping the children alive and healthy would be of inestimable advantage in the difficult effort of reconstruction after the war. If this were true then, as it certainly was, it is true today with reference to the occupied countries of Europe.

Whenever approached, Germany has agreed to give safe conduct for relief food shipments. If, however, she should refuse, food could not be sent. In that event we could tell the people of the occupied countries that we were ready and willing to feed them, but that their conquerors would not permit it. This would give us great psychological advantage, and we would continue to enjoy their affection and gratitude. Until we make the effort, however, we are not blameless, and must bear a considerable part of the responsibility for the loss of a generation of children.

As a limited relief project for 10,000,000 of the most needy children, nursing and expectant mothers of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, I have suggested the monthly sending of 30,000 tons of cereals, 6,000 tons of fats, 9,000 tons of meat, and 6,000 tons of milk, making a total of 51,000 tons monthly. This would provide each of these persons with a daily ration of cereals 100 grams, fats 20 grams, meat 30 grams, powdered or condensed milk 20 grams. In addition to what they are now getting, this would probably keep them in a fair degree of health.

The minimum size of such a project will be seen when it is recalled that the four countries named have nearly 10 times the population of Greece, while the amount of food suggested is less than 3 times the amount actually going to Greece each month. There has been widespread approval of this project, as it is now generally realized that vitamins and milk are no longer sufficient to save these children.

Who can measure the value of 10,000,000 children?

Who can measure the value of the contribution that these four countries have made to the world or the irreparable disaster to civilization that the destruction of their peoples would mean? It is no disparagement of others to point out that for centuries these have been among the most valiant defenders of human freedom. Shall they now perish by our refusal to aid them after they have been mortally stricken by the common enemy? Shall we, like the priest and Levite, pass by on the other side, saying that because we did not do it, there is no obligation upon us? What of our future relations to these countries if we sit by doing nothing while they die of starvation? What faith will any people anywhere have in our humanitarian protestations if we refuse to succor our own allies and friends?

Reclamation in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 28, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include copies of two important communications which are embodied in a news release by the Bureau of Reclamation. One is a letter from President Roosevelt and the other is a letter from Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Both are addressed to Hon. Oliver S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont., president of the National Reclamation Association which last week held a highly important and interesting convention at Denver, Colo.

Both the President and Secretary Ickes emphasize the heavy contributions being made by reclamation and other irrigated lands in the West to war foods for the armed forces. The West appreciates this recognition from these eminent authorities and hopes that their viewpoints so ably expressed will aid in demonstrating to others in the executive branch of the Government that reclamation projects can make even greater contributions. Neither the President nor Secretary Ickes has hesitated to express himself on the importance of accelerating reclamation construction but unfortunately their views have not always permeated to the point where other agencies have recognized the facts.

It is also pleasing to note that both the President and the Secretary emphasize that reclamation will have an important place in the post-war public-works program. Secretary Ickes stressed the necessity for the Bureau of Reclamation to be prepared to cushion the impact in the West of the demobilization of service men and women and emergency industrial workers.

I desire to point out that the Bureau of Reclamation was prepared to do a great deal more in the production of war foods and power than it was permitted to do. I hope that it will not be similarly hamstrung in the development and execution of the public-works program which Commissioner Harry W. Bashore outlined to the same convention at Denver on October 28. I suggest that my colleagues read Mr. Bashore's informative and well-ordered presentation of the reclamation program today and tomorrow, which appeared on page A4571 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I take this occasion to add my

congratulations not only to Mr. Bashore on his recent appointment as Commissioner but to assure him and the new Assistant Commissioner, Mr. William E. Warne, that they will have the support of the West in the big job that lies ahead.

The letters from the President and Secretary Ickes to Mr. Warden are as follows:

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

Mr. OLIVER S. WARDEN,
President, National Reclamation Association, Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. WARDEN: The Nation can be proud of the courage and foresight of those men who believed that great acreages of arid western lands could be reclaimed. The food from these lands is now sustaining our armed forces and saving thousands of other men and women at home and abroad from hunger.

For the sake of our returning sailors and soldiers, the Nation can also be grateful that the men who fought for reclamation combined their foresight with courage. They wanted to use the public domain to provide opportunities for life and usefulness for large numbers of independent farmers, so they wrote antiland monopoly into the reclamation laws. They wanted the water to serve all, rather than to be held by a few, so they made it impossible for the few to garner all of its benefits. They wanted no speculators to reap all of the value of Government investment nor to burden the homesteaders with the weight of heavy mortgages, so they wrote antiland speculation provisions into the basic law. They wanted no gifts from the taxpayers, but only an opportunity to pay back the money that was invested by the Government, so they wrote definite terms of repayment into the laws. They stood on their own feet.

Together with the food now being produced, these are accomplishments for which the Nation and the soldiers may both be thankful, for in the great new land openings that will come shortly in the Columbia Basin—in the Central Valley of California and elsewhere—it will now be possible for the Nation to provide opportunities for homes and for honest, valuable work for some of our returning servicemen and demobilized soldiers of industry, under conditions which any working farmer would be proud to bequeath to his own son coming back from battle abroad. They will be the heirs of the wise provisions which were enacted to keep our farmers from becoming victims of Nature and of their fellow men.

I hope that the men from all the States who make up the membership of the National Reclamation Association will renew the great tradition which has made these results possible. I take pleasure in wishing them every success.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

OCTOBER 25, 1943.

Hon. O. S. WARDEN,
President, National Reclamation Association, Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. WARDEN: I wish that I could join you personally in the 12th annual convention of the National Reclamation Association. I congratulate the West on the outstanding job that reclamation is doing in the production of food and power for war purposes, and I urge you to look forward to the important place which the conservation and use of western water resources will have in the post-war reconstruction.

I am gratified as you are that reclamation was well prepared to meet the war demands. During the past 10 years of my responsibility, storage capacity available in reclamation reservoirs was increased from fourteen and one-half to sixty-four million acre-feet, and made possible the production by the Bureau of Reclamation this year of nearly 40 times as much power as it could generate in 1933.

The war value of irrigated land can be appraised, in part, by the recent clearance of critical materials to expedite the construction of 12 irrigation projects for the purpose of increasing war-food production. The Bureau of Reclamation has a major place in the war-food program. The 4,000,000 acres irrigated by reclamation systems this year produced foods, feeds, and fibers, which, in a very real sense, made possible the war industrial expansion along the west coast.

I have encouraged the Bureau of Reclamation to be equally as well prepared to cushion the impact in the West of the demobilization of service men and women and emergency industrial workers as they were to meet the needs of the West and of the Nation in the war emergency. The power now serving in the war must be made to turn the wheels of industries that will maintain peacetime pay rolls and afford increased markets for the products of irrigated land.

The pioneers among the men who believed in the reclamation of the West fought for conditions under which all the reclamation farmers could be free and independent. The Reclamation Act is their monument. Its provisions against water and land monopoly and against speculation in improved lands not only protect the farmers today but will protect all of the returning soldiers as well as all of the farmers who move into the Columbia Basin, the Central Valley, and the other great land openings of the future. You and I can be grateful to the pioneers for an achievement that extends through the years.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Post-War Opportunities in the Great West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during the last week of October the National Reclamation Association held its annual convention at Denver, Colo. Although I had planned to attend, it was impossible for me to leave Washington at that time. Arrangements were made, however, by which I had the privilege of briefly addressing the convention by radio transcription through the facilities of Station KOA Denver, and the National Broadcasting Co. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks to the convention may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only the fact that the Senate is now considering the Connally resolution on international post-war cooperation for peace and is about to take up my bill for the production of synthetic liquid fuel from coal and oil shale has prevented me from attending this meeting of the National Reclamation Association. I regret that I can talk to you tonight only by means of electrical transcription and by the courtesy of this radio station, but it will not be overlooked that the very feasibility of my addressing you in this manner and from such a great distance is in itself an illustration of what man can do to overcome the handicaps of nature.

Surely when the human voice can be thus transmitted through space and time, we need not be fearful of approaching the tasks that confront us in preparing for the post-war world. Particularly is this true of groups like the National Reclamation Association, made up as it is of men and women who by nature are builders and pioneers. Never was constructive thought and action more needed than now and nowhere is there to be found a greater disposition to build than among the people who inhabit the great West, and nowhere is there to be found a greater opportunity than here.

More than 2 years ago when I introduced the resolution under which the Senate Committee on Public Lands initiated the program for western mineral development, I pointed out that Hitler was throwing his legions into Russia and Hirohito was seizing Malaya and the Dutch East Indies in search of the very materials which are to be found in great abundance in this area in which we live. From the Mississippi River west to the Pacific coast there lies a tremendous expanse of territory which has been only partially developed, and in the Rocky Mountain area there is to be found all of the natural resources by the development of which the West can be industrialized and opportunities created for the employment of 10,000,000 soldiers and sailors who will be seeking jobs when this war is over. Add to those returning servicemen the war workers who will no longer be employed in the manufacture of arms and ammunition, and it becomes evident that it will be necessary for us, if we are to have prosperity as well as peace, to find from fifteen to nineteen million new jobs when the fighting ceases.

In the Rocky Mountain States from which many delegates to this convention have come—Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada—there are more than 850,000 square miles inhabited by less than four and a half million people. This is an area twice as large as Germany and France together. It is an area that teems with resources which Germany and France and, indeed, which all Europe except Russia, lack. Those countries, however, support a population 30 times as great as the population of the intermountain states. It requires no argument, therefore, to prove that here where we live are to be found the resources and the land upon which, if we properly approach the problem, will be found the means of supporting the men and women who will be demobilized with the end of the war.

Surely it takes no argument to convince anyone who is at all familiar with the program of Federal reclamation that the job can be done. We know that when the present program of the Reclamation Bureau shall have been completed, more than 10,000,000 persons in the West will be using the facilities which the United States Government has provided by way of water and electrical energy. More than 12,000,000 acres will be receiving irrigation water and more than 5,000,000 additional acres will have been brought into cultivation.

Forty-two Bureau of Reclamation projects have transformed millions of acres of land from desert or sage brush into productive farms—and the end is not yet. The construction of these projects has not only created new farms but it has brought into existence innumerable towns and cities in which the people in their local activities

maintain their homes and the industrial and business activity which pours millions of dollars in tax revenue into State and Federal treasuries and creates the demand for the goods and services in which business enterprise deals.

We know from our own experience with these projects that the money which the Federal Government has invested in reclamaton is productive money. It is money which brings with it its own return, not only in repayment charges but in the creation of opportunities for new industry. To any person who questions the advisability of Federal expenditures fof reclamation at this period in our national history, it is only necessary to point out that reclamation pays its own way. The construction charges on 19 reclamation projects in these 11 intermountain States, to December 31, 1942, amounted to $62,910,000 Of this sum, $60,669,400 had been repaid. That means that of all the construction charges, only 3½ percent had been unpaid by the end of last year. I venture to say that it would be very difficult indeed to find any industry, any business, any enterprise which shows a better record. That the farmers who are living on these projects and using reclamation water are keeping up the operation and maintenance of the projects in the same highly businesslike manner is demonstrated by the fact that of the operation and maintenance charges amounting to $36,447,000, only 1/10 percent of the amount due and payable was delinquent on December 31.

There is, however, much more to the story than that, because the projects we are now constructing, the multiple-purpose projects, also produce electric energy. The power installations in 18 projects will, it is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation, produce this year twelve and a quarter million kilowatthours of electrical energy. That is more than the entire output of all plants in the United States in 1913. Power is the creator of business. Power is the foundation of industry. When power is available the people can exercise their skill and ingenuity in the manufacture of the things they need.

Here in the West we have not only electrical energy produced on the reclamation projects but we have also unlimited amounts of coal, great deposits of oil and oil shale, huge beds of phosphate and potash and sodium. We have iron and magnesium, chromium, alunite, clay for the manufacture of alumina, and scores of materials out of which the chemists of the future will develop the industries of the future.

One hears it commonly asserted nowadays that the frontier is gone. That is true enough in the sense that there are no new lands to be discovered. But the frontier of the future lies within the domain of chemistry and here in the West we have not yet begun to imagine the chemical opportunities that await us. For example, we are well aware of the timber resources of the Northwest, but few of us realize that out of this timber can be made wood sugar, a source of protein feed for animals and perhaps even for man. The Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service has already demonstrated that the timbers of the United States are more productive of wood sugar than even those of Germany, where the art has been developed to its highest point.

When we realize that the public domain embraces almost 51 percent of the total land area of the 11 far Western States, ranging from 32.6 percent in the State of Washington to 86 percent in the State of Nevada, we realize how broad is the prospect that confronts us and how splendid the opportunity for building here the new republic of agriculture and industry for which returning soldiers will be looking when the peace has come.

In all the current discussions about the post-war world it seems to be universally agreed that the primary objective is so to arrange our domestic economy that there shall be full employment at good wages for all who are able and willing to work. Without full employment there can be no possibility of a prosperous economy. The Government is now purchasing with deficit dollars—that is to say, with red ink—50 percent of all the goods and services that are produced in America. When Uncle Sam stops buying, it will be absolutely essential to provide a substitute purchaser in the persons of the entire population of the country. Like the businessman, the farmer will need the market which can be provided only by people who are fully employed.

With business and agriculture both needing full employment, it is clear that the prime requisite for post-war reorganization is the union of businessmen, farmers, and workers to keep the economic machine running. All of the elements of our economy have worked together harmoniously for the prosecution of the war. They must now begin to work together harmoniously for the winning of the peace. The first consideration is for industry, agriculture, and labor to stop shooting at one another and to begin to work together enthusiastically to create the business without which there cannot be full employment for labor, nor markets for agriculture, nor business for industry, nor jobs for the returning soldiers.

Here in the West the new frontier awaits us. Here in the West by united action to promote investment of private funds in free, independent enterprise and by careful investment of Federal funds in productive public works like reclamation, we have the opportunity to lay the foundations of a new prosperity.

The world is waiting for the emergence of a truly democratic society in which the people rule supreme, both in the sphere of economics and of politics. This is the challenge which is presented to us. This is the opportunity that is ours—to build the dynamic democracy here in the United States that will lead all the world to a new and higher standard of full employment and prosperity.

Senator Barbour Calls for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, because of the fact that I made the statement as far back as October 8, and in the light of the recommendations and declarations I made at that time which are so timely today, if I may say so, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of the statement I then released in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BARBOUR CALLS FOR ACTION

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 8.—"I feel very strongly," Senator BARBOUR said today, "that the Senate of the United States should formulate and announce promptly and forthrightly an embracive declaration of post-war aims and responsibilities as the House did when it passed with an overwhelming majority the Fulbright resolution, especially as the Senate has the duty jointly with the Chief Executive in this field of foreign relations.

"It is my further conviction," the Senator further declared, "that the people throughout the country as a whole are evidencing increasingly that they want above all else to end for all time, whatever the cost, if it is humanly possible to do so, these regularly recurring frightful world spasms which become worse each time a migraine again commences.

"The Fulbright resolution, the declaration of principles unanimously agreed upon at the Mackinac Conference, the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution all are a long step in the right direction and added evidence of this growing recognition of an inescapable task which confronts us, and it is my hope that the Senate will act forthrightly and quickly because time is of the essence.

"But I want to emphasize again that the Constitution imposes upon the United States Senate a joint responsibility with the Chief Executive in that treaties can only be made subject to the advice and consent of the Senate and, by the same token, the Senate certainly should not side-step its constitutional responsibility by continuing to acquiesce in so-called 'Executive agreements' to avoid ratification.

"Every American should recall very vividly the difficulties which President Wilson encountered after World War No. 1 when he propounded his Fourteen Points in an effort to bring about a world peace. Unfortunately, due to lack of proper coordination and cooperation between the Chief Executive and the United States Senate at that time, we saw the subsequent failure of this country to take a firm and foremost position in world events. And with our not taking the leading part, the ground work for World War No. 2 was laid.

"All of which obviously calls for nonpartisan and nonpolitical coordination and cooperation between the Chief Executive and the United States Senate, lest we fall heir to the same dilemma which confronted the Nation when President Wilson was in the White House."

Appeal for the Election of Walter E. Edge as Governor of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on October 30 last the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] addressed the people of New Jersey in behalf of the election of Hon. Walter E. Edge, our former colleague in this body, to be Governor of New Jersey. The address was broadcast over the radio from station WOR. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On November 2 the people of the State of New Jersey will choose a Governor as chief executive of the State for 3 years. Every

patriotic citizen who has the right to vote should exercise that sacred privilege.

Each of us should ask ourselves, "What kind of a man do we want as Governor of the State in the best interests of the people as a whole?" I have asked myself that question many times and it is my considered judgment that Walter E. Edge fills the bill and will make a most satisfactory Governor during these troublous times of the State, the Nation, and the world. Why? Because he has integrity, intelligence, ability, and courage. Other men might have these same qualities and yet not be so satisfactory as Walter E. Edge. The Honorable Walter E. Edge has experience. He has demonstrated in years of public service to the people of the State, to the people of the Nation, and to foreign people as Ambassador to France that he keeps faith with his word. He has the ability to understand the difficult problems that confront the human family in its relationship under our form of government, and in its relationship with the people of other countries.

He has demonstrated a definite belief in our Constitution and the American system which made this country the leading Nation in the world. The State of New Jersey is one of the smaller States of the Union, but one of the most important of all and the eyes of the Nation are upon the decision we make at the polls November 2.

Never in the history of our State has it been more important to have a man as Governor who understands the problems of all groups that make up our American life. Senator Edge has a well rounded out understanding of the problems of each group and that understanding comes from actual experience in working directly, either with or in, each of those groups.

He knows the problems of agriculture because he has done farming to a substantial extent.

He knows the problems of business, both large and small, because he has been in business and a part of it, for many years.

He knows that the thousands of small businessmen are the backbone of our American business structure. Yes—the foundation upon which the free enterprise system rests.

He knows that big business has obligations to the people of the State, just the same as it has the right to expect fair treatment from the people of the State.

Senator Edge knows that the people of this State and of the Nation must never falter in doing everything within their power to win the kind of a victory in this war which will enable us to make a contribution to peace and the welfare of humanity throughout the world.

He has the great advantage over his opponent of having as Governor dealt with the problems that follow a war. He appreciates that the solving of the post-war problems with fairness and justice to all who served in the armed forces, as well as those who served in the army which remained at home to back up those forces, is vital if we are to continue as a free people and preserve the American business system of freemen.

The voters of the State of New Jersey should carefully analyze the record of experience of Senator Edge and I feel certain, in their own interest, they will decide to vote so they may have the benefit of this experience in the State of New Jersey for the next 3 years.

Senator Edge believes in local government and State government on all questions which have not been ceded to the Federal Government through the procedure established by the Constitution of the United States.

He is opposed to irregular and confused bureaucratic ruling of the lives of the people by Executive mandates which come from the concentration of power in the Federal Government. He believes in a rule of laws rather than a rule of men.

He recognizes that the obligation of the State is to help people to help themselves and that it is only by the preservation of fair opportunities to work and accomplish through the exercise of private initiative and genius that we can hope to preserve our American system, which has built in the United States of America the highest living standard ever attained by any people anywhere on earth.

"By their works ye shall know them," is advice none of us should fail to understand and use in our appraisal of men. Senator Edge has rendered an efficient and effective service as Governor of this State for 3 years and the record he made is known by vast numbers and available for all to see.

He rendered a service in the United States Senate for a period of 10 years, which is remembered most favorably by both Republican and Democratic Senators. The people of New Jersey recognize the great importance of having a Governor who understands not only the tremendous problems which now confront us but the greater problems which will confront us in the post-ward period—a man who understands something about our relationship with foreign nations and the world. We recognize our relationship will be on a different basis than ever before and hope that we do our full part in world affairs, in cooperation with other nations who are willing to do their full part and find a way to establish a just and enduring peace. Yes, find a way to establish a means of keeping that peace without destroying our national identity.

Walter E. Edge has had a vast business experience outside of his public service. He knows that the tax burden on the people cannot go beyond a certain point. He is in favor of all proper economies and the reduction of taxes.

Walter E. Edge recognizes that the objective of labor and capital must be identical and that their interests must be balanced on a fair basis with due regard to the rights of each, if our great American system of business is to endure and the rights of private initiative be preserved to each and all of the people, with equal opportunity for progress based upon accomplishment.

Senator Edge has demonstrated in public office, and his platform clearly shows, that labor must have as fair a deal, under our system, as any other group that makes up our American life. In the Republican platform Senator Edge presented a plank which recognizes without question the right of labor to organize. The right of labor to have collective bargaining. The right of labor to lawfully strike in peacetimes. He recognizes that in labor's own best interests, no group of our American life must grow to be as strong as, or stronger than, the Government itself. He has been friendly to labor and always will be.

He recognizes that labor of today is the capital of tomorrow, and the worker, in the plant of today may become the manager or the head of an institution in the tomorrow under our system.

He recognizes that no employer or set of employers, or no labor leader or set of labor leaders, should or can control the vote of the working people of the United States. The right to vote is the most sacred possession of every American citizen. The patriotic American workers throughout this State and throughout the Nation appreciate today, more than ever before, that the right of suffrage belongs to them in their individual capacity. They seem to know and understand that if and when anyone can step in and tell them how to vote or direct them to vote a certain way—then the processes of freemen are being destroyed, and it will not take long until individual freedom has perished—business, founded upon free enterprise or private initiative, has vanished and then each of us will find that we have lost our rights as individuals and are taking orders from the State.

I am strongly convinced that Senator Edge realizes that only through bringing about a better understanding between employer and employee—through bringing about justice and fairness on the part of each in its relationship with the other, and thus rebuilding respect of the employer for his employee and the respect of the employee for his employer—can we hope to have voluntary cooperation, which spells efficiency in production and lower cost on products desired by the citizens, and thus create a satisfied people, which is the foundation we must have if our processes of freemen are to continue.

It is my firm conviction that no man can render a great contribution to the people of this State or this Nation unless he has a wholesome respect for, and deep interest in, the welfare of labor and the preservation of capital and the American business system. Well-measured and well-balanced interest in both groups is what we require.

Walter E. Edge does not have with him the forces of political bossism. He does not have with him the labor-leader racketeers. He does not have with him the Communists or those who would destroy our form of government.

He has the patriotic, fine American working people, both in and out of the unions. He has the support of intelligent business men and professional men who believe in the preservation of the American system. He has all sound-thinking people engaged in agriculture. He has with him most of our citizens who believe in America, its Constitution, and what our armed forces are fighting for.

Some say that truth is expected everywhere except in politics. Perhaps that is what is the matter with politics. I believe Walter E. Edge sincerely means every pledge and principle he has announced to the people and will keep his pledges.

It is important to you as citizens, it is important to the State, as well as to the Nation, that we elect Walter E. Edge as our next Governor on November 2. Remember liberty is freedom, but freedom is not free. If we wish to remain free people, each of us must understand the candidates and know what they stand for, then go to the polls and exercise our right of suffrage. Complacency and the "let George do it" attitude must not prevail in this election, otherwise all you will be able to do is more wishful thinking and have further opportunity to complain about bad administration of government. I have great faith in the common sense of the people when they understand—and I believe all who look at the record of our candidate in his public service will say, " 'By their works ye shall know them'—therefore, we want Walter E. Edge as our next Governor."

Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter discussing sovereignty, written by Emery Reves, which was published in the New York Times of October 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVEREIGNTY EXPOUNDED—IT WOULD APPEAR CONCEPTIONS SHOULD BE REVISED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Mr. Hoover's speech in Kansas City, Sumner Welles' speech in New York, the debate now going on in the Senate in connection with the Connally resolution all center on the notion of sovereignty.

This mysterious word—sovereignty—is, in fact, the fundamental problem of international peace. This is not a theoretical debate, but an issue more vital than wages, prices, taxes, food, or any other major item in the news, because in final analysis the solution of all those problems depends upon the outcome of the present world crisis.

What does this word "sovereignty" mean? From the very beginning of social life, at the dawn of history, it was necessary to establish certain rules of conduct, so that men might live together in a family, in a tribe, in a community. Human nature is such that man does not accept rules except when they are imposed upon him by constituted authority. The first absolute authority was God, and the first lawmakers were priests who proclaimed the will of God.

Later on, as human society developed and law and order grew, it was necessary to separate that which was Caesar's from that which was God's. During that long period of history when peoples were ruled by the divine right of absolute monarchs, to maintain their authority and law-making power it was necessary for them to derive their power from God. These attributes were called sovereign and the persons vested with them were the sovereigns.

PEOPLE GOT RIGHTS

The great change came in the eighteenth century when French, English, and American thinkers, whose ideas were based on Greek philosophy, proclaimed the democratic principle that "sovereignty resides in the community." This revolutionary idea led to the great popular uprisings of the eighteenth century, to the establishment of the American and French Republics, and to the "king reigns but does not govern" parliamentary system in England and in many other countries.

Our present conception of national sovereignty shows how an ideal once realized can be distorted in the span of a single century.

According to eighteenth century thought, no individual or group of individuals could exert sovereign rights unless derived from the sovereignty of the community. At that time there were no railways, there were no machines, and the widest horizon of those forebears of democracy was the nation. When they proclaimed the sovereignty of the nation, they meant the sovereignty of the community; they meant sovereignty to have the broadest possible basis.

CONDITIONS CHANGED

Today, 150 years later, when we can fly around the globe in less time than it took to go from Boston to New York, the situation is completely different.

As the world is organized today, sovereignty does not reside in the community, but is exercised in an absolute form by groups of individuals we call nations. Today sovereignty has far too narrow a basis; it no longer has the power it should and was meant to have.

The significant thing about the present crisis is that the nation-states, even the most powerful, even the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are no longer strong enough, no longer powerful enough, to fulfill the purpose for which they were created. They cannot prevent disasters like the First and Second World Wars. However sincerely the American and Russian Governments wanted to keep out of this war, they were forced into it.

If the sovereignty of the United States and the sovereignty of Soviet Russia do not suffice to protect the citizens, then we need not even talk about the fiction of sovereignty in Latvia, Luxemburg, or Rumania.

This war has finally demonstrated that not a single one of the existing nations, even the most powerful, is economically self-sufficient, and that at the end of this war in the whole world there will be no more than three nations capable of creating and maintaining armed forces in the modern sense. These indisputable facts prove that our present conception of national sovereignty is outdated and is fraught with deadly danger for us all.

PEOPLE ABOVE NATIONS

The inescapable economic and technical realities of our age make it imperative to restate and reinterpret this notion, and to create sovereignties based on the community, according to the original democratic conception. Sovereignty of the people must stand above the nations, so that under it each nation may be safe and equal, just as each individual is safe and equal under the law in a civilized state.

There is no question of giving up national traditions, opening the gates to foreign entanglements. But there are certain elements of sovereignty that can no longer be left in many hands, but which must be vested in and exercised by a single world body.

We have to institute a separation of sovereignties, leaving in the hands of national states all sovereign rights over national affairs, but creating world-wide sovereignties that will give each nation military security and economic prosperity.

There is no other way out. We know by experience that lasting peaceful collaboration of sovereign nations is an impossibility, a contradiction in itself, a Utopia. It has been tried thousands of times. It never will work.

The question is not one of surrendering national sovereignty. The problem is not negative and does not involve giving up something we already have. The problem is positive—creating something which we never had but imperatively need.

The creation of institutions with universal sovereignty is merely another phase of the same process in the development of human history—the extension of law and order into another field of human association which heretofore has remained unregulated and in disorder.

A few centuries ago cities held full sovereign rights. Later, parts of these municipal sovereignties were transferred to provinces, then to larger units, and, finally, at the end of the eighteenth century to the nation-states.

SOME EXAMPLES

In America today the problems of fire prevention, water supply, street cleaning, and other similar matters are under municipal authority.

The construction of roads, marital legislation, education, legislation regarding industrial and commercial enterprise, and endless other issues, are predominantly under State sovereignty.

And, finally, problems affecting the United States Army, Navy, foreign policy, and others are under Federal sovereignty.

The development is crystal clear. As human progress continues, conditions require a broader basis for sovereignty, for absolute power, in order to fulfill its purpose—the protection of the people.

New Yorkers are the citizens of the city of New York, of the State of New York, and of the United States of America. But they are also the citizens of the world. Their lives, their security, their liberties are protected in a very wide field by the sovereign authority which resides in the people, who have delegated its exercise partly to the city, partly to the State, and partly to the Federal Government.

But during the last 25 years we have learned that these sovereign national corporate units, created by the people, are not strong enough, are not sovereign enough, to protect them against attack by a foreign power over which the existing sovereignties have no control whatever.

If the State of New York enacted economic or social legislation that reacted harmfully on economic and labor conditions in Connecticut, such an act on the part of the sovereign State of New York could not be prevented by the sovereign State of Connecticut, except by declaring war.

HIGHER SOVEREIGNTY NEEDED

Only a higher sovereignty—the Federal sovereignty—can protect the people against such dangers.

Existing anarchy in international relations, due to absolute national sovereignty, must be superseded by international statutory law, enacted by a duly elected legislative body. Such international law must take the place of the fanciful, utterly ineffectual and precarious rule of unenforceable treaty obligations signed by sovereign nations.

The planners of future peace should bear in mind their fundamental illusions: that they can create an order to last forever. No one can put this world into a strait jacket. No one can design an order and freeze it into permanent shape. It is against the nature of things to create a system of national boundaries and alliances, of economic organization, and then command history to become stationary, considering anyone who attempts to change this order an aggressor.

This is the fundamental fallacy of the idea of collective security based on treaty agreements between sovereign nations. When the essence of life is perpetual change, adherence to old forms must lead to explosions.

Those who talk of surrendering the sovereignty of the United States, of England, or of any other democratic country, simply don't understand the exact meaning of sovereignty.

DEMOCRACIES NOT SOVEREIGN

A democratic state cannot surrender sovereignty for the simple reason that it is not sovereign. Only a Nazi or Fascist state is sovereign. A democratic state is sovereign only to the degree in which it is granted sovereignty by those in whom, under the democratic concept, sovereignty is vested—the people. The real source of sovereign power must not be lost sight of for a true understanding of the political problem we face. It is the people who create governments and not—as the Fascists say—governments that make nations.

The nation-states, as they were set up in the eighteenth century and as they are organized in the democracies today, are nothing but instruments of the sovereign people, with the specific purpose of carrying out certain objectives, to protect the people, and to maintain law and order. Should the people realize and come to the conclusion that in certain fields they would be better protected by delegating part of their sovereignty to bodies other than the nation-states, then nothing would be surrendered. Rather would something be created for the better protection of the lives and liberties of the peoples. Sovereignty would continue to reside in the people, but institutions would be created to give better expression to the democratic sovereignty of the people.

EMERY REVES.

NEW YORK, *October 29, 1943.*

Civilian Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civilian Awards," which appeared in the New York Times for Saturday, October 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVILIAN AWARDS

Testimony to the effect that the stimulus of the Army-Navy E and the Maritime M production awards has been very great constantly is accumulating. Both management and labor on the home front have been helped to even greater efforts and results by these recognitions of unselfish devotion to the great task of turning out the vital materials of war. Now both directors and workers in a category other than those previcusly recognized are to receive an achievement award for work well done. These are the seasonal processors of food. The fact that they are not year-around operators makes them ineligible for Army-Navy E recognition. But if they meet the same high standards demanded for that badge of honor they are to receive the award of the War Food Administration's A flag. Qualifications considered in selection for the award will include ingenuity in the development of war food products, low absenteeism, cooperation in the various food-purchase programs, accident prevention, and the like.

A number of vital factors on the home front still lack recognition in the form of public awards. The power and utility companies, the communications companies, and even the enormously busy railroads do not fall within the technical requirements for existing awards. There would seem to be little reason why the powerful incentive which existing awards for merit have supplied should not be extended to such fundamentally important elements as the electric light and power industry, which has shown an increase of 73 percent in its kilowatt-hour output since 1939; or the telephone industry, which last year handled 93 percent more long-distance calls than in 1939; or the American railroads, which in 1942 increased the ton miles moved as compared with 1939 by 92 percent and the passenger miles by 135 percent in the same period. The service industries have done and are doing an outstanding war job. They, too, deserve an accolade.

Hate Never Builds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial entitled "Hate Never Builds," written by Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, and published in the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of Sunday, October 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HATE NEVER BUILDS

The generations now undergoing the most terrible war in history have been confronting evil in its most hideous forms. There has been, certainly, a more extensive manifestation of brutality, duplicity, and sheer horror than ever before has been known in the world. This frightful reality has severely challenged or even shaken the most steadfast faith in the power of good, the effectiveness of reason and good will, in dealing with such evil.

There are many men of gentle instincts and moderate temper who have come to the conclusion that the only way to overcome certain kinds of evil is by stronger physical force, exercised as vigorously, even as ruthlessly, as conditions may require. Indeed, there will be little questioning of the necessity for such procedure under certain circumstances—such as often have presented themselves in this war.

But the thinking of many good men and women has carried them even farther respecting the uses of ruthlessness and hatred. They have come to believe that such a spirit must be maintained even beyond the time when the violence that called it forth has been put down; that it is necessary that the passions of bitterness and vengefulness be kept fiercely burning even in the making of the settlements at the end of the war. Otherwise, it is feared, there may be no sufficiently drastic action for the control and suppression of the powerful forces of evil which we have seen to be inherent in the world.

No thoughtful person should have difficulty in understanding such tendencies of thought and feeling, even though in disagreement with them. But there remain many, in this country and other lands, who still are profoundly of the conviction that hatred and bitterness and revenge can only be destructive and defeating influences in post-war efforts to build a better world.

Some maintain that men can be all the more effective fighters even in battle when their minds are not inflamed and clouded by bitter passions. But however conflicting opinions may be on that particular question, it surely should be a matter of very wide recognition and agreement that bitter passions do not create, that they do not build. Whatever may be their service as driving forces in violent conflict, they are not forces of construction and reconciliation. It is only through reason and good will that men can move forward in true civilization, in bettering human relations, in taking advantage of their widening material advantages.

There can be no real peace unless the spirit of reason and good will prevails. That is the spirit of peace.

The People's Mandate Committee for Inter-American Peace and Cooperation, an organization of women under the chairmanship of Dr. Mary E. Woolley, is continuing to emphasize this basic truth as the dangers of hatred and vengeance grow under the terrible provocations of the war. The committee recently issued a pamphlet, There Must Be No Bitterness, in which are collected excerpts rom articles and speeches stressing this spirit. The title comes from the notable speech by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in New York last spring.

It is easy to yield to the innumerable provocations to hatred in a great war.

It is difficult to maintain the faith that reason and good will yet can prevail over evil.

But those groups, those individuals, that never forget the true nature of peace, that always remember that hatred and vengeance can never build or create, are themselves fighting a great battle for all mankind.

The eventual, climactic job in winning this war will be a building job, a creative job. That is the great task beyond the immediate business of suppressing rampant, violent evil. For that task the clearest minds, the highest and broadest humanitarian spirit we can possibly achieve and maintain are required. And required now. For even while the war is being pressed on to victory the making of the peace to come is inevitably proceeding in the minds and hearts of all men and all nations.

United States Policies in Algiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the first edition of the Washington Post of today carries an Associated Press dispatch from Algiers, north Africa, dealing with questions which have been discussed by Members of the Senate committee who recently reported the results of their investigations in the war areas in Europe. Inasmuch as this article did not appear in other editions, and was not printed in full in other newspapers, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICIES QUESTIONED IN ALGIERS

ALGIERS, November 3.—A year ago the name "American" was a magic one to the French in north Africa. Today, a year after the Allied landings it is more often a term of reproach than praise.

Gossips are spreading false rumors that certain foodstuffs are unobtainable, or at least are very scarce in north Africa, because the Americans bought up all the supplies to feed to the Italians.

Credulous housewives seemingly have little difficulty in believing other false rumors that the high cost of living is due to the Americans.

In other words, there is a strong fifth column operating in French north Africa and it is doing its work well because the United States apparently has failed to find an effective basis of counterpropaganda. The habit of blaming the United States for almost everything that goes sour in north Africa has become so fixed that Axis sympathizers find it easy to sow new seeds of distrust.

DARLAN DEAL HURT PRESTIGE

The decline in American prestige began with the Darlan incident and the subsequent de Gaulle-Giraud scramble for power. The attitude of most Frenchmen here toward the United States could reasonably have been expected to improve once the new French Committee of National Liberation was formed and large quantities of modern American weapons and supplies for the French troops and large shipments of American food, gasoline, and other essentials began to arrive.

Such, however, has not been the case. Many intelligent, well-informed Frenchmen

here believe the old cordial feeling of Frenchmen toward the Americans will not survive this war unless the United States can devise a better means of telling the French people what the Americans are doing now and what they propose to do in the future.

The Italian policy has also been criticized.

The mere fact that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is commander in chief of this war theater is in large part responsible for the fact that the United States alone among the United Nations finds itself an easy target of criticism.

The British stock among the French in north Africa has risen as the Americans' has declined. But there is little if any relation between the rising popularity of the British and the declining influence of the United States.

The British are a long way ahead of the United States in the presentation of her role in the war in north Africa. Reuters, the British news agency, supplies the bulk of the foreign news in the north African newspapers and London date lines dominate the front pages, often appearing on items originating in this war theater.

Reduction of Sick Time in Army Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Army's Reconditioning Program Cuts Down Sick Time in Hospitals," written by Albert Deutsch, and published in PM of October 13, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY'S RECONDITIONING PROGRAM CUTS DOWN SICK TIME IN HOSPITALS

(By Albert Deutsch)

The Army Air Force, which has one of the most progressive medical departments in the services, is conducting a reconditioning program for sick soldiers that has cut down sick time in hospitals to an amazing extent.

Maj. Gen. David N. W. Grant, head of the A. A. F.'s medical service, reported to the American Public Health Association's wartime conference yesterday how this program has not only returned sick soldiers to duty sooner and healthier, but has also cut down the rate of disability discharges.

The program covers convalescent soldiers in Air Force hospitals who have got over the acute stage of their illness but are not ready to return to full military duty.

"The convalescents' training program," General Grant explained, "is designed for the ordinary sick soldier in our station hospitals. Physical reconditioning is accomplished by a systematic and graduated series of physical exercises and calisthenics, given in their mildest form even to bed patients, in addition to supervised outdoor games, recreation and close order drill."

TWO HUNDRED VICTORY GARDENS

Patients are started on bed exercises 2 days after surgical operations, to prevent their muscles from becoming flabby. A popular phase of the program calls for the tending of over 200 Victory gardens by convalescent patients.

Together with physical reconditioning, a broad educational program for convalescents is carried on in these hospitals, General Grant says. Patients are taught self-protection, gas warfare, camouflage, booby traps, and first aid while convalescing. They are told: "While you are in the hospital today, you may learn something that might save your life 6 months from now."

Special classes are held for illiterate convalescents. They can be taught to write their names and serial numbers in two days. "This may seem a small matter," General Grant says, "but it is a tremendous morale factor because, with this knowledge, the soldier need not disclose his ignorance to his comrades."

MORALE FILM

Morale films are regularly shown the hospitalized men, and language lessons are given through recordings.

"The results of our experience with convalescents' training," General Grant declares, "have been most gratifying. Hospital re-admissions have been reduced because men are being sent back to duty in better physical condition. The period of convalescence in certain acute, infectious, and contagious diseases have been definitely shortened. One hospital reported a reduction from 15 to 11 days in patients with measles, and a drop from 33 to 23 hospital days for convalescents with scarlet fever."

A study was recently made of two groups of soldiers hospitalized for virus pneumonia. One group was given the special reconditioning program, the other wasn't. The group deprived of the program averaged 45 days of hospitalization, with 30 percent of the cases having a recurrence of sickness. The other group averaged only 31 hospital days, with but 3 percent of the cases recurring.

Civilian hospital officials would do well to study this A. A. F. program closely. It provides a key to revolutionizing convalescent care in hospitals and cutting down civilian sick time.

Starving Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, began hearings today on the proposal to feed the starving children of the occupied democracies of Europe. Former President Hoover appeared as a witness and made an eloquent plea for Senate action with respect to this matter.

I notice that a splended editorial appears in today's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STARVING CHILDREN

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is at last giving consideration to proposals for sending American food to the starving children of Axis-conquered Europe. The need of these children is very great, very urgent—and it has been before our eyes for a longer time than we can acknowledge with comfortable conscience. We have arrived at a stage in our war against the Axis when we can and must respond to this need—when to ignore it longer would not only leave us guilty of barbarous inhumanity but would also endanger our own practical interest in the European future.

We shall have to reckon with Europe's children when the fighting ends. In the approaching years, it is they who will determine whether the Continent is to be peaceful and stable and democratic. Their hunger, in a real sense, is a menace to our children here at home. For their hunger, if it continues too long, can produce not only emaciated bodies but also the warped and twisted and dangerous minds which breed fascism and war. If they are to share our democratic beliefs they must be saved from starvation. Certainly if they are to arise and help us when we arrive as liberators, they must be given sustenance.

The means for helping the children of Europe are readily available to us. If we spared them nothing more than the food which we waste from our overladen dinner tables we could grant them immeasurable relief. Their own governments have funds impounded in this country with which to pay for the food they need. Neutral ships could carry it overseas without adding any burden to our shipping facilities. The enemy has indicated a willingness to grant safe conduct to such shipments. The International Red Cross stands ready to supervise its distribution—and to guarantee that none of it will fall into Nazi hands.

It is a fear that the Nazis will take away whatever food we may send which has thus far kept us from sending relief to the conquered countries. But as the pattern of victory emerges, we are able to see now that it does not depend upon a ruthless blockade of the Continent. We shall destroy Germany from the air, crush her by means of the Allied armies moving toward her borders from the east and the south and soon, perhaps, from the west as well. The starvation of Germany's victims is a wholly needless tactic for us to pursue. It is, indeed, a tactic which, as the Germans themselves have realized, can only boomerang against us. For it merely assists the Nazis in their domination of the Continent. And it threatens to convert our potential allies, by embittering them, into angry foes.

The Members of Congress who weigh this problem should understand that procrastination is perilous. If we are to provide a remedy, we must provide it without any further delay. Hunger cannot be assuaged by legislative debate; its toll is taken inexorably as the days and weeks move on. These children of Europe can look only to America for salvation. We shall be acting both generously and wisely if we save them.

Government Centralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the Forum, published at Fargo, N. Dak., in its issue of October 31, carried a column under the headline "Government centralization is scored by a Governor," the article being written by one of the editors of the paper, Mr. Earl K. Bitzing. I ask unani-

mous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT CENTRALIZATION IS SCORED BY A GOVERNOR

(By Earl K. Bitzing)

In the hectic years of the depression, and then of the war, much has been said about the centralization of authority in Washington. While one must expect certain centralization in order to conduct a war of the proportions of this war, yet the centralization begun some 10 years ago has mushroomed in fields wholly aside from the war effort.

One has witnessed the continued taking away of the rights of the States. One has watched the development of a great Federal bureaucracy. One has realized the reaching out of Washington for ever-increasing power.

The other day the Cleveland Plain Dealer unearthed "a Governor who is among those mentioned prominently as a 1944 Presidential possibility." It speaks of what he has to say about the trend of affairs in Washington. It says his remarks "may seem old-fashioned and off the throb to some of our New Deal friends, but seems to us to represent sound American thinking."

In his inaugural address, the Plain Dealer finds this Governor said: "There is a present dangerous tendency to forget a fundamental of American democracy—the tendency to encourage consolidation of power at the top of a governmental structure alien to our system and more closely akin to a dictatorship or the central committee of a Communist regime. We have met difficulties before this and have solved them in accordance with the basic theories of a representative democracy. Let us not at this time pursue the easy road of centralization of authority, lest some day we discover too late that our liberties have disappeared."

And then again: "It was clear to the framers of our Constitution * * * that any administration attempting to make all laws for a whole nation * * * would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself.

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'master minds' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'master minds' so unselfish; so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices; men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand—such a government might be to the interests of the country, but there is none such on our horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

These remarks of this particular Governor were made in the "roaring twenties."

Yes; you are right—they were made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Conditions in the Dairy Industry of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Martyn B. Kenney, secretary of the Milk Control Board of the State of New Hampshire, relating to the fixing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities. Enclosed in the letter are excerpts from documents in the files of the New Hampshire Milk Control Board. I ask that the letter and the enclosure be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
MILK CONTROL BOARD,
Concord, November 2, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The dairy industry of New Hampshire is entering on the darkest days of its history, principally caused by ill-advised and unwarranted Federal regulations. Shortages of fluid supply are prevalent in many communities, even in New Hampshire where usually there exists a surplus. Milk for manufacturing fluid cream supplies has entirely disappeared. Production has recently dropped much lower than is seasonably usual, this condition in the face of the greatest consumer demand ever known and the request from the War Food Administration for increased production to meet both fluid demands and the requirements for manufactured dairy products.

The reasons for this decrease in production are primarily, (1) shortage of competent labor (2) prices too low to meet costs of production and the refusal of the Office of Price Administration to permit necessary upward adjustments (3) shortage of quality grains. Relief from these conditions must be immediate if New England is to maintain production of fluid milk during 1944 sufficient to even approximate consumer demands.

Of primary importance is price adjustments to cover costs of production. A greater return to the farmer will permit utilization of incompetent help and also serve to retain such help as has stayed on the farms. An adequate price will encourage producers to make superhuman efforts to maintain production and counteract the temptation to sell dairy cows at the present abnormal price level. A higher price will also permit the feeding of larger amounts of grain wherever available to offset the decreased value of much of the roughage which is available this year.

Various farm groups at public hearings presented evidence of sharply increased costs. Unchallenged evidence shows farm-labor costs to have advanced nearly 25 percent, and grain costs nearly one-third within the year. These are only two of the major items of cost as cow replacement values, machinery costs and repairs have also increased sharply.

Agencies such as the New England Milk Producers' Association, the State United States Department of Agriculture, War Board Conference, held in Laconia October 28 and 29, the conference of New England commissioners of agriculture meeting in Concord November 1, and the New Hampshire Milk Control Board, following regional hearings covering the entire State, all unite in going on record to the effect that an immediate increase of 2 cents per quart at least is necessary to maintain an adequate supply of milk in New England, to say nothing about increased production requested by War Foods Administration.

We are advised that the authority to raise ceiling prices on fluid milk only exists in the National Office of Price Administration and, further, that for the Office of Price Administration to take such action violates the "hold the line" order. We state that to maintain this position will cause production to fall to a level which will prevent the filling of orders to the armed forces, lend-lease commitments, and cause severe and unnecessary hardship to the civilian consumer.

It is our understanding that the Price Control Act as passed by Congress in 1942 forbids the fixing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities at less than cost of production with labor a factor in determining these costs. If this is the case there would appear to be a violation of law in enforcing the ceilings now in effect or in continuing the refusal for making needed adjustments.

We appeal to Congress to take such action as may be necessary to require Federal agencies to correct this injustice either by the removal of price ceilings on fluid milk or by adjusting the ceilings at a level which will permit milk production in New England to continue in such amounts as will meet reasonable demands under a war economy.

Individuals, groups, and agencies alike are also opposed to the payment of subsidies as a substitute for establishment of adequate prices for milk and milk products. It is in our opinion a dangerous and unnecessary practice to mortgage the income of future generations to pay the grocery bill incurred during the present days of abnormally high national income.

I am enclosing pertinent excerpts from various statements which are a part of the public records of our department.

Sincerely yours,

MARTYN B. KENNEY,
Secretary.

EXCERPTS FROM VARIOUS DOCUMENTS IN THE FILES OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MILK CONTROL BOARD

Brief of New England Milk Producers' Association submitted at State and Federal hearings.

The New England Milk Producers' Association and other cooperatives representing producers who deliver milk to the Boston market, have requested an increase of 93 cents per hundredweight in the Boston class I price. We rest our case on a few simple facts, which can be summarized as follows:

1. Prices of milk have not advanced in line with increased production costs. Milk prices have been frozen, while wages of labor and the price of feed have continued to rise.

2. Milk is not priced on a competitive basis with other farm products, or with other opportunities available to farm operators and the labor employed on dairy farms. Prices for fluid milk have been kept low in relation to prices for livestock and other farm products, and low in relation to the levels of industrial wages.

3 Dairy farmers for several years have been on the short end of the competition for labor, and are now on the short end of the competition for food. The dairy farmer who is getting a low price for milk cannot compete with the hog producer who is getting a much higher price for his pork. The diversion of labor and diversion of feed have become so critical as to threaten the fluid milk supply, not only for New England, but the entire densely populated eastern seaboard area.

FARM LABOR COSTS

The official reports of the United States Department of Agriculture indicate that farm wages per month with board in New England have advanced about $15 a month since the fall of last year. Wages per month without board have increased about $18 a month. The official indexes do not accurately represent the level of wages paid to dairy farm labor, since they apply to all classes of farm labor and include the labor of children in such occupations as strawberry picking, truck farming, apple harvesting, etc. We may take the figure of $15 a month as a conservative estimate of the increase in wage rates paid to dairy farm labor.

GRAIN

The quotations of Eastern States Farmers' Exchange for a ready-mixed dairy ration commonly used in New England (car door advance order) showed an advance of $9 per ton from September last year to July of the present year. On July 31, O. P. A. issued new price regulations for oilseed meals represented by M. P. R. 442, 443, and 444. The immediate effect of these orders is to raise the carlot prices of the various oilseed meals approximately by the following amounts:

	Per ton
Soybean meal	$11.50
Cottonseed meal	19.50
Peanut meal	10.00
Linseed meal	2.00

The effect of these price advances on the cost of producing milk will vary by regions and by feeding practices. But in all cases, feeding costs are materially increased as a result of these orders. The index number of all feedstuff prices has advanced about 7 percent as the result of these new ceiling prices on oilseed cakes and meals. Based on feeding practices common in New England, the effect of these price changes, approved by O. P. A. and effective July 31, is to add at least $3 per ton to the cost of a standard daily ration. This means a total increase of about $12 per ton in the cost of a standard dairy ration, since the fall of last year.

"Since this brief was written further increases in dairy ration costs have averaged $7 per ton." (M. B. K.)

DAIRY COW REPLACEMENTS

Another factor is the increased cost of dairy cow replacements, and the shorter life or more rapid depreciation of dairy cows, due to inexperienced milkers and inferior quality of feed supplies. The New England Crop Reporting Service, United States Department of Agriculture, in a summary issued July 14, 1943, reports that the average price paid for fresh- or near-springer grade cows has increased slightly more than $54 per head in northern New England, and slightly more than $58 in southern New England. The average increase for New England as a whole is approximately $56 per head since the fall of last year.

If we want milk and other dairy products, dairy farmers must be able to compete for labor and the feed required to maintain production. Otherwise, the labor and feed will both be diverted to other higher-priced uses.

In our previous testimony we have attempted to measure the changes in the cost of producing milk, based on the actual prices now being paid by dairy farmers for labor and feed. But farm wages are not at a competitive level sufficient to hold labor on farms. And feed prices are not at a competitive level which will attract sufficient supplies of feed to maintain the dairy production of New England.

If we want milk and other dairy products, we must be willing to pay a competitive wage for farm labor. This applies not only to hired farm labor, but also to family labor and the farm operator. The decline in the number of producers delivering milk to Boston and other New England markets is sufficient evidence that farm operators are leaving the farm, as well as hired farm labor.

This does not mean paying the same level of wages that are paid in war industry. It does mean that farm wages must keep within some normal, reasonable relationship to wages obtained from industrial employment.

This does not mean paying the same level of wages that are paid in war industry. It does mean that farm wages must keep within some normal, reasonable relationship to wages obtained from industrial employment.

CONFERENCE OF STATE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE WAR BOARD

According to figures submitted at the State-United States Department of Agriculture War Board conference in Laconia last week, New Hampshire milk production in 1943 will be below 346,000,000 pounds as against 348,000,000 pounds in 1942 and an average of 355,000,000 pounds in the years 1937 to 1941. This is in the face of an all-out attempt to reach a yearly goal of 350,000,000 pounds.

Report of dairy committee which was unanimously approved by the conference.

The dairy goal and price policy committee feel that the 1944 milk production goal should be to maintain the 1943 production which is expected to be 346,000,000 pounds. It should be recognized that the expected 1943 production is 2,000,000 pounds below the 1942 level and 4,000,000 pounds below the 1943 goal.

The committee suggests the 1944 goal of 346,000,000 pounds because of the urgent need for milk, realizing that in view of existing conditions milk production in 1944 may be well below that of 1943. If the goal is to be attained prompt action must be taken on the following conditions which now tend to discourage greater production.

1. That sufficient competent labor must be made available.

2. That the price of milk be adequate to meet continually increasing costs of production. Under existing costs of labor and feed, the committee estimates that an increase in price of approximately $1 per hundredweight will be needed to maintain the present rate of production. Dairymen should be advised well in advance as to the price they are to receive.

In support of this suggested increase the Committee points out that the seasonal decline in production at the present time is much greater than normal. Many local New Hampshire markets now find it impossible to supply fluid demands from normal producing areas and are importing milk from outside the State.

3. That an adequate feed supply of the proper quality is necessary to maintain production.

4. That sufficient machinery and repair parts on hand when needed are necessary to both supplement a shorter supply of labor and to make more efficient use of that labor available.

Unanimous recommendations of the New England Commissioners of Agriculture to the Governors of New England, in part—

That subsidy in any form be opposed.

We feel that the average of farm prices for 1943 has been reasonably satisfactory, but there are some glaring inequalities, chief of which is milk. The price of milk should reflect the cost of production. Therefore we recommend an increased price of 93 cents per hundredweight at the farm level. Such action is imperative if reasonable consumer demands are to be met in 1944.

I would refer you to the resolutions adopted by the International Association of Milk Control Agencies at Philadelphia, Pa., on October 1, a copy of which I believe has been mailed to you and also the resolutions adopted by the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the New England Milk Producers' Association at Boston on October 27.

Price Increase on Oil

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the next great bottleneck in America will be oil and this bottleneck can be attributed to the shortsighted policy of the administrative forces in their "hold the line" order.

The recent decision of Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, rejecting the recommendation of a 35-cent-a-barrel increase in crude oil affects the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the country and the outcome of the terrific global war we are fighting throughout the world.

This attitude may be responsible for us losing the war if sufficient stock piles of oil are not available to the fighting forces in the various theaters of war throughout the world. It may be responsible for us losing the peace that follows.

The price of oil has been static since being frozen at artificially low levels in October 1941. Labor costs have greatly increased, material costs have greatly increased, and manpower is becoming scarcer, and now we have a statement issued which smacks of party politics "that we must keep faith with unnumbered millions of wage earners, and so forth; that the price increase would cost $500,000,000 annually." This grandstand declaration sounds like the opening of the 1944 campaign.

PRODUCTION OFF GREATLY

In the Pennsylvania grade area production in the last 8 months has declined 1,700,000 barrels, when an increase in the price of oil would have produced sufficient oil to meet the demands of the American people for the fuel oil and gasoline so necessary along the eastern coast. For a full year Pennsylvania production will be off 2,300,000 barrels of crude, which would have produced 50,000,000 gallons of gasoline.

It is ridiculous to talk about the saving of $500,000,000 to American taxpayers when on the other hand we go up into the Canadian wilderness and spend $138,000,000 on the exploration of an oil project that is publicly stated is producing only approximately 3,000 barrels a day. Daily production in the United States is 4,250,000 barrels. If this $138,000,000 had been invested in a Pennsylvania field, a proven field, it would have produced many millions of barrels of oil. So this attempt to gloss over this matter of how it would save the American taxpayer money appears rather silly in view of the fact that no consideration was given the American taxpayers when this Canadian project was rushed through.

If we want to consider the American taxpayer we should consider his problem from all angles.

MANY WELLS NOW IDLE

In my territory approximately 7,500 to 8,000 wells are not being pumped because the lease owners are unable to get the manpower at the price they can pay to pump the wells. Leases are being scrapped, casing and machinery sold for junk, and the oil forevermore lost. This because of the inability of the producer to meet the increased cost to produce the oil.

There are 300,000 stripper wells in the United States which have been on a starvation diet because they cannot meet

the lifting costs. They are the economic casualties the New Dealers refer to—the small operators who cannot meet the highly competitive situation that has developed—when an increase would not alone secure the oil, but would save an industry upon which several hundred thousand people are directly or indirectly dependent.

It is true that there are some large producers who would profit by a price increase, but they are in the minority. Like agriculture, the administration now insists that the oil industry accept subsidies, which they have steadfastly refused and will continue to refuse.

FIFTY-NINE PERCENT OF PARITY

Oil today is 59 percent of parity, which indicates the terrific beating the small producer throughout the Nation has taken in the production of oil. Price remains unchanged since October 1941, and any person knows that material, labor, and exploration costs have greatly increased.

I sincerely hope that the director of economic stabilization is right when he says supplies are in sight for all essential needs throughout 1945 because this does not agree with the P. A. W. administration statement that we will be short 500,000 barrels early in 1944.

It is gratifying to hear Mr. Vinson talk about saving $500,000,000 annually because this is the first time in a long time we have heard the administrative forces being interested in effecting any savings for the taxpayer.

I sincerely trust that further economies may be effected in the conduct and operation of the Government; to take about a million bureaucrats off the pay roll from their cushy swivel-chair jobs of from $3,500 to $10,000 a year which would effect some worth-while savings for the American people and place them in productive war effort where they rightfully belong.

Mr. Vinson also talks about the drilling of 19,000 wells in proven areas. I cannot understand why the administration spent $138,000,000 in Canadian wilderness before determining whether or not it was a proven area. Fifteen thousand tons of pipe was the initial shipment into the Canadian project which could have been used by the oil producers in the United States to good advantage.

STATEMENT SMACKS OF PIKE

If he does not get any more foreign oil than they are getting from the Canadian project, I cannot imagine where 337,000 barrels daily he speaks of is going to be obtained for 1944. The whole statement smasks of Sumner Pike, Deputy Administrator for Oil, who has been loaned to the O. P. A. from the S. E. C.

There seems to be a determined effort to crush the owners of 300,000 stripper wells in the United States while we carry on glorified boondoggling projects everywhere else at the expense of the American taxpayer.

In the calendar year of 1942 the estimated reserves found were 260,051,000 barrels, while the consumption was approximately 1,400,000,000 barrels. In the first 6 months of 1943 we found 473,000,000 barrels of new oil. In the same period we produced and used 709,000,000 barrels, and the consumption requirements are steadily rising every month. Every congressional committee that has gone into the subject, including the House of Representatives Interstate Commerce Committee, the Patman small-business committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, and various other congressional bodies, has unanimously reached the conclusion that the Nation faces an alarming decline in its oil reserves and that an increase in the price of crude oil is essential to bring the wildcatter into greater activity in the discovery of new oil reserves.

Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Discrimination," written by Fred M. Learned, editor of the New England Dairyman, published in the October 1943 issue of that monthly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION

The most outstanding feature of the cooperative movement is mutual assistance. Through our union there is strength, and we intend that there should be equality. And for that reason the New England Milk Producers Association is registering its protest against the allocation of subsidy payments throughout New England.

Just why there should be a difference of payments by States in the new subsidy program launched by the War Food Administration is beyond our grasp.

We can plainly see why there should be a difference in payment of subsidies between the midwestern farmer and the eastern dairyman, but it should be of a much wider variance than the 10- and 20-cent difference the W. F. A. has set up for those areas.

But why arbitrarily set aside Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire for a 40-cent-per-hundredweight subsidy, and Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for a 50-cent subsidy. If you are fortunate enough to own a farm in one of the latter States you can collect 10 cents more from the Government for each hundred pounds of milk than you can if you have the misfortune to be a Vermont, New Hampshire, or Maine dairyman.

The formula upon which the subsidy program is based remains one of those mysteries of bureaucracy, and the stated purpose of paying a subsidy to cover the increased cost of feeds is as far removed from the actual results of the program as the moon. Something like $1 per hundred pounds of milk would have to be paid if increased feed costs are to be met. This would have to be paid to eastern dairymen who are rapidly heading into one of the most critical feed situations in the history of America. And it couldn't be doled out to midwestern farmers, who hold the drawstrings on the feedbag with their high prices and veritable monopoly on grain, or it would not meet the requirements of equalizing feed prices for the eastern milk producers.

It seems lamentable that a Government agency with all of the facts at hand cannot recognize the injustice of handing out a 40-cent subsidy to Vermont farmers and a 30-cent subsidy to midwestern farmers with the avowed purpose of paying both of them for the increased cost of feed. The differential on this basis is 10 cents. In other words we are supposed to believe that it costs just 10 cents more per hundred pounds of milk to feed our cattle than it does a farmer in Wisconsin. There isn't a farm boy in New England who couldn't tell you that this is ridiculous, as he knows that practically all of the grain comes from the Midwestern States.

But this discrimination is hardly more understandable than that of the W. F. A. in fixing the subsidy price at one figure for one-half of New England and another for the other half.

We are not alone in our protest. A storm of criticism is rising rapidly. One source has taken active shape in a statement made by Fred H. Sexauer, president of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, who warned the Government agencies that consumers and war needs will be seriously affected by this destructive policy.

Sexauer said "to discriminate against New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont farmers to the extent of 10 cents as compared with farmers in adjoining States is little short of criminal."

He drew a grim picture of dairying prospects and correctly analyzed the situation when he said, "feed conditions in this territory are the worst in many years, grain crops have been almost a total failure. Thousands of dairymen are wondering where they are going to obtain sufficient feed to carry them through, as many feed dealers have placed them on a quota basis because dealers' supplies have been limited by Government corn and hog price policies."

Cordell Hull and the Moscow Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the joint four-nation declaration recently agreed to at Moscow by the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, marks a milestone and is regarded throughout the world as one of the greatest achievements of the century.

So far, no one has been displeased by it but the Axis Powers, and the purpose of the meeting was not only to displease but to defeat the Axis Powers, so their displeasure bears testimony to its success.

The Moscow declaration will tend to hasten the end of the war and ensure victory for the Allies. It will also mean cooperation of the four great powers to preserve peace when the war ends, all of which is devoutly to be desired.

Our great Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, emerges from this conference with new laurels, and the people

of the United States and the world owe him a debt of gratitude for the magnificent part he played in bringing the conference to a successful conclusion.

Many eulogies and tributes to Secretary Hull are being paid him, and under leave granted, I submit two of same herewith, one, an editorial appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., in its issue of November 3, 1943, entitled "Mr. Hull at Moscow", and the other from the well-known commentator, Mr. Mark Sullivan, entitled "Hull's Contribution."

MR. HULL AT MOSCOW

The agreement reached at Moscow is in the nature of a personal triumph for Secretary of State Hull, quickly recognized and applauded by his friends. Being a very human man, he must have carried with him to Moscow the recollection of ungenerous things that had been said of him here in Washington. One was that, having just turned seventy-two, and being frail rather than robust in health, he could not stand the physical strain of the long flight, an ordeal for any man. Another was that he was too far behind the times, that he harbored skepticism toward our Russian allies which would weaken his standing at the Kremlin. As for the first, the correspondents in Moscow say that he came through the long journey and the conferences as chipper and as spry as any of them. As for the second, one may be sure that Mr. Hull in Moscow was no different from Mr. Hull in Washington—dignified, canny, honest, and frank. It is certain that he did not give away anything he did not have to give. It is equally certain he did not ask for anything he had no right to claim. He must have been himself, in other words, a good American, proud of his country, respectful of another point of view, with no personal illusions as to how easy it is to make the world over but with definite ideas on where to begin. Full of years, wise in the ways of men, Mr. Hull is an emissary Americans are proud to have represent them in any capital. His name on the Moscow resolutions gives them a prestige which in his own land, at least, is unique.

HULL'S CONTRIBUTION

In the American comment on the Moscow agreements, one of the most pertinent was that of Acting Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, who said in effect that the world owes a debt to Mr. Cordell Hull. The debt does not lie merely in what was done at Moscow—for that the world is indebted to all three participants. The special debt to Mr. Hull lies in what led up to Moscow. It lies in the patient thought Mr. Hull has long given to the problem of world peace and a practicable means of achieving it. The sum of this thought, Mr. Hull put into two radio addresses to the Nation, one delivered last September 12, the other in July the year before. Examination of those addresses now will show how much of Mr. Hull's thought went into the Moscow agreements. It will show also that of all the Americans thinking about post-war world organization, the contribution of Mr. Hull turns out now to have made the largest approach toward practicable reality.

It is not possible to take the Moscow agreements apart and identify the sources of the ideas. Nor would it be fair to give one person credit for ideas that may have been held by more than one; nor to make fine-spun allocations of credit as between the value of proposing an idea and the equal value of generously assenting to it. But these things can be said: The Moscow agreements contain nothing that is contrary to Mr. Hull's judgment as expressed in his two radio addresses already referred to. They contain so much that was in Mr. Hull's addresses as to make it possible to say the Moscow agreements parallel the thought Mr. Hull had given to the world.

Specification of "the principle of sovereign equality" on the part of nations entering into a world organization is identical with Mr. Hull's thought. So is the specification of the purpose of the world organization, "the maintenance of international peace and security"—which by implication negatives the additional purposes that some enthusiasts have envisaged. Likewise identical with Mr. Hull's thought is the assumption, inherent in the Moscow agreements, that nations and peoples shall have such form of government as they choose. One touch in the agreements is so associated with Mr. Hull that one infers he must have urged it on the Moscow Conference. This is the statement that while Austria is to be independent, she should by her conduct now help pay for her liberation. The idea that nations and peoples should be responsible for helping to preserve their independence is a thought that Mr. Hull has expressed frequently in the negotiations that brought the Latin-American and other countries into the common front against the Axis.

That so much of Mr. Hull's beliefs are in the Moscow agreements and that nothing is in them contrary to Mr. Hull's beliefs will help to get support for the agreements from the American people and from Congress. In the world of foreign relations much of Congress is willing to accept on faith what Mr. Hull recommends.

Government Grants in Form of Federal Aid to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House makes appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

Bills of this character result from requests received by the Congress from the Bureau of the Budget. The requests submitted to the Congress amounted to a total of $1,108,828,749.32 and in addition requests were made for some $87,600,000 to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the making of rural rehabilitation loans. In all, the committee was requested to provide for appropriations and obligations and authority to expend money amounting to $1,196,428,749.32. The bill as reported to the House provides for but $215,368,444.32. In other words the committee provided for direct appropriations of only this amount which was $941,560,305 below that requested for direct appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget. This in itself will give the taxpayer an idea of how the Congress of the United States, through its Appropriations Committee, is endeavoring to hold down expenditures.

We have heard a great deal of the campaign to reduce the normal expenditures of the Government. Estimates have been made that it is possible to reduce the Government expenditures as much as four or five billion dollars. In my opinion that is almost impossible unless scores of laws authorizing appropriations are repealed.

The fixed charges against the Government run into billions. Fixed charges mean that appropriations must be made for certain activities that the Congress has authorized and are obligations that must be met. For instance, let me name two although many others could be named. Two of the most important are the appropriations for the interest on the national debt and appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, to take care of pensions, hospitalizations, and so forth, of men who served in the armed forces who have been disabled.

Mr. Speaker, I can look back to the day when Federal aid to the States amounted to practically nothing. I recall the first appropriation that was made for Federal aid for roads. Seventy-five million dollars was provided, but it was to be spent over a period of 5 years. The purpose was to stimulate the States to construct hard-surface roads. It was to be allocated at the rate of five million for the first year, ten million for the second year, fifteen million the third year, twenty million the fourth year, and twenty-five million the fifth year. We have been stimulating the States ever since until the amount now runs over one hundred million and some years it has gone up to nearly two hundred million. Feeling that it would be interesting to have a list of Federal grants to the States, I asked the Bureau of the Budget to send me the information.

As part of my remarks, I include a letter received from the Administrative Assistant to the Director of the Budget as well as a statement prepared by the Director of the Budget. They follow:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1943.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: In accordance with the request contained in your letter of October 16, there is enclosed a statement of expenditures for grants to States for the fiscal years 1941 to 1943 (actual) and 1944 (estimated).

You will note in a few instances obligations or appropriations have been used instead of expenditures. This is done where the obligations from certain appropriations are made for different purposes and the expenditures are not obtainable on a functional basis.

This tabulation does not include grants for some minor items below the appropriation level.

I trust this statement will give you the information desired.

Very truly yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Administrative Assistant.

Statement of expenditures for grants to States, fiscal years 1944 (estimated), 1943, 1942, 1941 (actual)

Detail	Estimated, 1944	Actual		
		1943	1942	1941
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Water Power Act	$26,000	$43	$28,695	$20,219
War Shipping Administration: State marine schools	350,000	171,729	121,864	164,743
Veterans' Administration: Federal aid to States and Territories, soldiers' homes [1]	1,254,000	1,175,520	1,375,000	1,431,840
Federal Security Agency:				
American Printing House for the Blind	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts—permanent appropriation	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,00
Vocational education:				
Further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories	14,200,000	13,694,220	13,416,649	12,987,975
Promotion of vocational education in Hawaii	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Promotion of vocational education in Puerto Rico	105,000	91,443	96,044	96,727
Cooperative vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry	3,200,000	2,783,065	2,651,503	2,181,075
Cooperative vocational rehabilitation, residents of the District of Columbia	27,000	49,613	22,703	30,498
Promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry, Hawaii	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Vocational education, defense workers			18,928	14,943,263
Education and training, defense workers	140,000,000	130,932,820	111,263,237	45,358,063
Promotion of vocational education, permanent appropriation	7,000,000	7,095,109	6,832,858	6,952,965
Expenses, Division of Venereal Diseases: Grants [1]	10,276,200	9,325,058	7,644,699	
Public Health Service:				
Grants to States for public health work, Social Security Act	11,000,000	10,572,672	11,472,995	10,772,531
Training for nurses	3,500,000	3,058,235	573,954	
Social Security Board:				
Grants to States for old-age assistance	338,000,000	319,175,802	299,054,496	259,780,984
Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration		52,851,864	71,612,418	63,011,153
Grants to States for aid to dependent children	68,000,000	67,927,263	69,406,313	62,990,837
Grants to States for aid to the blind	9,000,000	8,522,688	7,954,052	7,073,151
Payments and grants to States, U. S. Employment Service			1,600,222	3,187,597
Federal Works Agency:				
Public Roads Administration:				
Federal-aid highway system	57,000,000	77,067,733	107,109,869	118,615,219
Federal-aid secondary or feeder roads	5,000,000	6,619,377	16,048,720	17,359,206
Elimination of grade crossings	7,000,000	13,630,251	26,040,776	29,924,578
Public-lands highways		216,444	811,590	1,421,955
Strategic highway network	16,000,000	3,032,421		
Surveys and plans	4,500,000	5,488		
Work Projects Administration, State and local projects [1]		227,554,651	815,134,227	1,263,731,888
National Housing Agency: U. S. Housing Authority, annual contributions	11,600,000	9,882,882	9,925,891	4,747,176
Department of Agriculture:				
Office of Experiment Stations, payments to States and Territories for agricultural experiment stations	7,001,208	6,921,703	6,924,832	6,861,423
Extension Service:				
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural extension work	14,238,950	14,078,984	14,141,804	13,775,918
Cooperative agricultural extension work	4,704,700	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,701,165
Forest Service:				
Payments to States and Territories from the national-forests fund	1,670,000	1,668,717	1,539,291	1,440,325
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national-forests fund	23,300	22,832	22,787	23,392
Forest-fire cooperation	3,900,000	3,255,033	2,353,725	2,235,757
Farm Tenant Act, payments to counties from submarginal land program	65,000	59,476	44,604	32,193
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities:				
Purchases of agricultural commodities for distribution through school lunches and State welfare agencies [1]	50,000,000	15,340,134	42,630,588	84,201,483
Diversion of agricultural commodities to byproducts, new uses, and school milk program [1]	16,286,855	13,181,623	9,116,500	15,968,538
Department of the Interior:				
Payments to States under Grazing Act	000,000	547,913	561,598	386,082
General Land Office:				
Payments to States of 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands	2,500	4,792	481	9,364
Revested Oregon & California R. R. and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon	275,000	242,268	206,228	167,536
Payment of proceeds of sales of Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands and timber				5,762
Payment to Oklahoma from royalties, oil and gas, south half of Red River	3,000		10,498	
Payment to counties, the Oregon and California land-grant fund	700,000	718,510	667,052	558,606
Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act	2,000,000	2,534,963	2,165,347	1,948,444
Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg., in lieu of taxes on Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands	26,000		27,781	30,598
Payments to States from potash deposits, royalties, and rentals	130,000		80,254	142,152
Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Payments to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	22,875	25,095	34,554	16,751
Federal aid in wildlife restoration	1,250,000	1,859,397	1,713,339	1,189,470
Department of Labor:				
Grants to States under Social Security Act:				
Maternal and child-health services	6,210,000	5,740,218	5,926,966	5,471,286
Services for crippled children	4,280,000	3,862,531	3,996,637	3,928,281
Child-welfare services	1,550,000	1,582,774	1,573,391	1,531,770
Emergency maternity and infant care [2]	23,000,000	1,200,000		
Total, grants to States	850,157,588	1,048,168,164	1,683,840,670	2,076,589,742

[1] Obligations.
[2] Appropriations.

NOTE.—Expenditures from the following appropriations are excluded from the above tabulation of grants to States since the amounts on a purely grant basis would be very difficult to obtain: Community facilities, defense public works, and war public works in and near the District of Columbia. Appropriations—1944, $50,000,000; 1943, $17,500,000; 1942 $300,000,000.

Waste of Lumber by United States Military Forces

REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, today we have before us an appropriation bill and the subject of economy will be the keynote of many speeches. We all recognize the necessity of economy during such an emergency, and there is a possibility that some of our domestic programs will be curtailed to a point where they will not be able to function as properly as they should. Therefore, in the interest of the entire Nation, it does seem that our Army and Navy should also consider this topic of economy. An example of sheer waste and absolute disregard of any semblance of economy is definitely brought out in the letter from Mr. Haggerty, president of the California State Federation of Labor, and a resolution by that organization, which I am quoting herewith:

Enclosed you will find copy of a resolution adopted by the Orange County District Council of Carpenters, which is self-explanatory. The executive council of the California State Federation of Labor endorsed this resolution, and is of the opinion that this waste of lumber is inexcusable and should be stopped at once. We strongly urge that you take whatever appropriate action you consider necessary to correct this situation.

"RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ORANGE COUNTY DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS IN THEIR REGULAR MEETING, JULY 16, 1943

"Whereas we recognize that there exists an acute shortage of building material, especially lumber; and

"Whereas it is becoming ever more difficult for civilians to procure lumber to build new homes or to repair or remodel old ones; and

"Whereas the United States Navy, on all of its projects which have been built in this area, has refused to sell or donate lumber which is not used or which is used and discarded (referring to scaffolding and form lumber) but makes a practice of burning large quantities of lumber considered usable by the average householder; and

"Whereas both Army and Navy have wrecked and burned habitable homes which were standing on property purchased for the uses of the armed forces, the wrecking being done over the protests of citizens who wished to purchase the homes and remove them to other suitable sites, and disregarding the fact that Orange County has been declared a critical housing area: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Orange County District Council of Carpenters go on record as opposing this excessive waste of lumber by the United States military forces, and requests that these charges of waste be investigated by the Truman committee, and if found true that remedial measures be inaugurated immediately and the officials responsible be properly disciplined."

Waste of Food, Equipment, and So Forth, in the Armed Forces

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much regarding the waste of food, equipment, and so forth, in the armed forces. Unquestionably these charges in many instances are based upon facts. There is no doubt in my mind but that these conditions could be much improved, and I think they would be, provided commanding officers were as meticulous in the care and use of supplies and equipment as is the commanding officer of one of our larger and more modern naval units.

I have just had a letter from this commanding officer who, by the way, I named to the Naval Academy years ago. He forwarded a copy of a mimeographed communication to "All officers and men, U. S. S. ————" on the the subject of economy. In order that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to see for themselves the care taken by some of the higher ranking officers of the Naval Establishment to conserve the equipment and supplies, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein this communication. At the officer's request I am deleting his name and the name of his ship as he desires no personal publicity whatsoever.

From: Captain.
To: All officers and men, U. S. S. ————.
Subject: Economy.

1. This war will be won by ourselves or by our enemies, depending on which has superiority in:

(a) Manpower.

(b) Character (leadership, courage, competence, stamina, etc.).

(c) Geographical position.

(d) Material, including natural resources, industrial capacity, and national wealth.

This directive concerns the last factor.

2. As an excuse for extravagant expenditures of money, material, and man-hours, I frequently hear such remarks as, "Money doesn't mean anything in wartime," and, "War is necessarily wasteful." Such talk is thoughtless and dangerous.

3. Money is important in wartime for two simple, fundamental reasons:

(a) It is important as money itself. As a piece of printed paper a dollar bill is worth a fraction of a cent. As a medium of exchange backed by silver or gold, or the Nation's good credit, a dollar bill is worth, say, a bushel of wheat. But when people begin to regard money lightly it loses its exchange value; confidence in the Government's credit deteriorates, and we have inflation with all its terrible consequences. Your dollar bill then won't be worth a good square meal; it won't be even worth the paper it is printed on; the whole financial system of the country is thrown into confusion. Everyone suffers during inflation.

(b) Money is important as a symbol or measure of national wealth and natural resources. Extravagant expenditure of money is equivalent to waste of natural resources.

4. In a sense, war is wasteful because the Nation's effort is devoted to destruction of the enemy instead of construction of useful things for ourselves. But we can be efficient and economical in destruction as well as in construction. Every dollar spent on the war effort should yield 100 cents worth of destruction to the enemy. In this latter sense, war need not and should not be wasteful or extravagant.

5. From all present appearances this war will last a long time. It may well be lost by the nations which first exhaust their national wealth and natural resources. Our enemies are thrifty and efficient in the art of destruction. Whether they or we have greater natural resources is a debatable question. Our reserves of some materials are dangerously low. Our civilian population is on short rations, and even completely deprived of most comforts and many necessities so that we in the armed services may have all we need. Our country already has the colossal national debt of $117,000,000,000. We are but one step short of inflation, which in turn is but one step short of national bankruptcy. Economy is essential to winning the war. Economy is essential to having anything left after the war is over.

6. There is nothing we can do about waste elsewhere except to set a good example. We can and will do something about economy in the use of Government money and materials on this ship, because:

(a) We can cruise longer and fight better if we conserve our supplies.

(b) It is our duty as responsible Government officials and public servants.

(c) It is our duty to the taxpayers who foot the bills, and taxpayers include nearly everyone, in and out of the Navy.

(d) It is in our own selfish interest to promote sound national finance since each of us has a share in and profits by national prosperity.

(e) We may, in some small way at least, set a good example to others.

7. I do not desire to curtail any expenditures which contribute to the military efficiency of the ship and to the destruction of our enemies. I do propose to stop waste.

8. Below are listed a few examples of wasteful practices:

At mess, taking food you don't need and don't intend to eat.

Using a small piece of rubber from a full sheet and throwing away the rest. (Rubber is a critical material.)

Careless handling of optical instruments and instruments of precision. (This is a court-martial offense on this ship.)

Throwing away clothing which may be cleaned, mended, and used for work clothes.

Careless use, or loss, of hand tools; exposing them to corrosion; failing to return them when finished.

Breaking or losing mess china and silverware.

Excessive estimates of material required to do a repair job.

Neeedless burning of flashlights.

Cutting a short length of manila line from a new coil when a discarded rope's end would serve the purpose. (Manila is a critical material.)

Waste of fresh water.

Excessive use of cleaning rags (a critical material).

Use of brooms instead of scrub brushes for scrubbing or clamping down. (NOTE.—A wet broom quickly wears out; a scrubber lasts indefinitely. Keep brooms dry.)

Using expensive or critical materials for a job where cheaper material would serve the purpose.

These are only random examples of many practices which require correction.

9. All officers, petty officers, and nonrated men are directed to give this matter their continuing attention and stop waste, extravagance, and needless expense on this ship.

Where Livestock Products Are Produced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, no peoples ever lived long on honeyed words. The food problem is becoming more acute each day. The scarcity of livestock products appears to be the most serious, and the most difficult to solve. In production of livestock products, the manpower problem involved not only in producing the feeds needed for the livestock, but also the manpower problem involved in converting these feeds into livestock products, and in addition the manpower problem involved in the transportation and processing of the livestock products for use by the armed forces, domestic consumption, and lease lend is also involved.

Any desired increase in some livestock products like manufactured dairy products for example, should be stimulated in areas and communities where transportation of the raw materials can better be provided; where the plants and equipment are more fully available, and where

the producer is by experience familiar with the production practices needed to increase the supply of these particular products. Another example is shown in pork production. Since Iowa and Illinois produce about one-third of the corn of the Nation and about one-third of the pork of the Nation, it is apparent that an increase in pork production in these States could be obtained more efficiently than an increase in pork production could be efficiently effectuated in a State that has been engaged in the production of crops, a large part of which has been converted into milk or other livestock products. The equipment factor as well as the feed availability also enters this picture as well.

The following table shows the production of livestock products in 1942 based on sales of these products:

Value of sales of agricultural commodities, 1942

[In thousands of dollars]

	Livestock products [1]
Maine	35,561
New Hampshire	23,928
Vermont	51,209
Massachusetts	70,233
Rhode Island	9,344
Connecticut	53,304
New York	341,578
New Jersey	85,201
Pennsylvania	287,126
Ohio	399,171
Indiana	411,313
Illinois	626,499
Michigan	241,004
Wisconsin	515,925
Minnesota	532,486
Iowa	1,011,392
Missouri	422,669
North Dakota	116,781
South Dakota	172,951
Nebraska	333,427
Kansas	348,132
Delaware	47,835
Maryland	72,546
Virginia	106,926
West Virginia	48,567
North Carolina	67,103
South Carolina	30,884
Georgia	67,817
Florida	36,933
Kentucky	143,817
Tennessee	112,692
Alabama	54,784
Mississippi	54,214
Arkansas	77,601
Louisiana	43,704
Oklahoma	195,767
Texas	421,449
Montana	88,524
Idaho	84,285
Wyoming	47,726
Colorado	137,346
New Mexico	55,117
Arizona	40,181
Utah	54,169
Nevada	16,826
Washington	115,356
Oregon	100,429
California	361,715
Total, United States	8,773,607

[1] Includes cash income from sales of cattle and calves, hogs, sheep and lambs, chickens, eggs (chicken), and turkeys, value of sales of milk, and gross income from commercial broilers.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Price Ceilings on Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the very serious situation being created by the price ceilings on corn. My congressional district is being penalized by having a ceiling price 10 to 20 cents lower per bushel than the nearby territory in Kansas. It is totally upsetting the economy of many, many communities and large numbers of individuals. The following wire states the problem:

Acute corn shortage here for feeding purposes due to wide spread in O. P. A. corn ceiling prices in Kansas and Nebraska. Practically all corn being hauled to Kansas elevators from this territory. As this is a large feeding territory this situation should be remedied at once. Would appreciate if you would give this your immediate attention.

RUSKIN GRAIN CO.

Mr. Speaker, the muddling of the ceiling price on corn in my congressional district is doing more to shake the faith of good men in their Government at Washington than any other thing that has happened. Can any individual justify an O. P. A. ruling that places the ceiling on corn at Benkelman, Nebr., which permits the elevators to pay the farmers 92 cents a bushel, while at St. Francis, Kans., a few miles south, they can lawfully pay $1.25 a bushel. Why does the O. P. A. fix the farmer-to-farmer sale price on corn at Falls City, Nebr., at 95 cents a bushel and the ceiling on the same type of transaction at Reserve, Kans., 5 miles away, at $1.11?

Mr. J. F. Lawrence, State extension agent of the College of Agriculture of the University of Nebraska, writes me as follows:

The elevator manager at Danbury is only 5 or 6 miles from the Kansas line and he says there is a 23-cent difference in the corn price between what he can pay and what they can pay over in Kansas.

This situation is greatly disrupting the production of foodstuffs, as well as distressing every farmer, every feeder, and every elevator man. My district extends for approximately 350 miles along the Kansas State line. Arbitrary and senseless rulings of the Office of Price Administration in reference to this corn ceiling are disrupting the economy of my entire district.

The Beatrice (Nebr.) Times on October 29, described the situation as follows:

An order of the War Food Administration which permits Kansas grain buyers to pay 10 to 20 cents per bushel above the Gage County ceiling prices day by day is robbing the Beatrice area of most of its 1943 corn crop—affecting Gage County elevators adversely, and deteriorating the county supplies which will be needed this winter as feed.

Despite the repetition of complaints to State office of Price Administration and War Food Administration headquarters no action has been taken to stop the steady flow of choice new corn from this county into Marshall and Washington Counties in Kansas.

Farmers who protest the disparity in Kansas and Nebraska ceiling prices have found no effort by the official sources moving to correct the situation.

The differential in the price of corn between Kansas and Nebraska is not the only blunder of the O. P. A. in reference to corn. There is another very serious situation in area 7 in respect to this ceiling price on corn. The problem in my home town of Minden, Nebr., is typical of that problem in all of area 7. At Minden the ceiling price on corn sold by the farmer to the elevator is 92 cents a bushel, yet the elevators can lawfully sell this corn for $1.09. This is a profit of 17 cents. The elevators do not want to make a profit of more than 4 cents, yet the men in the O. P. A. make it unlawful for them to pass any part of this profit on to the farmers. This situation has existed for months and months. The Office of Price Administration say they are studying it and promising a remedy, but they never do anything about it.

I want to quote from the Holdrege Daily Citizen of October 25 an article which clearly describes the problem in reference to this corn ceiling:

An unfair spread in the O. P. A. ceiling price of corn that is forcing dealers to take a 17¾ cents per bushel margin when in the past they have taken only 3 to 4 cents, is keeping Phelps County's bumper crop of corn from going to market.

At the same time cattle and livestock feeders are being caught in the squeeze and formerly large cattle feeders are going to have practically empty feed lots, while the Department of Agriculture is bemoaning the fact that there is going to be a serious shortage of meat.

Under the ceiling prices established by O. P. A., dealers in this central Nebraska area can only pay farmers 92 cents per bushel for corn, while dealers can market the corn under O. P. A. ceilings at $1.0975 on the track. That gives the dealers a 0.1775-cent margin, while for years they have been collecting only a 3- to 4-cent margin spread.

The attention of the O. P. A. has at numerous times been called to the unfair corn price situation and O. P. A. was warned that the corn harvest would not bring any of the corn to market.

A check-up of elevators in Phelps County has revealed that there has been practically no corn marketed and there is every indication that there will be none marketed.

Cattle feeders who are permitted to pay 94 cents per bushel for corn under O. P. A. ceilings aren't finding any that can be bought, either.

On October 25 and 26, 1943, I wired Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator; Mr. Charles S. Kenney of the O. P. A.; Mr. Chester A. Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A.; Mr. Raymond S. McKeough, regional administrator of the O. P. A. at Chicago; and Mr. Colin Gordon, price executive of the Cereals, Feeds, and Agricultural Chemical Branch of the O. P. A., asking them if they approved of this injustice and, if not, whether they would correct it. On October 30 I wired all of these individuals

again, except Mr. McKeough, who apparently has nothing to do with these ceilings, giving them further facts as to this area and again asking them if they approved of this injustice and, if not, if they would immediately correct it.

A wire from Mr. McKeough at Chicago advises that he does not have authority to adjust it. Aside from a telephone call from some subordinate in the office of Mr. Marvin Jones, my communications to these men have been utterly ignored.

Mr. Speaker, in appealing to these gentlemen as Mr. Roosevelt's agents in charge of price ceilings, I was not making a personal request. I was speaking as the representative of 369,190 citizens of the First Congressional District of Nebraska. Those people have a problem that is disrupting their entire economy. The bulk of them are taxpayers and producers of things needed to win this war. Many of them are the families of our fighting men. These high bureaucratic officials have no right to so ignore them. In saying this, I want to serve notice upon all of these agents of President Roosevelt's who are in charge of these ceilings, that we are not going to be satisfied with a theoretical explanation. We want the injustice remedied.

Federal Automobile Use Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: May I present for the committee's consideration the suggestion that the Federal automobile use tax be repealed at the earliest practicable date. I urge the immediate repeal of this levy for the following important reasons:

1. The tax is being inadequately and ineffectively administered.

2. The tax imposes an undue and unfair burden upon automobile owners.

3. The tax is of doubtful constitutionality.

Under present arrangements the revenue stamps are issued through post offices with no provision whatsoever made for enforcement by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the agency properly responsible for the administration of revenue laws and the collection of Federal taxes. Complaints about avoidance of the levy are, of course, commonplace. Enforcement rests entirely with State and local police authorities who function in the Government's interest only as an incident to State and local law enforcement. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has advised me, as it has doubtless advised others who have inquired into the matter, that there is a percentage of delinquency under this levy, and that existing machinery is inadequate to make collections in delinquent cases. It is my belief that there is no simple and inexpensive way to administer this levy so that a considerable percentage of delinquency can be avoided.

Critical shortages of gasoline and rubber have, of course, sharply reduced the use of automobiles. It is apparent that these shortages will become increasingly critical and will further greatly reduce the general use of privately owned cars and trucks for some time in the future. In view of the fact that the automobile is already carrying a disproportionate burden of taxation, it would appear that this additional Federal levy cannot be warranted or justified.

The Federal use tax on automobiles is essentially a tax levy upon private or personal property, and as such, quite plainly invades the authority of State and local units of government to levy such taxes. Only a comparatively small percentage of automobiles and trucks, privately owned, might properly be defined as facilities in interstate commerce, and thus subject to Federal control and taxation. The vast bulk of privately owned cars and trucks in my opinion should rer ain taxable only under the authority of State and local governments. On the other hand if Congress supports the use tax as a precedent for the levy of Federal taxes upon personal property it would seem to follow inevitably that the Federal Government may further invade tax fields heretofore clearly reserved to State and local governments.

I urge, therefore, that the committee immediately take appropriate steps for the repeal of this levy.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST A. HARNESS.

Are "Reds" Running O. W. I.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore News-Post of November 2, 1943:

ARE REDS RUNNING O. W. I.?

The Dies committee, or some other competent committee of Congress, should discover fully and completely for the American people exactly what goes on in and around the Office of War Information.

According to the Communist Daily Worker, a young Communist known to his comrades as "Whitey" Goodfriend was chosen as the typical American youth to be presented by radio to the overseas world by the Foreign Broadcasts Section of the O. W. I.

According to Elmer Davis, O. W. I. Director, "Whitey" was actually chosen all right—not by the O. W. I. itself, but by a C. I. O. union in Baltimore at the request of the O. W. I.

According to the Daily Worker, a message from "Whitey" was beamed abroad by the foreign broadcasts section.

According to Mr. Davis, such a message was received all right, but it was not transmitted, as too much material was available.

But the Daily Worker says otherwise.

In fact, the Daily Worker printed quite a paean about "Whitey's" message on October 21.

"Whitey" had appeared at that time at the final convention of the Young Communist League, when that organization went out of existence under its old name and immediately reincarnated itself as American Youth for Democracy.

Explaining that "Whitey" was a sailor in the merchant marine who had been on a torpedoed ship, the Daily Worker said:

"There was a surprise in store for Whitey when he got home last May.

"He was chosen by the O. W. I. as the 'typical American youth' and was requested to write a message to the youth of China, Great Britain, and Russia in celebration of China Youth Day.

"That note of Whitey's was relayed to his young allies by short-wave radio. * * *

"And you can be sure that they heard it. * * *

"Yes; you can be quite sure that 23-year-old Whitey Goodfriend's message was heard everywhere."

If the Daily Worker lied about the episode—if the Goodfriend message was not broadcast "everywhere" abroad, as the Daily Worker emphatically assured its partisans that it was—why has there been no public rebuke from the O. W. I.?

Why are the Communists permitted to exploit the name of the O. W. I. in such a baseless and unscrupulous manner—if that is what they are really doing?

Why was the episode hidden in secrecy until the Daily Worker bragged about it and Representative JOE STARNES, of the Dies committee, began to investigate it?

And why did the O. W. I. itself, in its search for a "typical American youth, proceed in such a manner as to turn up a young Communist in that role?

Several million American youths are bearing arms for their country and serving its ships in the perilous oceans; thousands of them have won the medals and awards of heroes; tens of thousands of them have been maimed in battle or have perished gallantly at sea or have been buried on the battlefields of Africa and Italy and Oceania.

Those youths went willingly into service to defend the Stars and Stripes, not the red flag of Leninism.

Those youths fought or are fighting to uphold the Constitution of the United States, not the Communist manifesto of Marx and Engels.

It would be a task more trying than all the labors of Hercules to choose one typical American youth among so many simply because there are so many of them.

But this much is certain: Chosen by any American method and by any American standard, the typical American youth would not be found in the ranks of the Communists.

Far more likely, he would be found among the half-forgotten prisoners of Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. Davis, as the O. W. I. Director, offered an amazingly naive excuse for the selection of a young Communist instead.

In an interview with David Sentner, a Washington correspondent for the Hearst newspapers, he said:

"Somebody seems to have slipped one over."

Now, that is a very damaging confession.

The American public depends upon the O. W. I. for war information.

Furthermore, the O. W. I. is permitted to concoct and to short-wave radio propaganda to foreign countries, and the nature of that propaganda is not known to the people in whose name it is sent and who pay the costly bills of the O. W. I.

If the O. W. I. is so innocent that the Communists are able to "slip one over" on it, then

the O. W. I. is not competent to assess news and to present it to the American public, nor is it competent to serve as their unsupervised spokesman to the world.

In point of fact, this is not the first time the Foreign Broadcasts Section of the O. W. I. has made itself suspect.

It was this same agency that secretly transmitted the broadcast calling Victor Emmanuel a moronic little king at a critical moment when General Eisenhower was arranging the Italian surrender in order to save thousands of American lives.

That broadcast became known here only because a newspaper plucked it out of the air waves and published it.

Thereupon, President Roosevelt denounced and repudiated it as misrepresenting the Government and endangering the national interest.

The excuse then was that the Foreign Broadcasts Section had been unable to get a State Department or War Department visa that night—so the broadcast was hurriedly sent anyway, without authority or approval.

In brief, somebody had "slipped one over" and significantly on that occasion the outlaw broadcast adhered to the Communist Party line.

It has been charged that the Foreign Broadcasts Section of the O. W. I. is pretty well packed with Communist fellow travelers and even with alien-born Communists, who are not citizens of this country and who were discredited in their own countries before they came here and got jobs in the O. W. I. whence to broadcast propaganda from America to their former countrymen in the name of the American people and Government.

That, if it be true, would amply explain how these communistic things are "slipped over."

And two furtive occurrences of the same general kind may justify a suspicion that perhaps the whole O. W. I. is being "slipped over" on the people.

Congress is neglecting an obvious duty if it does not get to the very bottom of this murky situation.

Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 27, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I desire to make available in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Kit F. Clardy of Lansing, Mich., in which he analyzes the aviation bill, H. R. 3420, now on the House Calendar. This bill is of such importance that I hope every Member will study this proposed legislation before it is acted on in the House.

The letter follows:

LANSING, MICH.

DEAR SIR: If you will go through the bill quickly, for the purpose of getting an over-all impression, you will see that every section, paragraph, and word is directed toward completely extinguishing all State and local authority. There are so many things that would have to be changed and corrected to prevent a court interpretation destroying all rights of the States, it would be an impossible task unless the entire bill was completely rewritten. Even the definitions are bad in that particular because their very breadth would furnish sufficient for a court to say that the intent of the act was to confer complete and absolute jurisdiction on the Federal body. The definition of the term "air contractor" ties in with the definitions of the terms "air navigation," "domestic air commerce," and "domestic air transportation" in such a way as to make it impossible for any State authority to continue to exist after this becomes law. The policy section carries out the idea in a way that is positively criminal. The New Deal idea that every phase of the individual's activity should be regulated from Washington is expressed in every line in the policy section. The alarming thing about it is that apparently commercial aviation seemingly has not become alarmed over the implications in this bill. If it is permitted to stand as written it will, if upheld in court, give to the Federal bureau complete direction over almost every phase of air transportation business.

If there is any doubt about the intent of the act, it is certainly completely resolved in section IV of the policy section wherein the act expressly declares that the Federal Government is "declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States." I know that many people can think up plausible arguments to support the theory that this is essential. Their arguments will run all the way from declaring that we will lose the war if this is not done, down to arguing that public safety can only be protected in this fashion. Both of these arguments are ridiculous, but to one who is not a pilot they probably sound very impressive. I could cite a great many other sections going to establish my first point that this bill is directly aimed at the complete destruction of States' authority and that it would definitely accomplish that purpose. I think the sections I have mentioned, however, are sufficient for that purpose.

The other prime purpose seems to be a deliberate effort to wipe out private aviation by the indirect method of regulating it to death. I have long been convinced of the fact that the present set-up is bad for private aviation but I must admit that it is practically perfect compared with this new proposal. The burdensome provisions are too numerous to discuss in detail but I will point out one or two. The sections dealing with the control of airports will certainly give enough power to enable the Government to hamstring private aviation right out of the picture. I doubt whether any operator could continue an airport if some of these sections are put to any use whatsoever. The sections dealing with ground hazards is all that your letter implies. Indeed, this would do something for the first time that I do not believe has ever been attempted before except in rare instances. This act would enable the Administrator to arbitrarily decide that certain property should be acquired in the name of safety and to let him proceed to condemn such property without having his judgment subject to any check. Aside from the fact that he could bankrupt a municipality or a private operator at will by simply deciding certain property was to be purchased, we have a much more important consideration. This act will permit the Federal Government, through the Administrator, to use the harsh and arbitrary power of condemnation for the use and benefit of a private individual. This means that an airport operator who has the good fortune to be a political friend of the Administrator could use the power and authority of the entire Nation to forcibly take over any property he desired. To make the matter worse, this act would not be subject to any effective review in court. Having watched the present set-up for some time, I refuse to be convinced that this arbitrary power will never be misused. The very lack of an effective court review of the arbitrary actions of the Administrator would foster crookedness and would do many other things the simple-minded idiots who wrote the bill may not have thought of—or did they?

A most vicious provision is set up in section 310 (a). This deals with the subject just discussed. The very language of the act confers final and supreme authority upon the Administrator to do just as he likes without the advice or consent of anyone and without court review. This section makes the Administrator superior to State governments, courts, and the private citizens. It has so many deliberately insulting provisions I wonder at their brass in setting it up in such plain language.

One of the things I particularly dislike is the language in section 203 (k). The language in that section on page 13 of the bill quite clearly goes beyond all limits. It will enable the Administrator to publish orders, rules, and regulations without limit and to then enable him to publish them secretly and yet have them received in court as though they had actually been published to the world. I shall not go into details in explaining this, but, in substance, it will permit the Administrator to prosecute a person in court for violation of a rule that was actually never published. This is apparently set up in an effort to make it possible for the Administrator to change rules in the middle of the game, if he finds it necessary to do so, in pursuing someone he does not like.

Several of the sections combined give the new Commission authority that should never be possessed by any tribunal set up to act in an impartial manner. In theory, every person who seeks the right to start a new service is entitled to the fair and impartial judgment of the Commission in passing on his application. At the same time, carriers already in the field are entitled to be heard in opposition. On page 36 in section 401 we find a provision authorizing the Commission to first determine that a new service is needed and to then go out and encourage someone to ask for the authority. If such a function can be exercised by the tribunal that is to hear the case without seriously prejudicing the rights of parties before it, I shall be greatly surprised. It would be rather difficult for me to appear in opposition to the grant of a new certificate if the court (Commission) had first decided that the new service was needed. If there is to be any such function performed by anyone, an independent agency should perform it. Frankly, I do not think it is the function of government at all, and it is my judgment that this will eventually be the chief means of subjugating all air lines. This section, however, is an apt illustration of the definite purpose in the bill to give the Commission and the Administrator power to manage the business of the carriers subject to its jurisdiction. Succeeding sections, particularly the one on page 38, carry out the idea just discussed.

An interesting legal question presents itself in connection with the use of the word "substantial" in section 402. Here is a provision for a hearing upon the request of a person having a substantial interest in the proceeding. This enables the Commission to rule you out of a case, if it desires, and to permit anyone to come in if it feels like favoring someone. Every line in this act seems to be designed to give extreme and arbitrary power to the Commission and the Administrator and to do it in a particularly offensive way. The power conferred in the proviso set up on page 48 (sec. 408) carries out the idea just expressed. The very purpose of regulation is to create monopolies, if necessary, to secure the best service. In the field of telephone communication it is instantly apparent why this practice is necessary. It is just as important and just as true in the field of transportation. Indeed, the only justification for government

regulation of an industry is that the benefits of free competition can be retained without disadvantage through the use of proper government regulation. There is no excuse for government regulation in a democracy, if free and unrestrained competition will serve the public just as effectively. The act proposes, however, to prohibit any action that would or has resulted in creating a monopoly. This means that if a single line between certain points can handle all of the available traffic, something must be done to create competition. I know that it can be argued that other interpretations can be given this section but, with many of the courts looking at things as they do today, I am willing to gamble my interpretation will be the one adopted.

The section dealing with arbitration (417) apparently seems to be someone's idea of how to short circuit the use of courts. I do not understand why the carriers have not made an objection to this section. When taken in conjunction with many other sections in the act, I think the time will come when they regret having even thought of Federal regulation.

As I view the act in its entirety, private aviation will be regarded as something less than a stepchild. Everything that is suggested by the act is designed to further the interests of commercial aviation to the detriment of private flying. When the war is over commercial aviation will, unquestionably, occupy a most prominent place. Unfortunately, however, most people do not seem to understand that even today private aviation far overshadows the commercial field. The war will make private aviation tower so far above the commercial end that I wonder at the smallness of the mind of those who are fostering this kind of legislation. The hampering effects of bureaucracy have done much to retard the growth of private aviation. If a bill like this one is adopted, one of two things is bound to happen: Either private aviation will be strangled or the indignation will become so great the bureaucrats will be strangled. Personally, I favor the latter course.

I am hopeful that the war may produce a simplification of regulation. I hope that the present idea of having many bodies perform the same functions for the Federal Government will be abandoned. I hope that the developments brought about by the war will demonstrate the fact that many of the so-called safety and inspection regulations of the past are no longer needed. I hope the F. C. C. will be completely out of the picture and that radio may become easier to use. I have hoped that some day it may occur to someone that if automobiles had been subjected to the same rigorous regulation applied to planes, the millions would never have been able to acquire rapid personal transportation. I hope the idea that Government must regulate what we eat, where we sleep, and what we shall do to earn a living is pushed into the ashcan. If this bill is adopted, it certainly will be a long step in the wrong direction.

Very truly yours,

KIT F. CLARDY.

The Margarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Times:

[From the New York Times of October 31, 1943]

THE TAX ON MARGARINE

The House Agriculture Committee has opened hearings on a bill by Chairman FULMER to repeal a 57-year-old law imposing an excise tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow-colored margarine, one-quarter of a cent a pound on uncolored, and various license taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of margarine. It was the dairy interests that were responsible for putting these discriminatory taxes into effect. There was never a sound case for them. The objections to them are stronger today than ever.

The one restriction that it is proper for the law to make against margarine is that it must not be misrepresented to the consumer as butter. But this applies against fraud of any kind. We do not allow cotton to be sold as wool or zircons to be sold as diamonds; but we do not put a special tax on zircons from which diamonds are exempt, nor do we put a special tax on cotton from which wool is exempt. This is precisely what we have been doing, however, in the case of margarine and butter. The situation is even worse than this, for the Government is now subsidizing the consumer of butter, who is comparatively well off, while taxing the consumer of oleomargarine, who is likely to be at a lower economic level. Even with the roll-back on butter and the tax on margarine, margarine sells today for about half the price of butter.

The representatives of the dairy interests have never openly argued that margarine should be taxed and restricted simply because it competes with butter. They have urged the discrimination on the ground that margarine is an inferior product. But no sound objection can be made today against margarine on the ground of health. The New York Academy of Medicine has declared that present-day margarine is "nutritionally equal to butter," and this is the verdict of most nutrition and medical authorities. But as long as margarine is not actually injurious to health (and, like the other products, it must meet the requirements of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938) comparisons of the nutritive value of margarine and butter are irrelevant so far as legal discrimination is concerned.

The products compete on the market at different prices. The consumer should be left free to make his choice at those prices. There is no more vicious principle of legislation than to put a discriminatory tax on one product merely to protect from its competition the growers or manufacturers of another.

[From the New York Times of November 1, 1943]

MARGARINE BAITING

It is significant that the bill to repeal the discriminatory tax on oleomargarine has been introduced in the House by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee itself—an indication of shifting farm sentiment that would have seemed scarcely credible a generation ago. Part of the explanation lies in the fact that while the chief ingredients of margarine were once animal fats and coconut oils, the chief ingredients of present-day margarine are corn oil, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil. This provides a substantial farm interest to combat the dairy interests in favor of the discriminatory taxes. In addition to this farm interest there is today a much stronger interest than heretofore on the part of consumers in getting the tax repealed because the shortage of butter has driven millions to the use of substitutes.

Yet if the unjustified legal discriminations against margarine are to be removed, we shall have to go further than changes merely in the Federal law. According to a recent statement of the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, eight States tax all margarine, and 22 tax all margarine except that made from domestically produced fats and oils. Fifteen States prohibit its use in State institutions.

According to a recent publication of the Department of Commerce, oleomargarine is the subject of special legislative provision in 46 States. The oleomargarine industry is subject to a special license tax in 7 States. Special excise taxes are imposed on margarine in 22 States. License fees levied on oleomargarine manufacturers range from $1 to $1,000; fees levied on wholesalers range from $5 to $1,000; on retailers from $1 to $400.

Special excise taxes on oleomargarine in 22 States range from 5 cents on uncolored to 15 cents on colored or all margarine. Ten of these 22 States also impose the license fees already described. Coloring of margarine is prohibited in 29 States.

Consumers, of course, should be legally protected against deception regarding what it is that they are buying. But when once they have been safeguarded in this respect by proper labeling, as with any other product, it is impossible to find justification for the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine.

Address of Hon. Howard W. Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address delivered by the Honorable Howard W. Jackson, former mayor of Baltimore, Md., before the Exchange Club of Baltimore on August 25, 1943:

Gentlemen, to meet with the members of the Exchange Club of Baltimore is always pleasant, but tonight is an occasion of particular pleasure. It marks for me a reintroduction as a private citizen and businessman. After 16 years—12 consecutive years—as mayor of the city of Baltimore, this is my first formal address as Howard W. Jackson, private citizen.

Forty-six years ago this oldest of luncheon clubs was incorporated with the high purpose of contributing its services to the good of the community, the State, and the Nation. I can think of no better dedication for what I am about to say than that, in the words of your charter, it be dedicated to the good of the community, the State, and the Nation.

At present most, if not all, civilized peoples are at war—most, if not all, uncivilized people are not. At this time, more so than ever before in the history of the world we need straight thinking. Men, leaders, must make decisions that will result in a higher plane of civilization. To quote Sir Francis Bacon "God forbid that I should give out a dream of my imagination for a pattern of the world."

There has been much lip service given lately to what we call post-war planning. It's a phrase that has already become a byword, tossed glibly about and used by many

who have no conception of its serious import nor of all the ramifications that lie behind it. Post-war planning commissions are mushrooming everywhere. They are being formed by both small and large communities; by industry; by labor organizations; by city, State, and National administrations and finally, by international groups. I was glad of the opportunity to appoint Baltimore's post-war planning commission, Mr. Bancroft Hill, chairman. Planning commissions are a dime a dozen, and I say, more power to them, for this is true democracy in action. It is one of the most hopeful signs of renewed interest of the individual citizen in government. The more widespread the interest of the individual in planning, discussing, accepting, rejecting a charted course for a world at peace, the less chance there will be for a dictated course of action by government in the post-war world. I repeat, this ever-growing interest in post-war planning commissions is democracy at its best.

I believe I am perfectly safe in saying that no one here would be startled should I say, frankly and flatly, that it is my idea that a sound post-war economy ought to be built on the time-tested foundation of free enterprise.

I want to emphasize that what I say tonight is neither anti nor pro any official or individual. I am speaking pro-America. At the outset, I am going to quote Tom M. Girdler, steel and aircraft industrialist. He has been called all kinds of names by labor representatives. He has been classed with the economic royalists. I am not here defending him, but I believe I should say that he has, in large measure, been successful because of the American system of free enterprise that offers opportunity to all who are willing to work.

"Many more people, I fear, are worrying about Little Orphan Annie than are worrying about the things that give me great concern. I am not worried about the outcome of the war, but I am genuinely frightened at times because of the likelihood that this country will not again be so able to fight off its enemies.

"We are fighting them off this time, with weapons produced by industrial power that unquestionably is as great as it is, because in the past, the right to work was relatively unimpaired. That right is dangerously impaired today.

"When we reach the end of the war, this country will confront a problem almost as big as preparing for war. If there were the same desire in Government as there is out of it, to enable capitalism to meet this test, there could be more intelligent planning for the emergency ahead in every county in the country. Even with the best of planning there is certain to be at least temporary unemployment of dismaying proportions.

"Yet if we are to avoid dictatorship, jobs ought to be made for at least 55,000,000 workers, and at such a rate as to inspire people with confidence that the conversion to peacetime work will occur with a minimum of delay. This conversion process is only the initial phase of the trial we shall then be facing.

"I have complete sympathy for the feelings of those who hold that long periods of mass idleness are no longer tolerable in a civilized society. Unemployment is a waste of human energy, useful materials, capital, and lives. As an industrial executive, I loathe waste. From that same viewpoint, I can see how employment might be made on a scale equal to that which now exists, even greater.

"Countless opportunities are available for capital. Management is ready and anxious to make the most of them. But if industry is to function at full capacity after the war it will be necessary, as the post-war period begins, for the Government to relax and relinquish its wartime emergency control as rapidly as good sense would suggest.

"However, since the basic problem is work, something more is required. Men won't be interested in pay rolls if these do not imply pay envelopes. What can industry put in pay envelopes if industrial enterprises are not allowed in wartime to build up sufficient reserves to meet the staggering cost of reconversion to peacetime production? The present whole-hog policy of the Government can lead only to ruin for a considerable part of industry. The consequence of this policy will be hopeless unemployment for millions of workers."

Ever since I have seen the handwriting on the wall, faintly at first, but now unmistakable, I have devoted every opportunity to thrust home the urgency of the preservation of the system which has built a powerful America, a system that has never failed us, and which has proven itself a giant of production, of inventive genius, and a maker of miracles in our present conflict.

Already the bureaucratic undertakers are waiting smugly at the back door. They are impatient that the corpse of free enterprise (or shall we be more specific, still?)—the corpse of the capitalistic system—is so long in being delivered into their hands for embalming and burial. While they wait, making up suitable speeches out of respect for the dead, how the dear departed was good in its day, but had, at last, outlived its usefulness, free enterprise, with renewed strength and vigor, has bolted out the front door and outstripped in accomplishment her hypocritical mourners.

The capitalistic system dead? The news from the battle fronts doesn't indicate it. The hum of the assembly lines denies it. In answer to those who accuse this system of failure in the depression, I say that it did not fail. It was stricken with the same malady that attacked every known form of government in the world during the period of economic and political exhaustion after the feverish, inflationary period of the twenties. An apt bit of Scottish verse, often quoted by the late Daniel Willard, comes to mind in this connection:

"I am wounded, but not slain;
I will lie down and bleed awhile
Then I shall rise and fight again."

Certainly, gentlemen, this global war has been a supreme test for the endurance of the free-enterprise system.

Now, I realize, as well as you do, that if we are going to mouth platitudes about the past wonders of free enterprise, we'll get nowhere fast. We cannot even consume time, in painting glowing accounts of what free enterprise can do in the future. But we can point out what it is doing in the present. We have been told by the advocates of the American way of life that every man, woman, and child who has saved a dollar is a capitalist. That's true. We've been told that every insurance policyholder in the Nation is part owner in American business and industry. And, that is true. We've been told that every worker is a stockholder in his plant because the money he puts into insurance, into savings accounts, is invested by the banks and insurance companies in the very industries that pay him his wages. All that is true. Whether we like the word capitalist or not, each of us, who possesses anything at all, is, in a sense, a capitalist.

But just knowing and repeating these facts won't get us anywhere in our post-war planning unless we can apply them and prove to the world that free enterprise and the capitalistic system can function as efficiently in time of peace as it is now doing in time of war. If we believe this is true, then it is up to us who have faith, to enlighten our fellow Americans who are being smothered and confused by a barrage of propaganda from both sides, the faction believing in the free enterprise system and the faction that dedicates its energies to bringing about a system of complete bureaucratic control of American business and American life.

Our post-war planning commissions are taking form dangerously near the brink of economic disaster. American business is just about a couple of decades too late in its planning. If we had had the courage and intelligence to plan and take the lead 20 years ago, then the great American depression might have been a different story.

But we must remember that we are locked, at this moment, in a bitter conflict. No man or woman, even in this land, where the right of free speech is sacred, has the right to speak with nothing but bitter criticism when the Nation is at war. Each of us owes unstinted loyalty to our Commander in Chief and to his officers. Their report to the Nation is the news from the battle fronts. We know that regimentation is necessary to military victory; we know that penny pinching has no place in total war where precious lives and sacred institutions are at stake. This war is a tragic nightmare—a horrible interlude, in what should have been the onward march of American progress and, for that matter, the progress of the world.

But I would remind you that the tangle of bureaucracy was already at work 10 or more years ago. War has but strengthened its hold on the American people. Unless those of us who believe in the fundamentals of American democracy come to the defense of those principles, post-war America will be delivered to the bureaucrats who will quickly paraphrase our sacred hymn from America the Beautiful, to America, the Dutiful. The flame of American freedom will be snuffed out by the hand of dictatorship, whether by an individual or by commissions makes no difference.

What we ask of the post-war world is simple. But how to get what we want is the most baffling, the most intricate problem that has ever confronted man. You and I, personally, cannot solve it. But you and I with 134,000,000 other Americans can solve it. What then, do we ask of life after military victory? We ask for peace—not only for America, but for all the world. With the fast dwindling space which once separated us from the rest of the world, we can no longer live in peace unless our neighbors are at peace, too. We ask economic security and prosperity, for ourselves. But again, we have come to realize that unless the rest of the world is on a sound economic basis, we cannot hope for our own. We do not need to be told that we shall have to help the rest of the world back to health and strength. But let me strongly emphasize the fact that only a strong America, strong financially and spiritually, can hold out the helping hand to an exhausted world. Private business knows from long experience, that unless that strength is forthcoming we shall have to default on our promise of the "four freedoms."

As an American businessman, I humbly submit, it takes good, hard cash to run a business, even the Government. In speaking to one of the strange, new breed of intellectual planners, I was shocked to hear him remark that the national debt was nothing to be disturbed about. "You see," he said, "you're just old fashioned. Everything's changed now. It works like this; the Government keeps on owing more, but the people, individually owe less." Well, thank God for my old-fashioned arithmetic! I still believe that 2 and 2 are 4; I still believe that when you buy a pound of pork chops or a suit of clothes or a house to live in, you have to pay for them sooner or later. What the National Government owes, the people owe, and somehow, sometime that debt has to be squared. And so I

believe that one of the first problems we will have to tackle in post-war planning is the financial one.

For a hard, common sense approach to this, I can think of nothing better than what was said by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. In that year, you will remember, the subject of the soldiers' bonus was a campaign issue. That, undoubtedly, was a plea for assistance in the time of stress, and one made by our own people. Mr. Roosevelt made himself clear on the issue in a speech at Pittsburgh, on October 19, 1932. He said, "I do not see how, as a matter of common sense, a government running behind $2,000,000,000 a year can consider the anticipation of bonus payment until it has a balanced budget, not only on paper, but with a surplus of cash in the treasury." In that same speech, he went further, on the subject of national debt. I quote: "Our Federal extravagance and improvidence in addition to imposing a tax burden that individuals and business cannot bear, because of the unorthodox Federal financing, has impaired the whole credit structure." Again, I quote: "The first and most important step in balancing our Federal budget is to reduce expenses." And again, he said: "I am sure the 50 percent increase in Government overhead in 4 years, from 1927 to 1931, reveals why we can never expect any important economy from this administration. It is committed to the idea that we ought to center control of everything in Washington as rapidly as possible. That was the idea that increased Government cost by $1,000,000,000 in a year. Now, ever since the days of Thomas Jefferson that has been the exact reverse of the democratic concept, which is to permit Washington to take from the States nothing more than is necessary to keep abreast of our changing economic situation."

Once more I offer a solution for post-war economic stability in the words of Mr. Roosevelt. In 1932, in the same speech, he hit the nail on the head when he said, "I have sought to make two things clear: First, that we can make savings by reorganization of existing departments, by eliminating functions, by abolishing many of the innumerable boards and commissions which over a long period of years have grown up as excrescences on the regular system. These savings can properly be made to total many hundreds of millions of dollars a year." And, finally, I quote Mr. Roosevelt, as of October 1932, when he said, "Upon the financial stability of the United States Government depends the stability of trade and employment and of the entire banking, saving, and insurance systems of the country."

This is the sound, logical reasoning of our President in the campaign of 1932. This reasoning is still sound. It must form the basis for successful post-war economic planning.

We have no difficulty in saying what we want of a post-war world. But the process of working out a sound, balanced program will take time, patience, and faith. There will be no sudden miracle; there will be no Shang-ri-la. The clear-thinking businessmen, professional men, and labor leaders are convinced that free enterprise, working with a helpful, sympathetic government, is the answer to post-war prosperity. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor is frank, to say the least. I quote: "As the spokesman for a labor organization with six and a half million members, I want to make it emphatically clear, here and now, that the American Federation of Labor stands foursquare in support of free enterprise. We recognize the right to own and manage private property for public service and profit. We believe that private business and private industry have made tremendous contributions to the development of our country in the past, and will take advantage of the glowing opportunities for even greater growth in the future. For these services to the people, we concede that the owners and managers of private property are entitled to a fair profit. We of the American Federation of Labor will oppose any attempt to abridge, restrict, or interfere with the freedom and rights of free enterprise."

Mr. Green further stated that the American Federation of Labor would insist that industry acknowledge labor's equal right to the enjoyments of free enterprise and the equality of opportunity. Mr. Green is right. Unless the great mass of the American people can share in private business, with fair wages for their work and constantly improved living conditions, then free enterprise has failed. Mr. Sherman Rogers, author, in his Great American Delusion, gives us figures from the United States Department of Commerce, pointing out that from 1930 to 1940 the manufacturing industry of the United States produced an income of $129,130,000,000, the employees receiving $111,125,000,000 and the stockholders and owners in dividends and accumulations of surplus $17,405,000,000. Employees received 86½ cents of each dollar; owners and stockholders 13½ cents. During that decade the average number of employees was about 8,000,000, while the stockholders numbered more than 8,000,000. So, instead of a handful of stockholders, we actually had more stockholders than employees, and they, the stockholders, received only 13½ cents out of each dollar earned, while labor received 86½ cents.

Businessmen cannot solve the post-war problem alone. Labor cannot solve it alone; and the Government cannot and should not try to solve it alone. Only through the closest, the most friendly cooperation of all three—Government, business, and labor—can a satisfactory solution be found.

Our business now, as post-war planners, is to get down to the drudgery of working out the details for a post-war housecleaning. We must resurrect from their dust-covered hiding places the fundamentals of American democracy. We must polish them up and bring them back into use again. We must test the scales of the three branches of government and make certain that the executive, the legislative, and the judicial balance is true and fine and delicate as it was meant to be. We must produce and save our way out of debt instead of trying to spend our way out. We must insist that free and private enterprise is the foundation of American prosperity and progress. Although we must remodel and replace some of the outmoded superstructure and build to conform to modern architecture, we must not disturb the rock bed of the foundations of the private enterprise system.

America wants peace, prosperity, and security, but not at the price of liberty. The security we ask is not the paternalistic dole, but job security, security of opportunity to work for the peace and prosperity we ask and to profit thereby. Please believe me, the people of America have the faith, the ability, and the patience to plan their own salvation. When enough of us get down to the basics of our problems; when we have the answers, so also do we have the right and power to carry us through to victory. The people under American democracy have the final say. It cannot be otherwise, if we are to preserve, after the war, the democracy for which we are fighting and dying now. In the words of Mr. Roosevelt to the New York Legislature in 1931, I quote: "The Government is not the master, but the creature of the people. The duty of the state toward the citizens is the duty of the servant to the master. The people have created it, the people by common consent, permit its continued existence."

In conclusion, I haven't much faith in alliances. It may be well to have some. It has, however, been proven that alliances are not a guaranty of security and peace. Hitler and Stalin had a nonaggression security alliance in 1939—they are at war. Britain and Japan are at war, yet we have not forgotten the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Britain and France had promised Poland to protect her borders. I could name other alliances back to the Triple Alliance of 1688 and yet wars occur periodically. We must not fool ourselves in the future as we have at times in the past. We want no Maginot Line tombstones. We must outthink all Austrian and other paper hangers who would bring death and destruction to all people.

In our planning let us have in mind our responsibility to keep our Nation and people strong spiritually, fiscally, economically, and militarily, decent in our domestic and foreign policies and relations so that all peoples will respect us, want to trade with us, and be afraid to attack us.

On every post-war planning commission, whether it be international, national, or local, whether it be in the capitals of the world or in some remote village or hamlet; on every conference may there be laid the blessings of God and may He inspire and strengthen our faith; faith in our country, faith in our traditions, faith in our institutions, and faith in our ability to meet our responsibilities.

What Has the New Deal Done for Clarion County?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clarion (Pa.) Republican of October 21, 1943:

WHAT HAS THE NEW DEAL DONE FOR CLARION COUNTY?

What has the New Deal done for Clarion County? It has taxed and taxed, spent and spent, and now as voting time draws near it is trying to elect and elect.

The voters of Clarion County are tired of the New Deal; they want none of it. Bureaucratic regimentation and interference have pushed our farmers around so fast they are dizzy. One year production must be cut, crops plowed under, and animals slaughtered, even though a third of our population is underfed. This is to keep prices up. Then—presto chango—the next year production must be increased to the limit, crops doubled and trebled, livestock and poultry bred in ever-increaing numbers. Our farmers must feed the whole wide world, and large subsidies must be paid from the pockets of you and I. The subsidies are to keep prices down. Does it make sense? About the only things on the farm the New Deal hasn't tried to change are bossy's moo, biddy's cackle, and piggy's squeal.

Ask the oil and gas producers of Clarion County how they like the New Deal. They can tell you all about drilling restrictions and prices. The Army and Navy are needing more and more petroleum, yet oil and gas operators of this county cannot afford to drill even on proven territory.

What did the Guffy coal law do to the small coal mines of Clarion County?

How about the independent merchant with a small neighborhood store, with half of his shelves empty?. Does he like the New Deal?

Are the large chain and department stores better or worse?

But why go on—let's now draw the mantle of charity over this blundering and confusion, and say "They have done what they could." Now it is our turn.

Yes; it is our turn, and we are going to the polls to register our protest. We are going to stand firmly by our principle—government by laws, not by individuals; government by legislation and judicial checks and balances, not by bureaucrats who make and enforce their own restrictions.

All Republicans know that every Democratic candidate is tied up with GUFFEY, Roosevelt, and the New Deal. We are not going to be misled by the fact that they are emphasizing the pleasing personalities and popularity of their qualifications for the job.

We are going to the polls to vote against the New Deal and every one who represents it. We are not voting for any candidate because he is personally pleasing or is considered a good "vote getter," but because we are voting for men who believe in the Constitution as interpreted by the founding fathers, free enterprise, the encouragement of American initiative, and American business.

We are voting for the things our boys are fighting for and we pledge ourselves to do all in our power to keep the government of our small portion of Pennsylvania "of the people, for the people, and by the people."

Something To Shoot At

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following address delivered by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, of New York City, before the Boston conference of distribution on October 18, 1943. In this discussion Mr. Ruml calls attention to some post-war problems that should be given immediate consideration.

The address follows:

When I selected Something To Shoot At as the title for my speech tonight, I made it very easy to have plenty to talk about. First of all, there are the Germans, and the Japanese. They are certainly something to shoot at. And there is the President and Congress. They, too, are legitimate targets for such verbal shooting as may seem appropriate to 140,000,000 marksmen, each with a hunting license guaranteed in good standing by the Constitution of the United States. There are the alphabetical agencies, the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the F. C. C., and the rest. There is plenty to shoot at here.

But the shooting I want to discuss tonight is of a different kind. The object of the hunt is less a target than it is a goal. What I propose is that we consider some of the things we should be striving for in the period that will follow the war. In what direction, and at what level should we aim?

We are all aware, I am sure, of the great popular interest in post-war planning, and I suppose there are few subjects on which there is more general agreement than that we should begin now to get ahead with our post-war plans. It must be clear that planning of the sort we are talking about does not mean regimentation. In certain quarters there is a prejudice against the word "planning" that probably springs from apprehension that planning may lead us into a regimented way of life. I feel that just the opposite is the case. Planning is to regimentation both antithesis and antidote. Regimentation arises after planning has failed. Regimentation must depend on force and violence to implement its intuitions and its fanatic will. Free, open, democratic planning, thinking about our national future out loud, will contribute to the success of our form of government by bringing abiding satisfactions in the American way of life. Thus, planning will render regimentation, always distasteful, unnecessary.

People want those agencies and individuals who are responsible for thinking about the post-war period to proceed energetically with their work. To be sure, they want first of all to win the war, speedily and decisively, and they want nothing to detract from that effort. Second, they want no plans that represent mere wishful thinking or special interest ax grinding. They want some practical leads as to where we go from here when the present job is finished.

I think that we have come to feel that post-war planning will be unifying rather than divisive, that it will give purpose and drive to our efforts, and will, therefore, help the war effort itself. We have all felt the danger to morale in the question, too frequently heard, "What's coming out of it all, and who is doing anything about it?"

There is another deep influence that may explain in part this insistent demand on the part of people generally that something be done now about planning for the period to follow the war. We are a well-educated people, and we know that, even recognizing wonderful material advances, the scientific and technical progress of the last 150 years has never truly ripened in terms of human betterment. We know that in our country, to go no farther afield, we had a decade of mass unemployment of men and machines, and before that we were worried about what we called technological unemployment. We know that during the thirties alone in the United States, we lost forever a product of goods and services which would have amounted to more than $200,000,000,000. Not only for these material things, but for other values lost as well, we want in the future that this product be created, conserved, and applied to the increased welfare of us all. We, in America, expect this fruition of our energy, or skill and our resources, and its it therefore natural that we should be sympathetic with, and that we should encourage leadership wherever it arises that points the way toward the realization of these expectations.

It is particularly encouraging that businessmen have already begun to give thought to what business itself can do to help make real the benefits of high employment.

Today most businessmen agree that the elimination of mass unemployment is the first requirement for the post-war period. Many will go so far as to agree that unless mass unemployment can be eliminated under a system of private business enterprise, private business enterprise will be supplanted by some other arrangements for the production and distribution of goods and services. The demonstration of what we are able to produce under the rules of a wartime economy is unanswerable evidence of what machines and men and organization can accomplish if their technical capacities are given full rein. And we know that at the present time, with the newness of the wartime conditions under which we are working, the organizational and administrative arrangements are of much less effectiveness than they will become with longer experience. And so, for these good reasons, businessmen are giving thought to the responsibilities of private enterprise in doing its full part in achieving high production and high employment in the post-war period. I hasten to say that as far as I know, these businessmen would in every case subordinate this thinking about post-war employment to efforts directed toward the winning of the war, and each, in his capacity as a business manager, has made sure that his responsibilities for present wartime production are being efficiently discharged.

Although the task is difficult, the rewards of success are so great from every material and human point of view that it is an effort which can be undertaken with real zest and enthusiasm. Little differences of opinion and petty special interests become insignificant and can be brushed aside in view of the prospect that lies ahead. Business is definitely committed to take the initiative and to do its proper part.

But it would be folly to expect that business can make the transition from full wartime employment to high peacetime employment without cooperation from public government at every level—Federal, State, and local.

These measures of cooperation between government and business are good, but in my opinion they are not enough. In addition, we require for success in the attack by business and government on the danger of mass unemployment a commitment on the part of government that, through an explicit fiscal and monetary policy, it will act when business, as business, cannot act to sustain employment and effective demand.

To put it in another way, it is inescapable that the national state, through an explicit and implemented fiscal and monetary policy, must complement and supplement the activities of private business in the maintenance of high production and high employment.

To make this proposition more effective than a mere statement of intent, there are a number of corrective measures that the Government should adopt on its own behalf and for the sake of its own effectiveness. At the present time, even if a fiscal and monetary policy to complement and supplement the activities of private business were generally agreed upon, there is no possibility under the present organization of the Federal Government of its being made operative or effective.

There are three principal causes for this inadequacy, and ways must be found for eliminating them, or at least reducing the severity of their influence.

The first change that needs to be made is in the organization of the administrative agencies of the Federal Government. The administration of any fiscal policy at all calls for cooperation among agencies and for singleness of policy in at least several respects: the Federal Budget; the Federal lending policy at home and abroad; the credit and monetary policies under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve System; the creation and refunding of Federal debt, which is now managed by the Treasury; the tax program; and, possibly, the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission. These several functions are all intimately associated in giving reality to any governmental fiscal and monetary policy designed to cooperate with private business in achieving high productivity and high employment. These functions are scattered among several departments and agencies, and, during the thirties, there was clear evidence of conflict in basic policy. This meant that during that period the administration had no consistent or continuing fiscal policy and was unable to use the full power of fiscal measures to support its attempts to reach the humane goals it had set for itself in other fields.

A similar situation exists in Congress with the several committees of both House and Senate that must consider legislative policy on fiscal and monetary matters. Even if a consistently strong policy should emerge from the administrative branch it would be subject to delay and possible damaging amendment before the necessary legislation would be forthcoming. As far as taking the initiative is concerned, Congress is handicapped both by organizational and procedural difficulties and also by grossly inadequate staffing of its technical services.

Another very serious difficulty is the lack of close collaboration on policies of expenditure and taxation between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the State and local governments on the other. This weakness has been well understood for years, but the initiative which might have been expected from the Federal Government in analyzing the problem and making some preliminary suggestions has not been forthcoming until recently. The report of the Treasury committee on intergovernmental levels treats of this problem in a somewhat timid and ineffective way, in sharp contrast to the bold assurance of its suggestions on currency stabilization as among the sovereign nations of the whole world.

Here, at the point of fiscal and monetary policy, where the relations between Government and business are of the greatest importance for the working out of post-war employment and production problems, business may properly be apprehensive. It may be apprehensive, not that the intentions of government will be hostile, or even indifferent, but that, unless the preparatory organizational work is done now, the Federal Government will be helpless in executing even the most elementary collaborative program.

A fiscal policy that complements and supplements the activities of private business in the maintenance of high employment is sometimes called a compensatory fiscal policy. There is not the time for a detailed discussion of the elements of such a policy. But there are certain points that are worth mentioning to avoid misunderstanding.

A compensatory fiscal policy does not contemplate permanent Budget deficits as a necessary element in the economy. On the contrary, it allows for the possible overexpansion of private business activity which would be checked by public debt retirement.

Such a policy does not require spending for its own sake, nor does it approve wasteful expenditure. Sound policy dictates that the activities of any public body should be determined by policy considerations as to the appropriate field of public activity, not by the generalized needs of the economic system for expansion of purchasing power. Sound policy also requires that public expenditures should be made with efficiency and with high standards of productivity.

But given the wide area which is generally agreed to be suitable for common undertakings through public agencies, the stimulus to purchasing power when needed may well come through reduction of taxation. Why not leave at home for expenditure by the individual, income that otherwise would have to be pumped out again in order to maintain high employment? Such reduction in taxes should be made where they will do the most good in creating demand and in encouraging private enterprise. And it is particularly important to notice that under a compensatory fiscal policy, if stimulus is needed, we need not wait for a balanced Budget to proceed with a program of reducing taxes.

Much has been said and written about public works as a means of providing employment and of evening out the business cycle. Lately, we have become familiar with the phrase "a shelf of projects" to be ready if business should become depressed.

We must not expect too much from a public works program as a general support for high employment. If we believe in the policy of no wasteful public expenditure and no spending for its own sake, the administrative difficulties make proper timing almost impossible, and reduce the potential volume well below the requirements of a true depression. Public works alone cannot do the job.

The most we can expect, and this is no small gain, is that public works can be planned and undertaken in such a way as to even out the activities of the construction industry itself, thereby providing a reasonable level of construction throughout the year and year after year. Some rough approximation could be made of what aggregate employment in construction would be suitable over a period of years, and to maintain the desired volume of construction, public works might be undertaken when private construction fell off. Of course not all public works could or should be deferred, but many optional plans could be ready when the need for public works construction employment became apparent.

But, as I have said, it seems to me unreasonable, indeed I feel that it is reckless optimism, to expect that public works expenditures can be counted on as a balancing factor for the economy as a whole. Nevertheless, if we could only achieve reasonable balance in the construction industry itself a great deal would have been accomplished.

A reasonably continuous level of activity in the construction industry within the year and over the years would greatly increase the efficiency of the industry and any given level of employment would yield a larger and larger product as the years went by. The traditiona recurrent idleness of men and equipment in the construction industry has forced for sheer survival the adoption of practices which all deplore.

These practices, I feel sure, can be largely eliminated once the industry comes to have confidence in continuity of activity. But as these practices now exist, they are a serious obstacle to the use of the construction industry as a publicly supported agency for employment.

Mr. William Benton, speaking before the Producers' Council and the American Institute of Architects in Cincinnati on May 26, 1943, pointed out that it is impossible for this country long to maintain prosperity without an active construction industry. He went on to say, "The practices in your industry are notorious. Every form of so-called monopolistic practice seems to come to full flower in the political, labor, and business standards which prevail in your industry. This is ominous not only for the industry, which may be overrun by the Government, but for the whole system of free, independent enterprise in this country."

This is a businessman talking to businessmen in their own assembly.

Then Mr. Benton asks, "Will it take a congressional investigation to focus attention on these practices and to seek correction for them? I hope not. I'd like to see the construction industry at least make the effort to clean its own stables. But if it takes a congressional investigation, many businessmen will be for it. Many feel that every business practice which impedes employment and production must be fought. How else can business honestly go to labor or to Government and say, "Give us conditions under which we can operate'?"

I hope with Mr. Benton that the construction industry will take the initiative and attack the evil of restrictive conditions. But I also feel that the leadership in the industry would be heartened if the volume and timing of public-works construction were such as to give promise of a reasonably continuous level of public and private demand over the years.

The attainment of high levels of employment will still leave many individual men and women in need. A modern industrial society with its enormous productive capacity can give a certain minimum protection to the individual citizen against the occasion of unemployment, destitution in old age, accident, and disease. It can assess the burden of this minimum protection with reasonable fairness against the aggregate national product. I do not believe that such humane provision will weaken our energies or our ambitions, nor do I feel that we require the spectacle of fortuitous human distress to teach us the wisdom of avoiding error and evil.

Not only in the area of high employment, high production, and humane protection, are there goals to aim at. In our democratic representative process, there are also objectives that are worth thinking about.

During the debates of recent months, the public has watched the operations of the legislative process with unusually close attention. Inevitably, as a result of the ups and downs and delays, Congress has come in for a lot of criticism. In spite of this criticism, some of which was just, and some of which was not, it is a good thing that in this country we have a Congress to work with.

This does not mean that Congress is perfect, or even that as a democratic legislative body it is not susceptible to the improvement that comes with the passage of time and from the lessons of experience.

Some of this improvement must come on the initiative of Congress itself. Change and modernization of rules, precedents, and procedures should be undertaken, changes that would not weaken the essential integrity of the representative process, but that would make it less clumsy and more effective, more nearly in fact as we picture it as an ideal. The initiative for these changes must come from Congress itself, because in Congress is to be found the wisdom, the intuitive sense of balance, and the authority that can bring helpful reforms into being.

But there are some things that Congress cannot do alone, that require the initiative and support of the people generally, the citizens whom Congress serves.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress is the top legislative job in our very important country, that it is therefore a very important job both for our country and for the world.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress has become a full-time job, not a job that can be fitted in between crop seasons, or between law cases or while a partner can handle the business alone. The time required in Washington has grown to be and will continue to be extensive, and the time at home is fully occupied with duties that arise from legislative responsibilities.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress requires unusual talents of intellectual equipment, energy, courage, and the rare ability to make oneself acceptable to a constituency through the operation of our democratic process.

We should also encourage Congress to provide itself with much more adequate technical and professional services. Congress has not made the provision for its own needs that modern times require. As a result it has been too dependent on outside experts, occasional and fortuitous consultation, and on the permanent establishments of the administrative branch. These good sources of information and suggestion should not be brushed aside, but Congress should have its own technical services fully equipped to handle problems as the recognized servant of Congress. Such services could be built up in a number of ways. For example, the Library of Congress lends itself admirably to important extension and development. In time, it might become the cornerstone of a national university of a special type, a great

institution of learning, serving the people generally and at the same time available to the Members of Congress and responsive to every technical need.

We must give due attention to our representative process and the measures and attitudes that may strengthen it. Our economic and social problems are exceedingly important, but we need not for that reason neglect our legislative institutions, on which so much depends, as we move on to extend and enrich our democracy.

We must not count on Congress to do all our post-war planning for us. The strengthening of Congress in any case will come slowly and after long deliberation. Fortunately, Congress is not the only way in which the people can work together as a Federal Nation. As a matter of fact, the present method of organizing Congress was a second choice. The first choice, expressed in the form of the Continental Congress, was to have the Colonies be represented as governmental units and the people express themselves through the Colonies. At the time, this plan did not work very well, because there was no tradition or discipline of national unity, the interests of the Colonies were too diverse, and a stronger method of bringing the country together was needed.

But this old form has been revived. Today in the United States, the States, every one of them, are associated officially together in the Council of State Governments. Because of the youth of the Council of State Governments, its procedures are well adapted to modern times, and because it does not have responsibility for either legislative or administrative action, it is able to approach national questions with simple directness and with a minimum of partisan compromise. Recent memoranda coming from the council on the subject of post-war reconstruction and on post-war agriculture reach levels of excellence rarely attained in the reports of representative bodies.

Since the same citizens are represented in the Council of State Governments as well as in Congress, there is good reason why the council should be looked to for an important share of post-war planning. If the conclusions of the council recommend themselves to the people, they can then be implemented by the people acting through Congress.

These then are a few of the things we have to shoot at—high employment and high production, maximum activity of private enterprise, an effective compensatory fiscal policy, prompt tax reduction, public works planned to contribute to a more stable and more efficient construction industry, a minimum protection against the hazards of life, and finally an improvement in the operations and position of our representative processes.

These are splendid goals and they give us great promise for the future. But standing before these goals are those more immediate targets, the Germans and the Japanese. Let us use our goals to give us unity and energy and sense of direction in attacking these targets. The war comes first, always, and our thinking about the future can help us in the winning of the war.

Smaller Air Lines Strongly Support Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, claims are made in a minority report on the Lea civil aviation bill that the provisions of the bill would foster a monopoly by the larger air lines, and would therefore injure the smaller air lines. There is no group in better position to answer such a charge than the officials of the smaller air lines.

A group of these officials have found the charge "wholly unfounded," and in a telegram to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] they state their strong support of the Lea bill.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the telegram, which follows:

Hon. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aviation of House Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, New House Office Building:

The smaller air lines strongly support the Lea civil-aviation bill as favorably reported by House committee. In our considered judgment the assertions in the minority report that the bill would foster a monopoly by the larger air lines is wholly unfounded. We vigorously urge against adoption of the views advanced in the minority report.

Halsey R. Bazley, president; All American Aviation, Inc.; T. E. Braniff, president, Braniff Airways, Inc.; Carleton Putnam, president, Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc.; Sigmunf Nanas, president, Colonial Air Lines, Inc.; T. C. Drinkwater, executive vice president, Continental Air Lines, Inc.; C. E. Woolman, vice president, Delta Air Corporation; R. Leferink, president, Inland Air Lines, Inc.; J. W. Miller, president, Mid-Continent Airlines, Inc.; G. T. Baker, president, National Airlines, Inc.; S. J. Solomon, president, Northeast Airlines, Inc.; Croil Hunter, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; C. Bedell Monro, president, Pennsylvania - Central Airlines Corporation; L. H. Dwerlkott executive vice president, Western Air Lines, Inc.

A Soldier's Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, one of my soldier constituents, who has been serving overseas for 10 months has posed a very pertinent question to the editor of the Woonsocket Call, a daily newspaper published in my district.

Because so much has been said relative to the drafting of fathers, this soldier suggests that attention be given now to the plan that will be put into effect when men are discharged from the service after the war. He expresses the hope that married men with dependents will be given preference when the time comes for the return of servicemen to civilian life.

In the hope that his desire for discussion of this subject may be realized, I enclose in my remarks an excerpt from his letter and the Woonsocket Call editorial of October 28, 1943.

This soldier says:

The reason I am writing this is because I have been reading about all those bills that are passed by the Senate, and I am wondering if this would not be a good question to bring up. I am a married man with a child back home. I have been in this country for more than 10 months, and have no hope of getting back until the war is over. Now I wonder if it wouldn't be right to ask that married men with dependents be given preference when it comes time to go back home after the war. I have as yet not heard anything on that issue, and I am wondering if you could help to bring the question out before the people, and I am not the only one in that predicament.

The editorial follows:

WOULD LET DADS OUT OF ARMY FIRST

Pertinent to the current hodge-podge of ideas relative to getting fathers into the draft is a well-taken point raised by a Woonsocket father now in service on an overseas front concerning getting them out.

This soldier claims he speaks for many men in his own "predicament," and we cannot dispute the likelihood that he does voice the sentiment of most fathers in the services. By V-mail he asks us to pose the question for executive consideration as to whether draftees with dependents could not be among the first mustered out of service when the war is over.

It may be a long look ahead, but it seems to us this Woonsocket Yank has an idea that could well receive careful consideration by War Department leaders. If President Roosevelt wins in his stoutly opposed demand that fathers be drafted, we can visualize the merits of the plan receiving widespread support.

One dissenting voice, however, may be heard from those members of the former National Guard units who were inducted into Federal service at the very outbreak of hostilities. They may deem the release of draftee fathers ahead of their own demobilization as constituting a bit of discrimination not to be endured without protest. One feature of this phase of the problem, however, is the fact that many of the National Guard members were married and fathers at the time of their induction, and so would be eligible for quick return to civilian status, anyway.

Regardless of acceptance of the idea or its rejection as not feasible, it is one more step in the direction of right thinking on post-war plans.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in yesterday morning's Washington Post.

I first want to congratulate the Washington Post on its wisdom in appreciating and its courage in stating just what the F. S. A. stands for. In this respect it is unique among most of the great metropolitan newspapers.

It is indeed encouraging in these days when reactionary tendencies are becoming so evident that at least one great

newspaper should espouse the cause of the struggling, hard-working small farmer who, because he loves the soil, is trying desperately to hold on and to contribute in his small way to the sum total of food production that the Nation, aye, the whole world, needs in this crucial hour in the history of mankind.

I am also glad that the Washington Post characterized as hatchet men the Farm Bureau's vicious lobby. That phrase describes them to a T.

On the week of the 15th of November there will come to the floor of the House H. R. 3477. This measure, described as a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States and for other purposes, is actually a measure primarily designed to take the ceilings off of agricultural products and to usher in an era of inflation that will, if the bill becomes a law, immediately disrupt our whole economic system.

This bill is sponsored by, if not actually written by, the Farm Bureau Federation in conjunction with the Grange and other reactionary farm organizations whose sole interest in life seems to be to get while the getting is good and let the consequences take care of themselves.

I sincerely hope that the farmers of the Nation are not so short-sighted as to approve this kind of unintelligent skulduggery.

The unfortunate fact is, however, that the farm groups and the farm bloc that are sponsoring and supporting this narrow, selfish, and destructive program, seem to have forgotten that one Sampson, of Bible fame, indulged in just this sort of performance and that in wrecking the temple he, too, perished.

The editorial follows:

ATTACK ON F. S. A.

The Farm Bureau Federation's hatchet men are still relentlessly pursuing the Farm Security Administration. Last June, at a time when its potential service to the war effort was most vital, they succeeded in crippling F. S. A. by pruning its appropriation to the barest subsistence level. The House wanted to provide only $20,000,000 for administration of the agency; the Senate proposed $30,000,000. A conference compromise retained the House figure with a stipulation that F. S. A. could spend at a higher rate during the first 4 months in order to continue its most essential operations.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH

By November, it was expected, a House subcommittee studying permanent legislation on F. S. A. would be ready to report. But this subcommittee has not yet completed its hearings or prepared any recommendations. F. S. A. has asked for authorization to make additional rehabilitation loans and to be allowed to continue spending for administrative purposes at the rate fixed by the House-Senate conference. If these requests are denied—and a House Appropriations subcommittee has recommended denial—F. S. A. will be obliged summarily to close half its county offices. It will be unable either to make any new loans or to provide appropriate supervision for the loans which are currently outstanding.

The supplemental appropriation sought by F. S. A. has been endorsed by President Roosevelt and vigorously supported by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones. It would enable this agency to make some 50,000 new food-production loans to small farmers. Such loans would result in very substantial production increases. For it is among the small family farm units that our greatest production potential exists. The big commercial farms are already producing to capacity. But the little farms can achieve maximum productivity only if they can secure assistance from the Federal Government in the form of funds and expert guidance.

F. S. A.'S SOLE CRIME IS THAT IT SEEKS TO AID SMALL FARMER

Now it is precisely because F. S. A. has, from its inception, rendered aid to the little men of agriculture that the farm bloc in Congress dominated by the Farm Bureau Federation, is after its scalp. As the issue was stated by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, "F. S. A.'s sole crime is that, for the first time in 40 years, it checked the increase in farm tenancy by the rehabilitation of nearly 1,000,000 local farm families." The threatened abolition of F. S. A. is in reality a threat to the economic independence of America's rural population. Deprived of the assistance which this agency alone has given to them, the family farms of this country will be progressively absorbed by the development of corporate and plantation agriculture. It is no overstatement to say that we stand in real danger of a reversion toward feudalism and serfdom.

BACKBONE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE THREATENED

Family farming—small farms cultivated by those who live on them and own them—is the historic backbone of American agriculture. It is the principal mainstay of rural democracy. To the little farmers, the men and women struggling to preserve or to gain their independence, F. S. A. has become a symbol. Congress cannot destroy this symbol without destroying the one remaining hope of those who wrest their living from our soil. We urge the Members of Congress to restore F. S. A., strengthen it, and make it an effective instrument for war food production and for the general rehabilitation of rural America.

Rob Peter To Pay Paul—The Bribery of a Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, anent the message of the President in re subsidies, when the lexicographer summarized his definition of what it means "to subsidize" by saying it means "to encourage, partially support, or promote by a subsidy; now often implying bribery," he told more truth than the administration likes to hear.

If ever there was an ineffective attempt made by a government in power to purchase the votes of the people it is found in these subsidies, the last resort of a very resourceful group, whose main business has been to spend other people's money wastefully, wantonly, and wickedly, in order to keep themselves in office in perpetuity. Tuesday's vote is a partial pay-off.

Attempted subsidization of the electorate is the first step toward a feudalism by purchase, involving the sale by the people of a liberty which should be priceless to them—except to those who are altogether too numerous, who love to live in America so long as they can live off it and us and at our expense.

However, the days of serfdom can only return if and when a majority of the people, tired of the freedoms they enjoy, sell them for the mess of pottage of temporary financial betterment at their own expense.

Subsidies mark the beginning of the end of independence. It is time for those who love liberty to stop sucking the teats of national gratuity. It takes no Joseph to read or to interpret the handwriting on the wall. Sovereignty rests with the people. They exercised their prerogatives in Tuesday's elections. They can save themselves, and they will.

Subsidization smells of the tomb for free enterprise; is a three-in-one act, involving a crucifixion of the taxpayer, an attempted resuscitation and resurrection by artificial respiration, and his exit down the road to feudalism—all a fantasy and a dream, which should be and is a horrible nightmare to those not hypnotized by the lavish spending of the money that is theirs. To rob Peter is not to pay Paul.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, when I was invited to speak to the Vermont State Grange at Burlington, recently, I told them some of these things, by way of introduction, and now under leave heretofore granted, I am including a verbatim report of the speech I finally made on that occasion:

Mr. Toastmaster, in the 10 or 15 minutes allotted me you cannot expect me to do much more than thank you for the courtesy of your invitation to be present.

Last year about this time my subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture commenced its study of the preliminary budget. We spent over 100 days hearing testimony and listening to all kinds of crack-pot schemes whose originators wanted your money to back them. We will be at it again in a few weeks.

I am not a Monday morning quarterback. I opposed and voted against the original Wickard subsidy plan. A lot of blood-sucking, live-off-the-taxpayer, get-something-for-nothing people didn't like what I said 6 months—yes; 10 months ago—I said:

"In order to appease those whose buying power is greater today than ever before in the history of the country, and as a gesture of pure obstinacy and political vote-getting strategy, as a sop to the labor racketeers, the farmer—the forgotten man of this administration—is 'again and still and yet' made the goat as the subsidy program is attempted to be initiated over the dead body and against the protest of a Congress definitely opposed to such a program. That is what I said."

The program for subsidies is all wrong. Subsidies represent a constantly increasing debt which, in the first place, will have to be transferred to the shoulders of the returning soldiers. Subsidies are inflationary, strengthen bureaucratic control over the lives of people who temporarily profit at their own expense, develop an interlocking control which regiments the people by substituting government by regulation by men for government by law.

Vermonters are an independent group. They know that—

> "What we have of freedom,
> What we use and know,
> This our forefathers got for us,
> Long and long ago"—

which is as Rudyard Kipling said, "The leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law."

The absolute disregard of the will of the people, as evidenced by the votes of Congress; of the economic law of supply and demand; the attempt to substitute a subsidy in lieu of an adequate price at a time when the vast majority of the people are amply able to pay for the food they eat, and at a figure which will make it an object for the farmer to produce, are policies of this administration which deserve to be bitterly condemned. Of course, farmers should be compensated for their increasing costs of production and so enabled to meet the demands of the Government that they produce, and produce, and produce, and buy bonds, and pay taxes—by being treated as the most essential group in the country—without whose wholehearted cooperation we cannot win this war.

We might summarize the situation and say:

1. The farmer doesn't want any indication that he has to be paid for his patriotism.

2. The general belief prevails that there is no just reason to ask the soldiers to fight the war, and then come home and pay the grocery bills for people who have been getting the highest wages in history and time and a half and double time for overtime.

3. The producer believes that if they need a new tax bill to drain off the forty-five extra billions that are lying around, there is no reason why these people cannot pay for what they eat.

4. Most people realize that this roll-back subsidy program would require additional thousands of bureaucrats to put it into operation. There are now two man tellers for the number of toilers in the food program.

5. Fair-minded people subscribe to a plan like the Christian Herter bill that provides cheaper food to the low-income groups, but no roll-back subsidy for the professional subsidizing.

6. The only roll-back the producers of America seem to be interested in is in the program to roll back the bureaus. I heard a little song a few days ago, entitled the "Pork Barrel Polka," which went something like this:

"Roll back the bureaus,
We'll have aplenty to eat.
Kick out the long hairs,
We'll have both butter and meat.
Stick to the farmers,
They'll produce the food;
No New Deal is needed
To get them in this mood."

The National Grange is one of the most influential farm organizations in Washington. Our, or your, national master, Mr. Albert S. Goss, is recognized as one of the deepest thinkers in the agricultural world today. He is so thorough, so far, so practical in his approach, that his counsel and his recommendations receive attention and support in the Halls of Congress.

And our own Henry L. Stoddard has made for himself a place and a seat high up in the seats of the mighty. We have a right to be proud of him, his good old Yankee common sense, and the way he keeps both feet on the ground.

The National Grange is to be congratulated on its opposition to the unsound proposals of the little men in the big places, who have temporary influence in Washington. There are too many of them by the thousands.

The administration is responsible for its own misguided and unworkable policies. Nobody but the executive branch of the Government is responsible for the shortage of food and fuel and gas and oil and meat. Congress provided the money and urged that action be taken long before Pearl Harbor to prepare us for such an emergency as now exists. Jealousy, politics, incompetence, delayed action, an attempt to build up a political organization and to carry on as usual, taking advantage of the war to do it, are black marks which cannot be erased for they indelibly brand those who are responsible for them.

Serious food shortages may cause actual hunger this winter right here in Vermont. Such shortage is directly chargeable to manpower and machinery shortage on the farm, bad weather, and an attempt, as I have said, on the part of impractical theorists and bureaucrats to circumvent the will of the people as registered by Congress and to beat the inexorable laws of supply and demand and other economic laws.

History does and will repeat itself. Public money extracted from the pockets of the people cannot be extracted or expended indefinitely. The right to tax the people involves the power to destroy their economic life. The profit and loss system, free enterprise, the free market, the law of supply and demand are on the way back, but they will only come back so fast as and when the people realize the desperate situation which now confronts us on the home front. Congress has recently reflected the fact that the people back home are determined to speed the coming of that day or return to sanity, saving, and safety.

The people have spoken as of Tuesday.

The truth is not always pleasant to hear, but it is mighty and eventually will prevail. The people ought to have known what they now know, as stated by Senator BURTON a few days ago when he said that the long continuance of one administration produces the inherent vices of bureaucracy.

Willkie said the same thing long ago and again the other night.

It leads to overloading the pay rolls, inefficiency in service, wastefulness in expenditures, arbitrariness, favoritism, nepotism, political use of the civil service, and ease in concealment of frauds.

The appointive power reaches not only throughout the executive branch of the Government but with even deeper effect into the Federal judiciary. Already seven of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and great numbers of the judges of the lower Federal courts have been appointed for life by the present administration. This influence of one man upon the character of our courts of final jurisdiction already is contrary to the best interests of the system. That is a very polite and moderate indictment.

The civilian personnel in Federal employment has risen to 3,000,000 employees This is five times the number when this administration took office 10 years ago. This administration shows every indication of increasing rather than reducing this number. Or did.

It is hard for any administration, even if it wishes to do so, to get rid of incompetents appointed by it. This administration, moreover, has become particularly infamous for its unwillingness to drop from Federal employment anyone whom it has once put into Federal service. The Nation also has suffered recently from extraordinary administrative ineffectiveness due to overlapping jurisdictions within the continually increasing, hastily improvised bureaucracy, to say nothing of the personal controversies between bureaucratic officials themselves. The effect of this excessive pay roll is not only to waste the taxpayers' money but also to promote political support of the administration at the taxpayers' expense.

Three hundred billion dollars is an awful lot of money for the taxpayers to pay for their lack of wisdom as voters.

There is only one way out of the morass into which we are sinking because of New Deal leadership. Why fool ourselves further or longer by proposing to amend laws which cannot be amended or repealed until we have the necessary votes to do it? The farmer, the industrialist, and everybody else has a complete remedy. In fact, his only relief will be found if and when he adopts it. The only sure cure for all these ills is the election of a new administration dedicated to economy and efficiency and free from the obligations of the present administration to its own appointees.

This ought to be apparent to every citizen who feels the responsibility of his citizenship.

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." The people once more have a chance to save themselves. Lest we forget, let's take a look over our shoulders. See the Boston Herald of November 3, 1940, with its 2-inch headline screaming across the top of the page, "Roosevelt vows no fourth term—the President, addressing 16,000 in the Cleveland Auditorium, said that he needed 4 more years to complete the New Deal * * * and declared in effect that there would be no fourth term."

What suckers we were. And he has certainly completed the New Deal, if that is what he calls finishing it and being present at the death. And "when that term is over," he said, "there will be another President."

There certainly is more than one sucker born every moment—for that bait was swallowed, hook, line, and sinker—and here we are again with Franklin D. Roosevelt, candidate, playing politics every minute. What are we going to do about it now? Let the people answer.

And do you remember that speech of Wendell Willkie on that evening of November 3, 1940, at Madison Square Garden, in which he said that, and I quote almost verbatim:

"The unlimited spending of borrowed money, the piling up of bureaucracy, the usurpation of powers reserved to Congress, the subjugation of the courts, the concentration of enormous authority in the hands of the Executive, the discouragement of enterprice, and the continuance of economic dependence for millions of our citizens upon government are the methods of the New Deal and are not the methods of democracy. The conflict is on those issues."

The issue, then as now, was and is the preservation of democracy in the United States, the only way in which America can be kept strong and free. A democracy within a republic.

Shall we keep it so? We have that chance. This time the people should not muff the ball. They are playing for the highest stake for which they have played since the Civil War, so far as the perpetuation of our form of government is involved. It is now or never if we wish to save it. That is no hyperbolic statement, for unless we execute an about face, we shall fall into the same abyss which is the all-time burial place of democracies everywhere and elsewhere. We are very far along today toward the edge of that precipice, whether we realize it or not.

It certainly is time and this is the place for us to stop and look and listen, while we have that opportunity as freemen, so to do.

For 10 years the present administration has placed less and less faith in the people. For 10 years the present administration has been assuming more and more direction over the people. The time has come for the people of America to throw off such government and to resume governing themselves.

Farm subsidies, as it has been said and proven to be a fact over and over again, conceal costs, defeat efforts to correct leaks, promote inefficiency, make everyone pay for

benefits enjoyed only by a few, destroy initiative, are an expedient way of dodging a hard disagreeable issue, open the way to political abuse, and are the means of building up and maintaining a bureaucratic centralized government, while leading to inflation and disaster.

Vermonters are the last people in the world to invite or to tolerate regimentation, or to contribute toward a change in our form of government. Let the people speak. As Salmon P. Chase wrote Horace Greeley, "the only way to resumption is to resume."

Twenty-second Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following coast-to-coast radio address, originating in station WEAF on Friday, October 29, 1943:

Tonight, I ask you, the people of America, for your help in behalf of freedom of speech on the radio.

In addition to my general duties as a Representative in Congress, I have the special duty, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to study legislation which comes within our jurisdiction and to suggest the manner of law enforcement. Legislation affecting radio is the responsibility of my committee.

Until recently, it was generally accepted that the first amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees the freedom of speech, applied with full force and effect to speech by radio or wire communication. However, two great discussions of recent origin have jarred the people of America out of this complacency and have righteously caused us apprehension that the radio might be employed as an instrument of oppression rather than an agency of enlightened freedom.

These disturbing controversies were first, the legal case of the broadcasting chains which was decided by the United States Supreme Court last May, and second, the flaming debate now current among radio commentators. Some commentators assert the right to express their personal opinions freely. Others would have the remarks of commentators subject to censorship.

In the case of the broadcasting chains, the danger we must guard against is brought home to us by two statements proclaimed from the bench of our Supreme Court. Judge Murphy said, in his dissenting opinion, and I quote, "In the present case we are dealing with a subject of extreme importance in the life of the Nation. Although radio broadcasting, like the press, is generally conducted on a commercial basis, it is not an ordinary business activity, like the selling of securities or the marketing of electrical power. In the dissemination of information and opinion, radio has assumed a position of commanding importance, rivaling the press and the pulpit. Events in Europe show that radio may readily be a weapon of authority and misrepresentation, instead of a means of entertainment and enlightenment. It may even be an instrument of oppression."

Judge Murphy was evidently alarmed, and I share his feelings, by the following statement, which is part of the majority opinion of the Court, rendered by Judge Frankfurter. I quote:

"The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without a license. The licensing system, established by Congress in the Communications Act of 1934, was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for the licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, or necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the act, is not a denial of free speech."

This language of the Court practically says that Congress authorized a censorship and that the first amendment does not forbid such censorship.

In my opinion, Congress, in 1934, never intended that the standards set up in the act "public interest, convenience, or necessity," should comprehend a censorship. This recent decision indicates that a censorship could be set up under an act of the Congress and not be in violation of the free-speech amendment of the Constitution.

Only recently, the Federal Communications Commission withheld a renewal of a license to a certain network until the owners of the network pledged that it, the network, "has no intention to and will not broadcast any so-called editorial hereafter."

Within the past month, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission made a plea for free speech for news commentators when he became critical of a rule, made by a broadcasting company, forbidding expression of personal opinion by their news analysts.

The opinions expressed by Chairman Fly of the Federal Communications Commission should have permanency. In view of the Supreme Court decision, it is quite evident that the only way we may be sure of freedom of speech on the air is by adopting my resolution which is to be known as the twenty-second amendment. Here is the language of my proposed amendment.

"AMENDMENT 22

"SECTION 1. Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of any law, license, or contract, in violation of section 1 are hereby declared inoperative."

Section 1 of my amendment prohibits any Congress, now or in the future, from imposing a censorship on speech by radio or wire communication. According to the Court there is no present constitutional restraint upon Congress in this respect. The Constitution, in the vital matter of the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religious worship is most emphatic in its restraints on Congress, and throughout the years the Constitution has been so construed by the Supreme Court. Because the Supreme Court is not decisive in the application of the first amendment to speech by radio, the adoption of my amendment will clear the air of legalistic doubts and will place, in our written Constitution, protection of freedom of speech by radio.

Speech is a gift from God, a sacred and precious trust, the breath of the Spirit. The surest criterion of the character and essential soundness of any government will always be found in the degree of freedom of discussion which is tolerated, nay encouraged, by that government. To keep and maintain the body politic in a healthful and vigorous state, there must be an unobstructed circulation of thought and opinion; this is the very life's blood of all social existence.

The radio plays an important part in our social existence, in the lives of our citizens, particularly those millions of souls living in our land who are blind, physically disabled, too old to read or unfamiliar with our printed word and, therefore, are completely dependent upon the radio.

Thomas Jefferson, who swore eternal hostility to every form of tyranny, has established this point in terms which all true Americans can appreciate and approve. Jefferson said: "The basis of our Government is the opinion of the people. Reason and persuasion are the only practicable instruments. To make way for these, free inquiry must be indulged. How can we wish others to indulge it while we refuse it ourselves? It is error alone which needs the support of authority. Truth can stand by itself."

We cannot hamper liberty of speech in one respect without impairing its safety and its strength at all points. Expediency is a dangerous pretext. Be the infringement ever so tiny, it must, in the end, inevitably undermine the entire structure of our society which was erected at a tremendous cost in blood and sweat and toil and tears.

This discriminatory censorship springs from fear and the weakness in which that fear is engendered. It distrusts the source and fountain of all democratic government: The God-given right of the people to speak out freely at all times on all topics. Indeed, it threatens the very security it affects to foster. Such unnatural restraints will neither prevent the vigor of opinion nor improve the patience of the people. How shall we nominate persons properly qualified to act as censors, or how shall we find decent patriots who will soberly undertake that dubious duty? To put such an indignity upon the good sense of a liberty-loving nation constitutes an affront to the temple of truth itself.

Let us hold fast to those first principles for which the founding fathers did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor. Let us pledge ourselves, and all we have and all we are, to those eternal verities which, in a large part of the world today, are violently condemned and cast out, and which we and our gallant allies are fighting and dying to restore and preserve. Let us have no dealing with that un-American timidity which seeks to stigmatize, by the single epithet propaganda, all difference of opinion, all passion for truth foreign to their own fearful and feeble patriotism. Theirs is the voice of Jacob, to be sure, but the hands are the hands of Esau. We refuse to let those hands, howsoever gentle, throttle us. To permit such an outrage upon the sovereign birthright of our people would be tantamount to an act of treason. We must not betray the service stars that, tonight, shine proudly forth from the windows of millions of American homes; we shall not tarnish their glorious luster.

How eloquently did the inspired poet of Paradise Lost express the conviction that animates and sustains our hearts in these difficult, soul-searching times when he declared:

"Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do ingloriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?"

Free and open, indeed, by the grace of God, truth shall remain in the United States of America.

Let us do our part by helping to have adopted the Kennedy resolution and thereby place the strong arm of the Constitution around free speech on the radio.

Philippine Society Protests House Joint Resolution 164

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter from the Philippine Society of Southern California. The office of the society is in Los Angeles. The letter is signed by its president. The members of this society have lived in the islands and are thoroughly familiar with the Pacific area and with its affairs, and are genuinely interested in its future. The letter should be given consideration by the Congress in connection with any discussions of House Joint Resolution 164. The letter follows:

THE PHILIPPINE SOCIETY
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, October 29, 1943.

The Philippine Society of Southern California, a society composed of about 300 families of American citizens formerly resident in the Philippine Islands, wishes to bring to your attention the provisions of H. J. Res. 164, presented to the House of Representatives on September 27, 1943, and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

At the same time to call your attention to subsequent recommendations reported to have been made by other officials of the Government in respect to the matters referred to in this proposed joint resolution.

It is the considered opinion of the members of this society who are, by their residence in the Philippines and knowledge of eastern affairs, in a position to know that for this resolution or anyone of similar or related import to be passed at this time would be extremely detrimental to the best interests of the Philippine Islands and of the United States.

The first declaration in this resolution that the Congress should immediately recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands made at a time when the United States is unable to grant such independence is to say the least absurd and insincere.

Furthermore, it would be a violation of the expressed wishes of the legally constituted representatives of the islands as expressed in the report of the joint preparatory committee on Philippine affairs of May 20, 1938, volume 1, page 157, in which they set forth clearly the reasons why the advancement of the date of independence would be detrimental.

The act of March 24, 1934, providing for the ultimate independence of the Philippines contained certain provisions for the protection of the Filipino people and together with the Constitution of the Philippines which was adopted in pursuance of said act provided in effect for the appointment of the representatives of the Filipino people to act for them by a president to be subsequently elected after the tenure of the present president had expired by the provisions of the Philippine Constitution and for approval thereof, by a commission appointed by a national assembly to be elected hereafter. The object of these restrictions was expressed by the Constitutional Convention as being a means to prevent a dictatorship and to preserve the sovereignty in the people as declared in the Constitution.

For the Congress of the United States to disregard this entire system, which has been so carefully set up and protected, and to cast the Philippines aside and at the same time to attempt to negotiate with a group declared to be representatives of the Philippines but not appointed by the representatives of the people as provided by legal enactments, would constitute an unwarranted usurpation of powers already granted to them and an act of bad faith which no degree of argument could justify.

On November 15, 1943, by the provisions of the Philippine Constitution, the present executive control of the Philippines automatically changes.

This fact has already been given long and careful consideration by the Filipino people. Under no circumstances should the Congress assume to nullify this protection of their rights.

Very respectfully,

S. J. WRIGHT,
President.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a committee has gone to work to find a suitable gavel for JOE MARTIN.

We are in favor of tree growers being given full time to grow trees.

The O. W. I. has 3,600 employees in this country in its Overseas Division, while there are only 1,700 overseas.

The three S's have gone down on the stock market this week, subsidies for food, socialized medicine, and social gains at $400 per month.

Walter Winchell's passion for Under Cover was not generated entirely in recent weeks. He had a lotion of it away back there when he changed his name.

Let us watch and see what is done about getting any overseas bases for our planes after the war. They should talk it over now in Moscow while they are talking.

If Mr. Hull got Russia to agree to fight to the full end his visit was a success. In fact, it was something when he got Joe in the same room with himself and Eden.

We recall the Portsmouth treaty where a Mr. Witte operating for Russia outmaneuvered the Japanese delegates. Our sympathies were with Japan then for she had won the battles.

The "Commander in Chief" of civilians, by Executive order, had more luck filling the miner's dinner pail than he will have in force-feeding Congress on food subsidies.

Hope Ridings Miller is right on insisting that the Senate give the women secretaries of Senators the privileges of the floor the same as men secretaries before they pass on full equal legal rights for women.

"If you don't work you die; and no man prizing his real essential freedoms, worthy to have them, able to defend them, would dream of forfeiting them by asking his government to guarantee to him freedom from want," says Dan Casement, Manhattan, Kans.

Freedom of Speech on the Air—Fact, Formula, or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Americans are interested in radio, make no mistake about that. Judging from some recent surveys I have made of correspondence reaching Congress on this subject, of speeches and articles on radio policies, of editorials, and tabulated opinions of Members of the Senate and the House, something is going to be done with regard to private radio and its future in this country. One Senate committee has now started holding hearings on one aspect of the question and various members of the Federal Communications Commission have given considerable recent study to radio problems and have reached some conclusions, although the Commission is not in unanimous agreement in its present albeit tentative conclusions.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that radio appear before the court of public opinion in America with clean hands. If this is to be done, certain radio networks, individual stations, and individual commentators owe an obligation to the institution of free radio and the future of the radio industry to correct at its source existing causes for legitimate complaint about the fairness of radio and the factual quality of the so-called freedom of speech with which it operates. Freedom of speech is a precious American heritage. Whether its function on radio is a matter of fact, a pretty formula behind which abuses are perpetuated, or an absolute fiction used to cover over the use of radio facilities for propaganda and lobbying purposes by individuals or corporations is a matter of primary significance to freedom-loving Americans. The radio industry—if it will—can so regulate its own behavior that there can be no question about the factual operation of freedom of speech over the air.

In this connection and toward this end the Columbia Broadcasting Co. has taken some important steps within the past few weeks. Editorial opinion in this country appears overwhelmingly to favor the standards of fair performance which C. B. S. has set up for itself in declining to permit its facilities to be used for propaganda purposes and in insisting that what appears under the label

of "news" over Columbia facilities is actually news and not thinly disguised personal prejudice or corporation propaganda. A sample of the popular reaction to the laudable action of C. B. S. is found in the editorial columns of the current issue of Collier's magazine which concludes an editorial on Opinion on the Air with this paragraph, "We'll be hearing from dozens, hundreds, or thousands of customers that we're helping radio destroy freedom of speech in this country. Nevertheless, we think C. B. S. is essentially right in this matter of opinion on the air, and will do itself and a long-suffering radio public a favor by sticking to its guns." Such forthright praise from frank-spoken Collier's is reflective of a great segment of public opinion in this country which is growing very tired of being propagandized over the radio by men courting favors, seeking profit, grinding axes, seeking revenge, venting spleen, or merely peddling propaganda piffle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the privilege extended me by the House to include with these remarks a radio address which I delivered on the evening of November 2, 1943, on the subject Can Free Radio Be Preserved?

Ladies and gentlemen, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the first paragraph, therefore, in our hallowed Bill of Rights reads as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Had radio broadcasting been in existence to its present extent when this amendment was written, our early American statesmen would undoubtedly have made specific mention of it just as they did of the press. Since radio is a modern development, however, it is necessary for present-day citizens to apply this first amendment to the institution of radio in order to make certain that freedom of speech may be preserved and advanced by its use rather than jeopardized or circumvented. To that end, the thought provoking decision of the Supreme Court made on the 10th of last May and recent policy statements by some of America's leading radio networks and radio authorities have given rise to considerable interest in Congress as to what—if anything—should be done to protect both private radio and the general public from the practices and policies which might ultimately thwart the true functioning of freedom of speech on the air. A number of bills are now before Congress. As yet, however, there has been no general agreement in Congress as to the scope and nature of this legislation if it is to best serve the interests of the people of America.

On October 18, I addressed the House of Representatives at some length on the subject, Needed—A Code of Radio Good Behavior. I know from the reactions I have had to this address—both from other Members of Congress, from members of the Federal Communications Commission, and from private citizens who have written me in great numbers—that the dissatisfaction with certain radio practices which I am about to describe is far more widespread and vigorous than many radio executives appreciate.

Unless correctives are developed from within the radio industry, the signs of the times all point to the fact that either the Federal Communications Commission or the Congress—or both together—will have to step in to prevent the continued abuses of radio by the monopolistic corporations controlling the wave lengths assigned to them as a public trust by temporary governmental license.

More and more people are advocating the establishment of a great radio network owned, operated, and regulated by the Government in a nonpartisan and unprejudiced manner. Some people believe that such a system—modeled perhaps after the British Broadcasting Co. in Britain—would prevent radio corporations, their rich advertising sponsors, or their commentators from using radio as a means of spreading propaganda beneficial to themselves or in conformity with their individual points of view while at the same time using radio to discredit and disparage men and measures of conflicting points of view.

I, myself, am not one of those who favors the Government ownership and operation of radio. I think the need in America, today, is for less rather than more Government competition with private business. I think our goal should be less rather than more Government ownership of private enterprises. I hope, therefore, that intelligent radio management plus wise legislation and Government regulation will not permit the great semipublic monopoly which today is radio, to become so offensive to good taste, so repugnant to the principles of fair play, and so out of harmony with the functioning of constitutional considerations of free speech that its future as a private enterprise will be in jeopardy.

What, then, is the basis for the criticisms of present-day radio practices which we in Congress are hearing with increasing frequency? What is the source of this smoldering dissatisfaction? It is not, ladies and gentlemen, with 80 to 90 percent of the programs provided by American radio—both by individual stations and over the four Nationwide networks. The musical programs, the educational programs, the programs devoted to legitimate advertising, the drama, the poetry, the handling of political campaign speeches, the weather and market reports are all appreciated by the public and are all properly handled by the vast majority of program directors. The crux of the problem grows out of the increasing use of men and women who are presented to the radio audience as news commentators, news analysts, or reporters, and who pervert these programs into opinionated monologs in which to voice either their personal prejudices or to propagandize for some point of view of special interest or profit to the private advertiser or the radio corporation sponsoring the speaker as the case may be. In other words and in very plain words, the use of radio for propaganda purposes to present one-sided arguments for or against an individual, an institution, a cause, or an organization is being used to circumvent the functioning of free speech by certain radio outlets and certain radio speakers. The American public—always quick to sense a violation of the rules of fair play—is growing steadily more dissatisfied at having what purports to be news twisted into a parade of personal prejudices or corporation propaganda. The American public is eager to get honest facts and complete news coverage from every possible source but it wants to reserve to itself in traditional American style the formation of the opinions which are based on the happenings in the news.

Mr. John Q. Citizen wants the facts and he wants all the facts—he wants them in his newspapers, in his magazines, in his books, and in the so-called news programs he hears over the air. But John Q. Citizen does not want to be told over the air that he is getting news when instead he is being subjected to prejudices, propaganda, and personal or corporation lobbying which distorts the truth, colors the reports, twists some facts and omits others, and altogether practices the worst features of discredited yellow journalism on a radio system which depends upon the Government for its license. This is even more true since radio has to be monopolistic to be workable in a world in which science has as yet not overcome the fact that too many duplications on a given wave length spoil the air waves for everyone.

SUBSIDIZED RADIO HATCHET MEN

I have heard over the radio as you have heard in your own homes so-called news analysts or commentators purporting to give the news but actually reporting—let us say—a strike story in such a manner that the whole program becomes a tirade against organized labor. Because of personal prejudice, corporation pressure, excitable emotionalism, or the petty personal courting of favors from those with favors to give, some radio speakers have reported labor disputes as though labor unions were the creatures of Satan and labor leaders the likeness thereof. Such attacks upon an institution, an organization, an individual, or a cause—without the provision for a right of rejoinder and this the commentator on the air never provides—is an abridgement of the right of free speech because it uses the Bill of Rights as a device for attack but denies its use as a device for protection.

I have heard some radio commentators—as you have heard them—denouncing the farm bloc in Congress or farm organizations throughout the country under the guise of reporting news over the air but actually as part of a personal pattern of prejudice or a corporation creed of propaganda. Farm spokesmen have been attacked by name—their sincerity questioned—their judgment denounced—their patriotism impugned all under the pretext of "reporting or analyzing the news" but virtually as part of a prejudice purveying program either inspired by the individual commentator or conceived by the corporation whose wares he peddles on the air or whose checks he cashes for speaking on sustaining time.

What has happened to men in public or private life who speak for the farmers in conflict with what some radio commentator finds it patriotic or profitable to believe has also happened, as I have said, to spokesmen for organized labor. It has happened to other groups and causes as well, and it can happen to all who refuse to court the friendship and favor of those controlling radio time and talent. It is against these manifestations of unfairness and against this type of "yellow journalism on the air" that Americans rebel.

Some radio stations and at least one great radio network—the Columbia Broadcasting System—have taken steps to prevent the twisting of news by radio commentators and the use of sponsored or sustaining radio time to attack individuals or institutions on the air. It is hoped that other radio outlets will follow this far-sighted and public-serving example. Unless flagrant abuses of radio are corrected by voluntary action the Government—soon or late—will have to act, and it is better by far for private radio ownership to clean up its own offensive habits rather than to wait for Government to put it in a strait jacket which in order to go far enough is altogether likely to go too far.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES FOR PERNICIOUS PRACTICES

Some remedies have been discussed of late in places of authority here in Washington. None has as yet been agreed upon—it is easier to point to the abuses of radio than it is to correct the difficulties, but out of these suggestions may come regulations, legislation, or self-imposed voluntary codes which will protect the listening public against being subjected to opinionated monologs and prejudicial preachments when they have a right to expect authoritative news and honest facts.

One suggestion gaining some ground is that whenever any radio speaker uses sustaining or commercial time to attack or assail an individual, institution, organization, or a cause over the air, upon written request that station or that network must make available without charge to the party mentioned an opportunity to present the other point of view on the same hook-up and at the same hour at the next regular program interval of the offending speaker or corporation. By thus insisting on a true functioning of the right of free speech it would be possible for the public to get both sides of the question, the party offended would not suffer any abridgment of his freedom of speech, and regular violators of good taste on the air would soon stop their attacks since radio networks and advertising corporations would find it unprofitable to be compelled to provide so much free time for the answers to these unjustifieable attacks.

Another approach is proposed by Quincy Howe, writing in the November issue of the Atlantic Monthly, in a stimulating article entitled, "Policing the Commentator: A News Analysis." One radio commentator himself suggests a remedy in an article in Broadcasting Magazine whereby all opinions and personal prejudices would be eliminated from regular news casts. Periods devoted to news analysis and radio reporting would be free from propaganda and never used for lobbying purposes. Instead, regular periods for forum discussions would be set aside where all points of view would be represented. Several splendid radio forums are now established programs on the air but it is distressing to see some of them kicked around on the program schedules and relegated to less attractive spots as advertisers or networks veer toward sensationalism, gossip commentators, or other programs in which propaganda prevails and prejudice rather than truth is king.

RADIO AND THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

Today's trend in radio may well result in a situation in which the power of the purse completely controls the type of news and the slant of the propaganda we hear over the air, unless voluntary correctives or legislative remedies are applied. Unless radio itself makes freedom of speech over the air a fact rather than a fiction, either the Federal Communications Commission or the Congress must act to prevent this great medium of communication from becoming a haven for propagandists instead of a helpmate in the crusade to develop steadily a better informed and more enlightened citizenry in America. In this Republic, access to the facts rather than allegiance to the propagandists is the basis of good government and the bulwark of our "four freedoms."

How War Came

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 4 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able and interesting article by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times magazine on July 18, 1943, entitled "How War Came: Extracts From the Hull Files—The Historic and Fateful Sequence of Events is Revealed in Reports From Our Diplomats Abroad."

This article contains so much exceedingly valuable information and is so ably prepared that it should be made a permanent part of the records of Congress by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the first installment, and I will ask to insert the second installment very shortly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WAR CAME: EXTRACTS FROM THE HULL FILES—THE HISTORIC AND FATEFUL SEQUENCE OF EVENTS IS REVEALED IN REPORTS FROM OUR DIPLOMATS ABROAD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—Four years ago, in the summer of 1939, Hitler was playing double or quits with civilization as the stakes. The greatest gamble of history was nearing its climax.

Again repudiating their pledges, the Nazis had swallowed Czechoslovakia in March, and the cruel pressure on Poland had begun with the Free City of Danzig as the point of impact.

Hitler, as is now evident, believed he could sweep the board without facing the challenge of general war. The democracies had only begun to arm, while Germany and its Axis allies, Italy and Japan, were equipped for great military and naval offensives. Nazi agents reported truthfully to Berlin that the people of Great Britain and the United States hated and dreaded war. Having been compelled to surrender to Hitler at Munich in September 1938, Great Britain and France, these Nazi agents reported, had not been able to turn their populations from the psychological path of peace-at-any-price.

The gambler's plan was to seize what he could while the game was running with him, until all the counters were in his hands and those of his partners. Against the event that the democracies at some point would resist, bringing on war, Hitler had prepared a timetable in concert with Italy. Each would strike at the most effective hour, crush Great Britain and France, and leave only Russia and the United States to be crushed later, after the entrance of Japan in the war.

But while these calculations were being made in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo, agents of the democracies were reporting to their governments the plan in detail, as this article will reveal. They were building up—accurately and forcefully—a body of information which would be employed to induce peace-loving peoples, powerfully and grimly, to enter upon the war they hoped to avoid, from which they shrank with loathing, and for which at the outset they were so disastrously unprepared.

When the events of June and July persuaded the heads of the British and French states that they could not allow Hitler to win his gamble and maintain either security or self-respect, they made a desperate effort to reverse their Soviet policy and effect an alliance with Moscow. In August a French-British military mission was hastily dispatched to the Russian capital with that end in view.

As the subsequent texts reveal, Russia, in deep fear of the Axis, indignant because it had been excluded from the abandonment at Munich of a Slav state, and desiring to turn the Germans westward while Soviet arms were made more powerful, seized on a pretext to sign a nonaggression pact with Hitler during the stay of the French-British mission in Moscow. This pretext, uttered repeatedly by Foreign Commissar Molotov to the British Ambassador, Sir William Seeds, was that Poland's obduracy and the empty-handedness of the allied mission left Russia with no recourse. Molotov's statement of this excuse to Ambassador Seeds will be found hereafter.

By the end of August Hitler's gamble brought him to the great decision and the bloody hazard. He stormed Poland, believing that the democracies, unprepared and hating war, would not stand by their pledge. They stood by it, and the greatest conflict of all time began in the first week of September, 4 years ago.

During this fateful period there were in the United States doubt, confusion, and conflict over the prospect of war in Europe.

The President and the Secretary of State were gloomily convinced that war was inevitable. A majority of those Members of Congress who controlled the legislative process with respect to foreign policy ranged from strong doubt to total disbelief.

On the night of July 19 the President summoned Senators of both parties from the list of the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss the outlook. His immediate purpose was to convince them that national security required repeal of a provision in the so-called Neutrality Act which laid an embargo on the export of munitions to any belligerent. It, with the other sections of the act, was a reflection of the isolationist philosophy then prevailing which was based on the premise that the way to stay out of war was to put a wall around the country, and on the further premise that such a wall would protect the United States from any consequence of foreign war, whoever the victors might be.

The President and his administration had yielded to this viewpoint for a long time insofar as policy is concerned. In his message that destroyed the London Economic Conference of 1933 Mr. Roosevelt had been an aggressive architect of the policy. But in words from 1936 forward—Secretary Hull having been the earliest to use them—the Nation had been steadily warned of the evil prospect and advised that the isolationist position meant ultimate peril. Yet no resolute effort to challenge the supposed majority sentiment of Congress in favor of isolation had been made until that directed against lifting the arms embargo.

At the White House conference the President and the Secretary sought to impress their hearers, who gathered in an upstairs study, that Europe was set for conflict. The President said he wanted another "shot to fire" in the interest of world peace and that repeal of the embargo and other changes in the Neutrality Act would supply him with "ammunition."

The Republican Senators argued with the President and Mr. Hull against the proposal. Senator WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont, a consistent supporter of the Executive foreign policy and a leader in preparedness measures, said that Congress had furnished this ammunition in increased appropriations for the Army and the Navy, and that if a crisis arose it could be dealt with then by calling a special session.

But, said the President and Mr. Hull, the idea is to avert the crisis by advance action. Whereupon a dramatic incident occurred.

Among those present was the late Senator William E. Borah of Idaho, an isolationist of World War vintage and before. Mr. Hull had been quoting from confidential reports sent to him by his agents in the field to support his conclusion that war in Europe was imminent. Mr. Borah bluntly challenged the accuracy—some thought the authenticity—of these reports. He said he had his own sources of information, that these were as good or better, and that their burden was Europe would not go to war.

What was the source of his information? He was asked repeatedly but in vain. The general belief is that the late Senator was relying on letters from public men—writers,

politicians out of office, and members of pacifist groups in Europe—with whom the wish was father to the thought.

Mr. Borah expressed his opinion of the State Department's reports in such terms that Mr. Hull took obvious offense. The conference ended after the Vice President, John N. Garner, polled those present on the President's proposal and said: "Cap'n (his name for Mr. Roosevelt), you see you haven't got the votes." The repeal plan was dropped, to be successfully revived—by trading cash-and-carry for the embargo—when the State Department's reports proved all too accurate and war came in September with Hitler's attack on Poland.

Now that the war which Mr. Borah said would not come has lasted 4 years, and surged over the United States in its suffusion of the surface of the planet, the time seems at hand for an inspection of the reports on which the President and Mr. Hull based their prophecy of things to come in July 1939. This correspondent has reconstructed the contents of some of the most important by plucking cogent phrases employed in them from the memories and records of officials who read and filed the reports as they were received.

Because much of the most important reporting was made by telephone and in direct letters to the President, the product is incomplete. Also, it is the synthesis of a very small portion of the official reports. Doubtless in the full file, which will not be published for many years, there are diplomatic dispatches with false conclusions and errors, and retractions of some of the material presented here.

But, partly textual, partly synthetic, yet close to the originals, there emerges the picture of an alert, well-informed foreign service and consequently a well-informed executive department during the period chosen for examination: from the end of March 1939, just after Hitler had seized the remainder of Czechoslovakia, to the hour when his airmen rained death and destruction on Poland. This period was chosen because in its very midst Senator Borah offered his challenge of that information.

Before the listening posts are monitored, however, two official reports serve to introduce the survey. One made in 1937 to Secretary Hull by George Messersmith, then Consul General to Berlin, now Ambassador to Mexico; the other a report in 1939 from Ambassador Kennedy in London.

Mr. Messersmith foretold the dismal future in the following words—an extract from a long report dated October 11, 1937, following a long inspection of conditions.

"The crux of the major problem which concerns the world and ourselves is still Germany. If there were a reasonable German Government in power we could negotiate with them a settlement of the far eastern and Mediterranean questions as well as those in Europe. Much deeper than a conflict between the haves and the havenot nations is a basic clash of ideologies. If dangerous compromises continue to be made, a catastrophic war is the sole possible outcome.

"The final aim of the three dictatorships under the subtle leadership of the present Government of Germany is the disintegration of the British Empire, the consequent weakening of England and Europe, and the opening of a way to attack the United States. These conclusions are based upon first-hand conversations with major leaders of the German Government who have made no secret of her attempt. They are playing on the fear of war in the democracies and the lack of unity of action among them."

For almost 2 years thereafter the responsible political leaders in the democracies bent to that fear of war on which the Nazis were openly counting. They shrank from the candid speech and the preparedness in arms that might have prevented war. In the United States this counsel produced the antiwar pledges of the 1940 Presidential candidates which maintained in this Nation illusions of security even while the Nazis were swallowing Europe.

The basis of policy was Lord Baldwin's: "Otherwise, we would have been voted out of power."

The fruits of this policy were the enforced surrender at Munich and the long, costly, and bloody march of the democracies—with Britain long marching alone—to a position of offense.

On March 24, 1939, Ambassador Kennedy had been talking with Viscount Halifax, the British Foreign Secretary, and his dispatch was a report of that conversation, of which the following is a summary:

Lord Halifax believed that Poland was of more value to the democratic tie-up than Russia because his information showed the Russian air force to be very weak, old, and short-ranged, the army poor, and its industrial backing frightful. [So did our own information and that procured by the agents of France, Germany, and Italy.] The most that could be expected from Russia, assuming that Russia wanted to be of help, would be some ammunition to Poland in the event of trouble, and Lord Halifax thought it possible that Rumania might join with Poland in a fight against Germany.

Britain, he said, was turning out nearly 600 planes a month, with the output increasing. The Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, had ordered the British Fleets mobilized if reports Lord Halifax had been receiving were confirmed—these reports being that German divisions had been called to the western front. But confirmation was still lacking.

"I told Halifax," cabled the Ambassador, "That I thought when Britain and France tested the assurances of Poland—and possibly those of Rumania and Russia also—it would be obvious they didn't amount to much.

"Halifax favored laying down a line for Germany and anouncing that the war would be on if Germany crossed that line. Halifax is convinced that war is inevitable sooner or later anyhow.

"He said the cabinet is with him in laying down a line for Germany and expressed hope that the Germans would break away from Hitler in the event of war. * * * I think Halifax has decided that unlike last year, the British are now more fearful of tyranny than of war."

In that period there was doubt of Russia's policy, and strong support of a French-British strategy that would put Russia beyond the line mentioned by Lord Halifax. This was based on the hope that, if Russia were excluded from the reserved territory, Hitler would feel free to carry out the reasoning of Mein Kampf and attack the Soviet instead of Poland. Nazi-ism and communism, it was argued, would then destroy each other.

The British Foreign Minister and the American Ambassador reviewed this argument in their conversation.

With the above utterances as preface, we come to the end of March 1939, and a dispatch from Paris to Mr. Hull by Ambassador William C. Bullitt. Reconstructed by the processes described above, the following is the heart of the dispatch:

"The invasion of Czechoslovakia ends definitely all possibility of diplomatic negotiation. Nothing remains but to develop as much armed force as possible, as rapidly as possible, to await the day when Germany and Italy will strike against France and England.

"This day may arrive as early as the 20th of the month (April). It is thought that Mussolini may first seize Albania (he did so on April 7) or advance on Djibouti. The French troops at Djibouti will resist and war will result not only in Africa but also in Europe.

"Hitler wants Mussolini—whether he advances in Albania or elsewhere—to adjourn action until after he should have reduced Hungary and Rumania to the positions of vassal states. But it is not believed that Mussolini will wait (he did not). The Poles will fight if they are attacked but Soviet Russia will not help them."

Events soon bore out this experienced look into the immediate future. It was further validated the next day when Consul Howard Bucknell reported from Geneva that "in the opinion of diplomats and others" at the headquarters of the League of Nations "the seizure of Czechoslovakia by Hitler makes war almost inevitable" and is "considered Hitler's first great mistake."

But when would Hitler be ready to start the war in Europe? One answer came April 8 from Berlin where Raymond H. Geist was in charge of the Embassy in the absence of Ambassador Wilson. "Unusual military preparations are going on here," he reported, "but they are not sufficiently advanced to warrant taking decisive action at once against Poland. Albania (Mussolini had already anticipated his Axis partner's plans) was invaded several days prior to the date set in concert by the Germans and the Italians."

The bellicose picture was growing plainer and plainer. "Danzig now bears even closer watching as a potential volcanic spot," was the warning addressed to the Secretary from Warsaw by Ambassador A. J. D. Biddle, Jr., on May 1. "The grim prospect calls for no let-up on our part in armament, conscription, and reinforcement of antiaggression pacts."

No warning could have been plainer, no advice more sound. But months were to pass before it even began to be heeded in Washington by those responsible for the Nation's armament, food, export stock piles, manpower, and transportation.

The clouds gathered and darkened steadily, and on May 3 Chargé Geist reported the development of the German plan. A military coup against Poland, he cabled, would come either in the next 2 weeks or at the end of 4 months. "Just before it Danzig and the Polish Corridor will be demanded."

Ambassador Kennedy saw Lord Halifax again on June 7 and reported that the Foreign Secretary was finding "the Russian situation growing a bit mysterious" and was sending a Foreign Office man to Moscow. The foreign secretary's belief was that if he could get Molotov to sit around a table, all his arguments could be answered.

"But I think," wrote Mr. Kennedy, "the suspicion is beginning to dawn on the British that Russia may be taking them up a very dark road."

Mr. Kennedy found Lord Halifax uncertain "where Hitler would jump," and convinced that the Germans were beginning to believe Hitler's propaganda of encirclement. Since Hitler would not see Sir Nevile Henderson, British Ambassador to Berlin, the foreign secretary was thinking of sending Lord Derby or some other German-speaking Briton "on a vacation or a botany expedition to find out on what basis Hitler would talk turkey. I think something must break soon."

The Ambassador learned from the Foreign Secretary that Mussolini had told the Ambassador in Rome there seemed "no sense in keeping on with the Anglo-Italian agreement" after the British had made one with Turkey; and London had dispatched a firm note to Mussolini that his point was not well taken, but if he wished to cancel the Anglo-Italian agreement "that was his look-out."

The pair talked of a recent speech by Dino Grandi, Italian Ambassador to London, which was viciously Fascist and how Grandi had told Halifax he was obliged to make the speech to regain his high party position, which had been damaged at home but now was restored. The Fascist leaders, said Grandi to Halifax, had taken great care to have his speech published.

"Halifax says the most serious situation," the report went on, "is the unwillingness of the French to treat with the Spanish and Italians. He had taken it up with Daladier,

Premier of France, and got no satisfaction. So he had suggested to the Prime Minister to remind Daladier that while England and France were urging a conference to settle European differences, France was refusing to try to settle those that concerned her." Halifax said that Franco, the Spanish Dictator, is getting fed up with the French and that he may be driven into the Axis according to Mr. Kennedy, who continued:

"I think that Halifax realizes that they, the French and the British, are still putting coal into an engine that is not going any place, but they are just keeping it up because there doesn't seem to be anything else to do."

The summer advanced, and on July 26 Mr. Biddle, at Warsaw, relayed the details of the German plan of operations and of the German terms by which war could be avoided—terms which Mr. Hull knew were unthinkable for acceptance either in Washington or in London.

Mr. Biddle cabled that he had just finished talking with the Turkish Ambassador who had been assigned to Tokyo. The Turk was fresh from a conversation with Marshal Smigly-Rydz, chief of the Polish armed forces, who thought the war chances for 1939 were 60 percent (the Turk told Mr. Biddle they were, in his opinion, 65 percent). Mr. Biddle conveyed the sense of a higher percentage, reporting as follows:

"The German plan is to attack Poland with 1,000 planes in flights of 100 at a time, 20 minutes apart, and destroy airports, railway stations, bridges, telephones, telegraph and radio centers in that order. I believe this information passed on by the Turkish Ambassador came from the German military attaché in Warsaw.

"Danzig, from the German standpoint, serves Berlin in its game with London like a button connected with a high voltage line leading into London. When Berlin wants to stir up the jitters in London it presses the button and hopes the high voltage charge may succeed in shaking loose London's grasp on the objects of Berlin's larger aspirations—colonial concessions, priority in the Balkans, new financial accommodations, and a settlement of Italy's claims against France."

The forecast of the German plan of attack on Poland was borne out. Dispatches to this newspaper, dated September 1 and 2, related that the Germans proceeded systematically on those very lines.

Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me last night in Philadelphia on the subject of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union before the American-Soviet Friendship Meeting at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, Pa., in celebration of the tenth anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On June 22, 1941, Adolf Hitler, after due consultation with his intuitions, took the plunge into the deepest military quagmire known to modern man. It was a proud army which he sent on that day into Soviet Russia—though not too proud to follow the prescribed Axis pattern of the treacherous sneak punch in violation of past agreements.

At that time we in America heard the prediction of certain home-grown experts on international affairs—the prediction that Hitler's war machine would crush the Red Army—and I quote—within 2 months. Unquote.

It has been a long 2 months.

I am not one of those experts. But I welcome, along with millions of other Americans, the opportunity which this occasion offers, just after the most triumphant of all missions to Moscow, to look back over the inspiring record of our gallant ally in war, and to look ahead to the no less inspiring certainty that she will be our ally in peace.

The tradition of friendship between these two great nations, the United States and the U. S. S. R., dates back years beyond the attacks which have made us warring allies. And events of the last few days, the signal victories that have been achieved both on the battlefield and at the council table, are enough in themselves to fill our hearts with gratitude to our own national leadership which, a decade ago, committed our country to the recognition of and the establishment of firm friendship with the Soviet Union.

The character of that recognition was realistic, as has been the character of dealings between these two Nations ever since—and as we feel both confident and gratified that they will continue to be. For realism, which has never sat well among the myths of Berchtesgaden nor attended the hemispheric pipe dreams of Tokyo, is the very substance and lifeblood of a lasting friendship among nations.

For its own good reasons, especially collective security and aid in its own industrialization, the Soviet Union sought collaboration with us. And for our own reasons, our foresighted suspicion of possible trouble with Japan, and also for the give and take of commerce in prospect, we welcomed that collaboration.

On November 18, 1933, 2 days after the reestablishment of diplomatic relations, President Roosevelt summed up the matter by declaring that the impelling motive of the Soviet-American conversations was—I quote—"the desire of both countries for peace and for the strengthening of the peaceful purposes of the civilized world."

That desire still lives. Through the ordeal of fire, through the hour of mounting doubt as the aggressor made his terrible bid for supremacy, it turned from desire to an unshakable resolve. Today, as the armies of four great power score triumph after triumph over the breaking ranks of that same enemy, it turns from resolve to certainty.

As one of the terms under which diplomatic relationship was reestablished, the Soviet Government undertook to "respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way." Among other promises both parties to the agreement were pledged to refrain from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention. This latter has been regarded by many specialists in international law as equivalent to a pledge of nonaggression.

Both nations have lived up to their word. And the accord which was entered 10 years ago by men and peoples of good will has, in peace and in war, brought forth a harvest in these intervening years many times richer than either party could have foreseen.

What momentous years they have been. They have brought us, here in America, through the passing of an old, an outworn set of traditions and practices, and into the path that leads our people toward a greater share in the "four freedoms." We have witnessed, in those years, a vast resurgence of the democratic spirit, a renascence so insistent that total war, world war, cannot permanently hold it in check.

In that renewal of hope for the common man, the Soviet Union and the United States have worked and marched side by side. Today, with Great Britain, China, and their other allies, they are fighting side by side. Lest anyone doubt the program of action of our Soviet ally, let me quote from an address by the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, given on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the October revolution. I quote:

"The program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is: Abolition of racial exclusiveness; equality of nations and integrity of their territories; liberation of the enslaved nations and the restoration of their sovereign rights; the right of every nation to manage its affairs in its own way; economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance in establishing their material welfare; restoration of democratic liberties; and destruction of the Hitler regime."

During the 10 years of our good neighborhood with the Soviet Union we have mutually lived up to other obligations. Long before the inception of the lend-lease program—before there was need of that—America was supplying goods and services and the skills of men to help speed our neighbor's tremendous program of industrialization. Our engineers helped to build the great dams, the power projects and the factories, helped set up the originals after which others, dotting the vast expanse of the Soviet Union, were modeled. And in business as in political commitments, the Russians have kept their word. No nation's credit has been better than that of Soviet Russia.

It was fitting that there should have evolved this meeting of minds, this recognition of mutual purposes, between the United States and the Soviet Union. Behind it there had been a long tradition of friendship—again based solidly on the realism that some care to call self-interest, but which, among nations, is the only tradition of friendship which has any real insurance value.

There are many of these practical, down-to-earth common denominators, the most striking, of course, being the fact that these great powers are the world's two dominant continental nations. There is more in this than geography. For this kind of geography overlaps into and vitally affects the thinking, the planning of these nations for the future of their peoples. The Russians, like us, must do everything in a big way. They have gone into the vast stretches of Siberia, through the forests, their great mountains and long rivers, much as we swashbuckled into the frontier of our great West. Even when they stage a Stalingrad, they stage a good big one, bagging Nazi troops by the hundreds of thousands, and not failing to come home with everybody from field marshals on down.

This way of thinking, of doing, draws us together. It is no mere coincidence that in every great international crisis that we Americans have had to face over the past hundred years, the Russians have always turned up at our side.

It was no accident of history, therefore, that during the Civil War, at a time when relationships of the Union with powers outside its borders were in a particularly shaky

state, the Russian Fleet appeared in New York Harbor. It was no accident that when other powers were reaching out for the Hawaiian Islands toward the close of the last century, Russia, through instructions sent to her Ambassador at Washington, advised our Government that she would look with favor on American acquisition of the islands, and, in giving us this assurance of her attitude, strengthened our own determination to add this vital defense outpost.

When Russia sold Alaska to us—not for love but for money and for common-sense practicality—she knew that in relinquishing her only territory in the Western Hemisphere she would be in no way endangering herself, but, on the contrary, adding to her own and our safety. It is 10 minutes by air from American territory to Soviet Russia. On a clear summer day an American, standing on the shore of the Bering Straits, can see the faint blue outlines of Russian mountains on the Asiatic Continent.

Across that narrow strip of water the bond has been one of good living together, cooperation in respect to the business and commerce of the North Pacific, peaceful conduct of the fishery and the sealing industry, and the building up of a long tradition of good will.

The recognition of Russia in 1933 was a wholesome and fitting revival of that tradition. Within 10 years we have seen it grow, until, under stress of attack by a common enemy, it has come to magnificent fruition in a relationship that goes deeper than the ties of geography or commerce, more meaningful than the mere coexistence of neighbors at peace. This newer, more intimate relationship is certain to continue and to grow. The Moscow conference is only one expression of it. There will be others—in action as well as in words.

Of course, this growth has not been free of opposition, of set-backs, of all sorts of hazards. All along the way, it has run into the constant need of public education. And we have among us today—particularly in the remaining hard cores of isolationism—those who cling to their suspicions, their prejudices, their frayed and shoddy weave of outworn fears, their tall tales of the Red bogeyman.

Herr Goebbels is not unaware of the presence among us of this bogey brigade. Up until a few days ago he believed the game was still worth playing—the effort to reach them with anguished warnings of the "coming bolshevization of Europe." When the results of the Moscow conference were made known, that game was up.

But while diplomatic missions can act in good faith and act quickly, divisive fear and studied hate do not vanish overnight. The minorities that have nursed these fears, this bias, have been at work a long time. In his book Mission to Moscow, Ambassador Joseph Davies said:

"What if Stalin defeats Hitler? Will not communism then sweep Europe? Hitler stooges have been trying to frighten us into the belief that communism will destroy our form of government if the Soviet Union defeats Hitler. That is just plain bunk. It is bad medicine. It is as unintelligent as it is unpatriotic and un-American."

Over and above its value as an instrument of common accord, I believe and hope the Moscow Conference will prove of needful service in speeding along this public education. I do not expect the career isolationists to give up their unsavory work as a result of it. But I do not see how they can well answer the compact point if they are confronted with it. Their fears all look to the future and ignore the past. Certainly none of the nations signatory to that compact can present a more convincing exhibit of evidence of good intention, based on the record since Hitler went on the march, or even since the last World War, than can Russia.

Let us glance back, then, over that record, and examine the basis of the Soviet Union's claim to good faith in once again espousing the cause of collective security against aggression. This nation, which, we must remember, was not admitted to the League of Nations until Germany withdrew in 1934, sent Maxim Litvinov as its representative in the council of the League. On March 17, 1936, Litvinov told the council:

"We are for internation agreement which would not only fortify the present mainstays of peace, but would if possible set up new ones. We are for participation in such an agreement of all countries desirous of doing so. But we are opposed to granting to a state withdrawing from the League of Nations, grossly violating international treaties and engaged in sword rattling, the privilege of dictating to all Europe its conditions of negotiation. I declare on behalf of my government that it is ready to take part in all measures that may be proposed to the council of the League by the Locarno Powers and will be acceptable to the other members of the council."

In July of 1936, Litvinov told the League:

"If I say all this in the interest of strengthening peace, I cannot do otherwise than mention the measure which the Soviet Union has always considered the maximum guaranty of peace, I mean complete disarmament. But while this radical measure is in abeyance, all we can do is to strengthen the League of Nations as an instrument of peace. To strengthen the League of Nations is to abide by the principle of collective security. We must recognize that at the present time there is not one state, large or small, that is not open to aggression, and that even if the next war spares one state or another, she must, sooner or later, attract the longing eyes of the victorious aggressor."

On March 17, 1938, after Austria had been invaded and while Czechoslovakia was threatened, Litvinov told the foreign press correspondents:

"I can say on behalf of the government that, on its part, it is ready as before to join in collective actions which, decided jointly with it, would have the purpose of arresting further development of aggression. It agrees to proceed immediately to discuss practical measures, dictated by circumstances, with other powers in the League of Nations or outside it. Tomorrow may be too late, but today there is time yet, if all states, particularly great states, take up a firm, unambiguous standpoint on the problem of the collective salvation of peace."

Of such does the record consist. Can we show a better one? Can any other nation on earth now come forward with the record of its efforts to avert war, and offer better proof of its intentions for the future, in the form of actions of the past? In the preface to his biography of Litvinov, Arthur Upham Pope includes this paragraph:

"One thing is clear—the statesmanship of the last 30 years is bankrupt. It was powerless to stay the disaster that all feared. The foreign offices which demanded to be let alone to arrange affairs as they saw fit can no longer request, 'Leave it to us.' Their policy of appeasement led straight to catastrophe, a lesson too slowly learned."

When the foreign policy of Russia, under the stress of threatened attacks from two sides, took on the color of isolation, it was hardly the becoming part for American accusers to point out the beam in her eye. Surely we had a visible note in our own.

What was the character of that involuntary isolation into which the Soviet Union took last resort after her best efforts at collaboration and collective security were coolly set at nothing by her reluctant neighbors? Why did her foreign policy take a new direction from Munich?

Suppose that where the Pacific washes the shores of California, there was more dry land, enough land to support a compact nation of some 80,000,000 people. Suppose that nation was made up of people who despised us, regarded us as barbarians, and—last but not least—would like very much to grab our land and enslave our people. Suppose that nation began preparing itself to do just that.

Then suppose, off the shores of our Atlantic States, there lay a string of islands, on which lived other millions, another compact nation, with pretty much the same ideas about us, and with a record of past treachery matching perfectly the attack on Pearl Harbor. Suppose this nation was also getting ready.

I suspect that under those circumstances we would be the world's greatest advocates of collective security. And I suspect further that if our appeals for collective security were to fall on the deaf ears of Soviet Russia on the one side and Britain and continental Europe on the other, we, too, would begin to display a certain noticeable degree of defensive isolation.

Against one of her enemies, the one on her western frontier, Hitler, the whole world knows and honors the magnificent victories of the Russians and their unrelenting determination with us to destroy utterly the military and war-making power of that enemy. That will free one Russian frontier from the ever-constant menace of another sneak attack.

But some ask, What about Russia's enemy on her eastern boundary? Will she help, when Hitler is crushed, Britain, China, the Dutch, and us to destroy the evil common enemy Tojo and his international bandit gang? Remember that it was the Japanese Navy, which on February 8, 1904, without a declaration of war, without offense or justification, opened fire upon the Russian Navy at Port Arthur and began the Russo-Japanese war by the same dastardly kind of an attack with which she launched this war upon us at Pearl Harbor. You would not suppose that Russia has forgotten that. Nor would one believe that when Russia with us has an opportunity to eliminate that ever-constant menace to her security in the East that she will pass it by. It is safe always to read national policy in terms of national interest. Japan and Russia have been enemies at least through this century. They still are enemies, and I have no doubt that when Russia feels that when one frontier is safe, that she will turn her mighty strength toward establishing an equal safety and security for the other in the East. For none of us, you know, and that includes the Germans as well as the British and ourselves, like to fight a war on two fronts at the same time when we can help it. It is almost always necessary, at least, to concentrate upon and to emphasize war on one front, if it is to be well fought.

Now from Moscow comes one of the greatest and heartening declarations of our time. We cannot suppress a great pride in what our aged but active and honorable Secretary of State has accomplished in the name of our country. He comes home to read gratitude in a Nation's admiring eyes. And he brings to his fellow countrymen assurances and solemn promises about a great many things which have been the occasion of honest concern to some, and the fuel for prejudicial and partisan fire for others. Nobody can read the Moscow Declaration without a new certainty in victory for the United Nations' cause, without new confidence that the victory we win this time shall not go with the evil wind. Listen to this joint declaration of Russia, Britain, China, and ourselves:

"1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the

organization and maintenance of peace and security.

"2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

"3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

"4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states—states large and small—for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

"6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

"7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with the other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the postwar period."

While we are fighting the war we are laying the structual foundations of the peace for which we fight. These four national cornerstones are great enough and mighty enough, indeed, to hold up like a new atlas, a new world.

We in the Senate by the accord of all who are not still chained by the sentiment of isolation, have agreed upon a Senate declaration which specifically incorporates point number 4 of the Moscow Declaration, which of the seven point is the pivotal one on postwar organization. It is the intention of the Senate to echo the sentiments of the Moscow Declaration, to give assurance to our cosigners of that new charter of a new world that America has at last rid and purged itself of the virus of isolation and it stands today a stalwart protector of world peace—one who will do its honorable and great part to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare of mankind.

Yet my fellow Americans, this pledge of the Senate can be kept only if it is guaranteed by a public opinion which will never allow it once to waiver. Our constitutional requirement that treaties be ratified by two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting in the Senate when the vote is had, in a country like ours of many religions, many races, of intense political partisanship, of many emotional and economic stresses and strains, is a precarious foundation for any sustained and forthright foreign policy by our Government.

It would seem only fair to say that if the Senate is to insist upon its prerogative, which the Constitution clearly gives it, to be the final arbiter of American foreign policy, that that prerogative must be exercised before treaties are made as well as afterward.

Surely the Senate can ill afford to say that however many nations may gather together in common counsel, however momentous may be the issues that they decide, however delicate may be the equilibrium which wise statesmanship and common-sense compromise may bring about, however great the need for haste in reaching international accord may be, that the Senate may comfortably sit by and see all of such a great drama relatively unmoved, and then in due course when the document is presented as a formal instrument, as the curtain of the conference falls, bring it under the dissecting scrutiny of the Senate and subject it to the legislative technique in the Senate which provides for leisurely consideration, protracted hearings, unlimited debate, and finally the requirement of a two-thirds majority for ratification, without taking very great and dangerous responsibility.

I might as well say, my friends, that I do not believe that the present senatorial power of ratification is consistent with the national safety or world peace. A technique which might well have applied to bilateral treaties of moment only to the contracting parties is no longer adequate or effective as was proved in what the Senate did to the Treaty of Versailles, to treaties signed by one or two score of nations, which set up world settlement and which alone are the vehicles of world welfare and world peace.

Surely, the requirements of our system of checks and balances would give the people adequate safeguard against Executive action in the making of treaties, if the power of ratification were given to a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House of Representatives, and if each body by a majority vote had authority to fix the time when the final vote upon ratification or not should occur. This would take away from a third of the Senators present and voting, maybe as few as 17 Senators in the Senate, the power to shatter the hope of the world. It would take away from 12 Senators, constituting a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, the power to thwart the plaintive appeal of the Nation and the mute call of the dead. It would deprive perhaps a lesser number, who might constitute a subcommittee, of the clutch which might choke world hope and aspiration.

In this great Nation where democracy stands, thank God, still secure against every onslaught and attack, where the people are sovereign in power, the people must also bear the heavy weight of responsibility for the conduct and the course of their country. We must not only will the kind of a world which our gallant fighting men and all who have sacrificed with them deserve, we must in the democratic way find the means through which to build that world. It is not enough to profess democracy. It is not enough even to save it. We must make democracy work at home and abroad.

Let the people, therefore, search out every danger to the kind of a world they want, whether it be prejudice, ignorance, shortsightedness, or whether it be techniques outmoded and outworn which might deprive the victors of their just gains, might make futile and main all that they have given, whether of treasure or of blood.

My fellow Americans, as you have today commemorated a great friendship with a great people, go out to make that public opinion which shall keep that friendship and, better, deserve it; and go out, my fellow Americans, to your other great tasks which beckon and challenge you; and walk firmly and thoughtfully as you go, for you must know that it is history which follows after you.

A Triumphant Homecoming for Mr. Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Triumphant Homecoming for Mr. Hull," written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of November 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIUMPHANT HOMECOMING FOR MR. HULL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 4.—The willingness of the Senate to adopt as its own that part of the Declaration of Moscow which must take treaty form to become the living postwar foreign policy of the United States arose from several causes. Point 4 is a statement of what has been proved to be the wish and hope of the American people, and this was most influential on the Senate, without whose participation the paragraph is mere language. But the fact that Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, stood behind it played a profoundly important part.

Throughout the long period in which Mr. Hull and the Department of State have been assailed by critics with audiences ranging from local to international, Congress has maintained its trust in the wisdom, ability, high-mindedness, and liberalism of the Secretary. This was especially true of the Senate, where he was a most respected Member Though many others share credit for the remarkable progress of the effort to achieve American political unity on international policy, none was so effective an advocate on Capitol Hill as Mr. Hull. Since the Senate must ratify any treaties by which this unity will become a pledge to the world, the unmatched and sustained trust the Senate reposes in the Secretary has been a major factor.

This confidence that Mr. Hull will at all times stand firmly behind the constitutional process, and countenance no clever evasions others may devise, was illustrated again yesterday in a minor instance. Someone had fathered a news story that under international law the Declaration of Moscow could be carried out by Presidential action, as was the exchange arrangement of destroyers and bases with Great Britain. Quickly the word passed that, if the Senate should approve any of the declaration, that would amount to blanket advance endorsement of treaties concluded by the Executive with other nations. But the moment a State Department representative known to be close to Mr. Hull repudiated the publication the flurry subsided.

A REJUVENATED DEPARTMENT

The Secretary will return from his triumphant errand to a Capital anxious to do him honor. In honoring him the President and Congress will also be honoring themselves, for the former has sustained him when a choice between the Secretary and his critics was required, and the latter indicated it never understood why the necessity to make a choice ever was permitted to arise.

In his own Department the Secretary will find something of a new atmosphere. It was impossible to expect any set of public officials to remain happy under the organized barrage that for so long was hurled at Mr. Hull and his chief administrators. And doubts must have been sown even in their minds that they and their chief were functioning with the ability and public devotion which must be brought to their tasks.

For months they read and heard that they were a group of secret lovers of fascism, hoodwinking a senile and unworldly old gentleman in easy treatment of the enemies of democracy and the attempted assassins of western civilization. For months they read and heard that, in the top ranks of the Department, only Sumner Welles possessed competence to deal with diplomatic problems and liberalism truly representative of his

fellow citizens. For months they heard and read that their chief was narrow and provincial, a reactionary, anti-Russian regardless of the matter in hand, senescent and too feeble to perform the duties demanded by his office and by the times (though the more elderly Mr. Stimson was coevally held up as the model Cabinet member).

It was dinned into their ears that men like Robert Murphy, whom they had believed to be among their best, were failures or worse and must be recalled lest they do irretrievable damage. Over and over again they read that men like Assistant Secretary Breckenridge Long were dealing with the refugee quotas in the spirit of bigotry, though he was merely carrying out the President's policy and the laws passed by Congress.

CHARTS OF MOSCOW

When the Secretary made the two profound and responsible addresses, in which he outlined with authority the post-war world he hoped to have a part in achieving, he was attacked as dull, wordy, and a merchant of threadbare goods. Livelier speeches, which could be more entertaining because they lacked his responsibility, were hailed as the stuff that was really needed and could not be furnished by so pedestrian a mind as his.

Yet those two speeches by the Secretary took form in much that was agreed on at Moscow. And the agreement was in part the result of the new attitude of Congress which Mr. Hull was able to report to the conferees and which he had an important part in creating.

Now that these facts are coming into general acceptance with the news from Moscow, the Department personnel is rejuvenated through the personal triumph of the Secretary. It needs new blood, some amputations, and a general synchronization with the world as it is and will be. But those under Mr. Hull who have been responsible for the Department never merited any more than he did most of the attacks made upon them.

The Fighting South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'The Fighting South'—A Good Book for Americans" from the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHTING SOUTH—A GOOD BOOK FOR AMERICANS

John Temple Graves, editor of the Birmingham Age-Herald and daily columnist for the Times-Union, has given America in his new book, The Fighting South, a volume that will make of every American who reads it a better citizen, and every southerner a more loyal advocate of his native land.

With rare skill, Mr. Graves has drawn from his full knowledge and thorough understanding of the South and the country as a whole, the material for his book and cleverly woven it into an accurate, entertaining, and instructive story that will make every southern reader proud of his homeland, and at the same time inspire him to put forth greater efforts toward making it a still more alluring section of America.

The author has made no effort to hide the weaknesses and faults of the South. He boldly points them out—the handling of the racial problem, the economic drawback created by the tenant farmer and the sharecropper, the too ready acquiescence of southerners in the exploitation of their resources by outsiders, the soils whose richness has gone down the gullies into streams and on to the deltas and lowlands, and many others.

He shows how these things became a part of the South and suggests ways and means to remedy them.

But for every such black spot against the South Mr. Graves paints two or more bright ones, the obvious result being a completed picture that reveals this section of America as one of great charm and desirability. It is not the booster type of picture in the ordinary sense, but one of refinement and rare attractiveness. He begins with the beginning, leads the reader gently and entertainingly through the decades up to the present era, and then places before him an alluring vision of what the future promises.

The South he holds up to view is one whose "variety goes to America's spice. Its extremes cartoon a nation. Its high lights advertise, its low ones warn. Its poverties and racial troubles ask for answers that must be made for a world entire. Its tradition, lodged in fact or southern fancy, has ideals for our future if the future is to be brave. Its sicknesses are the mendable ones of the immature. Its health is a stone from which may be chiseled something near the heart's desire. And its fighting, for the good thing or the bad, speaks of nature's law and the dream of enterprise."

That is why he says his "book about the South is a book about the United States and its years to come."

It is a book that will influence the thinking of all who read it, and the influence will be for good. Which is to say that Mr. Graves has served his native South and all of America well by writing "The Fighting South."

Address to Graduates of Officers' Candidate School by Justice Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 21st of August, last, an eminent former Member of the Senate, and now a member of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Hugo Black, delivered a very notable address to the graduating members of the officers' candidate school, Miami Beach, Fla. The occasion included the graduation of the son of Justice Black, Lt. Sterling Black.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Justice Black, together with a very fitting and eloquent statement of introduction by a brother of a distinguished Member of this body, Lt. Col. Luther L. Hill, Chief of Staff, fifth district, Army Air Forces Technical Training Command, at Miami, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and the introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF MR. JUSTICE HUGO BLACK BY COL. LUTHER L. HILL, CHIEF OF STAFF, FIFTH DISTRICT, ARMY AIR FORCES TECHNICAL TRAINING COMMAND, AT OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL GRADUATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., AUGUST 21, 1943

General Krogstad, Colonel Storck, guests, and members of this command, there are a few men who are living symbols of our American democracy. Our guest speaker is one of this select company.

Born in north Alabama, he knew, as a young man, what he wanted to do—to be a lawyer and play an honorable part in the affairs of the State and Nation.

As a lawyer, he was eminently successful. Upon our entry into World War No. 1, our speaker immediately entered the Army and attended a school very similar to our own officer candidate school. At the end of the war, he had risen to the rank of captain in the Field Artillery.

The people of his State, recognizing his ability and sincerity, called upon him to serve two terms in the Senate of the United States.

In 1937, our guest was appointed Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court—the highest recognition of his profession.

Our speaker has two sons; today, both are in the military service, and one, as many of you know, is a member of your class. Our speaker has a deep personal interest in you.

Gentlemen, it is a long, yes, a very long way from the red clay hills of Alabama to the Supreme Court of the United States. A courageous and forward-looking mind, a stout and "never say die" heart have carried our speaker the entire distance and, what is more important, as he traveled the road, he added to the welfare and happiness of the American people—Justice Hugo L. Black.

ADDRESS OF HON. HUGO BLACK

Your inspiring program brings to me the thought that 26 years ago this month I left civilian life and entered an officers' candidate school. I well remember that, after 3 months' hard work there, what I wanted was not a long speech, but my commission and my orders to move on to active duty as an officer. These memories admonish me to be brief in what I say. You will, I am sure, be happy to know that this admonition will be heeded and that, so far as I am concerned, you can take your oath of office and get your commission within 10 minutes from now.

Your presence as members of this graduating class is proof that your selection as candidates was wise and that you possess that tenacity and preliminary knowledge upon which efficiency in military action is based. It would certainly not be appropriate for me, a civilian, to seek to give military instruction to you who have successfully passed through this school. Your determination to acquit yourselves honorably and bravely as American soldiers is in your own hearts, and the inspiration you give me is far more than any I can hope to give you. I shall, therefore, confine myself to a discussion of what we are fighting for.

To understand why this Nation fights, we must understand the hopes and ambitions of our citizens of today and tomorrow. Unlike the soldiers of our enemies, you are citizen soldiers steeped in the philosophy of a democratic society dedicated to liberty, equality, and justice. Up to this time your careers have not been military. Recently drawn from the paths of peaceful life, most of you, when military victory is won, will eagerly return to the life you have only temporarily left. You have accepted Army discipline, not as an end, but as a means to an end—and

that end is the resumption of a life in which you shape your own plans and decisions and carry them out freely so long as you do not infringe upon the liberties of your neighbor. The temporary surrender of some of your civilian freedom to accomplish a military victory is to the end that you may have a permanent and even more abounding freedom.

It is not by chance that our country entrusts its wartime fate to citizen soldiers rather than to a large standing army. The founders of our Government planned it just that way. They had fought in the Revolutionary War not for the false glory of conquest, but for the true glory of the right to establish a government devoted to the promotion of life, liberty, and happiness. •They believed that if war ever became necessary to protect this government of peace, the citizens would have a fighting faith which would make them unconquerable. History has proved, and is now proving again, that the founders were right. We do have this fighting faith. It is making us unconquerable.

Defeat of the enemy, however, will be but an episode in our continuing struggle for a better, fuller, more secure life for the average citizen—what our forefathers called life, liberty, and happiness. Our country, both now and when victorious, must face the questions of peace, and must face them inspired by the same faith that will carry us to the total defeat of the enemy on the battlefield. There are men who do not have this fighting faith, timid men who are ruled by an unreasoning fear of change. They say that periodic economic depressions, unemployment, poverty, economic insecurity, special privilege, and inequality are ordained by inexorable natural laws. In effect, they say that, try as hard as we may, we cannot make it possible for every man to provide himself with a decent home of his own, plenty of good nourishing food, necessary medical treatment, and the ordinary comforts essential to a happy life. These timid persons have counterparts who assert that since we have always had war, a peaceful world is impossible. In other words, they suggest that there is a divine decree that men must kill each other. But there are still other persons who refuse to subscribe to these defeatist doctrines, who insist that man was created for happiness, not misery; for life, not untimely death on a battlefield; and that wars can be prevented by international cooperative efforts. I suspect that returning soldiers who have won a war with new and revolutionary weapons and techniques will be little impressed by the statements of the timid that "These things cannot be done, because they never have been done."

The extent of your peacetime responsibilities as citizens will not discourage you, I am sure, any more than your military assignments have discouraged you. That my generation and its predecessors have failed to achieve fully all of the lofty objectives of our Government is no valid argument that you and your successors cannot do better. The men who fought the Revolution were not frightened by the unprecedented task of creating a unified, peacetime, representative government for 13 jealous and diverse States. They believed that certain evils existed in old patterns of society, that certain governmental practices blocked the way to human happiness; and, in spite of the protests of timid traditionalists, they preserved what they thought was good, and abandoned what they thought was bad.

At the same time, they set the stage for necessary future changes when they guaranteed Americans freedom of thought and expression. With freedom of expression, the right of the ballot, and an educated citizenry, goals toward which we come ever nearer, our people have the complete confidence that their Government will continue to serve their needs no matter how greatly these needs may change from time to time. This belief, that we are on our way to the satisfaction of human needs through common effort, gives each American his fighting faith.

But it will not be enough for us to attack the problems of peace at home. Peace problems, like those of war, must be attacked both at home and abroad. We have learned from bitter experience that the interdependence of the nations of the world is more than a theory; it is a vital fact which affects the lives of every one of us. The lessons which wars and depressions have taught is that if we want peace, prosperity, and happiness at home we must help establish it abroad. Surely it is time to face this fact and, divesting ourselves of deep-rooted fears and prejudices, act with a boldness and intelligence befitting Americans.

What I have said today is not a suggestion that we citizens who remain at home can or should throw all the responsibilities of Government on those who carry the active burdens of war. On the contrary, it occurs to me that we at home fail in our responsibilities to you members of our armed forces if we do not try now to make this an even better country to come back to than it was to leave. Only in this way can we give full reality to your fighting faith.

I congratulate each of you for what you have already achieved. I congratulate you on the opportunity that is yours to serve as an officer of an army not seeking power, conquest, or military glory, but seeking an infinitely nobler goal—the advancement of the liberty and dignity of men and women everywhere, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Purpose of H. R. 3529 Is To Furnish Borrowing Power to Veterans in Addition to Outright Benefits Voted by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called the attention of the House to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act as the measure that would allow the dependents of servicemen to conserve the use of the dependency benefits voted them for current living expenses, and not for the payment of debts incurred by the family prior to the induction of the wage earner into the armed forces. However, everyone understands that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act only provides for a moratorium, which will result in the accumulation of debt that the serviceman will have to pay upon his discharge from the armed forces. It does not take into consideration the problem of the returning serviceman in readjusting himself to civilian life. Under this act the average veteran will find himself in the unfortunate position of trying to catch up on past due obligations and meet his current obligations at the same time.

As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 3529 which provides for loans up to $1,000 to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service. My purpose in introducing this bill was to furnish a borrowing power to veterans in addition to the outright benefits that will undoubtedly be voted the veterans by the Congress of the United States. It may be some time yet before the program of veterans' benefits is worked out and put into effect. In the interim the returning veteran should have some ready funds available for use in readjusting himself to civilian activity.

It has been stated in the press that H. R. 3529 may not reach the floor of the House but that it has started some serious congressional thinking along the line I am presently discussing. If this is the case, I may well consider my bill a success, for it is also reported that there is some thought by members of the Military Affairs Committee that these accumulated debts and obligations be paid outright by the United States Government. To this thought I am, most certainly, not opposed.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an article which appeared in the Washington Post of October 31, 1943, on this subject.

ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LOAN PROPOSED FOR NEW VETERANS

A plan for lending $1,000 to returning servicemen to settle their debts came up on Capitol Hill yesterday, a possible forerunner of measures for even broader benefits.

Introduced by Representative KING (Democrat), of California, the loan bill has been referred to the House Banking Committee, with indications it will be kept there while a more comprehensive aid program is worked out.

KING's bill would permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to underwrite loans made to honorably discharged servicemen by private lending institutions. The loans would be for the proven amount of the veteran's obligations at the time of his discharge, but not exceeding $1,000. They would bear 6 percent interest and be repayable in installments over a 3-year period.

No security, indorsers, or comakers would be required, the Government acting, in effect, as the veteran's indorser.

While KING's bill may never get before the House, it has started some serious congressional thinking along such lines.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, passed last year, permits veterans to go into court upon their return and have their obligations stayed for a period equal to the length of time they were in service.

Some members of the House Military Committee who have been studying the subject say the relief thus provided may be insufficient should the war last several more years, because a soldier's obligations may amount, at the time of his discharge, to a sum too large to be handled by a man trying to readjust himself to civilian life.

"If this war lasts 2 more years," said one committeeman, "Congress will have to do something for these veterans. It will be impossible for many men to catch up on their past-due obligations and at the same time meet current expenses during the time now provided."

He suggested that a moratorium on all veterans' obligations or even outright payment by the Government be provided in cases where it can be proved that the veteran has little or no chance to get caught up without help.

Uncle Sam—Our Biggest Land Owner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2338, which has for its purpose providing for payments in lieu of taxes by the United States to the States and their political subdivisions on account of certain real property being acquired by the Federal Government and thereby removed from the tax roll.

In my own State of Oregon the Federal Government owns over one-half of the area of the State. Immense quantities of land are being acquired by the Government throughout the various States of the Union and these properties are being taken off the tax rolls. In many cases counties are being deprived of a substantial portion of the tax-bearing property of the counties, which is very materially interfering with the carrying on of local public activities. The text of my bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all real property in the continental United States which heretofore, subsequent to December 7, 1941, was acquired, or which shall hereafter be acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by or on behalf of the United States, for general military purposes (including property acquired for, or for use in connection with, fortifications, coast defenses, military camps, cantonments, proving grounds, training areas, bomb-testing areas, and the manufacture of munitions), together with the improvements on any such real property at the time such property is so acquired, shall remain subject to taxation by the State and political subdivision in which such property is located, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any property with respect to which such power of taxation is waived in accordance with State law by the State or political subdivision in which such property is located. Any property covered by any such waiver shall not thereafter be subject to such taxation by the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, so long as such property is held by or on behalf of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Tom C. Watson, the very able assessor of the county of Multnomah, in Oregon, which county comprises the district which I have the honor to represent, on or about October 1, made an address before the National Association of Assessing Officers at its annual convention in Chicago, Ill. This address is replete with factual information on this important problem and is worthy of consideration of all the Members of the Congress in connection with legislation providing for the payment by the Federal Government of sums equivalent to taxes on land taken over by the Federal Government. I include the address as part of my remarks, which is as follows:

ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTIES AFFECTED BY WARTIME MEASURES

(By Tom C. Watson)

I appreciate this opportunity of discussing with you one of our mutual present-day problems which I fear will still confront us when the war has been won. In order that we may better understand the subject before us—Assessment of Properties Affected by Wartime Measures—I should like first to speak a little about Government-owned property prior to Pearl Harbor.

Federal exemptions are something that affect every assessor in the United States. It is true, as I shall set out to prove, some will be affected to a greater degree and some to a lesser degree. Our economic future will be greatly influenced by the manner in which this issue is finally settled.

In 1939 the Federal Government owned more than 20 percent of all the land in the United States. The total acreage of the continental United States is 1,903,221,280 acres, Federal real estate, 391,657,721 acres.

This means that our Government in Washington owns an area equal to all the lands east of the Mississippi River except Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi. These lands are located in 2,628 counties, of a total of 3,071 counties, and in 2,965 cities. So, you see, a large majority of our counties and many of our cities are thus affected.

Fifty percent of the land area of the 11 Western States is Federally owned. Federal acquisition, exclusive of military needs, is building up at the rate of approximately one million acres per year.

Senate Document No. 12—Separate No. 1, titled, "A National Plan for American Forestry," recommends public acquisition by the United States of an additional 47,000,000 acres in the West and 177,000,000 acres in the East, equal to the combined area of the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Iowa. It is plainly evident that eastern taxpayers have a stake in securing cash payments in lieu of taxes on Federally acquired lands amounting to the equivalent of taxes if the properties were taxable.

The fair market value of the Federal lands and improvements has been estimated to be $4,696,061,638. The estimated taxes based on local assessments and millage rates is $91,051,374. There are 26 States which would receive more than a million dollars in lieu of taxes and every State would benefit to some degree.

1. New York would receive $8,856,000.
2. California would receive $6,476,000.
3. Arizona would receive $5,034,000.
4. Montana would receive $4,793,000.
5. Iowa would receive $4,178,000.
6. Massachusetts would receive $4,110,000.
7. Nevada would receive $3,638,000.
8. Pennsylvania would receive $3,339,000.
9. Illinois would receive $3,095,000.
10. Washington would receive $3,038,000.
11. New Jersey would receive $2,902,000.
12. Oregon would receive $2,333,000.
13. Idaho would receive $1,979,000.
14. Colorado would receive $1,836,000.
15. Virginia would receive $1,582,000.
16. Texas would receive $1,581,000.
17. Maryland would receive $1,535,000.
18. Wyoming would receive $1,486,000.
19. Ohio would receive $1,344,000.
20. Louisiana would receive $1,320,000.
21. South Dakota would receive $1,299,000.
22. Alabama would receive $1,297,000.
23. Utah would receive $1,209,000.
24. Michigan would receive $1,195,000.
25. Florida would receive $1,009,000.
26. Minnesota would receive $1,006,000.

It has been repeatedly stated by officials in a position to know, that the Federal Government, in its determination to prosecute the war to its fullest extent, has found it necessary to purchase between six and seven million additional acres of land in connection with war activities. Some of this area is very good land and some of it is very poor land.

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, in March of this year, announced that the Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, owned 1,479 plant projects—1,022 of them in operation in March and he expected to have the balance in operation in 1943; 800 having been completed since Pearl Harbor. These plants up to that date cost $9,175,000,000; $2,650,000,000 was invested in aircraft accessories plants. The total square feet of airplane plant space alone is 35,000,000 which would cover 700 city blocks 250 by 200 feet or one solid city block 33 miles long by 200 feet wide. The 1,022 complete plants are in 43 States and are operated by 708 different companies. The total cost to D. P. C. of equipping and constructing these 1,022 plants is $4,317,000,000. A flying fortress is made up of a great many separate parts which are fabricated in several different plants, many of which are quite small.

In August of this year D. P. C. began the construction of a modern steel plant in Provo, Utah, costing $190,000,000. This is the largest steel mill west of the Mississippi. This plant covers 1,600 acres of what was formerly agricultural land, including 11 miles of railroad.

In the past 3 years Jesse Jones estimates we have spent some $25,000,000,000 in building plants and facilities of one kind or another. Much of this money has been spent for strictly military purposes and things for which we will have little use after the war. But a great deal has been spent in shipbuilding and industrial facilities which can and should be used after the war if we are to keep people at work and if we are to pay our huge national debt.

The Government owns 92 percent of the magnesium production and 10 percent of the total steel production. The Government has invested $625,000,000 in synthetic-rubber manufacture and will soon be able to manufacture more than 800,000 tons annually, which is one-third more rubber than we have ever used in peacetime.

The R. F. C. will own almost one-half of the country's machine-tool manufacturing facilities. The Government's investment in aviation amounts to 10 times the value of privately owned investments in the field.

The R. F. C. has built 3,800 miles of pipe lines, including the 1,500 miles from Longview, Tex., to Philadelphia and New York. They have invested $180,000,000 in these lines and $500,000,000 in high-octane plants.

These last-mentioned plants are owned by the D. P. C. or the R. F. C. and pay taxes on the real estate only. They pay no personal-property tax. They are in direct competition to privately owned plants that do pay taxes on their personal property.

There is another Federal agency which has not yet been mentioned, which is the Maritime Commission. It owns many shipyards with vast equipment and facilities. In Multnomah County, Oreg., alone this amounts to $46,000,000. And they do not pay a dime on the improvements and facilities. This is obviously unfair to competition which borrows huge sums of money from the same Maritime Commission which is invested in land, improvement and personal property on which taxes are paid. If the Maritime Commission paid taxes, our local government would receive more than $1,000,000. Added to what we have already lost, this makes more than $3,000,000 in taxes lost to the State, and our total loss is now probably nearer $5,000,000.

In the city of Portland, Oreg., there are 15,032 units in the 12 major defense housing projects. Under the terms of the Lanham

Act, the Government makes payments in lieu of taxes. These payments are the same as if the properties were privately owned and taxed.

Senator McNARY, from Oregon, now has a bill before Congress which, if passed, will direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay 2 percent of the fair value of any lands in any State, title to which is held in the United States, and which are (1) included within a national forest; (2) included within a national wildlife refuge; (3) administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; (4) included within an Indian reservation, or held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian; (5) administered under the terms of the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1269, as amended; (6) sold by the United States upon an agreement providing that title shall remain in the United States until the purchase price is paid in full; or (7) leased by the United States for a valuable consideration.

This measure does not in any way affect the six to seven million acres acquired by the United States in connection with war activities. Real estate ownership should be protected against any further impairment from faulty or ill-advised legislation.

There are some 28 shipbuilding centers in the United States and it is my understanding that the Maritime Commission and the United States Navy own property to a greater or lesser degree in all of them. These holdings are not included in the McNary bill, and I should like to recommend to this association that we ask our legislative committee to draft a suitable proposed bill covering these properties, as well as property of any other Federal agency owning real estate of a similar nature.

Gentlemen, I believe we should get behind the McNary bill now before Congress, and the bill by Congressman CARTER MANASCO, from Alabama, which provides for a systematic and orderly disposal of all the surplus real estate after the war, and calls for the establishment of a surplus land and war plant board to see that the provisions of the law are carried out. We need also the enactment of a bill covering these agencies of Government which now escape any form of taxation. Human existence is dependent upon real estate, and we should use our influence against any action which tends to destroy its value or injure its management.

It quite naturally follows that as requirements for the war diminish, there will be less and less need for all of this Government-owned real estate, and a proper plan for its disposal is economically necessary. The reason for liquidation, of course, is to reduce our national debt.

Under present conditions it would be possible for the Federal Government to appropriate the entire area of a municipal subdivision of a State the size of a county which would have the effect of totally liquidating that unit of State government. As an actual example of this tendency, I know of one locality in the State of Oregon, Camp Adair, in which the Federal Government has appropriated the major part of the most valuable agricultural lands in the county, that were formerly paying a considerable part of the taxes of that county. This deprives this particular county of a large part of its tax revenue, and creates a situation where this community is "paying tribute to Caesar" without any appropriate return.

We all realize that ships must be built and that facilities for building them must be quickly provided. However, the Federal Government in establishing these centers has overlooked the cost of necessary service provided by local government. The federally owned real property and personal property is in direct competition to other privately owned properties that do pay taxes. For illustration:

The Albina Engine & Machine Works of Portland borrow no money from the Federal Government and pay taxes on their entire capital investment until the ships which they build are accepted by the Federal Government. This small plant had an assessment this year of $427,655. The Commercial Iron Works and the Willamette Iron & Steel Co. borrow huge sums of money from Federal agencies and pay no taxes on this investment. It is true that the two last-named companies do pay taxes on both real estate and personal property owned by them. These two companies are assessed for more than $2,800,000.

The Maritime Commission owns both the Oregon shipyard and the Swan Island yard. On January 1 of this year they had an investment of some $46,000,000. These plants are leased to the Kaiser Co. and pay no taxes except on the land which is owned by the company. This investment of $46,000,000, if assessed, would produce an annual tax, based on today's mileage rate, of more than $1,000,000.

In view of all these facts I believe that all property, situated in any locality of a sovereign State, appropriated for the purpose of any national public use, should bear its fair, relative share in the support of the local government in which it is situated.

Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Assessing Officers at the meeting to which I refer also passed a resolution bearing on this subject, which is worthy of consideration while studying this assessment problem. I also include the resolution:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSESSING OFFICERS AT THE ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN CHICAGO ON OCTOBER 1, 1943

Whereas the ownership of property by the Federal Government restricts the tax base from which local governments draw the bulk of their revenues, and thereby affects the financial stability of counties, cities, school districts, and other political subdivisions; and

Whereas property owned by the Federal Government is not distributed uniformly over the country, but frequently is concentrated in particular areas which in turn results in serious inequalities as between different local governments; and

Whereas property owned by the Federal Government generally requires the same services of local government as does property owned by private citizens; and

Whereas the beneficiaries of Federally owned property are the people of the entire Nation and not merely the residents of areas where Federal property is situated; and

Whereas Congress is investigating the problems arising out of Federal ownership of property, and has indicated a willingness to enact corrective legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the consensus of the membership of the National Association of Assessing Officers—

1. That when Federal agencies acquire property for temporary use, such property should be leased rather than purchased in order to preserve necessary revenues to local governments;

2. That Congress be urged to enact legislation authorizing the taxation of the following specific types of federally owned property:

(a) Property withdrawn from local tax rolls for temporary purposes, military or otherwise;

(b) Property used for housing and resettlement projects;

(c) Real and personal property used for manufacturing and industrial purposes.

3. That, in providing for the taxation of federally owned property, Congress require that such taxation be applied to the same extent and in the same manner as privately owned property is taxed.

War Food Administrator Judge Marvin Jones' Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was predicted that the checks to the dairy farmers, which were to be due on account of the new dairy program, would not be delivered until possibly January 1, 1944, and certainly not before December 1, 1943. Judge Jones made every effort to get the checks delivered promptly and he was successful in doing so. At a staff meeting November 3, 1943, Judge Marvin Jones, after receiving the report of the first dairy checks going out, stated in an impromptu talk to the members of his staff:

I am glad to have that report, and I want to congratulate you fellows. One of the difficulties in relationships with the public and the Hill is the delay that is sometimes occasioned in the handling of these matters. There isn't anything that will tend so to put people in a bad humor as having a few days' delay in something that they think is coming to them. On the other hand—it works both ways—there is nothing that is more calculated to create a good feeling than to get a little ahead of the schedule, and I think this is very fine. This is socner than they expected it to be done and naturally the reaction can't be other than favorable. I am very much pleased with it because I heard—in fact, I had three or four Members of Congress tell me—the checks would not be out probably until December, and maybe not until January. I know some of them will be agreeably surprised.

It is not a matter of crankiness on the part of the people on the Hill—it is the reflection of the sentiment in the country. There isn't any other such political thought indicator, for they go back to their part of the country every 2 years. They have to get the majority to think their way. With all the criticism against the House—some against the Senate but more true about the House because it is a 2-year proposition—they know what the public thought is. When over an extended period the Congress persists in a certain thought, I get to wondering if maybe they're not about right, at least if they haven't probably interpreted the public opinion properly. At any rate I know this from my own experience on the Hill, there isn't anything that pleases a constituent more than a quick answer—quick results. That is the reason I have asked when a letter or telegram comes from a Senator or a Member of the House, if you can speed up the right answer to it, regardless of the action taken, a day or two, or get it back within 2 or 3 days, it produces a very fine result.

After all, the whole life of every Department depends upon the appropriations made by the Congress. We are creatures of the Congress in one sense. At least all accounting has to go to them, so it isn't a matter of simply trying to curry favor with Congress, it is a matter of rendering just dues to the people who make provisions for the Department. That is a link in democratic government. These people go back and get their commission every 2 years direct from the folks. Of the million employees of the Federal Government, only 533 are selected by the people. These are the President, the Vice

President, the 96 Senators, and the 435 Members of the House. Nobody else has that direct, vital connection with the folks, and this is a country of public opinion, especially when it is well thought out over any reasonable period.

Opinions or convictions are entitled to be reflected in public action, so the close contact with the Hill, the cooperation with the Hill, the proper interpretation of the language that is written into the laws up there is not a matter of currying favor, it is a matter of just procedure. It is a matter of carrying on long-range operations of a free government, and I think it is just as much the duty of anybody in a department to try to find out what the honest intention of the Congress is in carrying out that intention as expressed in the language, as any obligation any man can have. I believe it is a warping, and I believe it is almost a violation, of duty to try to find a clever way around a thing in an effort to do something not intended by the Congress.

If a change is needed in the provisions of law, the only way is to go up and try to get them to change it. If you can't get them to, well and good. It is all right to fight just as hard as you want to before legislation is enacted for a change or for a different form of legislation, but when it is done, that is a decision, just as when a decision is made in the Department that ought to be the decision of the whole Department. There ought not to be any sabotage or going around telling somebody else that you didn't agree to that decision. It ought to be a unified thing. The same thing prevails in carrying out the legislative intent of the Congress.

I think it runs far deeper than a question of trying to secure favorable consideration. It runs to the whole essence of maintaining free government. It is part of the life of governmental operations if people are to remain free and not have a dictatorship. There can be several kinds of dictatorship. There can be a dictatorship of one man or more than one man, or one branch or more than one branch, or of one group or more than one group—various forms—if they can get control of the machinery and are able to dictate its purposes.

For that reason I think it helps very greatly if quick action can be had on all these matters just as quick as can be in carrying out the legislative intent and administrative purpose in a proper way. Any intentional delay, any pigeonholing, any thinking "Well, I don't think he ought to ask that question, anyway," tends in the long run to clog the machinery and hamper the operations of a free people. There is only one method and manner that has been discovered in the history of the world to operate a democracy, and that is through representative action.

Mr. Speaker, if all public officials assumed this attitude of understanding and tolerance toward Congress and the public and the executive department which the officials are serving, our internal or domestic situation would be considerably improved.

Low-Down From "Down Under" on What's What in Wheat and Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, from far-off Australia I recently received the following newspaper clipping from a South Dakota chaplain serving with the One Hundred and Forty-seventh Field Artillery, Rev. Henry T. Praed, formerly of Madison and Pierre, in South Dakota. My good friend, Henry, has a sense of humor combined with his spirit of patriotism, and his letter stated that many an Australian reader was getting a chuckle as the people "down under" read this squib which is circulating in the exchange columns of Australian newspapers:

LOW-DOWN ON THE WHEAT SITUATION

Problems of distributing the world's wheat surplus have given many an economist a headache. It has remained for a South Australian schoolboy to tell us just what happens to the grain which millions of the world's people want but cannot get. His unconsciously humorous essay, which has received some publicity in Australia, reads:

"Wheat is growed in quite a lot of countries, and generally sent across the sea to other countries which could just as well grow it themselves. This is done to make prophets for shipowners, agents, middlemen, politicians, and scalliwags, who can't make an 'onest living. That is why bread is deer.

"In America wheat is sold about twenty times, each buyer making a prophet, although he never saw the wheat or the corner ware it was stored.

"In Australia they put all the wheat in a pool ware it gets wet and take it out to send away in ships.

"A lot of wheat what is left gets eaten up by weevils and a lot of it drops out of the pool in a way no one knows. It is no good asking a policeman.

"What is left in the pool is scraped up and growned into flour. This is made into bread, and sold to the gaols at 5 pence a loaf and to 'onest people at 8 pence. The difference pays the wages of the deliveryman what drops the bread in the mud."

Mr. Speaker, it is probably fortunate that the bewildered Australian school boy who wrote the above essay on wheat is not a regular reader of American newspapers. If he were, his confusion would be many times confounded as he tried to square his judgment with such New Deal economic wizardy, for example, as Vice President WALLACE'S famed theory of endeavoring to provide plenty for hungry people during the depression by plowing under the crops and killing the little pigs (a theory of scarcity, incidentally, for which President Roosevelt endeavored to apologize in his 12,000-word message on food subsidies yesterday).

The awe of the Australian lad would grow additionally, of course, if he were to try to follow more recent New Deal theories such as the program of projecting freedoms abroad by curtailing them at home and proposing democratic principles of Government for other countries while seeking to perpetuate personal governmental powers at home by a 16-year term of tenure which exceeds, by several years, the average terms of kings and emperors throughout the history of the world.

And even adult Australians must wrinkle their brows and wring their hands in hopeless confusion when they try to follow the food subsidy reasoning of the Roosevelt economic revolutionaries who now tell us that the way to control inflation is to increase the ratio of purchasing power to consumer goods by shifting the costs of today's food bills to the backs of tomorrow's taxpayers. From the standpoint of protecting the reputation of American schools perhaps it would be just as well if no American schoolboy attempts to write an essay about New Deal consistency in 1943.

Just for the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Metropolitan News, West Hartford, Conn., of November 4, 1943:

JUST FOR THE RECORD

Ever since we've been old enough to know better, we have had a consuming desire to read political speeches. As is the case with most people now a days, we never listen to political harangues on the radio, it interferes with Lowell Thomas, Fred Waring, and others—like Frank Sinatra.

We always assume that a political speaker who is competing with radio entertainment on other air waves is talking into either a vacuum or a dead mike and while he probably appreciates this, he knows that the newspapers will pick up the pertinent parts of his speech (culled from an advanced release) and thus please the politician's ego.

Some of these speeches that go out over the partly dead air waves sometimes have the habit of coming back to haunt the speaker. Once we were going to start the ambitious project of cataloging the most ridiculous political radio talks, but decided to call the whole thing off when Vice President HENRY WALLACE blossomed forth with the promise of a quart of milk on every world-wide doorstep.

Last Saturday a new height of the ridiculous was reached by Mr. Herman Kopplemann who once represented our district in the Halls of Congress. His radio talk, reprinted in the Hartford Courant, wins the brown derby and gains Mr. Kopplemann permanent possession of the dunce cap.

Apparently taking advantage of the fact that Saturday was Halloween. Mr. Kopplemann decided to throw a bogeyman at the poor souls whom he thought might be listening. The sum and substance of his speech—and if you don't believe it buy the Courant and see for yourself—was this: If Hartford does not elect a Democratic mayor, the people in the villages, towns, and cities of oppressed Europe will know that we have let them down. If the Republicans win the Hartford election it's just too bad, the war might as well be over right now.

If you don't want to let those conquered people down, vote Democratic, Mr. Kopplemann said, remember they are watching the election and only a real strong Democratic majority will assure these people that we are still in there to fight and win this war and release them from their bondage.

We could just visualize the contrasting scenes in Europe: Mrs. Propokovski dropping her plate of borscht and shouting for glee as she heard that Denny O'Connor had been chosen mayor of Hartford, Tito Korovetz of the Yugoslav guerillas dashing out to knock off a few more Nazis to celebrate the Democratic victory.

Or, on the other hand the more poignant scenes, as all those poor downtrodden people under the heel of Hitler listen to their radios (so, it's verboten) and cry in their (needled) beer in despair as Mortensen is elected.

We could just picture the news flashes coming in swiftly as the world learned Tuesday that Bill Mortensen, a Republican (!) was elected mayor of Hartford. * * *

Well, Bill Mortensen was elected mayor of Hartford Tuesday. We stayed up all night anxiously awaiting some late news flashes from Europe revealing overseas reaction to the election. The Deutsche Nachrichten Buero made no mention of repercussions caused in conquered countries by the Republican victory here. Reuters in England too made no comment. Pravda, official organ of the Soviet, did not even devote one line to the Hartford elections. Even Radio Tokyo ignored the whole matter.

Mr. Kopplemann must today be one of the most disillusioned men in the world—the people in Europe have let him down * * * they failed to react according to his expectations.

But that should not disconcert Mr. Kopplemann. It is not his first disappointment at the hands of the people and we doubt whether it will be his last.

Oleomargarine and Crisco Can Be Subsidized and Sold for 1 Cent a Pound, but Dairy Products Cannot Be Subsidized Under Republican Proposal Against Certain Subsidies in Commodity Credit Corporation Act Extension Bill H. R. 3477

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, H. R. 3477, section 3 will effectively stop all subsidies after December 31, 1943, except such prohibition will not include, according to the language of section 3, domestic fats, oil, and oil seeds. In other words, this provision, which was inserted by a solid vote of the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and three or four members of the Democratic side, will allow the Administration to subsidize oleomargarine and Crisco to the extent that these products may be sold for 1 cent a pound, but will deny the same kind of a subsidy to dairy products.

It is my opinion that the question of what should be subsidized and what should not be subsidized should be left entirely up to the Administrator, as subsidies will work in some cases and will not work in other cases. Therefore, I am in favor of not only allowing the Administrator to subsidize domestic fats, oils, and oil seeds but I am also in favor of allowing him to subsidize any dairy products that he believes should be subsidized in the public interest.

Of course, it is quite a tribute to those who will enforce this law for the Republican members to trust them not to subsidize oleomargarine and Crisco to the extent that I have suggested they may be subsidized, but I cannot understand why they are willing to trust them to that extent and not willing to trust them on dairy and other farm products.

In this morning's mail I have received a letter from Farmers Equity Union, of Greenville, Ill., calling my attention to a resolution passed by the national convention that this group is associated with in which it was stated that no changes should be made in the oleomargarine laws, that all taxes should be continued on oleomargarine. Under the present law oleomargarine is taxed 10 cents a pound, obviously for the purpose of making it more difficult for this product to compete with butter. It is true that the tax is only one-fourth cent a pound if it has no coloring, so in practice the groceryman sells a pound of oleomargarine uncolored, and a small package of coloring in a separate package at the same time to go along with it to be mixed with the oleomargarine, and thereby the consumer is saved 9¾ cents a pound, but the consumer must do his own mixing.

What I cannot understand is why some of the dairy organizations are so insistent that the oleomargarine taxes continue and at the same time make no objection whatsoever to peanuts, cottonseed, and all oil seeds and the products made therefrom being subsidized without limit or restriction of any kind whatsoever.

Resolution of Disabled American Veterans in Favor of a National Military Cemetery in Every State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter recently received from Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, there was enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted at the 1943 national convention of the organization in favor of the establishment and maintenance of a national military cemetery in every State. As this resolution will be of much interest to Members of the House and to veterans' organizations and to veterans generally, I have requested that it be printed in the RECORD under extension of remarks:

A resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in every State

Whereas it is believed desirable that there should be a national cemetery in every 1 of the 48 States, and in the Territories of the United States, so that the bodies of honorably discharged and of deceased servicemen might be buried in such cemeteries within a reasonable distance of the residence of their next of kin; and

Whereas it is believed that a national cemetery in each State would not only serve as a convenience for the next of kin of deceased veterans but would be regarded as a patriotic shrine and memorial place; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans, assembled in its twenty-second national convention in New York City this 17th to 20th day of September 1943, That the D. A. V. sponsor the introduction in Congress of a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in each State and that, to that end, the cooperation of other veteran organizations be secured; be it further

Resolved, That the national service director of the D. A. V. be hereby authorized to cooperate with each State department of the D. A. V. in securing the enactment of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery in each State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the above resolution be transmitted to the local newspapers and to our Congressmen and that an appropriate redraft thereof be presented to, and for the consideration of, the national executive committee and the next national convention of the D. A. V.

An Adequate Food Supply and Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was given consent to incorporate in the RECORD a resolution by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, which was adopted by this great organization on October 29, 1943.

As bearing on the subject of an adequate food supply, and current food subsidy proposals of this administration—and also, by way of background, the perpetuation of a sound democracy—I think that this resolution is extremely challenging and provocative, and worthy of wide attention and thought.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FOODS AND MARKETS OF THE NEW YORK CITY FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Whereas every homemaker is primarily and vitally interested in the maintenance of an adequate food supply at reasonable prices and also wishes to perpetuate a sound democracy based upon free enterprise and individual initiative, at the same time protecting the country from inflation and excessive debt; and

Whereas subsidies on food products when generally applied to large segments of our food supply tend to induce Government regulation, with its discouragement of activity and effort and with consequent decrease in food production; and

Whereas this will inevitably lead to lessened production of farm products and greater shortages of food, which in turn will mean sharply higher food prices for all consumers; and

Whereas the use of Government borrowed funds to pay a part of every citizen's grocery and butcher bill when consumers' purchasing power is the greatest on record is inflationary in the extreme: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled October 29, 1943, oppose the extension of subsidies for food except to such extent that the use of Government moneys is for providing basic nutritional needs for the undernourished who are found unable to provide such necessary basic diets for themselves; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, Members of Congress and the Senate, also to the Chairman of Price Administration and the War Food Administrator.

SARAH G. LEONARD
(Mrs. Thomas Leonard),
Chairman.

The Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of December 12 to 18, 1943, as Bill of Rights Week. A precedent was established for this resolution 2 years ago by the enactment of Public Law No. 243, Seventy-seventh Congress, in observing the sesquicentennial of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to our Constitution, which have come to be known as the Bill of Rights.

There has been no period in American history more critical than that which we now face. At this time we are engaged in a global war with American soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen fighting our battle for survival at some 40 different places on the earth's surface. It is a war for the survival of our Bill of Rights.

No greater political documents have ever been conceived in the mind of man than our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution and the amendments to it. The Bill of Rights forever proclaims to the world the high purpose of democracy in a republican form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. No other nation in any form of government has ever been so dedicated to the individual citizen.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons there is greater desirability in focusing our attention upon the Bill of Rights now than at any time since these amendments were added to our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given permission to extend and revise my remarks by inserting the Bill of Rights in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

ARTICLE I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

ARTICLE II

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

ARTICLE III

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

ARTICLE IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

ARTICLE VI

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

ARTICLE VII

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

ARTICLE VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

ARTICLE IX

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Investigation of Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times:

INVESTIGATION OF LEND-LEASE

The more that is said about lend-lease the more essential it seems that there should be a thorough and impartial congressional investigation of its administration. The issue is not whether lend-lease should or should not continue as a system of American aid to its allies in this war. No one of responsibility has attacked the idea of lend-lease, no one has demanded that it be abandoned. On the contrary, what its most severe critics want is better lend-lease—lend-lease administered to win the war and not to waste American efforts and sacrifices, either on the battlefield, at home, or after the war.

Now that the purely factional and partisan political furore in this country over the reports of the five Senators who toured battle fronts has died down, and now that England has quit assuming that their criticism was aimed at her when it was aimed almost entirely at our own American officials, some of the problems raised by the Senators can be viewed in more understanding manner. The more they are viewed in the clarifying atmosphere of retrospect, the more evident it becomes that these problems must not be ignored simply because one or two statements by individual Senators might have been untimely.

Lend-lease administration received the heaviest blows in the reports of the Senators. Those seeking to defend its administration—until recently directed by the President's personal aide, Harry Hopkins—seem to have forgotten that the most emphatic charges on lend-lease did not come from Republican BREWSTER, of Maine, but from Senator HILL, southern Democrat, who is usually found well in the front of the New Deal political columns. The allegation of "politics" can hardly hold against HILL.

Senator HILL now has, after calm deliberation, repeated his criticism of various phases of the Washington administration's handling of lend-lease. He has done so openly and publicly, on the Senate floor, and to the extent of 62 full pages of a prepared speech. In those 62 pages he not only has repeated his charge that the Washington Government administration of lend-lease ignores the post-war interests of the United States but he has added considerable amplification to his original statements.

It should be realized to begin with that these Senators did not go on a sight-seeing junket, but went as the representatives of 96 Senators of every known senatorial political faith, representing people of every State in the United States. A majority of them were pro-administration pro-Roosevelt Senators politically. The allegations they have made of waste, of mismanagement, of incompetent and extravagant administration and of failure up to now to guarantee wartime or post-war protection of American interests cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. As a body of inquiry which visited the scenes of

activity they have—separately in some cases and jointly in others—returned indictments which necessitate full and impartial hearing. If their charges are unfounded or exaggerated, the best and surest way to prove it is by Senate investigation. If their charges are correct an investigation will enable Congress to end the evils and set up preventives against repetition.

The contention that President Roosevelt reports to Congress on lend-lease activities quarterly and that "this is all that is necessary" cannot be made to hold water. The President reports briefly on the amounts spent and for what nations. His reports do not and could not possibly prove or disprove incompetency in setting lend-lease policies, or determine the competency or incompetency with which policies are administered. In this connection, another pro-Roosevelt Democrat, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, has stated on the Senate floor that by Executive order (which means by order of the President) some $50,000,000,000 has been diverted to lend-lease from congressional appropriations made for other purposes—this $50,000,000,000 being over and above the totals actually set up for lend-lease by Congress.

That single sum—$50,000,000,000—stated by Senator O'MAHONEY to have been diverted to lend-lease by the President, is enough to run the entire Federal Government for 10 to 12 years under normally economical peacetime conditions. Haven't the people a right to know what is being done with it? Hasn't Congress a right to know what is being done with money—which it never authorized for lend-lease to begin with?

Address of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation at the graduation exercises, twenty-third session, National Police Academy, Washington, D. C., October 23, 1943:

To you men who have toiled through 14 weeks of intensive training in the twenty-third session of the National Police Academy, we of the F. B. I. offer our congratulations. You have better prepared yourselves for your role in the fight that lies ahead. As law-enforcement officers, your responsibilities, your jobs in safeguarding the home fronts, demand the same fighting spirit as that required of the men achieving such glorious victories in both the Pacific and European theaters of war. Your task is by no means an easy one, and it is becoming more difficult each day.

The natural enemies of law enforcement are those who flout the rights of their fellow men, who disregard their own obligations to their country and to their God. In time of war the forces of these enemies are augmented by traitors, spies, potential saboteurs, and foreign agents; their strength is great and their weapons are myriad. Yours is the task of meeting that enemy in a constant battle for justice in order that democracy might survive.

In a democracy law enforcement is not and should not be nationally organized into a single force, under one head, maintaining order through terror, and destroying freedom under the guise of preserving it. There is no place in America for a gestapo.

The past 2 years have demonstrated that the fear of a Gestapo in America is a myth that exists only in the minds of the uninformed and those obstructionists and subverters who cry for license rather than liberty. I, of course, am referring to the splendid work that has been carried on by professional law-enforcing agencies, which has done so much to hold down hysteria and vigilante activities. We must continue to be on the alert to protect vigorously the innocent and bring the guilty to justice.

That the job of law enforcement is becoming increasingly difficult is reflected in the growing maze of technicalities that are arising. When you men of law enforcement reach the point of seeming futility, remember that responsibility always finds a final resting place. It is our job to get the facts and only the facts. When that job is done the responsibility passes to prosecutors, judges, and penal authorities.

So long as law enforcement does its job, it fulfills its obligations. Should society fail to receive its measure of protection by the fettering and handcuffing of law enforcement by legal technicalities that place the right of criminals above those of law-abiding citizens, then aroused citizens will see to it that they are protected. Our democratic Government was founded and exists today in order that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness shall prevail. I have no fear but that the day will come when legislative halls will take steps to see to it that unwarranted judicial fetters are severed. We must see to it, however, that the same vigorous action shall be applied to protecting the innocent that is expended in convicting the guilty.

The saboteurs of lawful authority are the many so-called respectable citizens who operate on the fringe of the law. The shyster lawyers and the criminal doctors, who prostitute their professions and betray their trust by aiding the criminal in his illegal operations, must likewise be brought to justice. Wartime racketeers, those who harbor and aid the enemies of democracy, all must be opposed with every weapon at our command.

We must fight, too, the enemies that are undermining the youth of America—operators of ill-famed establishments where debauchery and immorality and lawlessness are nurtured. We must work unceasingly to attain the cooperation of parent, teacher, lawmaker, and prosecutor so that our youth may survive the ravages of war. Although we should and, indeed, must rely upon the cooperation of church, school, and civic groups and individual citizens in the prevention of crime, the primary responsibility lies with us. We must meet that responsibility with firmness and understanding, with a realistic, yet intelligent attack, with sympathetic understanding but no maudlin sentimentality.

The evils of mob spirit and racial disorders bring new and grievous problems to our task. Not only must we oppose with every possible effort violence in any form, not only must we be vigorous in our preservation of the internal peace of our Nation, but we must endeavor as well to seek out and eliminate the causes of these disturbances.

A great part of the struggle before us lies in education. We must bring to the misinformed and the misguided, the victims of ignorance and unreal theories, the hard realities of the battle for security. The press of America, for the most part already warring on crime, shares with us a grave responsibility and already it has offered and given its aid and cooperation.

Thus far in our struggle against the subversive elements within our country, we can say with satisfaction that we have achieved a large measure of success. The activities of the spy and the saboteur have been frustrated; enemy agents have been apprehended and removed from society. Splendid cooperation on the part of all the forces of law and order has made success a reality. But the battle is by no means won. Our efforts must be doubled and redoubled; our fight must go on with increasing alertness.

As you who are graduating from the National Police Academy return to your work, trained to carry a larger share of the burden of battle, you have the pledge of the F. B. I. to support you in every possible manner. We are standing side by side with you and, with the forces of justice thoughout the land, we shall all fight with courage and determination until the day when a true and lasting peace shall fill the minds and hearts and homes of America. To that end we give you our motto: "Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity." May you cherish it with us.

Lt. J. W. Selzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, Lt. J. W. Selzer, of Waterloo, Iowa, now in the air force in the South Pacific, has seen a great deal of service. In fact sometime ago he was awarded a medal for meritorious service in certain aerial combats between the dates of May 3 and June 2, 1942. During that time he participated in more than 25 missions "in which hostile contact was probable and expected." On June 22, 1943, after having been in continuous service for many months, Lieutenant Selzer was offered a leave with permission to visit his home. He declined it, feeling that he could not be spared from his post of duty at that time. This young man is a splendid example of the steadfastness and patriotism of the men in our armed forces. Never in all our history have we had such a magnificent fighting force. The report from impartial sources is that in courage, in skill, and in devotion to duty this is the greatest Army and Navy that ever fought under the American flag.

What a great thing it would be if things in Washington were going as well as they are on the battle fronts. No one has any doubt about winning the war now being fought against our enemies abroad. But at home the issue is still in doubt. Here we have waste and confusion that is literally appalling. The taxes to pay for the profligate and unnecessary spending over a period of 10 years will be a heavy burden on many future generations. Under the guise of war a gigantic bureaucracy is being built up that threatens to destroy representative government. We see the sad spectacle of a few pampered organized labor

leaders periodically defying the Government and allowing the war effort to proceed only by their sufferance.

When are we going to begin the attack on the home front?

Unstable Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, all small independent oil producers in America have a right to feel keenly disappointed with last week's ruling of Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson denying an increase in the price of crude oil, and recommending in lieu thereof certain subsidies. Already many small producers have been driven out of business. Now many more will be squeezed out of the petroleum industry, to the detriment of the country as a whole. No one has any right to complain of necessary economic war casualties, but certainly unnecessary economic war casualties, especially in the small business structure of the country, is to be deplored.

We do not accuse Economic Stabilizer Vinson of maliciousness; his motives are unquestionably good. Nevertheless, he seems to have been badly advised by the Petroleum Section of O. P. A. Certainly he has ignored the advice of numerous congressional committees and of the Petroleum Administration for War, and of 99 percent of all petroleum experts.

In the first place, we are hurting now from crude oil shortages. To permit an increase in the price of crude oil would be an immediately effective remedy which would undoubtedly give some relief. On the other hand, Economic Stabilizer Vinson's recommendations, if at all workable, and if at all followed, will take effect at some future, uncertain date, affording no immediate relief. Many fear that in trying to work out the clumsy, involved, and complicated subsidy program recommended by Judge Vinson only confusion will result, and nothing will be done.

A good many fallacies are apparent in Judge Vinson's decision and opinion. He says that he has no authority to grant a price increase in crude oil. If his office has no authority in this particular, then it has no authority in any particular. The only alleged restriction on the authority of Economic Stabilizer Vinson to grant an increase in the price of crude oil is certain Executive rulings. If such Executive rulings are, in fact, a limitation, they could easily be changed by the Executive under whose direction the Economic Stabilizer acts. There is much less authority for the subsidy program recommended by Judge Vinson than there is for an increase in the price of crude oil. In fact no authority now exists for the subsidy program, whereas ample authority exists for the price increase as recommended by P. A. W. and others.

Again, the Economic Stabilizer says that through his recommendation there would be adequate supplies of oil to meet military and essential needs. There is at this time wholly inadequate supplies of crude oil to meet military and essential needs. If the Economic Stabilizer's recommended program produces all of the additional petroleum claimed for it, such additional petroleum will only take care of increased depletion in present supplies, and will not relieve present shortages.

Again, the Economic Stabilizer says that wildcatting is actually at an all-time high. This certainly is an error.

All of the arguments that can be offered against subsidies in general can certainly be offered against the recommendations of the Economic Stabilizer in this instance. The proposed subsidies are subject to additional evils. Practically all of the known reserves are owned and controlled by major oil companies. If drilling in these known reserves is to be defined as "wildcatting" under the proposed program, then such subsidies will be a bonus to the major oil companies. If subsidies are to be paid for wildcatting in unproven territory, without regard to discovery and production, then we will have the wildest wildcatting imaginable, and a consequent waste of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to introduce Petroleum Administrator Harold Ickes' reply to Judge Vinson by letter dated November 4, 1943:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1943.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization.

MY DEAR JUDGE VINSON: I wish to acknowledge the receipt of the statement of your decision upon my recommendation on crude oil prices which I first made to the Price Administrator on April 7, renewed on June 10, and finally submitted to you on August 9. Naturally this is disappointing to me. I only hope that it will not prove discouraging in the industry to the point of restricting development at a time when we so greatly need a stimulated activity as acknowledged by all who have studied the oil problem, including yourself.

In my first communication to the Price Administrator I stated:

"My views, of course, represent my judgment on the oil situation only. Having weighed these views, you or the Director of Economic Stabilization may deem the risk of an oil shortage less grave than the risk of other possible effects upon the Nation's economic structure. If so, under your statutory powers, that is clearly a decision that you, not I, should make."

From the standpoint of oil supply, which is my responsibility, your statement does not alter at all my conclusion as to the necessity for an upward adjustment in oil prices, and I am sure that you did not expect it to do so.

I do appreciate the manner in which you have recognized that during the lengthy period while this price question has been under consideration, both my office and the petroleum industry have aggressively pursued and continue to pursue such means as lie within our power to augment our petroleum supplies. As you yourself have indicated, these have already included, among others, the increasing use of our small remaining additional crude-oil capacity, particularly in west Texas, by providing necessary transportation facilities, increasing the use of foreign oils as far as the tanker situation and foreign refining capacities permit, and a relaxation of spacing requirements in existing oil fields as rapidly as additional drilling materials become available and wherever such additional drilling will actually provide more oil rather than merely more holes in the ground.

The ultimate objective of our efforts is, as you know, not alone to provide for all military demands and the present restricted civilian rations of gasoline and oils but, if possible, to eliminate eventually the necessity for restrictions upon civilian use and to protect adequately and in the broadest sense the oil future of the country. That objective springs from our concern for the future welfare of the same "unnumbered millions of wage earners, producers, and merchants" of whom you speak. Aside from military considerations, an increase in price to stimulate production is only justified, of course, if it returns full value to the American public. I have been convinced, and remain convinced, that the price increase recommended would so return full value.

We have already stated our conviction that, in the absence of any tested or tried alternative, a general price increase would be the most practical and best financial device for minimizing the risks of crude oil shortages in this country. No subsidy plan or proposal yet developed has met even your very general tests of simplicity and the avoidance of impossible administrative burdens, on the one hand, o the dangers of grave misuse of public funds on the other. However, at the forthcoming meeting of the Petroleum Industry War Council I shall ask that body for its cooperation in further attempting to determine what plan or program, if any, other than a general price increase, might be designed within the general limits that you have prescribed.

I trust that you recognize that under any subsidy plan the inherently speculative character of the whole business of finding and producing oil would compel public rather than private funds to be gambled upon what your decision calls "prospector's luck." I only hope that if this should be done, the Congress and the people would remember, after the moneys were spent, that wildcats are usually dry and only seldom successful, and that losses, not profits, are to be expected.

While I receive your decision in the spirit in which I know that it was rendered, the problem, as such, remains unsolved. We cannot, therefore, be at rest on the present basis and you will hear further from me.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that time will prove my apprehensions in these matters entirely wrong. It is certainly to be hoped that our war effort and our domestic economy will not further suffer from increasing petroleum shortages. However, if Judge Vinson continues to follow the bad advice which it seems to me he has followed in this instance, then I fear the worst in the matter of crude-oil supplies.

Address of Hon. Homer Ferguson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, United States Senator from Michigan, at Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy exercises, Washington, D. C., on October 23, 1943:

Mr. Hoover, honored guests, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a distinct pleasure for me to appear here this morning and say a few words to this graduating class. This is commencement day. I know that all who came here came because they felt that this particular institution, this academy, could train them so they might go back home and do a better job as law-enforcing officers. They came here realizing that this academy had as its slogan, Fidelity, Bravery, and Integrity—each one of these words so essential if they are to perform their work properly.

I want to say to you that no college, no academy, no institution of learning in America today will graduate a class more important to the community to which the members will return than the class graduating from this particular academy.

We do not always realize the importance of law enforcement until we find it breaking down; then communities realize that it is very important and that the men who do the work of law enforcement are very important.

The fine thing about what the Director told us this morning was that we know that he means every word of it, and that he intends to do just the things he stands for. That is why he stands at the head, at the top of law enforcement in America.

He has told us today that it is not the intention of America to build up one grand police force to govern the homes and the lives of all individuals in our land. He believes that the primary responsibility for law enforcement, for maintaining peace on the home front, rests back in the respective communities from which you have come; and while he has the great job of the enforcement of the law of the United States of America, you and each of you have your job when you go back to enforce the law in the city or the village in the State in which you are to work. The people are not going to be satisfied merely with the fact that you work hard. They are going to be satisfied only when you solve the problems of law enforcement and of maintaining peace and order on the home front.

You have been here during the last 14 weeks not only to obtain information that you might personally use in your respective communities and your home States but you came here that you might go back as teachers and leaders in the great movement of law enforcement in America; not for a Gestapo, but recognizing that the law must be enforced under our democratic institutions; and in my humble opinion it can be so enforced just as effectively and just as well as it can under any dictatorial form of government. In fact, it can be enforced more efficiently because you are going to have the good wishes of every responsible citizen.

You are going to be given at times the opportunity to come back here and refresh your minds. One of the policies of the F. B. I. is that its agents out in the States come back here yearly that they may study and learn the new things, and that they may do a better job here in America. Oh, I hope the day may come when the lawyers who practice in the criminal courts will take refresher courses; and I hope the day may come when the men on the bench will take refresher courses that they may do a better job.

I realize, as was said here this morning, that one of your duties is to get the facts; but the community should be able to believe that when you present those facts to the prosecuting attorneys, and to the courts, there will be no flaw in the enforcement of the law as far as those agencies are concerned.

Mere words cannot tell you of the great work the director of this institution has done. Mr. Hoover stands at the head of law enforcement because he is intelligent, he studies daily, he believes in the education of officers. But we must not forget that he is incorruptible; he has always been incorruptible as far as money is concerned. He is incorruptible also insofar as political pressure is concerned, and let me say to you that political-pressure corruption is many times stronger than money corruption, and it is because of his character and integrity that he has been able to stand out against all political pressure since 1924.

We think that the institution was born then because this great leader took charge at that time, and I deem it a real privilege today to sit upon the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, which as far as any legislative body is concerned, has the power to help this great agency. I feel that in a way I can do something there to help in law enforcement. I shall never forget the importance of law enforcement no matter what my task may be in America, because I believe it is the fundamental idea, it is the solid rock upon which the home, the school, and the church must rest in order that we may realize the truth of those words that are inscribed in marble over the portals of the Supreme Court Building, "Equality and Justice under law." That is democracy, my friends.

This great leader at this institute is a leader because he can handle men. You are to return to your respective communities that you may follow his example in handling men. Mr. Hoover would tell you that he takes every precaution to see that each man who comes on his force is incorruptible. There are weak men, there are strong men who have weak moments, but we pray to God that we do not have weak men in law enforcement, and we pray to God that men in law enforcement never have weak moments, because it is for those moments and it is for that kind of men that the highwayman, the local gangster, and the corrupt politician are always looking, and once you fall, they will not allow you to rise again. They keep you down, and it is this fact that you must instil in the heart and soul of each and every officer, as you return to your several communities.

We realize that there are three branches of the Government. You are in the executive branch today, but your work is so close to the judicial branch that I have always felt personally that you were part and parcel of the judicial branch.

I am glad today that Michigan has Mr. William Spencer here from Flint. He is an officer who is going back to our great State to help to build up law enforcement in Michigan. You cannot be any stronger than your judicial system, and I feel that if the courts of America would work just as hard to see that justice is done for the people as they do at times to see that the crook is released from prison, we would have real law enforcement in America. That is not an indictment of the entire judicial system, but it is an indictment of those that the Director was talking about, who for political reasons, for money, in fact, and because of pressure, will weaken and allow the criminal to have an advantage to which he is not entitled.

I remember one of the first cases that I ever tried as a young lawyer. I came from the University of Michigan into Detroit. They had then a great district attorney and some great judges on the bench. I was appointed to try a criminal case and, of course, under the system at that time there was no compensation for me. I remember trying that case, and I remember that because of the lack of intelligence on the part of the officer or because he did not present the facts properly to the jury, the judge, after it was over, called me up to the bench and as he looked down at me he said, "Young man, you have freed a guilty man." That was very embarrassing to me as a young lawyer. I assured him, in what words I could gather together at that particular moment, that if my client, the defendant, was declared not guilty it was because the jury had pronounced him not guilty.

I leave with you this thought that you may take back, though you may not need it yourself, that the ability of the officer to present the facts properly to the court and to the jury is important. That case of mine turned upon the point of a purported confession by the defendant at the bar. The officer who had written into the book the so-called confession used the words that "he" had stolen the goods. It was one of the first cases under the Car Seal Act. Of course, he had either used the wrong pronoun or there were two men in the job; the judge felt that the man was freed because the officer had gotten mixed up on his pronouns and was not able to give the exact language of the confession to the jury.

I had very little criminal work before 1939, but my experience on the bench was that search-and-seizure cases were lost many times because the facts were not properly presented to the court, who, I will admit, was at times looking for a loophole to let the defendant go. But there is your job, to present the facts just as you find them and to be sure that you are able to express yourself in a way that all will understand. Oh, you face a grave responsibility when you return to your work back home.

We find that a large portion of the crime being committed in America today is by those who are under 18 years of age. If they are not checked, if they are not brought before the proper authorities, we will find in America after the close of this war a new crop of local domestic gangsters, after we have put forth all our effort to do away with the international gangsters.

So your work is important. You return to your communities to help law enforcement. Your job is never done until all the evidence is presented to the grand jury and to the trial jury so that justice may be done.

I have traveled through the slums of government in the last 3 years before I came here to the Senate probably as much as any other man in America. Not that we in Detroit and Michigan had the only slums in government, but it just happened that I was on the bench at that time and was called upon to perform the services of a one-man grand jury in Detroit and in Michigan. I do not come out of those slums and I do not leave the bench feeling that democracy will not work. I remember that when I received the appointment to do that work, one of the first men whose aid and advice I sought was the Director of this institution,

because I knew that he was the top law-enforcing officer in America, and that from him I could receive valuable advice. And I leave those slums of government realizing that under the laws of a democracy, they can be cleaned up completely. It had been thought in many States that the only cleansing force and the only force that could accomplish such results was the Federal authority because Mr. Hoover had done such a grand job; and the thing on which I wanted to convince myself at least was that the State, if it desired to, could do the same kind of an incorruptible job, paying no attention to political influences and pressure groups and other things such as the threat of death to you or to your family, which every law-enforcement officer experiences. The only thing that such threats do is to lead you to the conclusion that you are getting close to what the miners call "pay dirt." The more they threaten to kill you and the more they threaten your family, the more you are convinced that you must be getting near to the big and strong fellows who are committing crime; so as law-enforcing officers, it is rather encouraging to get such threats. It spurs you on to greater effort.

When you get back, try to lead your fellow officers to believe as you do after you leave this institution. I am not fully satisfied with the enforcement of law as it is today as far as the prosecution of criminals is concerned. I think we can do much to give the people a greater degree of protection under the law. You know every criminal case in the United States is brought in the name of the people of the United States of America. The title of such a case back in Michigan is, "The People of the State of Michigan Against the Defendant, John Doe." So you see that there is a different set-up in a democracy than in a totalitarian form of government.

It is the people who are the prosecutors in criminal cases. We are making some development along that line but we are not going fast enough. The science laboratory has helped the law-enforcement officer to find the facts and to do the job. We in America must see that the courts develop further along this line.

It is only in the last few years that a defendant could testify in his own defense in a case; now he testifies freely, but we have thrown around him a shield so that if he doesn't testify the judge cannot make any comment on the fact that he does not testify in the case; and my experience has been that many a man sits back beside his counsel, not testifying, the judge telling the jury that they must not consider that fact in the discharge of their duty.

Now I believe in the sanctity of the home, that a man's home is his castle. I believe in the theory that the people of the United States should prove their case beyond a reasonable doubt; but I do say that the people need more protection, they need laws that will help to see that justice is done under law; and as citizens we must be thinking of these things.

The law will not be enforced unless we have the cooperation of each individual citizen who wants right to prevail, but we never want the time to come when the individual citizen feels that he must be the law-enforcing officer. We want that as it is now as far as the F. B. I. is concerned and this is true of many other law-enforcing agencies. We want the people to feel satisfied that if they go and report the facts to the law-enforcing officers they can trust those officers to see that the facts are brought to the proper authorities and that justice really will be done

Let me close by saying to you men who are here graduating in this class that when you do return to your respective States, you should consider well the facts that you have obtained here from these men who are leaders in law enforcement. I know that you are going to return inspired by the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, and that you will never let anything dim that enthusiasm and that you will be able in a small way at least to impart to your fellow officers the things that Mr. Hoover and the institution stand for, and that your respective citizens in your States will know that you have benefited by this course that you have taken, that they will have more faith in your department, that they will have more faith in the other departments which are receiving information from you; and if that is done, then your time has been well spent and America as a whole will benefit.

May God speed you in your work on the battle front at home.

O. P. A. Deceit and Duplicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Office of Economic Stabilization in imposing a ceiling on the price of live cattle marks a new high, or perhaps it would be better to say a new low, in the use by Government agencies of chicanery, deceit, and subterfuge in an effort to defy Congress and to evade the effect of legislation passed by Congress. I realize that this is strong language, but I am using it advisedly. I would not think of making these charges if I did not have the facts and evidence available to support them. Those facts and that evidence are submitted herewith.

It has been known for some time, in fact ever since last February, according to officials of the O. P. A., that the present beef ceilings are unfair to a group of slaughterers known as nonprocessing slaughterers. According to the figures of the O. P. A. as given the Committee on Agriculture by Dr. Gilbert, its chief economist, existing ceilings put this group of slaughterers in the red to the extent of about 1½ cents per pound on what they slaughter. Several of these packers have filed actions in the emergency court set up under the Price Stabilization Act, which actions are based upon provision of the Price Control Act that in fixing price ceilings the O. P. A. must provide a generally fair and equitable margin for the distributor.

Obviously, a price ceiling which put this group of slaughterers in a position where they were losing 1½ cents per pound on all the beef they slaughtered failed to give them this fair and equitable margin and officials of the O. P. A. admit that they have no defense to these lawsuits. They have known this for 9 months but did nothing about it until last week. Apparently, the reason they did something about it last week was because on Wednesday, October 27, the O. P. A. was required to file an answer in court to these lawsuits. Their own lawyers told them they hadn't a leg to stand on in the way of defending these suits and, therefore, it was necessary to do something. That something was the order which put ceilings into effect on live cattle.

Now, in themselves, ceilings on live cattle would not help these nonprocessing slaughterers a bit unless they were placed so low as to give processing slaughterers an exorbitant profit. Therefore, the imposition of ceilings was not in any way necessary in order to help the nonprocessing slaughterers. Their predicament was merely used as a subterfuge to justify the imposition of these ceilings.

Inasmuch as these ceilings afforded no relief to the nonprocessing slaughterers, it was necessary to take some action to meet the situation and this was done by setting up a special subsidy of 80 cents per hundredweight to nonprocessing slaughterers who are defined in the directive issued by Stabilization Director Vinson as "slaughterers who, during the year 1942, sold and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the total dressed carcass weight of cattle slaughtered by them in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, frozen boneless beef, or ground beef." This 80-cent subsidy was to be in addition to the rollback subsidy paid all processors. The order furthermore makes some change in the subsidies paid to processors by providing that the subsidy rate shall be based upon grade, some grades receiving a higher and some a lower rate. That, however, does not in any way affect the 80-cent subsidy to the nonprocessing slaughterers. If the purpose had been to simply take care of the nonprocessing slaughterers, it could have been done very simply and very easily by giving them the 80-cent subsidy. I think perhaps this is one illustration of an instance where the subsidy might well be used because if the O. P. A. figures are correct, all other types of slaughterers are showing a good profit on sales and an increased return on their invested capital.

Under the circumstances it would seem rather sensible to pay this subsidy to a small group of processors rather than increase the profits of the great bulk of the processors by increasing the ceilings. However, the O. P. A. was not satisfied to do this. Their slick lawyers and economists saw in this situation a chance to slip over a price ceiling on live cattle without the necessity of securing the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator as provided by Congress. They saw in this situation an opportunity to impose price ceilings without having to comply with their promise made many times to the livestock producers and distributors that they would be consulted if price ceilings were put into effect.

How do they get around the requirement of law that price ceilings must be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and his successor, the War Food Administrator? By simply

saying that the ceilings which have been imposed are not price ceilings at all, notwithstanding the fact that they say very definitely what a processor can and cannot pay by grades for the livestock which he purchases during any calendar month. True, the processor is not held to the ceiling on any particular transaction, but the average price paid on his purchases over the month must not exceed the ceiling imposed for any one of the six grades into which cattle have been divided.

The theory of Dr. Gilbert and other officials of the O. P. A., on which this subterfuge was based, is set out in the hearings held before the House Committee on Agriculture on October 26, pages 28 and 29, as follows:

Mr. HOPE. I want to see if I understand correctly just what program you have been operating under and what one you are operating under now. If I understood you, the program which you are expecting the emergency court to throw out as being unauthorized is under the stabilization program, under the Price Control Act. Is that correct?

Mr. GILBERT. That is correct; Regulation No. 169.

Mr. HOPE. Now, you are substituting for that a program which you say does not come under the Price Control Act at all.

Mr. GILBERT. We are not substituting. We are maintaining that regulation. We are modifying the present subsidy arrangement, which calls for a flat payment of $1.10 per hundredweight. We are substituting for that.

Mr. HOPE. You are not going to discard this order that you say is under attack?

Mr. GILBERT. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. But you intend to supplement that, then, with this change in the subsidy program, which you contend does not come under the Stabilization Act but comes under the subsidy program?

Mr. GILBERT. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. And it is your contention that these maximum prices that you are putting on here are not ceiling prices, although as a matter of fact I think you must agree that they do have that effect.

Mr. GILBERT. But there is this very significant difference. No man is in violation of any price regulation if he pays more than these prices. He is not subject to any of the penalties of the act—neither buyer nor seller. The buyer, in this case the packer, is under a penalty arrangement by which, if he pays more than this list of prices on the average, he receives a smaller degree of assistance from the Government. Likewise, if he pays less than these floor prices.

Mr. HOPE. You mean he isn't subject to a penalty if he pays above the ceiling price or the maximum price in one instance or two instances, but if he does it consistently throughout the period he is, isn't he?

Mr. BROWNLEE. He is subject to no penalty except the loss of part of his subsidy.

Mr. HOPE. If the subsidies are necessary in order to enable him to continue in business, and I assume they are, that is a penalty. That would put him out of business just as quick as if you did it some other way.

Mr. Speaker, as the above very clearly shows, there is no difference whatever between the ceiling imposed here and a ceiling imposed under the Price Control Act, except that in this case a different kind of penalty—namely, the loss of the subsidy—is imposed rather than the penalties provided in the Price Control Act. It is conceded by everyone that the subsidy is necessary to keep the processors in business. If they violate the ceiling they do not get the subsidy. If they do not get the subsidy they go out of business. I submit this is an even more expeditious way of putting a processor who violates ceiling regulations out of business than would be the application of the penalties provided under the Price Control Act. In that case he would at least have the semblance of a day in court.

If this procedure is countenanced by Congress and is carried out in the case of other farm products, it means that the provisions which Congress has written into the Price Control Act for the protection of agricultural producers have no force or validity whatever and that Dr. Gilbert and his crew in the O. P. A. have again bypassed Congress.

I call attention also to the fact that this is an admitted use by the O. P. A. of subsidies for the purpose of control. Those of us who have been opposing subsidies all along have expressed the fear that subsidies would be used for the purpose of further controlling and regimenting business and agriculture. This has been denied by numerous Government agencies, but here we have a clear-cut case. Price ceilings were put into effect. Of course, the packers do not have to abide by them. Oh, no—that is, they do not have to abide by them if they can get along without a subsidy. Inasmuch as there are ceilings on the beef which they process which make a subsidy necessary in order for them to stay in business, they have the wonderful choice of abiding by the ceiling or going out of business through the withdrawal of the subsidy.

If a subsidy can be used to enforce a regulation of this kind, it can be used to enforce any regulation or order which Dr. Gilbert and his wrecking crew can concoct any time in the future.

The question is, What is the remedy? What can Congress do to stop this wanton, willful disregard of the laws which we pass and the deceit and skulduggery on the part of the O. P. A. and other governmental agencies? It seems to me we have one very obvious remedy and one which we are going to have an opportunity to exercise very shortly. That is the passage of the bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation with the amendment prohibiting all subsidies of this type. If we abolish subsidies we will at least put a stop to their use in the manner pursued by the O. P. A. in the case of beef cattle ceilings. I say this notwithstanding the fact that I think there are some cases in which subsidies can be used to advantage, including the one which I have heretofore mentioned, namely the 80-cent subsidy to the small nonprocessing packers. The action of the O. P. A. and the Office of Economic Stabilization, however, has clearly shown that we cannot trust these organizations to use the tremendous power of subsidies in a fair and honest manner. If we give them an inch they take a mile. Unfortunately, we do not have much choice of remedies. We have to use what we have at hand. The only effective weapon that I see now is to put a stop to all subsidies of this type.

Price of Crude Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities on November 4, 1943:

Whereas the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities is a conference the membership of which is composed of members of the various State regulatory authorities of the 17 principal oil-producing States of the United States—

That it is the responsibility and authority of the individual members of this conference in their respective States to supervise and administer the regulations and laws of the oil-producing States affecting the conservation and petroleum production operations in these States. As such, it is their responsibility and duty to keep constantly alert as to the actual production conditions, reserves of petroleum, and necessities of the petroleum industry to effect the conservation and production of petroleum in these States.

The National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities was organized under the direction and authority of the Petroleum Administrator for War and has been in existence as such organization since March 1942 and is charged with the responsibility of advising the Petroleum Administrator of petroleum producing conditions in the States and making such recommendations as were proper to assist him in his responsibility of assuring to the Nation during this period of emergency supplies of crude petroleum sufficient to meet the requirements for our military, essential civilian, and industrial demands.

That one of the first recommendations made to the Petroleum Administrator to insure constant exploratory effort and to maintain the production of properties already producing was that an over-all increase in the price of crude petroleum should be authorized. This recommendation was filed with the Petroleum Administrator for his guidance.

That the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, in line with the authority granted him by the President, recommended to the Price Administrator an increase in the price of crude petroleum.

That this subject was sincerely and urgently recommended by this body, but that in spite of the necessity of the situation, the Office of Price Administration has long delayed any action, and it was not until the 1st day of May 1943 that action was taken by the Office of Price Administration on this important question. Thereafter, the Petroleum Administrator again urged the reconsideration of his recommendation which was again acted upon adversely by the Price Administrator. Thereafter the Petroleum Administrator appealed from the decision of the Price Administration to the Office of Economic Stabilization.

That on October 29, 1943, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization,, rendered his decision denying the increase in the price of crude petroleum. That as a part of the decision of the Director of Economic Stabilization, he suggests that some form of subsidy might be used as an alternative to price increase and

suggests that this subject be explored: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities, That we deplore the action of the Director of Economic Stabilization in denying the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War for a price increase of crude petroleum and that we deplore the long delay in the consideration of this question in the Office of the Price Administrator; be it further

Resolved, That we commend the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, for his recognition of the seriousness of the question of proper price for crude petroleum and for his vigorous and earnest presentations of this subject to the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Economic Stabilization; and that we recommend that the Petroleum Administrator for War take any and all steps necessary to prosecute his recommendation to a final and successful conclusion, whether it be by appeal or otherwise; that we recommend that he exercise the authority given him by the Executive order creating the Office of Petroleum Administration for War to report directly to the President of the United States and recommend to him that he exercise his authority to insure the granting of such price increases as are proper; be it further

Resolved, That following careful discussion and study of the question of subsidies as an alternative for price increase, it is the considered opinion of this body that no form of subsidy now known to this body would be adequate or sufficient to meet the serious requirements of increased exploratory effort for reserves and production of reserves now known to exist; be it further

Resolved, That since the Director of Economic Stabilization in denying the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War, dated October 29, 1943, he on many occasions called attention to the fact that the Executive Order (No. 9328) orders that there are to be no price increases authorized by the Price Administrator not required by law. Since it is the opinion of the Director of Economic Stabilization that he is not authorized to make such price increases until special provision of the law is made for such increase, we therefore recommend to the Congress of the United States that the Congress enact sufficient and proper legislation to insure the authority of those responsible to grant price ceilings for crude petroleum in such amounts as are recommended by the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War.

Address of Hon. Ralph A. Bard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, at the graduation of the class of marines in O. C. S. at Quantico, Va., on November 3. The son of Mr. Bard was a member of that class. He spoke to the graduates, not only as an official of the Navy Department, but as a father to a son. He symbolized the service in the marines when he said in substance "the first duty of every officer in the service is to forget self and to remember he is responsible for the safety and lives of the men in his command." That is the spirit of service in the marines, the spirit that has made the name "marines" sacred in our glorious history, the spirit, which has won for the marines eternal glory from the turbulent waters of Tripoli in 1805 to the steaming jungles of the Solomons in 1943.

The address follows:

Brigadier General Cates, other hosts, members of this graduating class, and friends, it is indeed a genuine pleasure and a real honor for me to be able to attend these graduating exercises. I along with everyone else I know of in this country have the highest admiration for the marines—which was not in the least affected by your Commandant General Holcomb—who at a dinner not long ago took me off my high horse in great shape.

Secretary Knox was giving a dinner to King George of Greece. It was a small dinner. General Holcomb was there, as were a number of admirals of the Navy. We all had a good time. It was very informal and everybody warmed up in good shape. After dinner I was standing with General Holcomb and several admirals—and I said to the general:

"General—I have a great admiration for the marines—I am thinking of resigning from my job as Assistant Secretary of the Navy and joining the marines. What will you do for me?"

The general cast his eyes around the ceiling—and finally said:

"Well, Mr. Bard, I'll tell you what we will do, we'll make you a private, first class, in the marines."

Well, anyway, you see how the marines rate—at least in the mind of your commandant general—and I must admit that I would consider it a real honor to be a private, first class, in the marines.

This for you men is an hour of honor and achievement, and yet, at the same time, both for you and your families, a solemn hour. Some of you are about to leave this institution in which you have been trained in marine fundamentals. Others are remaining here for further training, but eventually you are all headed for active service at a time when all you have learned here will be put to the test—the supreme test of war. There is no situation in which a young American of spirit would rather be placed than precisely where you men are today—facing high adventure and perilous duty in this hour of our Nation's trial.

Fighting takes courage—winning the fight takes more than courage. Winning takes training; it takes morale; it takes resourcefulness; it takes discipline, subordination to authority; and, finally, it takes that bold determination which carries men to their objective, whatever the cost.

Most of you will be entering a new kind of life in which you will occupy positions of leadership in command of men. In your active service there will be many demands upon you—demands upon your self-control, upon your endurance, and upon your ability. You will do things you do not want to do, and at times when you do not want to do them. You will stand long, dreary, lonesome watches. You will be given tasks for which your experience furnished no precedent. The marine does not have at hand guides for every situation. Each case differs from the preceding case, and you must school yourselves to think ahead and to be prepared to meet emergencies. You will be too hot, or too cold, hungry, and tired, and perhaps never wholly comfortable. That's a marine's life. And you will have to think of the men more than yourself. That's an officer's life. You will find your seniors exacting, but understanding and helpful, and as quick to recognize merits as to disapprove shortcomings. As you have been taught, the habit of obedience to seniors is a prerequisite to the exercise of command over juniors—one cannot know how to command unless one knows how to obey.

The enlisted men of the marines will elicit your admiration, for they are a fine body of men. While you are sizing them up, they will submit you to searching scrutiny, and in a short space of time they will have formed an estimate of your character and ability, which will be more accurate than your own estimate of yourself. They are eager to respect and admire and trust their officers and will be quick to recognize those qualities of leadership, fair dealing, and ability which will command their respect and admiration and trust. At the same time let me warn you they are a perceiving body with whom bluff carries little weight and from whom deficiencies are not easily hidden.

Gentlemen, the marines are our first line of offense and also the first line of danger. In seeking active service in the marines you demonstrate your courage and your will to fight; and if necessary to die for your country.

Our enemies fight to subjugate and enslave all the peoples of the earth. We fight to preserve freedom for all the peoples of the earth. Our enemies proclaim the virtues of so-called superior races with a mystical right to oppress all other peoples. We fight for a world where every race and every nation will have an equal chance to grow and prosper. They proclaim war as the ultimate destiny of man. We see war only as an inescapable necessity and peace as man's destiny. I bid you recall also that every halting step man has made along that path toward a more perfect life has been paid for by sacrifice. Willingness to sacrifice lies at the root of every great human advance, and sacrifice is the constant price man must pay to preserve that which is good and to move forward to that which is better.

In such a war there can only be one outcome. For the will to be free, the will to speak one's mind, and to worship one's God in safety, are the fundamental driving forces of the human race. They have brought men out of barbarism and the forward surge to a better, brighter world shall not be blocked now by any man or any nation. With men like you rising to the challenge everywhere the shadow of another dark age shall not again spread across the earth.

Many gallant men have contributed to the high standards of the Marine Corps. They have built a tradition of faithfulness that has never been questioned.

For more than a century and a half—even before the signing of the Declaration of Independence—marines have fought their country's battles on land and sea. One hundred and sixty-eight years ago last month marines under the command of Capt. Samuel Nicholas landed from the ships of Commodore Esek Hopkins' naval squadron at New Providence in the Bahamas—and promptly took the situation in hand.

Marines were with the armies led by George Washington, and with the ships commanded by John Paul Jones. Marines manned the fighting tops of the *Bonhomme Richard* in her desperate and historic encounter with the *Serapis*—and the deadly fire from their rifles played an important part in that great victory.

Marines, a very small force of one sergeant and six privates, under Lt. Presley N. O'Bannon, led the attack on the harbor fort at Derne, Tripoli, in April 1805, and raised the Stars and Stripes for the first time in that part of the world.

Marines have participated in all of the wars of this country, and in between those wars marines have served in many lands, guarding American interests and protecting American lives at the far-flung outposts of the world. Our heritage is indeed a proud tradition, a great tradition. Its preservation must and shall remain a sacred trust.

There is one other thing I would just like to mention in case you men have not heard

about it—the Marine Corps is a part of the Navy. I was reminded of this the other day by a marine gunner who is assigned to my office. He told me of a conversation he overheard on a street corner in Washington recently. Two marines were discussing the sartorial carelessness of some Navy men as they walked by. One marine was overheard saying:

"Now, don't be too tough on 'em, boy, remember, the Navy is our ally in this war, just like the Chinese."

I am further reminded of the exuberant pride of the marines by a tailor friend of mine who refuses to tailor marine uniforms as he claims they are so fussy about every detail of fit that he just can't make any money due to alterations, and besides their fastidiousness upsets his digestion.

To you men and women who are here, the parents of these young men, and to those who are absent, I want to offer my congratulations and the Navy's thanks. These young men of yours have come into the marines with high bold hearts, with a faith and love of something better than life itself. They have come from homes where love of country, where respect for our traditions, have been bred into them from childhood. The presence of your sons here is a testimonial, beyond compare, of your own patriotism and love of country.

Gentlemen, you have been preparing yourselves for participation in the greatest struggle of the ages; for this war, more than any other in history, will decide the fate of the people of the world for generations to come. Sacrifices which you will endure, culminating in victory for the Allied Nations, will rid the world of a regime and a philosophy which, if successful and dominant, would mean the end of freedom and tolerance and opportunity for yourselves, your children and their children, and plunge the world back into the dark ages.

For those who see in this war a significance and a duty beyond that of mere existence, and who cling to their faith in immortality, this is a time of tremendous challenge and tremendous opportunity for service to God and to mankind. To play a part in settling the fate of the world and a part in building a world of the future is no small role. These are your tasks; may God give you strength and courage to play your part as a man, as a citizen of this great country, and as an officer of the marines.

On behalf of the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department I extend sincere congratulations to each of you, and I am delighted to welcome you to the commissioned ranks of the naval service. When you go into action remember that you do not go alone. You carry with you that heritage of those other brave men all through the centuries who have fought, and sometimes died, for the same cause for which you are fighting. May your active service in the Navy abound with high credit to yourselves, to your country, and to the marines, and help bring confusion and early defeat to our enemies.

Let Us Insure a Continuous Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. KUNKLE. Mr. Speaker, quite recently Secretary Knox made the suggestion that both major political parties adopt the same plank in their platform in respect to foreign policy. This would certainly be highly desirable. Even if there is a difference as to the exact language used, nevertheless I feel reasonably certain that there will be substantial agreement. It is even more important to have accord and agreement after the election takes place. As I see the problem this result can only be attained either by constitutional amendment or by mutual agreement. My resolution is an effort to secure this highly desirable objective through mutual agreement and by the Congress expressing the wishes and desires of the people of the United States in that regard. I feel that the President and President-elect will be guided by such an expression of opinion.

The period between the election and the time of taking office always presents a problem. It has already been recognized by the American people through the passage of the so-called "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution. In ordinary times no great difficulties arise, but in the present emergency it is extremely important that our executive department be able to speak to other nations with the assurance that they speak for the entire American people.

My resolution follows:

House concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the role of a President-elect during the interim between his election and inauguration in the present emergency

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in the event any person is elected in 1944 to the office of President to succeed the incumbent President, such President-elect shall be associated with the Government at the earliest possible date after such election in a capacity that will best insure continuity of action in the war effort, a consistent policy in our foreign affairs, and the establishment of a just and enduring peace.

Trends in Civil Aviation Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert an address delivered on October 26, 1943, at Cincinnati, Ohio, before the Aero Medical Association of Cincinnati by Dr. W. R. Stovall, medical director of C. A. A.:

TRENDS IN CIVIL AVIATION MEDICINE

CHANGE IN CONCEPTS

The right of the citizen to unhindered use of the air as a medium of transit must be recognized. This right must not be interpreted as license to exercise the privilege when the public safety is endangered. The task of civil aviation medicine is to determine whether the airman and airman applicant can perform requisite functions with a degree of skill commensurate with his own and the public safety. This is somewhat in contrast to the military mission in which the best is selected from the material available, for the task at hand; herein lies the fundamental difference between civil and military aviation medicine.

Insofar as selection is concerned, civil aviation medicine may be said to begin where the military leaves off.

This is not to infer that civil airmen are physically inferior to those of the military nor that civil aviation can be regarded as a refuge for the washed-out military pilot. The point for emphasis is that civil aviation must extend into the hinterlands and give everyone the opportunity not only to determine whether he meets the appropriate standards, but to demonstrate whether he compensates for any physical deficiency he may possess.

The further consideration that is due and which must be given to the individual who, by selection standards, is regarded as marginal or substandard has become a major endeavor.

With this difference of function, it is not reasonable to expect that civil aviation medicine can be patterned after military concepts, yet this has been the tendency in the past.

STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION

Public safety demands the maintenance of physical standards for the airman. It is obvious that these standards must be reasonable, adequate, and suited to the type of operation contemplated. That such standards should rest upon a foundation of factual information does not require argument. The rapidly developing aviation program with its highly specialized types of flying requires that consideration be given to the physical characteristics necessary to each particular type of flying operation. There need be no fear of the scientific application of medical knowledge to the determination of the applicant's suitability, for the same formula that would determine one individual to be unsafe would prove another capable of operating safely in the presence of what may now be regarded as a disqualifying defect.

If we exclude for the moment the relatively small number of airmen engaged in scheduled air transportation, the inclination is to assume the physical ability of the airman to perform so long as he is able to comply with the prescribed physical standards. On the other hand, the burden of proof of such ability rests upon the individual whose physical condition is marginal or below these standards.

Emphasis to date has been placed on the physical qualities with too little thought to behavior characteristics. There is the individual who may be found either in the normal or marginal and subnormal groups; he is the accident-prone automobile driver. There is ample evidence that many persons are definitely scheduled for accidents. These people can be expected to carry this characteristic with them into their flying. Employers of truck drivers have long followed the policy of firing the accident repeater. We cannot afford to wait for the pilot to have a sufficient number of accidents in the more lethal mode of transportation, the airplane, to establish himself as an accident-prone flyer. Tests must be devised to predetermine these individuals and keep them out of the air, or prescribe types of flying that will render them innocuous. When we learn more about them, we may be able to pay less attention to the physical structure, except as it may cause one to be a fumblethumb.

EMPHASIS ON FACTUAL REPORTING

The proper determination of the applicant's ability begins with the true assessment of his physical condition. The premium placed upon compliance with prescribed standards, and conversely the seeming penalty attached to noncompliance, requiring that medical certification be obtained the

hard way, would on first consideration encourage methods of circumvention. This tendency to conceal, misrepresent, and ignore, like the poor, is always with us. Partial remedy lies in rendering less painful the consequence of one's failure to meet the standards, and much has been accomplished.

Under current civil air regulations, the denial of medical certification for failure to meet the appropriate physical standard is not final so long as there remains the reasonable probability that the individual can demonstrate that he has properly compensated for his physical deficiency or that the disability has been removed. The neophyte has at his disposal a graduated series of procedures that he may follow to demonstrate such compensation. The experienced pilot need fear no longer that he will be deprived of his airman certificate should medical certification be temporarily withdrawn or delayed. Those who meet the requirements are able to obtain recertification at a minimum of inconveneince. The opportunity of those who have been denied certification to offer proof of compensation and the removal of the fear of losing the airman certificate has already paid dividends in more factual data. For those who would still hold out, there has just been provided a further encouragement in the form of a declaration on the report of physical examination to be signed jointly by the applicant and the medical examiner with an appropriate penalty for falsification.

Responsibility for obtaining full and factual information regarding the physical status of the applicant devolves upon the individual examiner. Conditions under which the examination is performed; the state of mind of the examiner, his training, and even his interest in aviation; and finally the state of flux of the applicant at the time of the examination will render variation in findings inevitable. Uniformity of findings at the expense of individual judgments are undesirable. Variables which are within reason can be accounted for. The untruthful applicant and the indifferent examiner will likewise reveal themselves.

Obligation on the part of the examiner to exercise every precaution to portray an accurate picture of the applicant can be discharged more easily if the reviewing body before whom the final picture is projected will discharge its obligations to give the examiner a picture of the whole. It would be of material assistance to the examiner to know frequency distributions, proportionate disqualifications, and finally his own batting average. Such information is now well within the realm of possibility. The necessity for retakes and exposures from different angles will decrease in inverse proportions as these facilities are implemented.

WAIVER OF PHYSICAL STANDARDS

The difficulty of obtaining a true picture of the applicant's physical and mental condition, even under the most ideal conditions, the elusiveness of the line of demarcation between the safe and the unsafe physical state, and the variation in the individual's ability to compensate for his physical deficiency renders some form of waiver provision mandatory. This necessity has been recognized since the outset. The problem has been to permit waiver and at the same time avoid its abuse.

Two conflicting schools of thought have been active in the determination of waiver policy. The one holds that unless the pilot who incurs a physical deficiency has had previous aeronautical experience in the grade he is seeking, while in full possession of his faculties, he cannot reach a state of full compensation because he does not know what is expected of him. The second school holds that having knowledge of his deficiency the inexperienced pilot will strive all the harder to excel and while he may not reach the state of perfection of his more fortunate brother, he will be all the more careful and thus avoid accident. Either type of reasoning carried to an extreme becomes absurd. Waivers, until lately, have been granted on the first hypothesis. Application to individual cases has carried it to the foregoing extreme. The present policy recognizes, on the average, the physically handicapped learns as readily as those we now regard as normal. It must be determined wherein the particular physical deficiency does interfere with safe piloting and what hazards would be encountered by reason of such deficiency.

This determination is made on the basis of additional clinical evidence, and in the case of structural physical defects, the applicant is permitted to proceed under a carefully supervised and graduated series of instruction. When he feels that his aeronautical experience, ability, and judgment compensate for his physical deficiency, a special medical flight test is authorized. The purely medical deficiency must be resolved alone on the basis of clinical information; nothing can be gained by flight test; in fact, it could prove distinctly dangerous. In brief, if a reasonable "factor of safety" is demonstrated, medical certification is granted; often with limitation as to type of operation, type of aircraft flown, or period of reexamination.

DEVELOPMENT

Earlier in the discussion it was stated that so long as the airman is able to comply with the prescribed physical standards, the inclination is to assume his physical ability to perform. It is the only logical procedure in the light of present knowledge and under conditions that prevail. Its danger is reflected in the fact that 85 percent of aircraft accidents are attributed to pilot error alone, a term covering a multitude of sins. It may be synonymous with accident proneness. The enormity of the percentage in this one instance is sufficient to disturb the most complacent.

It would be pointless to undertake an aviation medical development program that would duplicate the work now being performed so ably by the military services and the numerous research foundations, institutions, laboratories, and other organizations. There is a definite need, however, for facilities which would permit the substantiation and proof testing of selected procedures, instruments, and apparatus, applicable to the person, that are being developed at present. Many such, no doubt, would contribute to the comfort and safety, not to mention the life span of the airman, but must now be shelved for lack of methods for investigation as to their practicability.

Measures must be taken to clear the pathways of foreign air travel and render them safe against disease as well as accident.

Although much laboratory investigation with specific physical reference applicable to aviation in general has been done by isolated groups, no centralized facility has ever been provided wherein the practical aspects of these laboratory and statistical findings could be determined. By reason of this lack, most of the material developed by the various research bodies has been lost for the most part to civil aviation medicine. The evaluation of the aeronautical capabilities of the individual airman applicant therefore largely rests today, as it did with the passage of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, upon the judgment of those charged with that responsibility, supported principally by the body of facts of general medical knowledge. The flying public, the operator, and the pilot are demanding a more scientific application of this general knowledge.

The Senate Two-thirds Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, October 31, 1943, by Mr. Robert L. Norton:

PERIL TO PEACE IN OLD SYSTEM—TWO-THIRDS RULE IN CONGRESS NEEDS TO BE ABOLISHED—BALKS WILL OF THE MAJORITY

(By Robert L. Norton)

The prolonged controversy in the Senate over the Connally resolution points one indisputable conclusion: Namely, that if this country is to get anywhere in future international cooperation Congress should move to abolish the two-thirds rule. A great many years ago it was said on the floor of the Constitutional Convention that this rule puts it in the power of a minority to control the will of a majority.

And this is just as true today as it was then. Under the existing practice it will be nothing short of a miracle if any sound agreement on world peace and our future responsibility can be achieved. There is certain to be the old rigmarole of the major parties struggling for power. And when it comes to a show-down, while the President, be it Mr. Roosevelt or someone else, at the time will encounter these difficulties. Had it not been for the intense political and personal hatred of Senator Lodge for Woodrow Wilson this country would have been in the League of Nations. This is not to say that our entry into World War No. 2 would have been avoided, but it was a very long step in this direction.

NO REASON TO RETAIN AMENDMENT

Were Congress, and more particularly the Senate, less concerned with politics a constitutional amendment could be put over in a few months, with the same speed as the repeal of prohibition was adopted. There is no possible excuse for retaining the amendment in the Constitution today. It is simply begging the question, as asserted by some of the legal sharps that a series of agreements can be substituted for the two-thirds rule on the adoption of treaties, and it is subterfuge of the worst kind. Yet, under the circumstances no other course is available to whatever administration may be in power, and considering the extraordinary multiplicity of problems which are bound to arise when peace arrangements are considered. As a matter of fact a number of such agreements have been negotiated in the prosecution of the war and considerable doubt may be raised as to their validity. There would not seem to be the shadow of doubt but that the States would agree to the proposed amendment, since by common consent this is a country where majority rule prevails.

The existence of the two-thirds rule constitutes the chief stumbling block in the way of collaboration of the United Nations after the war. There was a time when the chief political argument for the abrogation of the rule was the insistence of the southern Members in retaining a veto power of one-third of the Senate. This idea was carried into the deliberations of the national conventions of the Democratic Party, but finally abolished at Chicago in 1932, chiefly at the

instigation of James A. Farley. It was then described as utterly un-American, a characterization which fits equally today.

ISOLATION DANGEROUS POSSIBILITY

The squabbling of the Senate over the terms of the post-war collaboration plainly indicates what may be expected in future deliberations. It is true that there is a disposition to go slow in the present nature of our commitments because of the uncertainty of what the future holds for the United States. Also we might let ourselves in for obligations which this country in good faith might not be able to fulfill. The current use of the term "an international police force" is a good deal of a misnomer. It is perfectly obvious, however, hidden in controversial verbiage in the Senate, that the United States must ultimately make some arrangement for military agreements with its allies if the peace is to be preserved after the war. The nature of these arrangements can only be determined when the war is over. But there is no sound argument against declaring our good intentions at this time. The alternative is isolation, military and economic, which might prove more costly and dangerous to our people than the existence of what is termed an "alliance," although this is a word which does not set well with some millions of Americans, since it implies playing power politics in the world.

As the Connally amendment is drawn it might be susceptible of a score of interpretations. It is certainly ambiguous. There was a recent statement drawn by some of the ablest leaders of the three greatest religious groups in America—Protestants, Jews, and Catholics—which, it seems to us, in a few brief words sets forth the aims and purposes of this country. The succinct paragraph was as follows: "An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law, guaranteeing the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revive them when necessary: assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

But none of these great objectives is to be accomplished if there is a bad defect in the machinery necessary to carry them to a successful conclusion. And such a defect is contained in the two-thirds rule which serves to impede the introduction of a sound foreign policy. It works to frustrate the hopes and the will of the American people which would lead the world to a permanent peace.

TWO-THIRDS RULE BLUDGEON OF MINORITY

The late Justice Holmes once said that there was nothing sacrosanct about the Constitution. It would be a good idea to amend it every few years as conditions developed which seemed to make such amendment desirable. And from time to time, we have followed the practice of amending the Constitution, without disturbing the essential rights which it guarantees to every citizen.

The two-thirds rule has frequently become an effectual instrument with which to provide the means by which an irreconcilable minority has prevented the majority from effecting its policy. Thus it is a historical fact that the use of this rule effectually prevented Grover Cleveland from obtaining a treaty of arbitration with Great Britain. The rule played a part in making ineffectual the efforts of Theodore Roosevelt and President Taft to carry out the same policy of arbitration with Germany, Great Britain, and France, as well as a number of other countries.

And Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, dissecting the course of the rule in history, asserts that not only did the rule defeat Woodrow Wilson, and an overwhelming mapority of the American people in adherence to the League of Nations, but it also kept this country out of the World Court.

MIGHT WAGE PRESENT WAR IN VAIN

All the terrible costs and sacrifices of this war are now endangered by the same process. The Cleveland treaty with Great Britain was carried in the Senate by a majority vote of 43 to 26, yet it was defeated because it lacked two-thirds. The Covenant of the League was approved in the Senate by a vote of 49 to 35 and fell 7 votes short of the necessary two-thirds. And the same fate met the World Court, which was adopted by a vote of 52 to 36. The rejection of the League of Nations was the victory of 17 Senators over 78.

The argument against the League Covenant was that the United States should isolate itself, that it could stay at peace although the rest of the world was engulfed by war. We now know that was impossible. The Wyoming Senator points out with conclusiveness that if the Lease-Lend Act had not been enacted because of the rule, and it was argued at the time that the rule applied since it concerned a series of treaties, Germany, by now, would in all probability have overrun England, Russia, for lack of lease-lend aid, would be reeling before the Nazi armies and we would be carrying on the war with Japan alone.

The defeat of the Treaty of Versailles did not keep us at peace. On the contrary it made war more inevitable. We turned to ineffective substitutes. For lack of the League Covenant there was first the disarmament conference under Secretary of State Hughes, one of the saddest episodes in all American history. We scrapped a fleet which was second to none in the world. We permitted the Japs to build a formidable navy while we were tearing our own down.

Pertinent Remarks on Present-Day Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

AMERICA'S BEST-RUN WAR

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Because the war is going well on all fronts we are told, "You should not change horses in the middle of the stream." The war on the battlefields is going very well indeed because the President has had the wisdom not to interfere either in our war strategy or in the selection of Army and Navy leaders. He has permitted Army and Navy leaders a free hand in determining both the war strategy and the selection of men to be placed in charge of important assignments. Secretary of War Stimson says:

The President has absolutely refrained from interfering in any way with the War Department and in the choice of any generals of the United States Army and in their assignments to duty. The President has followed the advice of his military leaders in the consideration of all questions of strategy which have governed the war.

The home front, however, has not been going so well as the battle front. In this field the President is in complete command. In this field he has selected his own advisers, also the keymen who hold all important positions on the home front. The list of names is quite imposing: Frankfurter, Wallace, Hopkins, Rosenman, Cohen, and others. The home front has bogged down. It has become a debacle. The President is responsible. At long last he is changing his home-front leaders and doing it "in the middle of the stream." He is belatedly placing in the saddle on the home front such men as Byrnes, Vinson, Bowles, Crowley, and Stettinius—strong businessmen who believe in our system of free enterprise and propose to preserve it. The questions that will face the American voter in 1944 are: Will a new President be inclined to interfere in the war strategy that is working out today so successfully? Will he not rather be inclined to concentrate his efforts upon straightening out our home-front mess? Will he surround himself with the strongest Cabinet he can find, regardless of party affiliation, to help him in his task and to help plan our post-war future?

THE CASE AGAINST ROLL-BACK SUBSIDIES

Few of the legislative problems that have come before the Congress in recent years are as complex as the proposal of the administration to pay subsidies to keep down the cost of living. Briefly, here are some of the objections that have been made to subsidies:

First. Subsidies increase the national debt.

Second. They introduce the dangerous doctrine that the state should support its people rather than vice versa.

Third. In the long run they cost the taxpayer more than he is saved on his food bill.

Fourth. They lead to political control. The Supreme Court has said the Government has a right to regulate what it subsidizes.

Fifth. Subsidies will have to be paid in increased taxes by future generations, which means the veterans of the war will pay part of the grocery bills of the wage earners of today, many of whom are making more than ever before in history.

Sixth. Subsidies are a demagogue's paradise for they enable him to promise higher prices for producer and lower costs to consumer.

Seventh. The administration says the people have too much money and that this inflationary danger must be absorbed by higher taxes. If this is true the people are better able to pay their grocery bills now than ever before.

Eighth. A price structure built on subsidies will bring economic chaos when the supports are removed.

Ninth. Subsidies are inflationary because they mean more purchasing power

and money in the pockets of the people at a time when there is a shortage of consumer goods and a temptation to compete in price for them.

Tenth. Food subsidies have been tried before and have never worked successfully. They have wrecked nations from early Biblical times on down through Rome and the Middle Ages to the present.

Eleventh. Our greatest inflationary threats are excessive Government spending. This excessive spending can and should be checked.

FRUSTRATIONS MEAN RESIGNATIONS

Top executives in Government positions are resentful because they are prevented from adopting policies that they know are necessary to speed up the war effort and to bring order out of the chaos in their respective departments. These top executives are prevented from doing what they know should be done because basic decisions are made from a political angle by men above them without consulting them beforehand, also because their departments have been overstaffed with employees that are saturated with the New Deal philosophy, so much so, in fact, that these employees are antagonistic to the business-like policies the department head wishes to carry out, and administrative pressure is applied to prevent the department head from firing these disloyal employees. Chester Davis was so frustrated that he resigned. Prentiss Brown was another frustrated man. Stettinius was ready to quit when he was shifted to the State Department. Now Marvin Jones has been overruled on live-cattle prices; and so it goes.

DRASTIC REDUCTIONS

The administration, speaking through the President a few months ago, stated we must have $16,000,000,000 in new taxes. A few weeks ago, because of opposition in Congress and a demand for economy in expenditures, the sixteen billion was scaled down to twelve billion. Then Secretary Morgenthau told Congress the Treasury would settle for ten and one-half billion. Now Congress, speaking to the administration through the Ways and Means Committee, says, "We will give you two billion in new taxes and that is all. We suggest that you cut your expenditures eight and one-half billion." Congress itself deserves the Congressional Medal for bravery under fire.

Decision of Supreme Court in Associated Press Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, a few days ago I read a newspaper account which referred to a statement issued by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar, on the much-publicized Associated Press antitrust case. I wanted to read the Montague statement in its entirety, and I requested a copy of it. It is my thought that other Members of Congress will profit from reading it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Can the courts legislate? When Congress and the State legislatures refrain from doing so, can the courts legislate a public-utility status upon an industry that has always been highly competitive? Can the courts go further, and legislate that status upon a single unit in that industry, leaving all its competitors free from any public-utility obligations? Specifically, can the courts legislate a public-utility status upon the Associated Press because of its size and efficiency, but leave all its competitors, the United Press, the International News Service, the New York Times News Syndicate, and all other news-gathering services, free from any public-utility obligations?

To these questions in the Associated Press case on October 6 one judge answered "No," but two judges answered "Yes." If this case is appealed, a doctrine that is now being pushed in several different fields by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, but is wholly discordant with earlier New Deal principles, will have to be reviewed by the Supreme Court.

Who could have dreamed that the Sherman Act, enacted more than 50 years ago to keep industry competitive, could ever be tortured by the Antitrust Division into a mandate permitting the courts to bypass Congress and the State legislatures, and to legislate a public-utility status upon enterprises which Congress and the State legislatures could never be induced to legislate into the public-utility class?

Applying the persuasion of criminal indictments, the Antitrust Division in 1938 induced the Chrysler Corporation and the Ford Motor Co. to consent to decrees which not only enjoined and regulated these companies but also bypassed Congress and the State legislatures, and legislated a national program of detailed regulation upon every outside company that financed any purchases of Chrysler or Ford cars.

In 1940 the Antitrust Division induced Paramount, Loew's, R. K. O., Warner Brothers, Vitagraph, and Twentieth-Century Fox to consent to a decree that bypassed Congress and the State legislatures, and legislated upon these companies and every theater dealing with them a code of rules and an enforcement machinery far exceeding any that Congress or the State legislatures could ever have been induced to legislate.

For several years congressional committees have been holding hearings and pondering without recommendation proposals for amending the patent laws, so as to forbid patent agreements restricting the quantity, the price, and the purpose of the article produced under the patent and the geographical area within which it may be produced and sold, and to compel the patent owner to permit the public to use any patent involved in a violation of these amendments or of the antitrust laws. When these proposals were first made these restrictions were legal according to Supreme Court decisions in which Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone had concurred, but since then eight new members have been appointed to the Supreme Court, and as Justice Frankfurter candidly remarks, "after a reconstruction in the membership of the Court" there may be "important shifts of opinion." By 1942 indications were multiplying that without waiting for any amendment of the patent laws several members of the "reconstructed" Supreme Court might be ready to over-rule earlier Supreme Court decisions and to hold that patent agreements containing these restrictions were not permitted by the existing patent laws and were contrary to the existing antitrust laws. Early in 1942 the Supreme Court refused to permit a patent owner to sue for infringement when a patent had been used in excess of the patent protection and in violation of the antitrust laws. Relying on the war emergency and these new Supreme Court trends, and again applying the persuasion of criminal indictments, the Antitrust Division in 1942 and 1943 induced a number of the most prominent corporations in America to consent to decrees which enjoined such restrictions and permitted the public for the duration of the war to use any of the patents involved in these restrictions.

Following the pattern of these consent decrees the lower courts in several recent contested cases have assumed that the Sherman Act empowers them to legislate a public utility status upon an industry or a single unit of a competitive industry.

Last April the lower court held that the Pullman Co. had a monopoly of the sleeping-car transportation business. Instead of prohibiting the monopoly as the Sherman Act provides, leaving to Congress and the State legislatures the question whether sleeping-car transportation should be legislated into a public-utility status, the lower court legislated this status upon the Pullman Co., by requiring that the company must separate its manufacturing business from its transportation business, and that the company when requested must sell used sleeping cars to a railroad, and that the company must operate and service sleeping cars built by any manufacturer and tendered to the company for operation and service, and that the company must furnish through-line sleeping-car service to any railroad or group of railroads.

In the Hartford-Empire case, which will be argued in the Supreme Court this November, the lower court in 1942 legislated the company into a public-utility status by requiring the company to sell to its licensees outright on terms to be prescribed by the court, all machines previously leased by the company to the licensees, and requiring the company to license, royalty-free to all applicants, all the company's existing patents and methods, and requiring the company to license to all applicants on identical royalties to be fixed by the court all the company's future patents and methods.

This same pattern is followed in the Associated Press case in the 2-to-1 decision of the lower court, which, more candidly than these other courts, frankly admits that it is acting legislatively and that what it is legislating is a public-utility status upon the Associated Press, by requiring "that members in the same field as the applicant shall not have power to impose, or dispense with, any conditions upon his admission, and that the bylaws shall affirmatively declare that the effect of admission upon the ability of an applicant to compete with members in the same field shall not be taken into consideration in passing upon his application." This leaves free from all public-utility obligations all of the Associated Press' competitors—the United Press, the International News Service, the New York Times News Syndicate, and all other news-gathering services.

This torturing of the Sherman Act so as to empower the court to bypass Congress and the State legislatures, and by court decrees to legislate into public utility status an industry—or only a single unit of an industry as in the Associated Press case—shows how far the courts have departed in these cases from the rule laid down years ago by the Supreme Court that "one of the fundamental purposes of the statute is to protect, not to

destroy, rights of property * * * not as depriving stockholders or corporations of the right to live under the law of the land but as compelling obedience to that law."

Discussing the Chrysler and Ford consent decrees, a contemporary member of the Antitrust Division, writing later from the detached viewpoint of a lecturer at Harvard Law School, questioned whether there was any statutory authority for them, and deplored them as in essence a legislative effort raising "grave problems of legal propriety and legal power," regarding which "a decent respect for the lesson of recent history should induce the utmost circumspection," and concluded that "determinations so broad and fundamental do not lie with officials charged with the administration of the antitrust laws."

Justice Brandeis, whom Attorney General (now Justice) Jackson has called "the original New Dealer," cogently stated in his dissenting opinion in a Supreme Court case quoted by the dissenting judge in the recent Associated Press case the reasons why the courts should not legislate public utility obligations upon the business of news-gathering.

Justice Murphy, another New Dealer, dissenting last May from the Supreme Court decision in the case between the broadcasting companies and the Federal Communications Commission, refused to spell out from indefinite provisions of the Communications Act the power to regulate broadcasting which was assumed by the Commission, and insisted that the Commission should not undertake to regulate a purveyor of news and entertainment and a medium of public discussion until Congress had legislated unequivocally.

Before the Supreme Court was "reconstructed" the New Deal accusation against the "old" Supreme Court was that the "old" Court usurped legislative power by acting as a censor of legislation.

Surely the usurpation of legislative power is greater, when courts in Sherman Act decrees bypass Congress and the State legislatures, and legislate a public utility status upon enterprises after Congress and the State legislatures have refrained from doing so.

Industrial Pioneering in Accident Prevention and Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, on October 23, 1943, Mr. James A. Emery, general counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, delivered a most interesting and instructive speech to the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions at Harrisburg, Pa.

There is so much of value in this speech, from a factual and historical standpoint, that I believe the Members of Congress should have an opportunity to read it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Emery's speech printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the privilege of addressing this notable gathering is enhanced by the presence and words of the Governor of Pennsylvania. It is as refreshing as it is rare to hear a powerful American executive warn his fellow citizens to do their part to keep him within the bounds of his legitimate authority. But such words are to be expected from one who has never missed an opportunity to serve his State and Nation. It was he who on the slopes of the Argonne, in one of the most critical moments of that great struggle, seized a German helmet when his own was knocked from his wounded head and made it a transformed symbol of American courage and accomplishment.

I have accepted this opportunity to recall a forgotten, and correct an often misrepresented or misunderstood contribution to American social history. It is a familiar practice to picture the American industrialist as an invincible and reactionary opponent of social legislation. Nothing is further from the historic fact. Let me offer as a standard for comparative conduct a statement from the notable address made to your 1941 gathering by the present Secretary of Labor. Recalling the early stages of the movement to which your services are devoted, she declared:

"Workmen's compensation had its beginning, or at least its first wide application, between 1914 and 1918."

She continued:

"It is the oldest of our social insurances and it is the cornerstone of the great structure which now provides protection against most of the hazards of a workingman's life."

The modern student of that revolutionary social movement may be surprised to discover that the much criticized American industrialist, by the test of the Secretary's statement, was an aggressive pioneer in clearing the obstructions of opinion and law from the pathway of that great political and social change.

The record, however, is beyond dispute. Five years before the earliest date suggested by the Secretary as the beginning of the wide application of workmen's compensation, the National Association of Manufacturers organized its first major committee for the study of the problems involved in 1909. In 1910 the association established a permanent committee on industrial indemnity insurance. Recognizing the limited and inaccurate information respecting the causes, prevention, and relief of work accidents then available, and the interest but lack of unified opinion necessary to formulate a policy, the committee circulated some 25,000 carefully drafted questionnaires among American manufacturing plants, going far beyond the association's membership, and received an 80-percent response to its inquiry. It provided for an elaborate and comprehensive investigation of foreign experience in the field of accident prevention and relief and published and circulated as complete a body of European accident data as was then available.

Following this, in 1910, the association at its annual meeting, recognized and declared: "Our own Nation is less advanced than the progressive European nations in respect to employers' liability and industrial accident indemnity to the detriment of the Nation, its institutions, and its people."

It declared our present liability system "Unsatisfactory, wasteful, slow in operation, and antagonistic to harmonious relations between employers and wage workers."

It urged the establishment of a substitute system automatically providing indemnity for victims of industrial accidents and their dependents to reduce waste, litigation and friction, and meet other requirements of an enlightened industrial nation.

It expressed its determination to cooperate with State legislators for such a purpose and recommended to its members, pending the formulation of legislation, a method of voluntary, mutually contributory industrial accident indemnity insurance, elastic enough to provide for voluntary sickness and old-age and death insurance.

The association emphasized what all authorities have since accepted as indispensable, the superior importance of accident prevention. It authorized a department on prevention of industrial accidents to be established by the association, independently or in cooperation with others, to provide a means for the study and exhibition of preventive devices for cooperation with State and National inspection departments, for the compilation and analysis of statistics and the payment of substantial money prizes for the safest plants and the most practical safety devices brought to the association's attention each year.

In 1911 the association reformulated its position in the light of new information, experience and court decisions. It desired to have established by law in our national industrial system, in practical form, the principle of relief or compensation to injured workers irrespective of the question of fault or negligence, which relief or compensation shall be prompt and sure in payment, fixed in amount, and the moneys or fund out of which the same is paid so collected and disbursed as to insure the least possible waste and the reduction of the cost of such relief or compensation as near as may be to a fixed and certain charge upon industry.

The association urged that such legislation should cover every wage earner, including those in agriculture, save where injury was due to criminal carelessness or intoxication. It knew then from the studies of its committees, what is now certainly recognized, that there are more occupational fatalities and injuries in farm work than in any other industry.

It further constantly emphasized at that early date the superior importance of accident prevention and the fact that the greatest of all accident preventives is the habit of caution. During 1912, 1913, and 1914, the formative period of our earliest compensation legislation, the association cooperated with and aided the compensation commissions then established, both among the States of the Union and the Canadian Provinces, presenting, by request, its information and exhibits to many such bodies and State legislatures. It was during those early years that the engineer department of the association aided and advised the association members in matters of plant sanitation and hygiene, and in cooperation with other outstanding organizations, developed a continuing study and practical testing of numerous submitted accident-prevention devices and appliances. With respect to many of these constituting personal equipment like goggles and foundry shoes, it arranged for manufacture and distribution to workers at cost.

During these years it enlarged its cooperative relations with other associations in this field and maintained a notable collection of traveling safety exhibits and aided in the establishment and maintenance of the American Safety Museum.

By 1913 the association had developed a series of motion pictures relating in story form the advantages and practicalities of accident prevention. Those early flickering films were made both independently and in cooperation with companies like the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. They were made available and exhibited throughout the plants of the country and shown in more than 7,500 of the multiplying moving-picture theaters. These films were finally presented to the National Safety Council, but unfortunately the state of the art did not assure their preservation and they are now lost to us.

In 1913 President Wilson recommended and the Congress established a Commission on

Industrial Relations. After a year of investigation the Commission's majority report was written by Prof. John Commons of the University of Wisconsin, the father of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission. Surely no one would accuse him of prejudice in favor of manufacturers. With him as a public member was associated Mrs. Borden Harriman, whose recent ministry to Norway won national commendation. In that notable report the doctor examined at length the problems of accident prevention and relief, and identifying by name the contributions of the National Association of Manufacturers and its coope-ators, he declared:

"Three great private associations have sprung up which are doing as much or more for safety than all the State and Federal Governments combined."

In 1914, Mr. Magnus Alexander, a notable electrical engineer, and the organizer of the National Industrial Conference Board, was a member of the Massachusetts Compensation Commission and simultaneously a member of the association's committee on accident prevention and relief. An authority in these social studies, he established in cooperation with manufacturers and leading representatives of the medical profession, a conference board of physicians in industry. Particularly during the 10 years between 1914 and 1924 that unique body made important pioneer contributions in the field of industrial medicine and surgery. It enlisted the interest and aid of the medical profession in the field of work accidents, industrial hygiene, sanitation, and occupational disease. In bimonthly conferences, aided by prominent physicians and surgeons, and especially by plant physicians devoting themselves to medicine and surgery in special application to the industrial worker, the work of the board developed a new appreciation of these great responsibilities of American industry.

To the voluntary contributions of these medical leaders, especially of the chairman of the board, Dr. John Moorhead, professor of surgery, New York Post Graduate Medical School and Hospital, a great and inspiring leader, and to the cooperation of industrialists, we owe the beginnings of the modern development of plant hospitalization. The vast scale of first-aid facilities, the modern study of the physical capacity of the worker, and the allocation of tasks for which he is physically adapted and the standardization of diagnosis and treatment by a specialist in work-accident injuries and occupational disease, are the characteristics of the modern American plant.

In these days when there is universal acceptance of the compensation principle it is somewhat difficult to realize the conditions that surrounded the introduction of the original principle into the social thinking tradition and institutional law of our country. Prior to 1927 we had no public accident statistics of authority. We had to rely upon fragmentary private compilations and estimates or parallels with foreign information. We had to learn from an experience not our own. Neither could we if we would, nor would we if we could, Germanicize or Anglicize the legal structure of our States. We could and did adapt to their varying conditions and traditions a fundamental principle. We recognized that the mechanisms and the power employed in modern production and distribution were essential to the material needs of our industrial civilization. But we perceived also that they were unhappily accompanied by an inherent hazard in the way the modern world does its work. They could be controlled by the individual only in a limited way. Many accidents thus arose in a large sense from the circumstances of production and only in part through the fault of individuals. They represented a series of risks inherent in our industrial organization.

There was a world-wide recognition of the inadequacy of the existing system of employers' liability as a means of meeting the need for relief of industrial injuries. The judgment of civilized mankind perceived the need of special public consideration because of the economic and social effect of such injuries upon a civilized people. We turned from torts and fault and negligence to a new conception of authority by which our society determined to insure itself against a physical deterioration of one of the most important classes of its population. It was social protection against an evil, social in its origin and to be thus reached and rectified.

It has been too long forgotten that in the earliest and most difficult period of our primary steps in social insurance, the so-called reactionary industrialist gave practical leadership to his fellows and his country, instigated original investigations, established the primary importance of accident prevention and of medical care and rehabilitation, aided lawmakers in the definition of policy, and most difficult of all, contributed to the formulation of the elementary social philosophy that now lies at the roots of our flowering system of accident prevention and compensatory relief. The manufacturer was no laggard. He made himself the pioneer missionary of new ideas and practical methods of accomplishment. In justice let his contribution to the great result be neither misrepresented nor forgotten.

Today the business of life is the manufacture of death. The world is at war. Traumatic surgery is the order of the day. The doctor fights disease and casualty on the field and in the hospital. Not a few of newer and better methods found their origin and development in industrial medicine and surgery.

In that awful hour of Pearl Harbor one of New York's foremost surgeons and citizens was lecturing at the invitation and under the auspices of the University of Hawaii, to the medical profession of Honolulu. They had assembled in the early morning since the lecturer anticipated his departure before noon. He was, among other things, an authority on the new sulfanilamide treatment of wounds and infection. By the inscrutable designs of Providence that man was Dr. John Moorhead, first chairman of the Conference Board of Physicians in Industry, from 1914–24. In that tragic hour that Japan the assassin struck her dastardly blow, he organized the civilian medical forces of Hawaii and marshalled them in that place of desolation and death. From the evidence of the highest military authority his special knowledge and unusual capacity for organization and leadership contributed beyond the highest hopes to the reduction of the fatalities of that catastrophe.

League of Free Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by one of the prominent citizens of California, Dr. Arthur E. Briggs, on our international problems.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF FREE PEOPLES—A PLAN FOR THE PERPETUAL PEACE OF THE WORLD

(By Dr. Arthur E. Briggs)

FOREWORD

Twenty-five years ago the world had a new hope for peace which was expressed in the League of Nations. It failed, not because peace is impossible, but because that League was not designed to be a secure guaranty of peace.

American experience in government can tell exactly why. The present problem of our world is much the same as confronted our Revolutionary forefathers. The League of Nations Covenant contained the same defects of the Articles of Confederation adopted by the American Colonies in 1778. The League lacked power to keep the peace of the world, because, like the Articles of Confederation, its rule of unanimity of consent stymied decisions and paralyzed action, because it possessed no independent revenues to support the League, because it had no executive head, because it could not enforce the decrees of its impartial court, because it was at the mercy of any recalcitrant state. In a similar crisis the Constitution makers of the United States formed "a more perfect union."

We failed to win the peace after we had won the last war. But again the Allied Nations will probably have opportunity to establish a stable world order. What shall we do in the present crisis of world affairs?

The Atlantic Charter was our first great step. It is superior to Wilson's Fourteen Points. Yet there is just complaint of its inadequacy. In our statement below of declaration of principles we have attempted to express more precisely and more fully as law what was there only a promise of the Allied Nations. To make such principles efficacious additional institutions to apply and enforce them are necessary. The latter are wanting in the Atlantic Charter. In this regard our statesmen must reassure the American people.

For our traditions sufficiently warn us against entangling alliances. We will not underwrite any treaties to perpetuate imperialisms, much less to extend them. We will not join any concert of powers. We will not play the game of balances of power. Nor should we be allured by any false dream of geopolitical preponderance of power, even though the United States be offered the hegemony of such an alliance, for history proves it could not last and would raise new enemies against us.

In collective security there is only one dependable solution—that lies in a democratic union of the peoples of the world. We propose therefore a federal union, in effect a united states of the world. Not a superstate, nor any dictator's regime, for that would not be a democratic union. As within the United States of America the States are separate and independent, possessing the genius of local government and gaining from it strength and greater freedom, which has been a reciprocal advantage to state and national governments; so in this league of free peoples free and independent states may continue to exist absolute and sovereign in their internal affairs. We repudiate the nonsense of obtaining collective security at the price of surrendering any of our liberties.

COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF FREE PEOPLES

PREAMBLE

We, people of the United States, gathered here from all the countries of the world, address to all peoples this proposal for a

League of Free Peoples to establish and maintain a permanent peace.

To that end we declare certain well-defined principles of peace which have been confirmed by the experience of history and by the general consent of mankind, and further we propose certain tried and proven institutions for the guaranty and assurance of peaceful relations among men, peoples, and nations.

To advance this peace plan we invite all people everywhere to found these principles in their several countries and to unite with us to form a world union of peoples for the establishment, maintenance, and perpetuation of peace for our time and our posterity.

ARTICLE I

Declaration of principles

1. Continual peace is the reasonable desire of law-abiding men everywhere.

2. The foundation of all peace is social justice.

3. Justice rests upon the principles of freedom and equality.

4. Freedom must include freedom of religion, freedom of speech, press, and assembly, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

5. Equality is the equal right of men to life, liberty, reputation, property, association, and pursuit of happiness, each in the degree of his ability and effort to attain, enjoy, and justly use such right and with the duty to respect the like rights of everyone.

6. The principles of freedom and equality for individual men apply alike to groups, associations, peoples, and nations, and all persons.

7. The welfare of each and every human being is paramount and superior to every other interest, right, or duty whatsoever.

The right to make war, to manufacture munitions and sell them to our potential enemies to make war upon us with them or to shoot back our scrap iron at us, to deal in the trickeries of the old diplomacy, to sign up worthless treaties, to take our chances in the melees of international lawlessness, to finance with more frequency the recurring world wars—these, if privileges, have such doubtful value that to forego them would give us and all the peoples of the world those freedoms from fear and from want which all over the earth the people are hysterically crying for.

The fortunate and happy position of the United States in this crisis is unique. In our hands at this moment is a kind of power we may never be able to exercise again, that is the power to make a permanent peace of the world. We, as no other nation in the world, are composed of the people from every land, no one people has made up chiefly the number of our inhabitants, we are mingled of all the races. The myth of one race is refuted here. We have made our democracy out of such mingled peoples and races. As democracy has proven the most durable form of governments, in America and elsewhere, and also the type of government and social condition most productive of genius, culture, and human welfare, we have therefore a special warrant from our own experiences in this government to recommend it to the lands from which our fathers came to America as the means and instrument by which all the peoples of the world may dwell together in a democratic world union of peace and mutual prosperity.

We present the following, therefore, as a plan for a democratic union for the peace of the world.

8. Government is a function and instrument of human welfare; only government based upon freedom and equality is tolerable; and such government is assured only when it is government of all the people, by all the people, and for all the people.

9. A government for peace is a government of laws and equal justice and must itself be subject to law.

10. Personal relationship is elemental to law and order and is to be promoted and preserved by institutions of family and self-governing local community and by Federal and cooperative unions in larger communities, organizations, states, nations, and a world order, as changing conditions in human needs from time to time and place to place make expedient or necessary.

11. The league of peoples shall guarantee the self-determination of the family, the community, functional groups and organizations, municipalities, states, and nations, and the autonomy of the world order, insofar as these and each of these exist for the security of individual human welfare of each and all.

12. This declaration of principles shall be interpreted and held to be the law governing the relations of peoples and shall be broadly construed in the interest of all human beings everywhere.

ARTICLE II

Institutions and powers of the league

The powers of the league shall be vested in an assembly of peoples, a world court, a president, and a secretariat.

ARTICLE III

Assembly of the league

SECTION 1. The assembly of the league shall be composed of representatives of peoples apportioned and chosen as—

1. One member from each fully self-governed state, dominion, or colony which shall subscribe and agree to this covenant, to be chosen by the governing body thereof.

2. One additional member for each unit of 50,000,000 people which may choose its representative by popular vote in the manner to be determined by the assembly.

3. Members chosen as provided in subdivision 2 may be chosen on the basis of regional representation, by the union of the peoples of two or more states, dominions, or colonies to constitute one or more of such units.

4. In addition to each member each electing body or unit shall choose two other persons, each of whom in the order of precedence to be determined by the electing body or unit shall have authority to act in the event of vacancy, absence, or other incapacity to act of the prior ranking member.

SEC. 2. 1. In the first assembly the membership shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes and classified for terms of 2, 4, and 6 years, respectively, and the terms of the members first seated shall be determined in said classification by lot; and thereafter in succession each member shall be chosen for a term of 6 years.

2. Any membership may become vacant by death, resignation, recall, misconduct, or ineligibility of a member.

3. Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as a member or alternate shall be chosen for the full term and the person chosen shall serve for the unexpired term.

4. The assembly shall be the judge of elections, returns, and qualifications of its members.

5. Each member shall have one vote, and a majority of members in attendance at any session shall constitute a quorum for business.

Section 3: The assembly of the League shall have power:

1. To legislate upon any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world; excepting that it shall require a majority of the votes of all members: to amend, alter, or modify any of the provisions of this Covenant; to declare any member disqualified by reasons of misconduct; to override the veto of the president; and to recall any decision of the World Court.

2. To elect a president and secretary-general of the League.

3. To provide for the government of any territory which is not self-governing, with the object in view to enable it speedily to become self-governing.

4. To regulate the interrelations of states, dominions, colonies, and peoples, but not to interfere with the domestic concerns of any self-governing body excepting when necessary for the peace of the world and of peaceful relations between states, dominions, colonies, and peoples.

ARTICLE IV

The president of the league

1. The president shall be elected for a term of 6 years, by a majority of the quorum of the assembly at a meeting called specially for that purpose, and he shall hold office until his successor shall be chosen and qualified, unless his office shall sooner be made vacant by his death, resignation, or incapacity to act, or he be recalled by a majority vote of all the members of the assembly.

2. He shall be the chief executive officer of the league, excepting as to matters specially delegated to the secretariat of the league.

3. He shall be the commander in chief of the military forces of the league by land, air, and sea.

4. He shall have veto power upon any act of the assembly not adopted or readopted by a majority of all the members thereof.

5. It shall be the duty of the president at any session of the assembly upon its request to advise it as fully as he may be able concerning any matter affecting the league, the interrelations of states, dominions, colonies, and peoples, and the peace of the world, and to lay before the assembly any matter which he may deem necessary or important for its consideration or action.

6. The president shall, with the advice and approval of the assembly, appoint the members of the highest tribunal of the world court, the secretary-general, and such other officers of the league as the assembly may determine.

7. He shall have visitory powers over each branch, department, and office of the league for the purpose of informing the assembly of any matters for the governance of the league, and may at any time require from any officer or department of the league report and information concerning any matter of interest to the league.

ARTICLE V

The secretariat

1. The administrative functions of the league shall be exercised by the secretariat. The secretariat shall consist of the secretary-general and of the administrative officers of the league.

2. The secretary-general shall have general supervision and control of the officers and administration of the secretariat under such rules and regulations as shall be provided by or under the authorization of the assembly.

ARTICLE VI

The World Court

1. The judicial power of the League shall be vested in the World Court, which shall consist of a supreme court and such courts of inferior jurisdiction as the Assembly from time to time may determine.

2. The jurisdiction of the World Court shall extend to all justiciable controversies between self-governing states, dominions, colonies, and peoples, and to all litigable cases arising under this Covenant, the law of nations and peoples, the legislative acts of the Assembly of the League, and the administration of the League. The highest tribunal of the World Court shall also upon formal request of the Assembly render a declaratory judgment upon any question of law or fact

which the Assembly may frame and submit to it for decision.

ARTICLE VII

International controls

1. No nation, state, dominion, colony, people, organization, or person shall without the authorization of the League enter into any treaty, alliance, federation, or compact of interrelationship excepting in accordance with the laws and authority of this League, provided it shall be lawful for any person or political subdivision of any self-governing nation, state, dominion, colony, or people to enter any agreement and to do or perform any act under the internal jurisdiction of a self-governing nation, state, dominion, colony, or people, and then only to the extent and degree such agreement or act is not subject to the jurisdiction of this League.

2. No state, dominion, colony, people, or person shall make, manufacture, deal in, or possess any arms, munitions, vessel, or instrument of war excepting as may be expressly permitted and lawfully authorized by the Assembly of the League, its officers, and agents thereunto duly authorized.

3. No state, dominion, colony, people or person whatsoever shall wage or engage in any war unless thereunto duly authorized and directed by the Assembly of the League or its officers having authority thereunto duly vested in them, excepting in cases of unlawful invasion and in such imminent danger from unlawful acts as will not admit of delay, and in no such case shall repel such invasion with more force than reasonably necessary therefor.

4. Any person who without authority of the League shall conduct any war against any state, dominion, colony, or people, or who shall commit or give aid or comfort to anyone committing an act of war against any state, dominion, colony, or people, or who shall make, manufacture, or deal in any arms, munitions, vessel, or instrument of war without authority of the League, shall be guilty of treason. The Assembly shall have the power to declare the punishment of treason. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court.

5. All obligations or understandings between states, dominions, colonies, or persons; public or private, inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, of the acts of the Assembly, of the law of nations, and of any rules or regulations made under the authority of the League and by its duly authorized agencies and officers, shall be invalid and held of no force or effect.

Diplomatic Situation in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] requested leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with certain conditions existing in north Africa. There is an article in the Portland (Maine) Evening Express dealing with the same subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRICTION IS DISRUPTING FRANCO-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN NORTH AFRICA—WAVE OF RESENTMENT BUILT UP BY MUTUAL MISUNDERSTANDING—FRENCH IRKED PARTICULARLY BY ALLIES' TREATMENT OF ITALIANS AFTER SURRENDER

(By Tom Wolf)

ALGIERS.—There are two outstanding aspects to America's first year on liberated foreign soil:

The first is the complete military success in north Africa.

The second is that the Franco-American honeymoon is over in north Africa. This does not imply that divorce is imminent, or even in the offing. But there have been increasing frictions, mistrusts. From the point of view of international relations, on the man-on-the-street level, this year has not been a success.

RISES AND FALLS

The undercurrent of friction between the French and the Americans is not a steady stream. It rises and falls in waves, but after a peak it never quite subsides to its original level. A higher residue of misunderstanding remains.

The present wave, which is rising, concerns America's attitude toward and treatment of, the Italians.

The French feel that they have suffered greatly at the hands of the Italians. Was it not, they ask, your own President Roosevelt who called Italy's declaration of war on France a stab in the back? How then, they wonder, can America treat the defeated Italians almost as allies?

Justified or not, French resentment runs very strong against what seems to them to be preferential treatment of the Italians by America.

BASIC FACTS LISTED

To understand Franco-American relations here it's necessary to consider a few basic facts. In the first place, French North Africa bears the same relationship to continental France as does, say, Trinidad to England. It is basically colonial (even though Algeria is a department of metropolitan France)—meaning that a white minority, through military and economic power, forces the Arab and Negro majority to do its bidding. It is, in effect, essentially a Fascist-type state.

The gros colons (big colonists) had a far better time before the Allied landings. There were then no foreign troops on north African soil. The Germans very kindly bought up every available drop of wine. The Americans have bought practically none for export. The gros colons are less well off economically than before the landings.

BIG SHOTS RESENT US

All over Algiers there are signs proclaiming: "Only one goal: Victory." But the gros colons' goal is not victory but the comfort and power they are used to. And they have been badly discomforted by our presence.

Take requisitioning alone. We have requisitioned most of the transportation system, the capital machinery, and hundreds of the best office and apartment buildings. Rightly or wrongly, the gros colons resent it.

The question of requisitioning, incidentally, has repercussions on a lower social level—among the working classes who were friendly to the Americans long after the gros colons. Because schools make ideal office buildings, we have requisitioned many, if not most of the schools of Algiers. In one working-class district, for example, one school which had 600 students was taken as office space for United States officers. Most of the students aren't going to be able to go to school this year. Their parents can't be expected to like it.

RESPECT LOST

America has—temporarily, at least—lost rather than gained respect in French North Africa.

There are many good friends of both France and America who believe that unless American troops are able to leave the frigid atmosphere of north Africa and get acquainted with European France, revising their views of the French on that basis, a serious problem of post-war Franco-American relationships is in the making.

An important difference in viewpoints between Americans and Frenchmen is evident here. Patriotic Frenchmen feel that, while France has suffered many hard blows, France never has been defeated. And indeed many Frenchmen never have stopped fighting. They therefore resent what they feel to be the Americans' rather condescending attitude.

AMERICANS LACK TACT

What it boils down to is that the French feel they are entitled to American help. The average G. I. feels that we have been pretty altruistic about coming over here and that the French should be duly and humbly grateful.

At the highest level this means that the French committee, which is bound and determined not only to restore the glory that was France but also personally to be the instrument of its restoration, finds us in its way in both instances. Our relationship with the committee has been often less than tactful. Just one example is the difference between the wording of the British and American notes recognizing the committee. Both meant the same things, but the French feel, rightly or wrongly, that we went out of our way to say it grudgingly.

Officially, America has said that we would leave the internal administration of France to the French. But the French feel that we have gone against our word at the highest level, by boosting Giraud vis-à-vis de Gaulle.

Many of our misunderstandings with the French spring from the circumstances of our early dealings immediately after the landings. The agreement which Admiral Darlan signed with the Allies was an armistice—implying defeat—instead of a mutual aid pact.

HOW FRICTION GREW

In consequence of this, the French sat back and said, in effect: "Go ahead, do what you want." We did without much cooperation from the French. So the American G. I. got into the habit of thinking of the Frenchman as uncooperative, lazy, or dirty. And he still had the "Mademoiselle from Armentieres" idea of French women.

With this as their attitude, it is hardly surprising if the G. I.'s behavior has sometimes been less than correct toward the local population. A specific example may be seen in the Bab-el-Oued district, a working-class section which was wildly enthusiastic in its welcome of our troops. Today, largely because of the attitude of some of the G. I.'s, the French are reluctant to serve them in many of the shops in this district.

Some of the misunderstandings have been petty. The campaign ribbon for this theater has the colors of the major warring European nations. The French resent G. I.'s wearing a ribbon which puts France between Germany and Italy.

Some of the frictions run deeper. American high wages have put much of north Africa's economy out of kilter. Algiers manufacturers are crying for apprentices in vain because young women are working as waitresses or clerks for the Americans at higher wages. We gave the Arabs sugar and tea and textiles. Now they say that the Arabs won't work without these added remunerations.

Remove the Tax on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is now being considered legislation proposing to remove the tax on oleomargarine. Recently there have appeared some very fine editorials regarding this proposal. Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose two good and thought-provoking editorials on this subject:

[From the Washington Post of November 5, 1943]

MARGARINE TAX

A bill calling for repeal of the restrictive taxes on the manufacture and sale of margarine products is being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture. We hope the bill will be pushed through to passage. There will never be a more propitious time than the present for getting rid of the punitive taxes that have been imposed on this industry not for the sake of revenue but for the benefit of the dairy interests. The latter have for years successfully fought to prevent the manufacturers of margarine from competing on an equal basis with producers of butter. By means of a high excise tax imposed on each pound of colored margarine, a lower tax on uncolored margarine, and special taxes on manufacturers and distributors of margarine, colored and uncolored, the industry has been severely handicapped in the competitive struggle, while the public has been prevented from enjoying to the full the benefits of a cheaper, harmless, and highly nutritive substitute for butter.

With the demands of war causing an acute butter shortage, there is no present danger that butter sales will be unfavorably affected by removing the tax barriers to free and fair competition between butter and margarine. Since margarine is plainly labeled, there is likewise no danger that it will be palmed off on unsuspecting consumers as real butter. Hence, there is no valid reason why dairy farmers should continue to be protected against fair and open competition from other farmers producing the materials used for margarine manufacture. Under our competitive trade system, consumers are entitled to decide for themselves what they wish to buy, provided they know what they are getting.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

LET THE CONSUMER SAY

Golden butter spread on equally golden toast or well-browned flapjacks adds a definitely sunny touch to breakfast table scenery. But what if there simply isn't any more butter in the refrigerator? Well, makers of the better margarines, and faithful users of them, too, insist that fresh, modern margarine can be just as appetizing as real butter. In fact many a family has been surprised—and amused—to find out it hadn't had any butter for weeks.

But the sunny disposition of a busy housewife is apt to be clouded by the prospect of taking the little capsule of coloring material enclosed with the margarine, and mixing it with the otherwise rather wan product. She may even wish that her family could butter its toast—or rather, margine it—with closed eyes. For, she argues, the taste is exactly the same anyway.

If some Congressmen have their way, though, the color may soon be mixed right in with the margarine before it is sold—as it is in most butter. It's kept separate now because there's a 10-percent tax on colored margarine. This, and other restrictions would be lifted under a bill now under consideration.

Meanwhile, butter lobbyists are running into opposition from champions of the soybean, which is one of the major ingredients of some margarines.

From the standpoint of sound public policy the question should not be decided by the pressures of any blocs—margarine packers, dairy interests, or bean raisers. By far the largest interest is that of consumers, and those who wish to deny them the right to choose freely what they will buy to spread on their bread bear a very heavy burden of proof.

A Splendid Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, men who give their lives in the service of their country in the present war are martyrs for the ideals of American Government. They die bravely and willingly under orders confident that by their death greater good will be accomplished. They have known life, enjoyed for fleeting hours its present possession, and with high hope and prayerful heart have crossed into the valley of death. Their names are monuments of sacrifice for our right to live.

These heroes of the services were men with the same hopes, ambitions, and loves as our own. Fox holes and pill boxes and cannon were to them realities, not words. "Back the attack" meant to them the difference between life and death, not merely a slogan to catch the eye to facilitate the raising of money. Shellfire and mud, noise and filth brought home to them the love of home more clearly and pungently than any words ever written or speech ever uttered. Fathers of children, guiltless of any wrong in life, have gone away forever, leaving behind only the memory of a name for posterity. As we ponder these thoughts let us in solemn acknowledgment remember that, as these men faced their deaths, thoughts of life for their children raced like changing shadows across their minds. All their lost hopes for the education of their sons in higher degree than even they enjoyed may well have clouded the last minutes of life, and proud aspirations for the social advantages for their sons and daughters gained from higher education may have for them ascended in fitful prayer for the future protection and well-being of their children.

Boston University has recognized this tragedy of life. Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, farvisioned and generous-minded president of the board of trustees of this great university, recommended on October 14 last that children of such graduates of Boston University as are killed or die in service during the present war shall be granted full tuition scholarships. The trustees of this institution are looking forward into the future to the time when the babies and young children of these heroes will be ready to enter college. If and when these children wish to enter Boston University and satisfy Boston University's requirements for entrance and promotion, the doorway to a broader and more enlightened citizenship is opened by the generous recognition of the president of Boston University of the frustration of the hopes of her sons through their sacrifice for love of America and the protection of the American way of life as they pictured it in their ideals.

In a world of confusion, disorder, and distraction we see the mind of this great man and educator, Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, looking constructively into the future and effecting the realization of the hopes of some of those who learned of life from him and his associates. I am privileged to be able to pause a minute in our deliberations to pay tribute to him and to Boston University for their courageous thought in memory of those who have brought honor to their alma mater on the fields of war.

The press of the city of Boston has recognized the permanency of this monument to these men by this action of the trustees of Boston University and I wish to include in my commendation of Dr. Marsh and his board of trustees the editorial appearing in the Boston Globe, October 16, 1943.

LASTING TRIBUTE

Looking into the future, Boston University has announced a policy that is to be commended to institutions of higher learning all over this country. On the recommendation of President Marsh, the trustees of Boston University have voted to establish scholarships giving full tuition to the children of graduates who are killed in their country's service during this war.

One of the worries that comes to every young father in uniform is for the future of his children. He knows that the time will come when, so he hopes, the boy or the girl will be ready for college. Except among the affluent there is usually the question of where the money is to be found. From that anxiety about tuition the alumni of Boston University are now relieved, as far as the perils of war are concerned.

This underwriting of educational expense should not be considered too difficult by any firmly established college or university. Those who take the same view as that announced by President Marsh will contribute to the assurance of opportunity for their children so important for men at the front.

Mr. Speaker, the gratitude of the sons of Boston University and the congratulations of the Nation are due Dr. Marsh for the inspirational precedent he has established. It is my sincere hope that his leadership will be followed by others who will see in this acknowledgment of heroism the real value of his contribution to the education of the men and women of tomorrow.

Third Deficiency Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave for the extension of remarks on the third deficiency bill enacted today, I wish to say that I feel that the House made a serious mistake in refusing the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for what I consider a nominal sum for the building of airports in certain portions of the United States where the local communities had provided contributions. Of course, this amendment was defeated by only one vote, and while the sponsors had ample votes to carry the amendment, I am informed that they were so certain that the amendment would be accepted that no effort was made to assemble the friends of aviation in the House for the vote.

It is my opinion that nearly every Member of Congress is interested in the security and progress of our own United States, and that they are especially alive to the value of airports at strategic locations for defense purposes, and for the convenience of our own people for travel, mail, and express, and three items in the bill totaling the sum of $14,989,300 were authorized without any opposition, all three items being for construction and expansion of our air facilities.

We all hope that those Members who voted against this amendment will give further consideration to this important problem, and that when the matter is again presented to the House that they will give their support and vote for the same.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to have included in these remarks two excerpts from the Washington Post in regard to this subject, as follows:

Disregarding daydreamers, air transport experts agree that the aviation industry is facing two major problems in the effort to popularize commercial flying:

1. Airports will have to be brought to every sizable community and should be within easy reach of travelers.

2. Operations must be based on the recognition that equipment will be pretty much the same for some years to come and that its profitable and efficient use in mass transport will pose the major question.

STANTON URGES VAST AIR EXPANSION TO CONNECT MOST CITIES OF UNITED STATES IN POST-WAR PROGRAM

(By Kurt Kelman)

Extension of air transportation to "every sizable community that has need of it" was advocated yesterday by Civil Aeronautics Administrator Charles I. Stanton, who appeared as first witness at the hearings of the Civil Aeronautics Board on local, feeder, and pick-up service.

Envisaging the transportation of all first-class mail by air, Stanton declared:

"When I speak of expansion, I mean hundreds of new schedules, thousands of miles of new routes, millions of new passengers, and great quantities of express or freight."

Stanton presented an array of figures and said surveys conducted by the C. A. A. indicate establishment of some 850 stops throughout the country would bring well over 80,000,000 people, and more than 90 percent of the urban population, within the orbit of our air transportation system.

"Less than 600 new stops would be needed, since 273 are already authorized," Stanton said, estimating that "the total of construction and installation costs is about $227,000,000. Certainly, this is a moderate cost to pay for the facilities needed to provide a very large and adequate air-transport system," he concluded.

In this connection, Stanton said "the Federal Government may have to extend its activities with respect to airports, particularly in the direction of establishing and financing a Federal-aid program."

Although toning down exaggerated hopes "in the immediate post-war future" in regard to the helicopter's role in air transport, Stanton declared that "if we are prepared to take advantage of our unparalleled opportunities, the expansion of air traffic will be of a magnitude to astound most of us."

He based his remarks and observations on the thesis that "American aviation today, in all its phases and ramifications, is the largest industry in the country." Stanton painted a picture of enormous strides expected in commercial air transportation after the war.

Representative RANDOLPH (Democrat), of West Virginia, a long-time advocate of local feeder and pick-up service and a pioneer air legislator, termed the extension of air service to our "back-door communities perhaps the most significant development in American aviation.

"Washington will, no doubt, serve as the hub in the air transportation wheel," RANDOLPH, chairman of the House District Committee, said, "which is to be developed with an unknown number of spokes.

"Its position as a great air terminal, connecting it with other world capitals, will be tremendously expanded by domestic service which will radiate from this metropolitan district.

"I believe," he added, "after a reasonable period of readjustment at the war's end there will be 600 scheduled air-line arrivals and departures here daily."

RANDOLPH was among the more than 300 persons present at the opening session of the hearings which will be continued in the departmental auditorium throughout the week.

C. A. B. Chairman L. Welch Pogue called Stanton as first witness. William J. Madden and Albert F. Beitel are serving as examiners of the case.

Fairmont Area Under War Manpower Hiring, Firing Plan on Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Claude N. Swanson, which was published recently in the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn.:

THE LAKE BREEZES WHISPER

(By Claude N. Swanson)

Did you read that page 1 item in Friday's Sentinel under two-column head, "Fairmont area under war manpower hiring, firing plan on help"? Did you notice it said:

Federal regulations provide: "All hiring and solicitation of workers in, or for work in the Fairmont area shall be conducted in accordance with this employment-stabilization program." (Penalty for violation of any provision of this directive is a fine of not to exceed $1,000 and 1 year in jail, or both.)

The directive is important enough to warrant republication of some of the most vital provisions inasmuch as they affect the welfare, the liberty, the freedom of thought and action of practically every employer and employee.

Did you notice that a new employee may be hired only upon presentation of a referral card from the United States Employment Service?

If during the preceding 60-day period the new employee was engaged in an essential activity;

If the new employee is to be hired for work in a critical occupation or his last employment was in a critical occupation;

If the new employee has not lived or worked in the locality of the new employment throughout the preceding 30-day period; (For the purpose of this section it shall be required that before a worker may be hired in a new locality, he must have received a statement of availability from the United States Employment Service office in the locality in which he is or was last employed and be referred by the local employment service office in the locality of his proposed employment.)

If the new employee's last regular employment was in agriculture and he is to be hired for nonagricultural work, provided that no such individual shall be referred to nonagricultural work except after consultation with the county agricultural agent of his county, and provided further that such an individual may be hired for nonagricultural work for a period of not to exceed 6 weeks without referral or presentation of a statement of availability.

Fortunately for a few liberty-loving Americans, the plan does not apply to agricultural labor, hiring an employee for less than 7 days, hiring by municipal, county, or State, or other governmental agencies (unless they so elect); domestic service, and school teachers.

Is the above plan in the Constitution?

Is it a law passed by the Congress?

Did the people have anything to say about whether such a control should be fastened upon them?

Does it say any such thing in our Bill of Rights?

Have the people it affects a chance to vote on whether they wish to submit to or be governed by this rule?

Have our Representatives in the United States Senate and in Congress the intelligence and guts to abolish the dictatorial, self-making directive before starry-eyed professors start regulating our bowel movements and sleeping habits?

The purpose of the plan may look good to impractical nuts—on paper. But it doesn't look good to liberty-loving Americans.

It won't look good to our boys who are fighting for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It doesn't look good to the man who has initiative.

It doesn't look good to anyone who has red blood in his veins.

Who gave Irl Starr the right to tell us whom we shall hire and who we shall work for? And yet he has that right and that power—in 3 counties, affecting 65,402 people.

Starry-eyed professors may hold that the plan will control essential labor, so conscienceless contractors couldn't, for example, overnight leave Railway Motors or the Fairmont Canning Co. stripped of help.

Were there a genuine need and desire to prevent such an instance, could not Congress, the day after war was declared, have enacted a law which would have frozen wages and prices on every commodity, for duration?

Could it be that Congress, which is responsible to the people, and elected by the people, didn't have a sufficient number of statesmen among its membership, to put the welfare of their country above politics?

As it is, the makers of directives are complaining witness, sheriff, prosecuting attorney, jury, and executioner, all rolled in one. And the public and the taxpayer has no appeal, no redress.

Ask Gus Bcosalis, forced out of the restaurant business, what he thinks directives do to a legitimate, necessary business. Ask Charley Potter, also forced out of the restaurant business, what he thinks of the directive system of planned regulation.

Is it the aim of the Government to do that to all types of business and industry?

What will be the next step to be thought up by "brains" among the more than 3,000,000 jobholders on the Federal pay roll?

Considering what chance a nonunion man had to do his bit for his country in defense plants, or in the shipyards, will this latest move afford racketeers an opportunity to organize and exact dues and initiation fees from every laboring man and woman?

It is something to consider. And if a spineless, gutless press will do its duty and inform its readers of what has been going on while they've been asleep, it will be considered.

And then maybe we'll get somewhere.

The Last Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Sidney Robbins, age 21, of New York City, killed in action in north Africa, was awarded the Purple Heart, posthumously, for gallantry in action. His last letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Rabinowitz, is reproduced here in part:

APRIL 26, 1943.

DEAR PA AND ADELE: This is my last letter to you. I am keeping it in my pocket, and if I should be killed, I hope somebody will mail it to you.

I used to say that I wanted to do something to help make the world better?

Now I have the chance. If I die, at least I will know that I died to make the world a better place to live in.

I'll die, not as a hero, but as an ordinary young man who did all he could to help overcome the forces of evil.

I'm only worried about how sad you would be if I get killed. But I hope you will also be proud that your son gave his life for the greatest cause in the world—that men might be free.

God bless you both.

I'll always love you.

Your devoted son,

SIDNEY.

Administration of the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there recently issued from the White House a defense of employees of the Federal Government, who were reported to be the victims of "groundless charges and irresponsible rumors" of slackerism and draft dodging initiated by "mud slingers." This defense is so far off the target that it actually deserves very little comment, but I would like to call attention to certain interesting and curious features of it.

Since I know of no other independent organized and concerted effort to develop the full facts about the administration of the Selective Service Act and the resultant draft practices, both in and out of Government, except that which has been undertaken by the Special Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the House, I assume that this critical blast must have been made at the members of this committee. As a member of that committee, I can prove from the detailed records of the hearings and investigations to date that there has been utterly no effort to question patriotism and loyalty of the great body of Federal employees.

Your committee has conducted no witch hunts and has avoided persecution of individuals. In fact, all we have been interested in is to stop hoarding and wasting of manpower. It is only as an incident to this main purpose that we have examined the possibility that Government is providing a haven for draft dodgers and slackers. Your committee has not even dwelt particularly upon the fact that the Government pay rolls are crowded with nearly 3,000,000 persons in this period when we are critically short of manpower. Neither have we directly questioned the essentiality of hundreds of bureaus and agencies, nor have we particularly criticized Government for the patent fact that a high percentage of the activities are so overstaffed. The administration has already been so thoroughly grilled upon that phase of the manpower problem by other committees and by an aroused public sentiment that it has seemed unnecessary for this committee to add to the volume of criticism.

What we have insisted upon finding out is why there have been vast numbers of men eligible for military service who are not officially deferred but who still remain in civilian status, despite the fact that local draft boards for months have been taking family men and in many instances stripping essential industries to meet draft quotas. What we still insist upon is knowing why there still remain, even at this late date, upward of 240,000 draft-age eligibles on Government pay rolls for whom no official deferment has been requested.

The administration knows very well that since our committee has made no attack upon this great body of Federal employees, no statement in their defense is needed. That ought to make it apparent that this recent White House statement is another red herring designed to divert attention from the fact that Federal employment practices have unduly influenced the operation of our draft machinery; and that, although important changes and improvements have been forced upon the administration in recent months, these employment practices are almost solely responsible for the fact that there remains a reserve of at least 240,000 men in Government eligible for the draft and not officially deferred. These are single men or married men without children between the ages of 18 and 38, as the statistics in your committee's second interim report will show.

In fairness to the executive agencies and particularly to the Review Committee, the organization responsible for final action in all cases of official occupational deferment, it can be stated that many of the abuses and shortcomings existing a few months ago have been corrected. As a result, the number of men within Government eligible for military service has been greatly reduced. We hope that there will continue to be a steady flow of men from this pool of available manpower until it can be said in pride that there is not a single individual left in the Government service who ought to be in a fighting uniform.

Just so long as the record in Government is less than perfect, however, and just so long as there are any single men and men without dependents still filling nonessential jobs, I believe I can speak for your committee in stating that our work will continue. It must be remembered that the Selective Service System for some time has been so near the end of its manpower reserve that thousands of fathers are being called up for service. We may be unable to prevent or long delay those sacrifices, but it is going to be mighty hard to satisfy these broken families that their sacrifices are unavoidable so long as there are single men and married men without dependents still in nonessential civilian jobs.

This report dealt heavily in statistics to prove how complete and adequate is the job Government is doing to send its male employees into the services. In fact, it stated, in extolling the Federal record, that "This record is much better than the occupational deferments in private industry." Of course, it remains

eternally true that statistics can be developed to prove any given case. As against the statistics of the White House message, let me cite you to one short set of comparative figures, which you will find in the statistical appendix of your committee's second interim report. In appendix 9, prepared from Selective Service records, you will notice that of the total of 22,212,000 comprising all registrants between 18 and 38, only 1,518,000 have been given occupational deferments. The national average of occupational deferment, in other words, is roughly 6¾ percent. Now note that there are at present slightly more than 900,000 males between 18 and 38 working for Government. Note particularly that there are at present 115,000 of this number holding occupational deferments. As against a national occupational deferment rate of 6¾ percent, therefore, we find that the rate within Government is roughly 12¾ percent, or almost twice as great.

That comparison by itself should indicate that there is less need of defending Federal workers as a group than there is of explaining what has been wrong in Federal employment practices to date.

Colleges of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an excerpt from a broadcast by Mr. Cedric Foster, delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System October 11, 1943:

Once again today I'm back in New England from the Southland. This time from Roanoke, Va., where so many friends were so kind—Dr. Hugh Trout; John L. Walker; Powell Chapman; S. H. McVitty; Miss Bessie Randolph, president of Hollins College; and Dr. Charles Smith, president of Roanoke College.

If we are interested in learning why America is the great Nation that it is, we will find one reason in the existence of the small, liberal college, the college that teaches so thoroughly the basic principles of America's philosophy of freedom to the boys and girls of our land. Roanoke College, at Salem, and Hollins College, at Hollins, Va., nearby, are striking examples of this type of institution. They were both founded in the year 1842, and they lived through the history of this country for more than a century. Yesterday I walked through the grounds of Hollins with Miss Randolph. The Alleghenies flanked us on one side, the Blue Ridge on the other. Throwing a protecting shoulder over Hollins and its 350 girls from three-quarters of the States of the Union was Tinker, the mountain which is so close that you can see the browns and yellows, the reds and the golds, in its changing foliage. There in the quiet valley the war-stricken world seemed a million miles away. But it has been in the halls of Hollins that many thousands of American girls have absorbed the background of American tradition and culture so thoroughly that they've gone forth into the world entirely able to bear the burdens which have been thrust upon their shoulders. In thinking of education, we are prone to think in terms of the great university, but the irrefutable fact remains that the small liberal college is one of the strongest supports in the vertebra of this land. Destroy that college and you tear down the structure of American education. If we are to survive the small college must live. Roanoke, Randolph-Macon, Hollins, are examples of this in the South.

Furloughs for Members of the Armed Forces Serving in the South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters from the War and Navy Departments:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 27, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, in which you state you have received letters from eight mothers of Winchester, Mass., asking that their sons be granted furloughs to return home from the South Pacific, where they have been stationed for the past 21 months.

The matter of providing a definite time limit for service overseas has been studied continuously since the outbreak of hostilities, but in every such plan proposed there is the one insurmountable obstacle—insufficient shipping facilities.

The present War Department policy places upon the overseas commander concerned the determination as to when an individual should be returned to the United States. Primary emphasis is placed upon rotating personnel from station to station within the theater in order to provide relief for those on duty at remote and small stations, as well as for those serving under severe climatic conditions.

Shipping conditions in the southwest Pacific area are such that there will probably be no return of units to the United States under the rotation policy for an indefinite period. The existing policy in that area provides for the rotation of individuals and units within the southwest Pacific area to provide relief at isolated stations and in localities where climatic conditions are severe. A similar policy is followed in the South Pacific area. New Zealand and Australia have proved to be very suitable areas for the rest and rehabilitation of personnel withdrawn from the smaller and more remote islands, and the commander in chief, South Pacific area, and the commander in chief of the southwest Pacific area, have been rotating divisions under their commands whenever possible and consistent with the over-all tactical situation in those areas.

With regard to the retention of some soldiers in this country while others have been stationed overseas several months, the overall strategic concept and availability of shipping greatly determine when the organization will and can be sent overseas. If shipping facilities would permit, many more combat units would be overseas, and they are being sent as quickly as the necessary transports become available.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and you may be assured that the subject will continue to receive careful study in the War Department.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

NOVEMBER 6, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Replying to your letter of October 27, 1943, in the interest of a number of men now serving in the South Pacific:

The Department has announced the policy of rotating enlisted personnel for rehabilitation leave and reassignment, after a minimum period of service of 18 months in hazardous duty afloat or in outlying stations. However, this is promulgated as a matter of policy and not of directive since the granting of leave or rotation must be consistent with the maintenance of the fighting efficiency of the service. The method of effectuating this policy is a matter within the cognizance of administrative commands, and the granting of leave remains the prerogative of the commanding officer.

These men should, therefore, apply to their commanding officers and while no assurance can be given that these men can be spared from their duties, every consideration will be given consistent with the needs of the service.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

The Forgotten Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from today's issue of the New York Times, under the caption "The forgotten millions." The writer explodes some of the statements currently prevalent of the subject of subsidies:

THE FORGOTTEN MILLIONS

Last week the administration's labor-and-wage policy took a further disturbing turn. The country's coal miners once more went out on strike, ceasing to produce a material vitally necessary for the war effort. The President again replied, not by penalizing the strikers themselves, but by seizing the property of the mine owners, who were powerless in the situation. Secretary Ickes, in spite of his publicly announced opposition to the policies of the War Labor Board, was authorized to negotiate a contract with the representatives of the miners. He did so while the strike was still on. The owners of the mines, who will be saddled with the results of this contract, were not even allowed to participate in the negotiations.

Mr. Ickes negotiated a contract which broke through the daily wage rate ceiling announced by the W. L. B. It increased this daily rate by the device of reducing the miners' lunch period from a half hour to only 15 minutes a day. Either this violates the humanitarian professions of the administration, or it was inserted in the knowledge that it would not for any long time be seriously adhered to. But the War Labor Board, with only one of its 12 members dissenting, swallowed its pride and the contract.

Seizing the owners' property and granting wage increases to strikers while they are still striking would hardly seem to most people the ideal way for the Government to discourage future wage demands and future strikes. But the administration and the War Labor Board, not content with this latest surrender, have gone on to hint that bigger and better wage increases are in the offing. The President has named a five-man committee of the W. L. B. to investigate the cost of living, though this is already the function of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If any one's statistics need serious investigating, however, they are those of the W. L. B. itself. Chairman Davis, in a letter to Vice President WALLACE makes the extraordinary assertion that while living costs have been rising the board has continued to hold wages to the general level of September 15, 1942. This means, he continues, that we are asking one segment of our society to do its part to protect all Americans from the ravages of inflation, while no similar obligation has been placed on other groups.

The facts could hardly be further from what this statement implies. The war began on September 1, 1939. By September 1942, living costs had risen 17.4 percent, hourly earnings of workers in manufacturing industries 32.9 percent, and their weekly earnings 53.1 percent. By August of this year living costs had risen 22 percent, hourly earnings of such workers 41.8 percent, and their weekly earnings 69.3 percent. Thus the wages of these workers have been racing far ahead of living costs.

Mr. Davis and the Little Steel formula, however, take account only of what has happened to the average straight-time wage rate. This has become a largely meaningless figure under present conditions, for, with the 50 percent penalty rate for overtime, the real average wage rate is much higher. Whatever may be said to the contrary, for example, it cannot be doubted that the settlement just made of coal wages is inflationary. It will increase the cost of producing coal, and therefore the price of coal. The Little Steel formula itself is inflationary because, in spite of the apparently rigid limit on it, it is based only on straight-time rates; it ignores the real hourly average wage rates brought about by the compulsory overtime provisions of the Wages-and-Hours Act. If a new formula is now to be adopted, therefore, which allows wages to rise with living costs, it will be even more inflationary unless it takes into account the real average hourly wage rate.

In spite of Mr. Davis' statements, we know where the real inflationary pressure is. The President declared in his message to Congress in September a year ago: "Annual wage and salary disbursements have increased from $43,700,000,000 in 1939 to an estimated $75,000,000,000 in 1942. This represents an increase of 71 percent." Other comparisons then made by the President showed that both in volume of increase and in total amount the purchasing power of labor was five times that of farmers.

In his veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill last summer, moreover, the President recognized a situation that he has yet to act upon in his policies:

"It is too easy to act on the assumption that all consumers have surplus purchasing power; and that the high earnings of some workers in munitions plants are enjoyed by every worker's family. This * * * ignores the millions of salaried, white-collar workers—the school teachers, the clergymen, the State, county, and city officials, the policemen, the firemen, the clerks—whose salaries have remained low, but whose living standards are being cruelly and inequitably slashed by higher food prices. It equally ignores others on fixed incomes—the dependent mother of the soldier boy with her scant $37 per month, the widow living off the proceeds of her husband's insurance policy, and the old-age pensioner. * * * These unorganized millions must not become the forgotten men and women of our war enconomy."

Yet, it is precisely by raising the wages of the organized millions that the administration itself has been raising the living costs of the "unorganized millions." It is these "unorganized millions" who are still being forgotten.

Reemployment of Executives of National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board, it has been discovered that the administration now in power has made places for a number of the key executives of that agency and has placed them in other agencies at high salaries. When Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board it was thought that it was doing an act whereby the unnecessary cost and expense of government would be materially curtailed. However, this spending administration has seen fit to place many of the executives of that agency, which Congress abolished, in other Federal agencies, so that their salaries may be continued. Congress has done its part in trying to reduce the nonessential expenses of government, but the President, and his crowd, continue to force these nonessential and unnecessary people upon the public pay roll. We are in a terrible war, and the people are taxed to the very limit—yet this administration continues to make easy jobs, at fat salaries, for all of their coworkers. What the people want is a reduction in the cost and expense of government. They do not want additional employees placed upon any pay roll.

Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis News, of Indianapolis, Ind., published a very illuminating editorial on the fourth day of November 1943, on this subject, which gives some of the large salaries now being drawn by quite a number of those who have been transferred from the National Resources Planning Board to other agencies of government, which editorial I include in my own remarks on this subject.

The editorial is entitled "Look, Congress" and reads as follows:

LOOK, CONGRESS

Last summer Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board, the agency headed by the President's uncle, which was going to give this Nation complete social security—from the cradle to the grave. Congress ordered the N. R. P. B. to go out of business by August 31. Its budget was somewhere between $1,000,000 and $1,250,000 a year, a large part of it, obviously, in pay roll.

Now it has been revealed that of the 29 full-time key executives with the N. R. P. B., 22 of them are still on the Federal pay roll—transferred to other Federal agencies, presumably at the same high salary schedules they were on. Of the remaining 7, 2 went into the Army and the other 5 are now with other planning organizations.

But the revelation of their new connections also included the kind of money they were drawing to plan cradle-to-the-grave security. They were getting salaries ranging from $5,600 a year to $8,750 a year.

Three of them got $5,600—which is more than $107 a week.

One drew $6,400—which is more than $123 a week.

Eight were paid $6,500—$125 a week.
Three got $6,750—more than $129 a week.
One got $7,500—more than $144 a week.
Two got $8,000—more than $153 a week.
Two got $8,250—more than $158 a week.
Two got $8,750—more than $168 a week.

All of these 22 are still on the Federal pay roll. Is anyone naive enough to believe that they are drawing less than they were formerly?

Congress thought it was doing a great job in abolishing the N. R. P. B. But the planners plan far better for themselves than they do for the people. The pay roll proves it.

A New Way To Make Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, what of the peace that is to follow this war? Former President Hoover and Hugh Gibson contribute a timely article on the subject in a current magazine that is both timely and thought-provoking. These able statesmen outline a three-point program for lasting peace that will be approved by all thinking men and women in all lands. That the seed they have sown will germinate and grow into fruitful plants is the hope and prayer of all peace-loving men and women. The article follows:

A NEW WAY TO MAKE PEACE

(By Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson)

We have received hundreds of letters from officers and men in the armed services commenting on things we have said and written upon the making of the peace. Several thoughts run through these letters.

The millions of men in our armed forces are discussing the kind of peace we must make. They insist that the final purpose of this war is not this time to make the world safe for democracy, but to produce a lasting peace no matter what the ideologies of the world may be.

They fear the interests of America are not being kept in mind.

They do not want some sudden peace agreement pulled out of a hat before they can return home and have a voice in the discussion.

They resent the idea that this job may be done—and badly done—while they are away and without their being given a chance to have a say in the settlements.

It would be a mockery if in their absence we commit them for all time to some regime which their vivid experience abroad has shown them to be wrong.

This right of the men who fight and sacrifice to have a voice is one reason for our insistence during the past 18 months that there must be no general peace conference making hasty settlements like that of Versailles.

The world has never yet made a lasting peace. Signing a document with fanfares of trumpets, banquets, and conferring of decorations certainly has not made peace yet.

LESS TALK

Nor can peace be made by oratory, nebular resolutions, or phantasies. It is a hard, practical job in which each nation will contend for its aims and interests. This is not to discount the high importance of ideals. They are the lights that must guide us. But we must walk toward these lights with our feet on the ground. Surely we need a new approach—a new method of making peace.

In the land of realism there are two separate and distinct groups of problems involved in making peace. First, there are the urgent things that must be done at once when firing ceases. Second, there are the long-view problems which cannot be solved hastily without wrecking our hopes of lasting peace.

We are convinced that the key to lasting peace lies in getting away from the Old World practice of general peace conferences, which were the battleground of power politics. As a substitute, we propose a transition period from war to peace during which the long-view problems can be adequately solved. This plan of a transition period has been referred to as a "cooling-off period." This is a misnomer. Its purpose is far greater than this incidental benefit. A world sick from war must be nursed back to health. It cannot be cured with power politics. It is true this is a new idea. It has never been done. But faced with the fact that the world has never yet made a lasting peace, it is surely time to try something new.

THE FIRST STEPS

But to have a transition period two things must first be done: We must agree now on a responsible leadership for the transition period as assurance against collapse into chaos. And we must agree now on the immediate action that will have to be taken on certain urgent things when war ends so that the sick world can start convalescing.

The enemy countries must be disarmed. Order must be established. People must have food, or anarchy will run rampant. The guilty men must be punished. Governments must be restored in occupied countries, and started functioning in enemy countries. The huge Allied armies must be demobilized as soon as the threat of enemy armament is removed. Production and world trade must be started again so that people can support themselves.

The long delay in acting upon these urgent economic questions in 1919 greatly debilitated the world. By doing these urgent things immediately we will gain time to tackle the greater problems which will make or break lasting peace.

The very nature of these long-view problems requires time. They are so gigantic that no hasty solutions must be attempted as was done in 1919, or we will have laid the tinder for World War No. 3. A transition period will give us time to solve them. It will also give our servicemen a voice in their solution.

Ultimately we must set up some sort of world institution to preserve peace. But first we must solve many complex, long-view questions which will enter into that peace. And we must have some method or machinery for dealing with these matters until the world institution can be set up.

Therefore, we have proposed that there should be a steering committee, or "trustees" of peace, composed of a few leading nations and invested with their powers and duties by agreement of the United Nations. Actually, the leading victorious powers do dominate the world after every great war. They did so after the last World War. This time we want them to act in the open to further peace, not in secret to serve their own interests as before.

The first duty of the "trustees" would be to impose upon the enemy countries the urgent measures which are necessary to get political and economic life started again; in fact, to impose a provisional regime under which enemy countries are to live.

WHEN FIRING CEASES

Having started life again in the world, the "trustees" should then turn their attention, during the transition period, to working out a real peace. Immediately firing ceases in Europe and later in Asia, the "trustees" should see that regional councils or special committees of the United Nations concerned are put to work on each of the long-view problems the war has raised. These committees should propose settlements of those problems for scrutiny of our people and the people of other nations. Here is the place where all the United Nations interested in particular questions should have their voice. This cannot be a peace of the big powers. The little powers have their rights to full participation.

To indicate these greater problems and the time they will require, we may mention only a few.

There are 16 countries in Europe and Asia today held in subjection which formerly enjoyed national independence. All of them want, and have a right to, restoration of their independence. The 7 enemy peoples also must ultimately have independence and self-government. The boundaries of all these countries must be settled. This will at once raise the question of mixed populations along their borders. In some way the problem of these minorities must be solved so that they may not again become centers of infection making for war. Many of these countries cannot live separated from each other economically. Many cannot adequately defend themselves. Some way must be found to group them economically and for defense or they will again fall into the old pattern that has always made for war.

There is the problem of the politically backward peoples who must have supervision designed to develop their capacity for self-government if we are to end imperialism in the world.

There is the problem of general trade barriers which must be reduced if the world is to recover prosperity. Currencies, trade monopolies, cartels, excessive tariffs, etc., must be dealt with.

There are the stupendous problems of eradicating militarism and gangsterism from Germany, Japan, Italy, and some other countries.

Not only that, but their peoples must be made to realize that war does not pay and that it is their job to keep gangsters out of government. For we must nurse these nations back into the family of mankind by support of the decent elements in their populations if we are to have lasting peace.

Having observed Versailles on the ground and having dealt with its consequences, the authors know the number of problems which flow out of total war. And the world institution for preserving peace is only one of these problems. The Treaty of Versailles consisted of 613 paragraphs, and only 26 of them dealt with the League Covenant and preserving peace. It was mostly the 587 articles on other problems, many of them hasty and ill-considered, that broke the back of the League. Certainly it was the sins of omission and commission in the 587 which led inevitably to this war.

There are destructive dynamic forces in the world which makes for war. They include conflicts of ideologies, economic pressures, excessive nationalism, militarism, domination of one race over another, fear, hate, and revenge. And unless we test out the settlement of every problem in the light of these forces we shall never have peace.

At the peace after World War No. 1 militarism was not properly curbed, excessive nationalism ran riot, economic pressures were not allayed, imperialism grew hugely and hate and revenge sat at the peace table. No leagues, councils, or world institutions, or military policing of the world can dispel or dominate these disruptive forces if they are again unleashed to dominate the settlements as they did at Versailles.

Before any world institution to preserve peace can succeed, the great questions have to be settled in such a fashion that they do not create disruption and ultimately lead to war. All these problems take time and the conclusions upon them must be understood and approved by the world, including the American people and our servicemen. In their successful solution alone lies lasting peace. There is no short cut. No world institution can survive unless these foundations are properly laid this time.

NO "SCRAPS OF PAPER"

Truly we must form some sort of world institution to keep the peace. But when we listen to current discussions of peace, we find them almost wholly directed to methods and machinery for preserving peace.

This is a valuable discussion. But as practical souls, the authors would like to rise and suggest that we have to make peace before we can preserve it. And these are two entirely different jobs. They must not be confused. If we make a good peace, it will largely preserve itself. If we make a bad one like Versailles, we shall simply be preparing another world war. And no machinery for preserving peace will prevent the conflagration.

It has been said that unless we first and quickly form some sort of league, council, union, or supergovernment, the world will have lost its enthusiasm and relapse again into isolationism. The answer to this is twofold. Nations are never held by paper agreements when those agreements are not in their interest. Unless the world is enough interested to form such an institution after the foundations of peace are laid, it will not be enough interested to maintain it. And it would not survive either.

No one can today foresee the changes which this war will bring, and any such scheme of world institution laid now will not meet these changes.

If some world institution were first set up and told to settle all these terrible problems, its back would be broken like that of the League of Nations which tried to solve them at the same time it was trying to preserve peace. And again we should have no peace.

The transition period is not a plan to delay real peace. It is, on the contrary, a plan to assure and expedite it.

If we have a general peace conference like Versailles, with 50 nations and thousands of diplomats, we shall see a delay of months in

settling those things that should be settled quickly. And yet the long-view problems will be hastily settled by compromise of principle, greed and hate—and, as at Versailles, there will be no peace.

A transition period, in which the great problems must be solved, requires no military alliances. It requires a short declaration of purpose by the United Nations. It requires that we carry on the same collaboration during the transition period that we have had during war.

Collaboration is based upon common purpose and good will, whether in war or in peace. No documents can create or perpetuate either good will or common purpose. And if the world cannot collaborate during a transition period to make peace, it is nonsense to say it can successfully build a world institution to preserve peace.

TRANSITION TO PEACE

Such a period would not only allow the American people to understand, debate, and approve step by step the long-view measures taken, but it would test out in practice whether other nations are prepared to collaborate for general peace and not for their own selfish interests.

By imposing the provisional peace at once on victory, our boys can come home more quickly. By setting up a transition period for deliberation and solution of the real problems of lasting peace, our servicemen can have a voice in national conclusions. By establishing a world institution to preserve peace, after these long-view problems have been successfully solved, we then may truly hope for a world in which our sons will not be called upon to fight another war.

Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee:

Whereas House Joint Resolution 148 has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman SABATH, of Illinois, providing for the diversion of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan, through the Chicago Drainage Canal; and

Whereas after extended hearings, the United States Supreme Court in 1930 authorized an allowable diversion of 1,500 c. f. s. plus domestic pumpage, and the proposed bill would increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by 3,500 c. f. s.; and

Whereas the proposed bill represents the latest maneuver by the Chicago Sanitary District in a campaign of more than 40 years' duration to secure special benefits for Chicago by diversion of water from Lake Michigan, Chicago now alleging that diversion of water from Lake Michigan is necessary to alleviate alleged pollution said to be threatening the health of Chicago's population which is refuted by competent medical authority and medical evidence; and

Whereas in a recent report to the President of the United States, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, and Mr. Leland Olds, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, ruled that increased water diversion by Chicago does not appear necessary to meet the Chicago health problem, and that an increase in diversion might well have a serious effect upon navigation, this report decisively disposing of the Chicago demand for more water from Lake Michigan; and acting upon this report, the President of the United States refused to exercise his wartime powers to authorize additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan by Chicago; and

Whereas the States of Illinois and Indiana have failed to exercise their police powers to prevent pollution of the waters of Lake Michigan, and the Chicago Sanitary District, over a long period of years, has failed to take proper measures to complete adequate sewage disposal and water filtration plants which would once and for all end the pollution menace without the necessity of encroaching upon the waters of Lake Michigan; and

Whereas the proposed increased diversion would substantially lower lake levels and would cause great damage to lake ports by reducing channel depths and vessel drafts, to the great detriment of vital war transportation service furnished by lake shipping and lake ports, and would lead to the deterioration of harbor, dock, and beach facilities at port cities on the shores of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the city of Milwaukee has been firmly opposed to the Chicago water diversion project from its inception and has vigorously opposed attempts to secure increased water diversion, being cognizant that such action would prove disastrous to the navigation interests of the city of Milwaukee and of the other port cities on the Great Lakes, and represents an unwarranted encroachment upon the sovereign rights and the natural resources of the peoples, the cities, and the States of the Great Lakes area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it reaffirms its opposition to Chicago water-diversion proposals in excess of quantities authorized by Supreme Court decree; that it specifically opposes House Joint Resolution 148, now pending in the House of Representatives; and that it urges Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin to take appropriate measures in opposition to the passage of said bill; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified, be furnished to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; to the Secretary of War; and to the President of the United States.

The Children of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a protest against the threatened extermination of Polish children, adopted by the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, a leading fraternal organization in this country:

The executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, at its plenary meeting held in Chicago on October 12, 1943, in the course of deliberations, considered the tragic situation of Polish children, remaining in Poland and wandering abroad.

The lot of the children of Poland is terrible in the extreme. The enemy systematically resorts to famine, disease, hard labor, executions, and torture as a means in the planned extermination of the Polish children.

Separated from their parents, the children are beaten and deprived of the barest necessities of life, food, heat, and shelter, and as a result of this treatment, die by the thousands. One, out of every three children, dies before attaining 1 year of age.

The health of adolescent boys and girls, insufficiently nourished, is broken by forced hard labor on roads, bridges, in quarries and mines.

Many children die in the course of the eviction and deportation of Polish families. In one instance alone, during a 10-day trip from the city of Leszno to the city of Piotrkow, in sealed and unheated railway cars, of 260 children aboard, only 17 remained alive upon arrival at the point of destination.

The enemy has organized special camps, in which racial experiments are conducted and Nazi theories are expounded, for the purpose of Germanizing the Polish youth.

The German authorities distribute pornographic literature, open public houses, and debauch Polish youth with alcohol. The German barbarian uses all vile means to undermine the morals and health of the Polish children.

The great majority of Polish children are deprived of education and religious solace. Before the war, more than 5,000,000 children attended the elementary schools in Poland. Today, less than 1,500,000, thoroughly Germanized children, attend the schools.

Information has been received that 220,000 Polish children have been exiled to Soviet Russia, where they are perishing from hunger, cold, and disease.

The executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, visualizing this tragic picture, protests with greatest indignation this inhuman treatment of the Polish children and the destruction of the Polish nation. We fervently request our noble President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the great protector of all oppressed nations, to consider the tragic plight of the Polish children, in Poland and in Soviet Russia, and to use all means to save them from extermination. We also ask our representatives in Congress to take note of the misfortune of the Polish children and to use their influence to halt the terror to which the Polish children are subjected.

We promise, on our part, to extend every possible aid to the unfortunate and innocent victims of terror and bestial oppression.

JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.
STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General.

Taking a Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I recently made inquiry of the Military Affairs Committee about the bill that is intended to give posthumous recognition to one of the first Americans with foresight

enough to know that the very element which turned the tide of this global war in favor of the United Nations would have prevented the great sacrifice of this war in blood, material, and sorrowing hearts, and I was advised by its chairman that the War Department was not in favor of the bill.

It seems to me that the time is long since past when a mere statement on the part of the War Department that they are not in favor of the bill, is sufficient reason for delay of consideration of this most justifiable action on the part of this great body to remove the stigma from the name of Billy Mitchell, and restore to his name the honor of distinction and greatness that it so justly deserves.

Every temple, as well as every nation, has among its people one or more who are worthy of being honored in some special manner. Among the great of our military men was Billy Mitchell. The blind passion for tradition and custom as well as the strong bond of a fraternal hierarchy within the military leaders of another year, refused to honor the name of Billy Mitchell. They went even further, they pinned the badge of dishonor upon him and cast him out from their midst.

To our shame it is a late day for the restoration of due credit and honor to this great man. It is within the power of this House and this body to do that duty.

Is it not time to ask the War Department, why we should not do this act and pass this bill? It is too late to acknowledge to Billy Mitchell what he already knew, that he was right, but it is not too late to do justice to his name.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram:

TAKING A LOOK AHEAD

Most of us believe, and with reason, that although much hard fighting lies ahead, the end of the war is now dimly in sight. Part of this belief rests on the parallel that is apparent between this contest and World War No. 1. Then the defeat of Germany was preceded by the desertion by her allies. The collapse of the empire came suddenly and the armistice was upon us before many people realized it.

Now Germany has already been deserted by Italy, her most important European ally, and is becoming so hemmed in that collapse sooner or later becomes inevitable.

But the parallel may well end here. After the first war the boys came home quickly and we seemed shortly on the way back to normalcy. There is no evidence yet that this will happen again. Industry was not so badly dislocated during the first war and production was not so fully expended. Furthermore, our taxes were negligible compared with the rate today and we had a debt of less than $30,000,000,000.

Now the conditions are different. War industries are much greater now than then, as is employment in war industries. Furthermore most observers believe that our national debt will be $300,000,000,000 at the end of this global contest—more than 10 times what it was in 1919. Therefore, the post-war picture is somewhat different and we want to take this into account in post-war planning. Of course there is another difference. Defeat of Germany will not end the war this time as Japan is still to be taken care of and the letdown will not be as complete or immediate as it was after the first war. This may serve to cushion the shock to an extent.

Still we cannot blink at that $300,000,000,000 indebtedness, which will call for interest of more than $7,000,000,000 a year before we begin to figure on veteran relief, social security, or the ordinary Federal expenditures, to say nothing of State and local taxes.

Many statesmen are declaring we can never be prosperous again unless the whole world is prosperous along with us. To get international prosperity there will have to be a lot of rehabilitation and reconstruction abroad. How will this be done? Is Uncle Sam to furnish the money to retain world good will? If so the ending of the war will not be a return to normal expenditures by the Government and a balancing of the budget may not be possible. The situation calls for sober thought. It will not all be over with the blowing of the armistice whistles.

The Late Honorable C. W. Ramseyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Hon. C. W. Ramseyer, 18 years a Member of the House of Representatives, Iowa loses one of the great men of the State. Fine tribute was paid to the statesmanship of Mr. Ramseyer by Members of the House, and the press of Iowa has referred to his life and services editorially. Included in my remarks is a tribute from the pen of his life-long friend, Hon. John Huston, publisher of one of the leading newspapers of Iowa, the Ottumwa Daily Courier:

A FRIEND PASSES

The story of the life of Christian William Ramseyer is the typical saga of an American who came up the hard way and attained success in his chosen field of the law and politics.

Former Congressman Ramseyer, whose sudden death in Washington Monday has saddened thousands in his old local congressional district, served faithfully and well in the offices which he held under national seal.

A former Davis County attorney, he went to Congress from the Sixth Iowa in 1915 and he was reelected eight times. In 1931 Iowa was ordered redistricted and the new alinement threw the old Sixth, which Mr. Ramseyer had then represented for 16 years, into competition with the old Eighth District, from which another veteran legislator, Lloyd Thurston of Osceola, repeatedly had been returned to Congress.

In the 1932 primary, Mr. Thurston was the successful Republican nominee from the new Fifth District, created by a fusion of the Sixth and Eighth, in the main.

That concluded Mr. Ramseyer's tenure in Congress. But he was not finished with public service. President Hoover had his eye on him, and appointed him as a commissioner of the Federal Court of Claims, sitting in Washington. The Bloomfield man took office March 4, 1933, and held it continuously until his death.

Political fortune and advancement never made one whit of difference with Mr. Ramseyer. He remained "Bill" to thousands in his old district and beyond. Occasionally he traveled from the Capital to hold sessions of the claims court. On nearly every trip west he managed to drop in at Bloomfield, Ottumwa, and other places in the old district.

Always the same genial, calm, reassuring type of man, he found warm welcome wherever he went. While his work of the last decade has been quite foreign to the homeland and its people, he never lost the ties which once bound him so closely to them as their representative in Congress.

From his freshman days in the lower House, Mr. Ramseyer applied his inherent studious trend of mind, his practical analysis of all problems, his careful decisions to legislative matters. He rose to a position which warranted attention to him as a possible successor to Nicholas Longworth, as Speaker of the House, at Mr. Longworth's untimely passing.

And so, on Saturday, "Bill" Ramseyer is coming back to Bloomfield for the last time. His legion of friends and acquaintances all over the old Sixth District, and beyond, in Iowa and other States, mourn with his family in the stepping from the stage of life of this good American.

When the War Is Over, Then What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the problems following this war will be about as difficult to solve as those during the war itself. Mr. Frank J. Sell, of Adrian, Minn., former State senator from that legislative district, expresses concisely and informatively the nature of some of these problems facing our country in days to come. The following article by Mr. Sell entitled "When This War Is Over, Then, What?" is well worth the study of those interested in this subject:

As the Allied armies are moving closer to Germany through Italy and Russia a definite trend has been established in our favor. The great task of establishing a lasting peace will tax the brains of the ablest diplomats the Allied countries can produce.

Lincoln expressed his views for a lasting peace to an America torn asunder by a devastating civil war in these words, "With malice toward none but justice to all." It was the principle which the late President Wilson tried to instill at the Versailles Treaty but failed because of the greed and jealousy that finally crept in when formulating that historic doctrine. The Allied Nations should set up a democratic form of government in Germany and enforce it. All her war plants should be dissolved so that no more war materials can be produced in Germany. They should see that none of the military leaders shall again have a chance to rule Germany and cause another world catastrophe. The Allied Nations should assist the German people in maintaining a democratic and peace-loving Germany through education in all their schools for at least 25 years to instill nonmilitary policies in the minds of the younger German people so that there will be no opportunity for any military-minded leader in Germany to ever rise to power again. Constructive cooperation will prove to be a powerful influence.

Through an educated Germany along these lines this can be done.

Needless Government expenditures should be reduced as quickly as possible, starting right now. Every Government department should be scanned and the savings set up for debt reduction. Federal spending must be curtailed where it will not interfere with bringing the war to a successful conclusion. No nation should be privileged to reap post-war benefits from any American lend-lease contribution to other countries for the prosecution of the war, and especially before hostilities have ceased. America should have access to all airfields for post-war commercial routes, which we are building and have built from appropriations made from our United States Treasury. George Bernard Shaw, noted British author, said: "The biggest job the United States will have after the war will be to collect her debts, and she will have a hard time collecting any." In this respect, we should have just consideration at the Allied Nations peace conference. Most Government restrictions, as war measures, should be dropped when hostilities are ended. Wartime Government bureaus must be dispensed with at the same time so that a free democratic America can and will be perpetuated.

When this war is over we will have many years of constructive work ahead of us, within our own Nation. The change-over from war industry to peacetime industry should be done as quickly as possible so that the transition will not cause any more unemployment than absolutely necessary. The tremendous backlog of orders for American products, brought about because of the war, should maintain an orderly employment for years to come. A carefully planned public works program aided by the largest post-war road-building program in history also will continue to prevent any large-scale unemployment, possibly for several years. All public works programs should be developed with strict regard to their cost and the ability of the taxpayers to finance them.

In connection with Britain's various schemes for post-war readjustment, including the famous Beveridge plan, Prime Minister Churchill has implied that it would be a grave mistake to foist upon the public visionary reforms demanding far more than the contents of the ordinary man's pocketbook. In my opinion, this does not imply chronic opposition to all forward-looking programs of a social, political, or economic nature. Instead, I feel the real friend of progress is he who exercises a reasonable amount of fiscal restraint before entering the realm of idealistic experimentation. What will be needed is the ability to separate the wheat from the chaff and then centralize upon those plans which offer the people real promise of everlasting betterment without causing a universal economic breakdown because of a general inability to pay the bill. I believe we must try to maintain the social gains we have already made and continue to improve on them the best we can. Industry and labor must strive to aid each other. Agriculture must be kept on a sound paying basis and small business everywhere should be encouraged and protected. We must be careful not to "kill the goose which lays the golden egg."

But we must not stint in taking care of our returning armed forces. They deserve everything which can be given them. They have left their homes, their jobs, and their families at the call of their country. They are giving everything they have, even life itself, to fight for freedom and the preservation of democracy and free institutions. They are trained into a new type of life and as they return, after the war is over, they will have to be trained back and readjusted into peacetime and civilian life. This cannot be done overnight. It will take time, and they should be given an opportunity to do so without fear of want to themselves and their families.

War has brought about a changed economic system. Many businesses will have gone out of existence. They may be forced to look for new jobs and positions. Many may wish to change their occupations. Others may desire to go back to school and prepare themselves for a different livelihood. Possibly a large majority will not find jobs waiting, even if they felt like accepting one at once. The Government and industry should try to place them in gainful work as quickly as they can. Many will be forced to accept only part-time jobs while becoming adjusted to take their place in a peacetime world. So I feel that every member of the armed service should receive $100 per month for the first 6 months after becoming discharged; $75 a month for the next 6 months period; $50 a month for the next 6 months, and $25 a month for the final 6 months period. This will give them 2 years with pay, and without fear of want to regain their position in life. The Congress of the United States should make ample appropriations, beginning as quickly as possible, to take care of every member of our armed forces, whatever branch of service they may have, or are in, for at least the above amounts. All red tape should be dispensed with in taking care of the wounded and disabled along with their families. They deserve everything we can give them. We are indebted to them for their help, they will need ours, so let's all see they receive a fair chance to go forward in their peacetime life.

The Feed Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Perry T. Kistler, of Bangor, Pa.:

The purpose of this article is to answer in part two leading questions:

1. Has the Government done anything to improve the feed situation for the coming 1943–44 feeding season?

2. Will the Northeast have feed this winter?

(The word "Government" is used as a singular or group reference to the Federal departments and agencies such as U. S. D. A., W. F. A., A. A. A., C. C. C., F. D. A., O. D. T., O. P. A., etc.)

High industry officials have shouted from numerous rostrums, "We are headed for a calamity in deficient grain and crop-producing areas such as the Northeast—the Government has done little or nothing to relieve this situation. We will run out of feed about March 1, 1944. The only solution is to liquidate 20 percent of our poultry and livestock population—etc."

We all know a rather serious situation may exist, yet it seems far from being hopeless. Yes, there seems to be danger in carrying this "scare psychology" too far, because there could easily result unnecessary liquidation, and then our goals of milk, eggs, and meat would be impossible. If just some of the facts and recent decisions are briefly considered, it will tend to show that the Government has not been idly standing by—but on the contrary it seems it has been, is, and will be a coworker with industry in striving toward the solution of our common feed problems; all of which leads to the conclusion that it seems hopeful to expect reasonable feed supplies in the Northeast this winter.

Yes; 1943 has been the largest feeding year on record. However, it is the considered opinion of some authorities that feeding has reached its peak; that there has been a gradual decline since early August; and that these high feeding levels are not likely to be repeated again in 1944. This condition and outlook is due to orderly liquidation and heavier seasonal marketings of beef cattle, hogs, and poultry, and prospects of some decreases in livestock production in 1944, especially hogs. The net result may be a livestock population that is not much greater on January 1, 1944, than on last January 1.

Considering marketings this fall, it is expected that 75 percent of the finished beef cattle will be marketed by November 1 and that feeder cattle going into feed lot will be about 11 percent less and fattened for shorter periods. It is further expected that the record pig crop of last spring will see heaviest movement during October, November, and December, and will be marketed at lighter weights; besides, fall farrowings are expected to be about 17 percent lower than original intentions or a net total of 45,000,000 fall pigs. The heavy movement in poultry is also taking place. There are reported tendencies toward heavier culling and some liquidation, and it seems that the expected 10-percent increase in laying hens on January 1, 1944, will hardly materialize. This entire trend of marketings and future populations suggests a reasonable easing of the tight feed situation, especially corn. All of this means gradual relief, and more feed supplies should be available for the Northeast.

Next consider feed supplies. Of first importance is another record or near record corn crop. The wheat crop is big, but not quite as large as last year, but total wheat reserves (domestic and foreign) seem ample for both milling and feed purposes. Oats and barley are in fair supply. In addition, Canada holds a large reserve grain supply of wheat, oats, and barley, and if this is needed it seems our Government will lose no time making this grain available, especially in the Northeast.

The roughage crops have been excellent. Another record-breaking crop will be soybeans. There is an indicated 6 to 8 percent increase in vegetable protein oil meals for feeding. Animal proteins are expected to be in about the same supply. Don't forget, the Government has arranged for importations of meat scrap, liver meal, cottonseed, and flaxseed from South America. These importations are now realities and should especially benefit the Northeast.

Time will tell if we have brought our 1944 poultry and livestock population in balance with the available feed supplies.

The major dislocation in our 1943 feeding program in the Northeast is the lack of corn since early July. It is claimed that the Midwest hogs "hogged the corn crop" because of favorable feeding ratios. It must not be overlooked that a basic consideration causing this early withholding of corn was the extremely late plantings—so it was only a natural tendency to hold back corn until such time that the new crop was in sight. Nevertheless, it is still claimed that it will take higher prices to move corn from the Corn Belt, and it is also claimed that the hog population must be reduced in order to free corn, thus preventing another serious dislocation in corn supplies for the Northeast.

Let us "look at the record" to see what the Government has done about hogs and corn.

There are five major actions taken by the Government in order to probably avoid any future dislocations caused by either hogs or corn. These major decisions are as follows:

1. The hog support price of $13.75, Chicago, was ordered to apply to a lower weight scale, namely, 200 to 270 pounds. This suggests that the trend will be toward lighter weight hogs; so, much feed and corn will be saved for other purposes.

2. A hog price ceiling of $14.75, Chicago, went into effect October 4, 1943. This action will tend to keep hog production in the corn States and to reduce hog production in areas outside the Corn Belt, thus releasing this feed for other kinds of livestock.

3. A new hog floor price of $12.50, Chicago, is announced to be effective November 1, 1944, until March 31, 1945. This will tend to adjust the Corn Belt hog ratio to a more normal level. In this action the weight scale is further reduced to 200 to 240 pounds, and this suggests still lighter weight hogs with more corn saved for other purposes.

4. It is also strongly intimated that higher corn prices will be forthcoming to the corn grower. To help the prompt movement of corn the Corn Belt producers have been guaranteed the benefits of any advance in corn prices before November 30, 1943. This applies to any corn sent to market from September 28 to October 31. So probably the worst is over as far as corn supplies are concerned in the Northeast.

5. Finally, the 1944 food-production program calls for a 17-percent reduction in numbers of hogs along with smaller weights asked for. The record 1943 crop of 126,000,000 hogs marketed at 255 pounds average, is asked to be reduced to 105,000,000 head of an average market weight of 230 pounds.

These five steps seem like a very complete program. Government actions may move rather slowly, but they seem wise and on the right track, and the rights of minorities are more likely to be protected. For a good example of such progressive action, let us analyze the 1944 hog-production goal calling for a reduction of 21,000,000 hogs with a reduced weight of 25 pounds per hog applied to the entire hog production of 105,000,000 that are asked for. This actually means that nearly 8,000,000,000 pounds of hogs less can be produced in 1944, and this reduction is equivalent to about 16,000,000 tons of feed saved. Just stop to think; this item alone could probably balance the supposed deficiency in feed requirements for 1944. In terms of corn this saving is equivalent to about 570,000,000 bushels of corn, or an amount equal to all the corn that normally leaves all the farms in 1 year. This certainly should enhance the possibilities of reasonable supplies of corn coming into the Northeast.

Yes; in many ways 1943 has been the most successful feeding year on record throughout the country, and especially in the Northeast. I wonder how many of us have thought of who might be deserving of some credit for this huge success. It seems we (the feed industry and feeders alike) owe a debt of gratitude to a group of Government workers in the Commodity Credit Corporation who administered the feed-wheat program. Their efforts have been tireless, often working 14 to 16 hours a day, directing the shipments of feed wheat to all the deficient feed areas of the country. First came the squeeze in mill feeds. Then followed the great dislocation in corn supplies. By the herculean efforts of these "forgotten men" feed wheat has filled in the gap—without it the attainment of our food goals, milk, eggs, and meat would have been impossible. This is just one example of the "tie that binds" industry, feeder, and Government together for the solution of an emergency, and the protection of minorities. This further suggests that in the sale and distribution of all feeding materials, there should be provision for emergency allocations by properly designated agencies who might be fully informed as to true feed emergencies that might exist in the various States or regions.

The feed industry has also played an important part in this banner year. Outstanding has been the voluntary plan for protein conservation, and this program must be continued in 1944. In addition, feed manufacturers and feed dealers have worked in close harmony in apprising farm feed consumers of the feed situation; with the result that today feed is being rationed voluntarily to established feed consumers, and this is a big step in feed conservation.

In passing, let us mention that industry asked for an upward revision of protein prices in order to prevent the waste of protein and to provide more equitable distribution of these products. The Government responded first with equalizing meat-scrap and tankage prices throughout the country. The Northeast previously was a low-price area, and probably much meat scrap produced in the Northeast was shipped to higher-priced areas. Now the tendency will be to keep all the meat scrap produced in the Northeast there for feeding purposes. The Government has also responded with higher prices on soybean-oil meal and cottonseed meal, and has established price ceilings on linseed meal. This again is constructive action and should benefit the Northeast in that more protein supplies should reach the Northeast.

Some authorities feel the over-all feed situation shows there is probably enough feed in sight to go around, but that the major problem may be distribution to deficient feed areas. At present the matter of transportion seems important. However, in light of previous events we should have faith in the ability of the feed industry and the Government to work out the solution. It is important that all segments of the industry share the feed supplies on an equitable basis. When squeezes threaten, wouldn't a 30- to 60-day forward basis for everyone, including the feed consumer, rather than a 90- to 120-day or longer forward basis, promote more equal distribution?

Probably no one can predict accurately what the future will bring. The writer, as one engaged in the feed industry, is merely attempting to present some facts as he sees them to help answer the two questions presented at the beginning of this article. The answer to both questions is "Yes."

1. The Government apparently is doing everything possible to improve the feed situation.

2. It seems hopeful to expect reasonable feed supplies in the Northeast this winter. However, this will require effort and real teamwork by the feed industry, the feed consumer, and the Government.

Subsidy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, said the President in his congressional food message:

While the question of production for 1944 is an essential one, we must not lose sight of the necessity for keeping the prices of our present food supply at reasonable levels. We must see to it not only that the prices of food do not go up any further, but that the prices of those foods which have gotten out of the line are actually reduced.

Here the President miserably failed in putting first things first.

Emphatically, the index numbers of price levels which the President uses are but mathematical abstractions. No one knows this truth better than the President's confidential economists with whom he counsels. For instance, the President's disbelief in his economists' statistics is evidenced by his demand that the wage experts of the War Labor Board investigate living costs. He now doubts the accuracy of present methods of his economists in computing living costs.

Then, too, the price indices which the President has been using do not reflect the black market prices or the actual prices growing out of the Federal Treasury passing back cash in the form of subsidies. Neither do these price-level indices which the President uses show the elements of changed labels or qualities of the goods as the alteration takes place. For instance, I was in a small store in Chesaning, Mich., a short time ago and examined overalls for boys and men and work shoes such as usually worn on farms. I found that not only had the prices advanced tremendously, but the quality of the goods had been materially altered, and if a person simply published the increased price of those goods and said nothing about the change in quality he would be presenting a very incomplete picture. That is exactly what the President did in his 10,000-word message to Congress. The President has adopted the real "fetish" of the day—the preservation of the steadiness of the price level. He clothes it with great sacredness and forces one to conclude that its preservation is necessary and that food production is only essential.

The President knows full well the 1929–33 economic debacle followed an extraordinary stable price level from 1923 to 1929. He knows the billions of pump-priming dollars dished out by the Treasury to "reflate" the price level of the thirties back toward the 1926 index figure. He needs only to read pages 255–259 of the April 1939 Federal Reserve Bulletin where he will find one of the profoundest statements ever offered on this subject of price relation and stable-price level. The Reserve Board in part said, "One reason why steady average prices do not assure prosperity is that the average can be steady while prices of some of the commodities that make it up change violently. People are more interested in the relation between the prices of what they produce and sell and the prices of what they buy and use than in the general price level. A farmer is interested not only in what he can get for his products over and above the cost of production but also in what he has to pay for the things that he needs to buy—how many bushels of wheat or pounds of cotton it takes to get a suit of clothes or a new plow. For the industrial producer the cost of his raw materials and labor compared with the prices that his products will fetch is what counts. To the wage earner or salaried man the im-

portant thing is the relation between his income and the cost of living. Even the ability of people to pay their debts does not depend so much on the average level of prices as upon the amount by which their net income exceeds their living expenses.

PRODUCTION OF GOODS OR STABLE PRICE LEVEL?

Which does the President want? Which is necessary? Which essential? Any high-school student will say production is necessary. Why all the rationing; sweating going here and there trying to get the necessities of life and production? It is because there is too little production. It is not for the want of a stable price level. Shall this Nation go along with a subsidy program operated for the purpose of stabilizing prices instead of a program for a tremendously expanded production with proper price relation? May God help us to think straight in this hour of great need for foodstuffs and other civilian goods and services.

Remember our commitments—the Atlantic Charter; declaration by the United Nations; lend-lease; the mutual-aid agreements which have been executed with several score of other nations by our State Department; the "four freedoms"; the Moscow Declaration; and, last but not least, the resolution of the Senate last Friday, and all, with the foreign propaganda being spread over the whole earth by the Office of War Information, leads the whole world to look to the United States for its material and financial succor. Sure! We have in substance told the world that we are the biggest duck in the puddle, with the strongest wings, most feathers, greatest quantity of meat, and all the trimmings. These obligations we, as a Nation, have assumed. Make no mistake about that. In the face of these facts how in the name of common sense can we spend our time quibbling about stable price levels as being necessary when the whole world cries out for more and more of goods and services with which to satiate its appetite? Only through greatly expanded production can that freedom from want be attained in this fair land.

Where it is known that an increased price will bring forth more production of needed goods, let the price go up and the production come forth. If it is known that an increase in price will not bring forth greater production of the real article or a satisfactory substitute, that is the price to talk about stabilizing. But what Government official is smart enough to know what stimulated production will flow from an ingenious and energetic people and as a result of rising prices? Have you in mind any bureau to whom you would assign this phase of our economic destiny?

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

The President knows full well that the acceptance of his subsidy proposal by the American people will further extend into our economic vitals the creeping paralysis of Federal bureaucracy. He knows the introduction of subsidies into the philosophy of the two major political parties with promiscuous promises being made by public office seekers will carry a burden and threat to Government sound fiscal policy and undoubtedly load taxpayers with billions of dollars of tax burdens in the war and post-war periods. He well knows that no government, by itself, can maintain or restore the well-being of its citizens. He knows the number of dollars now begging for more goods and that holding down prices by Federal subsidies artificially stimulates demand and interferes with production. And, too, the President knows this job cannot be handled with less than a great bureaucracy. Such a program encourages black markets, withers private industry, promotes disrespect for the Government debt and moves in the direction of disastrous economic and fiscal policies of government. This is no time to further cripple and pauperize private agricultural enterprise, promote industrial stagnation, and rob the Federal Treasury of the revenue which flows to it as result of profits to industry and income to our pay rollees. From the people this Government still derives its spending power and when its citizens can no longer buy bonds out of the income of their enterprise we shall then have to finance socialistic experiments through heavier taxes, forced loans and no doubt the confiscation of private savings. The condition of the poor will not be improved. These are some of the reasons why so many farmers write me opposing subsidies.

Address of Mr. Charles E. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman, War Production Board, at F. B. I. National Police Academy exercises, Washington, D. C., on October 23, 1943:

Mr. Hoover, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, I have looked forward with considerable eagerness to the opportunity of talking to this graduating class today. Like every other American citizen, I have long been impressed by the extraordinary skill which American law-enforcement agencies have developed in tracking down criminals and proving that crime does not pay. I think it is safe to say that not only the small boys of the country, but every intelligent adult is a hearty enthusiast for the law-enforcement methods developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and spread widely through your splendid organization, the National Police Academy. But in recent years, both in private industry and in my work with the War Production Board, I have become aware that the Nation owes its crime experts a debt which goes far beyond the value of day-to-day law enforcement. It is my conviction that, in a very real sense, the security of the entire Nation, and the hope of our national future rests largely upon the splendid work done by our Federal and local law-enforcement agencies.

Long before there was any declaration of war, the F. B. I. came to grips with the Axis. Long before the American public realized what was going on, men trained in this very school from which you are graduating were fighting a grim and silent war for the preservation of our country against a ruthless and dangerous and highly skilled army of foreign spies and saboteurs. It was your good fortune and mine, the good fortune of every American, that the men who led our forces in this under-cover battle were tough-minded realists, who recognized the terrible danger that threatened the Nation.

So it was that the first defeat which Americans inflicted on the Axis took place on our own soil long before Pearl Harbor, and many months before the average easy-going American dreamed about the likelihood of war. That defeat was of historical importance. It is a glowing proof of the talented leadership and sustained vitality of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I do not know how it was done. It is not my business to know, but I shall always feel an awed respect for the fact that as soon as the Gestapo-trained spies and saboteurs were landed on our shores the F. B. I. was ready to greet them with open arms, with open cells, and finally with open graves. I do not believe that the law-enforcement agencies of any other country in the world—even in Europe, where the arts of counterespionage have long been practiced—can match the astonishing performance made possible by the methods in which you yourselves are trained.

Our enemies counted on what they believed to be a naive and trusting attitude among Americans. Certainly there were plenty of us who were naive and who were trusting, but fortunately these were not the men who were running the law-enforcement agencies. I think I am safe in saying that the F. B. I. was not particularly astonished on that dreadful Sunday when bombs rained on Pearl Harbor. Months before December 7, 1941, John Edgar Hoover had begun an intensive survey of 2,300 of the great industrial plants of America which would be called upon to produce for war if war should come.

The F. B. I. was taking no chances. It knew that the drums of jeopardy were rumbling in the far distance and that America's broad oceans were no longer a barrier to the terror which was running loose in the world. This survey begun by you, when many a soft-minded American was blandly asserting that no one would ever attack us, revealed some startling and some curious facts. In one factory in which confidential blueprints and documents were stored, the combination of the principal vault was plainly written upon an adjacent wall. In another plant which is today making war materials of vital importance to our fighting forces, an employee working in a key spot was found to be insane. Instance after instance was uncovered of employees in confidential positions who had connections which strained their patriotism. Ruthlessly, swiftly, silently, the F. B. I. cleaned house, and I as an American will never cease to be thankful that they did.

In the last war there was widespread sabotage, even terrorism, long before our troops moved into action. Immense munition plants were wiped out. Brazen espionage was practiced so openly as to insult our intelligence. An official of the German Embassy directed a campaign calculated to undermine our morals and nullify our efforts to assist the Allies in their struggle.

Not so in this war. The F. B. I. has anticipated the stratagems of the enemy at every point. The G-man, once the terror of gangsters in the prohibition era, became the nemesis of the saboteur. The F. B. I. knew that the country's real strength lay in its industrial muscles. It recognized that the

enemy would strike first at our factories, rather than our shore lines. But before the attack on our plants and machines could be made, the American agents were ready. They attacked first, and Gestapo Chief Himmler suffered as bad defeats in America as General Von Bock in Russia or Rommel in Africa. The graduates of Himmler's famous Gestapo schools walked innocently into traps which had been set months in advance. His prize scholars were overwhelmed by a brand of swift, subtle, hard-hitting counter-espionage that no European thought existed in America.

This is an achievement which most of our fellow countrymen still do not fully realize. But history will record it as one of the most brilliant chapters in the war against world fascism.

Most of the so-called sabotage which has occured in American plants has been due to carelessness, accident, or personal grievance. Foreign agents have had little to show for their great pains.

I speak from personal experience when I tell you that the defeat of industrial sabotage, that silent war within the war, has been of incalculable importance to our armed forces, and to the fighting men of all the United Nations.

The trend of the war, as we all know, is now highly favorable, but not long ago it was distinctly unfavorable. The turning point came in the great battles of north Africa and Russia, at El Alamein and at Stalingrad. We all know now that American equipment played a substantial part in those victories. War material turned out by American factories—tanks, and planes, and military supplies of all kinds—provided the extra margin of strength, without which those crucial fights might not have yielded such glorious and conclusive victories. American war production has made itself felt throughout the world, and is one of the decisive factors that is now crushing the Axis on every front. Perhaps you may be interested in knowing just how much we have produced and are producing. From January 1, 1942, a few weeks after Pearl Harbor, to the end of September, America turned out about 110,000 military planes and the production curve is steadily rising. Very soon we will be turning out a completed plane every 5 minutes around the clock, every day of the month. In the same period of time since Pearl Harbor, we have produced 60,000 tanks and tank chassis. More than 21,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant vessels, and nearly 3,000,000 displacement tons of naval vessels have come from our shipyards during this time.

We have made over 170,000 pieces of artillery for our ground forces alone and nearly 1,500,000 machine guns. As for submachine guns and rifles, our factories have turned out over 6,700,000 since Pearl Harbor, with more than 26,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition—enough to let us fire nearly 2,000 shots at every soldier in the Axis armies.

This is a war in which fire power and mobility must be added to human courage before victory can be won. It is the fire power and mobility, as well as the courage of the armies of the United Nations, which are now winning the war for us, and that fire power and that mobility can be definitely traced in a very large part to the astonishing performance of American industry.

But suppose sabotage had occurred at a strategic moment in a few of our large plants?. What then? Surely it is clear that had it not been for the watchfulness of our law-enforcement agencies, the magnificent victories of the recent past might well have been denied us, and a gloomy and dangerous prospect might now reach out before us. I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that if American war production had been stalled by sabotage as it was stalled several times and in several places during the last war, the enemy today might be hammering at Suez, at Moscow, at London, and at the Hawaiian Islands. Instead, we are doing the hammering in places that have very different names. The brilliant performance of the F. B. I. and the related police organizations have, to my way of thinking, probably made a difference of months or years in the time required to win the war, and have probably saved hundreds of thousands of American lives.

You men are in a very real sense silent custodians of the American war effort. It is your job to collaborate in the protection of resources which are vital to the winning of the war. You have a high responsibility for the protection of the home front, and you must play a large role in protecting the unity and solidarity of American life which is essential to civilian morale and to a total war effort. By guarding the source of the Army supplies you make a contribution to victory as essential as that of the men who destroy the enemy armies. In a literal sense, you are members of the American armed forces, for you are armed and you are ready to shoot and be shot at in order to preserve the power of America from destruction by our enemies.

But, at the same time, I know you have not lost sight of the fact that your responsibility in the final analysis goes far beyond even the destruction of the enemy system of sabotage and the smashing of our domestic criminal gangs. It is only through you and your associates and the work you do and the way you do it that the respect for law in America can grow. I do not speak of a respect based upon fear—a respect which crumbles as soon as the back of the law-enforcement agency is turned. I am talking about a healthy regard for the rights of others and the authority of the society.

I am sure that you, like myself, are deeply concerned over the growth of juvenile delinquency in this country during recent years. It promises trouble for the future. This war will not yet be over before another war will be starting for you. Most of us can remember the era of lawlessness which followed the last war—the gangsterism, the flouting of civil authority. That ugly period lasted for more than a decade and consumed both life and wealth. The Nation cannot afford a similar break-down in law enforcement after this war. The civil peace will have to be preserved while 10,000,000 fighting men are being reabsorbed into civilian life and while the economic structure of the country undergoes the serious strain of reconversion to peacetime production. That will be a period of travail and heartbreak unless you stout-hearted men of the law can, with one hand, keep a firm grip on the business of law enforcement, while with the other you help to direct the weak and the wayward, the bewildered and the maladjusted, into normal, productive life.

We have talked much of winning the peace after we win the war. That means far more than merely making satisfactory international settlements. No international settlement can be stronger than our national unity. We must win the peace, not only abroad but also right here at home, and it will not be easy to do. When the military music dies down and the great inspiration is no more—when the cheering crowds are no longer interested in sacrifice and heroism—in that period, we will need the strength and skill of professionals like you, who know how to meet the resulting problems of law enforcement with a sure and steady hand. Yours is a deadly serious business, and I am not exaggerating when I say that the future of our kind of country and our kind of life depends largely upon your ability and your integrity in meeting the challenge which lies ahead.

I do not pretend to be a prophet, and I certainly don't know what to expect in the post-war world, but I do know that if you should fail us, if there is not a firm, strong, tolerant, and seasoned body of law enforcement on the home front—men trained and prepared to cope with conditions which have never before been faced by this country—if we do not have that essential protection, our great Nation may face dangers as serious and threatening as those which we are overcoming in this war. Many of the restraints of wartime will quickly dissolve when peace comes. Normal living will be hard to re-establish. Quacks and demagogs of all kinds will very likely flourish, with their cheap political panaceas and their reckless leadership. That is a time when your judgment, your strength, and your competence are going to be indispensable to the country's healthy development.

Yes, gentlemen, both in war and in peace your function is essential to the proper functioning of our whole society. Your success now insures victory at the battle front. Your success in the days to come will insure victory at home.

It is in the light of this dual responsibility that I congratulate you gentlemen as you graduate from the National Police Academy, for you are facing a task of the highest dignity and importance to the future history of our country. You can and will leave your mark on that history—a mark that I am confident will be gratefully remembered by the generations to come. It is because of your responsibility that I note with deep interest one passage in the F. B. I. pledge which you have taken:

"I am aware of the serious responsibilities of my office and in the performance of my duties I shall, as a minister, seek to supply comfort, advice, and aid to those who may be in need of such benefits. As a soldier, I shall wage vigorous warfare against the enemies of my country, of its laws, and of its principles; and as a physician, I shall seek to eliminate the criminal parasite which preys upon our social order, and to strengthen the lawful process of our body politic."

So long as you adhere to that pledge—and I know you will—I think we may take it as certain that the future of law enforcement in this country is in good hands.

The Administration's Wartime Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S WARTIME TROUBLES

One by one the New Deal's stanchest friends are drifting away from the fold. The businessman was the first to go. The farmer has been off the reservation for about a year, and now there are signs that organized labor is cooling off.

Here are the signs as they appeared in last Tuesday's elections: In New York the support of the American Labor Party combined with the Democratic organization failed to elect the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor. In New Jersey the Democratic candidate for Governor, who was himself a labor leader and who had the support of all labor groups, lost his race. In the heavily industrialized State of Connecticut, Repub-

licans won elections held 3 weeks ago in 114 cities out of a total of 123. This week they added the industrial city of Hartford, which had been Democratic since 1933. In the city of Philadelphia, which has many huge war contracts, the Democratic candidate for mayor failed to oust the Republican incumbent.

While some of the administration's troubles are products of its own mistakes, most of them are the inevitable result of governing a nation like the United States in time of war. Many of the administration's troubles emanate from its laudable attempt to hold the line against inflation. By holding down prices and the cost of living the President and his administrators are benefiting the consumer, and since the consumer means everybody, it would seem that this policy would gain votes instead of losing them. But that isn't the way it works. The farmer is primarily a producer and he wants better prices on the open market, not subsidies. The laborer is also a producer and he wants higher wages, not statistics on how the anti-inflation program is keeping down the cost of living. The industrialist and businessman is a producer and he resents the curbs which Government has put on his profit-making ability. Everybody is a taxpayer and he grumbles over higher taxes. All of these groups are also consumers, but their main interests lie in their separate fields of endeavor. By attempting to benefit the whole population the administration is put in the paradoxical predicament of incurring the political animosity of the parts which make up the whole.

When future historians write the story of the critical period in which we are now living, the administration may emerge as the Nation's great benefactor, but this won't halt the present political trend. American voters are now reacting according to habit and history. The New Deal has been in office longer than any previous administration. It has accumulated more than its share of the political liabilities that go with long tenure. One of the greatest of these liabilities is the fact that the American people are inclined to vote out any regime after it has been in power a certain length of time.

Therefore, the present political trend is likely to continue until the New Deal is voted out. The Republicans will then hold office until they have accumulated their share of inevitable troubles and the American people will vote them out and put another crowd in office. So long as this process continues, American democracy will never be in serious danger.

Blitz From the Surface

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include here an editorial appearing in the November 1 issue of American Aviation.

The editorial, which deals with a vital subject now facing the Congress and the country, follows:

BLITZ FROM THE SURFACE

The air-transport industry is currently on the receiving end of a blitzkrieg from various surface carriers. In Congress a minority group of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee suddenly switched from its earlier support of the Lea bill which would create a Civil Aeronautics Commission and threw its support behind a report and a bill quite obviously inspired by surface carriers. In the Civil Aeronautics Board the hearing into the feeder airline problem heard a lengthy and well-prepared frontal assault on the air-transport field by the Greyhound Bus interests.

The maneuvers in Congress are designed simply to forestall action on or to defeat the Lea bill, which has been under consideration in various forms since January. Its real purpose is to open up the air-transport field to all comers, although this purpose is supplemented and disguised by a wide variety of charges, including the States' rights argument and the usual charge against monopoly. The hasty move is so obvious, however, and the interests of three large railroads and one steamship company in this report are so well known to Members of Congress that right-thinking legislators are not apt to be swayed by this sudden pressure.

Nurseries and Shipyards in Portland, Oreg., a Contribution to Our War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out on the floor on numerous occasions, the shipyard industries in my State and in the trade territory of Portland, Oreg., in my district, have made an outstanding contribution to our war effort.

On October 31 the press carried the report that a pair of ships had just been launched from the Portland area shipyards of the second series of 500 ship launchings of that area. The five hundredth ship launching, the *PC 806*, a 173-foot steel subchaser, was launched by the Commercial Iron Works and the five hundred and first ship, the *William D. Hoard*, by the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation.

At the present time more than 120,000 workers earn over $7,000,000 a week in the Portland area shipyards. This outstanding record has not been achieved without a great sacrifice on the part of all of the citizens of this great Northwest area. The women of my State and of my district have arisen to the occasion and play a heroic part in this building program. More than 4,000 of these women employed in the Portland area shipyards are mothers—many with children of school age. The shipyards expect to employ an additional 1,500 women shortly to take the place of our men who are donning uniforms and taking their places at the front.

In order to meet the problems arising from the employment of mothers the nursery has come to the Portland shipyards. A new plan has been launched by the Kaiser yards where many mothers are now employed by the construction of child service centers where provisions are made for nursery care for the children of working mothers. Specially designed buildings immediately adjacent to the shipyard entrances have been constructed. These have inner courts where the youngsters may play and be protected from traffic. Nursery rooms face on these courts and are provided with ample lighting and air and sanitation for protection of these little ones. Not only are windows on two sides of these rooms but the walls are finished in pastel shades and the floors of soft attractive linoleum blending with the plan of decoration for the entire nursery.

I include as a part of my remarks a very instructive and intriguing statement describing in some detail this nursery program written by Lois Meek Stolz, consultant director and a member of the child service department of the Kaiser Co., Inc., which article appeared in the New York Times magazine November 7, 1943. The article is as follows:

THE NURSERY COMES TO THE SHIPYARD—A NEW PLAN FOR CHILD CARE IS LAUNCHED AT KAISER'S PORTLAND YARDS, WHERE MANY MOTHERS ARE EMPLOYED

(By Lois Meek Stolz, consultant director, child-service department, Kaiser Co., Inc.)

Never before has American industry cried out for womanpower as it is doing today. The demand is for mothers as well as for unmarried women. But if mothers have no conveniently situated, capably run place in which to leave their young children during working hours they will not stick loyally at their war jobs. The Nation recognizes this, as child-care centers springing up everywhere, in schoolhouses and other converted buildings, amply testify.

But busy mothers frequently feel they cannot make the extra trip, sometimes of several miles, to and from the centers before and after a full workday. Thus the child-care problem too often is left still unsolved.

An outstanding undertaking for the care of American preschool children in wartime is about to begin at two shipyards in this city. It seeks to supply some of the shortcomings noted elsewhere and to point the way toward putting a wartime job in line with the best practice in the field of child development.

The operator will be the United States Maritime Commission, with the benefit of advice from officials of the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Works Agency, and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Progress will be watched eagerly by child-care specialists throughout the country.

Sixteen thousand women now are helping build tankers and cargo ships at 2 of Portland's yards—the plant of the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, and the Swan Island yard of the Kaiser Co., Inc. More than 4,000 of these women are mothers, many with children of preschool age. To take care of replacements and meet increased demand for welders, the yards expect to recruit another 1,500 women, among whom are sure to be more mothers.

In order to stabilize the employment of these mothers and to do so without jeopardizing the development of their children, two child-service centers will be operated, one at each yard. Mothers will bring their preschool children with them when they come to work. As they enter the yards they will leave their children at the center under the care and supervision of teachers and nurses especially prepared for work in this field.

Right at the shipyard, amid physically attractive surroundings, the children will have

an opportunity to live wholesome, happy lives. They will play and eat and sleep in an environment especially planned for them, while not far away their mothers—welders, clerks, timekeepers, and secretaries—put in a full 8-hour shift. The centers will go a step further. When the tired mother lays down her welding equipment and stops to call for her child, she will be able to buy, right at the center and at cost, a dinner to take home to place before her family.

Those who shake their heads at the thought of setting up a child-care center in a dirty shipyard have never seen these yards. Newly built since the Maritime Commission put its great shipbuilding program under way, they overlook the lovely Willamette River, miles away from what is usually thought of as the industrial part of town. The Oregon shipyard backs up to fields and woods, giving an opportunity for children's gardens and for colonies of pet animals.

The centers themselves, although the buildings are temporary, have been designed to fit in with the architecture of the immaculately kept yards. Enclosing an octagonal space—a great inner court in which the children will play, protected from outside traffic—are rectangular rooms (each 26 by 49 feet), with windows on two sides to insure proper lighting and walls of pastel shades, in blues, yellows, apricots, depending on the exposure of the individual room. Floors are of soft blue linoleum which blends with the general color scheme. Connecting corridors are painted a pale gray-green.

The rooms will have facilities to fit the age levels of the children: shelves for toys and books, toilets, wash bowls and individual lockers built in like a dressing-room unit. Storage space is provide for cots, bedding, and supplies. Besides the 15 rooms, arranged in pairs, are supplementary rooms which will be used for morning inspection, for small groups of children, or for teachers' conferences.

In the center of the inside court is a flagpole flanked by four wading pools and surrounded by a grass plot, outside of which is a large hard-surfaced playground with covered play porches for use during Portland's rainy season. The play court is to be divited so as to leave sections for each age level.

Like the shipyards themselves, the child service centers will be open on a 12-month basis, 7 days a week. At first they will operate on a 2-shift basis, with 3 shifts a later possibility. Each center will be capable of caring for about 400 children at each shift.

Let us see what kind of schedule will be followed by a 3-year-old child brought to the Oregon shipyard by a mother working on the day shift.

The shift begins at 9 o'clock in the morning and continues until 5:30 p. m. The child will arrive between 7:30 and 8:45 and remain until about 5:45. The service center is so placed that every woman who comes to work, whether in the administration section, out in the shops, or on the shipways themselves, must pass the building.

On entering the center the child will go to the examination room for inspection by a nurse, so that the spread of colds and diseases will be kept at a minimum. A play program with sandboxes, blocks, climbing apparatus, and wheel toys will follow and then Mary or John will have a brief rest period, followed by a glass of fruit juice.

From then until lunch time there will be more play, including stories, music, painting, or modeling in clay. A well-balanced dinner, the main meal of the day, will be followed by an afternoon nap. A light afternoon lunch and another play period will follow the sleep time.

The program for children of mothers working on the "swing shift" and "graveyard shift" will be adapted to fit the different hours. The total cost to each mother-worker, including food for the children, will be 75 cents a day for one child $1.25 for two, $1.75 for three.

Experience has shown that illness of children is one of the greatest causes of absence among defense workers who are mothers. Therefore, in each center an infirmary will care for any child with minor ailments which result in the 2- or 3-day sicknesses prevalent among preschool children. A staff of nurses under supervision of a pediatrician will be on hand to look after these slight illnesses which usually are the responsibility of the mother.

Obviously this enterprise calls for an operating staff of professionals. Before the centers were built Edgar F. Kaiser, son of Henry J. Kaiser, and general manager of the two Portland yards, consulted with authorities in Washington, and those in charge assembled a staff of specialists who have won an outstanding position in child education. James L. Hymes, Jr., released from the War Department at Mr. Kaiser's request, is resident director of the centers. Mr. Hymes was formerly head of the Hessian Hills School at Croton-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.

The centers have been especially designed from the ground up by Wolff & Phillips, Portland architects, for a maximum wartime job, and the staff, as the day approaches for the start of the program, is preparing to make Portland the focal point of the Nation in the care of working mothers' preschool children.

Americans in Quest of a Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following condensation of an article by my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE:

AMERICANS IN QUEST OF A FOREIGN POLICY

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Congresswoman from Connecticut)

Today as never before the American people are profoundly troubled about the relations of their Nation to the family of nations. They know at last that the destinies of all the countries of the earth have become so exquisitely interdependent that America's only hope of peace and prosperity depends upon the firm establishment of friendly and fruitful relations with all nations, big and small. Overwhelmingly, therefore, it is the will of Americans that international relations be established and maintained which will allow us to live at peace with our neighbors, and aid and encourage our neighbors' neighbors to live at peace with each other. On this question there is complete national unity. * * *

The procedure by which a people's will in relation to its neighbors abroad is implemented is called the nation's foreign policy. If the people's will is thwarted or denied, we say that nation's foreign policy has failed. Twice in our times the American people's will to peace has been thwarted—twice in our lifetime this Nation has been involved in a disastrous world war. Twice, therefore, our foreign policy has failed.

But again today, the people of the United States want for the future what they have always wanted in the past; the kind of foreign policy which will keep this Nation at peace in a peaceful world. This they want more, perhaps, than they want anything else. And yet millions of Americans have awakened to the terrifying knowledge that they, the American people, do not seem to have that kind of foreign policy even yet. Indeed, they seem to have no foreign policy at all. * * *

Why, they ask, can't they get what they want—an American foreign policy designed to carry out the will of their minds and hearts?

The answer, the fundamental answer, is so simple that it is a terrible tragedy that the average American does not know it. Americans can't get the kind of foreign policy they want because the American people themselves play no active, direct, democratic part in the formulation of their own Nation's foreign policy.

By the law of our land, the power to formulate, devise, create, inaugurate, and execute any policy in relation to any foreign power, whether it be the relinquishment or acquisition of territory or trade routes, economic or financial arrangements, recognition of foreign governments, or writing of treaties, lies entirely and solely in the hands of the President. Also by law, the agent through whom the President works is his first lieutenant, the Secretary of State, who is responsible only to the President. He is appointed by the President and may be dismissed by him. The people's Congress has no legal power, not one jot of it, in the creation, initiation, negotiation, or execution of any part of America's foreign policy. The Senators and Representatives do exercise, to be sure, a veto power: One-third of the Senate can say no to any international treaty the President lays before them; the House can refuse, by a simple majority, to grant the President the moneys he may need to carry out foreign policies which he has devised. But these are totally negative and nonconstructive powers.

The important thing for Americans who are in quest of a foreign policy to realize today is that the President is not required by the law of our land, nor is his Secretary of State, to report to the House or the Senate, or to any Member or committee in Congress. the status of his foreign negotiations at any time, nor even the reasons which he may have for entering upon any given course of action in relation to a foreign power. Nor need he give to the people, through the press or radio, any information as to the action he is taking with heads of foreign states. * * *

In the days when the founding fathers lodged all the powers having to do with the making of America's foreign policy in the hands of the President alone, there was indeed a vast difference between American domestic and foreign policy. In sailing-ship days the oceans were a barrier between us and the rest of the world. * * * But since then, because of the steamship, the radio, the airplane, and the industrialization of the civilized world, the elaborate integration between any nation's foreign and domestic policies has become almost complete.

As the wise or stupid operation of America's foreign policy certainly affects the decisions of other foreign powers in matters economic, military, and political, so our foreign policy is bound to shape our domestic policy directly. The shaping of a wise foreign policy for America will certainly insure its domestic prosperity. The unsound handling of this Nation's foreign policy will inevitably make a bloody mockery of all the social-security laws, tax laws, or any other laws that Congress passes at home. Tomorrow the man who handles our foreign policy—and, according to law, it is only one man—has it in his power,

if his decisions are not wise, to plunge this country into another and more terrible war, or to put upon the backs of the people taxes so heavy that the wisest domestic policy would be incapable of long withstanding the shock.

* * * * *

Remember, Franklin Roosevelt does not have this power because he grabbed it. It is a power that was given him by the Constitution, but which when given was not very great. Like Topsy, it has just growed.

And the only three brakes upon that prodigious power are: 1. The Senate's right to veto treaties. This brake is less and less effective, as the modern trend is against foreign agreements being presented in the shape of treaties to the Senate. "Executive agreements" is the new technique by which modern Presidents have sought to bypass the Senate. 2. The right of Congress to refuse moneys. This brake is growing weaker, too, since a strong political majority in Congress will generally pass anything its President hands down from the White House. 3. Public opinion. And this brake, which should be the most effective, is only effective if the people themselves are at all times alert to the international situation and well informed of the facts, either by the President and his Secretary of State or, in spite of him, by a zealous free press and radio.

* * * * *

What is the answer to this horrible impasse between the Chief Executive and the people on foreign policy? * * *

I will not say there is any one answer. There are two. But I do say only one is a democratic answer.

1. We can rob the Congress even of its veto power by allowing the President to short-circuit the Senate altogether and doing away with all treaties. Or we can further weaken the Senate veto power by saying that ratifications of whatever treaties do come to the Senate shall be by simple majority. The effect of either course would be to break the stalemate in favor of greater Presidential power. This is the solution that the administration is seeking now. This would do away altogether with any legislative brake on the President's executive power. He would then have the same power over our foreign policy as Hitler had over Germany's or Stalin has over Russia's. Like them, he would have to deal with public opinion only. Plainly, this is not a wise solution from the average American point of view. And strangely enough, except for these Democrats who expect to benefit immediately, it is not the solution any patriot would choose. * * *

2. There is a second solution and it is the democratic one. It is for the President to share his vast powers with the people through their representatives, so that together the President, the people, the Congress, and the State Department may arrive at the choice of a sound American foreign policy.

There are two ways this could be done: First, by amendment to the Constitution, which would require the President and the Secretary of State to consult at regular intervals with the Congress, or Members thereof, and to subject himself to questioning at regular intervals on his conduct of foreign affairs. But a constitutional amendment is a long and tedious process. Second, the President himself could offer to appear once a month before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to subject himself to questioning on his conduct of foreign policy. And he could require his Secretary of State to do likewise. In this way, via their representatives, the whole people would be taken into the full confidence of the President and at all times be aware of what course he was pursuing in the interests of America, and why. To say that this won't work is simply to say that democracy won't work, and that we have fought a great and dreadful war in vain.

A recent magazine article by Democratic Senator CARL HATCH, of New Mexico, called United Now For Peace, is revealing. With the greatest good will and patriotism, Senator HATCH makes the old, old cry to the people to "wake up and take part." Then he bemoans the terrible division of opinion among 96 Senators, which is, he fears, going to lose the peace. It strikes him as horrible and undemocratic that our Senators have a variety of views on international subjects. At the beginning of his article he says he wants them to "make up their minds" that we must cooperate with Europe and Asia. A paragraph later he admits that, by and large, they have made up their minds to do so. What Senator HATCH really means is that all the Senators just won't make up their minds to do—what? Unite solidly behind the President's foreign policy, whatever it is, or may be in 1944. And then he lets the cat out of the bag unwittingly. He writes: "The President met with the Committee on Foreign Relations before the invasion of Poland began, but that meeting was not fruitful."

In short, Mr. Roosevelt met once, before the European war, with the Foreign Relations Committee. This was in a period during which the American people and their legislators, in long ignorance of the facts about Europe and Asia, were torn by the desire to stay out and the fear that we might be plunged in. And because that was not a fruitful meeting Mr. Roosevelt never met again with the Foreign Relations Committee to explain anything to them at all.

But in spite of his natural partisanship, Senator HATCH knows the answer, too. For partisan or not, like all Americans, he is a patriot. Says he: "It seems clear to me that a method for closer contact between the President and the Senate must be provided. It seems entirely reasonable that there should be frequent meetings between the President, his advisers, the Secretary of State, and the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is a national problem and not a party matter. It is also a matter of life and death for us as a nation."

I quarrel (mildly) with Senator HATCH simply because, knowing as he does there have been no such meetings for 4 years, he complains that some of our Senators are ignorant non-world-minded fellows. To me the wonder is that all aren't, cut off as they are from a free and regular intercourse with the President on international affairs. I believe, and I am sure Senator HATCH does too, that the present one-third veto power of the Senate would prove no handicap to the development of a sound American foreign policy, provided that at regular stated intervals the President and his Secretary of State presented themselves before Members of the Senate to explain why the policy they envisaged, or the treaty they wanted to negotiate, or the "world peace plan" they were projecting was for the long-term interests of the whole Nation. To say that the Senate, once in full possession of the facts, would not cooperate is to say that only the President of the United States is a patriot and all Senators and Congressmen are potential traitors.

* * * * *

To sum up: A major obstacle in the quest of an American foreign policy is the gap left by our Constitution, which does not make it obligatory for the President to discuss his foreign policy with the people through their duly elected Representatives. Perhaps the time has come for our President (who is a great tradition buster) to "bust" this tradition in the best interests of the whole American people and to assume, in this world crisis, the moral and patriotic obligation which does not legally exist.

This, I venture to predict, the President will probably not do. There are few men in the world who part with legally delegated power gracefully. Then there is only one course left to Americans if they want a foreign policy. That is to demand that the President, on the radio and through the press, tell them fully and frankly what sort of foreign policy he believes they ought to have—and why—and submit the major facts concerning what he has done and is doing to formulate a policy that will keep us out of war for at least 50 years. His is the power and his is the knowledge. If he shares neither with us, our endless debates with one another on a foreign policy for America will be futile—and a source of endless disunity.

I have not attempted to describe a foreign policy for America, but I have indicated the first step that must be taken in that quest. If this step is not taken, we may never get a foreign policy. And a sound American policy, as Walter Lippmann has so well said, is the shield of the Republic. That shield must be wrought in the warm desires and enlightened wishes of all the people—and borne happily and in full acceptance of the honor by all their duly elected Representatives. If it is wrought alone, in the mind of one man—as it is today—the shield is bound to be twisted and warped and very thin indeed. And when it is carried into battle it will serve not to protect us but merely as a bloody litter on which to bring our dead sons home to their sons, who will fight again within what would have been their fathers' lifetime.

Organized Labor Urges Freedom of Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently a committee of the Tacoma Central Labor Council, representing A. F. of L. unions, appeared before Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and, through a spokesman, presented a clear-cut statement as to the position of labor in post-war planning. The A. F. of L. union representatives made a forthright declaration as to their ideas, convictions, and suggestions anent post-victory employment. These trade-unionists sum up their position in the statement I am hereinbelow quoting, requesting that the Government facilitate the expansion and strengthening of free enterprise, remove bureaucratic restrictions, and reduce or limit governmental regimentation to a minimum degree.

Representatives of the Industrial Conference Board of Tacoma, Inc., have advised me that they regard highly this presentation of trade-unionists and denominate it as one of the most significant statements yet issued in the field of post-war pronouncements.

Certainly the problems facing our citizens at the end of this terrible war will need unity of purpose and thinking for the best solution. In this statement, the A. F. of L. union representatives insist

that they can work out their own problems under the general laws of the United States, without the use of repressive legislative measures directed at either labor or management. They deplore the hamstringing or shackling of either group—employer or employee.

But let the workers speak for themselves. Here is their statement:

TACOMA A. F. OF L. PLANS POST-VICTORY EMPLOYMENT

(Statement of Central Labor Council Committee delivered before Senate subcommittee hearing, Hon. JAMES C. O'MAHONEY, chairman, Army and Navy room, Winthrop Hotel, Tacoma, Saturday, September 18, 1943)

For almost a year and a half the Central Labor Council of Tacoma has been grappling with the problem of post-victory employment for returning servicemen and demobilized war workers of this area.

During this time definite progress has been made, notably along lines of setting up the organizational machinery necessary to handle the job.

Early in our discussions it became apparent that speeches, blueprints, and plausible plans would do little to obviate the possibility of post-war economic dislocation and that neither organized labor nor the employers could plan effectively without planning and working to this end together.

The Post-Victory Employment Committee grew out of joint employer-employee discussions at meetings of the Tacoma Round Table and it is through this committee that organized wage earners of this area and the men who sign the pay checks are making the surveys without which any realistic approach to the problem of post-victory employment would be impossible.

The procedure approved by the Central Labor Council and the majority of affiliated membership consists of a threefold joint cooperative effort on the part of labor, management, and Government.

This was done in the firm belief that working people in and out of uniform prefer steady jobs at wages established by collective bargaining and opportunities for advancement under the laws and Constitution of this country and our traditional system of free enterprise rather than Government doles, made jobs or other forms of semi-Fascist paternalism.

In preferring to plan for steady jobs, organized labor is not taking a position of rejecting Government help or counsel during the period of post-war readjustment. There will be plenty for the Government to do without trying to take over.

All labor asks is that those bureaus and agencies set up in response to wartime needs be dissolved as soon as possible when the war is over lest both management and labor become serfs of the centralized bureaucratic state.

Under no circumstances would organized labor in Tacoma approve of any governmental maneuvering to socialize American business institutions, reorganize labor unions, or to displace collective bargaining with any form of involuntary governmental regimentation.

Regardless of eastern financial, economic, or political pressure groups, organized labor in Tacoma insists on the exploitation and development of Northwest resources by local workers and investors. And this includes a vigorous protest against any flooding of our war industry areas with alien or other undesirable outside labor on grounds of a temporary — and often imaginary — labor shortage.

Labor's demands for the restoration of its traditional right of direct collective bargaining with the employers is coupled with a demand for the removal of restraints on employers seeking to build up a financial backlog for post-victory pay rolls and the development of Northwest resources.

Tacoma labor, now engaged in surveying the potentialities of post-war commodity purchasing, urges strongly that the Government refrain from disorganizing the post-war market by dumping accumulated stockpile of goods on the market without regard to community business and local pay rolls.

Along the same line and for the same reason Tacoma labor urges that the Government should make no attempt to use its overwhelming advantages in competition with post-war employers. Plants so owned and operated at present should be returned to private management rather than be retained as a nucleus of further socialization. Everything possible should be done to encourage post-war pay rolls in this area.

In order to cushion the shock of possible post-war dislocation all war contracts and wage agreements in war industries should be protected and preserved for a reasonable length of time rather than being canceled when hostilities cease, as was done in the last war.

In Tacoma both the unions and the employers have found that they can get along under the laws of the land without calling for repressive legislative measures directed at either group. It is to be hoped that both will emerge from the war without being shackled or hamstrung.

It is the devout wish of Tacoma labor unionists that the cordial employer-employee relationships built up to insure victory will be continued as the basis of a new era of fellowship and prosperity for all levels of American life; that creditable American living standards based on full production for war can be sustained, by means of rational planning, to cover the difficult period of post-war readjustment and the years to follow.

H. S. MCILVAIGH,
CHARLES GROVER,
DONALD AHRENS,
TED HOPKINS,
RAY MOISIO,
RALPH CHAPLIN,
Central Labor Council Post-Victory Employment Committee.

Waiting at the Pay Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune for Friday, November 5, 1943. The editorial speaks for itself.

WAITING AT THE PAY WINDOW

A reader in Lawrence, Mich., has sent us an advertisement of the Lawrence Cooperative Creamery Co. informing the farmers in its territory about the Federal subsidies on butterfat.

The creamery says that the War Food Administration has announced an additional subsidy of 4 cents per pound on butterfat to be paid on cream sold during the last quarter of 1943.

"Our creamery is already collecting 5 cents per pound subsidy on butter and handing it on to the producer," the advertisement reports. "To add the 4 cents onto the 5 cents would be a simple matter—very much too simple. Instead, beginning with this check you are to save your cream check statement and take it to the A. A. A. office at Bangor and collect the 4 cents per pound butterfat."

In other words, the New Deal commissars are not only determined to pay subsidies on farm produce in spite of the opposition of Congress, but the farmers are going to be made to realize who is handing out this money. They are going to have to drive, ride, or walk to the party headquarters to get their cash.

The creamery's advertisement concludes with the ironic observation: "No doubt this is intended to save gas, tires, time, and labor." In truth, it is intended to buy back the farm vote that the New Dealers realize now they have lost, and buy it back in time to reelect Mr. Roosevelt to a fourth term.

An Outspoken Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of October 26, 1943:

AN OUTSPOKEN GOVERNOR

In the thick of these trying days of bewilderment and confusion, Americans still crave for courage and candor in their leaders. Their respect goes to him, whether he be President, Governor, Senator, or merely a candidate who possesses these qualities.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer has unearthed such a man—"a Governor who is among those mentioned prominently as a 1944 Presidential possibility." What he has to say about "the trend of affairs in Washington," remarks the Cleveland paper, "may seem old-fashioned and off the throb to some of our New Deal friends, but seems to us to represent sound American thinking."

We believe most of our readers, including many of both political parties, will agree with the Plain Dealer's opinion. That paper quotes from a radio address by the Governor, as well as from an inaugural address which, it thinks, "has received too little national attention."

From the inaugural address this quotation, we believe, is timely and should be helpful:

"There is a present dangerous tendency to forget a fundamental of American democracy—the tendency to encourage consolidation of power at the top of a governmental structure alien to our system and more closely akin to a dictatorship or the central committee of a Communist regime. We have met difficulties before this and have solved them in accordance with the basic theories of a representative democracy. Let us not at this time pursue the easy road of centralization of authority, lest some day we discover too late that our liberties have disappeared."

And from the radio address these straightforward remarks are likewise pertinent:

"It was clear to the framers of our Constitution * * * that any administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation * * * would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself.

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by master minds has been too glaringly

apparent in Washington during these last 10 years. * * * To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government."

This, it must be admitted, is hitting pretty hard. Some may feel justified in complaining against hitting beneath the belt, when there is talk of a dictatorship, of a Communist regime, of an oligarchy masquerading as a democracy. It might, indeed, be proper to plead that greater restraint be exercised in speaking of a President of the United States—that there is a limit beyond which partisanship should not go. It could well be charged that a personal animus against President Roosevelt is clearly revealed in this Governor's ruthless attack.

Fortunately the partisan charge may be dismissed. For it was not Governor Bricker, of Ohio, or Governor Dewey, of New York, or Governor Griswold, of Nebraska, who spoke the quoted words. It was not any Republican Governor.

The words are those of a Democratic Governor. And while Mr. Roosevelt has a good many enemies in his own party, both personal and factional, this Governor, we believe, could not be represented as an enemy of our President. He is rather a friend, who uniformly has given Franklin Roosevelt his hearty and unquestioning support.

For, as the Plain Dealer discloses, "these remarks were made by Franklin D. Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York and Herbert Hoover was in the White House."

That fact, however, has little bearing on the case. For the important thing is not who said it but Is it true?

Is there "a dangerous tendency * * * alien to our system * * * akin to a dictatorship or a Communist regime * * * a government by oligarchy masquerading as a democracy" that is the cause of the present confusion of the home front affecting labor, industry, commerce, and agriculture alike, and giving rise to justifiable fears that we may "discover too late that our liberties have disappeared"?

That question every citizen, including Mr. Roosevelt, may answer for himself. Perhaps some may say that the dangerous tendency so evident in Mr. Hoover's time, deserving of such unsparing attack, has by now practically disappeared. And that defense, if you have a split lip, would cause you considerable pain.

No Encroachment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the trucking industry has gone on record as favoring legislation that will prohibit any form of transportation from encroaching on any other form through interlocking directors, or officers, stock control, or indirect holdings.

A resolution setting forth that position was passed at the recent meeting of the American Trucking Associations; and under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include that resolution. It follows:

Resolution 7

Whereas the American Trucking Associations, Inc., has consistently opposed the entrance of railroads into the field of motor-carrier transportation; and

Whereas there is now an increasing prospect of the emergence of another form of freight transportation, namely, by air; and

Whereas strangulation of existing agencies and a trend toward monopolistic control of transportation would be of great public harm, as well as harm to the independent trucking industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the American Trucking Associations instruct the staff of the association to resist encroachment by any form of transportation upon another and that the association support vigorously any legislation designed to prohibit such an encroachment.

How a Foreign-Language Newspaper Promotes Our War Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative in Congress from the city of Buffalo, N. Y., which has one of the Nation's largest concentrations of Polish population, I take pride in the notable contribution which is being made to the winning of this war by a Polish-language newspaper published in Buffalo, Everybody's Daily, which is America's largest Polish newspaper. In the recent third war-loan drive the efforts of this newspaper are credited with the sale, through its readers and carrier boys, of more than $5,000,000 of War bonds and stamps in a single day.

The Treasury has announced that among all newspapers in the United States, Everybody's Daily, which was the only foreign-language newspaper so cooperating, was third in the number and value of War bonds and stamps sold as a result of newspaper promotion. Only two English-language newspapers, the Kansas City Star, whose circulation is 312,969, and the Providence Journal-Bulletin, with a circulation of 161,400, were able to exceed the performance of the Polish Everybody's Daily, of Buffalo.

The productive record of Everybody's Daily in War bond and stamp sales is a reflection of the intense loyalty and patriotism of its readers, Poland-born and native Americans of Polish descent, to the United States and to the cause of freedom as exemplified in this war by the comrades-in-arms of the United States and of the Republic of Poland, and of all the United Nations.

Here is a record of which both the newspaper, Everybody's Daily, and I have reason to be proud:

Everybody's Daily has expounded Americanism to its readers throughout the 36 years that it has been published.

In 9 months the Polish Americans, who are the readers of Everybody's Daily have bought, in large degree, perhaps, because of the excellent and patriotic work of Everybody's Daily, $9,266,025 of War bonds and stamps, although their quota was only $6,175,000—and they have subscribed these $9,000,000 in addition to all the bonds and stamps which they have otherwise purchased by individual initiative alone and through pay-roll deductions and organization buying. In the first War bond drive in December 1942, when they were asked to subscribe $175,000, they responded with $456,520; in the second War bond drive last April, when appeal was made to them for $2,000,000, they subscribed $3,690,105; and in September, when the third War bond drive was conducted, they responded not merely by buying the $4,000,000 of bonds and stamps, which was their quota, but by improving upon that quota with the purchase of $5,119,400 of War savings—which is war financing—certificates and stamps.

After the first War bond drive, the Treasury's War Savings staff, newspaper advisory committee, commended Everybody's Daily in these words:

Upon checking, we find that you occupy the unique position of being the only foreign-language newspaper in the United States cooperating in the carrier boys' campaign for the sale of War Savings stamps. Not only are you the only foreign-language newspaper in the country cooperating in the campaign but, proportionately, you are cooperating to the extent that you are away over any other newspaper in the country as to sales figures. Taking into consideration your circulation of approximately 40,000, as compared with a large paper of 300,000 circulation which has sold at the most 675,000 in any one week, your sales of 693,000 for the week ending December 12 is an almost unbelievable increase, your previous weekly average having been about 10,000 per week.

Your staff is doing a splendid job, and you are to be congratulated on such fine results. Your last week's sales of 143,000 indicate a live sales force and show that you are continuing to carry on with no let-down in your efforts.

I have wished this information concerning a Polish-language newspaper, Everybody's Daily, to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we may all be reminded that ours is a united nation—which is a correct description in exact language—among united nations.

Unnecessary Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring one example of unnecessary spending to the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted November 5, 1943, by the Battle Creek Realty Board of Battle Creek, Mich. It brings to light just another bureaucratic spending project that should be stopped.

At the same time, the members of the Battle Creek Realty Board should be

congratulated for having exposed the proposed waste of the taxpayers' money. The resolution follows:

Resolved by the Battle Creek Realty Board, of Battle Creek, Mich., That said board is unalterably opposed and does hereby register its protest to the appropriation of funds and the allocation and use thereof for the construction of a recreational building in Battle Creek Township, Calhoun County, Mich., in connection with the Prairieview homes project and the acquiring of a site therefor, for the following reasons, namely:

1. That there is no real need for any such additional building at this time;

2. That there are ample recreational facilities in the community, and ample places for wholesome recreation, without same being provided under Government ownership;

3. That there is no more need for the providing of recreational facilities and building for such Federal housing project than for any other group or neighborhood in the community;

4. That it would be using vitally needed materials and labor, of which there is a decided scarcity, and would not help in the promotion of the war effort;

5. That the amortization of the cost of said project, estimated to cost $50,000, over a period of 35 years, would make such project a permanent one, rather than of a temporary nature for the period of the duration of the war;

6. That we are opposed to Government ownership and operation of permanent projects of this nature, after the emergency has passed, and feel that any such permanent improvements should be locally financed and supported; and be it hereby further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the regional office of the Federal Public Housing Authority, at Cleveland, Ohio, the War Production Board, at Washington, D. C., and Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER, Member of Congress from this district.

New England Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including the recommendations of the New England commissioners of agriculture to the Governors of New England; also, I include the resolutions passed by the Addison County Farm Bureau Association, Inc., at the annual meeting on October 25, 1943:

The New England Commissioners of Agriculture unanimously recommend the following to the Governors of New England:

1. That apple ceilings reflect quality packs in line with New England grades established over many years. We also recommend that shipping point ceilings do not apply to loads under 300 bushels.

2. That all ceilings on fresh vegetables be eliminated. However, if ceilings are continued that they reflect the cost of production, and act as incentive for the production of quality vegetables.

3. We feel that the 1943 potato program has been helpful to producer and consumer, and we recommend the continuance of the program as now in operation without the application of any roll-back policy.

4 That subsidy in any form be opposed.

5. We feel that the average of farm prices for 1943 has been reasonably satisfactory, but there are some glaring inequalities, chief of which is milk. The price of milk should reflect the cost of production, therefore, we recommend an increased price of 93 cents per hundredweight at the farm level. Such action is imperative if reasonable consumer demands are to be met in 1944.

6. In consideration of the best information obtainable, there would seem to be two choices in this feed situation. (1) The total grain deficit for the northeast during the coming winter totals 66,995,000 bushels. To meet required necessities, one solution that we can see to this problem is to follow the recommended program of the reduction of livestock. We believe that should be as follows: Sharp reduction in (a) broilers; (b) hogs; (c) beef-type cattle; (d) if and when found necessary, laying hens and, lastly, dairy cows. (2) The second alternative is to maintain our reasonable livestock population in New England and to be assured of sufficient feed for this population we recommend a change in feed price ratios; i. e., either a lower support price on hogs or an additional discount on heavy hogs, or an increase in price of corn, or a combination of these. This would establish a reasonable corn-hog price ratio, the result of which, we believe, would allow the release of corn for our New England area and have a salutary effect on the price of oats and barley.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ADDISON COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION, INC., AT NEW HAVEN, CONN., OCTOBER 25, 1943

1. While prices of farm products have risen, they are still not comparable with other prices and wages. Farmers can feed themselves but cannot feed the world unless prices are such that they can compete in the labor market.

2. Farm production will decline unless competent farm labor and machinery are made available.

3. We believe that the labor program of the Extension Service has been helpful and urge its continuance.

4. We recommend approval by the War Production Board of electric wiring and fixtures for farm tenant houses.

5. A grain shortage in the East will cause a heavy decline in milk production and entirely stop egg production. Therefore, we resolve that the Extension Service and Department of Agriculture should take steps to secure the necessary grain for livestock and poultry.

6. We oppose subsidies for industrial products, farm products, and labor.

7. We resent the arbitrary decision of the State A. C. P. officials under which sheep are excluded while beef cattle are counted in allotment of fertilizer and direct that a copy of this resolution be sent to the State A. C. P. committee.

8. Resolved, that no farm machinery be exported for which there is a demand in the United States and that the decision as to whether or not there is such a demand should rest in a committee appointed by the farm organizations and manufacturers of farm machinery.

9. We recommend the future establishment of a poultry department to the University of Vermont.

10. *Resolved*, That we approve of the efforts of the Farm Bureau and other national organizations in their fight against the regimentation and socialistic standing of the O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture and we urge their more continued and emphatic efforts.

Addresses on Occasion of Award of Army-Navy E to the Central California War Industries, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in connection with the award of the Army-Navy E to the Central California War Industries, Inc., of Fresno, Calif., on September 4, 1943. I also request that the remarks of Lieutenant Commander Lovett, chairman of the day, of Admiral Friedell, and of Mr. Nutwell on the same occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LOVETT

As our guest speaker today, we are exceedingly fortunate in being able to present the Nation's foremost champion of American small business enterprises. Except for a few mass-production plants, our peacetime production was traditionally concentrated in independent business establishments employing less than 100 persons. From an engineering and paper work standpoint alone, the marshaling of the greatest possible number of the 183,000 smaller plants of this country for war production presented one of the most perplexing problems at the outset of the war.

To Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman and founder of the Senate Small Business Committee, goes the credit for formulating the constructive policies and for providing the administrative agencies and funds to bring all convertible small plants into war production. With the experience and knowledge he has gained by the committee investigations throughout the Nation, Senator MURRAY has a thorough understanding of the problems which confronted the smaller industries of Fresno. We are especially honored that he made the trip here, and that he will address us today. I wish to present the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana, and Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. Senator MURRAY.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MONTANA

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Friedell, Mr. Nutwell, Colonel Kirksey, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen:

My hearty congratulations to Fresno!

I deeply appreciate the honor of being invited to participate in this celebration. It is regrettable that every member of the Senate Small Business Committee cannot be with us here today.

The record you have made here will leave with me an abiding sense of satisfaction—personal satisfaction that the ultimate goals of our Committee have been attained in almost every section of the United States; and satisfaction that I came to know first hand, the particularly outstanding production record achieved by the small plants of Fresno.

This is Fresno's moment for national honor. The highest award of the military arm of our Government is being made to

the employees of Central California War Industries, with its affiliated, independently owned and operated member firms. The award is to be given directly to your small manufacturing plants that have helped to keep the Pacific Fleet fighting.

It is also true that the award has been highly influenced by the militant spirit, the unselfish leadership, and the highly productive genius of the citizens of the entire San Joaquin Valley. The Army-Navy E is a tribute to your manufacturing industry.

But the excellence of your record in manufacturing, in turn, has been duplicated in this great valley by your splendid record in the production of food; raw and processed materials; in the supply of manpower for our armed forces; in your community mobilization for war; and your oversubscribed quotas for War bonds and stamps.

At the outset of our national war emergency, every thinking man and woman in this famous valley knew that you would be called upon by our fighting men for a record-breaking supply of the nutritious foods indigenous to your fertile lands.

Fresno is famed for its craftsmen of the soil. No outside planner, economist, or Government procurement agent thought of calling on Fresno for reserves of industrial energy. It was logical to believe that you would exercise in the highest measure your physical strength in producing a wide variety of essential war foods. But Fresno did not rest its efforts there. It is to your everlasting credit that your relatively small manufacturers spent months in active efforts to make their contribution to the war-production program. To the hundreds of procurement officers who were the "doubting Thomases" in the mobilization of the machine-tool capacity of the small plants of this Nation, the plea of Fresno for war work for a time fell upon deaf ears. Prodded by absolute necessity and by the public investigations of the Senate Small Business Committee, the procurement agents have since developed a sound program for the utilization of small plants employing between 100 and 500 employees. This program has been effective. But it has always been hard to convince our war agencies that required war materials in quantity, in strict quality, and against hard delivery schedules, that there was any place for really small manufacturers with less than 50 employees. The Senate Small Business Committee for a long time had made representations that these small plants had a place in the program. It had given assurances, and had authoritative witnesses testify in force, that small plants could be used, and should be used, if America intended to accomplish total war mobilization. But no official voice, no Senate report, no engineering chart, speaks with the authority and persuasion of actual performance. Fresno has been the outstanding community in America to prove our point by setting up its tools, marshaling its skilled workers, and delivering in quantity, in quality, and on time.

When Central California War Industries, Inc., in search of work, approached the officers of the Mare Island Navy Yard, it found a receptive group. Mare Island had already experienced the value of such an organization of plants at Denver. Your community organized this war-production pool of small plants just at the time when the navy yard was expanding production and reaching out for more facilities. And Mare Island did more than respond to your solicitation with orders. Its skilled officers and engineers developed a style of contract that swept aside objectionable red-tape procedures and permitted a small but certain profit.

But more than that, the navy-yard engineers came to Fresno with technical advice and production experience which enabled Fresno to undertake tasks which at first seemed well-nigh impossible. When the war is ended, the small plants of Fresno will have had a rich experience and will be able to go forward to greater goals of achievement in civilian production.

While Fresno does not have a national advertising budget, it has an interesting story to tell the world—a story which can be repeated in other cities throughout our country. Your small repair shops, normally serving agriculture, lumber mills, and transportation, have performed—with Mare Island Navy Yard—these true miracles of production and repair. Many of the winches, blowers, pumps, and valves you have manufactured have been utilized in refitting the fighting vessels of the Pacific Fleet damaged at Pearl Harbor.

Since I heard the remarkable fact that your pay roll of 656 men and women is scattered in 28 plants, and that only 4 plants have over 25 employees, I have been remarking about it to my friends. One of them asked, "How did these plants work to the close Navy tolerances?"

I answered, "I'm not a machinist, but I know that unless they could satisfy the Navy's rigid specifications, they would not have been awarded the Army-Navy 'E'."

That award could not be won except on the basis of the genuine skill and efficiency of the management and employees of the plants.

I am aware that your plants have received orders from the Army and the Maritime Commission, as well as from the Navy, but your most valuable work, and that which has been performed by your smallest plants, has been for the Mare Island Navy Yard and the Alameda Naval Air Station.

I want to compliment the commanding officers of both of these naval shore establishments and the officers in charge of the farming-out program. They have put into practice the policy our committee wrote into the so-called Murray-Patman Small Business Act. To increase the necessary speed and production for war, these governmental agencies have utilized in great measure the idle facilities of hundreds of small plants, from Denver, Colo., and Sheridan, Wyo., to Sacramento, Stockton, Fresno, and Bakersfield.

A few months ago our committee held hearings during which the full story of the Mare Island farming-out program was presented. All my colleagues on the committee were highly pleased with the results. Without such a program, the thousands of machine-tool-hours and man-hours which were waiting to be utilized in Fresno would have been lost to the Nation and to our boys on the battle fronts.

This is a war of production. We are winning the war because we are vastly outproducing our enemies. Fresno, therefore, is playing a vital part in achieving victory. It is setting an example to the whole Nation in the utilization of the productive capacity of our small plants. The Mare Island program in Fresno has been a 100-percent net gain in production, and highly merits the honor it is receiving today.

Again let me say that I have greatly enjoyed being present on this occasion, and I also enjoyed meeting the men behind the machines at Fresno who are giving such remarkable support to the men behind the guns on our battle fronts throughout the world.

Congratulations to you all.

Lieutenant Commander LOVETT. The Senator has told us of the important part which the Mare Island Navy Yard has played in the success of the Central California War Industries, Inc. It is now my honor and privilege to present to you Rear Admiral W. L. Friedell, United States Navy, commandant of the Mare Island Navy Yard, who will present the Army-Navy E award. Admiral Friedell.

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL FRIEDELL

Mr. Chairman, Senator MURRAY, Mr. Nutwell, Colonel Kirksey, men and women of Central California War Industries, Inc., it was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation to make this presentation of the Army-Navy E award here today. As explained on the program, this award is the highest honor that can be bestowed upon a manufacturing organization in time of war because it is official recognition of the patriotism, skill, and work of the men and women who earned it. You may be interested to know that less than 2½ percent of the manufacturing organizations engaged in work for the Army and Navy have been awarded this honor. Today's award is unique in that, while it is made to a single firm, the Central California War Industries, Inc., this firm is composed of such a large number of lesser organizations of this city that it practically amounts to an award to the city of Fresno.

Furthermore, I have a personal feeling in this award, due to the fact that of the approximate $1,200,000 in work undertaken by this corporation over $1,000,000 of it was assigned by the Mare Island Navy Yard, of which I am the commandant. May I give you a little history? When we at Mare Island realized that an emergency existed, we began to look around for ways and means to increase our productive capacity. The first step was to increase the number of our employees. This was successful at first, but soon the local community reached a saturation point. The next step was to sublet contracts to firms in the proximity of Mare Island capable of taking on fair-sized jobs. We soon reached the limit of this capacity, but found that there were still a number of smaller firms in our vicinity which we had been unable to contact. A determined effort was made to reach these firms and take advantage of their facilities. In order to do this, we at Mare Island, after much study, developed what is known as the type C contract. This contract insures the small factory against loss and gives to it a fair fee for the work done. I might add that we have been so successful with this contract that the Navy Department has adopted it for general use throughout the country. Here in Fresno a war industry pool called the Central California War Industries, Inc., was organized. Mare Island considers this organization, and the men and women who work in it, a part of Mare Island Navy Yard, and any glory they achieve is reflected at Mare Island. The success of this organization is attested to by the award made here today.

By setting up these new production units away from our congested labor markets and housing areas you have added hundreds of men to the productive manpower of Mare Island Navy Yard and have at the same time relieved in the difficult task of housing them and their families. This has resulted in a contribution, not only to Mare Island but to the economic security of the country. It has additional significance at a time when so many families are deserting the interior and disrupting the economic balance in communities away from the sea coasts to migrate to coastal war industrial areas.

To those workers who have stayed here at home and assisted in the building and repairing of ships I would like to say that Mare Island would not have accomplished its shipbuilding and battle-damage repair efforts without your hard, willing, and efficient work. In the last analysis, the ability of any shipbuilding group to meet or exceed scheduled delivery dates and to produce satisfactory parts and sections for a shipbuilding program is dependent upon the skill and industry of the men and women who do the work. Therefore, each and every one of you here today should feel that you have had a part

in the creation of this new industry in Fresno, and I congratulate the managements of the various firms on your cooperation with each other in order to expedite this war effort. To all of you I say that you have worked hard, but your labors here must continue with renewed vigor until that final day when democracy triumphs over oppression. We are forging ahead to that triumph, but the end is still over the horizon. You have worked hard, yes, but you and your fellow Americans must continue to exert every waking hour to this vital productive work. I have come today to pay more than verbal tribute. On behalf of the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox, I have come to present the Army-Navy E award to the Central California War Industries, Inc.

By your resourcefulness, cooperation, and the ability to produce the goods you have met the exacting standards set by the Navy for industrial production and today receive the Army-Navy E award. Let this banner fly high so that it may serve as an incentive to even greater production by you and all those good Americans who labor with you.

You see mounted on this blue and red pennant the letter "E." This letter stands for excellence in industrial production and has been achieved by hard work, loyalty, and devotion to duty by every one of you.

Mr. Nutwell, this pennant is recognition by your Nation of the outstanding efforts of you and your companies and of a job well done.

ADDRESS OF MR. NUTWELL

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murray, Admiral Friedell, Colonel Kirksey, and employees of the member firms of the Central California War Industries, Inc., it is a signal honor that has come to the Central California War Industries, Inc., this day, and it is with a feeling of humility, but genuine satisfaction, that I accept, on behalf of the men and women who have labored under the direction of the Central California War Industries, Inc., this coveted Army and Navy production award. Senator Murray, Admiral Friedell, and Colonel Kirksey, these men and women workers are the cause of this celebration; they are the reason you are here; they are the reason that this distinctive symbol of wartime merit, effort, and accomplishment soon will be raised over the corporation office.

This is an infant group as compared with some of the giant industries that have so nobly come to the aid of their country and because this so definitely upholds the American way of life, I know that you, fellow workers, are just as happy about this award as I am. You are undoubtedly happier, because yours has been the actual work—yours have been the hands that produced the parts that have sent great ships on their dangerous ways—that helped provide submarines with their instruments of war, and helped produce the guns that arm our ships and shores—yours the last fervent wish that accompanied these materials of war as they went on their way to defeat our enemies—yours the invisible but tangible connection between our boys on the fighting front and those of us back home.

And so this distinction comes to you justly and honorably. You should be happy and proud because of it.

The award of the Army and Navy E for outstanding industrial achievement in wartime is certainly a brilliant and just citation. We are familiar with the traditional decorations—those given for valor and sacrifice in battle, and we are in complete agreement. These awards should be given. However, until we started to beat Herr Hitler and his satellite partners at their own game, there was little notice accorded to the men and women behind the men behind the guns. Certainly the part of industry in wartime effort is of equal importance with that of the soldiers, sailors, and marines on the fighting fronts, and in this award a grateful nation is acknowledging that fact.

For a little over a year, these 28 plants have been banded together as the Central California War Industries, Inc., and have thus been enable to bring the peacetime skills of you men and women to bear in a very definite way on wartime problems. This has resulted in war materials flowing quickly and smoothly toward the fighting fronts and, because the manufacture of these war materials has varied so greatly from your peacetime activities, it has required additional effort. The presentation of this award puts your Nation's stamp of approval upon your efforts of which you may well be proud.

Once more I congratulate each of you on earning this honor and we thank the Army and Navy for conferring it.

However, your job is not finished. In fact, your responsibility may be greater as the weeks roll on. The award should serve, therefore, as an even greater incentive to higher performance in the fulfillment of our responsibility in building and processing additional war goods for the Nation's needs.

We are all imbued with the same spirit to do everything we possibly can to win a quick victory. Having enough war materials, characteristic of American industrial quality, is one way to hasten that day.

In the face of a growing need for skilled industrial workers a further challenge is presented to industry. Quality must be maintained and as many short cuts as possible to attain this quality must be devised.

Today as America looks at Fresno, America knows that there will be no let-down and that final victory will crown the joint efforts of the men and women in our industrial plants.

As is true on the field of battle, joint and cooperative action between the armed services is also true in the recognition of work well done in the field of production. Representing the Army at today's ceremony is an officer well known to many of you here in Fresno. We are fortunate to have with us to present the token Army-Navy E lapel pins, Col. Guy Kirksey, Air Corps commanding officer, Hammer Field.

Army and Navy Maintenance Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the purposes and objectives of a bill (H. R. 3556) creating an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, introduced by me on October 27, 1943:

PURPOSES OF H. R. 3556

The primary purpose of the bill is to frame into law the democratic principle that every male citizen of draft age should henceforth be liable in time of war to defend his country according to his mental and physical capacities; and that deferment for moral, mental, physical reasons, or other reasons from the combat services should not relieve him from this legal liability.

With this democratic principle of extending the legal liability to defend their country to deferred men of fighting age, no patriot can possibly quarrel. The President himself has said that in the pursuit of military victory no distinction can be made between the home front and the battle front. Therefore, it follows there should be no distinction between the legal liability of men of fighting age, whether deferred or not, to defend the home front as well as the battle front. This is not a work or fight bill; it is a work and fight bill.

For it is the sense of this bill that the assembly belt, the farm and field, and all war efforts essential to the supply of our troops are integral and inseparable components of the battle front itself, and that this battle front-home front should be manned if, when, and wherever endangered, by men deferred from the fighting services, who are capable of doing so, and who are not doing so.

This is the only principle which today seems just to the ten millions of young men under arms who are required by law to stand ready to lay down their lives for their country. They and their many millions of fathers and mothers and relatives and friends, cannot understand, and should not be asked to understand, why other men of draft age who are deferred in the national interest owing to economic or biological reasons, should not also be required by law to stand ready to lay their hands to support their fighting efforts.

This bill does the following things:

1. Gives the President the authority to provide the necessary manpower for victory and distribution thereof, at such times and to such extent as he determines necessary.

2. Helps to maintain the fighting strength of the Army by furnishing the armed services the most effective men who are not now or would not otherwise be available, since it offers a way by which men deferred from combat service for occupational reasons may be fairly and efficiently replaced by men who are not combat material.

3. Inevitably curtails further drafting of fathers by offering a method by which replacements of men of combat caliber in industry, agriculture, etc., whe nneeded by the armed services, can be made from a manpower pool not yet touched, and today untouchable.

4. Provides a mobile corps of bottleneck breakers in industry, agriculture, and other essential war efforts, such as shipping, transportation, etc.

5. Prevents turn-overs in industries and the drain of labor from farms for higher wages into industry, since if this bill becomes law, no deferred man on the home front can leave any essential war effort without first securing the consent of his local draft board.

6. Prevents the hoarding of labor by requiring a careful and systematic scrutiny of manpower requirements.

7. Offers service opportunity to all 4-F's and other deferred and discharged and released men who wish to serve their country in some capacity comparable to that of fighting men with comparable personal rights, benefits, and protections, without which many deferred men have heretofore been unable to shift from unessential jobs into essential war jobs.

8. Brings men into the corps it creates for service on the home front by the same democratic, impartial selective-service method by which the armed forces are today raised, i. e., it calls first those who are not already employed in essential industry and it calls these only according to their capacities and ability to sacrifice.

9. Restores the moral and mental dignity of every man with deferred status, whether deferred from combat for occupational or physical or hardship reasons, for it allows him to say to his neighbors in all honesty, that he is entitled to work wherever he is

working, since his local draft board, which had deferred him, is now empowered when it shall need his services elsewhere on the home front to call upon his services, and by the impartial selective method, detail him where needed. Under the provisions of this bill no man can be a slacker, nor need feel like a slacker, because when the time comes or the need arises, he knows that his Government will have the power to use him where best he can be used to further the war effort.

10. Forces the Federal bureaus and Federal agencies, charged with the administration of the war effort, to do the essential arithmetic of manpower by requiring them to lay on the line their current or foreseeable manpower shortages.

11. Prevents the creation of any gigantic Federal civilian-manpower-draft bureaucracy, with the power to regiment the lives of all civilians, male and female, and thrust them at inequal pay into the employ of private industry, because it uses for its induction methods the existent framework of the draft system and of selective service on the Nation-wide, State-wide quota principle. There can be, in its functioning, no suspicion of politics or unfair political favoritism.

12. Tends to prevent the further centralization of industry, since if this bill is made law and the President wishes to use the powers this bill provides, war industry can be brought to regions where manpower already exists but cannot be uprooted for economic and social reasons.

13. Tends to put money into the United States Treasury, and to the extent it does so, also tends to control inflation and lower living costs.

14. Gives the President an instrument with which to prevent and stop strikes, when according to his own findings, such strikes materially interfere with the war effort, but it does not interfere with labor's essential right to bargain collectively at all times, nor with any existing wage scales in industry, nor with the unionization of any worker who is not an active member of the corps created by this bill, nor with union efforts to provide union manpower by voluntary methods.

This bill does not do the following things:

1. Does not become law by congressional mandate, since it leaves entirely in the President's hands the right to say when and if the manpower shortage is serious enough to necessitate its use.

2. Does not mobilize overnight the whole available manpower of the United States of America. It affects only men of draft age not already in essential war industry, or who are decided to be in the wrong industry, for the national interest, and who refuse to change to the right one, and it affects these men only when, as, and if the employer and union organization, upon their own certification to the President and the Secretary of War, concede that they have temporarily failed in a specific locality to supply needed manpower under the voluntary system to meet production schedules.

3. Does not form an indissoluble large home-front auxiliary army, since it specifically states that at no time and in no place must the strength of the corps it creates be any larger than the manpower needs of the moment, and these very needs are a matter for the determinations of the Federal bureaus, the unions, and the employers charged with production and supply for our field armies. It is a corps built entirely on an accordion principle. It expands only as employer and union voluntary recruitment methods fail, and conversely, it contracts automatically as these methods are restored and begin again to provide necessary manpower. Furthermore, this accordion corps is made of selective types, those who can best be spared from their present occupations, and who can afford best to leave them.

4. Does not financially benefit the private or public employer, since for any member of the bottleneck-breaking corps which he uses, he is compelled to pay prevailing wages into the United States Treasury.

5. Does not affect the status, wages, conditions, earnings, of any deferred man who is now currently working and continues to work in an essential war effort or goes into such work before its passage. Unions should have no objections to this bill's general application because they will be the first to agree that if they cannot get the men and if the work must be done, somehow the Nation must obtain the men needed to assure victory. The status of a corps member so far as employer and union are concerned is neutral. He is not an employee of the employer, but is an employee of Uncle Sam which furnishes him in an emergency declared first to exist by labor and management as independent contractors. A corps member has no employer or union status and does not participate one way or the other in labor or management matters.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. The provisions of this bill apply equally to the deferred nonessential worker in a small ill-paid home-front job, and to the deferred big-salaried executive. Either may be inducted into the home-front Army and Navy Maintenance Corps for exactly the same reasons and at exactly the same salary. Rich and poor alike, in a deferred status and in nonessential jobs or professions, are liable to be called to work for their country, just as rich and poor alike, when physically fit, are liable to be called to fight for their country.

2. This bill is an answer to the question which 10,000,000 soldiers and sailors are every day asking of the Nation: "Why should we die, while in the face of a manpower shortage many men who stay home are not even required to perform the work necessary to support us unless they care to, or find it convenient?"

3. This bill has one "bug" which is a matter for the many wise minds in Congress to deal with, namely: It may sometimes put men who are working for Uncle Sam at Army wages (though with all Army benefits, compensations, guaranties of their preinduction jobs back, etc.) to work side by side with men who are already earning in war efforts higher wages or greater salaries. Thus, this bill inevitably tends to pose to the nation the ultimate question of equality of service and sacrifice between all men of fighting age in a democracy.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 3556

The first section of the bill recites the constitutional basis for the legislation, namely the provisions of the Constitution which give Congress power to raise and support armies. The first section also recites the necessity for its enactment.

Creation of Army and Navy Maintenance Corps

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the President, through the Secretary of War, to establish and organize an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps to be auxiliary to but not a part of the Army. In the discretion of the Secretary of War, the members of the corps are to be given ranks and grades comparable to those of commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, and to the extent deemed advisable by the Secretary are to receive comparable pay, allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation. The Secretary is authorized to provide the members with training, and to utilize facilities, equipment, appropriations, and personnel of the Army and War Department for the purposes of the bill.

Liability for training and service in Army and Navy Maintenance Corps

Section 3 of the bill provides who is to be liable for training and service in the Army and Navy Maintenance Corps. Such liability extends to those who are liable for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and who are in a deferred status under that act. A person deferred under that act on occupational grounds is also to be deferred from training and service in the Maintenance Corps unless the local Selective Service board, subject to appeal in the same manner as under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, finds it to be more in the national interest for such person to be in another occupation. If it so finds the deferment from training and service in the Maintenance Corps is to continue only if such person transfers to such other occupation.

Change of occupation without approval of local board

Section 4 of the bill provides that a registrant deferred on occupational grounds under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, who is found by his local board, subject to appeal as described above, to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an occupation essential to the war effort and to be irreplaceable, and who leaves his occupation without the approval of his local board, subject to appeal as described, shall be reclassified as immediately available for military or naval service and within a reasonable time delivered for induction into the land or naval forces. If rejected for such forces, he is to be inducted into the Maintenance Corps if found acceptable to and required for such corps.

Use of members of Maintenance Corps

Section 5 of the bill provides that whenever an employer (which includes Government) who is engaged in a war activity determines that his manpower requirements, either because of Selective Service withdrawals or because of other causes will not at some time in the future be met by him, by a labor organization, or by a Government agency, through the usual voluntary recruitment and employment channels, he may submit this information to the Federal agency concerned, set forth in the bill. Such agency is to check the information furnished and then submit it to the President, or an official designated by the President, together with recommendations with respect to the number of men required who cannot be employed through such channels, and also with respect to the purposes for which and the time or times at which such men will be required. The President, or the official designated by the President, is to make the determination as to what the requirements are. Such a determination may be made by the President or the designated official, even in the absence of a request by an employer.

Upon such a determination, the President or his designated official is to call upon the Secretary of War to induct into the Maintenance Corps the necessary number of qualified men. The Secretary of War is to call upon the Director of Selective Service to deliver for examination and industion into the Maintenance Corps men in numbers determined by the Secretary of War to be necessary to meet calls of the President. The detail of members of the Maintenance Corps to fill the employer's manpower requirements is made by the Secretary of War.

The selection of men for induction into the Maintenance Corps is to be made in an impartial manner, and, so far as possible, the Director of Selective Service must order registrants to report for induction in the following order:

1. Volunteers; registrants who leave essential occupations without the approval required under section 4 of the bill; registrants who fail to transfer from one essential occupation to another as provided in section 3 of the bill; and registrants who are found by their local boards, subject to appeal as described above, to be absent from their work for such time and under such circumstances as the President may prescribe, provided, however, that the registrants who leave their jobs without local board permission, or refuse to shift jobs, or who are absent for a time and under the conditions specified by the President, shall be inducted either into the armed forces or into the Maintenance Corps, depending upon in which force they can perform the maximum service in the national interest.

2. Single men under 38 who have been discharged or released from the armed forces or who are classified in 4–F.

3. Single men over 38 who have been discharged or released from the armed forces or who are classified in class 4–F and are deferred from service in the armed forces because of age.

4. Married men under 38, without children, who have been discharged or released from the armed forces or who are classified in class 4–F.

5. Married men over 38, without children, who have been discharged or released from the armed forces or who are classified in class 4–F and deferred from service in the armed forces because of age.

6. Men under 38, with children born prior to September 15, 1942, who have been discharged or released from the armed forces or who are classified in class 4–F.

7. Other registrants in the order prescribed by the Director of Selective Service. A man may be deferred from service in the Maintenance Corps if his induction therein would result in extreme hardship or would not be in the public interest.

Employers' labor costs

Section 6 of the bill provides that employers using Maintenance Corps personnel must pay with respect to such personnel the prevailing wages, but such payment is to be made into the United States Treasury. Social Security taxes are also required to be paid by the employer with respect to these wages.

Penalties and administrative provisions

Section 7 contains provisions authorizing delegations of authority by the President, the Secretary of War, and the Director of Selective Service. Violations of duties or orders imposed or issued under the bill are subject to the same penalties as are provided in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The Secretary of War is authorized to extend the Articles of War in whole or in part to govern personnel of the Maintenance Corps.

Separability

Section 8 contains the usual separability provision.

Suspension of conflicting laws

Section 9 suspends laws in conflict with the provisions of the bill.

Termination

Section 10 provides that the bill shall cease to apply on and after May 15, 1945, except that the term of service of the Maintenance Corps personnel shall be the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

Appropriations

Section 11 authorizes the necessary appropriations.

Effective date

Section 12 provides that the bill shall take effect on its enactment.

Short title

Section 13 provides that the bill may be cited as the "Army and Navy Maintenance Corps Act of 1943."

The Second Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Second Imperative," broadcast by me over Wisconsin radio stations on the 5th of November last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week I discussed the first of five imperatives, to wit: "The imperative need of all America appreciating the enormous task confronting America before the war is won."

Tonight we shall talk about the second—"The imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort."

The Moscow conference has resulted in an agreement between the United Nations in respect to the following:

1. Unconditional surrender of the Axis.
2. United action for peace and security.
3. Continued cooperation when peace comes for regulation of armaments and enforcement of peace.
4. Agreement on statement in relation to Austria and Italy.

This omens well for the peace of the world.

But if this accord is not continued, if we allow bickering and misunderstanding to creep into our dealings with our allies, then the war, if it is not lost, will be immeasurably lengthened and the grim toll of blood and sacrifice will mount to appalling heights.

The Axis policy has from the beginning been to divide and conquer. To this policy can be attributed their great successes in the earlier part of the war. Hitler's nibbling away at the smaller countries of Europe and with each nibble stoutly professing that it was his last territorial demand, gained him control over the entire continent before England and France awakened to the fact that his was a dream of world conquest, and these were but the preliminary steps to turning that dream into grim reality.

To gain his diabolical ends he has sown the seeds of distrust and suspicion in every nation of the world. His rise to power in Germany was achieved by these methods. Racial and religious distrust and antipathy were the instruments by which he thwarted the honest efforts of those men of good will in Germany who were striving to build a government upon sound democratic principles. In his rise to power every dictator must have a scapegoat. Hitler had three of them. Communism, capitalism, and Judaism. In the first stages of his rise to power he attacked communism and Judaism almost exclusively. By his attacks upon the Jews he launched a reign of lettor that is unparalleled in the world's history. By the confiscation of their worldly goods he was able to pay for the recruiting of the gang of hoodlums and cutthroats who formed and still form the nucleus of the ruthless Nazi machine. But the money he was able to wring from the Jews was not enough to finance the grand scale operations his warped mind had envisioned.

So again he began to sow the seeds of hatred and distrust. This time the fantastic bogey of communism was brought into the picture and it succeeded beyond his fondest expectations. His gruesome picture of communism brought more money pouring into his war chest. The business interests of Germany rallied to his standard. And not only the business interests of Germany, but of other countries were deluded by this madman, and the Nazi movement assumed in some quarters the proportions of a crusade to save Europe and the rest of the world from communism. Too late were the scales removed from the eyes of his deluded victims and too late did they find they had a tiger by the tail and couldn't let go. He turned upon the men who fed and nourished him to power and today most of these men are penniless exiles in a foreign land or have fallen victims to a firing squad. Yes his dragon seeds of hatred and distrust had fallen upon fertile soil and brought forth a crop of death and destruction upon those who had helped in the planting.

When Rudolf Hess, right-hand man of Hitler, bailed out of a plane over the moors of Scotland, he was carrying out another step in the Nazi plan to foment distrust and discord among the Allies. He was bringing the message from his master to the English Government that Germany was willing to call off its war against the British and throw their full strength against Russia. Thank God that Britain treated the proposal with contempt. Because she did, Rudolf Hess today languishes in an English prison camp, Russia has the Nazis in a full-scale retreat, and the Allied Nations have the foe on the defensive on every front.

Japan, too, has profited by the Hitler plan of "divide and conquer." She, too, has sown the seeds of distrust and hatred among would-be peace-loving nations and has hovered over them to gather the fruits of her devilish planting. By her evil machinations in China she set brother against brother and now has the puppet government of Manchukuo in the war on her side. Her policy of divide and conquer was so successful in Burma and Thailand that she was greeted as a liberator when she marched into these countries. And now she is attempting those same tactics in India and seems to be gaining a certain amount of success. She recently set up a puppet ruler in exile who has declared war on England and is exhorting the people of India to revolt against what he calls their English overlords.

Yes; Tojo, too, is finding that the policy of "divide and conquer," the policy of creating distrust and hatred among friendly neighbors, is worth many divisions of men and countless numbers of battleships, tanks, and airplanes.

But this policy of "divide and conquer," this policy of creating distrust and hatred, is a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. It has proved so for Japan and Hitler. We were able to employ this weapon with complete success in the north African campaign. Our advance agents, bringing their message of democracy and good will, built up a vast reservoir of friendship among the natives of that continent, and when our troops landed they were able to take over with a relatively small loss in lives and equipment.

The clouds are lifting over a war-torn world. We are emerging from the shadows, and the light of a full and complete victory is beginning to show over the horizon because of military accord with our allies. The Allied military might is exerting an increasing pressure on every theater of operations. Victory may not be just around the corner, but it is inevitable if we maintain a unity of effort and press toward the goal of unconditional surrender—"all for one and one for all."

We must bear in mind that in spite of the Moscow agreement, Hitler and Tojo will still strive to use their last weapon with which to attempt to stave off a complete and crushing defeat. That weapon is the creation of a discord among the Allied Nations that would weaken their solidarity and lead to a stalemate or negotiated peace. Axis agents are busy in all the Allied countries spewing out their venom in a continued attempt to

create disunity among the Allies. We must not allow them to accomplish their evil purpose. We must work out a complete accord, an accord with one purpose in mind, to completely crush every vestige of the Axis military machine. By that only can we win through to victory and restore a just and lasting peace to a war-weary world.

This complete accord can be achieved only by a frank, complete understanding among all the Allied Nations. There must be no secret pacts and secret understandings such a were entered into by a number of the Allies while World War No. 1 was still raging. Ther must be no "behind-the-door" diplomacy which will arise to disrupt our unity.

In the pre-war days had France and England not misjudged the real foe, Hitler, and had they worked out a complete accord with Russia, the nation which is now carrying the brunt of the burden on the European continent, the Nazi war machine might have been stopped in its inception stages—before it loosed its might upon an unprepared world—and this terrible cataclysm of blood and suffering would have been averted. Yes, the lack of complete accord between England and France and Russia made the Second World War possible. Hitler knew of the differences which existed between these nations, and he fanned the flame of discord.

Of course, the accord about which we are talking here does not prevent honest discussion. In fact, honest differences should be brought out. The recent outburst in relation to lend-lease caused by our returning five Senators was a healthy thing. These Senators praised the British official for his efficiency, for his loyalty to Britain, and suggested that America might well make sure that she has efficient public servants working for her throughout the world.

We rejoice that the three-power conference in Moscow has reached a general agreement, and we trust that this agreement will be the beginning of a continuous march toward international accord between the United Nations and the other nations of the earth.

We have seen the terrible consequences of a lack of complete accord among peace-loving nations during the past years. We have seen how this lack loosed upon the world the terrific savagery of Hitler's and Hirohito's war machines. Had this complete accord been attained a short 10 years ago, Germany and Japan would not now be ravaging the world with brutal ruthlessness, and we would not be sending the pride of our youth to fight and die on distant battlefields.

Yes; I repeat we must have a full and complete accord if we are to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion. We must have this complete and full accord not only between the members of the Allied Nations, but we must have it on the home front among ourselves as well. Only by this action can we expect an early cessation of hostilities and a return to a peaceful world.

The American Competitive System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. E. F. Hutton, Westbury, Long Island, a letter which so admirably discusses very vital questions now confronting our Government and the people of America that I think it deserves inclusion in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent that this very able letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND,
November 4, 1943.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am writing to you because you are one of a growing number of Senators and Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, who have been most vocal in pointing out to the American people the dangers to our American competitive system which have been mounting during the past several years.

I write to you concerning that system. Our many businesses and industries are each trunks of the trees in our economic forest. The sap which nourishes those trees is our competitive system. The forest is in danger of being leveled by the ax of confiscatory taxation, and the sap which nourishes it is being dried up by attempts to supplant it with the barren fluid of state socialism.

If our constitutional form of government—guaranteeing as it does the rights of our people as individuals—should ever be replaced by a form of state socialism, everyone in the country would suffer—not only the men who manage our business and industry, who are but a minority, but the stockholders who support it, and the workers who are employed by it. These people are a majority. These people are America.

As a representative of the people, Senator BYRD—and I class myself as one of the people—I ask you and your associates in Congress to continue your efforts to protect the investment of stockholders who built American business and industry and the livelihood and right to progress and advance that the workers of this country enjoy in private enterprise.

When corporations are attacked unfairly, the American people are attacked, for the American people own our corporations. In one of our largest enterprises, for example, 86 percent of the stockholders are people whose holdings average 15 shares apiece. These people are capitalists in the truest sense of the word. They believe in the American system and have invested their life's savings in it. By the improved processes which their investments made possible, workers' productiveness has been increased so that instead of $1 a day which they earned two generations ago, today they earn $1 an hour.

Today that system is being threatened not from without so much as from within—by men sprinkled through our National Government, men in key positions, men who feel that they—as bureaucrats—could run our business better than we, than the stockholders who financed it, and the workers who keep it going. They have made such statements as the following, and I quote:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must mean inevitably that the Government ultimately will control and own those activities * * *. Over a period of years the Government gradually will come to own most of the production plants of the United States."

This statement was made before the war. Even at that time these men helped set up hurdles of confiscatory taxation which are now weakening private industry for the job ahead. In the face of this, they are threatening that if private industry fails to provide post war jobs they will take over and do it with public funds. Under these conditions, bureaucracy must naturally win.

The statements I have referred to have been taken to the American people with public funds. I lament the fact that American business management has failed in large part to counteract these statements in their advertising and public relations. They have every right to. They depend on their advertising to distribute and sell their goods. They should put greater dependence on it to champion the system of free enterprise without which their businesses could not function.

I would like to quote to you from an address by Samuel B. Pettengill, for 8 years Democratic Member of Congress from Indiana:

"The managers of our industry have shown marvelous ability to produce and distribute the goods which contribute to the comfort and well-being of life, but they have fallen down in selling the whole system under which these goods are produced. They have been so immersed with the details of their own business that the greater business—the survival of free enterprise and constitutional government—has been in peril of going by default."

As one deeply interested in our constitutional form of government, I would feel that I was lacking in citizenship if I did not address such a letter as this to you. The competitive system is the sap that has nourished the growth of America from the first. It has given its people more of the good things of life than any other system anywhere in the world. It must be protected vigilantly now.

Sincerely yours,

E. F. HUTTON.

Expenditures by Federal Government in 1943 for Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested to learn how the $26,100,000 farm-labor appropriation was spent to secure labor for American farms. Thirteen million fifty thousand dollars was allocated for expenditure within the respective States, according to the table herewith given, and the balance of $13,000,000 was spent by the Federal Government for interstate labor. I am also including a letter on the subject from the War Food Administration:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 6, 1943.

Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: In response to your informal request to this office, we are attaching a statement showing the distribution of the funds available under section 2 (a) of Public, 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, for payments to States in connection with the farm labor supply program for 1943.

As we understood your request, you desired information on the amount of the allotment to each State and the amount of money spent by each State. The attached statement reflects the allotments as of September 30, obligations as of that date, estimated obligations for the period October 1 through December 31,

and total estimated obligations for the entire period.

You also requested information concerning the amount of funds allotted for administrative expenses in Washington. As you know, the act authorizes the use of 2 percent of the total appropriation of $26,100,000 for administrative expense. There has been allotted, however, somewhat less than the total allowed, namely, $486,000, for all expense related to this work in the Washington office. This includes allotments made to the Office of the Solicitor, Office of Information, Extension Service, Office of the Administrator, and to the Office of Labor.

If we can be of any further assistance to you at any time, please let us know.

Sincerely,

PHILIP G. BRUTON,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Director of Labor.

War Food Administration—supply and distribution of farm labor (Public, 45, 78th Cong., approved Apr. 29, 1943)—available funds and obligations for payments to States

State	Allotted as of Sept. 30, 1943	Actual obligations as of Sept. 30, 1943	Estimated obligations (Oct. 1 through Dec. 31, 1943)[1]	Total estimated obligations through Dec. 31, 1943
Alabama	$135,000	$64,203	$50,797	$115,000
Arizona	80,000	18,557	57,000	75,557
Arkansas	155,000	63,640	59,984	123,624
California	800,000	318,500	390,000	708,500
Colorado	100,000	39,618	24,000	63,618
Connecticut	90,000	38,767	19,155	57,922
Delaware	20,000	15,173	4,100	19,273
Florida	115,000	17,521	52,364	69,885
Georgia	180,000	75,650	60,000	135,650
Idaho	115,000	53,275	46,775	100,000
Illinois	300,000	135,490	64,000	199,490
Indiana	255,000	71,425	35,000	106,425
Iowa	335,000	61,484	30,000	91,484
Kansas	145,000	55,724	6,811	62,535
Kentucky	140,000	40,889	58,600	99,489
Louisiana	115,000	33,660	201,600	235,260
Maine	60,000	27,343	47,347	74,690
Maryland	100,000	42,000	28,000	70,000
Massachusetts	60,000	18,500	11,500	30,000
Michigan	225,000	87,167	50,000	137,167
Minnesota	200,000	74,500	25,500	100,000
Mississippi	135,000	44,348	52,108	96,456
Missouri	230,000	73,961	54,000	127,961
Montana	90,000	35,250	33,031	68,281
Nebraska	140,000	49,375	20,000	69,375
Nevada	30,000	16,500	13,500	30,000
New Jersey	95,000	37,755	16,355	54,110
New Hampshire	33,000	15,329	15,000	30,329
New Mexico	70,000	17,603	38,000	55,603
New York	420,000	251,506	105,494	357,000
North Carolina	285,000	103,119	42,881	146,000
North Dakota	115,000	59,599	15,500	75,099
Ohio	295,000	97,154	53,846	151,000
Oklahoma	235,000	69,821	84,564	154,385
Oregon	190,000	110,298	20,000	130,298
Pennsylvania	265,000	100,396	40,000	140,396
Rhode Island	15,000	5,359	3,800	9,159
South Carolina	155,000	34,041	34,940	68,981
South Dakota	95,000	37,557	24,330	61,887
Tennessee	155,000	75,776	43,635	119,411
Texas	400,000	142,000	358,000	500,000
Utah	55,000	27,211	9,000	36,211
Vermont	40,000	22,199	12,500	34,699
Virginia	245,000	81,000	60,000	141,000
Washington	225,000	108,217	16,800	125,017
West Virginia	55,000	30,000	15,000	45,000
Wisconsin	190,000	78,400	60,000	138,400
Wyoming	75,000	33,454	27,000	60,454
Subtotal	8,058,000	3,110,314	2,591,767	5,702,081
Available for subsequent payments	4,992,000			
Total available for payments to States	13,050,000	3,110,314	2,591,767	5,702,081

[1] Figures in these columns were furnished by the States.

West Coast Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the west coast has been subject for almost 2 years to many precautionary regulations due to its proximity to the striking force of the Japanese. Recently many of those regulations have been lifted. The course of the war has given us reason to believe that the threat of attack from the Japanese is becoming lessened. Civilian defense has been organized on the west coast to a greater degree than in other sections of the country. Citizens in west coast cities have done many hours of yeoman work in protecting their areas. Although the fortunes of war have placed us in a better position, it is hoped that the relaxation of regulations will not tend to create too much apathy regarding the prospect of a Japanese attack, even though such an attack may be of a hit-and-run nature. Puget Sound is the closest point on the continent of the United States to the war machine of Japan.

Capt. Lowell Limpus, noted war analyst, pretty well hit the nail on the head in an article recently which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD. Obviously such an attack would be selective. No carrier or task force of the Japanese Navy could afford to take the risk or make the long trek from Japanese bases without having definite military and productive targets in mind. It is in these selective areas that the danger might still exist. Such an area would be the concentrated war industries of Elliott Bay and the huge Bremerton Naval Establishment.

The article follows:

JAPS WILL TRY COAST RAIDS, EXPERTS SAY

(By Capt. Lowell M. Limpus)

The fact that Japan's leaders know she is beaten guarantees that she will try to bomb American Pacific coast cities, before she goes under. And the bombing attempt will be carried out by suicide expeditions, devoted to death, just as was the last remnant of the Attu garrison.

That's the reaction of qualified Japanese experts here to reports brought back by repatriates aboard the *Gripsholm*, to the effect that the military leaders of the island empire already realize that their cause is doomed.

EXPECT MIRACLE

It is expressed by men in a position to know what they are talking about, although they occupy positions which makes it impossible to quote them directly.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt in their minds. They are quite certain that Nipponese suicide fliers will undertake such missions, just as soon as their commanders decide that the last flickering hope of avoiding complete disaster is gone. Until then, they say, the Jap commanders will husband their failing aerial strength in the effort to utilize it to achieve a miracle.

They expect that the Japs will have no trouble securing the men to ride on these last flaming rides to death. It is pointed out that the fanatic disciples of Shintoism will come winging in above the western waves, firmly convinced that they are going home to glory, and that they will probably exhibit the same death-defying devotion that characterized the early-Christian martyrs—albeit they will be dying in a totally different manner and for a quite different cause.

WILL DEFY DEATH

Men familiar with the Japanese mentality declare that this kind of devotion extends right through the high command, and that the leaders themselves will be anxious to take as many Americans as possible with them when they finally close the books for their sacred Emperor.

"They'll be quite different from the German generals," explained one such source yesterday. "The German will surrender, in order to save the lives of his men and in the hope of living to fight again, when he finds himself in a militarily impossible position. But not so the Jap. He doesn't care about living to fight again, and his paramount desire is to take as many enemies with him as he can.

"The easiest way to take the greatest number is to send bombers over the coast cities. Just before the final collapse, you may count on Jap plane carriers beginning that last suicidal dash—and if they manage to get through, you'll see bombs raining down on the coast from one end to the other."

It was explained that it is hard for Americans to understand the Jap attitude because of our different attitude toward death. The Jap kills men, women, and children with the same carelessness with which we crush a spider or swat a fly, according to this opinion and he is certain to try to kill a lot of them as his Empire approaches its end.

"They'd better not relax on the coast from now on," runs the consensus of advice. "The more nearly we approach the final victory, the greater the danger of the suicide bombings."

Personality Portrait of Representative Albert J. Engel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Michigan is justly proud of one of its worth-while citizens. I refer to Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL. Mr. ENGEL is one of the outstanding Members of Congress. His work here has saved literally millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the Nation. His reputation extends beyond the State; indeed, he is a national figure, and deservedly so.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include a personality portrait of Mr. ENGEL given by Robert St. John over the National Broadcasting Co. on October 21, 1943, which is as follows:

And now for our man of the day! It's been a long time since we've gone into the

Halls of Congress for one of our portraits, so today I am going to give you a Congressman, Representative ALBERT JOSEPH ENGEL of Michigan. To meet him, let's drop back to a January morning in 1941. Washington. It's still dark, for it's not yet 5 a. m. But in the modest home of Congressman ENGEL, the lights are burning. The thick-set energetic little Representative from Michigan is getting ready to start on a motor trip. He throws some clothes into a bag, picks up his old box camera, a couple of notebooks and a supply of freshly sharpened pencils; pulls on his overcoat, and he's off—off for Watertown, N. Y.—off on a one-man congressional investigation.

He's a hustling, bustling, blunt-spoken individual with the sort of independence you have to admire. He's a member of the Appropriations Committee and he's determined to see that we get our money's worth for the funds we're pouring into this war. And what I like about him—he's dead set against contractors, war plants, or anybody else getting rich out of war. He voted for the bill which appropriated half a billion dollars to build Army camps (back in 1940) but he warned that none of the money must be wasted or go to line the pockets of war profiteers. Now, several months later, he thinks the time has come to find out how this money is being spent. And he thinks the best way to find out is to go and see for himself. And so, he's off on one of the strangest congressional investigations on record.

The Engel investigation has none of the usual trappings—no press releases, no witnesses called to Washington—it's no fancy junket, at Government expense so a few Congressmen can have a pleasant trip. He just gets into his car, alone, and drives over icy roads to Watertown, N. Y. He wants to see work going on, in the North, in winter, because one reason given (for high construction costs) is "cold weather."

ENGEL arrives in Watertown early the next morning; he sleeps in his car for a few hours, then has some breakfast. At 7 a. m. he drives through the gates of the camp, in company with the workers. Unrecognized and unaccompanied, he drives all over the place. He notes the difficulty of excavating frozen earth, of keeping concrete warm enough to pour. He counts the knots in boards, to see what grade lumber is being used. He talks with workers; takes pictures and notes. After several hours he's ready with his questions and so he presents himself to the commanding officer and tells him the purpose of his visit. This brings offers of official hospitality. ENGEL declines with thanks; says that neither he nor the officers have time for hospitality. He tells the commanding officer: "There are three things you can do for me." (He talks so fast his words seem to stumble over each other.) "First, tell your public relations officer I am not here! Next, ask your architects and engineers to meet me for several hours and to give me the information I want. Third, at noon, have a bottle of milk and a sandwich sent in to me—ham on rye if you've got it. Ask the men who are to meet me to have their lunches sent in too." For the next 3 or 4 hours ENGEL works over blueprints and contracts and price lists. Then he tours the camp, while officials explain their problems, right on the spot. Then dinner. ENGEL picks a cheap restaurant in town—one the workers patronize. He spends the dinner hour talking to them. Then he goes to a pool hall, not to play pool, but to talk to more workers. Late in the evening he starts for the next town on his list. He drives 1,600 miles in 7 days, investigates five camps. He doesn't miss much. He looks into dump heaps to see what's being thrown away.

At Fort Devens he takes a flashlight and goes down into a sewer to see the condition of the bricks. At Indiantown, Pa., he notices that the camp is built on practically solid rock but that termite shields are being put on the buildings. He says to the officer in charge: "You wouldn't think there'd be any termites in ground like this. It's almost solid rock." The officer says: "You wouldn't think so." ENGEL points to an ancient-looking structure. "How old is that building?" The officer replies: "Some say it was built in 1660, some say 1700." Then ENGEL asks: "Any termites in it?" The officer admits the answer is "No." And then he admits that he has spoken to Washington, about the fact that termite shields really are not needed, but he's been told it would be more costly to change the orders than to build the termite shields. That was just the sort of thing ENGEL was looking for.

Back in Washington (after his whirlwind tour) there was no one who could argue with his mass of facts and figures. He'd uncovered conditions which would not (otherwise) have come to light until long after the war. And it was not too late for reforms. His findings saved the Government millions of dollars.

Last spring ENGEL got disturbed about the loose talk about war plants—about people getting rich out of the war. So he went off on another one-man investigation. He visited 47 war plants, talked with workers, looked over pay rolls, examined the war equipment being turned out. He found some janitors and elevator operators getting the pay of skilled workers. He found some skilled workers whose pay had doubled in 1 year; situations understandable, perhaps, in the confusion of war, but situations which, nevertheless, were adding to the cost of war.

And then he found out a few things about profits—one war plant, making 1,740 percent profit on its investment, war-plant officials making salaries of well over $100,000 per year apiece, plenty of stockholders drawing 30-, 40-, 50-percent dividends after the payment of taxes. And there was one company which paid $377 per share in dividends last year on stock which cost only $5 per share, in the first place.

ENGEL'S report shocked the country. Now, let's take a look at this man. AL ENGEL knows the value of money because he came by his success the hard way. He grew up in a little Ohio town, the son of parents who'd fled from Alsace to America rather than live under German rule. There were few luxuries in the Engel home, and when the family moved to the pioneer country of Michigan there were no luxuries. The boy Albert did a man's work on the farm after school. When he finished eighth grade he left school to work in a logging camp, cutting trees, clearing a swamp, operating a sawmill. He gained the reputation of being the best fighter among the small fry in the camp. He saved his meager earnings, bought a bicycle and a new suit of clothes, and set out for Saginaw, the nearest big town. There he signed up with a threshing crew for $1 a day, plus room and board, went from farm to farm, sleeping in barns and haymows. By fall he had $75, and he went job hunting in Chicago. He had no friends there. Chicago was a tough place to find a job. But one morning he was walking along a shabby street when the door of a store suddenly burst open. An obviously frightened man came bounding out and ran down the street. AL ENGEL walked into that store and took the job the young man had left so hurriedly—a job running errands, for $5 a week. He went to school evenings at the Y. M. C. A., then he worked his way through law school by driving an express truck 6 hours every night. Nineteen hundred and sixteen: AL ENGEL is back in Lake City, Mich., running for prosecuting attorney, because again he needs a job. He starts his house-to-house campaign in a broken-down automobile, which gives out completely long before election day. From then on he walks, and the sight of a serious young lawyer going around on foot to solicit their votes so pleases the thrifty pioneer townspeople that they elect him.

When World War No. 1 began, ENGEL resigned to join the Army. He had a special reason for wanting to go overseas. He wanted to help the Alsatian aunts and uncles and cousins (whom his mother and father had talked so much about) throw off the German yoke they hated so much. And high on the list of things he wanted to do (second only to beating the Germans) was to see the home town from which his parents had come.

He did get overseas; spent months there. When the Armistice came (and his No. 1 job was done) he got special permission to visit that Alsatian town. He found the house easily and introduced himself. But to his surprise and chagrin, his aunt was suspicious. She didn't know that he was in France. She'd never seen an American captain's uniform. She wouldn't believe that he was the son of a sister who she hadn't seen for 48 years. But she invited him in. And it was the most heart-warming experience of AL ENGEL'S entire life; for there on the parlor wall was a picture which had been sent from a little Ohio town 20 years before, a picture of his father and mother, the whole family, and a little boy with a smoothly shaven head. ENGEL recalled the day that that picture was snapped. It was right after he had taken the scissors to the long black curls which were the pride of the family, but the bane of his existence. The result had been so ghastly that his father had shaved his head. And now here was the picture, years later, on the wall of a French farmhouse—a little boy, with a head like a billiard ball. ENGEL went over to the picture and started naming the people in it. Then his aunt believed his story. So she went out to the barn and ripped up a plank in the floor and found a bottle of wine, hidden there since the war began—a bottle of 1896 vintage—the best wine the region had ever produced—and they celebrated a red-letter day in that French homestead. Later back in Michigan Albert decided to run for public office again. He went about it in a characteristic manner. He did not consult party bosses. His opponent went around claiming that "at the behest of my many good friends I have agreed to offer myself for the State senate." But AL ENGEL just said: "Nobody asked me to run for office. I'm running because I'd like to have a job." From the State senate he was sent to Congress, where he's been representing his Michigan district since 1934. And that is ALBERT J. ENGEL, the man who is against people getting rich out of a war. And that is my personality portrait of the day.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an address delivered by Col. G. W. Cocheu at ceremonies unveiling a bust of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the newly established hall of fame at the University of Tennessee:

First I desire to express my personal appreciation for having been invited to speak before this assemblage today.

Forty-four years ago last June, to be exact on the 6th day of June, I, with something over 200 other youngsters, reported at West Point. In the group was a tall black-haired, erect boy of slightly over 19 years of age. I can see him now, jauntily wearing a light colored hat which in those days was called a "fedora." That was Douglas MacArthur.

Entrance to the Military Academy, at that time, was only by written examination taken at the time of reporting. One hundred and seventy of us survived this ordeal, were finally admitted, and on June 13, 1899, we were sworn in as members of the United States Corps of Cadets. On that day began a military career of the man in whose honor we are meeting.

Cadet MacArthur came from a military family, in fact was born on a military post. His father, Arthur MacArthur, as a colonel, commanded a regiment in action before he was 21 years old. There were two boys, Arthur, Jr., and Douglas. The older, Arthur, went to the Naval Academy and we are honored today by the presence of the wife of this Navy brother, herself the daughter of a distinguished Navy officer, Admiral McCalla.

Everyone is more or less acquainted with General MacArthur's present military activities. In speaking before one of the leading educational institutions of our country it seems appropriate to refer to General MacArthur's scholastic attainments. In doing so, I must ask your pardon for dealing in superlatives. We live in an age of superlatives and General MacArthur is typical of the age. The system of instruction in vogue at West Point differs materially from that at other comparable institutions, due to the fact that a cadet is called upon to make an oral recitation on practically 5 out of every 6 days. He is marked on every recitation. His final standing depends on the summation of these daily marks. The total number of subjects covered in MacArthur's day was 16. In every one he averaged above 90 percent and in 13 out of the 16 he made over 95 percent. In three subjects, law, history, and English, he received a mark of 100 percent and for the entire course of 4 years his average was 98.2 percent, the highest mark made by any cadet in the first hundred years of the history of the Military Academy. Upon graduation there was as much difference in standing between MacArthur and the second man as there was between the second and fifth man. In addition, and from a military point of view, he was the first corporal in his yearling, or sophomore year, the ranking first sergeant in his second class, or junior year, and was first captain of the Corps of Cadets when a first classman or senior. As a cadet he many times exhibited those outstanding qualities of leadership which have marked his entire career.

On graduation his first duty was in the Philippine Islands and, strange as it may seem, he made military surveys in many of the localities where he is now so magnificently commanding Allied troops.

At the outbreak of World War No. 1, General MacArthur was a major on the General Staff in the Office of the Chief of Staff at Washington. He conceived and organized the Forty-second Division, very appropriately naming it the Rainbow Division. The division was made up of units of the National Guard from 27 different States. The States of Tennessee furnished its ambulance company No. 1, which became the One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Ambulance Company of the One Hundred and Seventeenth Sanitary Train. It acquitted itself with distinction.

General MacArthur, throughout his entire career has shown that spark of genius which we call leadership. Soldiers adore him. And when I say soldiers I mean officers and enlisted men. I have yet to hear of any soldier who ever served under him, and especially in battle, who does not idolize him. One of our classmates, now dead, used to like to tell the following story about him:

"During the battle of the Meuse-Argonne, in 1918, this officer was trying to locate General MacArthur. He saw two soldiers of the Forty-second Division sitting by the side of the road and asked them if they had seen General MacArthur go that way. They both answered in the negative. The officer then asked, 'Do you know General MacArthur when you see him?' The indignant reply was, 'Every soldier in the Forty-second Division knows General MacArthur'."

To use a baseball expression, a game in which he won his coveted letter as a cadet, he is a soldier's soldier.

He was twice decorated for extraordinary heroism against an armed enemy thereby winning the Distinguished Service Cross with an oak-leaf cluster. The citation for the second award concludes with the following:

"On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was a dominant factor."

In addition he received seven Silver Star citations for personal gallantry in action. He was wounded twice, for which he wears the Purple Heart with oak-leaf cluster. Incidentally this decoration is the oldest American award having been established in the Revolutionary War by Gen. George Washington and revived by General MacActhur, as Chief of Staff, on the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of General Washington. He also was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, with oak-leaf cluster for exceptionally meritorious service to his country in duties of great responsibility. As you know, in the present war he has been decorated with the Medal of Honor, the highest award in the gift of the Nation. It is only given to a person who distinguishes himself at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty.

It is not necessary to dilate upon his accomplishments in the present war. All you have to do is to read the papers. When ordered to leave Corregidor it is reported that he said he would come back. In nearly 45 years of intimate acquaintance I have always found that when he said he was going to do a thing, he has done it and nothing has caused him to swerve from such determination.

West Point is highly honored in having this replica of a bust already installed at the Military Academy, placed at the University of Tennessee as the first of a hoped-for gallery of busts of great Americans. It will serve to strengthen and cement the ties already existing between these two great institutions.

One of the outstanding, if not the outstanding, instructor in our day was a graduate of the University of Tennessee. He then went to West Point, graduating in 1896, and at the time of his death was a major general in the Regular Army. I refer to Robert Emmett Callan, of Knoxville. Then there is your beloved Bob Neyland, West Point 1916, who is now once more in uniform with the colors.

Just before leaving Washington I received a letter which I now desire to read.

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES
MILITARY ACADEMY,
West Point, N. Y., October 12, 1943.

DEAR COCHEU: I have your letter saying that you have been asked to speak on the occasion of the presentation of a replica of the bust of General MacArthur to the University of Tennessee by the people of Knoxville.

Your classmate, Douglas MacArthur, is one of West Point's most honored graduates. He has served with the highest distinction in positions of grave responsibility and great difficulty. His defense of Bataan and Corregidor are unparalleled examples of courage and devotion to duty.

In the presentation and acceptance of this bust of General MacArthur, the people of Knoxville and the University of Tennessee do honor to his alma mater. Please convey the greetings of the Military Academy to the people and the university. We join them in the prayer that this illustrious soldier may soon return victoriously to the Philippines and the country he loves so well.

Sincerely,

F. B. WILBY,
Major General, Superintendent.

It has indeed been a privilege to take part today in these ceremonies honoring one of West Point's many brilliant sons and one who typifies in the highest degree the motto of the Military Academy: Duty, honor, country.

Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of November 5, 1943:

FASCISM

By this time the miners are mostly back at work and John L. Lewis has won his point. President Roosevelt would not accept Lewis' terms and Lewis would not accept the terms of Mr. Roosevelt's War Labor Board. So the President turned the controversy over to Ickes and a neat job of face saving all around was done, but not before Mr. Lewis gambled with national safety.

Mr. Lewis, head of one labor union, matched his powers with those of the President of the United States who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with the country in a state of war. America is winning the war on the strength of her industrial output. Mr. Lewis demonstrated he could choke off this output until the Government agreed to his terms, and he made the antistrike law enacted recently by Congress look like 10 cents' worth of heaven help us.

It is often said that we have a labor government in this country. Really it is a labor supergovernment. Labor is subject to none of the restrictions which apply to capital. Although it is the most powerful potential agency in restraint of interstate commerce, all the antitrust laws specifically exempt it from regulatory and punitive provisions.

Although labor's income in dues, assessments and other charges is said to be $1,000,000,000 a year, there are no laws protecting the members of those unions from exploitation by their leaders. There is no public accounting for the moneys received. There are no taxes levied on these moneys. Yet, the Government has given labor the power to destroy practically any industry in the land and while doing this its members can draw strike pay in the shape of unemployment compensation from funds levied on the employers of the country.

For all this power labor is indebted to President Roosevelt. Labor in the mass elected Mr. Roosevelt in 1936 and 1940, and in 1936 Mr. Lewis' union contributed half a

million dollars to the Roosevelt political campaign. Only a few years ago no man was more welcome in the White House than John L. Lewis. In his letters to Mr. Lewis Mr. Roosevelt always addressed him "Dear John."

It was Lewis who organized the C. I. O., with the blessing of Mr. Roosevelt. It was Lewis who organized the C. I. O. steel and automobile industries, with the aid of President Roosevelt. Philip Murray, now president of the C. I. O., was understudy to Mr. Lewis. In mental force Mr. Lewis is superior to President Roosevelt, but the President is too imperious in his own right to allow himself to be dominated by Mr. Lewis. Because of this they are no longer friends. This clash of temperaments more than anything else has been responsible for the series of miners' strikes which have afflicted this country in this critical year of war.

How necessary is coal to the war? Well, bituminous coal supplies 49 percent of all the mechanical energy produced in the United States. It powers 95 percent of our railroad locomotives and generates 55 percent of our electricity. The four basic war chemicals—phenol, toluene, ammonia, and naphthalene—are made from bituminous coal. Such high explosives as TNT, picric acid, and tetryl are obtained in whole or in part from coal.

We hear much about the evils of fascism. Fascism is merely individual power in control of the Government. Mr. Lewis demanded the Wagner Act and got it. He demanded White House support for his C. I. O. and got it. The Federal courts have uniformly decided in labor's favor. Therefore the three branches of the Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—are under the thumb of two or three labor leaders, and the most powerful of these is John L. Lewis. If this be not fascism what is it?

Churchill and George Washington Related to Weschyngton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments by Mr. Eric Underwood, published in the Washington Evening Star:

CHURCHILL AND GEORGE WASHINGTON RELATED TO WESCHYNGTON

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I have just returned from a speaking tour in 30 States of the Union. During this tour it has been my privilege to address several university audiences, and I have been surprised by the large number of students who are unaware of the origin of the Stars and Stripes in the national flag. And this ignorance, be it added, sotto voce, often has not been confined to the students.

When in England, on a number of occasions I have had the pleasure of taking American visitors to Sulgrave, Northamptonshire, the home of that branch of the Washingtons from which the founder of the Republic was descended, and of showing them the Washington coat of arms in the church there. When a visitor confessed that he had not known that the shield of these armorial bearings was the origin of Old Glory, I had concluded his was an exceptional case.

It appears that this is not so. There even may be some of your readers who do not know that the shield of this old English family of squires consists of a row of stars above a series of stripes (in heraldic language molets and bends) and that there can be no question that this is the origin of the national flag. There is no record of it, but it seems likely that this adaptation of his family coat of arms was made with the approval, possibly even at the suggestion, of George Washington himself.

In addition to this, another interesting fact has been established of which even that omniscient, but now misnamed, American publication, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, seems unaware—that the American eagle has an English origin. It is true that the crest of the Sulgrave Washingtons was a raven; but they had come from earlier Washingtons settled in Lancashire in the fourteenth century, and these had for their crest an eagle with raised wings—the bird of freedom today.

It may be of interest to add that the mother of Lawrence Washington, of Warton, Lancashire, the first owner of Sulgrave, was Margaret Kitson, whose brother, Thomas, was a direct ancestor of Winston Churchill. George Washington and Mr. Churchill are therefore blood relations, having a common ancestor in Robert Kitson, the father of Margaret and Thomas.

Many contemporary coats-of-arms of the Washingtons, besides that at Sulgrave, exist in England. A window of the library of Durham College shows the arms of John Wessington, prior of Durham, 1416–1446. A parchment in the British Museum of the mid-fifteenth century incorporates the shield of "Tomas Weschynton of ye byschopperyke of Derham." An even earlier coat—that of William de Wassington, before 1400, can be seen in Windemere Church. In all these arms the stars and stripes are featured. The heiress of the last of the Durham Washingtons, Allanora, married Sir William Tempest and died in 1451. Their only child married William Mallory, whose descendant, Dorothy Mallory, was the first wife of Sir George Bowes, an ancestor by his second marriage of the Bowes-Lyon family and of the present Queen of England.

ERIC UNDERWOOD.

It Is Better To Light a Candle Than To Curse the Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, a farmer, businessman, and long-time public official, before the Morrisville Rotary Club on November 3, 1943:

It is a safe prediction that the fate of civilization no longer rests on the battlefield, but in the problems of the peace. The war will be won in good time, but the inevitable readjustments of the post-war period will plague us for many years.

We still have isolationists trying to stir up animosity and hate, but the overwhelming majority of the American people realize that the United States must assume definite leadership and partnership in world affairs when this terrible conflict is ended. For the most part we have laid the old bogy of English misunderstanding. As a matter of fact, we ought to accept accord with the British Commonwealth of Nations as an established fact and quit boasting about it. Collaboration with the British Commonwealth of Nations is important but it is not enough.

Understanding with Russia is essential to the peace of the world. This great Nation of ours has no counterpart in natural resources, mechanical genius, and initiative except in the United Soviet Republic. That they have a different form of government must not be a bar to our understanding and friendship. They have made more progress in a generation than any other people anywhere in the history of civilization. It has been a realistic but ruthless growth, and it has been based on the age-old truth that only the productive can be strong.

The present administration heretofore had failed to live up to its obligations or accord proper recognition to the Russian Government. The Russian Army is forging its own passport to a major seat at the peace table and dominance of the European situation. At most the British and American armies face 20 German divisions. Russia faces 300 divisions.

Twenty million Russians have died, tortured, mutilated, and suffering untold degradations. They bear testimony to the contribution the Soviets have made toward winning the war. We would be foolish indeed if we failed to recognize the implications and the realities of this situation. The American people would be digging a pit of their own construction if by any chance they elected a small man with nationalistic viewpoints and prejudices to the Presidency. Only occasionally in the history of civilization has the fate of the world rested on so momentous a decision.

While we have as yet a pathless roadway to world peace one fact is clear, we cannot remain an island of prosperity in an ocean of adversity. We must do our fair share toward an intelligent, farsighted, and general readjustment of the social and economic conditions of the world so as to prevent if possible a repetition of this world tragedy. To achieve a semblance of order in a war-torn world will require strength not softness. There can be no soft peace for those barbarians who have practiced inhumanities on innocent people which have had no parallel in world history since the days of Genghis Khan.

We can help others to help themselves but no program of deliberate permanent impoverishment here and a gigantic W. P. A. for the benefit of a large part of the world at our expense will be tolerated by the American people. Uncle Sam can be neither a Shylock nor a Santa Claus.

We have not attained the degree of unity and the crusading spirit necessary to solve our many domestic problems. Intolerance is rampant in the land. We have sown the wind to reap a whirlwind in deliberately setting class against class. Racial and group prejudices are terrific in their implication. Only a spark is needed to ignite the powder keg.

For the first time in almost a generation we are learning as one people and by bitter experience that the money we are spending, giving away, and wasting must be earned. We are only at the beginning of this experience. Already new methods are being devised to further tax the people. Many of them had believed we could borrow ourselves into prosperity. For 10 years they have been taught this by a profligate government. The group which controls and charts the destinies of the American people is still operating under the false premise that a $300,000,000,000 debt is a national asset and the more we go into debt the more prosperous we will become. They claim we must pay more taxes to prevent inflation, which is true enough.

It is contrary to their philosophy to talk about paying our bills.

Inflation is still a threat to the Nation. It will continue to be a threat so long as powerful political pressure groups are encouraged and are able to obtain concessions and advantages. Continual and conflicting changes in national policies, utterances, and directives have resulted in a dangerous lack of respect for law and order. Truth seems to be the commodity most drastically rationed by the Government.

Some of the theorists who are seeking to increase the powers of a bureaucratic government through taxation are advocating confiscation of all property once in a generation.

The present national tax policy has already made it next to impossible for the average man—the common man, if you please—to create a competence adequate to maintain himself and his family in old age or to provide security for his family after he has passed away. It has accomplished this by a confiscatory tax program combined with a systematic method of inflation until a competence of even $100,000 will return an income of no more than $1,000 a year in a savings bank, or $2,250 a year if invested in Government bonds.

The destruction of the incentive and opportunity to acquire a competence is not only contrary to all the theories and methods of democracy, but falls heaviest on the farmer, the home owner, the laborer, and those who work for a living. These people, not the millionaires, are the real capitalists in America.

There is grave need in this country for men to tell us that the road ahead is not a pathway strewn with roses, but one rough, stony, and beset by many pitfalls. One of the outstanding sins in public life has been the policy of sidestepping our public duties. We cannot dodge or deny responsibility in our home. But Americans shrug their shoulders, take no part in public affairs, or elections, and expect someone else to preserve for them their rights, their freedom, and their liberty. Straddling of issues is a common practice of men in public life. The greatest domestic issue to face our people since the Civil War is whether the people are going to control the Government or whether the Government will control the people. In that decision we will determine whether we shall substitute for the democratic man-made state the dictatorship of the state-made man.

Economic reconversion and development is the all important challenge for a sound partnership between labor and industry to avoid the revolution and chaos which will result if extensive and long sustained unemployment should result as the war effort tapers off and comes to an end. Let no one believe that agriculture and all other groups are not equally and vitally concerned in a solution of this paramount problem.

Labor's and industry's record in the war is sufficient evidence that our system of free enterprise is not outmoded. It is surpassed by no other system of management anywhere in the world. It has given us advantages and a standard of living achieved by no other people. Labor and industry have an equal stake in its preservation. The old policy of the pot calling the kettle black must be abandoned. The maintenance of a decent wage scale is imperative. Collective bargaining has become a permanent institution in the American system. Labor must, however, assume responsibility commensurate with the benefits it has secured. The merging of two great rival labor organizations augers well for the country. One great union will make for such responsibility. It is a common failing that too much power is often abused. This situation was true of business in the predepression days and it is no secret that in its own interest labor ought to pull in its horns in some instances today. The sins of the few should not be visited on the many, but it has happened before and can happen again.

Good leadership can be neither conservative nor reactionary in this world revolution. It must be sympathetic to the interests of all groups, bound by none of them, sound and just to the great mass average. Irrespective of vocation we all have a stake in this objective and achievement.

Over 80,000 men a month have been discharged from our armed forces because of physical or mental unfitness. These are not men rejected in the first instance because of unfitness but men who have passed the draft boards. In many instances their rehabilitation is the duty of Government, and the over-all problem constitutes a challenge and propounds the question of what we are going to do to stop this national waste at its source.

Employment is the cornerstone of democracy. If the American way of life is to survive, it must be built around real enterprise—freedom of opportunity, initiative, industry, expansion, thrift, and real jobs at decent wages. All of the freedoms which we seek, and which we must maintain, stem from this foundation. No other program will support our tax structure, maintain a prosperous agriculture, establish the American home, educate the American child, pay the public debt, and finance a sound program of social insurance. Employment is the guaranty of freedom from want; it is the insurance of freedom from fear.

Consequences of food shortages in this country are terrifying in their possibilities of changing the whole course of human affairs. The Federal attitude and regulations have made farming an increasingly hazardous and difficult occupation. They have reduced rather than increased an already insufficient food production. The agricultural situation is in a terrible mess and is steadily growing worse. Farmers are opposed to subsidies as exchanging their former free birthright for a mess of pottage. Subsidies dodge the issue, create false impressions, and will not obtain results. They follow the familiar bureaucratic pattern—the extension of borrowing and the creation of a greater tax burden on the people.

It is unfortunate that lack of understanding has maneuvered agriculture into an unfortunate position with the American public, which has always taken food for granted, resents its inability to obtain rationed items, and is enjoying generally a high income.

The farmer would be the last to inaugurate a new circle of rising prices or to encourage inflation. For 2 years he has seen his own costs rise out of all proportion to the returns from his own arduous labor. Cheap food is a good political slogan for an administration which has abandoned the American farmer, but cheap food will not mean more food.

Food prices are only 7 percent above 1929 levels. The individual worker's income is 59 percent above 1929 levels. Cost of living is only 1.6 percent above 1929 levels. We are spending only 21 percent of our income for food—said to be less than we have ever spent. Low-income groups, old-age, and public-assistance recipients can be aided by adoption of more effective measures than farmer subsidies.

American agriculture needs the assurance that it will not be sold down the river in the post-war period on a good-neighbor policy or by reciprocal trade agreements. One of the best guaranties of continued national prosperity would be a floor under agricultural prices. Britain, which has virtually doubled its food production during the war, has adopted a policy of guaranteed prices to the farmer for the duration and 1 year after the war.

There is a legacy of evil thoughts and evil deeds in the world engendered from exterminating and debasing the cream of European manhood in all of the occupied countries. In 800 years the world has not witnessed cold-blooded mass murder on the scale established by the new barbarians.

The hatred arising from rape, murder, and torture will take generations of Christian kindness to eradicate.

We cannot destroy a great proportion of the material wealth of the world or expend it in powder, shot, and shell without severe economic aftermaths and a long period of rebuilding and reconstruction. We are destined to bitter disappointment if we think that freedom from want will rise full-fledged from the ashes of this great war. It will require many generations and long years, perhaps centuries, to turn the entire world into the single, large, and prosperous workshop regardless of language, race, or previous condition of ancestral glory which it is ultimately destined to be. Our arm and our anvil must be strong to forge the materials for the freedoms we seek. Our way of life contains no threat to the freedom of mankind but a hope for its redemption and preservation.

We cannot successfully substitute economic formulas for age-old and time-tested natural laws, although with some, fundamental things are held in poor repute. We must become more industrious, more practical, more prudent, and we must build our cooperative society to higher and higher levels. If free enterprise and the democratic way of life are to survive, it must be through the elimination of prejudices, hatred, bigotry, intolerance, and class advantages, and through cooperative effort established on Christian principles.

The new order must be a cooperative society based on the continuation of free enterprise by freemen, opposed to any theory that economic control over the individual should become a permanent governmental function. It will be the alternative to dictatorship. It will require of us self-discipline and self-denial. Only the productive can be strong, and only the strong can be free.

Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, of Dartmouth College, has said:

"The foundations of American society were laid by men who endured economic want and physical hardships that they might gain access to opportunities few in number and inconsiderable in importance as compared with those which today lie close at hand for all of us. There was no thought in their minds that the conditions of life ought to be anything but a challenge or the rewards of life possessed except through valiant effort. They accepted the conditions and went their individual ways without dismay and without complaint, with definite purpose and high aspirations. Thus from recognization of the fact that life must be a struggle for men to profit most from it, arose a great people."

Freedom from want cannot be forced on a people or given a people. It must be won by them. Winning it needs faith and courage. Faith in our future and ideals—courage to face facts and difficulties and overcome them. It needs national unity and responsibility. Unity built from the grass roots and responsibility of the individual, the community, and the State. It needs tolerance and fair play—tolerance of race, class, and creed—the fair play for which century after century our forefathers were prepared to die.

Lastly, we must remember that the source of our philosophy and the basis for all sound democracy is fundamentally religious. Christianity kindled the fires of political freedom and established the basic charter of man's dignity and kinship with his Creator.

In the long struggle for liberty and equality since the Son of God envisioned and enunciated the doctrine of the brotherhood of man no other philosophy has been so clearly emblematical of the freedom that endures.

In advancing the doctrine of cooperation and making a plea for understanding one can only do so in the spirit and faith of the old Chinese philosopher who said: "It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness."

Campaign Address By Governor-Elect Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely comprehensive and compelling radio address delivered in the gubernatorial campaign in New Jersey on Monday evening, November 1, by Hon. Walter E. Edge, Governor-elect of New Jersey. I should like to add that, as will be remembered, Governor-elect Edge was Governor of New Jersey during World War No. 1, served two terms in the United States Senate, from 1919 to 1929, and was Ambassador to France in the Hoover administration; a record unsurpassed in the history of the Garden State.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my purpose as a candidate for the high office of Governor of New Jersey to devote my time and efforts during this campaign to explaining my views on public policy during the war and post-war periods. On this election eve, I feel that you should have from me a summary of the issues which should decide tomorrow's vote.

May I, at this time, express my appreciation for the loyal and unselfish support I have received from so many deeply interested Jersey men and women who have so thoroughly demonstrated their realization of the outstanding issues, the proper solution of which are dependent on the verdict of the voters on Tuesday?

The inspiring reports from all war centers have thrilled America and her allies, and the Republican Party pledges every resource in its power to hasten this great crusade for freedom, praying for a speedy and all-victorious conclusion. A successful termination of the war transcends all other responsibilities; but victory must mark only the beginning of what we are fighting for.

The election of a State Governor and the decision on a constitutional referendum may appear small matters in contrast with the life-and-death struggles being waged in Italy, Russia, China, and the Pacific. But when we remember that one of the underlying reasons for these titanic struggles, involving the lives of your boys and mine, was a loss of free elections in Germany, it gives new weight to our home-front responsibility. There are a few false prophets who would selfishly postpone all elections, and I dare say all democratic processes, until the war is won. There could be no greater danger to the self-government upon which this Nation is founded, no greater betrayal of the democracy for which our sons are giving their lives. It is the solemn obligation of every one of us to the men at the fighting front to vote tomorrow.

Our New Jersey State election has special meaning. You and I will vote for or against authorizing the legislature to write a new State constitution, which would be submitted to all the voters next year for their approval or rejection. This is the first time in 100 years that the people of New Jersey have had a similar opportunity. Tomorrow's election of our State Governor will likewise have effects reaching far beyond the ordinary election, for the next 3 years will be a period of war and, we devoutly hope, post-war adjustment. At no time in our history has there been more need for judgment and understanding. In these critical years ahead, we must not fail to satisfy the three essential conditions of our way of life: Full employment, a protected standard of living, and effective social security.

I know you feel as I do, that the time has arrived when we can no longer permit the Federal system under which we live to drift on the tides of political expediency. The war has of necessity meant a tremendous concentration of authority in Washington. This is necessary because military matters cannot be resolved by popular discussion and popular decision while the enemy takes advantage of every moment. But the gradual eclipse of the States has not been effected by the war alone, and will not pass after the war, unless we can show a genuine purpose and competency in State government. The liquidation of our State governments must cease. The responsibility is ours, and we vote tomorrow to guide the Nation back to the concept of the free state that has given America her place as the first democracy in the world.

The one place in which the Federal Government excels above all others is in the magnitude of its fiscal resources. It has a larger purse than any State, and Federal bureaucracy has learned to use it, particularly near election time. But the great political power that comes with control of the purse strings has not given Federal officials any greater insight into local problems hundreds of miles away, nor has it brought them any nearer to the people who need the services of government. As the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, one of the most distinguished Democratic Members of Congress, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, recently said:

"Government is exercised best in the local community. There the problems are perceived with greater clarity because they are close to the people and on a scale within their grasp. The self-reliance of the individual, town, and State is being destroyed as they are being relieved of the necessity of governing themselves. When people stop thinking for themselves there is always someone willing to step forward and do their thinking for them. This is precisely the bureaucratic control we will have if we persist in making Washington the guide, philosopher, big brother, supervisor, and master of every activity within our borders. The remedy—and the only remedy—is to send all these non-Federal functions back where they belong—to the States and the local communities, where they can be handled upon a scale within the comprehension of the limited mind of man."

It is for these reasons that I have discussed New Jersey State problems with you during the past weeks against their Federal background and meaning. When my opponent says that he bars national issues in a State election he is either aware of the great disadvantage he is under in discussing them or he is completely unaware of the vital pressures of Federal-State relations which are destroying the sovereignty of our State and the freedom of our citizens.

I have differed with my opponent upon many other points during the past weeks. It had been my hope to develop a clear-cut choice, first, of candidates, and, second, of policies for you to decide at tomorrow's election. I regret that my opponent has introduced a third choice, that of campaign methods.

His confusion of irresponsible charges and promises has been unfortunate, I believe, for him. He apparently preferred to resort to the well-known technique of repeating a falsehood so frequently that some people might begin to believe it. To every voter in the State this type of campaigning in itself is an issue in tomorrow's election.

So are the all too frequent strikes in war industries and in activities closely related to the war effort. My opponent and his outstanding national labor political allies have had little to say regarding these offenses against the Government. If they can't influence their membership in times of stress, it is hardly consistent that they be given group command and leadership in a great State with its multitudinous responsibilities.

The integrity of our election machinery is another issue for tomorrow's decision. In winning the war abroad let us not fail to win the war at home. The first safeguard of the home front is free elections and, as I pointed out in my statement to the Republican convention on September 28, the recent primary vote in this State is as plain an example of the jeopardy of free elections as can be found anywhere. In a total primary vote of 395,000, Hudson County contributed 111,000 votes. In other words, one county (Hudson) with less than one-sixth of the State's population contributed almost one-third of the votes, and over one-half of my opponent's vote came from this county. This is a flagrant insult to freemen and a travesty of democratic government. I pledge to every man and woman fighting for our country abroad, and to every citizen working for victory at home, that if I am elected Governor, this subversive influence will be removed from New Jersey.

My opponent has placed his claim to office squarely upon his past affiliation with organized labor as a State federation officer. He has since added to that the support of the Communist Party of Earl Browder who refrained from nominating a candidate for Governor, being entirely satisfied with Mr. Murphy. The situation is unique in that Mr. Murphy lacks any authority from the rank and file of labor to be their political spokesman; and in that he proposes to deliver the New Jersey labor vote for the Hague machine which only 5 years ago deported C. I. O. organizers from Jersey City. There is good evidence of dissatisfaction with this arrangement among sincere unionists. What an unholy combination to control the destinies of a great State—Hague, Browder, and Murphy.

Mr. Murphy's drive to regiment labor in the interest of his own election is not in the tradition of enlightened labor leadership. It is in the subversive style of the Hague political machine, to which Murphy has now become completely subservient.

Serious-minded labor leaders have always recognized the harmfulness of any attempt to set up organized labor as a separate class whose interests are supposed to be in conflict with the interest of all the people. The fact is that the best interests of labor are the same as the common interests of all of us. This is fundamental in our American concept of social progress, and I firmly believe will be demonstrated again when votes are counted tomorrow.

These are not pleasant issues to discuss, but I would be neglecting my duty to you, as responsible voters of New Jersey, were I to omit them from tonight's summary of tomorrow's choice.

The most pressing thoughts in the minds of all of us have not even been discussed by my opponent. Those thoughts concern the great job ahead of winning not only the war but the peace to follow. My opponent proposes to appoint several study commissions to give him all the answers; I propose to go before the legislature in January with a concrete program which I have already presented to the voters of this State.

Demobilized service men and women will need and are entitled to everything we can provide in the way of public services to solve their special problems. At the top of our list, reemployment of those returning from the armed forces must be made as simple and as effective as possible. We must have all the machinery set and ready to go for a complete program of physical and mental rehabilitation, education, job training and placement.

The details of any State plan must, of course, depend upon policies adopted by the Federal Government as part of its prosecution of the war. But we must so prepare ourselves as to be ready for any contingency.

As the next Governor of New Jersey, I cannot say to our returning men and women: "The Federal Government has made all preparations to care for you. Your State is in no position to help." In this matter, above all others, we must marshal every resource and not wait for the cumbersome, overlapping processes in Washington to fail as they did twenty-odd years ago.

I would also provide for our State a post-war conversion program to assist business in returning to a peacetime basis; a replacement program to assist business in rehousing and retooling problems; a public-works development program to cushion the transition of employment from war to peace operations; and a Federal-State relation program to give attention to the broader aspects of Federal-State relations in the post-war economy. In this field, Federal aid will doubtless play an important part; but regardless of its importance, the present haphazard contacts of the Federal Government with State offices, boards, commissions, counties, and municipalities must be systematized; and a recognized State authority must guide the acceptance and disposition of Federal money.

We need not blind ourselves to the difficult problems these objectives will create, but it is equally foolish to adopt the pessimistic attitude which I am sorry to say colors much private and public thinking today. Our State of New Jersey, in particular, has suffered less economic unbalance during the past 2 years than practically any other State doing a major share of war production. This is a strong sign that we can and we will provide productive jobs for full employment at fair wages at the close of the war.

I fail to recall any constructive suggestion for State government that Mr. Murphy has made since the Democratic platform was adopted in Trenton, the same day our Republican platform was adopted. In the Democratic platform there appears nothing about revision of the constitution of the State of New Jersey. In the Republican platform this need is very clearly enunciated, approved, and pledged. As your candidate for Governor, I asked that my leadership in that connection be followed by those who trust in me.

I am especially anxious that the post-war welfare of our demobilized service men and women and war workers should not be prejudiced by lack of harmony between the legislative and executive branches of our State government. Our greatest hope for the future lies in unity on the home front as well as on the war front. During my former term as Governor, I succeeded in bringing together legislative and executive viewpoints. I am sure a peaceful and efficient relation can again be restored in Trenton with a Republican legislature and a Republican Governor in office.

It is with confidence that I leave these great choices to the people of New Jersey at the polls tomorrow. There can be no safer place to leave these great decisions than in the hands of an electorate that for many generations has passed critically and wisely on the issues of good and bad government. There is merely one admonition I would leave with you: do not give comfort to the enemy by neglecting to use your most precious democratic asset—the right to vote.

Death Notice—Public Invited to Funeral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, when you stop to think who he is, how able he is, what part of the country he comes from, of his record as a statesman, what he has done, and a lot of other things to be considered in appraising any statement which he makes, then the interview which Senator JOHNSON, Democrat from Colorado, granted makes quite interesting reading for those of us who for some time have entertained the same opinion.

If I had said it, a lot of people wouldn't have paid any attention to it, some would have read it and agreed, others would have intimated that my statement was born of partisan prejudice.

When a Democratic war horse, such as is the Senator from Colorado, says "The New Deal is through," it attracts the attention of his fellow Democrats the country over; confirms the judgment of all Republicans everywhere, and that of all real Democrats. He is quoted as having said:

> Even a child knows that a political revolution comparable to the Harding landslide is sweeping this Nation.
>
> As Americans we ought to be interested in its causes and we should place country ahead of party.
>
> CONTINUED SWEEP
>
> Unless drastic steps are taken by the Democrats—
>
> JOHNSON declared—
>
> they can look for a sweeping continuation of the Republican gains reflected by election of Governors in Kentucky and New Jersey, a lieutenant governor in New York, and by victories in several local contests.

He termed the New Deal a "dead corpse" and predicted that if the Democratic Party clings to it, the Democrats will lose the Senate, the House, and the Governors of every Northern and Western State in the next election.

The only exception I can take to the statement is to say that the sun of the day to which he refers as in future has already set. The landslide is unstoppable and only those unwise enough not to know it will persist in following the hearse carrying the New Deal corpse to its grave in the cemetery of innocuous desuetude, as Grover Cleveland would have it.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

As we know the Banking and Currency Committee of the House has recently been conducting hearings on the question of extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation beyond January 1, 1944, and increasing the borrowing capacity of the Corporation.

The President, backed principally by organized labor, has strongly urged the use of subsidies as a device to halt the trend toward further inflation. On the other hand, a majority of the Members of Congress together with the farm organizations and representatives of small business have opposed subsidies in lieu of compensatory prices for farm products.

Taking the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939 as a base, the cost of living has increased only 23 percent. Retail food prices have gone up 37 percent, while labor costs per unit of industrial production have increased more than 65 percent. In the meantime, factory pay rolls per employed worker have gone up 94 percent. Corporation earnings, after taxes, have increased 96 percent.

In view of these figures, drawn from official sources, and with more than $50,000,000,000 of purchasing power in the hands of consumers in excess of the supply of available goods, those of us who oppose subsidies feel that our position is impregnable from the standpoint of common sense and sound economics. We should vote accordingly, if and when the Commodity Credit extension bill is reported. There should be no subsidies.

THE ICKES-LEWIS CONTRACT

It has been truly said that the Ickes-Lewis contract violates the President's own assurance that no contract would be negotiated with men on strike and that the contract should be in accordance with the W. L. B. award. No juggling with words or figures can excuse it. It has undermined the prestige of this Government at a time when at home and abroad every American should be upholding it.

The spectacle is striking in contrast. Came the whole world in arms, and this Nation, rising to the pinnacle of its puissant strength, shocked its enemies and amazed its allies. Yet its Government bows meekly to John L. Lewis. After 2 years of war this Nation, with the aid of its allies, has got its enemies on the run on the battlefields of every continent. Yet, its Government is on the run itself from John L. Lewis. This Nation in its sovereign might is crushing a tyranny which had arisen beyond the seas. Yet, its Government has harbored, succored, and now is succumbing to a tyranny within its own bosom. Or is it? Congress is as much a part of the Government as the Executive, and, with this lesson in front of it, it must restore the

dignity of our Government which the President himself has trailed in the dust. There is no room for such tyrannies as John L. Lewis' in the American system.

In the language of the editor of the Washington Post it may further be said that—

Our President in the name of our Government has caved in at the command of John L. Lewis. Mr. Lewis was once described by a friend and co-worker as "hell-bent on creating national confusion and national disunity."

That friend was none other than Phil Murray. Lewis is certainly a formidable figure. Physically he is so powerful that in his coal mining youth he is said to have felled a mule with one blow of his fist. But it was not brute strength that enabled him to fell our Government. It was the power which had been given him by our President to control the jobs and therefore the lives and fortunes of the entire coal-mining population. The kayo, in consequence, came easy. Surrender to Lewis was inevitable from the very day that unlimited power was handed to Lewis. For, coupled with this supreme power over coal and the physical and moral strength to use it in a holdup of his Nation, he knew and discounted the caliber of the men with whom he was dealing. Not once but many times has he expressed his contempt for his negotiating opposites in the Government.

Mr. Lewis knew his opposites better than we did ourselves. On November 2 we gave the President, in commenting on his decision authorizing Secretary Ickes to negotiate a contract with John L. Lewis, "in accordance with the recent opinion of the National War Labor Board and subject to its approval," a commendation for his "vigor and dispatch." It did not occur to our simple minds that the "vigor and dispatch" would be expressed in signing up with Mr. Lewis while the men were out on strike and in disregard of the W. L. B. award. Maybe the President would contend that the agreement is not a marked contravention of the W. L. B. award. The argument is a reminder of the excuse of the housemaid for her illegitimate offspring that "it is only a small one."

STRIKES

Strikes in coal mines since December 7, 1941, probably have resulted in loss of more American lives in battle through lessened supplies than were lost in the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, so Representative POAGE of Texas told the House the other day.

Criticizing the Government's dealing with John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers, Representative POAGE said:

Appeasement which many of us had supposed died with 3,000 American boys at Pearl Harbor, marches on as the official policy of the Government of the United States today.

We are properly fighting Japan to the death, but we are rewarding John L. Lewis with a wage increase which the War Labor Board held just 10 days ago to be unreasonable and inflationary.

THE REMEDY

The remedy is in the hands of the people, ultimately. The only way to stop the wrecking program is to take the job away from the wreckers and put the task of running this Government into the hands of those who can and will assume the responsibility for its operation constructively instead of destructively.

The only way this can be done effectively is by a change of administration. The people have done too little too late to help out their present emergencies, but they can and will save themselves from the wanton, willful disregard of the laws enacted by Congress; and from the deceit and skulduggery on the part of bureaus and Government agencies by registering their protest at the polls.

It is not to be forgotten by the people that the bureaus in Washington are working to carry out the policies determined at the White House. You may grumble at O. P. A. and the other agencies, but they are only carrying out orders and policies determined by the administration. To get rid of them we must "throw the rascals out" and do not let anybody tell you anything other or different. To abolish these boards and bureaus we need the votes in Congress to do the trick. The burden of responsibility for supplying the necessary votes in Congress rests on the citizens themselves.

While Senator JOHNSON is correct in his statement, yet the people should make it their selfish and patriotic duty to see to it that there is a corpse, an autopsy, a post mortem, and an incineration for burial is too old-fashioned, if not too good, for a New Deal.

War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "War and Peace," delivered by Archbishop John T. McNicholas at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In considering peace it will be well to examine the proximate and remote causes of war.

Global war is the evil business promoted by totalitarian governments. We know today the horrors of total war in a nation. We know the gruesome terrors, the inhumanity, and the mass murder of groups, peoples, and nations in this global war. Europe at many points has literally become a slaughterhouse of human beings, without any regard to the dignity of human personality and the sacred and divine value of an immortal soul.

PHYSICAL DEGRADATION

Unparalleled in all history is the large scale destruction and murder which is ruthlessly exterminating the Poles, the Jews, the Yugoslavs, the Czechs, to mention merely the most conspicuous examples.

That such little value should be attached to human life and that such physical degradation should be brought about by monstrous rulers, who have usurped the seats of authority, would seem incredible if it were not a reality. This physical degradation we can, to some extent, understand, because we are witnesses of it. But it is more difficult to understand the intellectual and moral degradation which has made it possible.

ACUTE CAUSES OF WAR

What are the causes of this global war? The causes are acute and remote. Economic slavery and economic world crises, industrial and social injustice, in large measure, have been the proximate and acute causes. Uninformed and unsympathetic industrialists, capitalists, and legislators have contributed much to the global conflict. They have helped to maintain the false security of society by four inadequate measures, which they assumed would maintain peace under all conditions. These measures are: First, adequate protection by police and armed forces; second, the defense of private property; third, distracting recreations; and, fourth, the freedom of religion.

These are not adequate measures when teeming millions of persons throughout the world, constituting more than half the population of the earth, undernourished, ill clothed, and poorly clad are forced to expend all their efforts merely to eke out a miserable existence, unfavorable alike to body, intellect, and soul. These inadequate measures cannot long stand, because moral standards and spiritual values must demand more.

EVERY VILLAGE A GARDEN OF PLENTY

Modern means of travel, communication, transportation, and distribution have made the world a village. Evil report is flashed instantly to every part of the earth. Weapons of destruction move with lightning speed above and below the waters. These same means turned to construction instead of destruction could make every hamlet in the world a garden of plenty. In a short time they could transport all the things which potentially could supply the essential needs of mankind for shelter, clothing, food, medicine, and even for modest security.

DIGNITY OF EVERY PERSON

Selfishness, ambition, injustice, legal but not moral monopolies of individuals, groups, and nations must be overcome before the fact is accepted that every human person on the face of the earth is entitled to live as a human being, not by the favor of someone or by the privilege of government but by the native, inalienable, and imprescriptible right that is his as a human person.

A minority is found and will always be found in every nation, totally incapable of caring for itself physically and in the temporal order. These incapable and dependent persons, by whatever name they may be called, become the charge of each government. Until the essentials necessary to maintain the physical man in honor are accessible and can be earned by all, we shall have unrest, the beginnings of revolutions, and the acute and proximate causes of war. Mere palliatives will not do.

MORAL TEACHERS

We who are public moral teachers, whose duty it is to promote harmony, good will, social justice, and love of all men because of love of God, must not betray the poor, the laborer, the dependent and incapable group, and those unjustly dealt with in our times. We must fearlessly say that some increase in wages, fewer working hours, a token of partnership by an annual bonus, and some

protection by new and questionable forms of security in time of sickness and old age are not of themselves sufficient. These palliatives have no assurance of continuity and increase. Permanent peace cannot be established under them.

THE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT

Reconstruction of economic life can be brought about only by a practical application of the Christian spirit.

The Christian spirit only can change the mind and heart of employer and employee and make governments just to both. It is only Christian principles and Christian living that will make the employer satisfied with a just return on his investment and nothing more. It is only the Christian spirit that will make the worker a true crusader, insisting on his dignity as a human person, on his right to sit at the conference table with his employer to agree upon or to readjust the terms of the contract under which he labors.

Christian principles, Christian living, and Christian labor can awaken and stimulate the creative spirit among workers, can insist that there be joy in one's work and a genuine sense of responsibility. This fullness of joy, enthusiasm, and responsibility in work are not possible if the profit motive dominates everything. These are not possible while mechanized slavery or the spy system of our industrial age pervades the shop or factory, or while regimentation, suspicion, unchecked ambition, sharp and immoral practices rule employees and business and professional men.

REMOTE CAUSES OF WAR

The remote causes of war are those which make human beings intellectual and moral degenerates. One becomes an intellectual or moral degenerate who prostitutes his noblest faculties by accepting and acting on the following false propositions, either in whole or in part:

False Proposition 1. There is no personal and omnipotent God.

False Proposition 2. There is no eternal law and no unchangeable law of nature having their source in God.

False Proposition 3. There is no accountability to God either by individuals or by nations.

False Proposition 4. Man is not free, is not entitled to enjoy freedom as a native right, and the human person is not invested with a dignity which gives it something of a divine character.

False Proposition 5. The family is not of divine origin. It is merely a convention of society. Family life can be entirely abolished by government.

False Proposition 6. All the sanctions under which men live today can be modified, changed, or abolished by human convention tomorrow.

False Proposition 7. There is no revealed or supernatural religion. There is no natural religion which imposes any obligation on man or on society.

False Proposition 8. Every person is not entitled to the minimum of sufficient food, clothing, shelter, and security to live according to the dignity of human nature.

All persons embracing these erroneous and degrading principles, and they are legion today, constitute a regiment which, consciously or unconsciously, promotes war.

Unfortunately, many in this unnumbered army are misled; they have never studied fundamental truths or basic principles; they know many of the wrongs and evils of society. Many have embraced those pernicious principles through the influence of university and college professors, through ephemeral literature, through attractive promises of atheists, who are often eloquent and right in condemning what is unjust but who cannot reasonably hope to put society in order by bringing about chaos and confusion, and by promoting strife, class hatred, and war.

DEGENERACY OF NATIONS

Nations that have accepted these false principles have descended to the depths of intellectual and moral degradation. This apostasy of the nations has built a broad highway on which citizens are directed to move not truthward, not Godward, but to be indifferent to the Supreme Being—yea, even to turn against God and to wage war on Him. The division, the confusion, the hostility existing between religious groups, and the consequent decadence of faith among their followers have advanced intellectual and moral degeneracy. Religious groups cannot avoid all responsibility of promoting remotely this unspeakable global war.

GLOBAL WARS

We have now been involved in two global wars. Those who study world economy and world politics insist that if there be a third global war, we cannot possibly escape involvement. It behooves us, therefore, to turn our thoughts from global war to global peace. We have made unparalleled sacrifices for global war. We should be prepared, if necessary, to make great sacrifices for global peace. The best students of world affairs and of our own country are convinced that, as the most powerful nation on earth, we should exercise our influence in maintaining world peace by preventing global wars.

Two great popes, especially Benedict XV and Pope Pius XII, have laid down the basic principles of a truly Christian peace. If world peace does not have its source in Christ and in the teachings of His Gospel, it cannot long endure.

RIGHT, NOT MIGHT, MUST WIN PEACE

The first condition of world peace is the rejection of might as right. The might of any nation, however powerful, cannot in the court of God and in the court of true conscience destroy the right of another nation, however small or weak, to life and independence.

MIGHT WILL GAIN VICTORY

Might will win the victory in this global war. Only right can win a true and lasting peace. Might may grant only a token sovereignty and independence to Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and the Balkan states. Might can refuse to be just to many of the weak nations throughout the world. Might can insist that the colonies remain after the war as they were before it, without insisting that they be given the responsibilities of national life and independence when they are prepared for them. Might can refuse to go beyond the mandates which were given after the First World War. These mandates were a promise of better things for colonial and backward peoples, but mere promises will not be sufficient after the present global war. The nations that have might on their side must, if they want a really peaceful world, strive above all things to do what is best for these colonial and backward peoples in the interest of global peace.

Might can ignore the interdependent economic life of the nations of the world, especially the weak nations. There is abundance and superabundance of everything that is necessary for all nations and peoples of the world, but to supply it and to distribute it might must divide the earth into regions and be just to the weaker nations and to the backward peoples, so that they can live according to the dignity of human beings.

RESPONSIBILITY OF FOUR GREAT POWERS

We see then clearly what is the terrifying responsibility of the mighty nations, the United States of America, Great Britain, Russia, and China. The might of these nations will gain victory for the world. Their might of itself cannot win the peace. These four powers can establish global peace and maintain it only by justice and charity. They must recognize that there is not one law of justice and charity for individuals and another law very different for the four nations that have won the war. The Christian duty of these four powers will be to exercise justice and charity, not only to defenseless nations, peoples, and minorities, but even to conquered Germany, Italy, and Japan.

RESTRICTION OF ARMAMENTS

The second condition for global peace is that the four victorious nations in some way unite according to moral principles in limiting the armaments of all the nations of the world. If this be done reasonably and justly, it can be done without violently depriving any country of its right to national life and independence. Each nation in the interest of global peace will be called upon to surrender cheerfully something of its sovereign rights in placing limitations upon its armaments. If a nation refuses to place these limitations, then the mighty peacemakers, the four great powers, must find some formula to restrict and restrain a government that wants to be an outlaw.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTION

The third condition of world peace is a regulating international institution. The peace of the world will depend, in large measure, upon an international institution which may be called the league of family of nations or world community. This international institution must not be a world government, which will not and cannot long endure. The four great powers that win the victory must not control the world for their own interest or for the greater interest of any one of them, but for the justice and peace of the world. This world organization must, if it is to succeed, continue and develop the humanitarian efforts of the League of Nations, but it must avoid the political mistakes which caused the League of Nations to fail. The four victorious powers must assume responsibility for whatever sort of an international organization is set up to aid all the countries of the world. The four great powers can profit by the mistakes of the past. They may decide in their wisdom that it will be better to have several international institutions than to have one overall world organization.

INTERNATIONAL COURT

Certainly among these institutions there should be an international tribunal whose judges would interpret the terms of peace. These same judges ought to be given authority to make broad applications to conditions which could not possibly have been foreseen at the time of the peace agreement. The peace covenant ought to be a document incorporating basic principles, which international judges should be instructed to regard as something living and applicable to countries and conditions that are moving and developing. This juridical institution should give a living voice to the peace covenant and should, if conducted on the highest plane, inspire confidence, not only in our day but in generations yet to come.

JUST DEMANDS OF NATIONS, PEOPLES, MINORITIES, AND COLONIES

The fourth condition for a lasting peace is that the four great powers must catalog the real needs, the just demands of nations and peoples, and also those of racial minorities. Colonial expansion, colonial government, and colonial exploitation have written black pages in the history of nations. Can the four great victorious powers be entirely fair in listing the imperialistic aims of the nations? Will they state fearlessly the truth about densely populated countries, the need

of raw materials in many nations? Will they insist on fairness to groups constituting a large population, and, likewise, will they demand that racial minorities be treated justly? Will they try to avoid grouping elements and racial minorities that cannot live in peace, such as was done in the Treaty of Versailles? Will they condemn the violation of the God-given rights of racial minorities, which violation has been a scourge of the world since the end of the First World War?

There are black and ugly spots that the four great powers must acknowledge and change if we are to have a world at peace.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The fifth essential condition for peace is freedom of religion. This freedom must be a true freedom. Religion must not be harnessed and hampered and made a tool of the state for merely civic and material ends. Religion must not be told that it is free and then denied liberty to carry on its mission. If the four great powers really want freedom of religion, they must insist on some measures by which unrestrained, unlimited, and vile attacks on religion cannot be carried on with assurance of state protection. If the four great powers really appreciate the salutary influence of religion, they will realize that it is the greatest support of a nation and of all the nations of the world. They will realize that any encouragement they give to those who attack religion and destroy it will ultimately react on themselves, to their own great disadvantage, and to the injury of world order and global peace.

If the four great powers have a comprehensive grasp of an ordered world and of nations living under the principles of justice and charity, they will realize that global peace is not merely a question of economics or of industry or of capital and labor but that it is basically a moral and religious matter, which must be settled by the principles of morality and religion. The great curse of the world for several decades has been the abandonment of the moral order and of the juridical order founded on the principles of religion.

Let us hope that the four great powers will not fail substantially in international cooperation and solidarity. If they do fail, it will be because they have rejected the moral order and the principles of religion. There is the possibility of the United States reacting to isolationism. There is the possibility that Great Britain will refuse to change anything of her imperialistic or colonial system. There is the possibility that Russia may want to control Europe and force under her sway peoples and countries that can never really be united to her. There is the possibility that China may be left to her own resources despite all her sacrifices. If all these things happen, the world will be left in what seems to be a hopeless condition. But even if all this should happen, it seems clear that our country should take the practical measures, which can readily be done, to have all the countries of North, Central, and South America live in perfect harmony, subscribing to international cooperation and solidarity. All the Americas can be an example and inspiration to the whole world.

"We are all peacemakers," the Archbishop concluded, "and in that sense are we all blessed. The peacemakers shall be called the children of God. We should, as peacemakers, do the most we can to influence public opinion for a just and lasting peace. We should offer our prayers incessantly for the authorities of the four great powers that must decide soon, either on the peaceful destinies of the world or on an armistice which will mean preparation for a third global war. May God enlighten and guide these rulers and make them courageous to do what is best for the peace of the world."

Tribute to Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post, commenting upon the appointment of Mr. Bernard Baruch to be the head of the agency having to do with the organization of plans for war demobilization and the mobilization for peace after this war is over.

I believe the selection of Mr. Baruch for this most important task will meet with Nation-wide approval. No man better fitted, nor in whom the people have more confidence, could have been chosen for this important assignment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB OF UNSCRAMBLING

There is no more difficult assignment in the whole sphere of wartime and post-war activities than that given to Bernard M. Baruch by O. W. M. Director Byrnes. Mr. Baruch's great service in clearing up the rubber dilemma a year and a half ago and his more recent report on manpower are both overshadowed by the immensity of the problem that has been dropped into his lap. For he has been asked to work out plans and policies through which the economy of a great nation engaged in total war can be unscrambled when the fighting is over and redirected by orderly processes into the activities of peacetime.

Mr. Baruch is admirably qualified for this assignment. In addition to his outstanding service as Chairman of the War Industries Board in the last war, he has functioned as the President's chief trouble shooter on the home front through most of the present hostilities. He has a profound knowledge of business and industry; he knows the men who are directing the production of war supplies and has their confidence as well as that of the administration and the public. He is courageous enough to say what he thinks and independent enough to reject pressure from any source. Even more important, he knows how to tackle a big undertaking without delay, and he carries with him through the toughest assignments a keen sense of the national interest.

All these qualities will be much in demand, for the problems of wartime and post-war adjustment are becoming more critical every day. Our war-making is certain to stop much more quickly than it began, and chaos will be an unwelcome companion of victory unless the Government is ready to meet the consequent shock to our economic system. The Government is far from being ready to meet this obligation now.

The extent of our unpreparedness to cope with such an emergency is illustrated by the fact that there is no agreement as to the power of governmental agencies to cancel contracts. The War Department insists that it has authority to negotiate settlements when contracts are terminated at the convenience of the Government. But the Comptroller General believes that settlements thus negotiated are an infringement upon his powers under the Budget and Accounting Act. Such a controversy, if left unsolved by Congress, might have the effect of holding up settlements indefinitely and of wreaking havoc upon our economic system at a most critical time.

The whole problem of post-war employment is tied up with this question of prompt settlement of wartime-contract obligations. Reconversion of industry will be a baffling undertaking at best. The Government will have to decide what industries shall have first call upon scarce materials for a resumption of civilian manufacturing. It will be bedeviled by questions as to what plants within a given industry should be first relieved of war contracts. Some of these questions will probably have to be answered before the war is over, with full knowledge of the fact that resumption of civilian industry even on a small scale will encourage a scramble for premature reconversion. Had questions of this sort merely been allowed to accumulate until the end of the war, the outlook would be truly frightening.

We think that the creation of a post-war adjustment unit within the Office of War Mobilization holds special promise because it should lead to an integrated policy as to the termination of war contracts, the disposal of surplus war materials and the reconversion of war plants. The diffusion of war procurement powers among many agencies has proved to be a costly mistake. The least the Government can do is to avoid similar mistakes in the demobilization of our industrial war machinery. And that appears to be the gist of the assignment given to Mr. Baruch.

Post-War Program for the Fighting Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely address delivered on Friday last over the N. B. C. network by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. The address is entitled "A Post-war Program for the Men and Women of Our Fighting Forces."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this all-out global war the lives of most of the people in our Nation have been necessarily disturbed. While those of us in civilian life have been called upon to make sacrifices, no matter how great, they are nothing to compare with those of our boys in the service. They have been called from school and work and forced to leave good homes in order to preserve for the present and future generations the privileges of the world's greatest democracy, which has made the enjoyment of these same privileges possible; which permits the attendance of schools of their own choice, and the selection of their preferred work. They are now undergoing great hardships and dangers and will continue to do so until victory is ours. We here at home have

a duty to see to it that their sacrifices are kept at a minimum.

When the last shot is fired, of the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, approximately 9,000,000 will be discharged and will come back to take their places in private life. There will be unrest among our boys returning from the fox holes, swamps, and deserts. In making these sacrifices many of them will have given the best years of their lives. They have been forced to leave good homes and fight beasts on the other side under the most trying conditions. Both their mental and physical strength is being taxed to the uttermost, so we cannot expect them to return and be able to take up just where they left off, whether it was at school or at work. They will need assistance, which will necessarily have to vary in accordance with their needs. Some of them will need to return to high schools or colleges; others will want to attend occupational schools. Some who have already finished college and are married—many while in the service—will have wives and children awaiting them on their return. They will be badly in need of homes. Some have left the farm, selling their farm equipment at a sacrifice, and will come back without money with which to purchase equipment. Others have had to sell small businesses at sacrifices and will want to start in on enterprises for themselves.

The assistance which we give them, although different, must be of equal value in order to be equitable. I have, ever since our entry into the war, given thought to legislation which would meet the different needs of men and women returning from the service, and, at the same time, give assistance of equal value. After most careful study the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself introduced Senate bill 1495 which we feel meets these requirements.

S. 1495 follows and carries out a resolution adopted by the American Legion of the Department of Arizona at its annual convention at Phoenix, Ariz., in August of this year. It provides as a basis for the amount of the benefits for veterans of this war, double the amount of that used for the adjusted pay certificate issued to World War No. 1 veterans; that is, for the benefits to be received by veterans of this war $2 per day for home service and $2.50 per day for foreign service with a limitation of $1,000 to those without foreign service and $1,250 for those with foreign service. This sum is to be paid by the issuance of a bond upon discharge from the service, which will mature in 10 years and draw the same interest as War Savings bonds issued under the 2d Liberty Bond Act, to be subject to the same terms and conditions, except that it is redeemable after the expiration of 3 years from date of issuance.

However, any veteran to whom any bond has been issued who desires to use the benefits of such bond prior to the expiration of 3 years from the date of its issuance for instruction at any high school, vocational school, college, or other educational institution, may apply to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs. If the Administrator finds that such veteran is in need of and qualified for such course of instruction, and that it is likely to be of substantial benefit to him, he shall approve the application and thereupon said bond shall be payable to the veteran at the rate of $100 per month while he is pursuing the approved course of instruction in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Administrator. In addition to the payment of the face value of the bond, the Administrator shall also pay from funds appropriated for that purpose the charges for tuition, and the cost of books required by the veteran while pursuing the approved course of instruction.

Senate bill 1495 also provides that a veteran in need of a home may apply to the Federal Housing Agency for the purchase of a home and provision is made for the immediate payment of the amount of the bond as a down payment for the purchase of such home under an F. H. A. loan, or otherwise. A similar provision provides for the use of such money as a down payment upon a small business under the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, also as a down payment for the purchase of farm machinery, or as a down payment on a farm on approval of the Secretary of Agriculture making available the provisions of the Farm Tenancy Act to the veteran. In addition to these benefits the bill provides for a 3-month furlough immediately prior to discharge with pay at the same rate he is receiving at the time, but not to exceed $100 per month. This provision is to give him sufficient time to make up his mind as to what he desires to do, as well as to provide for a well-earned rest.

We feel this bill meets the recommendations of the President and others advocating schooling for veterans upon their return from the service, and leaves the question of who shall go to school up to the individual. Each will have this privilege if he desires. This should be determined by the individual himself and not by any bureau or board. We must see to it that the veteran has the privilege of using his money where it is needed the most. I have talked to men in the service who have wives and children who are most anxious to purchase homes upon their return. Certainly it is important to give them this privilege. I am one who believes it is highly desirable for everyone to have the privilege of owning his own home. It is equally important that he have the privilege of purchasing a small business. I know servicemen who sold small businesses, such as service stations, at a loss and this money would enable them to make up those losses making possible the purchase of businesses upon their return to continue their line of work.

I talked to a boy stationed in Arizona who had farmed in Nebraska prior to his entrance into the service, and he had to sell his equipment at a loss. Certainly we should help him purchase new equipment upon his return. There are thousands of others who need this money for different purposes.

I know there are those who will say that this will cost a lot of money. There is no question about that, assuming that the 11,000,000 men in the service will receive an average of $1,000, it would mean a total cost to our Government of $11,000,000,000. Truly, this is a lot of money, but it is just a part of the cost of the war. We have not hesitated to buy and pay for the necessary implements of war, and we should not hesitate to help rehabilitate our men and women upon their return from the service. The war has already cost some $264,000,000,000. While $11,000,000,000 is a large sum, it is not so great in comparison with the total cost of the war. Let us not hesitate to take care of those who are really serving our Nation. We cannot afford to have our boys wandering over the country as they did after the last war. We were given adjusted pay, but too late. We were able to bring sufficient pressure to get it, but not in time to be of the greatest benefit. Does anyone doubt World War No. 2 veterans will have less influence? Yes, there will be adjusted pay. It is our belief that we should take care of our veterans when they come home, not 10 years after the war. The stark tragedy of Anacostia Flats must not be relived—we must face this problem today. Let's send them this news overseas as an inspiration.

Resolutions of General Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which met at Swampscott, Mass., from June 28 to July 2, 1943. I regard these resolutions as being of far-reaching importance, and, therefore, ask for their insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND POST-WAR PLANNING

Whereas two world wars in a single generation have brought upon humanity immeasurable death and destruction and have demonstrated the urgent necessity of international collaboration for the maintenance of peace and justice among the nations; and

Whereas the United States, after attempting to remain apart from each of these wars, has, in defense of its own security and freedom, been drawn into them at heavy cost in human lives and material wealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled at Swampscott, Mass., June 29, 1943, hereby expresses its conviction that international machinery must be created for the establishment of a just peace and the prevention of future aggression, and that the United States in its own self-interest must participate therein.

WAR SERVICE DEPARTMENT AND STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS.

TEACHING PROFESSION AND LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Whereas the teachers in many public schools are leaving the school systems to join the armed services, the Federal Government, and private industry; and

Whereas curtailment of the teaching staff is causing overcrowding of classrooms, elimination of subjects from the curriculum, and the employment of teachers without adequate professional training; and

Whereas the education of future teachers is being disrupted by the discontinuance of many liberal arts colleges: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled in Swampscott, Mass., June 30, 1943, reaffirm its stand relative to the maintenance of public education as an essential function of democratic government, and that the educational authorities throughout the country be urged to maintain salaries sufficient to obtain and retain competent teachers, uphold high professional and personal standards for teachers, recognize the teaching profession as essential to the winning of the war, and the liberal arts colleges as essential to the win-

ning of the peace, as well as the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, and all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the need for the National Youth Administration is no longer acute, and it necessitates an unnecessary expenditure of funds now needed for war efforts; and,

Whereas, certain other Government agencies are now providing financial aid for deserving students in high schools and colleges: Therefore be it.

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., June 30, 1943, approves the liquidation of the N. Y. A. as soon as possible.

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.

BLACK MARKETS

Whereas the health and welfare of the people of the United States are threatened by the break-down in the national attempt to secure for all our people their just share of the available consumer goods; and

Whereas, black markets are now an alarming evidence of the break-down; and

Whereas these black markets constitute also a menace to the legitimate business of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, condemns the disloyal practice on the part of housewives in seeking advantage by patronizing such black markets; and be it further

Resolved, That all persons and agencies possessing powers of enforcement be urged to use all diligence possible in investigation and prosecution of infractions of these laws by consumers and dealers.

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department,
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. R. I. C. PROUT,
Chairman, Nutrition Commitee, War Service Department.
Mrs. PATRICK HENRY ADAMS,
Chairman, Consumer Problems Committee, War Service Department.
Mrs. F. EARLE MAGEE,
Chairman, Conservation of War Products Committe, War Service Department.

PURE FOOD, DRUGS AND COSMETICS ACT

Whereas the Pure Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act, passed in 1906 and amended in 1938, has proved of inestimable value to the American people in safeguarding their health by protecting them against adulteration and misbranding; and

Whereas from time to time efforts are made to evade or violate these principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which helped enact this legislation, goes on record in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, as endorsing its principles and upholding its enforcement from attack in every way possible.

Mrs. HARVEY W. WILEY,
Chairman, Legislation Department.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Whereas the problem of the rapidly mounting rate of juvenile delinquency is confronting every community in the United States; and

Whereas this condition is a responsibility of the forces of the home, the school, the church, and the community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, urges the formation of committees within the individual clubs, districts, and States of the federation, which shall work toward the coordination of effort of all organizations and agencies of the community interested in the welfare of children and youth, to combat juvenile delinquency through the establishment of such community services as a survey shall prove to be necessary in the local communities.

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.
Mrs. EDWIN I. FOSTON,
Chairman, American Home Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

STRIKES AND RIOTS

Whereas this Nation and its Allies in the present world struggle have been shocked and dismayed by the strikes and riots which have occurred in this country; and

Whereas serious delays in production of war materials have resulted which threaten the success of the war effort; and

Whereas organized labor has outlawed strikes during the war emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, condemns selfishness of purpose and failure to cooperate in the war effort, in accord with this agreement of organized labor, as unpatriotic and regards inflammatory agitations as sabotage; be it further

Resolved, That it urges its member clubs to foster a public opinion which will not tolerate such attitudes and practices on the part of any person or groups of persons, but will demand that prompt, consistent, and impartial execution of the punishments now prescribed by law be meted out to those proved guilty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Members of Congress, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National War Labor Board, the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and United Mine Workers of America.

Mrs. HORACE B. RITCHIE,
Chairman, Public Welfare Department.
Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.
Mrs. HIRAM C. HOUGHTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Education Department.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court of May 10 confers upon the Federal Communications Commission broad and expansive powers, including the right to control business policy and program content of radio stations; and

Whereas the very existence of such power and the constant threat of its exercise constitutes a form of censorship which may interfere with the freedom of speech over the radio and marks a distinct step toward Government control of this great medium of communication: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, ask that Congress thoroughly review the legislation governing the regulation of radio, and specifically limit the power of the Commission to regulate the physical aspects of communication by radio; and that specific provisions be written into the law to the end that no Government agency shall be clothed with any power whatsoever over the program content of this greatest of all systems of mass communication.

Mrs. J. WARREN BURGESS,
Chairman, Fine Arts Department.

RADIO TRANSCRIPTIONS

Whereas James Caesar Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians, since last August 1 has banned the recording of music for both home and radio; and

Whereas in accordance with our national wartime labor policy the manufacturers of radio transcriptions referred their dispute with Mr. Petrillo to the United States Conciliation Service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, hereby urges the Director of the United States Conciliation Service to certify this dispute to the National War Labor Board for appropriate disposition if conciliation fails to bring settlement within a reasonable time; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the National War Labor Board to give prompt consideration to this prolonged strike, if and when it is certified to the Board.

Mrs. J. WARREN BURGESS,
Chairman, Fine Arts Department.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Whereas natural resources are indispensable during times of war and peace; and

Whereas emphasis upon judicious use and fullest development of renewable and nonrenewable natural resources will assume greater importance in new and widened horizons in the maintenance of a just and durable peace; and

Whereas there is danger of many nonrenewable natural resources being depleted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, reaffirms its convictions that a comprehensive program for the conservation of our natural resources is necessary through the study of the evaluation of the status of our natural resources of soil, water, forests, wildlife, minerals, metals, gases, fuels, helium, and other renewable and nonrenewable basic raw materials; through work for remedial action that will keep our renewable resources in continuous production, and promotion of measures to safeguard the prolonging of the life of nonrenewable natural resources; and through continued efforts to promote conservation education of adults and school children.

Mrs. T. M. FRANCIS,
Chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY FERRYING SQUADRON

Whereas the Women's Army Corps, the Reserves in the United States Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, are official in the United States service; and

Whereas women are serving in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron, which at the present time has no official status; and

Whereas their contribution to the war effort is of inestimable value: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 2, 1943, requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which

would establish the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron on the same status as the other organized women's armed forces.

Mrs. GUSTAV KETTERER,
Chairman, War Service Department.

Liberalization of Old-Age Pension System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement suggesting that the existing old-age pension system should be liberalized.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of my constituents, an Oklahoma pioneer, who over 40 years ago filed on a homestead and lived in a dugout, has asked me for an explanation of the Townsend bill—H. R. 1649—which proposes to liberalize the provisions of the old-age pension system.

My answer was as follows:

This bill lowers the age limit to 60 years and makes the system wholly Federal so that citizens of the poorer States shall receive the same assistance as do those who reside in the more wealthy States.

The bill provides that the pensions shall be paid out of a fund created by a 3-percent gross income tax.

Many people are urging that the Congress adopt a 10-percent sales tax as a war revenue measure and such proposal is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

The bill follows the general principles of the Federal Retirement Law so that citizens who reach the age of 60 years may retire with equal assured benefits.

Retirement benefits are now provided for Federal employees and members of the armed forces. In the States teachers and other groups are provided with retirement benefits.

It is my contention that no group of citizens are more deserving and more entitled to annuities than are the pioneers who entered the wilderness, took up claims and homesteads, pioneered the frontiers and developed America.

The present system of old-age assistance wherein citizens of the less wealthy States receive a mere pittance while the citizens of the wealthy States receive the full amount authorized cannot be defended.

This bill should be of the greatest interest and benefit to the poorer sections of American agriculture. I can think of nothing that would make things easier for the ordinary small farmer, on land that is not too productive, than to know that the old folks could get a cash income every month.

What better cash crop could any farmer have than to know that the old folks now on the farm—and the farmer himself, or his wife, anytime they reach the age of 60 years—could get a fixed annuity check each month as the result of the passage of the Townsend bill?

As stated, the Townsend plan bill, is now in the House of Representatives. Being a revenue-raising measure it must be passed by the House first. This is a constitutional requirement.

This bill, unquestionably, has great merit. If the general retirement principle is sound, then this bill is sound. The bill, in addition to taking care of those over 60 years of age also proposes to care for the blind, the chronically ill and those physically handicapped.

If this bill can be enacted into law our senior citizens will be cared for and this long time embarrassing problem will have been settled.

Eight Grossmans in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., is indeed proud of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Grossman, who reside on Stanton Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., in view of the fact that last Friday Michael Grossman became the eighth son to enter the services of his country. Only two married sons and a daughter of this splendid family remain at home. Mr. and Mrs. Grossman were honored by the American Legion and by the selective service board of the city of Pittsburgh, and they acknowledged these honors with pride and said they were happy that their boys could serve this great country of ours to help preserve the ideals that make it possible for Catholics, Protestants, and Jews to live together in a spirit of brotherhood and fellowship. I include in my remarks an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., issue of October 20, 1943.

EIGHTH GROSSMAN GOING TO ARMY—YOUNGEST SON OF STANTON AVENUE FAMILY TO LEAVE

The youngest Grossman son—the eighth—will leave his Stanton Avenue home Friday for the Army.

The departure of Michael Grossman brought a service-flag problem to Mrs. Samuel Grossman, who has had to replenish the stars in her window frequently for 2 years. This time, the complication was solved by an American Legion Post which presented the mother with an eight-starred flag.

The family of 10 sons and 1 daughter has been depleted of its manpower so badly that only 2 married sons are left. Mr. and Mrs. Grossman recently received citations from Pittsburgh officials when their sixth and seventh sons reported for service.

Michael, a welder at Dravo Corporation for 16 months, enlisted shortly after his brother Carl reported home for a furlough. The soldier Grossmans include: Lieutenant Hyman, Sergeant Carl, Sergeant Leonard, Sergeant Saul, Sergeant Allan, and Private Israel, while Moses is a chief petty officer in the Navy.

Meanwhile, the mother of the eight servicemen, who is called Shorty by all her sons, began the job of stitching over two blue stars with white thread to represent the soldiers overseas.

Counting the Ballots Before They Are Voted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of yesterday. I should like to read one paragraph from it:

The vote Tuesday was 800,000 under the 1940 Presidential election totals in New Jersey; 3,000,000 under 1940 in New York; 460,000 under 1940 in Kentucky, and 250,000 under 1940 in Philadelphia.

The editorial is very interesting and instructive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTING THE BALLOTS BEFORE THEY ARE VOTED

It has been so long since the G. O. P. national leadership has had much to cheer about that we don't begrudge Chairman Spangler, Wendell Willkie, and others the joy they find in last Tuesday's returns.

That's only human for them. Just as it's only human for new dealers to suggest that they do not hoist their hopes too high. Even four swallows, in four States, do not make the summer of 1944.

Since most of us do enjoy post mortems, let's have a look at Tuesday's returns with respect to the national picture.

We Philadelphians know the many factors which contributed to the defeat of Mr. Bullitt, factors having nothing to do with the Federal administration. Similar factors were operating in New York, New Jersey, and in Kentucky, where the G. O. P. seems to have squeezed through to a narrow triumph.

Just for the fun of it, though, let's forget all that. Let's not only admit that this election showed, as we said on Thursday, the usual anti-administration trend in wartime off-year elections, the normal public restiveness with rationing, high taxes, restrictions of other kinds; let's go further.

Yet even if we make the incorrect assumption that all this voting was on national issues alone—

The G. O. P. is still counting an awful lot of unhatched chickens.

First, the vote Tuesday was 800,000 under the 1940 Presidential election totals in New Jersey, 3,000,000 under 1940 in New York, 460,000 under 1940 in Kentucky, and 250,000 under 1940 in Philadelphia.

President Roosevelt won handsomely in all four—when he was the candidate.

But F. D. R. can't lease-lend his personal popularity, as history shows.

Roosevelt himself runs—well, ask any Republican politician if that doesn't make the big difference.

Gallup polls of the last few months show the President's popularity remaining high indeed. In its August poll, between Roosevelt and Willkie, the President had 59 percent of the vote, Willkie 41 percent. The Fortune poll last week, with Roosevelt against the field, the President had 51.5 percent of the vote, with his nearest G. O. P. contender, Dewey, assured of only 12 percent; Willkie less than 10.

In short, the four and a half million who voted in Jersey, New York, Kentucky, and Philadelphia in the last Presidential election and who seldom vote in off years, will probably make the final decision in 1944—as they did last time.

No one can say that these figures prove Roosevelt a winner in 1944. He may not even run. But for Willkie to try to make them prove a G. O. P. victory is letting hope run away with sense.

Between now and then, so much can happen. The circumstances of autumn 1944, both at home and abroad, may be sharply different from those of autumn 1943.

The American people are not very likely to reject the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt in the midst of a war, unless the G. O. P. can offer a candidate who has much more "on the ball" than any of its contenders now in sight.

The Presidency of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been shown in granting the Filipinos their independence to cope with the move made by Japan. On the other hand, we find our administration favoring the retention of Quezon as President, which is contrary to the Constitution, and the following editorial taken from the Philippines Mail, Salinas, Calif., written by Delfin F. Cruz, editor and publisher, is worthy of note:

AMERICA, OUR MOTHER COUNTRY, DO NOT TAKE AWAY OUR CONSTITUTION

Who is going to be the President of the Philippines in Washington on November 15, 1943—Manuel L. Quezon or Sergio Osmeña?

By the clear provisions of the Philippine Constitution under which they are serving the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, now Vice President, will be the President on that date. He succeeds the Honorable Manuel L. Quezon, who on that date shall have served out the constitutional time-limit of 8 consecutive years.

Why the question at all? To put it bluntly, the answer is that certain interested Filipino officials want to see Mr. Quezon to go on indefinitely as President and incidentally themselves also.

What is against Mr. Osmeña as President? Nothing whatever except that Filipino Fascists and reactionaries don't like him. What riles the Filipinos in America is that this small but powerful group consists mostly of recently naturalized Filipinos of Spanish descent, rich men whose background, ideals, and practices are far from being democratic.

Mr. Osmeña is a man of good will, great humility, fine dignity, high honor, good mind, immense political experience, unquestioned patriotism, and beloved by Filipinos everywhere. In the last national election the Philippine electorate gave him more votes as Vice President than Mr. Quezon as President. For a long time he was the No. 1 Filipino official in the Government. He is sincerely and soberly pro-American.

How will Mr. Osmeña be deprived of his constitutional right to be the President? By ruling that the constitution is not in operation in the United States, and, therefore, the provisions for the Presidential succession will not be followed.

Lawyers have been working to find a way to brush aside the constitution, and they have finally concluded that the question should be submitted to President Roosevelt for decision if he cares to take cognizance of it. The Attorney General will render an opinion to guide the President.

If the decision is in favor of the constitution, as every disinterested lawyer and layman expects, the next move will be to ask Congress to amend the organic law (the act of Congress of March 24, 1934) which gave birth to the constitution so the constitution itself could be changed.

That move failing, as the Philippine director of information has intimated, Mr. Quezon by his own decree, which thus will be superior to the constitution itself, might declare what would be the political equivalent of a sit-down strike and stay on the job as long as he wants to. That is fascism de luxe.

The whole thing from the beginning to end is most extraordinary, not to say that it smacks of fascistic and nazi-istic procedures. The President of the United States, in deciding whether the constitution is dead or not, would be abrogating to himself powers that are more judicial than executive, to say the least.

We wish to make it clear that we are not concerned with the persons involved, either Mr. Quezon or Mr. Osmeña, but we are profoundly concerned that the constitution is kept intact, to "preserve and defend" it, as the presidential oath reads. Yes, we are terribly concerned that if our precious constitution here is pronounced dead, the only constitution that the Filipino people will hear about will be that of the Jap-Philippine republic in Manila, and that would be like driving them against their best impulses to embrace a false Bible and falsified fidelity.

Messrs. Quezon and Osmeña took the oath of office at Corregidor on December 30, 1941, for the second term, which expires as to Mr. Quezon on November 15 next. After functioning under that constitution, the idea is now advanced that that charter is not alive. What a travesty on common sense! Where is the logic and consistency in that? Why didn't somebody think of it before? Why the long wait until the end of Mr. Quezon's term approaches to doubt the validity of the constitution?

The mere submission of the question to President Roosevelt now implies that the proponents, headed by Mr. Quezon himself, are doubting the very instrument from which their power has emanated, and it shows that the doubt is one of those emperical doubts that are usually raised for some ulterior purpose.

The two Filipino leaders were elected in a regular election in November 1941. The Filipino voters knew what terms of office they were being elected to serve. To theorize otherwise would be to nullify the expressed and informed will of the electorate. There is no occasion therefore to determine what the will of the Filipino electorate is at this time, for already they have registered it formally in the last election.

The Philippine Government, which is the juridical agency of the American Government in the Philippines, has not in law been destroyed by the temporary occupation of the country by the enemy. The other way of expressing the idea is that the American sovereignty in the Philippines remains intact as it is indivisible. Still another way of putting it is that the American ownership of the islands remains unaffected, although the possession is temporary. After the Japanese have been driven out of the islands any flitting cloud on the title will be completely canceled. This all means that the Philippine Government and its constitution are still marching on. If the Japanese have not destroyed them, why in the name of heaven should we do the destroying ourselves?

There is another point that must be discussed here because it presents the most fascistic and antidemocratic suggestion. It is said that by virtue of an act of the national assembly of December 14, 1941, President Quezon was given broad powers to carry out effectively the national will and policy to wage war. But the assembly could not have given him the power of perpetuating himself in office because it did not have that power, for it amounts to granting him the power to amend the constitution.

Finally, if the constitution is dead, by what color of authority is the Philippine Government in Washington existing? This is a question which the average American in the street would like to know. And the Filipinos here and at home would be anxious to be advised on it. The doubt that assails their mind would weaken their morale, diminish their respect for the government and plunge them into all sorts of suspicion.

Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino citizen, in a newspaper article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14, said: "The constitution was drafted by the Filipino constitutional convention in Manila in 1935, adopted by the Filipino people in a special referendum and approved by the President of the United States. It is the cornerstone of the government and should be kept solidly and firmly in place." We agree with him thoroughly.

It is most important that unity among the Filipinos is preserved. Those who are trying to consign the constitution to the legal cemetery when it is very much alive are solely responsible for whatever disunity may arise from the present case. That's crystal clear and no misplacing of responsibility is possible.

We Filipinos of the rank and file—and there are 125,000 Filipinos here in America—appeal to the American Government to help us keep our counsel and unity. We appeal for the preservation of our constitution. The American flag has our love and loyalty. We are ready to die for it and our own. To the noble America that we have known for 44 years we say in unison: "America, our mother country, do not take away our precious constitution."

Draft of Pre-Pearl Harbor Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter written by Mr. G. C. McCall to Col. Mills F. Mead, Director of the Virginia Selective Service. Mr. McCall is president of the First National Bank of Norton, Va., and has been a member of the Selective Service Board of Wise County since the board was set up. He is able, conscientious, and has given of his time and talent unsparingly in the discharge of his duties as a member of the board. I ask the membership of the House to

give serious consideration to the views expressed by Mr. McCall. I call particular attention to Mr. McCall's statement with reference to the physical examination of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Many of these fathers are up in their thirties, have established businesses or hold responsible positions, and, moreover, are not fit physically for military service. Then why should not these fathers be thoroughly examined before their call in order to determine their military fitness? If this is not done many of these fathers, realizing that they are subject to call, will have to arrange their affairs to respond to the call. This, in many cases, will mean either sacrificing their businesses or giving up good jobs, only to find later that they have been turned down for some physical defect that they did not know about. We should not permit this to happen.

The letter referred to follows:

NORTON, VA., *November 3, 1943.*

Col. MILLS F. NEAL,
Director, Virginia Selective Service System, Richmond, Va.

DEAR COLONEL NEAL: Now that it is considered necessary to draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers some consideration should be given to the fact that most of these men, if not all, are holding reasonably responsible or necessary positions in addition to those who own or operate their own businesses. A great many of these men will not be physically fit, and the present method of screen testing does not disclose this fact, making it necessary for them to be sent to an induction station. This also means that a great many of these unfit will make arrangements to leave their jobs or dispose of their business both at a great sacrifice, and then find that they have to start all over again, because they had no previous knowledge of their physical defects.

It seems that some method should be devised whereby examining boards could be set up, so that these men could be examined before their call and determine their physical fitness, in order that it may not be necessary for them to make a drastic adjustment or rearrangement of their affairs and later find that they will not be inducted.

I realize that it will be hard to get anything done, but it seems that some further arrangements should be made whereby married men with children could be assigned either for training or actual replacement of unmarried men physically fit for service thereby making those married men available for service. A great many jobs that are filled by unmarried men or men without children should not be of such technical nature but could be easily filled by a married man with children with reasonable intelligence and similar educational qualifications and do so in a short time.

Possibly your organization has given a great deal of thought to this and endeavored to get some correction made, and while I have not written you personally with regard to these particular matters, I have discussed it with various representatives of your organization who have appeared before our board.

I accepted appointment on the Selective Service board as a patriotic duty, and I have endeavored for the past 3 years to give this kind of service, but it is getting rather close when it is necessary for me to induct men with children breaking up family ties and relationships when a very slight change would answer the need for men at this time and satisfactorily postpone the induction of fathers until it is absolutely necessary and after all available single men have been used.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

G. C. MCCALL,
Chairman Wise County Local Board No. 1.

Election Results in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of November 8, containing extracts from a radio address by Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, in which he charged the Republican Party with being completely responsible for the election of Thomas A. Aurelio as Supreme Court Justice and denying that the New Deal had been defeated. He stated that if President Roosevelt were a candidate for reelection now he would carry New York City by 750,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN PARTY SCORED BY MAYOR—WAS COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ELECTION OF AURELIO, HE ASSERTS IN RADIO TALK—NEW DEAL DEFEAT DENIED—ROOSEVELT WOULD CARRY CITY BY 750,000 IN ELECTION NOW, LAGUARDIA HOLDS

Mayor LaGuardia, in his regular Sunday broadcast from station WNYC, charged yesterday that the Republican Party was completely responsible for the election of Thomas A. Aurelio as supreme court justice; denied that the election of Senator Joe R. Hanley, Republican nominee for Lieutenant Governor, was a defeat of the New Deal; and asserted that President Roosevelt, if a candidate for reelection tomorrow, would carry New York City by 750,000.

"Now, on my comment, my personal views—I don't think they're worth very much in politics—I don't know much about politics, and so you've got to bear this in mind when I try to analyze the vote of last Tuesday," the mayor said.

"We had one interesting contest. That was the election of a supreme court judge who was charged with having obtained his nomination with the aid of an underworld character. I think it has been established that Thomas Aurelio was nominated because of the help he got from the racketeer Frank Costello. But he owes his election to the Republican Party. I can't make that any too strong.

"I believe, too, that if the bar association had been more vigorous and less inclined to divide along party lines Mr. Aurelio would have been defeated. There is one thing that I want to say and one thing which I shall continue to say to the entire country: The electorate of your city is intelligent and a greater number of voters voted against Mr. Aurelio than voted for him. He was elected because of the insistence of the Republican Party in putting up a third candidate."

SOME BAR LEADERS PRAISED

Mayor LaGuardia declared that the Republicans had only 14 percent of the vote in the Bronx and 24 percent of the vote in Manhattan and could not elect anybody and that the vote for George Frankenthaler, candidate of the Republican-sponsored Judiciary Party, merely divided the anti-Aurelio vote and prevented the election of Matthew M. Levy, American Labor Party candidate. In his criticism of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, he exempted Allen Wardwell, president, and John G. Jackson, chairman of its executive committee, and said that they and Dean Enbree, president of the New York County Lawyers Association, gave every possible help to the candidacy of Mr. Levy.

Mayor LaGuardia charged that Secretary of State Thomas J. Curran, New York County Republican chairman, had made an unfair statement when he said that Mr. Levy polled "a meager 38,456 votes on the Integrity and Justice Party line," while Mr. Frankenthaler polled 140,000 on the Judiciary Party line. This made it appear, the mayor said, that Levy received only 38,456 votes, whereas his total on all lines was 217,577. The mayor added that if Mr. Frankenthaler also had received the 92,000 votes cast for Aurelio on the Republican line Aurelio still would have been elected.

RECALLS FARLEY DEFEATS

Saying that he could talk only for New York City, the mayor declared that the election result was not a defeat of the New Deal.

"The forces that were supposed to be for the New Deal were generalled by Mr. James Farley, and who said that James Farley is for the New Deal?" the mayor went on. "In fact, when did James Farley ever win an election in New York City?

"In 1933 he commanded the campaign of the candidate against me. We licked him. In 1940 he was not for the President. In 1941 he again assumed command of the mayoralty campaign and was defeated. In 1942 he again assumed command for the Governorship and was defeated. In 1943 you know the results.

"I can only speak for New York City, and I say that, if Mr. Roosevelt were to run tomorrow in New York, he would carry the city by over 750,000 votes. And that's the situation so far as the vote in New York has any significance to the national question.

"True, Mr. Hanley got a very good vote. Mr. Dewey has given an excellent administration and other factors entered into it, but the fact remains that, insofar as New York City's vote is concerned, it has no bearing whatsoever with either President Roosevelt's following or support of the New Deal."

M. L. Benedum, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, deserving tribute was recently paid to Mr. M. L. Benedum, a West Virginian by birth but who attained Nation-wide acclaim and success as a native son of Pittsburgh, Pa. We who know Mike Benedum are indeed proud of him. He is one of Pittsburgh's most famous citizens and an outstanding American. He has courage, faith, and vision, and as an explorer in the oil fields of the United States, Mexico, and South America he earned international fame and fortune.

Mr. Benedum is also a noted philanthropist and a humanitarian. He contributes freely to all charities, regardless of race, color, or creed. Above all, he is a great believer in the church, the House of God. Mr. M. L. Benedum and his lovely wife, a sweet, gentle, and godly woman who has been his companion in life for

almost 50 years, are stanch Methodists and are strong supporters of the great Methodist Center, of Pittsburgh, Pa. Recently a life portrait of Mr. M. L. Benedum was presented to the Methodist Center by his charming wife. I am happy to include in my remarks the beautiful and inspiring remarks of Walter S. Hallanan, an outstanding American and president of the Plymouth Oil Co., made in behalf of Mrs. M. L. Benedum on presentation of the portrait:

A great poet has said that mankind was never so happily or divinely inspired as when it built a cathedral. Today we are impressed with the reality of that poetic expression as we meet here in this house of worship—this hallowed shrine of Methodism, which has been reconstructed as the center and administrative headquarters of the Pittsburgh district of the Methodist Church.

While it is true that a nation's greatness lies not in its material resources but in its faith, its intelligence, spiritual strength, and moral forces, yet those attributes find objective expression in cathedrals and temples and memorials of our land. These are the living symbols of a people's faith and spirituality. They are the signs by which future civilizations may appraise our degree of culture and faith. After all, religion must necessarily find expression in symbolism, because we can reproduce only that which we can see, and the essence of religion is a thing that cannot be comprehended by the physical senses of man.

This beautiful center, which is being put to such useful and practical purpose by Bishop Straughn, Dr. Corcoran, and their associates, is a symbol of the unity and militant progress of Methodism. More than that, it will stand here for generations to come as a monument to the vision and faith and capacity of the men who conceived the idea of centralizing the activities of the church on this sacred corner, which is affectionately and reverently known to all Methodism as "Old Brimstone," and to the men and women who translated that conception into the practical reality which we see here today.

We have assembled to pay a deserved honor to one whose contribution to the fulfillment of this dream cannot be measured alone by his large and generous material contribution to its accomplishment, nor alone by the inspiring leadership which he gave to the successful campaign that made it possible, but rather in the broader terms of those fine qualities of heart and mind which make of him a true Christian gentleman. It is eminently fitting that his portrait should adorn this edifice as visual evidence of his important contribution to the center and to methodism, and, in a larger sense, as a monument to his fulfillment of the noblest destiny of man—which is to dedicate his life to the service of others, to the brotherhood of man. It is fitting that his portrait should be here where his heart is. I know that if it were his to choose where his likeness should be placed and preserved, he would want it here in this hallowed center.

Those of us who are privileged to enjoy the interesting everyday association with Mr. M. L. Benedum—and it is a privilege which human tongue cannot express—have been made conscious almost daily for 2 years of his devotion to the Methodist Center. Throughout that period, those of us over in the Benedum-Trees Building have really heard more about "Old Brimstone" than we have heard about oil, and the names of Straughn, Corcoran, McQuiston, Morgan, Samson, and others of Pittsburgh methodism, have become as familiar to us as those of the people within our own family organization. Mr. Benedum approached the seemingly impossible problem of freeing this shrine of its debt and remodeling it as a center of the church in the same thorough and determined manner in which he has approached all of the problems of life. The impossible was nothing new to him because he had been doing that for many years. I well remember once when, with the courage of his convictions, he drilled a wildcat oil well in a spot in West Texas where the geologists and other technicians said that it was impossible to find oil. Those of less courage christened the well with a Spanish title which means the "saint of the impossible." We saw that well as a gusher which opened a prolific field, added millions of dollars to the national wealth, and enriched a great State and its leading university.

In all of the 20 years of my close personal association with Mr. Benedum, may I say here that I have had no higher privilege, no greater pleasure or satisfaction than that which is given me today in the opportunity to present his portrait to this institution of the Methodist Church. I am honored to make the presentation on behalf of and in the name of the sweet, gentle, and godly woman who has been his companion in life for almost 50 years and who, no less than he, has generously given both materially and in the higher sense to this center and to every worth-while cause—our beloved Mama Benedum. Today shall be an everlasting day in the life of this noble woman.

As a West Virginian, may I express the pride of every resident of the State which gave birth to Mr. Benedum. We of West Virginia are proud to claim him as one of our own and we can appreciate the pride with which you of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania challenge our claim and assert that he now belongs to the community and State where he has resided for 35 years. As Methodists, we of both States join in expressing satisfaction that he is affiliated with our church. And yet, I think that all of us—West Virginians, Pennsylvanians, and Methodists—are conscious of the fact that he has long since gone beyond both geographical and denominational boundaries and that in truth he belongs to our common country and to Christianity.

The oil industry, with which Mr. Benedum has been identified for more than half a century, knows him as its No. 1 pioneer, but those of us who daily sit across the desk from him and share in his vision and courage, know him better as the No. 1 Christian gentleman. His generous philanthropy, which he bestows with a tolerance that knows no race, color, or creed, but which is measured only in terms of human need, is but an expression and not the real essence of a virtue that is a rich and wholesome influence upon every life that it touches. Mr. Benedum has achieved distinction in many fields, but to him distinction has always been a consequence and never an object.

It has been truly said that all great men are not good but that all good men are great. Mr. Benedum is both a great and a good man who measures up in every respect to the three infallible signs of greatness—generosity in design, humanity in execution, and humility in success. It is no mere poetic tribute or gesture, but a statement of literal fact, that Mr. Benedum works as if he were to live forever, and lives as if he were to die tomorrow.

Bishop Straughn, it is now my genuine pleasure and high privilege on behalf of Mrs. Benedum to present to the Methodist Center the portrait of Mr. Benedum, here to reflect in the years to come his eternal devotion to the high principles of Christianity. As I do so, I should like to paraphrase the poet, Eugene Field, in expressing what I know is in the heart of every person in this audience today:

"Here's to you, Mr. Benedum!
May you live a thousand years,
Just to keep things lively in this vale of human tears.
May I live a thousand too;
No—a thousand less a day,
For I shouldn't want to be on earth
To hear that you had passed away."

League of Nations Accepted in Form Rejected by Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "League of Nations Accepted in Form Rejected by Wilson," by Arthur Sears Henning, which was published in the Washington Times-Herald of November 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF NATIONS ACCEPTED IN FORM REJECTED BY WILSON

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

Under the terms of the Connally resolution adopted by the Senate last week, with the declaration of the Moscow Conference therein, the United States, according to the view widely held in official Washington, is committed to go into a League of Nations to enforce peace with essentially the same reservations voted by the Senate to Woodrow Wilson's League Covenant in 1919.

Mr. Wilson rejected the reservations and the League treaty failed of ratification as a result of the opposition of 42 Democrats and 13 Republicans.

TOOK 24 YEARS

The Nation, it is pointed out, stands today exactly where it stood 24 years ago. It is ready to participate in an international organization to preserve peace, which does not require surrender of its sovereignty or freedom of action in dealing with specific questions.

The Roosevelt administration yielded to the Nation's will in the Declaration of Moscow and accepted the reservation of sovereignty Mr. Wilson would not tolerate. It took 24 years, say the Republicans, for the Democrats to reach this point.

WILLKIE'S IDEA SCRAPPED

Numerous other repercussions of the adoption of the peace program are engaging the attention of the politically minded. The overwhelming vote by which the Connally resolution was adopted—55 Democrats and 35 Republicans for it; 2 Democrats, 3 Republicans, one Progressive against it—moves a good many politicians to the opinion that the foreign affairs issue is likely to be eliminated almost entirely from the Presidential election next year.

It is the subject of common remark that the Connally resolution, as adopted, closely resembles the Republican declaration at Mackinac Island, which incorporated the reservations of sovereignty and constitutional process in the resolution originally introduced in the Senate by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan, one of the

nationalist leaders, and Senator WALLACE WHITE (Republican), of Maine.

Conspicuously rejected by the Senate were the superstate and international police force espoused by Wendell Willkie and other extreme internationalists.

By many politicians the action of the Senate is regarded as a serious blow to Mr. Willkie's Presidential ambitions. Willkie, it is suggested, now finds a good deal of the wind taken out of his sails by the adoption of a program of international cooperation to preserve peace.

OUT OF STEP

To the extent that he persists in advocating a superstate and international police force, he will find himself out of step with the country and therefore out of favor as a Presidential aspirant.

The original Vandenberg-White resolution, introduced last June, proposed "that this Congress favors: (1) The prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation of the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression, and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests."

The Republican resolution adopted at Mackinac Island declared for "prosecution of the war by a united nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies" and for "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world," with "due regard for all American interests and responsibilities" and in accord with constitutional process.

WHAT RESOLUTION PROVIDES

Adopting the principles of the Vandenberg-White resolution and the Mackinac Island declaration, Senator TOM CONNALLY [Democrat, of Texas], chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the resolution that bears his name.

It provided: "That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved; that the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace; that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Senator CONNALLY cabled the text of the resolution to Secretary of State Cordell Hull in Moscow with the information that it represented the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate and would be adopted by far more than the two-thirds required for ratification of a treaty of international cooperation.

Secretary Hull in the negotiation of the Four-Power declaration gave heed to the reservation of sovereignty running through the Vandenberg-White resolution, the Republican Mackinac Island declaration and the Connally resolution.

As finally promulgated the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China declared that they will fight to the unconditional surrender of their enemies and that they "recognize the necessity of establishing, at the earliest practicable date, a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership of all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Senate promptly added to the Connally resolution the Moscow Declaration for a league of nations with the sovereignty reservation and also added the proviso that any treaty establishing such league would require the approval of two-thirds of the Senate.

KEEP COMPLETE SOVEREIGNTY

Under the terms of the Connally resolution with the Moscow Declaration incorporated, the United States, it is pointed out, would retain complete sovereignty and freedom of action in any situation involving joint action of the League members to preserve peace.

Such, it is contended, was the purpose of the Lodge reservations to American ratification of the League of Nations Covenant in 1919.

The Mikado Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of much contemporary discussion regarding the problem of Japanese government after her inevitable defeat by the Allies, and in further view of much lack of knowledge in this country regarding the Japanese mind and Japanese "isms," it seems important that facts throwing light upon this almost insurmountable situation could well be digested by us in America who will play the most important role in the readjustment.

Recently there has been offered a suggestion that we might well use the present Emperor of Japan as a puppet ruler as an aid to the Allied cause. There are those who feel that this would be one of the grave mistakes arising out of the war. The Chinese appear to have that opinion, and I quote an article from the Chinese News Service which covers the matter in great detail and not without thought:

THE MIKADO MUST GO

(By Dr. B. A. Liu, research associate of Chinese News Service)

Fifteen years ago this month, on November 10, 1928, a ceremony took place in the ancient Japanese city of Kyoto which made one Hirohito a divine emperor destined to be the "ruler of all nations." Yoshihito, the previous Mikado, had died of a mental disease which had rendered him unfit for state affairs for many years. Young Hirohito was making a grand tour of Europe in 1921 when he was recalled to assume the responsibilities of government as regent at the age of 20. The death of the old Mikado in 1926 left the young man in actual occupation of the throne, but the ceremony of enthronement was not performed till 2 years later.

Hirohito's inheritance included the "three sacred treasures" consisting of a sword, a mirror, and a stone necklace, said to have been handed down from the first legendary emperor of Japan. The possession of these treasures transformed the young Mikado, in the eyes of his 70,000,000 subjects, into a divine personage, a lineal descendant and living representative of the sun goddess, Amaterasu-Omikami.

Three years later, in September 1931, this half-god Mikado's troops marched into China's northeastern Provinces (Liaoning, Kirin, Heilungkiang, and Jehol) and started a train of fateful events which led from Manchuria to Ethiopia, from Munich to Warsaw, and finally completed a world circuit at Pearl Harbor, Manila, Hong Kong, and Singapore. When the arch-criminals of World War No. 2 are rounded up and made to answer for their crimes against humanity, Hirohito's name no doubt will head the list.

The millions of men, women, and children in devastated China, tortured Philippines, and plundered East Indies will not be satisfied merely with the punishment of a few of the Mikado's underlings to expatiate the crimes committed by them at the explicit order and with the full knowledge of the Mikado. They will demand the death of the Mikado who has caused the death of so many of their fathers, mothers, wives, and children. They will clamor for the confiscation of the Mikado's vast properties in partial compensation for the homes that he has burned, villages that he has sacked, and cities that he has destroyed. But above all, they will insist on the removal of the absurdly outmoded system of Mikadoism which has been at the bottom of the whole Japanese scheme of world conquest by armed aggression.

For the assurance of world peace and the safety of mankind after these terrible years of suffering and sacrifice, one of the first conditions is already clear:

The Mikado must go!

THE MIKADO IN MYTH AND FICTION

The Japanese propaganda has for years skillfully built up the idea of a Mikado who is different from any other ruler in the world in the following ways:

1. He is a divine person, descended from a goddess, and therefore not subject to any human laws.

2. He is so aloof from mundane affairs that he does not take direct part even in the business of governing his own country.

3. He acts only on the advice of his ministers and is therefore not responsible for anything done in his name.

And, largely for home consumption, the Japanese propagandists have included the following points in their Mikado fiction:

4. He occupies a throne which is established forever, and continues a line of rulers "unbroken for ages eternal."

5. He is destined to be the ruler of all nations, when all peoples from the "eight corners" of the world will be brought under "one roof."

6. Any war fought in his name is a holy war, and anyone who is killed while fighting his war becomes immortalized as a god in the Shinto pantheon.

In spite of the tangled web of myth and fiction that has been woven around the Mikado, it is possible for the careful student to sift out the pertinent facts that are necessary to throw light on the question of how to deal with the Mikado after the war.

THE LEGEND OF DIVINE DESCENT

According to the Kojiki and the Nihongi, two legendary histories of Japan written in the eighth century A. D., the Japanese islands were created by the union of two deities, Izanagi (the male-who-invites) and his younger sister Izanami (the female-who-invites). Between the two they not only gave birth to the islands but produced numerous gods and goddesses who inhabited them.

Amaterasu Omikami, the sun goddess, after a series of quarrels with her brother, decided to populate the "land of reed plains" with her own brood. So she sent her grand-

son with the command: "This reed-plain land of 15,000 autumns of fair rice eaters is the country over which my descendants shall be lords. Do thou, my august grandchild, proceed thither and rule over it. Go, and may prosperity attend thy dynasty, and it shall, like heaven and earth, endure forever."

From this divine brood came Jimmu Tenno (the divine-warrior heavenly emperor) who allegedly ascended the throne on February 11, 660 B. C. The dynasty thus founded is supposed to have continued for 26 centuries, through a line of 124 emperors and empresses, down to Hirohito, the present incumbent.

An official teachers' manual accompanying a history textbook for primary schools thus comments on the uniqueness of the Japanese national structure: "Great Japan is the land of the gods. Here the deity of the sun has handed on her eternal rule. This is true only of our country and there is nothing like it in any other land."

While other nations in times past have made much over the divine right of their rulers, and Chinese emperors used to speak of holding the decree of heaven, no nation in modern times has deliberately maintained the fiction of divine descent in the person of its ruler. The myths and legends of this type may make interesting fairy tales to tell of a winter's evening, but when they are taught as serious history in a nation's schoolrooms, they constitute a dangerous seed of international wars.

THE FICTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

In 1889 the emperor Meiji gave his people a constitution. According to Japan's own interpreters this constitution is "not a contract between the ruler and the ruled"; it is devised "without the assent or consent of the governed."

Nevertheless Japanese apologists have sometimes claimed that their country is a constitutional monarchy, and their Mikado occupies the same position as the heads of other constitutional monarchies. But the orthodox view, and the only one accepted in Japan today, insists that the Emperor remains above the constitution, that his will is the will of the state, and that "the Emperor is the state."

The constitution affirms that the Emperor is sacred and inviolable. This is taken to mean that "he is not to be held responsible for overstepping the limitations of law in the exercise of his sovereignty * * * and he is not subject to any law."

Both in theory and in practice, Japan remains today a theocratic monarchy comparable to the absolutism of the old czarist regime in Russia and utterly contrary to the principles of democratic government. When such an autocratic nation is mobilized for war, as is the case with Japan today, it makes for a solidarity difficult to destroy. However, a people accustomed to follow blindly the orders of a half-god monarch are not prepared to take part freely in the affairs of a peaceful world society.

THE SHACKLES OF SHINTOISM

The development of modern Shintoism in Japan is an outstanding example of the exploitation of a people's religion to further the interests of governmental policy. Japanese propagandists have sometimes tried to draw a distinction between Shinto as a people's religion and Shinto as a state institution, but the two are so closely related and interwoven that it is useless to try to separate them. The fact remains that under state sponsorship and political coercion Shinto has indeed become the national religion of Japan.

Originally a form of primitive animism long submerged under the combined influence of Confucianism and Buddhism, Shinto has experienced a remarkable revival since the beginning of the Meiji era. An imperial edict of 1868, the first year of Meiji, contains the following passage which has formed the charter of modern Shintoism as a state religion:

"The worship of the gods and regard for ceremonies are the great properties of the Empire and the fundamental principles of national policy and education. * * * On this occasion of the restoration, Tokyo has been made the new capital and the Emperor shall reign in person. First of all, rituals shall be initiated and the administration of law and order shall be established. Thus the way of the unity of religion and government shall be revived."

Today the Japanese Government requires all the Mikado's subjects, from the Prime Minister down to the smallest school child, to worship at the national and local jinja, or shrines. These shrines house the spirits of the imperial ancestors, national heroes, and warriors who have died for their country, as well as the numerous gods of thunder, lightning, rain, and fertility, and even the deified fox spirit and the spirits of the trees and mountains.

The culmination of this state-sponsored pantheistic religion is the worship of the Mikado, during his lifetime as well as after his death. School children are required to bow to a picture of the Mikado each day at school, and everyone passing the Mikado's palace must lower his head in reverence and worship. In time of war, since the Mikado is commander in chief of all the armed forces, every soldier who dies in the war is deified at the national shrine, and thus joins the legion of gods in the Shinto pantheon.

Thus the people of Japan will never be rid of the shackles of Shintoism, nor able to enjoy real freedom of religion, until the whole Mikado system is abolished, and all forms of political coercion removed from the religious worship of the people. Incidentally, it would make it harder for the Japanese militarists to start another war if the soldiers cannot expect to become gods by the act of dying in battle.

THE MIKADO A WAR CRIMINAL

The evils of the Mikado system cannot be undone merely by removing Hirohito and putting another on the throne. The system itself must be abolished, in order that the Japanese people may have a chance to order their own lives and manage their own country's affairs. However, the first step toward this house cleaning in the Japanese Government will be the bringing to trial of Hirohito for his part in the crimes committed by his hirelings in this war.

It is not generally known that Hirohito was first instructed in statecraft and military science by none other than Admiral Togo, hero of the Russo-Japanese War. From the start of his reign he has always received regular reports from his ministers, and kept up with the news in the daily newspapers published in his own capital.

Hirohito has not only known of the plans of his military underlings, but has undoubtedly given explicit approval to their actions, from the invasion of Manchuria to the treacherous attack at Pearl Harbor and ever since. The master blueprint of Japan's own program of world conquest was drawn up by the warlords and submitted by Baron Tanaka for Hirohito's approval in 1927, 4 years before the first fateful step was taken in Manchuria.

All through the period of the active campaign in 1931 and the years following, the Mikado was kept informed of the progress by his military chiefs, who have always had direct access to him. After the rape of Nanking in 1937, a high Japanese official was received in private audience by Hirohito, as reported by Hallett Abend. For 2 hours this official whispered into the Mikado's ears all the horrible details of the crimes committed by the Mikado's troops in that city. "I kept back nothing," as he related to Mr. Abend afterwards, "and he asked many searching questions."

When the news of the sinking of the *Panay* reached this country, President Roosevelt instructed Mr. Hull to tell the Japanese Ambassador that he was shocked by the news, and he requested "that the Emperor be so advised." Reports from Tokyo indicated later that the Mikado "was informed directly and in detail" of the situation, and that he had assumed personal charge of the investigation. Yet aside from the recall of an air commander for his purported mistake in the *Panay* affair, there is no record that Hirohito was in any way displeased at the wanton acts of his warlords. On the contrary, at the opening of the parliament session a few days later, Hirohito delivered an address praising the military for "winning every battle and enhancing their military prestige both at home and abroad."

Three months before the attack at Pearl Harbor, Hirohito received his privy council, heard lengthy reports from the military, and suddenly assumed direct command of the Army in setting up a new defense headquarters for the Japanese homeland. Since there was at that time no threat from any source of an invasion of Japan by hostile forces, the inference is all too clear that the whole Japanese strategy in the Pacific warfare had been settled and personally approved by Hirohito during those conferences in September 1941.

When American airmen under General Doolittle's command raided Tokyo in April 1942, they carefully avoided bombing the Mikado's palace, confining themselves to the military objectives. Unfortunately, some of these airmen later fell into the hands of the Mikado's troops. They were then executed in the name of the same Mikado whose life they had so painstakingly protected. It might be advisable for the Allied command to bear in mind the possible disillusioning effect upon the Japanese people of a direct hit upon the palace of their divine Emperor and upon the shrines of their deified heroes.

THE MIKADO MUST PAY

When Hirohito is finally rounded up along with the other criminals of the war, he might presumably choose to commit harakiri rather than submit to public trial and punishment. In any event he must surely be removed from any position in which he can again become a menace to the peace of the world. It must not be forgotten also that Hirohito is probably one of the wealthiest men in the whole world, and that his vast landed property, and holdings in the numerous economic interests of his empire in Manchuria, Formosa, Indochina, Siam, and the Philippines could furnish considerable compensation for the immense losses he has inflicted on the peoples of the countries overrun by his hordes.

There is no falsehood more deliberately maintained by the Japanese war lords than that of the divinity and inviolability of the Mikado. The fairy tale of the sun goddess and the mumbo-jumbo of Shinto are both used to support the fiction of a divine emperor leading a nation in a holy war to bring the whole world under his rule. There is no better antidote to such poisonous indoctrination than the removal of the Mikado, the nucleus of the entire fabrication.

NO PEACE WITH THE MIKADO

Above all, it must be emphasized that there is no peace settlement or agreement possible with the Japanese people as long as the Mikado stands in the way. While the crafty war lords of Japan may propose that the

Mikado alone has the constitutional prerogative to make peace and conclude a treaty, the record is clear that the Mikado either would not or could not speak for his people in any treaty concluded with another nation.

When the Japanese delegation brought back in 1928 a treaty for the renunciation of war concluded in Paris by the representatives of 15 nations, its ratification by the Japanese Government was held up on account of the clause "in the names of their respective peoples" in the first article of the pact. The pact was eventually ratified but the effect of the ratification was in reality nullified by the declaration that that particular clause was inapplicable to Japan, inasmuch as the Japanese Emperor concludes treaties only in his own name and not in the name of his people.

This time, following the victory of the United Nations, it behooves the latter to make sure that they deal with some authority competent to represent the people of Japan. Whatever authority that may be, it will not, since it cannot, be the Mikado.

AMERICAN OPINION ON THE MIKADO

In an article, What Shall We Do With the Japanese Emperor? in a recent issue of Amerasia, Professor Kenneth Colegrove has summed up the main arguments for and against the abolition of the Mikado after the war. Among the arguments for the elimination of the Japanese Emperor, he cites: (1) The growing influence of Emperor worship in Japan; (2) the fanatical zeal of the Japanese soldier in serving his Emperor; (3) the dual system of government resulting from the unique position of the Emperor; (4) the aloofness of the Emperor from access by his ministers; (5) the menace to world security inherent in the Japanese national structure; (6) the necessity for destroying the imperial palace and some of the national shrines during the war; (7) the importance of ideological assault in total warfare; and (8) the elimination of military rule in Japan as a prerequisite to world peace.

On the other hand, he voices caution in this regard in view of the sensibilities of the Japanese people, the implications of the Atlantic Charter, and the danger of Fascist and terrorist regimes replacing the deposed Emperor. In any case, Professor Colegrove advocates the discussion of the Mikado problem during the war, and maintains that the character of the war waged against Japan should depend upon the answers to the questions raised in this connection.

W. C. Lamott, a long-time resident of Japan and former instructor in a Japanese college, presents his point of view in a recent article in Asia, which says in part: "Fundamentally the ideas of racial superiority, national destiny, and territorial expansion are all inextricably involved in the basic myth upon which the modern Japanese state is founded. The belief in a divine emperor, descended from the gods, one of an imperial line destined to rule Japan upon ages eternal, will always be a stumbling block to the establishment of a government in which we can place confidence. Attempts to achieve democracy within the framework of the divine-emperor ideology will meet with the same failure as did the attempt to liberalize the throne in the era following World War No. 1."

"What is to be the position of the emperor in post-war Japan?" asks the editorial writer in the Christian Century. The writer goes on to say, "When the war ends there will be no escaping this question. Upon the answer given to it may well depend whether the next generation must fight a third world war. * * * If the world is to have lasting peace, on no issue is action more imperative and on none will more wisdom be needed."

STATEMENT OF CHINESE POSITION

The attitude of many Chinese people toward this question of the Mikado after the war is well expressed by Dr. Sun Fo, president of the Legislative Yuan, in an article in the New Work Times of October 10, 1943. After pointing out that the present-day "divine" position of the Japanese ruler is a recent creation of the military caste who have mislearned their lesson from ancient Chinese history, Dr. Sun holds that not only must the military caste be swept away but the emperor and emperor-worship must be abolished so as to preclude any resurrection of a militarist and aggressive Japan.

"The Japanese Empire must be overthrown," says Dr. Sun, "and a Japanese republic set up in its place. It is only by this means that real democracy can be introduced and instituted in Japan and the peace of the world safeguarded. * * * The Japanese people, once they are rid of their present rulers who are bringing ruin and suffering and despair to countless homes in their own land, will never want to undergo another war if they can exercise their will freely. But they will not be able to go their way so long as the Emperor remains a divine institution and the cult of emperor worship a state religion."

"Of a democratic-republican Japan we need have no fear. On the contrary we shall be ready and willing to reestablish normal relations with a new Japan, revolutionized after her defeat, whose government will be democratically constituted and responsible to the Japanese people as a whole. Such a new Japan must and will take her rightful place among the world community of law-abiding and peaceful nations."

Railroad Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter under date of November 6, 1943, addressed to the Vice President, by C. E. Childe, who is a member of the Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation.

The letter concerns itself with the subject of freight rates, and particularly relates to the address made by Vice President WALLACE at Dallas, Tex., on October 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 6, 1943.

HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In your speech at Dallas, October 20, you said many things about freight rates which needed to be said for the public good.

"Equality of opportunity," as you truly pointed out, "is the foundation of economic and political democracy." The basic and most urgent transportation problem is—as is true of our other economic and political problems—to make the doctrine of equality of opportunity a practical rule of action.

The freight-rate structure of the country is a mass of discriminations. Until they are removed, a national transportation system cannot be developed in which each type of carrier performs the kind of service for which it is best fitted. Our vast national resources cannot come into full use so long as freight-rate discriminations retard production, manufacturing, and distribution in one area, as compared with another. Discriminatory freight rates mean smaller production and earnings, fewer jobs, less purchasing power and wealth, lower living standards, for the entire country. The fact must become more deeply and generally understood that the individual prosperity of every type of business, and of each one of us, depends in the long run on the general level of prosperity of the whole country—upon giving fair opportunity to the other fellow, as well as to ourselves. The only way to maintain full employment after the war will be to keep the factories going throughout the whole country—not just in some regions, with idleness in others. There cannot be full production under a system of discriminatory freight rates.

The basic trouble with freight rates goes back to the early days when the railroads adopted the practice of "charging what the traffic will bear." Their rates bore little or no relation to the cost of rendering the service, but each carrier attempted to charge whatever the management thought would bring it the best possible total revenue. Rate levels were fixed by competition. Rates were kept high on such traffic as the carrier felt would not be taken away from it by a competitor, and were reduced in instances where the competition of some other carrier or some competitive product took away or threatened to take away the traffic. The larger shippers, controlling a heavy volume of traffic, were favored over the smaller ones. Rate levels were low where numerous railroads competed against each other, and were lowest where railroads competed against water carriers.

Public resentment against the intolerable discriminations resulting from this method of rate making caused the enactment by Congress in 1887 of the original act to regulate commerce and the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The principal object of this legislation was to wipe out discriminations. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been struggling with the problem ever since. It has succeeded in removing or modifying many individual discriminations, but regional discriminations, discriminations between localities and between commodities, and growing out of competition between different types of carriers, permeate and dominate the rate structure today. Our legislation has failed in its purpose, because the courts and the Commission have construed and administered the law as justifying discriminations brought about by differences in competitive conditions. In other words, where competition is keen and direct, low rates are held to be proper, and higher rates are held to be justified where competition has not compelled reductions. Thus, the old established powerful industries and industrial areas retain their advantages over newer, weaker industries and areas.

In your speech, you charge the rate committees of the railroads and of other carriers with the responsibility for maintaining these rate discriminations. This is partly true. But the main responsibility lies with Congress, which controls rate-making policy, and with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has authority to fix rates. The true reason why rate discriminations persist and flourish is that we do not have a clearly defined and enforced national policy of rate regulation, compelling observance of the fundamental principle of equality of opportunity.

You urge as a remedy that competition must be restored, under regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to protect the public interest. Of course, you have

in mind that unrestrained competition would not wipe out discriminations; it would, in fact, make them worse. Regulation in the public interest implies that each carrier and each type of transportation should compete at rates reflecting the cost of its operations, extended to all shippers upon equal terms. Regulation cannot be effective in removing discriminations until the cost to the carrier of performing the service is recognized as the proper basis for freight rates. This does not mean arbitrary or rigid adherence to a mathematical formula, but a flexible and realistic system adjusted to practical transportation conditions and needs of commerce; and, above all, the fundamental principle that we are one Nation in which all shippers and all areas are entitled to equal treatment for equal service.

Bills are now pending in both houses of Congress, based on recommendations of the Board of Investigation and Research, declaring it to be the policy of Congress that a uniform classification of freight and uniform class rates be established throughout the United States, with only such exceptions as may be justified by differences in transportation conditions and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make the policy effective. In my opinion, the enactment of the recommended legislation will be a necessary and constructive step in the program which you advocated so ably in your speech "to recast our transportation laws to insure the utmost development of each form of transportation," under which "regional rate discriminations will disappear, and transportation will then truly serve the public interest."

Yours very truly,

C. E. CHILDE.

Message From Roane Waring, National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished fellow townsman, Roane Waring, has just retired as national commander of the American Legion.

During his term of office he had occasion to visit our troops in north Africa. His report to the Nation was made before a capacity audience in Constitution Hall, and taken to the country by radio. No commander has served more intelligently nor more industriously. He gave himself wholly to the Legion during this past year. Throughout the country he held high its aims and purposes, and contributed substantially to the war effort. He made many fine speeches, but none more vigorous and timely than a brief message addressed as a farewell to his comrades.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I have the honor to include that message in the RECORD that my colleagues may be able to read it in full.

By the time you, my comrades in the Legion, read these lines, I will have retired from office and our great organization at its second wartime convention will have set its course for another year of service to God and country.

The report of my stewardship as national commander will be found in the summary of proceedings of the Omaha National Convention. Many of you will have received the message from me there but it seems fitting that I repeat certain phases of it in this, my last printed message to you as national commander.

I have been with our fighting men in many of the Army camps in this country, and on the African battle front. I have talked with them in the camps, in hospitals, and at the front. I know how proud they are of their country; of America—the arsenal of the United Nations. I know, too, of their disappointment and anger when too often they hear of the selfishness, the squabbling, and the jockeying for personal advantage which slows down production on the home front while they defy death, to beat and crush a powerful, cunning, and resourceful foe.

They are going to win the victory. They are going to defeat and crush Italy and Germany, and Japan will be destroyed. The initiative is already ours, but total victory is not likely for a long, long time.

In public addresses and in writing I have taken every opportunity to express approval and admiration for America's fighting men. Since my return from Africa, I have said repeatedly, "The American Army of today is the best trained, the best equipped, and the best led army America has ever had," and this applies to all of our armed forces.

In their name and by your authority, I have unhesitatingly condemned all selfish actions, all political jockeying which have tended to deprive them of the implements of war. I have challenged all un-American doctrines that jeopardize their right to live in a free democracy when they victoriously return and lay down their arms.

I have the utmost confidence in the ability of our fighting men. Like the well-trained and disciplined soldiers they are, they will fight on to a glorious victory, but I have repeatedly cautioned the American people against indifference to our war effort on the home front. We of the American Legion—and all true American citizens—owe our fighting men every measure of protection we can give them. We must protect them from defeat on the battle front by supplying them with the ships, the guns, the planes, and the tanks just as fast as it is humanly possible to manufacture these armaments. We must protect them and their future by demanding a peace of absolute victory, ever remembering that a compromise peace would pass a death sentence on their sons. We must protect them by demanding that Congress assert itself and assume its rightful authority as the lawmaking branch of the Federal Government. If bureaucracies continue to be pyramided and continue to make bureau regulations to govern this country instead of laws passed by Congress, then our Constitution will be ignored and we will have lost the freedom for which they fight.

In short, we on the home front must strive to match the efforts of our fighting men on the battle front and with this concentration of American might we will speed the final victory.

When peace dawns again we can meet our soldiers, look them in the eye and truthfully say to them, "We too have done our best. We have carried on. We have tried with our every might to match your courage and your patriotism on the battle front with our zeal and our patriotism on the home front."

And so, I say to you in parting, be vigilant—keep America a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Be generous, buy bonds and give liberally of your time to worth-while activities. Be patriotic—as good Americans and as good Legionnaires, so conduct yourselves as to set an example for other Americans to follow while our Nation is at war.

Legionnaires: "Carry on!"

Sees United States and Nazis Pursuing Similar Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Daily Journal of Los Angeles, Calif., on a speech delivered by Malcolm McDermott, professor of law at Duke University, and is worthy of consideration:

SEES UNITED STATES AND NAZIS PURSUING SIMILAR IDEAS—"DEADLY PARALLEL" IS NOTED BY SPEAKER IN DESCRIBING PRINCIPLES OF HITLER RULE; HOME FRONT ISSUE

RALEIGH, N. C., November 1.—Describing 12 salient features of national socialism as it has been developed in Germany, Malcolm McDermott, professor of law at Duke University, told the North Carolina State Bar that there was a "deadly parallel" between the Nazi methods and what has transpired in the United States during the past decade.

Dr. McDermott, winner several years ago of the American Bar Association's Ross essay contest, told the bar he had spent some time in Germany in 1937 and 1938 in an effort to learn what national socialism really meant. He said he found out that:

WHAT THE NAZIS DO

1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems.

2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out so that the leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

3. The centralized government, while appearing in form to represent the people, must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

4. Constitutional guaranties must be swept aside.

MUST UNDERMINE COURTS

5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined.

6. The lawmaking body must be intimidated and from time to time be rebuked so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

7. Economically the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay.

8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens.

DISTRUST OF BUSINESS

9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive.

10. Government bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life.

11. The education of the youth of the Nation is taken under control to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing, there is kept flowing a steady

stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

ATTITUDE TOWARD CONSTITUTION

"One of the most striking similarities between the present administration and a national Socialist government is its attitude toward the Constitution," Dr. McDermott observed.

The speaker also alluded to the Treasury's recently submitted tax plan which "was so revealing that even Democratic Congressmen were shocked" and the purpose of which was not to distribute the tax burden equitably but to equalize American citizens' incomes.

"The real issue on the domestic front," the legal educator declared, "is whether national socialism shall supplant American democracy—American democracy as we have known and grown up under it and as our forefathers established and maintained it for us."

Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., Winston-Salem Journal, Winston-Salem, N. C., and the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C.:

[From the Greensboro Daily News of November 8, 1943]

WHERE HONOR IS DUE

To the Daily News it seems that there is place in the reams of copy that have been written about the Moscow Conference for a personal tribute to Cordell Hull, veteran American statesman, for an achievement which crowns long years of public service.

The successful role which Mr. Hull played in the tripartite conversations and the memorable results obtained therein must confound his critics. They had openly condemned him as anti-Russian; they had accused him of building up a conservative and, if anything, Fascist-minded Department of State. They had assailed policies of the Department and grown especially caustic in their denunciation of the conditions under which Sumner Welles, hailed as the Department's guiding star in Russian relations, had left or been driven from the undersecretaryship. Finally they had said that Mr. Hull was physically unequal to the long trip to Moscow and the rigor which conference attendance and participation would impose upon him.

But the 72-year-old head of the State Department, manifesting that will power and physical and mental stamina which have carried him through many a political crisis, carried on in a manner which has now won world acclaim. From the work that Sumner Welles did in the Department and the influence which he had in the build-up for the Moscow Conference, the Daily News would detract not a whit. But it was Mr. Hull who went to the Russian capital, presented the American position, conducted the negotiations on highly controversial and ticklish subjects, and emerged with an agreement which may well prove one of the high marks of history. As for the Secretary's physical condition, it is noted that he remained at the banquet given by Stalin in celebration of the parley's success until 2 o'clock in the morning, participated actively in the celebration, and was back at his desk a few hours later as ready and as fit for work as any of his much younger contemporaries.

How much credit must actually be given Mr. Hull for the conference's accomplishments, we would not know. But to his qualities of patience, of determination, of firmness, of steadfastness of purpose, of paramount interest in good neighborliness and cooperation among nations and in known characteristics of an east Tennessee mountaineer, calculated to strengthen him in the graces of Georgian peasant Stalin, we are willing to pay tribute as having been a major factor in a program which has brought victory much closer and given to the world new hope and confidence for the days which are ahead.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal of November 8, 1943]

CONFOUNDING HIS CRITICS

Frank R. Kent thinks Cordell Hull has treated his critics very shabbily. Here, he has gone off to Moscow in an airplane, a trip which his unfriends said he couldn't make on account of his fear of air travel, his age, and his feeble health.

Then, although he was practically senile, according to his bright young liberal critics, had no knowledge of foreign affairs, and was "bitterly anti-Russian," he went ahead and helped consummate an agreement among the four great powers of America, Britain, and Russia and China which assures the full cooperation and close unity of the United Nations in one common war effort, and pledges them to work together in winning the peace after the war is won.

The old meanie. Senile? Feeble? Futile? Why Cordell Hull impressed Russians, Englishmen, and Chinese alike with the keenness of his mind, it seems, and this "bitterly anti-Russian" American statesman was received as a real friend by a man named Josef Stalin, who happens to be the ruler of Russia. Futile? The Moscow Conference is everywhere hailed as one of the significant Allied political victories of the war. Many believe it sealed the doom of both Germany and Japan.

What are you going to do with the tough old hoss trader from Tennessee, anyhow? The bright boys were going to toss Cordell Hull right out of the State Department back in 1933. Raymond Moley was the brains of the Department then, as Sumner Welles was to be later on, in the opinion of the really knowing folk. But Mr. Moley, after his dramatic chase after Mr. Hull to the London Economic Conference, didn't last long. And so with others, who, according to the critics, would actually work out a consistent liberal foreign policy if only Judge Hull would quit doddering around in the State Department.

Judge Hull, however, wasn't doddering, and he stayed in the State Department. His reciprocal trade treaties and his efforts to promote the good neighbor policy were distinguished by sound statesmanship and succeeded in remarkable degree. His Vichy policy met with much criticism, but in large measure apparently has justified itself. And now comes the crowning achievement of a distinguished State Department career in the Moscow Four-Power Agreement.

Mr. Kent is right. Cordell Hull has left his smart young critics in a terrible fix!

[From the Charlotte Observer of November 5, 1943]

PRAISE FOR MR. HULL

It is generally agreed that the Moscow agreement was in large measure the handiwork of Secretary Cordell Hull, of the American State Department.

And such being the case, he has put many of his severest critics to rout.

Mr. Hull has been unjustly accused for his alleged antipathy toward Russia.

Some went so far, indeed, as to charge that the basic reason for the feud between him and Sumner Welles, his Under Secretary of State, derived from the prejudice of Mr. Hull toward the Soviets and the open acclaim of Mr. Welles for the Kremlin.

There was the further criticism that at his advanced age of 72, the poor condition of his health, and especially in view of his conservatism, Mr. Hull would not be the ideal representative of the American Government at this fateful and destiny-making conference to bespeak the spirit and purpose of a liberalized nation.

But as it turns out, he seems to have virtually dominated the consultations and succeeded in writing into the final agreement signed by representatives of all of the governments of the four major powers the practical ideals of Woodrow Wilson for an international alliance in which the United States would have a commanding hand of leadership.

Mr. Hull has performed many notable services for the Government and for the American people during his long career as a public servant in Washington.

But this achievement at Moscow will historically stand out as his greatest.

Manufactured News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much interesting discussion before the House and Senate Judiciary subcommittees on the subject of the insurance legislation now before the Congress. This legislation is designed to maintain the historical State supervision of insurance companies. A most important editorial on the subject, printed in a Missouri newspaper, has come to my attention.

The editorial is as follows:

MANUFACTURED NEWS

Recently the St. Louis evening newspapers have been manufacturing a great deal of news about the insurance bills before the Congress. Screaming, editorially, the reader would get the impression that someone was trying to steal something.

These insurance bills, introduced by Senator VAN NUYS and Representative WALTER, are obviously and candidly bills introduced at the request of the stock fire-insurance companies to clarify the intent of the Congress. The bills declare that the supervision of the fire-insurance business shall be left to the several States. The Congress can pass the bills or not as it chooses. It happens that the Federal court in Atlanta recently threw a New Deal indictment, brought by the Justice

Department, out of court on a demurrer. This is not new, for the courts have held for more than 75 years that the regulation of insurance companies is not a Federal job. The St. Louis papers, New Dealish to the stooge degree, do not tell the people that the entire plot by the administration is to get into its control the many million of dollars of insurance policyholders' reserves.

One St. Louis evening newspaper in an editorial tried to impugn Congressman WALTER PLOESER'S announced support of the bills. This newspaper has attacked the Congressman unfairly before. It is not because they actually doubt his integrity. PLOESER'S most bitter enemies very likely secretly respect the integrity of the Congressman. But the New Deal hates PLOESER as much as it hates any other man in the United States who opposes their views, and this newspaper must do the bidding of the master. In the case of the other evening newspaper, it is more a case of the distorted and muddled opinion of what constitutes liberalism. That newspaper, once great, is for free enterprise as it applies to itself but also for everything and everyone else being cartelized and regulated in the good old Fascist style.

We are sure that the Congress will pay little or no attention to these newspapers. The purpose of this editorial is to remind these critics that Congressman PLOESER commands the respect of the people partly because of his liberal and progressive insurance record.

Some States may have made a mess of the handling of the insurance business but, on the other hand, many of the States have done a splendid job. Missouri, under the infamous rule of the New Deal's Tom Pendergast and Insurance Commissioner Emmet O'Malley, did a most deplorable job of handling the insurance business. Now, let us remember, who was it who first called to the attention of the public the dishonest conduct of the O'Malley insurance department? Who was it that first denounced the notorious Missouri rate compromise? Who was it that first defied the insurance department and sent someone hurrying to see where the rats may be hidden? If our memory and the record serves us correctly it was none other than insurance man, WALTER PLOESER, in October 1936. For a further memory refresher the place was Columbia, Mo., and the occasion, the 1936 insurance agents convention. Insurance man PLOESER did this in a speech before the convention which he made in opposition to a resolution of endorsement for the notorious New Dealer O'Malley. PLOESER braved the anger of most of the insurance fraternity in Missouri by so doing. Since then he has merited undying gratitude for his courage at a time when it was most unpopular to be courageous. If the word of insurance men is accurate, he has brought about other reforms in the insurance business. His record in the past is one of constant battle against monopoly. He is one of the few men in the country who knows a monopoly when he sees one, and that includes the New Deal governmental type, too.

In 1942 Attorney General McKittrick threatened to come to St. Louis and speak against PLOESER on this insurance issue but after reflection remembered his only and disastrous encounter with PLOESER before the Small Business Committee of the House in the spring of 1942. One newspaper's trumped-up bluff with McKittrick never developed. We think we know why. Read the committee hearings on this same subject and you will learn that PLOESER made McKittrick look ridiculous. In 1943, the Federal Court of Atlanta confirmed PLOESER'S opinions.

There are two sides to this issue, and manufactured news only draws attention to extreme political bias.

Making America Over by Court Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post of October 30, 1943, one of the most important editorials in American history appeared. Making America Over by Court Order is deeply significant of the erosion of American Government which proceeds rapidly against the best interests of a free people. Generally, the people are unaware of this transition. Legislators and lawyers are aware. It is the congressional duty to prevent this rapid trend. The editorial follows:

MAKING AMERICA OVER BY COURT ORDER

The governors who met at Columbus, Ohio, last summer decided to fight. It was high time. As Governor Maw, of Utah, a Democrat, put it, the Leviathan on the Potomac will have to grow only a little more until the voting power of Federal job holders will be so great that no party dare challenge it. So the governors are setting up a lobby of their own in Washington to influence their Congressmen and Senators against voting their own States into oblivion.

Already powers which once unquestionably belonged to the States have been lost. The new interpretations given to the words "interstate commerce" and "general welfare" by Congress and the courts have altered the Constitution more profoundly than have all the 21 amendments which have been expressly submitted to the people and adopted by them.

In New York City—to cite one example—there is a 22-story building, parts of which are rented to clothing manufacturers who sell their products in interstate commerce. The owners of the building employ elevator operators, firemen, electricians, janitors, and so on. These men are not employed by the clothing manufacturers. Their wages do not enter into the costs of the clothing. These building employees make no clothing or anything else that enters into commerce. Their jobs are as stationary as the building.

Now the question arises whether these employees are governed by the Federal wage-and-hour law or by New York law. The only nail on which to hang Federal jurisdiction is "interstate commerce." How does the Supreme Court of the United States—Frankfurter, Justice, speaking—accomplish this?

It's this way: The seamstress on the twenty-second floor, employed by the clothing manufacturers, can't sew if her fingers are cold. So the fireman in the basement who shovels the coal, which burns in the furnace, which heats the water, which makes the steam, which warms the radiator, which heats the air, which unlimbers the fingers of the seamstress, is himself engaged in interstate commerce, or affects it. The Court says so, Justice Roberts dissenting, in *Kirchbaum* v. *Walling*, known in the trade as "the loft case."

Supreme Court Justices have called this legislative sleight of hand "attenuated reasoning," a "subversive doctrine," and "destructive of our form of government." They put up a brave fight against those who "hope to end a system of government inhospitable to their ultimate designs." But these judges are no longer on the bench, with the exception of Owen J. Roberts, who said of the fireman's case, "The power of Congress does not reach the purely local activities in question. If it did, the commerce power would support regulation of any local action."

And that is just what the commerce clause is being called on to do. In Chicago, one dairyman buys milk only from Illinois farmers. The milk he bottles for sale is not mixed with milk from any other State. It goes straight from Illinois cow to Illinois customer. It crosses no State line.

Is this dairyman in interstate commerce? In *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy*, the Supreme Court says he is. And this is the way of it: 60 percent of all milk consumed in Chicago comes from Illinois farms, but 40 percent comes from Indiana, Wisconsin, and other States. Now, to foster, encourage, and promote interstate commerce in milk, the Federal authorities have set a legal minimum price for milk. But the interstate milk competes in the Chicago market with the purely Illinois milk. Thus the 40-percent tail wags the 60-percent dog, and the dairyman finds himself in interstate commerce, although he planned to be only in intrastate commerce. He can't buy or sell Illinois milk below the legal price fixed for out-of-State milk. The principle would be the same, it seems, if the out-of-State milk were only 14, or 4, or 1 percent of the total. The greater is controlled by the less.

The economics of this is as absurd as the law. It forces all Chicago consumers of milk to pay more than they would have to pay in a free market, in order to benefit producers in other States. It also repeals geography by depriving Illinois farmers of the right to compete with out-of-State farmers in their local and natural markets.

It is plain that, if the reasoning of these cases were applied to all the thousands of articles grown, mined, or made to be sold to 135,000,000 people, the States would lose their power and jurisdiction over the business lives of their people. In short, intrastate business would disappear, along with the right of States to order as they please what is left of their local affairs.

The merits of the argument between the champions of centralization and the supporters of the local autonomy are not discussed here, nor the means open to the States to reverse the trend. But as a preliminary to future comment on this important constitutional question, it may be profitable to indicate some of the means by which the advocates of centralization are attempting to carry out their purpose. Incidentally, the reader may take ironic satisfaction in noting how nearly the Supreme Court is coming to justify Mr. Roosevelt's once bitter description of that body as a superlegislature whose members pass on the wisdom of legislation on the basis of their own personal, political, and economic philosophy.

We Must Preserve Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Eldorado, Ill.

This organization is composed of representative business and professional men and farmers of that community. Eldorado is a city of approximately 5,000 people located in the southern part of Illinois some 30 miles from the Kentucky border. It is a typical American community. From the way this letter reads and from the way the people of Kentucky voted last Tuesday, it seems that the people of that section of the country are thinking very much alike, and from reports we get from other sections of the country, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people agree with them. They are tired of the New Deal. They still believe in the policies of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Grover Cleveland, Calvin Coolidge and that long list of other great Americans who have helped make America great. They are unalterably opposed to the regimentation of the American people and the New Deal philosophy. What our people want is to win this war as soon as possible and bring our brave boys home. They want to maintain free enterprise and to preserve our American way of life, so that when our boys have won this war and returned home they will find opportunity awaiting them. They want less bureaucrats and more business.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter:

ELDORADO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Eldorado, Ill., November 5, 1943.

Hon. J. V. HEIDINGER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HEIDINGER: If you had been at our meeting last evening and heard the discussion on the socialized medicine bills that are being considered by both the House and Senate, you would have received a much better impression of the feeling of the members of our organization, than I can possibly convey in this letter.

As business and professional men of this community, we feel that it is high time for our Representatives in both Houses to put an end to this socialized way of life, and get back to the way that has made America what she is today and that is the individual operation of business and professions.

We desire to state that we are absolutely against any form of socialized medicine and/or any other form of socialized business legislation. By vote of our membership I am instructed to convey this action and wish of our organization to you, for your earnest consideration when matters of this nature are brought forth in our national legislative bodies.

Yours very truly,
ELDORADO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ALLEN MURPHY, *Secretary.*

Grape Jam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bulletin from a preserver in Kansas City, Mo.:

Kansas City, Mo., October 18, 1943.
Brokers advice No. 418:

GRAPE JAM

The fear that the fresh market would attract an abnormal portion of all Concord grapes, just as it took a preponderance of the crop of all other fruits and berries (at prices prohibitive to us) was not without foundation, for Concord grapes have been peddled from coast to coast by truckers who found ready buyers at sky-high prices.

All this took place while the industry waited for the W. F. A. and the O. P. A. to act and to follow through with (FDO-80) restrictions on sales to other than legitimate barrelers, preservers, and grape-juice packers. MPR-425 setting prices to the grower at $85 per ton New York and $75 per ton Michigan came through but too late to divert the crop from the fresh market.

There has been some new crop Concord grape jam delivered to the trade at prices based on jam made from grapes fresh from the vineyard and calculated by using the price formula provided for preserves, this being improper calculation. Invoices for these shipments were recalled by O. P. A. for correction to the grape jam calculation basis rather than the preserve basis. Result—to date there is no correct price on grape jam.

This letter represents confusion galore. Nobody knows who is going to do what to which—very disturbing when we are trying to acquire sufficient fruit to at least partly provide for our customer requirements. At the moment we are still in the dark as to how many grapes will be available to us. As soon as we have assurance of the quantity of fruit we will receive from our sources of supply, we will immediately check each of our memo orders and make allotments to those customers who depended upon us for grape jam in 1942. Should we be fortunate enough to acquire any surplus, our second consideration will be to our customers who look to us for preserves but have not been grape-jam buyers heretofore.

To date this is the long and short of it. As quickly as there is definite information available you will be advised.

BLISS SYRUP & PRESERVING CO.

Triumph at Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the United States News for November 12, 1943, written by David Lawrence, which is as follows:

TRIUMPH AT MOSCOW
(By David Lawrence)

AGREEMENTS FURNISH A PEACE FORMULA OUT OF WHICH LEAGUE OF NATIONS CAN BE BUILT—WORK CAN BE BEGUN AT ONCE ON PLANS FOR ADMISSION OF ALL PEACE-LOVING SOVEREIGN NATIONS—INFLUENCE OF AMERICA PERSUADES STALIN

Idealism triumphed at Moscow.

A pledge to work together in war, a pledge to work together in peace, a pledge to unite with all other peace-loving sovereign nations, large and small, to maintain peace—these three commitments were duly signed last week by the Governments of Russia, Great Britain, China, and the United States.

But something more was proclaimed—President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill set forth formally the conditions under which the Italian people are to be liberated, and these conditions specifically include provision for freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of worship, and the right of self-government.

We have, therefore, the actual beginnings of a practical peace program. We have before us an accomplishment epochal in its significance, transcendent in its moral effect on the winning of the war.

We have, moreover, definite agreement now for the military staffs of Russia, Britain, and the United States to collaborate. This closes a gap which has existed between military men of Russia on the one hand and of Britain and America on the other. We shall presently see the benefits in united air and land operations in vital areas encircling the Nazis.

The agreements are cause for congratulation and for thanks to Almighty God for having steered four mighty nations into harmony on a program that augurs so much for humanity.

To Cordell Hull and Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretaries of the United States and Britain, respectively, goes the gratitude of the American and British people for statesmanship and clea vision. To Premier Stalin and Foreign Commissar Molotov, who have given us an appreciation of a new Russia, the whole world can extend now the hand of fellowship. Last, but not least, we are indebted for tactful cooperation to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, friend and partner.

ENDURING PEACE BROUGHT CLOSER BY AGREEMENTS

The Moscow agreements constitute a sensational advance toward the making of an enduring peace. The bold step taken is a vindication of the theory that during war agreements can be made that are more influential than if we were to wait to start until after hostilities cease. It is now—while the consciousness of sacrifice is so widespread—that nations are willing to make binding pledges such as were recorded at Moscow. This means that we can go forward now with the general international organization which is to maintain peace. We can readily consider for this purpose the League of Nations and any other machinery of international collaboration. We need not wait till the war is over to begin work—we actually have begun already.

ISOLATIONISM MUST BE AVOIDED BY REPUBLICANS

Those who advocated a cooling-off or transition period never did define how long they believed that period was to last. If by transition they meant temporary machinery to blend the solution of problems of war and post-war, there is nothing in the Moscow agreements which prevents such an interpretation. If by transition was meant a long period of years while Great Britain, Russia, America, and China bossed the world while proud nations like France and Norway and Sweden and Denmark and the Balkan nations or Latin-American peoples waited for the Big Four to impose conditions of admission, then it is apparent that the Moscow agreements envisage no such lengthy or hazardous process.

The Moscow agreements constitute a peace formula that becomes effective at once. They set in motion a preliminary peace conference which can become a continuing peace conference. We must not let matters drift. We must not let the enthusiasm of the world grow cold or the attitudes of the outside nations become indifferent. The achievements of the Moscow Conference can and must be broadened by conference with other nations.

The Senate has lent a helping hand. The language of the Connally resolution, now happily revised to include the basic point of the Moscow agreement, assures the world that our Upper House will cooperate, that no minority of slightly more than one-third will block a treaty containing the international organization or league of nations, which everybody now must see is the true foundation of a lasting peace.

There is only one danger spot on the horizon. It emerges out of last week's elections in the United States. The Republicans made some deserved gains based on the people's protest against incompetence and arrogance in the bureaus of the New Deal. The outlook is for the rise of the Republicans in 1944. It may or may not mean a shift in the Presidency, but it certainly means an increased membership for the Republicans in both Houses of Congress.

The Republicans, however, will forfeit their chances for victory if the politicians assume that last week's results in any way encourages the isolationists to try for a stronger hold than they have today on the Republican Party. The biggest single handicap the Republican Party has carried in the last few years—indeed in 1940—was the belief of independent voters that the Republicans would not cooperate internationally but would, after pious resolutions, speeches, and gestures, revert as they did in 1920 to a selfish isolationism.

It is only fair to utter a word of warning now. The millions of independent voters who went back to the Republican ticket in 1940 after having departed in 1932 saw Willkie as a progressive in domestic issues and as a foe of the reactionary New Deal bureaucrats. But not enough of the independents were convinced of Willkie's willingness to carry on the Roosevelt-Hull foreign policies. Too many of the independents saw the isolationist wing working enthusiastically for Willkie, and they wondered if he would have the fortitude to forsake that type of support when he took office.

The same tests will apply in 1944. Unless the Republican nominee is a man who can shake off the taint of selfish isolationism and show himself sincerely ready to carry out the principles of the Moscow Conference there will be enough independent voters who will prefer even a fourth term for President Roosevelt to the possibility of a disgraceful turn-back such as the Republican Party made in 1920 after its leading spokesmen pledged themselves to a league of nations.

FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE FREE OF PARTISANSHIP

Herbert Hoover and Wendell Willkie have proclaimed the spirit and faith of our people in these times. They see clearly that we must cooperate in world peace along the lines of the policies laid down already by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull. Mr. Hoover's speeches recently and Mr. Willkie's addresses and statements and writings for the last 3 years have emphasized the very points that now are covered in the Moscow agreements. Republicans as well as Democrats, therefore, can feel a pride in what the United States Government agreed to at Moscow.

Foreign issues can be kept out of politics. And the way to accomplish this is for the Republicans outside of as well as in Congress to demonstrate their good faith by helping wholeheartedly to carry forward the splendid start made at Moscow. The group of Republican Senators who urged the revision of the Connally resolution appear to have made a good impression. Their coalition with an equally international-minded Democratic group is a hopeful sign of the times. It can mean continued cooperation on foreign policy without partisanship.

A MAGNA CARTA OF BROTHERHOOD FOR ALL PEOPLES

America can feel happier because of this favorable turn of events. The turn has come suddenly, unexpectedly. More than many of us had a right to hope for came out of the Moscow Conference.

But why did Stalin agree? As the months and years ahead of us unfold, the answer will become clearer but the answer may perhaps be found in obvious rather than devious reasoning. Russia has had much of her territory devastated. Her people have made immense sacrifices. Stalin has proved himself a remarkable leader in war. His future prestige with his own nation, perhaps even his power to rule, depends on what he can do to rebuild Russia and advance her position in the family of nations, what he can do to rekindle the hopes of his people that they may derive from this life a higher and higher standard of living and a greater assurance of security.

Russia needs America. We have plant capacity. We have resources. We can help rebuild Russia faster than the Russians by long years of toil can possibly reconstruct their demolished cities and broken plants. Stalin knows he can trust America. We have no designs on his territory. Russia can get a square deal from America on any of her legitimate objectives, and yet Stalin can expect that our interest in the restoration of sovereign countries conquered by Germany will not waver, that we will join an international organization of peace-loving sovereign nations.

The miracle of human brotherhood can happen. It must happen. The Moscow agreements illumine the way. Again, the thanks of a grateful nation go to Divine Providence who in His wisdom guided the minds of those who wrote at Moscow the magna carta of a war-torn world. We are beginning to keep faith with the brave men of all nations who have given their lives that the world might some day be governed by reason and mutual trust instead of by the savagery of organized might.

Farm Security Administration Should Be Given Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed the Appropriations Committee of the House did not see fit to include an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration when it recently had under consideration the deficiency appropriation. Several Senators have indicated that an effort will be made to place an appropriation for F. S. A. in the bill when it is considered in the Senate. I hope that this may be done. In justice to the Farm Security Administration it should be done. If an allowance is included by the Senate the House conferees and the Members of the House should agree to it.

The request for supplemental funds for the Farm Security Administration is consistent with the position already taken by the House on this agency. It is not a request for funds over and above those which were anticipated when the Agriculture appropriation bill was passed early in July. This request, on the contrary, is pursuant to the compromise that the House entered into with the Senate at that time.

When the original appropriation was passed, Farm Security funds were left in a rather unusual situation. The appropriation did not finally determine the exact amount for a full year's operations, but deliberately left the way open to further action on funds for operations after the first 4 months.

The Senate had voted an appropriation of $29,600,000. The House committee countered with a proposal of $20,000,000. It was acknowledged on the House floor by Members familiar with the agency's needs that the House figure probably was inadequate for its current work. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee pointed this out when he urged that this agency be assigned the administration of the special flood restoration loan funds which the Congress voted.

The House and Senate finally compromised on an agreement to leave the $20,000,000 figure in the bill, but to authorize expenditures for the first 4 months at such level as the War Food Administrator found to be necessary for the effective carrying on of the farm-security program. It was anticipated at that time that the House subcommittee investigating F. S. A. might have legislative proposals to make and that permanent legislation calling for reconsideration of the appropriation item might be passed in 4 months.

The time allowed, however, was too short, particularly in view of the congressional recess which followed. The committee is still at work on its study of F. S. A. and expects at some later date to make recommendations for the future operations of this Agency.

In the meantime, the War Food Administrator has had a study made of the Agency's responsibilities and has determined the minimum appropriation necessary to carry them out. This $6,500,000 supplemental request is the amount recommended, in addition to the $20,000,000 already provided, to allow the Agency to carry out its current work.

This request, therefore, is in furtherance of the compromise agreement previously entered into and is in accordance with the authority given by the Congress and the findings of the War Food Administrator.

It should be recognized that without these supplemental funds, the Farm Security Administration will be forced to reduce far below the level originally proposed by the House. Since a somewhat higher rate of expenditure was authorized for the first 4 months, expenditures for the remaining 8 months would have to be cut proportionately below even the $20,000,000 level if no supplementary funds were provided.

The House should stand by its original position and, if included in the conference report, should approve this request. The total figure for the year would thus

be $26,500,000 which is $3,100,000 less than the Senate voted. When this is also compared to the $42,500,000 available last year and more than $60,000,000 the year before, it is obvious that the House has gone far indeed to serve the needs of economy without actually destroying the work and inviting heavy losses on Government loans which are still being serviced and collected.

Serious Misinformation on Lea Bill Cleared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on November 4 there was inserted in the RECORD at page A4679 a letter from Mr. Kit F. Clardy, addressed to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]. Evidently Mr. Clardy suffered from a serious shortage of accurate information on the subject of the Lea civil aviation bill. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the misinformation contained in his letter.

In order to set the RECORD straight on many of the points mentioned in that letter, I desire to include here, under leave granted to extend my remarks, a letter from Mr. Wayne W. Parrish, editor and publisher of American Aviation and American Aviation Daily to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

In this letter Mr. Parrish takes up, paragraph by paragraph, many of the misleading arguments made by Mr. Clardy, and because of the tremendous importance of the questions and policies here raised with reference to the future of aviation, I sincerely invite a close reading of this letter by all Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Parrish's letter follows:

NOVEMBER 9, 1943.

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER,
Representative, First Congressional District, Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 4, 1943, at page A4679, there appears a letter by a Mr. Kit F. Clardy, which you inserted in the RECORD, in which Mr. Clardy has given some serious misinformation to you and to the Congress regarding the Lea civil aviation bill.

The early enactment of this bill is of such importance to the future development of civil aviation that it would be unfortunate were Mr. Clardy's statements to go unchallenged. In the first place, in offering his letter you state that Mr. Clardy has analyzed the Lea bill now on the House Calendar as H. R. 3420. Actually, however, it is apparent from Mr. Clardy's letter that in writing it he had not read H. R. 3420, for his letter refers to some provisions which are not even included in H. R. 3420, and refers to other provisions in which H. R. 3420 has made very substantial and material changes from earlier drafts of the bill. Since Mr. Clardy is discussing a different bill, his letter is all the more confusing and it is rather difficult to set the record straight in all respects.

Mr. Clardy refers to "the simple-minded idiots who wrote the bill." This is an insulting statement which cannot pass unchallenged in view of the well-known fact that the bill is the product of many, many months of hard work by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is equally well known, from various public announcements made during the drafting of the bill, that H. R. 3420 represents many personal contributions by Mr. LEA, chairman of the committee, and by Mr. BULWINKLE, chairman of the subcommittee, as well as numerous other members of the committee. These gentlemen are not simple-minded idiots.

Mr. Clardy takes exception to the declaration of national sovereignty in the air space which appears in section 4. This provision declares that the United States "is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty" in the air space above the United States. This section is nothing more than an exact reenactment of the declaration of national sovereignty which appears in the existing Air Commerce Act of 1926, and which reflects the precise terms of an international treaty to which our Nation has long been a party and which was duly ratified by the Senate. There is nothing new about the declaration. The only occasion for its appearing in the Lea bill, is that that bill, among its many other commendable features, is a painstaking codification of our civil aviation laws—a codification which has long been desirable and for the accomplishment of which the House committee is to be warmly congratulated. It would be too bad were the fruits of the committee's labor in codifying the law to be destroyed by criticism which betrays ignorance of our existing law and our existing international treaties.

Mr. Clardy also states that one of the prime purposes of the bill "seems to be a deliberate effort to wipe out private aviation by the indirect method of regulating it to death." Again Mr. Clardy betrays a surprising ignorance of the law he presumes to criticize. As explained in the majority report on the bill, the regulatory provisions affecting private flying are no different, in substance, from the present law. And present law, in this respect, has not been basically changed since the original adoption of the Air Commerce Act of 1926. The Lea bill rewrites the safety regulation of present law only for the purpose of making minor clarifying changes and eliminating the confusion respecting the division of functions between the present Administrator and the C. A. B. which resulted from the vague terms of the 1940 reorganization orders affecting those agencies. In fact, the revision in this bill protects private interests from arbitrary action by the Administrator by providing for the first time effective administrative review by a quasi judicial agency and by providing for effective judicial review by the courts.

Mr. Clardy's statements about airport zoning are quite mistaken. He says that the Administrator "could bankrupt a municipality or a private operator of an airport at will by simply deciding certain property was to be purchased." The bill makes no such provision. It permits no condemnation, for the purpose of enforcing zoning regulations, except at the request of the airport owner (typically a municipality) and subject to other safeguards. Likewise payment of the condemnation award must be voluntarily agreed to by the municipality or other person before condemnation proceedings can be brought. Mr. Clardy's assertion is false.

Mr. Clardy also states that the zoning provisions are not subject to effective court review. Obviously he has failed to read the bill. Beginning in line 17 on page 39 of the bill as reported, Mr. Clardy will find, if he will only take the trouble to look, most complete provisions for judicial review which state that in any condemnation proceeding the court is to have complete jurisdiction to determine whether the condemnation is necessary and can stay the taking of possession of the property pending the court determination. There are few provisions to be found in the Federal statutes which give such broad and complete judicial review.

Mr. Clardy also states that the bill would enable the Administrator to publish orders secretly and then prosecute a person in court for violation of a rule that was actually never published. The citation to the bill which Mr. Clardy gives is mistaken. In any case he once again shows his ignorance. The bill, at page 19, beginning in line 16, requires that the Administrator publish his orders, rules, etc.—a salutary provision not included in present law. Mr. Clardy has apparently forgotten the provisions of the Federal Register Act in which it is required that "every document or order which shall prescribe a penalty" must be published in the Federal Register before it can take effect. (See title 44 of the U. S. Code, sec. 305 and sec. 307.) This prevents secret rules.

Mr. Clardy also states that "everything that is suggested by the act is designed to further the interests of commercial aviation to the detriment of private flying." As I have already pointed out, so far as private flying is concerned, the bill does not make the existing Federal safety regulation law any more severe. On the contrary, the private flyer receives definite protection which he does not have under present law with respect to administrative and judicial review. Also, if the bill is adopted, the private flyer will be assured for the first time that he can make an interstate flight so long as he complies with the Federal safety regulations. Furthermore, the bill provides definite encouragement and assistance to private flying activities which have never before been included in any Federal law. This bill is the most liberal, helpful, and farsighted proposal for the encouragement and development of private flying which has ever been placed before the Congress for action.

Mr. Clardy closes his letter by asking for simplification of regulation and expresses the hope "that the present idea of having many bodies perform the same functions for the Federal Government will be abandoned." The bill will accomplish exactly what Mr. Clardy hopes. It will produce a simplification of regulation in that it will prevent overlapping and duplicating and conflicting regulation among 49 different agencies of government. It will also eliminate the present duplication of functions within the Federal Government arising from the reorganization of 1940 and will restore for civil aviation an independent Civil Aeronautics Commission in which the Federal Government's functions will once again be centralized.

This letter would be unduly lengthened were an answer to be attempted to all of the misleading statements which Mr. Clardy's letter makes. The foregoing will, however, serve to show how mistaken Mr. Cardy's criticism is. The Lea bill is a most constructive and helpful measure for all branches of civil aviation. It has been prepared with great care after many months of concentrated work on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The hearings were exhaustive. In the hearings every branch of civil aviation registered its support of the bill—private fliers, aircraft manufacturers, training schools, the air lines, airline labor, and others. Misrepresentation, such as set forth in Mr. Clardy's letter, should not be permitted to defeat a measure of such supreme importance to the future sound development of one of our most vital civil activities.

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE W. PARRISH,
Editor and Publisher, American Aviation and American Aviation Daily.

The Florida Barge Canal Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, some facts have come to light of late in regard to the Florida barge canal which indicate that the wishes of the people's representatives in Congress, or at least a majority of them, are not taken seriously by other departments of the Government, including the President of the United States.

Members of the House will recall that during the present session, the Appropriations Committee of the House refused to include an item of $44,000,000 in the War Department civil functions appropriation bill to construct the Florida barge canal. No attempt was made to include it on the floor of the House when this bill was up for consideration and neither was it included in another legislative body in this Capitol when that legislation was up for consideration. These proceedings took place on or about April 1, 1943.

After this bill was passed from which the item for the Florida barge canal was entirely omitted, the President of the United States communicated with the Honorable Joseph J. Mansfield, Chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, in which the President announced that detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay. The fact that no appropriation had been made by the Congress of the United States, and that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives had refused to appropriate any money for its construction, did not prevent the President from ignoring completely such fact and notifying the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that the plans for the building of the barge canal would go forward notwithstanding.

If the President knew the facts, his action is difficult to reconcile with the procedure of this body. I prefer to believe that the President was not fully advised in the matter.

However, a further fact has developed, more astounding than the one I have just related. It appears that the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1944 contained an item of $3,000,000, appropriated for the purpose of having the Corps of Engineers prepare plans and specifications on projects to be constructed in the post war period as one means of providing work. The $3,000,000 was to include projects anywhere in the United States and in our insular possessions.

Recently the Chief of Engineers of the Army allocated $1,000,000 of this sum, or one-third of it, for the purpose of preparing plans to build the Florida barge canal, for the construction of which no money had yet been appropriated by Congress. I have always entertained the highest respect and confidence in the integrity and efficiency of the Corps of Engineers for river-and-harbor work. I cannot believe that General Robins, Acting Chief of Engineers, would deliberately allocate one-third of the appropriation for the preparation of plans to build a project for which no money had been appropriated unless he had authority to do so from the President of the United States.

Instead of the $44,000,000, for which a second bill has been introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH HENDRICKS, of Florida, the Chief of Engineers believes that it will cost $60,000,000.

Whatever the amount, it is indeed a strange procedure and one which the people of the country will regard with amazement when the wishes of the Congress of the United States are completely ignored by the executive department of the Government. Either the President ordered the Army engineers to proceed with the plans for the construction of the barge canal or the Army engineers acted without authority to do so.

It should be noted that the surveys and plans for the Florida barge canal will be along the same route as that for the Florida ship canal. One may rightfully come to the conclusion that the statement of a distinguished Senator from Florida that the Florida barge canal is but the first step toward the building of the Florida ship canal is correct; and this procedure which I have detailed is proof of the Senator's assertion.

The President's letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to the effect that "detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages—manpower, materials, and equipment—are overcome" was made without regard to the fact that Congress, and Congress alone, has the power to appropriate funds with which to construct projects. It is little wonder that the people of the Nation, in the face of proceedings of this kind, are losing faith in the legislative branch of their Government. I doubt if Congress has delegated power and authority to the extent that the Executive can proceed with projects regardless of appropriation by the people's representatives.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee to protest the appropriating of $44,000,000 for this canal. The record is complete on the part of more than one Government agency in opposition to it.

I include as a part of my remarks an editorial reprinted in the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., from the Miami Herald, which indicates what the people, North and South, think of this proposal. It is not a flattering statement to those who propose the building of this canal when we are fighting the greatest war in the history of the world and at a time when the National Treasury is empty and the people are called upon to sacrifice in every way possible to support the war effort of the Nation.

The people of the country will not approve the method I have set forth of forcing through projects regardless of their chosen representatives in the Congress of the United States. I hope the Appropriations Committee of this House will not include $44,000,000 or any other sum in any appropriation bill for the construction of the Florida barge canal at this time. We do not need it. It is not necessary to the war effort. It could not be constructed in time to be of any use in the war effort even if it were essential.

PLAN $44,000,000 RAID

Again the great, mendacious myth—that the Nation needs a new Florida cross-State canal as a war measure—is before Congress. DeLand's Representative HENDRICKS has reintroduced his bill to spend $44,000,000 for construction of the barge canal which was turned down last year by the House Appropriations Committee.

The bold effrontery, with which advocates of the waterway, little brother to the $500,000,000 ship canal boondoggle, revive this nefarious plan to rifle the public Treasury is unparalleled in national pork barrel plundering. That it should be plotted while the Nation is battling for its very existence beggars comprehension.

HENDRICKS repeats the same specious argument with which he failed to beguile the Congress last year: The proposed North Florida barge canal would solve the East's petroleum shortage.

That deception was stripped from the measure in June 1942, by General Reybold, Chief of the Army Board of Engineers, before a Senate subcommittee. Reybold testified the barge canal would take 3 years to construct, adding significantly that he had gone the limit when he said the waterway could be placed in operation within that period.

COMPETES WITH WAR NEEDS

More than a year has elapsed and the manpower and material situation is so critical that the ditch could not possibly be completed within 3 years. Where are the canal advocates going to get the machinery, the men, the equipment to dig their ditch? The armed services are demanding more men; essential war industry is frantic over the depletion of its manpower pool; agriculture is in such a dire state that we are importing foreign labor to supply farm hands.

Would the canal promoters divert to their purposes the steel that should go into guns and tanks and trucks? Would they take men away from building airplanes and other vital tools of war? Would they strip the farms of labor, needed to plant and harvest the great war weapon food, to cut a gash across Florida?

Of course they would. Winning the war means nothing to the selfish canal interests. All they want is $44,000,000 to start with and when that is gone a half-billion more to put over their ultimate objective, the cross-State ship canal.

It is a discouraging prospect to the people of the United States, who face a $10,500,000,000 tax bill on top of the load they are now carrying, to see a proposal made to Congress to waste nearly $50,000,000 on an unwanted, unneeded, uneconomic waterway. Especially when there already exists the cross-State Fort Myers-Stuart canal, which, as proved by actual tests, could be utilized to handle 162,000 barrels of oil daily and which with an expenditure of less than $300,000 could maintain a turgid flow of petroleum to the eastern seaboard.

HENDRICKS' proposal is not a Florida sectional issue. It is national. The people of the United States should wrathfully inform their representatives that they will not stand for it. (The Miami (Fla.) Herald.)

The Nature and Extent of Our Obligation Must Be Made Very Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, according to my information, envoys of 43 or 44 nations tomorrow will affix their signatures to an international agreement for relief and rehabilitation of Europe after occupation by Allied armies. As I understand it, the original draft of this agreement was released to the press on September 23, having been drafted on September 20, it being release No. 395 of the Department of State.

The copy of the release which I saw indicates that it was drafted on September 20, 1943, and that recalls to my mind the Fulbright resolution which passed overwhelmingly in the House on September 20. I supported the Fulbright resolution at that time with the hope that it would help to prevent the recurrence of another war such as this. I am even more in favor now than I was at the close of the First World War of a safe and sane international organization to preserve peace. I want to state emphatically I have all along been in favor of such an international organization to prevent, if possible, or minimize wars and to make the world a safe and decent place for civilized human beings to inhabit. This agreement about to be signed providing for united action of the United Nations to bind up the wounds of war, is a part of the thing which I hoped for in supporting the Fulbright resolution on September 20.

Probably I am not as much of a Christian as I once was, for in my heart I feel determined that justice shall be dealt to the international outlaws without any mixture of mercy. On the other hand, I do have something closely akin to Christian sympathy for the victims of this war, and I think that as a civilized nation, if not a Christian nation, we have a great task before us to play the part of a humanitarian people. However, I place very definite limits upon the part I would want us to play as a Good Samaritan. Probably I would not go as far in binding up the wounds of war as many of my fellow countrymen would wish to go.

As I read this international agreement which is about to be signed I do not find that it commits this Government legally to any extensive or definite financial obligations or to any unusual degree of national charity. One way to look at it, it is a promissory note jointly signed, but if it is to be signed at all, that is the way I think it should be. Whatever promises are entered into by our signing it are made jointly with all the others and the same definite obligation rests upon every one of the signatories. No doubt there will be some who say that one conscientious and solvent signer of a promissory note may be called upon to pay the note in full if the other signers are unable to pay. Yes; many know that can happen—from unhappy personal experience.

In this promise of united action for relief and rehabilitation the organization is provided, but no commitments other than what the legal authorities of each signatory government may hereafter provide. Now that is the legality of the matter. Therefore the peoples of the Old World cannot collect from us more than our legally constituted authorities furnish for this purpose. Yet, it is not enough to consider only the legal terms of the agreement.

There is a more serious aspect of this matter. The starving and broken people of Europe will probably never read the language of this document. They may get the idea—erroneous though it is—that America is going to play Santa Claus and that our Nation is hereby embarking upon a world-wide W. P. A. They may think this act commits us to feed and clothe the world for a long future and to rebuild what the barbarians have torn down. It is conceivable that such an idea might become prevalent throughout the Old World, for many nations and people will want to believe it, no matter how false the idea may be. In such a case, their feeling may change quickly from gratitude to hate if we do not live up to the promise as they conceive it. It is also conceivable that opponents of this international effort on our part may want to spread the idea that we are going to play Santa Claus, thus encouraging the multitudes of the Old World to look to America for every possible kind of handout and especially to this country which presumably has such great resources and such big hearts.

With the kindliest consideration for our friends in the Old World who are victims of this war, I feel that it is of paramount importance that they be fully informed that this country is only 1 of 44, or whatever the number may be, joining in this agreement, and that our participation in it is dependent upon the participation of all others in some equitable way and that our carrying out a part of the agreement is conditioned upon each of the other nations doing its part. Some of our efforts will be for humanity's sake, but a part of it is in self-interest, and only as it can contribute to the world's good and our own good do I favor it.

I am one who remembers. At the close of the other World War, I remember that America furnished relief and much rehabilitation to Europe, some of which found its way directly or indirectly into rearmament. I saw a generation of young people grow up in poverty in this land of abundance as a result of our national folly after that war. Most of our sons now dying on the battle fronts of the world to save us a second time from savagery, have already twice been the victims of America's blunderings. Do we want another "lost generation" now in the nursery to starve through their teen age years before being fed to the cannon in the Third World War? Next only to greedy selfishness, blundering charity can be most effective in bringing such to pass.

O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 9, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A.:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C. November 4, 1943.

The Honorable MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your remarks in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, October 26, have just come to my attention.

I think you can rest assured that we in the Office of Price Administration are very much interested in attaining efficient and effective price control and rent control in New York City. We are hopeful that, with certain organizational changes being considered at the present time, we shall be able to establish in New York an organization that will lead the rest of the country insofar as efficiency is concerned.

You will probably be interested in some of the actions we are taking in an effort to make this plan effective. As you probably know by this time, the county administrator in New York, his assistant, and three other members of the rationing board system in New York, who resigned on Friday, October 22, have withdrawn their resignations and have stated their intense interest in the price-control program and their desire to continue to cooperate in it.

The Civil Service Commission has been conducting an examination for the position of regional administrator in region 2, which comprises the States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. We expect to receive from the Commission within the next 10 days a list of three men, from which we can select someone who will be capable of holding the position of regional administrator. It is our understanding that some very well qualified and successful businessmen have submitted their applications to the Civil Service Commission, and we are hopeful that among them we can find someone who can effectively carry on our activities in that region. We feel sure that when this appointment is accomplished we can look forward to a much more efficient organization than we have ever had before.

At the present time we are also endeavoring to obtain the services of an outstanding New York man to assume the responsibility over the rent-control program in the New York area. We feel sure that this appointment will meet with the approval of all interested groups in New York and should have a very salutary effect on the entire organization. It is contemplated that certain other organizational changes will be made with a view toward achieving much more effective price control, rent control, and rationing in New York.

We appreciate your constructive criticism and sincerely hope that as time goes on you will have occasion to see the results of what we are planning at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Acting Administrator.

Tribute to Our Pacific Submarine Fleet

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to many of our unpublicized fighting heroes. Their bravery, valor, their hardships and sufferings, and their outstanding accomplishments are unheralded and unsung.

I refer to the strong, brave officers and men who man our submarine fleet. For weeks at a time these men live, so to speak, in a barrel beneath the sea. Too much importance cannot be placed on the heavy destruction of Japanese merchant and war ships that our submarine fleet is causing.

Vice Admiral Samuel Robinson, Chief of the Bureau of Procurement and Material of the Navy, advises me that we have the best submarines in the world. They are as far superior to the German and Jap submarines of today, as were Germany's superior to ours in 1917. We have 175 subs now, for the benefit and edification of the little emperor, and that number is increasing each month.

With well-justified pride during the past few weeks we have been receiving reports of advances made by our troops, our planes, and our ships in the South Pacific. General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz have been able to make steady gains on Bougainville Island, they have been able to carry out effective drives against the Jap forces at Rabaul, and their planes and ships have succeeded in stopping any effective reinforcements reaching the hard-pressed Nipponese forces that are being backed harder and harder against a fatal wall.

Back here in Washington we have heartily applauded this brilliant action in all its phases. America is, and has every reason to be, very much pleased at the way the war in the South Pacific is going. But I want to call your attention today to a part of these forces that are making the situation so awkward for the Japs—a segment of this fighting team, Mr. Speaker, about which very little is heard.

I have reference to the American submarine fleet that has been operating against the Japanese Navy, the Japanese supply line, and the ships that Japan is using in an effort to reinforce her hard-pressed strongholds south of the Equator.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that few of the successes our forces have achieved since we began the offensive against Japan could have been possible had it not been for the harassing tactics of the determined fleet of American submarines, snapping at the Jap supply ships like a pack of persistent bloodhounds. Those submarine men make up what is known as the silent service. We all know that they are traditionally unsung. For matters of security, it has been very necessary for the submarine service to carry out its assigned tasks without benefit of fanfare and the publicity attendant upon other types of naval and land operations. Naturally, the enemy would prefer us to speak more openly and loudly about our undersea operations and the tactics that we use in carrying them out, and, just as naturally, we are not going to do this. But, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this reticence about our submarine fleet has led to a great lack of understanding of the important part these ships are carrying out in this war.

These sinkings that have been carried out against Japan have made an enormous difference both to her striking power and her offensive ability. I am sure that most Members of this House are aware of the fact that up to the 1st of October Japan had lost more than one-third of her pre-war tonnage in merchant ships. She had lost 313 combat vessels, and American submarines have accounted for more than 72 percent of these combat ships.

It seems to me that a certain amount of prejudice has sprung up about the submarine, mostly because what we read is either about the destructive power of the enemy submarine fleet or the anti-submarine measures we are carrying out. But today, Mr. Speaker, I think for a few minutes it might be well for us to consider the submarine as an offensive weapon in our own hands, especially when we realize what the gallant men of this silent service have been able to do in the way of damage to the enemy. After all—and both the Nazis and the Japs would certainly agree to this statement—submarine warfare is a game that we, too, can and have been playing. When this war is over, we will find that submarine for submarine, the United States has beaten the enemy in what both our major enemies considered their own particular game.

The submarine has been and increasingly is playing an important role in the Pacific theater. I do not think we can stress this fact too highly. And I am revealing no secret when I tell you that it is America's elemental strategy to sever Japan's over-expanded empire by cutting her lines of communications. The submarine is one of our chief instruments for doing this.

Actually Japan's success is predicated far more than we realize on holding a 6,000-mile supply line and exploiting her conquered possessions from north China down through the South Pacific islands. We do not even have to look at a map to remember that these are long and over-extended sea-borne lines of communications. In warfare, you continually seek out the enemy and destroy him, and you do this at his weakest point. Japan's greatest weakness happens to be her supply line. This line happens to be very vulnerable to our submarines. Given enough of these vessels and with half-way reasonable bases from which to operate, we should be able to cut those lines through which Japanese ships must pass. In doing so we would thus cut the whole fabric of Japan's ill-gotten empire.

In this war our submarines have played practically every conceivable role, from humble supply ship to daring raider. For example, in the dark, desperate early days of the war, our submarines maintained our only physical contact with beleaguered Corregidor.

They sailed literally below the very noses of Japanese warships to bring in badly needed food supplies. They were simple cargo ships then, for they unloaded their torpedoes in friendly ports in order to pack every available inch with supplies.

When the fall of Corregidor appeared inevitable, our submarines became rescue ships. They evacuated President Manuel Quezon and High Commissioner Francis Sayre and his official party. They took from Corregidor important staff officers and nurses. And inside the black hull of one submarine went much of the monetary wealth of the Philippines—the gold, silver, and securities Japan so desperately wanted.

In later days, when isolated individuals in Japanese-held territory sounded frantic calls for help, submarines answered the call. They took American nuns and civilians from one heavily fortified island. From another island they removed a band of stranded Australian aviators who were in dire danger of capture.

These were no simple accomplishments, for a submarine invading enemy territory does not merely surface at a dock and tie up. These deeds required the utmost in courage and superb seamanship in the blackness of night.

The story of the marine raid on the Makin Islands has already been told in part. Submarines landed the raiders and protected them while they were ashore. One submarine commanded by Commander William H. Brockman, Jr., of Connecticut, its range guided from ashore by James Roosevelt, son of the President, fired over coconut trees to destroy two Japanese ships.

American submarines have also effectively mined Japanese sea lanes, putting in double jeopardy ships flying the Rising Sun. A recent Navy communiqué revealed that one submarine captain after a difficult mine-laying operation personally observed the destruction of an 8,000-ton enemy vessel, by contact with one of his mines. Later he executed daring attacks on enemy ships, sinking 15,271 tons, meriting him the Navy Cross.

We have then, the story of American submarines serving as cargo and supply ships, rescue ships, raiders, and as mine layers. And it might be pointed out, to add to the versatility of the submarine, that German submarines landed saboteurs and spies on our own shores.

But the chief aim of submarines is to sink ships. I am happy to reiterate that our submarines are sinking ships, not haphazardly and by chance, but systematically and regularly.

We have under way a very satisfactory program of submarine building, but in order to increase our submarine effort in the Pacific more of these vessels are

not the only necessity. Just at this time we also need more men to operate these submarines—young, tough, highly trained men possessing very definite and high qualifications. It takes longer to train a crew for the submarine service than it does to build the submarine itself. Men for this specialized branch must start out by passing very rigid physical examinations. In addition, they must be temperamentally constituted so as to live in the confined quarters of the interior of an underwater world, cut off from every contact from the outside, on occasions for weeks at a time. But the surprising thing about this service is that statistics show it to be one of the safest branches of naval activity with which to be associated. We generally think of submarine warfare as a very grim business, but it is not without its lighter moments, and some great stories have come out of the activities of this undersea fleet since Pearl Harbor.

One of the favorite submarine stories concerns an American Negro messboy aboard a submarine in the Pacific. His sub had made a successful attack on a convoy and there followed a determined attack by the enraged escorting warships.

Depth charges exploded all about the submarine. To the starboard a charge went off. Another went off to the port; likewise at the bow and the stern. The messboy, grinning broadly at the thought of what his submarine had just accomplished, carried a cup of coffee to the commanding officer.

Another depth charge exploded dangerously near, rocking the submarine and sending water swishing madly along her hull. Another cracked nearby almost immediately. The mess boy, steadying himself, looked at his skipper and said informally: "Captain, we sure is giving them hell, ain't we."

Our Navy is fighting with spirit and determination. Our submarines are softening Japan for the knock-out blow that will eventually come. In the Pacific the enemy is finding it difficult to survive the terrible losses inflicted by our submarines.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, but that the young men, the officers and enlisted men who have volunteered for this submarine service and who have performed so brilliantly in fulfilling their responsibility deserve possibly more credit than any branch of the service for our successes to this date. They have sent to the bottom the ships Japan was using to send stolen riches to their homeland. They have sent up in billows of smoke many of the Jap oil vessels transporting stolen oil to feed their diabolical war machine. Thousands of Jap soldiers never reached their destination because of the torpedoes launched from these effective vessels.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the submarine story in part. When the final chapter in the history of this war has been written, I am sure, that cold statistics will show the true importance of the submarine in the achievement of the victory which for us is sure to come.

Forty-eight-Hour Week

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 25th of October of this year, in placing my remarks in the RECORD of that date, I included therein an editorial of the Dallas News on the manpower shortage. I advocated in my remarks the passage of my bill—H. R. 2071—which, if passed, would standardize for the duration a 48-hour workweek.

By all means this bill should pass and become a law, as it would help materially our manpower problems. I am trusting that this Congress will arise to the occasion and pass this much-needed legislation.

I want to ask this Congress at this time to get behind this bill and push it. If this Congress will do so and we can pass this much-needed legislation, we will be rendering a very valuable service to the people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, since making my remarks on that date, many newspapers of the country have written and printed editorials in support of H. R. 2071. Among them was one in the Mobile Register, of Mobile, Ala., on the 30th of October, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point by including this editorial. The editorial is as follows:

THIS LEGISLATION WOULD DO MUCH TO RELIEVE MANPOWER PROBLEMS

The manpower muddle has led now to a proposed broad study of "critical areas" to promote better utilization of labor and lessen complaints of shortages in war industry. This suggestion comes from Senator TRUMAN as chairman of the Truman investigating committee, who names the executive vice chairman of the War Production Board as a logical choice to direct the survey.

We have no doubt that careful examination would discover a great many instances in which manpower in war work could be utilized more effectively. And certainly there is no justification for lost motion, overstaffing, or any other practice which detracts from the production of war necessities.

But while the Truman committee is calling for a survey, Congress is neglecting a much more promising opportunity to improve the manpower situation. This opportunity is presented in a bill sponsored by Representative RUSSELL, of Texas, to increase the straight-time workweek to 48 hours. Mr. RUSSELL is appealing to his colleagues to enact this measure as a substitute for the 40-hour law. His arguments bear the weight of plain, common sense when he pictures the advantage to be obtained and urges his colleagues to adopt his bill "immediately and without hesitation."

Representative RUSSELL insists that by standardizing the wartime workweek at 48 hours, manpower would be increased one-seventh. He reasons that "this increase would be of material aid in solving our manpower shortage" and also "help to prevent the breaking up of the homes of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers," in that it would partly eliminate the necessity for drafting them for military service.

Mr. RUSSELL makes an intelligent answer to critics of a 48-hour week.

"It has been said against this bill," he observes, "that many are already working in excess of the 40 hours per week now provided by law. My answer is that a very small percent of the total workers are working in excess of 40 hours and those who are working longer are paid, under the law, time and one-half of the base pay for such excess work.

"This extra pay, in most instances, is now being paid by the Government. It comes from the funds of money raised by taxation and it is creating an extra burden on the taxpayers, who are now being strained to the limit in the raising of funds to carry on our war effort and who will necessarily have to suffer more as our tax burdens grow.

"This extra expense of overtime pay is in itself aiding inflation, which we are supposed to be fighting to hold down."

In further answer to the statement that many employees are putting in more than 40 hours a week, Representative RUSSELL emphasizes that "There are many companies and contractors who refuse to work their employees over 40 hours a week by reason of the added expense of the time-and-one-half pay for such excess work."

He points out that under his bill the employee would work "one-seventh more than he works under the 40-hour week law" and would receive "one-seventh more pay" for his week's services.

Mr. RUSSELL doubts that the American people will "get alarmed at our Government's cry of shortage of manpower as long as the 40-hour-week law remains on the statute books." He makes this further pertinent observation: "The millions of our American soldiers who are fighting on every battle front are not limited to 40 hours per week. Those men * * * are on the job 24 hours a day."

It is perfectly apparent that on one hand the 40-hour workweek is a drawback to war production and on the other an incubator of inflationary tendencies. The Dallas News reminds that while the labor force in this country is working only a little above 40 hours a week as a whole, "the labor forces of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, and other Allied and enemy countries are working 50 to 70 hours weekly." It agrees that with a 48-hour workweek such as Representative RUSSELL'S bill proposes, "the labor situation (in the United States) would very largely be relieved."

Congress should heed Representative RUSSELL'S appeal for the passage of his bill "immediately and without hesitation." The merits of the proposal are obvious. So is the urgency. Enactment of this legislation would do immensely more than any survey can be expected to do to improve the over-all manpower situation in this country.

How Shall America Be Saved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the November 7 issue of the Arkansas Gazette:

HOW SHALL AMERICA BE SAVED?

"God save America," HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, cried to a Senate that was about to pass the Connally resolution pledging the United States to post-war collaboration in joint international action to prevent new wars and preserve the peace of the world.

This incurable isolationist must be credited with complete sincerity in his uncompromising attitude. But God did not "save America" after Senator JOHNSON and others a quarter century ago were instrumental in keeping the United States out of the League of Nations, whose history might have been vastly different if the voice of America had spoken in its councils.

Now Senator JOHNSON prays that this country may be protected and preserved "in the days to come as in the days that have passed." America is being protected and preserved, yes. But at what tragic cost in blood and treasure, with what sacrifice by fathers and mothers and wives and children, with what dislocations of the whole economic structure on which the normal existence of all of us depends.

This aged Senator, whose isolationism is seemingly unaffected by this second holocaust that is scourging the world, declares that for 77 years he has "known no allegiance but to the United States of America."

So some man living among people newly brought together in a community, and without the usual protective services might say that he knew no allegiance except to his own home and his family, and refuse to have part in establishing authority to maintain police and fire and health services for the community.

Office of War Information

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday and Friday, November 4 and 5, when the first supplemental appropriation bill for national defense for 1944 was under discussion, I made two speeches wherein I exposed certain activities of the Office of War Information that, in my opinion, were detrimental to our constitutional form of government.

I also introduced on Thursday, November 4, 1943, House Resolution 344, calling for a thorough investigation of this agency of our Government set up under Executive order of the President.

I maintain that the only way this Congress will ever be advised of the real truth regarding the operations of the Office of War Information is to authorize this congressional investigation.

I also maintain that this Congress is entitled to know the real truth regarding this agency, and if this investigating committee is authorized, I will produce witnesses who will testify under oath to facts that will not only shock the Members of the House of Representatives, but the people of the United States.

I mentioned last Thursday, and reiterate my statement made then, that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee only heard one side of the story, because of the 24 men who testified on the appropriation for the Office of War Information, all were employees of that agency with the exception of Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure. If the $5,000,000 they were then asking for is given to them by the Congress, they are the same ones who will be spending the money.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of these remarks, the text of House Resolution 344, providing for the authorization for this committee of investigation, and hope it will have the unanimous support of every Member of the House of Representatives:

House Resolution 344

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Office of War Information, with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been and is acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the cries that resounds over the Nation today is for national unity. That cry, it seems to me, is important. It is important because—to paraphrase a well-known axiom—"in unity there is strength."

But, my colleagues, I am sorely troubled by the fact that in this House today there is a singular lack of unity. That lack is so apparent that no one can successfully maintain that unity exists.

May I suggest that this lack of unity is due to the fact that a few of the Members are not in the least interested in unity. They are interested only in politics. They are interested in class hatreds. They are interested in broadcasting to the world at large that in the United States we care nothing about victory of our armed forces, only about victory for a political group.

One of the outstanding members of this disunity cabal is the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who, if his daily broadcasts, to use a charitable term, are to be considered important, which I deny, seems determined to undermine all efforts at unity.

How the irrepressibly psychopathic Adolf Hitler must gloat when a Member of this body, supposedly a responsible representative body, openly charges that special privileges were granted time and again to members of certain unions—granted because of certain contributions which had been made during the 1936 campaign.

The gentleman knows, but carefully refrains from so stating, that these alleged contributions were not contributions at all but loans. Loans which the Democratic National Committee repaid, just as they would have repaid these loans if made by a bank.

Since when has it become a crime to borrow money, even from a labor union?

If this loan had been secured from banks, I suppose it would have been all O. K. As a matter of cold fact, if the banks had been in the slightest degree grateful, they should have been glad to loan money to the Democratic National Committee in just a mere measure of appreciation of what the Democratic Party had done for them.

The Democratic Party stands convicted of having saved the banks, the railroads, the insurance companies and thousands of other enterprises from the bankruptcy and devastation brought about by the policy of corruption under Harding, and unintelligent contentment under Coolidge and finally under the fatheaded policy of Hoover, the great engineer, who had no more conception of what was happening than had any of his fat-headed contemporaries in key positions of the Government at that time.

I suggest to Mr. HOFFMAN that he take a day off and read the history of his party from 1920 to 1932.

If he can find consolation in that record, I suggest that he broadcast that to the country.

I will venture just this one observation. For legislative ineptitude, executive blundering, that 12 years from Harding to Hoover takes the palm.

If the distinguished gentleman can point to one constructive measure—and I will exclude the sinking of 585,000 tons of good Navy fighting ships, a sentimental but mistaken gesture toward peace; or, if he will tell this House of one instance in which he has been right, particularly in his pacifist "America First" policy, I will be glad to listen to

him, otherwise I suggest that he start expounding not class hatred but national unity, which in spite of him we will achieve along with victory.

Let's Wait to See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Tribune for November 11, 1943:

LET'S WAIT TO SEE

It has been our custom to devote our lead editorial once each year to the significance of Armistice Day. We have timed it to appear in the issue that goes to press nearest to November 11, a day set aside at the request of the Nation's veterans by the Congress as a national holiday. The veterans had noted for years the apathy of the general public toward the preservation of those basic principles of Americanism for which heroes have bled and died, and we have lent our effort annually to the purpose of refreshing the memories of the carelessly forgetful. The day is one that calls for earnest reflection and humility, one on which every American might well ask whether he or she has been worthy of the sacrifice and travail of those who have given their all for their country's sake.

On this Armistice Day we believe we can do a greater honor to our comrades in eternal sleep if we accept a challenge thrown down to all veterans by the editor of the Washington Post in a recent comment relating to immigration. He who is "known but to God" can not answer this deliberate attack on the ideals of all men who have served in our country's uniform. The media are not available to many others who would reply. We speak for all of them. We echo their unanimous sentiment.

The Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed by a nonrecord vote in the House on October 21, and the Senate will be called upon to vote on the subject very shortly. The whole purpose of wiping the act off the statute books can be stated very briefly. It is an international gesture of friendliness to the gallant Chinese people who are allied with us in World War No. 2, and who have at tremendous cost stood off Japanese aggression for so many years. Looking at it from almost any angle, the legal admission of 105 Chinese nationals to the United States each year means very little. They would constitute no threat to the national economy; they would not affect the labor market; they are sufficiently assimilable to make good citizens; and they are a sober, industrious, and congenial people; that many Chinese come into the country illegally each year anyway, and we have had no serious trouble with them. Of itself this move in the Congress is of no great concern to veterans, but it carries with it a danger that means a great deal to every one of our citizens. It is an entering wedge whereby the bars can be let down and there can come a flood of immigrants to America that could bring with it calamitous consequences.

Speaking for the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Representative A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana, presented an amendment on the House floor asking that no immigrants be admitted to our shores in any year during which as many as 1,000,000 persons are unemployed here. The proposal was submitted for the Legion and was supported by a far more restrictive mandate of the V. F. W. Mr. ALLEN was speaking for them as well as for himself. The veterans were looking ahead to the vast unemployment problem that may well face our people when the boys come marching home, and it is of moment to state that the Congressman, friendly at all times to the cause of servicemen, now has two sons in action on the fighing front. Both the veterans and Mr. ALLEN are also profoundly aware of several bills now pending in the Congress which would permit an almost unlimited number of oppressed aliens to walk in on us and settle down to American security and American jobs, even while the lads who most deserve them are far away from home fighting to preserve those jobs for themselves.

The internationally minded Washington Post, never known at any time to entertain a friendly consciousness of the problems of veterans and generally hostile to them, calls the Legion resolution isolationist and Mr. ALLEN'S espousal of it "sublimely ironic." It uses a lot of words with nasty implications; states in lovely language that neither the Legion nor the Congressman know what they are talking about; and, by using illogical premises, proceeds to knock the tar out of the position veterans have assumed to protect American workingmen and the men who are today fighting our battles overseas.

Eugene Meyer, the editor, whom we assume is responsible for the editorial, blandly accepts conditions of today as the same that will apply after this war is over. From here on out he says, in effect, we shall be rebuilding our own economy. We shall enlarge our markets the world over, increase our raw materials, and just move on to run the world in such a way that opportunity will be unlimited. We must, therefore, not lock our gates against foreign ideas, skills, and energies. It is defeatism, he says, to plan otherwise, and we might as well ban procreation.

We agree that the future has possibilities, but we have seen something of the effect of wars, too. We also are fully aware that to some degree alien energy and skill have, in the dear days of plenty, helped to build our Nation, but we likewise recall that the groundwork was well-conceived and well-planned by men who toiled to make an America with ideals, and we remember that the immigrants who came with their ideas to help us do it were of a class that cannot come to us now, and will not come after this war because their talents will be needed at home.

A further distinct recollection, and a later one, compels us to remind our friends with their heads in the clouds that within 4 years after the last war was won, 1,500,000 of "oppressed peoples" were admitted to our shores. Most of them have become good citizens, it is true and many are now fighting in American uniforms, but we did not then rebuild the world nor afford ourselves unlimited opportunities. Instead, not too long after the boys came home, our veterans sold apples on the street corners. The jobs they had held had gone a-glimmering. Unemployment was the rule, not the exception, and free immigration was one of the reasons. After a brief period of prosperity, we went through years of terrible depression.

History has a habit of repeating itself. Our veterans' organizations are planning against future unemployment. Perhaps the world will open up to great new opportunities after this war. If so, we can find plenty of room for friendly aliens who seek to assimilate our brand of Americanism. But first the veterans of this country want to wait and see. They would look realistically at what they believe are coming problems. They want no aliens employed until our own people, particularly our returning warriors, are first hired. That much we owe to our own.

The National Tribune, on this day devoted to memories of sacrifice to the death for the sake of principle, commends the veterans' organizations for their foresight. Our people owe to them and to Congressman ALLEN a debt of gratitude. The millennium is not yet here, even though the socially minded Mr. Meyer may think so.

Income Taxes on Back Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Leopold V. Rossi, Esq., concerning taxes on back salaries.

Because thousands of New York City employees will be affected by a decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on salaries which were not paid when due, I hope something may be done to correct the injustice set forth by Mr. Rossi:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 8, 1943.*

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the date of June 28, 1943, Mr. Guy T. Helvering, United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue, issued a directive which was printed in the Federal Register, volume 8, No. 128, Wednesday, June 30, 1943, relating to the collection of income tax at source on wages.

This ruling is now being followed by the comptroller of the city of New York. Under its provisions New York City civil service employees are paying a withholding tax of 5 percent and will pay, commencing January 1, 1944, a withholding tax of 20 percent on all back wages for the years commencing July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1943, owed them by the city of New York. These back moneys pursuant to statutory enactment are in payment of claims for wages, salaries, or compensation which should have been paid to these employees but which the city of New York, during the years mentioned, failed to appropriate in its budget for the periods involved.

Nowhere in the Federal statutes relating to income taxes did I find any provision enacted by the Congress of the United States that these back salaries which are now being paid or which will be paid to city employees are to be made subject to a withholding tax of 5 percent if they are paid between July 1, 1943, and December 31, 1943, or 20 percent withholding if they are paid after that date.

I am not maintaining in this communication that these employees should be exempt from taxation on these back salaries if the back salaries and what they previously earned for the specific period brings them within the taxable rates for those periods. They should be permitted to file amended returns in which they can add the back salary they are now receiving or will receive with what they earned in the former specific yearly periods. In that manner the intent of the Federal statutes would be carried out. Under the new income-tax law which is now being prepared, this matter should be clarified in order that this injustice to civil-service employees can be corrected.

I have taken this matter up with the office of the collector of internal revenue in the customs house in New York City, and they advised me that they had no choice but to follow Commissioner Helvering's ruling directing the 5-percent withholding tax if back pay moneys for the period commencing in 1937 and June 30, 1943, were paid to these civil-service employees between July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943, and a 20-percent withholding tax on these back pay moneys if they were paid after the 1st of January 1944. Commissioner Helvering's ruling will lead into litigation. Why should civil-service employees have to resort to the courts for protection if it was not the congressional intent to tax at current rates salaries earned in the past but which are now being paid or will be paid in the future? Verified claims based on the statutes involved for these back wages were all filed prior to June 30, 1943.

May I again suggest that in the new tax law that this situation be so clarified that there will be absolutely no doubt that back pay moneys for salaries, wages, or compensation which should have been paid pursuant to statutory obligations and which were not paid because of the failure of any administration to appropriate these moneys at that time be placed in the taxable group for the specific period in which these moneys were actually earned and not when they were or will be paid.

If you deem it necessary, I shall be glad to confer with you on this matter and give you any further information that you desire.

Respectfully yours,

LEOPOLD V. ROSSI.

Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the president, William R. Boyd, Jr., to members of the American Petroleum Institute at their twenty-fourth annual meeting, Chicago, November 10, 1943:

Oil is ammunition.

It is a secret behind the secret weapons in this war.

From oil field to battle field; petroleum serves on every front.

Next to the food we eat and the water we drink, oil is the most vital commodity of this country and of the world.

Long before Pearl Harbor the oil industry realized that war for us was inevitable. Operating under a system of free enterprise and in the characteristic American way, we quietly set about mobilizing our industry's enormous material and technical resources against the Nation's coming call to arms.

When war actually came, the petroleum industry accelerated the production of military gasolines, superlubricants, and hundreds of other petroleum products critically essential to the conduct of modern mechanized warfare. Concurrently, we were confronted with the difficult problem of providing vital petroleum products to defense plants, for essential transportation uses and for civilian needs on the home front.

Oceans of oil, rivers of gasoline, huge stock piles of refined products of every kind, have been furnished by our industry to power and lubricate thousands of types of war equipment from blood plasma refrigerators to giant bombers, 60-ton tanks, and an invincible armada of seagoing craft.

It has been our job, it still is our first duty, to insure a steady, uninterrupted flow of this vital oil ammunition in whatsoever product form prescribed, whenever and wherever it is needed for essential war usage on the home front, and on every battle front in all the theaters of war. Everything the oil industry does must have as its primary objective victory for our arms.

When the last gun fell silent on the western front 25 years ago tomorrow, many of the war-wise strategists realized that instead of ending all wars World War No. 1 had only ended the old type of war which had to be fought in theaters circumscribed by the mobility of armies and the range of weapons. Some military chieftains of both the victors and the vanquished understood prophetically that Armistice Day on November 11, 1918, was only the end of the first act of a new and terrible drama of war that would use the entire world as a stage and would make battlefields in the skies.

This new and complete type of warfare was made possible by petroleum, the liquid fuel that has given a new way of living to America—a better and more comfortable and easier way of living. With mankind still war-minded, it is inevitable that a product so important to living should be adapted to means for mutual extermination.

One of those who discerned the importance of petroleum in war, as well as in peace, was Lord Curzon, who, on November 21, 1918, at an interallied petroleum conference, Lancaster House, London, England, made his oft-quoted statement: "The Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil." True though that famous statement was, the few brief words that some day will tell the far more potent part that petroleum has played in this global war in which we are now engaged will say truly that World War No. 2 was won by American oil. We are not floating to victory in this war—we are fighting literally every inch of the way with oil—on land, on and under the seven seas, and in the skies. The panorama of millions slaughtered, peoples made destitute, and kingdoms crushed into the earth by mechanized means makes startlingly clear the fact that in this combat oil, more than any other weapon, decides the life or death of civilization.

Pause and seriously reflect on how this war might be going or what its ultimate outcome might be if the petroleum position of the United Nations and the Axis Powers were reversed. What kind of a war might it be if Germany or Japan had as much oil as the United States, or even as much as Texas or California, instead of a total supply which probably does not exceed more than the amount of 100-octane gasoline alone that we are now producing?

Oil is victory, and victory will be won only by the side abundantly supplied with amounts of the product processed for prompt action. But we must not stop with any passive, complacent acceptance of that truism. Our industry's responsibility to the American people, who otherwise will continue to expect us in war the same as in peace to supply them with the same quantities of oil at the same prices, demands that we iterate and reiterate from day to day and every hour of every day how America's oil industry is delivering the ammunition with which the United Nations are going to emerge as the victor of this war.

We must tell the public that for the petroleum industry this is an all-out war. We must tell them that, as far as crude-oil production is concerned, we are going all out; that we have called up the reserves we were hoping to hold for them until tomorrow; and that the decimation of those reserves this year means a weakened and exhausted line tomorrow unless a great new reservoir of reserves is found.

We must tell our friends, our neighbors, our relatives, and everyone else that the reforming of the petroleum supply lines that had been so disrupted by submarine warfare and direct war needs for oil has been one of the logistic achievements of history. The manner in which the petroleum transportation system of this country was revolutionized and the speed with which it was done is a story of accomplishment that will bear telling and retelling.

We must tell also of the great new war plants that miraculously have been built at petroleum refineries throughout the land. These plants, over a billion dollars' worth, are making the best aviation gasoline in the world in truly astonishing and ever-increasing amounts. They are producing toluene, cumene, xyline, butylene, butadiene, and other petroleum chemicals for explosives, superfuels, synthetic rubber, and many little known ingredients of war. They are producing the superb fuel and lubricants that our fighting machinery must have to win. Relentlessly driven by the lash of war necessity, the technologists of petroleum refining have compressed into the last 2 years more improvements than we would ordinarily witness in 25 years. When the final history of this war is written their achievements will be recorded as one of the great triumphs of American industrial science.

Everyone in this country has some realization of the importance of the crippling effect of massed and continuous bombing of the enemies' war industries and bases. Our Government regularly furnishes information about the tonnage of bombs dropped, the number of planes and personnel lost, and other details, but rarely ever does it tell of the petroleum products that powered the attack. When President Roosevelt stated that the October 8 blasting of Bremen and Vegesack with 1,250 tons of bombs required nearly a million gallons of 100-octane gasoline and 25,000 gallons of aviation lubricants, he indicated that it takes nearly 3 pounds of gasoline to deliver 1 pound of bombs to the objective. The bombs themselves were filled with petroleum derivative explosives. I agree with the Army officer who said that "the real key to any adequate attempt to crush an enemy nation by continuous air bombardment is not in the number of planes and trained men available for the task, but rather in the facilities for producing and transporting adequate quantities of gasoline and lubricants to the bases from which the air drive is launched." In other words, of what use is all the mechanized equipment without the fuel and lubricants to operate it? And, it is highly informative to say that the gasoline needs in this war already are 80 times greater than in the last war.

When Lieutenant General Somervell, commanding officer of the Army Services of Supply, told the Petroleum Industry War Council recently that war was already using over a million barrels a day of petroleum products, he inferred that soon nearly one-third of the oil production of the United States would be used in war. Reports of petroleum consumption from the fighting front indicate that it already requires an average of more than a barrel of petroleum products per month for every man we have overseas. The oil used by our Navy and by our supply ships and by our allies will probably boost the average consumption of oil per soldier and sailor to an even higher figure.

Putting it another way, every oil well in the United States must now produce each day an average of 3 barrels of oil for war and may soon have to produce an average of four barrels. The 296,000 "stripper" wells in this country that produce an average of about two barrels per well per day cannot produce

the average requirement for war which throws an added load on the other 105,000 producing wells which under the load become continually less capable of carrying it.

These are but some of the facts about oil that every oil executive, every oil worker, every automobile owner, every fuel-oil consumer, every traveler, every public official and every present and coming citizen should know. Are you keeping informed of what your industry is doing in the war and what, if anything, are you doing to help shout about it from the housetops?

It is not enough for the petroleum industry to be doing a superlative job in winning the war. It is not enough for our industry to rest content in the knowledge of a job well done unless there has also been well done the job of accounting to the American people for the disposition of the Nation's oil resources and why they are having to be restricted in their use of petroleum products.

The American Petroleum Institute, as one of the numerous trade associations representative of and supported by the industry, proposes to do everything it can to help unfold the story of oil before the American people. A program of information is already taking shape. However, it is not the job of any one organization or any one central agency to tell the story. It is a job for every trade association, local, regional, or national, a job for every oil company and for every individual of our vast, far-flung industry. It must be done by each oil association, each oil company, each individual in its or his own name and in its or his own way—but the objective should be the same and the tune should be pitched and sung in the same key and at the same tempo.

Uppermost in the minds of all of us is the hope that this second war conference of the American Petroleum Institute will be the last war conference to be held. It is my hope and prayer and yours that the Institute's 1944 annual meeting will be devoted to post-war and reconstruction problems which in their way will be no less in magnitude nor in moment than those which we have solved in such number in the 23 crowded months since Pearl Harbor. But, hope and pray though we may for victory in 1944, there must be no let-up, no relaxation of unremitting effort until victory is actually ours.

During the past year the unique Government-business partnership between the Petroleum Administration for War and the petroleum industry continued to flourish in a manner most satisfactory for both partners and in the best interest of the Nation. This relationship between Government and business is at once the envy and despair both of other industries, who long for partners like Petroleum Administrator Ickes and Deputy Administrator Davies and their staff, and of other Government agencies that crave a united industry represented by the counterpart of the Petroleum Industry War Council and the P. A. W. district organizations. As I have said repeatedly and sincerely, Petroleum Administrator Ickes, Deputy Administrator Ralph Davies, and the members of the P. A. W. staff are earnestly and with high intelligence, ability, fidelity, and patriotism discharging the trust imposed upon them by the President and their Government. They deserve continuance of the industry's full cooperation. They merit the commendation of all the American people for the excellent job they are doing, and, so far as I am concerned, they will get it now and in the future.

It is a well-known fact that it has been the policy of Secretary Ickes to staff the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War with men drafted from the oil industry, men who know from long experience the problems with which P. A. W. is compelled to deal. Oil operations are complicated and, in most instances involving production and supply, the problems are technical and require a high degree of skilled experience. P. A. W. has had to deal with the problem of securing and keeping the necessary trained personnel without which its war work could not be efficiently done. In dealing with this most difficult problem Secretary Ickes and Deputy Davies need the understanding cooperation of the industry and the help of oil companies, both large and small, who will release qualified men for Government service.

The oilmen who compose the working staff of P. A. W. have no "yen" for working for the Government. They have not sought these jobs. In almost every instance they have been "shanghaied" or drafted and they are sacrificing the evenly distributed work of their regular home employment and giving up the peaceful existence which normally surrounds their work and firesides at home for a hectic, abnormal life in Washington, where but few people are appreciative of what anyone is doing. These oilmen want to be only a part of a self-liquidating bureaucracy and their greatest ambition is to do their part in helping to win the war with oil—and then go home. Their compensation for making patriotically the sacrifice which they do should not be carping complaint from any of their fellow oilmen nor is there any merit whatsoever in the frequently made criticism that they are all there to serve some selfish end. Men can be and are as patriotic in essential civilian government service as they can be and are in uniform.

The example set by Secretary Ickes in staffing P. A. W. with oilmen quite appropriately has been followed by General Somervell who has staffed the Fuel and Lubricants Division of the Services of Supply branch of the Army (which works in close cooperation with P. A. W.), with oilmen who have donned Army uniforms to serve their country. This Division makes long-range Army petroleum supply plans and supply estimates; determines military and civilian requirements in conquered territories for the period of military control; analyzes sources of supply, and charts development and rehabilitation of oil fields. To quote from a recent O. W. I. press release, "Virtually the entire personnel of this Division is made up of experienced oilmen. Some have been production specialists in the industry while others have held important executive positions."

The members of the P. I. W. C. and the P. A. W. district committees have had another busy year. All too soon the regular monthly meetings of P. I. W. C. have rolled around, requiring attendance and consideration, debate and recommendation on the many urgent problems that have been presented by the Petroleum Administrator or which P. I. W. C. deems it desirable to present to him. All of these committeemen, too, are entitled to the gratitude of their fellow oilmen, the approbation of the Government forces, of which they are a working part, and the appreciation of the public generally for the contribution they are making to the public welfare and the war effort.

I can list here today only briefly some of the principal topics that have occupied the attention of the industry's war council during the past year:

1. Petroleum exploration and the discovery of great new reserves became recognized with substantial unanimity during the year as the most vital problem of the petroleum industry and the Nation. Although some good fields were discovered during the year, the average reserve of each primary discovery continues to shrink while the production and consumption of known reserves mounts steadily.

Associated with the discovery problem is the pressing problem of incentives to prospect, and the subject of an over-all increase in the price ceiling for crude oil for many months has been vigorously urged by the P. A. W. with the full support of the oil industry. The Economic Stabilization Director on October 29 rendered an adverse decision which he concluded with the following:

"There can be no general increase in the price of crude oil.

"The Petroleum Administrator is directed to formulate without delay a program to provide additional financial incentives for exploration and development of new fields in conformity with the standards outlined above and, if feasible, additional financial support for marginal stripper well and repressuring operations short of a general price increase. On formulation of selective incentive programs by the Petroleum Administrator consistent with the stabilization program the Economic Stabilization Director will direct execution of the programs by such other agencies as may be concerned."

What will result from this decision I, frankly, do not now know.

Meanwhile, the average gallon of American-produced crude oil still sells for less than the price of a 3-cent postage stamp.

2. Supplying increasing military war equipment and war-production-plant requirements and essential transportation demands and adjusting civilian supplies as satisfactorily as possible under prevailing rationing practices have occupied much of the time of P. A. W. and P. I. W. C. Involved in this supply problem were changing means of transportation, changing sources of crude oil and an increasing utilization of foreign crude oil as it became apparent that the United States could not meet all war demands for oil without seriously crippling the productive capacity of many fields and without impairing its internal civilian economy.

Various adjustments in refinery yields have been necessary during the year as has a relaxation of the oil to coal-conversion program as fuel oils have become more available on the east coast. Civilian supplies of gasoline have continued to diminish in the country as a whole and developments in the military picture will determine the extent to which future civilian rationing must go.

3. The vast construction program of the petroleum industry has been one of the major chores of P. A. W. and has been followed closely by P. I. W. C. As 1943 draws to a close it may be safely said that it has been the greatest construction year the petroleum industry ever has had. The construction of most of the Big Inch pipe line and the Little Big Inch line are the highlights in transportation construction, although the many other pipe lines that were laid, relaid, or reversed all contributed to the tremendous total and affected the movement of almost 1,000,000 barrels of oil daily.

The construction of new plants for the production of 100-octane gasoline, butadiene, petroleum aromatics, and aviation lubricants has likewise been one of the superconstruction jobs of the year. So much of this new construction has been completed in 1943 or will be completed before July 1944 that it may be said that within 7 months we shall have facilities to transport and refine practically all of the oil we can produce and all the products required for the prosecution of the war.

4. Increasing scarcity of manpower with which to carry on its construction program and war operations has been a subject of mounting seriousness with both P. A. W. and P. I. W. C.

Since I spoke here 1 year ago, the selective service has made further serious inroads on the manpower of the petroleum industry and other war industries have also taken a number of our trained men. At the same time our demand for men to find our oil and drill our oil wells and to build and operate our pipe lines and our refineries and to maintain the flow of our products into essential com-

merce has increased in proportion to the mounting demand for our products.

Strenuous efforts have been made jointly by P. A. W. and P. I. W. C., in cooperation with industry and the appropriate Government agencies, to retain as essential to the war many specially trained and particularly skilled men while procedure has developed to recruit replacements. The industry is being kept constantly informed of all developments affecting the manpower situation.

5. Not the least of the concerns of the P. I. W. C. and of the entire industry has been the survival and continuance of free enterprise under the impact of war. The industry has refrained from undertaking long-term financial commitments and business relationships that might conceivably lead to some type of governmental domination in later years. In this connection it is worth observing that most of the aviation gasoline construction program was financed by private capital which felt assured of the future for high-quality gasoline. In the case of synthetic rubber, which still remains shrouded by diplomatic and political uncertainties, the great bulk of the component plants has been built with Government money.

Fortunately for the petroleum industry, we feel that we have little to fear from direct Government domination as long as Secretary Ickes retains his post as Petroleum Administrator and to whatever extent he may control Government policy, for we have his repeated assurance that, so far as he is concerned, "come peacetime," he wants promptly to disband P. A. W. and again leave the petroleum industry to its normal peacetime responsibilities and competitive operations.

Business operations such as we have always conducted them in America cannot survive a permanently controlled, governmentally regimented economy. In such an economy, disappearance of the small business enterprise is inevitable for small business (the "independents" as we speak of them) in oil can only thrive under a system of free enterprise.

I have touched necessarily upon only a few of the accomplishments and problems of the petroleum industry. Others have been just as important. Other speakers on the program of this meeting will tell you more about them. They, I hope, will furnish you with much valuable source material which you can use in various ways which will occur to you to tell petroleum's story of accomplishment to the public generally. I must speak, however, of a splendid thing that with much satisfaction I have observed during the past year and that is the steadily growing confidence which the petroleum industry has in itself and which different segments of the industry have for others. This is largely the result of getting acquainted because as acquaintance grows, reserve and doubt vanish. This fine thing which is taking place within the industry can and should develop between the industry and the American people. The people of this country have a right to know more about the oil that is so essential in their daily lives but which the petroleum industry has so efficiently supplied that the public has begun to take their oil as much for granted as the mails and taxes.

Our experience as a working partner with government has been a gratifying one. It is a new experience for the oil industry and we like it. We hope the Government does too. It has made possible the magnificent job our industry has been doing to support the war program. Now, let us take the American people into our confidence. I am sure that such confidence will be reciprocated and that it will be profitable to all concerned. Next to our own primary job of winning the war, I submit that the most important duty of the petroleum industry is frankly to tell the public our problems and I commend that duty to you as an important part of your individual and collective efforts for 1944.

Deferment of Maintenance Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted to the Ways and Means Committee a tax proposal that will solve in some part many of the current industrial problems of the Nation and make a substantial contribution to post-war recovery. That sounds like a big order. In brief, my proposal is as follows: That corporations may set up in their operating expense account an amount equal to such maintenance expenditures currently appropriate as they find feasible to defer until the end of the war. The money in this account must be invested in a special issue of non-interest-bearing Government bonds. Said bonds can be redeemed at any time during the 18 months following the war upon adequate showing that an equivalent amount of deferred-maintenance work has been carried out. Bonds unredeemed for this purpose shall revert to the Treasury of the United States.

The significance of this proposal can best be understood by a review of the present tax law relating to excess profits. Under the 90 percent excess-profits tax it is almost mandatory for every corporation in America to carry on all possible maintenance work which can be included in operating expenses. Money spent for maintenance under current tax laws—and the new proposed excess-profits tax of 95 percent will accentuate this tendency—is being spent with the utmost liberality because the average corporation is paying in excess-profits taxes 90 percent of the moneys not thus expended. A study of the operating-income statements of a few representative concerns for 1942 compared with 10 years ago gives eloquent testimony to the effects of current excess-profits tax laws on maintenance expenditures. Eight concerns in varied lines of business spent on the average about 300 percent more on maintenance in 1942 than they did a few years earlier. The actual figures on the eight corporations I have chosen at random show that they spent $723,000,000 in 1942 on repair and maintenance as against $187,000,000 a few years earlier.

A substantial part of this increased maintenance can be attributed to increased business and higher maintenance costs. Nevertheless, a large part of this increased maintenance is work that could be postponed until after the war. Much of it is work that the concerns would much prefer to postpone until more normal conditions prevail. Most businesses anticipate a substantial letdown in their volume at the end of the war, with a large expense for reconversion, so that maintenance spending at that time under present tax laws would be ill-advised and dangerous from the standpoint of their corporate solvency. If this Congress can devise a tax plan that will postpone maintenance that is deferrable until that time, without a later drain on the corporation's treasury, it will be a real contribution to post-war stability.

If a substantial part of current maintenance work were thus deferred, the following direct advantages to the Nation would result:

First. The release now of a large number of men engaged in maintenance work for other jobs, thus solving in part the manpower shortage.

Second. A reduced demand for materials and supplies of all kinds at a time when almost all supplies are critically needed.

Third. The automatic investment in Government securities of additional funds in corporation treasuries, thus reducing the borrowing needs of the Government.

Fourth. A leveling-off of corporation spending during the war, and an automatic acceleration of their post-war expenditures.

Fifth. The elimination currently of large amounts of spendable funds in trade channels, thus reducing the inflationary gap in consumer income.

The importance of each one of these advantages could be elaborated considerably, but I will not take the time of this House to do so now. Likewise, this plan should probably be expanded to make similar provision for the deferment of maintenance expenditures generally, although it is in the field of corporation activity that the greatest volume of post-war activity could be stock-piled.

Summarizing, let me urge the Members of this House to draw upon their own experience and knowledge of our industrial problems to explore this plan. It is my conviction that, properly worked out, it can be the source of an automatic post-war stimulus to business that will do much toward giving the Nation a recovery bridge across the chasm of post-war dislocations and unemployment to the broad plateau of peacetime prosperity.

Consumer Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, October 9, 1943, my distinguished and able colleague, Mr. WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado, participated in the radio program known as the American Forum of the Air. I extend his formal remarks on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, when the House considers the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, food subsidies will have the center of the stage, and our discussion tonight is a prelude to that controversy.

The necessity for paying subsidies directly to the producer as an incentive for increased

production of essential farm commodities or other war material to meet the war situation has little opposition. But direct consumer food subsidies to lower living costs to all classes, regardless of their ability to pay, is quite another matter. Over this particular phase of the question the controversy arises.

The war emergency has given rise to a number of subsidies, but it should be remembered that subsidies are by no means new phenomena in our American economic system.

The question is not on the type of subsidy which we are now providing for the shipbuilding industry, copper, lead, and zinc production, or in transportation support to eastern sections of our country. But we are discussing consumer subsidies or a roll-back of food prices to consumers. Is it necessary and do we need it?

In a statement to a congressional committee, former Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown stated that the weekly wage of American laborers is 33 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. Yet the rise in living costs has been only 12 percent. Does this indicate we need consumer-food subsidies?

Prof. Richard V. Gilbert, Chief Economic Advisor to the O. P. A., says, and I quote: "I think it is necessary to subsidize only to the extent necessary to hold the cost of living stable." No supporter of consumer food subsidies as planned by the experts of O. P. A. would dare dispute the professor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics show that in June 1943 the average weekly earnings of laborers stood at an index of 163, the cost of living index at 124. Living costs have risen 24 points since January 1941 while the wages of the workingman have increased 63 points. Why are consumer-food subsidies necessary with the largest excess spending money ever available in the pockets of our American people? Shall we write our grocery bills on the cuff and pay them at a future date?

To be constructive, we should offer suggestions to improve the present program. First, the greatest hedge against inflation is all-out production. If it is food, then let us have the greatest production possible on every farm in America.

Second, a definite, clearly stated program, planned with vision and executed with vigor. Our producers must not be annoyed, badgered, harassed, and disturbed by constant changing of Federal regulations.

Finally, to assist the Federal Government in such a program we should have created—a central agency—responsible for the production, distribution, and the pricing of all food products. Such a plan is provided by the Fulmer bill now before the Rules Committee of the House.

I am convinced that consumer-food subsidies are inflationary, unjustified, and unnecessary; will eventually lead to chaotic marketing conditions; pile regulation upon regulation and eventually disrupt, if not destroy, our whole economic system.

Orville Wright Takes a Look Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 7, 1943:

ORVILLE WRIGHT TAKES LOOK BACK ON 40 YEARS SINCE FIRST FLIGHT; DESPITE AIR WAR, HAS NO REGRETS—INVENTOR, AT 72, SAYS HE AND BROTHER AT KITTY HAWK FORESAW SOME OF DEVELOPMENTS BUT, OF COURSE, NOT ALL—LIKENS AVIATION TO FIRE, USEFUL AS WELL AS DESTRUCTIVE

(By Fred C. Kelly, author of The Wright Brothers, the biography authorized by Orville Wright)

DAYTON, OHIO, November 6.—With the memorable date of December 17 approaching, the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight, Orville Wright, who made that flight, in a machine of his and his brother Wilbur's invention, consented to answer a number of questions for publication.

He was at his office and laboratory, at 15 North Broadway, on the West Side of Dayton, a short walk from the site of the bicycle shop in which the Wrights built the first plane. He had arrived, as he always does, punctually at 8:30 a. m., as if he had to punch a time clock.

Sitting so erect at times that he hardly touched the back of his chair, with arms folded in front of his chest, eyes alert, Orville Wright did not look his 72 years. There are few lines in his face except little smile wrinkles at the corners of his eyes and mouth.

My first question was, "What is your feeling about the use of the airplane as an instrument of wholesale destruction and human slaughter? Do you ever wish you had never invented it?"

"No," Wright replied promptly. "I don't have any regrets about my part in the invention of the airplane, though no one could deplore more than I do the destruction it has caused.

"I feel about the airplane much the same as I do in regard to fire. That is, I regret all the terrible damage caused by fire. But I think it is good for the human race that someone discovered how to start fires and that we have learned how to put fire to thousands of important uses."

NOT THINKING ABOUT WAR

"How much did you and Wilbur foresee of the uses of the airplane for war purposes?"

"At the time we first flew our power plane at Kitty Hawk, N. C., we were not thinking of any practical uses for it at all. We just wanted to show that it was possible to fly. But after our experiments at a field near Dayton in the summer of 1904 we saw that the machine could be useful for military purposes, especially for scouting.

"As early as January 1905 we had enough faith in its military uses to offer it to the United States Government, but our War Department did not then show any interest in it. We thought observations from scouting planes could prevent surprise attack by an enemy.

"We saw, too, that it would be possible to drop bombs on enemy territory. And we hoped that no government would want to risk starting a war and subjecting its people to the kind of devastation the airplane could inflict.

"One thing we particularly believed might prevent wars was the opportunity the airplane provided promptly to drop bombs on the buildings occupied by the members of parliament and highest government officials, or rulers, of the country that declared war. We thought the plane might thus make war so inadvisable that no government would dare to start one."

"But did you ever think the plane would create the world revolution it has, or that there would be night bombings from bases hundreds or even thousands of miles away?"

"No, we didn't even suppose anyone would ever fly or make landings at night. Nor did we reckon with the amount of punishment human beings seem able to endure.

HITLER UNDREAMED OF

"It never occurred to us that if a fanatical leader, for purposes of personal aggrandizement, should start a war, his people would put up with terrible suffering year after year without mass protest.

"Of course, the German people were doubtless led to accept the assurance of their leaders that the war would be fought on foreign soil with no bombings on their own cities. Perhaps the danger of bombings may cause even Germans to think twice before getting into another war."

"What do you consider the greatest single contribution of the Wright brothers toward successful flight? You were the first, I believe, to think of devising a mechanism to present the right and left wings at different angles to the wind, to get sidewise balance, and your wind-tunnel experiments provided the first accurate knowledge about air pressures on wing surfaces. Which of these contributions proved to be the more important?"

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION

Wright tilted back his chair and looked at me reflectively for a moment before replying:

"First of all, it was necessary to have a machine that would lift itself. There was no need of a system of control until one was able to get a machine into the air. Indeed, it would have been possible in 1903 for us to build a machine and fly it in calm air without our system of control, though, of course, such a machine could not have had any practical use. But without knowledge of how to build wings of the right shape—that is, of a shape to give more lift for the amount of power expended than had been possible before—we could not have flown at all.

"Except for what we learned from our wind-tunnel experiments in 1901, we never could have built wings that would lift the machine and a pilot with the amount of motor power then available.

"So, answering your question, for the first flight the system of control was less important than the knowledge of how to build wings of the right shape. But today, for the practical airplane, the two are about equally important. To try to distinguish between the value of these two features now would be like trying to determine whether the chicken or the egg should have precedence."

"Was there any time during your experiments when you felt greatly discouraged?"

"When we discovered in 1901 that tables of air pressures prepared by our predecessors were not accurate or dependable, that was discouraging, in a way, and disappointing. For it meant that instead of starting from where others had left off, as we had expected to do, we must start from scratch."

THRILL OF DISCOVERY

"But on the other hand the fact that these data which others had considered accurate now turned out to be inaccurate was interesting. One gets a certain thrill from discovering something others have not known. From one way of looking at it, you might even have called it encouraging, that the data others had used could not be relied upon. It suggested that maybe the reason others had failed to fly was not because the thing couldn't be done."

"And the moment of greatest elation? Was it when the plane first left the ground in successful flight on December 17, or after the flight was over and you could think about what you had achieved?"

Wright smiled as he said:

"Oh, neither of us felt any great elation over what we did that day. You see, we had faith in our calculations and had felt so sure we were going to fly that when we succeeded we were not surprised. In fact, I had got

more kick out of flying before I had ever been in the air—while lying in bed thinking of how exciting it would be to fly."

"By the way, how much gasoline did that first Kitty Hawk plane carry?"

"Only about half a gallon. The tank was just a foot long by 3 inches in diameter."

"It was that small to keep down the weight?"

"No; it could have been much larger as far as weight was concerned. But it was all we needed. It contained enough fuel to last about 18 minutes and take us 9 to 10 miles, and that was farther than we had any intention of going."

NOT INTERESTED IN DISTANCE

"You weren't interested then in making a distance record?"

"Well, of course, we knew it would be a record if we lifted into the air at all, because no one had ever done even that with a power machine before. But we weren't concerned about going any great distance or at high speed.

"We just wanted to make a clear demonstration that the machine was capable of sustained flight.

"The distance was not important as long as it was enough to prove that we had made a real flight—not a mere hop. As to speed, it would have been much easier to fly if we had built the machine for greater speed, as we could have done; but we wanted it to fly at as low speed as possible to give greater ease and safety in landing."

"Now, about military aviation today. Do you think our Government should have a department of the air, as some have suggested, headed by a Cabinet member, just as we have for the Army and the Navy?"

"No," Wright replied emphatically. "There should not be a separate air department. There should not be a separate Army and Navy, either. I think there should be a single department of national defense, with air forces, ground forces, and naval forces all parts of the whole. None of the branches of national defense should have any rivalry with another, but only cooperation.

PEARL HARBOR AND CRETE

"Both at Pearl Harbor and Crete were examples of what may happen when there is too much separation and independence in the different branches of a country's armed forces.

"If we had an air force, treated as a separate department, our situation would be made worse than it is. Each department would try to outdo the others. Each would be jealous of its prestige and be always trying to convince Congress that it, rather than another department, should have the larger increase in appropriations. I have had enough dealing with our Government to know how undesirable that sort of thing can be.

"I don't think there is much rivalry between, say, the Artillery, Cavalry, or Engineers, and the Infantry branches of the Army, because the men in those parts of the Army all think of themselves as belonging to the same team.

"But there has always been an unfortunate rivalry and competition between the Army and the Navy. That wouldn't exist if they weren't separated into different departments. And why should they be separated? Why should one be competing with the other for either appropriations or glory?

"One of the best things President Roosevelt has done since the present war started, it seems to me, is having the Army and Navy and Air Forces in certain areas under the command of one man, as, for example, General MacArthur in the southwest Pacific, and under General Brett, of the Army Air Force, at Panama. That same principle of unified command should be applied on a still broader scale."

FOR SAME BASIC TRAINING

"And you would not have aviators trained separately for work with land forces and to fly from ships at sea?"

"Naturally there would be some specialization, but the basic training should be all the same. And no flyer would think of himself as permanently assigned to land forces or sea forces. Every flyer would know that he was simply part of the national defense for assignment wherever needed."

"You wouldn't have one branch of the national defense trained at Annapolis and another at West Point?"

"No. Those places should not be separate institutions. If we were properly organized, students would go from one to the other to receive training. Having one place for the training of ground troops exclusively and the other for sea forces only helps to create a kind of rivalry that does harm. Such feeling of rivalry should never be allowed to start.

"Men who are drafted today go to perhaps half a dozen places for training and don't feel themselves bound to loyalties for any one training center. It should be the same in regard t West Point and Annapolis. Men being trained for officers could go to both."

"But wouldn't you have to separate the training of a man who is to be, say, an ocean navigator, or who will handle naval guns, and one who will direct ground troops?"

"Certainly. Just as we now separate the training of those who are to specialize in field artillery or cavalry. But such specialization doesn't need to be done in rival or competing institutions.

FLYING IS FLYING

"And the basic training could all be the same. A man trained to be an airplane navigator operates over both land and sea, and not much separate training should be needed for him to become a navigator on a battleship. Signal Corps training would be much the same whether for use by ground, sea or air forces.

"When a man starts to learn to fly it doesn't matter whether he is later to fly from the deck of a plane carrier or from an airfield. Most of the more fundamental training today at West Point and Annapolis is mathematics, languages, history, engineering, drilling and so on, presumably must be about the same, or should be.

"Every officer in the national defense forces should have been educated broadly enough to know problems and difficulties of the different branches of the national defense. It should be so organized that the high command could assign men to the land, sea, or air forces and transfer them from one to another, wherever most needed."

"Then you wouldn't have Army and Navy teams competing at football each year and showing bitter rivalry?"

"Surely it would be better," replied Wright with a chuckle, "if they had a football team made up of students from both West Point and Annapolis. Then they could be learning cooperation. They could doubtless find some other good teams to play against."

FUTURE OF AVIATION

"What about the future of aviation after the war?" I asked. "What developments do you look for in the way of new uses for the airplane?"

"Well, I'm not one of those who think the plane is going to supplant railroads, ships, trucks, and automobiles right away.

"Uses of airplanes will increase, of course. But it may be some time before they can carry freight as cheaply as railroads or ships can. There will be trans-Atlantic passenger service, much more passenger service of all kinds. And I shouldn't be surprised if passenger service by plane across the Atlantic may be lower priced, almost immediately after the war, than first-class fares on boats have been.

"It will be some time, though, before cargo planes can compete in price with big boats for carrying heavy freight. However, cargo planes will do more and more carrying of perishable goods.

"Perhaps letters sent to any considerable distance in the United States will regularly go by air at the same postage rate as those sent to nearby points by train or truck.

"There will be an increase in use of privately owned planes, but I don't think this increase will be enough for a few years yet to be at all revolutionary."

"Do you look for great advances in the speed, carrying power, and range of bombers?"

"I hope," replied Wright solemnly, "that after this war is over it will be possible to avoid building any more bombers of any kind.

"If, because of failure of international cooperation, it is still considered necessary to go on building up big fleets of bombers, then we'll be right back where we were and the sacrifices of this war will have been pretty much in vain. We shall have lost the war."

University of Lublin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Weekly K. A. P. Review Agency of New York, regarding the formal adoption of the Lublin University by the Fordham University, in a unique ceremony:

UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN FORMALLY ADOPTED BY FORDHAM UNIVERSITY IN A UNIQUE CEREMONY

In a unique ceremony, believed to be the first of its kind in the United States, the University of Lublin was formally adopted for the duration of the war by the Fordham University, in Keating Hall, Sunday evening, October 31, 1943. The faculty lounge in Keating Hall was dedicated as the Lublin room "a hallowed spot where Lublin can find an honorable refuge until the day of victory and peace when all the universities of Poland will light their lamps again." The furnishings of the Lublin University room were donated by the General Pulaski Memorial Committee.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

The Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of Fordham University, delivered the address of welcome, and explained why the Polish university had been singled out from among the many universities in Europe:

"If you would ask why Poland, instead of some other occupied country was chosen," he said, "we should answer that Poland is closer to the United States than any other European country occupied by the Nazis. Poland is close to the United States in spite of the difficulties arising from phonetics. As regards art and literature, Americans are hardly conscious that Polish art and literature are not their own. When they read the Russian novels of Chekhov, Gogol, or Dostoevski, when they ask for Rimski-Korsakov they realize that they travel in Europe. But Conrad and Sienkiewicz belong to us. When we read the Nigger of Narcissus, Lord Jim, or

Nostromo, we feel it was written by an American. Our boys raved about Wolodyjowski, they loved the heroes of Fire and Sword. Chopin and Paderewski are in every American home, like something we have written ourselves.

"But even more striking is the similarity of political ideals. We hear only too often the old slander always brought up by Poland's enemies: 'It is a country of peasants kept in slavery by a small aristocracy, that does nothing but fight and quarrel.' The facts are that Poland was the first country in Europe to elect its kings, the first to organize education for the masses, one of the first to free the serfs, and the first to set up a constitutional government based on the rights of the common people. Those were the ideals for which Kosciusko fought in Poland and in the United States. It is precisely because Russia, Austria, and Prussia could not tolerate the thought of a free republican parliament, that they partitioned Poland.

"There are many peasants still in Poland, but they are the type that would improve any country. They are spiritual, shrewd, brave. It was the peasants of Poland who made the right choice when the Bolsheviks offered to give them the whole country. They chose order rather than revolution, and it is to the Polish peasants that we owe the fact that Poland did not become a red bridge for Bolshevik Russia.

"We are inaugurating today the Hall of Lublin as a tribute to the bravery of every class in Poland. It is still true that 1 Pole is worth 10 Germans. The only thing proven by invasion, is that one dive bomber is equal to a thousand brave men on horseback.

"In the last few days great events have been prepared behind closed doors. We hope that the members of the Moscow Conference have not forgotten the confession of Napoleon at St. Helena. Napoleon admitted that three fatal mistakes wrecked all his plans: (1) That he had not strengthened Poland, the keystone of Europe; (2) that he had not annihilated Prussia; and (3) that he had undertaken the Russian campaign. Adolf Hitler has confirmed the folly of the third mistake. Let us hope that the United States and her gallant ally, Great Britain, will never know the bitterness of the other two."

National Cemeteries in All States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter received from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars states the position of the organization upon the establishment of national cemeteries in the States as follows:

Please be assured the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is whole-heartedly in favor of the enactment of this legislation, the organization having gone on record at several national encampments as advocating the placement of a national cemetery in each State and Territory of the United States.

Mr. Ketchum also enclosed copy of a resolution by the forty-second national encampment in 1941 reaffirming the organization's advocacy of national cemeteries in all the States, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Forty-second National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we do hereby reaffirm our advocacy of the establishment of a national cemetery in each of our States and Territories, and that we hereby direct our national legislative committee and our national legislative representative to cooperate with all State departments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and others in assisting to secure Federal authorizations and appropriations for the establishment, development, and maintenance of suitable and adequate national cemeteries in all States and for the acquiring of additional property where any existing cemetery facilities are exhausted.

Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a total of 264 ships of varying designs have been launched at the yard of the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md., during the 2½-year operating period between April 30, 1941, and November 1, 1943.

That represents an average of about eight ships a month for the entire time.

Beginning from scratch on March 18, 1941, an old shipyard site with but four ways, used for shipbuilding in the First World War, and an old Pullman car manufacturing site were converted into what are now the largest yard and fabricating shop on the east coast engaged in the construction of cargo vessels.

On April 1, 1941, the total pay roll of the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard amounted to 355 persons. Today 46,000 men and women are employed in this modern shipyard and fabricating shop, working day and night on 3 shifts.

An indication of how production has been stepped up from the time the keel for the first vessel was laid on April 30, 1941, is shown by the fact that the *Patrick Henry*, the initial Liberty ship, required 150 days from keel laying to launching, while the vessel *Jesse De Forest*, launched October 3, 1943, required but 22 days.

In October of this year the yard sent 20 ships down the ways in 31 days. In November it is expected that 21 ships will slide into the Patapsco River.

The establishment of the Bethlehem-Fairfield yard for the production of Liberty ships for the Second World War is an impressive record in itself.

The site is that of the old Union Shipbuilding Co., which consisted of only four ways during the First World War. It had not been used since that time. It included two 400-foot piers, badly in need of repairs, an office building, a brick warehouse, a paint shop, a machine shop, and a marine railway, long out of use.

Construction of the present yard was begun on March 18, 1941, and 6 weeks later the keel for the first Liberty ship built in this country, was laid, namely the *Patrick Henry*.

Existing facilities, consisting of the four original shipways of the Union Shipbuilding Co., were quickly converted for modern shipbuilding operations, but that was only a small part of the big job.

The main achievement was the creation, from beginning to end, of the present-day yard, with its 12 additional shipways, and the equipping, 2½ miles from the yard, of a modern fabricating plant, through which 70,000 tons of steel is handled monthly.

The terrain of the 12 new ways originally consisted of a soft spongelike soil, not far removed from swampland, and had to be converted speedily into complete shipbuilding purposes.

Transportation was a major problem, necessitating the building of 30 miles of trackage and other facilities for the handling of 100 carloads of materials and equipment daily from outside vendors, and for 40 carloads of fabricated assemblies to be shipped each day from the fabricating shop to the shipyard and then to the 16 ways.

The fabricating shop is on the site of the old Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co., Curtis Bay. Utilization of the existing buildings resulted in conservation of a great quantity of vitally needed construction material. The present shop consists of three 90-foot bays, is 1,660 feet long, and is able to produce 100 percent of all the steel that goes into the ships at Bethlehem-Fairfield yard.

The scope of both the yard and shop operations involves 245 acres of land, and it is believed that this is unsurpassed in the shipbuilding field in the East.

Seven ships were launched in 1941, believed at that time to be a good record. As additional facilities were added and as improvements were made, production was accelerated. During 1942 a total of 88 ships were built and delivered, 11 of which were of a special design that required a radical change in production methods. The new type vessels, for example, required five times as much electrical work as the original Liberty ship.

Toward the end of 1942, 12 of the 16 ways were changed to the production of the new type vessels.

In the present year—1943—82 ships were built and delivered during the first 5 months as compared to 22 ships for the same period in 1942, or in the proportion of almost four times the production of last year.

The yard is attempting to break its own records for ships launched in a single month, and it is hoped that the keel-laying to launching time will be cut from 22 to 21 or even to 20 days.

Immediately following the launching of the *Pope*, the entire bottom for another Liberty ship was laid in the record time of 2¾ hours.

The spirit of the shipyard workers was exemplified by the men on way No. 16 recently when they pledged themselves not to shave until the ship on which they

were working was launched. They have shaved.

The loyalty of the yard's men and women and their eagerness to see this war through to an early conclusion is best represented by the statement of a shipyard worker to a veteran of the Second World War who paid a visit recently to talk in behalf of the Third War Loan drive. Said the shipyard worker:

If you go back there, buddy, you tell the fellows that we're right behind them building the ships that will carry the supplies they need to win this war.

You tell them we won't let them down. You see, buddy, I got a son over there, and maybe one of these ships I've been working on will take over some bullets, or guns, or medical supplies that may save his life sometime. And that goes for a lot of the other fellows here, too.

You tell the boys on the war front that we're backing the attack all right, here on the home front.

This yard and fabricating shop and the fine records they have established are the outgrowth of an original assignment to the Bethlehem Steel Co. on February 4, 1941, from the United States Maritime Commission, to rebuild the 4 old ways of the Union Shipbuilding Co. and to construct 9 new ones, or a total of 13. The 3 additional shipways were added as time passed and as the needs arose.

Induction Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of November 9, 1943, entitled "Induction Ceremony":

INDUCTION CEREMONY

In deeply solemn rites today American Catholicism will accord to Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick the recognition of leadership which his talents and services have won for him. The position which he has held as acting head of the Catholic University of America since June 1942 is to be made official in the full meaning of that word. As seventh rector of one of the very greatest cultural institutions of the Western Hemisphere, he becomes an educational authority who hereafter will speak with the mandate of complete ordination.

What this signifies to Monsignor McCormick himself is his own particular secret. To the world at large his induction represents the fruition of four decades of devoted labor to the sacred cause of Christian learning. From the start of his career he has been a teacher in the professional connotation—a pedagogue in the modern scientific sense of being an instructor of instructors. His Washington period commenced in 1910, when he was only 29 years of age. Still youthful of countenance a third of a century later, he currently is at the apex of his powers.

The whole community, not merely any single portion of it, profits from the dedication of such a servant of the living God. Days dark with turmoil give little opportunity for reflection, but even through the prevailing clouds of confusion the light of the eternal truth appears in the example of a consecrated personality. Monsignor McCormick is needed now as perhaps he might not be in an era of peace and tranquillity. He is a pastor as well as a professor, a physician of souls as well as a publicist, a patriot as well as a loyal priest of the church. In each of these several roles he has work to do, and a multitude prays a divine blessing on his doing of it.

Nationalism Coming Into Its Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va.:

NATIONALISM COMING INTO ITS OWN

There is encouraging evidence that a coherent American foreign policy is beginning to take form. And as is the case with all important advances in the life of a people, it is rising from the people themselves rather than filtering down to them from the seat of formal authority.

The essence of this policy may best be described, perhaps, as a willingness to cooperate with other peoples in any proper program designed to promote international welfare, so long as the steps taken do not abridge any American right or subordinate any legitimate national interest.

The development of this philosophy of international relationship, as opposed to complete aloofness on the one hand or overboard internationalism on the other, is apparent in many places.

It was apparent in the pronouncement on post-war relationship agreed to at the Republican Mackinac conference.

It was apparent in the Four Power Declaration emerging from the Moscow Conference.

It was apparent in the unfolding of senatorial thought in the debate on the Connally resolution, and even more conspicuous in the ready acceptance of the principle of the Moscow Declaration by most Members of the Senate and by the American public.

We believe that this always has been the attitude of an overwhelming majority of the American people, but that political manipulation at Washington has prevented true expression of majority public sentiment.

The major error of our more ardent internationalists, many of whom at heart may not have been extreme as their utterances would seem to indicate, was their failure to recognize the validity of nationalism. They were willing—at least we so must judge from their words—to relegate national sovereignty to the background in favor of an over-all world authority to run the universe. This world set-up always was vague, but the principle of throwing national interest overboard in order that internationalism might function without restraint, was there. They branded with the term "isolationist" all who disagreed with them or who dared urge the wisdom of holding fast to national authority and keeping national interests always in sight. They denounced nationalism in season and out as shortsighted provincialism responsible for all the woes of the world.

As a result of all of this, they succeeded in completely distorting the picture, in creating an artificial division on the question of foreign policy, and in submerging the real thought of the people.

The fact that nationalism is in nowise incompatible with international cooperation was well stated in a recent speech by President Seymour, of Yale University. Urging revival of the League of Nations "without political functions of a coercive nature," Dr. Seymour warned that we should have learned from Versailles the futility of creating international institutions on paper before public opinion is prepared to operate them, and added this striking truth:

"National feeling, still perhaps the strongest spiritual force in the world, cannot be suppressed; it must be channeled into effective international cooperation. Those channels can be cut only by the popular will as it becomes educated to their value."

There is the core of the matter. If, to quote Dr. Seymour, "the tragic mistake of the past 20 years was to trust to uneducated human impulse and instinct instead of making what use we could of historical experience," the tragic blunder of the more vocal of our world planners of the present day has been to misunderstand entirely the fundamental character, the durability, and the virtue of nationalism. Any man worth his salt thinks first of the welfare of his own family, the security of his own fireside. That concern does not make him less a good citizen of the community, nor does it weaken his ability to cooperate with his neighbors in the promotion of community welfare. So with nations. And any plan of world organization which fails to take this basic fact into consideration is doomed to failure.

Fortunately, as we say, the people finally seem to be getting this thought over to their leaders. At all events, the scramble of most of our all-out world planners to get on the band wagon, to lay aside their plans for a shiny new world order with military alliances and all the trimmings, suggests that the light is beginning to filter through. We may expect all such, of course, to hail the present approach as their own offsprings, and to proclaim jubilantly the utter rout of the wicked nationalists and isolationists. But if there comes out of it all a reasonable approach to world organization, a foreign policy which will not scuttle American interests for a global dream, the price will be little enough to pay.

West River Valley Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolutions adopted by the Windham County (Vt.) Farm Bureau at its annual meeting on November 4, 1943, opposing the erection of a dam in the West River Valley as a threat to agricultural economics in the valley and favoring fair agricultural prices as opposed to subsidy payments:

Whereas the Federal Government, through the Army engineers, is surveying the possibility of erecting a dam in the West River Valley; and

Whereas such a dam as proposed would be a definite threat to the agricultural economics

of the valley and the business life of Windham County; and

Whereas such a dam as proposed would eliminate several rural communities, causing severe hardship and great property damage to families, farms, and summer homes, with questionable benefits: Be it

Resolved, That the Windham County Farm Bureau, met in annual session, go on record as being opposed to such a project and that it further instruct its officers and trustees to join in the effort to cause an abandonment of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the Windham County Farm Bureau, go on record as favoring fair agricultural prices as opposed to the subsidy payments.

Whereas the resources of our country both as to manpower, agriculture, and industry are demanded in our fight against a common enemy and will be needed in the establishment of a future peace: Be it

Resolved, That we condemn any unnecessary spending by our Government and by us as individuals, realizing that excessive spending now will make for depression later while thrift now will build for security in the years ahead of us.

In view of the agricultural progress made during the 30 years or so through which the extension service has been so successfully carried on by the county-agent system in cooperation with our farm bureaus: Be it

Resolved, That the Windham County Farm Bureau go on record as appreciating the values of this system of extension service and as favoring this method of developing our agricultural resources and as a general benefit to our rural communities; be it further

Resolved, That copies of all the foregoing resolutions be sent to our congressional representatives and to the State farm bureau.

The Fighting American Indian Deserves Fair American Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the records of this war disclose, as did the records of our last war, that the American Indian is unexcelled in fighting qualities and loyal devotion to American ideals. As General Douglas MacArthur well says in the following news article with reference to the American Indian soldier: "As a warrior his fame is world-wide."

Mr. Speaker, this fighting American Indian of ours deserves fair American treatment. He deserves to enjoy the privileges of American citizenship. He is entitled to assistance and guidance so that he can become a self-supporting, independent citizen, the same as the descendant of any other nationality in this country. The great American melting pot, in other words, should be expanded sufficiently to include the American Indian.

In a direct effort to improve the status of the American Indian and to make congressional consideration of his needs and wants more effective, I introduced House Resolution 166 on March 15 of this year. My resolution proposes to set up an investigation committee made up of members of the House Indian Affairs Committee and directed to examine into Indian conditions in this country to determine what recommendations should be presented to Congress for improving his status. It is generally agreed today by all students of the Indian problem that this Government is not adequately meeting its responsibilities to its Indian population. The time has come to take action to correct this situation.

On March 23 committee hearings were held before the House Committee on Indian Affairs regarding the advisability of conducting the investigation called for in my proposed resolution, House Resolution 166. After taking considerable testimony and hearing Commissioner John Collier, the Indian Affairs Committee, by a unanimous vote, approved of the investigation which I had proposed. This unanimous approval was reported to the Rules Committee of the House and there the whole program has been stopped.

From March 23 until the present, we have been unable to get the House Rules Committee to grant us a rule so that we can bring before the House for action House Resolution 166. I have personally talked with many members of the Rules Committee, as has our able and active committee chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. In spite of all this, no action has been forthcoming because the Rules Committee has refused to give us the rule without which we cannot get this resolution to the floor of the House. Republican members of the Rules Committee have assured me they will approve this resolution but the committee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], seems disinclined to permit this investigation to take place and thus far all action has been stymied. For some reason or other the Democratic Party in this House is blocking the conduct of this investigation.

Until and unless the Rules Committee will approve my resolution—or some other resolution providing for a study and investigation of the Indian situation—I am afraid the American Indian will never receive in this country the fair and just treatment which his splendid capacities and his heroic war record in two wars so richly entitle him to. Members of Congress interested in improving the status of the American Indian are urged to join me in an effort to get the Rules Committee of the House and its chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to give House Resolution 166 an opportunity to be voted upon on the floor of the House.

I conclude these remarks, Mr. Speaker, by including a short news story which reports the splendid services the Indian is rendering on the fighting fronts of this war:

INDIAN WARRIORS SOME OF FINEST ALLIED SOLDIERS

WASHINGTON, November 6.—Where is the "vanishing American" now? He's up there relentlessly stalking the "mustache smeller"—his name for Hitler—and using the bayonet on Japanese.

The 400,000 American Indians, with their superb, tireless fighting men and their traditional war fervor, are one of the most potent minority groups assisting in the march toward victory, the Office of Indian Affairs said today in a report on war activities.

Since Pearl Harbor, 18,000 warrior descendants of Geronimo and Crazy Horse, Tecumseh, Sitting Bull, and the rest, have joined the armed forces, most of them volunteers.

In some tribes, said Commissioner John Collier, 60 or 70 percent of the able-bodied men between 18 and 38 have gone to war.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in a recent message from Australia, said of the American Indian soldier:

"As a warrior his fame is world-wide. Many successful methods of modern warfare are based on what he evolved many centuries ago. * * * His tactics, so brilliantly utilized by our first great commander, George Washington, again apply in basic principle to the vast jungle-covered reaches of the present war."

Indians that have written their names in history in this war range from a major general, Clarence T. Tinker, who personally led his forces in the Battle of Midway and was killed, to Pvt. Joe Longknife, who killed 10 Japanese with 16 shots and saved his platoon from possible ambush.

Resolutions of Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions passed by Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association, at fall meeting held October 16, 1943:

RESOLUTION NO. 1, WAR MEAT BOARD

Whereas from the very beginning of the imposition of price ceilings on meat, the net result of confusing and conflicting orders and statements has been to bring chaos to one of our Nation's greatest and most necessary industries; and

Whereas the livestock and meat industry, at a conference held in Chicago early in April 1943, unanimously adopted a meat-management program which, in its opinion, would go far in controlling black markets, encouraging maximum production, and insuring better distribution of meat available; and

Whereas the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and the office of Quartermaster General approved the general principles of the plan as submitted by the industry following the Chicago meeting, and by agreement set up the War Meat Board to administer the war-meat program; and

Whereas, despite such approval, the War Meat Board has not been given an opportunity to carry on the program outlined but, instead, there have been continued threats to live animal ceilings, allocation of supplies, and even Government purchase of all livestock meats: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch of California Cattlemen, in session at Bakersfield, Calif., October 16, 1943, That we urge the responsible

Government officials and agencies dealing with the war-food program, to see that the War Meat Board is given sufficient authority, to enable it to properly and effectively administer the meat-management program, and in the meantime to see that threats of further Government controls which would hamper, rather than help, be immediately stopped.

RESOLUTION NO. 2. CEREALS AND VEGETABLE PROTEINS AS MEAT SUBSTITUTES

Whereas provincially minded people, completely failing to grasp the importance of livestock in our national economy, and ignoring the detrimental effect of a reduced meat diet on our national health, have urged that we must turn from the long-established practice of feeding grain and protein concentrates to livestock, to a new national program which contemplates far greater direct use of cereals by the human population, and to some extent the substitution of vegetable proteins for animal proteins in the diet, utterly ignoring the fact that animal proteins are far superior to vegetable proteins in stimulating and supporting the human body processes; and

Whereas 55 percent of our national acreage is in grass and only through its use by livestock can it be efficiently processed into human food; and

Whereas the nutritional basis of Anglo-Saxon success is the reliance on a meat diet, the importance of which is attested by the demand of the Army for meat in excess of normal civilian per capita consumption: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association, That we strongly protest the loose thinking and loose talking of those who, in the name of the war emergency, would seek to make impractical changes which would be disastrous to the country as a whole and could only seriously hamper the war effort itself.

RESOLUTION NO. 3. SUBSIDY ROLL-BACK

Whereas in order to appease those whose buying power is greater today than ever before in the history of the country, the subsidy roll-back program applying to meats and butter was initiated some weeks ago; and

Whereas, as anticipated, this program was immediately reflected in the livestock markets with packers making strenuous efforts to buy on a substantially lower basis, and it is now clear that in many instances the price already has been rolled back on the producer and feeder; and

Whereas the use of subsidies for such purposes, necessitating, as they do, ever greater taxation than the heavy burden now being borne, is frowned upon by the rank and file of the people of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association, That we urge Congress to take such action as would insure a discontinuance of the present subsidy roll-back program and put a stop to the efforts to expand it.

RESOLUTION NO. 4. CANCELING CONTRACTS FOR PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation, in recently announcing the new and substantially higher schedule of prices for protein concentrates for the 1943–44 crop, also arbitrarily canceled all existing contracts for old-crop cake and meal, although offering to resell the contracted product to the same users at an advance in price of $10 to $12 per ton, the profit resulting therefrom to go into the fund of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Whereas such cancelation of existing contracts will cause many feeders of livestock to take substantial losses on operations planned months ago, without any chance to protect themselves from such losses; and

Whereas this action is resulting in many feeders emptying their feed lots and refusing again to assume the heavy risk of feeding livestock unless action is taken to reimburse them for losses suffered on bona fide contracts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association, in session at Bakersfield, Calif., October 16, 1943, urge the Commodity Credit Corporation to honor claims filed by feeders for the amount of loss suffered under such bona fide contracts.

RESOLUTION NO. 5. LOW BYPRODUCT PRICES

Whereas for more than a year rigid price ceilings have been maintained upon dressed meat products, and in the case of beef ceilings they are relatively low compared with long-time relationship between beef and other meat products; and

Whereas the cost of labor, grain, and protein concentrates has advanced substantially without a compensatory advance in the meat ceilings themselves being permitted; and

Whereas it is recognized that any move to decrease fat-cattle prices below levels existing today would inevitably further discourage feeders and retard beef production: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, C. C. A., That as a partial measure of relief the ceilings on hides and other byproducts should be immediately raised to a reasonable level.

RESOLUTION NO. 6. PACKER MEAT QUOTAS

Whereas the rationing of meat to consumers and the set-aside order to packers make entirely unnecessary the continuance of the packer quota system covering volume of meat to be made available for civilian use; and

Whereas the operation of this quota system has tended to encourage black markets and has unnecessarily increased the transportation burden because local packers, in surplus livestock-producing areas, are not permitted to slaughter a volume sufficient to meet the local ration-coupon demand, causing livestock to be shipped out, processed, and the product returned for the distribution: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, C. C. A., in session at Bakersfield, Calif., October 16, 1943, That we commend the War Food Administration for its action of September 1, 1943, in suspending these quotas for 60 days, and urge that the suspension be made permanent.

RESOLUTION NO. 7. MEAT PRODUCTION

Whereas, with so much publicity on the shortage of meat which developed this spring, it is not generally realized that the livestock industry has tremendously expanded meat production, setting a new record for total production in 1940, 1941, and 1942, with every indication that this year's total production will exceed the all-time record set last year; and

Whereas, despite this record of great production, administrative agencies have resorted to charges that the livestock industry is responsible for the shortages, so much publicized, by hoarding livestock which should have gone to market: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, C. C. A., in session October 16, 1943, That we protest this unfounded charge of hoarding, which was nothing but a smoke screen to cover up the bungling of the said administration agencies.

RESOLUTION NO. 8. LIVE ANIMAL PRICE CEILINGS

Whereas over a period of 50 years or more the livestock industry of this country has developed an intricate system of marketing which enables producers in any section of the country to make immediate spot-cash sales in public markets, auction markets, concentration points, or, in many instances, right on the home farm or ranch; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, unaware of the confusion that would result from disturbing this marketing system, has repeatedly threatened to impose live-animal price ceilings which would completely upset this whole marketing structure, make necessary a complicated and unworkable system of allocating supply, and would in effect merely extend to the producing end of the industry the same confusion that has existed in the processing end ever since the imposition of the first price ceilings: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kern Branch, California Cattlemen's Association, in session in Bakersfield, Calif., October 16, 1943, That we are unalterably opposed to any tinkering with our marketing structure and demand that the threat of live-animal ceilings be removed from the livestock picture at once.

RESOLUTION NO. 9. ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITY

Whereas it has been clearly shown that both feeders and producers have made every effort to expand meat production; and

Whereas unfortunately, administration tactics have leaned largely toward the pyramiding of regulations instead of toward cooperative efforts that would bring far greater results; and

Whereas there are in the country record numbers of livestock, and prospects are for production of fairly adequate supplies of coarse grains and protein concentrates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Kern Branch of the California Cattlemen's Association, in session at Bakersfield, Calif., this 16th day of October, 1943, desire to call the attention of the consumers of the country to the fact that if under these conditions there should develop, next winter and spring, an even more serious shortage of meat, and particularly beef and lamb, than was the case last spring—and such a situation now seems possible unless administrative agencies move quickly along the lines long recommended by the livestock industry itself—that the full responsibility for such a meat shortage must be accepted by the administration.

RESOLUTION NO. 10. SUGAR BEETS AND THEIR BYPRODUCTS

Whereas in the sugar-beet-growing section of the country a large and very important livestock feeding business has been developed by feeding of beet byproducts; and

Whereas the uncertainty of the sugar beet program and the out of balance of prices fixed on sugar beets in relation to other farm crops have resulted in a curtailed acreage, thereby reducing the supply of our essential sugar and meat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Kern County Cattlemen's Association, urge upon the War Food Administration, first, that there be no restriction in the planting of sugar beets, and second, that a price be set on sugar beets that will encourage a normal planted acreage.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is the eternal hope of all, this Armistice Day, that wars will end permanently some day.

The drafting of fathers still dangles in a bill in conference and may never be taken down for a decent interment.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, in proposing General Marshall for President to save the Democratic Party from the Nudeal, may be long-headed.

When we undertake to lift the whole world with our depleted Treasury, successfully or unsuccessfully, we will be brought to a lower level.

The one question the Nudeal fails to mention in the proposal to rebuild the run-over countries is "Where are you going to get the money?"

A typical example of reverse lend-lease is: After being presented a $300,000 bomber the British provide winter flying clothes for the crew.

When we glory in the astuteness of a diplomatic act we have the same pride a horse trader takes when as a seller he influences the buyer to overlook a ringbone.

There is only one thing that will prevent F. D. R. from running for President again next year; that would be to make him the worthy grand sire of the superstate.

Scuttling the Philippine Constitution by extending the term of its President as a war emergency may be the precedent for an Executive order at home in 1944 to the same effect.

There are 125,000 Filipinos in this country and yet not one of them was given the opportunity to testify on the question of setting aside their country's constitution.

Hoisting the tattered flag from Guadalcanal in place of the one by the Capitol dome was patriotic and complete. Better far than if the marines had lifted foreign flags there instead.

If we insist on breaking down State laws and providing national machinery for the armies to vote on President, then we must expect the mail sacks for the front to be loaded with campaign literature—not good for the Army.

The bill preventing subsidies may reach a show-down next week in the House, or it may be further delayed to such time as best calculated to chloroform it. This is the advantage leadership has when it is in the minority on a certain subject.

Lack of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we are to accomplish the utmost, the people must have confidence in the administration. Waste, inefficiency, and bungling on the part of the administration has destroyed much of the confidence which the people normally have in their Government.

As an illustration of this lack of confidence, note the following excerpt from a letter received by me this morning, which is similar to many others which come in from day to day. The letter, in part, reads as follows:

Think it is about time that a change is made in the purchasing department. They must have a hell of a good time spending the other fellow's money.

I would suggest sending out a committee of, say, two new dealers—professors—and two no-yes men and let them visit the camps, warehouses, or storehouses—in fact, any place that food is stored. The packers are loaded up full; the dairies are loaded with butter.

Now they have frozen sauerkraut, and everyone knows that sauerkraut will work and spoil, so in the spring we will hear of carloads dumped on the dump pile, like the carloads of potatoes this spring while we were paying 80 cents a peck.

The newspaper article enclosed with the letter is as follows:

CANNERS SOUR ON GRAPEFRUIT-JUICE OFFERING

NEW YORK, November 7.—While the War Food Administration for the second time tried to sell more than 17,000 cases of ageing eggs (30 dozen to a case) that have been in storage since last spring, and which are described as unpalatable, the American Institute of Food Distribution reported yesterday to its 3,000 members that canners were "not eager" to take back 2,700,000 cases of 1942–43 pack grapefruit juice offered for sale by the Federal Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation.

"Canners are complaining about taking this merchandise back right now for several reasons," the institute said in its weekly Washington food report. "New pack is starting and it is difficult, or impossible, to sell old pack to the trade except at a discount. The old pack was grade A but now it couldn't pass for much better than C.

"The Government has offered the juice on an "as is" basis, but not allowing for any increase in the canners' ceiling or the probability that quality has deteriorated. Canners must also relabel and repack, but cannot include this cost in the form of an increased ceiling."

Invisible Foes of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the women's division, American Jewish Congress of New England, November 4, 1943, at Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass.:

I am particularly fortunate in my audience this afternoon; your interest, alive and alert, in the problems of Judaism is manifest; your very presence here is the clear indication that the importance of what I have to say to you is recognized.

In my radio addresses, newspaper and magazine articles, I faced the unknown quantities, never able to lose sight in the preparations thereof of the varying degrees of sympathy of those who chanced upon my utterances, their degree of knowledge of the antecedent facts, the necessity of emphasizing again and again that the Jewish problem is of great moment, of vital significance not to the Jew alone but to the world. It was at times like working at the writing of a primer, ofttimes carefully surveying and weighing the minds and hearts of my listeners with whatever psychological measurements I could use.

But to you I can talk candidly. I need not pause to engineer cautiously through apathy, inertia, disinterest, and skepticism. You will understand; and, knowing this, I am happy to be here.

The fate of Palestine is inextricably woven into the very fiber of the problems attendant upon the resettlement and rehabilitations of the Jew uprooted in the tragic war areas of Europe. It has been estimated that 4,150,000 of our race have migrated, seeking a place to live in safety and dignity. Fully one-half of world Jewry is in the grip of Nazi and Nazi-controlled countries. Many, it is true, will return to their former homes. Many will remain in the areas to which they fled. Others will find refuge through the carefully counted out immigration visas in western democratic Europe and the Americas. There still remain the scattered, the driven, the defenseless who will find no welcome anywhere—save in Palestine.

You cannot reasonably expect that nationals of the countries from whence the Jew fled to welcome him back as a competitor in the trades and professions in a war-destroyed economy that will be, at best, staggering uphill on a road to recovery. We see it right here in the United States, where every attempt at relaxed immigration is met with moans and shrieks that such steps must lead to augmented unemployment—and that in the richest democracy in the world. Can we expect better elsewhere?

True, twice gestures were made by the civilized world to indicate concretely the compassion for the tortured Jew—not naming him specifically, of course. That might, you know, lead to accusation of special privileges and considerations accorded a people who alone have the very highest distinction of being selected for complete annihilation.

In 1938, at Evian, France, 29 nations met in conference to discuss aid to persecuted minorities, that is, aid to refugees and potential refugees from nazidom. The agenda: What is to be done? The answer: What can we do? Nothing. But the prestige of 29 nations was at stake, so what better than to appoint a committee—the shell that conceals the hollowness? That always helps when replying to insistent critics. And thus out of the conference was born the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees now functioning in London.

Feebly, very feebly, the intergovernmental committee carried on. Its limited jurisdictional powers dropped to microscopic size with the entry of England into the war in 1939.

The second gesture came fully 5 years later, after 2,000,000 Jews lay dead, when Great Britain and the United States met at Bermuda. Once more "explorations" of the refugee problem were made. Again the deliberate massacre of a people could allow that people no differential treatment. All minorities were to be treated without regard to special urgencies. Again the logical approach that is Palestine was ignored. Discussion of Palestine was taboo, all upon the insistence of the British Foreign Office.

Results of the Bermuda Conference? Strangely enough, we don't know. Its findings are shrouded in mystery. It's all very, very secret, lest, we are informed, the Nazis receive knowledge of our plans and interfere with their execution. Truly, one would suppose the Nazi intelligence office is asleep; in all likelihood, the Nazis know more about the Bermuda Conference than do the American people. We do know, however, that recommendations were made to enlarge the scope of the intergovernmental committee which arose out of the Evian Conference. When I outline the composition of the inter-

governmental committee, you will realize why I say, "Strangely enough, we don't know."

The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees functions through an executive committee of six members—the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Brazil, and, note, Argentina. The executive committee members are the ambassadors from these countries. All the very secret proceedings, recommendations, and findings of the Bermuda Conference are known to this executive committee which is to act upon them, including Argentina. Argentina, who saw fit to ban the Jewish press, thus making of its anti-Semitism a state policy; Argentina, who was rebuked so sharply by Secretary Hull for its pro-Axis leanings; Argentina, who provoked the wrath of President Roosevelt in her proscription of Jewish publications. Of course, it is common knowledge that there is a pipe line of intelligence information running from Argentina to Berlin.

The meetings of the executive committee are held behind closed doors. When permission is asked to appear personally before it, the answer will be you can submit a brief, a brief that will lie in a filing cabinet.

The director is Sir Herbert Emerson, one time high commissioner of refugees in the League of Nations. Vice director is Patrick Malin, appointed by the United States. From this set-up how much concrete rescue work can be done I leave to you to surmise. You will agree with me that we would be preposterously optimistic to expect much.

They might indeed take a leaf out of the book of Denmark. The patriots of Denmark cooperated with the brave people of Sweden, enabling 6,000 Jews recently to escape from the Nazi clutches. That heroism might well be duplicated with the encouragement of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees by other countries.

They are casting about for havens of refuge and rescue, for zones of safety, and all the while, like frightened horses, they shy away from Palestine.

I have not strayed too far afield in pointing out these facts—all lead to the overwhelming question: Why this side-tracking of Palestine?

The spring of 1944 is not far off. Then, as laid down in the MacDonald White Paper of 1939, issued by Great Britain as the mandated power of Palestine, all Jewish immigration into Palestine must cease unless such further Jewish immigration be acquiesced to by the Arabs. Nor did the white paper allow free access into Palestine until that time, but limited it to 75,000 in the 5-year period from 1939 to 1944.

It is the most curious mockery of history that the Balfour Declaration, the ratification thereof by 52 nations, the approval of the United States by way of treaty and resolution, shall all be set aside by the will of the Arabs.

I want most eagerly to read to you a passege from the Palestine Royal Commission Report of 1937, which commission had been sent by England to investigate the unrest between the Arab and the Jew in Palestine. Most significantly it says: "The fact that the Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917 in order to enlist Jewish support for the Allies and the fact that this support was forthcoming are not sufficiently appreciated in Palestine. The Arabs do not appear to realize in the first place that the present position of the Arab world as a whole is mainly due to the great sacrifices made by the Allied and Associated Powers in the war and, second, that insofar as the Balfour Declaration helped bring about the Allies' victory, it helped to bring about the emancipation of all the Arab countries from Turkish rule. If the Turks and their German allies had won the war it is improbable that all the Arab countries except Palestine would now have become or be about to become independent states."

Remember, those are not the words of a zealous group of Zionists, but those of a commission sifting facts to arrive at a conclusion. I should like to quote another brief passage from the same report: "It is true that Jewish immigration is not merely sanctioned but required solemn international agreements. It is true that the Jews enter Palestine as of right and not on sufferance."

But those who have been wary of the checker game in the Near East and the fate of the coveted prize that is Palestine are stirred by a set of curious circumstances. It is no coincidence that one by one, like a project in the hands of a skillfully trained publicity man, articles have appeared in Nation-wide publication, spaced sufficiently apart so as not to be too obvious, repudiating the Jewish claim to Palestine.

Permit me to enumerate a few:

1. The recent article concerned with King Ibn Saud and Saudi Arabia in an issue of Life magazine, lauding this imperious sire who, to my mind, has the moral scruples of a tiger and whose eyes glisten with the lust of further bloody conquest. The article highlighted the pronouncement of Ibn Saud that the Jews have no claim to Palestine, historical or otherwise, and that no more Jews be permitted entrance. The story of the Caliph of Arabia was repeated in garbled form in Reader's Digest. Its editors sought to lionize him—make him a modern Mohammed, and, of all things, a devoted friend of America. The Bible says there are four things that are never satisfied—the grave, the barren womb, the earth that is not filled with water, and the fire that saith it is not enough. I add a fifth, King Ibn Saud, with his rapacity for land and power and plenty of American money.

2. The wide publicity given to the gun-running trial of two Jewish taxicab drivers in Palestine, the nature of which the prosecutor claimed was a vast Jewish scheme to seize the weapons for a reign of terror. During the trial the military prosecutor sought to prove that the Jews were intent upon deterring the United Nations' war effort. Arabs have been tried for gun-running before. In fact, it is a frequent occurrence, but this arms trial of two Jews presented a beautiful opportunity to advertise the Arab claims. While all other such trials were buried in obscurity, it is noteworthy that prior to this trial all the newspaper reporters were "tipped off" to hasten to the scene of the trial for some "hot" news. The fiery but false denunciations of the prosecutor were promptly printed and spread in all the newspapers abroad that would use it. Be it to their credit said that practically no metropolitan daily carried the news of this perverted trial except one. That one chose to channelize the garbled cabled dispatches along the lines laid down by the British Colonial Office, which seeks to discredit the Jewish agency and which would liquidate Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews. Jews apparently were to be denied the purchase of arms freely sold to the Arabs. The stock piles of weapons that the Arabs purchased and gathered, be it remembered, were used against the Jews denied these weapons in the pogroms of 1921, 1929, and 1930. It is little wonder that when the Arabs rushed in to kill and pillage they shouted, "El dowleh ma'ana—the government is with us." Is the British Colonial Office so asinine as to imagine the Jews can beat off the striking Arabs with their bare knuckles? The British Colonial Office failed to protect them against massacres before. The lives of themselves and their loved ones are at stake. They dare not go defenseless.

3. The gallant reception given to the well-timed visit of the two sons of King Ibn Saud to the United States by all the newspapers, replete with pictures, articles, all in the most sympathetic vein.

4. The article by Maj. Chefik Haddad, military attaché of the Iraq Legation, which appeared in the Herald Tribune of October 17, wherein claim is made that Palestine is the stumbling block to Arab unity and must be returned to Syria.

I answered this military attaché. My answer appeared in the same paper. I cracked his knuckles, this spokesman for interests hostile to the Jews in Palestine.

What cunning index finger is directing, pointing, and pushing this propaganda as the spring of 1944 approaches?

We are on our guard. The devil is subtle, yet weaves a coarse web. We see those strands, gossamer like, but deadly. It is well to examine some of the strands of evidence.

American companies have enormous holdings in the Middle East. We have a quarter share in Iraq oil. We have a half share in Kuwait, all of Bahrein oil. In 1939 the press reported the following as the main features of concessions granted to the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. An initial payment of $1,150,000 was to be made to the King of Saudi Arabia. An additional $165,000 was to be paid annually, and the company was obligated to deliver substantial quantities of gasoline and kerosene to the Government of Saudi Arabia during each year of the concession. The concession covered 89,000 square miles in addition to 165,000 square miles obtained in 1936 and had a life of 60 years. We do not know what additional favors were asked by King Ibn Saud for these valuable concessions. We can only guess in the light of the tightening ring that threatens to wipe out Palestine as the national home for the Jewish people. Why the sudden interest by columnists and commentators in the depletion of our supply and the need for repletion from foreign parts? This is nothing new. What strange connection is there between Palestine and oil? It is quite consistent for the Jews to have a national homeland in Palestine and for our national interests to be served as well. One has nothing to do with the other. Shall we be held up by the Arabs and the point of a gun and told to deliver Palestine or else? What sacrifice has the Arab made in the Allied cause that he must be given baksheesh or bribe?

When the fate of the Allies was hanging in the balance, Ibn Saud and the others would not even as much as give a donkey or camel to aid British and American soldiers. On the contrary, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin al Husseini, organized the pro-Axis revolt in Iraq and is now the head of the "Arab Government in Exile" under the Axis, and chief adviser of Hitler and Mussolini on Arab affairs. But while the Arabs revolted and even stabbed the Allied cause in the back, the Jews gave unstintingly of their lives, limbs, and treasures.

Are we then to be pawn for oil concessions. In the old days the slogan was: "The flag follows the dollar." That brought us into great disrepute throughout the world. The United States was looked upon as mere money-grabbers. Shall we follow a new slogan—The flag follows oil? Shall we again be brought into disrepute with human rights sacrificed in the worship of the golden calf? Was Anatole France right, after all, when he said, "Men think they die for their country; in reality they die for big business"?

Palestine is so piteously defenseless that it can be dangled with ease as bait before the Arabs. Our foreign policy is in the making. Shall we follow the way of decency or honor or become involved in the name of oil with the cartels that seek not human betterment, but control of wealth and power?

I say again and again that the establishment of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine in no way conflicts with national interests, be it in oil or other vital materials. Its only connection is that of being the bribe to offer on the altar of appeasement.

We add now another link to the chain. Why has not the United States set forth its policy on the promulgation of the MacDonald

White Paper which is so clearly an abrogation of its treaty with Great Britain in 1924 wherein it was agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion and wherein it was further agreed that the terms of the treaty cannot be changed by one without the consent of the other. How much of the tragic silence is attributable to the Arab sympathizers within the State Department? I am sure that Secretary of State Hull's heart is in the right place, but his hand is stayed by this same group of Arab sympathizers. What of those within the State Department who have become enchanted and enamored of the Arab emirs and princes who add their blunted callous viewpoint to the other forces now lustily demanding that Palestine be fed to the Arabs?

Nor are we done with the subtle and not so subtle forces swirling about to close forever the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. Even the flimsiest consideration of Palestine cannot omit the colonial policy of "divide and rule." There is nothing that should prevent the Jew and Arab living in accord and understanding. Each can easily live under his own vine and fig tree and "there shall be none to make him afraid." But that is contrary to the Tory imperialists and selfish benefactors of British power politics. The Englishman at home issued the Balfour Declaration and the Englishman in the colonies put it aside. There is an old Russian saying, "God Almighty is too high in heaven and the Czar is too far away." It is the immediate official, the colonial administrators to whom Zionism has been entrusted.

It must be kept in mind always that the possessions in the Middle East were worth fighting for and quarreling over. They were lands of great strategic, commercial, and sentimental values. The Suez Canal and oil, cotton and holy places, potash and vital crossroads—these were to be found in the Middle East. It is little wonder, then, that the British wish to maintain control. With traditional self-serving attitude, the Colonial Office must weigh whether to offend scattered world Jewry or the concentrated Arabs in their conflicting desires. The choice has been made with the policy of the MacDonald White Paper.

It has been a simple matter for England to lose sight of that fact that hers is merely a mandate over Palestine, a stewardship or trusteeship. A mandate is not ownership. I quote directly from the mandate for Palestine by the Council of the League of Nations. Article XI is as follows: "The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble and the development of self-governing institutions and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion." Is the MacDonald White Paper fitting for a power who has undertaken a specific pledge?

In my diatribes against the British Colonial Office and British Foreign Office I am not unaware of the valor and courage of her soldiers and the fortitude of her people. She is a strong ally. It is farthest from my purpose to create any semblance of disunity, but, nonetheless, we need not remain uncritical. On the anvil of the discussion may the truth be forged.

But I say to you in all frankness that the battle for the opening of Palestine to Jewish immigration is not the fighting of one foe, but the many-headed foe who holds the spear of many edges. It is well for us to know these facts, to be aware of our pitfalls, to be prepared in this fight for integrity and decency.

Admittedly, Palestine, is not the only factor in the resettlement of European Jewry. Explorations have been made, and are being made, for the possibilities of settlement in such countries as Alaska, Angola, Australia, Brazil, British Honduras, Chile, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Lower California, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru. We must, nevertheless, keep our eye steadily on Palestine, where colonization has admittedly been successful. Even the foes of the establishment of a national homeland in Palestine do not deny that.

One further thought I wish to leave with you: The opening of the doors of Palestine, mind you, does not mean we must cease our struggle to achieve equal legal and citizen status for the Jew, no matter where he resides. The loyalty of the American Jew or English Jew or Scandinavian Jew is not placed in jeopardy by the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine—no more than is the loyalty of a citizen of Irish, Danish, or Polish descent brought into question.

There are so many other facets to what is universally called the Jewish problem that time permits but a general survey of a few of them. Our concern with them is two-fold—as Jews and as living units of a civilization which recognizes that all of humanity, if it be worth preserving, must live together in freedom, security, and dignity, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Unfortunately, there are those in our State Department—and I am quite sure Secretary of State Hull is excluded—who would have the Jews led into the slough of despond, who would encourage violation by Britain of her solemn obligations, which violation would prevent the trek of hapless, hopeless Jews into Palestine, there to reestablish their Lord-given homeland.

I do, indeed, hope that the Secretary of State, as a result of his conferences at Moscow, will give hopeful signs that England will not be permitted by us to violate her conventions and that we will protest the MacDonald White Paper, which has, indeed, become a scarlet document, steeped in the blood of the desecrated and maimed victims. I am, indeed, hopeful that the Secretary of State will break a silence which has well-nigh become a thunder of injustice.

British Scheme To Secure Control of United States Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on November 10, 1943, at 10:15 p. m., eastern war time, from WMAL, the Washington studio of the Blue Network:

Ladies and gentlemen, you have no doubt heard of the British and American proposals for establishing a post-war international monetary scheme. The British propose the formation of an International Clearing Union, while the administration proposes the formation of a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund. These proposals are commonly referred to as the Keynes-Morgenthau plans because Lord John Maynard Keynes is credited with having drafted the British proposal and Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, is responsible for drafting the administration's proposal.

A study of these proposals has led me to the inescapable conclusion that the whole thing is nothing less than a plot to give Great Britain control of our gold stock and unload upon the United States an immense volume of debts owed by Britain to other countries.

I am convinced that either administration officials are being misled by the designers of the scheme or they are deliberately aiding in its promotion.

There are not two plans, the British and American. There is only one plan, namely, the British plan. The proof of this is so clear-cut and conclusive as to leave no possible room for doubt. The British furnished the materials for the scheme and our Treasury officials worked them up into legislative draft form.

In the short time at my disposal it will be impossible for me to do more than touch a few high points of this scheme. For a more detailed understanding of it I refer you to a speech I made on the floor of the House on November 1, which is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Lord Keynes, a high officer in the British Government, is unquestionably the spearhead of this movement, but it is the British Government the United States must hold responsible for its promotion, just as the Roosevelt administration must be held responsible for the part our Treasury officials are taking in it.

Lord Keynes in the British White Paper makes a deliberate attempt to deceive the American people. He subtly and slyly insinuates that we must not place too much confidence in the future usefulness of our gold, for it might, in the not too distant future, become altogether worthless to us. But, while he would have us believe our gold may soon be of no value to the United States, it is very clear that he believes our gold can be of great value to Great Britain.

The scheme by which the British hope to put our gold to their own use is something altogether new in the world. Nothing like it has ever been proposed before.

From an international standpoint the dollar is supreme because it is equivalent to gold and redeemable at face value in gold upon demand. It is readily acceptable in every country on earth. The British pound sterling is no longer the world's leading money—it is not redeemable at face value in gold on demand. The British understand this, so they propose a new international currency which they call bancor. This new money would not be gold. It would be paper. The plan provides that the value of this new international currency would be fixed in terms of gold, but not unalterably. Its value could be manipulated by the politicians operating the scheme.

Excepting the substitution of the name "unitas" for "bancor," the administration adopt in toto the international currency proposed by the British, notwithstanding that this would destroy the United States dollar as the leading international money. This is at the heart of the scheme.

The scheme provides for the setting up of an international fund with the member countries furnishing the capital. The total capital was first announced as $5,000,000,000, but latest reports indicate this may be changed to $8,000,000,000.

Each country would be given a quota which would represent its contribution to the fund. The fund would be composed of gold, paper currency, and Government securities. Member countries would meet their quotas not by contributing the same proportionate amount of gold and paper but in widely differing proportions.

One country would pay in gold 50 percent of its contribution, another somewhat in excess of 40 percent, and so on down to a much smaller amount.

The quota contribution of the United States is set at about 30 percent of the total five billion capital of the fund, or, roundly, one and one-half billion dollars. It would appear

we would pay approximately only $750,000,000 of this amount in gold.

But there is a catch at this point. Actually the United States would contribute her full one and one-half billion dollars in gold, regardless of how much of her contribution to the fund was made in paper. This is because our paper dollars, from an international standpoint, as previously mentioned, are equivalent to gold and redeemable at face value in gold on demand.

This is not true, however, of the paper currency contributed by many of the other countries. It is not true especially in the case of Great Britain. Her quota would be $640,000,000, but she would pay only 30 percent of that, or $192,000,000, in gold. This amount of gold would be her total gold liability, because her paper is not redeemable at face value in gold on demand.

The scheme is so devised that the gold liability of the United States would be nearly four times that of the whole British Empire, yet the United States would have only 20 percent of the votes, while the Empire would have 19 percent.

In the very first paragraph of the Keynes proposal under the objects of the plan, the British adroitly conceal another purpose of this scheme. That paragraph reads in part as follows: "We need an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations, so that blocked balances * * * are unnecessary."

Now, what are blocked balances? They are debts which one nation owes to another for merchandise purchased. It so happens that Great Britain is the one country principally concerned with these blocked balances or debts, because she owes upward of $5,000,000,000 or more to her colonies, dominions, South American and other countries for goods she purchased from them before and since the war began.

The United States holds no blocked balances.

Britain has been unable to pay these debts either with gold or goods. By a devious process, the scheme provides for relieving her of these debts with United States gold.

I ask each of you listening to me tonight, Why should our people be asked to assume the debts Britain owes her colonies and other countries?

The scheme provides for lending billions of dollars without interest. Why should the taxpayers of the United States furnish capital to lend to other countries without interest?

When the scheme was first set up, Mr. Morgenthau assured the country the United States would be in complete control. This is not true.

Foreign nations would have complete control, though the United States would furnish most of the capital.

The United States is asked to turn over to an international body the power to control the value of our money. This power the Constitution expressly vests in the Congress, and it could not rightly be delegated to another body except by constitutional amendment. The international body would be given control of the currencies of practically the whole world, and the world price of gold as well.

Now the power to control the price of gold, and the value of the currencies of most of the nations of the world, is too vast for the imagination to grasp.

The power sought by this scheme is the power to make the price of every day's labor, service, and commodity. It is the power to reduce the value of every dollar in circulation, in banks, in War Bonds, in insurance policies, in social security, and in pensions, and to make it worth 50 cents, or 25 cents, or 5 cents.

The scheme comprehends much more than we have mentioned. In the British White Paper we read that the plan "might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world," that it might "set up a clearing account in favor of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace," etc.

What really is proposed here is a world superstate, with Britain dominating.

Administration officials would have us believe this international monetary scheme is something that could be started and stopped like a watch, tried out and if found ineffective, abandoned to its own fate.

That is folly. It would not work that way. Once the scheme were in operation it would quickly generate forces that would make for self-perpetuation and expansion, as is the nature of all political machine.

International vested interests would quickly spring up and concurrently the protective mechanisms for maintaining them. Lend-lease started off with $7,000,000,000 and within 27 months reached the immeasurably high figure of $60,000,000,000.

Should we ever become enmeshed in this scheme, we should be fully prepared to continue—to complete exhaustion—to pour our gold into the European bottomless pit of debt.

There should be no question in anyone's mind now why this scheme was born and reared in the darkest secrecy.

It was conceived in the matrix of a British problem and is being nurtured and promoted to solve that problem.

I can see in it no promise or hope for a single concrete good for our country.

I see in it only a grave threat to our economy and to our national existence. I want to solemnly warn my countrymen of this danger.

Thank you and good night.

Absentee Vote for Servicemen

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, every real American bows in reverence today for the sacrifices made by our men in the First World War. Our hearts go out to the ones who are now struggling in this world contest for the preservation of our Republic and our American way of life.

While they are fighting to protect our country abroad, it is our duty to safeguard and protect our sacred institutions at home.

There is now pending before the Committee on Elections of President and Vice President, of which I am a member, a bill that contains some very dangerous provisions. Under the pretense of arranging for men in the armed service to vote by absentee ballot, this measure would set up a national election commission here in Washington with far-reaching and dangerous powers.

I propose to substitute a resolution calling upon the States to make it possible for the servicemen to vote by absentee ballots, authorizing and directing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to do everything possible to get these ballots to them and back, and providing free Air Mail Service in order that these ballots may go to the men in our armed forces and come back to their election precincts as quickly as possible.

This would enable the men in the service to vote, without violating the laws of the various States and without setting up a superelection bureaucracy here in Washington that would probably wreck the election machinery of every State in the Union.

While these young men are fighting our battles abroad, let us save this country and this Government, including the governments of their own States, for them when they return.

Inflation Brakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper from the Washington Daily News of November 10, 1943:

INFLATION BRAKES

(By Raymond Clapper)

The danger of wild inflation is increased by the action of a coalition of Democrats and Republicans in Congress to stop payment of food subsidies.

These subsidies are one of the means by which the Administration is trying to check the rising cost of living. Sums are paid to producers in certain lines of foodstuffs to encourage larger production without higher prices to the consumer.

It is a subject over which barber-shop argument can continue indefinitely. The question is whether to yield to more rapid inflation of prices, or whether to continue the rearguard action against it.

Subsidies, the Little Steel wage formula, price control, rationing are all brakes against the tremendous momentum of inflation that comes from the war. When 11,000,000 men are put into uniform, and more than half of our production facilities are given over to war, shortages of goods and manpower, and abundance of spending power create a relentless force for inflation.

About all we can hope to do is to throw obstacles in the way, slow it down, fight for time, give no ground without a struggle. That is what the administration is trying to do now on food subsidies.

The trouble is that large groups such as cattle growers, and dairy interests, want to get rid of all Government controls. They want the lid off prices. They are fighting to end the subsidies now. They have lined up the big farm organizations, the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange. Retail grocers are joining in.

Thus powerful political pressure has been created on Congress. Republicans have joined in. Several Republicans on the Banking Committee were understood to have favored continuing subsidies, but after having lunch with Representative JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader of the House, they went unanimously against the administration.

Off with price control. Let everybody collect all the traffic will bear. That's the game that is about to be put over in Washington.

The Democratic chairman of the House Banking Committee, HENRY B. STEAGALL, was buttered by the opponents of subsidies. They permitted a provision to go into the repeal legislation continuing subsidies on vegetable oils and fats. That takes care of the peanut

growers in STEAGALL's district. Having been assured subsidies for his growers, he had no further interest in other subsidies and turned against the administration.

That's the kind of a fight it is.

A minority group on the House Banking Committee is offering Congress an alternative. This group includes WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, FORD, of California, PATMAN, of Texas, FOLGER, of North Carolina, SULLIVAN, of Nevada, SPENCE, of Kentucky, and BARRY, of New York. It suggests continuing subsidies for another year, unless the Little Steel wage formula is abandoned earlier. That would give an incentive to the administration to fight all the harder to hold the line on wages, and the administration needs every incentive that can be offered because its grip is slipping dangerously.

This minority says that the only protection against increased wages is maintenance of the present price structure. The administration says without subsidies it cannot hold the steel wage formula.

One simple consideration seems persuasive. What happens if we knock out subsidies now after they have been in operation for more than a year?

Take that safety valve out of the price structure and the ceiling blows off. Wage demands become irresistible. The vicious cycle would spin this country into an uncontrolled ride of reckless profiteering and hoarding of goods. Such frantic scrambling would soon rend the home front into chaos.

As President Roosevelt pointed out in his message, the subsidy for the current year is equal to the cost of the war for 3 days. A dollar put into subsidies, when it holds the price level and the wage levels in check, pays enormous dividends in saving the Government and individuals from inflation prices.

Guayule Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, November 5, this House passed the first supplemental appropriation bill, after marked reductions in nearly all items had been made in committee. Among the requests not granted was one by the Department of Agriculture for an additional $7,500,000 to expand guayule production. While little issue can be taken with the objective of reducing all nonmilitary expenditures to the limit, certain facts should be pointed out in connection with the guayule project which may arise for future consideration.

To date Congress has appropriated approximately $45,000,000 for this project. The experimental station at Salinas, Calif., has made remarkable progress in ascertaining information about this particular shrub. Rubber is actually being obtained at the present time which, while small in total amount, is of genuine importance in view of our inability to obtain any material amount from abroad. However, the most important contribution to date has been the research activities of the project, which may prove invaluable to us in the future. The research work is still being carried on, and, in my judgment, should continue to be carried on until we possess every possible item of information that can be obtained about guayule.

One of the purposes of the supplemental appropriation was to enable the Federal Government to make long-time contracts with private farmers for the growing of guayule on a semi-commercial basis. I regret that a minimum of money was not appropriated for this particular purpose, since this proposal has been desired by all parties interested in guayule development, and I am hopeful that this House may at some future date make the necessary funds available for such private experimentation. My colleague, the Honorable JOHN Z. ANDERSON of California, and the individual most responsible for the inauguration of the guayule program, has introduced a resolution (H. Res. 346) authorizing the Committee on Agriculture or a subcommittee thereof to investigate the progress of the guayule program. I respectfully submit to this committee the suggestion that one field of its investigations be that of inquiring into this possibility of private planting.

I cannot close this statement without mentioning the excellent work of the Forestry Service. This agency has been both criticized and condemned for its handling of the guayule program. As one who has been in unusually close contact with the program, I pay tribute to the sincere efforts and the genuine accomplishments of this branch of the Federal Government. Mistakes there have been, but these have grown fewer and less serious as the program has developed, and as some of the pressure for speedy action has been removed. In my opinion, the Forestry Service's management of the guayule program while not free from error, has constituted a genuine contribution to our all-out war effort.

In conclusion, I should like to submit as part of my remarks a resolution passed by the subcommittee of the California guayule rubber committee, October 13, 1943, at San Francisco:

Whereas the California Guayule Rubber Committee was appointed by Gov. Earl Warren under a resolution of the assembly to study and make recommendations to assist the United States Government in developing the guayule rubber project, and, if possible, work out methods for the production to be handled by California farmers and the processing by private enterprise; and

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has done an excellent job in expanding the project from a very small beginning to an extensive agricultural industry and has attempted to work out contracts wherein the farmers could do the growing, but is under the usual difficulty imposed upon the Department of Agriculture that it cannot make a contract extending over 1 year, and the growing of guayule to maturity under present methods takes more than 1 year; and

Whereas the committee has been informed that the Rubber Reserve Corporation is making contracts for the production and purchase of rubber that extend beyond 1 year; and

Whereas the Emergency Rubber Project has developed extensive nurseries, with seedlings therein ready for transplanting, and have large amounts of seed on hand from present plantings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the committee recommends that the Rubber Reserve Corporation contract for the production and purchase of guayule and that the present Emergency Rubber Project of the United States Department of Agriculture be made the agent of the Rubber Reserve Corporation to represent them in making such contracts, and that a price be determined for the delivery of rubber from the guayule shrub at the end of 1, 2, 3, 4, or other agreed number of years. It is the opinion of the committee that, if possible, private enterprise should do the milling and that the Rubber Reserve Corporation plan accordingly. Contracts should be so drawn that the farmer growing the guayule be paid at some specified rate per ton of shrub based upon its rubber content; be it further

Resolved, That in case any private rubber company or industry desires to contract with farmers for the growing of the guayule shrub, that the Emergency Rubber Project be required to furnish the private company seed and plants, to be given to the farmers at cost, the Emergency Rubber Project protecting their present plans of planting and operation.

Freight Rates a Factor in Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in the November 5 issue of the United States News there appeared an analysis of a report issued by the board of investigation and research on the freight-rate dispute involving demands by shippers in the South and West for rate equality with the East. It is notable that the board reports freight rates to be a factor, though not the sole factor, in the matter of decentralization of industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article appearing in the United States News and just referred to:

BACK OF FREIGHT-RATE DISPUTE—DEMAND BY SHIPPERS IN SOUTH AND WEST FOR EQUALITY WITH THE EAST—DIFFERENCES IN THE METHODS OF FIXING RAILROAD CHARGES—EFFECTS ON NATION'S INDUSTRIES

Freight rates are making trouble again. An old controversy has reawakened a dispute that for 50 years has kept the South and West intermittently pitted against the industrial East. New developments have given the conflict a new and lustier life. The row is livelier just now than ever before.

The root of the difficulty can be stated simply: Freight rates are higher in the South than in the East. Freight rates also are higher in the West than in the East. South and West complain bitterly. They say that the rate differences handicap the industries of their areas and keep new industries from settling in their territories. They assert that the rate structure binds the South and the West to a raw-materials economy—for the enrichment of the East. In other words, the southerners and westerners complain that freight-rate inequalities are keeping their regions poor.

Vice President WALLACE has taken up the issue. He says the rates have held the South and West to a "colonial status." At the direction of Congress, a special Board of Investigation and Research (B. I. R.) has just completed a study of the rate structure. This Board recommends, with some qualifications,

that rates be equalized. The Tennessee Valley Authority has protested twice against the present situation. These developments have invigorated the campaign of the South and West. They are pressing for early action by Congress.

Meanwhile, the public, for the most part, is aware only that there is under way an important dispute of great technical complexity. Uncertain of itself in the intricacies of railroad rate making and railroad economics, the public is asking: Just what are the facts and issues? How great are the sectional rate differences? How did they come about? What is the economic effect of these differences where South, West, and East are concerned? What solutions have been proposed?

To strip the dispute of its technical entanglements and place the basic details in side-by-side perspective:

WHY THE DIFFERENTIALS?

Freight-rate making, like the railroads themselves, grew up on a regional basis. The first short lines connecting hinterland with waterways gradually were merged into systems serving broad but sharply defined areas. Even today comparatively few railroads cross the boundaries separating the three regions—the Mississippi dividing East from West, and the Ohio and Potomac, separating East and South. Then, as now, most of the freight loaded in one area had its destination within that area.

The roads of the various regions developed different systems of rate making. In the East the tendency was to base freight charges on the cost of transportation, and the larger volume of eastern traffic kept cost diminishing. In the South and West the tendency was to charge as much as demand for shipping space would bring. The two methods of rate making grew up within the American railroad system and their effect still is felt. Vice President WALLACE charges that the higher southern and western rates were retained as a result of monopolistic financial control of the lines. This the railroads deny.

PRESENT RATE SITAUTION

As things stand, first-class freight rates are 39 percent higher in the South and 28 to 84 percent higher in the West than they are in the East. This was the finding of the special board of investigation and research.

But the first-class rate is charged only on a limited number of items. Others move at fixed percentages of the first-class rate. These rates apply principally to manufactures and finished goods. In addition, there is a heavy movement of such commodities as lumber, coal, brick, lime, fertilizers, and building materials. These move in bulk, are moved more cheaply, and hence command substantially lower freight rates.

In fact, B. I. R. found that through the years established industries in the South and West have induced the roads to make considerable concessions on rates on some products. A few years ago a group of southern Governors, by bringing suit before the Interstate Commerce Commission, obtained broad reductions in freight rates on a number of manufactured products.

Taking one rate with another, the B. I. R. found that the average for the South was 3 to 5 percent higher than the eastern average. Western rates averaged 16.6 percent higher than eastern. The figures approximated an earlier finding by the Interstate Commerce Commission's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics.

The southern rates are charged only on freight moving between points within the southern territory. Similarly, the western rates apply only within the western region. When freight moves between territories, a new problem arises. A through rate is fixed by one of a number of methods. It usually emerges at a figure somewhere between the rate levels of the two territories involved. The B. I. R., however, found that through rates tended to lie closer to the rate of the higher than of the lower-rated area.

Contrary to prevalent opinion, the through rate, once determined, generally applies in both directions. That is, it costs no more to ship a particular article from Atlanta to Boston, than from Boston to Atlanta. The few exceptions involve some shipments between East and West on which the rate in the area of destination is charged. In these instances, the eastward rate is less than the rate westward, thus favoring the western shipper.

There, roughly, you have the present rate situation. Now, as to its consequences.

SOUTHERN AND WESTERN COMPLAINTS

Southerners and westerners contend that the freight-rate structure seriously hampers the industries already situated within their regions.

As the rates work out, southerners say, the eastern manufacturer has a competitive advantage in reaching the big market areas of the eastern region, where the buying power is. The easterner's freight rate is lower all the way, while the southerner must pay the higher rate charged for freight that moves from one territory to another. For goods laid down in a particular market, the easterner's transportation bill may be smaller, even though the distance from factory to market may be greater than for the southerner.

The South also contends that the East has an advantage in reaching many southern markets, particularly those in a broad belt just below the boundary. On such shipments, the southern businessman pays the high southern rate, while the easterner pays the lower interterritorial rate.

The South also says that rate differences make it more costly for the southern manufacturer to gather in the raw materials that he needs.

All these factors, the southerners say, enable eastern industry to undersell the South in most of the important markets. The western contention is similar.

Such considerations, say the South and West, make a businessman think twice before he locates a new enterprise within the southern or western rate territory. Over a period of years, the argument runs, freight rates have retarded industrial development in the South and West, and concentrated it in the East. The result is a relatively low per capita income and a loss of population, as southern and western workers seek jobs in the East.

These are the southern and western arguments. There is, however, another viewpoint on the relation of freight rates to industrial development.

FREIGHT RATES AND THE LOCATION OF INDUSTRY

The B. I. R. found that many influences, other than freight rates, affect the location of industry. And the National Resources Planning Board, in a study of national transportation problems, reached the same conclusion.

Mining, agriculture, and lumbering must locate where natural resources are to be found. Industries that process raw materials tend to locate near the source of those materials. Lead and zinc smelters, for example, usually are found near the mines; sawmills and wood-distillation plants, near the forests; beet-sugar refineries, near the fields, and pork-packing plants, near the corn-hog area. It saves shipping charges on the part of the raw material that becomes waste.

Other industries require, first of all, an abundance of cheap power, or are looking for cheap fuel, cheap labor or a supply of skilled workmen. Some industries are drawn to locations near their markets, regardless of equal freight levels. These are industries that turn out perishable products, use materials that are available almost everywhere, or must use a number of different materials.

On the whole, both B. I. R. and N. R. P. B. came to the conclusion that it would take a considerable shift in freight rates to achieve any noticeable relocation of existing industries.

As for the concentration of industry in the East, B. I. R. said the causes were numerous and complex, some of them rooted in the early history of the regions themselves. To attribute the concentration "wholly or even largely" to freight-rate differences, B. I. R. added, was an oversimplification.

But B. I. R. also had this to say: If freight rates affect the location of industry or the economic development of particular areas at all, then these rates should not favor any one region. The rate structure, it added, should place no obstacle in the way of situating an industry wherever, for natural reasons, might seem best. For that reason it urged a change in the rate structure.

UNIFORM RATES

The B. I. R. proposed that rates be made uniform the country over for all freight except the bulk commodities that move on special rates. The latter, it said, should have special treatment, since many such commodities move short distances only and present particular problems. It thought, however, that uniform rates could be applied on many such commodities.

The proposal also contemplated special treatment in limited areas where the cost of transportation is relatively high, and where particular railroads require a higher level of income to keep in operation. Although costs vary greatly between railroads and between subsections of the three great territories, B. I. R. found them fairly uniform for the three regions as a whole—somewhat lower in the South than the East, and somewhat higher in the West than in the East. Uniform rates, B. I. R. held, would relate freight charges more closely to actual transportation costs than the present rate structure.

Other solutions have been proposed. One would have inequalities in the present structure corrected by the I. C. C. as cases come before it. Another proposal calls for a charge for cargoes crossing the boundaries of the rate prevailing in the area of destination. T. V. A. has backed this in the past, but more recently has asked Nationwide rate uniformity.

PROSPECTS

The B. I. R. proposal is the one that has caught on in Congress. Bills based upon it have been introduced. Southern and western agitation for action is increasing, and uniformity in the rate structure is becoming the issue.

The change may be made, but, on the basis of B. I. R.'s and N. R. P. B.'s findings, do not look for any overnight reshuffling of the Nation's industries.

Japanese Relocation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, how much longer are the lives and property of American citizens going to be placed in jeopardy by the utterly

incapable handling of the Japanese relocation problem under the misguidance of the War Relocation Authority? The recent near-tragic events of the Tule Lake concentration camp prove definitely that the present director, Mr. Dillon Myer, is not only unable to cope with the problem but that he lacks the necessary experience and background which is required for dealing with persons of Japanese descent.

As pointed out in the report of the Dies subcommittee which recently investigated Japanese relocation centers, the W. R. A has been extremely dilatory in the matter of segregating the disloyal elements in the centers from those who profess loyalty to the United States. We can all be thankful that the War Department has stepped in and taken over jurisdiction at Tule Lake. In my opinion, the War Department should immediately take control of all relocation centers in the country.

It is apparent that no satisfactory method has yet been developed for deciding the difference between known loyal and disloyal Japanese descendants. Until this is done, we should proceed with the utmost caution in the matter of releasing individuals from Japanese relocation centers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the two following editorials from representative Pacific coast newspapers:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of November 5, 1943]

TULE LAKE

There has been trouble with the Japanese at Tule Lake. How serious it has been, or is, we have still to learn fully. What we do know for sure is that the W. R. A. has been trying to cover it up.

There is the clue to the trouble. When officials in a bureaucracy try to cover things up, when the facts are bursting out all around them, we know they are phonies. When phonies are put in charge of a group of sullen and resentful people, there is bound to be trouble. It doesn't take the Japanese 5 seconds to find out that the officials supposed to rule them have nothing behind their facades. A mule can find that out about a man in 6 seconds. And just as the mule does, these Japanese act accordingly, in contempt of the phonies.

These W. R. A. officials have convicted themselves by denying what could not be denied. We probably owe these Japanese a reward for bringing it to light. It is now made obvious that these are bad public servants, and from this showing it must be apparent that they have been serving the public badly all along. They do not belong in a job like this. They are examples of two-bit men pitchforked by bureaucracy into four-dollar jobs.

However, these W. R. A. hands have only followed a line all too prevalent in bureaucracy, which is to cover up wherever possible. But even in bureaucracies there are some individuals who know when things can be concealed and when they cannot. These didn't.

We have no hope for W. R. A. So long as it has charge, we may expect trouble with the disloyal Japanese who want to raise hell. Very early, W. R. A. showed its phony quality by conceiving its job to be "welfare" and "uplift" work in the camps, instead of confining itself to its proper function of keeping these Japanese fed, clothed, sanitarily housed and in order. These "workers" were a joke to the amiably disposed internees, but to the vicious ones W. R. A. became only an object of contempt, an invitation to trouble. Now that the bad Japanese have been concentrated at Tule Lake, they have lost little time in showing up W. R. A.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 6, 1943]

TULE LAKE JAP RIOTS PROVE MYER'S INCOMPETENCE

Despite the attempt of Dillon S. Myer, head of the War Relocation Authority, to minimize the Jap riots Monday at the Tule Lake Relocation Center, the fact that the Army had to take over Thursday night is enough in itself to show that the situation had got out of hand—at least, out of Myer's hand.

Serious-minded Californians who were willing to face realities have contended vigorously from the first that the Jap camps were no place for social experimentation, such as the New Dealish Myer and others like him have dealt in. Particularly have Californians opposed the return of Japs to the west coast during the war, either in or out of camps.

The placing of the known disloyal element among the Japs in the Tule camp in this State is one of the gross blunders of the whole mismanaged Jap relocation program.

Definite Army management of the whole program would have been desirable—at least, the Army should have had control of the bad actors in some camp away from the coast.

We can merely congratulate ourselves that at last the Army is in charge at Tule Lake. Myer has proved himself unsuited to his task, and should admit his mistake before any more harm is done.

From all accounts the Japs figuratively ran the tender-minded Myer up a tree and exposed him as incapable of dealing with the tough customers in his charge. Instead of frankly admitting at once that he could not handle the camp and calling for help, Myer put out soothing statements which denied any serious trouble, and by so doing endangered lives and property. Those endangered included himself.

Some such outcome of Myer's experiments in sweetness and light has been expected by all who read with care and attention the testimony before the Dies committee investigation of the war relocation centers, and noted Myer's reluctance to believe evil of any Jap.

Since the Roosevelt administration notoriously is against anything the Dies committee is for, no attention was paid to the committee's factual report, and Myer was left to run the centers in his own gentle way. It is lucky for the country—and for Myer—the consequences were not more serious.

It is safe to assume that, with the Army in control, monkey business will end.

What States Are Denying the Right To Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette November 8, 1943:

WHAT STATES ARE DENYING THE RIGHT TO VOTE?

As a way of forcing Southern States to drop the poll-tax voting qualification, Senator DANAHER, a Republican from Connecticut, proposes to reduce the delegations of poll-tax States in the House of Representatives in proportion to the number of electors prevented from taking part in elections.

Prevented by what? Any adult resident of Arkansas can qualify as a voter by paying the $1 poll tax. Nobody can qualify as a voter in Connecticut unless he can read the Constitution and statutes of that State. Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and California have similar requirements. In New York a voter must be able to comply with an educational qualification. Nobody who cannot read and speak English can qualify to vote in the State of Washington. For long years Rhode Island has required a would-be voter to pay a tax in the amount of $1 unless he owns real estate in the State. Do we hear the Senator from neighboring Connecticut indicting Rhode Island for preventing electors from taking part in elections because of that requirement?

It is true that the fourteenth amendment provides that if the right to vote is denied by any State to any of its adult inhabitants except for participation in rebellion or other crime, its basis of representation in Congress shall be proportionately reduced. But the poll tax no more denies the right to vote than the voting requirements of many other States deny that right. In fact, many a person could pay a poll tax who could not vote under the educational or literacy requirements in use in many of the States.

American Bar Association Among Those Favoring Federal Regulation of Air Commerce and Air Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following list of organizations and individuals who have gone on record as favoring the principle of exclusive Federal regulation of air commerce and air navigation as contained in H. R. 3420, which has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is now pending on the calendar. I would like to invite the attention of the House especially to the recommendation of the American Bar Association adopted at its sixty-sixth annual meeting:

1. American Bar Association: At its sixty-sixth annual meeting, the Association's House of Delegates adopted recommendation No. 2 of its committee on aeronautical law; paragraph (d) of which reads:

"(d) The declaration of principles and policies stated in H. R. 1012 (committee print No. 2, dated May 26, 1943) of Federal control of all air commerce to the exclusion of State control of a contrary, duplicating or otherwise burdensome nature are in accord with the announced policies of the American Bar Association." (P. 588, American Bar Association Journal, October 1943.)

2. Airline Mechanics Association (p. 114).

3. Air Transport Association of America (an association composed of all the scheduled air lines under the American flag everywhere).

4. Aviation Magazine (the oldest of American aeronautical magazines) (p. 116).

5. National Aeronautics Association (an association representing many branches and phases of aeronautics.)

6. The Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, Inc. (representing 90 percent of the aircraft manufacturing industry) (p. 110).

7. The Aeronautical Training Society (one of the two largest associations of aviation training schools) (p. 111).

8. The Air Cargo Research Association (a west coast group interested in air cargo research) (p. 145).

9. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (largest organization of private and miscellaneous aircraft operators) (p. 115).

10. The Airline Pilots Association (pp. 94 and 108).

11. The Army-Navy Journal (semiofficial organ of the Army and Navy).

12. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce (this chamber of commerce has been one of the most active of all municipal groups in connection with aviation development) (p. 143).

13. The National Aviation Training Association (the other of the two largest associations of aviation training schools) (p. 113).

14. Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt (for many years a member of and for 3 years chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical Law of the American Bar Association, and an outstanding student of aviation regulations) (p. 111).

15. Mr. William B. Ziff (distinguished aviation publisher and student) (p. 114).

(NOTE.—Unless otherwise indicated page numbers refer to booklet containing supplemental hearings on the Lea bill amending Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—originally H. R. 1012, now H. R. 3420.)

Rebirth of Labor Unions in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the Italian American Labor Council is conducting a drive to raise funds to assist in the rebirth of free labor unions in Italy. It is believed that the reestablishment of free labor unions in that country will provide a solid basis for the emergence of Italian democracy.

With this thought in mind, the New York War Chest of Labor's League for Human Rights contributed the sum of $100,000 toward this fund. A check for this amount was delivered to Luigi Antonini on October 11, 1943, at the afternoon session of the convention of the American Federation of Labor by Vice President Woll.

Mr. Antonini accepted the check on behalf of the movement and then delivered a very fine address, which I include herein, pursuant to leave granted to me.

Delegate Antonini, Ladies Garment Workers, President Green, Vice President Woll, and fellow delegates: Had the world been at peace, it would have celebrated a year ago the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of America by that great Italian mariner, Christopher Columbus. But this year—with the destruction of the Axis certain though not yet accomplished—it is even more fitting to celebrate the memorable occasion of the discovery of the New World.

Just now our eyes and hearts are turned to the bitter battles in Italy. The most decisive political event that has come out of this war to date has happened in Italy—the inspiring revolt of the Italian people against the Fascist dictatorship of Mussolini, the first collapse of the Axis home front. The Italian people have shown that more than 20 years of Fascist oppression and terror did not destroy their love of freedom, did not wipe out their ability and desire to think and act as freemen. This first magnificent moral and political victory for world democracy will speed the triumph of our country and the United Nations. This most fortunate turn of affairs will save the lives of many thousands of our own sons and brothers and those of our gallant allies.

I speak to you as an American—as an American by choice rather than chance—as an American who happens to be of Italian descent—as an American working in and for America, and not as an Italian in the United States. Today, the motherland of Christopher Columbus is steeped in tragic difficulties. Italy is fast becoming the battleground of Europe, the land where we first pierced that bastion of darkness—Hitler's fortress Europe. The monstrous Fascist dictatorship has left many a scar on the Italian people. They have suffered untold misery as a result of the shameful war forced upon them by Europe's first Quisling—that now discredited and bankrupt Mussolini. At this very moment, the jewel cities of Italy—traditional centers of enlightenment and democracy—are being systematically and spitefully pillaged by vandals in German uniforms, by Nazi and Fascist savages thirsting for revenge.

In these grave hours, we can rest assured that with the full return of the Italian people to the family of democratic nations, they will take their rightful and honorable place among the freedom-loving nations of the world. The Italian people, when they were free, made splendid contributions to human freedom and civilization. Five hundred years ago the glorious Italian city-states led in the renaissance of civilization, in the liberation of the human mind from the medieval dungeons of darkness. This year—on July 25—the great cities of Italy again came to the fore as bannerbearers of enlightenment. They dealt the first mortal blow to Fascist barbarism—the fiercest reaction mankind has ever experienced.

As Americans, native and naturalized, we cannot overlook the great moral debt which our country owes to the liberty-loving, industrious, and enlightened Italian people. The man whose discovery we honor today was the first to unfurl the flag of civilization on our blessed soil. The very name of the New World—America—is derived from that of the renowned Italian navigator, Amerigo Vespucci. An intimate friend and close collaborator of Thomas Jefferson, author of our immortal Declaration of Independence, was the Italian Dr. Filipo Mazzei, from whom the undying words "all men are created free and equal" were taken. Our great poets, Henry W. Longfellow and Edgar Allen Poe, reveal much Italian inspiration and influence. We all know how much that wizard of the baton, Arturo Toscanini, has enriched our American culture and happiness.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Italian descent have fought in World War No. 1 and are now in our armed services on all the far-flung battle fronts. We of the trade-union movement know how much American working men and women of Italian origin have contributed to the economic growth of our country, to the progress of our vigorous labor organizations, and our American standard of living. And today we can only welcome the revival of the deep friendship between the American and Italian peoples which flourished until the advent of the Fascist dictatorship.

Our American Federation of Labor has every reason to be proud of its own record in fighting militantly against the Fascist plague from the very moment of its inception. Not even for a split second did the A. F. of L. look upon fascism as a movement which might bring constructive reform or inject new life into the Italian nation. We are not fooled by Mussolini's noisy boasts about trains running on time, because we know, that, with Fascists at the throttle, these trains could run in only one direction—headlong toward the oppression of the people, the smashing of the free trade unions, and feverish preparation for plunging the world into total war.

We have been well rewarded for our confidence in the Italian workers throughout the dismal decades of fascism. It was the workers in the great factories of Bologna, Genoa, Milan, Naples, Rome, and Turin who struck the first blows against this infamous dictatorship, who led their nation to break with the Axis, and who are now the spearhead of the fearless fighters for the liberation of their country and the regeneration of Italian democracy. Italy, once the cradle of fascism will—under the deadly attacks of our armed forces and the courageous Italian guerrilla fighters—become the graveyard of Nazi-Fascist totalitarian slavery.

Our country and the entire New World are now playing the paramount role in international affairs. Our crushing onslaught against Axis tyranny and the miracles of production performed by American labor are only our repayment of the moral debt we owe to the Old World from which all our forefathers first came. In the new and better world to come out of this war, American labor can and must play a most vital part. The A. F. of L., as a mighty organization of free trade unions, can and will serve as a powerful force for inspiring and aiding the revival of free unionism in the world.

In this spirit I sincerely urge our great convention to hail the Italian working men and women who are today bravely resisting the Nazi terror and cooperating with the armed forces of the United Nations. Demand that the leaders of the United Nations should give the sternest warnings to the Nazi and Fascist chieftains and hold them strictly responsible for the horrible crimes they are now perpetrating against the heroic workers who raised the banner of freedom and independence in Italy. I am sure that the working people of Italy are most thankful to President Green for insisting that when this war is over and victory is ours the Fascist destroyers of their once powerful labor movement must be severely punished along with the war criminals.

In the name of the Italian-American Labor Council, let me thank you heartily for the warm support the League for Human Rights and many local unions have been giving to our campaign to raise $250,000 with which to help the reconstruction of free trade unions in Italy. Free trade unions are the bulwark of modern democracy and the strongest defense against every type of totalitarianism in every country.

Aroused Italian labor puts its full faith in the organized workers of America. This faith is well deserved. The day is not far off when a delegate from the rebuilt free trade unions of Italy will come to a convention of the A. F. of L. and convey to us the profound sympathy and friendship of the Italian people for our country. Through our generous support for rebuilding the free trade unions of Italy we are welding a most inspiring solidarity of world labor and assuring the triumph of democracy and lasting peace. This is to the eternal credit of free American labor.

Proposal for International Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the thinking of an earnest American woman on the problem of international organization to maintain peace, I am asking permission to include in the RECORD the following brief outline of a proposal by Mrs. J. R. Harrison, of Garvey, Calif.:

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF FREE NATIONS

(Proposal by Mrs. J. R. Harrison, of Garvey, Calif.)

EXPLANATION

This plan is called the international congress of free nations and is based on the principle of insurance. The delegates would correspond to a board, and the nations to the insured and each three delegates would represent and insure a nation in any dispute or claim, disaster, or infringement of rights or freedoms. The international congress would listen to all sides of the question, and, if necessary, appoint a committee for further investigation. The committee would report its findings and the international congress would vote. A two-thirds majority would be necessary to decide, and the decision of the international congress would be final. All reports, records, etc., would be public for all nations and all people except in time of war.

The nations belonging to the international congress would have to be free nations. These nations would have to delegate certain powers to the international congress to make it an effective working body, and in return the international congress would assume corresponding responsibilities which would richly repay these nations by the security and benefits provided to their people.

PROPOSED BYLAWS

Each member nation, upon paying a designated percentage of their national income derived from taxation (this amount should be estimated to pay for the running expenses of the international congress), would be eligible to send three delegates to the international congress.

The international congress would meet and select officers and standing committees by secret ballot. The officers are president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer, and the committees are finance, relief, and action. All are to serve for 3 years. The international congress is to be in continuous session.

MEMBERSHIP

Any free nation wishing to join the international congress may do so when two-thirds of the people of that nation vote to do so. These nations would have to have freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, free vote, and trial by jury.

DUTIES OF THE NATIONS HAVING MEMBERSHIP IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

1. To deposit in their own national treasury their yearly dues as a member of the international congress during January of the year they are due in the name of the International Congress of Free Nations. This money can be withdrawn only by the international congress by draft or check signed by the secretary and treasurer of the international congress.

2. To send three delegates, appointed by the head of the government (such as president or prime minister, etc.) and approved by the upper chamber of that government, to the international congress to represent that nation's interests.

3. The first delegate shall serve for 2 years, the second for 4 years, and the third for 6 years. As each term expires the new delegate is to be appointed for 3 years.

4. To assist the international congress in all ways possible in the execution of its duties, in the making available of surplus foods, expediting transportation, gathering information, etc.

5. To provide men, munitions, and funds when called upon by the international congress to assist in the liberation of a member nation or to protect a member nation which has been attacked.

6. Each nation agrees to keep a standing army in good condition with modern equipment which may be drawn upon as in paragraph 5.

7. Each nation agrees to give the international congress an accurate account of their armed forces and supplies, equipment, etc., every 6 months so that at all times the international congress will know the resources at their disposal.

8. Each nation agrees to pay its delegates a salary the same as is paid to a member of its upper legislative body.

9. Each nation agrees to respect the borders and rights of all nations and to submit any dispute with or claim against a nation to the international congress for settlement, and it further agrees to abide by all decisions of the international congress.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS

1. To ask men with specialized knowledge of economics, housing, medicine, relief, warfare, transportation, etc., for opinions on matters relating to the duties of the international congress.

2. To elect special committees when necessary.

3. To decide issues between nations by vote of the international congress in an open ballot.

4. To organize an army, drawn from the member nations' armies, to be used only in case a member country is invaded to repel the invader of that country or to enforce a free vote in any member country where the right to vote has been abolished.

5. To send a committee into any nation which has suffered famine or disaster or where freedom of the press or religion has been abolished. If this nation still has free vote, the committee shall report its findings to the people of that nation as well as to the international congress.

6. To relieve famine or disaster such as caused by floods, earthquake, etc.; to provide food and medical supplies for the victims of the disaster, to be distributed by the Red Cross if the Red Cross is able, and otherwise to be distributed by a special committee appointed and directed by the relief committee.

7. To protect the rights and borders of any member country from being violated by any other country and if a member country is invaded it is the duty of the international congress to wage war against the invader and repel him immediately with all the might of the international congress and its member nations.

8. At no time is the international congress allowed to gather funds in a central place, but the international congress may draw upon its funds only to make payment for services and supplies.

DUTIES OF THE DELEGATES

1. To report any infringement of his country's rights or the people's fundamental rights: Freedom of speech, press, religion, fear, vote, and trial by jury, and any serious want or disaster of magnitude in order that funds may be allocated for relief.

2. To make an annual report of his activities to his nation.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

1. The duties of the officers of the international congress shall be those usually attributed to these offices.

2. The relief committee shall carry out the instructions of the international congress on any matters assigned to it, such as the relief of disaster and the investigation into its causes.

3. The finance committee shall keep records of the financial affairs of the international congress and make a monthly report to it.

4. The action committee shall have charge of prosecuting any military action decided upon by the international congress and may call for men and supplies, in event the international congress has declared war or martial law in any country, from all member nations of the international congress, taking into consideration the countries' population and nearness to the disturbance.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the President which was broadcast on last Tuesday in connection with the signing of the agreement setting up the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here in the White House, seated about a table in the historic East Room, are representatives of 44 nations—United Nations and those associated with them.

The people of these 44 nations include approximately 80 percent of the human race, now united by a common devotion to the cause of civilization and by a common determination to build for the future a world of decency and security and peace.

Representatives of these 44 nations have just signed an agreement creating the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—commonly known as U. N. R. R. A.

This agency will help to put into practical effect some of the high purposes that were set forth in the declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1942.

Coming after the declarations of Moscow, this agreement shows that we mean business in this war in a political and humanitarian sense, just as surely as we mean business in a military sense. It is one more strong link joining the United Nations in facing problems of mutual need and interest.

The agreement which we have all just signed is based on a preamble in which the United Nations declare that they are "determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area * * * the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes

and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services." That is the preamble of the agreement which has just been signed here today.

All of the United Nations agree to cooperate and share in the work of U. N. R. R. A.—each nation according to its own individual resources—to provide relief and help in rehabilitation for the victims of German and Japanese barbarism.

It is hard for us to grasp the magnitude of the needs in occupied countries.

The Germans and the Japanese have carried on their campaigns of plunder and destruction with one purpose in mind: That in the lands they occupy there shall be left only a generation of half-men—undernourished, crushed in body and spirit, without strength or incentive to hope—ready, in fact, to be enslaved and used as beasts of burden by the self-styled master races.

The occupied countries have been robbed of their foodstuffs and raw materials, and even of the agricultural and industrial machinery upon which their workers must depend for employment. The Germans have been planning systematically to make the other countries economic vassals, utterly dependent upon and completely subservient to the Nazi tyrants.

Responsibility for alleviating the suffering and misery occasioned by this new order must be assumed not by any individual nation, but by all the United and Associated Nations acting together. No one country could, or should, attempt to bear the burden of meeting the vast relief needs—either in money or in supplies.

The work confronting U. N. R. R. A. is immediate and urgent. As it now begins its operations, many of the most fertile food regions of the world are either under Axis domination, or have been stripped by the practice of the dictatorships to make themselves self-sustaining on other peoples' lands. Additional regions will be blackened as the German and Japanese forces in their retreat scorch the earth behind them.

So it will be the task of U. N. R. R. A. to operate in these areas of food shortages until the resumption of peaceful occupations enables the liberated peoples once more to assume the full burden of their own support. It will be for U. N. R. R. A., first, to assure a fair distribution of available supplies among all of the liberated peoples, and, second, to ward off death by starvation or exposure among these peoples.

It would be supreme irony for us to win victory, and then to inherit world chaos simply because we were unprepared to meet what we know we shall have to meet. We know the human wants which will follow liberation. Many ruthlessly shattered cities and villages in Russia, China, and Italy provide horrible evidence of what the defeated retreating Germans and Japanese will leave behind.

It is not only humane and charitable for the United Nations to supply medicine, food, and other necessities to the peoples freed from Axis control; it is a clear matter of enlightened self-interest—of military strategic necessity. This was apparent to us even before the Germans were ousted from any of the countries under their control.

But we need not any longer speculate. We have had nearly a year of experience in French Africa—and later experience in Sicily and in Italy.

In French North Africa, the United Nations have given assistance in the form of seeds, agricultural supplies, and agricultural equipment; and have made it possible for the people there to increase their harvest.

After years of looting by the Germans, the people of French Africa are now able to supply virtually all of their own food needs. Besides, they are meeting important needs of the Allied armed forces in French Africa, in Sicily, and Italy, and giving much of the civilian labor which assists our armed forces there in loading and unloading ships.

The assistance rendered to the liberated peoples of French Africa was a joint venture of Great Britain and the United States.

The next step, as in the case of other joint operations of the United Nations, is to handle the problems of supply for the liberated areas on a United Nations basis—rather than the cooperation of only two nations.

We have shown that while the war lasts, whenever we help the liberated peoples with essential supplies and services, we hasten the day of the defeat of the Axis Powers.

When victory comes there can certainly be no secure peace until there is a return of law and order in the oppressed countries, until the peoples of these countries have been restored to a normal, healthy, self-sustaining existence. This means that the more quickly and effectually we apply measures of relief and rehabilitation, the more quickly will our own boys overseas be able to come home.

We have acted together with the other United Nations in harnessing our raw materials, our production and our other resources to defeat the common enemy. We have worked together with the United Nations in full agreement and action in the fighting on land, on the sea and in the air. We are now about to take an additional step in the combined actions which are necessary to win the war and to build the foundation for a secure peace.

The sufferings of the little men and women who have been ground under the Axis heel can be relieved only if we utilize the production of all the world to balance the want of all the world. In U. N. R. R. A. we have devised a mechanism based on the processes of true democracy, which can go far toward accomplishment of such an objective in the days and months of desperate emergency which will follow the overthrow of the Axis.

Like in most of the difficult and complex things in life, nations will learn to work together only by actually working together. Why not? They have common objectives. It is, therefore, with a lift of hope that we look on the signing of this agreement by all of the United Nations as a means of joining them together still more firmly.

Such is the spirit and such is the positive action of the United Nations at the time when our military power is becoming predominant, when our enemies are being pushed back—all over the world.

In defeat or in victory the United Nations have never deviated from adherence to the basic principles of freedom, tolerance, independence, and security.

Tomorrow the U. N. R. R. A. begins its first conference and makes the first bold steps toward the practicable, workable realization of freedom from want. The forces of the United Nations march forward and the peoples of the United Nations march with them.

The Canners' Outstanding Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Wisconsin Canners' Association at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on November 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset, may I express my appreciation for the privilege of addressing this group which has accomplished such an outstanding job on the food front. I know something of the importance of the canning industry in this State and particularly in my own part of the State. There are some 15 canning factories within a 50-mile radius of Chippewa Falls.

I should like to make it clear in the beginning, however, that I am not speaking to you as an authority on the problems of your industry. I am speaking only as your servant in Washington who realizes that your problems are in large part identical with other problems of a war-stressed economy, and I want to assure you that I shall continue to do everything possible as your Senator to help you find the right answers either as an association or individually.

At the same time I should like to express my own appreciation and, I am sure, that of the entire Nation for the fine job you have done in spite of many difficulties.

You have done a fine job in spite of the shortage of labor and in spite of what must appear at times to be a deliberate refusal on the part of Government officials to understand your own particular problems.

We all realize that the War Food Administration has had, and still has, an extremely difficult task. We all realize that the war food program, if it can be called a program, has had to be improvised on an almost day-to-day basis. Or at least we all realize this was the case during the opening months of the war.

But we have now been at war for nearly 2 years. And it might be supposed that the War Food Administration would now be in position to plan on something more than a day-to-day basis. For example, as canners you should be out in the field right now contracting acreage for next year. But to contract intelligently under present conditions you should have definite information about the plans of the War Food Administration for next year. You cannot very well enter into definite contracts unless you have some rather definite idea of 1944 production goals, and you most assuredly are confronted with the necessity of knowing something about the price to be paid to the grower and the resale price allowed for canners.

I know such things as prices are not supposed to be important in the present scheme of things around various Federal bureaus. What price a farmer must have for raising a crop and what price a canner must have for processing it doesn't seem to have any effect on whether a given chair at a given desk at a given bureau at Washington is overstuffed, understuffed, or just plain chair. Nor may such an item as price seem important to some overstuffed occupant of an overstuffed chair.

But we should not criticize our bureaucrats too severely; there are many who are doing an excellent job. After all, they are our hired men. After all, it is our fault if they should become our bosses. And after all, there is a difference between the outlook of a bureaucrat, whose income is guaranteed and paid by all of us, and the outlook of the individual farmer or canner, whose income depends entirely on the price he gets for his product.

In a normal economy the farmer, and particularly the canner, depends on general market conditions for his price. He takes a risk; that is, that he can grow or process his product and make enough on the transaction to

enable him to remain in the economic picture.

But this isn't a normal economy. It is a war economy. It is an economy regulated by Federal edict. We all recognize the necessity of regulation. We only ask that the regulations be based on ordinary common sense and fair play, and that they be devised with at least a minimum of practical understanding of the problems of the industry in question.

Of course, a little sympathetic understanding on the part of some of our bureaucrats would help, too. But, then, why expect the impossible?

Would it be asking too much of the War Food Administration to provide the canning industry right now with a definite schedule of production and prices for 1944—prices the canners can pay the growers? Or must the industry wait until February or March, as they did this last season, before getting any definite idea of what is expected of it and what prices it can charge?

I assure you that I shall be only too willing to do what I can toward getting some action in this particular matter of schedules at the earliest possible date. There has been some disposition recently in the National Capital to give consideration to the necessary facts in laying down a program. And it may be that some of this disposition has trickled into the War Food Administration.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not too optimistic. I am only mildly hopeful. And I am only promising to do the best I can. I shall be only too happy to have suggestions as to ways and means from those of you who have been in much more immediate contact with the problems of your industry than I have been. Perhaps between us we can work something out which will enable your industry to do an even better job next year than it has done this year and last year.

And it would be presumptuous for me to tell you that, regardless of difficulties, regardless of red tape, regardless of whimsical bureaucrats and capricious seventh-assistant administrators, regardless of labor shortages and rigid labor regulations, regardless of gasoline shortages, real or imposed, the canning industry will continue to do its best to produce its share of the first requisite of victory—enough food to supply our combat forces and the equally vital home front. Yes; and enough food for our 3,000,000 Federal employees.

I am sure the canning industry will continue to do its splendid best because the men and women of industry are first of all Americans; and their sons are now fighting on all the battle fronts of the world. As Americans they will do their full part in winning this war. As fathers and mothers they will do their full part in helping to bring their boys and curs back home again at the earliest possible moment.

Oh, yes; I know there are those who call themselves Americans who insist that any man engaged in business cannot be a good American. There are those who call themselves Americans who insist that only they and those who accept their collectivist notions can be good Americans. And we all know that these men have been holding and still are holding important key positions within the vast governmental machinery which has grown up at Washington which is spreading its tentacles all over this country. We know that their ideology has for nearly a decade been the accepted ideology of the present administration.

To you men and women of an industry which has felt the impact of the current ideology at first hand, to you men and women who have directly experienced the lack of understanding and common sense which finds expression in many current wartime regulations, I realize all this sounds discouraging.

It is discouraging. It is discouraging to find yourselves faced with the prospect of further direct restraints. It is discouraging to find yourselves confronted with the prospects of subsidies, of direct hand-outs of Federal cash, and with all the petty annoyances which go with the acceptance of hand-outs. It is discouraging to be told that you cannot pay a fair price for the crops you buy from the farmer and that you cannot charge a fair price for the products you sell to the wholesaler and retailer. It is discouraging to face the prospect of presenting yourselves, hats in hand, at the desk of some well-upholstered bureaucrat, there to plead your case for the privilege of staying in business.

It is particularly discouraging when you know full well that just a little political courage, just a little practical knowledge, just a little good will, just a little faith in the basic honesty and decency of the American farmer and American businessman would have made the entire humiliating prospect unnecessary.

But here is a heartening message: I can report to you that a new strength is being born in Congress. I can report to you a growing conviction among the Members of both Houses of Congress that subsidies are not only a measure of the mistakes and misconvictions of the Federal bureaucracy, they are an extremely dangerous part and parcel of the whole scheme of what has come to be called a planned economy, but which should be called by its right name—state socialism.

So I can report to you that there is slim chance of subsidies ever being fastened on us in any measurable degree.

This new strength in Congress, this new determination to stop any but the most necessary wartime restrictions, has its source in a growing awareness of the need of making America sound again at the core—sound politically, economically, socially.

It is a sign and a portent that Congress has discarded entirely the defeatist complex which prevailed in the days of the "rubber stamp."

It is an indication that Members of Congress, regardless of party, are coming to realize that when this war is over, the supreme task of Congress will be to restore to the American people their traditional freedom of enterprise under definite and reasonable law.

In all this, Congress is only expressing the convictions of the people who want a government of, for, and by the people, and not a government of whim by a new American herrenvolk.

And in all this, the people too, are expressing their own new-found convictions. They are expressing a rebirth of faith in the American way. They had been told that the American way was finished, that the American economy was a mature economy, that American social and political institutions no longer fit the need of the times. They had been told, in effect, that in the past Americans had concerned themselves too much with bill-of-rights democracy, and that they should henceforth concern themselves more and more with some new form of democracy. They had been told that if we are to win this war, we must first of all have a country worth fighting and winning for.

But the American people, in ever-increasing numbers, are finding that they are fighting and winning this war for the America they have always known. They are finding in the sacrifices of war a new sense of patriotism, of companionship, of belonging to each other, and working for each other.

And they are finding in this war a new confidence born of the triumphs of their traditional American system of enterprise. They are finding that their system is not an outmoded, dying system as Herr Hitler and many of our bureaucrats still insist. They are finding that it is still a system capable of offering great opportunity, still capable of unprecedented triumphs of production.

They are finding that it is still their system and that they can still make it work. They are finding that they can still make it work, because they have made it work, and they are making it work now.

I need scarcely point out to you what the American system of free enterprise has accomplished during the 23 months since Pearl Harbor or during the 4 years and 2 months since the outbreak of the war in Europe. Yet a few facts and figures may serve to emphasize this accomplishment.

The United States now has nearly 10,000,000 men in its combat forces, in its Army, Navy, and Air Forces. It has equipped these forces with the best weapons in the world and is clothing and feeding the personnel better than any other combat forces in the world.

It is doing this because the American people on the home front and under a free enterprise system badly handicapped by bureaucratic red tape, bungling, and contradictory restrictions, are now producing for war more than $7,700,000,000 worth of products a month, more than $90,000,000,000 worth a year.

In July 1940 we had a good Navy. It was generally rated second only to the British in total tonnage. It had a total tonnage of 1,875,000 tons. Today it has a total tonnage of nearly 5,000,000 tons. It is the strongest Navy in the world.

And perhaps I should say that those 5,000,000 tons are not "on hand or on order"; they are on the water, where they belong and where they are winning this war for us.

In July 1940 the Navy had only 1,744 planes of all types. Today it has some 18,000 planes of all types, again not on order but on the job.

In July 1940 we had a small and badly equipped Army. Today we have an Army which is rapidly approaching the 8,000,000 mark and which is equipped with the most effective weapons of any army in the world. We have an Army Air Force of 182,000 officers and 1,906,000 men.

In his splendid official report of September 3 this year, Gen. George C. Marshall, our able Chief of Staff, emphasized the growth of the Army Air Forces by using percentages.

In the last 2 years, he pointed out, the service units of the Army Air Forces have expanded approximately 12,000 percent and those of the Air Forces proper about 3,500 percent.

We have been performing equally unprecedented things in the merchant marine. As against a limping shipping industry 3 years ago, this year we are building 19,000,000 tons of merchant shipping. And we are now starting to build types of merchant vessels which will be useful in post-war world trade.

We have built Navy bases, airplane bases, Army bases, and modern harbors to handle our merchant shipping on a dozen different war fronts three to seven to twelve thousand miles from our own shores. We have sent several billion dollars worth of war material to our allies under the lend-lease program.

This has all been done because the American system of free enterprise has made it possible to do it. It has been done because American industry in 3 years has converted from the greatest peacetime industry in all the world to the greatest wartime industry of all time.

It doesn't matter whether it is an $85,000,000 battleship or a $70,000,000 airplane carrier, it doesn't matter whether it is a $450,000 bombing plane or a $150,000 fighter plane, it doesn't matter whether it is a $140,000 heavy tank, a $60,000 medium tank, or a $45,000 light tank, it doesn't matter whether it is a $900 jeep or a $65 silk parachute or a $20 submachine gun—American industry is producing it in unprecedented quantity and quality. It is producing the arms and the ammunitions to win this war. It is producing in unprecedented fashion because the free and inquiring minds of men have built into it those qualities of mind and spirit which see in

every challenge only another opportunity for service.

Tomorrow is Armistice Day. We can all recall, can we not, the great elation, the profound rejoicing with which we greeted that first Armistice Day, 25 years ago?

Today, on the eve of the twenty-fifth Armistice Day, we are also on the eve of victory in this war. We do not know, of course, the day or the week or the month when final victory will be ours. But we do know that it is drawing nearer every day. And we know that it is bringing with it great and challenging problems of reconstruction.

Twenty-five years ago, when we had won the war, we were convinced we had won a war to end all war. Many of us dreamed great dreams of what we would accomplish in the next quarter of a century.

Many explanations have been offered as to why we won that war and lost the peace which followed. And perhaps of the many, most are partly right; most have something of truth in them.

But it is, perhaps, truest of all, that we lost the peace because we only dreamed our future, because we refused to face the future and its problems squarely and with open eyes—and by we, I mean America and the peoples and statesmen of earth.

We must not try to build a dream world at the close of this war. We shall be confronted with a gigantic task in rebuilding, in putting together again the world in which we actually live. We will need all our energies, all our abilities, all our faith and courage, to face and solve the problems of reconstruction.

In grappling with these problems, our first task will be to get rid of all bureaucratic red tape, all unnecessary regimentation. Our first task will be to give back to management and labor their system of free enterprise, to retain only those necessary Government regulations which will protect both management and labor from the antisocial forces among them.

Our first task, in other words, will be to get rid of the men who distrust our accepted American ways, who foment discord among us, who preach the defeatism of a "mature economy" to us, who insist we can never meet the future and its problems unless we change our traditional ways of ordered freedom.

We must rid ourselves of these men of mistaken judgment. We must replace them with men of good will, with men who have faith in our institutions, who know and understand the essential honesty and decency of the overwhelming majority of our people.

We must rid ourselves of these men even as we grapple with the challenging problems of American and world reconstruction. What are some of these problems?

Here in America we will be confronted, when this war ends, with the gigantic task of reconverting from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

In doing this, we will be faced with the major task of liquidating some fifty or sixty billions of war contracts.

We will be confronted with the task of finding a place in our private enterprise system for some 2,426 industrial plants in which the Government has invested some $15,555,000,000.

We will be confronted with the task of finding maximum employment, not only in these plants, but in the 15,052 plants in which private industry has put an additional $4,445,000,000 capital.

We will be confronted with the task of disposing of some $50,000,000,000 worth of disposable material which the Army and Navy will probably have on hand. Of this $50,000,000,000 surplus, there will be some $15,000,000,000 of surplus food, clothing, shoes, and other consumer goods. I scarcely need to tell this audience of what direct importance this food surplus will be to the canned food industry.

We will be confronted with the task of finding jobs for some seven or eight million men now in the armed services, of continuing the employment of some eleven million now in direct war industries, and 17,000,000 women in industry.

I could enumerate many other important phases of the domestic problem. These should be sufficient to give point to its magnitude.

But I cannot emphasize too urgently the importance of speed in the great task of reconversion. Any delay in changing back to peacetime industry will aggravate the difficulties immeasurably. Let me offer one or two figures.

It has been estimated that some seven to twelve million will be thrown out of employment during the readjustment period. It is estimated that a reduction of $25,000,000,000 or more may be expected in the income of individuals. It has been estimated that industry's production index, now at 210 percent of the 1938–39 average, will drop to 140 or 150.

These are sobering estimates. They emphasize that a readjustment period prolonged by official delays or official confusions or official reluctance to let go of the encroachments it has made inside industry may plunge us into another grave depression, may lend superficial support to those champions of defeatism who would fasten state socialism on us permanently.

It is heartening to know that American industry and American business generally understands what is at stake. It is extremely encouraging to know that industry and business have set up a Nation-wide Committee on Post-War Employment to study these problems and to find American answers to them. And it is particularly heartening to me to be able to say to you that Congress is showing an increasing awareness of its importance.

We know, of course, that even during the stress of war, or perhaps we should say under the stress of war, industry has already made vast technological strides. We know that an entire new industry of plastics is emerging out of this war; that air transport and communications offer vast new fields. We know that many important improvements have been made in the quality of goods to which we have long been accustomed.

And we know of the vast potential buying demand of the American market. We know the need there will be for new homes, new cars, new radios, new clothes, new goods of all sorts as a result of the backlog built up by the prior demands of war during these years.

We know, too, that in the post-war period, the American people will have the money with which to give effective demand to their potential buying power. We know that more than forty billion American dollars have already been invested in war bonds by individual Americans. We know that by the close of the war this total may increase to sixty, perhaps eighty billion.

We know, in short, that only a man of little faith in America can seriously doubt the future of America. We know that in spite of the difficulties ahead, America is going forward into a future worthy of all our hopes and sacrifices. We know we can and will do this once we purge ourselves of sham ideologies, once we rid ourselves of the tiny minority of men who have worked themselves into places of power in our Government.

Of the world problems confronting us, I shall only point out one. The great problem, of course, is the problem of preserving the peace we are now winning. Unless we solve that problem, we shall solve none of the others.

There is a widely prevalent notion that America will be out-traded and out-smarted by others if we should undertake to protect American world interests and so help preserve world peace in the post-war period.

But America can be out-smarted only if we entrust our American destiny to men who have no faith in America and her institutions. America can be out-traded only if we entrust our interests to men who are more interested in building up a world-wide W. P. A. than in building a world of order and security in which all men may have a fair and decent chance to help themselves.

We shall have nothing to fear in the post-war world if we place our affairs in the hands of men who believe in America, in the hands of men who have faith in America, and who know that American influence in the future, as in the past, will be used entirely to promote a more stable and enduring world order.

It would be wishful thinking of the worst sort, however, to suggest that even in the most competent hands post-war problems will be readily untangled.

On the contrary, they will challenge the best minds and the most skillful hands we have. I, for one, have no fear for the future of America, if we entrust American destiny to real Americans.

As I have said, your industry is making a contribution to the war, and your industry will make a great contribution to the peace.

Your business is related to the big business of government, and the big business of government, whether we like it or not, is related to the big business of world affairs. Our sons who are fighting everywhere in the world today will return to the United States with a new concept of our place in world affairs.

Our fighting men are cognizant of the fact that we are in a key position to determine the directions of the people of the earth for years to come. We must provide adequate world leadership—a leadership which will insure that America herself will remain safe.

In all this food will play an important role. On this Armistice Day, while we are still engaged in another great war, it is well for us to realize that there can never be world peace while men are hungry. There can never be peace while there is famine. Dictators and unrest linger in the shadows of bread lines. Revolutions and wars are bred when men are starved physically and spiritually.

To the extent that we succeed in feeding men's bodies and men's spirits—to that extent alone can we dream and hope for an abiding peace.

Pay Schedule of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the eligibility for dependency allotment being set according to the base pay of men and women in our armed forces I have received many inquiries regarding the pay schedule of our armed forces. This information is valuable to the people back home in the collection of gratuity payment and arrears of pay in the event of a death casualty. The new Dependency Allotment Act applies to all men and women in our armed forces whose base pay is $138 per month or less. To give the people at home an

idea of who qualify under this new act it is necessary for them to acquaint themselves with the pay schedule. This pay schedule will also inform the people back home as to how much gratuity pay and arrears of pay is due them in the event of a death casualty.

For that reason I wish to place in the RECORD my summarized pay schedule of the men and women in our armed forces. It is as follows:

Annual pay of commissioned officers

Navy	Army	Salary per year
Admiral	General	$8,000
Vice admiral	Lieutenant general	8,000
Rear admiral (upper half).	Major general	8,000
Rear admiral (lower half).	Brigadier general	6,000
Captain	Colonel	4,000
Commander	Lieutenant colonel	3,500
Lieutenant commander	Major	3,000
Lieutenant	Captain	2,400
Lieutenant (junior grade).	First lieutenant	2,000
Ensign	Second lieutenant	1,800

NOTE.—This is the base pay only. Subsistence is not included in the base-pay schedule.

Monthly pay of other men and women in our armed forces

Navy	Army	Salary per month
First-grade mates	Master sergeant	$138
Second-grade petty officers (first class).	Technical sergeant	114
Third-grade petty officers (second class).	Staff sergeant	96
Fourth-grade petty officers (third class).	Sergeant	78
Fifth-grade nonrated men (first class).	Corporal	66
Sixth-grade nonrated men (second class).	Private, first class	54
Seventh-grade nonrated men (third class).	Private	50

NOTE.—Women in service receive the same pay as men in each of their ranks.

Letter to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting an article from the Farmington Valley Herald, written by William Porter Downey, editor and publisher of that paper, which I feel certain will be of interest to my colleagues:

LETTER TO WASHINGTON

The following letter may be of interest to Herald readers. It was sent earlier this week to able young Douglas Bennet, information chief of the Connecticut O. P. A., who is now on leave in Washington assisting National O. P. A. head Chester Bowles:

HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DOUGLAS J. BENNET,
Information Division, O. P. A.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOUG: When I called the Hartford O. P. A. this morning and learned that you are now spending a great part of your time in Washington I was not greatly surprised. You did a good job up here and you will do a good job down there. I understand that the change is not yet permanent, but should you be assigned to the national office I am sure you will prove to be of incalculable assistance to Chester Bowles.

I really called you this morning to remind you of your assurance (last summer) that milk production in this State was up—not a surprising statement, when one considered the fact that the bossies of Connecticut were at that time feeding on lush green pasturage.

The fact that each week less and less of them were then chewing their cuds contentedly is now revealed in our really critical milk shortage up here—as predicted in the Herald in January of this year. If you will refer to page A372 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix you will read this prediction by the Herald, as inserted by Senator MALONEY.

There is no point in referring to this now, except as it bears upon future policies affecting future production of food.

The ponderous, unwieldy, and wasteful processes of blanket subsidies just don't supply the answer, and while I know that in the minds of many with whom you are now directly associated, this administration is committed to a subsidy program, and no matter how much is said against it, or how logical it may be, it is still going to be subsidy—the long-suffering public just won't like to have this blanket, Nation-wide subsidy program forced down their protesting throats, as the milk subsidy was forced down the gullets of our local dairymen.

Again I point out that my objection to the method with which subsidy is being presented is even stronger than to the principle of subsidy itself.

Why not be completely honest about it, if you want to sell a bill of goods? Why tell the public that subsidies are a means of holding down the cost of foodstuffs (and merchandise) to the housewife? This simply is not true, and this little journal, as well as some thousands of others, will say so as often as the subsidy program is so presented.

In the case of our milk subsidy up here in the dairy country, the cost to the taxpayer may amount to many, many times the 1-cent-per-quart increase requested. I know it, you know it, the big boss knows it, and some of us are doing our level best to see that every housewife knows it too.

So why not assume—as Chester Bowles did with gas rationing up here with most gratifying response—that the great majority of the American public are honest and that they have a smattering of economic sense? After all, they have enough to earn the wherewithal to pay for subsidies.

Why not begin with the premise that we no longer must be treated as children by a paternalistic papa government who may or may not see all and know all—but who tells precious little to those who must pay his bills?

Probably the odds are all against it being done, but I can imagine a statement emanating from your Washington office that would make page 1 throughout the country—just telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The man has bitten the dog so much that the whole truth would really be news.

Why not tell us country folk whose sons and brothers and nephews are now stopping bullets in 37 parts of the globe that subsidy will cost one whale of a lot of money?

Why not let us know that you, too, realize that in many instances subsidy payments will be more costly to the consumer than price increases at the grocers' counter?

Why not inform the American men and women who must save—out of pennies and nickels and dimes, and quarters from their household budgets—the millions of dollars so casually appropriated down there in impersonal conclave, that this is an extremely costly, yet expedient device for averting evils you believe to be far more dangerous to our economic weal?

Why not tell them all—then let the public themselves be the judge, and abide by their decision—after they know all the facts?

Why not let Chester Bowles go on the air, to explain in exactly the same frank, open, and honest manner he used up here just what this matter of blanket subsidies is all about?

Why not permit him to explain both the disadvantages and the advantages as he sees them?

And why not dispense with sarcasm and innuendo and nasty little digs at opposition, and insinuations that build resentment? Why refer at all to opponents of subsidy as those who favor a little inflation? Many who oppose blanket subsidies, as you must know, have every reason to fight against inflation uncontrolled—because we are the fathers and mothers of the growing children who would suffer for it.

It is all very well to allude to those who oppose subsidies as economic hop heads, but name-calling accomplishes nothing and it works both ways.

Only history will reveal the truth about which faction is addicted to the needle. I shall be content to be so characterized should history so decide—but in the meantime I do not propose to be a party to kidding this immediate public, who are Herald readers and my friends.

Perhaps the foregoing will prove of interest and perhaps it will not—but believe me, you can accept it as an unadulterated, uncensored version of the way many thousands of American citizens are thinking.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM PORTER DOWNEY.

Who Changed Monro on Monopoly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the minority report on H. R. 3420, the civil aviation bill, brought out facts to show the aviation industry is dominated by a few big interests. The more these interests try to explain, the more they show a monopoly of control in the air industry. Let the following facts speak for themselves:

In the minority report, it is stated that 81 percent of domestic air transportation in this country is done by 4 companies, which may be shown to be dominated by a few individuals, and the remaining 19 percent by 15 companies. This information is from the speech made by Mr. C. Bedell Monro, president, Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Corporation, on September 30, 1943. Mr. Monro went on to explain in great detail the monopoly of the Big Four with supporting facts and figures.

Since that time, somebody has attempted to shut up Mr. Monro. On November 1, 1943, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman PRIEST, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, at page A4620, a letter from Mr. Monro, dated

October 25, 1943. This letter reads as follows:

OCTOBER 25, 1943.

Hon. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR BULWINKLE: The entire air-transport industry, the smaller lines as well as the larger lines, is unanimously and strongly in favor of the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) just reported by a large majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It has come to my attention that a minority report on this bill cites some remarks recently made by me. This citation is apparently intended to support the minority's argument that the Lea bill deliberately fosters a monopoly of domestic air transportation on the part of the four largest domestic air lines.

The fact is that the inequality in the relative positions of the smaller and the larger air lines, which I referred to in the remarks cited, resulted from the chaotic conditions antedating the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act corrected those conditions and contained specific provision to guard against monopoly. The only hope of the smaller air lines lies in the wise administration of that act in the spirit in which it was framed by your committee in 1938.

One reason that the smaller air lines so strongly favor the new Lea bill is that it strengthens the Civil Aeronautics Act and extends its very wise principles—calling for sound competition in air transportation—to all air commerce.

The minority report favors the Reece bill. It is a source of amazement that the minority cry out against the dangers of monopoly but at the same time advocate the removal of present restrictions against surface carriers going into competitive air transportation. The minority even suggest that surface carriers should provide feeder air service to the trunk air carriers, as well as engaging in trunk air service. No greater disaster could befall the small air lines than a development such as the minority espouses. The smaller air lines would then be hopelessly caught between the present powerful large air lines and the even more powerful surface carriers. Our only salvation—if any—would be a forced sale of the modest assets which we have so diligently tried to build up. The Reece bill is leveled with deadly aim at the very heart of free enterprise in air transportation.

I have read your majority report attentively. It is a statesmanlike, far-sighted discussion of civil aviation's problems, reflecting your long and arduous study. It and the bill you have framed are landmarks in the progress of civil aviation. May I respectfully express earnest hope that your bill will be approved by the House.

Sincerely yours,

PENNSYLVANIA-CENTRAL AIRLINES CORPORATION,
C. BEDELL MONRO, *President.*

What caused Mr. Monro to turn a flip-flop in 4 weeks?

At this point, I merely desire to insert as a matter of record the official figures which confirm the statement of Mr. Monro that the Big Four does most of the aviation business of the United States:

Operating revenues—domestic air lines

Air line	July—1943		12 months ending July 1943	
	Operating revenues	Percent of total	Operating revenues	Percent of total
American	$2,940,799	25.6	$29,830,757	25.6
United	2,620,639	22.8	26,171,991	22.6
Eastern	1,336,093	11.6	15,254,020	13.1
Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.	1,739,767	15.2	18,091,506	15.5
Northwest	486,951	4.2	4,643,357	4.0
Braniff	469,806	4.1	4,277,717	3.7
Penn-Central	395,989	3.4	3,396,310	2.9
Delta	236,843	2.1	2,489,835	2.1
Chicago-Southern	236,530	2.1	2,391,422	2.1
Western Air	235,553	2.1	2,414,415	2.0
Hawaiian	145,975	1.3	1,667,607	1.4
Continental	143,180	1.2	1,427,602	1.2
National	124,570	1.1	1,427,005	1.2
Northeast	89,861	.8	574,641	.5
Mid-Continent	84,414	.8	789,923	.7
Colonial	82,940	.7	734,899	.6
Inland	52,701	.5	482,947	.4
All-American	50,350	.4	522,306	.4
	11,472,961	100.0	116,588,260	100.0

NOTE.—For the year 1942 the 4 large companies—American, Eastern, Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., and United—had total revenues which were 78 percent of the revenues of the industry. In 1941 it was slightly over 80 percent.

The statement in Mr. Monro's letter of October 25, 1943, is nonunderstandable to say the least. In his speech of September 30, 1943, after referring to the foreign monopoly by one air line and the danger of possible monopoly if surface lines were allowed to go into the air business, he went on to say the following:

Those two sources of danger to a vital program of our industry are of national significance and the subject of national discussion and controversy. I have here mentioned them only briefly as I would like to bring to your attention in greater detail a third source of danger, of equal national significance and perhaps more far-reaching in the years to come. This source, equally invidious, equally destructive to orderly growth and progress, has up to the present time been considered only vaguely, discussed by only a few and never expressed publicly either as to fact or implication. And it stems from a threatened, if not now existent, virtual monopoly created by an economic unbalance among the domestic air lines of the United States.

This unbalance has little to do with size as measured by the number of route miles covered by each company, but rather with the nature of the territory served, particularly with regard to traffic potential. Do you know, for example, that in the year ended June 30, 1941 (the last year for which basic, comparable figures are available, because of wartime air transport curtailment) 4 of the 16 domestic air-line operators in existence did 81 percent of the total air-line business of the country, with one attaining the figure of 30 percent? Thus, those 4 companies left for the other 12 operators, territory from which only a total of 19 percent of the country's business could be developed. Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, which in some respects can be considered as the fifth largest carrier, did only 3.7 percent of the Nation's domestic air transport business, there being thus a tremendous gap between the revenues of the 4 largest and the one next in line. Nor did superior salesmanship or any other attributes of competition contribute materially to that situation, for the Big Four's routes were not competitive with those of the other 12 carriers except to a minor degree.

But that is only part of the story and here is where we get into a little air line economics. In that same year ended June 30, 1941, a total of 25,596 route miles were held by the 4 largest air lines, with 17,314 divided among the other 12 carriers. There can be no honest objection to that situation, but the pertinent fact is that for each route mile of the Big Four, 3 times more business was derived than from each route mile of the other 12. Again, this is not a question of better salesmanship or greater efficiency, or larger size. As a typical illustration of the basic reason, because of the potential, P. C. A. could never in uncounted years develop as much business on its 347-mile section between Detroit and Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as American now enjoys on its 261-mile section between Detroit and Chicago. In other words, it isn't just the miles over which an air line operates; it is a question of how much business can be developed in the operation of such mileage. And I repeat again that the 4 largest air lines generate about 3 times more business per route mile than do the other 12.

Mr. Monro then referred to another important aspect in respect to monopoly by the Big Four, namely, the fact that the Big Four averaged five times as much business at each station as would the smaller air lines. He went on to explain the importance of this from a competitive standpoint and also gave a number of statistics in support of his statement. He then went on to express the following:

Thus, there appears to be a most serious economic unbalance, a virtual monopoly on the part of the four largest air lines of the most lucrative routes in the country—a situation with potentialities as explosive to the sound, economic growth of aviation as a load of block-buster bombs—a situation which, if left uncorrected, can reduce to a minimum our ability to offer gainful employment to our returning servicemen in an industry which should lead all others in expansion and resultant job opportunities.

* * * * *

As air travel became accepted more widely by the American public, it was only natural that the gulf between those carriers established in "fat" territory and those established in "lean" territory widened enormously. And those companies in the latter category, with vision for the future, together with the necessary drive and energy, could expand only to such points and in such areas where the smaller degree of traffic potential was a grave handicap. With few exceptions, any incursions into more fertile fields, embodying as it did direct competition, were originally prohibited by law and later prevented by policy of the Government agency—the Civil Aeronautics Board—which since 1938 has had jurisdiction over our industry.

* * * * *

No, as stated before, there can be no quarrel with what has happened in the past, nor blame for any company, group, or agency. Issue should be taken, however, with the present complete disregard on the part of the larger carriers of self-evident facts when, with control of at least 81 percent of the business of the country, those carriers have laid plans and are seeking additional operating certificates for direct competition with

the smaller carriers for a substantial proportion of the remaining 19 percent. And certainly for the immediate and future public interest, issue should be taken with any policy which will either perpetuate or intensify a virtual monopoly, even though such monopoly were created originally by force of circumstances.

Mr. Monro then made a statement that size does not constitute a monopoly but rather exclusive control. Furthermore, he pointed out again that the Big Four served the largest territory in the country and left the dregs to the smaller lines. In other words, the Big Four were interested only in the cream of the traffic and were not interested in serving the thousands of smaller communities which might desire air transportation.

Later on in referring to the question of new applicants for entrance into the air-transportation field, he asked the question: "Should domestic operations be confined to present operating companies? That would not appear to be a fair restriction, though the present economic unbalance should first be corrected else the waters become too muddied for any constructive action."

Mr. Monro obviously was fighting for the lives and the future of the smaller companies menaced by the present monopoly of the Big Four.

This statement was made on September 30, 1943, and bears out the statistics above quoted with respect to the relative revenues of the Big Four and the smaller companies. It is difficult to understand the source of Mr. Monro's expressions in his letter of October 25 to the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee on page A4620 of the Appendix of the RECORD. Maybe while expressing his personal views on September 30 he was later led to believe that he might have spoken out of turn for the good of his own small company.

It is still more difficult to understand Mr. Monro's signature to a telegram to the chairman of the Special Committee on Aviation printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4685, which telegram reads as follows:

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aviation of House Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, New House Office Building:

The smaller air lines strongly support the Lea civil-aviation bill as favorably reported by House committee. In our considered judgment, the assertion in the minority report that the bill would foster a monopoly by the larger air lines is wholly unfounded. We vigorously urge against adoption of the views advanced in the minority report.

Halsey R. Bazley, president, All American Aviation, Inc.; T. E. Braniff, president, Braniff Airways, Inc.; Carleton Putman, president, Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc.; Sigmund Nanas, president, Colonial Air Lines, Inc.; T. C. Drinkwater, executive vice president, Continental Air Lines, Inc.; C. E. Woolman, vice president, Delta Air Corporation; R. Leferink, president, Inland Air Lines, Inc.; J. W. Miller, president, Mid-Continent Airlines, Inc.; G. T. Baker, president, National Airlines, Inc.; S. J. Solomon, president, Northeast Airlines, Inc.; Croil Hunter, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; C. Bedell Monro, president, Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Corporation; L. H. Dwerlkott, executive vice president, Western Air Lines, Inc.

The telegram refers to the charges in the minority report that the Lea bill would foster monopoly by the larger air lines to the injury of the smaller air lines.

The telegram states:

In our considered judgment, the assertions in the minority report that the bill would foster a monopoly by the larger air lines is wholly unfounded.

Mr. Monro has once again done a back-track, within a month of his speech of September 30, 1943, at Milwaukee. By what magic wand has his mind and financial interest been so quickly changed, and by what compelling suggestions have the other so-called signatures to this telegram been whipped into line?

The overpowering control of the Big Four speaks for itself. Monopoly is self-proving.

Every Member of Congress has seen how this has been done by inspired telegrams. The Big Four cracked the whip and the 15 smaller lines heeded the master's voice.

The reference to inequality in the relative position of the smaller and larger lines still exists. They approximate the same ratio from the beginning of the year 1941 to the present time. H. R. 3420 would preserve this inequality.

Under the grandfather clause of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, those already in operation were automatically continued in operation, but any newcomer in the field must prove public convenience and necessity for the institution of a new line. Certain extensions have been granted to those old grandfather rights, but no newcomer has been permitted to go into the field.

It is also important that the four major lines are competitive only to a limited extent as they follow substantially different routes, serving for the most part noncompetitive territory. Mr. Monro also states that it is a source of amazement that the minority cry out against the danger of a monopoly but at the same time advocate the removal of present restrictions against surface carriers going into competitive air transportation. Aside from the inaccuracy of this statement, it should be pointed out that the Pan American Airways, who held and still hold a monopoly of foreign and overseas transportation service, were able to preserve that monopoly by vigorously contesting the application of the American Export Lines—steamship—engaged exclusively in foreign commerce. It is also interesting to note from newspaper articles appearing for the past few months, the great concern shown by domestic carriers in regard to the monopoly held in foreign commerce by the Pan American. The American Export case was an excellent example of the monopoly desired to be preserved by existing air carriers to the exclusion of legitimate competition under approved regulation from any newcomer or any surface carrier.

Mr. Monro then proceeds to discuss the question of the provision of feeder air service by surface carriers to trunk-line air carriers as well as the possibility of the institution of trunk-line air service by surface carriers. He states that no greater disaster could befall smaller airlines. They would then be hopelessly caught between the present powerful large airlines and the even more powerful surface carriers. There was no evidence presented in support of this statement nor any attempt made to argue its justification. The Civil Aeronautics Board has full authority to see that competition is preserved and it can be trusted to do its duty. The motor-carrier industry has developed by leaps and bounds, notwithstanding the fact that rail carriers for over 20 years have carried on substantial operations by motor vehicles, both bus and truck.

The real fear is the invasion of the entrenched position of existing air lines by others on the basis of free, fair, and regulated competition. Regulated competition with no favor to anyone is the basic economic policy of this country with respect to transportation.

The action of the air-line executives prove they want a monopoly. I am submitting a number of examples of this, but the hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the feeder-line cases are rife with testimony to this effect, namely, preservation of the existing monopoly by present air lines. This is not only as to domestic commerce, but also as to foreign commerce. The foreign commerce situation is well exemplified by the American Export decision.

The hearings before the Civil Aeronautics Board contained abundant evidence that larger companies are desperately trying to prevent smaller companies from expanding. They are also trying to prevent all other citizens and forms of transportation from engaging in the air transportation business.

These hearings were instituted by the Board with respect to the development of local feeder and pick-up and delivery service and the hearings extended for a period of a month commencing late in September. Representatives of the air industry testified at these hearings and that testimony bears out the above statement.

For example, Mr. Oliver L. Parks, of Parks Air College, Inc., of East St. Louis, Ill., testified on October 12, 1943:

Surface carriers, railroads, truck companies, and bus lines should not operate local, feeder, pick-up air systems. Their thinking, their traditions, their efforts in the past and necessarily in the future, are geared to elements which tie down their efforts and their thinking to surface transportation and to the invested millions which represent it today.

Mr. H. K. Gilbert, president, State Airlines, Inc., of Charlotte, N. C., stated in the feeder case on October 22:

If surface carriers are permitted to inaugurate air transportation services, it is certain that there will be even less aviation

progress made. There is apt to be so much conflict in trying to do a job both ways that one will suffer at the hands of the other. The only satisfactory solution would be divorcing the two, which would give the same result as if an independent company originated the air service.

Mr. Hugh Knowlton, director of research and post-war planning of Eastern Airlines, testified in the feeder case October 22:

The existing air carriers are already on the scene geographically, and for this reason alone would appear to be best qualified to give service to such of the smaller communities in the United States as may desire and as may be able to justify it on economical grounds.

Mr. Knowlton presented considerable testimony in an attempt to prove that the existing transcontinental air carriers are the only qualified groups to operate feeder lines. This is pure monopoly.

Mr. Knowlton further said:

We cannot too strongly urge the board to pause before opening the air transportation field to inexperienced applicants motivated primarily by desire to get on the air bandwagon.

The expressions by representatives of the air industry speak for themselves. Monopoly is the keynote. There is even a glaring rift among the air transportation carriers themselves with respect to the question of future expansion.

In concluding his address of September 30, 1943, Mr. Monro summed the matter up as follows:

To sum up the situation—on the one hand there are four large carriers which are or should be self-sufficient in their enjoyment of 81 percent of the Nation's air transport business. On the other hand there are 12 carriers, which, because of territorial traffic insufficiency, would have, for the most part, operated at a substantial loss without substantial subsidy. And fundamental to a really great expansion of the entire industry is a reduction in the rate structure of all air lines. The larger air lines will be in a position to lower passenger and express rates, but what will happen to the smaller carriers who will be forced to meet such reduction? Unless economic balance is restored, the necessary cycle of an industry which has within it every element of greatness cannot be put into motion—the cycle of lower rates, greater expansion—greater expansion, greater employment.

* * * * *

If monopoly of any kind is permitted, if a virtual monopoly through economic unbalance is not corrected, then the air transport industry cannot help but fail miserably to meet its obligations and responsibilities in the reconstruction period. Such failure will severely harm not only our industry but other industries as well and hundreds of communities throughout the country. And we shall have to say to those returning from the battle fronts, "Sorry, boys, no jobs. We just couldn't win our campaign at home."

Mr. Speaker, the shift in the position of Mr. Monro from September 30 to October 25 shows conclusively the confusion that exists even in the minds of the air executives as to what should be done in aeronautics legislation.

The O. P. A. Gestapo and the Dairyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A., from the day of its creation, equipped with a horde of New Deal gestapo agents, has already done more to lend aid and comfort to the enemy than any one group of saboteurs thus far brought to light. Just now this organization is operating in the Forty-third Congressional District of New York, where it is attempting to have a temporary injunction made permanent by which the milk distributors are to be restrained from paying more than $3 per hundred pounds for milk or from selling it at retail for more than 14 cents per quart. The public is fully aware that if the dairy farmers are to continue to produce milk from their tested herds they must receive a price for it that will meet the cost of production and some profit.

I know that the dairymen of New York State have been confronted with a shortage of labor, higher labor costs, shortage of grain, shortage of gasoline, a shortage of tires, tractors, trucks with which to produce. Notwithstanding all of these hindrances, the farmers have done everything within the limit of endurance to avoid the necessity of killing off their tested dairy herds, yet some have been driven to sell their blooded cattle for beef. I deplore the fact that while men are fighting for the so-called "four freedoms" that the home folks should see a ruthless bureaucracy force the destruction of their property under a totalitarian technique not unlike that used by dictators abroad. It is evident from recent hearings held by the Agriculture Committee that the administration has far more interest in promoting the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine than it has in protecting and preserving the dairy industry. Fortunately, the Agricultural Committee had the courage to forestall, temporarily at least, the attempt of the administration to foist this oleomargarine fraud upon the public.

Mr. Speaker, unless the ruthless, devastating hand of the O. P. A. is removed from the throat of the farmers it will result in ghastly consequences to our fighting forces abroad as well as to the civilian population. The majority in Congress can rectify this deplorable situation by legislation, if it will. Of course the sovereign people can eventually free themselves from the shackles of totalitarian servitude through the ballot, but why endanger the cause to which the country is committed by permitting the O. P. A. to run its devastating course for almost a year.

The farmers are sick and tired of being made the target of attack by the New Deal every time the question of inflation is mentioned. Unshackle the farmer so that he can produce to the limit, which he will do if allowed at least the cost of production, and there will be less talk about the possible inflation of food prices. Why should the farmer be the one segment of society made the victim of New Deal spleen, when of all the groups engaged in war work the farmer works from 14 to 18 hours a day without thought of overtime pay or pay-and-a-half for overtime to meet the New Deal program which envisions giving a quart of milk every day to every person in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I for one believe that it is the solemn duty of this Congress to take from the O. P. A., through legislation, the power to ruin any branch of agriculture essential to the winning of the war. The dairy industry is vital to the food requirements of our fighting forces and to our allies, and no entrenched and arrogant bureaucracy should be clothed with delegated power to ruin it. This is true of many other agricultural activities.

Reply to Transportation Association of America — Statement by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, recently an association which calls itself the Transportation Association of America gave an interview to the newspapers critical of a speech made by the Vice President of the United States in Dallas, Tex., on the transportation question, with specific reference to the freight rate differentials against the South and West. Following the issuance of the statement by the Transportation Association the Vice President gave an interview himself which replied to the association's statement. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Vice President be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An association which calls itself the Transportation Association of America has taken issue with the charge in my Dallas speech that the railroads are planning to seize control of all forms of transportation through a plan which contemplates a limited number of railroad-controlled transportation companies operating all rail, highway, water, and air transport. It is important that the public understand the real character and history of the Transportation Association of America.

According to a report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce (77th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. No. 26, p. II), the Transportation Association of America was organized by individuals closely associated with the Association of American Railroads, with the financial assistance and guidance of officers of the Association of American

Railroads, and for the purpose of providing a "neutral," "independent," and "unbiased" vehicle through which the Association of American Railroads might express its views to the public. From this report it appears that the Transportation Association has submitted its materials to the Association of American Railroads for criticism and change, and that the Association of American Railroads has submitted its materials to the Transportation Association for publication. Thus though it would appear that the hands are the hands of Esau, there is no mistaking the fact that the voice is that of Jacob.

The transportation association claims authorship of the program to establish integrated transportation systems. That the record may be complete, it should be understood that after the transportation association's plan was presented to the Government's board of investigation and research, spokesmen for the Association of American Railroads appeared and endorsed the plan. Though the transportation association proclaims that its plan would preserve competition, it would, in fact, destroy the only effective competition in transportation which still survives, that between different forms of transportation. The railroads have successfully eliminated competition in rate-making among themselves. Give them control of highway, water and air carriers, and they would eliminate all competition in rate making. I shall take occasion at the earliest opportunity to express myself more fully in regard to the plan for seizing control of all forms of transportation which has been advanced through this association.

The association traces my speech to a statement prepared by Thurman Arnold, which appears in the record before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. I have read the record before that Committee on the price-fixing conspiracies of railroads and other forms of transportation, including Judge Arnold's statement. I recommend that every American citizen read the report of these hearings—read both sides of the controversy—and then judge for himself how monopoly influences dominate the fixing of transportation charges.

My study of transportation began before ever I held public office. I have testified in rate proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission. While Secretary of Agriculture, I made a particular study of transportation and presented my views to the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate in a letter in which the then Secretary of War and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission joined. The views expressed in my Dallas speech stem directly from my earlier studies; they are indeed merely an elaboration of them. I was, therefore, delighted when Thurman Arnold and the antitrust division took up the cudgels and developed the facts which substantiate and support the efforts of myself and others to inject a true public interest concept into our national transportation policy.

The association complains that I offered no solution for the ills of the transportation industry. This is a misstatement, for it ignores the specific recommendations made in my Dallas speech.

How War Came: Extracts From Hull Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second and last installment of an article entitled "How War Came: Extracts From the Hull Files—The Historic and Fateful Sequence of Events Revealed in Reports From Our Diplomats Abroad," written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times Magazine of July 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now what was well-informed, completely warned Washington doing about the prospect?

On the first day of the month Congress passed—not an armament measure—but a relief bill. It appropriated $1,755,000,000 of which $147,000,000 were for the W. P. A., $100,000,000 for the National Youth Administration (an increase of $24,000,000) and $143,000,000 for the Farm Security Administration, a rise of $21,000,000. That was the day Mr. Biddle reported to Mr. Hull that Hitler was planning a visit to Danzig and that the Poles would resist any coup attempted there.

On July 4 Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania urged a third term for the President—a project that was to cost months in preparedness for December, 1941. Two days later W. P. A. workers in New York City struck against an order of more work and less pay, and the A. F. of L. ordered out 30,000 of them.

On July 11 bills to restore the pay of the W. P. A. strikers were offered in Congress. Three days afterward Germany completed arrangements with Italy to lease the port of Trieste for 10 years.

A statement recurrently familiar was made by the President on July 15. He told the W. P. A. workers that they could not strike against the United States Government. The strike continued. A Japanese sentry at Wuhu slapped two American women missionaries, and the Senate informed the President it would not revise the neutrality laws at the current session. He retorted that he would call a special session in any war crisis, just about the time (July 21) that a Polish guard of the Danzig frontier was murdered by the Nazis.

The great democracies of the United States and Britain were engaged in official performances of the kind relied on by Hitler. The President pressed Congress to pass a spending bill of $2,800,000,000 to produce planned prosperity, and there was a Senate revolt. While Great Britain was conceding Japanese "rights" to security in China, Mr. Hull was saying he would not yield on that point and was announcing the trade treaty with Japan would be terminated in 6 months. Threats of reprisals swiftly followed from Tokyo as the year 1939 turned into August and the Anglo-French military mission began in Moscow those conversations which ended so disastrously in the German-Russian mutual defense pact.

Europe, Axis and non-Axis, had been watching the happenings in the United States. Minister Alexander Kirk reported from Berlin in August that "the recent action on neutrality legislation * * * is viewed as an indication of isolationist sentiment that may delay America's entrance into the European war for a considerable period, and that even if the United States associates itself with Britain and France eventually it won't be able to make its influence felt decisively in time." He added that the German people did not want war and believed Hitler knew how to get what he wanted without it. "But if confronted with the imminence of a general conflict," cabled Mr. Kirk, the German people "would conserve their solidarity and march in blind obedience."

The shadow of the German-Russian pact was over the world, but on August 2 and 4 Congress and the President were embattled over the spending bill and a proposed $800,000,000 appropriation measure for social-reform housing. Both measures were killed, Congress adjourned, and the President made plans to get home to Hyde Park. The Franco-British negotiators left Moscow without an accord, and there was trouble between the Japanese and the British in the Far East. Two British ships were destroyed in a raid on the Yangtze. The Japanese insults, said Prime Minister Chamberlain, made his "blood boil" and Britain might send a fleet to the Orient.

But all this was a distant prologue to Pearl Harbor and Singapore. The bloody events set off at Moscow were in train. Germany, seeing the triumph of its aims accomplished by the pact with Russia, launched threats of the mailed fist against Poland in the controlled Nazi press. The President ended a holiday cruise hastily and asked for reports from the embryo defense committees on the status of munitions, heavy industry, and aircraft. He began a series of appeals against war to Germany, Poland, and Italy, to which the Pope added his voice. The Poles answered satisfactorily, Mussolini evasively, and from Hitler came nothing at all. The President renewed his plea, and Washington had a foolish rumor that Hitler was yielding.

Still preparations for defense were few and feeble in the United States. The Plattsburg games revealed serious Army deficiencies, with neither the regulars nor the National Guard fit for the emergency. This was just before Hitler struck.

What was happening meanwhile is best told by the following reconstructions of official dispatches to Mr. Hull.

Ambassador Kennedy notified Secretary Hull on August 9 that he had seen Sir Alexander Cadogan, Under Secretary of the Foreign Office, that day. Sir Alexander was a trifle more cheerful, feeling that the situation in Europe was slowly taking better shape, that Hitler was beginning to realize the forces against him and the high level of the British and French war preparations.

"This confidence I find manifest in responsible official circles generally, and it is increasingly reflected in the press and among ordinary people," wrote Mr. Kennedy, "yet the public is psychologically ready for war, if it comes."

Cadogan asked the Ambassador, "What did the critics of the Government expect it to do but build up strong defenses while leaving the door open to a peaceful settlement?"

From Ambassador Bullitt, at Paris, August 22:

"Daladier said to me this afternoon he believed Hitler was planning to attack Poland within the next 8 days, and most probably this week end. In my presence he gave orders to General Gamelin and Admiral Darlan to prepare for immediate war.

"Daladier then said he wished he could transmit an immediate message to you. He said that he, Daladier, felt a general European war is imminent and that Japan would also enter the war. He hopes profoundly the President would issue a declaration stating that war seemed imminent and summoning all the nations of the earth to send delegates immediately to Washington to try to work out a pacific solution. [The President issued his peace appeals instead.] He feared that Germany would reject such a proposal, but it should be spread on the moral record.

"Daladier said that the action of the Soviet Union in signing a nonaggression pact with Germany, containing many unknown secret clauses, placed France in a most tragic and terrible situation. He could not understand how the French diplomats and negotiators could have been so deceived by the Russians. He reminded me that six times since January 1, I had warned him of the most serious negotiations under way between the Germans and the Russians and said he had told all

the press Government services to attempt to verify my statements to him but had been reassured there were no real negotiations other than commercial negotiations in progress between Germany and the Soviet Union.

"Daladier said the entire diplomatic structure he had attempted to build up in Europe had been destroyed by this act of the Russians. Rumania, unaided by Turkey, would be forced into the war on the German side. The Poles would have to fight alone and could not hold out for more than a few months, and France and Great Britain would be unable to give them much assistance, except for holding some German troops on the western border. After the fall of Poland the entire brunt of the land war against Germany and Italy would fall on the French Army. The British could not put in the field a serious army for nearly 2 years. As soon as the British and French were engaged in Europe, Japan would be taking over French, British, and Dutch possessions in the Pacific.

"He was faced with the alternative of sacrificing the lives of all the able-bodied Frenchmen in a war of doubtful outcome, or the worse alternative of abandoning the commitments of France to support Poland. That would be a horrible moral blow to the French people, and then Germany would swallow Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey, and thereafter turn on France and England.

"Daladier said the Poles were guilty of criminal folly in not replying in the affirmative to the Russians' proposal of active assistance. He realized of course, that the Russians had hoodwinked the French and British completely, and even if the Poles had agreed to admit an assisting Russian army the Russians would probably have found an excuse to conclude the pact with Germany anyhow.

"Before leaving to carry out the mobilization order Gamelin said he would not mobilize the reserves on the Italian frontier because the government did not wish to excite the Italians."

Mr. Bullitt on that same day called on Alexis Leger, the under secretary at the Foreign Office. M. Leger blamed the Poles and said that on August 20, Beck (the Polish Foreign Minister) had rejected the Russian proposal to send an army. While Mr. Bullitt was in M. Leger's office politicians kept phoning the under secretary that it would be folly to go to war to support Poland in view of the Russo-German pact. M. Leger replied that France must fight, picturing the alternatives as M. Daladier had.

The Ambassador asked M. Leger what would be the result of the war. It was a bad moment to start, said the French diplomat, and the outcome was exceedingly doubtful—for France and England. But the chance must be taken.

"Neither Leger nor Daladier was sure that Italy would enter on the German side immediately," said Mr. Bullitt, adding:

"The stupefaction at the foreign office over the Russo-German pact is so great that no constructive ideas have yet been evolved.

"Daladier said that as soon as Ribbentrop returned to Berlin with the Soviet-German pact Hitler would attack Poland."

Mr. Kennedy to Mr. Hull, August 23, 1939:

"Halifax told me that [British Ambassador] Seeds reported from Moscow that Molotov admitted the agreement to sign a nonaggression pact with Germany. Seeds asked him if the pact would contain the usual escape clause if one of the parties should commit aggression against another country. 'We shall have to wait to see what will happen later on,' answered Molotov. Halifax said that Vansittart, adviser to the foreign office, believes there is a provision in the pact for the fourth dismemberment of Poland.

"Molotov complained to Seeds that the British and French rejected a repeated Russian request for passage of troops through Polish and Rumanian territory to protect the situation. He rejected the accusation of bad faith in the agreement with Germany, saying that Russia was under no obligation to warn the British of plans to modify its policy and that it received no such information from Britain.

"Seeds said he referred to changes at the height of negotiations with all parties concerned. Molotoff answered that the 'height' of British-French insecurity was reached when their military mission arrived with nothing concrete to offer and unready to deal on the basic points of reciprocal assistance. He said the Soviet decided it was being played with and accepted the German proposal.

"Seeds asked if Russia would stand by and permit Poland to be overrun. Molotoff said the British must wait and see. Seeds asked 'Is all the achievement we have made toward a general defense against aggression to be of no account?' Molotoff said to wait and see. Seeds said that it was a great concession to send the Anglo-French military mission to Moscow before a military agreement had been concluded. Molotoff said he was uninterested in the past but only in sincerity.

"Halifax said that England would definitely go to war if Poland fights. However, I [Kennedy] have the distinct feeling that the British don't want to be more Polish than the Poles and are praying for an adjustment.

"Halifax says he doesn't believe that Mussolini will get in the fight when it starts. 'My reason,' he concluded, 'shows me no way out of war but my instincts still give me hope.'"

Mr. Kennedy on August 24 called on Sir Kingsley Wood (Air Minister) and found him "pessimistic." Sir Kingsley related that the air force had been called up, but in answer to a question by the Ambassador he said the only way the air force could help the Poles would be to bomb the Ruhr at once This was not likely because the British must refrain from bombing civilians as long as that is possible, said the Minister to the Ambassador, who, reporting to Mr. Hull, concluded:

"My own belief is that the Anglo-French plans will be made when war is declared and not before. They now talk about what they might do but have not come down to making it definite, always with hope in their hearts that somehow war will be averted."

Mr. Kennedy to Mr. Hull, August 29:

"The feeling expressed by responsible Foreign Office officials is that the preliminary report by Henderson (of his final talk with Hitler) is not entirely unsatisfactory, that the door is still open and the decision is balanced on the edge of a knife; but that Hitler is trying through blackmail to try to squeeze the last drop of possible advantage out of Poland without war."

One week later the door to peace was closed by the blast of the Polish invasion. Without war Hitler had been unable to "squeeze" that "last drop" from the Polish spirit and the pledge of Britain and France. With war it was to be proved he could not do it, either.

But to prove it, as has since been made manifest, civilization would have to descend into the inferno and battle long with death before the Alcestis of peace could be brought upward into the sunlight again.

Dawn of a New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dawn of a New Era," by V. Y. Dallman, published in the Illinois State Register of November 9, 1943. The editorial is a very interesting comment on the recent debate in the Senate on the Connally resolution which was under consideration last week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAWN OF A NEW ERA

The reactions to the passage of the Connally Senate resolution on world peace most gratifying to forward-looking students of world affairs are the unity which the decisive affirmative vote implies and the overwhelming surge of public sentiment which brought about that vote.

The chivalry now displayed in the Senate among those who were in disagreement during the long debate as to certain phraseological elements of the resolution is a classic in genuine Americanism.

Senators who led the fight to strengthen the resolution along the lines recommended by The State Register are to be commended for results obtained and for their favorable votes. As the Washington Post says: "Their speeches have been marked uniformly by a profound understanding of the question at issue, by great learning, and by a passionate determination that this time the horrible mistake of 1919 must be prevented from occurring again. * * * Belonging to both parties, they have shown that great matters of state can be dealt with on a completely nonpartisan basis."

Though the result is a great triumph for Senator TOM CONNALLY of Texas, who led the fight, there is honor enough for all who contributed to this great achievement for a profound principle.

It was with a fervent flow of soul prompted by genuine statesmanship that Majority Leader ALBEN BARKLEY bestowed honor upon Republicans and Democrats alike who supported the resolution while voicing respect for the few conscientious objectors. What Senator BARKLEY said of the bipartisan group headed by Senator BALL, Republican, is particularly significant of Senate chivalry. These are his words:

"I wish to pay tribute in a word to all the Senators who have contributed to the final meeting of our minds upon the subject and I include especially the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Due in no small part to their earnestness and their energy, their intensity and their sincerity, and to the effort which they have made to bring this matter forcibly before the people of the United States, we have reached this happy hour.

"I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was also chairman of the subcommittee of that committee which dealt for many months with this subject. He has been wise in his counsel, strong in his determination, farsighted in his grasp of the entire problem."

The State Register is deeply impressed by the manner in which this great accomplishment was brought about, as well as the majesty of the achievement in terms of future respect for the rights of nations and the liberties of their peoples.

A beautiful climax comes in a fervent utterance by the great former Republican Senator from Nebraska, the beloved George W. Norris, who opposed American participation in the League of Nations in 1919, but who now rises to bless those who passed the Connally resolution and to say:

"The reason for my change of mind is that changing circumstances demand changing

attitudes. No nation or nobody was trying to conquer the whole world and reduce it to slavery in the First World War as Hitler and the Japanese are now admittedly trying. I won't comment on the vote of Senator Hiram Johnson against the resolution * * * but to me the change is apparent. I was very much pleased by the Senate's action in endorsing the conclusions reached at Moscow because it advertises American national unity to the world."

Having supported the League of Nations program in 1919, having opposed its abandonment in years to follow, and having supported the entire preparedness-for-war program, including lend-lease and the history-making Committee to Defend America by aiding the Allies, The Illinois State Register is deeply gratified by what has just taken place in the United States Senate in response to public demand.

Consistent adherence to the principle involved will ultimately bring to the world permanent peace and prosperity based upon moral and spiritual values. It is the dawn of a new era.

The League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The League of Nations," by Oswald F. Schuette. I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the article will cost $630.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

(By Oswald F. Schuette)

(Published by the Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C., 1920)

Chapter I. The President makes the issue

"The Honorable Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, acting in his own name and by his own proper authority."

Thus stands the record on the title page of the Treaty of Versailles. What is the record behind it?

On October 25, 1918, President Wilson appealed to the people of the United States—"To my fellow countrymen"—for a vote of confidence in his leadership, for the election of a Democratic Congress. Only upon such a vote, he said, could he properly and authoritatively represent the United States in the remaking of the world that was to follow America's victory on the battlefields of Europe.

"If you have approved my leadership," he said in this appeal, "and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I earnestly beg that you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"I am your servant and will accept your judgment without cavil.

"The return of a Republican majority in either House of Congress would moreover be interpreted on the other side of the water as a repudiation of my leadership."

In the face of that direct appeal, the result of the election November 4 was a decisive repudiation of the leadership of President Wilson by the American people. Republican majorities were elected in both Houses of Congress.

It was in the face of this repudiation that the President, 2 weeks after election day, November 18, announced that he would sail for France, "immediately after the opening of the regular session of Congress, for the purpose of taking part in the discussion and settlement of the main features of the treaty of peace."

On November 29 the White House formally announced that "the representatives of the United States at the peace conference would be the President himself, the Secretary of State (Robert Lansing), Henry White, once Ambassador to France, Edward M. House, and Gen. Tasker H. Bliss."

WILSON GOES TO PEACE CONFERENCE

Five days later, December 4, President Wilson sailed from New York on the transport *George Washington*. He was the first President thus to absent himself from the United States, and he went at a time that was critical in the life of the Nation.

The war had just come to a close. It found the Democratic administration as unprepared for peace as it had been for conflict. The task of returning our industries and our commerce to peaceful channels demanded at once strength and statesmanship. But the President abandoned the helm and let the ship drift in the storm while he pursued the glittering limelight of European notoriety.

For 4 weeks after he landed in Europe President Wilson was the hero of the people of France, England, and Italy. He had found that the governments of those countries did not agree either with his war aims, his 14 points, or his League of Nations program. So he appealed to the peoples over the heads of their governments, now covertly filling them with suspicion, now openly inciting them to revolt. To Europe he was the voice of the great American people, of the Nation that had saved the world in its darkest hour, and his appeal was above the law.

In this situation there stood behind the name of Wilson, in the eyes of Europe, the immeasurable power and wealth of the United States. The people of Europe had learned little of America's real participation in the war, except through the propaganda of Mr. Wilson's publicity agent, George Creel. In the propaganda spread abroad by Mr. Creel, every step the United States had taken had been represented as taken in the name of Wilson. Then, too, Mr. Wilson was the Commander in Chief of the American Army and Navy. His was the only American voice heard in international intercourse. Congress had put into his hands the Nation's manpower, its wealth, its railroads, its shipping, its industries, even its farms and its very households.

In the stormy days of 1918 when the German tide was stemmed, it was the name of Wilson that Europe saw above the Stars and Stripes that saved the world. Last but not least, President Wilson stood in Europe and at the Peace Conference as the holder of $10,000,000,000 worth of Europe's promissory notes. Small wonder that sovereigns and governments listened to him and that the people acclaimed him until he was confirmed in his vain delusion that his mind could solve all the unsolvable problems which had baffled Europe since Ulysses wandered on his long way home from Troy.

In Europe, as well as in the United States, President Wilson won support for his League of Nations by this pledge: That the League would bring universal peace, and, therefore, universal disarmament. Is it any wonder that at the end of the bloodiest conflict in history, men's hopes for eternal peace should respond quickly to such a pledge, or that they should not scrutinize too carefully the means proposed to reach this end?

That was the reason Europe listened. That was the reason a large share of the American people, praying for universal peace, gave support to the Wilson project until they found it was all a sham—that instead of tranquillity, it would give America turmoil; that instead of disarmament, it would mean greater armament; that instead of leaving a sovereign United States as the one great pacific power capable of leading the world toward universal brotherhood, it would force even this country into the bloody angle of European imperialism, as a partner in war instead of a leader in peace.

The present record is here set down, because it shows how, unembarrassed by his repudiated leadership, President Wilson came to proclaim himself the sole voice of the American people, with a mandate to wrest from an unwilling Europe a League of Nations which should be above all nations.

We shall see him, by the force of that pretense, induce Europe to heed his demands. We shall see him return with his constitution of the League of Nations, and we shall hear him tell America that Europe's heart will break unless her distracted and suffering peoples secure this great boon. We shall see him, ignoring the unmistakable voice of his countrymen and defying the open challenge of the Senate, cross the seas again to tell the Peace Conference that the United States stands unanimous behind him, that it will take nothing less than the League of Nations—with i's undotted and t's uncrossed—and that the League must be the first provision of the treaty of peace. We shall see him, then, sacrifice America's vital interests and yield the great heritage of America's foreign policy to obtain the mere appearance of success. We shall see him return the second time to this country to fight, by every means within his autocratic powers, against the Americanization of the Covenant of the League.

When the Senate shall have adopted reservations to safeguard America's rights and Constitution, we shall see him order his democratic followers in the Senate to reject the treaty. This accomplished we shall see him veto a resolution declaring the war at an end. We shall see him finally bitter, defiant, alone in the position: "There shall be no peace but my peace. The Nation is still at war."

It is a drama without precedent in modern history. Future generations will stand aghast at the swift movement from arrogance to hypocrisy, from hypocrisy to perfidy, from perfidy to the betrayal of a nation. Even now the United States hardly knows all that it escaped, or how narrowly it missed accepting a partnership with European imperialism—a partnership in which it would have furnished the blood and the wealth to protect and to extend European empires, to keep rebellious nations in subjection, to guarantee forever the crimes of centuries of colonization, and all in the name of peace, liberty, and democracy.

Sometimes the proceedings take on the aspect of a deliberate conspiracy with foreign powers against the sovereignty of the United States. Nor do we yet know what secret promises and hidden pledges may have been given in the name of this country and still lie unrevealed in the silent chancelleries of Europe. Quite possibly the refusal of the Senate to accept President Wilson's league has canceled other pledges than the ones we know—only the future can tell.

Despite the acclaim of the peoples of Europe, the historian will search in vain for a trace of heroism in the labors of President Wilson. There is no point at which we can find him defending justice against odds or

championing any high but feeble cause. If the enemy is weak, he is stubborn. If the enemy is strong, he yields. It is a simple plan, but not a heroic one.

Consistent only in his inconsistencies, words mean nothing to him. Truth is subservient to expediency. His action of today belies his promise of yesterday. His words tomorrow will have no relation to what he did today. He says one thing to the Peace Conference and another to the people of the United States and then gives the Senate an explanation which agrees with neither.

The Constitution means nothing to him, except an obstacle to be circumvented. The Constitution provides that he shall ask the Senate's advice and he tries to browbeat the Senate into acceptance of his dictation. Exalted by the prestige of the United States, its victorious armies and lavish treasury, he poses to the starving, war-tired people of Europe as a messiah of peace, inflames them against their governments, and betrays the ideals he has asked them to support as if these ideals were mere catchwords to net applause. He declares his dogma of self-determination, inveighs against letting men pass as chattels from ruler to ruler with the shifting of boundaries, and then he pledges the use of the Army and the Navy of the United States to keep whole peoples in political bondage.

He proclaims his League of Nations as a guaranty of perpetual peace. Immediately new wars spring up in the silent battlefields, the cannon roar again over the graves in which sleep the armies of yesterday, and only the steadfast patriotism of the American Senate bars the way against his sending American soldiers to fight in these wars and to seal with American blood his serpentine compact. Often it is more than difficult to follow him in those twistings and turnings, inconsistencies and contradictions. How, for instance, is one going to explain facts like this:

In the spring of 1917, the Russian revolutionists published, from the archives of the Czar's government, the various secret treaties to which Russia had been a party. They involved England, France, Italy, Rumania, and Japan. They parceled out Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the Pacific. They were printed in all the neutral newspapers of Europe and finally broke through the lines of our own censorship and were printed in several American newspapers and magazines. They must have been sent to the State Department by our embassies and legations in Europe. Yet President Wilson solemnly avowed to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that he had no knowledge of these secret treaties until he sat down at the conference table at Versailles, in January 1919, almost 2 years after their first publication.

These facts are pertinent because they give a picture of the man who placed himself above the Constitution and his cause above the Government of the United States. Only in the light of these facts can we study this conflict between the President on the one side and the Senate of the United States, yes, the very United States itself, on the other. Only in their light can we interpret the long struggle which is not yet at an end.

Chapter II. The conflict begins

When President Wilson arrived in Europe, December 13, 1918, a month and 2 days after the armistice was signed, the great powers had not considered seriously the formation of a League of Nations, nor had they intended to include it in the formal peace with Germany. They desired a quick peace. We now have the testimony of Mr. House that a treaty of peace could have been concluded with Germany by Christmas of 1918. This was, as he said, "the obvious thing to do." But President Wilson's insistence on the League made a quick peace impossible.

Except a few men of prominence in Great Britain, like General Smuts and Sir Robert Cecil, and a still smaller number in France, the League project had no noteworthy supporters in those countries. It was Mr. Wilson's insistence and his contention that in this insistence he represented the demand of the American people, that made the League the first business of the conference and later an inseparable part of the treaty itself. No other country was in position to refuse such demand, made in the name of the United States. The French were particularly opposed to the League, fearing to trust their future to it. They demanded and finally secured a separate treaty for their defense.

How President Wilson brought the representatives of the European powers to heed his demands can give no pride to any American. Despite his pledge that the work of the conference was to be done in the open and that peace was to be made by "open covenants openly arrived at," the work at Versailles was done in secret. Not merely were the conferences themselves behind closed doors, but a stern censorship kept the world misinformed or wholly ignorant. Not until the negotiators and observers had left the realms of this censorship did the world get an inkling of the intrigue, the petty chicanery, the pompous hypocrisy, the betrayals, the bargains, and the baleful influences that swayed the men who held in their hands the destiny of the world.

The censorship was not confined to the work of the conference. A special censorship on despatches from the United States was ordered to prevent the French from learning what America really thought of the League, even as a special censorship on despatches from France was ordered to prevent the Americans from learning what the French really thought of the League. Without the duplicity of this censorship President Wilson might never have been able to obtain his demands. Even now the whole story has not been told of the price which President Wilson paid to have his way, how he played nation against nation and peoples against their governments, how he cast away American interests, threw overboard his principles, betrayed China, rebuffed Ireland, promised to send the American Armies and Navies into European wars, and used the great name of the American people to persuade or to browbeat those whom other appeals failed to move.

To obtain Great Britain's support, he abandoned his demand for the freedom of the seas, consented to her taking over vast German colonies in Africa and the Pacific, as well as Mesopotamia and Persia, recognized her protectorate over Egypt, and granted the British Empire six votes to America's one in the assembly of the League of Nations.

To France he gave a special treaty of military defense after pledging himself that no separate treaties should be made, consented to her acquisition of German and Turkish territories and yielded to her demands for the Saar Valley which he originally had opposed.

To Japan he conceded Shantung and the Pacific islands, although the concession of Shantung lost China to the League, and but for the veto of Australia, he might have conceded to Japan her coveted "racial equality."

He forced the hand of the Italian conferees by arousing the people of Italy against their government and undermining the Orlando ministry. To Rumania and Serbia he pledged the sending of United States soldiers and sailors across the seas to protect them, should such protection be needed.

In the great work of writing the real treaty of peace, of remaking the map of the world, and of laying the foundations for a peace with the Central Powers, he played but an unimportant part. His famous Fourteen Points were never mentioned at the conference. Such was the price he paid for his League of Nations.

Is it any wonder that he had his way? Obsessed with a personal mission and self-crowned with a halo of American leadership, he was able to override the judgment and wishes of the weak and to purchase, with American interests, the assent of the strong. His only thought was to get some form of League of Nations for his own personal glory, that history might mark him as the leader of all nations in this twentieth-century world. In thus making the League the substance and all else the shadow, he gained for the United States only the shadow and sacrificed the substance.

Having yielded to President Wilson's demand for a League, the representatives of the European governments devoted their attention to making that League conform to their desires. Having given him the shadow, they saw to it that the substance should be all their own. They devoted their thought and their effort to shaping the draft so that it would conform to their settled foreign policies, that it would dovetail with their plans and their international engagements, that it should not conflict but harmonize with their national interests, that it should bring to them help and added strength in enforcing their demands against the Central Powers, that it should safeguard the fruits they had determined to reap from America's victory, that it should add to their benefits, but at America's cost.

So it happened that the Covenant, drafted in the atmosphere of Paris, was based on a plan prepared by an Englishman, in an environment wholly foreign to American policy and to American institutions, by strong men who had no interest in the United States, who thought in terms of their own countries and not of ours, and who were determined to protect their own governments and their own interests above everything else.

There was no special hostility on their part to the United States. On the contrary, they wanted America's friendship. But it was not their business to seek to protect American interests nor to make the Covenant conform to the peculiar requirements of America's Constitution or to the traditions, policies, and fixed rules of America's foreign relations.

President Wilson admitted that the basis of the Covenant was not his own. He said he had made his original draft from the Phillimore report, obtained from England, and then had revised it to embody the principles of the draft prepared by General Smuts and Sir Robert Cecil. But his draft was not even considered by the Peace Conference. It was not even discussed. The draft that the conference accepted was the Smuts-Cecil document. To this President Wilson contributed but one article, the famous Article 10.

President Wilson was allowed to open the League of Nations discussion in the peace conference session of January 25, 1919. He talked eloquently of mandates from the American people, of instructions which he dared not compromise or abate. In the light of his complete abandonment of the Fourteen Points and his surrender in compromise after compromise, this pretense that the American people had commissioned him as the champion of the League of Nations is worthy of textual quotation:

"You can imagine, gentlemen, the sentiments and the purpose with which representatives of the United States support this great project for a League of Nations. We regard it as the keystone of the whole program which expressed our purposes and ideals in this war and which the associated nations accepted as the basis of the settlement. If we return to the United States without having made every effort in our power to realize this program, we should return to meet the merited scorn of our fellow citizens. For

they are a body that constitutes a great democracy. They expect their leaders to speak their thoughts and no private purpose of their own. They expect their representatives to be their servants. We have no choice but to obey their mandate. But it is with the greatest enthusiasm and pleasure that we accept that mandate; and because this is the keystone of the whole fabric, we have pledged our every purpose to it, as we have to every item of the fabric. We would not dare abate a single item of the program which constitutes our instructions. We would not dare compromise upon any matter as the champion of this thing—this peace of the world, this attitude of justice, this principle that we are the masters of no people, but are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies, not as we wish, but as it wishes.

"You can see that the representatives of the United States are, therefore, never put to the embarrassment of choosing a way of expediency, because they have laid down for them the unalterable lines of principle. And, thank God, those lines have been accepted as the lines of settlement by all the high-minded men who have had to do with the beginnings of this great business."

President Wilson was made the chairman of the special commission of the peace conference to deal with the League of Nations. This commission worked for 2 weeks on the preparation of a constitution for the League along the lines of the Smuts-Cecil draft. The work had to be hurried because President Wilson wished to sail for the United States February 15. The day before he sailed, the commission gathered its half-considered ideas into a hastily written constitution of the League of Nations and President Wilson presented it to the peace conference as a tentative report. As the Versailles proceedings had been carried on in the darkest secrecy, the most interesting point in President Wilson's presentation speech was his tribute to the publicity which was to make the League of Nations the great expression of "the moral force of the public opinion of the world." He said:

"We are depending primarily and chiefly upon one great force, and this is the moral force of the public opinion of the world—the pleasing and clarifying and compelling influence of publicity so that intrigues can no longer have their coverts, so that designs that are sinister can at any time be drawn into the open, so that those things that are destroyed by the light may be promptly destroyed by the overwhelming light of the universal expression of the condemnation of the world."

Although the constitution had been made public at Paris for the express purpose of arousing comment and provoking criticism, it seems to have been President Wilson's idea that this privilege did not extend to the United States. When he arrived in America, with his copy of this constitution, he requested no suggestions. He presented it as a sacred text in which no changes might be made. In his addresses and his conferences he was intolerant of any criticism. His speech at Boston, immediately after landing, was a message of defiance to anyone who might disagree with him.

"I should welcome no sweeter challenge than that," he said. "I have fighting blood in me, and it is sometimes a delight to let it have scope, but if it is a challenge, on this occasion it will be an indulgence."

This speech had no suggestion of invitation to criticism or counsel—not even an explanation of the terms of the document itself. Instead it bristled with resentment of the opposition which he must have felt that his betrayal of American interests would arouse when the country learned of it in detail. For there was no longer that rigid domestic censorship which could assure to him uniform praise for all he did.

So this first address upon his arrival shed no light upon the task he had gone abroad to perform. It was a defiant justification of his acts, against the criticism he knew would be provoked by a frank account of his stewardship abroad. It was a condemnation of "narrow, selfish, and provincial purposes which seem so dear to some minds that have no sweep beyond the nearest horizon."

Not a word did he say about the details of the machinery which would create a government over and above the United States, and in whose hands would be put the issue as to peace and war for the United States; only this, if the Wilson plan should fail: "Think of the picture. Think of the utter blackness of the world."

Yet the document which the President had signed and for which he demanded the Senate's ratification built up a new supreme government of the world, pledged the use of the United States Army and Navy in foreign wars, guaranteed the permanence of the new boundaries of the nations, put in the hands of the League the control of armaments, took from Congress the constitutional right to make war and subjected this right to the control of foreigners, rendered our economic life subservient to the decrees of the League, provided rules for arbitration whose violation meant war, and set up a machinery of secretariats and commissions whose powers transcended those of the Government in Washington.

Before his arrival in Washington, President Wilson had invited the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations to dine with him at the White House. At that conference he told these committees that "unless the United States entered the League of Nations the League would fail and chaos and turmoil beyond description would result in Europe."

Under the cross-examination of the committee members it developed that the President's own ideas of the exact workings of the League "constitution" were vague, that he had not even considered some of its most important aspects, that the exact methods of its operation were highly speculative, and that much of its language was ambiguous. During the conference Senator Brandegee, of Connecticut, said to the President:

"Mr. President, this League of Nations will not prevent war."

"It will not," admitted the President. "Nothing will prevent war, but it will bring about the discussion before the beginning of a war."

He laid all his emphasis at this time and throughout his brief stay in the United States on this element of discussion and delay, always ignoring or concealing the element of force which he later discovered to be "the heart of the Covenant."

One Senator pressed inquiries relating to the Irish question, and the President was reported to have answered that Ireland would have no vote in the League "at present," and that the Irish question was one for later solution between Ireland and England.

The President was asked if the League would not destroy the Monroe Doctrine. His reply was:

"Not at all; the League would extend the Monroe Doctrine to the entire world."

He also gave it as his interpretation that any member would be able to withdraw from the League if it saw fit. In reply to questions, he said that four plans had been considered, the British, French, Italian, and American; that the British plan had been adopted; that the others had been laid aside; that they had never been printed or published but that he knew of no objection to having that done.

The President's short stay in this country was sufficient to bring to the surface a vigorous wave of opposition to his League of Nations from all portions of the United States, from Democrats as well as Republicans. This aroused the bitter animosity of the President, and, in the minds of the few who reached him at the White House, he left no doubt of his violent resentment of all criticism.

The opposition to the President's plans reached its climax in a round robin which was signed by 37 Republican Senators and was introduced as a Senate resolution by Senator Lodge March 3. As the Constitution requires a majority of two-thirds in the Senate to ratify a treaty, the signatures of these 37 Senators were sufficient to guarantee that the President's plan could not be carried out.

The text of the resolution was short and to the point. It follows:

"Whereas owing to the victory of the arms of the United States and the nations with whom it is associated a peace conference was convened and is now in session for the purpose of settling the terms of peace; and

"Whereas a committee of the conference has proposed a constitution for a League of Nations and the proposal is now before the peace conference for its consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States in the discharge of its constitutional duty of advice in regard to treaties, That it is the sense of the Senate that while it is their desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament the constitution of the League of Nations in the form now proposed to the peace conference should not be accepted by the United States; and be it

"Resolved further, That it is the sense of the Senate that the negotiations on the part of the United States should immediately be directed to the utmost expedition of the urgent business of negotiating peace terms with Germany satisfactory to the United States and the nations with whom the United States is associated in the war against the German Government, and the proposal of a League of Nations to insure the permanent peace of the world should be then taken up for careful and serious consideration."

The signers of this resolution were Senators Lodge, Massachusetts; Knox, Pennsylvania; Sherman, Illinois; New, Indiana; Moses, New Hampshire; Wadsworth, New York; Fernald, Maine; Cummins, Iowa; Warren, Wyoming; Watson, Indiana; Sterling, South Dakota; Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; Harding, Ohio; Hale, Maine; Borah, Idaho; Brandegee, Connecticut; Calder, New York; Penrose, Pennsylvania; Page, Vermont; McLean, Connecticut; France, Maryland; Curtis, Kansas; Spencer, Missouri; Townsend, Michigan; Johnson, California; Dillingham, Vermont; Lenroot, Wisconsin; Poindexter, Washington; Sutherland, West Virginia; Smoot, Utah; and Gronna, North Dakota; Senators-elect Edge, New Jersey; Keyes, New Hampshire; McCormick, Illinois; Phipps, Colorado; Newberry, Michigan; and Ball, Delaware.

Later Senators Elkins, of West Virginia, and Fall, of New Mexico, signed the resolution, making 39 in all—a margin of 6 over the 33 needed to prevent ratification.

The round robin was made public 2 days before the President sailed from New York on his return to France. It was in reply to its challenge that President Wilson uttered a final defiance in his farewell speech at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, March 4. He said:

"When the treaty comes back, gentlemen on this side will find the Covenant not only not changed but so many threads of the treaty tied to the Covenant that you cannot dissect the Covenant from the treaty without destroying the whole vital structure. The structure of peace will not be vital without

the League of Nations, and no man is going to bring back a cadaver with him."

While President Wilson was in the United States, however, the members of the peace conference had continued their work. They were not deaf to criticism as the President had been. When he returned to France he found that they had decided not to make the League of Nations a part of the treaty of peace. By a direct ultimatum the President succeeded in overthrowing this decision and in incorporating the League in the treaty. But he accepted the other changes.

On April 28 he presented the revised draft for the League to the conference. The name of the document was changed from "constitution" to "covenant." A special clause had been inserted to conceal the conflict with the Monroe Doctrine. Several other clauses were changed or added. Not the least interesting of the amendments was the provision by which members of the League could refuse to accept amendments to the Covenant, although forfeiting their membership by so doing. President Wilson said that this provision had to be written into the Covenant because of the demands of the Brazilian delegation, "to meet constitutional requirements." Apparently, the constitution of Brazil was the only American constitution whose terms were considered in the writing of the final draft.

The most noteworthy change concerned the Monroe Doctrine. The criticism which President Wilson had resented so bitterly in the United States found consideration in Paris. Another amendment eliminated "domestic" questions from the purview of the League. On President Wilson's motion, Geneva was substituted for Brussels as the seat of the League—thereby arousing the hostility of Belgium. As a whole the changes were far more comprehensive and involved more articles than the later reservations of the Senate. Yet this was the document which President Wilson had considered perfect and with whose every detail—on this side of the ocean—he was completely satisfied.

But more than this. To placate the French and gain their consent to the League, President Wilson had to concede to them a special treaty of alliance and defense, in repudiation of his own denunciations of special treaties.

To Great Britain, the President yielded almost everything she asked. He did not even mention the freedom of the seas. When the natives of Egypt started a revolt at Cairo during the Peace Conference, the British told President Wilson that his forgotten "Fourteen Points" were responsible, so he formally recognized the British protectorate over Egypt, and that fact, placarded in Egypt with Wilson's name, broke the backbone of the Egyptian revolution. He conceded Ireland and India to be "domestic questions" of the British Empire. He signed a special reservation in favor of the British Colonies, not only conceding the British Empire six votes to America's one in the assembly of the League, but guaranteeing the right of the British Colonies to sit in the council of the League as independent powers. The British flag was raised over hundreds of thousands of square miles in Asia and Africa without a whisper of dissent from the President.

By trying to secure a guaranty of "religious equality," President Wilson called forth an effort on the part of the Japanese to obtain a pledge of "racial equality" in the League. This was favored by a majority vote, and only a ruling that a unanimous vote was necessary to a decision kept the clause out of the Covenant. The President conceded Shantung to Japan, because he feared that the Japanese delegation would bolt the conference, although Secretary Lansing has testified that he believed this fear was ill-founded.

When Serbia and Rumania demurred to certain features of the League Covenant, President Wilson, in a speech on May 31, gave them a pledge that American troops would be sent overseas to protect them, if necessary.

"If the world should be troubled again," he told them, "if the conditions which we all regard as fundamental are challenged, the guaranties which will be given to you will pledge that the United States will send its Army and fleet across the ocean"—and this although he later said in Columbus, Ohio: "When this treaty is accepted, men in khaki will not have to cross the seas again."

When we survey this moving picture of Mr. Wilson in Paris, we can understand better what he meant by his speech on the spirit of America before the International Law Association in Paris, May 9. "In the new League of Nations we are starting out on uncharted seas," he said, "and, therefore, we must have steadiness of purpose." No cataclysm of heaven or earth could shake his steadiness of purpose. No principle of the American Constitution, no interest of the American people could make him halt or hesitate.

Chapter III. The President against the Senate

The struggle to Americanize the League really began with the round-robin resolution in the Senate, March 3, 1919. The life of the Sixty-fifth Congress expired March 4, so the resolution was easily defeated by the objections of Wilson Democrats. The Democrats were then in control of both Houses of the Congress.

The Sixty-sixth Congress in both Chambers would be controlled by Republicans. Under the Constitution it could not meet until December 1919 except at the call of the President. While in Paris, President Wilson had let it be known he would not call a special session until he brought home the final text of the treaty. Domestic issues, however, forced his hand. On May 7, 1919, at Paris, he signed the call for a special session to meet May 19.

Meantime, at the Peace Conference, Mr. Wilson laid the strategic lines for his campaign. The challenge of the round robin and the response it called forth from the American people left no doubt that the constitution of the League would never be accepted as it stood. Changes were made at Paris, but these scarcely touched the points that were vital to the United States. Before sailing the second time for France, March 4, the President had announced his plan of operations. He would so intertwine the League and the treaty that they could not be separated. This meant that by his decree there could be no final peace in the world until the Senate had bowed to his will. The European nations opposed this political device. They wanted a peace treaty. They wanted it soon, and they wanted it signed and ratified by the United States. Already precious months had been wasted. Europe had spent a winter of starvation, misery, and disease worse than any winter of the war. Bolshevism threatened every European government. President Wilson had toured England, France, Belgium, and Italy. He had been welcomed as a hero, but he had spread discontent among the peoples and sowed the seeds of revolt against the governments whose guest he was. Every day of delay threatened the foundations of civilization in Europe.

But when he arrived in Versailles, President Wilson silenced all pleas for immediate peace. What were famine and revolt to him? What though another winter came with its harvest of death? What though war raged anew in Europe? He sought a weapon to use against the American Senate. The arguments of the other peace conferees were in vain. The League of Nations, as a covenant instead of a constitution, was made the first article of the Treaty of Versailles. It was not without a struggle, but the President was in fighting mood.

On April 23, in the controversy over Fiume, he appealed openly to the Italian people to repudiate their peace delegates. It was an act so unprecedented that it left the conference on the verge of collapse. Messrs. Orlando and Sonnino, the Italian premier and foreign minister, accepted the challenge and, April 24, hastened to Rome. There they secured a vote of confidence from the Italian Parliament and thus triumphed over Mr. Wilson. On April 25, Mr. Wilson presented the revised covenant and secured its acceptance in the conference.

By this time, the German delegates had begun to arrive in Paris. On April 30, their principal representatives came and then began the 2 months of negotiations with Germany which ended with the formal signing of the treaty by the Allies, by Mr. Wilson for the United States and by Germany, June 28. On June 30, the President sailed from Brest and arrived in New York, July 8. On July 10, he submitted the treaty to the Senate.

Meantime, the Senate—in session since May 19—had impatiently demanded the treaty. The text had been made known to the German delegates in April. It had been published in various forms throughout Europe and was in the hands of private citizens in New York. But all the demands of the Senate were ignored. Mr. Wilson's administration was in Europe and no one in Washington dared to act. Finally, June 9, the Senate obtained a copy of the treaty from a newspaper correspondent. But it took 5 hours of debate to overcome the objections of the Wilson Senators to allow the text to be printed in the RECORD. Then the Senate sat and waited for the President to arrive. How strange was all this quibbling over copies of the treaty in the light of the farewell speech of President Wilson to Congress, December 2, 1918. In that address, he said:

"I shall be in close touch with you and with affairs on this side of the water, and you will know all that I do.

"I am the servant of the Nation. I can have no private thought or purpose of my own in performing such an errand. * * * I shall count upon your friendly countenance and encouragement.

"I shall not be inaccessible. The cables and the wireless will render me available for any counsel or service you may desire of me."

For 7 months Mr. Wilson had ignored all requests from Congress for information and had spurned all suggestions of advice or criticism. Even formal Senate resolutions had failed to move him. He would not lift the veil which concealed his activity in Paris and its results. He even went so far as to cable M. Clemenceau, refusing to accede to the demand of the French senate for the proceedings of the League Commission.

So it must have created a strange impression in senatorial minds, when, in at last transmitting the treaty to the Senate, he said:

"My services and all the information I possess will be at your disposal and at the disposal of your committee on foreign relations at any time, either informally or in session as you prefer; and I hope that you will not hesitate to make use of them.

"In one sense, no doubt, there is no need that I should report to you what was attempted and done at Paris. You have been daily cognizant of what was going on over there. * * * The cross-currents of politics and of interest must have been evident to you. It would be presuming in me to attempt to explain the questions which arose or the many diverse elements that entered into them."

As a matter of fact, except for censor-garbled dispatches, Congress had been "daily cognizant" of nothing that happened at Versailles. But the President's speech was most

remarkable for its new presentation of America's reasons for entering the war:

"The United States entered the war upon a different footing from every other nation except our associates on this side of the sea. We entered it, not because our material interests were directly threatened or because any special treaty obligations to which we were parties had been violated, but only because we saw the supremacy and even the validity of right everywhere put in jeopardy and free government likely to be everywhere imperiled by the intolerable aggression of a power which respected neither right nor obligation and whose very system of government flouted the rights of the citizens as against the autocratic authority of its governors.

"We entered the war as the disinterested champions of right and we interested ourselves in the terms of peace in no other capacity."

This was in direct contradiction to President Wilson's war message of April 2, 1917. In that he had recorded among the causes for our entering war the specific fact that Germany had not only threatened the material interests of the United States but had waged war upon the American people. He had devoted much of that address to a definite statement of specific attacks upon national interests and designated them, at the head of the list, among the causes which forced this Government to accept "the status of belligerent which had thus been thrust upon it." Moreover, in previous notes to Germany as to the sinking of American ships he had demanded reparation based upon the violation of treaties between this country and the German Empire.

But President Wilson had forgotten his Fourteen Points at Paris. He had forgotten all his pledges to "the pleasing and clarifying and compelling influences of publicity." He had forgotten principle after principle to gain his coveted League. It is not strange then, perhaps, that he forgot the causes of the war, even though he had himself proclaimed them.

Another remarkable feature of this same address was Mr. Wilson's appeal for the abandonment of "independent action" by the United States:

"Every true heart in the world and every enlightened judgment demanded that at whatever cost of independent action, every government that took thought for its people or for justice or for freedom should lend itself to a new purpose and utterly destroy the old order of international politics.

"Shall we or any other free people hesitate to accept this great duty? Dare we reject it and break the heart of the world?

"It is thus that a new role and a new responsibility have come to this great Nation that we honor and which we would all wish to lift to yet higher levels of service and achievement. The stage is set, the destiny disclosed. It has come about by no plan of our conceiving, but by the hand of God, who led us into His way.

"We cannot turn back. We can only go forward, with lifted eyes and freshened spirit to follow the vision. It was of this that we had dreamed at our birth. America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead and nowhere else."

These were intended to be fine words! But how hideous are they when we consider the record at Versailles, the petty trickery, the broken promises, the bartered principles, the shattered hopes, the betrayal of this Nation's independence which the President sought to sanctify by the declaration that it was God who led the way. The sessions at Versailles had not even been opened with a prayer.

"The stage is set, the destiny disclosed!" Let the Senate forget its duty, its oath, its honor! Let it follow the vision of Columbia shackled to European chariots of conquest. "With lifted eyes and freshened spirit" let it abandon the heritage of the Fathers! Away with the Constitution! Away with independence! Away with all that Washington "dreamed at our birth" of this Nation's sovereignty among the powers of the earth! "The light streams upon the path ahead"—yes, the light of burning cities, the light of new wars, revealing a vista of American soldiers dying in alien conflicts on foreign battlefields!

To this cause the President, "acting in his own name and by his own proper authority," had given his word. It remained only for the Senate to ratify it.

Now such a ratification is no mere form. It is no mere ceremony of countersigning a presidential pledge. It is a responsibility as great as any President's. It is an obligation imposed upon the Senate by the Constitution of the United States. It is no mere hedge upon a President's plans. A single clause of the Constitution reposes the treaty-making power of the United States in the President and in the Senate. Paragraph 2 of section II of the second article of the Constitution prescribes:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The authority could not be stated more plainly or more simply. It is no question of mere concurrence. "By and with the advice and consent of the Senate" says the Constitution. Nor is that all. In this "advice and consent," two-thirds of the Senators present must concur before the treaty can be binding upon the people and the Government of the United States. That constitutional provision is notice to all the world that the President's word alone—unfortified by this advice, consent, and concurrence—is not the word of the people of the United States. It is solely the President's word and nothing more.

It is false that the peace conferees were misled into believing that the President had plenary powers and that the people of the United States had given him a mandate that overrode the Constitution. Owing to the censorship, the people of Europe may have believed this, but not their delegates at the peace table. These delegates knew the terms of the Constitution of the United States and they knew that it was only the President's word that they had, and they took, or pretended to take, that word as final because by so doing, they hoped to make the American people feel committed to the President's policies.

The Senate cannot waive its constitutional right. It cannot escape its duty, without betraying the Constitution and the people of the United States. But in this case the President asked no advice. He wished none. He demanded concurrence although he chafed under the constitutional requirement that forced him to ask it.

Throughout the long months of study and discussion that followed the submission of the treaty, President Wilson used every weapon of politics, of patronage, and of Presidential power, held the Senate up to public obloquy, appealed to every passion, kept the Nation at war, and closed its ports to "enemy" commerce, refusing American citizens the right to free travel, threatened and stormed across the continent to dictate or to overthrow the Senate's judgment. All in vain. The Senate stood fast. How it stood fast is part of the Nation's imperishable annals. And the Republican Party's leadership in that great fight against Executive domination and Executive betrayal is the most glorious page in the last 50 years of that party's history. Nor may one forget the Democratic Senators who placed their honor and their oath above subserviency to a transient dictator, who placed their country above patronage and Executive good will, and stood fast, too, undeterred by the tempest at the White House.

The Senate committee went carefully to work. It examined scores of witnesses in an endeavor to pierce the veil of secrecy which still, with President Wilson's connivance, was spread over the proceedings at Versailles. Little by little, however, it uncovered significant facts and learned the details of the making of the treaty.

The most distinguished witness was the President himself. But the committee got little information from him. As at the February dinner, he appeared to know little of the exact facts and to have but vague ideas concerning the extent of the international commitments to which he would pledge the United States. The committee's session at the White House was not public but a stenographic report was printed.

"I am absolutely glad," the President said by way of introduction, "that the committee should have responded in this way to my intimation that I would like to be of service to it. I welcome the opportunity for a frank and a full interchange of views."

Then he urged haste in the ratification of the treaty. The more haste, the less opportunity there would be for the Senate or the country to learn of the League Covenant or to discover the perils of the foreign entanglements into which the President was trying to lead the Nation. Only, he shifted his ground a trifle. Hitherto he had pleaded for the League as an expression of unselfish ideals. Now, he asked the Senators for speed in peacemaking on the more material grounds that the copper mines of Montana, Arizona, and Alaska were operating at a loss and on borrowed money, that the zinc mines of Missouri, Tennessee, and Wisconsin were working at half capacity, that the Idaho, Illinois, and Missouri lead mines were in a bad way, that cotton and oil and other things which we had to sell could not reach their markets properly—"all because the channels of trade are barred by war when there is no war."

Senators must waive their constitutional obligations and accept the President's decrees, because, as he puts it to them coldly and without reference to ideals, morals, or high religious principles, "practically the whole task of bringing the country back to normal conditions of life and industry waits upon the decision of the Senate with regard to the terms of the peace."

But lest the Senators miss the full burden of this plea for peace as it relates to markets and profits he announced further:

"The nations that ratify the treaty, such as Great Britain, Belgium, and France, will be in a position to lay their plans for controlling the markets of central Europe without competition from us if we do not presently act. We have no consular agents, no trade representatives there to look after our interests.

"Nothing, I am led to believe, stands in the way of the ratification of the treaty, except certain doubts with regard to the meaning and implication of certain articles of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and I must frankly say that I am unable to understand why such doubts should be entertained."

Three hours of questioning shed no light upon the things concerning which the President could see no reason for "doubts." He could not explain them. He spent more than half an hour trying to prove that there was no reason why the United States should hesitate to assume the obligation of article 10 to protect other League members "against external aggression" because this was a moral and not a legal obligation. In a dissertation on this distinction he set up the doctrine that "a moral obligation is, of course, superior to a legal obligation, and, if I may say so, has a greater binding force; only there always remains in the moral obligation the right to exercise one's judgment as to whether it is indeed incumbent upon one in those circumstances to do that thing."

When the session at the White House was over, the Senate committee settled back to the more prosaic and thankful task of trying to obtain definite information from less distinguished persons.

Chapter IV. The President appeals to the people

The work of the Senate committee was carried on in public session, as were afterward the treaty debates of the Senate itself. This was contrary to all Senate precedents, but it was an application of President Wilson's repudiated profession of "open covenants openly arrived at." For the first time the American people had full opportunity to know step by step what really was being done in their name in making a treaty with foreign powers. In defiance of his public promise, President Wilson at Paris had sought in secret to bind the American people to new and strange policies. The first step of the Senate, in Americanizing these policies and these secret pledges, was to bring them to the light of day.

The result of this publicity was to raise in the country an unmistakable opposition to the President's plans. As long as the President had only to appeal to emotions and sentiments, he had no difficulty. But when he had to meet revelations of facts that compromised the Nation's honor and encroached upon the Nation's sovereignty, the test was no longer one of eloquence but one of truth. He was plainly losing ground.

So President Wilson undertook a campaign among the people. He left the White House September 3 on a tour to the Pacific coast. His main plea was that the consummation of the League was the real object for which we had entered the war, "the central covenant that we made to our people." In the opening speech, at Columbus, Ohio, September 4, he said: "When this treaty is accepted, men in khaki will not have to cross the seas again."

Yet 3 short months before he had given his celebrated word to the Rumanian and Serbian delegates at Paris that, "if the world should be troubled again," the same treaty was "a pledge that the United States will send its Army and fleet across the ocean."

By the time he reached Des Moines, Iowa, 2 days later, he discovered that "revolution" was spreading in America and in the world because of the delay in the ratification of the treaty which he now styled "an American document."

"How long shall we be kept waiting for the answer whether the world may trust us or despise us? They have looked to us for leadership; they have looked to us for example; they have built their peace upon the basis of our suggestion, the great volume that contains the treaty of peace is drawn along the specifications laid down by the American Government. And now the world stands amazed because an authority in America hesitates whether it will endorse an American document or not."

The recalcitrant "authority in America" to whom he referred was the American Senate. On the same day in Kansas City, he said:

"I have, let me say, without the slightest affectation, the greatest respect for the Senate of the United States, but, my fellow citizens, I have come to fight for a cause. That cause is greater than the Senate. It is greater than the Government. It is as great as the cause of mankind.

Greater than the Government! Souls of the soldiers who died that this Government might live! Was this the voice of their commander in chief who sent them to their death and who swore a solemn oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States?

But the President had not yet warmed to his subject. There was still dignity in his references to the men whom the Constitution had placed as coequal with him in the treaty-making power. When he reached Omaha, September 8, this dignity began to slip away. There he spoke of the opposition Senators as men of infinite timidity who wished to scuttle from the Nation's duty. On the same evening in Sioux Falls, he discovered that "the pro-German element has lifted its head again" and presumably was inspiring Senator Lodge and his colleagues in their opposition to the President's desires. At St. Paul, September 9, he put the difference between his views and the Senate's thus:

"We have either got to be provincials or statesmen. We have either got to be ostriches or eagles."

In another speech, in St. Paul, on the same evening, he again discovered a pro-German basis for the opposition, saying:

"That hyphen which looked to us like a snake, the hyphen between German and American, has reared its ugly head again. You hear the hiss of its purpose, and what is that purpose?

"It is to keep America out of the concert of nations in order that America and Germany, being out of that concert, may sometime in their mistaken dream unite to dominate the world, or at any rate the one to assist the other in holding the nations of the world off while its ambitions are realized."

How preposterous even to suggest that the Senate majority should be part of such a fantastic German-American program!

As he proceeded westward, the President's bitterness grew, particularly against the Senate. He resented the Senate's part in treaty making and left no doubt in the minds of his hearers that only the specific provision of the Constitution could induce him to permit the Senate to review his handiwork. On the return trip from the Pacific coast, at Cheyenne, Wyo., he warned the Senate that he would regard the adoption of reservations to article 10 as tantamount to a rejection of the entire treaty and that this would mean the negotiation of a separate peace with Germany. It was in this speech that he also said:

"My friends—I use the word advisedly—the only recognized forces in this country, outside of Congressional Halls, against this treaty, are the forces of hyphenated Americans."

At Denver, September 25, he was more emphatic in his suggestion of a Presidential "rejection" of the Senate advice:

"I challenge the opponents of this treaty to show cause why there should be any hesitation in ratifying it. I do understand delays. I do not understand covert processes of opposition. It is time that we know where we shall stand, for observe, my fellow citizens, the negotiation of treaties rests upon the Executive of the United States. When the Senate has acted it will be for me to determine whether its action constitutes an adoption or rejection, and I beg the gentlemen who are responsible for the action of the United States Senate to make it perfectly clear whether it is an adoption or rejection."

The strain of the trip, increased by the fact that his cause was making no headway, had been telling on the President. To this must be ascribed much of his bitterness and license of language. At Pueblo, Colo., September 25, the President again charged that the opposition to his treaty program was the result of pro-German propaganda. He said:

"Any man who carries a hyphen about him carries a dagger which he is ready to plunge into the vitals of the Republic. If I catch a man with a hyphen in this great contest, I will know that I have caught an enemy of the Republic. My fellow citizens, it is only certain bodies of foreign sympathies, certain bodies of sympathy with foreign nations, that are organized against this great document which the American representatives have brought back from Paris."

It was a rambling speech and far below the level of the President's usual rhetoric. Speaking of the Paris Conference he revealed this interesting fact—if it was a fact:

"There was not a man at that table who did not admit the sacredness of the right of self-determination, the sacredness of the right of any body of people to say that they would not continue to live under the government they were then living under, and under article 2 of the Covenant they are given a place to say whether they will live under it or not. For following article 10 is article 11, which makes it the right of any member of the League at any time to call attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understandings between nations upon which the peace of the world depends."

There was no longer any doubt that the President was a sick man. The next morning when the train reached Wichita, Kans., his physician announced that the President's condition made it necessary to abandon his tour and to hurry him back to Washington.

From that time, the President's conflict with the Senate was conducted from his sickroom, and only rarely did even his closest followers in the Senate catch a glimpse of him.

In his public and private comment in Washington and on his speaking tour the President by this time had embittered his relations with the Senate beyond all precedent. Even now, with barely a year gone by, it is difficult to realize how hysterical was his vituperation. His license of speech was characterized thus by a Senator of his own party:

"If a cititzen refused to repudiate the policies under which our country had become great, the President characterized him as 'pygmy minded.' If he declined to turn his back upon Washington and Jefferson, he was described as afflicted 'with curious aberrations of thinking.' If he refused to surrender with the pen what Washington gained with the sword, he was described as a 'contemptible quitter.' If he could not see his way clear to embroil America in the wars of every country and to plunge her into controversies of every land, he saw with 'jaundiced eyes.' If he ventured to point out that article 10 bound us to send our soldiers to defend the frontiers of any land in any quarter of the globe, he was 'afflicted with amazing ignorance.' If he looked with pride upon the glorious achievements of America's past and refused to abandon the policies which brought us to the heights of prosperity, he was 'a dreamer living in the forgotten age.'

"If, after studying the League Covenant, lawyers and statesmen reached the conclusion that it was inimical to the public weal, they were classified as men 'whose heads are only fit to serve as knots to prevent their bodies from unraveling.'

"If Senators of the United States, sworn to defend the Constitution and to protect the Republic in strict accordance with the terms of their oath, studied the proposed Covenant and reached the conclusion that it was their duty not to advise or consent to its ratification, they were denounced as 'dishonest opponents of the treaty who will be gibbeted and who will regret that the gibbet is so high.' Or, again, they were informed, as was declared early in the conflict, that the President would like to see them 'hung on a gibbet as high as heaven, but pointed in the opposite direction.'"

While the President was still in the West, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had made its formal report on the treaty. The majority report of the committee, presented by Senator Lodge as chairman, recommended a series of amendments and reservations both as to the League Covenant and as to the remainder of the treaty. This report was signed by Senators Lodge, Borah,

Brandegee, Fall, Knox, Harding, Johnson, New, and Moses, all Republicans. The minority report was presented by Senator Hitchcock, the ranking Democrat and President Wilson's spokesman for the treaty. It was also signed by Senators Williams, Swanson, Pomerene, Smith of Arizona, and Pittman. It denounced the amendments and reservations offered by the majority report and recommended the ratification of the treaty as "the best hope in the world, even if like all human instrumentalities it be not divinely perfect in every detail." Senator McCumber, Republican, filed a separate report.

The Senate debate was long and warm. New amendments and reservations were offered from the floor. Most of these, as well as the committee amendments, were voted down. Then the Senate committee drafted a new set of 15 reservations which were presented October 23, and which were known as the Lodge reservations. With minor changes these were accepted by the Senate and November 19, the formal resolution of ratification, with these reservations, was ready for action. When Senator Lodge moved its adoption, Senator Hitchcock read a letter "of counsel" from President Wilson to the Democratic Senators. It said:

"I assume that the Senators only desire my judgment upon the all-important question of the final vote on the resolution containing the many reservations offered by Senator Lodge. On that I cannot hesitate, for, in my opinion the resolution in that form does not provide for ratification but really for the nullification of the treaty. I sincerely hope that the friends and supporters of the treaty will vote against the Lodge resolution of ratification."

The result was that the Democrats who followed President Wilson joined the "irreconcilable" Republicans who opposed the treaty either with or without reservations. The Lodge resolution failed by a vote, 41 ayes to 51 noes. A motion of Senator Underwood, Democrat, for unconditional ratification failed by a vote of 38 ayes to 53 noes, the "irreconcilables" this time joining the Lodge majority in the opposition.

The Senate adjourned November 19, to meet December 1. The rejection of the ratification, instead of strengthening President Wilson's demand for unconditional ratification, served to weaken his hold on some of the Democrats who wanted peace, even at the sacrifice of the Wilson ideals. This, however, had no effect on the obstinacy of the President. On December 14, an official statement was issued from the White House, announcing that President Wilson had "no compromise or concession of any kind in mind," and that he "would make no move to relieve the situation."

But many of the Democratic Senators were losing the habit of unquestioning subserviency. They went to work with the Republican Senators to map out a compromise. Word also came from the White House that the President's stubborness was weakening.

Then came the publication of a letter written by Lord Grey, who as British Ambassador, had just returned to London from Washington. This letter bore every appearance of British official sanction. It was accepted as notice that the British Government saw nothing unfriendly in the Senate reservations. It said:

"If the outcome of the long controversy in the Senate has been to offer cooperation in the League of Nations it would be the greatest mistake to refuse that cooperation because conditions are attached to it."

The only reservation in the acceptance of which Lord Grey found difficulties was the one that proposed to limit the effect of the 6-to-1 vote in the League accorded to the British Empire and its colonies.

President Wilson was angered by the Grey letter. He looked upon its as "the grossest breach of courtesy," as foreign interference in American affairs, so quickly had he forgotten his Fiume ultimatum which had almost disrupted the Peace Conference a year before.

These events had a vital effect on the progress of the compromise proceedings. On February 11 the committee presented the result to the Senate in the form of an amended resolution of ratification. The first votes on the various reservations came February 21. The reservations were adopted by varying roll calls, but it was March 19 before the final vote took place on what may be called the Senate reservations. The formal motion of ratification embodying these reservations failed by a vote of 49 ayes to 35 noes, a two-thirds majority being necessary under the provisions of the Constitution.

From certain viewpoints the battle over the Senate reservations was the greatest constitutional conflict in the history of the Nation. Defeat in 1861 would have lost only the Southern States; defeat in 1920 would have lost the United States. The effort of the President, on the one side, to surrender this country to a supreme government in Europe and the efforts of the Republicans, on the other side, to save the country from foreign domination involved an issue so stupendous that a special chapter will be devoted to consideration of the reservations in detail.

Chapter V. The Senate takes its stand

The final Senate reservations, as well as the original Lodge reservations on which they were based, did not exclude the United States from the League of Nations. They sought merely to make America's participation in the League conform to the Constitution of the United States and to the historic policy of this country's international relations. They kept the Government of the United States supreme in the control of foreign affairs. They retained in the hands of Congress the war-making power. They reserved to America, and America alone, every decision as to sending American soldiers across the seas. They maintained the Monroe Doctrine inviolate and inviolable against all European interference. In a word, they Americanized the participation of the United States in the Treaty of Versailles. It was at the dictation of President Wilson that this Americanization was frustrated and the treaty and the League were rejected.

Had President Wilson accepted this Americanization of the treaty, the United States would have had formal peace and the machinery of the League would have been left free to work in its proper sphere. But the President would not tolerate reservations. He regarded them apparently as encroachments on the part of the Senate, yet the making of such reservations was no new thing. The Senate has repeatedly incorporated vital reservations in its ratification of treaties and international agreements. It did so in its concurrence in the treaty with Korea in 1882, the Convention To Suppress Slave Traffic in 1890, the International Patent Convention of 1891, the Russian Corporation Treaty of 1904, the Algeciras Convention of 1906, the Hague Conventions of 1907, the Extradition Treaty with Portugal of 1908, the Panama Treaty of 1909, and the Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain of 1911.

The most vital reservations which the Senate wrote into its resolution of ratification of the Treaty of Versailles concerned article 10 of the Covenant. This article provides:

"The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled."

On this automatic commitment of the United States to participation in foreign controversy and bloodshed, the Senate reservation provided a dignified but comprehensive check. The reservation No. 2 reads:

"The United States assumes no obligations to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country by the employment of its military or naval forces, its resources, or any form of economic discrimination, or to interfere in any way in controversies between nations, including all controversies relating to territorial integrity or political independence, whether members of the League or not, under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States, under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall, in the exercise of full liberty of action, by act or joint resolution so provide."

Article 10 of the League Covenant is so definitely anti-American, so specific in its pledge to involve us in European wars, that it seems strange to find that President Wilson not only defended it, but boasted of it as the only article of the Covenant which he could identify as his exclusive contribution. He would tolerate no suggestion to weaken it, or even to define its obligations.

This article automatically exposed us to the perils of every war between nations anywhere in the world. For no such war is thinkable without involving "external aggression" or "political independence." It went further. By pledging us to "respect" as well as to "protect" the "territorial integrity" and the "political independence" of League members, it throttled in advance any possibility that we might ever recognize the independence or the belligerency of any subject nation that might be in revolt. Nor was that all. "In case of such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression" it made it the duty of the Council of the League to "advise" how this obligation "shall be fulfilled" by the United States.

In the face of this specific language, how weak were the pleas of the President that article 10 imposed only a moral obligation and not a legal one, or that the Council's decisions had to be unanimous instead of by a majority.

President Wilson proclaimed article 10 to be the backbone of the Covenant. Repeatedly, he announced that he would look upon a reservation framed to limit its binding force upon the United States, as equivalent to the rejection of the treaty. He would brook no effort to safeguard American interests against embroilment in foreign conflicts. In his testimony before the Senate committee, he sought to soften the specific provisions of the article by a declaration that the obligation imposed upon the United States to particpate in such wars was a moral and not a legal obligation. "It is an attitude of comradeship and protection among the members of the League," he said, "which in its very nature is moral and not legal."

"A moral obligation," he explained later, "is of course superior to a legal obligation, and if I may say so, has a greater binding force only there always remains in the moral obligation the right to exercise one's judgment as to whether it is indeed incumbent upon one in those circumstances to do that thing."

Senator Knox cited a specific violation of article 10 and asked the President:

"Would we be under any legal obligation to participate?"

"No, sir," was the President's reply, "but we would be under an absolutely compelling moral obligation."

"But no legal obligation," added Senator Knox.

"Not as I contemplate it," answered the President.

"Yet in your message transmitting the Franco-American Treaty, May 10," added Senator Knox, "you said that it is only binding us to do immediately what we otherwise would have been bound to do under the League of Nations."

"I did not use the word 'bound,' but 'morally bound,'" explained the President.

But a later search of the records revealed nothing of the kind. The cablegram from the President to Secretary Tumulty, printed May 10, read:

"I have promised to propose to the Senate a supplement in which we shall agree, subject to the approval of the Council of the League of Nations, to come immediately to the assistance of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany, thus merely hastening the action to which we should be bound by the Covenant of the League of Nations."

If in that cablegram, President Wilson had quibbled about the obligation and had written "morally bound" the French Government would have made immediate and justifiable protest. On this point Senator Lodge said in the Senate, May 12:

"There is to me no distinction whatever in a treaty between what some persons are pleased to call legal and moral obligations. A treaty rests and must rest, except where it is imposed under duress and securities and hostages are taken for its fulfillment, upon moral obligations. No doubt a great power, impossible of coercion, can cast aside a moral obligation if it sees fit and escape from the performance of the duty which it promises. The pathway of dishonor is always open. I, for one, however, cannot conceive of voting for a clause which I disapprove, because I know it can be escaped in that way.

"The broad fact remains that if any member of the League, suffering from external aggression, should appeal directly to the United States for support, the United States would be bound to give that support in its own capacity and without reference to the action of other powers because the United States itself is bound, and I hope the day will never come when the United States will not carry out its promises. If that day should come and the United States or any other great country should refuse, no matter how specious the reasons, to fulfill both in letter and spirit every obligation of this Covenant, the United States would be dishonored and the League would crumble into dust, leaving behind it a legacy of wars. If China should rise up and attack Japan in an effort to undo the great wrong of the cession of the control of Shantung to that power, we should be bound under the terms of article 10 to sustain Japan against China, and a guaranty of that sort is never invoked except when the question has passed beyond the stage of negotiation and has become a question for the application of force.

"There is no question that the preservation of a state against external aggression can contemplate nothing but war."

Only second in importance to the reservation on article 10 is the article by which the Senate sought to safeguard the Monroe Doctrine. In the revision of the original "constitution," President Wilson had written into the Covenant the following article 21:

"Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

The Republican Senators, as well as a large number of Democrats, took the position that this article was totally inadequate to preserve the Monroe Doctrine against Europe. The whole language of the article was vague and appeared intentionally ambiguous. It was the first time that the Monroe Doctrine had been designated either as a "regional understanding" or as an "international engagement for securing the maintenance of peace." The Republican Senators saw in this an attempt on the part of the peace conference to make the purely American Monroe Doctrine subject to the League, and to leave to other nations the decision on questions that might arise under it. President Wilson sought to prove that article 21 strengthened the Monroe Doctrine by securing for it recognition by the European governments. He said in San Francisco, September 17:

"This is the first time in the history of international diplomacy that any great government has acknowledged the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. Now for the first time all the great fighting powers of the world, except Germany, which for the time being has ceased to be a great fighting power, acknowledge the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and acknowledge it as part of the international practice of the world."

Yet the great fighting powers did nothing of the kind. They merely put this American doctrine under the jurisdiction of the League of Nations and threatened to rob it forever of its peculiar power in the Western Hemisphere.

How well they succeeded is demonstrated by the official British statement that future disputes over the Monroe Doctrine would be settled by the League. In the British White Paper on the treaty is the following language:

"The origin of the Monroe Doctrine is well known. It was proclaimed in 1823 to prevent America becoming a theater for the intrigues of European absolutism. At first a principle of American foreign policy, it has become an international understanding, and it is not illegitimate for the people of the United States to ask that the Covenant should recognize this fact. In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the Covenant, and indeed the principles of the League, as expressed in article 10, represent the extension to the world of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; while should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter (the Monroe Doctrine) ever arise between American and European powers, the League is there to settle it."

That is what President Wilson calls "safeguarding" the Monroe Doctrine. He would hand it over, for interpretation, to the whole world. What more could its worst enemy desire?

So the Senate made the reservation unmistakable by providing (reservation No. 5):

"The United States will not submit to arbitration or to inquiry by the assembly or by the Council of the League of Nations, provided for in said treaty of peace, any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to its long-established policy, commonly known as the Monroe Doctrine; said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said League of Nations and entirely unaffected by any provision contained in the said treaty of peace with Germany."

Another important reservation was put into the ratification resolution to offset the provision that accorded the British Empire six votes to America's one in the assembly of the League—one each for the British Empire, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India. Originally the Republican Senators proposed a reservation which would deprive the British Empire of this sextuple representation. This reservation might have necessitated new negotiations at the conference table. So the Senators agreed to let the British representation stand as far as other nations were concerned, but by Reservation No. 14 to make it powerless to bind the United States "until Part I, being the Covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate shall be entitled to cast." Until such time, it provides, "the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate have cast more than one vote."

This reservation further provides that "the United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, finding of the council or assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the League if such member, or any self-governing dominion, colony, empire, or part of empire united with it politically has voted."

Why the British Empire should have thus been made the only plural-voting nation in the League has never been adequately explained. Equality of votes was professedly made fundamental in the composition of the League, and Liberia, Haiti, Guatemala, and Siam were made equal in the assembly with the United States, with France, with Japan—with every world power except the British Empire. That nation—and it alone—was accorded six votes. President Wilson pretended that this was done to recognize the self-governing dominions of the British Empire. But one of these votes was given to India, and India is no more self-governing than Ireland, which got no vote and no hearing, or Madagascar or Korea—and not so much as the Philippines, which are not mentioned.

President Wilson tried to explain away the value of this British preponderance by asserting that it was of no value as the plural representation of the British Empire was limited to the Assembly. He told the Senate committee at the White House:

"In making up the constitution of the Council, it was provided, to speak with technical accuracy, that the five principal Allied or Associated Governments should each have one representative in the League; and in the opening paragraph of the treaty itself those powers are enumerated and among others is the British Empire. The Empire of Great Britain, I think, is the technical term. Therefore, their (the British Colonies) unity is established by their representation in the Council."

That statement can have but one construction—that in the Council of the League, the British Empire, including its Dominions and colonies, whose "unity is established" can have but one representative.

"To speak with technical accuracy," the designation of Great Britain in the opening paragraph of the treaty—which names the "Principal Allied and Associated Powers" is plainly and simply "The British Empire." But that is definite enough to give point to the President's assertion that it includes the British colonies.

No matter how carefully a person reads it, he can draw from Mr. Wilson's statement but one conclusion: That although the British Empire is accorded six seats in the Assembly of the League against one for the United States, in the Council of the League there is a perpetual equality between the powers and that the British Empire can have but one place there—only one.

But the President made his statement even more definite on his western trip. In Spokane, September 12, he said:

"The Council is the only part of the organization that can take effective action. No powers of action rest with the Assembly at all, and it is only in the Assembly that

the British Empire is represented as consisting of six units."

The plain implication of this declaration was that in the Council the British Empire could have one vote, and only one. The President added even greater emphasis to this point 5 days later at San Francisco, when he said:

"The point to remember is that the energy of the League of Nations resides in the Council, not in the Assembly, and that in the Council there is a perfect equality of votes. That settles that matter, and even some of my fellow countrymen who insist upon keeping a hyphen in the middle of their names ought to be satisfied with that."

There was the old epithet. Only a "hyphenate" could still disagree with President Wilson. Only a "hyphenate" could still doubt his solemn word that the plural representation of the British Empire was limited to the Assembly of the League. Yet at that very time his name was on a paper that stated the exact opposite.

It is important here to remember that the Council is made up of nine members—five to represent the United States, "the British Empire," France, Italy, and Japan—and four "other" members of the League. "These four members of the League," says the Covenant, "shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion." Plainly the worst we had to fear from the concession of six British votes in the Assembly was that the British Empire would use this preponderance to fill the four other Council seats with it owns friends—among the smaller nations—with nations such as Portugal and Persia, with whom it has special treaties.

No one would have had the temerity to doubt President Wilson's word and to suggest that the British Empire could use that preponderance to "elect" its own dominions into the Council.

Yet on May 6, 1919, President Wilson had signed a special "reservation" that flatly contradicted these assertions. Although he denied the Senate the right to protect the United States by making reservations in his Covenant and his treaty, because it might cause difficulties with the other signatory powers, he had no hesitancy in signing such a reservation himself in favor of a foreign power, and then keeping this "reservation" a secret from the Senate and denying it to the people of the United States. Not until it was needed to induce the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada to accept the treaty was this reservation made public. Here it is:

"The question having been raised as to the meaning of article 4 of the League of Nations' Covenant, we have been requested by Sir Robert Borden to state whether we concur in his view that upon the true construction of the first and second paragraphs of that article representatives of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire may be selected or named as members of the Council. We have no hesitation in expressing our entire concurrence in this view. If there were any doubt, it would be entirely removed by the fact that the articles are not subject to a narrow or technical construction.

"G. CLEMENCEAU.
"WOODROW WILSON.
"D. LLOYD GEORGE.

"Dated at Quai d'Orsay, Paris, the 6th day of May 1919."

Three months before his testimony in the Senate committee and 4 months before his western speeches, President Wilson—acting in his own name and by his own proper authority—had signed his name to the document which absolutely nullified his testimony and those speeches.

General Smuts, one of the authors of the League Covenant, told the South African Parliament, September 10, 2 days before the President's Spokane address:

"Regarding the League of Nations it is incorrect to say that in the League the British Empire is a unit. The Empire is a group, but South Africa has exactly the same rights and voice as England. Though England is a permanent member of the central Council, South Africa could be elected to that Council."

But the President had another excuse for the 6 to 1 predominance of the British Empire. He declared that this plural voting could always be nullified by the fact that the votes of the Assembly had to be unanimous, and that this left the United States with an absolute veto anyhow. In Spokane, September 12, he said:

"There is only one case when the Assembly can vote at all and that is when the Council refers a matter in dispute to the Assembly, in which case the Assembly can decide the matter by a majority, provided all the representatives of the nations represented in the Council vote on the side of the majority. So that alike in the Assembly and in the Council the one vote of the United States is an absolute veto."

When the President reached San Francisco, September 17, he had extended his researches and he told his audience:

"There are two things which a majority of the Assembly may do without the concurrent vote of the United States. A majority of the Assembly can admit a new member of the League of Nations. A majority of the Assembly can recommend to any nation a member of the League a reconsideration of such treaties as are apparently in conflict with the provisions of the Covenant itself; it can advise any member of the League to seek a reconsideration of any international obligation which seems to conflict with the Covenant itself, but it has no means whatsoever of obliging it to reconsider even so important a matter as that, which is obviously a moral duty on the part of any member of the League."

Here in his first sentence, Mr. Wilson concedes the importance of the six British votes—in the admission of new members. Skillfully used, these votes should enable England to convert any of her colonies, protectorates, islands, islets, and coaling stations into members of the League, eligible to sit in the Council of that body. For if the British Empire is entitled to a representative for New Zealand with half the population of Chicago, why not to another for Labrador or British Honduras or the Bahamas, to say nothing of Gibraltar, Malta, or Aden.

But even this argument as to the veto power of the single vote of the United States was false, because in a case in which the United States were involved, it would be excluded from voting while the British Empire would not, unless it, too, were a participant, and then only such a portion of the empire as might be directly concerned.

The foregoing reservations have been dealt with out of their regular order because of their importance. The remaining reservations will be handled in the order in which they appear in the resolution of ratification.

The preamble to this resolution caused considerable debate because of the effort of some Senators to eliminate the requirement as to acceptance by the other signatories. In its final form, however, the resolution specified that the ratification should not take effect until the Senate reservations should have been accepted "as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by the Allied and associated powers." The preamble also stipulated that failure on the part of these powers to object to the Senate reservations before the formal deposit of ratification by the United States "shall be taken as a full and final acceptance of such reservations and understanding by said powers."

Reservation No. 1 covers the right of withdrawal from the League. When the original Constitution of the League was drawn up, no provision was made for the withdrawal of members. In the revised form of article 1, this right of withdrawal was granted to any member who should have given 2 years' notice of such intention "provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal."

This, however, still left the withdrawing member at the mercy of the League because the latter could veto any withdrawal by declaring that the member had not fulfilled "all its international obligations"—a perilous and sweeping phrase. It made a mockery of the whole permission to withdraw. So the Senate rendered the article specific by including a reservation declaring that in case of withdrawal, "the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said Covenant shall have been fulfilled and notice of withdrawal by the United States may be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States."

President Wilson told the Senate Committee that the Covenant provision concerning the fulfillment of obligations was only "an argument to the conscience of the nations."

"If it were a matter for the Nation itself to judge," asked Senator Harding, "is not that a rather far-fetched provision?"

To this the President answered:

"Well, you are illustrating my recent remark, Senator, that the phraseology is your difficulty, not the idea. The idea is undoubtedly what I have expressed."

But it was the phraseology, not the idea, which he asked the Senate to ratify. So the Senate incorporated the reservation that the phraseology might conform to the idea.

The proposal to assign to the United States mandates for former German colonies or portions of the former Turkish Empire proved anything but attractive to the Senate. Great Britain, France, and Japan had privately apportioned these colonies among themselves, Great Britain had absorbed all the Turkish domains that promised either oil, commerce, or other profit, and only such troublous lands as Armenia were to be put under the protection of the United States. The Senate adopted a special reservation to article 22 of the League. It is reservation No. 3, and it provides that "no mandate shall be accepted by the United States under article 22, part I, or any other provision of the treaty of peace with Germany, except by action of the Congress of the United States."

Although the President told the Senate that "domestic questions" were excluded from the jurisdiction of the League, this exclusion was so vague and the perils of foreign interference in purely American affairs were so great that the Senate decided to safeguard American sovereignty by Reservation No. 4. This reserves to the United States "exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction" and declares that all domestic and political questions "relating wholly or in part to its internal affairs, including immigration, labor, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, the suppression of traffic in women and children and in opium and other dangerous drugs, and all other domestic questions are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not under this treaty to be submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the Council or of the Assembly of the League of Nations, or any agency thereof, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power."

Senate Reservation No. 6—the "Shantung reservation"—touches a subject vital to the League, although referring to another part of the treaty of peace. This reservation simply and comprehensively provides that "the United States withholds its assent to articles 156, 157, and 158 and reserves full

liberty of action with respect to any controversy which may arise under said articles."

The articles of the peace treaty cited in this reservation provide for the surrender of the Chinese province of Shantung to Japan. Because of the insertion of these articles, China refused to sign the treaty. Secretary Lansing, General Bliss, and Mr. White, three of Mr. Wilson's fellow Commissioners at Versailles, protested vigorously and in writing against this act of treachery to China, but President Wilson vetoed their objections and Japan won. He said he feared Japan other wise would carry out her threat to bolt the League. Secretary Lansing told the committee that he believed the President's fears were unfounded.

"Why did you yield on a question on which you thought you ought not to yield and that you thought was a principle?" Senator Johnson asked Secretary Lansing.

"Because naturally we were subject to the direction of the President of the United States," was the Secretary's reply.

The President, both in speaking to the Senate committee and in his speeches, declared that Japan had guaranteed to restore Chinese sovereignty in Shantung. There were conditions attached to that alleged guaranty, however, and the alleged guaranty was not in writing. The President told the committee that a record of the promise was in the confidential archives of the peace conference.

Senator Williams tried to find out from the President just what sovereignty Japan retained.

"She has not retained sovereignty over anything," was the impatient response of the President.

"She has not?" asked Senator Williams.

"I mean she has promised not to," added the President.

There the mystery rested. But the Senate would have none of these double dealings in secret Asiatic politics and decided that the United States must keep its hands clean and free to protect China against Japanese aggression if necessary.

The Shantung reservation had an interesting sequel. In trying to justify the betrayal of China, the President told an audience at St. Louis, September 5, that Great Britain, in order to make it more certain that Japan would come into the war, had promised that the German rights in Shantung should go to Japan. Senator Norris called the President's attention to the fact that Japan entered the war on August 23, 1914, and that the secret agreement giving her Shantung was not made until March 1917. President Wilson telegraphed from Carrison, Mont., September 12, thanking Senator Norris for pointing out an unintentional inaccuracy. Despite this grateful confession, President Wilson repeated the same "unintentional inaccuracy" in his speeches at Los Angeles, September 20, Reno, September 22, Salt Lake City, September 23, and Cheyenne on September 24.

At Los Angeles President Wilson also told the audience that President McKinley and John Hay, Secretary of State, had declined to protest against Germany's original acquisition of rights in Shantung. Senator Borah pointed out the fact that the Shantung lease had been consummated early in 1898, 6 months before Mr. Hay became head of the State Department.

To end the Wilson policy of appointing American representatives to various treaty commissions—even before the treaty had been ratified—the Senate adopted reservation No. 7, stipulating that "no person is or shall be authorized to represent the United States nor shall any citizen of the United States be eligible as a member of any body or agency established or authorized by said treaty of peace with Germany, except pursuant to an act of the Congress of the United States, providing for his appointment and defining his powers and duties."

In line with this defense of American interests against unauthorized action by treaty commissions, the Senate adopted reservation No. 8, forbidding interference by the Reparation Commission in German-American commerce, except by express congressional permission.

The Senate also adopted reservation No. 9, specifying that except for the proportionate share of the United States in the expenses of the office of the secretary general no obligation shall be incurred for the expenses of any other League or treaty agency, except under a direct appropriation by Congress.

Reservation No. 10 provides that no plan for the limitation of armaments can bind the United States unless accepted by Congress, and further reserves the right to increase armaments, without the consent of the League Council, "whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war."

To offset the sweeping provision of Article 16 of the League Covenant, providing for an immediate boycott against a Covenant-breaking member of the League, the Senate adopted a reservation, No. 11, providing that the United States "reserves the right to permit, in its discretion, the nationals of a Covenant-breaking state, as defined in Article 16, of the Covenant of the League of Nations, residing within the United States or in countries other than such Covenant-breaking state, to continue their commercial, financial, and personal relations with the nationals of the United States."

Reservation No. 12 was added by the Senate to protect the legal rights of American citizens against anything which might be done under articles 296 and 297 of the treaty, dealing with debts and general property rights and interests of enemy nationals or in enemy countries.

Reservation No. 13 is one of the most important of the series. It specifically withholds the assent of the United States from part XIII of the treaty. This President Wilson at Pueblo had rapturously described as the "Magna Charta of Labor." He said:

"If we do not have this treaty of peace, labor will continue to be regarded, not as it ought to be regarded, as a human function, but as a purchasable commodity throughout the world. There is set up here a means of periodic examination of the conditions of labor all over the world, particularly the labor of women and children and those who have not the physical force to handle some of the burdens that are put upon them, and it is made the duty of the nations of the world constantly to study the methods of raising the levels of human labor. You know what that means.

"We have not done our duty with regard to the amelioration and betterment of the conditions of labor in America, but the conditions here are better than they are anywhere else. We now have an opportunity to exercise our full influence to raise the levels everywhere to the levels which we have tried to maintain in this country, and then to take them higher into the fields of that sort of association between those who employ labor and those who execute it as will make it a real human relationship and not a mere commercial relationship."

Probably the most accurate test of the purpose of this "magna charta" is the fact that the first Director General of the International Labor Office created by the treaty is Albert Thomas, one of the leading Socialists of France.

But President Wilson's tribute to the treaty plan did little justice to the broad program outlined for the International Labor Office and the conferences of labor delegates to be held under its auspices.

The articles of the treaty which the Senate refused to accept create a special International Labor Conference in which each nation is to have four members, two for the government, one for organized labor, and one for the employers. This body is to control the International Labor Office, which in turn is to study all labor problems and disseminate information concerning them. The conference is to present proposals for the international labor agreements. After these have been accepted by the various governments, the governing body of the Conference has the right to enforce the provisions and to bring proceedings against the nations that violate them, before a special tribunal of three members, with a final appeal to a Permanent Court of International Justice.

Senator Reed outlined such a trial in a Senate speech:

"Here stands Uncle Sam, prisoner at the bar, charged with having violated the 8-hour law in Georgia, on a farm. They try him like a common criminal, and they find him guilty, and they proceed to fix the punishment, and there is no limit to the punishment. There is no law; there is no constitution; there is nothing except their gracious charity and pity; and they condemn old Uncle Sam, and I can see his majestic figure, his head somewhat bowed in shame, his eyes envisioning the day when he was a sovereign looking the world in the face, when his spirit was that of the eagle and his soul the soul of liberty. They lead him out, and then by three men, not an American there, try a sovereign nation before private individuals—that is all it amounts to; before international Socialists—that is all it amounts to; before anarchists who would destroy the structure of civilization and tear down the temple of liberty—that is what it amounts to. This monstrous creature you propose to set up. This is to be accepted undebated, undigested, not understood by the people of this country.

"This is not socialism. This is not anarchy. It is something worse than both. It proposes to destroy nationality. It proposes to destroy government. It proposes to set up a government selected not by the people of the world but by chosen classes of the people of the world. And you propose to establish that in this country. It is a betrayal of the United States."

The final reservation, No. 15, was adopted as a reiteration of a previous Senate resolution favoring the freedom of Ireland. It recites:

"In consenting to the ratification of the treaty with Germany, the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination of the Irish people for a government of their own choice adopted by the Senate, June 6, 1919, and declares that when such government is attained by Ireland, a consummation it is hoped is at hand, it should promptly be admitted as a member of the League of Nations."

After the Senate, March 19, had failed to adopt the ratification resolution embodying these reservations, Senator Lodge put an end to further parliamentary technicalities by securing the adoption of a resolution formally announcing the rejection of the treaty and sending the document back to President Wilson. The vote on the motion was 47 for to 37 against. This resolution read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to return to the President the Treaty of Peace with Germany signed at Versailles on the 28th day of June 1919 and respectfully inform the President that the Senate had failed to ratify said treaty, being unable to obtain the constitutional majority therefor."

Thereupon the Secretary of the Senate packed the treaty in a leather bag and took it to the White House, where he delivered it to the Secretary of the President, as Mr. Wilson was too ill to receive it in person.

The final rejection of the peace treaty left the country in a formal state of war. The President refused to act. But the way

was clear for congressional action to end the war. In both Houses, the Republican leaders took the position that by repealing the act of Congress declaring the existence of a state of war, they could create the existence of a state of peace. The followers of the President maintained that only he could terminate the war.

In December 1918 Senator Knox had introduced a peace resolution, but the Senate at that time was Democratic and the resolution died in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Relations. So he again introduced a peace resolution.

The House of Representatives, however, took the first real step in this effort to make peace. By a vote of 242 to 150, April 9, it adopted a resolution declaring the war with Germany at an end. Twenty-two Democrats voted with the Republicans on the majority side and two Republicans voted with the Democrats against the resolution.

On April 30 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made a favorable report in the Knox peace resolution as a substitute for the House resolution. On May 15 by a vote of 43 to 38, the Senate adopted this resolution.

The Senate resolution was then sent to the House of Representatives. The House, by a vote of 228 to 139, accepted the Senate resolution as a substitute for the House measure, and it was sent to the President for his signature. In this form the resolution formally repealed the resolution declaring war. It provided that this should not change the status of German property in the hands of the American Government and that the United States did not waive any rights it might have under the Treaty of Versailles. Another section declared the end of the war with Austria-Hungary. President Wilson vetoed the resolution. In this veto message, he made two especially noteworthy statements:

"I cannot bring myself to become a party to an action which would place an ineffaceable stain upon the gallantry and honor of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the fact that upon our entrance into the war we professed to be seeking to assist in the maintenance of common interests, nothing is said in this resolution about the freedom of navigation upon the seas."

"Freedom of navigation upon the seas!" What a strange complaint to come from the man who, having pledged himself publicly to obtain that freedom of the seas, had not once mentioned it in the long debates of Versailles! There is not a word of it in the treaty of peace. Why should he suddenly search for it so diligently in the Knox resolution?

The veto message was sent to the House of Representatives which had originated the peace resolution. It was speedily put to a vote. Two hundred and nineteen members voted to override the President's veto, while 152 voted to uphold it. As it required two-thirds majority to make the resolution a law despite the Presidential veto, the resolution was lost. Two hundred and two Republicans and 17 Democrats voted to pass the resolution over the President's veto and thus establish a condition of peace; 150 Democrats and 2 Republicans voted to support the President and thus continue the condition of war.

Undaunted by the Presidential veto Congress set out to end the war at least within the limits of the United States. Mr. Wilson's administration had kept on the Government pay rolls a great army of war employees, under the cover of various war emergency laws. Under the same laws the administration had been able to maintain an autocratic supervision of the people's private life and a participation in American industry.

By a vote of 324 to 3, the House of Representatives, June 3, passed a joint resolution terminating these wartime laws, except the Lever Food and Fuel Control Act, the District of Columbia rent law, the Trading With the Enemy Act, and the various Liberty and Victory bond statutes. This overwhelming majority demonstrated how nearly unanimous both the Republicans and the Democrats of the House were in their demand that these laws should no longer hamper industry or afford an excuse for the administration's universal meddling. The Senate amended the resolution by adding the passport law to the list of exemptions and then passed the resolution without a dissenting vote. The House of Representatives accepted the amendment and the resolution was sent to the President for his signature.

When President Wilson vetoed the Knox resolution, he said he did so because the United States had not made a proper settlement of the war as far as other nations were concerned. In the resolution to establish peace conditions in the United States, no other nations were concerned or interested. Yet he killed the repeal resolution by a pocket veto; that is, he withheld his signature until the adjournment of Congress June 5, automatically invalidated the measure. For this course he was not obliged to give any reason or excuse, new or old, and he gave none. He refused to give up his autocratic powers, although the emergency for which he had demanded them was long gone by. He refused stubbornly to do anything; that was all.

Chapter VI. Events vindicate the Senate

So the Nation has been left under war laws at home and without peace abroad. It is an amazing situation. Nearly 2 years ago the cannon ceased to thunder and the armies of the world moved homeward from the trenches. The war-tired millions in every land saw at last, over the smoldering ashes of their homes and hopes, the dawn of a rising sun of peace.

Against that rising sun, they saw the profile of the man from the west who, in their eyes, typified the new era that was to come. To them he promised universal disarmament and universal peace. To them he pictured a universal brotherhood of nations and of men. So they adored him; so they listened to his words as if inspired.

But his words brought not the blessings of peace. They brought no bread where famine had reigned. They brought no life where death had been supreme. They brought only new wars, new famine, new and unending desolation.

And in his own land—in this land—where without his word peace could not be restored, he withheld that word. Yes, he who had boasted that he would keep the Nation out of war, now by his own autocratic decree kept the Nation out of peace with its vanquished foe.

And why? Because he had made a personal project of his own a condition of peace; because by the maintenance of a state of war he secured a political and an economic weapon against those who opposed his project; because by keeping this country out of peace he thought he could force the Senate to accept his project for the denationalization of the United States.

So, by Presidential fiat, the United States is still at war with Germany. By that Executive decree, by that usurpation of autocracy, the United States must remain at war until the sworn defenders of the Constitution in the Senate consent to violate their oath and to betray their country.

What a world of execration Americans would heap today on any ruler in Europe or in Asia or Africa who dared do this thing. Suppose the British King or the German President or the Emperor of Japan had proclaimed to the world that he would not sign the resolution of peace which his people desired and his parliament had passed. President Wilson himself would be the first to read him and his country out of the family of self-governing nations.

Yet this is only a fitting climax to a series of unprecedented acts. Had any officer of the United States Government, save President Wilson, done what he had done in the last 2 years, that officer would have been impeached by an indignant Congress and driven from public life by an outraged people.

Suppose that Secretary Lansing had gone to Paris in President Wilson's stead. Suppose that he had entrusted this Nation's honor to Europe's keeping, had subordinated its sovereignty to a committee of foreigners, had sacrificed historic American policies and the gravest American interests in order to satisfy his own desire for a league of nations on which neither Senate, House, nor people had ever passed even an opinion.

And suppose that by the League thus bought with the Nation's choicest treasures, he had rendered the United States the vassal of the European war makers, had pledged its men and its money to protect their conquests, had deceived the Congress and the country as to the services he had promised them, having already deceived the powers of Europe as to his competence to bargain with them; and finally, to secure approval of his perfidious work upon the proper constitutional authority, had intrigued to keep the Nation a whole year uselessly at war.

What, under those circumstances, would Mr. Lansing have been called?

How long before he would have been under impeachment?

Beside whom would we have been pilloried in the history of the United States?

Through all the days of the peace conference and through all the months since then Europe has reverberated with the thunder of new wars. Nation has risen against nation as if in protest against all that was done at Paris. Governments that solemnly signed the League Covenant have challenged one another to do battle again. The soldiers of France, England, Poland, Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Rumania—men who stood in the trenches during the long years of war—were sent into alien lands again to fight anew in causes which the world is still trying to understand.

When the League of Nations was the topic of Senate debate, the defenders of the Constitution could only point to war clouds on the horizon and conjecture what might happen when the ill-starred peoples of Europe should again be at one another's throats. They could only say, for instance: "If Poland invades Russia and is driven back, we should have to protect Poland against invasion under article 10, for Poland is a member of the League."

What they conjectured has come to pass. Had the Senate not rejected the President's demands, American soldiers today would be on call to die on the Bug and the Vistula. If the Senate had not stood fast, American soldiers would be in Armenia, not only to defend Armenia against the Turks but to protect the British oil fields of Mesopotamia against Bolshevist invasion.

Had the Senate approved Mr. Wilson's covenant "without essential reservations," American soldiers would be on call today to embark for the danger zones between Italy and Yugoslavia, between Poland and Czechoslovakia, between Greeks, Bulgars, and Turks. Should the Turkish peril be provoked anew and Islam hammer again at the gates of Cairo, American soldiers would have to be ready to sail across the seas and defend, not Egypt, but Great Britain and its Suez Canal against the followers of Mahomet.

Should bolshevism sweep across Turkestan to threaten India, they would have to be ready to safeguard, not India, but the British Empire. If crumbling China fails to

hold her millions in check and an angry horde sweep into Shantung or Korea, they would be obligated, if called, to go to war, not to give freedom to Shantung or to Korea, but to rivet on them both the chains of Japanese oppression.

Could they do this under the Constitution of the United States? No! Not by twisting, turning, evading, or pretending. No, a thousand times no. Only to Congress have the people of the United States given the power to declare war, to support armies, to provide and maintain a navy. Yet we would be compromised or committed in all these things, had not the Senate of the United States stood, bold and firm, against the President's demands. Or does anyone doubt that if the President had had his way, he would scruple today to proclaim himself the supreme interpreter of America's obligations under the League and under the pretense of war emergency, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, order them abroad into any war that he and the League might choose?

The League of Nations is already in existence. Twenty-nine nations have accepted the treaty and the Covenant. It did not need to wait for the ratification of the United States. Nor has it waited. It came into being when the Allied Powers ratified the treaty. But it has been helpless to halt the new wars that rage in Europe and Asia. Its "counsel" and its "advice" have but served to arouse new antipathies and fan new flames of hatred and revenge. But the League exists and is at work.

Such, in the light of current events is the League of Nations, whose unconditional and unreserved ratification the President required and still requires from the Senate of the United States. Such is the price the United States would have contracted to pay on demand, in blood and money, to redeem the commitments, which under the false pretense of mandate from the American people, President Wilson gave in the dark secrecy of Versailles.

When President Wilson went to Europe, the prestige of the United States, its achievements in arms, its principles, and its wealth made it the greatest power at Versailles. Had it been represented at the conference by a statesman ambitious for his country rather than for himself, it would have played there a part such as it played in the war—to save the world from darkness and from ruin.

For to Europe, the United States stood as the one nation unembittered by hatred, unmoved by lust of conquest, unswayed by dreams of empire. From the conflicting ambitions and clashing aims that had involved Europe in the meshes of war, the United States alone was aloof.

Yet Mr. Wilson threw all advantages away the moment he got within the doors of the peace conference. He bartered away American prestige and American position for the promotion of his own vague and shapeless ideals. Every element of international strength and influence which the United States had developed during the war, every new acquisition that might be used for the greater welfare and glory of the United States was sacrificed by him behind those closed doors; nd that is not all nor the worst. With them went this country's heritage of diplomatic triumphs of the past, the whole structure of America's foreign relations and diplomacy. Not only did he repudiate the policy set forth in Washington's warning against entangling alliances but he allowed the Monroe Doctrine to be classified as a mere "regional understanding," to be interpreted by foreign powers in the League of Nations.

From the early days of the Republic it had been a fixed American policy to make the United States the first power on the Pacific. It was a policy, which was forecast by the Louisiana annexation under Jefferson, was revealed with the acquisition of the Oregon and California territories under Polk, was declared by Seward in the purchase of Alaska, was carried forward to cover Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, and the Philippines under McKinley, and was affirmed anew by Hay in the "Open Door in China." Woodrow Wilson "acting in his own name and by his own proper authority" at Versailles closed that door, sacrificed China to the Japanese, and, without securing in return even a respite from her demands upon us, allowed Japan to take the Ladrones, the Marianas, and the Carolines, the island outposts of the Philippines. By one sweep of his sterile and shallow statesmanship he gave away this country's Pacific policy.

In American history, there has been no prouder boast than that the United States was the friend of the oppressed in every continent. Mr. Wilson has ended all that.

Turn back the hands of the clock of time to that day in April, 22 years ago, when the United States harkened to the cry from Cuba. Had Mr. Wilson and the League been in operation at that time, Weyler could have worked out to the bitter end the bloody plan of Spain. And if, perhaps, Brazil or the Argentine or some other American republic had answered the despairing call of the Cuban people, American soldiers would have been pledged to answer the summons—not of Garcia and of Gomez, but of Weyler and the Spanish monarch.

Under the League, this land of ours would no longer be the light bearer and hope of the world. Across the seas would come in vain the cry of the despairing. Pledged to perpetuate the nations as they are, enlisted forever in the cause of the strong, we should be bound to turn a deaf ear to the call of the weak. Instead of lifting mankind to a higher level, we should merely sink with it in its chains. It is no vision, it is a nightmare that now confronts us as the actuality of Mr. Wilson's dream.

Chapter VII. Mr. Wilson defies facts

Thus stands the record of Mr. Wilson, "acting in his own name and by his own proper authority." We have following him through the dark mazes of Versailles and out in the open forum of the Senate of the United States. We have taken record of his acts and listened to the eloquent rhetoric of his explanations and arguments. We have heard him make great promises and we have seen him fulfill them with petty deeds.

But why all this, some reader may ask; why not leave him to history? Are not the country and the Constitution safe at last? Has not the Senate saved the country—averted the perils of foreign vassalage?

No; the struggle is not over. By President Wilson's decree, the Nation is still at war with Germany. By his decree, the Nation must record at the polls in November, in the "great and solemn referendum" whether it will bind itself with the bonds of his League of Nations.

The President's attitude to the League has not been changed. He still stands where he stood when he presented the League Covenant to the Senate. He still demands its ratification. By his autocratic power in the Democratic Party he has forced that party and its candidate in this campaign to endorse his demand that the American people, by their vote, November 2, ratify the humiliating document that he signed in the secret councils of Versailles.

"The League of Nations is the hope of the world," Mr. Wilson telegraphed G. E. Hamaker, chairman of the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee, at Portland, Oreg., last May 6. He added:

"The chief motives which led us to enter the war will be defeated unless that Covenant is ratified and acted upon with vigor. We cannot in honor whittle it down or weaken it as the Republican leaders in the Senate have proposed to do. If we are to exercise the kind of leadership to which the founders of the Republic looked forward and which they depended upon their successors to establish, we must do this thing with courage and unalterable determination. The Democratic Party has now the great opportunity to which it must measure up. The honor of the Nation is in its hands!"

The Democratic Convention, at the bidding of the President, proclaimed its staunch adherence to his League program:

"We commend the President for his courage and his high conception of good faith in steadfastly standing for the Covenant agreed to by all the associated and Allied Nations at war with Germany, and we condemn the Republican Senate for its refusal to ratify the treaty merely because it was the product of Democratic statesmanship, thus interposing partisan envy and personal hatred in the way of peace and renewed prosperity of the world.

"We indorse the President's views of our international obligations and his firm stand against reservations designed to cut to pieces the vital provisions of the Versailles Treaty, and we commend the Democrats in Congress for voting against resolutions for separate peace which would disgrace the Nation.

"We advocate the immediate ratification of the treaty without reservations which would impair its essential integrity, but do not oppose the acceptance of any reservations making clearer and more specific the obligations of the United States to the League associates."

"Making clearer or more specific the obligations of the United States to the League associates!" Clearer and more specific obligations! Rivet tighter the chains of American vassalage! Leave no loophole by which President Wilson's interpretation of moral obligation might weaken the Covenant! But not a word about safeguarding the Constitution, defending the sovereignty of this Nation, proclaiming anew the supremacy of American independence!

Not only did the San Francisco Convention do his bidding, but the candidate of the Convention, Gov. James M. Cox, went to the White House to learn at first hand what the President desired. The interview left no doubt that Governor Cox accepted Mr. Wilson's views on the League without reservations. As President Wilson said after the conference:

"I found what I indeed already knew and what Governor Cox has let the whole world know in his speeches, that he and I were absolutely as one with regard to the great issue of the League of Nations, and that he is ready to be the champion in every respect of the honor of the Nation and the secure peace of the world. Governor Cox will have the vigorous support of an absolutely united party."

Governor Cox added this statement:

"We are agreed as to the meaning and sufficiency of the Democratic platform and the duty of the party in the face of threatened bad faith to the world in the name of America. His thought is still of the war and the pledges we gave to those who sacrificed. One easily sees that as the leader of the Nation who asked for our sons and our resources upon a very distinct understanding and obligation, he is resolved that the faith shall be kept. To this his thought and life are dedicated. What he promised, I shall, if elected, endeavor with all my strength to give."

That is the Democratic pledge in the "great and solemn referendum." In his speech of acceptance, August 7, Governor Cox emphasized that pledge anew:

"The League of Nations is in operation. As the Democratic candidate, I favor going in.

"The first duty of the new administration clearly will be the ratification of the treaty."

Lest there be any doubt about the completeness of Mr. Cox's adoption of Mr. Wilson's views, the candidate repeated in his speech many of the peculiar arguments which the President had used in his conflict with the Senate.

"The Monroe Doctrine is the very essence of Article 10," he said, although the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed to keep Europe out of America, and America out of Europe, while Article 10 would take America into Europe and let Europe into America. As for the fact that the Covenant violated the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States, Governor Cox pleaded that as no treaty could override the Constitution, we could sign any such document with impunity, a plea even more reprehensible than the Wilson contention that the obligation of Article 10 was only a moral obligation which the United States therefore could carry out or evade, as its own judgment dictated.

But the whole speech was summed up in the pledge Governor Cox gave at the White House after his conference with President Wilson:

"What he promised I shall, if elected, endeavor with all my strength to give."

"To give"—what? To give the sovereignty and the independence of the United States. To give to European powers a control over the Army and Navy of the United States. To give Great Britain 6 votes to America's 1 in the League of Nations. To give the Monroe Doctrine into Europe's keeping. To give to alien counsels a power over war and peace that the Constitution now limits exclusively to the Congress. To give to Europe's imperialism the sanction, the blessing, and the protection of the blood and the wealth of the United States.

That is the gift. Fine words alter no facts. That is the bond, signed and sealed by the two Democratic leaders—signed and sealed beyond alteration or appeal.

"The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

(By unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. NYE and Mr. BARKLEY, and the debate which ensued, on December 8, 1943, were ordered to be printed also in the RECORD at this point.)

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. NYE. On Friday, November 12, I obtained the leave of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article on the League of Nations, written by Oswald F. Schuette, of Washington, D. C. He was a war correspondent in World War No. 1, and is an authority on international affairs.

The article was written in August 1920 during the Harding-Cox presidential campaign, and was issued by the Republican National Committee at that time as its campaign handbook on the subject of the League of Nations. At the time I offered the matter for the RECORD I failed to make note of the date of its origin.

I placed the article in the RECORD as a document important in its recording of vital history. I am told that the Republican National Committee printed 750,000 copies in the campaign of 1920, and that it was an important factor in making the League of Nations the decisive issue in that campaign. The pamphlet recited a history of the international negotiations and domestic politics of 1919 and 1920 which may well prove a deadly parallel to the situation which might develop when the present war comes to its close. If question is now raised about the propriety of putting this article into the RECORD, because it contains vigorous criticism of the late President Woodrow Wilson, of his part in writing the Covenant of the League and the Treaty of Versailles, and, particularly, of his efforts to induce the Senate to accept the League and to ratify the treaty, then I only plead that the criticism of Wilson was not what prompted my request for the printing of the article.

It might be suggested that some of its statements should be eliminated from the text printed in the RECORD. But if that were done, it would no longer be the historical document which had played an important part in the early twenties. Even President Wilson's friends will admit that he did not hesitate to criticize, sometimes with bitter words, the motives and the conduct of the Senators, and of others who opposed his advocacy of the League.

As late as March 1920 he vetoed a formal congressional resolution declaring the war at an end. As a result, the final peace treaty was not ratified by the Senate until October 18, 1921, in the administration of President Harding.

If this article had been written after the death of President Wilson, its author, with whom I have visited, might well have softened the criticism it contains. But it was written in the heat of a Presidential campaign when President Wilson was not only alive, but was still the President of the United States.

I ask that this comment of mine be printed also in conjunction with the article I inserted in the RECORD on November 12, when the permanent RECORD is printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have called the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] to what seemed to me to be offensive and objectionable statements in the article which he had inserted in the RECORD, reflecting upon the integrity and the honesty and good faith of President Wilson. It is easy enough to argue the merits of the League of Nations without impugning the motives of anybody connected with it on either side. I had forgotten at the time the article was published in the RECORD that it was a part of the Republican campaign literature in 1920, written by this man named——

Mr. NYE. Schuette.

Mr. BARKLEY. Schuette. It is not an inappropriate name, I think, in view of the character of his article. The article went on to state that President Wilson made the trip to Europe and that he advocated the League of Nations, not because of his belief in it, not because of his efforts to bring about a better world through a world organization of peace, but directly in order that he might satisfy a vainglorious pride and ambition on his own part.

Now we have gotten far enough away from those events and those unhappy days to recognize the fact, however much anyone might disagree or might have disagreed with President Wilson as to the wisdom of his course, that it is a violent slander upon his good name at this time, 25 years afterward, to be digging up articles written in the heat of a campaign, which reflect upon his personal honor and his integrity as President of the United States. That is the part of the article to which I objected and which I resented, and still resent, on the part of the writer.

I do not see any good purpose to be served at this time, when we are in the midst of another great crisis, by attempting to drag out again the bitter controversies which raged at that time, and, especially, to bring in an article of the type that reflects upon the honor, and the integrity, and the good name, and the character of a man whom the people of this country chose as President of the United States in two elections, and who bore a burden at that time greater than anyone since Lincoln, and of a wider nature, because it involved more world-wide questions. I regarded it then as unfortunate, and I regard it now as unfortunate that the Senator from North Dakota saw fit to dig up—or somebody dug it up for him, I presume, and it does not make any difference who dug it up—and put that thing into the RECORD, as a reflection upon the honor, the good faith, the integrity, of a man who as President of the United States was revered by millions of our people, and whose memory now is revered by millions of our people, of whom I am proud to be one. I appreciate what the Senator has said in the statement he has just made, but I still think it was very unfortunate to go back 25 years and revive unhappy memories which involve the personal character, honor, integrity, and good faith of one of the great men of this country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to proceed for just one moment, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. LODGE. I have the floor, and should like to discuss the pending bill. However, if the Senator will be brief——

Mr. NYE. I have just one remark to make.

Mr. LODGE. I did not realize I was yielding for a debate. I thought the Senator was going to request unanimous consent to have some matter printed in the RECORD. If the Senator will assure me that he will not launch upon a long flight of oratory, I shall yield.

Mr. NYE. I can assure the Senator I will be very brief.

Mr. President, I can fully appreciate the attitude of mind which the Senator from Kentucky has recorded in his remarks, and I am sure that others share the view he entertains with respect to the item. On the other hand, there are others who feel that the reprint of the article was of extreme value at this particular time. With the statement I have

made, I am leaving it a matter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the remarks made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will also be printed in the RECORD at the point indicated by the Senator from North Dakota.

Driftwood—A Column About Noteworthy People Published by a Noted South Dakota Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, out in South Dakota we have a newspaper columnist whose talented writing and able observations are believed by many to equal or excel those which are encompassed in the syndicated columns published by the metropolitan press. This columnist is Marie Christopherson, the brilliant wife of the editor of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus Leader, Fred C. Christopherson, whose editorials have frequently been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a recent column by Marie Christopherson which reports her observations with regard to some Americans who are prominent in the current news:

DRIFTWOOD

(By Marie Christopherson)

AS MRS. ROOSEVELT VIEWS THE ELECTIONS

Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the President of the United States, was in Philadelphia when Acting Mayor Bernard Samuel, Republican, was elected to a regular term in that office over William C. Bullitt, who was supported by the President.

"Evidently," said Mrs. Roosevelt, "the voters of Philadelphia believe in following a tradition."

I do not know where Mrs. Roosevelt was on the following day when late election returns gave the Kentucky governorship to Simeon S. Willis, Republican, rather than to J. Lyter Donaldson, Democratic nominee, but wherever she may have been I am sure Mrs. Roosevelt must have said:

"Evidently, the voters of Kentucky do not believe in following a tradition."

OUR TRADITION, PERHAPS

South Dakota is the only State in the Union that Mrs. Roosevelt has not visited. We couldn't present her with a grass skirt and we haven't any beaches suitable for dancing, but we could give her a pair of moccasins and let her climb Harney Peak.

We haven't any big cities like London but our State is 425 miles wide and for exercise she could walk out to Rapid City. Of all the States in the Union, South Dakota, with its vast open spaces and easy informality, should offer the greatest inducements for the indefatigable Eleanor.

But why has she never come here? Might it, by any chance, be our Republican tradition?

TIME IS GROWING SHORT

The time is growing short. The New Deal streamliner is making its last run because it isn't streamlined anymore. If Mrs. Roosevelt is to visit us as First Lady, as we would prefer, it will have to be within the next year, because a year from now South Dakota will have voted the largest Republican majorities in history and the Nation will have chosen another First Lady to preside (and reside, if she cares to) in the White House.

THE BIG WHITE FLAKES

Well. Well. Well. If it isn't snowing. I didn't want to talk about Eleanor, anyway.

"The horse knows the way
To carry the sleigh * * *"

What's the rest of it? Oh, yes—

"Through the white and drifted snow."

Those first big sloshy white flakes. Don't they make you feel like singing?

What shall we sing? How about—

"Jingle bells, jingle bells,
Jingle all the way.
Oh, what fun it is to ride
In a one-horse open sleigh."

I don't know how the first snow affects you, but it makes me feel about 10 years old, as you have no doubt guessed.

Awfully nice while it lasted. Exactly like Thanksgiving. But it didn't last long. Sun's coming out and the big flakes are melting. Now what was I saying about Eleanor? Oh, yes—

RIGHT OR WRONG, SHE SPEAKS

The other day Mrs. Roosevelt criticized the freight-rate structure of the country. That happens to be a subject with which many men but few women are familiar. She was puzzled as to why she should pay more freight on a single shipment of grapefruit from Texas than she paid for the grapefruit, and was immediately told by those who have studied the intricacies of rate making that the method of determining the charge was fair.

It was suggested that Mrs. Roosevelt should have consulted Mr. Eastman, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who could have explained to her the fundamentals of rate making. She might have learned that seeming discrepancies in freight rates are more often than not justified by more equitable charges to shippers in general, with consequent benefits to the public, and that critical pronouncements on the subject deserve previous investigation.

But Mrs. Roosevelt spoke out. Mrs. Roosevelt is never afraid to speak out. Right or wrong, she speaks her mind.

Initiative and self-assurance are what women need. Mrs. Roosevelt's example would be stimulating were it not for the fact that she is too frequently wrong.

HER INFLUENCE

There is no way to measure the effect of Mrs. Roosevelt's activities upon the cause of women in public affairs. It would be an interesting survey to make, if possible.

Advance models in any line of merchandise, you will find, are usually extreme. Women are comparative newcomers in the field of politics and government. Could it be that Mrs. Roosevelt is an advance model First Lady?

If so, there is one consoling thought. Advance models are invariably modified by the manufacturers as time goes by.

Mrs. Roosevelt's influence is probably negative. But five women who are making a constructive contribution to the prestige of women in public affairs are the five Congresswomen: FRANCIS P. BOLTON of Ohio, CLARE BOOTHE LUCE of Connecticut, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, MARGARET C. SMITH of Maine, and JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois.

CRUISE WITH WILLKIE? YES, BUT—

Women have been accused of emotionalism in voting—an accusation no truer of them than it is of men—as this illustration will serve to indicate.

During the Willkie hearings in Washington, a sweet young thing turned to her older woman companion and said: "Oh, isn't Willkie just too wonderful? Wouldn't you love to go on a cruise with him?"

"Yes, my dear," said her more cynical companion, "but not on the Ship of State."

New Balkan Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Balkan Danger," written by William Philip Simms, and published in the Washington Times of November 9, 1943. I hope Members of Congress will have an opportunity to read the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BALKAN DANGER

(By William Philip Simms)

Reports here indicate that Russia may soon withdraw her objections to some European federations, notably one including certain Danubian countries and perhaps a second embracing the Balkans.

Diplomatists remark that the present trend is toward breaking up Germany into several autonomous parts. Yugoslavia also may split into pieces. The danger, therefore, is that Europe may become more Balkanized than ever. A whole drove of little states—like tiny chicks around a hen—would be forced to look either to a new League of Nations or to one of their more powerful neighbors for subsistence. No such arrangement could long endure.

At Moscow the great powers pledged themselves to an independent Austria. But unless they do more, and permit Austria, Hungary and other nearby states to enter into some sort of entente or federation, the pledge will prove meaningless. History will simply repeat itself.

In Vienna, back in the middle twenties, I interviewed Dr. Michael Hainisch, the President of Austria. He led me to a wall map of Europe.

"See that!" he exclaimed indignantly, tapping Austria with his forefinger. "That is not a country. It is a fish—a fish out of water. And a fish out of water can't live." And history proved him tragically right.

Up to 1918, Austria had been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire with 261,000 square miles of territory and 51,000,000 population. Also included were Transylvania, Czechoslovakia, Polish Galicia, the Trentino, Croatia, Bosnia, Slovenia, Herzegovina and the Banat.

At the Paris peace table, Austria was trimmed down to 32,000 square miles and 6,500,000 people, half of whom lived in town. From Vienna as a hub, her railway system ran spoke-like out into the country a few miles and there disappeared across a frontier—perhaps in the middle of a beet-field. She was an economic impossibility and soon the League of Nations was forced to take her over, in a sort of receivership. She was, indeed, a fish out of water.

Hungary was not much better off. Nor were the other little countries around about. All were dependent upon their more powerful neighbors and eventually Germany swallowed them. Forced to buy from, and sell to Hitler or perish, it was not surprising that they became Nazi vassals.

Today the Allies are beginning to plan a new Europe. The job was well begun at Moscow. To continue it, they set up a joint consultative commission to sit in London. Already they have declared for a free Austria. But unless they do a better job by her this time than they did the last, her freedom will turn out to be a delusion and a sham.

As a member of some sort of Danubian federation, Austria this time would have a chance. Economically, though not politically, it would restore some of the conditions enjoyed before the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Similarly, a Balkan entente would add to the stability of that area. It is more than doubtful if the Yugoslav Kingdom can continue as it was before the war because of the bitterness which events have intensified between the Croats, Slovenes, and the Serbs. They might live side by side with less friction if each has its autonomy within a Balkan union.

Up to the present, however, Russia has opposed such federations. The Moscow Pacts, however, may result in her changing her mind. With each Danubian and Balkan state independent and under a democratic regime of its own choosing, the peace of Europe and of Russia would be more secure—provided the economy of these small states was made viable through a federation or federations.

Emergency Relief for Dependents of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in many cases my attention has been called to extreme hardship and destitute cases involving dependents of men and women in our armed forces. In some cases even the men and women in our armed forces have found themselves in destitute circumstances. In several score such cases, these cases have been so acutely critical that I personally volunteered to offer financial assistance.

My experience with such cases has led me to believe that many dependents and members of our armed forces are not acquainted with the fact that we have two agencies set up which are doing a marvelous job in offering emergency financial aid in these destitute circumstances. These two agencies are available all over America, and it would do well for all people to become acquainted with their services so that they might advise destitute dependents and members of our armed forces just where and how they can get the needed financial assistance.

ARMY EMERGENCY RELIEF

One agency is the Army Emergency Relief Fund. Any member of our armed forces in the Army can appeal to this organization for needed immediate financial assistance and such an applicant will receive most courteous and willing financial assistance at all times. This Army Emergency Relief Fund is also open to the dependents of men and women in the Army. The dependents, too, will receive needed financial help in a most courteous and willing manner. Should anyone know of any destitute dependent at home or any destitute member of our Army, advise them to appeal at once to the Army Emergency Relief Fund. In northern Wisconsin for immediate action contact at once, Officer in Charge, Army Emergency Relief, 1360 Civic Opera Building, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill., or contact Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Another agency is the Navy Relief Society. Any dependent of a man or woman in our naval forces can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. Any members of our naval forces who find themselves in destitute circumstances can appeal to the Navy Relief Society and their needs will be taken care of. Should anyone know of any dependent of our naval forces in dire circumstances advise them to take it up with the Navy Relief Society. Should anyone know of any member of our naval forces needing urgent financial assistance, advise him or her to contact the Navy Relief Fund. To get immediate action from the Navy Relief Society, it is best to take it up through the head of your local Red Cross. The local Red Cross will best handle the request for aid if the dependents concerned are connected with our naval forces.

NO NEED FOR MISERY

These two agencies were set up to take care of urgent critical cases in need of immediate financial assistance. Should anyone know of any such critical case in their neighborhood you would perform a real deed by calling on that person and advising her or him that this service is available. This service is available only to persons actually in our forces. It is not available to persons who have been discharged. Likewise this service is available only to dependents of men and women actually in our armed forces. It is not available to dependents of a discharged soldier or sailor. If urgent need actually exists it should not take more than a couple of hours to get financial help for anyone destitute. The Army and Navy emergency relief funds reach out into every community in the country. There is no reason why any dependent or sailor or soldier should be destitute. Contact the Army Emergency Relief Fund at: Officer in Charge, Army Emergency Relief, 1360 Civic Opera Building, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago 6, Ill., or contact Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., if connected with the Army, or the local Red Cross if connected with the Navy if you know of any urgent deserving case of a dependent or member of our armed forces. Should any question arise concerning this emergency help write Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Facts About Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, taking into consideration the tremendous amount of food our armed forces and our allies require, the cost of food does not by any means present a bad picture. True, there has been an increase in the cost of living, but to me it appears control through rationing and price fixing has saved the housewife billions in dollars.

The most outstanding benefit of rationing is that everyone, rich and poor, is treated alike.

Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, delivered a most interesting address over the Blue Network November 9 and, under the permission granted me, I include that speech as part of my remarks. It follows:

Good evening, everybody. Last week I told you something about the folks who work in the O. P. A. I explained to you our responsibilities and the kind of organization which we have set up to handle them.

I stressed the fact that it was necessarily a large organization and that from time to time, in spite of our best efforts, we are bound to make some mistakes and do some things which look a little foolish, and I pledged the wholehearted effort of our entire organization to see that those mistakes are reduced to the minimum and that our American farmers, businessmen, and workers, through the O. P. A., are given courteous and sensible treatment in the handling of wartime rationing and price controls.

Tonight I am going to tell you in some detail exactly what we are doing and what we have done to control your cost of living. I am going to talk to you in terms that are clear and simple. One by one we shall examine the prices you pay for meat, oranges, butter, chicken soup, canned asparagus, and cornflakes, the prices you pay for your house dresses and for Johnny's school suits, the prices you pay for rent and for that new dining-room set, and for those new curtains you may be needing in the parlor.

Believe me, there's been a lot of confusion on this whole subject of the cost of living. There have been some misguided and wild statements. I am hoping that I can get some important questions straightened out for you tonight.

Now, before we get down to cases, let's see what's happened to the cost of living as a whole. Let's take a brief look at the averages. To what extent have prices gone up? Has the O. P. A. done a fair job or a poor job in holding household prices and rentals in line?

The O. P. A. price program went into effect in May 1942—5 months after Pearl Harbor—and for the first year our performance was no

better than fair. Since last May, however, I believe our record has been good, and in saying that I'm not blowing my own horn because I've only been working here in Washington since August.

Here are the actual figures. From 1 year ago last May until the present, the cost of living has gone up an average of not quite 7 percent. The over-all cost of living today, moreover, is right where it was in April, 7 months ago. That, of course, includes the cost of rent, the cost of clothing, and food.

Now, right away I know you're thinking of certain products which have risen very sharply in price. For instance, last September before we lowered the price, I heard of apples selling for 10 cents each. My wife was asked to pay $2.50 last July for a watermelon. I've seen lettuce at 28 cents a head, and right now there are places where oranges sell for a dollar a dozen. Naturally, price rises like those make us forget the fact that dozens and hundreds of products have sold at the same prices for month on end. And, of course, it's all the things we buy, including rents and clothing and furniture, as well as food that's averaged into that 7 percent increase in living costs during the past 18 months.

Now exactly where do these living-cost figures come from? They're a part of a service which the United States Department of Labor has been handling for the past 40 years.

Every month workers from the Bureau of Labor Statistics call on about 2,000 retailers in 56 cities in all parts of the country. In the course of these calls, they check carefully into the price you are asked to pay for most of the products that you buy. These prices are then averaged and compared with the corresponding figures of the past month.

Now the United States Department of Labor is, of course, a completely independent organization. Statisticians and research authorities who have studied their methods tell us that they are extremely reliable. Naturally we watch the Bureau's report closely each month so we will know when we are successful and when we are unsuccessful in our efforts to keep your cost of living in line.

However, let's stop talking about theories and percentages and get down to the hard everyday facts that all of us can understand in terms of our local grocer, our landlord, and the department store down the street.

More than half of our American families live in rented dwellings and let's assume that's the case with you. In the last war, rents throughout the country went up on an average of more than 50 percent. By the time the war was over, some people found themselves paying two or three times as much to their landlords as when the war began. But in World War No. 2, the story has been vastly different. For the last 16 months, according to the Department of Labor, the O. P. A. has held the average cost of rentals exactly even throughout the country.

Now let's remember that's an average. Some rentals may have gone up somewhat but just as many others have gone down. So that's one vitally important part of your living costs on which there has been no increase.

Now let's take your clothing. Now women's clothes have shown some increases. But taking all shoes and clothing together—that's underwear, outerwear, children and men's wear—the over-all increase in the last 18 months is 5¼ percent.

Now that doesn't sound like much of an increase. But frankly our record here is not quite as good as it sounds, for the simple reason that in some lines quality has deteriorated. In other words the garment that you get today may not be quite as good as the garment you bought a year and a half ago. Of course, that's only true on a limited number of items. But I'm sorry that it's true at all. A drop in quality is the same as a rise in price, and it's up to us to protect you from lower quality just as much as we possibly can.

Now there's been another problem on clothing, and that's the fact that low price wool dresses selling under $4, and cotton and rayon dresses in the 98 cents and $1.98 range, have been getting harder and harder to find and you women folks know that only too well. For that reason you may have had to buy a higher priced dress than you expected to, when you couldn't find what you wanted at the price you wanted to pay. We're working hard to ease this problem now and if our present plans go through, I believe you will find more low-priced clothing in the markets before spring.

Now let's take furniture and household equipment. The prices here have risen on the average of 3⅓ percent since May 1942, which I think you'll agree isn't much. Of course, one of the greatest difficulties on household equipment is trying to find what you want. But with the war on, it would hardly be fair to blame the O. P. A. for that.

Now the last and the most important item on your budget is food. So let's go into food costs in some detail. The prices of some foods are up and the prices of others are down. We are told, however, by the Department of Labor that the average food prices in September, the latest month for which figures are available, were exactly the same as they were in March, 6 months earlier. I am talking, of course, about prices in legitimate retail stores, which means legal ceiling prices in almost every case. I am not talking about the prices that the black market exacts.

But again let's forget all the statistics. Let's take three typical meals—breakfast, dinner, and supper. Let's see what a housewife in a medium-sized town, planning for a typical American family, would have to pay for those three meals in March and what she'd have to pay today.

Let's start breakfast with orange juice. Now, right away, you'll find the price of oranges has increased. Today they are 10 and 20 cents above last March prices. I am hopeful, however, that the prices of oranges will be brought more nearly in line within the next month. If we had picked tomato juice or canned grapefruit juice for breakfast, we would have found that the price in 7 months was unchanged.

Now, let's have some cereal. Oatmeal? Today's price is the same as last spring. Also corn flakes, bran flakes, and every other cereal I can think of.

How about some bacon and eggs? The bacon you'll find is down 2 cents a pound. But the eggs are up about 12 cents a dozen. The reason for the higher price of eggs is seasonal. Present egg prices will go down steadily for the next few months.

If you want some toast, you'll find the price of bread still the same. Butter for the toast is 5 cents cheaper per pound.

Coffee is selling at the same price and so are sugar and milk. Sugar, by the way, now selling for 7 cents a pound, sold for 32 cents during the last World War.

Now, let's figure out a good dinner. Pork chops will be 6 cents a pound cheaper than last March, and you'll find a round steak selling for about 4 cents per pound less than 6 months ago.

Potatoes, now under O. P. A. price control, are selling for about 60 cents a peck compared to 70 cents in March and 90 to 95 cents in May. We can't honestly take credit for all that drop as some of it, of course, is seasonal.

Green beans, you'll find selling about 10 cents per pound cheaper. Carrots and lettuce are down very slightly and salad dressing or mayonnaise is the same.

If you'd like some canned peaches for dessert, you'll find the price hasn't changed. A No. 2½ can, for instance, is about 27 cents. If the children want some cookies with the peaches, you'll find no increase in price.

Now let's get on to supper. I'm getting hungry just talking about all this food.

How about some soup? The prices are all about the same as last March. Vegetable soup? Okay; 13 cents for a 10½-ounce can. Crackers to go with it? They're up very slightly—about 1 cent a pound box, on the average.

Hamburger you will now find selling for 5 cents per pound less than last March. And if you'd like some cabbage, that's way down in cost—5 cents per pound against 9 cents last spring. Part of that drop is seasonal.

If the children want some peanut butter to go with their bread, you'll find this price the same.

How about an apple pie for dessert? The flour is up very slightly—1 or 2 cents more for a 10-pound bag. Shortening is the same. Sugar is the same. Apples are quite a bit cheaper.

Now, remember, these prices are the prices charged by the average store operating legitimately under O. P. A. legal ceiling prices. They are taken from actual grocery-store records here in Washington last March and during recent weeks.

Prices on some products, even under O. P. A. ceilings, will naturally vary somewhat in different parts of the country. But the comparisons I have given you will, in all likelihood, hold true wherever you may be living.

That means that average food prices in all parts of the country are just about the same today as they were in March and April. A few food products, such as oranges and eggs, have risen in price, but their increases are balanced by lower ceiling prices on meat, fish, and butter.

As far as the prices of fruits and vegetables are concerned, I believe you are going to see definitely lower prices for this winter than you did a year ago. Lima and snap beans should cost you 20 percent less. Potatoes will be down 10 cents a peck. Onions down 2 percent. Apples, which cost you 15 cents a pound last winter, cost you 10½ cents now.

Now, as you can see, the O. P. A. has done a pretty good job of protecting you and your neighbors against higher rentals, higher clothing costs, and booming prices in food.

Surely, we've made some mistakes. Our job is so vast and our organization so far-reaching that in spite of our best efforts we'll probably make some more. I can assure you, however, that we'll work long hours to eliminate those mistakes and to give you and your family the protection to which you are entitled.

Now very likely you're asking what's likely to happen from now on as far as the cost of living is concerned. According to the Department of Labor, and as you can see for yourself, as we planned those three meals, we've held living costs even for the past 7 months. But can we continue to hold them in the future?

That opens a very big subject and it plumps us right into the middle of this subsidy argument that you may have read about in the newspapers.

Frankly, the situation as I see it is like this: If Congress allows us to continue our program by giving us the limited subsidy money which we are seeking, and if there is no broad increase in labor costs, I believe we can continue to hold your living costs as we've held them since last spring. But if Congress decides to scrap the program and eliminate the use of subsidies at the end of this year, retail prices are going up and they're going to start up on January 1, in spite of our best efforts to stop them.

I wish I had time to discuss this whole difficult situation now but I think I had better leave it until next week. If you will listen in then, I will try to explain exactly what will happen if Congress eliminates the

use of subsidies in controlling the cost of living.

However, let me make one point clear: Congress is our boss. Congress is our board of directors. Congress sets our policies. And whatever policy Congress decides is right and best is the policy which we shall follow.

So I'll be with you again next week at this time. Until then, good night to you all.

Our Post-War Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in browsing through the columns of the Washington Star, I found two letters written to the Star and published in the issue of November 10. One letter, signed by C. S. Longacre, is entitled "Supergovernment Held Not Solution of War." In particular view of the fact that I was one of the five Members of the Senate who voted and spoke against the Connally resolution, I should like to have that letter, together with another letter under the heading, "Story of Babel Recalled," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERGOVERNMENT HELD NOT SOLUTION OF WAR

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Is it possible to have a superworld government function on the same harmonious basis as does the Federal Government of the United States in its relation to the individual sovereign States composing the American Union?

There are some American statesmen and a large class of clergymen who seem to think that after the Axis Powers are defeated it should be possible to establish a permanent reign of peace upon this earth provided a superworld government is created and modeled after the pattern of the American Union.

They cite how the Federal Government has functioned successfully now for 150 years and still is functioning very effectively among 48 sovereign States, and they do not see why it is impossible to have a world government function on a similar basis. They forget that the Federal Union once was threatened with disruption by dissatisfied States and that most bloody internecine war was the only thing that saved the Union. The creation of the Union did not insure permanent peace even in the United States.

But a superworld government, after this war, would have to face far greater and more perplexing problems than the United States ever faced among its sovereign States. Instead of being a peace promoter, it would be a trouble provoker. The sovereign nations, with the exception of the English-speaking peoples, would speak different languages; they possess divergent state religions, divergent national sovereignties and divergent national ideals concerning economies and social relations, all of which have political and ecclesiastical dynamite in them.

The fact that such a superworld government would be supported by a large military organization to enforce its decrees against recalcitrant nations, is no insurance in favor of permanent peace, but would serve only as a determent or postponement of a world catastrophe. Peace based on force is never permanent. Permanent peace must be based on permanent principles and a transformation of human nature. Such a peace can come only through the Prince of Peace.

C. S. LONGACRE.

STORY OF BABEL RECALLED

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Referring to a letter in the Star signed Consulting Engineer, the writer often in recent years has wondered if the tale of the Towel of Babel was not a prognostication of what we now are witnessing, specifically among our own people and undoubtedly in other countries also.

Perhaps, in view of the inherent courage of man being forced into the open, this war may bring about vast changes, but only so if the masses of people will practice real Christianity and not merely profess to be Christians. It is by this, rather than by alliances, treaties, directives, etc., that this world may experience peace and security.

We must call a halt to the present totalitarian trends and realize that the Creator never intended that man should be nothing but a commodity traded in by the power holders. By losing sight of that fact we have been losing our rights as individuals; we unwittingly have contributed to the present state of world affairs and, in civic affairs, at least, are groping in a dense fog which, if we do not heed the warning, will result just as the attempt to build the Tower of Babel resulted.

C. J. S.

A Message for Wives and Infants of Men in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, free maternity care for wives of men in military service and free medical and nursing care for their babies is now provided through the Wisconsin State Board of Health as a result of money given to this State by Congress. This Congress appropriated $5,600,000 for that purpose last spring. This Congress also appropriated $18,600,000 for this purpose October 1, 1943.

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

IMPORTANT TO FOLLOW RULES

Wives of servicemen should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the rules set down for this free medical attention. The rules set down in Wisconsin are clearly stated and must be met in order to receive this care and service. The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis., and ask them to rush a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once, and rush it to Madison, Wis., for approval.

APPLY EARLY

It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy. The State board of health will not approve payment of the doctor, hospital, or any service before the application is made out. It is important that the application be made by the wife at the first sign of pregnancy. In case of an emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after the service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. It is most important, therefore, to get the application filled out and sent in at the earliest possible time. See your doctor at the first sign of pregnancy and apply for this free service.

Wives can see their regular family doctor for this. It is not necessary to go to a special or certain doctor to get this aid. It is most important that wives of servicemen remember that no payment for any such service will be made prior to the filing of an application. In other words, no application—no aid. Should you know of any wife of any serviceman who needs this aid be sure to warn her that she should see her doctor at once and make application for this free medical and hospital and infant care financial aid. It is tragic to be refused this aid simply because no application was made beforehand—which the rules require.

CHARGES PAID THROUGH STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

The charges for this medical, hospital, and surgical attention are paid through the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Wisconsin State Board of Health, Madison, Wis. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse. No money is given to the wife. No serviceman's wife need worry about proper medical, infant care, or hospital care in the event of a birth if she acquaints herself with this free service and makes proper application before the event rather than after. Pregnant wives can get prenatal care as well. No wife of a man in service, therefore, should fear seeing a doctor at once because of running up a bill. The sooner she sees her doctor the more free medical service she will get.

WHAT SERVICE WIVES CAN EXPECT

Complete medical service, for maternity patients during the prenatal period, childbirth, and 6 weeks thereafter—including care of complications, operations, postpartum examination—and to the newborn infant.

Health supervision for infants, usually provided in childbirth conferences.

Nursing care, in the home, through the local health department including bedside nursing care as necessary—for the

mother, before, during, and after childbirth and for the baby during the first year of life.

Hospital care, in wards or at ward rates, for maternity patients and infants. The funds cannot be used in part payment for more expensive hospital accommodations. A minimum stay in the hospital of 10 days after childbirth is arranged if possible. Hospital care may be authorized in any hospital, including Army and Navy hospitals, where the maternity and pediatric services have been approved by the State health agency.

CONGRESS SET UP THIS SERVICE

The money for this service is available by acts of Congress passed this year, 1943. Your present Congress has appropriated a total of $24,200,000 for this service. I would like to see servicemen's wives learn about this help and make use of it. Should any question arise regarding any phase of this aid, or should any doctor or hospital refuse wives of servicemen this aid—it will do you well to write your Congressman about it. Address your letter: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Commendation of Disabled American Veterans' Policies and Hon. Thomas E. Martin of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette, entitled "Military Service Intensifies Patriotism":

FACTS AND OPINION—MILITARY SERVICE INTENSIFIES PATRIOTISM

(By George Stimpson)

The question is often raised as to what the men in the armed forces will think of domestic affairs after the fighting is over and they reassume their places in civilian life.

Will their viewpoint and attitude be materially different from that of other men of comparable economic condition and previous political inclination? Does service in the Army and Navy in wartime develop in men any peculiar or characteristic notions of foreign and domestic policy? Will the ten or more million men who will have served in the Army and Navy throw their influence more or less as a body behind definite and specific men and measures? Or will the former servicemen split up into Republicans and Democrats, new dealers and anti-new dealers, conservatives and liberals, or what not, just as they did before they donned their uniforms?

Those are questions that many post-war planners and present and prospective politicians would like to see answered.

"I know of no way of judging the future but by the past," said Patrick Henry.

What happened after the First World War may throw some light on what will happen after the second. The comparison may be a little feeble because the First World War was of short duration so far as active participation of the United States was concerned and many of those who wore uniforms did not become thoroughly inoculated as soldiers and sailors.

But there is one group of which that is certainly not true. That group is the membership of the Disabled American Veterans, which is the only organization chartered by Congress, and composed exclusively of Americans who have been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving actively in the armed forces of the United States or of those of a country allied with the United States during time of war.

NOTHING RADICAL HERE

Congressman THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa City, a life member of the Disabled American Veterans by reason of his having been a regular First World War Army officer and retired because of disability, recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outline of the policies and objectives of this organization.

As we would expect, the Disabled American Veterans devote much of their attention to problems relating to the care and welfare of former servicemen and their dependents. As we would also expect, they generously demand similar care of future ex-servicemen and their dependents. Those are policies inherent in the organization.

When we examine their general policies we certainly find nothing radical or alarming. Here are some of the things the Disabled Veterans stand for:

Preserve America's freedoms; protect America; expand our specialized armed forces; produce needed war materials quickly; mobilize America's manpower quickly; perpetuate Americanism; protect Americanism by promoting Americanism; promote active workable representative democracy; protect democratic institutions against subversive forces; have all persons fingerprinted, registered, and identified; issue certificates to all citizens; equalize the burdens and profits of war; eliminate excess profits from all-out war for freedom; control purchasing power of money; impose taxes according to ability to pay; and regulate men, money, material, and machines toward war victory.

A STEADYING INFLUENCE

It seems that the men who suffered most physically in the service of the country during the First World War did not return with any wild-eyed or long-haired ideas of political reform or economic revolution. They seem to have been very careful not to act as a group in political matters.

On the contrary, they appear to have leaned over backwards not to become entangled as a group in purely political movements. Their military service intensified their patriotism and loyalty to our scheme of government, but it did not inspire them to act as a group to obtain and to retain control of either the domestic or foreign policies of the country. They have acted as a steadying influence as a group, but individually they have voted for men and supported measures upon their merits.

Personally, I see no reason to suppose that the 10,000,000 men now in uniform won't react in somewhat the same way. Military service gives men a wider experience and broadens their knowledge of their country and the world, and it makes them more conscious of their country in the general scheme of things; but military service and discipline do not seem to change the individual's attitude generally on politics, religion or personal freedom.

When the boys come back they will still be Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, northerners and southerners, easterners and westerners, and they will probably differ as widely in political opinions as they did when they entered the service of their country. There will be changes no doubt, but these changes will not be greatly different from those undergone by persons of the same age who remained in civilian life.

Poll Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very commendable statement by Judge Charles Warren, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, on the subject of poll taxes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WARREN

Mr. WARREN. Charles Warren. My business address is 710 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in any way you choose, Judge Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of this committee, in order that you may not think that my argument on the constitutionality of this bill is colored by my personal views in favor of a poll tax, I desire to say that I consider that the requirement of a poll tax to make a man eligible to vote is, in fact, unjust and unreasonable and should be abolished by the sovereignty which created it and not by any other sovereignty—that is, by the State and not by Congress.

I was very much interested to read the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate covering hearings in 1941 and 1942. I had a personal interest in various references contained in that volume because a number of the witnesses who appeared in favor of the bill cited the case of Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, who succeeded in obtaining the abolition of the Massachusetts State poll tax as a requirement for voting after a very vigorous campaign back in 1901.

I said I had a personal interest in that statement because I have a very vivid personal memory of it and personal contact with it. As a very young man, I was appointed private secretary to the Governor of Massachusetts by Gov. William E. Russell. He was the first Democratic Governor we had had in Massachusetts, for about 25 years and before my appointment I had, in the previous years, taken some part in Governor Russell's campaign for the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting. His campaign in that respect was successful and the Legislature of Massachusetts abolished it. At that time certainly there was no intimation that the United States Congress had power to abolish it or that any request would be made to Congress to perform an act which at that time was supposed to be a futile act as not within the power of the Congress.

I make that preliminary statement so as to clear the minds of the members of the committee that my argument on the constitutionality has anything to do with my

views as to the merits or nonmerits of a poll tax.

Before I go into any questions of detail, I should like to clear away a few of what I might call the debris which has rather clogged and interfered with the real questions at issue which I find in previous hearings. There has been a great deal of talk and argument, so far as I can make out, from the witnesses about the question whether the right to vote for Congress is or is not a Federal right secured by the Constitution. Well, I didn't suppose there was the slightest doubt that it was a right secured by the Constitution. The proponents of this bill have devoted much time to what they call the Classic case 2 years ago to support that proposition. Why, the Supreme Court has held that for 40, 50 years, that the right to vote for Congressmen was a Federal right secured by the Constitution, but the question here is, The right of whom to vote for Congressman? That is the issue here, not whether the right exists; of course, it exists. The Constitution created the office of Congressman, a Member of the House. It prescribed when they should be elected. It prescribed who should elect them. So it must be a Federal right secured by the Constitution, but the question is not whether it is a Federal right but to whom is the right given?

There is another phrase which has been very loosely used all through the hearings in 1941 and 1942. I find in briefs and all through the hearings reference to Federal suffrage and to the rights of national citizenship. I was surprised to find a brief, signed by the dean of the Law School of Nebraska, I think, and concurred in by a group of law professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they referred constantly to the "rights of the citizens to vote." Then, in their brief, they speak later of the "right of Congress to prohibit the States from unduly restricting the rights of national citizenship." Later on they speak of the imposition by the State of proper qualifications for voting "which do not abridge the rights of national citizenship" and they refer later to "protecting the rights of national citizenship." (See testimony in 1941 and 1942, pp. 35–52.)

Now, that, of course, is an entire misapprehension. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. There were many citizens of the United States who could not vote in the past and who cannot vote today. A woman was a citizen of the United States. She possessed national citizenship—but she could not vote until 1920; and this idea that national citizenship confers a right to vote for Congress is, of course, entirely erroneous. The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess the qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is the portion of United States citizens—that is the class of United States citizens—who can vote; but there is no right to vote vested in citizens of the United States in general; so that the issue is clogged and beclouded by using such expressions here as are used in this brief of these law professors.

With those preliminary, very fundamental remarks about this right to vote for Members of Congress, I now want to take up a phase which is equally fundamental. I am not going to go into the details of the Federal Convention of 1787, what they said and what they did not say. I am not going to go into the details of discussions of recent cases in the Supreme Court. Those have been discussed at great length and, I feel, at unnecessary length in the testimony of some of the previous witnesses.

But I am going to take up now the question in detail of what this section 2 of article I of the Constitution does and does not do. First, at the risk of going perhaps further than is necessary with gentlemen of your distinction and legal knowledge, I am going to impress upon you once again, what article X of the Bill of Rights provides, the tenth amendment. We must not lose sight of that for an instant, in trying to ascertain what the section of the Constitution now involved really means. Article X says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Now, what does this article X actually do? What is its function and what is its content?

In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787, there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

It was the last group who prevailed, and after 2 days of active debate, they left the Constitution in this respect as it now stands in (and I must trespass upon your patience by even reading again) this much-read section—section 2 of article I:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no relinquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new government and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year. That was a command. It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in the recent cases in the Supreme Court.

The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entitled to vote for Members of Congress. That was not a delegation of power by the State because the State never had the power to vote, the State inhabitants never had that power to vote for Members of Congress because there were no such things. That was a direct provision in the establishment of the new government and it did vest a right, but it vested a right in only certain people to vote for Members of Congress.

Now, the third thing that that section 2 contains is this: It contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress and different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite to render an inhabitant of their own State eligible to vote.

Let me repeat that. There is undoubtedly an implied prohibition that the States cannot establish qualifications for the electors of members of their own legislature which shall be different from those which they establish for electors of Members of Congress. That is neither a delegation nor a grant of power; that is an implied restriction, undoubtedly.

Now, is there in that section 2 any grant of power whatever? Not specifically, of course. I suppose there is, under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I, an implied power to Congress to do certain things, but what is the extent of those implied powers? It is to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper "for carrying into execution" the above provisions of article I, section 2.

What are the provisions? I go back again. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualification requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power; and thinks Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature.

Those are the only three things that can be done under article I, section 2, and those are the only three things on which Congress can act under the necessary and proper clause, and "carry into execution" under that clause.

Senator CONNALLY. Would it interrupt you if I asked you a question right there?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator CONNALLY. Is it your view or contention that in article I, section 2, where it says they shall elect Congressmen and the electors shall possess the same qualifications as the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, is that a constitutional fixation by the Federal Government of the absolute requirements to participate in the congressional election?

Mr. WARREN. I will say so. For those who are qualified.

Senator CONNALLY. That is what I mean. In other words, is it or not a fixation by the Federal Government of the qualifications of a man who wants to vote for Congressman and does it not become a Federal requirement that he must possess these qualifications before he can vote?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir; it is a Federal right.

Senator HATCH. The point he just brought out was what I was going to ask: Whether he meant the Constitution in this section does actually prescribe and fix the qualifications of voters.

Mr. WARREN. I haven't any doubt it does.

Senator HATCH. And that qualification is, of course, the same qualification that applies to the State legislature?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Following up that point, if that be true and the Constitution has actually fixed the qualifications, then any law that would either add to or take from the qualifications of the Constitution would violate that section of the Constitution?

Mr. WARREN. Not necessarily the qualifications as they existed in 1787.

Senator HATCH. The qualifications fixed by the Constitution, you say, are the same qualifications that the State fixes for its own representatives?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Now, if the State has a law, a poll-tax law, we will say, as a requirement for voting for State representatives and Congress would attempt to abrogate that,

would it not, in effect, change that section of article I?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think so. I think that section refers to any qualifications that the States might fix for their own members of the legislature. No one would claim——

Senator HATCH. I don't believe you get my point.

Mr. WARREN (continuing). No one would claim, of course, that the qualifications were fixed as of the date 1787.

Senator CONNALLY. He did not mean that. I think you misunderstood him, if I may interpret it. If the Federal Government lays down the qualifications which require the same qualifications to vote for the State legislature, then any Federal legislation that would modify that would be in violation of that clause of the Constitution?

Senator HATCH. Yes.

Senator CONNALLY. That was his point. I think he was in entire agreement with you.

Mr. WARREN. Let me change one word, Senator. You say "If the Federal Government lays down."

Senator CONNALLY. When I said "Government," I meant the "Federal Constitution."

Senator DANAHER. I would like to ask you a question, if I may, sir. A moment or two ago you said, sir, that Congress may exercise the power of seeing to it that the State conducted an election every second year for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. I said I thought that probably was within their powers under the necessary and proper clause, yes.

Senator DANAHER. Have you given any thought as to how Congress would cause the State to call such an election?

Mr. WARREN. No; that is beyond the present question, as to how Congress could act. I said it probably had the power to see that that portion of the section was carried into execution. How, is another matter. That is not within the purview of the present bill.

Senator DANAHER. One other point. It seems to me in the light of one of your comments on the power that should be exercised that article I of section 2 does not say a State shall hold an election; it uses the word "chosen."

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And it may make a very real difference in the manner of choice.

Senator CONNALLY. But when it says "electors," that is the implication.

Mr. WARREN. It is the implication, I should say, but I will not go into that because that is a little beyond the purview of my argument, and I was trying, at present, to establish what I consider the limits of the necessary and proper clause as applied to this section.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have one question which I hope will be a brief question.

Judge Warren, do you attach any significance to the fact that in section 2 of article I the Constitution uses this language: "Chosen every second year by the people?" It seems to me that they could have used in place of the word "people," "chosen every second year by the legislators of the several States and the electors in each State shall have certain qualifications."

To me, the fact that the Constitution uses the word "people" is significant, and I just wondered if you wanted to comment on that at all.

Mr. WARREN. I suppose that they were synonymous. If a person is chosen by the people, he is the person who is elected by the people. I suppose that the choice by the people meant the choice by electors.

Senator MURDOCK. I don't mean to make any distinction between "choosing" and "electing," but it seems to me that the use of the word "people" there means something and that when we find a condition as we find it today in some States, at least, where half of the people are disfranchised, that it probably would be a violation.

Mr. WARREN. I will take that up a little later in discussing what happened in connection with the fourteenth amendment. That argument, of course, was made by a few selected Senators—only one as I recall—who claimed that universal suffrage was prescribed by the Constitution. Of course, the matter did not get very much further than a similar argument on that subject in connection with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments—but I will take that up later, I hope.

Now, going a little further, section 2, of course, contains no power, specifically, of Congress to prescribe to the States who they shall qualify to vote for the members of their State legislatures and you have got to find such a power implied if anywhere under the necessary and proper clause. Let us see what the right of the State to prescribe the qualifications, the requirements for voting for its own legislature were when this section was under discussion and when it was adopted by the convention and when it was adopted by the States.

Before 1787, the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to lay down any requirements which the people of the States, through the constitutions or legislatures of the States in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify anyone of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

There was no limitation whatsoever. The State had the power, either in its constitution or in its legislature, as the case might be, to say to whom it desired to grant the vote for members of the legislature or from whom it desired to withhold the right, and when the people of the State had spoken in their constitution as to who should have the right to vote for members of the legislature, of course that was the last word.

You cannot get behind the people; and when the Convention of 1787 met, the people of nine States had spoken in their own States and fixed by their own constitutions the qualifications of those who should vote for members of their own legislature.

How could the Federal Convention get behind that action of the people of the States through their own constitutions? They did not attempt to meddle with the constitutions of the States in any explicit powers given in article I, section 2, and I can see no implied power under the necessary and proper clause which gave to the Congress the right to say to the people of the State who had already before devised and established their own constitutions, to say to the people of a State, "You shall not have the right to grant or to deny the right to vote for your own legislatures." Imagine that proposition put up to the members of the Federal Convention, that they were embodying in section 2 a denial to a State of its right through its own State constitution to establish the requirement of a State voter to vote for a member of a State legislature.

Why, it seems to me inconceivable, when you think of the jealousies of the States at that time and the extreme difficulty with which they were relinquishing any powers—and here they were not relinquishing specifically the power to qualify electors for the members of their own legislature. It is inconceivable that you can find an implied power under the necessary and proper clause to do that thing, to interfere with the sovereign right of the people to establish in their own constitution the right to vote for members of their own legislature.

In addition to that, of course, among the members of the Convention, if any such proposition as that had been advanced, it certainly cannot be found in any of the debates whatsoever as they were recorded by James Madison or King or Yates or Lansing, or any of them. And how unlikely it was that it would be advanced.

The members of that Convention had before them the actual restrictions which their State constitutions had put on the right of their State inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their legislature. They had before their eyes the fact that New Hampshire in 1784 had a requirement for the payment of a poll tax. They had before them that in Massachusetts in 1780 its constitution required the possession of a freehold. They had the Constitution of 1777 of New York, which required that a man should be either a freeholder or a taxpayer of New York or Albany. They had the Constitution of New Jersey of 1776, which required that a man should possess an estate of £50. They had the Constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, that a voter for the legislature should be a taxpayer. They had the Constitution of Maryland, which required that a voter for the State legislature should be a freeholder of 50 acres or the possessor of £50. They had the Constitution of North Carolina of 1776, that he should be a freeholder or a taxpayer, and so on. They had South Carolina and Georgia, which had similar requirements for voting in their State constitutions. The full provisions for voting in the States may be found in convenient tabular form in the appendix to my testimony. It is reproduced from the very valuable book, The Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850, by Francis Newton Thorpe (Harper Bros., New York, vol. I, pp. 93–971).

In addition to that, they had the fact that acting under these constitutions, several of the States had also statutes prescribing certain qualifications which were allowed by the legislatures. They had all that before them, and yet it is asked now, "Why didn't they describe what they mean by 'qualifications'? Why wasn't there some debate on the use of that term?"

Answer is, of course, that every delegate from every State knew what his State constitution meant by "qualifications" or what his State legislature meant by "qualifications," and they certainly were not giving power to this new government to define what their own State constitutions meant or to define what the State legislatures meant.

That was a matter for the State exclusively. No legislature can define the meaning of a word in its constitution; no one can define except the people of the State or the State judiciary, as to everything in connection with the construction and interpretation of section 2. There is an absolute absence of any right granted to Congress to decide or define what a State by its constitution or legislature could demand of one of its inhabitants in order to qualify him to vote for a State legislature.

The absence of anything of that kind shows clearly to my mind that the members of the Federal Convention never had any idea that they were giving any power to Congress to interfere with a State constitution or the State legislature.

Senator MURDOCK. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MURDOCK.

Senator MURDOCK. If I have followed the judge's argument, it is this: That if Congress were in a position to say that a qualification fixed by a State statute or by the constitution of a State is unconstitutional, it would be exercising judicial power in the interpretation of a State law or a State constitution, and that the Congress has no such judicial power. Have I followed you correctly?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator MURDOCK. I might say that that same suggestion was made a few days ago

after the previous hearing by Senator McFARLAND of Arizona. That was the first time that I had heard it made until you made it this morning.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I am going to come to that a little later but I am glad to answer that question now. At this point, perhaps I will just throw in a suggestion analogous to that.

Not only is it not within the power of Congress to interpret the legal meaning of that clause, but it must also be true, if one thinks of it a little more carefully than some statements that I have seen in the record would indicate—it must also be absolutely true that if you cannot interpret a clause of the Constitution through the exercise of congressional power, you certainly cannot insert something into the section. I notice—and this is said with all due deference because I suppose we are all entitled to differ, even with the Senators of the United States—I notice that Senator PEPPER in his argument says that "qualifications" means "reasonable qualifications." Of course, if Congress can insert the word "reasonable," it can insert the words "except poll-tax requirements" or any other words that it desires. The idea that Congress has the power not only to define the meaning of a word in the Constitution but to insert some other words that do not exist there—to my mind, if that is the congressional power—I see no limit to the exercise of it, none whatever.

Senator OVERTON. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator OVERTON.

Senator OVERTON. You made it very clear that section 2 of article I declares that the qualifications of the electors for the House of Representatives shall be the same qualifications as for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the two go hand in hand, you cannot have a set of qualifications for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures and another set of qualifications for electors of the House of Representatives, so if Congress should enact a bill that would prohibit the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification to vote, it would go further than merely to prescribe the qualifications of electors of the House of Representatives, it would be prohibiting the State from prescribing the qualifications for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Isn't that true?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably; and if it passed you would have to have at every polling booth two separate registers of electors.

Senator OVERTON. No; they would not. I beg your pardon, but you do not grasp my point. If the Congress of the United States can constitutionally prescribe any qualifications or can prohibit any qualifications for the House of Representatives, then the State must also make the same requirement with reference to the qualifications of electors for their legislature.

Mr. WARREN. I don't think Congress has the power to require the latter.

Senator OVERTON. I agree with you.

Mr. WARREN. And, therefore, I don't think it has the power to prescribe the former. I think unquestionably the two go hand in hand. If it has the power to do the former, it may have the power to do the latter. I don't suppose anybody in his wildest dreams would suppose that it had the power to restrict the States in prescribing qualifications for their own voters for their own legislatures.

Senator OVERTON. Just to repeat my thought again. I am reading from the Constitution: "The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite to electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature." so if Congress does declare that the prepayment of a poll tax shall not be a requirement then it prohibits the State from fixing the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification for electors of their own State legislature.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Judge Warren, while you are on the discussion of Senator PEPPER, I am sure you are going to come to this, but it is a question I do want your answer to.

I do not think that the main contention of those who favor the legislation is that it must be a reasonable qualification, but rather, as I understand it, the contention is that the State cannot, under the guise of fixing a qualification, fix something which is not either in law or in fact a qualification and if it does, then the Congress is charged with a duty of enacting legislation prohibiting the fixing of whatever it might be which is not actually a qualification.

Mr. WARREN. Well, that is giving the Congress the power to define the word "qualification," which is purely a judicial function and power. To define a word, any word, in the Constitution of the United States is purely for the court. Congress can no more define a word than it can insert a word.

That is my contention, but Senator PEPPER contended in the hearings in 1941 and 1942 that, "in prescribing the qualifications of a voter, they must be reasonable qualifications, subject to the rules of reasonableness." (See testimony, pp. 23, 24, 25.) Of course, that is simply inserting a word into this section 2 of article I of the Constitution, and if the Congress has power to insert one word it has power to insert others.

Senator CONNALLY. On that point, may I ask you one question? I don't want to interfere. If Congress should have the power to say what a reasonable qualification was, would it not amount to turning over to the Federal Government the whole question of qualifications?

Mr. WARREN. Of course.

Senator CONNALLY. And instead of leaving it to the State, as we think the Constitution did, if you grant Congress that supervision and can oversee what the State does, then you are turning over to the Federal Government the absolute control of suffrage.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, it is defining what a State in its own State or in its own constiuution can do in qualifying its voters for its own legislature.

Senator CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. WARREN. I now want to go into a historical discussion because it is a very valuable illumination on this question. So far as I have been able to ascertain, from 1788 down to 1865, there is no statement of any court, in any lawbook, in any legislative debate, or by any statesman that Congress had any such power to regulate suffrage in the States. Take the most extreme Federalist writer, for I suppose the man who made the largest claims for extension of Federal power was Mr. Justice Storey.

Mr. Justice Storey, in his Commentaries, written in 1833, describes this section—and discusses it very slightly because he says that there was no question that the States retained the full power over their own suffrage and, therefore, over the suffrage of their electors for Members of Congress. Storey's Commentaries (1933) states (vol. I, sec. 820), after treating at length in a number of sections, the subject of Congressional power under article I, section 4, to regulate the "times, places, and manner" of holding elections for Senators and Representatives "There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters."

That was the situation down to the year 1865.

Then arose that very heated condition growing out of the situation at the end of the war and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history, if there was ever a time that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. I want to read you, at the risk of trespassing a little on your patience and your time, the very emphatic statements made by the Senators at that time, not only the Senators of the North and East but the Senators of the West—of course, there were no Senators from the South. With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have the full control of the suffrage.

The only exception to that statement was Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and even he admitted that the State of Massachusetts had complete power to regulate suffrage with one exception; he did not think they had the power to deny suffrage to the Negro, but, with that exception—and how he worked out that exception is rather a mystery except that Senator Sumner used to insert the Negro into every bill that came along—but with that exception there was not a Senator who denied the full power of the State to regulate suffrage.

Let me recall to you who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment. When I said every Senator North, West, and East, I meant to include every Senator, Republican and Democratic. Who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment?

First, it was constructed by a joint committee of 15 of the Senate and House, the Senate chairman of which was William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, later President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury. The senior member and the man who took Senator Fessenden's place on the floor of the Senate when Fessenden was later ill was Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan, and then followed John Harris, of New York; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and George H. Williams, of Oregon.

And the members of that joint committee on the House side were Roscoe Conkling, of New York; George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; John A. Bingham, of Ohio, the author of the first section of the amendment; Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; E. B. Washburne, of Illinois; and two others—I forget where they came from. I think Grider, of Kentucky, was one of the lone two Democrats on the committee of the House. That was a very distinguished committee, who gave a great deal of thought to this amendment and, therefore, their views at this excited period when, if ever, the most extreme claims of Federal power would have been made, should give you some pause in considering this question.

This amendment was considered twice. The first two sections were considered separately and then as separate resolutions for separate amendments, and then they were later joined together and made articles of one amendment, the fourteenth amendment as it now appears.

When what is now the first section of the fourteenth amendment was reported to the House, it was drafted by John A. Bingham, a Republican Member of the House from Ohio and in answering it on May 10, Mr. Bingham made these statements (this is on p. 2542 in the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE if anyone wants to look it up). Mr. Bingham said: "This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power

to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States," and in the second section—that was the section, you remember, that reduced the representation of the States in case they denied to any person the right of suffrage—Bingham said: "The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law."

In the Senate, this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden; and he states (May 23, p. 3165 et seq.): "The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

As to section 2 (on p. 2766), Howard said: "This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize much less secure the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

In closing the debate, June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said (p. 3039): "We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution. That right has never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them; and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator DANAHER.

Senator DANAHER. Judge Warren, at the time that article I, section 2, was adopted as part of the Constitution, there was also a provision which read: "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

Obviously, that recognizes a distinction between what were known then as free persons and others?

Mr. WARREN. I did not catch that.

Senator DANAHER. Obviously recognizing a distinction between those who were then known as free persons and all others.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. That section was repealed by section 2 of article XIV.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And amendment XIV says: "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, but when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such a State being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion and other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion that the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of such male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Do you doubt the power of Congress to enforce that section by appropriate legislation?

Mr. WARREN. It says, in effect, that if the State chose to deny the right to vote to any section of its inhabitants, it should have its representation to that extent lessened.

In fact, that was the whole basis on which that section 2 was finally adopted, that they recognized the right of the State to deny any person the right to vote but they said: "If you deny any such persons the right to vote, then that number of your electors and your representation shall, to that extent and in exactly that same proportion, be reduced."

Senator DANAHER. Do you not agree, sir, that by the fourteenth amendment, section 2, we specified qualifications as a basis upon which abridgment of apportionment could be predicated?

Mr. WARREN. No; I do not see that section 2 states anything about qualifications.

Senator DANAHER. It says they must be 21 years of age. Is that not a qualification?

Mr. WARREN. It says, "denied to any person being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Are those not qualifications, Judge Warren?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator DANAHER. What are they?

Mr. WARREN. A woman is a citizen of the United States; a minor is a citizen of the United States; a pauper is a citizen of the United States. There are plenty of citizens of the United States who have not the right to vote in a State under the State constitutions. It has nothing to do with the question of being a citizen of the United States.

Senator DANAHER. Would we have the power, in your judgment, to deny representation—let us take, for example, the State of Texas—by reducing the numbers of Representatives in the House of Representatives on the basis that the right to vote is abridged as against citizens who are 21 years of age?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. Certainly you have got it specifically granted to you, the right to reduce representation. That is specifically granted by section 2 of the fourteenth amendment.

Senator DANAHER. So that if we were to amend this bill to say that if there be, in any State, a requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for the privilege of voting and the right of any citizen being 21 years of age is thus abridged, all numbers of such persons so denied the right to vote shall be excluded from the basis of apportionment of Representatives allotted to that State?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably.

Senator DANAHER. It may be a good answer to this whole bill.

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably. I am not discussing what Congress could do under some other power than that in section 2 of article I of the original Constitution. I hope you will not confine any illustration to the State of Texas, because I notice that the Senator from the State of Texas is temporarily absent from the room.

Senator MURDOCK. This argument and the same discussion as the colloquy between Senator DANAHER and yourself happened before the Judiciary Committee of the House when I was a member of that. The argument was made there that the second section of amendment 14 really contemplated that the States may abridge the right of certain people to vote but that if such abridgment or denial did take place that Congress had a remedy by reducing the number of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. And that was the only remedy at that time until the fifteenth amendment was passed. The fifteenth amendment was passed in order to get away from doing that thing and it was made a part of the Constitution that the Negro should not be excluded from voting.

Senator MURDOCK. You take the position, as I understand you, that under amendment 14, section 2, the exclusive remedy of Congress to meet such an abridgment by a State is the reduction of Representatives?

Mr. WARREN. And it is so stated. I was just going to read that.

Senator MURDOCK. Of course, the people who sponsor this anti-poll-tax law take the position that that is not the only remedy, that it is not exclusive.

Mr. WARREN. I would like now to pursue the statements made by the Senators who constructed the amendment because they are certainly very powerful. I think that the last quotation was from Senator Howard who reported the amendment to the Senate.

(I think that Senator DANAHER may be interested in this.) When they first took up the second section of the fourteenth amendment, Senator Fessenden, who was then recovered from a slight illess and was, as I say, the chairman of the joint committee, made this statement. He was controverting at the time, I think, Senator Sumner. On February 7, 1866, he said (p. 704): "The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please." Senator Sumner was claiming it was a class distinction to exclude the Negro: "The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please. The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power. It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves."

Later in his speech he describes what the second section means in requiring the reduction, and he said (p. 705): "It says to all the people of the United States, 'You shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge * * * we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let your charges participate in it.'"

Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, a very distinguished—one of the most distinguished lawyers at the Supreme Court bar—and who was the lone Senate Democrat on this joint committee of 15 in the Senate, speaking of the fact that at that time this question of suffrage of the Negro was not a Southern question entirely because of the fact that of the States of the North and the East at that time there were only 6 who admitted the Negro to the right of suffrage for members of their own legislature. In other words, that the free Negro was not admitted to the right of suffrage in any of the States of the North and East except 6, and Senator Johnson said, in pursuing that line of thought as to the complete power of the States at that time over the whole subject (p. 765): "I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts (Senator Sumner) will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose? Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * * The State and nobody else."

He then cited Federalist, No. 54: "The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that in

the opinion of the writers of the Federalist, the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage."

Then, further down, he says: "There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage. It depends wholly upon governmental regulation."

There was one other Democratic Senator not on the joint committee, but of considerable distinction, and I am citing these to show you that there was no difference of opinion between such prominent Republican Senators as Howard and Fessenden and the Democratic Senators, Reverdy Johnson and Hendricks of Indiana. Senator Hendricks said (p. 880): "I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that? The Senator from Massachusetts does. He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of elective franchise. It is absolute and perfect."

Then Senator Sumner got up and he denied the right of a State to deny the Negro suffrage, but he went on to say that the State had entire control over the right of suffrage and could deny it by reason of condition of age, residence, character, education, property, and the payment of taxes, but he claimed it could not be applicable to color. So you see, even Senator Sumner would have denied the right of Congress to pass the present bill.

Coming along in the debate, we find Senator Wilson, who was the colleague of Senator Sumner from Massachusetts, said (p. 1255): "The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions * * * they well knew what the qualifications were. Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power and they never intended to give that power."

That is the statement of Senator Wilson, afterwards Vice President of the United States.

Then, inclosing the early debate on that section, Senator Fessenden, who was chairman of the joint committee that drafted it, made this statement (p. 1278): "If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read," that is, the second section of article I of the Constitution, "acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed. * * * The States have a perfect right today and they may exercise it as they see fit to make such rules as suit them with regard to the qualifications of electors."

I won't weary you by any further citations.

When the fourteenth amendment was adopted, you will recall that it was claimed by some Republicans, I think by George H. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, who later became Secretary of the Treasury, that the first section denying to the States the power to abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States—although the contrary had been stated time and time again during the debate on this amendment—it was claimed that that privilege and immunity clause of the citizens of the United States denied to the State the power to restrict the right of suffrage, and when, in 1868, the fifteenth amendment was under consideration, Mr. Boutwell and some others thought it was not necessary to pass the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote because they said it could be done by a simple act of Congress under the privilege and immunity clause; that is, by an act of Congress enforcing the privilege and immunity clause. That attempt was soon dropped. That bill was debated in the House but it was soon dropped, and the fifteenth amendment was adopted in order to establish the power by the Constitution.

The fifteenth amendment was passed, I think, in 1869. The idea that the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States denied in some way the right of the States to control suffrage, that idea prevailed for a number of years until, in 1875, there came along the Slaughterhouse cases, and in those cases there was laid down, you remember, for the first time, the distinction between the rights of a citizen and a State and the rights of a citizen of the United States, as such; that is, the rights which grew out of some peculiar relation of an inhabitant of a State to the United States Government.

Then, you remember, very shortly after the Slaughterhouse cases, there came the case which, in fact, applied the general proposition that there was a distinction between the right of a citizen of a State and the right of a citizen of the United States per se, to the specific right of a woman to vote. That was the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 163). On March 29, 1875, in that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained, and Chief Justice Waite said that the "fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when you considered who was a citizen of the United States; everybody born here was a citizen of the United States and, therefore, if voting depended on citizenship every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote," and he concluded: "Certainly, if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage."

And using those same words here in the year 1943, I should suppose that if any question had been settled in 134 years, it was this question that the States alone possessed the right of control of suffrage.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock.

Senator MURDOCK. Are you familiar with Public Law 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved September 16, 1942, with reference to soldiers voting?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. I know there was such a law.

Senator MURDOCK. Section 2 reads as follows: "No person in military service at time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay a poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

I assume, from your statement here, that you would take the position that that section is unconstitutional?

Mr. WARREN. Personally, I should not have had any doubt about it; except for the fact that the war power has received such immense extensions in recent years. Hence I should not now be at all certain as to how far it extended in that direction. Except for the war power, everything that I have said on the present bill, so far would certainly apply. I would have made precisely the same argument if I had appeared before this committee in connection with that bill in 1942, except that I would have frankly stated that I do not know in that respect how far the war power extends. I have about come to the conclusion that all my previous views regarding the extent of power of this Government in time of war must be canceled and, that, at the present moment, I do not know what there is which the Government cannot do if the war makes it necessary.

Now, I take up another branch of my argument. I dislike always, in arguing before a court, for I think it is a very disagreeable thing for the court and I am sure it is for you gentlemen, to cite passages from cases; and yet, tracing this idea that Congress had no power to control the right of suffrage in the State down through the years and decades, I must show how far this statement comes down in decisions by the Supreme Court. I will only cite a few cases to show that it comes down all through the line.

The first case under the legislation that grew out of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments was not decided by the Supreme Court until 1876. You remember there was a series of statutes purporting to enforce the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. A large portion of those statutes were declared unconstitutional because of the effort of Congress to apply them directly to acts of individuals instead of to acts of States, but there was the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870; there was, of course, the Ku Klux Act of April 20, 1870; and there was the Federal Election Act of June 10, 1872, and there was the Civil Rights Act of March 1, 1875; and they all came before the Supreme Court sooner or later. Under them, many cases involving constitutional rights of citizens arose.

The first case was that of *The United States* v. *Reese* ((1876). 92 U. S. 214), decided in 1876. It involved the fifteenth amendment and the enforcement of it against persons who alleged the States to be discriminating in elections against them. The sections of the statute which were sought to be applied were held invalid because they were not appropriate legislation under the fifteenth amendment, but in the course of that case and decision, Chief Justice Waite said that "Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, it was possible for a State to exclude a man from voting because of his race, color, or otherwise."

He said: "Before its adoption, this could be done. It was then as much within the power of the State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race and so forth as it was on account of age, property, or education."

Then came the *Minor* v. *Happersett* decision, which held that a State might exclude women from voting. Then passing down a long list of cases, there is, of course, the statement in the *Ex parte Yarbrough* case in 1884 (110 U. S. 56), a case, I think, that was cited ten or a dozen times in the recent Classic case in which Judge Miller said: "The States, in prescribing the qualification of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Warren, if you desire, in the interest of conserving time, you can incorporate that in the record here as part of the record.

Mr. WARREN. I have only a few other citations. The decision in *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58), in 1900, answers the question, I think, that Senator Murdock asked. In discussing the right to vote for Members of Congress, Judge Gray said: "They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

I call attention to a statement made in *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621), in 1904, which has some bearing upon one of the contentions made here by the proponents of the present bill. Justice Peckham says: "A State, so far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that no one but native-born citizens shall be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution," and I want to call to your attention the following words: "The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one. * * * The right of a State to legislate upon the subject of the elective franchise as to it may seem good, subject, we believe, to the conditions already stated being as unassailable, we think it plain that the statute in question violates this right."

We come down as late as 1915 to a decision in *Gwinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347). That was the Oklahoma Constitution case which arose under the fifteenth amendment; and in it Chief Justice White stated: "It is true also that the amendment," that is, the fifteenth amendment, "does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their full power as to suffrage except, of course, as to the subject with which the amendment deals," that is the subject of the Negro.

I want to call your attention particularly to a passage in Chief Justice White's decision, in which he points out what was the contention of the Government of the United States at that time, made through its Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. John W. Davis: "The United States says that State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed, although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on their power that is insisted on—hence no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualifications of suffrage is advanced."

That is, the Government, through the Attorney General at that time, did not even pretend or contend that the judgment and discretion of the United States in fixing the qualification for suffrage existed.

I am not going to discuss the Classic case. It has been discussed, I think, in testimony rather ad nauseam. I had rather supposed—and before this question came up I read that case a number of times—I had not supposed that the case and its decision had anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of the State to control suffrage. It was simply concerned with whether a primary election was an election within the meaning of the term "manner" of regulating an election as used in this fourth section of article I of the Constitution. I searched in vain—I searched in vain to find a single word in that decision that has anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of suffrage. But you gentlemen are quite as capable, and probably more capable than I am, of knowing what that decision decides. I simply say that, so far as I can see, it decides nothing whatsoever pertinent to this question I am now arguing; and I had not supposed that, except for the fact it held that a primary election might be included within the term "election" as used in the Constitution, except for that decision, I had not supposed there was a single proposition or dictum or expression in that case that differed in the slightest from what had been held in case after case for 50 years before it.

I have finished what I had to say.

Senator CONNALLY. I agree with you that the fourteenth amendment does not give any power such as asserted in this bill, but there are those that do. There are those who assert that the Constitution gives some power to Congress. But I want to call your attention to the fact in 1917—I believe it was—that in the seventeenth amendment for the popular vote for Senators they reenacted, so far as the qualifications of Senators are concerned, the same clause as contained in section 2 of article I that "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for 6 years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

I wanted to ask you whether or not there were any powers in the fourteenth amendment, if it would not, as far as Senators at least are concerned, be repealed by the subsequent insertion in the Constitution of the seventeenth amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Well, I should not have any doubt about that. I should say that when a word had been used in the original Constitution and at least silently construed, that is, no one ever claimed that the qualifications could not be decided by the States, I should say that a word in the seventeenth amendment meant precisely what it meant in the original Constitution. Whether it had the effect of repealing anything in the fourteenth amendment I do not know. But I have, frankly, never given any consideration to that, believing so certainly and conclusively and impressively in the statements made by the Senators about the effect of the fourteenth amendment, so I cannot see that there is anything relating to the State's right over suffrage to repeal.

Senator CONNALLY. What I meant was this. That since the seventeenth amendment is specific that it deals with a single thing, the qualification of electors for Senators, and the fourteenth amendment having general terms and things of that kind, with the seventeenth amendment being subsequent to the fourteenth amendment, if there was anything in the fourteenth amendment it would certainly have to yield to the seventeenth amendment and even granting the proponents' views, you would have to have two boxes, you would have to have one for Congress and one for Senator and one for State officers, would you not?

Mr. WARREN. I should suppose so, but I do not think it is necessary on the basis of my argument.

Senator CONNALLY. Thank you.

Mr. WARREN. Just 1 minute. I suppose you are going to adjourn very shortly. I had not intended to cover this whole subject, of course, and I understand one of the great contentions of the proponents of this bill is that even if section 2 of article I gives no power, section 4, which authorizes Congress to adopt regulations as to time, place, and manner, gives the power to regulate the suffrage.

Of course, there is not a single decision of the United States courts from one end to the other that even intimates that "manner" of conducting an election includes the qualification of electors. But pass that by. If it does, what was the use of section 2? If the Constitution assumed to fix the qualifications of electors by section 2, why should it then pass section 4 and give Congress the right to change everything which it had already fixed in section 2? In other words, it is impossible that the two sections include the same subject matter, because by section 4, if it be true that "manner" includes fixing qualifications, then Congress has full power to do anything about qualifications and Congress has full power to override section 2. Is it conceivable that, having prescribed the qualifications for voting for Members of Congress in the Constitution itself by section 2, the Federal Convention then proceeded only a day or two later, to adopt section 4, which, on the present theory, empowered Congress to alter or do away with any or all of the qualifications which the Convention had already established by the Constitution itself in section 2? It cannot be that the Convention was adopting two sections, one of which absolutely nullified the other. That is all I have got to say on that subject. If that argument can be overcome, and the fact that no decision of the Supreme Court has ever intimated that "manner" included regulation of suffrage, if those two arguments can be overcome, I cannot make them any clearer or more forcible and I am not going to take them up.

I have confined my arguments purely to the meaning and construction and interpretation of section 2 of article I, and, as I say, I cannot find in the legislative debates in the courts or in the writings of any lawyer any attempt to assert that the States did not absolutely control the right of suffrage, until the question has arisen within the last few years and been encouraged by what some people think they find in the Classic case. If I am able to understand the English language, I cannot find there what they think they find; but I am not going into that because you gentlemen are fully competent to decide what you think the Classic case decides.

I wish to thank you gentlemen for your patience.

Senator CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to request the authority of the committee that the stenographer furnish Judge Warren a copy, at the earliest practical moment, of his remarks here and that he be accorded the privilege of inserting in full any matter that he has or embellishing what he has said to make it a full and complete statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. Senator AUSTIN.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to listen to Mr. Charles Warren on this subject. It has been a very illuminating discussion.

There is one point which, if he cares to talk on, I would like to hear his views on and that is the use or definition of qualifications in the brief and in many arguments that have appeared in support of this proposal. The assertion appears that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification and that it is only a prerequisite or condition and that, therefore, this proposal does not offend the Constitution. Do you care to comment on that subject?

Mr. WARREN. When we go back before the Constitution, a qualification to vote meant whatever the State constitution or the State legislature required of a man in order to make him eligible to vote. Therefore, the qualifications which the Constitution speaks of must mean what it meant in the States and what it meant in the States before 1787, i. e., such conditions, prerequisites, or the existence of such other facts or conditions as the States thought it necessary to require before granting to an inhabitant the right to vote. I cannot see how it could

possibly mean anything other than that. They were not originating a language. They were adopting the requirements with which they were perfectly familiar, which included the requirement of paying a poll tax; the requirement of possessing so much wealth or so much money, etc. It was a question for the States exclusively to decide what they should require of a man before they should render him qualified to vote.

I cannot see it in any other way than that because if that is not so, then you must find a power of Congress to define a word in the Constitution and I look in vain for any such power. That is purely a judicial question. Congress has, as I said at the opening, no more power to define a word in the Constitution than it has to insert a word in the Constitution, in fact, to define a word would, in many cases, be to insert it. Just as I said, Senator PEPPER wanted to prescribe "reasonable qualifications" which is certainly an insertion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MCFARLAND?

Senator MCFARLAND. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CONNALLY?

Senator CONNALLY. I merely want to express my own appreciation and I am sure all the other members of the committee are grateful to you for this very illuminating and unselfish argument you have made on this subject.

Mr. WARREN. I hope I have cast a few rays of light.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MURDOCK?

Senator MURDOCK. I have asked probably too many questions now. I do want to say I have thoroughly enjoyed the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator REVERCOMB?

Senator REVERCOMB. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator DANAHER?

Senator DANAHER. I think you might inadvertently have been led into error in reply to Senator CONNALLY'S question. Surely you do not mean that the seventeenth amendment repealed the fourteenth amendment?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly not.

Senator CONNALLY. I did not make that qualification. It was as to suffrage only that the seventeenth amendment referred to.

Mr. WARREN. My answer was that I did not agree that the fourteenth amendment had anything to do with suffrage at all, so I did not think the seventeenth would repeal it; but if the fourteenth amendment did have anything to do with State rights over suffrage, then I should say the Senator was correct in thinking that the seventeenth amendment might have repealed it. I would not make that too definite, because, in a constitutional amendment, I am rather inclined to think that if you are going to repeal some previous constitutional amendment, you had better make it specific.

Senator DANAHER. One other question. Surely it is a fact that apportionment is still based upon the fourteenth amendment, section 2?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly. Apportionment of Representatives, you mean?

Senator DANAHER. Yes; and we have a census every 10 years for the purpose of counting the number of persons within the State upon which apportionment shall be predicated.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Senator DANAHER. And when we passed the fourteenth amendment, we certainly repealed explicitly that portion of article I of the original Constitution which had prescribed a distinction between free persons and all others who were to be counted for apportionment purposes?

Mr. WARREN. Precisely. It is precisely the same subject—just as was the repeal of the prohibition amendment. You probably could not have repealed that amendment by implication merely.

Senator DANAHER. I have enjoyed your discussion very much and I have appreciated your contribution so greatly I would like to ask your opinion on a hypothetical point.

Mr. WARREN. My opinion on hypothetical points is usually not very valuable.

Senator DANAHER. It is at least as valuable as the expert witness and I would like to have you comment, if you will, on this assumption:

Assume there were before us a bill which read as follows: "Whenever any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision, or any person, whether or not acting under color of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, shall abridge in any way, the right of any citizen, being 21 years of age, to vote in any primary or election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representative in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof," those words following exactly article XIV, section 2: "the number of Representatives from any such State wherein such abridgment exists, shall be reduced in the ratio that the number of such citizens whose right so to vote shall be abridged bears to the whole number of persons in any such State."

Mr. WARREN. I think I have explained to you what I believed section 2 of the fourteenth amendment permitted Congress to do. As to any particular bill, I must answer what I have several times answered to a similar question before the Supreme Court when they have asked me: Would you say that this law applies to such-and-such and such-and-such? I have invariably had to answer that I have enough difficulty in arguing this one case and I certainly will argue the other cases when I come to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Judge Warren.

Your Congressman Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, during these trying times with rules and regulations going out by the hundreds it is difficult for most people to learn just what they are entitled to and what they are not entitled to. In this respect I would like to call the attention of my people to the fact that a Congressman's office is the best and surest way of getting help in straightening out Federal matters. It is a Congressman's duty to help in matters of difficulty confronting his people. A Congressman is the people's representative in Washington. He is their agent. If the people have any trouble in collecting their allotment or any benefit due them, their Congressman is the best bet to take care of it for them.

In my short experience here I have already helped in the adjustment of hundreds of dependency allotment cases. In my short time here I have already helped to straighten out scores of insurance claims. The Veterans' Administration and the Dependency Allotment Office here in Washington are without doubt two of the best and most conscientiously managed departments in Washington. They are most cooperative and courteous at all times. In no instance have they refused help or refused to settle claims fairly and honestly.

FINANCIAL CLAIMS ARE BEST HANDLED THROUGH A CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE

Should anyone have a claim against the Government for a dependency allotment or any war benefit, it is best to first ask for help from the local Red Cross, local veterans' service office, or American Legion. These local agencies will do everything they can. Sometimes, however, something goes wrong, and the claims are not settled, or it takes too much time to get the case settled. If that happens, your best bet is to write your Congressman and explain everything to him in detail. Your Congressman can find out what is wrong and can help in getting settlement.

Should my people know of any person whose claim is unduly long in being settled—remind that person that a Congressman's office is the best and most effective clearinghouse. Your Congressman has a direct connection with all offices in Washington. He can serve his people very effectively in getting matters straightened out. It is his duty to do this, and it costs nothing. That is what a Congressman draws his salary for. To give an idea of what a Congressman can do—in the 10 months I have been here the following claims have been adjusted with the aid of my office:

W. P. A. claims	$93,000
Veterans' pension claims of World War No. 1 (monthly)	2,000
Veterans' insurance claims of World War No. 2	250,000
Other claims (monthly)	750

Your Congressman has received splendid cooperation from the offices here in settling claims against the Government. He can help you just as he has helped hundreds of others. Use your Congressman. That is his job. Whether it be a claim for labor or service, an insurance claim, a dependency claim, a pension claim, or any other claim, use your Congressman if working through your local agencies does not work out satisfactorily. Your Congressman will be glad to help you, as he has helped others.

The American Doughboy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the rugged heroism of a soldier who is bearing the brunt of our fighting today. I refer to the doughboy, the man with a rifle in

his hands and determination in his heart, who has emerged as the great soldier of this war.

He is not always the first to strike at the enemy. The planes do that. But you can be sure that when the action is over, the doughboy will be standing guard over the ground he has taken, with a weary grin of satisfaction on his face and a bayonet which is still quick with death for any foe who dares to challenge him. I mean no derogation to the bravery of other arms when I say that it is the individual infantryman who has captured my imagination.

He comes in all sizes, and his name is written in all the polyglot tongues of our conglomerate America. There he stands: tough, sturdy, unbeatable—a helmeted symbol of America aroused.

He is not a showy fighter. But do not underestimate his skill and his resourcefulness. His way of warfare combines much of the shrewd caution which the plainsman knew and which his ancestors practiced in the deep forests of our new America. He fits superbly into the group plays of a combat team. But in the end, he is an individualist.

He must be. His fortress is often a lonely fox hole where he carries on by himself as a detached element of his team. Crouching there on the defense he absorbs the most terrible punishment. But when the tanks have rolled over his head, he rises from the earth to surprise and throw back the enemy infantry which follows.

The courage and fortitude which the American infantryman displays in the jungles of the Pacific islands, in the damp and frigid mists of Attu, on the muddy plains and in the rugged hills of Italy—these qualities, I say, command the admiration and the gratitude of the Nation. In the familiar acts of his daily life, this man displays a dogged heroism which is inconceivable to those who have not endured the constant imminence of death.

It is a life of exhaustion, with days of mud and rain and beating sun, with bivouacs threatened by the stealthy menace of enemy patrols, when the sweetest sound that disturbs his slumber is the whistle of his own artillery's shells searching out hidden pockets of resistance of the hillside ahead which will be tomorrow's business.

Thousands of Americans are leading that life today. They are not men who were selected for some special quality of courage. They are the men you passed on the streets a year, 2 years ago. You saw them in the restaurants at noontime. You laughed beside them at a neighborhood theater and cheered them on a football field.

Then the Army took them, put them through the most rigorous training, taught them to use a variety of weapons—machine guns, mortars, bazookas, antitank guns, light-field guns, grenades, knives, and, of course, the rifle. It taught them the cold-blooded business of stalking and killing an enemy. It taught them to hunt him down in the mountains, and to storm his beaches from assault boats. It taught them to swing down on him from the skies with incredible swiftness. It taught them so well that they were veterans before they ever heard the sound of a hostile bullet.

Now they are out there, almost constantly under fire, using with their hearts the soldier's skill which has become instinct. I do not know from what deep well of our country's traditions they have drawn their courage. But I do know that if for one instant we permit the comfort we still enjoy at home to deflect our attention from their deeds we shame and debase not only these men but ourselves.

The doughboy is a great American. In his bearing there is a dignity which only a free man, fighting for freedom, could hope to possess. Patient, perspiring, weary, so long as an enemy remains in the field he will be out there—fighting. And when the fighting is finally over he will still be out there, and the field will belong to him—to the individual infantryman.

Drive-for-Action Committee Reaffirms Policy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD a news release which was issued by the Drive-for-Action Committee following a meeting of our executive board on Friday:

Following a meeting of the executive board of the Drive-for-Action Committee late this afternoon, the following statement was issued jointly by Representative GERALD W. LANDIS and KARL E. MUNDT, who are serving as co-chairman of the committee which was formed a week ago and began its activities on Monday of this week:

"Five new members from five additional States were elected to the executive board of the Drive-for-Action Committee at today's meetings. The new board members are: Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California; Representative WILLIAM HILL, of Colorado; Representative CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire, Representative FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming; and Representative WALTER HORAN, of Washington; all Republicans.

"Each of the executive board members who now number 21 Representatives from 21 States is carrying a membership blank containing the pledge for action which all members are required to sign and the committee reaffirmed its decision to follow the policy of admitting to membership all who approve of the drive for action and request membership with the group but refraining from soliciting any new members. Committee regulations provide that all are welcome, but none are urged to join in the drive to compel the democratic leadership to end its do-nothing program and to bring before Congress legislation to correct existing problems on the home front. For the time being, we are continuing to concentrate on the problems of disposing of the food subsidy question, increasing the production of gasoline and fuel oil, setting up methods for effectuating economy in Government, and providing legislation which will give private citizens an opportunity to protect themselves, through regular judicial channels, against illegal invasions of private rights and by O. P. A. and other bureaucratic agencies. An action-planning committee headed by Representative THOMAS WINTER, of Kansas, is at work preparing a list of additional action objectives.

"The membership of the entire committee is now crowding 50 and it is expected that the entire membership of the committee with its committee assignments can be announced next week."

Commenting on the fact that the majority leader today announced that the House would be in session Saturday, LANDIS and MUNDT said, "When the Drive-for-Action Committee was first announced, we stated it was our purpose to hold the House in session every legislative day except Saturdays and holidays. However, we are glad that Mr. MCCORMACK is holding the House in session tomorrow even though Saturday sessions are a departure from the established custom. We propose to use the opportunity presented at tomorrow's session to secure additional signatures to petitions Nos. 13 and 14 which deal with the O. P. A. authorities and with the oil and gasoline situations respectively. Since the drive started by this committee, the signatures on both petitions have more than doubled and we expect to continue this line of attack on Saturday and during next week and all the following sessions until action is secured. We are also highly gratified that the majority leader today announced a working legislative program for next week. It is precisely this at which we have been aiming. We shall cooperate in every way to get action on pending legislation but we are ready to hold the House in session and to continue our program of outlining steps which Congress should take just as long as the majority leadership fails to face up to the serious problems now handicapping our war effort both at home and abroad."

Island Military Air Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely interesting article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky entitled "Seversky Doubts Future Value of Island Military Air Bases." The article was published in the Washington Star of Friday, November 5, 1943. I was particularly impressed by it, in view of the fact that for the past 5 years I have advocated the construction of a band of steel around our portion of the Western Hemisphere to secure us against assault by any nation or nations in the world. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] who recently made a worth-while trip

around the world, spoke of the establishment of bases in various sections of the world for the benefit of this country in the post-war days. I highly recommend a reading of the article by the Senator from Kentucky.

There being no objection, the article by Maj. A. P. de Seversky was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVERSKY DOUBTS FUTURE VALUE OF ISLAND MILITARY AIR BASES

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Interest in the post-war disposition of the great network of air bases built by the United States all around the globe has been stimulated by the reports of the special Senate committee which recently returned from an inspection tour of the battlefields. Concern for the fate of outlying points now being used as air bases was also reflected by the President in his reference to the Japanese mandated islands in his message to Congress.

The commercial and political phases of this problem are outside the scope of this dispatch. It is self-evident that globe-girdling passenger and freight services will require long chains of air stations to discharge and take on passengers and cargo, whether we own those stations outright or share their use with other countries.

But the military phase of the discussion deserves more serious thought than it has so far received. Nearly everyone assumes that a vast number of air bases distributed all over the planet will be needed to support a great military air force such as the United States is likely to possess.

PICTURE HAS CHANGED

This simply is not true, and it seems highly desirable that Americans should obtain a more realistic understanding of the matter. We surely do not want to gum up post-war relations with friendly countries for the sake of bases which, from the strictly military viewpoint, at least, are unnecessary.

When people assume that our air power will require far-flung bases clear around the globe, they are usually drawing a parallel with sea power. Naval operations call for permanent strong points at strategic intervals, like Gibraltar, Singapore, Pearl Harbor, Hong Kong, Corregidor, etc.; hence it is taken for granted that the same need exists in the case of air power.

But strategic aviation, designed for striking directly at the heart of the enemy, will have no use for intermediary bases. Their possession may even prove a handicap, in that the job of defending them will divert vital air power from the main task of knocking out the enemy in his homeland.

WILL BE BASED AT HOME

Air power in the near future will be fighting directly from its point of origin, which is to say from the mainland containing industries, natural resources, and manpower. Its function will be to destroy the corresponding enemy air power, likewise at its point of origin. In such a contest between main concentrations, all in-between bases will become meaningless.

Those who think we shall need chains of bases, even when they are politically far-sighted, frequently go astray on this issue because they are reckoning on the kind of aviation we have today, rather than the aviation certain to emerge tomorrow. They forget that most of the in-between bases constructed during the war were necessary to compensate for the short operational range of aircraft. Every time that additional range has been built into airplanes, more of these way stations have lost their strategic value. That is why General MacArthur now sees the possibility of using air power in long, massive strokes instead of hopping from island to island.

When we have available bombers with the range to bomb Europe from American soil, it will make not the slightest difference whether they operate from the American mainland or from, let us say, the Bahamas. The extra few hundred miles will not represent an advantage. On the contrary. First, it will be impossible to concentrate sufficient aviation at such outlying points for decisive offensive action; and second, the picture will be immensely complicated by the vulnerable overseas supply problem. The most sensible and economical procedure will be to fight from the main bases; that is, the American continent.

COULD SEIZE ENEMY ISLANDS

To hold an intermediary base you must be able to protect it with aviation equal to everything the enemy can throw against it. If that base is close to the enemy's main aerial strength, it therefore becomes indefensible. The same is true of an enemy's bases close to our own country. Suppose a hostile power held bases in the Caribbean, dependent on supplies from the other side of the ocean. Obviously we would take them over at will.

Japan found its mandated islands valuable because air power did not yet possess the reach to strike directly and consequently was obliged to hop from island to island. In the future such islands will be ignored by both sides. Air power will be applied in one massive stroke from the center of one great nation to the center of the opposing nation.

In the light of these indubitable trends in air-power development, much of the discussion about far-flung air bases is quite unrealistic from the purely military angle.

Feed Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Prof. T. B. Charles, head, department of poultry husbandry and acting extension poultryman, University of New Hampshire, November 9, 1943:

DEAR MR. MERROW: We are now conducting a series of poultry meetings throughout the State of New Hampshire in conjunction with which we are making farm visits to nearly every town in the State. According to all available information, including the reports of the Lower Lakes Grain Committee and Mr. Carpenter of Governor Dewey's special investigation committee, the Northeast is shy between 67,000,000 and 90,000,000 bushels of feed grains between now and April 1, 1944. Very little corn is reaching this area and it is quite clear that with the present price on corn and hogs little corn will move into this area. According to a statement made by Mr. Carpenter at the Boston conference recently, we will need about 90,000,000 bushels of corn between now and April 1, 1944. If corn does not move into this area then it is imperative that other feed grains do so to make up this deficit. No doubt you have this information on file in addition to other data which we may not have.

It is quite obvious from contacts with the poultrymen at our meetings and on their farms and with the feed dealers who are participating in these meetings that already we are in a very critical situation; some men having to feed pellets one day, possibly laying mash the next. This is especially true in the northern half of the State.

The goals which have been set up by the Government and which were approved by a committee of poultrymen, extension personnel, and War Board Committee at Laconia War Board meeting are as follows for this State:

Nineteen hundred and forty-four as compared to 1943: 1 percent more eggs; 5 percent fewer chickens raised, 27 percent less broilers produced, 3 percent less turkeys grown.

The committee accepted the goals set up by the Federal Government on the basis of the following qualifications:

1. Securing necessary quantity and quality of feed.
2. Adequate labor supply.
3. Replacement of needed equipment.
4. Continuation of our present (a) disease control, (b) management, (c) educational programs.
5. Guarantee the price of market eggs at a level that will give the producer a fair profit.
6. A policy of no price roll-backs.

Our poultry producers last year more than attained the goals which were requested by the Federal Government for food production. In some of these meetings we have had a definite statement that if the feed, labor, and equipment were assured, they could increase production still further in 1944.

It is, of course, quite obvious from the above data on feeds, and I am sure from information which you have on hand that feed is not going to be available to do this. It is quite obvious also that we will have to reduce poultry and other livestock probably to 1942–43 levels. This feed situation is really critical and anything you can do to get feed moving into New England to be sure that the livestock can be carried in order that enforced liquidation can be done at a normal rate, will be of great service to the agriculture of this State and to the food supply of the Northeast.

Best personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

T. B. CHARLES.

A Message to Dependents of the Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, any dependent of a man or woman in our armed forces, who is paid $138 a month or less, is eligible to receive a dependent's allotment from the Government. I hope all dependents will read this article and tear it out for future use. It must be remembered that this act applies only to men and women in service whose base pay is $138 a month or less. Those men and women in service who get more than

$138 per month come under another system. The new act just passed provides a monthly allotment as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. Note: A wife separated or divorced from a man in service will get no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree in case of alimony. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allotment.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in service 50 percent or less, they come under class B. Only $37 is allowed no matter if there are one or even four or five more partially dependent. Those who make application for this allotment, therefore, should be very careful to prove more than 50-percent dependency. This is important.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $11; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11. Note: Here again it must be remembered that it is important to prove more than 50-percent dependency. If it is not proved that they are more than 50-percent dependent they come automatically under class B and get much less. Extreme care should be taken, therefore, to prove as much dependency as possible when application is made. Remember that below or above 50 percent means a whole lot regarding how much money dependents will get.

HOW TO GET THE ALLOTMENT

Wherever possible, as soon as a man or woman enters service they should make application for the allotment. They should do this immediately when they are inducted. The allotment payments do not go back. The payments begin with the date the application is filed. Therefore, if the man or woman in service waits a month after induction before they file an application—1 month's allotment is lost. The longer they wait to file an application, the more money is lost. It is important that they file an application for this allotment the same day they are inducted.

The man or woman in service should submit the application on a form they can get from the commanding officer. In filling out this form it is good to be careful to spell all names correctly and give exact information as to marriage, dates of birth, and so forth. Many of the troubles dependents have in getting their allotment are due to the fact that the serviceman or woman is careless in filling out the blank. An extra minute in filling out the blank may save several months' time in getting the allotment approved. The application after careful study and filling out should then be handed to the commanding officer.

If the serviceman or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. If there is any question as to where or how to apply just drop a letter to your Congressman. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out. The Navy requires merely a letter giving name of applicant's wife and children, dates of birth, and so forth. Therefore, if any class A dependent does not know for certain just how to apply they had better write their Congressman and ask for instructions.

If the man or women in service with class B or B–1 dependents refuses to make an application for a dependency allotment, no other person can apply. Class B–1 allotments are granted and continued only at the will of the man or woman in service. They cannot be forced to make application. Wherever the serviceman or woman with class B or class B–1 dependents fails to make application, and these dependents are reasonably sure that he will approve it, they can make application. However, the permission of the man or woman in service will have to be obtained before application for allotment is approved for class B or B–1 dependents.

Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents.

BE PATIENT REGARDING INCREASED ALLOTMENTS

The increased allotments will not be paid at once. There are more than 3,000,000 such cases. It takes time to figure all of them out. It will probably take 4 months before the increases are paid. But the increases when figured out will be paid back to November 1, 1943. That is the date the increased allotments start. Therefore, about February 1, 1944, all dependents will get a check which will be for all back pay accrued since November 1, 1943. Therefore, if you do not get the increased allotment at once, please be patient. But if you do not get the increased allotment with back pay around February 1, 1944, please write your Congressman and he will settle it for you. During the next 4 months the allotments will be paid as usual at the old rate.

PARENTS AND BROTHERS AND SISTERS CAN RECEIVE ALLOTMENT AT THE SAME TIME AS WIFE AND CHILDREN

It is also important to know that parents and sisters can get an allotment even if the serviceman's wife and children get one. In other words, if men or women in service have parents and brothers and/or sisters dependent upon them as well as a wife and children—all of these dependents can get a dependency allotment. For example: If there is a wife and child dependent on the man in service they get $80. If this same man in service has two parents and a sister, also dependent upon him, they too, can get $79 a month also. This is important: To get this extra $79 only $5 more is taken out of the serviceman's pay. The balance of the $74 is paid by the Government. If the parents and brothers or sisters are only partially dependent, that is less than 50 percent, they can get $37. Because a serviceman has a wife and children getting an allotment does not prevent his parents and brothers and sisters dependent on him from getting an allotment also. If you have any questions on this write your Congressman and he will explain how to go about it.

PARENTS CAN GET ALLOTMENT FROM MORE THAN ONE SON OR DAUGHTER IN SERVICE

If parents are dependent upon more than one son or daughter or both in service they can get more dependency allotment. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son in service they get $68 per month. Now if another son or daughter in service helped support these same two parents they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN CAN HELP YOU IF YOU HAVE ANY TROUBLE

It is a Congressman's duty to help with such matters. He is your representative in Washington. If you have any trouble at all in this respect, your Congressman is the person to take it up with.

Your Congressman has already helped in more than 300 cases. Only 10 cases are still pending. Your Congressman has settled every other case and gotten for his people every cent they had coming.

If any questions arise regarding where to get application blanks or how to make an application—or if for any reason you know of any dependent not now receiving the allotment—or if for any reason you know of any dependent having any trouble getting the allotment, write to Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Views of the National Association of Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter received by me from the National Association of Salesmen containing their views on the gasoline situation:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SALESMEN,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, November 6, 1943.
Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: We, the undersigned, represent an organization formed here in Cedar Rapids and incorporated under the laws of the State of Iowa. It is our aim that this become, as its name implies, national in scope. Although the idea was launched less than 2 weeks ago it is astounding, even to us, the distant points from which we have had expressions of interest. Inquiries for information as to how to start new units have come from no less than 12 of the principal towns in our State, and 5 outside our borders.

This is no temporary group formation, but a permanent organization with aims that are sound and fundamental, as you may note. As set forth in our constitution, this is our platform:

1. To call the attention of the Nation to the important position of the salesman in the economic world.

2. To assist him in rendering his essential and educational services to the businessmen of America.

3. To promote and protect the interests and free enterprise of the American public and the membership of this organization.

The salesman is as much a part of the American way of life as national advertising and mass production. Neither of these could produce the high standard of living and general prosperity that are America's without mass selling, promulgated and impelled by the salesman. As Mr. George D. Haskell, district War Manpower Commissioner of Iowa, said recently in an address, "The United States is primarily a nation of production and distribution." Without a distributing organization (salesmen), production could create advantages for no one. This, then, is one of the phases of the salesman's important position in the economic world. There are many more.

In the present national crisis the salesman's services are almost indispensable to all branches of the military and industry. His absence would have a most crippling effect on the war effort. Many production managers, production, designing, and maintenance engineers, purchasing agents, et al., will testify to the salesman's important contribution to the conduct of the war through his educational work on priorities, price ceilings, freeze orders, etc., through his efforts in expediting the delivery of vital materials and commodities, through his advice on substitutions that might be made when the desired merchandise is not available and, in many instances, through training programs, carried on in military camps, ordnance plants, war production plants, hospitals, public utility shops, and plants, etc. So, you see, the salesman is more, far more, than just an "order taker"—he is an institution; an essential, vital institution that is an integral part of every phase of American life, including the successful execution of the war.

Without regard to all of the truths as set forth herein, there are some who say the salesman is nonessential, that he must take his place in the Army and the production lines. But, does the Army want him? Do the production lines want him? No. Many salesmen have been told by both that they are not wanted. They do not want him because he is 52 years of age (the average age of a group, exclusive of a few draft-age men, at a recent meeting) and has a training, they say, that is useless in these capacities.

What then is to become of him in the face of his finding it increasingly difficult to carry on due to the discrimination against him on gasoline rationing? Does it not appear tragic, and yet a little ridiculous, that such an important profession be denied enough gasoline to perform their duties while nonessential mileage allotments have been increased from 90 to 120 miles per month? Is it not ironic that men who have never asked for anything for themselves but to be let alone to toil for a livelihood have that opportunity denied them while joyriders, motorboat racers, the wealthy with several automobiles, et al., be permitted to burn precious gasoline?

As your constituents we ask your wholehearted cooperation in this grave situation. We earnestly beg you to investigate the matter with the view of correcting the present inequitable distribution of gasoline so that we might carry on for our country, our communities, and our families.

Respectfully yours,
National Association of Salesmen: Louis Locatell, president; Jesse L. Parker, Ray Rendle, John A. Clay, vice presidents; George R. Liddl, secretary; E. O. Samuelson, treasurer, Guy Hershey, sergeant at arms; Wilmer J. Robison, W. F. Todd, Harry C. Schrier, D. A. Atkinson, Oscar L. Lovett, board of directors.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a resolution opposing subsidies sent in by the Nebraska Livestock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Livestock Association. The resolutions were adopted in Omaha, Nebr., on November 9, 1943. It indicates quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of these groups as it relates to the meat-subsidy program and the system of allocation of livestock to slaughterers and feeders.

I have frequently called attention to the fact that the O. P. A. and other Government agencies have failed to follow the considered judgment and advice of the growers and feeders of livestock. We continue to ration meat and pay a roll-back subsidy on meat as though it were a very scarce article and must be carefully rationed in order to allocate sufficient meat to the military forces, the civilians, and to lend-lease, at the same time Marvin Jones announces in his food program that there must be a reduction in the number of live animals, including hogs, cattle, and poultry. The two ideas just do not make sense. Either we have sufficient meat in the country and there is no need of rationing meat or there is not enough and not only rationing but the increased production should be advocated. The War Food Administration goes around in circles. Apparently their left hand does not know what their right hand is doing.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the O. P. A. consumer meat subsidy program has discouraged livestock feeding operations to the extent that the war effort is being seriously impaired and unnecessary hardships are being imposed upon the civilian population; and

Whereas these regulations are encouraging black-market operations resulting in higher costs in the aggregate to the consumers with profits to the racketeers and losses to the livestock producers; and

Whereas these subsidies are being paid by the Government to reduce grocery bills that must be repaid in the future by taxes imposed upon the men and women now in the armed services; and

Whereas the Director of Economic Stabilization has ordered the War Food Administration to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is thoroughly impractical and would destroy the economy of the livestock industry; and

Whereas subsidies from the Federal Treasury to reduce food prices are inflationary: Be it therefore

Resolved, That representatives of the Nebraska Live Stock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Live Stock Association, in meeting assembled at Omaha, Nebr., November 9, 1943, hereby declare their unalterable opposition to the continuation of the price roll-back subsidy and livestock ceiling price program; be it further

Resolved, That the consumers of the Nation be advised that only by supporting food producers in their efforts to eliminate this unsound economic policy which is throttling production, can they hope to insure adequate future food supplies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; congressional delegations from the States mentioned; the Office of Price Administration; the Director of Economic Stabilization; the War Food Administrator, and to Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, who represented the consumers at a recent Kansas City livestock meeting.

Parr Young, Nehawka, Nebr.; Louis Smithberger, Stanton, Nebr.; Wayland Hopley, Atlantic, Iowa; Frank Retz, Lewiston, Iowa; Paul Krueger, Fort Calhoun, Nebr.; C. J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr.; Plummer Martin, Omaha, Nebr.; George B. Stein, Smith Center, Kans.; Resolutions Committee.

A Soldier's Letter to Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter written by Lt. Joseph R. McLean, of Scituate, Mass., stationed in the southwest Pacific. Lieutenant McLean received a letter from his father, Frank McLean, asking him what he wanted most of all for Christmas. In his letter the lieutenant's father pretended he was Santa Claus

and wrote that he was on a stocking-filling mission. Lieutenant McLean, carrying out the theme of his dad's letter, addressed this answer to his father:

DEAR SANTA CLAUS: I am writing this from a spot "somewhere in the southwest Pacific." Of course, to you, it is no mystery where that "somewhere" is, because I am still wallowing in the stench of the jungleland that held me last Christmas. If you remember, that was before our latest censorship bans, and when I wrote to you then, I was able to name our unhappy home. Just check through the beginning of your files; I'm one of the old timers on that list.

Last year you were able to visit us on the Holy Eve. The party we had on that eve and night was so noisy that your reindeer refused to land. Now, please don't condemn us for that riotous affair. It was really Nip's party and he was celebrating, oriental style, with firecrackers—big ones, too.

Our requests to you at that time were for choice tidbits of food, tobacco, and the many little knick-knacks that we used to think important in our American way of living. This year we don't have to bother you with the delivery of these things. Our Uncle Sam is taking much better care of us now; we are no longer his forgotten nephews. At least, not in some ways.

What I shall ask you for, and I ask not for myself alone but for all of us who have been many months in the jungle, will not burden your sleigh, nor will the dictates of the O. P. A. be offended. What I shall ask for are little, unimportant things to many people; things that some would consider unnecessary, but to us they mean much.

Bring us a supply of laughter; that carefree, bubbling, easily stirred laughter that once slipped out of us with natural ease; that laughter that spoke of happiness and spread happiness in its wake; that kind of laughter which we have been without for so long.

We are tired of forcing from our lips that caricature of a laugh that speaks of anything but humor. We are tired of cackling over things that would bring only tears to more normal people.

I ask you, Santa, bring us laughter; reams of it, yards of it, bushels of it, whatever the unit of measure may be, please bring us a supply that will last us a lifetime.

Another important request, Santa—memories. Our best ones, those of family, loved ones, and friends, those of people, places, and events that we knew in happier days, are fading beyond recollection. Like our eyes, they weaken and fade in the tropical glare.

We are losing that awareness of changing inflections of the voice, characteristic movements of the eyes, features or bodies that once made our memories live. With each passing day, the pictures in our minds become more silent, less legible, more like faded photographs and less like people we knew and hope to know again.

Yes, Santa, we need fresh memories. Bring us some that will live and breathe, move and talk, that we can meet again through the long nights to come.

Do you realize what a little optimism means to a person? Optimism—that faith in the appearance of tomorrow's sunrise, that sureness of mind that there will be a tomorrow that will be better than today. Optimism—that composite of faith and hope that is a salve to feet bruised over the rough road through life.

We need some. If you will, Santa, bring us just a little.

These are no small presents for which I ask, but, if they could be had as a Christmas present, I would really believe in Santa Claus.

Hopefully yours,

JUST A SOLDIER.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is a message of deep thought and beautiful sentiment under conditions of constant danger. It is a message of sacrifice in the defense of our country. It is also a message that the "whiners" and the "snipers" throughout the country could well profit from, if they lifted their minds above individual selfishness and considered first and foremost the best interests of our country. When we read such letters as these we realize the sacrifices that our fighting men and women everywhere are making, and on the other hand, appreciate how small are the sacrifices we on the home front are making.

Abraham Baldwin and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Robert Nelson Anderson, special assistant to the Attorney General, at a Constitution Day program arranged by the District of Columbia Daughters of the American Revolution, held in St. Paul's Church Hall, Colonial Rock Creek Parish, September 17, 1943, on the occasion of the unveiling of a marker to Abraham Baldwin, a signer of the Constitution:

I deem it a great privilege to be given a place on your program this evening—a program devoted to honoring the memory of a great American, Abraham Baldwin, whose body rests peacefully within only a short distance of this place. I have always had a great respect and admiration for your organization. The Daughters of the American Revolution have come to be known as the guardians of the very fundamentals of our American heritage. Faithfully indeed you have undertaken to preserve those great principles which have made us and kept us a mighty nation. We cannot too often think or dwell upon the great charters of our liberties, and the men and women who made them possible. It is therefore exceedingly appropriate that on this 17th day of September, which marks the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States by the deputies assembled at Philadelphia in the memorable year of 1787, we should pause in the pursuit of the ordinary things of life to pay our respects to one who was present on that occasion and was a signatory to that immortal document.

Fate, by preordaining that his remains should repose here in this district, the only signer of the Constitution as far as we know to be so interred, has furnished us with a peculiar inspiration for the occasion.

Shakespeare in his Julius Caesar has Mark Antony speak the much-quoted lines—

"The evil that men do, lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones."

But not so with Abraham Baldwin—if there was any evil in his life, history has not seen fit to record it. The time at our disposal will permit only a brief review of his career.

Born November 2, 1754, at New Guilford, Conn., his parents were of good New England stock. His great, great grandfather, Nathaniel Baldwin, had come to this continent from Devonshire, England, in 1639.

At the tender age of 14, Abraham Baldwin entered Yale, and was graduated 4 years later, or in 1772, with an A. B. degree. For 3 subsequent years he studied divinity and was licensed to preach on September 26, 1775. In the fall of that year he was appointed tutor in Yale College, serving in that capacity until June 1779, when he was appointed a chaplain with the rank of colonel in the Second Connecticut Brigade of the Continental Army, which post he held until the cessation of hostilities on June 3, 1783. It was during his service as chaplain that he studied law at Yale and was admitted to the bar at Fairfield in April 1783.

Shortly after his discharge from the Army, Baldwin, then 31, presumably at the invitation of Gen. Nathaniel Green, or the Governor, Lyman Hall, left for Georgia where he became a citizen of Wilkes County in the fall of 1783. His advancement in Georgia was rapid. He had gone there more or less as a missionary in the cause of education. Apparently believing that education was an essential to statecraft, he appears to have decided to apply his knowledge and training to public service in that cause.

Perceiving upon his arrival in Georgia that it would be some time before his plans for the advancement of education could materialize, Baldwin decided to practice law. On January 14, 1784, he presented to the House of Assembly of Georgia a petition to practice law in the courts of the State, which petition was granted. However, he was to soon enter public life, for on January 12, 1785, he qualified as a member of the house of assembly from his county. Probably the only college graduate in the assembly, his ability and leadership were immediately recognized. One of his outstanding feats as a member of the house of assembly was the securing of the passage of a bill granting a charter for the formation of a State university. He thus was the founder of the first State university in this country and was elected its first president.

We come next to consider occurrences and conditions which lead to Abraham Baldwin's greatest opportunity and achievement. On January 19, 1785, the Legislature of Georgia named him a delegate to the Continental Congress. One of the first objectives of the Continental Congress, which had first assembled on September 4, 1774, was to provide the means of a permanent union of all the Thirteen Colonies under a general government. The deliberations on this subject were coeval with the Declaration of Independence, and after various debates and discussions, at different sessions, the Continental Congress finally agreed in November 1777 upon a frame of government, contained in certain articles of confederation, which were immediately sent to all the States for their approval and adoption. Various delays and objections, however, on the part of some of the States took place; and as the government was not to go into effect until the consent of all the States was obtained, the Confederation was not finally adopted until March 1781, when Maryland (the last State) acceded to it.

The Articles of Confederation had scarcely been adopted before the defects of the plan, as a frame of national government, began to manifest themselves. Its leading defects were (1) an utter want of all coercive authority in the Continental Congress to carry into effect any of its constitutional measures, (2) its lack of power to lay taxes or to collect revenue for the public service, and (3) its lack of power to regulate commerce, either with foreign nations or among the several States composing the Union. These and other weaknesses of the National Government were gradually bringing the country to the

brink of ruin. A progressive destruction had set in of all our resources, all our industry, and all our credit. The utter unfitness of the Confederation as a frame of government for a free, enterprising, and industrious people had been thoroughly established. At length it became apparent that the Confederation, being left without resources and without powers, must soon expire of its own debility. The only question which remained was whether it should be left to a silent dissolution or an attempt should be made to form a more efficient government before the great interests of the Union were buried beneath its ruins. It was in the face of this desperate situation that Abraham Baldwin was sent by his home legislature as a delegate to the Continental Congress.

In September of the next year, or 1786, commissioners who had been appointed by the States, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, met at Annapolis for the purpose of considering the condition of trade of their respective States and the propriety of adopting a uniform system of commercial relations for their permanent harmony and common interest. But these commissioners went further than was at first contemplated. They framed a report calling attention to the defects in the failing Federal Government, to be laid before the Continental Congress, advising the latter to call a General Convention of Commissioners from all the States to meet in Philadelphia in May 1787, for a more effectual revision and strengthening of the Articles of Confederation. Upon receiving the report, the Continental Congress, meeting in New York considered the recommendations thereof, and, after debate, on February 21, 1787, passed a resolution looking forward to the assembling of such a convention as was suggested therein.

As a result of the passage of this resolution by the Continental Congress, all the States, except Rhode Island, appointed delegates, and the Constitutional Convention convened in Philadelphia in May of the same year. Here again the ability and wisdom of Abraham Baldwin was recognized by the leaders of his adopted State, for the legislature of Georgia appointed him as one of the deputies from Georgia to the convention. Detained in the Georgia legislature, Baldwin did not arrive at the convention until June 11, but thereafter he was in constant attendance. The influence of Georgia was substantially wielded by him, and probably was much greater than has been realized.

Much of the work of the Constitutional Convention was done in meetings of "grand committees," of which there were six. Committees were formed by members selected by ballot, one from each State. Baldwin was on four of these committees. He spoke eight times on the floor, always briefly, conservatively, with dignity and impressiveness. During the course of one of these speeches pertaining to the disposition of the immense western domains, Baldwin asserted that he did not wish any undue advantage to be given Georgia, and suggested the form of constitutional provision which was ultimately adopted, giving to Congress the power "to dispose of and make rules and regulations respecting the territories or other property belonging to the United States, without prejudice to the claims of the United States or any particular State." It was his belief that Georgia was genuinely desirous that the union of the States should be preserved. The vital interest of his State protected, the Georgia deputy cooperated zealously with those from other States in the endeavor to devise the best possible form of National Government that wisdom and experience could suggest as adequate to ensure its strength and perpetuity.

After very protracted deliberations and great diversities of opinion, the assembled 39 delegates, including Abraham Baldwin, finally, 156 years ago today, signed the present Constitution of the United States, and recommended it be laid by the Continental Congress before the several States, to be by them considered and ratified in convention of the representatives of the people to be called for that purpose. The Constitutional Convention thereupon adjourned, and Baldwin returned to the Continental Congress in New York to aid in securing the agreement of that body to the recommendations of the Convention. On September 28, 1787, the Continental Congress agreed to carry out those recommendations. Conventions were accordingly called in all the States except Rhode Island. James M. Beck, in commenting on the swiftness with which the agreement was reached, observed that it was "one of the few instances in human history where an existing government complacently committed suicide." But that is but a tribute to the character of the men involved.

The assent of only 9 States being required, and this having been given, steps were then taken by the Continental Congress to put the Constitution into operation. By a vote taken September 13, 1788, in which Baldwin joined, a resolution was adopted fixing the day for the appointment of electors in the several States, the day for taking their vote for a President, and the day and place for commencing proceedings under the new Constitution.

Thus was achieved a wonderful and glorious triumph in the cause of liberty which even exceeded that by which we were separated from the parent country. But it is obvious that this achievement was not accomplished without great difficulties and sacrifices of opinion. It required all the wisdom, patriotism, and genius of our best statesmen to overcome the obstacles that stood in the way. The pernicious influence of State jealousies and local interests had to be counteracted. And in this we have a lesson for today. Liberty may be lost when men are found ready to hazard its permanent blessings, rather than submit to the wholesome restraints which its permanent security demands.

As suggested by Sir Donald Somervell, Attorney General for England and Wales, in an address last month before the American Bar Association at Chicago—the great service which statesmen and lawyers like Abraham Baldwin rendered was that, "imbued with the principles of liberty and justice which animated the people, they enshrined them in the law" and provided effective methods for their preservation.

The history of the times in which Baldwin and his compatriots lived reminds us of the necessity of constantly guarding and preserving what had been thus earned at great sacrifice. The critical period through which we now move merely serves to accentuate this fundamental truth. As John Philpot Curran said in 1790 in his speech upon the right of election. "The conditions upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance."

But ours is even a greater responsibility than that which rested upon our forefathers. Their immediate concern was to make liberty a reality to the people of this Nation. To be sure they thought of the other peoples of the globe and held out a hope to them for future times. This was the very sentiment of the Declaration of Independence. Referring to that sentiment, Lincoln said: "It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

The founding fathers, moreover, were restricted in their accomplishments by the barriers of a great ocean. But today the scene has changed. Modern invention and scientific achievement has prepared us for a world challenge which our forefathers only contemplated in their dreams. The ocean barrier which nature erected around us has been bridged. The airplane and the radio has made the world one community. And we, at this very moment, in conjunction with our allies, are engaged in a mortal conflict to make liberty a reality for all the peoples of the earth. We and our allies fight that the "four freedoms" might prevail. As our great President has said: "The belief in the 'four freedoms' of common humanity—the belief in man, created free, in the image of God—is the crucial difference between ourselves and the enemies we face today. In it lies the absolute unity of our alliance, opposed to the oneness of the evil we hate. Here is our strength, the source and promise of victory." These "four freedoms"—the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, the freedom from want, and the freedom from fear, are the bill of rights of all mankind. It is fascinating to know that such bill of rights has its roots in the Bill of Rights attached to our Federal Constitution.

To those great men who framed the Constitution and secured its adoption we owe a debt of great gratitude. Here near the quiet resting place of one of them I know no better way to pay our obligation to them than to make this a day of dedication. We know that our armies will be victorious on the field of battle. The life and deeds of Abraham Baldwin and his compatriots inspire us to resolve that when the smoke of battle has died away and the peace has come, that we will do our utmost to make liberty for which they strove a reality for all mankind.

Let us take encouragement from the stirring lines of Arthur Hugh Clough's poem, Say Not the Struggle Nought Availeth, so vividly called to our attention by Mr. Winston Churchill in a broadcast to the United States last year:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in the main.
"And not by eastern windows only
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward look, the land is bright."

So in conclusion we salute the memory of Abraham Baldwin, the educator, the clergyman, the lawyer, the orator, member of the Georgia House, delegate to the Continental Congress, United States Representative from Georgia, United States Senator from Georgia, but, most important of all, a deputy to the Constitutional Convention and thereby one of the founding fathers. Laying down the cares of mortal life on March 4, 1807, his memory shall live as long as freemen shall inhabit the earth.

Kansas May Become New Chemical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article which appeared in yesterday's Wall Street Journal:

KANSAS MAY BECOME A NEW CHEMICAL CENTER

Representatives of several big companies in the industry have visited there recently,

to assay the prospects. They saw large natural gas and oil fields, plus salt and limestone. These are the chief raw materials of what promises to become the fastest growing post-war industry. One catch: Higher transportation costs. Hauling by rail and road is far more expensive than by ocean freight and tanker. The Gulf coast chemical plants benefit from their waterside locations.

Mr. Speaker, Kansas has long had potential manufacturing possibilities and I want to urge that not only the chemical industry but other manufacturing interests give consideration to the many natural resources in our State. Coal underlies more than 15,000 square miles. The State ranks fourth in oil production, ninth in natural gas and first in salt. Other mineral products are lead, zinc, portland cement, plus unlimited quantities of valuable clays, gravel and limestone. During the past 2 years Kansas has demonstrated that she has the executive leadership, manufacturing talent and skilled labor to produce airplanes, chemicals, ships and other manufactured articles used in our war program. Wichita, Kans., has been producing more planes per day than any other city in the United States. At the conclusion of the war we will have factories and skilled labor immediately available for post-war production. These two items, in addition to the many natural resources, should be the basis of a great industrial development of our State. This news article lists higher transportation costs as one of the obstacles that must be overcome. It is a pleasure to advise those interested that a restudy of the freight tariffs for Kansas is being conducted at the present time and I hope we can give additional encouragement along this line in the near future.

Early in this war Kansas recognized the need for a united effort to secure industrial work for the State and therefore the legislature created the Kansas Industrial Commission. The State appropriated sufficient funds for this commission to carry on its work and was the first State in the Union to establish offices in Washington, D. C. The commission was most fortunate in securing the services of R. H. (Dusty) Rhodes as its representative. His untiring effort has brought the State manyfold returns for the investment.

Anyone interested in the future industrial possibilities of our State may contact him in Washington, D. C.

The Program of Food Production and Canning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Minnesota Canners' Association, dealing with the many problems and difficulties the canners have to contend with in connection with commodities used in their business which they produce to a large extent and purchase from farmers. The canners have difficulties with the various agencies and bureaus of the Government which are fully stated in the letter, which will be of information to the bureaus, if they read the RECORD, as well as to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 5, 1943.
Hon HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is appreciated that you are very busy on critical and important matters pending before the Congress at this time; however, since some of these have to do with the important item of food, of which this industry is a large contributor, it is thought you would be interested in knowing what the canners in this section particularly are thinking relative to plans for 1944 food crops.

As you will recall, a number of so-called reform measures were fostered on the industry prior to the 1943 pack—these being, among others, compulsory grade labeling. O. P. A. we understand has decided that in spite of the Congress intent, Government grade should appear on all invoices; secondly, regional pricing as against formula pricing, which latter method worked satisfactorily in 1942. As you know, this regional pricing disrupts regular trade practices and historical methods of doing business.

In addition to this, canners were promised that if the N. W. L. B. granted increase in wages, such increased costs would be added to regional prices. N. W. L. B. did grant such increases in this area up to 10 cents per hour, representing approximately 2½ cents per dozen in additional costs, but as yet O. P. A. have not kept their promise in permitting this additional cost to be added to current ceiling prices.

We mention these particular factors because we feel, and we think you will agree, that the canning industry in 1943 went all out in their planned production—putting large acreages into the ground against having no definite program of selling prices, of guaranteed labor, or other factors important to the successful operation of the industry. While it is true the pack this season may not be as large as it was in 1942, this was not because the canners failed to plant nd plan for a larger production.

We fully believe that the canners are again willing to expand for 1944 season in attempting to produce an even larger production than was put up in the record years of 1942 and 1943, but before they go out and contract the large acreage needed, purchase seed any other supplies, and put this seed into the ground, they rightly feel that they are entitled to know from the Government what the program is for 1944 and that this program will be backed by something more than mere promises in the light of their experience this past season.

As an indication of what such a program should consist of, herewith are some of the important factors which are considered paramount to any full scale production next year:

1. The absolute deferment of keymen. In this connection, might just say to you now that the manager of one of the canneries in this State has been classified I-A—has had his preliminary examination and is subject to draft call. If keymen such as the one named, as well as those necessary in the operation of the factory and in the field are taken—all the acreage in the world won't do a bit of good because it cannot be handled.

2. General labor for field and factory. One plant in 1943 lost as high as 2,000 acres of peas because labor was not available in time to harvest these. It so happened that in this particular case an order had been placed and accepted for importation of Jamaicans, but for some reason or other, unexplained, these Jamaicans did not arrive on the job until 2 to 4 days after the date specified for their arrival and the above acreage was lost. Assurance is going to be necessary that general labor will be available to canners in 1944 in the form of Jamaicans, Bahamans, Mexican nationals, war prisoners, armed forces, or other available imported labor, as there is not sufficient labor in this area to harvest and process the crops.

3. Trucking facilities: In order for the canners to secure a larger acreage and particularly in competition with the hemp plants which have been set up in the heart of the canning section here in Minnesota, it is necessary to go further afield—which means an increased need for trucks and trucking facilities to get the raw product from the field to the factory. The situation was very acute during the packing season of 1943. Every indication points to an even more serious acute situation in 1944. Many local truckers have gone into defense plants because they have been unable to secure necessary maintenance equipment to keep their trucks operating. Some of the trucks are of course old, and it has been impossible to replace these. Some trucks have left the territory entirely for operation in other fields. The raw products of peas and corn—in order to retain their full quality and nutrition value, must be handled through the factory within a few hours from the time they are harvested. Insufficient trucking facilities is going to be a serious handicap.

4. In 1942 the Government requisitioned from canners 35 to 50 percent or more of their pack. In 1943 the Government also requisitioned from 20 to 50 percent of the pack. Practically all of the 1943 Government-owned goods are still in canners' warehouses, and a very large portion of the 1942 pack, if we are correctly informed, still remains in public warehouses. Canners feel they should be entitled to know what the Government stockpile consists of and what plans the Government is making to dispose of these goods should the war end within the near future—in order to avoid the depressed markets created at the end of the World War by the Government dumping of foods. In fact, canners feel that they should be entitled to a floor price as well as a ceiling price on future production.

5. At the meeting with the Minnesota State War Board, Department of Agriculture in January 1943, growers of corn and peas in this State recommended increase in the price of raw products of approximately 30 percent over 1942 prices. Canners recommended an increase of between 30 to 35 percent. As against this, the Federal Department of Agriculture established a price on the raw products in this State on peas, 30 percent over 1942 and on sweet corn, 67 percent over 1942. These prices on raw products were established for areas or regions and in no way took into consideration the location of producing areas to primary markets, nor to historical relationships or cost of raw products as determined by such locations. As an illustration, price on the raw product of sweet corn set for Minnesota was the same as that set in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Montana, Idaho—to name a few. On green peas, Minnesota was included with Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Tennessee, Kansas—to name a few. Canners in this State feel that in producing approximately 20 to 25 percent of the total sweet corn pack in the country and approximately 10 percent of the canned peas packed in the

country, they should be entitled to Minnesota being designated as an area by itself and maintaining historical relationships in prices of raw products to offset those States or areas who are located closer to primary markets.

6. Ceiling prices: Canners feel that ceiling prices for their products should be determined by formula basis as was satisfactorily accomplished in 1942. In this way such ceiling prices can and should fully reflect all costs, including hazard of the game, as against the now-established regional price ceilings.

7. Inasmuch as contracts covering Government requisitions of canned foods from canners are set price contracts and usually below ceiling prices established for a commodity, canners feel that they should be exempt from the operation of the renegotiation statute—either specifically or by raising the limit on contracts under which renegotiation operates.

We will trust you will pardon the length of this letter, but have tried to give you an honest, frank view of the thoughts that are running through canners' minds and which they feel must be answered specifically—in full faith—if they are to attempt a record food production the coming season.

With kindest regards, remain,

Yours very truly,

MINNESOTA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT L. WILSON, *Secretary*.

Preinduction Examination of Registrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to me from Mr. Robert Grant Walsh, Government appeal agent at St. Louis, Mo., of Board No. 21, of the Selective Service System, with reference to the subject of preinduction examination of registrants, which is a subject now pending before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
St. Louis, Mo., November 8, 1943.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: At a meeting of the Government appeal agents of St. Louis and St. Louis County last Wednesday evening it was called to my attention as chairman of the group that something should be done with reference to preinduction examination of registrants in order that this examination would be binding on the armed forces and not subject a man to a second examination after such examination has been obtained.

The present procedure is to send a man, who is in business for himself, to the barracks for a preinduction examination which is merely advisory. He might have an examiner who will tell him he will not pass and then go to the barracks later and be accepted for military service and find himself with a business on his hands and unable to dispose of it in time.

I am informed by Missouri State headquarters that there is now pending Senate bill No. 763, section V thereof providing: "any registrant, when it appears that his induction will shortly occur, shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination. Those registrants who are classified as I–A at the time of such physical examination or who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof shall remain thus classified and report for induction in regular order."

I am informed this bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate on October 21, 1943. The provisions of this bill have the wholehearted backing of selective-service personnel in this area, and I shall appreciate anything you may do to further its acceptance.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT GRANT WALSH,
Board No. 21.

Armistice Day, 1918

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this moment to recall to our minds the joy and the hopefulness of the American people on Armistice Day 25 years ago. It is well that we should pay honor to those who by their valor and courage made possible the victory of November 11, 1918. We thought we had fought a war that was going to end all wars; our hopes of permanent peace were high. We won the war but we failed to maintain the peace; as a result thousands of men who served in World War No. 1 are now back in our armed forces along with millions of others from this later generation. I can think of no better way to honor the memory of those who died in World War No. 1 than for all of us today to pledge that we are going to give more, produce more, and do more toward winning this war, speeding up the day of victory, speeding the next Armistice Day—do more than we have done as yet. We have a tremendous task facing us in this country.

By the very nature of modern warfare we will have thousands of disabled veterans who must be rehabilitated and, if possible, restored to usefulness in their respective communities. The fine mechanism of the human body was not created to withstand the shock of modern warfare. In addition to those wounded, other thousands will break down nervously and mentally. Fortunately, there are over 2,500,000 men and women in this country who remember their own experiences upon returning home from World War No. 1. These people should be able to contribute greatly to the rehabilitation of the veterans of this war. It is time now for employers of labor to instruct their supervisory staff to recognize the first symptoms of mental breakdown. We can all remember cases of men who were not able to make the tremendous readjustment from wartime to peacetime existence. We recall men who threw up job after job because of the inability to readjust themselves. If employers of labor are trained to recognize these early symptoms, a great deal of unnecessary hospitalization can be avoided.

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday, entitled "The Soldier Vote."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLDIER VOTE

It is not easy to enable soldiers to vote. With our armed forces distributed over nearly every portion of the planet, many of them isolated on remote islands of the Pacific, the sheer physical task of transporting and collecting ballots is formidable indeed. The expenditure of time, energy, and shipping space involved could be justified for no other purpose. But whatever it costs in effort, it is well worth it to preserve for servicemen the prerogatives of their citizenship.

Past endeavors to afford voting opportunities to servicemen have been pathetically unsuccessful. In the congressional elections of last year only 137,000 uniformed men applied for war ballots. And, when all the shouting was over, no more than 28,000 valid service ballots had been cast. The importance of the election to be held next year demands a far more effective enfranchisement of the men who have been called to the colors. They have a vital concern in the choice of a President in 1944 and in the selection of Senators and Representatives. To a greater extent, perhaps, than any other group of citizens, they are entitled to a voice in shaping the policies of the post-war period.

Legislation introduced in the House by Congressman WORLEY and in the upper Chamber by Senator GREEN gives promise of making the franchise available to most, if not all, our men and women in uniform. It would establish a bipartisan United States war ballot commission to superintend the balloting. But it would leave the actual distribution, collection, and return of ballots to the several branches of our Military and Naval Establishment. And it would entrust the counting of votes, sensibly, to the secretaries of state in the various States from which the voters hail.

The proposed system is not without shortcomings. It will be impossible to print the names of candidates on the ballots to be sent overseas. In some situations, even, lists of candidates may not be available for distribution among the men in time to acquaint them with all the nominees. But they will know

at least who the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates are and will be able to register their choices for these quintessential offices. Very wisely the bills under consideration provide for as great a degree of informality in voting as is consistent with secrecy and accurate tabulation of the results.

Some of the niceties of State qualifications for voting would be done away with under this system. No man in uniform, for example, would have to pay a poll tax. Registration would be combined with balloting. This sort of simplification of election procedures which may be in effect at home should not be deplored. And it should by no means be seized upon as an excuse for obstructing or sabotaging this vital piece of legislation. The proposals which are now before Congress have been formulated in collaboration with a number of State secretaries of state and meet all the reasonable requirements which they have raised.

Extension of the suffrage to servicemen will undoubtedly afford a big boost to their morale. It is one concrete, practical way of assuring them that their interests and aims are not being ignored or overridden at home. It will serve to narrow the breach which inevitably exists between them and civilians. And perhaps most important of all it will afford them a reminder of their responsibilities in the democratic form of society which they are fighting to preserve.

Secretary Hull's Return From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, our able and efficient Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, last Wednesday returned from one of the most important and far-reaching missions that has occurred within the last half century.

The account of his arrival in Washington is ably set forth by the Associated Press in the Washington Star of November 10. Other statements concerning Secretary Hull's return have been published in the RECORD, but the one to which I refer has not been placed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL ACCORDED HERO'S WELCOME ON RETURN HERE FROM MOSCOW

Cordell Hull, who startled the world with the success of his mission to Moscow, was startled himself today. He returned to Washington to find that he was a hero.

The 72-year-old Secretary of State stepped off a plane late yesterday and appeared astonished to see President Roosevelt and other high dignitaries waiting to give him an accolade.

"We'll give you the keys to the city," Mr. Roosevelt said with a grin.

Secretary Hull was moved to say:

"You don't know how much I appreciate this."

The Secretary, who signed the war and post-war acts with Britain's Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, and Soviet Russia's Molotov, drove with the President to the White House, where he discussed details that could be taken up only in private.

Mr. Hull came home—a "gallant American eagle" in the words of Prime Minister Churchill—and Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who has found plenty of fault with the administration on other scores, came right out with a declaration that the Secretary should be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for "his diplomatic success nearly beyond measure."

The Secretary exploded the myth that he wouldn't bear up well under air travel. The transport crew said he was the only one of his party who showed no ill effects of the long flight.

WIFE FIRST TO GREET HIM

Mrs. Hull was first to greet her husband as he stepped from the big Army cargo ship which landed at Capital Airport just at 3:20 p. m. Under Secretary Stettinius then shook his hand warmly. Mr. Hull stepped over to the President's car to receive the greeting of the Chief Executive.

"Hello, pardner," was his salutation as Majority Leader BARKLEY came forward to offer congratulations on the success of the mission to Russia.

Other old associates from Mr. Hull's days in Congress also crowded around, and Ambassador Wei Taoming of China likewise greeted Mr. Hull.

The greetings over, the Secretary went directly to the White House for the talk with President Roosevelt—a talk which presumably covered decisions of the Moscow Conference not yet made public and other matters too secret to be entrusted to ordinary means of communication.

BRUSHED ASIDE DELAY

One of these other matters may be word from Premier-Marshal Stalin as to where and when he will meet with President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill—a conference the Anglo-American leaders long have sought.

The President suggested the talk might be put off until today so that the Secretary could get some rest first, but Mr. Hull brushed that idea aside, assisted Mrs. Hull into the President's car and climbed in himself.

Before leaving for the White House, Mr. Hull spoke briefly to reporters of the Moscow Conference's main decisions—that none of the four countries represented—Russia, Britain, the United States, and China—would make a separate peace with a common enemy, and that all four would work together after the war to maintain peace.

"I believe that our country and other peace-loving countries have a vast opportunity to profit by the program of policies outlined by the Moscow Conference," he said. "I have supreme faith that they will avail themselves of that opportunity."

Important Message to Next of Kin of Men and Women in Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time when many war casualties are in the offing it might do well to inform the people of my district just what dependents and next of kin are entitled to as a result of losing a son, a daughter, a husband, or a father on the many battlefields of this world. Should any casualty occur in your family it should be remembered that there are four money benefits due the dependents of the deceased veteran. They are as follows:

First. A 6-month gratuity payment. This payment is automatically paid to a wife, or if there is no wife it is automatically paid to the child or children.

Here is an important thing to remember: This 6-month gratuity payment is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters. The man or woman in service must designate beforehand that the parents or brothers or sisters receive the 6-month gratuity payment. Therefore, if a man in service has no wife or children, it is important that he get a blank and designate that his parents, brothers, or sisters should get this 6-month gratuity payment. If the man in service fails to do this beforehand, his parents, or brothers, or sisters cannot collect this 6-month gratuity payment. Parents and brothers and sisters would do well to write their son or brother asking him if he has designated someone to receive this 6-month gratuity payment—or they might lose it.

The amount of this payment depends on the rank in service. If the casualty is a private it is $300. If the casualty is a corporal, it is $396. If the casualty is a sergeant, it is $468. The gratuity payment is six times the monthly base pay of the man or woman in service. This gratuity payment is paid in addition to the insurance. This gratuity pay is due even if the soldier had no insurance.

Second. Monthly insurance payments. This insurance is not paid in a lump sum. It is paid on a monthly basis depending on the age of the beneficiary. The older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy a beneficiary under 30 years of age will receive $55.51 a month for 240 months. A beneficiary over 30 years of age will get a guaranteed 120 equal installments—and if they survive beyond 120 months it is paid for life. The amount of monthly payment if the beneficiary is over 30 depends on the age of the beneficiary. Under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would do well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance policies are in order and in the hands of the beneficiaries. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of half blood.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check the insurance policy now. See that everything is in order. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen.

Third. A pension. This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are

in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or women in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased soldier can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow under 50 gets $50. Widow over 50 gets $50. Widow gets $15 a month for first child up to 10 years of age, and $13 for each additional child under 10 years of age. The widow also gets $13 per month for each additional child between 10 and 18 and continues up to 21 years of age if child is in school.

Note the fact that a widow, a child, or parent getting the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and get a pension besides.

Fourth. Arrears of pay. When a casualty occurs, that serviceman or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. For instance, if the casualty occurs on the 27th of the month, he had 27 days pay coming. If the casualty occurs on the 15th of the month, he had 15 days back pay coming. Then, too, when soldiers are at the front in actual combat they may miss several pay days. All of this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. The nearest heir of the deceased serviceman should inquire about and collect this arrears of pay if the serviceman or woman becomes a casualty.

SUMMARY

Should there be a death casualty in your family, remember that there are four payments due the dependents: First, 6 months' gratuity payment; second, insurance; third, a pension; and fourth, arrears of pay. If there are any questions or should you know anyone having difficulty getting these payments from the Government it would do them well to take it up with their Congressman. He will be glad to handle the case for them. Address your letter: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Keeping America American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, we have out in Iowa an outstanding county agent. He is among the most industrious and resourceful of all of our workers in the agriculture program. I have many times witnessed the display that his 4-H Clubs make in their annual county competition, and these clubs are splendid ones. I also attend, when I can, his annual journey or "run around" to visit the feed lots of his county where farmers are producing the beef that feeds us, our Army, and our allies.

One of his sons has already given his life to his country in a last supreme sacrifice while engaged in air combat in Africa. Another son is now a full-fledged Army Air Corps cadet, and as a pilot he intends to avenge his brother's death and proudly finish what Bob started.

This father took part in panel discussions in the recent Iowa-Nebraska convention of the Kiwanis Clubs, and he has been selected as chairman of the agricultural committee of the Kiwanis Iowa-Nebraska district for 1944.

I refer to Paul A. Johnson, of Denison, Iowa, and ask unanimous consent to put into the record the speech he made in that panel discussion. It is a clear statement of the value and duty of farms and farmers in preserving America and in keeping America American. Our real strength is found out among our rural populations and no nation has ever survived a decadent agriculture. The most tragic cry is the mother's cry for food, and the most dangerous cry is the cry for bread shouted by hungry and turbulent mobs. We must preserve the fertility of our soil and the prosperity of our farms and our farm homes, else our Republic will fail. Mr. Johnson points out these very things, and his speech is as follows:

One of the greatest of all Americans once said, "Public prosperity is like a tree—agriculture is its roots; industry and commerce its branches and leaves. When the roots suffer, the leaves wither, the branches break, and the tree dies."

Abraham Lincoln was not only a great American, but he was a clear-thinking statesman whom people could understand. He belongs to the ages. Born on a farm, reared in a typical midwestern rural community, Lincoln drew from his environment his understanding of America.

America has always drawn her strength from those farm folks who live close to the soil. Our cities would soon grow old, lose their vigor, their population, their leadership, and wither and pass away if they did not continually draw from the farms new life and vigor. Cities alone cannot perpetuate themselves. Their ever-decreasing birth rate is below the minimum required to maintain their population. To live, they draw from rural America not only numbers, but the strength of young and virile leadership that creates and builds cities.

The foundation of our American way of life, the fountainhead from which America draws her strength, is rural America. On the farms should be a people happy, contented, well-educated, with comfortable homes and an income from the farms to support and maintain these homes.

"No nation in history has ever survived a decadent agriculture."

Starving people revolt, dictators replace democracy. One has only to think back just a few short years when agitating non-Americans stirred up trouble in western Iowa, after farmers had suffered depression, deflation, financial ruin.

Hats off to the American farmer who in 1942 and 1943 did a most magnificent job of producing "food for freedom." Unless one has been with these farm families on the farms, one cannot appreciate the long hours of work it took to accomplish this. Record production, though, seriously drains the reserves of soil fertility, of farm machinery, and even the health of the farmer and his family.

It has ever been the farmer who has willingly given the most in order that an America be created or preserved. From the War of the Revolution that gave us America, the Civil War that left us a great nation, to World War No. 1 and the present world conflict, farm folks have given of their best, both in men and wealth. Too many of our best and bravest young men left the farms after Pearl Harbor to defend with their lives, if needed, their country. Many of these were needed on the farms. Honor also goes to those who stayed on the farms, when they were unqualifiedly needed at home to keep the farm going. (In every community there are only a selfish few more concerned in piling up wealth than in aiding America.) History and the boys who come home will decide their place in the community.

"Should the American farmer be the only patriotic group in America?" Is not the farmer also entitled to a fair price in the market place—a fair price without subsidy doles (something no thinking farmer wants)?

My son and other young men, who gave their lives for America, believed in fair play. They learned this on the football field. They did not believe in the rugged individualist, who by hook or crook obtained control of national resources, such as forests, fisheries, coal, oil, and agricultural lands and then by ruthlessly exploiting these, left deserts for future Americans. This was not the type of Americanism that built America.

THE HIGHEST ART

The highest art of agriculture is to farm so that the land is left more fertile and productive than before. Yet, no nation in the world's history has destroyed in less than 100 years so many millions of acres of fertile farm soil as America has done. "In America the desert is truly on the march." It is a record we cannot be proud of. It is a sad state of affairs when the American farmer cannot make even a living without cashing in on soil and soil fertility that under proper economic conditions should have been maintained and built up.

From an experience of some 20 years of contact with Kiwanis (starting in 1921 at Fairmont, Minn.), I will suggest a few ways in which I believe Kiwanis, by working with farm folks, can help keep America American.

1. Recognize outstanding farmers who have done a top job in building up fertile, well-kept farms, better livestock, helped to create improved methods of marketing and distribution.

2. Encourage and work with rural youth groups, both boys and girls, and young married farmers. Have them in at meetings to give their viewpoints on what Americans on the farm think and are doing.

NEED LOCAL LEADERS

Farm folks need more local leaders, leadership that will build up united farm communities—communities in which cooperation and neighborliness will prevail. We have grown away from this since 1918; folks travel too far from home in automobiles. Gas rationing may help overcome this.

Finally, "Agriculture is the roots of public prosperity," roots growing in the soil from which comes the food that keeps us strong. In Kiwanis "we build." To build America we must build with people. People mean homes. Homes where children work with their parents are typical of agriculture; they are homes where Americanism is taught; also a reverence for God. A house alone is never a home. Families make homes. If America is to continue great and strong as a nation where human rights are respected,

a nation whose strength is an educated, healthy, God-fearing, home-loving people, then we must see that the American home is still our greatest institution.

To keep America American rural communities must have incomes to build and maintain homes, homes in which the American way of life can be lived. Then from these homes, from our rural schools, our rural churches, our rural communities, will come an insurance of America's future strength.

I care not who piles up the wealth, it will be the folks who raise families that will rule America. The kind of America we will have will be determined by the kind of homes these boys and girls come from. They are the ones who will inherit the wealth and greatness of America. It is they who will decide the government. In their hands will lie the responsibility of America's future. In our hands today lies the responsibility for what they shall do and think. Today, America calls for deeds, not promises; action, not lip service; folks who build with an understanding of America's needs. That is why I see in farm folks our greatest assurance of how to keep America American.

Reclamation in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the importance of reclamation of our semiarid land and the recognition being given this development program by the departments of the Federal Government in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation is reassuring. For the information of my colleagues, there is inserted herewith the address of Mr. Frank W. Herring, Deputy Chairman of the Facilities Committee of the War Production Board, entitled "The W. P. B. Reviews Reclamation Projects":

As I read over the program of this annual convention a few days ago there came to my mind the fancy that I was looking at a cast of characters to appear in a drama entitled "Reclamation in Time of War." As I pursued that fancy, I could not avoid the unhappy conclusion that I was myself to appear as the villain of the piece.

However, as you have observed, the facilities committee of the W. P. B. has approved a number of irrigation projects as well as disapproved some others, so I am of the opinion that I should decline to put on theatrical make-up and attempt to explain to you what it is that goes on in our office that leads eventually to approval or denial.

I shall first endeavor to present to you the general framework of policy within which we in the W. P. B. must deal with irrigation projects. I shall then do my best to make clear to you the sort of machinery that exists in the W. P. B. for handling of construction projects and the processes and procedures involved, which should give you some understanding of the adventures a project proposal experiences in traveling along the hot Washington corridors. I shall then conclude by discussing the manner in which the facilities committee actually reviews these projects and the sort of things it takes into account in arriving at its decisions.

To begin with, there was promulgated by the W. P. B. more than a year ago its widely known limitation order on construction, the so-called L–41. That limitation order is long, it has been amended many times and in general it is couched in lawyer's language. A detailed discussion of it from this platform would be impracticable. The gist of it, however, is that, with certain specified exceptions, all construction undertakings are prohibited unless specifically authorized item by item by the W. P. B. The exceptions have to do with so-called command construction, which is that undertaken directly by the Army and Navy for carrying out their direct military functions, and the very small undertakings which are of not enough significance to warrant the sort of administrative control established in the order. The purpose of the order was and still is frankly restrictive, to curtail construction so that there will be a minimum of diversion of our productive resources of manpower, materials, and equipment from the immedate job of waging war. This order is the basic document establishing the necessity for W. P. B. authorization before any project not in the excepted categories, can proceed to construction.

To implement that order there was set up a year and a half ago the Directive for War-Time Construction, a policy statement jointly announced by the W. P. B. and the War and Navy Departments. It is worthwhile for me to quote from that directive at this point:

"To make available all possible material and effort for immediate war production, the following outlines the principles governing wartime construction:

1. In order that the consumption of materials and equipment by construction activities shall not impede the production of combat supplies and equipment, it is essential that all construction, whether financed by Government or other funds, be reduced to the absolute minimum necessary for the war effort. This applies also to construction essential for vital civilian needs.

2. Reduction in the consumption of materials and equipment by construction operations can be achieved either by the elimination of nonessential projects or parts thereof, by deferring projects not needed immediately or by appropriate changes in design and construction methods which will favor the use of those materials which are most plentiful and which will interfere least with the production of combat material.

3. In order to establish effective measures for the control of construction, the following general policies have been established by the War Production Board, in consultation with the War and Navy Departments.

4. Before any construction project can proceed, it must be acted upon affirmatively by some agency of the Federal Government or by its duly authorized representative. No project will be approved for construction unless it is found, by responsible authority, to meet the following criteria:

(a) It is essential for the war effort.

(b) Postponement of construction would be detrimental to the war effort.

(c) It is not practicable to rent or convert existing facilities for the purpose.

(d) The construction will not result in duplication or unnecessary expansion of existing plants or facilities now under construction or about to be constructed.

(e) All possible economies have been made in the project, resulting in deletion of all nonessential items and parts.

(f) The structure of the project has been designed of the simplest type, just sufficient to meet the minimum requirements.

(g) The answers to the following questions relating to conditions at the proposed site are all affirmative to the extent that they are pertinent:

(1) Are there sufficient labor and materials available to build it?

(2) Will adequate public utilities be available without costly extensions?

(3) Will transportation be available to serve it?

(4) Will labor be available to man it? Are housing and other community facilities adequate?

(5) Will machine tools and other equipment be available to equip it?

(6) Will raw materials be available to operate it?

(7) Can the manufactured product be used at once—or stored until needed?

There is one aspect of this directive which merits a few words of comment. It is to be noted that there is a positive requirement that a project will further the war effort if it is to be given W. P. B. approval. This is rather different from a mere failure to impede the war effort. I appreciate fully that positive contribution and failure to interfere are criteria that have a tendency to diffuse into each other and that the determination of positive essentiality is not one that can be made by a quick glance. But the directive's requirement for a positive furthering of the war effort is of paramount significance.

Further, you will have noted that the directive requires by implication an assurance that projects will in fact be constructed and will in fact be operated effectively. Approvals are not to be given, if the directive is to be observed, to projects which may fail of accomplishment, in either construction or operation, through inadequacy of supply of either labor or materials.

In the early fall of last year it became apparent that despite the restrictive policy established by the two documents I have cited the proportion of our total productive resources going into the construction of new facilities was greater than the war-production program could stand. The situation was adjudged to be critical. A course of action was taken that was somewhat drastic. Far-reaching stop construction orders were given on many projects which had already been under construction for some while and a further tightening of administrative machinery was brought about. As you all know, many of the going projects of the Bureau of Reclamation were ordered stopped at that time.

During the ensuing months the production of food became more and more a matter of national concern until it was accorded a full-fledged status as a wartime objective. Reclamation projects, thereupon, took on aspects of eligibility for W. P. B. consideration somewhat greater than they had had theretofore. For some while, however, differences of opinion prevailed as to how many years into the future we might properly assign a wartime objective to food production. When that matter was finally settled it was agreed that food production as far off as 1946 might be considered proper to take into account.

On the other hand, at about the same time a growing shortage of manpower also become a matter of great public concern. Indeed, inadequacy of our manpower resources promised to be a problem overshadowing even that of the short supply of materials. Consequently, any proposal to undertake the construction of a new facility, or to resume the construction of a project which had earlier been stopped, had to pass a higher hurdle than ever in order to demonstrate its worthwhileness. Indeed, the War Manpower Commission on August 30 issued a statement of policy which very clearly called for continued curtailment of the Nation's construction activities. The relevant sentences are:

"On the basis of present and future labor needs, the War Manpower Commission advises

that 2,100,000 employed persons must effect transfers during the remaining months of the year, and 500,000 must shift to war-useful jobs during the first 6 months of 1944. Of the total transfers expected up to July 1944, about 800,000 are construction workers, a large proportion of whom will change their jobs as construction of military and naval facilities eases off with the completion of facilities for producing war materials and vessels. These workers will then be turning out war materials instead of the means for producing war materials."

Despite the shifting scene, therefore, it was decided that the general restrictive policy was to continue in effect. To give it recognition the Production Executive Committee of the W. P. B. on September 29 adopted the following resolution:

"It shall be the continued policy of the War Production Board to restrict construction of new facilities and to reduce facilities under construction to the minimum necessary for the war program and for essential civilian needs, in order to conserve to the utmost all resources for the production of war supplies and equipment. In accomplishing this result, the Board will in each case seek a minimum consumption of materials and manpower, together with maximum utilization of existing facilities and equipment. The directive for wartime construction, dated May 20, 1942, which established these principles is hereby affirmed."

Most recently the manpower shortage has become highly critical in certain regions in the country, notably the west coast area. You will recall that the situation there has been of such critical importance that it came in for consideration by Justice Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization. The effect of this regional shortage of manpower has been to intensify the restrictive policy of the War Production Board in regard to construction in that area.

Let us now turn to the administrative machinery available for the purpose of applying these policies and let us examine the general procedures employed.

To begin with as you know, a number of so-called claimant agencies, about 25 of them, have been designated among whom the Nation's available supply of materials is, in theory, distributed. These agencies include the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and many other war agencies, including the War Food Administration.

Quarter by quarter, estimates are made of the probable supply and probable requirements for each of the controlled materials.

For example, the Steel Division estimates the probable amounts of carbon steel and alloy steel that will be available for all purposes during the coming quarter.

At about the same time, all the claimant agencies submit to the W. P. B. their estimates of the amount of steel their programs will require during that quarter. Characteristically, of course, the aggregate of these estimated requirements outruns the estimate of production and adjustments must be applied agency by agency until the total of requirements comes within the range of feasible supply. Obviously, the production programs of the agencies must themselves be adjusted in the process. You will note the close similarity to the normal budgetary procedure. When the proper adjustment has been arrived at the requirements committee, which is a body comprising representatives of the claimant agencies, announces the allotment of steel for each of the claimant agencies for the forthcoming quarter. Thereafter, all production and construction requirements falling due in that quarter are charged against the allotment of the appropriate agency. I have given this brief illustration of the workings of the allotment system in connection with steel. Similar estimates and adjustments lead to allotments of other controlled materials, including aluminum, copper, copper-base alloys, and the like.

In addition to the allotment system just described there also prevails a system of priority ratings which is applied to individual items of construction and purchase contracts. This priority system, however, is far simpler than it was a year or so ago, before the allotment system is introduced. At the present time, as far as construction is concerned there are three principal rating bands employed. By decision of the requirements committee, construction projects falling within certain designated categories, those most urgently needed for direct war purposes, are accorded the highest rating. The second order of priority is assigned to other specified categories of construction which are also directly and immediately related to the military effort, but for which the urgency of construction is not quite so pressing. All construction not specifically designated in those higher rating bands are accorded the third order of priority, AA-3. It is with this general order of priorities that we are concerned when we deal with reclamation projects.

The requirements committee has another function which is of importance to our discussion today. The committee issues so-called program determinations, which authorize certain levels of production activity or production capacity. For example, the level production of high-tenacity rayon to which the textile industry is now striving has been established by such a program determination. Proposals to construct high-tenacity rayon factories are eligible for consideration as long as the total of productive capacity to be provided falls within that authorized production level. Similarly, a program determination issued early this past summer establishes the currently authorized level of irrigation construction activity.

This last program determination, in which you are most interested, authorizes the construction of reclamation projects to the limit of 10,000 tons of carbon steel for the completion of the projects. The steel, the use of which is thereby authorized, is to come from the allotments made to the War Food Administration. The designated purpose of this use of materials and of the construction activity is the production of food. Within that general program framework individual projects are subject to the approval or disapproval of the Facilities Committee.

This program determination illustrates two extremely significant points: First, all construction projects undertaken in the country today have to have the sponsorship of a claimant agency against whose materials allotments the requirements of the project may be charged. Second, the use of allotted materials is in all instances subject to the policy regulations and administrative controls generally prevailing in the War Production Board. An allotment of materials and even a program determination, in other words, does not exempt a project from the provisions of the construction limitation order, to which I referred earlier, nor to the general policies of the Board applying to construction.

The role of the Facilities Committee, it should now be plain, is that of applying these general policies to project proposals and of determining in the light of those policies whether projects should be approved or disapproved. This function is carried out even though a prevailing program determination authorizes a level of total activity within which the proposed project would fall.

Most recently, in view of the critical shortage of manpower in certain areas of the country, there has been established some additional machinery designed to deal with those special area problems. This machinery includes Area Production Urgency Committees in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Detroit, Akron, and Hartford. The general administrative order establishing those committees states that no official of the War Production Board is authorized to approve any facility falling within the jurisdictional area of one of these committees unless there is a recommendation for approval by such area committee. If there is a recommendation for disapproval by the appropriate area committee, its approval can only be granted on the special authorization, case by case, by the W. P. B. Production Executive Committee.

In summary, the machinery we are concerned with is something like this: There are a number of claimant agencies, each of which is responsible for a recognized sector of the war effort and to each of which is made an apportionment of the amount of materials available in the country. In carrying out its functions each claimant operates within a framework of authorized programs. Each claimant proposes facilities and construction projects within its authorizations and those individual proposals are subject to the approval or disapproval of the facilities committee. If approved, the project receives a priority depending upon how important its purpose is to the immediate war objective. In designated critical areas special machinery, in addition to the foregoing, is employed to relieve critical conditions of manpower shortage.

I should now like to explain how the facilities committee carries out its task.

You will recall from what I have said earlier that the principal function of the facilities committee is to determine whether or not a project proposed is essential to the war effort. You will recall also that the committee operates within a general framework of War Production Board policy and procedure, a framework which involves an allotment system, program determinations, recommendations by claimant agencies, etc.

The determination of essentiality is not too difficult when it pertains to facilities which will yield direct and immediate war values. If, for example, the committee has before it a proposal to build a new plant to manufacture a certain chemical, the first criterion of essentiality is that more of that chemical than can be produced with existing facilities is necessary for the war program. The application of that criterion is relatively straightforward. If more production is needed, and existing facilities are incapable of producing the sufficient overload to meet the need, it may be presumed that a new facility is necessary. From there on the determination has to do with the type of facility proposed, the amount of new productive capacity involved, the proposed location and similar considerations.

But how is a determination to be made when the project is of a sort that does not lend itself to this sort of direct measurement? How are we to deal with a proposed hospital, for example, or with a proposed highway bridge, or to get down to cases, an irrigation project?

Our working principle here is that we are, in fact, dealing with wartime justification for construction, and in testing that justification we must take into account the wartime values to be derived from the project and the wartime costs. The wartime values may be in the form of improved transportation of war goods, in a road case; raised worker morale and consequent raised worker efficiency, in a school or hospital case; increased production of food in an irrigation case, or any one of a number of similar values. These values are always extremely difficult to measure in money terms and usually impossible. The wartime costs are also to be measured in other than money terms; there are costs in

critical materials, in man-hours of labor, in the using up of precious equipment, and in general, the utilization of productive resources. When the wartime values can be adjudged as worthy of the wartime costs measured in these terms, we may properly say that the project is essential. If on the other hand, the wartime values are not worthy of those costs, we may conclude that the project is not essential.

Dealing with reclamation projects, therefore, we must first analyze the real wartime values to be derived. Those values very clearly are to be measured in terms of food production—during the war period. I emphasize that last phrase because it is a critical consideration. The policy we are now working upon considers food production during 1944, 1945, and 1946 as food production for the war. Naturally, earlier production is more valuable than that which comes in relatively late. The amount of production, therefore, that can be expected during those years, particularly of crops which are needed for war purposes, is the first point of analysis.

Closely associated with the determination of food-production possibilities is the probability of that production being realized. That probability depends upon the probability of the construction being completed on schedule, of the water actually becoming available for distribution, the rate of which settlement will take place, in connection with a new project, and similar factors. In other words, the committee's concern is focused upon food, upon the time it will be produced and the assurance that actual production will be forthcoming.

I have said that the actual wartime costs of the project must be balanced against these wartime values. Although the committee does not have the function of reviewing design or of applying priority ratings to materials required, the demand that the project would make upon our national stock of critical materials is a primary focus of analysis. Of course, the appraisal of these costs will vary somewhat from time to time as materials as a whole or as various material items become scarcer or more plentiful. A project which will require a large amount of a material which is short in national supply will be considered to have a high cost. On the other hand, the cost of a project will be considered relatively low if its materials demands are modest and primarily of those items in which there is no serious shortage problem.

The other principal element of cost is manpower. You have all heard so much during recent months of the national manpower problem that I need not elaborate at this point upon its importance. It is enough to say that the total amount of manpower required to build a project, the type of labor required, the location of the project, as it bears upon competing wartime demands for manpower, are factors to be studied. As I have already pointed out, in a certain number of regions this question is considered of sufficient importance to warrant the establishment of special administrative machinery and as things now stand no project in any of the three West Coast States can be given favorable action by our committee unless the Area Production Urgency Committee has recommended that the project be undertaken.

These are the principal factors entering into the committee's decisions regarding project essentiality. There are many other incidental ones having application to specific projects.

I do not pretend, of course, that the committee's decisions are matters of arithmetic. The pertinent factors in the evaluation are never susceptible of nice calculation. In the final reckoning the element of judgment is the vital ingredient. Our weightiest responsibility is to have that judgment sound, as sound as a group of honest and intelligent men can make it.

Diplomat of Global Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John MacCormac from the New York Times:

DIPLOMAT OF GLOBAL ECONOMICS—LEO CROWLEY, WHO DIRECTS OUR OFFICE OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION, WILL TRY TO HELP THE WORLD, NOT RUN IT

(By John MacCormac)

WASHINGTON.—When Vice President HENRY WALLACE and Secretary Jesse Jones exploded last May into one of the most picturesque exhibitions of temperament Washington had seen and an aroused President Roosevelt hurled Jovian thunderbolts at them, the accompanying lightning flashes threw into high relief the handsome features of an agreeable and able man from Wisconsin named Leo Thomas Crowley.

Mr. Crowley had been around the Washington scene for 9 years and had climbed high up the ladders of public and corporate life. But he had shown a positive genius for avoiding the fierce white light that beats upon most persons of eminence. With his preference for privacy had never gone any fear of responsibility.

When Secretary Morgenthau of the Treasury and Attorney General Francis Biddle of the Justice Department in 1942 began to argue over who should be Alien Property Custodian the President had called Crowley in and Crowley had taken the job. He had never pretended that he wanted to keep it. Consequently, when the State Department absorbed the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation operations and set up a Division of Foreign Economic Coordination, Washington concluded that Leo Crowley, the trouble shooter, had been called in on an interim basis. He would bring order into the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's foreign subsidiaries until the State Department was ready to swallow them, too. Washington could scarcely be blamed for thinking this, since, at the time, it was Mr. Crowley's own impression. But it turned out not to be Mr. Roosevelt's. Instead the President not only confirmed his unpaid but faithful follower in control of B. E. W. and the Jesse Jones subsidiaries, but he added Lend-Lease and O. F. R. R. O. to them and directed Mr. Crowley to centralize their activities in an Office of Foreign Economic Administration.

This nothing-a-year man thus became one of the administration's biggest spenders and assumed a post which in tactical post-war significance ranks second to none in the Cabinet. Washington, which thought it knew Mr. Crowley and had expected nothing like this for him, sat up and took notice. What did Leo Crowley have that HENRY WALLACE and Jesse Jones hadn't?

Mr. Crowley, of course, has a number of attributes, beside the obvious one that, unlike Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jones, he quarrels neither with Mr. Jones nor Mr. WALLACE. He gets on with people, Republicans as well as Democrats, Congressmen as well as new dealers. But if there is one quality for which the President picked him it is—his friends feel sure—his superlative gift as an administrator. Good administrators were becoming a crying need in Mr. Roosevelt's wartime Cabinet, and nowhere was the lack more evident than in the field of foreign economic affairs.

It was not only that Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jones were wrangling in Washington over the planning of foreign economic policy. Abroad its execution was being divided, when it was not being duplicated, by five different agencies. B. E. W., Lend-Lease, and the State Department were eyeing and elbowing each other with the idea of being first to occupy the post-war economic field. On their outskirts the War Food Administration and the R. F. C. subsidiaries were to be discerned looking for opportunity to muscle in. Meanwhile no foreign Government was certain what United States foreign economic policy was nor what agency would execute it.

The retirement of Mr. Welles, the shushing of Mr. WALLACE, and the promotion of Edward Stettinius, Jr., to the second position in the State Department have made clear who is going to plan foreign economic policy and given some indication of what it is to be. The appointment of Mr. Crowley makes it certain that confusion in its execution is at an end. When the reorganization he is carrying out is completed, all those affected by American economic policy abroad will know that they will have, in any one area, only one man to deal with, while all those engaged in carrying it out will be aware that they have only one boss to consider.

Mr. Crowley is a man who thinks and moves in straight lines, but he is an organizer and administrator rather than a go-getter. To him business is a simple matter and an old story, for at the age of 21 he became president of the General Paper Supply Co., in which his first job had been clerk. He was already beginning to gray then, which may have been one of the things that helped him.

Before that he had had a spell as a grocer's boy while acquiring some formal learning in high school, topped off by a year in college. The Crowley family of Milton Junction, Wis., like most Irish families at that time, was large, and there was seldom more than enough to go around. So Leo Crowley started work young, and it hasn't hurt him a bit. He is always working himself out of one job by running it so well that someone else wants him. He made money in stocks in the soaring twenties, became president of the Bank of Wisconsin at Madison, and was buying up other banks when the depression came along.

The problem then became not one of acquiring banks but of saving the banking system. Mr. Crowley organized and became chairman of the Wisconsin Banking Review Board and put the Wisconsin banks on so firm a foundation that President Roosevelt brought him to Washington in 1934 to take charge of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It is a job he has held ever since and intends to retain. He will keep it even with the new burdens now piled on him. He thought the time had come to say goodbye to the F. D. I. C. in 1939, when he was made chairman of the Standard Gas & Electric Co., the billion-dollar utility which has been paying him $50,000 a year. But when he took his resignation to the White House it was to be told: "As long as I am in office I want you to be Chairman of the F. D. I. C."

And so he has stayed on, weeding out unsound banks and urging the sound ones to make themselves healthier so that never again will the United States see 16,800 banks crack in a dozen years with the irreparable loss of $3,000,000,000 in deposits, as happened between 1921 and 1933.

Between accepting new jobs and running them Mr. Crowley has found the time to acquire a great deal of influence in Federal politics. There are many things he has not found time for. One is to spend any time in "society," except that to be found in the

lobby of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington—where he lives in two rooms—an occasional game of bridge or gin rummy or a meal with friends.

Neither has this reasonable, eligible bachelor of 54 found time to get married. In many large Irish families—Mr. Crowley has four brothers, 4 sisters, and 17 nephews and nieces—you will find one who remains unwedded to play the part of patriarch. With his white hair he looks the part. In the last 5 years he has taken off 30 pounds—on a creamless, sugarless, and butterless, protein, fruit and vegetable diet, and no exercise more strenuous than walking. With Leo Crowley administration begins at home.

And now it is extending abroad. In what he himself admitted to be the most far-reaching consolidation of Government agencies since the war, he has just merged the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Economic Warfare, the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, the foreign procurement division of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Jones subsidiaries, and parts of the State Department's Office of Foreign Economic Coordination into one unit as the Foreign Economic Administration.

The organization chart of the new F. E. A. set-up shows authority descending down from Mr. Crowley through deputies and assistants to two levels. The first, entitled staff offices, is divided into general counsel, economic program staff, organization, and methods, personnel, finance, and management services. The second level, that of operating bureaus, is divided into the Bureau of Supplies and the Bureau of Areas. Under the Bureau of Supplies come the import procurement and developments, requirements and supply, and commodities services branches. Under the Bureau of Areas are the liberated areas, enemy areas, and general areas branches.

The chart is a graphic illustration of the Crowley administrative method. It was effected in 30 days. The hard-worked executive head of one of the merged agencies asked his new chief during what hours he would be available and remarked, "We've been working 16 hours a day here."

"You can see me any day—between 9 a. m. and 5 p. m.," was Mr. Crowley's reply. He does not believe in working 16 hours a day, either for himself or his subordinates. He does not see that there should be any necessity for it. Even during the strenuous month or reorganization, with its necessity for daily staff conferences, he was able to devote 4 or 5 hours a day to individual appointments. He also found time in the middle of every such day for a half-hour siesta and at the end of it for 9 or 10 hours' sleep.

Mr. Crowley is said to be a kindly man and loyal to his subordinates. There are some eight of them whom he has taken from one job to another. In 10 years he is said to have fired only 2 men whom he had appointed. But he maintains inflexibility that in any organization there can be only one policy and one boss.

So, in foreign economic affairs, Mr. Crowley is prepared to have President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull frame the policies—with some consultation with him. But when the policies are framed, his friends predict, Mr. Crowley will be the man who executes them. Neither the State Department nor the Army, nor anyone else, will be allowed to interfere.

Of course, Mr. Crowley has his own views on American foreign policy, just as he has them on the domestic policies of the Roosevelt administration. Although a big businessman, he has a touch of Wisconsin progressivism in him. He believes in the F. D. I. C., in social security, in the R. F. C., and the F. H. A.; he was for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. He did not like the W. P. A., but went along with the policy. He also believes in the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"These things," he says, "came because of abuses in our system." He thinks such controls, and such aids as the R. F. C., are proper for government in its relation with business. But government, he insists, must not try to operate.

"My primary duty," he told the writer, "will be to carry out policy rather than to make it. It seems obvious, however, that what I shall be called on to execute will be a short-term policy of helping stricken countries to help themselves rather than of our taking long-term responsibility for their economies. I realize, of course, that what the Foreign Economic Administration will do in the way of relief and rehabilitation will have a certain long-range effect. But its aim must be to assist the devastated nations to their feet, not to tell them where to go and take them in a wheelchair.

"But let me repeat," Mr. Crowley concluded, "that, however substantial may be our work of relief and rehabilitation, it will be essentially a shot-in-the-arm treatment and not custodial care. I don't think I know enough to run the world."

A Leading Agricultural District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa, which I have the honor to represent, is one of the most productive agricultural regions in the United States. The Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce recently sent me the following letter which I am sure will be of much interest to the people of my district and to my colleagues in the Congress. When we consider the fact that there are 3,070 counties in the United States, the facts and figures presented take on added significance:

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOEVEN: Of course, I know that you are familiar with the importance of your home counties—Buena Vista, Cherokee, Clay, Dickinson, Ida, Lyon, O'Brien, Osceola, Plymouth, Sac, Sioux, and Woodbury—in agricultural production, but you may not be familiar with their relative ranking among the more than 3,000 counties of the United States.

I am sending you, therefore, a booklet entitled "Ranking Agricultural Counties," issued by the Census Bureau, in which the 100 banner counties in each of 59 phases of agricultural production, are listed showing order of their rank with detail of their performance.

Sioux County had a very high ranking among all of the counties in the United States in a number of farm activities. It was thirteenth in both acreage and production of corn harvested for grain; fifteenth in acreage of oats threshed; fifty-ninth in acreage of barley but forty-eighth in production; and eighty-eighth in acreage of flax, while the production reached the sixty-seventh place.

Sioux County was sixteenth in number of chickens on farms; fifty-second in number of chickens raised; and twenty-eighth in egg production. It was thirty-eighth in total value of farm products in all of the counties of the United States; twenty-fifth in number of hogs on farms; fifty-seventh in cattle and calves on farms; twenty-second in number of horses on farms; and tied in rank with another county for fifty-sixth place in number of horse colts. This county was forty-first in value of domestic animals on farms and seventy-ninth in expenditure for feed purchased by farmers.

Plymouth County's ranks in acreage of field crops were—tenth in corn harvested for grain; forty-third in oats threshed; and forty-sixth in barley. It was fourteenth in number of hogs on farms; sixty-third in chickens on farms; and ninety-sixth in number of chickens raised. Plymouth was sixty-eighth in total value of farm products; sixty-sixth in expenditures for farm machinery; and fifty-sixth in the value of domestic animals on farms. It was thirty-ninth in number of horses and eighty-fifth in number of cattle and calves on farms.

Woodbury County was forty-fourth in total value of farm products; sixteenth in number of hogs on farms; eighth in acreage of corn harvested; ninetieth in expenditure for feed purchased; eighty-eighth in the value of domestic animals on farms; and seventy-fifth in the number of horses on farms.

Sac County was ninety-first in farm expenditures for machinery; ninety-seventh in number of hogs on farms; and forty-eighth in acreage of corn and thirty-sixth in production.

Osceola County was eightieth in acreage of oats threshed and fifty-fifth in production, and forty-third in acreage of flax harvested and thirty-third in production.

O'Brien County, with its high yields per acre in field crops, stood higher in production rank than in acreage. It ranked sixty-fifth in acreage of corn and thirtieth in production, seventy-ninth in acreage of oats and fifty-ninth in production, and fifty-eighth in acreage of flax and forty-fourth in production. This county was seventy-seventh in the number of hogs on farms and ninetieth in expenditures for farm machinery.

Lyon County was twenty-sixth in acreage of oats threshed but was twenty-third in production, sixty-second in acreage of corn harvested for grain and fifty-seventh in production, and sixty-eighth in acreage of flax and fifty-ninth in production.

Dickinson County was ninty-third in acreage of flax and seventy-first in production.

Clay County was eighty-sixth in number of hogs on farms, seventy-fifth in acreage of corn, but thirty-ninth in bushels harvested, and thirty-eighth in acreage of oats threshed.

Cherokee County was seventy-seventh among all the counties in the United States in total value of farm products, thirty-seventh in number of hogs on farms, and sixty-eighth in acreage of corn and forty-eighth in production.

Buena Vista County was fifty-fifth in farm expenditures for machinery, thirty-eighth in number of hogs on farms, forty-ninth in acreage of corn harvested for grain and thirty-third in production, and thirty-seventh in acreage of oats threshed.

The size of a county was not a consideration in arraying counties upon their agricultural performance, which may account for the absence of Ida County from the ranks of the 100 leading counties.

Chambers of commerce, newspapers, school authorities, and citizens in general in your district should find the foregoing information useful.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Benefits to War Veterans and Their Dependents Explained by General Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, no one is more able to fully explain the benefits Congress, by law, has provided for those who have served in the armed forces than Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the dedication of the high-altitude laboratory, Sperry Gyroscope Co., Nassau, Long Island. On Armistice Day General Hines delivered an interesting and informative address. Under permission granted by the House, I include his speech as part of my remarks. It follows:

General HINES. Thank you, President Gillmor. Until a short time ago Armistice Day had been a day of rejoicing. The veterans remembered it as the day that the guns were stilled—the day that men came out of the trenches and lighted fires in the open again. The home folks remembered it as the day that ended the danger to their loved ones, and signified that they would be returned to them once more.

We thought of the last war as the "war to end wars." But lack of a Christian spirit, plus greed and treachery, have forced our peace-loving people into another and a far more difficult war.

But, as in the last war, our arms and those of our allies will be again victorious. This time we will see to it that it is, indeed, "the war to end all wars."

All of war is not in the fighting, for its effects continue long years after hostilities have ceased.

This Nation has ever been grateful to its defenders who have suffered from war, and to the dependents of those who gave their last full measure of devotion.

Since the founding of the Republic, up to the present time, this Nation has paid out more than $21,000,000,000 in direct benefits to veterans and their families.

I cite this figure because it is proof that when the veterans of the present war return home after the victory has been won a grateful nation will not forget their sacrifices.

It is fitting, therefore, on this Armistice Day, to describe some of the Government measures provided to assist those who suffer from war.

So I welcome the opportunity afforded by the Blue Network to tell our radio audience something about the benefits provided for those who are making sacrifices today.

The Government now cares for the veterans of all of our wars and their dependents—about a million persons at the present time—through the Veterans' Administration.

This Government agency was created by consolidating six agencies or portions of agencies, which had been administering various relief programs to veterans and dependents of different wars and our regular services. The oldest agency in the consolidation—the Pension Bureau—dated back nearly a hundred years.

The Veterans' Administration had its real beginning, however, in 1917, when the Government decided to suspend the operation of the old pension system for the duration of the last war and to provide more modern and practical methods for the relief of misfortune resulting from service in the armed forces.

The new laws then brought forth supplied family allowances for men in the service who had left dependents at home and created a form of Government life insurance at cost, which a member of the armed forces could buy for his family's protection, up to $10,000 worth. Adequate compensation for death and disability resulting from service was also provided. Hospital treatment and medical care was authorized for those requiring it after their discharge from the service, and vocational rehabilitation training courses were provided for those disabled who had suffered vocational handicaps. The soldiers' homes were continued for the disabled veterans unable to earn a living.

These were all innovations except the soldiers' homes. Certain adjustments in the new laws were deemed advisable from time to time, as experience disclosed injustices or inequalities in their practical operation.

But it was found that the new system was a sound one, which provided more adequate relief than any other which had been previously developed.

So, after the infamous attack at Pearl Harbor, the Congress decided to provide similar laws to cover the present war. While these laws differ in some details from those of the last war, they are basically the same, excepting that the monthly payments to dependents have been substantially increased over the rates paid 25 years ago.

I think it only fair to say at this time that the experience we have gained as a going concern has enabled us to make great improvements in our administrative procedures, so that relief now comes more efficiently and quickly than it did after the last war.

This is not due entirely to the fact that we now have trained and experienced personnel. Much of it also results from the dispersal of our activities to the various States, where we have more than 100 field stations, including 93 hospitals and homes. Our services are thus brought closer to those who have the right to call upon us for the various benefits which have been provided.

The basic theory of our laws concerning disability resulting from service in the present war, is to do everything humanly possible to enable the disabled man to again become a self-supporting member of the community. However, disability must have occurred in line of duty, in order to receive a pension or vocational training, but hospital treatment and domiciliary care in solders' homes may be given for disability not due to war service.

Disability payments run from $10 a month for a 10-percent disability, to $100 a month for total disability. The current average rate of disability for the present war is 40 percent, which means a payment of $40 a month. Sums as high as $250 a month may be paid for certain specific disabilities.

If the disability for which he is being paid has caused the veteran to have a vocational handicap, he is entitled to receive vocational rehabilitation or training from the Veterans' Administration, so that the handicap may be overcome and his employability restored.

The Veterans' Administration pays all the expenses of this training, including tuition, books, or other equipment. In addition to this the man is supported while he is learning a new way of making a living.

This is accomplished by increasing his pension to $80 a month if single, and $90 a month if married, with additional sums for other dependents, for the period of his training.

We do not expect to receive heavy demands for training until after the war is over. The demands of war industries for manpower—even handicapped men—have caused a large proportion of the men who have been discharged for disability to seek war-production jobs. This is due to a desire to promote the war effort, as well as because of the high wages being paid.

Many companies, like the Sperry Corporation, have set up special training centers to teach handicapped veterans how to aid in war production.

We do not attempt to deter disabled veterans from accepting such employment, where no injury to health is involved. If they are still handicapped when the war is over, they will still be entitled to take vocational training, as the law provides that courses may continue for 6 years after the war, although no course may last longer than 4 years.

We are not setting up rehabilitation centers in which to train these disabled veterans. Instead of this, we are making use of existing facilities of a private or State character, such as educational institutions, commercial, trade, industrial, and agricultural establishments.

A good many of the men who have embarked upon courses of training are being trained on the job in private establishments, where they will be employed after they have completed their training. We refer to this as training into employment, and are finding it a very practical method to pursue.

Our contracts with the various establishments are made as warranted by conditions, and the wishes of the men involved. We endeavor to have men trained as close to their homes as possible. Although our vocational advisers assist the men in selecting the kind of training they desire, every consideration is given to the man's own wishes, as well as to his aptitude for the new vocation he wishes to learn.

Many of those listening in will recall that the vocational rehabilitation of disabled war veterans is not an innovation at the Veterans' Administration. We supplied such training after the last war, and 128,000 disabled veterans of that war completed their training courses. Many of them have achieved success and distinction in the new careers which had inception in the training we provided.

I hope that disabled veterans of the present war and their families will keep that record in mind and mark well these words:

The handicap caused by disability of even the most severe character may be overcome and employability restored by proper and adequate training. The future is not necessarily gloomy for the handicapped man—it may well be happy and bright if the disabled man will readjust himself, keep up his courage, and is determined to overcome his handicap.

Should a man lose his life in line of duty in the armed forces, his designated next of kin will receive from the Army or Navy a cash sum of money equal to 6 months of his pay.

In addition to this, his dependents will receive monthly pensions from the Veterans' Administration. The rates for these dependency pensions are as follows:

A wife will receive $50 a month; and if there is one child, $15 additional—with $13 for each additional child, with a limit of $100 a month for wife and children.

If no wife survives, $25 a month will be paid to the first child, $38 for two children, equally divided, and $10 for each additional child.

In addition to these sums for wife and children, a dependent parent will receive $45 a month. If both parents are dependent, each will receive $25 monthly.

Life-insurance payments, in the event of death in the service, are in a different class from the other Government payments.

This life insurance must be applied for by the soldier, sailor, marine, or member of the

Coast Guard. He must designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries, and the monthly premiums are deducted from his service pay.

This insurance is called national service life insurance. It is sold at a lower price than it would be possible for a private insurance company to charge, as the Government assumes the entire cost of operation, as well as the cost of the extra war hazard.

The Government has set these low rates and generous conditions, because this is strictly family insurance. For this reason beneficiaries are limited to wife, children, parents, sisters, and brothers.

A man may apply for amounts running from $1,000 to $10,000 total and within these limits may take out more than one policy if he so desires.

During the first 120 days of a man's service he may apply for insurance without an examination. If he applies after the first 120 days, he must take an examination. It, therefore, behooves all men to make application a short time after joining the colors. The Army and Navy urge that the $10,000 limit be applied for, and in this I think they are absolutely right.

After 1 year a man may convert his insurance to standard forms such as 20-pay life, which, in addition to providing his family with protection, will begin building up an asset for him when he gets out of the service.

In this connection I should remind the radio audience that a man may continue his insurance after he has left the service by forwarding the monthly premiums himself to the Veterans' Administration at Washington.

Up to the present time 13,000,000 policies have been applied for, with a face value of about $92,000,000,000. This is more than double the amount taken out in the last war and is 70 percent of the face value of all of the private life insurance now outstanding in the United States.

I feel sure you will agree that these huge figures show quite clearly that our boys are not forgetting the folks back home.

It is my hope that members of the radio audience may have a better understanding of benefits concerned with the present war, from the brief summary I have just given them. Many other benefits are being contemplated, but the ones I have outlined are the most important ones provided to date.

At the conclusion of my broadcast it will be exactly a quarter of a century ago, to the minute, that the guns ceased firing on the western front in the last war.

We and our allies won the military victory, and then proceeded to secure what we hoped would be a lasting peace. But we are at war again, a generation later, and our young relatives in the armed forces are finding that this war is more dangerous and more violent than the one in which their fathers fought.

Victory again seems assured, but at an appalling cost of lives, health, and treasure. Pray God that we may not again lose the peace, and so have to do the job all over again. This time we must be sure that the sacrifices are not made in vain.

I consider it a high honor to have been invited to participate in the dedication of your high-altitude chamber, and I especially welcome the privilege of doing this on Armistice Day.

The scientific tests made possibly by this new laboratory, are typical of the genius of America.

The effect of intense cold and rarefied atmosphere upon our aviators and their complicated instruments, may now be studied with great precision—so that corrective measures may be taken as a result of laboratory experiments, thus doing much to eliminate the trial-and-error methods of ascertaining defects through flying experiments.

It is technical achievements such as this which will save the lives of our boys, help shorten the war and contribute to the victory.

It is fitting that this dedication be made in the name of the late Frederic B. Vose, for he was the father of the high-altitude chamber. He died a soldier on the industrial front. All honor to his memory.

President Gillmor, I appreciate the privilege of having participated in these dedication ceremonies.

Farm Report From Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include in my remarks a very informative report made by the Nebraska Committee on Crop Acreages and Price Relationships. The report includes some brief but very valuable information regarding the general food situation in my State:

NEBRASKA COMMITTEE ON CROP ACREAGES AND PRICE RELATIONSHIPS

The following men served on the committee: R. L. Greene, chairman, A. A. A.; Frank Miller, secretary, experiment station; Arthur Anderson, Food Distribution Administration; Raymond B. Hill, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Elton Lux, Extension Service; R. H. Moats, Crop Reporting Service; H. F. Tagge, Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. W. E. Dolan, chief statistician of the State A. A. A. office, and Mr. Ed Johnson, of the Food Production Administration, met with the committee.

Weather conditions in the State have restricted the planting of wheat. Reports from the field indicate that seeding will not exceed 3,400,000 acres. Unless growing conditions during the winter are favorable, the rate of abandonment may be heavy. The planting of spring wheat may replace some of the abandoned acreage in the western counties. In the central and eastern counties the acreage not seeded and the abandoned area should be planted to corn, sorghum, oats, and barley. The price of wheat should be approximately 1.5 times that of corn.

PRICE SUPPORTS

Members of the committee felt that price relationships and insurance against excessive risk would be the determining factors in obtaining the acreage of some of the crops, such as dry beans, soybeans, and potatoes. Sugar beets, dry edible beans, potatoes, and wheat are competing crops in the area of the State where the soil and temperature are best adapted to the growing of beans and late potatoes. A price of 6 cents a pound net to the grower for No. 1 beans and insurance that will guarantee him the cost of production, including a return on the land equal to the normal rent income from the competing crop which would be replaced, will be necessary to get 100,000 acres. Growers insist that the insurance feature is essential to get the recommended acreage of beans. With beans at this price, sugar beets will have to bring $12.86 a ton to give the grower approximately the same return per acre above rent and operating costs that would be obtained from the average yield of beans. The following scale of potato prices is recommended in order to bring a return above rent and operating costs about equal to the net receipts from sugar beets and dry edible beans.

Grade and price per hundredweight

U. S. No. 1	$2.00
Commercial (85 percent No. 1)	1.90
Commercial (80 percent No. 1)	1.80
No. 2:	
Best grade	1.70
Medium grade	1.60
Low grade	1.50

Under Nebraska conditions soybeans are best adapted to the heavy corn-producing area. Under normal relationships the price of soybeans would have to be three times the price of corn in order to get 100,000 acres. If this relationship cannot be obtained, soybeans should be included in the list of insured crops.

Reports from farmers indicate that the 1944 acreage of oats and barley will be expanded at the expense of corn and soybeans, if the present price relationships are maintained. The committee feels that prices between these grains should be adjusted so that barley will sell for about three-fourths and oats one-half the price of corn.

CREDIT

Members of the Committee feel that both F1 and F2 loans should be continued through 1944. Approximately $3,287,000 of this type of credit will be needed for maximum production.

NEBRASKA LIVESTOCK, DAIRY, AND POULTRY PRODUCTION GOALS AND RELATED PRICE SUPPORTS

Members of the livestock committee considering livestock goals and price supports recommend the following suggestions:

DAIRY

The goals suggested with respect to milk on farms, milk production per cow, and the number of milk cows on farms, is feasible and will be met provided the relationships between feed and other costs and prices received for dairy products are adjusted and the proper price relationship maintained to encourage production. As an example of feed costs, hay prices have gone up as much as $15 per ton in the last 60 days. Under the present relationship of prices of butterfat and whole milk the tendency is to produce more butterfat and less whole milk largely because of the added labor involved in whole-milk production. In order to maintain production in some cases electrical equipment must be made available.

POULTRY

The goals suggested for eggs on farms, hens and pullets on farms, chickens on farms, and turkeys can be met and probably exceeded in some instances, even though some problems are arising and assistance will be needed to correct these problems. A special campaign should be put on to encourage closer culling of poultry flocks and better and additional housing. This, of course, will require lumber. Brooding equipment and lighting facilities appear to be a limiting factor in poultry production. The limiting factor in turkey production in 1943 is the availability of poults and will be a limiting factor again in 1944.

HOGS

The committee believes that the combined spring and fall goals can be met, although the tendency is no doubt to slightly exceed the suggested goal for spring farrowings and probably fall short somewhat on the suggested fall farrowings. In obtaining the suggested production of hogs the committee is quite sure that the present price relationships between feed costs and hog prices must be maintained since the tendency already is for the marginal producer to get out of hog production and even with the

present price relationships there may be a decrease below the goal, due largely to the marginal producer dropping out under present price relationships.

CATTLE

The goals for cattle can be met. The present tendency on the part of the range men is to cull cow herds and, considering inventories of feed, to hold younger stock. This young stock may be used to rebuild the breeding herd or may be sold off of grass a year from now, as conditions warrant. The committee feels that the numbers suggested on farms for January 1, 1945, is in keeping with a sound production program for this State.

SHEEP AND LAMBS

Breeding sheep numbers probably will be maintained, and the number of lambs on feed is hard to predict because of the feed situation at this time.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING LIVESTOCK, DAIRY, AND POULTRY PRODUCTION

Present price relationships are less favorable to livestock, dairy, and poultry production than at any time since the beginning of the present emergency, and even with the present price relationship it will be difficult to meet these goals; and any less favorable relationship wil probably make their achievement impossible. We urge the W. F. A. to be prepared to take proper steps to prevent the price of hogs from dropping below the announced floor price on any market day.

PROTEINS

To permit the Nebraska producers to follow established practices, which include feeding straight proteins in range areas and the mixing with home-produced grains in other areas, and, further, to save transportation and labor costs involved when these feeds are mixed off the farm, we urge that immediate steps be taken by requisitioning to assure a proportion of unmixed proteins to mixed proteins equal to that proportion prior to 1942. Priority on early deliveries should be to the range area to avoid weather delays. An immediate clarification of this situation is needed for any producer planning operations in the time ahead.

CREDIT

It is the opinion of this committee that no credit will be needed of the type offered by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation the past year to encourage livestock production.

Respectfully submitted by the committee on livestock, poultry, and dairy goals and price relationships.

M. L. BAKER,
Chairman.
E. M. LUTHER,
Secretary.
A. E. ANDERSON,
ED CROWLEY,
WALTER ANDERSON,
ED JANIKE,
RUFUS HOWARD.

Tragic Spectacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the November 10 Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., entitled "Tragic Spectacle":

TRAGIC SPECTACLE

President Roosevelt's surrender to John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers affords the people of the United States one of the most tragic and alarming spectacles in their history. Mr. Roosevelt allowed the settlement of the miners' strike on Lewis' terms and by permitting Harold L. Ickes to negotiate an agreement while the men were out, which violated his own promise to the contrary and the decision and award of the War Labor Board.

Thus at one and the same time he let Lewis get away with impudent refusal to obey his own orders and double-crossed the W. L. B., his own creation that he had frequently and expressly said would have the last word.

As the President made these sacrifices of principle and prestige on the altar of expediency, he likewise offered up his entire stabilization program. The test of strength between the President and Lewis was being watched by other unioneers no less rapacious than Lewis, but less truculent and brazen.

The ink was hardly dry on the agreement between Ickes and Lewis and the echoes of the one feeble protest voiced by Wayne L. Morse, of the W. L. B., had scarcely died out, when Murray, of the C. I. O., and many others were in full cry. All they needed was the proof Lewis gave that the Government was vulnerable to such attacks, that it would yield its powers and dignity under coercion.

Unless Congress has the courage and patriotism to step into the breach in the lines left by the administration's retreat, the people have no adequate defense against runaway inflation.

It is tragic to see Mr. Roosevelt outmaneuvered, outfaced, and surpassed in courage and resolution by any man, much less John L. Lewis. Lewis is what Mr. Roosevelt made him, a sort of Frankenstein's monster manufactured by the acceptance of $500,000 of miners' money for a campaign fund, by the passage of the lopsided Wagner Labor Relations Act, and stubborn refusal to allow any amendment; by the coddling of organized labor; by insistence that he would handle wage controls without benefit of statute.

It is tragic, too, that knuckling down to a brassy unioneer may send Mr. Roosevelt from the White House a discredited President in spite of his excellent handling of foreign policy and his skill and finesse in managing international relations and the fighting of the war.

Congress' duty is clear and its responsibility great and immediate. It must re-form the line against inflation shaken by the administration's defection. It must remember the millions outside the ranks of organized labor and other pressure groups. It must realize that as prices rise it has become increasingly and painfully difficult for many folks to buy anything beyond bare necessities and that unless the trend is halted, they will have to go without even a fair share of such necessities. It must understand Lewis' tyrannies at home, as well as those of Hitler abroad, must be defeated.

Lend-Lease—the British View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, whenever time affords me the opportunity, which is infrequent, I search the short-wave radio bands for foreign news broadcasts and propaganda for informational purposes. In the late evening of Armistice Day, November 11, 1943, at about 11:15 p. m. eastern wartime, I tuned in the British Broadcasting Co.'s program on a wave length about 2.9 megacycles. As was stated by the announcer, the program was being beamed or directed to America. The program was interesting to me and I listened for perhaps 10 to 15 minutes.

At about 11:20 p. m. comment was made on the simultaneous release that day of statements by the British Government and by President Roosevelt concerning "reverse lend-lease" and the contributions Britain had made of that nature.

As B. B. C. is a Government monopoly, it may be assumed that the statements made by way of comment represent the official British Government point of view. I think that such an assumption will not be challenged.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a view was expressed which I have neither read heretofore in the American press columns nor heard on any American rebroadcast, I believe it is desirable that it be set down in print.

In order to be quite certain that I was not mistaken in the language used, I asked the Federal Communications Commission's Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Mr. Sheppard, to supply me with a transcript of the text of that portion of the broadcast which was concerned with lend-lease.

Mr. Sheppard of our F. C. C. very kindly persisted in searching among the many texts transcribed that evening and has sent me the text which I heard delivered.

The text of that B. B. C. broadcast from London in English directed to North America on the evening of November 11, 1943, is as follows:

(NOTE.—Apparently an asterisk (*) indicates a word missed, and parentheses ( ) indicates uncertainty of our monitor as to the exact term used.)

For the first time, the British Government has put out an official report on what's been called lend-lease in reverse, meaning the help that Britain has given the United States and other Allies on lend-lease terms, that is no (*) payments, no debts, no exact calculation. Up to now there's been no attempt to measure Britain's reciprocal aid. The difficulty is that much of the help that Britain has given cannot be exactly (valued), which is true in two ways. From the British point of view, this has been America's war to the same degree that it has been Britain's war from the beginning, that is to say since 1939. As people see it here, Britain's performance in holding the enemy during 1940 and 1941, before America came into the war as a belligerent, that figures in the final balance sheet, if anyone ever tries to draw up a complete one. But how is that contribution to be calculated in pounds or dollars? It's just as hard, of course, to measure in money the war experience and information this country has passed on to the Allies.

That's one difficulty about stating the value of British reciprocal aid. Here's the other: Most of American lend-lease consists of hard goods—like guns, tanks, planes, food supplies, and so on—that are moved in bulk and can be counted and valued as they leave the United States. Much of the help that Britain gives is in the form of many small items

that are never entered in any ledger. If, for example, an American motorcycle breaks down in England and is repaired by the Royal Army Service Corps, that's a small service rendered, but it would be absurd to mark it up in a book, and no one thinks of doing so, yet, every day, thousands of such small services are given.

There are, however, some forms of British lend-lease which is possible to measure more or less exactly in money. Under this head come military barracks, hospitals, airports, built by British labor in Britain for the American forces. (There's again) air and naval supplies of many kinds, (free food), and there's freight services of British ships. In the year ended last June this recorded and measurable part of British aid to the United States amounted to 216,000,000 pounds, or nearly a billion dollars. That's just one figure from the British report.

It's an incomplete figure for the reasons I mentioned, and I don't think it's intended as definite bookkeeping offset to the money value of the help that the United States has given to this country. In fact, the British report stresses the point that lend-lease has become a system of pooling resources according to need and capacity, and it says in so many words that financial sacrifice is not the most valuable contribution which any of the United Nations may make to total war. That is certainly how the British people think of it.

At the same time they are glad to have it known that, insofar as mutual aid can be measured, this country has done its share, and I'm sure they'll be pleased by Mr. Roosevelt's references to British lend-lease at his press conference today.

Beet-Sugar Industry Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the rationing of sugar has impressed upon all of us the fact that we produce in this country only about 28 percent of the sugar which we consume. Therefore, we are largely dependent upon offshore production, and in time of war the uncertainties of production and transportation have accentuated the advisability of encouraging a greater expansion of the sugar industry in this country. Because of the delays in the Department of Agriculture last winter, inadequate attention was given to this need for 1943. Due to the inequities which developed as a result of this official inaction, there was a 40-percent decrease in beet acreage and a reduction of 12,800,000 bags of sugar.

At the recent annual convention of the National Reclamation Association considerable attention was given to this important industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the interesting address delivered at this reclamation meeting on October 29, 1943, by Douglas Scalley, president of the United States Beet Sugar Association:

It is a privilege to have the opportunity to participate in the program of this association. The stability, prosperity, and sound agricultural pursuits of the West have been underwritten by reclamation. From this era back through the annals of this country's history, we all can justly pay tribute to the Reclamation Association.

The subject assigned to me, The Future of the Beet Sugar Industry, is one of utmost importance to reclamation. The beet-sugar industry, which is approximately 150 years old, had its origin in Europe. It was introduced on this continent over 100 years ago. It is about 50 years since factories were operated successfully in this country. The growth and development of the industry in the West have been closely allied with reclamation. The two endeavors have complemented each other, and your leaders have always understood and shown a willingness to assist in the problems of the sugar industry. The men connected with the Bureau of Reclamation have recognized and appreciated the economic value of this cash crop on the various reclamation projects both new and old, and have contributed much toward bringing the facts to the American people.

This is not the time or place to review the problems such as the starting of a new industry, plant diseases, types of beets adapted to our areas, etc., the industry has encountered. However, I wish to mention one, for that is with us today—possibly more pronounced than ever—invested capital in offshore production and foreign countries. The beet-sugar industry in this country has been developed along with the highest standard of living in the world and has competed with some areas where the standard of living is at a very low level. The low standard of living in Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Caribbean, countries that supply this Nation with over one-half of its sugar, can be charged to the promoting of a greater one-crop system. After 40 years of control and supervision of Puerto Rico by our Government, the failure to further improve living conditions can be laid right at the door of the agricultural policy followed in lending encouragement and assistance to a generally speaking major one-crop system—sugarcane. All people connected with the sugar-beet industry receive compensation in line with the American standard of living. In recent years statements have been made regarding the inefficiency of the industry; this irrespective of the indisputable facts that the beet-sugar industry of this country is the most efficient in the world when standards of living are taken into consideration.

The sugar-beet industry, through its years of experience in this country, has not only found but is advocating its proper place in farming. That place is with other crops. The sugar beet in its rotation is the most important crop grown. It truly can be said it is the farm builder. Why? It encourages scientific farming, clean cultivation, and weed eradication. The byproducts of sugar beets rank as one of its most important assets. I am going to quote a statement that many of you have seen during the last few months: "The byproducts from an acre of beets, properly handled, are equal in livestock food values to 50 bushels of corn." The byproducts of sugar beets in the West occupy the same position as corn in the East for livestock and dairy products.

Sugar beets encourage livestock and dairy production. Through them, fertilizer and humus are returned to the soil in the shape of barnyard manure. Sugar beets establish a finished industry in the agricultural areas in which they are grown and processed. In the factories and fields, they are the medium of large-scale employment. They are responsible for reduction of transportation problems and costs in marketing finished products to a possible minimum. An average acre of beets in the United States produces 3,500 pounds of sugar, 3.6 tons beet pulp, 9 tons green tops, and one-half ton molasses. The contribution of sugar beets to the maintaining of our railroads is estimated at $36 an acre. Enormous quantities of coal and limerock from our mines are consumed. Sugar is packed in paper bags manufactured in the West and cotton bags from the South, and sugar beets have now entered the war on a new front. In order for the Government to insure yeast production, which is principally used in making bread, it has ordered 60 percent of all of the molasses previously used in the manufacture of sugar to be diverted to yeast production. There is not only a shortage of molasses, but the fact that sugar beet molasses is superior to any other type in the production of yeast has been definitely proved.

Now I shall come back to my subject The Future of the Beet Sugar Industry. I am going to open this subject with this statement: In my opinion, the industry is now effecting the most important developments in its history. Without mentioning any groups or individuals, I want to pay tribute to those who, in the last few years, have contributed so much to the advancement of this industry. Until a few years ago, practically all seed planted in this country was imported from Europe. Today there is none. As a matter of fact, we are producing seed for our allies. The beet-seed production in this country has now expanded into a major industry with growth in many States—New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, Utah, California, Oregon, and Washington. The members of the Bureau of Plant Industry and the industry's own employees engaged in improving the quality and overcoming plant diseases of beets have achieved preeminent success, as we are today producing a beet of higher quality, type, and vigor from our own seed than the beet produced from foreign seed. But our own experts have not stopped there; they have taken the seed ball, which contains from 1 to 4 or 5 germs, and through scientific shearing, grading, and classifying and have perfected seeds from which the major portion will yield single plants.

What results will follow? The day of the beet thinner is about over. I like to talk about this, for as a boy I have spent many days on my hands and knees thinning beets. The use of the single-germ seed will not only minimize beet thinning but it will produce a more vigorous plant from the time it emerges from the ground until it is harvested. The single-germ seed has opened the way for cross-cultivation and mechanical blocking. It will afford an opportunity to graduate from the elementary classification of truck-garden farming to standard farm mechanical operations. The single-germ seed, along with mechanical harvesting, which will be discussed later, will remove from the growing of sugar beets a major portion of the seasonal labor demands.

Beet harvesting machinery has gone through a long period of development. The farm beet loader is a proven machine. In our own areas hundreds of loaders are in operation. The function of the loader is to eliminate all hand loading of beets. It greatly reduces the excess dirt being hauled to the points of delivery. The use of the loader over hand methods has another distinct advantage—the time required for loading is not over 15 percent of that required when the trucks are loaded by hand. This materially increases the delivered tonnage per truck per day. These loaders are of various designs and are now being built by different machinery manufacturers. The beet topper is in the fields this year on a practical basis. This machine lifts, tops, and windrows both beets and tops. Its performance is meeting expectation, and we sincerely hope that the farm-machinery manufacturers will be able to secure sufficient steel for a large-scale production in 1944 in order

to insure the beet grower this much-needed equipment. I have previously mentioned the value of beet byproducts. In that connection the industry is intensely carrying on work which will result in the farmer's making a complete harvest of his tops as well as sugar beets. You will be interested to know that at harvest time the weight of tops and crowns is about two-thirds the weight of beets.

In the processing of sugar beets, the industry is looking forward to more improvements. It is not content with the position it occupies today, and that position is the operation of the most efficient manufacturing sugar units in the world. I hope I have not conveyed the idea that all the problems of the industry are solved. In the time allotted to me I have dealt with only a few, for we must remember that the sugar beet of today is a thoroughbred. It has been developed from a wild plant about the size of your finger containing 4-percent sugar to a sizable root with a sugar content of from 16 to 20 percent. The beet-sugar industry recognizes that it faces a challenge to keep improving, and personally knowing many of the people within its realm, I am confident they will meet that challenge.

In conclusion, you are all familiar with the many political problems that have surrounded the industry. I only wish to take you back 2 years. In 1942 there were planted 1,040,000 acres of sugar beets, which produced 32,327,000 one-hundred-pound bags of sugar. In 1943 there are 620,000 planted acres, with an estimated production of 19,500,000 one-hundred-pound bags. This means a reduction of 12,800,000 bags of a vital war food, the closing of 26 sugar factories, and the reduction is adding to the serious transportation problems now confronting the Government in furnishing sugar to our people. I want to definitely place the responsibility for this decrease in production where it belongs. The subsidy and incentive programs under which farm crops are operating—sugar beets were not competitive with other crops. The reduction of over 400,000 acres this year is the complete answer—that sugar beets were not made competitive. In addition to the price established, the sugar-beet crop did not have the support of those who formulated the policy. The sugar-beet program was not brought out by the Government until late in the planting season of some areas, and right up to the planting time of many others. Now that is what happened, regardless of the fact there is no crop that can contribute acre for acre to the war effort and post-war period as much as the sugar beet. A serious condition is now confronting the irrigated areas of the West, where normally hundreds of thousands of head of sheep and cattle are fattened and finished for the market. A hurried survey indicates that less than 50 percent of the normal feeding operations will be carried on this year due, principally, to a shortage of beet byproducts.

"This year, believe it or not, 26 factories are completely idle—despite the fact that we are at war, that sugar is being rationed, that much more sugar is needed to satisfy the requirements of the United States public, that sugars are being shipped from our shores in vast quantities to meet the needs of our armed forces, that sugars are being shipped in large quantities from our shores to meet the needs, on a lend-lease basis, of the Britons, the Russians, and many other nations.

"There indeed you have a fistful of rank inconsistencies. But don't overlook the rankest inconsistency of all, to wit: The United States Government nutritionists tell us that there is little nutritional value in sugar, but we, at tremendous expense to the American taxpayer, are seeing that other nations get sugar, while steps are being taken to destroy an industry which was created by sweat and toil and savings.

"Does it make sense to have 26 beet sugar plants closed down in the United States under these conditions? Is it logical to destroy industry and production and at the same time, at the American taxpayer's expense, build ships and use those ships to transport sugar to the far corners of the world?"

Present conditions remind me of a discussion I heard recently among a doctor, an architect and a bureaucrat. They were arguing which one had the oldest profession. The doctor claimed it was a doctor who performed the operation on Adam which caused most of the resulting trouble. The architect went back further than that claiming that before the Garden of Eden was created there must have been an architect to create something out of the chaos that existed. The bureaucrat said one of us bureaucrats must have been there to create that chaos. There is no denying that chaos exists, but I am hoping a meeting such as this will help solve some of it.

The future of the beet sugar industry will see its going forward no matter what the opposition may be. It has survived and established itself on its own merit. This crop has a permanent advancing place in the lives of our people, for it produces sugar, livestock feed; it supports many other industries, and it furnishes gainful employment to thousands of our people under the highest living conditions in the world.

The beet sugar industry is grateful to reclamation, for it has expanded its production many times. It asks for your continued support, and in your development of new areas, it will take its rightful place.

Reclamation Possibilities in the Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD the following masterly address by S. O. Harper, Chief Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, before the National Reclamation Association at Denver, Colo., on Friday, October 29, 1943:

RECLAMATION POSSIBILITIES IN THE MISSOURI BASIN

(By S. O. Harper, Chief Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation)

The Missouri River Basin includes an area of 528,000 square miles, embracing all of Nebraska, large portions of the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North and South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri, and a small corner of Minnesota. Its drainage area is the largest in the Nation excepting only that of the Mississippi River, of which it is a tributary. It is approximately twice the size of either the Columbia or the Colorado River Basins which are the other two major streams in the West.

The Missouri rises in the Rocky Mountains in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, and the total length of the stream from Yellowstone Park to its mouth near St. Louis, is 2,500 miles. The basin is arid in its western third, semiarid in its middle third, and humid in its eastern third. The population of the basin from 1940 census figures is 6,867,000, the cropped acreage is 85,628,000, and the total annual crop value is $647,577,000, equivalent to an average return of $7.56 per acre, exclusive of returns from livestock.

The average annual discharge of the Missouri near its mouth for the last 13 years was approximately 40,000,000 acre-feet. This compares with an average discharge of the Columbia of about 150,000,000 acre-feet, and for the Colorado, of 12,000,000 acre-feet during the same period.

LARGEST UNDEVELOPED STREAM

It has often been stated that the Missouri is the largest undeveloped stream in the United States. It is unquestionably true that the region has been backward in putting to beneficial use the 40,000,000 acre-feet of water which passes out of the Missouri Basin each year, often carrying with it widespread destruction in the lower reaches. With vision and determination this present menace can be transformed into a tremendous future asset to those States in the basin which have been most backward in utilizing the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries. In no other river basin in the West is there a comparable quantity of water and so many millions of acres of high quality land on which it can be used. It is my purpose in the few minutes at my disposal to give you a brief summary of the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in this basin and an outline of a plan for development which will put to the highest beneficial use the maximum possible percentage of the waters now wasted.

The two major problems of the Missouri Basin are the control of devastating floods in the humid eastern third and the stabilization of agriculture in the semiarid middle third.

While much remains to be done in the arid western third of the basin, the utilization of the water resources in this region has, through the urge of necessity, advanced much further relatively than the development in the eastern two-thirds of the basin. This is evidenced by the construction of 195 reservoirs with a total capacity of 27,000,000 acre-feet, and the irrigation of 5,120,000 acres of land, nearly all of which is in the western third of the basin. In some of the tributary basins, such as the South Platte Valley in Colorado, the available waters have been utilized to practically their fullest possibilities with the result that northern Colorado has been transformed from an arid waste to one of the richest agricultural districts of the country.

I shall not attempt to cover in detail those portions of the basin where irrigation development is well advanced, but I want to discuss particularly the problems of the semihumid belt in the States of North and South Dakota, eastern Montana, and central Nebraska.

To those of you who live in this region the memories of the disastrous drought of the middle thirties are too vivid to be blotted out in your generation, and I shall not dwell on it other than to point out that it was largely responsible for a loss in population of over 200,000 people in the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas in the past decade. However, your problem is not, as many people think, a new one; it has been recognized ever since the region was opened to settlement.

POWELL'S HISTORIC PROPHECY

Fifty-four years ago, in 1889, John Wesley Powell, Director of the Geological Survey, from which the Bureau of Reclamation sprang, and who, more than any one man, is responsible for initiating development of the water resources of the arid West by the Federal Government, said:

"The State of North Dakota has a curious position geographically in relation to agriculture. The eastern portion of the State has sufficient rainfall for agricultural purposes; the western part has insufficient rainfall, and the western portion is practically wholly dependent on irrigation.

"In the western portion all dependence on rain will ultimately bring disaster to the people. They are unwilling yet, a good many of them, to admit it, but * * * they will have to depend forever on artificial irrigation for all agriculture. * * *

"Years will come of abundance and years will come of disaster, and between the two the people will be prosperous and unprosperous, and the thing to do is to look the question squarely in the face and provide for this and for all years."

With the passage of the Reclamation Act in 1902, numerous projects throughout the arid portion of the Missouri Basin were investigated, and many of these projects have been constructed during the past 41 years. The need for relief in the semihumid area in the Dakotas was recognized by the construction of two projects pumping from the Missouri River—the Williston and Buford-Trenton. A wet cycle followed the completion of these projects, with the result that farmers forgot the tragic consequences of former droughts, lost their interest in irrigation, and the two projects were abandoned. After a lapse of 30 years, the Buford-Trenton has been reconstructed by the Bureau as a water conservation and utility project, and water will be available next season for 14,800 acres of land. With the historical record now available and the realization that every wet cycle is certain to be followed by a cycle of drought, I venture the prediction that never again will this project be abandoned.

Furthermore, on the success in developing this and similar small projects into prosperous agricultural communities will depend to a large extent the answer to the question of whether the tremendous acreages of high class lands which are susceptible of irrigation from the Missouri River in North and South Dakota can be transformed from a dry-farming economy with average crop returns of less than $6 per acre, to irrigated agriculture with a reasonable expectation of returns of $25 or more per acre.

With the memory of the devastating drouth still fresh in the minds of the people of the middle basin, and with the enormous flood damages which occurred this season even fresher in the minds of the people of the lower basin, the time seems particularly propitious for all interests to unite on a comprehensive plan for the development of the entire basin which will remove the flood menace and put the waters now causing so much devastation to beneficial use.

OUTLINES SLOAN PLAN

The plan I will present in outline—and it is only an outline into which the details must later be worked—has been evolved by the Bureau's engineers after 5 years of intensive study of all irrigation possibilities in the arid and semi-arid portions of the basin, and of the most efficient multi-purpose use of reservoirs. It has been developed under the direction of Senior Engineer W. G. Sloan, who has devoted unstintingly his time and energy to this task, and has, as most of you know, acquired a sympathetic knowledge of the problems of the basin which few men possess.

The plan envisions not only the development of the ultimate irrigation possibilities, but also flood control adequate for all needs of the basin, together with hydroelectric power development when warranted at major dams, and the supplying of water required for municipal use and dilution of sewage and industrial waste, in addition to recreational facilities and the preservation of fish and wildlife.

Although the Missouri is spoken of as the largest undeveloped stream in the United States, it should not be forgotten that very large expenditures have already been made in developing and protecting the land and water resources of the basin. Approximately $325,000,000 have been expended by the Army engineers in the control of floods and improvement of navigation from Sioux City to St. Louis, and rough estimates indicate that substantially an equal amount has been expended in providing irrigation works for 5,120,000 acres in the upper reaches and tributaries of the main stream.

In spite of the substantial expenditures, both by the Army engineers and by drainage and levee districts along the lower river, experience during the 1943 flood period has shown that assurance from inundation of much of the bottom lands, as well as effective navigation, can be obtained only by the construction of multipurpose reservoirs in the upper reaches, in addition to providing a confining channel supplemented by levees in the lower reaches of the river. All the simple and inexpensive irrigation systems in the basin have been constructed, and we must face the fact that there are few, if any, new projects where the entire cost of irrigation can be repaid by the farmers.

Further development, therefore, will depend upon the construction of multipurpose reservoirs to accomplish full utilization of the water for flood control, navigation, silt control, municipal use, power development, and other purposes, as well as irrigation. By combining these various uses in a single structure and evaluating the benefits from each use a sound economic development is made possible where few, if any, of the individual projects, if constructed for a single purpose, could qualify as feasible or desirable.

In the course of investigations by the Bureau, the arable lands suitable for irrigation in each of the tributary basins and along the main stream as far east as Yankton, S. Dak., were classified and mapped. All prospective reservoir sites were examined and evaluated, and tentative selection made of the sites which will best meet the requirements for the maximum utilization of the water resources. Finally a comprehensive plan was formulated for the ultimate development of the basin to utilize to the best advantage all land and water resources, as well as to provide the necessary flood control, and the reasonable requirements for navigation below Sioux City.

SEES 4,401,000 ACRES

The comprehensive plan provides for the construction of 90 additional reservoirs with capacities totaling over 47,000,000 acre-feet and the irrigation of 4,400,000 acres of additional land. The capacities of the proposed reservoirs and areas of land to be served by canal systems diverting from the main river and the various tributaries are:

Sub-basin	Total capacity of proposed reservoirs	Area of new development
	Acre-feet	*Acres*
Kansas River	2,877,000	286,400
Platte and Niobrara Rivers	460,000	475,000
South Dakota tributaries	976,000	911,500
North Dakota tributaries	347,000	62,100
Montana tributaries, excluding Yellowstone	1,365,400	425,700
Yellowstone Basin	4,250,800	727,900
Missouri main stream	36,953,500	1,513,000
Total	47,229,700	4,401,600

Without attempting to mention them all, a few of the outstanding reservoirs proposed are Oahe and Fort Randall on the Missouri in South Dakota, with capacities of 16,600,000 and 3,400,000 acre-feet, respectively; Canyon Ferry on the Missouri in Montana, capacity 2,000,000 acre-feet; Mission on the Yellowstone in Montana, capacity 1,000,000 acre-feet; Boysen and Kane on the Bighorn in Wyoming, with capacities of 750,000 acre-feet each.

The dam sites on the main stream have been selected with a view to holding to a minimum the acreage of rich river bottom lands to be flooded by the reservoirs in North and South Dakota.

The estimated cost of the 90 projects, based on pre-war prices, is $867,300,000. It is believed that the lands may be expected to repay $258,000,000 of the irrigation costs under the terms of the reclamation laws, in addition to the cost of operation and maintenance of the individual projects. Increased crop returns under full development are expected to amount to over $80,000,000 per year.

POWER AND NAVIGATION

Many of the dams have been planned to utilize the power potentialities. Fourteen power plants are contemplated in the ultimate development, having an installed capacity of 952,000 kilowatts and an annual power production of 4,180,500,000 kilowatt-hours.

The absorption of this tremendous quantity of power will, of course, be far in the future and the various power plants would be constructed only as the market justifies the development. Although development may be slow, it is certain that eventually the power will produce an income sufficient to amortize a considerable proportion of the cost of the dams and thus contribute substantially to the repayment of the total investment in the over-all development. Costs in excess of those which can be repaid from irrigation charges and power revenues would have to be distributed to other benefits, including flood control, navigation, silt control, municipal water supply, and any other features to which charges may properly be made.

Flood control and navigation are the responsibility of the War Department and the allocation of costs of multipurpose reservoirs to these features would, of course, have to be worked out in collaboration with the Army engineers.

Engineering consideration of the best utilization of the river flow as far down as Yankton, S. Dak., has disclosed that if dams were constructed to utilize the fall in the river between Bismarck and Yankton for power purposes, there would incidentally be created sufficient storage to replace all water used for irrigation above, to adequately control floods and to provide sufficient water for reasonable navigation in the lower reaches. Concern is sometimes expressed that the operation, of reservoirs for irrigation, navigation, and power development will prevent their effective use for flood control. There need be no fear of this outcome, as adequate space in each reservoir will be dedicated to flood control and a coordinated plan of operation will be adopted to insure that flood-control capacity is evacuated well in advance of anticipated floods. Such a plan has been in effective operation at Boulder Dam for several years.

Congress has authorized the improvement of the river between St. Louis and Sioux City to permit navigation for boats of 6-foot draft. Fort Peck Reservoir was built by the War Department primarily for the purpose of augmenting the low flows of the river in order to maintain this channel. It is understood that the desirability of a 9-foot channel is now being advocated, the maintenance of which might leave insufficient water for the ultimate development of irrigation in the upper basin, which requires

an additional depletion of some 6,000,000 acre-feet.

It is hoped that the reasonable requirements of navigation can be met without impairing the best use of the river for more beneficial purposes, and if large multipurpose reservoirs are constructed as proposed, it is believed that the conflicting demands of irrigation and navigation can be reconciled. Realizing that the full responsibility for determining the requirements of navigation rests with the Corps of Engineers, I merely offer this as a suggestion. However, if the interests of irrigation and navigation do conflict, there will be presented a matter of basic policy that will have to be decided by the Congress. It would be the Bureau's recommendation, of course, that any policy so established should recognize irrigation as the higher use.

There are substitutes for water transportation, on land and in the air. There is no substitute for food. It can be obtained only from one source—the soil—and a soil to which adequate moisture must be supplied either by natural or artificial means. To reclaim an acre of arid land from the desert by irrigation is to add an acre to the area of the country just as effectively as though it were acquired by annexation.

For every acre of semihumid land on which production is doubled by irrigation, the equivalent of at least half an acre is added to the effective agricultural area and taxable wealth of the State and Nation.

Time will not permit me to describe in detail the various proposed projects and the location of the lands to be irrigated. However, in view of the large percentage of the potential irrigable lands in the basin which are included in the Missouri-Souris project in northwestern North Dakota, a brief description of this project is in order.

DESCRIBES DIVERSION PROPOSAL

It involves diversion from the Missouri River below Fort Peck Dam, and a series of gravity canals, reservoirs, power plants, and pumping plants to irrigate over a million and a quarter acres of land in Montana and North Dakota. The water would be conveyed from the Missouri River Basin to the basin of the Souris River which drains into Hudson Bay, and the major portion of the irrigable land is in this basin. A large quantity of water would be diverted from the Souris to the Cheyenne Drainage Basin, where it would be used in part to restore Devils Lake to its former level, and in part for rediversion to the James River Valley for such beneficial uses as may be justified in that basin. In magnitude, this project is second only to the Columbia Basin project in Washington.

From an engineering and construction standpoint it is entirely feasible and the lands can be placed under irrigation at a cost which, measured by present-day standards, is moderate.

The real problems which must be solved in reaching a determination of the feasibility of this project are economic and agricultural rather than engineering and construction. Whether the agricultural economy of an area of over a million acres which has been devoted to wheat growing on a large scale ever since it was settled, can be successfully transformed from dry farming to irrigated agriculture, I do not presume to say. However, this is an area in which nearly half the population was receiving some form of public assistance during the drouth period and its rehabilitation certainly is a challenge to the best agricultural and economic authorities. As I previously stated, the results accomplished on the Buford-Trenton and other pumping projects on the Missouri River will have an important bearing on the advisability of embarking on such a tremendous undertaking as the Missouri-Souris.

In the light of our present knowledge, I am convinced that in any basin-wide plan for the development of the Missouri River sufficient water should be reserved to meet the requirements of the Missouri-Souris project pending a complete and detailed investigation and conclusive determination of its economic and agricultural feasibility.

In the James River Valley and adjacent districts in South Dakota are large areas of land which can be placed under irrigation, the acreage being limited only by considerations of economic and agricultural feasibility and the available water supply. In this region, where the average annual precipitation is only about 18 inches, irrigation for specialized crops would unquestionably be of much benefit. However, whether the benefits would justify the cost is a question which must be resolved after more detailed studies and investigations than have been made up to this time.

LIMITS OF IRRIGATION

Just where the eastern limit of feasible irrigation development will eventually be reached no man can say. Certainly in the last decade it has crossed the one-hundredth meridian, which cuts through the center of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska.

When a large-scale cannery operator in the vicinity of Omaha finds that it pays large dividends to irrigate canning vegetables by expensive methods, and when a drought this summer, centering around Washington, D. C., the ravages of which I saw with my own eyes, is estimated to have cost $50,000,000 in loss of crops in Maryland, Virginia, and other States, when fire-department pumping equipment was commandeered to save victory gardens, who is there rash enough to fix a limitation in the areas which in years to come may have to be provided with supplemental irrigation to meet the food requirements of the increased population?

So I say again that any basin-wide plan for the development of the Missouri River must not foreclose the use of all available water for the highest beneficial purposes, revamping our present concepts if need be, to visualize the requirements of future generations.

Now to get back to some specific figures to evaluate roughly the benefits from irrigation. The estimated average annual increase of $80,000,000 in crop values is supported by statistics gathered on various projects constructed by the Bureau in the Upper Missouri Basin. This is equivalent to an average increased return of $20 per acre for the new development. In addition, supplemental water which will be provided for several hundred thousand acres will increase crop values by substantial amounts. Statistics show that on irrigated projects constructed by the Bureau, for every person placed on a farm, two additional people make their livelihood in nearby towns and cities.

Assuming an average farm of 100 acres, the ultimate development will support 44,000 families. With 4 people on each farm and 8 people in the cities, the increase in population may be expected to exceed 500,000, which is almost equal to the present population of the State of Montana.

Statistics also show that for each new person in a region the assessed valuatio : is increased by at least $1,000; thus the proposed development could increase the tax valuation of the Missouri River Basin by over $500,000,000. Direct flood damages in the lower river in 1 year have amounted to as much as $35,000,000, and indirect damages to several times that figure. The over-all plan of development includes construction of flood control reservoirs in the lower reaches of the river already authorized by Congress at a total value of $174,000,000, and the flood-control benefits resulting from the multipurpose reservoirs herein proposed, would reach very large sums. A total expenditure of over $1,000,000,000 for the development of a comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin appears to be fully justified on the basis of a critical economic analysis. National benefits would be equivalent to the addition of another State to the Union.

But in our optimism let us not forget that a development of this magnitude cannot be brought to full realization in a year, or a decade, or even in a generation.

The plan I have presented is nothing more than a rough framework into which must be worked the interlocking details of the many individual projects in each State, after years of intensive study. This does not mean that construction of the initial projects must await a finished and polished plan. In the Colorado River Basin, Boulder Dam was completed 8 years ago; Parker and Imperial Dams are in operation, Davis Dam has been started; but it will be many years before the plan for ultimate development is completed.

The important thing is to provide that the work which everyone concedes is most urgently needed, such as reservoirs for flood protection for the lower basin, be started promptly, to be followed by an orderly program for development in all parts of the basin, taking necessary precautions to insure, as was done in the case of Boulder Dam, that each project adopted for initial construction shall fit into the ultimate plan, and that each section of the basin shall be safeguarded in its rights for future development.

In the fulfillment of this development, it is needless for me to point out how essential it is that there be the closest cooperation between the Corps of Engineers of the War Department and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as other responsible Government and State agencies. The relations between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau's organization have been most cordial, and through consultation, conference, and interchange of information obtained by the respective organizations much more rapid and satisfactory progress is being made than could be accomplished by each organization operating independently.

On behalf of the Bureau, I wish to express my sincere thanks to General Reybold for the fine cooperation of his organization and to pledge the Bureau to do everything in its power to continue our joint efforts in furtherance of this development which means so much, not only to the people of the Missouri Basin States, but to the security of the Nation.

Problems of the Present-Day Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from my constituent, Mr. J. W. Tyer, of McCrory, Ark., concerning the problems of the present-day farmer:

MCCRORY, ARK., *November 8, 1943.*

DEAR MR. GATHINGS: I received your most kind and interesting letter today. I am very sorry indeed that I am not an educated

man so I could answer your letter respectfully, but I hope you will excuse my shortcoming.

With all due respect I want to tell you a few facts that exist here at home. I hope you will not think I am a griper or a bellyacher or even an unloyal citizen. I am a little two by four farmer trying to make an honest living, and trying to help to preserve the peace and freedom your forefathers and mine bled and died for.

Well, Mr. GATHINGS, just a word about subsidy. It's pretty hard to pass a bill to try to cut the cost of living for the man that is getting from $6 to $20 per day at the cost of us poor old farmers. I have a neighbor 65 years old who could not make a living on the farm, so sold out, went to California about 6 weeks ago, and now he is drawing $175 per month there. Isn't any ceiling price on his wage, but pass a subsidy bill so the cost of Mr. Davis' living won't be so high.

Pass a roll-back bill and knock the price on our cattle and hogs 2 and 3 cents per pound, you will say that was not intended maybe, but it did place a ceiling price on our corn at $1.14 per bushel. The other day one of our livestock dealers went to Memphis, carried a load of hogs, and asked the sale barn manager to feed his hogs. When he sold his hogs, and got his bill of sale he paid $2.76 per bushel, but my ceiling price is $1.14 per bushel. Is that fair to the farmer?

They set a ceiling price on my cotton at about 21 cents per pound, and I went to buy me a pair of cotton shirts the other day, and they cost me $7 per pair.

They set a price on my oil beans, $1.80 for A–1 grade beans, and they never graded mine A–1.

We had a guaranty of $2.35 per crate for Irish potatoes last spring. I dug my potatoes, carried them to a Government grader, and the supervisor told me he could not buy them. I hauled them back home, 29 miles, and tried to keep them, and I lost 75 percent of them, and the seed cost me $5 per hundred, and I had three neighbors that had 10 acres and did not dig them for the simple reason they could not sell them, and we were asked to plant them as a war crop.

Last year we had a ceiling price on our cotton at 21 cents per pound and paid $1 and $1.25 per hundred for picking, and $1.25 per day for labor to make it. This year we are making about one-half crop. Labor cost us $2 and up per day, yet, remember, our ceiling price is 21 cents per pound, and we are selling cotton today for 17½ cents and 18 cents. It was easy for the War Labor Board to raise the coal miners' wage $1.50 per day. Why can't we get a square deal just one time?

I have three boys in this war, and will have one more soon. I have bought all the bonds I am able to buy, and I am trying to provide a decent home for these boys to come back to when this crisis is over, but it looks as if it is going to be a complete failure.

I went to town this morning and bought my seed oats. They cost me $1.85 per bushel. I bought 9 sacks of hairy vetch that cost me $18 per hundred, but my cotton is worth 18 cents.

My beef is worth from 3 cents up to a certain grade, and the grade is always low, but I went to the butcher shop Saturday to get a piece of steak—"50 cents, please"—but my cotton is worth 18 cents, and my corn $1.14.

Well, it looks as if we farmers are doomed to disaster, yet we are the backbone of the world. We are feeding a large part of the world today. Why are we treated as we are? If it were not for us farmers we would not win this war. The President said that food would win the war and write the peace. Is that right or not?

They keep talking about parity. If they could get some of those high-salaried men and women out or if they could just get the price we get out of our labor with a ceiling on everything except what we buy and the labor we have. I will admit there is a ceiling on some things we buy. I will thank you if you will tell me how a man can get on a cash basis and pay the present price of labor and everything he has to buy, except a few items, and as much as break even with the price set on our products as they are.

What has the agricultural world done that the Government has got it in for them so hard about? What if we were to strike and walk out? Who would feed the Allies?

We as farmers are doing everything in our power, and giving our sons and daughters, to win this war. By the help of God we will get the job done.

Forgive me for the remarks I have just made, but they are true.

Respectfully, your friend,

J. W. TYER.

Taking Salt Out of Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding value of research laboratories is demonstrated again this time by the discovery of a method through the medium of a new chemical that takes salt out of sea water. This will not only be welcomed by the people of the world but more so by the many who have been adrift at sea.

The Navy has approved this fast new sea water desalter to cut deaths from thirst. It is the first chemical process to be approved for life raft use. Tests by the Navy were made at the laboratory of the Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. The result shows the spending of money for research purposes can never be assailed when dividends such as this are returned.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I include as part of my remarks a statement by Science Service dated November 11. It follows:

A new chemical that takes the deadly salt out of sea water in 20 minutes and permits a flyer to carry the makings of a 14-day supply of life-sustaining drinking water in his rubber life raft has been recommended by the Naval Medical Research Institute, and is already in production, climaxing more than a year of all-out research in which innumerable desalting devices have been invented and demonstrated.

The new chemical desalter, which weighs only 3½ pounds and converts more than 14 pints of sea water into drinking water, was designed to prevent death from thirst and tissue dehydration among flyers drifting on rubber life rafts.

At least a dozen methods of distilling or chemically desalting sea water for flyers have been tested by Naval Medical Research Institute chemists and physicians but were rejected because of awkwardness, poor yield, excess weight, or harmful reactions. A small can is the only water supply which downed flyers have been taking aboard their life rafts.

The new chemical, which is carried in the form of briquets the size of a small candy bar, is the result of many months of research on the part of the Permutit Co. of New York. When dropped into a plastic bag filled with sea water, the chemical quickly absorbs the dissolved salts, permitting them to be filtered out as the flyer sucks the water through a plastic tube. Each briquet weights only one-sixth as much as the drinking water it produces and takes up only one-tenth as much space, thus keeping within all-important plane-loading limits.

As a result of original tests made by the Navy Department and later corroborated by the American Airlines, officials of the American Airlines announced that they had adopted this sea water desalting process for all over-water cargo and passenger flights and had recommended it to other air lines operating fights under the Air Transport Command.

At a shipwreck demonstration in the Atlantic Ocean off Long Island, sea water was scooped up in the transparent bag and a briquet was dropped in. The bag was sealed and shaken and the chemical absorbed. Salts were retained by a cloth filter as the water was sucked out.

Chemical methods of converting sea water to drinkable water have been sought by scientists for centuries. Since man first went to sea thousands of shipwrecked sailors and airmen have died from thirst and many thousands of others have lost their reason.

Attention has been focused on the problem of water supply for life rafts by the vast amount of over-water flying and fighting, especially in the Pacific war zones where 2- and 3-week raft squattings have become commonplace. The Rickenbacker and Doxon-Aldrich-Pastula sagas, describing the tortures of thirst aboard life rafs, showed that lucky catches of fish, birds, and rain water were all that prevented their deaths from thirst. Medical opinion holds that water is more important than food in sustaining life, for dehydration of tissues is usually fatal.

Hon. Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of November 5, 1943:

THAT MAN HULL

The pleasantest part of Secretary Cordell Hull's return from his diplomatic triumph in Moscow will be to read the encomiums heaped on him by those who excoriated him but a few weeks back.

Fellow Americans, potent with voice and pen, scored and scoffed at the man who not only made the Russian Pact possible but, because he had a part in it, made it acceptable to many other Americans.

Some of the erstwhile detractors are limiting the cheers for Hull to two instead of the usual three rousing ones. But, nevertheless, they are agreeing that he did a remarkable job, much to their surprise.

It was no surprise to the majority of Americans who have followed his statecraft for more than a decade. Despite allegations that he had no foreign policy, leaned to expedi-

ency, was too old, too cautious, and too far behind the times, their faith has never wavered.

When charges were made that his good-neighbor policy was too impractical, that his trade treaty program was too slow, that his show-down with Sumner Welles was anti-liberal, they bided their time.

For the lank, quiet man with the poker face, not given to many words, able to hold his tongue despite taunts until the right time, has demonstrated again and again a disconcerting habit of obliterating the assumptions and innuendoes of the garrulous with facts.

Notably was the time when his representative in north Africa, Consul Murphy, was accused of playing ball with Vichy on behalf of Mr. Hull. Both were silent until the north African invasion proved that on orders of the President and the Secretary Consul Murphy all the time was paving the way for that blow.

There was the other time, and it lasted a long time, when Mr. Hull was charged with buttering Petain, Laval, and other French collaborationists. Recently State papers revealed that, on the contrary, all the time the Secretary was stiffly warning Vichy not to hob-nob with Hitler, at the price of American friendship and support.

So he went to Russia and the ultraliberals held their breath. Russia might resent him. Marshal Stalin might not like him. But the sincerity and honesty of the calm, tough, Lincolnian character evidently charmed Stalin. Born in a log cabin himself and never having lost the common touch, he was at home with the leader of the proletariat. He sat down, lifted his hand, and apparently played it superbly.

The Moscow Pact speaks for itself. It speaks for Mr. Hull's ability, as well as for the better world after victory which it makes more positive. But it says something else, clearly and unmistakably, in the triumph which it has been for our Secretary.

One can produce results around a council table of nations without being stiff and without groveling. One can be a good neighbor and at the same time a good American. Cordell Hull is all of that.

Lend-Lease Into Mutual Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, November 12, 1943, entitled "Lend-Lease Into Mutual Aid":

LEND-LEASE INTO MUTUAL AID

The British Chancellor's white paper on mutual aid and President Roosevelt's report on "the reverse lend-lease aid which we have received" will enlighten those who really wish to be enlightened as to our economic relations with our allies.

Lend-lease has never been all outgo and no income. In money terms through June 30, 1943, the United States had shipped to Great Britain $4,458,000,000 worth of goods. It had received in various ways $871,000,000 from Great Britain and about $300,000,000 from Australia, New Zealand, and India. These receipts are continuing at the rate of about $1,250,000,000 a year. The figures are not complete, since some supplies and facilities furnished our armies overseas have yet to be accounted for.

Moreover, they do not include an important new item. Under an agreement recently reached the British will extend mutual aid to raw materials, foodstuffs, and shipping services for which regular payments have until now been made. Some of the goods thus obtained will be rubber, sisal, pyrethrum (the soldier's friend when insects attack him), asbestos, chrome, cocoa, tea, coconut oil, and benzol and tar acids. These are important, whatever the cash value.

Both President Roosevelt and Sir John Anderson, the British Chancellor, remind us that conditions of mutual aid differ as between the two countries. Our lend-lease, as Mr. Roosevelt says, "flows from a central source," whereas "British aid is rendered to the armed forces of the United States all over the world." Despite all such differences, we are scarcely making a greater sacrifice than the British. According to the white paper, Great Britain has paid out $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease or mutual aid over and above receipts. The comparable figure for this richer, more populous, and less hard-pressed country is $15,235,000,000. Last May lend-lease amounted to 12 percent of our total war expenditure. The comparable figure for Britain is 10 percent.

The figures, at best, do not tell the whole story. If, says Sir John Anderson, the United States sends planes to Britain for British crews to fly "that is reckoned as lend-lease." If the planes are manned by American crews the transaction is not called lend-lease. What we give and what we receive cannot be treated in terms of bargaining. It counts for victory, which is indivisible and of which there will be plenty to go around.

First R. E. A. Award Presented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, November 13, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to announce that Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Childs, whom I am proud to claim as my constituents, are being signally honored this afternoon "for distinguished war service in the production of the Nation's food through the use of rural electric power."

The State of Iowa has been and is now in the forefront of all activities directed to the prompt and successful prosecution of the war. The first T flag given by the Treasury of the United States for distinction in the purchase of War Savings bonds through wage check-off was won by the city of Cedar Rapids. Management and labor in the Second District of Iowa have won many E awards for excellence in the production of war materials. And now the first award given by the Rural Electrification Administration has been won by a farm family residing in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the letter of notification which came to me from the Administrator, Harry Slattery, who is at Manchester, Iowa, today to present the award in person:

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
St. Louis, Mo., November 5, 1943.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: I don't need to remind you that the American farmers are doing a superb job of production under adverse conditions imposed by the war. They are displaying a remarkable willingness to do the best they can with what they have at hand.

Electricity on the farm has proved its worth as an instrument of production. It is highly versatile, especially so in the hands of a really determined farmer and his family. To reward this resourcefulness and bring it to the attention of the public, I am starting a program of merit awards "for distinguished war service in the production of the Nation's food through the use of rural electric power."

The person designated to receive the first plaque is Mr. Ralph Childs, of Delaware County, Iowa. I plan to present this award to Mr. and Mrs. Childs in Manchester, November 13, at 1 p. m. The ceremonies will probably be rather simple and brief. If you are going to be near Manchester at that time, I should be delighted to have you be present.

If you are unable to attend, and if you care to have any message given out at the initial award presentation, I should be glad to receive it.

For your information, I am enclosing a photograph of the plaque. The background is blue, the lettering on the eagle is red, and the lettering on the background and the circle on the eagle are yellow.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SLATTERY,
Administrator.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio speech delivered by me on Armistice Day, November 11, 1943, on Post-War Problems.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My first words must express my appreciation to the Yankee Network for again inviting me, as they have for several years past, to deliver an Armistice Day radio message to you. I feel I am justified in saying this privilege is appreciated by you who are listening, as well as myself.

On this day 25 years ago, there was great rejoicing, rejoicing that the World War was over—no more fighting, no more bloodshed, and hopes were high that the end of World War No. 1 marked the end of all wars. How vain were these hopes, what tragedy was then already in store, we now know.

We are now on the second and more devastating phase of the identical conflict that

we call World War No. 1. There is no rejoicing today, but only somber reflection and grim determination to win the war and to hope and pray that it shall not have been fought in vain.

No one can foretell when the present war, with its fearful toll of human lives, will end. We all pray that it may be soon. But whether the final victory is near at hand or still a long way off, now is none too soon to discuss and consider and plan for the return to civilian life of the millions of men and women now in the armed forces—for the transition from a war economy to a peace economy.

Now is none too soon to lay the foundations for a post-war world in which the freedom for which our forefathers waged the Battle of Independence, the democracy which was established by our Constitution, the rights of religious freedom, free speech, free enterprise, and the rights of local self-government, which are our heritage, shall be preserved in full force and effect.

Will we be able to preserve these political rights against those who are hostile to them and those who are placidly indifferent toward them? The growth of bureaucracy in the United States is a threat to all of them. It is in evidence by the inroads being made in many directions on the American way of life. One of the major attacks, observable at the present time, seeks to destroy private enterprise and thereby wreck our industrial and economic system through bureaucratic control of our lives and our freedoms.

Private enterprise, which embraces personal ownership and freedom to trade, is the basis and reason for the progress of the United States of America and for its industrial and economic growth and development. Without the right to possess private property there can be no individual independence. Indeed, the absence of freedom of enterprise, when properly restrained by reasonable regulations, inevitably spells slavery. Free business and free American labor is one of our fundamental liberties.

In the limited time at my disposal tonight, I can speak only briefly of some of the major considerations that enter into any discussion of the post-war era. These considerations fall into two general categories. One pertains to what is popularly described as the home front—questions of how we shall treat our returning soldiers, questions of post-war public works, of expansion in the social security program, questions of education and taxation, and many others.

In the other category are matters in the realm of international affairs—the question of the terms of the peace treaty, of an international organization to preserve peace, questions of disarmament, questions of free trade, of freedom of the seas, and of freedom of access to all natural resources.

The questions in both categories are of tremendous importance.

FOREIGN POLICY

The difficulties in effectively determining any post-war global policies are prodigious. First and foremost is the very uncertainty of the future. There is no knowing how long the war will last, when or how it will end. Shall we collaborate in our efforts to prevent wars in the future with one, as some suggest, or with two, as others urge, of our allies; or with all of the 38 nations known as the United Nations? Shall our collaboration be moral or physical? Shall all documentary protections against war made in any international covenant or treaty be reinforced by the Army or Navy? Shall we support offensive or defensive peace?

In considering our post-war foreign policy we must keep in mind some basic principles and truths. We should not forget that regardless of treaties and agreements and neutrality laws, which we ourselves rapidly repealed after the war broke out in Europe, a nation that does not pursue peace with the same zeal it is forced to pursue war, when war comes, will find soon enough that it is involved in the wars of other nations. Any nation that does not seek, plan, and cherish wholeheartedly peace cannot long resist war. Any nation that flirts with war or is indifferent toward its neutrality can easily find it.

Before we abandon the old policy that we have pursued since the foundation of our Government (what is known as the free hand; namely, to make our decisions in regard to our relations with other nations as circumstances and events develop) we should be certain that we are entering a new policy that we believe will be successful in insuring freedom and peace for the future of the United States, in order that our people may work out their destiny at home without interference.

Likewise, no one can justly question our right or our motives if we should make it clear, that in abandoning the policy of the free hand, we reserve the right to examine the international agreements which may bind us to take action in the future; that we reserve the right to examine the conditions on which it is proposed to base our membership in any world international organization for the purpose of determining whether any organization, when it is finally completed is more likely to bring about peace or more likely to produce wars.

I have observed, with regret, that there is altogether too little pressure being exerted in favor of our country's insisting upon the elimination of the major global maladjustments which lead to war. Practically all the pressure being exerted at this time upon the Congress is in favor of binding the United States to enforce, through a world union or an international police force, whatever peace settlement may be reached, however harsh and reactionary it may be. It is idle to entertain the thought that justice and the will and the rights of the people can be ignored and peace at the same time be preserved, irrespective of the kind or degree of international machinery we might create.

I do not want what I have said to be misconstrued. It does not imply suspicion or distrust of our allies. It means that we are like our allies in this war primarily for our own security and safety and that we propose, as our allies have frankly asserted, to keep in mind in any world planning the safety and security of our own people and our own institutions.

We should approach the question of international collaboration in a sympathetic manner, with a sincere purpose to establish, in conjunction with all other peoples and nations of good will, a program for world peace.

International collaboration in the post-war period necessarily presupposes a just and honorable peace. Indeed, if the peace is not a just one then efforts at international collaboration in the post-war era are foredoomed to failure.

As to what is a just and honorable peace, and as to ways and means for its maintenance, are questions which cannot possibly be decided until the terms and conditions are known and until the post-war international organization is translated from the realm of theory to the realm of fact.

We cannot—even if we wish to do so—commit our Government or the country to these things until the time comes when we know the terms and our obligations. Until then we should not sign any blank check governing our participation in the post-war international set-up and placing a mortgage on the next generation to redeem it.

Let it be clearly understood, however, that if the peace treaty is not founded on justice, then its terms can never be carried out except by force, and perhaps not even then. Certainly America will never join hands with other nations to enforce a treaty that fails to accord with the principles of justice and freedom.

Finally, we need to realize that it is the millions of men and women now in the armed forces who will have, and should have, the deciding voice in determining the post-war policies of our country. It is they who will shape America's destiny in the years to come.

It is impossible in the brief time at my disposal to more than mention these vital questions of international post-war policies; for tonight I want to speak briefly of questions relating to the home front in the post-war period.

One of our very first concerns, and none is of more importance, is with the returning soldier—how to insure that he has a real opportunity for getting on his feet in civilian life and getting ahead; a real job, if that is what he wants and needs; more schooling or specialized training, if that be his choice; a home, if none is waiting for him on his return.

I am speaking now of the men and women who come out of the Army and Navy and other branches of the armed services physically and mentally fit—free of any disability. With respect to war casualties, whether death or bodily injury or disease or mental disorder, the veterans of World War No. 2 must stand on at least the same footing as that of the veterans of World War No. 1. Congress has already taken action to extend hospitalization privileges and domiciliary care and to provide the same scale of benefit payments in all cases of service-connected disabilities and the same payments to their dependents; namely, to the wives, children, and parents, in cases of service-connected death, and, by a special act of Congress passed last March, the broad program of vocational training and rehabilitation was set up for those who come out of the Army handicapped by war injury.

But these questions, though of anxious concern in thousands of anxious homes, are apart from the broader question of providing for the millions of war veterans who, at the end of the war, will ask only for reinstatement in their rightful place in the post-war world. A proposal has already been submitted to Congress to give every returning soldier a year in school or university, at Government expense, if he wishes it. This will be helpful to the younger men who were drafted while midway through their school or college course and helpful to men who want technical training or who wish to enter a profession. This year of schooling at Government expense will lessen the impact upon the labor market of millions of returning soldiers; it will be of help, but obviously it is only a part-way and temporary expedient.

Our major problem is so to arrange our domestic economy that there shall be employment and good wages for all who are willing and able to work, both the returning soldier and the millions of men and women now gainfully employed in war industries or in agriculture. Without jobs for all those who need jobs, there can be no possibility of a prosperous economy. It is easier said than done. It is, in fact, an overpowering problem for which there is as yet no complete solution.

A former representative of O. P. A. recently expressed the view that in the post-war decline between 1944 and 1946, unemployment might reach a peak of 12,000,000 workers. Others have set the figure higher. The economists who are prophesying a severe economic depression in the period immediately following the war point to the fact that the Government is now purchasing with deficit

dollars 50 percent of all the goods and services produced in America. The day is coming when this buying must inevitably taper off, and when the Government stops buying, we must provide substitute purchasers; private citizens must take up the slack; but in order to maintain large-scale buying, our people must continue to be employed at good wages.

I am in favor of a post-war public works program, Federal and State; but I say this with full realization that no program of public works that is within the financial capacity of the Federal and State Governments will be large enough to come anywhere near filling the gap which arises when war production comes to a halt.

I am in favor of enlarging the coverage of the Old Age Retirement Act so as to bring in the various classes of our adult working population who are not now included. I am in favor of increasing the amounts of the retirement payments and old-age pension, both in the contributory and the noncontributory categories. When we do that we shall be giving an added incentive to the older workers to stop working, as well as providing them with a more adequate subsistence when they give up their jobs.

Retirement from work of the men and women in the upper age groups will be one means of providing openings for the returning soldiers.

I am in favor of liberalizing the provisions for unemployment insurance in order to care for the workers who might be thrown out of employment in the period of transition from the war economy to a peacetime economy.

In my judgment, we ought to plan now for a post-war housing program of a scope far larger than has yet been suggested; not Government housing but Government assistance to privately planned and privately owned homes.

Our Government, with money borrowed on the faith and credit of the United States, has invested upward of $20,000,000,000 in industrial plants. What is to become of these plants when the war ends? Surely the Government must not be permitted to operate them in competition with private business. We must plan now for ways and means of transferring these to private ownership on a basis that will permit of their profitable utilization and yet salvage to the Government as much as possible of this immense investment.

It is estimated that the Government's stock pile of materials on hand at the end of the war, comprising not only war materials but also food and clothing, automotive equipment, and machines and tools of every description, may aggregate as much as $50,000,000,000 in value. Unless this huge inventory is wisely handled it might completely submerge our private business operations in many lines and completely disrupt trade and commerce. Obviously the disposals of these stock piles must be entrusted to honest and prudent men and will have to be spread over a long period.

The Government debt at the end of the war, which may then stand at the stupendous figure of two hundred and fifty or even three hundred billion dollars, will present immensely difficult questions of finance, and tied to it will be the question of Federal taxation in the post-war period.

The mere enumeration of these many questions serves to bring a realization of the size and seriousness of the problem of post-war planning on the home front.

PROBABLE LENGTH OF THE WAR

I referred at the outset of my remarks to the uncertainties as to the length of the war. I said that no one can foretell the day when it will end. I am mindful of the fact that in recent weeks a wave of optimism has swept the country with widespread belief that the end of the war is near at hand. I fear it is a false hope.

I have consulted with some of the highest military authorities in Washington anticipatory of my address here tonight as to what I would be warranted in saying respecting the probable length of the war; and what I am now going to say is their carefully considered opinion—their opinion rather than mine.

First of all, these high military officials, who are charged with the responsibility of carrying the war to a successful conclusion, greatly deplore the present spread of the idea that the war is near the finish. I am authorized to say that, in the opinion of our high military commanders, there is no prospect of any immediate or early termination of the war, but, on the contrary, they believe that the road ahead is long and difficult and that we must be prepared for even greater sacrifices and greater losses than have heretofore transpired.

They insist that in planning our own future military and naval operations it would be folly to proceed on the assumption that a crack-up in Axis morale is near at hand.

On only one aspect of our military operations can we now afford to be positive, and that is that, regardless of the length of the war, regardless of its severity, complete and final victory is assured.

Tribute to Jewish Dead of World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on November 7, 1943, at Pittsburgh, Pa., at the B'nai B'rith centennial anniversary and Community Commitee Day program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a deep sense of reverence that I join in your program in honor of the sacred memory of the Jewish heroes who lie beneath the Star of David alongside their Christian brothers beneath the crosses, comrades all in World War No. 1. Armistice Day was set aside to keep ever fresh in our memories the full measure of devotion that these honored dead willingly gave to our Nation's cause and to the cause of democracy. It was their fervent hope, as it is ours, that the forces of tyranny and intolerance be forever banished from the earth. It was to nurture this ideal, this dream; it was to honor the memory of our heroes; it was to inspire those who lived on, that Armistice Day was set aside.

In the few short years which have elapsed since the first Armistice Day we devoted too little attention to the task of maintaining a vigilant watch over the conduct of the forces which drew us into the storm that has engulfed the world. That storm struck our country with all its fury at Pearl Harbor in December 1941. The fury of that storm has not yet been spent but there is a break in the clouds and the sun is coming through. The traces of a rainbow are visible in the sky. There are bright days ahead.

The forces of evil which fomented this bloody strife could have been frustrated at the outset had the world not sat idly by when Japan invaded the Asiatic mainland, or when persecutions of minorities became the order of the day under Hitler. Hitler cunningly and in a diabolical manner appealed to all that is low and base in man. Hitler rose to power on bigotry and intolerance. His persecution of the Jewish minorities in Nazi Germany followed the usual pattern of restrictive discriminations; the denial of the ordinary rights of citizenship; the denial of the right to engage in business or a profession; then the unlawful seizure of money and property, and finally the wholesale deportations and mass executions. These were the portents which should have warned the nations that the world itself was threatened.

We are grateful today that before it was too late the world did become aware of the possibility that the forces of nazi-ism might subject all peoples to slavery, just as they had persecuted the minorities at home. The Nazis took a terrible toll in the brutal killing of defenseless men, women, and children before the civilized peoples of the world were fired into action. By trickery and by deceit Hitler spread his tentacles over most of Europe, slowly but surely choking the life out of those smaller nations, while the democracies were following a pattern of appeasement. This treachery of Hitler and the appeasement of the democracies visited death and destruction upon millions in the Old World.

We can look back now and realize that it was only when the democracies called a halt to appeasement that they girded for battle. Then Poland resisted the aggressor. Then Holland resisted the aggressor. Then Belgium, France, Greece, and England all decided to fight for their existence. The weaker nations were overrun. The Continent of Europe became Hitler's private estate. The Allied armies were driven into the English Channel on the north, They were driven into the Mediterranean Sea on the south. The Russians were pushed eastward, ever eastward by the well-prepared Nazi military machine. The small island of England became the last fortress of freedom in Europe. Her brave people stoutly resisted a terrific onslaught from the air. The Axis then controlled the Mediterranean. Next they crossed the Mediterranean and gained control of north Africa. Then the ominous shadow of the Axis threatened the Middle East and west Africa. How soon would they control all of the Continent of Africa, all the shipping lanes to India, all the supply depots for China?

The other Axis partner in the meantime was moving westward to meet Hitler and join forces. The Japs took possession of the coastal areas of China. They took over French Indochina, the Malay Peninsula, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines, and the islands of the South Pacific. They all fell before the onslaught of an enemy that had long planned for war while the democracies were engaged in the pursuits of peace. The Japs found some willing victims among the many peoples to whom democracy meant little or nothing—the men and women of countries who knew fear and want.

The civilized world trembled lest the two poles of the Axis attain their goal—the joining of their military machines in India, subduing that vast area from the Atlantic Ocean on the west to the Pacific Ocean on the east, all of Europe, Africa, and Asia. The tide was running out fast; the disorganized democracies were at the mercy of the enemy; the Axis was on the offensive; it was victorious at every turn. It seems only yesterday that President Roosevelt warned us of the danger to the Western Hemisphere. He

sought at times almost single-handedly to prepare us for the inevitable attack. After Pearl Harbor our naval strength in the Pacific was woefully inadequate. The British Fleet in the Pacific had suffered one reverse after another. Our supply of rubber from that South Pacific area was suddenly cut off, and a nation that moved on rubber tires faced what seemed to be a hopeless situation. Our allies needed oil and gasoline and we were short on these commodities and short of the tankers with which to transport them.

We needed to raise, to train, and to equip an Army and Navy equal to the stupendous task of fighting a global war. Hitler said we were unequal to the task. Hitler said the democracies were weak; that our youth had grown soft with the luxuries which our economic system had lavished upon them. Hitler overplayed his hand. He did not reckon the strength of a free people determined to preserve their precious liberties at all costs. Under the farsighted leadership of the President America has become the arsenal and the granary of democracy. America has literally built a bridge of ships to span the oceans of the world; to transport the guns and tanks, the foodstuffs and supplies so vital in the war effort. We have filled the skies with fighter and bombing planes. That American youth of yesterday, that same youth that Hitler said was soft, is today the trained and alert soldier, sailor, or marine in the mightiest fighting force the world has ever known.

Our senatorial committee which visited the battle fronts of the world has reported to the Nation the effect which our vast contributions have had upon the outcome of the war. The tide of battle has turned in all theaters of war. Hitler and Tojo have lost the initiative everywhere. England, once the target of incessant bombings, is making Air Marshal Goering eat his boastful prophecies. The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor has been revenged—the Japs will sign the terms of surrender in the Capital, but it will be in their capital and the United Nations will dictate the terms.

I traversed north Africa from Casablanca on the west through Morocco, Tunisia, and Algiers, over the sandy desert wastes and rugged mountains which so recently were overrun by Rommel's Africa Corps. The last vestiges of the invader are gone. All that is left is the wreckage of Nazi war equipment, abandoned in their hasty retreat.

The Mediterranean Sea is now our lake; this great body of water is open to our commerce, transporting vital oil from the Middle East. Our armies have invaded Europe and are pushing up through Italy. I visited Egypt, Palestine, Iran, and Iraq and other areas of the Middle East, all free from the Hitler menace. The strategy of the war has proven itself; the leadership of the United Nations is in good hands.

In the Persian Gulf area, under the most trying climatic conditions of extreme heat, I witnessed the splendid job being accomplished by our military forces. There our boys are unloading lend-lease matériel arriving from the United States and transshipping it overland to our gallant Russian allies. The offensive of the Japs in China and Burma has been stopped but our air forces in that area are confronted with the superhuman task of flying supply cargoes by plane, over the dangerous Himalaya Mountains. We had to rise to an altitude of over 20,000 feet on our trip to visit General Stillwell and the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. To get over these high mountain peaks, one has to run the risk of ice formations so dangerous to flying. These are some of the hazards which are being overcome to bring aid and succor to the beleaguered Chinese people. Small as our contributions must be on account of the transportation difficulties, they have helped the indomitable patient Chinese people to carry on the struggle against great odds, in the cause of human freedom.

In the South Pacific the Japanese assault aimed at Australia has been stopped in its tracks. Our forces, under General MacArthur and Admirals Halsey and Nimitz are driving the Japs back toward Tokyo. Tojo's forces and Hitler's forces are far apart today. They have long since abandoned their plan of meeting in the territory between Africa and Asia; they are too busy concentrating on their own home defenses. Hitler's army is being driven off Russian soil. The continent of Europe, once his fortress, is now Hitler's jail. He is surrounded on all sides. His end is in sight.

To maintain this sustained drive to victory we of the United Nations need the moral and physical support of the oppressed minorities of Europe and Asia. We must prove to them that we are fighting not only in our own defense but in defense of all peoples, great and small. We must implement the promises of the Atlantic Charter as quickly as possible by making the "four freedoms" a reality. To the homeless we must offer a haven of safety, a refuge, a homeland where they can gather the scattered remnants of their families and start life anew. We must assure them that persecution has been banished forever. We must convince these oppressed peoples that democracy is a living, dynamic force, that it will mean far more to them in the future than it has in the past. These are the ideals for which we must strive if we are to achieve a permanent peace. The world of tomorrow must be founded on the everlasting principles of justice; justice as summarized in the joint declaration on world peace recently issued by the conference of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews here in our Nation's Capital.

We here in the United States can set an example for the world to follow by establishing a just social order within our own country, by respecting and guaranteeing the rights of minorities within our midst, by repudiating racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of the dignity of the human personality.

If these be our ideals on this Armistice Day, Divine Providence may reward our efforts with a termination of this world conflict before another year. We must persevere in these determinations, to shorten the war, to hasten the day of victory, to make lasting the peace.

I hope that what I say now will not be considered political in nature. I wish to say it, not only because I believe it, not only because I gleaned the information from people I met and talked with throughout the world, but because I am sure that the judgment of history will support every word I say.

We have in America, guiding our destinies as the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, the most influential personality in the leadership of any government on earth. The oppressed peoples of every nation in the world look to the leadership of America. They believe with all the faith in their hearts and souls in the leadership of America. Divine Providence, who watches over the affairs of men and nations, favored us when President Roosevelt became the leader of our Nation.

Action on War Losses Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, what is to be the policy which is to determine the final disposition of the alien-enemy property which is now held by our Alien Property Custodian? Is it, as following the last war, to be returned to its former alien-enemy owners or is it to be sold and the proceeds used to compensate American citizens who have suffered monetary damage as a consequence of enemy action?

That question will have to be answered within the next few months by the American Congress. Congress blundered in its treatment of the problem following the close of World War No. 1, and, as a consequence of that folly, thousands upon thousands of our fellow citizens who suffered great damage at the hands of our then enemies have not to this day been compensated. If we have learned anything from that unhappy experience, the Congress will declare another and wiser policy.

As there is no one in the country better informed in reference to this all-important subject than is Mr. Harold Aron, an eminent New York attorney who has during the last two decades devoted much of his time in perfecting himself as an expert on the proper treatment of alien-owned properties during wartime and after, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of his dealing with this intricate legislative problem which first appeared in the New York Times of November 10, 1943, may be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am sure that the membership of this body will find that which he wrote very helpful to them in determining their attitude toward the legislation to which they will soon be required to give their attention.

Mr. Aron's letter follows:

ACTION ON WAR LOSSES URGED—THOSE SUFFERED BY CITIZENS REGARDED AS SUBJECT FOR GOVERNMENT INTEREST

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The capitulation of Italy should bring a realization of immediacy in formulating and enacting into law the policy to be pursued by this country in recovering to the fullest extent possible losses suffered by American citizens at the hands of Axis nations. This has nothing to do with the question of whether or not we shall seek or get repayment for war debts long past due, or for what we lend and lease allied and friendly nations, nor does it have to do with what indemnities shall be demanded or received by the United States as a sovereign from defeated enemy countries. About both of these items the United States Government, as such, has a right to be magnanimous and even to be duped as in the past, for as to such it is acting in its sovereignty, and no citizen has any property interest which is directly affected thereby, although, of course, undue liberality will be paid for by American taxpayers.

When, however, we come to deal with private losses, incurred by our citizens, firms, and corporations, the Government has the duty as the trusted agent of the injured and damaged among its people to compel restitution to the fullest possible extent.

As a matter of international law, the Government of the United States, acting through Congress, is unlimited in its power of compulsion in recovering such private losses of its citizens, whose property has been destroyed, confiscated, or trespassed upon. There is a sound maxim of the law that one must be just before one is generous, and the Government that does less than all within its power in recovering the war losses of its citizens is an unfaithful steward, just as it is

not a Shylock in requiring full compensation from defeated enemy sovereignties.

NO PLACE FOR SENTIMENT

Let the Government be sentimental in largesse as to its own money and property, but it has no right so to deal with the losses its citizens have suffered.

Thus far no policy has been asserted. We were tragically slow about freezing and seizing Axis assets within our grasp, with the result that hundreds of millions of dollars, possibly billions, in values were siphoned out of the country under the incredibly stupid circumstance of giving semiofficial notice of our intentions long before any action was taken. We continue to hold these assets as frozen or in custody for account of whom it may concern, and there has been no new legislation of any moment as to enemy property since 1917. Instead of there being an alien property administrator, we continue the title "Custodian," keeping alive the hope of enemy aliens that these assets will again, as after the last war, be released from custody and returned, at least in major part.

It is not an overstatement to say that in a global war the subject of frozen assets, of both enemy and enemy-conquered nations, and seized property of enemy nations presents as intricate a problem of law and administration as human mentality can hope to solve. It seems likewise safe to say that astute handling of the problem can immeasurably reduce private losses suffered by our citizens as the result of enemy action and, as well, prove extremely useful in the post-war commercial struggle for world markets.

BENEFIT TO MANY

There may be more dramatic and less complicated subjects for instant public discussion and congressional action, but none which in hard dollars will as directly and beneficially affect more of our citizens, business concerns and great corporations whose shares are publicly owned.

While conditions following this war will vary greatly from those after the World War, and there will be lacking illusions which caused credit to be given to Germany's promises to settle war claims and pay indemnities, it is to be noted that three nations are jointly involved as obligors for the war damage that we shall actually have or share possession of some or all of their territories and physical assets; that this will be a dictated peace and that it may, to a considerable extent, be possible and fitting, in order to avoid transfer difficulties involved in payment of monetary compensation, to compel restoration in kind of American-owned real and personal property located in enemy countries and damaged or destroyed by enemy action. We may not make out so badly if our hearts don't rule our heads and we look out for Americans first and get about it now.

HAROLD G. ARON.

NEW YORK, *September 8, 1943.*

The Fuel Situation in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, while in my district in Massachusetts for the observance of Armistice Day, I received many anxious inquiries concerning the fuel situation for Springfield and neighboring cities and towns for the coming winter. During the winter of 1942–43, the handling of the supply and distribution of fuel oil in that area was the subject of investigation at my request.

The report as conveyed to me showed that the situation had been handled more unsatisfactorily in that area than anywhere else in the East. I was promised that the situation would be remedied and that conditions would be better during the winter of 1943–44. This year, with the situation regarding fuel oil still critical because of the military demands which may be made at any time, the people of western Massachusetts are faced with extreme difficulty in securing anthracite coal. We have Federal agencies and we have regulations, but I frankly am alarmed about the ability and the true concern of all the officials to secure an adequate supply of fuel in New England. I urge the officials to check every phase of the situation from the time that the coal is mined until it reaches the ultimate consumer—the family unit. Some of the mines are tied in with railroads, which will make more money if the coal is hauled to places other than New England. Some of the mines have their own retail outlets and are not anxious to furnish coal to independent dealers. I believe the officials should check closely upon the mines to see that they are operated to greater capacity, if possible, in this crisis. One dealer has advised me of his inability to get hard coal. I find too prevalent the attitude that householders are going to be lucky to get 90 percent of the coal; and if they have to take further cuts, they must endure suffering and privation.

I think the attitude should be more constructive and that the officials should show greater concern lest there be illness and deaths from this cause during the next 6 months. They seem to have established the proposition that if they perform a 90-percent job, it should be considered satisfactory. I feel that they should aim at a 100-percent job.

We are told that more fuel oil could be secured in the United States if the Government officials would take steps which would result in further development of oil fields. Instead of trying to secure more production of fuel oil, they demanded conversion from oil-burning plants to coal-burning plants. The result which they developed gives rise to real and warranted concern over the supply of both fuel oil and coal at this time.

I believe that Congress should keep in close touch with this situation and that frequent reports of the production, supply, and distribution of both fuel oil and anthracite and bituminous coal should be made available to the public. I believe that this activity on the home front warrants exercise of the greatest care on the part of the administrators charged with the duty of seeing that sufficient fuel is made available to keep our citizens from hardship during the approaching winter.

I have brought these facts to the attention of Secretary Ickes and I attach herewith my letter to him and the reply which I received from C. J. Potter, Deputy Solid Fuels Administrator for War. The important thing in his reply is his statement that New England has received 90,000 tons less of anthracite this year than in 1942. At the same time it is a known fact that due to conversion there are many more houses burning anthracite than last winter.

The letters are as follows:

OCTOBER 23, 1943.

HON. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ICKES: As a Congressman from western Massachusetts where the temperature reached 40 below zero last winter, I am anxious over the preparations being made for fuel for domestic purposes.

According to the Black Diamond trade magazine of October 2, 1943, page 19, the forwardings of anthracite to New England for 1943 for the year as of September 11 show a decrease of 310,750 tons as compared with the same period last year.

In the October 16 issue of Saward's Journal, page 344, it appears that the production of anthracite for 1943 was 73,000 tons more than for the corresponding period ending October 2, 1942.

It hardly makes sense to me that in a year where the production of anthracite is greater than it was last year and at a time of crises with reference to heating fuels in Massachusetts, a condition can exist where less anthracite coal is being shipped into our area when the coal is available. Evidently there has been a diversion to other areas.

Last year in the Springfield, Mass., area we had the worst distribution and supply of fuel oil of any area in the East. While a better showing is promised for this winter, it now appears that persons who converted from fuel oil to coal are not being protected.

I wish you would advise me if the figures contained in these magazines are correct. If so, I wish you would advise me why the anthracite coal has not been moved to New England rather than elsewhere at a time when most people would have stocked up in large part for the winter.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. CLASON.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1943.

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CLASON: Your letter of October 23, addressed to the Petroleum Administrator for War, has been referred to me for reply. You quote statistics from the Black Diamond trade magazine and Saward's Journal in regard to the production and distribution on anthracite and also call attention to the shortage of anthracite in western Massachusetts. You state that the distribution of anthracite to Massachusetts has been less this year than last year, even though there has been an increase in production, and you ask if the figures contained in these magazines are correct.

In considering statistics in regard to production and distribution of anthracite two distinctions should be made. First, it should be determined whether the figures are based on a calendar year or on the coal-burning year from April 1 through March 31. Second, the figures should relate to the particular sizes of anthracite under consideration, i. e., the figures should refer to total tonnage or should be broken down into domestic and industrial sizes. The figures quoted by you are based upon a calendar year rather than the coal-burning year and include all sizes of anthracite. A more reliable picture of the situation is obtained from studying figures based upon the coal-burning year, and which relate only to domestic sizes, since the more critical shortage is in such sizes.

Reliable data indicate that for the period April through August 1942, 1,025,710 tons of

anthracite in the prepared sizes moved into the State of Massachusetts, whereas for the same period during 1943 976,558 tons moved into that State. This represents a decrease of only 4.79 percent, or a difference of 49,152 tons, whereas during the same period there was a decrease in anthracite shipments in these sizes to all destinations of 9.55 percent.

Revised regulation No. 2, issued by this Office, permits wholesale suppliers to ship up to but not in excess of 90 percent of the anthracite which they shipped to destinations and dealers during the last coal-burning year. Accordingly, the foregoing figures indicate that during the period April 1, 1943, through August 31, 1943, the State of Massachusetts received 53,419 tons of anthracite in the prepared sizes in excess of the quota which would have been permitted by revised regulation No. 2.

You inquire why anthracite has not moved into New England rather than elsewhere at a time when most people would have stocked up for the winter. I call your attention to the fact that 1,899,690 tons of anthracite in the prepared sizes moved into New England during the period April through August 1943, as compared with 1,989,533 tons of the same sizes shipped into New England during the same period last year. This represents 9,110 tons more than the quota which would have been permitted by revised regulation No. 2 during that period.

Although there has been a slight increase in the production of anthracite in 1943, as compared with 1942, this increase has been more than offset by increased demands due to war activities. The recent work stoppages at the mines have further aggravated the situation. The problem is one of distribution of the available supply and I assure you that this Office is aware of the seriousness of the situation. Everything possible is being done to distribute this supply equitably and to see that Massachusetts receives its fair share of the available anthracite.

If I can be of any further service to you, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. POTTER,
Deputy Solid Fuels Administrator for War.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely and enlightening editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times recently on lend-lease:

THIS LEND-LEASE BUSINESS

As we understand lend-lease it works something like this. We provide great quantities of planes, tanks, guns, ships, etc., to our allies. They use them to lick nations we want to lick. Instead of having American pilots in planes, or gunners at triggers, we let Australians, Britishers, Russians, Chinese, and others do the shooting. They're shooting down our enemies and theirs.

Lend-lease is something we've never had before. It's saving American lives. It's saving a lot of fathers from the draft. It's so new that its intricate function in the "arsenal of democracy" had to be entrusted to a man like Edward Stettinius, Jr., head of United States Steel, the biggest steel company in the world. And United States Steel is like a pigmy compared with lend-lease.

Lend-lease is the biggest job man ever tried to do in war. All around the enemy world airfields had to be constructed so the Allies could get a whack at them from as many directions as possible. Harbor docks had to be built where materials could be unloaded. Railroads have been constructed to carry troops to the front and keep them supplied.

LEND-LEASE SHOULD GO ONE WAY

It has cost the United States $14,000,000,000 to get ourselves and the Allies in the shooting and push-off positions for the crushing attack that eventually will reach Berlin and other places we want to knock out. We've heard a lot of yapping about lend-lease going "one way." That's the way we want it to go—at the enemy and his vitals.

Now there's also a reverse lend-lease. The President told about it in his twelfth lend-lease report to Congress.

It's the materials, the ammunition, the food, etc., our allies turn over to us. England and Australia have had more help from us than they have given us, but the fact is that reverse lend-lease has its points in effectiveness on unity of attack on the enemy, even if the figures in cash leave us with the heaviest load.

Mr. Roosevelt says that the British Commonwealths are in better shape than they were in 1941 when the Japs hit us. They are supplying our war machine and men with goods and services at the rate of about one and one-fourth billion dollars a year. He says this will increase.

The sum involved in reverse lend-lease doesn't stack up very high against what the United States has put on the line. But the returns on the investment mount up every day of the war. They are evident in the blastings we're giving the German cities from the air. The Russians eating American food and shooting American guns are on the heels of racing Germans scooting for safety away from the steppes of the Soviet. It would be hard to place a value of the lend-lease in north Africa, where American tanks helped General Montgomery's eighth army in battles that could have taken a lot of American lives. The President says about reverse lend-lease:

"One thing is clear. By the help which our friends and allies have given us, and by the help which we have given them in the common cause, we have not only made progress in the war, but we have saved the lives of our own boys as well as those of our allies."

MR. ROOSEVELT ANSWERS SENATORS

Mr. Roosevelt told the Congress that Britain, Australia, India, and New Zealand supply much of the food, some of the clothing, airports, hospitals, communications, technical help, transportation, and other items to our armed forces. It all amounted to $1,171,000,000 up to June 30 of this year. He was answering the criticisms of the five Senators who reported after a world tour that there was too much American generosity involved in lend-lease operations.

The dollar casualties in this war are going to be tremendous. The casualties in lives are going to be heavy. But we're convinced that lend-lease and reverse lend-lease have made the cost in lives much lighter than if there had been no such arrangement. If a Russian firing an American-made lend-lease gun can kill a lot of Germans, that means we'll use fewer American soldiers firing other guns. If British crews will fly 50,000 airplanes, we're for giving them the planes, because American boys won't have to fly them.

New Deal Not So New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Bennington (Vt.) Evening Banner of Tuesday, November 9, 1943, entitled "New Deal Not So New":

NEW DEAL NOT SO NEW

Every person who reads history knows that in the matter of government and social order there is not much that is new. Communism is the first form of government after our half-savage ancestors emerged from the darkness of complete barbarism. Next came the rule of the chieftain and along with him the voodoo doctor and other forms of alleged magic, witch faith and many forms of superstition.

Following came nazi-ism in one form or another which was replaced by autocracy, which is merely nazi-ism in another and more violent type. Then the world had kings and emperors and along with them various religions which were largely superstition and selfish scheming. Gradually the Christian church did a little toward purifying itself and so also did some of the other religions, but the world was still sunk in ignorance and misery. Then along came the capitalistic system and started paying wages in shops and factories.

Gradually folks got jobs and bettered their condition and were on the way, slowly and painfully, to managing their own affairs. In the course of time they might have been their own masters and some degree of democracy might have come from the improvement of human conditions.

Then came Karl Marx and his well-meant socialistic dreams of utopia which were the same largely as the things that had preceded it. They were going to make people happy by doing things for them, and this is the foundation of the New Deal. Kings, cardinals, priests, Puritans, emperors, and voodoo doctors, all worked the same scheme which is, in all its forms, spending people's money for them, and not being willing to let them work out their own salvation, or damnation, according to the belief of the New Deal and all other forms of state socialism.

Then years ago when the N. R. A. was pushed onto the American people it was hailed as a wonderful idea that would make things better for both the Government and the people. It didn't work and went into the discard but not until it was discovered that the idea was not new but had been tried in the reign of Henry I. King of England, back in the thirteenth century. It wasn't a success and cannot be without a radical change in human nature.

Now comes Clayton Rand, a southern Democrat but not a supporter of the New Deal. In an address at Gulfport, Miss., Mr. Rand said in part:

For this occasion I call your attention in particular to one of the super-super planned economizers of all history. Diocletian became Emperor of Rome in A. D. 284. In an unprecedented depression and a great emergency he sprang a "new deal" on the Empire in 301. Under him the Roman senate became po-

litically impotent and the last traces of republican institutions disappeared. Diocletian was of the opinion that social security could be permanently established and the economy of the empire forever stabilized by the creation of federal bureaus and commissions. Diocletian was vested with absolute authority and he fixed by decree, he thought for all time, in supposedly fair relationship, the intricate processes of society.

The prices of all commodities, wages, and other activities of the people were in complete control of the state. Price ceilings were engraved on tablets of stone and were set up in the market places. Even to this day fragments of this edict are being unearthed in remote places once embraced by the Roman Empire. In all, 800 articles were included in the edict: cereals, wine, oil, meats, vegetables, skins, leather, furs, shoes, timber, clothing, poppy seeds, snails, goat's flesh, underwear, and Numidian mantles were given a fixed price. Wages for services rendered from common laborer to dancing teacher and professional advocate, were determined by directive and a bureaucracy regimented everything from the number of acres a farmer could plant to the maximum hours labor could be employed. There was rationing, rent controls, and a kind of interstate commerce commission covered transportation down to the "rent for a laden ass, per mile," which in our coinage was 18 cents. Unless the transportation agency of the time carried more than two persons per ass, there was no chance of showing a profit. And the asses that they employed then could not carry more than two passengers.

The only group Diocletian's edict did not regulate was physicians. It was left to the "new deal" to attempt to socialize medicine.

Rome flourished, its population increased, with the multiplicity of bureaus and coordinators. There were as many stonecutters in Rome as there are stenographers in Washington. The law of supply and demand was repealed and the economic life of the people was so completely regulated that a perfect society flourished. A kind of Plato's New Republic or Moore's Utopia or Roosevelt's New Deal or Huey Long's Every Man a King was organized in the Eternal City.

What happened to this strange experiment, this effort to socialize and regiment an empire? We have the verdict in history. Diocletian and his "new deal" failed to reckon with one significant fact that neither he nor all his legions could control human nature. Despite the fact that Diocletian punished by death or deportation all violations of his price-fixing agency, the scheme collapsed. Black markets flourished to traffic in meat. Overcharges made by merchants and the money changers who exacted usury were checked, but production also stopped.

Absenteeism became common with labor; merchants closed their marts and went on vacation. Competition disappeared, and men neglected to manufacture, to buy and sell, to exchange commodities for services. Farmers ceased to till their land, moved to the cities, and society became decadent.

What happened? Individual freedom was destroyed. The essential fires of enthusiasm were extinguished, individual and collective initiative perished. Diocletian took the fun out of work. Authoritative regulation crushed ambition in the masses. However good might have been the emperor's intentions, his attempt to regulate everything that could be controlled to meet a great emergency was disastrous, ultimately fatal, in its effect.

Diocletian stated, in part, in the introduction to his edict, "Inasmuch as there is only seen a mad desire without control to pay no heed to the needs of the many * * * it seems good to us, as we look into the future, to us who are the fathers of the people, that justice intervene to settle matters impartially, in order that that which, long hoped for, humanity itself could not bring about could not be secured for the common government of all the remedies which our care affords."

Writing of Diocletian's "new deal" more than 1,600 years ago, Lactantius wrote: "He tried to fix by law the price of articles offered for sale. Thereupon for the veriest trifles much blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse until, after the death of many persons, the law was repealed from mere necessity."

The passing of Diocletian marked the decline of local self-government and the growth of a centralized system. Probably no Roman emperor proposed so many sweeping reforms. Diocletian completely reorganized the government, set up new systems of coinage and taxation, and redivided the provinces. It is interesting to note that a new dealer has recently recommended dissolving the States and subdividing the Republic into districts and departments. Out of the emperor's experiments and those that preceded him sprang the socialistic schemes of later times.

Diocletian ruled for 20 years. The New Deal has run its course for only 10 years; but at the pace it runs, give it 10 years more and it will outdo Diocletian.

The collapse of Diocletian's edict also marks an important turning point on the highway of history, for there followed in the wake of his experiments a thousand years of night. From the year 300 almost to the year 1300, that period in civilization is rightly called the Dark Ages. During that night of a thousand years, what was once the Roman Empire produced not a single poet, historian, orator, painter, sculptor, architect, or builder. The practical effect of the decree was to stop the flow of goods into the markets and suspend the activities of the Empire. There were no banks, no insurance companies, no transportation companies, no mail service, and no newspapers. During this long night society slipped into slavery, human nature became depraved, men became selfish, base, and dishonest. The world was managed by priests and police. They took charge of the taxing power and production. Famines were frequent and the status of the human race, in its fight for food, was little better than that of the beasts of the jungle.

The Roman Empire was built before the coming of the Caesars. For 750 years the Roman citizen had enjoyed more freedom than man had ever before experienced. Under the planned economies of the Caesars it took 150 years to accomplish the complete disintegration of the Empire's commerce and agriculture, and expose it as easy prey to the barbarians. We have been 300 years carving this Republic out of the wilderness. How long will it take the streamlined bureaucrats to destroy it with their regulation, red tape, edicts, and directives?

Despite this bitter lesson of experience, planned economies continued. Frequent upheavals on the European continent are historic reminders of the countless efforts to regulate and regiment its peoples—authoritative attempts to destroy their freedom and build by a false economy of scarcity. Occasional economic recovery in Europe can be traced down through the centuries in terms of spasmodic freedom.

I shall not burden you with any recitation upon humanity's periodic recoveries, which came with the Renaissance, political and industrial revolutions, the conquest of the New World, or the Elizabethan age, during which the people of England enjoyed a little freedom and went forth with it to build an empire. For the purposes of this presentation let us rush on to the birth of this Republic, for, despite England's Magna Carta, freedom, as we understand it, was reborn in the American Revolution against King George III, his planned economies, and his authoritative pressure on the nerve centers of a people determined to be independent.

For 170 years before 1776, the roots of a transplanted, newer freedom were spreading on the North American Continent. American liberty is the product if the soil and genius of the open spaces and open minds of a freedom-loving people who made a covenant with God to release themselves, body and soul, from the ancient bondages of bureaucracy.

Step by step the colonists had severed themselves from European concepts. Full expression was given to the individual's bottled up energy and potential initiative. There developed a new philosophy of government under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson that found expression in the colonists' indictments against the king in our Declaration of Independence, then in the adoption of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. I doubt if there is a problem of personal conduct that one will not find an answer for in Poor Richard's Almanac. I doubt if there is a problem of state, or of our relationship with other peoples, that we will not find a solution for in the writings of the Father of Our Country. Did he not warn us in his third address to Congress, "Be at all times prepared for war; leave nothing to the uncertainty of procuring of war-like apparatus in the moment of danger." If we had heeded that admonition have you any doubt in your mind that either Japan or Germany would have dared attack us? What will the gross negligence of our Government at Pearl Harbor cost the country in blood and treasure? Thomas Jefferson put our newer freedom into a pungent paragraph when he said, "Agriculture, manufacture, commerce, and transportation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are most thriving when left free to individual enterprise."

Let us thank God for the unusual opportunity that comes to us—to keep the flame of liberty alive in a world in which millions are enslaved. The cardinal crimes in America are greed, cowardice, and indifference. First among us are they who have the courage of their convictions, the urge to serve, and the will to act.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1787, "What country before ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion * * * ? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

The little freedom man has enjoyed on the face of the earth he has gained by resisting autocratic authority and bureaucratic regimentation, and there is already evidence of a rebellion in the land.

Let us, then, on with the war to a victorious end—united and militant. And free from foreign invasion, let us resolve with peace to crush the sinister influences within that would destroy our individual freedom, our traditional independence, and our American way of life.

The World War will be of short duration—the fight for freedom will go on for generations, for liberty is easily lost and is only regained through great sacrifice and heroic effort.

Reasons for Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a talk entitled "Reasons for Rationing," given by the Reverend J. J. McLarney, O. P., professor of sacred eloquence at the Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D. C.:

Here in my hand is a ration book. I have been meditating on it. I am very ignorant about war-ration books, because I am not forced to shop for my dinner. There is a man in our house who does that for a hundred of us. And he does it very well. Rationing is not new to him. The people in houses like ours have been rationed for centuries. Meatless days are twice a week the year round. Lent for our house is not just 40 days, but at least 6 months; and that means meat but once a day, except on meatless days. Other things are measured accordingly. Such is the way of men in monasteries.

This war-ration book, however, is something new. On its cover I can read my name signed under a promise that I will use it for the purposes authorized by the Office of Price Administration. I read that it is a criminal offense to violate rationing regulations. On this other war-ration book, I read the statement of the Government as follows: "Persons who violate rationing regulations are subject to $10,000 fines, or imprisonment or both." Those are hard words for me, or for anybody. I cannot even buy the food I want to buy from a person who wants to sell without incurring such dangers. Who thinks he can push me around, who thinks he can regulate my appetite, who thinks he can deprive me of food? Who? Why, the Government can do that, the Government is doing just that, in our present emergency. And we all agree with the principle that the Government has a perfect right to do it at the present time.

The war-ration book makes me think that, if we hunger and thirst now, we shall have our fill later on, and thus we'll win the peace. It makes me think about that grain of wheat which buries itself now that it may burst forth green in the spring. It makes me remember we are not giving things equally to everyone now, but are curtailing our food on the home front, that our soldiers may have more than sufficient to win the war; we are giving to each according to his need, as St. Augustine advises. This war-ration book makes me think about the occupied and conquered countries, which may be given enough to eat because we deny ourselves something of our abundance. It makes me think that Christ will tell us on the last day: "I was hungry, and you gave me to eat * * * as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (Matthew, 25: 35; 40). It makes me think that we can revive a place like Sicily, for example, and once more, as Longfellow writes, make "the happy island dance in corn and wine." This ration book reminds me that I must suppress my rights for the time in favor of the common good of all. That is why Uncle Sam has pulled in his belt. That is why we all follow suit. That is why liberty has blown her trumpet and we all march in line. Some pitiable Americans may, like skulking dwarfs, creep in and out of black markets. But most of us are keeping in step. America has a war to win, as well as a face to feed.

Rationing is nothing new, as I said before. Long ago the church blew a trumpet in Zion and sanctified a fast. There was a war going on then, and there is a war going on now, as far as the church is concerned. It is a war against evil—against the evil of flesh and blood in our own fallen nature, against the evil of the spirit of wickedness in high places, against powers and dominations of hell. To win that war the church, like a wise old mother who has seen war and strife and dying souls on many a spiritual front—the church tells her children that there may be times in which to feast, but there are also times for fast.

What does Mother Church say? She says, in the code of canon law, that at certain times the quantity of food must be cut to one full meal, and perhaps two small collations daily. That means fast. She says, also, that at certain times the quality of food must be regulated, so that flesh meat is forbidden. That means abstinence. She says that all who are more than 6 years old are obliged to abstain. She says that all who are more than 20 and less than 60 are obliged to fast. On each Friday, during Lent, and on certain other days, these laws are active. That, for the information of those who wonder and may demur, is a very brief statement of the laws of fast and abstinence. It is not very complicated.

Well, I might say, "Who is the church that I am pushed around the dining table like that? Who is the church, that she says I must swallow fish and pass up the meat? Who is the church that she makes laws about one meal a day and other starvation routines? Who or what is this church?"

That is not a difficult question to answer. It is no more difficult to answer that question, "Who is the church?" than it is to answer the question, "Who is this country?" This country which regulates my food, my shoes, my gasoline, and the cuffs of my trousers? Who is this country? Why, you are this country. So am I. So are all of us: we are this country. And no one can say nay to us if we wish to eat lightly. This country has a Government which regulates the amounts and kinds of things which we use, and eat and wear—because we have a war to win.

Who is this church? We, you and I, all who acknowledge it as the one and true society founded by Christ for our salvation. We are the church. And no one can say us nay, or say that we are fanatics, or say that we are very foolish, if for good purposes we wish to serve a light table. The church, that is, we have a church government which regulates the amounts and the kinds of things which we eat—because we have a war to win, that is, we have souls to save.

That is why Catholics observe the laws of fast and abstinence. It is all very reasonable. No one is asked to do the impossible. If a person be sick, or an expectant mother, or a working man or woman, the fast and sometimes the abstinence is relaxed. Even the family of the workingman may eat what he is permitted to eat, so that the domestic situation will not be too complicated. In times like these bishops have relaxed the laws more freely because of local conditions. As far as I know, there have been no cases of malnutrition to be laid at the door of the Catholic Church.

Does the law of fast and abstinence make Catholics become like prisoners on bread and water? Hardly, if my own experience can be cited. Does the law restrict our freedom? Not at all. On the contrary, the law of fast and abstinence is an assurance of greater freedom.

Fast and abstinence assure us of freedom from want. There are many kinds of want. There is the want of food for some, because others are selfish about food. If the fast and abstinence of Catholics can impress on the minds of the greedy that one's stomach is not a divinity, those who have will be more inclined to give to those who have not, and there will be a better distribution of it all. The last few years in England have witnessed that blessing.

Then there is also the want of health. Fast and abstinence are an assurance of health. Too many people dig their graves with their teeth, because they have not learned self-discipline and control. There is some foundation for the belief that this is the reason why there is sometimes such lethargy among the rich and such vitality among the poor.

This may also be one of the reasons why there is such a healthy birth rate among the poor and such an unhealthy birth rate among the rich.

This could explain why a rich country often has a problem of manpower.

Most biologists will agree that animals that are slightly underfed multiply more abundantly than animals which are sleek and fat. Fast and abstinence, governed by moderation—there can be intemperance, you know, of too little, and intemperance of too much—fast and abstinence, governed by moderation, are an assurance of health. The church, wise old mother, is a good nurse and a good dietitian.

Fast and abstinence make for freedom for those who fast and abstain. They make for freedom from fear. There is the fear which stalks the world today that monsters of might and materialism will devour the spirit of liberty and personal right. To be free of that fear we have rolled up our sleeves; we have converted our factories and machines; we have produced our guns and planes and tanks; we have flung the healthiest and the best-equipped and the best-fed Army in history all over the world. And we fast and abstain, with ration books, to strike down that stalking fear and raise that freedom on high.

There is also the fear in every human heart that the greedy flesh will overcome and devour the beauty of the free soul, which longs for the happiness of God. There is the fear that the law of hungry members, the craving of bodily appetites, will conquer the law of the mind, which tells us that it is better to need a little than to have too much. There is the fear that the body will have its reward in the flesh pots of pleasure in this life at the cost of the eternal loss of the soul. But that fear does not exist in that heart which is controlled and disciplined to the reasonable rigors of fast and abstinence.

There is a fear, finally, that full with food and heavy with sleep, we may forget that the Lord of the Heavenly Harvest, who multiplied bread, who dined with publicans and sinners, the Lord who changed water into wine that men might feast—that same Lord fasted in the time of fast; He taught us to feast and taught us to fast; and how; and when; and where, as any reader of the Scriptures knows. Yet, with the shadow of the cross upon Him, He invited us to imitate Himself: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me" (Luke 9: 23). He took up His cross, and on that cross He died to save us on the sixth day of the week, Friday. And for fear that selfish, sinful, fattened men and women will forget that Lord, that cross, that Friday when true freedom was born, a wise mother, with tears and remembrance, tells her children to restrain themselves and think, and give thanks and pray. That is why Catholics do not eat meat on Friday.

These reasons are not hard to understand. They are very noble reasons which the church

has for her rationing plan. They are very much akin to the reasons which Americans have today who grit their teeth and say: "We can win this fight. We can help a lot, if we hunger a little."

These thoughts may help you to beef less, if I may borrow a word, about your little bit of beef; to kick less, to borrow another, with fewer shoes; to cover more ground in the road to victory with less gasoline.

These thoughts may help Americans who are now beginning to remember God; these thoughts may help the country which is now on the way to triumph—a country of strong, and lean, and self-sacrificing people—these thoughts may help us all to realize that the wise mother—our church—has been leading the way for a long, long time.

The Voice of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask that the following editorial from the Pacific Rural Press be reprinted here. I do not need to tell any farmer about the P. R. P.; it bears the very highest reputation wherever agricultural products are grown. It is important, therefore, when a journal of this standing comes out and suggests that the best way for the California farmers to meet the A. A. A. goals for 1944 is not to follow the instructions. The California farmer has had experience with Government regulations; it has been a sad experience. The editorial explains why:

THE VOICE OF THE WEST

It is probable that California farmers will find great opportunity in the A. A. A. goals for 1944—by not following them.

That's the way they treated the A. A. A. goals for 1943. They made their own practical decisions, fitted to the land, equipment and labor, and produced heroically—an all-time outpouring of farm products needed by war.

Time proved they were mostly right. Washington mostly wrong.

Why this attitude toward Government?

Perhaps the constructive and patriotic thing to do is to frankly discuss it.

Farmers have very little confidence in the too-little-and-too-late regimenteers of Washington.

Nor have they respect for the politicians who created inflation by giving industry cost-plus, giving labor 300 percent of parity, and now want to halt inflation by holding farmers to bare parity, or less.

Farmers call this "biting the hand which feeds you."

Western farmers are particularly scornful of the new plans of the Washington regimenteers to play down livestock and play up crops to be eaten directly by humans.

The West is a red-meat country, and considers meat a "morale food" as does the Army.

Western geography demands livestock. Even in California—a great fruit and vegetable State—80 percent of the land has no agricultural use except grazing.

Looking at the A. A. A. goal, summarized on another page, California farmers will be glad to produce fruits and vegetables to the limit, as requested.

But they will apply common sense to their plans. They will recall how they were asked to produce more carrots and less lettuce last year, and of how carrots rotted because the price would not pay for harvesting, while Washington belatedly called for more lettuce, because the Army demanded it.

Government started out by calling lettuce a luxury, ended up by classing it as a necessity.

Perhaps California's greatest opportunity, and the Nation's greatest need, is for farmers to disregard the A. A. A. quotas and increase production of meat.

Washington, which muffed it in feed production plans this year, proposes to cover its mistakes by fitting livestock to pasture and forage resources next year. Well, no State can produce more year-around feed with pastures and forage than California—irrigated pastures, natural pastures, winter pastures, and forage grown on fallow and unused lands. And we can and ought to greatly increase the practice of hogging down, with hogs, cattle, and sheep.

Foraging turkeys have a place in the West not fully recognized by the type of academic schemers of Washington who are humorously described by Dan McKinney, of the Cattlemen's Association, as "plunging blindly into the river and drowning in 10 feet of water because their statistics show the average depth is only 4 feet."

Did you notice who is buying all the turkeys now? It's Washington—for our fighting men.

Some people are worried about the rebellious spirit of our western farmers.

What many of these self-reliant producers of the West think and say about the regimenteers of Washington would not look well in ink, or sound well on the air.

But no one need worry whether they will produce to the limit—they will.

They will not produce for Washington, but for war.

They will produce for the cause—for their sons.

And they are too smart to fall into the political trap of laying down on the production job and giving the regimenteers a chance to turn the fury of consumers against them.

While these farmers have buried themselves in production, they have learned something about the importance of public relations.

These farmers are sons and daughters of the West. They won the West by fighting—they have to maintain it by fighting.

Their self-reliance is the spirit of real democracy.

You can count on these patriots for production in 1944. They will give 80 hours a week or more, to the job, and they will come through again magnificently, despite tremendous difficulties.

That's the spirit of the West.

It's the voice of victory.

Pvt. Joe P. Martinez, of Ault, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of November 12, 1943:

HERO POSTHUMOUSLY REWARDED FOR STIRRING ADVANCE ON ATTU

(By John G. Norris)

Honor was paid by the Army yesterday to 51 privates for deeds of heroism of widely differing character, one in battle with the Japs and the others in combat against an equally potent foe—malaria.

To Pvt. Joe P. Martinez, 23, of Ault, Colo., went the Nation's highest honor—the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was awarded posthumously, for Martinez, a former farm laborer, was killed in leading an American battalion to victory in a charge up the snow-covered mountains of Attu Island.

The other 50 men were given the Legion of Merit for deliberately exposing themselves to malaria in the jungles of New Guinea. They took part in a test reminiscent of the Army men under Maj. Walter Reed, who exposed themselves to yellow fever in Cuba 42 years ago.

Martinez was a member of a battalion which had been trying for several days to drive the Japs from a key defensive position on Attu, but the attacks bogged down in the face of heavy machine-gun, rifle, and mortar fire.

"In the face of the severe hostile fire," declared the citation with the Medal of Honor, "Private Martinez arose to his feet and alone resumed his advance. Occasionally he stopped to urge his comrades on and his example inspired the others to follow."

He reached a plateau and cleaned out several Jap fox holes with hand grenades and his automatic rifle. The troops accompanying him drove on but again the attack bogged down under heavy Jap fire from protected positions.

"Then," his battalion commander reported, "one lone figure rose and started up the snow slope that led to the pass. Again it was Martinez. Again the other men followed."

Moving across open ground under heavy fire, the young soldier wiped out the Japs in one trench and moved on forward up the slope, still under fire, to a second trench which he also cleared of the enemy. Then he went on up the mountains in the face of the barrage and reached the strategic pass.

"Standing up on the ridge overlooking the pass leading into Chichagof Harbor, he emptied his rifle into the Japanese positions just below and beyond the pass," the War Department said. "He was mortally wounded with his rifle still at his shoulder, absorbing all enemy fire and permitting all units to move up behind him and successfully take and hold the pass."

The capture of this pass, said the Army, was "an important preliminary to the end of organized hostile resistance" on the island of Attu.

EXPOSED TO DISEASE

The 50 privates who volunteered to expose themselves to malaria were quartered in a swampy coconut grove near a native village which was filled with malaria-infected natives.

For 6 weeks, the soldiers spent their working hours at hard physical labor, and no steps were taken to protect them from the deadly anopheles mosquito. An unknown number contracted malaria and received prompt treatment, but only after they had become victims of the disease.

Two other groups of soldiers took part in the test. One group was given atabrine as a malaria suppressive and the other a new type of drug.

Complete reports have not been received on the condition of the men in the first group who contracted malaria, but as far as the records show here, none have died.

Regionalized Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. John P. Ferris, Director, Commerce Department, Tennessee Valley Authority. The letter is on the subject of regionalized freight rates, and gives a summary of the findings of the Tennessee Valley Authority on that question.

I may add that recently Mr. Ferris made a speech here in Washington before a group interested in this question, and was asked to reduce his speech to writing that it might be placed in the RECORD, and this letter is in response to that request. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD. The Public Printer estimates that the printing will cost $105.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., November 3, 1943.

The Honorable TOM STEWART,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STEWART: This letter is in response to your request for a brief statement concerning regionalized freight rates, based upon the findings of the Tennessee Valley Authority. As I understand it, you are particularly interested in two subjects: Economic effects, including a discussion of how the freight-rate handicaps suffered by some regions interfere with the efforts of businessmen to establish new manufacturing enterprises or to expand old ones; and the merits of the contentions which have been advanced against a nationally uniform system of class rates (the body of rates which applies especially to the more highly manufactured kinds of goods).

The existence of large and discriminatory inequities has been completely proved by thorough research studies conducted by impartial public agencies. The Tennessee Valley Authority made its first report on the subject to the President and the Congress in 1937, which was published as House Document No. 264, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, the Interterritorial Freight Rate Problem of the United States. Supplemental Phases of the Interterritorial Freight Rate Problem of the United States was the subject of a second study published as House Document No. 271, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. The T. V. A.'s latest report to the President and the Congress was published in March of this year as House Document No. 137, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, Regionalized Freight Rates: Barrier to National Productiveness.

The transportation facts about regionalized freight rates are very thoroughly brought out in studies by another Federal agency, the Board of Investigation and Research, created by the Transportation Act of 1940. Its summary report on interterritorial freight rates, published as a House document, was issued in April 1943; and its full report on interterritorial freight rates came out in September.

The T. V. A. has concluded after some 9 years of consideration of this problem that the existing regionalization of class rates is in fact one of the important barriers to the development of manufacturing in the interior parts of the country in general, and in the South and inland West in particular.

This finding is supported by the experience over this 9-year period which the T. V. A. has gained in its program of resource development. In connection with this program we have analyzed the feasibility of many types of industrial operations in the Southeast. In doing so we have attempted to discover the specific difficulties or barriers which prevented the development of industry commensurate with the raw-materials resources, the skills, and the general potentialities of the region. In this work we have been in close contact with the businessmen of the region; we have not relied merely on abstract economic data. These resource-development studies, as well as our analysis of the transportation facts of the situation, have convinced us that the unlocking of the resources of the South and the inland West for full development requires that businessmen shall know in advance, when considering new investments in industry, that they will be faced only with normal risks involved in a new business venture, and not with the added handicap of unfair freight-rate discriminations.

The T. V. A. has also come to the conclusion that the continued deficiency of industrial development in the South and the inland West is to a large extent responsible for the fact that their general economic status is lower than that of the rest of the country. Finally, we are convinced that the entire country would benefit from expanded manufacturing activities in the inland regions of the country. Higher income there means more buyers for the goods of the already heavily industrialized regions, and it means a higher total national income with more to go around. Practically everyone agrees that the Nation must, in the post-war period, achieve a higher national income and a higher productivity than we have ever had. The development of the South and the inland West, therefore, is not going to be at the expense of any other region.

Though conditions in the Tennessee Valley differ in a variety of detail from those in other parts of the country, it is clear that a basic economic similarity exists between the Southeast, the Southwest, and the interior West. That similarity lies in the fact that these regions are predominantly producers of raw materials, including agricultural products.

In 1940, for instance, eight Southeastern States (roughly corresponding with southern freight-rate territory) had nearly 39 percent of their employed population engaged in the production of raw materials; four Southwestern States, 37 percent; the remaining eight States between the Rockies and the Mississippi, including Colorado (that is, western trunk-line freight-rate territory), 33 percent. By contrast, in eastern or official territory, the freight-rate region north of the Ohio and Potomac and east of the Mississippi, only 11 percent of the employed population was engaged in the production of raw materials. To state it differently, the southern and western regions I have delineated had 36 percent of the country's gainfully employed population and 62 percent of the persons engaged in raw-materials production; but they had only 23 percent—far below their population percentage—in manufacturing. Manufacturing is greatly concentrated in official territory, with 55 percent of the country's employed population, 69 percent of the employment in manufacturing, and only 29 percent of the employment in raw materials.

Another economic similarity between the South and West lies in the fact that the income of their people is below average. In 1940, the national average income per person gainfully employed was $1,688. In western trunk-line territory it was $1,411, or 16 percent below average; in southwestern, $1,177 or 30 percent below; in southern, that is, the Southeastern States, $940, or 44 percent below. But in official territory, the great industrial region, the income was $1,988, or 18 percent above the national average.

These facts suggest that the level of income varies with the degree of industrialization—that income is highest where the greatest proportion of the people get their earnings from manufacturing and the business and service enterprises that go along with manufacturing, and lowest where the greatest proportion of the people must depend on raw materials. With few exceptions, we have found this to be true. It is very clearly shown in a chart on page 26 of the latest T. V. A. freight-rate report, "Regionalized freight rates: Barrier to national productiveness."

In referring to industrial deficiency, I am not overlooking the fact that the South has had some rather conspicuous industrial development in recent years. But two facts need to be noted about it. First, it is far too little to meet the need. Second, most of the growth has been either in comparatively low-grade products, which are not subject to the freight-rate handicap, such as cast iron pipe, or in products which enjoy such great production-cost advantages in the South as to overcome the freight-rate handicaps, such as cigarettes and low-grade textiles. As a general proposition, the same remarks apply to the inland West.

While there is not space to recite it here, the evidence indicates that these difficulties are not self-correcting. For a great many years, the South and West have had proportions of the country's manufacturing far short of their proportions of the population. And their levels of income have been consistently lower than the national average, barring only the short-lived World War No. 1 agricultural boom in the West.

A NATIONAL PROBLEM

It is clear, we believe, that the South, Southwest, and inland West need to produce much more manufactured goods in the future than they have in the past. For some reason that fact has caused expressions of alarm from some people in the rate-favored official territory. They assume, apparently, that the South and West can have more industry only by taking industry away from official territory. That assumption is not realistic. It does not, for example, fit the facts of recent industrial changes in the Tennessee Valley region. Major recent industrial developments have represented productive capacity which never before existed anywhere: New phosphorus plants, electrochemical operations, new quick-freezing and food-processing industries, to name a few. Furthermore, as we all know, the desire for manufactured products has never come anywhere near satisfaction. If industry can be made to grow more abundantly in the industrially deficient regions, these regions will provide new markets that have never before existed. This also has been proved by T. V. A. experience; the very considerable growth in the use of electric power in the Tennessee Valley region and the South has meant expanding markets for electrical equipment and supplies, virtually all of which are manufactured in official territory. While new industry, of course, implies greater competition, competition is not only the life of trade but the only democratic means by which the American Nation can really reach its full potential development. Let the South and West build prosperity on the foundations of their great human, material, and energy resources, and not these regions alone but every part of the country will benefit.

The freight-rate problem before us is necessarily drawn on regional lines, for that is the way the rates are made. It is wrong, however, to regard the question as a battle among regions for commercial advantage. The country cannot be fully prosperous until all its parts are prosperous.

The South and West need industry. Several things stand in the way. I do not want to suggest for a moment that freight rates are the whole trouble, and we do not think that the correction of freight-rate discrimination will be followed by an explosive growth of industry. We do believe, however, that the class-rate handicaps on the South and West act as a slow poison in the industrial life of these regions. The reasons for that belief are partly set out in the following selections from the available evidence.

HOW RATE DIFFERENCES HANDICAP BUSINESS

Freight charges are a part of the cost of doing business. As a general proposition, the consumer finally pays all the freight—raw materials to the plant, finished goods to the distributor and merchant, and retail delivery. If the rates are too high in one region in relation to those in another, consumers in the high-rate region must spend too much of their purchasing power in transportation charges, and in consequence their purchases of goods are necessarily curtailed. To some extent, exactly that things happens to consumers of manufactured goods in the South and West.

Without overlooking for a moment the effect of freight rates on consumer prices, we are especially concerned with what happens when rate-handicapped producers come into competition with rate-favored ones. The public will not, and could not be expected to, pay a premium price for any product when the same product or an equal one can be obtained for a normal price. Because the rates from southern and western plants are much higher on a mile-for-mile basis than those from official territory plants, it follows that these rate differences must too often be absorbed by manufacturers in the rate-handicapped regions. This they can do only by cutting corners somewhere.

The possibilities of corner-cutting are limited. Sometimes it may be in the prices paid for raw materials. Often it falls on wages. It is easy to see the connection between the southern rate differential; that is, an excess over northern rates, and the southern wage differential, a margin below northern wages. Partly because of the freight handicap, it is ordinarily difficult for a new industry to get started in the South if it pays wages as high as those in the rate-favored regions. Sometimes the freight rate handicap must be paid out of profits. In actual fact, it may, of course, require a cut in all three—raw materials prices, wages, and profits.

I have heard it said repeatedly that rate handicaps can have little if any effect on wages and profits. At the same time, some of the same people are fighting against having the handicap removed because they fear the heightened competition from southern and western industries. The effect on wages and profits, in actual fact, is often very considerable.

We found, for instance, that if the sweetpotato starch plant at Laurel, Miss., had enjoyed the same bases of rates as its official territory competitors in a period during 1940 and 1941, the saving, if devoted to higher payments for raw materials, would have supported an 8-percent rise in the price of sweetpotatoes. If devoted entirely to wages, it would have supported an increase of 10 percent. And if devoted entirely to profits, the actual net income would have been 2¼ times as great as it actually was. Similar studies made in Texas showed equally dramatic results in that State. The same thing could be shown for a very wide variety of enterprises in all parts of the rate-handicapped regions.

Here are some other examples based on the studies that went into the making of the most recent T. V. A. report. Let me stress that in each instance the distances involved are equal or so nearly so as to make no difference. Without access to the records of individual enterprises, we cannot say that these examples actually apply to any particular manufacturers, but they do show about what southern and western manufacturers may expect under the existing freight rate system.

In carload lots (all these are carlot examples), storage batteries produced at Jacksonville, Fla., would encounter rate handicaps of 11.2 cents per battery if sold in Washington in competition with batteries from Chicago. The distances, as I said, are equal. While 11.2 cents may not sound impressive, it is enough to cut out 44 percent of the customary profit in this industry. Or if the handicap was paid out of wages instead of profits, it would account for a 19 percent depression in the wages at Jacksonville.

On paints shipped from Chattanooga, Tenn., to Burlington, Iowa, in competition with Pittsburgh, the handicap would amount to 4.59 cents per gallon—which is equal to 45 percent of the profits, or 38 percent of the wages.

Here are some Southwestern examples. Milk bottles from Sapulpa, Okla., in competition with Toledo, Ohio, at St. Louis, would incur handicaps of 11.1 cents per gross—not a large figure in itself, but 18 percent of the profits. White laundry soap from Fort Worth, Tex., in competition with Cambridge, Mass., at Augusta, Ga., would suffer a handicap of 13 cents per 100 pounds—equal to 29 percent of the profits. This latter example brings out the very interesting fact that the present rate structure discourages direct trade between the South and the West by giving lower rates to traffic between official territory and these regions.

The same kind of result shows up in examples drawn from the inland West. Canned green peas from Marshalltown, Iowa., in competition with peas from Indianapolis at Belvidere, Ill., equally distant from the two places, would be handicapped only 1.2 cents per case. But the margin in the canning industry is so small that this handicap amounts to 12 percent of the profits. Automobile tires from Denver, Colo., in competition with Conshohocken, Pa. (a tire manufacturing town), at Peoria, Ill., would undergo a handicap of 13.64 cents each—amounting to 31 percent of the profits.

I could add indefinitely to these examples. Some would be much more spectacular; some would be less so. They are enough, however, to make it clear that the existing system of freight rates works against manufacturing in the South and West. Where paid out of wages, rate handicaps curtail purchasing power, which is the very lifeblood of all industry. Where paid out of profits, they either discourage capital investment or make it impossible for manufacturers in these regions to do business in as wide a territory as they otherwise might. And in the broadest national sense, they restrict freedom of trade within our own continental area, though it is precisely this freedom that has made us so strong a Nation.

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

In the light of such considerations, it may well be wondered why we have so long lacked Nation-wide uniformity in class rates. I do not have the space to go into all the reasons, but I do wish to deal briefly with a few of them.

The thing that has especially deterred action in the past has been a widespread belief that the costs of providing transportation service in the South and West were higher than those in official territory. That belief has now been thoroughly discredited. Several studies during the 1930's made by Interstate Commerce Commission staff members and the Federal Coordinator of Transportation began to cast doubt on its validity. Then, as a part of the Commission's own studies in connection with the pending class-rate investigation, its cost section, under Dr. Ford K. Edwards, undertook an extremely comprehensive investigation into comparative costs. The results indicate that the unit costs of providing the service are, if anything, a little lower in the southeast and southwest than in official territory, and only by a small percentage higher in western trunk-line territory. This study has been ordered printed as Senate Document No. 63, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

Another current contention offered apparently in all seriousness is that southern and western rate handicaps on manufactured goods are offset by rate advantages offered in these regions to raw materials and semi-manufactured goods. This position is unreasonable and unfair. First, the same people do not get the advantages and disadvantages; the South and West are not all-embracing corporations with the ability to pour all their profits and losses into a single balance sheet. It would be little comfort to a man who wanted to make storage batteries in Jacksonville or tires in Denver to be told that his handicap is canceled out by some exceptionally advantageous rates offered to lumber manufacturers or coal-mining companies, even if they did happen to be in the same regions.

And second, southern and western manufacturers cannot hope to reap all the rate advantages that may actually exist on certain crude materials. Some of the most important of these materials are shipped in large quantities from the South and West to official territory, to be used in factories there. On such shipments, any rate advantages are reaped either by southern and western raw materials producers or by official territory industries, depending on competitive conditions. When reaped by official territory manufacturers, they actually swing the terms of competition further against southern and western manufacturers. An out-bound rate disadvantage against one's self plus an in-bound advantage for one's competitor is not disadvantage offset, but disadvantage compounded. Under such conditions, southern and western industry cannot hope to break even.

A closely related contention would have it believed that any reduction in southern and western class rates (assuming that equality would be reached by reducing them to the existing official territory level) would require ruinous increases in the commodity rates on which raw materials and low-grade processed goods are moved within and from these regions. This fear is undoubtedly behind the vigorous opposition of a few "heavy" southern industries to any change. Even taken at its face value, this contention is not very impressive. The very ones who make it have repeatedly asserted that in the Southeast, probably 90 percent of the total traffic moves not on the class rates, which are disadvantageously high, but on commodity rates, which are often as low as those of official territory and sometimes lower. Since class rates contribute only a comparatively small part of the total revenue, it follows that they could be reduced to the official level with only very small compensatory increases in the large proportion of traffic moved on commodity rates.

But the contention actually has no such worth. It assumes that the total volume of traffic is static, and hence that Paul can be

paid only by robbing Peter. It entirely overlooks the fact that lower rates would stimulate more production of and traffic in high-grade manufactured goods, with the consequence that the railroads could expect to earn more under lower rates on such goods rather than less. The same thing has been proved over and over in other public-utility fields, and in some manufacturing industries as well.

One of the most often reiterated arguments against change has been that the railroads will make any necessary concessions on behalf of manufacturers who are suffering from high class rates, without any need for disturbing the whole rate structure. But it is basically unfair that a new manufacturer, or a prospective manufacturer, should have to depend on convincing the railroads that he actually requires the rates. Equal opportunity in the matter of freight rates should be a right, not a favor to be conferred in the discretion of the railroads. I need hardly labor the point either that when relief must be obtained by negotiation, the cost is very great. It can easily be borne by the larger, well-financed businesses. It is an impossible burden on the small business.

Furthermore, the railroads can by no means always make good on their declaration of willingness to adjust. With the best will in the world, the originating southern or western railroad can control the rates only to the end of its own lines. The records of the I. C. C. class rate investigation and of the hearings on Senate 942 (to regulate freight-rate associations) contain numerous instances in which official territory lines have either vetoed or unduly delayed lower rates the southern and western lines have proposed to them. Too often, rate changes require years of time and batteries of legal and rate counsel—a luxury denied to small manufacturers.

Perhaps most serious of all, it is hard to get relief without showing harm in the legalistic sense to a going concern. Obviously you cannot do it for an enterprise not yet established, even though it may be perfectly clear that adverse freight rates are the very thing preventing the birth of a new industry.

In conclusion, the case for a nationally uniform system of class rates rests on three propositions. First, no other system will mete out even-handed justice to individual business enterprises. Second, no other system will confer equality of opportunity among the several regions to make full use of their resources. Third, a nationally uniform system would promote greater production and greater prosperity in every region.

The big job of our generation is not to squabble among ourselves over the past flow of production. It is rather to expand that flow to heights which were undreamed of until the war came along and proved to us we have the means if we have the will.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. FERRIS,
Director, Commerce Department.

Position of the United States During and After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made at a meeting of the Sons of the American Revolution by Mr. E. B. Stahlman, one of the owners and editors of the Nashville Banner, at Nashville, Tenn.

This speech was made in Nashville a short time ago, and it concerns our position in the present war and our proposed position after the war is over.

It is a most interesting speech. I cannot say that I agree with all of it, but there is much food for thought in it. I am frank to say that I did not know at the time I first read Mr. Stahlman's speech that a United Nations Relief Rehabilitation Administration had been created. It must have been done while I was on my vacation. I agree with Mr. Stahlman when he says "undoubtedly the United States will have to do much to help the rest of the world get back on its feet after this great struggle is over," but I think it would be very unfair to the rest of the world as well as to ourselves if we undertook to feed them and clothe them except in the way of temporary aid to those who are in need. I do not agree with him when he says that the President's action in the matter is to bypass Congress and the American people. I do not think the President has undertaken any such thing. I think also he is mistaken when he says the relations between Congress and the President have been strained. I have been here during six administrations, and President Roosevelt seems to get along with Congress as well as any of the other Presidents I have known. Nor do I believe that we should have a world-wide political union of nations. I think such a course is impossible. However, when the war is over, I do think we ought to aid temporarily some of our allies and associates who are striving to better themselves, and at the same time I think we ought to enter a firm agreement to keep the peace; but I shall never vote to sink any more of our American ships, as the Congress did after the last war without my vote, and I shall never vote to make our land, naval, or air forces inferior to those of other nations.

The United States does not desire, and has never desired, to make war on other nations. It desires no other nation's territory. It desires no reparations from any other nation. It does not want to take advantage of any other nation, and for that reason we should be at all times prepared to defend ourselves. The necessity of this is shown in the fact that we have had two great world wars within less than 25 years of each other. Of course, as a result of this war which other nations brought on, it may be necessary for us to retain some naval and air stations or some strategic islands in order thoroughly to protect ourselves and mankind generally, in the future, from the advances of warlike nations; but we must be kept in a position to defend ourselves. I will have to change my mind mightily if I vote to lessen or limit our Navy or to limit our Air Corps or Army to proportions less than is necessary in good conscience to defend ourselves from the attacks of others. Mr. Stahlmans' speech is a most thoughtful and instructive one on vital questions before us, and the questions he raises are put in a most forceful and energetic style, and are entitled to high consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Here, gentlemen, we find the hopes, the prayers, the aspirations, and ideals of a free people provided in the preamble of the Constitution of the United States. Ordinarily I believe you would expect me, a newspaperman, to come before you prepared to defend the Bill of Rights, or, at least, the first article of amendment to the Constitution, bearing on the original Four Freedoms—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to peaceable assembly.

Today we celebrate the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of this remarkable document. We do this in spite of the fact that this document has been under continual attack and yet has survived. We pay tribute to this document, the very cornerstone of the foundation of our freedom, at a time when we are once again embroiled in a global war. I think it's fitting, at least, that we as men intensely interested in the welfare of our Nation take time out from our business and give consideration to things that are important to the Nation as a whole.

While I know that all of us consider the winning of the war as the most important thing in our lives today, surely none of us can be so blind that we are not willing to look beyond the war itself to the post-war period, and our plans, along with our Allied Nations, for the world to be. I suppose that there are hundreds of organizations that have already formed post-war committees and are now busily discussing plans for a better world. But, gentlemen, there will be one great committee, so far as the United States is concerned, that will have to pass upon any post-war plans that we may make. And that committee is the Senate of the United States. And it is about the Senate and its powers and the powers of the President of the United States that I would like to direct some of my remarks today.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution says as follows, speaking of the President:

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

There has been much talk, seemingly much confusion, regarding the suggestions by certain Congressmen for an abrogation of this right of the Senate to pass upon treaties. Some suggest that the House be permitted to vote upon these matters, also; and others merely suggest removing the two-thirds rule, and allow the Senate to pass treaties by a majority vote. We will not discuss this phase of the matter at all. We shall leave that for others to discuss.

Our thoughts today are going to be directed toward those plans that already have been formulated, and suggested to the American people as a plan—a post-war plan for this Nation—suggested by the Executive, and never as yet referred to the Senate for concurrence.

I wonder how many of you here today know what the newest alphabet body is. Well, it's none other than the U. N. R. R. A., perhaps better known as the United Nations Relief Rehabilitation Administration. Put together by the American, British, Chinese, and Russian Governments (this U. N. R. R. A. has been submitted to 31 nations, which, together with the United States, make up the group known as the United Nations. It is a blue-

print of (1) a post-war league of nations, and (2) a post-war world-wide W. P. A.) And now let's see how this great organization is to be formed. First, there will be one representative from each of the 32 United Nations, but a central committee which will do the real business, will be made up of Americans, British, Chinese, and Russian representatives. The director general chosen by the Big Four is to have truly colossal power and apparently can be removed only by unanimous vote of the central committee.

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE'S daily quart of milk for everybody in the world is just peanuts compared to what the real business of this organization is to include; and that will be about everything you can imagine in the way of post-war relief and rehabilitation for the whole world. It will mean food, clothing, housing, medicine, other basic necessities and other essential services. They are to be dealt around, and the U. N. R. R. A. is to be responsible for shipping them wherever they are needed. And, in addition, more powers are conferred on the U. N. R. R. A.—to acquire, hold, and transfer property; to make contracts, undertake obligations, designate and create agencies, and perform all other acts fitting to its purpose.

No wonder this sounded like a treaty to certain Senators, and no wonder that certain Senators considering it highly important that under the Constitution the Senate shall have final say, decided that the Senate should have the final say.

On the other hand, the State Department, in reply to a query from the Senate, announced that it had been decided that after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress, that the United States participation in the establishment of this United Nations Administration should be through an executive agreement.

Undoubtedly the United States will have to do much to help the rest of the world get back on its feet after this great struggle is over. And perhaps it is right that we should assume that responsibility. We shall not argue that. However, it does seem only right that the American people should have a right to say just how they should like to participate in this post-war work. It seems only right that the Senate should not be bypassed by the President in his efforts to assure favorable consideration of this problem, but that it should be submitted to the Senate, along with all other treaties, as they have been in the past.

Perhaps the President remembers the ill-fated League of Nations and the treatment of President Wilson by the Senate on that occasion. That is no excuse this time. There should be full, free, and public debate on this proposal. The American people who up to the present time have been the only ones nominated to pay the costs of the post-war world restoration, certainly should have a reasonably clear idea of what these costs are going to be. It seems that this is but another effort on the part of our Executive leader to bypass Congress and at the same time to bypass the American people—thus making laws by Executive order.

Why should the administration be so determined to pull us into some sort of league of nations or world state or supergovernment by the back door? Why not enter by the front door, with our eyes wide open? Aren't the American people intelligent enough to see the necessity of some type of world federation? Haven't we been through enough in the past 25 years to realize that only a strong international government of some sort can assure us any lasting peace? If the people of the United States desire to go in for a world federation they have a perfect right to do so. They also have the right and I believe it is the duty to insist that the change be made only after all the people know what it means, and know it in the way provided by the Constitution.

It has been many years since the relations between Congress and the President have been as strained as they are at the present time. This should not be, especially in wartime, for a healthy relationship between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government can be maintained only if each respects fully the rights of the other and keeps within its proper field, and recognizes its own functions and responsibilities.

It has been ably pointed out that the questions that the Constitution does not answer regarding the relationship of Congress and the President, must be answered by common sense. I agree with that. The relationship will be determined by acts both of initiative and of self-restraint and self-denial on the part of both. Congress has traditionally resented detailed recommendations of the President or the executive departments, regarding legislation. It has always been considered by Congress, something of an outrage for the executive department actually to frame a bill itself and openly declare it to be an administration bill. But this resentment finds no justification whatever in the Constitution, for the Constitution declares that: "The President shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

Many feel that by thus resenting and discouraging such action, Congress has not only failed to receive from the President the kind of open guidance that it should get, but it has actually encouraged the President and executive departments to evade what ought to be their plain responsibilities. If Congress invites the fullest Executive recommendations concerning its course of action, while it is under no obligation to follow these recommendations, certainly whenever it departs from them, it must depart from them intelligently and responsibly. It merely means that if Congress hopes to be able to meet the unparalleled duties and responsibilities imposed upon it by the present crisis, it must be organized much better than it now is. Congress must equip itself better, must have its own expert advisers, a full research staff; it must reduce the number and greatly reduce the existing prerogatives, of the hundreds of standing and special committees it has at present. Yes, if Congress hopes to adopt any coherent, unified policy of its own, then the recommendations of its standing committees must all be channeled through some single over-all committee. The President and Congress must join hands in this emergency. Congress must at last submit to discipline and to unified leadership. Only in that way can we hope to have a coherent policy and a definite direction.

Certainly the way of the President of the United States has not been easy these last few years, and while many of us have criticized him and still feel free to criticize him for what we consider his mistakes, the President has at least shown a willingness to fight this war with no holds barred. While the battle is being successfully waged in north Africa, in Guadalcanal, China, the Aleutians, and wherever the American Flag flies, the battle of Washington has not been so successful. For here within the President's ranks, the ranks of the administration, we find misunderstandings, petty jealousies, hatred, and at times open rebellion. Here we have found new dealer arrayed against new dealer. Here we have found men in high places passing the "lie." For nearly 2 years now we have seen a constant stream of wild-eyed dreamers, theorists, passing in and out of the Washington scene. Some perhaps have accomplished some good; others have but wasted time and money of a beneficent government. Perhaps if the President secures less dissension in his own ranks in the future, the Senate may respond more kindly to his requests for consideration of administration-supported bills. The President himself took ample steps to provide against any more outbursts on the part of leading new dealers, when he announced if any member of his administration wished to criticize the administration policies and personnel, he must submit his resignation along with his criticism.

One of the basic causes of the ensuing battle of Washington is due to the resentment produced on Capitol Hill of the President's failure to follow procedure in matters of the Atlantic Charter, the destroyer-bases trade, and other international commitments, none of which he referred to the Congress, for the obvious reason that Congress at that time was divided. The President is not obliged to do this. In the instance of the charter, he had reason to expect rough sledding if he did. Upon the terms of the Constitution, itself, he conducts the Nation's foreign affairs and can state its foreign policies as he may determine, and yet that same Constitution gives the Senate authority to ratify or reject treaties growing out of foreign policies. Thus on Congress it bestows the authority to ratify or reject certain other agreements that provide or refuse the funds to operate. It would be fine if Mr. Roosevelt could say as Mr. Churchill can, that his Government is behind him, not only on the Atlantic Charter, but other moves of foreign policy; then there would be less fighting on the American political front, more assurance of a sound, unified post-war policy in Washington. It is only natural that when the charter was first sprung on the Congress that some of the Members quickly challenged the President's right to state such a point as point 1. "The countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise." Those in Congress who did not agree with this had in mind the many Japanese islands from which their attack was launched against Pearl Harbor. Congress would not agree to leave these in the hands of Japan after the war and there will be a strong movement, certainly, to put them under the Stars and Stripes.

I think you will agree that in the beginning we fought our Revolution against an executive, George III, and the result of it was that the American people entered their national period with a decided prejudice against Executive power, in fact a fear of strong government of all sorts. That fact was of course reflected in this Constitution about which we speak. Yet, we must realize that from 1787 to the present time, the powers of the office of President have expanded tremendously. In other words, Executive power as it exists today is a matter of development, while congressional power to a certain extent is still a matter of constitutional grants and the Supreme Court decisions in regard to these grants.

We must not take the position of criticizing the President of undue assumption of power, because the President has not done anything that Congress could not undo, and since Congress has failed to undo anything, certainly we can't say that the President has seized powers. I think we must realize the distinction which must be drawn between wartime and peacetime actions by both the President and the legislative bodies. In a normal period, the President merely suggests policy. Congress considers it, deliberates on it, amends it and finally enacts the law, but in times like the present emergency, the President steps out, does things and subsequently asks Congress for its approval of the things he has done. We must all agree that Congress could in nowise execute a defense program. When an emergency occurs, the powers change, usually in the direction of an increase of Executive power. Some insist that in an emergency the President instead of having more power, should have less; that involvement in a war is the most vital step a nation could take, and it should not be left to one man. But, after all, no one man ever involved us in war. I still think that we are furnished with all the checks and balances

necessary in government, and I believe that Senator Norris' statement regarding the war and the President is one of the most apt. Senator Norris said: "You can't beat Hitler with congressional committees. Somebody's got to have the power. Even if I thought Roosevelt was going to abuse that power, I would want to give it to him, because somebody has to exercise the power."

Congress has every right to expect of President Roosevelt nonpartisan leadership. It's true that he is the head of his party, but he is also the head of his Nation. And, the President too, has the right to expect of Congress the same treatment. No one in this emergency has the right to play politics with the lives of millions of American boys.

The days that are yet to come will be the most important in the history of this Nation of ours. Decisions will have to be made; decisions of importance that will affect the lives of 130,000,000 people. The United States must have a strong foreign policy, "not merely a war to be won," upon which to base its post-war foreign alliances.

None can say when the war will be over nor when the peace will arrive, but when that time does come, the Senate should be prepared to meet its responsibilities fearlessly, and in order to do that they must be well informed, they must be informed of the thoughts in the minds and the hearts of their constituents back home. They must know and feel the pulse of the American people. When they vote, they must vote the conscience of a nation. It should be our desire that we send to the peace table with the other nations of the world, men competent to discuss those things which will directly or indirectly affect the people of this Nation. They must be able to speak as one voice, and if it be the will of the people, hold out to the other nations of the world a guarantee of free determination of their own individual national existence. It seems to me that the part we have to play along with England and with Russia is that of a military protector of the weak and a mighty check upon the strong.

We must have a reasoned philosophy about the war and about the peace, as well. We must recognize this simple truth that all the peoples on this planet are bound together indivisibly in an economic union, and that the only hope for a lasting peace can come from a world-wide political union. We are fighting this war to determine whether or not this political unification shall be armed force or from a meeting of the minds. This is the important question that this war must settle.

I believe that there are few Americans, at least thoughtful Americans, who do not believe and understand that there must be set up somehow in this post-war world, what is called a "peace enforcement union."

Order is always maintained among the inhabitants of nations by police, and thus when we talk about enforced maintenance of peace among whole peoples, we must necessarily think of international policing. To secure this there must be a central recognized sovereignty that will limit the sovereignty of each and every other state. This then is the price that must be paid for that peace and progress and freedom that we set up as the worshipped shrine of our political philosophy.

Without this there can be no end to periodic worldwide wars, into every one of which we Americans will be sucked as we were, seemingly against our will, in World War No. 1 and now again into this one. It is time that the political constitution of all society catches up with a more advanced economic world mechanism, and if we, as a nation, persist in remaining blind to this need, we are simply promoting human misery and obstructing human progress.

If it is our aim as a nation to strive to improve human welfare, with freedom and justice for all, then is it not our responsibility to see that a peace, soundly and intelligently based upon these premises, secures these rights for the nations of the world? For such a peace will truly be "the last, best hope of earth," and it is the men and women of this generation who will nobly save or meanly lose it.

The Third Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Third Imperative" delivered by me on November 11, 1943, over radio stations in Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In our first talk of this series, our subject was The Five Imperatives. Several weeks ago we discussed the fifth imperative—the imperative need of all America to learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity, and to apply them ever increasingly now, and in the post-war period.

Two weeks ago we discussed the first of the five imperatives, to wit: The imperative need of all America appreciating the enormous task confronting America before the war is won.

A week ago we discussed the second imperative, to wit: The imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort.

At this time we shall discuss the third imperative—the imperative need of working out now, complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period.

In the 5th of November last, the Senate of the United States took a significant step toward international accord when it passed Senate Resolution 192. In view of the widespread discussion precipitated by the passage of that resolution, I am relating it to the subject under consideration this evening.

The resolution resolved, that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved; that the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and an honorable peace; and that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world.

This resolution is based on sound thinking. It is a harbinger of better things to come. It manifests that spirit of cooperation which omens well for the future of the world. However, it is not a fulfillment—it is simply a beginning. It is well to remember that the mere adoption of a resolution will not accomplish the objective—the imperative need for working out complete accord between the United Nations for the post-war period. To attain that end, this resolution must be implemented by the will to keep and enforce the peace; and that will must exist not only in America, but in each of the United Nations and in many others. Without this will for peace, wars will continue to rise and sweep the world.

I believe that world peace can best be assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty, and protecting their own interests, find common ground on which to work together. To find a common ground is the important thing. The United Nations have fought well together because they had ideals in common for which to fight. They will work well together in the peace which follows the war, if they have ideals in common on which to build a lasting peace.

This common ground can be found only by clearing away existing differences among the major Allied Nations, and building the new order we seek, on the basis of definite, common purposes. Common ground was found at Moscow, in the declaration which provided, (1) for unconditional surrender of the Axis; (2) united action of the United Nations for peace and security; (3) continued cooperation when peace comes for regulation of and enforcement of peace; (4) agreement on statement in relation to Austria and Italy.

This, as I have said, was just a beginning. It is the hope of all of us that this common ground will be extended.

Of course, the Executive of this Nation is the negotiator under our Constitution. It is for him and our allies to develop that common ground. The Senate cannot draw the blueprint. It cannot be drawn by any one nation. It must be drawn by all the nations who are parties to it. The Senate then can ratify, advise, or reject.

The resolution as adopted by the Senate expressed a hope—yes, more, a faith—that the way will be found for permanent peace. The Senate and the people know that there is nothing magic in this resolution, that it will not of itself do away with the causes of war. The nations of the world will have to bring about a moral housecleaning within themselves—a cleansing of themselves from the causes of war. Yes; there must be a moral and a spiritual renaissance in the peoples of the earth before we can expect any real cure for war; and that moral awakening will bring into being that will for peace which will build a common ground for all nations.

By this resolution the Senate virtually says to the peoples of the world, "Come, join with us in an attempt to find the way which will lead to peace. Come, let us reason together and work together to find the solution to war and the threat of world war."

It is apparent to everyone now, and I hope it will remain apparent in America for generations to come, that until international relationships become beyond all question orderly and morally secure, this country must keep its powder dry and maintain its defenses, so there will be no more Pearl Harbors. It is our obligation to ourselves and to the world to make sure that America remains safe. America is sound at the core, and we do not want any synthetic thinking to threaten her safety or her liberty.

So much has been said about this resolution, that I want to emphasize that we must not be lulled into a false sense of security by its passage and by the resulting actions of the President and the Senate now and in the post-war period. That is what happened after the last World War. Why, the Kellogg-Briand Pact even outlawed war, and a lot of folks thought it would be effective. I don't want such mental sabotage to occur again. I don't want our people to fall into a slough of unreality where they forget they are living in a world, not of angels but of mortals, some of whom, unfortunately, have not learned to respect the rights of others. Next time, an R. A. F. may not be able to

save us. In those years following the First World War, we came through a period in which we thought we could, by mere legislation, change practically every law of nature, economics, and politics. We know differently now.

There is a hunger in America, and all over the world, for peace—for doing away with this awful curse of war which has hovered over the world since the dawn of human history. This is a good hunger, and I hope and pray we may find the way to satisfy the craving for peace.

In the post-war period, I want to make sure that those who deal for America around the peace table will be on their toes—that they will be alert and on guard. I want America to go into this era with hope and faith, faith in God Almighty, faith in her own destiny; but I don't want her to close her eyes to realities. We want to help the world. We want to help other nations to get on their feet and become self-sustaining—that is one of the ways to attain that common ground we've been talking about—but we do not want to be a perpetual Santa Claus for the world. That would not be good for the world, and it certainly would not be good for Santa Claus.

Can the United Nations agree on a plan—a just plan, to keep peace in the world? Then, will the United Nations abide by that plan, live up to its obligations?

In other words, is there a will to keep the peace, and a will to enforce that peace if necessary? These questions present the issues at stake.

The world is in ferment as never before. Our boys are all over the world, and they are learning a lot about it, and about its various peoples. They will have to be consulted about this peace plan. The fact that these boys are getting acquainted with so many different peoples of the world, and that those peoples are becoming acquainted with American boys with American ideals, should make for a better understanding between the citizens of the world. I believe that mankind generally, is ready for the great adventure of collaboration between nations.

Sitting in the Senate of the United States and listening to the 10-day debate on this subject, it seemed to me that two emotions seemed to predominate—the emotions of faith and fear—the thought that the nations can live together without war, and the thought that they cannot.

I take my stand with faith. I believe that America possesses the experience and the wisdom with which to teach others how to live together without war. For the United States, the melting pot of all nations, creeds, and ideas, has already learned the way. Switzerland, too, has done a fine job along that line. Though composed of three nationalities, she has lived in peace, with herself and with the world.

It is a tremendous undertaking, but I think we are competent to take a major hand in the doing of it. I believe that is the sense of America. I believe that is what the vote in the Senate meant when there were 85 yeas and only 5 nays to a resolution for cooperation with others.

The terrific cost of this war in lives and property, in suffering, in destruction of all values, makes it imperatively necessary that a solution to the threat of war be found. If we in America can become the agency that will make for unifying the major nations of the world in some form of association that will result in the abolition of war, and at the same time safeguard American and other national interests, then we shall do the world the greatest service it is possible for any one nation to render.

On this Armistice Day, when the coming of peace is being accelerated both by victories on the battle fronts and by negotiations between nations and we dare again to look toward the future with confidence and joy instead of with dread or fear, let us go forward with a song of hope in our hearts and faith in the power of God to utilize America as an instrument for peace. Thus may we fulfill that imperative need of working out complete accord between the nations, provide security for ourselves and them, and make possible the success of the plan for international cooperation which has in mind the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the peace of the world.

Address by Secretary Ickes Before National Council of American Soviet Friendship, Interview with Col. Robert R. McCormick, and Editorial From Washington Times-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, at the National Council of American Soviet Friendship Meeting, Madison Square Garden, New York, on November 8, 1943.

Evidently that address caused a little dispute among several newspaper publishers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following the address by Secretary Ickes, a newspaper account of an interview with Col. Robert R. McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, and an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, by Mr. Patterson, of the New York News. In that way we may get both sides of the question.

There being no objection, the address and related articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR AULD LANG SYNE

It is a thrilling coincidence that, upon this occasion of an important anniversary in the relations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States, we have the opportunity to cheer the four-power pact consummated in Moscow last week. Together with our two great allies, Great Britain and China, we have pledged each other to fight our common enemy to his knees and to act in unison to assure world peace and security. This is a cause for real jubilation, for thus is the terrible fate of the enemy sealed irrevocably. The day of his doom begins to dawn.

One of the wisest decisions in international affairs during this generation was made 10 years ago when the Russian and American peoples, through their Governments, decided formally to renew their historic and long-time friendship. If statesmanship is the capacity to look ahead so as to be prepared for whatever may befall, then indeed Premier Stalin and President Roosevelt proved that they were statesmen of the highest order.

There never has been any real conflict between Russia and the United States. Nor have our two nations ever been engaged in any competition that bred jealousy or caused bad blood. On the contrary, Russia, even under the czars, has been friendly to the American Republic from the earliest days. On this we have the testimony of no less a witness than the redoubtable Andrew Jackson. In his first message to Congress he said: "In Russia, the United States have always found a steadfast friend."

It should be recalled also that Russia gave loyal support to Abraham Lincoln during the harrowing days of the greatest domestic crisis in our national history. Russia showed our Republic the greatest good will when she sold us Alaska for a pittance. The possession of this Territory brings the United States physically closer to Russia than in any other of the great powers. Finally, in the last war, Russia, under enormous difficulties, was a brave and loyal ally, sacrificing millions of lives in the Allied cause.

So far as today is concerned, who could even begin to imagine the condition of the world, or the direction of our own destiny, if Russia had not only been unready but unwilling to engage the false and treacherous Hitler and his bloody-handed barbarians? Hitler, breaking solemn faith—as usual—thrust his armies across the Russian border in the expectation that he could do what he had already accomplished within the borders of other countries that had trusted him too long and too implicitly. He struck in force and with great confidence.

Indomitably, the Russians withstood every blow, with no mobile help from the outside until they had gathered up their strength and started an overwhelming offensive at Stalingrad that, for months now, has been irresistible. And, valiantly she engaged, single-handed, the might of the German divisions while waiting for her comrades-in-arms to strike, as they did, first in north Africa, then in Italy, while at the same time making ready for a deadlier spring at a more vital part of the mortal foe. What Russia has done, not only in holding but in thrusting back the Boche, has engaged the admiration and won the undying gratitude of every true American. We may well ask ourselves, Where would we be today if it had not been for mighty Russia?

So much for the present. What of the future? We want peace and security. The Soviet Union and all of the others of the United Nations want peace and security. Peace inevitably will come. But peace and security are not synonymous; they are not even conterminous. We had peace following the last war, but we lacked security because the civilized peoples of the world did not have sense enough, or good will enough to provide it. We must not let the same thing happen again.

We must pull the poisonous fangs of that evil thing, war, and not permit them to grow again. The Soviet Union, China, Great Britain, and the United States, four sturdy and indestructible pillars of the temple of peace and security, are already committed to, and all of the nations of good will in the world must, mutually assist each other in formulating a peace that will be fair, just, and above all, enduring. That peace, as is the internal peace of the United States or of any other nation, must be policed, and the police force must be strong enough and mobile enough to discourage any international criminal from ever going berserk again.

It is of the utmost importance for our two nations to understand each other. Unfortunately there are powerful and active forces in this country that are deliberately fostering ill will toward Russia. There are those who hate Premier Stalin and President

Roosevelt so bitterly that they would rather see Hitler win the war, if the alternative is his defeat by a leadership shared in by the great Russian and the great American. Need I name names? Let me simply mention, as an example, the Hearst press and the Patterson-McCormick newspaper axis, particularly the latter.

It may be a consolation of a wry sort to our Russian and British friends to be told that if these newspaper publishers hate Russia and Great Britain their hate of their own country is more than libertine. For, despite anything that anyone might say to the contrary, the fact is that they must hate their own country and despise its institutions if, deliberately, they pursue an intention to stir up hate for the two nations whose help we must have if we are to defeat Hitler.

While it would be a difficult, or even a futile undertaking to try to explain the uncontrolled and adolescent hatred of Russia and Great Britain, engendered by these hectoring detractors, there is one quality that they possess in common with Hitler that probably ennobles him in their eyes. They all have a disregard for the truth that is both congenital and total.

Many have paid tribute to Hitler as the greatest liar in the world—the broken Russian treaty is not the only exhibit that could be offered in that behalf. His vocal audacities have never been equaled, but that does not mean that he has not had rivals. I suppose that there can be an affinity between liars as there can be between people who have more creditable common interests. No reader of any of the newspapers controlled by these four purveyors of applesauce, unless he were naive indeed, would require proof of the charge that the newspapers referred to, particularly those within the New York-Washington-Chicago axis, have no greater scruple about deliberately saying what is not true, no more hesitate to misrepresent, than Hitler himself.

While the journalistic "integrity" of no one of the three axis newspapers wears a chastity belt, the morning Colonel of Chicago is really in a class by himself. He sees evil, hears evil, and does evil. Possessing no good will for anyone, so far as known, he sneers at the attribute. Himself immune to good will, he belittles such a policy between nations.

Pro-Fascist snipers, following the line of the Patterson-McCormick axis, constantly spew out hate of our brave and valiant ally, the Soviet Union, and insinuate rank inventions to disparage equally brave England to the deliberately intended hurt of our own country. The excuse given by these four vendors of venom for their unpatriotic behavior is that the Soviet Union has chosen to be communistic politically.

Jefferson once said to Monroe that the presumption of dictating to an independent nation the form of its government was "arrogant" and "atrocious," and most Americans will agree with him. We do not like communism? Well, the Russians do not like capitalism. Communism has faults? Capitalism has plenty of them, too. We had better not start this kind of an argument, or somebody will be sure to say something about the pot and the kettle.

For my part I have always believed that any political entity is entitled to that form of government which the majority of its people desire. The right of any nation to political self-determination should be unquestioned. It is not for us to dispute the right of Great Britain to her form of government or of the Soviet Union to hers. I would not even question the right of the Huns to retain Hitler as dictator if they would abstain from seeking to destroy the right of other nations to live their lives in their own way. But a criminal nation is no more to be left at large with deadly weapons in its hands than is a homicidal maniac.

There are both good and bad things in every system of government. The truth is that, despite the vicious Hitlerisms of Hearst and of the Patterson-McCormick newspaper axis, there are many things of which the Soviet Union has reason to be proud. In certain respects we could do well to learn from Russia; yes, even to imitate Russia.

In saying this I want to make it clear that I am a Democrat with a passionate belief in freedom, all forms of freedom, including freedom of enterprise and particularly the freedom of peoples to maintain governments of their own choosing, subject only to the rights of others to do likewise.

Our own country resembles the Soviet Union in that it is composed of many races and strains. In the United States, over 40,000,000 people may be classified as minority groups, linguistically, culturally, and racially. This is about one-third of our total population. About 22,000,000 of our people, or one-sixth of the Nation, speak a language other than English as their mother tongue. Nearly 14,000,000 of our citizens, or 10 percent of the total, are of the Negro race.

Our professional patriots do not like to have it said out loud that our treatment of our minority groups, especially that of the Negro, is wretched when compared to Russia's. Of course, we do treat our minority citizens better than the Nazis and Fascists do theirs, but we won't boast of that.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has done a splendid job in this respect. In the Soviet Union there is genuine and true equality of opportunity for all ethnic strains and cultural groups. This is one of the noble and lasting achievements of the Russian Revolution. As a matter of fact, the word "Russia" is not an accurate word with which to describe the Soviets. Russians proper make up less than 60 percent of the total population. The rest of the Soviet population consists of some 70 nationalities of all colors, shades, religions, and cultural variations.

Among the Soviet races and peoples are Buddhists, Catholics, Jews, Protestants, Moslems, and men of no religion. One may believe or not believe, worship or not worship, what and as he sees fit. To each one, regardless of color or creed or origin, the Soviet Union offers social, economic, and educational opportunities. It takes a serious view of racial or religious intolerance. Anti-Semitism, for example, is severely punished as treason to the nation. The Soviets consider an attack on any group of citizens as one against the whole nation.

Out of this war will emerge four great world powers—the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, including the British Commonwealth, and China. Our relations with Britain and China are good and will, I am convinced, continue to be so. Before the pact of Moscow, we might well have asked, "But what about the Soviet Union?" This question has been answered, decisively, before it could be uttered. It was not only answered at Moscow, it has been answered here tonight by the words and the presence of the Soviet Ambassador, recently accredited to the United States and warmly welcomed by us, the distinguished scientist and scholar, Mr. Andrei A. Gromyko, whose training at home as Chief of the American Countries of Foreign Affairs, and whose outstanding diplomatic career since coming to this country in 1939, have peculiarly befitted him for the duties of his high office.

Whatever our political affiliations or ideological variations let us not permit ourselves to make any mistakes about the Soviet Union. A fact is a stubborn thing, and the fact is that that nation is physically the largest country on earth. It possesses one-sixth of the earth's land surface, a truly breath-taking total. In a few years the Soviet population will be 200,000,000 strong.

The Soviets have immense natural resources. The people are energetic, intelligent, full of courage and enterprise; they have an inspiring love of country, and a passion for building a decent future for themselves and for their children. They are a great people, and we should be proud to have them as friends. Common sense and enlightened self-interest require that we leave nothing undone in order to live on terms of peace and understanding with these next-door neighbors of ours in a world that has been foreshortened by the airplane.

However, there are vicious forces that keep on whispering that some day—perhaps the sooner the better—we must fight the Soviets. Must we? I should like to know why. There seems to be no reason in the world for such an attitude, except malice or fear. Such an unthinkable conflict would be about the greatest tragedy that could befall our two great nations and the world.

I do not see what possible cause for an embroilment there could be between the United States and the Soviet Union after the present war. The fact that the Soviet Union is a Communist state is really not our concern. We would not permit any other country to dictate to us our form of government. Hitler undertook that, and see what is happening to him. Both of our countries are essentially peace-loving and satisfied with their present possessions. Neither covets aught that the other has.

It seems to me of the utmost importance for the United States and the Soviet Union to maintain the closest possible understanding in the post-war world. It stands to reason that if these two giants, together with their allies, should abide with each other in a spirit of justice and good will they would remain together and thus assure an unbreakable peace. If, on the other hand, ill will and misunderstanding should mar their relationship, then there is no hope whatever for peace on earth. There would only be time to prepare to make bloody fools of ourselves again. The fate of civilization and the lives and well-being of future generations depend upon the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Our statesmen and diplomats must not bungle this job. For my part, I believe that there is enough good will and wisdom in both countries to help to build a bridge of permanent peace that will securely span the narrow waters that separate our mighty republics.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

COLONEL MCCORMICK ANSWERS ICKES' "SMEAR" ATTACK

NEW YORK, November 9.—Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, last night replied to a "smear" attack by Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes.

M'CORMICK'S STATEMENT

Colonel McCormick issued the following statement:

"Ickes, in Chicago, was a small bucket-shop operator, who, as a Republican, did dirty work for Democratic Boss Brennan. He was taken into the administration to do its dirtiest work, which he did consistently, and as reward has been allowed to carry on petty graft in his Department.

"The speech tonight before the Communist gathering at Madison Square Garden is only an attempt to distract attention from the overwhelming repudiation of Roosevelt at the last elections.

"I wouldn't reply to this man with a fouler tongue than Winchell's except that it gives

me the opportunity to point out that the only hope that the people who want to overthrow our Republic have is to steal the Republican nomination for President in 1944 as it was stolen in 1940."

The Cabinet member was a speaker at Madison Square Garden exercises celebrating the tenth anniversary of United States relations with Russia.

He praised the Soviets for their triumphs over Hitlerism, pictured a great future for them and warned Americans they must realize that Russians will be as powerful in peace as they are mighty in war.

ATTACK BY ICKES

Then Ickes said:

"Unfortunately, there are powerful and active forces in this country that are deliberately fostering ill will toward Russia. There are those who hate Premier Stalin and President Roosevelt so bitterly they would rather see Hitler win the war, if the alternative is his defeat by a leadership shared in by the great Russian and the great American.

"Need I name names? Let me simply mention, as example, the Hearst press and the Patterson-McCormick newspaper axis, particularly the latter."

The Secretary assigned to these publishers one quality in common with Hitler, that they "have no greater scruple about deliberately saying what is not true, no more hesitate to misrepresent, than Hitler himself."

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

FOURTH-TERM SMEAR TACTICS

ICKES HEARD FROM AGAIN

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes spoke Monday evening in New York City at the Madison Square Garden celebration of the tenth anniversary of this country's recognition of Soviet Russia. Mr. Ickes used the occasion as a sounding board for a smear attack on the Hearst newspapers and what he calls the McCormick-Patterson newspaper axis.

Mr. Hearst and the publishers of the McCormick-Patterson papers, said Mr. Ickes—particularly the latter—hate Stalin and Roosevelt so bitterly "that they would rather see Hitler win the war, if the alternative is his defeat by a leadership shared by the great Russian and the great American."

Mr. Ickes' statement is untrue. It is of interest, however, because it foreshadows the tactics the New Dealers can be expected to use in trying to win a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt. Those tactics will be to turn public attention from the question that matters: Is Mr. Roosevelt a good enough third-term President to merit a fourth term? And to smear with accusations of treason everybody who opposes Mr. Roosevelt's fourth-term ambitions.

THREE NEWSPAPERS

What is this McCormick-Patterson newspaper "axis" to which Mr. Ickes frequently refers? ("Axis," of course, is a smear word here.) He is talking about the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, and the Washington Times-Herald.

The Tribune is published by Robert R. McCormick, the News by Joseph M. Patterson, the Times-Herald by Mrs. Eleanor Patterson. These three persons are grandchildren of Joseph Medill, a great newspaperman in his time, who died in 1899. The Tribune came to R. R. McCormick and J. M. Patterson by inheritance. They founded the News in 1919. Mrs. Eleanor Patterson bought the Times-Herald from W. R. Hearst, and owns and operates it herself.

Each of these three papers is managed independently by its publishers; there is no concerted editorial policy. The News and the Times-Herald, for illustration, supported Mr. Roosevelt in three Presidential campaigns, while the Tribune opposed him in all three.

There is, we think, more than coincidence in the fact that the Tribune has the largest circulation in Chicago, the News the largest in New York, and the Times-Herald the largest in Washington.

NEWS, TIMES-HERALD OPINIONS

The News and the Times-Herald feel this way about Russia and Mr. Stalin:

It seems evident that Stalin's government is more efficient than were the czarist governments, judging from Russia's contrasting records in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. We don't care whether Russia is Communist at home, but we didn't like Russia's efforts to promote Communist revolution here—efforts which it appears to have tapered off, at least for the time being.

We are glad Russia is doing so much damage to Hitler. We hope the time may come when Russia will realize that the United States has Japan for an enemy as well as Germany; and that Russia will then see fit to abandon its present neutrality as between this country and Japan. A lend-lease arrangement covering some Siberian air bases from which we could bomb Japan would be of great value to the United States. But we acquiesce that this proposal be not pressed on Russia now, since Allied grand strategy calls for defeating Germany ahead of Japan.

The News and the Times-Herald feel this way about the British Empire:

From the present war, the United States and the British Empire will emerge with the most powerful air forces and navies in world history. If we use this power in concert, and maintain it at adequate levels, nobody can attack us successfully. Therefore, we believe the present American-British military cooperation should be continued after this war—and that the United States and Canada should have a joint general staff for North American continental defense.

As for England, the United States and Russia: Russia has nothing that we want, and we should have nothing that Russia wants. Russia will come out of this war as the great land power of Europe and Asia. There would be no sense, profit or hope of victory, so far as we can see, in a war between Russia and a United States-British coalition.

Mr. Ickes, when he made his Monday evening speech, evidently was smarting from the licking he has just taken from John L. Lewis, and from the Republican victories in New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky, which seem to dim the chances of a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Ickes.

Address by Ralph A. Bard Before Catholic Men's League of the Brooklyn Navy Yard

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Ralph A. Bard, before the Catholic Men's League of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Sunday, November 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, employees of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and friends, I am more than delighted to be present and to be able to participate in this communion breakfast. I am always impressed with meetings of this character as they are an expression of the moral and spiritual fiber of American people which make the United States a truly great nation. The only trouble is that we do not have more meetings with a background of real religion—whatever the creed—to add to the stamina and the fighting power of both our civilians and our soldiers and sailors. It is fitting that on this twenty-first Sunday after Trinity we pay this tribute to our fighting men and our war workers. In the fox holes our boys turn to God in no uncertain manner, and in our home communities, in our factories and cities, our efforts will be much more effective if God and the Golden Rule have a greater influence on our civilian efforts.

First, I want to pay tribute to you workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard for the part you have played in helping build and maintain the largest and finest navy in the entire world today. You here today could tell me more than I can tell you, through personal experience, of the building and repair problems you have faced in these last 2 years. But, in spite of these problems, we were able to proudly declare on the observance of Navy Day last month that since the defense program started in the middle of 1940 we have completed over 23,000 new naval vessels of all types, ranging from battleships to a large number of small landing craft. In spite of the difficulties of both labor and management in the midst of war, the United States has built the greatest sea-air power on earth, and more ships are sliding down the ways every day. Since January 1 of this year the Navy has doubled the number of its combatant ships; 1943 was, indeed, the harvest year of your crop of labor—the fruition of enormous prior work. Total of naval shipbuilding is approaching its peak, as planned. However, we have not yet reached that peak. Our shipbuilding program still moves upward. The Navy needs more ships, and will continue to need them until the war is won. The reason for continued production and continued speed in building is particularly obvious to you men, for you have had the opportunity of seeing first-hand the results of enemy action.

Here in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, ships bearing the brine of many seas on their hulls have come in for repairs—our own battlewagons and those of Allied Nations. You have seen ships split in half—ships with holes big enough to drive a truck through—ships with the marks of plane strafing on their decks. In addition to building new ships, you have repaired the old ones. You know that war means replacements and constant repair work to keep a fleet trim and strong.

Builders today have shown great energy and inventiveness. New ships such as the landing craft used for invasions in Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the Pacific islands, the destroyer escorts and converted carriers to fight the U-boats have been both designed and built since the war began. All our larger ships of the fleet had to be refitted with increased antiaircraft guns—until now the famous *South Dakota* is known to have checked up a record of 32 Jap planes shot down in one action, combining the ability to fight off air attack with the ability to attack enemy surface units. Some of the

ships you've built have altered the course of the war.

In July 1940 the Navy received 5 newly completed vessels, in June 1943 almost 1,200; many of them, of course, smaller landing craft.

In July 1940 the Navy alone received 25 new airplanes, in September 1943 over 2,000.

Between those dates the Navy built 2,200,000 tons of combatant ships; added to its air arm 23,000 planes, and completed $6,500,000,000 of shore facilities.

Three years ago the Navy had 383 fighting ships; today it has well over 800, after all losses, transfers to other nations, and conversions to noncombat types.

In July 1940 the Navy air arm consisted of 1,744 planes; today it is way over 18,000, after transferring to other agencies and writing off for obsolescence more than 9,000 planes.

Navy fighter planes today fire in 1 minute five times the weight of projectiles their 1940 predecessors fired. A battleship's antiaircraft fire power is 100 times what it was 3 years ago. Torpedo production last month alone equaled the torpedo production during all of World War No. 1.

Of the many duties and responsibilities of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy—the most important function is the administrative responsibility for the supervision of all civilian personnel in the Navy. The average citizen does not realize that for every 3 persons in naval uniform, there is 1 Navy civilian employee performing tasks necessary to the fighting effectiveness of our forces at sea. They are all employees such as you. Among the nearly 700,000 civilian employees in the Navy, practically every occupation found in American industry is represented. The Navy's rapid expansion during a manpower shortage period created unusual problems which could only be solved by sound personnel administration. The problems of recruiting, employing, training placement, safety and sanitation, upgrading, promotion, transfer, discipline, labor relations, transportation, housing, feeding, recreational and social activities, other employee services, and the efficient utilization of this vast army of civilians presented a truly amazing and gigantic task as the numbers mounted from 74,000 in 1939 to 684,000 at present.

As a result of a study of some of these problems a labor relations policy for the United States Navy was established and I give you, following, its important features:

"The United States Navy is one of the largest employers of labor in this country, if not in the world. It is the Navy of the farmer, the businessman, the banker, and it is the Navy of labor of all types and categories; in short, it is the Navy of all of the people of the United States. As such, all men and women working for the Navy are working for and serving, particularly in wartime, one of the most vital and necessary institutions of their own Government, and their own country—a fighting unit organized and now being developed to the maximum degree solely for the purpose of protecting and safeguarding not only the homes, families, and property of all of the people, including all those working for the Navy, but, also, fighting for the preservation of all the principles, rights, and privileges now enjoyed by all the people of this country, again including labor which supports the huge program of the Navy.

"This reasoning brings us to the conclusion that the aims, ambitions, plans, and hopes of the Navy are identical with those of the vast majority of the men and women who work for the Navy—and that the Navy and its employees are engaged and joined in a common cause and a common objective which can be achieved to the fullest degree only by wholehearted cooperation between those responsible for the operation of the Navy in all stages of management, and those who labor to produce the ships, guns, planes, and ammunition so vital to its program.

"We are convinced beyond any doubt that the great majority of workers in our navy yards, ordnance plants, and other industrial shore establishments of the Navy, are just as interested in production and in progress in all directions toward winning this war as are those of us in charge of the operations of the Navy in Washington, or on the high seas.

"We feel that there should be no misunderstanding, no controversies, and no inequities which cannot be solved by management and production workers of the Navy working closely and harmoniously together to help win this war.

"We expect all representatives of Navy management to meet at all times representatives of labor on an all-out basis of open-mindedness, friendship, tolerance, and mutual good will. We believe such a working policy carried on by all concerned will further enhance the morale of our naval establishments and we call upon all in authority, in all levels of management, and upon labor spokesmen, and labor itself, to adapt its thinking, its actions, and its sentiments, to the end that the utmost cooperation may exist in all of the relationships within the Navy family; all of whom shall be engaged now in helping to make the Navy the most effective and powerful weapon possible for the service of our country in this, the most difficult hour of its history.

"This program does not mean higher wages, shorter hours of work, or less discipline; it means closer cooperation, more understanding of each other's problems, more friendliness in our relationships, and undoubtedly greater sacrifice on the part of all of us."

We feel in the Navy that real progress has been made along these lines and that our continuing effort with the cooperation of all concerned will reach our objective, which is top-notch cooperation between the Navy forces afloat and the naval and civilian forces ashore.

It has long been my earnest conviction that peaceful labor relations are not incompatible with capitalistic enterprise. As Assistant Secretary of the Navy, it has been my duty to represent the United States Government as the employer of hundreds of thousands of civilian workers in our naval shore establishments. The Navy belongs to all citizens and is your Navy. It is not operated for profit and cannot be described as a capitalistic enterprise. But the tremendous expansion of the Navy's industrial plant under the stress of global war has brought the same problems of labor-management relations that confront private industry. On the basis of experience with these problems, I am more firmly committed to the conviction that the future not only of free trade-unions but of free capitalistic enterprise—which has made this country great—can be secured if management and labor face with honesty and realism the inescapable fact that they must learn to live together happily to preserve and expand the economic system upon which both free labor and free enterprise depend for their continued existence. If one pulls and the other tugs, free enterprise is sunk in this Nation, just as surely as a home will break up without unity of purpose and understanding cooperation between the principals.

This old truth is so widely accepted that we take it for granted and do nothing about it. But events will not wait on us when the day arrives for economic demobilization in this country. And remember—10,000,000 war-weary soldiers and sailors returning to civilian life will not with equanimity submit to factional conflict and internal bickering which may rob them of jobs or business opportunities.

Banal as these considerations on the need for industrial cooperation may be, it seems fitting to repeat them here today at a communion breakfast of the Catholic Men's League. The great Popes of your church have chosen to bear down on this subject. His Holiness, Leo XIII, raised his voice in 1891 against the inhuman aspects of industrialism and in his deathless encyclical, Rerum Novarum, reminded the world that there is a natural law governing the rights of the human being. The philosophy of laissez faire, which dominated the thinking of those days, had run to its materialistic limits in denying the essential dignity of the individual, and the labor of mankind was regarded as a lifeless commodity to be reckoned in the same manner of accounting as the cost of other stock-pile commodities like iron ore and lumber. Leo XIII, a realist, recognized the fallacies in the theory of contract, which assumed that an individual could bargain on equal terms with a corporation, and he reminded the world that the workingman had a God-given right to organize and improve his condition.

In our own time the late Pius XI, in the encyclical Quadragesimo Anno, brought this humane concept up to date and reminded us of the great truth that there is a middle ground between the extremes of capitalism and communism, a middle ground which management and labor must recognize as a first step in their search for industrial peace, a middle ground in which property rights exist but are not absolute, but limited by the rights inherent in the dignity of the individual, and the human right of that individual to organization and to a decent living for himself and his family.

Pope Pius XI also summed up in happier language than is available to me the reciprocal dependence of management and labor, when he said, in Quadragesimo Anno, I quote:

"Now the natural law, or rather God's will, manifested by it, demands that right order be observed in the application of natural resources to human needs; and this order consists in everything having its proper owner. Hence it follows that unless a man apply his labor to his own property, an alliance must be formed between his toil and his neighbor's property, for each is helpless without the other. This was what Leo XIII had in mind when he wrote: 'Capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital.' It is therefore entirely false to ascribe the results of their combined efforts to either party alone; and it is flagrantly unjust that either should deny the efficacy of the other and seize all the profits."

It is becoming more and more apparent that the people of the United Nations desire international peace and are willing to establish an international police force if necessary to preserve and maintain that peace. There is much talk of international security, league of nations, courts of international justice, and a family of nations. While all of this may be desirable, I feel too little attention has been given to the need of Christian unity among all faiths which is the foundation of any permanent world peace. This war has already done much to bring all peoples closer together and to realize how insignificant many of the small differences in our religions actually are. There are no atheists in fox holes, nor in the gun turrets of our fighting ships at sea.

When the war started there were about 100 chaplains in the naval service. Today there are more than 1,750 chaplains. The Navy realizes that fighting men must keep

with them the religious principles learned at home. They are "must" equipment in this great struggle to protect the four freedoms. All of our Navy chaplains, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike who are indoctrinated at the Naval Training School for Chaplains, attend the same lectures, live and room together, and are taught to render spiritual services to those of other faiths. To my knowledge, this has never occurred before in the history of the world. For instance, every Protestant chaplain carries a crucifix and if in battle, or elsewhere, a Catholic is wounded and is facing a critical hour, if no Catholic chaplain is available, the Protestant chaplain would give the crucifix to the Catholic if his own was not readily available, and would assist him in his prayer of contrition. Likewise, a Catholic chaplain carries a Jewish prayer book and under similar circumstances, if a Jewish chaplain were not present, the Catholic chaplain would give the Jew the prayer book and assist him in performing his religious duty. Navy men who command are responsible for the lives and conduct of their men and have a deep and abiding regard for the spiritual lives of their men. On ships at sea, in our far-flung battle stations, men of all faiths attend religious services. On smaller vessels unable to carry chaplains, commanding officers frequently arrange for informal divine services. The normalcy of religious life aboard ship would probably surprise most church members. Divine services at sea or on a lonely island may be amid strange surroundings, but the hymns are the same and although the men may be dressed in dungarees instead of "Sunday best," they are for the most part the same men who would be going to church if they were at home.

I feel that when they return home they will be much closer together than they ever have been before. Let us hope that they will furnish an example this country can well emulate by providing more spiritual leadership than now exists.

Paul, the apostle, turned out to be quite a sailor and quite a shipfitter on his famous and dangerous voyage to Rome. You will remember a storm broke up the ship and he had to put in at the island of Clauda for repairs. As related by Paul, "They used helps undergirding the ship," I think the time has come, and now is, when we should seek and use spiritual "helps" to support and reinforce the bulkheads of freedom and democracy and to strengthen the moral fiber of our people. The new world must be built on the principles of justice and freedom which leads without fail to the Golden Rule and the universal brotherhood of man. The guiding principles of religion are more fundamental than international law. Unless we can bridge many of these religious prejudices it is doubtful if we will ever accomplish a peace of long duration. Wars force men to use their intelligence to control their individualistic instincts. Let us hope that when the peace is realized this same motivating force will impel us toward a more enlightened appreciation of the need of spiritual leadership and understanding.

In closing, on behalf of the Navy I again salute the Brooklyn Navy Yard workers. The war is going well on all fronts; but that's no reason for slowing down. We must pour it on our enemies from all directions, without pause, without respite. In the last war there were 26,000 casualties on the last day of the war. Let no one be able to say that this war was prolonged for an extra day for lack of effort on your part.

War Production Board Review of Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered at the recent annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, at Denver, Colo., by Frank W. Herring, deputy chairman of the facilities committee. I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate of the cost of printing the address. It is estimated that it will cost $105, or $5 over the normal limitation. The estimate statement is attached.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I read over the program of this annual convention a few days ago there came to my mind the fancy that I was looking at a cast of characters to appear in a drama entitled "Reclamation in Time of War." As I pursued that fancy, I could not avoid the unhappy conclusion that I was myself to appear as the villain of the piece.

However, as you have observed, the Facilities Committee of the W. P. B. has approved a number of irrigation projects as well as disapproved some others, so I am of the opinion that I should decline to put on theatrical make-up and attempt to explain to you what it is that goes on in our office that leads eventually to approval or denial

I shall first endeavor to present to you the general framework of policy within which we in W. P. B. must deal with irrigation projects. I shall then do my best to make clear to you the sort of machinery that exists in the W. P. B. for handling of construction projects and the processes and procedures involved, which should give you some understanding of the adventures a project proposal experiences in traveling along the hot Washington corridors. I shall then conclude by discussing the manner in which the Facilities Committee actually reviews these projects and the sort of things it takes into account in arriving at its decisions.

To begin with, there was promulgated by the W. P. B. more than a year ago its widely known limitation order on construction, the so-called L–41. That limitation order is long, it has been amended many times and in general it is couched in lawyer's language. A detailed discussion of it from this platform would be impracticable. The gist of it, however, is that, with certain specified exceptions, all construction undertakings are prohibited unless specifically authorized item by item by the W. P. B. The exceptions have to do with so-called command construction, which is that undertaken directly by the Army and Navy for carrying out their direct military functions, and the very small undertakings which are of not enough significance to warrant the sort of administrative control established in the order.

The purpose of the order was and still is frankly restrictive, to curtail construction so that there will be a minimum of diversion of our productive resources of manpower, materials, and equipment from the immediate job of waging war. This order is the basic document establishing the necessity for W. P. B. authorization before any project not in the excepted categories can proceed to construction.

To implement that order there was set up a year and a half ago the directive for wartime construction, a policy statement jointly announced by the W. P. B. and the War and Navy Departments. It is worth while for me to quote from that directive at this point:

"To make available all possible material and effort for immediate war production, the following outlines the principles governing wartime construction:

"1. In order that the consumption of materials and equipment by construction activities shall not impede the production of combat supplies and equipment, it is essential that all construction, whether financed by Government or other funds, be reduced to the absolute minimum necessary for the war effort. This applies also to construction essential for vital civilian needs.

"2. Reduction in the consumption of materials and equipment by construction operations can be achieved either by the elimination of nonessential projects or parts thereof, by deferring projects not needed immediately, or by appropriate changes in design and construction methods which will favor the use of those materials which are most plentiful and which will interfere least with the production of cambat material.

"3. In order to establish effective measures for the control of construction, the following general policies have been established by the War Production Board, in consultation with the War and Navy Departments:

4. Before any construction project can proceed, it must be acted upon affirmatively by some agency of the Federal Government or by its duly authorized representative. No project will be approved for construction unless it is found, by responsible authority, to meet the following criteria:

(a) It is essential for the war effort.

(b) Postponement of construction would be detrimental to the war effort.

(c) It is not practicable to rent or convert existing facilities for the purpcse.

(d) The construction will not result in duplication or unnecessary expansion of existing plants or facilities now under construction or about to be constructed.

(e) All possible economies have been made in the project, resulting in deletion of all nonessential items and parts.

(f) The structure of the project has been designed of the simplest type, just sufficient to meet the minimum requirements.

(g) The answers to the following questions relating to conditions at the proposed site are all affirmative to the extent that they are pertinent:

(1) Are there sufficient labor and materials available to build it?

(2) Will adequate public utilities be available without costly extensions?

(3) Will transportation be available to serve it?

(4) Will labor be available to man it? (Are housing and other community facilities adequate?)

(5) Will machine tools and other equipment be available to equip it?

(6) Will raw materials be available to operate it?

(7) Can the manufactured product be used at once or stored until needed?

There is one aspect of this directive which merits a few words of comment. It is to be noted that there is a positive requirement that a project further the war effort if it is to be given W. P. B. approval. This is rather different from a mere failure to impede the war effort. I appreciate fully that positive contribution and failure to interfere are

criteria that have a tendency to diffuse into each other, and that the determination of positive essentiality is not one that can be made by a quick glance. But the directive's requirement for a positive furthering of the war effort is of paramount significance.

Further, you will have noted that the directive requires by implication an assurance that projects will in fact be constructed and will in fact be operated effectively. Approvals are not to be given, if the directive is to be observed, to projects which may fail of accomplishment, in either construction or operation, through inadequacy of supply of either labor or materials.

In the early fall of last year it became apparent that despite the restrictive policy established by the two documents I have cited the proportion of our total productive resources going into the construction of new facilities was greater than the war production program could stand. The situation was adjudged to be critical. A course of action was taken that was somewhat drastic. Far-reaching stop-construction orders were given on many projects which had already been under construction for some while and a further tightening of administrative machinery was brought about. As you all know, many of the going projects of the Bureau of Reclamation were ordered stopped at that time.

During the ensuing months the production of food became more and more a matter of national concern until it was accorded a full-fleged status as a wartime objective. Reclamation projects, thereupon, took on aspects of eligibility for W. P. B. consideration somewhat greater than they had theretofore. For some while, however, differences of opinion prevailed as to how many years into the future we might properly assign a wartime objective to food production. When that matter was finally settled it was agreed that food production as far off as 1946 might be considered proper to take into account.

On the other hand, at about the same time a growing shortage of manpower also became a matter of great public concern. Indeed inadequacy of our manpower resources promised to be a problem overshadowing even that of the short supply of materials. Consequently, any proposal to undertake the construction of a new facility, or to resume the construction of a project which had earlier been stopped, had to pass a higher hurdle than ever in order to demonstrate its worthwhileness. Indeed, the War Manpower Commission on August 30 issued a statement of policy which very clearly called for continued curtailment of the Nation's construction activities. The relevant sentences are:

"On the basis of present and future labor needs, the War Manpower Commission advises that 2,100,000 employed persons must effect transfers during the remaining months of the year, and 500,000 must shift to war-useful jobs during the first 6 months of 1944. Of the total transfers expected up to July 1944, about 800,000 are construction workers, a large proportion of whom will change their jobs as construction of military and naval facilities eases off with the completion of facilities for producing war materials and vessels. These workers will then be turning out war materials instead of the means for producing war materials."

Despite the shifting scene, therefore, it was decided that the general restrictive policy was to continue in effect. To give it recognition, the Production Executive Committee of the W. P. B. on September 29 adopted the following resolution:

"It shall be the continued policy of the War Production Board to restrict construction of new facilities and to reduce facilities under construction to the minimum necessary for the war program and for essential civilian needs, in order to conserve to the utmost all resources for the production of war supplies and equipment. In accomplishing this result, the Board will in each case seek a minimum consumption of materials and manpower, together with maximum utilization of existing facilities and equipment. The directive for wartime construction, dated May 20, 1942, which established these principles, is hereby affirmed."

Most recently the manpower shortage has become highly critical in certain regions in the country, notably the west coast area. You will recall that the situation there has been of such critical importance that it came in for consideration by Justice Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization. The effect of this regional shortage of manpower has been to intensify the restrictive policy of the War Production Board in regard to construction in that area.

Let us now turn to the administrative machinery available for the purpose of applying these policies and let us examine the general procedures employed.

To begin with, as you know, a number of so-called claimant agencies, about 25 of them, have been designated among whom the Nation's available supply of materials is, in theory, distributed. These agencies include the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and many other war agencies, including the War Food Administration.

Quarter by quarter estimates are made of the probable supply and probable requirements for each of the controlled materials.

For example, the Steel Division estimates the probable amounts of carbon steel and alloy steel that will be available for all purposes during the coming quarter.

At about the same time all the claimant agencies submit to the W. P. B. their estimates of the amount of steel their programs will require during that quarter. Characteristically, of course, the aggregate of these estimated requirements outruns the estimate of production, and adjustments must be applied, agency by agency, until the total of requirements comes within the range of feasible supply. Obviously, the production programs of the agencies must themselves be adjusted in the process. You will note the close similarity to the normal budgetary procedure. When the proper adjustment has been arrived at, the requirements committee, which is a body comprising representatives of the claimant agencies, announces the allotment of steel for each of the claimant agencies for the forthcoming quarter. Thereafter all production and construction requirements falling due in that quarter are charged against the allotment of the appropriate agency. I have given this brief illustration of the workings of the allotment system in connection with steel. Similar estimates and adjustments lead to allotments of other controlled materials, including aluminum, copper, copper-base alloys, and the like.

In addition to the allotment system just described, there also prevails a system of priority ratings which is applied to individual items of construction and purchase contracts. This priority system, however, is far simpler than it was a year or so ago, before the allotment system was introduced. At the present time, as far as construction is concerned, there are three principle rating bands employed. By decision of the Requirements Committee, construction projects falling within certain designated categories, those most urgently needed for direct war purposes, are accorded the highest rating. The second order of priority is assigned to other specified categories of construction which are also directly and immediately related to the military effort, but for which the urgency of construction is not quite so pressing. All construction not specifically designated in those higher rating bands are accorded the third order of priority, AA-3. It is with this general order of priorities that we are concerned when we deal with reclamation projects.

The Requirements Committee has another function which is of importance to our discussion today. The committee issues so-called program determinations, which authorize certain levels of production activity or production capacity. For example, the level production of high-tenacity rayon to which the textile industry is now striving has been established by such a program determination. Proposals to construct high-tenacity rayon factories are eligible for consideration as long as the total of productive capacity to be provided falls within that authorized production level. Similarly, a program determination issued early this past summer establishes the currently authorized level of irrigation construction activity.

This last program determination, in which you are most interested, authorizes the construction of reclamation projects to the limit of 10,000 tons of carbon steel for the completion of the projects. The steel, the use of which is thereby authorized, is to come from the allotments made to the War Food Administration. The designated purpose of this use of materials and of the construction activity is the production of food. Within that general program framework individual projects are subject to the approval or disapproval of the Facilities Committee.

This program determination illustrates two extremely significant points: First, all construction projects undertaken in the country today have to have the sponsorship of a claimant agency against whose materials allotments the requirements of the project may be charged. Second, the use of allotted materials is in all instances subject to the policy regulations and administrative controls generally prevailing in the War Production Board. An allotment of materials and even a program determination, in other words, does not exempt a project from the provisions of the construction limitation order, to which I referred earlier, nor to the general policies of the Board applying to construction.

The role of the facilities committee, it should now be plain, is that of applying these general policies to project proposals and of determining in the light of those policies whether projects should be approved or disapproved. This function is carried out even though a prevailing program determination authorizes a level of total activity within which the proposed project would fall.

Most recently, in view of the critical shortage of manpower in certain areas of the country, there has been established some additional machinery designed to deal with those special area problems. This machinery includes area production urgency committees in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Detroit, Akron, and Hartford. The general administrative order establishing those committees states that no official of the War Production Board is authorized to approve any facility falling within the jurisdictional area of one of these committees unless there is a recommendation for approval by such area committee. If there is a recommendation for disapproval by the appropriate area committee, its approval can only be granted on the special authorization, case by case, by the W. P. B. Production Executive Committee.

In summary, the machinery we are concerned with is something like this: There are a number of claimant agencies, each of which is responsible for a recognized sector of the war effort and to each of which is made an apportionment of the amount of materials available in the country. In carrying out its functions each claimant operates within a

framework of authorized programs. Each claimant proposes facilities and construction projects within its authorizations, and those individual proposals are subject to the approval or disapproval of the facilities committee. If approved, the project receives a priority depending upon how important its purpose is to the immediate war objective. In designated critical areas special machinery, in addition to the foregoing, is employed to relieve critical conditions of manpower shortage.

I should now like to explain how the facilities committee carries out its task.

You will recall from what I have said earlier that the principal function of the facilities committee is to determine whether or not a project proposed is essential to the war effort. You will recall also that the committee operates within a general framework of War Production Board policy and procedure, a framework which involves an allotment system, program determinations, recommendations by claimant agencies, etc.

The determination of essentiality is not too difficult when it pertains to facilities which will yield direct and immediate war values. If, for example, the committee has before it a proposal to build a new plant to manufacture a certain chemical, the first criterion of essentiality is that more of that chemical than can be produced with existing facilities is necessary for the war program. The application of that criterion is relatively straightforward. If more production is needed, and existing facilities are incapable of producing the sufficient overload to meet the need, it may be presumed that a new facility is necessary. From there on the determination has to do with the type of facility proposed, the amount of new productive capacity involved, the proposed location, and similar considerations.

But how is a determination to be made when the project is of a sort that does not lend itself to this sort of direct measurement? How are we to deal with a proposed hospital, for example, or with a proposed highway bridge, or to get down to cases, an irrigation project?

Our working principle here is that we are, in fact, dealing with wartime justification for construction, and in testing that justification we must take into account the wartime values to be derived from the project and the wartime costs. The wartime values may be in the form of improved transportation of war goods in a road case, raised worker morale, and consequent raised worker efficiency, in a school or hospital case, increased production of food in an irrigation case, or any one of a number of similar values.

These values are always extremely difficult to measure in money terms and usually impossible. The wartime costs are also to be measured in other than money terms; there are costs in critical materials, in man-hours of labor, in the using up of precious equipment, and, in general, the utilization of productive resources. When the wartime values can be adjudged as worthy of the wartime costs measured in these terms, we may properly say that the project is essential. If, on the other hand, the wartime values are not worthy of those costs, we may conclude that the project is not essential.

Dealing with reclamation projects, therefore, we must first analyze the real wartime values to be derived. Those values very clearly are to be measured in terms of food production—during the war period. I emphasize that last phrase because it is a critical consideration. The policy we are now working upon considers food production during 1944, 1945, and 1946 as food production for the war. Naturally, earlier production is more valuable than that which comes in relatively late. The amount of production, therefore, that can be expected during those years, particularly of crops which are needed for war purposes, is the first point of analysis.

Closely associated with the determination of food-production possibilities is the probability of that production being realized. That probability depends upon the probability of the construction being completed on schedule, of the water actually becoming available for distribution, the rate of which settlement will take place, in connection with a new project, and similar factors. In other words, the committee's concern is focused upon food, upon the time it will be produced, and the assurance that actual production will be forthcoming.

I have said that the actual wartime costs of the project must be balanced against these wartime values. Although the committee does not have the function of reviewing design or of applying priority ratings to materials required, the demand that the project would make upon our national stock of critical materials is a primary focus of analysis. Of course, the appraisal of these costs will vary somewhat from time to time as materials as a whole or as various material items become scarcer or more plentiful. A project which will require a large amount of a material which is short in national supply will be considered to have a high cost. On the other hand, the cost of a project will be considered relatively low if its materials demands are modest and primarily of those items in which there is no serious shortage problem.

The other principal element of cost is manpower. You have all heard so much during recent months of the national manpower problem that I need not elaborate at this point upon its importance. It is enough to say that the total amount of manpower required to build a project, the type of labor required, the location of the project, as it bears upon competing wartime demands for manpower, are factors to be studied. As I have already pointed out, in a certain number of regions this question is considered of sufficient importance to warrant the establishment of special administrative machinery and as things now stand no project in any of the three west coast States can be given favorable action by our committee unless the area production urgency committee has recommended that the project be undertaken.

These are the principal factors entering into the committee's decisions regarding project essentiality. There are many other incidental ones having application to specific projects.

I do not pretend, of course, that the committee's decisions are matters of arithmetic. The pertinent factors in the evaluation are never susceptible of nice calculation. In the final reckoning the element of judgment is the vital ingredient. Our weightiest responsibility is to have that judgment sound, as sound as a group of honest and intelligent men can make it.

Business Profits Soar Despite Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Business Profits Soar Despite Taxes," published in August 10, 1943, issue of the newspaper PM.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS PROFITS SOAR DESPITE TAXES—NATIONAL CITY ADMITS 14 PERCENT RISE—PAUL SAYS IT'S HIGHER

(By Nathan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, August 10.—The current National City Bank report shows corporation income this year, after taxes, running about 14 percent higher than last year. This is the latest of a series of disclosures indicating war profits are reaching new record-breaking peaks.

The bank's August survey of economic conditions covered published reports of 340 industrial companies, including most of the larger manufacturing firms. Despite the higher war taxes this year, these firms made 13.7 percent more during the first 6 months of 1943 after the payment of all taxes than during the first half of 1942.

DOUBLE 1939

An even more striking picture of war profits was provided by Randolph Paul, Treasury general counsel, in a recent issue of Dun's Review, published by Dun & Bradstreet. Paul estimated corporation profits this year, after taxes, would reach $8,300,000,000, or more than double the figure for 1939, the last pre-war year. He estimated corporate profits, before taxes, at $26,200,000,000, or almost four times the 1939 level.

American industry has never before approached such a total profit figure. It means that industry as a whole is making so much money that it can pay the biggest corporate tax bill in the world's history and still enjoy more than double its peacetime income. It means that the Government and the public are carrying industry's war tax burden.

Paul's figures and the National City Bank report are backed up by other Government statistics all indicating the same trend in profits as war production mounts. They foreshadow proposals for much heavier corporate taxation in the coming tax bill.

EVEN PUBLIC UTILITIES

The National City Bank report showed that 284 manufacturing companies reported a 14.4 percent increase in income this year over last year. Stone, clay, and glass profits were up 69.7 percent; automobiles, 37.2 percent; and miscellaneous manufacturing 46.9 percent. The only reductions were in paper products and iron and steel.

Railroad profits, the bank said, were up 32 percent this year over last year's lush returns and even the usually stable public utilities showed a 6-percent jump. The bank admitted that these profits figures were probably conservative compared with tax returns, because in their published statements the corporations have deducted huge reserves not allowed as tax deductions.

The bank, painting as conservative a picture as possible, said the corporation profits were still 22 percent less than for the first half of 1941. But Paul's more complete figures challenged this. They showed total corporate profits, after taxes, had risen from $4,040,000,000 in 1939 to $4,777,000,000 in 1940. Here is the way Paul estimated the next 3 years:

1941	$7,100,000,000
1942	7,400,000,000
1943	8,300,000,000

FOR HIGHER TAXES

Analyzing the figures for the profit-making corporations alone, which are the companies that pay taxes, Paul found even higher profits. He estimated them at $9,700,000,000,

after taxes, for 1943 as compared with $6,016,000,000 for 1939. Their profits before taxes were estimated at $27,400,000,000 this year as compared with $9,028,000,000 in 1939.

Arguing for higher corporate taxes, Paul said "the huge and increasing volume of wartime profits offers an obvious point of attack on the problem of inflation." He said if corporations were allowed to keep a substantial part of their excess profits, "workers would undoubtedly insist upon a share of these 'windfalls,' which would mean higher wages and additional pressure on the price ceilings."

"Hence," he said, "it is evident that high corporation taxes are an essential part of the wartime stabilization program, and that without these high taxes, the effectiveness of our war effort would be seriously impaired."

Paul said some of the increased profits were earned by increased effort or efficiency but "a large percentage of them are in the nature of 'windfalls,'" resulting from increased Government buying.

The Author of Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Shameless Smear-Artist," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of November 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHAMELESS SMEAR ARTIST

Reported as booked solid through the first of March at $500 or more per lecture, is Greek-born Arthur Derounian, an Armenian, who, using the pen name Roy Carlson, has written (under the title of Under Cover) one of the most wantonly vicious smear books yet to appear in this country.

Roy Carlson, however, is but one of several aliases employed by Derounian, who has also been known, at various times, as George Pagnanelli, Thomas L. Decker, George Paige, John Correa, and Rudolph Elbers, and who, by his own admission, once served as editor of the violently anti-Semitic Christian Defender.

It is strange, indeed, that respectable organizations should be thus duped into paying good American money in lecture fees to this man who, in various anti-Jewish articles, denounced the Yiddish spittle press and Jew stooges, but who is now hailed by the screaming Walter Winchell and other malicious and vindictive New Deal partisans as a great liberal.

This Derounian (alias Carlson, alias Pagnanelli, alias Decker, alias Paige, alias Correa, alias Elbers) has now, in the book called Under Cover, thrown vile calumny upon outstanding Senators and Representatives—chosen representatives of the American people—who, because they hate tyranny and oppression, are striving to preserve the great American traditions of freedom, tolerance, and good will which sinister enemies on the home front are laboring to destroy.

Such fancy lecture fees as his agents are now charging for the public appearances of Derounian (alias Carlson, etc., etc.) are in marked contrast with the $50 a week which he has been receiving from a well-heeled left wing political-front outfit known as Friends of Democracy.

But in the past the fellow has also been (probably at better salaries) on the pay roll of Russell Davenport, one of Wendell Willkie's favorite flunkies on the Time-Life-Fortune staff.

And anyway, thanks to the plugging of the Communist Daily Worker and New Masses, and such venomous rabble rousers as Walter Winchell and Rex Stout, Comrade Derounian (alias Carlson, etc., etc.) seems by way of getting "into the bucks" through his gleanings from book royalties.

Most persons would not welcome wealth from such sources. Most writers would be somewhat embarrassed by reviews like the one in Secretary of the Navy Knox's Chicago Daily News, in which a noted columnist, Howard Vincent O'Brien, says, of Under Cover: "The ease with which the author circulated in the political underworld makes one wonder if he ever really traveled from his own library."

Even more critical is Lee Casey, who, describing the book in the Denver Rocky Mountain News, declares that Under Cover "itself represents subversiveness of the worst sort."

Carlson's narrative is described by Mr. Casey as "revolting * * * the story of a sneak and a spy, not dissimilar to Valtin's Out of the Night."

Indeed, the author of Under Cover, as Mr. Casey continues, "attended secret and public meetings of the bund, applauded all Fascist speakers, sold anti-Semitic pamphlets on the streets, sought to prove his devotion to the Nazi cause by calling upon hoodlums to attack Jews—he 'turned his head away,' he now says, when his appeals were acted upon."

Of this ballyhooed book, which viciously lumps Henry Ford and Fritz Kuhn, William Dudley Pelley and Senator BURTON K. WHEELER together indiscriminately, Mr. Casey correctly asserts:

"At the very time when national unity is most necessary, this sort of thing is calculated to cause disunity by challenging the loyalty of patriotic men and women whose views on foreign policy differed from those of the administration before Pearl Harbor."

After all, "Some of these men and women, and not a few of their sons, have died for the national cause since that attack was made. To challenge their loyalty is infamous. The author of Under Cover, by his own admission, is shameless. But the publishers, as a reputable house, should be deeply ashamed of this book."

All too many program chairmen "buy names"—that is to say, they contract for lectures by men who have been widely ballyhooed for books that the program chairmen have never read, but which are supposed to be best-seller big stuff.

It may blessedly develop that as the true character of some of these alien smear artists and their Red-supported work is discovered by those solicited to give them lecture engagements in various local communities, a flock of cancelations will convert their prospective "take" from the lyceum "road" into mere paper profits.

The One Thing Roosevelt Is Afraid of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, given me during my discussion today on subsidies, I wish to include an editorial from the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, of October 20, 1943. Its caption is "The one thing Roosevelt is afraid of," and it was written by the very thoughtful editor of that paper, Mr. R. C. Hoiles. In all the confusion on the subject of subsidies, and the administrative methods of applying subsidies, I hope this editorial will be read by the Members of Congress:

THE ONE THING ROOSEVELT IS AFRAID OF

There is one thing that Roosevelt is afraid of more than anything else. That is of the people coming to know that his government restrictions over industry and private business are bound to lead to the cost of living going up.

When the people begin to find out that being forced by the Government to pay people time and a half, that forcing people into labor unions, that limiting the number of hours men can be hired at a fixed rate, that paying people for killing the pigs and not raising crops all tend to make things scarcer and make their own cost of living go up, they will vote the man out of public office that has done more to increase the cost of living in the United States than any other man that ever lived in the United States.

For this reason all Roosevelt's suggestions are now aimed at keeping people from knowing the truth as to what causes living costs to go up. His opposition to the sales tax is to keep people for the time being from knowing that the cost of living is going up. He implies by his advocacy of taxing the big producers instead of the consumers that he is not eating up the seed corn—reducing the efficiency of the tools workers must use.

He is able to fool people on this score, because it is true that if we do not use any corn for seed in any particular year, we can live better the year we are eating up the seed corn than we could if we set aside a part of the corn to be used so that we can have more corn succeeding years.

His contention that taxing the rich and not directly taxing the consumer will keep the cost of living down is just as illogical as to claim that killing the hen that lays the egg can help the poor. We can live better while we are eating the hen, but getting eggs to eat after the hen has been eaten will be much harder. Just as it will be much harder for the worker to get good paying jobs after we tax the men with big incomes who would use their income to furnish workers with better tools.

His rent ceilings is just another way of keeping the people for the time being from realizing that the cost of rents will eventually go up. They will go up because when rents are set so that there is no reward for building new buildings, there will be no new buildings built. Those that are able to buy homes that are now rented for less than their true value will get homes and those people who have been getting rents for less than cost will eventually find themselves without a place to live in.

Oh yes, I hear the apologizers claiming that the Government will build the houses.

But if the Government builds the houses and rents them for less than cost, other things that have to be taxed in order to pay for this loss will cost more.

Yes, Roosevelt is worried more about the cost of living going up and thus losing his glamour with the people than anything else. And well he might be because there is no man that has ever done as much in the United States to raise the cost of living as Franklin Roosevelt with all his magical way of temporarily consuming the wealth accumulated over decades to keep the present cost of living down at the expense of a higher cost in each succeeding year.

More Subsidies, More Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, comes now the city of Hannibal, in the "Show Me" State, and offers to show you how to reduce Government waste and how to cut out unnecessary Government spending, about which there has been so much said and so little done.

The said city of Hannibal, Mo., which has no Government war plants, no Government hospitals, no Government projects of any kind, has refused a Government subsidy.

As evidence of this unusual attitude toward the dear "Uncle Santa," I include herein a news article published in the Hannibal Courier-Post in its issue of Saturday, October 16, 1943, as follows:

SCHOOL BOARD REFUSES TO TAKE $4,000 IN GOVERNMENT FUNDS IN TIME OF WAR; FOOD SUBSIDY PLAN

The Hannibal Board of Education at a meeting held last night at the senior high school turned down an offer made by a Government bureau to subsidize lunches for school children in the various public schools of the city, which would have represented a savings on money paid for lunches of approximately $4,000 annually.

The bureau proposed to subsidize lunches served to the school children to the extent of 4 cents per meal, providing certain farm and dairy products were included in the meal. Among those included in the subsidy plan were butter and cheese, now rationed to the general public on account of the war.

It was explained to the board by Supt. E. T. Miller that the agent of the War Food Administration, Food Distribution Administration had contacted him and explained the school-lunch subsidy plan which the bureau agent stated was designed to aid the farmer and at the same time see that the school child had proper nourishment.

Miller explained that the sponsoring Government agent offered to pay for the following foods used in the school lunches: Milk, cheese, fresh and dried fruits, fresh and processed vegetables, fresh meat and poultry, eggs, dry beans and peas, soybeans and products thereof, and peanuts and peanut butter, oleomargarine with added vitamin A, butter, lard, and other cooking fats and oils, cereals, and such other foods as may be specifically designated by the Administration.

Dr. W. J. Smith, in opening the discussion said, "It is time that somebody was telling the Government bureaus that they don't want this kind of money when it is not absolutely needed." He continued by saying, "We are at war and the people are being taxed heavily to carry on the functions of government." Other board members joined in the discussion and concurred in the views expressed by Dr. Smith.

Superintendent Miller explained that the school system was now using a Government subsidy known as the penny milk plan and urged that this subsidy be continued in the school system. The board instructed the superintendent to continue with the penny milk plan.

President J. C. Raible, Jr., stated that it was not good policy for the local school district to accept a Government subsidy on food for 1 year which may be taken away from the district the next year. He continued by saying, "if school lunches are subsidized and the Government withdraws its support then there will be a clamor by the patrons that the subsidy be continued out of the school funds of the district which would not be available."

Superintendent Miller said the bureau representative told him that the sum of $50,000,000 had been set aside to subsidize certain foods. The superintendent also stated that the contacting agent of the Government told him, "I don't care whether you take it or not, we will give it to some other school district."

Profits Soar While Packers Complain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Profits Soar While Packers Complain," appearing in the Kidder County News of November 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS SOAR WHILE PACKERS COMPLAIN

While America's big meat packers are yelling for an outright repeal of price ceilings, the Office of Price Administration revealed this week that their profits have skyrocketed to over four times the average of 3 pre-war years, 1936–39.

A confidential O. P. A. study, covering 53 companies which handle 85 percent of the Nation's meat production, made the startling disclosure that whereas profits of the packers aggregated $24,971,000 a year in the peacetime base period, they had scooted to $108,613,000 in 1942.

Not only did the total "take" shoot up, but on each dollar of investment profits mounted three and one-half times, the O. P. A. said.

Major gain was for the so-called medium packers, doing a volume of $5,000,000 to $50,000,000 a year, and for the big corporations selling over $50,000,000 annually.

The top group, which does 70 percent of the total business, rolled up 336 percent more profits, from $23,476,000 to $102,322,000. The medium firms rose even more, by 638 percent, from $717,000 to $5,293,000, while the small companies (doing under $5,000,000 a year each) fared worse, going up only 28 percent—from $778,000 to $998,000.

In 1942 alone, compared with the previous year, the large packers fattened their profits by 40 percent and the medium group 100 percent.

Despite these staggering profits, the packers have been running full-page ads in newspapers demanding complete abolition of ceiling prices. They blamed the ceilings and low profits for an alleged meat shortage.

In lieu of a price limit, they proposed a so-called meat management plan, which, boiled down merely to juggling of ration points in such manner as to control the supply of meat. This, they contended, would automatically keep prices down.

The labor advisory committee to the San Francisco regional office of the O. P. A. took the trouble to analyze the plan and in a report sent out to central labor bodies throughout the country declared the scheme was simply a doctored-up one making consumers pay through the nose.

"Its ultimate result can only mean a complete break-down to a fixed-price food program," the committee said. "It will inevitably lead to the destruction of price ceilings on other commodities.

"The brunt of this inflationary scheme would fall upon the families of workers, because its adoption would amount to a wage reduction by taking more out of the pay envelope."

Subsidy Is a Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Denver (Colo.) Post. It has to do with subsidies. It also has to do with milk. The present methods of trying to apply the subsidy program, against all the experiences of hundreds of years, and against the intelligent suggestions of the representatives of the commodities involved, will do just the opposite of "maintain and increase production," which is the objective of the subsidy program, and is so stated to be in the Presidential directive. The editorial shows the reaction of the people of Denver to the subsidy program:

SUBSIDY IS A CRIME

Bureaucratic bullheadedness is endangering Denver's milk supply. The O. P. A. has frozen the milk price here at 12 cents a quart which the dairymen who produce 90 percent of the city's milk supply say is 2 cents a quart less than the cost of production. They claim that the Denver O. P. A. office recommended a price increase. All members of the Colorado congressional delegation went to bat for the milk producers and tried to get for them the relief needed. But the O. P. A. in Washington stubbornly refused to allow any price increase. And the relief offered in the form of a promised subsidy is less than half what the milk producers say they must have if they are to stay in business and continue to provide milk for Denver children and adults.

There isn't any question that the dairymen must get more for their milk or they will "go broke." The only excuse offered for O. P. A. refusal to allow the 2-cents-a-quart price increase requested is that this would violate the administration's "hold the line" policy. Holding the health line is a thousand times more important than holding any political line. Denver children must have milk to drink. They can't drink any "hold the line" policy.

The attempt of the O. P. A. to substitute a subsidy for a price increase is idiotic. The bureaucratic notion that paying a subsidy to hold prices below the cost of production holds down the cost of living and guards against inflation is one of the most colossal frauds ever perpetrated against the American people. Every dollar paid out in subsidies has to be borrowed and interest has to be paid on it and by the time the loans are repaid every borrowed dollar probably will cost the taxpayers $2.

One of the most damnable features of this subsidy racket is that it will make American fighting men who survive this war help to pay the grocery bills of all the people. These

men now in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and Air Corps will be taxed to pay interest and principal on the money borrowed to pay subsidies.

"Subsidies do not fall like manna from heaven" Congressman MILLER of Nebraska warns the Nation. "Someone must pay the bill. Someone also must pay the cost in the operation of the program. The money the Government borrows to pay subsidies so your grocery bill and mine may be lower will have to be repaid and with interest by those very men and women who are now fighting our battles. It would seem that it would almost be a crime for this Congress to appropriate money or to permit the Government to borrow money to pay our grocery bills." Actually it would be a crime.

Nobody wants this subsidy program except some of the bureaucrats and political bunco men. The bureaucrats are for it because it gives them a chance to perpetuate themselves in power and in soft, lucrative jobs. Political demagogs favor it because it fits into their skin game of making people believe they can get something for nothing.

Penicillin, the Magic Drug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in the opening session today, I took a moment to correct an erroneous radio broadcast regarding the method used in distributing penicillin, the new "wonder drug," to civilians. All appeals for this drug for civilian uses must be made to Dr. Chester Keefer, Evans Memorial Hospital, Boston, Mass. For civilians he is the penicillin czar, so to speak, as he has been designated to handle all civilian applications. Dr. Keefer acts as the agent of the Committee on Medical Research of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

In May 1940 penicillin was first used in this country in the treatment of a case. Penicillin is very difficult to manufacture and it was May 1942 before many cases were treated by the use of this drug. It was found especially useful in the treatment of infections.

In July 1943 the War Production Board took over the direction of the production of penicillin. About 19 companies are manufacturing, or soon will be manufacturing, penicillin. Officials of the War Production Board estimate that by February 1944 it will be possible to meet all Army and Navy requirements and that within a few more months—possibly by July 1, 1944—it will be possible to take care of all pressing civilian demands. This is good news, and it is to be hoped that the estimate is not too optimistic. It will mean the saving of many thousands of lives of soldiers, sailors, and civilians. By November 1 of this year the drug had been used in 794 civilian cases, and the results were amazingly effective, according to official reports. This is only the beginning of the use of one of the greatest medical discoveries of all time.

About 25 percent of the drug which has been produced in recent months has been used in treating civilians. A much larger portion has been allocated to the Army for use in Army hospitals. The Navy gets one-third as much as the Army.

Prior to October 1 the Army was using the drug experimentally in 20 Army hospitals. The drug was used by the Army in about 2,000 cases. It was used in 3 general types of cases. The first type involved the treatment of bone infections. The second type had to do with the treatment of certain venereal diseases where the patient did not respond favorably to the sulfa drug. The third class of cases involved the treatment of such diseases as pneumonia, meningitis, and blood-stream infections. The results were highly satisfactory, especially in the first 2 classes of cases.

Experimental treatments proved so highly successful the Army began last month to allocate the bulk of its quota for use in treating soldiers overseas. We cannot foresee what our casualties may be in the coming months. This much is certain. The availability of penicillin to the Army and Navy will mean that many American boys will live who otherwise would have had no chance of recovery. The Army is now losing less than 3 percent of the boys who are hospitalized, as compared with 15 percent in World War No. 1. The use of the new magic drug should now enable the Army to make even a better record.

The following letter received today from the office of the Surgeon General of the Army points out the error in the radio broadcast previously referred to and gives essential facts regarding the distribution of penicillin:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, November 15, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE MAHON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAHON: The Surgeon General has directed me to reply to your telephonic inquiry for information regarding the accuracy of Mr. Walter Winchell's statement that the War Department controls all supplies of penicillin. It is evident that Mr. Winchell has been misinformed since his statement on penicillin was completely in error. Production and allocation of penicillin is controlled by the War Production Board. The latter agency determines allocation of penicillin to the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Public Health Service, the Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development, and to other agencies making application for allocation. Allocations are made on a monthly basis and are determined on an estimate of production and a weighing of the relative merits of applications by the several agencies requesting penicillin.

All penicillin allocated to the Army is intended solely for the treatment of military personnel. None of it can be released to civilians. Rather general misunderstanding of this fact has resulted in many applications for penicillin being directed to The Surgeon General, United States Army from civilian sources. In all such cases the applicant has been advised that the doctor in charge of the civilian case in question should make direct application to Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Evans Memorial Hospital, Boston, Mass. Dr. Keefer acts for the Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development in determining the detailed distribution of penicillin allocated for civilian uses.

The Surgeon General wil be appreciative of any action which may help to clarify public understanding regarding the distribution of penicillin in this country. At no time during the development of penicillin has the Army controlled the entire supply but misstatements on this point have continued to recur.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT J. CARPENTER,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Corps,
Executive Officer.

Permanent Medical Corps, Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the bill (H. R. 3623) to insure adequate care of disabled veterans by establishment of a permanent medical service in the Veterans' Administration, which I have introduced. That medical corps would be a component part of the armed forces. It can be done, and very likely will be done, by Executive order of the President. That may not be a permanent corps, and I think in order to get the best care for the veterans of the First World War now in veterans' hospitals and for the veterans of this Second World War after they are discharged from the Army and Navy hospitals we should have a permanent corps, a corps that will attract the best medical and surgical men to care for the boys. I have stated to the House before that doctors are resigning from the Veterans' Administration at the rate of one a day. Legislation should be passed creating this corps, whether an order which I believe will be issued by the President shortly goes into effect or not.

The bill, H. R. 3623, follows:

A bill to insure adequate care of disabled veterans by establishment of a permanent medical service in the Veterans' Administration

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, is hereby authorized and directed to establish in the Veterans' Administration a permanent medical service to be known as the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps, and hereinafter referred to as the Medical Corps, which shall constitute a component part of the military forces of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as giving any member of the Medical Corps any military control or authority over any office, officer, or member of any other military or naval force of the United States except by direction of the President.

SEC. 2. The functions of the Medical Corps shall be those of a medical or medical ad-

ministrative nature, to be prescribed by the Administrator in connection with the administration of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 3. That the Medical Corps shall consist of the following members:

(a) Physicians and dentists: 1 Surgeon General, with the temporary rank of brigadier general, 132 with the rank of colonel, 201 with the rank of lieutenant colonel, 500 with the rank of major, 800 with the rank of captain, and 1,200 with the rank of first lieutenant.

(b) Nurses and other personnel: 1 superintendent of nurses with the rank of lieutenant colonel, 15 officers with the rank of major, 125 officers with the rank of captain, 400 officers with the rank of first lieutenant, 5,000 officers with the rank of second lieutenant, and such other commissioned, noncommissioned, enlisted personnel, and civilian employees as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator for a term of 4 years, unless sooner removed by the President, and he shall be responsible to the Administrator for the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. The Surgeon General may be appointed for additional terms of 4 years in the discretion of the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator. During his term of office, the Surgeon General may be promoted in the permanent ranks in the same manner as if not temporarily commissioned in a higher grade, due regard being given to the manner of promotion and the pay of members of the Medical Corps.

SEC. 5. The Medical Corps shall include such female professional and other female technical personnel as the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator shall deem practical.

SEC. 6. After the original appointment to the grade of Surgeon General, a vacancy occurring in that grade shall be filled by appointment from members of the Medical Corps who have served not less than 2 years in the grade of colonel or lieutenant colonel.

SEC. 7. No commissioned officer shall be appointed, or promoted to a higher grade or rank on the active list, until his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform all the duties of his assigned rank and grade have been established to the satisfaction of the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Administrator.

SEC. 8. The rates of pay and allowances, increase of pay, transportation of property, retirement benefits, and other gratuities and privileges for commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Medical Corps and Medical Reserve Corps shall be identical with those provided for personnel of the corresponding rank and status in the United States Army.

SEC. 9. Members of the Medical Corps may purchase quartermaster and commissary supplies in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps under the same conditions as are applicable to members of the Regular Establishments.

SEC. 10. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of personnel and regulations respecting the internal administration of the Medical Corps.

SEC. 11. The Administrator shall establish and maintain a Medical Reserve Corps of officers and enlisted personnel to which there shall be appointed physicians, dentists, pharmacists, technicians, nurses, dietitians, and such other personnel found qualified on examination in such numbers and ranks as are deemed necessary by the Administrator to fill any vacancies or meet any emergent conditions. Members of the Medical Reserve Corps may be assigned to active duty whenever needed, and any member of the Medical Corps may be transferred to the Reserve for any period during which his services on active duty are not required. Regulations may provide for longevity and other credits for service in the Reserve as well as active service in the Medical Corps.

SEC. 12. The Surgeon General, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, shall from time to time appoint a board of not less than three or more than five officers of the Medical Corps, to determine charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of any member of the Medical Corps, and if such charge or charges are sustained shall recommend reduction in grade, retirement, or discharge from the Medical Corps of such member. Any member so discharged for inefficiency or inaptitude shall be entitled to 1 month's pay at the rate of pay in effect at the time of discharge for every completed year of service in the Medical Corps not in excess of 6 years, but no additional pay shall be allowed to a member discharged because of misconduct.

SEC. 13. Commissioned officers and enlisted personnel of the Medical Corps of the Veterans' Administration may be detailed for service with the medical services of the Army and Navy, and commissioned or enlisted medical personnel of the Army and Navy may be detailed for service with the Medical Corps of the Veterans' Administration, when such detail will promote the public interests without, however, in anywise impairing the efficiency of the service for the purpose of which the same was created and is maintained.

SEC. 14. The Administrator, in his discretion, may establish and continue a medical council composed of members of the medical and allied scientific profession whose duties shall be to advise the Administrator and the Surgeon General relative to the care and treatment of disabled ex-service men and women. The number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members of such council shall be in accord with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

SEC. 15. The expenses, except membership fees, of members of the Medical Corps detailed by the Surgeon General to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical science, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 16. The Administrator, in his discretion, may grant members of the Medical Corps leaves of absence for 30 days per annum, without deduction of pay. Such leave may accumulate annually for a period not in excess of 3 months. In addition to such annual leave, members of the Medical Corps may be allowed a period of 30 days per annum on account of illness.

SEC. 17. The Administrator, upon recommendation of the Surgeon General may employ medical and dental personnel in addition to commissioned or enlisted personnel of the Medical Corps, on a full-time, part-time, or fee basis at such rates of pay as he may prescribe.

SEC. 18. The Medical Corps shall be entitled to use the insignia of rank as provided by the Army and such insignia of service and use thereof as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenses deemed necessary and appropriate to carry out these and other provisions of this act. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to enter into agreements or contracts with the War Department for the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, equipment, and other supplies for the Medical Corps.

SEC. 19 (a) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "full military benefits" means all rights, privileges, immunities, and benefits provided under any law of the United States in the case of commissioned or enlisted military and naval personnel of the United States (including their surviving beneficiaries) on account of active military or naval service, including, but not limited to, burial payments in the event of death, 6 months' pay and allowances in case of death, veterans' compensation, and pensions and other veterans' benefits, retirement, including retirement for disability; the rights provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, as amended; the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended; travel allowances, including per diem allowances for travel without regard to repeated travel between two or more places in the same vicinity; allowances for uniforms, exemption of certain pay from Federal income taxation, and other benefits, privileges, and exemptions under the internal revenue laws;

(2) the term "limited military benefits" means full military benefits, except veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, and eligibility under the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

(b) Beginning with the date of establishment of the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps under this act, commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps, Regular and Reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries)—

(1) in time of war, shall be entitled to limited military benefits with respect to all active service in such Medical Corps;

(2) while such officers or enlisted men are detailed for duty with the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such duty;

(3) while such officers or enlisted men are serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in time of war, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such service.

(c) In time of war, the President may by Executive order declare the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps a part of the military forces of the United States and provide the extent to which it shall be subject to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Upon the issuance of such an Executive order, all commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps, Regular and Reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries) shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to active service rendered while the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps is a part of the military forces of the United States.

SEC. 20. Commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps, Regular and Reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries), shall be entitled to receive the same benefits for injury or death in the performance of their duties as civil officers and employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That any such officer or enlisted man or beneficiary of such officer or enlisted man eligible to receive any benefit authorized by this section who is also eligible to receive any payment or benefit (except the proceeds of any insurance policy) under any provision of law other than such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the same injury or death, shall elect which benefit he shall receive.

SEC. 21. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby modified accordingly.

Our Battles on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at National Association of Commercial Organization Secretaries Second War Conference, October 25, 1943, Pittsburgh, Pa., by Leonard E. Read, general manager, Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Calif.:

We take no positions at a N. A. C. O. S. conference, which is another way of saying that thus assembled we determine no policies. Rather we meet here to obtain new ideas for more useful and effective work in our several communities. We gather better to prepare ourselves for the year ahead.

A keynote address, therefore, would seem more appropriate were it to focus attention on the problems of the coming year than were it merely to preface the specific items of the conference program. Should this be an incorrect premise then accept it for what it actually is—a justification for some unorthodox keynoting.

The year ahead will command our attention in two broad respects: (1) Our part in successfully conducting the war and (2) our part in preparing for the post-war period.

VOLUNTARY RESOURCES UNTAPPED

There is little requirement for comment on our home-front war activities. We in the chamber of commerce field seem to be doing our utmost, which is to say we seem to be doing all we are permitted to do.

Chambers of commerce, like all other voluntary resources of the Nation, have anxiously and avidly sought to play an ever-increasing role in war helpfulness. A high degree of competence, local "know how," and organizing ability have supported the enlistment of our services. Yet officially, with some minor exceptions, the great voluntary resources of this Nation have not been used effectively in the war effort. At least these voluntary resources have not been given a place on the varsity.

Millions of citizens, in and out of chambers of commerce, have sought to do war tasks with no profit to themselves or cost to the Government. To serve, to get ourselves off the bench, to get on the playing team we have had to join Federal pay rolls, become part of the bureaucracy and tie ourselves up in its red tape.

COERCION OFFICIAL TREND

Our Government tends to belittle voluntary resources and, for that matter, most freedom procedures. It leans to the doctrines of regimentation, restrictionism, and coercion with itself as the master mind of all things economic and social. These attitudes are at loggerheads with the doctrines and practices of freedom. One needs no better sample evidence than the Federal distinctions between organizations where memberships are forced, even by government itself, and those where memberships are still a matter of choice.

Admitting the need for a greater degree of directed action during war, directed action even on the home front, it is not strange that our present excesses of it have had confusing, not to say chaotic, effects. Regimentation produces different results among a people accustomed to freedom than among those trained to the goose step.

Failure to employ the voluntary resources of the Nation to the utmost and the consequent insistence on doing everything possible by governmental organization has left unsolved a multitude of problems which we must face, problems which will challenge our capacities and our abilities.

FAILURES TO PLAGUE US

In the year ahead all of us are going to be confronted with the failures of an enormous, badly managed bureaucracy and these failures are going to be tossed in our laps with "now it's up to the local community." Some of these problems are going to be almost beyond solution because of the manner in which they have been manhandled and because of the extent to which government has preempted the avenues normal to voluntary processes. As an example, I cite the manpower problem and its application to a No. 1 labor shortage area. We are told that now the job is up to us, yet the field of action is so restricted by laws, rules, and decrees that little remains which we can do. We are placed in a strait jacket and are told to run a hundred yards in 10 flat.

But this battle on the home front, with all its difficulties, is minor compared to the battles on the war front. It is at once our opportunity and our duty to do the best we can, to do more than our share if that be possible, regardless of the esteem in which we are held officially and irrespective of the role it is our lot to play. Getting on with the war, getting the horrible mess over at the earliest possible moment and with the least cost in lives and resources must be our unfaltering objective.

ARE WE SO GOOD, OURSELVES?

But now to part two—our part in preparing for the post-war period. How are we doing, we who are supposed to represent the voluntary and free enterprise idea of society, in assuring that type of society for the post-war era? We who criticize bureaucracy and the Utopian plans of the collectivists—what are we doing to assure a better post-war America? Isn't it proper to ask, Are we so good ourselves? And by ourselves I mean not merely chamber secretaries but along with us our associates and members, business and professional people generally.

In assaying our steadfastness to the principles which we allegedly espouse we find, for instance, that some of us supported N. R. A., notwithstanding the fact that it was as antienterprise as any movement ever devised—fascism, pure and simple.

Some of us in certain sections of the Nation helped enact the so-called Fair Labor Standards Act as an antienterprise scheme to help stifle the industrial development of another section of our country.

OUR POLITICAL SINS ARE MANY

Some of us sanction and defend the use of political means to support antienterprise manipulations of the Federal Treasury on behalf of the silver-mining industry.

Some of us have put the products of agriculture on the dole. We call it parity, removal of surpluses, price stabilization, or crop insurance.

Many of us, including the organization I represent, have helped to put on the statute books the so-called fair-trade acts, or resale price maintenance laws, antienterprise devices for legalizing agreements to restrict price competition and maintain the merchant's mark-up.

Others of us lend assistance and even initiate prorate schemes, devices to control production, allocate markets and stabilize prices on a variety of products. Such schemes are antienterprise in their whole conception.

Probably in no instance do so many of us get off the free-enterprise beam as in the case of protective tariffs. There are honest and sound reasons for some tariffs based on national defense requirements, due to the low state of morality and economic integrity between nations. But to support tariffs in general on the grounds that they permanently increase purchasing power, employment, and prosperity is evidence that we need some lessons in first principles. Our group, so long as it insists on this scarcity device, and for scarcity reasons, can be assured that we never will or never should be effective in ridding our Nation of the scarcity devices of labor, agriculture, and government.

WE PLEASE KARL MARX

But to these few samples must be added another fault not exclusive to our organizations but so generally practiced by them that it deserves the name "Chamber of Commerce Socialism." It is the trick of running to the Federal grab-bag for the financing of local projects on the theory that if we don't get ours the other fellows will, and justified on the insupportable grounds that there is no other way to pay for local improvements. Karl Marx, could he rise from the dust of his communistic old bones and see the paths we have beaten to Washington for that inferior brand of fool's gold, deficit money, would shout that the world might hear:

"See! What did I tell you? Those Americans! Those capitalists! They have nothing but material interests. I said so in Das Kapital. I called it Economic Determinism. I know it. I knew it. And comes the revolution!"

Now we might for illustrative purposes sample some of our more prominent post-war thinking.

MORE WAR, MORE PROSPERITY

Many of the leaders among us assure America that everything is going to be all right because we shall have, at the end of this war, some $125,000,000,000 in pent-up purchasing power. They refer, of course, to that something for which the English language has no name but which results from monetizing deficits. Should the war last twice as long as estimated we would then have $250,000,000,000 in pent-up purchasing power. The longer the war lasts the more prosperous we shall be.

Another idea of ours is, if we plan courageously enough, think of all the things, products, commodities, and gadgets we can make, estimate the employment that each will take in its making, and if the labor thus aggregated equals our total employables, we shall have full employment. As though thinking of a product or even making it were a prime factor in determining its marketability. Producers who act as if they had large orders on hand when they have only small orders, or no orders, will soon go broke no matter how noble their motives and no matter how many of them join in such follies.

FAIRY-TALE MARKET RESEARCH

Still a third contribution by us to our post-war salvation is a research job, done Gallup style, in which we ask people what they want for the post-war Christmas. Is it a brand-new automobile, an electric stove, a new ice box, or could it be a new home? Well, anyway, when the research and the arithmetic incident to it are done it shows what the American people now think they may want when the shooting is over. This list of heart's desires is then made available to all who fabricate that they may be aided in blueprinting the coming days of peace and prosperity. (The suggestion is offered that a more imposing list could be had from China, where there are more people who have fewer things. If desire is an important condition to actually possessing things, then why isn't a list from

China even more useful than one made up here?)[1]

One more profundity of ours is "if business doesn't provide full employment, Government will." These are words put in our mouths by the collectivists. Responsibility for employment rests where authority resides. Management, today, has little authority over conditions controlling employment. Such authority is more with labor groups and with Government than with business. What we ought to say is "if we can't rid ourselves of bureaucracy and restrictionism so that we may employ ourselves and others as free men, then by deficit processes we will try to employ ourselves through Government, the most inefficient way we have of organizing ourselves economically."

NEW ATTITUDE IN ORDER

This self-castigation, these criticisms which have been so generously ventured, are made not to disparage the voluntary remnant—those on our side of the freedom fence—but rather to suggest that we have no monopoly on economic virtue; that our thinking is too casual and frothy, with little relation to the real issues; that very often we are as anti-enterprise as those we condemn; and that a new attitude on our part is in order. It is certainly in order if we are to offer any worthwhile and workable solutions to the post-war problems.

Before we examine these suggested new attitudes and approaches it is well to brief the problem we want to solve. The first question is, What kind of society or, more precisely, what conditions do we want to prevail in the post-war era?

There are many elaborate ways of answering this question, but here is a simple and perhaps an adequate one: When my two boys return from the war I don't want them to come to me and say, "Dad, with what Government bureau should we seek a job?" Nor do I want new opportunity so restricted that they will be forced to ask, "With what existing employer shall we try for employment?" I want conditions in these United States to be such that they will want to ask, "In what line of endeavor do you believe we should set up for ourselves?"

Full employment could easily be a meaningless accomplishment. Many slave states attain it. Full employment, if it is to be the productive kind we want, is a product of something more basic. It is at this something more basic that we should aim. This something more basic is job makers. We must have several hundred thousand new job makers each year.

JOB MAKERS OUR WORRY

Give us enough job makers and full employment will follow as a matter of course. Under a sound economic society job makers will spring from all ranks—labor, jobless war workers, returning soldiers. Such results are possible only under one form of economic society, free competitive enterprise. Free competitive enterprise is possible, even for America, only after a drastic remodeling of our whole political and economic structure. This remodeling is possible only if enough of us understand what free competitive enterprise is. That understanding is not sufficient today.

OUR OPPORTUNITY, OUR DUTY

These postulates, and few, if any, in this group will contend that they are not self-evident truths, make clear our opportunity, our duty, and our program: It is to develop an understanding and skilled advocacy of free competitive enterprise.

The job is not easy. It is difficult almost beyond description, for so very many from our own group, while paying lip service to free competitive enterprise, want none of it when, for the first time in their business lives, they find out what it actually is. That the job can be done has been evidenced by the performance of the Manchester, England, Chamber of Commerce.

The performance is buried in a century of history and is not well known. But England, following 20 years of the Napoleonic wars, was in a distressing economic condition, a condition assured to us when we finish this war:

She had been fighting Napoleon in Europe, Asia, and Africa, besides financing the war efforts of her European allies.

Her national debt, in proportion to her population and income, was equivalent to the staggering load which we are piling on our own shoulders.

Industry, trade, and agriculture were burdened by an annual tax load estimated at half the national income.

Her currency was depreciated and her budget badly unbalanced.

Unemployment was widespread and she had a larger proportion of her people on relief than ever before or since.

Enterprisers and job makers were handicapped by a top-heavy bureaucracy and by attempts of government to provide security in place of opportunity.

PRODUCTIVE ENERGY RELEASED

The businessmen of Manchester under the leadership of two economic thinkers, Cobden and Bright, and operating through the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, were the initiators of a freedom movement. The leaders in this movement developed an understanding of free competitive enterprise. They became skilled advocates of it. They perfected their arguments. They gained convictions too informed and well-founded for adversaries successfully to combat. Members of Parliament gave ear to their suggestions. Restrictionism was destroyed. Regimentation was dissolved. Laws hindering production and trade were repealed. The human energy abounding in millions of individuals was released. Within a few years England entered the most prosperous era of her long history.

No Manchester Chamber of Commerce can do this service for America. Our country is much larger, our economy is more complex, and our troubles more difficult to diagnose than was the case in England a century ago. But all of us working together, inspiring the leadership of all ranks with the sincerity and worthiness of our purpose, could turn the tide of statism into the productive currents of freedom. If the techniques we have learned be sound, if we have the organizing ability we claim, if we be as ingenious as reputed and if we have the ability effectively to meet changing situations and problems, we will accept this challenge and win this battle on the home front. This is the greatest single opportunity presented in American chamber of commerce history.

LET'S OUTDO EACH OTHER

A program of this character is to be sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It will be announced shortly. The national chamber can serve as the stimulator and as the clearing house for ideas, but the real genius will have to be supplied by our local organizations. I could have nothing more important to suggest to this second war conference than the idea that we try to outdo each other in the performance of this service for our country, for our armed forces, and for millions of temporary war workers!

And let us not be discouraged by the defeatists who say that free enterprise no longer is a possibility, that a great social revolution is sweeping the world. There is a movement unmistakable in its scope and in its meaning but it does not deserve the term social revolution. More accurately it should be called a social scourge. At least it is a social scourge to the extent that it represents attempts to profit at the expense of others—to get something for nothing. These attempts seems to be the essence of the so-called social revolution. The term "social revolution" ought to be reserved for the movement, the movement here advocated, aimed at the overthrow of this scourge.

A CONTEST IN LEADERSHIP

I have one more point. It is that we look to the improvement of ourselves and our own ideas and that we quit worrying so much about how little other people know. The job we should do on ourselves is perhaps bigger than we are capable of accomplishing. Let's not be like the fly described by Matthew Prior, the fly who sat perched on a chariot wheel, declaring to the world:

> "Did ever any mortal fly
> Raise such a cloud of dust as I."

The contest in America today, the contest between freedom and coercion, is a contest between leaders, leaders being men of ingenuity and energy. There are many thousands of leaders on either side. Their weapons are ideas. The fellows on the other side have developed their jargon rather well. On our side we don't explain, we sputter. Isn't it clear, then, that our principal task is the perfection of ourselves, of our own ideas? And that our enemies are never people or political parties but bad ideas? And that we should cherish good ideas? And that we should train ourselves to distinguish between the two?

WHAT IS FIRST, WHAT IS LAST?

This conference was keynoted, in a manner agreeable to this keynoter, 25 centuries ago. It was done by Confucius, who observed that perfection in things depends largely in knowing what is first and what is last. In expanding the thought he had this to say:

"The ancients who wished to illustrate virtue throughout the kingdom first governed well their state.

Wishing to govern well their state they first regulated their families.

Wishing to regulate their families they first cultivated their personalities.

Wishing to cultivate their personalities they first rectified their minds.

Wishing to rectify their minds they first sought to be sincere in their thoughts.

Wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, they first extended to the utmost their knowledge.

The extension of knowledge is by the investigation of things.

Things being investigated, knowledge became complete.

Their knowledge being complete, their thoughts were sincere.

Their thoughts being sincere, their hearts were then rectified.

Their hearts being rectified, their personalities were cultivated.

Their personalities being cultivated, their families were regulated.

Their families being regulated, their states were rightly governed.

The states being rightly governed, the whole kingdom was made tranquil and happy."

[1] Purchasing power as well as desire is necessary. People have purchasing power where they produce it. They produce it where they start a productive enterprise or work for a successful enterpriser.

The Utilities' Swollen Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Utilities' Swollen Profits." The article was published in the October 4, 1943, issue of the New Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UTILITIES SWOLLEN PROFITS

Utility companies of the United States are accumulating excess profits of such magnitude that a major financial scandal is probable unless speedy solution shall be made of the problem presented by such unprecedented accumulation.

Unchecked and unregulated possession of these excessive and illegal profits is general and is against the public interest. A few Government agencies, the Federal Power Commission, the Security and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and two or three State public-service commissions have made efforts to investigate these huge profits and to turn back to consumers the overcharges, but, in the main, the abuse has not been attacked by the agencies to which proper regulation has been intrusted. Instead of regulation, a movement to postpone investigation until after the war emergency is under way.

Virtually all utilities share in this enormous increase of excess earnings. The Edison Electric Institute and the American Gas Association, reporting jointly for 173 utility subsidiaries of registered holding companies with combined assets of approximately $10,000,000,000, show how sudden excess wealth has come to these two groups. Commonwealth & Southern, for example, the utility formerly headed by Wendell Willkie, shows a net income for the first 6 months of 1943, amounting to $7,331,000 after paying all operating charges—its best showing in 10 years. Consolidated Edison of New York, the utility Colossus whose bond issues overtop those of any other electric utility, shows a net income for the second quarter of 1943 amounting to $5,869,000, an increase over the record-breaking net income for the corresponding 3 months of last year of approximately 25 percent.

But this is only a small part of the amazing story of the excess profits that are being stored and held by the utilities. Under the guise of depreciation reserves, which means money set aside to replace outworn and obsolete equipment, utility companies had increased by 51 percent their holdings of idle funds at the end of 1941, as compared with these same reserves at the end of 1936. The increase in the 5-year period amounted to $395,000,000. This showing included 85 percent of all natural-gas and electric utilities.

It is estimated that for 1943 electric-light and power companies alone will store in depreciation reserves more than $310,000,000, against which an estimated $275,000,000 will be charged for new construction and replacements.

Bonanza days have come to the railroads and to transportation utilities generally in common with the widespread gold rush. The 1942 report by the Interstate Commerce Commission, just issued shows that operating revenues for last year were virtually double those of 1941. The totals are $514,607,131 for 1941, as against $1,028,185,625 for 1942. After deducting operating expenses, the net income in 1942 was $958,860,655, against $501,393,076 in 1941. Both gross and net income have risen sharply in 1943.

When President Roosevelt opened his battle against inflation by creating the Office of Price Administration he gave to that agency the power to control prices of everything entering into the cost of living, with one exception. That exception was the cost of services rendered by public utilities.

The reason for the exception, he explained, was that regulatory commissions, both Federal and State, were experienced in the regulation of the income, rates, and services of these utility companies and that he was entrusting them with the duty of keeping prices of these services and the income flowing from these prices below a level above which inflation would begin. In other words, he tied the costs of public services to his broad noninflation policy, but instead of giving the O. P. A. the power and the duty of placing ceilings over these rates, he passed this control to the utility commissions.

That trust is about to be betrayed. Most of the public utilities, as I have shown, particularly those selling to the public electric light and power, telephony, transportation, and natural gas, are making profits far in excess of normal, reasonable, and legal earnings. Instead of supervision and other regulatory action which is within their duty, a policy is being promoted by most regulatory agencies which will give to all utility companies the green light to keep on accumulating excess earnings without check or investigation during the war emergency and for an indefinite period thereafter.

The farmer must sell his crops below ceiling prices, merchants must sometimes sell food and commodities at prices that bring them close to bankruptcy, labor must work for fixed wages, and manufacturers must operate within sharply supervised and limited earnings, but the monopolies to which Federal and State governments have given extraordinary powers and have guaranteed reasonable legal profits, are to be allowed enormously increased profits with ceilings unlimited.

This amazing condition has found expression in a statement of policy adopted June 7, 1943, by the Pennsylvania Utility Commission by a vote of 3 to 1, Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan, the only remaining Democratic member, dissenting. The formal order putting this policy into effect follows:

It is imperative that public utilities maintain a strong financial position throughout the war emergency, to the end that they may render prompt and uninterrupted service during said emergency and that they may enter the post-war period prepared to promptly take up the matter of deferred maintenance and the rehabilitation of their properties.

The Commission deems it inadvisable to institute formal investigations into the reasonableness of existing rates which appear to be producing increased earnings as the result of an artificial economic situation created by war conditions.

The Commission invites the cooperation of all public utilities in refraining from the payment of dividends or owners' salaries materially higher than similar payments in peacetime, to the end that cash may be conserved to adequately meet post-war conditions; but that without such cooperation the only alternative left to the Commission is to institute an investigation into the rates, depreciation, and maintenance practices and other relative affairs of any public utility showing abnormal earnings.

Every Federal and State commission charged with the duty of regulating public utilities has been pondering this problem of sharply increasing utility revenue ever since the war emergency arose. In two national conventions of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissions, which include Federal and State commissioners, the problem was discussed and debated at length. Nothing was decided. A number of policies were proposed, but only tentatively. It remained for the Pennsylvania Utility Commission to come forward with a policy which is wholly satisfactory to every utility in the country; no investigation of excess earnings. No ceilings on utility profits. Trust the utilities to do the fair thing after the war emergency has passed; one rigid set of regulations for agriculture, labor, commerce, and industry; another trustful, elastic tender code for public utilities.

The combined forces of public-utility lobbyists and pro-utility State commissions completely dominated the annual convention of Federal and State utility commissioners which opened in Chicago, September 14. No convention in the long history of the association has ever placed upon its official record such complete subservience to the demand of the utilities. Here are some of the formal actions of the convention:

1. It directed the general counsel of the association to present to Congress a bill which would remove from the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over rates and services of public utilities doing interstate business in all cases except those involving wholesale rates. This bill would have made impossible such investigations as those which exposed the villainies of the Hopson holding-company system and other combinations preying on the public. It is intended by this bill to curb investigations already under way by the Federal Power Commission.

2. The convention rejected by a viva voce vote the report of the committee on progress in utility regulation. This report, which was presented by Commissioner Leon Jourolman, of Tennessee, attacked specifically certain bad practices by holding companies and their subsidiaries. In the viva voce voting, utility lobbyists participated in at least as great a number as commissioners.

3. Lobbyists were given the floor during the discussions and one of them made a bitter attack on all Federal commissions except the Interstate Commerce Commission.

4. A line-up of the proutility forces was headed by Massachusetts, with Maine, Virginia, Arkansas, and Georgia among the most vocal in the argument. Pennsylvania showed a divided delegation by a vote of 4 to 1. California's sole representative, Kramer, voted with the reactionaries, although the California commissioners by a majority vote favored continuing the present powers of the Federal Power Commission. New Jersey's delegation, following the lead of Governor Edison, was against the reactionary trend. The southern commissions generally followed Virginia in opposing the policies of the F. P. C.

The general effect of the convention was a cancelation of real utility regulation as it has been conducted by Federal commissions and by progressive State commissions. The issues developed in the convention will undoubtedly be projected into next year's Presidential campaign, both in the political conventions and thereafter. It will be substantially the same issue raised by Theodore Roosevelt in the Republican Convention of 1912 when the trusts combined with Taft, Penrose, Barnes, et al., to hand over the economic policy of the Nation to the oligarchs.

In the meantime, Federal commissions and some State commissions are cutting into excess earnings of some big utilities through formal or informal investigations and orders. The Federal Power Commission, in the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline case and the Hope Natural Gas case, set up a rule that the return to a wholesale natural-gas company under present conditions should not exceed 6½ percent per annum. Proceeding on that basis, the Federal Power Commission in four major rate cases forced in 1942 substantial rate reductions by the Lone Star Gas Co., the El Paso Natural Gas Co., the Northern Natural Gas Co. and the United Gas Pipeline Co. It also scored a complete victory by the affirmation by the United States Supreme Court of its rate reduction in the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America case.

Concerning the amazing increase of excess profits by telephone companies, the issue is pointed up by the recent order of the Federal Communications Commission directing the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. to make a cut of $54,000,000 in its annual revenue. Of this amount $34,000,000 is to go to reduction of rates on long-distance interstate calls and $20,000,000 will go to the Bell companies of various States on intrastate service.

Engineers and accountants of the Pennsylvania Commission have calculated that Pennsylvania's share of this intrastate cut of $20,000,000 will be approximately $1,490,000 nearly all of which would go to Pennsylvania telephone users in the form of reduced rates. The A. T. and T. had agreed to the reduction and the Bell Co. of Pennsylvania, after conference with commisison technicians, was ready for the reduction, when the majority of the commission brought all proceedings to an abrupt halt.

The reduction, said the majority, will be contrary to our newly declared policy. It is true that the Federal Communications Commission found a great volume of excess earnings and the A. T. and T. agreed to the cut, but our policy covers all utilities. No reduction will be made in intrastate telephone rates. Commissioner Buchanan again dissented.

The general adoption of the Pennsylvania policy would result in the accumulation of huge cash reserves for deferred maintenance and other ostensible objectives. Claims that such reserves would not be subject to normal income and excess-profit taxes are already heard. Inasmuch as these taxes would take 85 percent of the total, segregation of the sum in a tax-free reserve would mean tax-dodging by legal subterfuge on a grand scale. Hopson, Annenburg and Al Capone went to the penitentiary because their lawyers figured a little too far over the foul line. With favorable commission policies, the utilities hope to beat the rap in their tax cases. That the proposed policy would be injurious to consumers generally and to residential consumers particularly is shown by an analysis of its language.

Proper procedure toward excess earnings would appear to be to consider each case separately upon its merits. The Federal Communications Commission did exactly that when it considered and adjudicated the enormous excess of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Interstate Commerce Commission proceeded similarly against swollen earnings of the railroads. In that connection, Chairman Walter McDonald of the Georgia Commission recently advocated that excess earnings of the railroads be frozen and devoted to payment of their outstanding debts. This suggestion was immediately opposed by Commissioners Sachse of California, Jourolman of Tennessee, and the writer, who was then a Pennsylvania commissioner.

The possible solution of the problem is increase of depreciation reserves to meet needs caused by excessive use and wartime speeds. The whole question of utility depreciation practices received extraordinary attention at the Chicago convention, when the committee on depreciation of utility property presented its long-awaited formal report. The committee, whose chairman is Nelson Lee Smith, former chairman of the New Hampshire Public Service Commission and recently appointed member of the Federal Power Commission, is composed of engineers and accountants from Federal and State commissions and a number of technicians representing public utilities.

Methods of computing depreciation have caused conflicting decisions in the courts for more than 30 years. There is hope that standards set at Chicago will bring some order out of the existing chaos.

One remedy which will give relief to consumers and will provide an equitable anti-inflation solution of the problem remains in the hands of President Roosevelt. He should remove from the State utility commissions the power to deal with excess earnings of public utilities and should give to the Office of Price Administration the duty of setting ceilings over the income of utilities in the same manner that ceilings are set for agriculture, labor, and industry generally.

RICHARD J. BEAMISH.

The League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, day by day we come to a realization that the world will make a serious mistake if it overlooks the start that has already been made toward a League of Nations.

The Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in the Journal of the American Bar Association for November 1943, has set forth in magnificent language his thoughts on the kind of organization this world must have to enforce peace.

While I do not desire to reprint in full the excellent article, I do believe that that portion of his address which deals most directly with the League of Nations should be called to the attention of this Congress. Therefore, under permission granted me, I insert some of the sections of his statement and urge anyone interested in the subject to turn to the American Bar Association Journal for November and read pages 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, and 622.

Following are a few of Judge Parker's comments on the League of Nations:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

In any thinking about world organization, we must take account of what the League of Nations accomplished. As a matter of fact, it did a very great deal toward unifying world life. It brought together 63 of the 72 nations to discuss in a common forum problems affecting international life. It resulted in fruitful cooperative effort in the solution of many vexing problems of international significance, such as international labor problems, international health problems, problems arising out of the traffic in narcotic drugs, etc. It provided sound government for areas subjected to international control. It brought into being the Permanent Court of International Justice for the settlement of international disputes upon a juridical basis. It unquestionably averted wars in a number of instances. And it could undoubtedly have accomplished a great deal more along this line if the United States had been a member. The League was born of the idealism of this country, and was incorporated in the treaty of Versailles by reason of the insistence of our President. We were the richest and most powerful nation in the world and no one can say what would have been the course of the League's development or what it might have accomplished in world affairs if American statesmen had sat in its councils and helped direct its efforts in the stormy years following the last war. Not only were League efforts crippled by reason of the impossibility of securing unanimous action of nations in the absence of the United States, but this absence resulted in the loss of leadership of the country that naturally should and in all probability would have been the leader of League action.

The fact that the League failed, under such circumstances, to preserve the peace in this world crisis is no reason why the idea of world organization for collective security should be abandoned. The League's usefulness has been demonstrated and its weaknesses have been pointed out by experience, and we are now in position to build a better organization on the basis of the knowledge thereby acquired. We have learned much from our experience with the League just as our fathers learned much from their attempts to form a confederated government in the early history of this country. Our first attempt to form a government in America, the Confederation, was a failure. Our first efforts under the Constitution itself resulted in the Civil War, the greatest war that had ever been fought in the world up to that time. Not until we had organized the life of the country in a central government with adequate powers was our confederacy of States anymore than a rope of sand, and not until we had further strengthened it by the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, was it capable of functioning with assurance and success.

We should remember that the League was formulated by some of the best minds who have ever given thought to international affairs. It brought together in its organization, at one time or another, all of the leading nations of the world except ourselves. Britain and Russia, the two great nations with which we must deal in the future in forming any sort of world organization, were enthusiastic in its support and conceivably would be willing to cooperate along similar lines. It has accumulated a vast fund of experience and has perfected organizations of great value for dealing with international questions. To me it seems wiser to proceed along the general lines of the League structure, strengthening it where it is weak, adding such powers as experience has demonstrated to be necessary, and making such changes in its organization as seem to be wise, rather than to attempt some entirely new and different plan of organization.

The League was a mere asscciation of sovereign states for the purpose of preserving peace among nations. Its value consisted in the agreement among its members to refrain from warfare as an instrument of national policy, to submit to arbitration or judicial settlement matters of dispute which might arise,

to consider in council and to advise with regard to matters which might threaten international peace, and to assist in the defense of a member unjustly attacked. It was given no power, however, to legislate with respect to international affairs and had no independent force of its own which it might use for the preservation of peace between nations. It consisted of a council and an assembly in which the members sat more as ambassadors than as members of an independent organization, and which could not act, even in an advisory capacity, except by unanimous vote. It created a Permanent Court of International Justice, but the jurisdiction of that court depended upon the consent of parties and the League was given no adequate power to enforce its decrees.

The weaknesses of the League, which experience demonstrated, were: (1) It was given no power to legislate with respect to the international phase of world life and thus give organization and stability to international relationships; (2) it was given no power to use organized force for the enforcement of international law or the preservation of world peace, but could only advise action by member nations; (3) no adequate provision was made for the compulsory adjudication of international disputes or for enforcement of the decrees of the court which it established; (4) unanimous action was required both of its council and assembly; and (5) members of the council and assembly were under no obligation with respect to the League, but only with respect to the countries that they represented, and voted by countries. In any world organization to be hereafter set up, these weaknesses must be overcome.

The association of nations and the obligations assumed under the old covenant must be retained, but to these must be added powers which will enable the league to function adequately in the regulation of international life and to restrain breaches of the public peace. This means that to the League must be given certain governmental powers in international matters. These powers should, of course, be strictly defined and limited, as they would constitute limitations upon the sovereignty of member nations and failure to define and limit them strictly would be a fruitful source of future strife and conflict. It is a mistake, however, to regard the granting of such powers as in any sense a detriment to or a weakening of the nations granting them. New York enjoys a richer and fuller life as a member of the American Union than she would ever be able to attain as an independent sovereignty; and the same result would follow in the case of nations becoming members of an international organization and giving to such organization powers with respect to the international phases of world life. It is a source of weakness and not of strength for nations to be charged with responsibility with respect to matters beyond their jurisdiction and control.

SOVEREIGNTY AND LIMITATION OF POWER

There has been much nonsense talked about sovereignty. "Sovereignty," says Chief Justice Jay in *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* (2 Dallas 419, 472), "is the right to govern." This right is not arbitrary, but arises out of the nature of the relationship to which it is applied. In our American Union the people of the several States possess sovereign power with respect to local affairs, the people of the entire Union with respect to national affairs. The international community, on the same principle, should exercise sovereign power with respect to international affairs. If a matter concerns me and nobody else, I am the one to decide what to do about it. If it concerns the people of North Carolina and nobody else, the people of North Carolina should decide. If it concerns the people of the United States and nobody else, they should decide. If, however, it concerns the international society of the world, that society, properly organized, should make the decision. In exercising sovereign power in matters of national concern, the Federal Government does not encroach upon any powers which the State of North Carolina ought in the nature of things to exercise; and in exercising sovereign power in matters of international concern an international organization would not encroach upon powers which any nation should exercise. A whole should be governed by laws relating to the whole and not by laws relating to a particular part, and only by government having relation to the welfare of the whole can conflict be avoided between conflicting interests of the parts.

As stated above, the powers of any sort of world government which is to be set up must be strictly defined and limited. To give general jurisdiction to legislate with respect to any matter that may threaten international conflict would constitute such an invasion of national sovereignty that no considerable number of nations, I think, would agree to it. Certainly this Nation would not; and it is well to remember that fear that something like this might be involved was an important factor in our refusal to join the old League of Nations. On the other hand, it is essential that power be vested somewhere to control the international phases of world life. Attempts by the several nations individually to control international relations can only result in strife and conflict; and attempts to regulate them by common consent will invariably break down when there is deep-seated disagreement or where national selfishness or ambition come into play.

What are the powers that an international government should have? Without attempting to enumerate them with exactitude, they may be stated generally to be the powers necessary to regulate the international phases of world life—i. e., the power to prescribe general laws regulating international trade, travel, and communication, the power to protect the freedom of the seas and of the air for these purposes, the power to make rules of international law, the power to preserve the peace between nations by the exercise of its own force where necessary, the power to render and enforce binding judgments in international disputes, and powers of this general character. These powers should be definitely and unequivocally stated; and it should be made clear that no power is granted to interfere with the exercise of national sovereignty in other particulars. With respect to the control of international trade and communication, for instance, it should be made clear that the powers granted the international government do not infringe upon the power of nations to regulate their internal affairs by the imposition of tariffs or by restriction of immigration.

For the protection of the powers vested in the international government, definite limitations should be placed on the exercise of national sovereignty. The right to make war except in self-defense should be forbidden to the member nations, certain kinds of treaties and alliances should be forbidden, provision should be made for limitation of armaments capable of being used for offensive warfare, and limitations should be placed upon the right of nations to restrict the use of the air or the seas for travel or communication or to restrict the use of ports or navigable waters.

There has been a widespread notion in this country recently that an international government should be charged with responsibility for guaranteeing freedom and democracy to men everywhere, and some have gone beyond this and have advocated something like a planned economy for the entire world. This, of course, is a dream that can do nothing but hinder our efforts towards world organization. Russia would never be willing to accept our ideas of democracic government for regulation of her internal affairs, and it is certain that we would not accept her system here. The efforts at planned economy have nowhere met with such success as to justify an attempt to apply it on a world scale. We must leave to the nations the regulation of their internal institutions and internal economy, not only because they will be better satisfied with their own institutions than with those provided for them by others, but also because no world organization that could by any possibility be evolved could successfully prescribe local government for widely scattered peoples with widely differing ideas and ideals. There is no more important element in the concept of democracy than the principle of local self-government.

Provision should be made, however, for setting up commissions to make studies and recomendations as to matters which are important to the development of world life but which are left entirely within the sphere of national control. The most important and fruitful activities of the League of Nations have been in this field, and efforts of this character might well be extended. Studies and recommendations with respect to labor questions, currency stabilization and exchange, agricultural development, production, and distribution of food and raw materials, public health and control of disease, regulation of the traffic in narcotic drugs, etc.—these would be of great value to the progress of mankind. I do not mean that the international organization be given power to legislate with respect to anything except the international phases of such matters, but commissions should be set up to make studies and recommendations with regard thereto on a broader basis to further international agreements and legislation by the member countries.

Among the subjects which should be studied by an international commission is the formulation of an international bill of rights, a declaration of certain fundamental rights of the individual which all nations admitted to membership in the world organization should observe in dealing with their peoples. All men need justice and all men need freedom to express personality and to worship God; and no nation which denies these fundamental rights to its people is entitled to be a member of a community of civilized nations. It is probably not practicable to secure universal adoption of the principles embodied in the American bill of rights; but it is not too much to hope that we may eventually secure an agreement among nations not to deny their peoples freedom of religion, freedom of speech, or the equal protection of the laws. This would solve in large measure the troublesome question of dealing with minorities. If every citizen is given equal justice under law, governmental oppression of minorities cannot arise.

IS THE PROPOSAL PRACTICABLE?

The test of any plan for preserving the peace of the world is, not merely whether it is desirable, but whether it will work. The question arises, therefore, whether it is practicable to give a world organization of nations the limited power to deal with international matters that I suggest. I believe that it is. I see no reason why a legislative body could not be set up composed of representatives of the constituent nations, to which could be given real power of legislation with respect to matters within the League's jurisdiction, such matters as raising and equipping an adequate armed force, prescribing general rules governing international

trade, travel and communication, prescribing and modifying the rules of international law, or defining crimes against the laws of nations and providing for their adequate punishment. I see no reason why an executive council could not be vested with power to see that the laws of the international organization are enforced and obligations assumed by member nations are observed, or why it could not be provided with a military force subject to its control adequate to enforce the law and guarantee international peace. And I see no reason why the Permanent Court of International Justice should not be given compulsory jurisdiction of international disputes of a legal nature and some form of compulsory arbitration be provided for the settlement of other international disputes. The exact form of the international organization or the precise powers to be given it are not important. The matter of importance is to set up some form of world structure which can bring to bear the force of organized society in support of government by law.

A Voice From the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Voice From the Country," by Louis Bromfield. The article was published in the Washington Evening Star of November 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY

(By Louis Bromfield)

I have a friend called Bill who has a picturesque gift of speech. A few days ago we were sitting in a Columbus, Ohio, hotel and Bill began to talk. He's a Democrat and used to be a new dealer. He's a big fellow with a big heart and he liked what we were told the New Deal was going to do for the common man. A couple of years ago he began to have doubts, and last year the doubts turned into a kind of fury. He was talking about it the other night. This is what he said. I dislike quotes so I'll leave them out. The rest of the column is Bill's.

Bill said: After 10 years it's pretty clear that there never was any integrated New Deal program but only a number of high-fallutin' phrases like "the New Deal" and "the common man" and "the Four Freedoms." The rest has been compromise, patchwork, political maneuvering, and day-by-day improvisation. As each improvisation comes to a futile end the failure is covered by a lot of ballyhoo, drum beating, and trumpet blowing. A lot of new performers are got in, and the sideshow begins all over again with another improvisation. Nowadays when the drum beating and trumpet blowing announcing a new sideshow begins the American citizen is likely to say to himself, "That's where I came in."

Nothing illustrates this technique better than the present situation between the administration and the mine workers. Balloons have gone up, fireworks gone off, and drums been beaten, but we are still just about where we came in. There have been belly dances, snake charming, and sword swallowing by Mr. Ickes, by the War Labor Board, and by "Secretary" Perkins. Meanwhile we're getting short of coal and the country is getting sick of the whole thing.

GAVE $500,000

It all began a long time ago when the President was accusing big businessmen of everything on earth. John L. Lewis came along and contributed $500,000 of the mine workers' hard-earned money to elect the President. I think everyone will agree that you don't kick in $500,000 without expecting to get something in return. Even the administration, in accepting the $500,000, could not be expected to believe that all that hay was simply for feeding carriage horses. When John L. Lewis and his mine workers discovered they weren't getting anything for their investment the fight began.

In the meanwhile, the political picture changed. It is years later somewhere in Washington. The President has long since forgotten that he ever knew John L. Lewis, or wishes he could forget it. The new characters on the stage are the big businessmen. They are everywhere in the Government. The Big Boss is calling them in—even the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce—to act as his "advisers."

To be sure, they probably won't replace Harry Hopkins, or Felix Frankfurter and Sam Rosenman and Ben Cohen, but there they are. And as for the coal situation, as it is called, it's still threateningly with us. Along the way are a series of weathered, dilapidated side shows—the Department of Labor, Mr. Ickes' special fire-eating act, mine seizure by the Government, a couple of War Labor Boards, and all kinds of committees. The trumpets are about to blow again, but there's not much of a crowd waiting outside. They've seen all the ducking, dodging, juggling acts before and can guess how it all ends up.

FARMERS AREN'T FOOLED

Not very far away from the mine workers greatest side show on earth is another labeled "biggest food show on earth." And outside that tent there isn't anybody at all. Recently the Big Boss sent out emissaries headed by the assistant boss himself, to drum up trade among the "hick" farmers who used to be the best customers. But the emissaries didn't get very far. They couldn't find any farmer who hadn't seen the juggling act before, many times. The farmer knew what the inside of the tent looked like—a lot of bureaucrats all throwing plates in the air and all trying to grab each other's plates.

Trade is falling off in the labor tent, too. The public used to rush in to see the greatest show on earth. Now they're just standing listlessly in the doorway waiting to see whether the proprietor can pull a new act out of the hat. Off in the corner are huddled a lot of railroad workers muttering among themselves because they found the act wasn't as advertised, and from a distance a bunch of coal miners are appeased, but still muttering.

In front of the shell-game pitch there's nobody at all.

The show has been all the way round the circle and now they're beating the bass drum to get in the big business trade. It seems the proprietor and his advisers are thinking of going into the main top, big show business with a lot of new international acts, but some people say he's going to find a lot of hot English and Russian competition and that he won't be able to raise the capital until he's paid off some of the past indebtedness.

Although business isn't so good, the cashier and a couple of "secretaries" are still hanging around. They haven't got much to do, but they liked being called "secretary" rather than just "stenographer."

Well, that's how Bill had it sized up, but maybe he's wrong. He did remark that when a couple of shrewd fellows called Farley and Howe were around business was a lot better.

Price of Crude Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence relating to the oil industry:

OCTOBER 30, 1943.

The Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: Your inquiry for my reaction to the price of oil touches on one of the most momentous problems currently facing not only the petroleum industry but the entire Nation. I firmly believe that the price is being held at a lower level than is justified by existing facts. Maintenance of the present ceiling is doing irreparable damage to most, if not all, oil producers, and, in my studied opinion, maintenance of this price much longer will have an adverse effect on the economy of the entire Nation and may seriously handicap the progress of the war.

The oil industry has been recently attacked by some of the governmental agencies for asking that the crude-oil price ceiling be raised at a time when many of the companies are earning larger profits than they made in the recent past. These profits are, however, liquidation payments of companies that are selling resources acquired at good advantage in the past at prices that do not now permit their replacement because of increased finding costs. From the very nature of the business oil-producing companies acquire reserves many years in advance of their exhaustion and the cost of acquisition of the reserves is charged off over the years as the reserves are produced. Oil producers regularly spend a sizable portion of their income to build up reserves for future production. In the case of our own company, during the last 12 years about 26 percent of the total cost of operating our producing branch has been spent in developing reserves for future production. Until the last 4 or 5 years we have been reasonably successful in finding new reserves at a cost low enough to allow us to operate profitably on crude oil price levels as they existed in the past. Since 1939 costs have increased markedly, and, in common with practically all other producing companies in the country, our efforts and expenditures have not discovered nearly so much new oil. This results in a much higher cost per barrel for recent additions to reserves. Since most of our oil is produced from reserves discovered a number of years ago, the finding cost currently charged against production is historical and is no indication of a fair cost to maintain our organization as a going concern. We are thus in the position of a shopkeeper who because of a favorable purchase of stock sometime

earlier, sells his goods at a mark-up above cost to him but at a price below the cost of replacement of stock. Obviously, the shopkeeper can show a profit until the stock is gone, then he goes out of business.

Integrated oil companies are, of course, materially affected by the economics of the situation, but financially they are, in most instances, better able to withstand the maladjustment than are the small producers. Many of these producers have been highly successful in discovering new oil fields. Generally they develop these rapidly since they do not have sufficient capital to justify keeping too much of it in reserves to be utilized in the future. There is a growing tendency on the part of such producers to sell out their holdings to integrated companies and devote their energies to other lines of endeavor, since chances of profit on finding new oil fields are not favorable under existing high cost of exploration and relatively low ceiling prices for the product if found.

With regard to the implications of the crude-oil price ceiling in the economy of the Nation in its war effort, the importance of petroleum needs no elaboration. The entire oil industry and the Government, especially the Petroleum Administration for War, have recently worked together and performed an amazing feat of engineering in successfully providing substitute transportation facilities from our major oil fields in the midcontinent and Gulf coast areas to the Atlantic seaboard refinery centers. The oil transportation crisis has been met. Production of crude oil is currently at an all-time high. The requirements for petroleum production for the armed forces and for essential civilian needs have been met in full to date, but some of the important though less essential civilian demand has not been met. At the present time all the oil-producing areas of the United States except parts of west Texas, New Mexico, and Wyoming are being produced at rates as high as can be achieved without serious waste. Transportation facilities are being built as rapidly as possible to transport the balance of the oil in these three areas to market. The present forecast indicates a serious shortage of petroleum will be experienced throughout the Nation before the end of next year, and if the war continues through 1945, it is probable that the war effort will have to be slowed down to the pace at which petroleum can be supplied for the armed forces and civilian uses essential to the operation of the armed forces.

Once a new field is fully developed its production rate inevitably declines. Our known fields are so nearly developed that they cannot even maintain the present producing rate. Since 1938 discoveries of new fields have been too few and the fields have been too small to keep pace with rate of production as shown by the following figures:

Year	Number of wildcats drilled	New reserves discovered (million barrels)	Production (million barrels)	Net increase or decrease in reserves (million barrels)
1937	2,224	2,050	1,279	+771
1938	2,638	1,900	1,214	+686
1939	2,589	1,125	1,265	−140
1940	3,038	1,000	1,353	−353
1941	3,268	680	1,402	−722
1942	3,219	625	1,385	−760
1943, first 6 months	1,602	438	709	−271

The only hope for relief from the critical supply problem is the discovery of a number of major oil pools which are considered as pools that will ultimately produce 20,000,000 barrels of oil or more.

You have probably heard that the United States is supplying more than its share of the United Nations' oil requirements. This is true but very little can be done about it if the present pace of the war is maintained. The only important developed reserves of oil outside the United States that remain under control of the United Nations are in the Caribbean area and in the Near East. Until recently the submarine menace and lack of control of the Mediterranean have made these sources of supply unavailable. Production in both these areas has now been expanded to the limit of transportation facilities and available refinery capacity. Plans have been made to obtain increasing quantities of oil from these fields by additional transportation and refining facilities and added field development. Forecasts indicate that at best these plans can provide only mild relief to our supply problem next year and will not avoid a real crisis in 1945, if the war demand continues.

While it is true that more wildcat wells are being drilled than in previous periods, this statement is misleading as it tells only part of the story. Preliminary figures indicate that 2,444 wildcat wells were drilled in the first 9 months of 1943 as compared with 2,396 drilled in the comparable period of 1942. Only 363 of the wells drilled in 1943 found commercial production, however, as compared to 402 wells drilled in the first 9 months of 1942. In other words, approximately 2 percent more wildcat wells were drilled, but 9.7 percent fewer oil fields were found. It should be pointed out that the finding record for 1942 was far from satisfactory. Although slightly more new oil has been found so far in 1943, the discoveries are still far below the amount of oil produced from reserves during the same period. The fact remains that we are not drilling enough wildcat wells so long as we are using up our reserves more rapidly than we are finding new ones.

Restrictions on the use of critical materials have curtailed exploration to some extent in the past, but if the importance of developing additional oil reserves is demonstrated, enough material can be made available to the industry to drill more wildcat wells than have been drilled. There is an appreciable time lag between discovering a new oil reserve and producing oil in quantity from the field. This lag may be from 1 year to 3 years, depending upon the urgency of demand for petroleum. It therefore becomes highly important to find now the oil needed for 1944 and 1945. With the existing price ceiling on crude oil, it is very doubtful if the operators could be induced to drill many more wildcat wells, since finding costs are very much higher now than they have been in the past and there might not be any profit on the production of new oil if it were discovered.

One of the most potent deterrents to drilling more wildcat wells has been the low ceiling price on oil. The Office of Price Administration at one time suggested that a special increased ceiling price might be granted to newly discovered oil. The oil industry and the Petroleum Administration for War have seriously considered this proposal and do not find it workable. The time lag between discovery and development of oil fields would require a complicated multiple price structure on essentially the same grade of product throughout the many years a new field would produce. The adjustment would have to be carried through the refining and marketing branches of the industry, and the difficulties seem insuperable. The producing companies in the past have always been willing and anxious to spend their own money in searching for new reserves any time the price structure indicated reasonable expectation of future profit on its production. Even though producing companies appear to be making profits on present production, they cannot afford to invest much currently in search for new oil if the anticipated price structure in the future will not cover the increased cost of looking for it. The fact remains that the present crude-oil price ceiling threatens to hamstring our war effort and we must find more oil now.

The Office of Price Administration has been unwilling to concede that there is any casual relation between oil-field development and the price received for crude oil. On the attached graph are shown the number of well completions and the average price of crude oil prevailing from 1900 through to 1942. A rather definite relation between these two is apparent to me. It should be pointed out that no controlled economy existed prior to 1941. The smaller number of well completions since 1941 is attributable chiefly to well-spacing restrictions and manpower shortages.

The whole situation boils down to this: (1) The profits currently shown by the oil-producing companies result largely from the time lag between incurring discovery costs and production of the oil discovered and are not representative of the true condition of the industry. (2) The depressed crude-oil price ceiling is discouraging the development of new reserves to such an extent that many producers are being forced out of business, and all oil companies are liquidating their capital at a selling price below that at which it can be replaced. (3) Inadequacy of supply to meet the increased demand under our war economy is already being felt and threatens to impede seriously the progress of the war. (4) The necessary time lag between finding new reserves and using the newly discovered oil makes it imperative that all necessary steps be taken immediately to increase oil discoveries. (5) While other factors are involved, the low ceiling on crude-oil prices is believed by the entire oil industry and the Petroleum Administration for War to be the most important deterrent to providing sufficient quantities of oil for our present and future needs.

Since preparing the above, I learn that Economic Stabilizer Vinson has rejected the industry's request for an increase in crude-oil price ceiling. In his rejection he has suggested three alternatives: (1) full use of unused productive capacity in developed Texas fields; (2) drilling in proved areas instead of drilling wildcat wells; (3) greater use of foreign oil.

In the opinion of the best petroleum engineers in the country there is very little unused productive capacity left in any of our oil fields. As mentioned above, all efforts are being made to speed up transportation facilities to carry the unused capacity to market, whether it be the 300,000 barrels per day mentioned by Judge Vinson, or about 200,000 barrels per day estimated by the economics committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council. Drilling new wells in proved areas can prove only a mild temporary relief, that at best can do little more than delay the decline in production in proved oil fields for a few months. It cannot solve our supply problem over the longer period. As mentioned above, plans are being accelerated to increase the production in foreign fields, but we do not have adequate assurance that the submarine menace will permit uninterrupted flow of oil from the foreign areas for our war effort. Even with additional field development contemplated in foreign areas it is not believed that the extra oil obtainable from foreign sources can avert a real crisis in supply in 1945.

It appears that Judge Vinson has not grasped the gravity of the situation and it now seems that the only relief that can be expected is through an act of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

O. D. DONNELL.

RESOLUTION PASSED NOVEMBER 9, 1943, BY THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY WAR COUNCIL IN SESSION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Whereas on the 29th of October 1943 the Office of Economic Stabilization disapproved

the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for an increase of 35 cents per barrel in the price of oil; and

Whereas it is still the opinion of the Petroleum Industry War Council that the price of oil must be raised if the oil industry is to fulfill its obligation to produce sufficient oil to meet the need of the war program and essential civilian demand: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this council memorialize the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to amend the existing price-control statutes so as to insure a proper and adequate price for crude oil and its products.

To the Chairman and Members of the Petroleum Industrial War Council.

SIRS: Your committee appointed at the meeting of November 8 for the purpose of reviewing the letter dated November 5, 1943, addressed to the Petroleum Industry War Council by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, has studied the decision of Economic Stabilizer Vinson denying a general increase in the price of crude oil and also the resolutions offered to the council by the production committee.

Your committee has unanimously agreed upon the resolutions following as the reply to the communication of Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator. It is recommended that if and when such resolution is adopted by the council that the secretary be instructed to forward a copy of the same to the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War together with a letter advising him the views of this council as expressed in the resolution, a copy of which accompanies this letter and assure him that it is the desire of the Petroleum Industry War Council to cooperate with the Petroleum Administrator for War and the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War to the fullest extent.

Respectfully submitted.

J. C. Hunter, chairman; Ralph T. Zook, Walter S. Hallanan, John M. Lovejoy, John D. Gill, E. E. Pyles, William F. Humphrey, J. D. Sandefer, Jr., R. S. Shannon.

Whereas, under date of November 5, 1943, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War Mr. Ralph K. Davies, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Petroleum Industry War Council requesting that the Council give further thought to the question of an alternative to the recommended crude price increase, in keeping with Economic Stabilizer Vinson's directive to the Petroleum Administrator for War; and

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has carefully reviewed the decision of Economic Stabilizer Vinson, issued under date of October 29, in which he denied the general price increase recommended by the Petroleum Administrator for War; and

Whereas the petroleum industry and the Petroleum Administration for War long ago set in motion the various plans suggested by Economic Stabilizer Vinson for the development, expansion, and increased availability of its productive capacity in order to insure utilization of all available oil resources for military and other essential needs; and

Whereas the increasing military demands and the uncertainties of enemy action, together with declining production capacity, foreshadow an increasing shortage of supply; and

Whereas the Economic Stabilization Director has recognized the need for increasing oil-field activity but proposes financial incentive for this purpose through Government subsidy payments; and

Whereas this recommendation ignored the long studied conclusions of the industry and the advice of the Petroleum Administrator for War on the impracticability of subsidies, bonuses, and other incentives falling in this category; and

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has again reviewed these suggestions and has again reached the considered opinion that there is no way in which the productive capacity of this Nation can be increased without greater over-all oil field activity and that this can only be achieved effectively and efficiently through greater over-all price incentive, and

Whereas the long delays in the Offices of Price Administration and Economic Stabilization culminating in the decision of Stabilizer Vinson to deny a general price increase have permitted conditions to become progressively worse; these governmental agencies must assume the chief responsibility for the shortage in petroleum supplies and the consequent aggravation of the rationing of gasoline and fuel oil.

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has read with approval the letter of November 4 of the Petroleum Administrator for War in reply to the decision of Economic Stabilizer Vinson and it is the desire of the Petroleum Industry War Council to pledge to him sincere cooperation in full harmony with the objectives outlined in that communication: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Petroleum Industry War Council reaffirms its conviction that no selective incentive program including subsidies or bonuses, will effectively, efficiently, or adequately increase the production capacity of the Nation and any such plan would result in demoralization of normal economic processes and the foisting on the industry, the Government, and the public of a vast, expensive bureaucracy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Petroleum Industry War Council urge the Petroleum Administrator for War to renew his efforts to obtain a general increase in the price of crude oil with corresponding increase in product prices with all the resources at his command.

Nonoperating Employees Wage Adjustment Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter I wrote to Mr. Fred M. Vinson:

NOVEMBER 12, 1943.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VINSON: Thank you for your letter of November 9 and enclosed copy of press release dated November 8 setting forth your opinion on the recommendations of the Special Emergency Board established by the President to consider the so-called non-operating employees wage adjustment case.

I would like to express my personal opinion in this matter as I am convinced that the members of the railway organizations have been grossly mistreated.

These men comprise the best labor organizations we have in this country. They have been loyal to their Government and have done a wonderful job in the transportation field during this emergency. For this loyalty and the fact that they have called no strikes, they are being punished by those in authority.

It is ridiculous to enforce the "hold the line" order when it comes to the railroad men and allow every other union to receive increases. It is a known fact to every American citizen that prices as well as wages have gone up continually and the railroad men have received no increase. I would like to cite one example of the gross injustices being done one type of railroad worker, and there are many others similar to this. The mechanic in the railroad shop receives 97 cents per hour and he has fitted himself for this job by serving an apprenticeship of 4 years at a very low wage. We have thousands of shipyard workers who have taken a 6 weeks' course with good pay and at the end of this short period of training earn $1.25 to $1.50 per hour.

If this country should be paralyzed in the near future by a strike involving all employees of the railroad unions I am sure we will have no one to blame but those in authority who have refused the just demands of this group of loyal American citizens. I believe the only way to prevent such a disaster will be to immediately give these men what they so justly deserve.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY PRICE,
Member of Congress.

Resolutions of Farm Bureau of Appanoose County, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Iowa was settled by people of industry and vision and Iowa has long been recognized as one of the greatest food-producing States. This is the direct result of the fact that the present farmers have lost none of the ability, energy and far-sightedness of their pioneer ancestors. In keeping with the well-deserved reputation for progress, in Appanoose County, where great strides have been made in increasing production for the war effort, the Farm Bureau has recently adopted resolutions which propose further increases of all farm products, and at the same time look forward to the peace to come. I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein this set of resolutions:

1. We salute the men and women in the armed services of our country. The farmers of Appanoose County pledge to the members of the armed services from this county that the utmost effort will be made to provide necessary food and maintain home and community institutions during their absence. No hardship nor sacrifice on our part is too great for us to contribute.

2. We believe that price ceilings and floors for agricultural products should be flexible and thus be capable of adjustment in line with labor and industry.

Confidence of farmers in price ceilings and floors depend upon the ability of the Government agencies to maintain them. It is important that necessary action be taken to build such confidence.

3. We are opposed to price roll-backs or subsidies on farm products.

4. We demand fair prices for farm products and define "fair prices" as such prices for our

products as are comparable to those received by labor and industry.

5. We urge farmers to cooperate with truckers and processors in the orderly marketing of livestock in order to conserve trucks, tires, and gasoline.

The Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federations are requested to use their best efforts in opposing mandatory marketing.

6. We recommend that the Iowa Farm Bureau take necessary steps to assure that a reasonable amount of protein be allocated to farmers for livestock and poultry feeding in order that adequate production may be maintained.

7. We urge farmers to use labor and machinery efficiently for crop and livestock production. Sufficient new equipment should be made available by the War Production Board to maintain production.

8. We commend the Selective Service Board for their consideration of the farm-labor problem.

9. We favor the continuation of the A. A. A.

Present soil-conservation methods are ineffectual and mistakes made in 1918–19 are being repeated.

We urge that A. A. A. allot sufficient funds and use such other methods as are necessary to maintain the fertility of southern Iowa soil.

We favor the organization of a soil-conservation district in Appanoose County.

10. We believe that rural children should have equal educational opportunities with town and city children and that any proposed legislation should provide for equalization of school costs.

11. We commend all the leaders, officers, and others for their work in promoting 4–H Club work in Appanoose County during the past year and urge added support during 1944.

12. We reaffirm our confidence in the Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federations and commend their officers for the efforts put forth in our behalf during the past year.

Point Values of Butter and Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Turtle Lake Local, Barron County, a local unit of the Wisconsin Farmers Union:

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has raised the point value of a pound of butter to 16 and left its so-called substitute oleomargarine remaining at its former point value of 4 points per pound; and

Whereas this advantage of fewer points being required will give the margarine interests an unfair advantage to boost their product now during wartime and to build up their industry for large sales after the war, thus ruining our dairy industry; and

Whereas the health of our Nation will be affected if the people are deprived of this wholesome product, by this increased value in points; and

Whereas we of the dairy industry feel that it was unnecessary for the O. P. A. to raise the point value of butter since there are reports to show that the stocks of butter held in storage this year are much greater than in 1942: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand an equalization of the point values of butter and oleomargarine; further

Resolved, That the promotion of margarine will not be allowed under any circumstances after the rationing of any dairy products is discontinued; further

Resolved, That any attempt to disturb the law relating to the control of oleomargarine or the tax on it should be fought by our Representatives and Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators, Representatives, Governor of Wisconsin Walter S. Goodland, O. P. A. Administrator Prentiss Brown, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickard.

Kansas Marine Hero Acclaimed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Outlook, Lawrence, Kans., of the experience of Capt. Sam Logan, a Paola, Kans., boy, whose right foot was cut off by the propeller of a Japanese plane, after the Jap pilot had shot down the American plane and had used up his remaining ammunition in an effort to shoot the American pilot after he had parachuted from his damaged plane.

Though weakened by the loss of blood and suffering intense plain, he retained consciousness when he landed in the sea, inflated his rubber boat, applied his own first-aid treatment, and is now getting ready to master the manipulation of an artificial foot that he may return to the battle front. It will be just too bad if he should again meet that Jap pilot. This is just one of many examples of typical Kansas courage.

The article referred to follows:

KANSAS MARINE HERO ACCLAIMED

Capt. Sam Loman, 22-year-old marine fighter pilot from Paola, Kans., has been nominated for Esquire magazine's Hall of Heroes because he kept on fighting when other men would have quit. The unkillable quarry, a full-page, full-color, painting by John Falter in the December Esquire, pictures the scene over the South Pacific sea where a Jap Zero pilot used his propeller to amputate Captain Logan's foot as he drifted helplessly in his parachute. Paul Gallico has vividly described the incident in an accompanying article called The Pilot Who Kept on Fighting.

Almost 2 years to the day from the date he enlisted in the Naval Reserve as a seaman second class, Sam Logan was piloting a Vought Corsair on his second combat mission over the Russell Islands. On his first, he had bagged a Jap, but on this one, the Jap bagged him. He felt has Corsair vibrating badly and turned to discover his tail assembly in shreds. He climbed out of the cockpit, kicked off and pulled.

His chute opened and brought him up with a satisfying lurch and Sam began to drift down through a sky filled with zooming, spitting ships and hissing bullets. Then his adventure began.

The Zero that had shot up his ship dove at him with its machine gun blazing. Sam made a moving target of himself by maneuvering the shrouds of his chute so that the Jap missed.

The Zero climbed to make a second pass. But he wasn't shooting any more. The marine's heart lifted—the Jap was out of ammunition. But still he came on. Then Captain Logan saw the Jap's plan—to use his propeller as an executioner's sword. The whirling propeller blade came at him, but he lifted his feet and it missed—so closely that he could have kicked the cockpit.

A third time the Zero came at him. This time a puff of air trapped his chute. As he pulled desperately at the shroud lines to get out of the way the propeller was at him again. He lifted his feet but felt a shock and a bump and a stab of pain. Captain Logan looked down to find his right foot gone and the Jap climbing for another pass at him. This time a vengeful Army P–40 came down at the Jap with its gun blazing. The Zero turned and fled; and Sam Logan floated down to what should have been his end.

But it wasn't. Where other men would have fainted from shock or loss of blood, Sam Logan remained conscious and cool-headed. When he landed in the cold, blue water he slipped out of his chute harness and inflated his rubber boat. Then, though the loss of blood was weakening him, he pulled himself into the boat, found his emergency kit, applied a tourniquet to his leg. and gave himself a morphine injection. Then he lay on his back in the rubber boat, quite alone in the sea.

He thought of Maj. Alexander de Seversky who had lost a leg in the last war and still came back to be one of the greatest airmen of our time, and wondered how long it would take to learn to fly with an artificial foot. At that moment a single plane appeared overhead. Unsure of whether it was friend or foe, Sam took a metal mirror from his emergency kit and flashed his recognition code. The plane circled lower till he could see the white star and sea floats of the United States Army Air Force.

A moment later it landed on the water. An hour later he was safe at a base hospital under medical care. Today he is back in this country. waiting to be fitted with an artificial foot so he can get back into his plane and keep on fighting.

It is because of this determination, this will to live, that Sam Logan has been named for a place in the Esquire Hall of Heroes—that his name will live on after him as the pilot who kept on fighting.

Letter From Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., is delighted to claim as one of its residents that most human of war reporters, Ernie Pyle. True, he returns there infrequently and stays for too short a time, but his neighbors and friends look forward with keen anticipation to even these brief interludes.

On his recent stop, Ernie wrote a letter to his good friend, E. H. Shaffer, the editor of the Albuquerque Tribune, in which

he told how he feels toward the home folks. Feeling that it is worth repeating, I add it to these remarks under permission granted me. Here is his letter:

EDITOR, THE TRIBUNE:

Through the Tribune, I'd like to thank the people of Albuquerque for being so good to me while I was home on furlough from the war zones.

We like Albuquerque. If not, we wouldn't live there. One of the reasons we like it is that we can feel free, and just be ourselves. We know that if we want to eat lunch at the Alvarado in blue jeans, it's all right. Or that if the country club invites us to a formal dance and we don't want to go, that's all right too.

During my short stay at home, I had to say "no" a good many times to requests to speak, or to appear here or appear there. The fact that you were so gracious about my refusals is one of the reasons we like Albuquerque. Naturally I'd have liked to do everything everybody wanted me to—and yet, when a fellow is home for only a few short weeks out of 3 long years he gets pretty jealous of every moment of his time, and tries to guard it and hoard it all for himself.

You did make my vacation pleasant—by saying nice things to me about the column when we'd meet on the streets or in the stores; by doing so many extra little things for me; and above all, by being understanding enough to let my time be largely my own.

Maybe it's presumptuous of me to write such a letter as this at all, but I just felt I wanted to. For we most certainly do have the feeling that in Albuquerque we are completely among friends.

ERNIE PYLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Elimination of Waste and Extravagance in Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, today we visualize the greatest spending of the taxpayers' money that the world has ever known. What the end will be, no one can contemplate. We are engaged in a terrible war, and we must prosecute the war to a complete victory. We will not deny our military and naval forces any essential thing until that victory comes. We will go forward to that day when our enemies will completely surrender—there is no other verdict that will be acceptable to the people of this country.

May I observe, Mr. Speaker, that there are so many things which cost untold sums of money, and which are now promoted and carried out by the administration now in power, that could and should be entirely eliminated. Agencies of government are maintained in time of war which have no place and which do not lend any aid to our all-out war effort. Boards, bureaus, and commissions are now being maintained, with a huge personnel, which cost enormous sums of money, which should be entirely eliminated. Many and various functions are now being promoted and carried into ultimate effect by many of the boards, bureaus, and commissions which are not conducive to our ultimate victory in this war, but the tremendous cost and expense of those needless and unnecessary promotional schemes are highly detrimental to our war effort. They merely sap the resources of our Nation, and are thereby an obstruction to our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation have their financial limitations. The people can withstand a financial burden which is within their limitations; they have almost reached that limitation. The people are struggling to buy bonds and to pay taxes. They are working as they have never worked before. They are going forward with the will and determination to win this war, and to save our country. They are faced with many phases of regimentation that they do not believe is necessary; they are faced with the burden of making out numberless reports and answering questionnaires, many of which are usless and needless and many of which ultimately rest in a waste-paper basket; they are beset by the constant visits of snoopers and so-called inspectors, all of whom draw large salaries and have an expense account provided by Government funds—the majority of which snoopers and inspectors should be entirely eliminated, because they are obstructing the war effort, and they are rendering no worthwhile service to our Government in time of war.

Yet this administration continues to keep this huge army of civilian personnel on the pay roll. Those in power are making the burden to the taxpayers many times heavier than it should be. This is war, and it is my hope that those in power in Washington will awaken to that fact. This political administration is apparently nonwar-minded during our greatest crisis—and they do not appear to change their policies even though our boys are dying on every battle front in the world.

Recently, I received a communication from a fine young man, now in the Army, who is fighting somewhere—presumably in the South Pacific—and he stated in his letter:

I wish some of the unnecessary civilian personnel working in the departments of Government could be sent down here to help us. We must win this war.

The boys in the service know of the overloading of the boards, bureaus, and commissions with unnecessary personnel. They cannot understand why those in power continue it. Those boys are fighting for the preservation of our Nation—and this administration continues to do those things which will ultimately destroy this Nation. The boys do not like that program. We are engaged in war. We must win this war. Those in power must become war-conscious, and begin fighting this war as it should be fought—and that means to eliminate every nonessential and unnecessary department of Government and project which does not directly aid in our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous cost of this war frightens our people. Recently I observed a terse statement in one of our newspapers, in which it stated:

The United States Government has spent as much in the 4⅓ months since July 1 as the total cost of World War No. 1 to this Nation—$32,830,000,000.

That statement appalls the people generally, and when the people are in full possession of all of the facts involved—when they know of the waste and extravagance in this war—they will be incensed beyond measure. While they do know of some of the waste and extravagance, yet the salient facts set forth in hearings before many committees will give them much information which has not yet been made public.

This particular newspaper report, to which I have referred above, continues:

The $32,830,000,000 figured by the Government as the total cost of World War No. 1 included $23,424,000,000 of actual war costs and $9,406,000,000 of loans made to other governments immediately after the war.

Mr. Speaker, whatever is absolutely necessary for the prosecution of this war to ultimate and complete victory that must and will be provided by our people. But the waste and extravagance must be eliminated. It is the duty of those in charge of the spending of the people's money in this war to see that we get $1 in value for every dollar that is spent. It is their duty to eliminate every nonessential agency of Government, and every nonessential project, during this war. It is their duty to separate every nonessential and unnecessary civilian from the Federal pay roll during this frightful war. It is their duty to become war conscious, and to conduct this war as it should be conducted—to eliminate every expenditure of money where it is unnecessary, and to buckle up the belt and discontinue every item of spending which is unnecessary and which is disarming us in this war.

Mr. Speaker, the people are observing every economy today. They are doing all they can do to arm this country for victory. They want those in high places to observe that same economy, and they want their President and every head of every department of government to practice this same procedure; they want to win this war; they do not want to face an insurmountable debt after the war is over, created largely by waste, extravagance and mismanagement. Their hope is that their own government will not let them down in this all out war effort.

The people want this Nation, after the war is over, to face the future where opportunity awaits every American. They want the children of today, who will become the fathers and mothers of tomorrow, to have the opportunity to make progress as free people in a free nation. They do not want the children to approach our tomorrow as slaves under an unnecessary burden of debt created through waste, extravagance and mismanagement, and by reason of nonessential things.

Lend-Lease Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial from the Washington Post of November 12, 1943, entitled "Lend-Lease," which clears up some of the misconceptions of the purpose and aims of lend-lease and how same is to be prorated among the United Nations:

LEND-LEASE

The newspapers, unwittingly no doubt, gave the public at home and abroad a very distorted impression of the tone, temper and contents of the Truman committee report on post-war conversion problems. It was regarded as a document on lend-lease problems. In point of fact, only brief reference was made to the connection between the lend-lease program and the principal issue under discussion. But emphasis on that one section combined with provocative newspaper headlines, conveyed the idea that the Truman committee members are bitterly critical of the system as it is now operated and convinced we are getting a raw deal.

To be sure, the committee did refer to the rubber monopoly that forced us to pay exorbitant prices for pre-war British-owned rubber while we were being called Shylocks for requesting repayments of World War No. 1 war loans. This raking up of old grievances was designed, however, to buttress suggestions that we ought to consider now the terms and conditions under which any such rubber monopoly should be continued after this war. This proposal, reasonable enough per se, though inopportune, suggested other possibilities of remuneration such as taking payment in kind for petroleum needed by England through transfer of an equivalent value of foreign petroleum reserves or of English-held securities of corporations having title to such reserves.

The Truman report declares that lease-lend was never intended as a device to shift a portion of the war costs of our allies to us, but only as a realistic recognition that they did not have the means to pay for needed materials. In so saying it does not fairly state the issue. The real question is to what extent our war costs can properly be segregated from those of our allies in a joint enterprise such as that on which we have embarked. That question is really unanswerable, and the reason why that is so is clearly indicated in a British White Paper published today called A Report on Mutual Aid. In that report presented by the Chancellor of the Exchequer an attempt is made for the first time to appraise in detail the value of some of the services rendered by the British in exchange for what we have advanced to them.

The summary is impressive, but what the report shows most clearly is the impossibility of ascertaining the comparative value of the mutual lend-lease aid furnished by Britain and the United States, respectively. In the first place, it is almost impossible, as the White Paper states, to obtain information from operational areas. Secondly, comparisons based on money values lead to serious underestimates of the British contribution in view of higher American price levels. Finally the national sacrifice represented by lend-lease aid cannot be determined by comparing the value of the aid extended by Britain with the value of the goods and services supplied by us. For, as the British report well states, "The claims of war against each [of the United Nations] are the same, that is, they should give all they have." If we keep that thought in mind, we shall avoid laying up a lot of trouble for the future.

Give Railroad Employees More Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that hundreds of thousands of our most able and useful citizens in the United States are being denied a just wage increase which they seek in order that they can meet living costs. I refer to the case of railroad employees whose request for a reasonable pay raise is being held up by action of Economic Stabilization Director Vinson in refusing to approve an agreement reached by the employees and the railroad companies.

This deplorable situation has developed to the point where a strike vote is now being taken. I know full well that a strike is the last thing the loyal railroad workers of the country want. The decision to ballot on this matter was reached only after every effort to carry out the agreement of the carriers and the employees had failed. The vote is designed to demonstrate to the Nation how the railroad workers feel over the unjust treatment accorded them.

More than a year ago the railroad employees asked for a reasonable wage increase. The request, under provisions of the Railway Labor Act, which amply provides for handling of such matters, was referred by President Roosevelt to an emergency board, which ruled that an 8-cents-an-hour increase would not be inflationary. President Roosevelt asked the union leaders to accept this award, which they did.

With the employees and the railroad companies agreed on the increase, the Stabilization Director suddenly vetoed the 8-cent-an-hour increase, on the grounds that it was inflationary, although he stated he would approve an increase of 4 cents an hour. He has continued to oppose the 8-cent-an-hour increase, although recently he stated he would approve increases ranging from 4 to 10 cents an hour, which is unsatisfactory and unworkable.

The recommendation of the Emergency Board for the increase of 8 cents an hour was filed with the President on May 24, 1943. On August 7, 1943, an agreement to carry out the increase was made between the railroads and 15 cooperating railroad labor organizations. The increase, however, has never been put into effect and in the meantime the nonoperating railway employees have continued to work on a wage scale which is on the average 21 cents an hour less than that of workers in other industries doing similar jobs. The railroad employees are not receiving wages comparable with those employed in other war industries.

The 8-cent-an-hour increase should have been put into operation promptly after the agreement was reached between the carriers and the employees. The employees followed the procedure established by the Railway Labor Act and were willing to comply with the order of the Emergency Board which was set up under authority of that act. I know of no proof having been offered to show that the order was unreasonable, and I cannot understand why the Stabilization Director should, of his own accord, change or modify it, particularly when it had been agreed to by both the railroads and the employees.

The argument of the Stabilization Director that the increase was inflationary is in my opinion unfounded. To hold that such an increase was inflationary when other increases were allowed without question, is inconsistent. Not so long ago millions of Government employees were granted wage increases with a minimum of 15 percent. I do not recall any argument being advanced at that time that such increases were inflationary. Surely it is not reasonable to say that the 8-cent-an-hour increase is inflationary when employees in war plants with far less experience are receiving so much more pay for their services.

Without doubt, the railroad employees are entitled at this time to an increase of at least 8 cents an hour in the face of increased living costs and other circumstances. Certainly their case was proven by the decision of the Emergency Board which went into the matter so fully. Furthermore, it is evident to me that the agreement between the railroads and the employees would in no way affect the principles and purposes of the Stabilization Act.

The Emergency Board, in recommending the 8-cent-an-hour increase, stated:

> Railroad wages have maintained a degree of stability, entirely apart from the anti-inflation measures of the war emergency, that has been equaled or surpassed by few industries. Wages on the railroads have moved more slowly, both up and down, than in industry as a whole, and the level of railroad wages, both up and down, has changed more moderately than in other industrial spheres.

The Railway Labor Act has provided, for many years, the processes for stabilizing wages in that industry. In fact, this is the only industry in the United States for which such provision has been made, and was operative when the United States entered the war. I am sure that the Stabilization Act was directed primarily to the need of stabilizing prices and wages in industries other than the railway industry.

Primary purpose of the wage increase recommended by the Emergency Board is to better enable the railroad employees to cope with higher living costs. Despite the opportunities to derive higher wages in other industries, employees have remained loyally on the job in operating the transportation systems so vital to the winning of the war. Whether they can

continue to do so and meet their needs in the face of the mounting cost of necessities of life, however, is problematical. Not only is the welfare of these hundreds of thousands of workers at stake; the very success of the war effort is involved.

We all realize the outstanding part the railroads are performing in the war and the efficient and patriotic manner in which the employees are keeping the troops and the weapons of war and the food supplies moving. In many instances these services are being rendered under considerable handicap, but the employees are not complaining. They are getting the job done. All they ask in return is simple justice and I believe the American people as a whole are in sympathy with the cause of these very essential workers.

I am personally acquainted with hundreds of railroad employees. I know them to be loyal in every way to their Nation, their families, their friends, and to their duties in carrying on the great rail transportation industry that blankets our country. I know them to be substantial, esteemed citizens of their communities, contributing their full share to the general good. They do not make unnecessary or unreasonable demands. Their actions have always been guided by a spirit of moderation and fair play.

There should be no further delay in putting into effect the pay increase recommended several months ago by the Emergency Board and accepted by the railroad companies and the employees. And since those in the Government with power and authority to act in this matter have declined to bring this necessary wage increase about, Congress has taken steps to correct the situation through House Joint Resolution 187 introduced by Representative CROSSER, of Ohio, in the House of Representatives and by a companion measure introduced by Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, in the Senate.

The Crosser resolution points out gross inequities in the pay of the railroad employees as compared with the higher wages of workers in other industries and quotes from a letter sent by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation to the chief executives of all railroads and railroad labor organizations, September 1, 1943, in which it was stated:

> The railroads of the country are headed for a manpower crisis unless extraordinary measures are taken quickly to forestall it.

One cause of this situation, the resolution points out, "is the inability of the railroads to obtain and to retain in employment the necessary skilled and semiskilled workers among the nonoperating employees because of inadequate wages."

Referring to the agreement between the railroads and the employees, the resolution asserts:

> Whereas the terms of said agreement have not been carried out because of the question being raised as to whether said agreement is in contravention of any existing requirements of law: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That the agreement made in Washington, D. C., on August 7, 1943, by and between the carriers and railway labor organization parties thereto, is in accord with the requirements of the Railway Labor Act and all other requirements of law, and shall be held so to be, anything in the law or laws of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am giving my active support to this legislation, which is designed to guarantee that reason and justice shall prevail in the very deserving case of the railroad workers. Such a guarantee is in keeping with the principles upon which our Government was founded.

Consumers and the United States Save Eighty-nine Billions by Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., of November 14, 1943, entitled "Consumers and the United States Save Eighty-nine Billions by Price Controls, O. P. A. Claims":

CONSUMERS, UNITED STATES SAVE EIGHTY-NINE BILLIONS BY PRICE CONTROLS, O. P. A. CLAIMS—MAJOR COMMODITIES COST LESS NOW THAN DURING WORLD WAR

(By James Y. Newton)

Compared with the World War, present price controls will save the public and the Government $89,000,000,000 through January 1, Price Administrator Chester Bowles said yesterday.

Statistics compiled by the O. P. A. show that war goods purchased by the Government by the year's end would have cost $67,000,000,000 more at the relatively uncontrolled prices for materials and services prevailing at the close of the last war. That conclusion is based on an estimated expenditure for war goods of $128,000,000,000.

Consumers, C. P. A. said, will save $22,000,000,000 by the end of the year because of the generally lower cost of living in this war.

Projecting the savings of price control through 1944 O. P. A. said that by the close of that year war materials savings will reach $121,000,000,000, based on an expected Government expenditure of $228,000,000,000. The savings to consumers by that time will total $54,000,000,000. Both figures, however, are based on the Government's ability to hold prices at current levels.

A break-down into commodities indicates the current price of almost every major item is far under the peak cost in the World War. The differential in prices in the two wars is particularly striking among the war materials purchased by the Government. Prices of such materials have remained virtually unchanged since before the Pearl Harbor attack.

"It seems clear to me," Mr. Bowles said, "and it should be to every thinking American, that we all have a tremendous stake in price control.

"If we can hold the line, if prices of both industrial materials and living cost items can be maintained at present levels, we can come out of this war with a reasonable standard of living. That is something worth thinking about twice."

O. P. A. said prices have been unchanged for some time for such war industrial materials as foundry iron, steel billets, steel scrap, antimony, aluminum, copper, lead, zinc, tin, print cloth, hides, and petroleum products.

From the start of the last war in 1914 until the armistice, prices of iron and steel products nearly tripled.

PRICES COMPARED

The following table compares current prices of industrial materials with top prices of the same materials in the last war:

	Last war	This war
Steel shapes, per ton	$123.00	$42.00
Steel plates, do	180.00	42.00
Steel rods, do	96.00	42.00
Steel billets, do	95.00	34.00
Tin plate, do	240.00	100.00
Tin, per pound	1.01	.52
Copper, do	.35	.12

Two additional important war materials reached price peaks shortly after the end of the last war, O. P. A. said. These were cotton and coal. "Middling" grade cotton sold on the New Orleans market in 1920 for 41 cents a pound. The price of the same grade at New Orleans last September was 19.3 cents.

Anthracite coal (chestnut) reached its highest point in the last war period in 1921 when it sold for $10.66 a ton. The same type currently brings only slightly less, $10.59 a ton. Bituminous coal (mine run) sold in 1920 for $7.28. The price today, delivered at wholesale yards, is $5.80 per ton.

FOOD PRICE RANGE

Of more interest to consumers, O. P. A. reported that impressive differences are shown in comparing prices of food items. The following table compares average peak prices of some foods in the last war and recent prices (the comparative data gathered in 36 identical cities).

	Last war	This war
Butter, per pound	$0.78	$0.50½
Coffee, do	.49	.30
Eggs, per dozen	.92	.63
Potatoes, per pound	.10½	.04

In some of the busier war centers, O. P. A. said butter rose to more than a dollar a pound during the last war. Similarly, eggs in some instances during the World War sold for as much as $1.20 a dozen.

The current prices presented, of course, do not take into consideration the black markets which exist for most food products. There also has been indication, especially last year when materials were scarce, that there were black markets for major war goods.

Army Control at Tule Lake Japanese Segregation Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

TURLOCK, CALIF., *November 13, 1943.*

Hon. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

After a complete investigation and hearing held in the Tule Lake section the California State senate fact finding committee on Japanese resettlement unanimously recommend and urge that Army control be maintained permanently at the Tule Lake Japanese segregation camp. We feel this is

imperative for protection of the people of the State of California.

HUGH P. DONNELLY, *Chairman.*
HERBERT W. SLATER,
IRWIN T. QUINN,
GEORGE J. HATFIELD,
JESS R. DORSEY.

Fiftieth Consecutive Broadcast Tonight of Congressional Record on the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, tonight a distinguished United States Senator will speak on the air in one of the Congressional Record on the Air programs which are being sponsored in this city by Leo J. Paulin and which are broadcast each Monday evening over radio station WHN, New York City, the largest independent station in the United States. The distinctive feature about tonight's broadcast is the fact that it is the fiftieth consecutive Congressional Record on the Air broadcast since these public-serving programs started nearly 1 year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that both the country and the Congress owes a debt of gratitude to both radio station WHN and to Mr. Paulin for their enterprise in arranging these weekly programs which bring to the microphone at 8:30 each Monday evening a Senator or Representative who discusses a pertinent public problem from either the Democratic, Republican, or Independent viewpoint as the case may be. Starting this week and continuing henceforth these programs will occur during the 15-minute interval each Monday night between 7:30 and 7:45.

Many of the speakers who have appeared on this program come from areas of the country which are not reached by Station WHN and their willingness to appear on the program indicates a real desire to be of service to the country in the matter of bringing factual and interpretative data to the attention of its citizens.

When Congress is not in session Mr. Paulin and Mr. Herbert L. Pettey, director of station WHN, continue the series by inviting some official of the executive department of Government to speak over the air. So far as I know, WHN is the only independent radio station in America which affords its listeners this type of regular weekly discussion by Members of Congress and Government officials representing every political and sectional viewpoint in the Republic. It is a pattern of radio service which may very well some day be extended to the network field, since it is entirely devoid of propaganda purposes and dedicated solely to the task of keeping the individual citizen better informed about the operations and attitudes of his Government.

Among the Senators and Representatives who have appeared on the Congressional Record on the Air series since its inception are the following:

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York.
Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas.
Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, of Iowa.
Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.
Senator ALBERT B. CHANDLER, of Kentucky.
Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, of Maryland.
Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York.
Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan.
Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, of Colorado.
Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, of Rhode Island, who will speak on Monday, November 15, on the subject The Soldiers Vote.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconson.

Representatives who have appeared on the Congressional Record on the Air program are—

Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia.
Representative CLARENCE LEA, of California.
Representative HAMPTON P. FULMER, of South Carolina.
Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.
Representative FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama.
Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, of New York.
Representative J. W. ROBINSON, of Utah.
Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana.
Representative HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida.
Representative ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois.
Representative JASPER BELL, of Missouri.
Representative RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Texas.
Representative FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.
Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan.
Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia.
Representative WALTER PLOESER, of Missouri.
Representative MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York.
Representative JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN, of New York.
Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York.
Representative J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.
Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York.
Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, of Oregon.
Representative DANIEL ELLISON, of Maryland.
Representative WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma.
Representative ROBERT HALE, of Maine.
Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Address by Senator Pepper at Halifax, Nova Scotia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Halifax, Nova Scotia, on March 21, 1942, in connection with the War Bond drive.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are glad to come to Halifax and to Nova Scotia by the romance and the beauty of which we have been intrigued all our lives. We wish we might have had this pleasure when the world was at peace and there was no suggestion of war to divert one from the thrill of going about over this ancient and lovely land and enjoying the friendship and fellowship of the people in whose midst was established the first good time club in America.

God has put Canada and the United States very close together. We must never let anything put us farther apart. We all are proud of the example which your people and mine have been able to show to the world for more than a century of how two peoples can live side by side in peace, confidence, and friendship.

This is possible because our people know that we share the same destiny, that we have the same interests, we seek alike the privilege to work, build, and have the good things which can come only through peace. Moreover, in this new world we respect other men as we expect them to respect us. We cheerfully accord to them those freedoms and liberties which we naturally claim for ourselves. We believe in adjusting differences in the civilized way and not by the jungle law.

"The simple plan
That he should take who has the power
And he should keep who can."

We believe in helping one another, for we know that the rule of live and let live is as good business as it is ethics. We have reduced our boundary line to the thinnest possible thread so that as little as possible it would impede our working and playing and growing together. We like to think that we have given the world the best example it has of what ought to be the relations among all nations. Yet, what a sad spectacle the world presents today, the whole earth thrust into the holocaust of war, men torn from their peaceful pursuits and hurled to the odious tasks of war, industry diverted from building fuller and richer and better lives for men, women, and children to the cruel necessity of war, homes blasted, families rent asunder, children massacred, noble edifices in ruins, saturated with the blood of its finest youth, all to satisfy the lusts for power of certain international monsters and brigands.

Not one of us in your country or mine but knows that each of us is in the gravest of danger. As Hitler rightly said two worlds are in conflict; one must fall asunder. This Western Hemisphere of ours is the bastion of the anti-Hitler world. We are the mightiest foe which stands in his path except he

conquer us, except he break our might, except he disarm and destroy our power he cannot conquer. We have accepted Hitler's gage of battle to the death and all our strength we have dedicated to the utter destruction of these monsters of aggression.

This, therefore, is no war of nations, it is a war of continents, the battle line of which stretches across every continent and sea, underneath the waters of every ocean, and in the stratosphere of every land. From snow-capped mountains to barren desert, from pole to pole, around the torrid equator, in mountain and marsh, do men under the principal leadership of Hitler or Roosevelt battle to the death. It is even more than a world war, it is a war of worlds, when the whole race of man is divided into friend and foe.

The battle is not one for the continents, the oceans, and the world's wealth—it is veritably for the soul of man. For it is a war between God and the devil, heaven and hell, goodness and godlessness, Christianity and paganism.

How can we burn that frightening fact into the consciousness of every man, woman, and child whose fate lies in our cause. That is the supreme challenge to every thinking person in the United States in the anti-Hitler world today.

What I have said is not rhetoric. I mean to say what you already know with your heads—that dependent upon the outcome of this struggle is the retention of the profit, the jobs, the professions, the homes, the fields, the factories, the families, the freedom which is America. I mean that our mighty and ruthless enemies have already captured to a large extent the strategic and critical materials which are essential to the continuation of our industry and our way of life. I mean, they have already taken control of the markets which are essential not only to our prosperity but to our standard of life here. I mean that these militant and aggressive enemies by brilliant strokes and willingness to make any sacrifice have captured the strategic areas upon which depend our essential safety as a nation. I mean that these wide oceans which we have thought our assurance of security are now but the broad highways over which our enemies daily hurl against us deadly and devastating engines of assault. I mean that the air which we thought an unbridgeable space has now, too, become the well-nigh immune medium for sinister attacks from which so many thought our great land completely removed.

We are encircled by the enemy. He is tightening his boa constrictorlike grip. He is pressing us harder and harder. He has the advantage of fighting from the center to the circumference of the circle, and has therefore been able to thin our lines to a dangerous spread. We shall be hard put to hold him back, until we have gathered our strength and our weapons to strike him a mortal blow.

There are certain "musts" in our strategy until we do mobilize our full might. First, we must keep open the supply lines across the Atlantic and the Pacific to those who hold back the main force of the enemy today in Europe and in the Far East. Second, we must keep Hitler shut up in Europe and add increasing strength to those mighty friends in Russia and Britain who are now and have been so heroically pushing him back and bruising his evil head. Third, we must hold the dastardly Japanese to the Far East. To do that, we must add to the growing strength of the Chinese, who have fought longest and most gallantly of all against the hated foe, which has now become the empire of the setting sun; the stubborn Dutch, and the British.

In short, what it sums up to is that we must prevent at all costs a junction of the main forces of Hitler and Hirohito, while at the same time maintaining the coordination of our own.

We can all see that if our enemies are able to join their forces and gain mastery over the continents of Asia and Africa, as they today have mastery over the continent of Europe, they will be possessed of seven-eighths of the world's people and twice as much of the earth's land as would lie elsewhere, the major part of the world's resources. Against such might how would we fare, and if in the end, the long end, we should gain the victory, who dares to contemplate what would be its cost in men, money, women, and children to our American way of life.

We of the Americas, therefore, face the stern alternative—conquer or die.

Are we prepared for so terrible a decision? Are we prepared to meet an enemy so fiendish and deadly? I mean to ask are we prepared to make the sacrifices necessary to make us stand up against foes the like of which have never assaulted the citadels of heaven and earth.

What is the nature of these foes and what is their strength? Remember that Germany, a nation of 80,000,000 strong, able, courageous people, with an incomparable skill and will for war, led by the most conspicuous multisided genius since Napoleon—maybe of all times. The history of this people is that of a warrior people. War has been the chief instrument of their policy from the conception of the state. Three times in a generation almost these people have hurled the world into a holocaust of war. In peace they prepare only for war. They take, therefore, to war as naturally as the bird to the air, hence the regimentation, the suppression of personal liberties, the complete mobilization of the nation's power, the martial spirit—all these instruments of war are rooted in the German tradition and are readily invoked in war.

We know that at least since 1933 half of the income of that great nation has been spent getting ready for "der Tag," the day when the war dogs should be unleashed. Imagine the might which was raised in all those years. Every factory was geared for war production, every farm, every laborer, every family made a smooth working, disciplined cog in this colossal war machine. You have, therefore, one of the earth's mightiest powers completely mobilized, throbbing in measured rhythm its whole force hurled and ordered by a single sinister satanic genius. There was never such power upon the face of the earth. Man never faced such a menace.

The very education of the children in the schools, in special movements into which they were inducted from their homes, the iron rigor of the discipline which a system of secret police imposed upon every person made every man, woman, and child a moving unity. This whole great people had its imagination and fancy touched with visions and dreams of conquest and gain. The wealth of the earth was held up as the Spanish Main, to be plundered by the most efficient piracy conscience could conceive.

Every person was made conscious of a stake which he or she had in that gain. In other words, Hitler has painted upon the retina of the German eye not only grand pictures of national power, but he has identified every one of his people with that mighty struggle, so that he or she has not only the push of fear and discipline, but the pulling hunger of vanity and selfishness.

We know that for a generation the same philosophy has goaded the Japs, smarting under the conscience of their natural baseness and inferiority, they but slept, worked, dreamed conquest against the day when they could strike down their white masters whom they both despised and envied. Hence, sacrifice was a stepping stone toward the long-looked-for opportunity. Every instrument of that power have they forged into weapons for this struggle.

Do we not shudder to think of our weakness in the face of this jungle strength. Our very civilization, Christianity, and culture put us at a disadvantage in such a contest. Industrial and American genius, in our kind of a world, which if harnessed to the chariots of war might have smitten the earth, we hitched to the chariots of peace to edify the earth. They built for war—we built for peace. Now the destiny of man is to be determined upon the field of war. Can we adapt ourselves, can we change over? Not only mechanically, but mentally and spiritually, to meet the foe upon his own ground at his own game, with his own weapons. Can we impregnate every man, every woman, every child who fights on our side to the consciousness that he or she has, too, a personal stake in the outcome of this struggle, which means that he shall not only keep what he or she has, but gain more and better if we win.

What better do we offer our fighters—our people? Are we really determined and resolved in our hearts that, if we win, we shall make it a bonanza for the earth; that, so help us God, we shall bring freedom to the race of man; we shall strike down tyranny, uproot force, chain the god of war tighter than ever Prometheus was bound? Do we swear that the hope of man which flutters upon our banners shall be released and those banners wave triumphant over the world; that every child be better and healthier born, be better educated, according to his inclinations and his powers; that every man and woman reach nearer to the possibilities God has given him; that the agents of science be harnessed for the comfort and beauty of every home; that disease shall be uprooted, poverty overcome, fear erased from the mind of man; that we shall keep together in peace, as we have in war, to build a better world? Are there strong voices who can give us these assurances and arouse us to a oneness around these aims and make them real to us all?

I do not wish to be a prophet of pessimism, but I humbly suggest that we consider that it has not yet been proved that our kind of democracy can stand against the totalitarian state of this day. Indeed, it is both a bright and a dark page of history that the only power which has stood against the dictator is a power whose principles, though estimable, are not democratic. The discipline of the heroic people of Russia, although apparently voluntarily accepted with matchless fervor by those great people, emanates from the top and not the bottom of the structure.

There are some who say hat all discipline is tyrannical. Not so. If a single tyrant imposes his will upon a people and holds them in a viselike discipline, that is tyranny. But if a free people, conscious of the great danger which threatens them, deeply moved by the menace which hangs over their heads, subject themselves freely and voluntarily to a rigorous discipline, that is not tyranny but the highest kind of democracy. This is the supreme challenge to our people. Can we voluntarily impose upon ourselves the stern ordering which alone can make us strong enough to stand up against the ruthless efficiency of a totalitarian power?

Can we give of ourselves, can we give of our money, can we give of our luxuries, can we make voluntarily the sacrifices which the dictators impose upon their people, which will give us a chance against them? This, then, is the supreme test of democracy. In all the world it shall prove not only whether it shall live but whether it deserves to live; it shall prove whether it is a dying or a dynamic order. Not only, therefore, are the eyes of all who now live upon us but the stern gaze of history is focused upon everything we do and everything we do not do. Will

we be big enough to sacrifice our very liberties, our very freedom, temporarily in order that we might preserve those very liberties and that very freedom for the long time to come?

I commend to you what a great English judge, the present Master of the Rolls of Great Britain, said in Washington a bit ago—that the people in Britain have made the very sacrifice of their usual rights and privileges a challenge which they have hurled into the face of dictatorship as the supreme evidence of their determination that those liberties shall live again.

Our forefathers set up on this continent a new kind of nation, built a new kind of a world. In doing so they made every challenge—the challenge of the Old World system, the challenge of the New World dangers and difficulties. They overcame them all and they emerged stronger and mightier with every passing day.

We shall therefore conquer as well the new menace, this hideous monster which has reared his ugly head to devour the earth. We shall slay it and bury it beneath the highest mountains of man's determination; we shall guard it throughout time to see that it is not resurrected; we shall link the earth in a new spirit of good will and cooperation; we shall set up machinery which can order the good earth as man and God would have it.

From the confidence we have in what we can do, from what we have done in our long and honorable past, we know that we shall so meet this new challenge; that they who come after us will say that we kept our rendezvous with destiny; we were true to the race of man.

Armistice Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the work of Woodrow Wilson toward a league of nations became the subject of bitter political debate at the close of the last war. No one then thought that war on a world-wide scale would again be possible. The horrors of World War No. 1 had been so great that no nation or group of nations would again plunge humanity into such devastating tragedy.

Unfortunately, we are finding out that all the planning of Woodrow Wilson should not have been in vain. We are learning that a league of nations was necessary then and is more than ever necessary now. Thoughtful writers and speakers are frequently expressing that point of view.

On Armistice Day of 1943, the Honorable Huston Thompson, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, spoke at the tomb of President Wilson in the Washington Cathedral. His address is of importance in that it points again to the urgency of going forward from the point reached by a great President in the last war. It stresses the desirability of using the machinery already erected and calls upon us now to finish the task to which our arms were dedicated 25 years ago.

Under the permission granted me I add that address at this point:

We meet again at the tomb of Woodrow Wilson to take, as he would say, common counsel of the past, the present, and the future.

It is well that we do so on this twenty-fifth anniversary of the armistice of the Great War; interesting, because he was then the world's greatest leader; important, because he had led our arms to victory and the world out of a wilderness of encircling gloom, to the threshold of a promised land; necessary, because we, and the rest of the world, having turned away from his program, have since been wandering in the wilderness.

Does it not in this hour behoove us, then, to pause and consider a brief background of our immortal leader? We now know that his philosophy was embodied in two of his favorite poems—Kipling's If, and Wordsworth's Happy Warrior. As one of his students, I can go back to the days of his professorship at Princeton and see him standing before his class. An aura seems to be about him, as with arm raised and finger pointed, he sketches subjects of constitutional, economic, or international interest. He illuminates them with such a glow that invariably there is an outburst of applause, and out into the world go students who will never forget the thrill that came from this gifted teacher.

Elevated to the presidency of Princeton, thereafter authors, scholars, and thinkers gravitate toward the little town of Princeton, making it a mecca of high thoughts and high endeavor.

We behold him struggling to keep Princeton University a citadel of democracy, seeking to fire it with what he believes should be its ideal. In the language of Kipling, he was willing, in this effort, to "make one heap of of all his winnings and risk it in one turn of pitch and toss, and lose, and start again at his (your) beginnings." He lost, but in losing he was elevated to the governorship of New Jersey, where he staked his all in behalf of what he believed to be in the interests of the inarticulate masses. This time his reward was the Presidency of the United States.

Immediately, his efforts were dedicated to what he termed the New Freedom. With a swiftness that was startling he put through legislative acts, backing them up with administrative action that made the Government more responsive to the people. And he was suceeding beyond even his dreams, when suddenly the world was ablaze with the attack of the Huns. Calling on every energy in his makeup, he sought to keep us neutral, but our Nation was soon engulfed.

Over night this lover of peace became a terrible warrior—terrible to his enemies because of his implacable drive and extraordinary administrative execution. Remembering how totally unprepared we were, history will probably never record a greater speed or effort under such circumstances.

As democracy and liberalism disappeared down over the horizon, out of the western world, Woodrow Wilson arose to battle for the cause of democracy. He formulated and expounded the reasons for which we were battling in his Eight, and then his Fourteen Points.

Now, he was talking to us as Americans, rousing us, convincing us, convicting us as to our duties. We would have to yield up for the duration many of our most cherished rights—freedom of speech, of assemblage, of the press, even of person and property. Just as he set those Princeton students on fire, so he fired this Nation, and when he had molded it into a cohesive force he turned and addressed the world, and in particular the German people, behind the German Army.

Above the global roar he invited humanity to consider the fundamentals of a just peace. He went so far as to suggest that after we had conquered the enemy there be a peace without victory, meaning thereby one without a spirit of revenge.

Then a strange phenomenon occurred. Behind the enemies' lines there was a kind of mental paralysis as people listened to this voice of democracy. He described democracy as he had seen it in our own land.

Who will challenge the thought that those trumpeting notes of his across the world were as much the cause of bringing about defeat of the enemy as were our brave armies? And the world that listened was, for the moment, delirious with joy when the surrender came and soldiers stacked their arms. Perhaps never again will humanity feel such a thrill as it did on that day.

At first a victorious peace seemed to be in the making. Having attained one of our great objectives, he next proposed "such a peace as will satisfy the longing of the whole world for disinterested justice, embodied in the settlements which are based upon something much better and much more lasting than the selfish competitive interests of powerful states."

But humanity which had gladly climbed the heights with him became confused by voices of prejudice and passion, and, seized with inertia, turned away, and went down the slopes.

Woodrow Wilson had proposed a world organized for peace through a League of Nations embodied in what he termed a Covenant. That Covenant was given its death blow by the refusal of two-thirds of the Senate of the United States to confirm it. As he saw his cause deserted this prophet uttered the following, at Omaha, September 8, 1919:

"I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it."

And a week later, at San Diego, September 19, 1919:

"I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though, it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. * * * What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war."

When Woodrow Wilson passed on, well might his opponents have thought that he had entered Valhalla, never to return. At last they viewed him as one who had passed, after life's fitfull fever, into perpetual obscurity. What was wanted, they said, was a more realistic philosophy than his. Practical leaders were expected to follow one another through what seemed to be a very unobscured future. In fact, life took on such a rosy hue that these self-appointed seers thought that the events of the time were justifying their prophecies. Peoples and nations seemed to prosper. Apparent but not real wealth accumulated and pyramided itself. We actually reached the stage where we believed that there would be no returning to want.

The rumblings from abroad were so dull and obscure that they seemed to come from another world. Nations were at peace with their neighbors and there appeared no reason why such a state should not continue. At least, we were beyond involvement in wars with any foreign government.

Only a global financial crash threw out a warning. Then came rumblings, reports, disturbances, and the second conflagration burst upon the world, engulfing us, as Woodrow Wilson had said it would.

Now the clouds are lifting. The horizon brightens. Our world is beginning to plan another after-war program.

Is it too much to say that the plan of Moscow points toward a League of Nations? Can we not with fair confidence predict that it

will be the League of Nations ere long? Has not our Senate, which was stymied in the past by fear, practically removed that political and mental hazard through the endorsement of the action at Moscow?

"There is no other conceivable way in which any other League of Nations is attainable," said Wilson.

No one can successfully challenge his thought behind the League, since it is founded on cooperation through the "cultivation of friendship."

Such a "friendship must have a machinery," said Wilson. "If I cannot correspond with you," he added, "if I cannot learn your mind, if I cannot cooperate with you, I cannot be your friend, and if the world is to remain a body of friends it must have the means of friendship, the means of constant friendly intercourse, the means of constant watchfulness over the common interest. I never thought," he continued, "that I had a big difference with a man that I did not find when I came into conference with him that after all, it was rather a little difference and that if we were frank with one another, and did not too much stand upon that great enemy of mankind which is called pride we would come together. It is the wish to come together that is more than half of the process."

These utterances of a Christian statesman convey in essence one of the great themes of the New Testament.

But men say that by adopting the covenant we will suffer a loss of sovereignty. How can this be when the actions of the nations are mutually voluntary, and withdrawal from the covenant permissible? If that be a surrender, then is man's whole life a surrender and the teachings of democracy a vain thing.

When, in the approaching days, nations will meet again to form a global association, what will they demand? Will it not be a security based on the respect and preservation of all against external aggression; respect for the political independence of each of us, advice and common counsel as to the means of our protection; a severance of all trade and financial relations toward those who would violate our compact; the support of each for all in financial, economic, war-like matters; a freedom of religion and worship; a free commercial intercourse in the world and freedom from unjust and vexatious restrictions?

All of these protections are, however, clearly expressed in the Covenant of the League. Why, then, ask for another League?

So, despite an almost universal conspiracy to speak in whispers, if at all, in the last 25 years, about the League, logic, and reason are driving us toward it, and into it, as surely as the sun has risen this day. With its ascension will emerge a long deferred glory for him beside whose mortal remains we stand today.

As he speaks to us from the tomb I believe we can hear him say, "Finish the task to which our arms are dedicated. Then draw a veil over the mistakes of the past. Begin again at your beginnings, with charity for all and malice toward none; let security founded upon friendship, be the watchword."

Political Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System Tuesday evening, November 16, 1943, in the Congress Speaks series:

The issue of providing $800,000,000 for food subsidies, as demanded by President Roosevelt and the New Deal superguard, will be up for consideration in Congress on Thursday of this week. The administration of this proposal is under the Office of Price Administration, commonly called the O. P. A. This agency has for its chief spokesman and economist, an inexperienced and intellectual young man by name of Richard Gilbert, a leading thinker of the superguard, and also a follower of the Henderson-Ginsburg philosophy which proclaims that the American people are not fit to govern themselves, and that they, the intellectual but inexperienced bureaucracy must permanently take over and direct the social, economic, and political welfare of all of the people. In other words, these bureaucrats in the superguard are laying plans to continue themselves in power on the domestic front, and the food subsidy proposal is one of the schemes which they intend to use to again fool the people.

Last night, I had the opportunity to listen, over another network, to my colleague from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, a leading New Deal Democrat, who extolled the virtues of the O. P. A. and food subsidies, and told the country that the issue of subsidies and roll-backs was a political issue. He charged the Republicans with a conspiracy to defeat the New Deal subsidy program. I have always felt that the question of food subsidies was an economic issue, but now that Mr. PATMAN, as spokesman for the President and the New Deal superguard, has come out in the open, and declared the issue to be strictly political, I will take him and the administration at their word. Furthermore, if the Republicans have entered into a conspiracy to defeat subsidies, which I emphatically deny, then there must be a lot of Republicans in the country. Ninety percent of the people of the solid Democratic South, including the State of Texas, are bitterly opposed to food subsidies. A fellow Texan of Mr. PATMAN, Judge Joseph Montague, of Fort Worth, denounces subsidies as a form of government "bribery and blackmail." He also states that the subsidy scheme is a part of a bureaucratic program to "revolutionize the social, economic, and political structure of this country." Judge Montague is a Democrat. Congressman HENRY STEAGALL, a Democrat and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, is leading the fight against the subsidy scheme. I could mention at least 50 more prominent Democrats in the House who are of the same opinion, including the distinguished statesman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS. Does the administration believe that these men would enter into a conspiracy? I might also add that the Democrats have a working majority in Congress, and they could put through any legislation demanded by their leader, but most of them have refused to continue being used as "rubber stamps."

Farmers everywhere, business and professional men, and the rank and file of consumers are opposed to food subsidies to be paid out of the United States Treasury. They are willing to pay their own grocery bill. They recognize that for every dollar taken out of the Treasury to help pay on grocery bills, they will be called upon to pay approximately $3 in taxes and much more in interest on Government bonds.

The trouble with the gentleman from Texas and his New Deal associates, is the fact that during the past 10 years, they have become so accustomed to paying out billions of dollars from the Treasury in their effort to retain political support, that they now feel it necessary to make a political offer for 1944 to pay a few dollars on every one's grocery bill, which includes Rockefeller and Henry Ford, out of the United States Treasury and at the expense of the taxpayers—and that means all of the people. Don't forget that we have had a new tax bill, with increased rates, every year for the past 10 years.

Let us examine the merits of the subsidy proposal and see how it works. Thus far, the subsidy scheme contemplates paying a part of your milk, butter and meat bill. If the average individual uses 5 quarts of milk a week, the Government will pay 1 cent a quart subsidy, or $2.60 for the year. According to the War Food Administration, the milk subsidy to save you $2.60 a year on your milk bill, will cost the taxpayers $90,000,000 for 3 months or $360,000,000 for a year. The roll-back and subsidy on butter is 5 cents a pound, if you can get it. Under the rationing system of 16 points per pound, you may be able to get 12 pounds of butter a year, which figures up a saving of 60 cents on butter for 12 months. This small item will cost the taxpayers $90,000,000 a year. Under the roll-back and subsidy scheme you are supposed to save 3 cents per pound on meat, if you have points enough to get it after buying butter. We will assume that you can buy 2 pounds of meat a week, which means, under the subsidy plan, that the Government will pay 6 cents a week on your meat bill, or $3.12 a year. The total cost of the meat subsidy for a year is estimated to be $350,000,000.

Now, let us do a little simple arithmetic. The sponsors of the subsidy scheme propose to save you $2.60 a year on your milk bill, 60 cents a year on your butter bill, and $3.12 a year on your meat bill, making a total saving on this part of your grocery bill for 1944 of $6.32. And it will cost the taxpayers, and that means all of you, the staggering sum of $800,000,000, to say nothing of the additional cost of hiring thousands of New Deal administrators to police and administer the scheme. This is to save you $6.32 on your 1944 election-year grocery bill.

Let us do a little more figuring. Of course, the Treasury does not have the $800,000,000 and, therefore, more taxes must be raised and more bonds sold to each of you. If this sum is to be raised by taxation, the normal tax rate must be increased from 10 percent as fixed by the new tax bill, to 11.6 percent. Everyone realizes that money raised by taxation must first be used to finance and win the war and, therefore, it will be necessary for the Treasury to sell you War Savings bonds to make up this subsidy fund for 1944.

When we consider that our national debt may be over $300,000,000,000 before the end of the war, no one expects that the $800,000,000 in bonds sold to raise the money to save you $6.32 on your 1944 grocery bill will be paid within 50 years. The interest alone on the $800,000,000 for 50 years at the rate allowed for War Savings bonds will be $1,160,000,000 and the total amount paid out in interest and principal to redeem the bonds will be $1,960,000,000, or more than 2⅓ times the amount of the original subsidy. This means that in the end every consumer will pay around $19 in taxes to save $6.32 on your 1944 election-year grocery bill. Some argue, why worry about what is going to take place 50 years from 1944. Well, if we don't pay our grocery bill today, your children and grandchildren will be called upon to do it. I am inclined to believe that the coming generations will have enough of a burden on their shoulders to help pay for the cost of this tragic war.

Congressman PATMAN, as the spokesman for the administration, did not present a single argument for the food-subsidy scheme. On the contrary, in his desperation he charged political conspiracy against radio commentators, news columnists, and Republicans, and blamed them for inflation and future economic collapse. The Congressman forgets that the New Deal and its planned economy has been in power for the past 10

years and still has control of the Government with a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress. New Deal failures cannot be shunted aside so lightly, Mr. Spokesman, and the people know it and will remember in 1944.

Congressman PATMAN also said that the Government was buying one-half of all commodities upon which a subsidy was paid. If this statement were correct, you would not be able to get enough meat, milk, and butter to give yourself a diet for the average Hottentot. If the statement is accurate, we have one of the answers for raising the points on butter from 8 to 16 points, and the reason for the scarcity of milk. Time will not permit to analyze all commodities, but in the case of butter, the Government bought 456,000,000 pounds or 35 percent of the production of butter between February and October 1 of this year, to be used by the armed forces, lend-lease for our allies, and for other purposes. That is the reason for the shortage of butter to take care of civilian needs.

Let me add here that certain subsidies were authorized by Congress to increase the production of critical materials. Food subsidies to consumers, as I have outlined are inflationary and will retard production of foods instead of increasing them. Producers of food need man and machine power to produce in abundance, and they must be placed in a proper competitive position with reference to price levels, if we are to keep our armed forces and civilians with adequate supplies of food.

The people of the United States are rapidly discovering that they are being governed by bureaucratic orders, regulations, and directives from Washington, many of which are illegal, instead of by laws enacted by your Congress—and they don't like it. Prior to 10 years ago—the inception of the New Deal—it was the custom for a large majority of the American people to respect laws enacted by Congress. They expected the Executive and the courts to administer and construe such laws according to the intent of Congress. Our Government was designed to be one of laws and not of men.

But this kind of traditional American government has been changed, and we are now largely governed by men—call them bureaucrats, if you please, who disregard the intent of Congress, and issue thousands of orders and regulations according to their personal views as to how our domestic economy and government should be run. I am not saying that all officials in key places are unfit men for the positions which they occupy, because they are scores of good men who are trying their utmost to carry out laws according to the will of Congress. But it is to be regretted that the President has seen fit to place so many inexperienced and incompetent men in high policy-making positions, when it is well known that most of these officials are bending every effort to reshape our democracy—to what appears to be a socialistic state, and to permanently remake our free economy so every citizen will be compelled to come to them in Washington and pray for permission to operate a farm, conduct a business, or engage in a profession.

It is only natural for you to ask, Who is responsible for this change in the operation of our Government? Primarily, the fault rests upon the Democratic majority in Congress. During the past 10 years of New Deal regimentation, and up to January 3, 1943, the large "rubber stamp" Democratic majority in Congress, over the vigorous and bitter opposition of the small Republican minority, delegated a tremendous amount of legislative power to President Roosevelt, and this made possible the building of the gigantic and dictatorial bureaucracy about which the people complain today.

Congress, with the aid of an aroused public opinion expressed at the polls, will recover its legislative power, and that will be soon. Since the beginning of the Seventy-eighth Congress in January several important powers have been recaptured from the Executive, and more will be accomplished in this direction by the denial of appropriations to those agencies and bureaus which seek to undermine our form of government and system of enterprise. We want no traffic with socialism or any other kind of "ism" except Americanism. We want to keep America free. That is what our boys are fighting and dying for on the battle fronts of the world. We have a job to do on the home front to keep faith with the men who will keep America free and we must not let them down.

Before the spokesman for the administration, from Texas, begins charging politics and conspiracy against the Republicans of this country he and his New Deal associates had better take a good look at themselves on the cool of a November evening. Abraham Lincoln said something about fooling the people part of the time but not fooling them all of the time. I will take the gentleman from Texas at his word and consider that he, as spokesman for the New Deal, has at least told the truth by designating the food subsidy scheme as a political device for the 1944 election year, and I can assure him that the people will not fail to speak with emphasis when the roll is called in 1944.

Read It—Then Complain if You Can

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a boy who died on the battlefield in the jungle of New Guinea, after laying for 10 days, suffering from wounds, comes a letter dated December 11, 1942. It was addressed to his parents and read:

Dearly beloved, my dear, sweet father, mother, and sister, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Horton, Jr., and sister, Gwenivere. [About 9 a. m.]

I came out on a mercy patrol to pick up the dog tags of our dead. This was the morning of December 1, 1942.

I was trying to turn over the body of Captain Keast, a friend of mine, when I was shot two or three times in my right leg and hip. Lieutenant Ellis, Sergeant Young, and Pvt. Merle Christian were with me. I yelled that I was shot. I was in front of all but Merle. They ran for shelter. I dragged myself toward a Jap grass shanty about 12 yards to the rear of where I was shot.

Sergeant Young said he would send help as soon as possible. The possible never came, evidently, because I lay there unattended in any way, without food or water or medical care. Two days of semidelirium, and then I called Captain Shirley's name. Finally Lieutenant Gibbs and one of his men from the antitank company came to me. Their medic also came with them. Their medic gave me my first drink of water in 3 days, but he had no food to offer. The medic bandaged me temporarily. Lieutenant Gibbs promised me aid, but I never saw him again.

The medic came back and gave me water, but a man helping him got shot there and that scared him away. Life from then on was a terrible nightmare. The hot, burning sun. The delirious nights. No one came near me from then on, but I did dig a water hole in 4 days' time, which was wonderful to me, although it was polluted by all the rotting bodies within 12 or 14 feet of me.

Then two or three rescue parties from my company came out, but they never could find me. On two or three occasions they nearly got to me, when the Japs or rainstorms made it impossible. The Japs were living within 15 yards of me. I could see them every day.

I have tried to make splints and crawl or walk out, but I just can't make them. Today [as nearly as I can judge, December 11] I managed to stand, but I can go no farther. A Jap shot me in the shoulder and neck as I weakly sat there and I thought my time had come, but no.

I sit here and lie here in this terrible place, wondering not why God has forsaken me, but rather why He is making me suffer this terrible end.

It is true I understand life and its reason now, but why should He send it to this terrible grave with me? Why not let me live and tell others? I am not afraid to die, although I nearly lost my faith during a couple of days here. I have a pistol here but I could not kill myself. I still have faith in the Lord. I think he must be giving me the supreme test.

I know now how Christ felt on the cross—I have imagined hearing several other rescue parties, but one's imagination grows as his body shrivels—I have had no food of any kind since that morning I was shot. My right hip is broken and my right leg, both compound fractures, else I would have been out of here the first couple of days, wounds or no wounds.

My life has been good, but I am so young and have so many things undone that a man of 29 should do—we may never know God's purpose in striking me down like this, but He must have one. I can say truthfully that I have never killed a man, although I have been ordered to order others to kill——. I wonder how long a man can go on like this? I shall continue to pray for a miracle of rescue. I want to commend Lieutenant Ellis for his wonderful effort and heroism in attempting to rescue me under Jap treachery.

God bless you, my loved ones. Keep the faith—don't worry. I shall see you all again some day. I am prepared to meet my Maker. Love,

HERSCHEL.

Mr. Speaker, the next time I begin to feel sorry for myself, I will read the foregoing letter again.

Hull's Great Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, Americans all agree that Cordell Hull did a most remarkable job at the Moscow Conference. This news came as no surprise to the majority of our people. His sincerity, honesty, and strong Jeffer-

sonian character undoubtedly impressed Joseph Stalin.

He was born into a humble log-cabin home of Tennessee, the humbleness of which he has personified throughout a career of marked success as a soldier and statesman. So often it is that the values and virtues of a great man are not recognized or recorded until long ere the life is spent. Not so with Cordell Hull, for today all Americans and freedom-loving people the globe over pay tribute and offer a resounding three cheers for the Nation's stalwart statesman from the deep South.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I ask leave to include a recent editorial from one of Tennessee's great newspapers, the Commercial Appeal:

HULL'S GREAT STATURE

When Secretary of State Cordell Hull—Judge Hull to Tennessee—returned to Washington from his fateful journey to Moscow he was met by the President of the United States. Thereby was history made, for there is scarcely a handful of living men to whom such honor would be paid, and they would have to be chiefs of great states. Never before has honor so great been done a subordinate American official.

That gesture of appreciation for accomplishment symbolizes more than anything else which has happened the great length of the shadow which Judge Hull's stature casts across his native land, and when one thinks back just a few weeks when Judge Hull's leftist detractors were decrying him as the man "who betrayed Russia," retributive, indeed, was the justice of a President's warm and grateful welcome home to his senior Cabinet member.

There are many aspects of Judge Hull's far journey and its result which challenge the imagination and admiration, not only of his friends, but of all the world.

His burden in the State Department has for many years been a crushing one. In the face of strong antagonism and suspicion he made pan-Americanism such a real and practical thing with his trade pacts, his obviously sincere desire of a good neighborliness of more than mere words that when war did come to us only one of the Pan American Union—Argentina—failed to fall quickly into step with the United Nations.

Because necessity compelled it, his was the tremendous task of preventing a climactic break-down in Japanese-American relations any sooner than it did come. A year before the break, Judge Hull warned it was inevitable. It was not his fault that it was so totally disregarded.

The journey to Moscow was undertaken immediately after there had been a grave transition in the State Department which had its culmination in the resignation of Under Secretary Sumner Welles, an occurrence which, unquestionably, put further great strain on Judge Hull. Nor was that all. His detractors had done all they could to add to his burdens, to misrepresent him to the Russian people—to establish the lie in their minds that he was their enemy rather than the friend he is and has been.

In that sort of atmosphere did a 72-year-old man set forth on his first air journey of thousands of miles—a journey fraught with great dangers, and one which would have taxed the endurance of much younger men.

Judge Hull was a predominant figure at the history-making conference which brought forth the momentous Moscow declarations. Stalin likes him. Russia likes him. They couldn't help it, because they like and understand virility of character and plain speaking, and there's much that is homespun in them. In Judge Hull they found a type of international statesman they hadn't encountered before—one who would deal across the board and say what he thought without any superfluous sugar coating, and he doesn't "double talk."

Now he is home in triumph and the Nation seems to be suddenly discovering what Tennessee has known these many years—that in Judge Hull the people have a spokesman and representative whose capabilities and accomplishments are not dwarfed by those of any who have ever preceded him in direction of America's foreign policy.

Tennessee knows the hill country wherein lie the taproots of Cordell Hull's background—his strength, his vision, his honesty—his forthrightness. Have his accomplishments belied his years? The Tennessee mountain folk are lean folk, and as rugged as the hills unto which they daily lift their eyes. They live and work long.

As for politics, "The Judge" was schooled in Nashville's old Maxwell House, and thus was his an education denied Marshal Stalin, President Roosevelt, and Prime Minister Churchill, past masters though they be in the art of international politics.

When Judge Hull sat down at the Moscow table there was none there who knew better than he how to play that particular game. Play it he did—to win, we hope, for all mankind.

Burning of the University of Naples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Hillyer Junior College faculty on the burning of the University of Naples by the Germans which, I am certain, will be of interest to my colleagues:

Whereas the University of Naples, Italy, together with its library, as well as the libraries of the Academia Pontinania and of the Royal Society of Naples, was wantonly and maliciously burned on September 12, 1943, by the German Army occupying Naples; and

Whereas this university, founded in 1224, and consequently one of the most ancient institutions of higher learning in the world, symbolizes the striving of all peoples toward knowledge, decency, and civilization: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the faculty of Hillyer Junior College condemns the destruction of the University of Naples by the German Army as an act of irresponsible savagery and brutality;

And furthermore that the faculty of Hillyer Junior College respectfully urges all institutions of higher learning and all friends of education in the United States of America and in the civilized world to join forces at the expiration of the present war in an attempt to restore the University of Naples, insofar as this may prove possible, to its former status of educational importance and effectiveness.

Federal Control of Commercial Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and telegrams:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of October 25, 1943]

UNIFIED CONTROL ESSENTIAL

A post-war plan already undertaken and deserving of support is embodied in the pending Lea-Bailey bill to establish Federal control of commercial aviation and prohibit regulation by individual States.

Just how far we'll advance toward that superaerial dream the advertising artists portray, with the skies swarming with gigantic liners and freighters, there's no telling now. But it's obvious that little progress or convenience will result from even limited aviation development if every State line is to be a regulatory barrier—and every one different.

It's easy to imagine what a muddle the railroads would have been in all these years had varying rates and conflicting regulations of all kinds prevailed in each State. And difficult as that might seem, it would be nothing compared to the confusion such a set-up would create in the air.

Growing centralization of government is in many cases a trend to be resisted. But regulation of interstate commerce is unquestionably and properly reserved to Federal jurisdiction, and the sooner this additional measure of control is adopted the better.

Hon. C. F. LEA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a member of the Aeronautical Advisory Commission of the State of Ohio, and the commissioner of airports of the city of Cleveland, it gives me great pleasure to wholeheartedly endorse your bill, H. R. 3420.

JOHN BERRY.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

House bill 3420 regarding regulation of aeronautics should be passed, as its provisions are urgently needed at this time. The uncertainties and conflicts of the present situation should be cleared up at once by the passage of this bill.

WILFRID O'LEARY,
Wyoming State Aeronautical Commission.

OCTOBER 28, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Nebraska Aeronautics Commission heartily endorses H. R. 3420, as we believe its enactment is necessary to the future expansion of aviation.

C. M. SHARRAR,
Chairman, Nebraska
Aeronautics Commission.

Civil War in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper articles dealing with the Yugoslav situation. One is by William Philip Simms, published in the Washington News, and the other is by Ervin Acel, published in the New York News of October 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News]

YUGOSLAV MESS

(By William Philip Simms)

The situation in Yugoslavia is rapidly developing into a mess which, unless cleared up soon, will cast discredit, if not disgrace, on the Allied cause.

Partisans of Gen. Josip (Tito) Brozovich in this country are now convinced that the government-in-exile of King Peter II is on the way out and that recognition by the big powers of Tito's revolutionaries in Yugoslavia is near.

The immediate reason for this belief was the amazingly blunt warning of Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, Allied commander in chief in the Middle East, to "certain men dishonoring the name of Chetnik." Some "Chetniks," he charged in a radio broadcast to Yugoslavia, were aiding the Nazis against "patriotic elements" within that country. Unless they ceased, he said, they would be regarded as traitors.

The significant thing is that Sir Henry did not include all Yugoslavs in his ultimatum. He specified "Chetniks," the name by which Gen. Draja Mihailovich's guerrillas are known. He did not mention the "Partisans," as Tito's forces are called.

General Mihailovich is Minister of War in the Yugoslav government-in-exile. He is King Peter's commander in chief in the field. With the backing of the British and Americans, King Peter's government overthrew the regency of Prince Paul and joined the Allies. Mihailovich, then a colonel, took to the hills and at once began to organize resistance against the Axis. He has more than won his place as an Allied leader.

General Brozovich is a Croatian, a former metal worker, a veteran of the Bolshevik revolution and the Spanish civil war. As a Communist or leftist organizer against King Alexander, Peter's father, he took the name of "Tito" or "Broz." He and his guerrillas are now continuing the fight against the dynasty, and his activities have the complete and powerful backing of Moscow.

Between these two groups, the Chetniks and the Partisans, there has long been a state of civil war. And both have been fighting the Axis. At times, Axis troops and Partisans would be attacking the Chetniks, and at others, no doubt, Chetniks and Axis forces would be attacking the Partisans. It might well happen, under the extraordinary circumstances.

The time, however, is rapidly approaching when the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union must agree on a joint Yugoslav policy. This should be one of the first jobs tackled by the European Advisory Commission at London. Until recently Washington and London backed King Peter, and Moscow backed Tito. Of late, however, for reasons of expediency or otherwise, London has been moving in the direction of the Partisans and Sir Henry's warning to the "Chetniks" indicated closer relations still. At any rate, that is the impression among Tito's supporters in this country, and the impression is not doing Allied prestige much good.

The smaller members of the United Nations feel that if expediency is to be the yardstick, then the Atlantic Charter and all the other democratic pronouncements were just so much window-dressing.

Miss Ruth Mitchell, sister of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell and an honorary "Chetnik," telegraphs from Nevada that "we are betraying the Serbs." They were with us in the First World War, she observes, and are with us in the second. The Croats were against us in both. Now, she says, they are trying to escape the penalty for having sided with the Axis by joining Tito's Partisans and the Communists.

"Our disloyalty to the Serbs," she wires, "is a black disgrace to democracy * * * and can only result in strengthening antidemocratic forces everywhere."

[From the New York News of October 30, 1943]

WAR WITHIN WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA KNOTTY PROBLEM TO ALLIES

(By Ervin Acel)

Hardly any incident of the war has pained and perplexed the Allied world as much as the fratricidal struggle between rival Yugoslav factions in the Balkans. The two guerrilla leaders, Draja Mihailovitch and Josip (Tito) Brozovitch, fight not only against the Axis but also among themselves.

The real importance of this quarrel is that it forecasts the difficulties that will have to be overcome at the peace table by Allied statesmen—if they want to establish a permanent settlement in eastern Europe. In the end it may prove much easier to lay down conditions for the defeated Axis than to deal with some of our allies.

SYNTHETIC NATION

The present civil war in Yugoslavia is the result of the fact that she was made up of motley and mutually hostile elements. The Versailles and Trianon peace treaties rearranged eastern Europe on the basis of power politics.

Yugoslavia, as created after the First World War, has contained about 16,000,000 inhabitants. But the ruling Serbs numbered only 6,500,000. Under the Serbs have lived 5,000,000 Croats, 1,200,000 Slovenes, 1,000,000 Macedonians or Bulgars, 600,000 Germans, 500,000 Albanians, and 500,000 Magyars.

These races from the beginning did not harmonize. Especially there has been friction between the two leading components—Serbs and Croats. Instead of bowing to centralized Serb rule, the Croats have been striving for autonomy.

ESTABLISHED DICTATORSHIP

The struggle culminated in the killing of Stephan Radich, Croat leader, in the Belgrade Parliament by a hot-headed Serb deputy. This made parliamentary government difficult and, as a consequence, the late King Alexander established a dictatorship in 1929. Alexander himself in turn was murdered by Croat conspirators in 1934.

Address to National Grange by Senator Aiken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN THOMAS

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered November 3 last by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at Grand Rapids, Mich., before the National Grange.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In attending this session of the National Grange, I have attained a desire of long standing. Thirty-seven years ago last month, I became a member of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry and for 37 years it has been my hope that some time I might attend a meeting and become a member of the National Grange. Therefore, it gives me the greatest pleasure to be at this meeting today.

There is another reason, irrespective of my desire to attend as a member, which gives me much satisfaction. That is the close cooperation which the Congress, and particularly the Senate Committee on Agriculture, has received from the National Grange.

There is no organization representing any group or principle which stands higher in the respect of Members of Congress than does the Grange. The work of Past Master Louis Taber is well known to you and I want to tell you that in Worthy Master Goss he has a most able successor.

Albert Goss appears very frequently before committees of which I am a member and other committees of the Congress as well. His influence in behalf of sound legislation for American agriculture cannot be overrated, and the respect which Members of Congress have for him is also held by the leaders and the membership of all the great farm organizations as well. He has played a great part in bringing together farm groups to work for a mutual cause and I am glad to pay tribute to him today before you who have chosen him for the high office which he holds.

Perhaps some of you may think that what I am going to say to you is too political, but if there ever was a time since the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock when every person in America should be interested in his Government and in politics, that time is now. I assure you that whatever I may say I will not speak as a partisan, but as an American.

The National Congress has recently devoted 2 weeks of debate to a resolution expressing the hopes and desires of the United States for a post-war organization of nations for the prevention of future wars and the promotion of economic stability and prosperity throughout the world.

Public speakers, the press, and the radio have found this subject a popular one for discussion. The announced objective is most laudable. Both the humble and the great desire a world wherein justice, freedom, peace, and plenty may prevail.

No such organization of nations can long endure unless all of the great powers participate therein. No such organization can long endure unless each nation which participates does so in full sincerity.

The success of any undertaking of this nature will depend not only on the integrity, but upon the soundness of the participating governments.

If England, Russia, China, or the United States takes part in an international cooperative body for any other purpose than the laudable ones which have been pronounced, the organization will fail. Therefore, it is vitally necessary that the affairs of each of these nations be ably and honestly administered by its respective governments.

If we are to have a world-wide political structure, it must be built upon a foundation of government reaching down through each national government, through the states or provinces, and finally to each community.

That foundation must be sound. The lofty words of American statesmen, even the idealistic utterances of the President, mean nothing unless government in America, even down to the town and county unit, is conducted on a plane worthy of the ideals we seek.

That is why I will speak to you today not of the perfect political order of the world which may lie untold centuries into the future, but upon the Government of the United States under which we live and upon which the attainment of a broader idealism must depend.

America has long been regarded as the stronghold of democracy. It was settled by those hardy souls of the Old World who chose to face the dangers of the wilderness in preference to the suppression of freedom, a condition which for centuries has plagued the nations of Europe.

Our forefathers carved not only their homes but their freedom as well out of the forests and prairies of North America. They built their liberties and their wealth and their government step by step over 300 years of time and every step was gained at the cost at which such priceless treasures must be bought. They freed themselves of the Old World tyrannies and founded a nation based upon the right of freemen to govern themselves; a nation founded upon ideals and principles which never grow old. During the intervening 160 years, they have many times been called upon to defend those ideals and principles with their lives.

The heritage which our forefathers gained has been handed down from generation to generation and has been added to during the trusteeship of each.

It was inevitable that from time to time our national security should be threatened. Each time that this has happened, the farm people of America have united to successfully repel each threat. They must fight again today. Farmers of the North, South, East, and West must unite with all their strength to again repel forces which if unrestrained will destroy our right to live as free Americans and reduce our country to the political level of Old World nations.

We are engaged in a battle for the preservation of American democracy. We cannot fight this battle as Republicans or Democrats, but we must fight it as 100-percent Americans and freemen of the soil.

It is for us to say whether misfortune shall come to our country or not. It is for us to say whether we shall become subservient to the Government or will continue to carry onward the banner of a government controlled by the people. Upon the course we choose will depend not only our own future but the future of a prayerful and discouraged world as well.

Whether we want it or not, most of the nations of the earth look to America for leadership today. We will accept that leadership and pray that we may use it wisely. It must not carry with it, however, any pledge to support the rest of the world. We cannot do this. We should not promise that which we cannot do. We can only help the other people to help themselves. We will not do this by scattering American resources in careless abandonment. Above all, let us promise ourselves that while we will assume leadership, it will be world leadership and not world domination.

But before we assume that we can lead the world to a better day, let us take stock of ourselves.

For 10 years now we have drifted toward centralization and paternalism of Government in Washington. The fault does not lie wholly with those officials to whom we have delegated such broad powers until today we have become regimented to an un-American extent. The American people and the Congress are as much to blame for this condition as are those who have sought such power.

For more than a decade following the First World War, Americans lived high, wide, and handsome. If we could write our name we could borrow money—and we did. Most of us lived beyond our means. We went heavily in debt. We lived a life of comparative luxury, and when the economic crash came we were unwilling to give up those things which we had learned to enjoy but could not always afford.

We, the people, demanded that Government take care of us in the manner to which we had become accustomed. We passed laws to bring this about. We put our burden on a government composed of human beings with human weaknesses and human desires for power.

We demanded that Government give. The Government gave, but for each hand-out we gave a portion of our liberty in return.

Now we know that we have gone too far in surrendering our most precious asset and we fret under the restraint which has been placed upon us by our unwillingness to carry our own burdens.

A Supreme Court decision has ruled that "where Government gives money it has the right to regulate." If the American farmer accepts a Government check in lieu of an equitable market price for that which he produces, he may expect Government to regulate our farms and our lives.

Please don't get the idea that I am opposed to all Government spending in behalf of our farmers. I believe that Government should contribute in restoring areas where disaster has struck. I believe that we were wise in offering incentive payments for the production of flax, hemp, vegetable oil, and other farm crops which were previously imported in large quantities but the importation of which has been stopped by the war.

I believe in support prices for some farm crops. Support prices guaranteeing adequate returns to the farmers have secured an immense supply of pork and potatoes. I want to say, however, that when the Government offers a support price the Government must maintain that price.

These are methods of increasing production which I can approve of. I believe they are authorized by the Price Control Act.

I want to state emphatically, however, that I do not approve the executive department's failure to comply with certain provisions of the Price Control Act.

The Congress inserted three provisions in this act for the express purpose of protecting American agriculture. One provision provides that the Office of Price Administration shall not interfere with the functions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act. Another paragraph provides that in fixing ceiling prices for farm products the cost of farm labor must be given full consideration. And the third provision requires the executive department to modify ceiling prices so as to reflect changing costs of production.

These three provisions of the Price Control Act have not been complied with by the executive department, and thus a grave issue has been raised. That issue is whether the executive department of our Government can defy the expressed will of the Congress.

Industry has accepted Government benefits until the operations of virtually every industry in America are regulated from Washington.

A large number of American industrialists and businessmen fear to protest the abuses which Government heaps upon them. They are afraid they will lose Government contracts if they do. I'd like to say to American businessmen that they are never going to recover their rights as American businessmen without somebody getting hurt.

Maybe they would lose contracts. Maybe many of them would be forced into bankruptcy, but unless they stand up for the rights which are properly theirs, they will find themselves completely regimented by Government with no rights at all. Someone has got to sacrifice if this battle for the preservation of democracy is to be won.

The national debt limit of necessity has been raised from time to time until there is a strong probability that before the war in which we are engaged is ended, we shall owe a total national debt of over $300,000,000,000.

We, and those who come after us, including the men in the armed services who will return, must some day pay this debt. We should hold it to a minimum. It will be a travesty on justice and a travesty on good government if we permit the Government, in its desire to ingratiate itself with the consuming public, and that means all of us, to run up grocery bills for the boys to pay when they get home. I shall oppose any raid on the Treasury for this purpose, even though such raid be led by President Roosevelt himself.

We should see to it that every worthy person in America has enough to eat, but at a time when more people are better able to pay for their food than ever before, we must insist that they do so and refuse to burden the generations that will follow us.

At the same time, we must not be misled by those forces both in and out of Government who would use the age-old technique of divide and conquer. These forces scheme to set labor, agriculture, and industry against one another. They conspire to set race against race and creed against creed. They stir up region against region. They would divide and discredit the Congress in order to attain their ends. In fact, at times it appears as if hostilities actually existed among these groups. Let us realize that we are interdependent, and let's stop these foolish attempts to secure special advantages for one group or another.

When industry or labor is distressed, we lose our markets and when farm income is below its rightful level, industry and labor also suffer to a corresponding extent.

I have been in Washington 3 years and I have had scarcely any communications from industrial workers protesting the efforts of farm people to secure decent prices. Only the professional agitators are now raising the cry of lower farm prices so that city consumers can buy their food for less and farmers be forced to kneel before the altar of government. The rank and file of human beings are very much the same wherever we find them. We should all try to understand the problems of other groups.

A large percentage of the farm population of the United States was distinctly elated at the results of the elections on November 2. They interpreted these results as America's answer to the bureaucratic system of government. While I, too, rejoice at the spirit which was shown in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky, which shows the awakening of a long-patient citizenry, yet I

would temper this rejoicing with a word of caution.

The American people are indisputably girding themselves to battle the policy of regimentation and reckless expenditures by government. This swing is bound to continue and expand. It must not go too far, however. We don't want to return to the feudal ages any more than we want to adopt the policy of communism, state socialism or fascism.

I see little choice between living under an economic dictatorship or under a political dictatorship, except that theoretically we can always control an economic monopoly.

However, my word of warning is this—there are those in America who would repeal many of the rightful advantages which agriculture has achieved during the past generation. There are those who would do away with farm cooperatives. There are those who would repeal the laws providing for farm credit at reasonable rates of interest. There are those who would gladly turn the rural electric lines over to corporate interests. There are those who would sell out American agriculture to foreign nations for the benefit of certain industries. There are those who believe that every man who is poor is responsible for his own misfortune.

These people must not control our Nation. Let us give them fair warning that we are not going to turn the hands of the clock of progress backwards.

Both major political parties in the United States have been perilously close to moral bankruptcy during recent years. They have indicated little regard for the rights of the common man. We cannot expect either of them to represent the great mass of American people except as we compel them to do so in order to gain or retain supremacy. Let us force them to keep their hands clean. We don't want a political party run by Wall Street in control in Washington any more than we want a party with ideas of Old World political domination.

We do not want our political system in America to sink to the level of the old world, where all opposition to the Government is driven into the cellars and the side streets. Nor do we want our politics conducted from the back offices of corporate monopolies who think only in terms of their greed for wealth and power. If our great political parties do not avoid those pitfalls, they will bring chaos and disaster to America within our own generation.

Whether our politics are kept clean or not depends upon the interest shown by the people. This interest must start in local affairs. If we are concerned with the affairs of our town, our county, our State, we need not worry so much about the National Government, but if we show no interest in our local affairs we may be sure that such lack of concern will be reflected in incompetency and even dishonesty at Washington.

The kind of government we will have depends upon how we meet the present crisis. If we divide among ourselves; if we permit agriculture to hate labor and labor to hate industry; if we indulge in race rioting or food rioting or any other preliminary to revolution to a great enough extent then we have a right to fear that some day a military dictatorship will take charge of us.

There is no question but what a comparatively small group of people is working to this end. We can easily defeat their purpose by the simple use of common sense. That means realizing that labor is comprised almost wholly of loyal, patriotic, honest Americans, though they have bad men in their ranks.

We must realize that industry stands foursquare for a free productive America, though they have in their ranks men who by almost any means would gain control over necessities of life and thus exercise an economic dictatorship.

I dare say that not all of us engaged in agriculture are as good as we might be. We must work with labor and industry to preserve our country and not exhaust ourselves fighting each other. We must stop calling names and writing derogatory editorials and refusing to hear the other side of the case if we don't want the Old World brand of government practiced on us.

I say to you that the opponents of progress will unquestionably attempt to seize control and dictate the policies of any political party which they think will best serve their purpose. They will promote their candidates behind a front of righteousnes· and respectability. They will conduct their operations so as to focus the mind of the public on worthy motives as far removed as possible from their own ulterior objectives. They will seek the support of agriculture by pointing out the things which have been done to our disadvantage while they say nothing about the schemes they really have in mind.

Let us not be fooled. We know the good that has been done for agriculture during the past generation. We also know the evil that has been inflicted upon us.

The farmers of America should not follow blindly the leadership of any political group which seeks either party or national control and which simply promises to undo certain existing bad practices. The time may be past when the agricultural vote of America controls elections, but the time is not past when we hold the balance of power.

Let us make the most of it. Let us warn any political group and party that seeks our support that we are going forward, not backward, and let us put political candidates irrevocably on record as to how they stand on farm financing, transportation, inland waterways, rural electrification, farmer and consumer cooperatives, education for the children of the poor, and consideration for the helpless and needy.

Within the next 12 months, candidates for every office from the Presidency itself down to town selectman will be seeking your support and your vote. I urge you to scrutinize each one of these candidates closely before you grant him or her your suffrage. Not only should you look at the record of the men and women whom you send to make your laws and to execute them, but you should look over their shoulders to make sure that no selfish or reactionary forces or advocates of alien doctrines are lurking ther .

I have not spoken to you today in the manner in which I usually speak. I would much prefer to talk about the happier picture of rural life; of our cooperative efforts to bring about the better days that I think will come, of the growing of crops, the new methods of processing foods, of the greater conveniences and opportunities of farm life to come

I have departed from my usual manner of speaking because I believe that the most important thing in America today is to make everybody Government conscious if possible.

Unless we are on guard, there won't be happier days ahead for our farmers or any other people.

Here we are with our form of government threatened by a small group comprised of not more than a few hundred thousand at the most, but they have organized and they have skillful leadership and are not to be underrated.

We need leadership of the highest caliber in order to thwart their plans. If I have learned anything during the 37 years since I became a member of the Grange, it is that within our own order we have that leadership. In every community you will find that leaders of the Grange are leaders of the community as well, and I believe—in fact, I know—that they will exercise that leadership so that when our boys come back from overseas they will find—not chaos and the kind of government they have risked their lives to destroy, but instead the opportunity for a richer and fuller existence because we protected their heritage while they were away.

Marketing News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am submitting the following article entitled "Marketing News" which appeared in the Hartford Courant of October 28:

MARKETING NEWS

Dazzling indeed is the illumination that shines from many of the documents published in Washington for the enlightenment of "the peepul." The September issue of Marketing Activities, published by the War Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture, is a case in point. Of its 30 multigraphed pages 9 are devoted to a description, chiefly in dialog, of cotton picking.

In the first three paragraphs Tom, "a middle-aged Negro wearing a straw hat, patched pants, and a faded blue-denim jumper over his shirt" is told that "the farmers around here have got together and set the price" for picking. The "weigh boss" in charge of the field is described as a hard-boiled, partially toothless ignoramus with "faded red hair." Even the idle pickaninnies are not neglected. They spend much time toying with a dead snake. Indeed exciting is the account of a race between two cotton pickers, which really was a photo finish, except that the weight of the cotton gathered was the determining factor. To the delight of the country Negroes their man Quail won over "Slick," the nimble boy from the city. All such information may not seem to be highly important to the growers of the cotton crop or to those who turn it into cloth.

But the high point of the story devolves about the visit of the county agent, who makes a patriotic appeal to the pickers to do a clean job this fall, as "the Government is counting on you." Tom asks: "Do the President tell us that?" The county agent replies: "He does, through an outfit of his called the War Food Administration." And that is highly useful for the pickers to know.

The real gem of this publication, however, is in the first two paragraphs of an article by Esther Osser, who writes on We're On a Milk Drinking Spree. It is a defense of the W. F. A.'s milk-rationing program. We pass over the economic argument. To discuss that at this point might detract from the introductory paragraphs that merit quoting in full:

"Any farm boy knows that Bossy the Cow has four faucets, but four's too many to illustrate our point, so pretend she's got only two. From one comes the milk that we bottle and drink fresh. From the other comes the milk that goes into manufactured dairy products such as cheese, butter, evaporated milk, and milk powder.

"When milk is coming out of both spigots in just the right amounts everything is just fine. But if we consumers ask the farmer to pull too hard on one faucet—if he gets a disproportionate amount of Bossy's inventory to bottle, for instance, then the milk pail that

goes to the manufacturer is cheated. And that's exactly what's been happening to our milk supply for about a year now."

Certainly it would be sheer lack of appreciation on our part to mention the fact that this contribution to our knowledge of animal husbandry was produced at the expense of the taxpayers. Isn't it worth a few pennies to learn that Bossy the Cow is equipped with "faucets" and "spigots," although any farm boy could tell Esther that the protuberance on the udder is a teat? And wouldn't the hired man look a bit puzzled if he were asked to put the cow's "inventory" into a can and set it in the cooler?

Since Esther's cows have too many "faucets" and since the trouble with the milk situation is that the farmer has been asked to pull too hard on one of them (who ever got anything out of a faucet or spigot by pulling it?), why not solve the problem at once by calling a plumber, not a veterinarian, to remove two of the "faucets," and install "inventorying" machines set to take just the proper amount of Bossy's "inventory" from each of the remaining "faucets"? The process could be made foolproof by labeling one "faucet" "inventory for fluid consumption" and the other "inventory for processing." In that way cows, farmers, and consumers would all be contented. Oh for more Esthers to explain and solve the problem of food.

Freeman's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, an unusual association has been incorporated in Vermont under the name and style of Freeman, Inc., its object being to protect the rights of freemen.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am including an article with respect to this unique association, clipped from the Montpelier Argus of November 12:

UNIQUE VERMONT FREEMAN'S ASSOCIATION FORMS TO PROTECT RIGHTS OF FREEMEN

Articles of association of Freeman, Inc., of Brattleboro, Vt., has been filed in the secretary of state's office. The purpose of this unusual association is to perpetuate the spirit of the men and women who have achieved and maintained the dignity of freeman.

To oppose, by all lawful means the unwarranted encroachment on our inherent rights of freeman by a Federal bureaucracy within our State borders.

To foster the preservation of freedom and oppose the unwarranted trespass of State rights.

To oppose by all lawful means the erection of a dam by any Federal or other agency in the West River Valley unless the project receives the approval of this association.

To oppose taking of property and the homes of our citizens for the unwarranted overdevelopment of our streams.

To challenge the right of a national bureaucracy to interfere with the internal structure of Vermont.

To oppose the removal of the remains of our ancestors in the proposed floor area.

To cherish and preserve the principles established by the Bill of Rights.

The association also proposes to make what regulations are deemed necessary to manage the affairs of the association and to publish information of public interest with reference to the proposed invasion of Vermont by the Federal Government.

There is no stock and no dividends shall be declared.

The articles are signed by men from West Dummerston and Newfane, Vt.

Housing and Our Post-War Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Housing and our Post-War Plans, delivered by me to the Better Housing League of Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 30 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful to you indeed for giving me this excuse for leaving Washington and spending a few days at home. During the past 4 years Congress has been so continuously in session that I can hardly ever make an engagement to speak away from Washington, and often have to cancel those which I have made. This week we have been involved in Washington in the discussion of post-war plans for preserving peace throughout the world, and for a time I thought that a Saturday session might force me to cancel my engagement here.

Today I wish to turn from foreign fields to a discussion of the post-war situation in the United States and the relation thereto of a housing program. The newspapers and the Congress are full of discussions of post-war foreign policy. I do not wish to depreciate the importance of setting up some kind of organization to prevent the recurrence of the tragedy of world war. On the other hand, if this war is carried through to a successful conclusion, we are not likely to face another war for 25 years. Furthermore, it is not very likely that we will have a definite international agreement or League of Nations to consider for several years after the armistice. Altogether I do not believe that problems of foreign policy are going to affect the actual life of the American people for a good many years to come.

But the moment the armistice occurs we will be faced here at home by gigantic problems on the immediate solution of which depend the welfare and the happiness and the very freedom of the people of this country during our lifetime. We must deal promptly with the whole problem of the demobilization of men and reconversion of industry. We are already considering the best method of terminating war contracts and of turning over Government plants as far as possible to private ownership and operation. We are considering post-war reserves to permit the reconversion of industry. We are considering the conversion of our great fleet of merchant vessels to peacetime trade. There is general agreement that we should develop a program to reestablish and foster the growth of private industry, gradually reducing the activities of the Government.

This whole process, however, will be gradual, and last over a period of several years. There will be a period of readjustment in which many war expenditures continue. It will take months to demobilize the greater part of our Army and Navy, the expenses of which will run on at a very heavy rate. All Government orders cannot be terminated overnight, and should not be. Some commodity control must continue until demand and supply are more nearly adjusted. All of this means that there will be a Government deficit for several years and a further addition to the huge Government debt brought about by the war.

But we must face now and immediately after the war the problem of a permanent financial policy for the Federal Government. A school of economic thought has arisen which teaches that Government spending is the solution of every problem, and can be indefinitely continued with huge additions to the Government debt. When it is pointed out that Government deficits in the thirties did not prevent the continuous unemployment of 10,000,000 men, the answer is that the deficits were not sufficiently large. It is proposed that we substitute for a wartime deficit a peacetime deficit sufficiently large to guarantee jobs to every worker in the United States.

This is the theory adopted by the National Resources Planning Board, abolished this year by a Congress which completely disagreed with the Board's philosophy. Affected unconsciously by this very enticing solution, men who ought to know better are proposing a vast program of Federal expenditure. Nearly everyone has a pet project to present, and no one has yet gathered all these projects together and faced the problem which they present.

When the war is over we will face a public debt of at least $300,000,000,000. That means that the cost of interest alone will certainly be $6,000,000,000 a year. It is likely that the Army and Navy, after they have been reduced, will cost at least another $6,000,000,000 a year. The normal operations of the Federal Government will cost four or five billion. We have presented to us a vast social security program, which is comparable to the Beveridge plan in England. I estimate that the total cost of applying the Beveridge plan in this country, with our standards, would be approximately $21,000,000,000 a year, of which the Government would have to pay about ten billion. Every Government department and every State and local government is making tremendous plans for public works, and there seems to be some theory that Federal money is to be poured out for any purpose requested by the State and local governments. We have had no public works grants or loans to State and local government for 4 or 5 years, but the proposal is that we now establish a bigger and better P. W. A. and W. P. A. The plan for a Federal subsidy to common-school education which has just been postponed by action of the Senate will undoubtedly be revived, and the ultimate plan appears to call for at least $3,000,000,000 of Federal money for local education. We are being asked to finance foreign trade by loans which may amount to another three billion a year. Finally, we come to the proposal for vast expenditures for urban redevelopment and a comparatively modest program of Government spending for housing. The total of these proposed expenditures is nearly $50,000,000,000 for the Federal Government alone, to which must be added a State and local tax burden of approximately $7,000,000,000.

It is not too much to say that if any such program is adopted, calling for taxes in excess of 50 percent of the national income, there is no possibility of maintaining a free-enterprise system—or individual freedom—in the United States. In the long run there is

no way in which men can be supported in idleness or in nonproductive activity except by the work of those who are producing. If half the products of those producers are taken in taxes, it will inevitably kill incentive, not only in the owners and managers, but in the workmen themselves. I do not know just where the point is, but there is a point at which Government expense and activity pyramid upon themselves. Various private enterprises become so lacking in profit and in opportunity that no new private capital can be attracted. Then the Government must take over the industry and impose a still larger burden on those who still struggle. Any such tax burden as I have outlined—of $57,000,000,000 a year—would inevitably socialize the United States.

Those who advocate this spending take the position that all we have to do is to borrow the money; that we need no more taxes; that the public debt can be indefinitely increased and is of no importance because we owe it to ourselves. When they analyze it, the American people know that this can't be true. Any further increase in the public debt after the war will almost certainly result in disastrous inflation. Why do we have a 25-percent increase in the cost of living today, in spite of the most rigorous price and wage control of our history? Simply because of the Government deficit. Price controls and rationing may hold inflation temporarily in check; but if the deficit continues after the war, when the people reject such controls, inflation is inevitable. We reach the general result of a socialized United States by a different route, but we reach it just as certainly. Once inflation has destroyed all of our financial institutions, our currency, our life insurance and savings, there is no way in which we can avoid the Government taking over the reorganization of production and the direction of individual life.

When we come to consider the post-war program, therefore, we cannot consider social security by itself, or public works by themselves, or housing by itself. We must relate each of these to the general program of Government activity and Government planning. We all desire to go forward in the various plans for improvement which have been made. We all feel that through the vast production of which this country is capable we ought to be able to eliminate extreme poverty and hardship. But surely these plans can be of reasonable scope, and surely they must not impose an intolerable burden on those who do not participate in them.

It is a complete fallacy to regard Government spending as an end in itself. We must spend Government money to assist the unfortunate; but as a stimulator of prosperity or a remedy for unemployment it is bound to be a wash-out. It is foolish to talk about the Government guaranteeing a real job to every man in the United States. What is a real job? Half the men to whom the Government makes such a promise will be dissatisfied with the jobs which the Government provides. Furthermore, the cost of any such program is utterly prohibitive. The expenditure of $5,000,000,000—in the housing industry, for instance—will only keep 2,000,000 men at continuous work, and there are 60,000,000 workers in the United States. The only way in which we can assure general prosperity and a base on which to tax is through the stimulation of private industry and substantially full employment through private industry.

There is no way in which the Government Budget can be less than $15,000,000,000 a year, to which must be added the local and State expenditure. We should certainly endeavor to hold the Federal Budget as close to that figure as we can. And yet I believe that at a very reasonable cost we can accomplish our main purpose of insuring a minimum standard of food, housing, medical care, and education for all the people of this country who are interested in obtaining them. I believe that we can see that every person in the United States is eligible for an old-age pension and unemployment compensation, that when such unemployment compensation is exhausted he can be given work relief or direct relief. I believe that there can be a minimum standard of health and hospital service for every man no matter how poor. I believe there can be a minimum standard of housing available to all. But it will only be possible if we study to see that the burden of these expenses is just as small as possible. Certainly it must not be so great as to destroy all reward for work and diligence and risk in the rest of the people.

We cannot possibly use Government spending as a means of creating general prosperity. We must rely upon a program of stimulating and encouraging private enterprise to produce the wealth for the program I have outlined. Of course, it is wise to have the Government spend more when industry is depressed and less when industry is active, but spending cannot solve the problem of prosperity and depressions. If we can stimulate prosperity by wise measures, it will reduce the cost of any program for providing minimum standards of living. Obviously if the general standard of living and prosperity can be sufficiently raised, there will be much less call for Government insurance against hardship. There are other means by which the cost of maintaining minimum standards can be less burdensome upon the Federal Government. Thus in the health field we already have a system of health and hospital care which reaches the greater part of the lower income groups even though there are gaps in private service. Surely we should use all the existing services, and doctors, and hospitals, and only call upon the Government, through grants to the States, to fill up the gaps. In the housing field we should certainly avail ourselves of every possible activity by private industry, and only call on the Government in those categories where private industry cannot operate.

In this whole post-war planning, a planned housing program serves a dual purpose. It can be one of the greatest of private industries and provide great employment. It can provide a decent standard of housing for all the people, with a very small percentage of the total to be charged against Federal spending. The Housing Census of 1940 places the total number of occupied dwelling units in the United States at approximately 35,000,000. This is an increase of about 5,000,000 over 1930, so that we may estimate another 5,000,000 dwellings needed by 1950. To this we may add the normal replacements of existing dwelling units, which even if we estimate a life of 60 years would be about 6,000,000 in 10 years. Since the war will eliminate several years of permanent construction, we would have to provide about 1,500,000 dwelling units a year to catch up by 1950. Undoubtedly we shall have to do the job more gradually, but 1,000,000 dwelling units a year is not too much to aim at. Preliminary estimates of the National Housing Agency show that during the first full year after the war we may be able to build from 250,000 to 350,000 dwelling units. The volume of new construction for the second year might be double that figure. Such a program, at an estimated expenditure, after the first 2 years, of $5,000,000,000 a year, would be far greater than any public-works program likely to be considered. It would put over 2,000,000 men to work at 40 hours a week for 50 weeks, and support that number of families. It would maintain continuously a lot of capital industries whose ups and downs have contributed so largely to recurrent depressions.

Just as much of this building as possible should be done by private builders without expense to the Government. I am hopeful that nearly all of this housing may be bought and paid for by families from their own earnings if we have a reasonable standard of prosperity. But my belief is that no matter how prosperous we may be, there will be a certain number of unemployed, or men employed at less productive jobs, who cannot meet the cost of decent quarters. I myself believe that the Federal Government should assist these men until finally we have eliminated substandard housing.

The burden of expense of this Government housing can be reduced in a number of different ways. The lower the cost of a privately constructed house, the fewer men will be unable to pay for it. Great steps have been taken in the field of reducing costs, in developing new materials, in prefabrication, and standardization. Those fields must be thoroughly explored, and the hampering effect of unreasonable building restrictions removed. Of course, one of the most important elements of cost in housing is interest, and a decreased interest rate will substantially reduce the cost of the home. This is the field in which the Federal Housing Administration has operated successfully. Taken by and large, loans on homes are a safe form of investment. They are entitled to a national market, which means a low interest rate. It is the function of the F. H. A. to see that that national market is provided. It is not necessary that this interest rate be maintained entirely by the Federal Government, and certainly in this field, as elsewhere, the advantage of private operation is considerable. I believe we should maintain the Federal Housing Administration to stabilize the interest rate throughout the Nation, to make home mortgages a standard investment, and particularly to eliminate the second-mortgage abuse which formerly existed. Title 6 loans should be discontinued with the armistice. If wisely administered, the F. H. A. should not involve the Government in any net loss.

If we admit that some of the smaller income groups are unable to pay for decent housing even when its cost is reduced, and accept the principle that the Government should see that there is a minimum standard of housing, then we are led inevitably to some Government subsidy for housing, just as we have always had in theory a Government subsidy for unemployment and a Government subsidy for medical care, poor relief, and free general hospitals. Granting that there must be such a subsidy, what should be its limitations and characteristics? It seems to me obvious that it must be offered to all those in a given income class and not restricted to a favored few. We must plan to make our minimum standard of housing ultimately available for everyone in specified low-income groups. It is utterly unfair to favor half a million renters if there are 2,000,000 other people in the same situation who remain in the slums. The plan which we make must cover the entire field. If the cost of the plan is too great to be completed in 10 years, then we must plan to complete it in 20 years. One of my objections to the U. S. H. A. was that it had no such plan. Projects were built here and there in a hit-or-miss style, and no one knew whether the Government was planning to take care of 500,000 families or 10,000,000.

Furthermore, I think it should be recognized that the subsidy, after all, is a subsidy to the individual and is based upon his inability to earn sufficient to pay an economic rent. The U. S. H. A. has finally come to some recognition of this principle. Starting with a uniform rent based upon a subsidy of approximately 50 percent of the economic rent, they have in many places come to a basic economic rent, which is then reduced for particular tenants in accordance with their individual needs. This economic rent should include the same amount for local taxes as would have to be paid for a similar private project. It does not seem to me, therefore, that a subsidy for housing requires

in every case a Government-built slum-clearance project. Private individuals might be encouraged to build rental projects if they knew that all tenants who came to that project could be assured of the ability to pay a minimum rental. Of course, the character of such projects would have to meet Government specifications.

I feel that one of the great objections to Government housing, particularly among the people, is the strong feeling in favor of home owning as opposed to renting. I share that feeling. I believe that nothing will contribute so much to the general stability and happiness and freedom of the people as a high percentage of home owning. The apparent prejudice against home owning on the part of Mr. Tugwell and Mr. Straus probably had more to do with building up an opposition to public housing than any other factor. A subsidy might take the form of assistance in the construction of a man's own home. It would be far cheaper for the Government to contribute $500 to the construction of a home, provided the tenant could then maintain it, than it would be to contribute $100 a year for 60 years. I don't know whether such a program is at all practical, but I do believe that a study should be made of the different methods by which assistance can be given to the lower income groups for the provision of decent housing.

There is another factor to be considered in problems of subsidy. If the Government is to provide a floor under income and medical care and housing, it must not be such as to discourage those who are just able through their own efforts to provide this standard, or a little better. If, for instance, a man is to get an old-age pension of $40 a month, although he has never done a lick of work in his life, then there must be some assistance to the man who has worked and put aside something for his own old age. After all, he would have to save about $15,000 to get an income of $480 a year. He certainly should not be barred from a pension because he has saved to build his own home and at the age of 65 has no means of keeping up that home. Mr. Beveridge eliminates a means test altogether in his old-age-pension plan. Perhaps we should not go that far, but certainly the diligent and thrifty man should be paid some pension to put him in his old age in a better position than the town bum. Otherwise we will destroy all incentive to work and save.

So, in housing, if we provide Government assistance for those, say, with incomes under a thousand dollars, we should certainly do something for the man who earns between a thousand dollars and $1,500 a year. Usually he earns more because he is a better workman, more diligent and more intelligent. No man should find that the taxes and expense of upkeep of his own home, which he built from his own earnings, are greater than the rent paid by a Government beneficiary across the street for a clean, modern apartment. Of course, such a principle is going to increase the total cost of a floor under housing, but I believe that if we find the total cost too great, we should reduce the subsidy for the lower income groups. If anything is to remain of the principle of reward for initiative and hard work, we must see that the position of different men is in proportion to their own ability and diligence and thrift. This country has been built on the incentive to work provided by that principle of reward. If it is destroyed, we shall sink to a dead level of mediocrity.

Finally, I am convinced that all of these plans for progress must depend upon local initiative and control. Old-age pensions and unemployment compensation began in the States, and were only coordinated and stimulated by the Federal Government. Demands for medical care and hospital service came from the States. One of the handicaps of housing has been the lack of initiative from local communities. In many places the Federal Government practically imposed a Federal program before the people of the community had acquired the slightest interest in the subject.

In my opinion local self-government is the very key to both freedom and democracy. I believe very strongly that all problems of unemployment and relief should be handled by local administration, with the Federal Government only contributing part of the funds. And so in housing the success of the program depends upon education at home, the acceptance of the necessity of some public housing to improve gradually the conditions of living. Here in Cincinnati your Better Housing League has stimulated that interest. There is more work to be done. The Federal Government should not be called upon to put up all the money for a housing subsidy. Some part of the funds, or contributions in the way of tax exemption, must come from the State and local government if only to give assurance that the people are interested.

I have only suggested a few of the problems in the vast field of post-war problems relating to housing, and suggested some of the principles which I believe must guide the decision of those problems. I have long sponsored a complete study of the problem by Congress. Up to this time every hearing has been promoted by the sponsors of a particular plan, the U. S. H. A., the F. H. A., or war housing. The study should be impartial and open-minded. It must, of course, deal with the disposition of emergency war housing.

Senator George has just appointed me the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Post-War Economic Planning Committee to study and report on housing and urban redevelopment. We will have an advisory committee from the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the Education and Labor Committee of the Senate, the two committees which consider different phases of the housing program. The Senators who will probably serve on the subcommittee are ELLENDER, of Louisiana; LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; WAGNER, of New York; RADCLIFFE, of Maryland; and BALL, of Minnesota.

I do not claim to be any expert in the housing field. I can only assure you that we will approach the problem in the most constructive attitude, and that we hope to present to the Congress a program upon which both the Republican and Democratic Parties may agree, coordinated with the general post-war plans of the Federal Government, based primarily upon private construction, and with Federal subsidy held within reasonable bounds.

Emma Guffey Miller on Anniversary of the Birth of Elizabeth Cady Stanton

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller in the crypt of the Capitol on the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Elizabeth Cady Stanton on Friday, November 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When arrangements for this meeting were first being made, there was only one idea in view, honoring the memory of a great American pioneer. However, since the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has refused to allow the equal-rights amendment to be voted on by the House as a whole, this meeting becomes one of solemn protest.

What suppresses this simple request that the people of the Nation be given an opportunity to express their opinions, either pro or con, on the equal-rights amendment? Some of the opposition comes from prejudice; some from ignorance and misunderstanding; and we fear that much of it comes from certain labor leaders who are afraid to face a world in which women are competing with men.

This seems a fitting time therefore to do honor to a woman of great intellect, unbounded vision, and extraordinary courage, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Almost a century ago she said, "Lifting woman into her proper place in the scale of being is the mightiest revolution the world has yet known." That revolution is not yet finished; it is far from complete for, with all their progress, women still lack one fundamental right—legal equality.

When the equal-rights amendment becomes a part of the Constitution and no opposition, even broken promises and apparent double dealing by a few members of the House Judiciary Committee, can prevent this, then the work of these three outstanding women whose likenesses are here immortalized in stone will be realized.

The amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." Why should any citizen of the United States, that has dedicated its entire strength to winning the "four freedoms" for the whole world, now oppose equal legal rights for the women of its own country?

I believe I am familiar with every argument against the amendment that its opponents offer, and the more I study them the weaker they become.

The opposition comes mostly from a few organizations, among them the League of Women Voters, on one of whose boards I once served and which now refuses to place the amendment on its study program. This seems incredible on the part of an organization which was founded in order to enlighten the women electorate of the Nation.

"There are none so blind as those who will not see." How can anyone be familiar with a great political or constitutional problem unless one studies both sides of the question? And yet there are members of the League of Women Voters who are active politically, fill high positions, make their own contracts, and even run for office assuming for themselves an equality which they refuse the working women of the country.

Another opposing organization is the National Consumers' League, in which I was once very active and which opened my eyes more than 30 years ago to the need for woman suffrage.

When lobbying in Rhode Island in 1910–13 for bills to reduce the working hours for women and little children from 60 to 54 hours a week, I sensed the necessity of having the right to vote for the men who made the laws and finally as a citizen I came to a far greater realization that the next step forward for women was equality under the law.

Last summer the Consumers' League, which in recent years has been more or less quiescent, issued an open letter to the Senators and Congressmen of the United States.

This is an astounding letter. It begins, "We believe in equal rights for women. We oppose the so-called equal-rights amendment; first, because it disregards the fact that while men and women are equal in right, they are not identical in economic and social function or in physical capacity." Perhaps that paragraph makes sense to the ladies who signed it, but it doesn't to anyone to whom I have shown it, including business and professional women, working women and men of much intelligence and high purpose. First acknowledging that men and women are equal in right, they then deny economic rights to women. May I remind them that a few State laws and likewise the Fair Labor Standards Act declare that for the same work women must be paid at the same rate as men. Several years ago the Honorable Frances Perkins, our Secretary of Labor, said pay for a job should not be based on sex but on the work done.

The fact that women are not identical with men in social function has never been questioned; one is a father and the other a mother, but what has that to do with equality of rights under the law? As for "women not being identical in physical capacity." I would like to get the opinion of the millions of women now in war industries, the nurses who are on the battle front, and the WAC's who are serving overseas—not under the Army but as a part of the Army. Are not many of them doing the same work as men?

You will recall that Mussolini and Hitler talked about decadent democracies whose citizens were too soft to fight a war. Have the women of China and Russia, where they have equality under the law, shown themselves unequal to the horrors and the hardships of war? Are we now asked to acknowledge that the women citizens of this country are not as brave, strong, and capable as those of the other nations fighting for world freedom?

The second paragraph of this same bewildering letter states the Consumers' League opposes the equal-rights amendment "because it would imperil hard-won legislation enacted to safeguard women as homemakers and mothers, including laws regarding hours, employment of young girls, exposure to industrial substances and processes which are peculiarly hazardous to women, laws which workingwomen themselves do not want to lose."

How could equality under the law imperil women as homemakers and mothers, for mothers' pensions or assistance acts are particular legislation and do not apply to all women any more than bonus legislation applied to all men. Why bring young girls into the argument when we are talking about citizens of 21 years and over? Young girls would still come under so-called guardianship laws, and if industrial substances and processes are hazardous to women, why are they not also hazardous to men as well, and both should be protected equally.

We who support the amendment believe that workingwomen should be safeguarded as should workingmen, but there are millions of other women who suffer from unjust and discriminatory laws. What does this opposition propose to do about them? They acknowledge the injustice of many of these laws, but their only answer is "kill the amendment" and then repeal them State by State. This would take a century, and may I remind them once again that what one legislature can do another can undo. As for killing the amendment, may I also remind them that all the power and force and cruelty of fascism and nazi-ism have failed to blot out the eternal hope of freedom among the unconquerable people of the occupied countries of Europe? American women denied equal justice will forever fight for their right.

The third point the Consumers' League offers in opposition to the amendment is that "it would not redress major inequalities persisting today, notably in professional and technical fields of training and practice, since these are in the main matters of tradition and custom, rather than law."

I wonder if this group of ladies has ever made a study of the long struggle of women to gain the right of franchise and of their tedious struggle to enter business and the professions. Custom and tradition certainly denied women the right of equal education, entrance into business and the professions. So, in many States, a resort to law had to be made, and in a number of States today it is law, not custom, which prevents women from taking a place in business and government equal with men.

Finally, the league states that "because this proposal, if enacted and ratified, would confuse and complicate essential progress toward higher standards of safety and security for all workers—men as well as women." This argument has an old familiar ring as it is almost identical with the arguments brought forth by the antisuffragists of the last generation. You will recall their dire forebodings regarding legal complications if the suffrage amendment passed. What became of them? Well, they are one with the leaves of yesterday.

Further, if the same standards of safety and security are given to men and women workers, how can any reasonable being say that it would be bad for both of them?

A further argument brought forward by this group of women is that State minimum-wage laws would be wiped out. I would remind the 17 New York women who signed this letter that the Women's Bureau of the New York State Department of Labor stated recently—New York Times of Friday, October 15, 1943—that there are still women in their State who draw less than the minimum-wage rates established several years ago. Of what value was this legislation to these women? How much better to have equality under the law than to work under a law which ends in inequality.

I have read carefully the list of the signers of this Consumers' League letter. Many of them I have known for years, a number of them are my friends, but of the 80 women who signed it, I do not believe there are more than 5 who could actually be called working women. The other 75 would resent with deep indignation and vehemence the idea that they would have to live under the same legal restrictions they approve for other women. They say they fear the abolition of so-called protective laws for women and I, for one, hope they will be abolished, because experience has shown that where there was a minimum-wage law for women alone, in times of depression men underbid the women for their jobs, and thus the standard of living was lowered for both men and women. Concerning night laws passed at the insistence largely of labor leaders and nonworking women, it has been proven that such laws are a detriment to working women, but a boon to men because in States where women can no longer work at night the higher wages and tips all go to the men.

Another favorite argument of the opponents is that working women are not sufficiently organized to have equal legal rights. What curious reasoning! Workingmen secured the great benefits they now enjoy because they have had equality under the law with every other man since we became a Nation. It naturally follows that if working women have legal equality they, too, could rise to the same high position as the laboring man. This reasoning brings to mind a recent ruling by a judge in Memphis, Tenn. In that State women are not allowed to wear men's trousers, but they may wear slacks provided they are made for women, but in case they are unable to procure slacks for their work in industrial plants they would be forbidden to borrow the trousers of the male members of their families even though work in ammunition plants might cease because of the difference in the cut of nether garments.

By July 1, 1944, the Government has stated, a million more women workers will be needed. Does anyone, however ignorant or prejudiced, believe that the many millions of women now helping to win the war and now temporarily given equal pay and in some cases equal legal status, are going to be satisfied to be put back into the shackles of so-called protective legislation? I know there are some working women who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment but there were also many slaves who resented the Emancipation Proclamation.

Certain prominent groups within the Roman Catholic Church recently protested the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and thus there has arisen the false belief that the church itself has taken a stand against the amendment. Nothing could be more erroneous because the Catholic church, a great democracy, leaves its members free to act as they believe best in all civil and political matters. Since the Equal Rights Amendment is a political matter which has to do with constitutional law and since it in nowise interferes with the practice of faith or morals, all Catholics and some Protestants know that the church itself has not and will not take a stand on such a question.

On October 7 in New York three great religious faiths of America, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish took a united stand before the world in a common declaration which called upon the nations to preserve the rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit in the terms of the peace to come.

Seven broad priniciples were agreed upon, one of which is "an international declaration of human rights and vindication of human dignity."

Surely human rights apply to women as well as men and human dignity has as much place in the life of women as of men. After all, higher wages, fewer hours of labor, added professional privileges or political preferment, pleasant as they may be to some women, are in the end as dust in the mouths of all women when they are denied the basic rights of equality.

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton was granted the unusual privilege of addressing the members of the Legislature in New York State in 1854 she made an impassioned plea for women who at that time could scarcely call their souls their own. She ended her address thus: "In conclusion then let us say—in behalf of the women of this State, we ask for all that you have asked for yourselves in the progress of your development since the *Mayflower* cast anchor beside Plymouth Rock and simply on the ground that the rights of every human being are the same and identical."

How far ahead of her time was this wonderful woman and how much longer will it take our lagging democracy to catch up with her?

Gentlemen of the Congress, the sands of the tenure of your terms of office are running low. Act while you yet have the opportunity.

The Japanese Problem in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail I received a report from Dillon S. Myer, Director of the War Relocation Authority, addressed to all members of

the California Congressional Delegation, and also a resolution from the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, likewise a telegram from a special committee of the California Senate to investigate the Japanese problem in California. Incidentally this committee has a Democratic majority. I am herewith inserting in the RECORD the resolution and the telegram, and I want to briefly comment upon the report by Dillon S. Myer, which is quite lengthy:

Whereas the American Legion at its department convention in Los Angeles, 1942, and again at its department convention at San Francisco in 1943, called to the attention of the authorities the lax and undisciplined manner in which Japanese, disloyal to the United States, were being handled, to the end that they are endangering the internal security of the United States; and

Whereas it was urged that these alien enemies and persons of Japanese ancestry whose loyalty is to the Japanese Empire be placed under supervision of the United States Army, and that control by misguided social workers be ended; and

Whereas this action of the Department of California was adopted by the national convention in Omaha; and

Whereas the authorities have ignored these demands as requested in said resolution with the result that now revolt and disorder has broken out in the Tule Lake Relocation Center, menacing the welfare and life of Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Council, American Legion, emphasizes the original requests of the American Legion and condemns those officials who ignored the original warnings of this organization; and be it further

Resolved, That Los Angeles County Council, American Legion, again demands that these Japanese be placed under control of the United States Army; and be it further

Resolved, That Governor Earl Warren be commended for his statement urging Army control of these persons who are endangering our homes; and

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress from Los Angeles County, Gov. Earl Warren, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, and the President of the United States of America.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNCIL,
AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
By L. F. OLSON, *Commander*,
CARO A. KREBS, *Adjutant*.

NOVEMBER 5, 1943.

TURLOCK, CALIF., *November 13, 1943*.
Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

After a complete investigation and hearing held in the Tule Lake section, the California State Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement unanimously recommend and urge that Army control be maintained permanently at the Tule Lake Japanese segregation camp. We feel this is imperative for protection of the people of the State of California.

HUGH P. DONNELLY,
Chairman.
HERBERT W. SLATER.
IRWIN T. QUINN.
GEORGE J. HATFIELD.
JESS R. DORSEY.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, there seems to be quite a conflict in facts and opinions. I am more definitely inclined to believe the information furnished by this special California committee, as well as the information which we have all received from news reports and statements made by Mr. CLARE INGLE, the new Member of Congress from California, who represents that district.

Mr. Myer's report definitely exemplifies his pussy-footing, appeasing program which has been carried out through the War Relocation Authority. All committees have recommended that there be a segregation of the loyal and disloyal Japanese, and if I am not mistaken, Mr. Myer has even agreed upon that point. While admitting that Dr. Pedicord was beaten and injured, that property was damaged, and that 3,500 to 4,000 Japanese made demands of his office by congregating outside of the office building, yet he attempts to write up the entire incident as a mutual admiration get-together. He states:

A large number of the evacuees at Tule Lake are citizens of the United States, with the constitutional rights of citizens. Many of them are children under 17, and they, together with a very large number of the adults, have no responsible part in the recent events.

This in itself does not sound like a segregation of loyal and disloyal Japanese. And in his final summary, he states that everything has been exaggerated, that the people were hysterical, and that the situation was absolutely misrepresented. According to his statement, everyone in California has been hysterical and has lied, while Mr. Myer is the only one to tell the truth.

We are at war; we need men of courage instead of appeasers to head the War Relocation Authority.

South Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bob Coyne from the Boston Sunday Post of November 7, 1943:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS.

(By Bob Coyne)

The history of South Boston, since 1630 when the *Mary and John* landed in what was then Dorchester Bay, has been colorful and stirring. It was but a year or so later that a famine occurred and historians claim that the only loaf of bread was in the Governor's house. Across the waters from old Ireland came a ship named the *Lion*, loaded with food to sustain the starving people of Boston. In thanksgiving the Governor declared the next day, February 6, a day of prayer. Today the majority of South Boston citizens are descendants of early Irish settlers but few of them are aware of the incident that long ago linked the "auld sod" with early Boston.

South Boston is distinguished for both its religious and military history. Its contribution to the ranks of the Catholic priesthood is in itself an epic of generations who built for eternity. Three bishops of the church: Bishop Joseph O'Hare, S. J.; Bishop Thomas Emmet, S. J.; and Bishop Richard J. Cushing are native sons, and the long line of priests is most impressive.

Families have given not one or two but even three sons to the service of the church. The Cronin family gave three, of whom only Father James V. Cronin, Salem pastor, remains. Not material possessions, but the splendid example of parents who toiled, whose feet trod worn old paths, whose hands were wrinkled with labor, made that section the rich source of the priesthood. It is interesting in this connection to recall Miss Jessie Stewart, who taught Latin at the Thomas N. Hart School. Miss Stewart was a very devout Presbyterian but her proudest boast was that she personally had sent more boys to the priesthood by way of the Hart School than any other Bostonian.

FAME IN MILITARY HISTORY

The military history of the community rates a salute. March 17 will always be honored as Evacuation Day, the day on which the British sailed away never to return. In this connection one cannot overlook Col. Richard Gridley, who directed the building of the fortifications on the heights. Gunfire from that hill was a strong factor in forcing the British to withdraw.

The Revolutionary period also recalls Mrs. Foster, a neglected heroine. After the Boston Tea Party she gathered all the tea that floated ashore and refused to permit anyone, even herself, to use it. She was South Boston's Molly Stark.

In World War No. 1, one of the greatest heroes of all time came from South Boston. A game little fighter who single-handed went through a blaze of guns, crashing his way into a German pill box, to become one of our national heroes, was South Boston's own Mickey Perkins. The Nation gave him posthumously its highest tribute, the Congressional Medal of Honor, and South Boston put him first—for valor unsurpassed and for superb courage—Pvt. Michael Perkins. Other officers rated as great military leaders, and the list of unnamed heroes is great also; South Boston knows and honors them all. In this war, Brig. Gen. Albert F. Hegenberger has been recognized as an outstanding flying hero.

DISTINGUISHED SONS

Old Boston has its Lowells, Lodges, and Cabots, but South Boston has its own honored names—men distinguished in every field, vivid personalities, famous and loved characters. Placed first in the category is Patrick A. Collins, identified with every worthy cause and a leader in civic reforms. As mayor of Boston and later as consul general to England, he brought into play the qualities of a great orator, a distinguished scholar, and an able administrator. With affection the community also recalls the late Congressman James A. Gallivan, and the later Martin Tuohy will always be remembered in connection with his shamrock vest.

The alumni of its citizenry who today are noteworthy include such names as: Judge William J. Day; Judge David G. Nagle; Francis J. W. Ford, famous as a Harvard athlete and now as a distinguished jurist; Brigadier General Dunn; Brigadier General Devine; Col. Thomas Sullivan, State fuel administrator; William J. Foley, district attorney of Suffolk County; Benny Drohan, composer and actor; James B. Connolly, writer of sea yarns; John Moakley, track coach at Cornell; William P. Hickey, traffic commissioner; and Thomas Drohan, trainer of the immortal John L.

In addition, there are the Reverend Harold J. Martin, vice president of the Utica Club and president of the Canadian-American Baseball League; Father Dunphy, now of Guadalcanal; the Reverend John A. Madden, S. J., member of an old family and chaplain of the city hospital; and Msgr. Francis Burke, remembered as a captain of South Boston High and later as a Boston College athlete. These names indicate the talents and character of South Boston citizenry, and there are hundreds of others equally important.

LEADERS OF INDUSTRIAL ERA

Families that have been outstanding in their service include names that will always live in the history of the community. They brought such fame and so great a measure of prosperity in the early years of the settlement that they are gratefully recalled. Especially prominent were the Harrison-Loring shipbuilders. It was in their yards that the steamship *John Hancock* was built; this was the vessel that carried Commodore Perry on his expedition to Japan.

The Lawleys were builders of cup defenders; the Walworths, steel makers; the Gavins, Dr. Michael and Dr. Patrick, leaders in the medical profession through whose efforts hospitals were established to aid Bostonians; and the Jenney brothers, whose name is perpetuated in an automobile fuel.

Industries such as the Phoenix Glass Works, the chain factory, the Bay State Rolling Mills and similar industries advanced South Boston so that enterprising businessmen, believing it would continue to grow industrially, erected the Mount Washington Hotel on Broadway. The building eventually became the property of the Perkins Institute for the Blind and was its home for many years.

South Boston of today is chiefly residential. In addition to its great fish pier, largest in the country, and its Marine Park, a recreation center for thousands, it has many places of interest. One of the most interesting is a tiny chapel that is over 10 years old. Part of a long-forgotten era, it stands beneath towering English elms and something of its remoteness and its solitude suggests lines from Gray's Elegy. It was built by the saintly Bishop Cheverus as a final resting place for his dear friend, Father Matignon, whose body had been buried in the lot of a friend in the Old Granery Cemetery.

Among those who subscribed to the chapel was John Adams, then President of the United States and one of the close friends of the bishop. South Boston has many such memories of glorious days and deeds, of Yankee thrift and ingenuity, of Irish fervor and talents that combined to make the peninsula section truly noteworthy.

Current Farm Problems and Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on October 28, M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, made a great speech before the Montana Farmers Union annual convention. Because of Mr. Thatcher's frank discussion of current farm problems and trends, this address will be of general interest to the Senate and the country. I ask, therefore, that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, delegates, my friends, and visitors, the purpose of this convention is to enable you to make your annual appraisement of the Farmers Union in this State—and, further, to consider your work during the past year—in relation to what you are seeking to accomplish for your industry, as farmers, on the national level.

So you may well consider the Farmers Union in light of two things, what you have done in Montana to advance the Farmers Union during this past year, and what has been done during the past year by the National Farmers Union.

As general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, I am in touch with your grain and seed production and sale on both the State and National levels. A more detailed report of our business will be given at the stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association at St. Paul, Minn., beginning December 14, 1943, but you will be interested in a general outline of our operating structure.

The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, in general outline, may be summarized as follows: Our general offices are in St. Paul, Minn. For the marketing of grain, we also maintain branches at Minneapolis and Duluth, Minn.; Superior, Wis.; Great Falls, Shelby, and Lewistown, Mont.; Aberdeen and Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Fargo, Grand Forks, Minot, and Williston, N. Dak.; and Spokane, Wash. We finance about 300 farmers' elevator accounts in the spring wheat area, for which we now extend credit in excess of $10,000,000. We operate a line elevator system on a cooperative basis for 152 country elevators in the States of Montana, the Dakotas, and Minnesota. We operate a durum mill and subterminal elevator at Rush City, Minn., where we process one-sixth to one-seventh of the total durum milling crop. Our products are used to bake macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles. We own and control through Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association on a cooperative basis three subsidiaries, namely:

1. Farmers Union Grain & Supply Co., with plants at Minot and Williston, N. Dak., and a bean and seed plant at Billings, Mont. We started this a year and a half ago by putting $25,000 in its capital structure. It has proved to be a phenomenal success and has a net worth today of $260,000. It furnishes farmers in North Dakota and Montana with a hatchery and feed service, as well as providing marketing for grain, seed, and beans.

2. The second subsidiary is Farmer Union G. T. A. Mills, Inc., which is about 2 years old. It furnishes feed, seeds, concentrates, and minerals—and is very successful. It furnishes deficit supplies for Minot and Williston, N. Dak., and Havre, Mont., cooperatives which wholesale to the local cooperatives in distribution of feeds, minerals, etc.

3. The third subsidiary is the Farmers Lumber & Supply Co., operating 38 lumber yards on a cooperative basis in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana.

As regards these three subsidiaries, the majority of the directors in each instance are members of the Board of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, which has capitalized these three subsidiaries—furnishes all of their financing, and controls and directs their management. These are entirely within the Farmers Union family. They are yours—and you were not required to put up any cash to create them.

The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association operates facilities in eight States—Nebraska, Iowa, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, and Washington. During the year, we bought out three private grain businesses:

1. St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co., with 135 country elevators and 37 lumber yards;

2. Brown Grain Co.—a commission business;

3. Winter-Truesdale-Diercks Co.—a line of 20 country elevators.

These three purchases required about $3,000,000. The former owners of these three business have been paid in full.

The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's fiscal year ends on May 31. The savings for the last fiscal year were $1,250,000. We have now completed 4 months of this current year, June 1 to October 1; for these 4 months our volume of business is in excess of $50,000,000, or $500,000 per day for each business day. Our net savings for the 4 months are double the amount for the same period a year ago. It costs over $9,000 per day to operate your Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. We employ over 650 persons, every one bonded up to $25,000. We operate three terminal elevators—at St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., and Superior, Wis.—as well as subterminals at Rush City, Minn.; Williston, N. Dak.; Lewistown and Shelby, Mont.; and Spokane, Wash. We sell grain, feed, seed, and flour in 32 of the 48 States. Our grain volume for the past 4 months was 39,000,000 bushels. For the last marketing year the patronage dividend in our preferred stock paid to our affiliated cooperative elevators was in excess of the commission rate which is charged by all grain firms for selling grain. In addition to that, we paid in cash, as we do each year, 3 percent interest on outstanding preferred stock.

The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is just past 5 years old. We started it on June 1, 1938. We started it with the following finances: $30,000 capital stock purchased by the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc.; $300,000 capital loan from the old Farm Board Revolving Fund; $900,000 operating loan from the Central Bank for Cooperatives.

The $300,000 loan and the $900,000 loan were paid in full before maturity dates. The purchase of stock by the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., was a reciprocal investment. It was a reciprocal investment when Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association was set up and Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., put up $30,000, because that is exactly what the old Farmers Union Terminal Association did years before for the Farmers Union Exchange, which later became the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc. I was general manager for both the Farmers Union Central Exchange and the old Farmers Union Terminal Association up to April 1932, when I resigned to go to Washington to take care of your legislative work. On my recommendation, the Farmers Union Central Exchange was started and financed, and $25,000 of grain money was invested in the capital stock of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, and $75,000 of grain money was loaned to the exchange, to be paid off over a period of years. That $100,000 of grain money was the foundation of the Farmers Union Central Exchange. In those days and years, up to April 1, 1932, I managed both the Farmers Union Central Exchange and the Farmers Union Terminal Association, and when I resigned the exchange had 97 country petroleum setups. It was on its way. It has since grown to a great cooperative supply institution and is properly a pride of the Farmers Union of the Northwest. What I have been relating is to me a cooperative romance.

I was appointed chairman of the Farmers Union organization committee by the Farmers Union national board, along about 1927, to carry the Farmers Union into Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana. Mr. C. C. Talbott and Mr. A. W. Ricker were my associates. It is a long story from then to now. I have the entire file of Farmers Union Heralds covering that history in my office at St. Paul. From its pages we have begun to write a factual history of the Farmers Union and its cooperatives covering the past 17 years. You will need that for your understanding and guidance in the future. That history will also report our legislative and educational work.

A word on legislation. This is the first year in a long time that I have not served as chairman of your committee on national leg-

islation. You will remember that last year your convention passed a resolution which was carefully dressed to conceal its meaning, but I believe whoever inspired it meant that I should be fired as your legislative chairman. After that, I spoke to you and told you what I thought—and you gave me a rising vote of confidence. At the national convention of the Farmers Union last November following your convention, I resigned as chairman of the national legislative committee. Within 60 days, the National Farmers Union family, including your good State president and State director of education, met at Des Moines, Iowa, and asked me to again take over your legislative work. I yielded to that urgent request. Within another 3 months I found conditions such that I could no longer serve as your legislative chairman. I have since resigned as vice chairman of the National Farmers Union executive council. I have no official connection with the National Farmers Union. I continue, however, to serve as president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives in order to look after your interests on matters relating to grain and seed prices floor prices, boxcars for cooperative elevators, etc.

In my long years of legislative service and experience, I have frequently made a beeline to the office of your senior Senator [BURTON K. WHEELER] when I need help at Washington—and I get it. There is right now a terrific fight in the making on cooperatives. The Farm Credit Administration is under attack—that means that you are under atack. Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association borrows all of its facility and operating credit from Farm Credit Administration. That means you. Without that credit, how could we operate Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association; without Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, what would you grain farmers get done to you?

Another attack will seek to get Congress to take away exemptions your cooperatives now have from paying Federal income taxes. That means you. I have just come from a national conference on this matter. I may not publicly tell you the details or the name of the official who called it. He called eight of us in the cooperative movement in the United States. We've started to plan our fight and defense against these two attacks. The farmers and their cooperatives are under attack now by the strongest forces in this country. That means you. The Farm Union Grain Terminal Association and I are No. 1 on the enemies' list for attack—that is what I am told. That is the essence of the story in the September issue of the big national business magazine Business Week.

That is all to the good—because I know how to fight. I've been under attack and in fights ever since I first started to serve you 29 years ago. Of those fights, I've won every fight for you—and I don't plan on losing either of these new fights. The first Member of the Congress I shall discuss this with will be Senator B. K. WHEELER. Why? I've had many tough battles in Washington. By the way, don't let any article you read "kid" you into believing that what success I had at Washington was because I was going with the tide. Three years of hard work, 1933 to 1936, were spent at Washington in fighting the big boys who were in control of the grain and cotton exchanges. Winning that fight for passage of the Commodities Exchange Act was not going with the tide. Two other tough fights were over Farm Security Administration and interest rates of the Federal Land Bank System. Farm Security Administration was formerly known as Resettlement Administration. It was about 1934, when neither the House nor Senate Committees on Appropriation would give Resettlement Administration a hearing. It was dead as dodo. Administrator Tugwell, with tears in his eyes said, "Bill, they've killed the greatest program poor farmers and drought-stricken farmers could ever wish for." I told him we were not licked and he thought I was crazy.

I went to Senator WHEELER and told him the story. He called 10 Senators out from the Senate floor to his committee room. I explained what the loss of Resettlement Administration would mean to the South and the Great Plains States in time of low prices and drought. There and then we organized our fight and won it on the floor of the Senate. The Senate made the House go along—and thus we saved Resettlement Administration. Later its name was changed to Farm Security Administration.

In this year of 1943, the Congress practically killed Farm Security Administration. In the hard years, where would your hard-luck Montana farmers have gone except for grant payments? If Farm Security Administration had not been saved in 1934, we could not have built 130 cooperative elevators financed by loans from Farm Security Administration in 1939 and 1940. Without those elevators and their patronage, we could not have built the elevators at Superior, Wis., Shelby or Lewistown, Mont., nor purchased 3 private grain firms in 1943. Senator WHEELER was at the base of all this Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association success because of his service to you and others back in those days, leading the fight to save Farm Security Administration. He carried our amendment to an appropriations bill to cut land-bank mortgage interest rates—way back there in 1935—down to 3½ percent. Farmers with land-bank mortgages have been saved since that date over $300,000,000 in interest costs. Senator WHEELER held the Senate floor for 2 days until he was sure he had enough votes to win that amendment. Again, the Senate made the House yield. Not only were farmers in the land-bank mortgage system saved over $300,000,000 in interest costs during the past 8 years but it has had the effect of reducing interest rates on farm mortgages all over the United States.

I've been in a fight for weeks with the railroads and O. D. T. because of discrimination in furnishing boxcars to cooperative elevators. It has cost cooperative elevators untold loss of millions of bushels of grain—and worse, it has penalized the farmers who were thus forced to go to a privately owned elevator to sell their grain. I could get nowhere until I went to Washington. I went to Senator WHEELER and told him the story. It was on Saturday afternoon, September 18. Senator WHEELER is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. At 2:30 p. m. he telephoned Mr. Joseph Eastman, Chairman of the United States Interstate Commerce Commission and Chairman of the O. D. T. Believe it or not, but at 4:30 that day I was enjoying a private meeting with the United States Interstate Commerce Commission—all because of Senator WHEELER.

I got a fine hearing—all the time I wished. I've been getting action ever since. It is a slow job to lick the Association of American Railroads on an order that has stood unchallenged for 20 years. On Thursday of last week Senator WHEELER pushed through the resolution of Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, and it was approved by the United States Senate. That resolution provides $25,000 of Senate funds to investigate the matter of the shortage of grain boxcars and discrimination against grain cooperatives. I talked to the Senator last Friday night to learn what he had further done. He stated he had appointed a subcommittee of three out of his whole Committee on Interstate Commerce and he would attend the hearings when I testified.

I don't agree with Senator WHEELER on all matters—you don't always agree with your wife or husband. He has "socked" me from the platform; but on the cold record of Senator WHEELER with me as representing the Farmers Union, his services are far beyond what you can ever repay him. I'll be needing Senator WHEELER in the tough fights ahead, and it is a comfort to know I can count on the farmers' friend.

Senator MURRAY and your two Congressmen, Messrs. O'CONNOR and MANSFIELD, have supported every position of the Farmers Union which we called to their attention. If the Members of Congress from all agricultural States supported us as do the delegations from Montana and North Dakota, the Farmers Union would really straighten out the terrible agricultural legislative mess which has existed for months at Washington.

Two years ago last winter we set up the Terminal Agency, Inc.—a general insurance agency—to write all of the insurance business of Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association and such country cooperative elevators as cared to turn over their business to it. Under the law and insurance ethics, such a general insurance agency may not be a cooperative. We set this up as of March 1, 1941, with practically all of the stock owned by the four Northwest State Farmers Union organizations—North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana. After paying income taxes to the State of Minnesota and the United States Government, these four States received enough dividends to pay for their stock ownership, and this year your Montana Farmers Union received a check for over 200 percent on the stock it got for nothing. In addition, your State organization receives a monthly check for countersignature fees. Let us summarize what the Montana Farmers Union received in cash this year from Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association and the insurance business—outside of our advertising in its paper, the radio program which we pay for, and some field work. Here they are:

Insurance counter-signature fees	$695.09
Dividends on insurance stock in the Terminal Agency, Inc	1,681.10
From F. U. G. T. A.'s 5 percent educational fees of $42,162.81—Montana's share	9,791.77
Cash total in 1943	12,367.96

NOTE.—Montana's share in the 5 percent educational fee for Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's year ended May 31, 1943—out of $42,162.81 based on grain handled by the association which originated in Montana—was 10,422,848 bushels.

Out of the faith and hope of you farmers and farmers like you—and all the soldiers and workers in the locals and counties in Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, see what you have wrought. Look at all of these local cooperatives in these States—your Farmers Union Livestock Commission Co., your Farmers Union Central Exchange, and your Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. You have made a great beginning. You have built most all of these great institutions and buildings out of your faith, hope, and patronage. You are scaring the owners of the profit system into hysterics. But, let's relate this cooperative history, enterprise, and hope to the Montana Farmers Union, the National Farmers Union, and the welfare of our Nation.

The whole Farmers Union enterprise rests upon education of farmers, business and professional people, along with all who labor, to understand the limitations of a safe capitalistic economy. History is the story of the struggle of man for existence. Men's fight for existence does not rest upon the lack of nature to provide the soil, minerals, and seasons for plenty but, solely, his fight for existence rests upon the few who defraud him by legalistic mechanics. Whether it is a cartel, a patent monopoly, deprivation of education, a poll-tax law, lack of medical care, a group of public utilities, or transportation, or lack of credit consideration—back

of it all, you will find State and Federal legislation which has created a legalistic fiction which the weak are forced to accept. When the greed of capitalism is extended to where it becomes a predatory practice on the great majority of those who produce, and so predatory that the masses receive less than they need to purchase just their basic consumptive needs—then comes a depression. Therefore, a depression is not the fault of natural things such as soil, minerals, and seasons, or of abundance—but a depression is caused by the accumulated predatory profits exacted beyond the ability of people to pay and yet have enough left to purchase their essential needs.

These recurring depressions, which cause bankruptcies, loss of homes, lives, and hope itself, make people think. These are the conditions which created socialism, communism, fascism, nazi-ism. More locally it caused the Populist movement, the Non-Partisan League—even the Farmers' Holiday Association. Out of that same system of unbearable exploitation of farmers came the creation of the Farmers Union, with its cooperative movement. This cooperative movement of ours is limited capitalism. It has invested capital—pays interest dividends on capital stock—but is limited. There is no exploitation in our Farmers Union cooperative capitalism. We support a parity of income for labor—and demand a parity of income for farmers. We fight cartels, monopolies, usury, excess profits, disease, and ignorance. We are now fighting a ghastly world war, we hope, for the "four freedoms"—three meals, a peaceful bed, a healthy family, and commonwealth.

The Farmers Union does not make its fight only for its members—it fights for all the people here and everywhere. Our literature is testimony of our brotherhood for all. We are our brother's keeper. Let us be concrete and apply our efforts and results as we have worked in, with, and for Montana. Let us state some experiences.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange smashed the unbearable profit margins which, up until recent years, were exploited not only on farmers but every person in this State and others who bought gasoline and motor oils—yet not 1 person in 25 in this State knows they so benefit from the Farmers Union. The central exchange also cracked the Twine Trust monopoly—yet very few farmers know it.

Look at the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's fight for fair markets—for Federal control of grain exchanges, to put an end to grain corners and market squeezes; our successful effort to take 1932 bankruptcy grain prices to levels of living for our farmers; benefit payments, parity payments, floor prices under grain, farm storage, and loans on farm-stored grain. Look at our success in buying off-grade wheat, moving acreage restrictions, increasing flaxseed production, and getting fair prices for flaxseed. I could prove that our work brought at least $100,000,000 more grain money into Montana during the years from 1932 to 1943. Not just for our members, but all farmers in this State. What did the farmers of this State do with those millions? They made Great Falls greater; they made all people of Montana better off because that money has been spent in Montana and not in Florida or California. That money did not go into a few estates in Minneapolis and Duluth and Chicago and New York, etc.

But, more important, you members of the Farmers Union, through your dues, and 5 percent educational fees out of your cooperatives have put funds into the hands of your State leaders to spread the education about the Farmers Union program to the farmers and, more important, to your children and others in this State.

We, in the Farmers Union, seek full employment of people and maximum production for our needs for the well-being of everybody. Everybody is our Nation. We want our farmers protected—with parity of income—we want people in jobs to be fairly paid; we want schools, hospitals, libraries, good roads, clean entertainment, good doctors, dentists, well stocked stores, fair banking and transportation under a decent democratic system—with voting rights, school rights, health rights, fair play and equal opportunity to all, regardless of color, race or creed. We, Farmers' Union people seek parity of opportunity for all, the end of a predatory capitalism, the full growth of cooperative capitalism. The lack of these brought on this most terrible of all wars. Some worry about the national debt. I worry about the national death. We could cancel debts, if necessary—but we cannot recall our boys and girls from death.

The Farmers Union cooperative system squares with the Golden Rule. Will the people continue to build it? Are our leaders honest and courageous enough to be worthy the trust placed in their hands? Will man's meanness and jealousy mislead him from his trust given by our members? Are you members elert to fifth columnists in your groups? Have you courage to challenge gossipers, and compel them to sign their names to a statement of charges when they whisper to you? The continued growth of your organization, its cooperatives and effective education depends upon you as members.

1. Will you be alert to saboteurs?
2. Will you support your local, county and state organization?
3. Will you read your Farmers Union papers and educational material?
4. Will you discuss your union with neighbors and get them to join?
5. Will you faithfully support your cooperatives, even though you don't like some leader, director, or manager?
6. Will you urge your children to be a part of our great junior movement?
7. Will you help to secure new members for the Farmers Union?

If you—and all of you—support those rules, you will make Montana great and help make a great Nation. Those seven rules require no cash investment. They do require the investment of your courage, faith, and loyalty.

Disturbances in Tule Lake Relocation Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16 (legislative day of Friday, November 12), 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the November 5 issue of the Douglas (Ariz.) Daily Dispatch, discussing the disturbances which have recently taken place in the Tule Lake Japanese relocation center.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULE LAKE DISTURBANCE

The recent disturbance at the Tule Lake relocation center, where disloyal Japanese are housed, is just another in a series of incidents, more of which will occur before the war is over.

There is considerable agitation to have the War Relocation Authority abandoned and all relocation centers placed under the direct supervision of the Army.

It would seem the sensible thing to do.

After all, whether the Japanese in the relocation centers are loyal or disloyal, and so segregated, they are living in the centers because we are at war with Japan. It would, therefore, seem only logical to have their centers administered by the War Department.

There is, of course, a vast difference between the loyal Japanese, who is an American citizen, and who knows no loyalty except to the country of his birth, and the disloyal, Japan-born Japanese. And it is too bad that the safe prosecution of the war makes segregation necessary.

But it is in reality as much for the safety of the Japanese themselves, as it is for the country. For there are fanatics, here, who would not stop to reason, nor to find out which kind of Japanese an individual be before heaping his bitterness and hatred upon him.

At Tule Lake, the situation is bad, unquestionably. Last week, the disloyal members of the camp refused to harvest crops which were not only grown to feed themselves but other Japanese.

Loyal Japanese from other centers volunteered to go to Tule Lake to harvest the crops and save them from rotting in the fields.

Just why the Japanese demanded the resignation of some of the W. R. A. officials at the camp is not known. None except those who inquire deeply will ever know, probably.

One thing is certain, however, and that is that the interned Japanese, whether loyal or disloyal, are being treated with care and consideration. They are well housed, well fed, and certainly not mistreated physically.

In the early months of the camp, when they were first built, of course there were hardships, of course the camps were crude—

But so were the military camps to which our own soldiers were sent. At more than one camp, newly built in this country, the men waded ankle deep in dust. They were housed in barren barracks in the dead of summer with no air-conditioning of any kind. They sometimes were on rationed food because supplies were slow in arriving.

The interned Japanese, just as with prisoners of war, should be treated like human beings, given reasonable comfort and protection, but at the same time they should not be pampered. It would be an unwise policy to mistreat them, for our boys in the clutches of the Japs might suffer.

And the conduct of their camps, the regulation of their lives so long as the war shall last, should be under the military authorities, for they are, after all, interned because of the war.

American Citizens in Bondage—Facts About the Star-Route Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a situation has developed which can no longer be ignored by Congress. The manner of handling our star-mail-route contracts has for many years been a disgrace to our Government, but now with a world war in progress and expenses rising, these low bidders on star mail routes directly are up against it.

The law under which these star-route carriers operate was written about 100

years ago, and is as obsolete now as the stage coaches which were operating at that time would be today.

As a result, over 2,000 star-route contract holders have failed financially in the past few years. That is not all, the system has broken up homes, caused ill health and deaths and misery.

Only Congress can change this law and this situation, since the Post Office Department refuses to recognize the problem.

This matter merits immediate interest and action.

So that the picture may be clearly seen by all Members of Congress, I beg permission to reprint in the RECORD some facts published by the National Star Route Mail Carriers Association in a booklet entitled "People in Bondage—These Are Your Constituents."

The article follows:

Congress established star routes specifically for the transportation of mail between towns (post offices) by stage coach. Method and purpose was for handling mail entirely by sack or pouch under lock, to places not reached by railroad. Time, 1845.

About 15 years later (1860) the Pony Express, during its brief life, operated under contract but was not competitive with any similar mode of transportation.

Nineteen years later (1864) Congress created the Railway Mail Service. This was the first separation of mail in transit. That service has been changed and modernized many times since it was established.

Star routes continued to operate as strictly transportation where railroads did not reach for another 35 years up to 1900, at which time it had been in operation more than 50 years, during which time the railroad era had come into being and the stage coach had disappeared.

NOTE THESE CHANGES

At this time, from 1897 to 1900, the rural service was established by Congress. It expanded rapidly and was modernized to keep pace with private business. No change was made in star-route service to meet the changed conditions, but in many instances it was required to perform rural free delivery service. From 1900 to 1918, the two services remained primarily a horse-power operation, and the final change was made by the Post Office Department in 1918 to meet the changed conditions and the advent of largely motorized equipment.

HOW IT WAS DONE

In 1901 the report of the Postmaster General states that a "new regulation" had been made, providing for the delivery of mail into boxes on star routes. Seventeen years later, in 1918, the report of the Postmaster General states that a "new feature" had been adopted on star routes which required the contractor, in addition to box delivery and collection service (which was the 1901 new regulation), "to provide the same facilities to patrons as that afforded on rural routes; that is, to sell stamp supplies, deliver registered matter, handle money orders, c. o. d., registered matter, etc.," going on to define full rural service.

Thus the record is perfectly clear that in this manner the Department by "regulations" completely changed the working operation of the Star Route Service into a combination transportation and rural service without any change in the law. They took it out of the stagecoach operation for which it was established and made of it a rural and transportation service which covers both rural and metropolitan service to meet the changed conditions and need of the time, but without any change in the law of its operation. In other words, after it had been in operation for more than 50 years the era for which it was created had disappeared, and to meet the changed condition, the Department made the change by regulation, while the law remained unchanged, as it still remains today, under which they are trying to operate a service of today on a law that was made for conditions of 100 years ago.

The annual reports of the Postmasters General throughout the entire time from the establishment of the Star Route Service down to 1900 when the change was made as stated, contain conclusive statements that the Service never was free from trouble and never was fully satisfactory. Its history contains some of the sorriest pages in Government records.

From the time in 1900 and 1918 when the Service was changed into a combination rural and transportation service operating under a stagecoach law, it has gradually gone from bad to worse, and in that respect it follows the same history as all other unregulated transportation services; the railroads, the trucking industry; the air mail. Uncontrolled rates created bankruptcy and it has done so in star routes. More than 1,000 contracts have been given up in recent months.

Department statistics show the story more clearly than anything outside the actual conditions on many of these routes; the decline from 14 cents per mile to the present 5 and a fraction cents per mile (as against the 20½ cents per mile paid the rural service for the performance of the same type of work.)

This reduction of more than 50 percent during the time in which the price trend of everything has been in the opposite direction is the reason hundreds of these star-route carriers have gone bankrupt. It is why these contracts are peddled from pillar to post; routes abandoned, not once, but time after time; while the mail is carried by Tom, Dick, and Harry, or whoever can be found. Mail is mishandled; scattered along the routes by incompetent and inexperienced carriers; entire failure of schedules; bondsmen hiring whoever can be secured to handle many routes; temporary contracts without bonds, carried by persons who could not qualify otherwise.

Such is the system that is responsible for the present situation. A system which requires excessive administrative costs and a needless number of officials and personnel.

WHAT REASON IS THERE FOR THIS CONDITION?

Postmaster General Walker has repeatedly stressed in his speeches and radio broadcasts during the past year, one scintillating fact: That the post-office service has attained its present reputation for efficiency by reason of its selected personnel and the one outstanding fact that the work offers permanency and security. Those two factors are recognized by the Postmaster General, and have been for more than 60 years recognized as an essential necessity.

The star-route service is the second most important unit of the Postal Service in transportation, and transportation is both the foundation and the backbone of the Postal Service. Therefore, what a strange anomaly that officials are opposed to the same principles for the star-route service which are declared to be indispensable in the other postal units handling the same mail in the same manner. It is so inconsistent as to indicate something radically wrong.

THE BOND SITUATION

All persons handling mail are under bond for honesty with the exception of the star-route carrier. Star routes are required to have a performance bond in lieu of the bond required of other postal workers, and this exacts thousands of dollars in toll annually, above that required for other postal units handling the same mail. The star route of today is doing the same work the other postal units are doing and there is no logical reason why they should be under the so-called competitive bidding of the stagecoach era. If that system is desirable for postal work, then it is equally necessary that post-office clerks, letter carriers, rural carriers, and all postal positions be put under that system. Some agency could make a handsome profit in handling a pool of these jobs and farming them out as is now done with star routes. If it would be destructive to those positions and the service, it is equally destructive now to the star-route carrier and service. (And we submit that any position in the world would eventually be reduced to bankruptcy under such system.)

FACTS CONGRESS SHOULD KNOW

1. That the Star Route Service is one of the most important units of the Postal Service today.

2. The work and responsibility required is, on thousands of routes, more than is necessary in rural service. Hundreds of star routes daily perform more work than is performed in rural service.

Thousands of post offices and rural routes would not operate at all but for the Star Route Service.

That rural service receives 20½ cents per mile, and the Star Route Service about 5½ cents per mile for the same kind of service.

Many of them perform nothing but rural service. Thousands of them combine transportation and rural service, and as a result, hundreds of these carriers, American citizens, many of them veterans of World War No. 1, annually lose their homes and equipment after years of faithful service.

The home, the family, the equipment, the savings of a lifetime, and often years of service given to this work are ruthlessly taken from these carriers that a showing of even as little as $1 per year may be shown in the record of savings, and that same saving may and often does cost a hundred times the saving shown.

The savings thus shown by the Department made in this manner and by these methods are often fictitious and result in substantial loss to the public and the Department.

Administrative costs are excessive.

LAWS CHANGED BY DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS

In a Washington newspaper we recently noticed the statement that some Government departments are able to take a law enacted by the Congress and by writing their own regulations virtually change the law to their own desired interpretation and operation.

No more outstanding example of this could be found than in the evolution and operation of the Star Route Service where, by the addition of two "regulations" over a period of time, the Department has largely changed the original purpose of the law, in fact, almost abrogated the original law.

Department regulations have made of it a combination transportation and rural service, but carried on under that century-old law for stage coaches.

Congress established this law—only Congress can change it.

The remedy is the passage of H. R. 1809, introduced by Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON.

The Greek United Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by Basil

J. Vlavianos which appeared in the Nation of November 6, 1943, entitled "The Greek United Front."

The heroic Greek people have borne consistent misery and suffering since the invasion of their country by the Nazis and Italians more than 2 years ago. Today they are threatened with an outbreak of civil war which would subject them to further misery. The United Nations must not be divided further in their efforts to achieve victory. Greece is a democratic member of the United Nations and we must help it to stay democratic.

The article follows:

THE GREEK UNITED FRONT

(By Basil J. Vlavianos)

The news from Greece is extremely confused. Various contradictory reports have appeared in the American press, most of them garbled and misleading. News emanating from Egypt and the Near East is distorted by a ruthless censorship, which seems designed primarily to stifle the truth about the nature of the Greek resistance. The reason for this is simple: Publication of the truth would create an atmosphere unfavorable to the return of King George II to his country. Consequently, foreign correspondents in Egypt must either cable nothing at all or repeat the confused and generally inaccurate stories furnished them by the supporters of the King.

Recently we have been told that Greece is divided, that the guerrilla leaders are fighting each other, and that the King and the British authorities have shouldered the burden of appeasing them. The truth is quite different. Small clashes, provoked by royalist propaganda, have been greatly exaggerated by groups interested in foisting the King upon a divided Greece. Actually, the Greeks as a whole are united in their struggle against both foreign and domestic tyrants. They are striving to liberate themselves from the German and Bulgarian yoke and to prevent the reestablishment of Greek fascism under George II.

Their unity is clearly reflected in a moving report which I received some weeks ago from the head of a delegation sent to Egypt by the National Liberation Front and other underground organizations. This report, signed by Elias T. Tsirimokos, former member of the Greek Parliament and now general secretary of the Union for Popular Democracy, one of the groups forming the Liberation Front, describes the struggle against the invader as "the hardest and most beautiful ever undertaken by the Greek people."

The National Liberation Front (E. A. M.) was created 1 month after Germany's invasion of Greece to coordinate the activities of various popular factions, patriotic organizations, and civilian movements. Its aims may be summarized as, first, liberation of the country from the foreign occupation, and, second, establishment of a popular government after the liberation. It keeps up resistance to the invader by organizing armed struggle in the countryside and hostile demonstrations in the cities. The Greek people's support of the Liberation Front is their reaction to the misery, starvation, and moral degradation to which they have been subjected.

In the first year of the occupation, 1941–42, the chief concern of the Greek people was to escape destruction by starvation. People could not even obtain rationed bread. Owing to the inflation and the scarcity of foodstuffs, Tsirimokos said in his report, wages and the salaries of public officials were "nothing but wages of death and starvation." But in spite of the widespread misery the spirit of opposition and the strength of the popular movement grew day by day. Demonstrations of open revolt against the conqueror were staged, general strikes were called, and political warfare was carried on by every possible means.

On March 5, 1942, for instance, the news that citizens were to be drafted for compulsory work was the occasion of an enormous demonstration, organized in 24 hours, in Athens and Piraeus. About 250,000 people gathered at designated places and marched in the streets for many hours, despite the violent intervention of the Italian police. Many persons were killed and wounded, but the draft was frustrated.

Another important manifestation of resistance took place on July 22, 1943, when the expansion of the Bulgarian occupation in Macedonia became known. The Germans had declared that they would resort to unusual force to put down militant demonstrations. Only a few weeks before, they had executed 106 men for participating in one. However, more than 300,000 Athenians gathered that day to protest against the Bulgarian occupation, ignoring German bullets, hand grenades, and tanks.

It is known, from Tsirimokos' and other authentic reports, that as the result of successful guerrilla fighting a large section of Greece is today free and self-governed. Only the big cities, where the Germans maintain their garrisons, and the roads leading to the border are controlled by the invaders. Under the surveillance of guerilla and underground organizations freely elected communal councils administer the country. Free Greece is living under the most democratic laws the Greek people have ever known.

The National Liberation Front, or E. A. M., is the largest as well as the oldest of the Greek underground movements. Its army is known as the Greek Liberation Army, or E. L. A. S. Among other guerrilla units are the Greek National Democratic Army, or E. D. E. S., and the National and Social Liberation Group, or E. K. K. A. All have fought heroically against the incomparably superior forces of the enemy. The Allied command in the Middle East, with which the Greek guerrillas are connected, has repeatedly expressed the warmest admiration for their achievements. But the guerrillas are strongly opposed to the King, who gave impetus to the Greek Fascist dictatorship. And this opposition is responsible for the systematic concealment of underground activities by the government in exile. Just as the truth about Tito's Partisans in Yugoslavia was suppressed, so the deeds of the Greek guerrillas, united in their opposition to King George II, have been relegated to obscurity by the propaganda of his Hellenic Majesty.

The "civil strife" in Greece of which we read, to the extent to which it exists, is instigated by royalist agents. Tsirimokos openly denounced the King's methods in his report: "The whole movement of liberation has not only been ignored; it has been obstructed by agents sent to Greece. Abroad, calumny has characterized the aims of the heroic fighters for freedom as wicked and anarchistic." The idea of the King and his supporters is to win over, by any means at their disposal, one or more of the guerrilla leaders in order to divide the opposition and to substantiate their claim that anarchy would follow the elimination of the monarchy. They have been working zealously for months and months, and are still working, toward that end. On June 11, 1943, the London Tribune said that division among the Greek forces might result from this lamentable policy. The Greek liberals in this country issued a similar warning.

Owing to the censorship, no one here is in a position to know how far King George's divisive propaganda has succeeded. But on August 10 the British managed to smuggle out of Greece and to bring to Egypt a delegation representing the Greek guerrilla and underground movement. This delegation was composed of three former members of the Greek Parliament—two of the Liberal and one of the former Royalist Party—one Independent Democrat, one Conservative, and one Communist. All these men are prominent in the groups which are resisting the German and Bulgarian occupation and supporting the cause of the United Nations. Some belong to the E. A. M., others to the E. D. E. S. or the E. K. K. A., that is, to the organizations which, according to the correspondent of the New York Times, are engaged in bitter internal strife.

Not the slightest sign of any dissension among them has been apparent since they arrived in Egypt. Not only have they reached a complete accord with the military authorities in the Middle East on how better to synchronize the efforts of the guerrillas with those of the Allied forces, but they have worked closely together in trying to solve the Greek political problem.

On August 17, 1943, the delegation, together with Mr. Exintaris, the accredited representative of all the Greek parties—except the Communists—in the last parliament of 1936, and Mr. Kanellopoulos, who resigned last March as Vice President of the government in exile, signed a letter to the Prime Minister, Mr. Tsouderos. It declared that "for the sake of national unity, which alone insures the success of the national struggle and the normal development of the country, it is necessary that it be announced that the King will not return to Greece before the people have decided on the form of government." On receipt of the letter the Prime Minister immediately called a meeting of the Cabinet, and after a long discussion all the ministers, including the Prime Minister himself, one of the King's most devoted adherents, decided to pledge themselves to support the demand expressed in the letter and to inform the King of their decision.

Instead of making the required declaration, which any man of good faith would unhesitatingly have done, the King refused. Ignoring the Greek constitution once more and the political rules which require the King to follow the advice of his ministers as long as he keeps them in office, he retired to Lebanon for reasons of health.

This story was kept strictly secret from the American and British public until the Greek National Herald of New York published the Tsirimokos report, sent here through private channels. It is still impossible to obtain accurate information of what is actually happening in Egypt. George II has succeeded in withholding all news about the representatives of the Greek people and the attitude of his ministers, who have often seemed at variance with him. At the same time the most dubious stories have begun to circulate about alleged civil strife among the same guerrilla groups whose representatives are collaborating so closely and harmoniously in Egypt.

Mystery still shrouds the situation. But two things seem certain: first, that news about the civil war in Greece has been deliberately exaggerated; and, second, that any dissension among the guerrillas has been provoked chiefly by King George II and his supporters.

Subsidies or High Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of November 1, 1943:

SUBSIDIES OR HIGH PRICES?

When the Nation set out to forestall a disastrous wartime inflation, President Roosevelt laid down seven interrelated tasks essential to that objective. These were the tasks: (1) Tax heavily; (2) establish price and rent ceilings; (3) stabilize wages and salaries; (4) stabilize farm prices; (5) stimulate War-bond buying; (6) ration scarce essentials; (7) discourage credit buying.

It has always been true that success on all of these fronts is vital to the Nation's economic welfare. On some we have done well, despite terrific group pressures. But the outcome still hangs in the balance, and Mr. Roosevelt's expected message on food prices and subsidies this week will launch a new battle to prevent a general rise in prices.

The very fact that Congress has refused to increase taxes this fall makes it doubly important to hold the line on another front—prices and wages. Essential to that purpose is a well-administered program of subsidies, such as both Britain and Canada have employed with conspicuous success. By paying subsidies to food producers or processors, the Nation can bring out full production without increasing the cost to consumers. The amount so paid will be but a fraction of the cost of a general price rise, bringing in its train, as it must, new wage increases.

The congressional committee for protection of the consumer, headed by Representative SCANLON, of Pennsylvania, has called for public support in its fight for subsidies. The committee deserves that support from every American who opposes paying an extra cent for every loaf of bread and quart of milk, 10 percent more for meat and 25 percent more for canned vegetables.

Resolution of the Buchanan County (Mo.) Medical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

THE BUCHANAN COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
St. Joseph, Mo., November 10, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the last regular meeting on November 3, 1943, the Buchanan County Medical Society, of St. Joseph, Mo., unanimously voted and went on record as opposed to the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills (Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861) for the following reasons:

1. This bill would set up political control over the health of the entire Nation; control of all hospitals by politicians; denying to the individual the right of choice of his own physician and surgeon, compelling one to take the medical attendant prescribed by political bureaucrats; politicians would prescribe what doctor could treat what patients and by what prescribed treatment.

2. Numerous European countries, notably Germany, Britain, and France, have for a number of years been operating under a system of state-controlled medicine, the state control resulting in the squandering of 40 percent of available funds on political administration. The consensus of opinion of both lay and professional medical groups abroad, subject to bureaucratic medicine, reveals the utter dissatisfaction with state medical care on the part of the public and the medical profession. On the part of the public because of deterioration in quality of medical care. On the part of the profession because of the lack of incentive to keep abreast of the times or of improving one's self since political pull, not professional attainments, is the yardstick of advancement. This sad state of affairs abroad is reflected in the fact that until the past 25 to 30 years American physicians went abroad for postgraduate study. The exact opposite is now true. Students now come from Europe for post-graduate training in America, the recognized medical center of the world.

American medicine needs no apology. Operating under the traditional American system of equality of opportunity for all, it has lengthened the average span of life nearly 20 years during the past 80 years. It has organized the most effective Public Health Service and Army and Navy medical departments in the history of the world. No other country has ever been able to remotely challenge the effective way the miraculous cures are effected by the medical departments of our American forces, in keeping contagion and pestilence at an undreamed-of low level, and returning to combat or to productive civilian work, the large number of casualties suffered. This challenge has not and cannot be met by any politically dominated organization. General Eisenhower has stated that the medical department was the most efficient department in the United States Army in the north African and Sicilian campaigns. Lieutenant General Vandegrift, Marine Corps, has stated that the three things which made the occupation of Guadalcanal possible were:

1. The Army Medical Corps.
2. The sulfa drugs.
3. Air evacuation of the wounded.

These accomplishments, together with the almost miraculous saving of the lives of the wounded, and again returning them to active service, constitute a record never even remotely achieved by any medical department of this or any other country. This enviable record has been accomplished by the medical men educated, trained, and practicing under the American system of free enterprise and opportunity for all. Almost one-third of the American medical profession is now in the service of the armed forces; the most of them are the ablest physicians and surgeons in our country. Hence they are unable to protest against this bill. We feel that it is not fair to have them return to the practice of medicine under political domination, not of their choice and against which they had no opportunity to protest. We feel that this bill is directed against the very things for which we are fighting.

3. Such a proposed plan of socialized medical and hospital care is unnecessary. There is no provision made for medical care of the unemployed and indigent who need it most. Furthermore, there are already enrolled in the United States over 11,000,000 people who are members of one or another of the Blue Cross Plans for prepaid hospitalization, many of whom are also members of various voluntary prepaid medical and surgical plans. The number of both is increasing daily.

Because of these facts we ask and confidently expect your aid in defeating this proposed bill.

Yours very truly,
G. T. BLOOMER, M. D.,
Chairman,
J. I. BYRNE, M. D.,
CHAS. GREENBERG, M. D.,
F. X. HARTIGAN, M. D.,
W. T. ELAM, M. W.,
State Medicine Committee.

Address of Associate Justice Frank Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Frank Murphy, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth:

[Telegram]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 15, 1943.

Hon. FRANK MURPHY,
Supreme Court of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Today, on this anniversary and on every day that shall pass until the Japanese enemy is finally and totally defeated, the American people send messages of hope and faith to you, the gallant people of the Philippine Commonwealth. We work and we fight for the day of your liberation—for the day when your Government shall be restored to Manila—when you shall enjoy the true freedom and independence and national dignity which you have so fully earned.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

That message was written by the President of the United States, who sponsored and approved the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth. He is the same President who has solemnly vowed that the freedom of the Philippines will be redeemed. You need only know his integrity and uncompromising tenacity of purpose to realize that this promise to the Philippine people will be kept.

Eight years ago today, November 15, 1935, a quarter million people gathered before the Legislative Building in Manila witnessed a momentous and heart-warming event. They saw the inauguration of a new democratic government established by and for a nation of 17,000,000 Filipino souls with the aid and wholehearted approval of a nation of 132,000,000 Americans. They saw a great world power—the United States—forswearing the fruits of conquest, commend the destiny of a rich and matchless archipelago into the hands of the Filipino people. Before their eyes a commonwealth was born. Participating in that event as the last Governor General of the Philippines and relinquishing the reins of government to a president of their own choosing was a privilege that I shall always deeply cherish.

Today we mark the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth. It is the second to be observed by the Filipino people under the hostile surveillance of a Japanese army of occupation. It may not be the last. But I have a strong conviction if on the next 15th of November the Japanese are still in the Philippines, their days in the islands will be of brief number. For, in the South Pacific the avenging hosts of the Allied Armies and Navies are mustering for a sweep to the north backed by all the power and might of this great country. Their gaze is fixed on Manila, and beyond Manila lies Tokyo.

It is nearly 2 years since the Japanese completed their military conquest of the Philippines. But their brief victory is one of arms alone. Their real struggle to conquer the Philippines—their fruitless effort to win the loyalty of the Filipino people—continues to

this day. How desperately the invaders are trying to propagandize their victims can be seen in the news which is doled out every day over the Manila and Tokyo radios. Japanese speakers proclaim the slogan that the Filipino people are oriental, not occidental. Therefore, it is argued, the Filipinos should cast their lot not with the Americans but with their brother orientals, the Japanese.

There are few Filipinos who will be misled by a contention so obviously fraudulent. It is true that the Philippines are geographically a part of the Orient. But it is not geography alone that has determined the spiritual and political character of the Philippine Nation. That character is a composite of two western civilizations. From sixteenth-century Spain there came to the Philippines the Christian religion and the advanced culture of the richest and most powerful nation of Europe. And from the United States, American administrators of the twentieth century brought the precepts and ideals of American political democracy. The result was the only Christian nation, the only democratic state in the Far East. This is the nation that is now asked to join hands with the feudal autocracy of Imperial Japan.

In furtherance of this program, the Japanese have advanced the claim that the Filipinos failed, through years of struggle, to win their freedom from the United States. And to complete this attempted hoax, the Japanese, to whom republican government is utterly foreign, have established an "ersatz" Philippine Republic with all the external trappings of legitimate self-government. Let those who may be in doubt look beneath this mask and they will find the sinister outlines of the Japanese military machine. They will find no genuine freedom or independence but the brute power with which Japan in years past has fastened a harsh imperial rule on Korea, Manchuria, and the unhappy provinces of occupied China. During this same period the American people were developing democratic institutions in the Philippines and providing in law for their real independence in 1946, both economic and political. This was a covenant openly arrived at—not under the pressure of wartime expediency but in the leisurely days of peace.

People of the Philippines, this covenant will be kept. We in America are determined to retake by force of arms that which our soldiers in company with yours so bravely defended and lost on Bataan and Corregidor. We shall not falter or slacken our efforts until this defeat has been fully avenged. Our victories in Africa and Europe will be matched by further victories in Asia, leading to eventual deliverance of those who are now the unhappy and unwilling victims of Japanese aggression and treachery. We shall not rest until our colors are again joined with yours and the invader is driven from Philippine soil.

And when our flag is restored it will not be merely as a symbol of authority. It will be a final sign of liberation and a symbol of freedom. Our task will then have been completed. At that juncture, the Philippine people, already versed in the art of self-government and spiritually strengthened by the ordeal of war, will take over the privileges and responsibilities of sovereignty, a sovereignty which will belong to them as a matter of natural right and divine law.

On that auspicious day, too, they will extend the hand of welcome to their gallant President, Manuel Quezon, and their distinguished Vice President, Sergio Osmeña, who have been continued in their respective offices by the Congress of the United States until constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippines. The people of the Philippines, having witnessed the destruction of their political institutions, will be cheered by this action of the Congress. For it was an action both of these patriotic statesmen approved and recommended in the belief that it would speed the day of victory. And it is victory, and the restoration of their homeland, that the Filipino people desire above all else.

A great future lies before you, people of the Philippines. Already your President, although physically racked with illness, is zealously working and preparing for your economic rehabilitation and your defense in the days after victory is won. These measures are tangible evidence of the God-given freedom that will soon be yours.

One day, in the not far distant future, you will see the American Fleet—Stars and Stripes afloat—sailing proudly into Manila Bay. It will be final assurance that the story of the quest for Philippine independence did not end in the blasted tunnels of Corregidor. The enemy has written a few tragic pages. But, as we prayed and hoped on the 15th day of November 1935, the Divine Author yet will bring the saga to a happy ending. And on that day there will begin for the people of the Philippines a chapter more fair and full of promise than any that has yet been written.

Address at Boylston, Mass., Honor Roll Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Boylston honor roll exercises, August 26, 1943:

It is a great honor and a high privilege for me this evening here in this historic New England town where American liberty has been nurtured and developed, to join with those of you who have so thoughtfully assembled here to perform the patriotic duty of dedicating this beautiful honor roll in honor of the young men and women of Boylston who are now in the service of our country.

If it were not for his unfortunate illness, I am sure that your own distinguished Congressman FEHR G. HOLMES would have likewise been deeply honored to be present on this occasion, and it affords me considerable pleasure to be able, as the Congressman from the Third Congressional District, to come here in his stead.

A most generous thought has inaugurated this ceremony, a most patriotic motive animates it, and an atmosphere of solemn gratitude dominates the occasion which brings us together today.

Those we honor not only serve us gloriously in war but served us faithfully and well in time of peace. The whole community can well be proud of this gallant band to whom we pay this appropriate and well-earned tribute.

Communities like Boylston are truly the depositaries of American liberty. It was in towns like this that the greatest sacrifices were made to establish and ordain American democracy. And it is in towns like this that the tradition and spirit of American patriotism and loyalty burns with unsurpassed fervor, enthusiasm, and devotion. It is, therefore, not at all surprising, although it should be a source of great pride to all, that such a large number of Boylston's sons should be enrolled in the service of our country.

The New England town is one of America's greatest and most precious possessions. Here we find a reverence for freedom in the true American sense, the freedom that springs from the dignity of the individual and from love of God, love of family, love of community, and love of country. No government can last which does not recognize the right of the ordinary human being to enjoy freedom and liberty under the law. And no great nation, like ours, which is founded on immutable natural principles of righteousness and justice derived from the Almighty can be worthy of its heritage unless it preserves the tradition and spirit of freedom and liberty that emanates from the hearthstones and shrines of its people. To keep and save local self-government, free private enterprise, and all the cherished freedoms of our Constitution from the wily, radical conspirators who would destroy them must be our unalterable purpose as we dedicate this honor roll, for if we lose these priceless blessings of representative government our cause will be in vain and our people will be placed in the shackles of the radical, totalitarian state.

Today we should ask ourselves two questions. First, why have these citizens been suddenly taken from our midst and cast into the vortex of a great and terrible global war? They join millions of others unselfishly serving their country in virtually every part of the world, on the high seas, and in the air. They have enlisted in that great and immortal force which we have every confidence will bring us glorious victory in what we hope will be the very earliest time. These brave and loyal sons and daughters of ours have gallantly answered the call to higher duty—the call of country, of democracy, of liberty itself.

In honoring them here this afternoon, here in the presence of beloved spiritual leaders and civic and military groups and high officials, it is idle for us to try to determine where responsibility lies for the unspeakable human failures that produced this terrible conflict. It is a sad commentary indeed upon the futility of higher civilization and the impotency of modern statesmen to grapple with the problem of controlling greed, avarice, and the lust for tyrannical power. It is a horrible irony that the intelligent opinion of the world was not able to suppress the impulses of power-crazed despots. The failure of modern government and statesmanship to prevent a small group of men from instituting a reign of terror, hatred, and slaughter on this earth and sending millions to untimely death, is surely a challenge to our generation.

The second question I would like to pose briefly is, What can we, what do we propose, to do about it? What power resides in us to prevent the periodic recurrence of future wars which threaten to extinguish all civilized life? First, in justice to those who have sacrificed their lives and who are giving their unselfish, unflinching service we must wage the present conflict with renewed determination and ever-increasing zeal to overcome the brutal enemies who seek our destruction. We must leave nothing undone that can be done to support our men and women on the fighting front. They are our first line of defense and there is no sacrifice we can make that is too great or too exacting in order to insure them the means and wherewithal to gain a speedy victory. Secondly, we must ever be mindful of the dangerous forces of radicalism and ruin that beset us on the home front—the apostles of alien theories of government, the philosophers of hate and discontent, the advocates of forceful overthrow and change of our beloved American institutions.

In order to enjoy freedom we must be worthy of it ourselves, we must be willing to sacrifice for it, we must be ready to

struggle, fight, and die, if need be, to preserve, protect, and maintain it, and we must realize above all that in the present great crisis our first and most difficult task on the home front is to keep and save for ourselves and our children and our children's children the precious freedom that has made America the greatest country on earth.

Thirdly, we must be willing to work and strive in every reasonable and practicable way we can consistently with the preservation of our own form of government, our own sovereignty and our own liberty, after victory has been won, to establish a just and a lasting peace, a peace that will be based on justice, mercy, charity, and righteousness, a peace that will renounce greed and avarice and recognize the right of every nation and individual to be accorded an opportunity to work out their own salvation under institutions of reason, law, and justice.

With hearts full of gratitude for the bravery and patriotism of these fine young men and women, as we dedicate this occasion and this beautiful honor roll to their memory, their spirit of sacrifice and their valor, let us resolve to do our part in every human way we can to speed the day which, pray God, may soon be at hand, when these heroes and all the others who are with them on the far-flung battlefields of the world will be returned to their homes, their families, their loved ones, their peaceful pursuits and a greater, finer, and nobler America which will truly guarantee to every man, woman, and child within its sacred precincts, irrespective of race, color, or creed, the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Parents of Men Lost Forever in Philippines Unite to Aid Jap Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernie Pyle from the Washington Daily News:

PARENTS OF MEN LOST IN PHILIPPINES UNITE TO AID JAP PRISONERS

(By Ernie Pyle)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., November 16.—You don't seem to feel the war so very much here in Albuquerque. There are plenty of reasons you should feel it; but I think maybe the bigness of the West, and the stoicism of the Indians, and the magnificence of the sky—somehow it's all so big it can sort of absorb tragedy, and tears, and sorrow.

Few communities have been harder hit by the war than Albuquerque. I mean really hit—in the heart. Nearly 400 Albuquerque boys vanished on Bataan. More than 1,300 from throughout this sparsely populated State were lost with the Philippines.

News of the Albuquerque boys is scarce. Official death notices have been received on 113 of them. More than 300 are still listed as "missing." Unquestionably many of the remainder are dead by now, from disease and starvation in the Jap prison camps.

The parents of these 1,300 boys feel that they were martyred; but it's too late to do anything about that now, so they don't make an issue of it.

Instead they have formed an association, to do what they can—which isn't much. It is called the Bataan Relief Organization. Their sole purpose is to try to get little relief shipments to their suffering children in the Jap camps.

It would, of course, please the families of this suffering group if our high command were to direct the mass of American might immediately at the Philippines and at Japan's heart. It is only human nature that they should feel that way.

Yet they realize the war is broader and greater than their own grief, so they do not attempt to lobby the War Department in any way. They do send an occasional delegate to Washington, but it's to arrange for relief shipments to their boys, and nothing else.

The Spanish-American people of one community alone recently collected $38 in pennies, nickels, and dimes to help send the organization's president, Dr. H. V. Spensley, to Washington.

Around three-fourths of the 1,300 lost men are of Spanish or Indian blood. Many families have 2 sons gone with Bataan. The man who laid the brickwork for our house is among them. So is the boy called Lightning, who used to deliver our groceries. Everywhere you go you notice the inroads Bataan made upon Albuquerque.

The biggest shipment sent to the boys so far went on the *Gripsholm* in September. The first shipment of relief packages, sent more than a year ago, reached the prison camps in January, and unquestionably saved many lives.

The last shipment on the *Gripsholm* cost $27 a box. The contents were meticulously chosen. From $8 to $12 worth of every package was made up of vitamin and salt tablets. Each box also included 250 malted-milk tablets.

In addition to that went candy, antiseptic pencils, underwear, socks, sweaters, shoestrings, chewing gum, and razors. (They bought up every razor in Albuquerque.) Everything that came in glass or tin cans was repacked. The State police helped pick up the packages from all over the State. At the last minute some packages were specially flown to New York by Transcontinental & Western Air to catch the *Gripsholm*.

The relief organization holds meetings, gives dances, and is very active. In January it fostered a State-wide "MacArthur Day." It conducted a 1-week War bond and stamp drive, with a quota of $300,000, and raised over $600,000.

The Government gave it the right to name a Flying Fortress, so in July the Spirit of Bataan was christened at the Albuquerque air base.

The Bataan Relief Organization lists as its purpose—"To obtain immediate relief for all American soldiers held as Japanese prisoners of war, their release as quickly as possible, and their safe delivery home." And as one of the officers adds—"trying desperately to keep the heroic deeds of these almost forgotten heroes kindled in the hearts of their countrymen."

My old set in Albuquerque has ceased to exist. It wasn't a set of young bucks, either, but of mature, some of them middle-aged men. The fun we used to have playing croquet, bowling, shooting at tin cans, and sometimes just going downtown and raising hell—it will all have to wait for years now before it can ever be resumed. For there's nobody around any more.

Earl Mount, the big-hearted, hard-bitten contractor, is in the Aleutians; Arthur McCollum, always sad because he never got overseas in the last war, has made it in this one; Barney Livingstone, the newspaperman, is serving the Navy in Washington; Doc Connor has been freed from delivering babies and gone into the Navy. There were five of us—and all five of us are gone. But when we all get back—Albuquerque look out!

Letters to Citizens of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following four letters, which I am sending to the citizens of Louisiana:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1942.

DEAR FELLOW OFFICIAL: I am taking the liberty of addressing you in this manner because both of us have one thing in common and that is that we hold public office and were elected by the people.

As you know, I am running for Governor in the election on January 18. I will certainly appreciate it if you could see fit to support my candidacy. It may be that with my duties here in Washington and the limited time for making a campaign, that I will be unable to contact you personally, and for that reason I am writing you this letter asking for your support.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: You were one of my supporters in the last Governor's race. I am writing you this letter to let you know that I hope you can see fit to again support me. My campaign is progressing nicely, and it looks like ground is being gained every day. I feel very confident I will be elected.

Please accept my sincere appreciation for your kind support in the past. If I can be of any assistance to you as a Congressman, please do not hesitate to write me either in Hammond, La., or in Washington.

Again thanking you and hoping that I may have the opportunity of seeing you personally during this campaign, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: As it was my good fortune to speak at your community at a recent date in my campaign for Governor, I am taking this means of writing you a letter and express my appreciation of your interest in my behalf. I assure you that your vote and support will have my deep appreciation.

I am asking that a copy of the Farmers' Friend be sent you upon each publication.

If there is anything I can do for you as a Member of Congress, please do not hesitate to write me either at Hammond, La., or at Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing you this letter to let you know how deeply I appreciate your efforts on my behalf. You have my sincere gratitude.

I am very much enthused at this time about my chances to become Louisiana's next Governor. Things look brighter every day.

I have put you on a special list and you will receive my campaign literature and cards. In the meantime, I am counting on you to take a leading part on my behalf in your community.

Please write me at Hammond, La., or Washington if you have any suggestion.

Thanking you again, and with kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Keep the Air Lines Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of November 14, 1943:

KEEP THE AIR LINES FREE

Shall American aviation be allowed to develop freely or shall it be burdened with intolerable post-war handicaps by legislative enactment? That is the question Congress must decide in choosing between the Lea bill and the Reece bill, two measures heading toward House debate as soon as released by the Rules Committee.

The Lea bill, approved by a majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would modernize without destroying the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which has made possible the previous expansion of America's incomparable domestic air-line network.

The Reece bill, proposed as a substitute by a committee minority, would almost literally cut the throat of the independent air-line industry.

Mr. REECE'S measure would reverse an established principle and allow railroads and other surface carriers to enter the air-line business, where they could use their wealth and power to hold back—not expand—growth of their new competitor.

It would impose on the air lines a fantastic States' rights handicap, limiting Federal authority in favor of State regulation and giving 48 separate sovereignties the power to devise rules for a business which, by its nature, totally transcends artificial State boundaries.

The Lea bill, on the other hand, would reassert provisions of existing law which prohibit direct or indirect control of air lines by older transportation forms anxious to protect their invested capital.

It would reaffirm the authority of the Federal Government to regulate foreign and domestic air commerce, as urged by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

The Lea bill would improve the present situation by removing the Civil Aeronautics Board from the Department of Commerce (where its position has always been confused) and making it an independent agency, on the pattern of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill would provide independent investigation of accidents. It would clearly set forth a national policy of promoting air commerce—something the Reece bill carefully avoids.

Congress has often had to deal with the conflicts of various transportation agencies. Infant railroads had to be protected against bitter-end hostility of inland waterways. Steamship lines using the Panama Canal had to be protected against domination by railroads, which feared competition on transcontinental cargoes.

Now the Legislature must decide whether aviation shall have liberty to achieve its natural growth or be placed, in its early youth, under the throttling control of its competitors. Precedent and the public interest strongly urge that the issue be settled by enactment of the essentials of the Lea bill.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of November 14, 1943:

IT IS NOT UN-AMERICAN

The Georgia Farm Bureau Federation used an unfortunate argument in the resolutions, adopted at Macon, Thursday, expressing opposition to the national administration's plan for subsidies to stimulate the production of certain food crops and at the same time hold down consumer prices.

This argument was the statement that subsidies are un-American in principle.

The fact is, the very first general law that passed the First Congress was a subsidy act. It was a protective tariff which subsidized manufacturers. Another act of that same First Congress was a shipping subsidy.

The transcontinental railways were speeded in construction if not made possible, by governmental subsidies. Our inland waterways have always been and now are subsidized. Our merchant marine is subsidized, the air lines and railroads are subsidized by mail payments, every rural newspaper in the United States has been subsidized for many decades by having its intracounty circulation delivered postage free.

Our agriculture has been subsidized, and heavily, since 1933. Here is the total of subsidies paid to cotton farmers in the form of adjustment, conservation, and parity payments:

1933	$181,025,000
1934	115,226,000
1935	120,451,000
1937	68,742,000
1938	265,595,000
1939	215,012,000
1940	198,316,000
1941	184,957,000

At the present moment, as the Farm Bureau knows better than the general public, conservation checks are going out to 225,000 Georgia farmers in the total sum of $10,000,000.

What are these payments for? They are rewards to the landowners for improving the fertility and therefore the value of their own acres.

Now, as we see it, there is nothing un-American about these subsidies to the farmers, though the recipients are a special class and the payers are the American people as a whole. We believe in the economic and social philosophy of the A. A. A. program which was put into effect by the Roosevelt administration despite the harsh criticism of nonagricultural elements in our population. We believe it was a practical manner in which to effect what the Roosevelt haters now term a "social reform." It was a means by which the economic unbalance, which had let the farmers down into poverty, could be expediently corrected, and we believe the correction of this unbalance has brought to the Nation as a whole benefits which far exceed the cost to the National Treasury.

But the fact remains that the triple-A program is a direct subsidy, and it will strike the average citizen as strange that the Farm Bureau Federation, the Georgia members of which have profited so deservedly from its distributions, and who on Thursday endorsed the triple-A, should brand subsidization as un-American.

The Macon resolution goes on to say that "we hold it unfair to pass on to present and future taxpayers part of the grocery bills of civilians who are today receiving the highest wages and salaries ever known and are spending the smallest percentage of their incomes for food in all their experience."

The statement, unfortunately, is an untrue generalization. There are many Americans, of course, who are making more in wages or salaries than they ever made before. But there are more Americans whose income has been pegged and to whom the rise in the price of food necessities has inflicted a hardship which a further increase in costs would make unbearable.

The administration's subsidy plan would be a practical means by which the Nation could obtain the needed increase in food production without removal of the present high-level ceilings on the products required. It is a vital essential to prevent a disastrous inflation spiral.

It has worked in Canada. Concerning its operations there since the spring of 1942, Donald Gordon, who is no visionary or starry-eyed dreamer, but is deputy governor of the Bank of Canada, has testified:

"Our experience leads me to say, rather definitely, that a price-ceiling policy cannot be successful unless there is an acceptance of the principle of subsidies and a judicious but unhesitating application of it when the need is apparent.

"We have found in practice that it has not been necessary to pay out anything like the sums which some pessimists had predicted.

"If, instead of subsidies, price increases were allowed to take place, then not only would you have the indiscriminate and haphazardous dislocations of inflation but as well the elected representatives of the people would have no means of influencing the situation."

Address Before Uxbridge (Mass.) Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Uxbridge Rotary Club, Uxbridge, Mass., March 16, 1943:

My dear friends, it always affords me considerable pleasure, not to speak of great privilege and honor, to meet with local groups in the Third Congressional District, who

represent such a broad section of the business, professional, and economic life of the community as the group which has gathered here tonight.

Your organization performs most useful functions. It combines the promotion among its own members of sociability and good fellowship with many vital, charitable, and civic services to the area which it embraces. The community and the country had good reason to be proud and grateful for your fine contributions.

When I talk to a group like yours, I know I am talking to real red-blooded, two-fisted Americans, not only men who love their country but men who, having made their own way in life, believe in and are willing to sacrifice in order to defend our American institutions. I know I am talking to fair-minded, tolerant, charitable, public-spirited men who are fundamentally sound in their viewpoint, patriotic in their motives, and pledged to the preservation of the American system of free opportunity, with all it implies in the way of justice, liberality, and considerate treatment of all classes regardless of race, color, or creed.

Someone has well said that adversity is the real test of the character of a man. It is also the real test of the moral fiber of a nation. It is easy to survive in time of prosperity and peace but the true mark of an exceptional man or an exceptional nation is the ability to survive in time of disorder, strife, and conflict.

Free government has been accomplished only after centuries of struggle and sacrifice. Our people have faced and endured many critical days in order to establish and maintain it. The struggles of Valley Forge, the sacrifices at Gettysburg, the heroism of Manila Bay, the gallantry of Belleau Woods and Chateau Thierry all have marked outstanding periods in the history of our struggle to win and keep, for ourselves and those who follow us, the priceless benefits and blessings of free government.

Now we have come to another great crisis, the greatest of all, that this or any other nation has ever faced. It is war to be sure, cruel, ruthless war, but unlike previous wars, this is war on two fronts, one abroad and the other at home. I might say we are fighting two wars, one against foreign foes and the other against scheming, conniving and cunning domestic enemies. It will avail us little indeed if we win decisive victory over the tyrants of the world and lose the battle here at home against the evil forces who even now in our time of greatest national peril are plotting the destruction of our magnificent constitutional liberties and the substitution therefor of the regimented totalitarian state.

These domestic enemies feed on the discontent and dissatisfaction of our people. They thrive on economic depression and the want and privation arising from unemployment. Some of their arguments are unanswerable and constitute a real challenge to the intelligence of our statesmanship and the genius of our people to make their institutions responsive to the needs of all rather than the privileges of the few. The American people can and will banish poverty and want from this Nation.

But the most favorable time of all for performing their dastardly work of destroying free government comes in time of war. It is then that all the strong, virile young manhood of the country has left their homes and is engaged in battle throughout the world on land, on sea and in the air in defense of their country. It is then that their families and every other true American, anxious for their welfare, eager for victory and their return home, center all their attention on the war effort and have little time or attention to give to the solution of domestic problems.

It is then that the radical social reformers and bureaucrats intensify their activities. Realizing that the people are ready and willing to endure anything in order to gain final victory, they prey upon this state of mind to inaugurate sweeping changes in our basic institutions, in our domestic economy, in the social organization of our people and in the form of government itself. Using the war as a cloak and excuse for every movement, they execute carefully laid plans to control every phase of our daily lives. They regulate the wages we receive, the prices we can charge, the clothing we wear and the food we eat. They even regulate the news we read and the radio we listen to and of course, long since, they have been able to regulate, through subtle forms of repression and coercion, the things we say.

If one dares to criticize anything they do, however unreasonable, arbitrary, and offensive, they are promptly smeared and vilified and branded as agents of the Axis. In this way, honest criticism is suppressed, for what businessman, what professional man, what wage earner, what citizen—unless he be made of the sternest stuff—wants to put himself in a position where he is rendered subject to the power of these bureaucrats, the widespread smears, vituperations, and assaults on his motives that invariably occur whenever he ventures to make an honest criticism of crackpot schemes that upset business and disorganize the whole economic and social structure?

These radical reformers who abound in the Government and in the country have now changed their operations from the domestic to the international sphere. Everybody is employed at home in wartime, at good wages, hence they cannot poison the minds of the people by spreading class hatred, so they simply change their methods. Now they move into the field of world social reform. Through the Office of War Information, the O. W. I. so-called, they carry on constant propaganda over the radio and through the circulation of newspapers and magazines in practically every country in the world. While they are sending millions of copies of their political propaganda magazines and literature into foreign lands and using valuable shipping space for this purpose, they will not let our American fighting forces receive a single solitary newspaper from their home towns or a single gift, a single solitary package from their loved ones at home. I realize we desperately need shipping space for more vital things. But if we cannot send newspapers and packages to our own boys, these bureaucrats should not be permitted to send their worthless propaganda magazines.

More than that, while our own loyal working classes have ceilings placed upon their wages in most cases, the prices of foodstuffs and necessaries of life are bounding up in the unregulated black market. Farmers are forced to sell their cattle for slaughter, because they cannot get adequate prices for milk or because they cannot get adequate help to do the work on the farms, farm machinery is being exported and we are moving into a period of scarcity and threatened privation unparalleled in our history. A few years ago we were killing little pigs and plowing under vital crops. Now the Bureau of Economic Warfare and Lend-Lease operating on a world-wide front is directing the shipment of our foodstuffs and necessaries of life to practically every part of the civilized and uncivilized world.

Last week I took occasion on the floor of Congress to protest against this alarming situation. I pointed to the huge shipments of foodstuffs and necessaries of life to civilian populations of many other countries. I told of rayon panties and pajamas that had been sent to the natives of north Africa; of American shoes which these uncivilized people tied together and wore around their necks and used for pockets. Figures for the year 1943 show estimated increases in these shipments. It is planned to take a very impressive proportion of meat, eggs, cheese, fats and oils, canned foods of every kind, and many other commodities which the American people require for their own subsistence. This at a time when most of these foods already have been or will be drastically rationed in this country.

There is not the slightest doubt but that these policies, coupled with strict rationing and price-fixing programs and failure to deal with farm-labor problems will lead us to the brink of the gravest of conditions here at home. First, the ruin of dairy farmers, indeed, other farmers also, who are selling their herds for slaughter because of high prices of feed, shortage of labor, and low prices of milk. Next, with increasing inability to obtain materials and supplies, the ruin of all small business in the United States, and finally, what some believe is desired by these radical reformers, the complete collapse of our own domestic economy.

I need hardly remind you of the frightening consequences that would ensue when this condition comes to pass. Serious need both at home and abroad, undernourishment of labor, and our own civilian population, marked reduction in war production, and ultimately lack of the very things we need to win this war, namely, ships, planes, guns, and supplies for our Army and Navy and armed forces throughout the world.

When the stage is reached, as it is bound to be unless some affirmative action is taken in the very near future, our people will be undernourished and broken in morale, our system of production will be crippled, our economic system will face collapse, and there will be justification then for the imposition by the social reformers of the absolute totalitarian state. This would spell the doom of all the things that have made our country great.

Thus I give you a brief survey of the overall picture that confronts us in this hour of trial and tribulation. It is not optimistic. But there is a somewhat brighter side. We have within our own hands the means to apply the remedy. There are already signs in the Congress of the American people of an awakened public opinion that insist upon the immediate correction of these distressing conditions.

But there is not time to waste. Some believe that the damage is already done, and that it is too late to apply the remedy. I am not of that view. I think the American people still have it within their power to control their own destiny and I urge that we move at once to combat the dangerous enemies on the home front and put our own house in order.

There are many things we can do toward this end. First, enact a practical pay-as-you-go tax system. Second, so far as possible, equalize sacrifices and render the rationing and price-fixing systems equitable to all groups of our people with no favoritism, no discrimination, and no black markets. Third, extend an immediate hand to the farmer so that he may have desperately needed manpower and machinery, and be assured of reasonable prices of feed and for the milk he produces. Fourth, so regulate the export of vital essentials of life, except for immediate and necessary war purposes to our own and Allied armies, that our own people may be spared from the threat of privation and need. Fifth, exercise the utmost vigilance to preserve our form of government and our economic system against further attack by radical domestic enemies.

Let us remember that the soul of America is being tested in the greatest crucible of all times. The way ahead is fraught with the utmost difficulties and sacrifices. Our suffering will be great. But we can survive now only through tears, sweat, and blood and by the will and determination of our whole people. Let not these great sacrifices be in

vain. While our gallant heroes fight abroad, let us fight with equal fury here at home to save for ourselves and our children's children, imperishable and untarnished, the magnificent structure of the American system of government and the American way of life with their magnificent blessings and privileges of free American citizenship, with all the rights of our Constitution guaranteed to all. If we but steel ourselves to this great effort, we will not only gain glorious victory in the war, but be able to insure security and peace for this and untold generations yet to come.

Taxation of Federally Owned Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

TOWN OF FRAMINGHAM,
BOARD OF ASSESSORS,
Framingham, Mass., November 5, 1943.

Hon. PEHR HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned heartily concur with the following resolution recently passed by the National Association of Assessing Officers and the Association of Massachusetts Assessors, and wish that you would do whatever you can in conformity with it.

"Whereas the ownership of property by the Federal Government restricts the tax base from which local governments draw the bulk of their revenues, and thereby affects the financial stability of counties, cities, school districts, and other political subdivisions; and

"Whereas property owned by the Federal Government is not distributed uniformly over the country, but frequently is concentrated in particular areas which in turn results in serious inequalities as between different local governments; and

"Whereas properly owned by the Federal Government generally requires the same services of local government as does property owned by private citizens; and

"Whereas the beneficiaries of federally owned property are the people of the entire Nation and not merely the residents of areas where Federal property is situated; and

"Whereas Congress is investigating the problems arising out of Federal ownership of property, and has indicated a willingness to enact corrective legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the consensus of the membership of this board—

"1. That when Federal agencies acquire property for temporary use, such property should be leased rather than purchased in order to preserve necessary revenues to local governments;

"2. That Congress be urged to enact legislation authorizing the taxation of the following specific types of federally owned property:

"(a) Property withdrawn from local tax rolls for temporary purposes, military or otherwise;

"(b) Property used for housing and resettlement projects;

"(c) Real and personal property used for manufacturing and industrial purposes;

"3. That, in providing for the taxation of federally owned property, Congress require that such taxation be applied to the same extent and in the same manner as privately owned property is taxed."

OTIS H. ADAMS,
TIMOTHY A. DONOGHUE,
CLYDE VAN DUZER,
Board of Assessors.

The Lovett Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many strange and unusual things appear during these days in our country. We have recently witnessed one bureaucrat defying the Congress of the United States. Mr. Ickes is that man who now defies the representatives of the people—the Congress. Congress has its duty to perform and Congress has spoken regarding Robert Morss Lovett.

A very enlightening article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date, written by George Rothwell Brown on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the article entitled "Ickes Bound To Lose in Battle With Congress," which follows:

POLITICAL PARADE

ICKES BOUND TO LOSE IN BATTLE WITH CONGRESS

(By George Rothwell Brown)

In contemptuous defiance of Congress, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes has informed the House Insular Affairs Committee that he will continue Robert Morss Lovett in office as executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands, notwithstanding the statutory prohibition, pending a test by the Supreme Court of the right of the legislative branch of the Government to remove a minor employee of the executive branch.

"I feel," said Ickes, "that the Congress has improperly trespassed upon my prerogatives as the head of an executive department by seeking to dictate to me in the selection of my responsible subordinates."

Can you beat that for bureaucratic gall and impudence?

"May I say," he added, "that we are not solicitous of the will of Congress when we think Congress is unconstitutionally encroaching on our powers."

To this arrogant flouting of the expressed will of Congress, by a Democratic member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which proposed the legislation barring Lovett from any employment under the Government, unless nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, made this succinct reply:

"Not one dollar of money will be made available for the payment of the salary of Mr. Lovett, in any capacity, after November 15, unless by that time his nomination has been sent to the Senate, and he has been confirmed.

"A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is investigating charges of subversive affiliations and sympathies against other Federal employees, and appropriate action will be taken against them as the evidence and report are presented to the full committee."

This joined what is regarded at the Capitol as the most serious head-on collision between the executive and legislative branches of the Government since the impeachment of Andrew Johnson.

Ickes had been summoned before the Insular Affairs Committee to state by what authority he had transferred Lovett from the position of secretary of the Virgin Islands, which he held at the time the ouster was ordered by Congress, to the position of executive assistant to the Governor, after Congress had found him guilty of affiliations with subversive organizations.

The Interior Secretary is reported to have told the committee that he had no authority other than the constitutional authority he had outlined. He proposed to have a test of the case made before the Supreme Court. This seems so unnecessary in view of the judicial functions assumed by the old curmudgeon himself.

Ickes admitted he had once written a letter to Lovett in which he had said that these affiliations were embarrassing to him, but he insisted that Lovett continued to enjoy his complete confidence.

This arrogant attitude by a member of the Cabinet toward the Congress leaves both Ickes and Lovett in a position of danger to themselves, although the issue would have to become much more acute for the House of Representatives, in time of war, to invoke its great power of impeachment.

But with regard to Lovett, the elderly University of Chicago professor, who is a cheerfully admitted joiner of innumerable Communist front organizations, the situation is different.

The Comptroller General certainly will cut off his pay if he hasn't been nominated and confirmed by November 15.

If he should continue to function as a Government employee after that date, without having been nominated and confirmed, he will run into a Federal law which makes it a felony for anybody to serve the Government without pay.

Since he can neither draw pay after November 15 nor work for the Government after that date, how will he be able to establish a claim for pay before the Court of Claims? How does he propose to carry an appeal to the Supreme Court?

Meanwhile, Congress will not weaken. It will not appropriate a thin dime for Mr. Lovett.

Mr. Ickes, what's your next best card?

Patriotism of American Slovaks in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, thousands of American Slovaks of the State of New York have concluded their campaign November 11, with groups affiliated with the Slovak League of America in their $6,000,000 War-bond campaign, one of the purposes being for the purchase of a Flying Fortress to be named, "Slovaks of New York State."

Under the leadership of the Reverend Florian C. Billy, O. M. C., pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Church, Schenectady, N. Y., State chairman of this drive, thousands of these loyal men and women from the Thirtieth Congressional District, New York, comprising the counties of Schenectady, Montgomery, Fulton, and Hamilton have contributed to this Fortress by their purchase of War bonds and War stamps. Thoroughly American in thought, word, and deed, not only have they contributed their time, money, and energy to the three War bond drives, but thousands of their sons and daughters are serving their country in the armed services. Many of these gallant men and women have performed deeds of valor which have been recognized by their commanding officers, and many bear honorable wounds testifying to their devotion to duty and love of country.

Address of Hon. Manuel Quezon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Manuel Quezon, on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth:

Today is the eighth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. Eight years ago today I was inaugurated President. The achievements of our Commonwealth since its establishment I need not review for you know them well. Before the invasion of our country by the Japanese we were living in peace, prosperity, and contentment. Then the enemy struck, without provocation on our part. The shadow of death fell upon our towns and cities. Our people were maimed and killed, our homes wrecked or burned, our sacred shores trampled by the feet of the invader.

In Bataan we showed the world once more our heritage of heroism. By every nation's first duty of self-defense and self-preservation we took up arms and fought the invader. No self-respecting nation could have shirked the challenge of that treacherous attack that started in Baguio on December 8, 1941. To have avoided that challenge or to have cowered before it would have been to lose all pride and dignity, to have suffered a bottomless humiliation.

We Filipinos are not a people accustomed to crooking the knee to any power that may purpose to invade our country and to hold us in thrall. We have been overcome by superior forces, but we have never been outfought; our country has been conquered, but we have never been vanquished. Every power that has ever dared to overrun our country has known the avenging anger of Filipino arms.

I think of this as I lie on my bed today and recall every incident of our epic resistance from Vigan through Lingayen to Bataan. It showed that the defiant blood of Lapulapu still courses in our veins, pulsating not one whit less proudly in the heart of such as Capt. Jesus Villamor than in the hearts of Dagohoy, Diego Silang, Antonio Luna, and Gregio del Pilar.

Last year, on this same date, I addressed the people of the United States to tell them that after Bataan and Corregidor, our friendship is sealed in the blood of heroes which makes it sacred and forever lasting. I want to tell my people today that during this 1 year that I have been in America, this country has been giving the Filipinos tangible evidences not only of friendship but of its gratitude for our uncompromising stand in the defense of liberty and freedom.

Not only has President Roosevelt recognized the Philippines as "possessed of the attributes of full nationhood," as a result of which the Philippines is now a member of the United Nations, a virtual recognition of the Commonwealth as an independent nation, but the Philippines has been given a seat in the Pacific War Council, and President Roosevelt and I have agreed to set up a joint commission to study problems of Philippine economic reconstruction, financial rehabilitation, and future security.

Crowning my efforts and negotiations in your behalf since undertaking the conduct of the affairs of our Commonwealth Government from the city of Washington more than a year ago, the President of the United States recommended in a message to the Congress of October 6, 1943, specific measures designed to effect the establishment of an independent Philippine Republic at the earliest time that the course of the war will safely permit, and to provide for our people full post-war rehabilitation and future economic and national security.

President Roosevelt asked Congress that he be given the authority "after consultation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, to advance the date provided in the existing law and to proclaim the legal independence of the Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation as soon as feasible."

The President's message goes beyond the commitments made in the Tydings-McDuffie Act, for it recommends not only the establishment of an independent Philippine Republic, but it gives the assurance that the political and territorial integrity of the Republic will be defended by the power of the United States in concert and cooperation with the Philippines.

The message recommends even more than that. It recommends legislation covering the trade relations between the United States and the Philippines after independence that will assist the Philippines as an independent nation to become economically secure. It urges that the Congress appropriate funds for the economic rehabilitation of the Philippines, and for the reconstruction of all Government properties and public works and improvements that have been destroyed since the Japanese invasion. Damages caused to, and losses suffered by, Government as well as private corporations and private individuals will be covered. And, more important still, the poor people who have lost their small properties, such as their little houses, carabaos, hogs, etc., will be fully indemnified.

As the President stated in his message, all of this is due to the Filipino people "in recognition of their heroic role in this war, the political ties which have bound us together, and the bonds of friendship which will join us together in the future."

I know that Japan has granted a so-called independence to the Philippines. How unreal and meaningless that independence is, you and I know. The real purpose of this pseudo-independence is contained in the text of the military pact ratified by the national assembly October 18, according to a Manila-datelined Domei report broadcast by Tokyo, which says that "the high contracting parties shall closely cooperate on matters political, economic, and military for the successful prosecution of the war of greater east Asia."

The terms of the alliance, as announced by Tokyo, clearly show the real purpose behind the granting by Japan of a so-called independence, namely, to use the Philippines politically, economically, and militarily for the successful prosecution of the war of greater east Asia.

I want to give you my assurance that the Government of the Philippines will provide amply for those who fought in this war, for their orphans and their dependents.

I also want to assure you that the time of your redemption is fast approaching. America is gathering her strength in the Pacific, and soon General MacArthur will be able to start the reconquest of our homeland. Indeed, he has already won important battles in the southwest Pacific, in which he has decisively defeated the Japanese and driven them out of Gona, Buna, Munda, Villa, Salamaua, Finschafen, in New Guinea, and Kolobangara, in the central Solomons, all preparatory for that conquest.

I realize how sometimes you must have felt that you were being abandoned. But once again I want to assure you that the Government and people of the United States have never forgotten their obligations to you. General MacArthur has been constantly asking for more planes, supplies, and materials in order that he can carry out his one dream, which is to oust the Japanese from our shores. That not more has been done so far is due to the fact that it was simply a matter of inability to do more up to the present time. The situation has now changed. I have it on good authority that General MacArthur will soon have the men and material he needs for the reconquest of our homeland.

I have felt your sufferings so deeply and have constantly shared them with you that I have been a sick man since I arrived in Washington, and for the last 5 months I have been actually unable to leave my bed. But sick as I was, I have not for a moment failed to do my duty. As a matter of fact the conference which resulted in the message of President Roosevelt was held practically in my bedroom.

Nobody knows and feels as intensely as I do your sufferings and your sacrifices, how fiercely the flame of hate and anger against the invader burns in your hearts, how bravely you have accepted the bitter fact of Japanese occupation. I know your hearts are full of sorrow, but I also know your faith is whole. I ask you to keep that faith unimpaired. Freedom is worth all our trials, tears, and bloodshed. We are suffering today for our future generations that they may be spared the anguish and the agony of a repetition of what we are now undergoing. We are also building for them from the ruins of today and thus guarantee their economic security. For the freedom, peace, and well-being of our generations yet unborn, we are now paying the price.

To our armed forces, who are fighting in the hills, mountains and jungles of the Philippines, my tribute of admiration for your courage and heroism. You are writing with your sacrifices another chapter in the history of the Philippines that, like the epic of Bataan, will live forever in the hearts of lovers of freedom everywhere.

My fellow countrymen, I am proud of you. I know that you have been wielding against the enemy two potent weapons: Filipino unity and faith. Stronger than any arm of destruction, your weapons are of untold and terrible power. Stronger than a thousand sheets of steel, with them you are invincible. Carry on, and today, I repeat to you with conviction what General MacArthur said when he arrived in Australia

from Bataan: "I broke through and I will return."

People of the Philippines, I will return with General MacArthur. Our day of redemption is at hand.

That Third Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press:

THAT THIRD TERM

The talk you hear frequently nowadays is about a possible fourth term. But how about the third term?

For almost 2 full years we have been a full-fledged participant in the war. We face a long, difficult, costly struggle before it ends. We must marshal all our strength, all our resources, all our concentration on winning. We dare not lose.

And what do we have to contend with, meanwhile?

For one thing, a Secretary of the Treasury who, 23 months after Pearl Harbor, cooks up a revenue bill frankly framed on a political, not a fiscal basis—whose principal contributions to the war effort have been confusion, delay and obstruction.

For another, we have a Secretary of Labor who, 23 months after Pearl Harbor, functions chiefly as a statistical clerk, issuing occasional data on the rise in the cost of living and employment, while administration of matters concerning labor are carried on by the War Labor Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service—everywhere but in the Department of Labor.

For another, we have a Secretary of the Interior who, 23 months after Pearl Harbor, is conspicuous as a writer of books and magazine articles, a petroleum administrator, a coal-mine operator, a fiesheries administrator, and a confessed curmudgeon—a prolific and ubiquitous personage skilled in the arts of invective and persiflage. But seldom a Secretary of the Interior.

We have a palace major-domo in the person of Harry Hopkins, whose real function nobody knows but Harry Hopkins, and his boss; an economic warfare administrator who is not in the Cabinet; a Vice President whose only administrative function was stripped from him after he got into an alley scrap with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation chief (who doubles as a Secretary of Commerce), and who devotes his time away from the Senate to will-o'-the-wisp speech making; a food administrator who is not connected with the Department of Agriculture; a price and wage administrator who for weeks held only a title and an actual administrator who functioned without the title—neither of them in the Cabinet; a war production administrator also outside the Cabinet; an "information" office without Cabinet status but with definite and far-reaching influence in foreign affairs.

We have a system of ironing out difficulties in one Federal agency by creating three new and superspecial ones to take its place, empowered to coordinate and mediate and issue directives; we have no War Cabinet; we have an abundance of politically slanted double talk that involves even the administration of the Army and global strategy in unceasing gossip, slander, and innuendo; we have self-perpetuating and multiplying bureaucracy in astronomic proportions; we have policy makers who talk out of turn so vigorously and frequently that the White House chastises the newspapers for reporting the confusion.

We have a foreign policy that often is obtuse and fails to take the public into its confidence; no domestic policy other than that dictated by the fluctuating tides of political hocus-pocus and economic change.

We have a 10-year-old official family nominally serving as a Cabinet but which has relatively little to do with the sole major concern of the Nation—winning the war. We have an assorted flock of war administrators without Cabinet rank, with overlapping authorities and no central control. We have coordinators by the score but no coordination. We have a mounting debt so far in the stratosphere that paying even the interest is a major concern. We have an official disaffinity for economy that is virtually a trade-mark of the administration.

We have mistrust of free speech and free press, and a petulant, off-with-his-head reaction to any and all critics.

We have a subtly schemed but full-blown fourth-term campaign.

And that's what we have in a third term. Want to go for the $64 question?

Appearance Before Congress of Heads of Government Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the scheduled appearance of Secretary Hull before this body on Thursday next is a notable event. Perhaps it will lend strength to the proposal recently advanced by Congressman KEFAUVER with respect to amending our rules so that department heads may appear before us at regular times. The attached statement by Gould Lincoln in today's Washington Star commenting on the Kefauver proposal is so clear a statement that I feel it should be quoted in full:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Better teamwork between the law-making and the law-administering branches of the Government may grow out of a proposal by Representative KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, which calls for a "question period" in the House when Cabinet officers and heads of independent executive agencies may be interrogated by Members of the House.

The idea of having heads of the various Government departments appear and speak at sessions of one or both Houses of Congress is not new. Indeed, as Mr. KEFAUVER points out, this was a practice during the First Congress, when President Washington participated. It is a plan that has been broached a number of times since it was abandoned long years ago, though it never has been adopted. In these days when teamwork is vital, and will continue to be after the war, the Kefauver proposal deserves serious consideration. If adopted, it might help to head off and break down many so-called bureaucratic practices which have enraged a lot of Americans—some of them Members of Congress.

It is conceivable, for example, that had the head of the O. P. A. been subject to questioning in the House, many things done by that organization might have been avoided. What those things are have just been made the subject of a devastatingly critical report by a select committee of the House, headed by Representative SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia. Had it been possible to get Leon Henderson before the House membership for questioning there might have been a better understanding of the law on the part of Mr. Henderson, and of the intent of Congress.

PLAN IS SIMPLE

Mr. KEFAUVER'S plan can be put into effect by a simple amendment of the House rules. He has a resolution before the Rules Committee which provides for a question period at least once in each 2 weeks and not more often than once a week. This period, which is limited to 2 hours, will give the Members the opportunity of questioning the heads of departments and independent agencies. One-half of the time is to be allotted to written questions which have been submitted previously and the other half to questions asked by Members from the floor. These questions are to be submitted first to a House committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

No effort is made in the resolution to compel the attendance of the executive officers. They merely are to be invited to attend and to answer the questions, copies of which will be supplied to them in advance. However, it is considered unlikely that any of these officials would decline such a request. Public opinion would operate against such a declination. Further, since the Congress makes all appropriations for these Government agencies, it is unlikely that their heads would wish to provoke its resentment. The only tenable reason for refusing to appear and answer questions would be that questioning is against the best interests of the country—for example when secrecy is required in the details of the war effort.

It has been argued that under the Constitution the three branches of the Government, legislative, executive, and judicial, are intended to be entirely separate—and should be kept separate. There is, however, no good reason why they should be hermetically sealed against each other. Nor are they, in actual practice. The President is called upon by the Constitution to make reports on the state of the Union to Congress, and he does. He makes special recommendations of legislation that he deems needed. The Cabinet officers and other officials are called upon under the law to submit reports to Congress. These officials appear constantly before committees of Congress to discuss needed appropriations and legislation. The President approves laws enacted by the Congress or they are passed over his veto or rejected. Members of Congress constantly visit heads of departments and vice versa.

WOULD CURB INVESTIGATIONS

The Kefauver proposal would give all the Members of the House an opportunity to learn of the administration of the laws they pass from the responsible heads of departments. It would give these officials an opportunity to explain to the House just what their departments are doing and why. It would make unnecessary, it is argued, many of the special investigations voted by the House, some of which are merely "fishing" expeditions and which would not be voted at all, if the whole membership of the House had complete information.

Mr. KEFAUVER maintains that if his plan is adopted it would step up the speed of government without in any way disturbing the balance as between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It would also give to administrative officers an opportunity to reply to criticisms of their departments in the open House, a real forum, which they do not now possess.

There have been many proposals in the past that Cabinet officers be permitted to take part in debate on the floor of the House or the Senate, when matters particularly affecting their departments are under consideration. In 1864 a select committee of the House unanimously approved such a plan. In 1881 a select committee of the Senate made a similar recommendation. It was adopted by seven outstanding Members of that body, Senators George H. Pendleton, W. B. Allison, D W. Vorhees, James G. Blaine, John J. Inglass, O. H. Platt, and J. T. Farley. President Taft recommended a similar plan in a message to Congress. President Wilson, President Garfield, John W. Davis, and Elihu Root also supported the proposal.

Post-War Security for Our Fighting Men

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are beginning to realize the disturbing consequences of waging an all-out global war. People on the home front are being subjected to rationing of every sort, heavy taxation, and to many other sacrifices. But these hardships are insignificant in comparison with the sacrifices, tragedies, and horrors of modern war faced by our fighting men on the battle fronts of the world. Our fighting forces, composed to a great extent of mere lads taken from high schools and colleges, have been forced to leave good homes and loved ones to help fight a ruthless enemy in order to preserve the cherished liberties and freedoms of a great democracy. These men are engaged in a titanic struggle to assist in liberating conquered peoples everywhere so that we can all live as free people under God in a world at peace.

At this very moment our boys are undergoing great hardships and dangers. Many of them are sacrificing their lives to the end that eventual victory of which we are certain, will soon be ours. We at home have a sacred duty to see to it that the sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors are kept at a minimum. When this war ends our armed forces will be demobilized and millions of our men will return home to take their normal places in private life. Demobilization of our forces in the European theater is expected before that of our forces in the Pacific area, and we must now make the necessary preparations. It will not be an easy task for our boys to mold themselves into our everyday life, to just step in where they left off. Living for years in fox holes, swamps, deserts, and in the cold Arctic will have had its effect on the minds and bodies of our boys; they will come back tired and calloused. They will need rest and assistance that will vary in accordance with their individual needs. Some will desire to complete their education in high schools and colleges. Others will signify their intention of recapturing their former businesses, which in many instances were relinquished at a sacrifice when these men entered the service. Some will want to begin their new life by investing in a home for their family.

The gigantic task of rehabilitating the returning soldiers and sailors is the sole responsibility of Congress. Congress and the people at home have a solemn obligation to provide a practical post-war security program for our fighting men and women. As Members of Congress, each of us has subscribed to a sworn obligation not to permit history to repeat itself. After World War No. 1, you might recall that a great many Americans, including those in authority, forgot the returning soldier. Thousands of these soldiers suffering the horrible wounds of war sought refuge in the Capital, which they so gallantly fought to preserve, yet they were turned out by guards and the militia at the point of bayonets. This must not happen again.

With this objective in mind, and at the suggestion and request of my good friend Sherman J. Bainbridge, general manager of the Townsend National Weekly, I originally introduced H. R. 7372 in the Seventy-seventh Congress and again introduced this very same measure as H. R. 1701 in this Seventy-eighth Congress. It is the purpose of H. R. 1701 "To protect and enhance the social-security benefits to all persons inducted into the military service, and to provide a cushion for post-war conditions." The bill was originally proposed by Dr. Townsend, the champion for security-pension benefits, to fully protect our fighting men and women. The bill further provides:

That title — of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a provision that unemployment benefits shall be augmented so that each man on discharge from Army, Navy, or Coast Guard shall be paid unemployment benefits of $100 per month for 12 months following discharge, and that this $100 payment shall be based on the average purchasing power of $100 as calculated on commodity price levels for the year 1941; and that age-benefit provisions of the Social Security Act shall accrue to all persons in military service on the basis that each individual shall be deemed to have been paid wages in the amount of $100 per month during his entire period in active military service in land, air, or Navy forces (including Coast Guard) of the United States.

Let us not wait until the cessation of hostilities to enact legislation to protect our boys who are fighting and dying for us. Many soldiers in the battle areas have written to me pleading for Congress not to let them down. Let us not measure the cost. The cost is negligible when we consider that we have already authorized $263,000,000,000 in appropriations for war purposes to destroy property and take human life.

Let us carry out the simple religious philosophy of Almighty God by helping restore and rehabilitate our boys to normal God-fearing Americans. Let us promptly enact H. R. 1701 and send this heartening news to our boys overseas. What an inspiration indeed it will serve to our soldiers and sailors when we will be able to prove to them that we are not forgetting them. This additional step in the interest of the morale of our fighting sons will also have its effect upon our enemy.

History must not repeat itself. History will not repeat itself.

New York State Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. FAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of New York State laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, compiled by Mr. Abraham Janko, national service officer, Disabled American Veterans, care of Veterans' Administration Facility, Bronx 63, New York.

I am hopeful that this résumé of New York State laws will come to the attention of all the potential beneficiaries, who are not fully aware of the valuable rights and privileges and benefits that are available to them under certain circumstances.

I should like to commend the high service standards sought by the Disabled American Veterans in New York City. I am proud to be a member of this organization that goes all out as America's disabled defenders.

The outline prepared by Comrade Janko is as follows:

NEW YORK STATE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Burial: County allowance for burial of indigent veterans, their wives, or widows and minor children. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives or friends may conduct the funeral.

Privilege of removal of bodies from potter's field or neglected or abandoned cemeteries to properly kept cemeteries.

Burial grounds: Counties may acquire soldiers' burial grounds, and provide for maintenance of same.

Towns may purchase soldiers' burial plots in cemeteries, and provide for the care of same.

Soldiers' monument corporations may acquire cemetery lots.

Grave care and registration: Reports to the adjutant general of the burial place of soldiers, sailors, or marines, giving the name and location of the cemetery, and the location of the grave in the cemetery.

Perpetual care of soldiers' burial plots in Dutchess and Niagara Counties.

Headstones: County allowance for headstones for the graves of indigent veterans, their wives or widows, or for the grave of a

veteran left unmarked for 5 years by a suitable headstone.

CLAIMS: ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Public record certification: Free copies of public records for wards of the Veterans' Administration, under Uniform Guardianship Act.

The fee for a copy of an honorable discharge, payable to county clerks of the counties in New York City, is limited to $1.

Recording of discharges: Honorable discharges of World War veterans are to be recorded by the county clerk, free of charge.

Safekeeping of discharge papers, etc.: Officers or soldiers are allowed to deposit discharge papers, descriptive lists, etc., in the Bureau of War Records for safekeeping.

Service officers, etc.: Authorizes counties to employ county service officers to assist veterans and their dependents living in the county in obtaining any Federal or State awards to which they are entitled.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absent registration by patients in veterans' hospitals, and by the wives, widows, mothers, and dependent daughters of honorably discharged veterans, who are inmates of State institutions for the care of such persons.

Absent voting by inmates of soldiers' homes and Veterans' Administration hospitals.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS—QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

State scholarships for World War veterans.

The board of regents may endorse a Federal rehabilitation certificate as a license to practice any of the professions over which it has supervision.

Federal vocational training credited as experience on examination of the disabled World War veteran for a position under civil service.

Credit for Federal rehabilitation course in architecture, on application of disabled World War veteran for license to practice.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Scholarships for resident children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States or as a result thereof, or, under certain circumstances, to the children of honorably discharged veterans. Amount: $150 for tuition, and $100 for maintenance, per person.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Extension of age limit for appointment of armorer or superintendent of an armory, on application of certain veterans.

Preference, rights, and privileges of veterans under civil service, in State and local units.

Preference to World War veterans in appointment of employees of the bureau for the relief of sick and disabled New York veterans, division of military and naval affairs.

Retirement of veterans employed in the division of public buildings.

Allows war service credit in computing service for retirement of State police.

War service is counted as leave of absence in computing service to qualify as an exempt volunteer fireman.

War service is credited in computing service under the Police Pension Act applicable in certain villages.

Allows war service credit to New York veterans in relation to allowance upon retirement of employees in State correctional institutions.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Pensions or other rewards granted by the United States or by a State for military or naval services, and certain personal property used in such service are exempt from execution, and from seizure in any legal proceeding.

GUARDIANSHIP

Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act with modifications. Provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Admission of veterans, their wives or widows, mothers and dependent daughters, to the State Woman's Relief Corps Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital, under Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

Provision for the compilation and publication of the laws of the State relating to veterans, and for revision thereof.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Conspicuous service cross awards for World War service.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit for time spent in the active service of the United States.

Retirement and pensions of certain war veterans from the military or naval service of the State.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Leave of absence to veterans in public service of State and local units on Memorial and Armistice Days.

Cities may appropriate money for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days, to be expended through veterans' organizations.

Towns may appropriate money for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days to be expended through veterans' organizations.

Villages may appropriate money for observance of Memorial Day.

PENSIONS

Pensions to blind veterans and their widows.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Provision for hall of military records in the capitol, and the deposit of records, relics, etc., for safekeeping.

RELIEF

Relief of veterans and their families, through veterans' organizations, in their own homes.

Relief of sick and disabled veterans.

County aid to a veteran or veteran's family.

County appropriations to associations or organizations for the aid of disabled veterans.

Use of certain war-chest funds for relief of veterans.

TAX EXEMPTIONS, EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, ETC.

Peddler's license: Veterans or their widows are exempt from fee for county license.

Property tax: Real property purchased with the proceeds of a pension, bonus, or insurance granted by the United States or the State of New York for military or naval services, owned by the person who rendered the services, his wife or widow, of dependent father or mother, may be exempted from taxation except school and road taxes. Maximum exemption, $5,000.

Exemption of property of veterans' organizations.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Conventions; reports of proceedings: Appropriation to encourage and promote the selection of New York as the place for holding the convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in 1941.

State printing of reports for certain veterans' organizations.

Corporate rights: Powers of certain associations under the benevolent-orders law.

Insignia: Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations decleared a misdemeanor.

Makes it a misdemeanor for anyone, veteran or otherwise, to sell for personal gain or profit poppies, forget-me-nots, flags, or other articles sold for patriotic purposes, fraudulently claiming that such sale is for the benefit of an organization authorized to administer relief to veterans.

Meeting places, etc.: Armory privileges. Quarters in the capitol for Veterans of Foreign Wars.

General-expense appropriations to the G. A. R. and United Spanish War Veterans.

Municipal corporation may lease public buildings to veterans' associations free of charge or at nominal rent.

Cities and towns may appropriate money to assist certain veterans' organizations in defraying expenses for rental or maintenance of rooms.

Parades: Rights of veterans' associations, under the general city law.

Patriotic holiday observance: Expenditure of city appropriations for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days through certain veterans' organizations.

Records, relics, etc.: Privileges of veterans' organizations to assist the adjutant general in collection of records, relics, etc., for the bureau of war records.

Relief to veterans, etc.: Administration of veterans' relief through veterans' associations.

Function of certain organizations in administration of relief of sick and disabled veterans.

County aid through associations or organizations for the aid of disabled veterans.

Transfer of war chest funds to certain veterans' associations for veterans' relief.

Tax exemptions: Exemption of real property of veterans' associations.

Loose Talk About Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an article from the Boston Globe by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Landon's Charge Called Baseless":

LANDON'S CHARGE CALLED BASELESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The speech which ex-Governor Landon delivered last week contains the following statement: "The only foreign policy the administration has approved, and that by indirection, is the old discredited theory of a balance of power alliance. Alliances tend to separate the nations of the world rather than to pull them together. Especially is this true of the proposed exclusive alliance. * * * I submit that the proposed British-American alliance is joint isolationism."

Since Governor Landon is supposed to be a responsible man, we have a right to ask him who has proposed an exclusive British-American alliance. He says in a public speech that "the administration" has "approved" and "proposed" an exclusive alliance. When and by whom was an exclusive alliance proposed? The answer is that nobody who matters, not the President, the Prime Minister, Mr. Eden, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welles, Mr. Connally, has approved or proposed an exclusive British-American alliance. If Governor Landon does not know that, it is because he hasn't taken the trouble to read the newspapers, much less to investigate the subject, before making his inflammable speech.

For it is an inflammable speech. When a man who has been candidate for President of

the United States tells the world that Britain and America are proposing an alliance which excludes Russia, China, France, our Latin-American neighbors, and our other European allies, he is making a charge which, if it were believed abroad, would break up the United Nations and plunge the world into anarchy. His statement is in fact a plain, unvarnished untruth.

The mischief of such reckless talk is that if it goes undenied, many will believe it. If it is denied, refuted, and denounced, it is advertised and treated more seriously than it deserves.

It is, however, easy to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that there cannot possibly be any truth in Governor Landon's charge and that he has invented it without any evidence whatever. Every official statement from British and American sources has contemplated an eventual world organization, emerging from the grand alliance of the United Nations within which Britain, Russia, China, and the United States would be the principal guarantors of peace. There have been and there are some differences of opinion as to the responsibility which various other nations are able to discharge—what, for example, is to be the original role of France; whether China can assume responsibility outside of eastern Asia and the western Pacific.

But no one has ever proposed to exclude Russia. On the contrary, it is the settled conviction in London and Washington that the inclusion of Russia is indispensable to any hope of order and peace. If anyone were proposing to exclude Russia would Mr. Eden, would Mr. Hull, have gone to Moscow—would Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt be waiting for the agreement to go halfway around the world to meet Mr. Stalin? How then dare anyone speak of a proposed exclusive British-American alliance when the whole effort of our diplomacy for more than a year has been to achieve an inclusive alliance?

Governor Landon seems never to have heard of, and certainly never to have read, the Anglo-Soviet treaty signed May 26, 1942, with our approval. In that treaty, as Mr. Molotov explained, part 2 provides for the collaboration of Britain and Russia "with other United Nations in the peace settlement and in the post-war period." So the fact is that while Governor Landon talks about an exclusive British-American alliance, the British already have a 20-year alliance with Russia to collaborate with the United Nations.

This is carrying loose talk beyond the permissible limits of loose talking. If Governor Landon is not prepared to retract his baseless charge, he ought at least to relapse into a decent silence on matters concerning which he is manifestly altogether ignorant.

Mailing of Fascistic Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads:

DICKSTEIN AND LYNCH BILLS (PROHIBITING THE MAILING OF FASCISTIC PROPAGANDA)

Mr. Chairman, before I make my statement to this honorable subcommittee, I wish to congratulate your group on its decision to consider the important subject embodied in House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328. I also thank our colleagues from New York, Mr. LYNCH and Mr. DICKSTEIN, for introducing these timely resolutions.

BATTLEGROUND OF FASCISM VERSUS DEMOCRACY—THE HUMAN MIND

Today the Democratic forces and the fascistic forces are locked in a death struggle throughout the earth. Out of this struggle there can emerge only one victor. That victor must be democracy. This mortal struggle is not confined to the military front alone nor to any specific geographical boundary. This battleground is limited only to the extent of the human mind, because the brutal philosophy of fascism, born of wicked ideas from the twisted and warped minds of evil men, is limited only by its acceptance or rejection by the minds of men.

No geographical area, be it ever so isolated, is free from the insidious infiltration of these ideas. Wherever credulous minds are found, there is also found fertile ground wherein the seeds of totalitarian philosophy will grow. Such minds are found in every nation under the sun, including our own beloved land. In order to indoctrinate these credulous minds, some means of transmission must be used. Certainly one of the most important methods used is the sending of printed matter through the United States mail. I realize that a proposal to restrict the use of the mails is a serious one and fraught with dangerous possibilities.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

Freedom of speech and printed word are among the most fundamental principles in the democratic philosophy. We will not be put in the position of using fascistic methods to defend democracy. Neither should we allow the foe to enter our house and despoil those within. Regulation or legislation for the common welfare of the majority is usually justified and cannot be classified as tyrannical. Personal liberties granted under a democracy become license when exercised in a manner or to an extent where those liberties transgress or threaten the liberties of another. The defender of democracy must always be on the alert to prevent the Fascist from abusing our precious liberties for the express purpose of eliminating en toto those same liberties. The maintenance of existing liberties depends upon our vigilance in drawing justly and fairly the distinction between liberty and license.

I believe that House Joint Resolution 49 clearly and safely makes this distinction. It strikes directly against the use of mailed printed matter (one of our precious liberties) in an abusive way to destroy certain basic principles upon which democracy depends. What are those principles?

OUR CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES RACIAL EQUALITY

(a) Racial equality before the law: This principle is so integrated in our democratic life that any attempt to foment racial hate or prejudice cannot be judged as inimical to our national welfare. This principle was written into the Declaration of Independence and affirmed by the Constitution. Our great Civil War was fought chiefly to remove the yoke of chattel slavery from the colored race and to give them equality before the law. The blood of many races was shed in establishing, defending, and maintaining our national life. This very hour in our armed forces men of every race under heaven, including even the German and Japanese races, are fighting and dying for this principle.

On the other hand, we know that the Fascist philosophy is built on the principle of racial discrimination and persecution. It was vicious, lying race lies that Hitler used as the rallying cry for the storm troopers. And as the fascistic movement grew, it fed itself upon racial persecution of many races. Millions of Jews, Poles, Negroes, and other races have been murdered in cold blood; innocent men, women, and children were sacrificed to this monstrous and hideous idol of racism.

It is my opinion, gentlemen, that democracy is justified in passing laws which will stamp out in every way possible this abominable doctrine of racism. We are a nation composed of many races. Our existence as a nation depends upon the unifying force of racial equality and opportunity before the law. Our national life depends upon the willingness of all those races to fight and, if necessary, to die for its preservation. Any attempt to incite racial hatred or strife is a dagger in the heart of democracy and a threat against your liberties and mine.

OUR CONSTITUTION PROTECTS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(b) Religious freedom: The inseparable companion of racism is religious persecution and prejudice, and the same Constitution that established racial equality gave us religious freedom. The freedom of the body must be accompanied by freedom of the soul or man is less than half free. Carved in eternal marble within the Thomas Jefferson Memorial are the words of our second President and the author of our Declaration of Independence, "I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The advocacy of religious hatred, bigotry, or intolerance has as its inevitable counterpart the denial of religious freedom to another. Let him who will practice and preach the religion of his choice, but, under that same principle of liberty, it ill behooves him to condemn his neighbor because his conscience dictates otherwise. Discussion, analysis, difference of opinion vocally or in written form—yes; unrestrained condemnation designed to cause religious hatred, bigotry, or intolerance—no. Those who love and practice the liberty of religious freedom are entitled to protect their liberty against those who abuse the freedom of speech and press to destroy it.

STRENGTHEN THE BULWARKS OF DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

I fear, gentlemen of the committee, that we the people of this great democracy, have taken for granted our blessings for too long a time. We have enjoyed our liberties without counting their purchase price and without proper regard and diligence to their perpetuation. I believe the events of the past few years have awakened many of us to our responsibilities. This committee has an opportunity to strengthen, in a calm and judicious way, the bulwarks of our democratic philosophy. This committee has the opportunity to strike a telling blow at the Axis agents who use our mails to spread racism and religious intolerance. I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that this committee report one of these two bills (H. J. Res. 49 or H. R. 2328), either as they are now written or with amendments which they shall deem wise which will effectuate the purpose of these bills.

The Nation May Face an Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, when the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War was created and Mr. Ickes was appointed to this position, he organized

an advisory council known as the Petroleum Industry War Council, consisting of 73 members. In making this selection the Petroleum Administrator selected men from various parts of the country who knew all branches of the oil industry from the oil sand to the consume.'s tank. This Council has met regularly since 1941, giving its time and best efforts, without charge, to assist the Petroleum Administrator for War in securing the much-needed supply of oil.

This council, at a meeting held in Chicago, Ill., November 9, 1943, adopted two resolutions relative to recommendations previously made by it to the Petroleum Administrator urging the necessity for an over-all increase in the price of crude oil.

The first resolution reaffirms the conviction of the council "that no selective incentive program including subsidies or bonuses will effectively, efficiently, or adequately increase the production capacity of the Nation, and any such plan would result in the demoralization of normal economic processes and the foisting on the industry, the Government, and the public of a vast, expensive bureaucracy," and urged the Petroleum Administrator for War to renew his efforts to obtain a general increase in the price of crude oil (with a corresponding increase in product prices) with all the resources at his command.

The second resolution memorialized "the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to amend the existing price-control statutes so as to insure a proper and adequate price for crude oil and its products."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit these two resolutions for the consideration of the Congress:

Whereas, under date of November 5, 1943, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ralph K. Davies, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Petroleum Industry War Council requesting that the council give further thought to the question of an alternative to the recommended crude price increase in keeping with Economic Stabilizer Vinson's directive to the Petroleum Administrator for War; and

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has carefully reviewed the decision of Economic Stabilizer Vinson, issued under date of October 29, in which he denied the general price increase recommended by the Petroleum Administrator for War; and

Whereas the petroleum industry and the Petroleum Administration for War long ago set in motion the various plans suggested by Economic Stabilizer Vinson for the development, expansion, and increased availability of its productive capacity in order to insure utilization of all available oil resources for military and other essential needs; and

Whereas the increasing military demands and the uncertainties of enemy action together with declining production capacity foreshadow an increasing shortage of supply; and

Whereas the Economic Stabilization Director has recognized the need for increasing oil-field activity but proposes financial incentive for this purpose through Government subsidy payments; and

Whereas this recommendation ignored the long-studied conclusions of the industry and the advice of the Petroleum Administrator for War on the impracticability of subsidies, bonuses, and other incentives falling in this category; and

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has again reviewed these suggestions and has again reached the considered opinion that there is no way in which the productive capacity of this Nation can be increased without greater over-all oil field activity and that this can only be achieved effectively and efficiently through greater over-all price incentive; and

Whereas the long delays in the Offices of Price Administration and Economic Stabilization culminating in the decision of Stabilizer Vinson to deny a general price increase have permitted conditions to become progressively worse: these governmental agencies must assume the chief responsibility for the shortage in petroleum supplies and the consequent aggravation of the rationing of gasoline and fuel oil; and

Whereas the Petroleum Industry War Council has read with approval the letter of November 4 of the Petroleum Administrator for War in reply to the decision of Economic Stabilizer Vinson and it is the desire of the Petroleum Industry War Council to pledge to him sincere cooperation in full harmony with the objectives outlined in that communication: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Petroleum Industry War Council reaffirms its conviction that no selective incentive program including subsidies or bonuses, will effectively, efficiently, or adequately increase the production capacity of the Nation and any such plan would result in demoralization of normal economic processes and the foisting on the industry, the Government, and the public of a vast, expensive bureaucracy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Petroleum Industry War Council urge the Petroleum Administrator for War to renew his efforts to obtain a general increase in the price of crude oil with corresponding increase in product prices with all the resources at his command.

Whereas on the 29th of October 1943 the Office of Economic Stabilization disapproved the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for an increase of 35 cents per barrel in the price of oil; and

Whereas it is still the opinion of the Petroleum Industry War Council that the price of oil must be raised if the oil industry is to fulfill its obligation to produce sufficient oil to meet the need of the war program and essential civilian demand: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this council memorialize the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to amend the existing price-control statutes so as to insure a proper and adequate price for crude oil and its products.

Administration of the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, many times before have I protested the unfair and discriminatory manner in which the Selective Service Act has been interpreted and administered. It is not the fault of the local boards. Their hands are t'ed. The fault is here in Washington where a deliberate attempt is being made to keep Negroes, single Negroes, out of the service while white fathers are being drafted. Has it actually come to pass in America that the color of a man's skin is the basis for his being deferred, even if he is single and has no dependents? We people of the South are beginning to think so as evidenced by the following editorial from the Morehouse Enterprise, of Bastrop, La.:

A group of married men with pre-Pearl Harbor children left last week from Morehouse Parish for induction into the Army, the first of this group to be drafted. It was a sad parting for those families and it is only the beginning.

Of course, it is sad when any man must depart but the leaving of little children behind, to us, is much worse. Those children need the guidance of a father. But as Sherman said, "War is h——," and if it is necessary that these men be taken, it will have to be!

Nevertheless, we feel that these men should be taken only after all other sources have been exhausted. Yet in Morehouse Parish, according to the local draft board records, there are still 267 colored men in I–A who have not been inducted—simply because there has been no "colored call" for them.

Regardless of whether these men are white or black, we feel that the Government has no right to induct other men with pre-Pearl Harbor children until it has used up the available list of single men and married men without families.

Simply because the Government doesn't seem to want Negroes in the armed forces is no excuse. It is race discrimination and the colored men of Morehouse Parish feel that it is putting them in an inferior classification.

Morehouse Parish and the whole South, with large colored populations, are far ahead of the North in the number of men with families being taken into the services. The draft calls are based on population, both white, and black. If Uncle Sam is going to take the attitude that the black man will not make a suitable soldier, then the draft calls should be based on white population.

We don't believe either the Negroes or whites of Morehouse Parish like this kind of a draft system—one that leaves healthy single men behind and takes men with families.

Mr. Speaker, right today the bill to draft fathers, pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, white fathers, is before the conference committee of the House and Senate, yet there are pools of single colored men, and limited-service men available throughout the country. I warn you, gentlemen of the House, that such discrimination is detrimental to the morale of the Nation.

Dedication of the Salisbury-Wicomico County Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech, made by Mr. Charles B. Donaldson, Director of

Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, at the dedication of the Salisbury-Wicomico County Airport, November 11, 1943:

It is a real pleasure to be here today and participate in the dedication of this fine airport. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is highly appreciative of the fine cooperation on the part of the people of this area in joining with the Federal Government to make possible this airport development.

This project was approved for inclusion under the defense airport construction program of the C. A. A. during the early months of the war, for use by our military forces as one of a chain of coastal airports in the event of an enemy attack on our shores. Fortunately, we have not yet had to use these coastal airports for that purpose.

The value of this Salisbury Airport is twofold. First, it provides an airport located in a strategic area along our eastern coast for use by our military branches in the proper protection and defense of our coast line. Second, it is a public airport owned by the city of Salisbury and Wicomico County, and following the war will be maintained and operated primarily for civil aviation. Approximately $1,350,000 has been expended by the Federal Government in its development.

On every side we hear of great things in store for aviation in the post-war period. The Nation's air-line companies are busy planning for the expansion of our present air-transport system into a vast network of air routes all over the globe. In this expansion there is no question in my mind but that there will be air-line service from New York to Norfolk along the New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware coasts. Salisbury is a logical stop on such an air line and it is my understanding that applications have been filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board by at least two air lines for permission to inaugurate such service. The only air lines operating in this area today follow a roundabout route from Norfolk northwest to Washington, then double back northeast to New York via Philadelphia, bypassing all coastal towns.

It only needs a glance at a map to see how air-line service will improve transportation facilities into this area. At the present time, in order to reach Norfolk, Richmond, or Washington from here it requires traveling the length of the peninsula and then backtracking, unless you depend upon water transportation across the bay. Air lines would be of great convenience and benefit to this coastal area for personal travel and for business.

Among other industries, this area is in the center of one of the world's greatest poultry-raising sections, and it does not require much imagination to visualize the benefits of air transportation to the poultry industry. For example, in shipping baby chicks from the hatcheries the market is now limited in distance to whatever points can be reached in 2 or 3 days by surface transportation. By air line there is no reason why baby chicks could not be transported from here to any section of the country, including the Pacific coast, without undue loss. Baby chicks are just one of the commodities that can be shipped advantageously by air service, since their value is high in relation to their weight. You might be interested to know that Pan American Airways is now actually hauling baby chicks from the United States to South America—something that would not be possible by any other method.

It might also be possible to send full-grown chickens to market by air. I understand that once broilers have reached the right weight they must be disposed of quickly or in a few days' time they will eat up the profits in feed. The airplane could take broilers to market in a matter of hours and extend the profitable sales territory for this area by hundreds of miles. These are just a few thoughts on the many ways in which air-transport service would benefit this area.

Turning from the freight and passenger business, I think you will see a great increase in the popularity of Ocean City and the other beach resorts when people can come to Salisbury by plane and go on from here by a quick bus ride over your excellent roads.

Still another benefit of air transport would be speeding up your bank clearances. A day's interest on any one transaction might be a small amount, but multiply it by the number of checks cleared for this territory in a year, and you would find the sum running into thousands of dollars. In the same way, if buyers could get to and from Salisbury by direct air service, your turn-over would be increased accordingly.

In speaking of the possibilities for the future, I have mentioned only a few of the benefits which will accrue from the development of this Salisbury Airport. Speaking for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, let me assure you that we stand ready to do everything in our power to assist you in the development of your aviation resources.

But I want to emphasize the important part you yourselves will have to play through your local government and civic organizations if you are to realize all possible benefits which aviation can bring to this community in the future. For one thing, it is important that you provide suitable terminal building facilities and hangars and competent management for your new airport.

In the post-war period you will find many problems arising with the growth of aviation. There will be questions of fueling concessions, eating places, bus and taxi service, and local private flying operations. There is no textbook that will tell you how to handle them. They can only be solved by able management, which means the combination of business efficiency and aviation knowledge. Choose a capable manager, show your confidence in him by generous financial support, and you will have an airport that will pay dividends in terms of the welfare of your community.

In closing I want to express the appreciation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the excellent spirit of cooperation on the part of the city of Salisbury and Wicomico County in joining with the Federal Government in making possible the construction of this fine airport and its contribution to the war effort.

I want to take this occasion to acknowledge the cooperation of Congressman WARD, who has worked hard and long in the interests of this airport and aviation in general.

You may be sure that we will be much interested in the steps taken by Salisbury to assure your proper place in the development to come in aviation and we shall stand ready and willing to lend every possible assistance. The C. A. A. extends to you its best wishes for your success in reaching your aviation objectives.

Consumers Should Insist On Governmental Policies That Will Aid Production of Food

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of America should insist that the agents of the President, in carrying out rationing and price fixing, should see to it that the production of food is not curtailed. Ample production assures the consumers fair prices and it is an important factor in preventing inflation.

At the present time, the ceiling price on live hogs and cattle is disrupting the entire industry to the disadvantage not only of the farmers and feeders, but to the eventual disadvantage of the consumers. The mismanagement and the interference in the production and distribution of protein feeds is also seriously hurting production.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including two resolutions passed by the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce, at Holdrege, Nebr., on November 9, 1943.

To FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic
Stabilization, Washington, D. C.:

1. Whereas recent action by the Office of Economic Stabilization to create live price ceilings on cattle adds to the confusion already created by live price ceilings on hogs and the June roll-back on cattle prices; and

2. Whereas this action will contribute to curtailment of livestock production far below the production goals for 1944, as established by the War Food Administration, and will seriously hamper food production for the war effort and be detrimental to the economic welfare of the country; and

3. Whereas livestock producers today are operating under the least favorable relationship between feed costs and livestock prices since the beginning of the present emergency and cannot sensibly plan their operations on a sound basis in the face of continual changes in administration policies which result in confusion; and

4. Whereas there is no justification for ceiling prices on live animals and the resulting use of manpower in the administration of such program with wholesale and retail ceiling prices on beef and pork: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Office of Economic Stabilization be most urgently requested to wholly rescind those parts of its recent order establishing live price ceilings on cattle and hogs, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately by the Secretary of this organization to Fred M. Vinson, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Nebraska.

To MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas many Nebraska livestock, dairy, and poultry producers are accustomed to purchasing their protein supplements such as soybean oil meal, cottonseed meal, and linseed oil meal in unmixed forms as they prefer to mix these supplements with home-produced feeds rather than to purchase mixed supplements of lower protein content which contain many feeds they produce at home; and

Whereas there is a fair supply of the mixed feeds but an extremely short supply of unmixed protein feeds available in this State; and

Whereas much labor in mixing and transportation could be saved by sending unmixed protein feeds to this State; and

Whereas the producers of meat, milk, and eggs are entitled to receive a percentage of the 1943 oilseed byproducts output in unmixed forms equal to the percentage distributed in unmixed forms prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the War Food Administrator be urged to take immediate action under the powers vested in him, to authorize and

direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to make shipments of such oilseed byproducts in unmixed forms into this State; and that copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately by the secretary of this organization to Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Nebraska.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article from the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper, under date of November 15, 1943, entitled "Food Subsidies":

FOOD SUBSIDIES

(By Raymond Clapper)

Several arguments are made against food subsidies which seem to make sense until you take a second look at them.

For instance, some people write in saying that the food subsidies add to the public debt and therefore only aggravate the danger of inflation, although the subsidies have saved the public and the Government a large sum, probably billions.

The subsidies do add to the public debt. They run about $800,000,000 a year—the cost of the war for 3 days. But what would happen if the subsidies were knocked out? You would not add that particular item to the public debt. But you would add a larger item to the public debt just a little bit later.

For if the food subsidies are knocked out, prices will go up. James F. Byrnes, director of war mobilization, says the Government cannot hold the Little Steel formula unless food subsidies are continued. There would be a strong wave of wage increases. And then all of your cost-plus-fee contracts would begin to crawl up. Seventy percent of industrial production is devoted to war. In other words, the Government, roughly speaking, buys nearly three-quarters of the industrial output of the country. Wages are a big item in the cost of those goods. So the Government pays more for the billions of dollars in war goods that it buys and your public debt goes up—not by the restricted amount of the subsidy, but by the amount reached after pyramiding it through the whole economic system.

The cheaper system in cost to the Government is the subsidy. But you have to take a second look to see that. Another argument is persuasive at first glance. It is that the subsidies are only loading on the public debt a charge that will have to be paid by the American soldiers when they return home.

Take the point which I have just made and apply it here. The public debt will be less in the long run by holding down prices, and by holding the line against inflation than if inflation is allowed to break loose because the Government is such a heavy consumer.

But there is also another consideration. Families of most soldiers are dependent, partially at least, on dependency allotments. Those are fixed amounts. Run up prices and by every cent of price increase you, in effect, cut down the allotment pay by the same amount. You either subject families of soldiers to what amounts to a reduction in their means of support, or else the Government will have to increase the allowances. There you come back to our old friend the public debt, which then takes another jump.

The fight against subsidies has its real purpose—one that nobody wants to admit openly—the breaking up of price control so that producers in certain foods can gouge the Nation for all that can be squeezed out of people at a time when all consumption is distorted by the heavy demands of war.

Subsidies are paid on some of the metals, and to transport coal and oil to eastern consuming regions. If that were not done the Government would have been left short of some precious metals.

Every dollar of copper subsidy has saved the Government perhaps $28 in price. The eastern industrial area would have had to sustain a far higher cost for fuel that would have been reflected in higher prices for the war output.

The term subsidy is a bad one. Subsidies themselves are undesirable. But ever since we first began using the protective tariff, we have used subsidies in one form or another.

The choice now is between a smaller evil and a larger evil. When I look over my mail, I am astounded at how many people want the larger evil, some innocently because they have not thought through the problem, and some because there happens to be profit in it.

Sale of Hurricane-Felled Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, November 13, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is to acknowledge your recent inquiry as to whether persons in Massachusetts who sold logs from their hurricane-felled timber to the Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration will receive additional payments.

I can readily appreciate the interest of many of your constituents in the outcome of this salvage operation because the log vendors were assured that they would receive additional payments if profits accrued from this operation. This project has not yet been closed and final figures will not be available for several more months. It is, however, sufficiently near completion to indicate that the Administration will not recover its entire investment and, obviously, there will be no surplus to distribute among the log vendors.

There has been some misunderstanding as to returns from this operation because current retail prices for wood products are so high. I want briefly to review a few of the steps that were taken which may clarify some of the misunderstanding: The hurricane occurred on September 21, 1938. The salvage program was initiated on November 8 of the same year. At that time the lumber market was not only inactive but prices were abnormally low. There was concern whether such a large volume of wind-thrown timber, if put immediately on the market, would not disrupt the then current market price for logs and stumpage and lumber as well. A plan was devised on the basis of conferences with State and Federal agencies, public leaders, local lumbermen, and farmers, which considered all of these difficulties. Certain objectives to guide the Administration were set up. Briefly, these were:

1. The log vendors would be given maximum relief, consistent with fair business practice and with prospective market values. They were to be protected as far as it was possible.

2. Local needs for logs and lumber would be given first priority.

3. Lumber would be sold in an orderly fashion so as to minimize disruption of local business which depended on logs and lumber.

4. To reduce losses from insects and decay, maximum storage of logs in ponds would be undertaken.

5. Logs which could not be stored in ponds were to be processed as soon as feasible into rough lumber for future disposal.

6. Rough lumber would be sold to lumber dealers for reprocessing and retail merchandising.

With the help of local public-spirited farmers and landowners, approximately 350,000,000 board-feet of logs were stored in ponds. About 20 percent of them were sold as logs to local wood-using industries. The remaining logs were manufactured into rough lumber under contract with 241 mills, many of them, from necessity, moved in from other States.

In carrying out the general policy outlined, some 460 sale contracts were executed, almost all of the material reaching local industries. The prices for each sale were determined by individual appraisal, which took into account current operating costs and current market values. All sales were publicly advertised and were open to all bidders, and in many instances the bid prices were above appraised values. It became obvious that local wood-using industries could not absorb all of the manufactured material. It was, therefore, necessary to invite some large sales organization to contract for the orderly disposal of lumber over and above the needs of local industries. Advertisements for proposals, over a several months' period, finally resulted in the contract of September 1940 with the Eastern Pine Sales Corporation covering a 4¼-year period; a contract which provided for orderly marketing and prices subject to adjustment every 3 months. These adjusted prices were calculated on the basis of changing market values. The increase in price to this company was $8.55 per thousand board feet from September 1940 to the last recalculated price.

The conditions under which this salvage undertaking had to be handled, as you may know, were not particularly attractive for private capital. The risks involved were large, and the capital needed to conduct the operations was larger than local interest was willing to invest. In handling the project, overhead costs were held to a minimum and a real effort was made to secure a profit for future distribution to log vendors. Two main factors which favored the log vendor and reduced the margin between cost of operations and returns from lumber sold by the Administration were the scheduled price established for grade 3 logs, and the log scale adopted. The price for grade 3 logs, which made up 70 percent of the total, proved to be substantially above their actual worth when converted into lumber at the average prices which prevailed from 1938–43. The log scale used resulted in considerable underrun in salable material. This, in effect, means that the 90 percent paid to log vendors represented more nearly the actual worth of the logs at the time of purchase.

We are, of course, disappointed that it was not possible to make a profit which could

be distributed to the many log vendors who cooperated so well with the Administration in the salvaging of nearly 700,000,000 feet of wind-thrown material.

I apologize for the length of this letter but I wanted you to know some of the pertinent facts concerning the salvage program. I will be very glad to furnish any additional information which you may desire.

Very sincerely yours,

EARLE S. PEIRCE,
Acting Administrator, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration.

Ranking Agricultural Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ROLAND KINZER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following letter I received a few days ago from Mr. J. C. Capt, Director of the Bureau of the Census:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. KINZER: Of course, I know you are familiar with the importance of your home counties—Lancaster and Chester—in agricultural production, but you may not be familiar with their relative ranking among the more than 3,000 counties of the United States.

I am sending you, therefore, a booklet entitled "Ranking Agricultural Counties," issued by the Census Bureau, in which the 100 banner counties in each of 59 phases of agricultural production are listed and the order of their rank with detail of their performance.

Lancaster County ranked high among the first 100 counties in 26 agricultural activities, which placed it sixth of all counties in the number of these farm activities. Very few counties had such distinction. Lancaster was the fifth county of the United States in total value of farm products based on the full peacetime year of 1939. It was the first county in the value of farm products used by farm households; the second county in the United States in the amount of annual expenditures for farm machinery; fourth in the expenditures for feed purchased; and tenth in quantity of fertilizer purchased. It was the fourth county of the United States in the value of domestic animals on the farm; eleventh in the number of horses; and forty-sixth in the number of mules on farms. It ranked twenty-ninth in the number of cattle and calves on farms; twenty-fourth in the number of cows milked; twentieth in the volume of milk produced; seventh in the value of dairy products sold; and thirty-sixth in the volume of wages paid to farm workers.

In poultry, it stood fourth in the number of chickens on farms; seventh in the number of chickens raised; and fourth in chicken eggs produced, reporting a production in 1939 of over 11,500,000 dozen.

In tobacco, Lancaster was ninth in acreage and third in amount of production; it was twenty-fifth in acreage of Irish potatoes; forty-fourth in acreage of hay; eighty-third in vegetables harvested for sale; forty-sixth in acreage of sweet corn; third in value of vegetables grown for home use; seventy-fourth in number of apple trees, but fifty-first in bushels of apples harvested; thirty-third in area of crops grown under glass; and ninety-eighth in green pea acreage.

Chester County, because of its large mushroom production, was the first county in the United States in area of crops grown under glass; it was twenty-fourth in the total value of farm products; eighty-ninth in value of products used by farm households; twenty-second in expenditures for farm machinery; thirty-seventh in expenditures for feed purchased; and fifty-third in quantity of fertilizer purchased.

In the amount of wages paid to labor, Chester County was twenty-fourth in the United States. It was likewise twenty-fourth in the value of domestic animals on the farm; eighty-eighth in cattle and calves on farms; forty-second in number of cows milked; thirty-sixth in milk produced; tenth in value of dairy products; fifty-second in number of chickens on farms; fiftieth in number of chickens raised; and fifty-fourth in number of eggs produced.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT, *Director.*

Dedication of Headquarters of United Auto Workers at Evansville, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am tendering an address which I made before Local No. 705, United Auto Workers of America, C. I. O., at Evansville, Ind., on November 14, 1943, on the occasion of the dedication of a new building and headquarters which that union local had theretofore purchased and acquired.

You have extended to me an invitation to speak at this meeting which is held for the purpose of celebrating the opening and dedication of the new building and headquarters which your local has acquired. Certainly, this advance in the possession of material things—a building and a meeting place owned, operated, and conducted by working people—evidences an advancement in the possession and ownership of property and material things by the workers who work in just one industry which could not be envisioned, except by a few so-called visionary people, 10 years ago.

You have been kind enough to furnish me a review of your history since the formation of your union in 1937. I need not particularize upon that history, but it is sufficient to point out that you have survived a violent dissension, that you have voluntarily divided the original organization into a Chrysler local and a Briggs local, and in the matter of material well-being you have consistently advanced until you have acquired this building, which is a tremendous material and financial accomplishment. I am impressed by the care and attention and thoughtfulness which you have given to the preparation of your headquarters in this building, including not only a meeting place, but rooms for your officers, your executive committee, and social or sitting rooms for the members of the families of your membership. I earnestly congratulate you upon your material achievements to date.

If I were interested only in being popular I would now sit down. But these are times when altogether too much emphasis is being placed upon material things and much too little upon the intangible or spiritual thing called democracy, its ethics and its obligations, that, if I am to retain my own self-respect and obtain that of those present who truly believe in democracy, I must go on. For, just as Jesus of Nazareth said, "Not all of you who cry out to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall see the kingdom of heaven," so it is true today that not all of those why cry, "Democracy, democracy" the loudest, understand it, uphold it, or practice it.

There are many standards and measurements by which to judge the development of an American labor movement, destined and suited to have its impact upon, and to become a part of, the growth of democracy in all of its aspects and all of its implications in America. It must not and cannot be measured solely by any material advancement of an American labor union, nor by the material advancement of its individual members. Such a concept of the goal and the end of the American labor movement reduces it to a standard measured solely by the philosophy of materialism which, in substance, says that man, like the animal, has no desires higher than the filling of his belly and the protecting of his body from the cold.

Such a philosophy is the antithesis of the fundamental philosophy or ethic of democracy which has its foundation in Hebraic-Christian thinking, the cornerstone of which is the thought that man is individual and spiritual in his nature; that he is the most dignified thing in the world; that he creates governments for his own purposes and makes them his own servants; that he, himself, participates in making the rules which are to control him; that no rules shall be thrust down upon him by any group of superthinkers whom man must not permit to destroy his independence by denying him the opportunity to make his own mistakes, even if we admit for the purpose of argument that their plans for our well-being are superior to our own.

Those who love democracy know that unless man is free to make his own mistakes and willing to accept the responsibility and the consequences of them he cannot attain his full dignity. Indeed, true progress is only attained and made permanent when people have reached a high degree of intelligence, emotional control, and training in democracy by practicing it. It is only then that we can really develop a society in which such a concept of democracy has become so well established in the popular thinking that it has entered into, pervaded, and controls all of the fields of man's existence during his stay upon and conquest of this earth.

As a people we have been given great teachers in the matter of democracy. The political philosophers among the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of this country, who largely wrote that document and had the greatest influence upon the delegates who were assembled, had probably the highest understanding of the concept of democracy and its application to the political field of any thinkers of their time. Since that time the impact of Lincoln upon our understanding of the true nature of democracy and its range and scope and the contributions of those Members of the Congress of the United States who led the fight for the direct election of the United States Senators have portrayed so clearly for Americans the possibilities of the democratic concept that I do not believe that the American people will abandon the democratic concept in working out a solution of their problems unless we fail to extend that concept into other fields where it is not presently operating. Therefore, to me, the positive approach to the problems confronting America is the obligation of a person in public life to work for and to strive to make our system operate so well that

they will reject the philosophy of materialism as one not calculated to produce the greatest amount of material well-being for the people of America, and as one which carries with it a concept of the state, inconsistent with the Hebraic-Christian concept of the dignity of the individual.

Also, before making my final observation, I should like to point out a difference between my definition and my concept of democracy, in its purest form, and that given by Vice President WALLACE within the last year. I think the difference is one of definition rather than of fundamental concept, but the difference in definition is more than a quibbling over terms. In reality, it goes deeper than that and consists of defining democracy in a way in which the obligations, of those who profess democracy, and the conduct required, of those who profess democracy, will be more clearly understood.

I shall not try to quote the Vice President directly, but in substance, he spoke of democracy as though it were capable of being divided or split up into segments or kinds of democracy. He spoke of Bill of Rights democracy, and too disparagingly, I think; he spoke of economic democracy; and he spoke of racial democracy; and, as I recall, he spoke of one or two other kinds or segments of democracy. I am convinced that this is an erroneous statement of a correct concept of democracy.

There is but one democracy, which is a philosophy based upon a complete application of the injunction of Christ, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself," which He called the second commandment. And, this commandment and this ethic must be practiced by man exclusively in all fields of man's efforts and endeavors and operations on earth. Thus conceived, it is true that democracy operates and has rules which we must still unfold, discover, and develop in the field of economics and in the field of racial relationships, as well as in the field of political science; but, it is self-evident to me, nevertheless, that there is but one democracy. It is a faith, a hope, and an ethic, which requires our unswerving devotion to and practice of a set of principles in every field in which man comes in contact with his fellow man.

Since democracy is a universal belief which demands of those who profess their belief in it, an understanding of its ethics and the practice of certain standards of conduct, consistent with those ethics in every field of endeavor, it follows that if people come to other people and say "You must follow me in expanding the application of democracy into new fields"—then the people approached have a right to investigate the conduct and practice of democracy of those who make such a demand. I point this out to you because you will not make headway towards your announced goal of bringing about economic democracy in America without the use of force or coercion, and, of course, the use of force or coercion immediately denies the existence of democratic processes, unless you are able to persuade and convince the farmers and the middle class and the intellectual liberals of this country of your capacity and ability to bring about an economic democracy in America.

But, the farmers and the middle class and intellectual liberals of America are not fools, and they will demand of you, as you must admit they have a right to do, evidence showing that you understand and have practiced democracy in the field or element of personal relationships, union conduct, and political activities, before they will accept, without a struggle, any professional program calling for the application of democratic principles in the economic field. Because you are a new source of untried leadership in America, unless you come to these others with a record evidencing clearly that you have positively and absolutely in the conduct of your union affairs and in your activities in politics, practiced democracy with all of its implications and all of its obligations to a higher degree than any other group in America, people will not follow you voluntarily.

Therefore, whatever your goal may be, you will not attain it without the use of force, bloodshed, and strife; and I point out to you now, that once you resort to the use of force, bloodshed, or strife, this force set loose in the world always boomerangs back upon those who release it. Many of you present will be destroyed by the wrongful practices, coercion, or violence which you release, and as a consequence of which, instead of furthering the cause of democracy and bringing yourself further freedom, you will set back the cause of democracy so far that neither you, nor your children, nor, in all probability, your children's children, will ever enjoy its benefits in any field or sphere of activity.

In reviewing your history and your advancement to date I find certain things which I consider to be much more valuable and much more hopeful for your ultimate success and for your ultimate development into a force in America which will truly advance the cause of democracy than the mere acquisition of this building. These outward signs, which are the only ones which those of us who are not privileged to sit in your meetings can see, may be considered by some to be of minor significance, but because I am hopeful, because I want to believe in your capacity to practice and develop democracy, I consider them significant.

Your union is only 6 years old, and yet it is a historical fact that none of its original officers now hold any office in your union. I consider this significant and important and valuable, because I know, and you know, that 6 years is not a very long tenure in office for officeholders in either a local or an international union. Therefore, the fact that you have had a rotation of your members in office is of itself a sign that there is capacity in your union to understand and practice democrary. Rotation in office is more than a mere passing sign of the evidence of democracy; it is a prerequisite to the existence of a healthy, democratic condition in any organization. This is true because it evidences, first, that there has not been such coercion, force, or fraud in the conduct of the union's affairs by its officers that rotation has become impossible, and, of course, the use of any force, coercion, or fraud by any person in office to sustain himself in office is utterly incompatible with the democratic concept, and any person in your union who would do that or any person in any so-called democratic society who would do that and then proclaim to you that he understood or practiced democracy would be made out a liar by the force of his own conduct. Furthermore, rotation in office also evidences a capacity of an organization to produce out of its ranks new people competent to hold office. And an institution which is not so conducted as to advance and train its members and develop their capacity to conduct its affairs is one which is not operating under the leavening processes of the spirit and ethics of democracy.

I am not so foolish to say that this one piece of evidence of existence of democracy in your union, rotation of office, proves conclusively that you have reached your full development in an understanding or practice of democracy, and you would not expect me to make a finding in your favor on that evidence alone. On the other hand, I have not had brought to my attention by your own members any claim that your union is not conducted as a democratic institution; and because I think it is so important that the union labor movement begin to evidence throughout the country a capacity to practice the democracy which its leaders too loudly assert for it, I am willing to say to you today that I consider the fact that you have evidenced the capacity to remove old leaders and to develop new leaders is a more important development in the growth of your union than the acquisition of this building.

I understand as fully as anyone in America that we will not fulfill America's destiny until we not only improve our concept of, and practice of, democracy in the political field, but until we extend the concept of democracy into the economic field, the racial field, and all of the other spheres which affect man's life on this earth.

The labor movement in America is becoming more powerful every day. In my opinion, it is now the most powerful element, not politically, but economically, in America, for many reasons which my limited time will not permit me to elaborate upon. But from this it follows that if you do not satisfy those of us who desire a better America, a more democratic America, by evidence of your capacity to practice democracy in your labor unions and by evidence of your capacity to practice democracy in the field of politics and government, then you will simply offer us a change of masters and not progress. The people will accept and join you in a fight for progress but we will not accept you as a new oppressive, totalitarian, undemocratic master without a fight. If you fail in your mission, you will not only disappoint, but destroy, all of the people of good will in this country, and there are millions of them, who have been expecting something better out of your ascendancy to power. If you destroy that vast segment of society, if you destroy their faith in you, then yours is the responsibility for not developing a better and finer America. And, unless the labor movement begins to practice real democracy in its union affairs and in the field of politics and government, it will permit its leaders, whom it has not curbed to date, to lead America into one of the most vicious class civil wars that the world has ever seen, and it will destroy forever this country which today is the last fair hope of earth.

If you persist in the policy which you are now pursuing, failing to learn about and to practice democracy so that people will have faith in your intention and capacity to bring about democracy in our economy, then it is futile to believe that it will be brought about by lawful, democratic methods. Certainly the extension of democracy into the field of economics cannot be brought about by participating in a solely class struggle, measured only by the percentage of wage which you are able to wring out of the particular industry in which you are employed; particularly when organized labor persists in accompanying that struggle with a too obvious willingness to prostitute political democracy as it heeds the siren call of and alines its cause upon the side of the political corruptionists and looters of cities who are still at large in this country.

The decision is yours, and largely a decision to be made by the individual members of the labor movement, because, whether you or I like it or not, I tell you as a fact, there is nowhere on the American scene today a labor leader who, by virtue of his public pronouncements or his record of democratic actions or conduct, can draw to the labor movement the good will of the liberal intellectuals, the middle classes, and the farmers and the dwellers in small towns, which it is necessary for you to have with you if you would create a democratic economy by democratic evolutions, and at the same time advance and create a higher degree of democracy and morality in the field of politics and government.

America today is truly standing at the crossroads. Within 2 years we may have either evolution or revolution in this country. Hearken then, won't you, to the voice of the past—the Knights of Labor, men who

were truly great fighters for the rights of men, men who fought alone, unaided by Government agencies and laws, in their convention at Richmond, Va., in 1836 made this declaration of principles:

"What are the remedies? There are two. One is legitimate, safe, and effective. The other, illegitimate, unsafe, and ineffective. The legitimate and safe plan is public enlightenment on financial and industrial subjects as taught by the Knights of Labor, and to be consummated through the ballot box and wise legislation. The illegitimate and unsafe course is that taught and practiced by the advocates of violence for legislative evils, and consummated in the flames of burning cities and the general destruction of property and human life."

That was the truth then, it is the truth today, it will be truth when this world ends, for it is eternal truth.

Oratory Vital Wartime Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following article by Henry Gillen in the Boston Sunday Post, November 14, 1943:

ORATORY VITAL WARTIME NEED—ALLIES FORTUNATE IN HAVING LEADERS LIKE ROOSEVELT AND CHURCHILL TO GUIDE AND INSPIRE THEM

(By Henry Gillen)

After Dunkerque a voice resounded in England. After Pearl Harbor a voice resounded in the United States. People, shaken and transfixed, listened. People heard, rolled up their sleeves, and said, "We will beat them."

In those crimson hours which came to the English and American people, they wanted to hear such voices, voices strong and bold, voices of leaders, voices of men who talked with their fists clenched and their chins out, voices of determined men, dogged, confident, and unafraid.

If they had not spoken when skies were red, when hopes were harried, and when hearts were low, if in their places there had been weaker voices, hesitant, hysterical, or helpless, would we now be as near to victory? That, no one can judge. But no one, in his or her right reason, can say that we are any less because they spoke.

When the historians to come tabulate the things which brought the final triumph to the United Nations, when they write down our assets and advantages which won the last battle, when they chronicle the manpower, courage, industrial might, persistency, weapons, and will, let them include the oratory. It was no secret weapon. It was a brand Excalibur, bright and flashing throughout, strong, sure, and superb.

Oratory is one of the arts. The war has deemphasized the arts as subjects in the schools. The stress at the moment is upon the sciences, because wars have become scientific. The machine has made war precise and the factors can be figured almost to the last fraction.

Mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other measured studies, naturally overshadow the value and importance to the well-rounded person of Latin, Greek, philosophy, art appreciation, poetry, music, and the rest. Youngsters who some day may have to handle the slide-rule robots of mechanized battle, will be better prepared by knowing Euclid than by being surpassing in Cicero.

COMING TUG-OF-WAR

Yet, it will be neglect if a moment is not found for the spoken word. For the war of weapons, which is the fight for freedom at the moment, some day is going to become a war of words, deftly handled as a rapier, in the fight for a peace that will last beyond the time again when a new generation has grown up.

It will be more than a fight for peace. The currents of varying ideologies will clash in "the battlefields of the mind." The forces unleashed in the world in which we live will not be blotted out completely by the stroke of the pen on the peace treaty. These forces will still have supporters, just as after the last war many who thought that might was right still clung to that belief and started another one.

Democracy will loom supreme and win many new champions and supporters who did not dare speak before. But other ocracies and isms will be kept alive by old guards, underground, perhaps, but still potent. And it has been the experience that champions of other isms have displayed in the past a fine faculty for public speaking, are skilled in debate and by their eloquence oftentimes superficially convincing.

MUST LEARN TO TALK

Into the world of tomorrow will troop the youngsters of today. It will be well to know geometry, the properties of water, how many ribs are in the human body, what is a fulcrum, and why we have storms. But if men or women arise who have the power to shift multitudes by the sound of their voices and the placement of words, it will take more than algebra and meteorology to unconvince those temporarily led away.

Young folks can be taught to speak, and even if they never have the opportunity to lead people with their voices alone, they will at least not suffer the bitter embarrassment, when called upon at a house party or town meeting, of being forced to say, "I am sorry, but I cannot talk."

Yes, they can be taught to talk. But they cannot be taught to become great orators. That calls, as does writing poetry, painting, or composing music, for inspiration. And as the poet derives from reading the poetry of the masters, the painter from studying great paintings, and the composer from listening to musical masterpieces, so the embryo orator improves from listening to the established ones speak.

RARE OPPORTUNITY

At the moment, children and young folks have the rare opportunity of hearing with frequency two men who will be remembered long after our time, not so much probably for the offices they held, but for the things which they said. For the speeches will be handed down and generations from now youths will recite ringing excerpts in declamation contests throughout the English-speaking parts of the globe.

But as they can inspire others to emulate them, these men themselves had their inspirations. President Roosevelt had his, a number of good ones in his party before him, chief among them, one of the best, whom he followed with devotion when alive and has never forgotten since he died, Woodrow Wilson. And Woodrow Wilson's growing greatness is due more to the things he said, perhaps, than to his deeds.

Prime Minister Churchill also had his inspiration and, oddly enough, his inspiration was an American, an American from Ireland, born in Sligo, who came to this country, became a citizen, served several terms as a Congressman, was many times a power for good and through his useful life held multitudes spellbound for hours with the magnificence of his oratory—Bourke Cockran.

FIRST MEETING

Winston Churchill was in his twenties when he first met him. The young Churchill, energetic and ambitious, torn between the desire to be a soldier and a writer, determined as well as destined to be great, was on his way to Cuba to fight with the Spaniards before the turn of the century. He traveled there by way of New York and, in Manhattan, Mr. Cockran, a friend of his mother's family, took him in charge during that, his first visit to America.

"It was the first time," says Rene Kraus in his biography of Churchill," that Winston Churchill had ever heard the dynamic American language from the mouth of one of its best speakers in that age. Even during his early days he had a fine ear for the power of language which later was to be his special weapon.

"He had never heard such conversation as Mr. Cockran's 'either in point, in rotundity, in antithesis, or in comprehension.' Even in decades later he felt that he had never met another speaker with the acuteness and the individuality of this American politician. This New York politician, more than any other man, served as Winston Churchill's model."

TWO STYLES

The advantage of the young folks listening to the President or the Prime Minister is that they have a choice of two styles of public speaking. One is modern, American, delivered in almost a conversational way, but with eloquent and forceful emphasis on the points to be made, in language clear and understandable to the average man.

Churchill, on the other hand, is a throwback to the Webster school of which Cockran was a more modern exemplar. His words drip eloquence. Each sentence is polished literature. While he is at his best with the speech prepared beforehand and memorized, he demonstrated on his recent visit to Harvard University, with a handful of notes, that extemporaneously, he is also a master.

But both champions of the art demonstrate one thing in common besides voices which impinge on the mind and hold the attention, a thing which makes an orator great and which embryo orators often overlook. There is more to oratory than voice or gesture, words or phrases strung in a line like raindrops on a telegraph wire.

Behind the words there must be thoughts and the thoughts can hardly be those of someone else. The ideas may be, and generally are, for there are few new ideas in the world Man has been thinking a long time. But what the individual who is speaking thinks about the things that is his topic, is what holds and stirs the applause for orators. And good speakers, honest, sincere and convincing, must be thinkers.

Statehood for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a petition to the Congress of the United States of America and to the citizens of the District of Columbia by Mr. David Darrin of Washington, D. C.

Whereas we hold that our Nation and the world now face the most critical condition in national and world history; and

Whereas the drastic nature of this emergency is but a measure of the necessity, possibility, and opportunity that it presents for our Nation to take the lead in organizing a new world on the basis of the American brand of peace, plenty, and progress; and

Whereas centuries of destructive international warfare have amply proven the futility of trying to maintain peace among nations, while no nation is enjoying the benefits possible through international organization, and therefore owes gratitude or allegiance to such beneficent world-state; and

Whereas the success of a world-state in permanently outlawing war depends upon its adoption of a democratic form of government; and

Whereas the United States of America, as the leading democracy of the world, should take the lead in organizing a world-state dedicated to democracy; and

Whereas it cannot do so with clean hands, while denying democratic control of their government to the citizens of the District of Columbia, the seat of our national Government; and

Whereas the population of the District of Columbia, numbering about 750,000 people, exceeds the populations of 12 States in our Union;

Therefore we, the undersigned, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to grant to the District of Columbia the status of full Statehood, according to terms hereinafter detailed, while complying fully with paragraph 17, section 8, article I of the Federal Constitution, by retaining exclusive final jurisdiction over all District of Columbia legislation.

Therefore we also petition the citizens of the District of Columbia to immediately resume the patriotic exercise—informally and unofficially, pending Congressional action which can make such exercise fully formal and official—of its original Constitutional voting franchise which has never been denied by law—

Through election of two United States Senators whose qualifications for the office shall be as specified in the Federal Constitution;

Through election of two Members of the House of Representatives, whose qualifications for the office shall be as specified in the Federal Constitution;

Through election of 108 members of the District Assembly—2 from each of the territories now covered by citizens' organizations, pending more accurate determination of District boundaries—all of such legislative functions being purely advisory;

Through election of nine members of the District Executive Council, each to head one of the following departments: Resources, production, distribution, research, formulation, instruction, conservation, coordination, development, and to exercise purely administrative functions.

And through the adoption of a District constitution.

It is understood that the above positions, both legislative and administrative, shall be purely honorary, without compensation and without voice or vote in either House of Congress or in local affairs, until the same be granted by enabling act of Congress.

We pledge ourselves to exert our best efforts to provide facilities essential to the exercise of this voting franchise, and, to that end, invite the cooperation of all patriotic citizens and organizations of the District of Columbia.

DAVID DARRIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Rehabilitation Activities of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following letter and memorandum on rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration written to me by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 16, 1943.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I am in receipt of your letter of November 10 and have read the 32 articles written by Mr. Frank Sinclair, of the Milwaukee Journal.

The articles are well written and have been distributed among more than 30 of the daily papers throughout the Nation. I think Mr. Sinclair is familiar with the rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration, which includes medical and vocational rehabilitation, as well as insurance benefits. As the article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is primarily concerned with medical and vocational rehabilitation, I will confine my discussion of our work to these two phases, and fo. your ready reference, I am attaching this in outline form.

Referring specifically to the charge that delay exists in inducting veterans into vocational rehabilitation under the Veterans' Administration, it is necessary for me to point out that the Congress, through the passage of Public Law 16, established four definite requirements which must be met by an honorably discharged veteran of World War No. 2 to entitle him to vocational rehabilitation. These stipulations immediately follow:

1. That the person must have been in the active military or naval service any time after December 6, 1941, and during the present war;

2. That he or she must be honorably discharged;

3. That he or she must have a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; and

4. That he or she must be in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability.

The Veterans' Administration is legally required to determine that an individual veteran has a pensionable disability producing a vocational handicap and is in need of training before his induction into vocational training can be effected. This obviously does require some time and there may be instances where the individual veteran will experience difficulty in establishing his legal entitlement to these benefits. In the average instance, the presence or absence of a pensionable disability producing a vocational handicap, and a determination as to the need for vocational training, requires very little time.

Honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2 and other wars in which the United States has been engaged are entitled to hospitalization for any disability. Veterans having service-incurred-or-aggravated disabilities are also entitled to out-patient treatment.

I think you will be interested in knowing that it is anticipated that the medical facilities available to the Veterans' Administration will be adequate to care for the needs of veterans of World War No. 2 and prior wars for years. It is my opinion that the Veterans' Administration will eventually need about 800,000 beds to enable veterans of the current conflict to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as provided for veterans of earlier wars. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until long after the war or require the eventual additional construction of more thar 100,000 beds, since there will be under present plans 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities and it should be possible to obtain at least that number from the Army and Navy shortly after the war terminates. To summarize, the Veterans' Administration expects to have 100,000 beds in its own facilities and 100,000 beds capable of being allotted or transferred to it by the War and Navy Departments, thus leaving 100,000 to be erected as needed under a long-range building program.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation essentially consists in physical, and in some cases mental, repair, plus, in the case of those with handicaps arising from service disability, vocational training.

(A) MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES, AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Persons entitled to medical treatment, hospital treatment, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care: Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, having a service-incurred disability requiring such care, treatment or appliance, or who has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment.

2. Persons entitled to hospital or domiciliary care, contingent upon availability of facilities: Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

3. Service groups included: All components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the respective Women's Reserves thereof.

4. Facilities available: The Veterans' Administration maintains 93 facilities, and has contract facilities, with a total of 84,388 beds distributed as follows (as of August 4, 1943):

Tuberculosis	5,695
Neuropsychiatric	35,029
General medical and surgical	22,279
Domiciliary	18,455
Contract—other government	2,600
State and private	330
Total	84,388

Diagnostic centers, with expert specialists available are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif., and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present authorized building program will raise this total to 100,000 beds; and it reasonably may be anticipated that immediate post-war needs may be met by Army and Navy facilities of a type suitable for care of veterans.

The 100,000-bed program was undertaken in the light of careful estimates or forecasts

of World War No. 1 hospital needs, indicating the peak of neuropsychiatric cases in 1949 and of an over-all load later. Considering that the entire potential of World War No. 1, and prior wars, is fewer than 5,000,000, the additional needs arising out of a present force of more than twice that number can be estimated—albeit, the peak will b reached more than a quarter century in the future.

5. Claims, and numbers hospitalized: Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration, is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits, and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one or more in each State in the Union, except Delaware.

Twenty-five thousand, nine hundred and one veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration to September 30, 1943, and 7,799 remained in Veterans' Administration facilities as of September 30, 1943.

6. Domiciliary care: While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who h .ve reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

(B) VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

1. Entitlement, and scope of program: Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides:

(1) That any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

(2) And who was honorably discharged;

(3) And who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; and

(4) Who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

Immediately following the passage of that legislation, there was created in the Veterans' Administration a Vocational Rehabilitation Service, composed of three divisions, namely, the Vocational Advisement Division, the Training Into Employment Division, and the Research Division. The planning and control functions created by the administration of this act are exercised in the central office of the Veterans' Administration. All operations, including determinations of need for training, vocational advisement, induction into training, supervision, as well as the selection of training facilities, are functions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in that facility of the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. These facilities are, generally speaking, bound by State boundary lines. In a few States there is more than one facility. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability." In performing the functions imposed upon this Administration by Public Law No. 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been satisfactorily accomplished through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

2. Monetary benefits while in training: While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month, if married, with $5 additional for each child and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

3. Service groups potentially entitled: All persons presently in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the Women's Army Corps, are potentially entitled to this benefit. The Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps are included for this benefit since the approval of Public Law No. 183, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved November 8, 1943. There is legislation pending in the Congress which would include for entitlement the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, not now entitled because of the fact that they are not, under existing statutes, entitled to pension.

4. Applications and approval of training: The program has been initiated and applications for vocational rehabilitation are being received from those who have been discharged from the armed forces. It will be observed that entitlement is contingent upon an award of pension or retirement pay. Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition makes training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

O. P. A. on a Rail Fence

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult job for any man to sit on a rail fence, but when he straddles it, with his feet off the ground, then his real trouble begins.

That is the predicament of Chester Bowles, of the O. P. A., who succeeded our friend of the "class of 1933," who tried to do a good job, but couldn't get cooperation, and was smart enough to get out from under before the landslide.

The O. P. A. straddle will not work. Its pretensions are contradicted and contravened by its operations.

Here is an example: While I was temporarily in Vermont to fill a speaking engagement the Governor of Vermont, disgusted by his inability to get an action through correspondence with the O. P. A., wired my office to request me, if possible, to arrange for a conference for him with Mr. Bowles. In my absence, my secretaries exhausted themselves, if nobody else, to make such an engagement.

The Governor arrived. During his presence in the city my secretaries again undertook to get an opportunity for the Governor of a sovereign State to talk to Mr. Bowles by telephone concerning a matter of more vital interest to Mr. Bowles than to the Governor, but of great consequence not only to the people of Vermont, but those of New England. Such a conference could not be arranged, and was not.

I have received a letter from the Governor of Vermont which I am including herewith, and it reads as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Montpelier, October 11, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLES: I attempted through your office, while I was in Washington, to have a conference with Chester Bowles in connection with the butter situation in Vermont. The details of my attempt are better known to your office force there. At any rate, I was unable to find anyone to talk to except down the line so far that I did not think we would accomplish my errand.

With kind personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WILLS,
Governor.

There are a lot of things I might say, but shall not. I will say that there was no justification for the refusal of a conference. No man is so big—except in his own estimation—as not to be able to find 10 minutes for a conference with the Governor of a State, inside a 48-hour limit, if he wishes to talk with the Governor of any State, or with any Member of Congress.

You are right in thinking that the attitude of "the people be damned" permeates the whole organization from the top to the clerks who do his bidding.

It is time for some people to find out that this is still a representative government—not an autocracy, nor a bureaucracy.

It is true that the Office of Price Administration has not remained within the bounds of its statutory powers, and has misinterpreted the language of the act so as to arrogate unto itself additional powers nowhere granted it by law and has administered the act in such fashion as to cause many unnecessary hardships to our citizens.

Some of the methods employed by its so-called police force, as Mr. Smith's committee so well says, not only contravene statutory safeguards of private rights but even invade the field of immunity guaranteed by the Constitution against unlawful searches and seizures.

The committee is to be commended for the work it has done and for the comprehensive report it has made—House Report No. 862.

Its conclusion, with which I agree, is especially forceful, viz:

Your committee wishes to reiterate its firm belief and conviction that both rationing and price control are vital wartime necessities. It has no wish to handicap the operation of either, and indeed, where necessary, it is anxious to strengthen them. In consequence, your committee recommends that the laws governing the Office of Price Administration be amended in such manner as to retain and strengthen inflation control and at the same time eliminate the abuses and injustices now apparent. A revision and simplification of the rules, regulations, and orders of that agency is an immediate necessity. It should be pointed out that the illegal, absurd, useless, and conflicting regulations heretofore promulgated by the Office of Price Administration are creating such great confusion that it is impossible for the average citizen to know how to comply. This situation inevitably tends to bring the law into contempt and ridicule and creates widespread indignation and resentment among our citizens. Such an unfortunate situation will ultimately lead to a complete break-down of the price-control law and necessarily retard the effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has control of both the purse and the sword, and it should use both controls to scrape from the ship of state the barnacles which so definitely impede its progress.

If I am correctly advised, that is just what is going to be done.

Oratory Vital Wartime Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Boston Post by Henry Gillen:

ORATORY VITAL WARTIME NEED—ALLIES FORTUNATE IN HAVING LEADERS LIKE ROOSEVELT AND CHURCHILL TO GUIDE AND INSPIRE THEM

(By Henry Gillen)

After Dunkerque a voice resounded in England. After Pearl Harbor a voice resounded in the United States. People, shaken and transfixed, listened. People heard, rolled up their sleeves, and said, "We will beat them."

In those crimson hours which came to the English and American people, they wanted to hear such voices, voices strong and bold, voices of leaders, voices of men who talked with their fists clenched and their chins out, voices of determined men, dogged, confident, and unafraid.

If they had not spoken when skies were red, when hopes were harried, and when hearts were low, if in their places there had been weaker voices, hesitant, hysterical, or helpless, would we now be as near to victory? That, no one can judge. But no one, in his or her right reason, can say that we are any less because they spoke.

When the historians to come tabulate the things which brought the final triumph to the United Nations, when they write down our assets and advantages which won the last battle, when they chronicle the manpower, courage, industrial might, persistency, weapons, and will, let them include the oratory. It was no secret weapon. It was a brand Excalibur, bright and flashing throughout, strong, sure, and superb.

Oratory is one of the arts. The war has deemphasized the arts as subjects in the schools. The stress at the moment is upon the sciences, because wars have become scientific. The machine has made war precise and the factors can be figured almost to the last fraction.

Mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other measured studies naturally overshadow the value and importance to the well-rounded person of Latin, Greek, philosophy, art appreciation, poetry, music, and the rest. Youngsters who some day may have to handle the slide-rule robots of mechanized battle, will be better prepared by knowing Euclid than by being surpassing in Cicero.

COMING TUG OF WAR

Yet, it will be neglect if a moment is not found for the spoken word. For the war of weapons, which is the fight for freedom at the moment, some day is going to become a war of words, deftly handled as a rapier, in the fight for a peace that will last beyond the time again when a new generation has grown up.

It will be more than a fight for peace. The currents of varying ideologies will clash in "the battlefields of the mind." The forces unleashed in the world in which we live will not be blotted out completely by the stroke of the pen on the peace treaty. These forces will still have supporters, just as after the last war many who thought that might was right still clung to that belief and started another one.

Democracy will loom supreme and win many new champions and supporters who did not dare speak before. But other ocracies and isms will be kept alive by old guards, underground, perhaps, but till potent. And it has been the experience that champions of other isms have displayed in the past a fine faculty for public speaking, are skilled in debate and by their eloquence oftentimes superficially convincing.

MUST LEARN TO TALK

Into the world of tomorrow will troop the youngsters of today. It will be well to know geometry, the properties of water, how many ribs are in the human body, what is a fulcrum, and why we have storms. But if men or women arise who have the power to shift multitudes by the sound of their voices and the placement of words, it will take more than algebra and meteorology to unconvince those temporarily led away.

Young folks can be taught to speak, and even if they never have the opportunity to lead people with their voices alone, they will at least not suffer the bitter embarrassment, when called upon at a house party or town meeting, of being forced to say, "I am sorry, but I cannot talk."

Yes; they can be taught to talk. But they cannot be taught to become great orators. That calls, as does writing poetry, painting, or composing music, for inspiration. And as the poet derives from reading the poetry of the masters, the painter from studying great paintings, and the composer from listening to musical masterpieces, so the embryo orator improves from listening to the established ones speak.

RARE OPPORTUNITY

At the moment children and young folks have the rare opportunity of hearing with frequency two men who will be remembered long after our time, not so much probably for the offices they held but for the things which they said. For the speeches will be handed down, and generations from now youths will recite ringing excerpts in declamation contests throughout the English-speaking parts of the globe.

But as they can inspire others to emulate them, these men themselves had their inspirations. President Roosevelt had his, a number of good ones in his party before him, chief among them, one of the best, whom he followed with devotion when alive and has never forgotten since he died, Woodrow Wilson. And Woodrow Wilson's growing greatness is due more to the things he said, perhaps, than to his deeds.

Prime Minister Churchill also had his inspiration, and, oddly enough, his inspiration was an American, an American from Ireland, born in Sligo, who came to this country, became a citizen, served several terms as a Congressman, was many times a power for good, and through his useful life held multitudes spellbound for hours with the magnificence of his oratory—Bourke Cockran.

FIRST MEETING

Winston Churchill was in his twenties when he first met him. The young Churchill, energetic and ambitious, torn between the desire to be a soldier and a writer, determined as well as destined to be great, was on his way to Cuba to fight with the Spaniards before the turn of the century. He traveled there by way of New York, and, in Manhattan, Mr. Cockran, a friend of his mother's family, took him in charge during that, his first visit to America.

"It was the first time," says Rene Kraus in his biography of Churchill, "that Winston Churchill had ever heard the dynamic American language from the mouth of one of its best speakers in that age. Even during his early days he had a fine ear for the power of language which later was to be his special weapon.

"He had never heard such conversation as Mr. Cockran's 'either in point, in rotundity, in antithesis, or in comprehension.' Even in decades later he felt that he had never met another speaker with the acuteness and the individuality of this American politician. This New York politician, more than any other man, served as Winston Churchill's model."

TWO STYLES

The advantage of the young folk listening to the President or the Prime Minister is that they have a choice of two styles of public speaking. One is modern, American, delivered in almost a conversational way, but with eloquent and forceful emphasis on the points to be made, in language clear and understandable to the average man.

Churchill, on the other hand, is a throwback to the Webster school of which Cockran was a more modern exemplar. His words drip eloquence. Each sentence is polished literature. While he is at his best with the speech prepared beforehand and memorized, he demonstrated on his recent visit to Harvard University, with a handful of notes, that extemporaneously, he is also a master.

But both champions of the art demonstrate one thing in common besides voices which impinge on the mind and hold the attention, a thing which makes an orator great and which embryo orators often overlook. There is more to oratory than voice or gesture, words or phrases strung in a line like raindrops on a telegraph wire.

Behind the words there must be thoughts and the thoughts can hardly be those of someone else. The ideas may be, and generally are, for there are few new ideas in the world. Man has been thinking a long time. But what the individual who is speaking thinks about the things that is his topic, is what holds and stirs the applause for orators. And good speakers, honest, sincere, and convincing, must be thinkers.

Answering Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me November 15, 1943, over Mutual Broadcasting System radio network in answer to Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr.:

I am grateful for the opportunity to talk to you tonight about food subsidies.

The air waves which bring this message to you are not the personal property of corporations which use them. Neither do they belong to any commentator, or to the sponsors which hire him. And when, night after night, you hear from this microphone a crusade against food subsidies, there is an affirmative obligation upon those who control these channels of expression either to keep the commentators out of politics, or else to permit others an equal opportunity to answer them. Radio is not free when any one individual can reach you night after night with partisan utterances and expressions of personal prejudice.

I am not going to engage in personalities in the brief time allotted to me to discuss this important question of food subsidies. If it appears that I am making a political speech, I have no apologies to make, because I am simply answering some of the political arguments you hear every night on this program.

You don't have to take my word for the fact that this is a political issue pure and simple. I will call as a witness that distinguished news columnist, Raymond Clapper, who was voted by his colleagues in the Washington press gallery as the fairest and best informed columnist writing about national affairs.

Now, if you don't want to take my word, let Mr. Fulton Lewis tell you what Washington and the country think about Ray Clapper's ability as a reporter and observer.

Last week Mr. Clapper, in endorsing the administration's food-subsidy plan, said:

"The trouble is that large groups want to get rid of all Government controls. They want the lid off prices. They are fighting to end subsidies now. Thus powerful political pressure has been created on Congress. Republicans have joined in. Several Republicans on the Banking and Currency Committee were understood to have favored continuing subsidies, but—and I want the listeners to get this particularly—after having lunch with JOE MARTIN, they unanimously went against the administration."

So there you have it, my friends, we are engaged in a desperate political fight, launched and led by the Republican Party. A few Democrats on the committee joined with the solid Republican group only after the prohibition against subsidies was removed against certain crops.

Mr. Clapper reports further as to the Republican attitude on subsidies:

"Off with price control. Let everybody collect all the traffic will bear. That's the game about to be put over in Washington."

Yes, that's the Republican game unless President Roosevelt and his supporters can stop it. These political enemies of the President give a kind of lip service to his brilliant leadership in the world crisis. They applaud the magnificent diplomatic triumphs of that great statesman, Cordell Hull. Yet on the home front they stab our great Commander in Chief in the back in order to gain political advantage. It is a reckless and trifling policy that would thus gamble with the country's future. And mark you well, if the Republicans have their way, we will have a spectacle of wages and prices chasing each other in a mad race to disaster.

Every argument against war-food subsidies can be easily answered. I will select the argument that is made the most frequently by Mr. Fulton Lewis on this program, one of the most popular and one of the most misleading arguments. He says that subsidies are inflationary because the subsidy money must be borrowed and in addition our returning soldiers will have to pay it with interest. The answer is that the Government is buying much more than 50 percent of the commodities that are subsidized and for every dollar paid in a subsidy the consumers including the Government are saved from $5 to $30. Therefore, it is not only good sense but good business as well, for the Government to spend $1 on a subsidy to keep from increasing the cost of the war purchases from $2.50 to $15, which would also have to be borrowed and paid back with interest. If a subsidy is bad, in this case at least, it is better to accept something bad to keep from being compelled to take something much worse.

The Government being the largest purchaser will be helped the most but if any class of consumers will be provided with additional purchasing power that might become inflationary through this method it can, and will be, siphoned off in the form of taxes and paid on our huge national debt.

Let me describe to you the consequences of this Republican proposal which would torpedo the farmers' support-price program and pick the consumers' pockets. I have time to only sketch a few of the results. So, I say first to you housewives:

If the price of ham goes up 10 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesmen.

If veal cutlets go up 6 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesmen.

If the price of butter goes up 10 cents a pound, if milk goes up 3 cents a quart, canned vegetables 10 percent, sliced bacon a nickel a pound, bread 2 cents a loaf, sugar a cent a pound, thank Mr. JOE MARTIN, his Republican cohorts, and his radio spokesmen.

I ask you workingmen, if you will continue to accept stabilization of your wages, if the price of food goes up? The answer is obvious. If labor leaders urge you to demand higher wages, the Republicans and their spokesmen are responsible. Of course I deplore the unjustified surrender to that national menace, John L. Lewis. But are we going to throw overboard the stabilization program because this ruthless and irresponsible leader of 1 percent of our workers has held a pistol to his country's head in the hour of its supreme crisis?

The bill proposed by the Republicans on the Banking and Currency Committee would eliminate all food subsidies as of January 1 1944. This Republican New Year's gift to the country would be a 10 percent increase in the cost of your market basket. But would it stop there? Of course not. As wages are increased, prices again go up. There is no end to the spiral except ruin and misery and hardship for us all.

If the bill as proposed by the Republicans is adopted, there is only one other alternative to letting food costs go up. And that is to let farm prices go down. So I say to you farmers:

If you bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame the Republicans.

If you bring your beef cattle to the auction pens and get only 9 cents for good steers, blame the Republicans.

If milk goes down 50 cents a hundredweight or more, if your vegetable crops, your wheat, and other commodities are reduced in price, you can blame the Republican Party which would, as I have said, gamble with the Nation's welfare in a reckless and shameful conspiracy to rise to power from the confusion and the anarchy which would attend the abandonment of stabilization.

No, my friends, let us not be deluded. You are the intended victim of a diabolical political plot. That plot has a single aim: So to confuse and bewilder the American people that they will be unwittingly escorted into the madness and folly of inflation.

Out of the chaos which follows inflation, these conspirators hope for the dissatisfaction which may lead to the election of a Republican President in 1944. For this purpose, the Republican conspirators are willing to toss to the wolves of inflation the farmers of America, the laboring people of America, and the soldiers of America, along with their wives, their mothers, and their children who must live upon a few dollars a month while food prices and wages will soar.

Who are these conspirators? They are the same Republicans who sired the speculative orgy of the twenties and the depression of the thirties. They are the same Republicans who stood idly by while the farms and homesteads of this Nation went on the auction block in one continuous procession of bankruptcy sales. They are the same Republicans who forced the farmer to use his grain for fuel and arrogantly told him to eat his cotton. They are the same Republicans whose only answer to the unemployment and misery of America's unemployed was written in the cold steel of bayonets aimed at the breasts of men who fought to defend this Nation in World War No. 1. They are the same Republicans who made Federal funds available to feed a hungry mule or a hungry hog, but declared it un-American to feed a hungry hero's wife or baby.

Their conspiracy must fail. During the war in which our independence was won, there were cynical and ambitious men who conspired against Washington. Thank God their conspiracy failed and this Nation was born. During the First World War, a little group of wiliful men conspired for partisan advantage against Woodrow Wilson, and struck him down at the very hour of freedom's triumph. Their conspiracy succeeded and because of its success, our boys are dying today.

It is a conspiracy to betray the fighting men of America by lowering ruthlessly the inadequate living standards of their dependent families. It is a conspiracy to betray the farmers of America into another panic offering them the fool's gold of inflation. It is a conspiracy which will promote strikes and slow-downs by forcing the working people of America into the unrest and bitterness of class warfare. It is a conspiracy which will crucify the millions of humble people—the school teachers, the policemen and firemen, the Government employees, the preachers, the clerks and bookkeepers—and all others who must live upon fixed incomes.

Those who seek to enlist you in this conspiracy are your enemies. They may seek to seduce you with soft words; they may pose as objective and nonpartisan reporters; but behind them lurk the sinister forces of political conspiracy.

Tonight, in all seriousness, I call upon you to rebuke the conspirators. Rise in your might and let your Representatives know that you want them to support the Commander in Chief and his aids in their battle to "hold the line." Make your sentiments known in no uncertain terms and you will write a gilt-edged insurance policy for your children and your country.

Uncle Sam, Driller?

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial which appeared in the New York Sun entitled "Uncle Sam, Driller?"

Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to follows:

[From the New York Sun of November 1, 1943]

NO OIL PRICE INCREASE

Denying a price increase of 35 cents a barrel on crude oil recommended by the Petroleum Administration for War, Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, urges instead financial incentives to encourage wildcat drilling and maintenance of stripper wells, that is, those where production is tapering off. Judge Vinson argues that if crude-oil prices are increased generally, the benefit will go to wells now producing at a profit as well as to new wells brought in by the incentive of a higher price. His estimate is that higher crude-oil prices would cost consumers $500,000,000 a year. One of the principal consumers is the Federal Government, buying oil products for use in the war.

Until the program recommended by Judge Vinson takes more definite shape, criticism may be withheld, but there certainly is clear indication that it will rest on the favorite method of new dealers—the subsidy. A dominant factor in keeping down wildcat drilling is the increased cost of operations. The argument for an increase in the price of crude oil is that it would provide an incentive for wildcat operations despite these increased costs. On the other hand, if a subsidy were provided, it would have to be paid whether the wildcatters struck oil or not. Otherwise it would provide no more incentive for exploration than now exists. Thus Uncle Sam, as financial agent for the same consumers whom Judge Vinson seeks to protect, would be paying a subsidy for the drilling of dry wells. The application of a subsidy to get the last barrel of oil out of stripper wells might be more defensible, but the highest cost of the oil would be brought home to the taxpayer just as surely as if a price increase had been granted.

Judge Vinson expressed the hope that more foreign oil may be available and that the Texas fields may be brought to their maximum yield. These are factors rather remote from the price question, but they have a bearing on final settlement of the whole problem.

[From the New York Sun of November 5, 1943]

UNCLE SAM, DRILLER?

If the New Deal is toying with the idea of paying a subsidy to encourage wildcat drilling for oil, it ought also to toy with available statistics on this year's drilling. These show that approximately 85 percent of the wildcat wells drilled so far this year were dry holes and that only 11 percent were oil producers. The large element of risk in wildcat drilling is clearly demonstrated. What is not so clear is just how the Government would be expected to behave as a partner in the risks. Would it set a limit beyond which no well could be driven? Would it limit its financial backing on each enterprise? Would it select the sites? Would Members of Congress demand allocation of subsidies to the oil-producing States on the basis of past production? Numerous questions of this sort are bound to arise when Uncle Sam's name is mentioned as a possible partner in so risky a business as wildcatting.

An Excellent Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Calumet, Chicago, Ill., of November 13, 1943:

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Prior to the entrance of the United States into the war—during the period we were operating the defense program—and since Pearl Harbor, this column has praised numerous policies suggested by Bernard M. Baruch, whose record for past decades as a great practical economist has been outstanding. His appointment by James F. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director, to coordinate Government agencies in the war and prepare for the solution of post-war problems is splendid.

A thorough student of and experienced in economic affairs during the productive period of his 73 years, Mr. Baruch has been adviser to several Presidents of both parties on domestic and world matters. During World War No. 1 he was the head of the War Industries Board and indications point to his new appointment as similar to that of the last war. During the prosecution of World War No. 1 his counsel was continually sought and heeded.

Popularly called "Barney," Mr. Baruch, at the inception of the period when war production started rolling and pay rolls swelling, sensed the threat of inflation. He advocated prompt establishment of ceilings on both commodities and wages, to curb it. His advice went unheeded. As the head of the Baruch committee on the rubber problem, which had been growing seriously acute as time went on, he devised the measures for producing synthetic rubber clearly and promptly. William Jeffers was then named as director of the agency to put those measures into effect, a task that was administered equally as promptly and efficiently.

Since the post taken over by Mr. Baruch is by appointment of War Mobilization Director Byrnes, our interpretation is that his functions will be, throughout the war's duration, to more thoroughly perfect all units of mobilization, and continue on during the post-war period to adapt them to reconstruction purposes. In both phases his rich experience, capabilities, and sound judgment for which he is universally admired by businessmen, financial men, statesmen, and the public in general are inspirational.

The heads of the numerous agencies that will come under his scope should welcome the coordinating aid of Mr. Baruch. Not alone, during the remaining period of the war, we feel, should these bureaus profit by his efforts, but in the gravely important era after the war will the affairs of these units be facilitated and expedited thereby. That the post-war problems are to be treated by Mr. Baruch, in addition to those of the current war period, is significant. It indicates that mobilization measures for the reconstruction era are being planned by the administration.

Our regret is that Bernard M. Baruch enters into the picture of assuming an important official role so tardily. As coordinator of a group of vital war agencies that so often have confusedly floundered and counteracted each other's functions he could have been of inestimable value to the war effort. As it is, from his pun-inviting, unofficial office—a park bench—his wise and deliberated counsel has been timely, constructive, and exceedingly helpful. We repeat as we wrote many months ago, there has been far too little advantage taken of much costly experience derived from military and production operations in World War No. 1, and of such economic veterans as "Barney" Baruch.

Reclamation and the Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has finally awakened to the fact of the necessity of developing the Missouri River Basin. It has become conscious of the enormous possibilities in conserving and using the waters of the Missouri River in the production of wealth, power, and navigation, as well as in the prevention of floods, by utilization of the surplus waters. Therefore, it gives me pleasure to insert here an address by William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., before the annual convention of the North Dakota Reclamation Association at Valley City, N. Dak. The address follows:

I am glad that I could get away from Washington and come out West to meet with you people of North Dakota. I say this not in any sense of deprecation of the National Capital or of the serious-minded men and women who labor there in the operation of your Government. I say it rather because I have always admired the perseverance and vision of the people of the Flickertail State, and I have not heretofore had the opportunity to be with you. The legend of pioneering in North Dakota is still fresh, and, being the son of a pioneer on an irrigated farm in a southwestern desert, I am interested in your history.

American pioneers did not have easy tasks anywhere, whether they followed the Indian trails through the Alleghenies, built sod huts in the plains, or pitched tents in the deserts to assist in the winning of an empire. Certainly the early settlers of North Dakota were no exceptions to the rule. They won through against severe winters and recurring droughts in summer until today you have a right to look forward with confidence to a brighter and better future.

North Dakota and other Plains States of the Missouri River Basin are endowed with hardy, resourceful people. The soils of this region will compare favorably with any in the entire United States. But these plains lie in a zone between the arid west and the humid east in which from year to year your for-

tunes wax or wane in accordance with annual variations in a scant average rainfall.

We in the United States have come to think of any area that receives on the average less than 20 inches of rain a year as being arid, or, if the deficiency be slight, semiarid. We say that in arid or semiarid regions general farming and close settlement are not secure unless there be irrigation. The 20-inch rainfall line splits off into the humid zone a few eastern counties of North Dakota, and it puts the rest of the State in the semiarid belt.

The rainfall average, it is true, ranges up pretty close to 20 inches over much of eastern North Dakota, shading off only gradually as you go west. And while the figure of 20 inches is somewhat arbitrarily chosen to mark the dividing line between arid and humid climates in our country, it is touch-and-go in most parts of North Dakota and in large sections of other Plains States of the Missouri Basin. Slight departures from the rainfall norm make very big differences. Fluctuations in rainfall here may not be even so great, when measured in inches, as in most States of the Union. But when you fall short here only a little, you drop below the critical point at which it is not possible to grow crops without irrigation, and today you have very little irrigation.

I am not the first speaker to make this point before a meeting in North Dakota. So many have come and told you these things, which you live with every year, that you may be growing tired of hearing them said. However, one engaged in irrigation—in the conservation and use of our water resources—will not concede that these things can be said too often nor understood too well. Maj. John Wesley Power, at your constitutional convention more than 50 years ago, pointed out your peculiar climatic situation when he urged upon the founding fathers of North Dakota a forward-looking public policy with respect to conservation of the waters in your streams for irrigation.

Powell was a seer, which I am not. He foresaw some of the experiences that you of this generation have now lived through. It is a rather pleasant human failing that we always anticipate the best. In years of plentiful rainfall it is easy to conclude that the worst is over and that it will continue to rain as needed. But one does not need to be a prophet to warn you that in this region droughts will occur again, droughts as severe at least of any known to have occurred here in the past.

* * * * *

I like the motto of your State. It goes, as you well know, "Liberty and Union, one and inseparable, now and forever." The determination to hang together and to go forward together that it expresses is the spirit it takes to overcome nature in her not-too-willing forms. It is what makes America great.

The cooperation which your motto promises, I might say, is a part of what I want to talk with you about this afternoon. You have here in the Missouri Basin the soil and the people to establish and maintain a stable, prosperous community. Lack of natural rainfall is your great handicap. Yet you have flowing through North Dakota one of the great rivers of America, the Missouri. I think it was Theodore Roosevelt who once said that the United States had done less about developing her rivers than any other civilized country. Considerable has been done in the last 40 years, but not enough to render the statement far from right. Certainly, the Missouri River is largely undeveloped today.

It seems a little odd sometimes that we should have developed and perfected irrigation in the United States first in the vacant areas that were driest, and that we shall probably develop irrigation last in the settled areas where the rainfall is only a little below what is needed to keep the people prosperous and happy. In other words, so far we have found it easier, strangely enough, to do great things where there were no people suffering for the lack of them, than to do the same great things in places where people struggle against severe natural handicaps that could as readily be overcome.

* * * * *

The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, the agency that I represent, is one of the organizations that the people of the United States have set up to assist in the job of harnessing our western rivers. The Bureau was established 41 years ago, and it now operates in 15 Western States, serving irrigation water to nearly 4,000,000 acres of land. Most of the 4,000,000 acres of land that the Bureau has irrigated was sagebrush desert before our projects were built. Last year these desert lands, with the aid of well-planned and engineered irrigation systems, produced widely diversified crops that were valued at $272,000,000. The average value per acre of these crops from this irrigated land was $70.17.

For comparison, the 17,854,000 acres of cropped land in North Dakota in 1942, the same year, is reported by the Department of Agriculture to have produced crops valued at $297,689,000, or an average of less than $17 per acre. The total production was just a few million more, but the average per acre was less than one-quarter as much as on the irrigated lands of Federal reclamation projects.

Note right here, however, that many of the crops that ran the per acre crop value up so high on irrigation projects could not be produced even with irrigation in North Dakota or in many other parts of the Missouri Basin. The average includes fruits and vegetables that bring high prices but require a milder climate. Let us see, therefore, what the 14,000 acres of irrigated lands that lie in McKenzie County, N. Dak., produced. They are a part of the lower Yellowstone project of the Bureau of Reclamation. They produced crops of an average value per acre of $48.18, which is just about three times the general average of the cropland in the State.

Just to complete the picture let me contrast the crop records of irrigated land with that of nonirrigated land in McKenzie County, as reported by the agricultural census for 1939. The comparisons are as follows:

Crop	Irrigated	Nonirrigated
	Per acre	*Per acre*
Potatoes, bushels	157.9	42.7
Barley, do	37.6	16.1
Wheat, do	24.9	7.9
Corn, do	37.3	14.0
Oats, do	40.4	19.2
Sugar beets, tons	14.01	----------

From these figures you can readily see why the crop values on irrigated land in McKenzie County are three times the average for North Dakota as a whole.

For comparison again: On the 4,000,000 acres that are irrigated by Federal projects are 88,000 farms which support nearly 250,000 families on the farms and in cities and towns that have grown up among them. In your State, which has 4 times as much cropland, there are approximately 150,000 families—100,000 less.

These figures are important merely in that they demonstrate that on irrigated land the farming is more intensive of higher-value crops that do not fail in any year because of drought. And they show that where the water supply is controlled by man it is possible to support many more people on the land. These facts should be of interest to the Missouri River Basin, for which such fine plans are being made. It will be necessary one of these days for North Dakota and the other States of the basin to decide whether such water as can be made available from the Missouri River system should be utilized in irrigating some of your fine soil.

To complete nearly any large irrigation project requires the construction of a dam. Almost any dam, and certainly any large irrigation dam, makes it possible to take power from the same river that contributes the irrigation water. That will surely be true along the Missouri. It is true at many of the dams that have been built by the Bureau of Reclamation, which now has facilities for the generation of more power than any other agency in the world. Just a week ago another giant generator went into action at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in Washington, bringing to a total of more than 2,000,000 kilowatts the installations at reclamation dams. From these generators will come 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy this year, more than were produced by all the utilities in the country in 1912, about the time that the first reclamation power plant commenced operation.

Like the water used in irrigation, the water that makes the power (and it usually is the same water) acquires value and significance only through the ends promoted by its use. Right now power from the great reclamation dams is turning more than half of all the wheels in the gigantic new war industries of the Pacific coast. It makes aluminum, powers aircraft factories, and welds the seams of whole fleets of Victory ships. It makes chemicals, lights air bases, and does war work around the clock and never gets tired.

I bring out the value of power on reclamation projects because when the Missouri River is harnessed, as it must be, there will be created immediate opportunities for generating more than a million horsepower of electric energy for your use. This power, together with your coal and other resources should open industrial doors that you scarcely dream of today. This power should make it possible to electrify most of the homes in the basin. The revenue from this power will aid in paying the way of the development of the river. Water power is a natural resource belonging to the people that they should use and protect, just as they use and protect the water, itself.

Power is one of the very important products of the development of the Missouri River. It would be a sinful waste not to plan the use of power in order to get the largest and the highest public benefit from it.

Backed by more than 40 years of experience that have made possible its achievements of today, the Bureau of Reclamation is ready and anxious to undertake a plan for the development of the Missouri Basin for irrigation and power. The Bureau will cooperate with the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, and with others in this development. Cooperatively, we are pledged to work out means of providing maximum flood control to protect life and property in the lower reaches of the river, and to assure that adequate provisions are made for navigation. These are the fields in which the Corps of Engineers works. The Bureau of Reclamation does not mean to trespass upon legitimate work of any other agency.

Since Mr. W. G. Sloan, assistant regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, will give your meeting more details, I will barely sketch the outlines of the Bureau of Reclamation plan. It involves some 90 reservoirs on the main stem and the tributaries of the Missouri River which will have for their purposes the following:

1. The irrigation of about 4,400,000 acres of land in 6 arid and semiarid States of the

Missouri River Basin. This will provide settlement opportunities for half a million people on productive, secure farms.

2. Head will be created by the dams for the generation of 952,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power with an estimated annual output of about 4,000,000,000-kilowatt hours. That is equivalent to the entire electric production in these six States in 1940.

3. Flood protection will be provided along the Missouri River, and simultaneously reduction in flood stages will be obtained farther down along the Mississippi as well.

4. Adequate provision will be made for navigation, including the 6-foot channel from St. Louis to Sioux City that is now authorized and consideration of a 9-foot channel as it may be warranted.

5. Miscellaneous additional benefits will accrue from such related conservation activities as fish and wildlife preservation, provision of water bodies for recreational uses, alleviation of pollution problems that have arisen in some areas, and the provision of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial use. The completion of the program would be expected to make a major contribution toward the restoration, through the years, of receding ground water levels over large areas.

The Missouri River may seem remote from some of the counties in eastern North Dakota and remote from other areas of the States that in part lie within the Missouri Basin. But the problem of the western and central counties of North Dakota are not remote from any part of the Nation, and are very near to all of you.

During the last decade, which was marked by great droughts, 30,000 farm families departed from North Dakota alone, and their going came near to wrecking some communities. The Federal Government, representing all the people of the Nation, joined in combating the ravages of the dry cycle. The National Treasury was called upon to expend more than $600,000,000 in the 6 semiarid States of the Missouri Basin in 6 years, $92,000,000 in North Dakota alone. That huge sum of money would go a very long way toward completing the development of the Missouri River, and the development of the Missouri River would make a real and permanent contribution toward protection of the basin from future droughts.

Floods are not infrequent along the river. Three floods during this year did more than $35,000,000 damages. Development of the Missouri River, in accordance with the plans of the Corps of Engineers and the plans we have about completed, would go a long way toward eliminating the floods as well as alleviating the droughts. It would not take many such fields to destroy values in excess of the cost of the whole development as planned.

We are dealing in big figures here; we are talking a billion-dollar plan, but heroic measures are needed.

In the reconstruction period that will follow our sure victory in this war, such plans as this may well be useful in absorbing the mobilized energies of the Nation. What better way of providing employment for the returning soldier and the war-industrial worker than in giving them work in the building of such great projects for the permanent improvement of the land; the land that they have risked so much to protect and preserve?

The development of the Missouri River will pay its own way. Lands that are irrigated can afford to pay and will be required to pay their share. Power will pay its proportion. And the savings in wreckage that otherwise would be caused by flood and drought run into hundreds of millions more.

While this is my first trip to meet with you in North Dakota, the Bureau of Reclamation has been in this State before. Soon after the passage of the National Reclamation Act in 1902, the Williston and Buford-Trenton projects were constructed in western North Dakota on the Missouri River. A wet cycle followed, and the local farmers and the people of the State generally lost their interest in irrigation. After a few years the facilities were abandoned. But the Lower Yellowstone project was extended into North Dakota, and has been in continuous operation. It is a splendid example of what irrigation can do in this semiarid country. The average rainfall of McKenzie County, in which that project is located, is 15 inches a year, only 3½ inches less than in Barnes County, of which our host today, Valley City, is the county seat. Remember that those 15 inches, supplemented by irrigation, got crops in 1942 in McKenzie County that were valued at an average of $48.18 per acre.

When the great drought struck in 1934, it was deeply regretted that irrigation works of the Williston and Buford-Trenton projects were not in working order. It was freely stated then that they would have paid for themselves in a single year. The Bureau of Reclamation was importuned to reconstruct these projects and to build others in North Dakota. The Buford-Trenton has been reconstructed and was in service this year for several thousand acres of land.

The big plan for the Missouri Basin that has developed contemplates the eventual irrigation of something like 1,750,000 acres of land in North Dakota, some along the main stem of the Missouri, and some in the Souris Valley, which would be reached by diversion, and some elsewhere. This would be a mighty stabilizing influence that would affect the economy of the entire State. I do not need to draw you a diagram for you to see the picture of the thousands of substantial new homes that it would make possible, of the new towns and the growing cities.

A series of pumping projects on the main stem of the Missouri are immediate possibilities. The Missouri-Souris, of course, is the major undertaking under study in the plan and it is the key to any extensive irrigation development in North Dakota. This proposal is of interest here in Valley City. Implications of the Missouri-Souris extend to the Sheyenne Valley, into which some diversion would be made from the key project. A diversion into the James River has also been considered. One reason for these diversions would be to assure water for municipal use and sewage dilution of 19 cities in North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota on the Sheyenne, the Red River, and the James River.

I shall leave to Mr. Sloan the job of giving you the details of the reclamation possibilities not only in North Dakota, but in the Missouri Basin. Before closing, I simply want to point out again the great importance that the Bureau of Reclamation attaches to the intentions of the people of North Dakota in connection with these plans. It would not do to build a great project like the Missouri-Souris and to have it fall into disuse, or to find in the very year of depressing drought when the project was most needed that its facilities had not been maintained and therefore could not be used.

I do not know how I could tell you any more clearly than I have told you that it is our opinion that North Dakota is a semiarid State in very large part; that in semiarid regions irrigation is believed to be necessary for secure general farming and close settlement; that the risk of farming without irrigation in semiarid regions is very great and leads inevitably to periodic disasters; that irrigation has proved its worth in McKenzie County; and that eventually the waters of the Missouri River must and will be used. Our country cannot reach the zenith of its development until the water resources of this region are fully used.

* * * * * *

One of the big questions is, Will the people of the Missouri River Basin be ready to seize the opportunities? Will they be willing to irrigate their farms and to accept the responsibility for operating and maintaining irrigation works? I leave these questions with you. You must answer them yourselves.

Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of November 17, 1943:

POLL-TAX BILL

(By Mark Sullivan)

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

The present status in the Senate of the proposal to outlaw the poll tax as a qualification for voting is this: The bill to abolish it by act of Congress was reported this week by the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Senate floor and can be called up at any time. Proponents of the measure say they will call it up soon. When called up, it will lead to earnest debate. The issue affects the American structure of government more profoundly than any other proposal before this or any recent Congress. There is no call upon the American public more urgent than that this issue be understood at a time when action upon it is imminent.

The poll tax, as a qualification for voting, is an exercise of the functions of State governments. So is every other qualification for voting, everywhere. Qualifications requiring that the voter must have lived in the State a certain length of time, that he must be a citizen, that if of alien birth he must have been naturalized a certain length of time, that he must be able to read and write—all these and every other one of the various qualifications in different States—all are prescribed by State governments. None are prescribed by the Federal Government at Washington. Fixing qualifications for voting is an exclusive function of the States. It is the most fundamental of their functions—for it is an attribute of their very existence as units of government.

The present proposal would take part of this function away from the States. It would forbid any State to require payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting in any election to choose Federal officials (President, Vice President, Members of Congress).

If Congress should take this step, if it should enact the poll-tax bill, it would by that act establish a principle and a precedent. The principle and precedent would be that Congress has a right to determine voting qualifications, that Congress can override qualifications fixed by States. By that principle and precedent, if now established, Congress could change any voting qualification in any State. It could forbid any of the familiar qualifications now widely practiced, having to do with length of residence and the like. It would go further than merely

forbid qualifications set up by the States—it could set up and enforce new qualifications of its own.

The proposal soon to be debated by the Senate is of concern not merely to the small number of States, eight, which still have the poll-tax requirement. It is of concern to every State, to every cititzen. It is of the deepest possible concern to persons who have at heart the preservation of the American structure of government.

This proposal to take from the States part of a function now exercised exclusively by them, comes at a time when there is already serious anxiety about the extent to which the Federal Government, during the past few years, has intruded upon functions of the States. The extent of the Federal absorption of functions of government can be suggested by 2 figures. In the State of Ohio, all the functions of government exercised by the State are carried on by 22,000 State employees. But in the same State the number of Federal employees—exercising Federal functions of government and deriving their authority from Washington—is 90,000.

The issue here set forth is so fundamental that no other aspect of the poll-tax measure is comparable. That the poll tax is undesirable is now generally conceded. Formerly practiced in many States, it is being gradually wiped out by the States themselves. It was wiped out by Florida in 1937, by Pennsylvania in 1933, by Louisiana in 1932, by Massachusetts in 1892. In two of the States still retaining it, Tennessee and Arkansas, active movements to repeal it are under way.

To help eliminate rancor from the coming debate, one point should be understood. Because there are large Negro populations in the eight States, all southern, which still have the poll tax, it is frequently charged that the poll tax discriminates against Negroes. This impression is widespread and has been cultivated. The impression is utterly wrong. The poll tax applies to whites exactly the same as to Negroes. There are in some Southern States devices, especially as respects primary elections, which do discriminate against Negroes. But the poll tax makes no such discrimination. Argument against it can fairly be based on many grounds—but not on the grounds of discrimination between whites and Negroes. In the coming debate, there is no more occasion to use the word "Negro" than to use the word "Swede" or "Italian" or "Greek."

Resolution Adopted by the National Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of the United States recently paid a tribute to our country's railroads for their outstanding performance wherein it declared that "the battle of transportation is being won," and "railroad transportation is vastly better than in the last war"; and

Whereas railroad workers have continued to exert their supreme efforts toward the successful prosecution of the war while they have patiently awaited the outcome of the proceedings on their demands for a wage increase, which have been pending for over a year; and

Whereas the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America is desirous that every peaceful effort be made to avert a strike, realizing as it does the devastating effect such action would have upon the interests of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas management, likewise cognizant of its obligation, has reached an accord with the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America; and

Whereas all of the respective agencies of the United States Government which have dealt with the question of wage increase, up to now have not succeeded in bringing about a satisfactory solution; and

Whereas the graduated scale of wage increase from 4 cents to 10 cents per hour, as recommended by the Special Emergency Board, is an unnecessary and dangerous interference with existing differentials in the railroad industry: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved: 1. The Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America is unalterably opposed to the graduated scale of wage increase from 4 cents to 10 cents per hour as recommended by the Special Emergency Board.

2. The Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America favors the immediate adoption of the resolution (S. J. Res. 91) introduced into the Senate of the United States by Senator TRUMAN, and the resolution (H. J. Res. 187) introduced into the House of Representatives by Representative CROSSER as being in the best interests of not only the railroad workers of America but the welfare of America as a whole and as an aid to the successful prosecution of the war.

Mexican Citizens Receive American Rations

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read an item in one of the local papers which I thought would be of interest to the Members and millions of housewives of this country.

In view of the beating we have taken from the O. P. A. through rationing and other regulations, it is interesting to note that we can be awfully kind to some people, especially if they are citizens of another country. I quote from the article:

EL PASO, TEX., November 6.—A brisk black market in American meat points and shoe coupons is functioning in Mexico as a result of a one-way good-neighbor policy under which citizens from the Mexican side of the Rio Grande receive a regular allowance of American rations.

This was admitted here today by local officials of the Office of Price Administration as they completed their fourth bimonthly issue of ration books to Mexican applicants.

It was estimated that 140,000 citizens of Mexico participated in the distribution from Texas and other American border States.

Shoe coupons are being sold by Mexicans here at prices ranging from 25 cents to $2.50 each, with $1 being the usual price. Local observers estimated the monthly traffic in shoe coupons in El Paso alone as amounting to about $10,000. Meat points have been sold for as much as 10 cents a point, it was said.

The granting of American ration books to Mexican residents is the "food across the border" policy of the Office of Price Administration. Discussing operation of the plan, L. S. Scott, Deputy Administrator here, termed it O. P. A.'s "biggest headache" in the Southwest.

Scott estimated that 500,000 points in meat and 340,000 points in processed goods went to citizens of Juarez alone during July and August.

POINTS REQUIRED

With a similar situation existing in Nogales, Aqua Prieta, New Laredo, and other border cities, O. P. A. officials said that probably 2½ million points in meat and butter went across the line from border States in July and August.

Although beef is plentiful and butter is unrestricted in Mexican cities, American citizens who buy such articles across the line must surrender coupons to custom officials or permit their purchases to be confiscated, it was said.

Free Enterprise in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, free enterprise is frequently spoken of during these days of strife and war. Many definitions are heard but one of the best that I have seen was given in an address entitled, "Free Enterprise in American History," delivered by Preston Hotchkis, president of the California State Chamber of Commerce, at the Governor's breakfast in Sacramento, Calif., recently. In this address, Mr. Hotchkis traced the development and accomplishments of the enterprise system in America and is well worth the careful reading by every American citizen. Mr. Hotchkis is an outstanding citizen of the State of California who has contributed much to the development of that great State. The following is a copy of his address:

FREE ENTERPRISE IN AMERICAN HISTORY—TRACING THE DEVELOPMENT AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM IN AMERICA

(By Preston Hotchkis, president of the California State Chamber of Commerce)

PEARL HARBOR

Approximately 21 months ago, an unspeakable act of treachery plunged us into this war. Much of our fleet was lying at the bottom of Pearl Harbor. Japan was taking in succession the Philippines, Hong Kong, Singapore, Dutch East Indies, Burma, and the perimeter of islands flanking Australia. Hawaii, Alaska, and our whole Pacific coast was exposed to an extent never dreamed of before.

Nor could England give us help in our hour of peril, for her Egyptian armies were hard-pressed by Rommel in north Africa, while at home she was still bleeding from that hell of bombs in the Battle of Britain, and invasion of her island itself was still considered imminent. Indeed, she required the continuance of the weapons and the food we had been sending to her to keep her on her feet and fighting.

And Russia, though battling valiantly, was being beaten back on a 2,000-mile front by an avalanche of Nazi armor, to the very shadows of Moscow and Leningrad. Two-thirds of her industrial capacity and almost half of her food-growing area had been conquered, and only the indomitable fighting instinct of the Russian people kept her from complete disaster.

Added to all of this, the Luftwaffe dominated the air and the U-boat critically bottlenecked the help we could send to both England and Russia.

Who could dream up a more sinister setting for our plunging into a global Armageddon—taking on two of the most highly militarized powers in the world—one flanking us 3,000 miles across one ocean, and the other flanking us 7,000 miles across the other ocean.

WE TURN THE CORNER

But, what is the picture today? Our fleet has been built to twice the size of pre-Pearl Harbor, and in some categories, to many times the size. Our air force, both Army and Navy, is the largest and most deadly accurate of any in the world. Ask the Japs and the Germans. The little brown men have been thrown completely off of American soil. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, with too little of everything including authority, is slowly turning the Japanese flank in the southwest Pacific.

In the other hemisphere, we and the British have completed the conquest of Africa, we have knocked Italy out of the war, and when we rid her land of the German armies it will be on to Berlin! Russia has the unbeatable Nazi war machine back-pedaling to the Dnieper for dear life. The battle of the U-boat has been all but won, our combined air forces dominate the skies, and the United Nations are on the offensive on all fronts.

Does anyone doubt that this is the most remarkable reversal in all military history?

How was it accomplished? By the undying will to fight of the whole British people, in the face of almost unsurmountable obstacles? Yes; in part—for that spirit and the feats of their military are inscribed in the immortal book of courage. By the fortitude of the Russian people and their armies? Yes; in part—for the utter desperation of the Russians' defense of their homeland will form an everlasting chapter of valor in this war.

But who practically rearmed the British in those critical days? Who sent them bombers right off the assembly line? Who built ships, loaded them, and sent them overseas faster than the subs could sink them? Who put new weapons and food into the hands of our Russian allies in their hour of peril, and sent them loaded convoys through that hell of bombs and torpedoes off the coast of Norway, on the road to Murmansk?

With modesty, but with pride, that war the task which our country assumed. Assumed at the same time—mark you—that we were raising and training our own Army of 8,000,000, our own Navy of 2,500,000, and our own air force of 2,000,000. Assumed at the time we were building a two-ocean Navy, a merchant fleet of 30,000,000 tons, and an air fleet of over 100,000 planes. Assumed at the time we changed our entire economy from peacetime production to wartime production.

But how could we, a nonmilitary Nation with 99 percent of our production geared to civilian consumption, perform such a Herculean task? How could we, without a background of experience, substantially rearm and feed our allies, while arming and training ourselves, and carrying an increasing share of the fighting?

HOW DID WE DO IT?

By the close teamwork of management and labor, sparked by the American system of free enterprise—the American way. Take away the principle of free enterprise from our industry, business, and agriculture, and you take the spark plug from the engine, the spirit from the body.

Specifically, what is the enterprise principle, and how did it come to be the pulsating force of our economy? Let's take a quick glimpse at our own history.

BIRTH OF OUR FREEDOM

In 1776, two great documents were given to the world, which were destined more profoundly to affect the thinking of the English-speaking people than any other document save the Bible. One of these was the Declaration of Independence, which promulgated the principle of "political democracy" under law. The other was Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations, which declared for the principle of "economic freedom" under law. Thomas Jefferson was penning the aspirations of mankind in the political realm, and Adam Smith in the economic. Both were reaching for the same heritage of freedom in matters affecting the individual. Both were talking against the same thing. They were talking against the economic system known as mercantilism which believed in management of the wealth of the country to the end that it might prosper the Crown of England.

"Mercantilism" was characterized by economic barriers between nations, by control of supply by government, by debasement of the currency, and by price-fixing policies, to the end that the Crown might be enriched. It called for a regimented people and a planned economy.

Under mercantilism the people were poor. There was no money. Government was big. Business was little. The economic and political order was subservient to the crown.

FROM MERCANTILISM TO THE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Adam Smith and Thomas Jefferson cried out against this system and pointed the way to a new economy called the enterprise system.

And today this system of economics forms a part of America's heritage of human freedom. It is the principle which underlies the accomplishment and character of the American people. Under it, America became the world's strongest and most prosperous nation.

What is the enterprise principle? It recognizes the individual personality as the most important element in the economy, and as the source of all creative power, limited only by the immutable laws of nature and of God. Under the enterprise system, the individual is free to work at any occupation, save or spend his earnings, acquire and own property, and enter any business, invest savings, and free to dispose of his earnings and savings. All of this he is free to do on his own judgment, or his own responsibility, and at his own risk. The new system pulled economics away from the Crown, and the economic system was made free.

OUR CONSTITUTION IS BORN

To preserve this heritage of freedom and the enterprise system, the Constitution of the United States was written. The men who wrote the Constitution were imbued with the philosophy of the natural rights of man. They believed that there was a body of rights which no institution created by man could deny to men. They said that under the law of God, every person was entitled to three natural rights—the right to life, to liberty, and to property. They maintained that the individual man should be the master and that government should be the servant. Under this Constitution, and within the framework of private enterprise, this Nation has lived for over a century and a half.

Today we are in the midst of a period of great national stress and world turmoil. Fighting a war to the death in two hemispheres, while supplying many of the weapons and much of the food to our allies, with our national debt stripping the gears of the adding machine, with our post-war domestic and world problems bearing sinister potentials we hear men in high places say that free enterprise cannot survive—it is on the way out. But we must never forget that America has gone through many periods of adversity. It is only when our Nation is subjected to severe strain that the people question the political and economic institutions and the principles by which they live.

WHAT PANICS PRODUCE

When you look at the history of civilization, you will find that in the periods of adversity a people's poets and philosophers dream of Utopias. It is then that the rash of crackpots breaks out with an epidemic of panaceas. For example, the panic of 1873 produced Henry George and his "Progress and Poverty," advancing the single tax as the cure-all for poverty. The financial collapse of 1884 lead Edward Bellamy to write "Looking Backward," in which he painted an enchanted era to exist by the year 2000, and sold over a million copies. It was directed at the American enterprise system, and was the forerunner of many of the patent medicines that grew out of the depression of 1929. "Looking Backward" bears a marked resemblance in its conception of foreign trade and the rationing of consumption to the "Century of the Common Man," by Mr. HENRY WALLACE.

And long before our own Nation was born, what do we find? At the end of the Peloponnesian wars with Attica in rubble, Plato gave the world "the Republic." When modern Europe emerged out of the Renaissance, amid confusion and chaos, Thomas Moore wrote Utopia. When the spirit of international revolution was ripe in 1848, Marx and Engel produced the Communist Manifesto.

AMERICA MARCHES ON

Our Nation was born out of the crisis of war. Through the blood and turmoil of five major conflicts, America has marched and triumphed. But not alone has our way of life withstood the strain of war, it has also survived the upheaval of every economic crisis of our history—1819, 1837, 1857, 1873, 1884, 1893, 1903, 1921, and probably the depression of all depressions, 1929.

THIS WAR AND FREE ENTERPRISE

To fight this war we have willingly surrendered some of our liberties and important segments of our free enterprise system that our people might regain and enjoy those freedoms after victory is won. But we must be on the alert every second to make dead certain that nothing is done to prevent that return the first minute possible. That those gally little government gremlins who would do America over, are not given the key to the safe-deposit box of our temporarily trusteed liberties. (I can think of something better to give them.) And that the courage and hopes of our founding fathers are justified.

JOHN ADAMS

That courage and those hopes were given tongue by John Adams when he firmly fixed his signature to the Declaration of Independence. He said, "I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light

and glory. I can see that the end is worth more than all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transactions."

Toil and blood? Yes, for 5 years then the rays of ravishing light and glory at Yorktown, and after that the Constitution. Can you and I of this generation allow those rays of ravishing light and glory to go out? Let's keep them.

Regional Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under date of November 1943 there appeared an article in the Western Metals magazine, written by Elliott Taylor, the Washington editor of the said publication, on the subject of regional economy. The article is well written and most intelligently presents the problems confronting the Pacific coast. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the said article and the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce with reference to Senate Resolution 190, introduced by the Honorable Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, and referred to in Mr. Taylor's editorial:

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Elliott Taylor)

REGIONAL ECONOMY

The practical viewpoint that our so-called national economy is, after all, the result of nothing less than the harmonious interplay of an almost infinite number of local or regional economies is coming to the forefront in Washington consideration of post-war economic planning and policy. During the past few weeks this has been particularly evidenced by the resumption of activity of the McCarran decentralist group, and by the visit to the Pacific coast of Senator O'MAHONEY, representing the Subcommittee on Industrial Reorganization of the George committee on post-war planning and policy.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and Congressman CECIL R. KING, of California, two of the most active legislators in the decentralist group, had the ground laid for their recent meeting prior to the summer recess, and shortly after Congress had reconvened some 50 Members of the House and 30 Senators met to discuss plans that had been prepared in outline during the summer months. The first phase of the program concerns itself with the creation of expanded or new production facilities, particularly iron and steel in those areas of the Nation where natural resources are available to justify their existence. Additional funds will be sought to continue and enlarge the scope of the subsurface mineral survey that was authorized by Congress in June.

Under a resolution passed by the joint group, Senator MCCARRAN was authorized to set up a steering committee for both the House and Senate. At this writing the House steering committee appointments have been made, with JOHN COFFEE, of Washington, chairman, and Congressmen KING, PATMAN, TARVER, MANSFIELD, WINTER, and CASE members. MCCARRAN has announced his intention of filing a resolution in the Senate calling for a select Senate committee to investigate the whole problem of centralized industry and to study plans and proposals for decentralization.

INDUSTRIAL SURVIVAL

While one group of congressmen are concerning themselves with the question of expanding industrial activity into areas that have been held back by the forces of industrial concentration, another and equally farsighted committee is devoting its attention to the matter of what is going to be done with the output of existing plants when the war orders begin to disappear from the books.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the industrial reorganization subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Planning and Policy, has just completed a survey of the industrial areas of the Pacific coast and released a report in which he summarizes the testimony presented in hearings in San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and Tacoma.

Gist of the facts presented is to the unanimous effect that unless farsighted plans are adopted during the war and provisions made for the transition from a war to a peace footing for industry, the post-war set-back to the new industries of the Pacific coast will be sufficient to wipe out all of the advantages that a war-inspired impetus has given them.

Industrially the West has been crowded into the vulnerable position of a two-industry region—the industries being shipbuilding and aviation. The combined population of the five principal Pacific coast cities has increased 15.7 percent in less than 3 years, but in the same period industrial wage earners have increased 208 percent. In terms of aircraft employment the increase has been 1,204.1 percent; and employment in the shipbuilding industry has increased 2,868.3 percent.

POLICY

It is our view that the problem of western industry is one of markets rather than of new industry or industrial expansion at the present time, and that markets will continue in an increasing degree to be the problem after the war. After Uncle Sam ceases to be the prime customer for over 50 percent of all America's industrial output, where will the goods be sold, the manufacture of which are to keep western mills and factories operating, and western pay rolls up?

The question is further complicated by the fact that the end of the war in Europe will see an intensification of effort in the Pacific, clogging railway facilities crowded beyond capacity with the west-bound freight movement, and the resulting demand for an ever-increasing diversion of every ounce of western production capacity to the production of war materials. Preoccupation with this final phase of the war may well preclude the West from making products for, or plans to develop, the new markets that western industry must serve if it is to survive. Meanwhile the industrial East and the Middle West, able to achieve a partial reconversion to peacetime pursuits, will be solidly entrenched.

We believe the time is ripe for Congress to make a statement of policy on the matter of reconversion of industry, and we believe that that policy should be one that envisions the release of all industry from its 100-percent war-production status on the basis of the greatest measure of regional equity that is possible while the war continues.

REPORT NO. 519—INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 190) to investigate the effect of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, after full consideration, without dissent, report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The amendment proposed is as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "$10,000," and insert "$5,000."

One of the important problems presented for the attention of the Congress is the problem of a proper use of our natural resources. This is true not only in relation to post-war planning, where it is a vital factor, but also now, while the war is in progress, because it is important to the conduct of the war.

Much of this country's expansion for war production has ignored such basic factors as the location of resources, and has followed what appears to have been the line of least resistance; that is, augmentation and expansion of facilities already in existence. Whether this policy has prevented the country from reaching its maximum potentialities in various lines of production, and how much this policy has contributed to transportation bottlenecks, are questions of great importance.

These questions, and others proposed for consideration by the committee which this resolution would create, are so broad in scope and embrace so many factors related to the economic development of various sections of the country, and of the country as a whole, that your committee deems it proper they should be the subject of inquiry by a special committee of the Senate.

Of immediate concern is the fact that shortages of scrap, of iron ore, and of steel continue serious. The war needs of the country for steel have been reported as more than 25 percent in excess of production. Yet vast natural resources for steel production remain unexploited.

The following table, based on information furnished by the United States Bureau of Mines, shows one phase of this situation, State by State:

State	Has coal	Has iron ore	Produces iron or steel
Alabama	X	X	X
Arizona	X	X	
Arkansas	X	X	
California	X	X	X
Colorado	X	X	X
Connecticut		X	X
Delaware			
Florida			
Georgia	X	X	X
Idaho	X	X	
Illinois	X		X
Indiana	X		X
Iowa	X	X	
Kansas	X		
Kentucky	X	X	X
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland	X	X	X
Massachusetts		X	X
Michigan	X	X	X
Minnesota		X	X
Mississippi		X	
Missouri	X	X	X
Montana	X	X	
Nebraska			
Nevada	X	X	
New Hampshire			
New Jersey		X	X
New Mexico	X	X	
New York		X	X
North Carolina	X	X	
North Dakota	X		
Ohio	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	
Oregon	X		
Pennsylvania	X	X	X
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota	X	X	
Tennessee	X	X	
Texas	X	X	X
Utah	X	X	X
Vermont			
Virginia	X	X	X
Washington	X	X	X
West Virginia	X	X	
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming	X	X	

It will be noted that known coal deposits are to be found in 32 States, while iron ore in usable quantity and quality is known to

exist in 34 States. Twenty-seven States have both iron ore and coal, but only 13 of these States have any iron or steel production. On the other hand, 7 of the States which now produce iron or steel lack, as a part of their natural resources, either coal or iron ore.

Many States which do produce iron or steel produce so little that their contribution to the total national output is almost inconsiderable. It is a question which should have the attention of the Congress, whether those States whose production now is so small should not, through some coordinated program, be given opportunity to achieve a substantial expansion of this industry, so as to attain whatever place in the national picture should be theirs on the basis of their natural resources.

As to the States which have both iron ore and natural coal deposits, in usable quantity and quality, but which produce no iron or steel, it is a proper subject of inquiry whether any factors other than natural economic laws are hampering or preventing establishment in such States of such facilities for iron and steel production as their natural resources justify.

Centralization of industry can be a self-perpetuating economic factor. To whatever extent it is self-perpetuating, rather than dictated by the more basic factors such as resources, transportation, and labor supply, it is unsound and detrimental to the national economy. The importance, to the Senate, of having the full and true facts regarding this situation, in the United States, is obvious. Such facts are basic to a proper consideration of the problems incident to the post-war planning which is and must be the responsibility of the Congress.

The Senate should have no hesitancy in authorizing a special committee to secure these facts, to study their implications, and to make sound recommendations for dealing with the complicated problems involved. For a proper discharge of its duties, the Senate must have such facts and such recommendations, and it should not be required to rely, in this regard, upon any outside source.

Dedication of the Salisbury-Wicomico County, Md., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dedication of the Salisbury-Wicomico County, Md., Airport, November 11, 1943:

When it was announced August 1, 1941, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration, upon completion of a national survey, had selected Salisbury as one of the cities suitable for an airport, it was my pleasure to convey this information to the officials of the city of Salisbury and Wicomico County.

A meeting of the Salisbury Chamber of Commerce was held in the Wicomico Hotel on June 19, 1941. When the proposition was put before that group of businessmen, stating the object and the future possibilities of such an airport for Salisbury and vicinity, not one voice was raised in opposition.

It was proposed that upon acquisition of a suitable site by the community, the Civil Aeronautics Administration would make allocations of funds from appropriations authorized by Congress for national airport development. The airport would be the class 4 type, the highest of three classifications, having runways 4,500 feet or longer.

At a meeting of the city authorities and county commissioners, held in the courthouse on June 20, 1941, it was decided to purchase a site, and the city and county to jointly sponsor the project.

Announcing the selection of 149 new locations, of which Salisbury was one of 43 of the class 4 type, the Civil Aeronautics Administrator said that no recommendations were made until a thorough survey by airport engineers established the value of the locations to national defense. However, while the airports were selected to meet defense requirements, every effort was made to select sites offering future value to commerce and civil aviation.

The Salisbury-Wicomico Airport, as indicated, is one of the large type of airports in the national airport program, adequate for the largest planes. Landing strips are 500 by 5,000 feet, and runways 150 by 5,000 feet, nearly a mile in length. The original project provided for two runways, but the future possibilities of the Salisbury-Wicomico site in the national program made a third runway essential.

Before the war, the Civil Aeronautics Administration made a Nation-wide survey of airports, and with this serving as a base, a tentative plan was made for a network of 4,000 ports to serve the country. The war caused many changes in the plan. To the present time, approximately $400,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress for the national defense airport development program, which is limited to the development and improvement of sites considered as essential to the war effort, and approved by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce.

At the present time there are almost 3,000 classified airports in the country, either under construction or completed, 1,000 short of the pre-war plan. Recently it has been considered necessary to concentrate upon the larger fields with runways at least 3,500 feet long and capable of handling the largest transport planes. We had 76 such fields 2 years ago. We shall have 865 by the end of this year. This airport is one of that group. The remainder of the 3,000 are the smaller airports, which will be needed for future commercial flying.

The dedication today of this imposing airport marks a new era in the development of this community. Many of us living in this southern section of Maryland may not realize the great achievement already accomplished and what it actually means for our future welfare. This port, one of the largest and best constructed ports in the country now in use or ready for use, is a real asset to the community. As well as being a defense project, it will prove of great value in our business and commercial life.

The air age has come sooner than we expected. Just 40 years ago, the Wright brothers made their first successful flight on a North Carolina beach. We have come a long way in 40 years. In 1918, just 25 years ago, United States Air Mail Service started between Washington and New York; 1918 also marked the beginning of world-wide commercial flying. And what a long way we have come since 1918.

Today, no place on earth is more than 60 hours by plane from this airport. This is how small the world is today because of the airplane. Pilots and crews are flying long-range planes ferrying men and supplies to battle fronts all over the globe. The shortest Atlantic crossing is less than 7 hours flying time. Australia and San Francisco are 35 hours flying time apart. You can hop from the United States, touch Brazil, and come down in Africa in 27 hours flying time. The flying time from New York to London is 17 hours; from New York to Berlin, 20 hours; and from Washington to Moscow, 42 hours.

Today, of course, the global skyways are reserved for war; but after the war, when freedom of the air returns, trade and travel by plane will become as much a part of everyday life as the use of cars, trucks, busses, railroads, and ocean liners. The day is rapidly advancing when a proper airway system will be as necessary as a proper highway system.

Looking forward to post-war development, a bill has been introduced in Congress by Chairman LEA of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which provides for revision of our civil aviation law. It provides for Federal regulation in cooperation with the States and other local agencies—not Federal ownership or operation, but Federal regulation by law. It deals with a Nation-wide zoning program and a national training program for pilots and mechanics, authorized through cooperation with the States.

It is not too soon to begin now to plan for the future place of air transportation in the community life of every American city. It is difficult to conceive of the wonders of aviation demonstrated in this war. Aside from consideration of combat by air power, the use of the plane in transporting men, supplies, and heavy cargo is phenomenal.

It has been estimated that more than 50,000 men have been evacuated by air from combat areas since the war began. They are the sick and wounded of our own and Allied forces and sick and wounded prisoners of war. In the midst of the horrors of war we are happy to learn of the kindly, humane, and efficient care the wounded and sick are receiving by this means. It is indeed a remarkable achievement.

We shall soon have some 3,000,000 men in the Air Forces of the Army and Navy. As expansion continues, the number of men will increase accordingly. More than 300,000 will be trained as pilots. Many more will be skilled as navigators, mechanics, radiomen, airport and maintenance engineers. When peace comes, most of these men will desire to continue in the work for which they have been trained. This great development of aviation will be carried forward and utilized when peace has been established.

I desire to express my sincere appreciation for the fine cooperative spirit shown by our city and county officials, by our representative businessmen, and the community at large in making the airport project a reality. I also wish to express deep appreciation for the fine work of the engineers, contractors, and other employees, whose efforts have so largely contributed to making possible the dedication of this magnificent airport today.

We have assured ourselves a place in the great air transport network in the years to come.

Ohio State Junior Chamber of Commerce Urges Enactment of Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, which was passed last week in Columbus, Ohio, by the Ohio State Junior Chamber of Commerce. This is an organization of businessmen drawn from 46 cities in Ohio:

"The Ohio State Junior Chamber of Commerce recommends the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, as constructive legislation. We believe it to be a forward step for aviation, private and commercial, in that it provides the proper regulation and assistance to further development of traffic by air: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That, on this 14th day of November 1943, the Ohio State Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record as being in favor of the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, and provide that copies of this resolution be sent to the delegation to Congress from Ohio and the Honorable Clarence Lea."

This organization represents the following cities in Ohio: Akron, Alliance, Ashland, Ashtabula, Campbell, Canton, Chillicothe, Cincinnati, Circleville, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Dover, New Philadelphia, East Liverpool, Elyria, Fremont, Galion, Geneva, Girard, Hamilton, Hubbard, Ironton, Kent, Lancaster, Lisbon, London, Lorain, Mansfield, Marietta, Marion, Massillon, Middletown, Newark, Niles, Portsmouth, Ravenna, Salem, Sandusky, Shelby, Springfield, Struthers, Tiffin, Toledo, Warren, Youngstown.

STARLING WILLIAMSON,
Secretary.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARD JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of October 31, 1943, Mr. Zach Lamar Cobb, an attorney of Los Angeles, Calif., made a 5-minute statement over radio station KFAC on the question of whether or not subsidies are necessary to combat inflation. This statement refers particularly to the supply and price of fluid milk in southern California, and contains therein some very pertinent facts in connection therewith. The statement is as follows:

The question before us this evening is whether subsidies are necessary to combat inflation.

First, I am going to cite Thomas Jefferson, the greatest exponent of American democracy, as a witness against the evils which the subsidy system is bringing upon us. Jefferson wrote these words into the Declaration of Independence:

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

If the food producers of this country are permitted to sell their products in the natural course of trade under fair price ceilings to cover cost of production and a legitimate margin of profit, there will be no need for a multitude of new offices, for sending hither among us in Los Angeles, and to every other community in the country, swarms of Government officers to harass our people, nor for having this burden of regimentation to eat out the substance of the food and the food values produced by our people.

Next, I call attention to the present milk situation in Los Angeles. The O. P. A. fixed the milk ceiling price here, according to the Labor Department statistics released June 18 last, at one-half cent lower than in Washington and Kansas City, 1 cent lower than in Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, and from 1½ cents to 3 cents lower than in Providence, New York City, Newark, Rochester, Buffalo, Chicago, and Springfield, Ill., although our Los Angeles cost of production is higher than in any of those cities.

In calling your attention to these facts I ask you to bear in mind that it is the milk consumers, 3,250,000 people in Los Angeles County, who are the sufferers when milk producers cannot get a price sufficient to maintain their herds. Every time herds are liquidated and milk cows are slaughtered, the supply for our people is cut down.

I hold a letter from Dr. L. M. Hurt, Los Angeles County livestock inspector, showing that 43,403 milk cows passed through the Los Angeles and Vernon stockyards for slaughter between January 1 and August 31 of this year.

Now I corroborate the seriousness of this situation by quoting from a letter of Mr. Chester Bowles, of the O. P. A., to Congressman FULMER, dated September 24, 1943, in which he says:

"We are convinced that some assistance must be given to Los Angeles dairymen if they are to maintain their herds in the face of increased feed costs. We are currently drafting amendments to our regulations governing hay and feed-concentrate prices in California. These amendments will provide authority for our San Francisco office to make feed-price adjustments which in its judgment are necessary in order to help alleviate the current squeeze on southern California milk producers.

"We recognize that if the current cost-price relationship in the Los Angeles milkshed continues for an extended period milk production will decline substantially."

Think of this official admission that a "squeeze," and I quote "squeeze," was put on our milk producers as a preliminary to subsidies.

Since the Bowles' letter, Vice President WALLACE has admitted, in his Cleveland address, that we must change our diets to new foods, and reduce the amount of food we eat. This, of course, would be under the prescription of left-wing theorists in Washington. In answer to Mr. WALLACE, I wish to say that would not increase the efficiency of labor, nor their output of war materials, nor would it safeguard resistance to disease in people generally.

In conclusion, I submit that subsidies are not necessary to prevent inflation for these reasons, among others:

1. Subsidies are a fake that only conceal increase in prices, just as the manipulation in hours and overtime are a fake to conceal increase in wages. Such fakery is contrary to American character, and unworthy of our great Nation.

2. The actual cost of foodstuffs is made up by ceiling prices plus subsidies, and not by any false pretense in ceiling prices alone.

3. The actual cost to the consuming public would be higher under ceiling prices plus subsidies than by an equal, open, and honest raise in ceiling prices, because subsidies would be loaded with the added expense of an unnecessary multitude of bureaucrats and Government employees.

4. And lastly, because subsidies, and control of producers and consumers through subsidies, would be destructive of American independence in private enterprise, and a menace to the very liberty of our people.

A Free Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is a land of free speech. The radio constitutes one of the mediums of that privilege. This Government should and will ever maintain a free radio.

I care not for "soap operas," and, according to my information, neither does Mr. James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, whose attitude in this respect has been so ably described in an editorial which I have taken from the Memphis Commercial Appeal under date of November 13, 1943.

He apparently has proposed the enactment of a Federal statute that will extend to him and the Commission the privilege of removing from the air soap operas and other programs which he and the Commission, as the sole arbitrators, might construe as objectionable; thus the Commission could, by the same law, bar from the air broadcasts to my liking or to yours or to that of some other free American citizen, and at the same time deny this medium of advertising to legitimate business.

I submit that the Commission should not be so empowered. After all, Mr. Speaker, this is still a free country. As a part of my remarks, I most respectfully ask that I may include the editorial to which I have referred, as follows:

FLY PLAYS SIR ORACLE

Revealing and enlightening was the spectacle witnessed when James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, appeared before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to demand laws that will drive off the radio such programs as Mr. Fly does not like. Mr. Fly played Sir Oracle and indicated that no loudspeaker should bark unless he had approved of the matter. Who, we wonder, does Mr. Fly think he is? It must be somebody very great and grand, however, when he feels free to set himself up to tell the people whose taxes pay his salary, and by whose sufferance he holds office, what they can and can't listen to on their radio sets.

Mr. Fly is very strict with what he terms "the so-called soap operas" and other programs that he elegantly describes as "drooly." He is apparently impatient with the whole idea of a radio industry supported by advertising, and we believe he is. Mr. Fly's entire conduct since he took office has been that of a man who would prefer to have New Deal control of radio, and nothing has seemed to pain him as much as the spectacle of a free radio making a growing success by businesslike methods. Anyhow, Mr. Fly doesn't like soap operas, so soap operas must go, regardless of the fact that millions on millions of people like them. At our guess, the radio listeners have more sound sense in a minute than Mr. Fly and his mortar board boys have in a month.

Just who Mr. Fly thinks he is puzzles us, as we indicated a moment ago, but we do know precisely what he sounds like. His

entire tone and manner, as well as the content of his oracular pronouncements, sound like dicta from some ministry of propaganda and enlightenment. Mr. Fly would do well to reflect that there is no disputing about tastes in a free country, and to imagine the possibility that soap operas and suchlike may be all right even if he doesn't like them.

American radio has its faults and has made its errors, as the people in the business know a lot better than Mr. Fly could tell them. At the same time, American radio is far and away the best in the world in service, efficiency, and entertainment. Heaven help the people of this country if the radio ever becomes a tool in the hands of men like Mr. Fly. Mr. Fly's move to be made the policeman of radio morals ought to be resisted to the last gulp of a soap opera.

Petroleum Resources Are Drained—Secretary Ickes Answers Leon Henderson—Price Increase Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and excerpts from a radio address by Leon Henderson:

OCTOBER 25, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator,
Petroleum Administration for War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ICKES: As a citizen of the East coast, a Member of Congress, and as chairman of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I have been much interested in the oil problem. All the information I have had indicates that there is a shortage of known oil reserves and, too, that the present rate of use surpasses the present supply. Your statements before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, at which I was present, appear to verify and support my understanding.

I have been much concerned over a statement made by Leon Henderson, former Price Administrator, regarding the oil supply. Mr. Henderson, as you undoubtedly know, is employed as a commentator for the O'Sullivan Rubber Co., Inc., of Winchester, Va. On his broadcast of September 25, he made certain startling charges.

I am enclosing excerpts from this broadcast which I believe to be particularly pertinent. They are, however, so contradictory to those you have made that I felt it necessary to present them to you and ask for an official statement in order that I may make proper replies to my constituents who are writing for an explanation.

You will be interested, I feel sure, to know that the Mines and Mining Committee of the House today unanimously reported H. R. 3209, with amendments, which provides for the establishment and operation of demonstration plants for the production of gasoline and liquid fuels from coal and other substances. This legislation, sponsored by myself, and a similar bill by Senator O'MAHONEY in the other body will, in my opinion, need the immediate and favorable attention of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I am gratified to learn from your letter of October 25 that the Mines and Mining Committee of the House of Representatives has unanimously reported H. R. 3209 with amendments, which bill provides for the establishment and operation of demonstration plants for the production of gasoline and liquid fuels from coal and other substances. This brings us one step nearer the enactment of legislation which I consider essential to the fuel economy of the Nation. You are, of course, familiar with my endorsement of S. 1243, a Senate bill which is similar to H. R. 3209. I desire to repeat again my endorsement of this legislation.

It is quite true that we are faced with a shortage of crude oil supply. The discovery and development of new crude oil reserves has not kept pace with the mounting demands of the armed forces and essential civilian requirements for petroleum products. The cold hard facts indicate that by the end of 1944 we shall require the importation from foreign sources of approximately 300,000 barrels of crude oil daily to meet the projected demand for petroleum products at that time. Obviously, in the face of these facts, all possible steps should be taken to augment the Nation's petroleum supply. H. R. 3209 is a desirable step in that direction.

I am having an analysis made of the statements published by Mr. Leon Henderson in his broadcast of September 25, which you forwarded with your letter. You will hear further from me with respect to that matter.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH K. DAVIES,
Acting Petroleum Administrator for War.

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: This is in further reply to your letter of October 25 transmitting excerpts from a recent broadcast by Mr. Leon Henderson with respect to certain oil matters. I can well understand your concern over his statements. They illustrate again the dangers inherent in public comment on oil by persons who either do not know the true facts or have made no effort to learn them.

Mr. Henderson jumbles naked inaccuracies and half-truths to give a completely unreal picture of the supply of petroleum products available for consumption in the Eastern States. On September 25—the date of his broadcast—the facts with respect to stocks of heating oil and gasoline in district 1 (the East Coast States) were these: Stocks of gasoline were 71.1 percent of what they were in 1942, stocks of kerosene were 91.6 percent, stocks of distillate fuels were 74 percent of their comparable 1942 levels, and stocks of residual fuels—so vital to eastern wartime industrial activity—were 105.1 percent of 1942 stocks of that product. On October 30, district 1 stocks of gasoline were 82.9 percent of 1942 levels, kerosene stocks were 85.4 percent, distillate fuels were at a level of 87.5 percent of 1942 stocks, and residual fuel stocks were 112.6 percent of what they were in 1942.

Moreover, these statistics do not tell the complete story. During the 1943–44 winter season, as a result of the intense efforts of the oil industry, the Petroleum Administration for War, and the Office of Defense Transportation, there will be more and better transportation facilities available to move petroleum products into and within the east coast region. We expect to provide no less heating oil in the east coast area this winter than was provided last winter. In view of the improved transportation situation we confidently expect to better last winter's performance.

Mr. Henderson says that a Baruch committee on oil might find that the oil industry really runs the Petroleum Administration. Neither a Baruch committee nor any other kind of committee will find that to be a fact. Since its inception the Petroleum Administration for War, through its system of Nation-wide industry committees, has utilized the resources of the oil industry to gather facts and data on wartime oil problems and has sought the recommendations and advice of men who have spent their lives in the oil industry in the solution of these problems. The final decisions made—the ultimate orders issued—have always been the responsibility of the Petroleum Administration for War as a Government agency. We take pride in the record made by the partnership between the oil industry and Government which has marked the course of our joint efforts.

Mr. Henderson states that at least 16 of the top Government officials who control oil are connected with leading oil companies. I do not know what Mr. Henderson means by the term "leading oil companies." However, the fact with respect to this matter is simply this: Out of 28 men occupying executive positions in the Petroleum Administration for War, 12 were previously connected with major oil companies, as the term is used in the reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee (of which Mr. Henderson was a member), 16 were drawn from other sources, including minor oil companies, petroleum equipment manufacturers, other governmental agencies, etc.

It is not true that the Petroleum Administration for War recently made an attempt to increase the industry control or that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice stopped it because it was too much like a cartel. The fact is that the Department of Justice has never disapproved a program we have submitted to that agency.

A substantial portion of Mr. Henderson's remarks are devoted to the subject of a crude-oil price increase. I do not know whether it is true, as he says, that more pressure was put upon him when he was Price Administrator to raise the price of crude oil than he had ever experienced before in his life, or whether he could or could not see any factual basis for raising the price of crude oil, or whether the oil bloc in Congress—if in fact there is such a thing—is getting set to put on more pressure for an increase in the price of crude petroleum, or whether the Congressmen—names and number unknown—threaten to pass some legislation if the administrative agencies do not see their way clear to raising the price of crude or whether certain secret testimony taken before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will, if made public, refute a lot of the arguments made for higher prices. These are statements which are within Mr. Henderson's own knowledge—assuming, of course, that he has taken more pains to verify them than he has the other statements made in his broadcast.

The facts with respect to a crude-oil price increase are these: After the Office of Price Administration rejected the original recommendation for an average crude-oil-price increase of 35 cents a barrel, the matter was submitted to Judge Vinson, the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, for his consideration. On October 29, Judge Vinson advised that he did not approve this recommendation. In his statement Judge Vinson indicated that he believed that the problem of meeting the crude-oil shortage might be solved by taking certain other steps short of an over-all crude-oil price increase.

Judge Vinson has been advised that pursuant to his direction, and in cooperation with the petroleum industry, an effort will

be made to determine what plan or program, if any, other than a general price increase, might be designed to meet the problem which we face. We have taken the position consistently that a general price increase would, in the absence of any tested or tried alternative, be the most practical and best financial device for minimizing the risk of crude-oil shortages in this country.

A crude-oil price increase would go, not alone to the wildcatter who discovered new oil fields, but also to the operator of the so-called stripper well. These wells represent a major portion of the wells now producing in the United States, and a price increase would serve to postpone the day of their abandonment. Likewise, a price increase would serve to stimulate the drilling of so-called marginal locations.

It is only a half truth to say that "exploration isn't falling behind." The fact is that, irrespective of the increase in the number of wildcat wells drilled, less oil is being discovered than ever before. At the same time, consumption of petroleum products is rising in astronomical quantities.

The statement that "every year for 5 years the amount of oil known to be in the ground has been higher than the year before" is likewise a dangerous half truth. It is true that estimates of reserves, made when a particular field was first discovered, are constantly being revised—in many cases upwards. But this is merely finding petroleum with a pencil and not with a drill bit. However, after all such calculations, the fact remains that we face a crude-oil shortage. By the end of 1944, we shall have a deficiency in crude-oil supply of approximately 300,000 barrels a day. We shall be forced to rely upon importations from foreign sources if we are to meet the projected demands for petroleum products at this time.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

EXCERPTS FROM RADIO ADDRESS BY LEON HENDERSON

It looks to me as if there would be all kinds of news about oil this winter.

In the first place, the supply situation in the East is none too favorable. Deliveries are picking up but stocks of heating oil and gasoline are 30 to 35 percent below last year, and you will recall that there was constant trouble about shortages all last winter. Already the New England States are concerned.

It doesn't look as if the East would get an increase in gasoline for passenger cars for some time.

The oil bloc in Congress is getting set to put on more pressure for an increase in the price of crude petroleum. Ickes has asked O. P. A. for a 35-cents-a-barrel increase a couple of times and has been turned down. He has appealed to Fred Vinson to overrule O. P. A. The Congressmen are talking of anywhere from 60 to 75 cents a barrel increase and threaten to pass some legislation if the administrative agencies do not see their way clear to raising the price.

Ickes has been asking Jimmy Byrnes to take price control and rationing away from O. P. A. and give it to him, but so far Ickes couldn't prove to Byrnes' satisfaction that his organization could run the rationing.

The whole situation is something like rubber was earlier in the war, and I hear Baruch may be asked to make a study. The subject is full of dynamite and politics, but some of the politicians are getting interested on the side of the consumer and may break some stories wide open.

The Naval Affairs Committee of the House took testimony in secret some time ago and has now decided to make the hearings public. Some of the facts are sensational and will refute a lot of the arguments made for higher prices.

I had a lot to do with oil when I was Price Administrator and I've tried to keep informed. Here are some of my observations made now on my own responsibility.

In the first place, certain eastern Congressmen know that oil supplies could have been larger. Now they are trying to find out what happened. A few weeks back there was at least 80,000 barrels per day that could have been brought in by barges and pipe lines, I am told.

Now as to prices. I never had any more pressure put on me in my life than I had as Price Administrator to raise the price of crude. I never could see any factual basis for raising the price, and evidently my successors haven't either. The profits of oil companies have been higher every year of the war than the year previous.

The argument is usually made that we need more oil well discoveries, and a higher price would get it. I figure it would cost over a million dollars a day to raise the price 25 cents a barrel. But the increase wouldn't go to the wildcatter who discovers wells. It would go to those who own the wells which are producing now. I admit we need more oil reserves, but I suggested paying bonuses to those who actually did the exploration.

Exploration isn't falling behind. Every year for 5 years the amount of oil known to be in the ground has been higher than the year before. Last year more pools were discovered than ever before, and this year more wells will be drilled than last year. And next year there ought to be more steel for drilling wells, which has been a handicap for a couple of years.

A Baruch committee on oil might find that the oil industry really runs the Petroleum Administration. There is no other commodity in which the industry participates so directly in governmental war controls. Recently, I understand, an attempt was made to increase the industry control, but the Antitrust Division stopped it, because it was too much like a cartel. At least 16 of the top Government officials who control oil are connected with leading oil companies. The industry has wanted to keep its competitive relationships just as they were before the war, and the oil officials who act as Government officers have tried to preserve this status, which policy no other industry has got from government.

It may be here that some of the difficulty rests.

Over the Back Fence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Charles H. Bartlett, a distinguished newspaperman in my district. Mr. Bartlett wields a facile pen and I agree with him in the views which he expresses in this article. I hope he continues to write on these national problems. He has a wide audience especially in my district and I know the people have respect for his views.

The article follows:

OVER THE BACK FENCE
(By C. H. Bartlett)

I am, I believe, just an average citizen of the United States. Here I've lived my humble life. Here are my friends. Here when my days are finished is where I want to die. The only people I know are common people. Lords, dukes, and earls are beyond my ken. Of them I know less than nothing. And worthily or not, thus may it ever be.

I had a shock the other night when a speaker said I ought to commence thinking of myself as a citizen of the world. I don't like this. I say so while it still is my privilege. I don't want to be a citizen of the world, and I'm not going to be as long as I can help it. And the world-planners might as well understand right now that there are millions of dwellers here in the hinterland who feel the same as I do.

My views may be limited and my views provincial, but on occasion I have climbed the mountain top and have gazed afar, and liking little of what I saw, have returned to the foothills where abide the peace and contentment which men eternally seek, and finding, too often fail to recognize and keep.

Always have I been proud that it was my privilege to be a citizen of the United States. I have never met a man so low that he denied this heritage. Among common people such men do not exist. I have exulted in the glorious history of this, my country. I have been proud of its humble birth and of its constant progress toward an honorable maturity; proud of a country that has stood for liberty and equality, freedom, and justice—perhaps not in the fullest degree, but far exceeding anything offered elsewhere; certainly, beyond our ability to properly appreciate and enjoy; and sorrowfully, beyond our understanding to safeguard and defend.

I was taught in the public schools that our grandfathers left Europe and its intrigue; left England, France, and Spain, and came to this new land to escape oppression and persecution; and that here they purposed to build a new life and establish a new government based on principles of decency and honor.

I was taught that the founding fathers were God-fearing men of vision and courage; and that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, if not of divine origin, are very close indeed to this source of Holy Writ. I was taught that they bled and died at Lexington and Concord; starved, froze, and prayed at Valley Forge; battled the Hessians at Trenton and the Redcoats at Yorktown to wrest this land of opportunity from the oppressor and hold it safe for future generations to develop and enjoy.

I think my country has been a tremendous success, measured by any yardstick, by any norm or gage. I know that the citizens of our country, even in humble circumstances, have living standards elsewhere unapproached. Our soldiers in near and far areas of the globe and on its seven seas testify daily to this fact in their letters home. They see new country; they measure all it has to offer, and they long incessantly for the best they've left behind.

England, supreme on her island, with a background of opportunity appraised by the centuries, is far short of our standards; her government of her colonies has been a failure, and all the world knows it; the loyalty of her dominions is measured by their own self-interest, and I don't blame them. If England has learned a thing about colonial management since 1776, the record doesn't show it.

For 200 years, smart people have been leaving Europe by first boat and coming over here where they can worship God and do a lot of other things pretty much as they please—or could before we let ourselves be pushed, hauled, coaxed, and bullyragged into the awful hell of two world wars; over here where they can pursue happiness when they feel like it, which is frequent, and practice the art of earning a living, when necessary, with less effort and more reward. They, too, have been proud to become foster-citizens of

this great land of ours, which in its worst moments excels anything in the whole European grab-bag of nations at their best.

Europe can put its own house in order when Europe wants to do so. The pattern is plain. Observance of a little unselfishness by a few nations will unlock the door. Here in the American hemisphere is a glorious example of how it is done. We teach them to live in peace with honor whenever, with sincerity, they are ready to learn.

The world is not looking to the United States for leadership, regardless of eminent proclamations to this effect. The only thing the world is looking to the United States for is "suckership," and surely we have played out this role.

On all fronts we shall continue the successful prosecution of this horrible conflict, and we shall cooperate with our allies until victory is complete and our boys are home. All have promised cooperation in establishing an international organization to insure world peace and security. Noble words have been spoken, and the hearts of the nations of the world are in tune. But noble words were spoken 25 years ago, and the world then cried for peace with a single voice.

I am just an average citizen, a dweller in the hinterland. And until Europe shows more evidence of sincere repentance than is today apparent, I don't want to become a citizen of its kind of world. It has nothing to offer which appeals to a common man.

I see nothing but ruin for my country in bartering its birthright for another mess of pottage, in becoming a life partner of a Europe which, I suspect, continues to subscribe in general to the same senseless practices which our forefathers came here to escape.

Montana Has Remembered the "Helena"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, Montana has remembered the U. S. S. *Helena*, sunk in Kula Gulf by the Japanese. I am happy to report to the Congress the results of the recent War bond campaign in my State. During that drive Montana led the Nation in per capita purchases of E, F, and G bonds. Our average for every man, woman, and child was $38.13, which was $14.53 above the national average.

Yes, Montana has remembered, as always, her duty to the country. In resources, money, and in manpower she ranks well up in the forefront of contributions to the welfare of the Nation. We have never shirked our responsibilities and we never will. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Helena Independent of November 11, 1943, and an editorial from the same paper on November 12, 1943:

[From the Helena Independent of November 11, 1943]

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY LED MONTANA IN THIRD LOAN DRIVE—PER CAPITA SALES IN THIS COMMUNITY AVERAGED $147.22

Lewis and Clark County, where per capita sales were $147.22, led Montana to its top ranking nationally in purchasing War bonds during the Third War Loan Drive, Chairman A. T. Hibbard, of the State war finance committee, said today in a final report.

(The Treasury Department reported Monday that Montanans bought more bonds per capita during the drive than did residents of any other State. The Treasury State average for E, F, and G bonds was $38.13.)

Meagher County, where the per capita sales were $133.89, was second, and Cascade County, third, with per capita sales of $130.05.

Per capita sales of War bonds in other counties during the drive included: Custer, $82.95; Flathead, $60.90; Missoula, $86.62; Fergus, $82.61; Silver Bow, $82.61; Gallatin, $80.29; Park, $60.05; and Yellowstone, $93.81.

While the Treasury's announcement listed per capita sales of E, F, and G bonds only, the county-by-county per capita sales figures listed by Chairman Hibbard included all issues of bonds. For all issues, the State's per capita sales amounted to $82.89.

In E bond sales, Daniels County was best with a per capita of $68.44. Chouteau County was a close second with $67.68.

Montana "made a brilliant record," Hibbard said, with total sales of $41,039,376, and with every county exceeding its goal.

Men and women of Montana serving in the armed forces throughout the world invested $505,000 in bonds during the drive, the Treasury informed Hibbard.

"The objective of the Montana campaign of raising funds to replace Montana's cruiser, *Helena*, has been fully met," the chairman concluded.

[From the Helena Independent of November 12, 1943]

MONTANANS CITED

Montanans have received a very high citation for their bond-buying activities. Throughout the third war loan we were credited with buying more E bonds per capita than most States. In fact, we led the parade right up to the last and then were nosed out for first place by a narrow margin.

Now, we appear to have been awarded a blue ribbon for per capita purchases of E, F, and G bonds. Our official average is $38.13 for every man, woman, and child in the State. That is $14.53 above the national average.

We expect another honor shortly. Navy Secretary Knox has informed Governor Ford that the next cruiser to go down the ways probably will be named the *Helena*. She will replace the cruiser sunk in the south Pacific. Montanans entered the third war loan campaign with the understanding that their quota of $35,000,000 would be used for a new cruiser. So Treasure State people purchased more than $41,000,000 in bonds. We shall be mightily proud of that new cruiser.

A summary of our livestock, grain, and mine production leads to the conclusion Montanans are holding up their end of the home-front effort. When we add the citation for bond buying, we think we are within the sphere of modesty in claiming a very fine all-around record.

City of Worcester, Mass., Urges Passage of Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the junior Senator from Massachusetts by the mayor of Worcester, Mass., recommending passage of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Worcester, Mass., November 6, 1943.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inasmuch as Worcester has a vital interest in airport development and the air lines are striving for the full cooperation of the Federal Government in that development, I urge you to give whatever support you are able to H. R. 3420, known as the civil aviation bill.

I believe it is adequately designed to provide what is needed in the way of Federal control of civil air activities, while at the same time setting up machinery which would be beneficial to Worcester.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. BENNETT, *Mayor.*

Abolish the War Relocation Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the dastardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the Army, under the direction of Maj. Gen. John L. DeWitt, then commander of the Ninth Corps Area, performed an excellent job in rounding up and segregating all Japanese in the Pacific coast area. Later, the War Relocation Authority was organized and the custody of these Japanese was transferred to it. From that time to the present the handling of Japanese segregation has progressively deteriorated until it reached a climax in the disgraceful and unfortunate reign of terror at Tule Lake, Calif.

More than 15,000 of these Japanese continue to manifest their disloyalty, while other thousands cloak such disloyalty under a craftiness peculiar to themselves and which is little understood by people who have not lived in the same communities with them. People living in the eastern part of these United States little appreciate the problems involved with these Japanese. As a result the War Relocation Authority has pursued a policy that has encouraged the opportunity for display of their disloyalty.

The War Relocation Authority should be abolished. All Japanese internees should be immediately placed under the jurisdiction of the Army. The Army will provide wholesome food, adequate housing, and proper clothing and will administer their supervision in a manner that will prevent any future recurrence of the riots that have occurred at the Japanese Relocation Center at Tule Lake, Calif.

An editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner so ably presents the almost unanimous views of

our Pacific coast citizens, that I include it herewith as a part of this statement:

ABOLISH THE WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

The War Relocation Authority has been temporarily superseded by the United States Army at the Tule Lake Japanese Relocation Center in California, and should be permanently supplanted.

Recurring riots at this place of segregation for thousands of avowedly disloyal Japanese have been the plague of the War Relocation Authority, and its responsibility.

The riots are, of course, an offense to the patriotic sense of the American people.

But the incompetence and dereliction of the War Relocation Authority offend the intelligence and menace the security of the American people.

These responsible—or rather irresponsible—authorities futilely sought to conceal the facts about the dangerous situation at Tule Lake from the public by stupidly denying them.

They even went so far as to assert that all reports of trouble were "the product of deliberately subversive efforts by German agents."

But when their policy of concealment failed, they belatedly acknowledged what the public already knew to be the truth.

And when their coddling policies in dealing with the Japanese failed to keep the peace among the Japanese, they were compelled to seek protection of their own precious skins by the Army.

The War Relocation Authority is sufficiently indicted by these facts, and by its own accusing record, to warrant its dissolution by Congress—as measures now pending before Congress would provide.

It has always been an inept and vacillating agency.

Now it is revealed to be an unreliable and untrustworthy agency.

There could be no reasonable or acceptable explanation for deliberate suppression of the facts about the Tule Lake situation.

The only purpose such suppression could serve would be to prevent the American people from knowing the facts, and thus to prevent the people from knowing about the War Relocation Authority's continuing ineptness and glaring incompetence.

The Army should not be held back as an ace in the hole, to be used only in the event the War Relocation Authority finds itself in a dangerous situation as a result of its policy of coddling the Japanese.

It was the Army, with the able assistance and complete cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which had the vision and courage to eliminate the Japanese as a menace on the Pacific coast at the outbreak of war.

It was the Army and the Federal Bureau of Investigation which prevented the harrowing and destructive campaign of sabotage and espionage for which the thousands of Japanese residents in the United States had long prepared.

All that the War Relocation Authority has accomplished has been to restore opportunities for sabotage and espionage to thousands of assertedly loyal Japanese, and to segregate the admittedly disloyal Japanese in circumstances conducive of riots and actually productive of riots.

The War Relocation Authority has impaired the security of the United States by its policy toward the Japanese.

It has been delinquent in its own responsibilities.

It has outraged the natural sentiments of the people of the United States.

It has not even won the respect of the Japanese it coddled.

Why not turn this ominous situation back to the Army, which knows the character and intentions and capacities of the Japanese as mischief-makers, which frustrated and thwarted them at the start of the war, and which is the only agency of the Government competent to frustrate and thwart them permanently?

Thanksgiving in a Foxhole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Roland P. Wirths:

THANKSGIVING IN A FOXHOLE

(By Roland P. Wirths)

Today I heard a doughboy pray
In a desert foxhole, far away,
Where life is cheap and death is living
And every day is his Thanksgiving.
"Today, dear God, we give our thanks
In foxholes, trenches, planes, and tanks,
For there's so much to be thankful for
Despite the bitter pangs of war.
We're thankful for the chaplain's prayer
While shells are bursting everywhere,
And for the courage, faith, and truth
That guides our country's fighting youth.
We're thankful for the words of cheer
From all the friends we love so dear,
And for the flag for which we fight
Which symbolizes, 'right is might.'
We thank Thee for our daily bread,
The strength that helps us forge ahead,
And for Thy Word, that keeps alive
The faith that freedom will survive.
We're thankful for the starlit nights,
The folks at home, our Bill of Rights,
The hills of home we know so well—
The valleys, where our mem'ries dwell."
And then a tear rolled down his cheek;
He raised his eyes, but did not speak,
The hour had come to strike again
With flaming gun, and a hushed 'Amen,'
For this is the man that fights for me
In a foxhole-church across the sea
Where Thanksgiving rises with the sun,
And carries on till day is done.

War Bond Sales at Pine Bluff Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORRELL: It gives me great pleasure to extend to you a personal invitation to be present at the ceremony marking the award of the Treasury Department Minuteman flag to Pine Bluff Arsenal in recognition of the fact that the military and civilian personnel of this arsenal have subscribed more than 10 percent of their total salaries to the War Bond campaign and that more than 90 percent of all the personnel of this arsenal are purchasing bonds by pay-roll deductions.

This ceremony will take place on Friday, November 19, at 2 p. m. at the Administration Building, Pine Bluff Arsenal. The ceremony will be a simple one, lasting not over half an hour. The award will be made by Maj. Gen. Richard Donovan, commanding general, Eighth Service Command. As an incidental feature of the ceremony the Army-Navy E award flag, with star marking the renewal of this award for a 6-months' period, will be hoisted for the first time.

Kindly inform me whether or not you will be able to accept this invitation, and if you will arrive by train, let me know the place and time of your arrival so that I may provide transportation to bring you to the arsenal. If you arrive by private car, please present the enclosed invitation to the guard at any of the arsenal gates and he will direct you to the headquarters building. It is hoped that you will arrive not later than 1:45 p. m. on the day of the award.

In accordance with instructions from the War Department, there will be no social events connected with this ceremony.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. PRENTISS,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Commanding.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1943.

Brig. Gen. A. M. PRENTISS,
Commanding Officer, Pine Bluff Arsenal,
Pine Bluff, Ark.

DEAR GENERAL PRENTISS: Thank you for your kind letter of November 8 extending a personal invitation to me to be present at the presentation of the Treasury Department's Minuteman T flag to the employees of Pine Bluff Arsenal on November 19, 1943, at 2 p. m., as an incidental feature of which ceremony the Army-Navy E award flag with star marking the renewal of the award for a 6-month period, will be hoisted for the first time.

I am most grateful for your thoughtfulness and regret that circumstances are such that it will not be possible for me to attend. Since it is not possible, I should like, through you as commanding officer of the great Pine Bluff Arsenal to extend my heartiest congratulations to you and the employees of the arsenal and my very genuine gratification for this recognition of the patriotism of these splendid men and women.

Sincerely,

W. F. NORRELL.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PINE BLUFF ARSENAL,
Pine Bluff, Ark., November 13, 1943.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORRELL: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your cordial letter of November 11, 1943, advising me that it will not be possible for you to attend the exercises at Pine Bluff Arsenal on November 19, 1943, and regret the circumstances are such that you cannot be with us on that occasion.

I deeply appreciate the kind sentiments you express in your letter with respect to the achievement of the employees of this arsenal, as regards both their war-production and bond-subscription efforts. It is indeed gratifying to me and the Chemical Warfare Service to know that the employees of Pine Bluff Arsenal are contributing their dollars as well as their sweat to help their country reach the victorious goal of this war.

I also wish to take this occasion to express to you the pride and satisfaction of the Chemical Warfare Service that we have been able to take untrained agricultural citizens of Arkansas and put them into a highly organized manufacturing establishment and

convert them almost overnight to effective, industrial workers. Not only is this conversion in itself a problem, but in addition, these workers have been brought under many new rules and regulations which govern Government agencies, which they perhaps would not have had to cope with had this arsenal been a commercial manufacturing establishment. That they have been able to adapt themselves to this new work and environment and have produced such splendid results reflects great credit upon their capabilities and patriotism.

With cordial personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

A. M. PRENTISS,
Brigadier General,
United States Army, Commanding.

Lea Civil Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and letter:

DALLAS, TEX., *November 13, 1943.*
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am sending you air-mail special-delivery letter in support Lea aviation bill. Appreciate your consideration of reasons set forth.

HOWARD N. SMITH,
Chairman, Texas Private Fliers Association.

TEXAS PRIVATE FLIERS ASSOCIATION,
Dallas, Tex., November 15, 1943.
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Representative, First Congressional District, Washington,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAGNUSON: As chairman of the Private Fliers Association of Texas, I would like to acquaint you with my views on the Lea civil-aviation bill (H. R. 3420). This bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The bill is the best legislation for the development and promotion of private flyers which I have ever seen. I have heard that some rumors have been spread that this bill will hurt private flying. These rumors are so far from the truth and the bill is so important to private aviation, that I want to write you about it and point out some of its very excellent features. It is just what private flying has needed for many years.

You probably know that the airplane can be used for a great many things, especially out here in the West. Its biggest use will be in flying for pleasure and for private business use. But it will also be used, aside from the commercial transportation, for many other things such as cattle herding, pipe-line patrol work, crop dusting, sales and contact work, ambulance flying, etc.

During the war, for obvious reasons, the ordinary private flyer has been restricted in the flying he can do. Since we all want to win the war we are not complaining but in normal times conditions are very different, and, in the great development of aviation which will come after this war, every pilot and every aircraft owner is going to be interested in being as free as reasonably possible to use aviation in scores of ways.

Aviation cannot be used, however, by the ordinary small operator or private pilot unless he is able to fly from place to place and State to State without undue restriction. Even in a State as big as Texas there are very few, if any, private fliers who will not frequently have to fly long distances and into other States, both for the fun of it and in order to earn a livelihood.

There is where the Lea bill comes in. That bill makes a Federal safety regulation applicable everywhere on a uniform basis. These safety regulations are very strict for commercial transportation, but for ordinary private aviation they simply require a pilot's license, a proper certificate showing that the aircraft is airworthy, certain "rules of the road," and things of that sort.

One thing we private fliers have always been afraid of is that the different States might begin requiring observance of different regulations from one State to another. In fact, from experience in the case of automobiles and highway transportation, we can expect that sooner or later railroad commissions or other State regulatory bodies may devise different laws and regulations to be applied in different States for air navigation. There have already been some cases where differences have appeared in different State regulations. In fact, while many people have been trying to get uniform State laws and regulations for the last 15 or 20 years, we just don't have uniformity today.

Therefore, unless Congress takes some action the private flyer is going to be faced with a condition where he will not fly from his home to another State without running the risk of getting caught by some State law or regulation that he does not know about.

Since all of us private flyers have to know about and abide by the Federal regulations in any event it would become extremely burdensome if we also had to find out about all kinds of State regulations every time we might want to make a flight through a few neighboring States. We aren't lawyers and we can't afford to carry lawyers along in the cockpit. We think that if we abide by the Federal safety regulations with which we have all been familiar since they were first adopted back in 1926, that that should be enough.

The Lea bill makes it clear that the Federal regulations will apply through all air navigation. Under it all of us will know what rules the other fellow is following. In addition, the bill provides, in section 802, that there will not be any other regulations which will burden or impair uniformity of air navigation from one State to another.

The bill definitely does not make regulations of the private flyers any more complicated. It just takes the provisions of the present Federal law, clarifies them in some respects which are desirable, and makes sure that they will apply elsewhere and that conditions will be uniform when we want to fly from one State to another.

We know that there must be proper regulations of all commercial flying to prevent chaotic and cut-throat competition.

The Lea bill will help the small operator by making sure that when he gets a Federal license he can operate within the limits of that license without having to acquire licenses in the different States in his area.

While the points I have mentioned are the most important from the standpoint of the private flyer, the Lea bill does have a number of other provisions which are a great step forward. It is the first bill ever proposed which definitely provides for encouraging and promoting private flying as a national policy. Other legislation has always concentrated on commercial air transportation because it had to be fostered, and the Government had to get it on its feet.

The Lea bill directs the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to assist the States in encouraging private flying clubs and other organizations of that character, promoting aviation education, keeps the civilian pilot training program from coming to an end, provides for a real airport-development program in which the States and municipalities are to have a chance to cooperate, and directs the Civil Aeronautics Commission to make recommendations to the insurance agency in the various States with the view of improving our insurance situation. These and other provisions of the bill should be a tremendous help to all of private aviation.

This letter is pretty long, but I just want to get across to you, as well as I can, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has turned out a wonderful proposal for civil aviation. It is greatly needed. It is constructive, and it will do more than anything else that has been talked about to make some of the rosy promises about post-war civil aviation development really come true.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD N. SMITH, *Chairman.*

Unveiling of Service Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the occasion of the unveiling of the fourteenth ward, city of Milwaukee, service memorial:

Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, we are gathered this afternoon to pay homage and tribute to the women and men of the fourteenth ward who are in the armed services of our country. We are not gathered here as Democrats, Progressives, Republicans or Socialists but rather as Americans. We meet here as relatives, friends, and neighbors of the women and men we honor today.

Having lived in the fourteenth ward for more than 33 years I have had the privilege and pleasure of growing up with and knowing many of the girls and boys in the services as well as their parents. Many of them are my personal friends and former schoolmates. These boys and girls are real persons to us all.

The women and men we honor today are giving their all on many fronts in this global war. Some of them may never come back. They are rendering distinguished service to their country. Almost daily one or several of them are singled out for valor and bravery in action. They are proving themselves worthy of their heritage. Their mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts, sisters and brothers, are justly proud of them. All that these worthy daughters and sons of America ask of us is that we continue to do our part.

The news from the war fronts has been very good during the past several weeks. We are making definite progress. Our forces are making substantial gains in many theaters of the war. This has given rise to a spirit of over-optimism at home which is dangerous. During my stay in town I have heard many persons express confidence that the war in Europe will end before Christmas and that then it will be but a few months and the Japs too will be licked. I pray to the Lord Almighty that these predictions may be true. The day of decisive and complete victory

cannot come too soon for any of us. However, according to the statements of the men who have all the facts of the war's progress, the day of victory is not yet at hand. To avoid disappointment and insure a constant drive to victory we must be prepared for any eventuality. We must be prepared for a long struggle. We cannot for a moment allow ourselves to slacken our pace until our forces march victoriously into Berlin and Tokyo. For the most part, particularly in Milwaukee, labor and industry are doing a magnificent job. There must be no stoppages or slowdowns—there must be a constant increase of momentum until final victory.

We must be prepared to face many inconveniences and sacrifices. Our inconveniences and sacrifices at home can never equal those of the men in the armed services; however there is no reason why we should not strive to approach them.

When our women and men in the armed forces have completed their job of wiping out the Axis Powers we still have two big jobs ahead of us: One, to insure a lasting peace by providing some instrument of international collaboration to prevent a recurrence of the living hell our men are now enduring; second, we must assure each of our men gainful employment upon his return to civilian life.

Never again can we allow ourselves to be deluded into believing we can keep out of war by cutting ourselves off from the rest of the world. As the greatest and most powerful nation in the world we owe a responsibility to civilization and to ourselves to assume the obligation that comes with greatness. We know now that we cannot remain at peace while chaos exists in other parts of the world. We must profit from our repeated unfortunate experience in one generation. We must not err again.

We are told that the principal concern of the boys at the fronts is to get back to their jobs when victory is won. They do not want "made jobs." They want real work that will permit them to earn their living, lead a normal life, and become a part of their respective communities. It is, therefore, important that we cooperate in post-war planning that will afford each serviceman gainful employment upon his return home.

Each and everyone of us knows what his job is in this crisis and the part he is to play in its successful execution. Beyond the erection of memorials we still have much to do if we are to keep faith with the women and men we honor today. They are doing their part. We must not let them down. We shall not let them down.

Aeronautic Association of Boston, Mass., Recommends Passage of Lea Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Aeronautic Association of Boston at its November meeting, endorsed the provisions of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, now pending on the House Calendar. The following letter from the executive secretary of the association has been received by the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

AERONAUTIC ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON,
Boston, Mass., November 9, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the regular monthly meeting today of the directors and committee chairman of the Aeronautics Association of Boston it was voted to approve in principle the bill H. R. 3420, and this is to officially advise you of this fact.

Very truly yours,

H. AINSLEY HIGHMAN,
Executive Secretary.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a radio speech by Mayor La Guardia in connection with subsidies:

INCREASE IN LIVING COST

Let's get back to something that's very important and very serious. Enforcing ceiling prices, of course, is necessary and I do not know what would happen if we did not do it. Residents of New York City are given better protection in food prices than in any other city of the country. We will continue to do everything within our power to provide this necessary protection. There is, though, something more fundamental that must be studied. There is one big problem that has not yet been solved. That is the cost of living. We read statistics from time to time. Statistics are provided for the guidance of officials, the trade, and for assurance to the consumers and the people of the country. Useful as they are, people cannot eat statistics. I've been watching the cost of living in this city for a long time. I have reached the point now where I am convinced that the cost of living has increased to such an extent that our Government will have to do something more than is now being done. There must be either a roll-back of prices, and I mean real prices, the actual cost of food and clothes and all the necessaries of life, or else the situation must be faced courageously. If the President's plan of subsidizing the cost of food is approved by Congress, and it works satisfactorily and in accordance with expectations, that may be enough.

Here is the situation as I see it: From the monthly reports of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics on the cost of living it can be seen that there has been a constant increase. Normal wages, of normal nonwar industry employment, has not kept pace with the war cost of living. I maintain that the actual cost of living is even higher than that found in the Government reports. But let us take the Government figures. Studies by the Department of Commerce indicate that the actual average compensation, now note this average, please, of all wage earners and salaried workers in private nonagricultural industry increased 37 percent between 1939 and 1942. It goes on to say that many individual and family incomes have advanced more rapidly than living costs. Yes, in the war industries. It then compares the 37-percent increase in average salaries with an increase of 17 percent in living costs as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index in the same period. Since that time cost of living has increased an additional 6 percent. Now that picture may be true of an average which embraces millions working in war industries, shipyards, or in private employment where the benefits and prices of war goods are reflected. An average family increase of income does no good to the family who gets no actual income increase but must meet a real increase in the cost of living. Well over 50 percent of wage and salary earners have not had a 15-percent increase in salary since the period covered by the 23-percent over-all increased cost of living.

But the present and actual cost of living, according to the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of August 15, now get this, 1943, indicates for New York City an increase on all items of 22.6 percent since January 15, 1941. That includes all items in New York City: Food, 37 percent increase; clothing, 29 percent increase; house furnishings, 25-percent increase; and miscellaneous, 16.2 percent. I am particularly concerned in our city with the increase in food and clothing which makes an increase of 33 percent. Let us assume, now, that with rent freezing, we have no increase in rents, say, since 1942. There is such an increase in food and clothing as to create a real problem in this section of the country and in our city, particularly. Let us leave aside for just a moment Government statistics. My best source of information is Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Jones, and Mrs. Epstein and Mrs. O'Flaherty and Mrs. Esposito, and, incidentially, Mrs. La Guardia. They all know that food has gone up from 33 to 37 percent, clothing 29 percent, or more, particularly children's clothing, children's shoes. Now that the winter is upon us, the increased prices of winter clothes are a great deal more than that indicated by the Government reports. I do not dare mention medical supplies and incidental expenses if sickness hits the home. As I have said so many time, New York City is not a war-boom city. This is a matter of great concern to me because of the large number of wage earners and salaried people in our city with no immediate relief in sight as to the cost of living. Add to the increased cost of living the 20-percent withholding tax and the plight of millions of families borders on the critical.

I spent most of the afternoon of election day with Mr. Bernard Baruch, who knows more about inflation and more about the cost of living than anyone else in the whole country. I did not come away much encouraged. He spoke very frankly to me. He has always been very helpful. We have a bad situation in this city and a problem which we must meet very soon. I am watching the situation in Washington very carefully and realize that something must be done if there is no real substantial reduction in the cost of living, and that by January 1. I know, and it's not a pleasant thought to carry, of the difficulties of the average family in our city to make both ends meet at this time. None of us expects or suggests the buying of fancy clothes. We do not desire any luxury. All must make sacrifices, but we do want to see that our children are properly clad and that they do have proper and sufficient nourishment.

LOAN-SHARK ACTIVITY

The loan sharks are doing a thriving business. Going into debt not only prolongs but increases the difficulty of such families. We want to avoid inflation, for that will bring greater hardship and suffering to the wage and salary earners than to any other group. The nonwar wage and salary earner is willing to do his part and a little more. He does not complain of a 20-percent tax if that will prevent inflation and help pay for the cost of the war. He will adjust himself to a 30-percent increase in the cost of living, but he just cannot take both. The problem is right before us. It must be met.

Continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Manuel L. Quezon:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1943.

The Honorable C. JASPER BELL,
Chairman, Committee on Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BELL: The joint resolution "to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands," which was unanimously passed by the Senate and by a big majority in the House, has touched me deeply and has been a source of pride and gratification. I take it as a public recognition on the part of the representatives of the American people of my service to my country and to the United States in this hour so tragic for both peoples, and of my continued usefulness in the military struggle which lies before us.

Very sincerely yours,

MANUEL L. QUEZON.

Termination of National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PHILADELPHIA, *October 14, 1943.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MEYERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MYERS: It is now over 2 months since Congress terminated the National Youth Administration, and I think that it should know the consequences of the action of those responsible.

The act was passed on Saturday, July 3, and all N. Y. A. training facilities were closed the following Monday. An appropriation was made only for the liquidation of the agency, but none for its continuance. As a result, it was necessary to immediately close every training facility until the training shops could be turned over to Federal procurement. All personnel was dropped except those assigned to the taking of inventories of over $100,000,000 worth of equipment preparatory to transferring it to the Federal Procurement Office of the United States Treasury. This was completed by the end of the first week in September. Since then Procurement has been engaged in checking each item and has undertaken to give us receipts for all facilities by October 15. Not until then can the facilities be used for training purposes by any other agency.

The advocates of abolishing N. Y. A. contended that this training could be taken care of by schools. At the time of the termination of the agency we were providing war industries with approximately 1,000 trained workers per day. Forty percent of them were in our resident war training centers. These young men and women were brought from towns where there are no vocational training facilities. There was therefore a loss of 400 per day, as not one of these centers is or can be operated by the schools. In a year's time that means a loss of 146,000 trainees from a labor source which will no longer be available.

If we consider the 100 days from the time N. Y. A. closed until the facilities are handed over to Procurement, it is fair to estimate a loss of 400 a day from the resident war centers and at least half of the balance, or 300 a day from local shops in towns where schools do not have adequate vocational training facilities, making a total of 700 per day. This means a loss of approximately 70,000 trainees in 100 days. This is confirmed by the official figures of the War Manpower Commission which show a net loss of 67,656 trainees from June 30 to August 31.

As of June 30 last, the preemployment trainees reported by the schools	66,644
Of this number, receiving training in N. Y. A. shops by teachers	11,747
Preemployment trainees in vocational schools	53,897
N. Y. A. preemployment trainees	55,656
Total preemployment trainees in June, in both agencies	109,553
Total preemployment trainees in the schools as of Aug. 31	41,897
Net loss of trained labor for war industries June 30 to Aug. 31	67,656

This is conclusive evidence of the great loss of trained labor for the manufacture of implements of war by closing the N. Y. A. training facilities.

Early in July the Secretary of War made the statement that a serious crisis had arisen because of the shortage of implements of war and this was followed by a statement from General Somervell calling attention to the situation; this was subsequently emphasized by Donald Nelson and the President. Time magazine in three issues called attention to the shortage of implements of war and the serious effect that it might have on our war effort. I quote one sentence from the leading article in the issue of July 12:

"When production falls below goals 2 months in a row, as seems to have happened, the Army loses not only equipment but time—and if enough time is lost, an all-out assault on Festung Europa may be delayed too long."

It is interesting to note that the termination of the agency has not only severely curtailed the number of trained workers for war industries, but has actually increased the cost of training. Schools are unable to obtain trainees unless industry pays them while so engaged. They are paying them from 60 cents to $1.10 an hour. Two cases will illustrate this. In Scranton, N. Y. A. had an agreement with the Murray Corporation to provide them with 4,000 trained workers. We were paying the youth 25 cents an hour. Murray Corporation is now paying them 80 cents an hour. In addition to that they get a profit of 10 percent on what they spend on training, so the actual expense is 88 cents an hour. If you estimate this on an annual basis it amounts to $5,888,000 more than the wage which would have been paid to 4,000 N. Y. A. trainees. This is more than the entire budget for training the youth for the third region (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) last year and is 350 percent higher than the N. Y. A. wage.

Another illustration: It was recently announced by the director of war training in Philadelphia that 3,300 of their trainees were paid by industry from 60 to 80 cents an hour. On a yearly basis this amounts to more than the entire youth wage yearly budget for this region. The figures of the extravagant costs of N. Y. A. have been proved to be fallacious. I will give you the facts:

The appropriation recommended by the committee of the House for the conduct of the N. Y. A. War Training Program for the year 1943–44 was $45,000,000. The number of N. Y. A. youth in training June 30, 1943, was 55,656; the average turn-over of trainees was 5½ times per year. This makes the cost per youth $145. We should deduct from this, however, the $40 per month paid for the youth wage for the production of the war implements in shops for 2 months average training period, so that the actual cost of training is around $65 per person.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that none of the other training agencies reported the wage paid to the trainees in estimating the cost of training.

One of the reasons that schools have not been able to obtain enough trainees nor will in the future be able to do so, is that they do not have facilities for recruiting and transporting the youth from small towns to the training centers.

Irrespective of the cost of training, however, the prime consideration is that the country is at war; that the country has been going through a crisis created by the shortage of the implements of war; that more trained workers were required by war industries at the time of the termination of the agency than were available and the labor shortage continues; that before the termination of N. Y. A. we were supplying at least 1,000 a day and this supply has been practically cut off.

This conclusion is inevitable that a great disservice has been done to the Nation in a time of war by the abolishment of the National Youth Administration.

Respectfully,

ISAAC C. SUTTON.

Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, a poem written by a talented constituent:

SACRIFICE

(Dedicated to the parents and sweethearts of the brave defenders of democracy)

A mother's heart is heavy,
Her face shows grief and care.
With tear-dimmed eyes she watches
Her son for war prepare.

A father who has planned, that
His son shall take his place
When age slows down his efforts,
And he cannot keep apace—

Stands aside, and with bowed head,
Recalls the days elsewhere,
When he too, fought for freedom
In the World War "over there."

A sweetheart sacrifices
Her loved one to duty's call;
Surrenders life's ambitions
To stem the foe's cabal.

While demons rear their ugly heads,
And spew out shot and shell,
Brave men are sent to blast them
To the very depths of hell.

Such punishment is not too great,
For remember, this is war
In righteous indignation,
It's peace, we're fighting for.

As sure as the sky's above us,
If, in unison we fight,
This war will soon be over,
For right is always might.

So, fathers, mothers, sweethearts,
Be strong and carry through.
Have faith, be brave, keep smiling
For the lads protecting you.

—*Janet Williams.*

Proportional Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is engaging for several reasons, but principally because of the writer's boldness.

In the paragraph entitled "Voters Here Not Ready," Mr. Kaplan presumes to appraise the intelligence of the voters in Greater New York. In my opinion, only a fool or a conceited jackass would assume the right to characterize, as does Mr. Kaplan, the people of my city because the candidates chosen by the people, as a result of the system of proportional representation, do not meet with his approval.

I have implicit confidence in the ability and intelligence of the residents of New York in all matters and resent the insolence which prompted the writer and poor editorial supervision which gave it publicity.

From the outset I have opposed this method of election for the reason that, in my opinion, it is un-American, disuniting, and uneconomical. It tends to emphasize race and creed. In the face of these sound objections, it ill behooves one, like Mr. Kaplan, to attempt to justify his error in supporting "P. R." by an indictment of our fellow citizens.

The letter follows:

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION HELD NOT FOR NEW YORK—EARLY SUPPORTER OF SYSTEM VIEWS THE RESULTS AND RECANTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of November 13 on the illusions of proportional representation election of our city councilmen prompts me to beat my breast and bow my head. I was among the earliest supporters of proportional representation, because, like so many other well-meaning civic enterprises, I thought it was a reasonably effective means of breaking the backs of the political machines engendered by the clubhouses and in control of our election machinery.

Indeed, I encouraged the civil-service employee groups to support the referendum in the belief that it would give them an opportunity to elect someone interested in their welfare to represent them on the city council and show up the spoils-ridden politics from which we have so long suffered. It is not too much to state that without the civil employes' support of the proposal it would undoubtedly have failed of adoption.

SYSTEM TOO CUMBERSOME

That I have been disillusioned about the soundness or efficacy of proportional representation is putting is mildly. It has failed to come up to reasonable expectations as an instrumentality of good democratic technique. It is much too cumbersome a system for the average voter to understand and apply, in spite of the oversimplification of the system in explanation by its advocates who, I am afraid, were overwhelmed by its intriguing blackboard demonstrations of elections in abstract.

It is true that we have succeeded in diluting the majority control of the council by diffusing representation among minorities. Is this all we want from a complicated, hybrid system of electing representatives? It seems to me all that has really happened is that we have, in our attempt to strengthen minority representation, divested the strong minority party of real representation of the voters and made it possible for highly organized pressure groups to get in their licks at the expense of the majority of the voters and against the majority's will.

In place of an overwhelming majority of Democratic representatives with a few representatives of the Republican and American Labor Parties, we have substituted a number of more or less irresponsible howlers who do not represent the people even in their own districts, not to mention boroughs, but solely smartly led, selfish groups whose leaders have outwitted the political parties.

VOTERS HERE NOT READY

Possibly proportional representation may have its virtues in some places and under conditions of a highly educated and trained citizenry, but I am now convinced more than ever that it is not practicable nor fairly applied here in New York, where the voters are not intellectually ready for it.

My guess is that the voters who have now seen its operations, and who, incidentally, voted for proportional representation because they thought, or were misled into believing, that proportional representation was inherently an essential concomitant of the new charter, would reject it overwhelmingly now if referred to them for reconsideration.

Would it not be fair to let the voters have another chance to pass on the merits of the proportional representation system of electing our council members now that they at least have some understanding of it in practice? All they knew about it before was theoretical and in abstraction. It was adopted in an era of despair, when they were too willing to listen to the beating of almost anyone's tom-tom under the banner of "reform." Anybody afraid?

H. ELIOT KAPLAN.

NEW YORK, *November 15, 1943.*

Chambers of Commerce in Massachusetts Advocate Passage of Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending on the House Calendar H. R. 3420, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. In this connection, I would like to bring to the attention of the House recent action by the Chambers of Commerce of Quincy and Gardner, Mass., endorsing this legislation and urging its enactment. Representatives in Congress have received telegrams from the respective chambers as follows:

Gardner Chamber of Commerce believes Lea bill, H. R. 3420, should have your support.

H. O. BERRY,
President, Gardner Chamber of Commerce, Gardner, Mass.

QUINCY, MASS., *November 12, 1943.*

Important that you support fully civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420, in order that proper post-war plans for aviation can be developed immediately and in order that this great industry may have an opportunity to adequately and safely serve the citizens of this country.

QUINCY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
E. J. MACEWAN.

The Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Manchester Union, Tuesday, November 16, 1943:

THE LEA BILL

The House of Representatives will probably vote this week on the bill of Representative CLARENCE LEA, of California, which provides for revision of the over-all Federal regulation of air transportation. The bulk of the existing industry of transportation by air wants the bill passed. The business has been under rather comprehensive Federal regulation since 1925.

It may be regrettable that a comparatively new industry should not only seek but apparently seek with great eagerness to be regulated at all, but nowadays "freedom" has come to mean relative immunity from statism. Therefore, after examining the rival proposals now in Congress, we are forced to the conclusion that the Lea bill, or a measure of substantially the same nature, should be passed now, so that the air lines and their allied businesses and activities may be properly squared away for progress when the war ends.

The air lines believe that a law on the lines of the Lea bill would prove to be a more effective safeguard against sabotage by complex and conflicting regulations by the States than the present Federal law. Air transport is mostly interstate commerce, in the most complete sense of the term.

In a trip from New York to Los Angeles via Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Kansas City, an air liner spends the following number of minutes in the air over the following States respectively: New York, 3; New Jersey, 13; Pennsylvania, 58; Ohio, 47; Indiana, 31; Missouri, 48; Kansas, 54; Oklahoma, 21; Texas, 41; New Mexico, 79; Arizona, 72; California, 54.

We believe that such a list speaks for itself in the interest of enough over-all Federal

regulations to assure simplicity. No constitutional right of any State can, of course, be minimized by the Lea bill, but unless Federal regulation is comprehensive the number of States listed above suggests how State regulations could become burdensome to the point of sabotaging the development of air transport.

The Lea bill would take the regulation of air transport out of the Department of Commerce and place it again under a wholly independent body like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulates the railroads. Air transport enjoyed that form of control before President Roosevelt's bill aiming at a general reorganization of the Government was passed. We believe that public opinion will back the rule of air transport by an independent air-minded commission not interlocked with any departmental bureaucracy, especially since the reorganization law has proved to be an abortive measure that has effected no real simplification or economy of government.

The Lea bill provides for no changes in the relations of surface carriers and air carriers. The present law, passed in 1938, permits the Civil Aeronautics Board to authorize surface carriers to get into air transportation only when such action would not restrain competition, and when such air services would be incidental to the surface carrier's main operations. We believe that such safeguards are necessary for air transport in its present formative stages.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley from the Washington Post:

REPUBLICAN PARTY UNWILLING TO FIGHT INFLATION

(By Ernest Lindley)

Traditionally the Republican Party has regarded itself as the party of "sound money." It will present itself to the Nation next year as the party which knows how to manage the domestic economy of the United States.

What does the recent record show? It shows the Republicans in Congress aligning themselves overwhelmingly against effective controls over inflation. It shows them voting in large majority for measures which would force up the cost of living and which hold the danger of a serious, possibly uncontrollable, inflation. It shows them ducking the tax problems while voting to increase the cost of the war and the weight of the national debt.

Not many are likely to be deceived by the efforts of some of them to dramatize "economies." Of course, all unnecessary expenditures should be eliminated. They mean the use of manpower and perhaps of materials which should be employed for more essential purposes. But in the aggregate they amount to practically nothing, relative to the cost of the war. A small increase in the price level would wipe out these trivial savings. Some of the Senators and Representatives who occupy themselves with these small matters know they are dodging the main issues. If they don't, they surely cannot be considered competent to manage the national economy in war or in peace.

This is not intended to be a partisan attack. It applies also to some of the Democrats on the Hill. Nor is it intended to excuse the delays, weaknesses, and mistakes of the administration in dealing with inflation and related domestic problems. The administration's record in this respect has not been good. In many respects, as this column has sought to bring out on numerous occasions, it has been mad. But faulty as it has been, the administration's program has been more comprehensive and stronger than any other which has been able to muster more than a scattering of political support. The administration has been willing to make a fight. That fact cannot be obscured by the misdirected Treasury tax recommendations or by the blunders in the handling of the coal dispute.

For a year and a half the large picture has been this: the administration, on the whole, attempting to control inflation, in the face of strenuous and growing opposition from Congress, and especially from the Republican Party. Both the administration and Congress have been subjected to heavy inflationary pressures from special interests. The administration has given ground but, compared to Congress and especially to the Republican Party in Congress, it has been a rock. The administration has sought to dramatize the issue, to educate the public to the dangers of inflation. The Republican leadership has not. No amount of criticism of the administration's omissions and weaknesses can obscure this revealing and fundamental fact.

The easy way for the hand-to-mouth politician is to ride with the inflationary pressures. The politician may know enough elementary economics to know that the increase which he helps the farmer or the wage earner to get will be illusory, and that both of them may be even worse off as a result. But it is easier to be accommodating than to explain to lobbyists why they are chasing will-o'-the-wisps.

It takes courage to try to sit on the lid, to turn down demands and claims on all sides, to ignore political threats. It takes some capacity to look ahead and a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. No group of men who lack these qualities can be considered capable of governing well.

This failure in the Republican Party is not confined to Congress. The Republican governors have stood aside or remained silent. And where does Wendell Willkie stand? Mr. Willkie has accomplished so much in readjusting the thinking of the Republican Party on international questions that it would be unfair to ask him to do more if he were not a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. The silence of the Republican governors is politically understandable. It is not their fight directly. And yet it is, in the same way that the resolution adopted at Mackinac was their fight. There are too many able and promising men among the Republican governors to attribute their silence to ignorance of the importance of the inflation problem.

It is hard to see how Wendell Willkie, the Republican governors, the Republican Senators and Congressmen, can either work for inflation or duck the issue and still claim either the knowledge or the courage necessary to take control of the National Government. The inflation problem won't wait. If the Republican Party has leadership on the domestic side comparable to Willkie's on foreign policy, now is the time for it to show itself.

New Mexico State Aeronautic Commission Endorses Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in a telegram to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the State Aeronautic Commission of New Mexico has gone on record in favor of the pending Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, and urges its enactment. The telegram received by Chairman LEA reads as follows:

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *November 8, 1943.*

Congressman CLARENCE LEA,

United States House of Representatives:

We feel it vital that H. R. 3420 be approved and feel that it is necessary to orderly development of aviation in this section of country.

CHARLTON,

Secretary, State Aeronautic Commission.

Montana Leads Nation in Bond Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at this time, under unanimous-consent request, I desire to insert in the RECORD an article from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., dated November 11, 1943, which explains better than I can say the part played by my State in the recent War Bond drive:

MONTANA LEADS NATION IN BOND PURCHASES—PER CAPITA SALE IN STATE DURING DRIVE FAR ABOVE AVERAGE

WASHINGTON, November 8.—Montanans bought more War bonds per capita during the recent Third War Loan than residents of any other State, the Treasury reported today.

Aggregate sale of $18,000,000 worth of series E, F, and G bonds gave the Copper State an average of $38.13 for every man, woman, and child—$14.53 higher than the average for the Nation.

Second place on a per capita basis, $37.19, went to the District of Columbia, with $31,200,000 in sales. Northern California was third at $37, with aggregate sales of $120,600,000.

Next in order among the first 10 were Oregon, $36.63; North Dakota, $35.26; Iowa, $35; Michigan, $33.21; Washington, $32.99; South Dakota, $32.19; and Nebraska, $31.89.

The Department did not make public per capita figures for the other States. Aggregate War Bond sales during the drive amounted to $3,037,000,000. Other types of securities made up the balance of the nearly $19,000,000,000 raised in the campaign.

Synthetic Rubber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Morning World-Herald, of Omaha, Nebr., dated November 15, 1943. The subject is Synthetic Rubber Industry.

Mr. Speaker, the recent utterances of the administration indicates that they want to junk the synthetic-rubber program after this war is over. It is unfortunate that the administration does not have a more practical understanding of how infant industries have developed in this country. We now have nearly $800,000,000 in this synthetic-rubber industry. It is an infant industry and should have some degree of protection until it can stand on its feet. This procedure has been followed in the past with many other industries and as a result of this practice this country under the free enterprise system has been able to develop huge industries which give employment to millions of people and a profitable market for raw materials. If it had not been for this policy our industry and labor might not have made it possible for us to become the great arsenal of democracy. Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito might easily have become the masters of the world. We must look to the future generations of the world and give the needed protection to this infant synthetic-rubber industry so that it may grow and provide not only employment for millions of people but a project which will use the raw products produced in America. If this policy is followed we never again will become dependent upon other countries for our rubber products.

The editorial referred to follows:

MR. STEFAN'S PROTEST

Representative STEFAN wants to foster and protect the infant synthetic-rubber industry of our country. He is opposed to junking the $750,000,000 plant investment already made and to "surrendering again to the British-Dutch rubber monopolies."

The monopoly has been all but absolute normally, supplying some 90 percent of American consumption. It has sold crude rubber at as low as 3 cents, usually has charged around 20 cents, and some 20 years ago jacked the price up mountain high, causing loud cries of anguish and indignation to arise here in the United States. In common, the monopoly exacts all that the traffic will bear without squawking, and on occasion a good deal more, depending on the condition of its appetite.

Now we have a chance to produce our own rubber synthetically. The cost at present is high. The product does not equal the quality of natural rubber. But the industry is truly an infant. Judging by past experience, there is good reason for believing that the infant, if allowed to grow, experiment, develop, improve, will once again demonstrate that American ingenuity can beat the world and produce the best rubber either grown or concocted.

Many persons want to give this infant a chance. This not only to free us from the coils of a foreign monopoly but to open a rich field for investment, for employment, and for raw materials. They want to help all the world, including Burma and Malaya, these persons do, but not at the total sacrifice of our own industry.

The President and Vice President, however, think differently. They are opposed to any protection for the infant American industry. They favor instead providing an American market for the foreign product, in order to give what they believe to be needed help to capital in London and Rotterdam and coolie labor in the far islands of the Orient. Like resistance has been extended to the beet sugar and other domestic industries and for the same reason—by buying abroad we become a world benefactor.

The theory is a pretty one. But it does not represent the policy and practice by which America has been built.

Tariffs to protect greedy domestic monopoly are one thing—and thoroughly bad. But tariffs actually needed in the early stages to build legitimate industry are quite another thing—and represent sound and justifiable public policy.

But juggling the tariff power to protect foreign monopoly against American competition seems about the worst policy imaginable.

Mr. STEFAN's protest is in order and deserving of support.

The House of Representatives To Hold Respect, Must Respect Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, anyone coming here 11 years ago, and noting the respect and esteem in which the Congress was held at that time, does not have to go outside the Capitol Building itself to note the change in the spirit that prevails.

I enclose a copy of a letter I have written on this subject to our very distinguished and respectful Doorkeeper for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NOVEMBER 17, 1943.

Mr. RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Doorkeeper, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROBERTS: I am returning the admission ticket to the House called on the occasion of the appearance of Secretary Hull to render a report to the Congress on his mission to Russia as you have requested. I know that many strangers and people not connected with the Congress will be given consideration and precedence over my wife and daughter by admission to the House on this occasion. It may be observed that the Congress and its Members are only accorded such respect as they deserve; and the lack of respect prevailing around the Capitol itself is by no means inducive to respect in the Federal departments, and it can hardly be expected that the treatment accepted by the Congress from these executive departments is conducive to respect of the legislative branch throughout the country. Let us hope that the future will bring a change in this situation from which the American people as a whole will benefit.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Problem of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of November 13, 1943:

PROBLEM OF EDUCATION

Attorney General Francis Biddle, addressing a meeting in New York, said that though our Axis enemies may not have directly caused outbreaks of racial and religious intolerance in this country, they do profit by them. We do have groups which deliberately foment hatred against Negroes, against Jews, against foreigners, against liberals, against all who believe in a tolerant democracy. Such groups appeal to the maladjusted, to the ignorant, to the prejudiced. Those who are tempted to join in these movements or to encourage them need only look around them to see what poor specimens of humanity they are taking as their associates. But how are we to make people understand that in doing this they are actually labeling themselves as timid, ignorant, and inferior?

The remedy is not Federal action, except in cases where constitutional rights are violated. State and local police action may be necessary, but it does not cure the disease. We have to fall back on education—in the schools, in the churches, in the press, in enlightened groups formed to combat the unenlightened. The process must be continuous. Respect for other people's rights must be expressed not only in mass meetings but in the habits of everyday life. At bottom it is more self-respect that is needed, for the self-respecting man, confident of his own place in the world, feels no urge to hurt or humiliate others.

Wheat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, Indiana has long been famous for the large number of interesting and informative writers which it has contributed to the Nation. The country and the Congress will, therefore, be especially interested in the following comments by Maurice

Early which, under leave of the House, I am including in these remarks. Mr. Early is a prominent Hoosier columnist whose comments appear daily on the front page of the Indianapolis Star:

THE DAY IN INDIANA

(By Maurice Early)

WHEAT SHORTAGE SEEN

Indiana farmers meeting in Indianapolis next week will be advised that even though it has been thought that "it cannot happen here" there is a possibility of a wheat shortage for bread next year.

Milling experts, who keep a close tab on wheat supplies, declare that no one knows the exact status of the wheat reserves because so much of it has been diverted to new uses. But they advance the fear that bread might be on the rationed list before another year ends.

For many years the Nation had such a large surplus of wheat it was regarded as inexhaustible. Shortage of stock feed has resulted in wheat being used for that purpose. Wartime employment has resulted in a bigger demand for wheat products and a large slice of the reserves has been diverted to make products used in manufacturing synthetic rubber.

Inducements given to Midwest farmers to grow soybeans have resulted in reduction of wheat acreages.

Meanwhile the flour-famine crisis for bakers is getting closer as millers continue to decline to take orders for better grades because the price of wheat makes it unprofitable to sell flour at ceiling prices. This dislocation of distribution can be cured only by raising the ceiling price of flour (which means higher bread prices) or by granting a subsidy to the millers or wheat growers. Washington is struggling with the problem.

Save the Lives of 500,000 American Boys Through Furnishing China Real Implements of War Rather Than Chopsticks and Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

With due humility I must confess that I little realized the far-reaching consequences of the memorable interview upon February 6 at Washington with friends of China vitally interested in the war now entering its seventh year with Japan. I was informed by this distinguished group that the Chinese military mission which came to Washington for the purpose of promoting a larger measure of cooperation between China and the Allies was about to leave within 48 hours, disheartened by the failure to receive the encouragement and aid which they anticipated in return for their services in the war they had been waging over so long a period of time against Japan.

I was convinced, as a consequence of my talk with this distinguished group, that provided China was furnished the necessary implements of war it would be possible to prevent the loss of the lives of 500,000 or more American boys which must of necessity be destroyed in the island-to-island program being conducted. Their judgment was more recently confirmed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his reference to the island-to-island policy as the hop-to-hop policy being pursued in fighting Japan.

As a result of my conference, I addressed Congress under date of February 8, 1943, and at that time pressed a resolution requesting the President of the United States to take up with the Lend-Lease Administration the question of increasing the allocation of lend-lease material to China from 2 to 10 percent. During the year 1942 the allocation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was 79 percent, and to Russia 17.7 percent, with about 2 percent for China—and of this 2 percent but one-half of 1 percent was ultimately received by the Chinese forces.

At my earnest solicitation the Chinese military mission remained over to await the outcome of the resolution as presented by me. Within 1 week sentiment changed and the supplies so sorely needed by the Chinese who had been fighting with chopsticks and kind words from America for a period now within its seventh year was assured.

In a recent conversation with a high official of the Chinese Government I learned that in the past 4 months the lend-lease war materials supplied to China had been 10 times greater than in the entire year of 1942, and that as a consequence the Chinese for the first time in the war have been fighting under a real umbrella of planes. I was further informed that in the past 4 months the Chinese have captured and killed more than 200,000 Japs and provided the war materials supplied by the United States is 5 times as great in the next 4 months as it has been in the past 4 months, the Japs will be driven from their bread basket, which is China, and the Chinese, provided the supplies needed for the war to continue be received by them, are firmly of the opinion that within 1 year they can enter the back door of Japan and defeat the Japs without the loss of a single American soldier.

I am interested in saving the lives of American boys, and I am likewise interested in speeding up the winning of the war and in doing my part in the establishment of a permanent peace based on spiritual justice in conformity with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter. I realized at the outset, in view of the declaration of Prime Minister Churchill, that "he was not made Prime Minister to dismember the British Empire," that I was treading on dangerous ground even as an American when I demanded justice for China; nevertheless, I propose to continue along the line which I have started regardless of political or personal consequences. To me the lives of 500,000 American boys are far more important than the retention by Great Britain of her possessions formerly held in China, India, or in any other eastern territory which she controls.

It is becoming clearly evident to every thoughtful citizen that when the forces of Hitlerism have been conquered and destroyed in Europe, that a demand will be made by the British Empire for the speedy ending of the war with the restoration of possessions formerly held by the British Empire in China, and possibly the retention of territory by Japan which she now holds there, to prevent the establishment of a virile Chinese Republic—the establishment of which might result in a similar republic in India.

It has been my very great pleasure in the past week to address Congress in favor of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act—not only as a friendly gesture but as a means of ending the propaganda inaugurated by Japan that "Asia should be held by the Asiatics."

Today, after 2 full years of war, Japan has extended her territorial possessions and rule to 15,000,000 square miles; Japan has strengthened its Burma garrison 100 percent and by occupation of the land link over the Burma Road toward Kunming it opens a return to the new interior supply line direct from Indochina, which, if successful, would greatly lengthen the period in which the reconquest of Burma would be possible. Adopting the policy of Germany, now employing native labor drawn from the population in the areas of upwards of 400,000,000 people, through insidious propaganda, they are winning the native public support and it is vital that this be ended if there is to be an early end of the war in the Far East.

Given the necessary materials of war, it should be possible, within a short period of time, for China to recapture Japan's most highly entrenched center in China, namely, Manchuria—where Japan has been establishing industries on a major scale for the past 3 years. The vital supply lines established by Japan have not been seriously impaired to the present time and none of her individual centers, either in Japan or China, have been subject to the character of air raids which would be possible provided we had done our part in aiding China. Japan continues to exploit coal, tin, rubber, oil, timber, and other essential war resources undisturbed due to Japan's conquest of China, coupled with the duration of the war between China and Japan and the propaganda of "Asia for the Asiatics."

China should receive every aid that it is possible for us to give at the present time. We all rejoice at the masterly work of Gen. Douglas MacArthur with his handful of men, and we are hopeful that the drive of the British in Burma will come to a speedy and successful conclusion, but we recognize the necessity for a major assault by sea and air power plus the opening of the Burma Road to the end that the Chinese may receive the materials which will make succcessful the drive of the Japanese from China which is their breadbasket, and a drive to the heart of Japan direct from China.

The belated acknowledgement by Congress in its adoption of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act should do much to destroy the effectiveness of the Japanese propaganda "Asia for the Asiatics." The sad spectacle of China, whom we declared an equal ally with Great Britain, Russia, and other nations associated with us in the conduct of the war at the time of the adoption of the Atlantic Charter still remains impossible of explanation. The opportunity for the saving of 500,000 or more American lives through the arming of the Chinese forces represents a proposition that it is extremely difficult for America either to explain or justify.

It is far more important that the lives of these 500,000 American boys be preserved than England either reacquire possession in China or continue in the control of India. It must be apparent to every thoughtful American that from the viewpoint of British statesmen, the retention of India and the reacquirement of Hong Kong is of greater importance to the United Kingdom of Great Britain than the lives of 500,000 American boys. It must likewise be apparent to everyone that the Atlantic Charter is meaningless when British possessions are at stake.

The possibility at some future date of a war between the orientals and the occidentals, at a time when the occidentals have been bled white as a consequence of the present war, apparently does not disturb the equanimity of the British Empire and is of less importance than the continued possession of far-eastern territory. Those two great storehouses of manpower, China with its population of 450,000,000, India with its 400,000,000, and the adjoining territory with another 150,000,000 represent a total of 1,000,000,000 people—who, unless dealt with justly and in conformity with the Atlantic

Charter must someday be reckoned with. When this war has ended with victory for the Allies, as it must and will end, the orientals will be as well versed in the use of the agencies for the conduct of war as the occidentals are at the present time, and if we wish to avoid a repetition of what occurred as a consequence of the Versailles Treaty, it is imperative that we deal justly with China who has been both friend and ally—dependable at all times.

It is horrible to contemplate the consequences that must inevitably result from a failure to do our full duty—not only from now until the end of the war, but after the war has ended. If we wish to give mothers of the world some more inviting prospects to look forward to than the tears and sorrow, destruction and death of their sons in the next quarter of a century, we have the opportunity and if we fail to measure up to it, we have but ourselves to blame. God grant that we may have the vision and the courage to do that which we know is right and just.

The World We Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brilliant address entitled "The World We Want" delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before the New York Herald Tribune Forum, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on November 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pioneering for a civilized world is an excellent theme for a forum at this particular phase of history. The whole world is on the move as never before.

We want a world where men are free to grow physically, mentally, and spiritually. To get this world we shall have to work harder than our grandfathers when they subdued the forests, the plains, and the mountains. They battled physical difficulties, but we, in the spirit of St. Paul, have the task of wrestling against the rulers of the darkness of this world and against spiritual wickedness in high places. Our task is to make this the century of the common man. This idea, this dream, can become a reality.

Once a man was discussing with Carlyle the whole question of ideas and how ineffective they were. Carlyle, half in fun, half seriously, replied: "There was once a man named Rousseau. He wrote a book which contained nothing but ideas. People laughed at it. But the skins of those who laughed went to bind the second edition of the book."

Here in our own country we have seen the great liberating force of a common purpose. Twice in a generation we have found unity and strength in the act of buckling down to war. The war has shown us the magic of production. Production—the full use of our labor and materials—is in itself the cure of most of our social and political evils. Production is good for the body and the soul. Full production, full employment, and fair distribution will give us a tough-fibered, self-respecting people moving on with strength and courage to the job of hewing out a better world. The common man wants free enterprise. But private enterprise is not a goal in itself. Private enterprise was made for man, not man for private enterprise. It is a means to production, not the end of life. The common man will turn from private enterprise only if there is not full production and jobs enough to go around.

Is production so great an enterprise that it demands not only the full use of the energy of all the people, but also of Government? Is Government cooperation an indispensable factor in securing full production? In time of war, yes. In the decade immediately following war, also yes, undoubtedly.

Governmental planning can be reduced to a minimum only if certain sweeping over-all decisions are boldly made by Congress. For example, we must plan our governmental policy so that we are not compelled to give things away to other nations in peace No. 2 as we did in the peace after World War No. 1. In peace No. 1, in the years of normalcy, those who insisted that we raise our tariffs thought they were hardheaded businessmen. They were not. From the standpoint of serving the national welfare all of them were impractical and some of them were selfish morons. The tariff subsidized our manufacturers by billions of dollars every year and made it impossible to sell our customary exports of wheat, cotton, pork, and tobacco abroad unless we were willing to loan foreigners money. We loaned Europe money not only to buy farm products, but also to build factories, apartment houses, and swimming pools. We rehabilitated Germany. All this was done by private loans unpoliced by Government. The big bankers got the commissions. The small bankers got the bonds. And the people got it in the neck.

American private industry, seduced by unsound promoters in the decade of the twenties, ran the greatest charitable institution in the world. But those who finally paid for the billions of private charity to Europe were not those who raised the tariffs or those who floated the bonds. Most of the bill was finally paid by the farmer, the worker, the small banker, and the small investor. Europe finally got free of charge from the United States less than $15,000,000,000 worth of goods, but our failure to plan the simple arithmetic of international exchange eventually cost the United States more than $100,000,000,000. In this loss the big businessman finally were hit. The ultimate payment was in terms of Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and the blood of our young men.

At this late date, we need not blame the little men who defeated Wilson and produced that false peace after World War No. 1. Our concern is that peace No. 2 recognize the simple realities of international trade. When the greatest creditor nation in the world holds its debtors to account and at the same time makes it impossible for them to pay, the wrath of the foreign victims sooner or later revenges itself tenfold. Twenty years ago we, the great creditor nation, could have led the world toward full employment of men, skills, and resources. The short-time cost would have been many billions, but the long-time cost would have been nothing. On the contrary, there would have been a great profit in an expanding volume of world trade based on confidence in enduring peace.

Today, peace No. 2 is rapidly coming upon us. By lack of planning and the selfishness of so-called hard-headed men we can turn peace No. 2 into "World War No. 3." The common man does not want that. Nor the farmer, nor the businessman, large or small. But to save peace No. 2, we must make freedom from want that reality which is implicit in our resources, manpower, and skills. We must resolve that we shall not again produce world-wide explosion by allowing certain private interests to high pressure Congress into higher tariffs while other private interests are financing unsound loans abroad at the expense of the small American investor. When this war ends the greater part of the $70,000,000,000 of savings accumulated by United States citizens during the past 3 years must be used right here. We must use these savings to rebuild America and not to rearm Germany.

Properly invested, the money we send abroad can and should increase jobs in the United States. The loans should be self-liquidating and should, if possible, furnish the borrowing nation with the means of repayment. Such loans are pioneering loans. They are the kind of loans which the East made to the Middle West to get it settled. The building of roads, bridges, and airports in Latin America and Asia illustrates what I mean. American-built highways, American-built airways, and American tourists, with all the development which will inevitably follow, can furnish millions of jobs for the whole world on a basis which will enable the world to repay the United States for her help. If American tourists spend a billion dollars annually in foreign lands, the money which we loan for highways and airways can be soundly liquidated over a period of 50 years. We shall keep our engineering firms busy, furnish markets for our automobile and airplane factories, and develop friendships over the entire world. I am looking ahead to the day when the Iowa farmer can drive his own car to Buenos Aires—when the Oklahoma oil man can go by air to Chungking and there hire an auto to drive himself into India and finally west to Moscow and Paris. Then, when millions of our people have seen the realities of a world on the march, isolationism, already dead, will be buried for all time.

The time has come for that vast group which stands for the general welfare in the United States to rise in its majesty to adopt methods which will prevent pressure groups from leading us to a temporary peace or a partial employment. There must be jobs for all, and we cannot have them if there is fear of another war. The service of peace No. 2 requires an enthusiasm like that displayed by the common man of Russia during the war. The new democracy, if it solves the problem of full production and fair distribution, can give our common man the enthusiasm and faith of the Russian common man, and even more.

Americans have learned at last that we cannot isolate ourselves from the world. It is no longer a question of whether isolationism is good or bad. Isolationism is impossible. The airplane and radio settled that.

When the war is over the central fact will be hunger—physical and spiritual hunger. Within 2 years the United Nations will rebuild with physical food the shattered bodies of the tens of millions who have been starved by the Nazis. Food that they can get their teeth into—food they can fill their stomachs with—comes first. Europe can eventually pay for this food in healthful labor, provided we of the New World are willing to accept goods in payment. But even more important in the long run than physical food is the spiritual food represented by genuine democracy. Those who have lived for years under the dictator's heel want to be sure that fascism and the forces that lead to it are stamped out everywhere in the world.

Unfortunately, we are much further from victory over fascism than from victory over the German armies. Fascism fights us on both sides of the line. Fascism fights us in both continents in the New World. Fascism will fight on from new bases after military victory is complete. Let us not commit the tragic folly of underestimating our enemy. No country has escaped it. The world-wide assault on the power, on the worth and dignity of man, is the living issue of our time.

Fascism flourishes in a time of faltering and divided purpose. It will die in a time of dynamic common purpose and faith.

We must make that common purpose inevitable. The future of the world holds a promise greater than the past has ever shown us. The future is not a fixed thing. It is not predestined. We have only to bestir ourselves in order to realize our dreams. For we have the lands, the forests, the mines, and the people. We have in our hands the tools of science, gigantic in their power, miraculously swift in their accomplishment. We can control floods, make the desert bloom, house a nation in comfort, conquer poverty, and stamp out most disease. We know we can do these things if we will to do them. The common man is on the march. His vision of the future will largely determine the world's future.

We must realize that we are a part of the great world and start to plan to live in that world. We want life to be more humane. We want to live up to the great historic issue of America—freedom—freedom for our own land and for all the world.

America will find a new song, a new opportunity. In her world relations she will demonstrate the practicality of Christianity—that in serving the world she serves herself. The really hard-headed are those who see furthest. Christ was the hardest-headed man of historic record. Truly we are members one of another. Christian precepts and common sense will save the coming peace. The common man, well informed, working with good will, is the greatest force in producing the world we want.

Telegram to President Roosevelt From National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed to President Roosevelt by the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 16, 1493.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

In its issue of November 14 the New York Times has published the following news from Mexico City, quote: "In a speech delivered late last night Constantine Oumansky, Soviet Ambassador, indicated that Russia was determined to retain the part of Polish territory she received on the basis of the German-Soviet agreement of September 28, 1939, after the German invasion of Poland. * * * Diplomatic circles here say it was the first time in the Western Hemisphere that a leading Soviet official had publicly announced such a claim. There was no doubt, according to these sources, that Mr. Oumansky's statement, coming shortly after the three-power conference in Moscow, was the outcome of instructions from the Kremlin. Some diplomats saw it as an indication that Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden yielded to the Russians on the post-war settlement of Poland." This statement, made at a time when even the most skeptical have been convinced that the Moscow Conference is a tremendous success and that we must accept in good faith the word of the Soviet Government given our representatives, has deeply shocked millions of Americans of Polish origin, whose feelings and thoughts I consider it my duty to interpret in this message. Ambassador Oumansky's statement clearly and unmistakably challenges that most noble document, the Atlantic Charter, construed and signed by you, Mr. President, and given to the tottering peoples of the world as an anchor to grasp and hold onto in their continued resistance and hope that decency shall finally prevail. That hope was given to all of Poland and not half. The signatories of the Atlantic Charter say: "They wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." Ambassador Oumansky says that the Soviets have no intention of respecting Poland's sovereign rights to half of the territory grabbed in their joint enterprise with Hitler. Ambassador Oumansky's statement constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of international law adhered to by civilized peoples even before the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter. Ambassador Oumansky openly declares that the Soviet Government has resolved to violate the following agreements freely entered into: I. The Treaty of Riga; II. The Kellogg Pact; III. The Convention for Definition of Aggression; IV. The Nonaggression Pact Concluded With Poland; V. The Covenant of the League of Nations, of which the Soviets were a member on September 17, 1939; VI. The Polish-Soviet Pact, signed July 30, 1941, in which pact the Soviets nullified their agreement with Germany made September 28, 1939; VII. Finally, the declaration of the United Nations signed at the White House January 1, 1942, which act bound the signatories to respect the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The lofty ideals of this charter for the realization of which the American people decided to raise their mighty arm and shed their blood on the battlefields of Europe have been degraded by a high dignitary of the Soviet Government. I consider it my duty to inform you, Mr. President, that 5,000,000 Americans of Polish origin are deeply shocked and gravely concerned in the face of this newly expressed will of aggression so far officially not answered. Moreover, Ambassador Oumansky's attitude can be construed as an attempt to undermine the faith of 300,000,000 European peoples in the historic role of America and your moral leadership. These peoples with the people of Poland in glorious lead continue to resist Germany's ruthless force because of their conviction that the ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the "Four Freedoms" are to become the basis for the better world of the future.

Yours most respectfully,

M. F. WEGRZYNEK,
National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent.

Counting the Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, November 17, 1943, which gives the views of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] with reference to the counting of the soldier vote.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTING THE SOLDIER VOTE—SENATOR AUSTIN WANTS REPUBLICAN TELLERS AGREEABLE TO PARTY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 16.—Senator WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont, who was a Republican pillar of the President's allied aid policy long before Pearl Harbor made that a normal military measure, has been brooding over methods to assure nonpartisanship and public confidence in the count of the votes which will be cast in the 1944 Federal elections by our armed forces abroad. Having been persuaded by the committee which has reported the Lucas-Green bill that no such antipolitics safeguards as he has in mind should be written into the bill itself Mr. AUSTIN determined on an informal protective method, which he outlined to this correspondent today.

He proposes that an understanding shall be reached with the President by Republican leaders that, in selecting the two Republicans who with two Democrats are to compose the electoral commission, Mr. Roosevelt will make his minority party choices from a list submitted by Republican organization authorities. This method is designed to torpedo in advance charges which may arise that the President selected nominal Republicans who could not be relied on to be vigilant in the party interest.

WARNS OF "NEW DEAL CAPTIVE"

There are a number of registered Republicans, in Washington and outside it, who have been called captives of the New Deal. It is these Mr. AUSTIN wants to be certain to exclude from supervision of the armed forces vote count so that public confidence in its results cannot be weakened by any attack. He said today he did not doubt the integrity of Republicans in this category, but that he deemed it most important the public should have full faith in the count and feared this would not be forthcoming if any such Republican was named.

In the 1940 campaign there were registered Republicans in the (as it was then known) defense administration who came out openly for a third term for Mr. Roosevelt against their party nominee simply because war was threatened. Others supported him privately. Any of these could be named to the Commission in full obedience to the text of the Lucas-Green bill.

"When we were considering the legislation," said Mr. AUSTIN today, "I asked the Republican National Committee Chairman, Mr. Spangler, if he would be willing to prepare a list of 12 known and eligible Republicans, thinking to put that means of choice into the law. There was also discussion of prior Senate advice to the President on the commission personnel. But the first idea was rejected as unconstitutional and the second as bad legislation. Some safeguards, however, are most desirable in addition to the provision that the four commissioners named by the President must be approved by a Senate majority before they can serve."

Mr. AUSTIN said he was not imputing evasion, dishonesty, or a wish to gain party advantage in the rules of the count to anyone. But, he said, the duty of Congress is to frame the law so that such misconduct could not be imputed and gain any measure of public credence.

PROPOSES AUTHORIZED GROUP

"I hope," he continued, "the President will agree to accept a list of Republican eligibles for the commission from an authorized party group: the Senate and House minority leaders, the Republican National Chairman, the three living Presidential candidates of the party, or all of these. I don't care who does the screening just so it is done. I cannot conceive that the President will reject this counsel. And the group I have listed, or any section of it, could with propriety and responsibility make the proposal."

The Lucas-Green bill provides that four commissioners shall supervise the collection of the absentee voting by the Army and the Navy. Two must be chosen from the party casting the largest popular vote in the 1940 Presidential election (the Democrats), and two from the party casting the second largest vote (the Republicans). In the event of ties, an umpire, selected by the Chief Justice from the Federal judiciary, shall break them.

Since 10,000,000 votes of soldiers, sailors, marines, and merchant-ship crews may be concerned, Senator AUSTIN'S proposal is addressed to a matter of fundamental importance.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Should Alaska Wait," taken from the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD ALASKA WAIT?

Many Alaskans are asking other Alaskans, whose opinions they respect, what their views are toward the proposal to extend statehood to the Territory.

This is the first indication that residents of the Territory are giving consideration to one of the most important issues before them. It is a good sign.

The most frequent answer which we have heard goes something like this:

"Statehood for Alaska? We aren't ready for it. We had better wait a while until Alaska grows up a bit."

That's an easy answer to make—a simple way to brush off a question that requires thought. But unless that little statement is backed up with a thoughtful study of the issues involved, it is an empty answer.

We trust that those making the inquiries will value such answers on the basis of the thought that goes with them.

As far as we are concerned, we would like to ask, What is the basis for such a conclusion? While we have not sold ourselves on statehood, there seems to be an abundance of facts available that point toward a conclusion that statehood for Alaska is a very desirable proposition.

Could it be that the reason Alaska should wait a while is because her population is so small?

That does not seem logical because the Territory already has a population greater than that of 10 States at the time they were admitted to the Union.

The last census put the Alaska population at 71,911, which for sake of discussion may be called 72,000. There has been an increase since October 1939, when the census was taken, but this increase can be disregarded for the present.

The populations of the following 10 States at the time of their admission, all less than the official population of Alaska, were:

Colorado	39,864
Delaware	59,096
Illinois	55,211
Missouri	66,586
Nevada	42,491
Ohio	45,365
Oregon	52,465
Rhode Island	68,825
Tennessee	35,691
Wyoming	62,555

In the above list, there is reason to question the accuracy of the figure presented for Nevada. As a territory, Nevada had a population of 6,857 in 1860. She was admitted to the union as a full-fledged State in 1864 and her population in that year is not stated in the Encyclopedia Britannica. However, a gold stampede followed and the population of the State increased to 42,491 by 1870. There is reason to believe that it was not that great in 1864.

Many other States had populations less than the present probable population of Alaska, at the time they were admitted to the Union. These include:

Georgia	82,548
Kentucky	73,677
Louisiana	76,556
Mississippi	75,448

If anyone bases the conclusion that Alaska is not ready for statehood upon the lack of sufficient population, what is the answer to those figures?

Could it be that Alaska is considered too immature for statehood for lack of wealth?

Facts on Alaska's wealth seem to answer that question negatively. Alaska has more wealth than many of the States of the Union. She produces more wealth each year than some States.

The World Almanac shows that Federal income-tax receipts collected in Alaska total more each year than the total collections in 16 of the States of the Nation. Income-tax collections in 1927 reached a peak in the Territory when they totaled $10,400,000. They reached the lowest point in 1933 when they were $1,600,000. Yet, the Territory led at least 16 States in collections both times.

In 1939 total income-tax collections in Alaska were $7,300,000. This figure compares with the following totals for 16 States in that same year:

Arizona	$2,500,000
Arkansas	4,000,000
Idaho	2,000,000
Mississippi	3,100,000
Montana	3,100,000
Nebraska	7,000,000
Nevada	3,000,000
New Hampshire	4,200,000
New Mexico	1,600,000
North Dakota	1,000,000
Oregon	6,400,000
South Carolina	5,400,000
South Dakota	1,000,000
Utah	3,400,000
Vermont	2,100,000
Wyoming	1,400,000

Considering that the Federal Government collects more income taxes in Alaska than in 16 States of the Union, there seems to be more reason to believe that there is more wealth here than in a large part of the Nation.

This line of study may be pursued further with comparisons of the value of goods produced in Alaska and those of individual States. But that study is worthy of more than passing consideration here. Suffice it to say that the information we have found thus far seems to indicate that the comparisons will be very favorable to Alaska.

In discussing statehood with friends, it is well to consider the background from which their statements emanate. There is reason to believe that representatives of corporations will frown on the proposition, principally because they fear an upset in the status quo under which they are prospering. They would also be likely to fear new taxes if a State government should be created. Some corporations, at least, believe they can fare better dealing with bureaus than Alaskans.

There is also reason to suspect that officeholders under the present system of government might be opposed to statehood for fear that the upset under a State government would abolish their jobs. Federal bureaus might well be fearful lest they stand to lose some of their powers.

It stands as a fact that Alaska has remained under the status of a territory longer than any other territory in the Nation's history. We have produced for the Nation much more than we have obtained from it.

While we consider the subject still open for discussion and final decision, there appears evidence that Alaska is fully mature and ready for statehood.

Those 13 Original Colonies undertook the responsibilities of a sovereign nation when they were but the feeble forerunners of the States that were to come. Not only that, they fought for the rights which Alaskans now stand a chance of getting by peaceful means. Let's don't pass them up summarily.

The Maritime Future of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me yesterday evening, Wednesday, November 17, before the United States Maritime American Legion Post No. 47, under the auspices of the Maritime Commission, in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce Building.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The maritime future of the United States is one of our most momentous problems. As a member of both the Naval Affairs and the Commerce Committees of the United States Senate, I have been afforded the opportunity to make a careful study of the Nation's sea power, both as it relates to our security and our economy.

Ours should be as great a maritime nation as any in the world. That is our right by virtue of our national status and through heritage. Thinking Americans, since the beginning of our national existence, have held firmly to that principle.

Unfortunately, we have developed at times an isolationist complex and as a result have become indifferent to foreign trade, proper international relationships and the maritime development that those relationships require.

The history of our merchant marine particularly has been tragic. Quite properly has the Chairman of the Maritime Commission on recent occasions declared it to be "the Nation's cross-eyed stepchild." That was particularly true up to 1936 when the present Merchant Marine Act was adopted and a definite policy finally was established.

The principal difficulty in the past, it seems to me, has been our national indifference to our maritime progress. This despite the fact that virtually every President of this country since Washington has recognized the need and the desirability of having a strong merchant marine. No better fundamental thought on the subject has been expressed than by the Nation's first President, who said, and I quote:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your (Congress') serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects * * *. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure."

The declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 follows out this same philosophy when it declares in effect that it is necessary for the national defense and development of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States that the Nation shall have a merchant marine sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce, a substantial portion of the water-borne foreign commerce of the United States, and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. Expressed in briefest terms, the intent of Congress is that the American merchant marine shall be ample to serve our foreign commerce and to serve our national defense.

In the early years of the last century, 90 percent of our foreign commerce was carried in American vessels. We were a nation of shipbuilders and seafaring men. We produced the Yankee clippers, the finest ships of their time. We were truly a maritime nation and our ships made a great contribution toward building the country we have today.

The Civil War retarded our foreign commerce. After that war, we were absorbed in reconstruction work and the extension of our Nation to the westward. We became more and more self-centered—more isolated so to speak. Our shipping became a memory tinged with romance. We turned away from the sea.

The result was that in the early part of the present century we carried about 10 percent of our foreign trade in American-flag ships. We became a fifth-rate maritime power. The real reason for this decline was that we became self-centered in our interest and indifferent to the overseas world.

Careful analysis will show that our attitude helped to create world problems as well as domestic problems which played no small part in bringing about conditions which induced the First World War.

Our naval and merchant marine position thus became entirely inadequate for a world power of our status and we were particularly vulnerable. But the First World War jolted us out of our complacency. We were forced to play our part in world affairs, vastly expand our Navy and our merchant marine as a matter of self-preservation.

Unfortunately we did not learn our lesson. Our maritime expansion was nothing more than a war measure. It induced no immediate subsequent adoption of a sound maritime policy or a proper merchant marine rehabilitation.

Once again we drifted back into a comparatively weak maritime position. After the war our ships went to the auction block and were sold without much consideration as to whether the ultimate purchaser would contribute anything to our maritime strength or the betterment of our foreign commerce.

Our principal error lay in the fact that we considered primarily the possession of a certain number of ships, and not the effective and well-planned operation of a merchant marine for our national advancement.

At intervals those Members of the Congress who recognized the weakness of our position sought remedial legislation. Unfortunately, the majority of the American people, and consequently a majority of their representatives in Congress, did not understand how essential an adequate maritime establishment was to the Nation's economy. In the First World War, we launched a great shipbuilding program too late. Its peak was reached 9 months after the Armistice was signed. But our greatest failure was neglect to use that war-created resource of a great fleet of merchant ships.

We went through the experience of assembling a shipbuilding industry and a merchant marine, only to disassemble them and find it necessary to reassemble them when the Second World War became a threat to our national security and to civilization as a whole.

Fortunately, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which passed the House of Representatives by a bare eight votes, had laid a groundwork upon which we could build for this Second World War.

The Maritime Commission, under the mandate in that law, had inaugurated a construction program of building 50 ships a year for 10 years to provide our merchant marine with modern, efficient vessels. It was not a bold program nor particularly ambitious. It did serve, however, to reestablish the shipbuilding industry on a modest basis and to provide us with modern cargo ships and tankers which could be immediately turned over to the armed forces as auxiliaries.

It served the further purpose of providing a nucleus on which we could expand rapidly to meet the maritime needs of not only our Nation but of all of our allies among the United Nations.

Today the United States is the greatest shipbuilding nation of all time. Every shipbuilding record has been broken. Our shipyards are producing nearly six merchant ships a day, in addition to the greatest naval force in the world.

By the end of 1944 under our present plan, American shipyards will have produced since the inception of the Maritime Commission program a total of about 50,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant vessels. This merchant fleet is the equivalent of two-thirds of all the merchant vessels in the world in 1939.

We shall emerge from this war not only with the greatest Navy but with the largest merchant marine. We will own fully one-half of the world's merchant tonnage. The recent trend of the shipbuilding program toward more of the fast ships and fewer of the slower ones means that the policy of the Merchant Marine Act will have been followed out and that our merchant fleet will consist of sufficient fast modern vessels to permit us to operate on a vastly expanded scale.

Once again war has brought about a maritime development that we as a nation would not contemplate in peacetime. Once again we have abandoned our domestic tranquillity because of the war. The question that confronts us now is whether we are to return to that tranquillity in the post-war period. It is my considered judgment that we must not again commit that grevious and costly error. We must assume our responsibilities in a world order that will assure survival of and security for the institutions and the freedoms that are the foundation upon which our Nation is established.

A strong merchant marine has been proved to be vital part of our defense in time of war. It has played and is playing a considerable part in destruction of the forces of aggression. It must continue to play an equally vital part in the establishment and maintenance of a proper peacetime world economy. Otherwise we will be confronted recurrently with devasting world conflicts.

Many agencies of our Government, the Congress, our great civic and industrial organizations, as well as others, are devoting considerable attention to post-war planning. The Maritime Commission has set up an extensive post-war planning organization. The Moscow agreement recently reached among the United States, England, Russia, and China and concurred in by virtually all of the other United Nations, deals in no small part with the post-war era. All of this is most encouraging for it indicates that we are at least seeking a cure for the ills that have induced these world disorders that have proved so costly in lives and money. We must, of course, formulate our future plans with due consideration for international relationships. Particularly is this true of our future maritime program.

We cannot, however, take the position that our Nation is entitled to less than full equality with other maritime powers in our post-war merchant marine establishment.

No better basis for our future merchant marine can be found than is contained in the Merchant Marine Act—to serve adequately our foreign commerce and our national defense. Those are proper national ambitions. We have had them in the past but we have done little to bring them to realization. We have failed to interpret properly the world adequately. Most certainly we ignored those policies in the wake of the last war. How strongly will we adhere to them when this war is ended?

The reasons set forth in our Merchant Marine Act for proper reestablishment of our maritime strength are valid and are potent. Our Nation can ill afford to ignore them. In our post-war planning as applied to the first of these reasons—to adequately serve our foreign commerce—we can assume that commerce will be greater after the war than ever before. World trade will be vastly expanded, particularly during the period of reconstruction and rehabilitation. There will be worldwide effort to repair the ravages of war and at the same time to create a proper balance of living conditions and opportunities among nations. International trade is one of the greatest equalizers. It brings nations into closer contact and cultivates better understanding. It can be properly called one of the best preventatives of war. Expansion of world trade will induce expansion in our own Nation. At the same time it will develop relationships which will induce further expansion until we have reached the point of saturation. No one yet has had the temerity to predict what that will be.

It naturally follows that the number of ships required for this expanded world trade will be vastly greater than have sailed the seas heretofore. That means a greatly expanded American merchant marine. Sound economic judgment, therefore, dictates that we cannot accept the volume of pre-war world trade as a basis for limitation of our merchant fleet in the post-war future.

We can well learn a lesson from our great merchandising establishments such as the successful grocer, the department store, and

the wholesaler. They have found that an adequate delivery service—an ample fleet of trucks—is the best trade expander they can possess. Why, then, is it fallacious to assume that our Nation could expand its trade through similar methods? By rendering proper service to other nations of the world through an adequate delivery system, we can profit from the service we render.

Let us consider the second reason for a greater merchant marine—that to serve our national defense. Our Navy has been increased manyfold. The war is extending our frontiers far across the seas. Under policies already enunciated by the Senate and contained in such international agreements as have been made to date, we will be called upon to police and protect distant lands and shipping on the seven seas. We will be obliged to do our part in enforcement of restrictions imposed upon the aggressor nations and to participate properly in world government and regulation.

Our expanded Navy will have need for a vastly augmented force of auxiliaries, cargo ships, tankers, and transports. And so it is our merchant fleet must expand in direct proportion to the size of our Navy. The same fundamental reason which justifies expansion of one applies to expansion of the other. It would be shortsighted, indeed, for this Nation to maintain a Naval Establishment on the scale we now propose and fail to provide it with a strong right arm in the shape of an expanded and efficient merchant fleet. Such a combination is essential to preservation of world peace and is the best insurance against future war.

It is my firm conviction that had the United States possessed in 1939 the naval and merchant fleets it has today, Hitler and his Nazi cohorts would have hesitated long before plunging Europe into war. One of their principal strategies was to set up a submarine blockade of England. They could have done it effectively and permanently had it not been for the marvelous shipbuilding achievement of American shipyards. Had we possessed the maritime strength sufficient to convince Germany that a blockade could not be established, there might have been no World War No. 2.

In the Pacific, there was a parallel situation. Japan had little respect for our shipping. Her sneak attack on Pearl Harbor proved that the Japanese war lords looked upon our comparative naval weakness as their ace in the hole.

For years Japan had been building a merchant fleet intended to become an important part of her naval forces when she was ready to launch an attack on America. Fast Japanese cargo ships were converted into dangerous sea raiders. In peacetime they served to put our merchant vessels into a position of competitive inequality, with the result that our own merchant fleet was curtailed. Had the United States possessed an adequate naval and merchant ship establishment—one large enough and potent enough to have nullified Japan's arrogant confidence—it is quite likely that the Nipponese would have hesitated to have invaded China politically or physically.

We know now that Japan's capacity for mischief in the future will depend largely on how far she will be allowed to go as a maritime nation.

If we again adopt the policy of maintaining small naval and merchant marine establishments and fail to take our proper part in world commerce we will be extending an invitation to possible aggressors in the future to launch new wars. We cannot permit world maritime strength to fall to potential aggressor nations. If we do, there will be war again within a generation. An inadequate merchant marine under the American flag is tantamount to an invitation to war. An adequate merchant fleet, I believe, should be not less than 20,000,000 deadweight tons, with a 5,000,000 ton reserve for emergency uses.

We must in the future think in terms of sea power. By that I mean not only naval power but the combined power of adequate naval and merchant fleets.

The United States, Great Britain, Russia, and their allies among the United Nations must determine a proper and fair distribution of sea power. We have no desire to hog or monopolize the seas. We want our allies to have fair and equitable treatment, and we expect the same. Our naval treaties provide for equality between Great Britain and the United States. We certainly are justified to expect the same equality with regard to our merchant marine. There is no reason why we cannot establish such a basis, not only from the economic standpoint but because of the mutual protection such an arrangement will afford the nonaggressor nations. We know that world wars are won by those nations who hold the preponderance of sea power. We should see to it that those nations who have proved throughout the years that they have no desire for aggression and seek only to maintain peace and freedom throughout the world, shall have the sea power necessary.

There is no sound reason, in my opinion, why the two principal maritime nations in the world today, England and the United States, should fail to reach an agreement concerning the post-war maritime situation. The two countries now own more than three-fourths of the merchant tonnage of the world and control the operation of most of the balance outside the Axis Nations. Agreement between those two countries, with proper consideration for their allies, would mean that the future sea power of both countries would serve in unity to insure peace and freedom for humanity in the years to come. That would be one of the strongest deterrents possible to future wars of aggression. It would be one of the finest heritages that could be passed on to future generations, to our children and their children.

Religion and World Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able, timely, and important address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] before the Institute for Religious Studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary in America, at New York City on November 16, in connection with the graduate school conducted with the cooperation of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant scholars.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among America's contributions to a better world is her theory of freedom of religion, which embraces the concept of freedom for religions. American theory says to the state: There shall be no state church; politics and religion shall remain in separate spheres; no religious test shall ever be exacted for office holding. To the individual this same American theory says: You may believe what you wish; you may worship what you choose.

Freedom of and for religion is one freedom absolutely essential in a democracy and a necessary fundamental to the theory of a freeman. This in essence means the right td discriminate for man, but it also implies the necessity for restraint on the part of the state, the community, or the group for or against any religion or religionist. Individual man can only be free if the group, the community, or the state restrains itself. The right to be left alone, to live and let live, depends upon the will of the majority. If individual man is to be free, group man must be curbed. The individual shall have the right to discriminate; the state, the community, or the group never. The American constitutional guaranties for freedom depend upon restraint through fundamental law upon the actions of the state. Protection for minority and individual thought, belief, and writing is thus in theory restrained by that which represents the will of the whole people. In the physical realm absolute freedom can extend only to the place or condition where it does not interfere with the freedom of others. In the realm of thought or belief, the soarings of man's mind and heart cannot be curbed. Thus while everywhere man may be physically in chains, he can be a freeman when communing with himself, nature, or God. Man can project himself in thought forward or backward through endless time, and he has always done it without physical aid. This thought or projection, even though he write it, remains individual. Some persons have thought that they could experience the heart or the mind of another, but that cannot be done.

The Roman conqueror who ordered that he alone should enter the holy of holies because he wanted to know what held the hearts and the souls of the conquered people, found nothing there when he broke through the veil. Long before I learned that this Roman story was a counterpart of my own experience in a lesser degree, alone in the woods of Japan I came upon a Shinto shrine. I always wanted to see what was inside the shrine, what made it a thing of reverence. Free to act and alone, curiosity caused me to desecrate a holy spot, and I, too, learned that there was nothing there. That, pretty generally, is the reward for those without faith.

The genius of the American Constitution is not that the majority rules but that under it the minority is protected, listened to, and respected. In the case of our highest Court, the minority dissent often is quoted so extensively that it becomes in time the law of the land. This does not happen merely as a constitutional practice but as an almost every-day occurrence in the small decisions that guide our democratic mode of life. In this way democratic life actually breaks the shackles of custom, caste, and the past. Men cease to be ruled by their dead, and the chains of fate are definitely broken. I must stop there or I may find myself lost in the labyrinth of conflict over free will.

I am an American and I am a Mormon. I do not go back of the fundamentals on which our Constitution rests, nor do I question the fundamentals of my religion, for they are based on revelation. The citizen in America is a responsible individual; the soul of man in Mormon theory is a free agent in this, the previous, or the future life. In the condition where the whole world will be the unit the problem will remain the same—the conflict between the person and the group. In world-wide organization the problem of leaving the individual free means the tempering of nations in their actions toward the individual person. That is what happens under our Federal system in regard to freedom of religion. Seldom, if ever, has persecution been a matter between persons. Group

thought, or I had better say thought which dominates group action, has produced the damning outrages in States, communities, or churches where the single will in theory prevails. It is not Hitler against a Jew; it is the Nazi mob against its victims. It was not Paul who stoned Stephen; it was a group action against a person. No mobocrat murdered Joseph Smith; the mob did the deadly work.

America has experienced 150 years of experimentation in freedom for religions. If this freedom is to be extended to the whole world, it should properly come under American leadership or at least through cooperation with those nations which long ago ceased to discriminate among religions in their political life. American freedom has produced a type of citizen who consciously or unconsciously has embraced in his own outlook characteristics which are typical of the outstanding religious concepts of the wide world. Freedom of religious thought and freedom for religions in America has produced a citizen who in his religious life actually has become a cosmopolitan, or a citizen of the world. This I count good, and I will tell you why as we move along.

The American is restrained. He believes in a curb on his desires. He likes moderation. And he has learned how to appreciate those with whom he does not agree. Thus in a sense he reflects the basic ideas of the finest social and democratic aspects of Buddhism. Yet he has never been closely exposed to Buddhism. The American has accepted the concept of progress. He believes in planning. He saves, he prepares for the rainy day, he accepts the theory that the world can be made better. He is convinced that it has been made better from his own study of history. Thus he has either consciously or unconsciously accepted that phase of what might be termed the Greek approach to religion as it is expressed in the story of Prometheus, who stole fire from heaven for the good of man. He thus represents the belief that God can do something for man and that man can do much for himself in cooperating with the will of God. The Lord's Prayer is meaningless if God and man do not work together that His Kingdom shall come.

All Americans are basically Christian; that is, our pre-constitutional institutions and our post-constitutional habits and thoughts reflect, especially when there is distress in the world and especially by our missionary efforts, the sympathetic love which underlies the fundamentals of Christianity. Every American knows who his neighbor is for he is schooled in the scriptures to that extent. He will hedge a bit, as Cain did, if asked about his brother; but he is socially conscious and he accepts his social and vicarious responsibilities.

Hebrew social justice, as it has been tempered by 2,000 years of Christian thought, is American. The outstanding deduction which an ordinary observer would make of our political debates and aims is that underlying both is a basic desire for the attainment of social justice. Thus does the Hebrew ideal influence the lives and thoughts of Americans.

There is just enough in the average American, due probably to his higher standard of living or to the lack of restraint in his teaching, which causes him to accept for the moment, if not as a basic philosophy, the idea that he should live for today and that he should make the most of that day. Life has made him an epicurean.

The average American is surely a Chinaman. He uses in colloquial discussion oftener probably than any other expression, "That's natural," which phrase is the key to my loose assertion. "That's natural" ends all argument with him. He does not formally accept a natural law, but he appeals constantly to it. With this appeal the American lawyer convinces a jury. Under our constitutional system, natural law is definitely a part of our theory of the graduation of law. We resort to the logic of an appeal to the higher law so often that such an appeal is a commonplace among us. The appeal to the higher law, which is even above the Constitution, has kept many a man from hanging.

I do not say that the average American has in his mind this mingling of thought as his plan of life, but I do say that in every American you can find all of these philosophies. Thus we have a prototype of what the religious world may become if there is established universally, freedom for religion and freedom of religion. I call it healthful. Under this system those religions which are strongly authoritarian have thrived and and those which are lax in stressing eternal life and the church's right to loose and to bind on earth and in heaven have developed to a strong position also. Witness the different divorce standards in our 48 jurisdictions. Judging from American experiences, world religions and religionists should have nothing to fear if that freedom of religion and for religion which Americans enjoy becomes universal.

The irony of history in regard to these great principles is not better expressed than it was when representatives of the two outstanding authoritarian Christian churches offered their prayers at the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial last spring. Each of these reverend gentleman thanked God for the life and the work of Thomas Jefferson. Less than 2 weeks ago, in a church not my own, and one different from the two just mentioned, I took part in the dedication of memorial windows which honored both Jefferson and Lincoln. Spokesmen present approved the religious life of each of these great men. When we realize what contemporary religionists said of Jefferson while he was alive, no one can deny that freedom of and for religion in America has suceeded better than anyone ever dreamed it would.

Now, if we are to have a world which will produce a world citizen free in regard to religion, we must face the problems. The world must do what America has done. All religionists must live up to their religions. By that I mean to point out the fact that if we analyze the fundamental principles of the world's great extant religions we shall find that every one of them accepts the principle of toleration. Religions are broad; religionists generally narrow. Religions seek catholicity and universality; religionists emphasize differences. Cocksureness is not found in religious systems, but among religionists it is often a definite characteristic. This cocksureness must in some way be overcome because it is boring—it is the egotism of the ignorant. By cocksureness I mean that dual attitude where one not only asserts his own belief but also damns with disdain all others.

The Jew must not think that the whole world is against him. The Jewish case, to be sure, is an old one. Jewish persecution has been wide, but it has not been universal. The Jew, too, has been quite as intolerant of his neighbor as his neighbor has been intolerant of him. Like begets like; dislike begets dislike.

The Roman Catholics and Protestants must learn that the Reformation is not understood everywhere; that in reality it was quite a local question as it became a reason for persecution. Even among Greek and Russian Catholics the Reformation as western Europe and America understand it is outside their experience. The restoration of the Gospel, which is the Mormon thesis, only has meaning among Christian peoples.

I am talking to Jews, Catholics, and Protestants. It is indeed hard for us—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—to feel that persecutions have taken place outside our experiences, but they have. The burning of books was not limited to European experiences, and especially not limited to Mr. Hitler's Germany. Books were burned when Tsin Shih Hwang Ti ordered the destruction of the teachings of the Chou dynasty.

We cannot have world-wide freedoms with Nation-wide interpretation of history. The Chinese wall aloofness has occurred everywhere. It is not in China only that a foreign policy was built around a wall. And in the religious field spheres are smaller even than in the political one. In fact I may say that there are parts of the world where people live rather tolerant lives because religionists, caste defenders, and arousers of hate against all but themselves are so strong that toleration must be practiced in self-defense. We cannot bring about a universal acceptance of the freedom of religion until we become fully conscious of the fact that persecutions when judged from a world-wide standpoint have always been geographically quite local.

The conflicts among Jews, Catholics, and Protestants seem great, but they are unimportant indeed when we reach out and think in terms of world-wide freedoms. If we get in a world-wide realm, then will come the great test because the question immediately comes to the minds of all of us whose systems are based on the concept of revelation: Shall we allow freedom for that which is not true? We have had to do so where all parties to a conflict accepted the concept of revelation. Surely then we can do so where the concept of revelation is lacking.

That brings us to the outstanding question which we of the West must settle if there shall be freedom of and for religions everywhere. All religious systems in the West whether they be Hebrew, Christian, Mohammedan, or Greek are based upon the concept of revelation. This has made for a religious thought which accepts absolutes. That which God says cannot be questioned. It is this loyalty which has been engendered in defense of these absolutes which has produced martyrs, war for a righteous cause, persecution, and no compromise. Western nationalisms have come into existence and been defended on the basis of a defense of the faith.

When the Japanese Government turned nationalistic in its nature and western in its form, it was assumed by many that the people of Japan would have to become Christian because it was only in Christian lands that the nationalistic appeal was effective. The scheme was for the Crown Prince to become a Christian, and the evolution would be gradual with the development of constitutional government. But certain westerners pointed out that by application of a western theory, the divine right of kings, the Emperor could be given constitutional support as a son of the gods. However, the son of heaven in Chinese theory, or the descendant of Ameterasu in Japanese theory, never carried the significance of the divine right of kings. That theory is, as I said before, of western origin and was developed to meet a purely western situation. The king-god idea is well known throughout all Asia, but the Japanese knew in the last decade of the last century that it would be impossible in our modern times to ascribe divinity to any person. Thus, Shinto became a political religion, and the Mikado cult for both religious and political reasons became a fact.

The most vivid experience of my life in regard to the conflict of fundamental religious contrasts came when a certain secretary of the interior in Japan called a conference of Christians, Buddhists, Confucianists, Shintoists, and Mohammedans and asked the members attending the conference to work out a religion for Japan. I had my answer. My religion was for the whole world and if the Japanese wanted it they could accept it. But my religion was made by God, not by man. I could not change it. I need not mention what other religionists present, who accepted the concept of revelation, might

have said when invited to compromise their own system for the benefit of a nonbelieving people. Thus, the conference broke up.

Since Asiatic thought does not accept the concept of revelation, compromise and intermingling of concepts are possible. There are no absolutes; therefore there should be no religious loyalties which require defense to the death. The problem then of world-wide acceptance of freedom of and for religions is not basically an eastern problem. It is a problem in those lands where religions have come into existence as a result of a revelation from God.

The strength of a tolerant land like China in being able to overcome the unyielding attitude of the Jewish religionists who went to China, proves in this particular that the problem of freedom of religions and for religions is primarily a western problem. Therefore, we must look to our own western history for its solution. In the last 200 years Europe and America have passed through an evolution in regard to this great freedom which becomes startling when we point out that not many years ago we justified the persecution and the killing of the heretic as being pleasing to God. Persecution gave way to a spirit of forbearance. The time came when men said, "Don't kill them—just ignore them." About the time our Constitution came into existence a spirit of toleration came into the world It has grown and developed to such an extent that a meeting such as the one we have here tonight seems not out of place. You see, I could not experience the joy of delivering this talk if you were not beneficiaries of one of our great constitutional freedoms. But we are not thinking longer about the fact that a Mormon can talk to Protestants and Catholics in a Jewish seminary. That is one of the fruits of toleration.

But toleration is not enough. If freedom in regard to religion can work in the world we must not only cease to persecute, we must not only cease to forbear. We must extend our concept of toleration to the place where we can actually appreciate our neighbor and his belief. That will be the hardest of all the gaps for us Europeans and Americans to bridge. Can heathens have anything worth appreciating? The only way we shall ever find out is to study the thought of those heathens. As religionists, let us be broad enough to accept the thesis of the first verse of the first chapter of Hebrews, and extend that to the whole world. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His son." The writer in Hebrews does not condemn the revelation of the fathers; he accepts it, but he adds another prophet to those already accepted.

We do not want to overcome the concept of revelation, but probably we can appreciate others to the extent that we will accept the theory that God likely did not forget the rest of mankind when he remembered his prophets. We cannot give up the concept of revelation. That would destroy all western religions. But we can recognize the source of all revelation as the father of all mankind.

The West accepts the concept of revelation, but it denies its power. Like Confucius, who wrote a book to bind the Chinese for 2,000 years, some of us in the West would close our doors to more revelation. The two great western concepts—revelation and progress—must be joined. When they are, the door to greater thought and achievement will not remain shut.

The problem for the religionist is in reality not much greater than the problem for the nationalist patriot in bringing about a better world order and making universal the great freedoms. To appreciate other religions does not mean to be disloyal to one's own. Appreciation of others' loyalties will, in fact, enlarge the meaning of one's own.

Let me say, if I can, just what I have said, in the light of my own religion. Revelation is a primary and an absolutely essential principle. Eternalism, that is that the individual entity which constitutes the soul of man so far as time is concerned is indestructible, is another cardinal principle. I accept the fatherhood of God idea and the brotherhood of man concept. I can therefore appreciate truth wherever it is found. I myself have moved out of that sphere of thought which caused the great missionary, Xavier, as he traveled through the East and discovered so many things like his own to decide that the devil had been there before him and had taught much truth to the people to deceive them. I do not think that fossils were placed in the rocks to make the Genesis story about the creation of the world harder to believe. Am I less a Jew or a Christian if I accept a modern theory in geology? In my concept of the economy of time the earth's creation was purposeful, man's experience on the earth is essential to his eternal development. It is not for me to judge which of these experiences may become of more lasting worth as eternal life approaches, for eternal life must mean eternal growth. I can have beliefs, but I cannot know. In regard to my eternal life, I must live by faith. It is not within my temporal experience, memory, or ability to project myself into the future, for me to know. I can know the past only to the extent of my memory. I can know the present only by the extent of my services.

Thus we can appreciate others without depreciating ourselves. I am no less an American because I may see good in a Chinaman. Catholics in this free land of America are no less Catholics than in a land where there are nothing but Catholics. If we recognize the worth of the individual, which is the essence of democracy, the freedoms can be extended to the whole world. We must not attempt to destroy differences and make all religions exactly the same. That might mar the power of growth and development. To cut off newly discovered truth or to kill a new idea would stop progress. All religion today becomes dead indeed if we lose the aspiration for a better world.

Can we not make real that partnership between heaven and earth prayed for throughout the ages, and feasible under the western concept of revelation, so that the "desire of all nations shall come"?

Advertising of War Bond Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Advertising Has Paid Its Way," published in the Washington News of November 16, 1943. The editorial is based upon an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] on November 11, at Chicago, Ill., before the annual meeting of the Central Council of the American Association of Advertising Agencies. I should like to have the editorial followed in the RECORD by the address of the Senator from Missouri.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of November 16, 1943]

ADVERTISING HAS PAID ITS WAY

Advertising being one of the sinews of newspaper prosperity, perhaps we will be pardoned for citing some kind words by Senator TRUMAN of Missouri.

Not all of the Senator's talk to the American Association of Advertising Agencies was honeyed. He was properly critical of misleading advertisements, citing some examples and of overlarge outlays (before taxes) for advertising by war contractors. But he had this to say in retort to critics of the institution of advertising—critics who regard advertising as "simply an extra expense to be paid by the consumer":

"Such a position wholly overlooks the fact that advertising calls the attention of the public to the availability of new articles and better merchandise and, thereby, stimulates a desire on the part of the reader to purchase such merchandise.

"For example, when Americans were told about new and improved household devices * * * they planned and worked to make the savings necessary to acquire them. This, in turn, enabled the manufacturers to produce goods in greater quantities, thereby both providing work for additional thousands of employees and reducing the cost of production. This brought the cost of the articles within the price range of still other consumers. * * *

"Advertising has induced progress in the use by manufacturers of new materials, new tools, and new processes of manufacture. * * *

"Advertising has paid its way. Its contributions have resulted in better living, not only by providing greater comfort and luxury, but also by providing better health and a greater opportunity for leisure and cultural development."

There are people in the Government who could read that, and the rest of the speech, with profit if not pleasure.

Incidentally, we commend to Senator BANKHEAD, author of the pending press-subsidy bill, Senator TRUMAN's praise of the way the advertising industry has gone to bat for the War bond and other Government campaigns, and his remark in this connection:

"It is a tribute to the advertising industry and to advertisers that all of this has been done on a voluntary basis, rather than by paid Government campaigns. The dangers and difficulties inherent in attempting to do a job of this type by paid Government advertising are obvious. * * * Even if there were no abuses, public confidence in the integrity of the press and radio might be undermined."

THE RELATION OF ADVERTISING TO THE WAR PROGRAM

(Speech of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri)

Mr. Chairman and members of the central council of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, I appreciate this opportunity to address you on the subject of the relation of advertising to the war program.

In the years before the war, advertising had become increasingly important to American business. Some people made the mistake of assuming that the only result of advertising was to get the public to buy one company's product in preference to that of its competitor. If that were the only purpose of advertising, there would have been merit in the suggestion that was sometimes

made by the uninformed that advertising was simply an extra expense which had to be paid by the consumer.

Such a position wholly overlooks the fact that advertising calls the attention of the public to the availability of new articles and better merchandise and, thereby, stimulates a desire on the part of the reader to purchase such merchandise. For example, when Americans were told about new and improved household devices which would make their homes more comfortable and reduce the work of their wives, they planned and worked to make the savings necessary to acquire them. This, in turn, enabled the manufacturers to produce goods in greater quantities, thereby both providing work for additional thousands of employees and reducing the cost of production. This brought the cost of the articles within the price range of still other consumers.

Because advertising acquainted the American public with the facts, every American businessman realized that his products were in competition for the consumer's dollar not only with the similar products manufactured by his competitors, but with all other articles which were being offered to the American consumer. This served as a strong stimulation to improve the products, and to make them more satisfactory to the consumer.

Advertising has induced progress in the use by manufacturers of new materials, new tools, and new processes of manufacture by calling their attention to the economies which could be achieved and to the new uses to which they could be put. Without such advertising, information of this kind would take years to reach all of those who might benefit by it, and progress would be delayed.

Advertising has paid its way. Its contributions have resulted in better living, not only by providing greater comfort and luxury, but also by providing better health and a greater opportunity for leisure and cultural development

A practical measure of the value of advertising is the fact that American businessmen, the shrewdest in the world, are willing to pay hundreds of millions of dollars annually for advertising, because they know that it produces results in stimulating people to the activity necessary to acquire good merchandise.

In the United States, our natural resources were so great that it was possible to obtain sufficient food, shelter, and clothing for bare subsistence with only a fraction of the labor available. If there had been little knowledge of better things and no stimulation of the desire to obtain them, we would not have created the factories and machinery which have enabled us to amaze the world in the production of war material.

If our people had not known the better things in store for them after victory, they would not have appreciated so thoroughly what we are fighting for, and it would have been difficult to increase production of war material when the quantity of civilian goods, which workers could buy with increased wages, was so small. We have found, during the war, that in many foreign areas even the payment of high wages is not sufficient to induce production because the workers are used to bare subsistence, are unfamiliar with the benefits which increased wages would bring to them, and have not been stimulated to work to obtain them.

When the war broke out, it was apparent that this advertising machinery could render important assistance to the Government in informing people about matters important to the war effort and in inducing them to act accordingly.

Theoretically this could be done without advertising, by public statements from Government officials which would be carried by the press and radio as news stories. There is no doubt that our press and radio have done a tremendous job in that respect. However, news stories alone might not be sufficient to strike deep into the public consciousness and induce action.

To use an example, the prospective shortage of food, the necessity for rationing, and the consequent desirability of planting victory gardens is a news story which would be widely circulated. It would be sufficiently important, as a news story, to warrant some repetition, but to accomplish the task of inducing the actual planting of millions of Victory gardens it was necessary to keep the attention of the public constantly focused on that subject. This was done, and could only have been done, by advertising. You will all recall that almost every issue of our leading magazines carried advertisements recommending the planting of Victory gardens, and many radio programs called the attention of their listeners to the campaign to get Victory gardens planted.

Similarly, the announcement of a drive for the sale of War bonds is news, but a large number of the purchases are actually induced by the advertising campaigns which constantly bring to the attention of the public the purpose of the loans and the benefits, both to the country and to the individual.

Campaigns by advertisers to assist the Government to get Victory gardens planted and War bonds purchased are only 2 of 44 war campaigns which advertisers have worked out in cooperation with the Government. Such campaigns include scrap salvage, conservation of household greases and fats, transfer of workers to essential jobs, reducing absenteeism in war plants, part-time labor to harvest crops, food rationing, avoidance of black markets, and the reduction of travel. They have been a great help to the war effort.

Advertisers estimate that the commercial value of advertising time, space, and services, voluntarily contributed for war purposes, in 1942, exceeded $250,000,000. Substantially more is being contributed this year, which should be contrasted with the less than $2,000,000 contributed during all of World War No. 1. Most of you are more familiar with these facts than I am, for you have helped in the planning of the campaigns and the creation of the advertisements.

It is a tribute to the advertising industry and to advertisers that all of this has been done on a voluntary basis rather than by paid Government campaigns. The dangers and difficulties inherent in attempting to do a job of this type by paid Government advertising campaigns are obvious.

In the first place, our press and radio are so dependent upon revenues from advertising that it would be dangerous to entrust Government bureaucrats with the spending of huge sums of money for advertising, and the distribution of advertising among the various newspapers and radio stations. Even if there were no abuses, public confidence in the integrity of the press and radio might be undermined.

In the second place, Government campaigns would require the Government to hire its own advertising talent, and make its own contracts for newspaper space and radio time and talent in competition with private business. This would have been a tremendous task and, even if successfully completed, would have resulted in a disruption of the advertising industry and of newspapers and radio programs. Major readjustments would have been required at the end of the war, and pressure undoubtedly would have arisen for the continuance of paid Government advertising campaigns.

I think we have been very wise in avoiding this, and that we have obtained most of the benefits of Government advertising campaigns without the detriment of Government interference in advertising or threats to the independence of the press and radio.

This combination of Government agencies indicating their needs and private advertising supplying those needs has enabled the advertising agencies to hold their staffs together and to obtain fees for advertising, much of which would not otherwise have been placed. The cost of the advertising, in turn, has been charged by the advertisers on their books as an expense, before profit. This has resulted in reducing the amount of profit on which Federal income taxes are payable. Since a number of the advertisers have substantially no business except war business from the Government, and still others have a much greater war business than civilian business and are in the highest excess-profits-tax brackets, this means that much of the advertising is indirectly paid for by the Government.

To the extent that the Government has obtained value from the war campaigns, which I previously referred to, it is entirely proper that it should pay the expense. However, advertisers fall into several different classifications; and different considerations apply to each.

First, there are those advertisers who still make civilian goods and who obtain little or no profit from the sale of war products to the Government. They still have goods to sell today, and in donating part of their advertising space for Government campaigns, they are giving up what they otherwise could use for their own purposes and are not being compensated by escaping a high excess-profits tax on profits from war business which they would not otherwise have. Their compensation comes from the knowledge that they have done a worthy act which most of the public will recognize as such.

A second group of corporations consists of those which produced peace-time articles before the war, and which established valuable goodwill with the public by advertising the merits of their products. Although their profits come from the production of war goods, the profits, especially after renegotiation, are in most cases not much greater than the profits which they would have made had they been permitted to continue their regular business. In some cases, they are even less. If these corporations were not permitted to obtain a sufficient return from their Government contracts to enable them, by advertising, to keep their names and products before the public, they would lose one of their most valuable assets that they paid hard cash to create. The expense of maintaining this goodwill through advertising may be likened to the expense of maintaining tools and machinery and factory buildings, which were used in peacetime production, but for which there is only limited use during the war. In such cases, it is only fair that corporations be allowed to continue a reasonable advertising program and to charge the cost thereof as an expense. This is particularly so as, in most instances, it has been possible to prepare advertising that promotes Government-sponsored war campaigns at the same time that it protects the goodwill and established reputation of the advertiser.

A third class of corporations includes those which had no extensive business before the war but which, as a result of the erection of huge plants at Government expense and the hiring of thousands of new employees, now have huge contracts for the production of war matériel. Such corporations did little or no advertising before the war, and have no established markets or products which they must protect by advertising campaigns during the war. When we permit such corporations to charge huge advertising campaigns as expenses, before taxes, for the purpose of creating a goodwill and market position with the public for their post-war benefit, we are giving them an additional gain or benefit from the war which is just as important, and in some cases more important, than the dollar profits they are permitted to retain.

It may be said that these companies will need goodwill and markets after the war if their factories are to operate and their workmen are to be employed, and that they should therefore be permitted to advertise at Government expense. But if that argument is valid, we should also provide them—at the taxpayer's expense—with working capital and with the tools and facilities necessary for peacetime production. This would not only be a burden to the taxpayers but would be unfair to the investors in established businesses which would have to compete with corporations whose owners had made little contribution except their services.

Such corporations should be assisted but not at the expense of the taxpayers. The Senate Committee to Investigate the War Program, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will soon hold a series of hearings to ascertain how these war businesses can be assisted to become sound peacetime businesses. Real progress can be made toward eliminating many of the problems that confront them, and I believe that if business and Government will cooperate and work out these problems, the war businesses will not require a dole from the taxpayers.

I do not mean that war businesses should not be allowed to do any advertising or to charge the cost thereof as an expense before profits. After all, most of them had done some advertising before the war, and much of their advertising is useful to the war campaigns. What I do mean is that there are distinct limits on the extent to which such corporations should be permitted to charge the advertising as an expense of war business and that, in my opinion, many of such corporations have gone beyond those limits.

There has been too much of what advertising agencies refer to as blue-sky advertising. It is virtually impossible today to pick up a magazine or newspaper without finding page after page of glowing tribute to American industry. To read the dramatically written messages and to see the highly colored photographs and drawings, one would almost think that our battles were not won by our fighting men at all but by our war industries.

Some of these companies have even used advertising, the cost of which is indirectly borne by the taxpayer, to create false impressions or to counteract criticism which has legitimately been directed at them. For example, one corporation advertised an airplane as the best dive bomber in the world at a time when it had spent over $100,000,000 of Government money in a plant, built at Government expense, without producing a single dive bomber which could be used in combat. Another airplane company inserted a number of advertisements, the plain import of which was that its planes were blasting the Axis and making a large contribution to victory abroad, when the fact was that none of the planes in question were in use, or are ever expected to be placed in use, at any fighting front.

Other corporations inserted numerous advertisements to the effect that the Navy was using helicopters against submarines, when the fact was that the Army and not the Navy was developing helicopters, and that the Navy deserved criticism, rather than praise, for its action with respect to helicopters.

In other cases, corporations have inserted advertisements, indirectly paid for by the taxpayer, in which they try to justify corporate action under investigation. These advertisements frequently contain half-truths and innuendoes and even false statements. Certainly, the taxpayers should not be asked to pay for them.

I point out these abuses of advertising to you, not in a spirit of criticism, but because I know that you and others interested in sound advertising desire to prevent them. The Internal Revenue Department has approached the problem of advertising and the allowance of its cost in a common-sense, realistic way by declaring that advertising costs will be allowed as expenses to the extent that they are reasonable.

The proper application of this standard of reason should be sufficient to make proper allowance for the differences in the situations of the corporations involved. It cannot, however, deal with cases of exaggerated or false claims unless the Department of Internal Revenue is, in effect, to be made a censor of advertising practices. It would be impractical for it to attempt any such function, and the detriments might well exceed the benefits.

Consequently, it is up to the advertising industry, itself, constantly to review its own practices and to make certain that every piece of advertising carries a real and an honest message to the public. Much has already been accomplished along these lines by the advertising agencies and by our better newspaper publishers and radio station owners.

It has frequently been said that no amount of advertising will persuade people long to accept a poor product or a wrong idea. It is just as true that advertising, to merit the support of the public and the payment of the cost thereof, must be good advertising.

Good advertising in wartime is that which renders a service, not alone to the companies' immediate self-interest, but to its customers—past, present, and future. There are some notable examples where advertisers have adopted some appropriate Government campaign or war theme, and I am told that this has been productive of the best results for the companies and their products, for industry as a whole, and for the Nation. Advertising that profits all around is good advertising. Let us have more good advertising of that sort.

Cost-Plus-A-Fixed-Fee War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release issued by the Office of War Information with reference to reports made by the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration to James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, on the subject of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contracts, and other related subjects.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports made by the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration to James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, disclose that cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contracts are being converted whenever possible into employer incentive and fixed-price contracts.

The significance of this action, the Office of War Information declared today in making public a summary of these reports, is that progress definitely is being made toward—

1. Reducing the cost of war materials.
2. Eliminating conditions which have caused some war contractors to hoard labor.
3. Eliminating waste of manpower and money.

When our war-preparation program began, the procurement agencies of Government undertook to secure fixed-price contracts. In 1940 Congress made illegal the old cost-plus-10-percent contract of the last war. It developed, however, that procurement agencies could not secure the needed production of war goods under fixed-price contracts because manufacturers were without experience in producing war materials and had no basis on which to estimate their costs.

To meet this situation a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract was developed, the fee being a fixed amount of dollars which did not change with variations of cost. As production attained large volume, and production experience indicated what further production would cost, the Government procurement agencies have been able to get many contractors to convert their contracts to a fixed-price basis.

Large savings of dollars and manpower have been effected, but the reports made by the agencies to Mr. Byrnes do not indicate any estimate of the total savings, or what percentage of the over-all war expenditure is involved.

There remain a large number of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, mostly in the Navy and in the Air Corps and Ordnance departments of the Army, and these procurement agencies are actively engaged in trying to obtain the consent of contractors to converted type of contracts.

The reports of the four agencies disclosed that the Maritime Commission had used cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts on fewer than 100 of the 4,392 vessels contracted for up to last August 30, and that the other three agencies all have made progress in converting such contracts.

The Navy's first conversion from a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to a contractor-incentive basis reduced the cost to the Government of one unnamed instrument from $195 to $146 each, according to a report made by James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, to Mr. Byrnes.

The way the Navy's policy worked in this first test case is as follows:

The Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics, from a previous contract with another manufacturer for the same article, knew the cost. A contract was awarded on a price based on that experience, with a provision that as costs were reduced the contractor, within certain limits, participated in the increased savings to the Government.

Since this policy was adopted by the Navy Department, similar contracts have been written or agreed upon by the Bureau of Aeronautics with four big airplane companies, and similar contracts are in process of negotiation with three other large companies, Mr. Forrestal reported.

On January 28, 1943, the Navy Department announced a policy of using fixed-price contracts wherever possible and of discouraging cost-plus-fee contracts for war materials and supplies.

The Navy's Bureau of Ships is studying the best means of converting ship contracts, and instructions have been given to each Navy bureau to examine outstanding future contracts with the idea of converting wherever possible.

"In my opinion," Mr. Forrestal said to Mr. Byrnes, "this form of incentive-type contract developed by the Navy Department effectively meets present conditions and is of advantage to both the Government and the contractor and, under proper supervision, can prevent the profits of the contractor from becoming excessive. The Navy Department hopes to use this form of contract wherever feasible.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson reported that ever since the War Department was authorized, in the act of July 2, 1940, to enter into cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, it has attempted to limit such

contracts, because they do not provide direct financial incentive to the contractor to control costs and because they require considerable manpower for auditing and administration. Such contracts were necessary in instances where time does not permit adequate preparation of plans or specifications, when the production of new types of munitions is involved, or when the contractor lacks cost data or production experience or is unable to assume the risks of fixed-price contracts.

The War Department early in 1942 authorized two modified forms of fixed-price contracts providing for the setting of a tentative original price and then fixing the final price after part performance. In the fall of 1942, the Army Air Forces were instructed that cost-plus-a-fixed-fee supply contracts are only to be entered into where absolutely necessary or for experimental or developmental items and were directed immediately to take steps to change wherever practicable all existing fixed-fee contracts to firm price contracts. Similar directives were sent to the Army Technical Services last December.

In January 1943 the War Department authorized a new type of contract article providing for periodic adjustment of prices. Under it long-term contracts are divided into a series of pricing periods extending for 4 to 6 months each. The contract price is fixed for only one period and is adjusted either upward or downward for the next period by negotiation based on conditions then prevailing, and the contracting officer is authorized in his discretion to exempt from statutory renegotiation the price fixed for any period. By limiting the length of the contractor's commitment, this type of contract enables him to fix a reasonable price to be adjusted during the life of the contract to reflect changing conditions. The exemption from renegotiation provides a means for obtaining a close price and for maintaining maximum incentives for reductions in costs during each period.

At about the same time the War Department authorized another contract article to provide incentives in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by adjusting the fee inversely for differences in costs to reward efficient performance. Under it a target estimate of cost is fixed after part performance and the fee is increased if the costs are reduced through efficiency or is decreased if the costs exceed the estimate.

Mr. Patterson reported that in accordance with this policy the War Department has made extensive efforts for more than 10 months to convert to fixed-price basis through both the Air Forces and the Ordnance Department, which are the only War Department services making cost-plus-a-fixed-fee supply contracts to any important extent. The Army Air Forces, from January 1, 1943, to September 15, 1943, have converted about $170,000,000 in face amount, but still have outstanding approximately 343 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts with about 133 contractors, Mr. Patterson reported. These unconverted contracts represent more than 40 percent of the dollar volume of the Air Forces' expenditures. Most of the stable items of Air Forces equipment are purchased on a fixed-price basis.

The Army Ordnance Department on last April 15 had 54 cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to which the conversion program applied and since then 4 have been added and 7 have been completed or terminated—making a total of 51. Of these, 2 have been converted, commitments have been obtained from contractors to convert 4 more and it is hoped to be able to convert about 5 more in the near future. Efforts have been made to convert the remaining 40 but it has been felt that conversion of at least 20 of these is not feasible. Some of them will be completed or terminated before the end of the year. Negotiations for conversion are being conducted with the remaining 20, "but the contractors are either unwilling to convert at all or are willing to do so only at prices believed to be entirely too high to justify the change," Mr. Patterson reported.

The Under Secretary's report pointed out several major obstacles to conversion as demonstrated by the War Department's efforts so far, as follows:

1. The rate of production of certain items fluctuates so rapidly and so widely according to strategic and military factors and specification changes that the resulting variations in the costs of production make it almost impossible to fix a reasonable price without heavy contingency allowances or constant adjustment of the price

2. Many of the fixed-fee contractors, especially with the Air Forces have so little previous experience with production of their present products or depend so heavily on subcontractors in this condition, that they are unable to estimate their costs with reasonable accuracy.

3. Many of the contractors under fixed-fee contracts have only moderate amounts of capital but are doing an enormous volume of business totally disproportionate to their capital, and are entirely unwilling to assume the risks inherent in the fixed-price contract for fear that even small errors might ruin the company entirely.

4. With the tremendous expansion of business, management and engineering personnel in some companies has been spread so thin that they are either unable or unwilling to divert their time and energies to the computation and negotiation of prices instead of to production.

5. The instability of labor conditions in certain areas involving heavy turn-over, shortages in personnel, large training costs, and low efficiency makes estimates of labor costs exteremely uncertain.

6. Certain of the fixed-fee contractors, especially with Ordnance, have undertaken to manage plants producing articles totally different from their commercial business, primarily as a public service and without desire for substantial or any profit; often they are not willing to embark on a business venture in such fields, desiring neither the attendant profits nor the risks.

The War Department to meet such circumstances has studied the so-called incentive-type contracts, sometimes known as target price contracts, and has authorized a form of contract provision which in effect makes the contractor's fee depend on his record in controlling costs. The fixing of an accurate target or estimate of cost is the heart of this provision, since an inaccurate estimate will reward or penalize the contractor on a fictitious basis. Under provisions governing Army contracts, the target is fixed after the contractor in question has performed part of the contract involved, since most experience with such clauses have indicated that the target estimate should be based on the actual cost experience of the particular contractor.

The Army Ordnance Department has recently used another method of providing incentives for efficiency in cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts at Government-owned privately operated small-arms ammunition plants. This involves a contract provision for periodic review of contracts to include comparison of operations costs with other similar plants, the extent of effective utilization of manpower and the volume of production during the last half of 1943 and the scheduled production during the first half of 1944.

Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, reported that the fewer than 100 vessels covered by cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts were either of a design not yet fully developed or vessels which had been partially completed by the original contractors and had to be completed by another. In both such cases it was impossible to make accurate estimates of cost or number of man-hours required.

The Maritime Commission, aside from these exceptions, has three types of contracts for construction of vessels, "fixed-price contracts" aggregating $325,000,000, "price-minus" contracts aggregating $1,900,000,000 and "man-hour" contracts aggregating $3,500,000,000.

The "price-minus" contracts, used for the more complicated, nonstandardized vessels, assures the private shipbuilder reimbursement for all of his legitimate costs plus a small minimum fee, and it also provides an incentive for reduction in cost and in use of manpower. As in the Army and Navy incentive type contracts, the Government agency sets an estimate, based on detailed experience and knowledge. Then if the shipbuilder reduces his cost below his estimate, his fee is increased. In effect the contractor and the Government share savings below the contract price so that the contractor who reduces his man-hours or otherwise effects economies gets one-half the savings added to his minimum fee and the Commission gets the ship for the contract price minus half the savings—hence the term "price-minus." Under "price-minus" a ship might be estimated to cost, for labor, material and overhead, $1,000,000. The minimum fee might likely be set at $30,000 and the contract price at $1,100,000. Then, if the vessel actually cost $1,000,000 to build, the contractor would be paid the $1,000,000 cost plus the $30,000 fee. He would also be paid one-half the difference between the $1,030,000 and the contract price of $1,100,000. In other words, he would receive a total fee of $65,000, or 6½ percent of the estimated cost and the vessel would cost the Government $35,000 less than the contract price.

If this contractor were to cut down his use of labor or effect other savings to build the vessel at a cost of $950,000, he would be paid that amount plus $30,000, or $980,000, and half of the difference between $980,000 and the $1,100,000 contract price. In that event the contractor's total fee would be $90,000 and the vessel would cost the Government $60,000 less than the contract price.

If the cost of building the vessel exceeded the $1,100,000 contract price, the contractor would get his cost and only the $30,000 minimum fee. Escalator clauses are provided to adjust to meet changes in prices and wage scales over which the contractor has no control.

The man-hours contract used for Liberty and Victory ships is similar in general effect, but it places the emphasis upon man-hours rather than dollars of cost. This is practicable because of the high degree of standardization and because of the fact that virtually all the parts and material for these ships are purchased directly by the Commission and sent by it to the shipyards. The contractor is therefore concerned mainly with economy of labor. A normal number of man-hours is stipulated in the contract and if this is realized in the actual building of the ship, a normal fee is paid. If the normal number of man-hours is exceeded, the fee is reduced; if it is bettered, the fee is increased, sharing the savings between the contractor and the Government.

The man-hours contract policy was adopted by the Commission early in 1941, and its wisdom, according to Chairman Land, is demonstrated by the fact that total man-hours required for building a Liberty ship before have been reduced from an estimated figure of 648,432 man-hours to as low as 336,846.

The fixed-price contracts of the Commission also provide a strong incentive for reduction in both man-hour and dollar costs by subjecting profits included above a fixed figure to recapture—except that the contractor may increase his amount of profits if he decreases the contract price.

Deputy Administrator L. W. Douglas, of the War Shipping Administration, which handles repair work of its ships and those of the Navy and War Departments, reported that a new contract has been developed to meet objections raised by the Comptroller General against the former ship-repair contracts. "The nature of ship repairs, with uncertainty as to extent of work and difficulties developing after a job has started, usually prevents complete and exact specifications at time of initial award," Mr. Douglas said. Hence the new master repair contract which has been used in some yards since May 1, 1943, does not include the incentive features which have been adopted by the other agencies.

The War Shipping Administration, however, has created a Field Service Division to survey and report on conditions in ship-repair yards which affect the cost of the ship repair and conversion program; provide better control over the costs of repairs and to train personnel in analyzing and checking the cost and efficiency of repairs. About 75 members of this field force have been given training and assigned to duty in shipyards, and reports indicate a noticeable response on the part of shipyard workers and management to the presence of these field force workers in uniform, Mr. Douglas reported.

This field force is charged with responsibility of action to prevent excessive use of overtime, loading of labor costs, and excessive use of man-hours; excessive use and waste of materials; excessive use of subcontractors, with resulting pyramiding of fees; duplication of work and charges caused by faulty workmanship and lack of proper supervision; duplicating of charges on materials withdrawn from stock; inadequate accounting of excess materials and scrap removed from vessels.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article recently written by Hon. Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska, expressing his views on the farm program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWENTY MILLION

(By Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska)

To be of enduring use to the United States, a farm program must accomplish two things. It must promote the production of all the food and fiber needed and it must render unto the farmer a return commensurate with the value of his products.

In our Nation 20,000,000 people live on farms while 112,000,000 people live elsewhere. For the sake of national security, for the sake of national development, it is the first task of the 20,000,000 to feed the Nation and to supply it with fibrous raw materials. Each of the 112,000,000 should be as interested as anyone else in seeing this job done. Surely the war has revealed the folly of shopping abroad for food.

If the American farmer fills this order, he is entitled to be paid accordingly, and when he is so paid, he will prosper; he will live as a good citizen ought to live; he will be able to educate his children so that they, blessed with the God-fearing heritage of the soil, can step forward into the ranks of tomorrow's leadership.

The farm program that achieves this twofold goal must have a firm foundation. The decade just closed provides an experience table of great aid in laying the foundation. For a sane farm program these keystones are vital:

1. It must strive for abundance—not scarcity.
2. It must place the few production adjustments it needs on marketings; not acreages.
3. It must protect the natural value of the earth against waste, abuse, and exploitation.
4. It must encourage the discovery of new industrial uses for agricultural products and foster them until they grow mighty of themselves.
5. It must permit the farm to bargain equitably with industry for manpower.
6. It must include a sound, simple, and unambitious credit system.
7. It must reduce nursing from a governmental bottle.
8 And above all, it must encourage individual enterprise.

These salient points for 1944 building are in some instances diametrically opposed to those supporting the present farm structure, but there is no need to dwell upon the mistakes of the past. They can best be written off in the words of a Democratic Member of the Senate from Iowa, the Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE: "There probably is nothing Congress or the Administration can do with the farm problem now to avert serious shortages because of bungling and mismanagement in the past."

Our task is not to conduct a tour backward along the New Deal's rural route, pointing out the ruins of the social farmstead here and the forbidden acres there; it is rather for us to face forward, to think constructively, and to build positively upon solid ground.

ABUNDANCE IS GOAL

Plain, common sense prompts the sound conclusion that farms must produce if they are to prosper. Factories do not expand by closing down. Why, then, prescribe choking as a cure for agricultural ills? No, the war has exploded the surplus-food theory. On the heels of attempts to reduce food production, the Nation now faces a food deficit. If it was not clear to the majority a few years ago, it must be clear now that in the early 1930's we suffered from underconsumption, not overproduction. When consumers have the means to buy the food they want and need, we need have no fears of mounting surpluses.

Between the years of 1789 and 1929 the United States progressed from a low per capita income standard to a very high per capita income standard. The memorable point about this growth in per capita income is that it was accompanied by a growth in per capita production. Our pioneer ancestors were energetic, thrifty, and forward looking. They knew that production and income are inseparable twins; they knew that a nation must produce more than it consumes to acquire wealth, and they knew that a high standard of living can be attained only by producing a large volume of goods and services and distributing them widely. It is natural for people to want to be well fed and well clothed, and if this natural demand is to be met, a large volume of food and fibers must be produced. A farm economy of plenty is necessary to meet the growing needs of a mighty nation.

We can strive for abundance and be wealthy; we can continue a program of scarcity and be poor. There is an example of this principle in the record. During the first 20 years of this century the average annual production of food and feed crops was 9 percent greater than during the 1926–1930 period and 26 percent greater than during the years 1931 to 1940. What happened from 1931 to 1940 is also of record: the tens of thousands of farm losses, the unemployed, the increase in national debt, the decline in national wealth.

ACREAGE CONTROL WRONG

Belief in a doctrine of abundance is, and must remain, distinct from belief in prodigality. Abundance production is not wasteful production nor is it unadjustable, but it most certainly is unsuited to the theory of acreage control. The fallacy of acreage control is proved by the increased corn and wheat yields in several recent years from a smaller acreage. Hybrid corn, the use of the best land for crops, improved tillage practices, all contribute to greater production from less acreage. Moreover, acreage curtailment fails to give consideration to weather hazards and prevents farmers from increasing acreage when planting conditions are favorable so that the resulting harvest can carry them through the lean years. This is particularly true in the Great Plains region.

But there is an even deeper danger in the acreage control scheme. It robs the farmer of his independent right to farm his ground the way he thinks it should be farmed, and the lifeblood of American farm life is pumped from a well bricked with unmitigated, rugged individualism. Take away that heritage and you remove the hallmark of the American farmer.

Whatever adjustment abundant production needs, the point of adjustment must be at the market. With his eyes on the market, the decision as to acreage is best left with the man closest to the soil—the farmer.

Plans to produce to meet the needs of this Nation must be long range—not for next year or next term. The soil is the basis of farm production, and it is only axiomatic that it be properly maintained, that it receive full benefit of good husbandry. Too much of it is being abused, and entirely too much of it is being carried away by our streams. Governmental cash incentives are proper to encourage such soil-management practices as crop rotation, contour farming, pasturage and meadow increases, but there is a difference between a proper cash incentive and sucker money, just as there is a difference between a proper cash incentive and a bribe which prompts a sensible, albeit human farmer to ridiculous inactivity.

A farm program, devoted to abundance to give the people of the Nation goods for domestic use and for exchange with other nations, cannot neglect research. Agricultural research is as vital to the farm as industrial research is to the factory. Research in farm organization to reveal the most profitable size and type of operating units, research to improve crop varieties, to curb insects, weed pests, and disease must be continually encouraged. Likewise, chemurgic industries which provide new outlets for products of the soil must be given every reasonable opportunity to prove their worth and survive.

Founded upon such principles, a farm program will furnish the people of this Naton with the agricultural products they need. But this is half the story, the achievement of but one of the goals. The rest concerns the farmer, his right to an equitable return for his labor, his patience, and his skill.

FAIR SHARE OF INCOME

No artificial respiration will spell success for a lasting farm program; its longevity will be measured by its reliance upon natural laws. It must, in the natural course of events, give the farmer a reasonable percent of the national income, for in the final analysis, it is the proportion of the national income that is important, not the number of dollars the farmer receives. The farmer who gets $2 per bushel for his wheat and must

pay $2 per pair for his socks is no better off than the farmer who gets 10 cents for his wheat and pays 10 cents per pair for the same socks.

What is a fair share of the national income for farmers? In recent years farmers have said they should receive the share that farmers received in the 1910–14 period. Discount for the bias of a farm State Governor, and that share is still more than modest. In the 1910–14 era, one-third of the United States population lived on the farm and got one-eighth of the income. In 1942, 20 percent of our people lived on the farm and got 10 percent of the national income. Real farm income must be improved to a point where the farm will be able to bid equitably for labor—one of its vital needs—in competition with industry. Four major dairy farms in the neighborhood of Lincoln, Nebr., sold out last year because the price of milk was too low to permit payment of sufficient wages to keep the necessary labor.

Much talk is made these days of the increase in farm income that has already taken place. In ringing tones we hear the true statement that for every dollar of average income the farmer received during the years 1931–40 he received $2.79 in average income in 1942 on a per capita basis. But that report fails to reveal that for every dollar the farmer got on a per capita basis in 1942 the nonfarmer received $2.77. You can see which way the income scales still tilt.

There is no important dispute on the point that the price the farmer receives in the market place for his products must be comparable to the prices of the commodities he buys. It is the achievement and maintenance of this ratio that gives the trouble. Such factors as weather, plant and animal diseases, and the natural length of the growing season make it impossible to turn farm production on and off like a spigot to keep in step with the law of supply and demand. Therefore, it is only reasonable that a valid farm program must assure the farmer of an equitable price because the farmer has no way of protecting himself against falling prices once his crop is planted.

NEED COMMODITY LOANS

A plan for commodity loans similar to that now in operation will likely prove the best way to meet this market price problem; most certainly commodity loans should not be discarded for direct subsidy payments. While it probably is true that a commodity loan plan will not guarantee prices, it is likewise true that a price guaranty, even accepted for the sake of argument as desirable, could not be obtained without a rigid acreage control involving physical destruction of maturing, temporary surpluses. The sensibilities of this Nation already have been sufficiently insulated by such a practice. Still desirable, however, is a plan which cushions farm prices from the effect of a tremendous overproduction by distributing the shock so that it is absorbed by the 112,000,000 nonfarmers along with the 20,000,000 farmers. After all, 112,000,000 are just as anxious to eat and to prosper as are the 20,000,000. Let the farmers absorb their share of the shock through market penalties while the 112,000,000 keep the penalty at a minimum by helping to pay the cost of a rational price floor established through the operation of the governmental commodity loan system.

Operations of any commodity-loan plan should be such as to encourage farmers to effect more orderly marketing by using local storage, which in itself will tend to relieve the downward pressure on prices. Should normal prices fall below the loan floors, market quotas could be employed as an emergency measure. The quotas should be set on a per centum basis in keeping with historical production records, and to the farmer should be reserved the right to feed livestock from his storage.

Like everybody else, the farmer would like to sell his products to the world at a high price and buy the world's products at a low price. This desire through the years has tagged the farmer as an advocate of low tariffs on manufactured imports and high tariffs on agricultural imports; but be that as it may, the fact remains that if a nation does not buy, it cannot continue to sell. Since it is elementary that the essence of prosperity is trade, it follows that agriculture will benefit from a tariff policy which encourages more freedom of trade in both agricultural and industrial products. International trade must be a two-way mechanism with exports balancing imports, and in regulating it we must take into account differences in living standards and prices so that necessary protection will be given our farmers and laborers. With trade barriers lowered, each country will be permitted to export such commodities as it can grow or produce most economically, and under such a program, the United States will again regain a profitable export market for such farm products as wheat and cotton.

Because it is a slow-moving endeavor, destined to wait months for its harvest money and years for full returns from its herds, agriculture must have an adequate credit system. The system should be cooperative in form, patterned after the original Federal Land Bank system, governed by a nonpolitical board independent of the Department of Agriculture or any other direct governmental agency, and designed to afford its borrowers with eventual ownership and control with a minimum of Government financing. Its purpose should be, and remain, the assurance of reasonable interest rates to farmers for the purchase of land, and when private lending agencies do not function, for the general financing of farm operations. There is no need for any farm community to sacrifice its local bank to the acquired ambitions of a federally-sponsored agency created only to provide a yardstick for reasonable loan rates—not created to monopolize the whole field of farm credit.

In time of war, agriculture must take its place in the ranks with other forms of American enterprise and submit to emergency controls which in time of peace would run counter to our fundamental precepts of democratic life. But even while the war lasts, the control should be accepted strictly as temporary and should be openly in the hands of one general commander who is willing to accept the full responsibility of wielding authority over production, prices, and food distribution. And the agricultural commander must obtain for farmers the necessary machinery and divert to the farm enough labor to meet at least the minimum needs.

As soon as possible the control of the Nation's farm program must again be returned to the farmers, operating through groups in the various States and through the State agricultural colleges and extension services, whose staffs are more competent to analyze and advise on production and price problems than are political appointees sitting in Washington. Give the farmer control of the farm program and he, intimate with frugality, will soon whack away administrative bind-weed and expense.

REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

Control of the farm program by the farmer is so important that it surmounts all other considerations. In the hands of the 20,000,000, no farm program will ever be permitted to transgress vital personal rights, for the American farmer, with his inherent suspicion, his reluctance to become a "joiner," his sly mask of simplicity, his quiet stamina, his steel-cased love of individualism, is the real inner guard of freedom in this Nation. Democracy as we have come to know it will have a champion so long as the last farmer on the last acre draws a breath.

With this in mind, let us make sure that the crop of boys and girls that come from the American farms keep this same spirit. And they will have it if permitted to make decisions and develop ideas for themselves under the tutelage of American parents.

A proper post-war farm program will be built upon principles of abundance, price equality, good husbandry, research, sound economy, individual initiative—the greatest of these is individual initiative. Development of such a program in all likelihood will require the expenditure of Government funds to promote soil conservation and protect prices, but the money will be spent in the interest of national defense and the promulgation of a vital American heritage—a cheap premium for our security.

This is the kind of a farm program the Republicans should present to the Nation in 1944.

Woodrow Wilson's Last Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief editorial comment by David Lawrence in the United States News of November 19, 1943, and the Armistice Day address delivered by President Woodrow Wilson in 1923, and an article entitled "The Road Away From Revolution" contributed by President Wilson to the Atlantic Monthly of August 1923.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODROW WILSON'S LAST WARNINGS

Between the time President Wilson left the White House on March 4, 1921, and his death on February 3, 1924, he wrote only two statements for publication. Both declarations were made just 20 years ago—one a radio speech on the eve of Armistice Day, November 10, 1923, and the other an article contributed to the August 1923 issue of the Atlantic Monthly. The full text of both statements is given here, and reproduction of the magazine article is with the permission of the Atlantic Monthly Press, Inc.

The nations of the world still have not solved the problems he outlined nor have we heeded the warnings given us by the man who led us to victory through World War No. 1 in 1917 and 1918.—David Lawrence.

ARMISTICE DAY, 1923

(Radio speech from Washington, November 10, 1923)

The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit because of the proud recollection that it was our day, a day above those early days of that never-to-be-forgotten November which lifted the world to the high levels of vision and achievement upon which the great war for democracy and right was fought and won; although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered—chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacri-

fices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace, or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

This must always be a source of deep mortification to us and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

And now, as if to furnish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion.

The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail.

Happily, the present situation in the world of affairs affords us the opportunity to retrieve the past and to render mankind the inestimable service of proving that there is at least one great and powerful nation which can turn away from programs of self-interest and devote itself to practicing and establishing the highest ideals of disinterested service and the consistent maintenance of exalted standards of conscience and of right.

The only way in which we can worthily give proof of our appreciation of the high significance of Armistice Day is by resolving to put self-interest away and once more formulate and act upon the highest ideals and purposes of international policy.

Thus, and only thus, can we return to the true traditions of America.

[From the Atlantic Monthly, August 1923]

THE ROAD AWAY FROM REVOLUTION

In these doubtful and anxious days, when all the world is at unrest and, look which way you will, the road ahead seems darkened by shadows which portend dangers of many kinds, it is only common prudence that we should look about us and attempt to assess the causes of distress and the most likely means of removing them.

There must be some real ground for the universal unrest and perturbation. It is not to be found in superficial politics or in mere economic blunders. It probably lies deep at the sources of the spiritual life of our time. It leads to revolution; and perhaps if we take the case of the Russian Revolution, the outstanding event of its kind in our age, we may find a good deal of instruction for our judgment of present critical situations and circumstances.

What gave rise to the Russian Revolution? The answer can only be that it was the product of a whole social system. It was not in fact a sudden thing. It had been gathering head for several generations. It was due to the systematic denial to the great body of Russians of the rights and privileges which all normal men desire and must have if they are to be contented and within reach of happiness. The lives of the great mass of the Russian people contained no opportunities, but were hemmed in by barriers against which they were constantly flinging their spirits, only to fall back bruised and dispirited. Only the powerful were suffered to secure their rights or even to gain access to the means of material success.

It is to be noted as a leading fact of our time that it was against capitalism that the Russian leaders directed their attack. It was capitalism that made them see red; and it is against "capitalism" under one name or another that the discontented classes everywhere draw their indictment.

There are thoughtful and well-informed men all over the world who believe, with much apparently sound reason, that the abstract thing, the system, which we call capitalism, is indispensable to the industrial support and development of modern civilization. And yet everyone who has an intelligent knowledge of social forces must know that great and widespread reactions like that which is now unquestionably manifesting itself against capitalism do not occur without cause or provocation; and before we commit ourselves irreconcilably to an attitude of hostility to this movement of the time, we ought frankly to put to ourselves the question, Is the capitalistic system unimpeachable? which is another way of asking, Have capitalists generally used their power for the benefit of the countries in which their capital is employed and for the benefit of their fellow men?

Is it not, on the contrary, too true that capitalists have often seemed to regard the men whom they used as mere instruments of profit, whose physical and mental powers it was legitimate to exploit with as slight cost to themselves as possible, either of money or of sympathy? Have not many fine men who were actuated by the highest principles in every other relationship of life seemed to hold that generosity and humane feeling were not among the imperative mandates of conscience in the conduct of a banking business, or in the development of an industrial or commercial enterprise?

And, if these offenses against high morality and true citizenship have been frequently observable, are we to say that the blame for the present discontent and turbulence is wholly on the side of those who are in revolt against them? Ought we not, rather, to seek a way to remove such offenses and make life itself clean for those who will share honorably and cleanly in it?

The world has been made safe for democracy. There need now be no fear that any such mad design as that entertained by the insolent and ignorant Hohenzollerns and their counselors may prevail against it. But democracy has not yet made the world safe against irrational revolution. That supreme task, which is nothing less than the salvation of civilization, now faces democracy, insistent, imperative. There is no escaping it, unless everything we have built up is presently to fall in ruin about us; and the United States, as the greatest of democracies, must undertake it.

The road that leads away from revolution is clearly marked, for it is defined by the nature of men and of organized society. It therefore behooves us to study very carefully and very candidly the exact nature of the task and the means of its accomplishment.

The nature of men and of organized society dictates the maintenance in every field of action of the highest and purest standards of justice and of right dealing; and it is essential to efficacious thinking in this critical matter that we should not entertain a narrow or technical conception of justice. By justice the lawyer generally means the prompt, fair, and open application of impartial rules; but we call ours a Christian civilization, and a Christian conception of justice must be much higher. It must include sympathy and helpfulness and a willingness to forego self-interest in order to promote the welfare, happiness, and contentment of others and of the community as a whole. This is what our age is blindly feeling in its reaction against what it deems the too-great selfishness of the capitalistic system.

The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country. Shall we not all earnestly cooperate to bring in the new day?

Harry Slattery, R. E. A. Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by William Allen White entitled "The Fight on Slattery," which appeared in the Emporia Gazette of October 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT ON SLATTERY

Press reports that White House functionaries as well as Secretary Wickard have been trying to force Harry Slattery to resign as R. E. A. Administrator have not been denied.

This is significant since reports also indicate that Administration men have been and are endeavoring to sidetrack and limit the Senate investigation of the administration of R. E. A. under the Shipstead resolution of July 1. The reason advanced is that it is unwise to detract from the war effort and stir up scandals that might injure R. E. A. and the progress of public power. The tactic is to quietly get rid of Slattery on the assumption that the whole disturbance would then die down, the cause having been removed.

These gentlemen, and all like them, do not appear to have grasped the situation or understand the size of the keg of dynamite with which they are so carelessly playing. The issues involved are much greater than the personal fortunes of Administrator Slattery. His loyalty to R. E. A. and resistance to the financial and political schemes of designing men remind us of the ousting of Chief Forester Gifford Pinchot by President Taft for opposing the enemies of the conservation policies of President Theodore Roosevelt. Taft came off second best in that conflict because he misjudged it and history may repeat.

The Shipstead resolution necessitates a probe into the creation, financing, and questionable activities of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. There is some evidence for contending that this group, under the leadership of its executive manager, Clyde T. Ellis, may be responsible for the drive to eliminate Slattery immediately without hearings. Incidentally, the row touched off the investigation. It requires also an inquiry as to how R. E. A. has fared under the

stewardship of Secretary Wickard who has been Slattery's boss since 1940, and whether R. E. A. should not be made independent as in the beginning—another explosive subject.

Still another matter of which the committee will be forced to take cognizance is the friendly alliance which appears to exist between Wickard, Ellis, and some of the White House crowd. This is indicated by the appearance upon the same platform at recent State-wide meetings of R. E. A. cooperatives of Mr. Ellis and Mr. William J. Neal recently appointed by Wickard as R. E. A. Deputy Administrator to succeed Robert Craig, the original promoter of the N. R. E. C. A. Occasionally an assistant to the President also appears. At these meetings, Ellis, unrebuked by his administration associates, continues his charges against Mr. Slattery.

This smells of party politics and it is sufficient to remark here that one of the most stupid blunders this or any other administration could make would be to attempt to turn R. E. A. or the cooperatives into a political partisan machine.

We Have Been Censored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from an article by Mr. Andrew Bromstad, publisher of the Milan Standard, of my congressional district, as follows:

WE HAVE BEEN CENSORED

Miss Bertha Rorstad is a Milan young lady who is in the missionary service of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America at Fort Dauphin, Madagascar. Naturally she is an interested reader of her home-town paper, the Milan Standard. Mrs. S. R. Anderson, her sister here, has furnished the Standard excerpts of Bertha's recent letters to her home folks. They are published elsewhere in this issue.

In these excerpts we find the following passage: "The first editorial for March 27, 1942, was entirely cut out by the censor. Tell Mr. Bromstad as he might be interested in looking it up. It is the only part ever censored in the Standard."

Yes, we surely were interested and, looking through our files, we found the copy of March 27, 1942. The first editorial reads as follows:

"WE MUST BE ON GUARD

"Are we ready to scrap our present economic system known as capitalism? In America where it has been given the widest possible chance of development, it is admitted that the common ordinary man enjoys more comforts of life than any person in the same station of life in any other country on earth.

"We are now at war to defend the freedoms that we enjoy under this system. But even now in our own Government there are forces at work to deprive us of the advantages we have gained under the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

"A politically dominated industry and agriculture will necessitate the inclusion of all other activities. If this tendency to Government domination is not arrested by an awakened public opinion we may find that the war we are now fighting for the preservation of democracy has been fought in vain."

What information useful to the enemy this editorial contains is a puzzle to us.

Mr. Speaker, we have the right to ask, Just why should an editorial of this nature be censored? Is it a prelude to the censoring this coming year of information which must be given to our troops in foreign lands if we are to expect them to know the true issues of the campaign which lies ahead?

Surely our men on the front can be trusted to read editorials of this nature, or shall it be said that we are today losing one of our proudest possessions, freedom of the press, and that this shall be denied to the American soldiers on the front?

Basil Izzi, of Barre, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the reception to Basil Izzi, Barre, Mass., April 11, 1943:

My dear friends, as Congressman from the Third Congressional District, which embraces this fine old historic New England town, I am greatly honored this afternoon to come here to this magnificent outpouring of loyal and patriotic American citizens to add my few humble words to that which has been said in recognition of the exploits and heroism of one of Barre's great heroes, Basil Izzi.

We have gathered here to render him well-deserved tribute. We have come from all walks of life, from every strata of citizenship, from every race and creed, to do appropriate honor to this fine young patriot. The distinguished senior Senator, DAVID I. WALSH, has seen fit to come all the way from Washington and by his presence, give additional impressive official sanction to the character of this reception.

Probably we ought not remind Basil Izzi of the experiences he underwent for the cause he served so well, perhaps we merely should express our gratitude for the high type of service he rendered and breathe our prayers to the Almighty for his miraculous salvation for certainly it was only through the intercession of Divine Providence guarding and watching over him constantly during those terrible 83 days, while he was adrift and starving on the high seas, that Basil Izzi is permitted to be among us today.

Of course his family and his friends are proud of him, his community is proud of him and his country has every reason to be proud of him because it is the indomitable spirit of boys like Basil Izzi, unflinching in the face of overwhelming danger, undaunted by trials and tribulations, invincible in the determination to overcome all obstacles, that lies the hope of our Nation to triumph over the evil forces that would destroy us and gain a final and glorious victory in the great struggle in which we are now engaged.

In extending him our congratulations for a magnificent service to his country, in praising him for his fortitude and courage, in commending him for his modesty and restraint, let us all take renewed inspiration from the example he has set. From his heroism and from his gallantry in action, from his willing sacrifices, let us all gain new spirit and energy to continue with the great cause of protecting our country and its precious institutions from destruction by its enemies.

Here in the very bosom of America's rugged hills, among friends and well-wishers, as we honor Basil Izzi and render him the homage and tribute of a grateful people, let us repledge ourselves once again to strive with increased vigor, determination, courage, loyalty, and patriotism to the end that our great democracy, which has given us unparalleled opportunities and happiness, may be saved alike from the ravages of foreign foes and the insidious conspiracies of domestic enemies and peace may reign again in all our homes.

As true and loyal Americans all, let us go forward from this day on stimulated and inspired by the fine deeds of Basil Izzi, unswerving in our purpose never to lay down our arms until we have gained glorious victory in this war and have thus preserved for ourselves and our posterity the priceless benefits, privileges, opportunities, and blessings of our own beloved democracy, the United States of America.

Hail Basil Izzi, Barre's gallant hero. In your future adventures, may you continue to have Godspeed and good luck.

A Grave Injustice to Native Puerto Ricans Who Are War Department Employees in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein letters addressed by me to the Secretary of War and the President and a reply from the War Department, touching upon the plight of several hundred native Puerto Ricans employed by the War Department in Puerto Rico. From this correspondence it is clear that a grave injustice has been inflicted upon these workers. I have asked the President to remedy the situation. The letters are as follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1943.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STIMSON: My attention has been called to Civilian Personnel Circular No. 20, issued August 27, 1943, by the War Department over your signature. It is my understanding that pursuant to this circular several hundred employees of the United States Engineering Division of the War Department at Puerto Rico, who are natives of Puerto Rico, are to have their salaries reduced both in the amount of the 25 percent differential now paid Federal employees outside continental United States and in the further amount of the difference between the rate paid such employee according to his classification by the Civil Service Commission and what is determined by the War Depart-

ment to represent a wage consistent with the standard of living in Puerto Rico.

If my information is correct I wish to register with you a most earnest protest against such action and an urgent request that such an order be rescinded by you.

It is most unfair, in my opinion, to establish a situation whereby employees working side by side, doing the same work, with the same competence are paid different wages. This is bound to be the effect of an order differentiating pay on the basis of residence in continental United States or territorial United States. Moreover, the proposal is further harmful in that it will take from loyal American citizens of Puerto Rican origin a rate of pay they have received for some time and substitute therefor a lower rate of pay, while at the same time exacting of these workers the same caliber of work hitherto performed. It is clear that impairment of worker morale, a push by the workers affected to leave Puerto Rico and generally chaotic conditions must result from the operation of such an order.

I will appreciate a reply from you indicating if I have correctly interpreted the abovementioned circular. If my interpretation is correct I feel sure you will wish to correct the obvious inequities which it creates for loyal Puerto Ricans who have contributed so much to the success of our country's engineering operations in the Antilles.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 6, 1943.

DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: Your letter of October 20, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War has been referred to me for reply.

We well recognize the problem you have raised and its implications, yet upon restudy of the circular to which you refer, we find the proper representation of the facts are as indicated in the circular. Informal contacts with the legal authorities, both within and without the War Department, confirm our understanding that the Classification Act of 1923 does not apply to native Puerto Ricans even though they are citizens of the United States.

In order that there shall be further specific decision in the matter, it is the intention of the War Department to seek an official interpretation from the Comptroller General of the United States. In the meantime, however, we have no other recourse than to follow the law and the regulations as they currently exist and therefore the commanding officers of the War Department having jurisdiction in Puerto Rico have the discretion as to what to pay native Puerto Ricans.

Sincerely yours,

WM. H. KUSHNICK,
Director of Civilian Personnel and Training.

NOVEMBER 16, 1943.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to call to your attention the serious plight of several hundred loyal Puerto Rican employees of the War Department engaged in vital war work in Puerto Rico, who are about to have their salaries reduced by War Department order more than 25 percent.

Upon a ruling that natives of Puerto Rico do not come under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, the Secretary of War on August 27, 1943, issued Civilian Personnel Circular No. 20, affecting the wages of this group of native Puerto Ricans employed by the War Department. Under the terms of this circular, this group of workers will have their salaries cut first in the amount of the 25 percent differential allowed Federal employees outside of continental United States; and second, in the amount which commanding officers of the War Department in Puerto Rico establish as the difference between the cost of living in Puerto Rico and the United States.

On October 20 I wrote the Secretary of War and pointed out the following: "It is most unfair, in my opinion, to establish a situation where employees working side by side, doing the same work, with the same competence are paid different wages. This is bound to be the effect of an order differentiating pay on the basis of residence in continental or territorial United States. Moreover, the proposal is further harmful in that it will take from loyal American citizens of Puerto Rican origin a rate of pay they have received for some time and substitute therefor a lower rate of pay, while at the same time exacting of these workers the same caliber of work hitherto performed."

Replying to these observations for the Secretary of War, W. H. Kushnick, Director of Civilian Personnel and Training, admitted the correctness of the above analysis, but declared: "In the meantime, however, we have no other recourse than to follow the law and the regulations as they currently exist, and therefore the commanding officers of the War Department having jurisdiction in Puerto Rico have discretion as to what wages to pay native Puerto Ricans."

I suggest, Mr. President, that such action as outlined above on the part of the War Department, however justified on the basis of existing law, is nevertheless unfair, unworkable, and injurious to the morale of these several hundred Puerto Rican war workers. It is for these reasons that I urge you to exercise your war powers to issue an Executive order restoring salary scales for these workers.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

Chicago Junior Association of Commerce Endorses Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, now pending on the House Calendar, I am taking this opportunity to place in the RECORD the contents of a telegram from Mr. H. S. Sedgwick, president, Junior Association of Commerce, of Chicago. The telegram reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.

The Lea bill, H. R. 3420, encourages the development of civil and commercial aviation to best interests of public. Your favorable consideration is respectfully solicited.

H. S. SEDGWICK,
President, Junior Association of Commerce.

NOVEMBER 9, 1943.

To His Honor, the Mayor of the City of Chicago, and the Members of the City Council, City of Chicago:

Your Chicago Aero Commission in a meeting today passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, is now pending in the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the Chicago Aero Commission believing that the passage of this bill will be in the best interests of the development of civil aviation in the United States; and

"Whereas Chicago, as the aviation center of the United States, will directly benefit from the growth of civil aviation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That H. R. 3420 be given favorable consideration by the City Council of the City of Chicago with a view to its endorsement by that body; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That inasmuch as this bill will be acted upon by Congress within the next 10 days, that immediate consideration of this resolution be given."

Respectfully submitted.

CHICAGO AERO COMMISSION.
MERRILL C. MEIGS, *Chairman.*

THE LEA BILL

The House of Representatives will probably vote next week on the bill of Representative CLARENCE LEA, of California, which provides for revision of the over-all Federal regulations of air transportation. The bulk of the existing industry of transportation by air wants the bill passed. As the business has been under rather comprehensive Federal regulation since 1925, when there was little or nothing to regulate, we can assume that there is no chance now for a period of real freedom of enterprise, such as the automobile industry enjoyed in this country in its earlier years.

It may be regrettable that a comparatively new industry should not only seek, but apparently seek with great eagerness to be regulated at all, but nowadays "freedom" has come to mean relative immunity from the dead hand of statism. Therefore, after examining the rival proposals now in Congress, we are forced to the conclusion that the Lea bill, or a measure of substantially the same nature, should be passed now, so that the air lines and their allied businesses and activities may be properly squared away for progress when the war ends.

The air lines believe that a law on the lines of the Lea bill would prove to be a more effective safeguard against sabotage by complex and conflicting regulations by the States than the present Federal law. Air transport is mostly interstate commerce, in the most complete sense of the term. In a trip from New York to Los Angeles via Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Kansas City, an air liner spends the following number of minutes in the air over the following States, respectively: New York, 3; New Jersey, 13; Pennsylvania, 59; Ohio, 47; Indiana, 31; Missouri, 48; Kansas, 54; Oklahoma, 21; Texas, 41; New Mexico, 79; Arizona, 72; California, 54.

We believe that such a list speaks for itself, in the interest of enough over-all Federal regulations to assure simplicity. No constitutional right of any State can, of course, be minimized by the Lea bill; but unless Federal regulation is comprehensive, the number of States listed above suggests how State regulations could become burdensome to the point of sabotaging the development of air transport.

The Lea bill would take the regulation of air transport out of the Department of Commerce and place it again under a wholly independent body like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulates the railroads. Air transport enjoyed that form of control before President Roosevelt's bill aiming at a general reorganization of the Government was passed. We believe that public opinion will back the rule of air transport by an independent air-minded commission

not interlocked with any departmental bureaucracy, especially since the reorganization law has proved to be an abortive measure that has effected no real simplification or economy of government.

The Lea bill provides for no changes in the relations of surface carriers and air carriers. The present law, passed in 1938, permits the Civil Aeronautics Board to authorize surface carriers to get into air transportation only when such action would not restrain competition, and when such air services would be incidental to the surface carrier's main operations. We believe that such safeguards are necessary for air transport in its present formative stages.

There is a long scroll of unfortunate history in railroad ventures into river steamboating, canal control, coastal shipping, and even trolley operations, in the heyday of the "interurban" electric railroad. While here and there a railroad like the New Haven came near to developing into a general transportation agency, too often the auxiliary railroad-owned service mainly acted as a bar to competitive capital. At the same time the railroads were extremely laggard in promoting overseas ship lines as feeders for their import and export trade. With the great decline of foreign financial influence in American railroads due to the war, we wonder if our railroads will overcome tradition sufficiently to overcome their apparent allergy to blue water?

Why Hull Stands Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Morris:

WHY HULL STANDS OUT

(By George Morris)

WASHINGTON, November 14.—It was by no strange coincidence or spectacular incident that caused Secretary of State Hull to receive the larger share of credit for the success of the Moscow Conference. The universal acclaim, grudging in only a few instances in this country, was natural. He set out on an expedition involving as many elements for failure as for success, and returned after having accomplished more than his most enthusiastic supporters expected or imagined.

Part of the acclaim he received upon return was, of course, a tribute to a statesman who deserves and holds the respect and affection of the American people, who would have paid tribute to him even if the achievement had been considerably short of what was accomplished.

No such sentiment actuated the Russian and British representatives at the conference. They conceded its success to Secretary Hull simply because he deserved it, and in fairness there was no disposition to withhold credit from one to whom credit was due.

The underlying reason for the success of the Moscow Conference was that Secretary Hull began working on plans for the conference a year and a half ago, when neither Britain nor Moscow considered even a conference possible, much less success and unanimous agreement. Such things are not the immediate result of inspiration or decision that they would be a good thing.

Secretary Hull began a cautious approach to his objective many months ago, necessitating long, involved, and at times discouraging, negotiations. True to character, when he weighed all the issues, favorable and unfavorable, and decided a conference was essential to continuing successful prosecution of the war and a permanent post-war peace, he permitted nothing to stand in the way of bringing the conference about and laying the ground work for its success.

A sidelight on the Moscow Conference which might have inspired confidence could have been gained from consideration of a few of his outstanding achievements in the field of foreign relations. The first notable success was the act of Congress authorizing a negotiation of trade agreements, which displaced the old logrolling legislative method of dealing with tariffs, a system dominated about equally by industrial buccaneers and labor racketeers.

Of equal importance at the time, and of vital importance as developed in the war emergency, was the Good Neighbor policy, originated by Secretary Hull, fostered by him, and accepted by the countries of the Western Hemisphere mainly because they believed in Secretary Hull's honesty and integrity.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was an expression of congressional confidence in Secretary Hull just as the success of the Good Neighbor policy was a tribute to the man. History does not record where any other official has accomplished so much or gained so many concessions as a result of absolute confidence in the individual.

In the face of what Secretary Hull has accomplished for the country and the credit he is to the administration, which otherwise has had little claim upon the respect or confidence of the country, there has scarcely been a time when some of the hatchet men of the palace guard, supported by numerous writers and radio commentators, have not been endeavoring to force Secretary Hull's resignation, on the suspicion that he is not entirely sympathetic with the New Deal ideology for revolutionizing the country.

What Secretary Hull thinks of the management and policy of foreign affairs is well known, because his policy is a matter of public record. That is his portfolio, and he sticks to it and operates courageously, openly, and aboveboard. What he thinks of the New Deal domestic policy is known only to himself, if he has thought of it, as he probably has, but, being outside of his province, he has remained aloof and concentrated upon the responsibilities that belong to him.

The New Deal conception of a true New Dealer is Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who is presumed to meddle with many things that do not concern him, and Harry Hopkins, who wields a heavy hand in the Government with no official responsibility.

While Secretary Hull has accomplished more in his department than any predecessor, his critics are constantly complaining that he is not a career diplomat. He has been lawyer, judge, Member of the House and Senate, author of the income-tax law, and recognized as the foremost authority on tariff and taxation. His record and experience are unexcelled, and his achievements as Secretary of State without parallel.

When he decided to attend the Moscow Conference, his critics finally were reduced to relying solely upon the charge that he had never ridden in an airplane. Now that he has returned safely by plane to the acclaim of the world, one can only wait with patience the next point of attack.

It was typical of Secretary Hull that he should have been bewildered and somewhat embarrassed when he was met upon his return by the President, a large congressional delegation, and a crowd of admirers who gathered to pay him tribute. He is accustomed to doing the job he sets out to do, and to do it well he considers no more than reasonable expectation.

The modest man from the hills of Tennessee, whose preparation for statecraft was in the shade of the trees on the banks of the Cumberland River, has had few diversions and devoted many years exclusively to the study of questions concerning the welfare of his country. The world is beginning to appreciate the qualities of the man whose friends have long recognized them and wished for the day when all the people would know him as they do.

President Roosevelt Repudiates the Lindsay Warren Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an exchange of correspondence between myself and White House officials on the recent ruling of the Comptroller General of the United States affecting the operation of the F. E. P. C. The F. E. P. C. has begun to make a marked contribution to full utilization of America's manpower in our war effort. For this reason I am sure the forthright statement of the President will be welcomed by all who wish to see a speedy victory. At the same time the ruling of Mr. Warren makes clear the need for legislation establishing a permanent F. E. P. C. This is the reason why at this time I am pushing for action on my bill, H. R. 1732, to accomplish that result and why I have today filed a discharge petition to bring my bill to a vote.

The correspondence follows:

OCTOBER 30, 1943.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On October 7, 1943, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, in a ruling furnished Justice James Byrnes, liaison officer of the Office for Emergency Management, held that the failure of a Government agency to include in a contract with a nongovernmental contractor a provision against discrimination in employment as set forth in your Executive Order 9346 will not render such contract void or preclude payments under such contract. On October 16, pursuant to this opinion the Director of the Division of Central Administrative Services sent out a directive to his field agents informing them of this ruling. He also, subsequent to this ruling, entered into contracts with certain firms, eliminating from such contracts any provisions such as are prescribed by your Executive Order 9346.

It is clear that as a result of the actions of the Director of the Division of Central Administrative Services—an agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government re-

sponsible to you—the stated objectives of your Executive Order 9346 have been vitiated so far as the contracts above mentioned are concerned. Moreover the ruling of the Comptroller General threatens to destroy much of the effectiveness of your Committee on Fair Employment Practices, whose essentiality to our war effort you so clearly described in your recent letter to Mr. Malcolm Ross, appointing him chairman of the Committee.

I am profoundly disturbed at the effect which this recent development in the matter of fair employment practices will have upon the problem of the wartime morale of minority groups and of full employment and utilization at highest skills of all American workers, as a vital prerequisite to victory.

I respectfully suggest to you that while you have no power to remove the Comptroller General for his distinct disservice to our war effort, it does lie within your power to order every contracting agency of the Federal Government not to enter into a contract with any person, persons, or firm which refuses to accept the nondiscrimination provisions of Executive Order 9346 in such contract. By taking such action you can restore the effectiveness of your Executive order and guarantee the attainment of its objectives of full utilization of American manpower for our war effort.

If, as even the Comptroller General suggests in his opinion, the number of concerns who would refuse to enter into such contracts is negligible, I again suggest respectfully that it is within your wartime powers to establish Government control of such recalcitrant, un-American concerns in the interest of the war effort.

I urge upon you the justice of the suggestions made in this letter and the high seriousness of the situation created by the action of the Comptroller General and by the subsequent actions of your subordinate, the Director of the Division of Central Administrative Services. I join with others in urging you to take those steps in order to preserve the effectiveness of your own Executive order.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION,
Washington, November 10, 1943.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the request of the President, I am acknowledging your communication with reference to the opinion rendered by the General Accounting Office as to the necessity for including in Government contracts a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and requiring a similar provision in all subcontracts.

On November 5 the President issued a directive making mandatory the inclusion of such a provision in Government contracts. A copy of his directive is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. BYRNES,
Director.

NOVEMBER 5, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You have brought to my attention the Comptroller General's opinion holding that Executive Order 9346 is directive only and not mandatory in requiring insertion in all Government contracts of a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment on account of race, creed, color, or national origin; and requiring the contractor to include similar contractual provisions in all sub-contracts.

There is no need for me to reiterate the fundamental principles underlying the promulgation of the Executive order, namely, that the prosecution of the war demands that we utilize fully all available manpower, and that the discrimination by war industries against persons for any of the reasons named in the order is detrimental to the prosecution of the war and is opposed to our national democratic purposes.

I realize the hesitancy of the Comptroller General to withhold payments on Government contracts in which these provisions have not been included where there is doubt as to whether the order is mandatory. I therefore wish to make it perfectly clear that these provisions are mandatory and should be incorporated in all Government contracts. The order should be so construed by all Government contracting agencies.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Advisory Board on Just Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Executive Order 9387 and ask permission to include that order in my remarks.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on November 4, 1943, postponed further consideration of H. R. 2731. Previously Executive Order 9387 established an Advisory Board on Just Compensation, consisting of three members; Judge Learned Hand, Judge John J. Parker, and Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr. The Board, in the Executive order, is directed, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, to establish fair and equitable standards, rules, and formulas of general applicability for the guidance of the War Shipping Administration in determining the just compensation of all vessels requisitioned, purchased, chartered, or insured by the Administration. It was provided that the War Shipping Administration, in determining the amount of just compensation for each vessel, should be guided by the general standards, rules, and formulas established by the Board. The full text of the Executive order is as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9387—ESTABLISHING AN ADVISORY BOARD ON JUST COMPENSATION AND PRESCRIBING ITS FUNCTIONS

The War Shipping Administration was established to insure the fullest utilization of our shipping facilities for the successful prosecution of the war. Substantially all the vessels of the United States merchant marine, including many fishing boats and other small craft, have been requisitioned by the United States through the Administrator, War Shipping Administration. In some cases this requisition was only of the use of the vessel, in others it included full title. In determining the amount of just compensation which the United States is required to pay under applicable statutes, numerous questions of fact and law must be solved. By obtaining guidance in these matters, the operations of the War Shipping Administration will be greatly facilitated and the determination of the proper compensation to be paid for individual vessels will be more speedily accomplished.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. There is hereby established a board, to be known as the Advisory Board on Just Compensation (hereinafter referred to as the Board), whose composition, powers, functions, and responsibilities are defined herein.

2. The Board shall consist of the following members: Judge Learned Hand, Judge John J. Parker, and Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr. The members of the Board shall serve for a period of 3 months or for such lesser period of time as may be required for the completion of the functions of the Board as set forth in paragraph 4 of this order.

3. The Board shall be furnished by the War Shipping Administration with such professional, technical, clerical, stenographic, and other personnel as may be selected by the Board to assist it in carrying out its functions.

4. The Board, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, shall establish fair and equitable standards, rules and formulae of general applicability for the guidance of the War Shipping Administration in determining the just compensation to be paid for all vessels requisitioned, purchased, chartered or insured by the Administration. The Board may prescribe such rules, regulations and procedures as it deems necessary or advisable in carrying out its functions.

5. In determining the amount of just compensation which should be paid for each vessel, the War Shipping Administration will be guided by the general standards, rules, and formulae established by the Board.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 15, 1943.*

During the past year, Members of Congress and the public have learned repeatedly of the difficulties that have developed in the administration of the merchant-marine laws and particularly in the determination of just compensation under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. These difficulties have arisen from various causes, partly interpretations by various agencies, partly administrative, and partly factual. Because of the conflict of laws and diverse conclusions of facts by several agencies, we have been confronted with a complete break-down of the machinery for compensating shipowners, large and small, for vessels requisitioned, purchased, or insured by the United States in connection with the war effort.

The bill was introduced by me in order that all aspects of the question of just compensation might be examined and considered. A painstaking analysis and study of the entire question has been made, the results of which may be

found in Committee Document 20, prepared for use of the committee in connection with the hearings on H. R. 2731.

The action of the President in creating the Advisory Board on Just Compensation and the procedure contemplated in connection therewith should provide a speedy remedy of the difficulties in a manner that should eliminate the issue from unwarranted criticism or controversy. The Executive order left no need for legislative action at this time and the bill was therefore indefinitely postponed.

The President has appointed to the Board three outstanding jurists possessing unexcelled qualifications for the assigned task—Judge Learned Hand, Judge John J. Parker, and Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr. Under the Constitution just compensation is ultimately a question for judicial determination, and no action by Congress or by an administrative agency can deprive owners of property of just compensation determined in accordance with the fifth amendment. It is, therefore, entirely fitting and proper that a determination of this question be made by three jurists of such outstanding attainment and prestige. All members of this Board are free of any partisan or personal connection with any controversy regarding the interpretation of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Their handling of the problem will maintain any such controversy on a high plane of fair and equitable determination. The three jurists who have consented to serve in this capacity are entitled to the highest commendation for assuming these arduous duties while maintaining the heavy burden of their ordinary judicial functions. I am confident that the determination reached by these jurists will be generally acceptable and will aid materially to a speedy solution of the problem.

A brief review of the basic facts relating to this problem may be of interest to the Congress.

Prior to December 7, 1941, the Congress of the United States, by various statutes, granted sweeping authority to the Maritime Commission—which authority, by Executive Order 9054, was transferred to the War Shipping Administration—to requisition, purchase, charter, and insure the merchant fleet of the United States.

Section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, authorizes the requisition of any vessel or other watercraft owned by citizens of the United States during a national emergency and directs that the owner be paid just compensation for the property taken or the use thereof "but in no case shall the value of the property taken or used be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use." The quoted phrase above is known as the enhancement clause of section 902 (a).

Subsequently, Congress—by Public Law 101, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 6, 1941—authorized the purchase or charter of any United States or foreign vessel suitable for transportation of the foreign commerce of the United States. The so-called enhancement clause quoted above is not applicable in such cases.

Under title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Administrator is authorized to provide marine and war-risk insurance "in accordance with commercial practice," no reference being made to the so-called enhancement clause, which therefore is inapplicable to these insurance activities.

During the present war practically the entire merchant fleet of the United States, including more than 2,500 small vessels, have been acquired by the Government. In most instances the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, has acted for the United States in acquiring either the use or the title to these vessels.

On November 28, 1942, the Comptroller General of the United States stated his opinion as to the meaning of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. The opinion of the Comptroller General is set forth in full in Document No. 20 at page 124. Following receipt of this opinion which in substance would require that the just compensation payable to shipowners, regardless of the time of the requisition by the United States, be measured by the value of the vessel on September 8, 1939, adjusted to reflect subsequent increase in values not directly caused by the emergency, the Administrator withheld certain payments to shipowners. (See Committee Document No. 20, page 129 et seq.)

The Comptroller General's ruling is based on the assumption that section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, became effective when the President declared a limited emergency on September 8, 1939. It is my opinion that the Comptroller General is in error. I am convinced that section 902 did not become effective until the President declared an unlimited emergency on May 27, 1941. The House Merchant Marine Committee has recommended and reported legislation, and the Congress has legislated, in a manner entirely inconsistent with the Comptroller General's assumptions under section 902 and as more fully set forth in the communication from the Administrator to the Comptroller General found on page 133 of Committee Document No. 20 and particularly pages 138 through 142 thereof. These views are also supported by former Attorney General William D. Mitchell, whose opinion, dated February 11, 1943, may be found on page 154 of Committee Document No. 20.

Based upon diligent, careful study and research of all the hearings, briefs, and decisions submitted in connection with the problem of "just compensation," many of which I have read repeatedly in an effort to reach a conclusion which would reconcile present legislation with existing provisions of the Constitution, deal justice to all concerned and break the deadlock existing from conflicting opinions in the present problem, I am convinced that the procedure prescribed and agencies provided by Executive Order No. 9387, will accomplish the results sought by me more quickly and more completely than any other method that I can conceive of or that has been suggested by any individual or source. I have given so many weeks of hard work to an effort to solve these problems, and I have been so close to all of this legislation from its earliest stages and I am so convinced that the action of the committee is the best possible under all the circumstances, that I feel it to be my duty to state my conclusions to the House.

In any event, shipowners whose vessels have been requisitioned are not precluded from pursuing all their legal and constitutional rights in the courts. With respect to determinations of just compensation in particular cases, if there are any cases where the Board rulings indicate that the awards previously made are not in accordance with their understanding of section 902, I am sure the Administrator will take proper action to make the necessary adjustments. As to the purely legal questions I feel that the opinion of the eminent jurists on this Board should be accepted by the Congress and others as authoritative expressions of law by persons most qualified to pass on such issues.

Whatever the meaning of the enhancement clause may be, it has been used with salutary effect by the Administrator to achieve gradual reductions in rates and values paid by the Government for vessels requisitioned, chartered, or insured. The action of the Congress in inserting the clause can therefore be credited with substantial assistance in achieving the present level of rates and values, which are extremely moderate when contrasted with the rates and values prevailing prior to our entrance in the present war. When contrasted with rates paid by the Government, under court decisions, during the First World War, the beneficial effect of the clause and the reasonableness of values determined by the Administrator thereunder becomes even more apparent—see Committee Document No. 20, page 388 and following.

Implementing the creation of the Board, the Administrator has taken temporary steps as set forth in his notice to owners of vessels purchased, chartered, or requisitioned for use or for title by the War Shipping Administration, all of which has been reported to my committee.

I am mindful of the extreme financial distress that might have resulted in many situations because of the existence of conflicts. I understand that, so far as possible, the Administrator has been able to apply sufficient relief in order to avoid serious financial consequences in many cases. The War Shipping Administrator is subject only to limited review by the General Accounting Office. Where the Comptroller General feels that the Administrator has failed to apply law correctly, his function is to report such action to Congress for appropriate review and consideration. The duty of acting, if action is required, is then for Congress to determine. In choosing to observe the Comptroller General's opinion of November 28, 1942, as a precautionary measure, even though the opinion was not legally binding upon him instead of proceeding without regard to that opinion, the Administrator exercised wise administrative discretion and permitted an orderly, careful, and deliberate evaluation of all

the factors involved in this complicated problem, and a calm and peaceful disposition. This is in the interest of shipowners as well as the Government.

I wish to commend the Administrator, the Comptroller General, their staffs, and counsel for their persistent and continued efforts to secure a satisfactory solution which would do justice to all and bring order out of chaos. I know of my own knowledge that the Administrator and his staff have labored ceaselessly during the past year in an effort to find a solution for this difficulty which would both protect the interests of the United States and would provide an equitable solution for the owners. I believe that the action which the Administrator has taken on the advice of his counsel was consistent only with the best interests of the United States and the merchant marine.

Supervision of Business of Fire-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, recently two bills, H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270, were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. They concern the supervision of business carried on throughout the United States by fire-insurance companies. This business has been controlled for many decades by insurance commissioners of the several States. Persons who are interested in the proper division of activities between the States and the Federal Government and persons who are interested in the fire-insurance business have written to me a great many letters in favor of this legislation.

I believe that all of the Members of the House will be interested in the argument and material set forth by one of my constituents in a letter which I have recently received from him. For that reason I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that you may be familiar with the purposes of this legislation which has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary and will undoubtedly be taken up in the House within a very short time. The letter is as follows:

SENATE BILL 1362 AND HOUSE BILLS H. R. 3269 AND H. R. 3270

Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

These identical bills are to affirm the intent of Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business.

As one who is vitally interested in this subject, I am hopeful that you will give your powerful support to the enactment of these bills.

Those of us who are connected with insurance are deeply concerned by the recent attempts to apply the Federal antitrust laws to the fire insurance business. Those attempts involve the rights of the States, the will of Congress and the orderly conduct of a business built for years to conform to detailed regulation by the States, a business largely conducted by thousands of local agents.

May I remind you briefly of certain important facts regarding the regulation of insurance:

1. For over 75 years the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that insurance may be regulated by the States.

2. For over 90 years insurance has been regulated by the States, each acting to meet local conditions and each as it deems best for its citizens. (The impression in uninformed quarters that insurance is not regulated is grossly false.)

3. State regulation began prior to the enactment of Federal antitrust laws, and congressional history strongly indicates that Congress never intended such laws to apply to insurance.

4. The average fire-insurance rate in the United States was $1.10 per $100 in 1910; in 1942 it was 61 cents per $100. In a little over 30 years rates have been reduced more than 40 percent and these results have been brought about under State laws.

5. As regards present State regulations, let me point out that—

(a) Every State requires a license as a prerequisite to engaging in fire-insurance underwriting.

(b) Every State has requirements aimed at maintaining the solvency of the fire-insurance companies licensed by it.

(c) Every State reserves the right to revoke or refuse any license granted by it.

(d) Twenty-seven States provide by statute for rating bureaus. Only 2 States, Nebraska and Iowa, prohibit them.

(e) Twenty States provide that the rates used by the fire-insurance companies be filed with State insurance departments.

(f) In 19 States fire-insurance companies may not deviate from the rates promulgated by the rating bureaus, unless a formal deviation is filed with or approved by the State insurance department.

(g) In all States comprehensive exhibits of the details of operations, including profit-and-loss computations, are required to be filed annually.

(h) In addition, expert auditors employed by the States critically and in great detail periodically examine the financial condition of every fire-insurance company authorized to do business in the respective States.

(i) The States have shown great interest in encouraging uniform fire-insurance rates through antirebate and antidiscrimination statutes. At the present time 43 States prohibit rebating or giving an assured any advantage not specified in the policy. Thirty-six States forbid the making of any rate which designates unfairly between risks in the application of like charges and credits and between risks of essentially the same hazards.

You can, therefore, see that State regulation is directed at controlling competition and preventing unfair discrimination. It aims at uniform and equal treatment for equal hazards.

6. In August 1942, the Federal Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice secured an indictment in the District Court of Atlanta, Ga., against the insurance companies, charging the defendants with violating Federal antitrust laws. A year later, the district court in Atlanta announced that the Federal antitrust laws did not apply to insurance and dismissed the indictment. The Federal Antitrust Division has now appealed to the Supreme Court.

7. If the Supreme Court should reverse the lower court's decision, the following conditions are bound to prevail:

(a) The States have found that to permit uncontrolled competition tends to result in favoritism to the strong as against the weak, and the companies which write at rates violating the laws of averages must, in the end, become insolvent, with nothing but loss to the policyholders and to the State. In contrast, the Federal antitrust laws aim to secure unrestricted competition by prohibiting cooperative accord or action. They seek individual trading and not uniformity. The primary public interest is the protection of the policyholders through the preservation of the financial soundness of the insurer, and only by cooperative action and uniformity of rates and practices can that financial soundness be maintained.

(b) If the fire insurance business is now held subject to the Federal antitrust laws, the practical result will be that if the business complies with the Federal antitrust laws it will not conform to State laws, and if it complies to State laws, it will not conform to Federal laws. No man can serve two masters, and in such a state of affairs, only chaos could result. A long period of litigation for the ultimate determination of what portion of State regulation is valid and what portion is invalid would result. During that period no effective regulation at all would ensue and the solvency of the companies would be jeopardized.

(c) The States have not called for Federal aid. No one will contend that State regulation is absolutely perfect, but certainly Federal regulation would be far less perfect.

8. Happily Congress is now in a position to make certain that such a disastrous situation will never arise, by simply affirming that its antitrust laws are not applicable to insurance. By taking such action Congress would waive no power or right; it would grant no special privilege; it would remove the danger of the conflict between the States and the Federal Government and the chaotic conditions in insurance which would arise if the Federal antitrust laws were held applicable to that business.

Sioux Indian Woman Receives Achievement Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, American Indian Day in Illinois, Ella Cara Deloria, a Yankton Sioux Indian woman born on a reservation in South Dakota, was awarded the Indian achievement award given annually by the Indian Council Fire of Chicago to an American Indian whose accomplishments are worthy of national recognition.

The award is symbolized by a bronze medal designed by a Cherokee Indian. Miss Deloria, an anthropologist in the field of Indian lore, is the third woman and the third Sioux to receive the award since it was established 11 years ago.

She has been research specialist in the Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, since 1929, and has written numerous books on Indian languages, customs, and social history. In 1940 she wrote and produced a pageant about Indians in North Carolina. At present she is writing a reader on Indians for the missionary education movement.

Miss Deloria is of five-eighths Indian blood; she graduated from an Episcopal school for girls at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., attended Oberlin College and Columbia University. At one time she was national secretary for Indian work for the Y. W. C. A.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, Miss Deloria suggested using the Sioux language for code communications by radio with ships at sea. This would be an important war contribution to the safety of not only her Indian brothers but to every American fighting on the far-flung front-line trench, for the enemy would find it hard to decode a native American language. Today we read in the newspapers that Indian soldiers are serving as dispatchers and baffling the enemy with native American communications.

Stirring Race Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting excerpts from an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, of November 15, 1943, written by Westbrook Pegler, showing who is stirring up race trouble throughout this country.

The matter referred to follows:

NEW YORK, November 15.—Mr. Biddle, the Attorney General, made an address last week in which he deplored racial disunity and prejudice and proposed that local groups be formed across the Nation to combat this sort of thing. He should have gone into particulars regarding the sources of this dangerous agitation, for he certainly is in a position to know that the trouble is aggravated much less by the ordinary American who, undoubtedly, does have his prejudices, usually mild or dormant, than by the Communists, the Negro press, and Marshall Field, all of whom exploit for their own purposes the frictions between whites and Negroes, Gentiles and Jews.

The Communists not only address their appeals to the Negro as a Negro and the Jew as a Jew and the first victim of Hitlerism, but they constantly put forward the most exasperating individuals to be found in either group as representative, even heroic, Negroes and Jews with the very purpose of arousing hatred. Their method is to identify such individuals as typical Negroes and Jews, knowing that the most normal Americans will instinctively hate them and thus be tempted to hate all Negroes and all Jews. The Communists thrive on turmoil, disunity, and confusion, and, as even Mayor LaGuardia once remarked when they were deliberately promoting and prolonging a local problem, they never want a peaceful settlement of any issue, but would sacrifice the very people for whom they pretend to fight. Their objective is violence in the streets, then the break-down of government through the weakness or hesitation of mayors and Governors, then anarchy, and, finally, the dictatorship.

There is no element comparable to the Negro press in the promotion of race consciousness among the Negroes and racial distrust of the white population. These publications have a large circulation and they constantly remind the Negro that he is a Negro while calling on the white press to forego all such distinctions. They misrepresent the background facts of all disturbances so as to make it appear that, invariably, some white man was responsible for the trouble and the Negro Communists and fellow-travelers always receive recognition as racial leaders. Thus white men who read this propaganda are given to suspect or believe that the whole Negro population is following men and women whose purpose in life is to destroy the American Government. This naturally does not make for that friendship and understanding by the Negro of the white man and vice versa for which Mr. Biddle pleads and all good Americans yearn.

Mr. Field is a false friend of both groups for whom he pretends to carry on unremitting war in print. He aggravates incidents into causes and, although he identifies individual Jews as Jews, he holds that it is evidence of hatred in a gentile to describe himself as such. Further to arouse hatred by an indirect but not very subtle device, Mr. Field prints inflammatory rumors in sensational style and then nails them as falsehoods. But in so doing he gives circulation to disturbing ideas some or all of which may be sheer inventions of his journalists who, at the very beginning of his publishing enterprise in New York, included many of the most conspicuous followers of the Communist Party line and adherents of the Communist leadership in the Newspaper Guild. When a man goes in for the publication of false rumors he knows nobody can check on the origin of the rumors. Thus he puts himself in a position to use his imagination and put forth terrible scares which leave an impression even though he does denounce them as false and imputes them to some unidentified person described as a hate-monger.

Mr. Biddle is not a naive man, and I am sure he knows that the most influential agitators of racial and religious hatred are to be found among these elements. The standard daily press of the country has handled these very delicate problems with great tact and has even played down some incidents just because they were inflammatory. The guiltiest of all agitators are those who pretend to fight against group hatreds.

Mr. Speaker, the Marshall Field press to which Mr. Pegler refers is PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, that is now being financed out of that $70,000,000 Marshall Field received some time ago and on which he has so far escaped the payment of 1 cent of taxes.

If the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue want to render a real service to this country, they can do so by bringing suit at once to recover the taxes due on this $70,000,000, which Marshall Field attempts to escape through the schemes of a shrewd lawyer in preparing his grandfather's will 40 years ago.

While our boys are shedding their blood on every battle front in the world, and while every other American is being taxed to the limit, the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue should not permit Marshall Field to escape the payment of taxes on a vast fortune of $70,000,000, of which he never earned a nickel, and then use it to finance a Communist publication that is constantly abusing the white people of the South, and doing more to stir up race friction in this country, and less to promote national unity, than any other newspaper in America.

The Liquor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 10, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many flamboyant statements flying around concerning liquor. The pending senatorial investigation, like a bolt from the blue, should clear the atmosphere.

As I see it, there are two reasons for the present disorder and chaos. First, the dwindling supply; and second, hoarding and frantic purchasing due to the coming jumping of the excise tax to $9 per proof gallon, or $2.50 a quart.

The industry is being squeezed between the upper and nether stones. Unless the pressure from above or below is released, you will have more chaos and more confusion, and all the investigations in the world cannot give you more whisky when the demand is five times the supply.

Unless some permission is given to replenish a portion of the supply or unless the taxes are made sensible, it all will be duck soup for moonshiners and bootleggers, and the blue-nose prohibitionists will laugh like Cheshire cats.

The thirsty riveters, machinists, and clerks, in fact, the rank and file of male and female workers everywhere, enjoying greater economic benefits, will get their liquor willy-nilly. They will be easy prey for the hootch makers. They want the real McCoy and will pay high for genuine Scotch, rye, and bourbon. But, failing to get it after the barrel of available supply is scraped, they will again, as in the prohibition days, be deceived by the usual signs and the refilling of old bottles with familiar labels. They will be taken in with "ginger jake," "bathtub gin," "needled beer," and "rotgut." The hip-pocket flask will again become the badge of youth.

We must be sensible. We are not facing any theories; we are facing a condition—a condition of genuine shortage, with great incentive for illicit manufacture and sale, together with the tremendous demands, in addition to the need to satisfy, in part, that demand to maintain morale. There hovers over the whole situation the memory of the horrors of prohibition.

We want no return to prohibition. It would be like the dog returning to its vomit.

We must follow one of two courses. First, we cannot allow the taxes to go up to $9 per proof gallon or $2.50 a quart,

which is really $10 per proof gallon. Remember, that superimposed upon that contemplated tax are State taxes, which, like in New York State, is $1 per proof gallon. Then there are the license fees that come up to $2,500 per year in a number of States. Each bottle sold must help defray all those taxes, license fees, and burdens. Superimposed is an overall profit even on the taxes.

Those huge exactions are entirely too high. They are a "green light" to the bootlegger and illicit trader. The thousands of enforcement officers and millions of appropriations could not enforce prohibition. We have not the time nor the inclination to enforce a sort of another prohibition on the Nation again.

If we want to keep those taxes as high as $9 or even higher, then we must assume a sensible attitude and allow the repletion of dwindling supplies and should permit the distillation of at least 50,000,000 gallons.

On October 1, 1943, there were in the United States Government bonded warehouses a supply of 406,000,000 gallons of original entry. Actually, there were only 308,000,000 gallons. You must subtract from the amount of original entry about 22½ percent loss due to evaporation and natural leakage.

The distillers in all likelihood took from the 308,000,000 gallons about 1,000,000 proof gallons for post-war reserves that would be needed for blending purposes. Otherwise, directly after the war, with resumption of distillation, the public would only get "green whisky." Common sense dictates the wise policy of setting up such reserves. Thus, there is left for actual consumption during the rest of the war, 208,000,000 proof gallons. This is about a 2½ years' supply at the present rate of consumption.

The distillers have been rationing their supply. They were compelled to do so. Seventeen of our States have the dispensary system, and they have been rationing for upward of 1½ years and demanded rationing by the distillers.

There are about 100 or so prime distillers and importers who control the manufacture and entrance of whisky into the domestic market. They are under rigid control by the Treasury Department, War Production Board, and Office of Price Administration.

In justice to them, it must be said with little or no exceptions, they have hewed exactly to the legal line. Below the scale are about 2,500 wholesalers who are likewise watched carefully and assiduously by the various arms of the Government. They, too, have maintained a patriotic attitude of living up to the law and regulations. Further below are some 200,000 retailers for off-the-premises and on-the-premises consumption. They include package stores, hotels, taverns, cafes, and "juke joints." The lower you get in that scale of operations the more difficult enforcement becomes. All these operators are importuned daily for goods they cannot supply. The Government must, and should, step in the breach and allow a repletion of that supply.

It is interesting to note how the State government monopolies have injected themselves into this situation. A number of the monopoly commissions have told their retailers that they could not give them their usual supplies and that they should go out and cross the State borders and buy anywhere and everywhere. This caused great confusion. Thousands of hotel keepers, cafe owners, and other licensees flooded New York and elsewhere buying from all manner and kinds of stores at retail. This has been going on for months and had added to the dwindling supply in New York and other metropolitan areas.

One monopoly State had the hardihood to be in the market at the very present moment to purchase and gobble up two and one-half million cases of Scotch. This is all the more outrageous when you consider that for the calendar year 1943, the estimated importation of all Scotch whisky in this country was about two and one-half million cases. This one monopoly State commission wants to monopolize all the Scotch that could possibly be squeezed into this country in 1 year.

The hoarding and excited purchasing of Scotch whisky has added to the confusion.

England controls all allotment of Scotch imported into this country. Ordinarily we import from three to three and one-half million cases a year. During this calendar year it will be between two and one-fourth and two and one-half million cases.

Standardized Air Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo (Ohio) Times of November 14, 1943:

STANDARDIZED AIR RULES

Air-minded Toledo should be interested in the Lea bill which is scheduled for a vote in Congress within the next 2 weeks.

Broadly, the bill is the first step in the standardizing of airports and flying regulations, putting them on a national basis rather than on a State or municipal basis.

The bill would set up a Civil Aeronautics Commission, similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would operate independent of the executive arm of the Government. It restores the same independent investigation of aircraft accidents. Such a safety committee would be entirely free of the body responsible for regulation.

The proposal also makes available to the community a procedure for zoning of condemnation under standards guaranteeing fair compensation and full judicial review.

The real benefit of such legislation is the standardization of flying regulations within States as well as between States. Planes, flying rules, and airports can be standardized in the interest of the rapid development of flying.

The Lea bill does not destroy States' rights. States and municipalities can still build, administer, and operate airports.

The proposed legislation points the way to a great stride in aviation and should lead to the expansion of air travel and aviation employment for many of the fliers now in the armed forces.

The President and the Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the majority report filed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on October 20, in connection with the Lea bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, now before the Rules Committee, is silent on a most vital and serious aspect of the proposed legislation, and that is, the expressed and emphatic disapproval of the President. Under date of June 4, 1943, in a letter to Representative LEA, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the President, in clear, unmistakable language, indicated the danger of tampering with the Aeronautics Act during the war.

Aside from the many other urgent reasons why this bill should not be enacted into law, the serious and valid objections of the President to the bill demand and deserve the close attention and consideration of the Congress.

I congratulate the President upon the direct, helpful, and convincing statements contained in his letter to Chairman LEA and, as one member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I apologize to the President for the shabby treatment given his constructive and friendly suggestions.

The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 4, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN LEA: I have noted, with appreciation, the attention which is being given by your committee to the pending bill, H. R. 1012, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, by way of improvement and implementation of the existing provisions of the act. I feel obliged, however, in this connection to indicate my view that it would be unwise, at any rate at the present time, to incorporate in the pending legislation a proposal, which I understand has been put forward, to remove the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board from the Department of Commerce, put the administration under the supervision of the Board, and create a new independent director of aviation accident investigation.

I am not in favor of these changes for the same reasons which led me to displace the somewhat similar organization which existed

before the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in 1940 (see my message accompanying Reorganization Plan IV). I think it particularly significant that the readjustments incident to the reorganization of 1940 are now completed and the Board and the Administrator's organization appear to be working satisfactorily.

I question, moreover, the advisability, at a time when there is a paramount need for the performance by the Administration and the Board of services of vital importance to the armed forces, of providing, in a measure otherwise restricted to the accomplishment of more or less recognized betterments in the operative procedures of the existing agencies, for such a major reorganization of these agencies as would be contemplated by the proposal in question. I fear that the consideration, enactment, and putting into operation of such a reorganization plan would so distract the attention of officials and employees of these agencies, and so impair their working efficiency, as to seriously interfere with the contribution that they could otherwise make in the interest of securing successful civil aviation assistance in the conduct of the war.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, Before the Exchange Club of Gardner, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Exchange Club, Gardner, Mass., July 12, 1943:

It is surely a great privilege, especially coming so soon after the recess of Congress, to have the opportunity this evening of discussing some of our very serious national problems with the members of this organization.

One of the more significant features of a true democracy is the right of free, untrammelled expression, the right of the individual to speak his own mind and to join together with his friends, neighbors, and business and professional associates for the purpose of exchanging views and opinions and formulating ideas into definite policies of thought and action.

Certainly the need for communion of ideas and community of action has never been greater or more urgent than it is in America today. So I must commend and compliment this group of civic-spirited patriotic citizens of Gardner, vitally interested as you are—as, indeed, we all must be—in the promptest and most effective solution possible of the imminent and critical problems confronting the country.

Every thinking person, surely every business or professional man, must be deeply conscious of our present grave crisis.

Leaving the colossal war aside for the moment, we must be greatly alarmed by the bewildering confusion and the astounding, almost incredible disorder we witness all around us. This disorder is in many governmental activities. This confusion reaches into virtually every place of business and every home in the country. It has reached a point where it has already endangered the morale of our people so vital to productive efficiency and the manifold efforts, physical, financial, and spiritual which we must make in unmeasured degree to insure ultimate success and victory in the war.

These very disturbing conditions are not entirely or to any considerable extent due to the war effort alone. Naturally, we expect, and as lovers of our country are prepared to accept, the dislocations of business and industry and the personal inconveniences and discomforts and the regimentation and mobilization of human and economic resources that over-all global war entails. For the most part, our people are not only willing but eager to bear more than their full share of sacrifice and hardship that may be necessary in order to bring success and victory to our American arms.

But our people are insistent on making these willing contributions in the knowledge that necessary burdens when imposed are not confined or limited to any one group, any one section, any one economic unit or individual, but are equitably apportioned and spread over the entire country. The whole American people are at war; and if gasoline and fuel oil and food have to be rationed to supply our armed forces or to serve the legitimate purposes of the war, in equity and justice, these and other similar programs exacting sacrifices on the part of the people ought to be conducted in a spirit of fairness and impartiality and on a country-wide basis.

Moreover, the people desire as much as the winning of the war itself that in the process of economic regimentation and mobilization associated with the war effort, the greatest concern be felt and practiced with regard to the maintenance and preservation of fundamental American institutions of democracy, freedom, liberty, and justice. They desire wholeheartedly and predominantly that in our understandable zeal to win the war, the greatest care and scruple be employed by the national leadership lest our form of government and the essentials of our free-enterprise system be transmuted during these fateful days by accident or design from democratic into dictatorial organization. In a word, our people want and intend to continue to possess the representative democracy of Washington and Jefferson and not have foisted on them against their will and under the false guise of war necessity the bureaucratic commissariat of Harry Hopkins and Felix Frankfurter.

The war has given impetus to a most unfortunate movement begun some time ago. In the Federal Government, bureau after bureau, agency after agency, commission after commission have piled up on top of each other with alarming speed and to staggering size. We have been plagued by split authority and divided responsibility. Some 2,270 separate Federal bureaus are seeking to handle our affairs. At some time or other 12 or more of these have exercised powers over rubber; 10 over oil and fuel; several over procurement of strategic materials; 10 over food. In such circumstances where centralized control and authority is absent, orderly consideration and swift effective action is impossible. The solution of every problem—and these problems are fraught with life and death for some—is bound up with red tape, waste, delay, and inefficiency.

Chaos was certain from the start. The poorly conceived, badly mismanaged price fixing and rationing programs soon broke down because the meddling radicals and inexperienced theorists were ineffectual to prevent it. The people were left without food because of complete break-down of an impossible uneconomic system of regulation. The same philosophers of disgruntlement and despair who instituted the economics of scarcity by killing little pigs and plowing under crops now established an international W. P. A. and precipitated broken price ceilings and the black market while bestowing an incredible American largesse on most nations of the earth. Their plans still proceed from the plainly impractical to the amazingly fantastic.

To reformers of every shade of the political spectroscope, possessed of great social uplift but no discoverable brains, business judgment, or common sense, the word "economy" is but an ancient hobgoblin. They long since rejected the once respected theory that debts were incurred to be paid, and, of course, view as sheer heresy the notion that a nation, like an individual, has to live within its means. Deficit spending—spending beyond its means and income—became the accepted financial policy of the Government of the United States.

I do not mean to infer that such a great social and economic upheaval from which we now suffer can be met and conquered without some social and economic unorthodoxy, but am simply pointing out that the average taxpayer of this country has little basis, in the light of this background of unabashed radicalism and improvidence of some of the policy-making and high administrative officials of the Government, to expect that substantial economy would be practiced in the conduct of the war or in the simultaneous programs of reform, alleviation, and gratuitous dispersal of our economic wealth and resources which followed as a matter of course the inauguration of the international W. P. A.

The lives and welfare of our boys and the welfare of our country come first and we would not tolerate for one moment any policy of niggardliness with regard to their basic needs. We are all eager that they should have the best of everything the Nation can provide—food, clothing, equipment, and the arms and means to defend themselves and carry on the fight for democracy. But we did not expect to see our substance squandered and thrown to the four global winds. Yet this has been done with a profligacy that beggars description and certainly has had no counterpart in the world since the days that the brothers Gracchus passed out free corn and poised the great and glorious Roman Empire at the top of the toboggan of ruination and doom.

It is only fair to state that there has been discernible nowhere among those charged with financing this war and these concomitant programs of radical social reform any regard whatever for economy. Reputable economists have estimated that these costs could well be cut in half. Yet the national debt mounts steadily into the upper reaches of stratospheric space. Few seem to show the slightest concern about it.

Recently in one appropriation bill for the War Department Congress appropriated $71,000,000,000 or almost one-half as much as the total expenditures of this Government from the time of its inception. A national debt of $300,000,000,000 is astronomical and staggering yet it is a reality. Moreover, it will have to be paid, or liquidated through depreciation or repudiation with consequent financial and personal ruin to millions of our citizens and institutions. When that time comes, as it surely will unless desperate measures of retrenchment and economy are soon applied, the fondest hopes of the Utopian world dreamers and Soviet schemers will be realized—their objectives will be gained—the system of free enterprise which has brought to America unparalleled prosperity, liberty, and happiness will be laid in ruins and the yoke of totalitarian vassalage and serfdom will be fastened about the necks of the American people.

The war situation is a reason but not an excuse for spending huge sums of money though the long-haired men and short-haired women in some Government agencies notoriously fail to consider cost in relation to their pet theories and projects. The American taxpayer who will ultimately have to pay the

bill and the American investor, including millions of our humblest citizens who have so generously purchased War bonds and thus have a life savings at stake in the Government of the United States, demand that sound fiscal policies be pursued, and that waste, duplication, incompetency, and inefficiency be eliminated from the Government.

Of necessity, this Congress has made record-breaking wartime appropriations. In 6 months' time, it voted over $114,000,000,000. There has been no attempt or desire to stint with regard to funds needed for the successful prosecution of the war. On the other hand, Congress has sought persistently to cut down expenditures of the regular agencies of the Government. Several lopsided, uneconomic units pursuing world and domestic social reform have been completely liquidated. Others have been sharply curtailed. It is only through careful paring of unnecessary outlays and putting the Government on a strictly business-like basis of efficient management and economy that we will ever be able to reconcile our tremendous debt structure with the income-producing capacity of our industry and people.

While Congress has thus effected some substantial savings, the enactment of pay-as-you-go tax legislation, although not precisely in the form desired, and the abrogation of the 10-year-old Executive power to devalue the dollar were steps in the right direction. Even so, our individual citizens cannot possibly escape steadily mounting taxes, steadily decreasing standards of living, and greater burdens of sacrifice and hardship than the country has even known in the past. When Congress reconvenes in the fall it will probably enact another tax bill, effective the first of the year, calling for several additional billions, and before the end of the war it is not at all the inconceivable that a sum approximating 50 percent of the national annual income may be taken in Federal taxes.

The vigilance of Congress has extended along the entire domestic war front. Its committees have kept constant touch with maladjustments of production, manpower, food, fuel, and other necessities. With the Army and Navy approaching 10,000,000 men requiring vast amounts of supplies, materials, and equipment, critical shortages of manpower, food, and fuel have been inevitable. It can hardly be hoped that these shortages will be less severe in time to come; in fact, they may well be accentuated. But come what may, our people are prepared to accept the challenge which our enemies have given in a spirit of patriotism and willingness to sacrifice. They only ask in return that the sacrifices required by the very grave war situation not be multiplied unnecessarily and additional burdens thereby imposed by the foolish, ill-considered, improvident conduct of some Federal agencies more interested apparently in establishing a world-wide Utopia than in the prompt expeditious winning of the war.

One of the truly amazing performances of the war effort on the home front is given by American industry operating under the free enterprise system, hampered to a very great degree by onerous regulation of governmental bureaus, but which notwithstanding has set up a record for gigantic all-time volume of production of war materials and essentials never believed possible. This great and most meritorious task was accomplished by a free American economy in which our businessmen, our scientists, and our free, well-paid, high-standard American labor worked together harmoniously and efficiently animated by a genuine spirit of patriotism and loyalty.

When you compare this remarkable record of business efficiency and productive capacity with the sorry bungling, the inane regulating, the interference, the misfeasance, and bewilderment that has characterized the efforts of many Government bureaucrats, you can have no doubt concerning the inherent advantages of free private initiative over the stultifying efforts of bureaucratic control. I make these references with no intent to criticize but rather with every desire to acknowledge the services of very many able and patriotic administrators employed by the Federal Government. For the most part our Federal employees are industrious, hard-working and patriotic. The Nation is indebted to them for loyal, efficient service.

I am happy to report to you that in the main the Congress has awakened to the desperate need for curbing obnoxious bureaucracy, recapturing congressional legislative powers and bringing order out of the chaos that has been created in our domestic economy by unwise regulatory activities.

Considerable progress has been made toward restoring control of the Government to the people, but much remains to be done. Only an aroused public opinion indicating to Congress its impatience with and revulsion toward continued administrative incompetence can produce the state of mind in that body that will bring relief from confusion and disorder.

There is no time to lose. Well-nigh irreparable damage has already been done. Unless drastic action is speedily taken to correct present conditions the country will be confronted with total collapse of its economy and even more serious food shortages and dislocation of the whole system of production and distribution is bound to ensue.

We intend to make it clear that the American people propose to stand loyally behind the Commander in Chief in the speedy, efficient prosecution of the war, but in so doing they do not propose to surrender the right of every American citizen to question and seek to correct policies which they deem injurious and harmful to their system of government, to their way of economic life, and which ultimately can only result in shattering morale and obstructing the war effort.

Another recently developing and most apprehensive feature of our national life is the emergence in some sections of the country of strong bitter racial and group antagonisms. These threaten to create disturbances and divisions among our people at a time when, above all, we need absolute national unity and cooperation. To hate or discriminate against a man because of his race or creed is not only detestable but is un-American and contrary to the spirit and traditions of our free Government. In denouncing and condemning those who seek to spread dissension among our people through the development of racial and religious prejudice, we ought to be constantly mindful of the fact that we cannot be too zealous in guarding these basic American rights for each and every individual and each and every group in our country regardless of race, color, or creed.

Many people who are disturbed about the generally chaotic conditions surrounding us in our daily lives have repeatedly asked me what the ordinary citizen can do to bring about speedy corrective remedy. My answer has been and is—faith, hope, and work—faith in liberal, representative democracy and in the expressly declared intention of the American Congress, at any cost, to adhere to our form of government—hope that dissensionist groups in our midst in and out of the Government service will soon see the light, or feel, as they surely will, the lash of an aroused determined public opinion, and unceasing work in order that we may all contribute our utmost, each within our own sphere, to the sacred cause for which we fight, for our own country, the greatest country on earth, and for the perpetuation now and forever of its priceless institutions.

I have painted a gloomy and forbidding picture. Taken together with the all-embracing and awe-inspiring strategical and tactical problems inextricably associated with the great and vast global war we fight, it is not an optimistic picture. Not only are our people called upon to summon every ounce of their resources and strength; to make unbelievable sacrifices of the blood of their boys and the last measure of their treasure in order to ward off and overpower foreign tyrants seeking our destruction, but most unfortunately we also must exercise constant vigilance and wage unceasing battle against the dangerous forces of radical conspiracy right here in the very midst of our own homes and own institutions of government.

Grave and forbidding though these vast problems be, the American people will find a way to solve them. Our boys are willing and heroic; the temper of our people is unflinching; the spirit of the country is unconquerable. God willing, we will find a way in our own time to gain glorious victory and bring those boys back home. We will also find a way—and the process has already begun—to reinstate constitutional liberal, democratic government in the United States; to stamp out the radical termites seeking to destroy it; to protect and preserve American liberty in all its fullness and glory, not only for ourselves and for the gallant heroes of the global fronts, but also for our children and our children's children.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation spent twenty-nine billions in the first 4 months of this fiscal year.

"Consumer subsidies beget consumer subsidies," says JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of House Banking and Currency Committee.

Fulton Lewis, Jr., says he is an independent in politics. No doubt WRIGHT PATMAN has now made him a Republican for life.

When the Senate Agriculture Committee held hearings on a subject coming before the House this week from their Banking and Currency Committee, it made new history.

The New Deal in Kentucky said night after night over the radio in the campaign, "Elect Willis Governor and you vindicate long JOHN ROBSION and the isolationists"; and they did.

The two Houses gathered in Representatives' hall, Thursday, to furnish Cordell Hull a sounding board to retell the story of Moscow. He did a nice job of it. Even a third of the Cabinet came.

The proposed 1 percent of our incomes to rebuild devastated lands on top of lend-lease and a hundred other helps would be merely letting the bear and lion get their noses under the tent.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, head of General Electric, and who had added prestige to W. P. B., is compelled to go the route that Chester Davis took, victim of altitude pressure from the superinvisible.

Amendment No. 5 to Maximum Price Regulation No. 319: All commodities listed in Appendix A are those known to

the trade as such, excepting therefrom such thereof, if any, while subject to another regulation.

Angelo Bertelli, of Notre Dame, went to Parris Island, put on the uniform, and quit shooting the ball. Walter Winchell, of Jergens, stayed on Manhattan Island, took off his uniform, and continues to shoot the bull.

Anticipated Donations to Religious and Charitable Institutions Should Be Deducted Before Applying the Withholding Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, many fine endorsements of the legislation sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and myself embodying identical bills, to wit: H. R. 3472 and H. R. 3473, have arrived at my office. I extend my remarks by including a resolution passed by the general conference of the Seventh-day Adventists, Takoma Park, D. C. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADDRESSED TO THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY THE AUTUMN COUNCIL OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Whereas from the earliest beginnings of Christianity people have been taught to cherish a spirit of liberality, both in sustaining the cause of God and in supplying the wants of the needy; and

Whereas the Holy Scriptures admonish the believers to bring into the churches the tithes and offerings; and

Whereas the God-fearing founders of these great United States were so thoroughly convinced that there should be absolute separation of church and state that they provided in the early colonial constitutions that no tax money should be used for the support of the church and later incorporated their beliefs in the first article of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas freedom of religious worship has been maintained in this country through the private support of the churches by their members; and

Whereas heavy demands of a national wartime budget have already seriously curtailed offerings to religious institutions; and

Whereas under the present pay-as-you-go tax program insufficient consideration is given in each pay-roll period to deductions for tithes and offerings of millions of church members who follow the principles of Christian stewardship: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Autumn Council of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists representing its churches and religious institutions petition the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives to incorporate into pending tax legislation now under its consideration the principles of H. R. 3472 and H. R. 3473.

I wish to further extend my remarks by including the following article, which appeared in the Catholic News, New York, N. Y., on Saturday, October 30, 1943:

CATHOLIC EDUCATORS BACK PLAN FOR TAX DEDUCTION

WASHINGTON.—The National Catholic Educational Association has notified Representative CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, that it fully supports the principle of his proposed amendment to the Federal withholding income-tax law, which would permit an employee to have subtracted from his salary the amount of his contributions before the tax rate is applied.

By way of illustration, Representative CURTIS said before the committee: "Let us take the case of a taxpayer whose salary is $250 a month. If this provision is made law, this taxpayer may notify his employer that he expects to give his church, his college, the American Red Cross, the U. S. O., and perhaps some other organizations, the sum of $30 a month. The employer would then withhold the tax from the taxpayer's wages, not on the basis of $250 a month, but on the basis of $220 a month."

The Right Reverend Monsignor George Johnson, secretary general of the National Catholic Educational Association, in a letter to Representative CURTIS, informed him of the organization's support. The letter, in part stated:

"Catholic schools and colleges in the United States are supported entirely by the generosity of the Catholic people. They are making a splendid contribution to our American democracy and, incidentally, save the Government millions of dollars each year. Under the circumstances, it would seem that fundamental justice would dictate that some way be found of insuring that they get substantial credit for their contributions to education when the time comes for them to pay their Federal income tax."

Representative CURTIS told the Ways and Means Committee he believed that enactment of his amendment would greatly add to the contributions made to churches, colleges, and charitable institutions.

Many businessmen, attorneys, and tax experts endorsed this bill. They know that it is not only just and right, but that it is workable and to the advantage of the Government of the United States. I wish to further extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. James L. Baldwin, research director of the Institute for Capital Conservation, Chicago, Ill. The letter is as follows:

INSTITUTE FOR CAPITAL CONSERVATION,
Chicago, November 2, 1943.

Hon. CARL CURTIS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: From the standpoint of both sound tax administration and public policy the passage of your bill, H. R. 3472, is an imperative necessity.

The writer has served as research director for organizations numbering thousands of individual and corporate taxpayers during the past 2 decades. From the point of view of the professional tax specialist, I would say that your proposed amendment of section 1622 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code is essential to the true legislative intent of Congress in enacting the provision for the withholding of the income tax from wages. This provision was clearly intended to aid the small taxpayer to keep current in his tax payments.

It was not intended to work a hardship upon the taxpayer, and still less to deprive him of a constitutional guaranty. Yet that is exactly what the withholding provision inadvertently does. Constitutional freedom of worship is an empty phrase if the State by law deprives the church and church-motivated charities of the revenues essential to their continued existence.

The 20-percent withholding provision, unless modified to permit the withdrawal of declared charitable contributions, including current support of the churches, will absorb the margin available to wage earners for such gifts. It will dry up and bankrupt our churches, hospitals, colleges, and other voluntarily supported institutions of benevolence. Already, their receipts are the lowest in American history in ratio to national income.

Some years ago the country was shocked by the scandalous failure of the city of Chicago to pay its public-school teachers. The fact that they were eventually paid did not cure the harm done to the rising generation by reason of the demoralization of the school system for a year or more. Now we face the possibility of a national scandal of a far graver nature. The mentioned school teachers were enabled to obtain local credit to meet their absolute necessities because their salaries were legal obligations. But the clergy of America cannot fall back upon any such assured credit if they are permitted to starve for a year.

An eventual refund or credit to the taxpayer covering his charitable contribution will not meet the current needs of the clergy and the urgent necessity of those dependent upon charity for their day-to-day subsistence. Indeed, such a plan would discourage any giving at all.

Your amendment not only remedies this intolerable evil but also makes a valuable contribution to public policy in that it will encourage the same regularity of religious stewardship as that required by political government. It is to be borne in mind that thousands of Christians and Jews regard the tithe as a solemn religious obligation. The payment of one-tenth of income to religion was a direct commandment from God. It was specifically approved by Christ and universally practiced by the early Christian church. The point is that one does not give the tithe. It is paid as a divine mandate. When man-made government steps in to nullify this payment for all practical purposes, it is treading upon the dangerous ground of invading the sacred rights of religion.

The growing class strife and racial tension in America warn us that the foes of democratic brotherhood are within as well as without our borders. Only a strengthening of our support of religious institutions will save democracy. To weaken that support would be calamitous and treasonable. I am sure that I speak the minds of taxpayers of all levels when I say that the passage of your amendment is necessary to the preservation of public morality.

Yours cordially,

JAMES L. BALDWIN,
Research Director.

The Real Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

THE REAL POLL-TAX ISSUE

Mark Sullivan in his syndicated column yesterday took what we think was a courageous and correct stand on the Senate bill to

abolish the poll tax in eight Southern States as a voting qualification.

The poll tax (usually a dollar or two per poll, or head) has been bitterly attacked as discrimination against the large Negro populations in those States—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

What the poll tax really amounts to is a property qualification for voting. It therefore is aimed at poor whites down South as well as at Negroes, and so discriminates, not against Negroes, but against anybody who lacks the money or the political interest to pay a small tax for the privilege of voting.

There are plenty of arguments against such discrimination. But the point is that the eight poll-tax States' own people adopted these rules long ago and have not yet seen fit to throw them out.

Under our system of Government, as Mr. Sullivan points out, the fixing of qualifications for voting is "an exclusive function of the States * * * the most fundamental of their functions."

So the poll-tax fight boils down to this: If Congress by a blanket statute wipes out poll taxes as a voting qualification in all States, and if that statute is eventually O. K.'d by the Supreme Court, Congress will have pretty much wiped out the 48 States themselves.

Soldiers and Sailors' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the new pay schedule for the Army and the Navy. I am also inserting a table which gives the amount of money paid to dependents:

Base pay for noncommissioned men in the Army[1]

	Per month
Private	$50
Private (first class)	54
Corporal	66
Sergeant	78
Staff sergeant	96
First sergeant	114
Master sergeant	138

[1] Plus 20 percent for foreign service.

Maximum pay for commissioned officers

	Per year
Second lieutenant	$2,592
First lieutenant	3,704
Captain	4,584
Major	6,066
Lieutenant colonel	7,271
Colonel	7,944
Brigadier general	7,944
Major general	9,944

Base pay for noncommissioned men of the Navy[1]

	Per month
Apprentice seaman	$50
Second-class seaman	54
First-class seaman	66
Petty officer (third class)	78
Petty officer (second class)	96
Petty officer (first class)	114
Chief petty officer	138
Warrant officer	150

[1] Plus 20-percent bonus for sea duty.

Maximum pay for commissioned officers of the Navy

	Per year
Ensign	$2,592
Navy lieutenant (junior grade)	3,704
Navy lieutenant	4,584
Lieutenant commander	6,066
Commander	7,271
Captain	7,944
Rear admiral (lower half)	7,944
Rear admiral	9,944

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Family allowances, in addition to Army and Navy pay, have been approved by Congress. These allowances can be paid to all enlisted men as well as aviation cadets:

Class A dependents:	
Wife, no child	$50
Wife, 1 child	80
Divorced wife	42
Divorced wife, 1 child	72
Child but no wife	42
For each additional child	20
Class B–1 dependents (for chief support):	
1 parent	50
2 parents	68
1 parent and 1 brother or sister	68
2 parents and 1 brother or sister	79
1 brother or sister (no parent)	42
For each additional brother or sister	11
Class B dependent or dependents (those partially dependent) (payable only if there is no allowance payable to any class B–1 dependent)	37

In cases in which only one class of dependent is involved, the deductions from the soldier's pay is $22 a month. In cases where more than one class is involved, $27 is deducted from his pay.

Subsidy Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., of November 18, 1943, entitled "Subsidy Fight":

SUBSIDY FIGHT

Without doubt many abuses and inequities have developed in connection with the system of subsidy price control. Congress should be on the alert to detect and insist upon the correction of such abuses. But remedial action need not entail abolition of limited subsidies giving marginal producers a reasonable incentive to maintain or increase their output and preventing a general rise in the prices charged consumers for basic food products. Unfortunately the subsidy fight now raging on the Hill is not being conducted along rational lines.

The Post has consistently taken a middle ground on this subsidy issue. We feel that a selective limited use of subsidies to encourage the production of essential farm products is justified. However, recognizing the political dangers inherent in all subsidy systems, we have supported proposals to limit total subsidy payments. We have, moreover, been more than lukewarm toward the so-called roll-back subsidies that were introduced as a sop to organized labor in the vain hope of staving off demands for wage increases. At the same time we realize that the indiscriminate banning of all subsidies on food products would deal a well-nigh fatal blow to the existing price-control system.

Some of the presumed opponents of subsidies are evidently rather muddled in their thinking on the subject. For example, spokesmen for livestock interests simultaneously denounce packer subsidies and complain because the administration has fallen down in its efforts to maintain support prices for livestock. Apparently, these critics are quite unaware that a price-support program which necessitates employment of public funds to keep prices from declining below a certain level is just another kind of subsidy. Further elements of confusion have been injected into the subsidy controversy by Louis Bromfield, novelist-farmer, who told the Senate Committee on Agriculture that the controversy over Federal subsidies is a manifestation of revolt against the "Germanic theory" that the citizen is the servant of the state. We can only say in reply that Mr. Bromfield is a better novelist than historian and call his attention to the fact that this Nation has had subsidies in one form or another throughout its history.

The Atlanta Journal recently published a brilliant editorial refuting the silly allegation that subsidies are un-American. It pointed out that the First Congress approved a shipping subsidy, that governmental subsidies helped to build our transcontinental railways, while protective tariffs have provided an indirect subsidy for industry. Coming a little nearer to present times the Atlanta Journal listed the imposing amounts of the subsidies paid to cotton farmers during the years from 1933 to the outbreak of war. The A. A. A.'s subsidization program has not been denounced as un-American by spokesmen for the cotton farmers. Why, then, do subsidies suddenly become un-American when they are employed in connection with a price control designed to keep down retail prices of food? We leave that puzzle to Mr. Bromfield.

The Philippine Constitution, R. I. P.—Statements of Vice President Sergio Osmeña and Attorney Vicente Villamin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, to complete the record of the debate in the House on the resolution which suspended the Philippine Constitution, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of Vice President Osmeña giving his reasons why he favored it and a statement of Mr. Vicente Villamin, lawyer and economist, who led the opposition.

This case is a demonstration that Filipinos are observing the democratic process and the freedom of thought and speech. It also shows that they can differ with each other while the question is under discussion and get together again after the decision is made.

Vice President Osmeña is responsible for the passage of the bill, and he gets both the credit and criticism for it. The

bill would not have been introduced at all if not for his previous endorsement, and if it had been introduced without his endorsement it would not have passed.

Mr. Villamin made a heroic one-man effort to prevent the passage of the resolution and the formidable opposition that developed in the House, which made it imperative for the Speaker of the House and the majority floor leader to make special appeals to pass the measure, is most significant indeed.

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT SERGIO OSMEÑA

A joint resolution was passed by Congress continuing President Quezon in office for the duration of the war. Under this resolution, which has been approved by the President of the United States, my right to succeed to the presidency on November 15, 1943, has been postponed until constitutional processes shall have been restored in the Philippines.

Congress acted on this matter upon the request of the Philippine Government in exile and this action of the Philippine Government was taken on my own initiative. I owe it to my people who gave me their confidence in the last elections to state the reasons for my action.

If we were in normal times, my duty would be clear and simple: I would have to assume the Presidency on the 15th of this month as a matter of right. But these are not normal times. Our country not only is at war, but also is occupied by the enemy.

Under these circumstances, our principal concern and primary consideration is to win the war, liberate our people from the invaders, and establish the independence of our country. The question naturally arises: What is the best thing to do in order to help accomplish these aims?

It is unnecessary for me to remind you that President Quezon was the head of our government at the time of the outbreak of the war and that it was his lot to lead our people by the side of the United States. Faithfully and courageously, he has complied with his duty even with his health greatly impaired. His voice continues to encourage our people to resist the enemy and to keep faith with the United States. It was he who signed for us the declaration of the United Nations. Due to his efforts the Philippines has been given a seat in the Pacific war council.

Moreover, those responsible for the prosecution of the war on the part of the United States have expressed to me their concern over the possible effect of the change of leadership at this time. They said that the enemy would take advantage of President Quezon's retirement from active leadership by telling the Filipinos that President Quezon had withdrawn from the fight and that he was no longer interested in this war. They added that the morale of the Filipinos still fighting the enemy in the mountains of Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao and receiving inspiration from him might weaken if President Quezon retired. Furthermore, they told me that in their opinion, based on recent information from the front, the unity of our people in general would be better maintained and secured with the retention of President Quezon in office since that would mean that both of us would continue working together.

The Presidential succession therefore ceased to be a domestic matter involving only our own interests and desires. Related, as it was, to the war, it became a matter that concerned not ourselves alone but also the United States.

With the redemption of our country uppermost in my mind and with the conviction that this objective cannot be achieved without the full support, much less without the leadership, of the United States, I prepared the letter which the Philippine Government approved and sent to Congress. In that letter, the matter of the Presidential succession was placed before Congress with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government and the Government of the United States during this emergency.

Congress, after thorough consideration, passed the joint resolution providing for the continuance in office of President Quezon for the duration of the war. This resolution expresses the considered judgment of the American people. I accept it without reserve and I urge every Filipino, whether in the homeland, in continental United States, in Hawaii or anywhere else, to accept this congressional action which is intended to safeguard the best interests of the two peoples.

As for me, I consider it my inescapable duty to continue giving to President Quezon's leadership my utmost support and cooperation so that the Commonwealth Government now in Washington may render the greatest service to the Philippines and the Filipinos. It is my desire to assist the Commonwealth government in its endeavor to make every Filipino, wherever he may be, feel that he is close to his government which is always solicitous of his interest and welfare.

Fellow countrymen, these are critical days for individuals as well as nations. Our sense of responsibility as a people and the strength of our national solidarity have once more been tested. We have again proved our unity. With this action, we have shown the world that when the freedom of our country and the validity of our commitments are at stake, there are no differences among us and selfish considerations carry no weight in our decisions.

STATEMENT OF MR. VICENTE VILLAMIN

As a Filipino who fought for the preservation of the Philippine Constitution, I read carefully the statement of Vice President Sergio Osmeña giving his reasons for "initiating the move that led to the enactment of a congressional resolution to keep President Manuel L. Quezon in office for the duration of the war."

I must say, at the outset, that I am for the Philippine Government in Washington as against the government in Manila. I am for it with its imperfections and the occasional errors of its leaders, provided the errors are corrected when discovered and not transmuted into virtues by way of self-justification.

The reconquest of the Philippines from the Japanese invaders is at present in its psychological stage. We are laying down the barrage for a psychological warfare to the end that the faith of the Filipino people in the reconquering hosts under Gen. Douglas MacArthur may be retained and strengthened. It is expected that thereby their active collaboration shall be exerted when they see the American and Filipino flags at the head of the forces of liberation.

The task of keeping the Filipino people in line is becoming ever more difficult because the Japanese propagandists and their Filipino collaborationists are untiring in their efforts to befriend the Filipinos and to alienate them not only from the American Government but also from their own government situated 10,000 miles away in Washington.

The Philippine Government here is headed by Messrs. Quezon and Osmeña, who are approaching after many busy years the twilight of their days. Sooner or later younger men will hold the battle flags and carry on where they leave off. So it is their business to see to it now that their task shall not be rendered unnecessarily difficult through the avoidable miscalculations of their contemporary leaders.

It is in this spirit that I make bold to assert that in my humble opinion the resolution suspending the Philippine Constitution, besides its grave political connotations, is a questionable maneuver in the field of psychological warfare and that, instead of fortifying the battle positions of the two officials in that field, it will weaken them if it does not actually result in their total deterioration.

This opinion is advanced for the sole purpose of suggesting that, if found plausible, some forestalling action may be taken to consolidate and improve their positions. To ignore it would mean to remain unprepared for enemy assault. This paper is free from the taint of back-biting post mortem. It accepts the decision of the American Government and is merely describing the consequences of the decision.

The facts upon which the opinion is predicated bear reiteration. On November 11, 1941, amidst an atmosphere implicit with the imminence of war, the Filipino people went to the polls and voted overwhelmingly for Messrs. Quezon and Osmeña. They had it in their minds and hearts that Mr. Osmeña, whatever might happen, was going to be the leader of the Nation from November 15, 1943.

The resolution suppressed that deliberate intent and superimposed upon it the theory that Mr. Quezon could do better than Mr. Osmeña as long as the war lasted. The latter, in an act of self-abasement, embraced the theory, stressing that those in charge of the prosecution of the war wanted it upheld.

Mr. Osmeña offers explanations but no apologies with a frankness worthy of a greater cause. Therefore, his is both the vertical responsibility that arises from acquiescence and the horizontal responsibility that radiates from relinquishment.

Assisted and dazzled by Japanese propaganda, the Filipinos might repine that their will as registered at the polls has been nullified by the American Congress in the elastic name of a war measure and that their own Government in Washington has committed constitutional suicide, with the result that their government beyond the seas now rests on a congressional resolution and not on their constitution.

Moreover, the provisions of their constitution which gave them their President and Vice President having been suspended, they might with some plausibility deduce that under the new dispensation Messrs. Quezon and Osmeña have ceased to be their elected constitutional representatives and they have become in effect naught but resident agents of the Congress of the United States.

These dangerous and demoralizing thoughts will be admitted both by the legalists and the realists as destructive of the morale of the Filipino people and potentially productive of more harm to the war effort than if Mr. Osmeña had become President and Mr. Quezon had retired from office pursuant to the constitution. Parenthetically, Mr. Osmeña would make a splendid war President himself and surprise those who underrated his effectiveness.

In the collocation of responsibility for the resolution on the Filipino side 1 percent goes to Mr. Quezon and 99 percent to Mr. Osmeña. The former gave up no right or duty, for his term of office having expired on November 15, he had no more right and duty to give up. The Congress had merely called him from an expected retirement and asked him to continue being President, and he obliged by accepting the charge. But Mr. Osmeña, by advocating the resolution depriving him of his lawful office, voluntarily gave up his right and duty to be President in disregard of the mandate which he received from the Filipino people and which he swore to carry out when he took the oath of office under the constitution at Corregidor on December

30, 1941, while that fortress was under enemy bombardment.

The resolution was placed in the category of military necessity, so urged, according to the House debate, by General MacArthur. However, it is of record that President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief, was silent, but approved the measure when it came before him.

Mr. Osmeña, in his statement beamed to the Philippines, said that it was represented to him by those directing the prosecution of the war that "the enemy would take advantage of President Quezon's retirement from active leadership by telling the Filipinos that President Quezon had withdrawn from the fight and that he was no longer interested in this war." This means that President Quezon will cease to be interested in the war as soon as he ceases to be President. I am sure that is not Mr. Quezon's standard of duty. And the Filipino people know that he would do his duty whether President or private citizen.

As President, Mr. Osmeña could have appointed his predecessor as the Philippine representative on the Pacific War Council, of which President Roosevelt is the chairman, and further make him the director of Philippine war activities and also designate him as the future plenipotentiary at the eventual peace conference. This would have kept Mr. Quezon in the government, this time concentrating his energies on the war and relieving himself of the administrative cares of the presidential office.

That arrangement would have tended to make the Philippine war effort more effective and at the same time saved the Philippine Constitution as the symbol of the indestructibility of the American sovereignty in the Philippines and the constitutional stability of the Philippine Government. Thus a dangerous precedent could have been avoided, a precedent that is roughly comparable to a coup d'etat to install a person in office in defiance of the fundamental law of the land.

Restating my faith, after making the foregoing avowal for the one purpose of pointing to some dangers so they can be avoided, I am supporting the Philippine Government in Washington and hope that it shall ever rest on the tripod of justice, common sense, and forthright action.

Commander Peyton (Pete) Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks an article published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin concerning Commander Peyton (Pete) Harrison. Commander Harrison was appointed to the Naval Academy from the district I have the honor to represent. The article follows:

"PETE" HARRISON COMMENDED BY KNOX FOR KOMANDORSKI ACTION

Commander Peyton Harrison, United States Naval Reserve, well-known Honolulu resident, has been highly commended by Secretary Frank Knox of the Navy Department for meritorious conduct in battle action earlier this year.

News of this commendation, which was given by the naval Secretary September 10, has just been received by friends of Commander Harrison here.

Prior to the war Mr. Harrison—known informally as Pete—was with Alexander & Baldwin. A former naval officer, he continued actively in the Naval Reserve after he went into private business life.

At the outbreak of the war he was immediately called into active service. For a brief period his civilian friends saw him now and then, but infrequently. Then he disappeared.

Vague rumors got around that he'd gone somewhere north, probably to the Aleutians, but nothing was definite. Even when news got around that there'd been action in the Komandorski Island group—in the Bering Straits between Alaska and Siberia—it wasn't known that Pete Harrison was in it.

Now the letter from Secretary Knox tells the details, briefly.

It reads:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., September 10, 1943.

From the Secretary of the Navy.
To Commander Peyton Harrison, DE-V G),
United States Naval Reserve.
Subject: Commendation.

1. The Department has been informed of your courageous and meritorious conduct as operations officer on the staff of the officer of tactical command during action off Komandorski Islands, March 22, 1943. Not only did you render valuable service to the flag officer commanding our forces by your excellent advice and suggestions, but by your timely and accurate information you kept the officer of tactical command advised of the situation during the approach of a numerically superior enemy force and the then ensuing engagement.

Your skillful performance of an important task in spite of difficult combat conditions contributed to the success of our forces in preventing sorely needed supplies from reaching Japanese units in the Aleutians.

2. For your efficient and conscientious devotion to duty on this occasion you are hereby commended.

3. A copy of this letter has been made a part of your official record.

FRANK KNOX.

At latest reports Commander Harrison was on the west coast and hoping that his duty would bring him back to Hawaii for at least a brief visit.

The Komandorski action was described briefly in an official Navy communiqué May 4, 1943, 6 weeks after the action.

A United States light patrol force was cruising west of Attu, southeast of the Komandorski group. It encountered a superior Japanese force, attacked it, and the Japanese retired.

The United States force consisted of one heavy cruiser, one light cruiser, and four destroyers. The Japanese force included two heavy cruisers, two light cruisers, six destroyers, and two transports.

The United States destroyers dashed in and let loose torpedoes at the Japanese, and with guns blazing, hits were scored on both sides. The engagement lasted for 3½ hours. The Japanese turned tail when the torpedoes were cut loose at them. Only minor damage was suffered on the American side.

Interior and Agriculture Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, recently I reported to the House on the number of Federal employees in the State of South Dakota, as given me by the Civil Service Commission.

I now have a break-down on the employees in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, supplied by the Director of Personnel in each Department, respectively. These are interesting in showing the distribution of employees, and I offer them for the RECORD at this point:

Number of employees in the Department of Agriculture in the State of South Dakota

Bureau of Agricultural Economics	7
Bureau of Animal Industry	15
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	9
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering	6
Farm Credit Administration	30
Forest Service	53
Food Distribution Administration	82
Agricultural Adjustment Administration	65
Farm Security Administration	154
Soil Conservation Service	131
Total	552

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: I have received your letter of October 22 asking for a break-down of the Interior Department employees located in South Dakota. Our records show the employment of permanent personnel in South Dakota, as follows:

Bureau of Mines	8
Fish and Wildlife Service	12
Indian Service	[1] 806
National Park Service	9
Bureau of Reclamation	19
General Land Office	2
Geological Survey	1
Total	857

[1] Including 12 South Dakota employees at the Standing Rock Indian Agency.

Sincerely yours,
J. ATWOOD MAULDING,
(Mrs. J. Atwood Maulding),
Director of Personnel.

Flood of Income—Trickle of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very interesting article on taxes. It is necessary that we pay more of the cost of this war as we go. A dollar paid now saves another dollar or two or three more dollars if it must be borrowed on long-term bonds at interest. Besides it helps to prevent inflation and deals more fairly with our returning veterans of this war if we pay more of the cost of the war now. The article is as follows:

FLOOD OF INCOME—TRICKLE OF TAXES

(By Merlo Pusey)

No action taken by Congress since the declaration of war is likely to have as profound

an effect upon our lives as its failure to enact taxes to pay for the war. Any comparison of incomes today with incomes before the war shows that the American people are rolling in wealth—money wealth that cannot be used to raise their standard of living because of wartime scarcities. Yet Congress refuses to draw upon that wealth to pay for the war.

In the single month of September income payments to individuals reached the enormous total of $12,500,000,000. Department of Commerce figures show that this is an increase of 20 percent in a year. A much better measure of changes that war has brought may be found in the Department's index of total income payments. It shows: Average for the 1935–39 period, 100; for last September, 215.7.

What are the people doing with this enormous income? The Commerce Department's findings on this point are also enlightening. Here is what it has to say as to the disposition of income payments during the third quarter of this year, the figures reflecting annual rates in billions of dollars:

Income payments	144.3
Personal taxes	18.0
Disposable income	126.3
Consumer expenditures	91.2
Net saving of individuals	35.1

It is interesting to note that net savings amount to almost twice as much as personal taxes. Savings are very desirable, of course, especially in a period of great prosperity that is certain to be followed by a slackening of industry and employment. Some of these savings are going into War bonds. But we ought not to stop our thinking about these enormous savings with this generality. The fact is that much of this money which is being poured into the people's savings coffers is money which the Government has borrowed to pay for war supplies. And there is no way the Government can pay it back, except by taxing the people.

These facts about our towering wartime savings must be coupled with the spending picture. Consumer expenditures, says the Department of Commerce, are at an all-time peak. In spite of rationing and the shortages of many goods we would like to have, we are spending more than ever before. Part of this, to be sure, represents higher costs of living. Still the fact remains that we are spending huge sums on thousands of things that are not really essential in wartime.

Against this picture of unprecedented wartime prosperity, the House Ways and Means Committee offers a tax bill that would raise a little more than $2,000,000,000. That would pay a little over half the interest on the national debt at the figure it will reach next June. It would leave us still paying only about one-third the cost of government in wartime. Great Britain and Canada are paying roughly half of their wartime expenses.

There is one real difficulty in the way of levying stiff taxes to siphon off the vast excess of income which the people cannot advantageously spend. The increase in income payments has not been distributed evenly over the whole population. It is estimated that nearly 15,000,000 heads of families have had no increase in incomes since the wages of organized workers began their spectacular climb in 1940. Severe taxes applied to white-collar workers whose living costs have gone up and whose incomes have remained stationary, it is said, would "draw blood."

To my way of thinking a little drawing of blood on the home front would be preferable to risking a bust in our economy. "Blood that can be drawn from the pocketbook should be at least as expendable as that shed from the veins of living men on the battlefields. But no such drastic demands upon the people are necessary. Congress can devise ways and means of raising many billions of dollars without imposing any unbearable hardship on anyone. It can recognize the fact that the war has put into the pockets of wage and salary earners about $70,000,000,000 that they would not otherwise have. And it can dip into that enormous income, wherever it may be found, to slow down inflation and help pay the cost of the war.

The Government's need for revenue is stupendous. The ability of the people to pay is greater than it has ever been before and much greater than it is likely to be when the war is over. In the light of these facts, the request for a paltry two and fourteen one hundredths billions in taxes out of thirty-five billions in savings is an insult to our intelligence. It is based on the assumption that we are too yellow to face the necessity of paying for the war, or even a fair portion of it, while our sons and brothers are fighting in foreign lands. We must not admit that that assumption is correct. For it would amount to the worst betrayal of our defenders to which the American people have ever stooped.

Proposing Another National Shrine—John Hanson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Jacob A. Nelson of Decorah, Iowa, on November 15, over radio station KWLC and before several audiences in Winneshiek County, the occasion being the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the death of the early patriot and statesman, John Hanson:

Mr. President, members of the faculty and students of Luther College, we live today in the greatest tension of our history. The past, although filled with horrible tragedies, and glowing with marvelous achievements of great men, does not measure up to the immensity of the activities of our present day. The battles and the sacrifices of the past have always centered about freedom, about the preservation of our Union, and about the liberation of oppressed people. The war that is being waged today is not different, except for proportions. To be specific, it is world-wide and has complications beyond human comprehension.

In these serious moments, to my mind, there is nothing more encouraging than reviewing our early history and getting inspiration from the brave men living then who planned and struggled that this great Nation might be prepared to contribute its share in a broader sense to a better life among people with a government so constituted as to make this possible.

Today, November 15, 1943, it is 160 years since the passing of John Hanson, the first President of the United States in Congress assembled. He was a Marylander of high rank and great vision. His death was a marked loss to this new and bewildered Nation which was trying to exist in the midst of war and to rule its subjects within itself without the force or help of royalty; and I pray and trust that I may do justice to his memory in this humble tribute.

He bore a simple name; his personality permeated simple but sublime traits. Having lived a simple life, his death was quiet, his moving from mortal realms was almost unheralded and unnoticed. Time has placed his memory and his service in the still caverns of oblivion, almost to be forever forgotten, almost never to be recalled. But it was not to be so. It is true that others have tried sincerely to wake him from the dead that the story of his life might become known, but the lot has, for some unknown reason, fallen on me to give you the fragments of the untold story of this statesman surrounded by one of the greatest of American historical romances.

Far be it from my purpose to belittle the great tasks performed by Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Paul Revere, Patrick Henry, and scores of other immortals, who each gave his contribution to the winning of the Revolution, the establishment of freedom and the building of democracy. But none of these, were their voices to be heard today, would for one moment be silent if aware that John Hanson and the services which he also rendered in those same hazardous days, are not recognized—simply forgotten and ignored without reason. History has dealt harshly with this man, and no reason is to be found, except that he died in the early days of history of our national beginnings. It would serve no good purpose here on speculating as to why John Hanson has been forgotten all these years. On the other hand, it might be of more lasting value and of greater interest to review some of the things he did for his country.

He was one of the first to take definite steps for freedom and independence by signing the nonimportation act several years before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

In the War of the Revolution, he was one of General Washington's most dependable workers in the civilian sphere, provided the first army from the South to join the forces of the North. He built and operated flintlock factories and powder mills to provide the soldiers with ammunition. Hanson looked forward to a day of victory with optimism, and planned definitely that the mere winning of the war was not sufficient for the future. He harbored visions of a great empire to be molded from the wilderness to the west, to be added to the Union in the form of States as the development of the interior would proceed. And that is why Maryland held off signing the Articles of Confederation, our first political Constitution. Among the provisions of the document was one to the effect that it should not become operative until signed by all of the Thirteen Colonies. Hanson stood firm that all of the colonies having backlands or western lands, should turn it over to the Union before Maryland would lend its aid to the adoption.

As a delegate to the Continental Congress from Maryland, with Daniel Carroll, this problem became possible of solution, and on March 1, 1781, the Maryland delegates signed the Articles of Confederation on the same table in the famous Hall of Delegates, as witnessed the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. With this accomplished, our Nation took its first breath of life and began to function as a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." In accordance with the specific terms of the articles, John Hanson was elected the first President on November 4, 1781, and served his term until his retirement from public life, 1 year before he died.

As President, his work was outstanding. He exhibited the qualities of a statesman who gained respect both at home and abroad. Every move that he made was made with precision and an understanding of the problems which confronted the new nation. He felt his way, so to speak, without rules to go by, or definite programs to follow. As President, he welcomed General Washington after his defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown, which virtually ended the war. The United

States of America during his term of office was recognized as a nation by the Kingdoms of Sweden and Holland. He ordered, provided, and first used the great seal of the United States, which has been used by every President down to the present day. He issued military orders and state papers of great importance. He arranged for the first Cabinet and named the members thereof. As a closing chapter in his career, as President, he issued the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation, setting aside the last Thursday in November 1782, as Thanksgiving Day, with orders that it be devoted to praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God.

A year later, November 15, 1783, he passed to the great beyond after a serious illness. Nowhere is there a marker or a record to be found as to the location of his grave, although it is certain to be in the State of Maryland. His weary bones rest in the free soil of that empire which through his services became possible. Not only is it apparent that through his wisdom and sagacity, the West was joined with the East, in that massive and mighty political structure which since his day has even reached beyond to another ocean and its principles and ideals, though unchanged in the main, have become the means of eradicating oppression, bringing to people "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Shall a service of such importance to this Nation go unnoticed? Are we, as people, showing our proper spirit of gratitude to the memory of one who rendered such marvelous work in the hour of our Nation's beginning? Should not this great civil leader, that schoolmaster in statescraft, that planner and builder of our Nation be recognized even at this late day?

There can be but one answer and that is that a shrine should be erected to his worthy memory, to the glory of his unsurpassed achievements. As to what it should be, in form and proportions, that can best be determined in your own imagination. Surely, it should depict the grandeur and simplicity of his life and should be a thing of beauty, reviving this national lore, serving as "a joy forever."

In closing, what finer and more fitting tribute can be paid to this great American. He deserves this recognition, that the memory of his life and works might live on in the hearts of a grateful people. Thinking as we do, of this great forgotten patriot, we are reminded of some words found in the poem on the burial of Moses by Alexander—

"But no man built that sepulcher,
And no man saw it e'er,
For the angels of God upturned the sod
And laid the dead man there."

Surely, John Hanson deserves a memorial to his memory and this should be of such proportions and display such dignity as to be reckoned as another American shrine.

We Should Not Involve Our Generals and Admirals in Politics

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, agitation has been going on for some time boosting the name of General MacArthur for Republican candidate for President in 1944. No greater injury could be done to MacArthur personally or to our war effort. MacArthur is not a politician but a great soldier and is engaged in a furious struggle with a ruthless enemy. Even if the Presidency could be handed to him on a platter, I am sure he would not accept it, and he would be the last general to quit the battle front for any consideration.

I am also quite sure that he has just one ambition, and that is to fight his way back to the Philippines and crush the Japs in the Pacific.

All this ballyhoo about politics can but make his one ambition harder to obtain.

Some unthinking enthusiast has also mentioned General Marshall as a candidate. We must be bankrupt for candidates in the United States if we cannot leave our operating generals alone long enough to win the war.

Queen Elizabeth, with all her faults, made one wise remark when she said, "God protect us from our friends."

We have candidates enough outside of the armed forces to talk about. Everyone who boosts a new man says, before he gets through talking, that Willkie cannot have the nomination. Just remember a little history, if you will. Five days before the last Republican convention I made a speech in the House and predicted the nomination of Willkie. He did not have a single delegate instructed for him; he had no background entitling him to be considered by the Republican Party, but he had the money to put on a campaign at the convention. Telegrams rolled in to each delegate until he was deluged—all paid for by the money backing Willkie. The convention hall was jammed with rooters who in chorus shouted, "We want Willkie." Delegates were shown that with Willkie as a candidate, funds for the home fight would be forthcoming. Starting without a single delegate, he wound up with the nomination.

If Willkie has the same financial backing he had last time, he can have the nomination if he wants it. Remember also that the people who do the voting never have a chance, under our system, of selecting a candidate. The voters must take one or the other of the candidates put up by the two major parties.

The people might want a third party or rather a new party, but that cannot take place under our system for two reasons: First, those strong individuals who propose a new party cannot remain united long enough to build a party which can cope with either of the two presently operating parties. Secondly, such third party or new party must be started, if started at all, by men who are dreamers and not practical men. Being such they cannot command any funds to finance such a party. If any financial assistance is forthcoming, it is usually contributed by one of the major parties for the purpose of permitting the new party to level off their perennial opponents, the Republicans or Democrats, as the case may be. Neither major party is immune from contributions that will further its own interest. When the campaign is over, all money is gone and the new party disappears until the next campaign.

We have a lot of good men who might possibly make a satisfactory President, if elected. In the eighties Bill Nye, speaking about the coming National Republican Convention, said:

What we need in a candidate more than any other quality is a man with extremely good health, and speaking for myself I never felt better in my life than I have the past spring and summer.

There are a lot of Presidential lightning rods up already: Dewey, Willkie, Bricker, and Warren. There will be more as we near the convention. Those who do not want Willkie nominated had better keep their eye on the ball, for if there is a chance to snatch that nomination out of the air and run for a touchdown, he will do it.

I have no objection to suggestions from any quarter as to who would be the best candidate, and the best President, as long as we leave our fighting forces alone. The people at large are so helpless in having any influence on a convention, that they are pretty sure the best man will not be chosen. He seldom is. Our best men will either not run at all, or cannot be nominated. We will have to take what the two conventions hand out and be satisfied. When we get far enough along in the scale of intelligence to elect our Presidents by popular vote, we shall all have something to say.

Effect of Feed Situation on New Hampshire Poultry Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, as long ago as July 8, just before Congress recessed, I called the attention of the House to the gravity of the feed situation as it concerns New Hampshire poultrymen and dairymen and their attempt to contribute increased production to the war effort, as they had been urged to do by Government agencies. During the summer, I had opportunity to talk with many of them, both individually and in groups, and to see for myself the gravity of the situation that confronts them if they are unable to get deliveries of corn. By myself, and in cooperation with those of my colleagues having the same problem, I have used every form of pressure known to me to get corn. I do not know what more I can do; but at least I can keep hollering for corn. Under permission granted me, I am including in my remarks a letter just received from Mr. Cleveland Gilcreast, manager of the New Hampshire Egg Producers Cooperative, which gives a fair statement of the critical situation that exists today in our New Hampshire poultry industry. I will only

add that the need of proper feeds for our dairy herds is just as great.

The letter follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE EGG
PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE,
Derry, N. H., November 17, 1943.

The Honorable FOSTER STEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The feed situation is growing more drastic daily. You undoubtedly know that the supply of corn is almost impossible to obtain; this places an unprecedented demand on other feed grains to the extent that they are becoming not only more costly but also more difficult to secure.

On behalf of the 2,475 poultry farmers who are members of this cooperative association, I would like to enlist your active support in attempting to obtain enough feed in New England to keep the poultry and dairy business on a going basis.

As you are doubtlessly aware, the United States Department of Agriculture over the past number of years has urged poultry farmers to increase their flocks so that enough eggs would be available for the armed forces and lend-lease, as well as for civilian use. This has been done and New Hampshire poultry farmers have increased their production to an even greater extent than was requested. Now we face the situation where it is apparent that there will be some liquidation of flocks; on a national average, the Department of Agriculture tells us this must be approximately 20 percent. Unless some feed can be brought into New England, however, it is likely that the reduction here will of necessity be much higher, whereas in the grain-producing States it need not be as great.

It will be a severe blow to the entire poultry industry of the country should the high quality breeding flocks of New England have to be liquidated. New Hampshire alone exports millions of hatching eggs and baby chicks which are used as breed stock for building up laying flocks in other parts of the country. These flocks have been built up over a period of years and their loss would mean a serious set-back throughout the poultry industry.

Many grain dealers in the northern part of New Hampshire already have been out of feed for several days at a time and the shortage is rapidly moving southward to the main part of the poultry flocks.

I certainly hope it will be possible for you to work with the other Members of Congress in seeing that New England is treated equitably in this feed situation.

Very truly yours,
CLEVELAND GILCREAST,
Manager.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from one of my constituents:

FITZHUGH, ARK., *November 17, 1943.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GATHINGS: Thanks for your letters on the subsidy roll-back and the farmer in 1944.

I assure you we farmers appreciate your fight against the administration's farm-subsidy program; also your efforts to have the parity price of cotton adjusted to include labor costs.

If the administration thinks it can prevent inflation by boosting wages and holding down the price of most commodities by subsidizing the commodities, it is all wet. The law of supply and demand must be considered, and living costs must follow the upward trend of wages so as to siphon off the excess income of labor.

In my opinion, we should have moderate inflation in wartime so as to encourage production. To curb inflation wages and prices must be frozen at comparable positions to prevent black markets, or else wages must be taxed to the point of siphoning off all excess income. Taxing present income for the purpose of creating savings to be paid back later simply is encouraging inflation later.

The present socialistic trend of the administration is not in conformity with our southern democratic principles, and the sooner we get rid of a majority of those governmental agencies of a bureaucratic trend the quicker we will return to our freedoms.

Sincerely yours,
J. H. SNAPP.

The Lea Aviation Bill Should Have Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the present and future welfare of aviation deserves our most thoughtful consideration. The problems in connection therewith are many and varied. No legislation should be passed unless and until every proposal contained in such legislation has been the subject of hearings. Every interested party, both pro and con, should have opportunity to be heard. Every obtainable fact and all possible information, having any bearing on the provisions of such legislation, should be sought after and considered before legislation is either recommended by the committee, or, adopted by the House.

The pending bill (H. R. 3420) was reported to this House with many vital and important changes in the existing law. It would not be improper to say that in some particulars the bill makes radical changes. As an illustration the bill destroys all vestige of State rights in the regulation and control of aircraft. It assumes jurisdiction of intrastate as well as interstate commerce by air. Several of its provisions are highly controversial and have provoked considerable opposition.

There have been no hearings on this bill. Hearings, however, were held on H. R. 1012 for 8 days last February and supplemental hearings of an ex parte character were held for 3 days in March. H. R. 1012 was reported favorably and placed upon the calendar. No action has been taken to move the bill and it is still on the calendar. In the time that has intervened between the reporting of H. R. 1012, in February last, and H. R. 3420 on October 20, no further hearings have been held. Consequently there has been no testimony before the committee other than that taken early this year and that formed the basis for H. R. 1012. Such testimony does not begin to cover, or, justify the many changes that appear in H. R. 3420.

On October 19 the House adopted House Resolution 307, which was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BULWINKLE.

This resolution directs the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable, and report to the House during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable.

There is so much in H. R. 3420 which is not based on facts and without adequate investigation that it would appear to be unwise to pass important legislation of this character until the Bulwinkle committee, under House Resolution 307, has had time to complete its investigation and make its report to the House.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. Chester Bowles over the Blue Network on November 16, 1943:

Good evening, everybody. Tonight I want to talk to you about what seems to me a very important subject—that is subsidies.

I say it's an important subject because subsidies can mean so much to the pocketbook of every family in the country.

Tonight I'd like to give you an idea of how subsidies work and just what effect they have on the prices of things you buy every day for yourself and the family.

You remember last week I told you in some detail of the efforts of the Office of Price Administration to keep your cost of living from rising.

Now some people have a very mistaken impression that the cost of living has been rising steadily. They see that the prices of oranges and some other fruits have risen sharply, as they have. But they forget that the prices of the vast majority of products on their grocers' shelves have been pretty well stabilized. Meat, butter, cheese, apples, potatoes, cabbage, and several other products are actually cheaper than last June. Rents,

an important part of your living costs, are roughly the same as 8 months ago.

Since May 1942, 18 months ago, according to the Department of Labor, the average over-all cost of living as reflected in legal O. P. A. ceiling prices in legitimate stores has actually risen only 7 percent. For the past 7 months the cost of living has been remarkably stable. The average cost of food stands today at the same level as last March.

But the big question in everybody's mind today is, Can we continue to hold prices in check? Can we continue to keep your cost of living from getting out of hand?

The answer to that question depends on two important "ifs." The first "if" involves wages. Obviously, if wage rates are increased, the cost of producing various products is increased. In many cases that would make it necessary for you to pay higher prices at the stores.

Now, assuming that wage rates are held at their present levels, I believe most emphatically that we can maintain a successful control of the cost of living with a second big "if"—if Congress allows us to continue the price control program which has proven so successful during the last 6 months.

This program involves the limited use of carefully controlled subsidies. And sometime before January 1 Congress must decide whether or not the present price control program will be continued. In other words, Congress must decide whether or not we will be allowed to use limited subsidies to keep your costs in the retail stores from going up.

So let's take a good look at this whole subject. Let's start with an explanation of just what a subsidy is.

I think the easiest way to get at that is to describe briefly how a subsidy works and with what results. And to be realistic, let's take the subsidy on dairy products, which is an important one, though not the simplest.

After the retail prices for milk and other dairy products were put under control, the price of feed for cows and the wages of farm hands to milk them continued to go up. The price of feed could not be controlled because it hadn't reached parity, and Congress directed that agricultural prices cannot be controlled at prices below parity.

Of course, feed prices are an important item of cost for the dairy farmer in the production of his milk. So his costs continued to rise. One of two things had to happen—unless the farmer was to produce milk at a loss, and I don't think anyone would expect him to continue to do that. Either the farmer had to get a higher price for his milk or he had to get some extra money from the Government to help cover the increased cost of the feed.

What was done was simply this. The War Food Administration looked into its records covering every county of the country and set up a schedule of payments which would make up to the dairy farmers of every county for the rise in their feed costs since September 1942. Those payments are the so-called subsidy on milk and other dairy products. They are being made during the last 3 months of this year. Payments range from about one-half to 1 cent a quart on milk and 4 cents to 6 cents a pound on butterfat.

Through these subsidy payments our dairy farmers were given relief for the increases in feed prices. At the same time the retail prices which you pay for milk, cheese, and butter remain the same. Without these payments to cover the increased cost of feed, milk would cost you 1 cent more a quart and cheese 3 cents more a pound. Without this subsidy butter would go up 4½ cents a pound. But there's another subsidy on butter, and if that were removed, too, the total increase on butter would be 10 cents a pound.

That's the way the subsidy works on milk and other dairy products. It's a payment which maintains the production of those products without increasing prices to the people who buy the milk, cheese, and butter.

At present we are spending at the rate of about $800,000,000 a year in subsidies of one kind or another to maintain your retail prices on an even keel. If we are to continue to keep the prices you pay from booming upward, we will need a limited amount of additional funds for 1944.

If Congress decides against the use of Government funds for this purpose, we are going to be in trouble as far as the cost of living is concerned—there's no doubt about that. Besides milk, cheese, and butter, all meats will increase in price between 2 and 6 cents per pound. Veal cutlets will go up 6 cents a pound. Round steak and bacon will increase by 5¼ cents a pound, hamburger by 4 cents. Bread will increase by, roughly, 1 cent a loaf, sugar by 1 cent a pound. There will be additional increases on some canned goods, some cereals and onions.

Now there is one very important point about the program of carefully planned subsidies which most people miss. And here it is. If well used, subsidies save the public a lot more money than they cost. Let me explain exactly how it works.

Right now we are spending at the rate of eight hundred million on subsidy payments to hold the prices of meat, milk, butter, sugar, cheese, and other products at reasonable levels. If these subsidies are withdrawn on January 1, the prices of all these products are going to rise. But that is only the beginning.

If the cost of foods start up, I think it is clear to all of us that wages will go up, too. The War Labor Board has made it very clear that, unless we can hold living costs steady, it will be impossible for them to maintain the Little Steel formula of wage control. From one end of the country to the other we will see requests for higher wages, and many of them will be reasonable requests.

More than that, once a certain few products start to rise in prices we here in the O. P. A. will be overwhelmed for increases on other items. Although we are always under pressure from groups which would like to charge more for their goods, the present pressures will be intensified and, frankly, it will be difficult or impossible to resist them.

If prices in general increase by an average of only 10 percent during 1944, and that may be a conservative figure, the cost of goods that are now on sale in the stores and the cost of your rentals and everything else that goes to make up your cost of living, will be increased by a total of $8,000,000,000 during 1944, alone. That is 10 percent of the $80,000,000,000 which you people are spending today.

But in addition, during 1944, that increase to your living costs will cause a huge extra payment to be tacked on to our national debt. If our prices rise by 10 percent, and again I repeat that this may be a minimum figure, it means a sharp increase in the cost of fighting the war. If our war costs during 1944 total $100,000,000,000, that is more billions of dollars added to the national debt. Additional billions on which we will pay taxes indefinitely.

That's why I say that subsidies, as we are using them today, are in my opinion a businessman's bargain. With a billion to a billion and a half dollars in subsidies, we can keep your living costs from going any higher for a good many months to come. If this money is withdrawn by Congress, prices as I have said, are going up. If they go up only as much as 10 percent, the total extra cost may run as high as $15,000,000,000 or more through higher prices in the stores, higher rentals, and additions to our national debt.

A year or two ago, I thought we could control inflation by letting the prices go up inch by inch. Many of the businessmen whom I have brought in to help me run the O. P. A. had this same feeling when they first joined the organization during the last 2 or 3 months. But once they come face to face with the overwhelming pressures for higher prices on this item and on that, which crowd in on us daily from all directions, they changed their minds. They realized as I did that we can only make retail price control effective on essential products by drawing a line and saying that thus far can prices go and no farther.

Now there is no question but that subsidies can be dangerous unless they are used with care. I, for one, would like it much better if we didn't have to use them. But neither do I like iodine. I know iodine taken internally, is a deadly poison, and I don't like to have poison lying around the house. Still I would far rather use iodine in limited doses than develop an infected finger or perhaps lose an arm.

In my opinion, the same reasoning should apply to subsidies. If we use them as we have used them in the past, with care and discretion, they can save us from the real calamity of run-away living costs with all the huge losses and difficulties which that would bring us.

If we are allowed by Congress to continue our present price-control program, and if the present hour-wage rates are maintained, I believe we can hold your living costs in line for an indefinite period. For the sake of every one of us—farmers, workers, school teachers, white-collar employees and businessmen—I sincerely hope that the final decision will be a favorable one.

But let me make one final point and let me state it in a way which cannot be misinterpreted. Congress is our boss—Congress is our Board of Directors. Congress decides the policies which administrative agencies such as the O. P. A. must follow. The decision which Congress makes during the next 6 weeks will become, wrong or right, our decision.

To the limit of our ability we will strive to hold the cost of living to the smallest possible increases. No matter how relentless or how selfish the pressures may be, we will not lie down on the job.

It is our responsibility to help insure your future security and the security of our men in uniform by trying to keep our economic system from starting on an inflationary joy ride that must surely end in the ditch. And you can count on us to do our best.

Next week I'm going to answer some very specific questions which have been asked of me lately on rationing problems. Many have come to me in letters; many have been asked by friends I meet from time to time. I am hoping the answers will give you an idea of how we are working to improve our various regulations, to simplify them, and to make them easier for you and your neighbors to live with in this difficult time of war.

Until then, goodnight to you all.

Bureaucracy Rampant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of November 16, 1943:

BUREAUCRACY RAMPANT

The most damning indictment yet to be returned against a war-created bureau has been made by the House Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies against the Office of Price Administration.

In a lengthy, caustic report submitted to the Congress yesterday, the committee finds that:

"The Office of Price Administration has assumed unauthorized powers to legislate by regulation and has, by misinterpretation of acts of Congress, set up a Nation-wide system of judicial tribunals through which this executive agency judges the actions of American citizens relative to its own regulations and orders and imposes drastic and unconstitutional penalties upon those citizens, depriving them in certain instances of vital rights and liberties without due process of law."

The committee expresses belief that the facts it presents to the Congress "reveal practices which if not halted might conceivably lead to the undermining of our basic constitutional provisions for separate and independent executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government."

This trend is found, not alone in O. P. A. but in other branches of Government which, the committee assures the Congress, it will expose in future reports.

The O. P. A. report will be about all that any American will want to try to digest at one sitting. Some of its charges are so shocking as to be almost unbelievable, unless one has been, of course, a victim of the practices against which the congressional committee complains. The new report supplements an earlier report on O. P. A. handling of rent-control matters and deals chiefly with the investigative, prosecutive, and punitive phases of O. P. A. administration.

Citing the manner in which the three major branches of Government are constitutionally established, the committee points out that no executive agency has the right to go beyond the restrictions imposed by Congress in applying rules and inflicting punishments, and no right whatever to create mock courts. Having done that, it charges that O. P. A. has developed an unauthorized and illegal judicial system, and that through the masses of rules and regulations daily enacted by that agency it has also developed such intricate and involved administrative review machinery that litigants are completely bewildered by the maze of procedure through which they must wander to eventually arrive at a court which will grant them only the crumbs of judicial relief.

"This situation," says the committee, "must be changed, and changed immediately."

Weaknesses and lack of congressional restrictions in the Price Control Act and in the Allocation, Priorities and War Powers Acts, plus the grossly abusive manner in which the O. P. A. has interpreted its own functions and powers, are held by the committee to be responsible for the unconstitutional manner in which citizens are being dealt with by O. P. A.

The Price Control Act set up an emergency court of appeals to the exclusion of all other courts, and of this the committee says:

"That a citizen may be indicted, tried, and convicted for violation of an illegal regulation or order made by an executive agency, without having the right to plead such invalidity in the court where he is indicted and tried, is, indeed, a novelty in our jurisprudence, and if sustained by the courts it should be immediately corrected by amending the act."

Commenting on the compliance sections of the Price Control Act and the manner in which O. P. A. officials enforce them, the committee says:

"The Office of Price Administration has not remained within the bounds of its statutory powers. It has misinterpreted the language of the act so as to arrogate unto itself additional powers nowhere granted it by law and has administered the act in such fashion as to cause many unnecessary hardships to our citizens."

It charges that complicated and unreasonable regulations and interpretations placed thereon by O. P. A. officials are driving a large number of our citizens to the point of desperation.

"Regulations are conceived," it asserts, "in the interest, and to serve the convenience of, the administrator. The individual, if unfortunate, is left to fall by the wayside."

By its regulations and practices, O. P. A. has violated the legislative prohibition against compelling changes in business practices and has gone about at will causing changes in business practices, cost practices, and distribution practices by its regulations and orders. And to all this it adds:

"With top officials of the O. P. A. entertaining the opinion that Congress lacks understanding of the legislation it has enacted, your committee ceases to wonder at the frequent misinterpretation given by that agency to its guiding statutes."

The purpose of the Price Control Act was to prevent inflation and a subsequent living cost rise. A coincidental objective was to prevent profiteering. In no place, however, in the act, as the committee well asserts, is there any authorization for inclusive profit control. Yet, says the committee, in the files of David Ginsburg, former O. P. A. general counsel, the committee found "a well devised and planned scheme to control the profits of American industry by freezing them at the level earned by such industry during the period 1936–39."

"The O. P. A. has no legal right or authority to formulate such a plan or attempt to put such a plan in effect," asserts the committee.

In regard to imposition of punitive measures, the committee flatly charges:

"The punishment meted out by O. P. A. to offenders which its 'courts' have found guilty is in many cases most severe."

Of O. P. A.'s investigators:

"Some of the methods used by this police force not only contravene statutory safeguards of private rights, but even invade the field of immunity guaranteed by the Constitution against unlawful searches and seizures." The committee cites instances where O. P. A. investigators have invaded premises without legal process and have actually held citizens prisoners.

It finds that O. P. A. has usurped power and has stretched the statutes in some cases "beyond all reasonable understanding," and it urges the Congress to specifically prohibit this usurpation.

In conclusion the committee recognizes that rationing and price control are vital wartime necessities, but it recommends immediate elimination of the now apparent abuses and injustices. This it declares is an "immediate necessity."

The situation as it now exists is such that the "illegal, absurd, useless, and conflicting regulations promulgated by O. P. A. are creating such confusion that it is impossible for the average citizen to know how to comply."

It inevitably "tends to bring the law into contempt and ridicule and creates widespread indignation and resentment among our citizens. Such an unfortunate situation will ultimately lead to a complete break-down of the price control law and necessarily retard the effective prosecution of the war."

Anything added to that and the other accusations of the committee would be superfluous. The Office of Price Administration is losing the confidence of the people. Its multitudinous and often asinine regulations are creating a nation of liars, thieves, and petty chiselers out of usually and want-to-be honest, patriotic citizens.

The usurpations of O. P. A. and other bureaus are a stench in the nostrils of every free-born American.

It is the duty of the Congress to act on the committee's recommendations, and act at once.

Subsidies in British and American Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions it has been argued that because subsidies have worked so well for Canada and England there is no reason why they should not be good for Americans, too. The two situations are entirely different, as you will readily see by studying the following report submitted by D. H. Butler:

SUBSIDIES IN BRITISH AND CANADIAN PRICE CONTROL

You will recall that over a year ago it was pointed out that the London economists ridiculed the very idea of the United States using price control or subsidies in relation to food. At that time they indicated that the basic difference between the United States and England concerning the food problem is that England must import her food because of limited production facilities, whereas the United States can increase her production of food for purposes of supplying England. The thought behind that criticism of the United States policy is that if production responds to increased prices, there is no danger of inflation, and increased crops will themselves control prices.

With the above in mind, it is interesting to read a recent report on British and Canadian price control, especially, a brief of which follows:

As you are aware, the British subsidy method is called the trading loss method. Since the Ministry of Food is the sole importer of food products, it merely sells to distributors below its actual cost. The same policy is followed in regard to products raised in Britain. Superficially the program appears to have been successful in stabilizing the cost of living. The food index in recent months has been maintained at 20 percent above the level of September 1939.

Back of the apparent success of the British plan lie two very important considerations: 1. They look upon the British Empire, the United States, and South America as their source of supply. They are almost certain of getting a supply sufficient for their needs.

2. They get that supply at a price which is the result of political shopping among their different sources of foodstuffs. Their supply has been assured in terms of both tonnage and price. In other words, that they have the food supply at the price which they pay is the result of using Government effort to hold down food prices here at a cost to both the producing farmer and the processing manufacturer. "That they shop their sources for the best prices" was clearly demonstrated in my memorandum to you concerning the British purchase of pork in the Argentine while pork prices were high here and renewed purchase of pork in the United States after pork prices had been reduced by Government order here.

Therefore, the English program has been greatly helped—

1. Because they did not have the problem of paying prices sufficient to get production from any one producer; their supply was promised.

2. They have been able to purchase from different sources of supply at prices which they consider most favorable regardless of the production problems of those sources.

Even so, the cost of English subsidies for 1943 was estimated at £210,000,000.

It should be pointed out that the United States not only has had to practically guarantee the food supply of England but has also had the problem of obtaining that production without increasing prices and by use of the support price methods. In other words, the increased cost to the United States should actually be considered as part of the cost of the English food program.

It should be pointed out that the purpose of attempting to stabilize the cost-of-living index in Canada is to stabilize wage costs; whereas in England this is not the primary concern, although it was closely tied in. Therefore, the Canadian indexes of food costs of certain retail food prices reflect the subsidy action, the purpose of which is to keep the index down rather than keeping down the actual cost of living. (Both the Canadian and American labor movements are criticizing the cost-of-living indexes for this purpose.)

Index numbers of certain retail food prices in Canada

[1935-39=100]

Date	Beef, sirloin	Pork, fresh	Milk* (fresh)	Butter, creamery	Potatoes	Bread, white	Tea*	Total food index	Total cost-of-living index
Aug. 1, 1939	110.7	105.8	100.0	88.7	126.4	98.4	105.6	99.3	100.8
Nov. 1, 1941 (before general price control)	135.2	133.2	111.0	121.7	113.4	104.8	151.2	125.4	116.3
Dec. 1, 1941 (when control was imposed)	133.6	132.4	111.0	124.6	113.6	104.8	153.2	123.8	115.8
Nov. 2, 1942 (before roll-back of items marked thus*)	150.2	138.1	112.8	129.4	153.1	104.8	156.3	132.4	118.6
Dec. 1, 1942 (after roll-back)	150.2	138.9	112.8	132.7	154.7	104.8	156.3	132.8	118.8
Mar. 1, 1943	154.9	140.3	95.4	129.4	170.9	104.8	138.4	127.7	117.2
Apr. 1, 1943	156.5	142.1	95.4	129.4	181.0	104.8	138.4	128.7	117.6
May 1, 1943	158.1	143.3	95.4	129.1	194.6	104.8	138.7	129.9	118.1
June 1, 1943	160.1	145.7	95.4	126.5	202.3	104.8	138.7	130.9	118.5
July 2, 1943	160.5	146.2	95.4	125.9	210.1	104.8	138.7	131.8	118.8
Aug. 2, 1943								133.2	119.2

From Foreign Commerce Weekly, Oct. 30, 1943.

The Canadians are frank to admit that the cost of the direct subsidy is not the total cost. For example, they point out that the release of low cost wheat from the Canadian Wheat Board stocks should be considered as part of the cost. (Of course, it can be argued that if they did not hold those wheat stocks back from the public, they would not have high cost wheat and, therefore, they could not point to these stocks as being low cost.) Only two items on the food list and two or three on the nonfood list are subsidized.

Principal subsidies paid by Canadian Government, Dec. 1, 1941, to Mar. 31, 1943

Item	On domestic goods	On imports
Total payments	$30,999,920	$34,161,386
Food	25,177,016	3,362,026
Butterfat	10,315,133	
Milk	8,740,100	
Canned goods	1,773,828	
Groceries	1,536,573	
Strawberries	72,285	
Peaches	52,990	
Apricots	41,824	
Cereal products	3,685	
Tea and coffee	[1] 2,682,390	1,198,680
Rice		474,367
Cocoa beans		693,033
Prunes		471,244
Oranges		122,889
Grapefruit juice		212,539
Ginger and spices		54,192
Edible gelatine		47,762
Nonfood	5,822,904	30,799,360
Petroleum		24,028,436
Fibers and textiles		4,109,027
Cotton linters		183,259
Cotton yarns		55,064
Cotton fabrics		2,242,885
Sisal fibers		1,064,291
Horsehair		135,913
Viscose fiber		141,142
Yarns of artificial silk		130,783
Raw hides and skins (pickled sheep and lamb)		699,981
Garment leather	1,283,519	
Footwear	3,272,490	
Coal and coke	1,185,647	349,455
Broomcorn		359,636
Articles entering into the cost of fertilizers		278,582

[1] Roll-back of December 1941 applicable to inventory—hence is "domestic."

From Foreign Commerce Weekly, Oct. 30, 1943.

It is frankly stated that these are items for which the supply had to be increased. In other words, the supply of other products was ample or could be supplemented by supplies from the United States or other sources. In the case of butterfat and milk the English demand was so great that Canada had to pay a subsidy to get increased supply and the United States had to allow the manufacturer of butter and certain cheeses to pay a higher price than could be paid for the same grade of butterfat for other uses. In other words, both Canada and the United States recognize the importance of the influence of higher prices in obtaining increased production. It is frankly admitted in Canada that the milk products subsidy was used to increase supply as well as to decrease consumer cost. It is pointed out that when there was a matter of 2 cents retail price involved which would have put the cost-of-living index over the wage bonus point, that the subsidy was increased in order to hold down the cost-of-living index. (This, of course, causes Canadian labor to protest that their actual cost of living is going up in the form of increased taxes but their income is not allowed to go up.)

The Canadians point out that the price of beef as well as the price of pork has been allowed to increase because export demands are so heavy that some incentive for production is desirable. This is a frank admittance that increased prices are necessary for increased production and especially is it to be allowed where those increased prices do not affect too drastically the cost of living.

The decision to subsidize canned food manufacture was apparently reached on the basis that it is cheaper to subsidize on a value-added basis than it is to subsidize on a total crop-value basis. Therefore, prices have been allowed to rise for many farm products. Meat and eggs are two specific items and this has stimulated production. As a result, consumer prices have been gradually increased as indicated in the table of price indexes.

It is admitted that the dollar cost of subsidies on imported foodstuffs is not the total cost and it is pointed out that import taxes were remitted on many such items and should be considered as part of the cost. (It would surely follow that any price stabilization in the United States is also part of the cost of subsidizing canned food supplies.)

Although not so stated by the Canadians, it would appear that they have used subsidies mainly to hold down the retail price on those items on which an increase in price would affect the cost of living and thus give the basis for increased wages. On commodities whose supply is definitely short and whose increased retail prices would not so affect the cost of living index, the Canadian Government has been unwilling to use subsidies and has allowed increased prices to bring the necessary result.

In conclusion, it would seem there are three important items for consideration.

1. The success of subsidies in other countries is in large part dependent upon the operation of support prices and Government set aside orders in the United States.

2. The success of a subsidy program cannot be measured in governments which do not have the full responsibility of obtaining the necessary production. Especially is this so since in Canada, it is admitted that increased prices are necessary for increased production of beef and pork.

3. The question of whether consumer or producer subsidies should be used gives us two important considerations:

(1) Consumer subsidies, so-called, can and do affect immediately a cost of living index, but the point remains that such Government manipulations actually increase the hidden cost of living without allowing increased incomes to the taxpayers who must meet those hidden costs.

(2) Producer subsidies which act indirectly and raise a conflict as to the points in the marketing process at which they will be paid, become a definite political means of pressure. Here too, the actual indirect cost of living is increased without any benefit to the consumer.

In both cases, unless subsidies are used for increased production, they are actually means of creating inflation insofar as food is concerned. If subsidies are used to increase production, then it follows that they are merely a political subterfuge and, during wartime especially, such machinations should be eliminated.

We should approach the problem directly and allow higher prices to bring about increased production. The increased production will, in itself, control prices. More important, the increased production will insure the consumer that his dollar will buy something. As long as that is the case there need to be no fear of inflation because of a freely acting price for foodstuffs.

NOVEMBER 18, 1943.

Mr. Hull Returns to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Walter Lippmann, who in my opinion is a great columnist and news analyst. He is a very thoughtful and profound writer and has pointed the direction of public thinking on many important questions. This thoughtful article demands the consideration of every one of us and, it seems to me, clearly indicates a weakness in our system of

doing things here in Washington that could easily be solved. It follows:

MR. HULL RETURNS TO CONGRESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The fact that immediately upon his return Secretary Hull is making a personal report directly to Congress may in the long run be recognized as one of the historic events of our time. Mr. Hull could not have achieved so tremendous a success at Moscow if the Senate had not given him such an overwhelming vote of confidence in the Connally resolution. For without that vote he would have been speaking for only one branch of the Government; with that vote he spoke for the United States. No other American diplomat in our times has spoken with such weight.

Now he returns to the Congress which made this possible. We may rejoice. For in the conflict between Congress and the Executive there resides the most dangerous weakness of our institutions. Upon their ability to work together, each informing and each strengthening the other, depends our political salvation, and in no small measure that of the world.

It has been increasingly evident during the war that ways must be found to bridge the chasm between the two branches of the Government. Our constitutional system is based on the doctrine of the separation of powers, but this doctrine was never meant to mean that Congress and the Executive should live as suspicious rivals in separate worlds. In fact, it was originally intended, as the actions of George Washington show, that the President or the members of his Cabinet should go down to Congress as Mr. Hull is now doing. It was bad luck, rather than anything in the letter and spirit of the Constitution itself, which caused Washington to stop going to Congress and to set the unfortunate precedent of aloofness which has prevailed ever since. Time and again men have sought to reestablish continuing relations. Committees of Congress have recommended it. Presidents Garfield, Taft, and Wilson have urged it. For the United States Government cannot be well conducted, especially in time of great stress and urgency, unless there is constant, confident communication between the two branches.

It is distressing to think how much unnecessary trouble we might have been spared if Congress and the Executive had regularly pooled their knowledge and instructed one another before either committed itself to a position which the other would not support. Indeed, we may say that if the two branches could establish regular communication we should have dealt with the thing which will either make or break our system of government. This reform is as simple as it is obvious, and as it is important. It requires no constitutional amendment, no new laws, nothing more than a supplementary rule of procedure in the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. Hull's appearance before Congress might well serve as a means of drawing attention to a resolution recently introduced by a Representative from his own State of Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER. The resolution calls for an amendment to rule XXXIII of the House by which, once a week or once a fortnight, there would be a 2-hour period in which heads of departments and of the independent agencies would answer in person and orally both written and oral questions propounded by Members of the House. Mr. KEFAUVER has outlined the mechanics which, as he himself insists, are merely suggestions for the House to consider. The short debate which took place a few days ago on his resolution was conducted on a very high plane, was quite nonpartisan, and indicated wide support for the idea in the House.

There is no doubt whatever that if the House adopted the proposal the Executive would welcome it. It is true that Congress could not compel Cabinet members to come before it. But the Cabinet member who did not wish to come would be a foolish man, indeed, and would at once write himself down as unfit for his office.

The advantages of the proposal are so evident that it seems almost unnecessary to insist upon them. Perhaps the greatest advantage of all would be that by this simple bit of common sense the ordinary citizen would find it infinitely easier to know what is going on in Washington.

For example, the five Senators made a tour of the world and came back with many impressions, criticisms, and observations. These were retailed in press interviews, secret speeches that leaked out in part, and then investigated through complicated hearings of committees which not 10 citizens outside of Washington were able to understand.

Under the Kefauver resolution, if something like it were adopted in the Senate, Mr. BREWSTER would have submitted a series of carefully phrased written questions on the subjects which bothered him—for example, oil from the Middle East, lend-lease trucks in Australia, landing rights for American civilian planes in foreign air fields which we have constructed. These questions would then have been passed on to the executive officers responsible for handling these questions. They would have had a few days' notice to prepare their answers. They would have come to Congress, and face to face with Senator BREWSTER to reply to him, and to debate orally what these prepared answers did not, in the opinion of the Senate, adequately cover.

Is there any doubt that this would help the public, and we may add the Washington newspapermen, to get a lucid conclusion out of what, under our present system, was a confused and rather unpleasant disturbance? Moreover, is it not clear that because questions would have to be answered responsibly at a fixed date, the effect on all would be good? Congressmen would know they were going to be answered and would not wish to ask the wrong questions. Executive officers, knowing that they would be questioned, would take care to know what they were doing. And the public would acquire the habit of suspending judgment until they had heard both sides, knowing that the questions could be asked and would have to be answered.

There is no single thing that could be done which would so greatly serve that free opinion which is sovereign in our constitutional system. And this would be a most appropriate time to do it.

Endorsement of Gov. John W. Bricker for the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to do so by inserting the following resolutions adopted by the Republican Membership in Congress for Ohio, endorsing the candidacy of Gov. John W. Bricker for the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States. These resolutions speak for themselves and are expressive of the views of a steadily increasing number of Americans. Governor Bricker has the character and capacity that will command the respect and confidence of people in all walks of life. His conspicuous service as a three-term Governor of Ohio establishes him as an executive of great ability.

The resolutions follow:

Fourscore and ten years ago in one of the great crises of the Nation the people firmly resolved to reestablish the wavering Government on a safe and sound foundation. Abraham Lincoln, then comparatively unknown, led the people to this resolution and the Republican Party was then established and it courageously brought about the desired result.

Again we are in a great national crisis and the people have again firmly resolved to reclaim and reestablish the Government on a safe and sound foundation. The Republican Party will do it.

The New Deal is dead. It has been consumed by the fires of its own arrogance. Firm and farsighted foreign policies are required so that we may play our part in world affairs. Honest and sensible domestic policies are demanded that we may keep America American.

Whereas the State of Ohio has always been progressive, and has always been sensibly cautious when caution was a virtue, and has contributed conspicuously at all times and in many ways to the welfare of the Nation through the efforts of her people and her many competent and famous sons and daughters; and

Whereas the State of Ohio, among the larger States, is today the foremost Republican State of the Union. Her courthouses are quite generally officiated over by competent Republicans. Republicans have been given the honor and responsibility of presiding as mayors over a great majority of the municipalities of the State. Both branches of the State legislature are overwhelmingly Republican. Both of her United States Senators are militant Republicans. Twenty of the 23 Representatives in Congress are stalwart Republicans upholding free government and opposing New Deal extravagance and arrogance at every opportunity. Ohio has a Republican Governor who as the chief executive of the State is now serving his third consecutive term—an honor heretofore granted to but one man in the history of the State; and

Whereas John W. Bricker, as Governor of the State of Ohio, is everywhere recognized as one of the ablest and most capable chief executives in the Nation because he has rendered such signal and outstanding service in supplanting incompetency and demanding honest and faithful public service, and has conducted the fiscal affairs of the State in such a manner as to command the respect of right-thinking people everywhere; and when he assumed the duties of Governor of Ohio the State was staggering under a typical New Deal debt of $40,000,000; and in 5 years Governor Bricker has paid that debt and the State has now a surplus of $65,000,000, which is a most unusual innovation when contrasted with the fiscal affairs of the National Government; and

Whereas the people of Ohio with almost unanimous cordiality have indicated their desire that Governor Bricker become a candidate for the nomination of the Republican Party for the Presidency of the United States: Be it

Resolved by the Republican Representatives in Congress from the State of Ohio, That the candidacy of John W. Bricker for the nomination of the Republican Party for the high office of President of the United States be approved and endorsed; and be it further

Resolved, That each and every member of the Republican delegation from the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States here and now dedicates himself or herself to render unswerving devotion to this cause and to exert to the utmost every reasonable and honorable effort to bring about the nomination of Governor Bricker for the Presidency by the Republican National Convention and thereafter to exert every reasonable effort to elect him President of the United States.

Unanimously adopted.

THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman of the Delegation.
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Secretary.

Taxation of Federally Owned Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

ASSOCIATION OF
MASSACHUSETTS ASSESSORS,
Gloucester, Mass., November 17, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

You are respectfully advised that at the fifty-fourth annual meeting of the Association of Massachusetts Assessors, held at the State House, Boston, Mass., on October 28, 1943, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the ownership of property by the Federal Government restricts the tax base from which local governments draw the bulk of their revenues, and thereby affects the financial stability of counties, cities, school districts, and other political subdivisions; and

"Whereas property owned by the Federal Government is not distributed uniformly over the country, but frequently is concentrated in particular areas, which in turn results in serious inequalities as between different local governments; and

"Whereas property owned by the Federal Government generally requires the same services of local government as does property owned by private citizens; and

"Whereas the beneficiaries of federally owned property are the people of the entire Nation, and not merely the residents of areas where Federal property is situated; and

"Whereas Congress is investigating the problems arising out of Federal ownership of property and has indicated a willingness to enact corrective legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That it is the consensus of the membership of the National Association of Assessing Officers—

"1. That when Federal agencies acquire property for temporary use such property should be leased rather than purchased, in order to preserve necessary revenues to local governments;

"2. That Congress be urged to enact legislation authorizing the taxation of the following specific types of federally owned property:

"(a) Property withdrawn from local tax rolls for temporary purposes, military or otherwise,

"(b) Property used for housing and resettlement projects,

"(c) Real and personal property used for manufacturing and industrial purposes;

"3. That, in providing for the taxation of federally owned property, Congress require that such taxation be applied to the same extent and in the same manner as privately owned property is taxed."

In compliance with the vote of the Association of Massachusetts Assessors and their instructions, I am hereby transmitting this resolution to you.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK A. ROGERS,
Secretary.

Foundations for Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of November 16, 1943:

FOUNDATIONS FOR AVIATION

Americans have been thinking a good deal about the tremendous development of civil aviation to be expected after the war. Improved equipment is in sight, financial and operational plans are ready for a vast extension of passenger, express, and freight traffic. Already airports are being enlarged and little towns are dreaming dreams of becoming metropolises of the skyways, even as thousands of fliers and mechanics are counting on civil aviation jobs when they get out of uniform. But the blueprint for coordinating these dreams and plans and laying down a legislative foundation for them is only now coming up in Congress.

It is called the Lea bill and amounts to a revision and extension of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It provides for a whole system of Federal regulation and promotion of civil aviation, under a Civil Aeronautics Commissioner and Administrator. The powers given to these officials are broad and, like the provisions for governmental subsidies for air-line development, may need to be reexamined after there has been some experience with them. But the bill has been worked out with some care in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and is acceptable to those who have had the practical task of developing the United States civil aviation.

Citizens who are concerned over the centralization of government may raise questions about the drastic authority placed in Federal officials. However, the Civil Aeronautics Commission will be not an executive agency, but, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, will be answerable directly to Congress. Its powers appear necessary if there is to be adequate coordination of aviation. To permit anything like the multitude of State regulations—amounting to State barriers—which has cramped truck transport would be particularly ridiculous with anything so naturally free as air transportation. If there is to be freedom of the air inside America, something like the Lea bill seems imperative.

Airport Zoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton Daily News of October 24, 1943:

AIRPORT ZONING

No provision of the bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, introduced last week by Chairman LEA, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, appears more important than that which would insert in the act a new title covering ground hazards to air navigation. It provides in part that the Civil Aeronautics Administrator "shall formulate and maintain a Nation-wide zoning program for clearing and protecting aerial approaches to airports through regulation of the height and location of structures and of objects of natural growth on and in the vicinity of airports. Such program shall include standards, as nearly uniform as reasonably possible, for such zoning."

The aim is the maximum usefulness of airports consistent with the highest possible factor of safety. It goes without saying that such legislation is long overdue. The phenomenal growth of commercial air transport even through the pre-war years emphasized the need. Since the passage of the present Civil Aeronautics Act has come the war and the vast military aviation program in the wake of which, with peace, all authorities agree, will follow a tremendous commercial flying expansion. It is reasonable to believe, moreover, if experience has taught us anything, that we shall maintain a greater military air force. Facilities for its safe and ready movement about the country will be a fundamental of national security. In both prospects the safeguarding of present airports and those to come from ground hazards is a prime necessity.

The bill, it should be noted, provides also that "the Administrator shall invite the cooperation of duly constituted authorities of States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof, in the formulation, maintenance, and carrying out of such zoning program, and in the carrying out of such program he shall furnish to such authorities such information, technical assistance, and other aids as they may request and as he may deem to be feasible."

There is no reason, of course, why State and local governments should not themselves already have moved in this direction. More than 2½ years ago both the C. A. A. and the National Institute of Municipal Law officers prepared model airport-zoning acts, but it is significant that, up to early 1943, only seven States had enacted zoning legislation of any consequence, and even among these the measures adopted were inadequate and at considerable variance. Federal action along the lines designated would not only encourage parallel legislation by State and local governments but also assure that reasonable uniformity of zoning throughout the country, which, obviously, is vital to the success of the program.

We know the costly and hazardous confusion which came from failure to anticipate the ubiquity of the automobile and its cross-country character. The result was wide variation in traffic regulations, not only as between the States but between the cities within a single State, with all the difficulties and

deadliness that such a situation engenders. Despite the years of hindsight campaigning for uniformity, that is a confusion never yet cleared.

Now we confront, and yet in time to meet it largely in advance, the comparable need of uniform airport zoning to eliminate ground hazards. There was some excuse, perhaps, for missing the potentialities of the onrushing automobile and the problems attendant. There is no such excuse in the case of the forthcoming air age. Tragedies have already written the urgency of uniform airport zoning into the record. Present needs demand it and the future outlook makes continued lack of such legislation unthinkable.

The hope is for prompt consideration and passage of this measure by Congress, with States and cities moving equally promptly, then, to supplement Federal action. There should be no further delay.

A Practical Farmer Writes on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter from a practical and outstanding farmer of my acquaintance, Mr. Scott Ellis, of Dallas Center, Iowa:

DALLAS CENTER, IOWA, *November 16, 1943.*
Mr. PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

DEAR FRIEND: I know the fight is starting on the subsidy question

I am still bitterly opposed to subsidy, not from a selfish standpoint but from the standpoint of the consumer. If the present subsidy continues, dairymen will have to quit and there will be a dearth of milk. Now at the Des Moines plant we only had about 50 cans more than the distributors could use yesterday. We should be drying in large quantities for the lend-lease contract. Farmers are letting up and it is only the beginning of what will happen when they fully realize what their costs are.

Our subsidy in Dallas County is $0.30 per hundredweight. Our last 2 weeks' price of milk delivered in Des Moines was $2.90 per hundredweight. I have just computed accurately my costs subject to present prices. Feed costs and other costs are all figured on 100-pound basis.

Feed	$2.60
Labor	.80
Electricity	.02
Hauling	.25
Per 100-pound milk	3.67

We are milking 45 cows now. In addition to this we are feeding 28 calves, 1 bull, and 42 head of heifers and dry cows. None of their feed costs have been figured in. This would run costs of milk up considerably and would be a legitimate addition.

I am feeding these cows the cheapest hay possible. On alfalfa or clover hay the costs would be much higher.

I am not charging anything for my own labor or my boys' labor. I figured my own labor bill at coal miners' pay and it came to $98 per week for the hours I put in.

I want to win this war as bad as anybody in the world. I want my boy back alive if possible.

I am willing to work for nothing and not only that but willing to lose 76 cents on every hundred pounds of milk to win the war, but I know hundreds of dairymen that can't and won't go on that way.

Everybody has wages sufficient to pay for milk at a decent price and pay for the product now. Subsidy and cost of administration will have to be paid for by my boy who is working for $50 per month in a chemical-warfare unit and you know what that means.

Fight with all your might against subsidy and the inflation it would bring.

I am only trying to bring you up to date on the costs as well as the emergency.

Your friend,

SCOTT ELLIS.

Testimony of South Dakota State Secretary of Agriculture and Former President of National Farmers Union on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Ed Everson, State secretary of agriculture of South Dakota and for 4 years the president of the National Farmers Union, testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the important subject of consumers' subsidies. In view of Mr. Everson's national standing as a farm leader and the large following which he has throughout the Republic I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the statement of Mr. Everson with regard to the subsidy question on which this House will vote next week:

SUBSIDIES, PRICE CEILINGS, BELOW-PARITY PRICES, PRICE ROLL-BACKS, AND COMMODITY LOANS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON MAXIMUM PRODUCTION OF FARM CROPS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on April 27, this year, in a radio address in my State, I emphasized the importance of abundant production of feed for our livestock, to the end that farmers would not be required to go before rationing boards and secure rationing points to feed their livestock next winter. Well, on May 7 an Associated Press report from Washington, D. C., stated that "the Government may extend control of feed distribution" and that "although no official decisions have been made, serious consideration is being given to proposals for Government requisitioning of corn from growers, feeders, and others having supplies deemed to be in excess of current requirements and for rationing of protein feeds." The foregoing A. P. report was dated May 7, this year.

Now, I want to quote from another A. P. report from Washington as of May 8, this year, under the heading "Plan to subsidize living costs takes Capital spotlight." I quote from this report, Washington, D. C., May 8:

"Reported plans of the administration for establishing a $2,000,000,000-a-year program for subsidizing the cost of living took the spotlight in the Capital news picture today. Price Administrator Prentiss Brown already has announced the meat, coffee, and butter subsidies, designed to force a 10-percent reduction in the cost of these products, will become effective June 1. The meat, coffee, and butter program, to be financed through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will cost about $400,000,000 a year. The $2,000,000,000 proposal under study by the administration leaders was said to include plans for subsidizing canned fruits and vegetables and a long list of other foods."

Following shortly after the foregoing announcements a roll-back in the price of butter of 5 cents a pound was put into effect and subsidizing payments of 5 cents a pound were offered to producers who would and could comply with certain requirements, though it was not to apply to producers of 1,000 pounds or less. As a result of that roll-back and the uncertainty, confusion, and loss of confidence on the part of the farmers in these policies and the administration of this program, butter production, according to the United States Department of Agriculture for the fourth week in October was 11 percent less than a year ago. And now, mind you, they are offering from 4 to 5 cents per pound for butter and from 30 to 50 cents a hundred for whole milk in another subsidy to stimulate increased butter and milk production. I suppose they think this will bring those dry cows and the cows that the calves were turned onto, back into production.

Well, following right on the heels of that roll-back in price of 5 cents per pound, and in order to share the shortage caused by this roll-back, they found it necessary to raise the point value of butter effective August 1 from 8 points per pound to 10 points per pound, and on September 1 from 10 points per pound to 12 points, and in October from 12 points per pound to 16 points, actually doubling the point value of butter in the course of about 3 months. I would say that with these subsidies and roll-backs they have been advancing backward quite rapidly. If our armies had taken that course, they would have been licked before they got well started. After years of reduction and restriction and subsidies for nonproduction and penalties for overproduction of feed grains we find ourselves short on feed to supply our livestock. I want to quote to you a news report from a daily paper in my State—the Lead Daily Call, published at Lead, S. Dak., and as of July 27, 1942, and reporting the burning of 100 acres of wheat near Broadus, Mont., to comply with the triple A program. I quote:

"ONE HUNDRED ACRES OF WHEAT IN MONTANA ARE BURNED IN COMPLIANCE WITH A. A. A.—POTENTIAL FOOD FOR STARVING COUNTRIES GOES UP IN SMOKE.

"BROADUS, MONT., July 27, 1942.—A tall smoke plume west of Broadus last Monday evening brought visions to many of an approaching prairie fire, and the fire wardens here were ready to man their stations. The sheriff, Claude Anderson, drove west on the highway past the Louis Monroe place, but by the time he got to Monroe's the smoke had vanished, leaving no trace from where it had come. Later it was learned that the fire came from burning of 100 acres of volunteer wheat on the Charles Jesse place that was burned to comply with the A. A. A. program. The 100 acres, it was said, would have made 20 bushels to the acre. Newspapers in famine-ridden China, please copy."

Does anyone question the fact that such sabotaging of crops last year in order to comply with the triple-A program and escape the 49-cents-per-bushel penalty on overproduction of wheat has contributed materially to the shortage of feed grains now?

Now I want to quote from a bulletin issued November 20, 1939, by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Washington, D. C., entitled "Instructions for State and County

Committees for Determining Eligibility and Completing Documents for Loans on 1939 Corn." At the top of page 4 of this bulletin I read the following: "1939 corn loans bearing 3 percent interest will be available from December 1, 1939, to March 31, 1940, inclusive, and will mature on August 1, 1940." If I properly interpret that section, it means your corn loans were due on August 1, 1940. Do any of you know of any time in the year when a farmer in the Corn Belt would be less able to meet an obligation or deliver grain than on August 1? I'm sure I could not select a more undesirable date for the farmer when he is right in the midst of harvest and haying. What do you think would be the natural effect on the corn market of having all these corn loans come due on August 1?

Were those loans made for the purpose of supporting corn prices up to a parity price or were they made for the purpose of holding the price down to about 52 to 75 percent of parity, the amount loaned on the corn? It just seems to me if they were actually made to support the market price on corn up to parity they would not have been made to mature on August 1 and would not have been callable when the market price of corn was below parity, and even then they would not be called in such amounts as to depress the market price. I know they argue that these loans were extended and that they were not called, but that is not the point. They could have been called and the farmer would have had to surrender his corn at from 52 to 75 percent of the parity price and I say to you, gentlemen, that this is too much power to place in the hands of any department of Government or individual or corporation. Certainly our local bankers, at least those who are honest and reputable, would know better than to expect farmers to meet an obligation at that time of year. If these commodity loans were actually made to support prices up to parity they would not mature at a time when the market price of grain is below parity.

They tell us these loans and subsidies, price ceilings, and roll-backs are necessary to hold the line against inflation and I am sure farmers realize the evils of both inflation and deflation, but especially deflation of which they were the innocent and unfortunate victims following the last war. Too much inflation, however, is a cause and a forerunner of serious and often disastrous deflation and I am in accord with holding the line against all such unnecessary inflation. In holding this line, however, the place to hold it is where the line is breaking and it just seems to me that the place where it is breaking is in the defense plants and under cost-plus contracts, at least they seem to attract more of our trained farm help who are not inducted into the Army.

I think we ought to analyze this inflation problem and see just what it is and where it originates and see that an honest effort to stop it is made at its source. We are told that we have inflation when the volume of purchasing power among the people greatly exceeds the volume of goods and commodities available to be purchased, and I find no fault with that definition, and I fully recognize the dangers in such a situation and the debasing effect it may have on our medium of exchange. I do think then we should get at the cause of this surplus purchasing power. Where did it come from? Where did it originate? Surely it has not just recently burst forth out of the earth, nor do I believe it has rained down from the heavens. Surely it has not suddenly come to us from the nations beyond the seas to whom we loaned so much money during the last World War, and of whom only Finland has returned any to us. No, to the contrary, billions of dollars of our purchasing power and billions of dollars worth of our commodities have been going over to those countries under our lend-lease programs. Just where in the world could this surplus buying power have come from except from New Deal subsidies and Government debts created through such subsidies?

Surely our 6,000,000 farm families with our limited farm help and machinery never can hope to produce crops and raw materials fast enough to match the enormous purchasing power that is being created through Government subsidies and debts that are being converted into purchasing power even if we should extend our working day from 15 to 18 or 20 hours. While the 8-hour day and time and a half for overtime prevails in the factories and defense plants and with wage rates at 279 percent of the 1912-14 wage level, we can put that down to an impossible undertaking to begin with; and the more we are handicapped by scarcity of farm labor and machinery and price ceilings below parity and roll-backs in farm prices the more impossible it will become. More Government subsidies and debts to hold farm prices down will not only not remedy that disparity existing between the amount of purchasing power among the people and the amount of goods and commodities available to be purchased, but to the contrary will extend and widen the existing disparity, thus augmenting the inflation spiral rather than retarding it.

In the President's recent message to Congress, in which he urged the Congress to continue and increase the administration's $800,000,000 subsidy program to assure an adequate supply of food and prevent a serious and dangerous cycle of inflation, the President said "some people say a little inflation will not hurt anyone," adding "they are like the man who takes the first shot of opium for the sensation he thinks it will give him. He likes it, although he swears that he will not make it a habit. Soon he is taking two and then more and more and then he loses all control of himself. Inflation is like that. A little leads to more. I am unalterable opposed to taking the first shot, by congressional or any other action. The Nation cannot afford to acquire the habit. We have children to think of."

Now, gentlemen of the committee, if these subsidies constitute the principal source of this surplus purchasing power that is causing inflation, as I firmly believe they do, then is not the President asking Congress for more opium in asking for more subsidies? Has he not already been given too many such shots? According to the Byrd committee, we have now more than 3,000,000 civilian-service employees on the Federal civilian pay roll. That is a lot of manpower. Almost half as many as we have of farm families to produce all the food and fabric to supply our 130,000,000 population and our allies with food and raw materials. More than 100,000 of these, I am told, are employed in the United States Department of Agriculture, and many of them are supposed to be experts in the vocation of agriculture but are now primarily engaged in consuming and dispensing these farm subsidies. It just seems to me if these subsidies are discontinued, a large number of these consumers and dispensers of subsidies should be able to relieve the manpower shortage out on the farms throughout the country and for which service they should be eminently qualified. They might even assist in speeding up production on the farms to such an extent as to provide an abundance of food and raw materials to supply the demand and thus insure this Nation against any dangers of inflation so far as farm prices are concerned, because an abundant production properly distributed, is a sure preventative of inflation. That, then, would eliminate the necessity for rationing food, which would release a lot more manpower for productive service on farms, in factories, and in processing industries, and just think of the reams of paper, rationing stamps, report blanks, and Government red tape—yes; and red ink, too—that would save, together with all other rationing costs. Some time ago Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Britain, told the British Parliament that he had not become the King's Prime Minister for the purpose of liquidating the British Empire.

I wish to say in conclusion that it is my candid opinion that the vast majority of the people in the United States still have faith in their Congress, the lawmaking department of our Government, made up of their elected representatives, and that they are confidently looking to you, gentlemen, to see to it that the bureaucrats in Washington are not permitted to liquidate the greatest Republic this world has ever known, namely, the United States of America.

Navy Milk Spoilage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Zanesville (Ohio) News:

NAVY MILK SPOILAGE IS PROBED—30 CARLOADS DELIVERED TO WAREHOUSE HERE

The spoilage of a large quantity of evaporated milk which had been stored in a Zanesville warehouse for shipment to the United States Navy, was the subject of Statewide discussion today.

Thirty carloads of the milk have been shipped to this city within the past 3 months by the Westerville Creamery of Covington, Ohio, and are stored at the Evans Bros. terminal warehouse, First and Main streets.

Today, it was estimated by the Muskingum County health department that 60 or possibly 75 percent of the milk has spoiled.

The condition of the milk, which is contained in 12-ounce cans bearing the Navy's label, was discovered recently when several of the cans exploded.

Examination disclosed that many of them have bulged perceptibly due to gas formed inside.

Paul Aitken, county sanitarian, said today they contained bacteria.

It was he who conducted an investigation and notified the State health department at Columbus and the Navy Department at Washington.

Although it would have been possible for him to declare an embargo on movement of the milk, it was decided to let the Navy deal with the situation.

The evaporated milk was destined for delivery to Baltimore where it was to be turned over to the Navy. The creamery in Covington had simply engaged warehouse space here for storage of the product until it was consigned for delivery.

Evaporated milk is diluted with water for cooking and for use at sea by the Navy.

At Columbus today, Dr. R. H. Markwith, State health director, said any investigation as to the cause of spoilage would have to be undertaken by the Navy.

He said that on the basis of information received it appeared the cans had opened at

the seams, probably because in wartime production the cans had been given only a thin coating of tin.

He said the milk undoubtedly was all right when canned since the Navy approved the shipment.

The office of Dr. Beatrice T. Hagen, Muskingum County health director, was praised for handling the situation so promptly.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an address delivered by my colleague, Hon. WALT HORAN, of Washington, over the radio last night. This is a very splendid address on the subject of food. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is an expert on food production and food marketing and is a member of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

The address follows:

Before I became a Member of Congress I was a farmer. I have been one all my life. As a farmer, then, let me talk to you about a problem that affects food producers as well as every man, woman, and child in a matter very common to all of us: The food for your table and the general cost of living.

On my way to work this morning, I passed by the Lincoln Memorial erected to the memory of a great American who concluded a speech with these words: "That government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Across the Tidal Basin I saw gleaming the great white dome of another memorial erected to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, who wrote: "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

As I went along Constitution Avenue I came abreast of a third memorial, a monument erected to the Father of this Country, the first pilot of this experiment in self-government. Long before the Constitution, even before the writing and the famous signing of the Declaration of Independence, George Washington had written, in October 1774, to a captain in the British Army. Washington and Captain MacKenzie had served together in the French and Indian War. They corresponded regularly and in a long letter MacKenzie had protested about the insubordination of the people of Massachusetts Bay Colony. In his letter to MacKenzie defending the good people of Massachusetts, Washington had said, "None of them will ever submit to the loss of those valuable rights and privileges which are essential to the happiness of every free state and without which life, liberty, and property are rendered totally insecure."

As I continued along Constitution Avenue, I passed by the White House and the various buildings housing departments of a government which had been instituted by its founders in an attempt to free mankind in society. That design has worked. It has kindled and encouraged individual initiative and enterprise. It has built a nation that is today the hope of the world, the marvel of peoples everywhere. It has grown in the free atmosphere of this country. It is something native, and we must be eternally vigilant lest we destroy it with imported plans and policies forced on us at full value under the stress and excuse of a world crisis, that have never proved successful.

At the Capitol this afternoon, after hearing Secretary of State Cordell Hull speak to us regarding a recent conference in Moscow, Russia, we began consideration of the so-called Commodity Credit bill—a bill which will determine whether the American people, and particularly our farm populations, shall rely upon free production, the free movement, and free exchange of goods, or shall continue increasingly to rely upon the crutch of consumer subsidies deriving part of their income from the workings of a free market and part of their income by means of adjustment payments from the Government.

Those of us who would resist consumer subsidies do so because we do not believe that in the long run any man or men can aspire to achieve freedom if their economic security rests upon the shifting sands of political designs or expediencies. I say "achieve freedom," because the market place has always been the place where freedom is in danger. It must remain a struggle so long as we are human. And yet this Nation faces the greatest crisis that any nation or peoples has ever faced. We have built up here a tremendous productiveness. We have built up here the greatest national debt and have seen the greatest strain upon the credit of our Nation that any nation in history has ever witnessed. That debt has to be controlled. At some time or other we must stop building up that debt. We must call a halt in governmental expenditures. At the same time we must achieve and maintain a national income capable of being taxed for those sums necessary to pay the interest on the national debt, to run the necessary functions of this Federal Union, and eventually also to hew away and reduce, possibly retire, the national debt which must remain an obligation against the integrity of the United States of America.

It has become well fixed in the public mind that we must guard against inflation. No one denies this. It has been well fixed in the public mind that prices of everything must be held down to reasonable levels. No one denies this. It has been well fixed in the public mind that when prices rise too high demand falls off, and an automatic boycott threatens the security of the producer. We also know that we cannot, in justice, limit with price ceilings one phase of our national economy without limiting all across the board. I maintain that we cannot control through consumer subsidies one phase of the national economy without eventually controlling all phases of our national life. Thus does government of the people and for the people take precedence over government by the people.

Here, then, lies the inherent fear, the wellspring of resistance to consumer subsidies. We stand at the subtle crossroads. We, the people, have a challenge to meet. Our concern is how to meet that challenge. How to achieve order in the market place, how to control the cost of living, how to recognize our fiscal needs, how to control inflation without consumer subsidies. The administration says it cannot be done. Subsidies simply have to be the foundation of the program.

What they are saying is that they must have the control of the income of every American. The charge is made that 4,000 directives have been issued by the O. P. A. alone, without full knowledge or even tacit consent of the governed, and today the people of America are no different than the people of Massachusetts Bay Colony, for they sense that they are being forced to submit to the loss of valuable rights and privileges which are essential to the happiness of every free state and without which life, liberty, and property are rendered totally insecure.

This Congress feels its direct responsibility to the people. The great majority of this Congress oppose subsidies. Subsidies add to the national debt and tend to depress the national income below the point which rising tax demands make necessary. Viewed in this light, consumer subsidies become doubly inflationary.

What, then, is the program that is better than consumer subsidies?

We Republicans asked ourselves that question 10 months ago and organized the Republican Food Study Committee. It is an unofficial committee and is not supported by tax funds. We wanted to discuss the problem among ourselves and hold hearings around the country. We wanted to find out what was wrong and what was the best solution. Above all, we wanted the people themselves to have a full part in their affairs as they face and live through this crisis.

As a result of the work of this committee, our chairman, the Honorable THOMAS JENKINS, of Ohio, on May 18, introduced H. R. 2739, calling for greater authority for the Food Administrator. This bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, where it still is. A fortnight later, on June 1, the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER introduced a very similar bill, H. R. 2837. This was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, of which Mr. FULMER (Democrat), of South Carolina, is chairman. That committee reported it out unanimously on June 24. Today it is being held up in the administration controlled Rules Committee.

Republican Members, and many Democrats as well, are supporting the Fulmer bill. We believe it would dissolve the confusion here of conflicting authorities, allow for a real stabilizing program to be built through more government by the people, and assure a continuous food production. It would give the War Food Administrator full control of food. Today he is held responsible only for food production. He is merely advisory in such matters as manpower, machinery, transportation, rationing, and price.

Despite this handicap and despite the inner politics that has seen several changes at the top, the War Food Administration has done an acceptable job. It is entitled to an authority equal to its job of keeping your larder filled, your table adequately set. So far their approaches to the solutions of problems confronting them have followed the American plan. They have encouraged the utmost of cooperative effort right back home in the areas of food production. They know how the manpower problem is met on the farm. The 80-hour week worked by the farmer and his family, the closing of local stores and the use of students from high school and college. They know of the specific limits of the Federal Government in these situations. They know how the farm machinery debacle was met and conquered by resourceful men of good will right on the ground where the crops were. They know of these and many other problems that were and are being met, locally, in the face of this great national need. Farmers understand that the national purpose today is freedom. Well, now, the farmer has lived for the day when he could be free. Free of debt. Free from dependence on Federal doles—the gentle rain of checks. Freed from compliance orders. He hates scarcity and revels in the fact, today, that his crops find ready demand. Yesterday he was killing little pigs—presumably that he might charge more for the few that did go to market. But he was not fooled.

He knows that consumption is the sole objective of production and that prosperity comes when the 40,000,000 underprivileged are gainfully at work and present in the market place where his goods are offered.

The farmer knows about the automatic boycott and its influence in bringing future

hard times on any commodity where the price rises too high. This wisdom has sprung from the farmer's experience of the last 20 years. It is as much a national resource as our water power, as much a national asset as our mechanical schools.

I believe in the native honesty of the vast majority of our Americans when a worthy purpose is made clear and responsibilities are fixed. We should use it. I believe that the War Food Administrator would use it if given the authority to do so in the Fulmer bill. Yesterday I was informed that local committees were planned for all producing sections of fruits and vegetables. This would tend to put government by the people back into food production, and I had long known this to be the desire of a top man in War Food. The actual producer, local industry itself, should be given the responsibility, not alone of producing our needs, but the responsibility of holding prices at a reasonable level. Production, of course, not legislation and policemen, will check inflation and provide taxation. It is the failure to recognize this inherent patriotism and to glorify it with responsibility that makes black markets. The restoration of the spirit of government of the people, for the people, and by the people alone can reduce the size of government. This America of ours will not in the end consent to government by decree, and unless government by the people is given greater voice, the same spirit that once moved in Massachusetts will surely move again.

Uncle Sam: No. 1 Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during a recent speech on the floor of the House I made the statement that Uncle Sam is now the world's No. 1 publisher and that our Government puts out a most amazing number of daily, weekly, semiweekly, monthly, and quarterly periodicals. Several days later I received a most unusual letter from Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information. Mr. Davis asked me for a list of the periodicals put out by Uncle Sam.

I do not know whether Mr. Davis expected me to come through with the list or not, but I did. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will ask unanimous consent that the only really comprehensive list of Government periodicals now in existence be printed in the RECORD. True, the Government Printing Office puts out a partial list of Government periodicals each month, but the list is about what you could expect from a Federal agency. Of course, bureaus are created and abolished so frequently in Washington that any list is subject to daily change.

This, in many respects, is a strange thing—that I, a Congressman, should have to make up a list of the Government periodicals published at the taxpayers' expense. In a way it proves that we Republicans are doing more than giving lip-service to the idea of economy in Government. But, strange as it may seem, no agency of the executive department has such a list. Mr. Davis, admittedly, has no such list, for he asked me to furnish him the information, although he has been O. W. I. Director at least 16 months and has had some thousands of employees to help him compile an even more comprehensive list than the one I will insert in the RECORD.

Augustus E. Giegengack, the Public Printer, who, according to law, is supposed to pass on all printing undertaken by any Federal agency, recently admitted before the Boren subcommittee investigating the newsprint shortage that he did not know of all the printing being done by Uncle Sam's various agencies. He said, as a matter of fact, that he "has been trying for years" to get that information. Mr. Giegengack did know, however, that in the last fiscal year, the Government agencies used 161,611 tons or 40 percent more paper than they had consumed in the previous fiscal year. At the same time private publishers have suffered a 15 percent cut in paper supply, are now faced with a 23 percent cut, and the Nation is engaged in another scrap paper salvage campaign.

THERE ARE MORE TO BE FOUND

I do not pose as an expert on Government periodicals, and my list is not to be taken as final. No doubt, there are dozens of periodicals not uncovered by my investigation. I have only a small staff, as does every Congressman, and I could not be expected to get up a list of periodicals that would be correct to the dotting of an i and the crossing of a t. That is Mr. Davis' job. Our Government is such a big one, with some 2,241 subdivisions today, that one poor Congressman cannot be expected to check on agencies strung from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Shangri La to Timbuktu. Yet, I repeat, this is a more comprehensive list than any agency of the Government can furnish you this afternoon—and I do not bar the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the O. W. I., or the Government Printing Office. No fact proves more clearly the need for coordination and new management in Washington than that the Government can put out untold hundreds of periodicals. The only purpose of many of them is to advertise the agency which puts them out and to drum up public and congressional support for a continuation of the respective agency's particular brand of alphabetical bureaucracy.

PURPOSE OF THIS DISCLOSURE

The printers and publishers of the Nation will be interested in this list, for they know how much money and time must go into these many periodicals. They will be able to spot the needed and unneeded publications. There is no need for me to go into detail on that. Some of these periodicals are obviously needed and are required by law. Others are not. I seek only to indicate the magnitude of this Government enterprise and to submit that it needs review from the standpoint of wartime value and legitimate Government activity.

Every editor will realize that behind all these hundreds of periodicals, there must necessarily be publicity men to write the copy, editors to check the copy, stenographers to type the copy, statisticians to get the facts to fit the "party line" and others to supervise the whole operation in each agency.

Heaven only knows how many thousands upon thousands of persons are employed in putting out all these various publications. Certainly, when a new administration takes office and checks to get even an approximate figure, the people will stand aghast at the money that has been thrown away on useless information that is nothing in the world, generally speaking, but cleverly designed propaganda to perpetuate the administration in office or to make over America into a state not unlike those against which our boys are fighting in Europe.

I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert this partial list of Government periodicals in the RECORD, emphasizing at the same time that it is the most comprehensive list of periodicals possible for me to compile in this Washington wonderland:

Totals of Government periodicals known to Congressman Marion T. Bennett

Dailies	9
Every other day	1
Weeklies	48
Semimonthly—biweekly	12
Monthly	241
Bimonthly	8
Quarterly	33
Semiannual	3
Annual	20
Biennial	2
Irregularly or seasonally	63
Three times per year	1
Total	441

Some U. S. Government periodicals

Periodical	Issuance
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	
The Dairy Situation	Weekly.
Cotton Literature	Monthly.
Crops and Markets	Do.
Journal of Agricultural Research	Semimonthly.
Clip Sheet	Weekly.
Consumers' Guide	Monthly.
Consumers' Market Service	Semimonthly.
Car Lot Shipments of Fruits and Vegetables.	Weekly.
Cold Storage Report	Monthly.
Cotton Market Review	Weekly.
Crops and Markets	Monthly.
Drive-In Receipts of Livestock	Do.
Grain Market Review	Weekly.
Honey Report	Semimonthly.
Livestock on Farms January 1	Annual.
Livestock, Meats and Wool	Weekly.
Marketing Activities	Monthly.
P and S Docket	Do.
Peanut Report	Weekly.
Receipts and Disposition of Livestock at Public Stockyards.	Monthly.
Weekly Review American Cotton Linters.	Weekly.
Agricultural Economic Literature	Monthly.
Agricultural Situation	Do.
Cotton Situation	Do.
Demand and Price Situation	Do.
Dairy Production	Do.
Farm Income Situation	Do.
Fats and Oils Situation	Do.
Feed Situation	Do.
Fruit Flashes	Weekly.
Fruit Situation	Monthly.
General Crop Report	Do.
Land Policy Review	Do.
Livestock Situation	Do.
Poultry and Egg Situation	Do.
Publications	Do.
Vegetable Situation	Do.
Wheat Situation	Do.
Wool Situation	Do.
Bangs Disease	Do.
Extension Animal Husbandman	Quarterly.
Summary of Bangs Disease Work in Cooperation with various States.	Monthly.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—CON.	
Summary of Tuberculosis Eradication in Cooperation with various States.	Monthly
Statement, Loans and Commodities Owned.	Quarterly.
Trade in Cotton Futures	Monthly.
Trade in Wool Top Futures	Do.
Trading in Grain Futures	Do.
Agriculture Decisions	Do.
Bibliography of Agriculture	Do.
Agricultural Finance Review	Do.
Agricultural Prices	Do.
Farm Credit Quarterly	Quarterly.
Monthly List of Publications	Monthly.
Livestock and Wool Situation	Do.
Dairy Herd Improvement Association Letter.	Do.
Entomology Current Literature	Do.
Insect Pest Survey	Do.
News Letter	Do.
Review of United States Patents Relating to Pest Control.	Do.
Current Literature in Agricultural Engineering.	Do.
List of Station Publications Received by O. E. S.	Do.
Experiment Station Record	Do.
Extension Service Review	Do.
Consumers' Market Service	Bimonthly.
Cooperative Saving with Federal Credit Unions.	Do.
Federal Credit Union Monthly	Monthly
News for Farmer Cooperatives	Do.
Report on Loans and Discounts	Semiannual.
Fire Control Notes	Quarterly.
Agriculture in the Americas	Monthly.
Foreign Agriculture	Do.
Foreign Crops and Markets	Weekly.
The Plant Disease Reporter	Semimonthly.
Plant Science Literature	Weekly.
Soil Conservation	
Soil Conservation Literature: Selected Current References.	Bimonthly.
Agricultural Library Notes	Monthly.
Rural Electrification News	Do.
Coal Consumers' Digest	Do.
Marketing and Transportation Situation.	Do.
The National Food Situation	Do.
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	
Animal and Vegetable Fats and Oils	Annual.
Asphalt Prepared Roofing	Monthly.
Automobiles	Do.
Automobile Financing	Do.
Boots, Shoes, and Slippers	Do.
Canned Food Stocks	Quarterly.
Consumption of Raw Cotton by Classes.	Monthly.
Cotton Consumed	Do.
Cottonseed	Do.
Edible Gelatin	Quarterly.
Employment Survey	Do.
Fats and Oils	Do.
Floor and Wall Tile	Monthly.
Galvanized Range Boilers	Do.
Knit Wool Gloves and Mittens	Do.
Linseed Oil Production	Quarterly.
Malleable Iron Castings	Monthly.
Mechanical Stokers	Do.
Men's, Youths', and Boys' Clothing	Weekly.
Methanol	Monthly.
Mortality Index	Weekly.
Motor Vehicle Accidents	Do.
Oil Burners	Monthly.
Paint, Varnish, Lacquer	Do.
Paperboard	Do.
Plastic Paints, etc	Do.
Catalog of Copyright Entries	Do.
Opinions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.	Irregular.
Climatological Data for Alaska, Hawaii and West Indies.	Monthly.
Comprehensive Export Control Schedules.	Irregular.
Climatological Data for the United States.	Monthly.
Porcelain Enameled Products	Do.
Pyroxylin-Coated Woven Cotton Fabrics.	Do.
Pulverizers	Do.
Retail Sales	Do.
Sales Finance Companies	Do.
Shingles	Do.
Shipment of Mining and Industrial Locomotives.	Quarterly.
Steel Barrels	Monthly.
Steel Boilers	Do.
Steel Castings	Do.
Steel Office Furniture	Do.
Structural Clay Products	Do.
Superphosphate	Do.
Underwear, Knit Cloth, Knit Fabric Gloves	Do.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—CON.	
Warm-Air Furnaces	Quarterly.
Wheat and Wheat Flour Stocks	Do.
Wheat Ground and Wheat-Milling Products.	Monthly.
Wool Consumption	Do.
Wool Machinery Activity Report	Do.
Air Navigation Radio Aids	Do.
Civil Aeronautics Journal	Semimonthly.
Chain Drug Store Sales	Monthly.
Chain Store and Mail Order Sales	Do.
Consumer Installment Cash Loans	Do.
Department Store Credit	Do.
Domestic Commerce Weekly	Weekly.
Exports and Imports	Monthly.
Foreign Commerce Weekly	Weekly.
Hardware and Allied Trades	Monthly.
Income Payments	Do.
Industry Survey	Do.
Industrial Reference Service	Irregular.
Lumber Demand and Supply	Quarterly.
Manufacturers' Inventories	Monthly.
New Passenger Automobiles	Do.
Retail Installment Credit	Do.
Survey of Current Business	Do.
Survey of Current Business	Weekly.
Tire Stocks	Monthly.
Journal of Research	Do.
News Bulletin of Paper Section	Do.
Weights and Measures	Irregular.
Classification of Patents Issued	Weekly.
List of Trade Mark Applications	Do.
Official Gazette of the United States Patent Office.	Do.
Monthly Weather Review	Monthly.
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION	
Minute by Minute News Service	Daily.
Operating Data from Monthly Reports of Telegraph and Cable Carriers.	Monthly.
Summary of Monthly Reports of Large Telephone Carriers in the United States.	Do.
FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY	
Federal Home Loan Bank Review	Do.
Mortgage Recording Letter	Do.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation Monthly Report.	Do.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation Quarterly Report.	Quarterly.
Insured Mortgage Portfolio	Do.
Newspaper Releases	Weekly.
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION	
Electric Power Statistics	Monthly.
National Electric Rate Book (with supplements).	Irregular.
Statistics of Electric Utilities	Annual.
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF	
Annual Report	Do.
Bank Debits (Debits to Deposit Accounts, Except Interbank Accounts).	Weekly
Do	Monthly.
Do	Annual.
Brokers Balances	Monthly.
Business Indexes	Do.
Changes in State Bank Membership	Irregular.
National Banks Granted Trust Powers.	Do.
Condition of Federal Reserve Banks.	Weekly.
Condition of Weekly Reporting Member Banks in Central Reserve Cities.	Do.
Condition of Weekly Reporting Member Banks in Leading Cities.	Do.
Department Store Inventories	Quarterly.
Department Store Sales	Weekly.
Do	Monthly.
Federal Reserve "Par List"	Annual.
Foreign Exchange Rates	Monthly.
Member Bank Call Report	Irregular.
Money Rates	Weekly.
National Summary of Business Conditions.	Monthly.
Net Contribution of the Federal Government to National Buying Power.	Do.
Weekly Review of Periodicals	Weekly.
Bulletin (12 districts)	Monthly (1 to each district).
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY	
Statistical Summary	Monthly.
Education for Victory	Biweekly.
Educational Directory	Annual.
Hospital News	Semimonthly.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—CON.	
Industrial Hygiene	Monthly.
Journal of the National Cancer Institute.	Bimonthly.
National Institute of Health Bulletins.	Irregular.
National Negro Health News	Quarterly.
Public Health Engineering Abstracts.	Monthly.
Public Health Reports	Weekly.
Venereal Diseases Information	Monthly.
Advance Tables	Do.
Employer Estimates of Labor Needs in Selected Defense Industries.	Irregular.
Employment Security Review	Monthly.
Farm Labor Market Conditions	Do.
Labor Market Developments	Do.
Labor Supply and Demand in Selected Defense Occupations.	Irregular.
Labor Supply Available at Public Employment Offices in Selected Defense Occupations.	Monthly.
Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Statistics: Employment and Wages of Covered Workers.	Annual.
Public Assistance	Monthly.
Social Security Yearbook	Annual.
Vocational Training Activities of Public Employment Offices.	Monthly.
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
Calendar of Hearings	Weekly.
Monthly Reproduction of Press Releases.	Do.
Monthly Summary of Work	Monthly.
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY	
Highways: Current Literature	Weekly.
Public Roads: A Journal of Highway Research.	Monthly.
Bibliography of Research Projects Reports.	Irregular.
Federal Works Programs and Public Assistance.	Monthly.
Index of Research Projects	Irregular.
Monthly Report of Unemployment	Monthly.
Report on Progress of the W. P. A. Program.	Annual.
Research Monographs	Irregular.
Special Reports	Do.
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE	
Monthly Catalog	Monthly.
Weekly List of Selected U. S. Government Publications.	Weekly.
Government Periodicals	Monthly.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	
Indians at Work	Do.
Bituminous Coal Tables	Annual.
Distribution of Coal Shipments	Monthly.
Preliminary Estimates of Production of Bituminous Coal.	Do.
Weekly Coal Reports	Weekly.
Coal-Mine Fatalities	Monthly.
Crude Refinery Report	Do.
Economic Paper	Irregular.
Foreign Minerals Quarterly	Quarterly.
Bureau of Mines Handbook	Irregular.
International Petroleum Trade	Monthly.
Iron and Steel Scrap, Monthly Stock Report.	Do.
Mineral Market Reports	Annual.
Mineral Trade Notes	Monthly.
Minerals Yearbook	Annual.
Monograph	Irregular.
Cement Statement	Monthly.
Coke Report	Do.
Indian Education	Irregular.
Report on Names by Board on Geographical Names.	Daily.
Natural Gasoline Report	Monthly.
Petroleum Forecast	Do.
Petroleum Statement	Do.
Anthracite and Beehive Coke	Do.
Quarterly Gypsum Report	Quarterly.
Report of Investigation	Irregular.
Schedule	Do.
Technical Paper	Do.
Weekly Anthracite and Beehive Coke Report.	Weekly.
Weekly Crude Oil Stock Report	Do.
Technical Memorandum	Irregular.
Fuel	Monthly.
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION	
Motor Carriers	Do.
Railroad Employees	Do.
Railroads	10 monthlies.
Do	2 quarterlies.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
Instruction to United States Attorneys, Marshals, Clerks and Commissioners.	Irregular.
Official Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States.	Do.
Register of the Department of Justice.	Biennial.
Decrees and Judgments in Anti-Trust Cases.	Irregular.
Federal Anti-Trust Laws. Supplement.	Do.
Regulations for the Preparation of Title Evidence in Land Acquisitions by the United States.	Do.
Justice Library Review	Bimonthly.
Federal Bureau of Investigation Annual Report.	Annual.
Uniform Crime Reports	Semiannual.
Compilation of Laws Relating to U. S. Prisoners, Prisons, Penitentiaries, Jails, etc.	Irregular.
Federal Probation	Quarterly.
Federal Offenders	Annual.
Rules & Regulations Governing the Paroling of U. S. Prisoners from U. S. Penitentiaries, National Training School.	Irregular.
Social Service Resource Director	Do.
Trends in Volume and Treatment of Federal Offenders.	Do.
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR	
Labor Information Review	Monthly.
Manpower Review	Do.
Average Hourly Earnings	Do.
Average Wholesale Prices and Index Number of Individual Commodities.	Do.
Building Construction	Do.
Building Permits in Principal Cities	Do.
Changes in Cost of Living	Do.
Do	Quarterly.
Civil Non-Agricultural Employment	Monthly.
Employment and Pay Rolls	Do.
Estimated Family Expenditures	Do.
Family Expenditures	Do.
Hours and Earnings of Factory Workers.	Do.
Index Numbers of Strategic and Critical Materials Week Ended.	Weekly.
Labor Information Bulletin	Monthly.
Strikes	Do.
Labor Turn-over	Do.
Labor Conditions in Latin America	Do.
Living Costs in Large Cities	Do.
Monthly Labor Review	Do.
Retail Cost of Food	Weekly.
Retail Prices	Monthly.
Wages and Hours of Labor in Selected Industries.	Do.
Wholesale Prices	Do.
Wholesale Prices for Week Ending	Weekly.
The Child	Monthly.
Defense of Children Series	Irregular.
Publications	Do.
Legislative Reports	Semimonthly.
Analysis of Minimum Wage Determinations.	Irregular.
Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, Rulings & Interpretations.	Do.
The Woman Worker	Bimonthly.
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS	
Catalog of Copyright Entries	Monthly.
List of Subject Headings, 3d ed., Additions and Changes.	Do.
Monthly Check List of State Publications.	Do.
Notes and Decisions on the Application of the Decimal Classification, 13th ed.	Quarterly.
Subject Headings, Fourth Edition Quarterly Supplements.	Do.
Digest of Public General Bills	Bimonthly.
Special Reports No. 1	Irregular.
State Law Digest Report No. 1	Do.
State Law Index	Biennial.
THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES	
Federal Register	Daily.
National Archives Accessions	Quarterly.
Preliminary Inventories	Irregular.
NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY	
Federal Home Loan Bank Review	Monthly.
Housing Authority Information	Do.
Housing Legal Digest	Do.
Public Housing Monthly	Do.
Insured Mortgage Portfolio	Quarterly.
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	
Monthly Summary	Monthly.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS. INFORMATION SERVICE	
Housing Program of the U. S. Government.	Irregular.
Information Handbook	Annual.
National Defense and Neutrality	Irregular.
U. S. Government Manual	3 times year.
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	
Victory	Weekly.
War and Business	Do.
War Program Report	Do.
PAN AMERICAN UNION	
Commercial Pan America	Monthly.
Education Series	Irregular.
Lectura	Monthly.
Pan American Book Shelf	Do.
Panorama	Do.
Points of View	Irregular.
Series on Cooperatives	Do.
PRICE ADMIN STRATION, OFFICE OF	
Employee Publication (Region 1)	Monthly.
Consumer Prices	Do.
Also publications in nine O. P. A. regional offices.	
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD	
Monthly Review	Do.
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION	
Brokers and Dealers	Semimonthly.
Corporate Reorganization	Irregular.
Official Summary of Security Transactions & Holdings.	Semimonthly.
Registration Record	Daily.
Statistical Series	Daily, weekly, monthly.
Trust Indenture Act of 1939	Irregular.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE	
Arbitration Series	Do.
Commercial Policy Series	Do.
Conference Series	Do.
Department of State Bulletin	Weekly.
Diplomatic List	Monthly.
European Series	Irregular
Executive Agreement Series	Do.
Far Eastern Series	Do.
Federal Laws	Do.
Foreign Consular Offices in United States.	Annual.
Foreign Relations of the United States.	Irregular.
Foreign Service List	Quarterly.
Immigration Series	Irregular.
Inter-American Series	Do.
Near Eastern Series	Do.
Passport Series	Do.
Publications of Department of State	Quarterly.
Register of Department of State	Annual.
Territorial Papers of the United States.	Irregular.
Treaties & Other International Acts of the U. S.	Do.
Treaty Series	Do.
TREASURY DEPARTMENT	
Bulletin of the Treasury Department	Monthly.
Daily Statement	Daily.
Marketable Securities	Monthly.
Statement on the Currency Situation	Do.
Internal Revenue Bulletin	Semimonthly.
Domestic Coinage Executed by Mints.	Monthly.
Minute Man	Do.
Values of Foreign Monetary Units	Quarterly.
Bank Statement	Semiannual.
Abstract Condition of National Banks.	Irregular.
Public Debt	Monthly.
Internal Revenue Collections	Do.
Internal Revenue Collections	Annual.
Statistic of Income	Do.
Tax-Paid Products	Monthly.
Circulation Statement of United States Money.	Do.
UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION	
Civil Employment and Pay Rolls in the Executive Branch of the United States Government.	Do.
Civil Service Acts and Rules, Statutes, Executive Orders and Regulations.	Irregular.

Some U. S. Government periodicals—Con.

Periodical	Issuance
UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—con.	
Civilian Employment in the Executive Branch of the United States Government by Department and Bureau.	Quarterly.
Condition of the Apportionment at Close of Business.	Semimonthly.
Employment Opportunities	Weekly.
OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION	
Summary of Press Releases	Daily.
Victory	Weekly.
U. S. A	Monthly.
Suggestions to Magazine Editors	Do.
U. S. Government Manual	Quarterly.
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE	
Comptroller General's Decisions	Monthly.
CONGRESS	
The Congressional Record	Daily.
OFFICE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS	
En Guardia (in Spanish)	Monthly.
Inter-American Economic News	Do.
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION	
The Labor Management News	Weekly.
Priorities	Monthly.
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT	
Schedule of Steamships Carrying Mails.	Do.
Postal Bulletin	Every other day.
Postal Guide	Monthly.
NAVY DEPARTMENT	
Naval Medical Bulletin	Bimonthly.
Pilot Charts	Monthly.
WAR DEPARTMENT	
Stars and Stripes	Daily.
Yank	Weekly.
List of Army Procurement Offices (Many other camp newspapers and Army newspapers not known to the compiler.)	Monthly.
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD	
Social Security Bulletin	Do.
Unemployment Compensation	Do.
UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION	
Safety Bulletin	Do.
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION	
Medical Bulletin of the Veterans' Administration.	Quarterly.
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES	
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.	Monthly.
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL	
Highway Research Abstracts	Do.

Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram which has been received from the Honorable Gus Hawkins, city commissioner of Jackson, Miss., in which he urges enactment

of the pending Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420:

JACKSON, MISS.

Am very much interested in passage of Lea bill. Understand this bill will be before Congress about November 15. If it meets with your approval I will appreciate your efforts in its passage.

GUS HAWKINS,
City Commissioner.

Governor Neely of West Virginia Urges Consideration of Post-War Aviation Problems Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to take this opportunity to include therein an extemporaneous address delivered by the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, Governor of West Virginia, while presiding at the opening of the second session of the National Aviation Planning Clinic in Oklahoma City on November 12.

The opposition in the matter of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, are recklessly suggesting that the legislation be postponed until after the soldiers return home from World War No. 2. I agree with Governor Neely when he suggests immediate and quick action in order that our sons, when they return from the war, will not be forced to say, "Dad, what have you fellows been doing while we won the war?"

Many of the Members are not aware that it took 3 years to pass the 1926 Civil Aviation Act and 2 years to pass the 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act. The present bill has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House for approximately 11 months. It seems logical to assume that it will probably take 2 years this time before legislation is enacted. In this connection I would like to point out that this length of time seems to be involved in spite of the fact that the pending bill (H. R. 3420) contains principles which the House has advocated and supported as far back as 17 years ago.

The war with Germany will be successfully terminated, in my judgment, some time in 1944. Immediately thereafter the combined air fleets of the United States and Great Britain will be turned against Japan. The war in the Orient should be over in 1945 or 1946. This should mean that our boys will be back from the aerial war field around 1947 or so. Even if the House should immediately start considering civil aviation it would probably be 1949 before a law could be passed. At that it would only be an authorization act and it would be 1950 before appropriations could be made. This would mean that our aircraft manufacturers would be forced to stop production for several years and be ruined, just as happened after the last war. The same situation would exist with respect to our aviation training schools.

Never again will Great Britain and America have a war that will permit them time to train and equip their forces. Those days are gone forever. America in peace must prepare for war, and it is equally important now that America in war prepare for peace.

The address of Governor Neely follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Aviation Clinic: My appreciation of your generosity in choosing me to preside over this important session is much greater than my power of expression. Therefore, please consider the trite verbal collocation "I thank you" raised to the *n*th power and sent as a swift-winged messenger of gratitude directly to your several hearts.

Let me unconditionally proclaim my unlimited admiration for Oklahoma City's progressive and untiring Chamber of Commerce, which has most generously contributed its fine mental ability, manpower, feminine captivation, and financial means to the success of this meeting. To me it is as pleasing as it is surprising to find a chamber of commerce devoting all its time, energy, and intelligence exclusively to the promotion of the general welfare, without attempting to dictate the political policies of its city, county, or State; and without a discernible shadow of a desire to harass by word or obstruct by deed any public official solely because of his inability to approve every opinion or espouse every cause that has received the chamber's blessing.

Let me also express my delight in paying a second visit to Oklahoma City—a magnificent municipal monument to American faith, hope, vision, and industry. Thirty-one years ago it was my privilege and pleasure to spend two days and a night in this city of notable achievement and charm. During the intervening years Oklahoma City has grown almost as miraculously as Jack's beanstalk in the fairy tale, which overnight became a fabric of root and leafy vine that rose from the "lowly earth to the vaulted sky," and there supported a fantastic world in which wonders as amazing as those of twentieth-century occasioned no surprise. Long live Oklahoma City and Oklahoma State, and may their famous men, like Governor Kerr, Elmer Thomas, "Josh" Lee, Lyle Boren, and Scott Ferris, and all their indomitable, enterprising, praiseworthy people continue to prosper, and without let or hindrance drink from the fountains of health and happiness—

"Till the sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the judgment book unfold."

Before delivering the session to those who will, in the order indicated in the program, address you, let me very respectfully voice my disagreement with some of the remarks that were made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan just before adjournment yesterday afternoon. Let me dissent to the opinion that this meeting has been "packed" for any special interest or that any sinister motive is actuating anyone who is participating in it. Furthermore, I must record my opposition to the suggestion that the solution of the important problems of aviation should be postponed until after we have won the war. If we ignore these problems until our boys come home, bringing with them the priceless heritage of security that they obtained for us with their toil and their blood, will they not say to us: "What did you do for the country while we were fighting to preserve the American way of life and establish lasting freedom, justice, and peace for all mankind?"

The intensive promotion of aviation is an imperative task and a pressing patriotic duty—the performance of which must not be stayed for the duration of the war, or imposed upon those who are already doing much more than their share. This task and this duty are ours. The place to begin to perform the one and discharge the other is here. The time to begin is now. Next month or next year some other country may, by its foresight and promptitude, have made unavailing a dilatory effort on our part to make the United States an air power so great that it cannot be surpassed in war or peace by any other nation in the world.

Aviation is the watchword of the hour that charms the ear, thrills the heart, and fires the imagination of all the thoughtful millions on the globe. Aviation is daily revolutionizing the world before our eyes. American cities, regardless of their present rank, will, if without adequate airports, during the next 20 years, become as unimportant as the crossroad towns of 1943.

My firm belief in the accuracy of this statement and the manifest difficulties of constructing landing fields in States in which the topography is similar to that of West Virginia impel me to take advantage of my momentary authority on the rostrum to invite all the members of the clinic who are "dwellers in the hills" to meet with me immediately after the final adjournment today, to the end that we may form an organization for mutual cooperation in the important matter of obtaining necessary Federal aid for indispensable airport construction in States in which nature has made locally prohibitive the cost of such an improvement.

For example, in West Virginia it would cost not less than $5,000,000 to construct an airfield as desirable as one that could be constructed for $50,000 on the level land of the western plains.

But, regardless of cost or toil or sacrifice, West Virginians are determined that their State shall have the airports it needs. West Virginians have determined to make their mountains like diminutive molehills and their hills like microscopic warts, if necessary, in order for them to be in the van of aviation's twentieth-century breath-taking procession.

We appeal to the great air-transportation companies, which are most capably represented here, for their moral and material support in this expensive enterprise. And we cordially invite the representatives of these companies to attend the proposed meeting of the ladies and gentlemen of the hills, and the invitation is also extended to any other members of the clinic who may be disposed to throw out a life line to those of us who are desperately struggling with the problem of surmounting the extraordinary obstacles that nature has interposed between us and the enjoyment of the coveted airports which we long have seen in our visions and dreams.

For your patient indulgence and complimentary attention I thank you again and again.

Ladies and gentlemen, it now affords me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you Mr. C. Edward Leasure, Chief of the Proceedings Division of the Civil Aeronautics Board of Washington. [Applause.]

Black and White Blood Totem and Taboo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, doctor friends of mine told me a year or so ago that the blood of a Negro has the same

constituents as that of any Aryan and that all the controversy with respect to the segregation of plasma was much ado about nothing and had no pathological basis, since the race of the donor had nothing to do with the blood type into which it might fall.

So I was interested in a recent article by Dorothy Thompson on this subject. Under leave heretofore granted, I am including the article herewith:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Spokesmen for colored Americans have protested the policy of keeping Negro and white plasma in two blood banks for the separate treatment of Negro and white wounded needing transfusions.

The Negroes regard it as another sign of racial discrimination.

Officials of the American Red Cross know that the controversy plays in a realm of totem and taboo, that has nothing to do with pathology.

The constituents of a Negro's blood are exactly the same as Winston Churchill's or Adolf Hitler's.

There are four types of blood, as discovered and classified by medical research. (Plasma is derived from all four types equally.) Whole blood for transfusion purposes must be labeled according to type. But the race of the donor has nothing to do with the blood type into which he may fall.

If a blond white man of Norwegian ancestry should be suffering from acute hemorrhage and it were necessary to pick off the street a man willing to shed his blood to save another's life, the right blood type might be found in a Galatian Jew, a south Slav, a Japanese, or a Negro, while another Norwegian might have to be rejected.

Thus the Scriptures are almost but not quite scientifically correct when they say that "The Lord hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth." The Lord hath made of four bloods all the nations of the earth, and has diffused the four so thoroughly that two cousins may belong to different types, and a Jew and Julius Streicher to the same.

PREJUDICE EXISTS

Why, then, this prejudice of men against having their lives saved by plasma or blood from the veins of men of another color? For that prejudice exists.

I think the reason goes back to the unprecise use of words. A white boy resisting a transfusion of "colored" plasma, believes that it will make him partly Negro. And everything that we say on the subject of blood confirms him in this pure superstition.

We say, "I am of pure Anglo-Saxon blood."

Or, of a high-bred horse, "blooded mare."

Or of an aristocrat, "blue blood."

Or "blood will tell."

Or "blood is thicker than water."

These, and a thousand other phrases, confirm the human race in the superstition that racial and other inherited characteristics are transmitted in the blood stream. It is astonishing to me that this superstition remains even when serum from horses, cows, or sheep is put into human veins. No one seems to fear his children will walk on four legs or moo or neigh.

MEN WANT TO RETAIN RACE

If racial characteristics were carried by the blood stream, the resistance of one race of men to having transfusions of the blood or plasma of other races would probably be insuperable. For, although they have no control over it in the first place, most men do not desire to change their race, unless they belong to one which suffers peculiar disadvantages. If a man's visible racial characteristics make it difficult for him to find work or expose him to humiliations, he may desire to escape from his race by obliterating its more obvious characteristics. Among many American Negroes it is a social distinction to be light colored for the obvious reason that they thereby more closely approach the dominant white world. In a great and prosperous African civilization exactly the reverse would probably be true.

Orientals, who live largely on vegetarian diets, find that the carnivorous westerners have a horrible smell, "like cadavers." The Irishman who brags of the hair on his chest as a sign of virility is not comprehensible to a Chinese or a Japanese, who certainly belong to fecund races, but find the hairyness of Nordic man, closely akin to the hairyness of the baboon.

But no amount of pumping other people's blood into men's veins affects their color, hair, stature, or any other racial characteristics of themselves or progeny.

CHROMOSOMES KEY TO RACE

Racial characteristics are transmitted through the chromosomes. A person is determined as colored or white, the moment he is conceived and the blood stream has nothing to do with it.

If, for centuries, people had been saying, "I am of pure Anglo-Saxon chromosomes," the statement would certainly be untrue, considering the endless mixture, not of blood, but of sexes, but the idea would be correct.

If we are going to go on talking about our blood and speaking precisely, we'll have to get used to describing ourselves as types O, A, B or AD, none of which is anything to brag about. All four include geniuses and morons, yellows, browns, whites, and blacks. But considering how long it takes a superstition to die, I would say to my Negro friends: Stop bothering about the blood banks. It's a silly controversy, and not worth a campaign. Since your blood is of the same physiological constituency as everyone else's, your argument contributes to scientific precision. But, you don't win any victory for your race by winning the argument. Race and blood are two different matters.

Aircraft Manufacturers Urge Enactment of Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the aircraft manufacturers of this country, realizing the need for action now in connection with our post-war program for civil aviation, are deeply interested in the pending Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, and urge its early enactment. In this connection, I would like to include in my remarks the following telegrams which have been received from some of our outstanding manufacturers:

EVANSVILLE, IND., *November 9, 1943.*

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly endorse and urge the passage of H. R. 3420.

REPUBLIC AVIATION CORPORATION,
MUNDY I. PEALE, *Vice President,*
Indiana Division.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *November 10, 1943.*

Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe the legislation affecting postwar aviation which you are sponsoring will have a beneficial result and we are in favor of its enactment.

CONSOLIDATED VULTEE AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
H. WOODHEAD, *President.*

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *November 11, 1943.*

Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The principal provisions of your bill, H. R. 3420, as reported by the committee, are constructive, will help development of all phases of aviation in the days to come, and have my support.

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO., INC.,
DONALD W. DOUGLAS, *President,*
Santa Monica, Calif.

FARMINGDALE, N. Y., *November 9, 1943.*

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily endorse and urge prompt passage of H. R. 3420.

REPUBLIC AVIATION CORPORATION,
ALFRED MARCHEV, *President.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 9, 1943.*

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The aircraft industry of the Nation, including both transportation and manufacturing branches, look to H. R. 3420 as the sound and constructive legislative approach to our future problems in serving the Nation. We endorse the measure and urge prompt action by Congress to give it favorable consideration in the interests of properly controlled expansion of America's airborne commerce.

KELLETT AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
WILLIAM L. WILSON,
Assistant to the President.

Demobilization and Surplus War Property Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer for the RECORD comments that continue to come in to me in reference to H. R. 3200, introduced September 14, 1943, the bill known as Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act, which I introduced on September 14. A few excerpts follow:

I was very glad to note the news item in the Baltimore Sunday Sun stating that you are recognizing that even under the conditions which may face us in the post-war period, the destruction of useful goods and materials represents a waste and cannot in the long run be otherwise than harmful. Remembering the pressures that were brought to bear at the end of the last war, and knowing that you will have similar difficulties this time, I want to wish you success in your efforts to prevent waste. (Adrian Hughes,

director of research, The Baltimore Transit Co., Baltimore, Md.)

My curiosity is aroused as to what type of legislation is proposed concerning the "use of surplus war property to encourage the establishment of small business enterprises." Is it proposed that Government agencies be set up from which war veterans may purchase or lease surplus war property such as office equipment, vehicles, and perhaps even small former war production plants? Will any Government credit facilities be extended to the qualified war veteran who endeavors to enter into his own small business? In particular, I have in mind a credit arrangement whereby the Government would temporarily finance an enterprise in an amount equal to the veteran's personal investment of between $5.000 and $10,000. (Kenneth N. Dellamater, first lieutenant, Air Corps, north Africa.)

Have been reading with interest article in Army and Navy Journal of bills to be presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means. Point 9; bonds being increased in maturity and redemption value when used to apply on purchase of farms. I think a fine bill, but why apply only to farms? Why not homes also? I imagine there are many couples like my husband and me who are planning a small home after the war. We can't run a farm, but plan to have enough acreage to grow our own foodstuff, because I think the food problem is going to be serious, and everything that can be done should be done, although you can only raise enough for your own family.

My husband is overseas and I'm in the Navy—releasing a man for sea duty—and I'm sure all of us service people would buy more bonds with every spare penny we had if we knew we could have bonds mature and buy our home. (Seaman Second Class Eleanor Byron, Naval Air Station, Parachute School, Lakehurst, N. J.)

OFFICIAL OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SAYS FARM PLAN SOUND

Your advocacy of a plan to encourage the acquisition of small farms by veterans can be proved economically sound by a mass of statistics which I have taken from the 1940 census. The continued decline of agricultural population is, to my mind, one of the serious developments of this country. I think you would be doing the country a service if you would help make it conscious of how this declining capacity of farms to absorb workers will contribute to the danger of excessive unemployment in the cities after the war. (Frank R. Wilson, assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce.)

After the former World War, I was a party to the purchase of more than a million dollars worth of property our Government had sold to France and which, in turn, France sold to us at less than 10 cents on the dollar, and we brought to this country and sold at 25 cents on the dollar. I know the havoc it created for a short while in some of the industries concerned. The billions of supplies, machinery, etc., for sale after this conflict will be a catastrophe if not handled differently.

The suggestion occurs to me that every governmental agency be prohibited the privilege of selling any item for less than 75 percent of its cost to the Government for the first year; 50 percent for the second, and 25 percent for the third. After the third year it may be sold at what it will bring. This will give industry a chance to come back, and will give to the Government a more respectable return for money spent. It is, of course, conceivable that a good deal of machines and materials would not be worth 75 percent of their cost, but they would not materially depreciate in the year they would have to be held and would then be worth 60 percent. But, perhaps more important, is the protection industry should have, and a known formula of disposal. I hope very much the several billions of materials now in sight may not have the proportionate effect the million I helped to distribute had. (From Pennsylvania.)

Your No. 4, "Compulsory Employment" is a beauty. It is more important than all the rest combined; please don't back down on it. (Henry J. Rohlfing, Hoboken, N. J.)

There will be millions of dollars of surplus Government equipment after the war. There will be millions of dollars of surplus equipment, from air conditioning units to restaurant fixtures—the best money can buy and almost infinite in variety—that would go a long way toward establishing mustered out servicemen in enterprises of their own.

There will be great resentment, and justly so, if this equipment is sold at ridiculously low prices to a few wealthy and powerful individuals and corporations who would then proceed to realize huge profits at the expense of men who have given everything, from years of their lives to their limbs or health, to protect the freedom of their country. * * * (Pvt. (1st cl.) Troy A. Womack, Childress, Tex.)

A good start has been made toward the handling of a very important problem. The problem is not only of interest to small business people such as automobile dealers, but, also, of great interest to the general public, who, in the final analysis, must foot the bill. (David E. Castles, president, National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C.)

Asks Discussion of Sovereignty Scope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, with enclosed editorial, and my reply thereto:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 18, 1943.*

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: I have just received a letter from Mr. George N. Peek asking me to send you a copy of a letter of mine published in the Hartford Daily Courant of October 26. You will find it enclosed.

I wrote this before the announcement of the Moscow agreement was published, but I think the principles stated in my communication are as pertinent now as before.

The international organization agreed upon by the three powers has still to be defined. Is it to be simply a revival of the old League of Nations? Is it to be a super world government? Is it to be a new sovereignty, with power to coerce constituent nations? How is its governing body to be chosen? Is it to possess an independent army and navy? How is it to be financed? Is it to be operated on a democratic basis?

The answers to all of these questions have been studiously avoided.

For this reason it seems to me that an understanding of the true meaning of sovereignty in its relation to individuals and our own country is highly important.

Please pardon me for trespassing on your time

Very sincerely yours,

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

[From the Hartford Courant of October 26, 1943]

ASKS DISCUSSION OF SOVEREIGNTY SCOPE

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

Mr. Sumner Welles, in his recent address before the Foreign Policy Association, said: "I can see no advantage to be gained at this moment by any general and theoretical discussion of the advantages or disadvantages obtaining to the United States by the limitations upon its sovereignty which it might undergo were it to participate in an international organization" (New York Times, October 17, 1943).

This seems to me to be a mistaken view. A clear grasp of the scope and meaning of sovereignty, as the term is applied in the United States, would certainly obviate many misunderstandings in current discussions of international post-war collaboration.

To be sure, the doctrine of sovereignty is a comparatively modern invention. It is purely theoretical. But it is none the less useful in explaining the source of public authority and the citizen's relation to his own government.

The framers of America's organic laws assumed that there must be a suprema potestas or supreme power in every civilized state, lodged in that ultimate authority which had organized the state, which could alter its form and fix the duties of its public officials. They assumed this supreme power belonged exclusively to the people. They called it sovereignty.

James Wilson, in the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention of 1788, said: "As our constitutions are superior to our legislatures, so the people are superior to our constitutions" (Elliot's Debates (1861), vol. II, p. 432). He was, of course, referring to the constitutions of the several States. But the same principle applies to the National Constitution.

SOVEREIGNTY DIVISIBLE

Since the people are sovereign, so it was argued, they may do with sovereignty as they please. We chose to treat it as divisible. And so, when independence was declared, the people in each colony created a republican government for their own protection and convenience, to which they gave only part of their sovereignty. That part which they kept for themselves is embodied in their State's Bill of Rights. It comprises the individual's natural and inalienable rights.

The theory which guided them is thus described in the General Advertiser of January 26, 1795: "Restraint from the commission of injuries, being necessary for the preservation of individual safety, forms one of the fundamental objects of the social state. Personal security, protection from violence, and enjoyment of civil rights are claims of the citizens which society is obligated to guarantee. To give efficacy to these rights, society is vested with adequate powers, composed of an aggregation of the rights surrendered by individuals for the safety and preservation of the residuum. These powers constitute the sovereignty of a State."

When the Federal Constitution was adopted, the people in each State gave a part of their State sovereignty to the United States and the aggregation of powers thus delegated constitutes the sovereignty of the United States.

Among the sovereign powers given to the National Government is that of making treaties. But treaties, like laws, must conform to the Constitution itself. They cannot enlarge or diminish the powers conferred by the people on their government.

MR. WELLES CALLED MISTAKEN

When a nation contracts with another nation or group of nations to do or refrain from doing certain things, it is exercising one of its sovereign powers. It is not limiting its sovereignty. Hence it is a mistake to say, as Mr. Welles does, that American history is replete with instances in which we have agreed to limit our sovereignty by treaty.

The Federal Government has unquestionable authority to enter into treaties providing for post-war collaborations with other governments, and for purposes which we hope will add to our own security or promote the peace of the world—and do this without parting with any of our sovereignty. Collaboration of this kind is, I think, approved by most Americans.

What many of us fear is that we may be induced to join with other nations in creating a world sovereignty with authority superior to our own—a sovereignty with power to coerce us.

The plans for world organization proposed by Clarence Streit, Governor Stassen, Ely Culbertson, Robert Lee Humber, and even Senator Ball's resolution, each contemplate a new sovereignty clad with coercive powers. This is why so many persons are anxious for a more specific definition of the international organization approved in general terms by the Fulbright resolution and other pronouncements similar to it, and why the Connally resolution appears to be preferable to any other.

If the proposed international body be not given coercive powers, there will be no infringement of American sovereignty. But it will be argued that if such world organization lacks sovereign powers it will be simply a league of friendship, as impotent as the American Government was under the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, concerning which, John Jay said:

"They may resolve, but they cannot execute, either with dispatch or with secrecy. In short, they may consult and deliberate, and recommend, and make requisitions, and they who please may regard them." (Correspondence and Public Papers, John Jay, vol. III, p. 300.)

MUST AMEND CONSTITUTION

Yet the fact is, not a single line in the Constitution of the United States authorizes the making of a treaty that would commit us to entry into a world government possessed of higher authority than our own. Neither the executive nor the legislative branches, acting separately or together, can abridge or enlarge the citizen's allegiance to his State or to the United States. No government power yet exists to impose upon us a duty of allegiance to any new and alien sovereign. This is why I think it of vital importance to discuss the meaning of sovereignty now.

If we, the people of the United States, as sovereigns wish to take part in the creation of a new world sovereignty, we have a right to do so. But it must be done by the method prescribed for such fundamental changes in our institutions. The Constitution of the United States must itself first be amended to authorize the surrender of a part of our sovereignty.

The debates which would attend the ratification or rejection of such an amendment would, I think, give us a clearer understanding of what sovereignty means to us both individually and collectively.

ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON.

NEW CANAAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1943.

MR. ARCHIBALD E. STEVENSON,
New York City.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I have your letter of November 18 enclosing your article appearing in the Hartford Daily Courant of October 26. I am taking the privilege of inserting both your letter and the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I agree with you that the answers to the questions propounded in the third paragraph of your letter have been studiously avoided.

Before this letter reaches you, you will probably have read carefully Secretary Hull's address to the joint session of Congress yesterday afternoon. The morning's Washington Post carries the front page headline, "Hull implies Moscow Pact ends need for alliances. Secretary sees no more use for spheres of influence or balance of power." If anything this interpretation, which I think was justified, only adds to the confusion of thought on the whole subject.

Thanking you for your letter and enclosure, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROY O. WOODRUFF.

Appearance of Cabinet Officers Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much comment recently on the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to bring into closer relationship the legislative and executive departments of government. The appearance yesterday of Secretary Hull has emphasized how effectively this plan might be used.

Two recent editorials in Washington papers have thoroughly dealt with this subject. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these editorials:

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 17, 1943]

A SOUND IDEA

Secretary Hull's decision to appear tomorrow before an informal joint session of Congress sets a new precedent for Cabinet officers and as such may lend impetus to the efforts of many serious-minded Americans to create a better and more effective liaison system between the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

One such effort is that being made by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, to have heads of departments and independent agencies appear before the House, once a week or once every 2 weeks, to answer questions put to them by the Members. To this end, Mr. KEFAUVER has introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House to permit that kind of procedure and to set up certain regulations to govern it. For instance, the question period would be limited to 2 hours and there would be specific committee controls designed to keep it from getting out of hand or running off on nongermane tangents.

Whatever may be the weaknesses of this proposal, there can be no doubt that it is fundamentally sound and that the objective it seeks to attain is eminently desirable. What it aims at is simply to bridge the gulf that all too often puts the legislative and executive branches at odds when they should be seeing eye to eye or working in a reasonably cooperative manner. It is true, of course, that the Constitution has wisely established these branches, along with the judiciary, as separate organs of the Government, neither of which is to encroach upon the province of the other. But as Mr. KEFAUVER points out, and as many others before him have pointed out, this does not mean that the three are sealed off from each other. For as coordinates, they must work together; otherwise, our federal system limps and the Nation suffers.

In arguing for his little-publicized proposal, Mr. KEFAUVER emphasizes that the idea behind it is not new but is in fact almost as old as the Republic. Something like it was advocated in the House in 1864, and in the Senate in 1881, and by President Taft in 1913, and by many others, including President Wilson, since then. If properly put into effect—and Mr. KEFAUVER does not claim that his suggested mechanism is the best one—it would certainly encourage a more wholesome relationship between Congress and the Executive, leading to a great degree of mutual understanding.

If during the past 10 or 15 years, for example, there had been a better liaison between the State Department and the Senate and House, would the war have come upon us with such shocking surprise? We can only speculate over the answer, but there is more than a little reason to believe that things would have been better if a system along the lines of that proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER had been a routine and long-standing part of our system of government.

[From the Washington Post of November 18, 1943]

BETTER TEAMWORK

In a formal sense the Secretary of State in consenting to address Congress today on the work he accomplished in Moscow is not establishing a precedent. In our history several distinguished members of the President's Cabinet have appeared before Congress. However, Mr. Hull's predecessors have spoken in Congress on ceremonial rather than on business occasions. Ever since the House declined to allow Alexander Hamilton to make his historic report on public credit in person, Congress has been content with reports from Cabinet officers in writing. Thus Mr. Hull is really breaking new ice in addressing the Members of Congress on a diplomatic matter of high moment which has not yet come to full fruition.

The precedent is altogether to be welcomed. It has long been the complaint that members of Congress are kept too much in the dark on the doings of the Executive. This newspaper has itself expressed the complaint as injurious to good government. After all, the Senate is expected to ratify the work of the Executive when that work is consummated in treaties with foreign nations. Logically, therefore, a state of confidential relationship should exist beween the President and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. If it is impossible to keep the Senators apprised of the progress of treaty making, at least they should be equipped with relevant data with which to come to intelligent conclusions on the subject matter of treaties. And what applies to foreign relations applies equally to domestic affairs. It is high time that an effort were made on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue to develop a liaison which would oil a system of government made cumbersome only by the addiction to conflict on the part of both President and Congress.

For the weakness of this liaison is not entirely the fault of a jealous Executive, as is sometimes represented; Congress itself is also to blame. No doubt succeeding Presidents would have followed George Washington's example and taken counsel with the Senate if the Senate had been more circumspect

with George Washington. As every schoolboy knows, the Senate gratuitously put Washington into a rage over the Jay Treaty. Congress could have had Secretary Hamilton's appearance for the asking. In this case the House was afraid of the redoubtable Secretary's powers as an expositor and a debater, and feared the result in Executive encroachment. This has led to a curious paradox. Congress has never ceased to complain about being kept uninformed, yet it has resisted several efforts to provide opportunities for members of the President's Cabinet to appear before Congress, apparently out of an instinctive apprehension of loss of legislative influence.

Now Congress is being given another chance to promote oral intercommunication simultaneously with Mr. Hull's appearance. The chance is provided by a bill submitted by Representative KEFAUVER. Under the Kefauver plan the House rules would be amended to provide for a "question period" for heads of departments and independent agencies. We find nothing but merit in the proposal. There may be some objection that a "question period" would be the opening wedge to transform our Presidential system into a parliamentary system on the British model. But only the most hidebound legislator could enter such an objection. It was not the intent of the founding fathers when they set up our system of the separation of powers to keep the Executive and legislature in watertight compartments. On the contrary, there was the expectation that the two branches would develop consultation.

Indeed, as far back as 1789, when the Treasury Department was established, provision was made for oral reports to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury. As we have already said, it was only a fear of Hamiltonian ratiocination that set the precedent of written reports. Accordingly, the precisians of constitutionalism need have no fear that the Kefauver proposal would introduce any alien usage into our Government system. His plan would do just the opposite—it would restore a usage which is necessary on grounds of elementary common sense. Consultation with executive officers would do more to educate Congress and the Nation than any other proposal we can think of. It would thus make for good as well as efficient government.

Missouri River Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 8, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address by Col. Miles Reber, C. E., division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., at the National Reclamation Association meeting, Denver, Colo., October 29, 1943. The address deals with a study made by direction of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

Colonel Reber's address follows:

In coming before the National Reclamation Association today, I am doubly humble. Sensible of the great compliment implied in an opportunity to address such a gathering as this, I also hold in deepest respect the responsibility of occupying the place on your program originally assigned to the Chief of Engineers.

General Reybold had looked forward for some time to the privilege of addressing your association again. An overseas trip necessitated a last-minute change in his plans, and he asked me to express his deep regret that this military duty prevents his being with you today. Although the General had prepared his message to this association, let me say specifically at this point that I am not attempting to deliver that address. For what I shall have to say, I must admit and am glad to take full responsibility.

For many years I have been intensely interested and engaged in work closely allied with your association's principal objective. My appointment as Division Engineer for the Missouri River Division brings me in closer proximity to thi great area and increases my responsibility in our common aims. I have attended your constructive meetings in the past and welcome this opportunity to be with you again.

MUST BE READY FOR PEACE

We meet here in the midst of the greatest war mankind has known in its more than 5,000 years of recorded history. The world is passing through a crisis in which we are evaluating, with an intensified judgment, the fruits of our peacetime endeavors—interpreting them in their relationship to our primary objective of winning the war. To the end of total victory we, as a nation, are wholly committed; to that end, as individual Americans, our fullest efforts and our very lives are consecrated.

Yet, even as we prosecute the war with all our strength and all our soul and all our mind, we must plan for the years to follow the inevitable victory. To wait until war's end is to wait too long. We do not know when the last battle will be fought nor where the peace will be signed. But we must be ready for that great day. You have all heard over and over again the admonition that to win the war we must also be prepared to win the peace. Do not let the triteness of that phrase distract you from its utter truth. And the responsibility for that preparedness rests upon all of us.

Looking to the future, we must search out the opportunities for development and progress, both human and material, and plan to organize them for the joint purpose of maximum productivity and a fair distribution of benefits. Foremost among these resources are our streams and rivers, now only partially developed and utilized.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, or play so small a part in the industrial life of the nations as those of the United States. In view of the use of rivers elsewhere, the failure to use our own is astonishing, and no thoughtful man can believe it will last."

In the intervening years since that pointed and well-justified comment, the improvements accomplished, while important, perhaps, in the eyes of this generation, have but scratched the surface of the possibilities awaiting fuller development. Much has been done, true, but much more remains to be done.

Yet, to our credit let it be said that years of surveys and studies by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies, Federal and State, have resulted in the accumulation in factual reports of more detailed information than is available to any nation in the world on its respective water resources.

MORE THAN 200 SURVEYS MADE

Since Congress in January 1927 authorized and directed the Secretary of War to make surveys of the navigable rivers of the United States and their tributaries, with a view to their most effective improvement for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and the development of power, reports have been prepared by my Department on more than 200 rivers. And continuing reviews, in strict compliance with congressional directives, have kept these reports up to date.

On the program of the Corps of Engineers, as established by Congress, the Western States are well represented in authorization, planning, and in construction of projects for flood control and multiple-purpose utilization of water.

Included in the existing authorizations are:

A comprehensive plan of reservoirs and channel improvements for the development of the Willamette River Basin in Oregon for flood control, navigation, conservation, stream-flow regulation, hydroelectric power, and other beneficial water uses;

A series of levees along the Columbia River and its tributaries in Washington and Oregon for the protection of valuable agricultural areas.

A comprehensive system of retarding basins, and channel improvements for flood protection of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County, Calif.

A system of flood control reservoirs in the Santa Ana River and adjacent areas for the protection of Orange County, Calif.

A system of levees, bypasses, and channel improvements in the lower Sacramento River Basin. Calif., for the protection of the highly productive agricultural lands and important transportation facilities in that area; and this system is carefully coordinated with the great Shasta Dam.

Comprehensive plans for reservoirs and protective works for flood control, water conservation, power, and other uses in the Missouri, Arkansas, and Red River Systems;

And reservoirs on Cherry Creek, Colo., for the protection of the city of Denver and for water conservation. That's quite a project, too. I saw the sites yesterday, and I sincerely hope to see structures in the area in the not too distant future.

Of this extensive program the Army engineers have already completed 10 dams, levees at more than 50 localities, and about 55 miles of improved channels. And we will continue that program to completion as soon as world conditions permit.

In accordance with authorization by Congress, the Corps of Engineers is also making examinations and surveys of most of the large river basins and many of the smaller basins throughout the Western States.

Advance planning activities include studies of such important basins as those of the Gila River in Arizona and New Mexico; streams draining into the Great Salt Basin in Utah and Nevada; the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Calif., the Santa Ana River, Calif.; the Rio Grande in New Mexico; the Snake River in Oregon and Idaho; and the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington. These surveys are being carefully correlated with the other agencies authorized to deal with the use of water in this great part of our country.

At this point on behalf of the Chief of Engineers and of the Corps of Engineers, I should like to express the sincere appreciation for the splendid cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation in our studies of the great western area. I am sure that this cooperation will improve and increase as we go along and both of us learn more about our respective fields of endeavor.

As division engineer of the Missouri River division, I have a particular interest in the comprehensive plan for the development of the vast region of the Missouri Valley as conceived and prepared by my predecessor, Col. Lewis A. Pick.

THE MISSOURI DUAL PROBLEM

That plan, designed to conquer drought and flood, the age-old enemies of man, in that area of over half a million square miles, provides direct benefits and additional opportunities for eleven and a half million people, and creates new national wealth for everyone to share. The report was submitted to the Chief of Engineers in Washington early in August of this year. It is now receiving the final review of the other Federal agencies responsible for various phases of water development under existing law, prior to its transmission to Congress.

The Missouri River Valley is one of the very few major basins of this country where comprehensive development and water utilization have progressed little beyond the planning stage. Yet, I know of no comparable area where money wisely spent can bring more commensurate returns in the greatest good for the greatest number.

In the upper reaches of the Missouri and its tributaries, a decade of drought during the thirties destroyed crops and livestock, and decreased populations.

In the lower reaches of the river, especially from Sioux City, Iowa, to the confluence with the Mississippi just above St. Louis, there are many thousands of acres subject to inundation by major floods. Much of this land is the most fertile and productive in the world.

This year no section of the 2,500-mile Missouri escaped the curse of floods. Beginning in March and extending until late in June, three disastrous waves of water inflicted tragic hardships on the people and worked incalculable damage to commercial and industrial activities directly connected with the war effort.

A million acres were flooded along the main stem of the Missouri, and an additional million were inundated on the tributaries. Tons and tons of potential food for our soldiers, ourselves, and our allies were destroyed. Rail, air, and highway transportation needed to speed vital war matériel were disrupted. Factory production was impeded. Direct and calculable damages caused by these floods in this year alone on the main stem and tributaries are now estimated to total $50,000,000.

Such recurring material losses and human hardships can and must be stopped. It is engineeringly feasible and economically necessary.

Briefly, the report of the Corps of Engineers on the over-all development of the Missouri River proposes the completion—as soon as existing and necessary limitations on public works are lifted—of the presently authorized reservoirs in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, and the construction of additional reservoirs, including a series of multiple-purpose dams in the upper river and on its major tributaries above Sioux City, Iowa. It proposes also a series of levees and appurtenant works along the main stem from Sioux City to the mouth to protect cities and industrial and agricultural areas against floods in the regions where reservoir control is not practicable.

It has been estimated that in the period from 1890 to 1942 a billion and a quarter acre-feet of water was the potential inflow into a comprehensive system of multiple-purpose reservoirs in the upper Missouri Basin—an average of more than 23,000,000 acre-feet a year.

The broad program outlined in Colonel Pick's report proposes approximately 73,000,000 acre-feet of storage in the major reservoirs in the basin. This storage is well apportioned among the essential items of flood control, reclamation, navigation, and power.

This system will hold and conserve for beneficial use the excess waters from snow and ice run-off in the upper regions, the cause of the early spring floods. It will impound and control the excess waters from the later spring rainfall in the tributary basins of the lower valley, which in this and in other years caused many millions of dollars of damage. In other words, the proposed program will remove once and for all the fear of floods that for many years has been a handicap, in fact a definite deterrent to the industrial, civic, and agricultural development of the Missouri Valley.

IRRIGATION'S PLACE IN PROGRAM

Irrigation has its important role in this program. A very vital role. The plan for each multiple-purpose project will be worked out in close collaboration with the water-using agencies concerned. As it is entirely feasible to provide water in these reservoirs for irrigation the amount of land that may be irrigated by this storage can be definitely determined by the Bureau of Reclamation and put to most advantageous use. Ample food is an essence of peace as well as a mighty weapon of war.

The power potentialities of this great river will likewise be determined in collaboration with the Federal Power Commission. The plan as contained in Colonel Pick's report is frankly a framework, the details of which must be filled in by the coordinated efforts of all Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with the use of the water resources of this basin. Our common objective should be and is gain to mankind over the entire valley.

While the preparation of this plan was completed in the short space of 3 months, from May 13, 1943—when the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives requested the Corps of Engineers to review previous reports on the Missouri River—this report represents the sum total of engineering study and experience of many years. The accumulated data of previous thorough surveys were immediately available for correlation and evaluation by Colonel Pick when he set out to prepare his report and to develop a comprehensive framework for the Missouri.

As I have said, the over-all development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley is of immediate and particular interest to me personally, not only because of my assignment to that territory but also because of my belief in the coordinated, intelligent, and cooperative effort of all interested agencies. I also believe that this is an outstanding illustration of the fact that America's greatest peacetime opportunities lie not with the past but in the future. There are still frontiers in this great country of ours. All they need is the practical and courageous approach that will assure the better use of our agricultural lands, the better utilization of our water resources, and the best coordinated efforts of those agencies—engineers, reclamation, agriculture, power, and others, State and local—which are expert in their respective fields of progressive development.

Here we meet to discuss the good works of peace for the benefit of man in the midst of a war, an interruption caused by three venomous vandals bent on wartime works for the detriment and enslavement of man. Attention to the defeat of one of the two remaining vandals has at the last minute even deprived us of the fellowship and counsel of the Chief of Engineers. But he will be back. And soon, too, I am sure.

COALITION OF EFFORT NEEDED

From the beginning, we have been fighting a coalition war against the Axis. With 10 years of direct preparation and a seemingly perfect coordination finely timed to the stab-in-the-back of France by Mussolini, and Tojo's thrust at Pearl Harbor, the Axis was positive that it would overrun the smaller nations and defeat in detail Britain, Russia, China, and the United States.

For the first time in history, it looked as if success would attend these despicable ambitions and that world-shaking conquests would ensue.

China, isolated, unequipped, hung on only by her fingernails. Britain, saved by the R. A. F., "the mighty few," alone for 1 long year stemmed the westward Nazi tide. She now has gathered with us the strength, the training, and the equipment which have cleared Africa, now pound Hitler's roofless "Fortress Europa" and push mightily against the southern door. Russia, whom all the experts (except the Russians) agreed could not hold out, has ranged her millions in a human fortress which held and, at the cost of carcasses and rivers of blood, now breaks the back of the Dnieper line.

Meanwhile we built and manufactured and shipped matériel to assist our three great allies in their desperate battles. Meanwhile we built the posts, and airfields, and facilities where we trained and from which we have sent a mighty army straight to the front lines. Millions have gone, and many millions more will go, for just one purpose—victory.

Coalition, once only a loose system of communicated reports of individual and unrelated actions, has become a closely knit grand strategy for military victory. The wartime wisdom of this working coalition is now admitted by all.

As we look toward the peace, what a parallel and a pattern it is for our interests at home.

Think of the power for good if and when we pool our experience and form an intelligent coalition to solve our problems. Such a coalition will provide protection from floods as real and as ruthless as the Nazi armored flood. It will carve and stabilize channels for connecting the links of commerce; it will impound waters, not only to prevent destruction by inundation but to conserve them to moisten arid farm lands to grow food for us all. It will turn the wheels which generate electric power. No single item of such a program is more important than the others. They must be carefully fitted and dovetailed together for the best over-all results, just as you are doing here today with your own special problems. That is the way of a free and democratic people, the American way.

While we plan this great peacetime coalition, our major wartime combination effects the tightening of two steel nooses, squeezing the life from the necks of both the monsters of Mars, whose heads rise from Berlin and from Tokyo.

Hitler has nowhere to turn but inward. From the Gulf of Finland to the Sea of Azov, the Russian rampage hurls him savagely back toward Berlin. From England, in an arc across Italy and around to Iraq and Iran, the planes and ships and tanks and guns of Britain and the United States pound closer and closer. This ring of steel and fire draws tighter day by day.

Likewise, Tojo finds himself within a clockwise circular vise—a steel-toothed vise featuring the teeth of Buckner, Nimitz, MacArthur, Mountbatten, and Chiang Kai-shek.

But this is only the cementing of the coalition—the beginning—the assurance of the end to come. There is only one possible, one thinkable conclusion in this struggle for a free world—the complete defeat of our enemies. But, though the outcome is certain, the road to victory may yet be long, as it is sure to be hard. Wars are not cheaply won against such wily and ruthless foes. Ahead lie blood and sacrifice, toil and sweat, yes, and permanent scars for all of us who wage this righteous fight. Yet we cannot falter at the cost, nor shirk whatever price we are called upon to pay. We must not relent or relax until the inevitable moment of final victory.

We have come a long way. We have far to go. Napoleon, by no means an ideal human being, still knew the business of war as few others have ever known it. He voiced

the idea that must prevail here at this stage of our efforts when he said, "If it comes to battle, let there be victory, come what may; he who thinks of anything but this single aim is lost."

PEACE WITHOUT PLANS—EMPTY

There is, however, a stronger answer to our meeting here today. It is good to plan here now. If victory fails—nothing matters anyhow. But when our certain victory comes—without farseeing, practical plans for peace, it becomes just an empty armistice.

Remember what Lincoln said when he was criticized for continuing the building of the Capitol during the War between the States. He replied, in effect, that when the people saw that work continued, they would know that the Union would survive.

In the midst of our titanic struggle, we take comfort in the realization that "this too will pass away." At the end of the war, humanity once again will stand at the crossroads of history. War has hastened the change which always comes—but slowly—even in calmer times. If we are to be ready for the post-war world, we must cultivate a new concept of space, a new understanding of world conditions, a new faith in the ability of men of all races, of all faiths and creeds, of all economic conditions—to work together for peace as we are fighting together for victory. Our enemies, by the brutal force of arms, set out to impose their so-called new order. We know that there will be a new order—but not one tailored to their sadistic ends. It will be a new order of understanding among men.

If human beings are going to live together and carry on their daily activities in the fertile valleys of our rivers and on the broad slopes and plains of our watersheds, their lives and property must be protected—protected through the conservation of their water resources—protected from destructive drought, from devastating floods, all of which discourage permanent homes, vital transportation facilities, and flourishing industries.

AMERICA'S JUSTIFICATION

When the first pioneer cleared a few acres and planted his seed, he did not have a chemical analysis of the soil nor any guarantee that there would be adequate rainfall and sunshine to produce a crop. There was no Department of Agriculture to advise him nor any adequate agency to assist him if his crop failed. In the face of these and other unknown elements, the pioneer farmer forged ahead. Land that was worth only a string of beads to the Indian became valuable to the white man.

What then—if the pioneer had no theory of economics to justify his labor, no precedents to guarantee the value of the land, and about a 50–50 chance of surviving, what then spurred him on? Obviously it was faith in a Divine Providence, courage, a goodly share of common sense, and a will to succeed.

With such stuff America was carved from wilderness, plain, and mountain. Man proved himself fit to survive. The post-war period will present a similar challenge. This great area needs the type of pioneering that characterized the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Mathematical equations and theoretical economics may not call for certain developments any more than theory justified the pioneer's risk of life. But the story of American history is ample justification.

The American people will provide the pioneer spirit if the Government will provide reasonable protection from devastating floods—reasonable programs to develop and conserve our water resources. The American people have decided that this is a proper function of the Federal Government, and the Congress has enacted their decision into law.

Therefore, let the layman, the engineer, and the Congress remember, when faced with the allegation that the present value of lands is less than the cost of a proposed improvement, that large buildings are worth more than the ground rights—that Manhattan Island was once valued at only $24—and, above all, that the pioneer ventured and gained without the safeguards which we enjoy today.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

To be specific about the points which I have covered, the comprehensive framework now proposed for the Missouri River Basin or any other major basin is not the final plan for ultimate development. There is not one single man among us, I am sure, who can foresee today the full needs of the next 50 years.

Therefore, we cannot and should not attempt to establish now the full pattern of that future. What I think you want, and what I know I want today is action.

That action is the adoption of a broad plan with every feature considered from a basin-wide standpoint—a definite plan for a practical beginning of constructive work—a flexible plan for the inspiring hopes of the future. The ideal of the kind of planning that I am talking about, gentlemen, is the Constitution of the United States.

In the long run, it is far more costly to do nothing than it is to do something.

Two thousand years ago this lesson was taught by the story of the slave who hid his master's talent in the ground; he feared that he might lose it. Not only did the slave lose his money, but he was cast into outer darkness.

The talent of the God-given resources of this western country must be developed. Let us plan intelligently, constructively, practically, and courageously to bring forth the latent possibilities that are here. Let us work together—unselfishly and with vision—to put these plans into effect—to add to our national strength and welfare, for the greater good of us all.

Paying for Past Follies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are today in the midst of this terrible war, paying dearly for the past follies of foolish politicians, selfish bureaucrats and irresponsible, ill-advised theorists as well as would-be autocrats, who were determined to make America over in order that they might have jobs for the rest of their lives at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers.

The hardships and the privations which the American people are today undergoing, the vast confusion, maladministration, and the disruption of American lives caused by point pricing, food scarcities, and black markets—all these are the result not of a sudden emergency arising like some tornado over the land, but of 10 years of unwise political experimentation with the American economy.

In their heyday the Tugwells, and the Wallaces, and the Hopkinses, and the Corcorans, and the Cohens, and the Ezekiels, and a score and more of other gleeful experimenters and "planned economy politicians" were going strong on their theory and practice of killing little pigs, wantonly slaughtering brood sows, plowing under cotton, paying farmers not to plant, and penalizing farmers for planting.

Back in those days any citizen, farmer or otherwise, who attempted to point out that farm machinery had to be kept up, that farm land had to be worked for crops instead of being left to produce only weeds; that if men could not farm as a way of life they would leave the land and go to the factory, such worried Americans were contemptuously characterized as tories and economic royalists and copperheads, and worse.

Today, as the people are paying a terrific price in privations for these political and economic follies of the last decade, the Tugwells, and the Wallaces, and the Hopkinses, and the Corcorans, and the Cohens, and the Ezekiels are keeping pretty mum about those days when they slaughtered little pigs by the millions and wantonly destroyed the brood sows by countless thousands, and plowed under the cotton and the corn. They have come forward—one or two of them, at least—with new world panaceas which demand of the American farmer an enormous production with which these power-hungry politicians now pretend they will try to feed the world.

But just remember, my friends, that every time you have to stand in line at your ration board and use your scarce gasoline and scarcer tires to go back again and again, and every time you have to deny yourselves some item of food or clothing to which you have normally been accustomed since you were children—just remember that you are paying the price which a good many of us warned that you would have to pay in those days of wanton destruction of animals and vegetable crops. You today, you and your sons and your daughters on the fighting lines, and in the armed services everywhere, are paying the penalty for the foolishness and the political aberrations and the bureaucratic arrogance and insolence of a decade of New Deal experimentation and disruption of the American economy by the Wallaces and the Tugwells and the Hopkinses and the Corcorans and the Cohens and the Ezekiels.

The American farmer has not had an easy way of life in America. He has had, however, the best way of life of any farmer in the world, hard as it has been. He has had many long, lean years, and those who now point to the fact that farm income has risen to a high level, look only at the momentary returns; they are not thinking anything about the long, lean years that stretch behind the American farmer; nor are they thinking much about the long, lean years which may stretch ahead after this war is over.

All the American farmer has ever asked at the hands of his Nation has been a chance to be independent, to run his farm within reasonable limits as he saw fit, to produce under conditions where he had a fair chance to produce at a reasonable cost and sell at a reasonable profit. The American farmer is the most solid, independent, and sound-minded citizen in the United States. He, least of all citizens of this country, wanted to be a ward of the Government. He wanted

to stand on his own feet and make his own way by his own efforts, asking nothing more than parity of opportunity and parity of price.

Of course, American farmers could not endure as a permanent proposition, a condition in which the prices of everything they had to buy were rising while the prices of everything they had to sell were falling. No other businessman, no other industrialist, could endure and survive such conditions as those.

The farmer was perfectly willing to cooperate, and did cooperate, in soil conservation and flood control, and in erosion prevention. Those were and always will be proper governmental functions. The trouble in the last 10 years—the folly for which you folks are now paying in point stamps, and ration stamps, in high prices, and black markets—is not the price of soil conservation, and flood control, and erosion prevention. It is the price of the grievous mistakes, the deceptions, the miscalculations, the maladministration, and the conniving of those who would change our Government into a Communist dictatorship or a Fascist dictatorship—those connivers and plotters and conspirators who used soil conservation and flood control and erosion prevention as a cover-up and an excuse to try to put the American farmer into a straitjacket, to handcuff and leg-iron him, and keep the keys in the political bureaus in Washington.

That is where the damage was done; that is how the damage was done; that is the damage you today are paying for in privations, scarcities, point pricing, rationing, black markets, high prices, and insolent regimentation and bossism by the O. P. A., the same O. P. A. that a committee of the Congress, within the last week, has found far exceeded its legal powers and authority, distorted the directions of the Congress, and usurped controls to which it was not entitled.

These experimentalists, these termites who were gnawing away at the pillars of Americanism and the foundations of the Constitution under the guise of setting up a planned economy, never seemed to think or to realize, as our colleague the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, recently pointed out, that "No one ever went hungry on a surplus." Instead, their great slogan was the "ever-normal granary." The tragedy was that under the Wallaces and the Hopkinses and the Tugwells, the ever-normal granary was allowed to be a granary which went empty in our first year of the war.

It has been said by some bureaucrats that the American farmer is never satisfied. That is true, and it is that spirit of always demanding something sounder and better that has made America the greatest Nation in the world; that has made the American Government the great Government in the world; that has put American living levels higher than any other in the world; that has given America the best wages and working conditions ever achieved in the world. If the American farmer had been satisfied, we would still be living in the days of the oxcart, the squirrel rifle, the ax, and the hoe.

The American farmer never will be satisfied so long as there is anything wrong with his Government or his country that he believes can be rectified by common sense and common effort. I tell you, my friends, one thing the American farmer has been satisfied with, very satisfied, indeed; that is our American Constitution and our American constitutional republican form of government. I can tell you something else the American farmer has been vastly satisfied with, and that is the American Bill of Rights, which is a part of the Constitution of the United States. It was only when a bunch of plotting politicians, scheming revolutionists, and starry-eyed theorists undertook to make the American farm and the American farmer over, and to jam him into a planned economy in which the Bill of Rights would be but an empty phrase, and the Constitution an outworn form, that the farmer began to fight back and demand that tinkering with his business and his way of life, by irresponsible bureaucrats such as the fellow who advised the farmers to take their shoes off their horses at night to save metal, cease.

We are asking the American farmer today to help win the war, and to help save the peace by producing more and more and ever more goods and fibers. The American farmer will not fail his country if he is given half a chance, and anything like a fair deal, while he sweats and toils to serve his fellow men. But you folks know, and I know, that the American farmer will never consent to be a peasant farmer; to be a serf tied to the land; to be regimented for years after the war; to be made the tool and pawn of politicians plotting for places of power in world politics, as they plotted for places of power in American politics.

The American farmer will never consent to these New Deal schemers using the American economy—and wrecking the American economy—in their post-war world plots for some kind of an American socialized imperialism.

That is why the students of affairs in the United States are convinced that the American farmers are turning back to the Republican Party to rescue this Nation from a clique, the members of which are more concerned with exploiting world affairs for their own purposes than in conducting our Government for the benefit of all the people.

It occurs to me at the moment that it has been exactly fourscore years ago this day when Abraham Lincoln stood on that crude platform at Gettysburg and out of the wealth of his wisdom as a man of the soil, said:

> Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. * * *
>
> That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

And, my friends, tonight, 80 years from that distant scene among the hills of Pennsylvania, we are again engaged in a great war—a great world war—to determine whether this Nation can continue to endure under God, whether it shall have a new birth of freedom after this war, and whether it shall be perpetuated as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and not perish from the earth.

Address Before Lehigh County Medical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the members of the Lehigh County Medical Society at Allentown, Pa., November 9, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Lehigh County Medical Society, and friends, it is indeed a pleasure and a privilege, as your Representative in Congress, to appear before you this evening and address you briefly upon such legislation in which I know full well that you have a vital interest.

I know that of paramount interest to all of you is Senate bill 1161, introduced by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY in the Senate, and in the House by Congressman DINGELL, of Michigan. This is the socialized medicine proposal of the leftist groups which have long shouted against the so-called tragedy of private medicine.

There have been attempts to disguise the origin of these socialized medicine proposals, but it is an established fact that the provisions offered in the measure originated first in the American Beveridge Plan, the socialization report of the National Resources Planning Board, headed by Frederic Delano, an uncle of the Chief Executive, who throughout his term in public life was known to lean toward the regimentation and destruction of private enterprise. The National Resources Planning Board was eliminated by an alert Congress which deprived it of an appropriation of almost $2,000,000, and ordered its dissolution. But the cradle-to-the-grave security plan of this now defunct board still lives on in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell proposal.

I say to you that there has been a great deal of agitation in favor of this measure, for it has the full approval of the pro-Communists and Socialist movements in the United States. These organizations, which have always been contrary to the American system, have long castigated private professional medical practice as being on the whole a commercialized and inhumane practice. You and I know full well that this is untrue, but it is the sort of propaganda the socialization and regimentation forces have been spreading in behalf of this bill.

Senators WAGNER and MURRAY, who have propounded much of the social-security legislation that has led us to the brink of socialization, and Congressman DINGELL, who has followed the same trend in the House, promise that S. 1161 is a great cure-all for the unfortunate in America, and they pose as the benefactors of mankind in proposing this legislation. However, I cannot agree with that view.

As physicians, you are aware that there are many poor folk who are unable to afford

complete hospitalization and the best of medical care when they are ill, but I say to you I have never heard of so much as one doctor ever refusing to lend his services even though he had no hope of getting a fee. On the contrary, Americans have long had the greatest system of medicine, medical care, and hospitalization of any peoples in the world, and our health rate, our birth rate, and the annual statistics of control of disease in the United States bears eloquent evidence of this fact. Free medical care and hospitalization is an established American custom; we have it here in Allentown, as well as in every other city and town in the country.

Emergency medical care is available free for the asking in every accessible spot in our great Nation. Americans are so hospital-conscious that 16 people enter a hospital, as an average, every day and night throughout the year; a baby is born in the United States every 14 seconds, and more than one-half of these births occur in hospitals, and almost all of them occur with the aid of the local doctor.

I say to you, therefore, that this latest proposal of Senator WAGNER, one of the authors, is not a cure for the inequities that are admittedly a part of American private medicine. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell proposal is instead a pattern of socialized medicine for a regimented people under a totalitarian state. And that, I say, shall never be in the United States of America.

S. 1161 is thinly disguised as a broadening of the existing Social Security Act. It is said that to put this proogram into being an amount of $3,000,000,000 per year would be necessary. To get this money, the measure provides that the present 1-percent social security tax rate would be increased to 6 percent. That is, each employer would deduct 6 percent social security taxes from the pay envelopes of his employees, and he would match that contribution with an additional 6 percent, just as is the case with the 1-percent tax today.

Thus, with the money provided, the bill would, briefly, place in the hands of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States, the actual power of enforced slavery over the medical profession of the entire country. This one man would have the power to establish rates of pay, to establish fee schedules for services, to establish qualifications for specialists, to determine the number of individuals for whom a physician may provide services, and to determine what hospitals or clinics may provide services for patients. This would in effect mean an absolute dictatorship over the medical profession, and enable the Government to practically control physicians by contract, and by a system of penalizing through denial of such provisions.

I believe that such a program would be a detriment to the health of the Nation, as well as to the profession to which you who are met here tonight have given the fruitful years of your lives. For this system would rob the individual doctor of all initiative and ambition; he would have nothing to strive for, no greater goal than to be the slave of the state. It is a fact that the average person, when he is ill, calls on his personal physician because he has faith in him. Faith in one's doctor has long been recognized as half the battle in regaining health. And, under the proposed Government control, the sick person is told what doctor will prescribe for him and administer to him, and thus, with the patient having no faith, no trust, in unsympathetic Government doctors, sickness and death might well increase rather than decrease as the advocates of this socialized medical program would have you believe. Furthermore, the physician himself would not be as apt to devote himself unstintingly to the case, for he would receive no reward of any kind, merely the Government fee, and no accompanying accolade of patient or fellowman for having performed above and beyond the actual call of duty.

The provision of S. 1161, which is innocently supposed to provide for the general welfare of our people, provides that any physician qualified by the State in which he resides, can furnish medical service in accordance with the regulations and rules as may be prescribed by the Surgeon General, and each individual needing such professional service can make his selection, also according to the Surgeon General's rules and regulations, from the posted selected list of physicians. I repeat that these provisions would destroy the faith of the patient in his doctor and thus remove that which is known to be a vital aid in fighting disease and death.

Available patients would be prorated among the physicians who met the Government standards for service, and they would be paid on a fee basis, or on a salary basis, either whole or part time, at the discretion of the Surgeon General. This proposed vast regimentation of the medical profession, therefore, sets up a virtual dictatorship over the practice of medicine in this country and proposes that the Federal Government assume the power of life and death over everyone of the Nation's 132,000,000 people.

I need not stress too greatly to you who are members of the highly respected, free, and uncontrolled medical profession, the dangers behind such rule and regulation. That is apparent to all free-thinking Americans who realize that the result of the enactment of such legislation would mean that the doctors of America would be forced to sacrifice their medical heritage and become mere pawns in the hands of social-minded politicians, bringing about the inevitable deterioration of private medicine and of the profession's contributions to the cause of humanity.

And, I say to you without fear of contradition, such a step would mean that, with the medical profession regimented, the way would be opened to the establishing of centralized Federal control of all of the professions, of all industry and business, and the American system of free enterprise which has made us in less than 160 years the greatest country in the world, would be relegated to oblivion, and we would be forced to live in a totalitarian state of the same sort against which our gallant boys are today giving their blood and their lives.

Before concluding, I want to say a few words on the financial aspect of the measure. The estimated $3,000,000,000 which would be raised under the measure and for its provisions, would be placed under the control of one man, the Surgeon General, and from the evidence of bureaucratic administration of other present-day social programs, it is apparent that the greater amount of this sum would be spent not for benefits to the people, but for the administration of the program, and the socialized political machine which would have the power over the physician. Thus federalized medicine would not only mean slavery for the doctor, but would bring about the catering by the practicing physician to the holders of the political money bags, rather than to the needs of the ailing human patients.

Under our American system, our unparalleled way of life, with freedom and justice for all, the medical profession of our country has developed the most effective and most widely distributed medical care that has ever been provided for any comparable number of people anywhere at any time. Freemen, following their chosen profession with fearless minds and not beholden to any rule or ruler, have constantly and progressively provided a higher and ever higher quality of medical care. The profession has conquered dread diseases, and others that have heretofore annually killed thousands of people have been brought under control. New drugs, such as the sulfa group and penicillin, have brought comfort, cure, and perfect health to vast numbers of people who might otherwise have faced suffering and death.

Under this great free and liberal American way, all of our people and all of humanity have benefited through and by those physicians who have been possessed with more than ordinary skills and abilities. All have benefited by the constant research and development, and the mass of the people, in the neighborhood physician's human and humane concept of the sanctity of human personality, in the continued utilization of the progress in the science of medicine, and the art of medical practice, have received relief from privation and disease and the lives that have been so saved are too numerous to count.

This is the system which we must fight to preserve and protect. When the Congress of the United States, in July of this year, voted against the appropriation for the continuance of the socialistic National Resources Planning Board—when the Congress told Mr. Delano and his associates to pack up and go home—the Congress then served notice that it did not desire to establish in America a medical czar and an all-powerful totalitarian control of the medical and other professions. The Congress further served notice that it stood to preserve inviolate the freedoms and liberties of the American people against the rapidly encroaching ideologies of foreign sources, and that it would not accept socialized medicine as a cure-all for those in adversity and human misery, but that all clear-thinking Americans, in the Congress and out, were still ready to defend and perpetuate our system of private enterprise and the great good which it bestows upon all.

In conclusion, friends, let me state that, should this measure be reported out of committee and to the floor of the House for consideration, you may be assured that I shall fight, and by voice and vote, do all within my power to defeat its insidious and un-American provisions. I believe sincerely that it is contrary to the pledge of allegiance which we make to the flag of the United States of America, and I, and my colleagues in Washington, will forever work to maintain that Republic which provides liberty and justice for all.

I thank you.

Will Someone Please Answer These Questions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, in my old age I have turned back to some of my early textbooks used as a student in younger days. I have been reviewing some of these textbooks in the field of economics and restudying terms and concepts contained therein. Many of these have a very vital bearing on the problems of this hour.

For instance, I have restudied what the textbook says about the law of supply and demand, and the concept of price and the pricing system. I recall that the subject known as economics was declared by some to be a science and there were

those who declare it to be an exact science. I further recall that it was said to deal with natural law and presumably some of those laws are more unchanging than the laws of the Medes and Persians. Since my student days I have sometimes wondered just how natural some of these so-called natural laws are, and how unchanging they may be. Of course, I remember old King Knute who attempted by royal command to halt the waves of the sea on his ocean beach and got a royal salt bath in addition to a lesson in a comparison of man-made versus natural law. Also I am thinking of many other cases where man-made law attempted to run counter to natural law with disastrous effects to the former and also some victims.

On the other hand, I have read of the law of gravity, which is undoubtedly a natural law, and I have never heard of its repeal by man-made enactments. It undoubtedly still operates, as the pages of every daily newspaper reveal. Yet somehow mankind has learned to understand it and apparently defy it, in this aviation age, to a remarkable extent. So much so that the expounder of the law of gravity just cannot say truthfully any more to man, "You cannot fly."

In my youth I was taught that price is a signal service between economic producers and consumers and that it was a natural way for one economic group to communicate with the other. To illutrate: If producers of a certain commodity were not producing enough of it to meet the demand, the price would go up to call for more. Or if the producers were producing more than was called for the price would go down. Thus when the price increased that was a natural signal for the producers to increase their efforts and to furnish more goods. As a reverse of this when prices went down, as demand fell off, it was a warning to the producers to ease up on their efforts.

All of that looks quite logical and scientific but it always did occur to me that such jerky action was a mighty clumsy signal service. True, it does get the idea across eventally, but in a very stuttering, hesitant fashion, which communication was often belatedly received to the hurt of producers most vitally interested in it. I have sometimes wondered whether there could be, without an intervention or contravention of any natural law, any better scheme devised by mortal man to communicate between these two vitally important economic groups. Or whether that which is depended upon in peacetime must prevail in wartime.

I further learned, as a youth, that in this mighty important business of producing economic goods and getting them to the individuals needing them that the law of supply and demand operated at the very heart of the process. Sometimes I have wondered whether it could be manipulated, or at least sufficiently understood and worked in such a way as to make it contribute to man's welfare. Of course, if price can be determined scientifically in no other way excepting by the operation of the law of supply and demand and if that is a "thus sayeth the Lord" we had better know it for a fact before we as legislators or administrators try to tinker with it.

I have the suspicion that some human beings in the industrial world do know how willfully to manipulate the law of supply and demand, and are able, by cutting down on supply, knowing that demand would remain about constant, can thereby affect the price by boosting it upward. I wonder if anybody is actually or has actually been doing just that. Well, whether they have in my day or not, I am sure there were men who did in the time of George Washington, and he said that such fellows should be hanged on a gallows higher than that of Haman. In fact, I believe Washington said "five times higher than that which Haman built for himself." Of course, Washington was severe on individuals who willfully tampered with supply to their country's hurt, but he knew it could be done. Is it not true that unintentional limitation of supply—regardless of the cause—may be equally harmful in effects upon prices?

No one will contend that it is impossible for human beings to manipulate the law of supply and demand, for industrial monopolists certainly do so to their own advantage and to the public hurt. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am always skeptical when anyone contends that Government cannot interfere with the law of supply and demand for the public's protection. I believe it can be done, and in many cases should be done, and particularly in times of war or grave emergency to the extent that it is feasible and justifiable.

Going back to our review of economic terms and so-called economic laws, I am puzzled again in regard to the term "producer." Who is an economic producer? I have heard my colleagues talking about consumer subsidies and producer subsidies and some seem to favor one kind over another, but we shall have to find out what is meant by the producer before thinking clearly on this matter.

I think the general conception may be widely different from the textbook conception. Then, too, this is a matter in which personal prejudices play such a vital part. I find different schools of opinion on these economic matters and incidentally I find about as much ill will generated over different views on economic doctrines as have been generated over a difference of views of religious doctrines. It always gave me food for thought to see how men hate each other because they differ as to how to go to Heaven. I can much more readily understand why they should hate each other and struggle against each other about what affects their pocketbooks and their living here and now.

Throughout the history of human labor we find the mass of laboring men feeling that they are the real producers of this world's goods and during most of human history they know labor has gotten a very small share of the total products of labor. Apparently some labor thinkers have had the one-sided and erroneous view that labor produces all value, at least, I have heard that contended. While I do regard labor as the chief contributor to the total value of economic goods, and I want labor to share in the distribution of wealth accordingly, I do not, of course, believe that those who toil with their hands produce the total and should fairly receive the total, because there are so many other factors, and some very necessary and vital factors, in the whole business of production of goods. In this case it becomes a nice question as to who are the laborers, or the real producers, and as to precisely what share is rightfully theirs.

The legislation before the House has to do primarily with agricultural production and the same question arises, Who are these producers? No doubt the farmer with his feet in the soil feels that he is the chief producer and some may even regard himself as the sole producer of food and fiber obtained from the earth. For my own part I give such a farmer much credit and wish for him proper and full reward, but I am convinced that there are others engaged as producers of the food and fiber which consumers need. True, I have always felt that the spread of cost between the man on the farm and the consumer in the home was too great and that so-called middlemen received too great a share of the take.

Reverting to our textbook days we were taught that there are several different kinds or methods of production of wealth. For instance, one who shapes raw elements into a more usable form produces form value. I am able to understand that and can see how a carpenter can take a certain amount of lumber and make it into a desk and thereby greatly increase the value of the material. Again there is what is known as place value, wherein the change in value is due to change in location to where the consumer wants it. All who are engaged in transportation have opportunity to add to the value of certain goods by carrying them from one place where their value is less to another place where their value is more. Therefore, I would regard one engaged in transportation likely as a producer. Then again there is such a concept as time value, wherein an increment of value occurs because of time that has elapsed, which time makes the article of greater usefulness to the consumer. I was taught to regard a merchant who buys coal in August and sells it to me in January as an economic producer. All that sounds simple and logical but I wish somebody would tell me what rightful proportions of the final cost which the consumer pays should go to each of these persons or factors which have added their increment of value to it.

I am told by my colleagues that if we pass this bill, H. R. 3477, with section 3 in it, it will merely prevent consumer subsidies, but permit producer subsidies. Then the question arises, "What did Congress mean in the act of October 1942 by the term 'producer'?" I understand that the Attorney General has ruled that that law included processors. Now, certainly processors are producers, for they give "form value," if nothing else. The pair of shoes I have on my feet were

once on the back of a steer, but I wouldn't have given very much for that portion of the hide of a steer as it was out on the range. Now, what I am trying to say is that as a friend of the farmer I want the farmer to get better prices and to get a larger share of the cost of what he produces as paid by the consumers. I am willing for the processor and some other middlemen to get a share, depending on a number of circumstances.

Now, I have so much confidence in Marvin Jones and in Fred Vinson, who would administer this law if amended and passed, that I think they will come as near doing the right thing in the assignment of subsidies, if we empower them further and give them the funds, as it is humanly possible to do it. These men were our colleagues. They are hard-headed, practical men, and they definitely are friends of the farmer. I would be willing to trust the administration of this delicate matter to such men, though I confess that I myself would lack the judgment as to the right distribution of such subsidies. If I vote to continue subsidies and to strike section 3 from this bill, it will be largely because of the confidence I have in the men who are to administer such subsidies, if any.

If we should have any food subsidies at all what kind should they be? There again I am sorely puzzled. My sympathy toward the farmer is such and my conception of the man who tills the soil as a producer is such that I am inclined to favor producer subsidies as I understand them. I know that the price of foodstuff to the consumer is so much greater than the price paid to farmers that the spread is too great and yet, I would not overlook the processor and many other middlemen who may be vital economic producers. The question is how much relatively should they get as the item passes through their control. Take fruit or garden truck. To my mind, it is absolutely unreasonable that some fellow in the city should merely sign a paper and make a thousand dollars on a carload, which is probably more than the grower received in the first instance. On the other hand, we know that cattle are not beef and a lot has to happen to a rangy steer before the steak is on the table, and I contend there is somebody between the corral and the table who is as much a producer of meat as is the cattleman or the cowboy. How can anyone less than the Angel Gabriel determine how much each take in computing the cost to the final consumer?

Sometimes in desperation I think we ought not to attempt to meddle in such matters and let Nature take her course. Yet if we took the same attitude toward fire, our homes and cities would be destroyed instead of our dwellings being comfortably warmed. I do hope somebody in the course of this debate who favors H. R. 3477 with section 3 in it can convince me that this if enacted into law will deal with a greater degree of justice to the farmer than would the subsidy plan, and also that there will be no destructive spiral of inflation to crush the consuming public and double or treble the taxpayers' war burden. Now while that person is about it, I would like also to be assured that—passing H. R. 3477 as is—the millions of Americans whose pay has not been increased or their incomes bettered by the war will not suffer destructive deprivation.

Now I want to do the right thing by our farmers—in fact, I believe I have a greater genuine interest in the American farmers than in any other group of our producers. Certainly I feel that throughout American political history the American farmer has received least consideration and had the smallest measure of justice dealt him by the Government. However, I have felt that on the whole our farmers have been considered quite well during the last 10 years. Long before the war in Europe began I wanted farmers to receive at least parity prices, and I have seriously considered, and more than half-way approved, any legislative arrangement that would have given them cost of production, plus. If that is a good thing for them in time of peace, and should have been granted them, why isn't it just as good for them in time of war? Now, that is what is puzzling me. If we attempt to deal fairly with the farmers in regard to a good price in the market place in time of war, will that not increase the cost of living out of due proportions and give a mighty impetus to the spiral of costs to all the people and the Government?

I believe the cost of this war is less than half as much now in dollars and cents as it would have cost at this time had we had no price control at all. If that is the case and we have already saved the taxpayers as much as the present cost of this war, is it not reasonable to suppose that we can save the taxpayers and the consuming public through ceilings on all costs as much or maybe twice as much during the remainder of the war as we shall spend for the remainder of the war? What I am afraid of is that if we give free rein to the law of supply and demand and remove price ceilings that cost of living and all costs will rise enormously, will even double or treble to a much greater degree of harm than anyone could receive benefit, but it is said, "We shall still retain O. P. A. and keep price ceilings without subsidies." But can we bring forth production with present price ceilings? I am afraid not. I need reassurance on that point.

Let's Have the Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Air Transport for November 1943:

LET'S HAVE THE LEA BILL

Now that N. A. A. President Gill Robb Wilson endorses the Lea bill, we find there is but one important hold-out against it outside of Congress which significantly is the State railroad and utilities commissions' lobby in Washington.

A recent minority report of nine members of Mr. LEA's committee follows the thinking of the railroad and utilities' lobby. Congressman CARROLL REECE of Tennessee has introduced a new bill (H. R. 3491) incorporating the surface transport and utility philosophies. The minority report makes good reading and in one or two respects may result in constructive modification of the Lea bill. Perhaps, as the Reece group recommends, the Administrator could remain in the Department of Commerce until the war is over but, in our opinion, he would be better out and it would not upset an apple cart in the middle of the stream (to coin a mixed metaphor) or add expense to do so now. The training provisions are advisedly the way they are to aid war training, if needed, and to provide transition training for the fighters.

This type of criticism including Gill Robb Wilson's earlier panning of the original draft of the bill has been helpful. With a view toward having a greater number of persons understand the present bill, H. R. 3420, we briefly outline its contents.

It proposes to regulate the air contractor in a way similar to present regulation of scheduled air lines but confining rate regulation to reasonable minimum rates. Motorbus lines and trucks asked for this statute and obtained it by I. C. C. regulation; there was chaos before they had this in their law. Why wait for the chaos to affect the men now fighting who will desire to get into the air contractor line? In the case of trucks and busses, men went broke and lost their businesses until their industry had a law comparable to that for which the Lea bill asks. The private flyers and flying schools applying for certificates for feeder routes recognize this need.

John Dwight Sullivan, of the American Legion Aeronautics Commission, objected to an early draft of the bill because of the zoning provision—thanks to him and others, this subject has been taken care of.

The insurance provision in an early draft of the bill which, on maximum liability, followed the Warsaw Convention, has been modified to call for study and reports of costs not now available.

The bill calls for a separate independent safety director whose reports will not be edited by the agency which promulgates safety regulations. Everyone who has studied this subject (regulators and regulated) favors this change in light of history.

In the first draft there was a proposed prohibition against multiple taxation of civilian aviation—a good idea, but one which State commissioners would fight to the last ditch and thus perhaps delay or even preclude passage of the more desirable and necessary provisions. Only a study is called for now on this subject which, as in the case of the provision with respect to insurance, may result in constructive handling of this complex subject at some future time.

In the case of flying other than point to point transportation for hire, the States can adopt any kind of regulation as long as it is consistent with Federal safety regulation. Thus, crop dusting, sightseeing, training schools, miscellaneous private flying, etc., could be regulated by the States in any way they please just so long as the States do not conflict with Federal safety regulations.

Point to point transportation for hire, on a common-carrier or contract-carrier basis, would be a matter of Federal regulation if the Lea bill becomes law. The purpose of this is, of course, to prevent the growth of interstate trade barriers for air commerce. At the same time means might well be worked out whereby the States would aid in the enforcement of the Federal regulations as some States have in the past.

The Aircraft Owners' and Pilots' Association—we know it checked with some members in the services—endorsed the bill. The National Aviation Training Association made up of W. T. S. contractors, endorsed the bill. The Aeronautical Training Society, comprised of the primary training schools under contract with the Army, endorsed the bill. The Air Lines Association endorsed the bill, as did the labor associations of their mechanics and pilots. Some of these organizations had suggestions to make about early drafts; those points have been taken care of. We don't say this glibly; it is true. James P. Murray (a pilot who had active combat service in the last war), as president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce, endorsed it for 90 percent of aircraft manufacturers. Thus the representatives of more than 2,000,000 persons now in aviation have endorsed this proposed legislation.

In Air Transport's opinion, anyone who opposes this Lea bill is against the progress of civil aviation.

The bill will not be perfect. Does anyone know of legislation, including the Constitution, which is perfect? The American Bar Association has studied this subject of State versus Federal jurisdiction for all phases of our national life. Its house of delegates recently ratified the endorsement of its aviation committee on this main feature of the Lea bill. Congressman CLARENCE LEA, of California, and war veteran Major BULWINKLE, Congressman from North Carolina, and other members of the Lea committee, which includes some of the most illustrious, sincere, and honest men in Congress, not only endorse the bill but drafted it and have earnestly, laboriously tried to make it practicable and sound. They want the men who are doing our fighting to have some civil aviation to come home to and will want to look those boys in the eyes. CLARENCE LEA looked them in the eyes the last time. Look up his record.

The Utility and Railroad Commissioners' group is naturally afraid that this bill, if it becomes law, will set a precedent for future railroad and utility laws. They "do not move so fast over spaces so vast" as civilian aviation does and won't need such a law. Aviation does need it now. Let's have the Lea bill.

Letter of Cooperative Potato Growers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PENNSYLVANIA COOPERATIVE POTATO GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Allentown, Pa., November 17, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GERLACH: The farmers of our country are anxious to make every acre produce at an increase for the coming year, enough to feed our fighting forces, civilians, and our allies. We hope we will be able to do our utmost toward this goal.

To do this, however, there are some other problems that enter into the picture which I want to call to your attention. In order for the farmers of our State and Nation to produce their goals, they must have equipment and repairs, and also the trained manpower to make the necessary repairs and adjustments. This is one of our greatest bottlenecks in production that stares the farmers in the face.

Equipment and repairs were not adequate for 1943, and upon investigation we ourselves have made it will not be adequate in 1944. We will not have the necessary technical help to do the repairs and adjustments on these many farm-equipment problems, to keep these tractors and mechanized machines running, in order to produce economically the food that we need.

The skilled labor that has been trained to make these things possible is rapidly being absorbed into training and other defense work, where they are recognized as essential, which is not the case, the way I understand, if they stay on the job making these many emergency repairs.

We are greatly concerned about this, Mr. Gerlach, because it takes at least 5 years to have any individual trained in this work to do a good job. These men have to be able to take their tools and go out in the fields where the tractor may have stopped in its tracks and cannot be moved to a repair shop to get its required attention. Oftentimes men are called away from the base to a distance of 75 miles, and must have tools with them to meet any emergency and must be able to locate the trouble, whatever it may be.

The producers are concerned about these men being taken into the service and feel that they are a cog in the wheel that helps to produce the food. If it would not be for these men repairing and adjusting equipment, there would be a calamity and great reduction in the final outcome. Producers are also concerned that these boys, after years of training in their line of work, are possibly thrown into some other sphere and have to take up other training where someone else could be used.

Years passed, every community had a blacksmith to shoe the horses and mules to keep the horsepower going and get the work done on the farms. These shops were of great importance in making repairs to whatever tools they had at that time, which were not so many. When we come down to the present day where the farms are mechanized, the picture changes. Instead of blacksmith shops, we have implement-repair people who journey from one farm to another to keep the wheels going around. This is the job the technically skilled labor is doing today.

I am not speaking for the area of eastern Pennsylvania alone, but what is true here is true over the entire country. I think it would be proper to have these trained men recognized by our Government as "men of victory." If such would be the case and our Government would announce it as such, these workers would realize that they are doing a noble act for their country.

I want to give you a concrete example, Mr. Congressman, of what I have reference to. We have an implement business and repair shop in Lehigh County that covers an area of at least 100 miles, from Wilkes-Barre to Philadelphia. It is the largest repair and implement business in the eastern part of the State. When the farmers have a breakdown anywhere in this area that cannot be fixed anywhere else, due to these boys being taken away, they have called at J. M. Snyder & Son, Neffs, Lehigh County, Pa., and naturally one of his men, with his many tools in his car, went to the farm, no matter where located, and made the necessary repairs.

J. M. Snyder & Son used to have 19 mechanics. Some of these men were trained in Diesel tractors, others in crawler tractors, and some in wheel tractors, and spent many hours in some school learning to become experts in those particular lines. They have also been trained in welding and machine shop work as well as making many other repairs that could be made by ordinary methods.

Some of these 19 men are already serving in the Army and others have been forced into defense work. Mr. Snyder has now 8 men working for him and his force has dwindled down to such an extent that the service to the farmers is greatly impaired. Of these 8 men, he still has 4 or 5 men that are experts in their line of work, and can be sent out throughout this entire area to handle any situation that may arise. These men are all subject to be called by the draft and if they are, Mr. Snyder can give no service to anyone.

Mr. Snyder has tried to hold his men and give better service than before, but he feels all has been in vain and if any more men are taken, he simply has to close his establishment entirely. We can substantiate everything I wrote here, Mr. GERLACH, and if you want proof of what I related, I will be glad to call Mr. Snyder in to see you at your convenience.

I am writing this in behalf of the farmers of the entire country, and I think it is my patriotic duty to do this in the interest of an utmost production. These men are just as essential in producing food as the man in the machine shop at work on planes, tanks, ships, and guns, because any one of these cannot be operated unless a man has something to eat, which is next to life itself.

The farmers want to feel that they have these most essential factors taken care of in order to lay plans for 1944, and meet their production goals. Anything you can do for us will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

P. DANIEL FRANTZ,
Manager.

Prevention of Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, much has been said of the needless waste of life and property on the home front at a time when our armed forces are engaged in bitter struggles on far-flung battle fronts. There is no doubt that the tragic toll of fatalities and injuries from on-the-job and off-the-job accidents is a matter of concern to everyone. However, it has taken determined efforts, such as the Smash the Seventh Column, Carelessness That Causes Accidents campaign being conducted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce in New York State, to make people really aware of the wartime waste and suffering caused by accidents. It was my pleasure to serve as a member of the honorary State-wide committee for the New York Seventh Column campaign.

This campaign is in every respect unique. It is the outgrowth of a desire of an insurance company to render wartime service. Bennett Moore, vice president and director of public relations of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., of Boston, conceived the idea of terming accidents the "Seventh Column." The "Smash the Seventh Column" slogan won Nation-wide attention, so much so that it has been supported by the War

Department, and has become the rallying cry for the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. It is perhaps one of the best-known of all wartime slogans—a slogan of public service.

One of the highlights of the campaign in New York State was an informative and constructive address delivered at Rochester by Maj. Gen. T. A. Terry, commanding Second Service Command, Governors Island.

I ask unanimous consent that General Terry's address be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As commanding general of the Second Service Command, embracing the States of New York, New Jersey, and Delaware, it is my privilege to be the link uniting the industrial forces in this service command with our fighting forces on every front throughout the world. The primary mission of the Army Service Forces is to procure, safeguard, and distribute men and military supplies to be used in combat.

Included in this mission is, of course, the continuing responsibility to help maintain production in privately owned manufacturing plants engaged in war work. Any threat to this war output is of immediate concern to the War Department and to me as service commander.

I know that it is often very difficult for those who are intensely engaged in an industrial operation to visualize that they are also in a very real sense a part of the war effort; that they are just as essential to that war effort as are the men on the fighting fronts. Yet, speaking as a soldier, I say to you, without qualification, that what is done or not done in the factories, in the mills, in the foundries, in the machine shops; yes, even in the offices, can be decisive in any one of our theaters of operation.

It is not sufficient that our troops be supplied with weapons and ammunition, essential as they are. They must be supplied with food, with transportation, and with fuel.

All these supplies must come from this country, running the gauntlet of enemy air and submarine attacks. Then, too, we must provide for the inevitable losses of war. We must be able to maintain a constant flow of supplies, vastly in excess of what would be the normal consumptive needs of the forces supplied.

Our forces must be kept in close and instantaneous communication with the War Department and the various supply agencies in this country. Even more, they must have the means of keeping in intimate contact with all their units in the theaters of operation.

This involves shipping to them huge quantities of material, ranging all the way from relatively crude supplies, such as building materials, to very delicate and sensitive instruments, such as radios, for use by combat units often operating deep in a hostile country many miles from their nearest bases.

Failure to supply any of these items must inevitably hamper the operations of our soldiers on the fighting fronts. With our men facing resourceful and determined enemies, often operating very much nearer their own bases, such failures could lead to costly and perhaps decisive set-backs. It is the job of the Army Service Forces and my job as service commander to see that such set-backs do not arise through any fault on our part.

It is the job of industry to produce the supplies needed on the fighting fronts. And right here I want to say that I am very pleased, and I know that the War Department is very pleased, with the splendid job that industry has done in delivering promptly the immense quantities of supplies produced to date.

We of the Army Service Forces have the job of getting these supplies to the fighting fronts. The Army Service Forces of the United States Army may be regarded very literally as one of the most gigantic business enterprises in the world's history. Like one of your own great business organizations, it is divided into groups for the more efficient performance of specialized functions. Some of these groups are set up on a technical basis, such as the Ordnance Department and the Signal Corps. Others are set up on a territorial basis. Of these latter, the nine service commands are the most important.

As commander of the Second Service Command, I consider one of my most important tasks is to work with the industries in this service command for the sole purpose of obtaining uninterrupted production at maximum capacity. The successful execution of that mission can and will be as decisive a factor in the final victory as the actual fighting itself. If we fail in our job, our fighting men will simply be brave men who never had a chance—and ours is the responsibility that that shall not happen.

One of the most important points to be considered is the United States Army's accident-prevention program. The question is sometimes asked, "Why should the Army, whose main function is the destruction of men and material of the enemy, have a safety program?" There are several answers to this question.

The main answer is that our industrial losses through accidents have reached figures difficult to comprehend. The National Safety Council reports that 480,000,000 man-days were lost to production in the plants throughout the United States in 1942 because of accidents. They interpret this figure in such a way that the amount of labor lost because of accidents would have produced the material to supply 200,000 soldiers—which is approximately the size of the task force which struck Sicily with such telling effect.

Another interpretation is that as much time is lost because of accidents as to the amount of labor which would be required to produce 38 battleships or 250 destroyers or 90,000 fighting planes or 125,000 light tanks.

Yes, gentlemen, there is a seventh column at work in this country. This seventh column is accidents, and you members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce are to be commended for your efforts to smash it. You have the support and backing of the War Department, and especially of the Second Service Command.

The War Department regards accident prevention as a very important element in the production program for the reason that the high accident toll referred to a few moments ago is hampering our main mission of continuing maximum production. Our Government has taken such cognizance of the seventh column, that it played a very important part in the National Safety Congress which was held in Chicago last month. There were 12,000 civilian and military delegates at this Congress—the largest in the history of the National Safety Council. At the Congress, high-ranking military officers attended and took active parts. Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War, gave the principal address. They explained the similarity between accident-prevention work being carried on in the armed forces and in privately owned plants having good accident records.

The Army bases its operations on detailed specifications which strive to anticipate every hazardous eventuality. It builds every machine with a view to the utmost in safety. It establishes safe-practice regulations for every operation; makes the wearing of personal protective equipment mandatory for hazardous operations. It trains every man thoroughly in the operations for which he will be normally responsible and provides supervision to enforce safe practices.

You accident-prevention men in this audience will easily recognize the similarity between this safety program and your own.

If adequate production figures are to be attained and maintained, the high accident toll in industrial plants must be curtailed.

In this connection I would like to refer to the production loss figures which I mentioned a few moments ago. These were Nation-wide figures. Before coming to Rochester I asked the accident-prevention section at my headquarters to let me have the figures covering the accident frequencies in the most important war plants in the Second Service Command. The figures were startling. For the first 6 months of this year over 1,000,000 man-days were lost through accidents in plants employing 1,000,000 employees. This means that, if the rate continues, we can expect 2,000,000 man-days lost for the entire year in the important war plants in the Second Service Command alone. To bring these figures closer to home I asked the accident-prevention section for a break-down covering the war plants in the Rochester area. These figures, too, were most disturbing.

For the first 9 months of this year over 70,000 man-days were lost in plants in the Rochester area employing 70,000 employees. This means that if the rate continues, we can expect that 90,000 man-days will be lost in the war plants in the Rochester area this year.

As huge as this figure is, the record of the Second Service Command is much better than that of most of the other service commands, and Rochester is one of the bright spots in the Second Service Command. There are nine service commands throughout the country, and for the first 6 months of this year the Second Service Command stood in second position with an accident frequency of 17.1 lost-time accidents per 1,000,000 man-hours worked. The service command which was in first position reported a frequency rate of 15.6, and the other seven service commands ranged from 17.7 to 41.8. This rate does not take into consideration lost hours through accidents where the injured party is able to return to work on the next shift or on the following day. If these accidents were included, the figure of 90,000 man-days being lost in this area would be quadrupled.

While there is do doubt that you have a seventh column at work in the Rochester area, I want to congratulate this group for the success of your efforts to make the public aware of this insidious enemy. That you are accomplishing results is indicated in the low-accident-frequency rate of 14.7 in the war plant in the Rochester area during the first 6 months of this year.

This rate is the lowest in the service command, and much lower than the Nation-wide rate for war plants. Yes, gentlemen; the accident-prevention work in the war plants in the Rochester area is achieving results, but there is yet much to be done.

We are at war on two fronts; the fighting front and the home front. On the home front we fight the relentless seventh column. The accident-frequency figure I mentioned a few moments ago tells us whether or not we are winning against the seventh column.

The Army has civilian and military plant-protection inspectors who inspect war plants fo various hazards. Part of their job is to inspect for accident hazards. Gentleman, the job to be done is far too big for any one agency, and that is why we must all work together to combat this common enemy.

During the last World War, 8 workers behind the lines were required to keep one soldier at the front. During this present highly mechanized war, it is estimated that 16 workers are required to provide the supplies for each fighting man. Therefore, whether the worker is running a punch press, operating a crane, mining coal, or trans-

porting material, he is one link in that chain which is keeping supplies going to the fighting fronts. Every break, every slowdown because the chain cannot carry full load means that war supplies will not arrive when needed. And, as one of our soldiers in Italy said: "I never knew how much I needed something until it wasn't there."

Fortunately, far-sighted industrial leaders have long since appreciated the need for accident prevention. The results of safety programs in these plants have been most gratifying. There are, however, several thousands of plants throughout the United States still lacking adequate safety programs. A survey made just prior to the declaration of war disclosed that less than 12 percent of the plants in the United States had safety organizations and were taking effective measures to reduce accidents. Realizing this and the extent to which accidents were resulting in costly delays in war production, the commanding general of the Army Service Forces ordered the establishment of the United States Army accident-prevention program to be placed under the supervision of the provost marshal general.

An accident-prevention section has been activated in my headquarters, with a section in each military district within the Service Command. The accident-prevention section is charged with the development of general policies and instructions relating to accident prevention in plants vital to the war effort, with supervision of accident-prevention activities performed by the Army and the coordination of its activities with other local, State, and Federal agencies concerned with this task. The services of this section are available to you, and I urge you to make full use of them.

The war is not yet won. That it will be won is a certainty. The issue is time. President Roosevelt has said, "Never before have we had so little time in which to do so much. Accidents are cutting into this precious time, and unless we curtail their enormous toll in our war plants, our fighting fronts will suffer. Every accident means victory delayed and more names on the memorials to those who did not come home. In working together to smash successfully the seventh column, our final achievement will be the saving of the lives of our boys because we supplied them with plenty when they needed it most.

Kaiser Believes Passage of Lea Aviation Bill Vital To Success of Post-War Aviation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram from Henry J. Kaiser, Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, urging enactment of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420:

The success or failure of post-war aviation seems to rest in the hands of Congress. By the passage of the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, I believe we can assure ourselves of a sound and progressive aviation program and I urge you to do all possible to assure the passage of this bill.

H. J. KAISER,
Brewster Aeronautical Corporation.

The Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Washington Scene, delivered by me November 17, 1943, before the National Founders' Association, at their convention held at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset, may I express my appreciation for the privilege of addressing this group which has accomplished such an outstanding job in the preservation of America—in peace and in war.

You have rendered a tremendous service to the Nation in building jobs, in building wealth, in building communities. You have helped make possible the economic current which made America prosperous and a leader in the world. Yours is an organization which means a great deal to America, and I know America means a great deal to each of you.

I am speaking to leaders, men who not only build material things, but who influence the thought and action of others; men who have the habit of accomplishment, of achieving results—who understand the need for possessing a sense of humor, faith in our country, faith in man's power to meet, with the aid of the Divine, the problems of war and the problems of peace.

I know you join with me today in the thought that it is a glorious thing to be an American—to belong to this great Nation which we all feel has an appointment with destiny. While the structure of many nations throughout the world is tottering and political systems falling, America is progressing firmly on her way to a greater life—a life of service to the world, not by means of an international dole, but by means of that true charity which will help the rest of the world to help itself grow toward those ideals which have meant so much to us—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The achievement of this better human order will require great things of us, both materially and spiritually; but, with the help of American industry, we can do it. American industry has never failed America, and it will not fail her now. And so I say, "Hats off to American industry."

But to the subject, The Washington Scene. What are we thinking about in Washington? In Washington, what is our faith as to the future of America?

Well, we are concerned with many things down in Washington, but chiefly we are concerned with two great matters—the winning of the war, and the winning of the peace. Let us talk about each of these in turn.

The winning of the war entails two imperatives—first, the imperative need for all of us to appreciate the enormous task—the big job—before America, before the war is won; and second, the imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort.

As to the imperative need for all of us to appreciate the enormous task before us before the war can be won—we in Washington fear that too many people have the idea that the war will be over in a few weeks. Every time we gain another mile or win another victory, we hear someone say, "Well, it will soon be over now."

Now, what are the facts? Recently it was my privilege to attend a conference presided over by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, General Marshall. They showed us the world picture—a grim picture. We had talks, we had diagrams, we had moving pictures, we had statistics. The talks were by General Marshall and other officers, as well as by boys who were back from the battle fronts. There was demonstrated to us the absolute necessity for not slowing down in our production of foodstuffs and war materials; the imperative need of keeping the home front unified. I can tell you gentlemen that those demonstrations brought to all of us a new realization of the enormous task confronting this country before this war can be won.

We were shown that Hitler's army today, in spite of his losses, is a great army, and as well-equipped and as efficient as when the war began. His production is not seriously impaired—our bombings have destroyed not over 10 percent of his production capacity. He has over 300,000,000 enslaved people from whom to draw his workers. His food supply is much better than it was in 1918. He has increased his production of synthetic gasoline to the point where there is now an ample supply for his fliers. His 35,000,000 war workers are turning out weapons, in many cases better than ours; some of them are new weapons of a type we do not even possess. One of their new weapons, a rocket gun, weighs less than 1,800 pounds; yet it has a fire power equal to six heavy field howitzers weighing nine tons apiece. Their 60-ton Tiger tanks are appearing in increasing numbers on the Italian mainland and on the Russian front. There are also a number of heavy new self-propelled guns. Our only hope for avoiding an extended struggle in Europe is, that with our increased bombings we may break the morale of the German people, and thus bring about a peace. While there is some evidence at this time that the morale of the people is weakening, to proceed on the assumption that it will break in the near future would be highly dangerous.

You read what Churchill said a week ago. He bluntly stated that the road ahead would be tough and costly unless something happened. That something is the break in morale of the German people at home.

It took the two best armies of the United States and Great Britain, containing a total of 13 divisions, 5 weeks to overcome the bitter defense of an enemy whose air cover had been removed and whose supply lines were paralyzed by our overwhelming air superiority. The highways in north Africa were in relatively good shape, only a small amount of new road construction being necessary. But as the enemy retreats in Europe, he destroys all highways and railroads, and it is necessary to construct entire new ones. That means construction equipment and construction supplies in very great quantities. In the last war, we could land our supplies on docks which had been prepared for us in France; but in Italy, all warehouses and docks are in ruins when we reach the harbors, and much of our material is destroyed in the process of landing.

Once the United Nations forces have reached the lines on which the Germans have determined to make their stand in defense of their homeland, the days of inexpensive victories for the United Nations will end. Further advances will be contested yard by yard and foot by foot, and by well-trained, veteran troops.

In addition to the European war, we have the still more difficult task of defeating the Japanese, who have over 2,000,000 men of military age not yet called to arms, and as

many more in the 17 to 20 age group. They are building planes faster than we are destroying them. Vast distances handicap our transportation program. While we have been victorious in the Aleutians and in the Solomon Islands, we are not yet within 3,000 miles of the mainland of Japan. The geographic factor gives her a tremendous advantage.

Now, I do not mean to create a sense of defeatism; I have no such feeling. All that I have said is with one objective, and that is for us to become aware—thoroughly aware—of the enormous task before America before the war can be won. It is always better to know the facts—to know what is required. Then, and then only, can we tackle the job adequately.

In addition to the munitions of war, there is another product which is equally essential to the war effort—food.

Unfortunately, our strategy on the food front has not been as able as our strategy on the battle front. This is due chiefly, I believe, to lack of coordination. On the one hand, the Government asks the farmers for increased production, and on the other hand it curtails farm manpower and farm machinery.

We all know that the same steel that could go into farm tractors or milk cans, can be used for tanks and guns; that the same chemicals that go into explosives also go into fertilizers.

The fact is, that the Government should strike a balance between all these needs, and allocate sufficient acreage, manpower, and materials to the farmers so they can perform their vital part in keeping up both the home front and the war front.

The second imperative for winning the war, as I said before, is the imperative need of working out complete accord between the United Nations in the war effort. The Moscow Conference omens well for that. It is a harbinger of better days to come. If this new accord should not continue, if we permit bickering and misunderstanding to creep into our dealings with our allies, then the war if not lost, will be immeasurably prolonged, and the grim toll of blood and sacrifice will mount to even more appalling heights.

Let us never forget that the Axis policy has been to divide and conquer, and that to this policy may be attributed much of its success in the earlier days of the war. As we all know, to gain his diabolical ends, Hitler sowed the seeds of distrust and suspicion in every nation of the world. His rise to power in Germany was achieved by these methods. Racial and religious distrust and antipathy were the instruments by which he thwarted the honest efforts of hose "men of good will" in Germany who were striving to build a government upon sound, democratic principles. Communism, capitalism, and Judaism were his scapegoats.

Japan too, has profited by that plan. By her evil machinations in China, she set brother against brother, and now has the puppet government of Manchukuo on her side in the war. Her policy of divide and conquer was so successful in Burma and Thailand that she was greeted as a liberator when she marched into those countries. And now she is attempting the same tactics in India and the Philippines, with a certain amount of success.

But this policy is a two-edged sword which cuts both ways. We were able to employ this weapon with complete success in the north African campaign. Our advance agents, bringing their message of democracy and good will, built up a vast reservoir of friendship among the natives of that continent, and when our troops landed they were able to take over with relatively small losses in lives and equipment.

Axis agents are still busy in all the Allied countries, in an effort to create disunion among the allies. We must not permit them to accomplish their evil purpose. We must work out a complete accord with our allies, and this can be achieved only by a frank, complete understanding. There must be no secret pacts and secret understandings, such as were entered into by a number of the Allies while World War No. 1 was still raging.

In the pre-war days, had France and England not misjudged the real foe—Hitler—and had they worked out a complete accord with Russia, the Nazi war machine might have been stopped in its inception stage, before it loosed its might upon an unprepared world, and this terrible cataclysm of blood and suffering might have been averted. So much for the two imperatives for winning the war.

But what about the winning of the peace? For, strange as it may seem, victories on the battle front do no insure lasting peace. That is perhaps the biggest lesson, and the bitterest, that we had to learn from the First World War. To insure a lasting peace, we must do away with the causes of war. We all know that if we can avert a contagious disease from our neighbor's home, we may spare ourselves the same disease.

In other words, if we can forestall the political and economical maladjustments which lead to militaristic governments, then we shall have prevented a possible source of militaristic infection.

To build for lasting peace, we must keep two ideas in mind—first, to restore order and recovery to the world by dealing justly with the political, economical, territorial and ideological problems of the various nations—and second, to create some sort of authority with power to preserve the peace.

So, for the winning of the peace, the first imperative is that of working out complete accord between the United Nations. This accord must begin now, and extend throughout the future years.

We have had a good beginning recently. The Moscow Conference was that good beginning. The passage of the Senate resolution was another beginning. I stress the word "beginning" because so many people have fallen into the habit of making a fetish of resolutions, as if the mere passage of a resolution would accomplish world peace.

But to really win the peace, there must be accord on the home front as well as between the nations. And to win the peace on the home front, all America must learn and apply the lessons of cooperation, tolerance, industry, and charity.

Long before the recent election returns were in—in fact, many months before—we saw a trend in Washington which indicated to us that Washington's sounding board—the Congress—was cognizant of a rejuvenated American spirit in the hinterland. Congress, as a result, became more independent. The results of the recent election will accelerate that trend.

Now, let us present a few of the problems that confront us on the home front—present them in the form of questions, and proceed to answer them.

1. What is the pattern that usually follows a great war?

There is widespread fear throughout the land that an economic collapse is in store for us because we cannot maintain the high level of production and employment which is in effect during the war. This immediately raises the question, What usually happens after a war?

The experience of past wars shows, that except for a few months of uncertainty immediately following the establishment of peace, the nations of the world go forward, and that has been true of our own country. We experienced a boom after the First World War, after passing the period of uncertainty.

Unfortunately, the boom went too fast. Prices soared to the skies; the cost of living went up, and that ended in a recession lasting for 18 months, followed, as you know, by 8 years of the most prosperous period in our history, from 1921 to 1929.

Are we going to be faced with a huge army of unemployed, with bread lines, and bonus marches besieging the Capitol?

There have been wild statements made as to the extent of unemployment after the war running as high as thirty to forty million of unemployed. This is sheer nonsense. The careful calculations of sound thinkers indicate that we are likely to have on our hands the responsibility of finding jobs for approximately 10,000,000—not thirty or forty million.

And we will find the jobs. Where and how? Well, invention and new industries and expanded industries will all step in.

Take aviation, for instance. We now have in the aviation service of the Army, Navy, and civilian air forces approximately 2,000,000 men. The airplane production industry today is four times greater than the automobile industry was at its peak.

In the United States today, only 310 municipalities enjoy the benefits of air mail, passenger air express service. In the post-war period, this should be extended to at least 10 times that number—approximately 3,400 municipalities. That means, that with increased aviation service, a large percentage of the 2,000,000 men who have become technically trained and educated in the field of aviation during the war can find employment in that field when they return to civil life.

Our 16 domestic air lines envision tremendous expansion of their services within and without America after the war. They are now flying many thousands of route miles on all 5 continents, delivering critical materials and personnel to all the theaters of war. They will continue to fly those routes in peacetime to meet the commercial demands of the world.

2. What are the factors in this war which differ from those of other wars which make the outlook for the post-war period appear more favorable?

(a) After the First World War we had no controls of prices, wages, or allocations of materials. The wartime controls which we have set up during this war can be usefully employed for a short period, a year or so, after the war—to prevent runaway prices, runaway wages, and runaway inventories. This is something new in our American economy.

But remember that this is only a temporary expedient, to be used only until we get back to approximately normal operation.

(b) Another favorable factor which we did not have in the last year is the tremendous backlog of purchasing power in the hands of the consuming public. Literally billions and billions of dollars of purchasing power are in the hands of American families who will want to buy radios, refrigerators, furniture, automobiles, clothing, and build homes.

(c) Never before have business concerns themselves prepared for the future so well, by building up reserves for the reconversion period after the war. Statements recently issued by the Federal Reserve Board and other governmental authorities, including the Treasury Department, show conclusively that the business corporations of the country have on hand a tremendous amount of surplus funds with which to go forward, expand their plants, grant loans, buy goods, and employ labor abundantly.

I foresaw this 2 years ago, and introduced a bill to provide for liberal refunds to business out of the taxes paid by corporations to the Government, the reserves to be used for reemployment and reconversion.

All of these are favorable factors which did not exist after the last war, but which are genuine assets now. This is not to say that there are no unfavorable factors. But when we balance the favorable and the un-

favorable, I think we must conclude that, if we keep our heads out of the clouds and our feet on the ground, we will enjoy a real prosperity—not so great perhaps, as during the war, but a normal period of prosperous activity.

3. In the period of great activity such as I envision, is there danger of inflation after the war which will wipe out the value of our dollar and depreciate the value of our bonds?

My answer is no, if we act sensibly. As a matter of fact, in this war all the nations of the world have learned the bitter lessons taught by the First World War. There has been greater economic stability and less inflation in all the countries of the world, including our own, than in the First World War.

With the various wartime controls temporarily maintained, and if we manage our Federal Budget sensibly, we can avoid the danger of financial inflation that submerged some of the European countries after the last war, and played havoc with us in this country from early 1920 to the end of 1921.

4. We have built up the largest productive machine the world has ever seen. Of what use will it be?

If we can keep our factories in full operation 40 hours a week, and provide the employment that this activity implies, we will be producing a net national income of somewhere around $125,000,000,000, as compared with 90 billion at the peak of 1929. Even allowing for the price rise which has occurred since then, we would still be in a very favorable position.

But how can we accomplish this full employment and full use of our productive resources? The answer is simple.

We must restore to the fullest extent private enterprise in this country.

We must take government out of business as quickly as possible after the establishment of peace and provide the incentives to businessmen to go forward.

Our tax structure should be such as to provide an incentive to people who have money to invest so that money has a prospect of reward, without turning all the profits over to the Government.

Our unprecedented economic development is based upon this private free-enterprise system, and that should be the target at which we shoot, the goal toward which we should strive.

What chance has a bank broker or private financier in competition with government—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation lending money to private citizens and private business? Obviously, the private financial institutions of this country would fade out of the picture if we develop a government finance system in competition with private enterprise. Government financial institutions must be required to restrict their activities, gradually making way for private enterprise, and remain in existence only when it is apparent that they are absolutely needed where banks cannot serve and where they might be available to meet a crisis. An economic house divided against itself cannot stand; and we in Washington are much concerned with this matter.

We feel that our private-enterprise system must be preserved. When the war is over, the Government will have on hand approximately $50,000,000 worth of goods and plants. These should be handled with extreme care. They should be disposed of in foreign trade through American business channels, in rehabilitation of foreign countries, and the balance distributed through regular business channels in this country.

The Government, in the post-war period, must not engage in distribution. Let business organizations do that. This is necessary, in order that we not fall into a dumping program such as followed the last war.

Wherever possible, plants should be turned back to private ownership, so that government will not extend its field of competition with business. Government competition usually means special privilege for Government-owned and operated business and plants, to the detriment of its competitors, its own citizens.

At the end of this year, the following industries will be owned, either outright or to a considerable extent, by the Federal Government: The entire synthetic-rubber industry; 90 percent of the aviation industry; 50 percent or more of the aluminum industry; 20 percent of the steel industry, based on peacetime output; about one-half the machine-tool industry; 8 percent of the magnesium industry.

These percentages are based on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's ownership of 1,500 or more war plants. When we take into consideration the tremendous future anticipated for the aviation industry, 90 percent Government ownership in that field is particularly significant. If this condition is permitted to continue, it means liquidation of our private enterprise system. And that, of course, means that the American way of life, which has always offered almost unlimited opportunity for the advancement of American youth, will not even exist.

5. What about the public debt? Is that going to bankrupt us?

The fear of a $300,000,000,000 debt is gripping the minds and hearts of our people. This is a staggering amount, but it is not fatal.

With a national income of $140,000,000,000, or even $125,000,000,000, we can meet the interest on the debt, which will amount to about five or six billion dollars.

The danger in the situation is not the interest on the debt but the philosophy which might creep into our economic system that the size of the debt does not matter. There actually are some wild-eyed people in Washington who talk that way, saying that we can go on spending and putting ourselves further in debt, that the sky is the limit, that it does not matter.

Such an attitude will destroy confidence in our financial stability. We must get rid of this false philosophy, and of the defeatest-minded folks, including those who believe in state socialism. We should keep ever before us the lessons taught by the statism of Hitler and Mussolini; we must constantly guard againt such a condition in our own land. We want no economic Pearl Harbors.

6. Does this mean that we should not spend money for other things?

No. The interest on the public debt will be only a small part of our annual Federal Budget, which might run as high as $20,000,000,000 a year, or approximately 15 percent of our national income, because we must provide security for every wage earner, every returning soldier, and for his dependents if he has paid the supreme sacrifice. Security means adequate opportunity for adequate living.

But this opportunity for economic security that we must and will provide for the wage earner, the farmer, and all elements of our society will make for a healthy and sound national economy.

One of the tremendous problems confronting America now and in the future is that of handling Government contracts when the war ceases. We certainly must not go through another period of "cancelitis" as we did after the last war. We must keep our labor employed, our factories going, our economy healthy, if it is at all feasible, and I think that it is. The various committees are studying this problem, and it is the contention of solid businessmen in and out of Government, that the Government, after it cancels its contracts, should not wait to get a perfect check as to what is considered the equitable damage that should be paid. The reason the Government should not wait is that the businessman cannot wait for his money; this is especially true of the small contractor or subcontractor.

An example I know of is that of a firm in my own State, which has some 400 or 500 subcontractors. While the firm itself might be able to absorb the shock, the 400 or 500 subcontratcors could not, unless they receive the money due them, to keep their businesses going, and pay their employees.

The suggestion is made by Under Secretary Patterson that instead of the Comptroller General having this matter in his control, the Army and Navy who made the contracts in the first instance, should be vested with the power to settle the obligations of the Government when cancelation takes place. After that, the Comptroller General could make investigation.

It is very important to our economy after the war that labor be kept employed. Therefore, industry must be reconverted immediately to peacetime demands, and that is why settlement should be made quickly after the contracts are canceled. If the settlements should be made with the Army and Navy, and any excess profits were made, those profits, of course, could be recaptured through the income-tax program.

In all these matters the real issue is what course would be for the greatest good to the Nation as a whole.

In Washington we are concerned also with the international economic situation in the post-war period.

Will there be a scramble for markets? Will there be a competitive, suicidal race between the industries of the various countries for these markets?

Is it possible to create an international monetary system by which goods can be exchanged between nations on a stable and sensible basis?

Certainly. This must be done. Otherwise we will have the chaos which confronted us after the break-down of 1921, with extravagant values between nations—a condition where we never knew from day to day what the American dollar, the British pound, the German mark, or the French franc was worth. This is a problem with which we in Washington will grapple during the coming months.

At the beginning of my talk I raised the question as to what is the faith of those of us who inhabit the "Washington Scene."

It is contended by some that America has no more frontiers, that this country can't develop any further, that the best we can look forward to is a static economy, and that we should therefore divide what we have because we'll never have any more to divide.

Such unhealthful pessimism is not only dangerous; it is entirely unfounded.

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but there is one prediction I can make unhesitatingly: Within 10 years after the close of the war, at least 60 percent of the total production in the United States will be on new products which were not, and never had been in commercial production when the war ended. The use of farm products as raw material in industry is just beginning, and a great stream of unbelievable things is coming out of our research laboratories.

I should perhaps qualify my prediction by saying that it can only materialize if we are governed by laws, and not by executive orders and directives emanating from dozens of bureaus, agencies, and boards. And we must all pull together, for we are all in the same boat. My prediction is also based on the presumption that government will act as an umpire, permitting management to go ahead on its own initiative.

We here in America are singularly blessed by having, already made, a sound foundation for a useful, prosperous future. That foundation includes constitutional government, the Bill of Rights, freedom of opportunity, private enterprise, and all the related things

which go to make up the American way of life. With Abraham Lincoln, "I have faith in the common people. Tell the people the truth and the Nation will be saved."

So, my conclusion is, that notwithstanding the terrible tragedy of this war, the inhuman sacrifice of lives and the destruction of vast amounts of property—my conclusion is, that on the ruins of this old world we can and we will build a better world. Certainly we can do this if we think straight, and adhere to the American way of life. God is available for guidance and direction. I believe America is seeking His light, and will not fail this day and generation.

That is our faith in Washington.

The Scrugham Stock-Piling Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the plans under consideration for national preparedness after we have won the present war, one of the most important things which should be undertaken will be providing our defense industries with a reserve of strategic metals. This is a subject which is receiving the attention of many prominent and thoughtful men throughout the country. In support of this program, it is my privilege to place in the RECORD an address made by State Senator Donald A. Callahan, president of Callahan Consolidated Mining Co., on the occasion of the recent convention of the North Idaho Chamber of Commerce at Kellogg, Idaho:

After the war the problem arising out of the dislocation of our domestic economy will be many and varied. If it is possible, there are two things that must be done:

First. Those who are in the armed forces and in war industries must be relocated in employment which will provide them with a living wage.

Second. Domestic economy must not be allowed to collapse, as might happen if measures are not taken to prevent it.

Everybody is thinking of post-war problems. Naturally, they are thinking in terms of their own particular business or industry. The mining industry realizes that it is facing the greatest crisis of its existence. During this war the Government not only urged the expansion of our mining facilities but has paid a premium for the production of certain critical metals. This has resulted in the opening up of many marginal mining properties and has, incidentally, retarded the development of other mines. The reason for this seeming paradox has been that the stress was laid upon the production of metals. While marginal operations have been able to carry on by reason of the premium prices, those mines with more valuable ore bodies have neglected their development work or have postponed it in order to use all their manpower on production.

Accordingly, we shall find many properties upon which development work has been postponed and many marginal mines which have not produced sufficient to return the capital which was necessary to put the properties in production. Many valuable properties will find their ore reserves exhausted because they have not been able to continue long-time development programs.

To permit a cessation of the payment of premium prices immediately following the close of the war will result in the closing down of all marginal properties without a return of invested capital. For this reason, a policy should be adopted in all justice which will permit these properties at least to secure a full return upon the investment that was made in order that these vital metals might be produced for the war emergency.

Then again, whether the war ends early or late, there unquestionably will be on hand in the ownership of Government agencies, or at processing and manufacturing plants, a surplus of metals. There does not seem to be any question that the surplus will be considerable. In addition to this, there will be large stocks of war machines which it may be necessary to scrap, thus throwing the metal upon the secondary market. Besides this, there will be in the hands of other nations large stocks of unused or secondary metal which unquestionably will seek admission to the markets of this country. If nothing is done, we can expect the greatest debacle, as far as the mining industry is concerned, that has ever been experienced.

We know that it will be the policy of the State Department, because it has so declared, to use the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to break down trade barriers and to permit the free flow of goods and materials among the nations as a part of a policy of friendliness and cooperation. We know from past experience that this policy conflicts directly with the interest of our mining industry at home. The condition in which the world will find itself following this war will be aggravated because of the necessity of finding markets for metals produced under labor conditions with which we cannot compete.

Then too, our sad experience at the beginning of this war should teach us that as a matter of national safety we should have on hand, at all times, a sufficient stock pile of critical and strategic metals to enable our Nation to arm itself in the event of another conflict. To my mind, this is the chief argument from a national standpoint for the continuance of the policy of purchasing and stock-piling these metals.

We cannot expect that our Nation outside of its mining areas, which represent a small portion of the total population, to be much concerned about our problems. Every section of the Nation will have its own problems just as critical. We do know, however, that the entire Nation will be concerned for its own safety and will be conscious as never before of the necessity of metal production as a measure of actual safety.

Wars now are fought with machines; machines are built of metals. Wars of the future will be determined by the ability of Nations to put these machines and munitions of war into the hands of their manpower as early in the conflict as possible. We cannot imagine that this Nation will be so short-sighted as to scrap a policy which has resulted in the accumulation of metals as soon as the immediate needs of this particular conflict are ended. Whatever agreements nations may make among themselves after the war; whatever provisions may be made for preserving the peace of the world, there is no question but that such a peace can only be preserved by preparing for armed conflict, should it arise.

To make such provision, as far as metals are concerned, is the object of the bill which has been introduced into the Senate by Senator SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, and which is known as the Mineral Stock Pile Act. I do not propose to bore you with the mechanics of this bill, but rather to advise you of its objectives. In essence these are as follows:

1. To avoid the repetition in any future emergency of the shortage and unbalance in production and supply of strategic and critical minerals that have impeded prosecution of the present war. Significantly, iron ore, coal, and petroleum are expressly excluded from the provisions of the act.

2. To stabilize and protect the domestic markets for metals and minerals from the dislocations that would result from dumping on these markets, in the post-war period, vast quantities of such metals and minerals as will have accumulated in various forms during hostilities.

3. To assure a measure of post-war economic security to the owners and operators of small and marginal mines in the United States that produce strategic and critical minerals and to stimulate production from such mines now and in the post-war period.

What can we of the mining industry do to bring about the passage of this important piece of legislation? First of all, we can make sure that all of our Representatives in Congress are thoroughly alive as to the necessity of its passage. Then, whenever possible, we should strive through organization to bring home to the Members of Congress, who are not interested in our industry, the grave necessity of making provision for the establishment of a stock pile of metals which will enable our country to arm at the earliest possible moment should it again be threatened by aggression.

While the problem of employment will be extremely serious in our mining areas, if some such measure as this is not enacted, the same situation will probably prevail in many other industries. Our Members of Congress should be urged to survey the entire field of employment and lend their support to all measures which will lessen its intensity. While the collapse of the mining industry will unquestionably cause great hardship among all those directly dependent upon it, our Members of Congress should realize that the collapse of any industry wherever situated will have the same effect, and they should be urged to support measures which will prevent such collapse in any industry.

To sum this all up, our problem is only one of the great serious situations which will be presented to the wisdom of the governing powers of our Nation at the close of this war. We, of the mining States, should be vigilant in impressing upon our representatives in the Government that we must stand together to prevent the collapse of our Nation's economy and to provide the means by which the full impact of change from a wartime to a peacetime economy may be cushioned.

Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, people back in the sticks where I live are not quite as dumb as the Washington bureaucrats think.

Below find printed excerpts which I just received from Handy Electric Mills, Inc., of my home town, Allegan, Mich. The Congress might do well to follow some of the common-sense suggestions of our constituents:

We do not propose to criticize the administration of rationing nor to question the

necessity of that program. We believe that the present unusual conditions made some such program mandatory. The danger might be, as we see it, that at some time control over certain things are no longer relinquished when the necessity is past, or temporarily removed. In the consideration of the above condition, may we call your attention to the following facts:

1. Some months ago the farm producers were urged to produce more meat. Emphasis was laid on the retention of a large number of breeding sows than the farmer normally kept. Farmers were also asked to give attention to pregnant sows so that litters would be larger, healthier, and the rate of mortality on small pigs could be lowered.

2. The offspring from the sows bred at the time the program outlined in paragraph 1 would now be ready for market.

3. Some weeks ago the sale of program wheat was prohibited to feeders having hogs in excess of 200 pounds in weight, meaning increased feeding costs if hogs are not marketed at this time.

It will readily be seen that if this is true, the farmer who trustingly and patriotically followed governmental pleas would now be victimized for this act. He cannot market his hogs if no one will buy, and to keep them he will have to resort to grain of higher price.

We do not know whether this condition is other than local, but we would think that it is at least State-wide.

If we could make a suggestion we would urge that the rationing of pork at least be suspended at once in all areas where conditions exist as above. We see no reason why, if the visible supply would appear to shrink, that rationing could not again be instituted. We believe that the suspension of pork rationing would give enough impetus to consumption of that article to greatly relieve the present situation.

Order Sons of Italy in America Reaffirms Devotion to American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, 400,000 militant, loyal Americans were represented at the national biannual convention of the Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 11, 12, and 13. The officers of the Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, are Supreme Venerable, Judge F. Forte; Assistant Supreme Venerable, S. M. LoPresti; Supreme Secretary, Salvatore Parisi; Supreme Treasurer, Vito Bianco; Supreme Orator, F. J. V. Gimino; and the following trustees: Ruggero Fragali, Lorenzo Moscarelli, Louis Lerz, Louis Orsatti, Louis Moccia, Nancy D'Orsi, Giuseppe Cernuto, John Saporito, James Caforio, Giuseppe Paravati.

Speakers at the biannual banquet included Ben V. Marconi, General Chairman; S. M. LoPresti, Toastmaster; Hon. Felix Forte, Judge, Superior Court, Boston, Mass.; Hon. Ugo Carusi, Executive Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Eugene Alessandroni, Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Peter H. Odegard, Assistant to Secretary Morgenthau; Hon. Edward Corsi, New York City; Louis R. Lanza, Grand Orator; Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Mayor of Cleveland; Hon. Carl V. Weygandt, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Ohio.

A resolution was represented by the Honorable Edward Corsi of New York City, and was adopted unanimously. The resolution follows:

The Order Sons of Italy in America, in convention assembled in Cleveland this day, Armistice Day 1943, renews its pledge of unlimited support of the war and once again, voicing its entire membership, reaffirms its devotion to the principles of democracy and freedom for which America and its allies are now fighting throughout the world.

We are proud of the record of Italian Americans in this war. We salute our 800,000 young men and women of Italian blood in the armed forces of the United States and pay lasting tribute to those in the Mediterranean, in Italy, and in the Pacific, who have died on the battlefield that we of their flesh and blood and all of our fellow men throughout the world may be free of oppression and tyranny. We salute, also, the millions of Italian Americans in shops and factories, in the mines, and on the farms, who produce the sinews and the implements of war which make victory inevitable and democratic government secure.

While Americans of Italian descent constitute but 4 percent of the population of the Nation, our young men and women in uniform are 11 percent of our armed forces. They constitute the largest single nationality unit in our Army. To the everlasting credit of Italian immigrants and their sons and daughters in America, let it be said that against them there is charged not a single act of sabotage or espionage or disloyalty of any kind. The hearts and the soul of these people are with America alone.

That we may further strengthen the Nation's cause and hasten the victory, we call our fellow Italian-Americans to redouble their efforts on the home front, continue to respond generously to the country's appeals for support to the war fund, to the Red Cross, to the Treasury Department, and to unite indissoluble on the broad basis of patriotism, casting aside all personal and group interest and clashing political and economic views which weaken and destroy this unity. Also that we may soon achieve victory over our Nazi and Japanese enemies and hasten the liberation of Italy, we pledge support to the democratic forces now striving heroically to restore liberty to the Italian people. We denounce the so-called Fascist Republican Party, puppet and tool of the barbarian hordes on Italian soil, and trust no Italian will be misled by its voice of betrayal and defeat.

We call upon America to return to their homeland, to fight for the liberation of Italy, all Italian prisoners of war whose hearts are with the cause of democracy. Pending their return to Italy, we ask that these prisoners be released in the custody of relatives and friends in America to aid in home-front production as workers in the common cause.

While we are mindful of and grateful for the tolerance and understanding with which our Government has dealt with Italian alien residents throughout the war, we believe the time has come for a review of all pending cases of Italian aliens still detained in alien camps as potentially dangerous to the national security. We are certain that, in the light of the present situation and the new status of Italy as a cobelligerent ally of America and the United Nations, most of these detained aliens will be found to be our friends and not our enemies. This we believe to be a further act of good will toward the people of Italy.

We recommend the opening of the mails to Italy, that there may blow freely to the Italian people in this tragic moment of their life the sentiments of their kinsmen in America. We ask, too, that the transmission of remittances in money and in kind be facilitated to that country.

The devastation, the hunger, the appalling human sufferings caused by the Nazi hordes in Sicily and southern Italy and by our own inevitable military activity in that theater of the war call for immediate and generous measures of relief and rehabilitation. It is to America that the Italians turn their emaciated faces and hopeful eyes for an answer to their impelling needs. We neither can ignore nor delay our answer, lest frustration and despair create new problems for the forces of liberation. This answer must come simultaneously both from our Government in Washington in appropriations adequate to the immediate need and from the 7,000,000 Italians in America who are eager and prepared to give all that they can in accordance with governmental requirements. We ask the President's War Relief Board in Washington to approve now the formation of a representative Italian-American committee for Italian relief and to authorize the collection of funds for this urgent cause. We ask, too, that the national war fund allocate out of its contingent fund a liberal contribution for Italian relief comparable with the sums allocated to other occupied and devastated countries. The cause of Italy is particularly and naturally dear to the hearts of those of us who trace our ancestry to that land. But the cause of Italy is even dearer and more important to those of all strains who realize that there cannot be a new democratic Europe and a better world order without a free, united, and happy Italy. The cradle of culture and the arts must be preserved as an instrument of progress in the world. It must be welcomed as an equal partner in the concert of free nations.

The Order Sons of Italy voicing the conviction of all Italian Americans urges as an integral element in the establishment of a just peace the preservation of the territory of Italy and a free access to the economic resources of the world in accordance with the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Any attempt to dismember that country, to deny it its right to natural boundaries or exploit by artificial arrangement for military or diplomatic needs must, and will be, fought vigorously by the liberal forces of the world. We condemn the propaganda in certain quarters to appease incipient imperialistic forces by promises of cession of strictly Italian territories to other nations. This would be a surrender to reaction and a continuance of the political and diplomatic practices which make for chaos and war.

In a new democratic world for which the blood of our sons is being shed freely on a vast world battle front, men and women must be accorded the right to earn their bread honestly wherever they may find it. Lest privilege and exploitation continue to frustrate the hopes of mankind, all unnecessary and selfish barriers impeding the free movement of men over the earth and the liberal exchange of men's handiwork must be broken down. We favor a liberal immigration policy among all the nations and an open door to the world's material and economic resources. In such a world colonial exploitation and imperialistic schemes and dreams have no place. In such a world the nations of the earth, Italy included, will find justice, opportunity, and peace. The alternative is the recurrent tragedy of war.

To this program the Order Sons of Italy in America is irrevocably committed. We see our country as the hope of the world. Lest

that hope fail, we join with all fellow-Americans in the affirmance of American leadership and the realization of America's ideals throughout the earth.

This resolution adopted unanimously at the supreme convention on this 11th day of November A. D. 1943.

Address of Robert Rooe Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 11, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the headline orators on the program of the Indiana State Conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution held at the Lincoln Hotel in Indianapolis on October 13, 1943, was a lad 17 years old, Robert Rooe Simpson, of 1010 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind. At that conference were present 750 delegates from 92 chapters.

Robert Rooe Simpson is junior president, National Society, Children of the American Revolution, which has 18,000 members in 48 States and Territories with another 10,000 senior sponsors and officers. His local society in Marion County has more than 150 members. His column, "Subdebs and Squires" appears weekly in the Indianapolis Sunday Star. Bob, a junior premedic at Wabash College, is ranked third nationally in intercollegiate boxing, and is official boxing instructor at the United States Naval Armory in Indianapolis. He is, indeed, a versatile youngster with a splendid mind and highly patriotic ideals.

During the past 4 months Bob has made a speaking tour covering 19 States, talking to State conferences of the Children of the American Revolution, and to assembled groups of Daughters and Sons of the American Revolution. His speech has received acclaim and has been given a fine press.

I share the pride of our Indianapolis people in this brilliant young man and I am pleased to say that the House of Representatives by unanimous action has honored my request that his address to the Indiana State Conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution shall be printed in the Congressional Record. It was as follows:

Madam State Regent, Indiana Daughters of the American Revolution, guests, it is a great privilege and honor to be invited to bring to you a message from the National Society, Children of the American Revolution.

In times such as these the Children of the American Revolution must do more than ever to keep alive the flame of liberty around the world. We are all working toward the same goal, and we shall reach it, namely, the destruction of all those forces opposing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom of convention. Although all of us in the C. A. R. are too young to take part in legislating, we all look forward to the day when we may freely vote and express ourselves.

A post-war world is being planned by you, our elders, but you are not the only ones who have to live through the reconstruction period which you are planning. We, the youth of today, will have to be the managers of that world of tomorrow, and for that reason we should definitely have a voice now in the planning of the post-war world. This is especially true of members of the Children of the American Revolution whose ancestors fought for freedom and planned the American way of life. No less must we fight today for our ideals. Won't you, Daughters of the American Revolution, leaders in your communities, see that we teen-agers, also descended from a worthy ancestry, gain a place at the council tables where plans for the post-war world are being formulated.

The precedent for our youthful leadership today was set centuries ago. Solomon ascended to the throne of Israel in his sixteenth year and governed his people wisely for 40 years. Aristotle, by the time he reached his eighteenth birthday, was sought for opinions and his decisions were followed. Alexander had conquered a large portion of the known world before he was 20. Archimedes discovered his main scientific principles while still in his teens. Christ was a mere child when He was accepted as an intellectual leader in the temple. Joan of Arc had saved France before she was 17. Queen Isabella of Spain started her public career at the age of 12, and it was the mental strength and moral courage of this youthful queen that made possible the discovery of America. Here in America, George Washington was well on his way to leadership at 16. Benjamin Franklin had his first literary efforts published when he was 14. And Alexander Hamilton began to write in defense of freedom when he was 17.

The Children of the American Revolution as an organized group offers the best guide of which I know for the development of leaders, and to the understanding of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity. Will you, Daughters of the American Revolution, encourage us so that we may strive a little harder and work a little longer in order that this, our flag, shall never cease to wave over the land of the free?

International Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, last Friday evening the National Lawyers' Guild held a testimonial banquet in honor of Hon. James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. At the conclusion of the postprandial exercises Mr. Fly delivered an address entitled "International Communications." It is so thoughtful and suggestive that I ask leave to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and suggest the advisability of my colleagues reading it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this country freedom of communication has been accepted and placed into practical operation as a part of our everyday life. To us, the free flow of intelligence is commonplace. The freedom to speak, to write, to listen, and to see, create only a shallow impress upon our consciousness. The developments of modern science which have made freedom of communication so vital in this Nation are seldom appraised in terms of their efficacy. Only by articulate reminders do we give more than a passing thought to the actual effectuation of this democratic principle. In modern complex society we could hardly understand one another without the free flow of intelligence. Nor could the solidarity of our people be achieved without it. As Washington has said, the very capacity of the people for self-government depends upon the wide diffusion of knowledge. This is, indeed, in much more than a theoretical sense, one of the basic cornerstones of democracy. The newspaper is on the living-room table; the telephone is almost within arms' reach; telegraph facilities are available on a moment's notice. Numerous wire, cable, and radio circuits carry news and other intelligence to and from the far ends of the earth, while radio broadcasting functions as the greatest practical achievement in the field of mass communications. Thus, we as a people, achieve well-nigh the optimum benefits from both the theoretical principle and the practical mechanism which provide a free and full communication of intelligence. Obviously, all of this is essential to our happiness, to our acquaintanceship with and our sympathetic understanding of one another, and to our comprehension of the problems of the Nation and the world.

Today Chungking is nearer to New York than was San Francisco a few decades ago. Developments in the field of transportation and communication have made us neighbors with every other country. All of the arguments in favor of the closer understanding among the people of the different portions of this country in the earlier days are today applicable in terms of the world of tomorrow. As Woodrow Wilson said, "Do you not know that all the world is all now one single whispering gallery?"

It is only natural, therefore, that at this critical juncture we should turn to a review of the problem of achieving adequate communications between this country and the far reaches of the earth. More depends upon this than one can readily realize; and the time is later than most of us know.

Let us take a brief look at the world communications picture which has developed during the past century. Needless to say, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, so far as rapid transmissions are concerned, we lived in a world of darkness, of ignorance, and of easy misunderstanding. There was in those days the degree of mental blindness that is possible now only through the oppressions of absolute governments. For example, in the fall of 1861, we all but went to war with Great Britain, due to the inability promptly to transmit a clarifying message. During the weeks of delay in transmitting the message, the forces of disruption were at work on both sides of the Atlantic, and our Ambassador in London had little knowledge of what was in the mind of his own Government. When the massage finally did arrive, and the difficulty was cleared up, the London Times declared, "We nearly went to war with America because we had not a telegraph across the Atlantic."

To the turn of the century, there was a slow but sure development of trans-Atlantic cables, which eventually and in a limited manner placed us in immediate contact with England and the European Continent. There came a lesser development of cables across the Pacific, one from Canada to Australia, and a single strand from the United States touching ultimately the Philippines, Japan, and China. Britain, Germany, and

Italy largely controlled the cable systems both along the coast lines of Europe, Africa, and Asia and along the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

As transportation by ship and rail improved and as trade and political relations grew, it soon became obvious that this system of cables was inadequate for the expanding needs of the world. It is a fortunate circumstance that by 1920 radio communications had been developed as a feasible mechanism. You may very well have assumed that this Nation, a leader in the field of scientific development, at that time promptly moved out and established a world-girdling network of communication by radio. I have to confess to you that this was not accomplished. As a consequence, we have today for the first time the task of enunciating a democratic philosophy for the free flow of international communications. And we have yet to chart both the principles and the mechanics which will adequately provide for that essential exchange of intelligence among all peoples.

But first let us review the practical situations that followed in the train of the Versailles Treaty. For it is true that even the growth of radiotelegraph follows pretty nearly the pattern set at Versailles.

At the Versailles peace table the problem of communication could have been approached in either of two ways. One was to scramble for facilities, and the other was to seek a comprehensive cooperative scheme whereby communications should be used for the equal benefit of all. As a matter of fact, President Wilson in Paris, in the spring of 1919, carried in his pocket a memorandum written by his chief communications adviser, Walter S. Rogers, which envisaged both the practical problems and to a great extent the principles which hinged upon the establishment of this practical mechanism. For example, the memorandum emphasized the important part which the distribution of the President's addresses and other American news had played in bringing the war to a conclusion and in clearing the way for a common understanding. Mr. Rogers pointed out plainly that when communication facilities are lacking the opportunity for growth of international misunderstanding is encouraged.

He emphasized the need to avoid at all costs any extensive control of communications facilities by one nation which favors its own people and its own commerce. Mr. Rogers asserted that the ideal is a world-wide freedom for news and the breaking down of existing barriers, chauvinism, or lack of vision. He called for adequate facilities, for the fair control thereof, and for the provision for the generous flow of intelligence in all directions, with the warning that there must be direct, unhampered communication lest suspicion lurks that intermediaries profit by information passing through their hands. There, at least, were both the idealistic kernel of the problem and the practical suggestions which would move toward the goal. But in the great scramble for power over a broad area of subject matters, the principles were neglected and the ownership and control of communications went along imperialistic lines To a great extent the United States was left, and it has been left to this good day, looking at the rest of the world through a bottleneck.

Great Britain emerged from the peace conference with her dominant position in world communications reenforced. Not only did it have its own world-wide cable system but it also acquired a good deal of the German cable system which, prior to World War No. 1, gave American interests a slight measure of protection through the balance achieved by the competition of these powers. And, since the consent of Great Britain is necessary to communicate with the important points in its Empire, it has been able to dictate the terms and conditions upon which such communication would take place.

Let us see what restrictions on the free flow of world communication the system of control has meant. For example, as early as 1931, R. C. A. C. negotiated a contract for a direct radio circuit between the United States and Australia. Despite the fact that the Australian Commonwealth was desirous of having the direct circuit established we were forestalled.

This meant that any message from the United States to Australia had to be transmitted first to Montreal or Vancouver and thence to Australia. Similarly, any message which an Australian desired to send to the United States had to go first to Montreal or Vancouver to be retransmitted to the United States.

After 12 years, a direct circuit was finally authorized between Australia and the United States, but this was limited to the duration of the war, and as a condition to the authorization it was required that the same old rate of 58 cents a word be maintained for the direct route while a 30-cents-a-word rate is applied between Australia and Canada. The rate on direct radio circuit from Dakar in West Africa to Montreal is 30 cents, to New York 90 cents per word.

Another example: Only this week we succeeded in establishing a radio communications circuit to British Guiana, in this hemisphere. Here again the existence of the circuit is limited to the duration of the war, the traffic to be handled is circumscribed, and it is insisted that current high rates be continued.

Moreover, we are still unable to secure authorization for a direct press circuit between Australia and the United States. Take the case of American and Canadian reporters assigned with General MacArthur in Australia. The Canadian correspondent can cable long messages throughout Canada at British Empire press rates of less than 2 cents a word. An American correspondent must pay 12 to 14½ cents a word.

To this day we have been unable to secure the establishment of direct communications between this country and Capetown, South Africa, and between this country and India. Messages to Capetown or India must first be funneled through London, then later retransmitted halfway around the world to Capetown or to India. The importance of direct communication to these points, especially during wartime, should readily be apparent.

The difficulties in such roundabout methods are obvious. Details of the operation are duplicated, thereby increasing the expenses. There are long hours of delay at the bottleneck. Some of the byproducts of this system alarmed not only American representatives at the Versailles Peace Conference but their views were amply described in an edition of the London Standard. It frankly stated:

"It gives power to survey the trade of the world and as a result of that survey to facilitate those activities which are to the interest (of those in control) and impede those which are not."

Perhaps we should give some more sympathetic thought to the British case. The British have long been aware that the lifeline of communication and its preferential treatment to its own areas are essential to the promotion of the Empire. Britain has developed and expanded and lives today, and will live tomorrow, upon its shipping, its aviation, its trade, its insurance, and its financial relations with the far-flung points of the globe. It hardly follows, however, that either our own Nation or other nations can live, or even endeavor to live, in the world of tomorrow without an adequate, comprehensive, and efficient system of direct communications reaching every important area on the globe. This must be accomplished in complete cooperation with the British Empire, as well as with all other countries, and it must be in complete recognition of the rights of all peoples.

A good many of these international problems, of course, can be partially solved right here at home and must be solved before an effective, constructive international job can be done. The lack of unification among American international carriers has played into the hands of those whose selfish interests has had a direct result on world communication inequities. At present our American carriers must compete with foreign monopolies, either Government-owned or Government-backed and controlled. These foreign monopolies play one American carrier off against the other. American carriers may get one-third of the rates as against two-thirds for the foreign monopoly. The result is that the rates to the public tend to be kept at an artificially high level so that the American companies can live. There are other disadvantages resulting from a multiplicity of American international carriers, such as the useless duplication of circuits, equipment, and manpower. In addition, a single organization would use fewer frequencies and thus leave room for expansion.

The continuing operation of our cables is essential for reasons of capacity and security. But cable operating costs are much higher than radio. If the rates are geared to the low-cost radio, the cables may go bankrupt. If rates are geared to cable costs, the public loses. The need is to combine these two systems so that the public will enjoy the lowest feasible over-all rate.

The whole history of cable operation has been one of high rates because of high costs. Consider for a moment the Government's first cable message. In 1866, when Maximilian set himself up as Emperor of Mexico, President Johnson sent Phil Sheridan with 50,000 troops to the Texas border. It was important to let Europe know immediately that he meant business. He despatched a cable message at a 50-percent Government discount, or a net cost of $23,000. Rates in general had to move downward; and as they did, history has proved that traffic moved up. But still it is idle to talk about the free flow of information and intelligence at either $23,000 per message or at the current rate of 30 cents per word between this country and its neighbors to the south, which is largely geared to cable costs.

In order to deal effectively with the foregoing problems, I cannot overemphasize that our own house must be put in order before we go to the next peace conference. The very least we should do is to establish a single American international carrier.

At this point let's see what practical results we may hope to attain by an effective system of international communications. Quite naturally we want to promote our international trade and insure amicable and mutually beneficial commercial relations and in this way to build our economic strength and stability. Shipping lanes must be kept open so that vessels can ply between markets hardly tapped in yesteryear. Radio must move, hand in hand. We must aid expanding systems of aviation. The essentiality of a vast array of radio communications to an international aviation industry is all too obvious to that industry and to us who must find the radio frequencies to carry the necessary hour to hour communications. Travelers by ship and by air should have service back home and to other points on the globe. There must be complete news and informational services. We must be prepared to serve the needs of our naval and military forces. Our diplomats must be served in promoting effective and favorable relations with foreign countries. And in considerable measure international communications must act as an instrument of broad political policy.

To resolve the problems and achieve the practical ends we must make sure that the next peace conference concerns itself with the principle of cooperation among nations and the effectuation of democratic principles to guide the practical means of establishing and operating a world communications system.

At the outset I cannot overstress the importance of removing of Axis controls and influences over communications facilities outside of their own boundaries. The United States should have no less control than any other country over the cables connecting America and the mainland of Europe via the Azores. The South American facilities must be free to carry on communications with the world, and Axis controls and influences must be eliminated. It is essential that control over local properties should be restored to local governments and their own citizens; it hardly behooves the democracies to move in imperialistically where the local governments or interests can do an effective job. Our consistent aim must be the unfettered flow of communications. And we ourselves should own local foreign properties only where and to the extent necessary to accomplish this guiding purpose.

It seems to me that before any worth-while world communications system can be projected, at least five basic principles must be accepted by all the nations at the peace conference.

The first of these principles is a uniform rate for all messages throughout the world in all directions. There should be a universal policy of nondiscrimination.

The second principle reinforces the first in that these rates must be low rates. I am not prepared to say at this time how low this rate should be nor do I think this is the proper time to make such a determination but I do think that our objective ought to be a rate of a few cents per word to any gateway in the world.

I can hear the skeptics challenge the feasibility of obtaining either of these objectives. They will ask how it is economically feasible for countries to operate communication systems at the same rate throughout the world and at cheap rates. The whole history of rate making in communications establishes the principle of increase in flow with decrease in cost. The British themselves have a uniform rate to any point within their far-flung empire, which is a good deal cheaper than the rates charged by any carriers between the United States and similar points.

Our forward looking postal administration has made the whole world a single postal district and letters flow throughout the world for a few cents. Yet their cost of operation bears a more direct relation to distance than in radiotelegraph where cost does not vary with distance.

The third principle to be used as a guide is instantaneous radio communications between all important areas on the globe. The future rests largely upon radio. The strain on the principle may be the shortage of frequencies. But radio is just becoming of age and its engineers already envisage some important technical advances.

For example, some engineers think that an electronic conveyor belt in the equatorial zone would have many advantages in overcoming certain undesirable natural phenomena which are disturbing in other latitudes, and along other transmission paths. Main transmitting stations might be located in Puerto Rico, West Africa, Egypt, India, China, Guam, Hawaii, and Mexico. All important world points would key into this belt for the instantaneous transmission and reception of intelligence, and full international use could be made of frequencies which are now useful only for short range communication during particular hours of the day or seasons of the year. Thus a message from New York to Sydney would be put on the belt at Puerto Rico, automatically relayed via Mexico, Hawaii and Guam, where it moves off the belt and down to Sydney. In this entire system relatively few frequencies would do the work of many. Of course, continuing international cooperation as well as extensive engineering research is essential as a basis for this or any comparable engineering plan.

However, more immediate benefits can be derived from recent technical developments which permit as many as twelve radio telegraph circuits to operate in a channel which heretofore would accommodate only one circuit. There are also possibilities with respect to a single side band transmission which cuts channel requirements in half. While this may sound very technical, the fact remains that full advantage of these technical developments cannot be realized without international cooperation.

The fourth principle is the establishment of uniform and low press rates throughout the world. To a great extent, as I have already indicated, this has been done by the British Empire. I think it is vitally important to our future post-war world that the same system be extended. It is idle to talk about a free press in terms of a well-informed world community where physical facilities are inadequate, or where they are throttled and controlled to serve selfish ends, or where the cost of service discourages less than the optimum usage.

Finally, we must have free ingress and egress of information, and freedom for all peoples of the world to communicate with each other. Facilities should be equally available to citizens of all nations without any form of preference between them.

At this juncture our concern must go beyond radio, telegraph, and telephone. International radio broadcasting, and when possible, international television must complete this world-communication picture. I have not developed this phase of the problem here simply because it is a separate subject. When these operations can be set up, all countries should be encouraged to establish comparable and reciprocal arrangements and facilities in this field. This greatest of all mechanisms for mass communication should serve as a mighty force in bringing about mutual acquaintanceship, respect, and sympathetic understanding among peoples.

In the field of broadcasting, as in all forms of public communication, each country should adopt certain policies which, without fettering the free interchange of news, information, and educational material, would guard against intrusion into purely domestic affairs and attacks upon nations, races, or creeds. Restraints, of course, should be applied sparingly; and we should rest assured that these restraints are amongst those which can properly be termed "those wise restraints which make men free."

This Nation, and with it, the world, missed an opportunity at Versailles in 1919. Shall we miss it again at the next peace conference?

The Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Lothrop Stoddard on November 21, 1943, which was broadcast over the radio. The address had to do with the Moscow Conference, and the declarations issued as a result of that conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three weeks have passed since the Moscow Declarations were given to the world. For the general public it has been a sort of honeymoon period. Hailed by political leaders and lauded by the press as an epoch-making achievement, the effect has been to engender an atmosphere of general popular optimism. The average citizen seems to believe that the basic problems of both the war and the post-war settlement have been solved; that the foundations of a stable, enduring peace have already been laid.

To a certain degree, optimism is justified. The Moscow Conference was undoubtedly a success in several respects. It solidified the big three—America, Britain, and Soviet Russia—in their common determination to prosecute the war against Hitler's Third Reich to a decisive conclusion. It evolved an agreement on certain broad formulas which could serve as a frame of reference for subsequent action. Last but not least, it adopted the method of continuous consultation by the establishment of an Advisory Commission for the study and discussion of outstanding matters. All this constitutes what Secretary Hull, in his address to Congress last Thursday, termed "the foundation for cooperative effort in the post-war world."

To be sure Mr. Hull likewise pointed out that this was only a first step and that a vast deal remained to be done before a post-war world of peace and security could be attained. Nevertheless, the general effect of his address was to inspire a degree of optimism which, in my humble opinion, at least, is not justified by the general world situation. Curiously enough the very loftiness of Mr. Hull's character and reputation are chiefly to blame for the excessive optimism which his words inspired. An old-time liberal, in the best sense of that somewhat abused term, he tends to believe that enunciated principles have an almost mystic virtue in themselves. This defect of his very qualities is common to many Americans. A good instance of this amiable tendency is the enthusiasm which swept American public opinion two decades ago at the adoption of the Kellogg Pact, ostensibly outlawing war, though a critical minority realized from the first that it did nothing of the kind. In similar fashion it seems to me that the wise attitude is to regard the Moscow Declarations as a hopeful and useful first step toward better things. But those declarations will be of practical efficacy only to the extent that they are interpreted, implemented, and specifically applied; just as the soundest law is no better than its enforcement.

Well, our war-torn world is sweeping onward so fast that the Moscow Declarations will have to be implemented and specifically applied very soon in order to cope with dangerous situations which are arising in several quarters, notably in Nazi-occupied Europe and in the Near East. Both those vast regions are veritable powder magazines heaped with high explosives. And the detonating agent in every instance seems to be the ulcerated nationalism which the war itself has intensified.

Three Sundays ago I quoted excerpts from a remarkable address by Herbert Hoover wherein that elder statesman emphasized the necessity of recognizing and constructively utilizing the tremendous dynamic of nationality. Nations, he warned, great or small, are less than ever "inclined to sur-

render their independence or any part of their sovereignty to anybody. That is an inevitable reality from which there is no escape. Lasting peace will not be built upon any surrender of the independence or sovereignty of nations. It must be built upon the collaboration of free peoples."

As a general principle, that statement probably evokes the hearty acceptance of most persons. Yet see how difficult is the application when two or more nationalisms conflict. First, let's take a look at what is behind the Lebanon crisis, whose historical background I sketched for you last Sunday. The Lebanese and Syrians demand the independence they ardently crave and which has been promised them over nearly 20 years by successive French governments, including the Free French regime headed by Gen. Charles de Gaulle. They want independence now, they are backed by a large part of the Moslem world, and if they don't get it, there may be the devil to pay all the way from Morocco to India. That would make it very tough for Britain, who tells De Gaulle and his Algiers committee that such consequences cannot be allowed. It would be bad for us, too, and our diplomats have emphatically told the Committee that we cannot understand how a nation suffering from Nazi oppression on its home soil can infringe the liberties of another people. But De Gaulle and his Committee are where they are because they deliberately cater to and foster the war-stimulated nationalism of the French people, who are morbidly touchy to anything that savors of foreign pressure and who see in Syria and Lebanon, not temporary League mandates but parts of the French national patrimony which must on no account be alienated. So General Catroux, De Gaulle's representative in Beirut, warns the British to keep their hands off. And if the British should feel impelled to take action in order to avoid disastrous results elsewhere, it would send De Gaulle's stock up 100 points at home and make him more than ever the national hero. On the other hand, if De Gaulle yields, his stock might soon sink below par. That is the danger at a time when patriotic passions run so high and are so blind to the larger consequences.

Now, let us consider some of the nationalistic complications which can be discerned on the European Continent. With the exception of insular Britain, historic Europe took no part in the Moscow Conference, a sad commentary on its decline from the greatness of former days. Yet, between the Atlantic Ocean and the Russian border live some 350,000,000 human beings, divided into many nationalities whose patriotic fervor has been made more burningly intense by the very threat to their survival which war and conquest have imposed. They demand that what they consider their inalienable rights to ind pendence and national sovereignty shall be respected and safeguarded. Unfortunately, many of those national claims overlap or conflict, and no peace settlement, however enlightened and altruistic, could satisfy all of them. No one can justly quarrel with the principle adopted at the Moscow Conference of adjourning frontier questions until after the termination of hostilities. Also, an excellent method of safeguarding the interim well-being of liberated peoples was adopted for Italy, which is to be guided by an inter-Allied commission, including Russia. Furthermore, article 2 of the Moscow Declaration regarding Italy states that: "Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press, and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people." Italy's post-war frontiers are left for subsequent adjudication, but the life, liberty, and property of individual Italians are assured today as well as in the future.

If the principles set forth in the Moscow Declaration on Italy were applied unqualifiedly to all other peoples as these are liberated, most of the dangers that now threaten would be automatically eliminated. Unfortunately, several European peoples today have no such confidence. This is especially true of the belt of peoples which lie in the path of the advancing Russian armies. Finns, Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, and Rumanians are alike gripped with fear lest their liberation from the tyranny they now suffer under the Nazis will be succeeded by something equally to be dreaded under uncontrolled Russian military occupation. This fear is founded upon their previous experience under Russian rule during the early years of the present war, when those territories came into Russian possession under the bargain struck in August 1939 between Hitler and Stalin. In every case Russian occupation was then followed by mass deportations to Siberia or other remote parts of the Soviet Union, these deportations including most of the upper and middle classes and aggregating some 2,000,000 persons—on the average, about 10 percent of the respective populations. Russian occupation likewise involved the wholesale expropriation of private property and the imposition of the Communist system in its political, economic, and social aspects. Furthermore, the Russian Government annexed them formally to the Soviet Union and declares that their status is not even discussible in the eventual peace settlement, although neither Britain nor the United States have recognized those annexations, and although our Government maintains regular diplomatic relations with the governments-in-exile.

The Moscow Conference gave no comfort to these frightened peoples, because, under the general terms of that agreement, the Russians have the right to occupy those regions with no interallied supervisio like that specifically provided for in Italy. Rightly or wrongly, the conviction is general that fresh deportations on an even greater scale would settle the question long before the general peace settlement by destroying the national lives of the peoples themselves. It is easy to visualize the disastrous consequences which might arise if Russian armies penetrate those regions under the present arrangement. German propaganda is losing no opportunity of pointing ou the blackest possibilities and seeks to mobilize those peoples to a last-ditch defense. What more likely that, in despairing fury, at least considerable sections of the populations would oppose the Russians and thereby invite even more terrible reprisals?

It seems to me that the only way of averting such imminent catastrophes is to apply the Moscow Declaration on Italy to all other European regions on their liberation from Nazi domination. Bona fide interallied commissions should be set up now, and guaranties for life, liberty, and property should be established. This would in no way controvert the decisions taken at Moscow to adjourn boundary settlements until after the war. It would, however, safeguard the populations during the interim period and deprive Nazi propaganda of one of its most effective arguments.

If that is not done, and done speedily, the consequences are apt to be very unfortunate, not only for Europe but for our own country as well. We Washingtonians feel we know something about national politics, so let's see what would probably happen in the United States of America. In this country there are estimated to be fully 3,000,000 voters of Polish birth or ancestry, and more than 500,000 of the other national origins I have mentioned. Nearly all of them vote in pivotal Northern States. They are good Americans, but they naturally have strong ties with their homelands and are deeply concerned with what happens there. If what I have suggested should happen, from Finland to Poland, does anyone doubt that most of those voters would do their best to punish the party in power, work against cordial relations with the Soviet Union, and oppose American participation in a European settlement which accepted those happenings? Those embittered and vengeful millions of voters would be a powerful addition to the isolationist reaction which is bound to occur in America anyway after the war. It would not be necessary for this reaction to embrace a majority of the voters to accomplish its negative purpose. If a trifle more than one-third of the Senate should be staunchly isolationist, the performance of 1919 would be repeated, when America rejected the Versailles Treaty and refused to join the League of Nations.

My regular listeners know that I seldom make predictions on these broadcasts. But I make one, here and now. "I predict," in the best Drew Pearson manner, that no United States Senate will either ratify a European peace treaty or join an international organization which condones and consecrates the extermination or mutilation of several European nations. That is something to think about. It seems to me that the administration and the State Department had better consider, and consider quickly, the extension of the Moscow Declaration on Italy to the whole of historic Europe.

Prophecy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 19, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some verses entitled, "Prophecy for Peace," which are so exalted and majestic as to be worthy of publication everywhere.

These inspiring lines were written by my friend, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a captain in the A. E. F. during the First World War, whose poem on the war effort, which appeared in the RECORD of September 17, 1943, has also appeared in recent issues of the American Legion Magazine, the Stars and Stripes, and other patriotic publications of Nation-wide circulation.

That which he now so generously dedicates to the national welfare is the following:

PROPHECY FOR PEACE

Elusive peace, so simple, yet blind lead blind
When power betrays its duty to mankind,
When gross ambition scoffs at right and wrong,
When mercy is not truly wise and strong.

"The world," vowed Wilson, "safe for democracy!"
Who heeded then his words of prophecy?
The League renounced, the boom and crash, lost youth,
Utopias—all delusions masked as truth.

What are, we ask, our men now fighting for
Which was not sanctified by the former war?
"It must not happen again," the millions cried;
But the battle closed, and faith soon dimmed and died.

What augurs now the stage of war unrolled
When on the front at home avarice is so bold
It knows no rule to mark its grasping bounds,
And even the distant fighting front confounds.

What soldier feels the invincible will to win
When here at home are many corrupt like sin,
Leaders of strife, who use the war to pry
Their profits more and more, while brave men die?

Chiefs of industry, whose first care is their gain,
Callous to death due to the ill-made plane;
Hirelings in Government, lobbyists in hall,
Political yes-men, gathering votes, one and all—

What matters it to such, if opportunity offers,
To pack to overflowing their golden coffers?
Let others fight the war, a mere mirage,
While piously they commit their sabotage.

Another day of trial will dawn and then
Will discord, guile and greed rule us again,
Despite the blood, the suffering, the treasure
Paid in the insatiable sieve, world-war's grim measure?

"Peace in our time" from the last war to this
Betrayed our judgment by a Judas kiss;
Again, unless we shun gold, pride and ease,
Today we'll fight, but tomorrow we'll appease.

It is in hearts of men that peace must grow;
The peace we reap is but the peace we sow.
Glossed words, false deeds, though decked with seal and wax,
Must mock their authors before they turn their backs.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Hull Ignores Ominous Sign in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown appearing in the Washington Evening Star of November 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL IGNORES OMINOUS SIGN IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

The war reception given by the Members of Congress to their former colleague and now the very distinguished Secretary of State Hull was well earned.

For many years, Mr. Hull has been battling for a world in which the wolf and the lamb would become bedfellows.

At one time he believed that by breaking down tariff barriers we could help the world toward the path of peace. This failed. In the year preceding the war he attempted to bring about universal peace by reciprocal trade agreements. This scheme also failed.

Now the Secretary believes that the Moscow protocols are the answer to world peace. Being a man who thinks that deceit and old-fashioned diplomacy no longer have a place in a world which has suffered from the ills of the war, Mr. Hull naturally is convinced that world diplomacy now is patterned after his own thoughts—honest and upright, and that a given word is a solemn bond which cannot be broken.

TROUBLE BREWS

So convinced is the Secretary that strife-ridden Europe has turned a new page and for the first time in its hundreds of years of history will become an element of peace and order in the world that he glosses over the ominous indications which already have begun to pour into Washington from across the Atlantic.

To his mind the pacts signed in Moscow have more than a moral value. They are, in his opinion, as binding as a decision of the Supreme Court.

Yet hardly was the ink on these documents dry that uncomfortable reports began reaching the Capital.

For instance, Izvestia, the Moscow newspaper, which is the sounding board of the Soviet Government, says that a confederation of smaller European states would be totally unacceptable to Moscow because it might assume the form of a "cordon sanitaire" against Russia and be an important tool in the hands of the Nazis. This, of course, could not be contradicted if the Nazis were allowed to remain a strong military power.

It was agreed in Moscow, however, that the Allies would fight until the Germans surrender unconditionally, and steps have been devised to pull all the teeth out of the mouth of the Nazi tiger. Consequently there is little reason to fear that the small nations which have suffered so heavily at the hands of the Germans would become the dupes of the Reich.

It is recalled that a confederation of the smaller states, particularly by those in central and southeastern Europe, had been advocated by Prime Minister Churchill in one of his important speeches early this year in the House of Commons. When he talked about the future peace conference, he suggested that the smaller states should be represented by one member speaking in the name of one or more groups of these nations. The suggestion was welcomed in official Washington circles and at that time there was no criticism from Moscow.

While William C. Bullitt was Ambassador in Paris, he gave an address urging the formation of such a confederation. At that time Russia could have interpreted this move as an attempt to establish a "cordon sanitaire." She was then on the suspect list in Washington, London, and even in Paris.

RUSSIA IS SAVIOR

Today the Europeans look to Russia as their savior. Hence, Moscow's opposition to the formation of a confederation is interpreted in many quarters as an indication that she intends to gobble up territories which should remain independent under the demands of international justice, for which Mr. Hull has been fighting with such a vigor.

There appear to be other incidents which are creating an uneasy feeling among Washington observers. For instance, Mr. Hull declared at his first press conference that the Free Germany Committee, which had given Washington and London a severe headache, had been disbanded. It appears that its end had been only an offhand promise not incorporated in written agreement.

According to those who are privileged to read translations of the Russian broadcasts distributed for Russian consumption, the committee will remain as active as heretofore.

Everyone agrees that Mr. Hull's mission to Moscow has been a spectacular success. But—and there always seems to be buts in diplomatic exchange—the agreements have left so much room for personalized interpretation that it is feared that their practical application will not correspond with the spirit of disinterested collaboration which the Secretary found during his 2-week stay in the Soviet capital.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Republic of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram, which I directed to Hon. John A. Pateracki, president of the General Pulaski Memorial Committee, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Republic of Poland.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
November 20, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. PATERACKI,
President, General Pulaski Memorial Committee, New York City:

On this twenty-fifth anniversary of the Republic of Poland, and having in mind the vast contributions made by her heroic sons in the military and civilian activities of our own Republic, I am confident that the full and complete restoration of Poland is the aim and the objective of the American people.

Poland's magnificent contribution in this war, first, in delaying Hitler's progress, and, second, by her remaining in the conflict even under great difficulties, deserves for the young Republic our lasting gratitude.

A liberated Republic of Poland's strength and virility taking its place in the family of nations will contribute to the security, the advancement, and the well-being of the world.

JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator.

Post-War International Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and informative article by William Philip Simms, published in the Washington News of November 18, 1943.

The article deals with the potential majorities in post-war international relationships.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PRECEDENT

(By William Philip Simms)

Apparently, as far as anyone on Capitol Hill can recall, Secretary of State Hull's invitation appearance there today before a joint session of Congress constitutes an American precedent.

This unique mark of esteem for a former colleague and ranking member of the President's Cabinet is regarded by Republicans and Democrats alike as the minimum due the American statesman to whom Russian and British spokesmen alike give most of the credit for the success of the now historic Moscow Conference.

United Nations officials here are particularly impressed by the congressional gesture. They regard it as the most conclusive proof yet that the people are solidly behind American collaboration to maintain a just and lasting peace.

The overwhelming passage of the Fulbright and Connally resolutions in the House and Senate was convincing enough, they agree, but the approval of Mr. Hull's mission to Moscow was even more so because of its obvious spontaneity.

Nevertheless, some of the shrewdest envoys here are cautioning against taking American participation in the post-war security set-up for granted. "It's not yet in the bag," observed one who knows this country unusually well. Said he:

"Unquestionably both Congress and people now favor American participation in the maintenance of peace—even if force is required. I am convinced they are prepared to bear their full share of the sacrifices required to make a league of nations, or whatever you want to call it, work. Nevertheless, I am equally convinced that there is present what I call a 'potential majority,' and a big one at that who will turn isolationist unless the forthcoming peace is just.

"The American people are notoriously sentimental. They are for the underdog. Nothing riles them more than to see a big fellow jump on a little fellow. They are on the side of the weak as against the strong.

"That is why all of your resolutions insist on a just peace and specify that future international collaboration shall be between peace-loving nations. Americans want nothing to do with aggressors or those who use their superior power to enforce their will on the weak.

"Mark my word, if, in the opinion of the American people, the little countries of Europe get a raw deal after the war, they will refuse to help enforce it. If this or that mighty nation arbitrarily retraces frontiers to suit itself, the American people will not send their sons overseas to die in defense of them. If gross injustice is done to populations as a whole, Americans will not collaborate with others to make the injustices permanent.

"That is why I say there is a 'potential' majority in America in favor of isolation * * * if the very same sentiment which now leads them toward world collaboration to forestall aggression and maintain a just peace would stampede them in the opposite direction if convinced the peace is not just.

"Here, in my opinion, is to be found the true secret of Secretary Hull's tremendous hold on the American people. He is so genuinely one of them. They feel they can trust him not to sell the small and the weak down the river. They are for the Moscow pacts because he helped to make them.

"If the rest of the world really wants the United States in the post-war set-up as badly as they say they do," the diplomatist concluded, "they would do well to remember all this at the peace table."

Our Future Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Future Merchant Marine" published in the Columbia (S. C.) The State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FUTURE MERCHANT MARINE

Rising at the suggestion of British statesmen that the United States after the war dispose of its present and building merchant fleet, GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Democratic Senator from Maryland, declares in the American Magazine for December that such a policy would risk our national security and be criminally negligent, reducing us again to a fifth rate merchant marine power. The Senator says we shall build 2,000 merchant vessels this year alone.

Opponents of a strong merchant marine, he says, may offer two stock arguments, namely, that we do not have the trained mariners to man the ships, and that we cannot build and maintain the ships as cheaply as can other nations due to our higher wage scale.

The Senator points out in reply that we should have 175,000 trained officers and men of the merchant marine by mid-1944, and that we should risk a serious unemployment problem by abandoning the ships at the armistice. He might have added that some man-of-war's men from the Navy might care to go into the merchant marine also.

Admitting we can neither build nor operate oceangoing ships as cheaply as our competitors, the Senate suggests continuing Government subsidies representing actual differences in cost of construction and operation, this plan having been practiced by other nations as well as our own.

Senator RADCLIFFE lists three outstanding benefits from a dominant merchant fleet:

"1. The assurance of ample facilities for transporting interocean shipments of men and material quickly and safely in time of national emergencies.

"2. A progressively increasing pool of trained mariners for combat vessels if and when they are needed.

"3. A bulwark of defense upon the sea, a floating parapet against aggressors, a deterrent to war."

He also contends, that because of the tremendous increase in productive capacity because of the war, we'll need the fleet in post-war years, and to prevent post-war depression we must maintain that production speed, and must also have international markets, shipping our products to every port on earth.

This last paragraph, it seems to us, holds the crux of the situation and states its problem. We cannot operate empty ships just to be prepared for the next war which, incidentally, we are now pledged to prevent. But shipping our goods to every port on earth calls for more talk again.

Our same high wages and resulting cost of production put American goods in a price category which peoples of other nations cannot meet in volume. American goods in foreign countries have been luxuries, and unless they are put on a much more modest scale in the future will continue to be luxuries.

It is definitely to be hoped that we shall be able to maintain a large merchant marine, but this business, like any other business, must operate at a profit to be maintained. That is the hurdle to be leaped.

New Frontier: The Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, recently the editor of Collier's Magazine published an article entitled "New Frontier: The Pacific Northwest." The editor requested a number of citizens from the great Oregon country to comment upon the article. I have a copy of one of the replies to the request, from Robert A. Hudson, president of Hudson-Duncan & Co., and it is of such merit, and is so informative as to the remarkable productive capacity of the Oregon country, particularly as it pertains to the production of super-excellent and abundant fruits and vegetables, that I ask unanimous consent to have the reply published in the Appendix of the RECORD, as well as my own comment on the article.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 10, 1943.

WILLIAM L. CHENERY,
Collier's, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CHENERY: I have your letter of the 3d enclosing a rough first proof of a special article written by Lawrence Drake entitled "New Frontier: The Pacific Northwest."

Same was very interesting, but, like all similar articles written about the Northwest appearing in the large national magazines, exploits lumber, water power, and, more recently, shipbuilding as developed by Henry Kaiser, but fails entirely to give mention to our most important and lasting resource, namely, our agricultural possibilities. Not unlike Michigan, Louisiana, and other lumber sections of the past, the Northwest, at the rate we are cutting timber, must ultimately bow to the inevitable and take our place among other lumber sections of the past. Water power naturally is in an entirely different sphere—the surface is hardly touched and is truly a natural and lasting resource and, with a diminishing oil supply, will be a boon to our industry. We were one of the largest shipbuilding communities during the last war. In too short a period thereafter the shipyards and allied industries passed into obscurity entirely. The post-war period only will prove whether the Kaiser and other yards

will remain a resource or pass into history. I think they will pass into history.

The resource never mentioned by writers in connection with the Northwest, namely, agriculture, has by far the greatest possibilities and is permanent. For illustration:

In peaches, we have freestone varieties, especially Elbertas, which are more palatable and more in demand by grocers and chain stores for their private labels than any other canned peach.

The Northwest is the second producing section as far as apricots are concerned. Please note article attached.

Our pears have long been conceded first place and are shipped, canned and fresh, over the entire United States and exported all over the world.

Italian prunes speak for themselves and are strictly a product of the Northwest. They are by far the best canning prune and make the best prune butter.

The Northwest produces more berries than any other section of the United States. In fact, practically half of the canned, barrelled, and fresh-packed berries are produced in the Northwest.

The Northwest is one of the largest apple-producing sections in the United States. Hood River and Yakima apples are in demand everywhere.

Our corn industry is growing by leaps and bounds. Already firms such as the California Packing Corporation, Libby, Bozeman Canning Co., Idaho Canning Co., and many other large canners are located in the Northwest and are shipping sizable quantities over the entire United States.

Peas grow wild on the Oregon and Washington coast. The largest pea cannery in the world is located at Walla Walla, Wash. The Northwest ranks among the largest producers of peas in the United States.

We grow the finest string beans in the world. Our canneries ship to grocers, jobbers, and chain stores for their top labels to such points as New York, Baltimore, Alabama, and other bean-producing areas in the United States.

Regarding pumpkin, such firms as Libby, the California Packing Corporation, and many others can their pumpkin in the Northwest and ship to all parts of the United States where freight rates permit.

Green asparagus grown in the Columbia River Basin is superior to any produced in the United States and such firms as Minnesota Valley Canning Co., the California Packing Corporation, Libby, and many others are doubling their acreage each year.

Beets, carrots, and onions are among the first vegetables produced in the Northwest. The pack now in these items is equal to any other section of the United States.

The Northwest is the only part of the United States in which filberts can be produced. They are native here. The production will exceed 5,000 tons this year.

With the post-war period approaching, many changes will take place in merchandising and among others, water transportation will become the most important. After the last World War—with the abundance of ships available—water rates in intercoastal and coastal trade finally settled down to about half the railroad rates. The railroads will be in a worse position after this war. To take care of the traffic developed by the war they have increased their rail mileage considerably and have materially increased their equipment. They have also been obliged to increase their pay envelopes; consequently with the loss of tonnage after the war their cost will be so high that they cannot reduce their rates which will certainly handicap all plants located off the coast lines of the United States. On account of the large quantity of boats which will be available after this war, competition will be keen and rates considerably lower than after the last war. The Northwest with its wonderful harbors will benefit by the railroads' misfortunes which means that practically the entire coast line of the United States will be reached by water rates; thereby forcing the business to coast-producing States.

No other section in the entire United States majors in so many important agricultural items. The facts given here cause me to believe that agriculture will be our No. 1 resource, and should be mentioned along with water power and lumber.

Yours very truly,

HUDSON-DUNCAN & CO.,
ROBERT A. HUDSON, *President.*

NOVEMBER 12, 1943.

Mr. WILLIAM L. CHENERY,
Publisher, Collier's, New York City.

MY DEAR MR. CHENERY: In response to your letter of the 3d instant with which was enclosed a first rough proof of the article by Mr. Lawrence Drake entitled "New Frontier—The Pacific Northwest," I am happy to commend the article and the timeliness of its publication.

The original Oregon country, which was all that area of North America between the Pacific Ocean and the summit of the Rocky Mountains north of California (42°), and south of Alaska (54°40') is an empire of boundless resources of almost limitless variety of products. Undoubtedly there are matchless opportunities there for millions of people if free enterprise is not destroyed by Mr. Roosevelt's new dealism.

For all those who have the spirit of the Oregon pioneers to labor industriously and to practice the homely virtues of thrift, economy, and honesty with intelligent direction, the Oregon country may be the promised land. But most emphatically, those ne'er-do-wells who expect to live as parasites on the labor of others and are obsessed with all the asininities of new dealism which is expressed in such phrases as "underprivileged" and "we are entitled to" will be just as improvident, incompetent, shiftless, and disappointed in the Oregon country under any circumstances as they were before they sponged their way into that area. Moreover, such people will complicate the already augmenting difficulties of municipal government in that area by the social problems which they create through their lack of self-reliance and self-control. If it rained twenty-dollar gold pieces this afternoon, some people would be in the bread lines tonight.

I hope you can present this thought to your readers: The Oregon country needs industries with which to refine for human use throughout the world, its boundless resources of the greatest variety and volume of raw products and that there is room for millions of industrious, self-reliant, independent law-abiding citizens of character in the area; but it is not, and never will be, a haven for the idle, lawless, shiftless, incompetent, and perpetually dependent, with neither material, mental or moral personal resources.

Sincerely yours,

RUFUS C. HOLMAN.

Relief of Sino-Korean People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, on behalf of the Korean people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINO-KOREAN PEOPLES LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1943.

Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Director General, and Representatives of 44 Nations, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J.:

Honorable representatives of 44 nations: The Sino-Korean Peoples League voices the sentiment of 26,000,000 Koreans, and humbly subscribes to this memoranda and petition and sincerely pleads that the U. N. R. R. A. conference officials put it on record and give it an early consideration in the interest and spirit of an enduring world peace.

Since the pronouncement of the historic Atlantic Charter—"four freedoms" and its kindred war and peace declarations—26,000,000 Koreans have continually and persistently pled with and begged the United Nations to restore Korea as one of the member sovereign nations within the family of United Nations fighting our enemy, Japan.

To date the question of Korea's freedom and independence has been evaded and pushed aside by the powers. Whether this attitude is due to political and military expediency, or whether the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and "four freedoms" does not apply to Korea and other small nations in the Far East, we cannot quite understand.

Nevertheless this delay and evasion has done much harm and will do greater damage unless clarified soon.

Whatever the powers' reason and logic in refusing to recognize Korea's strategic as well as significant psychological factors—may we plead and petition the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to include Korea as the forty-fifth nation?

As a food-producing nation, Korea has much to contribute toward the success of U. N. R. R. A. policy in the Far East. For the past generations rich rice and other grains produced in Korea have been shipped to Japan to feed millions of Japanese. Post-war Asia needs Korea's contribution not only in food but its 4,270-year-old culture.

Many great statesmen, political and military leaders have stressed the necessity of upholding small nations of Europe: namely, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Portugal, and hosts of other nations, for a permanent solution for peace—yet they have neglected to see the strategic and far-reaching political implications of Korea as a nation in the Far East to maintain peace in the Pacific.

PERTINENT FACTOR

Korea has three times the population of Belgium, and more than seven times the land area;

Korea has two times the population of the Republic of Argentina;

Korea has almost five times the population of the Republic of Chile in South America;

Korea has four times the population and twice the size of land area of Bulgaria in the Balkans of Europe;

Korea's population is two and a half times that of Czechoslovakia, and it has two and a half times the land area;

Korea's population is seven times larger than that of Finland; one and one-half times larger than that of the Philippine Islands; and almost eight times the population of Norway.

Realistic diplomats and leaders who are interested in a constructive and a working peace in the world should fully realize that

unless the 26,000,000 Koreans be given the recognition of an independent government, the future of Asia will be, as the Far East expert indicated in these prophetic words: "Those who wish to get a glimpse of the trend of future events in Asia should not neglect to study that vivid object lesson, Korea."

We believe beyond any reasonable doubt that this petition is a challenge to the wisdom and the integrity of the powers to do justice to a nation whom the powers have sold down the river for the sake of political and military expediency.

If the 44 representatives sincerely do believe in the success of the U. N. R. R. A. in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and all its peace declarations, we trust and hope Korea will be granted the privilege and the right to participate in the U. N. R. R. A. and other international conferences to prove their honorable intention for an effective, workable peace.

KOREA REMINDS RESPECTIVE POWERS OF UNFULFILLED OBLIGATIONS

Aside from the unimpeachable international moral justice and the never-to-be-forgotten factor—the psychological warfare against Japan—may we frankly and truthfully remind the respective powers to reconsider their past foreign policy toward Korea and fulfill their treaty obligations to Korea.

On May 22, 1882, the United States of America, the first western nation, pledged to: "If other powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either government, the other will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement, thus showing their friendly feelings."

Likewise Great Britain on November 26, 1883, pledged to help Korea.

China made similar treaty with Korea on September 11, 1899.

Russia, on June 25, 1884, pledged her honor that she would come to Korea's aid when we needed her.

Even Belgium, on March 23, 1901, pledged to use her good offices.

If ever Korea needed friendly help from these respective powers, we need it now in our struggle for freedom and independence.

In the spirit of the treaties between these powers and Korea and in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," we, with assurance and profound respect of truth and eventual international justice, do humbly submit this memorandum and petition to the U. N. R. R. A. for an early consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

KILSOO K. HAAN,
Washington Representative,
Sino-Korean Peoples League.

Republican Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able and instructive article entitled "Republican Strategy," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of last Saturday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN STRATEGY

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a widespread assumption among politicians that the Democrats are strong in foreign affairs and the Republicans in domestic affairs. This is, of course, true in the sense that dissatisfaction with the administration on the home front causes the voters to turn from the "ins" to the "outs." But responsible Republican leaders who look forward to carrying the country in 1944 will not, and I think are not, getting more comfort out of this notion than there is in it.

For it is only too evident that as an organized party in Congress the Republicans have nothing that could be described, even charitably, as a coherent, considered, and intelligible policy on domestic issues. What is the Republican position, as set forth in Congress, on the control of inflation; on how to control prices, how to control wages, on what to do about excess purchasing power? What is the Republican position on demobilization; on how to carry out reconversion, how to dispose of war facilities and surpluses, how to bridge the gap for the demobilized soldiers and the discharged war workers between war employment and civilian? What is the Republican position on the post-war economic transition; in respect to our huge merchant marine, to our vast aviation industry, to our enormously increased industrial plant, to the reconstruction of currency for international trade, to the relation between exports and tariffs, our creditor position, and our commercial and financial policies?

There are very able Republicans in both Houses of Congress who have worked out for themselves a constructive position on some of these matters. But if there is such a thing as a party doctrine on them, I wish someone would say where it can be found.

What can be found in abundance, almost daily and on all these matters, is denunciation by Republicans of what the administration is doing about these matters. Many or most of the complaints may be justified, and certainly there is no denying that the administration is vulnerable in the extreme. But the fact is that if the voters turned to the Republicans in Congress and said: "We agree with you and now you take charge and do better," the Republican Party in Congress would have to hold about a dozen Mackinac conferences before it began to know what it does think ought to be done. For the Republican legislators as a body have thus far learned only how to object and complain.

This is due, no doubt, to the fact that they have been so long out of power that they have almost forgotten the responsibilities and the burdens of power. It is no accident, then, that the renewal of Republican leadership is taking place, not among the congressional Republicans, but in the States and cities where Republicans are once again facing executive responsibility. Two elements of the party, which became visible at Mackinac, are now contending for mastery. They are the pre-New Deal and the post-New Deal Republicans. They are also by and large the new Republican Governors and the old opposition Republican Congressmen who have advanced by seniority.

It is often said that since few of the new dealers ever had to meet a pay roll, they do not know the facts of life. It can also be said that since few of the old-line Republicans in Congress ever had to administer a city, a State, or a Government department, they do not know the responsibilities of office. The new Republican Governors have had to govern, and that is why men like Dewey, Saltonstall, Warren are much soberer but much more effective critics of the administration than the men who have got into the opposition habit of thinking that when you have denounced and investigated something, you have proved your right to govern.

One of the things that must sober any Republican who contemplates the future is that a campaign of obstruction in Congress may or may not help to elect a Republican President; but it will surely present him with a horrible muddle. Let us suppose, for example, that the Republicans in Congress prevail. Because, quite rightly, they dislike the Treasury tax proposals, they take the easy way and refuse to vote new taxes that really discourage popular spending. Because they dislike O. P. A., they crack the price ceilings. Because they object to subsidies, they deprive the Government of the means to keep the prices of the essential items of the cost of living within the means of masses of people. Because they find that the New Deal has appeased organized labor unduly, they discredit, without putting anything in its place, the machinery by which the administration is holding the line, not firmly but still by a kind of elastic defense.

Is this good politics in the long run? Is it good politics for as long a run as 1945? I doubt it very much.

For while the Democrats, with or without Mr. Roosevelt as their candidate, may lose votes by this general agitation and assault, it would be the victorious Republican candidate and his party who would suffer the real consequences of a break-down of the wartime controls. If we are going to suffer a serious inflation, the chances are now greatly against this happening during Mr. Roosevelt's third term. Even if the German war is over and the Japanese approaching its climax, the real underlying wartime controls at the wholesale level will almost certainly continue to be effective during his term of office.

The dangerous period will come after hostilities end and, indeed, after the initial phase of the armistice and demobilization. This period cannot begin much sooner than 1945. Therefore it will be in the next administration, not in this one, that the dire effects of an uncontrolled war economy will make themselves felt. It will be not this President but the next President who will have to deal with the real consequences of any break-down in the controls now.

If the Republicans will remember what happened to Mr. Hoover, they will realize how dangerous to their own party is their negative attitude toward the wartime controls. President Hoover was the victim of President Coolidge's failure to control the inflationary forces of the twenties. It was President Coolidge who let them run wild and escaped all the blame for the result; it was President Hoover who got the crash that was prepared by his predecessor's failure to see what was happening and to take positive measures.

Now the net effect of the Republicans' action in this Congress is to break down, discourage, obstruct, and raise up pressure groups against the maintenance of control. If they expect to elect a Republican President, they are planting under him a time bomb with a fuse set to explode it just about when he takes office.

This is not shrewd politics. It is not good politics. And as the country studies it, many men who yearn for a change will wonder whether they dare to put in power a party which does not act as if it really thought it might have to assume the awful responsibility of governing.

Need for Practical Treaty of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the Boston Herald of November 21, 1943, written by Bill Cunningham, entitled "Treaty That Works After-War Need." This is an able article of particular interest to the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY THAT WORKS AFTER-WAR NEED—MOSES SAYS SENATE DID NOT REJECT LEAGUE, BUT WHOLE VERSAILLES PACT

(By Bill Cunningham)

The Honorable Cordell Hull returned from Moscow generally credited with having scored the greatest personal triumph of any statesman of our generation. The details of the agreements reached by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia have not been announced, but the fact that the three nations were able, speedily, and successfully, to reach complete agreements was officially announced, and that means that these gentlemen were able to form a team of three powerful players who don't wear the same political uniform.

Finding the common denominator, vital to cooperation in battle, and collaboration in peace between imperialistic Britain, communistic Russia, and a United States currently committed by the party in power to a nebulous program of international Santa Clausism, is indeed a miraculous and unprecedented feat. If such can agree, they can go on from there.

Mr. Hull's historic report Thursday to the joint Houses of Congress included—in fact, it concluded—with the glad news that we will go on from there. His final sentence, delivered in a ringing voice and touching off an ovation that thundered into the microphones, was:

"As an American, I am proud of the breadth and the height of vision and statesmanship which moved you ladies and gentlemen in each House of the Congress, to adopt, by overwhelming nonpartisan majorities, resolutions in favor of our country's participation with other sovereign nations in an effective system of international cooperation for the maintenance of peace and security."

That measures the matter as it stands at the moment.

It represents the thinking of all men of good will.

But what happened last time?

It may or may not be true, as Lord Byron contended, that the best of prophets of the future is the past, but certainly the past can be examined in the serious search for mistakes. Only 25 years ago we won this same victory. They were Huns then, instead of Nazis, and their leader was a kaiser instead of a fuehrer. Their flags bore eagles instead of swastikas, but their claims were the same, and their ambitions were, too.

But we beat them down then and at terrible cost. It's fashionable now to refer to that war as a dress rehearsal to this one, and to say this one is bigger and much more terrible. This one is spread over more ground and it employs some new weapons and techniques, but the very concentration of the other made it possibly the more terrible for the men who were in it.

The total casualties of the other reached the appalling proportions of 37,500,000, of which 8,500,000 were men slain in battle. In just one struggle, Verdun, the Germans sacrificed 278,000 soldiers in an effort to gain less than 3 miles. The French gave 460,000 lives to hold them to that gain. The result went into the history books as victory for the gallant French. That's scarcely typical of the price at which complete victory was bought, but the price was heavy. Despite it, however, it was bought and those who had paid the price faced the responsibility of fitting the world back together again.

What happened?

Where was the failure?

There probably aren't three people reading these words, barring practicing authorities or students of history, who can give the details of the other fumbling efforts to find peace. You'll have difficulties finding any simple and factual statements of it in any form of writing

WHAT WE WERE FIGHTING FOR

If you're the average American, you've probably forgotten, or maybe you never knew that, for all the bitter struggle, we apparently didn't know what we were fighting for last time and couldn't even get together with our late allies upon the matter even after victory was in our hands. It may come as a shock to many people to learn or even to be reminded that Great Britain and France made one sort of peace with Germany and that we made another one entirely different from theirs.

Many people probably don't know, or have forgotten, that the fighting stopped last time on November 11, 1918; that Germany signed the Versailles Treaty on July 10, 1919; Great Britain signed it on July 31; Italy, October 7; France, October 13; Japan, October 27, but that we never signed it at all, and that not until October 18, 1921, almost 3 years after the last shot was fired, and with Warren Harding President of the United States, did we ever officially make peace with Germany, and then by an entirely separate agreement.

I've lately discussed this with several authorities who say it isn't important.

Upon the contrary, and in view of what has happened, and what one day will happen again, it seems of tremendous importance. What it says is that we had no definite program in that past war beyond "making the world safe for democracy." The victory caught us and them so completely unprepared and so entirely without plan or understanding with our allies that we didn't know what to do with victory when it came. We were so utterly without understanding or unity of purpose that we couldn't proceed past the pulling of the final trigger.

Therein lay the makings of the war we are in. There's the major mistake to be avoided this time.

One of the three living members of the "Battalion of Death" who fought the Versailles Treaty and killed it in that other United States Senate is former United States Senator George H. Moses, of New Hampshire. The other two survivors are Jim Reed and United States Senator Hiram Johnson, of California, still a Member of the upper House but feeble of body and dreaming of mind.

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR MOSES

I recently made the journey to Concord, N. H., to ask the details of those days and that struggle from the man who was part of it. Senator Moses is not in the strongest of health physically, but his mind is as keen and as quick as a steel trap. I found him sitting in the big and handsome library of his spacious home, surrounded by his books and the autographed portraits of the big men of his time in Washington.

"I am here," he said, "surrounded by the dead. And I am dead with them."

But that last was obviously an exaggeration. He is so far from dead that he had the radio tuned on the Dartmouth-Cornell football game, and not even for the purposes of an interview would he tune it off. From there on it was a couple of hours of, "And Lloyd George said to me that the mandate covering Armenia—that's better, Mangene just made 5 yards; he must be a pretty good boy, but damn if I can see why they don't forward pass more—now, where was I? Oh, yes; the only thing they wanted to saddle on to us was the mandate over Armenia, and Lloyd George himself said to me that Armenia was the 'poor farm of the world.'"

It's no intention of mine to try to pass judgment upon the League of Nations fight. No words of mine can establish the intelligence or the vice versa of Woodrow Wilson. I am neither here trying to hoist the flag of former Senator Moses nor to haul it down in case it still flies. Obviously, the elder statesman is still true to his convictions. His eyes still flashed with the old battle fire as he recalled those times and those bitter debates. His voice took on the old band-saw bite when he referred to "the schoolmaster's mind of Woodrow Wilson."

WOULD NOT CHANGE HIS VOTE

In answer to the direct question, he said he wouldn't change his vote today, that, in fact, everything that has happened has proved that he was right, that his particular part of the fight was against the treaty, as such, and, getting out of his chair with surprising agility, he produced a bound copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 1919, and showed me a speech he delivered upon the floor of the Senate on July 22 of that year, that predicted exactly another war in case a serious attempt was made to enforce the Versailles Treaty. He called it an "outrageous document" and predicted that the new territorial boundaries it set up, especially the Polish Corridor isolating east Prussia, couldn't possibly lead but to more war.

My efforts here are only to straighten the record for those who never bothered before to look at the record.

"What happened to the last peace?" was my opening question. "Why wasn't it ratified? What was the fight really over?"

"The treaty, if that's what you mean, wasn't ratified," the gentleman fairly snorted, "because Woodrow Wilson wrote a letter to Senator Hitchcock, ranking Democratic member of the senatorial Committee on Foreign Relations, ordering loyal Democratic Senators not to vote for ratification as long as it included the so-called Lodge resolutions. There were 42 of them. There were 13 of us. That killed the required two-thirds majority. Woodrow Wilson, himself, therefore, kept this Nation out of the League But for him, we'd be a member of it today."

Then he untangled the story a little more carefully. The historical chronology of it was this:

On November 18, 1918, President Wilson announced that he would sail for France, as soon as Congress had officially opened for the purpose of taking part in the discussion and settlement of the main features of the treaty of peace. According to Moses, both Secretary of State Robert Lansing and his personal adviser, Colonel House, tried to talk him out of it, and he pulled down Lansing's book, The Peace Negotiations—A Personal Narrative, from the shelf behind him and read several lines from it to prove what he said. He said Colonel House also stated this fact in his papers. When Wilson went that meant Prime Ministers had to go. It would have been better if they'd sent representatives.

But Wilson went, and the United States Senate sat for 7 months waiting to know what the peace terms would be. They didn't know until Wilson returned, bringing the document with him. Wilson had gone to the conference to insist upon a League of Nations. According to Moses, that had blinded him completely to thoughts of any practical peace terms. Consequently, Lloyd George, and Orlando, but Clemenceau principally, sized him up swiftly and accurately, still according to Moses, gave him his League of Nations to play with off to one side and then sat down to write the treaty, which amounted to their demands of reparations from Germany. Moses called it "a license for banditry."

When Wilson brought it back, and they got a look at it, he said, it was "a most outrageous document" conceived in vengeance, and "apparently drawn without even looking at the map." With it, of course, the President brought his approved proposal for the League and presented it as "the indispensable instrumentality for carrying out the treaty."

SENATORS DECIDED TO FIGHT

After a dinner and a profound discussion at the home of Hiram Johnson, Senators Lodge, Knox, Johnson, Moses, and the rest decided to fight. Lodge and the others centered their fire upon the League, mostly the famed articles 10 and 15, which concerned territorial boundaries and the enforcement of sanctions. The technical questions of whether the right to order the United States Army and Navy into war would be taken away from Congress and given to the League and whether the British Empire wouldn't have 6 votes to the United States' 1, also came in for heavy senatorial shelling.

Most of the fighting, as a matter of fact, was on the League. Moses is the only man who made a full-scale attack upon the treaty as a treaty—that July 22 effort previously mentioned—although the Pennsylvania Senator, Philander C. Knox, delivered two addresses upon its legalistic aspects, and Colorado's Senator Charles A. Thomas, spoke very briefly upon the body of the treaty one day.

But in the meanwhile, the Senate was balking, which it could because the recent elections had given it a Republican majority. Wilson refused to accept any modifying resolutions, ordered Democrats to vote against them, and so ratification failed first on November 19.

Wilson then sailed for Paris again and this time he had the League of Nations incorporated into the treaty as its No. 1 provision. He returned. There was another long wrangle. The President decided to take the issue to the people, and he made a series of speeches across the country. It was on this tour that his health broke in Kansas. His admirers claiming that he had been crucified by "a little band of willful men," his critics maintaining that his stubbornness and his blazing anger had finally taken their physical toll.

RATIFICATION IS REFUSED

Whatever the truth, the Senate now strongly Republican, refused to ratify the treaty, despite some changes in its body. Twice the Senate tried to get peace declared by other means, so our Army could be officially disbanded, our troops come home from the Rhine, our wartime bans and emergency measures be dissolved. Once they even tried to accomplish this by simply revoking the original declaration of war. But President Wilson vetoed both efforts.

It wasn't until he was out of office and his successor was President that we made official peace with our enemy, and then it was a separate peace. France and England had theirs. We had ours. Thus it's on the record that we fought, and won, but we couldn't agree past that point.

And so was left the wide-open gap through which war came again.

I asked Senator Moses if he had any suggestions for this time, if he thought there were any lessons to be learned from the past.

"The fundamental that practically everybody overlooks," he said, "is that the first thing you have to do to make a peace is to make a treaty. Then you have to enforce it. Nobody can give the answers on this war until the treaty is seen. None of us was afraid of the League last time. We could get out of that in 2 years, but under the treaty we were bound to that European mess until 1951 with a territorial hodge podge that couldn't fail to lead to another war and with a set-up where the British had six votes to our one. That treaty was only a charter for banditry and we were being obligated as an enforcing power.

EFFORTS TO COLLECT

"Britain and France couldn't enforce it. They tried to collect but the payments broke down. Then came the Dawes plan, the Young plan, and all the futile rest. So far as this peace goes, you'll have to wait and see the treaty. Who's going to guarantee the integrity of the Balkan states? How about Bessarabia, taken away from Russia last time and given to the Rumanians? What about Poland, the Dutch East Indies, the old German islands mandated to Japan? You can't simply sit here and say, 'What about the peace?' until you see what the victors propose to build peace upon. There must be a world, and we must participate in it, but the first duty of all hands is to work out something that will work."

At Moscow we evidently started working out something that will work. This is definitely a long step ahead of our procedures last time, although with the words of that veteran of the last peace crisis still fresh in the ears, one couldn't help but note these words in the Hull address: "There were other problems such, for example, as questions relating to boundaries, which must, by their very nature, be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities."

Sacrifices to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sacrifices to Communism," from the Chicago American of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRIFICES TO COMMUNISM

A few weeks ago the Moscow Pact, which Secretary of State Hull helped to write, was being acclaimed widely and officially as a new grant of liberty to captive nations and as an infallible guaranty of future world peace.

So well accepted was this impression that the United States Senate wrote a portion of the pact into the resolution recently adopted as a prescript of American post-war policy.

Since then, there have been a number of disquieting, or rather disillusioning, developments—and the speech made by Secretary Hull before the two Houses of Congress did nothing to dispel the effects of these developments.

In spite of anything that Mr. Hull has said, it looks now as if the Moscow Pact has merely doomed the peoples of eastern Europe to Communist slavery when they have been "liberated" from Nazi thralldom.

It looks as if the Atlantic Charter was nullified at Moscow and must either be abandoned by the democracies or else be reaffirmed and defended by them.

It looks as if the Moscow Conference may have fertilized the seeds of World War No. 3 instead of sowing seeds of international justice and concord.

Consequently, it looks as if the august Senate of the United States may have acted without wisdom, in its zeal for internationalism, by hastily approving the Moscow Compact before its implications and its defaults were disclosed—even before its American coauthor had returned to his homeland to be questioned as to its terms.

Disillusionment began on November 6 with sudden discussion of Poland, for which this country obtained freedom and unity at the end of World War No. 1 after centuries of subjection and dismemberment.

Constantine Oumansky, the Soviet Ambassador to Mexico, announced in a speech at Mexico City that Russia intends to retrieve and to retain the territory that Stalin obtained by secret agreement with Hitler on September 28, 1939, in the notorious fourth partition of Poland.

Oumansky spoke, of course, under instructions from the Kremlin.

The published declarations of the Moscow Conference contained no mention of boundaries or freedom of Poland—nor of the postwar status of Finland, of Latvia, of Estonia, of Lithuania, or of Czechoslovakia—but the American people had assumed that all of them would be treated honorably in any understanding sanctioned by our State Department.

Immediate inquiries at Washington as to whether or not the fates of these nations were discussed at Moscow went unanswered.

Disillusionment increased enormously when 11 American archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, in session at Washington, D. C., issued on November 13 an analysis of the declarations of the Moscow Conference.

"Many serious men," said these prelates, "have misgivings that there may be tragic compromises and a fateful repudiation of sound principles. * * *

"Some things these documents imply by statement and more significantly still by omission leave an uneasiness in minds intent on peace with justice to all."

And the disillusionment was made complete by Secretary Hull himself in two press conferences preparatory to his appearance before Congress.

On November 15 the Secretary of State met with 80 representatives of the press to explain the Moscow Pact.

He told the correspondents that there had been no secret agreements at Moscow; he assured them that none of the principles of the Atlantic Charter had been compromised; and he informed them that liberated nations in Europe would choose their own forms of government in the manner that had been specifically indicated for Italy.

And, he said, there had been no discussion of the Balkan nations or of the Baltic republics.

In view of Ambassador Oumansky's statement in Mexico, and of the misgivings of the Catholic bishops, it became necessary for Secretary Hull to hold a second press conference on November 17 to explain away the doubts raised by his first conference.

Mr. Hull then belatedly reported that the determination of territorial boundaries of

European countries liberated from the German yoke would await victory over the Nazi armies.

The Italian formula promulgated by the Moscow conference, Mr. Hull then tardily acknowledged, does not apply until a territory has been liberated, and it will not apply to boundary disputes.

As reported by the New York Times:

"The provisions would be applicable to all liberated territory, Mr. Hull said, but it would have to be known what the liberated territory was."

And an Associated Press dispatch contributed thus further to the general disillusionment:

"WASHINGTON, November 16.—Secretary Hull's remarks today about the disposition of European boundary issues left unanswered such questions as the ultimate status of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as well as Finland, in relation to Russia."

Now Finland and Poland and Rumania are countries in eastern Europe with which Soviet Russia has boundary disputes, to which the Italian formula of self-government will not apply until the disputes are settled.

As for Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—although they were made free nations after the First World War and are now occupied by German troops—what hope have they of liberation under the Moscow Pact?

None whatever; for Stalin himself had warned, months before the Moscow Conference, that those countries must be regarded as so integrally a part of Soviet Russia that liberation for them cannot be discussed.

And, as Secretary Hull confirmed in his second press conference, this question was not discussed at the Moscow Conference.

On the one hand, Secretary Hull says that governmental self-determination of the liberated peoples will not be applied to half of Poland, and to part of Finland, and to all of the Baltic states, until their territorial future is determined.

On the other hand, Soviet Russia says that question has already been determined—by Soviet Russia; and the Moscow Pact itself upholds Soviet Russia.

For, as Secretary Hull also explained since his return, interim governments after the war will be administered in the liberated countries by whichever army occupies them; and the Red Army is the only Allied army that can occupy these areas in eastern Europe.

Moreover, any plebiscite in any liberated country will be supervised by the army of occupation, so that plebiscites in the territories which Russia claims, even if held, would be held in the presence of bolshevik troops.

It is plainly evident that Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, probably Czechoslovakia, and maybe others, have been abandoned to Russia by a formula which says no self-determination will be extended to them until their territorial future is determined, since that will be when Russia has taken armed possession of them, and practically incorporated their territory in Russia, and says, "Take them away if you can," which would necessarily mean another war.

The Washington spokesman of the Polish Government-in-exile and other foreign representatives have been fully disillusioned regarding the Moscow Pact.

Notwithstanding the Atlantic Charter, they say, Soviet Russia will make good her territorial pretensions: in fact, they say, the coveted territories have already been "incorporated" with Russia in Soviet textbooks.

And certainly the "four freedoms"—freedom of utterance, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear—will not enter those territories when the Nazis depart and the Red army returns.

It was Soviet Russia's wanton aggression that put Finland into this war as an accidental and unwilling ally of Germany.

It was Soviet Russia that first occupied the Baltic republics, desecrating their churches, silencing or slaying their clergy, collectivizing their farms, communizing or looting their industries, executing thousands of their "intellectuals" and transporting tens of thousands of victims to forced labor camps in Russia or to Siberian exile.

Under the Moscow Pact—to purchase Russia's promise to engage in some form of "world government"—these little nations of eastern Europe have been sacrificed to the Moloch of Russian bolshevism—those same republics most of which were supposedly under the protection of the government that largely created them, the government of the United States.

Nothing that Secretary Hull said before Congress refutes these facts.

So perhaps now a disillusioned United States Senate will want to recall, and reexamine, and recant, its resolution artlessly and ignorantly approving the Moscow Pact.

Government Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pertinent editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "Government Lands."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT LANDS

In translating the question into terms of real estate, the Byrd committee has given the American people their first clear notion of the extent to which the Federal Government has come to dominate the life of the country. If and when present plans for condemnations and purchases and other acquisitions are completed, the committee's supplementary report says that the Federal Government will own one-fifth of the entire land area of the United States.

The implications of this statement are staggering. Of course, a large part of the Government's holdings consists of uncultivated public domain. Nevertheless this condition represents a curious inversion of the problem of mortmain in medieval England. Then it was a question of whether all the lands in the realm might not ultimately pass into the hands of private or ecclesiastic corporations holding them in perpetual tenure. Now, apparently, it is a question of whether a large part of our population may not ultimately be reduced to a condition of tenancy under a Government which has already become the greatest landlord in the history of the world.

However, it is the State governments which have been first to feel the effects of this tendency. The more land that is taken from the taxable areas within a State the greater the burden placed on the remaining taxpayers. Conceivably the burden might become too heavy to be borne. There is also the question of the ever-shrinking jurisdiction of State governments within their own borders, since Federal law and jurisdiction are applicable on all Federal property. The property which the Federal Government now owns or plans to acquire is, according to the Byrd committee, equivalent in area to the Thirteen Original States, plus Maine, Vermont, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana. In many States the number of Federal administrative employees is vastly greater than the number of State employees. Mr. Mark Sullivan the other day gave us the instance of Ohio where, he said, the ratio of Federal to State employees is more than 4½ to 1.

Of course, a great part of the recent and contemplated acquisitions has some connection with the war program and does not necessarily imply permanent Government possession. Nevertheless, the committee finds that the tendency toward excessive purchases of land and real estate has been evident since 1938. It recommends an immediate liquidation of all land and real-estate holdings "which are needed for Federal activities." It is a question, however, whether a sudden liquidation of these properties would not precipitate a collapse of real-estate values, especially when it is remembered that the Government has title or leaseholds to a vast number of office buildings, hotels, theaters, laundries, and buildings of almost every conceivable character.

The problem is serious enough to have been made the subject of a recent speech by Under Secretary of War Patterson. He admitted that in many areas hardships have been worked on State and local governments, but apparently he agrees with the Federal Real Estate Board that these hardships should not be remedied by admitting Federal property to local taxation, as has been proposed, but by direct Federal grants from the general funds. The notion that property no longer needed should be offered to the original owners for repurchase, Mr. Patterson dismisses as utterly impracticable. "I know," he said, "of no error-proof formula" concerning the post-war disposition of Government land. Nor do we, and neither we suspect, does the Byrd committee. It is another example of how much easier it is for governments to create great problems than to solve them.

Air Power and America's Air Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 22 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a most valuable and interesting statement on air power and America's air generals, being a résumé of a special program arranged by the American Academy of Public Affairs and the Los Angeles Breakfast Club. The Government Printing Office estimates that the cost of printing the statement will amount to $135

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR POWER AND AMERICA'S AIR GENERALS

Col. WARREN JEFFERSON DAVIS, president of the academy. Since September 1939, the academy has operated as an educational adjunct in the national defense program, and following the declaration of war, as a clearing house of information in cooperation with the War Department and defense agencies. For the duration, the academy and the Los

Angeles Breakfast Club are affiliated. This year we pay joint tribute to air power and America's air generals. It is a happy coincidence that as the "last trains" even now are departing from Berlin we over here meet to celebrate the thirty-sixth anniversary of the birth of America's air forces. The 1943 awards will be made by the academy's most distinguished member, the Governor of California, whose rise as a national figure is emphasized by a feature article appearing in today's issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I have the honor to present to you the Honorable Earl Warren.

Governor WARREN. The technology of war advances rapidly with the discovery of each new weapon. Air power is a strategical weapon—the means by which a nation exerts its will directly through the air. The primary function of air power is to destroy hostile air forces—to strike at the enemy over long distances, to take and hold the skies. The major lesson of World War No. 2 is this: No decisive land or sea operations are possible without control of the air above. The battles of the first 2 years of the war were lost because in every instance the Germans or the Japanese held absolute command of the air.

An umbrella of adequate air power is the minimal condition today for surface warfare anywhere within striking distance of enemy aviation. The use of American and British air power as a primary independent weapon for the destruction of enemy war production and for the defeat of Germany and Japan resolves itself into what is known as the "air plan." The Secretary of War and our allied air leaders have stated that air power, if used in sufficient and continuous quantity, unremitting night and day precision bombing, in coordination with our Army and Navy, can and will win this war. It is believed to be a proven fact that no nation can win a sustained war without first attaining a preponderance of air power. To this extent, therefore, air power has become a key word of our tota' war effort, and the objective is destruction of the enemy through third dimensional warfare.

The directors and members of the advisory board of the academy have selected the head of the Army Air Forces as the recipient of our 1943 Award of Merit. We feel it is fitting that this year's award of the academy should go to you, General Arnold, as the commanding general of the Army Air Forces, and the symbol of the part America's air generals and air power have played in the preservation of our institutions and the American way of life.

The citation reads:

"Gen. Henry Harley Arnold, commanding general, United States Army Air Forces, under whose able and active leadership the air power of the United States has reached an unsurpassed degree of combat efficiency and superb morale—and whose intimate knowledge of our air personnel made possible the expeditious selection of keymen, so indispensable to the accomplishment of the tremendous expansion program of our air forces, and the development of our fighting flyers' superb esprit de corps."

The citation to General Doolittle reads:

"Maj. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, commanding general, northwest African strategical air forces, one of the most scientific flyers in the world, who, with the deadly accuracy and the striking power of the United States Army Air Forces, has written in the skies over Tokyo and Tunisia America's answer to the challenge of dictators."

I present to you, Brig. Gen. William E. Lynd, commanding general, Fourth Air Force, speaking as the representative of General Arnold and General Doolittle.

General LYND. Governor Warren, gentlemen, that devotion to duty which is so characteristic of General Arnold makes it impossible for him to be here this morning. He has asked that I accept on his behalf the 1943 Award of Merit from the American Academy of Public Affairs, and express for him his deep appreciation of the honor you have bestowed upon him and the Army Air Forces as well as regret for his inability to thank you personally.

He also desires to thank the Academy for its effective and continuing interest in the Army Air Forces, the Los Angeles Breakfast Club, whose gracious hospitality enhances these annual gatherings; and the Aircraft War Production Council which has contributed so greatly to present deliveries of more than 7,000 planes a month for the war effort.

With this award to General Arnold and to the other generals who have helped forge the basic weapon of this conflict, the Academy has recognized the embodiment of that fighting American spirit which has turned the tide of global warfare.

A little more than a year ago American Air Forces under General Arnold's leadership were first challenging enemy air supremacy on world battle fronts.

That supremacy is the enemy's no longer. He w[illegible] not regain it.

Wing to wing with our allied airmen, the American Air Forces are today persistently and progressively beating the air power of the Axis nations down—and back.

The combat elements of the air forces could not do this alone; we have accomplished this measure of success only by the aid of the men and the women of America who have given their sons and their daughters, their labor, and their money, their courage and their prayers.

Nor would we have overtaken the enemy so swiftly except for those foundations laid by the peacetime vision and assistance of such organizations as the American Academy of Public Affairs. That knowledge should give you deep satisfaction as you mark the t[illegible]n of the tide.

But let us not give aid and comfort to the enemy by idle chatter that the war is won. We have a long war ahead of us. We have just begun to fight.

One weak partner of the Axis is in collapse.

Another shivers under a rising crescendo of bombs which increasingly destroy his cities, his planes, his industry, and his morale. This is prelude. When the real attack is unleashed he will have no choice.

But across the Pacific, the homeland of our final, most stubborn, and most cruel enemy is still largely unscathed.

His march of conquest has been halted, he has been beaten repeatedly in the North and the South Pacific. But he believes that if he fights long enough our people will tire of war. He believes he will escape with little punishment and most of his loot—to strike again when he is ready.

He will not surrender. He must be destroyed.

But this enemy does not know us. He does not reckon with the long arm of the air forces and the long memory of the American people.

It will take time, but in days to come when nations are tempted to madness, they will remember how the soldiers of Democracy scrawled their initials in the ashes of Japan where our bombers had passed.

In times of need Providence has given the American people great leaders for great tasks. This is a time of need and great leaders have emerged. The outstanding one of the American fighting forces is one of those you have chosen to honor today, General Arnold.

In our time Providence has placed in the hands of the air forces "The fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword." General Arnold wishes me to assure you and the American people that it will not be sheathed until dictatorship shall have perished from the earth.

Governor WARREN. The citation to General Cousins reads:

"Maj. Gen. Ralph P. Cousins, commanding general, Army Air Forces West Coast Training Center at Santa Ana, under whose leadership and direction the training program for pilots, navigators, and bombardiers has been so effectively advanced in our 14 Western States, and whose initiative and driving energy have contributed so much to the speeding up of the almost incredible expansion program of the Army Air Forces."

General COUSINS. Honorable mention by one's fellow citizens is good to hear, but I am conscious that in wartime no individual can be praised for his own merit and exertion alone. Each one of us these days is helped and encouraged by a great many others working with him in the common cause. Especially is this true of the senior officers who have been chosen to direct and lead your armed forces. We are the custodians of a power to wage war which you have placed in our hands. When you say to us "Well done," we are proud—proud because we may say in response, "When you praise us, you praise the American people."

In the west coast training center we know what the people of this country have done for the Army Air Forces. Answering our call for air power, you have sent us your sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts; who shall measure the courage and faith implicit in the great recruitment? We asked for the young, the brave, the best. You know that they must follow trackless paths and fight a new kind of war. You did not falter. You bore and are bearing with good heart your difficult shares. Among the medals that are never struck—and in the silent ceremony of the fireside but majestically presented—there surely must be one that reads, "To John and Mary Smith—for valor."

When your son joins the armed forces, you indeed have joined with him. Your own spirit goes with your loved one into battle. The star beam stretches from your home with our insignia to all our airdromes across this world. This gentle web we would not break if we could. We are grateful for it.

Army Air Forces leadership has given up boasting—well, almost—we merely talk on occasion of our combat crews. How they have fought and are fighting. One of our colonels returned from duty in north Africa and said of these men "they are just automatically wonderful"; maybe he exaggerated a bit, they are not quite "automatically wonderful." They had to be trained first, but let the word "wonderful" stand. They were boys and in the stern school they became men. That was the aim of our flying training command. We are thankful to see our purpose so splendidly fulfilled.

Now, this is not to say that all our problems are solved or that we are coasting to victory; we still seek a substitute for time. The promise of air power is to shorten this war, to bring victory at the earliest hour. More planes, more pilots, navigators, bombardiers, and gunners is one answer. We are stepping up the intensity of our training program. That is another answer. We are working harder everyday to increase flying safety. That is axiomatic. Of course, the better we train our men, the quicker they can do things. A week, a day, an hour, or even a minute saved can win a battle. We are working at it.

There is one part of air-power promise we have already kept. We told you that air power would save lives. The battles of Bismarck Sea, Tunisia, Pantellaria, and Sicily demonstrated how air power, rightly used, can reduce casualties. I know that you home folks rejoice with us. You want no American boy to bleed or die unnecessarily. How many American lives have been saved on the beaches of Sicily alone, because we ruled the

skies above that island? Truly, air power has become the blessed miser. It is niggardly with American blood.

It saves a division here, a battleship there, a landing force on this beach, an army in the grand assault. It reaches out with a jealous and protecting hand over all lands and all seas—whenever our men must fly toward their sure, inevitable victory.

Governor WARREN. The citation to General Emmons reads:

"Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, commanding general, Hawaiian Department and Military Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, under whose direction the effectiveness of land-based bombers was so ably demonstrated at the Battle of Midway, and whose service as commanding general of the Hawaiian Department and Military Governor of the Territory of Hawaii has been so universally acclaimed."

General Emmons is on an undisclosed mission abroad, but before leaving for London Colonel Davis met with him at Washington. General Emmons has asked Colonel Davis to present a message for him.

Colonel DAVIS. Air power has been used as a hopeful expression by many of us for some years. Now events have translated these words into reality. The United States is now applying air power, as well as land power and sea power, against our enemies wherever they can be found.

Only history will reveal accurately the part that our air power will play in this war, but it has already done enough damage to our enemies to justify the great confidence that the American public has in our Army Air Forces, their leaders, their personnel, and their equipment.

General COUSINS. Our mission in the Training Command begins with the training of bombardiers, navigators, gunners, and pilots. Our real mission beyond that, however, is and has been from the first to mold men from boys—fighting, fearless men, who are eager and ready for combat, yet men who never lose their instinctive sense of teamwork and fair play. When trained these men are specialists, skilled to take their places in a close-knit fighting team.

Our greatest problem has been to find a substitute for time. * * *

As a Nation, we had run out of time before Pearl Harbor—but we are catching up—make sure of that.

One factor—probably the most important—which is making it possible for us to catch up is the splendid quality of American youth. They are wonderful material. The true greatness of this aviation effort and its meaning has found itself in the courage, intelligence, and stamina of the young men who make up our air crews today.

It was no accident that America had the right kind of youth when the challenge came. Our young people may have seemed a bit carefree and irresponsible, a little too fun-loving, but they possess something else which enables them to become the world's best airmen in a minimum of time. They are able to handle about anything on wheels before they are in high school. Bolts and gadgets of sorts are familiar to the touch of an American boy, motors hold few mysteries, and reflexes are in tune with mechanical cadence. In fact, your boys were probably tinkering with motorcycles and jallopies when German lads of their own age were being introduced to the "heil Hitler."

With this natural aptitude around machinery on the part of our youngsters, the air forces went a step further. The best selection and classification system that mind can devise has been put to work. Out of many hours and days of testing have come decisions to use this lad as a navigator, this one as a bombardier, and this one as a pilot. Into square holes have gone square pegs. Boys best suited for jobs as pursuit pilots eventually have found their way to the controls of fighter planes. Others more adapted to flying bombers have been spotted and directed toward that goal. Nimble-minded youngsters who found mathematics easy to master have been hurried into navigation studies.

Though time has been discouragingly short nothing has been spared to make these boys into superior fighting men. There have been no short cuts—no haste, but a great deal of hurry. Throughout their training in preflight, primary, basic, and advanced these boys have frequently run from class to class. Yet the long days of exacting work and study have only served to alert their young minds and to toughen their young bodies.

In recent months a great many of these young men have come back. I have watched a steady parade of heroes back from combat who were trained in my schools. I am proud to say that men who learned in this training command are now fighting in every theater of war throughout the world, and that they are defeating the enemy wherever they meet him.

Let me cite for you one example of these exploits:

The other day I welcomed back a man who only recently was one of my aviation cadets. His primary, basic, and advanced training were all received here in California. He was among the first of the pursuit or fighter pilots to be sent into action in the South Pacific at Guadalcanal.

Now back in the United States after an impressive number of combat missions he is helping to prepare others for the fighting ahead. And I think I am putting it mildly when I say that he can draw upon experiences which would startle a novelist with a lively imagination.

Of course, he's an ace—with seven Jap Zeros to his credit—but that's only the beginning. He led a flight of P-38's which sank a Japanese destroyer with cannon fire. He got another medal for polishing off a Jap freighter by skip bombing while flying in a P-38, which, let me remind you, is a fighter plane and not a bomber. And he got another Jap ship by splash bombings.

This is how it happened. When he sighted the Jap boat he had no bombs but he did have a couple of "belly" tanks full of high-test gasoline. So, with American ingenuity, he went to work. He dropped those tanks on the deck of the Jap ship and then sprayed the results with incendiary bullets, starting a pretty fair bonfire, which eventually destroyed the boat. Another time he improvised by using a P-39 as a dive bomber, dropping depth charges on the Japs at Guadalcanal to root them out of their fox holes and permit our infantry to advance.

You can't equal that American combination of skill and imagination. I could tell you more about this alumnus of the west coast training center, Capt. Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr., and there are many, many others.

I urge you to read and rejoice over the victories of men in the armies of our Nation—of our allies—but I also urge you to remember that careful planning for those victories, the almost unbelievable patience and care in the preparation for those victories, the amazing production for those victories are behind every yard gained and every enemy plane destroyed.

I say that America means many things. Among them I would say that it means an infinite capacity for success.

God willing, we will succeed. We dare not fail.

Colonel DAVIS. To the formal expressions on the part of our board of directors and advisory board of the academy, I would like to add my personal feeling of pleasure and pride that the generals we honor today have been given the opportunity of heading our air forces in this present emergency and leading us to victory. They are typical of the officers whose convictions, courage, and driving force in the formative years after the birth of aviation have brought our air forces to the present highly developed efficiency as a fighting force. These officers—high-ranking officers in charge of our Army Air Forces today—were the lieutenants and majors—young graduates of West Point during the last World War—who looked beyond the early types of airplanes and saw the improved long-range bombers, fighters, and training planes now in use and those to come in the future with circumglobular warfare. That seems only yesterday, and we are already in that glorious tomorrow when the dreams of yesterday have been translated into the living realities of today. They are the men who fought to give this Nation air power; what air strength we have in this conflict we owe to them and to a score or more of other air generals. They are the men best qualified to lead us to victory.

I can only add, God bless you, gentlemen, and give you the strength to carry through. You have the support of millions now in addition to your own splendid convictions and courage.

Public Health Address of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, of Mississippi, President-elect of the American Public Health Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Dr. Felix J. Underwood, of Mississippi, delivered before the seventy-second annual meeting of the American Public Health Association in New York City on October 12–14, 1943.

Dr. Underwood is not only the outstanding public-health leader in America, but he is president-elect of the American Public Health Association, which is the largest organization of its kind on earth, comprising the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Cuba; and it seems now that Central and South America will soon be included.

Thirty-five representatives of the Central and South American countries attended this seventy-second annual meeting, and the enthusiasm manifested by them indicates that they, too, will soon join in this onward march of modern progress for the protection and conservation of the health of mankind.

Dr. Underwood's address follows:

Measured by individual and collective health of our people, we, as public health workers, can derive satisfaction from our view of the attainments which have led up to the present state of efficiency in our field. As we make ready to tackle further and more difficult problems, we gain a new enthusiasm from obstacles already overcome. A review

of public health progress and developments at each annual meeting, serving as it does as a tonic and a stimulus to further achievement, has become traditional. However, the urgency of the conference this year suggests that we omit this time-honored reflection in the interest of more pressing considerations.

Since the outbreak of the war, public health has gone far in protecting troops and civilians alike from disease. Measures developed during peacetime and wartime have been put to work on every front with the result that few serious epidemics have occurred. The health status of the American people has been comparatively good. This contribution to the efficiency of the war effort and to ultimate victory is recognized.

Now that we are beginning to turn our eyes to the winning of the peace, it becomes no less important that we have a strong, physically fit population. Civilization will have to be rebuilt on a more enduring basis. And, public health will be a vital factor in attaining this goal. Already it is one of the principal subjects of discussions and considerations of post-war planning by medical and public health organizations in this country.

As distances evaporate, we suddenly find ourselves one large neighborhood or community in which there can be no absolute or lasting security for any one group unless such security be provided for all. Particularly is this true with regard to health security. Many diseases which seem remote because of our excellent public-health structure, which it has taken more than 70 years to build, still present a problem in other areas not so fortunate as to have the benefit of years of health experience. Transmission of these diseases to the unaffected populations grows increasingly apparent. The speed of air travel from every section of the globe will make it difficult to always detect disease carriers. Likewise, the dislocation of populations presents problems of tuberculosis control, dysentery, malaria, and others unless health measures for control are adequate. Potentially dangerous conditions which might establish new disease problems in this country or aggravate old ones loom on the public-health horizon at this time and present a maze of new and complex problems for solution. Whatever ingenuity and resourcefulness may be necessary to untangle these problems, public-health forces in this country as well as in other countries can be counted upon to apply. Public-health workers have never shied away from hard and difficult tasks and they will not do so now when so much depends upon individual and collective efforts.

These goals which we are setting call for a public health organization of the most efficient character. Planning is already under way. Urgency of immediate needs must not be allowed to overshadow the plans for the future. Our public-health plans for the future—that is after the war—are being laid now, notwithstanding the extreme shortages of public health and medical personnel taken up by the armed forces and war industries. I'm thinking particularly of diseases that may be brought home from the battlefields of the world, especially tropical diseases such as various forms of malaria and the dysenteries, because until recently, medical science had been unable to cope successfully with these diseases. Efforts of all public-health workers must be combined with sound, intelligent thinking and action. Make no mistake, there is a tremendous job ahead. If it is well executed, there will be few idle moments on anyone's hands.

It is believed necessary to consider first our doorstep problems. This word "doorstep" is preferred to home front because we certainly must remove whatever is on our own doorstep before we can travel beyond.

Doorstep diseases that present a serious threat to public health and will respond to a sound program of control are the deficiency diseases, malaria, gastrointestinal ailments, typhoid fever, various infectious diseases, and problems of rehabilitation arising out of the war. We must catch up with the work which was already pending before this crisis—and some of it has been pending for 50 years. To tolerate the existence of wholly preventable diseases in our midst (typhoid fever, as an example) is disgraceful. We can and must eliminate these conditions responsible for lowering the physical and economic status of our people. This is our first mission as public-health workers.

Personal application and appreciation of public health is an essential doorstep problem. Absorption of the great public-health truths because of association with public health has not worked. Some guidance is absolutely necessary.

Too few of the health departments of the country are following the notable example of efficient industrial organizations and others in keeping employee health records. From the standpoint of the organization and the individual, is it not a good thing? We cannot hope for the most effective results in our health teachings until such time as public-health workers personally apply the protective measures they advocate. The fact that great numbers are not now doing so would indicate a need real and urgent. There has been a tremendous turn-over in personnel since the outbreak of the war and a fertile field provided for educating a large number of people.

Many of these new workers have had their first glimpse into the workings of public health. The requirements for a health check-up periodically must be set forth. Human nature being what it is, some prodding is often necessary among the best of us. This should, therefore, be the responsibility of the organization. Essential records should be kept for the purpose of informing individuals of such things as needed immunizations, chest X-rays, laboratory tests, periodic physical check-ups, dental certificates, and so on. Once such a routine is established, the employee will discover the security and satisfaction which comes from eliminating preventable disease worries and physical incapacities. Active tuberculosis in a health department spreads in the same way as active tuberculosis outside the health department. As depicted in Susan and God, sometimes it seems that we go forth in every direction to do public good, leaving our own household unattended.

And still another doorstep problem is the organization of public health at the local level. Until each of the more than 3,000 counties in the United States has within reach, either through a district health department or a county health department, full-time health protection, we should not consider lend-leasing public health. Like schools, churches, post offices, public health must be "on the ground" to serve people. And just one word in behalf of housing community health programs: We should not be satisfied to undertake one of the most important social-security programs from the basement of the courthouse or the third floor of a run-down office building. We should insist upon adequate public-health facilities.

The horizon of public health presents many problems which must be solved without delay. There is a clamor for increased services in every direction. This tremendous load thrust upon the shoulders of public health would be too great a task to assume alone. But, the vast facilities of the medical, dental, nursing and allied professions are being utilized. Participation on the part of physicians, public-health workers and others is necessary but it is likewise necessary that the individual be urged on by education to assume an increasing share of personal responsibility for putting to work the vast knowledge which has been accumulated regarding sound health practices. Long-wished-for development of effective measures against such diseases as malaria, cardiovascular diseases, cancer, tuberculosis, virus infections and certain mental afflictions will provide still further public-health tools to utilize in the program for the welfare of mankind. In the meantime, while looking forward in happy anticipation to such developments, it might prove of more immediate value to try to perfect some of the tools we already have—many becoming rusty from disuse.

To prevent physical incapacities and disease and to promote health, the periodic health check-up for the general population has long been a paramount item in our public-health teaching. No worker has failed to point out its value. If we are to keep faith with those to whom we have advocated this procedure, I think it is time to plan for a greater thoroughness in its performance. The American Medical Association, in its desire to help the physician to fulfill certain minimum essentials in conducting the periodic health examination has issued a manual. In the hands of every member of the profession, this manual would be a public-health wedge. In the introductory pages the following statements are found:

"The periodic health examination serves to measure the present health status of the individual, subject to the qualification that obscure or insidious disease may not always be discoverable by methods at present available. Further, the examination discloses habits of living and environmental factors which may be unhealthful but susceptible of correction. Finally, of course, it gives opportunity for treatment of early or preclinical stages of disease. * * * The personal health inventory or periodic health examination, under whatever name it may become most widely known, must be regarded as a concept which has appealed to the intelligent elements of the American people to a somewhat limited extent, but which has in it enough promise of better health to warrant its more widespread popularization and adoption by increasing numbers of our people."

Other groups share the responsibility for the public's lack of response to this vitally important health measure. If we hope to divert the public from the ineffective over-the-counter drugstore practice and the resort to numberless proprietary remedies and patent medicines, to say nothing of the illegal practitioners, some specific must be set forth. Once this is accomplished by a competent committee, such as may be found within the American Medical Association, and put into force by the Nation's physicians, one of the major hurdles will be over. Having something definite to sell, it will be much easier for the advocates of the health check-up to sell it.

Sufficient experience in recent years enables the keen observer to realize that a greater program of physician-public health cooperation and participation is not only desirable but also essential in accomplishing the task before us.

Consider the venereal disease program as one example of a disease problem involving great numbers of the population and presenting a constant threat to public health. It is inconceivable that the progress made to date could have been achieved by either the medical profession or public health organizations working independently of each other. All along, we need a program of participation of physicians aiding the public health program and the health department helping the physician—both serving the health needs of the individual. The dental profession has also cooperated in the public health program and made possible greater

progress in this direction. Hospitals are now cooperating with Public Health in making available service for the wives of soldiers under the emergency maternity and infant-care program.

Today, we turn our thinking to all community resources, realizing that without them our efforts will fail. Brought closer together by the emergency of war, we will not relax our efforts and will not allow worthwhile programs to decay because of lack of pressure caused by the emergency. I do not need to point out to you what became of our venereal disease program after the last war * * * but let this be a reminder that the momentum behind our programs established on a wartime basis must be great enough to continue these as peacetime programs, if need still exists.

As we look ahead, there should be a joining of hands and of hearts of all forces. We now prepare for one of the biggest jobs of all times—that of rehabilitation, rebuilding, and restoration. The States owe a great deal to the United States Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, and other Federal agencies and nonofficial agencies for their fine coöperation and economic assistance. Greater uniformity of procedure among all the States has been achieved as a result of the Federal-State relationship in public health. It is true that Federal-State relationships with respect to public health administrative policies might be strengthened and made more effective in some instances. We all realize that personnel delegated to work with State and local forces on wartime public health programs have injected varying policies with regard to salary scale, hours of employment, leave, and so on, into public health administration. These obstacles though not great have caused conflicts within the organization. It would, doubtless, be difficult to have these employees conform fully to the policies of the organization to which they are assigned, but in due time these problems will be eliminated.

Thinking of the need of this Federal assistance, there is brought forcibly to our attention the impact of the demand for birth certificates created by the war. States operating on a 2-year appropriation could not expand sufficiently to meet this overwhelming demand and if it had not been for the fact that we were able to use a small amount of Federal funds to keep our heads above water, we would not, today, be able to have this important function retained where it rightfully belongs. Being aware of the importance of these vital records to the health program of the United States, a transfer of this function is being sought in order that the United States Public Health Service may assist the State divisions of vital statistics to improve registration and to render to the citizens of the States a uniform service. Without such assistance, the States will carry on a less effective service. This is one field that has not been covered by Federal assistance in previous years. We have not tapped our resources with regard to public-health statistics.

There are other fields opening up for Federal assistance. Heretofore, States have operated tuberculosis hospitals and mental hospitals without Federal assistance. These might be materially benefited if Federal assistance were available. The field here is fertile. For years, we have known the value of isolation and early treatment of cases in disease control. Facilities should be made available for an extension of these weapons.

Federal-State relationships can always be maintained on a mutually agreeable basis if each is alert and open-minded. We must guard against invasion of domains but likewise, we must welcome outside assistance that will strengthen. If disease recognizes no barriers and travels freely from one State to another, then public-health regulations in certain instances will have to know no barriers and will have to look to inter-State control measures. This same policy will one day be applied to global thinking as stricter examinations are required of those entering this country. We help most when we help others to help themselves. This should be our test of assistance whether it be at the global level, the Federal level, the State level, or the local level. And our programs of assistance should always be tested by the one measuring rod that will always keep us in the middle of the road insofar as policies and procedures are concerned. "We should not do for the individual what the individual can well do for himself."

We have not been neglecting altogether global health. Today American-trained public health workers are in Alaska, India, South America and Central America, several European countries, and all places where our armed forces now are operating. As we improve and make more effective our own local public-health program, we cultivate a fertile field for the training of global public-health workers. We can be of no greater assistance to our neighbors in this world community than to afford opportunities for observation and training. Insofar as we ourselves build a sound public-health program we assist our neighbors. To assist us in this field, we can now draw upon improved facilities for diagnosis and treatment made possible during the past few years and by wartime developments. Yesterday a chest X-ray was available only to a few, today it may be used as a part of a routine periodic check-up.

In entire counties in many sections of the country all of the public-school teachers and pupils of every grade in the school are being given physical examinations periodically—examinations which include chest X-rays, blood tests, and other necessary laboratory tests. This is routine in many of our American communities. All of this and more will be available to people of all countries of the world when the value of public health is accepted internationally.

Greater laboratory facilities, and other aids to diagnosis have brought us a great distance. All of these will be helpful and we can rightfully expect to see public health integrated into the post-war pattern. It is up to us to furnish the cloth—or the trained public-health workers. If we were to say today that we need 5,000 trained public-health workers, not one of us could point to a supply.

However, if tomorrow we need 10,000 trained public-health workers, some of the supply will come from definite training programs which are being instituted in each of the 48 States by means of Federal assistance, interested philanthropic foundations, and funds in this country. The supply of nurses will be greatly increased. The need for trained workers cannot be given too much emphasis. Today we have workers trained in the science of public health to carry on the program. Our number, however, is entirely too small for present, to say nothing of future, public-health needs.

Like a pebble dropped in a pool, public health begins with the smallest area (the family), then extends to the community, the State, and the Nation, and now may extend to all shores beyond. From this close association as a member of a world neighborhood we will benefit from an exchange of ideas, from an exchange of public-health plans. Public-health seed can grow where the soil is fertile, where public opinion is favorable. Much soil must be fertilized. The maximum development of the individual from the standpoint of health and physical fitness must be accomplished if progress is to be made and civilization advance. American public health leadership accepts, after more than 70 years of preparation, the challenge and pledges its full resources and talents to the continued conquest of disease in our own country and abroad.

Give the Soldiers the Complete Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Elections, I want to set out a few of the main provisions of Joint Resolution 190 which has been substituted in our committee for the Lucas-Worley bill, which was rejected and tabled.

In supporting Joint Resolution 190 the committee feels that under our resolution the whole ballot, bearing the names of all of the candidates from the top to the bottom, can be delivered to the soldiers on the various battle fronts of the world in time for them to vote a secret absentee ballot and get the same returned to the various election precincts in time for their choice to be counted.

It provides for holding the elections under State laws and calls upon the various States to cooperate by such amendments to State laws as they deem necessary where, in exceptional cases, such amendments would expedite the delivery of the ballot to and from the soldiers.

It calls upon the Secretary of War and the Navy to cooperate and assist in expediting the transportation, distribution, and return of the ballots.

It provides for free air-mail service for such ballots to and from the voter. Its final enactment will prevent the Federal Government from setting up an election bureaucracy and will prevent the passage of the Lucas-Worley bill, which violates the Federal Constitution and the constitution of most of the States.

Mr. Speaker, in Joint Resolution 190 we sincerely believe that we have the basic principles that will afford an orderly, legal election under our Federal Constitution and the laws of the various States. We believe that under this plan practically every soldier in the camps and on the battle fronts of the world who desires to vote will have an opportunity to receive from his home precinct the entire election ballot in time to vote it and get it back to be counted.

We prefer this sincere, sensible approach in an effort to give the soldiers an opportunity to vote rather than the war-ballot commission bill which is conceived out of political expediency, whose supporters are trying to sell it to the Nation and the Congress in an atmosphere of make-believe patriotism to give the soldiers a chance to vote, which it will not, in an effort to again substitute New Deal hysteria for sound public thinking.

Mr. Speaker, we who are supporting Resolution 190 object to the war-ballot commission bill, known as the Lucas-Worley bill, because it sets up a Federal Commission with doubtful constitutional powers and transfers so far as the military forces are concerned, the distribution and voting of the ballots from the

orderly processes of the State to the control of the Federal Government. There are many other valid objections to the setting up of a Federal elections bureaucracy.

We object to the bill on the grounds that it will not contain the names of any of the candidates on the ballot, and we do not believe that the relatives and friends of our men and women in the military forces, who are fighting for the freedom of this country, will feel that they have had proper consideration when they receive a blank ballot with an opportunity to vote for no one except the President, State senators, and Congressmen, and that the names of none of these men are on the ballot. We believe they would prefer to have the ballot from their home precinct beginning at the bottom with their neighbor, who may be a candidate for county treasurer, county clerk, or State's attorney, and with all of the names there so that they may so exercise their choice in voting a complete ballot from the President down to the lowest man on the ticket.

Mr. Speaker, we can, with the cooperation of the States, the Army, and the Navy, and free air mail, get such a ballot to these men and give them such an opportunity to vote under Joint Resolution 190. It is our responsibility while they are away fighting for this country to preserve for the home front the type of government they left. Our soldiers, their families, and relatives do not want this Congress to open up the doors of the Federal Government to a Federal bureaucracy for the control of this most important election. It is our duty to roll back and defeat bureaucracy here on the home front that is threatening the destruction of our present form of government, and not to encourage it by the passage of the Lucas bill.

Mr. Speaker, in further support of our plan under House Joint Resolution 190 for the purpose of furnishing the soldiers, at home and overseas, a full and complete ballot in conformity with the election laws of the various States and within the framework of our Constitution, it is realized that the time element in getting the absentee ballot to the soldier and back is the greatest obstacle.

To obviate this objection House Joint Resolution 190 calls upon the States to recognize the applicant's request for an absentee ballot on a certain form postal card, 11,000,000 of which have been printed and are now impounded on the various battlefronts of the world where, if our resolution is adopted, these application cards can and will be distributed by the Army and Navy to all of the voters far in advance of election, so that they may fill them out in time for the cards to reach the proper election official, whose duty it is to issue the absentee ballot without any delay in time when the ballot is ready to be issued. This card proposal cuts one trip off of the time limit for absentee voting.

To further explain the length of time required for the ballot to go from the election official to the soldier, then allowing the soldier 2 days in which to vote it and allowing for 2 days after it is returned to the election official for his handling, I think you will be interested in the following table which has been prepared for me by the War Department, which figures are authentic and which provide for the general average of time for the trip of such ballot from Springfield, Ill., near the center of the Nation, as a fair average location. Please bear in mind that these figures represent normal air mail postage and that in many instances the cooperation of the Army and Navy, as required in our joint resolution, can materially cut these authentic time tables. The ballot will go to the soldier from the precinct and return to the election precinct in the time set out as follows:

LOCATION OF SOLDIER DESIRING TO VOTE

(a) Alaskan area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 17 days.

(b) Pacific area: Nearest, 18 days; farthest, 30 days.

(c) Canal Zone: 13 days.

(d) Caribbean area: Nearest, 12 days; farthest, 16 days.

(e) South Atlantic area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 16 days.

(f) Middle East area: Nearest, 18 days; farthest, 20 days.

(g) Persian Gulf area: 22 days.

(h) Far East area: Nearest, 30 days; farthest, 46 days.

(i) Mediterranean area: Nearest long haul, 21 days; short haul, 18 days; farthest long haul, 26 days; short haul, 22 days.

(j) North Atlantic area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 24 days.

These figures are authentic as given out by the War Department.

Quarterly Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the volume and composition of saving by individuals, including unincorporated business, and the liquid assets of corporations which covers the third quarter of this year and prior periods.

The report follows:

In the third quarter of 1943, individuals, including noncorporate business enterprises, and corporations continued to augment their large holdings of liquid assets at the extremely high rate of the past year, according to the quarterly report on the volume and composition of saving released today by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Even more than in the prior quarter, investment in United States Government securities accounted for the predominant part of the increase in liquid saving and assets.

The rate of individuals' liquid saving[1] in this quarter reached a new high for the year, amounting to $9,900,000,000.[2] The increase of $700,000,000 over the second-quarter saving reflects a normal seasonal rise in the rate of saving as well as an increase in income after payment of taxes. In the 3 months July through September, individuals added $2.70 to their cash and deposits,[3] $5,500,000,000 to their holdings of United States Government bonds, and $700,000,000 to their equity in private insurance, mostly life insurance. They also paid off somewhat less than $200,000,000 of consumer indebtedness other than mortgages; at the same time they reduced their holdings of corporate securities by $300,000,000.

As in the previous quarter but to a greater extent, individuals' investment in United States Government securities exceeded their accumulation of cash on hand and in banks, due largely to the Third War Loan drive. Saving of individuals in the form of United States Government securities reached a new high in this quarter. While additions to currency and deposits were again substantial, they were less than in the preceding quarter and showed the smallest rate of increase since the second quarter of 1942.

Because of the magnitude of accumulations of cash and deposits since the beginning of the war, they have received considerable emphasis in recent discussions of the public's saving. It may, therefore, be well to note again that additions to individuals' cash on hand and in checking accounts, amounting roughly to $7,000,000,000 and $9,500,000,000 respectively since the end of 1941,[4] do not constitute saving in the same sense as increases in holdings of securities and life insurance, or debt liquidation, but represent in considerable part only a temporary accumulation of funds not ear-marked for investment that may at any time be diverted into consumption and other channels. In view of the differences between the various forms of saving it is important to consider not only the volume but also the components of saving and the significant shifts among them in order to determine the effects of saving on the economy during the war as well as in the post-war period.

As previously noted in these releases, a substantial proportion of the increase in individuals' saving is attributable to unincorporated businesses such as tradesmen, farmers, professionals, etc. With respect to demand deposits (a form of saving in which unincorporated businesses might be expected to hold a relatively larger share than in other forms) there is some reason to believe that these entrepreneurs accounted for as much as 50 percent of the saving in this form in the past year. This would indicate that the demand deposits of unincorporated businesses had increased by an amount in the neighborhood of $4,500,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 since the beginning of 1942, suggesting greatly increased profits.[5]

---

[1] Includes unincorporated business saving of types specified in the attached table.

[2] This includes saving in Government insurance, mostly social-security funds, amounting to $1,000,000,000.

[3] Includes currency, deposits in checking accounts, and deposits in savings accounts.

[4] It is estimated that additions to individuals' savings deposits amounted to $4,500,000,000 during this period.

[5] Part of the increase in cash and deposits reflects liquidation of inventories and receivables of unincorporated trade (not of retirement of notes and accounts payable). Although the amount of this increase is not known, it is believed to have been not more than $1,000,000,000.

The attached table presents in detail the estimates on which the above analysis is based:

[Billions of dollars]

	Change						Level as of Sept. 30, 1943
	1940	1941	1942	1943			
				January to March	April to June	July to September	
Currency and bank deposits	+2.2	+0.7	+3.3	[1] +3.0	+0.5	−0.7	[2] 19.9
U. S. Government securities	−.3	+2.0	+6.3	+.5	+2.6	+3.7	[3] 16.9
Inventories	+1.8	+5.6	+1.6	−.5	−.4	+.6	26.7
Federal income-tax liabilities	+1.3	+4.4	+4.7	+.1	+.7	+.7	13.3

[1] Somewhat less than $500,000,000 of this amount represented Victory taxes withheld by corporations (other than banks and insurance companies) but not paid to the Treasury Department until the next quarter.

[2] Somewhat over $500,000,000 of this amount represented withholding taxes not paid to the Treasury Department until the next quarter.

[3] Does not include purchases financed by bank loans, estimated at somewhat over $300,000,000.

In addition to the estimates of saving by individuals the Commission again made public estimates of corporate savings, excluding banks and insurance companies, in the form of increases in cash and deposits, Government securities and inventories, and the offsetting increases in Federal income-tax liabilities for the third quarter of 1943 and prior periods.[6]

This table shows that while during the third quarter there was a decrease of $700,000,000 in the cash and deposits of nonfinancial corporations' holdings of United States Government securities increased by $3,700,000,000, the highest increase on record. The net increase in cash, deposits, and United States Government securities combined amounting to $3,000,000,000 was at the same rate as in the first and second quarters of the year. Inventories increased $600,000,000 in contract to a decrease of approximately $500,000,000 in each of the prior quarters of the year. The increase of $700,000,000 in Federal income-tax liabilities was the same as in the second quarter.

In subsequent releases it is planned to present estimates of corporate saving in considerably more detail. The addition of these other forms of saving will, of course, give a much more adequate picture of the financial condition of corporations and their liquid position. In this way the volume and most significant components of the saving of all important segments of the national economy will be available.

[6] These estimates are based on Securities and Exchange Commission, Treasury Department, and Department of Commerce data.

Gross saving by individuals in the United States, 1940–43 [1]

[Billions of dollars]

	1940	1941	1942	January to March	1943 April to June	July to September
Gross saving	15.8	25.0	38.8	10.8	11.4	11.9
Liquid saving [2]	4.0	10.6	29.6	9.0	9.2	9.9
Gross saving by type:						
1. Currency and bank deposits	+3.0	+5.0	+11.5	+3.8	+3.0	+2.7
2. Savings and loan associations	+.2	+.4	+.3	+.1	+.2	+.1
3. Insurance and pension reserves:						
(a) Private insurance	+1.7	+2.1	+2.4	+.8	+.8	+.7
(b) Government insurance	+1.2	+1.8	+2.4	+.8	+1.1	+1.0
(c) Total	+2.9	+3.8	+4.9	+1.7	+1.8	+1.7
4. Securities: [3]						
(a) U. S. Savings bonds	+.9	+2.8	+8.0	+2.6	+3.0	+3.5
(b) Other U. S. Government	−.4	+.8	+2.0	0	+1.2	+2.0
(c) State and local governments	−.1	−.2	−.1	0	0	+1.1
(d) Corporate and other	−.5	−.5	+.3	0	−.2	−.3
(e) Total	−.1	+2.9	+10.2	+2.6	+4.0	+5.2
5. Nonfarm dwellings:						
(a) Purchases [4]	+2.5	+3.0	+1.6	+.2	+.2	+.3
(b) Change in debt	+.9	+.9	+.1	−.2	0	0
(c) Saving (a) minus (b)	+1.7	+2.1	+1.5	+.4	+.3	+.2
6. Automobiles and other durable consumers' goods [5]	+9.3	+11.4	+7.6	+1.6	+1.9	+1.8
7. Liquidation of debt, not elsewhere classified [6]	−1.1	−.6	+2.8	+.7	+.2	+.2

[1] Includes unincorporated business saving of the types specified. Does not include corporate or Government saving.

[2] Gross saving, excluding purchases of homes as well as of automobiles and other durable consumers' goods.

[3] Does not include net purchases by brokers and dealers or by other individuals financed by bank loans. In the third quarter of 1943 it is estimated that such purchases of U. S. Government securities amounted to approximately $1,000,000,000 for brokers and dealers and $300,000,000 for other individuals.

[4] New construction of 1 to 4 family nonfarm homes, less net acquisition of properties by nonindividuals.

[5] Purchases. Based on Department of Commerce data on commodity flow currently being revised. The figures shown above include all new passenger cars sold in the United States.

[6] Largely attributable to purchases of automobiles and other durable consumers' goods, although including some debt arising from purchases of consumption goods. The other segments of individuals' debt have been allocated to the assets to which they pertain, viz, saving in savings and loan associations, insurance, securities, and homes. Changes in the commercial indebtedness of unincorporated business and in consumers' indebtedness to unincorporated business are not included in these figures. The reduction in consumers' indebtedness to unincorporated business is estimated at about $50,000,000,000 in the third quarter of 1943.

NOTE.—The foregoing data have been compiled by the Commission from many different sources. Because of the nature of the figures, current data are necessarily estimates and, therefore, are subject to revision. Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Governor Saltonstall Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in the current issue of the American Mercury, by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, Governor of Massachusetts, entitled "A Governor Looks at Government."

The forthright views expressed therein are especially timely now when thoughtful citizens are eager to learn just what those men most in the public eye are thinking and saying about the problems of government. I trust the Members of Congress will be interested to read the article, which follows:

Throughout its entire history the fundamental principle of our democracy, as of every other democracy, has remained the same: the performance by Government of only such services for the benefit of the individual citizen as he believes can best be performed by all citizens acting together for the common good. Always the emphasis has been on the individual and his interests; government has ever been looked upon as no more than his servant. So, in discussing current problems I like to ask myself, What does the average citizen ask of this or that unit of government—local, State, or national? Are the governmental services of benefit to him, and are they performed with maximum efficiency? If the needs of each individual are truly met, then only does government function as it should.

Obviously what every American citizen asks of his Government at present is that it prosecute the war to a quick and victorious conclusion, and toward that end he is willing to make any sacrifice. That is the primary wish of all of us. But to make the winning of the war worth while we must give serious thought to the many difficult problems which will descend upon us the moment after the last shot is fired. This is a people's war, and the peace must be a people's peace. Our average citizen wants the United States to carry its fair and just load in world affairs. He wants it not only to take part in setting up the terms of peace, but in making certain that those terms are carried out to the last item. Only in this way can we keep faith with the men and women in our armed forces and spare future generations another war like the present.

At this stage it would be rash to draw up a blueprint of the peace terms or of the post-war world. Events are moving too rapidly. There are too many conflicting, changing, and imponderable factors involved. Let us not forget that the Constitution of the United States was not drawn up till 10 years after the Declaration of Independence, and then only after long deliberation.

Certain things, however, are already clear enough. The physical security and the future prosperity of the United States must be our primary concern. Events have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the future of the United States depends upon the

stability of the world Greater friendly understanding between nations is absolutely essential if international peace is to be preserved. No gross international injustice, no gross international aggression must ever again be looked upon as alien to us. The progress of science has made all nations neighbors. What happens to one is the concern of all.

The United States must assume its full share of neighborly responsibility, but in doing so we must beware of the holier-than-thou attitude. We cannot expect all the other peoples of the earth to have the same points of view, the same desires, the same reactions, just as we do not expect them to impose their ways upon us. There must be a spirit of give and take. Differences of race and creed must in no way interfere with tolerance for each other's beliefs and customs. Only the attainment of this goal will have made of this war a great and holy cause. Otherwise it would better not have been fought at all. The profound spiritual values of the conflict must never be lost sight of.

There are also practical aspects of the coming peace and the post-war world that command general agreement. "Sneak" attacks, such as the one on Pearl Harbor, must in the future be made impossible. We must have air and naval bases wherever the preservation of our national security demands them—in both the Pacific and the Atlantic.

As for international cooperation, there are many forms and all of them have merits. But whatever form is finally decided upon, it is clear that the stability of the world depends upon the best possible relations among the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, and between the Pan-American countries and the United Nations generally. Here, again, we don't have to tell each other how to run our local and private affairs. We need act together only on problems that affect our mutual security, our trade, and safety. The all-important thing is the will to act cooperatively in this sphere. It seems to me that the development of this will is immensely more imperative at this stage than the effort to draw up precise and detailed schemes of international organization, none of which can at present carry much authority.

Perhaps we must first make separate understandings with each of our allies. Certainly they would be very helpful. The United States might profitably pledge itself to a general policy of teaming up with other nations to keep the peace once victory is achieved. A clear-cut resolution by Congress in that direction would not only lay a firm basis for international cooperation; it would clear the atmosphere and accelerate world progress for years to come.[1]

II

With the world at peace again there will return the major responsibility of supplying the needs of our citizens at home. What each of them wants first of all is a job, and rightly so. Relatively, the troubles of a man at work are few. The problems of a nation at work are largely solved when the factory whistles blow. While prosecuting the war to complete victory must be our first duty now, planning to keep the country a going concern afterward is a responsibility we must assume at the same time.

The opportunity for each man to earn his daily bread is the surest guaranty of freedom from want. Naturally, character, initiative, and willingness to work are also essential to that freedom. But in these complex days and in the perplexing times ahead mere character and willingness to work are not enough. Jobs must be provided for willing workers at all times in the post-war world. It is a fundamental and terrifying fact that a nation unemployed threatens world peace.

With the end of the war in the United States will come an unprecedented shift from war to peace economy. Some 9,000,000 veterans, both men and women, will come home, eager to find jobs. Many times that number, now working in munitions factories and shipyards, will find themselves unemployed. What will happen to these millions? Will they be obliged to rake leaves, sell apples, boondoggle, exist on Government relief? If not, where will they find the jobs that will permit them to live life as we in America know it should be lived? And what of the farmers, especially those with 1 horse and 1 plow, who will suffer just as much in the transition period as the industrial workers?

Some of them will not be able to help themselves while the retooling from war to peace is in progress. They will expect the Government to create jobs for them on useful public projects. The Federal Government is rightly doing broad-scale planning in this direction, making preparations for vast public works which will take years to complete and will have permanent value. That is all to the good. But we must remember that such schemes can be only temporary; they cannot form the foundation for the future structure of our country. The people will want to get back on their own, and the sooner the better. Our Nation was built by self-reliant men and women, and it is composed of the same type of men and women today. They look upon Government help as a very transient makeshift. That attitude is one of the glories of our democracy. Let us always foster it.

We who are in State and local government can and must play a major role in bringing back our economy to the plane where Americans can be themselves. We can stimulate thinking ahead by public officials, individuals, companies, local commercial groups, and industrial associations. Unless private enterprise and local government play the major role—unless the problem is solved by democratic means—we won't have a democracy very long.

In Massachusetts more than 2 years ago we formed a post-war readjustment committee to lay the groundwork for meeting such problems. It is developing plans for the reconversion of the State's leading industries to peacetime production, either in their present fields or in new ones to which our resources, especially in skilled workers, are particularly adapted. We aim to help every returning soldier, every individual taken out of a wartime job, to direct his efforts to the best advantage to himself, which, we believe, will be to the best advantage of his community and ultimately of his Nation.

Our committee advises the consumer to curtail present expenditures, get out of debt, save, buy Government bonds for specific purposes, such as the children's education and the purchase of durable goods later. For the businessman the committee recommends planning in terms of volume of output, large employment, and total profits over a long period, rather than in terms of high unit prices and high margins. Labor leaders, the committee points out, should recognize that business profits and jobs go together, and that they should think in terms of permanent jobs rather than wage rates alone. The committee emphasizes that every plant should put one man in charge of post-war planning on a full-time basis now.

If industry, large and small, distributor as well as manufacturer, will tackle the tremendous task, then we shall win the post-war battle without suffering any serious social injury. Jobs, unlike Topsy, won't just grow up. We must deliberately create them. And the time is now, for already thousands of our boys are returning home, eager to be rehabilitated and go to work.

Aviation, of course, will offer the greatest opportunities for post-war progress and jobs for thousands of workers. The post-war period will see the real beginning of the air age. The operational phase will be ready for practically immediate realization, though the economic phase will present vast and intricate problems still to be settled. I believe there must be (1) worldwide freedom of peaceful transit, (2) private ownership and management, (3) genuine competition, (4) reasonable government regulation, and (5) the closest international cooperation. It goes without saying that government at all levels—national, State, and local—civic groups, and private industry, should exert great efforts to assist in the development of air transport, both passenger and freight, private and commercial. I look to the establishment of international airways as one of the most potent forces for international peace.

III

Beyond and above a job the average citizen wants the opportunity to get ahead and provide his family with a little more than he enjoyed. Victory abroad will not secure this opportunity for him. We at home must actively and continually strive for it. That means more team play among workers and employers. It means constant readjustments in the functioning of collective bargaining, more extensive cooperation through labor-management committees, some of which are already operating successfully. In Massachusetts we have one that meets for discussion and suggestions and covers the State as a whole. The same idea can be carried out even more effectively in individual plants.

The average worker rightly favors collective bargaining as the basis of America's future growth and stability. Judicious government assistance and regulation have to a great extent checked the abuses in both industry and labor. Our stupendous war production is traceable to the team play among all three: Government, labor, and industry. The fervor of wartime effort can and must be duplicated in peacetime. I have small patience with those who depict the labor-industry relationship as a struggle. Mutual respect between workers and employers, and friendly intervention or regulation by Government, can accomplish astonishing results. It has done so in war. It can do so in peace.

I cannot stress too much the importance of mutual respect in all social, as well as individual, relationships. The average citizen, whether he be worker or employer, whether or not he himself belongs to a racial or religious minority, I am convinced, wants fair treatment for all. We have done much in fostering this tolerance, but there remains much more to do. I am in favor of the widest possible discussion of real and fanciful complaints, even when coming from crackpots and agitators, because I believe the fundamental good sense of the American people will side, in the end, with what is right and fair. We need all the understanding and tolerance we can get. Only a really united and tolerant America will be worthy of our courageous soldiers and sailors when they return from the battle fronts of the world. As the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis has said, "The United States is a nation of nations." As such it must set an example to the rest of the world. It has done so in the past, and I believe it will continue to do even more so in the future.

The average citizen looks to his Government for an increasing amount of economic security, especially in the forms of unemployment compensation and old-age security. The funds for the first are raised from labor and industry. The National Government

[1] This article was written prior to the congressional vote on the Fulbright resolution.

provides administrative costs, and the States, the administration. I strongly believe the States should continue to perform this function. Children's aid and old-age security are provided by a combination of funds from local, State, and National Governments. Both services must be constantly improved and extended. Compensation for illness or disability may well be added gradually; and naturally those who are injured in the present war must be adequately provided for. And where a man or woman cannot work, direct relief should be available. But no Government unit should ever make a promise of a benefit it cannot see its way clear to carry out. There is no greater hypocrisy to our people and no better way to create lack of confidence in government.

In all these fields we have yet to work out completely satisfactory Federal-local relationships. The average citizen feels his local community can far better administer to his needs than a paternalistic Federal Government. How much the Federal Government should enter the picture, even with subsidies, depends upon the tax problem—the current need for revenue and the methods applied to raising it. Of the need for government help in social security there can be no question, but we must always remember that the most effective help which Americans have known from 1620 to 1943 has been help to help themselves.

The average American does not want the New Deal entirely scuttled if that means losing what has been unquestionably gained in the past decade. There can be no thought of turning our backs on the advances made in social security, regulation of securities exchanges, working conditions, wages and hours, and similar progressive measures. The average citizen wants to discard only government by edict, collectivism, and experiments made simply for the sake of change. He has no use for mere tradition. He wants to go forward without hesitation of fear. He wants to take the offensive in social progress. He wants to share fully in the operation of government, and he wants his town or city, and his State, which knows his needs best, to have the first call in meeting those needs. He rightly fears the weakening of individual enterprise, initiative, and resourcefulness by an overgrown central government.

The question of States' rights in our system of government is coming more and more to the front. A clue to its importance can be found in the recent newspaper poll of Congress as to the most vital domestic problems. Senators and Representatives of both parties placed as first and third on the list, the decentralization of Government and the safeguarding of private enterprise. It was no coincidence that the Governors of our States in annual conference in Columbus, Ohio, last June, made this topic the basis of their No. 1 resolution. Pointing out that to help win the war the States have already yielded many of their powers to the Federal Government, they unanimously resolved:

"No further concessions or encroachments on States' rights should be agreed to, except such as may clearly appear to be necessary to achieve victory, and that all rights of the States heretofore relinquished to the Federal Government to further the war effort be promptly reclaimed when this war shall be successfully terminated."

I feel, however, that the word "rights" does not clearly convey the spirit of the resolution. The States do not seek to preserve moth-eaten prerogatives. They seek only the restoration of the chance to do some of the jobs which can be done better by them than by remote control. The need for centralized authority in wartime is self-evident; but it decidedly should not continue into peacetime.

Looking toward the future, it is interesting to speculate what the result will be of certain trends we can see developing. Will the tendency to more and more federalization escape all checks, so that everything will be run from Washington, with the States practically disappearing as units of government, and even municipalities taking orders from Washington? This was actually suggested recently by a Federal official in Baltimore. Will the present wartime system take permanent form, with nationally appointed administrators, working through regional assistants, who cooperate in varying degrees with local officials? Or, finally, will there be a return to our history-tested balance of local, State, and National Governments? I favor the last choice as the best. Further, I think that the better the job which the State governments do now, on a strictly war program, the more will the people want them to resume greater responsibility in peacetime.

But can they function in the fields where they can serve best if the Federal Government taps the principal sources of revenue and constantly makes it more difficult for them to collect enough taxes to carry on? Can they, in fact, continue to exist at all if this trend persists?

The Federal Government, for example, builds housing which is tax-free. The law provides, to be sure, that the Administrator may pay to the cities in which these projects are located a sum equivalent to what the taxes would be if the property were in private hands. Unfortunately, he doesn't, as we have learned in Massachusetts, and a double burden falls on the city or State. Not only does the local unit fail to get the taxes rightfully due it; it must look for revenue elsewhere to build schools for the children in the housing projects, pave streets, and so on. A similar problem arises with war factories built and owned by the Federal Government. They, too, pay no local taxes. The revenue involved is tremendous when you consider that the Federal Government, according to a recent report, has taken from the tax rolls of the States an area equal to that of all the Atlantic Coast States plus West Virginia and Ohio, including all buildings and improvements on the land. This, I admit, may be justified in the war emergency, but it will raise many grave problems if not corrected in peacetime.

Clearly a line has to be drawn somewhere. Certain sources of revenue should be the sole province of the State and local governments, while others properly belong to the National Government. Some may rightfully belong to either. An unbiased study of the whole subject should be made and a definite policy adopted, not just talked about.

Industry must not be taxed to extinction. It must be permitted to accumulate sufficient reserves for deferred maintenance, alterations and depreciation from hard war service. Otherwise it will never be able to rebuild to peacetime service and provide jobs. In no case must taxes be permitted to drain a man's earnings to the point where they rob him of his incentive to work and get ahead.

IV

The great personal virtues extolled by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln must be revived. The country was built from the bottom up and not from the top down. Let us not reverse the direction. Always we must bear in mind the needs of the individual citizen, the common man. He must feel, and truthfully, that he is the most important consideration in his government's mind, not the other way around. And on election day he will mark his ballot in accordance with this principle, which is basic with our democracy. Patriotism is stronger than policing.

If the Republican Party will pay close attention to the needs and wishes of the average citizen, it will merit and win his approbation. It has a great opportunity. Its power as the minority party is tremendous. Half the governorships of the nation are at present held by Republicans, and in these twenty-four Republican States reside nearly two-thirds of the whole population. There are plenty of progressive, experienced Republican leaders in private as well as public life who are capable of assuming responsibility in local, State, and National affairs.

The American people are looking to them for sound leadership. But they insist on the truth. They will take, come what may. They don't want procrastination and political side-stepping.

If this country can go all out for war, it can go all out for peace. So let us tackle our peace problems now with the same fighting spirit that is bringing doom to the Axis. Let us look first to complete victory; then beyond victory abroad to victory at home and peace in the world for more than one generation to come. We can have it if we all work together for it. The average man and woman prays for it and will do his or her part to get it.

The Lamb Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the following statement was made before the Senate Agricultural Committee by Mr. W. D. Farr, secretary of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders' Association. This statement gives a clear picture of the present condition now facing the lamb feeders in our territory. If we are to continue to have sufficient meat supplies, a long-range program is essential:

I am appearing before you today as secretary of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association. Our members normally feed about one-fourth of all the lambs fed in the United States. Our fat lambs are sold during the months of January, February, March, April, and a few in May. During these months a very large percent of the lambs slaughtered come from the feed lots in the irrigated valleys of Colorado, Nebraska, and eastern Wyoming.

I am also authorized to speak for all segments of the lamb-feeding industry throughout the Corn Belt as these Corn Belt lamb feeders are all represented on the joint livestock committee, of which I am a member. These Corn Belt feeders feed about one-half of all lambs fed. Their lambs are marketed largely in November, December, January, with a few scattered through February and March.

This year our feed lots have about 15 percent less lambs on feed than a year ago, and last year was a reduction from normal operations. Reports from the Corn Belt States indicate that they are 15 to 25 percent short in the number of lambs on feed in their area. The reasons for this decrease are higher feed costs, increased labor costs, the uncertainty of O. P. A. regulations, and most particularly the threat of ceilings on live lambs.

The feeder is the middleman in the production of lamb and wool. The lambs which are too small and too thin to be slaughtered

have to be fed to a point where they can be slaughtered. The longer the lambs are fed and the better they are fed the more meat and the more wool will be produced.

Lamb and mutton are subject to ceilings on the wholesale carcasses. The carcass ceilings are set on a fixed basis per pound. The lamb industry has high-cost producers, who produce lamb at certain seasons of the year and normally receive a higher price for their lambs to offset their higher production costs. For example, part of our lambs are fed for April and May markets. This means an additional feed bill for 60 days, and with high-priced feed and stationary ceilings we cannot keep lambs for that period. We will sell our lambs as early as possible and there will be an extreme shortage of feed lambs in April and May. Besides the shortage in this period there will be the loss of the additional weight that would have been gained plus the extra wool growth that would have developed. All this loss caused by not having seasonable variations in the ceilings. We have urged the flexible ceilings ever since ceilings were imposed but to no avail.

To illustrate the position of our organization, we have never asked for higher ceiling prices. However, with the increased costs which we have had to absorb, either there will have to be higher prices so we can pay more for feeder lambs or there will continue to be more liquidation of range breeding herds than there has been to date. Last spring we had forced on us the consumer subsidy roll-back plan, which reduced the price of wholesale lamb 2 cents per pound. The slaughterer receives 95 cents per hundredweight alive subsidy payment for all lambs and sheep slaughtered to make up his reduction in wholesale value. This was supposed not to affect the market on live lambs. However, the figures show that after the roll-back went into effect that live lambs have never sold as high as they did before the roll-back.

Therefore our eleven hundred members, to a man—and I say this honestly; I have yet to talk to a single lamb feeder who is not absolutely opposed to subsidy payments of any kind on lambs or any other farm crops. In our opinion, there is absolutely no excuse for inflationary subsidies to the producers of farm products under present high-income conditions. Never in history has the public been more able to pay for the food it eats than it is today.

The lamb feeders of this country all approve of the War Meat Board and the meat-management plan. We offer this plan, which has been explained to you, as the only sane and workable plan which has yet been suggested to handle the meat problems of our country intelligently. The management of meat problems is important because meat is the mightiest food weapon we have. Certainly we cannot afford less production now. The Army has many times stated that meat is the most important item in the soldier's diet.

The Colorado-Nebraska lamb feeders and the Corn Belt lamb feeders request your committee to use all of your influence to eliminate all consumer food-subsidy plans. Put our food economy on a pay-as-you-go basis. We also urge you to see that the meat-management plan has a chance to operate. The plan has been approved by the producers, the packers, the retailers, by Prentiss Brown when he was Administrator for O. P. A., and by Chester Davis when he was Administrator of the War Food Administration. Everyone in the industry was united on trying the plan, but it was never allowed to operate because the economists had other plans. The food-subsidy plan which they are trying to force on us is inflationary, is unnecessary, and unwanted. It is a long step toward state socialism, and we absolutely oppose it, and ask to have good, honest, American business management instead.

Paper Mill Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News recently, as follows:

PAPER MILL EXPANSION

Expansion of newsprint manufacture in east Texas, as favored by a special congressional committee which has just paid a visit to America's first commercial pine paper mill at Lufkin, is not only practical but essential. Such a project is in line with freeing America from needless dependence upon far-away foreign sources of paper. LYLE BOREN, Oklahoma chairman of the congressional group which is studying America's paper problem, certainly has the right idea when he draws a parallel between our present dependence upon outside sources of newsprint and other paper and our former dependence upon East Indian rubber. East Texas has pointed the way as to how to achieve independence.

Nature has covered east Texas, and the whole tier of Gulf States, with vast resources of pines and gums, the raw material from which mills can make paper on a continuing basis under proper forest management. The daily papers of Texas Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which made possible the successful operation of Southland Paper Mills, Inc., would welcome a dependable, nearer-at-home supply of newsprint. They had faith in the vision of the late Dr. Charles Holmes Herty that Texas and the South someday will become an ever-renewable source of paper whenever trees are looked upon as what they really are—one of nature's basic assets to supply man's industrial machines. Doubling of the Southland's annual output, as proposed, would help greatly.

The use of war prisoners in east Texas, and possibly the speeding up of cutting methods and transportation facilities from forest to mill, should help to increase pulpwood production even during war. When peace returns doubtless our Federal and State forest services again will be adequately staffed in order to carry on fire protection, replanting of denuded areas, and the important educational work among farmers, forest owners, and the public in general to appreciate trees and cooperate with the thousands of men who work at the job of protecting them in the face of almost every imaginable obstacle.

The Anniversary of the Philippine Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to reprint here the address of the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, vice president of the Philippine Commonwealth, on the evening of November 19, over WWDC. It was the eighth anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth, and Mr. Osmeña was that evening the guest of Mr. Richard Eaton, world news commentator, on this Washington key station, over the Atlantic Coast Network. It is an interesting and significant address:

I am happy to address America's radio audience tonight to commemorate the eighth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The Philippine Commonwealth was born on November 15, 1935. Only 8 years old, it has seen the dark days of war as well as the bright days of peace. Its first 6 years were devoted to the thorough preparation for the responsibilities of independent nationhood. Among the problems we faced were national defense, stabilization of the Nation's economy, expansion of the educational system, improvement of the lot of the common man, a vast public-works program, and development of agriculture, industry, and commerce.

We were peacefully engaged in this work of preparing for our independence when war suddenly came on December 8, 1941, and the climactic event in Philippine-American relationship happened. The Filipinos stood to the death by America's side. In the epic of Bataan, which lasted for more than 4 months, Filipino and American soldiers sealed with their blood eternal friendship.

It was no accident that 21,000 Filipino soldiers died by the side of 3,000 American soldiers in their determined stand against the invaders. Neither is it an accident that today, after almost 2 years of Japanese military occupation, strong guerrilla resistance against the enemy is still going on in the mountains and remote towns of Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. For Filipino-American comradeship in this war is nothing new. It is but the continuation of many years of close and cordial cooperation between the two peoples.

From the beginning of her regime in the islands, America had forsworn any imperialistic or selfish motive. She had come not for territorial aggrandizement but to help the Filipinos along the path to self-government and freedom. Her avowed policy was "the Philippines for the Filipinos," a policy that has been consistently and faithfully followed to the letter and spirit.

As soon as organized Filipino resistance was overcome, American soldiers laid down the rifle and became teachers. American doctors took up the task of eradicating epidemics and diseases, while American engineers built roads and bridges.

With this evidence of good will, it did not take long for America to win over the Filipinos. In 1901 the Filipinos participated in the first municipal elections held under the American flag. However, it was not until 1907, when the Philippine Assembly was established, that the Filipino people decided upon a policy of complete cooperation with the United States. As the speaker of this first representative assembly in the Philippines, it was my responsibility to lead the Filipino participation in the government.

America's altruistic policy in the Philippines reached the climax in 1934 with the passage by Congress of the Philippine Independence Act, providing for the establishment of the present government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines under a constitution of their own making and setting the date for independence July 4, 1946.

The assumption by the Philippines of a semi-independent status did not weaken its political ties with the United States. That the Filipinos wanted independence was well known; that the Americans would give it to

them was beyond doubt. Though eventual political separation of the Philippines from the United States was already settled, the tender but firm attachment of one to the other during the transitory period became even more cherished, and Filipino-American cooperation went on as before.

When the Commonwealth was confronted with the problem of building up an army adequate for the defense of the Philippines, the United States lent us one of her finest soldiers, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, under whose able direction the Philippine Army was organized.

The United States also continued to place at the disposal of the Commonwealth noted Americans of business, of education, and of science. Many of the Americans who had so loyally served the Philippine Government in the past offer their services to the new government. Trade relationship between the two countries remained on a mutually profitable basis.

When, in the sixth year of the Commonwealth, war broke out in the Pacific and our loyalty to the United States was challenged, we presented to the world the epic of Bataan.

Tonight as we observe the eighth anniversary of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, we can visualize the role of the Filipino Nation—a daughter republic of the United States that will be ushered into the family of independent nations as soon as the enemy is driven out from our soil. Our cordial relationship with America will continue after our independence. Having shared with America the fortunes of war as well as the blessings of peace, we shall work with her in the establishment of the post-war world of freedom, justice, and security.

Subsidy on Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter concerning a recommendation favorable to country butter. It is my hope that the O. P. A. and R. F. C. will approve the recommendation of the War Food Administration for hay and feed used by those producing country butter have advanced in price just as the hay and feed of those producing other types of butter:

The letter follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 12, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR LINDLEY: This is in reply to your letter of October 16, with which you transmitted a newspaper clipping concerning the R. F. C. subsidy on butter and asked for information on the hay program for dairymen.

The R. F. C. subsidy on butter was initiated at the time wholesale and retail butter prices were reduced by the Office of Price Administration in order to prevent any roll-back in these prices to producers of butterfat. At the present time, the regulations do not provide for the making of this payment on country butter. We have discussed this matter with both the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Office of Price Administration and have recommended that such payments be made.

The War Food Administration, through the Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va., is buying hay at market prices in surplus-producing areas and shipping it into the Central Atlantic States for sale at fixed prices to dairymen. These prices range from $27.50 a ton for first quality alfalfa hay, to $20 a ton for clover and lespedeza hay. A copy of the press release announcing the program is attached. The War Food Administration absorbs any difference between the cost of the hay, plus transportation and handling charges, and the price charged dairymen in the designated drought counties. Any dairy producer in these counties is eligible, but the offer is limited to hay for feeding to dairy cows.

Consideration was given to initiating a similar program in the south central drought area, but it is a difficult program to handle, so instead, the maximum payment rate under the recently announced dairy feed payment program was established or designated drought counties in Texas and adjoining States. It was felt that the administrative costs would be reduced by having only one program in the area rather than two. As a matter of fact, some consideration is being given to discontinuing the hay program in the eastern drought area and increasing the payment rate under the feed program from 40 cents a hundredweight for whole milk deliveries, the rate now in effect, to the maximum of 50 cents a hundredweight.

If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us. The newspaper clipping is being returned at this time.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

The Battle for Competitive Bidding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article:

With the successful competitive sale of $30,000,000 Chesapeake & Ohio Railway bonds late in 1938 began the fight to extend to all railroad financing competitive bidding such as—

1. Has been required by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the sale of railroad equipment trust certificates since 1926;

2. Has been voluntarily employed by a number of railroads in bond financing in recent years;

3. Has long been common practice in the sale of State, county, and municipal securities;

4. Has for a number of years been required in the sale of public utility—and, in some cases, carrier—securities in the States of Massachusetts, Indiana, New Hampshire, and Missouri, and in the District of Columbia;

5. Has been required by the Federal Power Commission since 1939 in the sale of securities of public utility companies subject to its jurisdiction;

6. Has been required by the Securities and Exchange Commission since 1941 in the sale of securities of public utility companies under its jurisdiction; and

7. Was voluntarily adopted by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in the sale of its securities in 1941.

High points in the competitive bidding controversy from 1938 to date have been:

December 1938; $30,000,000 Chesapeake & Ohio Railway bond financing: Invited by the Chesapeake & Ohio to submit an offer for these bonds, a syndicate headed by Halsey, Stuart & Co. and Otis & Co., middle western investment banking houses, paid the railway $1,350,000 more than the best offer tendered by Morgan Stanley & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., eastern bankers who have long sought to maintain a monopoly on all railroad financing.

February 1939; $12,000,000 Cincinnati Union Terminal bond financing: While the Terminal Co. was preparing to close a privately negotiated deal with the Morgan-Kuhn, Loeb group, middle western houses asked for an opportunity to submit an offer. The company then voluntarily called for competitive bids and received four of them, the high and winning bid being $1,443,960 better than the best private offer that had been made by Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb.

July 1939; $25,000,000 Southern Bell Telephone debenture financing: Otis & Co. asked the company to open this financing to competition. Over the protest of the Governor or the utility commission of each of the nine States served by the company, however, the debentures were sold privately to Morgan Stanley and associates, traditional beneficiaries of the financing of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiaries since 1906, when the previous policy of competitive financing was dropped. Because of the threat of competition, the Morgan group substantially improved the price it had originally planned to pay for the Southern Bell debentures.

August 1939; $7,000,000 Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis bond financing: After initiating private negotiations with Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb, the company learned of the willingness of middle western bankers to compete for the purchase of its bonds, and opened the financing to bidding. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb refused to submit an offer, but strong bids were made by two independent banking groups, the one led by Halsey, Stuart & Co. and Otis & Co. being awarded the bonds.

December 1939; $18,000,000 Consumers Power Co. bond financing: The company originally proposed to close a private deal for $28,594,000 of its bonds with Morgan, and to sell 125,000 shares of common stock to Commonwealth & Southern, holding company parent of Consumers Power. Challenging public assertions of Wendell Willkie, then head of both Consumers and Commonwealth, that investors were unwilling to buy utility common stocks because of destructive Government policies, Otis & Co. offered to pay for the Consumers Power common a price higher than the figure proposed by Commonwealth, suggested that the $10,594,000 of new money included in the proposed bond issue be raised by the sale of additional common stock, and at the same time asked to be allowed to bid for any bonds the company might issue. After prolonged hearings, the S. E. C., in a divided decision, approved the intercompany stock transaction, cut the bond financing to the $18,000,000 amount necessary for refunding and, while letting Morgan handle the bonds, impounded the banking fees until it could be decided whether Morgan had been bargaining at arm's length with the utility or was sitting on both sides of the table in the transaction. The S. E. C.'s decision also indicated that a study of competitive bidding by the Commission was in order.

February 1940; $25,000,000 Dayton Power & Light bond financing: The company, a

subsidiary of another Morgan holding company, Columbia Gas & Electric, proposed to sell this bond issue privately to Morgan and associates. Independent bankers sought to make a bid, while the Dayton city council called on both the S. E. C. and the Ohio Utility Commission to require competitive bidding. Morgan raised the price it proposed to pay the company and the transaction was permitted to go through, but the Morgan fees were again impounded.

October 1940; $16,500,000 San Antonio Public Service bond financing: Otis & Co. made the company a bid higher than the price offered in private negotiation by Mellon Securities Corporation. Mellon raised its offer to meet the Otis bid and was awarded the bonds, but the S. E. C. impounded the Mellon fees.

April 1941; S. E. C. competitive bidding rule for utility securities adopted: After extensive hearings, the S. E. C. adopted a rule to require competitive bidding in the issuance and sale of securities of public utility companies under its jurisdiction. Subsequently Morgan, Stanley & Co. was found by the United States court not to have been bargaining at arm's length in the Dayton Power & Light financing and the impounded fees were returned to the Dayton company. As a result of this test case, bankers' fees impounded in other instances were similarly disposed of.

September 1941; $94,000,000 American Telephone & Telegraph debenture financing: The company voluntarily utilized competitive bidding in the sale of these debentures and thus broke off the exclusive banking arrangement that had been enjoyed by the Morgan group for 35 years.

September 1941; $18,000,000 Erie Railroad bond financing: As the company filed with the I. C. C. an application naming Morgan as prospective bankers for these bonds, middle western bankers let it be known they were prepared to submit a bid and, 24 hours later, the Erie reorganization managers decided to invite competition. Bids were tendered by three syndicates, the Erie receiving $512,262 more for its bonds than Morgan had offered to pay in private negotiations.

March 1943; $10,000,000 Erie Railroad serial note financing: The company originally proposed a privately negotiated sale of $14,000,000 bonds to the Morgan group, and refused to entertain the higher bid that Halsey, Stuart & Co. and Otis & Co. jointly offered to make. The I. C. C. rejected the Erie's application for this sale after hearings at which Halsey, Otis and the C. & O. Ry. brought out the transaction's improvidence. The Erie subsequently elected to sell a $10,000,000 serial note issue at competitive bidding and received three bids, of which that of Halsey and Otis was the high and winning bid.

March 1943; introduction of the Shipstead bill in the Senate: As an upshot of disclosures made at the I. C. C.'s Erie hearings, Senator SHIPSTEAD (Republican, of Minnesota) introduced in the Senate a bill to require competitive bidding for all new issues of railroad securities.

July 1943; $28,483,000 Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit bond financing: In the face of a request from Halsey, Stuart & Co. and Otis & Co. to be allowed to submit a bid, the Pennsylvania Railroad insisted on concluding secret negotiations with Kuhn Loeb for these bonds. While Division Four of the I. C. C. approved the transaction, in a divided decision, it required Kuhn, Loeb to increase the price to the railroad. As a result of this case, in which Otis & Co. intervened as a stockholder of the railroad, the I. C. C. ordered a complete study of competitive bidding, with briefs to be filed by interested parties and hearings to follow.

October 1943; Senator SHIPSTEAD charges $10,000,000 waste in P. O. & D. deal: Citing figures he had prepared, Senator SHIPSTEAD charged that the inferior terms obtained from Kuhn, Loeb in the Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit financing had cost the Pennsylvania Railroad more than $10,000,000. The Senator at the same time renewed his demands upon the I. C. C. to require competitive bidding for all railroad securities, and reminded the Commission that the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee would shortly commence hearings on the Shipstead bill.

October 1943; Vice President WALLACE demands end of Wall Street grip on railroads: Charging in his Dallas speech that Wall Street still controls the railroads as of yore, the Vice President followed up with a public statement in Washington stressing the desirability of competitive bidding for railroad securities.

November 5, 1943; I. C. C. hearings on competitive bidding: Proponents of competitive bidding for railroad securities, including Otis & Co.; Halsey, Stuart & Co.; the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway; Senator Truman (Democrat, Missouri); the Railway Labor Executives Association; the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and Eugene Casey, executive assistant to the president; and opponents, including Morgan Stanley & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; the Investment Bankers Association; the National Association of Securities Dealers; and the American Association of Railroads, presented oral argument to the full Commission, which is expected to issue its decision in the near future.

Stimulation of Oil Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a majority of the Members of the House have now signed petition 14, calling for the discharge of H. R. 2887 from committee and bringing it out for action.

This bill has as its purpose and its ultimate objective the stimulation of oil development. It is a recognition of the fact that under the price frozen in 1941 by the O. P. A. the necessary development cannot be carried on. The Nation now realizes this fact, for the Nation feels a shortage.

The Members who signed petition 14 are entitled to the thanks of the consumers of petroleum and of all who desire to see a critical war material supplied in the amount at the time it is needed.

This is not an "oil bloc" as some of the critics of this movement have styled it. The signers of this petition represent districts where no oil is produced and many where oil probably will never be produced, as well as districts where the crude oil is coming from. It was natural that those Members who live in oil-producing districts saw the danger first. They saw the decline in drilling and they saw at first hand the rise in the costs of drilling. Many others, far removed from oil-producing areas, thought of supply in terms of transportation for a long time. Transportation improved, but the supply of gasoline and of heating oil was no greater for their constituents. They began then to look at the facts which the oil producer had been giving to the O. P. A. for so many months. The result is that their names are on this petition, too.

Many, naturally, felt reluctant to sign. They wanted to respect the customary processes of the House and permit this bill to be dealt with in the regular way. But no prospect of action was in sight and we have waited too long. The Congress delegated to the executive department in the Price Control Act the authority to regulate prices, but it also imposed the duty of safeguarding the stimulating supply of essential commodities and materials. As to petroleum, the obligation was ignored. We have had excuses, delays, evasions, and dodging of the issue. The oil reserves of the Nation were drawn upon to capacity, the military demands increased, and the consumer's supply was lowered. The only program the administration offered was more and more rationing. Supply was ignored.

The responsibility for our present condition in petroleum is fixed. There can be no shifting of the blame. The Members of Congress, in ever-increasing numbers, have sought for upward of 2 years to persuade the O. P. A. to recognize the facts. Individually and as committees they have taken the case to the O. P. A., to the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the President himself has been given the facts.

Under our form of government there is a method of correction for every injury to the people. This is a case where the direct representatives of the people must act. They have now begun their action. This is a matter that is above political consideration. The man who walks and leaves his car in the garage to become worthless through lack of use, the man who needs a few more gallons of oil to heat his home, the fathers and mothers who want some attention paid to the future needs for petroleum of their sons in the battle zones, are not concerned whether it was a Democrat or a Republican who kept the oil producer from increasing the supply.

I think all these consumers appreciate, however, what it is we are now trying to do. I think every Member who signed this petition will be thanked for moving to end this long delay in getting more oil for the Nation.

It is probable that a legion of the O. P. A.'s defenders will spring into action at once to try to confuse the issue. They will represent, as they have in the past, that a price raise on petroleum would destroy the entire national economy and probably prolong the war.

We will meet them at every turn, for we are determined to stop this ruinous depletion of the Nation's oil reserves. The time is here for action to increase supply and not permit further bungling. We need more oil, not more rationing. We need action, not theorizing. We have now taken an important step toward getting that action.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
November 19, 1943.

Mr. JOHN NEWSOME,
Congressman From Alabama,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NEWSOME: Did you ever wonder what the people back home think of all the wrangling now going on in Washington? Congress is about to debate the merits of the subsidy roll-back. Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., a well-known radio commentator, takes the negative. Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, a commentator of equal prominence, takes the affirmative. Which one of these two men are the people supposed to believe?

The only way an individual can reach a definite conclusion, is to analyze the facts and reach his own conclusion, and it should be his or her duty to convey these opinions to their representatives in Washington. This is what I intend to do, and I hope that you will read personally what I have to say.

If the men in Washington knew what inflation really is there would be no debate on this question, because they would know that whether we have subsidies or not it would not affect inflation one way or the other. Inflation is caused by excess credit, and so long as we continue to have excess credit there is no way on earth to eliminate inflation, including the O. P. A. Please permit me to explain this statement.

Purchasing power can only be created by productive effort. By productive effort, I mean the ability to create or produce any goods or services desired by our fellow man. At this point it is imperative to distinguish between productive effort and work. Work may or may not be productive effort. For example, if a man goes in the woods and digs a hole with a pick and shovel, working 8 hours per day for an indefinite length of time, he certainly would be doing hard work; but, unless someone was willing to buy this hole, his work would not be productive, because he has not produced something that anyone wants.

Purchasing power is created and destroyed simultaneously, in that it is transformed into debt. If an individual is working for another individual, or a corporation, or the Government, the instant this person has completed the task the individual, the corporation, or the Government is indebted to this person. If an individual or a corporation produces some goods or services, the instant these items are acquired a debt is created. If they pay in cash, it is a debt of the Government; if it is paid by check it is a debt of the bank; if it is charged it is a debt of the purchaser.

But money is wealth, bank deposits are wealth, accounts are wealth. Wealth and debts are synonymous; neither can exist without the other. Wealth is someone else's debt. The reason that we have so much money on deposit in banks, is because the banks have loaned the Government so much money. Money cannot be made by any individual, corporation, or even the Government; money can only be borrowed. When we borrow money, regardless of whether it is from banks, insurance companies, corporations, or an individual it creates wealth and this wealth is potential purchasing power, identical with the wealth created by productive effort. Thus we see that we create wealth by borrowing money, we destroy wealth by paying off debts. With this information we are able to determine what causes inflation.

When more money is borrowed by individuals, corporations, or the Government than is being paid back or liquidated by the individuals, corporations, or the Government the purchasing power created by this excess credit subsidizes the purchasing power created by human effort which causes a demand in excess of normal supply which causes wages, farm prices, consumer goods, etc., to increase in value.

So long as we continue to pump purchasing power into our economy by borrowing money either from banks, insurance companies, corporations, or individuals there is no power on earth that can stop inflation. The sale of a $750 Government bond to an individual creates as much wealth or purchasing power as the sale of a $750 automobile to an individual.

If we fix the prices of wages, farm prices, consumer goods, etc., we merely change the effect of inflation. The rise in the price of these items is not the cause, but the effect, the result or symptom. When we fix the price we increase the consumption, and in an effort to satisfy this demand millions of jobs are created that otherwise would not exist. This explains the present manpower shortage.

When this policy of borrowing money stops, we will have the unemployed problem to solve. Industry cannot solve this problem, the ownership of Government bonds will not solve this problem. It requires as much purchasing power to buy a bond as the holder derives. A Government bond only creates purchasing power when it expands credit. The Government cannot solve this problem unless it is able to continue to borrow indefinitely. This problem can only be solved by establishing a balanced economy.

The only way we can stop inflation is by realizing that the cost of Government is as much a part of our cost of living as the cost of bread and butter. We cannot expect to carry on a war as costly as this one without making enormous sacrifices. Anyone who can afford to buy a bond can buy an equal amount in taxes. When we buy a bond we are merely buying an interest in our own indebtedness. The national debt is a debt of the American people; if it is ever paid, it is the American people who must pay. It will be no easier to pay in the future than it is today.

I hope that I have not bored you too much and that I have given you a thought that may be worth while.

Yours very truly,

THOS. H. FROST.

Broadcast by Philip Keyne Gordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a part of a broadcast by Philip Keyne Gordan, Akron, Ohio, made November 15, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, this broadcast sounds a fact that will rise to haunt this and future Congresses until justice is done to a man to whose name each day's passing adds greatness. God gives to some men vision, and with it an unswerving purpose. Such men are sometimes considered by their fellowmen to be unbalanced. They suffer discredit, denouncement, and are punished even unto death at times. The high star of purpose remains their goal and, no matter what the cost, they fight on for their principles. Such was the late Billy Mitchell. War Department officials have stated this man shall not have the honor attached to his name because he dared to disagree. This and other Congresses have sat supinely and let the passing days add dishonor to our Nation for not restoring to the name of Billy Mitchell the great honor it so richly deserves. Truth is as impossible to be soiled by an outward touch as the sunbeam:

The time has come, I think, for me to give you another report on the progress of the effort officially to restore his proper rank to the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell.

As I told you, my own Congressman, the Honorable ED ROWE, of Ohio, promised me he would do something about it. He did. Last Monday he presented for extension in the RECORD a formal statement. He said that he had inquired of the House Military Affairs Committee to see why there has been no action on the joint resolution which would restore the title of brigadier general to the pioneer of our Army Air Force. He said that a committee clerk had advised him that the War Department officials opposed its passage.

Personally he told me a funny little story. The committee clerks didn't even remember that there was such a resolution on file. It had gathered dust in a pigeonhole until even the Military Affairs Committee employees had forgotten its existence. Then when Mr. ROWE insisted that there was such a measure, they rooted it out and gave him the foregoing information.

So he passed that on to the Congress with the sapient observation "that the time is long past when a mere statement on the part of the War Department is sufficient reason for the delay of this most justifiable action."

He continued, "The blind passion for tradition and custom as well as the strong bond of a fraternal hierarchy within the military leaders of another year refused to honor the name of Billy Mitchell. They went even further. They pinned the badge of dishonor upon him and cast him out from their midst.

"To our shame it is a late day for the restoration of due credit and honor to this great man. Is it not time to ask the War Department why we should not do this act and pass this bill? Is it too late to acknowledge to Billy Mitchell what he already knew—that he was right? But it is not too late to do justice to his name."

That sums up the situation nicely.

The man who really fathered the American Air Force died stripped of the honors he had won. Their restoration, even posthumously, is not honor to Billy Mitchell alone. It is necessary to us—the American people—that we correct a mistake.

General Mitchell was never a diplomat. He was a soldier. One of you brought to mind the subject matter of an interview I had with him something over 10 years ago. Mrs. Isabel Tudeen, of St. Petersburg, Fla., wrote saying that she hoped Congress would wipe out the stigma on General Mitchell's name. She said that the question had aroused her interest and that she had read everything she could find about the general and his de-

mands for more American air power. She had run across a reference of his to the brass hats in which he called them "Brass heads." I recall his using the phrase to me one time. He said, "What the 'brass heads' do to me is of no consequence. I fear what they may do to America."

Mrs. Tudeen offered a little poem with her letter. It is supposed to be very bad broadcast practice to read a poem by a listener. But I'm going to do it anyway, because this is something more than a bit of verse. She calls it "At Ease, General." And here it is:

AT EASE, GENERAL

(Billy Mitchell, 1879–1936)

He hurled his molten words across the sky,
He beat his mighty wings against the bars,
And while he died he dared to prophesy,
And so they stripped him of his silver stars.

His restless spirit stalks the clouds today,
His boys are on the wing—and he is there—
He rides the bombers through the ack-ack's spray,
This pioneer crusader of the air.

Give back his stars for all the men who died
At black Pearl Harbor and Corregidor,
He fought their fight, and he was crucified,
He gave his life for them. Could he do more?
America shall speak this final word,
"Rest, General, your message has been heard."

You can help restore General Mitchell to his proper rank by reminding your Congressman that the bill is pending.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including some observations with respect to the elimination of the poll tax by Federal legislation which were sent to me by George Washington Williams, of Baltimore, Md.:

From time to time mention has been made of another possible attack upon the South if the poll-tax-repeal bill, now pending in Congress, fails of passage—namely, the reduction of the Representatives of the South in the House of Representatives

This was again suggested by Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General and the author of The History of the Supreme Court, when he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee a few days ago, and later referred to in the press by Senator DANAHER.

The suggestion is based on the fourteenth amendment, clause 2, which provides for the disfranchisement of a State to the extent that the right to vote is abridged for anything other than crime or rebellion.

The attack on the South in this direction has been expected by me for some time, but I think this contention effectively may be disposed of by quoting from the learned author of the Principles of Constitutional Law, Judge Cooley, one of the most enlightened and informed jurists of his time, a northern man who lived during the period when the fourteenth amendment was being considered and finally passed. In discussing the scope of the second clause thereof, which provides as above stated, he said, in part: "The provision is general; it is not limited to freedom, but it applies wherever the right to vote is denied—or abridged for other cause than for participation in crime. The State of Connecticut denies the right of suffrage to all who cannot read, and Massachusetts and Missouri to all who cannot both read and write, and many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer. So in the majority of the States a citizen absent therefrom, though in the public service, cannot vote, because the State requires as a condition the personal presence of the voter at the polls of his municipality. Possibly it may be said in respect to such cases that the representation of the State should be reduced in proportion to the number of those who are excluded or are absent. It is no likely, however, that any such position would be sustained."

To require the payment of a capitation tax is no denial of suffrage, it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration, or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud. Nor can it be said that the requirement to read is any denial of suffrage. It is obvious that this type of requirement was never considered to be an abridgment of the right to vote in any constitutional sense. By Mr. Warren's contention before the committee that the said poll-tax repeal bill is unconstitutional negates any such idea.

This view rationalizes the fourteenth amendment, and I do not believe it would have passed if it was believed that the registration laws and the like would be invalidated thereby. Thence I do not believe the above mode of attack upon the South will be upheld by the courts.

GEORGE WASHINGTON WILLIAMS.

BALTIMORE.

Railway Labor Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what is the real purpose back of the President's move in preventing going into effect the agreement reached August 7, 1943, in the railway labor wage dispute? Is he, with his bureaucrats, determined to destroy the Railway Labor Act? Has it not been generally agreed that this act has operated satisfactorily for nearly 18 years, and that it has served as a pattern in the settlement of labor disputes other than those involving railway workers? Has the administration set its envious and regal eye upon the transportation systems of America and decided that this part of our economy can be run better by the bureaucrats; that in any event this is necessary to attain the desired political control over our people? Is the President deliberately precipitating a rail strike so as to afford him the excuse to take over the railway system?

These are not hurried questions. They are the logical questions anyone would ask after going over the wage case of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations that has been pending since September 1942.

From the very outset the representatives of the 15 railway labor organizations have strictly followed and complied with all the requirements of the Railway Labor Act. But the administration certainly has not followed the act, in spirit or otherwise, in its handling of this wage dispute.

Beginning with the January 20, 1943, request of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations for appointment of an emergency board, as prescribed in the Railway Labor Act, the President has been ignoring the act. Instead, he issued a flood of Executive orders, and created labor panels, advisory boards, and economic stabilizers.

And what has been the result? It has only made the situation worse.

Following the May 24, 1943, report of the emergency board, the President on May 27, in conference with the representatives of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations, requested the employees to accept the emergency board's recommendations for a general hourly wage increase of 8 cents. Because of the national emergency the employees' representatives agreed to accept the board's recommended 8 cents, and with this understanding proceeded to arrange a conference with the carriers committee. But before this meeting with the carriers could materialize, Stabilizer Vinson, on June 24, stepped in and nullified the emergency board's May 24 report, as well as the May 27 understanding between the employees' representatives and the President.

Finally at the suggestion of the President and with the full knowledge of Mr. Vinson, on August 7 the employees and the carriers signed an agreement accepting the general wage increase of 8 cents as recommended by the Emergency Board May 24. Subsequent to the consummation of this agreement Messrs. Vinson and Byrnes declined to give the parties their approval of the agreement and which the parties to the agreement had every right to expect.

Following this, on September 16, the employees' representatives held another conference with the President and in order to settle the matter "that date" accepted certain recommendations of the President respecting a sliding scale instead of a straight increase to all labor. Then on September 17 the employees' representatives learned the President had again changed his mind after talking with his stabilizers. Then followed another Executive order and creation of a board clear outside of the Railway Labor Act. Since August 7, 1943, the administration has been interfering and preventing the agreement of that date being put in effect.

The administration is ignoring the Railway Labor Act, as well as violating the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, which specifically prohibited the suspension of any act except certain designated sections of the 1942 Price Control Act that had nothing to do with railway

labor disputes. On the other hand, should the President comply with his Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, it would be incumbent upon him to approve the August 7, 1943, agreement entered into by the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations and carriers, and relieve him of the responsibility of the threat of a Nation-wide railroad strike.

The Emergency Board in its report of May 24 to the President states very definitely that they recommend the 8-cent increase on the basis of gross inequities and aid in prosecution of the war. They also state there is no entitlement to any increase under the Little Steel formula and that the 8 cents has been allowed only on a basis of gross inequities and to aid in the prosecution of the war. Therefore, the Little Steel formula is not involved.

Nevertheless the administration claims if the August 7 agreement is approved it will wreck the Little Steel formula. Such a claim is wholly without foundation, as the President and everyone familiar with the facts must surely know. Secretary of the Interior Ickes certainly tossed the Little Steel formula out the window when John L. Lewis' demands were complied with. And bear in mind it was with the definite approval of the President that Secretary Ickes acted.

Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident that transoceanic transportation by air of both passengers and cargo will assume the proportions of a major industry after the present war; and

Whereas United States participation in such overseas transportation is essential to the promotion of peace and the stabilization of international conditions; and

Whereas the steamship industry of the United States, owning and operating American flag vessels, has contributed tremendously to the development and expansion of international trade and good will and has established and now maintains the organizations, facilities, and relationships necessary to the competent and efficient overseas carriage of passengers and cargo; and

Whereas it is in the best interests of the United States that the American steamship industry which, in the present national emergency, has demonstrated its patriotism and efficiency in its able performance of the huge wartime task of transportating troops and material of war to the far-flung fronts, be permitted and encouraged to participate in the development of transoceanic air service; and

Whereas the wisdom of integrated overseas surface and air services is attested by the plans which are being made by foreign steamship companies to inaugurate air services, which plans have the support of their governments and are not subject to the impediments applicable to American companies; and

Whereas if American steamship companies are not permitted to offer the same types of transportation as foreign companies, they will be at a serious competitive disadvantage; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill (H. R. 3420) proposing comprehensive and detailed amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act, and it is desirable and opportune for Congress at this time to remove and preclude any possible obstacles to the full participation by the American steamship industry in the development and maintenance of transoceanic air service: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Members of Congress be memorialized to adopt at this time an amendment to H. R. 3420 to add at the end of paragraph (1), section 401 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the following: "*Provided*, That nothing contained in section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, shall be construed to prevent or restrict a steamship company from acquiring, owning, operating, or controlling an air carrier engaged in foreign air commerce or foreign air transportation or in air commerce between the continental United States and a Territory or possession of the United States or between one Territory or possession and another Territory or possession"; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this corporation are hereby instructed and directed to cause copies of this resolution to be delivered to the Members of Congress and other interested parties.

Where Are the Food Crops Produced?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am inserting the following table, which shows the source of the food crops produced in 1942 in the United States. In view of the present discussion on the floor relative to food I think it may interest the Members of the House to see where the food crops of America are produced. The source of information is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. You will observe that California is the leading State in food-crop production. This table is based on cash returns, and California is a long distance from the eastern markets. It is probably true that about one-fifth of the food crops in the Nation are produced in that State. It is something to consider especially in view of the present problems of manpower and agricultural equipment. Food crops are produced in quantity in California and become an important contribution to the Nation's food supply.

The table follows:

[In $1,000]

Alabama	[1] 29,706
Arizona	24,019
Arkansas	40,271
California	619,804
Colorado	81,200
Connecticut	5,809
Delaware	8,072
Florida	164,599
Idaho	67,333
Illinois	142,299
Indiana	79,361
Iowa	70,823
Kansas	207,817
Kentucky	10,413
Louisiana	81,938
Maine	44,201
Maryland	29,181
Massachusetts	14,207
Michigan	105,697
Minnesota	45,294
Mississippi	14,768
Missouri	25,913
Montana	79,131
Nebraska	87,065
Nevada	812
New Hampshire	2,282
New Jersey	50,219
New Mexico	11,385
New York	113,695
North Carolina	56,389
North Dakota	163,298
Ohio	102,682
Oklahoma	67,244
Oregon	63,592
Pennsylvania	53,907
Rhode Island	1,545
South Carolina	18,881
South Dakota	47,654
Tennessee	14,701
Texas	155,443
Utah	15,053
Vermont	4,748
Virginia	53,289
Washington	163,223
West Virginia	6,966
Wisconsin	26,241
Wyoming	12,763
Total	3,288,776

[1] Food crop figures include value of sales of wheat, rye, buckwheat, rice, popcorn, peanuts, soybeans, dry peas, dry edible beans, sugar beets, sugarcane (sugar and sirup), sorghum sirup, maple (sugar and sirup), Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, fruits, pecans, cranberries, and truck crops.

Subsidies and Wartime Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on subsidies and wartime price control by Dr. Harry Gunnison Brown, professor of economics, University of Missouri, which is the most scientific and comprehensive treatise on the subject that I have read, and I would like to share it with other Members of the Congress:

About a year ago I published a paper, Fiscal Policy and Wartime Price Control, dealing with the problem of wartime inflation and

the attempt to hold prices down by administrative decree. Emphasis was placed on the difficulties of preventing price and wage increases while, simultaneously, increasing greatly the circulating medium. If Congress would levy taxes heavy enough to pay for the war, or nearly pay for it, from current tax revenue, such taxes would take spending power away from individuals in proportion as they increased the spending power of the Government. Excess money that would otherwise be used in bidding for goods and so promoting price increases would thereby be absorbed for Government wartime use. Inflation of the circulating medium would be unnecessary. And to follow this policy would be quite consistent on the financial side with the use of the principle of selective service on the military side. Everyone would be required to contribute what he could. Just as the young man able to meet the physical requirements for military service has been asked to sacrifice his liberty and well-being and to risk his health and his life, those at home with surplus spending power would at least be asked to pay in taxes substantially their entire surplus over reasonable necessary living expenses.

Because taxes have not been anything like as high as they might have been and because tax contributions plus purchases o Government bonds from savings, taken together, have been inadequate, the Government has felt obliged to borrow billions of dollars from banks. It is this borrowing of new and additional circulating medium from banks, and its distribution in paying for goods and for labor, that forms the basis for the current inflation. To attempt to hold down prices, wages, and rents under such conditions is like trying to hold back a car by pressing down the brakes, while simultaneously pressing down the gas pedal. Thereby come such various evasions, compromising adjustments by the price-fixing and wage-fixing authorities, quality and label changes, and black markets as were described in my paper mentioned above.

But when these inevitable effects of our fiscal policy occurred, the contention was advanced that these difficulties could be avoided by means of subsidies. According to this plan producers receive payments from the Government to cover, in part, their costs of production. In consideration of such payments they are supposed to keep down—or even reduce—their prices. The idea seems to be that the rise in the cost of living must be stopped, but not by doing away with its cause, viz, the increase in the circulating medium brought about through borrowing from banks.

From what source are such subsidies paid? The thought of the advocates of this plan appears to be that they will be paid out of increased taxes. That they will actually be so paid does not seem very likely in view of the history of our tax policy in this war. Nevertheless, let us suppose that funds for such subsidies are so raised. How far, then, do we really relieve ourselves from the evils of rising prices by thus paying less in formal purchase prices for goods when at the same time we pay correspondingly more in taxes so as to reimburse the very people from whom we purchase the goods.

It is argued by some, indeed, that the tax method has the advantage of making persons with larger incomes help pay the food and clothing bills of persons with smaller incomes. But if, because Government finances this war so largely by borrowing from banks, prices tend progressively upward and we are then urged to impose heavier taxes on the recipients of the larger incomes to protect others—by means of subsidies to producers—from the rising prices, why not instead impose these higher taxes to meet war expenses? Thereby we would avoid borrowing from banks and would bring an end to the progressive increase of the circulating medium from which the trouble stems. Is it not ridiculous that we should levy high taxes to get money to pay subsidies in order to secure funds to appear to hold down prices, when the prices are rising just because we won't levy high taxes to pay war expenses? Because we insist on paying a large part of these expenses by means of borrowing from banks?

It should be noted, however, that many advocates of subsidies do not wish to have the subsidies paid to all of the producers in a given subsidized line. Instead, they would have subsidies paid only to the high-cost producers, assuming that other producers can, and should be, compelled to keep prices down without such help. But in fact, as competent economists know, the question of what is the most expensive part (the high-cost part) of the supply of any commodity is much less simple than this. A very considerable proportion of the most expensive part of the supply of any commodity may come from producers who are, on the average of all their production, in the low-cost groups. A slightly lower price, therefore, might cause even such a low-cost producing corporation or individual to produce less of the commodity than before—e. g., to stop producing wheat from one of the poorer fields or from a field pretty well adapted to another crop, or to stop producing coal from one of the company's poorer veins. Or the lower price of the commodity might mean less demand for labor in that line and lower wages to employees, with the result that some of these employees would decide to leave the particular line of work for some other line.

Should subsidies be paid, then, not to high-cost producers only but to low-cost producers also, at least on part of their output; and, if so, on how much of their output should the subsidies be paid? Should subsidies be paid to workers who, because of their alternatives, may be unwilling to remain in an industry for a wage which many other workers are willing to accept? For, certainly, the product of such unwilling workers is a high-cost product. Or shall subsidies be paid to capitalists and landowners but never to wage earners? Should subsidies be paid to all of those who are relatively inefficient in a given industry, so as to keep them in it—on the theory that their part of the supply is a high-cost part? And then, if the subsidies in one industry make it seem relatively profitable, shall subsidies be paid to other industries to keep men from leaving them to go into the originally subsidized ones? How widely, indeed, shall this Government favor be spread?

The cost of production of any commodity, in the sense of what must be paid to get the commodity produced, depends on what those engaged in producing it—or who might be induced to produce it—believe they can get in other lines. Cost of production is, therefore, relative. If inflation causes some prices to rise rapidly while other prices are held down, many of those in the regulated lines are likely to leave those lines unless prices and incomes are allowed to rise in their lines also. And in like manner subsidies in some lines, which are not granted in other lines, definitely tend to draw labor and capital and land away from such other lines. Where, then, shall subsidies stop? And, if they are not given to everyone, who shall select the favored individuals and companies to which the payments shall be made, and on what basis and by what detailed research shall the selections be made?

But indeed, since we are not now meeting the expense of carrying on the war out of taxes (or, even, out of taxes plus voluntary savings invested in savings bonds) but are borrowing very largely from the banks and thereby expanding greatly our circulation medium, why is it so glibly assumed that the subsidies will be paid for out of taxes What if these subsidies are in fact paid for with funds borrowed from the banks? What if this means even more borrowing from the banks by the Federal Government than we have had hitherto and, consequently, an even vaster increase in purchasing power. Would such a result not resemble, in some sort of fashion, trying to hold back a car by pressing down the brake (price regulation and rationing) while simultaneously not only putting on a full head of gas (borrowing for the meeting of regular war expenses) but also getting the car pushed from behind (more borrowing—to pay for subsidies) by another car or a truck?

To date, in carrying on World War No. 2, we have not prevented prices from rising in considerable degree. If the above considerations apply, how can we conclude that subsidies are the real solution? How can we maintain that, if we now pay subsidies, prices will rise no further but that, instead, we shall successfully "roll back" the price level, improve the economic status of the relatively poor and allay discontent?

Keep America American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a poem entitled "Keep America American," written by Mr. Ray Madison, editor of the Center Post-Dispatch published at Center, Colo. I am sure that this poem will cause all of us to renew our determination that this country shall be kept American in its ideals, customs, and traditions, which is an obligation we solemnly owe to these boys who are so valiantly fighting on the battle fronts of the world to keep America American. The poem follows:

KEEP AMERICA AMERICAN

I'm writing to you, dear dad,
Because I know you'll understand
The way I feel about our native land.
We are afraid, my pals and I—
No; I do not mean afraid to die—
It's just the things we hear
That make us fear—
Reports of strikes that slow the flow
Of guns and planes and tanks
To battle fronts.
And we would like to know
Who is to blame;
What sabotage is dimming freedom's flame;
Are you, at home, about to lose the game?
Dad, do the very best you can
To keep America American.

When we come back
(If we do come back)
We will expect to find our liberty intact—
Such as the right to choose our way of life;
Each as an individual man—
It is for this we fight and plan.
We grant no governing power to bureaucrats,
We do not want a gestapo
To spy upon us every place we go;
We do not want security—we'll take a chance
To live as free men or fill graves,
For we have seen
What it can mean
To be the slaves of dictatorships.
And we abhor
Their lust for power,
Because they forced us into war.
Every liberty-loving man
Should keep America American.

I'm making plans for me and you,
And not forgetting Betty Lou
Whom I expect to marry when
The war is over, and I'm home again—
I want to give my sons a heritage
As priceless as the one I knew,
And dad, that's why I'm trusting you
To keep our country just the same
As when I left.
I do not want a new-made world—
Just home, and work
At jobs I've always done;
If I can play a fair, square game and win
I want to keep the laurels I have won.
Not being told how much to plant or sow;
No price set on the product of my toil;
That's all I crave—
I'll not need any "cradle to the grave"
Plans made for me,
Because I will be my own man,
And don't you see?
America will be American.

So dad, don't throw me and my buddies down—
Some of us, of course, will not return—
We will not rue to lie in foreign soil;
We'll rest in peaceful sleep
If you but keep
The torch of liberty aglow,
The blood of heroes is a sacred oil
That feeds the flames of freedom
In a never-ceasing flow.
So dad, do everything you can
To keep America American.

Now dad, it's up to you to keep the score,
And help us win the things we're fighting for.
Needless directives, useless waste,
Thoughtless planning and costly haste;
These are the fruits of dictatorship—
These are the things that you must whip.
Starry-eyed dreamers, power-mad fools,
Egotistic asses and unwitting tools;
These are the saboteurs
You'll have to ban
To keep America American.

—*Ray Madison.*

The State of the Farming Industry—Annual Message of the Master of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 15, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture and the people engaged in the farming industry are the backbone of our country.

The ideals of the people on the farms are a stabilizing influence in the political structure of our Government.

The administration and the Congress, in formulating national policies and enacting our legislative program, will do well to take counsel and give consideration to the good advice of our farm leaders.

The National Grange is fortunate in having as its leader a man of broad vision and wide experience. National Grange Master Albert S. Goss comes from the West and has an intimate knowledge of agriculture in all sections of the country.

Particularly do I commend for the consideration of the Congress the cardinal principles which has been laid down in the platform of the National Grange, and submitted to the resolution committee of the National Convention of both political parties which I quote:

There must be recognition of price parity as between the products of agriculture and industry in the domestic market.

Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar—one just to the debtor and creditor alike with constant purchasing power—preventing uncontrolled inflation and the disastrous effects of deflation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these principles constitute the most constructive plan that has ever been submitted in the platform of any party at any time.

Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of the Members of the House, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD the annual address of Grange Master Albert S. Goss:

Officers and members of the National Grange, 24 years ago the National Grange met in Grand Rapids. Although war had ended a year before, and much of the intervening year had been devoted to peace conferences, no peace proposals acceptable to the United States had yet been evolved, and the Versailles Treaty was defeated in the Senate as the Grange was concluding the work of the session. We are about to enter the third year of our participation in World War No. 2, which resulted from failure to solve our international problems following World War No. 1. The outlook for success at arms is far brighter than it was a year ago. There seems no reasonable doubt that the Axis Powers will be decisively defeated and their military might destroyed in the not too distant future. But the experience following the last war has taught us that winning a war and winning a peace are two distinct and separate problems. First, we must devote our utmost energy to the immediate task at hand—winning the war. But in doing so, unless we hold fast to sound principles governing our domestic and international relations, our sacrifices at arms will have proved in vain. Just as experience has proved that it was very costly to have neglected our preparedness for war, so it may prove equally costly to neglect preparing for peace.

These are days of tense living. Each is trying to do all he can to bring this terrible war to a successful conclusion, yet we recognize the necessity for looking ahead to what will happen when peace comes. There is always danger of following an immediate objective so intensely that we fail to see where it leads. The daily pursuits of the farmer provide opportunity for study and reflection. He is seldom carried away with the enthusiasm of mob action. Thus it is that the conclusions of a farm organization such as ours have more than ordinary significance. By the same token it is important that we reach these conclusions with the greatest care.

It is fortunate that we are meeting in the heart of the farming section of one of our great agricultural States. For many years Michigan has been one of our leading Grange States. She has furnished us some of our strongest farm leaders, men and women who pioneered in thought and action, and who based their action on careful consideration. It is well that we have gotten away from the hurry and confusion of war activities and have come here for 9 days of work and quiet deliberation. War and peace will be first in our minds, but here we can and must take time to reach our conclusions only after the most careful study.

Preparing for peace is the best form of preparedness against war. It is not suggested that it is necessary to work out details of war settlement at this time. It is suggested that there be a clear-cut understanding of the issues we are fighting for, and that the fight be carried on until enforceable agreements are reached so that never again will greedy nations set forth on a course of pillage and conquest, or seek to rule the world by force of arms. The foundation for peace must be firmly laid on the solid rock of justice and equity, and even in this hour of desperate combat we should not lose sight of the necessity of seeking out and agreeing on the definite principles upon which that foundation shall be laid.

FOUNDATION FOR PEACE

The foundation for a lasting peace does not lie solely in determining territorial borders or sovereignties. It does not lie in reparations or settlements of war claims. It does not lie in establishing the guilt of those responsible for the present war and meting out punishment for the crime. Peace will be lasting only when based on the solid foundation of prosperity. Adversity and want engender revolution and war. Prosperity breeds peace. Prosperity springs from the creation of wealth. The prosperity of one nation never injured another. Quite the contrary. The prosperity of any nation is more secure when other nations prosper. Danger lies when one nation attempts by force, physical or economic, to secure advantage over another—to rob it of its prosperity.

Last year we set up three guideposts to aid us in following a true course. The three economic principles so expressed apply just as truly in international affairs as they do in domestic or personal affairs.

1. Any program which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based upon what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression.

The foundation for a lasting peace must be based on these simple honesties, not on philanthropy and not on force, except the force necessary to protect one nation against wanton aggression by another. Through the advancement of science we have learned how to produce enough wealth for the comforts of all. The goal would therefore seem to be to promote among all nations the production of wealth and the prosperity which flows from it. Each nation must solve this problem for itself. Ways should be found under which they are freely permitted to do so.

We don't need to worry about assuring a quart of milk for everyone in the world, but rather that everybody has a chance to produce enough to get that quart for himself. Then if they won't do it, let them do the worrying. Freedom to produce should be the goal. To attempt to run the internal affairs of other nations; to dictate to them what their own laws and liberties shall be; to attempt to guarantee them against want; or to do more than give them full opportunity to do for themselves without hindrance, so long as they do not hinder others, will but lead to complications and sow the seed for future conflict.

BASES FOR POST-WAR AGREEMENTS

As long as there are dishonest men with the instincts of robbers, society must be prepared to use force if necessary to prevent their carrying out their evil designs. We are fighting a war to end international aggression and pillage, because there was no other means of preventing three powerful nations from robbing and plundering weaker nations. While we were bound by no treaties which compelled us to enter the war, we gave so much aid to the nations which had attempted to call a halt to international plundering that we were attacked and became involved in the conflict. We can expect a recurrence of such outrages unless steps are taken to stop international plundering just as soon as it shows its head. We cannot avoid involvement merely by refusing to join

with others to prevent aggression. On the other hand, if all join forces to put a stop to international pillage, we can end one fruitful cause of war.

The problem is how far we should go in any such international agreement. Any agreement involves definitions, and boundaries, and other causes for misunderstandings. It would seem that there should be fewer misunderstandings under carefully worked out agreements on a few basic principles than with no agreements at all. The Grange should consider this whole problem and the scope of any program for agreement. A few suggestions are offered.

Any agreement should be clear-cut on the means to be employed to prevent aggression, and should be limited to that one purpose, instead of attempting to parcel out the world, it should be limited at the outset to those matters not in dispute and should provide that the signatory nations bind themselves to respect such boundaries and territories as are listed and described therein, and which may be unanimously approved thereafter. Then let time and experience add nations and territory from time to time as all the interested nations may agree. At least we could make a start in taking part of the world out of the realm of dispute, and agree to prevent change therein through aggression or any means other than the agreement of the people involved. Let nothing be included in the agreement unless it is unanimously approved by all the parties at interest. There should be no hasty decisions. The winners of the war will have to police the world anyway for awhile, and it is far better to supplant their policing gradually as unanimous agreement develops, than to patch up some hasty agreements which may leave unhealed scars and sources for future infection.

So simple an agreement would not be subject to misinterpretation easily, yet some sort of advisory court might well be provided to act as a clearing house for adjusting differences. Such a court would be most used, obviously, as an aid to settling differences in boundaries, or other matters, before they were added to the list of approved agreements, thus becoming a part of a program for international cooperation. Nothing would prevent the signatory nations from adding additional provisions to such an international agreement from time to time if they unanimously desired to do so. Thus the world might gradually develop an international code of law, unanimously agreed upon, and provide means for its administration. It would seem, however, that the important feature would be to go slowly and take up step by step those matters which had passed beyond the stage of disagreement.

Similarly, let us not hasten too much in working out peace treaties. We should avoid reaching decisions which may be actuated by passion and hate. Time will enable all belligerents to pass judgment on the intentions of their enemies better than immediately following the conflict. We should remember that, for the most part, the people of all nations have been led to believe that they are fighting for justice. After the last war, the belligerents all modified their views considerably in the decade following the peace. Unquestionably we shall do so again. Let us be firm in our determination that aggression shall end, but let us remember that we and our children must live in the same world with those whom we are now trying to destroy, and let us take time to cool off in order that justice may not be thwarted by passion.

It might even be that an association such as outlined might take the place of a peace treaty. If, however, it appears best to have understandings between nations before they reach the stage of unanimous world agreement, let these understandings grow step by step as needed, first agreeing as to boundaries and then perhaps on an international medium of exchange or monetary system to facilitate trade, then trade relations, debt payments, alien property rights, and other matters. It is possible that some of the questions thus agreed on may become matters of unanimous world-wide permanent agreement and be incorporated in the agreements of an association of nations. Thus the deliberations of the peace conference may lead to broadening the scope of such an association and we will gradually evolve a system of international law which will have unanimous support and some day may reach a point where it will put an end to war. This can be done without any nation surrendering its sovereignty.

WORLD TRADE

Americans have been the victims of a lopsided system of world trade for a quarter of a century. Following the last war, we extended billions of dollars in credit to European nations so they could buy our products. Excepting Finland, little was ever paid on these loans. The result was that the American taxpayer gave many billion dollars in goods to European nations, but because we tried to collect part of the money, we gained the name of "Uncle Shylock."

Next, international bankers bought other billions in the bonds of foreign nations in order that they might buy our manufactured products. These bonds were largely sold to small banks and private investors. Many were never paid, while others were redeemed at heavy discounts. Many a bank closed because of this and again the public footed the bill.

When these two sources of credit became bankrupt, we began to deal for gold, and in order to make it go as far as possible, we raised the dollar value of an ounce of gold about 80 percent. We went further and created a fictitious value on silver and proceeded to buy up most of the gold and silver in the world and sell our real wealth for it. Finally, when nobody had any credit, any gold, or any silver to buy from us, we started a lend-lease program which has developed into a pure gift program.

That will come to an end some day, we hope, so now a new plan is developed. It is proposed to set up an international bank with $10,000,000,000 capital, most of it furnished by us. Other nations can subscribe capital and immediately borrow more than they put in. When they have used up all their credit, they can withdraw. I think we are still fooling ourselves.

There is only one way to provide for trade on a lasting basis. If we sell goods, we must get an equal value in goods in exchange, or some form of money which can be converted into goods whenever we want. If we sell at export, we have got to make up our minds to import an equal amount of goods; otherwise, what we have sold will become a gift. At this point our reciprocal trade agreements enter. The trade agreement is a form of barter which has arisen because of the breakdown in international credits for the reasons just cited. Under the barter agreement, we get goods in exchange and are not left empty handed, as we have been under the other forms of commerce incentives. However, too many of the agreements provide for selling industrial products and taking farm products in exchange—products which we can raise at home. Thus the American farmer finds no sale for the wealth he creates, and his buying power is shut off. Such trade agreements should be limited to things we do not produce at home. In our dealings with other nations we should take from them the things we need in exchange for the things that they need. Nothing is gained by exchanging identical or competing commodities.

The whole situation points to the need of an international medium of exchange which is backed by real value and can be redeemed by real value when desired. It should be a form of exchange, the value of which cannot be expanded or contracted at will by international bankers or government financiers. Its purchasing power should be constant and dependable.

No matter what we use for money, people are going to raise, buy, sell, and use wheat, cotton, coal, and many other staples. It takes a definite amount of work to produce a bushel of wheat, a bale of cotton, or a ton of coal. Therein lies stability or real wealth. Their intrinsic values remain constant. If it were not for the trouble of transporting them, they (and many similar staples) could always be used to buy goods anywhere in the world. If a man is denied credit, he can get busy and produce his own wealth in staples if he works hard enough. The same is true of a nation.

It is suggested that careful study be given to the practicability of establishing a medium of exchange based on the security of staple commodities. With a broad enough commodity base, any nation producing real wealth would have available a stable medium of exchange, free from fluctuations, manipulation, or control. The proposal is by no means as simple as it sounds, but it appears to have enough merit to warrant careful study.

In considering world trade we should never lose sight of the fact that the world's best market is right here at home. Had we spent the same amount of money in developing our home market that we have spent seeking foreign trade, we would have been much better off.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Ours is a constitutional form of government providing for three distinct functions, which are designed to be separate and independent.

The legislative branch is created to write the law defining the policies of the Government.

The executive branch is created to administer the law as passed by Congress.

The judicial branch is created to interpret the law and decide points of issue arising thereunder.

All powers not expressly given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or to the people.

In time of war, Congress may be justified in delegating special powers to the executive branch of Government in order to get quick action, but all such power should be revokable by a majority vote, and it is the duty of Congress to revoke it, if in its judgment the power is not being exercised in accord with the intent and purpose of Congress. Congress cannot dodge its responsibility to the people by delegating its power to someone else. It is still the law-making body of the land. It has the power to require that its laws be enforced, and the people have the right to expect Congress to exercise this power.

The people's rights are protected by the Constitution and by the laws of Congress, or of the several States. When violated, the people have the right to seek redress through the courts. Under the protection of such a constitutional framework, the people enjoy freedom to do and act as they please, so long as they transgress no law designed to protect the public or promote the general welfare.

Any executive encroachment on the rights of the people or the powers of Congress leads to breaking down the balance of power, to building up centralized control, and is a step toward dictatorship. The trend in that direction is too strong to be ignored. Abuses are occurring which seriously impair our rights and affect our daily lives. Some of these abuses result from direct law violations, while others arise from indirection. Congress should take whatever steps are necessary to put a stop to them as soon as they appear, for they are rapidly building up a bureaucracy which is taking unto itself the power to make

its own laws. A few examples are cited, not as a list of infringements, but merely to illustrate the type of abuse which is becoming so common as to give real cause for alarm.

As an example of ignoring the law, the Office of Economic Stabilization, in answer to queries as to why the provisions of law were not being followed gave as an explanation that it was operating under an Executive order and was therefore not responsible to Congress, which made the law.

An example of indirect violation is found in labor contracts. Congress has provided exceptions in labor laws to prevent the compulsory adoption of the closed shop, but in letting Government contracts the provision for a closed shop has frequently been included in spite of the expressed policy of Congress. Evasion by contract has been accomplished in many ways.

An example of direct evasion might be cited in the administration of the Farm Security Administration. Congress disapproved of their activities in establishing collectivist farm colonies. It forbade their buying any more land for such purposes, and ordered the land sold which the F. S. A. then held. The F. S. A. proceeded to set up cooperative corporations to operate through and went merrily along as before.

An example of direct violation is found in the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942. Congress was well aware that flat price ceilings had never curbed inflation and had always resulted in disaster through strangling production. After meeting the President's demands for legislation fixing a stabilization date, it included a safety clause to prevent the disaster which would follow any attempt to fix ceilings below cost. The clause provided that "modification in maximum prices shall be made * * * where it appears that modification is necessary to increase the production for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs * * * the maximum price so established will not reflect such increased costs." The Office of Price Administration has flatly refused to modify the ceiling prices to comply with this provision of law.

As an example of how this lawlessness is strangling production and affecting our citizens, a recent case of cutting down the milk supply of The Dalles, Oreg., by 75 percent is cited, where the health of the children was endangered. Proof that the ceilings were below cost brought no relief. Ordinarily citizens would have a means of redress through the courts, where an injunction could be obtained to prevent a violation of law which endangered the life or health of anyone. In all matters of price control, however, there is no protection given the public. The Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, first set up a special court located in Washington, D. C., to handle all O. P. A. matters but expressly provided that such court could not enjoin any action taken by the O. P. A. officials. ["The court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decrees staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 2, or any price schedule."—Sec. 204 (c).]

Having stopped the special court from interfering, in the next paragraph (sec. 204 (d)), every other court in the land (except the Supreme Court) was denied any jurisdiction in any price control case. In one sweep citizens were denied all relief through the courts from any imposition by the Price Control Administration, no matter how destructive or illegal it might be. Thus the legislative and the judicial branches of government are both made completely subservient to the executive branch. Call it by any name you want, this is the essence of dictatorship.

Congress should immediately repeal those provisions of the Price Control Act which deny to our citizens the use of the courts in seeking relief from law violations, and it should establish severe penalties for public officials who willfully violate the law. Instead of a government by law, we are rapidly becoming a government by regulation and Executive order. It has been stated that the volume of regulations and Executive orders issued during the past year exceeded the total volume of laws passed by Congress from the time of George Washington to date. We do not know whether the statement is accurate, but the volume is so great that no citizen can possibly know whether he is a law violator or not in pursuing his daily routine of life.

It is high time that we get back to constitutional government if we wish to preserve the liberties and rights of a free people.

The fact that we are engaged in the greatest war of all time furnishes no valid excuse for bypassing the Constitution and violating fundamental rights. In the famous Milligan case of Civil War days, which constitutes one of the landmarks of our judicial history, the Supreme Court most appropriately said:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism."

WARTIME AND PEACETIME ECONOMY

Our problems are by no means confined to the prosecution of the war, or to international relations and trade following the war. We face some of the most serious domestic problems in the history of the Nation. The methods we employ in meeting our current problems of production, inflation, price control, subsidies, taxation, and many others will have a controlling influence on the problems of reconstruction and shifting from a wartime to a peacetime economy. It is therefore essential that we follow no expedient course, but measure each step to determine where it leads. Here, too, our guideposts will be found helpful. In all our planning we must strive to preserve our system of private enterprise, else democracy fails.

FOOD

Our greatest problem is to obtain enough production. We have recognized that if we are to produce ships, airplanes, guns, and tanks, producers must get the cost of producing them. Fabulously profitable contracts have been freely entered into, and fabulous wages are being paid without regard to cost. For a long time farm production was not considered a war necessity. Farms were stripped of labor, farmers were denied fertilizer and machinery, while ceilings were placed on farm crops, some of them below production costs. In spite of this, farmers met their production goals for 2 years. In total, we met them this past year, although price-control bungling has resulted in overexpansion in some lines and in substantial shortages in others.

At last, after shortages have begun to pinch, food has become recognized as a war necessity, but, unfortunately, many destructive food policies still prevail. Our job is to produce food. We know how to do it and will produce to the limit of our capacity if given a chance. Our record production of the past 3 years didn't just happen. It is true that a kindly Providence provided the rain and the sun at the right time, but farmers did their full part, too. They increased the average workweek to 80 hours or more, as old men, women, and children labored in the field, many of them from daylight to dark.

If we are to produce food, we must have labor, machinery, supplies, and a price which will permit production.

FARM LABOR

The labor situation is improved, although in many areas it is still a serious bottleneck in production. Farm deferments have checked the rapid drain to the military forces, while better living conditions in farm work, particularly for men with families, are gradually working toward more stable labor conditions. Imported labor has worked out well, but the supply has not been adequate to meet the demand. It is suggested that efforts be made to retain the imported labor through the winter by work in the southern pulp forests, or other occupations where labor is short. This would mean less waste of time and expense in travel and assure more prompt filling of seasonal form labor requirements.

Basically the farm labor problem has been due to the long hours and low wages paid in comparison with other industries. Most farm workers do not mind the long hours if the pay is adequate, but for many years the low price level for farm crops has made it impossible to compete with industry for the best type of help. Recent price increases have made it possible to increase farm wages, with the result that farm wages have risen faster than those of any other industry except deep water transportation, where bonuses are paid for entering the war zones. This is shown by table I in the appendix. We do not mean that farm wages should be as high as industrial wages. Living conditions on the farm are more attractive for most workingmen and this is reflected in the wage scale. One advantage industrial workers have is social security. Farmers generally have not wanted to have farm workers come under social security because of the work involved in connection with it. Exchange labor and other unusual working conditions make social-security accounting difficult, but lack of social security is proving one of the handicaps in holding the highest type labor. In self-protection agriculture should study out practical ways of meeting the difficult problems of making it applicable to farm workers.

FARM MACHINERY

The steel allotments for farm machinery have been doubled and it is hoped that the impossible allocation regulations which prevented machines from being sent where needed will be abandoned, and the trade, which knows how to handle the machinery business, may be allowed to distribute it where needed again. There are disturbing reports to the effect that much of the machinery increase is to be exported. If we really want food, it would seem to be wise to keep the machinery here where we have the land and facilities for making maximum use of it.

FARM SUPPLIES

The farm groups have united in supporting an organization in Washington known as the committee for production supplies. This committee is constantly working on supply problems and through its efforts many of these problems are gradually being worked out. Production was substantially reduced during the past crop season due to the inability to get gasoline. Tractor farmers were given priorities, but no provision was made for dealer priorities in farming areas. It is hoped this blunder will not be repeated.

INFLATION

The past year has seen a disturbing trend toward inflation. The cost of living has not risen alarmingly, but the factors which cause inflation have largely gone unchecked, and the accumulated pressure from these factors is sure to cause trouble unless relieved. In the meantime the whole burden of inflation is being blamed on agriculture. Farmers as a group are the least to blame, as I will point out. First, however, let us look at some basic facts.

Inflation comes from two chief causes. One is Government debt so excessive that

people begin to lose confidence in the Government's ability to repay with a dollar having a purchasing power equal to the dollar borrowed. When this loss of confidence reaches a point where people will not willingly finance Government borrowing, first the tendency is to induce them to continue to lend by increasing interest rates or by selling bonds at a discount. This but shakes confidence further and speeds up the debt accumulation until finally the Government is forced to resort to printing-press money. Then money is well on the downward grade. This is the kind of inflation we saw in Europe following the last war. The only thing that can stop it is to adopt a new medium of exchange, but in the meantime all savings and credits are wiped out in a complete economic collapse.

The second cause of inflation rises from a surplus income and shortage of consumer goods. When the supply of consumer goods will not equal the demand those with surplus spending power begin to bid up the price. As prices rise costs rise, and if unchecked we get into a price inflationary spiral. We are at that stage now.

It is estimated that income payments to individuals in the fiscal year ending next June will amount to $152,000,000,000. The amount of available consumer goods and services are estimated at $89,000,000,000. This leaves a gross inflationary gap of $63,000,000,000 which will be cut down by taxes estimated at $21,000,000,000, leaving excess spending power of $42,000,000,000. Thus it can be seen that the net inflationary gap is increasing at the rate of $3,500,000,000 per month.

This is not new. Similar situations have arisen before many times in the last 3,000 years. It differs only in the size of the problem. Two schools of thought exist as to the cure. One believes in getting at the cause and curing the conditions which create such an unbalance. The other believes in treating the effect and ignoring the cause. If the causes are not basic and due to some small temporary disturbance which will right itself, treating the effect may provide temporary relief. If the conditions are basic, any attempt to cure the cause by price ceilings will fail, just as it has failed throughout history for economic reasons that cannot be changed by man-made laws or directives.

PRICE CEILINGS

The theory that inflation can be controlled by freezing all prices has never worked, because it is impossible to freeze all costs. War creates many dislocation costs that are not affected by price levels. We can freeze farm wages, but if the efficient young men go to war and leave only those who do half as much work, labor costs double in spite of the frozen wages. Similar war dislocation costs occur throughout our economy, and when the rising costs bump into the ceilings, production is strangled. When production is shut off, consumer supplies decline and the inflationary gap widens. The blundering O. P. A. ceiling policies have created many such shortages. The result has been that many items have been driven into black markets and many consumers either go without or pay exorbitant bootleg prices.

After pursuing such destructive policies for many months, the conclusion was reached that farmers could not continue to produce at less than cost indefinitely, so it was proposed to hold the price line and use subsidies to keep farmers in business.

SUBSIDIES

A year ago we reviewed many reasons why subsidies are undesirable. We will mention but three, because we wish to enlarge on them somewhat.

Subsidies aggravate the trouble we are seeking to remedy because they are themselves inflationary. The money has to be borrowed and increases the surplus income, while to the extent they fail to reach the producer, or fail to meet his increased costs, they fail to prevent the ceilings from curtailing production. There is a simple law of economics that cannot be brushed aside. If you want to increase the supply of anything, you increase the price, thus encouraging production and discouraging consumption. We are doing the opposite. We are short of food, and we are reducing the price to discourage production and encourage consumption, a most inflationary procedure.

Subsidies, plus an enormous cost of administration and interest, will be passed on to those who are fighting our battles at the front and to our children. This is entirely uncalled for. Although we are eating about 30 percent better than we did before war started, we are paying the lowest percent of our income for food in our history, only 21 percent—believed to be the lowest of any nation in the world. In other words, with our unprecedented income, we are better able to pay our grocery bill than ever before, and there is no reason on earth why we should pass it on to others. No one complained about the cost of food in 1928–29. We thought we were fairly prosperous. Since then our income has nearly doubled and the cost of living has gone up less than 2 percent. The talk about dire distress is not based on the truth.

Subsidies will lead to economic chaos. If we maintain price ceilings with subsidies to meet the rising costs, we will develop an increasingly unbalanced price structure. When war ends, if we are to escape that swift road to printing-press inflation, we will have to think about balancing the Budget. Subsidies will be one of the first items cut off. Then either farmers will have to raise prices to get production costs or go out of business. If during these days, when our surplus spending power is one of our greatest problems, we are not willing to pay the cost of producing our food, what would the chances be of raising prices when the boys come home looking for jobs? The answer is none, whatever. The result would be complete collapse.

THE REMEDY

There is only one cure for inflation. That is to close the inflationary gap by bringing supply and demand into balance. The gap must be closed from both ends. First, we must do all we can to increase the supply. Labor, machinery, and supplies are getting better. A compensatory price will produce an amply supply of most commodities, making ceilings unnecessary. A year ago we had a ceiling on potatoes which discouraged production, and we had a short supply much of which moved through black markets at ridiculous figures. Before planting last spring we reversed the procedure and established a support price at a fair value. The result is the largest potato crop in our history with no ceilings needed, for the prices are down to the support price. This same procedure could be followed in the case of most commodities.

If in some instances the supply cannot be increased to meet the demand, then the demand must be reduced to fit the supply. This can be done by rationing and by curtailing purchasing power through taxation or a practical savings plan. The tax and saving method is discussed later. It should be pointed out that rationing can be carried to such an extent that a surplus will develop sufficient to hold prices at reasonable levels. Before making specific recommendations for remedial action it may be well to examine further into the cause of our price rises.

WHERE THE TROUBLE LIES

Reference is made to the table where the figures are based on the 1935–39 period before war broke out in Europe. From the standpoint of agriculture, this is hardly a fair base to use, for farm prices and farm income were exceptionally low during those years, meaning that there should have been large increases in farm prices before we reached an even starting point. During this base period per capita farm income was $172, compared to $623 per capita nonfarm income. The base is selected because we have wanted to lean over backward to be fair.

Column 1 shows the cost of living.

Column 2 shows retail food prices.

There have been so many figures quoted on wage rates, overtime, and increases that the labor picture is quite confused. What we want is to find out if the amount of labor in a unit of finished product has been going up or down, and how much. We find that industrial production has been rising but not rising as fast as the labor cost in producing it. By dividing the factory pay rolls by the production, we get the increased labor cost in what we buy. That is what affects the cost of living. Column 3 therefore shows the increased labor cost per unit of production.

Column 4 shows the increase in "take home" pay per employed worker.

Column 5 shows the increase in wage rates of hired farm labor.

Columns 6 and 7 show increase in corporate earnings as compared to the average quarter in 1939.

It will be noted that for the first few months of 1940 everything except wages was down. Finally, by December the 10-percent wage increase had forced the labor cost in the things we buy to advance 6 percent. This in turn forced up living costs 1 percent, but food prices were still below par. By April 1941, however, farm labor had advanced 19 points, factory labor had gone up 22 points, the unit labor cost had climbed 7 points, and food had been forced to advance 1 point, while the cost of living went up 2 points. When we got into the war—January 1942—industrial earnings had gone up 118 points, farm labor had increased 47 points, labor's individual income was up 49 points, the labor cost per unit of production had risen 25 points, as compared with an increase in retail food prices of 16 points and 12 points in cost of living.

So it has gone throughout the whole period. Industry and labor have led the upward swing, month by month, to the present moment. By last July the increase in farm labor alone was 125 percent, and since labor makes up one-third of the farmer's cost, this increase alone raised farm costs over 40 percent, without mentioning all the other higher costs the farmer had to bear. The effort to lay the whole blame on the farmer is not only viciously unfair, but it is flagrantly misleading. It causes people to reach wrong conclusions, and seek abortive remedies.

Now it is proposed to roll farm prices back to September 1942. Let's see what has happened since then:

The cost of living is up 5 points, the cost of food is up 10 points, the cost per unit of production is up 15 points, the individual take-home pay is up 20 points, the cost of farm labor is up 50 points, corporate earnings are up 7 points.

It is ridiculous to think the situation can be cured by rolling food prices back 10 points when the labor cost alone in this food is up 17 points, and those who are complaining have had increases in income 4 times as great as the increase in living cost. Such superficial thinking is inviting disaster.

There are some whose incomes have not increased. President Roosevelt has said, "We must all be prepared in total war to accept a substantial cut in our accustomed standards of living." That is almost axiomatic. The doctrine that our incomes must keep pace with rising living costs is the very essence of inflation. One measure of how far we have gone down the road toward inflation is the measure of how fast income has increased above living costs. No one wants to give up anything, but somewhere we must call a halt. We've got to

accept cuts in our accustomed standards of living or face inflation. There will be a few cases of real distress where those with limited fixed incomes cannot make ends meet. Where real distress exists, it would be far better to meet it with a direct consumer subsidy in the form of a stamp plan, than to subsidize the vast majority who can get along without Government aid.

To use general subsidies and go deeper into debt rather than meet this issue is the height of inflationary folly. It would be very easy for the farmers to accept subsidies. We could immediately begin to boost our income and comfort ourselves by the thought that everyone else is doing it; but as we see it, the farmers are the one last hope the Nation has in standing fast against committing economic suicide. We must not only stand fast against subsidies, but we must accept and seek either rationing or price ceilings which will prevent farm prices rising too high. We must be content with margins very little above cost, for we too must accept cuts in our accustomed standards of living if inflation is to be licked. However, no hard and fast ceiling method can be made to work, and on some commodities ceilings will not work at all. Each commodity and each area must be given intelligent treatment, always bearing in mind that producers must get costs of production. An ample supply is the best medium for price control. Most farm prices are high enough today although some adjustments are badly needed.

The following course is recommended:

1. Employ a sound income-tax and savings program to relieve surplus income pressure along the lines of the combined income and savings plan later discussed.

2. Encourage abundant production by:

(a) Practical labor policies.

(b) Making available adequate machinery and supplies.

(c) An effective price-support program.

3. Employ rationing where necessary to assure equitable division of any short supply, and when used, ration to a surplus.

4. Use price ceilings only to prevent profiteering, with none established below support prices, and with full recognition of production and distribution costs.

5. Place the administration of food production, food distribution, rationing, and price control under one head.

6. Through advisory committees, make use of farm and producer groups, and all branches of the food industry in working out and maintaining that portion of an inflation-control program pertaining to food.

7. Where necessary to meet real distress, make use of a consumer stamp plan.

MANPOWER AND NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION

The general manpower situation is one of increasing seriousness. As our war industries have expanded their plants, the demands on the Nation's labor supply have also expanded. With the Government footing the bills, war industries have offered stupendous wages in competition for a dwindling labor supply. On the other hand, many of the war plants have been located where adequate housing was not available and workers have been compelled to live many miles from their work, necessitating heavy expenditure of time and money in traveling. The turn-over has been enormous because of these unsatisfactory conditions. This situation has been the chief contributing cause to a disturbing rise in prices and living costs.

The War Manpower Commission was created to deal with the many problems rising out of this situation. Last spring a new advisory committee was set up to pass upon policies and make recommendations to the Commission. This committee, known as the Labor-Management Advisory Committee, is made up of three representatives from labor, three from industry, and three from agriculture. The committee meets at least once a week and frequently oftener. Here the differences between these major groups are threshed out, and agreements have been reached on practically all questions of policy within the Commission's field.

America's over-all production can be stepped up materially if full use of our manpower can be made, and the War Manpower Commission has been doing excellent work in its efforts to bring this about.

The Commission should be particularly commended for its policies of decentralization of authority in the field, where problems can be met by those familiar with the facts.

The cooperation of the public has not been all that could be expected. This has given rise to an increasing demand for a national service act under which all men might be compelled to serve, either in the armed forces or in industry. For four basic reasons such action should be avoided:

First. It is one thing to compel citizens to serve the Nation in time of danger. It is quite another thing to compel a man to work for his fellow man who may exploit or make profit off of his labor.

Second. Unwilling labor is poor labor and without authoritative supervision it may prove dangerous labor.

Third. The average American will not only provide greater output under a voluntary system than under one of regimentation and compulsion, but he will also work where his services are most required if he understands the need and if conditions are satisfactory and he is properly approached.

Fourth. We have not cured the basic problem, and compulsory labor would not cure it. It would likely make matters worse. The basic problem lies in maldistribution of war contracts, ineffective use of the manpower now employed, and dislocation of manpower which could be better located if facilities are made available.

If the Nation faces danger which justifies commandeering the services of a certain age group for war, all within that group should serve where their capacities will produce maximum results. Those exempt from service at the battle front should serve in essential industry as far as practicable. There is considerable loss in manpower among rejectees who have not sought essential employment. Many are rejected for minor causes which do not preclude their employment in some war effort. In some sections many are venereals. There are a great many young men hanging around pool halls and capitalizing on their rejection by doing as they please. Rejected men should be given a conditional release which would remain in force until the man might be needed in spite of his physical cause for rejection, or as long as he secures a position and remains in essential employment. When he fails to do so, he should be inducted and put at whatever work can be found for him. Venereals should be employed where treatment is available. Segregation would have a wholesome effect on this national disgrace.

Those who are privileged to stay at home and work in industry should work under conditions permitting maximum production. Featherbedding, avoidable absenteeism, slowdowns, or any form of intentional work curtailment should be prevented by the elimination of regulations and labor practices making such abuses possible. Incentive plans where they can be applied to increase production without increasing unit costs should be employed.

Agriculture should be put in a position to compete with industry for labor. This does not mean that agriculture should extend the same rate of pay, the same hours of labor, or other working conditions, for this would not only be impossible, but in most instances work on the farm is more desirable than working in factories because of living conditions. The wages and working conditions should be such that agriculture can get its share of the desirable labor and not be reduced to the necessity of taking the "leavings" from industry. This presupposes a price for farm products which will permit paying wages and providing conditions which will attract desirable labor to the farm. Farmers with an average workweek of over 80 hours are generally doing their full part, but in those sections where their time is not fully occupied during the winter months they should seek some form of employment which will aid in our war effort as far as practicable.

Wartime strikes or union rules which prevent men from devoting their maximum efforts to production are equally indefensible Loyalty to the Nation should always be paramount to any obligation to any union or similar organization.

Federal legislation has done much to promote union organizations during the past few years. Those unions which use their increased strength to conduct strikes in essential industries at such a time should have the benefits and protection of law stripped from them.

FARM LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Basically our greatest post-war problem is to provide means for the equitable distribution of the wealth created. Here the principles set forth in our three guide posts are most important, especially the principle that the compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare. There must be an equitable balance between industry, labor, and agriculture. Generally speaking, for many years the compensation of industry has been overgenerous as compared to labor or agriculture, but we must not swing to extremes and destroy industrial incentive, for our whole economy is dependent upon the operation of the plants of industry.

If labor gets less than a fair share, the reduced purchasing power injures the markets of both industry and agriculture. If farms get less than a fair share the purchasing power of nearly half our population is cut and industry and labor suffer, for nearly half our people either farm or are directly dependent on the industry for a living.

If any group is overpaid, the others suffer proportionately. The greatest need in solving this problem is basic research to determine what is an equitable compensation for the services rendered by these three major groups so that we could have a measuring stick to use in our efforts to preserve an equitable balance. Only on such a broad foundation can real prosperity be based.

The farmer has much in common with both the industrial worker and the industrial operator. The farmer is both a worker and a capitalist. As a worker, most farmers are wholly dependent on the income they derive from their own labor. Furthermore, when farmers prosper, labor prospers, and when labor does well, agriculture shares the prosperity. It is a striking fact that farm income and labor income have always gone up and down together. This has been true for years, with a few outstanding exceptions, When one or the other got out of balance, trouble soon followed.

Viewed as a laborer, there are two striking differences between farmers and industrial workers. The industrial worker sells his labor; the farmer sells the product of his labor. The industrial worker often takes no direct interest in the output—in fact, some of the groups follow a practice of restricting production to make more hours of work. This violates the principle of Guide Post No. 2 and is a direct blow at an economy of abundance.

The farmer's income, on the other hand, is directly dependent upon what he produces. True, he must get a fair price for it just as the industrial worker must get a fair wage rate, but if the farmer does not first create the wealth, he gets no pay. Furthermore, he must furnish capital and has an overhead cost to meet. His income does not begin

until this overhead cost is met. In this respect, he faces the same problems as the industrialist. His income depends on the margins between the price he receives and the cost of production. When that margin disappears he goes broke. He is in the same position as an industrial worker who is asked to work without pay.

Conditions in agriculture vary greatly. The margins or net income vary between localities, between individuals, between farms, between labor, and between seasons. Prices rise and fall materially to meet many of these variations. The fallacy of the O. P. A. price ceiling program is that it is blind to such variations. It assumes that all farmers and all conditions can be poured into a common mold and come out a uniform product merely by issuing a governmental directive. Such directives do not change the weather and have practically no effect on farmers' costs.

Any attempt to control farm prices without regard to production costs will fail.

ABUNDANCE

Any attempt to restrict the production of wealth in order to create higher prices is unsound, whether it is practiced by labor, industry, or agriculture. An intelligent adjustment of production to meet demand is thoroughly sound. Industry has learned how to do this fairly well. In labor the answer will likely be found in hours of labor. In agriculture the adjustment is more difficult, but with the aid of a method of determining crop needs or goals, and with an adequate marketing system including crop loans and a two-price system for handling surpluses, such adjustments are entirely possible. We should never forget the principle set up in Guide Post No. 1 that any program which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

PARITY

The statement is frequently made that farm prices are substantially above parity. They may be above "false parity," but they are 6 points below real parity. The theory of parity is rather simple. The 5-year period from 1909–14 was chosen as a period when agriculture, labor, and industry enjoyed reasonably equitable prosperity. The reasoning is that if farm costs go up above the cost of that period, farm prices should go up an equal amount to maintain a parity of purchasing power. To measure these trends an index is compiled showing the cost of everything the farmer bought in the base period. If the index rises 40 percent, farm prices should rise 40 percent. However, farm labor constitutes one-third of the farmers' cost, and labor was omitted from the index. Farm wage rates have gone up far faster than other farm costs, but this fact is ignored in figuring parity. The table on page 38 will show that farm wage rates have gone up 131 percent since the 1935–39 base. Actually they have gone up 172 percent above the 1909–14 base, the farm wage index standing at 272 today. This cost cannot be ignored if farmers are to stay in business. The President recognized this when he said in his message to Congress of September 6, 1942:

"Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor."

No one can disagree with that. If the cost of labor is included, farm prices today are 6 points below parity, the index number of prices received standing at 193 as compared to 199 on things farmers buy.

As pointed out a year ago, there are other features of the present method of figuring parity which make it grossly inequitable. We need a completely new formula which will do full justice to industry, to labor, and to agriculture, for when the war ends, if prices are permitted to drop to levels comparable with those following the last war, we will be headed for a collapse far worse than the depression days of the thirties. Some standard of fair prices must be set up and maintained. Such standard should be real parity. Then a floor under commodity prices should be maintained at parity to prevent collapse.

TAXATION

The tax policy of the Grange has been founded upon the proposition that taxes should be levied in proportion to ability to pay and benefits received. Two new angles of the tax problem have been developing as a result of war conditions. The first has to do with the effect of a tax program on the control of inflation. As we have seen, it is necessary to close the inflationary gap by pressure from both sides. We must increase supplies and reduce surplus spending power. Taxation is a most effective and equitable way of accomplishing the latter if taxes are fairly levied.

We have always viewed the income tax as the best answer to decreasing surplus spending power, and so it is. However, the income tax is falling short of expectations in two respects. First, it is not producing enough money, and second, it is not as effective as it should be in reaching income where the income is. With taxes taking 90 percent of high incomes, there is not much chance of increasing the "take" very much from that source. The great big increase in income has come in the middle and lower brackets and how to reach it there presents a very practical problem in human relations.

A is a clerk holding a fairly responsible position at a salary which has remained at $4,000 for some time. He has assumed some fixed obligations such as life insurance, rent, or payments on a home, which absorb most of his income after taxes.

B is a factory worker who until recently made about $1,800, but who now is also making $4,000 a year. He suddenly finds himself with an unusual amount of money to spend. A tax which would bankrupt A because of his commitments could easily be paid by B. Because there are so many of them, it is men in the B class who are getting the largest part of our great increase in income. They are much more able to pay substantial taxes than those in the A group, but chiefly because they have not been able to buy since they received such an increase in income, so their ability to pay does not seem the correct measure of taxation. Yet it is largely their surplus spending power that is responsible for our fast increasing inflationary gap.

Consideration should be given to some combined method of income tax and savings plan under which income levies are substantially stepped up, especially in the middle and lower brackets, and a substantial portion of the tax levied be placed to the credit of the taxpayer to be repaid in such installments as would constitute sound Government financing when the war is over, with provision for drawing on such credit for certain specific purposes, such as payments on interest, life insurance or other fixed obligations contracted before the enactment of the law. While some might say such a plan would be unfair to B because it would not permit him to spend as much as A we must nevertheless be realistic about it and recognize the fact that until the war is over there will not be sufficient goods to buy, and if the pressure is allowed to continue, the answer will be inflated prices which will cost both A and B all they would have paid in increased taxes, and more too.

The second problem occurs largely in war industries, although agriculture is somewhat affected. It arises from converting factories (and farms) to war production without provision for meeting the costs of reconverting to peacetime production. The original conversion costs were largely paid by the Government. The question arises as to whether the Government should pay reconversion costs, how much, and what measure of control it would exercise over the plants where it has provided reconversion funds. The problem could be met in part by establishing a "war loss credit account" to which would be credited a substantial part of income taxes paid, held to the credit of taxpayers. When the war ends, funds could be released from such "war loss credit account" to meet war losses from reconversion or similar causes on proof of loss along lines clearly defined by law. Sound Government financing might require that such funds be withdrawn in installments, but the amount held to the credit of any taxpayer would constitute adequate collateral for intermediate financing.

One reason why the income tax is not more extensively used is that it lies most inequitably in some cases. For an extreme example, a peach grower may average one highly profitable crop in four, with 3 years of losses. If the Government takes most of the income in the profitable year, the grower will have no funds to carry over the unprofitable years. When the income tax was low, the injustice was not pronounced, but the higher the rates the greater the injustice. The same situation prevails to a greater or less degree among taxpayers with many types of income, and is one of the reasons why more reliance is not placed on the income tax for increased revenue.

Study should be given to an income equalization plan under which any taxpayer, upon figuring his taxable income, may pay up to one-half of that taxable income into an equalization account held by the Government, and pay income taxes on the balance. He could leave the amount so paid into the equalization account for as long as he wanted, not exceeding 10 years, where it would draw such a rate of interest as would be consistent with demand or short-term loans. He could draw down the amount to his credit at any time, but upon drawing it down it would become part of his taxable income, and would not be available for use again for equalization deposit. Thus taxpayers with fluctuating incomes would not be put to a disadvantage as compared with taxpayers with steady incomes.

These suggestions are made in the belief that unless we develop practical ways for making wider use of the income tax and overcoming some of the inequities which develop under it we will face the necessity of making use of a general sales tax. This would indeed be unfortunate, for it frequently penalizes those least able to pay. The farmer is both a consumer and a manufacturer. No adequate system has yet been devised for separating the items bought for personal consumption from those bought for farm operations. Consequently, he is usually doubly penalized by a sales tax.

The whole question of taxation deserves our most serious study, including such proposals as so-called incentive taxation which is a system of sales tax with credits for personal exemptions and incentives for production; but we must never get too far away from the proposition that taxes should be levied on the basis of ability to pay and benefits received.

I have pointed out that the income tax is not raising enough money. This statement is based on the proposition that we should pay currently as large a portion of the war bill as possible. Most of us are enjoying greater prosperity than before the war, yet we are piling up a stupendous debt to be paid in large part by those who are fighting the war and by future generations. No tax is enough until it results in paying all we can to hold this alarming accumulation of debt to a minimum.

The amount of increased taxes we can raise, however, is overshadowed by the extravagance and waste on every hand. Many Members of Congress are taking the stand that they will refuse to vote more taxes until this waste is cut out or sharply reduced. That is not the remedy. It merely assures passing on greater debt to future generations. The remedy is to cut down on the appropriations either in

the money to be expended or in the allowances for administration of those departments which persist in wasteful practices.

The extravagance is not confined to war activities. While we are engaged in total war, most branches of Government have expanded their operations. Today there are more Government employees, aside from our armed forces, than the total employees of all the States, counties, cities, and towns combined. Much of this is the direct result of war conditions, but much of it is not. A very important part of any tax program should be to weed out all unnecessary expenditure. This can best be done by a consistent plan for decentralizing government.

RENEGOTIATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

When war started, it became necessary to contract with private industry for enormous quantities of war material. No one could tell what costs would be. The cost-plus system was discredited because of the abuses of padding costs to increase profits, so many contracts were let on a flat price basis. As volume increased and assembly lines cut costs, profits mounted, and in some instances proved fabulous. Congress then authorized a system of renegotiating contracts to get them onto a reasonable basis.

Two evils have arisen which should be corrected. First, too great and too arbitrary power is placed in the hands of one man. Frequently he has not been too familiar with the business upon which he was passing, and rumblings of political preference have been too loud to be ignored. Renegotiation should be subject to review by a board of competent men.

Second, the flow-back has gone into the hands of the agencies which negotiated the exorbitant contracts in the first instance, but they are no longer under the restrictions of the appropriations act. They can use the money for anything they please. This should be corrected by having the flow-back go directly into the Treasury, withdrawable only by reappropriation. Since several billions of dollars are involved, economy demands that this source of extravagance be eliminated.

RECONVERSION

Closely connected with this problem is that of reconversion from a wartime to peacetime economy. What should be done with surplus plants? What should be done with surplus materials? Should the plants be sold for junk? Should the supplies and materials be dumped on the market? Since it is estimated that the plants and material involved may represent an investment of a hundred billion dollars, it can be readily seen that the question as to whether or not we can return to a stable, self-supporting, peacetime economy without a collapse will depend in large measure upon the disposition of these questions, and how these vast assets are handled.

How can industry get back into normal balance? For example, it is estimated that there will be a shortage of 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 automobiles against a normal consumption of possibly 3,000,000 a year. Should the industry attempt to fill the demand in possibly 2 years, manufacturing 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 per year, and then find itself overstaffed and overbuilt for normal demand? Or should it fill the deficit over a 10-year period or longer? If so, who is to decide? What authority is to be given for control?

Similar questions will have to be answered in regard to our transportation systems and most of our major industries. These questions annot be left to theorists, nor to those who may profit by the course determined upon. Their solution demands the best experience and thinking the Nation has. If we fail to find the answer before the crisis is upon us, we will probably be headed for the biggest scale political experimental playhouse the world has ever seen, with blunders and waste leading to bankruptcy.

There seem to be four possibilities for handling Government-owned war plants. They can be sold, leased, operated by the Government, or scrapped. No rule can be laid down to serve all cases but some general principles should be borne in mind.

All strictly war plants, such as munition factories, should be retained on a stand-by basis.

No hasty scrapping should be considered. Time should be allowed to determine whether plants are needed in some form of peace production to promote full employment. Many should be preserved as insurance against future war needs.

No hasty sales should be made, enabling purchasers to make enormous speculative profits.

Probably fewer mistakes will be made if the plants are leased, with options to buy, until times become normal, at figures to be adjusted to reproduction costs under normal conditions. Those plants which may be needed again for war production should be leased under long terms.

Government operations should be avoided where practicable to return the plants in some form to private operation.

It would seem wise to create a reconstruction commission of some sort, made up of the best men obtainable, on a nonpolitical basis, answerable to Congress, to carry out instructions from Congress on broad principles designed to bring about normal readjustments under private enterprise. What those principles should be will also need the study of men of similar capacity and experience. Congress could well give consideration to creating such an investigational commission as a first direct step to meet the problem.

TRANSPORTATION

Our domestic transportation problem is rapidly becoming acute. The increase in tonnage to be handled, combined with a manpower shortage, wear and tear on rail equipment, and a sharp decline in truck supplies, points to the necessity of drastic action if we are to avoid a serious break-down. Rail tonnage increased from 373,000,000,000 tonmiles in 1940 to 638,000,000,000 in 1942. By 1942 truck tonnage had increased about 40 percent over 1940, and 1943 tonnage is showing an increase of approximately 20 percent beyond 1942. Practically all farm products move to market by truck either in the first stage of transportation or, in many instances, clear through to destination. The estimates of this year's farm tonnage are the highest in history, being 21,000,000 tons above 1941.

This situation is complicated because neither replacements of rail equipment nor replacements of worn-out trucks have been available. In 1940, 618,450 new trucks were sold, while at present the pool of new trucks is apparently down to less than 50,000 vehicles, while the percent of vehicles immobilized for repairs has steadily mounted, due both to shortage of mechanics and parts. Freight is now backing up to an alarming degree at points of origin and at shipping points because of limited rail and truck facilities. The situation is more alarming because of the worn conditions and state of repair of both rail and truck facilities.

It is apparent that we have reached a stage where greater allocations of steel and manufacturing equipment must be diverted to producing repair parts and new equipment for both rail and truck service. However, it is altogether improbable that any great amount of relief can be found from this source. The greatest possibility for relief will be found in eliminating wasted mileage arising from incomplete loadings, cross-haul, and transportation of nonessential tonnage. It is estimated that in the field of trucking alone, if reasonable loading were achieved and unnecessary cross-hauls eliminated, the annual savings would amount to one and a half billion miles or, roughly, one-third of our truck mileage. It is estimated that in the country collection of milk alone there is a waste of approximately a half billion miles of travel which might be eliminated, thereby making 40,000 trucks available for other service. Some effort has been made to reduce this waste mileage, but so far the results have been negligible—only about 2 percent of the maximum estimate.

Inland waterways have helped to remove the strain and should be relied on for yet heavier service, for where they are readily available, freight can be moved by water at a greater saving of labor and equipment and cost than any other way. Furthermore, water-shipping equipment does not suffer such rapid depreciation.

Plainly, we are facing an emergency and have a big job to do. We know what ought to be done, but our task is to work out ways of doing it. Agriculture originates a large part of our freight tonnage and has a major responsibility in finding ways to adjust its transportation to meet the public welfare. Many subordinate Granges have done an excellent job in forming transportation pools. These should be widely expanded so as to save every possible truck-mile. Nationally, we will probably have to submit to very much more drastic transportation regulations. We may not like them, but they are infinitely preferable to the chaotic conditions which will follow a transportation break-down. This whole problem deserves the intensive study of the transportation committee.

In 1942 the railroads sought and obtained an increase in freight rates because of increased costs. Rapidly mounting volume soon resulted in an enormous increase in earnings. The National Grange played a leading part in securing the suspension of these increased rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission. If we are to recognize the principle of basing freight rates largely upon the return on the investment, another substantial cut would appear due. Normally the effect of such reduction would be to direct business from truck to rails, thus increasing earnings and making further reductions possible. During war times, limitations on facilities and replacements would minimize the normal trend. It would seem, however, an admirable time to put into reverse the spiral of freight-rate increases which drove so much traffic from the rails to the trucks.

When the war is over and air transport enters the freight field, the only advantage rail transportation will hold is low cost, and to maintain this advantage, it will have to maintain volume. Consideration should be given to the possibilities of a system of freight refunds on a patronage basis as a practical means of rehabilitating and maintaining volume of freight traffic. Agriculture has a real stake in seeing that low-cost transportation is maintained.

CROP INSURANCE

One of the simplest and best forms of cooperation is insurance. It is an effective way for the fortunate to aid the unfortunate. Insurance has long been a major Grange activity, and insurance against crop failure has long been a Grange aim. It has frequently been tried by private insurance companies, but the difficulties of building experience, developing a workable procedure, and getting farmer support have always resulted in abandoning the effort. The Grange has, therefore, supported Federal crop insurance as the only way of developing a method of meeting an otherwise inescapable hazard, recognizing that it would probably take years of experimentation and development work before a self-supporting system could be established.

A few years ago a start was made on wheat and later cotton was added. Definite progress was being made when Congress suddenly

abandoned the project in a wave of protest against too much Government in business. It seems apparent that if we are ever to have crop insurance, it must be established by the Government or through Government aid. To abandon the work so far done seems very short-sighted, particularly when we are urging farmers to increase production, which necessitates entering more hazardous areas. If Congress is not satisfied with any feature of the administration of the act, it should so amend it as to correct the difficulty rather than abandon the project. Crop insurance should be reinstated immediately before the progress so far made is lost.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Following the last war agriculture took an awful beating for reasons now fairly well recognized. For a dozen years efforts were made to enact remedial legislation, but they always ended up by some new plan for lending farmers more money. By 1932 there were some 8 or 10 different types of loans available, scattered through 3 or 4 different Government departments. The Farm Credit Administration was created to bring these various lending activities together so that a farmer could know where to go, and so as to avoid duplication. The loans were segregated into 2 main groups, permanent credit agencies and emergency credit agencies.

We seem to have learned little from experience. During the past 10 years we have set up new types of loans and revived old ones until again we have a complicated credit structure with duplication and confusion. Whenever a problem arises, we still try to meet it by lending more money, but the tendency is decidedly toward Government lending rather than cooperative lending. Farmers generally are making more money today than they have made for years, and there seems to be little excuse for expanding Government lending.

The Farm Credit Administration continues to represent the farm loan associations as largely bankrupt in an effort to effect a change leading to greater centralized control. If the banks and associations were permitted to share losses as the law provides, and if the banks were permitted to pay a portion of their huge surplus earnings in dividends, as the law intends, there would be very few impaired associations. Most of them would have enough income to operate on their own, and not be dependent on the banks for hand-outs with the resultant bank control.

Another disturbing tendency is the effort made by the Farm Credit Administration to force farm loan associations to consolidate so that full time secretary-treasurers may be employed. This results in taking the service further away from the farmers with less participation by farmers in their association affairs. The coercive tactics used to force these consolidations in many instances bespeak the progress made in gaining centralized control of the system. We need less consolidation and more flexibility to meet the rapid changes in acquisition and in collections. When the boys come home and farms begin to change hands, there will be a sharp upturn in farm mortgages. Associations two counties away will lose out. The trend is a dangerous one for the safety of the system.

The production credit associations have been under very heavy attack by some private lenders and some country bankers because they are enjoying the benefits of large sums of interest-free Government capital. These associations were set up to operate on a cooperative basis, and were originally capitalized by Government funds, with the expectation that they would get themselves into a position to retire the Government money and eventually be completely farmer-owned and farmer-controlled. Enough time has elapsed to have made substantial progress toward such an end, and it would seem reasonable to start repaying to the Government the funds so invested on a gradual basis. Those which have not been able to accumulate reserves sufficient to make a start, should adjust their lending practices so that they may become self-supporting.

The attention of those banks which are trying so hard to destroy the P. C. A.'s should be called to the fact that the P. C. A.'s are operating on a business basis, while some other Government lending agencies are lending far more Government money on a completely subsidized basis and are seeking widely expanded lending powers. It is suggested that these banks would be more consistent if they opposed this form of subsidized lending which is so often mixed with politics, rather than try to destroy cooperative credit. It is also suggested that they look into the Government subsidies they themselves enjoy through their Federal deposit insurance and currency issue before attacking the cooperative credit agencies so vigorously. The truth is that many of those most active in this campaign are motivated by the desire to see the return of 7 percent and 8 percent interest rates. It is only fair to say that the American Bankers Association has not participated in this campaign for destroying the P. C. A.'s.

LAND BOOM

During and following the last war, in many sections farm-land prices rose to highly inflated levels and there is considerable agitation for legislation to prevent a recurrence. It should be clearly recognized that such land values are not a cause of inflation, but a result of inflation, and the cause cannot be cured by treating the result. Most of the legislation proposed would be ineffective because it would be easily evaded, and much of it would handicap the honest farmer who had occasion to buy or sell a farm.

Over a period of years farm-land values are going to adjust themselves to the net income which can be made from the farm and any attempt to regulate these values by law will fail. Land buyers must consider the chances of continuing present price levels after the war, and the likelihood of higher or lower production costs, so they can estimate net income. They should not be carried away by dream planners into thinking that wartime demand will continue unabated, even though we hope it may be possible to maintain purchasing power at relatively high levels. We cannot ignore the fact that farm production will increase enormously throughout the world, and will have a very real effect on world supply and demand.

One phase of the problem lends itself to some measure of control. During the last war real-estate speculators, dealing in thin equities, were a large factor in boosting land sale prices. Farms frequently were sold several times within a year. Fortunes were made or lost purely on speculative values. This can be controlled by a high tax on quick turnover profits, but care should be exercised to protect farmers and credit agencies who have a legitimate, and not a speculative, interest in selling in the conduct of their business.

From the standpoint of farmers during times such as these, the safest rule is to keep out of debt—to buy only what they can pay for.

TENANCY

The best interests of the Nation will be served if a high percent of our farms are owner-operated. The increase in tenancy is a matter for real concern, particularly tenancy among former farm owners who have lost their farms. However, tenancy as such should not be condemned. Tenancy is a natural step in the progress from farm laborer to farm owner. Normally the young man starts to work for wages. If he is thrifty and industrious, he lays aside enough to buy some stock and equipment and is in position to rent a farm. As his savings and equipment grow, and he becomes able to establish an equity, he buys a farm on time. Gradually he is able to pay off the loan and becomes a debt-free owner. As his working years decline, he hires help, rents, and eventually sells. It is all a normal process. The problem arises where the worker, whether he is working for wages, renting, or is an equity owner, does not have a fair and equitable contract which permits adequate compensation for the work done.

An equitable lease contract should enable the tenant to earn more and lay aside more as his investment increases. If he improves the farm, means should be provided for establishing some equity in the improvements. Great progress along these lines has been made in a number of European countries where tenancy has been a problem for generations. We can learn much by studying the experience of others. The National Grange can render a real service by research in this field. Since no form of model lease contract can fit adequately the multitude of different conditions which prevail, the more practical approach would appear to be to develop some standard or model terms covering a few of the essential provisions of ordinary farm leases. Much progress has been made by the Farm Security Administration along this line. The farm organizations and the farm press can accomplish a great deal in improving leasing practices if they will definitely turn their attention to it.

Equally important are the terms of mortgage sale and optional sales contracts. There is a wealth of experience and information available on this subject. It is suggested that the National Grange take practical steps to carry out such studies and educational work.

One phase of the tenant problem should have our careful study. Is it practical to provide a taxing system under which owner-operated farms are taxed at a lower rate than rented properties? The effects of such a tax incentive to operator ownership should be carefully studied. Would it throw a heavier burden on the tenant and retard the progress toward ownership? Would it curtail, credit, or make it more expensive? These are among the questions which should be included in any research the Grange conducts on the subject.

SOLDIER LAND SETTLEMENT

One of the approaches to the unemployment problem when the boys come home from the front should be a sound land settlement program. A very high percent of postwar land settlement projects in the past have been failures, but if care is used to avoid the mistakes now fresh in our memories, and to plan well for the future, there is no reason why we should not try to get those who wish to farm back on the land as opportunity permits. It should be distinctly understood that the opportunities for farming are by no means limitless.

Only good farm land in units of adequate size should be offered, and at a price which will enable settlers to work out and pay for any debt incurred. The Tenant Purchase Division of the Farm Security Administration now has a trained staff which should be used in this work.

To qualify as an eligible settler, the applicant should:

(a) Have sufficient farming experience to indicate that he understands and accepts the problems of the undertaking.

(b) Have not less than 10 percent cash to pay down, so that he has a personal stake in the project.

In cases where experience and cash payments may not be sufficiently indicative of success, a probationary period on a rental basis should be provided.

Credit should be made available for eligible applicants up to a limited sum (possibly $3,000 for land purchase, plus 50 percent for stock and equipment) payable on

a variable payment plan at a low rate of interest.

Settlers should agree to apply to land banks for refinancing when they have developed sufficient equity to permit it.

Model loan contracts with options to buy and model sales contracts should be made available for those who are able to buy from owners direct without Government aid.

EXTENSION SERVICE AND FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The National Grange has always supported the Extension Service and the Farm Security Administration, although it has contended that the former should be independent of any farm organization and should treat all farmers alike, while the latter should confine its activities to those functions authorized by law. It, too, should show no preference because of affiliation with any farm organization. Unfortunately, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union have been engaged in a controversy in which the Extension Service and the Farm Security Administration became involved. The National Grange presented testimony before the Appropriation Committee of the Senate in which we recommended a clarification of the functions and a modification of the practices of both organizations.

Consultations have been held with officials of both organizations as how best to promote the effective work of each organization. Our aim should be to aid and improve the service, and we should work with the responsible officials in an effort to do so. This is a matter which should have the very earnest consideration of this convention.

GOOD OF THE ORDER

The heavy drain on agriculture to the armed forces and to industry has continued, although at a somewhat lessened pace. This has taken many scores of thousands from our ranks, and increased the burdens at home so as to make Grange attendance more difficult. Transportation limitations have materially added to this difficulty. On the other hand, the Grange has been so active in the many fields of war service that most Granges are reporting increased attendance and increased interest. When the figures are finally in I believe they will show that our "Every officer get a member" campaign has more than filled the gaps in membership because of losses to war and industry. A great many of those initiated did not appear in the June 30 reports. However, we should not be content with any nominal increase. We recognize the stability of an organization such as ours—that membership is not taken lightly and its responsibilities ended with the payment of dues—and that enormous or phenomenal growth is neither practical nor desired. Nevertheless, any farm organization which represents less than 10 percent of the farms of the Nation should not be satisfied. If we are to have a voice in the world of tomorrow, we must do a lot of work today. Labor has increased its membership over 500 percent during the past few years, and the influence is clearly felt. If farmers expect to have their cause adequately represented in community, State or Nation, we must build up a much better score than 10 percent representation. We should be satisfied with nothing less than 50 percent.

Merely talking about it will not get us anywhere. Neither will leaving it to other States to do the work. Each one of us must make very definite and practical plans for meeting this problem. The foundation for any such program of work must be a capable, interested, working deputy force.

DEPUTY FORCE

No State master can do justice to the administration of State Grange affairs single-handed. He should have a corps of able deputies large enough to cover every corner of the State. His chief task should be to organize such a force so that they are properly trained and fully informed on all matters pertaining to Grange work, including a knowledge of current programs and current events. These men and women should not only be the spokesmen for the State master, carrying grange doctrine and grange news throughout their jurisdiction but they should also be the eyes and ears of the State master, observing what should be done in every corner to strengthen Grange work. They should aid in surveying the field to determine where opportunities for new granges exist. They should aid the subordinate granges in surveying their own field to determine whether there are desirable prospects in the community, and lay plans that each of such should be visited and asked to unite with us in our work. A businesslike survey should be made in every area to do a businesslike job. Since conditions are continually changing, the studies should be made frequently.

During the past year the extension work of the National Grange has been devoted largely to aid in building such a deputy force. I believe the best aid the National Grange can give weak granges is to try to aid them to help themselves. We have urged granges to hold deputy schools and have tried to have someone from the national office attend where desired. We have urged that these schools be not half-day affairs, mostly speeches, but that 2 or 3 days be devoted to full discussion of grange law and procedure, and to mapping out definite plans for carrying out the Grange program. Plenty of time should be given to ways and means of developing constructive subordinate and Pomona Grange programs, as well as ample time for discussion of the programs of both the State and National Grange.

If every State should build and maintain such a working force, the power and influence of our organization would be beyond expression. There never was a time when the sound principles of the Grange were more needed than today.

Last year we tried to put the officers of every Grange to work in our "every officer get a member" campaign. Where granges seriously undertook this work and laid out a well-planned program, the results were excellent. I think, however, to a considerable extent we failed to use one of the main assets of the Grange. If there is any single main purpose of the Grange it is building the farm home. We are first of all a family organization. We meet as a family and act as a family. Our whole organization is such that we encourage family membership and family participation in all our meetings. I believe we are not stressing the family participation enough. A recent survey of Grange membership showed an average of 1.59 members per family. It ought to be double that number if we are to carry out our purposes fully. With that thought in mind, I suggest that consideration be given to laying definite plans for an "every family get a member" program in 1944.

There was never a time when Grange work was more needed, and those granges that have systematically gone at it have proved that seldom have farmers been more interested. In the transportation field alone during the past year, we have been chiefly responsible for saving farmers many times their investment in the Grange. The services we are rendering in war work are unsurpassed. The Grange is contributing possibly more to sound thinking nationally in these perilous times than ever before and stands in a firm place of leadership. Our new Grange home presents a better opportunity for building and consolidating our work than ever before. We have an unexcelled opportunity for growth and extension. With it is opportunity for greater service. We can do it if we have the will to do so. Let us lay the plans here, then go home and carry them out.

WAR ACTIVITIES IN THE GRANGE

Time does not permit listing in detail the many war activities in which the Grange has engaged. A few are mentioned because they provide practical means for yet more service:

HOME ECONOMICS COMMITTEE

For 2 years the Home Economics Committee has been on a war footing. Immediately after Pearl Harbor we assigned to the Home Economics Committee the task of organizing for Red Cross work. How well they succeeded is attested by the fact that, as a group, we exceeded our quota by the widest margin of any group in the Nation, and we were one of the first to get started. The past year has seen equally meritorious performance.

With food shortages in prospect, we called on the Home Economics Committee for aid in nutritional studies and for a practical program for food preservation. It was but a natural development to place the Victory gardens under their care. The results have exceeded all expectations. Not only have members raised record garden crops themselves, but they have cooperated with townsfolk in plowing, cultivating, providing land, supervision and help until the Victory-garden campaign has proved an overwhelming success and turned many prospective shortages into abundance.

Through the Home Economics Committee work, often in cooperation with other Grange committees, the Grange was the first in the field in scrap drives, and I believe has a collection record which has scarcely been approached.

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEES

In thousands of Granges the committees on agriculture or special committees went to work immediately to organize cooperative labor pools, transportation pools, machinery pools, and to lay plans for bringing in the idle acres and producing the critical crops demanded in the Department of Agriculture production goals. In some cases they handled the drives for sales of War bonds and stamps, or cooperated with other committees in this work.

THE GRANGE LECTURERS

The lecturers also went to work with a will. They arranged educational programs, staged contests, put on bond sales, and cooperated with the various committees in war work all over the land. Hundreds of Grange halls were turned over to the Government for military purposes, but the work went on, in homes, warehouses, schoolhouses, or wherever a place could be found. With tires and gasoline scarce or not obtainable, with labor gone and longer hours at home, Grange attendance has generally gone up and Grange work improved.

THE JUVENILE GRANGE

The juvenile granges, too, have caught the spirit of war service. Paper drives, scrap drives, bond and stamp sales, Victory gardens, Red Cross work, cooperative transportation pools—there has been scarcely anything the grown-ups attempted that the juveniles did not help in, and frequently they have been pretty hard pace-setters for their elders.

In this war work the National Grange lecturer, the chairman of the home economics committee, and the juvenile superintendent deserve special commendation for the long hours and hard work they have contributed.

SPECIAL YOUTH COMMITTEE

With the approval of the National Grange executive committee, a special committee

has been appointed to aid in coordinating Grange activities with youth movements such as the Future Farmers of America, the 4-H Clubs, and the Boy and Girl Scouts. The committee consists of men and women who are actively engaged in the field of these youth organizations, and will work as an advisory committee to the regular Grange youth committee.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The abandonment of the National Youth Administration has thrown a heavier burden upon vocational education. This system is well equipped to handle the increased responsibilities if given sufficient financial support, and probably will be able to do so more effectively and more economically than under N. Y. A.

THE GRANGE UNIQUE

All this has been made possible by the unique character of our organization. We are a fraternity with regular meetings twice each month. The members do not need a special call to bring them out. They go regularly and one of the things that takes them to the Grange is the chance that some worthwhile undertaking may be started in which they could take part to help the community or do some worthwhile service. So the Grange has been alert and ready. That made our many service records possible. Our members are not taken in lightly. We don't merely collect dues and call them members. They are proposed, passed on, voted on, and go through a schooling of initiation and instruction. When they finally become members they are expected to come out regularly and go to work, and most of them do. Such an organization makes these war activities records possible. We can well be proud of our record, but let us not forget that the task ahead is just as hard and just as much needed as the tasks so far done. We have learned much by the experience of the past 2 years. Let us make full use of that knowledge and strengthen our organization so that our service in the days ahead will be even better.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, INC.

The National Agricultural Research, Inc., was launched early in the year under a board of directors consisting of the executive committee and secretary of the National Grange. A weekly column has been prepared for the rural press, and a great deal of work has been done in contacting the daily press in meeting the vicious attacks made on agriculture which have characterized our efforts to insure a fair price for farm products and to prevent inflation. The research work is slowly taking form.

IN MEMORY

Since last we met, gold stars have appeared on Grange service flags in many sections of the country. We hope and pray that the end of such sacrifices may be near. Some thousands who have served at home in many granges throughout the land have also been called. Death has again taken its toll of those who have served in the National Grange. We pause in grateful acknowledgement of the service of—

Willis N. Cady, past master, Vermont State Grange, and past secretary, executive committee of National Grange.

Wesley Adams, past master, New Hampshire State Grange.

Edgar L. Tucker, past master, Connecticut State Grange.

Herman Ihde, past master, Wisconsin State Grange.

Henry M. Culbertson, past master, Wisconsin State Grange.

Mrs. John Morris, wife of past master, Colorado State Grange.

Mrs. Leonard Healey, widow of past master, Connecticut State Grange.

Mrs. Sayles B. Steere, wife of past master, Rhode Island State Grange.

Irvin Haase, husband of past master, Montana State Grange.

Sunday evening, we will gather in service in the memory of all who passed away during the year.

GRANGE BUILDING

Seventy years ago the Grange started a movement for a building in our Nation's Capital which would be the rallying point for farmers. Last summer that dream came true, when the executive committee purchased a modern eight-story fireproof building located in the very heart of Washington.

The chief industry in Washington is government. The Capitol and the Supreme Court are located "on the Hill" surrounded by the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Library of Congress. At the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is the White House, and Executive Offices, surrounded by the various executive branches of Government, such as the Department of State, Treasury, Interior, Commerce and others, in a widening semicircle extending for a mile or more to the east, south, and west. The various civic and business associations and farm organizations are most of them located in the area near and generally to the north of these operating departments, where their most frequent contacts lie.

The center of this semicircle is the White House and Lafayette Park, which joins the White House grounds on the north. Facing this park, less than a block from the White House is the new Grange Building. No better location could be found. No matter how great or in which direction the city grows, this location will always be the center of things as long as the Capitol and White House remain.

The building was built before the depression and revalued in 1933 to meet the changed conditions. The building was bought at the revalued basis, and needless to say, could not be constructed at any such value today. It is entirely rented at figures which should bring a substantial return on the investment after allowance for reasonable depreciation reserves.

In purchasing the building it was necessary to place a mortgage upon it, with one of our own insurance companies, for approximately 40 percent of its value. The income from the building will more than pay the interest on the mortgage and retire the principal, but it would seem to be a most desirable end if the building could be owned entirely debt free. If this could be accomplished it would be possible to set aside adequate space for the use of any of the farm groups which so frequently come to Washington on business missions. Thus the Grange Building could truly become the rallying place for farmers in a very real and practical sense. I recommend that the Grange lay plans for a campaign to retire the debt, combined with a membership campaign in keeping with the purpose sought to be achieved.

CONCLUSION

As the war progresses and questions of readjustment appear, our problems become more numerous and more difficult. Each of us sees but part of the picture. The industrial worker views the problem in the light of his experience. The banker, the broker, or other businessman must similarly base his judgments on the lessons of the past. The advice and opinions of each have value. We of agriculture, who live close to nature, and who are engaged in the fundamental industry of producing food, should have much to contribute. However, many questions will arise on which there may be little experience to guide us. We are on the threshold of much that is new. Probably the three guide posts adopted last year mark about as safe a course as we can find. Certainly we must seek to allay any strife between economic groups. Each will have an important part to play in the world of tomorrow, and the aim of each of us should be to do our part and do it well. In our limited wisdom, we can only seek Divine guidance. We will do well always to remember our Grange motto: "In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

Fraternally,

A. S. Goss,
Master National Grange.

APPENDIX NO. 1

WEEKLY EARNINGS COMPARED

Increase in weekly earnings per worker in selected industries January 1941–April 1943:

Water transportation (including bonuses for entering war zones)	96.7
Farm labor	81.1
Anthracite mining	72.0
Quarrying and nonmetallic mining	61.5
All manufacturing	59.5
Durable manufacturing	59.2
Bituminous mining	59.2
Shipbuilding	58.7
Textile mill products	53.0
Iron and steel	51.5
Rubber products	48.3
Chemicals and allied products	48.1
Cost of living	23.1

APPENDIX NO. 2

THE TEXT OF THE FOURTEEN POINTS

President Wilson's Fourteen Points, as set forth in an address made before the joint session of Congress on January 8, 1918.

1. Open covenants of peace openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

2. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action or the enforcement of international covenants.

3. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

4. Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

5. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

6. The evacuation of all Russian territory, and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy, and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

7. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and

determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

8. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

9. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

10. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

11. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

12. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties.

13. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

14. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

APPENDIX No. 3

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER'S EIGHT POINTS

The Atlantic Charter's eight points, as promulgated by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941:

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

4. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

6. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

8. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continued to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

APPENDIX No. 4

ECONOMIC TRENDS

Following will be found interesting tables of economic trends, over a considerable period. The figures at least are illuminating:

Economic trends—See explanatory footnotes

[Corporate earnings based on average quarter, 1939—Others based 1935-39]

Year and month	Cost of living (1)	Retail food prices (2)	Labor cost per unit of industrial production (3)	Factory pay rolls per employed worker (4)	Farm wage rates (5)	Increase in corporate earnings after taxes, percent (6)	Increase in corporate earnings before taxes, percent (7)
1940—January	100	95	97.5	110.2	105		
February	100	97	98.3	106.5			
March	100	96	98.2	105.4		−5.7	10.8
April	100	96	97.3	105.8	108		
May	100	97	95.0	106.0			
June	100	98	93.4	108.0		2.6	21.7
July	100	97	96.0	109.3	106		
August	100	96	99.0	111.5			
September	100	97	101.6	115.6		14.9	34.9
October	100	96	101.5	116.3	106		
November	100	96	102.2	117.2			
December	101	97	103.6	120.2		62.4	88.3
1941—January	101	98	105.0	121.1	109		
February	101	98	104.2	120.4			
March	101	98	102.7	119.7		29.4	98.6
April	102	101	106.9	121.8	119		
May	103	102	110.4	128.5			
June	105	106	113.9	133.5		67.4	156.5
July	105	107	118.1	136.5	131		
August	106	108	119.4	135.9			
September	108	111	121.1	138.5		97.3	200.5
October	109	112	121.3	139.6	136		
November	110	113	125.6	142.0			
December	110	113	124.6	144.9		117.8	230.4
1942—January	112	116	125.1	149.4	147		
February	113	117	129.1	151.2			
March	114	119	133.1	154.5		60.1	221.1
April	115	120	136.4	157.1	153		
May	116	122	139.7	160.0			
June	116	123	142.0	162.2		74.1	249.3
July	117	125	144.9	165.0	166		
August	118	126	148.1	171.4			
September	118	127	149.2	174.2		89.2	272.2
October	119	130	150.7	177.9	181		
November	120	131	152.8	181.9			
December	120	133	155.3	182.7		98.3	288.8
1943—January	121	133	155.9	181.5	197		
February	121	134	156.4	184.6			
March	123	137	160.9	188.4		84.2	309.9
April	124	141	162.1	191.7	207		
May	125	143	164.5	194.5			
June	125	142	167.3	195.1		96.2	332.4
July	124	139	165.5	194.1	225		
August	123	137					
October					231		

(1) Bureau of Labor Statistics.
(2) Bureau of Labor Statistics.
(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics and Federal Reserve Board. Factory pay rolls divided by industrial production.
(4) Bureau of Agricultural Economics.
(5) Bureau of Agricultural Economics—adjusted for seasonal variations.
(6) Based on average quarter for 1939 from data from Bureau of Agricultural Economics.
(7) Same as 6.

Health Conditions in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a report of the Subcommittee on Public Health of the District of Columbia Committee, which investigated insanitary housing, tuberculosis, and social diseases in the District of Columbia, and also Washington newspaper reports commenting on same.

I wish to inform the Members of the House that this report of the subcommittee was approved by the full District Committee on Monday, November 22.

The Committee on Appropriations can render the District of Columbia a great

service by giving this report their favorable consideration.

INVESTIGATIONS OF INSANITARY HOUSING, TUBERCULOSIS, AND SOCIAL DISEASES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1943.

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities, of the Committee on the District of Columbia respectfully presents the following report to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Following the statement made on the floor of the House on March 21, 1943, by the Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, the Representative in Congress from the State of Vermont, in which he charged that sanitary conditions in the District were bad and that the District residents were threatened with an epidemic of typhoid fever, induced by negligence of responsible parties, this subcommittee at the request of the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, initiated this investigation.

The chairman of the subcommittee held extensive hearings which disclosed the need for remedial action in regulations and enforcement procedure encompassing the entire life of the citizenry of the Nation's Capital.

The subcommittee attempted to coordinate all the needs disclosed by the hearings held on the several health subjects. It was clearly shown that the reason for many of the present problems is inadequate housing for families of low income. Time and time again during the hearing this was brought out, that insanitary and inadequate housing conditions were chiefly responsible for the decline in the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the people.

The subcommittee conducted hearings extending over 3 months, during which testimony was taken on various phases of the broad field investigated, and numerous personal inspections were made by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee finds that overcrowding is not confined merely to substandard dwellings, but that the better-class homes and dormitories also offer an epidemic hazard. It also learned that malaria mosquitoes (Anopheles) had been found breeding in stagnant water and that there is a shortage of quinine in the District. It was felt there was a grave possibility of an epidemic in Federal dormitories in the absence of adequate medical supervision. It is pertinent at this point to state that the incidence of meningitis for the 3 months of this year has been three times as great as that of the corresponding period of last year.

Private employers with 1,000 workers or less have found it dividend-paying to have a full-time medical officer in the plant. In contrast, the Federal Government often does not have a single medical officer in departments having as high as 60,000 employees.

In connection with this condition, the committee learned that many of the Federal employees, all of whom were selected through civil service, have shown definite symptoms of advanced stages of tuberculosis within 90 days after receiving their Government appointment. As a result, inquiries were made into the requirements of the medical blank which each civil-service employee has had filled out by his or her physician. No X-ray examination of the lungs is required and no blood test is taken. In view of the fact that a large percentage of Federal employees is stationed in Washington, it can readily be seen that a definite burden is placed on the local authorities.

Although 40 percent reduction is shown in the tuberculosis mortality since 1935, it is possible for this to be reduced even further. Should the minimum be attained, there would be a saving of approximately 400 lives each year.

SOCIAL DISEASES

In the matter of social diseases, it was learned that during the last 6 months of 1942 there were 1,109 infections contracted by members of the Army, and in the 5 months preceding that period there was an average of 75 infections a month. In the second 6 months of 1942 there was an average of 185 infections per month, or an increase of 147 percent. No improvement was noted in the first 3 months of 1943. While the exact numbers were not available, the number of infections in the Navy was shown to have increased, while the number of infections based on a Nation-wide study have declined about 42 percent. The study clearly indicated an urgent and immediate need for a hospital which would permit isolated treatment of persons with communicable diseases. It was also learned that the Commissioners, through the Police Department and their public health services, had not required medical examination of those persons arrested for prostitution. The 21 clinics, both public and private, giving treatment for communicable diseases, are inadequately staffed; however, the committee was impressed with the excellent work being done.

In checking the venereal diseases and the main contributing factor, crime, it was found that a total of 66 men in plain clothes have been concentrating on the suppression of vice with the result that commercial prostitution has been materially reduced. In following this portion of the study it was learned that a closer cooperation and coordination of the police and judicial authorities should be effected.

INSANITARY HOUSING

From crime and its resulting diseases, the subcommittee delved into the housing situation and were astounded to learn that 50 percent of the population of the District of Columbia were living under slum conditions. It was found that this portion of the population lived in an area slightly larger than 3 square miles. This area contains approximately 40 percent of all the structurally deficient dwellings in the District and approximately 40 percent of all dwelling units without indoor toilets or indoor water supplies. Forty percent of the District alley dwellings are located in this small section of the city.

This location was of particular interest to the members of the subcommittee, who visited several of the homes and found that the lack of sanitary facilities was the principal cause of insanitary housing.

The following is a description of one of the dwellings brought to the attention of the subcommittee:

A family of 8 pays $82.50 per month rent. They take in 2 families of 6 each to room, making 20 persons in a 6-room house, which is in extremely poor repair. There was broken glass in windows and doors. Rats were extremely bad; they have gnawed great holes in walls. Thin, cracked walls need replastering; they are dark, dingy, and dirty. The house is cold except near the stoves. Cooking is done over coal and wood stoves. They do have electricity.

Similar situations are not infrequent.

OUTDOOR PRIVIES

Nine hundred premises in the District of Columbia were not connected with the sewer and had outdoor privies. During the progress of the investigation it was strongly urged by all members of the subcommittee that the Commissioners, through their representatives in charge of the sanitary departments, exert every effort to require sewer connections where a sewer was available, and in those places where it was not to compel the property owners to place the outdoor privies in as sanitary a condition as possible.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Another very important derivative of poor housing was the great increase in juvenile delinquency during the first 3 months of this year. The subcommittee also learned that another important factor contributing to juvenile delinquency was the lack of constructive recreation.

A study made of the housing of 231 families showed 74 families living in deplorable conditions. These 74 families comprised 412 individuals. Six percent had no running water; 22 percent had no toilet facilities other than outdoor privies; 27 percent had no baths; 16 percent were lighted by kerosene lamps; 65 percent were without furnace heat; and 53 percent used either kerosene or coal stoves for cooking.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

The lack of adequate garbage containers and the indifference of the tenants in covering the garbage receptacles that were available is materially sustaining a large rat population.

The investigation developed the fact that garbage collections twice a week are not adequate, although in an inspection of a number of alleys the committee found that the garbage collections were apparently satisfactorily carried out.

It was further learned that many tenants owned garbage cans and had no means of proper disposal of their garbage. The overcrowded conditions in these houses naturally aggravated existing sanitary conditions.

It was apparent to the committee that these people need to be educated and directed, preferably through the medium of the various citizen and civic associations. The hope of the committee is that every householder will be educated in the proper handling and disposal of trash, garbage, and ashes, and know definitely when the various collections are made so that the alleys will be clear of refuse except for the days when collections are made.

In this connection the subject of rats was brought to the attention of the committee, and it was emphasized that the principal feeding ground of rats has been garbage pails and open sewers. The committee learned that during 1942 there were 6,303 premises entered and inspected and the occupants given instructions as to the proper procedure to follow in the extermination of rats.

It was learned that the District of Columbia Rodent Control Division is working in close cooperation with the Sanitary Service in the elimination of rats in the heavily infested areas.

Some rats have been found that were carriers of the dread typhus germs. For this reason the committee strongly urged the attending officials to materially increase their activities in rodent extermination, and assurance was given that this would be done.

Considering the overcrowded condition of the city, the extermination of rats is imperative to remove the potential threat of a typhus epidemic.

At this point in the hearings the need for a full-time sanitary engineer in the Health Department was shown.

IMPENDING DANGERS INDICATED

Unless corrective measures are immediately initiated, it is highly probable that Washington may be subjected to one or more epidemics, that can come from these or other sources:

Rats, carrying typhus germs, have been found in the District;

Very active tuberculosis cases among new arrivals in the District of Columbia, who, living under existing crowded housing conditions, are potentially a menace to all with whom they come in contact;

The incidence of meningitis, which was three times as great the first 3 months of this year as in the first 3 months of 1942;

Malaria-carrying mosquitoes that have been found in stagnant water in and about the District; and,

Respiratory diseases spread by crowded housing conditions. We recall our experience during the First World War with influenza, which resulted in high mortality.

RESULTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

Since the investigations were initiated by this subcommittee there has been greater renewed activity and closer cooperation between the Health Department, Police Department, and the military authorities in the enforcement of all regulations pertaining to the suppression of prostitution and the spread of venereal diseases. Likewise, there has been a better understanding on the part of practically everyone in those groups in carrying out the program for the suppression of prostitution and social diseases.

There has been a continuance of every police activity in connection with the enforcement of the laws against prostitution, and venereal diseases, with a definite reduction in the incidence of disease.

It is noticeable that there has been a general tightening up on the part of health and police officials to see that all females taken in raids are given a thorough medical examination and blood tests taken, to eliminate these sources of infection. A great many prostitutes and suspected persons who may infect or spread disease have been arrested by the police; and it is believed there has been a marked improvement in regard to the incidence of venereal diseases since the investigations were initiated.

The police have intensified their action in checking up those places mentioned by enlisted personnel as sources of contact that lead to infection.

Under the impact of the investigations of the subcommittee relating to the spread and menace of venereal infection, particularly among the enlisted personnel, this problem was presented in a different light to the Office of Price Administration and Mr. Maverick of that Office, who showed renewed interest and cleared the way for the acquisition of the essential material for the renovation of one old building and the erection of a new wing having a combined capacity of 100 beds at Gallinger Hospital for the treatment of cases of venereal diseases. This will provide for the housing of some of the infected persons who are not otherwise responsive to control and treatment measures. The first 50 beds will probably be ready for use between the 1st and 15th of July and the contract is now being placed for the 50-bed addition.

Following the disclosure that there were 900 premises in the District of Columbia not connected with the sewer and having outdoor privies, which was a great surprise to the subcommittee, the Sanitary Department of the District government rechecked the entire 900 premises. They found that some had sewer and water connections available, and in these cases immediately ordered the property owners to connect with the sewers. Where water and sewer connections were not available, the property owners were ordered to place the outdoor privies in as sanitary a condition as possible.

During the investigation President Roosevelt recommended that $250,000, in addition to the regular appropriation, be allocated for garbage collection in the Nation's Capital.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

This subcommittee feels that the health officer must display more aggressive action in the solution of the public-health problems of the District of Columbia. Some measure of censure must rest upon him and the District Commissioners for having permitted conditions to grow to their present extent.

Apparently the need for a sanitary engineer as assistant to the health officer in the Public Health Department has been recognized. We recommend that such a person be added to the staff of the District Health Department and urge that he be selected with care.

Another outstanding need of the Health Department is an increased staff of inspectors, who should be young and vigorous enough to perform the duties of their office. These inspectors should be trained by the Health Department before being sent out. We regard it as desirable that they be in uniform and have proper credentials. We stress the point about uniform because the evidence before this subcommittee shows that the public have more respect and greater confidence in uniformed representatives. In view of the manpower shortage here, the subcommittee suggests that the employment of more women be considered.

LOW-COST HOUSING

There should immediately be provided in the District more permanent low-cost family housing which should be developed through the cooperation of private builders and public agencies where necessary. It is the opinion of this subcommittee that wherever a private builder can fill a community need, he must be permitted to do so. However, the subcommittee realizes that under certain conditions where slums need clearance and replacement, that the expense is so great in proportion to the returns as to offer no inducement to private enterprise. In such cases, the subcommittee recommends that a public agency, whether the National Capital Housing Authority or other agency, start an immediate program of replacement of insanitary dwellings. The subcommittee is aware that such a program will require funds. In view of the urgency, we recommend that Congress appropriate such funds to whatever agency, in its judgment, can best do the job.

This subcommittee also recommends that the Board of Condemnation of Insanitary Dwellings take a new lease on life and use its authority to the fullest extent to compel profiteering property owners, agents, or operators to either repair or demolish insanitary dwellings.

In this respect the committee feels that it is not inappropriate to add that there is a growing consciousness in this country that the maintenance of insanitary housing is fully as dangerous to the general welfare of the public as any violation of the Pure Food and Drug Acts.

We are cognizant of the fact that such viciously insanitary housing as now exists in the District of Columbia is possibly more menacing to the health than the distribution of impure foods and drugs. We wish, therefore, to go on record as stating that every legal control over such housing should be exercised. We recommend that the corporation counsel under the broad police powers inherent in the municipality draft proper legislation under which insanitary housing can be eliminated, providing penalties so severe that it will be unprofitable for anyone to rent or maintain insanitary dwellings.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

It will undoubtedly be immediately brought to our attention that at this time the War Production Board will refuse priorities for construction here. In answer to that we can only point out that on numerous occasions in other parts of the country the War Production Board has been shown the need and convinced of the necessity for granting priorities.

We believe that an epidemic of major proportions in what has become the "Capital of the World" would be such a disastrous event that the War Production Board should be compelled to recognize the needs of this community and give its approval to the use of essential material for this purpose as a war measure.

We feel that the District of Columbia Commissioners have not been sufficiently energetic or active in the interest of the welfare of this Capital. Evidence before this committee shows that they have not carefully prepared statistics and facts, which were available to them, to support their requests to the War Production Board.

This committee is of the opinion that the War Production Board will consider reasonable and just requests, provided that all the facts are laid before them by appropriate officials. We charge the District Commissioners with the responsibility for fighting for the welfare of this community, and in our turn we will be glad to fortify their efforts.

RENTS—SHOULD BE REDUCED

This subcommittee on making a personal tour of certain slum areas in the District of Columbia was as impressed by the exorbitant rents charged as by the inadequacy of the housing and the deplorable conditions under which the people were living. We believe that these rents should be materially reduced. The difficulty in securing such just lowering of rents seems to lie in the inadequacy of the District rent-control law. There is no provision in this act requiring registration of properties and rents. This means that downward adjustments are only made on application of the tenants. Unfortunately the majority of the tenants in the slum areas are not sufficiently educated in statutes and regulations to be aware of the protection afforded them by District laws. We, therefore, recommend that it would be well worth while to consider an amendment to the District rent-control regulations, requiring registration of all property and the rents so that the District of Columbia Rent Control Administration could act on its own initiative to reduce rents that are exorbitant. Mr. Ernest Henry, counsel for the Rent Administration, is therefore instructed to prepare legislation looking toward the solution of this problem.

DR. COULTER AND DR. GILLICK COMMENDED

The subcommittee wishes to commend Dr. A. Barklie Coulter and Dr. Frederick Gillick, both of the District of Columbia Health Department, for their complete frankness and apparent comprehensive understanding of the problems in their respective departments.

The subcommittee also recommends—

That the budget of the Health Department be increased so that the amount spent for health will approximate the amount suggested by the American Public Health Association—namely, $2 to $2.50 per capita—thereby permitting much better control with an enlarged, adequate personnel;

An amendment to the Communicable Disease Regulations of the District of Columbia providing for the imposition of penalties, isolation and quarantine, treatment for selectees, persons suspected of vagrancy, etc.;

Venereally infected selectees, unfit for military service, be held by the military and given compulsory treatment;

That all women taken in raids by the vice squad should be given a complete medical examination, and, if necessary, the laws should be amended making such examinations compulsory;

That the law relating to the soliciting of prostitution be amended so as to make this practice a violation whether the solicitation is done inside a building or enclosure or out of doors—the present law covers only soliciting on the streets and does not cover solici-

ing in beer parlors, taverns, eating places, theaters, or similar places.

That persons known or believed to be suffering from venereal disease in a contagious or infectious stage be taken into custody and committed to an institution for a period not to exceed 10 days for observation and treatment without the necessity of a court order before commitment;

That there be established a definition of a habitual misdemeanant who on conviction will be given a mandatory sentence of 1 year in the workhouse;

That all civil-service applicants be given a thorough physical examination before they are employed;

That the Health Department be given additional funds for an enlarged force to make better progress in rodent control;

That the United States Public Health Service undertake a comprehensive survey of the venereal-disease situation in the District;

A more frequent garbage collection, particularly in the summertime; and

That the citizens and civic associations put forth all possible efforts to educate the citizens as to their part in the important sanitary problems centering about the disposal of garbage—many people need instructions as to the proper handling and when collections are made in their respective districts.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Chairman.

JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
JAY LEFEVRE,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Members.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, District Committee,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
(with certain reservations),
Ranking Minority Member,
Ex Officio Members.
MABEL G. HALLER, *Clerk.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Health, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thanks for your courtesy in permitting me to see your preliminary report in re Investigation of Insanitary Housing, Tuberculosis and Social Diseases in the District.

A lot of people undertook to take me for a ride down the alley because I called attention to the insanitary conditions in the District, which had been brought to my attention by qualified medical friends who assumed to know what the conditions were. I asserted that there was a threat of an epidemic and said that I thought the situation should be investigated.

The facts which you find with respect to the situation, as evidenced by your report, substantiate the charges I made.

I think your committee has performed a very worth-while service which, of course, will not amount to anything unless the necessary action is taken to enforce your recommendations with respect to what should be done in order to correct the situation and to clean up the District of Columbia.

Let me congratulate you on the thoroughness and efficiency with which your committee has performed an uninviting and disagreeable duty which was its to do.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, M. C.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 28, 1943]

PARRAN ENDORSES REPORT UNDERSCORING HEALTH MENACE HERE

Hope that action will be taken to wipe out Washington slum areas was stimulated yesterday as the D'Alesandro report, which administered a sound spanking to District authorities for health conditions here, was accepted with high praise.

Surgeon General Parran urged speedy enactment of legislation to carry out recommendations of the report and referred to it as "the most comprehensive, vigorous, and interesting report I have ever seen from a congressional committee on health conditions in the District of Columbia."

Dr. Parran took exception, however, to criticism of lack of aggression on the part of District Health Officer Ruhland, and pointed out that the report failed to suggest a specific remedy in the section on insanitary housing.

He blamed W. P. B. red tape for holding up urgently needed quarantine facilities for venereal cases, and said "there were several thousand selectees in Washington who are not taking their proper place in the armed forces because they have failed to refused to seek a cure of their infection."

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 28, 1943]

SPEEDY ACTION URGED BY DR. PARRAN ON D'ALESANDRO REPORT—OTHER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEADERS ASK CORRECTIVE MEASURES IN SLUM HEALTH MENACE

Speedy action to improve health and sanitation conditions in the District, along the lines recommended yesterday in the strongly worded D'Alesandro report, was urged today by Dr. Thomas Parran, United States Surgeon General.

Other Government and civic leaders also joined in demanding the corrective measures which the report ned must be initiated immediately if serious threats of epidemics here are to be eliminated.

Dr. Parran described the findings of the D'Alesandro committee as "the most comprehensive, vigorous, and interesting report I have ever seen come from a congressional committee on health conditions in the District of Columbia."

Climaxing a several months long investigation by the Public Health Subcommittee of the House District Committee, headed by Representative D'ALESANDRO, Democrat, of Maryland, the report warned of serious health dangers here, estimated that 50 percent of the District's residents live under slum conditions and recommended nearly two dozen immediate steps as a remedy.

Dr. Parran made only two exceptions in endorsing the report in its entirety.

He deplored the subcommittee's criticism of "lack of aggressive action" on the part of Dr. George Ruhland, District health officer, and said that he regretted the D'Alesandro group's "failure to suggest a specific remedy" to the insanitary housing problem.

[From the Washington Post of June 28, 1943]

PARRAN LAUDS D'ALESANDRO'S SLUMS REPORT—SURGEON GENERAL URGES FAST ACTION ON SUGGESTIONS

Declaring the D'Alesandro report on slum conditions here "the most comprehensive, vigorous and interesting report I have ever seen from a congressional committee on health conditions in the District of Columbia," Surgeon General Thomas Parran yesterday urged speedy enactment of legislation to carry out its recommendations.

Parran took only two exceptions to the many faceted report:

1. Criticism of the lack of aggressive action on the part of the District health officer.

2. A failure to suggest a specific remedy in the section on insanitary housing.

W. P. B. BLAMED

As regards District venereal disease, Dr. Parran pointed a finger of blame at the War Production Board. He said that for long months this organization "was the last remaining obstacle to securing urgently needed quarantine hospital facilities, the lack of which is partly responsible for great increase in venereal diseases reported by the committee. There are several thousand selectees in Washington who are not taking their proper place in the armed forces because they have failed or refused to seek a cure of their infection," he added.

"The committee very properly points out that its investigation (of venereal disease) of itself has stimulated more aggressive action," he said.

He further said: "The committee appropriately points out that private employers are doing a much better job to protect and promote the health of employees than is the Federal Government."

CITES POST EDITORIAL

"The Washington Post in a recent editorial has pointed out delayed action of this front," he said, noting that "less than half of the Government employees in Washington have an adequate employee health service."

"The committee and its chairman are to be congratulated on their exhaustive investigations and constructive recommendations," he said, but noted that it apparently did not have placed before it the complete information on certain topics.

"In recommending more aggressive action by the health officer," Dr. Parran said, "it should be recalled that recommendations from the health officer in Washington and in other jurisdictions usually must be approved by layers of higher authority before being released to the public."

More specifically, he asserted, "I know that Dr. Ruhland (the District health officer) has agitated for 5 years or more to secure a competent sanitary engineer which the committee recommends as a first need—still unmet—in order to deal with the basic sanitary problems depicted so vividly by the committee."

He further qualified his endorsement of the report by regretting "that the committee did not avoid a certain ambiguity as to the relative responsibility of public and private provision of urgently needed housing.

"The committee is quite accurate in its statement that insanitary housing is a greater menace than violation of food and drug laws, but it does not suggest an equally specific law to deal with it."

Dr. Parran apparently referred to the section of the report in which the committee said Congress should "appropriate money either to the National Capital Authority or other agency." The report did not specify whether the National Capital Housing Authority or some other Government agency should take this responsibility.

The N. C. H. A. was set up by Congress originally as the Alley Dwelling Authority to clear slums. Through a misunderstanding, Congress, in the belief that the Alley Dwelling Authority could borrow from another housing agency, discontinued funds for this purpose. The N. C. H. A. can handle no slum clearance without a further appropriation on the part of Congress.

Meanwhile, Senator ARTHUR A. CAPPER (Republican), Kansas, added his endorsement. He said "the Congressman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO], deserves the thanks of the District and of all Congress on behalf of their constituents for the energy and persistence he has displayed in exposing these conditions."

Senator CAPPER also congratulated the Post for the part it has played in focusing attention upon slum conditions. He praised the "energy, courage and persistence with which its writers called these condi ons to the attention of Congress and the people."

Maintaining that the shocking conditions revealed never would have developed had the District had suffrage, the veteran friend of

local vote promoters said that since the District lacks suffrage, "it is now very definitely up to the Congress of the United States to rectify this condition.

"We, members of both Houses will be held accountable by the Nation at large if a serious epidemic develops here which we have not made every effort to avert," he said.

Gratified at the evidence of support of the findings by chairman of the House District Committee, Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, CAPPER said the Senate "will look with sympathy upon any step which the House may take to effectuate this report."

Locally, Ray Everett, chairman of the Social Hygiene Society, said his organization "earnestly hopes to see recommendations by D'ALESANDRO's committee promptly enacted into law by Congress."

He urged particularly enactment of laws recommended to control prostitution and venereal disease, laws urgently needed by our health department and police department, he said.

Chester Bowles Has Drafted Businessmen for O. P. A. Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the subsidy question the statement has been frequently made that the O. P. A. is ruled by bureaucrats, professors, theorists, and so forth.

This charge is untrue at the present time, and under the permission granted me today by unanimous consent I herewith insert at this point two schedules of names, official positions in O. P. A., and the previous business affiliation of the businessmen now serving their country in the Office of Price Administration.

The appended list shows the names of the 35 businessmen who have joined the staff of the Office of Price Administration since August 1, 1943. Of these appointments 4 are to positions which are affected by the provisions of Public Law No. 139. One position affected by such statutory provision remains vacant. The others did not require replacement under the law, being already occupied by qualified personnel.

In addition to the 35 full-time employees drawn from business life, 25 part-time employees have been recruited from business to serve as consultants without compensation. A list of their names is also appended:

Office of Price Administration, businessmen employed since Aug. 1, 1943

FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

Name	Office	Previous employment
	OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	
James G. Rogers, Jr.	Assistant General Manager, National Office Operations	General Manager, Benton & Bowles, Inc., New York, N. Y.
	PRICE DEPARTMENT	
James F. Brownlee	Deputy Administrator, Price Department	President, Frankfort Distilleries, Louisville, Ky.; vice president, General Foods Corporation, New York, N. Y.; general sales manager, American Sugar Refining Co., New York, N. Y.
Milton A. Rosenfeld	Chief, Restaurant Branch	President, Blue Kitchen chain of restaurants, New York, N. Y.
	CONSUMER GOODS DIVISION	
Reagan P. Connally	Director, Consumer Goods Price Division	President, Interstate Department Stores, New York, N. Y.
Albert A. Kaplan	Chief, Manufactured Articles Branch	Assistant superintendent, C. Kenyon Co., Brooklyn (clothing manufacturing company); operating manager and assistant to the vice president, R. H. Macy Co., New York, N. Y.
Daniel L. Jacobs	Senior price analyst, Radio and Miscellaneous Section, Manufactured Articles Branch.	Manager, New Jersey office, York Automotive Distributing Co., New York, N. Y. (radio and radio parts distributors).
Byres H. Gitchell	Chief, Retail Distribution Branch	President and managing director, The Golden Rule, St. Paul, Minn. (department store).
Russell A. Walkey	Price analyst, Primary Products Branch	Office manager, H. C. Godman Co., Columbus, Ohio (shoe manufacturers).
	FOOD PRICE DIVISION	
Jean F. Carroll	Director, Food Price Division	Branch manager, Kroeger Grocery & Baking Co., Cincinnat., Ohio.
Geoffrey Baker	Assistant to the Director, Food Price Division	Assistant national manager in charge of Government sales, General Foods Sales Co., New York, N. Y.
Max A. Christopher	Chief, Distribution Branch	President, Symms-Shafer Merchandise Co., Colby, Kans.
Raymond A. Meserve	Head, Distribution Price Section, Distribution Branch	Manager and meat buyer, George C. Shaw Co., Portland, Maine (retail grocery company).
Thomas R. Bradley	Price analyst, Meats, Fish, Fats and Oils Price Branch	Manager, Rath Packing Co., Waterloo, Iowa.
Arnold Burke	Acting Chief, Poultry, Eggs, and Dairy Products Price Branch	Lunsford, Barnes & Co., Wichita, Kans. (public accounting firm); general manager, Wichita Dairy.
George S. Hine	Senior price analyst, Poultry, Eggs, and Dairy Products Price Branch.	S. K. Jensen Co., Wichita, Kans. (advising, servicing and selling to dairymen in Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri).
Colin S. Gordon	Chief, Cereals, Feeds and Agricultural Chemicals Price Branch	Vice president, Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.
Ralph E. deOng	Price analyst, Cereals, Feeds and Agricultural Chemicals Price Branch.	Secretary-treasurer, Pacific Insecticide Institute, San Francisco, Calif. (insecticide manufacturers' association).
Allan Q. Moore	Price analyst, Flour Section, Cereals, Feeds, and Agricultural Chemicals Price Branch.	Manager, Chicago grain office, Pillsbury Flour Co.
Carl N. Lovegren	Head, Processed Fruits and Vegetables Section, Fruits and Vegetables Price Branch.	President, Canners' League of California; president and general manager, Hunt Bros. Packing Co., Hayward, Calif. (canning business).
Prosper Lettunich	Business specialist, Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Section, Fruits and Vegetables Price Branch.	General manager, Watsonville Apple Growers & Packers Association, Watsonville, Calif. (marketing association).
Frank E. McSweeney	Head, Miscellaneous Petroleum Products Unit, Refined Products Section, Petroleum Price Branch.	Michigan division manager, Shell Oil Co., New York, N. Y.
	INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURING PRICE DIVISION	
Clarence W. Slocum	Director, Industrial Manufacturing Price Division	President, Beckwith Chandler Co., Newark, N. J. (manufacturers of paints and lacquers).
Arnett G. Lindsay	Price analyst, Coal Tar Unit, Chemicals and Drugs Price Branch.	Chamberlin Engineering Co, Chevy Chase, Md.
Martin S. Morton	Business specialist, Heavy Chemicals Unit, Chemicals and Drugs Price Branch.	New England representative, Adolph Hurst & Co., New York, N. Y. (importers and exporters of chemicals, industrial raw materials).
Wirth Howell	Head, Converted Paper Products Unit, Paper Products Section, Paper and Paper Products Price Branch.	Petrequin Paper Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
John Chaffe	Acting Head, Printing and Publishing Unit, Fine Papers and Printing Section, Paper and Paper Products Price Branch.	Administrative work, Rock City Construction Co., Nashville, Tenn.; advertising manager, O-Cedar Corporation, Chicago, Ill.
	RATIONING DEPARTMENT	
Col. Bryan Houston	Deputy Administrator, Rationing Department	Vice president, Young & Rubicam, New York, N. Y.; Purchases Division, Army Service Forces.
	FOOD RATIONING DIVISION	
Walter F. Straub	Director, Food Rationing Division	President and general manager, W. F. Straub Co., Chicago, Ill. (food and pharmaceutical chemical manufacturers).
Chase Sweetser, Jr.	Business analyst, Distribution Section, Sugar Branch	Assistant secretary-treasurer, Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
Melvin E. Guggenheim	Business economist, Meat Branch	Manager, beef department, Guggenheim Bros. Provision Co. (wholesale meat), Chicago, Ill.

Office of Price Administration, businessmen employed since Aug. 1, 1943—Continued

FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES—Continued

Name	Office	Previous employment
	RATIONING DEPARTMENT—Continued	
	FUEL RATIONING DIVISION	
Fred L. Parker	Business specialist, Heating and Cooking Equipment Branch, Fuel Rationing Division.	Assistant to president, Phillips & Buttorff Manufacturing Co., Nashville, Tenn. (manufacturers of coal, wood, gas and stoves).
Paul J. Dorsey	do	Personnel manager, Cribben & Sexton Co., Chicago, Ill. (manufacturer of airplane parts, shells).
Robert L. Hosmer	Field liaison representative, Fuel Oil Branch	New England manager, Mills Novelty Co., Chicago, Ill.
	INFORMATION DEPARTMENT	
Eugene Katz	Special assistant to the Deputy Administrator for Information	Director of radio and market research, the Katz Agency, Inc., New York, N. Y. (advertising).
Guy P. Jones	Chief, Magazine Section, Information Department	Managing editor, North American Newspaper Alliance, Crowell Publishing Co.

PART-TIME EMPLOYEES, CONSULTANTS WITHOUT COMPENSATION

	PRICE DEPARTMENT	
Robert K. Christenberry	Restaurant Branch	Vice president-general manager, Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y.
	CONSUMER GOODS DIVISION	
Robert Arbib	Leather Section, Primary Products Branch	Partner, Rossbach & Co., New York, N. Y. (leather manufacturing).
John R. Mason	do	Vice president, Millville Manufacturing Co., Millville, N. J. (cotton spinning and weaving mill, finishing plant and bleachery); vice president, Mays Landing Water Power Co., Mays Landing, N. J. (cotton spinning and weaving).
Albert J. Merker	do	Assistant to vice president, A. C. Lawrence Leather Co., Boston, Mass.
Truman P. Handy	Knitwear and Hosiery Section, Manufactured Articles Branch (consultant on hosiery).	Former general sales manager, Celanese Corporation of America, New York, N. Y.
Robert O. Huffman	do	President, Drexel Knitting Mills, Drexel, N. C.; treasurer and general manager, Garrou Knitting Mills, Morgantown, S. C.
George Jacobs	Consultant to the Price Executive, Manufactured Articles Branch.	President, Rollman & Sons Co., Cincinnati, Ohio (retail department store).
W. E. Long	Knitwear and Hosiery Section, Manufactured Articles Branch (consultant on wholesale dry goods).	Vice president and sales manager, Neal & Hyde, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y. (wholesale dry goods).
Arthur J. Reinthal	Knitwear and Hosiery Section, Manufactured Articles Branch	President, Bamberger, Reinthal Co., Cleveland, Ohio (knitting mill for outerwear).
Robert Seckler	Knitwear and Hosiery Section, Manufactured Articles Branch (consultant on knitted outerwear).	Secretary-treasurer, Shepherd Knitwear Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.
Edward Wilson	Knitwear and Hosiery Section, Manufactured Articles Branch	Vice president, Munsingwear Underwear Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
	FOOD PRICE DIVISION	
George Lafbury	Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Section, Fruits and Vegetables Branch.	President and general manager, George Lafbury Co., Pittsburgh, Pa. (wholesale receivers and distributors, fruits and vegetables).
James G. McCarrick	do	James G. McCarrick Co., Robstown, Tex. (fruit and vegetable distributors).
Anthony Alic	Meat Section, Meats, Fish, Fats and Oils Branch	Vice president in charge of livestock buying, Armour & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Frank H. Hoy	do	President, Hoy Food Products Co. and Hoy Equipment Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Harold E. Sanford	Feeds Section, Cereals, Feeds and Agricultural Chemicals Branch.	Vice president, west coast manager, Continental Grain Co., Portland, Oreg. (merchants, exporters, warehousemen).
	INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURING PRICE DIVISION	
Ira S. Reynolds	Paper and Paper Products Branch	St. Regis Paper Co., New York, N. Y.
	RATIONING DEPARTMENT	
	FOOD RATIONING DIVISION	
Albert J. Carpel	Wholesale Unit, Distribution Section, Processed Foods Branch	General manager-secretary, the Carpel Co., Washington, D. C. (food distributors).
F. M. Collins	do	General manager, Granger & Co., Buffalo, N. Y. (wholesale grocery).
Sylvan F. Durkheimer	do	President and general manager, Wadhams & Co., Portland, Oreg. (wholesale grocers).
Frank Fox	do	General manager-treasurer, Fox Grocery Co., Charleroi, Pa. (wholesale grocery).
L. A. Lohse	do	President-general manager, Southwestern Wholesale Grocery Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Norman Sharfman	do	Vice president-general manager, New England Grocery Supply Co., Worcester, Mass.
Benjamin Watts, Jr.	do	General manager, Gordon Sewall & Co., Houston, Tex. (wholesale grocers).
	MISCELLANEOUS PRODUCTS RATIONING DIVISION	
Elijah W. Sands	Program Planning Branch	Coal broker for self; sales representative, Atlantic Coal Co., Boston, Mass. (coal distributors).

Mr. Chester Bowles is a businessman of successful background. He is trying to follow the expressed will of Congress in staffing the O. P. A. with men drawn from the business world. Mr. Bowles has a hard job and in my opinion deserves the help and support of Congress in his fight against inflation.

The use of subsidies dates back to our first tariff law. It is being used in almost every phase of our war effort. Without the subsidized expansion of our defense plants, with Government funds, it would have been impossible to achieve the miracles of production necessary to win the war.

The vote against "subsidies" cannot be excused on the ground that it is new, un-American, or based on the recommendations of "impractical bureaucratic theorists."

The two lists of names which I have inserted consist of hard-headed, practical businessmen, drawn from some of the most important manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing firms in our Nation. These men join with their chief, Mr. Chester Bowles, in advocating the judicious use of subsidy funds to prevent an inflationary rise in the cost of living, maintain production on a sound basis, and to "hold the line" against the spiral of inflation.

A vote against subsidies is a vote for inflation, and a vote for inflation is against the best interests of the consumers on the home front and our boys on the military fronts throughout the world.

General Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the annual convention of the North Dakota Farmers Union went on record very definitely in regard to a general sales tax, and the resolution there adopted reads as follows:

Stabilization of economy: We commend our national and State leadership for standing firm for the Farmers Union policy formulated before Pearl Harbor for the complete stabilization of our internal economy and positive control of inflation. We recognized that at all costs we must prevent the repetition of the inflation and resultant deflation following World War No. 1 which caused 1,000,000 American farmers to lose their homes and eventually caused 16,000,000 workers to lose their jobs.

To that end we support: Opposition, with every ounce of strength we can muster, to a general sales tax which, if passed, would be highly inflationary—not deflationary.

It is apparent from the wording of this resolution that the farmers of North Dakota think clearly on this vital question and they have not forgotten the results of the last war. They are to be commended for their foresight in pointing out the dangers ahead.

Thanatopsis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 48 hours the grim reaper has laid his heavy hand on two Members of Congress—HENRY STEAGALL and BILL DITTER. The news of their demise had hardly been announced when we received the sad tidings of the death of W. WARREN BARBOUR, a Senator from the State of New Jersey. No Member of either body of the Seventy-eighth Congress can fail to realize that "while we are in life we are in the midst of death." The sentiments expressed in the poem of William Cullen Bryant, Thanatopsis, seem to be peculiarly appropriate at this time, and I am appending it to my remarks:

THANATOPSIS

To him who in the love of nature holds
Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
A various language; for his gayer hours
She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
And eloquence of beauty, and she glides
Into his darker musings, with a mild
And healing sympathy, that steals away
Their sharpness, ere he is aware. When thoughts
Of the last bitter hour come like a blight
Over thy spirit, and sad images
Of the stern agony, and shroud, and pall,
And breathless darkness, and the narrow house,
Make thee to shudder, and grow sick at heart—
Go forth, under the open sky, and list
To Nature's teachings, while from all around—
Earth and her waters, and the depths of air—
Comes a still voice—Yet a few days, and thee
The all-beholding sun shall see no more
In all his course; nor yet in the cold ground,
Where thy pale form was laid, with many tears,
Nor in the embrace of ocean, shall exist
Thy image. Earth, that nourished thee, shall claim
Thy growth, to be resolved to earth again,
And, lost each human trace, surrendering up
Thine individual being, shalt thou go
To mix forever with the elements,
To be a brother to the insensible rock
And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain
Turns with his share, and treads upon. The oak
Shall send his roots abroad, and pierce thy mold.
Yet not to thine eternal resting-place
Shalt thou retire alone, nor couldst thou wish
Couch more magnificent. Thou shalt lie down
With patriarchs of the infant world, with kings,
The powerful of the earth, the wise, the good,
Fair forms, and hoary seers of ages past,
All in one mighty sepulcher. The hills
Rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun, the vales
Stretching in pensive quietness between;
The venerable woods, rivers that move
In majesty, and the complaining brooks
That make the meadows green; and, poured round all,
Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste,
Are but the solemn decorations all
Of the great tomb of man. The golden sun,
The planets, all the infinite host of heaven,
Are shining on the sad abodes of death,
Through the still lapse of ages. All that tread
The globe are but a handful to the tribes
That slumber in its bosom, take the wings
Of morning, and the Barcan desert pierce,
Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
Where rolls the Oregan, and hears no sound,
Save his own dashings—yet—the dead are there;
And millions in those solitudes, since first
The flight of years began, have laid them down
In their last sleep—the dead reign there alone.
So shalt thou rest, and what if thou withdraw
Unheeded by the living—and no friend
Take note of thy departure? All that breathe
Will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh
When thou art gone, the solemn brood of care
Plod on, and each one as before will chase
His favorite phantom; yet all these shall leave
Their mirth and their employments, and shall come,
And make their bed with thee. As the long train
Of ages slide away, the sons of men,
The youth in life's green spring, and he who goes
In the full strength of years, matron and maid,
And the sweet babe, and the gray-headed man—
Shall one by one be gathered to thy side,
By those, who in their turn shall follow them.
So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, that moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Congressman Randolph Urges Favorable Action on Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a very excellent article by my colleague, Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, appearing in the November issue of Flying magazine.

There are few, even among those now engaged in the field of aeronautics, who have a full conception of the terrific impact with which post-war civil aviation will strike our world civilization. Technological advances since Pearl Harbor have been so vast that they are difficult to comprehend. More important, we have trained (and trained well) hundreds of thousands of our best young men in various branches of aviation. The results of this program have already become visible for all the world to see.

American skill plus American courage, fighting side by side with that of our allies, has battered the once mighty Luftwaffe into a quaking shell, unable today to do more than struggle weakly against the inevitable tomorrow when it will be swept from the skies. Boastful, strutting Mussolini has gone into oblivion. The arrogant Jap, trained to welcome death before surrender, fled from Kiska through the fog. On fronts the whole world over, Allied air power is demonstrating its supremacy in a manner that will shorten the war by years and save millions of lives.

When the conflict is over, when these discoveries and trained men turn to the useful purposes of peaceful society, civil aviation will come into its own, in a manner that will affect the daily lives of all humanity. Because so much of its development is American, its greatest effects will be felt here.

None of us knows when the war will end. However, we all realize—or should realize—that it would be a tragic mistake if, after the war ends, we are not in a position to proceed immediately, without lost time, in the development of the aviation industry. We have time now to lay the plans. If we wait until fighting is over we will run the risk of lagging behind during the period which will be most vital to the future health and strength of the aviation industry. It behooves us to delay no longer in making the necessary plans and to provide legislation immediately which will

enable the industry to get ready for the war's end, whether that end be 2 months or 2 years away.

There is pending in the House a bill, introduced by CLARENCE LEA, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which provides for revision of our civil aviation law. It embraces constructive suggestions for strengthening the legislative foundation for the industry. This proposal has been fully debated in the committee and in public discussion in the press and otherwise.

The draft being formulated contains provisions for the broad stimulation of private and miscellaneous flying which have long been needed. In no existing law is there a clear recognition of the function of the Government in developing and promoting this growth. In the past the author has introduced bills to provide for encouragement of aviation education in our schools. Such a provision is included in the Lea bill. The provision includes means for furnishing encouragement to the creation of voluntary groups of private flyers and other aviation activities which can do much to spread interest in and knowledge of flying.

Another provision of the bill would continue on a permanent basis the essentials of the Civilian Pilot Training Act. Vocational training for aviation pilots, mechanics, and other technicians would be authorized, to be conducted under contract with private schools. Needless to say, such a provision is of great importance in order to assist the private schools to survive the difficult adjustment period which will follow the war, and also to assure a continuing program of training our young men and women with the highest possible standards of safety and efficiency by responsible operators.

Within the framework is set forth the means for carrying out a Nation-wide program of airport construction and development. The war has shown us that a truly ambitious program of airport development is among our greatest needs. The day is rapidly coming when a proper airport system will be just as necessary as a proper highway system.

In the past we have failed, oftentimes lamentably, to provide a coordinated program with soundly conceived aims. Airport development, to a considerable extent, has been an off-shoot of work relief projects, and more recently has been the product of immediate military necessity. We used a carefully planned and balanced program which will take all considerations into account and by which various communities will be able to plan intelligently for their future. The author recently attended, at St. Paul, Minn., the first annual Midwest Global Air Conference. More than 500 persons from 20 States were present. Their primary concern was how and when to provide airport facilities for communities eager and demanding action. It was wholesome to hear and participate in the discussions.

Existing legislation has not brought this problem sharply into focus. The new bill would establish a definite policy and enable the representatives of States and municipalities to sit down with the Federal Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and plan and develop a real airport system suited to our needs.

For months the author has had before Congress a resolution calling for a Nation-wide survey of airport needs by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. This report would be made public in 8 months after passage. If there is undue delay in passage of the overall bill, enactment of this measure should be advocated so we can know soon the approximate costs and airport demands of the country.

Another principle, long neglected in civil aviation legislation but recognized in the new Lea plan, is that the regulation of flying must be primarily a matter of Federal concern. We who have been concerned with civil aviation's problems during the last 5 or 10 years have been increasingly troubled by the danger that the development of aviation will be impaired by too much Government regulation, restriction, and red tape. It is imperative that these be kept on the simplest possible basis consistent with safety and sound economics. Simplicity can never be assured if there are permitted to grow up conflicting, overlapping and duplicating regulations on the part of the Federal Government and the 48 States. Federal regulations are essential. Aviation has developed in this country under a basic pattern of regulation laid down by the Federal Government which, however, it may be criticized in detail, is fundamentally sound and constructive and has become familiar to all in the industry. Nothing would be gained by adding to this fabric of regulation additional laws and administrative requirements in the various States. The only result would be further complication of a matter which already is sufficiently (perhaps too) complex.

To enable all to know the rules by which they can fly anywhere in the vast air space of our Nation, and to keep those rules on the soundest possible basis, it is essential that we promote every possible step to prevent artificial division of the air space into 48 parts. Local authorities undoubtedly can and should help in enforcement. Many have set a splendid example. They have provided excellent cooperation and invaluable assistance in seeing to it that the Federal regulations are properly policed. The pending proposal contains provisions which will encourage that spirit of cooperation while at the same time, laying down the basic principle of Federal jurisdiction which will keep us all flying under one set of rules, so far as possible.

There is a question which has been demanding attention for many years, but thus far has been inadequately treated. This is proper airport zoning. Under the new bill, provision would be made for the promulgation of zoning standards throughout the Nation and machinery would be set up to assure compliance with zoning regulations consistent with such standards.

During the past year or so, in spite of curtailment in civil flying, the total volume of aviation operations in this country has so increased that we can begin to get an idea of what air traffic problems are likely to be in the years immediately ahead. More than one tragic and unnecessary accident in the past few months has been due to the fact that the aerial approaches to airports have been obstructed by poles, chimneys, trees, towers, or other structures which never should have been permitted in the first place. We have made but little progress toward correcting this situation. The adoption of adequate zoning laws and ordinances has been sporadic and oftentimes such measures have remained a dead letter even after adoption. The result is that it is actually possible today to cause the erection of a flagpole, for example, costing but a few dollars but extending into the approach path at a busy airport and thereby creating a hazard to human life with the most tragic consequences. The means must be provided whereby any municipality operating an airport can see to it that conditions of this sort are prevented or corrected.

Still another problem which needs immediate attention is that providing sane and sensible regulation of contract carriage by air. In the motor field we have seen a large development within the past 20 years. A similar progress is quite likely to occur in air commerce. Contract carriers by air may well become an important part of the industry within a relatively short time after the war is over. There now is no economic regulation for carriers of this type. The lack of such regulation has proved no especially serious problem. While there has been a substantial amount of contract cargo by air, primarily by fixed base operators, it had never reached proportions prior to the war where competitive malpractices had begun to threaten the industry.

But, immediately after the war we will undoubtedly find a situation where, if contract carriage remains unregulated, chaotic and cutthroat competition can arise overnight which would do irreparable damage. We know, from experience in other fields, that such methods can do no one permanent good. In the last analysis they result in waste of material and of talent and as often as not lower operating standards so as to cause accidents and encourage carelessness. The Lea bill will provide for licenses and necessary regulation so that the responsible operator can be protected and unfair, wasteful methods kept to a minimum.

Of fundamental importance to the future of civil aviation, with respect to which various interests have been advocating changes in our legislation, there is one item I am convinced would be most unwise. The Transportation Association of America has been urging that existing laws be amended so as to permit the growth of so-called integrated transportation systems, whereby a railroad, for example, would be permitted to engage not only in motor and water transportation but also in air transportation. It is argued that a single company engaged in all forms of transportation would provide greater economy and efficiency in its service.

It has been the policy of this country for many years to keep each form of transportation separate, generally speaking, from other forms. As a committee of Congress once said, it is the business of a railroad to run trains along its rails and not to operate ships. With equal reason it might be added that it is not the business of a railroad to operate airplanes.

It is difficult to see how a company with a vast investment in railroad property could be expected properly to develop air transportation, for it would be in competition with itself. It is simply human nature to expect that in such circumstances, if the railroad investment were becoming injured by the growth of air traffic, such a company would do all in its power, in order to carry out its duty to its stockholders, to prevent air traffic from growing in a way which would further injure its rail investment.

If there is to be healthy and vigorous competition in transportation, that competition must come between the various forms of transportation. The traveler or the shipper must be able freely to choose between rail, water, motor, and air. His field of choice should not be limited by any artificial restrictions imposed by a transportation company whose chief interest would necessarily be in the preservation of its investment.

The development of air transportation will be a big job. It will take a long time. It will require a truly tremendous expenditure of money, limitless application of time and energy on the part of a faithful and energetic management, and a singleness of purpose which requires undivided loyalty. If air transportation had already developed to the point where its permanent place in our economy could be appraised and decided, the case would be different. But the development of this new form of transportation has only barely begun. It was recently pointed out that with present-type airplanes and present-type fuel we would soon deplete our petroleum reserves if even so much as one-quarter of the total rail freight volume of 1941 were transported by air. This fact only serves to illustrate dramatically what a challenging task of technical and commercial development lies ahead if we are to provide an air transportation system on a basis which comes in range of fulfilling the expectations of modern America. Management must

spend 24 hours a day at work if air transportation is thus to be developed and if the problems which face it are to be intelligently solved. A management which is trying at the same time to operate a railroad cannot possibly devote the attention and the undivided interest which air transport will require.

Fame Has Eluded Maryland's Hanson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Katharine Scarborough from the Baltimore Sun of November 14, 1943:

By the provisions of a resolution introduced by Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington State, Congress was asked to designate tomorrow as "John Hanson day" in honor of the first President of the United States in Congress assembled under the Articles of Confederation. It also was asked to make this designation of November 15 permanent and to recognize the occasion with appropriate proceedings.

Tomorrow will complete the passage of 160 years since the death of this Maryland patriot and statesman at Oxon Hill Manor, the home of his nephew, Thomas Hanson, and even then one of the oldest of a string of big colonial houses built along the north bank of the Potomac. Though one of the most active and influential figures of the Revolutionary period, details of his life and service are strangely little known, either by the country at large or by Marylanders, whose ancestors he incited to proclaim their own declaration of independence almost a year before a similar and more famous document was signed in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

There is, to be sure, a tablet to his memory in the old courthouse at Frederick, scene of many of his Revolutionary activities. His portrait by Charles Wilson Peale hangs in the banquet room of Independence Hall in the Quaker City. There is a rather extensive literature concerning him, including a recent biography entitled "John Hanson and the Inseparable Union" by Jacob A. Nelson, of Decorah, Iowa, and his statue stands in the Hall of Fame in the United States Capitol. And yet he seems never to have captured the popular imagination. Even the guides in the Capitol, according to a speech made 5 years ago by Senator Ernest Lundeen, of Minnesota, "are unable to inform thousands of visitors who see this statue every year just why (it) stands in the Hall of Fame."

Just why this should be so his admirers are unable to explain. The Magnuson resolution, prepared by Mr. Nelson, declares that his "accomplishments in helping lay the foundation for our national order" were "unparalleled" and that it is now known that "he actually began the regime of 'government of the people, by the people and for the people'." His career was colorful, never more so than when he served as the leader of a Maryland "Tea Party" and compelled the captain of a British vessel to reship to England a cargo of goods landed in October 1769, at Port Tobacco, and his personality was apparently aggressive and dynamic. And, as if this were not enough, there is the further fact that it was John Hanson who caused to be prepared the first National Thanksgiving Day proclamation, setting aside the last Thursday in November 1782, for celebration by all Americans.

Of Swedish descent, Hanson entered public life in 1757 as a representative of Charles County in the lower house of the Maryland Assembly. He served nine terms in this capacity and, at a time when this body consisted of the ablest men in the province, ranked with the best. As a member of the Maryland Association of Free Men, he was among the first of the signatories who bound themselves "by the sacred ties of honor and reputation neither to import nor purchase any article taxed, or which should thereafter be taxed by Parliament for the purpose of revenue."

In 1773 Hanson moved to Frederick where he assumed leadership of the independence movement there. He was elected chairman of the committee on observation and, as such, one of his first acts was to send £200 sterling for the relief of the poor in Boston. Like some of the leading statesmen of today, he recognized the necessity of following up resolutions with action and organized for the manufacture of gunpowder, munitions, and all kinds of military equipment. He also is said to have organized and personally equipped troops for the conflict which, he felt, was unavoidable. Two companies of expert riflemen which he helped to form were the first troops from the South to join Washington's army after Bunker Hill.

In 1779, he was elected a delegate to the Congress. There, with Charles Carroll and Daniel Carroll, he was successful, through insisting that the vast territory known as the Western domain and then unsettled become common property of all the States in forging the bond which united 13 separate Colonies into a Nation. Had he and the Carrolls failed in this struggle a distinguished historian declares, Congress would have been, as Washington termed it, "a shadow without the substance." The territory which was then in dispute includes the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The Articles of Confederation which welded the Colonies into a union of States were finally adopted March 1, 1781, and with them a provision that "no person shall be allowed to serve in the office of President more than 1 year in any term of 3 years." Under this article John Hanson was elected, November 5, 1781, to serve as the first Chief Executive of the Nation. Peace had not been negotiated and problems were many and perplexing In addition, Hanson was ill. He was, consequently, glad enough to return to Frederick when his term was out. A year later he was dead. His burial place is unknown.

Further, to accord Hanson his due mead of honor, Mr. Nelson, as an enthusiastic biographer, has proposed the erection of a monument to his memory, either at Frederick, or in Washington. As he visualizes it, the shaft will be 159 feet high, crowned by a heroic figure of Hanson.

Price Inflation and Why Subsidies Will Roll Back Prices for Benefit of Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Detroit News of November 21, 1943:

WHAT PRICE INFLATION?

THIS WAR AND THE LAST WAR

Price ceilings came too late in this war to head off all inflation. We have it today in some degree. But it is under control. Even late, it has held down the cost of living to levels much lower than in the last war.

The following figures, prepared by O. P. A., show comparative increases from August 1914–18 and September 1939–43. Most of this war's increases came before price control was put in effect.

	World War No. 1 [1]	World War No. 2 [2]
Cost of living, total [3]	50.3	24.9
Food	63.9	46.7
Clothing	85.3	20.5
House furnishings	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total	96.1	37.5
Raw materials	102.1	69.5
Semimanufactures	131.3	24.7
Finished products	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities [4]	92.4	21.2
Selected manufactured items:		
Steel plates (tank)	187.4	0
Plate glass	76.1	0
Wool blankets	164.7	[5] 50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's)	132.5	[5] 71.9
Blue denims	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities	91.0	119.0
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods	78.0	116.0
Prices paid by farmers for commodities	[6] 71.0	34.0

[1] July 1914 to July 1918.
[2] August 1939 to August 1943.
[3] Rent and fuel, not available by months.
[4] All commodities other than farm products and foods.
[5] To May 1943, the latest available.
[6] 1914 to 1918, not available monthly for World War No. 1 period.

(Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

HOW THE ROLL-BACK WORKS

Prices of food in this war rose considerably before price controls were clamped on. Since then some items have been rolled back under the subsidy program which congressional inflationists are now attempting to eliminate. This same drive has as its purpose removal of all restraints so prices will be governed by the natural law of supply and demand.

In World War No. 1, prices were controlled to some extent during the war but the controls were lifted after the war, with resulting inflation. The following table compares the current prices of typical stable foods, some of which have been rolled back by subsidies, with the inflated prices just after the last war.

With much more money in circulation and economic forces much more explosive, an uncontrolled system today could not fail to result in much more drastic rises.

The figures are national averages, and do not directly list, therefore, the fact that in some industrial communities butter was selling for $1 a pound, and eggs for still higher prices.

Commodity	Inflated price, post-World War No. 1	Current price, including roll-backs
	In cents	*In cents*
Butter, December 1919 ... pound	78.0	50.5
Eggs, December 1920 ... dozen	92.4	62.7
Sugar, June 1920 ... pound	26.7	6.8
Coffee, July 1920 ... do	49.3	30.0
Potatoes, June 1920 ... 10 pounds	103.0	40.0
Lard, July 1919 ... pound	42.0	18.9
Round steak, July 1920 ... do	45.0	41.5
Pork chops, September 1920 ... do	50.0	37.9
Oranges, May 1920 ... dozen	71.8	51.8
Prunes, November 1919 ... pound	30.2	16.5

(Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

IF SUBSIDIES ARE BARRED

What will happen if Congress now bars subsidies?

No one, of course, can forecast precisely.

But Government statistical experts, whose business it is to follow such trends, have made an approximate estimate for their own guidance.

With present prices in Washington, D. C., these experts have paralleled their best informed guess as to what would happen to various foods by next March 1 and a year hence.

The variation in Detroit, they say, would be about the same. The estimates, which follow, are not only interesting, but ominous.

Items now subsidized	Present Washington prices [1] (per pound)	Mar. 1 Washington prices if subsidies are killed	December 1944 Washington prices if subsidies are killed
Round steak	$0.47	$0.52	$0.94
Rib roast	.39	.43	.78
Chuck roast	.32	.35	.64
Hamburger	.29	.32	.58
Veal cutlets	.50	.55	1.00
Pork chops	.39	.43	.78
Sliced bacon	.42	.46	.84
Whole ham	.39	.43	.78
Salt pork	.20	.22	.40
Leg of lamb	.39	.43	.78
Butter	.52	.57	1.04
American cheese	.49	.54	.98
Dried prunes	.17	.19	.34
Sugar	.08	.09	.16
Dry edible beans	.14	.15	.28
Milk at store	.15	.17	.30

[1] In large stores.

HOW RENT CONTROL WORKS

Perhaps the most spectacular success of the hold the line program has been its success in preventing rent-gouging. The rise in rents in World War No. 1 was more than 10 times the rise at the highest point in this war, which has since been cut back. Comparison:

World War No. 1, rent increase at this period of war—54.5 percent.

World War No. 2, maximum increase—5.4 percent.

World War No. 2, after rent control, but before New York reduction just put in effect—3.5 percent.

(Figures from O. P. A.)

HOW CONTROLS BENEFIT PUBLIC

The following table illustrates what happens in wartime when foods are not kept under strict price control.

Between May 1942, when the first "general maximum" price control was put in effect, and October of that year, when O. P. A.'s powers were strengthened by the law establishing the price levels of September 15 as the "line" to be held, some foods were under price ceilings. Others were exempted from such control by Congress. During this period, the indexes of food prices jumped sharply.

These lists of the percentage changes in prices of controlled and uncontrolled foods show where the rise took place, and forecast what will happen if the current inflationist campaign in Congress to wreck the control machinery is successful:

Price rises May 12–Oct. 13, 1942

Controlled foods:		Percent
Bread		No change
Round steak, pound	Up	0.7
Chuck roast, pound	Up	4.5
Pork chops	Down	.2
Sliced bacon, pound	Up	5.1
Milk	Up	.7
Potatoes	Down	3.6
Canned corn	Up	3.1
Sugar	Down	.2

Uncontrolled foods:		Percent
Butter	Up	18.2
Eggs	Up	42.8
Oranges	Up	41.7
Green beans	Up	24.6
Carrots	Up	22.7
Lettuce	Up	51.1
Spinach	Up	31.1
Prunes	Up	30.1
Roasting chickens	Up	17.5

(Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

UNCONTROLLED PRICES SOAR

The following table shows the percentage rise of food prices between August 1939 and September 1943. All prices were outside of any control for more than 2 years of this period, and therefore registered substantial rises. Nearly all have now been brought under control, some just recently, or are about to be.

In column 1 are foods which were outside of controls for almost all the period. In column 2 are foods which have been controlled since 1942. Note the difference in the percentage increases.

Percentage rise, August 1939–September 1943

Column 1:		Percent
Apples	Up	143
Bananas	Up	101.6
Oranges	Up	64.4
Carrots	Up	95.7
Onions	Up	102.8
Potatoes	Up	76.2
Green beans	Up	112.5
Sweetpotatoes	Up	85.5
Column 2:		
Bread	Up	14.1
Milk	Up	29.1
Canned peas	Up	5.9
Sugar	Up	30.8
Round steak	Up	14.0
Pork chops	Up	22.7
Butter	Up	64.5
Sliced ham	Up	12.5
Corn flakes	Down	5.7

(Figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

THE LOW-DOWN ON WASHINGTON—RECALL LAST INFLATION? NEXT WILL BE WORSE

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—People forget easily.

The United States had a taste of inflation after the last great war. It brought silk shirts and huge profit to a few in a swift, sweet wave of profiteering, sung to the tune of sentimental ballads about the boys who never came back. Its high cost of living—"old H. C. L."—brought a painful squeeze to many.

Shipyard workers rolled in unaccustomed wealth. Wheat rose to $2 a bushel, butter to $1 a pound, eggs to $1.20 a dozen. Once war controls were off, all prices shot up—and then came the crash.

The jar threw the whole national structure out of kilter. The boom in farm lands and farm prices collapsed. Agricultural America became a perennial mendicant for Government subsidies and guarantees to restore its shattered price levels.

The farmers were ignored by three Republican administrations. They were only partially revived by three Democratic administrations. They have never fully recovered from the effects of their last inflationary spree, which their false leaders in Washington are now hell-bent to repeat.

The industrial economy was temporarily rescued by the automobile-construction activity of the 1920's. But the lack of a strong, deep buying power in agricultural America contributed to a new and sharper collapse.

POISON OF INFLATION STILL LINGERS

The poison of inflation has not been cleared from the body economic. The Government had to pour out huge sums in the 1930's to keep millions of families from actually going hungry. Things never did straighten out until World War No. 2 was on us.

The same thing could happen again. But it won't happen again; not that way.

If inflation gets the jump on the American people now, the events of 1919-21, and the two decades of dislocation which followed largely as a result, will seem like "the good old days" when compared with the new tornado which will sweep the Nation.

For the ominous ingredients of an uncontrolled inflation, a depreciation of the value of their money such as Americans have never experienced, and never will have to if they exercise their own pressure on their elected representatives instead of leaving it to selfish blocs to exercise the controlling pressures, are incomparably more powerful today than in the last war. They are lashing in floodtide against the creaking seams of our economic structure.

It is an incomparably bigger war. It is taking, to win it, incomparably more production, more effort, more science, more soldiers, and more money.

There are nearly twice as many billions of dollars in the hands of buyers today than ever before, and a shortage of things to buy. If once a "flight from the dollar" starts, these billions will rush wildly for goods. Prices will shoot up. The dance of disaster will be on.

"HOLD THE LINE" POLICY OF PRESIDENT IN PERIL

Or it can come another way. President Roosevelt's "hold the line" policy, now the people's great bulwark against inflation, can be broken. This can happen either by the President himself knuckling to labor demands to smash the Little Steel formula, or by Congress knuckling to farm demands to lift the lid off food prices, or both.

If it happens in one instance, it will inevitably happen in both and, in the end, labor and the farmers, along with everyone else, will be wondering what they could have been thinking about to force such folly.

That is what the current fight in Congress over subsidies is all about.

There is a lot of talk going on which has little or nothing to do with the real issue. It is pointed out that the farmers have done a magnificent job in producing the vast totals of food needed for war, which is true. It is declared that they have been having a hard time of it, which is true as to manpower and some other factors, though, speaking generally, they have been rewarded in dollars to a degree never before approached.

It is charged that President Roosevelt chose in 1941 to play politics with labor and the farmers, rather than accept the stern advice of Bernard M. Baruch, who was thundering to hold the line then, which was true about the President, and also about Congress.

It is charged that Washington's administration of the complex mechanism through which food is produced and moved to market has been faulty in many particulars, which is also true. It is asserted that the economy ought to be able to operate on its own momentum and that subsidies, being a synthetic intrusion of outside force, are unsound, which if there were no emergency would be true, but which comes with strange grace from the farm lobbyists, whose personal incomes have for years been directly due to their skill at grasping more and more subsidy money from a pliant Congress.

But the issue today is not whether, if we could start all over, we might do the job better by doing it differently.

We cannot start over and there is not the slightest indication, either from their record or their current expressions, that the President's critics could have done a better job, if as good.

THE REAL ISSUE

The issue is not whether the policies of the War Food Administration or the O. P. A. or

the War Labor Board or John L. Lewis' buddy, Harold L. Ickes, could be improved upon. In nearly every instance, they could be and can be.

Nor is the issue whether the Republicans can make sufficient political capital out of these errors to undermine the President with the voters, make them forget international affairs and the conduct of the war, and concentrate on the "sacrifices" that the poor, downtrodden civilians are suffering at home while their sons fight and die for $50 a month.

The issue is simply this: How can inflation be averted, despite the tremendous inflationary impacts inherent in the economics of war, and despite all the mistakes of the President, the Congress and all the rest of us, so that in winning the war we will not wreck the structure on which peace must be built?

As things stand today, there is just one way that can be done—through consumer subsidies.

The cost of producing some foods, and the fixed prices of others which were guaranteed by the Government to stimulate production early in the war, are such that they cannot be marketed at current retail levels unless the Government steps in to subsidize a differential.

If it were a matter of granting an occasional price boost here or there without any secondary impact, subsidies might not be necessary. But the cost-of-living index has already outraced the Little Steel wage formula. If it is further broken, demands for higher wages can no longer be denied. And the farm bloc is not merely seeking an occasional price boost; its unconcealed purpose is to absorb the extra dollars in the economy, letting the prices of food jump all along the line. The entire O. P. A. system of controls is under harsh attack.

That is the path to uncontrolled inflation and the path on which inflationists in Congress have now embarked.

VANDENBERG WARNING

Senator VANDENBERG, whose personal inclination is antisubsidy and who is highly critical of the administration's food management, voted for subsidies when the issue was before the Senate last summer because, he warned, Congress could not shoulder the awful responsibility of rejecting them.

But the Republican politicians who control the House machine either do not comprehend the danger or do not care. They have scented what they think is a means of discrediting Roosevelt, perhaps sending him into a 1944 campaign with a home-front torn by the suffering and dissension inherent in inflation, and their minds seem to reach no further.

Allied with them are a coterie of reactionary southern Democrats, whose No. 1 rule for years has been to grab all the money possible for cotton and a few other favored crops by voting subsidies, support "loans," and other devices running into the billions.

They serve as stooges for Ed O'Neal, head of the Farm Bureau Federation, and the other inflationists, whose strategy is clear, simple, and selfish. When subsidies would benefit them alone, they were indispensable. But when a comparatively minor sum is required to "hold the line" on food prices, subsidies become a threat to the American way of life and a threat of socialization.

PROFIT CREED RULES

Why? Simply because the farm bloc now figures it will profit more by wrecking controls and letting prices "seek their level." They know that killing subsidies will smash the Little Steel formula, and that wages will race upward. They know that their course will exert a cruel squeeze first on fixed-income families and finally on all who must buy food. They know that the cost of the war will be increased by many billions and that the taxpayers some day will have to pay them back.

They are just too greedy to care and too superficial to recall what happened to the farmers after their last inflationary spree.

In other columns of the News today may be found tables indicating what the public can expect if the inflationists succeed in smashing up the price line and wrecking O. P. A.

The cost of living rose rapidly during World War No. 1, when partial controls were exercised, and even more rapidly after the war, when the controls were removed. That war cost many billions more than it had to because copper, for example, was 37 cents a pound, instead of the current price around 12, and steel plates brought $180 a ton, instead of $42.

RENTS ARE COMPARED

Rents in the last war rose 54.5 percent. In this war they have risen a net of 3.5 percent, dropping nearly 2 percent since rent control was instituted.

Between 1914–18, food, clothing, house furnishing, and all other living items rose an average of more than 50 percent. And after the war they went still higher and faster.

In this war, the cost of living has jumped substantially, though less than last time. This has not been due to the failure of price controls, but rather because they were imposed late and not universally.

That was because the farm bloc prevented O. P. A. from effectively regulating many items of food. During the period between May and October 1942, foods under control rose only two-fifths of 1 percent but uncontrolled foods rose nearly 17 percent. While bread was holding steady, and pork chops, potatoes, and sugar were dropping slightly, and round steak and milk rising only seven-tenths of 1 percent—all of which were controlled—butter was going up 18 percent, carrots 22 percent, spinach 31 percent, oranges 42 percent, eggs 43 percent, and lettuce 51 percent—all uncontrolled.

Some food items have only recently been brought under control. Since the war started, oranges have gone up 64 percent, potatoes have gone up 76 percent, sweetpotatoes 85, bananas 102, onions 103, green beans 113, and apples 143.

PUBLIC WILL REMEMBER

But despite these sweeping increases in uncontrolled items, enough items have been held down to keep the cost of living net increase under 25 percent.

Meanwhile some items, including round steak, increased in price until its price of 47 cents a pound exceeded the inflated peak after the last war, which was 42 cents. To this and other items subsidies were applied. Since ceilings were first ordered in March 1942, not a single processed meat has risen in price and many have fallen.

That is a source of acute pain to the farm lobbyists. It has denied them their great chance for a "killing" at the public expense. Now the day for that "killing" may shortly arrive, but if it comes, not only the public but Congress will pay.

If this latest surrender to political expediency and the farm lobbyists leads to uncontrolled inflation, the people will deal adequately with those who betrayed the many for the few.

Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the fight being made to save this Nation from the ravages of inflation is only next in importance to that of winning the war. It may, however, be truthfully stated that if we fail in our fight against inflation it will imperil our war effort and the security of our economic structure, both now and after the war, even though we are victorious over our enemies.

No one denies the dangers that are inherent in inflation. Everyone seeks to avoid the danger. The Congress has a very great responsibility in the matter. It cannot, however, be met by merely objecting to the subsidy plan offered by the administration. If the subsidy plan is not a proper solution then it is the duty of those who object to offer a better plan. There has been no other alternative offered. The subsidy plan is our only hope at this time.

In giving my support to the subsidy plan I am not certain it will entirely accomplish the purpose that is sought. But I hope it will be successful. If it is not, and no other adequate plan is offered, then the situation will be serious. The people will be faced with a continuing rise in the cost of living. The argument has been made that our national income is so great that there is no need for subsidies to keep down the price of necessities. That the wages being paid are the highest in the history of the Nation. That may be true as to some, but it does not apply to all.

There are millions of our people who have had no increase in wages, and yet they must pay out of their limited wages and salaries the high prices that now prevail for all the necessities of life. Teachers, religious workers, policemen, firemen, and others in governmental service, national, State, county, and local, and many so-called white collar workers. There is also that large class of pensioners who have a limited as well as small income. There are our ex-servicemen who depend upon meager disability compensation and their dependents who must also be supported out of the same. There are the wives, children, dependent fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters of men now in the service of their country who find it difficult to live on the allowances granted by the Government. All of these have a right to any and every protection that can be afforded by a subsidy program that aims to keep the cost of living from rising higher than it is.

I consider it my duty and obligation to support with my vote the subsidy program.

California Nears the 100-Year Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, for 5 decades the Richmond Banner has been serving the Richmond (Park Presidio District) of San Francisco. Editor Sin-

clair G. Trimble is active in every move for the city's development.

An interesting article appears in the Banner's issue of November 5, 1943. Attention is called to several historic centenary observances starting in California this year. The all-important date will be Admission Day, September 9, 1950. On the same date, 100 years earlier, the Golden State entered the Union.

The newspaper item follows:

We are indebted to Peter T. Conmy, grand historian of the order of Native Sons and the new Oakland librarian, for the following:

"The year 1943 has ushered in a number of centenary observances which should occupy the attention of Californians in the next few years. In 1843, the United States Government appointed the first American consul to California, then a Mexican province. In 1844 John C. Fremont led his first exploring expedition into California. In 1845, the native Californians overthrew Governor Micheltorena and placed Pio Pico in charge as an insurgent Governor. In 1846, the Bear flag was raised over Sonoma, and a few weeks later the Stars and Stripes over Monterey. In 1847, the first steamship on the Pacific coast made its trial run on San Francisco Bay. In 1848, California was ceded to the United States by Mexico, and gold was discovered by Marshall. In 1849, the first California constitution was drafted, and in 1850 the State was admitted to the Union. The event which was the forerunner of the great changes that came to California and which will be observed in the centenaries of the next few years was the appointment by President Tyler and the confirmation by the United States Senate of Thomas Oliver Larkin in 1843 as consul for Monterey.

"The decade from 1830 to 1840 witnessed a slow but nevertheless steady infiltration of California by men from the United States and from other foreign countries. Although this immigrant population constituted a minority, it was composed of men of such frontier vigor that it was not easily absorbed by the Mexican Californians."

Mr. Speaker, from census figures released recently, California is close to third place in population amongst the 48 States. Little did President John Tyler realize the empire he was opening, when in 1843 he appointed Thomas O. Larkin as consul to Alta-California.

The Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the political speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and finally printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A4921—was answered by Fulton Lewis, Jr., a copy of whose broadcast is as follows:

Well, from the deluge of telegrams and telephone calls and letters of protest which I've received in the last 24 hours, you're expecting from me tonight some sort of discussion and perhaps explanation of the talk which Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, made on this new period last evening.

There have been considerable repercussions in Congress here today as a result of Mr. PATMAN'S appearance, some of them rather amusing—about which I'll tell you later.

As for the facts of the case, and the talk itself, you know, of course, that I voluntarily invited Mr. PATMAN to take over my time last night, because the supporters of the subsidy program have said that I was not giving you enough of their side of the argument, and Mr. PATMAN said that I had attacked him personally on the subject (which I never did) and in the interest of getting every possible point of view before you, I gave Mr. PATMAN this time last evening.

You know, also, the understanding under which he accepted the invitation; that he was to confine himself to a discussion of the antisubsidy bill that's pending in Congress (and which, by the way, will get under debate on Thursday of this week, according to a decision by the House Rules Committee this afternoon).

I have no intention of indulging in personalities. Let's just analyze Representative PATMAN'S radio talk from a strictly reportorial standpoint.

He began by quoting Mr. Ray Clapper, the columnist and radio commentator, and on the basis of that quotation from Mr. Clapper, Mr. PATMAN built his entire speech. That quotation appearing in Mr. Clapper's column last week, was as follows:

"Powerful political pressure has been created (against the subsidy program) in Congress. Republicans have joined in. Several Republicans on the Banking and Currency Committee were understood to have favored continuing subsidies, but (and, said Mr. PATMAN, I want the listeners to get this particularly) after having lunch with JOE MARTIN, they unanimously went against the administration."

With that as a foundation Mr. PATMAN built his speech around the idea that the opposition to subsidies is—as he called it—a Republican conspiracy to plunge the Nation into anarchy in the hope that they can elect a President out of the chaos in 1944.

By way of qualifying Ray Clapper, Mr. PATMAN said that he has been voted the fairest and best-informed Washington columnist by his colleagues of the Press Gallery, and that if you won't take his word for that, you can take mine. It is true that in 1937 Ray Clapper was chosen the fairest and best-informed columnist in Washington by 77 Washington correspondents. He is a very old and very close friend of mine. He is a very well informed and very reliable reporter, and a very fair one. But he makes mistakes, just as I do and just as every other human being does who is honest enough to admit them. And this particular occasion seems to have been one of the times, because Representative JOE MARTIN told me today, and then stated on the floor of the House of Representatives, that he never has had lunch with the Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, nor dinner, nor breakfast, nor tea. He has never talked to them about their vote on the antisubsidy bill. The 11 Republican members themselves say the same thing today. So the original foundation on which Mr. PATMAN based his entire speech last night seems to be 100 percent incorrect.

Representative MARTIN added that, even if it had been true, that there are 26 members of the Banking and Currency Committee, and only 11 of them are Republicans. And yet this bill in question was approved by the Banking and Currency Committee by a vote of 23 to 3. He says that 11 Republicans cannot cast 23 votes; they only wish they could. He said that as for a Republican conspiracy to block subsidies, so as to bring on anarchy and chaos, it will take a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives and a two-thirds vote of the Senate, to pass this antisubsidy bill over the President's veto; that means 290 votes for the bill in the House of Representatives, if all the Members were present, and the Republicans have only 208 Members. It means 64 votes in the Senate, and the Republicans have only 38. So if the bill becomes law, he said, it's going to take a lot more than a Republican conspiracy.

He pointed out, also, that the actual author of this bill is a Democrat, Representative STEAGALL of Alabama, a loyal administration supporter for many years, and that its chief sponsor in the Senate is another Alabama Democrat, Senator BANKHEAD, the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Representative MARTIN said he thinks that should dispose of the question of a Republican conspiracy.

Representative PATMAN said that every argument against food subsidies can be easily answered, but in the entire 12½-minute broadcast he took up only one—that the money to pay the subsidy must be paid back eventually by the people who get the benefit of the subsidy.

He said that every dollar paid by the Government in subsidies means a saving of between $5 and $30 for the individual citizen. Representative JESSE WOLCOTT, the ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, says that statement has absolutely no foundation in fact. Representative RICHARD KLEBERG, a Democrat from Representative PATMAN'S own State of Texas, said "the arithmetic and logic which my friend and colleague used in his speech were not the brand of arithmetic and logic they have in Texas," but that he suspects they were taken from the O. P. A. economists. Two other top-ranking members of the Banking and Currency Committee—one of them a supporter of the subsidy program, and one against it—said that there is no possible substantiation for Mr. PATMAN'S statement; that it's purely a dogmatic declaration by him and cannot be proved, and he might as well have said $50 or $100 instead of $5 to $30.

As a matter of fact, in the butter-subsidy program, for example, the way it works is simply this: the Government, in effect, tells the grocery store from which you buy to reduce the price of butter to you from 65 cents to 60 cents, and the Government will give the grocer 5 cents out of the Federal Treasury to make up for his loss. For a 5-cent subsidy, the benefit to the public is 5 cents. For a dollar paid in subsidies, the benefit to the consuming public presumably is a dollar.

Representative PATMAN then said he would describe the consequences that would follow if the antisubsidy bill is passed; and he said that the price of hogs for the farmer will drop from the present figure of better than 12 cents down to only 8 cents a pound. No—that's not correct; but let's be absolutely fair about this. Mr. PATMAN was careful not to make that statement. Rather, he used an old trick of oratory, and put it this way. He said:

"If you (the farmer) bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame the Republicans. If you bring your beef cattle to the auction pens and get only 9 cents for good steers (which now are bringing 15 and 16 cents), blame the Republicans."

He didn't say that would happen. He avoided making the statement by making it provisional with the word "if."

By long-distance telephone from Grand Rapids, Mich., this afternoon, Mr. Albert Goss, president of the National Grange, stated to me that the antisubsidy bill contains no provisions which would do any such thing by the wildest stretch of the imagination; that, on the contrary, it specifically provides for the continuation of the guaranteed minimum prices on farm commodities, which have long been in effect, to encourage production. Also by long-distance telephone,

from Chicago, Mr. Ed O'Neal, the president of the other big farm organization, the Farm Bureau Federation, said exact' what Mr. Goss had said, and added that both his organization and the National Grange are unalterably opposed to the subsidy program as proposed by the administration leaders.

In the meantime, the novelist and farmer, Louis Bromfield, appearing as a witness before the Senate Agriculture Committee, as a spokesman for farmers of the Middle West who have no regular farm organization at all, said just what Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Goss had said.

In reply to Representative PATMAN's statement—once again in the form of a question—"I ask you workingmen whether you will be willing to continue to accept stabilization of your wages if the price of food goes up?"—I asked innumerable members of the Banking and Currency Committee whether prices will go up, in the event this antisubsidy bill is passed. Without exception they said that the question of what happens to prices is controlled entirely by the O. P. A. through price ceilings.

As a matter of fact, if you remember, that was the question which Representative PATMAN was supposed to answer first and foremost. It was in that connection that he complained that I attacked him. How is it that subsidies are necessary to hold the cost of living where it is now? He merely repeated by inference that it is necessary, but there still is no explanation.

Nor is there any explanation of how the individual consumer is better off, with a food bill reduced by three or four dollars a year, when the Government is taking several hundred dollars additional away from him in taxes.

Now, there's just one more angle of this little incident, on which I want to touch.

Mr. PATMAN implied repeatedly last night that I am a Republican, or the spokesman for the Republicans, and that's an untruth. I was born in the District of Columbia, and for that reason I've never had a vote, which is also true of my mother and father.

Having built up a little farm in southern Maryland, I registered there about 6 weeks ago, for the first time—as an Independent. I've watched the political scene come and go for 40 years, and no one knows better than I that neither party has any monopoly on virtue.

Not only do I not speak for any political party, but neither do I speak for any individual or any group. This program is set up with 120 different individual local sponsorships, of every conceivable kind, scattered all over the United States, and it was done that way for the express purpose of making it impossible for any sponsor to influence my reporting in any way. I have only one purpose over this microphone, and that is to be absolutely free to tell you what I believe you want to know, from the standpoint of free American citizens.

The appearance of Representative PATMAN on my broadcast time last night was an experiment. It probably is the first time it ever has been done, in the history of radio. We on the air are periodically beset by people who insist that we're unfair, this way or that way, and who demand our time to answer us. The invariable policy is to turn down those demands, but to offer side time, so that those people can express themselves.

That's what was done by the Mutual Broadcasting System and radio Station WHN in New York on this occasion. The assumption is that the radio commentator tries to be as fair as he can, and when he ceases to be fair, the public will wake up to that fact, and he'll be off the air.

But this time, by way of an experiment, I thought I'd try it—in the hope that perhaps Representative PATMAN did have some material that I had not presented to you. He is, after all, the leader of the subsidy supporters in the House.

He accepted my invitation with the agreement to stick to the subject. I required no advance script from him, because I didn't want him to think he was being policed, or censored. He had full rein.

In all fairness to the Republicans, I offered time this afternoon to Representative JOE MARTIN to answer the partisan political attack. Representative MARTIN turned it down with a smile. He said he thought he would let matters stand as they are, because he feels that Representative PATMAN did the Republicans more good last night than they have been able to do for themselves in a good many years.

Address of Henry J. Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Mr. Henry J. Kaiser at St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is indeed a fortunate country. In times of great national problems, there has always arisen from the people one in whom its citizens have faith because of his sincerity and proven leadership. No one denies that we have troubled days ahead. In the days that are to follow after the fighting ceases, we need honest, sincere aggressive leadership. We must have it if our Republic is to continue.

Mr. Kaiser said:

Our institutions are also on the altar. Every day brings new evidence of the extent to which the war and its demands are revolutionizing our way of life. It is no wonder that our people have begun to think and talk about the post-war world. The question is not only, What have we to fight for, but what have we to live for? I do not go with those who have given up hope for a new world. I believe that America's day of destiny is in the near term future. With you I am determined to do all in my power to contribute to America's true greatness in that epoch which is so nearly upon us.

And then he went on to lay before the people of the United States a sound and constructive plan to make that possible. He asked:

Must we always be resorting to subterfuge, always "beating about the bush"?

A challenge, Mr. Speaker, to all of us that cannot be ignored.

He then said:

If independence means anything we have got to achieve it. We have got to be worthy of it. This is the time to prove that we can support it. The real test to the Nation does not come in the glamour of war. It belongs to those days when we lay hold on the opportunities of peace to build the kind of a world we know we can have. Our hope is in ourselves, and our faith will prevail.

The speech in full follows:

America is fighting today as a nation to save her soul. And the depth of the sacrifices which are the price of victory can never be calculated. The casualty lists daily bring us the grim story of the youth who have surrendered all the hope and promise which life holds. Theirs is the supreme sacrifice which no statistics can reveal.

To give our fighting men everything they need, and provide our allies in arms with all the surplus we can produce, is our goal today and will be until the war is won.

We are all aware that we are spending our physical and material resources. Our reserves of iron ore, coal, and oil are being depleted at a terrifying rate. Our industrial, agricultural, transport, and domestic equipment is wearing out, and the capital accumulated through generations of toil and saving is being consumed.

Our institutions are also on the altar. Every day brings new evidence of the extent to which the war and its demands are revolutionizing our way of life. It is no wonder that our people have begun to think and talk about the post-war world. The question is not only, what have we to fight for, but what have we to live for? I do not go with those who have given up hope for a new world. I believe that America's day of destiny is in the near term future. With you, I am determined to do all in my power to contribute to America's true greatness in that epoch which is so nearly upon us.

But I am sobered tonight by facts which cannot be ignored. The vast extent of our productive powers has now been disclosed. Our capacity to produce food and equipment far surpasses the most extravagant estimates. Planning surveys have revealed what we can produce for peace; when, where, and how much. An overwhelming demand awaits an almost boundless supply.

But tonight, in the brief moments at my command, I invite you to dwell on the one great unsolved problem in recovery and reconstruction. We have no constructive program for financing peace. We have learned how to finance the war. In brief, we have done it by expanding credit, and we will continue to do it in this manner as long as the war lasts. But we have no real light on financing our future. In all the colossal effort which has been spent on post-war programs, in all the many plans which have been proposed and announced, I find no mention of the formation of capital. Without the support of reason, logic, or experience, it is presumed that we can continue to supply our capital needs by the expansion of credit. The latest manifestation of this point of view is the current theory that the Government can finance recovery even to 100 percent of the need. A score of bills are certain to be presented to the next session of Congress proposing to give credit-granting authority. They will even ask for discretionary credit powers for the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many similar agencies for the gigantic task of reconverting the Nation's business to peacetime pursuits.

Perhaps the greatest illusion we have suffered in the modern world is the theory that governments can finance anything and everything needful. We have forgotten that governments have no money; that national treasuries are not storehouses of wealth. We have forgotten that every time the government finances any individual or enterprise it does so out of taxation or borrowing. We have forgotten that taxation ultimately rests solely upon productive enterprise. We have forgotten that the Government can borrow with safety only from those who have the ability and the willingness to save. We have accepted the false doctrines that the size of the

debt is of no consequence, and that credit can be expanded indefinitely.

It is time for us to come to grips with certain basic truths. The first one is that the war must be paid for. The token of payment will be paid in taxes and advanced in loans, as it is today, but the real payment will be in work, profitable labor which produces real wealth, and that voluntary sacrifice which saves a portion of all that is produced.

Perhaps the gravest danger we face at this moment is the threat that reconversion, reconstruction, and expansion can be financed 100 percent by Government funds. Such a doctrine is only another way of saying that we will have to endure a vast and increasing burden of taxation; that the Government must continue to operate on a deficit basis; that it must borrow virtually all of the savings of its people; and that it must assume the role of investing for all of its citizens.

But the mere statement of the problem and a consideration of its gravity suggest no remedy. In the absence of any constructive proposals from the private institutions of national finance, it is certain that the present trends will not only continue, but will be greatly enhanced. To the extent that commercial banking and investment banking fail to meet the needs of conversion, reconstruction, and expansion, the Government will undertake the responsibility.

A cursory view of the present financial picture discloses that there is more money in circulation than at any time in the history of America. The American people and their banks now have some twenty billion dollars in currency in their possession. This is nearly five times as great as the volume which circulated in 1928 and 1929, the years of our greatest peacetime business activity. Furthermore, bank deposits are also at an all-time high, and should the war last another year they may well represent $150,000,000,000 in purchasing power.

It is a great misfortune that many people look upon this situation as an evidence of prosperity. Modern wars consume wealth, they do not create it. The method of financing them creates purchasing power, but it does not form capital.

I am far less interested in stating the problem than I am in finding a solution. The Federal Reserve Board says that 75 percent of the bank deposits are owned by industry. At the present moment American business has something close to $40,000,000,000 on deposit in the banking structure. But some of these deposits represent advances by the Government on contracts that have not yet been finished. Some of them represent impounds for taxes, the extent of which is never clearly known. Some of them are reserves against the cancellation or renegotiation of contracts. The evidence is that the accumulated bank deposits, as great as they are, will not take care of industry's post-war needs. Twenty-five percent of the bank deposits and perhaps fifteen billions of the total currency in circulation are owned by the public. What the people do with this vast sum of money is of the utmost importance in the early stages of peace. Will they spend or will they invest? The answer to this question will determine in a large measure the extent of our post-war inflation, and it will profoundly affect the prospects of real recovery.

Where will the money come from to quicken the production, sales, and distribution of the goods which will help us restore the economic values of our society? For a good many weeks American business has been listening in the hope that private finance would offer an answer to this vital question. Apparently there are some who hold to the belief that sound and solvent industry has built up reserves in bank deposits; that it will be able to borrow all the short-term capital it needs from the banks; and that it will have recourse to the old channels of investment for its long-term needs. Whatever truth there may be in this position, it ignores the nature and extent of the social and economic upheaval which has taken place. It is blind to the fact that a vast number of business organizations will have to have special accommodations which do not conform to standard credit requirements. There is instant and urgent need for a vast credit pool to take care of the rehabilitation of enterprise, both large and small, for whatever period is necessary to restore them to independent financial status.

In view of the magnitude of the problem, this may have to be a joint credit pool in which banking, life insurance, Government, and even industry itself will participate. Just as there have been development projects too large for private finance, so there are times when the credit needs transcend the ability of private agencies. As long as we recognize that Government financing does nothing more than mobilize the wealth and the saving of the people through taxation and borrowing, we are safe in employing it sparingly. Unhappily our choice now is not between Government financing and private financing. We shall probably have to do both. But the real situation is just as simple as this: The greater the willingness of private finance to do its job, the less will be the need of Government aid. The corollary is that the less we need Government aid, the less Government will interfere with the rights of investors to choose when and how they will employ their savings.

Do we have the will and good will to work together as a people in this most critical moment of our national life? A private credit pool would have the immense advantage of assembling the existing financial resources of the Nation, and utilizing them to the full. A 100 percent Government financing program would create the illusion of new financial resources, the result of which would be to dilute existing wealth and ultimately to weaken the value of our money and credit instruments. The choice is at hand, we cannot escape it.

I know you will pardon a personal reference if I say that I feel very much at home in this audience tonight. I began my business career selling household furnishings in a department store in Utica, N. Y. I speak your language and understand your problems. We know how difficult it is to acquire business, to influence the customer to sign on the dotted line, to win against opposition.

In the last 20 years of my life I have learned something about production and the difficulties of combining labor, capital, and management to the end that everybody in the undertaking may prosper. Because I feel that you understand, I am going to ask you to think about an unpopular subject, and listen to a challenging proposal.

I do not know anything about the political implications of a sales tax, and I am neither interested nor concerned in them. It is my studied conviction that a 10-percent tax on the sale of every item in our consumer economy would be the forthright and courageous way to service the debt which will be the money price of victory. I am advised that such a tax is unjust; also that it is so easy to levy and collect that it will invite further expenditures; perhaps waste and extravagance. I seriously question the validity of either of these assertions. The experience of the States where this tax is imposed does not support such contentions. What injustice could there be in the fact that the man who buys a $100 suit of clothes will pay $10 toward the reduction of the national debt, while the man who buys a $20 suit will pay only $2?

Either we are going to make a personal sacrifice in which every citizen will share or we are going to suffer increased taxation, the further expansion of bank credit, increased inflationary pressures, and the gradual decline in the ability of the Government to service its obligations.

As for the belief that it would encourage Government spending, let the legislation which imposes this tax earmark it as available solely for the service of the Federal debt. The wholehearted consecration of every sales-tax dollar to the liquidation of this burden would do more than any other one thing to restore business confidence and assure post-war employment.

And now comes the challenge to you. Would you be willing to make the extra effort to sell everything that you have to offer with 10 percent added to the price? To put it another way, would you be willing to see all of the goods marked up by that amount in the minds of the ultimate customers? Would you do this for the sake of national solvency? Would you do it to help maintain the Nation's credit. Would you do it to help us restore our sense of self-interest by the knowledge that we were paying our debts?

Must we be always resorting to subterfuge, always "beating around the bush," always saying one thing and meaning another about this debt? Will national unity be saved and good will engendered if we pass it on to one group or to future generations yet unborn? The most unifying influence in our national life would be our willingness to stand shoulder to shoulder, the high, the low, the fortunate and the unfortunate, and establish once and for all the integrity of our promises.

The theorists will use big words like "regressive," and they will talk about class-conscious legislation, but you and I know the plain every-day truth that we can neither borrow our way out of debt nor can we escape the payment. And, alas, the settlement could take the tragic form of a superinflation which would liquidate all of our values. Millions of our citizens have taken up arms to defend our way of life. Shall we lack the fortitude to pay the bill? If our patriotism were as deep as our pronouncements about it we would make the heroic effort to start paying it now.

I come now to what is perhaps the most difficult phase of this discussion. Looming large among the institutions of our American life is organized labor. I have no apology for my attitude toward the labor union, and I ask no praise for it. I believe whole-heartedly in collective bargaining. Furthermore, it is my belief that for every racketeer in labor leadership, there are many men of high integrity and worthy purpose. The labor union is deeply concerned in the prospects of post-war business. And union labor has the greatest stake in the continuance of the enterprise system. It has never enjoyed any advantages under State socialism, and it never will.

Organized labor has accumulated a vast store of funds. By every token of moral rectitude, the unions are responsible to their membership for the millions of dollars now in their treasuries. It may be that the unions should share in the credit pool; perhaps they should join with the bankers and the Government in providing the sinews of recovery, and participate in the administration of the fund. Then they would weigh and judge the intricate and complicated problems of business enterprise struggling to survive.

Finally, I cannot close this all too brief review without a word concerning risk capital. Private saving, private investment, in the century and a half of our national life, has built the vast industrial machine which today is helping us win the war. That saving came about partly because of the nature of our people, partly because of their confidence in their money and their Government, and partly because of the legitimate and proper hope for reward. The American people have risked their savings in American enterprise. Throughout the whole story there

have been losses as well as gains, but the gains outweighed the losses. Slowly and steadily the wealth of the country increased. If the savers and investors of America are wise they will continue to share the risks and hazards of American business. If the banks are wise they will get back to the risk business at the earliest possible moment. There may be some need for the continuation of the guaranteed loan, but we should set our faces resolutely toward the day when the lender will share the risks of the borrower, and when the price of venture will be commensurate with the chances involved.

As long as the Government debt bears heavily upon us, and in the early stages of reconstruction, a cheap money policy may be necessary. The cost of reconversion will be spread over the Nation as a whole, just as the cost of war is borne by all. But a healthy economy will not lean on guaranties. Risk capital must have its rewards, but it must also take its chances. In the long run it is not fair to saddle the burden of the losses upon the ventures that succeed This leveling process is all too common in the modern world. Much can be said for insurance in principle and in practice, but the hazards of enterprise are an essential part of our progress. We will do well to preserve the institution of risk.

May I close with what may seem to be a digression, but is in reality a related problem. Thus far our fighting men have had no opportunity to say what they think, or what they hope for in the post-war plans. For the moment it is the style to say that this or that or something else must be done for them. Education, bonuses, demobilization pay, pensions, and all similar proposals have been made without recourse to soldier opinion. Why not find out what they think? We reach these millions of young men at least once a month with their pay, and oftener with mail and supplies. Why not send each man in the fighting services a simple questionnaire. Let him say what he wants to do, and where he wants to live, what his plans are, if any, what his hopes are, if he cares to express them. Then place a simple tabulation of the results in the hands of a responsible committee in every community, representing the civic, religious, educational, and business elements Let them know how many boys expect to come to their town, what they want to do. Let them help to plan the desired opportunities. For the thousands of young men in the medical corps, offer them now the promise of a safe and useful return to their professional career. Give them the protection of medical facilities on a pay-as-you-go basis. Silence once and for all the threat of socialized medicine with its hopeless mediocrity.

The way to restore independence to our industries and our professions is not to criticize and abuse Government agencies or Government efforts, but to do the job so well that there will be no need for the subsidies and the bureaus.

And so I close with all the earnestness at my command, in a warning that all-out government financing will mean heavy taxation, further borrowing, and the centralization of investment in the hands of the state. Private financing has the resources and the ability to do the major part of the job. Working with the Government it can demonstrate its ability to carry more and more of the load. Then we can look forward to that great day when there will be no further need to call upon the government to marshal and administer the financial resources of the country.

Either we will begin the formation of capital by paying our debts, by saving, and by heroic sacrifices, or we will continue to expand credit to the point where inflation destroys all of our values. Either industry and finance will join in a great cooperative effort, or they will surrender their prerogatives to the State. We have come to one of those supreme moments in time when a decision determines the course of the future for perhaps a century to come. Everything that you and I hold dear is at stake. Every man in uniform, every war worker, and all those who depend on all of us, are listening for the answer to the soul-searching question, what are we fighting for?

If independence means anything, we have got to achieve it. We have got to be worthy of it. This is the time to prove that we can support it. The real test to the Nation does not come in the glamour of war. It belongs to those days when we lay hold on the opportunities of peace to build the kind of a world we know we can have. Our hope is in ourselves, and our faith will prevail.

Stand of the American Trucking Associations on the Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420, and the Reese Bill, H. R. 3491

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter written by Mr. John B. Lawrence, managing director, American Trucking Association, Inc., who represent truckers in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii:

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1943.

Re H. R. 3420 and H. R. 3491.

An insidious, monopolistic effort in wartime to establish integration of transportation companies into a limited number of systems operating in all forms of transportation—rail, water, air, and motor—through the present Congress is now under way. The first step in this general scheme of things will appear in the debate before the House on H. R. 3420, the aviation bill, and H. R. 3491, the proposed minority substitute bill for that measure. It is now anticipated that debate will begin early in the week following Thanksgiving.

Motor freight carriers from their record traffic year of 1941 have still further expanded the tonnage they haul, despite the paltry amount of new equipment available to them and the extreme difficulty in getting parts, tires, etc. Truck loadings in the first 9 months of 1943 exceeded those of the corresponding period in 1941 by 25 percent.

The railroads, too have done a splendid job of handling traffic. They have spent thousands of dollars in advertising programs telling the Nation about the job they have done. But at the same time, while other forms of transportation have been so busy handling the tremendous war load with inadequate manpower and facilities, the railroads have been busy in an attempt to further by congressional action their monopolistic proposals for integrated transportation.

H. R. 3420, a bill on the regulation and control of air transportation, has been reported out by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Due to belated controversy arising last spring, the provisions covering unification of control were removed from that bill and incorporated in a separate bill, H. R. 3421. Assurances were given that full and adequate hearings would be held on this latter measure.

In the meantime, the minority report proposes as a substitute for H. R. 3420 the bill H. R. 3491, which, among other provisions, in its section 5 (b) (amending sec. 401 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act) proposes to let down the bars and permit surface transportation companies to enter freely the field of air transport.

Our industry is violently opposed to any such measure. Our association through action of its directors in Chicago recently went on record opposing these proposed forms of integration. A copy of this resolution is attached. You will see that the motor carriers feel that they should not expect rights in the field of air transport and at the same time believe that other forms of transportation should not be allowed to acquire control of or be given operating rights in the motor-carrier field. The whole resolution is addressed to the fundamental principle that there must be competition between the various forms of transportation if the public is to benefit.

We understand that one or more additional amendments of a similar character may be offered in case section 5 (b) of H. R. 3491 fails of adoption. Passage of such an amendment would establish a new congressional policy and would definitely deprive our industry and other transportation industries of an opportunity to express their views at a hearing before the Congress.

We urge strongly that when this legislation comes before the House you oppose any attempt to substitute section 5 (b) of H. R. 3491, or any other amendment of the same character, in H. R. 3420, the bill reported out by the majority of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Yours very truly,
AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
JOHN V. LAWRENCE, *Managing Director.*

RESOLUTION PASSED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC., AT CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 20, 1943

Whereas the American Trucking Associations, Inc., has consistently opposed the entrance of railroads into the field of motor-carrier transportation; and

Whereas there is now an increasing prospect of the emergence of another form of freight transportation, namely, by air; and

Whereas strangulation of existing agencies and a trend toward monopolistic control of transportation would be of great public harm, as well as harm to the independent trucking industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., instruct the staff of the association to resist encroachment by any form of transportation upon another and that the association support vigorously any legislation designed to prohibit such an encroachment.

Some Practical Suggestions on How To Protect the Aged and To Help Prevent Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am in-

serting in the RECORD a memorandum I have just submitted to a colleague from Texas regarding the General Welfare Act, H. R. 836, which measure I reintroduced on January 7 of this year and which for almost 7 years has been the leading pension measure of a general character before Congress. This year it is being pressed for enactment by a nonpartisan steering committee of 150 Congressmen—77 Republicans, 71 Democrats, and 2 from the minor parties—who have signed a resolution in support of it. Those signing include every Member of Congress who has ever introduced a general pension measure, so that the bill can truly be said to be the one measure around which all those genuinely interested in doing something to remedy the distress of the aged and to plan constructively and in an intelligent and common-sense manner for the post-war era are rallying. I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition—No. 4—which I have filed for a floor hearing on the measure and to do all they can toward helping to get it enacted in this session of Congress. The time is short. Let us act now and act in unison by backing this one measure in this field which should go through without much opposition and which should have an appeal to every Member of the House from the legislative standpoint, not from the standpoint of playing politics with human misery by seeming to lend assistance to fantastic and impossible proposals which can never become law, no matter how much they are desired by sincere senior citizens who have been carried away by the fervor of the moment but who, if they were advocating something practical and legislatively attainable, would have gotten results long ago instead of pawing the air for a whole decade.

The memorandum, which I am submitting for the information of all sincerely interested in this subject, is as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE GENERAL WELFARE ACT, H. R. 836

H. R. 836 is divided into two parts and may be summarized as follows:

IMMEDIATE BENEFITS TO AGED

1. Increases old-age assistance one-half or 50 percent (top limit $45) by Federal 2 to 1 matching of State funds instead of 1 to 1 and gives funeral benefits up to $120 to those on old-age assistance. States may increase this pension, as California has done—enactment of this bill would make it $60 there—or grant one at an earlier age, as Colorado is doing. In Texas it would mean that those in need over 65 would get $30.45 per month instead of the $20.30 per month the 181,898 on the old-age pension rolls in that State are getting now on an average.

2. Allows earnings of $30 per month to supplement old-age assistance or annuities.

3. Liberalizes means test and takes pauper's stigma out of old-age assistance by preventing surrender of homes or insurance policies in order to become eligible.

POST-WAR BENEFITS

1. Seeks to establish a system of post-war refunds of what would be the equivalent of 1 percent of the 5-percent Victory tax—now being integrated into the income-tax structure—in social security annuities maturing at the age of 65, regardless of retirement. This would tend to popularize the present income-tax levy and would be a sounder policy for the Nation to adopt than even the present War bond drives, since War bonds may be cashed in lump sums when the war is over and this will have a decidedly inflationary effect. If the present taxes on income are retained, or even raised, and the people are assured by law of a refund in reasonabe monthly social-security annuities when they reach the retirement age and the war is over, they will welcome the payments and will seek to lower the income-tax exemptions so that they will all come in on these benefits and be protected against privation and want in old age. The bill proposes that the 1 percent of the present Victory tax, or its equivalent, be placed in the social-security reserve fund and borrowed by the Government to use in the war effort, just as the pay roll tax money is now being borrowed. Annuities are not payable until after the war, and 2 percent of the equivalent of the Victory tax will then be utilized to make this system of old-age annuities permanent.

2. Annuities continue for 4 months after death to provide funeral benefits of not less than $120 for those coming under this contributory system, which will include most of the people of the Nation.

This bill is the result of 7 years of study by a nonpartisan general welfare act steering committee, which now consists of 150 Congressmen, all of whom have signed a resolution in support of the bill. The signatures on this resolution were secured by Arthur L. Johnson, national executive and legislative secretary of the General Welfare Federation of America, who has presented various phases of the bill to the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee on many occasions during the past 7 years, and has modified the present bill to eliminate all legitimate objections raised from any source. I introduced the measure at the request of this steering committee, headed by Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD (Democrat) of California, of which committee I have been a member ever since it was organized nearly 7 years ago.

The strength attained by the measure in Congress is shown by the fact that 4 members of the Ways and Means Committee have signed up for it, as well as 17 members of the Appropriations Committee, 7 members of the Judiciary Committee, and 13 chairmen of important House committees. A discharge petition (No. 4) for a floor hearing on the measure already has around 130 signatures. The measure is not a complicated one that requires extended hearings or much debate. It involves merely a broad question of public policy as to whether the meager aid now being extended to the aged (less than $10 per month in several Southern States, and but $25.48 as a national average for the 2,164,618 now on the rolls), should be increased commensurate with the increased cost of living that has necessitated increases in the salary of Government employees and that caused the House of November 17, by a vote of 353 to 0, to favor an increase in World War veterans' pensions from $40 and $50 per month to $60 per month, also a broad question of public policy as to whether it is not sounder to return the excess purchasing power the Government is now siphoning off through voluntary or compulsory payments by the people through refunds in reasonable social security annuities of from $30 to $85 per month (depending upon the amount of contributions and the number of quarters covered) after the war is over and the person making the payments reaches the age of 65 rather than permitting the entire refund in cash, which will be the case with War bonds, and which may cause a disastrous inflation after the war is over.

Declaration of American Post-War Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

HOLLAND, MICH., *November 18, 1943.*

Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the regular meeting of the board of directors of the Holland Chamber of Commerce, held in the office of the chamber on Friday, November 12, 1943, a copy of "A declaration of American post-war economic policy" was read to the board by the president of the chamber. Whereupon it was moved by Mr. Andreasen, supported by Mayor Geerlings, that the following resolution be sent to Senators VANDENBERG and FERGUSON, and Congressmen JONKMAN and HOFFMAN:

"Whereas the membership of the Holland Chamber of Commerce are essentially so-called small businessmen, closely in touch with the convictions and opinions of common people of this vicinity and the surrounding rural community, and

"Whereas it is the firm belief and understanding of the board of directors of the said Holland chamber of commerce that the proposed declaration of American post-war economic policy represents clearly and definitely the convictions and feelings of the people of this community and vicinity; and

"Whereas the Holland Chamber of Commerce, as an organized medium for the expression of the economic convictions of the people of this vicinity, should at this vital time bring this matter to the attention of our representatives in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States give expression to its policy upon post-war economic matters by the passage of suitable resolution or resolutions incorporating the principles and ideas of the resolution attached hereto, to the end that the profit system of free enterprise, free competition, private initiative, and private financing in every worthy line of industry, trade, and commerce will be maintained."

Very truly yours,

HOLLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
E. P. STEPHAN,
Secretary-Manager.

Attest:

C. L. JALVING, *President.*

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY TO BE SUBMITTED AS A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR ADOPTION BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the war has imposed an obligation and responsibility upon American industry to produce the implements essential for fighting and winning the war for the United States, and in a very large measure to equip our allies throughout the world in order that they may continue as such until complete victory and peace have been achieved; and

Whereas each and every segment of our American economic system has wholeheartedly dedicated itself to fulfill these obligations and responsibilities imposed upon it

by the Federal Government in its conduct of the war; and

Whereas upon the advent of peace every business concern in every line of industry, trade, and commerce must be depended upon to absorb our armed forces into full-time employment and is therefore essential to the maintenance of our peacetime economy; and

Whereas the most important question, next only to the successful conclusion of the war, which is uppermost in the minds of the 7,500,000 small businessmen, operators of the 3,102,374 small businesses throughout this country, and which is causing them grave concern and uncertainty because of the clearly apparent trend of events affecting all business, is the question of the stability of the American system of free enterprise; and

Whereas reconversion from war to civilian production will inevitably bring our entire economic system face to face with the most critical question in all its history, namely: Whether economic state socialism or the free enterprise system shall prevail; and

Whereas the Congress alone has within its powers the authority to reassure the American people that this Nation, conceived as a republic and established under a written Constitution, shall be preserved as such; and

Whereas the morale of the American people will be intensified and exalted in these critical days by the definite assurance on the part of the Congress that the integrity of their God-given form of government, based upon the profit system of free enterprise, free competition, private initiative, and private financing, will be maintained inviolate; the Congress of the United States hereby and hereon gives this assurance without equivocation or reservation to the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States (the Senate concurring herein), That it is the declared American post-war economic policy of the Congress of the United States that the profit system of free enterprise, free competition, private initiative, and private financing in every worthy line of industry, trade, and commerce will be maintained by every means within the authority of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That not later than 1 year after the date of the cessation of hostilities that:

1. Liquidation of all Government financial or other interest or control in war production plants shall have been under way; excepting such plants as may be determined by the Congress to be essential for the further defense of this country.

2. Rules, regulations, and restrictions imposed upon industry by Government bureaus, boards, commissions, etc., which were created solely for war purposes, will be terminated upon the signing of an armistice, and such bureaus, boards, and commissions must also be in course of liquidation within the period of one (1) year after the cessation of hostilities, excepting the agencies as may be determined by the Congress to be essential for the further defense of this country.

3. Government shall not engage either wholly or in part in any form of business, commerce, trade, or industry for which ample private facilities are available, and which normally have been and should be operated under private ownership and management.

4. That the production and flow of commerce shall be fostered by every legitimate means consistent with equality of opportunity for all, and subject only to free, fair, and honest competition as between all elements of business, trade, commerce, finance, industry, public services, and the professions: Be it further

Resolved, That a congressional post-war economic advisory board, consisting of representative small businessmen, be constituted under this resolution whose duties it shall be to see to it, and to report to the Congress, that the provisions of this resolution are faithfully carried out; be it further

Resolved, That the President be, and hereby is, respectfully instructed to communicate this declared American post-war economic policy of the Congress of the United States to the various departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, and committees of the Government for their observance.

(The above is a declaration of independence from post-war regimentation adopted at a conference of American small business organizations, representing 200 organizations in 39 States.)

Letter From a Farm Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of H. R. 3477, a bill to continue Commodity Credit, and in which the matter of subsidies was featured, there continued to be charges that the farmer is responsible for the increased cost of living and inflation. I wish to repeat what I have said several times, that if the farmer—the producer of our important food—would give away free all of the food he produces the cost of living would not be reduced over 20 percent. I have given several examples for that statement so I will not burden you with them again. But it should be said once more that farm prices have little to do with the high cost of living because the cost of living is the sum total of things the consumer buys—the food, the clothing, the electric light bill, transportation, taxes, insurance premiums, and all other things, necessities and luxuries, for which people spend their money.

Radio Station WJAG, which is owned and operated by the Norfolk Daily News at Norfolk, Nebr., has just sent to me an open letter from one of the prominent farm women in my congressional district. I believe this letter reflects the thoughts and ideas of many farmers who are contributing so greatly toward our war effort. I believe every Member of the House should have the advantage of the thoughts contained in this letter and I extend it with my remarks for that purpose:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN KARL STEFAN

PLAINVIEW, NEBR., *November 16, 1943.*

DEAR KARL: We are in Pierce County of your district and wish to take this means to thank you for all you have done for the little people of your district by representing them so well.

We are one family of these little people who are between the frying pan and the fire nowadays. We are farmers—common run-of-the-mill farmers—trying to make an honest living. We sell some hogs, cattle, and poultry each year. Oh, no, not enough to win the war, but it is the millions of the little farmers who help roll up all those millions of hogs, cattle, and poultry that go to market each year. We want a square deal at these markets and right now we aren't getting it. In fact we are coming out of the little end of the horn.

About these roll-backs: To my way of thinking it's robbing Peter to give to Paul, except that the robbery has been made legal. In this case Peter is the farmer who works hard to produce needed products and is barely breaking even. No help is to be had; he goes to bed late at night, gets up when the alarm clock starts dancing around before daylight—too tired to crawl back in bed after he quiets the noisy clock (if it still works). He averages 70 hours a week without half trying.

Some smart guy said a farmer counts his time from the time that he leaves the house. Say, what farmer's chores don't start about a half-minute's walking distance from the house?

Paul in this case is the factory worker who gets a dollar or more an hour and time and a half overtime—anything over 40 hours. Maybe they do have quite a ways to work in some cases. They surely get paid for it. If some emergency like sickness or broken machinery comes up for us, we may or may not find the doctor in or we may or may not be able to get the needed part. And maybe we'll have enough gas without having to resort to the tractor gas for such emergencies. It seems to me that the distance from town should be taken into consideration. When you're several miles from town and can't walk to the grocery store on account of the little kids you have to have more gas. Rationing isn't always fair.

But I got off on a tangent. When you rob Peter to give to Paul the ones who are hurt are the producers of the products whose prices were rolled back. The wages those war workers are getting they can afford to pay the prices now charged and more, too. We are paying more for everything and we aren't getting as much in return proportionately.

We pay 4 cents a pound for tankage in comparison to 2 cents sometime ago. We feed higher-priced corn and grain to them. And in return we get 13 cents a pound now. Where's the profit? That's what we want to know.

In direct connection with this are the price ceilings. Farmers will accept fair price ceilings as soon as everything else has a proportionate ceiling price, including the wages of organized labor.

Our cattle and hogs aren't making us any money. We aren't going to keep many brood sows next year. Nor are we going to feed any cattle out. And we aren't alone. Everyone we have talked to feels that this uncertainty of a fair return for livestock as promised doesn't warrant trust. We've been hoodwinked before and we are just a little "cagey." We are just going to cut production. It will be a quiet strike that will take at least a year to break. Because if there is less breeding stock in the country there just won't be as many hogs and cattle to use to increase production. So some Washington white-collar farmers had better get wise and give farmers a square deal.

Farming isn't any fool's work. It requires special training and skill in several different lines—a farmer has to be veterinary, carpenter, mechanic, and jack-of-all-trades to run his farm. He needs faith in the future and perseverance in all he does. He doesn't work from 9 a. m. to 12, and 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., but from 4 a. m. to 10 and 11 p. m. in rush seasons and even in the wintertime he has to get up about 6 because wintertime is odd-job time unless it storms. In stormy weather we chore all day long.

We don't complain about the work though, like we do about not getting a fair price for our products.

And tell somebody who should know that we need heavy sturdy overalls, not the kind that shrink every time you wash them. And we need heavy shirts, not the cheesecloth kind we have been getting. * * *

Sincerely,

MRS. FOREST SCHREINER,
Plainview, Nebr.

Walter-Logan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, in 1940 the House, by a vote of almost 3 to 1, passed the Walter-Logan bill. This measure was thereafter passed by the Senate, but was vetoed by the President. The purpose of the bill was to regulate the bureaus which now virtually run the country.

This legislation would have given the people the right to be heard before rules and regulations were put into operation. Under its provisions any citizen aggrieved by the action of any bureau or any quasi-judicial tribunal had the right to appeal to the court.

The advent of the war made further progress along the line of control of bureaucracy even more difficult. However, we should constantly remember that we are fighting two wars, one on the foreign fields and one on the home front. The foreign war is progressing very well, but here at home our battle is steadily going against the people. It is no exaggeration to say that representative government has almost ceased to exist. Such a gigantic machine has been built up that it will take the combined efforts of all Americans to save us from the bankruptcy, the dictatorship, and the destruction toward which we are now heading.

For a splendid statement on this subject I include an editorial from the November 11, 1943, issue of the Waterloo Press, published at Waterloo, Iowa:

BLANKET AUTHORITY

Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes our Congress has ever made was to vote blanket authority over most everything to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Just how far this authority goes and the logical conclusion is a matter for some serious thought.

This country is at war. Its people are willing to make any necessary sacrifices for victory. We believe there is a vast difference between necessary expenditures to carry on both the war and the functions of Government and careless, ignorant expenditures of money. Every day we read and hear about someone who has had the nerve to criticize the administration being called traitor, Axis sympathizer, and so on. A little light might do our eyes good. This light may cause some of the New Deal worshipers to think.

Vice President WALLACE says we must save private business and thinks the new deal must do the job. When Hitler took over his neighbors, he called it "protective custody."

About a year ago one of our New Deal Federal agencies built some 300 houses for "war workers" at Arlington, Va., a suburb of Washington. About the same time, the Army started building an airport nearby. The Army then decided it needed another access road to the airport. It ordered the houses moved. These houses were torn down. They cost from $1,000 to $2,000 each to build.

The O. P. A. is spending much money uselessly. It recently released a little pamphlet by the thousands upon thousands. It read: "Our forefathers did without sugar until the thirteenth century, without coal until the fourteenth century; without bread until the fifteenth century; without potatoes until the sixteenth century; without coffee, tea and soap until the seventeenth century; without pudding until the eighteenth century and without gas, matches and electricity until the nineteenth century." We would like to suggest that we did without the O. P. A. until the twentieth century.

When Ralph K. Davies, deputy petroleum administrator, discovered there was a dire shortage of labor for the production of aviation gasoline, a survey showed that 7,500 able-bodied men and women were being used to guard government buildings in Washington. The O. P. A. is considering a poll of the Nation to get the public reaction to its rationing regulations. That would be a waste of manpower, money and time in finding out something everyone already knows.

Our able vice president, under the Constitution, is president of the Senate. He is expected to preside and vote in the event of a tie. For this little job, he receives in regular monthly payments a check to the tune of about $15,000 a year. The first six weeks after Congress convened in September, Mr. WALLACE was absent about 70 percent of the time. Naturally, with another election coming up, Mr. WALLACE apparently sees no reason why the Government money cannot be spent to further continuation of the present regime.

Our States are fast being taken over by the Federal Government in no uncertain terms. We would like to quote a few figures showing the situation:

In the State of Wyoming, which is lightly populated and where 1,100 employees are considered ample to conduct the State's affairs, the United States Government finds it necessary to maintain 6,200 Federal employees.

The State of Pennsylvania, with 44,500 State employees, is being watched over by 215,000 Federal employees. Massachusetts has some 129,000 Federal employees to guard 21,000 State employees. Ohio with 25,000 State employees, is being guarded by 90,000 Federal employees.

These figures represent an accumulative executive power. They show bureaucracy running in high. These bureaucrats certainly were not elected by the people and are not responsible to the people. On the other hand, they flout the will of the people down to the last crossroads. Their power is being extended over the lives of every one of us. A little illustration of what the average American cannot understand unless he is in business:

Last week, the usual several hundred orders were issued. There was one on malted grains. The W. P. B. revoked order M-288 in regard to malted grains and malt syrup, because it was superseded by order No. 66 of the food distribution administration. Then there was one about C. M. P., whatever C. M. P. means. The W. P. B. announced simply that the use of the symbol in connection with the preparation of orders under C. M. P. procedure has been clarified through the issuance of interpretation 14 on C. M. P. regulation 1. To the average American, who is inclined to take the complaints of businessmen as an exaggeration, this is a run-of-the-mill instance of what the businessman has to contend with.

If something isn't done to limit regulations and reduce the tremendous waste of money, these United States will soon be in such a state that no one will ever be able to get it back to normal again.

Subsidies Are Not the Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial on the subject Subsidies Are Not the Cure, from the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 4, 1943.

President Roosevelt's pleas for authorization and extension of the Government subsidy program constituted the chief and most controversial feature of his message to Congress on the Nation's food problem.

The subsidy question is one that ought to be decided on the basis of what is best for the people as a whole without regard to the contentions of special pressure groups, whether pro or con.

The first objective of subsidies paid from the Treasury to producers, processors, or distributors is stated to be the holding down of prices to the consumers. Obviously that is their effect at the time of purchase. The goods cost less at the store since those on the producing end have been compensated for their lower prices. But somebody has to foot the subsidy bill and that somebody is eventually the consumer and taxpayer for whom the Treasury acts merely as disbursing agent.

Subsidies are also advocated as stimulants to production. This is a sounder argument where they actually encourage production of articles required for the war, as in the case of copper. Our farmers are now enjoying the biggest food crops on record. It is further contended that subsidies militate against dangerous inflation, which may seem logical at first glance, since inflation means prices running a race with wages and the latter losing.

But to the extent that they create a volume of new civilian purchasing power, concentrated on a limited supply of goods, which is not the case with a copper subsidy, for instance, subsidies directly invite inflation.

The farm bloc wants to get its higher prices from the market, through elevation of official ceilings, and not from subsidies. Processors want subsidies to compensate for higher costs of materials and wages. Subsidies look good to labor because they lower some prices—until the day of reckoning.

But the only effective way to prevent inflation is to clamp down brakes on farm and industrial prices and wages in accordance with the original program and promise. Subsidies, at best, are merely a temporary expedient for allaying the symptoms. The threatened evil of inflation must be attacked at the root.

Letter From a Chaplain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Maj. Tunis S. Cordill, Jr., formerly pastor in San Dimas, Calif., and now chaplain in the United States Army Air Forces, seemed to me so vital a document as to be worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, under unanimous consent, I am including it herewith with my remarks:

MIDDLE EAST, *August 16, 1943.*

DEAR FOLKS: Yesterday marked the ending of 1 full year in the Middle East for me, for it was on August 16, 1942, that the troop transport landed some of us in this area. We thought it mighty nice to feel the solid earth under foot after a month crossing the dangerous waters. But now a full year has passed into history, and memory, and what a year it has been for me. I've had some of the richest experiences life can offer, and some bitter with the sweet. It's been a hard year any way you look at it. I haven't lost any fingers or toes, have gained some wrinkles and a few gray hairs, have lost some weight, still feel fine, and have earned no medals. I've been out of touch with so many things of real interest and concern to me and feel so far behind the times as far as things in the United States are concerned. A year's a long time to be away, and it's been mighty lonesome without my loved ones near, I tell you what.

I have followed close upon the heels of the victorious British Eighth Army from El Alamein to the Mareth Line, living through the desert with the men who have been keeping 'em flying. Eight long months were given to that desert warfare, with all the difficulties, disappointments, and hardships attendant upon it, as well as the successes and satisfactions of a job well done. Occasionally I have had some of the comforts and conveniences of the city, too, and appreciated them greatly.

I've talked to, played with, and served dozens of men who have given their all for this cause, and with others who may yet pay the supreme price before the final victory is won. I've camped in awful places weeks at a time, putting up with monotonous menus and shortages of water. I've been through the winter's rain, the summer's heat, and have "chewed through sand" along with scores, hundreds even, who have survived the experiences the same as I, hoping to get back into the peaceful, constructive, and happy activities of our home and more normal patterns of living again.

I've flown the skyways in transports and bombers (a total of 73½ hours actual flying time during this twelvemonth), have bounced over rough terrain in convoy trucks, and have hitchhiked between camps, towns, and hospitals to perform any necessary duties for the men. I've talked with individuals about the most sacred things in life, have celebrated anniversaries and holiday occasions with them, and have shared the news from home, news of births, of deaths, news of joys and of sorrows. I've passed the time of day with men on the alert at their gun positions, and have crouched in fox holes while enemy flares and friendly ack-ack lit up the night skies for miles around.

I've sat in conferences and briefings and have bade Godspeed to the men departing on perilous mission flights, thrilled at the excellent formations of bomber and fighters keeping their rendezvous overhead. I've spent many an anxious hour awaiting their return, rejoicing at times, and at others worried and concerned over the missing ones. I've given consolation to the sick and wounded, have buried the dead beside the highway, placing a cross to mark the spot, and have sent messages to newly made widows, children left fatherless, and parents bereft of a son.

I've umpired their games, joined them in singing songs, old and new, have led their serious discussions, shared their entertainment, and directed their devotions. I've read God's Word to thousands, served Holy Communion to hundreds, and read the ceremony which united a man and a woman in the sacred bonds of holy matrimony.

I've tried to maintain an optimistic outlook on life, and a happy attitude, with a strong foundation of Christian faith, sharing these qualities with my many associates. We've kept ever before us the youthful idealism of a better world in which to live, a world made better for everyone in it because of our efforts and sacrifices and service.

I've gotton around the Middle East quite a bit this year, too. For I've traveled over large parts of Egypt, Libya, Palestine, and Syria. I've been sightseeing a lot, and have made my life's pilgrimages to the most sacred places in the Holy Land. I've mingled with people from all parts of the world, and have come into face-to-face contact with many strange manners and customs. I've learned a lot, and have given of my best in service to those with whom I have been associated. I've had the thrills of adventure, new experiences galore, have met disappointments, and have suffered some hardships, to be sure, but can say in all sincerity, it's been a wonderful year. I wouldn't take a million dollars for it, nor give a dime for a dozen more like it. I hope the time is not too far distant for me to get back on the Good Earth again.

Cheerio for now, I hope this finds you all one hundred percent in every way. Keep the home fires burning, and best wishes always.

TUNIS S. CORDILL, Jr.,
Chaplain (Major) Assistant Air Force Chaplain, United States Army Forces in the Middle East.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, we must halt the ever-increasing cost of living. I am voting for this bill, because I firmly believe it will help stop inflation and the high cost of living.

Those who advocate food subsidies and want our "board bill of today put on our tax bill of tomorrow" are asking succeeding generations, including the men and women who are now working for $50 per month, to pay our living costs of today—a question of whether the people are competent to pay our bills or to allow another bureau to tell us how and when to pay.

Statement of Candidacy of John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Ohioans have a high regard for Governor Bricker, believing him to be just the man, in character and ability, needed at the helm of our National Government during these critical times. I believe the Governor's record in office, bringing order out of financial disorder, and placing the State in its strongest financial position in all its history during depression and wartime economics, qualifies him for the Presidency.

I know the Governor in the fullest sense of the word. He is all American. He is the product of an American farm, he was educated in typically American schools, and he is a firm believer in American doctrines. He is a solid citizen, not given to darting off at tangents in the pursuit of enticing rainbows dangled before his eyes by impractical theorists. The Governor knows by experience that there are no short cuts to any goal. He has had to work hard for every dollar, and work hard for the progress he has made in his field of endeavor.

The United States needs the guiding hand of a man who has his feet on the ground, instead of his head in the clouds, whose philosophy is untinged by un-American theories, who has the political courage to tell the American people that only through hard work can they prosper, and who has a wholesome respect for the tax dollars which were earned by the sweat of American labor. I believe Governor Bricker to be such a man, and I am happy that he has decided to exert all his energy in a campaign at bringing to Ohio the honor of having furnished the Nation with another President.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement on the candidacy of Governor Bricker:

Five years ago upon assuming the office of Governor of the State of Ohio I found departments confused and overstaffed, a debt of $40,000,000, and a general lack of confidence in the government of the State. During the past 5 years the government of the State has been reorganized, the deficit has been paid, and a net surplus of approximately $65,000,000 has been accumulated. In addition there is a reserve of $20,000,000 to meet the needs of educational and welfare building. The program for that work is now planned and can be put into effect as soon as essential materials are available.

Throughout these 5 years I have worked unceasingly along with those associated with me to reestablish the government of the State of Ohio in the confidence of its people.

I am very grateful for the many endorsements given me and the suggestions of the press in many sections of the State that I should be a candidate for a fourth term for Governor of Ohio. These approvals of the administration give assurance that good public service is the best party service. I am and

shall ever be grateful to the Republican Party in Ohio and its leadership for granting me six uncontested nominations for State office. Each succeeding election has brought increased majorities. I have tried to repay the obligation by conscientious service. Two years ago upon becoming a candidate for a third term as Governor of this State, I was confident that by the end of this term Allied victory would be assured. I still have that feeling today.

There comes a time in the life of every public official when he must make important decisions regarding his own service. The public interest should be his sole guide in those decisions. It is necessary to the preservation of the institutions of the Republic that a public official relinquish office and authority at the proper time as well as assume it when there is a need for his services. The worship of power and the desire to hold perpetually on to public office on the part of an individual, especially with the tremendous patronage that goes with the executive offices of the country could easily destroy our free Government. The principle is the same applied to the community, to the State, or to the Nation. At the recent Mackinac conference of the leadership of the Republican Party, I said that the next President of the United States should serve one term without thought of reelection and that an amendment should be submitted to the people of this country protecting against too long a tenure in the Presidency.

With these basic convictions and with a deep gratitude to the people of Ohio for the opportunities that I have had to serve them and to have had a constructive part in government during these dangerous days. I want now to make it publicly known that I shall not be a candidate for a fourth term as Governor of Ohio.

The Presidency of the United States is the most exalted office in the world. Grave problems will be presented during the term of the next President. Victory is now assured to the cause of righteousness in the war.

Our Army, Navy, and Air Forces are fighting great battles and winning notable victories and they will continue to final triumph under our proven military leaders. They have under their command the bravest, the strongest, and the best. As a result of our fighting the United States will be in a position of great power and responsibility among the nations of the world. All that power should be exercised with the deepest conviction that we have a great destiny to fulfill in America. We must keep ourselves strong, liberty loving, self-governing, and use that power and influence throughout the world to bring about better international relations and to prevent the deadly destruction of war.

We are a proud people. We need apologize to no nation on earth for our determination to preserve American liberty and individual opportunity against any odds and we will defy any power that attempts to take from us any part of our heritage or weaken our position of leadership. Our purpose always should be to help others to lift their standards but never to lower ours. There must be responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

The New Deal has come to the end of its service to the people of the United States. Confusion and distrust reign throughout the land. We need not alone a change of administration but a change of the philosophy of government held by many New Dealers. The playing of one class of our people against another, the building of pressure groups by government must come to an end. There is a need for impartial and just administration as between all classes, groups, and individuals in our society. The American people must be encouraged to look forward to the day as soon as possible after victory when Government restraint will be relieved, rationing with all its implications will end, business will be encouraged and individual liberty and opportunity restored. When sound government economy is established and our own Nation made self-reliant, we can help other peoples of the world. Pledges should be carefully made and loyally kept. A candidate's word and a party's platform are solemn covenants with the people of the country. They must be kept to restore confidence in our Government at home and faith in us among the nations of the world.

In view of the great needs, confident of the fact that the Republican Party will be called upon to lead our Nation at the next election, I shall be a candidate for President of the United States in the Ohio primaries and before the Republican National Convention.

Independent Nationalism Should Be Our Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to me has been submitted the question: Should the United States maintain a policy of independent nationalism?

In that question, the word "independent" means not subordinate or subject to nor dependent for support upon any other government.

The word "nationalism" means devotion to and advocacy of national interests, national unity and independence.

The question then is: Should the United States maintain a policy which is not dependent upon nor subject to control by other nations; should we maintain a policy of devotion to our national interests, a policy of national unity and independence?

My answer to that question is an emphatic "Yes," for history shows that the nation which is subordinate, which is subject to, or dependent for support upon, another government; whose people are not devoted to, who do not advocate, the national interests, national unity and independence, will perish as a nation.

Just as long as the individual is the master of his thoughts and his actions, he is free and independent and, for himself, in a land of opportunity, can, with due regard to the rights of others, carve his future.

And so it is with nations.

History has demonstrated that the nation whose people fail to give it their wholehearted allegiance, their devotion, and their support, eventually loses its sovereignty, becomes a dependent and a subservient nation.

Our forefathers declared "That these united Colonies are, and of a right ought to be, free and independent States."

They adopted the Constitution, which, while binding the Colonies together to act for the common interest, united them against all foreign foes.

Relying upon the Declaration of Independence, guided by the Constitution, we have reached the pinnacle of individual and national endeavor.

Individual nationalism is the foundation upon which we erected a Nation, a Nation which saved England and France from a defeat in the First World War. The destruction of their national existence would have held back the advancement of civilization for another hundred years.

This same independent nationalism is the keystone in the arch of the support which we gave to Great Britain in the dark days of the present war when her armed forces were thrown back upon the channel and London lay prostrate and at the mercy of Hitler's bombers.

Once again, because of independent nationalism, we were able to go to the rescue of the civilization of the world. Once more we saved England and the British Empire.

We were able to save the British Empire because our people had faith in the United States of America; because we had not dissipated our energies; because we had retained our independence and, by so doing, possessed the resources, the reserve power to turn the tide of battle.

That the turning point in two world wars was brought about by the people of an independent, self-reliant, industrious, liberty-loving Nation—our own—is proof that independent nationalism can make a nation so strong that it cannot only preserve itself but has the reserve power to come to the rescue of world civilization when needed.

It has been devotion to independent nationalism, to self-preservation, to thought of her own interest which has saved England and enabled her to secure our aid when needed.

We have demonstrated here in America that independent nationalism, faith and confidence in our people, in our form of government, and adherence to that form of government has created here in the new world a Nation so powerful that no one has successfully challenged our national sovereignty.

Upon that foundation of independent nationalism we have created a Nation which twice has saved Old World civilization from Old World tyranny and dictatorship.

Independent nationalism having shown its virtue and its strength, it would be foolish to substitute for it any other unproven policy.

A policy of independent nationalism does not mean that we will not aid other nations in their time of need, or that we will not do what can and must be done to insure world peace.

It does mean, however, that we will continue to follow a policy which will guarantee our future strength, our

ability to aid, and that, when we participate in international events, we will, at all times when our interests come in conflict with those of other nations, act first for the best interests of America.

Independent nationalism means nothing more—it can be nothing less—than self-preservation.

The Cooperatives Are Doing Too Good a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, from Spade news letter for November 13, 1943, I have taken the bulk of an article headed "Bitter Fight Ahead for Co-ops," and ask permission for it to be included with my remarks herewith in the RECORD.

There is plenty of evidence that a concerted effort is going to be made to weaken or destroy the cooperatives which have been built up by the American people over a period of years. This attack is centering in part upon the production credit associations and other branches of cooperative agriculture credit associations. It extends beyond that to cooperatives which have never had any connection whatsoever with the Government but are the free creations of the American people.

This drive against cooperatives should be resisted by any earnest Member of Congress who really believes in freedom for the common man in America, for the cooperative has been and will continue to be the one most effective means whereby power of monopoly can be broken:

BITTER FIGHT AHEAD FOR CO-OPS

Best that can be said of the big-scale attack coming on cooperatives is that it may force much needed unity in the co-op ranks.

For it's a major assault that's in the making, and not just another of the innumerable dog fights for which Washington is famous.

It will be more intense, bitter and on a wider front than most co-op leaders have realized until recently. Now, thoroughly alarmed, they are meeting this week in Chicago for a strategy conference. The meeting was called, not by the National Cooperative Council, but by Howard Cowan of the Consumer Cooperative Association, Kansas City. That in itself may be significant, indicating a new fighting coalition.

The far-flung cooperative line includes at least the following: Selling co-ops; consumer co-ops; cooperative credit including Production Credit Associations, Bank for Cooperatives, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, Farm Security Administration; mutual insurance; and rural electrification co-ops.

AN OLD FIGHT

Skirmishing has been going on for years. Last year it got more intense. The Indians took the furthest outpost, Farm Security Administration, scalped many of the defenders, and left the rest huddled in one corner of the fort where they are now under siege.

Last year, too, mutual insurance companies were attacked, and may be again.

Sniping at P. C. A.'s by the American Bankers' Association and country members picked up last year, too, and when R. A. C. C. came on the scene the Indians whooped up an attack in that direction.

The new offensive is being organized and directed by the recently formed Central Coordinating Group, Inc., with headquarters in Chicago and headed by E. Weaver Dobson, president of the Anderson Lumber & Fuel Co., of Minneapolis. The objectives of the opposition are:

HIGHER INTEREST RATES

1. Removal of the tax exemptions granted co-ops for 30 years or more as a part of a fixed congressional policy of exempting from taxation nonprofit organizations. This may raise the question of taxing other nonprofit organizations like labor unions and even churches.

2. End the practice, authorized by Congress, of directing agencies such as Commodity Credit Corporation to favor co-ops in handling Government business.

3. Require the Bank for Cooperatives to pay interest to the Government. The aim is to raise interest rates so high that co-op business would be turned to private banks, who pay little interest on money loaned because most of it comes from depositors.

4. Require all Government capital stock of the Bank for Cooperatives to be returned to the Treasury. Not more than 10 percent of the stock is supplied by borrowers—virtually all coming from the funds inherited from the old Farm Board.

P. C. A. UNDER ATTACK

5. Force the Production Credit Corporation to return its capital stock to the Government. Like other F. C. A. capital stock, this now furnishes revenue for paying overhead, and is used in part for capital stock for local P. C. A.'s. Among other things it would probably force out of business about 200 P. C. A.'s whose business is mostly small loans to small farmers. Margin between money borrowed from intermediate credit banks at 1½ percent and the loan rate and carrying charges is not enough to carry the load, so revenue from Government capital stock is used to make up the difference.

6. Continue the prohibition against F. S. A. loaning money to co-ops or even to clients for memberships in co-ops. This is now effectively curbing co-op development among small farmers.

7. Continue the old fight against R. E. A. co-ops as a part of the utility attack on cheap public power.

BIG FORCES, BIG MONEY

How strong are the attacking forces? Business Week said recently: "Chicago's Morrison Hotel, traditional convention place of the men who run the nation's co-op movement, was the site chosen early this month (September) as the birthplace of a new movement dedicated to fighting the co-op. First organized as the League for the Protection of Private Enterprise, the new bloc is incorporating as the Central Coordinating Group, Inc., with headquarters in Chicago's Continental Bank Building.

"The organization hopes, eventually, to represent not only grain, lumber, oil, and coal interests but also feed companies, retail clothiers, produce and commission houses, dairy groups, furniture and hardware companies, real-estate agents, meat dealers, and livestock associations."

How much money is in the fight? Co-op leaders don't know, but large sums undoubtedly are being gambled to load the legislative dice.

* * * * *

Summing it up: The fight on co-ops will be well directed and financed. If it succeeds it won't kill the cooperative movement but will slow down its development. It is significant that the attack is launched at this time, in seeming preparation for the postwar period, because cooperation is the way of the future for the small people of America; their reply to the encroachments of monopoly. To cripple or even slow it up now would be tragic, a wrong move at a particularly wrong time.

But out of it may come a closer union of cooperative groups, development of fighting spirit, and a new leadership fit to cope with the present, and the future.

Background of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a sermon delivered by Rev. Dr. Paul Little, rector of All Saints Episcopal Church, San Francisco, delivered at memorial services of the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, for the eighth consecutive year American Legion memorial services have been conducted by Rev. Dr. Paul Little, rector of All Saints Episcopal Church at that church in San Francisco. These services were held on Sunday, November 7, 1943. Dr. Little is serving his twenty-sixth consecutive year as chaplain of the American Legion in San Francisco, and is known and loved by all veteran groups throughout the State of California.

This divine service was attended by representatives of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the State, county, and city officials, as well as diplomatic representatives and legionnaires from the various posts of the city and county of San Francisco.

Dr. Little's sermon follows:

CHRISTIAN BATTLE BANNERS

"In the name of our God we will set up our banners." Psalm XX: 5.

BACKGROUND OF THIS REPUBLIC

We believe that this Republic is a child of Providence. The beginnings of this Nation reach far back of the year 1776. Indeed, the American Republic did not have its origin by the firing of the guns at Concord, Lexington, or at Yorktown. Nor did it begin with the signatures which were appended to the Declaration of Independence, for that Declaration was only the expression of ideas well established in the purposes of the age. The Revolution was not the origin of this land; it was only the declaration of its national consciousness. Back of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were the ideas and ideals which were already implanted on the Virginia seaboard in 1607, when the first colony was established at Jamestown and on the bleak New England shores 13 years later, when the Mayflower anchored at the spot which we now revere as Plymouth Harbor, and landed 120 men and women, to whose courage, imperishable love of liberty, and Christian faith we owe, under God, the glorious principles which have made this Republic foremost among the Nations of the world. The Christian ideals

which these sturdy men brought with them were the seed out of which the American Republic has grown.

Let us lift high the ancient banner—justice, freedom, and democracy—and furl it in this twentieth century breeze for the benefit of the oncoming generations.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

A study of the personnel of those 56 signers is very enlightening. They were not soldiers of fortune, happy-go-lucky, devil-may-care fellows. Indeed, they were the elite of the Colonies.

Twenty-seven were college graduates in a day when colleges were rare. Others, not college graduates, were equal in many instances to college professors. Benjamin Franklin, whose schooling in all amounted to 11 months, was respected at home and abroad as a statesman, scientist, and author.

Forty-eight were born in the United States, 8 abroad. Thirty-three had traveled more or less extensively abroad. Four were rich. Carroll, Hancock, Franklin, and Morris possessed large holdings. They risked their fortunes when they signed that famous document. Thirteen were planters, 8 merchants, 24 lawyers, 5 doctors, 1 was a preacher, and 8 were preacher's sons: Witherspoon, Taylor, Ross, Chase, Williams, Lewis, Hancock, and Tom Paine.

Franklin was the oldest, being 71; Rutledge the youngest at 27.

Every one of the 56 who proudly appended their names to the Declaration of Independence was a loyal churchman.

Similarly, there were 39 signers of the Constitution and again every one was an ardent churchman.

NATIONAL GREATNESS

Today, there is a false and foolish assumption prevalent in all the world that the strength and greatness of a nation can be built on the basis of mere material values. The history of the nations proves that the greatness and solidarity of a country does not lie in material things. Alliance with material forces has everywhere and always been a covenant with corruption and death.

One of our truly great Presidents, the late and lamented Woodrow Wilson, once said, "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

Not in commercial strength, nor in physical forces, nor in diplomatic shrewdness lies the strength of nations. The permanency and real strength of a nation lies in its faith in God and the character of its people. Today, more than ever before, we need to put the accent upon the spiritual values and man's dignity and worth to civilization. The real monument to our beloved country must be a land in which righteousness and justice and equal opportunity are the cornerstones, and where God is recognized as the alpha and omega of life. To such a monument every one of us can contribute something of his life and influence.

Recently, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, is quoted by Dr. William L. Stidger as saying:

"I don't give a hoot for a man's religion either in war or peace if it does not set him on fire with a passion to do and die for Christ."

GREAT MEN PERPETUATE THEIR COUNTRY

The ancient peoples of the world would soon be forgotten if they had not produced some great men. The average person does not think of countries such as Greece as the home of multitudes of people engaged in various occupations in an effort to earn livelihood, a people who fought many political battles, industrial and national wars. But he thinks of Greece as the land of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Pericles. We think of a foreign country as the home of great men.

What does the average foreigner know about this country? He probably never thinks of us as a great nation made up of 48 States, covering a tremendous territory with a population of about 135,000,000 people, with great industrial centers, our great waterways, thousands of miles of railways and concrete highways.

The average foreigner thinks of America as the home of few men like Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and the two Roosevelts. The country that cannot boast of giving to the world great men has little to attract the international seekers of truth for great men not only introduce their countries and then fade away, but they perpetuate the land that gave them birth.

The path of greatness is not one of ease or accident, it is a path of effort and sacrifice. The great men are the sturdy oaks of the human forest who have been shaken by the winds of adversity and who have survived the blizzards of life. The greatest teacher of all time has well said, "He who would save his life must lose it."

TWELVE GREATEST

Soon after World War No. 1 thousands of children of grammar-school age from 30 countries participated in a voting to choose the 12 greatest characters in history. We looked up the birthplaces of these great personalities. Being the speaker of the day at a service club, we passed around a list containing the 12 villages, towns, and cities, requesting them to write the names of those great characters. Not one in that large group guessed more than 50 percent correct. Here is the list:

Athens, Greece, Socrates; Genoa, Italy, Columbus; Florence, Italy, Florence Nightingale; Dole, France, Pasteur; Domremy, France, Joan of Arc; Mainz, Germany, Gutenberg; Wylam, England, Stephenson; Blantyre, Scotland, Livingstone; Bridges Creek, Va., Washington; Staunton, Va., Wilson; Hodgenville, Ky., Lincoln; Boston, Mass., Franklin.

Possibly many of our readers never heard of some of the birthplaces mentioned. Indeed, what does it matter where one is born? It is not the place that makes one renown but rather great personalities give fame to the place. The only true measure of any locality is the quality of the manhood which it produces. It is the men of character, the servants of mankind, the true lovers of humanity which justify the existence of a town, community, or nation.

Over 1,900 years ago a man named Paul languished in a dark prison cell in Rome, while a man named Nero sat on the throne. Today parents proudly name their sons Paul while they call their dogs Nero (with apologies to the lowly canines). So strangely does time right an ancient wrong.

GIVE US MEN

Mere wealth and legislation will not save a nation from decay. Today, America needs her sons to die for her in this terrible warfare. Tomorrow, when the victory is won America will need them just as sorely to live heroically for her. In every rank and order the call is for men and women with sacrificial spirit; men whom neither power nor riches can spoil. The challenging poem of the Bishop of Exeter, England, has not lost its force today:

"Give us men,
Men from every rank;
Fresh and free and frank,
Men of thought and reading,
Men of light and leading,
Men of loyal breeding.
The nation's welfare speeding;
Men of faith and not of fiction,
Men of lofty aim in action,
Give us men; I say again,
Give us men.

"Give us men,
Strong and stalwart ones,
Men whom highest hope inspires,
Men whom purest honor fires,
Men who trample self beneath them,
Men who make their country wreathe them
As her noble sons
Worthy of her sires;
Men who never shame their mothers,
Men who never fail their brothers;
True, however false are others,
Give us men, I say again,
Give us men.

"Give us men,
Men who when the tempest gathers
Grasp the standard of their fathers,
In the thickest fight;
Men who strike for home and altar,
Let the coward cringe and falter,
God defend the right!
True as truth; the lorn and lonely
Tender as the brave are only;
Men who tread where saints have trod,
Men for country, home and God,
Give us men, I say again,
Give us men."

Dr. Frank Gunsaulus, the late president of Armour Institute, Chicago, once defined a Christian statesman as "A man who has discovered which way the Almighty God is going and then tries to get things out of His road."

Today, surely the United Nations were never so certain as they are now which way the Almighty God is going. It is toward the goal of freedom, equality, justice, and the right to worship. Let us clear the debris of Nazi-ism, Fascism, and Hirohitoism out of His road so that "lights may go on again over the world."

GOOD WILL

Death and destruction is being meted out today on a more colossal scale than ever before in the history of mankind. Intrigue, hatred and cruelty is rampant on every hand. But thank God, wherever and whenever mutual good will is practiced, there is peace and plenty. On December 24 we celebrate the one hundred and twenty-ninth year of peace between the United States and Canada. In all the long line of 4,000 miles of boundary there is not a single cannon pointing toward each other. The reason is obvious. We have mutual good will toward each other which does away with intrigue, armaments, bombing planes, etc. These two great nations have the same common ideals of justice, freedom, love of religion, and that of human values.

Materialism and godlessness have miserably failed. The Master of mankind has said, "Peace I give up to you," and as His humble followers let us carry forward His banner to the oncoming generations.

"The kingdoms of the world go by
In purple and in gold,
They rise, they flourish, and they die
And all their tale is told.
One kingdom is only divine,
Its banners triumph still,
Its King—a Servant
And its sign—a gibbet on a hill!"

The Late Honorable Henry B. Steagall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

REPRESENTATIVE STEAGALL

In life's ever changing drama,
Strong in body, mind, and heart,
From the State of Alabama
Came a man to play his part,
At a time of perplexation,
When the great stage of the Nation
Was set for the whole duration,
Let the end be near or far
Of the other great World War.

Back when HENRY BASCOMB STEAGALL
Entered Congress no one thought
That he, watchful as an eagle,
Would attain the heights he sought—
For he longed to win the power
Of a statesman that would tower
High, when came the crucial hour,
And be leader in the fight
For his country and the right.

Three score years and ten had scattered
Silver threads among the gold,
But with him it little mattered,
For we all are growing old.
HENRY B. STEAGALL'S ambitions
Were to fulfill all conditions
Of this life's God-purposed missions,
So that, when the end should come,
He'd be welcomed safely home.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Excerpts From Address of Col. Edgar S. Gorrell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following excerpts from an address delivered by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America, at the First National Clinic of Domestic Aviation Planning in Oklahoma City on November 11, 1943:

The airplane will not automatically work for the good and to the best interest of all; it will take human effort, understanding, and planning.

Even now, before the war ends, we had best have clearly in mind the objectives toward which we should work, and insofar as legislation is necessary in order to accomplish those objectives the legislation should be enacted now, in order that there may be the least possible delay and confusion in going forward with the development of this industry after the war.

There is no doubt but that the industry's development can be made one of the means for cushioning against the shocks of postwar readjustment, for providing private employment, for opening up new lines of human endeavor.

Unless some planning is done now, we will find that at the war's end we are not ready, and will have to depend upon improvisation instead of a program.

The first matter is "freedom of the air" in our domestic civil aviation. * * * That is, whether, within the area of the Federal Union, there shall be real freedom of the air, without the crippling restrictions of interstate trade barriers.

Recently, * * * there has been a growing indication—not so much from the very splendid State aeronautical commissions as from other sources—which warns that the situation may be sharply changed within the next few years through the elaboration, under the authority of some of the States, of complex sets of State regulations which in some cases would affect a portion of civil aviation and in other cases might affect all branches of civil aviation.

Obviously if there were projected into the air a situation even midly reflecting the situation on our motor highways, freedom of the air for domestic civil aviation would be destroyed.

The only fully effective means for assuring domestic freedom of the air is through congressional action.

In the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) now pending before the House of Representatives this very important problem is dealt with in a manner which would seem to be eminently satisfactory.

In substance what the Lea bill * * * does is simply to guarantee a privilege which should be the birthright of every American flyer, the privilege to fly from one State to another without the risk of falling into some legal trap such as so often confronts the operator of an automobile or a truck on the highways in the course of an interstate journey.

The enactment of the Lea bill, providing thus for domestic freedom of the air, surely should assume a high place on any program for the future development of American civil aviation.

However, the Lea bill does not contemplate that the States are never to play a part. It simply provides that Congress is to be a kind of umpire through which duplication, waste, and conflict can be avoided.

A next essential point in any program for America's civil aviation is that of a sound, long-range airport-development program.

One of the important provisions of the Lea bill is a very specific section calling for an airport-development program which will include as well the necessary development of other air navigation facilities, designed for all branches of civil aviation and taking appropriate account for the needs of the national defense.

A further significant feature of this provision of the bill is the specific mandate that the program be formulated after consultation with the appropriate representatives of the various States, which would, of course, include the State aeronautical agencies as well as the municipalities.

No invasion of the rights of the States to administer and to operate airports is involved.

Nor is there anything proposed which in any way curb any individual State, or, for that matter, any individual municipality from going forward on any basis which might appear to it appropriate.

A further item in a sound program for American civil aviation, which intimately affects every branch of civil aviation, is that of airport zoning.

The Lea bill takes a first step in that it provides for cooperative development of appropriate zoning standards to be worked out by the Federal, State, and municipal authorities. It also makes available certain machinery for the enforcement of zoning in the event the local authorities desire to avail themselves of it.

But beyond the Lea bill, intelligent solution of this vital problem will require the closest cooperation among all groups in civil aviation, rallying behind the leadership of the State and local officials who, in the last analysis, have the heavy responsibility for taking the necessary action.

Another outstanding item without which any program for America's civil aviation would be incomplete is that of the need for concentrated development of aircraft engines and of fuels furnishing motive power.

From the standpoint of every branch of civil aviation, engine, and fuel research is of even more pressing importance than is the research needed to perfect dreams about the helicopter.

It would be no inconsiderable accomplishment if this domestic civil aviation clinic could contribute toward introducing a note of realism into some of the almost hysterical discussion which we now hear on every side, and point out the urgent need for still more concentrated research upon engine and fuel development on the part of the agencies of government concerned, the manufacturers and the fuel producers, those in commercial aviation, and all others who are and will be so vitally affected by this problem.

No program for America's civil aviation would be complete without a ringing declaration of independence of civil aviation from domination by surface carriers.

Such independence is provided for in existing law.

It would be reaffirmed in the Lea bill.

It is in accordance with the traditional transportation policy followed by Congress with respect to other forms of transportation.

So far as a Nation-wide coordinated service is concerned, that can be provided for under existing law.

Our existing air-line service has developed on a well coordinated basis, and as new air lines enter the field and existing air lines expand, there is no question but that the essential coordination of service will be maintained.

To provide a Nation-wide coordinated service it is not necessary that we break down the time-tested and traditional policies which prevent one form of transportation from dominating and controlling another.

Let the declaration of independence for civil aviation be reaffirmed—and not repealed.

Use of Subsidies for the Control of Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In your request to me of yesterday you asked me for two statements. First, what would be the effect on the cost of living if section 3 of H. R. 3477 is retained? Second, if this bill is passed in its present form at what level could a new price and wage line be established and held?

You stated that you would like an expression of my own judgment on these two questions and the judgment of the other businessmen who have recently come to Washington to help us in the reorganization of the O. P. A. and the administration of the price control and rationing programs.

As a background for my remarks I might explain that when I first began to study the problems of price control a year or two ago, I had a deep-seated prejudice against the use of subsidies, even to control living costs. It was my initial hope that a system of limited price increases would be adequate to keep inflation within close bounds.

From a close association with the practical problems of price control in Connecticut, before joining the national office of the O. P. A. last August, I was forced to reverse my earlier

thinking. The thinking of the businessmen whom I have brought in to help me during the last 3 months has followed this same evolution.

I think we may say quite objectively that we are practical-minded men whose judgment is affected primarily by practical considerations. It is the practical aspects of price control that have brought us to accept the use of subsidies as a necessary part of any price stabilization program. Let me explain the reason for this change in point of view.

From our own concentrated experience in the day-to-day problems of price control we are today only too well aware that, regardless of what theorists may say, it is impossible to control all production costs during wartime.

For instance, in order to meet their huge responsibilities, our farmers are sometimes forced to till inefficient land and to employ inefficient help. Worn machinery, which in peacetime would be discarded, must be retained in wartime in order to meet our huge production needs. In other words, there are certain increases in costs which in an expanding wartime economy cannot be ignored without serious danger to the production of necessary materials needed for the winning of the war and the meeting of our civilian requirements.

Again, based on practical experience, it has become clear to all of us here who are faced with problems of administering a price-control program, that if an increase in cost of a single product is met by raising the price, we will often increase the cost of producing other products and thereby create new pressures for a string of new price increases. To avoid this snowballing of price increases we must avoid, wherever possible, the need for increasing the first price. There are just two ways to prevent this first increase. One way is to let a squeeze develop on the producer or distributor, or both. This must impair production, or, in too many cases, depress distributors' margins to inequitable levels. The other way is to use subsidies, carefully and in limited amounts, to offset the initial cost increase.

It is, of course, impossible to apply a rigid "hold the line" policy to all items in our economy. For that reason the use of subsidies is contemplated only on items which are essential to our cost of living and which, if increased in price, would have a pyramiding effect upon other products and services which all of us require to carry on our normal lives.

If the use of subsidies for the control of the price of living is abandoned on December 31, the following increases in retail prices will result:

Product:	*Price increase (cents)*
Beef round steak, pound	5.2
Rib roast, pound	4.6
Chuck roast, pound	3.5
Hamburger, pound	3.8
Veal cutlet, pound	6.0
Pork chops, pound	4.6
Sliced bacon, pound	5.2
Sliced ham, pound	6.5
Whole ham, pound	4.5
Salt pork, pound	2.8
Leg of lamb, pound	1.7
Lamb rib chops, pound	3.2
Other meats, pound	2.0 to 6.0
Butter, pound	9.9
Cheese, pound	7.8
Milk, quart	1.0
Dried prunes, pound	3.2
Canned vegetables, No. 2 can	1.4
Sugar, pound	1.0
Dry edible beans, pound	1.0

If the increases in the cost of living could be limited to this list of food items, the result would be a 7-percent increase in the household cost of food, as shown in the monthly cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. However, as you know, the Stabilization Act also extends to wage rates, and, indeed, ties wage rates and the cost of living together. The men who have the responsibility for stabilizing wages have publicly stated that unless the cost of living is maintained at present levels or lower, the Little Steel formula must be modified.

The wage increases which would result from a breach of the Little Steel formula would add to the businessman's costs in all parts of the country. And any increase in the cost of doing business would in many industries call for further increases in wholesale and retail prices.

There is a third result of breaking the present price line which, while difficult to evaluate in degree, is, in our opinion, extremely serious, and that is the psychological effect on thousands of businessmen as they see certain prices start to rise in other fields.

At present we receive several hundred requests for price increases each week. Once our present price levels are broken, these pressures from a purely administrative viewpoint will become increasingly hard to deny. It indeed is impossible for us who must deal with the practical problems of price-control administration to exaggerate the pressures for higher prices which will be set loose.

Answering your first question, I have in a sense answered your second, "At what point or line can prices be stabilized once the present line is broken?" In effect, I have already stated that there can be no second line. There can be no second line, because, without subsidies, we will be deprived of the one tool which can choke off continuing pressures. Unless these are choked off, they will break through any line wherever we may attempt to establish it.

Lacking subsidies we will strive, nevertheless, in every way to limit the increase of the cost of living, but our policy must necessarily be one of consistent retreat. The rapidity of our retreat will depend on many factors, some economic and others psychological and, for the most part, beyond our direct control.

In closing I might point out that according to the Department of Labor, the cost of living today stands at the approximate levels of last April when the present hold-the-line program was put into effect.

It is our opinion that with a relatively limited subsidy budget over and above our present expenditures and with the continued stabilization of present hourly wage rates, we can continue to hold the present line of retail prices for some time to come.

If there is any other further information that you would like to have, I would be only too glad to provide it.

Yours very truly,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Hon. James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of sincere regret to us that our friend Jim McGranery saw fit to leave the precincts of this body, for greater usefulness as Assistant Attorney General.

All of us who had the pleasure of serving with him know his wonderful personality, his splendid sense of justice, and his fine devotion to duty.

Jim has been a Member of the congressional family for almost a decade, which although it does not qualify him as a veteran, and has during the years that he was with us, become so generally liked and admired that it seems as though his service has been much longer than it actually was.

He was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, which is the key committee of this House, and as such he had to have his pulse on the entire subject of our legislation, particularly tax legislation, which is of such extreme importance at the present time. I am sure that the committee will miss his presence, particularly on subcommittees dealing with the many details of tax legislation which called for a man of Jim's qualities and background.

He is a lawyer of rare ability, and I am sure that he will prove as strong a pillar in the edifice of the Department of Justice as he was to our colleagues in this House.

Along with his many other friends and colleagues, I wish him success in his new position as Assistant Attorney General.

The Kefauver Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of November 22, 1943.

REPORTING TO CONGRESS

KEFAUVER PLAN

(By Ernest Lindley)

Secretary Hull's report to Congress on the Moscow Conference has been generally applauded by Washington observers as a wholesome innovation. It was an innovation in only one respect: that a member of the Cabinet reported in person to Congress as a whole.

Mr. Hull said nothing that he could not have said in a statement transmitted in writing. He was not questioned—although his statement anticipated some of the most important questions which might have been asked. He said less, perhaps, than he might have said at an executive session of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations or of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, or in informal conference with the chairmen and ranking members of these committees or with the leaders of the two Houses.

Direct personal contacts between department heads and Congress are not an innovation; they are the common practice. Indeed, the practice is so common that the heads of some agencies have to spend a disproportionate amount of their time appearing before congressional committees. Some of these appearances are at open sessions, some behind closed doors. At these meetings department heads or their deputies are often submitted to exhaustive questioning. What they have not had is the opportunity to appear in person before Congress as a whole.

The committee encourages, if it does not require, specialization. Under the committee system, each Member of Congress tends

to become rather minutely informed about a few matters, while few acquire the information necessary to make sound judgments on a wide range of public policies. The exceptional Senator or Representative can overcome this handicap, especially if he does not permit himself to become tied down by the performance of a multitude of petty favors for his constituents. But time and energy impose limits. The average Representative is not well informed about many large public questions. In lesser degree, the average Member of the Senate also tends to be a specialist. This is a fundamental respect in which the ordinary member of our national legislature differs from the ordinary member of the British Parliament who hears the reports of all the ministers and has the opportunity to question them.

This is the defect which Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, proposes to remedy in part by an amendment to the rules of the House. Under the Kefauver plan, at least once every 2 weeks but not more than once a week, heads of departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear before the House to answer written and oral questions. The Committee on Rules would determine the date and the length (not to exceed 2 hours) of question period, and allot the time to each department or agency head to be questioned. The written questions would be reviewed by the appropriate committees of Congress before being transmitted to the department or agency heads. But the second half of each question period would be reserved for oral questions by Members of the House.

This is not the first time that some such arrangement has been proposed. In earlier years one of the obstacles—perhaps the chief one—was the attitude of some of the committee chairmen. They are often jealous of their prerogatives and influence. If the House as a whole were better informed, it might rely less on the recommendations dished up by its committees.

Mr. KEFAUVER seeks to overcome this obstacle by filtering the written questions through the committees. This probably is essential also to orderly and effective questioning. Questions can be consolidated and phrased to go to the heart of the problem. Picayune questions can be sifted out.

The House cannot compel any department or agency head to appear before it for questioning. It would not need to. The invitations certainly would not be declined. As in the House of Commons, the department or agency head could decline to answer a question and give his reasons.

The Kefauver plan is not a cure for the deficiencies of Congress. If adopted and practiced with good judgment, however, it should help to educate both the Members of Congress and the members of the executive branch who are questioned. It is a constructive idea. Surely no harm could come from giving it a thorough trial.

The Late Honorable J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I heard with profound shock and the deepest grief of the tragic death of our colleague, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER. To me his untimely end is an irreparable personal loss. During my 4 years of service in this body, it was my privilege to enjoy a helpful and intimate friendship with him.

As a Member of this body, he lived up to its highest and best traditions. To the performance of his duties he brought the mature wisdom of an understanding heart, a mind enriched with a knowledge of government and a full rounded experience in legislative procedure. He was passionately devoted to the preservation of constitutional government and was jealous of the integrity and prerogatives of the Congress.

He was a patriot. Devotion to what he conceived to be the highest interest of his country was the pole star by which he always charted his course. He was an able and learned lawyer, a fearless and accomplished legislator. He was especially effective in debate and gloried in the clash of intellect upon intellect. In debate he was at his best. Keen, incisive, resourceful, he could give it as well as take it. Those who measured lances with him on the floor of this House have all testified that he was a foeman worthy of any man's steel.

He was devoted to his family. He loved his home. Many, many times he has spoken to me in the most reverent and endearing terms of his home life. He was wrapped up in his children. I shall never forget his pride in the graduation of his daughter as a lawyer and her admission to the bar. His son was always uppermost in his mind. His pride in this fine young man when it was my privilege to meet him on a recent visit to the House was manifest in the bond of affection that bound father and son. Parents live again in their children. They are an "heritage of the Lord." J. WILLIAM DITTER had two sides to his nature—one to face the world with, the other to show the family he so fondly loved. I am glad that I saw this beautiful side of his life.

He was a party man, but no venomed shaft ever left his bow. His blows left no sting. He was loved and respected by both Democrats and Republicans. He never hit below the belt. He was a hard, fair fighter, and all the world loves a man who has the courage of his convictions and is not afraid to fight for them.

It has been my privilege to serve with him for 3 years as a member of the National Republican Congressional Committee. During all that time I never saw him lose his head. He was always firm, fair, loyal, wise, and helpful in all he said and did. In his unselfish work for the Republicans of this House and the Nation, he placed the party under an everlasting debt of gratitude to him.

"He who would have friends must show himself friendly." The selfish, self-centered man makes no friends. He has in his heart no room for them. The measure of a man's soul is in his capacity for friendship. J. WILLIAM DITTER was rich in the qualities of mind and heart that won the confidence, the respect, and the affection of men. He had friends because he gave himself in selfless service to others. To live in hearts we leave behind is not to die. It is, therefore, to the life of our friend that we pay tribute. May we not all join in the sentiment, "Friendship, mysterious cement of the soul, solder of society, and sweetener of life, I owe thee much."

In this hour of sorrow, we adopt the tender tribute of Robert Burns to his friend and benefactor, James, Earl of Glencairn, and apply it to our friend:

Oh, why has worth so short a date?
While villains ripen grey with time!
Must thou, the noble, generous, great,
Fall in bold manhood's hardy prime!
The bridegroom may forget the bride
Was made his wedded wife yestreen;
The monarch may forget the crown
That on his head an hour has been;
The mother may forget the child
That smiles sae sweetly on her knee;
But I'll remember thee, Glencairn,
And a' that thou hast done for me!

A GOOD MAN NEVER DIES

Man is not the pilgrim of a day,
Spawn of the worm or brother of the clay,
Frail as the leaf in Autumn's yellow bower,
Dust in the wind or dew upon the flower.

J. WILLIAM DITTER'S seat is vacant today, but he is not forgotten. For

You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling round it still.
His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

J. WILLIAM DITTER is not dead. He lives in the everlasting records of this House. He lives in the hearts of those who knew and loved him. He lives, let us hope, in that better world where the lives of just men are made perfect.

Ex-King Carol, of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

INDIANA HARBOR, IND., *November 21, 1943.*
Hon. RAY MADDEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been brought to our attention that ex-King Carol of Rumania is planning a broadcast to the American people on Tuesday, November 23. Carol's efforts to gain admittance into this country to date have failed. Now, to circumvent the decision of the Department of State to keep him out of the United States, Carol has made arrangements to address the American people. This effort, obviously, is in direct violation of the spirit of the State Department decision. We are protesting against granting of the Columbia broadcasting facilities to Carol, convinced that Carol's scheduled broadcast will damage the unity of the American people. Moreover, the subjugated Rumanians will view his broadcast as an American endorsement. This would lead the enslaved Rumanians to believe that they have been deceived by the American people, and would not only serve to confuse, but also to bewilder the militant anti-Fascist front headed by Dr.

Iuliu Maniu. Furthermore, granting Carol the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System is tantamount to an endorsement and recognition by the American people and can seriously weaken the Anglo-Soviet-American-Chinese Pact recently concluded at Moscow.

The Roumanian American Alliance for Democracy is entering a complete and absolute protest against the activities of Carol, and is opposed to the granting of permission to Fascist Carol, who is solely responsible for the present plight of Rumania, to broadcast. Your cooperation will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

The Roumanian American Alliance for Democracy, Thomas Costino, Sr., national president; The Roumanian American Alliance for Democracy, East Chicago and Indiana Harbor Branch, John Manta, Jr., president; Three Saints Roumanian Independent Orthodox Church, John Taus, vice president; St. Nicholas Greek Catholic Church, Vasile Matasian, president; United Brotherhood, Victor Ardelean, president; Club Nicolae Iorga, Nick Eva, president; St. Demetros Greek Catholic Church, Julius Cerchizan, president; The Flame Society, Dan Grecu, Jr., president, all of East Chicago, Ind.

The A, B, C of Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article from the Washington Post by Walter Lippmann, under date of November 23, 1943, entitled "The A, B, C of Subsidies":

THE A, B, C OF SUESIDIES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Having read the debate on subsidies, it seems to me that it may not be unuseful in clarifying the real issue to treat the matter as an elementary problem in economic science. The word "subsidy" is one of those words which mean so many different things and arouse so many emotions that they prevent us from thinking clearly and relevantly; the statistics and the procedure of the program are so complicated that it is for all practical purposes as impossible for the layman to master them as it would be for him to go aboard a modern battleship and know how to operate it.

Yet it is essential that we understand the essential principles sufficiently lest we now make an irreparable and dangerous mistake.

The elementary fact which is generally forgotten in the debate is that it costs some producers more to produce than it costs others. This is the paramount fact which we have to fix in our minds in order to understand the real issue in Congress. Unless we do fix this fact in our minds we shall never understand the subsidy issue.

To make the arithmetic as simple as possible, let us suppose that there are in the community three men who can produce a particular gadget. Smith can produce it and sell it for $1, and still make a profit. Brown can produce it and sell it for $2, and make a profit. Jones can produce it for $3, and make a profit. If the community wants all that Smith, Brown, and Jones can produce, what will be the price of the gadget? It will be Jones' price—that is, $3. If the community does not need Jones' production, and can get along with what $1 Smith and $2 Brown can make, what will be the price? It will be Brown's price—that is, $2—and Jones at $3 will not get any business.

Now this being wartime when the community wants all that can be produced, Jones' production is needed. That means that the price will be $3 for Smith and Brown as well as for Jones. Yet, if each of them got what he really needed, Smith would get $1, Brown $2, and Jones $3. The total cost of the whole supply of gadgets would be one plus two plus three dollars; or $6 altogether. But in fact since Jones' $3 price would, unless the Government interfered, become the price for everybody, the total cost of the whole supply will be three plus three plus three dollars—or $9 altogether. In order to get Jones to produce, all the prices have to rise to his high level.

Now, this is where the subsidy comes in. Suppose you say: $2 is the accepted price for this gadget—at $2 we can get Smith's and Brown's product and they will be making a fair profit; now then how can we get Jones' $3 product, which we want, without paying Smith and Brown $3, which is more than they need? We get it by paying Jones $2, and in addition a subsidy payment of $1.

This works out as follows: The community pays Smith $2 and Brown $2 and Jones $2—a total of $6—and the community as taxpayer also pays Jones a subsidy of $1. Thus the whole supply costs $7, whereas if the price were allowed to rise to Jones' level, the whole supply would cost $9.

This is the principle of the particular type of subsidy now under discussion, and the example demonstrates how by paying $1 in subsidy the community makes a net saving of $2 which it would otherwise have to spend.

If this is plain, then we can see clearly what, among those who understand it, is the real issue in Congress. By the payment of the subsidy to Jones, the consuming public gets the gadgets at the lowest feasible cost. But Smith and Brown, who can sell profitably at $2 do not get as big a profit as if the price rose to $3. Smith is denied an extra profit of $2 and Brown is denied an extra profit of $1. As a purely commercial matter, and ignoring all other public considerations, the use of the subsidy not only denies them the extra profit but compels them as taxpayers to pay their share of the cost of the subsidy. Instead of making the extra $3 for themselves, they have as taxpayers to contribute something to Jones' $1 subsidy.

So, as a commercial matter, they fight the subsidy and want the price ceiling lifted.

This is the crux of the whole controversy, and once it is understood, the necessity of using subsidies to stabilize prices in wartime is self-evident. There is no other way of getting Jones' high cost production without raising all other prices to his high cost level. There are different ways of applying subsidies to achieve this end, and it is by no means certain that the administration has selected the best way. But to prohibit such subsidies entirely is to make a rise of prices inevitable if Jones is to be kept producing.

The debate has shown that resentment against the rise of industrial wages is a powerful emotional force in the opposition to these particular subsidies to stabilize the cost of living. But resentment, however, justified, is never a sound basis for legislation. The fact is that while the blow against subsidies is aimed at organized labor, it will really fall upon the unorganized and most helpless members of the community. For organized labor, just because it is organized, will parry the blow by threatening to strike for higher wages to meet the increased cost of living. And Congress, which would not enact universal service, has no other effective means by which it can legislate miners or any other organized group of workers back to work.

But the rise of the cost of living, which cannot be prevented without subsidies, will strike all Government employees on fixed salaries, including Congressmen, all State and municipal employees, all soldiers' dependents on fixed allowances, all veterans and retired officials on pensions, all elderly people living on the income from their savings, all owners of bonds and insurance policies, all the schoolteachers, policemen, firemen, and virtually all the white-collared workers. For they cannot do what organized labor can do: threaten to strike and push up their wages at once.

For these reasons Congress will have to reconsider the matter.

Coalition for Certain Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and a printed editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the well-written and comprehensive suggestion for all those opposed to the New Deal in the election of 1944. The editorial appeared in the Olathe (Kans.) Mirror, whose editor is John Breyfogle. Mr. Breyfogle is one of the most capable men of Kansas, with a long record of leadership in the Republican Party and as a publisher. I am very glad to reprint it here for a wider consideration. Senator BYRD has been suggested by many for such a coalition candidate because of his relentless and effective sharpshooting for economy throughout the last half dozen years of the New Deal:

A HOUSE DIVIDED MUST SURELY FALL—WILL THE REPUBLICANS AND CONSERVATIVE DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO PLAY INTO THE HANDS OF THE NEW DEALERS?

The elections held last week in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky resulted in a victory for the Republican Party. These victories crystallized the sentiment of the new dealers for the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1944. It is generally conceded that he is the one man whom the new dealers can possibly elect. On the other hand, certain leaders in the Republican Party are now demanding that Dewey be drafted as the Republican candidate to oppose Roosevelt, the theory being that the results in New York last week make certain that he as the nominee of the Republican Party for President could carry New York in 1944.

One thing is certain: As a result of last week's election contest, the issue in 1944 can be a clear-cut New Deal and anti-New Deal contest. That being the case, it remains to be seen if the Republicans and anti-New Deal Democrats will continue to divide their forces in their opposition to the New Deal on account of a party label. It has been determined by party leaders, after careful analysis, that 70 percent of the voters of this country are opposed to the New Deal, and that the New Deal coalition constitutes the other 30 percent; yet, regardless of this preponderance of opposition to it, the New Deal is successful at the polls and remains in office for the reason that its opposition is divided against

itself and about 40 percent of the anti-New Deal vote is cast for the New Deal candidates—all because of a party label.

The conservative leaders of both the Republican and Democrat Parties, who claim to be superior in intelligence and judgment to the leaders of the New Deal Party, have, through selfishness or pride, or both, played into the hands of the so-called dreamers and crackpots. Will they do it again? If they are truly in earnest when they say that not only our economic system but our very form of government is in danger of being lost at the hands of the new dealers, then they will not hesitate to form a coalition for the purpose of restoring the control of the Government to the majority, where it belongs. If they fail to do this, certainly their patriotism, as well as their good sense, is open to question.

It will be argued by some Republican leaders that the trend has set in against the new dealers and that the Republican Party can win with a Republican as its candidate for President. This may be true, but it is far from certain. Even if we know it to be true, a coalition would still be of infinitely greater service to our country. In all probability the Republicans will gain control of the lower House of Congress. It is impossible, however for them to gain control of the Senate at the next election. This would mean that the Democrat majority in the Senate would play partisan politics in the hope of discrediting the Republicans and winning the election in 1948. Under a coalition there would be harmonious cooperation between a vast majority of both branches of Congress and the President supported by a coalition cabinet, to the end that a constructive program of rehabilitation might be carried out.

It has been pointed out heretofore in these columns that a coalition is not difficult; in fact, it is easy to form. There is no difference today between the principles of the Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats. If the Republicans will nominate an outstanding, nationally known anti-New Deal Democrat as their candidate, with an assurance that he will appoint a coalition cabinet composed of the ablest men of both parties, the result of the election would not be in doubt. The voters would go to the polls with the issues clear-cut and well-defined. Those persons who are opposed to the New Deal and its philosophies have a right to expect that their leaders, both Republican and Jeffersonian Democrats, will act in this matter with the same unselfish patriotism that we are now asked to give to the war effort. If these leaders fail their constituents in this crisis, they will be charged with placing self-interest above that of their country's welfare, in what they themselves have termed its greatest hour of peril.

The Bureaucrat's Lament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

THE BUREAUCRAT'S LAMENT OR AN OBITUARY TO CONSUMERS SUBSIDIES

Oh, subsidies! dear subsidies!
How kind you've been to me.
By your help we've stayed in office,
One term, two terms, and three.

We've counted on you, oh so much,
To help land us there once more;
But it seems those dumb taxpayers
Are getting a little sore.

So we may be parting company
Since you've fallen into disgrace,
But our crystal-gazin' crackpots
Will dream up something in your place.

So subsidies! dear subsidies!
We bid you fond adieu
Until we meet again in Hades,
Where we're welcome—me and you.

The Silver Dollar in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the press of the Nation has given wide publicity to the decline of the use of the silver dollar in Montana. As an exponent of the use of silver as currency, I would like to insert in the RECORD a resolution passed by Lodge 725 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Kalispell, Mont., the remarks of Leggiero, a columnist of the Kalispell Times, Kalispell, Mont., on November 18, 1943, and a letter to the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., on November 19, 1943, from Uncle Hiram. All of these communications are pertinent to the question of silver as currency:

[From the Kalispell Times of November 18, 1943]

THE SILVER DOLLAR MUST CONTINUE AS CIRCULATING COIN

Following is a copy of the resolution introduced in Elks Lodge No. 725 at a regular meeting November 8, by Past Exalted Ruler James M. Garey, and unanimously adopted.

The committee proposes to send a copy of this resolution to all the Elk lodges in the State and may also include the silver-producing States of Idaho, Colorado, Nevada, and other Rocky Mountain regions where silver mining is carried on, in an effort to prevent the isolation of this precious metal from United States coinage.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the silver dollar has been the basic medium of exchange in Montana since the beginning of its history; and

"Whereas it is one of the cherished traditions of Montana and the West; and

"Whereas the reasons for its proposed withdrawal from circulation seem spurious; and

"Whereas such withdrawal of the silver dollar would destroy confidence in our monetary system and cause the hoarding of coins: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the membership of Kalispell Lodge of B. P. O. Elks 725, in regular session assembled, at Kalispell, Mont., That the withdrawal of the silver dollar from circulation be, and it is hereby, strenuously protested, and that this protest be immediately communicated to the Helena, Mont., branch of the Federal Reserve System, and to the regional office of the Federal Reserve in Minneapolis, Minn.; and be it further

"Resolved, That a militant committee of the lodge be appointed to urge every business, commercial institution and civic organization to present similar protests."

[From the Kalispell Times, November 18, 1943]

SOMETHING OLD AND SOMETHING NEW

SILVER DOLLARS—AHEM

If the Federal Reserve bank has its way the silver dollar, long respected in this part of the United States of America, by the grace of God free and independent, will be retired from circulation in favor of paper money. The official reason is that the women in the subtreasury, or wherever it is, replacing the men gone to war, find it too arduous to wheel them around in the required quantities.

This may be a good reason, but to us it does not seem good enough. We have never known anyone—out here, that is—who felt them too heavy to cart around, nor have we heard anyone complain he had too many of them. In other words, this sounds like specious reasoning, and we don't like it. Long may the silver dollar wave, and by heck, we are going to stand up and fight for it.

[From the Daily Missoulian, Missoula, Mont., November 19, 1943]

LET'S KEEP THE SILVER

Editor, The Missoulian: Quit our silver dollars, eh? The next thing the prospectors will be asked to use cream puffs instead of sourdough bread. We're not surprised at all by the insinuation of the manager of the Helena Reserve Bank that the women employees who are more numerous now, can't wrestle the silver dollars. Phooey! With the ladies doing everything from riveting warships to pitching hay, insinuating that they are too feeble to handle silver dollars! When the girls in two large banks were asked if handling silver dollars was a distressing burden they laughed, thinking the idea a joke. The appeal to our chivalry just doesn't ring, either, for we haven't seen a bank yet that hasn't enough male help to lift the silver dollars if there was anything to the contention that the lady employees are too feeble.

None of the presentation in behalf of abandoning the old cartwheel rings true like the old silver dollar itself does. Having one in your pocket gives you a feeling of stability, a sense of possession. When you're low and happen to have two of them, just clinking them together braces you up wonderfully. Gives you a sense of unbrokenness that no measly, dirty little one dollar bills can produce.

Take a silver dollar and a one dollar bill of equal usage to any good bacteriological laboratory and they will be able to demonstrate 10 times as many germs on the dirty piece of paper as on the silver dollar. Try it.

UNCLE HIRAM.

Magic Fait Accompli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, of November 21, written by Clif Stratton, its Washington correspondent, one of the most comprehensive news-

papermen in Washington. This is a distinct contribution chronologically of the subterfuges we have suffered as a free people for years under the New Deal. It is important to refresh our minds as we put on the armor for our fight against subsidies and the long siege of nearly 12 months ahead of us to rescue constitutional government. All this is secondary to the winning of the war, but in the long run may not be less important:

WHITE HOUSE SAYS, 'TIS DONE, CONGRESS; WHAT NEXT, LITTLE MAN?

(By Clif Stratton)

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Congress and the country are on their way toward learning, sometimes by the hard way, that the Roosevelt administration has become a past master in the use of the "fait accompli"—accomplished fact—strategy in war, in peace, in political strategy.

The destroyer bases deal between the President and Churchill in 1940 was a "fait accompli" when Congress was informed of it by the White House.

The occupation of Iceland was a "fait accompli" when Congress was informed of it by the White House.

The British-American alliance, the so-called Atlantic Charter, was a "fait accompli" when Congress was informed the charter had been signed by the President and the Prime Minister.

The nomination of President Roosevelt for a third term by the Democratic National Convention was a "fait accompli" some time before the convention met in Chicago to go through the formality of drafting him for a third term.

The United States was in World War No. 2 as a "fait accompli" months before Pearl Harbor brought the declaration of war.

Consumer food subsidies are a "fait accompli" while Congress is still debating whether or not consumer food subsidies shall be used by the Government to hold down nominal food prices.

Just as wheat price ceilings below parity, meat price ceilings below the figure prescribed by law through an act of Congress were in each case a 'fait accompli" long before Congress tried to assert its authority in the field of price ceilings on farm commodities and products made from farm commodities.

And the odds are that national socialism will be a "fait accompli" for the United States before the Nation has decided whether or not it wants to change its republican form of government for national socialism.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, charming, debonair, self-assured, smilingly arrogant; friend of the people and protector of the poor; champion of the Forgotten Man and Messiah of Manifest Destiny, is past master of the art of the "fait accompli."

If and when President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin agree on the pattern for the post-war world, that pattern will be presented to the Senate of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the world, as a "fait accompli."

And the Senate of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the nations of the world, presented with the "fait accompli," can then sign on the dotted line—or else.

Almost ever since the Anti-Inflation Act of 1942, enacted in October of that year, was passed, the Congress has been trying to prohibit the use of consumer food subsidies to make the consumers of the United States believe they were getting part of the food they eat for nothing—the Government would pay for it.

The House of Representatives this week is scheduled to pass the latest Steagall bill (to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation) containing a flat and comprehensive prohibition against the use of consumer food subsidies from the Federal Treasury, the Senate is expected to indorse the House action the latter part of this week or next week.

But by the time the law is enacted, vetoed, and comes back for possible congressional action to override the Presidential food veto, the Congress will be presented with so many "fait accompli" in the line of consumer food subsidies, that Congress probably will feel it necessary to accept the "fait accompli" and agree to a compromise that will give the President a free hand and unlimited funds to carry on the consumer food subsidy program.

If the United States were not at war the Congress might rebel effectively against even the fait accompli, and check it to the people to decide in the coming general election of 1944 whether the United States should be governed by laws or by Executive directives.

But the United States is at war The President knows it. The Congress knows. Both the President and the Congress are aware that the people know it.

So the fait accompli has become a powerful weapon in the hands of the President against the Congress—and both the President and the Congress know it.

True, the Congress still has the power over the purse strings to enforce its will against the use of the consumer food subsidies—perhaps. If it does not enact the subsidy ban into law over the Presidential veto, Congress might refuse to appropriate funds to pay the subsidies.

Even if it passed the act over a Presidential veto, however, and the President continues the program, it is doubtful if the Congress, while the Nation is at war, would refuse to appropriate funds to carry out Presidential promises to pay. The President knows this. The Congress suspects it. Hence the continued use of the fait accompli strategy by the White House.

The latest group to meet the fait accompli are the millers.

Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, this week announced a $100,000,000 a year subsidy, payable monthly, to the millers as a flour subsidy.

The millers were up against it. The price of wheat, although it has been held consistently below parity by the O. P. A., still has advanced to the point that the millers cannot buy wheat, grind it into flour, and sell the flour at the established flour ceiling price, except at a loss.

The millers don't want a Government subsidy. But today they are faced with the fait accompli. While the House was debating the subsidy ban, Judge Vinson, acting under orders from the White House, announced the flour subsidy program. The millers can collect the Treasury subsidy, on proper showing that they have ground the wheat into flour, or they can mill flour at a loss—or go out of business.

Manifestly they are not going to go out of business. That would be inconceivable when the armed services and civilians engaged in supporting the war effort need the bread that is made from the flour the millers grind. On a showdown they are not going to operate at a loss, when by filling out the proper forms they can collect enough from the Federal Treasury to continue operating and also make a profit.

The millers have run up against a fait accompli. And most of them know it. The rest probably will when it comes time to put in their first application for the subsidy.

And when Congress faces the Presidential veto of the bill banning the subsidies, Congress will face the fait accompli that the millers, the packers, the dairymen, and large numbers of farmers are getting the subsidy payments. Also that if the subsidy payments should be cut off—granting that Congress might exert its purse string power and refuse to allow money for subsidy payments—then Congress must face the fact that prices of bread, and meats, and dairy products would rise. And the consumers, properly guided by Government propaganda through press and radio and speeches and bulletins, would be told that it is Congress that is raising living costs.

Congress will meet the fait accompli head-on.

What will Congress do?

Administration strategy is based on the supposition that Congress will recognize the fait accompli and act accordingly.

And administration strategy is also based on the not unnatural assumption that next November the voters also will recognize a fait accompli when they see it, and not fly in the face of Providence by butting their heads against the stone wall of a fait accompli.

Radio Broadcast of Rupert Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a radio broadcast of Rupert Hughes as of October 31, 1942:

Next month Thanksgiving Day is to be celebrated, and there is reason enough for it on our war front; but at home—anyway it reminds me of a Thanksgiving Day that found me living in London, where I had a job with the Encyclopaedia Britannica Co. That venerable work had been revived and made enormously popular by an American genius, Horace E. Hooper. Since then it has been brought to America to live.

It occurred to Horace Hooper to gather together all the Americans living in London for a mammoth Thanksgiving dinner. It was quite a rally, and the British cooks made a brave, I might say, a grim effort to provide pumpkin pie. If you have never been exposed to a Piccadilly pumpkin pie, you—well, you haven't missed much.

The Lord Mayor was there in all his glory with a town crier, or auctioneer, or something standing behind his chair and breaking out in ancient oyezes every now and then. Present were also many British bigwigs. There was much pledging of eternal friendship—and that is not hard to do when a bumper of wine goes with every pledge.

Our Ambassador Choate presided and repaid the British compliments in kind. Then, with a sudden and wonderful tenderness, he said something like this:

"We have exchanged all the courtesies with our British friends, and now let's forget them and imagine ourselves just a big family of Americans back home; and let's have a good talk just about us."

This morning I feel in a mood like that, one of warm and family exclusiveness; for they tell me that this broadcast is a comparatively narrowcast, it goes no farther east than the Rocky Mountains. That cuts way down the enormous number of people who don't listen to me. But it still offers to lots of people the opportunity to turn over and go back to sleep, saying, "Thank heaven, I don't have to stay awake for that."

But if anybody should be trapped and listening in, I must beg him or her not to let this go any farther than the Rockies. And if any effete easterners happen to drop in, I must ask them to drop out and leave us alone for a confidential chat.

So, as Ambassador Choate might have said: "Let's gather round the roaring radio and talk about just us."

The first Americans who visited this part of the world came in from the sea long before they got across the inner west and the mountain fence. So there has always been a certain separateness about this region; but it has never interfered with a larger patriotism. He who loves his family best and his home town best and his State best is sure to love his country best. Look at the practice he gets.

The original Colonies from which this vast Nation grew were 13. Here behind the Rockies and along the Pacific there are 13 States, too; if you count Hawaii and Alaska as States as we ought to.

Thirteen seems to be a lucky number for our country and our 13 on this side of the great hogback are doing as well as could be expected, and a little better. We might do still better if it wern't for the long-distance telephone, the telegraph, express train, airplane, and other modern inconveniences which make it too easy for the National Capital to keep an eye and an ear on us.

When it comes to the high honors and the big political plums, Washington, D. C., can't seem to reach this far; but the questionnaires all get here by fast freight.

Now I'm not proposing to start any Civil War or secession movement. We've already been seceded from. But we'll get along.

The immensity of this far western empire is not fully realized. I couldn't find any figures, so I totaled them up all by myself. I doubtless got them all wrong, for there are few things that I am better at being worse at than figures. So I'll give the round numbers.

When I added together the areas of all the 13 western sovereignties I got a grand aggregate of 1,800,000 square miles. Compare it with the area of Germany, which covers a territory of only 225,000 square miles, about an eighth of our domain.

Or take all the territory that Hitler is occupying—temporarily. Omitting that part of Russia in Europe from which he is retiring as fast as he can remove his feet from the flypaper. Let's give him all Italy instead—well, counting in Italy, Germany, Austria, France, Poland, Greece, and the other 10 countries his Gestapo covers, Hitler's empire contains only 1,200,000 square miles to our 1,800,000. In fact, all of Europe without Russia would just about equal our realm.

When it comes to population, the story is different. A great share of our space is taken up by landscape gardening, scenic mountain ranges, cattle ranges, and plain ranges. In Europe the human cattle are so crowded they are always locking horns and being milked by the wrong people. Our total population, counting the war-plant immigrants, amounts to about 14,000,000, considerably less than the population of Hungary, which occupies less than a twentieth of our space.

Our future lies where everybody's future seems to lie—to the west. Our future follows the sun's future, from the east. Even when the Original Thirteen Colonies were aligned along the Atlantic, their real business was waiting for them in the wilderness. As Artemus Ward put it, their future was behind them.

Their back door is our front door. Our occident is what they called the orient. There is no limit to the grandeur of our opportunity. Our situation was unintentionally forecast by the English poetess, Mary E. Coleridge, when with an entirely different purpose she said, or rather sang:

"We were young, we were merry, we were very, very wise;
And the door stood open at our feast;
When there passed us a woman with the West in her eyes
And a man with his back to the East."

Our door is wide open and visitors are always welcome at our feast—at reasonable rates for transients and a discount for regular boarders. As our Governor Langlie, of Washington, wrote in a recent article in Liberty: "A young man should still go West." He might have added that, as in covered wagon and clipper days, he could bring along his young woman. If he is old he should bring along his old roommate and his old rheumatism and any other member of his family he can pry loose. If he is all out of women we can furnish him with his choice either of pippins or of old reliable russets.

We have gigantic agricultural and industrial industries with stupendous prospects of disaster or triumph according to what the Government does to us or lets us do for ourselves. Today I will touch on only one of them—but what a one. Since there are few subjects on which my ignorance is so comprehensive as the aircraft craft, I have asked permission to quote from a powerful address made the other day by Vice President Carl B. Squier, of the Lockheed Co. I wish I could read all of it to you, but there are other radiotors waiting for me to step off this beam.

Mr. Squier begins by referring to President Roosevelt's first apparently impossible demand for 50,000 planes a year at a time when the total output was 5,000. The entire California industry had less than 20,000 employees. Now it has nearly 300,000. In 1939, the national production was valued at $225,000,000. Next year it will be $25,000,000,000. Mr. Squier says that today the aircraft people are being flooded with such questions as "What are you going to do with all your facilities after the war?" "How many of your employees will you be able to maintain in post-war operations?"

But the airplane producers are too busy keeping our forces flying to stop and answer; and furthermore they cannot know the answers till the Government makes up its mind and takes the public into its confidence. The Government is in debt for war contracts with all national industries to the tidy amount of $75,000,000,000. Some of the bureaucrats, "Don't worry; we owe it to ourselves." But, when peace comes, unless these debts are settled quietly and equitably, many industries will go bankrupt—not merely large industries, but as Mr. Squier says, "literally hundreds of thousands of small businesses and subcontractors in every hamlet and village in America."

"This affects the jobs of 20,000,000 people, war workers, and the entire national economy is indirectly dependent on the buying power of these men and women."

As for the Government's policy, Mr. Squier says: "Only uncertainty is certain." He goes on: "Following World War No. 1, when only $7,500,000,000 of incomplete war contracts were involved, it required 3½ years to settle contractors' claims. In this war, with 10 times the amount of contracts involved * * * unless prompt and final settlement is made, the entire economy of the Nation could be wrecked.

"During World War No. 1, profits were relatively unrestricted and industries were able to set aside funds to meet future needs. But today, renegotiation of contracts and high excess profit taxes make the accumulation of adequate post-war reserves a virtual impossibility."

Mr. Squier notes the startling contrast in two experiences of the United States Steel Corporation. In World War No. 1 it did a gross business of less than one billion and was able to set aside for the future two hundred million. In this war it has done nearly $2,000,000,000 gross and has been able to set aside less than twelve million. * * * It doubled its gross business and cut its reserves down to the vanishing point. And so it must face a future far more difficult than after the first World War.

The peace will leave all the national industries with a surplus of goods worth probably $25,000,000,000. Congressman Mancuso said: "When the war is over, we will have enough shoes on hand, if dumped on the world market, to destroy the shoe industry." The same is true of many other industries."

Mr. Squier foresees a general dumping of surplus goods. This would throw out enormous numbers of men and women working on new products. There is the further riddle of what is to be done with the Government's investment of $30,000,000,000 in war plants of all sorts. When these were building, provisions were made for private industry to buy them after the war. But how can private industry do that? What will it use for money?

Many of the plants were located for military expediency with little thought for labor availability, proximity to markets, raw materials, transportation, and other factors vital to private industries.

As Mr. Squier says: "The Government stands today in the position of being industry's biggest consumer; and still holding the threat of becoming its biggest competitor. There is little hope that private industry could long survive competition with the Government."

A vital—it might be a fatal—matter, is the question of reserves. Reserves can come only from profits. And where are the profits? Where are the snows of yesteryear? Where are the snows that never fell at all?

A terrific problem facing those who must arrange the change from wartime to peacetime industry is the purchase of costly tools and machines vitally needed. This will mean an investment of many billions. As Mr. Squier puts its politely:

"In their commendable effort to take the profit out of war, our legislators have unfortunately made it impossible to save up sufficient reserves to provide the tool money for post-war reconversion."

This task will be particularly hard for the aircraft industry. It is very young and in such a state that, in Mr. Squier's words, "Stockholders are in a poorer condition today than they were before the war. What they want to know is that they will not be wiped out after the war as a result of the tremendous contribution their companies have made in achieving victory.

"To deprive industry of its necessary reserves, he says, is as fantastic and improvident as to deprive farmers of the portion of their crop to be used as seed the following year. Reserves are industry's seed money, and to deprive industry of it is to invite industrial famine."

Mr. Squier ends his speech with a noble appeal for free enterprise as our one hope. The Government used to be our agent; it has lately been our employer. It has called the whole Nation out to work for it in the war and the Nation had been glad to sacrifice everything necessary, including its independence—for the time being.

When the magician Houdini was alive, they used to bind him and put him in a box and chuck him in the river. He would escape somehow; but once or twice he nearly didn't. Our dear Government has got industry bound and gagged and nailed inside a barrel, and is sitting on the barrel. Even Houdini could

not get out unless somehow he got the Government off the barrel.

Governor Warren of California foresees a wave of prosperity smothering his State at the end of the war in a rush that will make the gold rush of the Forty-niners look tame. Such a rush will, as it did before, flood the whole West, let us all pray that this may be true; but let us remember that if any of these "gold rushers" find any gold, they must rush it right back to the Government, to put in that nice hole in the ground it is maintaining in Tennessee.

Speaking of holes in the ground it is time for me to crawl into my own—and pull it in after me.

Radio Broadcast of Rupert Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad of the opportunity to have printed in the RECORD the radio broadcast of Rupert Hughes as of October 30, 1943:

It was a glorious day for all of us when our Russian allies finally won back the city of Dniepropetrovsk. It is almost as hard for us to pronounce as it was for them to recapture after their treacherous allies of former days had held it for 2 years and left it a shambles.

For once, our American Communists have rejoiced with the rest of our people. But they are characteristically silent about what they should be bragging about if they were true Americans. It is not only that American-built planes and tanks played a big part in the victory; and that our American people, by saving fats and rationing themselves on butter, have helped to keep the Russians warm. The important thing is that the city of that impregnably unpronounceable name of Dnieprо— and so forthsky owes its glory to America. Everybody knows that it is the seat of a famous dam across the Dnieper River and that its tremendous hydroelectric plant was bringing Russian industry up to date. When the Germans captured the city, the Russians shattered the dam to deny its power to the enemy. They plan, of course, to rebuild it.

Its reconquest and restoration will be a mighty monument to America in the deep of the Ukraine. For the Dnieper Dam was designed and built by American engineers. The master builder was Hugh Lincoln Cooper, who did many colossal works, but owed his greatest fame to his dramatic feat of harnessing the Mississippi River. The dam he built there was in many ways a greater piece of construction than the Panama Canal. This means a great deal to me because I swam in the river as a boy before the dam was built. My parents had moved from Missouri to the little Iowa city of Keokuk, whose name is curiously considered extremely funny. Somehow, people always find comedy in a name that has a "K" in it. We seem to get a kick out of it. In spite of its amusing name, Keokuk is a beautiful little city overlooking one of the noblest views in the world. The Mississippi is more than a mile wide there and used to run over sharp rocks in rapids that had been dammed with an "N" for 50 years before Hugh Cooper dammed the river with a double "M." A great lake replaces the rapids now and they are the scene of one of the greatest power plants on earth. Because of this achievement, the Russians called Hugh Cooper over to harness the mighty Dnieper.

Soon after its terrible struggles with the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution, the Russian leaders were forced to import hundreds of Americans to teach them nearly everything about machinery; how to build it, how to build factories to build it, how to run it, when it was built. In agriculture and many other fields, America was the kindergarten instructor of Russia. We sent them millions of tons of equipment and are still doing just that, now at immense sacrifice to us of treasure and of life.

Only lately, to help them out with transportation problems, we picked up an entire Ford plant, took it apart, and shipped it bodily to Russia, and sent along experts to put the picture puzzle together again and get it going. We are sending them other complete plants for making synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and other war necessities. The totalitarians are going to remake and save the world, yet none of them have ever done anything really important in invention or any other form of mechanical progress. Hitler's people, for all their ingenuity and toil, and their withering contempt for Democracy, could never turn out a cheap automobile that would take you there and bring your back.

Our free enterprise, with no Government aid except the patent laws, created and exploited a thousand things that have changed the face of the world and the life of everybody in it—things like the submarine, the iron battleship, the airplane, the conveyors that made possible the tank, and revolutionary farm machinery; the telegraph, the telephone, the cable, the phonograph, the moving pictures, the electric light—there's no end to the miracles.

It was rather funny to hear Vice President WALLACE the other day preaching the glad evangel that after the war is over, this Government of ours will come to the rescue of American invention and science and save them from being dominated by big corporations—although, in another speech, he said that the corporations which he approves every third Thursday, are 99 percent honest and beneficial. The Government, of course, will not be a big corporation; it will simply be all corporations in one, with a change of name but retaining all the evils and getting rid of the economy, the efficiency, and the competition. The Government will substitute all the glories and benefits of a gigantic new bureaucracy. They will have to start in on the Russian alphabet, however, to give it a name; for our alphabet is completely exhausted.

What a pity it is that our struggling inventors of other days did not have the benefit of questionnaires and priorities and Executive orders and price fixing from Washington, D. C. Thomas Edison began life as a boy selling peanuts on the train before he became a telegraph operator at an obscure station. He might have amounted to something if he had only had a few Utopian professors to bandage him in red tape. Even Henry Ford might have accomplished something if he had been aided by a benevolent despotism deep in the big heart of the District of Columbia. With the help of the bureaucrats, Hugh Cooper might still be working on the Keokuk Dam, and the dear old Dnieper would still be flowing, unvexed, to the Black Sea. But Hugh Cooper was only a Minnesota boy who overcame impossible obstacles and record-breaking floods and finished the dam in good season, under private contract. Just at the finish he ran so short of money that he had to mortgage his house to get the necessary dollars. If we had only had our present conditions he could have gone to Washington for the money and have spent years filling out papers. If he had lived he would be waiting yet.

Our American Communists are silent about the A B C's we taught the Russians. In repayment, they want to teach us what they consider the A B C's of government. Communism is the oldest failure in the world. It was the first form of government, the primeval effort of half-savage men to get along together. It has been tried a thousand times and has never succeeded. A hundred years before the Bolshevik revolution, communism was tried in our country, it was tried over and over again by various groups. They did not have the advantage of bloodshed, exile, and famine, but they always collapsed, as communism has already collapsed again in Russia.

For Stalin has been wise enough to keep inching to the right and slowly infiltrating capitalistic methods of incentive pay, big rewards, emulation, and competition.

Capitalism is an ugly word for a beautiful and fruitful way of life—a life in which the humblest may become and has become the greatest; in which the poorest may become the richest.

From 13 little starving Colonies on the edge of a wilderness our America has grown to its present sublimity. Yet these malcontents, these impudent marplots would have us throw away all its grandeur and its goodliness. Their fantastic visions are not inspired. They are the pink elephants of delirium tremens.

They have been recently finding ammunition for their attacks on various groups of Americans in that bundle of dynamite, the book called Under Cover. If you have not read the book you would never guess, from communistic quotations, that the author tried to pull them out from under cover, too. Let me quote from his concluding pages:

"I have said nothing about Communist subversive elements. In my opinion, Communist propaganda is as undesirable as Nazi propaganda. I tried hard to investigate the Communists, but I failed. The infinite shrewdness of the Communist Party lines never allowed anyone into their ranks without thoroughly investigating him.

"* * * I agree with Rex Stout when he says: 'The political ethics of the American Communists are about as low as anything ever observed in these parts.' "

May I interpolate in parentheses the offside question: Why should such pure-hearted saviors of the world as our pinks make it impossible to get in among them until one has been dipped in the same dye? The author of Under Cover states his own creed as follows:

"I believe in our democratic, capitalist order, and I have written this book as an exposé of those forces which look upon capitalist democracy as the only remaining obstacle to their international authoritarian schemes, and are determined to crush it at any cost."

The author knew the American Communists at the time when they were laughingly burlesquing George Cohan's line "The Yanks Are Coming" into the slogan "The Yanks are not coming." Let me quote from Under Cover again at page 245:

"During the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact, Nazi and Communist Party lines composed a united front to sabotage national defense." He shows how the Communists and the Nazis fought together to prevent the passage of the Conscription Act, to which we owe our military salvation. The author of Under Cover also says: 'The west coast Nazi agent, Hermann Schwinn, adopted in a speech the Communist slogan, The Yanks are not coming'."

And this reminds me of the only time I ever met Hermann Schwinn. He was then an American citizen but was later found guilty of obtaining his papers fraudulently. After his conviction, it took only 3 years

to get him behind bars; I had been invited to address the Los Angeles chapter of the Steuben Society, founded to perpetuate the memory of Baron Steuben, who was of such great aid to Washington as a drillmaster. I was told that the Nazis had taken over the Los Angeles chapter but its officers solemnly vowed that the charge was a libel. So I went to the Deutsches Haus to make my speech. On entering the lobby, I found that I had stepped outside the United States. The walls were lined with portraits of Hitler and copies of Mein Kampf. The people pouring in were giving one another the Nazi salute and exclaiming "Heil Hitler."

I was introduced to Hermann Schwinn, who tried to look like Der Fuehrer, little moustache, drooping forelock and all; and who called himself "Der Fuehrer des Westens."

This made me exceedingly uneasy. I never like to insult my hosts to their faces, especially when they are bigger and more numerous than I am. But I was pretty "regusted." So, when I was led out on the platform and introduced with a flourish, I lost my head as I looked out on an audience made up exclusively of Nazi sympathizers. I launched into a violent vituperation of Hitler and told them that, being now American citizens, they must shudder at the evil forces that had once more taken over their Vaterland. I ridiculed Hitler's so-called Aryan race as an idiotic fairy story that every respectable ethnologist laughed at as impossible. I referred to Hitler's wild threats of war upon democracy and said that of course they would fight him to the death if he came near our shores.

I denounced as especially infamous his heartless persecution of the helpless Jews and, to cap the climax, I told them this historical fact: When Baron Steuben was in this country, during the Revolutionary War, he could not collect his pay as an officer and would literally have starved to death in the streets if the Jew, Haym Salomon, a real American patriot of Polish birth, had not lent to Steuben the money to pay for his meals and his lodgings—which money Steuben never dreamed of repaying Salomon, any more than Hitler ever dreamed of repaying the Jews what he stole from them.

The only thing that saved me from being mobbed was that those wild-eyed American Nazis were suffering from what is called the anesthesia of shock. For once, I held an audience spellbound. They were muscle-bound. In my long life of shame and shamelessness, I have made many speeches; and many of them have fallen flatter than any flounder. But I have never floundered through a speech that fell flatter than that one.

I finished in a blaze of Fourth of July denunciation of Hitler's foul attacks on humanity and on freedom. The applause that followed was overwhelming—in its absence. I was deafened by what Irvin Cobb called thunders of silence. Those Bundist bounders were so gagged with rage that I was enabled to duck out the side door into a dark alley, unscathed. God sent me an instant taxicab, and I got home alive.

The quaint thing about all this, is that while I was telling the Nazis off to their faces, behind their backs and in any publication that would print my stuff, the American Communists, who are now so passionately patriotic, were cooperating with the Hitlerites and joining them in the slogan: "The Yanks Are Not Coming." But now, when I criticize our American Communists who so lately fellow-traveled with the Bundists, they denounce me as a Nazi agent; they demand that I be denied free speech and they have actually written to the F. B. I. to take me up as a German spy.

Aren't they wonderful, aren't they delicious, aren't they everything except American? They demand so much toleration and are so intolerant, the little Red devils!

Good Lord, that big clock in front of me must be a fellow-traveler too; for it has a racing red second hand that is telling me what the American Communists keep telling me: Get Off the Air!

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is true that we must win the war first, but nevertheless, we must not be caught off guard when the war is over by not having thought out suitable plans for the reconversion of industry from wartime to a peacetime basis. I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD a preliminary prospectus on termination of war contracts and adjustments prepared by Paul Engstrum, a well-known consultant on industrial and production engineering, of Washington and Los Angeles:

PRELIMINARY PROSPECTS ON TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS AND ADJUSTMENTS

THE SITUATION AND PROBLEM

This country will face serious economic problems when the war is over. For the war production, over 50 percent of our entire industries and economic resources are now being utilized. When the war supply needs are ended, the peacetime production, must be restored without delay, to bring about an economic stabilization. In planning for this situation, great care will have to be exerted, that every industry and its workers can be assured that there will be no unncessary delays in the return to peacetime production in order to avoid unemployment and the exhaustion of their savings, for subsistance.

Rapid and well-ordered conversion of industry to peacetime production and the fair adjustment of the economic and social problems will depend upon many factors. Government officials are acutely aware of the magnitude and realize that good judgment must be utilized if an economic upheaval is to be averted. The satisfactory manner of handling contract terminations and adjustments will have direct and indirect effect upon industry and its workers alike, and action by Congress and other Federal agencies will be required for the complete solution. The principal aim will be to keep the wheels of industry moving without interruptions, with business as usual, and employment uninterrupted.

The importance of this situation is manifested by the fact that one Government agency has approximately 100,000 prime contractors, who have close to 1,000,000 subcontracts.

Quoted from a release by the War Department, as of August 31, 1943, "the War Department in accomplishing necessary adjustments in the production program has completely or partially canceled 8,520 contracts and had finally settled 6,191 of these. The face value of these 8,520 contracts terminated so far in this war is $5,800,000,000. This is nearly $2,000,000,000 more than the total face amount of the 27,000 terminated contracts in the First World War."

Two great problems of the last war are emphasized—that it is vital to maintain a continuity of production and continuous employment. First, the need for fair and prompt settlement of the contractors' termination settlement proposals; and second, the need for interim financing of the contractors and subcontractors, pending final settlements.

SOLUTION

Contractors must be treated fairly. Practically every Government contract included this article. The Government must pay the contractor the contract price for all completed articles and all actual expenditures and costs incurred on the uncompleted part of the contract or in settling obligations and commitments related to the uncompleted portion, plus an amount for profit on the work in progress proportionate to the work done on it. In addition, the Government agrees to pay the contractor for its approved expenditures after termination in protecting Government property and in making settlement. Furthermore, at the end of the war the Government must terminate under this article instead of termination for any default, unless the default of the contractor has been gross or willful and has caused substantial damage to the Government. Under this article, if the Government terminates the contract, the contractor may be required to discontinue all work and to cancel all existing orders and subcontracts and to transfer to the Government all completed supplies and all work in progress and materials relating to the performance of the contract which are not disposed of or retained by the contractor with the approval of the contracting officers. Except in cases of default, the contractor is, therefore, assured that on termination at the end of the war he will receive his reasonable costs and a fair profit on the work done on the uncompleted part of his contract.

It is recognized that the contractor is interested in a prompt settlement. He needs working capital to put his plant into peacetime production and to give jobs to his employees. Several major obstacles must be overcome. First, the contractor must prepare a complete and comprehensive settlement report. It has been proven that the average contractor has taken from 4 to 6 months to prepare proposals for his contract adjustments. The second is the disposition of materials and equipment. The third problem is clearing subcontractors' settlements and adjustment reports. This is the biggest job under termination, and must be handled with speed, intelligence, and accuracy. For example, in the War Department alone, it is estimated that for each of the approximate 400 major prime contractors there may be 2,000 or more customers and 6,000 subcontractors. When this complex relationship is considered settlement cannot be considered simple under any one system. To surmount these problems and obtain prompt settlement, two things will be required: First, a trained organization; and, second, simple and workable procedures.

The job can be done by negotiation on a businesslike basis between representatives of the Government and the contractors, with the aid of expert consultants.

The Government, at present, is setting up a special division of trained personnel in anticipation for the work load of termination.

The following is quoted from a statement issued by a Government agency:

"Contractors must set up termination and adustment departments in their own organizations. These departments must be manned by men who are fully responsible officers of their company in whom they have confidence, as well as special consultants. This is necessary if we are to avoid fatal waste of time when mass settlements become necessary.

"Finally, industry must itself be prepared to settle the enormous volume of subcontracts which will be terminated in connection with the cancelations of prime contracts. The personnel of their termination departments must get their training in this difficult operation of making termination settlements of subcontracts."

FINANCING

The second great problem of termination is financing the contractors and subcontractors, in order to release their own working capital from frozen war inventories and receivables, and to permit them to return to peacetime business and continue to furnish employment to their workers. Substantial amounts of cash must begin to flow into industry in the shortest possible time after terminations.

Only advance payments and guaranteed loans now give a contractor or subcontractor some protection on termination. Advance payments made for war production do have their maturity extended and become interest free on termination, but since they do not free cash to permit the borrower to go about his normal business, they fail to give adequate relief. Likewise, partial payments on the contractors' settlement proposal for settlement are of only limited value for termination financing. The present reluctance of contracting and procurement officers to make substantial partial payments without exhaustive accounting for fear of personal liability can be corrected by pending legislation. While partial payments may finance the prime contractors with only a few contracts, they are not adequate for contractors with hundreds of small purchase orders from several procurement agencies and from various branches within each agency, or for companies which have contracts, subcontracts, and third, fourth, and fifth tier subcontracts. Eighty percent of the producers of war material fall into this class.

Certain provisions have been made recently by procurement agencies and contracting officers for guarantied V-loans for financing production and for freeing frozen inventories and receivables on terminated contracts. This is not satisfactory since the loans are complicated. The contractor must be constantly alert to the rapidly changing methods of procedure, in order to avoid serious delays in settlements.

To achieve adequate financing of termination settlements several things are required. For instance, first, interest must be allowed on the termination settlements to equalize tive position of the contractors who use private financing rather than Government. For instance, the type of financing must be extremely simple. Third, the method should permit advancing money against inventory, receivable, work in process and the payments to the tier of their subcontractors and suppliers.

Many methods of post-war financing are under consideration, including, "what part the Government will take and what financial assistance it will furnish."

Tribute to James E. Watson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, November 13, the Young Republicans of Indiana sponsored a huge testimonial banquet in Indianapolis, honoring that grand old Hoosier statesman, James E. Watson, former Congressman and floor leader of the Senate, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday anniversary.

During the celebration, the following telegram from the Indiana Republican delegation in Congress was received:

Indiana's Republican delegation sends its affectionate greetings, congratulations, and best wishes to that grand American and elder statesman, James E. Watson. This occasion marking the eightieth year of our beloved fighting majority Senate leader of former times finds us resolved to perpetuate the rigid honesty and sterling Americanism for which he stood. We pledge to espouse without falter the high Republican ideals which fostered honesty, good faith, and progress in our National Government for so many years. Jim, America hopefully expects a resumption of that progress which you led in the United States Senate and we highly resolve to carry on with your example ever before us.

RAYMOND E. WILLIS, CHARLES A. HALLECK, ROBERT A. GRANT, GEORGE W. GILLIE, FOREST A. HARNESS, NOBLE J. JOHNSON, CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, GERALD W. LANDIS, RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, EARL WILSON.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I also include the following tribute to Jim Watson, written by Mark E. Winings, of Elwood, Ind.:

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JAMES E. WATSON

When the artist paints a picture
Of a long and winding lane,
With a tall and handsome figure
Marching to the Hall of Fame;
Or the poet sets to music
And the author makes you thrill
With the life of James E. Watson
In the Town of Old Rushville.

There he dwelt in friendly fashion
Sharing friendships, pride, and love;
In communion with his neighbors
All inspired from above—
Proud and boastful of their honor
For they all were much akin;
But they never used his title—
Everybody—called him Jim.

He was one of those good fellows
That you always want to know,
With a charm and warmth of laughter
That will set the heart aglow—
They still meet in congregations
Though the ranks are growing thin;
All defending their religion
And their politics by Jim.

With a magic voice of wisdom
And the logic of the gods,
He espoused a cause eternal
Regardless of the odds—
He believed in two worlds.
This one—and the next—
And he proved it by the Bible,
From where he took his text.

The State and Nation claims him
But a Hoosier, through and through!
Like Riley and the Mortons,
And the Harrisons we know—
For he helped the wise and foolish,
The sinner and the saint;
And there are some crowns of glory
That no artist dares to paint.

Oh, the story reads like fiction
And it seems to have no end,
For its hard to tell the story
Who was everybody's friend—
On the battlefields or oceans
Where the bugler sounds his taps,
You will hear some soldier whisper—
"Jim was sure a friend of Pap's."

When the future paints this picture
And the angels set the time
There will be a Master Artist,
Who will write and paint divine—
Then with deft and handy fingers
He will write upon the scroll,
The name of James E. Watson,
"A kindly, generous soul."

—*Mark E. Winings.*

The Treasury's New Tax Program and the Homeowner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, there are 30,000,000 people in the United States who depend for their livelihood upon salaries, or pensions, or other more or less fixed annual income. These people are the ones who have been hit the hardest by Federal taxation and by rises in the cost of living in this present war crisis.

There are 500,000 home-owning families in New Jersey. This means that about half of the State's population of 4,160,000 live in homes which they own. The property taxes which these homeowners must pay are comparatively high, because the local governments in our densely populated State are required to maintain a high standard and wide range of public services. Total property taxes levied for all purposes in New Jersey for 1943 equal $250,000,000, and Federal taxes imposed upon New Jersey's taxpayers are expected to reach an amount equal to four times this sum during the present Federal fiscal year.

Nearly all of New Jersey's home owners are Federal income taxpayers. The majority of them, according to reports I have received from New Jersey savings and loan institutions and other authentic sources, live on salaried or other fixed incomes. There is a serious question in the minds of some savings and loan officials in New Jersey whether, if Federal taxes are further increased and if the cost of living continues to rise, many of these people will be able to keep on paying the property taxes and the mortgage payments on the homes they live in.

Some New Jersey real-estate men have begun to wonder what effect this condition may have on the marketability of real estate in the months and years to come.

Consider the following actual cases of white-collar workers whose present income is frozen by Executive Order No. 9328, which fall in the following categories of single with no dependents, married with no dependents, married with one dependent, and married with two dependents.

In the first case, a young man who is single and has an income of $3,100. This man had a net income, after allowable deductions of $2,559.58—this amount is

subject to surtaxes, and after deducting his personal exemption and earned income credit, there is $1,803.52 which is subject to the normal tax rate of 6 percent. In 1942 his tax was $457.73, but if the new rate and proposals are adopted, this same young man would be taxed $829.42, or an increase of 81 percent.

Take the case of a young woman who owns a small home, her income is $2,800 a year. After taking the allowable deductions of interest, taxes, and so forth, her net income subject to surtaxes is $2,241.53, and income subject to normal tax is $1,517.38. Her actual tax for 1942 was $389.68, and under the proposed rates she would have to pay $699.03, or an increase of 79 percent.

Now for the case of a young married couple, both of whom work and who have bought a little home. They have a combined income of $4,600 and in 1942 they filed a joint return. After allowable deductions, their net income subject to surtaxes was $3,830.56 and after personal exemptions and earned-income credit, income subject to normal tax was $2,247.50. Their tax for 1942 was $657.74, but under the Treasury's new rates this young couple would have to pay $1,314.53, a jump of 98 percent.

Another example of a married couple who have no dependents, but where only the husband works, it is as bad. He earns $6,000 a year. His net income subject to surtaxes is $4,862.59, and subject to normal tax is $3,176.23. This man paid $943.09 in 1942, and if the new rates are in effect he would pay $1,780.80, an increase of 89 percent.

Take the case of a salesman who is married and has one child. This man also owns a modest home, pays mortgage interest, taxes, and makes improvements on his house. After taking all allowable deductions his net income subject to tax is $5,157.65. Deducting his personal exemptions and earned income credit, the balance, $3,091.88, is used for computing normal taxes. He paid $1,627.04 in 1942, but he would have to pay $2,895.52, an increase of 78 percent under the new rates.

One more example of a married man with a dependent, in this case an aged, invalided father. After allowable deductions, his income subject to surtaxes was $3,267.31, and subject to normal taxes, $1,390.58. His tax for last year was $508.18, but would be $1,065.60 under the new rates, an increase of 110 percent.

To cite examples in the classification of those families having two dependents, here is a case of a man who earns $4,814.58. He too owns a home and has the attendant expenses. His income subject to surtaxes is $3,526.59 and after taking his personal exemptions and earned income credit, the amount subject to normal tax is $1,273.93. This man's tax was $580.69, but under the new proposed plan it would be $1,153.91, or an increase of 99 percent.

Here is an example of a family with two children whose income is $3,000. Their net income subject to surtaxes is $2,952.58, and subject to normal tax, $757.32. They paid $457.85 in 1942, but under the new proposal they would have to pay $906.55, an increase of 98 percent.

Examples such as these could be quoted indefinitely and the results would be almost identical, an unbelievable increase, in some cases, of double the now heavy burden which we must carry.

You may feel that the effect which the new proposed taxes would have sound most discouraging, but there is more to be considered if this program should be adopted for 1944 or 1945. There will also be due in both of these years the 12½ percent of the 1942 tax, unless you happen to be one of those fortunate individuals whose tax is wholly forgiven or if you are up to date on your tax payments.

So far we have considered only the direct effect upon the individual taxpayers, but now consider the indirect effect upon those who hold mortgages on these properties owned by the taxpayer. In talking with prominent men in the mortgage field, it was learned that on March 15 and June 15 of this year many people failed to make their periodic monthly payments, and gave as the excuse the Federal income-tax payments which were due on those dates. It does not take much imagination to realize what might happen if these defaults should increase with the resulting foreclosures on homes when and if these new proposed rates should go into effect. The repercussions, as you can see, will be far-reaching.

"Ah," you may say, "let those who can afford to hold mortgages carry the burden." But, remember, it is not only individuals who hold mortgages; in fact, they are in the minority. It is the insurance companies, the banks, and the savings and loan companies as well, and these organizations are responsible to their depositors—those thrifty people who have endeavored to save for a rainy day.

Let's Be Fair With Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, public opinion in America heartily favors a wage increase for the railway employees of this country. The railroad brotherhoods have been a symbol of unionization. The work and the responsibilities of the railroad employees have multiplied many times due to the increasing transportation demands of a nation waging a global war. Yet in the face of unbelievable requirements in the line of duty, the railway employees have done a remarkable job of "keeping them rolling." For this effort and sacrifice they are now being penalized.

The railroads realize that their employees are entitled to a substantial wage increase to meet the increased cost of living. Following lengthy hearings, and after presenting irrefutable documentary data, the Presidential Emergency Board awarded the workers an 8-cent-an-hour increase which was agreed to by the carriers and satisfactory to the workers themselves. The Emergency Board awarded this 8-cent increase as "a minimum, noninflationary adjustment necessary to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

Yet, notwithstanding this recommendation, Fred M. Vinson, Economic Stabilizer, out of a clear sky and without any factual support, set aside the 8-cent award just when the unions were about to sign a contract with the railroads. Unsuccessful efforts have since been made to settle the controversy. The result: The railroad brotherhoods and railway employees throughout the country are bitter; and they have every reason to be.

As I have frequently stated, Congress failed in its responsibility to roll back prices, and the cost of living has skyrocketed, yet the wages of the skilled and unskilled labor railway employees have remained static. In fact, railway employees are receiving less than the wages paid to common labor in any of the steel plants of the Nation. The railway wage is 73 cents an hour whereas in steel mills the minimum wage for common labor alone is 78 cents.

The railroads of this Nation actually face a labor crisis that has led to much black marketing in awarding maintenance work to independent contractors. To alleviate the situation, it is my humble opinion that Congress should promptly pass the joint resolution introduced, holding an agreement between the carriers and employees is a valid settlement of the wage controvery. This agreement, to most minds, is in absolute accord with the stabilization program of the President. Even though we may be reluctant to bypass the Economic Stabilizer, Fred M. Vinson, the responsibility belongs to Congress. This action by Congress will have a salutary effect upon railroad employees. It will be a measure of assurance to them that the American people appreciate the faith and loyalty of our railway employees, who constitute a large segment of the American workers.

Statement of Railroad Executive Regarding Lea Aviation Bill Denounced as Erroneous and Misleading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Allied Command firmly realizes that aviation, as evidenced by our striking air force, is an invaluable adjunct in waging an all-out war. The Nazis themselves know this by now for the R. A. F. and the American Air Forces have been wrecking

havoc with German industrial points and military establishments with around-the-clock bombing. Following this war, aviation will become a vital factor in world rehabilitation and unquestionably it will revolutionize world transportation traffic and business.

To prepare for this eventuality, legislation is necessary now to lead the way. The Lea bill, H. R. 3420, is a step in the right direction. Many erroneous and misleading statements have been made against the Lea bill by railroad executives. To discount these statements, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a statement of Col. Edward S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, following the broadcast of the Town Hall of the Air program on November 18, 1943:

"Tonight I have listened to Town Hall of the Air," said Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of Air Transport Association of America, and Chief of Staff of America's Air Forces in World War No. 1, "and heard Mr. Palmer, president of the New York, New Haven Railroad continue the spreading of misleading and mistaken information about the Lea civil aviation bill.

"He charged that the Lea bill provides for huge subsidies for training, airports, and other facilities for commercial air transportation.

"This is not so. The training provision, for example, in the Lea bill is simply the continuation of the present temporary Civilian Pilot Training Act, which provides for teaching our youngsters to fly safely and which has done so much to assist small training schools and other small miscellaneous operators to keep private and miscellaneous aviation alive. The provisions of the bill relating to airport development program do not provide for further expenditures. Such matters are left entirely to congressional appropriations from time to time. What the bill does is to provide for intelligent, long-range planning, so that if, as, and when Federal funds are spent for airports and other air-navigation facilities they will be spent wisely and for the benefit of the entire flying public.

"These and other provisions of the Lea bill, indeed, recognize for the first time in Federal law the need for the encouragement and development of miscellaneous flying rather than being confined to commercial air transportation.

"Mr. Palmer also stated that the Lea bill provides for keeping the railroads out of air transportation. The fact is the Lea bill contains no provision whatsoever on this subject. It does not affect or modify present law under which railroads may be au[illegible]orized to engage in air transportation where the public interest wo[illegible]ld be promoted by enabling the railroads to use aircraft supplementary to railroad operations and where there would be no restraint of competition. What Mr. Palmer advocated was adoption of the Reece bill under which existing safeguards with respect to the domination of air transportation [illegible]y surface carrie[illegible] would be br[illegible]en down. The Reece bill would permit the authorization of railroads' subsidiaries to engage in air transportation without regard to their relationship with the railroad line and without regard to the matter of restr[illegible]ints upon competition.

"This Reece bill, so vigorously supported by the railroads is being advanced without ever having had a word of public hearing on the question of railroad control. In an effort apparently to evade a public hearing and public scrutiny of the merits of their case, the railroads are attempting to tack onto the Lea bill a rider which would break down our country's historic transportation policy designed to keep different modes of transportation in their proper places and on a competitive basis.

"This transportation policy is based upon years of experience and has been frequently affirmed and reaffirmed by Congress. It is designed to prevent an older form of transportation from dominating and stifling the growth of an infant transportation industry. The adoption of the railroads' proposal for a drastic change in our civil aviation law so as to open the way for railroad domination of air transportation in the future would be a large step toward imposing upon the country a stifling monopoly of all forms of transportation under the control of railroad interests."

Hold the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles E. Hoffmaster, of Reading, Pa.:

Hon. DANIEL K. HOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From the news as published in the press, and in view of many recent developments, it would appear that the hold-the-line policy as a deterrent to inflation is in great danger of being cast aside. Pressure groups and powerful lobbyists interested only in their own gain are striving to open the gates of inflation and let prices find their level. Everyone with any fundamental knowledge of economics knows that in a war economy with the Government as the largest customer in the market such a policy is foolish and unwise.

The public debt, now unbelievably high, would soar to astronomical heights. The vast unorganized majority of people would have no recourse to relief of their predicament, and those with more or less fixed incomes would suffer a material reduction in their standard of living.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will not give way to minority pressure, and that measures will be taken to adequately protect the interests of all.

We do not want our boys to return to a country in which there is economic confusion and instability, but rather to a land of sound principles where they can be given a fair chance of good employment in a stable economy.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. HOFFMASTER.

Roosevelt Performed Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on November 21, 1943:

ROOSEVELT PERFORMED MIRACLES

In the news column we hear so much about the Deweys, Willkies, Warrens, Brickers, and Saltonstalls to be the Republican Party standard bearers.

It is surprising to read about these would-be standard bearers, when during the height of the depression they were not concerned about the people in the breadlines, the people selling appless, the people needing food, clothing, and shelter, and the millions needing jobs.

Roosevelt has been recognized as the great humanitarian. He brought the workingmen out of slavery. He gave them everything possible by free government. The Republicans attacked him on advocating social security; now the same people hail it as the most progressive legislation in the history of mankind. Some of the G. O. P. leaders claim they can improve on the social-security law. They are the very persons who regarded it as socialism.

It was Roosevelt who gave the workingman unemployment compensation. It was Roosevelt who gave the workingman the right to collective bargaining; the right to organize and better their conditions. He helped small business to compete against big business. He saved the Nation from a revolution.

He was first to ask the quarantine of the aggressor nations. He was first to ask for larger navies and armies. He was first to ask for fortifying outposts. All these were sabotaged by the Republican Party.

He is leading us in this great war. His foreign policy has been approved by everyone. We see him attacked on the domestic front. Those who recall the last war remember when sugar was 30 cents a pound and you couldn't get it even by standing all day in line. The price of food and clothing was 10 times what it is today, and you couldn't get what you wanted. Rents were unusually high.

He broke the third term tradition by a great vote, and he will win in a walk in 1944. He will be endorsed by every State in the Union, including Maine and Vermont, next year.

The post-war years are going to be difficult ones, and no man is better prepared to face it than Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Address to Lynn Lions Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I made to the Lions Club of Lynn, Mass., on September 8, 1943.

The address is as follows:

Gentlemen, previous to today I have only known by hearsay of the traditional advice which is supposedly intended to reassure the amateur big game hunter; namely, that if he is confronted by a lion, he should confidently stare him in the eye. I have heard this proposed both in fun and as fact. Probably the fundamental fallacy of this doubtful counsel

is that the adventurer will only be confronted by one lion at a time. It is obvious that we are acting on fallacious presumptions about lions when we recall too the prevalence of the quaint phrase about "bearding the lion in his den," for I know that more capable and less vulnerable adventurers than myself have been bearded by the modern Lions in their own den.

The amateur big game hunter undoubtedly has concentrated his attention on only one characteristic of the lion, a characteristic which he believes involves a threat to his safety. Consequently, he does not recognize and acknowledge as does Frank Buck or Congressman George Tinkham, the other splendid qualities of the king of the beasts; his courage, his powerful grace, and his supremacy over the other animals; his nobility, so to speak.

And I would reveal myself as an amateur adventurer in like manner if I limited myself to an expression of gratitude for your kindness in inviting me to speak to you today. I am grateful for that kindness and looking you in the eye, assure you of my appreciation. But, as I say, there are other characteristics of the Lions' Club which I cannot help mentioning even at the expense of your modesty. The Lions' Club, not only of Lynn, but of other cities, has always seemed to me to be characterized by a spirit of fraternity, an invaluable blessing during these days. Moreover, the Lions' Club is invariably marked by progressiveness, enterprise and initiative, particularly in matters of community need and charitable relief. And out of these commendable qualities there has grown a natural sense of pride, an esprit de corps, both for the local club and for the entire organization.

But having turned the searchlight of attention on you thus far, I ask your permission to turn it full circle to that city which before the war was reputedly full of social lions. It has always seemed to me that the physical structure of Washington, for it is the city I refer to, is in a sense symbolic of the Capital itself and the business of Government. Although the city is laid out in a definite and ordered plan, the peculiar manner in which broad avenues are, as it were, superimposed on another network of parallel and perpendicular streets, makes it very confusing, particularly to the newcomer, until an understanding of the system is gained. And so too the structure and operation of the Government seems nothing but an incomprehensible and chaotic maze for a long time after one has attempted to discover some order. And the war has superimposed many avenues of executive agencies running obliquely over the established Government branches with their system of checks and balances.

The Congressman is often bewildered too by the seeming maze of the complexities of Government today, particularly since the maze focuses in and radiates out from Congress. In so doing, an imposing obligation is placed upon the legislator who tries conscientiously to see his way clear and proceed with confident steps in a definite direction. The two-way direction, in and out, arises from the fact that the Congressman represents the Nation as he cooperates in the formulation of the Nation's policies and laws and also represents his particular district, its communities, its organizations and its people in meeting their needs and presenting their problems. The tremendous upheaval of individual that has been an inevitable concomitant of all-out war has created thousands of problems of various kinds in which the individual needs assistance or advice. And by the same measure the national upheaval has created unprecedented demands for appropriate legislation to enable our democracy to keep pace with and out-distance the steamroller dictatorial technique of the Axis Powers. One striking illustration of this can be gained by recalling that the twenty or so appropriations bills which were subjected to such careful and meticulous scrutiny a short time ago appropriated a total of $110,445,827,000 for the continued conduct of the war and the maintenance of the Government.

Another approach which illustrates the twofold function of Congress can be obtained merely from a casual glance at the legislative function. From the wide diversity and unlimited possibility of laws proposed those specific measures which are wisest, most equitable, and necessary must be selected, formulated, and promulgated. One session of the House of Representatives, a year in duration, finds upward of 7,000 bills and resolutions introduced, proposed by their advocates to become law, and consequently subject to careful scrutiny and analysis. From this 7,000, roughly 400 became public laws. (I use the figures of the first session of the 77th Cong.) Each of these has been through a thorough process of study, investigation, hearings, conferences, debates, and amendments until it is finally adjudged by the majority of both Houses as worthy of becoming law. And the spreading out which follows this meticulous narrowing down lies in the fact that each law ranges out to affect the lives of all Americans; it becomes the law of the land.

In the coming months decisions must be reached on questions of transcendent importance. I know you will understand if I mention some of these issues that I speak with a humility which arises out of a recognition of the complexity and significance that these issues present. I know too that you will accept my sincere assertion that I will attempt to resolve these issues in accordance with the best interests of this district and this Nation. Briefly, then, here are some of the subjects which will be involved: Taxation, expenditures, and the public debt; renegotiation and termination of war contracts; disposition of surplus war properties; post-war operation of Government-owned plants; formation of a sound and fair labor policy; extension and revision of social security; demobilization of the armed forces; relinquishment of wartime controls; international treaties, trade, and commerce. In the complex diversity of problems so presented, the Congressman looks for advice and assistance to men whose experience, judgment, and work enable them to speak authoritatively on particular aspects of these problems. Consequently, I look to my constituents for their opinions, their attitudes, their experiences as these issues arise. It is almost imperative that you take every opportunity to make practical, positive, and constructive suggestions which will help in intelligently meeting the issues and making the decisions. If the priceless heritage of representative democracy is to be preserved, each individual must accept a personal responsibility for supporting and encouraging sound congressional action. We are living in a world of action and tumult. Only the active, the vigilant, and the farseeing can hope for long to maintain the principles they believe in.

We have reached a point in the war struggle when we can plan for the future with confidence that the future will present the opportunity, or rather the necessity, of implementing the plans which we have made. We can be confident of final victory if we hold fast to our realization that our efforts must be unstinting to the very end, and if we are prepared to acknowledge that even the course to victory is laborious, bloody, and tragic. I believe that the American people have the glint of victory in their eyes, and I believe too that that glint will rather accelerate than retard our efforts.

It is with these realizations deeply impressed that I turn briefly to one of the multiple aspects of the post-war world which is already receiving appropriate attention. However, before I speak of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, I would like to make several assurances. Our Nation has suffered in this war; we have expended great sums of money. We know that the post-war period at home will present problems of great magnitude. Finally, we want the assurance that these problems will be met, that preparations will have been made in advance, and above all we want the assurance that this country will not sacrifice herself and her welfare before the throne of foreign commitments. Of this last we need have no fear. The primary concern of the Government is internal, that is the welfare of our people and our Nation. And every foreign commitment which we make will have our own interest and well-being as a basic principle. This country is not a pawn or a tool of any other nation.

As for the immediate post-war problems here at home, I would like to reassure you here that preparations, careful, thoughtful and effective, are being made. One great obligation is the demobilization and reemployment of our armed forces. In several recent speeches, I have described in some detail the machinery which has been set up for reemployment, rehabilitation, pensions, extension of credit, unemployment insurance, etc. Preparations have been made on a national and a community basis. We are prepared to give our best effort to this problem.

It is impossible for me today to discuss in detail the plans which are under way for the return to a peaceful economy, the reestablishment of American enterprise, the gradual loosening of enforced restrictions, the extension of social security. Plans are already in progress in which both industry, labor, and the Government are participating, and thorough study and adequate machinery will be established to guarantee the order, security, and freedoms for which we are fighting

There is a program to which the United States is committed which is little understood, and unless it is, I fear that serious erroneous impressions and possibly bitter altercations may result. It is impossible for me here to give an adequate picture of the work of this agency, but for more complete details I refer you to recent articles by former Governor of New York, Mr. Herbert H. Lehman, which appeared in the August 1 issue of the magazine Vital Speeches and in the American Magazine for September respectively. Mr. Lehman is the United States Director of Foreign Relief and thus head of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation

This office has been directed by President Roosevelt to provide such necessities as food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and medical care to relieve the victims of war in areas liberated from Axis control. The President has stated the position of the United States: "The United Nations forces will bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick. Every aid possible will be given to restore each of the liberated countries to soundness and strength, so that each may make its full contribution to a United Nations victory and to the peace which follows."

Two practical considerations demand attention. The first arises from the too prevalent attitude found in the belligerent question, "Is the United States going to feed the world?" The first answer is that military and civilian needs of this country come first. That Americans will not be deprived of necessities is assured by the fact that no food will be shipped without the approval of the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture. Our supply programs for purchases of clothing and other goods must be approved by the War Production Board. Furthermore, America cannot feed the world from its resources alone. Neither can Britain nor Russia nor China nor any other of the American republics. Satisfaction of the wants of millions of suffering men, women, and children can be accom-

plished only by the concerted action of all the nations whose productive resources were fortunately spared the fire and destruction of modern war. But recently the Department of State has placed before the 43 governments of all the United Nations and the other nations associated with us in this war, a draft agreement of a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration through which the productive resources of all the nations of good will may shortly be mobilized to bring succor to the victims of war.

The second consideration is humanitarian. Although food conditions in the area of the Axis occupation are treacherous, official reports from Europe and Asia leave no doubt that hunger is the general rule, that starvation is commonplace, and that the area enslaved by the Axis is a breeding place for all the diseases of the body and of the spirit that are born of starvation, suffering and death. Agricultural production in Europe has dropped substantially, and, as months roll on, the manpower shortage, the wastage and deterioration of machinery, the neglect of the soil and the increasing disorganization of the economy, will cut deeper into food production. The occupied nations have been systematically drained of their resources, raw materials, and commercial goods to serve a vicious new order. Never before has the world witnessed so ruthless a despoliation of so many in so short a time. Dr. W. A. MacKenzie of England, chairman of the Inter-Allied Medical Board, told me recently that he estimated that over 30,000,000 people, including soldiers, have been uprooted from their homes in Europe. He said that only the most heroic efforts will prevent a terrible spread of contagious disease when these people begin a mass movement to return to their homes. He stated that while these people are subjected to military control by the Axis armies disease will be checked by the military for the sake of expediency and self-protection. But when this grip is loosened, disease may run riotous ruin all over Europe. We cannot, on the premise of the "four freedoms" which we are fighting for, permit this starvation, suffering and death to be the inexorable fate of Europe.

The final practical consideration is twofold. First, in Mr. Lehman's words, "Our objective is to help people to help themselves and thereby to help ourselves, by making possible a world in which the 'four freedoms' can have a chance of realization." The fruits of this policy are already manifest in Algeria and Tunisia, so recently liberated. Indications are that their very first harvest under the favoring sun of freedom will produce more than an abundance of the olives, oils, grapes, and other products peculiar to the region.

Finally, in all situations, the technique of salvage and rehabilitation must constantly be oriented toward the objective of reconstituting the economy of the recipient nation. That is the way to put an end to relief. Millions of people have been plundered, despoiled and starved. Unless the United States, in concert with the other United Nations, extends a helping hand to these peoples, we can anticipate with certainty that the liberated areas for decades will suffer from disrupted economies, crushing burdens of unemployment, shattering inflations and the internal turmoil which adds up to chaos. In closing I again quote Mr. Lehman: "If we have learned anything from the decades just behind us it is this: That we cannot, even if we could, make ourselves secure in a world in which millions of men, women, and children are dying of want or by epidemic. Let us recognize frankly that freedom from want is a basic component of any enduring peace and that if America is to have any hope of lasting peace and a stable world economy it must help see to it that the liberated peoples of the world are restored as rapidly as possible to a self-sustaining basis. That is merely enlightened self-interest."

The Forest Service Does Its Part in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as a further indication and proof of the fine work that the Forest Service is doing in furthering the war effort I am inserting in the RECORD under unanimous consent an article from the Daily Missoulian of Missoula, Mont., dated November 16, 1943. Not only is the worth of the Forest Service recognized by the Army in training its medical officers in parachute jumping but the United States Coast Guard has likewise seen fit to send groups of its personnel to Missoula during the past summer for like training. The silent service in the war effort has been the Forest Service and all too many of our legislators and citizens are unaware of the many fine accomplishments rendered to our war effort by the competent and loyal men and women who comprise its makeup. It is a real pleasure for me to bring this latest acknowledgment of its worth to the attention of my colleagues. Incidentally, Col. Earl Vance, commanding the Second Air Force Search and Rescue Station, understands, from personal experience, the value of this kind of work. As a Montanan he knows the contributions of the Forest Service:

AIR CORPS RESCUE MEN TRAIN NEAR HERE NOW

Training of Army medical officers in parachute jumping in the Forest Service parachute school at Seeley Lake is under way, as part of the organization of the Second Air Force search and rescue section. Col. Earl Vance, of the Second Air Force headquarters at Colorado Springs, Colo., in charge of this section, made the announcement today for the commanding general, St. Clair Street.

The new section will be utilized in searching for and rescuing personnel from or in aircraft accidents. The organization will cover the entire Second Air Force, especially the mountain, desert, and swamp sections, where such work is most difficult after missing planes or accidents are reported.

The Army medical officers being trained in this section will be reinforced by use of Forest Service trained parachute jumpers as assistants on their jumping mission. A contingent of the Second Air Force medical officers and another contingent from the Arctic Rescue squadron, Buckley Field, Denver, is now at Seeley Lake.

The Second Air Force has a contract with the Forest Service to train its rescue and search section jumpers. Full utilization will be made of the facilities and personnel of the Forest Service and the Johnson Flying Service of Missoula, which have ample experience in working in the mountainous country.

As visualized at present, this activity, if its usefulness is demonstrated in the future, may be continued as the Coast Guard of the Air, bearing in mind that it has a greater range than the Coast Guard. It is planned to take advantage of all new developments that can be used as the training progresses, said Colonel Vance.

The Forest Service has carried on parachute jumping for 4 years, starting with a small crew in 1940 and expanding to training of 71 jumpers for its own crews in 1943. It has also trained a Coast Guard rescue squad from Alaska and Canadian squads.

J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 22, 1943

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our beloved colleague BILL DITTER comes as an inexpressible shock to all of us.

The stature of BILL DITTER was great; and his home State, Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost a great statesman and a great personality. His place in the Congress and in public affairs was unusually large and his influence extraordinarily great. The public service will miss him keenly.

In the circle of my personal friendships there is now a large gap. I shall miss BILL DITTER greatly, his affection, his loyalty, the warmth of his fine and great character. My heartfelt sympathies go to his family. I can hope that they may be somewhat sustained and comforted by the affection and love that the many friends of BILL DITTER had for him and the memories of him that they will cherish.

American Ideals Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, Americans will pause this Thanksgiving to give consideration to our national status in the face of crucial developments both abroad and at home. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following suggestions for a Thanksgiving Proclamation submitted by H. I. Phillips in the Washington Post:

SUGGESTION FOR A THANKSGIVING PROCLAMATION—1943

(By H. I. Phillips)

Whereas even a man looking through smoked glasses can see that this country owes more to Providence than any country on earth; and

Whereas God's special dispensation is to be seen in our escape from disaster under sudden attack, our national unity, and our fantastic transition from weakness to a strength that has amazed the world; and

Whereas this is to be reflected in the transformation of its pleasure-loving, peaceful youth into a resolute, fearless, hard-hitting, heroic fighting force; and in the transition of quiet hearth, peaceful farm, trinket-shop, luxury mill, and jalopy factory into one roaring arsenal of democracy; and

Whereas the soul of America has found itself, and its spirit felt a resurrection unequaled since Valley Forge and Concord Bridge; and

Whereas the year 1943 has, by the grace of God, shown increasing proof that we as a Nation have not grown too soft, too pigheaded, too fat, too selfish, and too futile to be worthy of our heritage; and

Whereas the whole Nation has seen a return to the altars of God and a surging back to the chapels on the templed hills and the cathedrals of the teeming cities; and

Whereas the ringing of a churchbell, the sound of children in a choir loft, the flash of sunlight through a stained-glass dome, the tingle of the communion chimes and the simple story of an American soldier furloughed by the Government, that he may embrace his dying dog, have come to stir our hearts as they once did; and

Whereas the "Gimme-Gimme" spirit, while still apparent in spots is surely being trampled under the national will to play four square with destiny; and

Whereas at last, we, as a pampered people accustomed to luxurious comforts have come in the nick of time to realize our weakness, repent and go straight before it is too late; and

Whereas it has been the will of God to give us the Halseys, the Eisenhowers, the Chennaults, the Doolittles, the MacArthurs, the Cassin Youngs, the Bulkeleys, the "Butch" O'Hares, the Colin Kellys, the Dan Callaghans and the Five Sullivans, sparing us the Himmlers, the Gestapo boys, the hangmen's squads, the dynamiters of crowded postoffices; and

Whereas we have been privileged to keep this country—Abe Lincoln's country—"a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and to see it spared, through Providence, the blitz, the firing squad, the torch, and the Gestapo; and

Whereas the philosophies of a soft way of life, of compromise, of expediency and of dependence on Federal wet-nursing are swiftly being converted in the crucible of war into the old traditions of survival through the courage, integrity, and character of the farmers of Lexington and Bunker Hill; and

Whereas in a hazardous world which has seen nation after nation beaten into slavery, God has seen fit to endow us with His bright shield:

Now, therefore, let Thursday, November 25, be dedicated as a day for expressing our thanks to God for His rare blessings, acknowledging our debt for the strength that is ours through Him, and, incidentally, imploring Him to keep us from forgetting too soon.

Current Federal Legislation and Desirable Legislative Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of policy presented by the Manufacturers' Division of the Greater Lafayette Chamber of Commerce, of Lafayette, Ind., as an expression of their opinions concerning current Federal legislation and desirable legislative trends.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. RECONVERSION RESERVE FUNDS

Higher taxes, or even a continuance of present tax schedules and drastic renegotiation practices against corporations, will result in a serious handicap to private industry. Undoubtedly, such a course will prevent the accumulation of the funds necessary to rehabilitate worn out equipment, and to reconvert to peacetime products.

Unless such necessary reserves are allowed to be accumulated, the result will be that private industry will be unable to furnish employment after the war, to the extent that is necessary in order to prevent a serious disturbance to the country's economic balance.

If such funds are allowed, a quick conversion to peacetime products will allow industry to more rapidly absorb men released from the Army.

2. FORCED SAVINGS

Any plan of forced savings, whereby large amounts are accumulated for future spending, would simply serve to delay, rather than prevent, inflation.

Forced savings, although they will defer purchasing power, can in no way be considered as paying a portion of the war expense out of current income.

3. NEW FORM OF TAXATION

It is realized that the largest possible portion of the cost of the war should be paid out of current income and the national debt kept from ruinous expansion.

In our opinion, a retail-sales tax, paid by the ultimate consumer, would serve as a curb to inflation, provide new Government income, and would, in conjunction with the existing personal-income-tax structure, be equitable to all wage earners.

4. CONTRACT CANCELATION

Arrangements should be made now for the prompt payment in full of all war contracts immediately after cancelation. Smaller industry to exist must have this working capital in order to rehabilitate worn-out equipment and convert to other types of work.

5. EMERGENCY GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

Plans should be made now for the immediate termination, at the end of the war, of all emergency-caused Government controls.

6. GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF LABOR UNIONS

Legislation should be enacted giving the Government reasonable activity and accounting control over labor unions and definitely establish their responsibility and relationship to the national business structure.

7. GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

Special emphasis in the interest of present economy should be placed on all governmental bureaus and services and those eliminated which are unnecessary at the present time. A dollar saved in Government expenditure today is worth far more than a dollar received through taxation or war savings.

8. DISPOSAL OF EMERGENCY PLANTS

Plans should be made immediately for a reasonable and early disposal of Government-owned and controlled plants, immediately after the war, in order that private business may proceed with post-war plans without fear of Government competition.

9. MANPOWER STABILIZATION

It is most important that a balance be maintained between the manpower needs of industry and the manpower needs of the armed forces.

10. MANPOWER ALLOCATION SYSTEM FOR INDUSTRY

The principles involved in manpower allocation are not consistent with the ideals of democracy. In our opinion, the manpower situation at present does not warrant such a drastic action.

11. MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

Steps should be taken for the maintenance of a fair degree of efficiency in the motor transportation industry. Equipment is rapidly depreciating and wearing out and a more abundant supply of new equipment and replacement parts must be provided. This applies to farm transportation equipment as well as to commercial haulers.

12. SUBSIDIES

Subsidies on basic commodities are merely expediencies and are not corrective of the basic underlying faults. They will increase the national debt and are purely inflationary.

Milk Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from C. W. Swonger, research economist, New England Milk Producers' Association, November 19, 1943:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MERROW: In answer to your letter of November 16 I have undertaken to outline below the facts with respect to the present milk shortage in New England.

We have now reached the point in New England where it is no longer possible to find enough milk to cover dealers' quotas for fluid milk sales. Under Government order, dealers' sales of fluid milk are frozen at the June 1943 level. But this is largely academic, since there is no longer enough milk available to cover June sales.

For several years we were able to meet the increased demand for fluid milk by the transfer of milk from class II to class I—or from manufactured to fluid milk uses. Now we have taken up all of the slack. For the next 3 or 4 months we are going to face a very tight supply situation. There will be days and weeks, for several months, when dealers will not have enough milk to meet the fluid milk demands of consumers.

Last summer in northern New England, unusually favorable pasture conditions led to a heavy flow of milk. We were repeatedly told that milk production in New England was at all-time high records. But the pasture season is now over, when cows can depend on green grass to make milk. We are beginning to experience the effects of the grain shortage, and the inability of dairy farmers to compete for available supplies of feed. Production has declined sharply in recent weeks, and we are now faced with a shortage of milk.

The present shortage will continue at least till the end of the year. It is possible that the low point in production may not be reached until some time in December this year. What happens beyond the first of the year depends on the feed situation and whether dairy farmers are allowed to compete for available supplies of feed. Dairy farmers in New England depend on the Mid-

die West for the major portion of their feed supply. A shortage of grain would compel lighter feeding, or else a reduction in the number of cows in dairy herds. Either of these would result in a serious decline in production of milk for New England markets.

While the present milk shortage has gradually developed, it is only within recent weeks that it has been brought home to consumers. The 14 large handlers who carry nearly all of the reserve supply of milk in New England showed 12 percent surplus for the last week of October, compared with 23 percent a year ago. This surplus or class II milk serves as the cushion or reservoir for Boston and other New England markets to insure consumers a supply of fluid milk. The same handlers estimated their class II milk at 2 percent for the first week of November—and for last week a deficit of 8 percent. In other words, the reservoir is dry and there is no longer enough milk to go around.

In the meantime efforts have been made to insure an orderly distribution of the available supply. An allocation program was developed to spread the shortage as evenly as possible between various dealers and markets. For the first week of November dealers were allocated 100 percent of their quotas. Many dealers, however, found it impossible to obtain their allotment and the market was short of milk.

For the second week of November allocations were reduced to 94 percent. Under the agreement this means 94 percent of dealers' sales for the last week of October, which now becomes the base for future allotments. But again, many dealers were unable to obtain their allotment, and the milk actually available to most retail and wholesale consumers was reduced by around 10 to 15 percent.

For the third week of November allocations were further reduced to 90 percent, and this figure has been continued for next week. With an allocation figure of 90 percent for this week and next week, our markets are running from 15 to 20 percent short of milk. The Federal Market Administrator expresses the hope that the low point has been reached in production and that it will not be necessary to further reduce allocations.

For various reasons the allocation figure appears to run 5 to 10 percent higher than the proportion of milk actually available to most retail and wholesale consumers. It is physically impossible in a market like Boston to convert all of the milk into fluid milk sales. Out of the dealers' allocation must come plant shrinkage and milk that is used to reduce the butterfat content of cream from 40 to 19 percent. There is also the problem of small amounts of milk scattered in a hundred-odd country plants from Bangor, Maine, to Eagle Bridge, N. Y. For these reasons the allocation figure gives a more optimistic picture of the situation than is warranted by actual conditions in the market.

Allocation, however, merely provides for spreading the shortage as evenly as possible. It does not get at the basic causes for the shortage of milk. Nor can the shortage be dismissed merely by saying that it arises from increased wartime demand or from seasonal decline in production. The decline in production in recent months has been much more than seasonal factors would explain—and the feed situation does not indicate any speedy recovery.

The reasons for the present milk shortage are obvious enough. Prices of milk have not kept pace with the rising costs of labor and feed. Dairy farmers for several years have been on the short end of the competition for labor, and are now on the short end of the competition for feed. The diversion of labor and diversion of feed has now become so critical as to threaten the fluid-milk supply, not only for New England but the entire densely populated eastern seaboard area.

Farm wages have risen about $25 a month since the fall of last year. Feed prices have advanced at least $15 a ton since a year ago, while the quality of purchased feed has seriously declined. Present indications point to a shortage in feed supplies of at least 20 percent in deficit feed areas like New England. Government economists are now estimating a further rise of 30 percent in feed costs, and of 20 percent in farm labor costs, by July next year.

I would simply add that unless prompt steps are taken to improve returns to dairy farmers to cover the increased cost of producing milk, and to enable them to compete for the necessary supplies of labor and feed, we are certain to have a far more serious shortage of milk and dairy products at the low point in production next year than anything we have yet experienced.

Yours very truly,

NEW ENGLAND MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,

C. W. SWONGER, *Research Economist.*

Dick Kleberg, Battler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Dick Kleberg, Battler," from the Dallas (Tex.) News of November 16, 1943:

DICK KLEBERG, BATTLER

Among those in Congress who courageously defend the American institution of private enterprise and initiative is one who has also championed the cause of our great cattle industry—RICHARD M. KLEBERG who represents the interests of that far-flung cattle empire, southwest Texas. DICK KLEBERG, as he is affectionately referred to, knows cattle and ranching as cooperator and manager of one of the world's largest livestock raising enterprises, the King ranch. Livestock traditions from the early days of Texas, when free enterprise meant exactly that, when ranching and pioneering were synonymous, and survival resulted from a rare combination of daring, capable management and resourcefulness, are still strong not only in southwest Texas but in all of the Southwest's great cattle empire.

The interference by theoretical economists and planners in the affairs of so independent a group of producers as cowmen has resulted in inevitable conflict. This conflict is increased when, during testimony, one of O. P. A.'s head economists freely admits that he knows nothing about cattle or any other livestock, but that he knows economics of a kind which is likely to ruin ranchmen if Congress does not put a stop to unwarranted interference in one of the Nation's essential food industries—beef cattle raising.

The needless confusion into which the entire meat industry, from ranchman and feeder to meat packer and consumer, has been thrust should be terminated at the earliest. The glut of red meat resulting from swamped markets due to sacrifice of beef cattle or protein feed failure (one of the most glaring results of mismanagement by crop control agencies) followed by a probable meat famine this winter, is a senseless procedure that could and should be stopped. More fighters like DICK KLEBERG are needed in Congress and other high places, who use their talents to reduce war-time control to a few simple basic measures without destroying an industry and working a hardship on a Nation through bureaucratic interference.

Our Deep Dark Secrets in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska's senior Senator, the Honorable HUGH A. BUTLER, has rendered an outstanding service to the Nation in his report upon Central and South America.

I understand that within a day or two the Senator is filing a lengthy and detailed report in the Senate on his 20,000 mile trip made this last summer. This report is filled with accurate, but startling facts. It is valuable to our Nation, because it will improve our good-neighbor policy and its recomendations will save the taxpayers of America millions of dollars.

Senator BUTLER has proven himself to be a real investigator. The outstanding thing about his work is that it did not cost the taxpayers one cent. This entire trip and all of its related expenses were paid personally by the Senator. Nebraska is proud of the Senator's work and as a State we feel that we have a better Senator because he has taken time and money to conduct this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article written by the Honorable HUGH A. BUTLER, appearing in the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, entitled "Our Deep Dark Secrets in Latin America." The article is as follows:

OUR DEEP DARK SECRETS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from Nebraska)

I have returned from 20,000 miles of inquiring travel in 20 Central and South American countries, astonished and appalled that our "good neighbor policy"—backed by six thousand million United States dollars—has widely become a hemispheric hand-out that is neither good nor neighborly.

I found that thoughtful Latin Americans are as alarmed at this as I became. Everywhere long-time friends of the United States warned me: "You can't buy good will."

"You hand us a few million dollars for sewers," said a businessman, "and you say, 'Let us be good neighbors.' I don't think it can be done that way."

Others less friendly, more suspicious, pass around the phrase, "Beware of North Americans bearing gifts."

One Latin-American editor said: "$6,000,000,000. There are 120,000,000 people in Latin America. That is $50 a piece. If our friendship were actually for sale, $50 would not be enough. But if we would sell it, $50 would be too much."

But the W. P. A.'s, P. W. A.'s, N. Y. A.'s, and F. S. A.'s which we have set up under one guise or another in Latin America have already entangled us in a vicious circle. Spending at the present rate, we are mistrusted as the economic Colossus of the North. Yet if

we stop, we will be blamed—and hated—for the economic collapse that will inevitably follow.

"Cut off the dollars," said our American Ambassador in another country, "and the boom that our money has made here would break within 24 hours; there might be a revolution within 48."

In 1941, the national budgets of the 20 Central and South American countries totaled $1,067,000,000. Our $6,000,000,000 outlay is spread over 3 years. It does not include all the untold sums we have spent in these countries for goods, food, and raw materials. But that $6,000,000,000 of spending, lending, and giving is over twice as much per year from the United States Treasury as these countries spend out of their own treasuries on themselves.

The spending itself is carried on by a dozen or more agencies of the United States Government. They operate more than 12,000 projects of some 1,000 different types.

The most disturbing fact about this vast program of spending is that it is necessary to go to Latin America to find out much about it. The story has been withheld from the American people. The nature and cost of the multifarious projects have not been publicly discussed for approval or disapproval by the taxpayer. It is even difficult for a Member of the United States Senate to get all the facts and be sure that the facts he gets are wholly complete and accurate. The entire record of undertakings and promises in Latin America needs to be brought from under this cloak of secrecy and publicly aired and debated.

American money is being spent to stock the streams and lakes of Venezuela with game fish. We have a fishery mission in Mexico. As "part of the inter-American program for development of hemispheric resources," we paid for a fish survey in the ocean adjacent to Panama.

Reminiscent of the W. P. A.'s writers' projects and guidebook series, we are financing the preparation of a handbook on the South American Indians; a guide to official publications of Latin America; a law guide and center of Latin American legal studies.

We are paying for a survey of collections of Latin-American music; also for the preparation of bibliographies of Latin-American music. We put up the cash to record folk music in the other American republics.

Some years ago Peru and Ecuador got into conflict. In the ensuing difficulty, Ecuador's Province of El Oro suffered severely. The damage has never been repaired. We are now doing it. This enterprise, we are told, "ranges from immediate relief for returning refugees to subsistency farming projects. The rehabilitation program includes health and sanitation as well as improvement of transportation and other productive facilities."

To keep our spending program going requires legions of United States agents. In several cities I had trouble securing hotel accommodations. In each case the answer was the same. Rooms were filled by employees of the United States Government. At the time of my visit there were 674 Federal workers attached to our Embassy in Mexico City. Our Ambassador in another country told me that the influx became so great that he was obliged to set up a sort of clearing house at the Embassy to get some semblance of order in their separate comings and goings. Our Government's representatives are so numerous in Brazil that they are called the United States Expeditionary Force.

But the size of our spending operation is no less alarming than the manner of it. The people of Latin America are proud. They naturally desire to be the architects of their own future. We, however, treat them like mendicants; seduce them with boondoggles; make it plain that, whether they like it or not, we aim to do them over in our image.

Nowhere is this fact more disruptively apparent than in the matter of wages. By American standards, wages in Latin America are very low. But so are living costs. Workers in most places do not prefer to earn more. They prefer to work less. That is what we are helping them to do.

Wages paid to Latin-American workers on United States projects run from 3 to 7 times as high as the prevailing wages. In the Dominican Republic, the prevailing wage is 70 cents a day. We pay the Dominicans $3 to $5 a day. In Paraguay, the prevailing wage is 60 cents a day. We pay the Paraguayans $3 to $5 a day. Bolivia's average is 90 cents a day. We pay the Bolivians from $6 to $8. Brazil has an average of $1.80. We pay from $5 to $10.

As a result, the laborer—getting a week's pay for a day's work—pockets it at the end of the day and lays off for a week. Labor turn-over is tremendous.

"The wage rate here is 60 cents a day," a Costa Rican employer told me. "Your Government moved in and pays $2.50 a day. My employees quit and start working for you. But you aren't helped any because they only work a day a week, and we are all losers because those who don't work for you are envious and sullen."

We are told that this is "the good-neighbor policy in deeds." Some of the deeds are worth examining.

Honduras is about the size of Nebraska. It has only 1,100,000 population. Thanks to soil and climate, it could support from 5 to 10 times that number. Starvation is unknown. At present, with a favorable trade balance, the country is more than normally well off. Nevertheless, in Honduras our money is being spent on a road-building project "designed to tide a banana-growing area over an unemployment crisis."

I saw these Honduran project workers of ours. Labor-saving machinery is barred because it would make fewer jobs. Picks and shovels, wielded in the best W. P. A. style, are the order of the day. If these roads endure, future generations of Hondurans may bless us. The present generation, however, travels mostly by burro and oxcart. There are fewer than 3,500 automobiles in the entire country.

But this is by no means all of our spending story in Honduras. The Honduran Government has not seen fit to go in for agricultural development. But the aim of the United States is to provide benefits for the long range while solving problems of immediate concern. As a starter, the purchase of 3,500 tracts of land was arranged. On these tracts, as rapidly as possible, we are resettling farmers. To see them through their first 20 years, until they are self-supporting, credits are extended by the Bank of Honduras. But back of the Bank of Honduras is the United States Treasury to the tune of $2,700,000 Export-Import credits. Thus, at our expense, we are doing for Honduran agriculture what Honduras has not undertaken at its own expense.

Tiny El Salvador's United States financed road building is described in W. P. A. phrases as aimed to give work relief to 2,000 unemployed.

There appears to be no visible connection between what we do to and for these countries and what they are financially able to do for themselves.

Take Cuba. The United States bought all of last year's Cuban sugar crop: $158,000,000. Our purchases from Cuba this year will probably total $200,000,000. Cuba is having a boom. Yet the urge to boondoggle is too strong to be suppressed. While there I motored on the Central Highway which runs from Havana through the wealthy plantation countryside across the island. It appeared to me to be a first-class road. But on the pretext that it might some day serve a useful military purpose—though it never has—it is now to be greatly widened, new pavements laid down, and the proper decorations installed to make it an American-class boulevard. The money—reportedly several million dollars—comes from lend-lease.

Some of our contributions have an emotional angle. It must have been for sentimental reasons that we gave 10 subchasers to Cuba when, for chasing subs, it would seem likely they would have been more useful in the American Navy.

To ease Ecuador's hurt pride at possessing, in times like these, no navy, our sympathetic agents secured a number of private yachts which had been taken over in the United States by our Government. They were fitted out and shipped, gratis, to Ecuador. Now they ride handsomely at anchor in the river at Guayaquil, 140 miles from the sea.

How little is expected from Latin America in support of these manifold undertakings insults both their self-concern and our intelligence.

Latin America's need for improved health is undeniable. The same is true of large areas of the United States. Here, certainly, is an area where, with the United States furnishing every possible assistance in training personnel and in putting our experience at the service of these neighbor nations, we have a right to expect that Latin America should bear a large share of the actual financial burden.

For health and sanitation projects in Ecuador (population 3,200,000) the United States has made an outright gift of $2,160,000. Ecuador contributes nothing. Nevertheless, we confer on the city of Quito (population 150,000) a 100-bed hospital. A 200-bed maternity hospital similarly financed is next on the list.

For health and sanitation projects—drainage, malaria prevention, sanitary improvements—we have made a $750,000 outright gift to Guatemala. Guatemala's contribution is $19,300. We are nonetheless going ahead to build a 300-bed general hospital in Guatemala City (population 167,000).

For similar projects we have given Honduras $500,000. Honduras matches that with $7,260. To start off with, we are building a 100-bed hospital in Choluteca (population 12,000).

Thus, with little pain to anybody but the United States taxpayer, no less than 30 major hospitals are already under construction or planned in Latin America. Nearly 200 health centers and dispensaries are under way or projected. For none of these gifts for health and sanitation is any Latin-American country obligated to repay the United States so much as a red cent. The physical well-being of Latin-America's 120,000,000 people appears to have been made a first charge on the United States Treasury.

How much of a responsive glow these warm deeds stir among Latin Americans is doubtful. The recently appointed Mexican Ambassador to the Argentine has likened our good neighborism to the exploits of Don Quixote—symbolizing generous but more-than-a-little addlepated irresponsibility.

I visited one country which—like numerous others—is in default on loans from private United States banks. The defaulted loan, in this case, is $81,000,000. That unpaid sum, however, has not restrained our cash dispensers. The Export-Import Bank recently extended $30,000,000 of credits from the United States till.

Whereupon our somewhat hard-bitten American Ambassador concluded that this was a propitious time to bring up again the matter of the defaulted loans. He went to the president of this country and asked for a 3 percent token payment. Weeks of negotiation followed. The president finally agreed

to make a payment, not of 3 but of 2 percent—but only if the Ambassador guaranteed to more than cover the amount by getting increased lend-lease aid.

The answer to all this is not to scrap the good-neighbor policy. The answer is to make it authentically good neighbor. Neighborliness is a two-way proposition. We should stop trying to be rich uncle to Latin America. We should insist that, according to their ability to pay, what we do for the nations of Latin America is matched, dollar for dollar, by what Latin America does for itself. This is not merely sound sense from the standpoint of our own interest, it is sound sense for the interests and self-respect of Latin America. When we begin to make that our first aim, then we will begin to merit the respect we have not won and cannot buy.

Canada in Rubber Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I took the floor to discuss the $750,000,000 investment which the taxpayers of the United States have in the synthetic rubber program. Since the time I made these remarks, many Members have asked many questions which perhaps were not covered in what I had to say on the subject. I want to repeat that from the availability of rubber the United States is self-sufficient under normal conditions, and the plants we have in operation or will have in operation in 1944 should be producing at the rate of 850,000 tons of rubber per year. I want to reiterate that this does not mean that we will have tires for everybody who wants a tire. I am informed that the bottleneck in the manufacture of tires will soon be broken, and some relief should be given our civilian population within the next 9 months.

An important part of the program is the expansion of the rubber manufacturing industry to process synthetic rubber into usable products. The expansion and conversion of allied industries to produce the necessary components of rubber goods is an important part of this program and relates to high-tenacity rayon tire cords, carbon blacks, and so forth. When the latter problem is solved there should be enough tires for war and essential civilian use.

In answer to questions regarding crude rubber, my information is that the present crude rubber stock pile together with new imports from tropical countries in the hands of the United Nations must carry us through. The imports of natural crude rubber for 1943 are now expected to be 60,000 long tons and the imports of 1944 will be augmented by increasing shipments from British territories and will be about one-third greater than in 1943, or 90,000 tons. This includes all South American rubber and rubber from Africa.

In my previous statement I said that there are over 50 plants which have something to do in our synthetic-rubber program, and that some plants are also located in Canada. This resulted in some very interesting discussion on the part of many Members who were of the opinion we are investing American taxpayers' money in synthetic-rubber plants located in Canada. I wish to assure the Membership of the House that the rubber program in Canada is financed 100 percent with Canadian Government funds. The only thing that is granted by the United States is the free interchange of ideas.

The rubber program in Canada is operated by the Polymer Corporation, which is similar to the Defense Plant Corporation and Rubber Reserve Company organized by this Government.

Imperial Oil Co., Ltd., was selected to operate the butadiene capacity of 30,000 tons per year. This company was also designated to operate a small butyl plant with a capacity of 7,000 tons. This butyl is to be manufactured by a process similar to that of the Standard Oil of the New Jersey group. All butadiene made in Canada will be made from a petroleum base.

The Canadian subsidiary of the Dow Chemical Co. is the operator of the styrene plant with a capacity of 10,000 tons. The process is one engineered by Dow Chemical from its own designs and knowledge.

The Canadian Synthetics Rubber, Inc., was formed to operate the copolymer plant which will make GR–S with a capacity of between 35,000 and 40,000 tons per year. This company was formed with the cooperation of the United States Tire & Rubber Co., Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

All plants in Canada are built on a cost-plus basis. Any engineering technique or designs employed which are derived from sources within the United States are paid for. Canadian authorities have cooperated 100 percent in the rubber program and their representatives sit with those of this country at most meetings. About the only thing that is granted free is the interchange of ideas.

Before World War No. 2, Canada consumed between 50,000 and 60,000 tons of crude rubber a year. An example of cooperation is that the Canadian Styrene plant was operating before the others, that styrene was shipped to the United States, while in return, certain butadiene was shipped to Canada. All the various units are now getting into production with final product GR–S from components made in Canada, and all will be in production in the near future.

At the present time, there is no plant in Canada to process butadiene from an alcohol base and so far as is known, none is contemplated. However, at the Ontario Paper Co., Thorold, Ontario, considerable work is being done on the production of alcohol from waste sulfite liquor.

As you know, heretofore sulfite liquor has been a waste byproduct of paper manufacturing plants. Its disposal has always been a problem. As work develops, it may be that sulfite liquor will become an economical base for alcohol for commercial purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in several of the statements I made on this floor regarding the rubber program, I made reference to the Honorable William M. Jeffers, the former Rubber Director. I stated then and I reiterate now that Mr. Jeffers made the program successful because of his unusual ability, progressiveness, initiative, and knowledge of organization. I have been informed by many people close to the program that Mr. Jeffers accomplished in the rubber program in 1 year what would normally take 10 or 12 years to do. This country owes him a great debt of gratitude for his gigantic contribution to the Government and the people at a time of great crisis. Mr. Jeffers recently made some statements about the rubber program. These statements were published in the November issue of the Railroad Trainman. By leave granted me, I include in my remarks the article which appeared in the Railroad Trainman magazine:

JEFFERS SUGGESTS UNITED STATES MANUFACTURE OF TIRES

Former Rubber Director William M. Jeffers has declared that, in order to protect the taxpayers' investment of $750,000,000 in synthetic rubber plants, and to avert "unnecessary interference" and "continual bickering and knifing" of the rubber program, "it may become necessary for the Government to go into the manufacturing of tires and rubber goods generally."

Jeffers' statement was in reply to an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record on October 4, which said:

"We are not getting enough synthetic rubber tires. The Nation faces a possible breakdown in rubber-borne transportation. Hadn't you better return to your job as rubber director and stick to the job, until it is done right?

"Why didn't you fight for enough manpower and equipment to see that tires were made?"

Answering that the shortage of manpower in the rubber industry "was repeatedly called to the attention of the War Manpower Commission," Mr. Jeffers charged that "it is the duty of rubber companies as well as every other industry in the country to think more about winning a war and getting the job done, and less about what their position might be post war."

The full text of his statement, which received scant notice in most of the Nation's press, is as follows:

OMAHA, *October 4, 1943.*

EDITOR, THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

Your wire of yesterday which implies criticism of me:

In my letter of resignation to the President I said "The big job covered by the recommendations of the Baruch report is done" and that is exactly the situation. You say "Hadn't you better return to your job as rubber director and stick to the job until it is done right."

As to the Associated Press survey from Akron quoting the views of the executives of five major rubber companies. I doubt that the chief executives of all the rubber companies made any such statements. Regardless of whether they did or not, it is of interest to note that the executives of the five

major rubber companies have finally appreciated their responsibilities in keeping this country on wheels.

The American people think of rubber in the manner in which it is largely used, namely tires. Some of these rubber companies are devoting too much of their manpower and facilities to other than making tires for military or civilian use.

Some 6 weeks ago I invited the executives of all of the rubber companies, as well as the officers of the rubber workers union to meet with me in Washington to discuss what I considered at least a 20-percent lag in production. Curiously enough, the rubber workers union was represented by their international president and the presidents of some 32 locals. The rubber companies were represented by 2 presidents of small rubber companies and the so-called major companies were represented by subordinate officers, most of whom were of the production expert type rather than the men at the top.

I hold no brief for the rubber workers union in this situation for the reason that there were two strikes which seriously interfered with the production of tires that should not have happened. Second, and again admittedly, there was a slow-down in production. But that is not the whole story.

The question of adequate intelligent supervision on the job, the matter of keeping machines in proper condition and keeping material up to the man at the machine, the matter of using more of the available manpower on the production of tires and less hoarding of labor in other departments not engaged in tire production, are all contributing to an unsatisfactory output.

The officers of these unions attended this meeting ready and willing to commit themselves to doing a job if the proper cooperation was forthcoming from the rubber industry.

While there is a shortage of manpower in the rubber industry it is not nearly as serious as the shortage of manpower on the American railroads. These railroad men, in maintenance, and particularly in transportation, train and engine men and yardmen, are not confining themselves to 7 hours per day as they are in the mines while the country is faced with a coal crisis. They are working 10, 12, 14, and 16 hours per day in an all-out effort to keep traffic moving in support of the war.

As to the tire-fabric problem, in my letter to the President I said there was a shortage of tire fabric for which the War Production Board was responsible. The Rubber Director as such was completely without authority to correct the tire fabric situation because the Chairman of the War Production Board personally had held it up for reasons best known to himself.

The question of shortage of manpower in the rubber industry was repeatedly called to the attention of the War Manpower Commission.

The increase in the military demands for tires in the larger sizes for the handling of mobile artillery, as well as for the larger sizes for the heavier planes that are now being turned out, further complicates the situation. This, however, is war and it is the duty of rubber companies as well as every other industry in the country to think more about winning a war and getting the job done, and less about what their position might be postwar.

Rubber companies still have salesmen on the road who ought to be making tires in the plants. Your attention is directed to the type of advertising of some rubber companies with which you are, or ought to be, familiar, praising the synthetic tire. Seemingly now they want to reverse themselves and talk up their difficulties in turning out synthetic tires.

Colonel Dewey, who worked with me for the past year on the rubber program, understands this problem thoroughly. With him in his organization is Tompkins of the U. S. Rubber Co., whom I consider tops in the rubber industry. Babcock of Firestone, who is in Dewey's organization, is one of the Nation's top men in developing the use of synthetics in all types of tires.

If Colonel Dewey will continue to not only ask for but demand the ultimate in support of the rubber program from these rubber companies, from the War Production Board, and from the War Manpower Commission, the rubber program will come through.

The taxpayers of this country have an investment of $750,000,000 in the synthetic rubber plants. Here is an investment that can and should pay dividends. I am a firm believer in private initiative and private business but in order to protect this investment and make certain that there is no unnecessary interference with the rubber-borne transportation on the highways of this country and to assure the manufacture of acceptable tires at a fair price, and at the same time to do away with this continual bickering and knifing of a program, it may become necessary for the Government to go into the manufacturing of tires and rubber goods generally.

In short the American people, I am sure, will insist upon the investment of these tremendous sums of money in synthetic rubber plants being utilized for the good of all, rather than being manhandled for and by the few.

I note statements in the press from a Dr. Phillips of the O. P. A. who is now experting on the rubber program. This is just another instance of the Phi Beta Kappa boys trying to get themselves into the spotlight. There are practical men in the O. P. A., who if given the opportunity to head up the rubber problem within the O. P. A. will do a job.

W. M. JEFFERS.

Congressman Bulwinkle Makes Contribution to Aviation Bill in Skyways Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an article by Representative BULWINKLE in Skyways news bulletin:

PENDING LEGISLATION

Recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a bill—H. R. 3421—which would clarify and preserve the section of the Civil Aeronautics Act with regard to maintaining aviation on a basis of healthly independence of other forms of transportation. Hearings on the bill will undoubtedly be held within the near future, at which time the entire question can be openly discussed. It will then be up to the Congress, as representatives of the public, to decide whether it wants to change its 30-year-old policy of preserving competition between the forms of transport.

Shortly thereafter a bill—H. R. 3491—was introduced in the House of Representatives which would permit railroads and other surface carriers to enter into domestic air transportation. The bill was introduced by a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who, not longer than 8 months ago, spoke from the floor of Congress about his part in keeping aviation free from the clutches of other forms of transportation.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

The possibilities of air transportation for the future welfare of our Nation can be realized only by dint of hard work requiring the utmost devotion to the objective of developing air transportation and an undivided concentration on the part of those in the air transport industry upon the job of building and expanding and improving their facilities. For air transportation today remains relatively insignificant in size, by comparison, but great in its experience. The last annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission shows us that of the total volume of intercity traffic within the United States in 1941, the ton-miles of cargo, including mail, carried by air were so few that they were not worth computing in percentage terms—being less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. Even in the passenger field air transportation accounted for only forty-four one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total passenger-miles of intercity traffic. And of persons employed or seeking work in all our transportation industries in 1940, only a little over 1 percent represented those in the air transportation industry.

Plainly, therefore, the air transport industry remains, relatively speaking, a mere infant.

As long as air transportation remains in need of such tremendous development as it now requires, it would be a fatal mistake to permit a situation to arise whereby that development could be governed by the needs or the interest of rail transportation. The proper place of air transportation in our national economy will ultimately have to be determined by the men and women, the farmers, and the manufacturers who use transportation. No edict of a governmental agency should be permitted to determine this question. As the National Resources Planning Board recently stated in its report entitled "Transportation and National Policy":

"Reliance must be placed upon the choices of the users, evidenced by their patronage of transportation services, to call forth their proper proportions of the Nation's resources into the industry and to effect a proper allocation of these resources among the various transport media. Allocation of traffic is not accomplished by Government fiat or by arbitrary prescription but by the free use of consumers."

And if we are to have an ultimate determination by the users of air transportation concerning its proper place in our economy, it is essential that the air-transport industry be built up to stand on its own feet on a basis where it can freely compete with other modes of transportation independently and without restraint.

PRINCIPLE OF COMPETITION

The need for keeping competing forms of transportation on a basis reasonably independent of each other has long been recognized by our people.

In the Republican platform of 1908 there was a declaration in favor of maintaining "the principle of competition between naturally competing lines." (See special message of the President of the United States on interstate commerce and antitrust laws, January 7, 1910.) This principle has been reflected in Federal legislation. Indeed, it represents a basic principle in our transportation philosophy.

Not only have we provided safeguards against undue suppression of competition among carriers engaged in the same form of transportation but we have also taken steps to assure that the several different forms of transportation shall be kept separate and that one shall not be susceptible to the domination of the other.

It will be recalled that in the Clayton Act, adopted in 1914, a section was included having the effect of prohibiting ownership by one common carrier of the stock of another, except in the case of an acquisition of "short lines so located as to become feeders to the main line," or acquisition of branch or other lines where there was no substantial competition.

WATER CARRIERS

In the case of different modes of transportation, there have been even more pointed restrictions upon the intermingling of interests.

In 1912 the United States Commissioner of Corporations, in a report entitled "Control of Water Carriers by Railroads and by Shipping Consolidations," stated:

"In acquiring their extensive control over domestic water carriers, railroads have had in general three purposes: First, to eliminate the competition of water carriers; second, to obtain an entrance into territory not open to their rail lines; and, third, to secure valuable feeders, mainly local lines." (See report of the Commissioner of Corporations, Transportation by Water in the United States, pt. IV, December 23, 1912, at p. xv.)

This report also pointed out:

"So far as the eastern part of the country is concerned, water lines have to a large extent become auxiliaries or subsidiaries of railroads. These conditions force consideration of the policy to be adopted toward such carriers. Since water competition has in a considerable measure been restricted by railroad control of water lines, this fact must be taken account of." (See idem, note 6, pp. xvi and xvii.)

In the same year the Interstate Commerce Act was amended so as to make it unlawful for a railroad to own or control or to have any interest whatsoever in any common carrier by water operated through the Panama Canal or elsewhere with which such railroad does or may compete. This provision was later modified to the extent of permitting acquisition of an interest in a water carrier not operated through the Canal upon a finding by the I. C. C. that such acquisition would not reduce or prevent competition and that there is a special justification for such acquisition.

RAIL-WATER CARRIERS

Legislation respecting rail-water carrier relationships, and the rigid regulation made applicable to such relationships, was the result of careful investigation by committees of Congress.

"The proper function of a railroad corporation is to operate trains on its tracks, not to occupy the water with ships in mock competition with itself, which in reality operate to the extinction of all genuine competition." (See H. Rept. No. 423, 62d Cong., 2d sess., p. 12.)

It had been found, for example, that railroads acquire river lines for "fighting purposes," that is simply as a means for driving others out of business. (See S. Doc. No. 325, 60th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 330–332 and 375.) It was further found that:

"A railroad obtains control of a water line or canal and (1) fails to maintain the efficiency of the same, thus making water transportation so expensive as to eliminate competition, or (2) fixes rates so high as to preclude its use, or (3) abandons the property.

"A railroad charters space from a competing water line, although not using it, thus depriving shippers of space and making them dissatisfied with the water-line service.

"A railroad or its controlled water line or terminal company holds all the available docks and shedded piers and refuses access to an independent line for the purposes of discharging and receiving cargo, or allows access only upon the payment of unreasonable charges. The independent line is thus required to unload at some other dock and team the goods to and from the railroad station.

"A railroad or its controlled water line owns the available water frontage which it refuses to utilize, at the same time refusing to release the same by sale or otherwise.

"A railway water line or large all-water line cuts rates unduly (thereby putting 'fighting ships' in the trade or by having its regular boats quote unremunerative rates and when the competition has been dissolved advances the rates even higher than they had been ordinarily. While cutting rates the large company recoups itself out of rates at noncompetitive points or on through business secured from railroads on a favorable basis." (See proceedings of House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in investigation of shipping combinations, 63d Cong., vol. IV, pp. 410–411.)

Another illustration of the adverse consequences of control by one form of transportation over another is found in an incident in connection with one of the railroads in the northeastern section of the country. At one time, shoe manufacturers around Boston were able to ship goods to retailers partly by water and partly by rail. The water line, however, was purchased by a railroad and shortly thereafter was discontinued; the result was that the rate to the shoe manufacturers was immediately increased by over 30 percent because of the necessity to use an all-rail route. (See Atwood, the Great Express Monopoly, the American magazine (March 1911), p. 623. See also 27 I. C. C. 560, 608, 609.) Similarly, in the early days of railroading, there was considerable evidence that persons interested in the Erie Canal were able to impose substantial restrictions upon the development of railroads in that territory; indeed, both canals and plank roads had some success for a number of years in preventing railroad development.

MOTOR CARRIERS

When the Motor Carrier Act was under consideration in Congress, the question of railroad control of motor carriers arose and was carefully considered. A special provision was written into the law designed to prevent railroad acquisition of motor carriers except where the motor operation was purely incidental to the rail service. In explaining this section on behalf of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. SADOWSKI said:

"Section 213 provides that the Commission shall control the consolidation, merger and acquisition of control of motor carriers. I will say in this respect that it is the intent, and it is important to the welfare and progress of the motor-carrier industry, that the acquisition of control of the carriers be regulated by the Commission so that the control does not get into the hands of other competing forms of transportation, who might use the control as a means to strangle, curtail or hinder progress in highway transportation for the benefit of the other competing transportation." (See 78 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12206.)

The reason for providing such a special safeguard was well stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission in these terms:

"Truck service would not, in our judgment, have developed to the extraordinary extent to which it has developed if it had been under railroad control. * * * The financial and soliciting resources of the railroads could easily be so used in this field that the development of (motor) service would be greatly hampered and restricted and with ultimate disadvantage to the public." (See 1 M. C. C. p. 112.)

And in later cases where railroads have sought certificates to engage directly in motor transportation, the I. C. C. has applied the same standards applicable in a case where the railroad seeks to acquire a motor carrier. (See 1 M. C. C. 221; 12 M. C. C. 485; 17 M. C. C. 413.)

The Commission has referred with approval to the contention of independent motor carriers "that railroad control of motor carriers might ultimately be able to prevail over independent competitors, not because of any superiority in service or operation but through their ability to draw upon the financial and other resources of their parent companies, and that the motor-carrier industry is more likely to develop in inherent strength and efficiency if it continues, as in the past, to remain largely in independent hands." (See 10 M. C. C. at p. 237.)

Increase of Compensation of Railroad Employees

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, having discussed this matter some weeks ago, I want again today to speak very briefly in support of the appeal of the railroad men to the Congress for a raise of their wages in the meager sum of 8 cents an hour.

I want to say to the Members of this House that I believe we should vote to give them the small amount they ask. Let me submit my reasons.

First, their wages are too low, compared with the average level of wages. I say average level in order to exclude workers in most of the war-producing plants, because in most war plants the workers are getting at least 50 percent more than the railroad men will get after this increase has been allowed.

Second, they can be granted this raise without breaking the "hold the line" order because such raise will not yet bring them above the wages they are entitled to in comparison with the cost of living or the Little Steel formula.

Third, to grant them this raise will not, in any way, raise the cost of living because such raise will not cause the railroads to raise their rates in a single instance.

Fourth, it will settle the discontent and restlessness that the administration and Mr. Vinson's denial of their rights has stirred up among them and it may prevent a general railway strike. The over a million men in these 15 organizations have seen their rights kicked around from one commission to another in a continuous game of "buck passing" till they are becoming aroused.

Fifth, collective bargaining between labor and management is an established institution in this Nation. It is regarded by the laboring men as the foundation of labor's bill of rights. The railroad management and the representatives of the men have met collectively, bargained and agreed upon the increase of 8 cents an hour, and if we believe in what we have written into the law, that agreement especially due to the fact that it does not even tend to raise the cost of living, should have been approved at once by Judge Vinson.

Sixth, when precedent and law is being evaded, bypassed and usurped by bureaucratic and dictatorial methods, it is time for Congress to assert itself and act swiftly and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I fear by our environment we allow ourselves in our thinking to get too far away from our people in our district. We forget the human equation. I want you to think with me for a moment so we can have a meeting of the minds and try to settle this question before this matter results in a Nation-wide strike and the Government finds an excuse to step in and take over the railroads. You remember, I am sure, the miserable and costly failure the Government made in operating the railroads in the First World War. None of us who remember that tragedy want to take a chance on it happening again.

The over a million men who are asking for this raise have not caused by a strike the loss of a day's time in 22 years. They have done a marvelous job in helping to keep the roadbeds and rolling stock in shape that has made it possible to move twice the amount of freight and passenger traffic since war was declared than has ever before been transported in this Nation. They are among our most respected and patriotic citizens of the Nation, yet over one-half million of these railroad men receive an average of less than 70 cents an hour, and 120,000 of these railroad men receive 46 cents an hour or less. This Congress, in my judgment, should pass the Truman-Crosser resolution, settle the matter, and remove this gross inequity in wages.

New Booklet Explaining Benefits, Rights, and Privileges of Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents; Also World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, practically every year for a number of years I have prepared a booklet on the rights and benefits of veterans and their dependents. I have just completed, with the aid of others who are given credit in the foreword of the publication, a Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War No. 1 and Their Dependents, House Document No. 285, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. Its printing has been authorized by a resolution of the House of Representatives. It contains 315 questions and answers, consisting of 76 pages.

A number of these booklets will be furnished each Member of the House. Although the number will not be sufficient for general distribution, it is thought that the number furnished will be sufficient for the service officers in a Member's district.

This handbook contains information relative to the laws, rules, and regulations up to this date and, of course, includes the revision of the allotments and allowances as provided in the new act. In other words, it is right up to date and will answer practically every question that is generally asked concerning the subject of the document. The index is as follows:

	Question and answer number
Allotment of pay	82–105
Allotment of pay, change or discontinuance of	87, 89
Allotment of pay, defined	82
Allotment of pay for insurance premiums	249
Allotments of pay, taxable to person making	29
Allotment of pay to a landlord	135
Allowances of military personnel, not subject to tax	28
Allowances to men on furlough	4
American Legion	311, 312
Appeals by claimants of compensation or pension	229
Application for burial allowance	271
Application for compensation or pension, by veterans	225
Application for family allowance	63–65
Application for hospitalization or domiciliary care	236
Attachment of veterans' benefit payments, prohibited	231
"Automatic pension age"	221
Aviation cadets, insurance protection	246
Beneficiaries of servicemen's life insurance	254, 255
"Brother and sister", defined for purpose of dependent's allowance	59
Burial of veterans; allowances, etc	263–272
Canteen, defined; sales to enlisted men	5, 6
Captured personnel, automatic insurance	261
Censorship of mail to foreign countries	22
"Child", defined for purpose of dependent's allowance	53
Children of veterans, when pensionable after reaching 18	228
Civil-service employment of veterans	296–298
Claims before Veterans' Administration, procedure	273–275
Clothing for veterans receiving hospitalization, etc	239
Coast Guard, assistance in securing employment on discharge	306
Coast Guard, rank and pay follow those of Navy	12, 14
Compensation for disability or death of veteran, granting of; rates, etc	216–235
Compensation of veterans, amount not confidential	277
Correspondence with foreign countries during war	22–24
Court martial of members of the Women's Army Corps	148
Death, absence as evidence of	280
Death gratuity, payment of	119–126
Dependents, age limit of	61
Dependents' allowances (act of 1942)	43–81
Dependents, defined for purpose of monetary allowance	97–100
Dependents of an enlisted individual; classified	57–60
Dependents of veterans, compensation to	227–231
Deposit of pay by enlisted men	16–18
Desertion, forfeits dependents' allowances	79
Desertion, forfeits pay deposited in "Pay of Army fund"	18
Disabled American veteran	315
Dishonorable discharge, how removed	2
Divorced wife, when eligible for dependent's allowance	54
Documentary evidence of war service required by United States Employment Service	301
Documentary proof of dependency	66
Documentary proof of marriage	67
Domiciliary care	236, 237
Employment of veterans after discharge from the service	294
"Enlisted individual," persons included in term	45
Enlistment requirements, Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard	173
Enlistment requirements, Women's Reserve of the United States Marine Corps	185
Eviction, for nonpayment of rent	134
Examples of income tax computation	33, 39–41
Exemptions from income tax	27, 28, 34–39
Families of veterans, assistance in securing employment	309
Family allowance not to overlap monetary allowance	93
Family allowances, general information concerning	46–91
Family allowance, tax exemption	27
Family allowance; total monthly allowance in typical cases	69
Fees for services before Veterans' Administration	274
File records of veterans, confidential nature of	276
Flags to drape caskets of veterans	267
Foreign service by members of the Women's Army Corps	157
Fraud in connection with dependent's allowance, penalty	81
Furlough, allowances to men on; reduced fares	3, 4
Furloughs in Women's Army Corps	151
Gratuity pay not taxable income	31
"Gratuity pay" not taxable to beneficiary	31
Headstones for graves of veterans	272
Hospitalization of members of Women's Army Corps	152, 158
Hospitalization of veterans	236–242
Income tax, abatement of	32
Income tax, exemption for servicemen; special provisions	25–42
Income tax, liability of members of the armed forces under the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943	33–42
Initial family allowance	46–49
Insurance policies, protection under Civil Relief Act	132, 133
Insurance (private) of servicemen, protection of	253, 259
Internees abroad, correspondence with	23, 24
Life insurance for servicemen; difference between World Wars Nos. 1 and 2	243–262
Longevity pay	11–15
Mail to servicemen, how to address, etc	19–21
Make-up allowed in Women's Army Corps	156
Marine Corps, assistance in securing employment on discharge	306
Marine Corps, rank and pay follow those of Army	11, 13
MARINE, female; an "enlisted individual" for purpose of family allowance law	80
Marriage, by members of women's military organizations	166, 175, 187
Married women eligible for Women's Army Corps	142
Married women eligible for Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard	174
Married women eligible for Women's Reserve, United States Marine Corps	186
"Missing" and "missing in action," meaning of the terms	107

	Question and answer number
"Missing in action," etc., effect on monetary allowance	91
Missing men and women and their dependents	106–118
Monetary allowance in lieu of quarters, defined	92
Monetary allowances in lieu of quarters for dependents	92–105
"Monthly family allowance"	50
National cemeteries, who entitled to burial in	266, 270
Navy; Women's Reserve	159–170
Non-service-connected disabilities, when pension payable for	219, 220, 222, 223
Nurses, Army and Navy; pay rates	15
Oath of enlistment	1
Officer candidate requirements in the Women's Army Corps	143
Officer candidate requirements, Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard	176
Officer candidate requirements, Women's Reserve of the Navy	161
Out-patient treatment	241
Overseas burial of servicemen	268, 269
Overseas service, pay increase for	9, 13, 15
"Parent," defined for purpose of dependent's allowance	58
Pay-as-you-go income tax, how servicemen can take advantage of	42
Pay of enlisted men	8–10, 13, 14
Pay of officers, commissioned and warrant	11, 12
"Pay of the Army fund," Government safekeeping of enlisted man's pay	16–18
Pay of the Women's Army Corps	145–147
Pay of Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard	177, 178
Pay of Women's Reserve, United States Marine Corps	190
Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; schedules of rates, etc	7–14
Pension and compensation distinguished	216
Personal effects of veterans dying while hospitalized, etc	242
Political influence no factor in granting veterans' benefits	201
Postage required on mail to Navy personnel	21
Postage unnecessary on mail for prisoners of war or internees	24
Post exchange, defined; sales to enlisted men	5, 6
Premiums on Government life insurance	247–250
Prisoners of war, allotment of pay continues	116
Prisoners of war, correspondence with	23, 24
Private hospitalization, reimbursement of expenses	238
Prosthetic appliances, when furnished by Government	240
Public-land leases, etc., not forfeited by military service	137
Qualifications, Women's Reserve of the Navy	162
Reduced fare to men on furlough	3
Rehabilitation of veterans	197, 281–309
Rent, allotment of pay for	135
Retired officers holding civilian office, limitation on retired pay	232
Retired officers, monetary benefits	235
Saluting by Women's Reserve of the Navy	165
Selectees, not inducted, not entitled to pension	224
Service-connected disability payments	217, 218, 233
"Servicemen" defined	194
"Serviceman" distinguished from "veteran"	194
Service record, how copy secured	275
Smiths in World War No. 1	215
Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, purpose and scope	127–139, 152, 258, 259
SPARS	171–182
SPAR, an enlisted individual for purposes of family allowance law	80
Specialized service, additional pay for	11, 14
Statutes of limitations, period of military service not counted in	138
Taxation of allotment to designated beneficiaries	29
Taxation of veterans' benefit payments, prohibited	231
Tax Payment Act of 1943, Current	33–42
Tax sale of serviceman's property	136
Training schools, Women's Army Corps	144
Transportation for hospital treatment, etc	237
United States Employment Service, assistance to veterans	299–309
"Veteran" defined and distinguished from "serviceman"	194
Veterans' Administration; establishment, duties, etc	202–206
Veterans' Administration facilities	210–213
Veterans' Administration field stations	205, 207
Veterans' Administration, procedure on claims	214, 215, 273–275
Veterans' Administration regional offices	208–209, 212
Veterans' benefits	194–280
Veterans of Foreign Wars	313, 314
Veterans' organization, benefits derived from	310
Veterans' preference under civil service	296
Vocational rehabilitation of veteran	283–295
Vocations, for persons undergoing vocational rehabilitation	292, 293
Voluntary allotments, who can make	84
WAC; an "enlisted individual" for purpose of family allowance law	80
WAVE; an "enlisted individual" for purpose of family allowance law	80
"WAVES," derivation of name	164
Women's Army Corps, vocational rehabilitation	294
Women's Army Corps	140–158
Women's Reserve of the Navy, benefits	167
Women's Reserve of the Navy	159–170
Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard	171–182
Women's Reserve of the United States Marine Corps	183–193

Consumers' Subsidies Is Not the Answer to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to present a phase of the subsidy issue that has not yet, I believe, been presented heretofore. If I thought that the payment of subsidies would bring relief from high prices to the millions of people in America with low incomes, including workers, I should support the payment of subsidies. However, I cannot convince myself that this bill will control prices. The payment of subsidies has not done so in the past and in my judgment will not do so in the future, for obvious reasons.

Let us examine the facts. Inflation is caused by the fact that there is more purchasing money than there is consumer goods available and that the so-called excess is not absorbed by either taxes or noninflationary investments. The President has tried to close what he calls the inflationary gap by absorbing the excess purchasing power through taxes and bond purchases. Income payments are the amounts paid to each group of people such as agriculture, labor, wages, and salaries, and so forth. The total income payments each year represents, of course, the amount of so-called money available for some kind of spending.

Let us examine the income payments of the Nation for the last 4 years. These figures were verified by the Department of Commerce today, November 24, 1943. In 1940 the income payments were $76,400,000,000. In 1941 they were $92,200,000,000, an increase of $15,800,000,000 over the preceding year. Income payments for 1942 were $115,400,000,000 or $23,200,000,000 over 1941. In 1943 income payments will be $142,000,000,000 or nearly $27,000,000,000 over the preceding year. Income payments or purchasing power has been almost doubled in 3 years or increased nearly $66,000,000,000. In 1940 income from wages and salaries was $50,100,000,000. In 1941 wages and salary income was $61,800,000,000, an increase of $11,700,000,000 over the preceding year.

In 1942 income from wages and salaries was $79,800,000,000, an increase of $18,000,000,000 over the preceding year. In 1943 the income from wages and salaries aggregated $100,900,000,000, an increase of more than $21,100,000,000 over the preceding year. Wages and salaries have increased $50,800,000,000 since 1940, or more than doubled in 3 years. The total farm income, while it has more than doubled since 1940, was at a low ebb in 1940, with farm products way below production costs. According to figures given me by the Department of Commerce, the total farm income for 1943 will be $12,500,000,000, or 8.8 percent of the total income for 1943.

This bill proposes to pay a subsidy of from 5 to 10 percent on only a part of that farm income. The Monroney amendment would have limited the amount to $750,000,000 during the next 10 months. To me it seems futile to argue that inflation and prices can be controlled by paying a subsidy of from 5 to 10 percent on a part of the food the farmer grows when his total income amounts to only 8.8 percent of the income of the Nation. To argue that we can control inflation by the payment of $700,000,000 to $800,000,000 a year in consumers subsidies when income payments and purchasing power are increasing from $15,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 a year, borders on the ridiculous. This is particularly true when we take into consideration the fact that the purchasing power has been increased $66,000,000,000 within the last 3 years, or more than doubled, and wages and salaries have increased $50,000,000,000, or more than doubled during the same period. It was obviously impossible to control prices in 1943 with a subsidy of this kind when wages and salaries increased during that year more than $21,000,000,000, and the total income of the country was increased during the same year by $27,000,000,000.

I called the attention of the House last June to the excessive wages paid in defense industries. I placed into the RECORD at that time advertisements by the United States Employment Service advertising:

We will pay $230 a month to women from 18 to 50 years of age during a short training period and then $270 per month. No experience required. (Signed) U. S. Employment Service.

I pointed out that they were advertising for dishwashers at $250 a month. I also placed into the RECORD the pay roll of one plant who had paid machine-gun assemblers in 1942 from $4,774 to $8,741, and machine-gun filers similar wages. I gave you information showing how janitors were paid $3,100, and Kresge dime-store girls were given $65 a week after a short training period. These janitors are still getting as high as $3,100 a year. Machine-gun assemblers are still being paid excessive amounts, and they are still advertising for welders at $65 a week.

To talk about controlling inflation by paying a consumers' subsidy in the face of these facts is ridiculous, to say the least. Every housewife will testify that prices have risen in the past 3 years, in spite of subsidies. Effective price control and effective control of costs of the elements that go into making up the cost of producing an article, either in the factory or on the farm, is the only sound method of controlling prices and inflation.

Increase in Price of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a situation that strikes me as highly incongruous.

Today in Montana eggs are selling for 71 cents a dozen while oil—the life blood of any mechanized war, such as this, and a product ranking third in importance in the prosecution of the war—brings but $1.10 per barrel. Drillers are costing the producers of that oil, for which they are paid $1.10 a barrel, $19 a day. A cackling hen is more valuable than an oil well.

Is it any wonder then that in my State and all over the West and Southwest marginal fields are being closed down and no new fields to speak of are being developed? Wild catting is an expensive and uncertain business, and $1.10 a barrel for oil simply is not conducive to an increase in the production of this all-important product.

Those who should know insist that it costs 50 cents per barrel more to produce a barrel of oil than it did when the price of oil was frozen back in 1941. Yet, Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson has seen fit to deny even the 35 cents per barrel increase previously recommended by Petroleum Administrator Ickes in April 1943.

A 35 cents a barrel increase in the price of oil would go a long way toward inducing these wildcatters to risk losing their shirts in the uncertain sinking of new wells.

That $100,000,000 gift to Canada for establishing a Canadian oil project, which I am told will only produce as much oil as a single tanker working part time could deliver to Alaska, would go a long way toward inducing United Production in marginal fields.

Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following peace program proposed by the Knights of Columbus and adopted by its supreme council, August 19, 1943:

Amid the horrors of carnage and slaughter, now engulfing the whole wide world, we cannot too often proclaim that "America fights for God-given rights," nor can we too often repeat, with all the moral force which the solemnity of the issue inspires, that lasting peace can be achieved only if the peoples of the world, who become parties to the peace treaty, whole-heartedly accept the following principles that embody those God-given rights.

1. In the spirit of the founding fathers, we hold as self-evident that all men are created equal in the sight of God. From this fundamental fact of creation, we proclaim the primacy of the rights of God over the rights of man, and in man himself, the primacy of duties over rights; because human rights signify nothing more than divinely bestowed means to the fulfillment of divinely imposed duties—that is, the first fact about man is his duties to the Creator, from which no human power can dispense, and for the discharge of those duties, the Creator bestows those necessary and inalienable rights which no dictator, political or economic, can ever take away.

2. To man's first duty of universal dependence upon the Creator, corresponds the universal right to life, personal domestic, social, economic, political, national, international and religious life; the duty to know God requires the right to learning; the duty to love God, the right to liberty; the duty to serve God with body and soul, the right to livelihood; and the duty to protect all these divinely bestowed rights requires the further right to law, both national and international.

3. Hence, the first step toward world peace must be the substitution of the law of moral right for the barbaric rule of material might; that is, the restoration of God's eternal law of duties and rights as the universal norm of morality—to distinguish right from wrong, and to displace the now prevalent norm of national self-interest and greed, backed by mammoth armaments—as the exemplar, the motive, and the binding force behind all international pacts, agreements, treaties, and conventions, and thus, through an ardent crusade of Christian forces, to prevent the complete collapse of Christian civilization—in short, to bring back God into world government.

4. To insure that all international institutions organized for world peace shall constitute, not a web of entangling alliances, but a government of laws and not of men, the following conditions must be fulfilled:

(a) Regeneration of the individual man through all the resources that education, religion, and morality can supply.

(b) Recognition of the essential unity, solidarity, and mutual interdependence of all mankind in the family of nations, all created by the one God and all redeemed by the one God-man.

(c) Eternal vigilance and insistence that the state exists for man, not man for the state.

(d) Elimination of the causes of war—namely, the struggle to dominate industry, the struggle to subjugate the majesty of the political state to the interests of avarice and economic greed, and the struggle to control relations between sovereign states themselves.

(e) Repudiation of both excessive nationalism (i. e., individualism) that seeks to promote separate national interests at the expense of the higher common good of the family of nations; and excessive internationalism, communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and kindred doctrines, that would promote a spurious view of the common good, by destroying the natural rights of man and compelling the surrender of national sovereignty and independence.

(f) Acceptance of the general principle that the question of damages and indemnities be submitted to an international commission which shall determine what justice and equity may require.

(g) Fidelity to the guaranties of "no aggrandizement, territorial or other," and no territorial arrangements that fail to accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

(h) Realization that "treaties of peace"—especially since the First World War—"formulated in a spirit opposed to the dictates of morality and a genuine political wisdom, have had a wretched and short-lived existence."

(i) Establishment, without entangling alliances, of some form of international institution with the following objectives:

1. To codify the natural and the positive law of nations;

2. To effectuate guaranties to all nations, great and small, of independence and the right to exist; and to all religious, racial, and cultural minorities, of full enjoyment of all the God-given rights of man

3. To promote progressive, reciprocal, simultaneous disarmament of all nations—on land, on sea, and in the air;

4. To demand universal abolition of compulsory military service as the acid test of sincerity in disarmament pacts; though we are not opposed to physical education for health;

5. To reduce military forces within national states to the minimum necessary for internal law and order.

(j) Substitution of conciliation, arbitration, and judicial processes for war.

(k) Except in obvious self-defense against unjust aggression, renunciation by all sovereign states of the right to war as an instrument of national or international policy.

(l) Establishment of effective sanctions against any nation declining to disarm or to abolish conscription, or failing to submit a dispute to arbitration, or refusing to abide by an arbitral decision—such sanctions to be

enforced by quarantining such offenders against world peace, delivering them over to the execration of mankind, and effectually isolating them from all world trade, from access to raw materials, and from all intercourse with other nations—economic, political, or diplomatic.

"God wills it, God wills it," cried the great Crusaders, in the age of chivalry, when knighthood was in flower. In the name of the fathers and mothers who abhor all wars, and of the plain people everywhere, who pay the price in loss of life and limb and livelihood, we Knights of Columbus dedicate, we consecrate, ourselves to an intensive crusade of education, to rouse the conscience of the world from the heavy torpor into which the drugs of false ideas, widely diffused, have sunk it; and, lest we win the war and lose the peace, we cordially invite all men of good will, the world over, who have seen and felt the folly and futility of war, and the failure of godless treaties to establish justice and charity, peace and concord among men—nay, by "the blood and sweat, the toil and tears" we are told this war will cost, we solemnly conjure all God-fearing men to join in this crusade to reestablish the social reign of the Prince of Peace—a divine crusade of prayer, of penance, and of the democratic processes of sober thought and public discussion, which shall reassert and recover, for the sorely stricken peoples of the earth, the fullest measure of the God-given rights of man: "For the nation that forgot God," as Washington warned us, "has never been allowed to endure."

John E. Swift, chairman; Francis P. Matthews, Joseph F. Lamb, Luke E. Hart, Francis J. Heazel, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Leo M. Finn, Timothy P. Galvin, Bernard A. Kennedy, Ray T. Miller, Philip Phelan, Michael F. Walsh, Committee.

Dallas Times-Herald Warns Abandonment of Subsidy Program Might Be Harmful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald, Dallas, Tex., which appeared November 22, 1943:

WHERE CONGRESS SHOULD BE CAREFUL

Those Congressmen are right who oppose the subsidy as a Government policy, but, in a time of crisis a Nation is sometimes compelled to make a choice of evils.

Donald Nelson is certainly not a theorist who believes in subsidies. Neither is Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy. Yet these men, both of them, declare that a complete ban on the use of the subsidy in holding down the retail price level would hamper the war program.

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, is not an advocate of the subsidy as a theory. He merely takes the position that it is the strongest instrument available at this time for checking inflation.

No one who cherishes our system of free enterprise, our traditional economic policy, could favor the subsidy device as a permanent instrument of Government. It is not so favored by Nelson, Knox, or Bowles. But the ox is in the ditch, so to speak, and Congress should think twice before it throws the whole subsidy program out the window.

Since no other program for holding down the price level is being offered by Congress, the lawmakers should hesitate to scrap the subsidy plan in its entirety. They can allow it to be used and, at the same time, make it clear that their sanction is no permanent commitment.

Congress is right in its attempts to stop abuse of authority by the functionaries in the numerous branches of the Government, but in doing this the lawmakers must not let the bureaucrats provoke them into rash action. The subsidy issue should be considered without regard for politics, partisanism, personalities, or prejudice.

The Importance of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been worth more to the farmers of this Nation than any other agency of our Government. It was first created by Executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Later it was incorporated into an act of Congress. This Corporation has been the vehicle through which the farmers have been greatly helped by providing them with a floor price for their products.

Under the act of October 2, 1942, which originated in the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, it is provided:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available upon any crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

Under this provision it will be noticed that loans will be provided to the farmers on the basic crops for 2 years after the declaration of peace. The loans will be 90 percent of parity. It is usually quite a while after the war actually ceases before the declaration of peace. In World War No. 1 this declaration came July 2, 1921, although the armistice was signed November 11, 1918. If the above provision had been in the law at that time farmers would have been saved from the collapse in farm prices, as their prices would have been guaranteed up to 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the 1st day of January following the declaration of peace which would have caused this guaranty to continue until the end of 1923.

GUARANTY TO FARMERS MUST BE CARRIED OUT

It was my pleasure to be one of the sponsors of this proposal, and I do not want to see anything happen to the Commodity Credit Corporation that would make it impossible for this promise and guaranty of our Government to be carried out.

The farmers of our country should be very proud of this protection as such protection is not afforded to any other class or group.

NONBASIC COMMODITIES PROTECTED

In the act approved July 1, 1941, which originated in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, the producers of nonbasic commodities are also given protection against a price collapse during and after this war. Section 4 of that act is as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco (peanuts inserted by amendment in October 2, 1942, act), and rice shall be deemed to be nonbasic commodities.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsection (a)) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of nonbasic commodities not covered by any such public announcement to a fair parity relationship with other commodities, to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the basic commodities and the commodities listed in any such public announcement and the ability of producers to bring supplies into line with demand.

Although this provision applies for the emergency only, in the act of October 2, 1942, Public Law No. 729, the following amendment to this act was inserted:

During the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

Therefore, the producers of nonbasic commodities have the same protection for 2 years after the war is over that the producers of basic commodities will have, except this aid to the nonbasic commodities is contingent upon encouraging production.

Furthermore, in the act of October 2, 1942, the 85 percent was stricken out and 90 percent inserted, which assures producers of nonbasic commodities a floor under their prices for 2 years after the declaration of peace equal to 90 percent parity prices the same as the basic commodities.

These provisions in our law are contingent upon the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the availability of funds.

BILL THAT PASSED HOUSE YESTERDAY

When the bill came up before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House recently to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 3477, which was passed by the House on yesterday, many of us were opposed to section 3 and voted against section 3 in the committee. When we were defeated, however, the question then was whether we should delay or probably stop the passage of a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or whether we should report the bill favorably to the House with section 3 in it, which many of us opposed. We decided to expedite the passage of the legislation although it contained this provision we did not like, and therefore voted in the committee practically unanimously to report the bill to the House, many of us with reservations as to section 3.

FAILING TO ELIMINATE INFLATIONARY PROVISIONS

On yesterday, when we put forth our best efforts to remove the inflationary and high-cost-of-living provisions of section 3, and we were unsuccessful in doing so, we were again confronted with the same problem. It was my judgment then, and it is my judgment now, that the Commodity Credit Corporation is so important that we cannot jeopardize its life by defeating the entire bill in the House, since it is obvious that those of us who oppose section 3 will have another chance, probably more than one, to register our disapproval. The Senate, and undoubtedly the conferees, will also have a chance to eliminate the provisions that we believe to be against the public interest.

AFTER VETO

Therefore, I felt like I should vote for the bill so as not to delay the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If the Senate does not remove the objectionable parts of section 3, and then the bill goes to the President the way that it passed the House, the President has already vetoed a similar bill in recent months and undoubtedly will veto this one. In that event, I expect to vote to sustain the President; and if he is sustained, we can then commence work on a resolution or proposal to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without reference to the antisubsidy provisions.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID J. WARD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, if price ceilings were placed at the proper levels on all food commodities, subsidies would not be needed.

The present ceiling-price levels should be changed in many instances, especially on corn. The ceiling on corn could be raised without adverse effect and would greatly benefit the farmer, the poultry and meat grower, and in fact the entire general public.

Generally speaking, if the O. P. A. will adjust the ceilings on food products to their proper levels, there would be little danger of inflation, insofar as food prices are concerned.

Illinois Congressman Tries Crude Political Swindle on Indianans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

ILLINOIS CONGRESSMAN TRIES CRUDE POLITICAL SWINDLE ON INDIANANS

Illinois isolationists, apparently supported by a few Indianans of a similar kidney, are trying to make it appear that this State is opposed to the Connally resolution, recently passed by the Senate by a vote of 85 to 5 and calling for American participation in making and maintaining peace after the war.

Evidence of the attempt came in a publicity release reaching the Post-Tribune yesterday. The release came from the Washington office of STEPHEN A. DAY, Illinois isolationist Congressman. It is an announcement that "a State-wide tribute to the public service of Senator HIRAM JOHNSON of California is being arranged by Indiana friends, according to the plans disclosed today by Congressman STEPHEN A. DAY."

According to the release, DAY first proposed the tribute in a letter to William A Gross, editor of the Fort Wayne News Sentinel. This is as it should be inasmuch as both Editor Gross and the News Sentinel have been strictly isolationist for years and apparently have not changed their belief an iota since the passing of the Connally resolution.

The nature of the tribute to JOHNSON is disclosed. Mention is made of the senator's vote against the Connally resolution, one of the "last ditch five," it will be recalled. Then DAY says "Today the State (Indiana) honors him as a venerable elder statesman who still holds aloft the bright banner of American sovereignty and independence."

Curious business, isn't it, of DAY announcing to the people of Indiana that they are honoring JOHNSON and why. DAY goes on to read a lecture in isolationism and represents it as expressing the attitude of Indiana citizens.

This effort of the Illinois Congressman is a startling indication of the methods isolationism has been forced to use. Public sentiment, as shown by every important poll taken during recent months, has shown a decided move toward international participation.

Carpetbagger DAY and his few Indiana supporters would not dare to try to hold an out-and-out isolationist meeting in Indianapolis and pretend that the isolationists present represented the people of this State. But by indirection they would use the name of a sick, old man to create a pretense of Indiana isolaticnism.

This is the crudest political swindle in recent years and it will react on the isolationists trying to put it over on Indianans. If the latter want to honor HIRAM JOHNSON they don't need to be told how to do it by Isolationist DAY, Illinois' Charley McCarthy.

Who by the way put DAY up to this effort to put a job over on this State? We doubt that DAY could have thought up this outlandish trick. Only a master brain could have conceived of an Illinois isolationist speaking for the people of Indiana. We can't help having a suspicion.

Why don't Steve and Editor Gross hold their meeting in Chicago or Springfield? Why not try it on the home folks first? Is it, by chance, because there is a growing belief that the Indiana delegates to the Republican convention next year will be supporting Wendell Willkie?

Political tricks often have the most curious purposes and it is not at all unlikely that someone in Washington or Fort Wayne or even Chicago is aiming HIRAM JOHNSON at Wendell Willkie.

But it is too bad to use a sick, old man for that purpose. We doubt that Senator JOHNSON will permit the use of his name if he is told that it is Carpetbagger DAY who is seeking to honor him in the name of our State. He should be told before this swindle goes any further.

Aviation—A Progress Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, every now and then we Americans see or hear something that gives us a thrill of pride in our great democracy.

The other day I read a report written by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., of New York City, which gave me that elated feeling.

It was a concise story of the progress made by the American aviation industry and labor and the effect it was having on the outcome of the war. It was published in each of the September issues of the 24 McGraw-Hill publications.

So that many others may read this splendid article, I am asking for permis-

sion to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

AVIATION—A PROGRESS REPORT—THE LESSONS OF WAR BECOME THE KEY TO A RICHER PEACE

Tunisia, Pantelleria, Sicily—stepping stones to momentous events! But that is not all. For they spell out across the blue waters of the Mediterranean a pattern of invasion that has progressed far since last summer's first major commando operation against the French coast.

From Dieppe, you remember, too many of the raiders never got back. But in Tunisia, and on through Sicily, the Allied might plowed inexorably forward, winning objective after objective at a surprisingly low cost in casualties. Air supremacy over the battlefields? Yes. But we have learned, too, how to save lives and shorten the war by strategic air bombardment as a prelude to invasion.

Thus the bombardment plane—rarely seen by the doughboys on the fighting fronts—is destined to save their lives by hundreds of thousands in the decisive attacks that are to come. This fact is confirmed by the cold calculations of the responsible strategists. It will give renewed courage and confidence to every member of the armed forces and of the home fronts throughout the United Nations.

For instance, thorough strategic bombardment of an objective reduces by nearly 50 percent the surface forces required for invasion. Anticipated losses are reduced from more than 50 percent of the original ground force to about 20 percent. Precision bombardment—as used on railroad objectives in Rome—reduces this percentage of loss still further when it is followed by offensive action on the ground.

The inference is clear. Effective prosecution of the war will require smaller ground combat forces and much larger air forces than some of our strategists once thought.

Our most urgent need, then, is for ever-mounting fleets of aircraft. And, fortunately, this is just what we are getting. The American aircraft industry now is producing as many airplanes as all the rest of the world combined. In 1938 we made 100 planes a month. Now we make three times that many in a single working day. By the end of 1943 our production rate will be about 10,000 a month.

But at this stage of the war, types of planes are more important than mere numbers. In the early months the program was heavy, and properly so, with single-engine trainers. Then, as training planes accumulated, the emphasis shifted to heavier types. Now we are turning out multi-engined bombers at a rate that is the envy of the entire world. Some months ago the President revealed that we were manufacturing 500 long-range bombers every month. The figure was conservative even then. And soon we shall be producing planes of this one type at a rate adequate to replace the normal losses of a fleet of at least 1,000 American heavy bombers operating as continuously as the weather will permit.

A glimpse of the poundage production may help us still further to evaluate the miraculous achievements of the aviation industry as a whole. It was 89,000,000 in 1941, 291,000,000 in 1942, 911,000,000 in 1943, and 1,417,000,000 in 1944—if we need it. There you have the mangnificient record of the American aircraft manufacturing industry—a monument to the cooperation of industry, labor, government, and to all-out teamwork between the aviation industry and those other industries which have converted their facilities to the manufacture of airplanes.

What of our enemies and our allies?

German production probably has flattened out at 2,500 a month—with downward revision in immediate prospect. Japan may be able to produce as many as 1,000 planes a month—until we get our new long-range superbombers in sufficient numbers to whittle down that figure. Italy may be able to turn out her 500 a month—for a little longer. At best the maximum Axis monthly total is 4,000.

Add to our monthly score of nearly 8,000, a total of approximately 4,000 for Britain, Canada, and Russia, and the United Nations score comes to 12,000 monthly. There we have a 3-to-1 advantage for our side. And between our own rising production and the brilliant operations of our bomber commands we should soon boost the ratio well above that figure. Therein lies the certainty of continued and growing air superiority over all the far-flung battlefields.

The critics of American airplane quality have been silenced ever since the ratio of enemy combat losses to our own on bombardment missions surpassed 4 to 1. In the Pacific, where our heavily armed and armored planes are knocking off the desperately stripped racing craft of the Nipponese, enemy losses often run as high as 8 to 1 or more. In the Mediterranean theater, where the Italians were abandoned by their allies, the story is much the same. Only in the well-defended homeland of the Nazis do we sometimes drop below the average, but even in those rare instances the ratio is still well in our favor and the effectiveness of our bombardment is adding constantly to our margin.

Behind the production lines the battle of research and design still rages. In many a laboratory night shift, on many a secret test field, new and terrible surprises for the enemy are in the making. Superbombers, destined for Tokyo, have long since passed out of the design stage and the Japanese may learn about them almost any day. New discoveries, designed to sow swift and silent devastation, are further along than our enemies believe. No longer will fog or storm or night be permitted to fight on the side of our foes.

The men of science who are toiling to broaden the horizon of our knowledge stand today on the threshold of discoveries that have been sought for centuries. New reservoirs of power may soon exert a profound influence in many fields of technology and through them on our way of life.

Once the war is won these new discoveries will be translated into better living. No longer will countless thousands spend their lives within their own communities or countries. New efficiencies in transportation will bring world travel within the reach of many who once had to stay at home. New family vehicles will navigate the skyways as easily and safely as the highways. Already more than a dozen manufacturers of airplanes, ships, automobiles, and electrical equipment are designing, building, or flying rotary-winged aircraft such as the helicopter or autogyro to meet the needs of tomorrow's families. New and safer aircraft of the fixed-wing type are ready for production as soon as materials become available.

The quality that now makes each of our war planes worth so many of those built by our enemies will be translated into the sturdy reliability demanded by peacetime operation. The devices that seek out and find our enemies behind the veil of fog or darkness will, after the war, reduce weather hazards to the point where they will be no greater in the air than on the ground.

Science and industry will continue to do their jobs and do them well. But if the world is to be made a better place for men to live in, statesmanship must not fail to do its part.

The Late Honorable J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 22, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a memoriam to J. WILLIAM DITTER.

Along with every other Member of Congress, I was deeply shocked and grieved to learn of the terrible calamity in which the Nation was deprived of the services of our distinguished and respected colleague, J. WILLIAM DITTER, and of the gallant young naval officer who was piloting the plane. So many Members have emphasized here this afternoon the extent of the loss which not only the Nation and the Congress has sustained but also Mr. DITTER's constituency and, most of all, his family, that there is little that I could add. I would like to include a poem which was just written today by one of his multitude of friends in the House, Horace C. Carlisle:

REPRESENTATIVE DITTER

Hark! the voice of Death is calling—
Tho' the thought is most appalling,
Statesmen, one by one, are falling
To be buried 'neath the sod;
But the loss is worse than bitter
When such as J. WILLIAM DITTER
One who is so greatly needed,
Is, by Death, called home to God.

In the fullness of the morning
Of life, which he was adorning,
Suddenly, and without warning,
Did the summons to him come;
And forthwith he, happy-hearted,
From the scenes of earth departed,
To enjoy the sweet, abundant
New life, in the Father's home.

When so true a statesman passes
From the troubled earth, the classes,
On a level with the masses,
Speak his praises, far and near;
And long Congress will remember
This most sad day in November,
When J. WILLIAM DITTER answered,
In the halls of glory, "Here."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Important Report of Committee of Forty-eight Interested in Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1943, Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, chairman, and Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma, secretary to the Committee of Forty-eight on Food Production, called

a meeting of all Congressmen as well as all the members of the committee for the purpose of bringing several agencies together for a round-table discussion of the situation existing with reference to the supply problems facing the farmers, livestockmen, small merchants, and civilians.

The Committee of 48 on Food Production, consisting of one representative from each State, was formed 6 months ago. It has done some very effective work in the past in bringing the various agencies together and coordinating their efforts. Some of the questions which were advanced by various representatives which were later propounded to the various agencies, including the 17 agencies constituting the Requirements Committee headed by the W. P. B., were:

First. Has the W. P. B. effected its decentralization promised several weeks ago? Members of Congress feel that such matters as applications for installation of gas stoves, gas units, trucks, and so forth should be handled by local boards instead of by Washington authorities.

Second. Is the Requirements Committee giving proper consideration to the fact that agriculture and small business are essential to the war effort?

Third. Is the Requirements Committee allowing the Army, lend-lease, and other agencies to store up quantities of goods in excess of needs, thus depriving civilians of goods, wares, merchandise, implements, and so forth needed to maintain the civilian economy and further the war effort?

Fourth. Are production goals of former implement allocations (80 percent of 1940 production) being met on schedule?

Fifth. Can the civilian supply situation be improved by a better distribution method?

Sixth. What are the agencies doing with reference to the critical situation which is about to exist with reference to the new truck supply? I pointed out that there were only 100 new three-fourth-ton pick-ups available to civilians in the whole United States. He also pointed out that there was only an 11 weeks' supply of new trucks of various kinds for use by civilians in the United States stock pile.

Seventh. Are drought and flood areas actually being given consideration in the allocation of supplies?

Eighth. Does the United States Treasury Procurement Office or Army have any surplus materials, including trucks, tractors, tools, tires, dry goods, and so forth, which might be made available to meet the civilian requirements without hampering or injuring the war effort?

Ninth. What percentage of the steel output is going into farm equipment?

Tenth. Why are cold-storage and frozen-food lockers not being given priorities?

Eleventh. Why are priorities for needed milking machines and pasteurizers not granted?

Twelfth. Why is production of hay loaders and four-row high-speed valve planters being delayed?

Thirteenth. Why are priorities for completion of irrigation and reclamation projects not granted?

Fourteenth. What plans are being formulated for procuring bins for storage of next year's wheat crop produced from the greatly increased acreage?

Fifteenth. Why have agencies unduly delayed granting of priorities for cans for canning?

Sixteenth. Why have the agencies been so slow in granting priorities to manufacturers for making windmills and why cannot the production be greatly increased to meet the urgent needs?

Seventeenth. Why cannot farmers secure a sufficient amount of shotgun shells and .22 cartridges to meet their minimum needs for use in destroying coyotes, rabbits, wolves, and other predatory animals which destroy crops, poultry, and sheep?

Eighteenth. Why is it impossible for small merchants to secure cotton scales, bachelor stoves, oil cans, squirt cans, buckets, milk pails, tubs, well casing, and so forth?

Nineteenth. Why cannot the small merchant secure any ducking, sheets, pillow cases, small children's clothes, overalls, cotton-picking gloves, and so forth, so badly needed by the farmers?

Twentieth. Why did the W. P. B., Rubber Director, and W. F. A. allow rubber companies to operate several months without making any 4.00 x 15, 5.00 x 15, and certain other needed sizes of tractor tires without correcting the situation?

Twenty-first. Are shipments of merchandise to dealers made upon a basis of replacement of stocks?

Twenty-second. Are lend-lease requirements taken from the quota alloted to agriculture?

Twenty-third. Why did the W. P. B. allocate an amount equal to only 80 percent of 1940 production of farm machinery when the minimum requirements submitted by the county and State war boards throughout the country was an amount equal to 96 percent of 1940 production?

Twenty-fourth. Why was International Harvester Co. given only sufficient material last year to produce 14 percent of an amount equal to 1940 production?

Twenty-fifth. Why do not the various agencies correlate their efforts?

Twenty-sixth. What are the agencies doing to relieve the shortage of dry goods, work clothes, and so forth, as indicated by the wholesale dry-goods companies and small department stores as outlined in the two letters set forth in the next two paragraphs, as follows:

O. P. A. RULES CAUSE SHORTAGES DRY GOODS

The War Labor Board has under consideration an advance of rates in the cotton-garment industry which will affect all our men's and boys' manufactured lines. If the Board approves the recommendation of the panel, this wage advance will be retroactive to September 1, 1943. You can readily appreciate that it is impossible for us to make and sell goods without knowing what they cost. Our ceilings are set, and, if this goes into effect, our operation would be an unprofitable one on this basis. Until we know this decision and unless we get relief from the present O. P. A. ceilings, we are unable to sell any of our own men's and boys' manufactured lines. Because of the above facts, we are forced to withdraw our men's and boys' lines from sale immediately. In addition, we will be unable to offer many spring lines in the departments until we know our position regarding the cost of manufacturing. (Ely & Walker Dry Goods Co. (wholesale), St. Louis, Mo.)

SMALL MERCHANT WITHOUT WORK CLOTHES

Men's shorts, boys' overalls and work clothing, sheets, pillow cases, towels, etc., are practically extinct at this time, to say nothing of all the other items of men's and boys' wear that has been extinct for some time. (Small Department Stores.)

Twenty-seventh. The Committee of 48 would like for the agencies to take cognizance of such matters as set forth in the following complaints which are typical of many received by the Members of Congress, to wit:

TRACTOR TIRES NEEDED TO INSURE PRODUCTION

There has been much agitation for months regarding raising more crops to furnish food for our armed forces and civilians, but how is this going to be done without furnishing the farmers equipment to do it with is more than we figure out. I would suggest that you and other Members of Congress build a fire under the authorities in Washington who have charge of the rubber situation and see that something is done to relieve this situation. This is the only way we are going to get the equipment which will enable farmers to prepare their land, sow their crops, cultivate them and harvest them. (A branch manager for an implement company.)

Farm machinery is going to pieces, primarily for want of repairs. As you know it takes a continual stream of parts to keep farm machinery going, and they are needed immediately. A few days delay often means the loss of a crop. The weather won't wait. The same urgency does not apply to the majority of industrial machinery nor to military equipment. (A machine shop.)

Mr. Speaker, the group of Representatives in Congress who were present at the November 3 meeting passed a resolution commending various officials for their cooperation, including Marvin Jones, J. W. Millard, M. Lee Marshall, L. L. Needler and Dave Meeker, all of the War Food Administration; also A. D. Whiteside, of the Office of Civilian Requirements of the W. P. B.; W. J. Hays, congressional liaison officer of the W. P. B.; also J. L. Harrison, congressional liaison officer of the O. P. A.; Mr. Kane and Mr. Tompkins, of the Rubber Director's office.

After a thorough discussion of the various problems a resolution was adopted by the Members representing the various States directing the chairman, Congressman William Lemke of North Dakota, and the secretary, Congressman Victor Wickersham of Oklahoma, to call a meeting of the Committee of Forty-eight Congressmen Interested in Food Production, in the Old House Office caucus room at 3 p. m., Thursday, November 11, 1943. It was further resolved that an invitation be extended to all agencies dealing with food production, including the gentlemen named in the preceding paragraph, and all of the members of the Requirements Committee, or their alternates in the event of the inability of the Requirements Committee members to be present. The invitations were extended, the Requirements Committee members, alternates, the title of the agency each represents, the room numbers, and telephone numbers being as follows:

Agency	Name	Title	Room No.	Telephone No.
Chairman	Krug, J. A		5300, Social Security Board	74642.
Vice Chairman	Kohlhepp, Charles E		5309, Social Security Board	73007.
Secretary	Isenhart, Frank R		5524, Social Security Board	2646.
Army	Member: Clay, Maj. Gen. Lucius D.	Director of Matériel, Army Service Forces, War Department.	4E-626, Pentagon	87-6469 or 2647.
	Alternate: Weaver, Brig. Gen. T. D.	Deputy Director, Production Division, Army Service Forces, War Department.	4068, Railroad Retirement Board.	87-5181 or 79907.
Navy	Member: Williams, Rear Admiral Henry.	Special Assistant to the Chief, Office of Procurement and Material, Navy Department.	1205, Navy Bldg	85-3777.
	Alternate: Keleher, Rear Admiral T. J.	Director, Program and Priorities Branch, Office of Procurement and Material, Navy Department.	4082, Railroad Retirement Board.	85-4704.
ARCO	Member: Meyers, Brig. Gen. Bennett E.	Chief of Staff, Mat'riel Command, Army Air Forces, War Department.	5C-885, Pentagon	87-3153.
	Alternate: Hopkins, Brig. Gen. F. M.	Chief, Resources Division, ARCO, War Department.	5C-888, Pentagon	87-6630 or 5917.
	Alternate: Royce, Capt. Donald	Assistant to the Director of Material, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.	2N-80, Navy Bldg	85-2219.
Office of Defense Transportation	Member: Young, Brig. Gen. C. D.	Deputy Director, Office of Defense Transportation.	5136, Interstate Commerce Commission.	73904.
	Alternate: Kelly, H. H	Director, Division of Materials and Equipment, Office of Defense Transportation.	2121, Interstate Commerce Commission.	2206.
Maritime	Member: Rockwell, Lt. Col. W. F.	Director, Production Division, U. S. Maritime Commission.	4800-A Commerce	824-92 or 98.
	Alternate: Berlage, T. N	Chief, Priorities Section, Production Division, U. S. Maritime Commission.	4802 Commerce	824-479.
Office of Economic Warfare	Member: Foulis, J. C	Chief, Requirements Branch, Office of Exports, Office of Economic Warfare.	1407 tempo "U"	OEW-2101.
	Alternate: Horwin, Leonard	Office of Exports, Requirements Branch, Office of Economic Warfare.	4525 Social Security Board	72478.
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	Member: Miller, H. C. L	Assistant Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration.	311—515 22d NW	4509.
	Alternate: Rebmann, G. Ruhland	Assistant Administrator in Charge of Requirements Control Division, Office of Lend-Lease Administration.	821—515 22d NW	74897.
	Alternate: McIntyre, F. E	Program officer, Office of Lend-Lease Administration.	818—515 22d NW	5498.
Department of State	Member: Ravndal, C. M	Chief, Division of Exports and Requirements, Department of State.	500—17th and F NW	817-2304.
	Alternate: Peurifoy, John E	Liaison officer, Division of Exports and Requirements, Department of State.	H-357 tempo "E"	4795.
National Housing Agency	Member: Woodbury, Coleman	Assistant Administrator, National Housing Agency.	1600 Eye NW	NHA-604.
	Alternate: Farrier, Clarence W	Director, Technical Division, National Housing Agency.	428 Barr Bldg	NHA-672.
Petroleum Administration for War	Member: Brown, Bruce K	Assistant Deputy Administrator, Petroleum Administration for War.	6643 South Interior	Interior 4711-2.
	Alternate: Watts, Frank A	Director of Materials, Petroleum Administration for War.	1442 South Interior	Interior 4585.
War Food Administration	Member: Marshall, M. Lee	Deputy Administrator, War Food Administration.	243-W Administration Bldg.	Agriculture 2764.
	Alternate: Northrup, F. B	Chief, Program Branch, Office of Materials and Facilities, War Food Administration.	1429 South Bldg	Agriculture 2775.
Office of Rubber Director	Member: Tompkins, L. D	Deputy Rubber Director, War Production Board.	5016, New Municipal	2455.
	Alternate: L. P. Best	Manager, Priorities and Materials Control, Office of Rubber Director, War Production Board.	6090, New Municipal	73779.
	Alternate: Greedon, F. R	Assistant Deputy Rubber Director in Charge of Plant Construction.	4153, New Municipal	2513.
Office of War Utilities	Member: Falck, Edward	Deputy Director, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board.	5312, Social Security Board	74788.
	Alternate: Weiler, C. F	Chief, Materials Control Branch, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board.	2735, Tempo "R"	2266.
Office of Civilian Requirements	Member: Burns, Arthur R	Director, Planning and Research, Office of Civilian Requirements, War Production Board.	2310, Social Security Board	3716.
	Alternate: Adams, Stanley	Controlled Materials Officer, Office of Civilian Requirements, War Production Board.	2340, Social Security Board	2735.
Steel Division	Member: Halcomb, Charles	Assistant Chief, Distribution Control Branch, Steel Division, War Production Board.	1314, Social Security Board	2573-4.
Aluminum and Magnesium Division.	Member: Anderson, S. W	Chief, Construction and Maintenance Branch, Aluminum and Magnesium Division, War Production Board.	2037 Tempo "R"	72427.
	Alternate: Batcheller, H. G	Operations Vice Chairman, War Production Board.	5006, Railroad Retirement Board.	3394.

Important Report on Farm Machinery and Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, as chairman, and I, as secretary, of the Committee of 48 Interested in Food Production, tender the following report, showing the result of a round-table discussion and conference between Members of Congress representing the various States and members of the 17 agencies constituting the Requirements Committee, headed by the W. P. B. and other agencies on November 9, 1943. The general opinion of the Members of Congress was that the allocation of materials to the agricultural industry would be insufficient to meet the production goals. It was the further opinion of the group representing the 48 States that a much greater allocation could be made without endangering the war effort; that better distribution could be effected and that the agencies dealing with this important problem should correlate their activities. A brief analysis of the problems and answers, together with the source of information is as follows:

GENERAL FARM MACHINERY OUTLOOK

Order L-257, effective July 1, 1943, indicates an increase in most items of farm machinery and equipment to be produced for the 1944 program under Order L-170, as amended. The program for 1944 represents approximately 80 percent of farm machinery produced in 1940 according to the essentiality of the items under the order. No restrictions are placed upon the manufacture of repair parts except that the manufacture of repair parts must be planned or scheduled for production and delivery in accordance with the controlled materials plan procedures. Materials will be allocated to producers for this purpose proportionately on the basis of past production and controlled materials plan applications. (George Krieger, Director, Farm Machinery and Equipment Division, W. P. B.)

IMPLEMENT SUPPLY INCREASED

The production schedule of farm implements and equipment will be that produced under L-257 plus the shippage of Order L-170. (M. C. DeChazeau, care of W. P. B.)

NAVY REALIZES IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE

Heavy demands of war production for steel and for some of the items themselves caused the constriction of supply for civilian use. However, recognizing the necessity of supplying some of this material to the farm areas, the W. P. B. issued Order M-330, of June 1, 1943. Priority regulations on farm supplies were also issued at the same time. These two instruments tell the farmer how to buy farm supplies. The Navy Department has concurred in the necessity for the various steps taken to supply these badly needed articles to the farm areas, and will continue to bear the farmers' problems in mind when considering regulations which may affect the flow of these items to the farm trade. (E. A. Ewing, commander, U. S. N. R.)

FACTORIES CAN SECURE A-1 RATINGS

In response to an inquiry by several members as to why factories having an AA-2 top

rating for production of farm supplies should not have an AA–1 rating equal to military rating, will say that I have a "kitty" of AA–1 ratings which could be given to factories needing and requesting same. (George Krieger.)

FARM-MACHINERY QUOTAS TO BE COMPLETED BY JULY 1, 1944

The War Food Administration has especially requested all quotas under Limitation Order L–257 be completed by July 1, 1944, and we are hopeful that all manufacturers will be in a position to build full quantity according to schedule. (George Krieger, Director, Farm Machinery and Equipment Division, W. P. B.)

FARM TRACTORS

Under Limitation Order L–257 there will be very few tractors available for any one county. We are not producing any model G tractors. We expect to have a few model A tractors and equipment for them. (C. L. Oheim, manager, Kansas City, Mo., branch, John Deere Plow Co.)

SUPPLY CRAWLER TYPE TRACTORS INADEQUATE

Only 250 to 270 caterpillars for civilian use are manufactured quarterly. (W. F. A.)

TRUCK SUPPLY LIMITED

The Army needs many trucks. Eighty thousand trucks were rationed to civilians from March to September 1943. The production schedule for 1944 is 81,366. (H. H. Kelly, care of O. D. T.)

TRUCK SHORTAGE ALARMING

There are only 100 new ¾-ton pick-ups for civilian use in the United States. (O. D. T.)

NEW-TRUCK STOCK PILE

Truck situation: In agricultural service in the United States are approximately:

Farm-owned trucks	1,050,000
Trucks serving agriculture	450,000
Total	1,500,000

Total number of trucks in the United States is 4,900,000.

Total truck production, including export, in years immediately prior to Pearl Harbor, 750,000 per year.

The number of trucks under construction is as follows: Third and fourth quarters program 7,500 heavy trucks authorized in June and about 19,000 so far authorized for 1944. Delivery dates on all of these are very uncertain because of the limitation of facilities to produce bearings, engines, transmissions, crankshafts, etc.

This small number of trucks for production presents an extremely critical situation from the agricultural standpoint as the condition of the trucks owned by farmers is very poor and is not being helped currently by the shortage of repair parts and the even more serious shortage of mechanics and garage facilities in the rural areas. (W. F. A.)

We have not been instructed to protest against the requests for steel to produce trucks, plows, tractors, etc., and it is my opinion that these requirements must be taken care of in a reasonable manner if we are to keep down the cost of food production.—W. F. Rockwell, Director, Production Division, United States Maritime Commission.

TRUCK REPAIRS

Replacement parts producers have been granted 100 percent of their material requirements for the fourth quarter of 1943 and the first quarter of 1944; parts for medium and heavy trucks, truck trailers, passenger carriers, and off-the-highway motor vehicles have been granted preference ratings which place these essential civilian requirements on par with military, except aircraft. Amendment 1 to Order L–158, covering production and distribution of replacement parts, reflects the higher preference rating authorized, and paragraph (1) "emergency orders for replacement parts" is for use by farmers and others whose vehicles may be tied up for lack of a specific part or parts.

The necessary steps are being taken to insure production of the minimum quantity of parts required to keep essential civilian vehicles operating. (R. L. Vaniman, Director, Automotive Division, W. P. B.)

AUTOMOTIVE REPLACEMENT PARTS

In the third quarter of 1943 producers of automotive replacement parts received 80 percent of their carbon steel they asked for, and in the fourth quarter their anticipated requirements were met 100 percent. (R. L. Vaniman, Director, Automotive Division, W. P. B.)

TRUCK TIRES AND CAMELBACK

We are doing everything possible to see that small truck tires, such as sizes 6:50 x 16, 6 x 16, 7 x 16, and 7 x 15, 7:50 x 10 tractor tires, are forwarded to critical areas. Camelback production is increasing. (Office of Rubber Director.)

TRUCK REPAIR PARTS INCREASED

There is a heavy production schedule of repair parts. (Mr. Hicks, care of O. D. T.)

TRAILERS ELIGIBLE FOR TIRES

With reference to your inquiry as to securing suitable tires for trailers that are used by farmers in marketing their produce, will state that a trailer is considered a commercial vehicle, and we have provided eligibility for them when it is shown that they are engaged in the transporting of farm products. If an applicant meets this requirement, he is eligible for any grade or type of tire. The Office of the Rubber Director, W. P. B., is responsible for the allocation of quotas of tires to the various counties, such quotas being based upon the available tire supply. (James L. Harrison, congressional O. P. A. liaison officer, O. P. A., House Office Bldg.)

TRACTORS AND COMBINES EQUIPPED WITH RUBBER

Farm tractors, combines, and several other farm machines are being built this year 100 percent equipped for rubber tires. It is not possible, however, to build all farm equipment on rubber tires due to the scarcity of rubber. The Rubber Director has permitted the use of rubber tires on the above-mentioned machines. (George Krieger, Director, Farm Machinery and Equipment Division, W. P. B.)

TIRES

If dealers will make a list of the types and sizes of tires for which certificates have been issued but tires could not be secured, and forward such list to Mr. George Beardshaw, Rubber Director's office, room 5156, New Municipal Center Building, Washington, D. C., he can assist them in this connection. (James L. Harrison, congressional liaison officer, O. P. A., 129 House Office Building.)

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT

There is in operation a program for disposal of all property, ranging from raw materials to finished products, for which the War Department has no immediate or foreseeable need. Under this program, stocks are continuously reviewed and when surpluses arise they are made known to Redistribution Division of W. P. B., the appropriate Industry Division of that agency, Office of Civilian Requirements, Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, and other interested Government agencies. Substantial quantities of property, including hand tools and hardware, will continue to be returned to use. (W. D. Styer, major general, U. S. A., commanding, War Department, Army Service Forces, office of the commanding general.)

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY FARM ITEMS OBTAINABLE ON PR–19

Steps have been taken by the W. P. B., beginning the first of 1943, to increase the manufacture of supplies for civilians so that production for 1943 will compare very favorably with normal. There may be some instances of maldistribution causing local shortages. The W. F. A. is concerned with seeing that farmers are able to secure the essential supplies necessary to maintain or increase their production and is doing all that it can to provide the necessary facilities. Recently priority assistance has been provided farmers to assist them in securing approximately 160 items of farm supplies. PR–19 should be used. To implement this order, jobbers were directed to set aside a definite portion of their inventories to fill orders for these supplies from dealers serving farming areas. Likewise additional materials were made available to manufacturers of many of these farm supplies. If shortages endanger production, the dealer should confer with the State war board which may offer direct assistance. (David Meeker, Farm Machinery and Supplies Branch, W. F. A.)

SMALL TOOLS, HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES, NAILS

Production of household equipment items such as tubs, buckets, dishpans, and cooking utensils has been greatly restricted for some time. The axes, nail hammers, forks, handles, lanterns, pliers, wrenches, nails, and rivets mentioned are all on PR–19, which provides an AA–5 rating to farmers for their purchase. On all items except the nails, the dealer may extend this AA–5 rating in replacing his stock. The purchase of nails by dealers is controlled by order M–21–b–2, which provides that dealers may replace in stock all nails sold since April 1, 1943, without other formality than to order them from their regular suppliers. The amount of nails being manufactured is sufficient so that they should be readily available. If the dealer's supply was exhausted on April 1, 1943, so that he has been unable to make any substantial amount of sales since that date, he may appeal to the Administrator of Order M–21–b–2, Steel Division, W. P. B., for permission to purchase enough nails to provide him with a working stock. Form WPB–547 (formerly PD–1x) may be used to obtain a priority to build up stock of the other items. The priority obtained on this form, however, may be applied only against manufacturers. For this reason it is dominantly a wholesaler's instrument but may be used by retailers if they are in a position to place orders directly with manufacturers. Procedures are being developed which will make a greater portion of these items available for essential civilian use. (A. D. Whiteside, Vice Chairman for Civilian Requirements, W. P. B.)

WINDMILLS

Present manufacturing limitations, plus the tremendous demand for windmills that we have had during the last few months, have placed us in a very critical position with regard to supplying our regular dealers, and at the present time we are sold out 3 to 4 months in advance of our manufacturing program. Under Limitation L–170 that was in effect prior to June 30 of this year, we were very seriously curtailed in our production, which resulted in a loss of a great number of our production men in the factory and we have been unable to replace them. It is extremely difficult for us to meet our present manufacturing program. (Aermotor Co., Chicago, Ill.)

STEEL WELL CASING

War Production Board Order L–257 now permits manufacturers to produce 100 percent of their production of steel for well casing during the base year 1940 or 1941, whichever was higher. Thus a normal amount of well casing should be flowing through usual channels. (L. L. Needler, Assistant Chief Farm Machinery & Supplies Branch, WFA.)

STOVE QUOTAS MAY BE INCREASED

Quotas for each community for all types of gas-, coal-, and wood-burning stoves were established in accordance with our basic estimates of genuine wartime needs in the community, but in some cases our estimates were too low. Wherever the original quota is not sufficient to take care of everyone who needs a stove, and there has been issued a certificate based on such need, the local boards have been instructed to ask for an increase from the district and/or regional reserves. (James L. Harrison, congressional liaison officer, O. P. A., 129 House Office Building.)

STOVE SUPPLY ASSURED

It is true that there may be some delay in getting stoves to consumers where there are no existing stocks, but stoves will get there. (Chester Bowles, Administrator, O. P. A.)

SCREEN WIRE AVAILABLE

Screen wire will be allocated by manufacturers on a quota basis based on the distributors' purchases during the past 3 years. (A. D. Whiteside, care of W. P. B.)

MACHINERY, TUBS, MILK PAILS, WIRE, AND WELL CASINGS

Such items as farm machinery, galvanized tubs, milk pails, smooth wire, and flat sheets for well casings have been programmed for increased production during the fourth quarter of this year and the first quarter of next year. (A. D. Whiteside, Vice Chairman for Civilian Requirements, W. P. B.)

Production of wash tubs has been increased recently from 50 percent of 1940 production rate of 75 percent. During first quarter of 1944 it should rise to 100 percent. (W. P. B.)

REPAIRMEN MAY SECURE SHEET METAL

For sheet metal, Form CMP-4-B may be filed by men doing repair work. The application to the W. P. B. should be for the amount of steel which will be required in the first quarter of 1944. The business should be described as a mechanical repair shop and it should be indicated on the application that the shop is engaged in the business of repairing farm machinery and industrial equipment. (L. L. Needler, Assistant Chief, Farm Machinery and Supplies Branch, War Food Administrator, Office of Materials and Facilities.)

CALF WEANERS

Calf weaners are authorized for production under order L-257 and reach farmers through regular trade channels without distribution control or rationing by the W. F. A. (L. L. Needler.)

ELECTRIC FENCE CONTROLLERS

Electric fence controllers may be made by all manufacturers at 100 percent of their 1940 or 1941 production, whichever was higher, and the quota for electric-fence accessories is 120 percent of the base production. (L. L. Needler.)

BATTERIES FOR FENCE CHARGERS

The W. P. B. realizes the importance of dry-cell batteries on the farm and through Priorities Regulation No. 19 has provided the farmer with a preference rating for their purchase. From June 16, 1943, to August 31, 1943, battery distributors were required to set aside 60 percent of their No. 6 batteries (the type used for electric fences) for distribution to farm outlets. The quota of such batteries going to each State would depend solely on the past purchases of such State distributors. (William S. Hammersley, Director, Consumers' Durable Goods Division, care of Ford H. Denslow, Chief, Section 1, W. P. B.)

AMMUNITION

A program has recently been adopted under which approximately 100,000,000 shot shells, 12,000,000 center-fire cartridges, and 100,000,000 .22 caliber rim-fire long-rifle cartridges will be made available for civilian use through regular trade channels. We do not have complete records on the distribution of this ammunition.

Substantial shipments of ammunition are now in transit to the State distributors and we are hopeful that the shipments will enable dealers to fill their backlog of orders. Rail facilities are congested with war orders. Most of this ammunition moves from Connecticut manufacturing points. Ammunition is heavy and moves by freight, as the expense would be too great to ship it by express. (Maury Maverick, Director, Government Division, W. P. B.)

Special effort has been made to get ammunition to farmers and ranchers by setting aside production quotas for them and by having them sign a short, simple certificate which dealers can use to get preferential consideration from their suppliers. This action still has not resulted in providing adequate supplies of ammunition for farmers to kill jack rabbits and other animals destroying crops, coyotes, wolves, and other animals which destroy poultry and sheep. (W. P. B.)

FARM LUMBER SUPPLY

One-inch lumber is the most critical item. The armed services are several hundred million feet behind requirements. As long as this situation lasts this type of lumber will not be easy to procure. We have taken steps to encourage production of one-inch stock with marked success, but the boxing and crating program of the direct military has assumed such enormous proportions that this increased production has not been reflected, as might have been expected had the requirements remained constant. A tremendous amount of lumber is moving at the present to different theaters of war as boxing, crating, and dunnage. None is returned because it plays a vital part in every theater of action; consequently, every boat comes back completely stripped of wood.

This division recognizes the importance of maintaining our farm plants in order to meet the food goal set by the War Food Administration. Last May we delegated to the War Food Administration authority to issue AA-2 priority ratings for 500,000,000 feet of lumber for emergency farm purposes. This rating was to supplement the AA-3 and AA-4 ratings assigned to the different farm uses under our Conservation Order M-208 and was designed to help out in cases where the regular ratings could not procure the lumber. Congressmen may obtain figures pertaining to their respective States. As a typical example, Oklahoma received 12,000,000 feet of this allotment which, on a pro rata basis, was 105 percent of what a normal distribution would have been. Our records show that as of October 1, 3 months after this plan had been in effect, the county war boards in Oklahoma had issued ratings against this amount of 3,048,124 feet, leaving a balance of 8,951,876 feet. We have two major species; Western Pine and Douglas Fir, under limitation orders, but only in the one species, Douglas Fir, do we have a break-down of our releases by States. Our figures on this species show that in the past 5 months we have released to the retail lumber yards in Oklahoma 14,523,000 feet, bearing in mind that this does not make into account the other species such as Western Pine and Southern Pine. These figures indicate that more lumber is moving into retail yards than was moving in the early spring and summer and we hope that we can continue to serve these very necessary distributors. (J. Philip Boyd, Director, Lumber and Lumber Products Division, W. P. B. Department 7825.)

LUMBER FOR AGRICULTURAL USES

In order to assist the lumber dealer to service essential civilian needs, Conservation Order M-208 is now in force and administered by the Lumber and Lumber Products Division of the W. P. B., assigns ratings to uses to which softwood lumber is put, such ratings being certified on orders by customers to lumber dealer. The lumber dealer accumulates these ratings and extends them to his suppliers to replace his inventory so sold.

A farmer should contact his local farm bureau office or county war board relative to ratings allotted to the United States Department of Agriculture for agricultural use, as it is believed these offices have been empowered to assign such ratings in cases they consider essential. (A. D. Whiteside, Vice Chairman for Civilian Requirements, W. P. B.)

NEED FOR WASHING MACHINES URGENT

Our people need washing machines for "Helpy-Selfy" laundries. These laundries furnish a place in farming towns where a woman can wash her clothes by paying a few cents an hour without burning her precious coal, wood, or carrying in and out water. They also need repairs. (Hardware stores in Southwest.)

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

We don't get anything for the 43 countries we can't justify. (J. C. Foulis, care of Board of Economic Warfare.)

LEND-LEASE

I will answer your questions as to shipments to various countries. (H. C. L. Miller, care of Lend-Lease.)

FLOOD AND DROUGHT AREAS GIVEN SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

The War Food Administration has given consideration to allocation to drought and flood areas. (L. L. Needler, care of W. F. A.)

O. P. A. PROMISES RELIEF

A meeting was held November 5, 1943, with members of the work-clothing industry, at which time it is hoped that some solution for alleviating this situation was worked out. (James L. Harrison, congressional liaison officer, O. P. A., House Office Building.)

N. B. Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of November 22, 1943:

N. B. CONGRESS

In the absence of any alternative proposal from the Congress whereby reasonably effective controls can be maintained over prices, particularly food prices, the members of the legislative branch of our Government are assuming a grave responsibility as they press proposals for putting an end to food subsidies and indicate an intention of canceling out the Office of Price Administration entirely.

No one in the country is satisfied with the workings of the present system on some particulars. Uneven application, inevitable errors, and other defects, have contributed to give the whole price-control effort a black eye. It should be remembered, however, that despite these shortcomings the over-all effects of the endeavor have been good. That is a fact fortified by the record, which shows that food prices in this war, after 2 years have risen less than half as high as they rose in a comparable period in World War No. 1. It is no solution to present difficulties to toss the lid off and whoop.

Neither is there any validity in the claims of foes of food subsidies, that the bill for them will have to be met by future generations—including the returned soldiers. The truth is that if the controls are wiped out, the home folks of the soldiers, and every soldier who has bought a War bond, will face loss through inflation of money values.

Is this irresponsible gesture by Congress a wise prelude to the announced plans of the Treasury for a new War bond sale in January? Is it wise to wreck stabilization in full tide of the war, before we have defeated our major foes?

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 23, 1943:

AGAINST SUBSIDIES

More than 2 years ago when the first serious thought was being given to means of avoiding the inflation which for 8 long years the administration had sought to promote, Bernard M. Baruch made the following observation about price controls that proved wiser probably than he knew:

"I do not believe in piecemeal price fixing. I think you have first to put a ceiling over the whole price structure, including wages, rents, and farm prices up to the parity level—and no higher—and then to adjust separate price schedules upward or downward if necessary, where justice or governmental policy so requires."

But for reasons which are well understood the administration refused to act on Baruch's advice. Because of its desire to pay its political debts to major pressure groups it took no action either to hold down wages or farm produce prices. In fact, there was a considerable period in which it was the policy of the administration to encourage higher wages and higher prices of farm produce, while professedly combating inflation.

With a price ceiling here and a sudsidy there the Office of Price Administration and of Economic Stabilization hoped to hold the line. But their piecemeal measures proved of little avail in the face of inflationary borrowing to finance the war, diminished supplies of consumer goods, and increases in costs which in greater or lesser measure are among the unavoidable concomitants of war.

This flimsy structure of piecemeal price control virtually collapsed with the settlement of the mine wage controversy. With this settlement the Little Steel formula became a scrap of paper, as the impending rise in the price of coal to compensate for the "noninflationary" increase in miners' wages and other probable wage increases clearly indicate.

Because of the collapse of the inadequate controls heretofore employed the administration is turning with ever greater vigor to subsidies. Yesterday's papers carried the appeal of O. P. A. Director Chester Bowles for the subsidy program with the representation that if it fails increases in a wide list of food products will follow as a matter of course.

But the subsidy is also a piecemeal approach to the problem of rising prices. As long as the public has billions in buying power and the supply of goods is limited prices somewhere along the line will advance. It may be possible by subsidies to hold down the price of vegetables, for example, but the price of fruit will rise. When fruits are placed under a ceiling and their producers are subsidized, surplus buying power will be directed into still another channel. By some means, legitimate or illegitimate, goods and money will meet in a manner which takes full cognizance of the scarcity of the former and the abundance of the latter.

The Plain Dealer is opposed to subsidies because it is convinced, first of all, that far from preventing inflation they will promote the broad inflationary process both by increased borrowing and restricted production. It is opposed furthermore because the subsidy is the tool of one of the pressure groups which almost without exception has been strong enough to dictate administration policy, however unsound.

Finally, we are opposed to subsidies because we are convinced that once they are abandoned the administration will then be forced, in self-defense, to adopt the sound fiscal measures and policies which alone can be relied upon to counteract the inflationary forces so long at work.

The fact that the subsidy is one more way of paying out public money, when the need of the domestic front is for retrenchment both in public and private expenditure, is one of the strongest arguments in favor of abolishing it. We hope the opponents of subsidies will stand their ground. If prices threaten to run away when subsidies are discontinued, sound and comprehensive measures of controlling them heretofore held in abeyance may then be adopted.

Don't Forget the Soda Mint Tablets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an editorial from the Elyria Chronicle-Telegram of November 5, 1943:

DON'T FORGET THE SODA MINT TABLETS

"Pass the mustard and make it snappy."

"Don't forget the soda mint tablets."

These should be familiar phrases in the coal mine areas before long.

The miners are going to get 15 minutes for lunch. This solves the pay raise problem. It gives the administration an "out." Cut the lunch hour and justify a pay raise. Eat faster and kick the Little Steel formula out the window. The wall against inflation is weakening. John L. Lewis put the administration in a corner. He demanded more pay for the miners and got it. Regardless of the subterfuge or any excuse, such as cutting the lunch hour in half, the fact remains that John L. Lewis held the whip and used it.

Coal mining is hard work. We know from experience that we couldn't mine coal even if we got an hour for lunch. We couldn't take it. We don't believe coal miners can take it either. Fifteen minutes for lunch doesn't appeal to us as the "more abundant life."

Health should be the first consideration. If we owned a drug store in a coal-mining town we would stock up on bicarbonate of soda, Acidex, Bellans, Cal-Bis-Ma, Pepto-Bismol, rhubarb and soda, Tums, Gests, soda mints, pepsin, and charcoal, papain tablets, and all the rest of the thousand and one "after-eating distress relievers." We feel sure that coal miners who work hard and are allowed 15 minutes for a lunch period will soon have to have a bottle of dyspepsia pills handy.

We have watched miners at work. We have seen them "pick" a seam of coal, shoot it with powder, and then shovel the lumps of coal into mine cars. We have watched miners dig in a room where the ceiling was so low that they had to stand in a crouched position and at the same time stand astride a stream of water which ran down through the mine. Mining coal is a he-man's job.

Somehow or other we can't sell ourselves on the 15-minute lunch period. Our job is not as hard as mining coal, and we don't believe we could get along on a quarter-hour lunch period very long.

We have had the opportunity several times to eat lunch with miners. When as a boy we used to visit a large Pennsylvania mine with our uncle, one of the high spots of the day was to partake of some of the food that was in his dinner bucket. We know from experience that miners are not light eaters. My uncle always had three or four meat sandwiches, some kind of fruit in season, a big slab of pie or several cookies, and the bottom part of the dinner bucket held about a quart of coffee, I wonder how he would have gotten along in those days with 15 minutes for lunch.

In these days one can't get enough red points so he can have as much meat as they did back there in the days before scarcities. Perhaps 15 minutes for lunch is the natural outcome of rationing, and also every kind of vitamin in pill or capsule form. Maybe the day is not far off when the miner will not take any time out for lunch but will simply pause for a second, until he can get a vitamin pill out of his pocket.

We don't think so.

We don't believe 15 minutes for lunch will contribute to the Nation's well-being. We hope the idea will not become universal.

We talked with a physician today for whose judgment we have great respect. He told us that people don't relax enough. They are in too much of a hurry. One of the most used phrases of a doctor is his advice to his patients to "take it slower, take it slower."

People who do manual labor are generally heavy eaters. This is characteristic of the coal miner. He works hard and he wants lots of solid food. If he takes a few minutes to wash off the heavy coal dust and has only 15 minutes for lunch altogether he doesn't have much time to eat. As soon as he has finished the last bite he has to go to work again and that allows him not a minute to relax or as they call it in the western Pennsylvania mine area, not a minute to "get his stomach settled."

We talked with a man today who has had a great deal of experience with horses. He has owned horses all of his life. We asked him what he thought of a 15-minute lunch hour. His reply was that he didn't know anything about the problems of a coal miner but he did know that he couldn't get along on 15 minutes at noon and he always allowed an hour for his team to eat and rest and that he thought human beings who work hard should get as long a lunch period as a team of horses. He said a 15-minute lunch period sounded to him like a "crazy idea."

Only time will tell and we wonder just how seriously the miners themselves are taking this 15-minute lunch-period idea. We predict that before long some concessions will have to be made; the lunch period will have to be lengthened in the interest of the health of the miners.

As we see it John L. Lewis had Mr. Roosevelt and his associates behind the eight ball. Mr. Lewis wouldn't give in and the miners would not go back to work. There had to be a way out as the people were demanding

that the President crack down as idle mines and idle furnaces could defeat our war effort to a large degree. The administration "cracked down" by being a party to a 15-minute lunch period which would be an excuse for the miners to get more pay. Under this plan no serious political repercussions were expected and that is important in Washington. Another excuse has been found to circumvent the Little Steel formula. The line is not being held. This exception and that exception, the sum total of all of them will surely result in the safeguard breaking down with ruinous inflation taking from us all whatever we have.

We are not arguing the merits of the pay increase. Mining is dangerous and arduous. The thing that riles us and a lot of Americans is the subterfuge of a 15-minute lunch hour which was used to settle the issue.

John L. Lewis must feel pretty good. He has demonstrated to the miners who pay his salary that he could find a way to get them more pay. If we were a labor leader, in the business of union organization work we would certainly ask Mr. Lewis for a page from his textbook on How To Get What You Want in Washington.

Congress as Partner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of November 18, 1943.

CONGRESS AS PARTNER

The importance and hopefulness of the rebirth of Russian-American friendship just reported to Congress by Mr. Hull can scarcely be exaggerated. Indeed, this development holds the core-promise of the new era in international cooperation, whose inaugural at Moscow the Secretary of State described so faithfully. But major features of the conference have been before the public for some days, and Mr. Hull's impressive person l testimony can stand on its own feet, so that for present discussion the most fruitful topic is not what he said but where he said it.

For one indispensable requirement for carrying American cooperation in international affairs beyond the generalized terms of the Connally resolution is such cooperation between the executive and legislative departments as is implied in the appearance of the Secretary of State in Congress.

The event seems almost revolutionary. Yet framers of the Constitution expected the President to conduct foreign affairs in close consultation with the Senate—originally scarcely larger than its present Foreign Relations Committee. George Washington made one attempt. But he was so displeased with his treatment on that occasion that he afterward refused to go to the Capitol. Right there was born a tradition of division and deadlock between the Executive and the Legislature which has made American diplomacy the most helpless in the world where called on for firm agreements.

It has become clear that some technique of teamwork must be achieved. This newspaper has repeatedly urged the President to consult frequently with the Foreign Affairs Committees of both Houses. Last March when the British Foreign Secretary visited Washington an inspired step was taken. He lunched with the two committees.

A marked improvement in the Washington atmosphere resulted. It was followed up by quiet consultations between State Department representatives and the committees over the plan for setting up the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That organization, which may become a pattern for much more extensive international cooperation, obtained as it were a congressional O. K. in advance. Now, Mr. Hull, who has always been the administration's most respected influence upon Congress, has capped the development with a full-dress report on the Moscow meeting.

A plan by which the appearance of Cabinet Members before Congress would become a regular and recognized part of better governmental coordination was recently debated in promising fashion by the House of Representatives, where another Tennessean, ESTES KEFAUVER, has proposed a simple change in rules to facilitate such reports. Few single steps to improve the functioning of American Government contain more sound sense. We hope that Mr. Hull's precedent-making report will lead to more informal efforts along this line, at least in the realm of foreign affairs. For there the cooperation of executive and legislative departments is second only to firm popular support if the "brotherhood of self-preservation" is to carry on for peace.

Milk and Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two resolutions adopted by New England commissioners of agriculture, representatives of milk-control boards, and principal cooperative milk-producer associations of New England November 19, 1943:

MILK

Whereas prices of fluid milk have been kept frozen, while no successful effort has been made to control the cost of labor, feed, and other items entering into the cost of producing milk; and

Whereas the wages of labor and the price of feed have continued to advance, while the quality of labor and feed supplies available has seriously declined; and

Whereas prices of fluid milk have been kept low in relation to prices for livestock and other farm products, and low in relation to the levels of industrial wages; and

Whereas dairy farmers can no longer compete for the labor and the feed required to maintain the production of milk; and

Whereas the Price Control Act as amended provides that adjustments "shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity" where necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes or to reflect increased labor or other costs incurred since January 1, 1941; and

Whereas adjustments in ceiling prices for milk and its products, in accordance with the provisions of the Price Control Act as amended, have been nullified and prevented by Executive decree; and

Whereas the supply of milk available in the principal milk markets of New England is now from 15 to 20 percent below the fluid-milk requirements of those markets, and similar conditions prevail throughout the Northeast, affecting the fluid-milk supply of around 40,000,000 consumers; and

Whereas failure to provide adequate prices to dairy farmers is certain to cause a far more severe shortage of milk and dairy products in the coming year than anything we have yet experienced; and

Whereas the temporary 3 months' subsidy program is completely inadequate to cover the increased costs of producing milk, or to insure a continued supply of fluid milk to consumers: Therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That an immediate increase of at least 93 cents per hundredweight in the price paid to producers for fluid milk in New England is necessary to cover the increased costs already incurred in producing milk, and to maintain the supply of fluid milk in New England.

2. We are opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of adequate prices for milk and its products.

3. We urge the Governors and the Members of Congress representing New England to use every means within their power to insure adequate prices to protect and maintain the supply of fluid milk, and to cooperate with Governors and congressional delegates of other States in the Northeast where similar conditions exist.

CORN

Resolved, That the ceiling price for corn on the Chicago basis be raised to a level equivalent to the feeding value of corn used for hog production, in order to restore a normal flow of corn into New England.

Present and approving the above resolutions:

E. H. Jones, commission of agriculture, Vermont; Andrew L. Felker, commissioner of agriculture, New Hampshire; Carl W. Smith, commissioner of agriculture, Maine; Dr. R. G. Bressler, commissioner of agriculture, Rhode Island; Martyn B. Kenney, New Hampshire Milk Control Board; J. C. Cort, Massachusetts Milk Control Board; Lester T. Tompkins, Massachusetts Department of Agriculture; Donald P. Corbett, Maine Department of Agriculture; W. P. Davis, New England Milk Producers' Association; C. W. Swonger, New England Milk Producers' Association; George H. Thompson, Bellows Falls Cooperative; Howard W. Selby, United Farmers' Cooperative; Paul B. Beck, New England Dairies; Carl A. Smith, Manchester Dairy System; Dr. H. P. Young, Northern Farms Cooperative; N. A. Emerson, Northern Farms Cooperative; M. E. Knapp, Maine Dairymen's Association; C. L. Hamlen, St. Albans Cooperative; Ken Geyer, Connecticut Milk Producers' Association.

Forty-seven States and Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Sunday, November 21, 1943, issue of the Miles City Daily Star,

entitled "Forty-seven States and Montana." Among other things, it certainly shows the splendid contribution Montana is making both in men and money in support of the war effort:

FORTY-SEVEN STATES AND MONTANA

That is about the way the war effort of this Nation has been handled, insofar as Montana is concerned. For some unannounced, but very pointed reason, Montana has been treated like a poor relation with leprosy, in the distribution of work and establishments in connection with the war effort. There has been, very decidedly, a condition of 47 States in the Union and Montana. Oh, we have been plied with promises by the politicians from time to time, that this or that or the other thing was going to be located in Montana forthwith. Once, the Washington folks even made the mistake of starting to build a ski-troop training base at West Yellowstone. But they got out their geographies (they would need them, you know) and found out that the camp was located closer to and of more benefit to Montana than to Idaho. A very convenient fire broke out in that part of the camp which was built and now a large neat pile of tin cans marks the spot. What about the camp? It was moved to Colorado. It makes little difference what the excuse was but our climate was either too rigorous or not rigorous enough for training ski troopers. It takes little effort for bureaucrats, to dig up a reason.

The Navy was all ready to locate its training station, now at Farragut, Idaho, on Flathead Lake in Montana. But, again, one of the boys slipped up on his geography. When they found out that the station would be in Montana and not in Idaho, the pin was pulled and away went that project.

Much time and money was put into the chrome mines at Columbus. The Federal boys even hollered their heads off because they wanted a bridge and fancy road built according to their specifications—but with the money that the State of Montana was hanging onto to get its residents out of the mud. Well, the fancy road and bridge were built, together with a lot of other things. Then the pin was pulled again. Rumor has it that since the Germans were knocked out of north Africa, the bright boys in Washington find it more expedient "diplomatically" to sacrifice the home chrome business and give it to Spain and Portugal and all the rest of those outfits which have been knifing us in the back. (That is what they were up to until Hitler's stock started going down.)

About this time a little chicken feed was scattered about the State in the nature of an air base at Great Falls and satellite bases at Lewiston, Cut Bank, and Glasgow, with a ranger training school at Helena. But it wasn't for long that Helena enjoyed that prosperity. One fine morning they woke up to see the Rangers leaving, and after that poor old Helena was clear down on its uppers, like Russell's cow, waiting for a chinook. It is significant that Great Falls got what little real bacon came into the State. The administration could conceivably have remembered the fact that Great Falls was the home of the Democratic national committeeman, who had been going back to Washington regularly for all the years of the misdeal New Deal, throwing down a hundred dollars for a plate of New Deal hash at the Jackson Day banquets, while the senior Senator from Montana reserved his God-given right to criticize the activities of that same administration.

After the Army had so many airfields located in Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico, that the training planes were running into each other quite regularly, they sent one surveying crew after another into Montana, looking for potential air-base sites. When everybody was all hopped up, that Montana had now been permitted to join the other 47 States, that we had at last been taken off the blacklist, the potential air bases went glimmering. We were told that the Army didn't need them after all. Maybe they were looking for them, for the next war, as the Army ordnance officer remarked at Denver the other day, about the antiaircraft gun that shoots 60,000 feet in the air. He said that was for the next war.

But there are two things that the administration boys allow Montana to excel in. They never pull the pin on either of them. One is the per capita call they have made upon us for men for the armed forces. On that score we rank high; we are pretty close to the top. They can use our men, all right. The other thing is our money. They take that in great per capita quantities. We are not on the blacklist, when it comes to buying bonds. And to prove to those bureaucrats that Montana is one of the 48 States, we topped the Nation in the per capita purchases of bonds during the Third War Loan. Not only that, but we outstripped all the rest of the country by more than $14.53 for every man, woman, and child.

Out of all of this, it occurs to us that if the three-term-administration in Washington would have accepted some of the per capita brains of Montana into its much-muddled war, food, and domestic programs, those Montanans might have gotten by without such farces as the War Labor Board and its handling of labor matters; the O. P. A. and its handling of domestic living; the War Food Administration and its trying to grow beans where beans won't grow, while we use rationed sugar from Cuba; the Selective Service and its policies of wrecking domestic economies; the Manpower Commission and its policies of God knows what.

Thanks, but We Don't Want It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Independent, Murphysboro, Ill., dated November 18, 1943:

THANKS, BUT WE DON'T WANT IT

The Independent urgently requests the Members of the lower House of Congress to kill the Bankhead bill which has passed the Senate.

It appropriates some $15,000,000 to be spent by the Government for newspaper advertising.

The Independent wants no part of this appropriation because it comes in the form of a subsidy. We don't like Government subsidies or bonuses to anybody, farmers, consumers, workers, or newspapers.

The man who accepts a subsidy accepts peonage and subserviency with it. The French newspapers, for generations, were subsidized by the government and by political parties. That was one of the reasons for France's fall.

Newspaper advertising can stand on its own feet and should. There are many times when the Government needs newspaper advertising and should pay for it. When it advertises for workers and applicants for civil-service jobs, for example, it should pay the regular rate for such advertising. Any private employer would expect to use paid advertising in such cases. The Government departments should do the same. They should buy advertising as they buy typewriters or office furniture or airships or tanks. They should buy it as needed, when needed, and buy it through regular channels from accepted mediums, paying regular prices for it. In such cases it is an excellent purchase.

Small city newspapers need advertising these days. That's no secret. But the Independent never will need it badly enough to accept it in the form of a gift or a subsidy. It might enable us to eat a little better and more regularly, but we wouldn't sleep so well. If we could state our attitude more plainly or forcibly, we would do so.

No Rationing of Courtesy to Servicemen, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Lorain Journal, Lorain, Ohio, of November 13, 1943:

NO RATIONING OF COURTESY TO SERVICEMEN, PLEASE

It's only 2 years since the slogan of practically all business was "The customer is always right."

It seems much longer than that, especially to the citizen who must stand in line for his lunch, must just about write his Congressman to get a train reservation, and put up with the haughty airs of hotel clerks.

Wartime shortages of both goods and manpower have brought about a new relationship between customer and seller of either goods or services. Many of the "extras" have had to be abandoned. And properly so, since they required extra help. There are understandable delays in stores and restaurants.

But there are no O. P. A. restrictions on courtesy, though some of those at hotel desks, theater box offices, railroad ticket windows, and behind counters act as though it was a highly rationed item.

Fortunately, the majority of those engaged in serving the public are as courteous and as cooperative as their doubled and redoubled duties will permit. And the public can charge up the snubs and arrogance of the others as part of the wartime sacrifice.

That doesn't apply to men in uniform, however. On leave after long months in camp or perhaps home from service overseas, they have looked forward to a comfortable hotel room, a good meal well served, a table at a night club.

In some cases they find discrimination against men in uniform. There have been instances of clubs seeking to limit attendance of servicemen to officers only.

A man recently returned from Miami tells of an affront to three officers in uniform by the clerk of a swank Miami hotel, the Dallas-Park. When the three asked for accommodations, the clerk said they would have to pay in advance. And, as if that were not enough, he demanded they post $1 for the hotel key.

Considering that the average civilian isn't asked to pay except on checking out, or at the end of stipulated periods, while a key deposit is almost unheard of, this would seem to be ample evidence that men in uniform were not welcome.

Since Miami is a landing point for overseas air traffic, these officers may have just arrived from Africa or Italy, for all that the clerk knew.

What must have been the reaction of these members of our armed forces to find themselves considered less desirable than almost any civilian?

These practices are not common, of course. But, common or not, the members of our armed forces should be protected against insult. Some machinery should be set up to investigate such incidents. And those responsible should be exposed.

Support Price on Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between War Food Administrator Marvin Jones and myself, together with an article from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, concerning the Government's failure to maintain the support price on hogs:

NOVEMBER 15, 1943.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration, Washington, D. C.:

Urge you take immediate and effective action to fulfill Government guaranty of floor price, $13.75 for hogs. Livestock farmers my district up in arms over failure W. F. A. to support prices as promised. Please inform me your action.

GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress,
Committee on Agriculture.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 20, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: Replying to your telegram will say that about a week ago we issued a statement that we would use every power to maintain the support price on hogs.

On November 18 we issued another statement announcing the various steps that are being taken. A copy of this second statement was mailed to you.

You may rest assured that we shall do everything in our power to see that this price is maintained.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of November 19, 1943]

GILLIE URGES W. F. A. TO KEEP HOG PRICE UP—REPRESENTATIVE SAYS INDIANA FARMERS GET LESS THAN GUARANTEED W. F. A. RATE

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 19.—Warning that American livestock farmers "are rapidly losing faith in Government promises," Representative GEORGE W. GILLIE, of Indiana, today urged the War Food Administration to act immediately to fulfill its guaranty of a $13.75 per hundredweight floor price for hogs.

Asserting that hog farmers in Indiana and many other Midwestern States have for several days been receiving considerably less than $13.75 support price for hogs guaranteed by the W. F. A., Representative GILLIE said that "this situation is creating such a lack of faith among hog producers in my district as to amount to a very serious problem unless corrective action is taken at once."

GILLIE urged War Food Administrator Marvin Jones to issue a decree ordering all packers to pay not less than the support price for hogs and to order an additional payment on those purchases which they have made below the support price.

He said that the argument that the packing trade cannot absorb the heavy receipts of hogs that are coming in was not a valid excuse for inaction on the part of the W. F. A.

"The heavy production of hogs came as a result of the Government's urge for greater hog production and the Government's guaranty of support prices," GILLIE declared. "It is also a fact that many small packers who could have been absorbing much of the livestock now coming to market have been liquidated by Federal regulations of one type or another."

NO PLANS MADE

Officials of the War Food Administration, describing the situation as "extraordinary," explained informally that so sure were they that prices would remain up to the $14.75 ceiling set by O. P. A. on live animals, that machinery for getting the guaranteed price to the farmer was not provided.

A complete formula for "taking care of the situation" was promised, however, and farmers throughout the country were being urged to have a definite price promise for hogs before sending them to market.

Meantime, these officials, somewhat frantically, were pleading with the War Manpower Commission to do something about the labor shortage in the Nation's packing houses—a shortage that makes it impossible for them to handle all the hogs coming to market from the country's record crop.

No estimate on the number of hogs being sold at less than support price has been made, but complaints have come in from markets scattered throughout the Midwest, including Indianapolis and Fort Wayne.

Manpower alone will not solve the entire situation, it was agreed. The Nation's food storage facilities are crowded to capacity and the market for pork is limited by rationing.

Leading Newspapers of Nation Editorially Support Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420) has been supported editorially in many of the leading newspapers throughout the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following list of papers which are known to me as having carried editorials recommending the enactment of this legislation:

New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, Journal of Commerce, Wall Street Journal, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Daily News, Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Chicago Daily News, Chicago Sun, Kansas City Times, Dayton Daily News, Buffalo Evening News, Utica Daily Press, Syracuse Herald-Journal, Syracuse Post-Standard, Cincinnati Post, St. Louis Post, Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati Times-Star, Columbus (Ohio) Citizen, Toledo (Ohio) Times, Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Jackson (Miss.) News, Vicksburg (Miss.) Post, San Diego (Calif.) Union, Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald, Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Lawrence (Mass.) Eagle, Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel, Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune, Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, Pottsville (Pa.) Journal, Waynesburg (Pa.) Democrat-Messenger, Danville (Pa.) News, Pittston (Pa.) Gazette, Mount Carmel (Pa.) Item, Uniontown (Pa.) Herald, Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat, Lancaster (Pa.) New Era.

Terre Haute (Ind.) Star, Peru (Ind.) Tribune, Frankfort (Ind.) Times, Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Marion (Ind.) Leader-Tribune, Manchester (N. H.) Leader, El Paso Times, Mobile (Ala.) Register, Florence (Ala.) Times, Huntsville (Ala.) Times, Fremont (Nebr.) Tribune, Harlan (Ky.) Enterprise, Middlesboro (Ky.) News, Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil, Pontiac (Ill.) Leader, Cairo (Ill.) Citizen and Bulletin, Edwardsville (Ill.) Intelligencer, Jacksonville (Ill.) Journal, Mount Vernon (Ill.) Register-News, Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, Williston (N. Dak.) Daily Herald, Popular Bluff (Mo.) American Republican, Newberg (Oreg.) Graphic, Ashland (Oreg.) Tidings, Paterson (N. J.) Call, Rhinelander (Wis.) News, South Norwalk (Conn.) Sentinel, Meriden (Conn.) Journal, New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, Williamsport (Ind.) Reverse Republican, Muncie (Ind.) Press, Portland (Ind.) Commercial Review, Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, Boone (Iowa) News-Republican, Manning (Iowa) Monitor, Davenport (Iowa) Bulletin, North Platte (Nebr.) Telegraph, South Sioux City (Nebr.) Star, Iowa City (Iowa) Iowan, East Hartford (Conn.) Gazette, Bridgeport (Conn.) Bridgeport Life, Palm Beach (Fla.) Post, Fort Pierce (Fla.) News-Tribune.

Key West (Fla.) Citizen; Carrollton (Ga.) Times; Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald; Lawrenceville (Ga.) Journal; Lansing (Ill.) Journal; Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic; Troup, Troup, Tex.; Wabash Weekly News, Mount Carmel, Ill.; Hampton, N. H.; McGeehee (Ark.) Times; Santa Rosa (Calif.) Republican; Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat; Ontario (Calif.) Report; Loyalton (Calif.) Sierra News; Los Angeles (Calif.) Enterprise; Sacramento (Calif.) Shopping News; Lamar (Colo.) Register; Mobile (Ala.) Post; Guntersville (Ala.) Advertiser; Merrill (Wis.) Daily Herald; Oakland (Calif.) Journal; Fort Pierce (Fla.) News-Tribune; Jefferson (Ga.) Jackson Herald; Scottsville (Ky.) Citizen-Times; Calumet (Mich.) Evening News Journal; Barnesville (Ohio) Whetstone; Duquesne (Pa.) Times; Wilmerding (Pa.) Westinghouse Valley News; St. Claire (Minn.) News; Detroit (Mich.) La Tribuna Italiana; Watertown (Mass.) Tribune-Enterprise; Radford (Va.) Evening Star; Gaffney (S. C.) Ledger; Camden (S. C.) Chronicle; Myrtle Beach (S. C.) News; Woonsocket (R. I.) Call and Evening Reporter; Newport (R. I.) Herald; Fairview (Mont.) News; Billings (Mont.) Times; Woonsocket (R. I.) Call and Reporter; Norristown (Pa.) Times-Herald; Philadelphia (Pa.) Dispatch; Easton (Pa.) Free Press; Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune; Ardmore (Pa.) Chronicle.

Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune, Cortlandt (N. Y.) Standard, Lockport (N. Y.) Union-Sun-Journal, Bainbridge (N. Y.) News, Morristown (N. J.) Banner, Irvington (N. J.) Herald, Newark (N. J.) Italian Tribune, Maple

Shade (N. J.) Progress, Keene (N. H.) Sentinel, West Point (Miss.) Times-Leader, Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth, International Falls (Minn.) Journal, Boston (East Dorchester, Mass.) Leader, Boston (Mass.) Dorchester Beacon, Cambridge (Mass.) Tech, Amherst (Mass.) Record, Hudson (Mass.) News Enterprise, Saginaw (Mich.) Tribune, Romeo (Mich.) Observer, Detroit (Mich.) M and F Record, Saginaw (Mich.) Tribune and Legal News, Denton (Md.) Journal, Bath (Maine) Times, Biddleford (Maine) Journal, Eunice (La.) New Era, Sogalusa (La.) Bulletin, Columbia (La.) Watchman, Mt. Sterling (Ky.) Gazette and Kentucky Courier, Burlington (Ky.) Recorder, Marysville (Kans.) Advocate Democrat, Neodesha (Kans.) Daily Sun.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 22, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Pettengill, always a conservative Democrat, gives us his views on subsidies. It is as follows:

THE RETURN OF GRACCHUS

The purchase of next year's election is under way. That is what the President's food-subsidy program amounts to. We might as well call things by their right names.

Labor leaders demand that the United States pay part of their grocery bill. They demand food for less than market price—less than O. P. A. price. They call this a roll-back. It amounts, of course, to a hidden wage increase. If milk, for example, is rolled back from 15 cents to 12 cents, the consumer pays the dairyman 12 cents and the Government pays 3 cents.

The 3 cents is added to the national debt. Before long it is $3,000,000,000 or more. When the 10,000,000 men in uniform, earning $50 a month, come home 2 or 3 years from now, they will be asked to help pay for the milk that was drunk in 1944. A stale grocery bill will be presented to them for payment. But that will be after the election.

The administration says that if food prices are not rolled back it can't hold the line against wage increases, which means inflation. But the roll-back is a wage increase and nothing is more inflationary than a subsidy. It leaves that much more money in the hands of the consumer, which is what the Government economists are howling about.

By saying it can't hold the line without subsidies the administration admits it is a prisoner of the labor leaders and must do as they demand. It did what John Lewis demanded after four strikes in wartime. Four strikes and out. Lewis got his portal-to-portal wage increase, as I predicted months ago. The administration shakes its fist at foreign dictators. It surrenders to dictators at home. The administration said it would enter into no contracts while under the gun of a strike. But it did.

How food subsidies helped to destroy the Roman Republic is described in a book written in 1831 by James Anthony Freude. Its title is Caesar, a Sketch. I quote: "Gracchus brought forward and carried through * * * a proposal that there should be public granaries maintained and filled at the cost of the state and that corn should be sold at a rate artificially cheap. * * * The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the state, to crowd the circus, and to clamor at the elections * * * certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid the highest for their votes. * * * It was the deadliest blow which had yet been dealt to the constitution. Party government turns on the majorities at the polling places and it was difficult afterward to recall a privilege which once conceded appeared to be a right. * * * If one side was ever strong enough to make the attempt, their rivals had a bribe to buy back the popular support."

It might be said of Gracchus that he fed the "needy unemployed." This administration proposes to feed the employed out of the coffers of the state. It proposes to pay part of the grocery bill of men making the highest wages in the history of the world.

And so, in the name of a war to strengthen democracy and destroy concentrated political power, the President urges a measure to weaken democracy and strengthen concentrated political power. For if democracy means anything it means free citizens, not voters on the auction block. It was said of the city of Rome a few decades after Gracchus that "it would sell itself if it could find a buyer."

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL,

Soldiers' Voting by Absentee Ballots—S. 1285

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Members of the House and Senate are really interested in the men in our armed forces voting by absentee ballots in the coming election, they will adopt S. 1285, now pending before the United States Senate, as a substitute for the so-called Lucas bill.

As I pointed out in my speech on November 17, which you will find at page 9629 of the RECORD of that date, the Lucas bill and the Worley bill both contain far-reaching and dangerous provisions that would threaten the very existence of our dual system of government. They not only violate the Constitution of the United States, but they violate the constitutions and the laws of practically every State in the Union.

They would set up a Federal election commission with far-reaching and dangerous powers.

This substitute to which I refer (S. 1285) that has been introduced by Senators EASTLAND, MCKELLAR, and MCCLELLAN is a companion of House Joint Resolution 190, referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] in his extension of remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A5014, as amended by House Joint Resolution 196, which has the support of two-thirds of the membership of the House committee handling this legislation.

This substitute (S. 1285) calls upon the States to pass whatever legislation is necessary to enable the men in our armed forces throughout the world to vote by absentee ballot. That has already been done, I understand, by every State in the Union, with the possible exception of Kentucky, whose legislature convenes in January.

It also makes it the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with the appropriate State agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and provides free air-mail service for such ballots and all communications in connection therewith.

It will do far more to expedite the transmission of these ballots to and from the men in the service and to facilitate their absentee voting than would the cumbersome and unconstitutional provisions of the so-called Lucas bill, for which it is offered as a substitute.

It would not set up any super Federal election commission in violation of law and in violation of the Constitution of the United States, but would leave the election machinery in the hands of the States themselves.

If the men in our armed forces could speak on this proposition, I dare say that 9 out of 10 of them would favor this substitute. They do not want their State election machinery destroyed or interfered with or dominated by any Federal bureaucracy.

While they are fighting our battles abroad, they expect us to protect these institutions at home.

The Senate bill to which I refer, S. 1285, reads as follows:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters in the armed forces in making application for absentee ballots, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, wherever practicable, and compatible with military operations cause such postal cards to be delivered to members of the armed forces located within or without the United States, as expeditiously as possible in order to enable such members of the armed forces to secure, execute, and return said ballots in ample time to be recorded for such election.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

Republican Drive for Action Wins Acclaim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including in the RECORD at this point some typical editorial reactions which have come to us from around the country in connection with the organization and activities of the Republican drive-for-action committee, announcement of which was made in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A4639:

[From the Madison (S. Dak.) Daily Leader]

CRUSADE FOR ACTION

A group of Republican congressmen have kicked over the traces on the comparative inactivity of Congress. They have formulated a drive-for-action committee, which proposes to hold the House in session every legislative day, to prevent a prolonged holiday adjournment, and to take all other steps within its powers to compel the Democratic leadership to bring up for legislative action pending bill destined to improve the conditions on the home front and advance the war effort.

Congressman KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, and GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, are the originators and sponsors of the committee, which has the blessing of the minority leader, JOE MARTIN, and progress has been rapid in converting, not only other Republicans, but possibly even members of the majority party.

It is the charge of the committee that the leaders of the major Democratic Party have permitted little of consequence to come up for action since the House convened September 14. The leadership has of late asked for 1- or 2-day recesses in an apparent effort to tide over the time until the year-end rush of affairs makes deliberate consideration of measures impossible.

The committee says that they have no political axes to grind, no candidates to promote, no special groups to protect or attack. They are not bound to vote for or against any measures, but they ask that constructive action be taken without delay.

Among the problems they insist should be settled are:

The food-subsidy question so farmers will be able to plan their next year's crop and so progress can be made in stimulating maximum production by providing farmers with fair prices in the market place without regimentation.

The need to take action to increase the production of crude oil so that existing gasoline and fuel-oil shortages may be relieved.

The double checking and careful investigation of all appropriation measures to be sure that economy becomes a working policy of the Government rather than merely a pious political promise.

The passage of legislation to provide citizens an appeal through regularly established judicial channels from any bureaucratic directive or regulation.

The committee says this is not a complete analysis of legislative jobs begging for action, but that others will be added from time to time.

We have long believed in action on the part of Congress. To us it looks like this is a move needed for wartime efficiency and common sense financial management. We wish the group of solons success in the effort to give procedure a shot in the arm. Nero fiddled while Rome burned; much of the time Congress only fiddles.

[From the Chicago Tribune of November 15, 1943]

THE REPUBLICANS PICK UP THE BALL

The majority of the people are now Republican, as recent elections have reemphasized, the executive department remains in the hands of the new dealers, but neither group controls Congress. Congress is Democratic, but anti-New Deal, through the combination of the strong Republican minority with the conservative Democrats.

This is a state of political affairs that rightly displeases the people of America. The administration stubbornly, even treacherously, follows a line of action to which the people are opposed, and which has alienated their trust and support. Congress, on which they should be able to depend to curb the Executive, frequently has been ineffective because the coalition that should exist in Congress has failed to coalesce.

The conservative Democrats are as bitterly opposed to the measures of the New Deal as are the Republicans, but the New Deal controls the machinery of their party. These Democrats are apparently bound in inaction by the fear that if they curb the New Deal they will damage their party, perhaps fatally. That the present domination of it by the new dealers is bound to destroy it in any event they seem unwilling to comprehend.

In these circumstances, the Republicans, who are nominally in the minority in Congress, but who form the majority of the majority group that disapproves of the New Deal program, are presented with a challenge of leadership. That challenge has been accepted, through the formation of the Republican action committee in the House. The committee, rightly charging the Democrats with failure in leadership, has brought forward a four-point program for immediate action.

This is its program—to settle the question of food subsidies at once, that farmers may plan next year's crops, and to force the appointment of a single food administrator with authority to end the chaos that the new dealers have inflicted on food production; to take action to stimulate petroleum production, ending the present gasoline and fuel-oil shortages; to provide citizens with appeals to the courts from the autocratic administrative orders of bureaucrats; and to investigate all appropriations and a means of enforcing a real policy of governmental economy.

This is a patriotic not a partisan program. It will help win the war, and it should appeal to those Democrats who are of like mind with the Republicans in their disgust with New Deal bungling and tyranny.

Specific legislative action on its program is being sought by the committee through three bills pending in Congress. The first measure would prevent Mr. Roosevelt's foolish, deceptive, and inflationary scheme of food subsidies by providing that they cannot be paid except to encourage increases in production. The second introduced would stimulate petroleum production by raising crude oil prices. The third measure, introduced by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, would grant citizens the protection of the courts against the imbecilities and malice of bureaucratic rule.

The Republicans cannot fail to turn Mr. Roosevelt and his heterogeneous rabble out of office next year if they satisfy the people in two respects. The Republicans must defeat the efforts of the internationalists, the millionaires, and the Communists to bewilder their convention and maneuver the nomination of another Roosevelt stooge, and they must demonstrate that they can deal effectively with the evils that the New Deal has brought on the country. The action committee has brought forward a workable, patriotic program on vital domestic issues. The Democratic Party, paralyzed by its split personality, has fumbled the ball. The Republicans in Congress have picked it up, and the country will cheer when they start running with it.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

TH' POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, November 10.—It is a commentary upon the nonpunch tactics of the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives that it was not until a bunch of G. O. P. "Young Turks" took policy-making into their hands that the Rayburn-McCormack machine was goaded into a semblance of legislative action.

This outfit, which reflected the White House on Capitol Hill, is the do-nothingest leadership this Congress has had. Meetings on Mondays and Thursdays have seemed to be sufficient, and meanwhile a veritable log-jam of greatly needed legislation has piled up in the committees, blocked by the Democratic leaderships, either deliberately, or because it has lacked the initiative to start something.

Into this moribund situation moved a couple of the Republican "Young Turks," KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and TOM WINTER, of Kansas. They decided something should be done.

They organized—just these two—a "committee of action," had some forms printed, and went out and got a lot of recruits. Nobody was urged to join, it was voluntary. Soon there were 18.

The "Young Turks" decided the Democratic leadership had been gumming up the works long enough. They moved in to prevent these 3-day recesses. They served notice that 2 weeks hence, if the Rayburn-McCormack coalition wasn't ready to fish or cut bait, they would prevent the customary week-end adjournment—they would keep the House in session on Saturdays.

Monday of this week Mr. MCCORMACK asked unanimous consent for skipping a day's work. MUNDT was alertly on the floor. He objected. MCCORMACK promised a full program from now on.

Why wasn't this full program launched long ago? What business is it of the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives to slow down the work of this legislative body of the people?

Why has this leadership permitted the blockade in committee of a great many long-pending bills, designed to correct a number of glaring abuses, of which the people are complaining bitterly all over the country?

What are some of these bills on which action has been prevented? Let us look at a few.

Since January a great number of measures for the relief and rehabilitation of the soldiers, sailors, and marines, as they return from the war fronts on land, sea, and in the air, have been filling overstuffed pigeonholes in House committees.

Action on them was held up, by whom the writer knows not, but it is significant that no action was taken, and that eventually the President himself took the ball and posed as the great champion of the veterans in the face of his known record to the contrary.

Blocked in committee is a bill by Representative DISNEY, of Oklahoma, authorizing the Congress to determine the price on crude oil, to stimulate production. Why should such a bill have been sidetracked in this time of gas and oil shortage?

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the most profound thankfulness today is for the victory to our armed forces.

The most unappropriate day to follow the passage of a tax bill is Thanksgiving Day.

The House vote of 278 to 117 against food subsidies is a hint to those bountifully fed Thursday that they may have to pay for all of it in the future.

The laugh for the week: Philip Murray, of C. I. O., appealing to JOE MARTIN for aid in "efforts to achieve and maintain a stabilized home front economy."

"Now let us all join in the Lord's Prayer," said the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, Thursday noon, November 18, as he closed his prayer; and another precedent was set.

The biblical story of the two grinding at the mill, one being taken and the other left, was no truer than the case of our three able colleagues who were all active last week and are now gone.

A tax bill is something no Member is intrinsically for and yet cannot consistently vote against, and is usually something he cannot even amend. It leaves one with the feeling of being waterlogged.

We are all out of joint here. While our committee hears the problems of migrant labor, which has largely ceased to migrate, the clock in the committee room strikes 12 at 11:30—neither the Lord's nor Roosevelt's time.

Every new house in Washington, and they are reaching out 10 miles in every direction, means a vacant one in each of 100,000 villages in our land. The alphabets are applesauce for the real estate dealers on the banks of the Potomac.

Four score years ago last Friday Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg. It came just 80 years after a peace with England had been effected that gave us our independence. Now at the end of another 80 years we are ready for a "new birth of freedom."

Address of Hon. Harold L. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address prepared by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, for delivery before the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute, Chicago, Ill., November 11, 1943, and read in his absence by George A. Hill, Jr., president, Houston Oil Co. of Texas:

Mr. Boyd and members of the American Petroleum Institute, this is the third year in a row that I have spoken to you men, either in person or by proxy, and I am quite certain that there are those in the audience who are thinking wistfully in terms of what the number 3 sometimes means. For example, when a man gets three strikes he is out. Or if he goes under three times he drowns. However, Mr. Boyd enticed me here on the assurance that this point of view is not unanimous, and so I will have at you once more, hoping that he is right.

Quite naturally, the first problem that confronted me after I had accepted the invitation to come here was deciding what I should talk about. In the course of my pondering it occurred to me that I undoubtedly could make you happiest if, instead of talking at all, I would borrow an idea from the burlesque shows and put on a little skit. I could begin by taking all of the orders and directives that the Petroleum Administration has ever issued and pretend that each was an item of ladies' clothing, and then, in the manner of Gypsy Rose Lee, I could, one by one, discard them forever.

Before someone shouts, "Go ahead and do it," I would like to get it on the record that we in P. A. W. wish as earnestly as anyone of you that these orders and directives might be terminated as of this afternoon. I will speak more to that point a little later.

In my remarks by proxy last year, to which Mr. W. Alton Jones undoubtedly gave far greater forensic finesse than I could myself have given, I reviewed in some detail the history of the wartime oil operation up to that time, as conducted cooperatively by the industry and the Petroleum Administration. Now that another year has passed, thus providing us with an additional sample of time to examine, it seemed to me that we might well consider the shape, as well as the detail, of this wartime oil operation. In other words, taking all of the pieces and fitting them together, what pattern do we find? What, if any, trends are indicated? What policies are exemplified? What purposes are demonstrated?

I have made such a diagnosis, and I find that there runs through the entire case history one all-important, all-dominating purpose: the supplying of petroleum products of the kinds needed, in the amounts needed, at the places needed, and at the times needed to win the war.

What, then, of the policies through which we have sought to achieve that purpose? In my own review of that record, I found the principal policies to be these:

First. To enlist a staff of minimum size but maximum competency—men who knew oil.

Second. To rely upon the industry, so far as possible, to do what needs to be done to accomplish the job, with only a necessary minimum of control and direction from Washington.

Third. So to operate that, so far as possible and practical, no act or omission of ours should permit any company or part of the industry to use the war to take advantage of or profit at the expense of others in the industry.

Fourth. To select members of our industry committees on a basis of keeping a fair balance as between all elements of the industry, particularly as between large and small companies.

Fifth. To find, produce, refine, transport, and distribute the greatest possible amount of petroleum and its products in the light of recognized conservation principles and subject to the unavoidable disturbances of war.

Sixth. To help the industry to obtain the materials, the manpower, and the money that it needed to do its war job most effectively.

Seventh. To impose restrictions only when the physical facts made them necessary and unavoidable.

I repeat that these have been the principal policies that I find exemplified by the record, and the reason why I repeat is that there have been suggestions here and there that we have not faithfully adhered to these policies, but have merely paid them lip service. This criterion does not apply to all of the points that I have mentioned. I don't believe that anybody will argue with me about the competency of the staff; and most of you, although not all, will agree that we have tried to keep our orders at a minimum and rely rather upon a cooperative process. It is when we get into the matter of the balance between the different interests in the industry that we run into some allegations that have made it difficult for me to maintain my customarily sweet disposition.

It was way back before we got into the war—on June 19, 1941—that I had my first meeting with representatives of the industry. There were 560 oil men present. They came from all parts of the country, and they represented every phase of the industry. It was at this meeting that I called upon the entire industry to let us have nominations for our proposed district committees. I said at that time—I quote: "The personnel of each of these committees * * * should, of course, be representative of the many different units in the industry and balanced between independent and so-called major companies." On that basis, nominations were requested. On that basis, appointments were made, although, quite frankly, there are occasions when I am still more than a little perplexed when I try to figure out what is a major company and what is an independent.

In any event, subject to the difficulties of precise definition, we did conscientiously attempt to strike a balance on these committees.

Yet it is brought to my attention every now and then that someone has been burping that P. A. W. is "dominated by the majors," or that P. A. W. "lacks sympathy for the independents."

Now, if anything were needed to make this kind of thing more stupid than it is, naturally, it is the fact that, all of my life, I have been motivated by the fervent desire to protect the rights of the independent businessman. Indeed, I have been so active and outspoken in that regard that I have on occasion been accused of being antibig business. Well, it so happens that I am not a foe of big business, so long as it is honest and so long as it is not monopolistic. However, I never expected to live to see the day when I would be branded as antilittle business. My reaction when I first began hearing of this rumormongering was to ignore it as unworthy of attention, but it is apparent that a systematic campaign is under way, and so I choose to bring it out into the open.

Yes; we have men from major oil companies on our staff. Mr. Davies is from a major oil company. Some of the division directors are from major oil companies, and I have no hesitancy in telling you that I have been very happy to have them. Far from attempting to use their positions to trample upon the independents, they have, judging from the evidence that I have seen, been scrupulous in leaning in just the opposite direction.

As to our industry committees, I have said that our aim has been to strike a balance as between independents and majors. Cer-

tainly, regardless of whatever dispute there may be as to whether this or that committee member is or is not a bona fide independent, I do not know of any committee which does not have independent representation. So, if the independents on any committee should at anytime decide that the cards are stacked against them, I would think that they would so report to us, either directly or through the Petroleum Industry War Council. After all, one of the principal purposes in creating the committees and the War Council was to give every element of the industry a voice. There are two ways in which that voice can be used: It can be used with the desired loudness in the committees, in the War Council, and to me, or it can be used in a whisper on Capitol Hill in an attempt to stir up political fires. Frankly, I would suggest that one of the first methods would be more productive, especially if there be a just grievance.

Turning now from the general to the specific, I think that there may be an interest in appraising, in terms of their significance, the things that have happened since your last meeting. If I were asked to name the highlights of the year, I would certainly include these:

First. The solution of the oil-transportation problem.

Second. The achievement of more than four times the production of 100-octane aviation gasoline that we had in January 1942. Incidentally, the figures will be more than eight times before many more months.

And, in passing, perhaps you will forgive me if I admit a sense of satisfaction because of the completion of the Big Inch pipeline, the long-ridiculed Ickes pipe dream, which is now close to its capacity delivery of 300,000 barrels of crude oil into the New York-Philadelphia area.

The Big Inch and its 20-inch companion, Big Inch, Jr., are the lines which have been getting most of the publicity, but I suspect that even some of you gentlemen are not aware that there are 16 other projects in the pipe-line program which P. A. W. and the industry have carried forward together. When they are all operating at capacity, they will be delivering a total of 725,000 barrels of oil into the east coast every day—more than half of the volume of oil which the east received in peacetime by tanker.

The progress in 100-octane production is no less astounding than that which has been wrought in transportation. The details have been told before and I shall not repeat them. I think that there again there is significance in the fact that the job has been done by Government and industry on a cooperative basis, within the framework of free enterprise.

But all of the developments of the last year have not been pleasant ones, and in saying this, I am thinking of the shortage of crude oil. It is purely academic to say that this shortage could have been prevented or alleviated if a higher price ceiling had been permitted. We have to face the fact that a higher price was not permitted. P. A. W. thought that a price increase should be granted. We said that we believed that it would stimulate exploration, that it would make possible more extensive employment of secondary recovery methods, and that it would enable many marginal locations to be drilled and more stripper wells to continue their operation. That is why we recommended a price increase to O. P. A. That is why we asked O. P. A. to reconsider our recommendation after we were turned down the first time. And that is why, after the second turndown, we appealed to the Director of Economic Stabilization.

His verdict was no less disappointing to us than it was to you, but it is, nevertheless, the verdict.

Whatever may be the final means of stimulating the discovery, development and production of additional crude-oil reserves, Judge Vinson has now advised the Petroleum Administration and the industry, through the Petroleum Industry War Council, to attempt to devise some plan, short of a general price increase, which will provide additional financial incentives for the achievement of these ends.

Obviously, an attempt to invent some such plan or program is the next step. In his opinion Judge Vinson said that he "entertains no doubt whatsoever of the ability of the P. A. W., in cooperation with the Petroleum Industry War Council, to devise a practical, workable program for giving additional financial support to exploratory activity and development of new fields without increasing the cost of living, burdening Government or business with an impossible administrative task, or dispensing public funds to those not engaged in exploratory activity or developments of new fields."

However, thus far we have been unable to formulate such a plan. But, in view of Judge Vinson's request that we discover some new formula short of a general price increase, I have asked my staff, and I now urge the industry, to undertake immediately to try to formulate some program or policy, other than a general price increase—one which we can conscientiously recommend to Judge Vinson as practical, workable, and administratively feasible.

Above all, I am unwilling, in view of our need of additional reserves, to allow this question of proper financial incentives for producers to remain unsolved. Therefore, it is necessary that we proceed in good faith and with all possible speed. This, as I have said, is the next step. Only after we have attempted to devise such a program as has been requested can we in P. A. W. determine what the steps thereafter shall be.

Now, this leads inevitably to the question of foreign oil—a question which has stimulated such heated controversy that I consider it essential that I discuss it as fully as may be, and make my position clear. There are both major and independent operators here today, and I address myself to both groups.

The subject of foreign oil has always been one that has aroused the particular interest of the independent producers, and quite understandably so because it has appeared to them to be a potential threat to their livelihood. Most of these independents are nonintegrated operators, and so any losses which they might incur through the competition of lower-priced foreign crude could not be offset by gains in their other operations. Therefore, they are opposed to a large-scale importation of oil for the reason that it might displace their domestic production. As I say, I well understand this viewpoint.

In fact, before I go ahead, I think that I might quote from an address which I made to the Independent Petroleum Association of America a year ago. I said, "Especially do I want you to know that I realize the importance of the independent producers, both in peace and in war. The very term 'independent' seems somehow symbolic of the American birthright of free opportunity * * * We must always have the independents—the little fellows—in all lines of endeavor in this country of ours. Without them, something would go out of the bone and fiber of America."

Let that position, then, be stipulated for the record.

The fact remains that the demand for oil for war is increasing. The fact remains that the only place in the United States where crude oil production can be increased substantially from known reserves is in West Texas.

And there is more to the situation even than the necessity of supplying the requirements of war. There is the consideration of what our position is to be after the war. I want to see the American petroleum industry live and prosper for many years to come. I don't want to see it wear itself out and slash years from its life by a wartime burst of inefficiently excessive production that would injure our oil fields irreparably. It is for this reason that we have long planned our activities so that, as conditions make it possible, the oil fields of other lands would contribute their share to the United Nations needs. It is for this reason, and not for the purpose of slipping in—under the guise of wartime necessity—a wedge that would threaten our domestic producers when peace comes.

With respect to the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, there seems to have been a great deal of misguided and inaccurate speculation as to its purposes and future course of conduct. Actually, there is no occasion for the type of rumors which have come to my ears. Petroleum Reserves Corporation is in no sense the first, although so far as I know it was the latest of the governmental corporations which the war has compelled us to create to meet our national needs for critical materials.

In order to protect business here in the United States, to assure the American people of enough oil to meet their needs, and to make certain that there is sufficient oil for military requirements, it is necessary that the United States obtain a fair measure of access to foreign oil resources. We will be able to make available within our present reserves enough oil to finish this global war, but we couldn't possibly oil another war of this size. In view of this fact, we would be remiss in our duty and indifferent about the future of our country if we did not adopt measures to assure ourselves of enough oil in the event of another world war. We hope that there will not be such a war, but we would do well to remember the old adage: "Soft words butter no parsnips."

At the present time, there is no international arrangement which adequately carries out the principles of the Atlantic Charter so as to guarantee to the nations of the world fair access to the world's oil resources. It is hoped that some such agreement will be forthcoming. A program of this sort would contribute greatly to the peace and security of all nations.

In the past, a number of United States oil companies have established themselves in the foreign oil business. They have obtained rights to oil reserves, they have constructed facilities to process and transport oil, and they have engaged in world-wide distribution of oil and its products. This has been done entirely as a result of private initiative with the Government extending its good offices. On the other hand, the other principal nations of the world—or most of them—have conducted their foreign oil business through corporations or agencies which are entirely or partly owned or in effect controlled by the government itself. The United States is one of the few major countries which has not participated in foreign oil activities through governmental financing or direction.

To the extent that private capital and private initiative are unable to establish and maintain a national position in this field, Government assistance and participation may be necessary. The Petroleum Reserves Corporation is available for these purposes whenever and wherever necessary. The directors of the corporation are the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

With respect to another phase of foreign oil, there has also been some indiscriminate shooting. It has been aimed at our Directive No. 70, which was issued to make possible the same kind of joint use of facilities and products in foreign operations as we have employed to meet war-created shortages of supplies and facilities at home.

The allegation is that Directive No. 70 constitutes a "cartel"—oh, even worse than that, a cartel cooked up by the Government itself.

I am not going to quarrel over the definition of cartel. But I am going to say quite assertively that Directive No. 70 is nothing of the sort.

It calls for a pooling of products and facilities, at the direction of the Petroleum Administrator for War, for the duration of the war. It has nothing to do with prices, it does not limit spheres of operation, and since it is a governmental design in order to facilitate the distribution of supplies to the armed forces, not only with the knowledge and consent of the Government, but at its direction, it cannot by the widest stretch of the imagination be called a cartel.

However, excitable men both in and out of Congress, and both in and out of newspapers, must have something for the consumption of headline readers. Apparently they do not know that we have had the same sort of arrangement in operation in the domestic field for many months, with the result that we have been able to supply our armed forces much more smoothly and quickly than would otherwise have been the case. Without the pooling of supplies and facilities which Directive 70 makes possible, we would not be able to make the most of our limited oil transportation and operating equipment and our available supplies abroad, and get to the battle fronts petroleum products to supply them. If anybody has a better way to suggest, I would be glad if he would come forward with it.

I think that the subject of private enterprise might be a good one on which to conclude my remarks. From the very beginning I have said that it would be my policy to rely as fully as possible upon free enterprise to get the wartime oil job done; that it would be my objective to hold Government direction and control to the minimum consistent with wartime requirements. It is my firm conviction that it is because of this policy that the petroleum industry has done so excellent a job so far in this war.

I take this occasion to acknowledge, as I have repeatedly done before, my appreciation of that job. You have cooperated in the most burdensome kind of circumstances. You have had continuing shortages of materials and increasing shortages of manpower. You have been called upon by us in Government to rearrange your operations at considerable inconvenience and often at considerable expense. Perhaps the one consoling circumstance—in addition to your satisfaction that you have had a major part in the victory—that we are winning—has been the fact that, through the industry committees and the Petroleum Industry War Council, you have at least been able to be heard when you have had something to say.

I am sure that the members of the Council will not mind if I single out one of them—their chairman and your president—for particular mention. In fact, I feel certain that they will agree with me that Bill Boyd deserves particular mention. His intelligent cooperation with us of P. A. W. has been no minor factor in the effectiveness of the Government-industry partnership plan. For this, he has our thanks. For this, he deserves your thanks.

When I addressed your convention in San Francisco back in 1941, there were those of you who feared that I wanted to take over the oil industry.

Parenthetically, there are those now in the coal industry who feel that it is their turn to fear, or pretend to fear, that I am in favor of the nationalization of that industry. That isn't so either. The fact that I turned the coal mines back as fast as I did—some commentators thought that I turned them back too fast and too early—ought to be some assurance that I am not for the nationalization of the coal industry. I wanted to get rid of these coal properties as fast as I could, and, just between you and me, I had hoped that the President, if he found it necessary to take them over again, would designate someone else as custodian of the mines of the country.

I hope that I have disabused you of the delusion that many of you had, but if there still be any who doubt, let me repeat that I still feel as I did in San Francisco.

At one of the meetings of the Petroleum Industry War Council, some months ago, one member expressed the fear that the industry would become so tangled in Government regulations and control that when peace came it would be impossible to untangle it. I assured this gentleman—and I repeat that assurance here—that, when the emergency has ended, if I have any authority in the matter, you will find me on your side working to restore the oil industry, so far as may be possible, to its ante bellum competitive status just as speedily as it can be accomplished. We will get rid of the orders and directives—and without a "strip tease."

Tomorrow Is Thanksgiving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Thanksgiving. I am not speaking from the well of the House of Representatives to recall some bit of early history connected with the founding of this country to your minds but I am before you today to pay my respects, and I know I speak for all Montana, to a boy who is no longer with us. This boy was born on Thanksgiving and his parents surely must have been thankful for and proud of that fact.

I am taking this means to pay my tribute to him on this occasion, and through him to all the other boys and girls from Montana who are or have been in the armed services of our country. This boy, Tom O'Donnell, lived every day of his life by the Golden Rule and he exemplified in his daily life the things that all of us hold most dear. When I think of him I am reminded of all the others from my State who are fighting our battles today in all parts of the world. I am thinking of the fact that these men and women of ours are paying now for mistakes which we of an older generation made. I am hoping that out of this ghastly struggle will come a peace this time that will endure so that the sacrifices made will not have been in vain. I am thinking of Tom's comrades from all parts of Montana, the cities, the small towns, the ranches, the mills, and the mines. I am thinking of the thousands whom I know personally and with whom I have been intimately connected. I am thinking also of the thousands whom I have never had the chance to know. I am thinking of their mothers and fathers, their wives and sweethearts, their relatives, and their friends. Together they represent our State and our country, and to say that we are proud of all of them is at best an understatement. We are also grateful to them for what they are doing and humble in the thought of the responsibility they bear. Our destiny as a nation is in their hands and our future rests on the points of their bayonets. May God continue to give success to our arms and guidance to our minds in these critical days before us.

Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1943, at Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., Mrs. Barbara Adams O'Donnell received the Distinguished Service Cross in behalf of her late husband, Capt. Tom O'Donnell, United States Army, killed on Attu. In my estimation this was a worthy gesture and a well-earned reward. I knew Tom well as a student of mine, a friend, and a real American. Montana has suffered a grievous loss in his passing, but his life and his memory will continue to serve as an example to the young men of our State. Quiet almost to the point of shyness, determined to the limit of his ability, and kind to everyone who crossed his path, he was the living embodiment of all the things we hold most precious. Words are useless, I know, to express one's real feelings, but they are the only means we have at times to overcome hurt, banish despair, and to encourage the desolate to hope again. In giving his life on Attu, Tom O'Donnell did so with the hope that other young men in future generations would be spared the ordeal through which he and his fellows passed. While his wife, Barbara, was proud to receive the Government's recognition of Tom's worth, I know she was sad, also, because she has lost someone whom she loved dearly. She cannot bring her husband back, but she can rest secure in the knowledge of his great and undying love for his country and for her. This is something no one can take away from her. For his sake she will carry on. We know that when our time comes we will again see the boy we respected, admired, and loved. The battle of life is now over for Captain O'Donnell, but the future beckons him ever onward and upward. Good luck and Godspeed to you, Tom. Tomorrow is Thanksgiving.

The Patton Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Patton incident has stirred the country. Mothers and fathers of sons in the service are much concerned. I feel that the public is entitled to know the facts as far

as they are available at this time. Therefore, I include in these remarks an account of the episode written by Edward Kenedy, Associated Press war correspondent, which appeared on the front page of the Washington Evening Star on November 23, 1943, as follows:

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS, ALGIERS, November 23.—It was disclosed officially today that Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., had apologized to all officers and men of the Seventh Army for striking a soldier during the Sicilian campaign.

At the same time allied headquarters said correspondents might reveal all of the facts they knew of the incident which since last August has been one of the main subjects of discussion among soldiers in this theater.

While General Patton was not relieved of his command of the Seventh Army and was not given a formal reprimand, he received a castigation from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower such as has seldom been administered to a commander of an army.

Today's disclosure came 16 hours after an official headquarters statement said, "General Patton is commanding the Seventh Army, has commanded it since it was activated, and is continuing to command it. General Patton has never been reprimanded at any time by General Eisenhower, or by anyone else in this theater."

The story is a strange one—the story of a general whose excellence is admitted by all, who in the heat of battle lost his temper and later admitted he was wrong and made amends.

The incident consisted of this, according to eyewitnesses:

General Patton slapped a shell-shocked soldier in a hospital tent because he thought the soldier was shirking his duty.

The incident occurred early in August when the Sicilian campaign was in one of its most critical periods.

General Patton visited the evacuation hospital and went among the wounded, trying to cheer them. He patted some on the back, sympathizing with them.

He then came upon a 24-year-old soldier sitting on a cot with his head buried in his hands, weeping.

"What's the matter with you?" General Patton asked, according to persons who were in the hospital tent at the time.

The soldier mumbled a reply, which was inaudible to the General. General Patton repeated his question.

"It's my nerves; I guess I can't stand shelling," the boy was quoted as replying.

General Patton thereupon burst into a rage. Employing much profanity, he called the soldier a coward, "yellow belly," and numerous other epithets, according to those present. He ordered the soldier back to the front.

The scene attracted several persons, including the commanding officer of the hospital, the doctor who had admitted the soldier, and a nurse.

After his verbal outburst General Patton struck the soldier in the rear of the head with the back of his hand.

The soldier fell over slightly and the liner of his helmet, which he was wearing, fell off and rolled over the floor of the tent.

A nurse, intent on protecting the patient, made a dive toward General Patton, but was pulled back by a doctor. The hospital's commanding officer then intervened.

General Patton then went before other patients, still in high temper, expressing his views. He returned to the shell-shocked soldier and berated him again.

The soldier appeared dazed as the incident progressed, but offered to return to the front, and tried to rise from his cot.

General Patton left the hospital without making further investigation of the case.

The facts concerning the soldier were later ascertained: He was a Regular Army man who had enlisted before the war from his home town in the South. He had fought throughout the Tunisian and Sicilian campaigns and his record was excellent. He had been diagnosed as a medical case the week previously, but had refused to leave the front, and continued on through the strain of battle. He finally was ordered to the hospital by his unit doctor.

After General Patton left the soldier demanded to return to the front. This request was refused at the time, but after a week of rest he was in good shape and returned to his unit at the front.

Immediately after the incident the soldier was reported in a miserable state. As a Regular Army man with pride in his record, he felt his whole world dashed to pieces.

"Don't tell my wife! Don't tell my wife!" he was quoted as saying by persons who talked to him later. The chaplain at the hospital, however, pointed out that the incident was the result of an outburst of temper due to the strain of battle, and, after several conversations with the soldier, persuaded him to accept it in that light.

The incident was reported to General Eisenhower. The commander in chief immediately wrote General Patton a letter in which he denounced his conduct and ordered him to make amends or be removed from his command.

"The old man certainly took the hide off him," an Allied headquarters spokesman said.

General Patton's conduct then became as generous as it had been furious.

He apologized to the soldier whom he had struck, to the commander of the hospital and to all those present at the time.

He then went before as many officers and men as could be assembled from each division under his command and repeated his apology.

At the close of the campaign in talking to correspondents, General Patton, after recounting the history of the Sicilian drive, said:

"When these things are happening a commanding general is under great nervous tension. He may do things he may afterward regret. I know a great many people regard me as a ——

"But I have patted five soldiers on the back for every one I have spoken a harsh word to. I dealt harshly with a couple of soldiers and was wrong. I am going to apologize to them."

The incident reflected the character of General Patton—a general who drives both himself and his men to the very limit in battles, who is highly emotional at times and is given to outbursts when under strain.

But he is regarded by many officers as the best field general in the American Army.

It is generally believed here by military men that Sicily never would have been conquered in 38 days had it not been for General Patton's driving force.

His value as a general was one reason why his case was dealt with as it was.

While many soldiers under General Patton's command may not have much affection for him, they all respect him as a great general and have confidence in him as a commander. General Patton himself doesn't care whether they like him or not—he regards his job as winning battles.

On Sunday night Drew Pearson had broadcast from Washington that General Patton had been "severely reprimanded" by General Eisenhower. The radio commentator expressed the opinion that General Patton would not "be used in combat any more."

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a country at war, where 75 percent of the Nation's economy is devoted to war production and the national income exceeds the supply of civilian goods by more than $35,000,000,000, the normal economic laws of supply and demand cannot be allowed free play without producing catastrophic inflation. Under such circumstances and conditions, measures must be taken that normally would not be reckoned with by a freedom- and liberty-loving people. I have always entertained a very strong antipathy toward subsidies in general, though their practical necessity as a stimulus for the production of unusual products of wartime must be conceded. In the past I have consistently voted against subsidies for cotton, peanuts, tobacco, and other products.

Like war, subsidies are not desirable. But in wartime, apparently, they are a necessary weapon. Selected subsidy payments, in view of the fact that no better program has been presented, must be used to control and stabilize food prices. However, subsidies should not be employed as a major weapon against inflation. Wage stabilization, fiscal policy, holding down prices, and subsidies must all be linked together.

Most people do not appreciate that we are now in a period of inflation despite all efforts to prevent it. Now that we are in it, we must do all in our power to keep it in control. Evidence of inflation is presented everywhere. During my recent visit in Milwaukee I was informed that high-school boys, who work part time and have more money than they had ever enjoyed, are buying socks that cost five to seven dollars a pair; that war workers are buying ten to fourteen dollar shirts made of broadcloth, not silk; women are buying handbags costing seventy, eighty, and one hundred dollars; used cars 2, 3, or more years old are selling for three to eight hundred dollars more than their original value; fur coats that brought $200 a year ago are now priced at $250 to $300; jewelry stores are swamped with business. There is a market for every kind of jewelry, and watches costing $150 and $250 are being sold as fast as they can be obtained.

People no longer inquire about the price of an item when shopping but merely select what they want and pay any price demanded without batting an eye. These are some of the causes for the present period of inflation.

Great inflationary increases in the prices of liquor, farm and city real estate, and various services, can be observed throughout the country. Prices of these commodities and services are

not regulated under Government price ceilings. But there is also price inflation in items that are under Government control. We have all been faced with the abnormal increases in the cost of fruits and vegetables. Meats and butter have been held down only through the aid of subsidies. The cheaper line of men's clothing has disappeared. Inflationary prices in clothing are felt more in the inferior quality and the elimination of low price lines than actual price rises. The price of women's clothing has also increased tremendously, though the quality has deteriorated.

If the general public could only be educated to limit its purchases in wartime to absolute bare necessities, competition would be cut down for the limited quantity of civilian products now available. By holding off purchases until after the war is won, a post-war demand can be created acting as a springboard for continued employment and prosperity. Thus, we can prevent an era of unemployment that is bound to follow if all the money now earned is dissipated.

Mr. Speaker, no one of us favors subsidies as a permanent policy. It is, therefore, important that Congress hold the line against unreasonable expansion of the subsidy program. This can best be done by limiting the amount of funds that are to be expended therein and setting a definite period of time over which it is to be extended.

Republican Drive for Action Wins Acclaim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including in the RECORD at this point some typical editorial comments which have come to us from around the country in connection with the organization and activities of the Republican Drive-For-Action Committee, announcement of which was made in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A4639:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star-Journal]

KEEPING CONGRESS AT WORK

Sixteen Members of the National House of Representatives, including Representative O'HARA, of Minnesota, have joined to keep that body in session by refusing to consent to recesses while important work remains undone. The group realizes that the minority cannot compel the Democratic leadership of the House to bring legislation to the floor, but the Glencoe Congressman points out that it can prevent long week-end and middle-of-the-week recesses.

The Steadfast Sixteen want action in the House on a 1944 farm program and the food subsidy snarl; to increase crude oil production; to review appropriation bills; and on legislation granting court appeals from decisions of Government bureaus.

The program is practical, and every problem on it deserves an early answer. And there are plenty of others * * *.

One job which Minneapolis would like to see the House do while it's resting is to take whatever action is needed to eliminate legal difficulties and clear the way for prompt post-war construction of the upper harbor here, which ought to be one of the first works undertaken in this area when we reach the public works stage of national reconstruction.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard]

LET'S GET GOING

Accusations of "stalling" and "apathy" have been made against the majority party in the House of Representatives by 16 Republican Members. They charge that the party in power is holding back legislation with the intention of railroading it through, without sufficient debate, in the year-end rush. And they have banded together with the declared intention of eliminating a lot of 1- and 2-day recesses, cutting the holiday recess short, and taking what other steps they can to speed up action on pending measures.

Without arguing the truth of these accusations, it can scarcely be claimed by anyone that the House has many constructive accomplishments to its credit in the 6 weeks since its long-due summer recess ended. Committees have been active, to be sure. But not much has come off the final assembly end of the legislative production line.

The Republican group lists four subjects on which it believes quick action should be forthcoming. They are the food subsidy question, crude-oil production as it affects gasoline and fuel rationing, more careful investigation of appropriation requests by Government agencies, and the opening of judicial channels through which citizens may appeal "any bureaucratic directive or regulation."

This choice of four is marked, quite naturally, by partisan emphasis. Perhaps the choice does not include all the questions that need settling, or even the most important ones. But at least these four are currently causing violent agitation in the turmoil over domestic war policy. It is a turmoil which constantly stirs Washington, and which reflects or infects the temper of the whole country.

The subsidy problem is one that ought to be settled quickly. Until Congress decides whether it will continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, farmers cannot plan with any confidence for their 1944 task of producing the greatest food supply in our history. The President made an impressive appeal for the present subsidy operation in his message to Congress. But it only increased activity of the sizable opposition group in both parties. Much of this opposition is not to the principle of subsidies, but to the present application. The problem is not insoluble, and it ought to be threshed out with no more delay.

Equally necessary to domestic tranquillity is a settlement of the long and bitter quarrel over government by directive. Congress and the agencies, particularly O. P. A., are constantly at each other's throats over broad interpretations of the war powers granted the President by Congress. Limitations and better interpretations won't be arrived at quickly or easily, but they are now scarcely beyond the fussing and fuming stage.

These are not all of the causes of domestic contention, of course. But if even in these we could approach the Government's unanimity of feeling on foreign policy, the war might be moved toward its conclusion a little faster.

[From the Grafton (W. Va.) Sentinel]

REPUBLICAN HOUSE GROUP FORMS DRIVE-FOR-ACTION COMMITTEE

An informal group of Republican House Members announced tonight the formation of a drive-for-action committee which proposes to hold the House in session every legislative day; to prevent a prolonged holiday adjournment, and to take other steps "within its power" to compel the Democratic leadership to bring up for legislative action pending bills destined to improve conditions on the home front and advance the war effort. Spokesmen for the committee said, "Winning the war is America's No. 1 job. A well-fed, busily working, productive home front can contribute greatly to the shortening of this war by setting forward the date of victory. It can thus do much to alleviate the suffering and sacrifices of the soldiers on our fighting fronts. Economical government and efficient administration combined with judicious legislation at this time can step up our war effort and scale down our war costs. Its purpose is to drive for action along these lines," according to Congressman A. C. SCHIFFLER.

The committee announcement stated, "In reviewing the record of the past 6 weeks of congressional sessions we have reluctantly been compelled to recognize that apathy rather than action has been the keyword of the party in power since the termination of the summer recess. The Democratic leadership, which, in cooperation with the President's advisers, determines which bills are to come up for action on the House floor or in the committees, has permitted very little of consequence to come up for consideration since September 14, on which date Congress reconvened. Of late, the leadership has even taken to asking for 1- and 2-day recesses as a matter of habit in an apparent effort to tide over the time until the year-end rush of affairs makes deliberate consideration of measures impossible. While we who are members of the minority party cannot compel the Democratic leadership to bring remedial legislation to the floor for action, we can at least prevent a continuation of the long week-end recesses and the recurring skipping of sessions in the middle of the legislative week, and this we propose to do.

"We shall endeavor to hold the House in continuous session hereafter and in these daily sessions we shall do our best to press for action on matters demanding early attention if the war effort and the home-front economy are to function at maximum efficiency. We shall point out to the public the problems which need legislative attention by Congress. We shall offer constructive suggestions. We shall make corrective proposals. We shall urge action by both the Congress and its committee on problems of vital importance. In every manner within our power we shall try to compel the Democratic leadership to act without further unnecessary delay. Daily sessions of Congress will provide an opportunity for such action and if it is not forthcoming these sessions will permit the public to learn the awful truth that the Democratic leadership is stalling and delaying decisions in a manner which weakens our home front and retards our war effort."

Among the problems listed by the committee as appropriate subjects for immediate action by Congress are the following:

1. The necessity of acting promptly once and for all to dispose of the food subsidy question so that farmers will be able to plan for their next year's crops and so that progress can be made in stimulating maximum production by providing farmers with fair prices in the market place without regimentation. This should be coupled with the naming of a single Food Administrator to bring order

out of the chaos which is doing so much to aggravate our serious food situation.

2. The need to take action to increase the production of crude oil so that existing gasoline and fuel oil shortages may be relieved.

3. The double checking and careful investigation of all appropriation measures to be sure that economy becomes a working policy of Government rather than merely a pious political promise. We vigorously oppose all expenditures and bureaucratic actions which are contrary to the expressed will of Congress.

4. The passage of legislation to provide citizens an appeal through regularly established judicial channels from any bureaucratic directive or regulation.

The drive-for-action committee stressed the fact that the four-point program announced last night is not a complete analysis of "legislative jobs which are begging for action." Additional points will be added from time to time

Committee spokesmen stated, "Our present membership list is not complete or exclusive; we expect that many other Members of Congress will join us in this drive. We have no political axes to grind, no candidates to promote, no special groups to protect or attack. We simply are insisting that Congress be given an opportunity to measure up to its responsibilities as a coordinate branch of Government in this Republic. We want the Democratic leadership to take off the brakes and let Congress function as freely and fully as the executive and judicial branches of Government. The House of Representatives is the voice of the people. We feel the time has come for this voice to be heard."

The statement issued by the executive board of the drive-for-action committee stated that the group had been organized after consultation with the minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., and that the movement has his approval.

Letter Addressed to Hon. Joseph J. O'Brien by Mr. Arthur L. Mepham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me November 19, 1943, by Mr. Arthur L. Mepham, an attorney, of Rochester, N. Y.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *November 19, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: In spite of the many claims made for the plan and the many different reasons advanced for its adoption, I still am unable to visualize the shining virtues supposed to be inherent in the subsidy program proposed by the administration bureaucrats.

I have heard numerous arguments advanced for the plan and there seems to be as many different reasons for its need and claims for its effectiveness, as it has advocates.

First, we start with the announced plan to subsidize foodstuffs only. At least, at the moment that is as far as its sponsors will admit their plan has been projected.

One argument is that in the absence of subsidies, the spiral of inflation will immediately begin to function and in spite of his vast powers to establish and enforce compliance with ceiling prices, the Executive will not be able to control it.

A second argument is that production will decrease unless by means of subsidies producers are given increased prices necessitated by increased costs.

A third argument is that while a part of our wage earners are receiving increased wages sufficient to meet an increase in the cost of food, nevertheless there are many receiving low wages and fixed incomes who must be protected against an increase in food costs by the use of subsidies.

A fourth argument is that prices must be rolled back and in order to do this, it is necessary to subsidize the distributor to make up for the lack of sufficient margin between the cost to him and his selling price.

The most potent reason which is spurring the administration on in its drive for subsidies and the one which it studiously refrains from mentioning, is the desire for votes next fall and the success it has had in the past through the distribution of tax money in the right places.

It has been argued that while wages under the Little Steel formula have risen only 15 percent, food costs have gone up 23 percent. What of it? Food is not the only item going into living costs. Rents have absolutely been frozen and efficiently held. Even if one-half the wages were put into food then the wage increase would be 30 percent as compared to food cost increase of 23 percent.

It has been argued that eight hundred million spent in subsidies would roll back food costs 15 percent. Then let's spent eight billion and roll the cost back 150 percent.

If the fixing of ceiling prices cannot stop the advancement of food costs, then the use of limited subsidies will be but a stop-gap to meet such advance, and as there is nothing in the subsidy plan preventing the continued advance in those costs, it must inevitably lead to the wider and wider use of greater and greater subsidies.

The arguments that subsidies are necessary to control prices and to induce increased production are clearly fallacies in the face of the power to fix and enforce ceiling price from the producers to the retailers, and there is no threat of decreased production if adequate price margins are fixed and assured. And those prices can be held if the cost of production is likewise held under the power to control labor costs.

If subsidies are necessary to relieve the hardships accruing to the low-wage and fixed-income groups, then it is essentially a relief measure. That being so, why subsidize the whole Nation in order that a minority group obtain the relief they need.

In this connection it is interesting to note that those of the wage earners who are most vociferous in advocating the subsidy are found almost exclusively among organized labor, whose incomes have risen and are not to be classed in the low-wage and income groups.

In view of the fact that expenditures of Government are many times its receipts and all money spent over income is from borrowings. then any additional spending must be from borrowings or an increase in taxes. If paid from borrowings, it means a part of the cost of our living is to be passed on for our children to pay. Are we to say to our descendants, "We didn't wish to endure the hardships and carry the burden of entirely supporting ourselves, so have passed part of that burden on to you for you to pay?"

Our Army is composed of young men, many in their teens, who are now enduring the hardships and carrying the burden of defending our Nation and fighting to insure peace and the chance for future prosperity to our country. They do not and cannot shift any part of that burden and hardship on to us or any future generation. Can we do less? They are the future taxpayers. Would the advocates of the subsidy program dare to honestly submit to those young men the question of our side-stepping our share of the war burdens and leaving it for them to pay in the future?

I wouldn't so much object to subsidies to equalize living costs between low and higher wage income groups if the financing of the program were to be from tax moneys currently raised by an increase in the normal income-tax rate of 1 or 2 percent. In this way all wage and income groups would carry their proportionate share and the burden would be principally borne by the higher groups to the relief of the lower.

In fact, it would test the sincerity of the Administration to propose such a plan for immediately financing it instead of leaving it to future generations.

I haven't yet heard one assertion backed up by any evidence that the taxpayers of the future will be in any better position to pay for part of our living than we are now in to pay it all. If the failure to use subsidy money now to prevent the need of spending additional money will induce inflation, then the spending of that money later to pay for those subsidies will as surely result in inflation at that time. It merely means the Administration is for its own purposes postponing inflation to a later generation of taxpayers which is at present, by reason of its youth, defenseless so far as the use of the ballot is concerned. The fact that they are not yet voters and at present of no value to the Administration may be one great reason why it is so willing to curry favor with the present voters at the expense of future voters.

Frankly, I feel that in the arguments against Government spending upon wild projects designed to influence voters, we have been rather lax in our nomenclature. Advocates of such spending from the administration and its innumerable bureaus, commissions and boards always refer to Government money, United States Treasury funds, subsidies, incentive allotments and the like.

The fact is the Government has no money nor has the Treasury. They are in the red operating largely on borrowed funds, with no liquid assets other than the power to assess and collect taxes. Wouldn't it be more fair to talk about spending "taxpayers' money" and on every occasion use such or a like term instead of Government money or Treasury funds? Every wage earner is now a taxpayer and he would then understand it is his money which the Administration wants to spend. Wouldn't it be more effective to speak of the spending of tax money to be paid by our children including that of the men and boys now in service in every case where it is urged that borrowed money be spent?

As to subsidies and the like, those words in the minds of the unthinking implies the use of money now on hand and immediately available, not money to be later wrested from future taxpayers by way of taxes. Why not honestly refer to such programs as programs to shift part of our burdens to the youth of the Nation. Clearly the subsidy program might well be called our "youth mortgaging program" or "make our children help support us program."

It is my earnest hope, not only for the sake of defeating subsidies but for its effect upon other programs to buy votes, that Congress can muster the votes and assert its independence sufficient to override the inevitable veto of the proposed subsidy ban.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR L. MEPHAM.

Address of Hon. Ralph K. Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, before the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., November 10, 1943:

Mr. President, members of the American Petroleum Institute, friends, we meet here today well back of the front line of battle, but for council of war none the less. You, of the leadership of the Petroleum Industry and we of the Petroleum Administration of the Federal Government, together represent the petroleum supply line of this war. And this petroleum supply line is but auxiliary to the battle lines in action today upon the continent of Europe, in China, and in the islands of the Pacific. Though we be many miles distant from the scene of military action, let us not for a moment forget that we are related to that action in a critically important sense. Let us be reminded of the fact that our fighting forces on all fronts are dependent upon us. These battle lines will advance only if our line here—the petroleum supply line—holds firm and continues to provide adequate support. The responsibility upon us is great, the consequences of our actions important in the extreme, and even decisive in many situations.

For my own part, I think I may say that I have never failed to recognize that ours is a Petroleum Administration for War. I emphasize "for War." It was created by the President to assume an obviously necessary wartime task. It exists for no other reason. Every policy, every decision, every action stems from a consideration of the needs of the Nation at war. I fear no contradiction when I make that assertion as to P. A. W. as an agency of Government. And I know that I speak the mind of Secretary Ickes as Petroleum Administrator, as well as my own, when I add that the liquidation of this war agency finally is a thing devoutly desired. The day cannot too soon arrive that we revoke the last of our war orders and, as someone has expressed it, "roll up the barbwire."

Thinking of oil in terms of war, I find myself on this eve of Armistice Day, impressed with the parallel between the position of the armed forces and the position of the oil industry as we approach the third year of hostilities. Like the men in uniform, you have had enormous obstacles to overcome. You have had periods of almost overpowering discouragement. You have had setbacks. But you have gone forward and won through—thus far—just as the men in uniform have done—thus far.

But what of the days ahead? What of the future prospect? General Eisenhower and his men have come through Tunisia triumphantly. Sicily, after desperate hours at Catania, is behind them. But now—Italy—and then what? I wonder if they do not have moments when the pits of their stomachs feel queer as they contemplate what might happen if there were just one bad slip at a crucial moment; if someone miscalculated; if someone relaxed—too soon. I am sure they must. Do not such disturbing feelings arise on occasion as you consider your war responsibility? In spite of shortages of materials, manpower, and time we together have delivered the oil where it was required, when it was required, and in the quantities required to date. Those struggles are successfully behind us. But now like the Fifth Army, we face Italy—and then—what? I confess to you that to experience a sinking feeling in the pit of my stomach I have only to think what might happen if we made just one bad slip, if we miscalculated, if any of us relaxed—too soon.

How far from final victory we may be in this war no one can know. But, whether the distance be short or long, the fact that we must exert ourselves to the utmost—all the way—until victory is achieved, is still the fact. In the course of battle such as being waged today, there can be no let-up until there is decision. Every week, every day, every hour counts. And so I would emphasize with this audience today, above all else, that we, each and every one of us, be reminded—and remind others continually—of the need to go on without let-up, go on with that vigilance that devotion to duty, that determines to win—which means victory for our side in the shortest space of time and with the least loss of human life.

In practical terms, this means to oil men many things. It means an uninterrupted drive for greater production; it means an undiminished cooperation and support in our common industry-Government undertaking; it means the willingness to continue to make personal sacrifices for the good of the cause. It means—and I want to underscore this—that the oil industry personnel that has so far devoted itself to our joint effort, must stick with the job until it is finished, just as the soldier. There can be no withdrawing of industry support at this stage if the petroleum task is to be completed creditably. Many a fine record, hard and fairly earned, has been destroyed through failing of completion, perhaps by but a little. I can think of nothing more tragic than that the oil industry, having attained to such high honors thus far, should through failing to carry through to the end in the original spirit, permit this record to be sullied. We have all made sacrifices, we are all tired and anxious to get back to what we have known as "normal." But we must agree that we have no honorable alternative but to see through to the finish—with such further sacrifices, as needs be—what jointly we undertook in the beginning.

I shall not today recount at any length the problems or the accomplishments of the year that has gone since last we met. You are familiar with them and while as much, unfortunately, cannot be said as to the public, I am speaking here to oil men who have themselves participated in all that has transpired. We, together, have been through gasoline crises and fuel-oil crises in the East. We have worked day and night to advance the production of that No. 1 "must"—100-octane aviation gasoline. We have fought hard for the materials and the manpower necessary to get the oil job done. We have completed a program of conversion from oil-burning facilities to other fuels to avert what threatened as a catastrophe. We have battled continually, if not always successfully, for those tools which we as oil men know must finally be provided if, in terms of oil supply, we are to secure the present and protect the future.

Where shortages have required, we have so allocated crude-oil supply as to keep the industry machinery as a whole in running order and preserve the equities in the business so far as possible. Qualities of products have been changed and on short notice. All manner of delicate and difficult adjustments have been made in refining practices. The technology of oil has been advanced unbelievably in many directions. Distribution facilities and methods have undergone drastic change to meet the unusual requirements of the war period. In the face of some of the most discouraging obstacles, exploration and development activities in the field of production have nevertheless progressed notably.

When the odds against the oil program have seemed well-nigh overpowering, and decisions many times unenlightened or even unfair, there has been no stoppage of production, no walking off the job, and no acceptance of defeat. Be it said to the everlasting credit of all the oil forces that they have pressed always forward in do-or-die spirit and with ever a full recognition of their great responsibility to the Nation.

In result, the armed forces acknowledge today that oil in adequate supply has not been lacking on any battle front; that nowhere have military operations been impeded by failure of the oil forces to deliver, and that the oil responsibility has been well discharged. And in this, it seems to me, is contained the real compensation and reward for us all—the soul-satisfying knowledge that we have done our part.

Prophesying the future in time of war is a dangerous business and there is no point in taking unnecessary risks. But if I were to do any crystal-ball gazing, I am sure I should detect these signs almost unmistakably:

1. We face a definite shortage of crude oil in this country in the coming year, unless the unforeseen happens in new discovery or the estimates of military requirements do not prove out.

2. The manpower situation in general will become progressively worse as men heretofore deferred for dependency alone are called.

3. The materials position will improve somewhat with sufficient materials for essential operations, some relaxing as in the matter of well spacing, but with no prospect of unrestricted activity.

4. The oil transportation problem—at least domestically—is pretty well solved.

5. Refining capacities will be taxed to their efficient limits in 1944 if forecasts of military demands materialize.

6. Refining operations will have to be conducted under the additional handicap of the unavailability of the desired qualities in crudes.

7. The quality of finished products will have to be debased, though they should remain sufficiently high to meet all practical necessities.

8. The gasoline supply for the motorist in 1944, on the basis of present military estimates of demand, cannot be greater and may well be less.

9. The full war order for oil, plus the industrial and the curtailed civilian demand, can only be met this coming year through greater reliance upon foreign oil resources, both British and American.

10. The present rate of new tanker construction and the improved control of the submarine menace assures an improved transportation capacity and greater flexibility, making possible a better balanced world-wide program of oil supply.

The price signs in my crystal are at present too indistinct to warrant prophecy. And anyway, Secretary Ickes, I know, will speak with you on this vital issue tomorrow and I shall not anticipate his remarks. I would only observe that if we haven't yet the price, we have still the price problem—to be pursued with energy and determination until some reasonable solution is found.

The fact that our Nation has possibly, if not probably, passed the peak of its productive capacity, faces us with two urgent and pressing problems. One, of discovering additional reserves; the other, of producing the greatest amount of oil and gas from them. Each of these problems is difficult to solve.

Admitting the difficulties, there is still no basis for extreme discouragement. We are far from whipped. The same ingenuity, the same resourcefulness, the same hard work, and the same straight thinking which have made the American petroleum industry paramount will carry us through this crisis; possibly through many more to come. It may be that domestically we have reached the end of our bonanza period of production—an end which we had to reach at some time. But we still have a long road to travel at home, to say nothing of the future abroad. With a reservoir of technical and business skill—the "know how"—with courage and with capital, bold enough to take the necessary risks, we possess the basic equipment to carry us to new successes.

We have produced in this country approximately 28,000,000,000 barrels of oil to the present time. Our reserves, producible under current technics and practices, amount to approximately 20,000,000,000 barrels. We cannot estimate with any degree of precision, of course, what the undiscovered reserves of the Nation may be. Interesting speculations by able geologists suggest that the ultimate production may be as much as 100,000,000,000 barrels. From this, one may derive an estimate of perhaps 50,000,000,000 barrels yet to be found. Our experience over the past five years and the outlook for the future, as far as we can see it, suggests that whatever the reserves yet to be discovered, they will be found more slowly, with greater difficulty, and at greater expense than reserves have been found in the past. Current studies show that it is four or five times as difficult and costly to find a barrel of new reserves today as it was in the pre-1938 period. Obviously the solution of this difficult problem of exploration calls for skill and courage in highest degree. Obviously, too, it calls for a practical treatment of the economics involved.

The other problem, that of producing the ultimate possible from our reserves, is the problem of conservation. Conservation by now should have emerged completely from the atmosphere of academic theory in which it was born, into the practical one of cold hard common sense. Much has already been done by individuals and companies, by State regulatory bodies and Government agencies, by trade associations, such as the I. P. A. A., and A. P. I., and Interstate Oil Compact Commission. But much remains to be done.

I cannot miss the opportunity arising out of the special character of this audience to urge upon the industry greater cooperation in production than has even yet been shown. The greatest bar to making conservation effective is now as it always has been, competition for the largest possible share of oil from a common pool. Industry is as it always has been, reluctant to surrender the management to further the ends of conservation and good production practice. It is almost axiomatic with the industry that each company producing department is the best producing department in the world. Obviously, this can't be true for everybody. I urge the most liberal spirit possible be shown in arranging for joint or unit operation. It will result in the greatest good for the Nation, for the State, and, in my opinion, in the end for the operators themselves.

Our office pledges to you, during its life as a war agency, its fullest cooperation and support in all your conservation program. I hope you maye make full use of its facilities during the period and so take advantage of a very real opportunity to further projects of this character at this time.

With the near completion of our second large pipe line to the east coast and other minor pipe-line projects, our first bottleneck, transportation, is well broken. No sooner do we arrive at this point, however, than new shortages face us. From here on, it is oil itself that is the supply problem—oil and refining capacity. This marks a change of a very fundamental sort, a transition which brings with it new and different and increasingly tough problems; new challenges to the capacities of the industry. But at least we may take comfort in the transportation success. The record of this accomplishment is well known to you and requires no gilding. It makes proud history for oil in the war.

I have made some reference to the necessity for world-wide programming in the effort to make ends meet in the matter of oil supply. I should like to elaborate a bit upon this point. In P. A. W. we have a Program Division. The function of this Division is to ascertain the demands for at least 2 years ahead and develop with the Operating Divisions plans for meeting them. The demand estimates come from the various sources best prepared to forecast the future in a given sphere, as the Army and Navy Petroleum Board in the case of the military requirement. The operating alternatives are worked out in a coordinated way in an operating committee where the several operating divisions join to discuss and solve the problems involved. In these deliberations, of course, the program director participates, and finally it is he who prepares for subsequent general approval the operating program of the office.

I point out that in this work we have always the assistance of the British through the British counterpart of our organization. Only so could we put together in an intelligent way a program that is balanced and practicably workable. And be it restated here that always the plans that are designed contemplate the best use of the combined oil resources of both nations. The war demands are met from the sources nearest the area of consumption. Obviously, with limited shipping facilities, the short haul principle must govern. But not always is the determining factor shipping; frequently there are other equally real physical limitations as the quality and quantity of particular products which can be refined at a given point. There has been some unpleasant suggestion abroad in the land that British oil resources have been conserved at the expense of American, and unnecessarily. The report is unfortunate and unfair. I hope that it may be once and for all rejected for it undermines confidence and it is bad for morale.

And speaking of foreign sources of supply and world-wide programs, let me remark that in none of our planning have we adopted any course injurious to the well-being of the industry domestically; in fact, the contrary. The relief that we are able to get from supply sources abroad—British or American—is relief which is protective of the American interest at home. The operator here will benefit, not suffer, from it. He will be enabled to continue to conduct his current operations on a sound basis rather than being required to wastefully operate to produce an unreasonably large volume with disregard of efficiency factors and jeopardy to his future. I assure you that we in P. A. W. entertain no idea of dealing with foreign supply in ways which run counter to our earnest desire for the highest possible degree of national self-sufficiency.

As the war moves into the phase of full-scale offensives, demands for oil mount, and surpluses disappear. The petroleum industry is required to operate more and more as a unit, taking full advantage of the added capacities which are developed from closely coordinated or merged operations. No longer is it possible to let natural laws regulate many of the industry's operations, as the determination of refinery yields, for example. The over-all national need and the peculiar requirements of the military forces impose special limitations, and these must be determined and applied by the Petroleum Administration of Government.

It was in recognition of this that the President issued his Executive order last December, changing the former coordinating office to a Petroleum Administration for War and conferring additional broad powers upon that agency. While we have issued a good number of orders of one kind or other since, I feel sure you will agree with me that these powers have been exercised with discretion and used as sparingly as possible. We said after the Executive order was issued that it would be temperately used with your advice and counsel, and I believe the industry will itself today acknowledge that we have kept that promise. I do not know anyone in P. A. W. who derives pleasure from the mere issuance of regulations. I know full well that I do not. The fact is, the issuance of orders is the unpleasant experience; the fun will consist in revocation when the day arrives that this is possible.

If the directives from Washington give you an occasional pain, they give us a continual headache. I had always a dislike for the "whereases" in commercial contracts but they were nothing compared to the preambles and definitions of the Government orders of today. I thought I knew what an oil well was, and a service station, or the product gasoline, for example—until I started dealing with this order technique. But after poring over all this new legal lingo, I am not sure I know anything about anything, least of all the English language. Except, as I say, I do know I don't like the orders.

But if the P. A. W. directive is not exactly simplicity itself, be reminded that there are worse. Here, for example, is how the order of a sister agency starts out:

"All commodities listed in appendix A are those known to the trade as such excepting therefrom such thereof, if any, while subject to another regulation."

I am told—and this is comforting—that if you don't get it the first time, it doesn't necessarily mean that you are stupid.

But, in fairness, we must recognize that all this goes with war, no part of which is pleasant.

I want to acknowledge here the great work of the industry committees upon which we lean so heavily over the country. They are the foundation of our organization, and a sound foundation. It is the secret of the success of our oil operation, as you all know, that we enlisted the industry forces at the very outset and have never deviated from our original concept of organization. The men who devote their time and energies on these committees are serving well their country and their industry. I trust you may give them always the fullest support and encouragement to carry on to the end.

And at this point I should like to pay my respects to your president, Bill Boyd. There is no need for me to extol his virtues. He is your president and you know him. But something I do want to say from my own experience in Washington. In this unsettled period when there seems about you so little that is firm and upon which you can place reliance, it is a source of great satisfaction to work with one so trustworthy, and so genuine—a diplomat of the first order, a master in the art of dealing with people, and one oil man who has a grasp of the problem of public relations. But I value most his constancy and his straight shooting. Successful partnerships, be it remembered, survive on a basis of good faith and confidence.

All of our problems in oil must be worked out against a background of public annoyance that is inevitable when a necessary product is rationed. This applies with especial force to petroleum because it has become such an essential in the everyday life of every family in every community. Now, add to this a new element—the rising tide of pre-1944 politics and you, and we, have a background of a peculiarly difficult sort against which to work. To succeed under such conditions re-

quires first of all, that a sound operating job be done. But this in itself is not enough. In the face of already created public prejudices and the continued dissemination of misinformation, it is of the highest importance that the true facts of oil be broadcast. We in Washington have a great responsibility in this respect. We are alive to it and we shall do our level best within the restrictions that are upon us, including that of personnel, to do an effective piece of work.

But I want to stress the point that you in the industry have an equal responsibility to keep the public thinking straight on oil. In many ways you are much better prepared to do this than are we in P. A. W. You have extensive organizations, funds that do not require congressional appropriation, and, beyond all this, a position with the public which should cause your statements to be accepted. Everyone knows that the oil industry is not averse to selling its products and when that industry itself speaks out and reports a shortage of product, the public is pretty apt to believe the statement. There has recently been some splendid teamwork between our office and the industry along just such lines. I have especially in mind the excellent ad that was run some weeks ago in district 2 when rations were cut and just recently in district 3. In these cases the oil industry publicized the facts supporting our statements and actions and so put out a lot of fire—fire that scorches not just the "bureaucrats" in Washington but fire that prevents a good job being done and in this and many other ways does real damage to the industry as well. Surely, this kind of teamwork in public relations is no more than the enlightened course. As a matter of fact, it presents to the oil industry an opportunity to improve its position with the public such as it may never have again.

There are stormy days ahead. Naturally, we in P. A. W. expect to be buffeted by the gale, but I think that no one of you fancies that the industry will occupy some favored area where these winds won't blow. If memory serves, you know that the oil industry has always been a favored target of demagogues and muckrakers. It would behoove you therefore, it seems to me, to take out storm insurance for yourselves. And the best kind of insurance is an active, intelligent effort to tell the public the whole story of the magnificent job you have done and are doing. If in the course of doing this, you happen to mention that your job has been facilitated by the Petroleum Administration for War, so reinforcing the statements that are continually being made by the administration as to industry cooperation, we shouldn't be offended and it might well advance our common cause.

I like to think that out of all this stress and strain of the war period will come not only victory and peace but advance in many directions. And I do think so. Such an experience as the present has never been had before. The last war is not comparable. The oil industry in these years is being tested and tried as never before in its history. In this test the industry is giving a good account of itself and its accomplishments are becoming widely known. Its stature is thereby increased, its position strengthened, and its future better assured. Both the Government and the public are seeing something of oil operation with which they were never familiar before. This greater understanding leads inevitably to a greater sympathy and to a more enlightened attitude. I see as one great good emerging from the war experience, this improved relationship between the Government and the oil industry, and this increased appreciation on the part of the public.

And the oil industry is learning some priceless lessons in terms of the problems of Government, the national interest, and of its own intraindustry relationships. The dependency of the separate units, one upon the other, in the broad industry sense is better understood today than ever before. There is developing, I think, a cohesion, a unity, an increased capacity for cooperation which has been absent in times past. There is a growing recognition of the fact that there is need for the "all for one; one for all" spirit, and this, I say, is one of the most promising signs of the day. Too often has the industry been its own worst enemy for lack of this very quality. Too often has this lack operated to prevent large accomplishment in directions advantageous to the Nation and to the industry.

And the new era post-war will be ushered in with a leadership better qualified to cope with the complexities of the modern world; better because of this war experience to which it has been exposed—perhaps somewhat painfully, but the pains are, at least in part, pains of growth. The American oil industry has developed a technical "know how" that is matchless. And today it is developing a comparably superior managerial skill in the handling of its public and its governmental relations—a new kind of "know how"—a quality of statesmanship—oil statesmanship. Here is an important gain.

But to return to the central concern of our lives today—the war: The immediate job leaves little time for speculation upon the future. And so it will be until the last battle is won. Our day-to-day duty is clear while fighting continues. In this spirit I want to read to you here a few lines from a paper issued by the Navy Department entitled "Lest We Forget," which consists of several messages from men who have been in battle on the fighting fronts. I select a paragraph or two from the letter of Lt. Robert Laub, who fought at Midway and won there the Navy Cross:

"Three Jap Zero planes came at me as I dove toward their carrier. My gunner shot down one and the other two veered off. About 800 yards from the carrier and 50 feet over the water I launched my torpedo. It seemed to be heading straight for the carrier. Then I got out of there—fast.

"When I arrived at my carrier I found that only 4 out of 14 planes in my squadron had returned safely. You people remember Midway as a great victory. I keep thinking of those 10 pilots and 10 gunners who didn't get back.

"Our squadron was flying old planes that day, planes that weren't nearly as fast or as well protected as our new machines. But when we returned to Pearl Harbor after the battle we found new planes for the whole squadron waiting for us on the field.

"That's what hurts. If someone had worked a little harder back home, if there hadn't been a delay somewhere along the line, we might have had those planes in time for the battle. And maybe—who can tell—maybe some of those 10 pilots and 10 gunners who didn't come back could have come back."

Gentlemen, may God forbid that any pilot shall fail to come back because we didn't get oil to him—on time.

Address of Warren H. Atherton, National Commander, the American Legion, Before the American Petroleum Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Warren H. Atherton, national commander, the American Legion, before the American Petroleum Institute at Chicago, Ill., November 10, 1943:

Twenty-five years ago the men who joined the American Legion took a pledge to serve God and country. They had already served in a war. They have since served a quarter of a century in peace. They are now serving through another war.

One hundred and fifty thousand Legionnaires are serving in uniform. The balance are serving on the home front. On home front and battle front they are making good on their pledge.

Our members know that war should not be a "picnic," "get rich quick racket," nor a "birthday binge."

Men are being killed and maimed and billions of dollars in materials are being shot at the enemy. Those men should not be called upon to do all the fighting and all the paying. That means that we must do some sacrificing and paying now.

Too many people at home are on the "take" and too few on the "put."

Everyone not putting lead into the enemy with a gun should be putting gold into the stack to back the attack.

We Americans at home must play less and pay more. We must work harder and get less.

It isn't a pleasant dose but the sooner we take our castor oil, the sooner the ordeal will be over and the sooner we will be on our way to health and recovery.

This war has not been won. At the rate of 1,000 casualties per mile, and that is light, we are 800,000 wounded and dead from Berlin. Measured by the same standard, 3,000,000 Jap-butchered victims lie between us and Tokyo.

That terrible price can only be lessened by shortening the war. The war can only be shortened by every American citizen buying more bonds, producing more planes, ships, tanks and ammunition; giving more blood to the blood bank; collecting more scrap; paying more taxes, and filling his niche in the scheme of things better than he ever filled it before.

Admiral Land once said if you want fast horses, fast women, or fast ships, it will cost you money. Winning a fast war is going to cost everyone of us plenty. Winning a slow one would cost us even more in blood and dollars. The sooner we put up and shut up, the sooner this war will be over.

The need for children and women and older citizens at the drill press and lathe has disrupted family life in this country of ours. Boys and girls who were learning about right from the mothers of America are now running the streets.

Young men and women who would normally be in high school are working in shops and businesses far from home. To make the United States a better Nation tomorrow there is great need to teach Americanism and build character.

The American Legion is pledged to support the Constitution of the United States; to maintain law and order, and to promote the ideals of Americanism.

We sponsor 3,000 Boy Scout troops. We take one-half million boys on the baseball field each year to learn to give and take. We conduct boys' states at the capital city of almost every State in the Nation to teach government to the oncoming citizens.

We conduct essay and oratorical contests on Americanism and good government, on a national basis.

We maintain a youth organization built on the keystone of loyalty, the Sons of the American Legion.

We have opposed subversive elements. We have upheld the virtues of justice, freedom, and democracy.

In the last quarter century we have seen I. W. W.'s, Communists, bunds, blackshirts, and dirty shirts use huge sums of money on propaganda intended to knock the foundation from representative government.

We are about to establish an Americanism foundation, which will be a buttress to government of, by, and for the people.

The funds from that foundation will be used to teach every person who has been fortunate enough to come to this land of ours in the past, everyone lucky enough to come in the future, and every child blessed by birth here that government by town meetings, city councils, State legislatures, and Congress, and the administration of that government by constables, mayors, sheriffs, Governors, and the President is the kind of government that protects the rights of individuals, that guarantees freedom and perpetuates our privileges. They should be told, and they will be told, that it is this kind of government that has converted the three-sided log shack into a bungalow; that has substituted penicillin, sulfa drugs, and a great medical science for herbs and bleeding; that has substituted cleanliness for filth, and culture for ignorance; that the Bill of Rights is a magic carpet which has moved the United States further toward honest rule and better living in a century and a half than all the rest of the world has progressed in the history of mankind.

Every American who loves this country will be invited to take a share in this foundation. It will be administered by persons from every walk of life and every part of our land, including those who have bought a share in democracy at the price of an arm or a leg. They will study America's problems, suggest remedies for orderly progress within the framework of the Constitution, and fight to perpetuate Americanism.

We ask you to join with us in drilling the great reservoir of American ability, loyalty, and idealism for gushers of better government.

Permit me to tell you about a sailor, a boatswain, and an admiral. The sailor and the boatswain were on trial for attacking the admiral. The prosecuting officer said to the boatswain, "You are accused of pushing the admiral on his face. What is your defense?" He replied, "I was driving the admiral's car. When he came out of his office I stepped around to open the door and assist him in. I have a bad bunion. He stepped on it. The pain and nervous reaction caused me to shove the admiral unconsciously." The prosecutor said there may be some excuse for you. We will look into it." Turning to the sailor he said, "You certainly have no such alibi as that. You were seen running 20 feet to kick the admiral when he was down. What have you got to say for yourself?" The sailor answered, "I saw the boatswain shove the old buzzard on his nose and I thought the war was over."

Unfortunately every outfit in America from the Society of Sisters for Kindness to Snails up must be seeing that admiral on the ground. Too many are dropping their war activities to start a post-war plan. Post-war plans are as common as fish in a Jap camp. This is only healthy if the plan is wrapped up and labeled "Open on the day after unconditional surrender." Post-war planning, which has for its first volume work, fight, sacrifice, give until the only Jap between us and Tokyo is a dead Jap, is sound thinking.

An enormous problem does exist. Twenty million persons not normally occupied in industry must be moved back into their natural place in community life. Twelve million of the best fighting men on earth must be given a job, a home, and a place of respect and honor in our daily life. Business must be reconverted to the humanitarian service of man. Educations must be completed. Broken life plans must be mended. Broken bodies and minds must be restored. Handicaps must be overcome. Vocational therapy must make able, useful, and happy citizens out of the men for whom the war will never end.

Every returning soldier or sailor will not be a perfect employee. Business must realize, however, that there would be no business in this country if Hitler had had his way, and be patient with those who need help.

Last week George Harrison, the president of the New York Life Insurance Co., said to me, "My company could use 2,000 men tomorrow. If the war was over, whom would I ask for them?"

Selective Service is furnishing the first answer to that question by establishing a contact representative and advisory board in connection with the office of every draft board. Every American Legion post has an employment officer. Today these men will be happy to serve you. Tomorrow and for some years to come present provisions will have to be greatly expanded. We are working on legislation now to accomplish that end.

One of the long-range solutions of the problem of employment will be furnished by increased trade with our southern neighbors. Many of the raw materials which we are firing at our enemies are coming from them. They are filling the hungry mouths of American factories with oil, tin, aluminum, rubber, manganese, and many other critical materials. We have been lavish in firing our raw materials at the enemy. Some of them are near exhaustion. In the future it will be more and more desirable to have access to South American sources. They in turn want our finished products, our engineers, our teachers, and the help of some of our capital. The growth of a healthy exchange will create jobs and prosperity for the whole hemisphere.

Without orders, without a superstate, without the use of force, 24 of our 25 neighboring republics have lined up with us against a common enemy. That is good will, that is good relations, that is neighborhood loyalty at its best. Let us keep that asset by appreciation and better understanding of the 120,000,000 Americans who live outside the United States. The American Legion has adopted the promotion of this as a policy. One of my aides, traveling with me, is an emissary of good will from our southern neighbors. He is a graduate of West Point, a second lieutenant in the Ecuadorean Army, a son of the Ambassador to the United States from Ecuador. In appreciation of the good will extended by him we must see that the United States forever continues to be as good a neighbor as any neighbor in the whole good neighbor family.

General Forrest said the way to win wars was "to get there with the mostest fustest." In today's war you get there most and you get there first if you have oil.

Napoleon said an army moves on its belly. He was partially right. Today's armies move on a bellyful of oil.

Hitler is beginning to lose—not because he has lost his bearings but because he has nothing to put into them.

The Allies are beginning to march to victory because they have marshaled the oil assets of the world.

Hitler planned the perfect crime against the world. Like every murderer from Cain to Lonergan, the crazy paperhanger made one fatal mistake. Shicklegruber's mistake was to begin a mechanized war without control of the world's oil.

The Allies' greatest stroke of genius was to spot the Axis Achilles' heel and to enlist Mother Nature on our side. One hundred octane, oil that lubricates at 60 below or 120 above, TNT, and myriad petroleum products are beating Hitler to his knees.

I commend the hundreds of thousands of loyal Americans working in the oil industry. In New Jersey, in Louisiana, in Texas, in California, on the high seas, I have seen them working and sweating, black and dirty, haggard from long hours, slugging the Huns and Hirohitos with oil and more oil. Day after day, month after month, year after year they have fought on. As fathers and mothers they have realized that their boys and the boys from their block were in submarines, on ships, in tanks, and in planes that might fail for lack of gas and oil. They knew that failure would mean death to them, perhaps the loss of the engagement, perhaps even the loss of a campaign. Without fanfare, without strikes, the men and women of oil, the oil industry, your Coordinator, Mr. Ickes, your Deputy Coordinator, Mr. Ralph K. Davies, and his staff have played the game. Blocking, interfering, carrying the ball, working into enemy territory, bringing us in sight of the goal of victory, the team play of oil has been magnificent.

Fighting with all it had, oil has called on every reserve. That has been a heavy drain on our strength for the post-war schedule.

In making that schedule America must demand free access to the oil resources of the world. We have seen the Axis lose the ball because of oil. When the treaty of peace is written it must keep the ball by placing the control of oil in the hands of the nations that want peace.

I have in my file a letter from a young American soldier overseas. He wrote to his father in Chicago that as he saw the war Hitler fought to get a better living for his people. He then said: "When we whip Hitler, I hope our statesmen won't forget to protect the living standard of our people."

The American Legion advocates collaboration between free and sovereign nations, to maintain peace, and to repress aggression by agreement.

That process has already begun. The military and naval authorities of the United States and Great Britain have agreed that the western Atlantic and the Pacific shall be patrolled by sea and air under American command, and that the eastern Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Indian Oceans shall be patrolled by British command of sea and air. Today when any ship or plane enters those zones it is automatically under the high command indicated.

The representatives of China, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States have at Moscow agreed that this arrangement shall continue after the surrender of our foes until the execution of a final agreement for peace.

That final agreement for peace must provide similar definite responsibilities of nations in keeping the peace.

We have tried promises to disarm. We have tried promises not to wage war. We have found that world thugs regard them as scraps of paper.

Thugs respect strength. If we keep America strong and maintain a high sense of justice for our fellow men there will be no war.

In a mechanized age strength depends on oil. We would be plain simple if we used our oil to win this war and walked away from the peace table without provision for its replenishment.

We would not be faithful to that boy on the front line who wrote his father that he hoped American statesmen would look out for the bread and butter of future Americans if we let him come home to a Nation without gas for his stove and gas for his car. We would have double-crossed that boy if we let him come home to a Nation that was a second-rate power because it did not have oil.

The Kaiser laughed at President Wilson because the United States was weak.

Hitler gave Franklin D. Roosevelt the "ha ha" because the United States was weak.

Let us never again risk the loss of liberty and the loss of American lives because America is weak. Let us resolve forever that the voice of America's President pleading for peace will be respected because America is prepared. Because America has an adequate supply of nature's weapons.

As I say these words American blood is flowing in Asia, in Europe and on the seven seas. This very moment men with gaping

wounds are lying in shell holes and on battered decks. Since I began to speak many new widows and orphans have been created. All this places a heavy debt on our backs. Ours the task that no one of them ever falls in the future for lack of the food or the medicine or the bullet or the weapon that we might have given them. Ours the task to see that those who return find a democracy where the peoples' will is done. Ours the task to care for the mangled and their dependents. Ours the task to make citizenship finer, government cleaner, and living better.

Let us perform our tasks with the fervor and the loyalty and the inspiration of our sons who kill Huns and slay Japs to keep us free from oppression.

On behalf of a million and a quarter servicemen and women of the last war I renew our pledge to serve God and country until Hitler and Hirohito are buried in the ruins of Berlin and Tokyo.

The Plight of the White-Collar Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is fully aware and deeply concerned about the plight of that great group of American citizens known as white-collar workers.

This concern has been expressed in the remarks on this floor made by many Members.

These are the people who are being squeezed by the frozen salaries and the increasing costs of living and higher taxes.

This is the great unorganized group of Americans.

In both justice and equity to this group of people, I have introduced H. R. 3698, which will permit them to receive an increase of not more than 15 percent of the salary they were drawing as of January 1, 1941.

This is in keeping with the Little Steel formula as applied to wages.

It is urgent that this bill be passed immediately.

The Drafting of Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. SHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling News-Register, Wheeling, W. Va.:

THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Now that young men we all know—young men whose little children we all know— are actually being called, it makes us think. It makes us think much more deeply than when we were viewing the proposed drafting of fathers from a purely objective standpoint.

It is heartrending to witness a father torn from his home and children, but when the larger social and economic aspects are considered, the situation exceeds the purely personal and becomes of grave communal concern.

What will be the repercussions if the generation of children now between the ages of 1 and 14 are to grow to maturity without the benefit of a father's guidance? What are the economic implications of young men up to 38 years of age being torn away from the businesses which they have just now succeeded in getting upon their feet? What of the so-called nonessential industries and businesses in which these young men hold key positions? What of the thousands of homes which these young fathers are just now paying for, the payments upon which the young wives will find it impossible to meet?

When we consider hundreds of thousands of firesides being broken up; tens of thousands of businesses being lost; tens of thousands of homes being sacrificed; tens of thousands of life's savings being wiped out; it makes us think. It makes us think of the hundreds of thousands of able-bodied young soldiers now holding down desk jobs who could probably be replaced by IV–F:

It makes us think of thousands upon thousands of Government employees who have been deferred. It makes us think of thousands upon thousands of young Jewish boys in Palestine who have been pleading for a chance to fight their enemies but have been prevented from so doing because of political considerations. It makes us think of hundreds of thousands of trained Italian soldiers wanting only in organization and equipment. It makes us think of millions of Chinese and millions of Indians who might be recruited. It makes us think of the fact that Canada and some other of the British dominions have no draft for overseas service and that Canada, within the past 60 days, demobilized part of her Army with the full consent of our Government. It makes us think of the fact that the Army overestimated our war needs of this year by more than $5,000,000,000.

It makes us thing of all these things and we begin to wonder. We wonder if the leaders of our Army may have overestimated our manpower needs as they did our financial needs. We wonder if every other possibility of fulfilling our manpower needs was exhausted before fathers were called. We wonder if the Army, accustomed as it is to consider only military aspects, should not be subjected to some civilian supervision. And lastly we wonder and we wonder very seriously, whether in view of the present military situation, a victory won at the cost of hundreds of thousands of fatherless children, at the cost of economic chaos, will indeed be a victory. It is something to think about.

Dirt Farmers Roosevelt and Morgenthau Under New Farm Labels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Times-Herald of November 24, 1943, by John O'Donnell, based on a speech I made in the House of Representatives yesterday concerning two of my distinguished constituents who have hitherto claimed to be dirt farmers but have lately been compelled, through O. P. A. restrictions and regimentation, to change their classifications, one to a forester or producer of Christmas trees and the other to a horticulturist or apple grower.

It is a sad commentary and a very bad example to the dairymen of the Nation, who are asked to produce more milk and butter in the war emergency, for the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., to sell out his dairy herd of 100 pedigreed milk cows when the country is threatened with a shortage of milk.

However, the country is still safe, because we will still have Christmas trees and apples, unless the O. P. A. interferes and regiments all producers of Christmas trees and places further restrictive regulations upon apple growers along with all the other farmers. It would be unfair and a shame if Forester Roosevelt and Horticulturist Morgenthau were again forced to change their farm classifications due to further New Deal regimentation.

The article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

In these days when Capitol Hill palpitates with the brain throbs of global thinking and post-war planning, it is heartening to see an earnest Congressman rise in the ancient well of the House and plead the cause of two oppressed constituents, sons of the soil both, mentioning them by name and demanding relief for their woes.

Representative HAMILTON FISH, Republican, of New York, represents the Twenty-sixth District of the Empire State, in which reside Hyde Park's ex-farmer, now arborealist, Franklin D. Roosevelt (whose dilatory domicile is the White House), and that old apple-knocker and dairy herdsman of Fishkill, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., greatest Secretary of the Treasury since the late William Woodin.

Last election day Squire Roosevelt, of Dutchess, wrote himself down as a "tree-grower" at the village election booth, sadly passing up his ancient title of dirt farmer but cheerfully and courageously facing a future dedicated to the nurture of groves of Christmas trees.

Squire Roosevelt didn't boast about it, but neighboring farmers nodded wisely and guessed that the sage old squire had picked up a lot of inside knowledge on Christmas trees and their uses from his study of lend-lease and the U. N. R. R. A. But anyway, the squire's quit dirt farming and that news pained neighbor Representative FISH, of Newburgh.

Then came the ominous tidings from Fishkill. At the very time when the Empire State and Nation face a milk famine, shrewd and canny old dirt farmer Henry Morgenthau has put his dairy herd up for auction and announced he will stick to apples. Henry has been casting an envious eye at the apple profits of New Deal financial critic Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and, so far as his personal wrestling with mother earth for a livelihood is concerned, will hereafter concentrate on apples and to hell with that hundred head of blooded Jerseys and Holsteins.

Hence the demands for justice raised yesterday by Representative FISH in behalf of constituents Roosevelt and Morgenthau. It

was all very unselfish because, so far as we know, there have been very few times when either Squire Roosevelt or old Marse Henry of Fishkill helped out HAM in his political career. We recall times when both made observations that could be taken as questioning the political wisdom of Representative FISH. But HAM isn't one to bear a grudge when a couple of farmer constituents get into trouble. HAM spoke right out in meeting and placed the blame where it belonged.

"Due to the exactions of New Deal and O. P. A. regimentation, Franklin D. Roosevelt in my district has had to abandon the claim of being a dirt farmer and assume a new title of forester or distributor of Christmas trees," said FISH sadly. The announcement was heart-breaking, but FISH recovered his composure, and continued:

"Fifteen miles away, another of my constituents, Henry Morgenthau of Fishkill, unable to cope with New Deal price regulations and the O. P. A. ceiling price on corn, has relinquished his title as a dirt farmer, is selling his dairy herd, and becomes a horticulturist."

We tried to cheer Farmer Morgenthau up by urging him to hold onto his cows for a little while, because we had a tip that Governor Dewey was trying to get the New Deal to lift those corn price ceilings and to save the Morgenthau herd from starvation.

We got back from the Treasury's public relations department a first-person discussion by Farmer Henry on the status of his dairy herd.

As we understand it, old Farmer Henry would keep the herd if he only had a cow-milking and cow-tending family.

"Dairying is a family affair in the East," observes the hardy son of the Fishkill soil. "The man, his wife, and children have to get out and all work—you know, milk the cows. On that basis, with 12 or 15 cows, that can make a dairy pay."

We realized that it would be a bit difficult for Henry to jump up from his Treasury desk at sundown and dash out to the barnyard to greet the Jerseys and Holsteins. Said Henry sadly:

"My neighbors have 12, 15, or 20 cows, and the whole family pitches in and works. I can't compete with that kind of labor. They can make a good living that way. I can't."

Then, courageously:

"But I can make a good living raising apples. I've got to make a living. I'm going to spend the rest of my life on the place in Fishkill, and I can make a very good living raising apples."

Then, with a touch of sentiment in his honest farmer's heart, swiftly brushing aside a tear with his toil-calloused hand, Farmer Henry gave the confident assurance:

"Every one of those cows is going to find a good home. I'm confident of it. And they will be milked, too. So you can see there will be no loss to the Nation so far as milk production is concerned."

Keep De Marigny Out of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, in a Miami, Fla., newspaper, there appeared a striking editorial regarding the so-called Count Alfred de Marigny, who has indicated a desire to emigrate from the Bahamas to the United States.

I am convinced that the American people, by a large majority, are bitterly opposed to providing an asylum for such undesirables as this man, De Marigny, and his pals. We have enough problems in this country without taking on the burden of supplying food and the necessities of life to such as these. His recent conviction of using "hot" oil, stolen from the Royal Air Force, is alone sufficient to justify his being excluded from the United States. The testimony taken in his recent murder trial indicates that he does not possess the character to warrant his being welcome here. But the editorial speaks for itself. Here it is:

NOT WANTED HERE

The verdict in the Sir Harry Oakes murder case will hold a singular place in international jurisprudence, not for the acquittal of the accused Alfred de Marigny but for the recommendation the Nassau jurors attached to it:

"Not guilty, by a vote of 9 to 3, with an unanimous recommendation for deportation."

The people of the United States are interested in the recommendation of the verdict. De Marigny hails from the French island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean. That's a long, long way from Nassau, where a murder jury asked that he be kicked out of the Bahamas. The United States is close handy by. Miami is only 186 miles distant. A fast plane can do it in less than an hour. And this city and Palm Beach have been previous stamping grounds for the international sophisticate whom our island neighbors don't want. Some years ago the Immigration Bureau refused to let the noble lady, Countess Cathcart, into this country for reasons of conduct no more cogent than those which De Marigny admitted during his trial.

We believe that this community and the American people will agree with a letter in the Voice of the People on this page: "The powers that be most certainly did the right thing in keeping Carol of Rumania out of these United States. Now let us see if these same powers will keep out the undesirable of Nassau. We don't want him here."

Lessons From World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, an able St. Louis industrialist, Mr. R. J. Russell, vice president and secretary of the Century Electric Co., in St. Louis, Mo., has sent me a prepared memorandum entitled "Lessons From World War No. 1," which I think is worthy of the attention of the Members of the Congress:

LESSONS FROM WORLD WAR NO. 1—REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WHEN THIS WAR ENDS?

1. If the war contractor or subcontractor will study the developments which followed immediately after Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, he will be fortified in his expectations regarding his problems when this war ends. At least three developments, following immediately after World War No. 1, were as unexpected to war contractors as they were difficult for them to surmount.

RESURGENCE OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

2. At the end of World War No. 1, the immediate change in attitude on Government contract and payment procedures was as sharp as the difference between day and night. As soon as the Government's need for war materials ended, the pressure changed from need for production to emphasis on statutory and procedural disbursement niceties.

RULINGS OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY

3. When World War No. 1 ended, the Comptroller of the Treasury jerked the Government accounting reins with a force which almost halted Government payments to war contractors. An act of Congress was required to open the gates and this was accomplished 4 months after the armistice by the passage of the Dent Act.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DELAYS IN PAYMENTS AND TERMINATION SETTLEMENTS

4. A part of the delay in payments which war contractors suffered at the end of World War No. 1 came about through their readiness to assist the war effort without requiring all transactions to be fully covered by formal orders and contracts.

A larger part of the payment hold-up, however, was caused by internal Government procedural requirements, over which the war contractors had no control whatsoever. Enabling legislation by Congress to keep the Government payment procedures open when this war ends is needed now just as the Dent Act was required in 1919.

ACCELERATED PRODUCTION IN 1918 AND IN 1943

5. War contractors and subcontractors in those days would have continued their utmost efforts to increase production and to advance the war program, even if they had anticipated the surprising developments which occurred immediately following the armistice. War contractors and subcontractors today will do the same.

FIVE IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENTS

6. Five developments followed in quick succession after the armistice on November 11, 1918. These surprised war contractors on account of their suddenness, their extent, and their severity.

First. The speed of termination and cancelation of war contracts.

Second. The problem of keeping labor employed. Always the responsibility of the businessman, this problem becomes far more acute when actually at hand on a large scale than when considered in the abstract as something which will happen in the future.

Third. The resurgence of bureau procedure and contract technicalities, the renewal of emphasis on responsibility and accountability as applying to Government personnel, and the casting overboard of all easements which had been allowed in order to make the production of war material the first and foremost consideration.

Fourth. A slow-down in payments on Government contracts which with many war contractors resulted in the stopping of payments for 4 to 6 months.

Fifth. A stalemate in the termination procedure with regard to the settlement of the uncompleted portions of contracts and agreements suspended. This resulted in delays of 4 to 10 months for the smaller war contractors and delays of 6 to 18 months for the larger war contractors.

SAME CONDITIONS HERE TODAY

7. All of the elements which brought about the above sequence of events are present today. The stage is set for a repeat performance all along the line. The only substantial difference today is that the volume of

contracts to be terminated will be not less than 5 times larger in amount than they were in November 1918. This cancelation volume can readily range up to 8 or 10 times the figures for World War No. 1.

DELAYS IN PAYMENTS AND SETTLEMENTS CAN BE REDUCED

8. Most of the hardships which war contractors and subcontractors suffered in 1919 due to the fourth and fifth developments outlined in paragraph 6, can be eliminated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First. Review all unfinished verbal orders, telephone orders, memorandum orders, informal commitments, and all production authorizations from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Maritime Commission, Lend-Lease, and other Government departments. Make sure at once that all such informal commitments are properly confirmed in writing, including the assignment of a Government order number in each case.

Second. Most Government purchases require a formal contract duly executed by the contractor on extensive forms submitted by the Government. Military bureaus are frequently slow in preparing this paper work and in forwarding these contract forms to the war contractors. All such cases were declared "illegal" following the Armistice on November 11, 1918. Investigate each unfinished contract in this regard and make certain that the Government formal contract papers have been referred to them.

Third. Sign all contract papers and other confirmations which have been submitted to you by the Government. Do not permit secondary questions to delay the immediate return of such instruments to the proper Government department, fully executed by you. If you are holding contract papers on which modifications must be made, assign the task to an authorized representative to spend the necessary time at the originating Government point and to remain there until these questions are adjusted. Until fully executed, these commitments could be declared illegal.

Fourth. Have a searching check made at once of all change orders, modifications, alterations, etc., which have occurred on your unfinished contracts and orders. Make sure that each directive is properly supported by written authorization from the originating Government department.

Fifth. Do not allow Government collections to drag.

Sixth. Settle all open claims. When the rush of contract terminations occurs at the end of this war, such claims will be lost in the billions of dollars of settlement determinations.

Seventh. Legislation required to prevent "hold-ups in payments" and "delays in termination settlements." Set up one central group for advancing these matters instead of the present tendency for various groups to work at cross purposes.

The Lawyer's Place in an Upset World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a great and timely address by the Honorable Malcolm McDermott, dean of the school of law of Duke University. This address was delivered before the North Carolina Bar Association in Raleigh on October 22, 1943.

Dean McDermott was dean of the law department of the University of Tennessee before going to Duke University. He is a learned lawyer and a great American.

He was engaged for many years in the active practice of the law in Knoxville, Tenn., where he won high rank in the profession.

Mr. McDermott's address follows:

Mr. Rice, Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the North Carolina Bar Association, it is with a feeling of reluctance that one rises to speak in times like these. Our hearts, our minds, and all our energies are centered upon one great objective, and properly so. The speedy and successful termination of this war must be our immediate and determined aim. Nothing must be allowed to divert us from that course.

We are aware, however, that post-war planning is being indulged in. It is said, and rightly so, that we must be prepared to insure a lasting peace. Great international problems must be solved in advance, as far as possible, to the end that this kind of peace may be realized. Insofar as this type of planning does not jeopardize our war effort, all will agree that it is sound. This time we must strive to the uttermost to win the peace, in behalf of decent civilization.

But you and I know, also, that there is another kind of planning going on, a kind that relates to the internal economy of America after the war. There are those who for one purpose or another feel constrained, even in the midst of war, to lay plans for the future life of the American people. In fact, from all of the evidence, it appears that the plan is an unfolding one. Step by step it is being put into effect. The post-war period will merely bring the finishing touches. The regimentation under the wartime emergency will, according to these planners, make the post-war achievement of their plan an easy one.

It is this internal post-war plan for America that I want to discuss, and do so as frankly, fairly and dispassionately as I can, judging it from the point of view of the evidence that has come to light.

The danger is that amid the preccupation of world problems, with our eyes focused on the international scene, we are going to overlook what is being done to our own country on the inside. Obviously, if America is to play her proper part in world affairs, she must be kept strong and sound within. Those qualities that have made her truly great must be preserved, not only for our benefit, but also for that of the world at large.

It is the peculiar function and duty of lawyers, I submit, to give heed to these vital matters. If our constitutional government is endangered, if the rights of the people are being subverted, if the foundations of the Republic are being undermined, then it is the lawyers of America who must raise the hue and cry. As you know, we are the only professional group who take an oath to support, maintain and defend the Constitution. We are the only class of citizens not on the public pay rolls who take that solemn vow. Furthermore, it is the lawyer who is best qualified for this task. He is a free lance. Schooled in a knowledge of the fundamentals of our governmental system, he can perceive what is going on beneath the surface and what others fail to note. It is the lawyer who speaks out boldly and fearlessly when all others cringe before criticism or pressure from high places.

It has seemed to me, therefore, that to the lawyer primarily belongs the duty to drag out into the open the issue I shall present, to enlighten the people thereon, and then to stand steadfast for what he believes to be the right. Such is the lawyer's place in this upset world, as I see it. From no other source can the people get such unbiased enlightenment. Of course, I realize we shall not all agree. Lawyers never do. But the lawyer, more than any other citizen, wants to hear and understand all that can be said against his own views. That is the happy quality of our profession. Hence, I am not deterred by the fact that I may here be discussing "controversial issues." We are used to both controversies and issues. What we want to know is, What is the real issue, and what are the facts?

I need hardly assure you that I have not come here to speak in any spirit of partisan politics. You will give me credit, I am sure, for recognizing the proprieties of the occasion. However, let me say at the outset that I propose to speak with utter frankness and with no apologies for the views advanced. When gentlemen in Washington make no bones of setting about to plan our lives for us, then the right to speak out belongs to the "plannee," quite as much as to the planner.

The truth is that what we are here to consider transcends party politics. If what I have to say sounds like an attack upon the present administration, let me remind you that men in the high councils of the party now in power are speaking out openly of the perils confronting our constitutional government. If you have not already done so, read what is said by the senior Democratic Senator from Wyoming in an article appearing in a national magazine and condensed in the August issue of Reader's Digest, under the title "America Is Being Made Over, and We Won't Like It." Then read another article in the September issue of Reader's Digest under the title "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats," by Congressman SUMNERS, a leading Democrat in the House of Representatives. Neither of these men can be accused of being a captious, partisan critic of the existing administration. As patriotic public servants they have laid before American citizens unvarnished facts showing that, quite apart from war measures, constitutional democratic government in this country is fast vanishing.

What kind of government is being substituted? The considered answer I have to offer to that question is that we are having foisted upon us national socialism, that is, none other than the German system of government. Now, of course, if the majority of the American people want that system then they are going to have it. What I presently object to is having the system put over under the guise of liberalism and democracy, and without an understanding on the part of citizens of just what is involved. I have talked with some of the inner circle in Washington. In answer to my remonstrances one of them said in substance this, "This is a democracy. Elections are held and we get a majority of the votes. What else is a democracy? We hold a mandate from the people."

If a majority vote means democracy, then I want to tell you that Germany and Italy (before her fall) were two of the most perfect democracies among the nations. There can now be no doubt of the fact that the last vote taken in Germany, showing over 90 percent of the voters behind Hitler, properly reflected the sentiments of the German people. They stuck to him throughout the decade of the thirties and they are sticking to him even in these dark hours. That is why the German collapse has been so long postponed. We are quite mistaken if we imagine that Hitler rose to power and kept that power by openly tyrannizing his people. On the contrary, he came as a savior of the

people, as the friend of the poor man, and as the opponent of the vested interests. The same is substantially true of Mussolini. Even his bitter enemies told me, when in Italy in 1936, that fully 80 percent of the people idolized him. That is why he held on as long as he did.

Now, if 54 percent or 60 percent of the pouplar vote for a party in this country, makes this a democracy, then we must bow to Europe's two high-powered dictatorships as the arch-democracies of all time.

The simple answer is that the mere fact that a majority of the people is corralled behind a party or its leader does not make of that government a democracy. We must look deeper and find out how that government deals with its people, and especially with unorganized minorities therein.

In the years 1936 and 1937 I spent considerable time in Germany. My chief purpose was to find out, if possible, just what national socialism really means. From my study of the situation there, from discussions with men and women inside Germany, and views of observers in adjacent countries, I came to the conclusion that national socialism, stripped of all fanfare, simply means a system of government that readily enables those who gain control to exploit the entire nation for their particular purposes. The people need not, and generally do not, know what those purposes ultimately are, but they are handled in such fashion that they willingly lend themselves to these ends. In Germany that purpose was to build a titanic war machine and launch it upon a course of world conquest. That is quite clear now, but it was not at all clear, even to the great mass of German people, as late as 1936.

The objective of the leader or group that gains control under a national socialistic regime may vary according to circumstances. It may be a purpose to take from those who have worked and saved, and give to those who have not, or to exalt a particular person or class, or to build a political machine, or a combination of any of these.

I wondered how an intelligent people, such as the Germans surely are or were, would let themselves be thus duped. This led to a study of the various steps by which national socialism had fixed its hold upon that nation. I wanted to find out what made national socialism work. I give you briefly the results of that first-hand study.

In order for national socialism to work certain definite steps must be taken, and they are the same for fascism, for the two differ in name only.

1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

3. The centralized government while appearing in form to represent the people must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

4. Constitutional guaranties must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.

5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. Let me pause to say that these various steps as thus enumerated are not necessarily undertaken in the order in which they are here listed. In fact, the subordination of the lawyers and of the courts is likely to be one of the early steps taken by those interested in setting up a national socialistic regime. As has recently been well said, "There is no place for the lawyer in a totalitarian state." Lawyers as champions of the peoples' rights must be suppressed at an early stage.

6. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time be rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

7. Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the Government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.

8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire Nation.

9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive, so that the public may not begin to rely upon their own resources.

10. Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men and not of laws.

11. The education of the youth of the Nation is taken under control, to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

I tell you I saw all of these steps consummated or rapidly being consummated in Germany in 1936. You can readily recognize them as the earmark, the vital features of national socialism. They are the cogs that made the Nazi machine work. Many a good and sensible German was drawn into its clutches, not realizing what he was getting into until it was too late to extricate himself. I came to know a German in Munich fairly well, so that he would talk to me somewhat freely. I put to him this question, "What is the most significant thing you consider Hitler has done for your people?" His reply was this, "He has brought us all to a common level," and then in a whisper he added, "But, my God, what a low level."

Yes; national socialism stands for the leveling process. That makes the lower classes think they are getting something. It keeps efficient and thrifty people from rising and possibly getting out of hand. At the same time it enriches the treasury for the spending purposes of the leader.

Perhaps as I have detailed all of this, there has flashed into your minds the deadly parallel between the national socialism of Germany and what has transpired here in the United States during the past decade. I confess it struck me with full force when I returned from Europe just at the time when the fight was launched to make the Supreme Court of the United States subservient to the will of the Chief Executive. This led me to make a comparison of details, a practice I have since continued. It has driven me to the conclusion already stated, that there is a deliberate purpose to supplant our constitutional government with the German brand of national socialism. If you will study the situation carefully you will find that no other explanation can make sense out of the conduct of our national government by those who have enjoyed practically complete control throughout the past 10 years.

I am not impugning the motives of any man or set of men. Motives are not the issue. These gentlemen may have the highest motives. They may sincerely believe that the German system of government will bring the greatest happiness to the American people, and that they are performing a public service in effecting the change. There are many, I am sure, who have innocently participated without knowing what was going on, such as the Senator from Wyoming and the Congressman from Texas, whose eyes are now opening. Then, too, I assume there are the usual number of selfish groups who are in on the thing for whatever they think they can get out of it by soaking the rich. All of such groups participated in the building up of national socialism in Germany. But that is beside the point. What we want to know is what these men are doing to America.

We can best determine this through testing what has developed here by reference to the essential elements of national socialism already set forth.

In the first place, you will recall that at the outset of this decade our country was experiencing an economic depression. It was by no means the first, nor yet, by comparison, the worst. Heretofore, the country shouldered its burdens and its losses, and pulled through. This time it was asserted that the people were unable to handle their own problems and hence all must look to Washington for the answers. That was to be the source of all recovery, handed down from above. This idea was so drilled into the minds of the people that it is now responsible, says Congressman SUMNERS, for the enormous bureaucracy that exists. That is why he entitled his article as he did, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats." His view is that under this kind of governmental nursing the people have grown more and more helpless and have formed the habit of turning over all their local problems for solution at the national capital. Certainly, no effort has ever been made to discourage the habit. On the contrary, Washington bureaucracy has been more than ready to reach out and down into the everyday lives of the people, and in many cases to insist upon doing for them what they should do for themselves. The longer this continues, of course, the more dependent becomes the populace upon the arm of government.

In the next place, we find that the right of local self-government, one of the cardinal principles of American democracy, is being steadily destroyed. This has been accomplished in part by a spurious interpretation of the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. Thus it has come to pass that the Central Government has assumed power, for example, to regulate the amount of wheat a farmer may grow, even though it is fed to his own chickens and never touches interstate commerce. This power has been upheld by the reconstituted Supreme Court upon the ground that if the farmer did not raise wheat he might buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be benefited, while if he did grow wheat he might not buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be depressed. Therefore, this is said to be a regulation of interstate commerce. Such is the astounding holding in the Wickard case.[1] By its reasoning practically every activity of human life can now be regulated in Washington.

Again, we have seen not only the judiciary but also the legislative branch of the National Government fall into line under the Executive. For years legislation was drafted for Congress under Executive direction and marked "must." Blanket appropriations were made in huge sums, the spending of which was left to Executive discretion. Broad pow-

[1] *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U. S. 111 (1942).

ers were granted to the President on the basis of an existing "emergency," but somehow the emergency never ceased and the powers continued. It was not until the election of 1 year ago that Congress began to reassert in some measure its true constitutional functions as the real lawmaking body. How long it can hold out under the enormous pressure of the Executive will depend, no doubt, on what reaction comes from an awakened public.

One of the most striking similarities between the present administration and a National Socialistic government is its attitude toward the Constitution. There was a time in this country when the Constitution was reverently regarded as the sacred instrument protecting the people in their rights and liberties even as against their own government. But nazi-ism brooks no interference or limitations on the powers of government once it gains control. A study of the attitude of our present government toward this great document discloses not only a spirit of disdain but even of flagrant disregard. Thus Congress was bluntly told to pass the Guffey Coal Act regardless of its constitutionality. The very principles on which the Constitution was drafted and adopted have been held up to ridicule and relegated to the days of horse and chaise. The present theory is that if the administration can push through a bill then it must be law, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

And so I might go on making the comparison down through the entire dozen points, but time will not suffice. It can readily be done, and in far more ample fashion than I have here attempted. There are two more, however, I must mention before passing on.

On the subject of taxation under national socialism, I wonder if you have had occasion to study the new $10,000,000,000 tax plan recently submitted by the Treasury Department to Congress. It was so revealing that even Democratic Congressmen were shocked. The avowed design of that proposal was not to distribute the new tax burden on an equitable basis, but rather to bring about the result that American citizens generally would all end up with an income of approximately $2,500 per year. That, you see, is getting them down to the common level. The proposal, it is said, will not be enacted into law. That may be true, but coming as it does from the very inner circles of the executive branch of Government it does disclose what that powerful group is planning for the American people. All of this is to be taken in connection with other pronouncements from the Executive. We have been told emphatically that when some eight million young men of our armed forces return home at the close of the war, private industry and private employers must furnish jobs for these men, or else Government will launch another of its vast public-works programs.

Now, consider the dilemma which confronts the would-be employer. He is taxed to the hilt so that he has no money left for expansion or for employing anyone, and he is going to be taxed the more to pay for a public-works program since he does not furnish employment. All of which adds up to this, that under national socialism the citizen is merely a producing unit. The government that controls him will let him keep from his earnings enough for a subsistence, while all above is to be turned over to the state, so-called, to be disposed of as the party, group, or leader in power sees fit. That is about as undemocratic and un-American as anything I know. It makes one wonder what an administration spokesman really means when he solemnly announces that private enterprise must be preserved in this country.

Lastly, let me call your attention to the subject of government control over public education. If a national socialistic government is to be maintained there must be careful supervision of the education of the nation's youth so that they may be held in line, and serve to strengthen the system as they grow up.

Thus far the Washington Government has refrained from open efforts in this direction, but now the step is about to be taken. A bill has been introduced with support from administration circles providing for an allotment to the States of $300,000,000 a year to be spent on public education. How the bill may fare just at this time is uncertain, but consider the circumstances under which this proposal is being launched. Here is the nation staggering under a public debt which will soon reach the $300,000,000,000 mark. Just the interest alone on that debt is going to cost the American people about $9,000,000,000 annually and that is a sum far in excess of the largest amount collected in Federal taxes during any year prior to our entry in the present war. On top of this enormous interest charge will be the enhanced cost of government resulting from the war. And yet, in the face of all that, the proposal is blandly made to hand over to the States $300,000,000 annually for public education. There is not a State in the Union that does not already have a creditable public-school system. There is not a State that is unable to support its system. Nevertheless, here is the Federal Government submerged in debt, constantly seeking new fields of taxation, and regularly appealing to its citizens to lend money on its bonds, now proposing to pile on another $300,000,000 annual charge by way of gift to the States.

There are some things in this life that just do not make sense, and that is one of them.

Only one sane explanation can be offered, and that is that it constitutes a move to enable the Washington Government to get its hand on public education throughout the country. On the average each State will receive annually something over $6,000,000 from this fund. As soon as States have their public-school systems geared up to these additional expenditures it will be simple indeed for Washington to begin to dictate policies in education. No local officials will dare refuse to cooperate and thus forfeit the supposed benefaction. What this may lead to is a matter of speculation, but it does present the perfect pattern for national socialism in public education.

From all of the evidence the conclusion seems inescapable that the real issue on the domestic front is whether national socialism shall supplant American democracy—American democracy as we have known and grown up under it, as our forefathers established and maintained it for us. In all honesty there ought not to be any disguising of this issue. It ought to be brought directly into the open where it can be considered and discussed with all of the attention it deserves. I can think of nothing more cruelly deceitful than to tell American youths on the battle fronts that they are fighting for democracy, if in reality they are to return to be governed by a brand of German national socialism. We ought to let them know what they are fighting for.

The guise in which the movement is being clothed in this country would be ludicrous, were it not for the tragedy of the thing. The entire process of putting the citizen in a governmental strait jacket is constantly being called "liberalism", when in reality it is but a reaction to the kind of autocratic government against which our forefathers rebelled. A liberal government, properly defined, is one which leaves its citizens alone to develop their own capacities and resources, to learn by their own mistakes, and to control their own earnings. Such a government interferes only to a minimum degree necessary to insure proper protection of the rights of others. It was that kind of Government our forefathers sought to establish in American democracy. They knew that the sweetest freedom known to man is the freedom to come and go as one pleases; to work when, where, and for whom he pleases; to make mistakes, it may be, and thus learn to stand on his own. That freedom of individual action, you may have noted, is nowhere mentioned in the Atlantic Charter. The "four freedoms" there set forth are readily obtainable in any Government prison. By getting yourself committed to the penitentiary, you can enjoy freedom of speech and of worship, for there will be no one interested in interfering. You will enjoy freedom from fear for you will be amply guarded and protected by governmental agents. You will enjoy freedom from want, for Government will supply you not only with shelter, but also with all necessary food and clothing. As for the clothing, the stripes thereon may run the wrong way, that is horizontally rather than vertically, but that should matter little to one who is interested merely in obtaining freedom from want.

The hitch is that in getting these four freedoms, you will have sacrificed the most precious freedom of them all, and that is just plain ordinary personal freedom.

Our forefathers were all too familiar with the dangers inherent in governmental power. That is why after setting up the machinery of government they immediately attached numerous brakes thereto, to prevent it from running away with itself; and that is why they carefully distributed the limited powers of the Central Government among the several branches, reserved all others to the States and to the people. Under that kind of government America grew, waxed strong, and weathered every storm.

Do we now mean to abandon that system of government, and turn to one that has brought unhappiness and disaster to every people who have tried it?

It may be that the American people want the change but by all the traditions of our profession, by our solemn oath to support the Constitution, you and I as lawyers are bound to see to it that the issue is fairly and squarely presented to the great body of citizenship. It is high time we began to discharge that obligation.

An Example of Discrimination in Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Northwest Airlines is an important transportation line in the United States. It has been anxious to secure official permission for direct service between Seattle-Tacoma and the city of New York, but it has been told that owing to the exigencies of war, facilities are not available for direct flight to the city of New York.

Recently an editorial appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which describes an unfortunate condition which has now developed. It appears that anyone can now travel from Vancouver,

British Columbia, aboard a Canadian plane on direct flight to New York. How and why Canadian air lines are allotted priorities for such a route and for sufficient planes, while an American line is denied the same facilities, is beyond my comprehension. It would appear that someone is more interested in building up Canadian competition than in supporting American lines.

Here is the editorial:

SEATTLE-NEW YORK AIR SERVICE

You certainly can't charge our Canadian neighbors with any lack of business enterprise.

Seattle firms have been receiving copies of letters from Trans-Canada Air Lines offices in Vancouver.

The letters point out that "by the recent addition of extra flights" the Canadian line is able to offer better service between Seattle and New York.

A Seattle businessman who may be unable to get passage on planes of United States commercial companies can leave here at 3:15 p. m., and after the short hop to Vancouver can board a Trans-Canada plane that will give him "direct flight" to New York, where arrival is scheduled for 1 o'clock the next afternoon.

The return trip is even more conveniently scheduled. The passenger can leave New York at 8 o'clock in the morning and be in Vancouver at 11:30 the same night and in Seattle 1 hour and 16 minutes later, it is pointed out by our Canadian friends—and competitors.

Two points attract our attention.

One is that the Canadian line seems to be better able to expand its operations than are United States lines, which have developed their facilities so largely to military uses.

The second point, and one imediately pertinent, is that Seattle should have the advantage of the most direct route to New York, thus eliminating a situation which encourages passengers to go out of their way through Vancouver.

Northwest Airlines recently has renewed its efforts to obtain official permission for direct service between Seattle and New York.

That permission should be granted.

Improved service will mean more patronage when additional planes are available, and they should be made available for all American lines at the earliest opportunity.

Certainly the showing that the Canadian line is able to offer direct service, Vancouver-New York, and has enough planes to compete for business from this section adds its own potent argument for conditions of equality, at least, for air lines operated on this side of the border.

American Property Claims Against Germany and Japan and the Coming Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance, I offer, for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article from the capable pens of Messrs. Harold G. Aron and Frederick W. Eisner, prominent lawyers and publicists of New York City and Washington, D. C., which first appeared in a recent issue of the Bankers magazine.

As the Congress will soon be required to define an American policy in respect to enemy-owned properties in our possession or under our control, that which has been written by Mr. Aron and Mr. Eisner, perhaps the greatest living experts in this phase of international law, will, no doubt, be revealing, and, incidently, very helpful to those who are interested in finding a way to avoid a repetition of the stupidities and scandals which grew out of the mishandling of seized properties during and following the First World War.

The article follows:

AMERICAN PROPERTY CLAIMS AGAINST GERMANY AND THE COMING PEACE TREATY

(By Harold G. Aron and Frederick W. Eisner)

Long before this war officially started, and long before we even knew the meaning of "freezing regulations," did Germany start the economic war against the United States by freezing all American assets in Germany, and by forbidding not only German debtors to pay their debts to creditors in this country, but by making it impossible for American companies lawfully doing business in Germany to transfer to the United States gains derived by them in Germany. Today, several and large groups of Americans have considerable claims against German nationals and against the German Government for unpaid obligations and for damages to life and property suffered during the present war. What chance is there, if any, that these claimants may collect their claims or at least a part thereof now or at any forseeable future date?

Any chance for collection presupposes, of course, that Germany will be thoroughly defeated and made to accept peace conditions which the United Nations may deem just and appropriate. Whatever these peace conditions may be, however, it is to be expected that Germany, with so many neighboring nations who have suffered tremendous destruction of life and property from the hands of ruthless invaders, will scarcely find herself in a condition to make substantial payments to American creditors. Thus, the only possibility of at least a partial payment of such claims may be found in the German assets within the United States. How were such assets treated in and after the last war, and what experience was encountered and what principles established, which may guide us in the just and successful solution of this problem?

The Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, which is still the law of the land and currently relied upon on several occasions by the President for issuing needed war regulations, empowered the President to create an Alien Property Custodian authorized to receive all money and property in the United States due or belonging to an enemy, and to hold the same under the general direction of the President. As enemies were considered the governments with which the United States was at war, and all such individuals or corporations of any nationality resident within the territory of, or territory occupied by, a nation with which the United States was at war. Following the concepts of Anglo-Saxon law, those Germans who were neither residing in Germany proper nor in the occupied countries were as a rule not considered enemies, and their property was not affected by our war measures. This rule has been adopted in the present war.

The total value of all enemy property seized during the last war, was estimated to approximate $760,000,000. Of such amount, approximately $275,000,000 was, by the end of 1926, returned to persons and corporations who could prove that they were not enemies within the meaning of the law, and another part of it had originally belonged to Austria and Hungary and their nationals and was independently dealt with. At the end of the war, the question arose what to do with this great mass of sequestrated German property. Our allies who had likewise sequestrated all German property within their respective countries provided in the Treaty of Versailles a clearing system by which such property was used to satisfy the demands of allied creditors against Germany and her nationals while the German Government undertook to indemnify the German property owners. Section 297 (e) of the Treaty of Versailles provided that the nationals of the Allied and Associated Powers were entitled to compensation in respect of damage or injury inflicted upon their property rights or interests, on account of exceptional war measures, including measures of all kinds, legislative, administrative, judicial, and others, and that the compensation should be borne by Germany and was chargeable upon the property of German nationals within the territory or under the control of the claimants' state. In section 297 (1), Germany undertook to compensate her nationals in respect of the sale or retention of their property, rights or interests in allied or associated states.

UNITED STATES MAKES SEPARATE ARRANGEMENT

In accordance with the above provisions, our allies applied all German property in their possession toward the payments of Germany's and her nationals' debts. We declined to follow such procedure, which some of us called confiscation, but which our allies never conceded to be such. In our peace treaty with Germany, the Treaty of Berlin of August 25, 1921, we were accorded the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, and advantages which had been stipulated for our benefit in the Treaty of Versailles. In addition, the Treaty of Berlin contained, as requested by us, the full text of section 5 of the Knox-Porter resolution, previously adopted by the Senate, in which it was provided that all property of the German Government and its nationals which had been sequestrated by the Alien Property Custodian was to be retained by the United States, and no disposition was to be made thereof until such time as the German Government would have made suitable provisions for the satisfaction of all claims against Germany of all persons who owed permanent allegiance to the United States and who had suffered, through the acts of the German Government, any loss or damage to their persons or properties.

While our allies, under the principles adopted by them, found themselves able to secure satisfaction for the claims of their nationals without much delay limited only by the amount of the enemy property in their hands, the course set by us led to an entirely unforeseen and unfortunate delay and into a welter of difficulties and intrigue with the result that at the beginning of World War No. 2, there was still a not inconsiderable part of American claims against Germany unsatisfied, without provision for payment, whereas at the end of World War No. 1 there had been sufficient enemy property in our possession to cover fully and adequately, with interest, all claims of our nationals against Germany.

How was such rather disappointing result brought about? American as well as English courts have in numerous decisions consistently held, that, while a declaration of war does not ipso jure vest title of enemy property in the sovereign, the sovereign may sequester and appropriate such property, and the will of the sovereign to do so, if made known in an express act, is binding on the courts. Thus, under our municipal law, the

United States was clearly entitled to dispose of enemy property in whatever way it might see fit.

Hence, section 12 of the Trading with the Enemy Act provided that the Alien Property Custodian should hold all the property conveyed to him as a common-law trustee, and in addition thereto, should be authorized to dispose of such properties by sale or otherwise in like manner as though he were the absolute owner thereof, and that after the end of the war, all claims of enemies to money or other property received and held by the Alien Property Custodian should be settled as Congress should direct. Congress was thus appointed the final arbiter to decide the fate of the enemy property held by the Alien Property Custodian and was untrammeled and free to authorize the seizure, use, or appropriation of such properties without any compensation to the owners. As the Supreme Court pointed out in the famous case of *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1) there is no constitutional prohibition against confiscation of enemy properties. In order to determine the amount of private American claims to be paid by Germany in satisfaction of Germany's financial obligations under the treaty of Berlin, the United States and Germany agreed upon the creation of a Mixed Claims Commission which should pass upon the American claims against Germany. Shortly thereafter, in March 1923, Congress enacted the Winslow act which provided that former enemy owners of funds not exceeding $10,000 should be fully reimbursed, those with claims exceeding $10,000 should be fully reimbursed, those with claims exceeding that amount receiving an on-account payment of $10,000 each, and in addition thereto up to $10,000 during any year from the income from their properties. It appeared then clear that even after such partial return of enemy property, enough would be left to fully satisfy the American creditors.

Upon considerable propaganda and pressure brought by former German owners and Americans opposed to "confiscation" of private property in war and in peace, a bill was submitted to Congress purporting to return the larger share of German properties to their former owners, which resulted, in March 1928, in the enactment of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928. At that time, the balance of the German property held by the United States and of the American claims against Germany was approximately this:

Value of German property held as of October 1926, including unallocated interest fund, $300,000,000.

Awards by Mixed Claims Commission on behalf of American nationals as of February 1927, including interest:

Awards entered, $145,000,000.

Estimate of awards to be entered, $33,000,000.

Awards on behalf of the United States, with interest, $59,000,000.

Total awards (including estimate of future awards), $237,000,000.

A total of $237,000,000 of American claims was thus secured by German funds in our possession, approximating $300,000,000. Under the Treaty of Berlin we had undoubtedly the right to satisfy our claims out of these $300,000,000. The Senate, in the Knox-Porter resolution, had expressly provided that all German property was to be retained by the United States until the German Government should have made suitable provision for the satisfaction of all American claimants, and in 1930 a statute was enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to conclude an agreement with Germany under which Germany was to deposit $500,000,000 in Government gold bonds in payment of her obligations remaining unpaid. Yet today a considerable part of the claims of American nationals remain unsatisfied, whereas the Germans recovered 80 percent of their funds; and furthermore unsatisfied remain the $59,000,000 awards entered for the United States, which, including interest since 1927, have almost doubled, not to speak of the claim of our Government for the costs of the occupation of the Rhineland by our Army which Germany was under an obligation to repay. How did this happen?

KNOX-PORTER RESOLUTION

At the time of the formulation of the Knox-Porter resolution it was thought that we could afford to avoid the appropriation of the German property in our possession toward the payment of Germany's debts and that we would merely have to retain such property until the time Germany would pay her debts which would assure us speedy payment, and which would lead toward the same goal as achieved by our allies. When it became later clear that Germany would not, or could not, make the necessary payments fast enough to entitle her and her nationals to the return of the property within the foreseeable future, as envisaged in the Knox-Porter resolution and the Treaty of Berlin, and when the Dawes Plan reduced Germany's payments to a scale which would have required approximately 80 years until full payment was made, the propaganda for the return of the property retained by us became almost irresistible. A flood of essays and publications appeared in which the demand for the unconditional return of German property was uniformly based upon our policy toward private property in general, and almost all referred to a dictum by Alexander Hamilton regarding the Jay Treaty of 1794 in which he had expressed his abhorrence at the idea of violating property of private individuals. Another most frequently used argument was the treaty between the United States and the King of Prussia of 1799 in which it was provided that in case war should arise between the two countries, the merchants of either country then residing in the other should be allowed to remain 9 months to collect their debts and settle their affairs, and should then be allowed to depart freely, carrying off all their effects without molestations or hindrance.

The Settlement of War Claims bill of 1927 as formulated by the House of Representatives provided for the immediate return of 80 percent of the property of German nationals held by the Alien Property Custodian to its former owners. The bill was not resolved, however, without encountering some stiff resistance, inasmuch as the American creditors depended, under the bill, for immediate payment of their claims partly upon moneys to be advanced from general funds of the Treasury. Vice President Garner, then a Member of the House, called the bill a "stupendous steal," "the greatest in the history of this country." And Secretary of State Hull, then likewise a Member of the House, remarked in regard to the argument of the treaty between the United States and Prussia of 1799 that this treaty had been violated by Germany in every conceivable way, both before we entered the war, and during the war. However, several distinguished American statesmen and jurists took the opposite view, adhering to the admonition of Alexander Hamilton. The Settlement of War Claims Act became law in 1928, and in accordance with its provisions, 80 percent of the properly was returned to the former German owners. Not until 1934 when Germany's willful default had become apparent and after most of the property had already been returned to the former German owners, did Congress enact Public Resolution No. 53, the Harrison Resolution, which forbade further refunds as long as Germany defaulted on her payments.

While thus the German nationals succeeded in recovering 80 percent of their former property, some of the American claimants who had suffered damages through Germany's war measures to the payment of which Germany was obligated under the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Berlin, encountered extraordinary difficulties in their endeavors to secure payment of their claims. Pursuant to an agreement of August 10, 1922, the United States and Germany set up a Mixed Claims Commission which was to determine the amount to be paid by Germany to American claimants in satisfaction of her financial obligations under the Treaty of Berlin of August 25, 1921. The Commission was composed of three members, one appointed by the United States, another by Germany, and an umpire selected by the two governments who throughout the life of the Commission was an American. The Commission entered altogether approximately 7,000 awards to American claimants for claims against Germany, amounting to $140,000,000, or, with interest, $254,000,000, of which approximately $160,000,000 were paid. (These figures do not include four awards in favor of the United States Government for approximately $42,000,000, or, with interest, $100,000,000, none of which was paid.) A substantial part of these awards, approximately $20,000,000, or, with interest, $52,000,000, resulted from the so-called sabotage claims, arising out of the destruction by German saboteurs of the Black Tom terminal in New York Harbor in July 1916, and the ammunition assembling plants at Kingsland, N. J., in January 1917. The Commission concluded originally in a decision at Hamburg in 1930, following oral argument at The Hague, that the Kingsland fire was not caused by German agents and that the Commission was far from being convinced that the Black Tom disaster was caused by a German agent.

After petitions for a rehearing were first dismissed by the Commission, the Commission finally decided to entertain a motion for a rehearing which was based on the allegation that the Commission in reaching its prior decisions in the sabotage claims had been misled and defrauded by perjury, collusion, and suppression of evidence. After long and protracted proceedings which extended over several years, final oral argument in this matter was heard in Washington during the period of January 16–27, 1939. Following the close of the argument, conferences in accordance with the usual procedure were had by three members of the Commission, during the course of which the American Commissioner expressed his opinion that the decision at Hamburg had been reached on false and fraudulent evidence, and that the proof of fraud was sufficient to set aside the Hamburg decision and to reopen the cases, to which opinion, on the question of fraud, the umpire expressed his full agreement. Thereupon, the German Commissioner, on March 1, 1939, announced in a letter to the umpire his "retirement" from the Commission. The German Government did not nominate any successor and the German Chargé d'Affaires, in notes addressed to the State Department, after severely criticizing the Commission, stated that his Government would ignore any further acts or decisions of the Commission, and requested the Department to disapprove of the acts of the Commission and to find some way of quashing them.

In his reply, dated October 18, 1939, the Secretary of State remarked that he must refrain from engaging in a discussion of the various complaints and protests set forth by the German Chargé d'Affaires, and that he had entire confidence in the ability and integrity of the umpire and the Commissioner appointed by the United States, despite the severe and entirely unwarranted criticism raised by Germany, and that he felt con-

strained to invite attention to the fact that the remarkable action of the Commission appointed by Germany (in withdrawing from the Commission) was apparently designed to frustrate or postpone indefinitely the work of the Commission at a time when, after years of labor on the particular cases involved, it was expected that its functions would be brought to a conclusion.

Apparently, the rather polite form of this note, in view of the German action, was due only to diplomatic custom and propriety. Without such due consideration, the now historic words used by our venerable Secretary, when receiving Ambassador Nomura's note, would probably have more adequately expressed his feelings: "I have never seen a document that was more crowded with infamous falsehoods and distortions—infamous falsehoods and distortions on a scale so huge that I never imagined until today that any government on this planet was capable of uttering them."

The Commission, despite the "retirement" of the German Commissioner, continued its work and entered awards for the sabotage claimants, finding that fraud in the evidence previously presented by Germany had misled the Commission and had affected its former decision in favor of Germany. In his final report, the American agent before the Mixed Claims Commission remarks quite properly that the voluminous record discloses the methods a sovereign government will use to avoid responsibility assumed under a treaty of peace for its acts committed on the soil of a friendly nation during time of war.

THE DRIER CLAIM

Another case before the Commission for many years, the claim of Katherine McNider Drier, demonstrates likewise the bad faith shown by the German Government. Valuable property of this claimant in Germany, real and personal, had been confiscated by the German Government after the war had actually ended. Two partial awards having been entered for the claimant by the Commission, the claimant filed a petition for a further award. Thereupon, the German agent reached an agreement with the American agent in February 1933 under which settlement the German agent agreed not to oppose a further and additional award in the amount of $160,000, with interest. The American agent was advised by the German agent that such amount had been approved by the German Foreign Office. Nevertheless, the German agent failed to consummate the settlement to which he had agreed with the approval of his foreign office.

During 1936 the Department of State received, through the attaché of the American Embassy in Berlin, an invitation from Goering, who was angling for a new trade treaty with the United States, asking that representatives of our Government be sent to Germany to discuss a general settlement of war claims, particularly the sabotage claims. Our State Department insisted that the Drier claim be included in such settlement. The American Agent before the Commission and his counsel proceeded thereupon to Bremen, where they were met by a representative from the German Government who accompanied them to Munich. After several informal conferences, there was delivered to the American agent on July 6, 1936, a formal offer of settlement, signed by one Captain von Pfeffer, "Ehren-Obergruppenfuehrer," and closing with "Heil Hitler." This offer covered a settlement of the sabotage claims and included also a repeated settlement of the Drier claim, under which an award was to be entered by the Commission for Mrs. Drier on the basis previously reached between the two agents in February 1933. The American agent addressed on the same day a letter to the German representative advising him that the proposed settlement was thereby accepted on behalf of his Government. On July 10, 1936, a formal meeting of the representatives of the two governments was held at which time they formally ratified and approved the exchange of notes as constituting official action by the respective governments in regard to the matters mentioned in the notes, and as constituting in their entirety an agreed statement for the disposition of those matters by the Mixed Claims Commission.

When the American agent, upon his return to the United States, endeavored to have awards entered by the Commission to consummate the settlement, the German agent declined to join with the American agent in signing the necessary papers, and the German Government declined to carry out the compromise settlement. As the Commission could not act without the signing of the necessary papers by the German agent, the whole settlement proved abortive. As the Commission could not, under the circumstances for technical reasons entertain the claim of Mrs. Drier for an additional award, Congress, after extended hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on War Claims, enacted a special law (54 Stat. 1341) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Mrs. Drier's claim out of the German special deposit account. This legislation was based upon the doctrine first applied in the Spanish Treaty case of 1819, when Spain had agreed to the cession of the Floridas to the United States, but afterwards refused to do so. Our then Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, declared the right of the United States to compel, with force if necessary, the rights once conceded in a treaty.

ADVENT OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Even before the last claims of American claimants of World War No. 1 were thus finally disposed of, though not fully paid, World War No. 2 broke out, and only 2 years later the United States found itself again at war. The Trading With the Enemy Act is still on our statute books and is the law of the land, including the powers bestowed under it upon our Government to seize enemy property. Our approach to dealing with enemy property in World War No. 2 was initially a different one. This was based upon the fact that even before we were directly attacked by the enemy, the consequences of the German invasions of neighboring countries were causing active repercussions upon our whole economic structure. Having invaded one country after another, the Germans did not hesitate to confiscate available property of the governments of the invaded countries, and they even converted, in clear violation of the Hague conventions, property belonging to the civilian population whenever that could be conveniently done. With threats to life and liberty, directly and indirectly, individuals were compelled to assign even their belongings in foreign countries to the invader or its agents, so that it might be used by the Germans in furtherance of their aims. In order to render it impossible for the Germans thus to acquire control of funds or other property within the United States, Executive orders were issued by the President freezing properties of nationals of the Axis countries and of nationals and governments of invaded and of certain neutral countries.

As the Treasury Department, which is in charge of the freezing operations, stated, the Foreign Funds Control has at its inception as its primary purpose the protection of the assets within the United States of invaded countries in order to prevent their falling into the hands of the invaders and in order to protect American financial institutions from possible adverse claims. As the international crisis deepened, the objectives were extended toward severance of all direct or indirect intercourse with the enemy, and the elimination of all financial and commercial activities engaged in by real or juridical persons within the United States whose influence or activity is deemed inimical to the security of the Western Hemisphere. However, the Foreign Funds Control did not undertake to vest any property in the United States, but limited itself to controlling, supervising, and, whenever deemed expedient, to prohibiting the transfer of alien property.

POLICY IN PRESENT WAR

The right to vest enemy property in an agency of the United States has been reserved to the recreated office of the Alien Property Custodian. Contrary to the practice developed by the Alien Property Custodian during World War No. 1, that office has taken over enemy property only to a limited degree. The value of the enemy property taken over has not yet been made public, so that no estimates can be made how much enemy property has been vested in the United States. Among other assets, the Alien Property Custodian has vested in himself the ownership of all patents belonging to German nationals. While after World War No. 1 the sequestrated German dye patents were sold in a much disputed deal for $250,000 to the Chemical Foundation, the Alien Property Custodian has this time chosen to grant licenses on all sequestrated patents without any consideration, thus omitting to conserve such assets or their value for transfer to the German special deposit account, or to such purposes as Congress may direct. It is likewise unknown how much enemy property is altogether available for seizure by our Government. On the basis of foreign property reports submitted to the Treasury Department, total investments of enemy countries in the United States amount to $464,000,000, which consist of the following (in million dollars):

Gold, earmarked	24
Deposits and other banking assets	160
Stocks and registered bonds	50
Direct investments	105
Other investments	125

These assets include the combined assets not only of Germany, but of all our enemies.

The question as to what to do with the enemy property after the war has not yet found any forum, and no suggestions or plans have been advanced, so far as can be seen. The reason for this fact is twofold. The one is that, the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 still being valid law, it did not become necessary for Congress to enact any new law pertaining to the treatment of enemy property, and, hence, no discussion of the topics connected with the enactment of such law was relevant. The other reason is that up to recently victory seemed to many far away so that a discussion of post-war problems appeared premature. With the growing success of our own and our allies' arms, however, a discussion of certain practical aspects of our post-war problems seems now timely.

This is especially true in regard to the problem of the disposition of enemy property. The highly unsatisfactory result of the enemy property liquidation after World War No. 1 was not the consequence of post-war administration or post-war legislation. The mainspring of most of the complications was the fact that the question of how to dispose of the enemy property after the war was not only completely held in abeyance during the war, but was dealt with only in a general and inconclusive manner in the peace treaty, and continued to remain unsolved and undecided even after the ratification of the Treaty of Berlin. Section 12 of the Trading with the Enemy Act provided, and still provides, that the Alien Property Custodian is vested in regard to the property held by him with all the powers of a common-law trustee, and that after the end of the war, any claim

of an enemy to property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian shall be settled as Congress shall direct.

Inasmuch as the Knox-Porter resolution, incorporated in the Treaty of Berlin, provided that no enemy property should be returned before Germany should have made "suitable provision for the satisfaction of all claims" for damages resulting from acts of the German Government, a vacuum came into existence in which neither side could move. At the time of the enactment of the Knox-Porter resolution and the conclusion of the Treaty of Berlin it had been widely assumed that Germany would be able to satisfy within a reasonable time the claims against her, and it was taken for granted that the temporary retaining of the former German property would automatically secure the speedy satisfaction of such claims, thus dispensing with the necessity of the clearing method as applied by our allies. As it turned out, Germany was allegedly unable, and certainly unwilling, to pay such claims at once, and under the terms of the Dawes plan under which we were to receive on mixed claims accounts 2¼ percent of all unpreferred receipts from Germany available for distribution, provided such sum should not exceed 45,000,000 goldmarks a year, the payments agreed to by Germany would have taken 80 years before payment of the claims, without interest, would have been completed. Thus, a condition had been created where, without new legislation, the American creditors could not receive full satisfaction of their claims despite the fact that sufficient German property was being retained by us.

Attempts to appropriate the enemy property for the payment of American claims were bitterly objected to for reasons of principle by some and self-interest by others, who constantly urged that the Alien Property Custodian's holdings constituted private property of the former owners which could not be used, under our Constitution, to satisfy claims against the Government of Germany. Although the Supreme Court held on several occasions that this argument was entirely wrong and that Congress was free to dispose of such property in whatever manner Congress saw fit (*United States* v. *Chemical Foundation*, supra; *Cummings* v. *Deutsche Bank*, 300 U. S. 115), it was this argument mainly which led to the enactment of the Settlement of War Claims Act and to the return of 80 percent of the German property to its former owners, while the claims of American claimants remained, and still remain, partly unsatisfied.

RECOMMENDED STEPS

It is submitted, as proposition No. 1, that such situation must not be permitted to occur again after this war and appropriate steps should be taken now while the war is still in progress and while the inherent war powers of our Government and of Congress may be unquestionably exercised. While the appeal to the principles of the inviolability of private property succeeded at the time, it has now become clear that the recapture of the former German property resulted less to the benefit of the former German owners than to the benefit of the German Government which used such funds, together with funds obtained in the form of loans and expropriated foreign investments, to prepare for a new war. And furthermore, there can be no doubt that the apparently guaranteed certainty of salvaging investments and interests in the United States even in case of war, has alleviated the fears of German business of financial penalties and losses through war with the United States, and has thus eliminated a potent force against war which otherwise may have exercised its influence against the German attack upon the United States.

Our proposition No. 1 is that the Congress should, without delay, amend section 12 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, with the view of decreeing that the Alien Property Custodian shall pay all enemy funds held by him into a special deposit account with the Treasury Department, or hold property other than money as agent for such special deposit account, title to which money and to which property shall vest forthwith in the United States to the exclusion at all times of the former owners, and such money and property used for the payment of war claims as Congress shall direct. The enactment of such amendment will prohibit a repetition of the occurrences after the last war when former enemies succeeded with their appeals to principles of our traditional policy in depriving American creditors of their just claims against property. In addition to the proposed change of the Trading with the Enemy Act, the Alien Property Custodian should be directed to vest in himself all enemy property subject to the provisions of the act, including those funds which are at present only frozen by Presidential order. Excluded from such vesting, of course, should be funds of invaded countries and their nationals, funds belonging to enemies who are bona fide residents of the United States, and also of persons of enemy nationality residing outside of Germany if such persons have left Germany on account of opposition to or persecution by the Nazi regime.

GERMANY MUST REIMBURSE FORMER OWNERS

Our second suggestion is that under the terms of any peace treaty, Germany be compelled to reimburse the former owners of such property in Germany at its value in German currency, such payments to be made before a relaxation of any occupational or other military measures against Germany can be maintained. It has been a recognized principle of our public policy to avoid, so far as possible, the confiscation of private property even in times of war, and it was this principle which was most relied upon, after the last war, by the advocates of a full restitution of seized enemy property. While the Supreme Court has since early times held that our Government has the unlimited power to confiscate private enemy property in time of war, it is highly desirable to avoid such confiscation wherever possible. However, it should be clearly understood that no confiscation is involved if the former owner receives full compensation, so to speak, in the coin of the realm where the property was owned. So far as the former owner is concerned, it is of no difference to him whether such restitution is made by the State which seized his property, or by another State which is compelled to make such restitution by another nation. If A owes his doctor $10 for medical services, it is of no concern to the doctor whether A sends him the $10 or whether a third person who is under an obligation to pay money to A, sends the doctor the $10 for A's account. Thus, if the former owners of German property located in the United States receive full compensation for their property by the German Government, no confiscation takes place. The German Government will have to make such payments as partial payments on account of its liability for the war and its costs, such reparation being only just and appropriate.

There was a provision in the Treaty of Versailles under which Germany had taken upon herself the obligation of indemnifying her nationals for properties sequestrated by the Allied and Associated Powers. Germany did indemnify such owners whose property was sequestrated by our allies, although, due to the German inflation which reduced to the vanishing point all claims against the Reich, the payments did not represent the full value of the properties. However, no payments of any kind were made by Germany to the former owners of property in the United States. The theory of the German Government was, that, inasmuch as the German property in the United States had not been sequestrated but was only temporarily retained by the Alien Property Custodian as trustee for the former owners, no indemnity was due to such owners under the Versailles Treaty. We could not well undertake to request Germany to make such compensations as long as we ourselves declared that we solely retained the property without allocating it to any other purpose. When, at the time of the deliberations of the Settlement of War Claims Act, 10 years after the end of the war, we were faced with the choice of appropriating such property for the payment of American claims, the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Garrard B. Winston, felt compelled to point out to the House Ways and Means Committee that, while Germany had agreed to make good to her citizens for the property we might take away from them, we knew then as a practical fact that the owners would never get full payment.

"If," stated the Under Secretary, "Germany was going to pay to her national full value of the property there would be no reason for returning the alient property; but she is not going to do that; that is the difficulty." And to Vice President Garner's question, then a Member of the House: "Now, is it confiscation of property for us to carry out the provision of a treaty where the German Government itself obligates itself to repay its citizens on account of our taking this property?", the Under Secretary answered: "If you take the property of an individual citizen to pay the debt of his government, and his government reimburses him for the property taken, there is no inequity." At that late date, there probably was no possibility of our compelling Germany to make such indemnity to her subjects. The time to impose such unqualified condition is before the signature of a peace treaty. The time to enforce it is before the relaxation of any military measures.

ABILITY TO PAY

Germany would have no standing should she claim to be financially unable to make such restitutions to her nationals in German currency within Germany. It is true that after the last war, Germany was unable to make the payments provided in the Versailles Treaty, and she even became unable to fulfill the reduced obligations of the Dawes plan. The difficulty, however, did not consist in raising the necessary amounts in Germany, but transferring them in foreign exchange to the creditor countries. Under Secretary Winston was quite correct when he stated to the House Ways and Means Committee: "The difficulty in the Dawes plan is in the transfer and not in the payment by Germany to the transfer agent. There is every reasonable assurance that the marks would be paid to the transfer agent and be available to pay in Germany to Germans in marks, although they might not be available to the United States in dollars." The same situation is likely to confront us again. We received under the Dawes plan, as stated above, only 2¼ percent of all unpreferred receipts from Germany available for distribution under the acute German shortage of foreign exchange, thus sharing proportionately every dollar available with our allies. Our allies, however, had secured to themselves additional assets by retaining the entire German property in their hands, whereas we returned the larger part of the German holdings unconditionally to Germany, retaining only 20 percent thereof. Hence, if this time, we succeed in compelling Germany to make resti-

tution to her nationals who were the former owners of such property, we definitely and clearly avoid confiscation, but shall nevertheless be able to use all available German property in our hands for satisfying American claims.

START AN INVENTORY

Our third suggestion is to start at once with the preparation of an inventory of all the property seized, and of its former owners, simultaneously estimating the present value of such property, and furthermore, to begin forthwith listing of American claims against Germany. After the last war it took nearly 4 years from the time of the end of hostilities even to set up machinery for adjudicating claims against Germany. This not only meant a considerable complication of the juridical work, but the further delay added greatly to the amounts to be paid because of interest accrued which had to be added to the lost capital. Inasmuch as, under our suggestion No. 2, Germany would have to reimburse the former property owners before the relaxation of any military measures taken against her, we should also have ready for presentation to her a docket containing the names of the former German owners of American assets and now sequestrated, and the estimated value thereof. As the value of such property may be open to dispute between the former owners and the German Government, and inasmuch as the former German owners may find themselves unable to receive full justice if they have to settle such disputes with their Government before the courts of Germany, and as it would furthermore be difficult for German courts to evaluate correctly property in the United States, a provision should be made permitting either the former German owners, or the German Government, to have such disputes decided by the appropriate United States Federal court in the district where the property had been situated prior to its sequestration.

This would mean a guaranty of a fair trial and of an impartial decision which the owners could not expect in German courts against the German Government. As in some cases a final decision may not be available for a considerable time, the German Government should be required, in such instances, to deposit security in the form of German currency in the amount of the estimated value of the property at the time proceedings are started, if either the former German owner, or the German Government, decides to seek the decision of an American court in regard to the value of the property. In order to render it possible to estimate the approximate total of the American claims immediately at the time of the end of hostilities, we should further begin forthwith to list American claims insofar as they are at present ascertainable. This would considerably improve our technical position in all ensuing negotiations. One of our allies, Russia, has already started the necessary preparations, and a commission has been formed in Russia to ascertain all damages suffered through German acts of war.

After the last war, American claimants were divided into four main groups, namely—

1. Those who had suffered personal injuries.

2. Those whose property had been damaged by military acts of Germany.

3. Insurance companies which had to make good for losses of cargo and hulls suffered by their insured on the high seas.

4. Those who had suffered damages in consequence of exceptional war measures applied to American property in Germany.

According to the estimate, made by the late Robert W. Bonynge, the American agent before the Mixed Claims Commission, awards entered by the Mixed Claims Commission up to April 1926 could be classified as follows:

Death and personal injury	$3, 850, 000
Hull and cargo losses:	
By private owners	54, 450, 000
By U. S. Government	42, 034, 000
Property seized, damaged, requisitioned, or sequestrated by the German Government in Germany or occupied countries	24, 750, 000
Bank deposits	5, 250, 000
Debts	1, 750, 000
Estate claims	2, 000, 000
Total	134, 084, 000

Approximately the same categories of claims will again come into existence, although the approximate amounts cannot even be guessed at this time. There is, however, one additional category of claims; namely, the claims of such former German subjects, now residents of the United States, and either American citizens or bona fide holders of preliminary citizenship papers who have been deprived of their belongings by lawless and confiscatory measures of the Nazi Government and party, in a manner as ruthless and cruel as any war measures taken in modern or ancient times. While many of these expropriations took place before the formal outbreak of war, they were, in fact, acts of destruction and annihilation of an undeclared war yielding in nothing in respect to heinousness and moral perfidy to the most cruel warfares against civilian populations of enemy countries. Unless the owners of these claims are permitted to share in the proceeds of the sequestrated German property, they have not the slightest expectation of ever recovering anything. Moral principles of international justice make it mandatory that these claimants should receive a partial, pro rata satisfaction of their claims, as otherwise Germany would, in effect, be permitted to retain the fruits of her predatory actions, a fact which may be later looked upon by other nations as a precedent, just as the fact that Japan was permitted to retain Manchuria, which it acquired by a similar predatory action, was the first step in the general direction which finally led to the outbreak of the present war.

There are, in addition, those holders of awards from the Mixed Claims Commission who have not yet received full payment of their awards. They, too, are entitled to recognition.

USE OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Our fourth, and final, suggestion is that the adjudication of war claims against Germany should not be entrusted again to a tribunal on which Germany nominates a member, but instead to the Federal judiciary before whom Germany would appear only as a party, without being also judge over claims against herself. After the last war, the United States and Germany created a Mixed Claims Commission which was composed of one American and one German Commissioner and an umpire to be agreed upon by the two Governments. While the umpires were all Americans, the fact that one of the Commissioners was a German gave Germany naturally considerable influence upon the decisions of the Commission. This was well recognized and appreciated by Germany which rewarded her first Commissioner, a young private lawyer, after his retirement from the Commission with the presidency of the Hanseatic Court of Appeals, one of the highest judicial honors in Germany. While no reproach is to be made against the German Commissioners as individuals, the Nazi Government gravely misused its power over its Commissioners when it withdrew the Commissioner without appointing a new one, in an attempt to obstruct justice, as set forth above in more detail.

While the resourceful and alert umpire was able to thwart such plan, the Nazi scheme might have succeeded if it had been attempted only a few weeks earlier before the members of the Commission had begun their deliberations on the respective cases. But even thus, efforts continued to frustrate the results of the decision of the Commission. Two private corporations, award holders, started soon after the Commission had handed down its final decision in favor of the sabotage claimants court actions against the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to enjoin them from certifying and paying the awards granted by the Commission. This the district court declined to do, and an unanimous Supreme Court upheld the decision.

Such being the record, it would seem that Germany, while she must receive full justice, shall not again have a chance to repeat a performance capable of discrediting the high ideals of international arbitration. In his last report, the American agent quite appropriately states his belief that this was the first occasion on which a decision had been rendered by an international tribunal against a Government party to the arbitration, based on findings that such Government had introduced false and fraudulent evidence and, he might have added, attempted to immobilize the tribunal when the fraud was being discovered. The recurrence of such attempt must be made impossible under all circumstances.

If the creation of another Mixed Commission appears thus inadvisable, jurisdiction to hear and decide the claims should be conferred upon the Federal judiciary. The Chief Justice of the United States should be entrusted with the power to designate a United States District Court with authority to hear, without juries, all such claims, in order to expedite and unify the procedure. The Chief Justice should be furthermore authorized to designate five Federal jurists, all to be attached to such District Court, who should exclusively hear such cases, and should be free during that time from all other duties. To each of the five jurists, the hearing of one of the five categories of claims should be assigned, so that one of the judges would hear personal injury claims, another claims for property damage by military acts of Germany, another claims of insurance companies, another claims of damages done to American property in Germany through exceptional war measures, and still another claims for damage to property by confiscation or expropriation by Germany of former German subjects now residing in the United States. If one of the judges is, on a question of law, about to reach a decision which would be in conflict with a general principle adhered to by one of the other judges in a prior decision, then, and in such case, the five judges should convene as a special statutory court and submit the general question of law involved to the full court, and the decision then reached by a majority of the five judges, and the principles underlying such decision, should be binding upon the individual judges for their future decisions, unless the full court, or the Supreme Court as the only court of appeals, should deem it appropriate to change or overrule such principle. Such process and constitution of the court would considerably expedite its procedure and, while leaving sufficient discretion to each individual judge, would yet guarantee a unity and conformity in principle, and an organic development of the principles to be applied to the solution of all basic and incidental problems, and as well eliminate dilatory appeals.

In order to make the procedure before the five judges more speedy and flexible than it

was before the Mixed Claims Commission, the parties should be permitted to have their claims presented to the court by their own attorneys, without the necessity of having the claim presented by a Government agent, a procedure which was necessary and appropriate before an international tribunal as the Mixed Claims Commission was. However, the cooperation of a Government representative, similar to the designation of the American agent before the Mixed Claims Commission, appears indispensable. Such agent, possibly a Special Assistant Attorney General, or one of his deputies, should be present at all hearings, and the documents concerning the respective claims should be presented to him before any hearing, so that he may adequately represent the interests of the Government in the proper, just, and equitable adjudication of all claims. His powers should combine the functions of a Solicitor General of the United States and that of amicus curiae.

It is believed that our above suggestions utilize the experience gained from the problem of enemy property in and after World War No. 1, and meet the demands for a just, adequate, and fair solution of that newly recreated problem. Although still in the heat of the fight, the American public, in discussing appropriate steps to be taken after full victory shall have been gained, will not and does not think in terms of hate or vengeance. The time is now to take appropriate steps to render impossible the recurrence of events which have just ended and which turned the protection of private enemy property from the devastations of war into American losses.

The Tragedy of Starvation in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to the silence which should be impressed upon us by good taste. A sense of justice and humanity transcends tact and diplomacy and adumbrates good manners. It may be circumspect and politic to refrain from indulging in criticism of our British ally with regard to its negligent treatment of the starving peoples of Bengal, in India, but it is the part of a warm-hearted, altruistic nation to register vigorously its protest at continued starvation amid plenty, of the suffering millions of our fellow human beings who inhabit the unhappy subcontinent of India.

One of the "four freedoms" is the freedom from want. Are we giving it to the Hindus? Far from it!

The current issue of Life magazine gives a graphic account of the culpability of our British ally and of the Indian government itself in this regard. We cannot escape responsibility ourselves, because we have hundreds of thousands of troops stationed in India and are, ipso facto, indirectly, a partner in this arrangement, should we not insist upon the allocation of a minimum number of ships for the shipment of rice and essential foodstuffs into India. How can we expect to secure the good will of India's peace loving millions, if we do not set the fires alight in dark places by first agitation, and then following it by doing something about it.

Just now the Japs are making tremendous inroads throughout the Orient, by depicting, graphically, to all orientals the sorry spectacle of thousands dying weekly of starvation in India—India, where native princes have wealth beyond the dreams of Croesus; India—where more jewels are concentrated than in any other section of the world;—India,—where governors live in splendor, on a scale regal and lavish beyond description; India,—rich in varied potential, but untouched, resources of every kind.

Mr. Speaker, why don't we practice what we preach? How can the natives of India enthuse about the "four freedoms" or the Atlantic Charter when it, apparently, has no application of them? Are we fighting this war for a principle or for more power? Do we mean what we say when we proclaim our devotion to the bringing of the benefits of freedom from want to the peoples of the world?

A recent article appeared in the New York daily newspaper, PM, written by that fearless and incisive writer, I. F. Stone, who has, in recent years, done so much as a publicist to provoke investigation of mistakes on our domestic front and, as a result of whose writings, many important changes for the better have been effectuated.

Let Mr. Stone's excellent article speak for itself:

SPEAK UP FOR INDIA

WASHINGTON.—I am sick of silence on India. A hundred thousand persons are dying of starvation there each week (Associated Press from New Delhi, October 27) and we look the other way.

It is not considered good form here to talk about India. India is the halitosis of the United Nations. Nice people do not mention it. Veddy, veddy, oh, quite frightfully radical Oxford dons and all that at the best cocktail parties here will tell you we Americans do not understand India. Nuts.

India is our bridgehead on the Asiatic continent for war against Japan. India has 390,000,000 people. Her great leaders, who were anti-Fascist when many in the British Government were still appeasers, are in jail. Now there is famine, worst in Assam and Bengal, the provinces from which our troops would march on Burma, the provinces in which most of our American soldiers in India are stationed. And in the wake of the famine, cholera, malaria, typhoid, and dysentery.

I think it time to tell tales out of school. Every emissary our Government has sent to India since the war began has come back worried and critical. They won't say so in public but they've said plenty off the record.

One of the men to whom I refer is former Ambassador William Phillips, a conservative career diplomat. We were appalled when we heard the President was sending him to India. We expected the British Government to take him into camp. He is not the kind of person one expects to get too far away from the better clubs. All this has made his testimony on his return the more appalling.

No one was more pro-British than the late Ben Robertson. Look back at his old dispatches to PM and see what India did to him.

I said Robertson was pro-British. So am I. But I reserve the right to pick my Britains and I am tired of leaving India's cause in Washington to characters like the bundbeloved Senator REYNOLDS. We western progressives are being compromised in the eyes of the East by our uneasy reluctance to speak out. In the long run Anglo-American relations will be hurt, not helped, by leaving the Indian sore to fester.

The British press is not silent.

"Somewhere," said a British newspaper, "we took a wrong turning, probably when we failed to realize that Indian political parties were more pro-Chinese and more anti-Japanese than we were, and had been anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist when we were appeasers. Their desire was to feel that the war was their war, but it still figures as a war to help Britain and save her empire."

That was the Tory Sunday Observer of London speaking.

Why is India starving? Because the British viceroyalty, so competent in repression, was incompetent in providing an expansion of production on India's idle acres to replace her normal rice imports from Japanese-held Burma, Indochina, and Thailand. As the British-owned Calcutta Statesman said, "Throughout the unfolding of this tragedy, authority seems to have been at least three moves behind events, and two moves behind public opinion."

Our troops in India give us the right to speak. Just plain decent concern for other human beings makes it our duty.

I ask that our Government request the British Government to call a food conference in India. I ask that India's great leaders be freed from jail to attend that conference. I ask that our own United Nations Food Conference at Atlantic City make immediate plans to ship some food and medical supplies to India. And I am sending this with a check for relief work to the India League of America, 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York City, and ask that you do likewise if you can.

I. F. STONE.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that under the closed rule none but members of the committee were permitted to offer amendments to the tax bill under consideration today.

I was opposed to some of the provisions of this bill, and I regret that I was unable to register this opposition.

Thanksgiving, New Guinea, 1942—Thanksgiving, Aurora, Ill., 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, throughout the 48 States of the Union, in war zones and on the high

seas, in churches and homes, on battlefields, and in the air, Americans will, at some time during the day, pause, even though it be for a moment, and orally or mentally praise God from whom all blessings flow. Those at home will pray for the health and safe return of their loved ones in the armed services. Those with the colors will pray for a speedy and successful determination of the noble cause for which they offer their bodies as a sacrifice. The theme of all these prayers will be peace; a just peace; a lasting peace; a peace that will forever banish tyranny, slavery, and subjugation; a peace that will bring food, care, health, and happiness to men, women, and children throughout the world.

The early settlers of our fair land, those pioneers who came to our shores and established homes in our wildernesses that they might enjoy freedom to worship as they pleased, inaugurated the observation of this day of thanks. They celebrated it by partaking at the festive board of the bounteous supplies of nature that God had furnished and that industry and determination had made available. That custom, too, is a tradition in our American way of life, and, in spite of necessary wartime restrictions, will wherever possible, be observed tomorrow by most Americans everywhere.

My thoughts tomorrow will take me to a home in Aurora in the State of Illinois. A man, a woman and a young girl will be seated at the dinner table. The elderly couple are Mr. and Mrs. George A. Horton and the girl is their daughter Gwenivere. On a table close by will rest the picture of a young man in uniform. It is their son, Herschel. This is the second successive Thanksgiving dinner that he has missed. Last year it had been a happy gathering at that same table. True, Herschel was somewhere in the southwest Pacific, but his letters, though not frequent, had been cheerful and full of hope. Even then they had admired his picture and their pride at his promotion to second lieutenant and then first lieutenant was quite evident from their faces. They had talked about him at that time and wondered where he was and what he was doing but there was no question in any of their minds but that a year hence he would again be with them occupying his accustomed place at the table. While, of course, there lurked in each of their minds some anxiety, some fear, some apprehension, yet hope and confidence won out and they looked forward to — tomorrow — when they would see that same smile, hear that same laughter, witness that same appreciation of his mother's cooking.

Several weeks passed and then came that cruelest of all days when an official communication from the War Department turned this house of gladness into a house of gloom.

"Killed in action"—what solace can there be in those words. How? Where? Under what circumstances? These were the tortuous questions that, month in and month out, troubled the grief-stricken mother, father, and sister. The answer was not forthcoming—until November 1, 1943—2 weeks before Hershel would have celebrated his thirtieth birthday. It came in another official envelope. But permit me to convey the message to you as the mother of this boy conveyed it to me:

AURORA, ILL., *November 14, 1943.*

DEAR MR. REED: Because tomorrow is the birthday of our only son, I am enclosing a copy of a letter we recently received. The letter speaks for itself.

I can only say, before God and man, a finer son, brother, or friend never lived. To me the war can never be over and you may know, this letter to us is Gethsemane.

I send it to you so you may know the terrible sacrifice someone from your own district has made.

Sincerely,

ODESSA J. HORTON.
(Mrs. George A.)

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
KANSAS CITY QUARTERMASTER DEPOT,
Kansas City, Mo., October 30, 1943.

Mr. GEORGE A. HORTON, Jr.,
Aurora, Ill.

DEAR MR. HORTON: It is with deep distress that I write you. Today, there has come into my possession a most tragic letter written by your son immediately prior to his death. It will cause you heartache and grief, but at the same time will give you even greater pride in being the father of a son who could face death as he did.

I send this letter to you, the father, because with you must rest the decision of whether Mrs. Horton and your daughter shall see it and read it. Please do not let Mrs. Horton feel that I have any desire to conceal or hide this letter. * * * I simply feel that such a letter might be too shocking for many a mother to receive.

This communication has been a difficult one for me to write. I hope you understand and appreciate my feeling.

To you and your family I extend every sympathy.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MURPHY,
Lieutenant Colonel, Q. M. C., Effects Quartermaster.

NEW GUINEA SWAMP.

Terrible battle on Thanksgiving Day—lost six men, and six wounded. November 29 the twentieth day on the trail—19 straight days with wet, sore feet. Received new socks yesterday. The tops of all the brush over my head has been shot away by Jap machine guns. I have laid here 3 days now. Sunday, November 29, 1942, eighth day under fire, still holding out. (Written in Hershel's prayer book.)

COPY OF HERSHEL'S LAST LETTER, WRITTEN IN HIS NOTEBOOK AND KEPT IN HIS PRAYER BOOK

Dear beloved, my dear sweet father, mother and sister, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Horton, Jr., and Sister Gwenivere, about 9 a. m. I came out on a mercy patrol to pick up dog tags, etc., of our dead. This was the morning of Tuesday, December 1, 1942.

I was trying to turn over the body of Captain Keast, a friend of mine, when I was shot two or three times in my right leg and hip. Lieutenant Ellis, Sergeant Young, and Pvt. Merle Christian were with me. I yelled that I was shot. I was in front of all but Merle; they ran for shelter. I dragged myself for a Jap grass shanty about 12 yards to the rear of where I was shot.

Sergeant Young said he would send help as soon as possible. Help never came, evidently because I laid there unattended in any way, without food, or water, or medical care. Two days of semidelirlousness, and then I called Captain Shirley's name, "Ellis, help," etc. Finally, Lieutenant Gibbs and one of his men from the antitank company came to me. Their medic also came up. The medic gave me my first drink of water in 3 days, but he had no food to offer. The medic bandaged me temporarily. Lieutenant Gibbs promised me aid, but I never saw him again. The medic came back and gave me water, but a man helping him got shot there and that scared him away. Life from then on was a terrible nightmare. The hot, burning sun, the delirious nights. No one came near me from then on, but I did dig a water hole in 4 days' time, which was wonderful to me, although it was polluted by all the rotting bodies within 12 and 14 feet of me. Then two or three rescue parties from my company came out, but they never could find me. On two or three occasions they nearly got to me, when the Japs or a rainstorm made it impossible. The Japs are living within 15 yards of me. I see them every day.

I have tried to make splints and crawl or walk out, but I just can't make it. Today (as nearly as I can judge, December 11), I managed to stand, but I could go no farther. A Jap shot me in the shoulder and neck as I weakly sat there, and I thought my time had come, but no, I sit and lay here in this terrible place, wondering not why God has forsaken me, but rather why He is making me suffer this terrible end. It is true I understand life and its reasons now, but why should He send it to this terrible grave with me? Why not let me live and tell others?

I am not afraid to die, although I have nearly lost my faith a couple of days here. I have a pistol here, but I could not kill myself; I still have faith in the Lord. I think He must be giving me the supreme test. I know now how Christ felt on the cross.

I have imagined hearing several other rescue parties, but one's imagination grows as his body shrivels.

I have had no food of any kind since that morning I was shot. My right hip is broken and my right leg, both compound fractures; else I could have been out of here in those first couple of days, wounds or no wounds.

My life has been good, but I am so young and have so many things undone that a man of 29 should do.

We may never know God's purpose in striking me down like this, but He must have one. I can still say truthfully that I have never killed a man, although I have been ordered to order others to.

I wonder how long a man can go on like this? I shall continue to pray for a miracle of rescue. I want to commend Lieutenant Ellis for his wonderful efforts and heroism in attempt to rescue me under Jap treachery.

God bless you my loved ones. Keep the faith; don't worry. I shall see you all again some day. I prepare to meet my Maker.

Love,

HERSHEL.

(First Lt. Hershel G. Horton, Company One, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Infantry, Third Battalion, Thirty-second Division, Sananada Road, New Guinea.)

Mr. Speaker, on the reverse side of the copy of this letter in the handwriting of the mother appear these appropriate words:

The only deeds he ever hid
Were acts of kindness that he did.
No broken pledge lost him respect,
He met all men with head erect,
And when he passed I think there went
A soul to yonder firmament
So white, so splendid, and so fine
It came almost to God's design.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further I can say. The whole story of this boy—of his life, of his hopes, of his ambition, of his death—is contained in these letters.

It is a story of valor, fortitude, and sacrifice. This life, so young, so blameless, so promising has like many others, been ruthlessly destroyed that greed and revenge and lust for power shall not overwhelm the world. He must not have died in vain. God in His infinite mercy has released him from earthly suffering, and in the tender years of his life, has taken him to a realm where peace is eternal. These words can, at this time, be of little or no consolation to those nearest and dearest to this hero. But when the deep pains of grief have been partially assuaged by the passage of time, great will be their pride in their every thought of this loved one who gave his all.

And not until the loom is silent,
And the shuttles cease to fly,
Shall God unroll the pattern.
And explain the reason why.
The dark threads were so needful
In the Weaver's skillful hand,
As the threads of gold and silver
For the pattern which He planned.

More Generous Treatment for the Retired Enlisted Men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because the restrictions contained in the rule which governs the consideration of the revenue bill of 1943—H. R. 3687—precludes me from reading a letter which I received today from Mrs. J. H. Hoeppel, a valiant fighter for the retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for whom she pleads, or from even presenting the amendment which she suggests, I ask unanimous consent that her letter be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks in the hope that it may be seen by kindlier eyes in another legislative body.

The letter in which the owner and publisher of National Defense pleads so earnestly and convincingly the cause of the retired enlisted personnel is the following:

NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Arcadia, Calif., November 20 1943.

Hon. BUD GEARHART,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEARHART: The retired personnel of California, approximately 7,000 strong, would appreciate your kind consideration to the following facts, as they appeal to you, through this periodical, to consider them for income-tax exemption when the new tax bill comes before the House next week.

Will you, yourself, please introduce the amendment (marked in red on the attached page); or, will you confer with Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN on this subject? The following will guide you and should help you if you will read it to the Members of the House in support of the amendment.

Here are the facts: Over 50 percent of the retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard did not receive an increase in pay in the Pay Act of June 1, 1942. Some few men received a dollar or so per month increase only, while thousands received absolutely no increase. I mention herewith four specific cases as indicative of the desperate financial status of this group:

1. John A. Newbauer, C. P. M., retired, of the Navy, who served in World War No. 1, is totally disabled (insane) as the result of an injury he received in service. He is now confined at St. Elizabeths Asylum, in Washington, D. C. His wife, with one child, is his guardian. His retired pay is $80.30 per month, out of which a withholding tax is taken. In addition, if the wife has further income, she must pay income taxes on this $80.30 per month retired pay, which she receives as the guardian of her husband—insane from service-connected disability.

2. F. J. Oliver, C. P. O., Orlando, Fla., totally disabled in line of duty. He is a chief petty officer, retired, of the Navy. He received $89.05 per month prior to the new Army pay boost. He continues to receive the same amount. We reiterate, his disabilities are of service origin. He is forced to pay income taxes and withholding taxes on this $89.05.

3. Joseph Skerhut, C. P. O., Redwood City, Calif., was disabled in service handling a torpedo. He is a deep-sea diver. Prior to the new pay bill he received $89.05 per month. As the new pay bill did not provide an increase for him, and thousands of others like him, he continues to receive $89.05 per month, out of which he must pay approximately $8 per month income tax. He was recalled to active service in this war and returned to the retired list because of disabilities. He is in serious physical shape.

4. George M. Hargey, first musician, Bridgetown, N. J., lost an eye in the service and has other physical disabilities. Prior to the new pay bill he received $64.55 per month. After passage of this bill his pay was raised $1.75 per month, so that he now receives $66.30 retired pay. Out of this amount he must pay income and withholding taxes.

The above represents four of thousands of similar cases. Some even receive as little as $41.80 per month, upon which they must pay income taxes in the event they have any other source of income. Now, in comparison with the above, which are only a few out of thousands of retired Navy and Marine Corps men, may we mention how foreign veterans, residing in the United States, are income-tax exempt on benefits they receive from their government. The attached page gives more specific information on this subject.

My brother-in-law, a retired railroad employee, who never contributed a penny toward the retirement fund, is income-tax exempt on the retired pay he receives, while my husband, who served 30 years, much of it at low pay (as low as $13 per month), is forced to pay income taxes on the Army retired pay which he receives.

As a fair-minded Congressman, Mr. GEARHART, do you think it is fair that all other veterans, including railroad employees, should be income tax exempt on their pay while retired, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard should be forced to pay?

Assuredly, you will say no. Therefore, I hope that you will, yourself, introduce an amendment to reduce this discrimination, or personally confer with Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, and support an amendment which he has promised to offer to remove this abject and unfair discrimination against the veterans of our former wars.

Thanking you for your favor, I am,
Sincerely,

MRS. J. H. HOEPPEL,
Owner and Publisher.

Check Thieving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article that appeared in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on November 19, 1943:

CHECK THIEVING.

Theft and forgery of checks sent by servicemen to their dependents at home has become so common that it has now reached dangerous and alarming proportions.

An investigation recently by the United States Secret Service at the request of the Navy Department revealed an amazing situation and an alarming increase in the number of checks stolen or lost after mail delivery at designated places. As a result all enlisted personnel are being urged to impress upon those at home the importance of properly safeguarding their dependency checks so that opportunities for theft and forgery will be greatly decreased.

It is unfortunate that thieves and transgressors would go so far as to steal and forge the endorsement of checks en route from those fighting for their country to dependents at home. It is true, however, that this has already become a common practice and police departments everywhere are hard pressed in their efforts to combat it. It is a low form of crime but some are so completely devoid of conscience that it makes no difference to them from whom they steal so long as they accomplish their ends.

Dependents of those in service who receive Government checks can do much to combat this depraved form of thievery by paying close attention to the instructions formulated by the Secret Service as the result of a most thorough investigation and by following them. The beneficiary is urged to be at home, or have a member of the family at home, when the check is due to arrive. It is also pointed out that if the check is removed from the mail box immediately it cannot be stolen by a check thief. It is suggested that the mail box be deep and strong and the name clearly printed on it, also that it be kept locked always. It is also recommended that if possible it would be desirable to have an arrangement with the mail carrier to signal in some way when he delivers the check. The postmaster should be notified immediately of any change of address. It is also deemed advisable to cash the check at the same place each month and identification will be much easier. The Secret Service is cautioning merchants to insist upon proper identification. Folding, pinning, or mutilating the allowance checks in any way is wrong.

The instructions that have been partially enumerated here are the most important ones that have resulted from a deep study of the wave of thefts that has become so alarming. The loss of a check is a severe one to any beneficiary and the chance of recovery is extremely slight. The best way to insure against such loss by theft is to study the instructions as formulated by the Secret Service and start immediately to put them into practice. The number of checks for dependents is constantly increasing and unless something is done to stop it the thieving will increase correspondingly.

A Line of Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following outstanding and enlightening editorial, first appearing in the Scottish Rite News Bulletin, and reprinted as an editorial by the Moundsville Journal, Moundsville, W. Va.:

A LINE OF CONVICTION

What is the race problem? There is nothing to riot about and shout about. Neither is there anything to whisper about.

So long as the finest minds agree that there is a vast difference between understanding and mutual respect, on the one hand, and melting or blending on the other hand, just so long will there be no problem. When there is a clear, distinct line or path there can be no problem. Only when there are two paths, several choices, a wavering line of conviction—only then is there a problem, a question.

Preoccupation with the matter of race prevents valuable contemplation of real man and his immortal existence.

Undoubtedly racial antagonism, so-called, springs from an inborn urge toward purity of the race. Antagonism is quite the wrong term and it emphasizes a primitive attitude, not an advanced attitude, toward a relationship that has become very close. No one now living can say that today or at any given time there must be a mingling, a fusion, of the races. During our brief time on this planet we may best live in such a way regarding the physical aspects of life that there can be a minimum of friction. A sudden departure from accepted practices which are sanctioned by long custom and rational regard for the mortal sojourning here would not be common sense. Leaders must simply see that there are no such leaps in the dark. No problem is involved.

Ignorant and indiscreet rabble-rousers of late years have used the word "race" in connection with noticeable prejudices that are class as in South America, or caste, as in India, or religious, as regards the Jews. Race relationships as between white and colored in the United States have no analogy whatever to the foregoing. Race relationships on the whole in the United States, while not ideal, are remarkably fine, and both predominant races here are much better off than they would be anywhere else in the world. Detouring around this happy fact leads to a confusion of crossroads some of which turn backward. And why detour around a happy fact?

It is foolish to say the United Nations are fighting to abolish race prejudices. However, the term "race prejudice," like the term "antagonism," is a misnomer.

What seems to be race prejudice is the manifestation of a desired security for one's own race and the determination that it be not trespassed upon. This is not hatred for another race, but pride in one's own race. Each race should have the opportunity to cultivate this pride just as each individual should have the opportunity to make of himself a fine person. The benefit to world society is obvious—the better the parts the better the whole. Furthermore and even more fundamental is the civilized realization that if one race feels "better than" any other race, then in exactly that proportion it is inferior to the other race. Each individual of each race is a child of the Divine Creator and there is no way to make any law to annul that or to raise any individual above that status. How strange, then, that discussions, ranging from the Biblical to the biological, continue. How natural and right to change thinking from illogical, riotous, and lurking fear to a simple straightforward view that admits no thought of race amalgamation and that is joyous in race advancement.

The matter of race is not a whispering matter. It has often become the cause of bitter political and economic discussions, both national and international, because race relationships have erroneously been thought to present a problem or question, whereas the very persons planning guidance are basically agreed that there is no question—that race purity is an acceptedly right condition. Each race is interesting, and is interesting to the other races; how dull a world it would seem if race differences were obliterated.

There is no problem involved except that which each individual of whatever color encounters in facing any phase of life on this planet, the problem of governing his own thinking. It is the individual white man's problem, the individual yellow man's problem, the individual black man's problem, constantly to mind—the more advanced the individual the fewer the restrictions which surround him. It is a matter of education and enlightment of the individual and not a question of superiority or inferiority of any given race. Enlightment, unfortunately, cannot be legislated.

When the individual's thinking is right, his actions will be right and progress will result. Fusion with another race is not the path to progress. When this is seen with clarity by every single individual of every color, as it already is by the majority, then and not until then can all barriers of discrimination of every kind be taken down. Social discrimination is strengthened not by those who set it up but by those who make it necessary. (Scottish Rite News Bulletin.)

Government, Business, and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Tuesday to address a luncheon of the New York Chapter of the American Marketing Association at the Hotel Commodore, New York City. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title is "Government, Business, and People."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Government, business, and people are the raw materials so to speak, out of which the post-war world will be constructed. There can be no rational plan for the future without first a clear understanding that neither government organization nor business organization is an end in itself. Government and business both exist solely for the purpose of serving people. The American ideal of living makes people supreme, and our purpose, therefore, in looking toward the post-war world should be to determine how best government and business can be used to improve the conditions under which people live. One thing is certain, neither government nor business can be permitted to regiment the people if they are to remain supreme.

The issue of our time grows directly out of these principles, and when the peace comes, we shall have to determine whether we are to have a managed economy or a free economy. It is immaterial whether the managers are clothed with central public power in government or are merely clothed with central economic power in business. If they manage the economy, then enterprise is not free and the people are regimented. America, therefore, must answer this question—whether it is to have an honest and definite system of competition or a regulated economy managed by central power.

This should not be a difficult question for the people of America to decide, because within the memory of most people now living, we have tried regimentation by both private and public power and neither has worked.

Organized business operating under private managers exercising central control dominated our economic system for a generation or more prior to the crash of 1929. It operated as though the success of the business organizations alone was the principal aim and object of our system instead of the welfare of the people. It ended in a crash which brought widespread hardship, suffering, and unemployment of men, money, and machines.

The people turned to the Government as the only agency that could act in the crisis and government set up its own system of central management. By the spending program, which has been so much criticized but to which few if any objected when it was undertaken, Government management succeeded in ameliorating but not in curing the hardship the people were enduring.

Then came the war and because it was a war brought on by totalitarian powers, that is to say, powers in which the lives of the people were regimented by central government, we were compelled ourselves to adopt totalitarian methods. We have organized the whole people and the whole economy, all our resources of men and material, to defeat the enemy and even greater power has been concentrated in the hands of Government than was exercised while Government was fighting depression.

The illusion of prosperity has been created. The national income has risen to unimagined heights and the leaders of some groups seem to think that profit can be made out of the war but all groups are visibly impatient of the restrictions that are imposed by Government upon their activities and their profit. Patriots and profiteers alike complain. Yet it is perfectly obvious that the economic activity, out of which grows the huge income of the people, is based upon the biggest national debt that was ever incurred by any nation at any time.

The economic activity which we see about us has been made possible solely by the fact that the Government is purchasing with borrowed money more than one-half of all the goods and services that are being produced in America.

It takes no seer to realize that when the Government stops buying food from the farms, ore from the mines, guns and bullets from the war plants, we shall then have to find a new market for the things that the people produce. We shall have to produce something else, because it is only out of production that the people can live and pay the national debt.

So the problem boils itself down to this: Private managers built up many strong business organizations but they did not provide full employment and prosperity for the people. Government central management has succeeded in bringing about full employment but only because we are involved in a war and because we have borrowed unimaginable billions against the future.

We resent central management by Government, we rebelled against central management by business, and, in our rush to escape from regimentation by Government when peace is restored, we shall have the alternative of going back to regimentation by central business planners or of setting up a real system of free enterprise in which the people shall be supreme in a competitive economy from which monopolistic practices have been eliminated.

This is an objective which can be attained if we are honest with ourselves, and if, instead of dividing into hostile groups upon the home front, with business, labor, and agriculture all shooting at one another, we imitate the men in the fighting forces and work together to create the jobs which we know must be created when servicemen and war workers find themselves demobilized at the end of the war.

Our fighting sons on the war front are giving us on the home front the example of patriotic unity, without which the reconversion of this Nation from war to peace cannot be accomplished. We who are now at home owe it to these men to put aside all selfishness and to get together now to make ready for their return.

It is a task that is much more simple than perhaps it sounds, and I can think of no group which ought to be better able to understand the fundamentals of the problem than those who are affiliated with a marketing association. You know that there can be no prosperity without markets. You know that there is no market for any commodity or for any service except in the desires of people. It is what people want that business produces and distributes. The prime requisite for every business is a market, and since in a world of peace the people, not the Government, are the primary purchasers, the very first principle in post-war reconstruction is that the ability of the people to buy the things they want must be cultivated and supported.

How people with the ability to buy what they want can create markets is strikingly illustrated by some recent statistics from the clothing section of the War Production Board. These show that even when allowances are made for price increases, sales of clothing for men and women have risen almost 40 percent since 1940, but more interesting even than that is the fact that the sale of wearing apparel for children is up 75 percent. In other words, mothers and fathers fully employed, think first of the welfare of their children and the youngsters of these war years throughout all America are better clothed now than at any time in history because fully employed parents have been thinking of their welfare.

Another interesting statistical revelation is that employment in power laundries and in dyeing and cleaning has been increasing. Assuming the index of employment in power laundries for 1939 to be 100, it had risen in August 1943 to 194.3, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. There had also been an increase of employment in dyeing and cleaning, and the average hours per week of employment in these service facilities had also increased. The desire of the people of America to be spick and span seems to be reflected in these figures, and all advertising writers seem to agree that personal appearance is a key to the "art of accomplishment." At any event, it is clear from both of these instances that steady employment means better markets.

Thus it is that the purchasing power of the masses of the people, if maintained upon a stable basis of permanent jobs at good pay, will create here in America the greatest market that business can hope to obtain.

How then, are we going to make sure that people will be employed when the soldiers come home from the war and the manufacture of war material ceases? Here is the program:

1. Promote and encourage the investment of private capital in new enterprise by a tax system that will create an incentive for the owner of capital to invest it in independent productive enterprise. To do this, we must reward the investor who creates new jobs by seeing to it that he receives credit on his tax bill. We must thoroughly overhaul the present Federal tax system so that it can no longer be said that Government is an obstacle to enterprise.

2. We must protect new independent enterprise from destruction by monopoly. We cannot do this with our tongues in our cheeks by pretending that monopolistic organizations are representative of free enterprise. We can only do it by frankly recognizing that whatever practice is followed with the purpose of regimenting, restricting, or restraining the business activity of the people is antisocial and should be abandoned by all groups, all organizations, all classes, all individuals.

3. Having created the incentive for private capital to go to work by tax reform and having protected it from monopolistic restraint, we must then protect it from restraint by Government. We must be sure that the Government boards and commissions which are set up to protect the public interest shall not be permitted to become the arbitrary managers of the peoples' affairs. To accomplish this objective, we must establish a system of administrative law whereby the citizens shall have the right to appeal to an impartial tribunal from the rules and regulations and decisions of administrative bureaus.

4. We must recognize that there is a difference between local business and national business and that the latter should not be permitted to crush the former. A big country needs big business, but it also needs little business. Big business cannot thrive, no matter how great its efficiency and how skilled its directors, if little business through the States and counties and cities and villages is overpowered and stifled by huge national and international business organizations. We must, therefore, have the registration of international cartels and a national corporate charter system whereby the duties and responsibilities of corporations and other national organizations may be made clear. Such a law would not regiment business. It would set business free.

5. The people, through their State governments and through their city governments, should begin to exercise local power to foster the full utilization of local resources. They should cease to look to Washington or to Wall Street for industrial or financial handouts to sustain their economic life. They should begin to develop a new community consciousness and community pride. The farmers, the workers, and the businessmen in local communities and local areas should begin to work with one another instead of against one another. Class consciousness, which in our time has been overcoming State and community consciousness, should be recognized for what it is, the progenitor of totalitarianism.

This war certainly has taught us that the principles of human equality, upon which this Nation was founded, are correct. The achievements of the fighting forces have been recorded by young men from every village and hamlet in America, from every class, from every group. They have come from the ranks of labor, from the ranks of agriculture, from the ranks of business. They have shown by their feats of heroism in every bloody battle all around the world that there is no monopoly upon brains, integrity, character, courage, or ability. They have shown that, given the opportunity, the people can accomplish wonders.

We should make up our minds now that when they return they will be given the opportunity to show what these same qualities can do upon the home front without restrictions by either private or public arbitrary power. Government and business must both be made to serve the people.

Letter From Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter and certain data I have received recently from the Civil Aeronautics Board:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your recent conversation with Mr. Warner in which you asked for a copy of Civil Aeronautics Bulletin No. 4, a statement of the present status of State aviation laws and information with respect to the Board's regulation requiring all pilots and aircraft operating in the air space of the United States to hold Federal pilot and aircraft certificates.

In response to your request, a copy of Bulletin No. 4 has already been forwarded to you. Attached is a chart showing the current status of State aviation legislation. The material on State legislation has been prepared in chart form in order that it can be used more conveniently.

Attached also is a copy of the Board's regulation effective December 1, 1941, requiring all pilots and aircraft operating in the air space overlying the United States to have Federal pilot and aircraft certificates. As is indicated by the findings made by the Board in support of this regulation, it was issued because the Board had become convinced that by reason of traffic conditions any aircraft operation in the United States might directly affect or endanger safety in interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce. Section 60.30 has since that date been amended and now reads as follows:

"60.30. Pilot certificates. No person shall pilot a civil aircraft in the United States unless such a person holds a valid pilot certificate issued by the Administrator or an effective foreign pilot certificate validated by the Administrator. Any person may operate the controls of an aircraft if the aircraft is equipped with fully functioning dual controls and one of the control seats is occupied by a person holding an appropriate pilot certificate."

You will recall that the Civil Aeronautics Act requires all pilots and aircraft operating in "air commerce" to have a Federal certificate and that "air commerce" is defined as: "interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce or the transportation of mail by aircraft or any operation or navigation of aircraft within the limits of any civil airway or any operation or navigation of aircraft which directly affects, or which may endanger safety in, in-

terstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce."

We regard the new definition of "air navigation" in H. R. 3420, which has just been reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to be a great improvement over the present definition of "air commerce." It is absolutely clear under that definition that all pilots and aircraft operating in the United States must have Federal certificates and must comply with Federal regulations. Under the existing definition, as you undoubtedly noted, the scope of Federal jurisdiction is not entirely clear, thus placing aircraft operators in the disadvantageous position of not being sure at all times as to the rules and regulations applying to them. The new definition proposed in H. R. 3420 will correct this.

I hope that I have provided you with the information you are seeking. If not, do not hesitate to call upon us again.

Very truly yours,

L. WELCH POGUE,
Chairman.

	Safety regulation								Provision for zoning	Economic regulation, certificates of convenience	Regulatory body		
	Federal license		Federal or State		State license		Air-traffic regulation	Airport development			Aeronautics Commission	Other commission	No commission
	All aircraft	All pilots	All aircraft	All pilots	All aircraft	All pilots							
Alabama			X	X				X	X		X		
Arizona	X	X					X	X		X		X	
Arkansas	X	X					X	X	X		X		
California	X	X					X	X		F			X
Colorado	X	X						X		X	X		
Connecticut					X	X	X	X	X		X		
Delaware	X	X					X	X					X
Florida	X	X						X	X			X	
Georgia	X	X						X					X
Idaho	X	X					X	X	X			X	
Illinois	X	X					X	X	X	X	X		
Indiana	X	X						X	X				X
Iowa	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Kansas	X	X					X	X	X				X
Kentucky	X	X					F	X			X		
Louisiana	X	X						X	X		X		
Maine	X	X					F	X	X			X	
Maryland			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Massachusetts	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Michigan	X	X					X	X	X		X		
Minnesota			X	X			X	X			X		
Mississippi	X	X						X	X				X
Missouri	X	X					X	X					X
Montana	X	X						X	X				X
Nebraska	X	X						X	X		X		
Nevada	C	C					X	X	X	X		X	
New Hampshire			X	X			X	X	X		X		
New Jersey			X	X			X	X	X		X		
New Mexico	X	X					F	X	X	X		X	
New York	X	X					F	X	X				X
North Carolina	X	X						X	X				X
North Dakota			C	X				X	X	X		X	
Ohio	X	X					F	X	X		X		
Oklahoma	X	X						X	X			X	
Oregon			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Pennsylvania	X	X					X	X	X	X		X	
Rhode Island	X	X					F					X	
South Carolina	X	X						X	X		X		
South Dakota	X	X					X	X			X		
Tennessee	X	X					X	X	X			X	
Texas	X	X						X	X				X
Utah			X	X			X	X	X		X		
Vermont	X	X					X	X				X	
Virginia	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	
Washington	X	X					F	X					X
West Virginia	X	X					X	X			X		
Wisconsin	X	X					X	X			X		
Wyoming	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	
Total	39	39	8	8	2	2	33	47	33	9	23	14	12

"F" indicates either statutory instructions or administrative policy of promulgating rules substantially the same as those of the Federal Government.

"C" indicates applicability to commercial aircraft, pilots, or operations only.

An Indian Sees War and Duty to Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter from Stephen Reuben, Indian, of Lapwai, Idaho, which was written upon notice that his grandson, Clifford Blackeagle had been seriously wounded in action in the north African area. The fine Christian and patriotic spirit of Tribesman Reuben is indeed to be commended and, I believe, typical of the willingness of the Indians of the United States to do their part in this great war which we are fighting and of Indian patriotism and loyalty to our country:

LAPWAI, IDAHO, *November 12, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I received your letter, 4th instant of November, of information about my grandson, Clifford Blackeagle, that he was wounded in action somewhere in north Africa.

I am not much sorry, and not ashamed about it, that he died under the United States flag for the country and people. Our Chiefs Treaty in 1855 with Governor Stevens provided that in the future our children would go to war and die together—and this is the time to fulfill our Chiefs Agreement. Many of our young men—whites and Indians—have died at war already and more will die before the war is over. * * *

Therefore, I say I am not sorrowing much for him. He was a Christian. But the sorrowful day is coming when I shall have parted from all my children forever.

I have three grandsons at war. The last words I told them were: "Go to war; die for the people and country; be brave soldiers; fear not death. Go forward to drop not your gun, to raise not your hands, but shoot until you are killed. And I will be proud—not ashamed." And I am glad one of my grandsons is wounded.

I have three stars in my house representing three soldiers.

I thank you, Mr. WHITE, who wrote to inform me. Please let me know again if you hear about him and be obliged.

I am yours,

S. J. REUBEN.

Whence America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, newspaper editorials are good, bad, and indifferent. Yes; possibly some are even in between those general classifications.

The Jackson Citizen Patriot is one of the leading dailies in Michigan and its editorials are, as a rule, informative, entertaining, and factually correct. In accordance with the unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including an editorial from its issue of November 21, 1943, which is logical, sound, and thought-provoking and is as follows:

WHENCE AMERICA?

The strength of Russia is the faith of the Russian people in their form of government. So Robert Kazmeyer, student of world affairs and authority on Russia, told an Executive Club audience here Wednesday evening.

"America has allowed itself to be divided into selfish groups." So M. J. Evans, Chicago management engineer, told the Rotary Club earlier the same day.

In those statements, the truth of which has been discussed in these columns more than once, is the explanation of much that is going on in the world today.

The Russian people were a divided, leaderless mass under the czar and again under Kerensky. Communism drew them together under powerful leaders. The methods by which this was accomplished were bloody and, in western eyes, criminal. But today Russia, except for a very small and inarticulate opposition, is united.

The same was true of Germany. Following defeat in the First World War its experiment in democracy was a dismal failure because strong leadership and mass support were licking. But Hitler provided leadership. He drew the German people together; and the Nazis emerged in a few years from a weak, broken nation to conquer Czechoslovakia,

Poland, France, Belgium, and Holland. That Germany now manifestly is doomed to defeat does not alter the fact that Hitler managed to build up a powerful nation out of a broken people.

Did these things just happen or did they occur because totalitarian government, which exists in both Russia and Germany, is the only form which can bring together a people in solid, common interest?

The answer to both of these questions in our opinion is "No." The cohesion of German and Russian peoples didn't just happen and it could have occurred under democratic leadership as well as totalitarian. But not the kind of democratic leadership and not with the kind of selfish division of the citizenry which now exists in the United States.

Mr. Evans hit the evil genii of America squarely between the eyes when he said, "America has allowed itself to be divided into selfish groups."

This Nation today presents a spectacle of blocs and groups greedily striving each for its own aggrandizement. Greed is the curse of our politics.

Many voices cry out in the land. Labor demands further wage increases. Farm spokesmen demand higher crop prices. Industrialists wail over renegotiations which curtail their war profits. And radicals ring the changes of class war.

But no one speaks for all of the people. No voice cries out in the name of the Republic. Materialism, crass, raw, rotten materialism rules.

The coal miners shut down the production of fuel needed to make steel for ships and guns and tanks to succor the Nation from the threat of enemy power. Workers in a huge bomber plant shut down first one section, then another of the great, sprawling factory thereby slowing the production of giant planes needed in England, in Italy, in India, in China, and in the South Pacific. Farmers stop the shipment of milk for the babies of fighting soldiers and of workingmen until they get what they want in higher prices.

Everywhere the dominant interest is, "What's in it for me or for us?"

Here and there a patriot head is raised, ready to work for victory regardless of profit or wage. The faith that is still in us tells us that in their inner hearts the people of all America would like to respond to that same urge—to serve the flag with no equivocation and no thought for self as their forebears served in the hunger and chill of Valley Forge, in a hundred frontier battles and in the bloody horror that was Gettysburg. But leadership is lacking. The voices that cry out are those of greed and self-interest. Cynics who say that American labor is unpatriotic are in the very nature of their charge saying that America has failed. Those who say that the farmer doesn't love his country acclaim their own doom. Those who charge industry with only self-interest indict a whole people.

The basic fault is in our leadership. Russia did not draw together out of the sheer force of mass will. Strong men magnetized government in the name of communism and drew the people to it. Strong men led the Red armies. Strong men called, and the people responded to fight bravely and without relief, to produce 12, 14, 16 hours a day with no rest.

For a generation America's leadership has offered it naught but materialistic philosophy. Mr. Roosevelt upped the wages of labor, and labor was for him. He offered subsidies to farmers, and they applauded until suddenly the subsidy bubble burst, and the tillers of the soil turned on their one-time benefactor. The New Deal curtailed the profits of capital and management, and capital and management fought it.

Men voted for their pocketbooks, not for their hearts. Those who profited from the New Deal supported it; those who lost by it fought against it. Only here and there were there those whose political concern was for the Nation rather than for self, who fought the New Deal because its political practices threatened our form of government.

Some will say that only demagogues who promise material blessings can garner votes and that the demagogue who promises the most will get the most votes.

But, if that is true, democracy in truth is a decadent philosophy. The faiths of our fathers were misplaced.

The fact is that America has not given a trial to any other leadership than that of demagoguery in recent years. It has not had a leader who has dared to stand up before it as Winston Churchill stood before the British people and promised only blood and sweat, toil and tears.

The material things of life are important. But "man cannot live by bread alone." America needs a leadership that will serve no clique nor clan nor bloc, but, rather, will dedicate itself to the people as a whole and the Nation alone. With that it needs a citizenry prepared to accept the responsibilities which are its obligation and the discipline without which democracy cannot survive.

When and if such a leadership makes itself known, its course will be tortuous, because opposing will be all of the demagogues who speak for greed. But if such a leadership, carrying the torch of a new crusade, can call to it the forces of a patriotic people, seeking what they can give to government, not what they can get from it, the future of America will be studded with brighter achievements than all of the glories of its great past. If there be no such crusade and no such renascence of citizenship, then, indeed, hard times and bitter disaster threaten the Republic in the years ahead.

Disposition of Surplus Property During and After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted for the RECORD on several occasions excerpts from letters received commenting on legislation introduced by me on the disposition of surplus war property. It should be noted that the majority of these letters are expressions of general fear of the distress which will necessarily result from the disposition of surplus Government-owned property except under a most orderly plan. The Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives is now giving the problem consideration.

I would like to submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, excerpts from a letter received from Mr. C. A. McKay, president of the Bentley-Gray Dry Goods Co., Tampa, Fla., which, I believe, is a splendid example of the constructive thinking along these lines.

NOVEMBER 16, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: This is a delayed reply to your letter of October 15, suggesting that I submit a letter to your committee on the subject of surplus property in lieu of a trip to Washington. In the meantime, I have investigated the subject further and have given particular attention to the reports of hearings before your committee.

This problem is not something theoretical which may or may not become an actuality—it is here now. The Army and Navy are already dumping goods on the market at irrelevant prices. During the week of November 10 to 16 a tabulation of invitations to bid reveals that over 80 different lots of material were offered for sale under sealed bid by the Government. Actual items ranged from textiles (31,000 yards wool cloth) through hardware, locomotives, and trucks, to new tires for cars and trucks. The latter were offered at Chicago in invitation 54–4 of the Treasury Department.

We are enclosing published data on these sales and particularly invite your attention to the prices at which this material is being sold—you will readily recognize that they are extremely low.

With such sales being made at a time when the country is straining every muscle to get material into the war effort, anyone can visualize the catastrophe that will take place when the war effort is relaxed unless proper controls are instituted quickly. It will be too late if we wait until next spring.

Your third interim report, dated November 1, is a splendid piece of work and is proof in itself of the deep study of the problem by yourself and your committee. Perhaps the best way I can be of assistance to you is to comment on the summary at the end of your report:

"1. The Congress should not pass any legislation which will have the net effect of delaying for a long interval the establishment of some central agency to handle the management and ultimate disposal of Government-owned surplus property.

"2. The Congress should immediately pass adequate legislation creating such a central agency."

I cannot plead too strongly for the immediate attention of Congress to the above. There are already numerous bills before Congress offering partial but no complete solution to the problem. They have the effect of dispersing legislative control and of creating confusion. They will, in effect, place Congress in the position of handling the details of a major problem, which they are not equipped to do, and of overlooking or passing up entirely their obligation to lay down a firm policy on a question of major national importance.

This whole problem, if it is to be administered properly, must be handled by a central agency, properly and thoroughly instructed by Congress with regard to the fundamental rules for dealing with the problem. Any attempt to deal with specific properties or commodities will only defeat attainment of this objective.

In creating this agency, I believe it of utmost importance that it should stand alone, should have no connection with any existing agencies or departments, and should look directly to Congress for its operating funds.

The legislation creating this agency should clearly specify that all executives in the agency must be men with actual and successful experience in the fields of business concerned:

"3. The Congress should provide the agency thus created with a specific declaration of policy to govern its actions which will provide the maximum degree of protection and encouragement:

"(a) Manufacturers now in business.

"(b) Distribution firms now in business.

"(c) Returning servicemen.

"(d) Persons currently employed in all lines of industry.

"(e) The taxpaying group."

Unless this point is more clearly and more forcefully delineated, I do not believe the desired objective will be attained by the agency.

It is necessary to protect manufacturers now in business. It is also an equal obligation to offer protection to legitimate manufacturers who will normally be expected to engage in business after the war. The same point holds true of distribution firms because in the normal state of legitimate business, with equal opportunity for all, new firms are continually being formed and old firms are being liquidated.

Instead of guaranteeing protection to firms now in business, would it not be far better to guarantee to the citizenry of this Nation that there will be no interference with the normal and legitimate course of business? Should not the Congress assure the investor or entrepreneur that he can engage in business without the fear that the Government will wipe out his capital overnight by dumping valuable property at ridiculous prices, in the lap of this competitors?

The obligation due all groups under item 3 can best be discharged by a guaranty not to disturb normal business channels. The manufacturer should solve his own problem with and through the agency. The distributors likewise. Returning servicemen will get their best opportunity to resume their civilian status through the guaranty of equal opportunity whether or not they become identified with the handling of surplus Government property, as will others who for sound reasons are not in the armed services.

Last and very important is the taxpaying group. When Government property is dumped on the market it is the taxpayer who is most seriously affected. The enormous profits made by a small group of speculators in surplus goods will come directly out of his pocket. His greatest loss, however, is the loss in tax revenue to the Government by the diversion of these goods from trade channels. If a surplus of $75,000,000,000 is dumped at prices comparable to evidence presented to your committee, hardly $15,000,000,000 will be realized by the Government. At resale values, the portion resold to consumers would scarcely produce more than $25,000,000,000 of taxable business. On the other hand, if this surplus is channeled back through primary business fields at proper values, it should produce by the time it reaches the consumer a gross business of at least $150,000,000,000, plus employment opportunities for hundreds of thousands of citizens.

The program devised by businessmen which is being widely advocated outlines the solution of the surplus-commodity question as follows:

"1. The Congress should create a body which will take over and dispose of all surplus Government property whether from military or Government stocks.

"2. This body is to be administered by experienced businessmen, and its cost of operation provided by separate annual appropriations.

"3. This body will dispose of its surplus supplies according to the following formula:

"(a) In the event the Congress should approve rehabilitation or like aid to other countries via Lend-Lease or similar agencies, these surplus supplies must first be disposed of through this channel.

"(b) Any supplies not disposed of through (a) must next be channeled back to the producing unit at a fair cost which will permit reconditioning when necessary and allow the supplies to enter normal trade channels at normal prices and profits.

"(c) Any supplies not disposed of through (a) and (b) are to be sold to the highest bidder after proper notice at a price not less than the current market value less 10 percent."

I hope this letter has not been too long—it is impossible to discuss it at shorter length—and if the thoughts expressed are helpful, I will be greatly pleased.

Respectfully yours,

BENTLEY-GRAY DRY GOODS CO.,
C. A. McKAY.

Spread of Russian Influence in Post-War Europe Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Sunday Star of November 21, 1943:

SPREAD OF RUSSIAN INFLUENCE IN POST-WAR EUROPE FORECAST

(By Constantine Brown)

More than 3 weeks have elapsed since the world learned of the Moscow agreements—and the news of the pacts have been described as the most momentous since the start of the war.

In this cooling-off period the various agreements signed in the Soviet capital have been carefully examined along with Secretary Hull's assurance that there were no "secret" understandings. They provide comfort to us from the military point of view and for the immediate future. But they suggest many questions for which only the future can provide an answer. The nature of these questions should be examined, and to do so does not detract from the value of the Moscow Conference.

America's neutrality ended in March 1941, when Congress passed the Lease-Lend Act empowering the President to lease-lend or give to the nations opposing aggression all they needed to bring their fight to a successful conclusion.

At that time we regarded as the foes of democracy all the nations fighting the countries which at least on the surface had subscribed to preserve democratic principles. These four nations were Germany, Italy, Japan, and Russia. By some unfortunate trick of fate the Russians, who today are fighting more brilliantly than any other nation to destroy Hitlerism, were on the side of our enemies, and we have to be thankful that Hitler was so blinded that he decided to turn against Premier Stalin, the leader of his most powerful associate in the early days of the war.

HAD FEARED PEACE MOVE

For several months prior to the Moscow Conference of the representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia, there had been discussion in Washington and London of the possibility that the Russians might make a separate peace with the Germans if the Germans agreed to certain terms which were said to include the surrender of all occupied territories as far as the Russian-German border of 1941 was concerned and the expulsion of Hitler and his Nazi gang from control of German affairs.

It is impossible to ascertain how well founded this possibility was. It was, at least, a possible contingency which required study. We do not know whether this contingency was supported by any actual intentions in that field by the Russians. Until the history of the war is written many years hence we shall remain in the dark as far as this phase is concerned.

But the fact remains that the question was seriously discussed by the American and British leaders at various meetings and it was decided to hold the Moscow meeting to learn what was going on and to get Russia's point of view on this and other matters in connection with the war and the peace which will follow the war.

At any rate, the conversations, superintended by Premier-Marshal Stalin, ended with a complete agreement on a point of supreme importance to us—the Russians will continue to fight until the unconditional surrender of the Nazis. Whether their continuation in the war will be predicated on an Allied offensive across the channel next spring is not yet clear. It is assumed that the promise for such an offensive has been reiterated in Moscow.

The Russian press, which is the best mouthpiece for the Soviet Government, has ceased its daily demands for an offensive and is now recognizing that the air activities of the Allied air forces in the west and the operations of our forces in Italy are a valuable contribution to final victory in Europe.

SOME OF THE QUESTIONS

The rest of the agreements reached in Moscow were taken at their face value. They are highly encouraging, although they are silent on a great many things we would like to know. We have, for instance, given expression more than once to the thought that the smaller nations, whose independence has been destroyed by the totalitarians that their political and territorial sovereignty will be safeguarded. How much will a new working alliance with Russia change our views on the self-determination of the smaller nations?

No news has yet come out of Moscow as to what will happen to all those kingdoms and republics which have been in the democratic camp since 1939. We saw one document whereby Austria, which was occupied by a Nazi military force in 1939 and compelled to hold a plebiscite indorsing her union with the Reich, was again considered an independent state.

The State Department had officially recognized the obliteration of that small country. It is only just that this recognition should now be withdrawn and Austria re-created. But there are three Baltic republics which suffered the same fate in 1940.

Unfortunately, our present associate, Russia, was involved in the disappearance of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Their representatives are still officially recognized by the United States. Nothing was said about their future except that some time ago the Moscow press pointed out that they were as much a part of the Soviet as California or Alaska is a part of the United States.

We do not know of the post-war plans for Poland and Yugoslavia, two minor Allies who have been subjected to violent aggression—one from Russia and Germany, the other from Germany and Italy and their satellites.

Territorially they may not have to suffer much. Poland may not even resent a small territorial amputation. But politically we see beyond a shadow of a doubt that they may be swallowed in the Russian orbit. There is a Polish Government in Moscow. It is in full ideological sympathy with the Moscow government which created it. There is little doubt that since the Russians will reach Poland long before ourselves, the Polish Government at Moscow will be given preference to the Polish Government-in-exile in London.

MOSCOW FAVORS TITO

In Yugoslavia the newly created Communist force, the Partisans, commanded by a

veteran Communist revolutionary, Drug Tito, is believed slated to become the guiding force of the future Yugoslav state, whatever that may be.

Moscow regards as a traitor Gen. Draja Mihailovich, the representative of the King of Yugoslavia who decided to accept a hopeless fight against the Nazis merely because he had received formal assurances from President Roosevelt that he risked only a temporary defeat and that his country would be reinstated after the defeat of the Nazis.

The Yugoslavs in exile read in this a very definite sign that when the Nazis are crushed the political orientation of their country will be directed from Moscow and will be intrusted to the same men who are now fighting King Peter's legions.

Reports from London now reaching Washington say that among the questions discussed at Moscow was what might be done to give Russia access to the warm seas of the Mediterranean, and that in all probability the question of the straits—the connecting link between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea—has been settled in a manner pleasing to the Soviet.

It is only proper that Russia should have an outlet to the Mediterranean. She may even make a satisfactory arrangement with Britain regarding her access to the Indian Ocean through the Persian Gulf.

PRESSURE ON DE GAULLE

The Moscow agreements have resulted in a tremendous increase in Russia's prestige throughout Europe. The Communists, representing the French underground, are now attempting to dictate to Gen. Charles de Gaulle the policies he must follow. Their demands, which at present are confined principally to obtaining for one of their ranks the vital post of commissioner for propaganda at Algiers, will soon become more exacting.

Either General de Gaulle will have to go along with his Communists or he will have to suffer the fate of his colleague, Gen. Henri Giraud. And General de Gaule is too smart a politician to stick his neck out. He is bound to recognize the supreme authority of Moscow either now or after France has been liberated.

So great has the prestige of Russia become that any early ending of the war—with an Allied victory—would make it probable that a very large part of Europe from Pas-de-Calais to the Urals would come under the Soviets' zone of influence.

Nowadays political supremacy also means an economic dictatorship. Russia is fighting bravely alongside the Allies. Our political views are no more obnoxious to her than her political system is obnoxious to us. But at no time has Russia indicated that she is willing or finds it advantageous to do away with its totalitarian form of economic life.

Russia has made tremendous strides under her economic totalitarianism, which is not much different from that of the Germans or the Japanese. Economic totalitarianism means that the government is the principal producer and employer, the raw materials produced in a totalitarian state are at the disposal of industry to produce whatever is needed.

PRIVATE INITIATIVE DISAPPEARS

A government cannot go bankrupt commercially. Hence, a totalitarian government can undersell anybody else in the world without its people suffering any disturbing consequences. There are no strikes, no wage and price arguments. Everybody works for one employer—the state—and private initiative must necessarily disappear.

This system works well in some countries and there is no reason why it shall not continue to work well in them. But in other countries such the United States, which owes its progress to the initiative of individuals and where, in spite of its many drawbacks, individualistic economics have not been a failure, it is doubtful that economic totalitarianism would be accepted.

So long as totalitarianism was an isolated form of economics there were only insignificant repercussions in our own system, which is now described by some as antiquated.

But a Europe under the wing of the Soviet Union must follow the pattern of its chief protector and necessarily is bound to become as totalitarian as the Soviets are. The principal benefits of political supremacy invariably are translated into economic advantages. There is no question in the minds of those who look without bias to the future that Europe within a short time after her liberation from the fangs of the German system will by necessity embrace the Russian form of totalitarianism.

Europe is no mean competitor. She has skilled workmen, fine engineers and almost everything she needs to expand economically, provided there are no conflicts or wars. Under the totalitarian system Europe can produce goods far cheaper than the country with an individualist economy.

SERIOUS PROBLEMS AHEAD

Once tariff barriers are broken down between the various European states and the raw materials produced by one are available to the other without nationalistic restrictions, some American economists venture to say that Europe will be able in less than a quarter of a century to excel our own production.

Her production eventually will more than suffice for her own needs. A totalitarian and well-disciplined Europe will then seek economic expansion and a head-on clash with our American economy will appear inevitable. What the consequences will be, it is difficult to forecast.

The Moscow agreements have given us immediate security. We know that the Russians will fight until the Nazis are beaten. They have signed a document to that effect and to doubt their signature would mean losing faith in all treaties. Our leaders say emphatically that we must not do so.

But the Moscow agreements have increased the prestige of Russia throughout Europe to such an extent that a brand-new set of problems, not anticipated in the beginning, are taking shape. The good thing about the Moscow Conference is that it seems to have laid the framework for a rational and friendly approach to the solution of these problems.

The Late Honorable W. Warren Barbour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and personally grieved at the sudden passing of the senior Senator from New Jersey, Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, a friend and counselor to the entire New Jersey delegation in the House. WARREN BARBOUR was a servant of the people, who had given most of life in a place of trust and honor. His love of the United States Senate is attested by his return to it after a break in his service.

As a follower of sports I like to think of him still as the champion. He was amateur heavyweight champion at the age of 22. And while he gave up his ring career, he still remained a champion among men who love a fighter. Yet, with his virile strength, this rugged, stalwart man, had a tenderness and gentleness much appreciated by those of us who had the good fortune to know him intimately.

That strength enabled him to continue in action till the end. He fell a victim in the ranks, with his armor on, and is gone from us, but in the language of the poet:

No; I cannot and I will not say
That he is dead.
He is just away!
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,
He has entered into that unknown land,
And left us dreaming, how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.
And you, O you, who the wildest yearn
For the old-time step and the glad return;
Think of him, passing on as fair in the love
Of there, as the love of here.
Think of him still as the same, I say.
He is not dead, he's just away.

The Thirty-sixth Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story by Mr. Relman Morin, of the Associated Press:

TEXANS ARE REVEALED AS MEN WHO BROKE DEFENSES AT SALERNO

(By Relman Morin)

WITH THE AMERICAN FIFTH ARMY IN ITALY, November 25.—There is another star in the flag of Texas today.

It was emblazoned there the morning of September 9, when the Fifth Army landed on the shores of Italy. The first troops to hit the beach that thunderous morning wore T patches on their shoulders. The letter T stood for Texas and the patch for the Thirty-sixth Division.

The Germans have come to know well the men of the Thirty-sixth.

The division was identified officially yesterday. Now the story of the Thirty-sixth can be told, and nowhere in the military history of the United States is there a finer one.

It was an untried division—untried in the sense that it never had been in combat.

GIVEN SPECIAL TRAINING

Throughout the Army it was known as a "hot" outfit, however. It had distinguished itself time and time again in maneuvers. As a result, it had been given special training for amphibious operations. Originally it had been slated for a major role in the north African landing, but through a change in plans it was held back for something bigger.

The Thirty-sixth was famous before it went into action. But it still was untried, and there is no trial like battle.

It was given a key mission in the invasion of Italy. If you asked its officers why this green division was entrusted with so important an assignment they replied unblushingly, "Because it's a Texas division."

The division brought a Lone Star flag with it and carried it into battle. In the standard there is a parchment bearing a copy of Colonel Travis' last message from the Alamo. Every man in the division, including those not natives of Texas, can repeat it by heart.

LANDED AT SALERNO

The Thirty-sixth came ashore in the Gulf of Salerno at dawn September 9. The defenses of the beaches were well constructed and German troops were manning them. The surrender of Italy had been announced the night before. But days before the Sixteenth Panzer Division had moved into position on these particular beaches. They were ready and waiting.

The Thirty-sixth hit hard, but it hit a strong wall. The first assault wave was pinned down by machine-gun fire. The second and third waded ashore through a hail of bullets and shells. It looked for a time as though none of the three waves would be able to breach the German shore defenses.

Finally the division broke through. For sheer courage in the face of withering fire, their attack at that moment rivals the greatest actions of American troops in any of our wars.

Their first objective was a railroad line about 1,000 yards from shore and once off the beach they roared straight across fields through some marshlands until they reached it.

Then came the first of two critical moments in the establishment of the beachhead.

PASSES MACHINE GUNS

The Thirty-sixth swept right past and around a cluster of machine guns and a few strong points which prudently remained silent during the charge of the first Texas elements.

The succeeding waves were caught in German fire when they tried to come up to the railroad. At the same time German artillery in well-chosen sites in the hills a few miles back began shelling the beach.

For perhaps a half hour then the battle hung in the balance.

At this moment the commanding general and his staff waded through the surf, crossed the beach, and made their way through the hottest part of the action up to the railroad, where the general took personal command of the action, his presence in the thick of the battle having an electric effect.

Two staff officers were in the Thirty-sixth in the last war. Lt. Col. Albert B. Crowther, San Antonio, Tex., was a sergeant then and Lt. Col. William H. Martin, Houston, Tex., was a lieutenant.

They will tell you that the Gulf of Salerno that morning compared with the worst moments of the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

Our New Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portsmouth (N. H.) Herald of November 20, 1943:

OUR NEW PLATFORM

Editorial platforms, like political platforms, require renovations and repairs from time to time. Our former platform, written in the days when victory (although we had faith it was attainable) was far, far away, now needs modernization.

Today we know victory is a certainty, and while the hour may not be in sight, we know that we are on the right road. Our problem now, therefore, is not one of victory alone; but one of complete victory without appeasement, so that this war will be really decisive, with all dictators crushed and all would-be dictators forever discouraged.

As much as we all want the war to end soon, we have only postponed the day of reckoning, if it ends before decisive victory, for then our children, or their children, will have to do again what we could and should have done.

The second point in our platform is not only for a just and lasting peace, for which we have always hoped; but for a peace built around a United Nations—nations united as closely and as effectively as our United States. The start has been made in the Moscow pact; we must not let the defeatists or politicians "sell us down the river."

There are many persons, far too many, who take the attitude that this war will not settle anything—that a third World War is inevitable. The same thing, they say, will happen after this war that happened after the last one—the peace will be manipulated and America, as usual, will be left paying the bills.

If we admit this attitude, it is to say that we Americans are stupid, that we cannot learn from experience, and that we have to go on repeating our mistakes. Perhaps we may fail to learn; but such failure is inescapable if we accept this defeatist philisophy. Our United States was built and made great by men who refused to accept things as impossible; by men who believed things could be done and, lo, they were done because of their belief. We of this generation can do no less than they; and should we fail, our failure will be an inspiration to others to try again. The acceptance of a defeatist attitude gives to future generations only the hopelessness of a futile existence.

The third point in our platform concerns our own community, the place where we live and die, work and play, find sorrow or happiness. Here at home we must prepare for peace just as intensively as we prepared for war, perhaps even more intensively, since it will be a hard job without the emotions of war to spur us on. If we do not lay our plans in advance, chance circumstance will make them for us; and there is little probability that they will be to our liking.

The fourth and final point in our platform asks that Portsmouth citizens practice the unity that all intelligent persons want for their states and nations. We must "live what we preach"; we must set the example in our own municipality. We must take an active part in community affairs, not only to create our post-war plans, but to see that they are carried out.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—in Portsmouth or in the universe.

Last Defense Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I enclose as part of my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times. It follows:

LAST DEFENSE AGAINST INFLATION

If the American Army, assigned to advance from the Garigalono and Sangro River lines in Italy, should suddenly turn their backs on the enemy and refuse to hold the line, the Nation would be horrified, and probably Congress alone would find words with which adequately to denounce the surrender.

But who will find words with which to denounce the predicted surrender of Congress on the "hold the line" front against inflation? If Congress votes against subsidies, it will be turning its back upon the enemy just as surely as would an American army in the field. It will be yielding the last remaining defense against skyrocketing prices, which would impoverish more than 33,000,000 Americans, who, so far, have either received no increase in their pay or no increase equal to that in the cost of living.

In all the thousands of words passionately uttered in Congress to justify the contemplated surrender to inflation these Congressmen have not been able to produce one creditable argument to support such a sell-out. In fact, the weakness of their position stands starkly exposed in their own efforts at self-justification. The administration by yielding to John L. Lewis in the coal strike breached the dam against inflation, they say. So they propose to demolish the dam outright and let the tumultuous waters flow where they will. But Congress cannot pass the responsibility. This is the field that Congress has been assigned to defend in the protection of the home front.

Some Congressmen have attempted to convey to the public the impression that the battle against inflation is largely lost. They say that Lewis' successful assault against the Little Steel formula will be followed by irresistible demands from all the other labor unions. This, they say, spells the end of all restraints on wages, and, that in the face of such rising costs, farm prices should be permitted to seek their own levels.

Here is an irresponsible rush to embrace disaster. It does not follow that because Lewis has broken the Little Steel formula a wholesale surrender on the wage front must be made. Congress, by retaining subsidies, can halt this trend. It can pull it up short. It can do its own duty without deference to the administration. It can, by its own example, make it impossible for the administration to yield again. But if it rejects subsidies, it will destroy every last brake on wage and price demands. It will catapult the Nation into a true economic crisis, immeasurably increasing the cost of this war to every last American in the country.

Subsidies do not represent an abandonment of the farmer. They represent a $750,000,000 outlay by the Nation to preserve price ceilings on essential food and, at the same time, compensate the farmer for his increased costs. Subsidies are not perfect, they are difficult to administer, they expand bureaucracy, and they extend a dangerous principle of Government underwriting. But after all of these things have been said, subsidies will not cost the Nation what a smashing of the last defense against inflation would most certainly cost us.

Congress, so long shamefully compliant in the demands of the farm bloc, has had no answer to the President's challenge that, if it does not like subsidies, it should present another plan that will protect the Nation. It, therefore, has the choice, either of retaining subsidies or of subjecting the country to utter planlessness on the home front at the dictates of pressure groups. If it does this latter thing, it will prove itself more despicable and bankrupt even than the notorious French

Chamber of Deputies which played its political fiddle while France plunged into disaster. Even the French Legislature, however, was able to furnish some modicum of leadership and to make some political sacrifices at the eleventh hour of France's doom.

If the United States Congress repeals subsidies, it will be playing politics as usual 2 years after this country entered this war for national survival.

Delaware Has Absentee Voting Law—Correction of the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE D. WILLEY
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call attention to a statement appearing on page 9630 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 17 to the effect that the State of Delaware is one of two States having no absentee voting law. The statement is a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] whose source of information was evidently not possessed of the latest information.

An enabling constitutional amendment was enacted in the early days of the 1943 session of the Delaware General Assembly. After such enactment an absentee voting law was passed and approved on April 15, 1943. Under the law all absent qualified electors of the State, whether absent because of public service, business, sickness, or physical disability who are unable to appear at the regular polling place, are permitted to cast an absentee ballot under proper restrictions and safeguards.

Bowles Amplifies Inflation Remarks at Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Chester Bowles, published in the Washington Sunday Star of November 21, 1943:

BOWLES AMPLIFIES INFLATION REMARKS AT PRESS CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Your newspaper, like many another, is serving the public well every day by bringing to their attention the important subjects of the day. I have a great deal of respect for the Evening Star and the job it does day in and day out.

However, I was very much disturbed to read the story regarding my press conference in this afternoon's edition. This story bore the headline, " 'Subsidies or nothing' is O. P. A. anti-inflation plan, Bowles says," and the subhead, "Director declares price administration has no secondary line of defense."

Quite frankly I think it puts an implication on my statement which is completely unwarranted. It is misleading. It implies that O. P. A. will throw in the sponge. The story leaves the impression that O. P. A. threatens to give up its efforts to control prices if Congress votes against subsidies.

It seems to me important that the public understand the position of this agency.

The point I thought I had made was that there cannot be a new stable line in price ceilings. Once the present line breaks and increases start, there is bound to develop a series of new pressures, one leading to others, which increases costs, first here then there. If you raise 1 man's prices you raise the cost of 10 others. That is why I said:

"You can't throw out subsidies and still say you are going to hold the line on living costs."

Regardless of the outcome on the subsidy issue, the task of controlling prices obviously remains. If the limited use of subsidies is discontinued, we shall make every effort to keep increases to the very minimum. We will be just as determined to do our part in stabilizing prices for the American family and costs for American business.

As I have often stated, the question of continuing the present cost-of-living program, with the limited use of subsidies, is a policy matter to be decided by Congress. Congress is our board of directors. Whatever its decision, we shall hold to our determination to keep prices as stable as possible, within the limits of the law.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

(The story referred to by Mr. Bowles was an Associated Press story appearing in the late editions of the Star yesterday. After a study of a transcript of Mr. Bowles' press conference, the Star finds no reason for correction but is publishing the above letter to allow the Price Administrator to clarify and amplify his remarks.)

First Meeting of Congress in Washington 143 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to an article in the Sunday Star of November 21, 1943, relating to the first meeting of Congress in Washington by my friend, Dr. Will P. Kennedy of the Star staff, which I feel, because of its historical significance, is of interest to every Member of Congress and others, and therefore should have its proper place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of its value as a document in these days when not too much attention is paid to the past, or to experience, or to the lessons to be learned therefrom.

The article follows:

FIRST MEETING OF CONGRESS IN WASHINGTON 143 YEARS AGO TODAY

(By Will P. Kennedy)

It was 143 years ago today that Congress first met in Washington—for the second session of the Sixth Congress. The following day President John Adams met both Houses in the Senate Chamber (now occupied by the law library of Congress) in what has been known throughout the years as the Supreme Court section.

The President in personally addressing Congress admonished them regarding the "important trust" vested in them by the Constitution—"local powers over the District of Columbia. You will consider it as the Capital of a great nation," he said, "advancing with unexampled rapidity in arts, in commerce, in wealth, and in population, and possessing within itself those resources which, if not thrown away or lamentably misdirected, will secure to it a long course of prosperity and self-government." Both Senate and House responded fittingly.

Senator John E. Howard, former Governor of Maryland, who had been a Member of the Continental Congress and been voted a medal and thanks by Congress for gallantry in the Revolution at Cowpens, was offered a seat in the Cabinet by Washington and a commission as brigadier general in the expected war with France, was President pro tempore of the Senate. Theodore Sedgwick, of Massachusetts, who had previously been President pro tempore of the Senate, and had served in the Continental Congress, was Speaker of the House.

THE NOVEMBER 21 QUORUM

Although November 17 had been fixed as the date for the opening of Congress in the new Federal city, a quorum of neither House was present on that date. The House had a quorum the next day but the Senate could not muster a quorum until November 21. There were then 106 House Members, 54 Federals, and 52 Republicans; and 32 in the Senate, 19 Federals and 13 Republicans.

For more than a month meetings had been held by a citizens' committee in Little Hotel, on the north side of F Street, 75 feet east of Fifteenth Street, which had been built by James Hoban, architect of the White House and superintendent of construction work on the Capitol.

The Washington Federalist of October 16, 1800, states the first of these meetings was called to devise a method of expressing their joy at the meeting of the grand council of the Nation. A procession was agreed upon and a committee appointed to cooperate with similar committees for Georgetown and Alexandria. The procession was to form in front of the Little Hotel on November 22 to escort the President to the Capitol.

THE PRESIDENT'S PALACE

President Adams had come to the new Federal Territory on November 1—and proceeded at once to the only partially finished President's Palace, which has been the home of all of his successors. Mrs. Thornton, wife of Dr. William Thornton, Architect of the Capitol, wrote in her diary on that date: "The President, with his secretary, Mr. Shaw, passed by in his chariot and four, no retinue, only one servant on horseback."

Mrs. Adams arrived on November 16. Her letter to her daughter, Mrs. Smith, 5 days later, is the principal contemporary account, and expressed the opinion that the grand scale of the mansion was not very well proportioned to the President's salary. Not a single apartment was finished. There was a serious shortage of firewood, not a bell in the house, and she used the unfinished East Room, the state reception room, to hang the family washing.

But the civic procession to the Capitol was not held. Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury, writing to his wife on December 4, said he "was told that some dispute respecting the appointment of a master of ceremonies prevented a display of the citizens."

The weather may have had something to do about that because the Intelligencer of November 21, 1900, records that there was a very unusual fall of snow—about 3 inches. The annals of Congress disclose, however, that

a congratulatory letter from sundry inhabitants of the District of Columbia was presented in the House. Also, a song was written for the occasion emphasizing that the "central spot" should be maintained for all future meetings of Congress.

PERMANENT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

The President referred to the moving of the Government to its new permanent seat, as follows, as recorded in the annals of Congress: "I congratulate the people of the United States on the assembling of Congress at the permanent seat of their Government; and I congratulate you gentlemen on the prospect of a residence not to be exchanged. It would be unbecoming the representatives of this Nation to assemble for the first time in this solemn temple without looking up to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and imploring His blessing.

"It is with you, gentlemen, to consider whether the local powers over the District of Columbia, vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States, shall be immediately exercised. If, in your opinion, this important trust ought now to be executed, you cannot fail, while performing it, to take into view the future probable situation of the Territory, for the happiness of which you are about to provide.

"You will consider it as the Capital of a great Nation advancing with unexampled rapidity in arts, in commerce, in wealth, and in population, and possessing within itself those resources, which, if not thrown away, or lamentably misdirected, will secure to it a long course of prosperity and self-government."

THE CAPITAL OF AMERICA

The Senate in its reply, said: "We meet you, sir, and the other branch of the National Legislature, in the city which is honored by the name of our late hero and sage, the illustrious Washington, with sensations and emotions which exceed our power of description."

The reply of the House to the President's address was: "The final establishment of the seat of National Government, which has now taken place in the District of Columbia, is an event of no small importance in the political transactions of our country. Nor can we on this occasion omit to express a hope that the spirit which animated the great founder of this city, may descend to future generations; and that the wisdom, magnanimity, and steadiness which marked the events of his public life may be imitated in all succeeding ages. A consideration of those powers which have been vested in Congress over the District of Columbia will not escape our attention; nor shall we forget that, in exercising those powers, a regard must be had to those events which will necessarily attend the Capital of America."

Vice President Jefferson did not arrive in the new Capital until November 27, according to the Intelligencer. He had rooms in the boarding house of Conrad and McMunn, who leased the house occupied by Thomas Law at the northwest corner of New Jersey Avenue and C Street SE. This site is now occupied by the New House Office Building. Mr. Law removed to a dwelling on Greenleaf Point. That corner house was occupied by Members of Congress, while an adjoining house, under the same lease, was for the accommodation of travelers and the usual patrons of a tavern. These were the properties occupied by the Vendome and Congress Hall Hotels until the New House Office Building was erected, which for many years had as their chief patrons Members of Congress.

Jefferson, in addition to his bedroom, enjoyed the distinction unusual in the then extent of accommodations in the new city of having also a parlor or reception room. He ate at the common table with some 30 other occupants of the house.

The Speaker of the House, Theodore Sedgwick, lived across the street, in another congressional mess in the house on the northeast corner of New Jersey Avenue and C Street, which was also owned by Thomas Law but leased to Thomas W. Peacock. In recognition of the dignity of his office, Speaker Sedgwick was allowed a room by himself, while other Members were obliged to room in pairs.

JEFFERSON ELECTED PRESIDENT

Three months after Congress first met in Washington, Jefferson was elected President most dramatically on February 17, 1801, in the first contest ever thrown into the House for decision, in the House Chamber which is now occupied (in part) by the Senate disbursing office and a few years ago by the Clerk of the Supreme Court.

After 6 days and nights of balloting, on the thirty-sixth ballot, Representative Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, cast the single deciding vote that made Jefferson President, consummating the will of the people.

It was Jefferson's most bitter personal and political enemies—John Marshall "of the Forests," later known as the Great Expounder of the Constitution, who simultaneously was Adam's Secretary of State, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and substituted for the President during the closing months of his administration, and Alexander Hamilton, Federalist leader and strategist, who made Jefferson's election possible.

CITY'S FIRST INAUGURAL

Then about 2 weeks later Jefferson was inaugurated President, the first inaugural ceremony held in Washington. Early on the morning of March 4, President Adams entered his carriage and started for his home in Braintree, Mass., but before he had passed out of the District he heard the thunder of a salute by the Washington artillery, ushering in the ceremonies for his successor.

About 10 o'clock the Alexandria company of riflemen joined the Washington artillery company and paraded in front of the incoming President's boarding house. Attended by a number of leading citizens and political advisers, Jefferson, according to the Aurora, contrary to the familiar story that he hitched his horse to the Capitol fence—walked the couple of blocks to the Capitol—a man afoot, dreamer and theorist, quietly ushering in that day a more lasting revolution than could a cavalcade of horsemen.

The Government by old colonial aristocracy was routed forever by his peaceful revolution. His entrance to the Capitol was heralded by an artillery volley. He entered the Senate Chamber in the basement, attended by the heads of the executive departments and the marshal, James M. Lingan, according to the journal of executive proceedings of the Senate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

After delivery of his inaugural address Jefferson took the oath of office, closing the ceremonies of an eventful day. The new President democratically walked back to his lodgings, where he continued to live until March 19, when he moved into the White House. Although the mansion was far from finished—the principal stairway had not been built, the East Room and most of the upstairs rooms had not been plastered—Jefferson promptly undertook to perform what he conceived to be the social duties of his office. Each day he had a company at dinner, limited to 12.

Jefferson made his first District appointments on March 16—a list of justices of the peace. He explained that such nomination by his predecessor "having been thought too numerous," he reduced the number for Washington County from 23 to 14 and "to one other, to wit, Thomas Corcoran" and for Alexandria County from 19 to 11. Jefferson appointed as marshal, Daniel Carroll Brent, a nephew of Daniel Carroll, the Commissioner; as collector of the port of Georgetown, John Oakley, and as attorney for the District, John Thompson Mason, instead of Thomas Swann.

Subsidizing the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to the attention of the House an excellent editorial appearing in the Waukegan News-Sun, Friday, November 19, 1943, in opposition to Senator BANKHEAD'S bill. This splendid editorial under the heading "Subsidizing the press," is as follows:

SUBSIDIZING THE PRESS

The Senate has passed Senator BANKHEAD'S bill to have the Government spend between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000 to purchase newspaper advertising space, in dailies, weeklies, semiweeklies and triweeklies, for the sale of bonds, notes, and other obligations of the United States.

Although those in the Senate favoring the bill disavow it, the News-Sun feels that such a measure is an attempt to subsidize the Nation's newspapers, and vigorously opposes any such legislation. The News-Sun does not feel that there is a need for such an expenditure on the part of the Government. Furthermore, it, in common with many other of the country's daily newspapers, does not want to be obligated to some politician for advertising.

The plan may appear feasible and practical, and it might be, if a nonpolitical group of advertising specialists was set up to administer the fund, but it would only be a matter of time before administration Senators and Congressmen would try to use allocations for advertising as a club over the heads of newspaper publishers who refuse to do their bidding. Such a situation is unthinkable, and if the time ever comes when it does prevail the American public will suffer, for then the press will have lost its freedom. A free press is the birthright of American citizens and any attempt to indirectly undermine it, whether by subsidized advertising or any other method, should be resisted.

The newspapers carried a large volume of War bond advertising during the recent campaigns, but at no cost to the Government. The advertising was sponsored by business and industrial concerns and individuals and the campaigns all were unqualified successes, so why change?

Representative CANNON, a Missouri Democrat, announces that a personal poll showed an overwhelming majority of the House in favor of the Government-financed advertising program and that the lower House would follow the Senate's lead and pass the bill. Naturally, the pork barrelers in the House and Senate, and they are legion, favor the bill. It would give them a chance to try to dictate the editorial and news policies of the Nation's press. Recalcitrant editors and publishers would be punished by withholding advertising. No thanks, we aren't having any of this "pork."

Resolution of League of Iowa Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the League of Iowa Municipalities at a meeting in Iowa City, November 5, 1943, expressed interest in legislation proposing post-war planning for road building and especially favoring H. R. 2426, but urge that the allocation of funds be left in the hands of the State highway commissions. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein the following resolution which was unanimously adopted by the league:

Be it resolved by the trustees of the League of Iowa Municipalities:

1. We sincerely appreciate and approve the growing sentiment in the Congress of the United States in favor of allocating definite percentages or amounts of any Federal appropriations for highway purposes to the cities and towns, in order that the cities and towns may receive their just share of such funds, and thereby be able to maintain the highways within their limits comparable with the highways outside cities and towns.

2. We appreciate and approve the general principles of the plan set out in H. R. 2426, as formulated by the National Association of State highway commissioners, and urge our Senators and Representatives to favor the principle of this bill, and thereby assure the cities and towns their share of any Federal appropriations for highway improvements or maintenance.

3. We call attention to the fact that most of the money appropriated for the municipalities in this bill, as it now stands, is allocated to cities of over 10,000 population, but that any money appropriated for municipalities should be appropriated for the benefit of all of the cities and towns in the State, and that, due to the fact that conditions vary in the different States, we urge that the allocation of any money to any State be left in the hands of the State highway commission to be allocated in their judgment to any and all of the cities and towns in that State.

4. That the secretary is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives from Iowa in the Congress of the United States.

Declining Cotton Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas News November 11, 1943. I hope the authorities of the A. A. A. will not continue to mention cotton goals, which by implication would indicate that we still have in effect a program of restriction, but instead will represent to our cotton farmers the truth, and that is that there are to be no quotas on cotton in 1944.

DECLINING COTTON CROPS

The steady decline of cotton in the Texas economy should be a subject of prime importance to every Texas businessman, banker, planter, tenant, or white-collar worker in town or city. Latest statistics show that the Texas cotton crop of 2,825,000 bales is about 600,000 bales below the 10-year average for the period 1932–41. Since these years (excepting 1937) are all acreage-control years, the production figure for the current season assumes even greater significance. Are we going out of cotton? It would seem so.

Even the 1944 crop goals, at last made public officially from college stations A. A. A. headquarters, show decidedly small interest in next season's cotton acreage. Farmers are asked to grow only as much cotton as in 1942 (8,050,000 acres). Compare that with the average of about 17,000,000 acres along about 1924–26. In those days cotton was a major crop, shipped to the corners of the world. Its byproducts, cottonseed cake and meal, were the basis of America's livestock feeding industry. Texas in those days not only furnished its own livestock with all required protein feedstuffs but supplied the great American Midwest and North with supplementary protein feeds, and had enough left to provide Denmark with thousands of tons which enabled that enterprising country to meet England's requirements for butter and cheese.

Look at the sad state into which cotton has fallen in Texas today! Our dairy farmers for lack of feed are forced to sell off their herds, and our ranchmen have to sacrifice tens of thousands of range cattle for want of essential cottonseed cake and meal. No longer does Texas ship its surplus protein feedstuffs to the Corn Belt or to Denmark. Instead, it must beg the Government to ship into this State some 5,500,000 bushels of Illinois, Iowa, or Indiana soybeans, in order to keep our cotton-oil mills busy and to relieve in part our distressing lack of protein feedstuffs. Verily it is high time for the friends of cotton to raise their voices in its behalf.

Woodrow Wilson's Plans and Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTIE W. CARAWAY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter signed by John Park Cravens, published in the Arkansas Gazette, entitled "Says Woodrow Wilson's Plans and Ideals Have Been Reborn." I ask to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE PEOPLE

SAYS WOODROW WILSON'S PLANS AND IDEALS HAVE BEEN REBORN

To the EDITOR of the GAZETTE:

My opinion is that when historians write the history of this great war for survival now being fought, the late Woodrow Wilson will come into his own. Our great republic won World War No. 1 but lost the peace because some of our political leaders would not listen to President Wilson.

This country now is having to fight a much greater war for survival of freedom and democracy, and resolutions acted upon in Congress indicate our present-day statesmen want our country to take an active part in maintaining peace among the nations of the world after the war is ended.

The plans and ideals of Woodrow Wilson for world peace that could not be put into effect due to political opposition in this country have been reborn and today our statesmen are approving them in the same terms and principles.

My opinion is that Woodrow Wilson was one of the greatest philosophers, statesmen, and educators America has ever had. He was a great scholar, a genius, and he did not have the assistance of ghost writers. He wrote his state papers, and I think historians in the future will give more recognition to them than those of any other statesman of this country.

When I was 18 I was editor and publisher of a weekly newspaper in a small Arkansas town. The town, in many respects, was isolated; there was a self-centered community spirit, and practically all of the citizens' interests were at home. You could have walked from my printing plant out of the main circulation of my weekly newspaper within 2 hours. After a few years the automobile, the State highway, and other things changed things in general.

No longer could the town in which I published my newspaper remain isolated and no longer could its citizens live normal lives by living as they had in the past. Isolationism, in every respect, was a thing of gone-by days. Progress of the Nation and the march of civilization brought about this change. So is our great Nation no longer isolated when it comes to the world as a whole.

Woodrow Wilson warned America against isolationism. With men like Congressman BILL FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, on the job at Washington I am sure this Nation at the end of this war will adopt a policy of nonisolationism and be placed in its rightful position as the leader in maintaining peace and righteousness throughout the world. And our war dead will not have died in vain, and Woodrow Wilson, like Gen. Billy Mitchell, will receive the credit due him.

JOHN PARK CRAVENS,
Magazine Age.

Food for French and Belgians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with Senate Resolution 100, published in the New York Herald Tribune of November 17, 1943. The title of the article is "French and Belgians Seeking Food Aid for Homelands Now."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH AND BELGIANS SEEKING FOOD AID FOR HOMELANDS NOW—DELEGATES TO U. N. R. R. A. CONFERENCE FEAR RELIEF AFTER LIBERATIONS WILL BE TOO LATE; DANGER OF AID TO GERMANS DECLARED SLIGHT

(By Dorothy Dunbar Bromley)

ATLANTIC CITY, November 16.—A specter is present as an uninvited guest at the first conference of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, called to consider ways and means of bringing relief to the occupied countries after the liberation. In the thoughts of many delegates, but on the lips of few, is the basic question: What proportion of the starving peoples of the occupied countries, and more especially of the children, will survive the slow but steady march of starvation that will not wait for liberation?

Former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Director of the U. N. R. R. A., was asked at his first press conference whether the question of immediate relief would be considered at the Atlantic City sessions. He replied that the subject was not on the agenda.

Periodically the governments-in-exile representing the countries in greatest need have urged the British Government and the American State Department to approve a plan for immediate relief on a minimum scale, properly controlled. Herve Alphand, second in rank to Jean Monnet in the delegation of the French Committee for National Liberation, said that 2 years ago General De Gaulle asked that dried milk and vitamins be sent through the blockade and distributed to pregnant women, children up to 14 years old, and sick persons in urban centers, except in the departments of La Moselle, Rhin, and Haut-Rhin, which the Germans had taken over completely. He proposed that the International Red Cross, using the good offices of the Swedish and Swiss Red Cross, be made responsible for the distribution. The British said they would study the plan.

PLAN BACKED BY BELGIANS

This plan, now revealed for the first time as having General de Gaulle's sponsorship, was again put before the British 6 months ago, with the concurrence of the Belgian Government-in-exile, by Rene Massigli, acting for the French committee. It met with no greater success than before.

"The last thing our committee—or the people inside France—want to do is to help the Germans, whom they hate more than the devil," Mr. Alphand said, "but we are convinced that a limited and properly controlled distribution confined to the cities could not benefit the Germans. They could not take an equivalent amount of foodstuffs from the cities because it is not there to take."

Mr. Alphand added that he had traveled recently with an agent of the Swedish Red Cross who had distributed supplies in Greece. The Swedish representative reported that the plan was working very well.

Advice from the underground in occupied France leaves no doubt as to the rapidly deteriorating health situation, Mr. Alphand added. It is particularly bad in the large cities and along the Mediterranean. The present ration of food—when obtainable—allows the Frenchman 884 calories a day. Unrationed foods may bring the average up to 1,200 calories. Mr. Alphand said that 2,400 is the normal ration for a man and 3,000 for one who is working. "A diet under 1,600," he said, "means latent starvation."

BELGIANS' PLIGHT WORSE

Belgium is nearer starvation than France. It is the most thickly populated country in Europe, and two-thirds of its 8,000,000 citizens live in cities and industrial areas. Before the war it imported more than half its total food supply, Paul Henri Spaak, Foreign Minister of the Government-in-exile, explained. Mr. Spaak, a Socialist, has been Belgian Foreign Minister since 1936.

"The minimum program, which we and the French Committee have urged the British Government to approve," he said, "calls for the importation into Belgium of only 20,000 tons a month of vitamins and dried milk. This would be a mere drop in the sea—of no interest to the Germans. Yet it might save our children. We have a ship of our own which could transport the supplies from the United States to Lisbon, and from there they could go by rail."

The Belgians and the French have the necessary funds.

Since the beginning of the war, small shipments of fish and vegetable oils have been trickling through from Spain and Portugal to Belgium, in the amount of 20,000 tons a year, enough to add 100 calories daily to the diet of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 children, adolescents, and invalids. The food has been served in canteens in the cities and industrial areas by the Belgian Red Cross and the Belgian winter help fund. The underground reports that none of this food has fallen into Nazi hands.

Belgians remember, Mr. Spaak said, the relief program of the last war, directed by Herbert Hoover, before the United States entered the war, and later by Spanish neutrals. There was a blockade then, as now, yet 11,000,000 tons of food a month, chiefly grains but including some meat and legumes, were imported into Belgium and a few departments in northern France.

Even with these supplies coming in, tuberculosis took a heavy toll in Belgium during the World War and for some years after. Today, there is at least a 60-percent increase in deaths from tuberculosis in urban areas, while the incidence of the disease has been multiplied from three to eight times, depending on the area, according to Mr. Spaak.

Edouard J. Bigwood, former professor of biology at the University of Brussels, now attached to the Ministry of Relief of the Belgian Government in London, is assisting the Foreign Minister as a member of the delegation.

"It should be noted," he said, "that in the last war we did not have a single case in Belgium of what is called starvation edema. Today such cases are appearing."

Belgians who cannot afford to buy in the black market are getting from 900 to 1,200 calories of food a day, while children fed in the canteens are getting from 1,000 to 1,300, it was said. The most the wealthy get is from 1,300 to 1,800. School hours in the populous areas have had to be cut to half a day and attendance is less than 50 percent of normal. Deaths have risen so rapidly that they exceed births by 20,000, whereas before the war Belgium had 50,000 more births than deaths a year.

Taking a realistic view, Mr. Spaak expressed the fear that help will reach Belgium too late—after she is liberated. Asked to comment on the statement made last week before a Senate subcommittee by Howard Kershner, of the American Friends' Service Committee, that the people of the democracies may be so weakened physically that only the Germans will have the strength to organize Europe, Mr. Spaak said this was a logical development to expect.

"Demographically speaking," Mr. Bigwood, who is a population expert, concluded, "if things continue as at present, the Germans, the British and the Russians will emerge, as the only physically strong people in Europe."

Impending Boom in Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the impending boom in farm prices published in the Miami Herald of November 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKETING FARM VALUES BRING FEAR OF BOOM—TRAGEDIES LURK, SAYS SUMMARY—FRENZY OF SILK SHIRT ERA ON WAY BACK

Present skyrocketing of farm-land values threatens a recurrence of the speculative frenzy of World War No. 1, "the greatest economic tragedy to the American farmer in modern times," says Ethyl News, publication of Ethyl Corporation.

Only the common sense of the American farmer, who is today getting out of debt and putting a substantial part of his earnings into the bank and into War bonds, can head off a boom, it is asserted.

"Nation-wide, average farm values are up more than 21 percent since the war began in 1939," the report points out. "Two-thirds of that increase occurred within the last year alone. In some areas, values are up 30, 40, or 50 percent and more.

HIGHEST SINCE 1920

"Farms which during the depression went under the auctioneer's hammer at distress sales today are selling at the highest prices since 1920, and selling fast.

"All this adds up to a mushrooming farm-land boom without equal since World War No. 1. And in that lies the deadly parallel. History is repeating, up to a point. Between 1914 and 1918, farm real-estate values climbed roughly 25 percent.

"That era saw days of $3.50 wheat and $25 silk shirts. Farmers thought their war-expanded incomes would continue indefinitely. And so they bought up land entirely out of proportion to their ability to carry it in more normal times. Farmers bought and bought in a wild speculative frenzy.

"Suddenly, in 1921, the bottom dropped out of the farm boom. As foreign demand for American foodstuffs dried up, farm prices declined 41 percent; cash farm income shrank 38 percent. The land that farmers thought would provide them with unending wealth now turned out to be a huge white elephant because of the mortgage payments that still had to be met despite shrunken incomes. Interest payments which in 1919 took a puny 3 percent of their lush earnings now required more than 8 percent of their reduced income and were hard to meet.

THOUSANDS LOSE HOMES

"Unable to pay their obligations, thousands of farmers lost their homes in bankruptcy and foreclosure proceedings. Hundreds of country banks and other farm investors went to the wall. The result was undoubtedly the greatest economic tragedy to the American farmer in modern times."

At present virtually all peacetime crop controls have been removed from essential commodities, and farmers have been encouraged to grow just as much as they physically can, the report adds.

"As a result, 1943's farm production, it is estimated, will exceed last year's record output by perhaps 3 percent, aided by an improvement in the farmer's labor and machinery problem, plus good growing weather. Larger production means higher income, even an increase over 1942's thumping return of $16,000,000,000.

"Farm prices since 1939 have more than doubled; between 1914 and 1918 they rose slightly more. Farm income has risen from $6,600,000,000 in 1939 to $11,700,000,000 in 1942; during the last war it increased from $6,000,000,000 in 1914, to $10,700,000,000 in 1918.

IMPORTANT DIFFERENCE

"But there are important differences between the farm boom now and then. For one thing, the quickening interest in farm land this time has not been accompanied by an over-all increase in farm mortgage debt thus far. On the contrary, outstanding farm mortgage indebtedness, between 1939 and 1943, declined by more than $70,000,000, to reach the lowest point in 26 years, $6,400,000,000. Farmers in 1942 reduced their mortgage debt by three times the average reduction of the preceding 3 years.

"One factor behind this restraint has been the conservative lending policies of farm credit institutions, while for their part most farmers have been using their increased earnings to get their properties out of debt. Further, farmers have been putting a substantial part of their earnings into the bank and into War bonds.

"Nevertheless the farm land boom is at a critical juncture, and Government officials in Washington are openly disturbed. To head off the boom a number of proposals have been made, involving principally the tightening up of terms of purchase and resale. But, most of all, officials are counting upon the common sense of the American farmer to prevent a recurrence of World War No. 1 tragedy."

Slap Heard Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lee Carson, published in the Washington Post of November 25, 1943:

PATTON'S WIFE OFFERS NO ALIBI FOR "TOUGH PERFECTIONIST"

(By Lee Carson)

Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr., white-haired wife of the general whose slap has been heard around the world, last night offered no alibi for her husband, but asked that the Nation try to understand him as "a tough perfectionist" and "a man fighting furiously for his country."

Both Mrs. Patton and her daughter, Mrs. J. K. Waters, wife of a Tank Corps colonel captured by the Nazis at Kasserine Pass, agreed that the general "will take any punishment without wincing."

"Dad can eat crow when he has to, better than anyone I know," Mrs. Waters said. "I've never known him to pass the buck or bow out or blame anyone else—when he is at fault."

Tough, hard-riding, and bellicose, General Patton's big soft spot is service to his country, the family said. He saw the war coming a long time ago and drove everyone crazy worrying over whether or not he was too old to get in.

Given command of the armored Seventh Division, the Army's most colorful field general was "all tied up, heart and soul, in turning his division into a perfect fighting machine."

His success was amply illustrated during the 39-day Sicilian campaign. Patton personally led his men in battle and "asked nothing of them that he couldn't or would not do himself," Mrs. Patton recalled last night.

"He did a wrong thing—he made a mistake—but perhaps a few people can understand it if they put themselves in his place," his wife said.

The general is "a man who feels deeply," she explained, "and after all those days of seeing his boys blown apart" and then walking down rows of "horribly wounded soldiers—with arms and legs and even faces blown off," the sight of an apparently able-bodied husky man "sitting on a cot in his helmet," probably touched off the dynamite of Patton's personality.

"He has been known to weep at his men's graves—as well as tear their hides off, you know," the family explained.

Mrs. Patton, whose two daughters are married to men in service and whose son, George III, is a cadet at West Point, added, thoughtfully, that "a commanding officer—from a shavetail to a general—is the 'father' of his men and sometimes reacts like one when they disappoint him."

"I think I'm a good mother—but I can remember all too well punishing my children in the heat of disappointment or shock and wishing later I hadn't. In fact I would have given my right hand—not to have given some of those spankings."

Her husband, Mrs. Patton said, undoubtedly felt just like that in this instance. The "deed is done and the mistake made," she continued, "and I'm sure George is sorrier and has punished himself more than anyone could possibly realize."

"I've known George Patton for 31 years, and I've never known him to be deliberately unfair. He's made mistakes—and he's paid for them. This was a big mistake, and he's paying a big price for it."

They expect the Senate to refuse to promote him to the permanent rank of major general and added it will "hurt but not maim him."

Mrs. Patton, the two Patton daughters and son, have had V-mail letters from the general, but in none of them did he mention the fatal day when he slapped a shell-shocked enlisted man while on an inspection tour of an evacuation hospital.

"The first I knew of it I heard on a broadcast a few days ago," Mrs. Patton said, "so actually I know nothing about it at all and shouldn't say anything."

In the last war, General Patton was wounded in action and left to die on the battlefield, but the far-famed Patton guts kept him in there pitching until help came.

"But don't you go to writing any mush about him," his wife said last night. "I won't have it. He wouldn't like it.

"He made a mistake, and it can't be undone; I just hope they won't kick him to death while he's down."

Thanksgiving Turkey for Our Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a different sort of turkey day this time, but wherever our men in the military service were on Thanksgiving Day turkey made a part of the meal. As one writer put it, "All over the world today Americans in the fighting forces sat down to the kind of Thanksgiving dinners they knew at home—turkey and fixin's."

True, there was not the festive family board, a beautifully decorated table, around which the family gathered as in peacetime. It must be that turkey was eaten under such widely varying camp conditions as prevail in the frigid regions of the far north, in the torrid heat of some of the islands of the sea, and other far-off places. Everywhere it was agreed that the Quartermaster Corps had delivered the goods.

In practically every region the world over our faithful fighting forces had turkey and fixin's. This was made possible by long and careful planning. Months ago the call went out for millions of pounds of turkey. Because the distances in many instances were great, various methods of transportation being required for the ultimate delivery, the work of buying and preparing for shipment so many turkeys was necessarily begun before the usual marketing season. So, at first, response was slow. As the turkeys grew so grew the numbers which came to market, and in due time the biggest embargo of all turkey orders was filled and lifted.

Possibly there was a little grumbling, but there was mighty little on the part of producers and the public. When civilians understood, all were willing to wait for the second table. All, too, were happier on Thanksgiving Day, even though the family here at home may not have had turkey. They were happy by having helped to make possible a bit of the feast for the boys in uniform. It is a way America has. As we contribute to the happiness of others we add to our own happiness.

The New York Times, on Thanksgiving Day morning, in speaking of the situation in America's largest city said:

> The public seemed aware that the armed forces had bought up all available turkeys from midsummer to October for shipment to camps here and abroad so that those on far-flung battle fronts could have a touch of home.

An Associated Press dispatch from far-off Algiers, dated November 24, told of how turkeys aplenty had been provided. I quote in part:

> There will be turkeys aplenty tomorrow for hundreds of thousands of American troops in the Mediterranean theater, many

of them for the second time observing the historic holiday overseas.

The Army has made every effort to see that front line troops in Italy get the lion's share of the turkey supply, but an unofficial survey indicated that the big majority from Casablanca to Tunis also will get a chance at white meat or drumstick.

The air force saved the day for many by flying 68 tons of cold-storage birds on emergency delivery from a ship which docked far from the area in which they were to be distributed. Planes of the troop carrier command flew them from the harbor to the Tunisian field where refrigerator trucks met the planes and rushed off packed full of fat birds.

From Wellington, New Zealand, came another message indicating thought on the part of our own Government, also fine cooperation on the part of others. Again I quote:

Americans in New Zealand will eat their Thanksgiving dinners largely under reciprocal aid, though the familiar turkey, the main dish, will be drawn from State supplies.

The turkeys will come from the stores of the joint purchasing authority maintained by the Army, Navy, and Marines in this region, but other foodstuffs, such as chickens, pigs, pumpkins for pumpkin pie, and ice cream, will be furnished by the New Zealanders.

A United Press dispatch from Naples, Italy, on Thanksgiving Day said:

Up there in the bleak, foggy, wind-swept mountain positions of the farthest American advances on the Italian front, American doughboys ate turkey and all the trimmings with one hand today while they cradled their rifles with the other.

It is interesting, too, to know that at a number of front-line messes captured German field kitchen equipment was used to cook the special Thanksgiving meal.

As we think of the Thanksgiving Day dinners that our men in the military service enjoyed not only here at home but wherever they were, there is a feeling of thankfulness for a Government which so splendidly cares for those who are risking their all in order that this good Government may be continued to bless America and the world.

While the story of supplying turkey for Thanksgiving Day naturally attracts attention, it represents a comparatively small accomplishment in what is being done in getting plenty of food and in plenty of time to men in the armed forces, wherever they may be. An army may move a few miles over practically impassable mud roads, may make its way over improvised bridges as rivers are crossed, troops may cover great distances by air, but wherever the stop is made and mealtime comes the food is there. It is a story of efficiency unexcelled. Never has any other army been so well fed; never has there been such able management. First, though, credit is due to the producer, the farmer and his family, on millions of farms, who despite shortages of labor and machinery, have again in 1943 established a new food production record.

War Food Administrator Jones properly speaks of the harvest of the "largest output of food in any year in the history of the United States." Surely, with the passing of another Thanksgiving season, all America should be thankful to our military forces, to the War Food Administration, and to the farmer and his family. Truly, "food fights for freedom."

Increased Compensation—Veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, it has been a pleasant duty for me to participate in and approve the bills, H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377, which have now passed the House of Representatives, providing an increase in the rates of compensation for veterans and certain dependents of veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. These increases were provided in recognition of the rise in the cost of living since the beginning of the war, and of the further fact that similar recognition has been accorded Federal employees and other groups in the Nation.

The following are the essential provisions of these bills:

H. R. 3356

Section 1 provides that the monthly amount of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, shall be increased by 15 percent.

Section 2 provides increases in monthly rates of compensation payable under Public Law No. 484, as amended. It would increase the widow's rate from $30 to $35, and the widow with one child, additional amount for the child to be increased from $8 to $10 per month, making a total payment of $45 per month. Payment for each additional child would be increased from $4 to $5 per month. In cases where there are children but no widow, the following rates apply: No widow, but one child, an increase from $15 to $18 per month; no widow, but two children, increased from $22, equally divided, to $27, equally divided, per month; no widow, but three children, increased from $30, equally divided, to $36, equally divided, per month; and the amount for additional children would be increased from $3 to $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

Section 3 provides the increases authorized by this bill shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Section 4 would extend the benefits of Public Law No. 484, as amended, to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war where death is not service connected but at time of death the veteran had a service-connected disability.

H. R. 3377

This bill provides for an increase in pensions payable to veterans of World War No. 1 who had honorable service for not less than 90 days and who have become totally and permanently disabled, regardless of the origin of their disabilities, other than for misconduct. It would increase all such persons on the rolls from $40 to $50 per month, except that where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and are in receipt of a pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or shall have reached the age of 65 years, then the amount of the pension will be $60 per month.

The provisions of the bill likewise apply to veterans of World War No. 2.

The Silver Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I hope to never see the day when silver is no longer used as a medium of exchange. Those of us from the West realize the value of this precious metal and desire to see its use increased and not decreased. There is a comfortable feeling about a silver dollar—if you have one—that a paper bill cannot displace. Silver helped to build our great West and silver is now needed more than ever in providing real hard backing to the money now being printed to pay for our tremendous war effort.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Charles Rowe, of the Western News, of Libby, Mont., dated November 11, 1943:

The West is being asked to give up one of its cherished practices. From out the effete East there comes a request that would deprive the virile westerner of the comfort and uplift he gets from feeling the weight of a few silver dollars in his pocket. We are asked to replace that noble symbol of our prosperity and of one of our great resources with pestiferous one-dollar bills.

That's asking too much. A one-dollar bill is a lifeless thing lacking in spirit and character. It can't be carried loose in one's pocket for instant and handy use without fear of its being pulled out and lost in a careless moment. Although a man might have a dozen of them in his pocket, there is no reassuring clink to them, none of that comforting sound that a few of the good old silver coins give out to encourage and give one confidence. A one-dollar bill is a hateful thing, the mark of a decadent civilization.

Federal Reserve bankers are asking this unreasonable thing on two grounds: first, it costs too much to ship the silver; second, the bags of silver dollars are too heavy for the women employees to handle, the fair sex having so largely replaced the men in these war days. We believe the ability of the fair sex has been underestimated, what with all their efficient labor on farms and in factories. And there is the long-held belief by many that, given the opportunity, most women could "lift" any number of dollars regardless of their weight. We'd like to be chivalrous, we'd like to accommodate the puny employees of the Federal Reserve banks, but some things just can't be done. The silver dollar is our last bulwark against the attacks of the encroaching East. Are we going to succumb to it or will we stand up for our rights like men?

The Kefauver Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1943, Representative KEFAUVER introduced House Resolution 327. This measure would amend rule XXXIII of the House of Representatives to provide for a question period at which the heads of executive departments and independent agencies are requested to appear and answer questions. The adoption of this measure will facilitate communication between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. The appearance of Cordell Hull before the Congress to report on the Moscow Conference calls attention to the importance of the Kefauver suggestion. The plan of the Member from Tennessee, Hull's own State, would decrease the unfounded criticism that is often made of the departments and would increase congressional knowledge. Congressman KEFAUVER'S proposal is a step toward a much-needed reform. In connection with his resolution I am placing in the RECORD an article written by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times November 17, 1943.

IN THE NATION—THE CABINET ON THE FLOORS OF CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

To the younger Members of Congress in particular the appearance of Secretary of State Hull before a joint meeting of the House and Senate tomorrow will be more than a tribute to his successful statecraft. It will, they hope, be the portent of a new order in which Congress as a whole can be better and more currently informed of the executive business, and two of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government can be really coordinated.

In that new order, as the younger Members of Congress envisage it, the heads of the Federal departments and independent agencies will come regularly to sessions of the House or the Senate, or to joint sessions, to make reports on general executive matters in which Congress has true partnership and to answer questions in the Chamber. This consummation is the objective of a change in the House bylaws which has been proposed by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a proposal that recently engendered a lively debate and has aroused much interest.

The change in the bylaws (and the Senate could make the same change) does not contemplate that the attendance of Cabinet members would be required, or that they would be expected to answer all questions addressed to them. It allows for occasions when sessions attended by Cabinet members who were being questioned would be closed in the public interest. Also, the proposal includes a plan for written questions, to be submitted in advance, supplemented by questions asked orally. This dual system would justify a departmental or agency head in limiting his answers to a selection of written questions and reserving the right to decline to reply to the oral ones.

PRESS CONFERENCE RULES

This is the rule that governs the press conferences of some of the more important war administrators who deal with delicate matters of military strategy. The only oral questions that may be addressed to these are inquiries directly germane to their formal statements or to any answer they may have made to a written question. This works fairly well.

Since the press conference is the nearest approach to a checked information system that exists here officially, the President's meetings with the radio and the press suggest themselves for comparison with what Mr. KEFAUVER has in mind for Congress. Mr. Roosevelt's secretariat will refer to the President such questions written in advance as they approve. But the bulk of the interrogation is oral, and he uses his own judgment what to answer, how to answer, and what to thrust aside.

Some of his Cabinet and the heads of agencies follow the same procedure. But the feeling is growing in Congress, especially among the younger Members, that the prior rights of the legislative branch are clear and should be satisfied in the manner proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER or in some other way. And congressional questioning would have authority which that of the press has not. The product should be an increase of well-checked and essential information which would keep down the number of congressional investigations and promote smoother, and therefore better, relations between Congress and the Executive.

The plan proposed is not new except in detail. In the early days of the Federal Government Cabinet members consulted with the legislative branches as a whole, and once President Washington went to the Senate to confer about a treaty. He was disgusted with his experience, but that need not always be the case. Presidents and congressional committees also have in the past approved bylaw changes which would permit members of the Cabinet to participate to a limited extent in House or Senate debates on matters affecting their own departments.

COMMITTEE SESSIONS NO ANSWER

In opposition to Mr. KEFAUVER'S general idea it is argued that Cabinet members and agency heads appear regularly before the committees charged with responsibility for legislation affecting them, and that attendance and submission to questioning in full session would be a duplication and an unbearable drain on their time. But, as the Tennessee Representative pointed out in his speech of explanation, there are many matters, particularly in time of war, in the province of an administrator that affect the work of every committee and every Member of Congress. Much less time would be consumed in attendance on full sessions than if the administrator appeared before every committee in interest.

Recent experience supports this point. There have been weeks in which Cabinet members, or their immediate subordinates, and agency heads have spent every day at the Capitol before committees, often going over the same ground. There have been days when these officials have been obliged to tell one committee something in the morning and retell it to another committee in the afternoon. If periodic attendance at full sessions, plus a cooperative attitude toward legitimate questions, would to a large degree supplant this exasperating and time-consuming method the reform would be great in the transaction of orderly legislative-executive business.

Mr. Hull's unprecedented appearance tomorrow may lend substance to the project.

Gen. George S. Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith two letters I have received from my district regarding the unfortunate conduct of General Patton, together with my reply thereto.

Our armed forces are astounding the world in their accomplishments and, of course, it is indeed unfortunate that anything should happen tending to reflect upon the fine relationship generally existing between officers and men.

I sincerely trust that a thorough investigation will be made of this unfortunate matter and that proper disposition may be made thereof.

PACOLET MILLS, S. C.,
November 23, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

DEAR SIR: I request that an investigation be made in the conduct of Gen. George S. Patton in his action toward a shell-shocked soldier of the Seventh Army. My son is now serving under Patton and also fought through the Sicilian campaign. My brother also fought and died under his command, and I have two other brothers, one on his way over now, and the other may have to soon go over, and I do hope they won't have to be under a general such as Patton. If a soldier should strike an officer, he would be court-martialed. Or in case of war, he would be shot. So why not govern the officers the same? It's bad enough to fight in this war without being shell-shocked and struck by a man over them. I think it's a shame and should be investigated at once.

I wish you would have my letter published, for I would like for all soldiers everywhere to know that we are all behind them 100 percent.

Respectfully,

MRS. NETTIE HODGE.

GREER, S. C., *November 24, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If it is true that General Patton slapped and cursed a soldier in a field hos-

pital, I think he should be thrown out of the Army. An officer that can't control himself any better than that is not fit to command a company, much less an army. If a private had struck and cursed him, he probably would have been shot the next day.

I certainly will appreciate you using your best efforts to see that he doesn't get by with this by apologizing.

Yours truly,

B. B. WATERS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1943.

Mrs. NETTIE HODGE,
Pacolet Mills, S. C.

MY DEAR MADAM: I am in receipt of your letter regarding the unfortunate occurrence in which General Patton is involved.

Our armed forces are accomplishing such astounding results all around the world in this global war, it is certainly tragic that anything should happen, regardless as to who is to blame, that might delay or hinder our success.

From what I can gather, General Patton has been regarded as an outstanding leader. From my own experience in the Army, I know how important proper leadership is. The officers of our sons in the service stand in loco parentis. It is human to err, but surely the occurrence in this instance is most unfortunate. In the Book of Books I believe it is stated, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city."

The Congress has already taken cognizance of the unfortunate episode, and I, of course, am giving my full support to its proper solution.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Same reply to Mr. B. B. Waters, of Greer, S. C.

The Nebraska Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have the privilege of living in the great State of Nebraska are happy to report to you that our State has just issued a very interesting story in words and pictures telling of the advancement of the State of which we are so proud. Because we want to share this story with you, I extend portions of it with my remarks:

THE SOWER

Atop the magnificent Nebraska Capitol stands a huge figure in bronze, the Sower, symbol of the faith of a Plains people in nature and work and patience.

In war or peace, food is first on Nebraska's production line. From its grain lands, its cattle country, from its corn and crop farms come the foods that add mightily to this Nation's greatness.

Years ago Nebraskans wrote into their constitution a prohibition against State indebtedness. It is still there, and Nebraska still pays cash for its roads, buildings and improvements.

ECONOMY IS A HABIT IN NEBRASKA

There is no State bonded debt.
There is no State sales tax.
There is no State income tax.
There is no State luxury tax.
State tax on real property for 10 years has averaged $2.40 per $1,000 valuation.

STREAMLINED LEGISLATURE

In 1934 Nebraska people voted to install a unicameral legislature. The one-house system began operation in 1937, has 43 members elected on a nonpartisan ballot. All hearings on all bills are public.

MIGHTY FRIENDLY PEOPLE

Long before they laid the railroad west from Omaha, an early traveler came a little way into what is now Nebraska and promptly anounced the place had no future—said it looked like desert to him.

But it didn't look like desert to a lot of other people. To these others it looked like home—and it was. For them the soil didn't just produce food. It grew towns and cities and railroads and churches, airports, factories and schools—and a mighty friendly people with a twinkle about the eyes, people who would rather talk to you about you than to somebody else about the money you have or don't have.

Nebraska takes pride in its people—in those like William Jennings Bryan and J. Sterling Morton, like Charles G. Dawes, Artist Dale Nichols, John J. Pershing and George W. Norris.

OPPORTUNITY FOR YOUTH

Since Nebraska is proud of its people and interested in their future, it has carefully built a sound, well-balanced educational system for its boys and girls—the great University of Nebraska, 4 State normal training schools, 13 denominational colleges, and 5 municipal institutions of higher education.

The design for Nebraska's seal was prescribed by the State's first legislature in 1867. The smith in the foreground typifies the mechanical arts. Agriculture is represented by shocks of grain and the growing corn and the settler's cabin. The steamboat on the Missouri River and the train represent the State's appreciation for transportation which hurried its settlement.

STATE OFFICERS BIENNIUM (1943–45)

Governor: Dwight Griswold.
Supreme court justices: Robert G. Simmons (chief justice), Bayard H. Paine, Edward F. Carter, Fred W. Messmore, John W. Yeager, Adolph E. Wenke, and E. B. Chappell.
Lieutenant Governor: Roy W. Johnson.
Secretary of state: Frank Marsh.
Auditor, public accounts: Ray C. Johnson.
Treasurer: Carl G. Swanson.
Attorney general: Walter R. Johnson.
Superintendent public instruction: Wayne O. Reed.
Adjutant general: Guy N. Henninger.
Railway commissioners: Duane T. Swanson, Richard H. Larson, John Knickrehm.
United States Senators: HUGH A. BUTLER, Omaha; KENNETH S. WHERRY, Pawnee City.
Congressmen: District 1, CARL T. CURTIS, Minden; district 2, HOWARD BUFFETT, Omaha; district 3, KARL STEFAN, Norfolk; district 4, A. L. MILLER, Grand Island.

You might like to know Nebraska has an area of 76,653 square miles; largest of its 93 counties, Cherry, is as big as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined; a larger percent of its land area in farms than any other State (1940 census); an altitude ranging from 835 feet in the southeast to 5,340 feet in the northwest; a population of 1,315,834; more miles of running water than any other State; the Nation's only one-house legislature; the second largest earthen dam in North America—the Kingsley—operating as part of a huge public power and irrigation system; one of the world's most beautiful capitols; a wider variety of songbirds than any State, save one; one of the world's best collections of mammoths and mastodons; excellent pheasant, duck, and goose hunting; much fine fishing.

Nebraska received its name from an Otoe Indian word meaning "flat water"—for the Platte River; was first visited by white men in 1541—the Coronado party; was organized as a Territory in 1854; became a State March 1, 1867; sometimes is known as the Tree Planter State because it first observed Arbor Day; is the site of the Nation's first homestead—the Daniel Freeman, 1863, near Beatrice; is the home of Boys Town, near Omaha.

Nebraska's oldest existing town is Bellevue, 1823; State flower is the golden rod; State bird is the western meadowlark; capital is Lincoln.

PRODUCTION SCOREBOARD

Even before prices reacted to the full effect of the war, Nebraska cash farm income was a half billion dollars a year.

During the first year of the war when foods, not dollars, became important. Nebraska marketed 1,250,000 cattle; 2,500,000 hogs; 1,333,000 sheep; 100,000,000 pounds of butter; 1,333,000 dozen eggs and raised 35,000,000 chickens.

At the start of the second year of war, Nebraska had more sheep on feed than any State; held fourth place in the number of beef cattle, seventh place in the number of hogs, and fourth place in dairy production.

Among the States, Nebraska ranked second in winter wheat production; third in corn, rye and sweet clover seed; first in wild hay; fifth in barley and sugar beets; eighth in beans and tenth in potatoes.

And while running up this record of food production Nebraska wanted no favors. Each call for men from the armed forces was met in full. Time was found to show the Nation the best method of collecting scrap. War bond quotas were oversubscribed.

INDUSTRIAL NEBRASKA BECOMES OF AGE

In 1 year Nebraska's manufactured goods exceed $600,000,000 in value. The products come from 1,150 plants engaged in some 75 different activities. Principal ones: Meat packing and processing, butter and dairy products, flour, grain mill products, bakery products, beet sugar, farm implements, petroleum products, structural materials, ornamental metal products, furniture and fixtures.

INDUSTRIAL AIDS

The State supports a chemurgic research laboratory.

A great link of hydroelectric and steam utilities produce more than a billion kilowatthours a year.

There's an abundant supply of coal nearby.

Six pipe lines bring natural gas to 153 municipalities.

TRANSPORTATION

Sixty thousand trucks operate on a $100,000,000 paid-for surfaced highway system.

Twelve major railroads.

East-west, north-south air lines serve the State.

Missouri River navigable south from Omaha to the Mississippi.

FOOD—THERE'S A NEBRASKA DISH ON ALMOST EVERY TABLE

Nebraska's biggest industry is food, not the tea party snacks, not that kind, but the kind Americans fight, work, and live on—the kind of food that is vital to victory, that sets the peace table.

Nebraska has 121,000 farms and there's plenty of production room. They average

391 acres in size—these Nebraska farms—more than twice the United States farm average. There are more than a billion dollars invested in them.

On each Nebraska farm the investment in machinery alone is 61 percent more than the average invested in the machinery of the average United States farm. The average value of land and buildings exceeds that of the Nation's average by 70 percent.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an address delivered by the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of the Eleventh Congressional District of Illinois, at the services in the United States Capitol on November 12, 1943, commemorating the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Elizabeth Cady Stanton:

Today, as we recall the accomplishments and honor the memory of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, on the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of her birth, I cannot but realize that there are, within the sound of my voice, many of her admirers, who, within the past few weeks have been discouraged over a temporary repulse of their untiring efforts to effectuate the objectives for which she devoted her labors during the major years of her active and useful life. Many of you feel that in declining to render a favorable report on the resolution for the submission to the States of the equal-rights amendment, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has struck a blow which has weakened your cause and obscured the triumphal day which you felt was already emerging from the horizon.

Your chagrin and disappointment has been intense, but you have not been defeated. You have not even been driven back. You merely failed to effect an advance that you had hoped to accomplish.

The resolution you espoused received the unstinted support of 9 of the 12 Republican members and 2 of the 14 Democratic members. Many of the adverse votes were not unsympathetic toward the principles therein enunciated, but were sceptical as to its form. The skirmish (for that is all it was) was not fatal. It was not even serious. On the contrary, it was probably most fortunate. It may have averted a deeper wound elsewhere. It did reveal to you the weaknesses in your own armor. Those defects you alone can mend. Powerful groups of your own sex are yet to be apprised of the virtue of your cause. Many who are so apprised are yet to be convinced. Some never will be until success has crowned your efforts.

You have before you the same educational problems, the same perplexities, the same opposing forces that confronted Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott in their efforts for recognition of your political rights. Today, none of the feminine groups that opposed the suffrage amendment would relinquish those rights without a struggle.

So I say to you, your real labors are still before you. You need have no fear from the men. When a clear-cut majority of the women are convinced of the merit of your cause, the men will fall in line, as they always do. I think it was Cato who said, "Men usually command women; but we command all men, and the women command us."

You have made tremendous strides in the past 3 years. Your resolution has received the endorsement of the last national convention of one of the major political parties and of the governing body of the most powerful and influential of women's organizations. These two accomplishments alone will have far-reaching effect. But there is still much more missionary work yet to do. As regards their own rights, women must be convinced by women and not by men. In the United States reforms by constitutional processes usually come slowly. Yours is no exception. And yet I wonder if, perchance, you are not nearer to your goal than you suspect. The war has brought women as well as men into our military and naval forces. It has demonstrated that they are capable of performing services in our factories and plants that they had hitherto never dreamed of attempting. Will not the realization at the close of hostilities that the great war was won by their joint energies with the men urge them to insist that civil rights be accorded them everywhere?

Elizabeth Cady Stanton became a pioneer for women's rights when she was but 25 years of age and attained national prominence when a young woman of 33. She endured sorrows, rebuffs, and disappointments, but never waivered in her steadfast determination to win. She was not privileged to witness the political emancipation of her sex in 1920, but her early struggles against ignorance, prejudice, and indifference undoubtedly paved the way that finally culminated in the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution. All honor to her and the cause for which she dedicated the best years of her life.

"Though woman never can be man,
By change of sex and a' that,
To social rights, 'gainst class and clan,
Her claim is just, for a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
Her Eden slip, and a' that,
In all that makes a living soul
She matches man, for a' that."

The Problems of Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two newspaper editorials with reference to the recent conference in Moscow and its relationship to the peace plans of Mr. Herbert Hoover and Mr. Hugh Gibson as advocated in their book entitled "The Problems of Lasting Peace."

These editorials, which I commend to every Member of the House of Representatives, follow:

[From the Kansas City Star of November 8, 1943]

THE HOOVER PLAN AT MOSCOW

For the last 18 months Herbert Hoover, with the collaboration of Hugh Gibson, career diplomat, has been pounding away at what he has called a new approach to the problem of lasting peace. As a result of the experience at Versailles, Mr. Hoover has been urging that there should be no long armistice and no general peace conference, but a transition period for the defeated nations in which the Allies should take the necessary measures to keep order and get them on their feet economically, and then should develop a world organization to preserve peace.

It is remarkable how closely the Moscow Agreements adhere to this plan. At Moscow it was provided that the Four Great Powers should fight the war to unconditional surrender and then through a "rapid and orderly transition from war to peace" that they collaborate to provide against violation of the terms imposed on the enemy. Later, "at the earliest practicable date," these powers are to set up an international organization to maintain peace, to which all peace-loving nations are to be admitted.

It is impossible to know to what extent the Hoover proposals influenced the deliberations at Moscow. But it may be assumed that Secretary Hull was familiar with them and that the former President made an important contribution to the settlement there reached.

[From the Tulsa Tribune of November 10, 1943]

MR. HOOVER AT MOSCOW

The big man at Moscow turns out to be Herbert Hoover and not Mr. Hull. Despite the monumental flood of diabolical falsehoods which the conscienceless new dealers have let loose against the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, in his simple capacity as a very helpful citizen, has rendered and is rendering an unseen service to our times which political littleness is studiously refusing to reveal.

At Moscow Mr. Hull and Mr. Stalin got together on high grounds. The common grounds of their agreement are precisely the recommendations and almost precisely the words of Herbert Hoover and his associate in foreign policy advocacy, Mr. Hugh Gibson.

The Moscow Declaration is the adoption of Mr. Hoover's and Mr. Gibson's proposed methods of making peace. Their proposal was: "A temporary trusteeship of leadership by collaboration of a few leading nations, a provisional peace for each defeated country, a transition period, and an ultimate world institution to preserve peace. * * * No general peace conference, no long armistice, no long-term military alliances."

In its peace phases the Moscow Declaration is notable by the absence of any reference to a general peace conference or any armistice, or any long-term military alliances. Instead it envisages:

a. The leadership by the four leading powers and action by joining consultation and collaboration.

b. A transition period after surrender and pending the establishment of some sort of world organization to preserve peace during which the leading nations will establish law and order.

c. The creation of such a world organization "based on the principle of the sovereign equality * * * and open to membership by all nations."

It is immaterial who is given credit for the creation of principles and policies that affect the people's peace here and throughout the world. The important thing is, has anyone created policies, programs, and purposes that may contribute to the permanency of peace?

Mr. Roosevelt has created no such policies. Mr. Hoover has.

Mr. Roosevelt has failed as the business manager of the people's business, failed ignominiously, and the people are just finding out

the high cost of the confusions into which he has dragged us.

In a last desperate plea he and his office-holding sycophants have tried to drag across the people's vision the red herring of foreign policy. "We must support the President's foreign policy," has been their cry.

The poor President has no foreign policy. He has had none. And when it comes to the pronouncement of a foreign policy, to which the ally that has borne the great brunt of battle may subscribe, it is the principles and policies of the slandered Mr. Hoover that is seized to light the torch that may bring peace to a war-weary world.

Funds for O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Funds for O W. I.," published in the October 30, 1943, issue of the Catholic weekly America. This is an enthusiastic report on the request of O. W. I. for a $5,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the O. W. I., that this new agency, under the able direction of Elmer Davis, is making remarkable progress in the efficiency of its operations, and in furthering the conduct of the war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDS FOR O. W. I.

It should not be necessary at this late date to insist that in the conduct of modern warfare words are at least as important as bullets. In an age when an entire nation must be mobilized to wage successful war, victory or defeat depends to an enormous extent on the morale of the masses. The Germans realize this very well, for they remember how the break-down on the home front in 1918 forced the surrender of a well-equipped army still capable of hard fighting. Herr Goebbels is determined not to let that happen again. Hard pressed as the Nazis are, he is spending huge sums on propaganda, and he is not spending this money, in Germany, in Europe, all over the world, without hope of some return.

Compared with the German achievement (and the Japanese, too) our propaganda effort shows up none too well. While the main reason for this may be the lack of a definite and constructive postwar program—something that would stir the world as did Wilson's Fourteen Points in 1918—it should not be overlooked that the country is asking its chief propaganda organ, the Office of War Information, to fight the war of the airwaves on little more than a shoestring. The 1943 appropriation for the foreign branch of O. W. I. amounts to not much more than the cost of the 60 bombers lost during the single raid on Schweinfurt!

This kind of economy, it strikes us, is apt to be a very expensive mistake, since our failure to use effectively the weapon of psychological warfare can easily prolong the war and involve wholly unnecessary expenditures of men and money. That is a piddling sum for a Nation which is spending billions on armaments.

The matter is especially pertinent right now. O. W. I.'s foreign branch has about reached the end of its limited resources, and last week Elmer Davis, head of O. W. I., had to go hat-in-hand to the Senate Appropriations Committee to beg for an additional $5,000,000 to carry on critically essential work. Why there should be any haggling over this request is hard to see. If anything, it errs on the side of modesty and reasonableness. The pity is that Mr. Davis should have to plead for funds which in the long run may save billions of dollars and no one knows how many lives.

Thanksgiving Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old-fashioned habit among Americans of giving thanks for what they have, of knowing how much worse life might be than it is, and of feeling humbly grateful to God. Our forefathers had this habit when there were fewer of the good things of life than we have today, even after 2 years of total war. They had it when it was popular to demand life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, not tires, gasoline, and the best of sirloin steak. They were thankful when the only ceiling price on corn was a scalp for an ear, when the only "meat points" that came their way were made of flint and shot from a bow.

Some Americans have not broken themselves of this very old-fashioned habit of giving thanks. Some Americans are humbly grateful for the liberties they still enjoy, for the mighty effort their people and their Government are making to preserve those liberties, and for the gallantry in battle that our boys have shown wherever they have met the enemy.

For this bravery in our fighting men, the people of Texas have great reason to be thankful. A dispatch from Italy, printed in the newspapers in this Thanksgiving season, described for them the landing of American troops to establish the beachhead at Salerno.

At dawn on September 9, troops of the Thirty-sixth Division stormed the beach for the invasion of the Italian mainland, and the first of these Americans to set foot on the enemy soil wore "T-patches"—the patch for the division, the T for Texas. According to the account, these troops were untried in battle in this war, but when reporters asked why they were selected for this extremely important assignment the reply of the commanding officer was that they were from Texas. That it appears, was considered explanation enough.

So it proved, and the rest—the hard fighting—the dauntless advance—and the decisive victory over the German Army is history.

On behalf of Americans who are thankful that we have men like these in the armed forces of the United States, I include this highly constructive column written by that great American journalist, Dorothy Thompson, and published in various newspapers on Thanksgiving Day, November 25, 1943:

ON THE RECORD—

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The annual harvest festival of Thanksgiving is an inheritance from a more pious age, and from a time when men were less arrogant about their own works, considering them as but contributions to the creative forces of nature and of God. God sent the rain and the sun, and men were but instruments to work with His purposes. Thus, if things turned out well, they praised God and not themselves.

The festival of Thanksgiving was a religious and a social event. It brought together families and communities and the festive meal was opened with a prayer of gratitude. It was the celebration of an annual victory—victory over the destructive powers of nature. And as that victory was won by common effort, it was welcomed by common joy.

We are often told that it is too early to celebrate victory. It is always too early to celebrate victory, unless it is celebrated in a humble and prayerful spirit—that it may be in reality, a victory for the creative forces in the universe. But in that spirit we can celebrate this Thanksgiving. The early Thanksgivings never represented any ultimate victory. Our forefathers had gotten through another year with reasonable cause for satisfaction. They had survived and laid foundations for another and better season to come. And from that viewpoint we can celebrate in 1943 a wonderful Thanksgiving.

PROGRESS EVERYWHERE

For what a year is behind us.

We have made progress everywhere on the fronts where our armies fight, and in the fields and factories that support them.

A year ago our troops had just landed in north Africa. Now they have cleared the last enemy from African soil, occupied the three great islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, conquered a third of Italy, and seen the first Fascist regime in Europe collapse in ignominy.

We have made progress even in the holding war of the south Pacific.

Together with our British allies, we have laid flat upon the ground very many of the German war industries.

And in a campaign unique in the military annals of history our Russian allies are relentlessly driving off their soil those who came to grab the fruits of other men's labor.

And if we are grateful for this, it can only be in the ancient spirit, with no boasting of our own prowess, but grateful for something that has been given us by the heroism of others and the logic and justice of history.

UNITY IS STRESSED

Until now our main contribution to the war has been economic, and there again we must be thankful for the unity for purpose, the social solidarity, the sense of responsibility, in all ranks and classes of the population, which alone have made it possible to complete such breath-taking achievements in production in so relatively short a time. It is our tendency to see the trees rather than the forest, the faults rather than the virtues, the strikes rather than the sweat, but looking

at the achievement as a whole, we are forced to realize that it would have been impossible without a remarkable brotherhood of endeavor in this effort.

We have not only transformed our industries and maintained production but we have vastly enlarged our industries almost to 50 percent, so that today, looking toward the future, we are almost appalled by the thought of what to do with all this wealth and power when the time comes to put it back in the service of peace.

CITIES ARE SPARED

And this unified endeavor around a common purpose has spared us most of the hardships that we saw at the outbreak of this war. Our cities have emerged from total darkness into modest light. In spite of all the talk of food scarcity, none in America have gone hungry, and thousands are better fed than ever in their lives. No one walks in rags, even if they walk in rayon instead of silk, and the normal life of America has proceeded as in no other country on earth. Let us not boast of this. Let us feel gratitude. And let us not forget that others are paying for our relative comfort.

In the ancient Thanksgivings the less fortunate were always remembered and the bounty was shared. Today we live in a world community, sharing with them a common purpose and suffering.

Tomorrow and tomorrow we shall have to share the bounty. Let us be thankful—thankful that we can.

Liberty Loan Drive in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extract from a letter addressed to me by Generoso Pope, a statement and an editorial appearing in Il Progresso Italo-Americano of September 10, 1943, pertaining to the Third War Loan drive conducted in our State under the leadership of Generoso Pope.

In this connection, I wish to add my own personal commendation to those already extended to the patriotic, loyal, and devoted citizens of Italian origin for the money and other substantial contributions which they are making to the war effort.

There being no objection, the extract from the letter, the statement, and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On September 10, 1943, Il Progresso Italo-Americano, leading Italian newspaper in this country, published by Mr. Generoso Pope, carried the following editorial entitled "An Appeal to Italo-Americans."

This editorial opened the Third War Loan drive by the committee for Americans of Italian origin of the State of New York, of which Mr. Generoso Pope was chairman.

On October 26, 1943, this committee, as a result of the untiring efforts and patriotic zeal of its members, was able to report that it had sold $48,508,243.50 in bonds to 644,891 persons. Thereafter, as a result of additional sales previously unreported, the committee was able to advance the total sales to the magnificent sum of $49,382,168.50.

This excellent report brought from the Treasury Department its own commendation on October 29, 1943, when Mr. Nevil Ford, the general manager of the New York State War Loan Drive, said:

"The results in this drive far surpass the expectations of the War Finance Committee.

"The War Bond Committee was actively supported by labor unions, banks, Columbia Associations, fraternal organizations, Italian benevolent societies, and many other groups.

"Mr. Pope and Americans of Italian origin are to be congratulated for the fine showing they have made in this great drive. Never, to my knowledge, has the Italian community so wholeheartedly and unselfishly supported a patriotic endeavor. It was most gratifying."

The Third War Loan drive has been crowned with greatest success throughout the Nation, and the Americans of Italian origin are very happy to have been able to contribute to this success with their large purchases of War bonds.

Only in the State of New York, the War Bond Committee, of which Generoso Pope is the chairman, has sold more than $49,000,000 worth of bonds, and this figure, large as it is, is but a small fraction of the total number of bonds, bought by those of Italian origin throughout the Nation, representing their contribution to the victory of the Allied armies.

We would like to send a vibrant vote of thanks to the chairmen of the various county committees who so enthusiastically cooperated with the State chairman, Generoso Pope, by selling millions of dollars of War bonds.

[From Il Progresso Italo-Americano of September 10, 1943]

AN APPEAL TO ITALO-AMERICANS

(By Generoso Pope, New York State chairman, War Bond Committee for Americans of Italian Origin)

The Third War Loan drive opens today. Americans of Italian origin have a deep-rooted love for America and have given ample evidence of it in the past. Today we have another magnificent occasion of showing our devotion to this great country of ours. This is our beloved land, where we and our parents found a haven, a land of opportunity, a land where our children could have enough of the abundance which is America's birthright, where they could enjoy the fruits of our democracy with proper food, play, and education. In our ways of life every man has the right to think and talk, to plan and build for a better future for himself and his family. These democratic ways have brought us security and freedom and a happier life. This is our stake. We must protect it.

In this war the free peoples of the world will achieve victory if they possess superior mec' anized forces. More and better planes, more and better tanks, more and better armored forces will determine the outcome of this titanic struggle. And there can be no doubt that American resourcefulness, American initiative, American industry, and American labor will win the battle of production to defeat the Axis and win the war.

American industry and labor will do more than provide the implements of war to protect and safeguard America. The genius and self-sacrifice of American labor will produce enough to supply our indomitable Allies. Free American labor will astonish the world with its efficiency and speed, its vigor and unity. American labor will not lay down its tools until we make sure that tomorrow will bring justice, freedom, and democracy to all the peoples of the world.

Napoleon once said that to insure victory in battle, three things were required: money, money, and money. In order that the necessary weapons of war roll out uninterruptedly from our foundries, assembly plants, and shipyards, dollars must roll in to the Treasury of the United States. America must buy War bonds. The War bonds are symbols of our independence, our liberty, and our honor. They are our sinews of war. And eventually, the enemies of America, the enemies of mankind, will be drowned in the floor of War bonds purchased by American men and women.

Buying War bonds is not solely a patriotic duty. It is a practical and wise investment, which protects your future existence by preserving your country's present existence. Businessmen and captains of industry are making handsome profits, a good part of which they are investing in War bonds. There is a great need for workers now. There is an actual shortage of manpower in armament plants, in aviation plants and shipyards. Almost everyone works steadily; many work overtime and earn a lot of money. But some day the war will be over, and very likely will be followed by dislocation of industry. Many plants essential to the prosecution of the war will be closed, as we change from a war economy to a normal, peace economy. We will be faced with a period of economic readjustment, a period of prolonged unemployment. And today, now, all those who have jobs, those who earn, should provide for a rainy day, and save, save, save by buying stamps and Government bonds. If a day should ever come when Uncle Sam's bonds are rendered valueless, then we can all take our bankbooks and cash and throw them into the Hudson River. Because all of the money you have is only a check issued by Uncle Sam. If Uncle Sam's signature on a bond is not to be trusted, then all that we have, all that we possess, isn't worth anything.

I believe, and I know you believe, that we can place implicit faith in the reliability of Uncle Sam. And remember, that by buying bonds you are reducing the possibility of still higher taxes. We will all have to pay for this war, and we'll pay for it in more taxes if we don't buy more bonds. But whatever is required of us, we will cheerfully buy bonds, and now that Italy is out of the war we want to help America assure a just peace for the people of Italy. And we will gladly pay higher taxes to bring about the downfall and rid the world of that unholy Hitler and the treacherous Hirohito.

The Revival of Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Revival of Nationalism" by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of November 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

The new spirit out of Russia that is moving the world, an unwilling world, to perhaps a begrudged admiration is nationalism—love of country. The revival of Russia's ancient heroes, of interest in Russian history, the pride at the recapture of the mother city, Kiev, are the response of a people to the call of their own soil. Yugoslavia has, throughout this war, Chetnik and Partisan, dreamed of freedom for Yugoslavia, for Croat and Slovene and Serb. That is nationalism. The Free French movement is the nationalistic soul of Joan of Arc speaking in twentieth century accents.

In China, nationalism has been struggling against feudalism for half a century, but never more intensely than today. The Chinese love for China is asserting itself with overpowering persistence, with a fervor and strength that no disappointment, no disillusionment, no corruption, no internal strife can destroy.

And so the course of the war moves in all countries. As victory approaches, nationalistic fervor intensifies. As the day of settlement shines ahead, love of country becomes the most potent, the most assertive of emotions. That will be true in the United States as in all countries.

It is curious that many of those who admire the Russians, the Yugoslavs, the French, the Chinese for their nationalism, despite this very quality in our own people. Praising it in others, they denounce it in us. Honoring patriotism when it appears afar, they hurl humiliations upon it here. It is a phenomenon in confused thinking. It is all right for Russians to love the soil of Russia, but it is all wrong for Americans to love the soil of America. Here this noblest of human virtues is degraded into chauvinism, into a narrow isolationism. Who can understand such logic? Or is it logic? Is it not, rather, an unwillingness to accept the reality that patriotism is the only ideal for which men will, in the mass of an army, give their lives—our men as well as those of Russia, Yugoslavia, France, and China?

Of course, there are men and women who accustom themselves to parts of the world other than their native lands, but there is a homing pull, a force of gravity as true in the spirit of man as in the physical world that forces them to remember not only the land of their birth, but the lands of their ancestors. I recall more than a quarter of a century ago listening to Talcott Williams of Columbia's School of Journalism speak on the homing instinct of man. And he knew. His father was a missionary in Syria; his uncle was perhaps the greatest missionary scholar America ever sent to China. Talcott Williams was born in Syria, but his spirit turned ever to the America where his forebears were buried. And yet, whenever he and I spoke of the lands in the East, Syria, and Palestine, where he was born and where my philosophy of life originated, there was always an overtone of love for the land of birth as for the land of more distant origin.

No normal person can separate himself from these influences which are not of the mind but of the spirit. And that explains the British power in the American consciousness. It is language, ancestry, religion. These qualities are more sure than politics and the reasoned dialectics by which anything can be proved. A nationalistic American can never misunderstand a nationalistic anyone else. He grasps that what appears to be selfish is really idealistic; that which seems to be narrow egocentricity is patriotism.

I could quarrel with Russia's communism and internationalism, but I cannot quarrel with Russia's nationalism. When the Russian speaks of the greatness of his own land, its thousand years of history, the beauty of its gloomy differentiation, I admire him and match what he says with strong words of the achievements of America over three centuries on this continent, of the glories of personal liberty, of our free institutions, of our high standard of living, of our initiative in material improvements, of our respect for God by respecting all God's children of whatever kind. That is nationalism. It is a force that makes for human ennoblement.

Uncle Sam: No. 1 Publisher—A Sequel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the O. W. I. appropriation bill I charged the Federal Government with being the Nation's biggest publisher. I pointed out that while private publishers were suffering a cut of from 15 to 23 percent in their paper supplies the Federal Government, in the last fiscal year, used 40 percent more paper. The director of the O. W. I., Mr. Elmer Davis, wrote me a letter asking for a list of Federal periodicals. I submitted to him a list of 441 periodicals with a request that they be reviewed from the standpoint of wartime necessity and legitimate Government activity. The list was admittedly incomplete but gave a fair indication of how 161,611 tons of paper were used by the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1943. Several days after writing to Mr. Davis I inserted the list of Federal periodicals in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have since been overwhelmed by the public response to my endeavor to save the taxpayers some money by reducing the number of Government periodicals. Under permission to extend my remarks I include herewith some of the typical editorials which appeared in the Nation's press on the subject. These editorials are from Democratic newspapers.

RESULTS OF CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

Subsequent to my disclosures the O. W. I. sent out a letter to all heads of Federal departments and bureaus, over the signature of Elmer Davis, calling for economy, requiring all Government literature to be approved by a committee of O. W. I. and other departmental officials, and announcing that after November 30, 1943, no orders for a publication involving 300,000 or more pages will be approved unless accompanied by clearance papers from the O. W. I. committee. It is said that Federal publications of all types, excluding maps, a year ago totaled some 38,117 and averaged 3,200 monthly. This would indicate that periodicals play only a small, though expensive, part in the expenditure of millions of dollars for Government propaganda which has necessitated the current scrap paper collection campaign, a further cut in newsprint available to private publishers, and an increase in the amount of paper consumed by the Government Printing Office.

We shall watch with interest to see how well the new O. W. I. orders are carried out and what results are finally obtained thereby.

[From the Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat of November 21, 1943]

WHO WASTES THE NEWSPRINT?

People who object to a fewer number of pages in their favorite newspapers these days can obtain better response to their complaints by taking the matter up with their Congressman instead of the editor.

Representative MARION BENNETT, from this district, has delved into the newsprint shortage situation and discovered Federal consumption of newsprint increased 40 percent the past year, while bureaus are howling for newspapers to cut their own use of this product. BENNETT produced a file of 441 Government periodicals, including daily publications, weekly publications, quarterlies, etc. And he only had a partial list.

Government agencies used 161,611 tons of newsprint in the last fiscal year, enough to publish the Capital and Democrat for 65 years. Most of the Government-printed hand-outs are wastebasket stuff.

Mr. BENNETT ought to know that his constituents disapprove of this unconscionable waste by Federal bureaus—too numerous in themselves. The only way the Congressman can find out your reaction is for you to write him.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph of November 22, 1943]

WORLD'S NO. 1 PUBLISHER

Representative BENNETT of Missouri has asked Congress to review Government printing activities, declaring that Federal consumption of newsprint increased 40 percent last year, while newspaper publishers were cut 15 percent.

He placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list which shows that the Government now publishes 241 monthlies, 9 dailies, 48 weeklies, 33 quarterlies, and many others of miscellaneous character.

Mr. BENNETT said he compiled the list after Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, questioned a recent statement that "Uncle Sam is now the world's No. 1 publisher."

The figures furnished by the Missouri Congressman certainly seem to bear out his contention, but the average newspaper has even more convincing evidence in the amount of Government hand-outs which have to be thrown in the wastebasket every day. There simply is no excuse for an increase of 40 percent in Government printing at a time when the newspapers have had to take a 15-percent cut in the use of newsprint, with a still larger reduction in prospect.

The waste and extravagance is not in Government use of newsprint alone. All the facilities of transportation and communication are needlessly cluttered up by this excess output of canned publicity. A heavy burden is imposed upon the depleted staff of the Post Office and tens of thousands of individuals are engaged in bringing out these publications when they might be more profitably employed elsewhere, perhaps on the battle front.

Let us hope that Representative BENNETT pushes home his demand for the restriction of Government publications.

[From the Daytona Beach (Fla.) Evening News of November 23, 1943]

STUFFED SHIRT LITERATURE

Representative BENNETT of Missouri last week in Washington pointed out an anachronism in governmental control of materials, manpower, and machinery which should interest every newspaper reader, taxpayer, and employer—every citizen, in fact, who wants war economy policies to get results.

BENNETT asked Congress to review government printing activities, and declared that Federal consumption of newsprint paper increased 40 percent last year while newspapers were compelled to use 15 percent less than they used in 1941.

BENNETT said he had compiled a list of 441 Government periodicals turned out by the Government Printing Office, in addition to the thousands of Federal bureau bulletins which, he said, "pour out in a steady flood."

Every newspaper office in the United States knows something of the vast volume of this "steady flood" of Federal printing press and mimeograph publicity, for it comes to the newsrooms of America in every mail—pounds of it, scores and hundreds and thousands of pages of it, an endless avalanche of words piled on top of words—literally billions and billions of them apparently dedicated to the proposition that words, mere words, will win the war.

For that is all that most of this Federal publicity amounts to—just words. Some of it is expensively printed in handsome booklet form. Some of it comes in neatly stapled sheaves of mimeographed sheets. But almost all of it is poorly written, repetitious, didactic, opinionated, and pompus.

Some of it tells the reader to save materials, machinery, time, and labor and thus help win the war—and the reader observing the waste of material, machinery, time, and labor that went into the pumpticus preachment wonders why this particular Government agency doesn't practice what it preaches.

Far more than paper is wasted in the manufacture, publication, and distribution of this stuffed-shirt literature. Labor, machinery, time, and the Nation's overstrained transportation facilities are wasted too.

Happily, nobody reads the stuff through. It would be more than tragic if everybody did. For if all the American people sat down and read all the official publicity that pours out of Washington they wouldn't have time to do anything else. This is the literal truth. The Nation's war pot would boil dry on the stove—unless the fire went out first.

Representative BENNETT is right. It is high time to review Government printing activities, not only to save money, newsprint, other materials, machinery, time, and labor, but to jolt some sense into the use of official publication privileges. Those privileges are being shamelessly abused.

Dedication of Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on October 30, last, I attended a very notable event in the city of Utica, N. Y. It was the dedication of the Rhoads General Hospital, which had been constructed by the United States Army for casualties of this war. In connection with my statement I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of addresses which were made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the addresses were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESENTATION SPEECH DELIVERED BY MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. TERRY, COMMANDING GENERAL, SECOND SERVICE COMMAND

Senator Mead, Colonel Canning, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, many important factors are considered in selecting the site for a large Army general hospital. Briefly, under the heading of environmental sanitation, these may be listed as: Character of terrain, climate, water supply, drainage, sewage disposal, and the prevalence of freedom of disease-bearing insects. Furthermore, the place selected should be secure from enemy action but should be in close proximity to railway facilities and, if possible, near a large airfield. Through highways leading into it are essential. A beautiful, cultural city such as Utica, where ambulatory patients can obtain wholesome recreation and where proper merchandise can be secured is highly desirable, but the hospital should be far enough from the noise and hustle of the city to insure a quiet, restful environment so beneficial to the sick. Rarely, if ever, is it possible to find a location that meets every requirement perfectly, but I am sure you will agree with me, after weighing all of the above factors, that it is doubtful if any other site could more nearly meet all of the specifications mentioned. Here, indeed, is a startling contrast which may serve as food for thought for anyone who is philosophically inclined. There is that calm so welcome to the soldier who has been wounded overseas and yet, almost within a stone's throw of the gates of this hospital are many of the important plants and factories which make the very material with which these same soldiers were and others still are defeating the enemies of our country.

The Rhoads General Hospital is one of five such hospitals established since the beginning of the present emergency within the Second Service Command, which includes the States of New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. Three of these hospitals are in New York; the others are in New Jersey. Their total capacity is 10,000 hospital beds. General hospitals are scattered over the entire country in such a way as to implement the policy of the War Department to provide adequate hospital facilities for sick and wounded soldiers as near as possible and practicable to their homes. This makes it easier for the families and friends of these soldiers to visit them while they are in the hospital. Nothing lifts the morale of a sick or injured soldier so much as a visitor from home. Nearly one-fifth of the general hospital beds in the Second Service Command will eventually be here at Rhoads General Hospital and it is certainly not anticipated that more than this number will be needed for soldiers whose homes are in central and upper New York State and a portion of western New England.

I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to the people of this community who have given so generously of their time and money to help equip this hospital with many refinements which would otherwise be lacking and which contribute so much to the welfare and comfort of both patients and staff. Although the Government is liberal in its appropriations for the buildings and technical equipment of this institution—in round figures, $3,000,000 for the construction, several hundred thousand for equipment, and a monthly pay roll of about $175,000—we frequently do not supply the little niceties, such as window drapes for nurses' quarters, comfortable chairs and lounges in the day rooms, and many other details which lessen the monotony of hospital life. The citizens of this community—the neighbors of this hospital—have demonstrated to it a commendable spirit of patriotism and friendship which is and will be appreciated by the personnel serving and being treated at this hospital. Your pride and personal interest and your cooperation are great assets to Colonel Canning, the commanding officer of Rhoads General Hospital. I take this occasion to thank you for this splendid spirit of helpfulness and cooperation.

Although in war casualties must result, the least we can do is to offer our soldiers sanctuary and the benefits of a hospital such as this in which they may be made whole again. We pray the casualties may be few. Colonel Canning, as commanding general of the second service command, I take great pleasure in presenting to you now this splendid hospital.

CITATION ACCOMPANYING THE AWARD OF THE LEGION OF MERIT TO COL. AUSTIN J. CANNING

HEADQUARTERS HAWAIIAN DEPARTMENT,
Fort Shafter, T. H., May 31, 1943.
General Order No. 73.

AWARD OF THE LEGION OF MERIT

By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 20, 1942 (sec. 3, Bull. No. 40, War Department, 1942), and Executive Order 9260, October 29, 1942 (sec. 1, Bull. No. 54, War Department, 1942), and pursuant to authority contained in War Department radiogram February 7, 1943, the Legion of Merit, in the degree of legionnaire, is awarded by the commanding general, Hawaiian department, to the following-named officers and enlisted men:

Austin J. Canning, colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army: For exceptionally meritorious service in the performance of outstanding service as commanding officer, station hospital, Schofield Barracks (now known as north sector General Hospital), in planning and coordinating the expansion of that hospital. During the period, commencing December 7, 1941, his performance of duty in establishing and carrying out the handling of battle casualties contributed in a large measure to the saving of a large percentage of such asualties. Entered military service from Pennsylvania.

By command of Lieutenant General Emmons.

LEONARD R. BOYD,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Chief of Staff.
Official:

R. E. FRAILE,
Colonel, A. G. D., Adjutant General.
A true copy:

C. M. GUYMON,
Captain, M. A. C.

TEXT OF ACCEPTANCE SPEECH DELIVERED BY COL. AUSTIN J. CANNING

Senator Mead, General Terry, General Marietta, General Kane, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor and my happy privilege to accept this hospital for the United States Army from the commanding general of the Second Service Command. I have watched this hospital grow from its very beginning. As a matter of fact, for many weeks, I was the staff of the Rhoads General Hospital! I clearly recall my first visit to the hospital site. It was on a very cold, snowy afternoon early in December. It had been snowing for 3 days

and the north wind was at its best. I was accompanied by my, cherished friend, Dr. Howard MacFarland of your grand city of Utica, and, as we drove out Burrstone Road, we finally came to the area. The Doctor stopped his car and said, "Well, colonel, this is it. Here it is." Well, I looked about at what was to be the Rhoads General Hospital. I didn't see very much—all that I could see was a lot of bulldozers going hither and yon and all they seemed to be doing were pushing snow here and there, but apparently they were doing other things at that. Well, I was very quiet; I didn't say anything. I was in that mood, sort of when a fellow sits and thinks, "Do I like it or don't I like it?"—that sort of a mood.

Finally, the doctor broke the silence and he said, "Colonel, I think you better be getting out of here now, looking the situation over, sort of makes a reconnaissance, sort of get the full topography, as it were." Well, I looked the doctor in the eye—he had a little twinkle in there, and I knew he knew that I had just returned from the Hawaiian Islands and this Utica cold was really bearing down on me, and I figured he wasn't trying to anoint my forehead with a little warm oil, but he was trying to slip me a little more of this Utica cold right down my back. So I said, "Doctor, you really said a mouthful that time. You gave me an idea and I'll just do that very thing. Today? No. Tomorrow? Maybe."

Well, from that very humble beginning has grown this very wonderful hospital, and we are glad to say that in the course of 10 months we are now some 90 or more percent completed. We have been receiving patients for 2½ months, and a goodly percentage of our beds are now occupied by the sick and wounded, the product of this second World War.

I would like to pause for a moment here and pay tribute to the engineers of the United States Engineer Corps who so ably designed and supervised the construction of this hospital and to the contractors who erected it. Their work was exceedingly difficult and they deserve a great deal of praise and credit. The winter conditions and the spring conditions this past year were the worst in the memory of some of our oldest citizens. However, that is water over the dam.

The Rhoads General Hospital is the typical example of the cantonment type hospital that is being erected throughout our land for the care of the sick and wounded of the present war. There is nothing pretentious about this hospital, as you can readily see. However, within its walls we have the finest medical equipment known to medical practice and our staff is of the very finest. The United States Government is today supplying to the men of the armed forces the finest medical and surgical service known, and because of the early treatment on the battlefield, the early evacuation to the rear and to the homeland, the use of plasma and the use of the sulfa drugs, we are having the lowest mortality rate in the history of warfare, and what a grand tribute that is to our democracy and what a great comfort to our armed forces wherever they may be, and to the mothers and fathers of these armed forces. War is an awful thing in any man's language, but it is hospitals like the Rhoads General that are doing so much to soften the hardships.

As commanding officer of the Rhoads General Hospital it shall be my aim and object, at all times, to make this hospital worthy of its name and to make it a credit to the Medical Department of the United States Army and an asset to the fine community in which it is located. I said worthy of its name—this hospital has been named in honor of Thomas Leidy Rhoads, a colonel in the United States Army for some 31 years and also an officer, a medical officer, in the United States Navy for about a year, making a total of some 32 years of very creditable, honorable service to his country. He was born in Boyertown, Pa., in 1870, and he died in Boyertown, Pa., in 1940 at the age of 70. He was a grand fellow. He was a very excellent surgeon and he was a very fine administrator. As a matter of fact he has the distinction of having been the personal physician to President Wilson and to President Taft and, upon the death of Archie Butt in the Taft administration, President Taft thought so much of him that he made him his aide. So I say that Rhoads General has a worthy name.

I want to thank the people of this community for the very generous support they have given us. They have been very wonderful. When the call went out to get some furniture for our day rooms, they responded beautifully. I want to take this opportunity to thank you and to tell you that we are appreciative. I want to thank General Terry for coming here today. General Terry is a very busy man and he has been so helpful to us. I am sure we are very proud, all of us, to be a member of his Second Service Command. We are particularly fortunate today in having with us the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from the Empire State of New York. The Senator has just completed a world tour of the battlefields and he is going to bring us his message a little later on on this program. On behalf of this community, the Rhoads Hospital, and its personnel, I want to thank the Senator for coming, and may God grant him health that he may continue his very fine work, not alone for the State of New York but for the United States at large. I want to thank General Marietta for coming here as a representative of the Surgeon General's office. General Marietta is an old friend of mine. I served with him years ago. I like him; he is a fine fellow, and, beyond that, he is a very excellent doctor. As a matter of fact, he is nationally known as an internist. I thank him for coming here today and helping us with this dedication. I want to thank General Kane. General Kane has been very wonderful to the Rhoads General Hospital in its infancy, and I take particular pride and pleasure in thanking him at this time. I want to thank every officer, every nurse, every enlisted man, every civilian, who has had a part in the making of this hospital. I clearly remember the early days when the officers were doing the filing. They were unpacking the boxes; the sergeants were doing stevedore's work, and so on. Much credit should go to them. As a matter of fact, I want to thank them from the bottom of my heart for all they have done to make the Rhoads Hospital what it is today, and now I have the profound regret to say that there are a great many friends of the Rhoads General Hospital that were not invited today. I am very sorry about that. I wish you good people would spread the word. It was simply a matter that there wasn't enough space in which to put them. I hope that you will bring that to everyone's attention. I want you to say to them that it wasn't that we overlooked them or that we didn't want them, for we did, but it was simply a case of trying to put a bushel into a peck which is exceedingly difficult. I thank you.

TEXT OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE JAMES M. MEAD, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the military, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel humble in my presence here with you today, because of the deep sense of appreciation I have for the work of the Medical Department of the United States Army and for the purposes for which we have here gathered. This ceremony permits us to pay tribute to the memory of a great character who devoted his life in the upbuilding and building up of one of the world's greatest humane enterprises. It is well for us to note the memory of men like Colonel Rhoads. It is, in addition, a happy privilege for me to participate with you in this added ceremony in which our friend receives the decoration of the Government of the United States for the services he has rendered as a member of the Army Medical Department. This quiet, mild-mannered, reticent, cultured servant of humanity, Colonel Canning, like Colonel Rhoads, merits the honor that has come to him this afternoon.

It has been my high privilege to have been closely associated with the personnel and the work of the United States Medical Department during the past several months. I have a higher appreciation of the magnitude of their problems and the heroic contribution they are making in the cause for which they are engaged. War, modern, mechanized war, is more deadly and devastating than ever before in the history of mankind. Ingenious land, sea, and air battleships, with devastating and destructive fire power, attacking frail humanity, certainly places the soldier in a very unenviable position. Land mines and bombs, booby traps, and torpedoes and all of the various contrivances make it even difficult for him to tread, where, in other wars he would be in the very citadel of safety. But there is one ray of hope in all this widespread devastation; there is one gleam of sunshine that penetrates this gloom, and I saw it in my travels as I came in contact with the men and the women of the Medical Corps of our military service.

First of all, this mobilization of our human resources is a great inventory, a census-taking of the health of the youth of the Nation. Hundreds of thousands of names of rejectees have been turned over to humane, private enterprises so that those unfortunate victims of disease and disability denied the right of service in the military of their country, might be rescued from an early death or might be given a chance to live healthy, wholesome lives.

This war is the greatest test that has ever been given to the Medical Corps of the Army and of the Navy of the United States. It is not confined to one battlefield in one nation, nor is it confined to the battlefields of a hemisphere. Our medical men can be found in the icy wastelands of the Frigid Zones. They are serving in the disease-ridden jungle countries of the South Pacific where malaria and dunage fever and other tropical ailments attack humankind; in the torrid tropics there you will find the Army and the Navy Medical Corps. Under all kinds of climatic conditions, in every section of the world, these men are now leaping from planes in parachutes into the mountain fastnesses of the Himalayas or into the woody jungle countries of the Solomons, there to rescue someone who needs their attention. They are called upon in addition to this global task to care for the health of the greatest Army that was ever organized by this country. The great many trivial diseases that follow such groupings of men would of itself tax the capacity and the ability of this Medical Corps, but when we add to that the many ailments incident to the climatic conditions under which boys from this healthful, wholesome Temperate Zone in which we live; boys that find themselves in the blistering, burning sands of an Arabian desert; boys that are up there facing the great icy mountains in Greenland; our boys that walk through the snake-infested swamplands of

New Guinea and the Solomons; it is indeed a gigantic task—almost a superhuman test—and, yet, they're meeting every challenge. They are serving every need.

I saw a doctor who had never made a parachute landing in his life, until recently; who never had one on until one day he was told to jump from an altitude of 20,000 feet and to a country supposed to house head-hunters and there to look for the victims of a forced landing that had radioed for help. Later he went in a second time to rescue the party that came out with Eric Severeid and others who crashed with him. I flew from the Solomons to a hospital in Australia with a wounded bombardier whose sight would be lost unless he reached an operating table in the matter of a few hours. I saw those Army nurses, affectionately called Hell's Angels flying out of Sicily to the hospitals of north Africa, those Army nurses with their wounded—wounded that reached the hospitals 5 hours after they became the victims of enemy shells.

Casualties—casualties of course are bound to mount in a war like this; casualties resulting from wounds, casualties that bring on gangrene and tetanus and other similar and kindred ailments, but thanks to the Medical Corps, gangrene and tetanus are wiped out or nearly so and victims of pneumonia that spent 2 and 3 months in the hospitals are now back with their commands in 10 or 12 days.

These men—men and women of the Medical Corps—are not only serving well the boys that are fighting for us but they are diagnosing the ailments and the diseases that that beset the people in the countries in which our boys are fighting. Investigation after investigation is made with the result that the victim of disease in China, in India, and in the far-off islands of the south Pacific and in the Arabian lands will be the beneficiaries of the contributions made to humanity by the men and the women of medicine who wear the uniform of the military of our country. They have measured up to the challenge. They have met the test and it is due to the fact, first of all, because they are zealous, patriotic, and heroic men and women; secondly, because of the intelligent direction and the advanced methods and the perfection of the system under which they operate. Perhaps while we are sitting here in this comfortable hall this afternoon, they're out there taking another island in the far-off southern Pacific—one of our boys drops by the wayside and, within minutes—yes; seconds—soldiers of the Medical Corps are whispering words of confidence into his ear, giving him the emergency treatment so necessary for life even within the range of the enemy guns; then the litter bearers carry him back to an emergency hospital where the sulfa drug and your blood perhaps, eliminates the shock and prepares him for the trip in the flying ambulance to the hospital just beyond the pale of the enemy guns. It is the system that wins that terrific fight against death. It is the system that saves 97 percent of the boys admitted to the hospital who win the fight to live again.

When the record of this war is over; when America and the world have opportunity to review the fruits that will accrue to humanity as the result of the sacrifices our boys and our people and theirs will have made; when humanity enjoys some of the freedoms they have heretofore been denied; a grateful America, a grateful world, will pause more often than we do today to honor men like Colonel Rhoads and Colonel Canning, because they served their fellow men and gave them an opportunity to enjoy a little more of life and a little more of health. We have every reason to be proud of our country's Medical Corps.

INVITED GUESTS OF HONOR

Col. John H. Daye, commanding officer, Third Military District, Syracuse, N. Y.

Brig. Gen. Clarence P. Kane, commanding general, Rome Air Service Command, Rome, N. Y.

First Lt. A. P. Diemer, assistant chaplain, Rhoads General Hospital.

Maj. James E. McDaniel, chaplain, Rhoads General Hospital.

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Terry, commanding general, Second Service Command, Governors Island, N. Y.

Col. Austin J. Canning, commanding officer, Rhoads General Hospital.

Maj. Gen. Shelley U. Marietta, commanding general, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.

Capt. John W. Cooley, assistant chaplain, Rhoads General Hospital.

Mr. Collier Rhoads, R. D. No. 3, Pottstown, Pa.

Mr. James G. Capps, president, Utica Chamber of Commerce, 6 Sage Court, Utica, N. Y.

Mayor Vincent R. Corrou, City Hall, Utica, N. Y.

Mr. Charles S. Donnelley, postmaster, Utica, N. Y.

Senator James M. Mead, Washington, D. C.

Capt. Carl M. Guymon, adjutant, Rhoads General Hospital.

Miss Selma Kaye, soloist, Radio City Music Hall, New York, N. Y.

Maj. H. E. Trevvett, New York State Guard, Utica, N. Y.

Col. G. J. Winslow, commanding officer, Sixth Regiment, New York State Guard, Utica, N. Y.

Lt. Col. John Elleman, district engineer, Syracuse, N. Y.

Col. Edward L. Smith, quartermaster, Rome Air Service Command, Rome, N. Y.

Col. Charles S. Mudgett, commanding officer, Two Hundred and Thirty-seventh Station Hospital, Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, N. Y.

Maj. F. R. Deland, first project engineer, Rhoads General Hospital.

Mr. Paul L. Sites, project engineer, Rhoads General Hospital.

Capt. Thomas Tailor, aide to Major General Terry.

Col. Lucius Clement, commanding officer, Madison Barracks, N. Y.

Judge Stephen W. Brennan, United States district judge, Utica, N. Y.

America's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am talking today to true Americans. To the 135,000,000 who prefer their own country—who will not sell it short. I am not talking today to foreign nations, or to foreign subsidized Americans or "one worlders" who would substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes.

America's program is to build, ever, a greater and stronger Nation, to raise, not lower, its standard of living. We will never consent to bring our standard of living down to the level of the Latin-American peon, the oriental coolie, or the untouchables in India. We believe in cooperation and collaboration for a just and permanent peace. Not a permanent protection for imperialists and oppressors. This is, and will continue to be, America's program.

When this cruel war ends it will be the duty of America to help form a United States of Europe. The more powerful European nations should be divided into states, and these states, together with the smaller nations, should constitute the United States of Europe. Unless we do this, national boundaries and racial hatreds in Europe will produce other wars.

When this devastating war is over, it will be our duty to help rebuild the ravaged nations. We must provide food for the hungry. We must provide material to rebuild productive enterprises. This from out of our surpluses—not out of our own necessities. No assistance must be given to foreign politicians in aid of suppression or oppression. That is not a productive enterprise.

Let us clear away the wreckage and help to build the world anew, but, all the time let us keep in mind that "charity begins at home." America will not sell its domestic markets in order to bribe good neighbors. Neighbors you have to bribe are not neighbors, but, enemies. We have gone far enough with that nonsense. We will not mingle our standard of living with the poverty of other nations, but, we will assist them in bringing their standard up to ours.

It is America's special duty to save the starving children of Norway, France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, Denmark, and Czechoslovakia. These nations have made the greatest sacrifice in blood and material loss. Yet, as I listened to Dr. Kershner before a Senate committee, I became alarmed. Dr. Kershner's testimony is substantiated by Mr. Hoover and other humanitarian workers.

We quote Dr. Kershner:

In June 1942 * * * our distribution came to an end because our Government would not give us a license to pay for additional supplies of powdered milk which we had purchased in Switzerland. Most of the 5,000 babies which we helped in this way are probably not alive today.

The following winter we could not get permission to bring even vitamin concentrate from America and reduced our distribution to 100,000 children * * * when we were not allowed to bring any clothing from the Western Hemisphere, we did succeed in getting two carloads of paper clothing from Sweden * * *.

The gratitude of the French people for the little help that we gave them was boundless. We received thousands of letters from the children, * * * with such expressions as: "If America is ever in trouble, I shall be the first to enlist"; "if American children are ever hungry, I will save my centimes for them"; "when I grow up, I shall teach my children to love America, even as I do"; "next to France, America is my country."

I thought our Government would be pleased with the arrangement that I had made to take this milk away from Germany to the babies of France. I think Washington was pleased. The State Department made no objection. The Treasury made no objection, but failed to issue the license. Why?

Threading our way through the departments in Washington, we finally traced the source of the opposition to the British Embassy.

Can it be that Britain did not want America to continue to be the sole recipient of gratitude for feeding the children of France?

Mr. Kershner stated that the British people, their Parliament, and all the governments in exile want to feed these children. He stated:

1. That the children can be saved without aiding the enemy or detracting from our war effort. 2. That such action would shorten rather than prolong the war. 3. That it would make post-war reconstruction much less difficult.

This makes one wonder who runs this Nation—London or Washington? What has become of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want? If I were President, I would use all the power of our Government to save these unfortunate children of our friends and our allies. I would throw open the blinds and let in the light of publicity on any foreign or domestic official who interfered and thus annihilate him forever with public opinion. May we ask, Is this a sample of the One Worlder's permanent and lasting peace? Peace by starvation and death?

Now, let us consider America's problems on the home front. All of us, except a few hyphenated hybrids, are primarily concerned with the welfare of our own Nation. Yes; we are Americans first, last, and all the time. Let that soak deep into your conscience. Anyway, what is wrong with being an American first? Churchill is an Englishman first. Stalin is a Russian first. Chiang Kai-shek is a Chinese first. Our armed forces are giving their lives for America. Then, why should not we all be Americans first? Can anyone but a disloyal person object?

When the war drums cease to beat, there will be plenty to do without fooling around with One World lunacy. Caesar, Alexander, Charlemagne, and Napoleon all died of that disease and it is about to finish Hitler. Do you realize that there will be 15,000,000 thrown out of employment when the war plants fold up? In addition, there will be 12,000,000 soldiers demanding that the Government that interrupted their lives give them an opportunity to get a new start.

When that time comes we will owe $300,000,000,000 Federal debts. We, 135,000,000 possessing less than 10 percent of the world's resources, will owe more than all the other nations together—more than the over 2,000,000,000 that possess 90 percent of the world's resources.

There will again be deflation; there will again be unemployment; there will again be overproduction, or, rather, underconsumption; there will again be an agricultural problem, a home owner's problem, this unless we meet these issues intelligently. There will again be unpaid taxes and debts by the billions. There will be a financial collapse unless we adopt an American program.

The time to face these issues is now The time to discuss them is now. The time to pass legislation to meet the situation is now. America must have a domestic program as well as a foreign policy.

First among these safety valves is cost of production for the farmer on 43 principal agricultural products—not 75-percent parity on only five. The ignorant regime of the "abundant life by scarcity" is past. Restricting production—wantonly killing livestock—regimenting and penalizing the farmer—now belongs to the Dark Ages. Never again will the farmer submit to having 265,000 bell wethers placed on his back to tell him what he may produce and what he may not produce, what he may eat and what he may not eat.

Do you know that the Secretary of Agriculture is now suing farmers to collect the unconstitutional penalty of 49 and 57 cents a bushel on so-called excess wheat? This is adding insult to injury. It interferes with the war effort. May I ask every farmer to write or wire his Congressman to sign Petition No. 10 at the Speaker's Desk. This will stop these lawsuits and will refund the $15,000,000 penalty extorted from the farmers. I say unconstitutional—the erroneous and unconstitutional decision of the Supreme Court notwithstanding. The Constitution, not the decision, is still the supreme law of the land.

Next, Congress must provide a living annual wage for common labor. We do not mean merely a subsistence wage, but, a wage sufficient so that the workers can educate their children the same as the rest of us. The hostility towards organized labor by the paid propaganda over the radio and the metropolitan press and theaters must stop. Organized labor consists of 48 percent of our population. They have 48 percent say about the Government under which we live.

American labor has done a marvelous job during this war. They, too, are getting tired of being regimented—of government by bureaucracy. May I suggest that if we have good sense we will cooperate with labor. If we are going to abolish government by bureaucracy, we must have some of labor's support in November 1944. If we are going to clean house of the alphabetical set-ups, if in November 1944 we are going to elect a President to help us do this, then, we must have sense enough to give a square deal to labor. We cannot win without some of labor's votes. We surely cannot get their support by slapping them in the face. This is their Government as much as ours. Paying to misrepresent labor injures all of us. It creates disunity. It is un-American.

Again, there must be an intelligent old-age compensation—security from want. Any person who has worked from the age of 20 to 60 has produced enough wealth to last for life. If such a person finds himself in financial distress, and without means of a comfortable livelihood, then it is because society appropriated the wealth he created. Therefore, it is society's duty to protect such a person from want.

Congress must also resurrect, protect, and promote individual enterprise. It must give to small business a square deal, not a new deal with points, stacked cards, and loaded dice. It must protect it from the nuisance of the O. P. A. and all the rest of the alphabetical set-ups. Congress must also protect small business from monopolies built up during this war. Look behind the scenes and you will find multimillionaires in all key positions. The Stettinius', the Rockefellers, the Harrimans, the Du Ponts, and even the Tommy Lamonts are in the saddle.

Again Congress must provide the soldiers, when they return, with the means of reestablishing themselves in private, productive enterprise. This will enable the returning soldiers to create employment for themselves and jobs for others in place of asking for jobs that will not exist.

We suggest that a paid-up life-insurance policy be issued to each veteran in the armed forces. The amount of such policy shall be at the rate of $300 a month for overseas service and $150 a month for home service. Any veteran who wishes to engage in any individual, productive enterprise should be allowed to make a loan for that purpose up to the face value of such policy. Such loan to be paid back in 20 annual installments with interest at 1½ percent per year. The income from such productive enterprise to be exempt from Federal and State income tax for 5 years.

If the American way of life is to continue, we must have more democracy—not less. All Executive sessions and secret diplomacy must cease. What our officials know we, their masters, are entitled to know. There must be no more one-man made laws. The courts must again learn to respect the Constitution.

If we are to continue as a republic we must provide for the nomination and election of the President and the Vice President by popular vote in a primary and general election. The term of office should be limited to 7 years with no successive reelection. The President and the Vice President should not be elected at the same time that Congress is elected. This will prevent political manipulation. It will prevent self-perpetuation in office. It will make the unwarranted assumption of legislative power by the Executive impossible.

Finally, government by bureaucracy must be abolished. There has been too much concentration of power in Washington. The bureaucrats not only wish to control the Nation's industrial activities, but insist upon doing the thinking for all of us. Many of these are incompetent to do their own thinking, let alone the Nation's. Congress must stop this nonsense—it is dangerous.

In conclusion permit me to dedicate America's program to any Republican candidate for President who will sponsor it. Such a candidate would be elected. However, remember campaign orators and preconvention orators need not apply. This time we, Americans, demand sincerity and good faith.

Pigs and Calves Being Destroyed in the Northwest Through Lack of Food to Sustain Them and Bungling of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the great Northwest, which from the early days has been devoted in a large measure to the growing of livestock and maintaining dairy herds, the bungling of O. P. A. is causing the owners to destroy young pigs and calves through their inability to obtain food for them and to comply with the crack-brain regulations being put into effect and enforced by the O. P. A. This great area of our country, by reason of its mild climate, extensive pasture lands, and fertile fields adapted to the growing of stock food, is being severely crippled by O. P. A. regulations, with which stock growers find it impossible to comply. We have the startling experience in my own district of dairymen having to kill and destroy young calves for the reasons named. I include as a part of these remarks the following article appearing in the Portland Oregonian of November 19, giving the facts with reference to one of many such cases. The article follows:

DAIRYMAN USES HAMMER TO SOLVE SURPLUS CALF PUZZLE; BLAMES WELTER OF GOVERNMENT RESTRICTIONS, CEILINGS

A 5-pound sledge hammer Thursday was brought into play by Albert Wardin, operator of the Fulton Park dairy at Hillsdale, to solve his surplus-calf problem.

Irked by Government red tape and alphabet organization rulings, Wardin picked up a sledge hammer and began slaughtering 2-day-old calves to which he was unable to feed valuable milk.

"I hate to do it," the dairyman declared, "but it's my only 'out.' With all these Government restrictions, it is impossible to dispose of calves. Even during the darkest days of the depression, when there was a surplus of everything, I could always sell my calves at a profit right after they were born. Today you can't even give them away."

Warden said he will continue to consign his calves to the hammer and incinerator until present Government regulations are rescinded.

"I have a herd of 300 milk cows," he continued. "They produce an average of five or six calves a day at this season. Under ordinary conditions, I would be able to fatten these calves up or sell them immediately. But under the present set-up no one wants to buy calves and I can't spare the milk to feed them."

Hundreds of other dairymen in Oregon are reputed to be in the same plight as Wardin.

S. B. Hall, Multnomah county agent, said that the uncertainty of the dairy industry and conflicting Government meat-marketing regulations were forcing dairymen to destroy their calves.

"There will be thousands of calves slaughtered in Oregon if the price ceiling on dairy products is not lifted," Hall declared. "Many dairymen are quitting business. They can't pay $40 a ton for hay and $60 a ton for mixed grain and pay the prevailing wage for workers and still stay within the price range set by the O. P. A.

"Under ordinary conditions, dairymen were able to feed their bull calves for 6 weeks and then sell them for veal. Heifers were fed until they reached maturity. The Government has changed all that. Some drastic action must be taken or the dairy industry, particularly in the Portland area, is faced with ruin."

Apprised of the killing of calves by the Fulton dairy, local O. P. A. officials expressed no surprise, nor could they suggest any O. P. A. action which would stop the practice.

"Slaughter of young bull calves by dairies is a common practice in the industry and has been for years," said Earl Hald, O. P. A. price executive of the Portland district. "To raise the ceiling price on milk would only add to the reasons for killing calves. The dairymen kill the animals because they can't afford to feed them milk at present prices.

"We realize that the situation caused by war exigencies with resultant scarcity of stock feed and high prices therefor doesn't make the picture any too rosy for the dairymen.

"It is a fact, however, that the number of cows milked in Oregon has been steadily increasing for the past 18 months.

"A fact that must not be lost sight of is that a Government subsidy to the dairy industry, effective October 1, has increased its revenue by 15 percent or about a cent a quart."

I also include an editorial appearing in the Oregon Journal of November 18, dealing with the same incident:

THEY KILL CALVES AT BIRTH

We have the spectacle of a Washington farmer. He shot and buried 25 young pigs because he couldn't feed them to market weight at present feed prices. We have examples of calves slaughtered at birth and of cattle ranches overloaded with steers awaiting a market already glutted. Yet in Pacific Northwest cities, coolers are full of meat and some country-killed stock has been refused by dealers because they don't have room for it. Further, the larger packing plants are operating at less than capacity, and families and restaurants are on short rations.

It is a confused situation, calling for solution in action by O. P. A. and W. F. A. and W. L. B. These Federal agencies have the power. The local bottleneck in the packing plants is shortage of labor. This, in turn, it is freely admitted, is due to the fact that wages are not competitive with those of war industries. It is reliably estimated that 150 skilled knifers and boners are in the shipyards who might be induced to return to their trade if wages were adequate. Here is a job for the War Labor Board, which should bear in mind also that the packing houses need unskilled as well as skilled workers.

Feed prices are high, and the supply is shrinking. Packing-house operations must be stepped up to save the livestock and to save the growers from irreparable damage. This stock must be moved to market, but, under present conditions, the surplus in dressed meats in the cities would only be aggravated. Consumption, then, must be expanded until the congestion is relieved.

The Grange at Toledo urges that all meat be made ration-free in this region for the next 60 days. Why not? Or, if not ration-free, at least meat point values should be sharply lowered in order that the consumer can buy more. It is a rule to apply to meat going to restaurants as well as to families. Unable to serve turkey for many weeks, and hampered by the high point of value of butter—double what it formerly was—restaurants are caught in a tight spot and are serving far less meat than they could and would. A temporary adjustment of points, for 60 to 90 days, would bring real relief to both grower and processor, especially if the latter is given a new wage ceiling which will permit him to increase his working force.

The War Food Administration, the O. P. A., and the War Labor Board should combine effort to get quick relief with help of our congressional delegations. They should do it now.

A few days ago, in the adjoining State of Washington, it was reported by a United Press dispatch under date of November 17, appearing in the Oregon Journal of that date, that pigs were destroyed by farmers in that area because it was impossible to market the animals, and under existing stock food O. P. A. regulations the farmers would suffer a great loss by attempting to mature the pigs for the market. I include the article to which I refer, giving the details of this destruction of food values:

LITTLE PIGS REACH GRAVE, NOT MARKET; PRICES BLAMED

WENATCHEE, WASH., November 17.—Twenty-five little pigs with bullet holes through their hearts lay in a farmyard grave near here today, victims of history's most complex agricultural economic system.

The tragic story of the little pigs that won't go to market was related by John Andrist, operator of a 20-acre diversified farm near Cashmere, who said he was forced to shoot the porkers because he would lose money if he continued to feed them.

Andrist figured from every angle but price ceilings on hogs and lack of price ceilings on feed formed a pincers with him in the middle, he said.

He estimated it would cost him $29 to feed the piglets until they weighed 200 pounds and $1 each to haul to market in Seattle. The floor price would net him only $24 per animal and if he got the ceiling of $15 per hundredweight he would still lose the stockyard commission charges.

Also, Andrist declared, there was no market for the suckling pigs because no one else could afford to feed them through the winter with prices of barley, wheat, and oats uncontrolled. Likewise, no one he knew had the ration points to put up for 15 or 20 pounds of suckling pig.

Andrist said he could make a go of the pig business if the O. P. A. would put a ceiling on feed, roll present feed prices back a little and set a support price of $15 per hundredweight on hogs, but at the present time, despite the anomalous situation of short supply and big demand, there was only one solution—a firing squad and a common grave for 25 little pigs.

A side light on the manner in which the O. P. A. is administered in that area is shown by the following editorial from the Oregon Journal of its issue of November 17:

THE O. P. A. IS NOT A COURT

Question. As one of the marketers penalized by O. P. A., what was your experience?

Answer. I operate a small market on the Vancouver side of the Columbia. I've been short-handed, working night and day. My mind had been addled by regulations. I hadn't sold any meat above ceiling price, but while I had attached most of the price tags I hadn't got them all on the meat. One of the O. P. A. inspectors came and I explained what I was up against. I was called in and was told that my penalty would be to close for 1 day. I did so. Then I was called in again and told to close for 30 days.

Question. Did you have an impression that O. P. A. officials handling the hearing had the authority of a court?

Answer. Yes. I had the impression, from the way my case was handled, that if I didn't accept the lighter penalty, the same persons who conducted my hearing could fine me $1,000, put me in jail for a couple of years, revoke my license and put me out of business. I'll declare that if I wasn't in business, if I hadn't made my investment and built up my trade, and if I had any other way to make a living, I'd like to get out of business until the war is over and I can conduct my affairs again in the American way.

NOTE.—This is the second interview with a marketer penalized by O. P. A. Officials of O. P. A. disavow intention on their part to create in the minds of persons charged with alleged overcharges on vegetables, fruit, and meat, or with violation of other O. P. A. regulations, the impression that the hearings constitute court trials with themselves as judges. Nevertheless, complaints are many that the hearings are conducted with such formality and in such a deliberately created atmosphere of fear that legally untutored defendants believe the O. P. A. examiners are both prosecutors and judges. Wartime rationing of essential commodities is, of course, necessary to make sure that the armed forces are adequately supplied and that there is fair distribution among civilians. Enforcement, also, is necessary. But the O. P. A. is not a court. In a regularly constituted court the status of O. P. A. would be that of a plaintiff filing suit. From evidence, it appears that fear has been overworked and that appeals for cooperation, to which the majority of Americans readily respond, have been too often overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we call a halt and put an end to these destructive directives and O. P. A. regulations and clean the slate by removing the inefficient and ignorant employees who are destroying many of the great industries of our country through which we receive our food supplies? Unless the O. P. A. is revamped and sensible regulations provided to supplant the crazy quilt we now have, in this winter and the summer to follow we will not only find our soldiers in need of food supplies but the civilian population will suffer severely.

United States at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the rank of Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States is respected by all but a small handful of the citizens of this Nation. The conduct of the war under him and the progress that has been made toward the defeat of our enemies also have won the respect of all but a small minority of the citizens of this Nation.

The more we learn of his life and work, the greater is our respect, not only for his rank but for the man.

Because it is a fine portrayal of the man who is our Commander in Chief, and because it is an outstanding piece of journalism by which I hope better to acquaint the people of my own and other States with the life and work of this man, I am inserting in the RECORD the following excerpts from an article in the November 29 issue of Time, under the caption, "U. S. at War." To the editor of Time, Mr. Henry R. Luce, and to his entire staff an expression of deep gratitude is due, both for the example given therein of faithful adherence to the ideals of fair play and freedom from bias which have earned for the American press the distinction of being truly free.

The excerpts follow:

UNITED STATES AT WAR

When the President, the Prime Minister, and the Premier-Marshal sit down with Pavlov, Stalin's brilliant interpreter who can take English shorthand notes of Russian conversation and vice versa, not they but history will decide the prime agenda of their talk.

* * * * *

Joseph Stalin will meet a calm and confident man. Behind his self-imposed veil of secrecy, President Roosevelt has grown steadily more buoyant. At times his face is lined and pouched with weariness, but he looked wearier a year ago than now. Today he is like a fighter in the tenth round of a 15-round bout. Plenty of hard punching lies ahead. But he has felt out his opponent now, and is sure he can take him.

Most Americans now 40 were still in their 20's when Franklin Roosevelt entered the White House; thousands of United States soldiers and sailors fighting around the world remember no other President. Yet associates still marvel at his Gargantuan appetite for work, his ability to relax in the midst of it, his endless gay optimism. As it has to everyone else, the strain of war has wrenched, strained, and hacked at his basic traits of character. But in the President's case the grind has only polished what was already polished, only toughened what was already steel-strong.

He still relishes jokes and wisecracks. He can still drop off for a cat nap anywhere, anytime. He still looks forward to a nightly old-fashioned or two in his study before dinner as a high point of his day. He has grown almost impervious to political criticism. He rarely becomes angry at all—and then it is usually when somebody snipes at him through one of his children. The four Roosevelt sons in service help explain the President's great sensitiveness to the casualty lists—always the first thing he asks about when told of a battle. That sensitiveness, in turn, his intimates say, helps explain his Darlanesque "expediency" dealings. The President has said, in effect: Maybe we shouldn't deal with this fellow, but if we do I think we can accomplish our objectives and save 30,000 lives.

The President now thrives on the hardest work of his life. His early-morning routine has changed little: Awake at 7:30; a quick but thorough go at the Washington and New York papers (he reads Columnists Clapper and Lippmann regularly); breakfast of scrambled eggs, bacon, toast and milk; then, propped in bed in his year-round lightweight solid-color pajamas, with a blue cape around his shoulders, a chat with his secretaries on the day's schedule. Despite their best efforts and the President's recurring resolutions to cut down, his daily list of callers always seems to grow longer. Franklin Roosevelt likes people and loves an audience; Secretary "Pa" Watson still faces the problem of dragging away overtime visitors in the midst of Presidential anecdotes.

About 10 a. m. the President is wheeled over to his office. There, first thing, he attacks the mountains of mail and documents piled up in his workbaskets. He reads with page-at-a-glance rapidity: But part of his speed in getting through his paper work results from the fact that he reads military and State Department reports carefully, but most domestic messages get a quick send-off to James F. Byrnes in the opposite wing of the White House. Jimmy Byrnes has now actually become what so many of his predecessors were wrongly touted to be: a genuine Assistant President. Other intimates hesitate to say that the little ex-Senator and ex-Justice, who has grown steadily in Mr. Roosevelt's esteem and confidence, is now closer to the President than is Harry Hopkins. But Jimmy sees him oftener in daytime than Harry does. One big difference: Hopkins' after-dinner sessions with the President are almost always about war problems on which the President makes his own decisions next morning. Byrnes gets most of the big domestic problems to decide for himself. Aside from his concern about inflation, his associates say, the President is almost wholly immersed in the conduct of the war.

Leaving his office late (often at 6 instead of the peacetime 5 p. m.), the President rarely stops now for a swim. His personal wants are attended by Prettyman, a retired Negro sergeant who combines the courtesy of his race with the discipline of an old Army man, and Caesar, a strapping Filipino. After dinner (a few friends), the President may have a movie shown (Army and Navy films have priority), read reports or an occasional mystery story, or dictate to handsome Grace Tully or pretty Dorothy Jones Brady until bedtime. He usually gets to bed—except when Churchill is visiting—at 11:30. Very often, still, he ends the day with his beloved stamp collection, shoving the album under his bed when he grows sleepy. Solitaire, especially on train trips, and quick unpublicized visits to his trees and almost equally numerous relatives at Hyde Park are the President's other diversions.

In 1936, when Franklin Roosevelt said: "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with Destiny," Destiny looked to the United States like such things as slum clearance and wider highways. Last week, abroad, Destiny appeared to be wearing, for the moment, the hard, square face of Joseph Stalin. At home, Destiny looked like realism, the 1943 American word of the moment.

With many Americans, realism meant a pessimism that could even conceive an American withdrawal into isolation again. With many more, realism was coming to mean an optimism that would fight through all obstacles and misunderstandings, through crisis after crisis, as long as there remained any sensible hope of a world organized in some substantial degree to keep the peace.

For the realism of the pessimist overlooks, too, the possibility that the American people, for all their wartime grabbing and grumbling, their nagging obsession with gasoline, meat, and chewing-gum shortages, may be possessed of a deep sense of the world crisis in which they are involved, may be growing aware that their generation is shaping the history of the world. Their outward apathy may cover a realistic appraisal of the task they face, a grim realization that the better world they want is not to be built overnight in a glorious burst of crusading exaltation, but only by hard, slow, disagreeable, long-continued trial and error. Perhaps Americans must sacrifice old dislikes, perhaps even material advantages, to win that better world.

In the person of their President, Franklin Roosevelt, they stand on the threshold of that world today.

Massachusetts Feed Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the national issues which is causing grave concern in New England is the failure of the administration to secure sufficient and adequate feeds for livestock and poultry in the northeastern section of the United States. The matter has received very careful attention by many of our outstanding leaders in the agricultural world.

I am attaching herewith a letter which I have received from Prof. R. T. Parkhurst, head of the department of poultry husbandry at Massachusetts State College in Amherst, Mass., together with resolutions adopted by the New England Feedmen. I believe that this information may be of value to the Members of Congress who are anxious that proper steps be taken to provide both sufficient and proper feed in order that meat, dairy, and poultry products may be available in sufficient supply during the coming months.

The letter and resolutions are as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF POULTRY HUSBANDRY,
Amherst, November 23, 1943.

Mr. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of November 5.

I have had occasion recently to inquire from groups of poultrymen as to the effect of the present shortage of feed ingredients on the results they have obtained. The majority of poultrymen feel that the maturity of their birds is much slower this fall than previously and the production at the present time is definitely poor due to the slower maturity and apparently to the quality of the rations they are now feeding to their birds. Of course, in some cases rations are just as good now as previously and so some poultrymen are getting just as good results as ever.

I believe you will be interested in the enclosed brief summary of the Massachusetts feed situation as of November 15, 1943.

Undoubtedly you have seen the report of the committee dispatched to corn-producing sections in the United States to investigate the possibilities of securing corn for New York and the Northeast. This report and the general feed situation is being discussed in New York now by Representatives from most of the Northeastern States. Mr. Quentin Reynolds, manager of the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange, is Governor Saltonstall's representative on the committee. It was an excellent selection.

At their recent meeting the feed committee of the Massachusetts State College, the Massachusetts Feed Industry Council, and the Committee of New England Feedmen all were unanimously of the opinion that the present feed situation is resulting in lower milk and egg production.

The Massachusetts Feed Industry Council, which is advisory to the Massachusetts State U. S. D. A. War Board, at a recent meeting went on record in favor of the following:

1. The ceiling price of corn should be readjusted to a more reasonable relationship to the price of hogs.

2. Following such adjustments, the reopening of the futures market be permitted, in order to offer an opportunity to elevators and grain shippers to hedge their purchases, and thereby permit the building of a visible supply of corn on any movement of the new crop.

3. The export of corn be limited to special permits.

4. The War Food Administration be requested to allocate a larger proportion of imported protein concentrates to the mixers and dealers in this region in order to help maintain production of milk and eggs in Massachusetts.

Both the college feed committee and also the Massachusetts Feed Industry Council have approved the resolutions adopted by the New England Feedmen, a copy of which was sent to you previously.

Cordially yours,

R. T. PARKHURST,
Head of Department.

THE MASSACHUSETTS FEED SITUATION AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 1943

FAVORABLE FACTORS

1. Livestock feed price rations are generally less favorable to livestock production.

2. The need for satisfactory distribution and very efficient use of feeds is realized by W. F. A. They are doing their best to find supplies and distribute them equitably.

3. The production of grains (indicated) increased nearly 2,000,000 tons in September. Except for barley, harvested acreage of all feed grains was larger in 1943 than in 1942.

4. Indicated production of wheat millfeeds is up. More should be available soon.

5. There has been a freer corn movement to terminals and grinding points. (Representative LANE cites FitzGerald as saying one N. E. mixer recently purchased 100,000 bushels of corn of heavy moisture content for drying and subsequent use.)

6. Feedstuffs of November 6 reported:

(a) Ample supplies of vitamin D, barley and barley meal, pulverized rye, whole and grain oats, wheat (whole).

(b) Moderate supplies of meatscraps. Vitamin A (outlook poor) corn gluten, feed, and meal (offered). Cottonseed meal, ground and flaked wheat.

7. Wheat and barley, cottonseed meal, flaxseed, and animal proteins have been purchased from Argentina. They may meet our needs satisfactorily when received.

8. Soybean oil meal and linseed oil meal should start moving between now and January 1 from crushers, and may be available in large enough quantities when received to meet demands for them.

9. The world supply of wheat seems adequate for all 1943–44 needs.

UNFAVORABLE FACTORS

1. The hog-corn price ratio is above the long time average.

2. The total output of feed grains in 1943 is forecast at 115,000,000 tons compared to 124,000,000 tons in 1942.

3. Supplies of feed concentrates per animal unit are 12 percent less than in 1942–43. They are expected to be the same in 1944–45 as in 1941–42 and below the 1942–43 level.

4. The pinch in feed supplies (concentrates) is to become most pronounced during the spring and early summer of 1944.

5. The prices of oats advanced 10 cents per bushel late August to early October and reached 26 cents more than a year ago. Barley has advanced materially in the past 6 weeks.

6. The 1944 prospects for high protein oilcake and meal declined by about 200,000 tons.

7. Stocks of corn in all positions (carryover) on October 1 totaled 373,000,000 bushels, 119,000,000 bushels less than a year earlier and 272,000,000 bushels less than 2 years earlier. Total supply is 238,000,000 less than for 1942.

8. Combined holdings of oats on October 1, 1943 is 186,000,000 bushels less than on October 1, 1942.

9. Disappearance of feed grains was about 35 percent greater during July-September 1943 than for 1942. For the 12-months' period, 24 percent larger than for 1941–42. The disappearance of wheat is three times larger. The disappearance of rye for feed is up 37 percent; oats, 19 percent; corn, 17 percent; and barley, 14 percent. The greatest increases have been from May to September 1943.

10. Localized shortages of marked severity are anticipated in 1944.

11. In North Atlantic States there is a more-than-normal requirement for shipped-in concentrates. The distribution to local markets is a problem.

12. The production of dried skim milk is down 60 percent.

13. A car shortage is resulting in failure to get more Canadian wheat to us. This may be true of shipments of other feedstuffs from the Middle West soon.

14. W. P. B. wants corn used for alcohol production because the yield is estimated at 15 percent more.

15. The distillers' dried-grains output for September (preliminary estimate) was only 30,900 tons as compared to 32,100 tons for September 1942.

16. The last allocation of liver meal to Massachusetts was August 1943.

17. Soybean-oil meal, Government wheat, corn, and hay shipments are going to southern and eastern drought areas.

18. Feedstuffs (November 6) reported our nearest primary markets had shortages of: alfalfa meal (no offerings), probably 40 percent short; distillers' dried grains (none offered); dried skim milk, buttermilk, and whey (supply limited); fish meal (scarce); hominy feed (none offered); linseed-oil meal (none offered); brewers' dried grains (none offered); mill feeds with flour only; molasses (supply limited); peanut meal (limited supply); dried beet pulp (none offered); tankage (inadequate); soybean-oil meal (limited, inadequate).

19. The dairy subsidy may result in as much or more concentrate feeding to dairy animals if they can get the feed.

20. Lack of grinding capacity is becoming acute, because barley, oats, and wheat require additional capacity.

21. Production of feed manufacturers is nearly 20 percent less due to various causes: Labor problems, 51.8 percent; increase in grinding capacity, 7.4 percent; shortage of ingredients, 40 percent; other, eight-tenths of 1 percent; total, 100 percent.

22. There is forecast a 6-percent lower world wheat production for 1943.

INTERMEDIATE FACTORS WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT BE FAVORABLE

1. Feed wheat is restricted to dairy cows, laying hens, and turkeys.

2. Mixtures of 95-percent yellow-corn meal and 5-percent barley meal are being shipped above corn ceiling prices. Cracked corn mixes of a similar nature are reported.

3. Ceilings may soon be placed on oats and barley.

4. The availability of purchases in Argentina and other South American countries depends upon what shipping is available.

5. In general, Government allocation of feedstuffs is not wanted by any group.

6. The milk price ratio is relatively unfavorable even with subsidies.

7. Amount of wheat imports in 1944 from Canada is problematical because of transportation and other difficulties.

Did Isolationism Fail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first of a series of very able articles by William Henry Chamberlain surveying the past and present of American foreign policy and charting a course for the future. The article is entitled "Did Isolationism Fail?" It was printed in The Progressive of Monday, November 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID ISOLATIONISM FAIL?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

No less an authority on the subject than Adolf Hitler asserted in Mein Kampf that any falsehood will be believed if it is only big enough and repeated with sufficient frequency. I am reminded of this assertion when I notice the tremendous barrage of propaganda that is being laid down to convince Americans that they were as blind as bats or moles between the two world wars, that isolationism governed all American foreign policy after the end of World War No. 1, that this isolationism failed, and even got us into World War No. 2. I believe any candid study of the record will prove this thesis inaccurate from beginning to end.

At first sight it may seem fruitless to discuss whether isolationism failed or not at a time when we are engaged with men, money, and supplies in combat theaters all over the world. Except for a negligible minority of absolute pacifists and a still smaller minority of Axis sympathizers, Americans are generally agreed that the attack on Pearl Harbor and the German and Italian declarations of war left us no choice except to fight the war through to victory.

But the events of the past should be, although they seldom are, guides to intelligent action in the future. If the proposition that isolationism was our Government policy and failed to keep us out of war is correct, we are entitled to draw certain conclusions. If this proposition is incorrect, we may draw other conclusions.

Now, irrespective of whether isolationism was worthy or unworthy, workable or unworkable, the assertion that it failed does not correspond with the facts. For it was never tried, least of all in the period, decisive for our participation in the present war, between the outbreak of hostilities in Europe and Pearl Harbor.

Much loose thinking is attributable to the practice of throwing around words like "isolationist," "Fascist," "appeaser," "radical," "Communist" as terms of abuse without any clear idea of what the words stand for. Let's try to define "isolationist."

WE HAVEN'T TRIED IT

The superisolationists of history, I suppose, were the Japanese when they forbade any intercourse between their people and foreigners on pain of death until our own Commodore Perry insistently knocked at their door. No one would seriously maintain that we practiced isolationism to this degree.

Isolationist might be used more reasonably as a term for those who believe that America's primary political and economic interests are in this hemispere, that we have much to lose and little to gain by participation in the wars of Europe and Asia. The logical implications of this belief would have been to cut loose from the Philippines, to withdraw token military and naval forces from China, to refrain from diplomatic intervention in European disputes, to concentrate on the defense of this hemisphere.

It is impossible to say how many Americans would have favored such a policy if it had ever been squarely put up to them by some such device as a referendum vote. But what is important, from the standpoint of determining whether isolationism failed, is that no such policy ever commanded the support of the policy making leaders of our Government. The Neutrality Act was perhaps an attempt to legislate America out of participation in overseas wars. But the Neutrality Act depended for effectiveness on a sympathetic interpretation which the present administration was certainly not inclined to give it.

The period of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover is often referred to as a high point in American isolationism. It is certainly far from my purpose to defend every detail of American foreign policy in that period. Especially in the closely interrelated question of tariffs and war debts we were short-sightedly selfish, although no more so than other peoples before and during the great depression.

Yet, each of these administrations took steps that could not be reconciled with a genuinely isolationist foreign policy. For instance, America played a leading role in promoting the far-eastern settlement embodied in the Washington treaties of 1922. The implication of this settlement was that we were very seriously concerned over the maintenance of the status quo in China.

THE PRESSURES WE EXERTED

We exerted quiet but effective pressure at this time to get the Japanese out of eastern Siberia. We committed ourselves to the proposition that the administrative sovereignty and territorial integrity of China should be maintained. China was a pretty remote country to figure in the calculations of an isolationist foreign policy.

In 1927 we showed ourselves ready to cooperate with armed force in local intervention in China. When Chinese nationalist troops got out of hand after occupying Nanking in the spring of 1927 and commenced to massacre foreigners, the American Admiral Williams gave orders to bombard a part of the city in order to cover the evacuation of foreign residents. Our consistent policy of maintaining troops in the foreign sections of Chinese cities and warships in Chinese waters was certainly not isolationist. It was an emphatic assertion of our right to be considered a major power in the Far East.

The far-eastern settlement agreed on at Washington was shaken to its foundation by the Japanese seizure of Manchuria in 1931. While the United States did not resort to war at this time, its policy was no more isolationist than that of European powers with important interests in the Orient, such as Great Britain and France. Indeed, Mr. Stimson's diplomatic language was considerably stronger than Sir John Simon's, although British stakes in the Far East, whether measured by investments in China or by the colonial empire which was threatened by an expansionist Japan, were incomparably larger than our own.

HULL STATES OUR POLICY

It is now fashionable to represent the 1930's as a period of craven isolationism in American foreign policy. But on January 10, 1938, the State Department released the text of a letter from Secretary Hull to Vice President Garner which, by implication, completely repudiated any isolationist or regionalist restrictions as to the aims of American foreign policy.

"The interests and concern of the United States in the far-eastern situation, in the European situation, and in situations on this continent," wrote Mr. Hull, "are not measured by the number of American citizens residing in a particular country at a particular moment, nor by the amount of investment by American citizens there, nor by the volume of trade. There is a broader and more fundamental interest, which is that orderly processes in international relationships be maintained."

Now the maintenance of "orderly processes in international relationships" was certainly a phrase wide enough to cover intervention in many parts of the world during the present era of universal disorder and violence. It is important to remember that even when large numbers of individual Americans probably hoped that their country could and would disinterest itself in conflicts originating in European and Asiatic conditions, this view was never shared by the policy-making branches of the Government.

Even when American bellicose sentiment was at a low ebb one can find no diplomatic document reflecting American acquiescence in the idea of withdrawing politically from the Orient and leaving the Japanese, the Chinese, the British, the Russians, and other peoples in that part of the world to fight out their quarrels among themselves.

Certainly the factual record of our far-eastern policy flatly contradicts the statement by Mrs. Roosevelt, as reported in an Associated Press dispatch from Wellington, New Zealand, that "at the end of the last war the people of my Nation thought they could withdraw from a united world, mind their own business and only have intercourse through trade with other nations." Equally unjustified as Wendell Willkie's statement that after World War No. 1 "we retired into an era of strictest detachment from world affairs" and Sumner Welles' declaration that "the United States after the victory of 1918 withdrew from almost every form of practical cooperation with friendly nations in the reconstruction tasks and made no effort to win the peace."

These statements reflect a complete misconception, extraordinary in view of the eminence of their authors, of our role in Europe, as well as in the Far East after the last war. One of our first very practical ventures in cooperation with the nations of Europe was to save central and eastern Europeans from dying of disease and starvation.

The immense humanitarian value of the work rendered by the A. R. A. (American Relief Administration) in the immediate post-war period is generously recognized by a competent British observer, J. M. Keynes, who, in his Economic Consequences of the Peace, draws a caustic parallel between the practical humanity of the A. R. A. and the futile wrangling over supposedly strategic borders that occupied much of the attention of the diplomats at Versailles.

American food, organization, and distribution saved millions of Russian lives during the great famine in that country in 1921–22. Besides the A. R. A., the Red Cross, the American Friends Service Committee, the Near East Relief, and the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, stepped into the breach to give help in many emergencies in foreign countries.

AMERICA TO THE RESCUE

No people in the world rivaled the American contribution in money, food, clothing, and the technical organization of relief work for Chinese famine and flood sufferers, uprooted Armenians, transplanted Greeks, and other

groups that experienced special disasters during the aftermath of the war.

No doubt America's gifts were only in proportion to American wealth. But a people that had slammed its doors on the outside world and thought only in selfish and noncooperative terms would never have set in motion so many benevolent enterprises in remote corners of the world.

Neither were we indifferent, as Mr. Welles suggests, to the great international post-war problems of economic reconstruction and disarmament. American experts played a leading, although unofficial part in the discussions that culminated in two efforts to place the reparations problem on a workable economic basis.

These two efforts received American names: the Dawes plan and the Young plan. After the adoption of the Dawes plan, American capital poured into Germany and facilitated economic recovery. It is true that the Young plan foundered on the rocks of the great depression, which made the transfer problem, always difficult, completely insoluble. But America did not stand aside from the effort to promote world economic reconstruction.

American foreign investments between 1915 and 1930 leaped from $2,600,000,000 to $15,675,000,000. We lent money from China to Peru. Many of these loans were granted hastily and improvidently and a considerable part of this money, along with the greater part of our $10,000,000,000 war loans, had to be finally written off as uncollectible. But it is absurd to describe as isolationist an economic policy that amounted to hawking our goods and capital in every market in the world.

This economic policy is indeed subject to just and severe criticism on other grounds. Most American politicians, bankers, and businessmen failed to recognize a proposition that should have been obvious to a freshman in Economics A: That international trade and investment must be a two-way street.

We proceeded on the absurd assumption that we could indefinitely continue to do three incompatible things at the same time: (1) Maintain a favorable balance of trade by means of high tariffs. (2) Lend money lavishly abroad, with the expectation of receiving back principal and interest. (3) Collect a large part of our war debts. This policy suffered from the same blind spot as the Anglo-French method of demanding huge reparations and yet excluding the German goods through which alone reparations could have been paid in any considerable amount.

BILLIONS WASTED ABROAD

But this justified criticism has nothing to do with an imaginary isolationism in our economic relations with the outside world. The American people would have been better off if our foreign economic policy had been more intelligently isolationist than it actually was. The vast sums lent abroad and largely lost by default could have financed scores of useful public improvements in the United States, more and better rural schools, slum-clearance efforts, large electric-power facilities, soil- and forest-conservation projects.

As regards disarmament, the record shows that we were anything but "indifferent," to use the word of Mr. Welles, or "strictly detached," to quote Mr. Willkie. We played a leading part in the Washington Conference of 1922 and the London Conference of 1930, which fixed levels of limitation of naval building. American observers attended all the League conferences on disarmament and economics, and constructive American proposals were put forward at these gatherings.

Frank Kent Talks to the American Electorate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, thumping Republican victories from New York to Kentucky, inclusive, on November 2, have given rise to many political predictions that the Republican candidate for President in 1944 will be elected whether or not Franklin Roosevelt runs again and again and again, and whether or not the war is over.

In this connection, the following article by Frank R. Kent should be of interest to readers both in and out of Congress. Long recognized as one of America's most able and accurate political observers, Mr. Kent is in position to speak with some authority on the matter of political trends and their impact upon the progress of this Republic. His analysis of the forces and groups behind the fourth term movement is therefore all the more significant and his estimate of what 16 years of the same ruling family would do to the American way of life is not something which can be lightly tossed aside by either Democrats or Republicans who sincerely are dedicated to the preservation of the American system.

Perhaps it is because of the facts brought out by Mr. Kent that loyal Americans in the Democratic Southland are increasingly active in the formation of plans to run Senator BYRD, of Virginia, General Marshall, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, or Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, as their candidate for President rather than once again going through the artifice of participating in a White House promoted "draft" in order to perpetuate the New Deal and its vast army of palace favored bureaucrats in control of the Democratic Party and perhaps the country for another four years.

Under leave granted me by the House, Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks the following thought-provoking discussion by Frank R. Kent:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

Since the recent election, emphasizing the strength and vigor of the antiadministration tide, the Republicans have been getting quite a lot of free advice about what they should do and what they should not do. Not all of this advice is disinterested. Not all of it is good.

Some of it comes from individuals and influences whose support no Republican candidate can get against either Mr. Roosevelt or any candidate named by Mr. Roosevelt—particularly no candidate who stands on anti-New Deal platform and can add two and two together without counting on his fingers.

These advisers include the professional liberals, the Communistic unioneers of the C. I. O. and the American Labor Party, and the out-and-out Communists who are frankly for Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal because they tend toward the economic chaos which is the essential forerunner of a change to communism.

It is silly to think that any of these groups will be for any Republican, and advice from them is inspired by malice and a mean purpose. But there are others—decent, well-meaning men—who, appreciating the probability that the Republicans will win in 1944, are greatly concerned lest their victory have calamitous consequences. These seem unduly alarmed. Most of their fears are likely to be dissipated by events.

VOTE SHOULD DISPEL FEARS

For example, until a short while ago there were those who felt that, despite the Mackinac resolution, the Republican is really the party of isolation and that its success would mean a swing away from post-war international cooperation. But that fear seems very foolish, indeed, since the Senate vote incorporating the Moscow agreement in the Connally resolution.

There were only five votes cast against that resolution and only one of the five was a Republican—the aged and infirm Hiram Johnson. Two were Democrats and the other two—a Wisconsin Progressive and a Minnesota Farmer-Laborite—are both supporters of the President. In other words, every Republican Senator except one voted for the Moscow agreement and the Connally resolution. One hardly could expect more than that.

Among other apprehensions voiced are, first, that, flushed by their prospects, the Republicans may nominate another Harding; second, that they may destroy the good things done by the New Deal. Mr. Willkie appears disturbed on both these counts. He need not be. As to the first, there isn't another Harding in sight. Not one of the Republicans even mentioned for the nomination justifies being classed as another Harding. And, certainly, not one of the three or four who are apt to get the nomination is in that class.

As to destroying the good things the New Deal has done, the argument is that these are far outweighed by the bad things. And, anyhow, the whole force of the anti-administration tide is derived from the dissatisfaction of the people with New Deal policies and performances.

Of course, certain things would be retained by a Republican President or any President. But if a Republican President does not put an end to wasteful spending, abolish useless agencies, reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy, reinvigorate the damaged doctrine of State rights, restore dignity and prestige to the Supreme Court, abandon demagogic taxation policies and—most of all—revamp the lopsided labor laws so that some degree of responsibility be placed upon labor unions and some control exercised over them—if a Republican President does not do those things, then there isn't much point to having one.

TRUTH SHOULD BE TOLD

Those who do not want these things done should support the fourth-term movement. But it is a little absurd to appeal to the Republicans to nominate someone who will not do them. Nor is it reasonable to insist, as some are doing, that they must try to win by assailing either Mr. or Mrs. Roosevelt. That is absurd. That would make the Republicans conduct a namby-pamby colorless campaign in which they would be without either issue or target, merely trusting that the time has come for a change. Responsibility of the Roosevelts is not denied by these advisers, but it is begged that they be treated tenderly.

It isn't likely that this course will be followed, and it shouldn't be. Exactly why it

should be urged is not clear. For one thing, there is nothing sacrosanct about either Mr. or Mrs. Roosevelt, and neither the war nor anything else should be used to create the illusion. They are both smart politicians who are missing no tricks. The truth should be told about them. Behind the fourth-term movement are some of the most sinister influences and figures in American politics. To mention one—Frank Hague, of New Jersey. Unless Mr. Roosevelt is frightened off by the prospect of defeat, the full weight of the great Federal machine, plus the power of the evil city machines in New York, Chicago, Jersey City, Albany, and elsewhere will be used in an effort to continue the President in office.

If this effort fails it will be because the American people are thoroughly fed up with the Roosevelts and the things for which they stand. Now that no foreign policy is involved, the Republicans would be foolish, indeed, not to make their fight accord with that sentiment.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 26 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, on the subject of subsidies, as published in the Georgia Farmer's Market Bulletin, issue of November 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIES

The following is part of a statement made by Tom Linder, Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture, appearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee in opposition to subsidies at Washington, D. C., Nov. 15, 1943.

"Mr. Chairman and Senators, if the proposal to pay subsidies was a war measure, no one would seriously object.

"If this was a problem that had developed as a consequence of our engagement in a world war, the payment of an additional few hundred million dollars would not be of serious consequence.

"At a time when the national expenditures are around $300,000,000 per day, no reasonable man would quibble over the payment of a few hundred million dollars for anything that was purely a war measure.

"PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES IS A NEW DEAL MEASURE—NOT A WAR MEASURE

"Unfortunately, the idea of paying subsidies is not a war measure. Neither is it a new proposal.

"The purpose of paying subsidies is not to win the war.

"The purpose of the payment of subsidies is not to control inflation, because subsidies themselves are inflationary.

"The purpose of payment of subsidies is purely a New Deal policy.

"REAL PURPOSE OF SUBSIDIES IS TO CONTROL VOTERS AND IS ALSO PART OF A CONTROLLED WORLD ECONOMY

"The people of Iowa are fine folks. Those citizens of that great State whom I know, are my friends. I am happy for the people of Iowa to receive all benefits they can legitimately get.

"It so happens that the voters of Iowa are not controlled in their voting by party affiliation. The people of Georgia in the past have been controlled in national elections strictly by party affiliation.

"In 1939, the year before the last presidential election, the powers that be in the New Deal knew that Georgia would vote for the third term. They did not know how the people of Iowa would vote.

"Unfortunately, the Congress had provided subsidies in the form of Government payment to farmers and had entrusted the payment of these subsidies to the administration.

"Let's look at the New Deal's own record and see what was done with subsidies to the American farmers in 1939.

"The United States Department of Commerce published its Statistical Abstract for 1940. If you will turn to page 670, you will find the table entitled 'Farm Production and Related Statistics, Table 633, Farm Income—Estimated Gross and Cash Income and Government Payments by States: 1938 and 1939.'

"If you will run down the list of States in this table to Iowa, under Crops and Livestock Combined, you will see that Iowa's cash farm income in 1939 was $585,800,000, while Georgia's cash income from crops and livestock was $132,700,000.

"The farm population of Iowa was 968,000 persons.

"This gave the farm population of Iowa a cash per capita income from the sale of farm products of $605.

"Georgia had a farm population of 1,406,000 persons with an income of $132,700,000. This gave Georgia's farm population a per capita cash income of $94 each.

"Think of that, gentlemen of the committee. The people who lived on the farms in Georgia in 1939 received a cash income of $94 each for the year.

"The President stated that the South was the Nation's number one economic problem. I am sure we all remember that. A section where the farm population received only $94 per capita for 12 months would certainly seem to bear out the President's statement that the South was the Nation's number one economic problem. Under these circumstances, you would naturally have thought that the people of the South would have been treated fairly in the payment of these subsidies by the New Deal.

"But, as stated, the National election was coming on in 1940. The New Deal knew how Georgia would vote but the New Deal did not know how Iowa would vote.

"The money which Congress had provided as subsidies to farmers was not used as subsidies to farm prices at all. That money was simply used in an effort to control the 1940 election.

"I now call to the witness stand before this committee, the same table of figures in the same statistical abstract of the United States Government.

"Under the column of cash income and benefit payments, you will see that Iowa received a total of cash and benefits of $655,300,000.

"Since Iowa's total cash return from the sale of crops was $585,800,000, this shows that Government benefits or subsidies paid in the State of Iowa was $69,500,000, or a little more than $71 per capita for each person on the farms in Iowa.

"Georgia received as cash income and benefit payments, a total of $158,500,000, while Georgia received from cash sale of crops and livestock, $132,700,000. This shows that Georgia received from benefits or subsidies, $25,800,000.

"This gave the farm population of Georgia $18 per capita of farm subsidies as against $71 per capita in farm subsidies to the farm population of Iowa.

"The independent voters of Iowa received exactly four times as much subsidy as the voters of Georgia, who were known to be controlled by party affiliation."

SPEAKS TO FARMERS GUILD IN FRANKFORT, IND.

Leaving Washington on the afternoon of the 15th, I will address the State convention of the Farmers Guild at Frankfort, Ind. on November 16.

I will give you a report on the Frankfort meeting in the next issue of the Bulletin.

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Thanksgiving Day Address by Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk delivered by me over radio stations in Wisconsin on Thanksgiving Day last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the first Thanksgiving Day, over 3 centuries ago, America has witnessed days of stress and days of great achievement. In every period there has been opportunity for fear and opportunity for faith.

On the first Thanksgiving Day, at Plymouth, Mass., there was not the abundant life in material things which we have today. But those men and women of Plymouth were rich in spiritual values, and since that day a mighty nation has been carved from the wilderness, and America has become the leading nation of the world.

So today, as the Pilgrims did in 1621, we reaffirm our faith in those abiding spiritual values which have been our great treasure all through the intervening years. We are indeed grateful for the freedom which America possesses—the freedom which we will use to build a better America and a better future world.

Thanksgiving today is a religious holiday—a day when we express our thanks to the Father of all men for all the blessings of this life bestowed upon this people. It is a day of humility and devotion. God dwells in a thankful heart.

Today, as we stand on the threshold of a mighty opportunity for service to mankind, we are grateful for the great souls of the past who builded America so well; for the founding fathers; for the pioneers; the men and women of the Lincoln type; men of faith, courage, industry; men whose spirit in the days past fought and sacrificed that this Nation might live. We are thankful for friends and for our heroic men and women of the services.

Wherever America's fighting forces are today, Wisconsin men are among them. A year

ago we had only begun to take the offensive against our Japanese enemies; today we are striking that Japanese enemy with continually increasing force in the central and southwest Pacific by means of our air and sea attacks on the Gilbert and Marshall Islands and over a 3,000-mile front on the sea and air fronts of the southwestern Pacific.

We are thankful for what the young men of Wisconsin have accomplished on the land, on the sea, and in the air in all the theaters of war. We are thankful for the contribution of Wisconsin youth to the conquest of Sicily and to the liberation of one-third of the mainland of Italy, and for the success of our arms in the Pacific and elsewhere.

We are thankful that Wisconsin has produced men possessing such outstanding qualities as those embodied in Staff Sgt. James J. Cavallo, United States Air Corps, who made his home in Milwaukee. Sergeant Cavallo, a gunner in the Air Corps, lost his life in a bombing raid over Palermo on April 17, 1943. He stood by his guns, despite wounds, until his mission was accomplished. Men like Capt Richard I. Bong, Poplar, Wis., ace of the Army's Pacific Air Forces, who downed 21 Jap planes.

These and others, by their great courage and devotion to duty, reflect credit upon themselves, upon the State of Wisconsin, and upon the armed forces of the United States. "Their courage mounted with the occasion."

On the home front we are thankful on this occasion to remember with pride the efforts of the Wisconsin farmer and the food processor who provide for the food needs of our fellow Americans and allies. This contribution is doubly valuable because all of us are aware of the great strain placed upon the farm manpower, farm machinery, and farm economy by the war.

We are thankful for what industrial Wisconsin has accomplished during the past year. From Kenosha to Superior, Wisconsin-made products have emerged from Wisconsin factories and shipyards to be sent to the ends of the earth in order to make this a shorter war.

We are grateful for the great, although perhaps hidden, contribution of the Wisconsin office worker, merchant, school teacher, and housewife. These patriotic Americans, in spite of economic dislocation due to the war, have endured hardships without complaint in order to increase the war effort of the State and the Nation. We should be grateful at this time that the years will not permit the great gifts of these patriotic Americans to remain hidden; that they will take their place with the contributions of our armed forces, our farmers, and our war-production workers.

The school teachers, the mothers and fathers of our State, have distinguished themselves on the home front by preparing the youth of our State for tomorrow—a tomorrow of problems and challenges.

All of us should be especially grateful to the school teachers of our State and Nation who have remained on the job—those faithful patriots who realized the tremendous importance of looking after the youth of the State and Nation during this period of upheaval, and whose idealism refused to yield to the lure of higher wages in the production plants.

I am reminded of what Mme. Chiang Kai-shek said recently, which is especially applicable to the heroic effort of the American teachers and parents. I quote: "It has been said, and I find it true from personal experience, that it is easier to risk one's life on the battlefield than it is to perform customary humble and commonplace duties which, however, are just as necessary to winning the war—true patriotism lies in possessing the morale and physical stamina to perform faithfully and conscientiously the daily tasks so that in the sum total the weakest link is the strongest."

On this Thanksgiving Day, we are not indifferent to the needs of other nations. The Moscow Conference, the passage by the House and the Senate of resolutions standing for international cooperation, and the report of Secretary Cordell Hull, are expressions of the heart and soul of humanity—indications of good will, altruism, and a vital desire to find an answer to war. They constitute the first steps. They are harbingers of better things to come if we continue in that way.

On this Thanksgiving Day, with gratitude to God for our blessings and with a humble and resolute spirit, we dedicate ourselves gratefully to finding that way, and we resolve that our faith shall be strong and our arms firm in defending the things we hold to be truly American, and to preserve them inviolate for the generations to come.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently received by me from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This will have reference to your request for a detailed statement as to what has been done by way of legislation on behalf of veterans since the Economy Act, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress. A detailed reply would be so extensive that I am sure it would not serve your purposes, but I may invite your attention to the fact that such report is in existence covering 239 printed pages contained in the House Committee Print, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, on the subject Veterans' Legislation, and the subtitle "Historical statement of the laws enacted and veterans' legislation promulgated on and after March 20, 1933, relating to veterans and their dependents with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction."

It is well to keep in mind that the underlying purpose of Public Law No. 2, generally referred to as the Economy Act, was to substitute a uniform system of pensions and hospitalization benefits for veterans of all wars subsequent to April 1, 1898, and for peacetime service subsequent to said date. It repealed all existing laws pertaining to such benefits, including pensions for both service-connected and non-service-connected disability, or death, for Spanish-War veterans, pensions for service connected disability or death, for peacetime veterans, and compensation and disability allowance for World War veterans. Compensation was pension under another name for service-connected death or disability and disability allowance was a disability pension for non-service-connected disabilities.

The act of Congress laid down certain definite qualifying criteria and within the limits thereof authorized the President by Executive order to provide pensions, hospitalization, and other benefits and to prescribe procedures relative thereto. It finally provided that the regulations issued by the President pursuant to the act which remained in effect at the expiration of 2 years after the date thereof, March 20, 1933, should continue in effect unless amended or modified by the Congress.

Pursuant to the authority thus granted, the President issued a series of Executive orders termed "Veterans Regulations," basically 12 in number, which, as modified by subsequent Executive orders issued within the 2-year period, or by acts of Congress, constitute the present pension system for all wars and peacetime service subsequent to 1898, including the present war. (These Veterans Regulations in their present form may be referred to readily in the 30 pp, 669–699, title 38, U. S. C., Ann., following ch. 12 thereof.) The several modifications of the Veterans Regulations made by Executive order were generally for the purpose of raising the pension rates found to have been initially established on bases not wholly equitable. These amendments to the Veterans Regulations, together with three congressional enactments, practically restored the benefits payable prior to the Economy Act, the principal exceptions being disability allowance for World War veterans and certain rates based upon statutory presumptions. The acts in question were Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, approved by the President June 16, 1933, Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, passed over the veto of the President, March 28, 1934, and Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved by the President August 13, 1935.

(At this point it may be well to note that the only other major veterans' legislation enacted over the veto of the President is the act of January 27, 1936, Public Law No. 425, 74th Cong., authorizing the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates and the cancelation of unpaid interest accrued on loans secured by such certificates. The act, Public Law No. 127, 75th Cong., passed over the veto June 1, 1937, authorizing the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level premium war-risk term-insurance policies of Government insurance affected only a relatively small number of policyholders and as anticipated has proved to be not an unmixed blessing. With respect to the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, authorizing prepayment of the bonus, it may be pertinent to recall that previous legislation on the subject of the soldiers' bonus had been likewise vetoed by other Presidents.)

While, as reference to the publication mentioned in the first paragraph above will disclose, there have been innumerable legislative enactments approved by the President subsequent to Public Law No. 2, the more important will be mentioned in chronological order.

June 28, 1934, Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, authorizing pensions for the widows and children of World War veterans dying of nonservice disabilities but having at the time of death a service-connected disability.

August 12, 1935, Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, authorizing stronger safeguards and procedure relative to the protection of the interests and estates of insane and minor beneficiaries under guardianship.

August 23, 1935, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-fourth Congress, broadening the eligibility for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

June 24, 1936, Public Law No. 788, Seventy-fourth Congress, increasing pension rates for peacetime service to 75 percent of the compensation or pension being paid on March 19, 1933.

June 29, 1936, Public Law No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, enlarging the group of

widows and children of World War veterans entitled to pensions for nonservice death, codifying certain existing laws and regulations relative to administration of benefits by the Veterans' Administration, and extending relief to World War veterans and their dependents on account of death or injury caused by the hurricane on September 2, 1935, on the Florida Keys.

August 16, 1937, Public Law No. 304, Seventy-fifth Congress, liberalizing the provisions of existing laws governing service-connected benefits for World War veterans and their dependents and materially increasing the death-pension rates.

August 25, 1937, Public Law No. 355, Seventy-fifth Congress, granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain Indian war veterans.

May 13, 1938, Public Law No. 514, Seventy-fifth Congress, liberalizing the eligibility provisions for death pension in non-service-connected World War cases. Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, supra.

May 24, 1938, Public Law No. 541, Seventy-fifth Congress, granting pensions and increases of pensions to veterans of War with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition.

June 16, 1938, Public, No. 648, Seventy-fifth Congress, liberalizing the definition of "in line of duty" as provided in Veterans Regulation No. 10–Series.

June 28, 1938, Public Law No. 758, Seventy-fifth Congress, extending the pension rates of part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to persons entitled to pension under the provisions of the general pension law for death resulting from service prior to April 21, 1898.

April 3, 1939, Public Law No. 18, Seventy-sixth Congress, giving veterans' benefits to Reserve and emergency officers serving in the regular forces for extended periods of more than 30 days.

July 19, 1939, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, further liberalizes benefits under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, supra, and increases the rates of death compensation thereunder. It likewise increased the death compensation rates for service-connected death and enlarged the eligibility criteria for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

August 4, 1939, Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, increasing the pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, based upon service after April 21, 1898, other than during a period of war, at rates equivalent to 75 percent of the compensation or pension payable to war veterans under the regulations issued pursuant to Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress.

June 6, 1940, Public Law No. 553, Seventy-sixth Congress, authorized the payment of pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service prior to April 21, 1898, at the rates provided in part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

July 15, 1940, Public Law No. 743, Seventy-sixth Congress, liberalized the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, relating to the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act.

July 18, 1940, Public Law No. 746, Seventy-sixth Congress, extended the emergency officers' retirement benefits to provisional, probationary, or temporary officers serving during the World War.

October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, part I, title VI, cited as the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, authorized insurance to persons serving in the active military and naval service on and after that date. As of the most recently available date, applications for insurance under this act exceed 13,000,000 and the insurance in effect thereunder exceeds $92,000,000,000.

October 17, 1940, Public Law No. 861, Seventy-sixth Congress, being in effect a reenactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of March 8, 1918.

October 17, 1940, Public Law No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, liberalizing numerous provisions of the statutes and regulations pertaining to veterans' benefits.

July 18, 1941, Public Law No. 182, Seventy-seventh Congress, extending pension and other benefits to veterans and their dependents, to officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard.

August 21, 1941, Public Law No. 242, Seventy-seventh Congress, increasing death benefits to widows and dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion.

September 22, 1941, Public Law No. 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, extending pension, retirement, and other benefits to officers appointed in the Army of the United States.

December 19, 1941, Public Law No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorized wartime rates for disability or death resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty, (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, (3) while the United States is engaged in war.

December 20, 1941, Public No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, extending the period for those in the service to apply for national service life insurance, and providing automatic gratuitous insurance for those dying, or having become totally disabled, without having in effect insurance aggregating at least $5,000.

June 10, 1942, Public Law No. 601, Seventy-seventh Congress, increasing to $40 per month the permanent total pension for nonservice disabilities for World War No. 1 veterans allowed under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

July 11, 1942, Public Law No. 667, Seventy-seventh Congress, further extends and liberalizes the automatic gratuitous insurance provisions of Public Law No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, supra.

July 30, 1942, Public Law No. 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, increases the pension rates to widows, children, and dependent parents based upon peacetime service-connected death to approximate 75 percent of the rates payable for wartime service-connected death.

October 6, 1942, Public Law No. 732, Seventy-seventh Congress, amends and liberalizes the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (Public Law No. 861, 76th Cong.).

March 17, 1943, Public Law No. 10, Seventy-eighth Congress, extends hospitalization and domiciliary care to veterans of World War No. 2 having non-service-connected disabilities on a parity with veterans of World War No. 1, and includes members of the several Women's Reserve components of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard.

March 23, 1943, Public Law No. 13, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing further renewal of the expiring 5-year level premium term Government converted insurance by an agent or beneficiary of an insured who is outside the continental limits of the United States and authorized automatic renewal of such policies of those who are unable to make application because of being outside of the continental limits of the United States. While this type of insurance is highly undesirable, it was recommended because of the existing exigencies.

March 24, 1943, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans of World War No. 2.

April 12, 1943, Public Law No. 36, Seventy-eighth Congress, extending the time to apply for national service life insurance.

July 1, 1943, Public Law No. 110, Seventy-eighth Congress, extending veterans' benefits to members of the Women's Army Corps.

July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for adequate and uniform administrative provisions in the laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and increasing the pension rates payable to widows and children of veterans of all wars whose death was due to service disability. It also increased the rates for death due to peacetime service. It is of interest to note that this act liberalizes with respect to service connection the provisions of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, which, as related above, was enacted without Presidential approval. It further extends such liberalized criteria to veterans of World War No. 2 and places claims for World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 benefits on an absolute parity in this and other important respects. The compensation or pension rates for disability or death service connected for all wars under the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended by the several acts mentioned, and by Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, are the highest in the history of pension legislation. This is true also as to peacetime service-connected disability and death pensions.

November 8, 1943: Public Law No. 183, Seventy-eighth Congress, extending veterans' benefits to members of the Women's Naval Reserve.

During the time covered by the above-outlined legislation increased provisions have been made for hospital and domiciliary care and construction under appropriation acts approved as follows:

HOSPITALS

August 12, 1935: Public, 260, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated $21,250,000 for extending facilities, etc.

March 19, 1936: Public, 479, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated $4,000,000, remaining amount authorized by Public, 868, Seventy-first Congress, March 4, 1931.

May 23, 1938: Public, 534, Seventy-fifth Congress, appropriated $4,500,000 for extending facilities, etc.

March 16, 1939: Public, 8, Seventy-sixth Congress, appropriated $4,015,000 for extending facilities, etc.

April 18, 1940: Public, 459, Seventy-sixth Congress, appropriated $2,165,000 for extending facilities, etc.

June 27, 1940: Public, 668, Seventy-sixth Congress, appropriated $1,000,000 for extending facilities, etc.

April 5, 1941: Public, 28, Seventy-seventh Congress, appropriated $3,500,000 for extending facilities, etc.

May 24, 1941: Public, 73, Seventy-seventh Congress, appropriated $1,000,000 for extending facilities, etc.

June 27, 1942: Public, 630, Seventy-seventh Congress, appropriated $4,557,000 for extending facilities, etc.

June 26, 1943: Public, 90, Seventy-eighth Congress, $4,557,000.

HOMES

June 30, 1932: Public, 228, Seventy-second Congress, appropriated $1,000,000, authorized by act of June 21, 1930, Public, 405, Seventy-first Congress.

June 30, 1932: Public, 228, Seventy-second Congress, appropriated $1,000,000, authorized by act of July 3, 1930, Public, 505, Seventy-first Congress.

February 2, 1935: Public, 2, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated $850,000, remaining balance authorized by act of April 23, 1928, Public, 300, Seventieth Congress.

February 2, 1935: Public, 2, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated $25,000, remaining balance authorized by act of February 20, 1929, Public, 780, Seventieth Congress.

February 2, 1935: Public, 2, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated $50,000, remaining

balance authorized by act of February 26, 1929, Public, 812, Seventieth Congress.

You will recall, I am sure, that the pending deficiency appropriation act carries a further item of $10,356,000 for further hospital construction. The hospital and domiciliary facilities have been expanded from a total of 62,515 beds in June 1933 to 80,219 as of June 1943. As you know, the present plans call for early completion of the 100,000-bed program and the post-war release of additional beds to the Veterans' Administration by the Army and Navy.

It is hoped that this concededly very brief résumé of legislation since 1933 will serve your present purposes, but if any further information is desired it will be supplied upon request. May I again, however, refer to the very complete compilation listing and explaining all of the acts of Congress affecting veterans enacted since March 20, 1933, referred to in the first part of this report, which was compiled and printed for the use of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. A copy of said document is attached for your use. By actual count it will be seen that as against the few veterans' bills vetoed the President has approved during the past 10 years more than 100 bills pertaining to veterans' benefits, some of them being, in acceptable amended form, bills previously disapproved.

There is also forwarded herewith for your information and use a one-page statistical résumé of benefits paid to or on account of veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, which figures are brought down to the most recent practicable date.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Veterans' Administration — Disbursements made for relief of World War No. 2 veterans and dependents, December 1941 to Aug. 31, 1943

	Disbursements	
	Total to Aug. 31, 1943	During August 1943
Pensions:		
Veterans:		
Service connected	$3,997,848.18	$749,433.78
Retired Reserve officers and enlisted men [1]	306,550.54	39,573.29
Dependents	5,352,413.00	718,966.37
Total	9,656,811.72	1,507,973.44
National service life insurance: Cash payments made for death benefits disbursed from national service life insurance	9,416,947.20	1,214,460.23
Approximate cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care: World War No. 2 veterans	4,301,095.86	756,748.89

[1] Retired Reserve officers included with Regular Establishment living veterans prior to fiscal year 1943.

World War No. 2 veterans hospitalized or domiciled

Admissions to hospitals and domiciliary care, December 1941 through Sept. 30, 1943; type of patient on admission				Remaining under hospitalization or domiciliary care at end of September 1943				
				Hospitalization				
Total	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General	Total	Tuberculosis	Neuropsychiatric	General	Domiciliary care
[1] 26,052	4,195	9,064	12,793	7,799	1,689	3,926	2,184	72

[1] Includes 151 domiciliary admissions.

Disbursements for relief of World War No. 1 veterans and dependents, 1918 to Aug. 31, 1943

	Total to Aug. 31, 1943	During August 1943
DIRECT BENEFITS		
Compensation or pension:		
Death:		
Service-connected	$837,313,433.06	$4,101,973.54
Non-service-connected	51,701,352.51	934,733.10
Disability:		
Service-connected	3,579,423,438.70	13,584,158.70
Emergency officers' retirement pay	82,425,594.34	349,861.11
Disability allowance or nonservice pensions	383,933,681.70	3,095,941.22
Adjusted service certificates	3,796,145,520.32	77,311.24
Adjusted service and dependent pay	55,513,490.99	[1] 19.51
Loans to veterans for transportation	76,103.36	
Insurance:		
Term	2,194,131,680.43	776,752.86
Government life (converted)	596,428,626.61	3,918,470.24
Allotments and allowances	582,933,234.19	[1] 536.50
Vocational rehabilitation	644,871,021.46	
Total expenditures for direct benefits	12,804,897,177.76	26,838,646.00
Indirect benefits [2]	2,015,964,956.57	9,749,255.58
Grand total	14,820,862,134.33	36,587,901.58

[1] Credit.

[2] Operating cost of central office, regional offices and hospitals, burials, transportation of beneficiaries, hospital construction, etc.

High Lights of Analysis by Representative Lea of Pending Civil Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the House has received in the mail from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] a booklet explaining in detail the various provisions of the Lea civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420.

This booklet is only 25 pages long, and I trust it may be possible for each Member to read it carefully.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include here some excerpts from this timely presentation.

They follow:

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, by reporting H. R. 3420 to the House, has acted in fulfillment of what we believe to be the mission committed to us by the House when it reaffirmed our jurisdiction over civil aviation last March.

This bill looks to a greater civil aviation for America, to the advancement of all its branches; to improved administration of its governmental regulation; to the improvement and extension of weather-reporting service; to better provisions for air safety; to airport development of a type and uniformity to meet the growing needs of this new form of transportation; to the lessening of ground hazards to air navigation on and in the vicinity of airports; to the codification of our civil aviation law; and to practical planning for post-war usefulness of the airplane.

The committee * * * seeks to anticipate the conditions which must * * * be met and to provide a program of administration, operation, and development which will meet the important problems of the post-war period.

A minority of the committee has presented a proposed substitute, H. R. 3491, which contains provisions which, if adopted, would, in my judgment, greatly handicap the progress of aviation. It directs three strong blows against aviation progress.

H. R. 3420 has been a year in preparation, has gone through a number of drafts which were given wide public distribution, has been the subject of two hearings, and has been extensively discussed in the public press and elsewhere for many months. All of the principal matters dealt with have, in fact, been under discussion for years, not only in our committee but among widely representative groups of private citizens.

The time has come to act.

The committee's bill proposes no change in the present law as to surface-carrier control of air transportation. The subject is not dealt with in the bill.

The provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which are left unchanged, provide that where the Commission finds that the transaction proposed will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier other than an air carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operation and will not restrain competition, it may permit control of an air carrier by a surface carrier.

The minority bill contains a provision as follows:

"No such certificate shall be issued to any common carrier subject to part I, II, III, or IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; but no application made under this section by a corporation controlled by, or under common control with, a common carrier subject to part I, II, III, or IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, shall be denied because of the relationship between such corporation and such common carrier."

The effect of this provision would be to prevent air transportation by a surface carrier directly, but permit it through a subsidiary or an affiliate. It would prohibit the Commission, in passing on an application, from considering the relation between the surface carrier and the air carrier so established.

This provision would make a drastic departure from our general transportation policy, which for more than 30 years has been established as one of the great safeguards against evils which can arise from one carrier controlling another type of transportation.

The principal carrier and the controlled carrier afford the public no competition in service between them. By excluding another air line, the public is denied the value of competition that would otherwise be created.

The effect of such a provision would be to restrict the advantages of competition and impede the progress of air transportation.

The substitute bill proposes * * * sweepingly to waive aside a congressional standard designed to give the public the benefits of competition between different means of transportation. In fact, it goes so far as to prevent the relationship between the surface carrier and the air carrier from being taken into consideration and so would completely deny to the administrative agency the power to protect the public against this break-down of competition between air and surface transportation.

Such legislation could not be adopted without justifying, equally, the repeal of the safeguards, long established, which prevent railroads from dominating motor and water transportation. In fact, logically enough, the statement of minority views advocates this very step.

* * * the minority proposes that all forms of transportation be intermingled and that traditional congressional safeguards be destroyed. Thus would be laid the foundation for a great system of transportation monopoly.

The committee did not want to inject this question into consideration of this bill. It took the view that this proposed breakdown in a protective policy for transportation, followed for the last 30 years, should not be undertaken without full consideration and full opportunity for all interested groups to be adequately heard.

For that purpose the committee proposed such a hearing in the early part of next year and a bill was introduced—H. R. 3421—to occasion such a hearing.

Instead of availing themselves of this opportunity, those interested seek this revolution in our transportation policy without opportunity for proper consideration and without any hearing on the question.

Aviation is in its infancy. We have had a comparatively small number of aircraft in operation. The total annual income of the largest domestic air carrier has never exceeded $30,000,000. That is a bagatelle in the transportation field. America has spent as much as over $20,000,000,000 in 1 year for transportation. The railroad income this year will probably exceed $7,000,000,000. The total for domestic air transportation will be less than $120,000,000.

If not handicapped by such restrictions as the minority propose, aviation will make great progress in the early years to come. That progress is dependent upon the support of the investing public.

The pioneers in civil aviation have brought it to its present stage of progress. They should not now be crowded out by the older types of transportation who have assumed little or no responsibility in aviation development.

Investors will be slow to develop independent lines if they know the railroads and other agencies have an open field.

The enactment of the minority proposals would act as a red flag to slow down progress of aviation.

We may not find fault with carriers who seek to advance their own interests. That is human nature. The historical fact is that every new form of transportation has faced attempted domination and destructive competition from the older forms of transportation. We need not spend our time in writing the indictment. It is a matter of human nature. It is history.

Governmental regulation of civil aviation is either for economic or safety purposes.

All air navigation is, under the committee's bill, regulated from the standpoint of safety. The only air navigation regulated from the economic standpoint is transportation for hire from point to point. Transportation for hire may be performed either by a common carrier by air or by a contact carrier.

The committee's bill provides for exclusive Federal regulation of point-to-point air transportation for hire. For this purpose the bill defines the term "domestic air commerce" to include both interstate and intrastate point-to-point transportation for hire.

However, such term does not include other types of civil flying. And State regulation of civil flying other than point-to-point transportation for hire is not excluded by the bill. All such civil flying—and this will mean the major part of civil flying—is left to State regulation subject only to two conditions. One is that the State regulation be consistent with the Federal safety regulation applicable thereto. The other is that the State regulation shall not burden interstate flying or impair the uniformity of conditions under which an interstate flight is conducted. The civil flying thus under State regulation would include the commercial use of an airplane in one's own business or the private carriage of persons or property other than for hire; the operation of training schools and flying for training purposes; aerial survey work; aerial photography; aerial patrol work, such as pipe line and forest patrol; uses of aircraft for agricultural purposes, such as crop-dusting, planting, etc.; airport sight-seeing flights; barnstorming; and numerous other miscellaneous activities.

The committee bill, like the present law, leaves the regulation of airports to local and State authorities.

The bill does not attempt to regulate or prevent State or municipal taxation of civil aviation.

The committee's bill is a response to the clear need for a substantial degree of uniformity in the governmental requirements affecting air navigation and commercial transportation by air.

The American Bar Association has been making a study of civil aviation and its regulation for over 20 years. At its annual meeting in August of this year it adopted a resolution declaring its determination as to the need of Federal regulation.

The committee bill conforms to the policies defined in this resolution of the American Bar Association.

Between 1938 and 1942, traffic even on our present civil-airways system, increased 800 percent. By 1950 it will probably have increased another 1,000 percent to 60,000,000 movements a year, or more.

There is only one possible system to assure reasonable safety in this congestion of the air. That must be Nation-wide, uniform rules of the road and safety.

The private flyer is an asset to every branch of the aviation industry.

The committee bill adds no burdens to the private flyer. It does not make present regulation stricter or more burdensome in any way. On the contrary, it materially aids the private flyer.

The airplane is of very limited value to the private flyer if he is restricted to the boundary of his own State, or if his passage to other States confronts him with confusing, conflicting, and sometimes punitive regulations. Under the committee bill he necessarily secures a Federal certificate of airworthiness and qualifications as a pilot just as he does under present law. He will then be free to go to any part of the Nation under uniform flying rules. He can fly from State to State without having to secure local licenses in each State. Wherever he may go he will be flying where others operate under the same rules of the road.

The committee bill also encourages and promotes private flying as a national policy. The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is instructed to encourage private flying clubs, promote aviation education, and further pilot-training programs and airport developments.

The committee bill would (1) move the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator out from the executive department; (2) change the name of the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Civil Aeronautics Commission and make it independent, as originally provided by Congress; (3) make the Administrator's functions subject to the Commission's regulations, or to its approval, except with respect to the actual operation by the Administrator of air navigation facilities, the administration of the civilian pilot-training program and certain promotional work; and (4) create a Director of Air Safety for the independent investigation of aircraft accidents.

The change would create greater efficiency and vindicate a long-standing policy of Congress for the protection of the independence of its own agencies. One very substantial contribution we can make to post-war planning and advancement of civil aviation is to prepare ahead of time for its efficient administration. We should not delay that improvement to the post-war period and look to the slow processes of legislation after that time arrives.

The Tax Bill—Labor's Love Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to be placed in a false position before the people of the State of Vermont or of the Nation by virtue of the charge that I unknowingly voted for a "joker" in the tax bill. I did no such thing. There was no "joker."

I knew, and so did the press and so did the interested public and so ought those who now complain the loudest, that the Ways and Means Committee proposed to report a bill in which there was a provision requiring corporations, other than elemosynary and charitable, to show how much money they had and how much income they had and on which they ought to pay taxes. Is there anything wrong with that or with the proposition that all the people should pay their fair share to run a people's government?

There was plenty of opportunity for publicity. The heads of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. must have known and should have known—and if they did not they are culpable for not having known—that it was proposed to put this provision in the bill, a provision which is just and fair and reasonable. My honest, unprejudiced judgment is that the labor leaders knew the provision was there. I think that they proposed to let it go and take it up with the Senate of the United States where a similar provision had heretofore once been defeated by them. There can be no other logical conclusion.

All I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I voted for the bill and for the provision about which these folks complain. They intentionally and for political effect now misbrand it as a joker.

The joke is on the labor leaders, if it is on anybody, because of their tactics. For political pressure purposes these leaders preferred to attack the Senate rather than the House.

I assert that it is only fair and right and just that some of the wealthiest corporations—namely, the labor unions of the United States, incorporated—should be subjected to the same rules

and regulations and provisions with respect to annual returns and involvement in taxes as are all other corporations and all other individuals and all other taxpayers who enjoy the protection of our laws. That is the crux and the summation of the whole matter concerning which they complain. That is what the gangsters and the racketeers, not the body politic which comprises the individuals who represent labor and who do the work, are undertaking to fight against. It is not a fair fight.

If these leaders, resting upon the record of the past and confident of their ability to lick such a provision in the Senate, were willing to ignore the action of the House until it were a fact, in order that they might insult the House by an assertion that they did not know such a provision was in the bill, they are and were derelict in their duty to those they represent, as well as un-American in their attempts to evade and to avoid their fair responsibility for bearing the burden of taxation which is imposed on us all. The blame rests on their shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is—and the great majority of the people know it—organized labor under its present leadership has missed the boat. It has delayed victory by the strikes it has permitted. It has not contributed what it should have contributed to the winning of the war. The people are not fooled. Organized labor has, as I say, tolerated strikes in essential industries. It has broken its promise not to strike. It has been coddled and nursed and deferred to by this administration, which has always been playing for its votes.

However, the American people are tired of strikes and threats and politics, superinduced by labor leaders, in wartimes when our boys are dying to defend American ideas and ideals on far-flung fields.

The polls of the public defend and substantiate, overwhelmingly, that statement.

Labor organizations are treading on thin ice on a pond the depths of which will cover them ignominiously unless they seek more substantial surfaces.

Some of us who are the best real friends the individual laborers in organized labor have ever had pray daily that those of them who believe in America and in our institutions may be delivered from the racketeers and the gangsters and those with the lust for personal place and power who are leading organized labor to the edge of a precipice over which it will fall to its own ruin and complete destruction and devastation as such.

I am and always have been for organized labor. But I say it should recognize the signs of the times.

The United States Senate now has all these matters and things under consideration in this tax bill. It is vital not only as a tax bill, but because it will set a precedent.

It is to be hoped that the best interests of all the American people, labor included, may be well served, as they will be if the bill, as passed by the House with the section referred to therein incorporated, passes the Senate.

I say the foregoing because, as I said at the outset, I do not propose to be placed in a false light before my constituents. I voted for the bill as was because I knew, as did those who now attack it, what was in it.

Belgian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Winkler, published in the Washington Post of November 25, 1943:

BELGIAN CHURCH FIGHTS NAZIS

(By Paul Winkler)

The attitude of the Catholic clergy toward the Nazi forces and the local collaborationists is of tremendous importance in those occupied countries whose populations are largely Catholic. This is the case of Belgium, where Catholic priests have been in the forefront of the resistance to the invader, inspiring and strengthening the Belgians in their struggle against the Germans.

This attitude has been maintained in spite of the attempt of Leon Degrelle, leader of Belgium's Rexist Nazi Party, to give his group the appearance of a Catholic rejuvenation movement. Its name comes from its slogan, "Christus Rex," but the Belgian clergy never allowed themselves to be deceived into lending the protection of their moral support to the Rexists. Even before the war, when Degrelle ran against former Premier Paul Van Zeeland for a seat in the Chamber of Deputies, his defeat was made certain when Cardinal Van Roey and the Catholic Party came out against him.

Since the occupation of Belgium, the Germans have found Catholic priests opposing them with the same consistency with which they repudiated Degrelle. German Military Governor of Belgium, General Reeder, recently vented his indignation concerning the pastoral letters of Cardinal Van Roey in a public speech.

PASTORAL LETTERS

"These letters," said the German commander, "which are issued on the pretext of calming the population, have, in fact, the effect of provoking revolts among the people, and are at the bottom of many thoughtless and dangerous actions. They have the same effect as badly prepared medicine."

Another accusation made by General Reeder against the Catholic priests is that they have encouraged young men to evade the labor draft. It is a fact, certainly, that the great majority of the students at the Catholic University of Louvain refused to perform the obligatory 6 months labor service demanded of them. As a result, the rector of the university was arrested and sentenced to 18 months in prison.

Belgian bishops agreed that they would not perform requiem masses for men killed while fighting on the Russian front with the German Army, and that they would not administer communion to wearers of the German uniform of Degrelle's anti-Bolshevik troops. Incidents caused by attempts of the Rexists to break these rulings have occurred in churches throughout Belgium, but the most disgraceful was precipitated by Degrelle himself.

Wearing the uniform of a German lieutenant, his hair cut in imitation of Hitler's Degrelle stamped with his iron-nailed Wehrmacht boots into the church of the little town of Bouillon. He took a place, and everyone in the vicinity immediately moved away from him, leaving him kneeling in a sort of self-created vacuum.

When the time came for the administering of communion, he went to the rail with the others—but the priest passed him by, giving the holy water to those on either side of him. Furious, Degrelle interrupted the ceremony and demanded an explanation. The priest said he had instructions from his hierarchic superiors not to give communion to wearers of his uniform.

GERMAN GESTAPO

Roaring with anger, Degrelle leaped at the priest and began pummeling him. The horrified worshippers pulled him away and threw him out of the church, where German Gestapo agents protected him from the angry mob. As a result, the Bishop of Namur announced Degrelle's excommunication, and his edict to that effect was read in every church of the diocese.

This is only one of the many incidents which have marked the part of the Belgian Catholic Church in the struggle against the Nazis, both German and Belgian. Canon von Fuerstenburg, a Belgian priest of German origin, was condemned to 2 years' imprisonment when it was discovered that the Latin inscription spiraling up the Pascal candle in the Cathedral of Mechlin could be interpreted as a condemnation of nazi-ism.

Rev. Father Magnee, prefect of the Jesuit college at Charleroi, was sent to the dread Dachau concentration camp for having disciplined a young Rexist student at the college for bringing in anti-British drawings. He died there last summer because of privation and maltreatment, according to the Belgian underground.

Many other Belgian priests have been arrested for various offenses, such as advising peasants not to deliver their produce to the German-controlled organizations which collected it. Several monks were imprisoned when it was discovered that young men evading forced-labor service for the Germans were being hidden in monasteries.

And one thing that most people who have heard of the famous Belgian underground paper, La Libre Belgique, do not know is that it is a Catholic paper. At the outbreak of this war it ducked underground again, and today in occupied Belgium La Libre Belgique continues to give forbidden news regularly to the Belgian people.

British Block Food to Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it appears that Britain is repeating her history in the Napoleonic wars, without any more feeling for the suffering now than 130 years ago. During the years 1809 to 1814, there were 300,000 Norwegians—men, women, children, and nursing babies—reduced to eating bread made from the ground bark of trees, who died

from starvation because Britain kept all foods from entering. We recall that Britain continued to maintain her blockade after World War No. 1, which again resulted in unnecessary deaths from starvation. That, mind you, was after the armistice.

I am loathe to criticize an ally in time of war, but we also have our own national conscience to consider and we must remember that we as a nation will continue to live after this war, and we as a nation want to be proud of our history and of our behavior as a civilized nation.

How long will our administration permit the policy of entirely unnecessary starvation? I say unnecessary because it is highly problematical if this food blockade serves any good military purpose. One word from the White House would correct this. It would save the lives of countless thousands. Will that word be coming forth now, and can we help to bring a little happiness, health, and a promise of future life into the great darkness of the lives of the peoples in the occupied countries?

The testimony of Dr. Kershner before a Senate committee shocked Christian America—North, Central, and South. It appeared in the New York Times on November 12, and it places the responsibility for the extreme suffering of the children of the occupied countries of Europe exactly where it belongs, first upon the instigators of the war, the German Nazis, and also upon our ally, Great Britain.

Dr. Kershner is considered the greatest authority in America on the feeding of starving people in the occupied countries. What he has to say is based upon wide practical experience. As head of the International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees—1939 to the present time—and as director of relief in Europe for the American Friends Service Committee, Dr. Kershner has fed hundreds of thousands of Europe's starving children. Dr. Kershner, like that other great humanitarian in World War No. 1, Herbert Hoover, is a Quaker, and it is as head of their relief work in Europe that he has gained an international reputation.

Dr. Kershner speaks without bias or any self-interest. He has given to the Congress and to the world a picture of the situation as it truly exists in the occupied countries, and what he has to say should give every American real concern because, after all, we are one of the United Nations, and we must share whatever blame attaches for the wholly unnecessary suffering that is being inflicted by Britain in the European countries that are now overrun by the Nazis.

The article follows:

SAYS BRITISH BLOCK FOOD TO STARVING—DR. KERSHNER TELLS SENATORS AID WE COULD GIVE EUROPEAN CHILDREN HAS BEEN HALTED

WASHINGTON, November 11.—Charging that the British Government blocked shipment of food to starving European children, although American officials and public opinion were in favor of rescuing the Nazi victims, Dr. Howard E. Kershner told a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that that policy might leave only Germany healthy enough to reconstruct the continent in the post-war period.

Dr. Kershner, who directed relief for the American Society of Friends in Europe from 1939 to 1942, related instances in which, he said, the objection of the British Government alone prevented the shipment of food to children in occupied countries, although the plan involved no movement of food through the blockade and no military considerations were involved.

"If the democratic peoples of Europe perish and the Germans alone have the health to reconstruct Europe after the war, the British Government will bear the responsibility," Dr. Kershner asserted. "Its unyielding policy of preventing the saving of the children of our friends and allies will be the cause."

REPLIES TO BRITISH ACTION

The Quaker administrator's testimony came as a reply to the action of the Churchill government in London yesterday, turning down suggestions for modifying the blockade. Dingle M. Foot, parliamentary secretary of the Ministry of Economic Warfare, asserted in London that reports of famine in Europe were "entirely misleading."

Summing up the physical condition of children in the Nazi-dominated countries, Dr. Kershner said:

"I have seen the starved wrecks that women become by the time they give birth to babies of half-normal weight. The children of the occupied countries are coming to school in the morning with little or no breakfast. They sit with practically bare feet on stone floors in unheated schoolrooms.

"Examining their lunch baskets, we found a small piece of bread and perhaps a few radishes or a boiled turnip. For dinner, vegetable soup, with occasionally a scrap of meat or cheese. Large categories get no more than seven to nine hundred calories per day. This is about one-third of what we give our children and not enough to sustain life over a long period of time.

"The children of Europe are dying."

REPORTS POWDERED MILK INVOLVED

Dr. Kershner, who appeared on behalf of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, New York, said that in November 1941 he bought 350 tons of powdered milk in Switzerland and got permission to take it to France, but that the Treasury Department, on the objection of the British Embassy, refused permission to pay for the fund out of blocked dollars in New York.

As a result the milk went to Germany, instead of giving a new lease on life "to the starving babies of France," he declared.

Afterward he said that he found 10 tons of beans in storage in Marseille since before the war, but that again the Treasury, "because of opposition, stemming apparently from the British Embassy," refused a license to pay dollars to the New York owner, and "not one of these beans was eaten by our hungry little wards in southern France."

He told of instituting a vitamin distribution to 250,000 of the most needy children in southern France in the fall of 1940. Each chocolate square was wrapped in a piece of tin foil carrying a message of friendship from the people of America to the children of France.

"To show their appreciation, the girls made bows of these wrappers and wore them for hair ribbons for days," he said. "Everyone knew of this feature of friendship, and everybody was talking."

The papers were filled with columns of publicity on the action and the whole nation was grateful, but the following winter permission was refused for bringing the vitamin concentrate from America, he said.

"Can it be that Britain did not want America to continue to be the sole recipient of gratitude for feeding the children of France?" he asked.

Quoting from President Roosevelt's radio appeal for contributions to the National War Fund and from the literature of the fund's campaign to show that the money was solicited for feeding the hungry in the occupied countries, he declared:

"If we do not send food to the children of the German-occupied countries, we will have obtained $125,000,000 from the American people in part under false pretenses. The people have been promised that some of their money would be used for this purpose and they expect that promise to be kept."

Reverse Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an article appearing in the Dallas News of November 14, 1943, entitled "Reverse English Lease-Lend Brings Us Priceless Intangibles Along With Billions in Goods," by Don MacIver:

REVERSE ENGLISH LEASE-LEND BRINGS US PRICELESS INTANGIBLES ALONG WITH BILLION IN GOODS

(By Don MacIver)

When Pvt. (1st cl.) Sam Houston Travis, from deep in the heart of Texas, sat down to breakfast this morning in the mess hall of his United States Army training base deep in the heart of England he satisfied his healthy young appetite with porridge, bacon and eggs, toast, coffee, and fresh fruit, then marched out the door with never a thought as to who would pay the bill.

Private Travis had more important business to occupy his mind—that of training and conditioning himself to become the world's toughest and best soldier. But his breakfast, which was paid for half and half without quibble or question by those two well-known gentlemen, Uncle Sam and John Bull, offers a perfect, if somewhat oversimplified, example of the operation of lease-lend and reverse lease-lend—the greatest one-for-all-and-for-one effort in all human history.

The Gallup poll this week found that only a small percentage of the American public knows very much about how lease-lend operates; that an even smaller percentage knows anything at all about reverse lease-lend. President Roosevelt's message to Congress Thursday and the simultaneous release by the British Government of a White Paper on the subject clarified, to some extent, the monentary scope of this vast pooling and trading arrangement. But neither shed much light on how Private Travis got his breakfast, nor on the million and one other items of material or service that enter into the picture.

As a matter of record, there was no breakfast check involved in that morning meal, nor for Private Travis' dinner or supper today, either. Had there been, it is probable to Private Travis would have spent the rest of the day trying to figure out just how much, respectively, Uncle Sam and John Bull each owed. If accurate accounts had to be kept on each separate lease-lend or reverse lease-lend transaction, Private Travis and half an Army division of expert accountants would be employed full time figuring them out, and it is doubtful if they ever would arrive at an accurate tally.

SIMPLE IN ESSENCE

In essence, lease-lend is simplicity itself. It calls for us to furnish Great Britain with

whatever she needs and cannot supply herself to successfully prosecute the war. Reverse lease-lend is the other half of the bargain or arrangement. Under it, Great Britain supplies us from her own stocks that which we need to feed, train, and service our men overseas when, by so doing, valuable time and cargo space required to send this material from America can be saved for other more pressing and urgent purposes.

In the matter of airplanes, tanks, guns, and similar commodities of war, books can be kept, and are being kept. Hence, President Roosevelt was able to announce that Great Britain has already supplied us with $1,174,000,000 in reverse lease-lend and that the flow of reverse lease-lend to the United States is steadily expanding. This represents repayment of more than one fourth of all lease-lend we have sent to Great Britain which, up to June 30 last, totaled $4,458,000,000.

But lend-lease and reverse lend-lease involve far more than bookkeepable things. For instance, by bitter experience of several years at war with the Germans, the English learned a technique of fighting that our training camps could never hope to teach without help except by a similar expenditure of blood, sweat, and tears. But Britain turned the results of that experience over to us, freely and without charge, by incorporating all that was best of the technique into the training regime of American soldiers in British camps. She went further and sent her best experts to the United States to bring the know-how to the American training camps. Who can put a dollar-and-cents mark on this aspect of reverse lease-lend?

HOW IT OPERATES

Great Britain is supplying from her own slender stocks half the food eaten by every American soldier in the "tight little isles," and this while the British populace remains on rations which would make the present-day American larder look bountiful by comparison. Uncle Sam gets no bills for this.

The British, with their own labor and materials, constructed all the huge training camps the American soldiers are using in the British Isles, then turned them over to the American Army, lock, stock, and barrel, without mention of payment.

Most of the American hospitals in Britain are being built under reverse lease-lend and when they are finished they are handed over complete to the last item of equipment and furnishings. There has been no bookkeeping entry to tell the cost, and there is no arrangement for payment. The British built complete hospital trains to specifications of the United States Army Medical Corps. Several 1,000-bed field hospitals with full operating facilities were turned over to the American Army for the north African affair.

Reverse lease-lend operates like this: Whatever the United States Army needs in Great Britain—whether it be 100 tanks cars of high-octane gasoline, 13,000 bicycles to take air-force crewmen to the dispersal fields, 100,000 pinochle decks for post exchanges, or a complete new Army infirmary—has 1–A priority. When the request is made, the British fill it with their own stocks immediately, without question and without quibble. No one bothers to make a bookkeeping entry of it.

The experience of Maj. Gen. Ira Eaker's Eighth Air Force offers a prime example of reverse lend-lease. When the Americans arrived the Royal Air Force turned over to them field after field, completely staffed and equipped with experienced civilian crews for operation and repair. Civilian English labor built the Eighth new fields, as well, then staffed and equipped them. No one has mentioned anything about future payment.

CLASSIC FOR AUDITOR

Another example: British homes, as well as British barracks, are never heated these days above 60 degrees in wintertime, as a fuel-conservation measure—even King George has had a line drawn around his bathtub five inches from the bottom to limit the use of hot water. But the United States Army demanded a minimum temperature of 65 degrees in its barracks, and coal was gladly supplied from the none-too-ample British stocks to comply with the demand.

And then there is this classic case for some wizard of double-entry ledger work to try and figure out. Early in the war the Royal Navy lent a fleet of ships, complete with officers and men, to the United States Navy to escort American tankers along the Atlantic Coast. They flew the British flag and the crews received their pay from the British Government. They were under United States Navy operation and ate American food, but drank their own tea and rum. The tankers carrier American oil and gasoline to Britain, and some of it quite possibly was requisitioned by the American Air Forces as reciprocal lease-lend.

There is hardly a naval operation in European or Mediterranean waters in which lease-lend and reverse lease-lend are not utilized—without benefit of bookkeeping.

But it is in the intangibles that Britain has made what is truly a priceless contribution—things upon which no one can place a dollar-and-cents price tag and which defy bookkeeping. These involve the vast and precious stores of British inventions and technical information on the intricate science of war, learned by Britain at the fearful cost of experience and handed over freely and fully to America. They include lessons in connection with mines, magnetic mines, explosives, and submarine devices in use by the enemy, and the best methods of counteracting them. They also include Britain's own discoveries, such as radiolocators, astrographs, medical appliances for aviation and other instruments. There are, perhaps, two ways of measuring the value of these; the terrific cost of learning them the hard way, as Britain did, and the thousands of lives, the months of time, and the millions of dollars that would have been necessary for Americans to have learned them in a laboratory of their own.

The whole complex fabric of lease-lend and reverse lease-lend is too great and intricate to be easily comprehended. But one salient fact emerges. During World War No. 1 the American Expeditionary Force bought or brought all its own equipment, food, and services, and it cost Uncle Sam well over a billion dollars to maintain 1,000,000 men in Britain during the last 13 months. Last December, it cost Uncle Sam well over a billion to maintain its forces in Great Britain for the month. While the number of American soldiers based there is still a military secret, the expense to the United States for supplying one soldier is down to less than 25 cents a month. Great Britain pays the balance, and there will be no statement of account for posterity to squabble over.

More Throttlebottom Antics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appears in the Philadelphia Inquirer of today. The editorial is entitled "More Throttlebottom Antics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE THROTTLEBOTTOM ANTICS

Because a United States Senator, reporting on a trip made through Central and South America, has dared to find fault with Government spending in that territory, Vice President WALLACE has seen fit to apologize to the Latin-American people for what he regards as a "shocking slur." In so doing, Mr. WALLACE exhibits once again his tremendous self-esteem and his strange slant on democratic government.

Congress has a perfect right to investigate the manner in which Washington agencies have been operating in Latin America. Senator BUTLER is within his rights to report his conclusions and criticisms. Whether his charges of waste can be substantiated; whether there is danger, as he says, that our enterprises are breeding hate and contempt for this country, are matters that a proper inquiry may reveal.

How can it injure the good-neighbor policy to make sure that American funds are not improperly used? And surely, as Mr. WALLACE's old-time opponent, Jesse H. Jones, once pointedly remarked: "Squandering the people's money, even in wartime, is no proof of patriotism."

Mr. WALLACE arrogates to himself a great deal of authority in apologizing for congressional prudence on the expenditure of public funds. Since when has he been Ambassador at Large and Envoy Extraordinary to all Latin America? He is not the custodian of the national interest in that part of the world, even though he has frequently acted that way.

It may be recalled that the Vice President, as head of the Board of Economic Warfare, controlled for some time a large part of our spending program to the South. It was his quarrel with Jones, outgrowth of his enthusiasm for lavish dollar tossing, that resulted in his removal from that post by the President.

The Wallace fears that criticism of our spending and lend-lease projects may be used to discredit the good-neighbor policy do not appear justified. That policy must not be based on bribery or sucker spending by Uncle Sam, but on mutual understanding and good will.

Wise conduct of our financial operations cannot impair our relations with Latin America. Mr. WALLACE's gratuitous apology to strictly in keeping with other of his Throttlebottom antics. But the good-neighbor policy can be preserved without it.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 26, 1943

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a condensation in the form of a newspaper report of an address delivered by Paul Bellamy, distinguished editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, as one of a series of the Don R. Mellett lectures conducted at the Ohio State University. The following ap-

peared in the Cleveland Press for Wednesday, November 10, 1943:

HITS WITHOLDING NEWS FROM PEOPLE—BELLAMY GIVES ANNUAL DON MELLETT LECTURE

COLUMBUS, November 10.—Army, Navy, and other Government agencies should realize that the American people are grown-ups and should revise their principles of censorship accordingly, Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, said here last night.

Speaking at Ohio State University in a lecture commemorating Don R. Mellett, Canton editor assassinated in 1926 while crusading against crime, Mr. Bellamy described Government measures which, he said, "should be disturbing to all true lovers of a free press."

Among these, he pointed out, are the trend toward centralized government, the acceptance of the idea that the press should be a propaganda agency for government, and the natural wartime restrictions of military censorship.

"Both government and press will reap a terrible harvest if the public finds after the war that it was deliberately misinformed or kept in ignorance as to the situation," he asserted.

He praised the work of Palmer Hoyt, chief of O. W. I.'s domestic branch, who is doing a clean job according to the rules of honest newspapering.

"But forces which used the O. W. I. for political objectives have not been rooted out of Washington," he added. "The press should unite in prayer to keep Mr. Hoyt on the job."

O. W. I.'s foreign division, he said, is frankly engaged in propaganda abroad.

He described as an additional danger to freedom of the press the effort of organized labor to enforce the closed shop on the editorial departments of newspapers.

The occasion also commemorated the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the publication of the first issue of the Centinel of the Northwestern Territory, first newspaper in Ohio, which was published in Cincinnati by William Maxwell on November 9, 1793.

The Poll Tax—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the subject of poll-tax reform by the constitutional amendment method, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Surer Road," published in the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., for November 17, 1943, and an editorial entitled "H. R. 7" published in the Washington Post of November 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of November 17, 1943]

A SURER ROAD

It is highly unfair to contend, as some of the more ardent advocates of poll-tax repeal are doing, that the O'Mahoney resolution is part of the filibuster to defeat repeal. The proposal of the Senator from Wyoming to abolish poll taxes by amending the Constitution rather than by an act of Congress, it is true, has been seized on by southern Senators. But Senator O'MAHONEY is entirely right in claiming that constitutional amendment is the surer method of outlawing a tax which is unfairly disenfranchising large numbers of American citizens.

For while the poll tax is highly undemocratic and while it ought to be abolished without delay, there is a great deal of honest doubt as to whether Congress has the power to take this step. Under the Constitution the States are plainly given the right to fix the qualifications for voting. Charles Warren, distinguished author of The Making of the Constitution and one of the profoundest students of that document, recently expressed his own conviction that the poll tax can be outlawed only by the States themselves or through an amendment to the Constitution.

There is more than an even chance that the Supreme Court will take a similar view if Congress votes to outlaw the poll tax as a qualification for voters.

Since this is true, amendment of the Constitution may well be a speedier as well as a sounder and safer road to abolition of the poll tax. The only serious opposition to repeal is centered in eight Southern States. Through the weapon of the filibuster this small minority has managed repeatedly to block any action in the Senate and the likelihood is that it will succeed again this time. But the objecting group will lose this commanding position once the issue is presented to the State legislature in the form of a constitutional amendment. Mr. O'MAHONEY may actually be a better friend of poll-tax repeal than those who are insisting that Congress do the job.

[From the Washington Post of November 20, 1943]

H. R. 7

Emotions have been so violently aroused on the poll tax that most of the arguments emanating from the champions of Federal legislation to abolish it have become demagogic. It is said that the poll tax equals disfranchisement. Of course, it equals nothing of the sort. The poll tax is merely a small payment for the privilege of voting which is burdensome only in the four cases where it is cumulative, though even in those cases there is a maximum payment which at the top is less than $50. Those who feel that the Federal Government has no mandate in the poll-tax issue are accused, as one of our correspondents accused this newspaper the other day of a "sneak attack on democracy." This is absurd. The fact that eight States still charge a poll tax is in no way a derogation of our system of representative democracy. It would be only a derogation of a system of pure democracy, i. e., a town meeting. John F. Finerty of the American Civil Liberties Union says that the poll tax violates the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government. But a republic is a state in which the sovereign power resides with the electorate without reference to any basis of election. The red herring of racism is even dragged across this contentious dispute. The poll tax, it is said, is discriminatory against the Negroes, though the entire population of the poll-tax States must pay the poll tax. It is called by the unthinking a denial of citizenship, as if women before they got the vote were noncitizens. Finally, those who question the validity of Federal interference are stigmatized as supporters of the poll tax.

All these charges have been flung from time to time at this newspaper because it has hitherto opposed Federal action to end the poll tax as a violation of the Constitution. Now they are appearing again in our mailbag as H. R. 7 is readied for Senate debate. It may serve to clarify our own position if we reiterate as flatly and as categorically as we can that we are opposed to the poll tax. No true believer in progressive democracy could take any other stand. He should always be in the van in the removal of obstacles to participation in self-government. But we are, first and foremost, believers in the attainment of necessary reforms by constitutional means. For on respect for our Constitution depends that liberty of the individual which is our most treasured possession. And a reading of the new arguments presented before the Senate Judiciary Committee leaves us still convinced that Federal legislation on the poll tax would be unconstitutional. The plain language of our fundamental law says that States may impose poll taxes on voters for Federal office if poll taxes are also prerequisite in voting in those States, for members of the State house of representatives. The poll tax, in other words, is strictly a State affair.

To be sure, this interpretation is debated by jurists themselves. Even the proponents of the constitutionality of Federal action admit that the constitutional issue is by no means clear. For instance, Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, qualifies a request for support of H. R. 7 with the statement "although there is a substantial argument on the other side." Should these doubters press for Federal action regardless? We think not. On the contrary, any group which is wedded to the preservation of civil liberties should be in the lead against any attempt to put a strain on the palladium of those civil liberties.

Pressure upon the legislature to take action which would be a strain on the Constitution is the surest way of breaking the Constitution. Let us, say the reformers, take a constitutional chance. Let us pass the buck to the Supreme Court. A sloppy practice, indeed; one which in the emotional stress of the times has become a dangerous doctrine. We know that in its addiction to it the Civil Liberties Union is in the distinguished company of the President. Mr. Roosevelt is a reformer in a hurry, who is impatient of judicial restraints. In 1935 he sought to wish through the Guffey coal bill by urging that Congress should not "permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation." This was nothing but Constitution-be-damned philosophy. It has come back to plague the President himself. The last occasion occurred over the congressional decision to stop the salaries of specific members of the executive department, which Mr. Roosevelt denounced as unconstitutional. Just as this newspaper denounced the President for his Constitution-be-damned philosophy, so we denounced Congress for its unconstitutional legislation. Our attitude toward the poll-tax debate is all of a piece with this background.

There is a way out for the true reformer which does not involve any sacrifice of conscience. That is the way of the constitutional amendment. Already Senator O'MAHONEY has introduced a joint resolution for an amendment to the Constitution reading: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any tax or on account of any property qualification." With this method of approaching the poll-tax controversy we are in hearty agreement. Let the enemies of the poll tax transfer their energies and emotions from H. R. 7 to the O'Mahoney resolution. They would not be abridging by one iota their passion for reform. But they would be exercising that passion intelligently and safely within the framework of constitutional procedure. It must be obvious that even if the reformers by process of intimidation rush

H. R. 7 onto the statute books, they will not have settled the issue at all. Litigation is bound to follow. And this litigation, coming on top of the interminable debate which is now threatened, will in itself compound the waste of time and temper and dissension and confusion which H. R. 7 is producing in the midst of what should be an all-consuming war. Nor for other reasons will H. R. 7 qualify 10,000,000 people to vote, or anything like that number. The poll-tax States have other voting qualifications at their disposal as well as the poll tax. And they will certainly fortify them on the passage of H. R. 7, as Senator BILBO made plain last Friday. But we would most emphasize that the way of the constitutional amendment is the safest method of approach. These repeated challenges to constitutional government are becoming a pernicious habit. The habit is fraught with menace in a world in which constitutional forms are being overthrown. It is well to remember that the Constitution is the only true safeguard of the minority rights which the proponents of H. R. 7 assert so vociferously they are championing.

Poetic Tribute to Senators Burton, Ball, Hill, and Hatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute by Franklin P. Adams to four Members of the Senate with whom I have been very closely associated.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are the lads that are hard to match:
BURTON and BALL and HILL and HATCH.
Boys who have courage not to be still:
BURTON and BALL and HATCH and HILL.
Men with voices sure and certain:
BALL and HATCH and HILL and BURTON.
Cheers for the Senators, best of all:
BURTON and HILL and HATCH and BALL.

—*F. P. A., Information Please.*

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

The Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, over the National Broadcasting Co., November 19, 1943:

First of all, I want to express my thanks to the management of the National Broadcasting Co. for inviting me to speak on these stations and affording to me this opportunity to discuss briefly a subject of such vital present concern to everyone in America; indeed, of vital concern to all peoples in every land.

Our food supply is our life line. Its vital relationship to successful prosecution of the war requires no argument. Maximum production of food must he our first consideration—food for provisioning our armed forces, food to sustain our civilian population, food for our fighting allies, food for the starving peoples in many lands.

The problem of food has many sides. One side is production with its questions of manpower, machinery, and of subsidies. Another side is the processing of food and its transportation. A third is distribution which, if it is to be maintained on an equitable basis in a wartime economy may involve the rationing of those foods of which there is not enough to go around. Finally, comes the question of prices which is interwoven with all phases of the problem.

Our Government has dealt in piece-meal fashion with these various sides of the food question. Farm production has been within the province of various bureaus and agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Farm equipment and machines for the processing of food is controlled by the War Production Board. Farm and food plant labor has been one of the headaches of the War Manpower Commission. Transportation is in the hands of the O. D. T. Price fixing has been in the hands of the O. P. A. and the rationing of food, when we came to it, has also been directed and controlled by the O. P. A. But although price fixing and rationing have been under the jurisdiction of the same agency, they have been separately handled with hardly any coordination.

The appointment, by Executive order, of a War Food Administrator, although strongly urged on many sides, did not materialize until more than a year after Pearl Harbor and did not, in fact, accomplish the centralized control of our food supply which has been so earnestly advocated by so many of those who have had occasion to study the subject.

The War Food Administrator has no direct control of prices or rationing. Food purchases by the armed services and for lend-lease account have been in other hands.

Our Government agencies are now overlaid with a blanket of coordinators and stabilizers, but the lack of centralized and unified control over the production, distribution, pricing, and rationing of food continues to be a major defect in the present set-up in Washington for dealing with this all-important segment of our war economy.

Efforts to bring this about by action of Congress found expression in a bill introduced in the House last May by Representative JENKINS of Ohio, chairman of the Republican Food Study Committee. The great need for unified and centralized control of our food supply was one of the very first conclusions reached by this committee; but the Jenkins bill, originating on the Republican side of the House, was side-tracked. The Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Representative FULMER of South Carolina, offered a bill of his own of similar intent and parallel provisions, and this bill was favorably reported to the House by the Agriculture Committee.

It is of small consequence whether affirmative action by Congress, looking to unified direction and control of food supplies, bears a Republican or a Democratic tag. There ought to be no partisanship and no politics in dealing constructively with this problem. The all-important consideration is to get action and to get results.

But, unfortunately, none of the legislative proposals for putting the War Food Administration on a statutory basis, with statutory powers and authority, has found favor with the White House, and the Democratic bill by Representative FULMER—up to the present time—has suffered the same fate as the Republican bill by Representative JENKINS. The Fulmer bill has been pigeonholed by the House Rules Committee.

No one has ventured to challenge the need for a thoroughgoing inquiry by a committee of Congress into the food supply question and existing policies relating thereto. But when, early in the present session, it became apparent that the Democratic majority in the House was reluctant to sanction such an inquiry, the Republicans went ahead and set up an unofficial committee of their own of 42 members, divided into several sections for the study of the different aspects of the matter. This committee has been hard at work for the past 6 months.

One of the repercussions to the activities of this Republican Food Committee was the offering of a resolution on the Democratic side, authorizing and directing the House Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of the marketing, transportation and distribution of farm products and to ascertain the effects upon the farmers, the middlemen, and the consumers.

This resolution, which the Republican side gladly supported, was adopted last May, and a few weeks later the House authorized $50,000 for the expense of this investigation by the Committee on Agriculture.

It is a shocking fact that up to the present moment this committee has done absolutely nothing looking to the investigation which the House expressly directed and for which the funds were provided. The resolution has been a dead-letter, and meantime the very questions to which it related have become increasingly acute and engulfed in controversy.

The Republican Food Study Committee of the House is now engaged in exploring all of these questions. Two of the major questions—food distribution and food rationing—were assigned to a subcommittee on which it has been my privilege to serve as the chairman. Our committee has by no means completed its investigation, but we have gone far enough to be able to bring forward certain constructive suggestions.

Wartime consumer rationing of food dates from May 1942, when ration book No. 1 was issued and the sale of sugar was put on a coupon basis. The rationing of processed foods and meats, on the point system, dates from last March. We may be sure that food rationing is here to stay for the duration of the war and, in all probability, will need to be continued for a considerable period after the war ends while the world is undergoing the transition from a war economy to a peace economy.

Food rationing has passed beyond the experimental stage and has reached a point where its strength and its weakness can be fairly well gaged. Certain faults are clearly visible; certain weaknesses ought to receive early correction.

One of the weaknesses is the commonly encountered inability of coupon holders to obtain the foodstuffs to which their coupons entitle them. Points but no butter, points but no beef—this has been a common complaint, a chronic situation. It is inexcusable. The food ration coupons issued by the Government should always be redeemable at their face value just as readily and positively as the Treasury's paper money silver certificates are redeemable for the silver dollar specified in the certificate.

To remedy this situation, food ration coupons ought not to be issued for a long period ahead. They should be issued only as against a reasonably foreseeable, adequate supply. It is better to have a margin that allows a relaxation of point values rather than the necessity for sudden increases in point values because of suddenly discovered shortages.

Black markets must be brought under better controls so that the rationed commodi-

ties may be kept within the bounds of legitimate trade outlets. Black markets, up to the present time, have originated not so much at the consumer level as within the framework of distribution because of faulty price structure.

The second major weakness in the present rationing system is the failure to differentiate between the widely varying food requirements of various classes of civilians. There is a big difference from the rationing standpoint between the farmers who live, in large part, off the land, and the urban dwellers, who must buy all of their food in a store or public eating place. But this difference is not eflected in our rationing system. In the issuance of food coupons and points no attempt has been made to distinguish as between the child, the white-collar adult, and the laborer in the heavy industries—mines, lumber camps, shipyards, and steel mills. The food needs of these different groups, particularly as to rationed meats and fats, vary greatly. If everyone is to receive the same basic quota of points and coupons as at present, then, certainly, adequate provision ought to be made for supplemental rations for those groups whose food needs are above the average.

The rationing policies applicable to public eating places require major revision. This is the third item in the preliminary report submitted by our committee. It is estimated that 50,000,000 meals per day are served in public eating places, and no ration stamps are required of the consumers. The determination of the ration stamp quota assigned to hotels, restaurants, and other public eating places is on the basis of a complicated and thoroughly unsatisfactory formula.

Furthermore, it is obvious that the present set-up, whereby patrons of public eating places may obtain point-ration foods without any subtraction from their individual ration point quotas, is highly unjust and discriminatory to those families who either haven't the money to supplement their food budgets by patronizing public eating places or else who are not accessible to public eating places, and, in either event, must depend entirely on their own coupons for securing rationed commodities. Today all rationed goods that are purchased by public eating places are a supplement to and not a part of the over-all rationing allowed individuals. This inequality is not the fault of the hotels and restaurants.

In most other countries where food rationing is in force, public eating places are required to secure ration coupons from their patrons for each course they serve which is prepared from rationed foods. The value of the coupon is indicated on the menu, the public eating place collects these coupons as cash, and is in turn entitled to buy just as much of the rationed articles as it has received coupons for. As a result, all public eating places are treated substantially alike and they can continually replace such rationed foods as they may have sold from day to day. And all persons are treated alike, whether they eat rationed food in a restaurant or eat it at home.

Our committee has recommended that butter and fats be rationed separately from meats. Butter and meats have no true relationship from the rationing standpoint and the present policy of making the same points applicable to both makes no sense. There are times when, perhaps, plenty of one and a shortage of the other exist in consumer markets.

We recommend also discontinuance of the rationing of sugar to the consumer. We can see no real justification for its continuance in view of existing and prospective supplies.

Our comparatively comfortable situation up to now with respect to food supply has not been the result of wise policies, careful planning, and efficient administration. We have had none of these things. It is attributable to the immense reserve stocks and to the abundance of our harvests, for which our thanks and gratitude should be directed to Divine Providence, rather than to governmental bureaucrats in Washington.

The United States has been blessed with 7 years of bountiful crops. The last 2 in particular were far above normal, both in the over-all total and in yields per acre. We can thank God for the remarkable growing weather of these past 2 years. We can also thank the farmers for the tremendous extra efforts which they have made under extremely difficult conditions.

We cannot safely bank upon Nature repeating herself. We must be prepared for the ever-present possibilities of crop failures. We must not be blind to the fact that farm labor is scarce, that farm machinery is wearing out, that maladjustments in supply and in prices of feed grains have resulted in hit-or-miss slaughtering and marketing of cattle and that thousands of our dairy and poultry farmers are being forced out of business and their herds and flocks wiped out.

Congress and the executive agencies of the Government ought to work together and move promptly to remedy the present deficiencies in the policies and controls pertaining to food supply and food rationing. Let us profit by experience and avoid further blunders in this all-important aspect of the war effort. Let it not be said that we did too little and that common-sense administration came too late.

Civil Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, as part of my remarks, a copy of a letter received this morning from an official of one of our major Connecticut industries. I have purposely left out the name of the company and the signer of the letter, but the original letter is in my files, should anyone care for it.

I am submitting this letter to indicate to the Members of this House just what is back of some of the mail they are receiving in support of the Lea bill (H. R. 3420):

———, CONN., *November 26, 1943.*

The Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: In reply to your query asking for further expression of opinion on the Lea bill, would say that I have checked on this thing to considerable lengths since receiving your letter.

Frankly we were approached by the American Airways to lend our support to this bill. Based on their statement that it was for the purpose of putting the transport companies under the same general regulations as are the railroads on rates from a competitive angle—with which idea we heartily concur—we felt we should go along.

However, on further investigation we do find there are several objectionable features to this bill which should either be struck out or modified; namely, the imposition of Federal control on State- or city-owned airports as well as intrastate service.

Furthermore, any move to limit the activities of private development of airway facilities or training for air-service work should not be incorporated in any Federal I. C. C. airways bill.

I wish you would send me a copy of the present bill with any suggested amendments which have been approved to date, as I have been talking this matter over with not only our chamber of commerce, but also the Connecticut Development Commission.

Sincerely yours,

———, ———,
Vice President.

Resolution of Ottumwa (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a constructive program for generally encouraging industry, business, and private enterprise after the war is of first importance. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to submit a set of resolutions for consideration by this Congress, prepared by a special committee after considerable study and adopted by the chamber of commerce of the city of Ottumwa. In this connection, may I say that Ottumwa is a city of about 40,000 population, the largest city in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. This community has made a tremendous contribution to the war effort in men, material, and money, and the Navy Department built one of its largest airfields and training bases there, located on a site of 1,440 acres of rich Iowa land which was given outright to the Government by the people of Ottumwa, at a cost of over $300,000.

This set of resolutions on the subject of post-war planning reads as follows:

Realizing that the responsibility of post-war adjustment, and the employment of labor should, and will, naturally fall upon American business, particularly the comparatively small business concerns of our country, and believing in the principle of individually owned, operated, and controlled business, and in view of the fact that the method, extent and character of taxation is a dominant and vital factor in all business life, your committees on taxation and legislation respectfully present for your consideration, the following resolution to be brought to the attention of each of our Iowa Congressmen, Senators, and other chambers of commerce of the State of Iowa:

"Whereas the winning of the war and the adequate financing of the war efforts of our country and its allies is of first importance; and

"Whereas the ultimate object of our war effort is to preserve to us, and to our posterity, the American way of living and the continuation of our constitutional right of the pursuit of happiness, and the right to live as a free people with the opportunity to fortify ourselves, and our posterity, against the fear of hunger and fear of encroachment upon our religious liberty; and

"Whereas the United States of America has attained its present place among the nations of the world by means of the development of its natural resources by private enterprise, free from unnecessary governmental control or undue burdens brought upon it through taxation; and

"Whereas it is our sincere hope and belief that, in the not too distant future, private enterprise will need to undertake the problems of post-war adjustments in order to preserve our American way of living; and

"Whereas the ultimate well-being of American labor, American agriculture, and American business depends upon a sound governmental economic policy, no one class being able to enjoy lasting prosperity at the expense of others: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States shall continue to make such appropriations as may be necessary to adequately finance our present war effort and to assist our allies in such manner as in their opinion will result in the earliest possible termination of our present conflict; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will foster and encourage individual enterprise in our country, relieving such enterprises, insofar as possible, from unnecessary governmental interference, and from the danger of governmentally subsidized competition; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will relieve American business from the burden of taxation made necessary in financing or supporting any plan or scheme of socialistic economy fostered and promulgated by bureaucratic control, regulation, and interference in private affairs, all in conflict with the fundamental principles of our free American Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary in connection with post-war planning to assure that any plan or system of public works to provide mass employment shall be limited to work public in nature and permanent in character and shall be carried out by means of private contracts let on the basis of competitive bids, free from unnecessary Government regulations and/or interference; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will further permit and encourage the building of capital reserves by private enterprise, through the medium of reasonable profit, for use in the financing by such enterprise post-war adjustment and activities, thereby enabling private enterprise to furnish maximum employment for those now in our armed forces, or engaged in war industries; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary to make available funds for the war effort through domestic economy, thereby eliminating the necessity of increasing the tax burden upon either corporate or individual incomes, and in this connection, during the present emergency, and the period of post-war readjustment, we make the following suggestions:

"1. The freezing of present rate of social security tax.

"2. The elimination of unnecessary, obsolete and overlapping bureaus.

"3. The elimination of governmental activity resulting in competition with private enterprise.

"4. Turning back to the respective States the responsibility of regulating and controlling all affairs not necessarily national in scope.

"5. Rewarding rather than penalizing individual effort, initiative, and economy, thereby increasing the number of potential taxpayers."

Dated this 23d day of November 1943, at Ottumwa, Iowa.

Respectfully submitted.

HORACE A. BROWN,
FLETCHER COPES,
R. E. WHITE,
ED J. GRIER,
Chairman of Tax Committee,
FRANK G. STROHAUER,
Chairman of Legislative Committee.

Proposal To Parole Prisoners for Use in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting proposal to parole prisoners for use in the armed forces has been made by R. V. Hartung in an article in the magazine published at the South Dakota State Prison.

I am not sure that the proposal could be worked out exactly as he suggests since a Federal law could hardly modify convictions in State courts under State laws. The possibility, however, of salvaging so large a reservoir of manpower as exists in the prisons makes the subject worthy of study.

I understand that a recent report by the Honorable Maury Maverick, Director of the Government Division of the War Production Board, reveals that 40,000 ex-prisoners are now serving in the Army. Obviously there is only a matter of a few months between being a prisoner and ex-prisoner. That time, in thousands of cases, might well be spent in rehabilitation training camps such as is suggested in the article by Mr. Hartung which I insert in the RECORD at this point in accord with permission given by the House:

WHY NOT?

(By R. V. Hartung)

Salvaged Soldiers, by Sidney Shalett in the October 2 issue of Liberty, is an exceedingly interesting article from the viewpoint of the convict. The possibilities contained therein are limitless.

In brief, the article sets forth the workings of 9 rehabilitation camps located at various points throughout the country, where soldiers who have fallen from grace are sent. Rather than dismiss men from the service, who might be salvaged and put to better uses, the Army puts them through a rigorous physical and mental regime which is planned to cull the wheat from the chaff. According to Shalett, the salvaging process has been highly successful, with better results to come. The 9 camps have a capacity of some 18,000 men, with the present population in the vicinity of 3,000.

There is no need to go into detail concerning the number of convicts available for military service. The figures are known to us all, as are all the plans and hopes for the utilization of this manpower reserve. Except in a few exceptional cases, all the well-intentioned and much-touted proposals have disappeared down the drain. Whereupon I propose another which is probably already destined for a similar fate. The only possible relief for the convict lies in Government legislation, which would automatically take precedence over any State law to the contrary. The Selective Service Act all over again, which would include the convict.

If the powers that be still hold that convicts would endanger the morals of the man in the ranks, then the solution to that problem is directly at hand, already created and working.

The rehabilitation camps, such as Camp Pickett, Va., are made to order for that very purpose and at this writing there are 15,000 vacancies. A 90-day probation period is sufficient to judge any man, and by feeding eligible convicts through these camps at 90-day intervals, the Army could accomplish the greatest piece of salvage in history, that of restoring self-respect to the forgotten American—the convict. It is reasonable to believe that any convict, sincere in his desire to serve his country, would have no objection to such a plan.

To digress a bit: The theory advanced by certain well-meaning but uninformed and biased citizens, that convicts in the Army would undermine the morals of their fellow soldiers is utterly ridiculous and has no background of fact. Convicts have been in the Army since the start of the war and they have trickled in ever since, with an exceptionally fine record. Some particularly vicious crimes have been committed by individual soldiers with no previous criminal records, in Australia, Ireland, England, and in the United States. These same soldiers would probably have made themselves known, had they remained in civil life, by similar offenses, but the fact that they committed the offenses while in the Army has certainly not injured the morals or morale of the men with whom they were trained.

If such a plan could be put into usage, one result would be a shortage of labor in prisons to man prison industry. There is a solution for this, too, which still gives the American convict his opportunity.

Much has been said of late regarding the use of Axis war prisoners in canning plants and in harvesting. Only a small percentage have been put to this work, but, if you were a farmer, canning-plant operator, or a manufacturer in the outside world, which of these would you rather have working for you?

A German or Japanese indoctrinated from birth with the vicious principles of nazi-ism or shintoism? A Nazi or a Jap whose creed is the complete destruction of your business, your home, your way of life? Or an American convict who loves the same things that you love, who has been brought up the way you have and who wants above all else the chance to redeem himself in the eyes of his fellow Americans in this war against oppression?

There would only be one choice. Put the Axis war prisoner in the penitentiaries and give America's convicts their chance.

But, say the die-hards, the convict should not be allowed to forget that he is a convict. We must put an added burden on his shoulders to make sure.

Taking into consideration the arguments of both sides in as unbiased a manner as possible, I propose the following, which might be incorporated into a successful piece of Federal legislation:

Every convict between the ages of 18 and 46, physically fit and who has not been convicted of a crime involving ugly sex offenses, to be inducted into the Army under the following conditions:

1. After induction he is sent to one of the nine rehabilitation camps for preliminary training and the regular course which the Army is using for its own offenders. If at the end of a 90-day period he is found to be qualified, he is automatically assigned to

duty. If he fails to qualify, he is returned to the penitentiary.

2. If he conducts himself as a good soldier for the duration at the time of his discharge he receives in addition to an honorable discharge, an unconditional pardon for the offense for which he was serving time.

3. If he commits a felony while serving in the Army, his previous sentence is automatically doubled. If the felony should be more serious than the one for which he was originally sentenced, the judgment would be decided by a civil or military court.

I believe that many would agree when I say that there would be few failures, and from a strictly practical viewpoint the country as a whole would be the gainer. The salvage of available manpower can hardly be bypassed in times like these.

If a plan like this went into effect, thousands of fathers would not be drafted.

My Visit With the Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered over the Blue Network, from station WMAL, on Saturday evening, November 27, by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to tell you tonight the story of $6,000,000,000. It was my original intention simply to recite the facts as I gathered them, but after handing my report on the $6,000,000,000 to the Senate yesterday, it has become necessary that I not only recite the facts but answer the counterattacks of the New Deal spokesmen who have tried to becloud the facts.

I recently returned from a 2-month tour of the 20 Latin-American countries, during which I spent several days in each nation and, with an assistant, probed into our Government's activities south of the border. I made my trip several months after our noted Vice President made his tour, but there were some differences. I visited all the Latin-American nations, not simply those on the west coast. I went as a taxpayer, not as one who had had free access to an almost limitless Federal Treasury for 11 years. Naturally we saw things differently, and I am sure we saw different things.

Although I disclaim having become an expert on South America because of a 60-day tour, I had visited both Mexico and Cuba previously and for years have had a genuine interest in Latin America, so I did not go without some background. I took the trip and paid for it out of my own pocket to see what was going on in Latin America and to obtain information for two important Senate committees.

Perhaps the first thing to point out is the fact that it is impossible to learn much about our good neighbors, about whom we hear a lot, or our program among those good neighbors, without going to South America. News services can give us only spot news from these countries due to Government censorship and official Washington information usually is either incomplete or full of half truths.

This is one of the most perturbing factors in our relations with South America today—that we, the people, are kept in darkness concerning either our Government's programs among our neighbors to the south or how those programs are being received.

We, the people, for example, have never been told that the United States Government has spent, or has committed itself to spend, some $6,000,000,000 in Latin America in the short space of 3 years—and much of it on made-work projects similar to our W. P. A. This is twice as much money as the total budgets of all the national governments of the entire 20 Latin American nations for the same years. We, the people, have not been told that many long-time friends of our Nation in Latin America are looking askance at our programs and are wondering what is going to happen when the spending spree ends, as they know it must, for the American taxpayer cannot stand forever the constant drain from his purse. We, the people, have not been told that Uncle Sam now has more than 12,000 projects of some 1,000 different kinds in the 20 Latin American nations.

Oh, yes; we hear from official sources, in magazine articles, and radio speeches about the successes of our programs in South America, but, oddly enough, official Washington sources do not tell about the costly failures.

Has any Government agency, for example, ever put out an official release showing that for every pound of rubber we have received from South America—and we have received very little, indeed, thus far—our Government has spent an estimated $500 a pound? Rubber cost about 20 cents a pound in 1939.

Has any Government agency ever put out an official release describing our rubber fiasco in the Amazon Valley, where Washington sent millions of tin cups, millions of atabrine tablets, millions of dollars worth of supplies for tens of thousands of men, but failed to get men to go into the valley to work? Have you ever read, from official sources, the story of how we paid millions of dollars to buy up nuts in Brazil to get workers released to work in the rubber forests, but later learned to our chagrin that the banks actually owned the nuts and that not a single worker was released, despite the enormous expenditures?

These are, of course, all factual statements, easily verified by anyone who takes the trouble to learn them. I confess that I am rather ashamed of our present administration's bungling attempts to be Santa Claus and a good neighbor at the same time in South America, although no one objects to our being a good neighbor. The financial fiascos created in Latin American nations because of our attempts to be a hemisphere Santa Claus should make all of us ashamed.

Have you, for instance, realized that your tax money is being used today for reparations between two countries that were at war some years ago? The warring nations were Peru and Ecuador and in the conflict they waged, Ecuador's province of El Oro suffered severely. The years passed, but none of the damage was repaired by the former belligerents. But Uncle Sam is doing it now. This enterprise ranges from immediate relief to returning refugees to subsistence farming projects.

Have you, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, been told that our Government is spending an estimated $200 a family in the rich little country of Costa Rica, not including our purchases of goods from growers there; that Uncle Sam is paying wages to native workers some five times higher than the prevailing wage scale?

The $200 a family our Government is expending in Costa Rica contrasts markedly with the 50 cents per family we have spent in hard-pressed China, which has fought the Japs for long, grueling years now.

American money is being spent to stock the streams and lakes of Venezuela with game fish. We have a fishery mission in Mexico. As part of the inter-American program for development of hemispheric resources, we paid for a fish survey in the ocean adjacent to Panama.

Reminiscent of the W. P. A.'s writers' projects and Guide Book Series we are financing the preparation of a handbook on the South American Indians; a Guide to Official Publications of Latin America, a Law Guide and Center of Latin-American Legal Studies.

Of course, there is overlapping, confusion, and duplication on a scale undreamed of as more than 40 United States agencies try to do good ahead of one another in South America. Does a South American country want more funds for a certain project? If so, there is an immediate influx of do-gooders representing half a dozen or more American agencies, each claiming that the gift, loan, or bequest is in its province. It goes without saying to anyone familiar with our 10-year-old bureaucrats that half of the agencies do not know what the other half are doing.

This same confusion was evidenced in Washington yesterday after my report to the United States Senate. Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, said, according to press reports, that the United States has spent and committed only $600,000,000 in South America and that this sum includes even the military expenditures. Perhaps he did not hear Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, who, immediately after I gave my report, took up the cudgels for the administration and declared that we have spent only $2,207,000,000 in South America. Senator MCKELLAR differed with Mr. Rockefeller to the tune of some $2,000,000,000—not a big discrepancy from the New Deal point of view.

Vice President WALLACE, that famous modern Don Quixote, who persists in engaging mysterious enemies in battle, last night went so far as to apologize to the South Americans for my disclosures. He would do better to apologize to North Americans, more particularly the hard-beset taxpayers of this Nation who are paying for the wild and woolly activities of this global W. P. A.

Vice President WALLACE says that my figures are fantastic and will be refuted by the appropriate agencies. This is a typical New Deal reply to any disclosure that does not tally with the pretty stories they have fed to the people for 11 years through their thousands of press agents and hundreds of official periodicals. My suggestion to Mr. WALLACE is to get an adding machine, go through the Federal Register, pick out the names of the various agencies dealing with Latin America, obtain from each agency the amounts they have wasted in South America, and add the figures. If he uses an old-fashioned adding machine—and not the New Deal kind—I am sure he will arrive at the same figures I presented to the Senate yesterday and give you tonight. That is one of our troubles in Washington—the adding machines here seem to be of a peculiar brand, not known in ordinary business offices.

In almost any large South American city, it is possible to find investigators from one Government department in Washington checking up on the investigators of another Government department, while the investigators from the second agency may be investigating the investigators from the first agency. It's a wonderland transported several thousands of miles away where joyous spending and lending can go on unobserved and, hence, unchecked in the slightest.

In the little capital of Asuncion, Paraguay, for example, our embassy has some 75 employees, the British, who have greater economic interests in Paraguay than we will

have for some time, have but four persons in their embassy.

And it is all so needless. Naturally, the South Americans are laughing at us, when they are not being irked by a new practice our sociologists initiate against all the customs and traditions of the country. The South Americans want us to be good neighbors, but they are somewhat tired of our grandiose, show-offy methods. And you and I know that, in our own personal affairs, we never make a true friend by handing him money.

Not long ago, a procurement officer for one of the many Federal agencies in Rio called on a newspaper man for advice. He was considerably agitated and told the newsman: "I have a big check here to buy strategic materials. The check is far more than the materials are worth, but I'm afraid it's not enough. If I'm not successful in getting this material, I'll lose my job. Should I make the check larger?"

"No," advised the newsman. "Let me have it and I'll see what I can do. Brazilians aren't so tough." So he went to see the local businessman.

"Look here," the reporter said. "You have a real opportunity to help the war effort and to be a good neighbor to Uncle Sam. The United States needs this material and you have been offered a premium price. What more do you want?"

"Why, nothing," the Brazilian said. "If it's really needed, I'll give it to your government. I'm as good a neighbor as anybody."

The newsman returned to the bureaucrat, returned him the check, and warned: "Let some of these fellows be good neighbors, too. They are in this thing with us."

I would like to close with this same thought in mind. I went to South America believing in the good-neighbor program and I came back sold on it completely. I know, as every one of intelligence should realize, that North and South America, working together for the common good, can be a great stabilizing factor in the world today and tomorrow. But I came back convinced that this friendship must be built on something firmer than a never-ending flow of dollars. As one editor in South America said to me: "Your Government is spending about $50 for every one of the 120,000,000 in South America. If our friendship were for sale, $50 would not be enough. But if we would sell it, $50 would be too much."

We in this country have been committed to a policy of friendship for Latin America since the days of James G. Blaine, who initiated the Pan-American Union. Herbert Hoover, as President-elect in 1929, visited many Latin-American nations on what became known as a good-neighbor trip. Every sensible man wants to develop good neighborliness as a national policy, regardless of the party in power. But we can have a more valuable tie with our neighbors on a much cheaper scale, in the opinion of every sensible person who has looked over our dream-world program of buying friends in Latin America.

All Against the Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a leading editorial from the Freehold Transcript, of Freehold, N. J., which appeared November 26, 1943. It seems to me that this editorial raises a very pertinent point in the national effort to win the war. If it is necessary for Government officials to investigate matters of the kind referred to in this editorial it seems only reasonable that the investigation could be postponed until the end of hostilities to allow the officials of corporations engaged in the furtherance of the war effort to extend their energies and devote all of their time to rendering service.

The editorial follows:

ALL AGAINST THE AXIS

Public Service Corporation of New Jersey, in a recent notice to its stockholders, informed them of the receipt from the Federal Power Commission and the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey of staff reports and orders to show cause dealing with the reclassification and original cost studies of the electric and gas plants. As the corporation objects to the writing off of substantial items of assets as suggested by the Commissions, on behalf of its stockholders it is now obliged to prepare to defend its position. The last two paragraphs of the notice read: "The electric department of the Electric & Gas Co. has had a kilowatt-hour increase since Pearl Harbor of 39.14 percent, largely if not altogether due to war work. It has performed its work well, and it has not failed the country in this great crisis. The same is true of the gas company. Now we will have to divert our energies to the extent required by the preparation for the hearings and the hearings themselves that will take place and the litigation that will be involved in this matter. There seems to be no peace for public utilities in this country. The whole matter is beyond human understanding."

As we have before written in these columns, we cannot understand why, while our soldiers and sailors are fighting like hell, and management has the most nerve-wracking time it is likely to have during the lifetime of its members, governmental bodies must go out of their way to disrupt the work being done by industry to win the war. After the war there will be a slack period; then, if the corporation must defend itself against Federal and State governmental bodies, its officers and employees will not be straining every nerve to do their everyday tasks.

We often hear that our people do not know there is a war on. That can be supplemented by saying we wonder if many governmental agencies realize there is a war to a finish between their country and enemies that seem willing to fight to the death, with no holds barred. Why must so many governmental employees do peacetime chores when the Army, Navy, and industry are clamoring for men and women for work absolutely essential to the long-time safety of our country? Cannot the Government for just a minute put itself in the shoes of the employees of utilities and realize they have a full-sized job on their hands to work, fight, and make democracy live"?

Underground Activities in Occupied European Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edwin L. James, from the New York Times of November 28, 1943:

COMMUNISTS BIG FACTOR IN EUROPE UNDERGROUND—RED ORGANIZATIONS PLAN AN IMPORTANT PART IN RESISTANCE TO GERMANS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES—CASE OF YUGOSLAV PARTISANS

(By Edwin L. James)

A most interesting aspect of the development of underground activities in occupied European countries is the large role being played by Communist organizations in most of the territory under German domination. There is evidence that the part of the Communists of many overrun countries is larger than their ordinary strength in certain countries. This is judged to be a reflection of the widespread organization which they had and maintained in a number of the countries seized by the Germans. It is evidence that the underground in Europe has been intensively and effectively served by the Reds.

The extent to which this Communist activity against the Germans is being directed from Moscow is not easy to estimate. Unquestionably, in some cases there is direct communication with the Russian capital; in other cases it is not so sure, but in no case can the possibility be entirely excluded.

It is not possible to allocate the Communist activities precisely in a general plan. In some cases they appear to be working with refugee governments; such may be said to be the case in France and in Czechoslovakia. In other cases this is not true, as in Poland and Greece. But this appears to be general: namely, that in most of the occupied countries the Communists will have a force to be reckoned with when liberation comes. Nor can it be successfully contended that they will not, by all political rules, be entitled to that consideration.

THE CASE OF FRANCE

Much attention was given to the action of General de Gaulle when last year he made a deal with Moscow. He was widely criticized in many quarters. But the action of De Gaulle represented no overnight whim. He took his action because the Communists in France were an important part of the underground which was backing him. There have been estimates that the Communists numbered as many as 50 percent of the active members of the French underground. This is disputed in Free French quarters, who think the Communists number 30 to 40 percent of the French underground. At any rate they are a considerable factor.

That this is true is shown by the influence of the Communists at Algiers in the dealings of the French National Committee of Liberation. Along with representatives of other factions of the old Front Populaire, the Communists are on hand in force. They have their power on the committee and De Gaulle is now negotiating with them for one or more places in his provisional government. Maurice Torres and André Marty, French Communist leaders, have shown up in Algiers. It is a matter of record that both of them were in Moscow not so long ago.

In France, as elsewhere, it is probable that the cell organizations of the Communists were particularly serviceable in the organization of an underground. People who had been obliged to work largely under cover naturally fit into an underground movement. It is intriguing to hear it reported that in the underground the Communists have frequently opposed open rebellion to the Germans in France, apparently on the ground that less open work brings good results with less cost in reprisals and executions.

YUGOSLAV PARTISANS

The most-publicized Communist-directed action in the struggle of occupied countries against the Nazi invaders has been the campaign of the Partisans in Yugoslavia. Here

General Tito was a leader in the anti-Franco struggle in Spain. Two of his chief assistants played similar roles. More than a year ago Moscow suddenly inspired a campaign against General Mikhailovitch, accusing him of conniving with the Germans, and at the same time began to extol the Partisans.

While the Partisans, who have been fighting bravely, have certain aid from other United Nations, there seems no doubt that their leaders are constantly in close touch with Russia. The wireless station, which nightly sends out Tito's communiqués, is located in Tiflis, on Russian soil. Although Russia is not able to send supplies to Tito, it is reasonable to suppose that he is getting guidance and advice.

Likewise, in Greece the Communists have a considerable role in the guerrilla warfare and some of the clashes of the Greek factions recently are believed to have been caused, at least in part, by differences caused by the Communists.

IN OTHER COUNTRIES

It is reliably reported that in Belgium and in the Netherlands the Communists are serving the cause of the underground. Furthermore, it is likely that the best vestige of an underground movement in Germany is represented by the Reds.

The case of Poland is peculiarly complicated. Moscow has had difficulties with the refugee Polish Government in London. At the same time, it is in touch with Communist elements in Poland who are working against the Germans. There is in existence in Moscow a Polish committee, which is certainly working for Russian ends.

In Czechoslovakia it is different. Moscow is on good terms with Benes and is engineering permanent relations with him. The Communists in Bohemia are, therefore, working in harmony with the refugee government.

In Italy there is a working Communist organization which seems for the present to be biding its time, so far as political action is concerned. It might have been expected that the Italian Communists would be among the first to demand that the King step down. But it has not worked out that way. The reasons are not clear at all.

It is therefore plain that in practically all of the countries of Europe the Communist organizations have been kept intact and are working busily in the underground movement against the Germans.

THE POLITICAL MEANING?

Whether the Communists in their underground work are doing a nationalist job in the various countries, for patriotic reasons, or whether they are doing an internationalist job must remain to be seen. The Comintern has been dissolved.

Put another way, Will the influence Stalin has through the activity of the Communists in the occupied countries be used to aid the national interests of each country, or will it be used for an international purpose? Perhaps the question might better be asked whether this Communist force will be used to get a greater degree of power in the reorganized governments as a domestic proposition, or will it be knit together to boost the influence of Russia in those countries?

Take the case of Yugoslavia. Mikhailovitch is fighting for the King. The Partisans are against the King. Moscow favors the Partisans. What will be the line-up when the war is over?

One thing is true: When the United Nations armies get into the countries now held by the Germans they are going to find the Communists wielding a strength that will be influential. They will also find that the Communists have in many cases done work against the common enemy. In France they will find that the Reds did what they could against Vichy. If they land on the Adriatic coast in Yugoslavia, they will find that Tito made the job easier. If Germany revolts against Hitler, they will find the Communists were probably in the vanguard.

It is therefore a problem which will confront the leaders of the Allies. If, as Secretary Hull said in his report to Congress on the Moscow meetings, spheres of influence will be out of style in the post-war regime being planned, the situation may be less difficult. But, one way or the other, the European Communists may be expected to try to cash in for the work they are doing and have been doing against the invaders of their countries. Even if anyone wished to do it, they will not be lightly brushed aside.

Inter-American Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Inter-American Cooperation Means," delivered by Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, at the American Legion dinner, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on November 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commander Atherton, distinguished representatives of the other American republics, honored guests, and gentlemen:

It is a great pleasure to be with you this evening and to have the opportunity to listen to the statesmanlike and eloquent remarks of Bishop O'Hara, Senator BARKLEY, and yourself, Commander, on the significance of inter-American solidarity and to have a chance to add a few words about what inter-American cooperation means to this country.

As veterans of the armed forces you Legionnaires know what it takes to win a war. You appreciate the importance of offensive and defensive bases of operations. You understand how precious are the essential materials from which the weapons of war are forged.

You know that without the twin shields of food and health no man can either work or fight. You know that victory lies in mobilization—mobilization of all the forces that spell victory.

No one knows better than you the importance of national and international solidarity in time of crisis. Nations next door to one another must be secure and firm in their joint support of a common cause. That security and that firmness do not develop overnight; they are the result of patient and painstaking preparation.

As citizens you Legionnaires are further aware that the people of the United States demand a durable peace. No American today questions the necessity of standing solidly with the other peace-living nations of the world, large and small, for the years to come.

It is highly significant that the Legion and its women's auxiliary—about 1,800,000 people—representing an important cross section of opinion in the United States, have undertaken as one of their major objectives the development of inter-American cooperation.

Our good-neighbor policy, as proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1933, was based on foundations laid during the past century by leaders throughout the American republics. Today it has been accepted as a fundamental national policy which should be beyond the reach of partisan debate.

Why are you legionnaires so earnestly concerned with the good-neighbor policy?

I think the answer is very simple. It is a practical policy and it works and there have been many mutual dividends. The other American republics are pulling their weight and doing their part in this struggle, and we in the United States can well be proud and grateful that we are a part of this family of nations.

Let us look at a few facts of first importance.

There are 20 other American republics in this hemisphere. Nineteen of them have broken relations with the enemy, and have given freely of their resources to the cause of the United Nations. Twelve have declared war.

As a result we have the use of military, naval, and air bases which have enormously simplified our strategic problems. In a very real sense the great base at Natal on the bulge of Brazil, where our planes swing across the South Atlantic, could be called Victory Corner.

Without hesitation, Ecuador, occupying a strategic position in relation to the Panama Canal, gives us the right to use the Galapagos Islands for an outpost of defense, and the port of Salinas, the most important naval harbor on the west coast of South America.

Cuban planes and subchasers are hunting down U-boats.

Mexican merchant sailors have lost their lives at sea by enemy action.

Brazilian airmen are blasting German submarines to the bottom, and Brazil is preparing troops for overseas service.

The other Americas have smashed centers of espionage and sabotage on two continents.

They have stepped up production of strategic raw materials throughout the hemisphere.

In the words of that distinguished Legionnaire, Louis Johnson, we can say: "Those who laughed at the pioneers of the good-neighbor policy have lived to see the day when South American materials saved the day for the arsenal of democracy."

But memory is an uncertain thing. Today's deeds dwarf the past. Let us take a minute to look back only 3 years.

The grand strategy of the Germans and the Japanese for their attack against the United States recognized that our vulnerable flank was the other American republics.

The Axis had been working for years in every one of those countries to create the conditions that would favor the plans for their aggression. In this work they expended millions, and took full advantage of every past error of the United States policy toward those countries.

Difficult it is—I admit—to recapture the realities of the summer of 1940. Yet realities they were.

In that summer of 1940 the Axis was winning the war. And if we were reckoning in tangibles alone we could only observe that the enemy had all the advantage of anticipation, preparation, and position—and that therefore there was good reason to believe they would keep on winning.

In those bleak days (under this mortal threat to the free existence of the United States and the other American republics) there was raised the standard of faith, the sheer, moral courage of strong people.

The Nazis and Fascists depended upon our inertia and our softness. The other American republics depended on our word. Our neighbors were right. Meeting at Panama in 1939 and at Habana in 1940, the foreign ministers of the American nations acted as one for the defense of the hemisphere. But a far greater test lay ahead: Pearl Harbor.

On that day—December 7, 1941—there was anguish and anxiety in the United States. The enemy might be coming through the door (a threatened Japanese invasion of the Pacific coast).

The enemy might be coming through our windows (potential trans-Atlantic air raids).

The enemy might be coming through the floor (a possible fifth column in the other Americas or an attack on the Panama Canal).

None of these fears materialized. Joint action, conscientious effort, and the many preliminary steps to success on the battlefields saved untold millions in lives and money.

And remember at Rio de Janeiro in 1942 the representatives of the other American republics (only 6 weeks after Pearl Harbor) pledged their aid to us at a time when our record showed nothing but defeat on land and sea.

So we see the results and we recall the conditions under which they were obtained. We may rightfully ask, "How does this policy of inter-American cooperation work? How is it administered? What is the specific share of the United States?"

We have purchased materials from the other Americas and have made expenditures to develop their production.

In this way we have gotten rubber for airplane tires, mica for radar equipment, quartz crystals for radio communications, diamonds for machine tools, fibers for ropes on battleships, copper for munitions, nitrates for explosives, tungsten for hardening steel, etc.

We have built naval and military installations at strategic points and we have provided lend-lease military equipment for the defense of the hemisphere. We have engaged in training programs to increase the skill of soldiers, farmers, factory workers, and technicians. We have helped to accelerate the output of key foods.

But let us go back for a minute. The story of the war might have been different. Instead of fighting on the islands of the Pacific, hundreds of thousands of our men might have been fighting side by side with the soldiers of our neighbors in the jungles of Brazil in the east and Ecuador in the west.

We anticipated the possibility of this situation and undertook cooperative programs of health and sanitation to combat malaria and other tropical diseases.

We helped to build hospitals and clinics (which, if fighting had come to this hemisphere) would have made the difference between life and death to your sons or my brothers.

As it is, this work in health and sanitation has saved the lives of thousands of workers producing raw materials so essential to our program.

Those of you who know the Tropics also know that the Panama Canal itself is less an engineering triumph than a victory over disease.

There has been considerable talk and speculation about the cost to the United States of this program of cooperation. Uninformed estimates have ranged all the way to $6,000,000,000, a figure I read in a magazine article just the other day. That figure was said to represent a 3-year outlay (not including, mind you) the sums spent for goods, food and raw materials.

That guess of $6,000,000,000 is a misrepresentation of the facts.

The truth is that all expenditures and commitments to spend made during the past 3 years by all Government agencies (including military and naval installations) total less than $600,000,000.

And after these three war years, United States Government loans to the other Americas (including lend-lease materials and Export-Import Bank loans) total $603,000,000, of which less than half has actually been disbursed.

It is interesting to note in this connection that up to date the other American republics have paid back to the Export-Import Bank loans totaling $107,000,000.

As in the case of that $6,000,000,000 mentioned in the article the figures I have just given do not include the sums spent for goods, food, and raw materials.

You and I know that we could not buy with money what the other Americas have given so willingly.

You and I know that a dollar value cannot be put upon faith and sacrifice—faith and sacrifice which have been translated with such reality and effect into the weapons of war. The American nations have contributed to a common effort for the attainment of a common goal.

From all of this experience we have drawn important lessons. As President Roosevelt said in a message to Congress last September 17: "The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step."

The attitude of the American Legion toward foreign affairs has been both consistent and constructive.

I recall the resolutions of your Boston convention of 1940 which took a bold stand against the menacing might of Germany and Italy.

I have seen the crystallization of your views and your forthright call of 1943 for a world organization with the force necessary to maintain peace.

In your silver jubilee convention at Omaha you of the Legion not only endorsed the good neighbor policy as such (by resolution), but you also gave to our American partners in war a message of inspiration for the future when you said:

"We warmly endorse the good neighbor policies which have strengthened the bonds of friendship throughout all the Americas. We urge continued effort to break down every difference of whatever nature that may now (or hereafter) threaten the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. We recommend every honest effort to remove all cause of misunderstanding, so that the nations of all the Americas shall speak and act as one in the cause of liberty and justice."

It is my belief that the principle of cooperation based so firmly in the Americas upon knowledge, understanding, mutual trust, and confidence will serve as an inspiring model for the world of the future.

Resolution of Glens Falls (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of policy, I wish to insert three letters received by me from the Chamber of Commerce, Glens Falls, N. Y., in which are expressed opinions concerning current Federal legislation, and desirable legislative trends:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Glens Falls, N. Y., November 22, 1943.

Hon. DEAN P. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: This is to advise you that at a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was unanimously adopted and I was requested to forward a copy of it to you and express the hope that you might see your way clear to be in accord with and support the action suggested:

"*Resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce believes that the success of air traffic in the post-war period demands at this time certain Government actions, the most important of which are—

"1. That the Government should record itself beyond doubt to the effect that it will maintain and support the principles of private ownership and operation of air lines, both in domestic and international commerce, subject to reasonable Government regulations;

"2. That the Government of the United States will foster and encourage a sound world-wide commercial air transportation system, free of monopolies as well as unbridled competition, which can promote domestic and foreign commerce, and at the same time maintain its proven military value to the Nation;

"3. That the Federal Government in its foreign relations, as well as in its domestic relations, will use its influence and authority to arrange for suitable civil and commercial airports and their facilities in the major trade centers of the world essential to meet the requirements of our domestic and foreign commerce and our air forces; and

"4. That the United States Government should adopt a policy of granting a foreign air line only those privileges corresponding to those granted by its home government to American-owned air lines; and such reciprocal relations should be arranged by international agreements, so that air lines carrying our flag shall not be placed at any disadvantage in the use of foreign air facilities."

Yours very truly,

F. M. SMALLEY,
Executive Secretary.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Glens Falls, N. Y., November 22, 1943.

Hon. DEAN P. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: This is to advise you that at a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was unanimously adopted and I was requested to forward a copy of it to you and express the hope that you might see your way clear to be in accord with and support the action suggested:

"*Resolved*, That the chamber of commerce believes it is essential to the national welfare that steps be taken immediately:

"1. To strengthen and expand the American merchant marine beyond its pre-war status, and

"2. As a means of accomplishing this end the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission is urged to appoint a committee of representatives of interested Government agencies, of outstanding shipping men, representative of every branch of the shipping industry, and of others interested in foreign and domestic water-borne commerce, who shall undertake an immediate investigation of post-war shipping problems; who shall submit reports containing recommendations with reference thereto in the interest of the development and maintenance in the post-war period of a stronger and more adequate merchant marine under private ownership;

and who shall continue their investigations and reports from time to time on development as they may arise affecting these problems."

Yours very truly,

F. M. SMALLEY,
Executive Secretary.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Glens Falls, N. Y., November 22, 1943.
Hon. DEAN P. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: This is to advise you that at a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and I was requested to forward a copy of it to you and express the hope that you might see your way clear to be in accord with and support the action suggested:

"*Resolved,* That the chamber of commerce urges the enactment into law of the Bailey-Van Nuys bill, S. 1362, identical with H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270, to establish beyond question 'that nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in any wise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States.'"

Yours very truly,

F. M. SMALLEY,
Executive Secretary.

Civil Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following resolution adopted by the directors of the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, Inc., at a meeting held on November 10, 1943, concerning the Lea bill, H. R. 3420:

Voted, That the president is hereby given authority to prepare and transmit a letter to the Connecticut Senators and Congressmen in Washington, expressing opposition of the directors to H. R. 3420, known as the Lea or civil-aviation bill.

Final Declaration of the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the final declaration of the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at New York, October 25–27, 1943. As a statement in part of policy relating to the reconstruction period, the views of American foreign traders at this time is of great importance as an approach to united policy by the United Nations at the close of the war.

I submit an estimate from the Public Printer that printing this statement will cost $189.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRTIETH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

To the armed services everywhere, this convention sends its greetings and its gratitude. The vigorous prosecution of the war until victory is won is the supreme concern of all Americans.

Representing through 1,700 delegates the industrial and business life of the Nation, this convention pledges its continued support to the Government in its efforts to maintain an effective superiority of military and economic power on all fighting fronts, on land and sea, and in the air.

The United Nations are now engaged in uprooting the Nazi and Fascists systems, which were designed in their economic and other aspects to serve the ends of military conquest. Our next great task will be to create rather than to destroy—to help to build a world order designed, in its economic and other aspects, to serve the ends of cooperation and peace.

For the information of the Government and in furtherance of continued collaboration by the National Foreign Trade Council with organizations in other countries, authorized to speak for their industrialists and businessmen, the convention, after careful consideration, presents the following declaration of policy as an expression of its views:

1. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

It is the impetus and the incentive inherent in private enterprise that gave to America a variety and an abundance of international commerce, without which the Nation could not have achieved its incomparable living standards of its stature as a great world power.

During war the normal processes of private enterprise in international commerce are subordinated to military needs; economic warfare is an integral part of total warfare, and the effective use of this weapon often demands extensive Government activity and a comprehensive system of controls over private transactions. American foreign traders have collaborated with the Government in endeavoring to solve the many difficult problems which this unavoidable interference with the normal processes of commerce involves.

When America and the world can turn once more to the constructive processes of peace, those engaged in foreign trade will stand again, as they have stood before, for the pursuit of our national objectives through the channels of private enterprise. It was through these channels that we moved forward; it is through them that we shall move forward again.

We see it as the function of government in foreign trade to provide a framework of national policy and of international convention within which the private trader may carry on his activity. We see it as the purpose of government to facilitate interchange of goods and services to the maximum by providing reasonable security and rules of conduct under which private enterprise may operate. We see it as the function and purpose of private enterprise itself to develop that maximum volume of total world trade upon which the welfare of the world, and hence our own domestic welfare, must ultimately depend.

With substantial reductions of critical shortages at home and the extension of our military power abroad, it is already timely to prepare for a return to private enterprise in this field of international trade—to reexamine the activities and controls now exercised by Government, both generally and with regard to specific areas, and to begin to invite private enterprise to reoccupy its traditional field of endeavor as rapidly as the national interest permits.

The ultimate revival and development of the maximum possible volume of total world trade, with its essential contribution to high levels of employment and standards of living, is a prime requisite for the maintenance of lasting peace. The convention holds that this objective can most surely be achieved, in the instance of our own vital contribution to the total scheme of things, by reliance upon that system of private enterprise which has served historically to make our Nation great—encouraged and facilitated by continuity of constructive practical Government policy and action.

2. RECONSTRUCTION OF WORLD TRADE RELATIONS

The convention calls to the attention of Government the principles it advocates in Declaration No. 1—Private Enterprise in International Commerce—as a primary and fundamental doctrine of economic reconstruction.

Foreign traders in other countries are, like ourselves, eager to enter into international trade on the basis of private enterprise. In each country there is fear that government controls will be removed in favor of the nationals of one country before they are removed in favor of the nationals of other countries. Cooperation between governments on a high moral plane is necessary for the solution of this problem of making trade in all areas accessible to all the United Nations, on the basis of equal opportunity.

The convention considers that the spirit with which the post-war problem is approached and the decisions carried through may be as important as the material measures agreed upon; that without integrity there can be no stability; and that there is need for a high standard of international conduct—some common denominator of honesty and fair dealing in the international sphere, as a basis for that mutual confidence without which commerce withers and dies.

Foreign branches and subsidiaries of American concerns must conform to legal concepts and requirements of the jurisdictions in which they are located. They should accordingly be given the utmost possible freedom from controls and restraints founded upon United States domestic laws. The extension of such controls and restraints by our Government, either by legal or extralegal compulsions, not only places American enterprises at a disadvantage with competitive enterprises of other countries not so limited, but also may cause irritation and danger to our cordial understanding with the nations concerned.

The convention urges the active prosecution of a program of negotiating and concluding with foreign nations treaties that will establish and define generally the conditions under which foreign traders and enterprises may operate, and afford that reasonable security without which the expansion of trade and foreign investment cannot fully be realized. There is both a real need and a most favorable opportunity for the conclusion of such treaties.

Specific attention should be given to the incorporation in such treaties of stipulations which will protect American foreign

direct investments, and assure American enterprises in foreign countries the right to representation by agents of their own choice.

3. MONETARY POLICY AND EXCHANGE STABILIZATION

Looking toward the resumption of freer foreign trade and international credit transactions in the post-war period, one of the most important objectives of international cooperation is the achievement of sound relationships between the principal currencies of the world and reasonable stability in the rates of exchange thereafter.

Many general political and economic conditions after the war may require considerable time for adjustment and settlement before world-wide stability in the exchanges is possible. A stable currency is the logical result of a sound economy and cannot exist long in its absence. Tenative plans for the establishment of international agencies, with large powers and resources, have been proposed by the British, Canadian and our own Treasuries. As wisely desired by these governments, these proposals have provoked wide discussion and an awareness of the difficulties involved. As yet no plan has received the approval of any Parliament or the American Congress.

We recommend particular and immediate consideration of our relationship to the problems of the British monetary and trade position, and of that of other countries which are now prepared to discuss their situations and possible post-war arrangements with our Government. We recognize that it may be advantageous for this country to extend credit in one form or another to assist other nations which are taking sound steps to rehabilitate their economies and monetary systems. We would thereby further stimulate and enlarge the opportunities for world trade.

We recommend the repeal of such laws as may require the further purchase of silver for monetary purposes.

The United States can make an important contribution toward international monetary stability by making determined efforts to put its own affairs in order by balancing its budget and by adopting policies with respect to tariffs and other trade restrictions which will permit debtor nations to meet their engagements through the delivery of goods and services.

While our present monetary policy must be influenced by the exigencies of financing the war, every effort should be made to control inflationary tendencies, in order to minimize the inevitable difficulties of post-war economic reconstruction.

This convention affirms its appreciation of the responsibility which will rest upon our Nation to cooperate with other leading countries, and all nations, toward the establishment of conditions and arrangements which will eventually result in stable rates of exchange and freedom for trading in them in the markets of the world. We recommend the eventual restoration of the convertibility of the dollar into gold, free of all exchange restrictions.

4. RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

The convention notes with satisfaction that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been renewed for the period expiring June 12, 1945. This constitutes a tangible gain in liberal international trade relations, and will be a stabilizing influence in the post-war era. The network of friendly trade agreements established pursuant to this act covers the greater part of the world, and is a safeguard against discrimination.

The convention recommends that measures be undertaken by our Government now, and vigorously prosecuted in cooperation with other nations, to begin the setting up of a system of economic and commercial international relations which shall be designed (a) to give private enterprise real opportunity to continue and to develop; (b) to reduce excessive tariffs and other trade barriers; (c) to encourage multilateral trade; and (d) to eliminate all types of trade discrimination. Such measures should be based on the same principles of liberalization, nondiscrimination, and cooperation, which underlie the reciprocal trade agreements program.

The preservation of this liberal policy calls for the continuing active interest, not only of those engaged in foreign trade but of all citizens of the United States, and requires those favoring the further development of the reciprocal trade agreements policy to make known their views to the Government.

The reciprocal trade agreements program has been consistently supported by the National Foreign Trade Council, and this convention recommends its continuation.

5. INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The large and mutually beneficial trade and economic relationship existing between the United States and other countries of this hemisphere was built up through private enterprise. The maintenance of close and friendly economic and political relations among these nations should continue to be a cardinal principle of national policy. It can best be implemented by a continuance of the principle of individual liberty and free enterprise which the leaders of the United Nations have proclaimed, but which will be menaced by a continuation of wartime controls in permanent peacetime policies. Private investment capital and management ability will continue to be available to other American republics if given fair opportunity and protected against nationalistic laws designed to deprive the direct investor of control and management of his property.

The other American republics have cooperated with us in the war effort of the United Nations by supplying many commodities essential to our domestic economy and indispensable to our war effort. Such a mutually beneficial association should be continued in the post-war period. It can be accomplished by the studying now and encouraging of greater use of their products and raw materials. This would assure the other American nations a sustained purchasing power for our exports and would be a practical contribution to the desirable expansion of trade necessary to the economy of all the American nations in peacetime years.

We refute the enemy propaganda which seeks to kindle in Latin America a suspicion that the policy of the United States will be reversed after the war. Our Latin-American friends need fear no abandonment of the principle of the good neighbor, or of the truly beneficial progress made thereunder.

6. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN-TRADE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION

The protection of the Nation's foreign commerce during and after the war will require close integration of those governmental departments and agencies in Washington concerned with the protection and promotion of our foreign trade. Essential coordination of autonomous departments through a central authority will avoid confusion and will be helpful to the permanent interests of our foreign trade and shipping.

7 LEND-LEASE AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASING PRACTICES

Recognizing the necessity of lend-lease operations as a war measure, regardless of the organization under which it is administered, we believe it is none too soon to recommend that our Government begin now to implement a return of foreign trade to commercial trade channels. We believe this is not solely in the interest of those engaged in foreign trade, but of vital concern to every citizen of these United States.

In order to accomplish this return to commercial channels, we see a need for those who administer lend-lease operations to concern themselves more deeply with trade problems, to the end that commercial business shall not be further penalized in the transition period.

We therefore recommend greater use of trade advisory committees, which have proved mutually beneficial in the past, greater flexibility in Government procurement practices, and a larger allocation of Government personnel to trade problems during this critical transitional period.

If sound commercial relationships are to be maintained for post-war use, private commercial trade on products essential to the war effort should have supply assistance equal to that accorded to United States and foreign government purchases for identical products. Inasmuch as over 80 percent of our total exports are going through lend-lease, it is imperative that everything possible be done to lessen the impact of lend-lease operations on our established channels of trade, and that lend-lease be restricted to supplying munitions and such other necessities as cannot be secured through private channels.

The convention emphasizes to all appropriate branches of our Government the dangers to our trade inherent in foreign government bulk purchasing of American goods. Such bulk purchasing eliminates long-established American brands and trade-marks and also jeopardizes our channels of distribution.

The convention again urges all Government agencies concerned to recognize the value to our economy of trade-marks, names, and brands, to maintain or reestablish the normal channels of sale and distribution and to assist in the early restoration of commercial volume.

The convention welcomes the indication that so-called cash-reimbursement transactions by lend-lease are being sharply restricted.

8. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING EXPORT TRADE

The convention recognizes that under wartime conditions various controls must be applied to our export trade. However, export trade should not be unnecessarily restricted by unwise policies and divided responsibilities such as have existed in the administration of these controls.

The convention is pleased that steps are being taken toward unification of policy and operations in the handling of emergency controls, and emphasizes the necessity of close integration of all agencies of supply, licensing and the allocation of shipping space.

The convention urges the early establishment of procedures which would:

1. Eliminate overlapping controls and authorities among Government agencies.

2. Simplify and minimize paper work here and abroad.

3. Prevent vessels leaving this country with unutilized cargo space when there is demand from abroad and supplies are available.

4. Eliminate individual licenses both here and abroad on commodities which do not require supply assistance. This applies both to decentralization and program licensing.

Preliminary steps having been taken to modify the decentralization plan, further modification should look toward the earliest possible abolishment of import recommendations or other semilicensing procedure in foreign countries. It is urged that similar steps be taken with respect to areas under program licensing.

Licensing procedures here and abroad should not impose restrictions, discriminatory to exports from the United States. Decentralization has encouraged governmental controls in foreign nations contrary to the trade-agreements program.

In accordance with the recommendation made in 1942, various advisory committees or

groups were established in certain Government agencies administrating wartime export control. To obtain the full benefit of this cooperative effort between Government and industry, the convention urges closer collaboration and fuller use of the assistance and advice which business can render.

The convention recommends that, at the earliest time commensurate with military necessities, trade with reoccupied areas be restored to commercial channels. It is further recommended that, consistent with this principle, and no later than similar privileges are available to nationals of other countries, facilities be made available to permit representatives of private American trade to proceed to those territories. This is an essential step in the effective reestablishment of private trade in such areas.

The convention strongly recommends that all Government departments and agencies interested in operating wartime controls give realistic consideration to our post-war competitive position.

9. UNITED STATES EXPORT PRICE CONTROL

The convention strongly urges that appropriate United States Government representatives in other American republics promptly undertakes a systematic and thorough program of publicizing to the consuming public in those countries the fact that United States exports are subject to an export price control.

It is of importance that there be a wider appreciation throughout the other republics of this hemisphere of the sincere efforts of United States exporters to supply all possible necessary commodities without excessive price increases due to wartime conditions.

10. DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR CONTROLLED MATERIAL ABROAD

When hostilities cease, Government-owned or controlled stocks in other countries, usable for civilian consumption, may be more than sufficient for the needs of the countries in which they are held. The method of disposition of such stocks in the country of location, or elsewhere, is of importance to our future export trade.

The sale of such stocks, as after the last war, at nominal or insufficient prices, would be detrimental to normal competition and marketing.

The necessity of prompt liquidation of stocks of consumer goods, such as foodstuffs and clothing, is recognized, but durable goods—such as vehicles, tools, and equipment of all kinds—should be sold with due regard to the orderly processes of private trade. The convention recommends that the Government give prompt consideration to this subject and, before disposing of such stocks, consult with appropriate American commercial interest to insure suitable disposition, adequate prices, and the least injury to our foreign trade.

11. UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

The convention recognizes that the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of war is the joint concern of all of the United Nations and of the nations associated with them in this war. Is recognizes further that the vast responsibilities for aiding the populations of areas devastated by the war can best be sustained by a coordinated and united effort, wherein each nation contributes goods and services in accordance with its resources.

Every effort must be made to return to normal international economic intercourse, and to restore the normal flow of trade and commerce.

The implementation of a sound United Nations program for the relief of victims of war will be one method for accelerating the establishment of a stable world economy.

Accordingly, the convention heartily approves the establishment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and the participation by the Government of the United States in this international cooperative effort.

12. MERCHANT SHIPPING

This war has emphasized the Nation's need for a much larger merchant marine, commensurate with the national economy and post-war international responsibilities. The withdrawal, in 1939, of most of the foreign flag vessels which had been carrying more than two-thirds of our foreign trade, left too few ships to serve our trade, our preparedness program, or our armed forces when, later, we entered the war. The Nation should not again be placed in this vulnerable position.

The Government, at a cost of more than $10,000,000,000, has built a new merchant fleet, constituting a large part of the world's total tonnage. With sufficient trained personnel, the Nation thus is assured of fast and efficient ships adequate to maintain its maritime position, both in commerce and defense. Warship tonnage has trebled since pre-war years, demanding, in turn, a much larger auxiliary fleet of merchant vessels, which is an indispensable element in sea power, and which now has been brought into balance with the need of our armed forces; a position which should be maintained.

The United States seeks no monopoly of shipping. With an active merchant fleet commensurate in size and quality with other factors in the national economy and sufficient at all times to serve our economic security and national defense, collaboration between American and friendly foreign shipping is desirable. This would contribute to stability of service and encourage trade recovery. However, in any steps taken toward such collaboration, we urge that competent and experienced representatives of the American shipping industry in foreign trade have an important part in the planning and effecting of policy and administration.

As the war is gradually won, ships from our rapidly expanding merchant fleet should be utilized, so far as possible without detriment to the war effort, to speed trade recovery. We recommend the employment of first-class vessels in operation, under the United States flag, on essential trade routes and, where practicable, on indirect routes. This will relieve the greatly restricted trade with friendly countries which have long been unable to import or export many products vital to their welfare and ours. Restoration of reasonable regularity of service, and company indentity largely obliterated by the dedication of the shipping industry to the war, is highly desirable so far as military considerations permit. We are building the ships, and the world's need is acute.

By sacrifice of life and unswerving devotion to duty, the enlarged personnel of the merchant marine is writing a memorable page in the history of this war.

To achieve and implement its objectives as an integral part of the national economy, and as defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, this convention recommends:

1. That the active merchant marine be maintained at a point adequate to serve our foreign commerce and our armed forces under all conditions.

2. That private operation continue to be the recognized principle of our national shipping policy and that, as rapidly as war conditions permit, vessels now under requisition be returned to their owners for regular service.

3. That in connection with the requisition of vessels by the Government just compensation, computed in accordance with law and reflecting the value of the vessels at the time of requisition, should be paid as soon as possible after the date of requisition. This convention believes that the failure of the War Shipping Administration to pay such compensation with reasonable promptness has created a serious menace to the American shipping industry.

4. That the new vessels be sold to American citizens for guaranteed operation in services established on existing essential trade routes or future new routes, including indirect trades; purchasers to be safeguarded by a fall clause against subsequent sale to others at more favorable prices or terms.

5. That wartime emergency controls be relaxed as promptly as practicable, with due regard to the primary task of the winning of the war.

6. That no fast ships should be sold or chartered to foreign operators, but be retained and utilized for replacement of obsolete vessels of the active merchant fleet and the enlargement of its operation.

7. That legislative and administrative restrictions, not offset by aid extended by the Merchant Marine Act, be removed to the fullest extent possible; otherwise, American ships, in competition with foreign vessels not subject to these restrictive laws, will be handicapped in serving our commerce. Participation, ownership, or operation by American shipping companies in overseas aviation should not be prohibited by law or by administrative regulation, when found to be in the public interest. Otherwise foreign shipping companies generally free of such restriction would have a competitive advantage over American shipping companies.

If, as seems probable after the attainment of these objectives, there will remain a substantial amount of surplus tonnage, we recommend the creation of a large inactive reserve of ships to be kept in good order against the recurrence of war or other national emergency. With regard to such ships as will then still remain, we recommend to the Maritime Commission continued study of the problem of their disposition, including possible sale to foreign ship operators for use in ways which will not unfairly compete with vessels of the United States.

We are opposed to the disposal of any of our ships, either directly or under arrangements which, immediately or ultimately, might result in a lesser cost to the foreign purchaser than to American citizens who purchase or charter ships from the Maritime Commission, or to their operation under conditions or in ways prejudicial to American ships.

The policy of a long-range program of shipbuilding, as defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, providing for yearly replacements and additions of American-built ships for the merchant marine, is essential to maintain the shipbuilding industry in a high state of efficiency in time of peace, and to insure its readiness to serve the Nation in a time of emergency.

13. CLEARANCE OF COMMERCIAL CARGOES

The convention, recognizing the necessity of conforming to military objectives in designating specific ports for clearance of commercial cargoes to specific destinations, expresses the hope that circumstances in the near future will permit careful consideration of the possibility of giving more adequate prior notice of change of clearance ports.

This would not only have the effect of reducing unnecessary rail movements and other transportation burdens, but would also serve to minimize delay and confusion in the ultimate clearance of export shipments.

14. MARINE AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE

The convention records its approval of the steps taken jointly by the War Shipping Administration and American commercial marine underwriters, in the adoption of the new war-risks exclusion clause in marine-insurance policies, and the granting of a fully complementary war-risk clause in war-risk policies issued both by the Government and the commercial war-risk insurance companies.

The inclusion in the war-risk policies of emergency perils arising out of the war is sound and to the best interests of shippers. This principle was advocated as far back as 1941, by a committee of the national foreign-trade council appointed to confer with a committee of commercial underwriters.

The convention recognizes the importance to our foreign trade and shipping of a strong commercial marine insurance market, domiciled in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of our courts and adequate to give full protection to foreign traders and shipowners.

To this end it is recommended that any disability which the American market may suffer in international competition by reason of unnecessary regulations or other restrictions, should be removed. Our Government, in negotiating with other nations, should recognize the importance of securing opportunities for our insurance companies in foreign nations equal to those afforded in the United States to companies of foreign nations.

The convention recommends that foreign traders, shipowners, and bankers dealing in foreign exchange give all possible support to the United States commercial marine-insurance market, and thereby foster its growth and development.

15. AVIATION

American commercial aviation is contributing effectively to the war effort. It is obvious that our commerce and other national interests after the war will require enlarged service on international air routes. This is essential to friendly political relations, as well as to national defense and economic security.

Foreign-trade interests require continued development of both passenger and cargo possibilities on all essential routes. So far as is consistent with the war effort, aviation lines should be permitted to receive and operate the larger, more modern, and faster equipment they have had on order, or which may be available.

Aviation is a facility for commerce and its future development will best be served by continuance of the principle of free enterprise.

The Government of the United States is urged to take such action as may be necessary to organize our post-war civil commercial aviation so as to maintain American supremacy and meet foreign competition.

16. PROTECTION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN PROPERTIES

Recognition of the inviolability of private property against confiscation is the sole assurance of a supply of international capital and credit, which has been the cornerstone of the economic development of the world. This principle should be reemphasized by the United States as a condition of all international cooperation, should be included in all treaties entered into with foreign nations, and should control our Government's actions in domestic and foreign matters.

This basic principle requires the restoration of, and compensation for, properties of which American concerns and individuals have been extensively and systematically despoiled and deprived under the pretense of legality, by enemy action. We believe that the American Government should insist that justice be done American owners by restoration, by substitution, by full compensation for the losses or damages effected by the enemy or by acts of war.

Property of private enemy nationals coming under the control of our Government (or the proceeds, if disposed of by our Government) should be conserved during the war in anticipation of a fair and realistic policy of restoration, or adequate compensation, after the war. This policy should be established by well-considered legislation, and implemented by appropriate stipulations in the eventual peace treaty.

17. INDUSTRIAL AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The principles asserted in declaration No. 16 above, of the inviolability of private property, apply specifically to industrial and intellectual property (patents, trade-marks, copyrights and the like). The United States was a signatory to the original Convention of the Union of Paris for the protection of industrial property, in 1883, and has consistently renewed its signature to subsequent revisions. Due regard must be had to the reciprocal rights and obligations of the United States and other nations under this convention.

18. UTILIZATION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN PROPERTIES IN THE WAR

This convention commends the prompt action taken by the National Foreign Trade Council for the protection of American properties abroad through the formation of the foreign property holders protective committee. American-owned properties now in the hands of the enemy should, as they are recovered by the armed forces of the United Nations, be utilized to the fullest extent practicable in prosecuting the war.

This convention urgently recommends that the United States Army take prompt advantage of the offer of the foreign property holders protective committee to send abroad sufficient widely experienced American personnel, familiar with the operation of such properties, to provide their maximum efficient operation in support of the military effort.

19. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING IMPORT TRADE

The convention recognizes that under wartime conditions various controls must be applied to our import trade. Imports of materials required by domestic producers of articles essential to the war must be accorded preference in the allocation of available inbound shipping space. Foreign goods needed for civilian requirements must also be considered in the allocation of such space.

The convention commends the policies which have been followed by the Government in the granting of authorizations under general imports order M-63, in a manner that utilizes cargo space to the best advantage. The convention recommends, however, that when future amendments are made in the lists of order M-63, a reasonable period be allowed between the date of the amendment and the effective date of the change, so that importers, bankers, and others concerned may be advised of such change prior to the effective date.

The maximum import price regulation should be constantly reviewed, so that desirable imported materials and goods are encouraged and not hindered by price control. The convention recommends that when price regulations are issued, care should be taken to avoid, so far as possible, any discrimination against the established channels of import trade. Specific maximum price regulations, covering imported commodities which have previously been issued, should now be reviewed. If inconsistent with the principles contained in the maximum import price regulation, these specific regulations should be revised to conform in all cases where price control of comparable domestic commodities is not endangered.

The convention approves the policy pursued by the Government in working out public purchase programs for strategic imported materials with the cooperation and participation of experienced importers. In those instances where these programs have been undertaken without the participation of the importers, the convention urges that private enterprise be called upon to participate therein at the earliest practical time.

20. ADMINISTRATIVE TARIFF CHANGES

The special and administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 were enacted by the Congress to meet conditions prevailing in the decade following World War No. 1. The amendments made since, with the exception of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, have chiefly been designed to assist customs administration. Some provisions of the law result in protracted investigations abroad and litigation, with consequent uncertainties as to customs clearance and final settlement of duty payments.

The convention recommends that the committees of the Congress concerned with tariff policy, the Treasury Department, and the Tariff Commission, institute studies of the special and administrative provisions of the law in preparation for the changes which may become necessary to adapt regulations to post-war trading conditions. Other governmental agencies concerned—the customs service, and other interested organizations—should be afforded full opportunity to assist in the suggested studies.

The convention further recommends that appropriate legislation be promptly considered, whenever the desirability of any amendment in the law is established.

21. CUSTOMS REGULATIONS

The difficulties in foreign trade arising from wartime conditions call for continued development of cooperation with importers on the part of the customs service, so that the application of existing customs law may be adapted so far as possible to war conditions. Such cooperation is also important, to the end that burdensome formalities and unreasonable interpretations of the law may be avoided. Precautions should be taken against the unnecessary issuance of administrative rulings which will result in undesirable changes in long-established customs procedures.

The convention recommends that the National Council of American Importers continue its work in the development of this cooperation, and particularly that it take up with the proper authorities at Washington the solution of problems relating to those delayed appraisements which hamper trade by preventing the prompt settlement of duty liabilities.

22. TAXATION

The convention believes that sound principles of taxation, consistently followed, which include relief from double and extra-territorial taxation are of prime importance, if foreign trade is to maintain a healthy volume and bring benefits to both the importing and exporting countries. To this end, the convention urges the continued maintenance of the foreign tax credit, and the exemption of earned income from sources without the United States for individual citizens of the United States who are bona fide residents of foreign countries. It also urges the conclusion of tax treaties with Allied and friendly countries, to provide for an adequate and equitable demarcation of the taxing sphere of each. The convention requests the tax committee of the National Foreign Trade Council to continue to give consideration to discriminatory tax laws and regulations, so that foreign trade may not be unduly hampered thereby.

23. THE PHILIPPINES

For the mutual benefit of the United States and the Philippine Islands, the convention hopes that the fellowship and mutual reliance on each other of the past may continue after the expulsion of the enemy forces from the islands.

Our Government has already acknowledged the responsibility of the United States to restore the physical installations of the Government of the Philippine Islands and its subdivisions, and private property, which may have been damaged or destroyed by acts of war. The convention commends this action.

In the light of the exceptional relationship between the United States Government and the Philippine Government under international law, the convention recommends that Congress should promptly enact legislation clearly establishing a definite policy for—

(a) The continuation of reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Philippines;

(b) Provision for adequate reparation of private property damaged by acts of war.

24. EXPORT AND IMPORT STATISTICS

The convention believes that the military position now is such that no useful purpose is served by the failure to publish export and import statistics with the same completeness as was in force prior to June 1940.

Resumption of such publications now would serve both as an audit and as a defense of the operations of export and import control. An audit, by bringing to light any discrimination, if there be such; a defense, by disclosing the considerable amounts of merchandise which have been exported in spite of the shortages existing, and the large imports which are reaching the United States from all parts of the world.

It is further recommended that study be given at this time by governmental agencies to a revised procedure for obtaining and compiling statistics that will assure accurate data in the post-war years.

25. ARBITRATION

The Americas now have in operation a Western Hemisphere system of commercial arbitration which provides facilities and administration for the settlement of controversies which arise in foreign trade in the Americas. The convention recommends that the National Foreign Trade Council cooperate with the American Arbitration Association, the Canadian-American and the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commissions in the expansion and adaptation of the arbitration system to post-war trade problems and controversies.

26. AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS OF COMMERCE AND PRODUCTION

The convention approves the continuation of the work of the Permanent Council of American Associations of Commerce and Production which, with headquarters at Montevideo, provides opportunities for the interchange of views and the formulation of policies for the economic development of all the countries of the Western Hemisphere and the promotion of the exchange of commodities and services.

27. STANDARDIZATION

The convention again registers its approval of an endeavor to establish throughout the Americas a comprehensive acceptance of agreed standards and specifications as a necessary step forward in facilitating orderly commercial procedure, and closer inter-American commercial cooperations. The convention endorses the movement of American industry to carry forward this endeavor under the auspices of the American Standards Association, and advocates support to that movement to the extent necessary to insure its continuity and effectiveness.

28. MAIL RESTRICTIONS

The convention commends the steps taken by the Office of the Censor and the Office of Exports, during the past year, to lighten the restrictions on, and formalities involved in, the mailing of technical data abroad, in the shape of technical periodicals, books and trade catalogs, booklets of instruction, etc., so necessary in the development of our export trade.

The convention urges that, in harmony with the expressed purpose of returning trade in north and west Africa or any other markets to normal trade channels at the earliest feasible moment, steps should be taken in cooperation with our allies to remove the present restrictions on the mailing of second- and third-class mail, including books, catalogs, and other information regarding American equipment and American merchandise, and that the present service for first-class mail be extended to these other classes of mail.

29. EDUCATION

The Foreign Trade Education Committee of the council is commended for the practical work it is accomplishing, particularly in the field of visual education for the acquirement of a knowledge of foreign languages. It is recommended that the relationship of language to international trade be given more consideration by businessmen in the immediate future, and for the postwar era, and that specific programs for language teaching be encouraged.

It is important that young men from neighboring American republics should come to the United States for technical and practical training in our industries. It is recommended that this movement be continued as the emergency permits, and that its expansion in the post-war period be fostered by private industry.

30. FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

The convention regards with satisfaction the progress of the New York Foreign Trade Zone in meeting unusual wartime demands upon its limited facilities, and again recommends the early establishment of foreign trade zones in Gulf, Pacific, and other Atlantic ports.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial by R. F. Beasley, which recently appeared in the Monroe Journal, Monroe, N. C.:

THE PROPHET WHOSE VOICE WAS NOT HEEDED—BUT PREDICTION OF MR. WILSON HAS COME TRUE TO THE LETTER

(By R. F. Beasley)

The last speech of any kind made by Woodrow Wilson, and the only one made as ex-President, was made 20 years ago on the night preceding Armistice Day. Feeble and dying, he was importuned by friends to make a statement after the fuss and fury and tragedy of the venomous series of campaigns that had defeated the League of Nations and wrecked his own life. There was no impediment in his thoughts though his body was wrecked and his time short. In his campaign for the League he had pointed out over and over that without some such an arrangement among the nations for peace another war would follow in a generation. In his last speech he was as sure of his prediction as he had been before.

"The anniversary of Armistice Day," he said, "should stir us to great exaltation of spirit * * * although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered, chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

"This must always be a source of deep mortification to us, and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

"That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

"And now, as if to finish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion.

"The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail."

Mr. Wilson did not put his trust in the written words of the League of Nations but in the belief that once having agreed to it the nations would have the willing mind to support it. He knew that a treaty or a league could not work unless there was the sincere desire to make it work. But unless such desire did develop he knew perfectly well that the next war was on its way. He overestimated the willingness of the nations to work together, and he especially overestimated the intelligence of the American public which fell so ignominiously for the falsifications and the venom which clouded the public mind. That falsification not only defeated the League but it carried through the next campaign and made the blackest chapter in American history. Looking back, one can scarcely understand the action of such men as Taft, Root, and Hughes, who had first advocated a league and had even conferred with Mr. Wilson on its draft. They advised that a vote for Harding would be a vote for the League with certain amendments. Harding had a chance to resubmit the League with the reservations, but he did no such thing, and these able men said nothing about it. The country had appeared to be in favor of the League and Mr. Wilson was certain that public pressure on the Senate would result in ratification. It was on his trip through the country to explain the League and arouse the public in its behalf that Mr. Wilson received the stroke that terminated his physical powers.

"Stop for a moment to think about the next war," he said to his audience. "For I can predict with absolute certainty that within

another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it.

"What shall I call it? The final war? It might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents. She is not exhausted at all.

"America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the industries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew.

"The next war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The Nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the Nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe. It is not likely that, with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but, unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face of the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and the day of her birth.

"The next time will come. It will come while this generation is living, and the children will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives.

"I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and shot into heavens, went for a hundred miles and more, and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization."

"In this generation," Mr. Wilson said. The very children before him, he pointed out, would be called to the next war. How true it has been. Have we learned the lesson? Will there again rise up men who for some selfish purposes of their own will be able to befuddle the public mind? Can the people again be distracted so that they can be made to think that black is white?

The willingness to act together, which Mr. Wilson foresaw as necessary for the success of the League or whatever might take its place, seems for the first time to be achieved for the present in the Moscow agreements as these agreements also indicate that future harmony and cooperation may be achieved for the core of what is to be will be Britain, America, and Russia, and these have no conflicting interests and the supreme vital need of all is peace.

A Dream Comes True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Richard J. Welch, supervisor of the city and county of San Francisco introduced a resolution in the board of supervisors to request the city's Representatives in Congress to make an effort to have a preliminary survey for a bridge over the Golden Gate.

The survey was made, the Army engineers, with Col. Thomas M. Robbins—now Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robbins, assistant Chief of Engineers—as chairman of the board, conducted hearings as to the feasibility of the bridge and recommended that a permit be given permitting the construction of the bridge.

The bridge was built and its completion marked the fulfillment of the dream of Mr. WELCH, our distinguished and beloved colleague from California in the House of Representatives since 1926. Little did he think when he suggested taking steps to build this bridge that it would be such a useful project. In the dark days and weeks following the Pearl Harbor tragedy the Army undoubtedly many times considered how useful this bridge would be in the event of an attack on our California shore. Should an evacuation of San Francisco ever be required more people could be evacuated from the city by this bridge than could be moved in a month by the old system of ferries.

I venture the prediction that should the Army be deprived of this bridge they would gladly spend the whole $35,000,000 that it cost, rather than be without it.

A portion of my congressional district is within the taxing district that will pay for this bridge. We are proud of the fact that our colleague had the vision to see the necessity and utility of this bridge. We hope he will live many more years and will have other dreams like the dream of the Golden Gate Bridge and that those dreams will come true.

Under unanimous consent, I include in this statement the following article from the Richmond Banner of San Francisco:

LOOKING AT IT FROM HERE

(By S. G. T.)

Well, you never know, do you? That common expression is always appropriate in incidents similar to the one that follows:

Turning to our Twenty-five Years Ago column in its regular position, on page 2, column 1, we find that during the same week that "the war to end wars" ended, Supervisor (now Congressman) RICHARD J. WELCH introduced a resolution asking the board of supervisors to "request the city's Representatives in Congress to make an effort to have a preliminary survey for a bridge over the Golden Gate."

Little did you or I or "DICK" WELCH realize that week what a bitter brutal 15-year battle lay ahead to make that inevitable improvement a reality.

And little did you or I or "DICK" WELCH realize that week that a quarter century more would see a worse war and that spectacular bridge the most important link in all Pacific coast land defenses.

Little did you or I think in 1918 that in 25 years Park-Presidio residents would be dashing to work over the Marin hills by automobile to help build the ships to destroy Japanese arrogance and aggression.

What does the future hold—more bridges and more wars? Increase in metallurgical science is said to have been the key to the Golden Gate Bridge. We have moved forward so well in the exact sciences. But in the so-called social sciences we have failed so lamentably. Perhaps our darkest gloom is just before a genuine dawn. And maybe the rise in Greece of such scientists as Archimedes and such philosophers as Aesop did not end the depravity in man that finds expression in war-making; and, by the same token, neither will it today.

We can, at least, say of Congressman WELCH today:

"He served his country well in peace and so he served it in war."

Address of Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman, War Production Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman, War Production Board, at general session before twenty-fourth annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., November 11, 1943:

This closing session of your twenty-fourth annual meeting could not be held at a happier hour; for it comes at a time when the entire Nation is confident of a speedy victory in this war and, more than that, it comes on one of the great triumphant days of American history.

We can afford a grim smile as we reflect that just 25 years ago today the Germans came to the conclusion that they had had enough of the First World War. There are signs that they are not far from reaching a similar conclusion in this war. All of us are certainly working, full time and more, to speed up that conclusion—to make the Germans and the Japs understand that irresistible logic of American bombs and American bullets. You members of the petroleum industry have done much to help drive home the lesson. Now I am going to ask you to do even more.

Now is the time to summon up every ounce of fighting power, both economic and military, to crush the Axis, once and for all, with relentless blows. I know that there will be no let-up on your part in the great production drive for final victory that lies ahead; and I want you to know that the War Production Board will do everything in its power to help you meet your responsibilities.

I realize, and you do not have to be told, that those responsibilities are enormous. We are fighting a global war. The President

has reminded us that it cannot be cut up into sections. It is all one war. The European struggle, the Pacific struggle, the fight on the high seas, and the job here on the home front are all part of one huge battle—the battle for a free world.

In the same way the entire war-production job of America is all one enterprise. Every piece of that enterprise is related to all the other pieces. All areas of war production move forward together. If any important area falls behind, the program as a whole must suffer.

That is why you members of the petroleum industry have faced, and continue to face, the problem of urgency. Your work has been in a process of expansion ever since Pearl Harbor. That expansion is likely to continue down to the end Not only must your production grow as the over-all military production program grows: The very fact that this is a mechanized war, fought by an extremely complex and highly industralized society, means that it is a war in which oil is the most priceless sort of fighting tool.

You know that, of course. You have known for a long time the essential relationship of oil to this war. But when the facts become very familiar, sometimes we incline to take them for granted. That is why I want, today, to review with you some of the simple premises upon which the Nation's oil program is built. You and I and all American businessmen can do our most effective work when we stand all square on a foundation of firm fact.

The one great fact about this war which makes it unlike all previous wars is its extreme mobility. It is a war of movement; a fluid war, in which nothing stays fixed; and although this has had a profound effect on military strategy, and on tactics, it has had an even greater effect on the economic and industrial strategy and tactics which must be followed behind the lines. From that fact arise the urgent production problems of you leaders of the petroleum industry. The ability to move freely and over great distances, which our Nation and all other United Nations must have if they are to win, is based upon oil. Without enough oil, all the rest of our enormous war-production program could not succeed in destroying the enemy as he must be destroyed.

Everywhere we turn in the military picture, we find that oil is the ultimate yardstick of accomplishment in modern warfare. It may be decided, for instance, that military requirements make the production of a certain number of airplanes necessary, and that the materials, the manpower, and the fabricating facilities are at hand to produce that number. We can decide that far. But the ultimate test of the value of those planes in use is the test of your industry. Only the fuel and the lubricants which you produce make possible the operation of those airplanes. Now we are manufacturing a very large number of planes, tanks, and trucks. In the months ahead we may well produce even more. The obligation which is put upon your shoulders has become correspondingly huge—and it is growing.

You who live with the problems of oil production are aware of what you are up against—aware of the reason for the present great demand for petroleum products. I wonder, however, whether the facts have been sufficiently brought home to the general public. Does the average man or woman really understand the tremendous needs of our war machine for oil? Frankly, I doubt it. Figures about oil consumption make pretty dull reading. A man can read oil figures till the cows come home; and if he is not statistically minded, he will not grasp the staggering importance of what he has read, nor will he sense his own related responsibilities.

Some statistics, of course, make popular reading. The country generally has enjoyed being told that, since July 1940, we have produced more than 28,000,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition—enough to let us fire about 2,000 bullets for every Axis soldier. The country is also impressed, and rightly so, when we report that to date we have produced more than 1,600,000 tons of aerial bombs. They have seen pictures of what bombs can do; they know that Hitler and Hirohito will also be impressed by the pulverizing force of those bombs.

But oil is another story. It is not so easy to be dramatic about oil. The vast quantity of petroleum products needed for the mechanized implements of war which have been produced in such numbers by this country and its allies is merely a lot of big numbers to the average citizen. You tell him that 600,000 barrels of gasoline per day—one-third of our total production—are being taken now by the military. And he says, "Well, well." Then you try translating that figure into terms that every motorist should understand. You say that our military requirements, every day, are equal to the gasoline that could be bought on 12,000,000 B coupons. Perhaps that makes it a little easier to see why rationing measures are necessary. But still the man who drives a car all too frequently looks at his B coupon book and says: "I wonder if I can get hold of enough gas for that fishing trip."

In my judgment, we have a growing need to interpret the oil program to the people in terms that will reach them more vigorously than they have yet been reached. Mr. Ickes certainly is not overstating the case when he says that the military next year will be taking a still bigger cut out of the gasoline output of our refineries. A few examples from the current war-production program will show why that is so. Take the most spectacular single example—airplanes.

Since July of 1940 this country alone has produced more than 140,000 military airplanes. Last month we produced 8,362 planes, which represents a rate of 100,000 planes a year. Our production curve is still going up. But even more important, so far as the oil problem is concerned, is the fact that we are constantly putting more emphasis on the big multiengined craft that can deal blows in every far corner of Europe and Japan. In October, for instance, we made three times as many four-engined bombers as we made last January. October production of all bombers, including the four-, the two-, and the one-engined jobs, was about double that of January. And we have not yet reached the full limit of our production possibilities in any of these capacities.

It is perfectly obvious from those figures that the demand for high-octane gasoline has been increasing very sharply, and must continue to increase. To meet that situation, the War Production Board, sometime ago, assigned the highest priorities to a considerable part of the 100-octane program, and gave special scheduling assistance to the balance. The time has now been reached when similar treatment for the rest of the program is imperative. Accordingly, last week we uprated all the remaining 100-octane plants to that top priority band. In addition, we are throwing our full energies into an effort to secure the equipment, the manpower, and all the other items needed to bring this program to rapid completion. I am sure that the armed services and the petroleum industry are in hearty agreement with this action, and I know that we can count on all members of the industry to use every practicable means of stepping up 100-octane production at once. I do not think it is news to you that impending military developments call for still more enormous amounts of aviation gasoline. We have heard the call, and we will meet it.

But airplanes are only the first in a series of petroleum-consuming weapons whose production is being pushed in the factories of the Nation. Since July of 1940 we have turned out more than 30,000 ships of various sizes. That, of course, includes a large number of very small craft; but if you ever owned a motorboat you don't need to be told that even a tiny vessel is a gluttonous gas eater. And included in that 30,000 figure are 2,400 oceangoing dry-cargo vessels and tankers, representing a total of about 25,000,000 deadweight tons. Included in the over-all total, likewise, are nearly 600 combat ships for our Navy—battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, submarines, and other warships which can slug it out with the best that Hirohito can put to sea. It can safely be said that we have already provided new naval and merchant ships in numbers so large as to bring terror both to Tokyo and to Berlin—and I might add that plans call for increased deliveries in most categories throughout the year. Those growing numbers of vessels call for more and more petroleum products. And the demand will continue to rise until the war ends.

Nor is that the end of the story. In the past 3 years we have produced about 1,300,000 motortrucks for our armed services and for lend-lease. In addition, large numbers of trailers, semitrailers, and other types of automotive equipment have been built for ourselves and for our allies. I certainly do not need to remind you that these trucks must consume tremendous quantities of gasoline. The size of the requirement can best be illustrated, perhaps, by pointing out that these 1,300,000 trucks are about the equivalent of one-fourth of the entire number of trucks now operating in the whole United States.

Your industry will be interested to know that the 1944 truck program, based on military requirements, is now actively being worked on by the procurement agencies and War Production Board. I can conservatively say that it is a gigantic program. For instance, in 1944, they are going to want more than twice as many of the heavy trucks—4 tons and larger—than our factories will have turned out in 1943—and in 1943, I might add, our truck-manufacturing facilities have been strenuously employed. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that we have made more than 50,000 light and medium tanks since the middle of 1940, with very large numbers of armored cars, scout cars, carriers, and other types of self-propelled equipment. And they all burn gasoline.

With all this tremendous production of oil-consuming munitions of war, the civilian economy has to be kept operating. Today it oeprates at a faster tempo than ever before. The 5,000,000 trucks now on the roads in the United States are vital to the war effort; and so, also, are the busses and passenger cars which help to make our productive effort possible. The motive power for this equipment must come from the refineries which you manage. The plain fact is that, until existing refineries abroad can come into full production again, and until new refineries are constructed overseas, most of the fuel for our own equipment and for that of our allies must come from the refineries of the United States. The energy stored up in American oil will win this war of freedom for the world.

The responsibility which rests upon the petroleum industry and upon the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War is a dramatic one, for it is nothing less than the responsibility for victory. And that responsibility is being squarely met. Splendid

achievements mark the record of the petroleum industry and the Petroleum Administration for War; and I, for one, want to pay a tribute to those achievements.

Perhaps first of your great achievements in this war—certainly first in point of time—has been the development of an internal oil-transportation system to supplant the ocean routes which were closed either by the submarine menace or by diversion of tankers to overseas service. I need not recall to you the bald statistics about the number of barrels of crude and of oil products which moved up along our eastern coast in prewar days; that movement was tremendous, as you all know. When the ocean route became inadequate, the oil men of the Nation were fertile in helping to find other ways of moving the all-essential petroleum.

In spite of many problems, in spite of delays in obtaining needed equipment—for many essential industries were clamoring at the same time for steel plate, for pumps, and for valves—in spite of all obstacles, the Big Inch pipe line from the Southwest to New York was finished in record time. Then some 65 percent of the Nation's tank cars were mobilized into a gigantic shuttle service from the oil-producing areas of the Midwest and Southwest to the eastern seaboard. Currently, the 20-inch oil-products pipe line, paralleling the Big Inch, is being laid, pumping stations are being installed, and valves are being put in place. We all hope that within the next few months this new line will be delivering petroleum products to its eastern terminus. And, although all of our internal oil-transportation needs may not have been fully met, I believe it is fair to say that the problem is now substantially solved. Great progress has also been made toward making the Allied tanker fleets equal to the job they have to do.

Your second great achievement to date has been on the technological front. There have been successive improvements in the quality of the 100-octane gasoline—the fuel which means so much to our aircraft as they roll up dazzling new records of achievement in all theaters of war. As the quality of this production has gone up, so, too, has the quantity. When the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, there were only 22 refineries making 100-octane gasoline. When the current program is completed, there will be six times as many. Today this country is producing four times as much 100-octane as it did in December 1942 and the Petroleum Administration for War says that in a few months this output will be doubled. I believe that the industry and the Petroleum Administration for War can take just pride in having supplied enough 100-octane gasoline so that no offensive operation has been restricted by lack of this vital product.

Another accomplishment of major significance has been the increase in our domestic crude-oil production. The steps which have been taken, and are now being planned, to increase the quantities of available petroleum products are a potent factor in our military progress. And the achievement is particularly noteworthy because it took place at a time when we were not able to make available all of the drilling and other equipment that you might have wished for, and at a time when the costs of exploration were increasing.

In producing oil and gas, and transporting them, the work done by your industry has been of prime value to the war effort. You can be proud of the record I have cited. But I know that you do not intend to rest on that record. The questions in your mind must be the same as in mine. What about the future? What is going to be required of the industry and of government during the rest of the war? What steps should be taken?

I believe that certain steps are self-evident.

1. There is need for the Government and industry to drive home to the people of the United States, in terms that will win genuine cooperation, the fundamental fact that oil is an essential tool of war, and that it must be used with the utmost economy.

2. Everything possible must be done to meet the growing demand for petroleum products. Your industry will have to make yet another major production effort. The Government will, of course, help all it can. So far as possible, materials and equipment will be made available to you—although perhaps not as freely as you might wish. You recognize, I am sure, that when munitions of war are produced at the rate of sixty, seventy, or eighty billions of dollars annually, the demand for steel, copper, aluminum, and other essential materials taxes the capacity of our mills. But every feasible assistance will be given to back up the work you do in furthering production.

3. By every means in its power, your industry must get maximum output of those products which are most vitally needed for war use. Management, labor, contractors, and suppliers will need to push themselves to expedite the completion of new facilities that are now being constructed. In the past, concentration on war products has required adjustments in customary refining and marketing practices. Frankly, I see no prospect that this situation will change in the near future. The needs of the war will not recognize private convenience and private inclination any more in the months immediately ahead than in the months gone by.

4. I think it is obvious that we must further develop and foster fuel conservation practices and devices. Technological progress must be stimulated and, as such progress is made, the new developments must be moved rapidly from the laboratory to the refinery. Of no other single commodity is there so urgent a need to make the best possible use of what we have as in the case of petroleum.

The motive power for these essential steps must come, it goes without saying, from your own minds and your own hearts. We cannot rely upon Government to solve all the problems of all our industries. Fortunately, we do not have to. This war has been a tremendous challenge to the ingenuity, the resourcefulness, and the patriotism of all of our industries. It is a challenge which has been well met. I have every confidence that it will continue to be well met. I know that a sustained, coordinated effort by all of us—by management, by labor, and by Government—will bring this war to a speedier conclusion. We still have not reached the high point of our production possibilities. It is up to all of us to hit that peak just as soon as it is humanly possible.

And I do not think there is one of use here today who is not willing to drive himself relentlessly to make his work contribute even more to the war effort. For every day of the bitter fights now raging in Europe and the Pacific teaches us anew the fact that oil saves lives. In every day of battle our fighting men, whether on land, on the sea, or in the air, depend on the mobility and the speed and the maneuverability of the equipment which we give them to use against the enemy of all mankind. That mobility, that speed, that maneuverability, are made possible by oil—the oil which only your know-how and your hard work and your patriotic cooperation can provide.

Your business today is not merely producing the products of petroleum; it is to enable some American fighting man, in a tank, or a truck, or on ships, or in a plane, to go into battle against the enemy, to annihilate him with steel and high explosive, and to return home to our shores unharmed and triumphant. You are not working for your Government now nor for any peacetime customers. Your only customer today is a man in uniform pouring gas into a plane, or a tank, or a truck, or a jeep, or pumping oil into a ship's hold as he waits for the signal to go into battle. If we can satisfy that customer, we can presently go about our normal business with the clear consciences of men who have also given their best answer to their country's call. I, for one, feel confident that the petroleum industry, at the heart of the war effort, will let no consideration interfere with the one great task—to produce, refine, and transport whatever is needed, and as much as is needed, to save American lives, smash the enemy into unconditional surrender, and bring us swiftly to the next great day of victorious armistice.

Complimenting the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, to wit, on November 14, 1943, I made an address at the Masonic Auditorium in Detroit, Mich., at an American-Soviet friendship rally, on the occasion of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the establishment of the U. S. S. R. and of the tenth anniversary of diplomatic recognition by our own Government of the Soviet Union.

There were present at the meeting 5,800 enthusiastic American citizens, with hundreds outside clamoring to get in, but for whom there were, unfortunately, no available seats. Each person present paid a minimum admission fee of 50 cents. The funds derived from the sale of tickets are used for the purchase of supplies and goods for donation to the Russian people. I was honored by being made the principal speaker of the gathering.

My speech was wholly extemporaneous and consumed about 45 minutes in its delivery. Subsequent to the meeting, some of those present expressed a desire to secure a copy of my talk. Regretfully, the stenographer assigned to take down my words on the stenotype was unable to keep up with the procession. This was due to no fault of hers, but resulted from my habit of talking very rapidly. However, I decided to dictate, from memory, a condensation of some of my speech, which, by unanimous consent of my colleagues, I am inserting herein below:

WE SALUTE THE RUSSIANS

If false assertion were argument and its reiteration proof, the case against the U. S. S. R. would be definitely closed. Our Russian allies have been subjected to outrageous diatribes and vitriolic attacks at the hands of misguided Tories on disturbingly frequent occasions in these United States. But the truth obfuscates falsehood. The superb record of Russian courage in this sanguinary war adumbrates the misrepresentations so promiscuously bandied about by domestic Fascists, Tories, and "red" baiters generally.

Russia has been a friend of the United States from the inception of our Republic. In his first message to Congress, the redoubtable Andrew Jackson feelingly eulogized the helpful friendship of Russia in its dealings with our young Republic. During the Civil War the Russian Government, as a gesture of amity, sent a powerful Russian fleet into

American waters. The presence of Russian warships in the ports of northern cities amid that fratricidal conflict raised the prestige of our country torn by civil strife and encouraged the immortal Abraham Lincoln in pursuing the war against the Confederacy. In World War No. 1, Russia established a second front which compelled Germany to detach at least 60 divisions from the western front and thus saved Paris and France and Britain from early defeat. Though the Battle of Tannenburg was a technical Russian set-back, it actually, in the long view, was a victory for the enemies of Germany. In that war Russia's Army compelled Germany to divide its strength. Hence, the Russians know from bitter experience the effectiveness of the establishment of a second front.

It was the threat of the invasion of East Prussia by the Soviet forces, in 1940, which caused Hitler to refrain from an invasion of Britain. Hitler heard the low growls of the Russian bear, despite the flush of victory at Dunkerque. When, in June 1941, he committed the greatest blunder of his career in ordering the invasion of Russia, he sowed the seeds which are now flowering in the full bloom of progessive German retreats.

There were some of us who were not surprised by early demonstration of the Soviet ability to resist invasion. Historically, the Russian soldier is among the best in the world. The Russian is devoted to the land. He is attached to the soil. He loves his family and his home. He will fight to the bitter end to protect his country, his family and his beliefs, from destruction. The Russians were never misled, nor deluded by the specious and high-sounding messages of friendship sent them by Hitler and his wrecking crew. For a decade and a half, Russia had been preparing for just such a contingency. Her army, navy, and air force were ready. The Russians, strategically, yielded territory at the outset, in a scheme now denominated as defense in depth. That they knew what they were about has been demonstrated by subsequent events. The turning point came at Stalingrad. The Russians have borne the brunt of the whole struggle. Their slaughter of thousands of seasoned Nazi veterans is bringing the war to an earlier close than might otherwise have been anticipated. The Russian soldier is proving himself to be a resourceful, persistent and unwavering warrior. In holding and thrusting back the Hun, Russia has elicited the enthusiastic admiration of the world and earned the sincere gratitude of the vast majority of Americans. Where would Great Britain and the United States be today in this war, were it not for the s crifices diurnally being made by our Russian ally?

Picture for a minute the intrepid Russian fighter. Unhesitatingly, he encounters and overcomes climatic obstacles. He is not alone victorious over the foe, he is victorious over excruciatingly congealing cold; biting, frigid winds, choking dust, engulfing mud, blistering heat, depressing hunger, dispiriting insanitation, body-wrenching fatigue. It never occurs to the Russian to succumb to the obstacles provided him in abundance by capricious nature. He thinks of his goal as ad astra per aspera—onward and upward to the stars—notwithstanding all difficulties. Hardship is his constant companion, but he carries on. Discouragements are ever-present, but he pursues his task without fear and without reproach.

Naturally, the Russian wants a second front. He knows only too poignantly how effective such a situation would be in expediting a decisive victory over the Axis.

Some there are in the United States who deplore the failure of the Soviet Union to declare war upon Japan. Yet, these same folks defend our continuing to maintain diplomatic relations with Finland—which is an active belligerent on the side of Hitler, against Russia. Naturally, the Russians cannot understand why the United States continues to maintain diplomatic relations with fascist Franco Spain, which sent its blue divisions to the Russian front to join the Axis. This is the same Franco Spain which sent a warm message of congratulations to the Japanese puppet government of the Philippines. Hitler would like nothing better than for Russia to cede to the United Nations air bases in Siberia, but our military strategists know full well that before we could occupy such bases the Japs would move in to forestall our entry. The mere threat of Russia has forced the Japs to allocate 500,000 of their finest trained soldiers to guard the borders of Manchuria and outer Mongolia and, thus, has kept his half million or more of Japs from joining the fight against China and our own forces in the southwest Pacific. Admiral Ernest R. King, 1 year ago, told me at the meeting of the Committee on Naval Appropriations, that it would be strategically unsound and unwise for Russia to cede air bases to us in Siberia. Furthermore, it would be a military blunder of primary magnitude for Russia to participate in war prematurely against Japan and, thus, be required to divide her Army.

Personally, I would sever diplomatic relations between the United States and Spain and Finland I very much fear that these two countries, which are active agents against the Soviet Union, are using their diplomatic privileges in the United States in a manner which will militate against the United Nations and for the benefit of the Axis.

It is highly appropriate that American-Soviet rallies are being held throughout our country during the first 2 weeks of November, as a recognition and tribute to the great Russian Republic, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of diplomatic recognition by the United States of the Soviet Union and of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Russian revolution. It is of imperative importance to the future peace of the world that the United States and Russia learn to know and trust each other to the utmost. It is not of our concern what form of government prevails within the borders of the Soviet Union. That is their business. Self-determination was one of the Fourteen Points enunciated by Woodrow WHson in the early months of 1918, as a basis for world peace. Communism has its faults and so does our own capitalism. He would be a rash patriot indeed who would arrogate to capitalism complete infallibility. Russians admit that blunders have occurred under communism, but they proudly proclaim the dynamics of their form of government. Russia is in process of growth. They change their government to suit developing events. More than a hundred years ago, the author of the Monroe Doctrine fulminated against any attempt by one nation to convert from one form into another the governmental status of a neighboring sovereign country.

Let us not be bemused nor befogged by hymns of hate against Russia, sung by domestic Fascists who seem unaware of the cardinal virtues of our own Declaration of Independence. There is a similarity between the Soviet Union and the United States. Each country has its racial minorities. In each country, many segments of the population speak varying languages. In each country, vast numbers of the population subscribe to conflicting religious beliefs. Our record of treatment of minority groups is not above criticism. In Russia, there is no Negro baiting. It is a crime against the state and treated as such. In Rusisa, Jew baiting, alien baiting, "red" baiting, labor baiting, is contemned and condemned. Those guilty of such practices are punished as criminals. In Russia may be found Catholics, Jews, Buddhists, Mohammedans, Protestants, agnostics, and atheists. A Russian citizen may worship what he pleases, without interference from the state, with impunity and free from the threat of any governmental pogroms by reason thereof.

In Rusisa no private monopolies exist. All businesses are operated for public benefit and use and not for profit. Cartels can have no meaning in Russia. In Russia there could be no spectacle of hundreds of private corporations being indicted for fraud in the manufacture of implements of war. Here, many of us are chagrined and ashamed by the fact that scores and scores of manufacturing concerns are so little moved by patriotism as to have conspired, deliberately, to provide defective instrumentalities of war for our own soldiers and sailors for the sake of profit.

Do not mistake me, I do not want my remarks to be construed as seeming to prefer a system of communism to that prevailing here. Let each country adhere to its own form of government. I merely have given expression to a few of our mistakes and weaknesses, to show that our own country has no monopoly on virtue.

I deplore those in our own midst who give free license to poisonous tongues and would cause dissension to arise between us and the U. S. S. R. The security and peace of the world depends, in no small measure, upon a practical collaboration between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China. The recent compact signed by the diplomatic representatives of these four countries, at Moscow, is the greatest achievement of the war to date and augurs favorably for the future well-being of the democratic peoples of the earth.

Neither Russia nor the United States covets any land possessed by the other. We are neighbors in the Pacific, where Alaska, in the form of the Aleutian Islands, stretches forth Uncle Sam's hand and arm in a geographic gesture of friendship, toward the coast of Siberia. Let us continue to promote a friendly relationship between our two countries. Let us establish a practical modus vivendi, as the diplomats call it, which will be the means for insuring uninterrupted exchanges of ideas between our respective peoples. Let no one be vouchsafed the privilege of undermining that friendship through the exercise of distorted free speech, without rebuke and certainly without refutation.

I salute our Russian allies. I congratulate those present for coming here today to join in a program which renders deserved recognition to the accomplishments of the Soviet Union.

The Late Joe D. Chittenden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a gallant American, Joe D. Chittenden, died at Mount Alto Hospital. Joe Chittenden was head of the National Rehabilitation Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His Army service was typical of the American Army. Born and reared in New York State he served with the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry of the Forty-second—the Rainbow Division—an Alabama regiment. During the bitter fighting of the Aisne-Marne offensive he was badly wounded. During the years that have passed since that war his suffering has been continuous. His legs riddled by German fire never ceased causing him great pain and agony.

Never complaining he carried on, not only for himself but in his official capacity he directed the handling on thousands of claims for men who had served overseas in all of our wars and campaigns. He was my friend and his tolerance and understanding of the problem of the veterans of this country will be missed over the entire Nation. To his beloved wife, his daughter, and his son, now a member of the Army Air Forces, go the sincere sympathy of all.

Scholastic All-Star Game Deserves Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater athletic community in the country than Washington, D. C., the capital of the world, where Mr. George P. Marshall holds forth with his Washington Redskins, national professional football champions. However, a game that is attracting city-wide interest is the scholastic all-star game between the pick of prep-school and high-school football players, which will be played at Griffith Stadium on Saturday, December 11, 1943. This game is being sponsored by the Washington Times-Herald and the Touchdown Club. The Touchdown Club, of Washington, D. C., has a splendid reputation for its accomplishments in encouraging high-school and college sports in this area. Its weekly award to the outstanding high-school and college football player in the District has spurred on many a lad to greater athletic achievement. The Metropolitan Police Boys' Club has been the special recipient of gifts totaling over $10,000 from the Touchdown Club. Among the past presidents of the Touchdown Club have been A. J. "Dutch" Bergman, present outstanding coach of the Washington Redskins, who was the first president of the club and one of its founders; John McGovern, of Minnesota; C. R. Fenwick, of Virginia; B. L. Eberts, nationally known football official, of Catholic University; R. D. Pittman, of Baylor University; Max Farrington, of Westminster; L. W. Thomas, Jr., of Maryland; and last year's president, the famous and only Admiral E. S. Land, of the Navy. The entire net proceeds of this game will be equally divided between Smokes for Yanks and the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club. Let us all in this busy capital of the world buy tickets, regardless of whether we attend, to help this worthy undertaking. I congratulate the Touchdown Club and the Washington Times-Herald.

I am happy to include in my remarks the letter pertaining to this game which I received from Mr. R. C. Simmons, of Texas, the present genial and able president of the Touchdown Club:

THE TOUCHDOWN CLUB OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1943.

Congressman SAMUEL WEISS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SAMMY: Following our recent conversation at the Touchdown Club Sunday evening regard the scholastic all-star game between the pick of prep school and high-school players on Saturday, December 11, we want you to know that the Washington Times-Herald and the Touchdown Club are the cosponsors of this game.

For the first time in the history of this community everyone of the schools in metropolitan Washington will be represented in a football game. Ten public high schools and eight prep schools with players and students from every section of this community will participate.

There is no question but what this game will prove highly attractive, not only to the players as an extra bit of recognition for their skill on the gridiron, but also to the students of the various schools involved, the families and, of course, the general public.

The entire net proceeds of this game will be divided evenly between "Smokes for Yanks," and the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club. "Smokes for Yanks" is considered a very worthy cause in aiding in a small way to contribute to the comfort of our boys on the fighting fronts.

The Metropolitan Police Boys Club has been the special recipients of gifts from Touchdown thus far this year of over $10,000. The total membership of the Metropolitan Police Boys Club has now reached almost 30,000 and it would be redundant for me to tell you the fine work that the Metropolitan Police Boys Club is doing in this community with underprivileged boys.

We, as sponsors, feel that this event will develop into an annual classic. Tickets for school students are 50 cents and for the general public the price will be only $1, including tax.

Your interest and enthusiasm in the game of football is well known throughout the Nation, and we know that you will lend your wholehearted support in a game that is going to help so materially, not only in encouraging underprivileged boys in these environs, but also every place our boys are fighting through the contribution this game will make to "Smokes for Yanks."

With kindest personal regards, and our deep appreciation of your support and also of any publicity you can give this game on Capitol Hill.

Sincerely yours,

BOB SIMMONS.

Domestic Freedom of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of November 16, 1943, entitled "Domestic Freedom of the Air," and an article by Leo Cullinane which appeared in the November 14 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 16, 1943]

DOMESTIC FREEDOM OF THE AIR

The extension of Federal control over matters better left to State regulation has been one of the elements of the New Deal which must be corrected. Nevertheless, there is at least one field where State authority can be an impractical anachronism—the field of aviation. Of all forms of interstate commerce this is the one wherein Federal regulation is most clearly desirable and where a patchwork of State legislation can be most harmful to the interests of the Nation with the least prospect of compensating benefits. Tomorrow the House will consider the Lea bill, an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which, in the words of Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association, will assure "domestic freedom of the air" by an extension of Federal authority.

The Lea bill has stirred up considerable controversy outside Congress. It is a long and complex measure which may, perhaps, require amendment in some details. But the principle of "domestic freedom of the air" is the chief consideration. The best friends of decentralized government must admit that in many phases of interstate commerce — notably that represented by trucks and buses—the complexity of State regulations has been a serious impediment. With the great present and prospective importance of the growing aviation industry to American economic life, it would be the height of folly to develop a confusion in the air similar to that which obtains on the roads. The Lea bill should be passed.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 14, 1943]

BILL ON CONTROL OF AIR LINES TO BE UP TUESDAY—HOUSE TO GET LEA MEASURE TO LAY FOUNDATION FOR AVIATION EXPANSION AFTER WAR, AND TO SET UP AN "I. C. C." FOR THE NATION'S SKYWAYS

(By Leo Cullinane)

WASHINGTON, November 13.—The Lea bill, a broad measure amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in light of peacetime and wartime experiences, is scheduled to be brought up for debate in the House of Representatives on Tuesday.

The bill is designed to lay the foundation for immediate post-war aviation expansion and to regulate almost all phases of civil aviation on a Federal basis, and would set up an independent commission controlling the operation of the air lines similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission's regulatory powers over the railroads.

Virtually the entire aviation industry in this country is lined up behind the bill. Proponents both in and out of Congress say that once the bill comes to a vote it will be passed by a wide margin.

Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association, an organization representing all of the Nation's commercial air lines, voiced the opinion of the industry this week when he said, "The enactment of the Lea bill, providing thus for domestic freedom of the air, surely should assume a high place on any program for the future development of American civil aviation." He added that the bill "guarantees a privilege which should be the birthright of every American flyer, the privilege to fly from one State to another without the risk of falling into some legal trap such as so often confronts the operator of an automobile or a truck on the highways in the course of an interstate journey."

The general purpose of the bill, according to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported it favorably to the House, is to aid and encourage the development of our civil aviation and further to promote its safety, stability, and efficiency.

The main provisions of the bill are summarged as follows:

It changes the name of the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Civil Aeronautics Commission and makes it an independent agency of the Government. Some critics have charged that so long as the present Civil Aeronautics Board remains under the Department of Commerce, it is subject to political pressure.

It restores independent accident investigation to be conducted by a director of air safety to be appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate.

It calls for an investigation and report by the Civil Aeronautics Commission with respect to the development of air commerce and air navigation which may be anticipated during the post-war period, such report to include suggested plans for meeting such post-war developments.

It proposes an investigation and report by the Postmaster General and also by the Civil Aeronautics Commission as to the feasibility of carrying all classes of mail by air when delivery thereby would be speeded.

It extends Federal jurisdiction over air commerce, and further defines Federal jurisdiction over air navigation.

It provides for a broad program of aviation training and education.

It proposes a long-range program under direction of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the development of air navigation facilities, including airports.

It provides a plan to protect the safety of flight by furnishing a means to remove or prevent hazards to air navigation on and in the vicinity of airports.

It provides additional means for necessary financial support of air transportation by the Government through direct payments.

It contains stricter prohibitions against the issuance of passes in air transportation.

It provides means for further developing traffic by air through granting discounts for quantity transportation.

It brings contract carriers by air under economic regulation.

It provides for a study of multiple taxation of persons engaged in air commerce and of their employees, to develop recommendations to prevent the growth of unsound tax policies affecting civil aviation.

It introduces improvements in the administrative procedure under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

It provides for strengthening and expanding the Weather Bureau service in aid of our air navigation both domestic and international.

It codifies civil-aviation law by bringing isolated legislative provisions into the Civil Aeronautcs Act.

It provides for the more efficient settlement of disputes involving air carriers by directing the Civil Aeronautics Commission to set up a procedure for the voluntary arbitration of such disputes.

It gives the airman in command of an aircraft, or other authorized employees, adequate power to prevent dangerous or disorderly conduct and otherwise assures safety of operation of the aircraft.

It call for an investigation and report by the Civil Aeronautics Commission as to matters affecting aviation insurance.

It makes clear that all employees of air carriers are subject to the Railway Labor Act, and it extends that act to contract carriers by air and their employees.

Advocates of the bill say its enactment is "vital to the sound promotion and development of all phases of civil aviation." They declare it is most important that the necessary foundation for the immediate post-war period be laid now. Other nations are preparing for rapid development as soon as the war is over, they point out, and urge that America be ready to maintain its leadership. They say civil aviation must be ready for immediate expansion, on a sound basis, at the war's end.

Reverse Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of November 13, 1943:

REVERSE LEND-LEASE

Lend-lease, like foreign trade, is not a one-way street. While this country is supplying far more goods and services to its allies than it is receiving from them, the reverse flow of aid has become an important factor in the prosecution of the war and promises to take a growing place in the Nation's military-naval economy.

President Roosevelt in a lengthy statement Thursday revealed the far-reaching nature of the lend-lease assistance given the United States by the British commonwealth. Such assistance, according to an incomplete summary, amounted through last June to $1,174,900,000.

This is only a little more than one-fifth of the more than $5,500,000,000 lend-lease aid this country has given Britain and the dominions, it is true. But, as the President pointed out, the mutual support being given by the allies is not to be calculated simply on a dollars-and-cents basis. The main purpose is to put the needed weapon into "the hands of that soldier—whatever may be his nationality—who can at the proper moment use it most effectively to defeat our common enemies."

The greater part of the help from the Empire, the report to Congress brought out, has been supplied by the United Kingdom. The British total of $871,000,000 is divided between airports, barracks, hospitals, and other facilities for American servicemen, $371,000,000; goods and services, $371,000,000; and shipping, $169,000,000.

The reverse flow of lend-lease from Australia to this country amounted to $196,000,000 through last June. New Zealand's help came to $51,000,000, and India's, $56,900,000.

Canada has received no lend-lease aid from this country, paying cash for her purchases here. Canada, like the United States, is putting out in the way of lend-lease more than she is taking in; she has made, in the President's words, "a billion dollars worth of aid available without payment to the United Kingdom and is now engaged in making available another $1,000,000,000 worth of aid" to various members of the United Nations on a mutual assistance program similar to lend-lease.

Britain's agreement last summer to include in the reverse lend-lease program commodities we formerly purchased from her, including food and raw materials, will make available to the United States without payment such items as "rubber from Ceylon, Trinidad, British Guiana, and British Honduras; asbestos and chrome from Southern Rhodesia, tea and coconut oil from Ceylon, and benzol and tar acids from the United Kingdom."

There is, the President maintained in his message, no physical or financial standard by which we can measure the contribution of each of the United Nations; but is is clear that the mutual assistance program has brought progress in the war and "saved the lives of many of our own boys as well as those of our allies."

Protect the American Form of Government by Adhering to American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, while so many plans are being offered for changes and innovations in our form of government in the post-war program, let us remember the lessons of our school days and adhere to the principles of government that have made America great.

There is inserted herewith an expression of my views on the subject in recent correspondence:

DEAR MR. MCVICKER: In considering your recommendation for technocracy, made in your recent letter, I assume you have a knowledge of history and know the many forms of government that had been tried in this world before our Government was established.

It is my feeling that the founders of the American Government were guided by the experience and the wisdom of the ages in devising and establishing the system of government under which we are at present living. It is my feeling that instead of experimenting with such schemes as technocracy, communism, and socialism, our efforts should be directed to protecting our present form of government.

I am old-fashioned enough to adhere to the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution rather than to experiment with some plan which might deprive us of the priceless heritage that has been bequeathed to us by the great leaders who have given us the best Government on earth.

I enclose a pronouncement of the principles to which I propose to adhere as stated in a recent letter.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. BERNAYS: Answering your inquiry of November 15. The paramount issue pressing for solution by the American people today is the same issue that has been pressing for solution since the Civil War—the money question.

My efforts have been and shall continue to be directed primarily to accomplishing two things. First, to provide the American people with a sound, workable, adequate money system that provides for the creation and circulation of sufficient cash freed from an interest charge as the price of its issuance

and circulation with which to transact the Nation's business. Second, to procure the equitable adjustment of the price structure by the free play of the law of supply and demand to be effected by unrestrained competition through the elimination of unfair trade practices and unfair competition.

I have no desire or intention to be drawn into any discussion of racial issues. If the American people can have the necessary cash with which to transact business in support of their national economy, and to finance the equitable distribution of the fruits of industry, the adherence to the liberal and constructive principles of government established by the designers of our form of government will keep the people of our country foremost among the progressive nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Our Mexican Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, persons who are looking for real evidence of cooperation between this country and Mexico can view with satisfaction the present arrangements for the use of Mexican nationals to assist our American farmers in harvesting their farm crops. In 1942 a fairly heavy percentage of essential food products, particularly in California, was lost because of a serious shortage of agricultural labor. In 1943 the loss, as far as labor is concerned, will prove to be negligible.

Those of us who have been actively interested in the employment of Mexican nationals since the inception of the program are more than pleased with the results achieved during the past season. One of the most serious threats to the orderly harvesting of farm crops has been a growing scarcity of help on the farms. Now our good neighbor to the south has substantially remedied this problem. We can look forward expectantly to increasingly better relations with Mexico as a direct result of the accomplishments so far attained.

During the congressional recess this summer I had occasion to talk with many California farmers who had employed the Mexican nationals. They were loud in their praise of the type of worker they had hired as well as the results obtained. In this connection, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in the following letter which I have just received from the California State Chamber of Commerce:

CALIFORNIA STATE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
November 23, 1943.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: For your information I give you herewith report submitted by our agricultural department in the hope it may be of interest and some value.

"Altogether, there were brought into the United States in 1943, up to October 30, 52,442 nationals. Of these, 36,660 were brought to California. On October 30, there were 23,216 still in this State. The peak number which were at work at any time in California during the year was between 27,000 and 30,000. The contract with Mexicans for 1944 is already consummated and provides for a considerably larger number than in 1943, provided that details of the recruitment and placement program can be worked out. Mr. Anglim was very modest about the activities of the Mexican nationals, but stated that, according to the Extension Service figures, between 15 and 20 percent of all crops harvested in California were harvested by Mexican nationals. The indirect value of stabilization of labor and the inspiration to local and transit labor is difficult to estimate, but it is certainly very substantial.

"Thirty percent of the citrus crop to date has been picked by Mexican nationals, and 50 percent of the picking since May has been done by these people. In Orange County, the figure is unusually high and totals 85 percent since May.

"Four thousand nationals were brought in by the Sugar Beet Association, and it is estimated that 65 percent of the crop was harvested by Mexican nationals. The Growers Farm Labor Group brought in 3,100 nationals and divided them into six units. In two of these units, 75 percent of the crop harvested was credited to the Mexican nationals; and in the other four, 34.2 percent was credited to the same source. In the Kadota fig deal, 70 percent of the $4,000,000 crop was picked by Mexican nationals."

Sincerely,

C. J. S. WILLIAMSON.

National University School of Law Taxation Clinic II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the program of the National University School of Law taxation clinic, dealing as it does with one of the most vital matters now before the Congress:

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW—TAXATION CLINIC II

(Dr. Milton I. Baldinger, director)

October 20: Renegotiation of Contracts as Related to the Tax Program. Maj. W. W. Watts, War Price Adjustment Board.

October 27: Taxation and the Fiscal Policy During and After the War. Dr. Gerhard Colm, Budget Bureau.

November 3: Some Problems in Current Tax Litigation. Mr. Samuel H. Levy, Department of Justice.

November 10: Pension Trusts. Mr. Adrian W. DeWind, Treasury Department.

*November 15: Taxes and Post-war Reserves. Mr. Ellsworth C. Alvord.

November 17: The Work of the Technical Staff. Mr. Craig L. Reddish, Internal Revenue.

*†November 22: Estate Conservation. Mr. George J. Laikin, Department of Justice.

December 1: Some Problems in the Revenue Acts and the Regulations. Mr. Ralph Dwan, Internal Revenue.

December 8: Simplification of Tax Returns. Hon. Randolph Paul, Treasury Department.

December 15: The Tax Bill of 1943. Senator ROBERT TAFT.

1944—

January 5: Life Insurance Under the Estate and Gift Taxes. Mr. Louis Eisenstein, Treasury Department.

January 12: Income Tax and the Serviceman. Dr. Baldinger.

*†January 17: Preparing Income Tax Returns. Dr. Baldinger.

January 19: Preparing Income Tax Returns. Dr. Baldinger.

The Taxation Clinic is a public service of National University and no charge will be made to auditors. Classes will meet in the lower hall of the School of Law.

Most of the sessions will meet on Wednesday evenings; sessions indicated by an asterisk (*) will meet on Mondays.

Sessions will be held from 6:30 to 7:30 p. m. save for those indicated by a dagger (†) which will meet from 6:30 to 8:30 p.. m.

Post-War Assistance for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WFBL, Syracuse, N. Y., on November 28, 1943:

This is the second of a number of periodic broadcasts which the management of WFBL has kindly arranged for me to deliver. It is directed to the people of up-State New York and particularly to those patriotic Americans of Madison and Chenango Counties.

The biggest responsibility we all face outside of winning the war is planning for the future of our servicemen when the war is ended.

Before I go into that rather broad field, I wish to point out that Congress and Congress alone, is responsible for the humane and just treatment now being administered by our Government to our valiant fighting men.

I make this statement because there has been an attempt on the part of many in high places to confuse the issue and to give the impression to our people that thanks for raising the base pay of servicemen, credit for increasing allotments, for taking steps to rehabilitate veterans and other proper measures should go to anybody but Congress.

The true fact of the matter is, however, that Congress, representing the wishes of all the people, was and is the only force which can bring about such worthy acts. Those of you who have seen the currently popular motion picture, "This Is the Army," will unfortunately find no reference to Congress in connection with raising the soldiers' pay. Yet, Congress not only passed this legislation, but initiated and proposed it against the none-too-friendly attitude of the War Department and others in the executive branch of our Government. If there is someone who doubts this statement, I suggest

he consult the record and find out for himself.

But I am not seeking any glory for Congress when I call your attention to the pay raise it gave the soldiers. The Congress needs no praise. It is the direct voice of the people and I earnestly hope and pray it remains so as long as our country endures. And our country will endure just so long as Congress continues to be the voice of the people.

The truth is that Congress would be neglecting its duty to our boys if it did not do everything possible in their behalf. Some may think because we have raised the soldiers' pay, increased the allotments of their loved ones, taken steps to rehabilitate those who will be maimed and disabled that we can sit back and boast of a job well done. But sad to say, Congress has only accomplished a portion of what should be accomplished. To my way of thinking, we have only scratched the surface.

Therefore it is my purpose this morning to discuss ways and means of restoring to a place in the sun after victory, the millions of young Americans who are giving up everything for their country.

When anyone talks about post-war planning, there is often raised a hue and cry that it is too early. Let me say to those concerned over this, I am afraid we are not starting early enough. Congress took a great step forward a few months ago when it appropriated several million dollars to train partially disabled men sent home from the front in vocations suited to their own cases. This is a great start. If we can develop highly specialized training in many different subjects for our men physically handicapped by the ravages of this war, we will kill 2 birds with one stone. Not only will we save these disabled heroes from total uselessness to society but we will bring them back to their own self respect by their independence and ability to make a living.

It will be a different situation then, and a happier one also, for the disabled veterans of World War No. 2 than it was for those shattered men who returned from France in 1918, and found the door of many shops and factories closed to them.

As I have said, Congress has already set up machinery to take care of this partially disabled group. I hesitate to say how many there will be. Along with the rest of the American people, I hope and pray the number is small. Time alone will tell.

But the total number of men in the armed forces by the end of the war is an easier conclusion to reach. We know there will be at least 12,000,000, Army, Navy, and Marines and the rest. This group is the bulk of our youthful population. This group will not be denied. It behooves us, therefore, to plan carefully for the days when they will be mustered out by the millions to return to their homes. Those days must be the happiest of their lives. They will be the happiest if we plan now.

Every veteran of this war has the right to look forward to occupying a productive place in post-war reconstruction. I refuse to be like many who do not believe there will be enough jobs to go around. With business, industry, private enterprise, and Government all joining hands to solve unemployment, I believe we can bring forth, after the war, the greatest era of prosperity the world has ever seen.

But first we must let the law of supply and demand in relation to peacetime goods take hold. The result will be tremendous. You and I know there is no limit to the demand which people will have for things that bring a higher standard of living.

There will be no limit to our demand for food for ourselves and the rest of the world after the war.

There will be no limit to our demand for decent homes, furniture, refrigerators, radios, furnaces, ranges, and household appliances.

There will be no limit to our demand for automobiles, machinery of all kinds, and a thousand and one other things to make life worth living.

There will be no limit to our demand for the manufacture of these peacetime goods and I sincerely hope that no power of reaction or selfishness in or out of the Government ever prevents the American people from enjoying to the fullest the fruits of their peacetime effort.

We maintain, then, that since the demands for these goods will be greater than ever before in history, there need be no limit on supply if we utilize our great industries, our huge agriculture, and reconvert the skills we used and developed to destroy our enemies in war to rebuild our Nation in peace.

Need anyone doubt that we should not be idle for one moment in view of the wonderful task that lies ahead? Slothful indeed are those leaders who would not exploit to the fullest the challenge this superb future has in store for America.

Our country will have use for every returning soldier to occupy a place in her blueprint for destiny. Of these twelve and more millions who come back, a substantial number will wish to return to agriculture. In order to assure the Nation of excellent food production and to encourage private ownership of our farms, which has been the secret of our success in food getting, Congress ought to place every veteran who so desires on at least a 50-acre plot and assure him of a start on that farm with arrangements for adequate loans or grants to acquire him farm tools and machinery. And while he is farming or before, if necessary, he should be given the chance to improve his knowledge of agriculture to prepare himself scientifically and practically for his life's work.

I am a firm believer in the ability of the American farmer to operate the family-size farm successfully if he is given half a chance by those in authority in Washington. The post-war farmer will be in the same boat.

As to how many ex-servicemen will pursue the occupation of farming, I do not know. If they are properly encouraged and aided by the sympathetic support of Congress, I feel certain they will prosper. Their success will be likewise the success of the whole country.

But what of the remaining millions of veterans who will choose other endeavors than agriculture? What of the countless young men who dropped their half-completed education to rush to their Nation's defense?

The answer is that we must reeducate them. They should start in the classroom and the laboratory where they left off. They should have the chance to renew their studies in some similar arrangement.

It has been estimated that advanced and secondary education in America has declined nearly 50 percent in the past 2 years of the war. If that is true, the responsibility of those in authority is clear-cut. The most necessary phase of post-war reconstruction will be making up for lost time in the education of this age. It constitutes a double burden upon society because the war will have stolen several precious years from the present generation.

Therefore, in the interest of 12,000,000 servicemen and women, I believe Congress must immediately consider proposals to make it possible after the war for them to study, or to be trained, or to specialize in order to prepare themselves for a definite place in peacetime America. This study or training should be of a thorough nature which will equip everybody for a useful occupation, pursuit, or profession. Those taking advantage of it should be allowed a wide choice, a long time for decision before they are precluded and plenty of encouragement from their teachers and instructors in the line of endeavor they finally elect to follow.

Any long-range plan for educating an army for the peace to come is apt to have many imperfect details. In submitting these proposals to give back the soil to the soldiers and to restore the divine light of knowledge to untold millions of servicemen as well as to complete training of unknown thousands of war crippled and disabled, I realize many details and phases will be imperfect.

Rather then, it is my wish that you people listening this morning will accept only the general outline of a humble attempt on my part to be helpful in solving the greatest problem any nation ever faced.

If we are able, we Americans together, to set up now the proper approach to aid, guide, and enlist the post-war energies of our men, fighting all over the world for freedom, we will have cemented the foundation of a glorious future, and assured the progress of this land of ours for a century to come.

Congress and the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Congress, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is falling behind in the procession with the people in the Government departments. There is just as much power delegated to the Congress of today as there was in the days of Speakers Reed and Cannon.

The direct representatives of the people in the House of Representatives have the power to control the policies and the actions of all the other branches of the Government. I tremble to think of the power that could be weilded by four men if the House was closely organized. The Speaker, the Floor Leader, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee have in their hands with the support of the Members of the House to impose their will on the departments of the Government and thereby maintain the respect for the Congress by both the appointees in the departments and the people they have the responsibility to represent.

The following letter from an experienced newspaperman makes some pertinent suggestions as to changes in the conduct of the Congress itself and in the format of the official record of the congressional proceedings, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Particularly do I commend to the consideration of my colleagues the plan of inserting with the extensions of remarks of individual Members a quarter column cut picture of

the Member making the extension of remarks in the RECORD.

And I desire to add that I have consistently advocated as an economy measure both to the Government and to the Members that the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be made to conform to standard newspaper columns, and a newspaper mat service be made available to Members so that reprints of their contributions appearing in the RECORD could be obtained at the actual cost of reproduction in the form of newspaper mats for reprinting elsewhere.

When we compute the savings, both in Government printing and mailing of congressional speeches by providing a means of having material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinted by this method in local newspapers, it is difficult to understand a congressional policy that prevents this service being made available to the Members.

I commend Mr. Stoner's letter inserted herewith for the thoughtful consideration of my fellow Members:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *November 27, 1943.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: I have read with interest your letter to Doorkeeper Roberts of November 17. I heartily agree with you. But don't you think that this has been caused in part by Congress's inaction to compete with the executive departments for publicity? Very few laymen profoundly respect Congress. There is mass indifference toward it, I honestly believe. Anyone acquainted with Congress and its work comes to have a saner, a more American viewpoint. Take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself. It really is the national newspaper of this country. And yet its very format is not conducive to mass subscription, nor is its subscription rates ($1.50 per month for those not on the free list). If Congress would but devise ways and means for having the RECORD published in regular newspaper format with fair and honest headlines and photos of Members speaking, I believe it would be no time at all before Congress took its just place in the hearts of all Americans. The executive branch has gone to no end to publicize itself and its activities and its leading personnel. I have been a hurried and underpaid newspaperman around Washington and after getting around a good bit, I came to find that Congress is really the only American institution in Washington. The great executive bureaucracy is too stilted, too status-conscious in the corny sense, too overawed, etc. The judicial branch is, of course, the judicial branch, learned and erudite. But for the salt of the American earth, I'll take Congress any day. Congress must openly accept the challenge of the executive bureaucrats and present itself in its proper and historic role. Otherwise, in the next crisis, Congress may be shut down altogether. This is urgent. I have studied this question a good bit and have unbounded faith in these, my beliefs. I hope you give them some serious consideration.

I have tried to get Life magazine now and then to publish a photo of each Member of Congress. They tell me in fact that the American people wouldn't be interested. And yet they will do a piece on the Dukes of England. I have even tried with my small funds to build up a column based solely on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and its interesting excerpts. Syndicate editors turn me down. But some day these ideas will triumph or else representative democracy will die. A nation cannot always pooh-pooh Congress and expect to have Congress with it always. Congress finally rests upon the good will of the people. As long as our citizens look upon Members of Congress as just peanut politicians whose only interest is that 10 grand per year plus, the future for congressional government bodes ill.

Sincerely,

HENRY STONER.

When Employer and Employee Cooperate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, too often in these days the employer and the employee are found in different armed camps. The theory prevails in many instances that whatever is good for the employer is detrimental to the employee. Consequently, there is a conflict on practically all public questions between the worker and his boss. As a matter of fact, however, now is the time for cooperation, and cooperation between the worker and the industrialist can be one of the most valuable aids for the winning of the war. There is no reason why the man who toils and the man who directs or supervises a factory or plant, or other similar institution, cannot work hand in hand for the common cause. Would that we had more of that spirit of cooperation between employer and employee that is manifested in a communication which arrived shortly before the vote was taken on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill in the House of Representatives on Tuesday last. This letter, signed by the management and the representative of the employees in a Chicago industry exemplifies that much to be desired cooperation between employer and employee.

GENERAL TRANSFORMER CORPORATION,
Chicago, November 22, 1943.
The Honorable WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully urge you to vote for passage of the subsidy bill.

We believe that subsidies are the lowest cost method of stabilizing prices and preventing inflation which is an unfair gouge of the wives, children and parents of our men who are fighting at the front.

Subsidies at the source must be paid for only once. Higher prices at the source compound all along the line so that the increase to the consumer is much greater than the increased return to the producer.

Higher prices to the consumer will result in demands for higher wages. Higher wages—higher prices—and so through the whole vicious spiral.

Subsidies prevent spiralling before it can start.

Because they will best serve the needs of all of us who make up these United States we, labor and management, urge you to vote for subsidies.

Very truly yours,
GENERAL TRANSFORMER CORPORATION,
NATHAN GOLDMAN,
President,
L. J. SEELIG,
Sales Manager,
FRANCES HOFMANN,
Chief Shop Steward.

Rubber Shipped to Sweden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Secretary of State setting forth the circumstances pertaining to the shipment of rubber to Sweden, to which my attention had been called by "a home-fronter" writing from Scenic, S. Dak.:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 18, 1943.
The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: With reference to your letter of October 22, 1943, addressed to Colonel Dewey in the Office of the Rubber Director and referred by that office to the Department of State for reply, I am glad to inform you of the circumstances pertaining to the shipment of certain rubber to Sweden.

The Governments of the United States and United Kingdom have recently entered into a war-trade agreement with Sweden in which the United States and United Kingdom agreed to make certain supplies available to Sweden in return for valuable concessions from the Swedish Government. These supplies included a shipment of 172 tons of crude rubber for the exclusive use of the Swedish armed forces which represented a part of the quantity of rubber owned by the Swedes in Brazil. The Swedes were given the opportunity to ship approximately half of the rubber, which they owned, provided they made the remainder available to the United States. Actually the transaction involved the requisitioning of the entire lot by the Brazilian Government which by operation of our over-all agreement with Brazil increased United States stocks. The United States in turn made the 172 tons available from other sources.

Concerning the possibility mentioned in your letter that this shipment may find its way to Germans, you will be interested to know that all shipments to Sweden from United Nations' sources are covered by guaranties from the Swedish Government against the re-export to any destination and that careful checks made on the execution of these guaranties have never revealed any evidence that the Swedish undertakings were not being lived up to. I believe it can safely be said, therefore, that Germany will not benefit in any way by the exportation to Sweden of this lot of rubber.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Forget Me Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 24, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following poem speaks for itself. It is written by a commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Capt. A. A. Roe, of Monrovia, Calif.

It should be read and remembered by all Members of Congress and the American people generally.

FORGET ME NOT

(Dedicated to the Disabled American Veterans, Inc., by Capt. A. A. Roe (1944))

Strike up the band, let joy know no bounds
The Victory is won—the Axis' flags are furled
The long pent-up voice of Freedom sounds
The lights of Liberty go on o'er all the world.

Platoons of tough, hard-fighting men go marching by
Sun-tan'd, strong, the glint of battle in their eye
But lo' midst all this joy and mirth I hear a sigh
"Where is my boy?" I hear a trembling voice nearby.

Look down that long list—the injured and the maimed
Somewhere on that sad roll you'll find his name.
For him the fighting—the battle has just begun
The fight for rehabilitation, for him is never done.

He would not take from the hero soldiers' grave
Not even the slender'st blades of grass that wave
Nor would he ask, or wish that you hand him down
A single star of honor from the general's crown.

All honor to them—heroes all, but forget not those
Who, on beds of pain, fight on in white hospital clothes
Through weeks, months, and years, they lay on a cot
It would be sweet to know America will forget me not.

OUR DUTY

As time flies on with a restless wing
And of noble knights the poets sing.
We shall continue to tell in our feeble way
Of the good they have done, in those other days
As we look on the battle-stained faces of those
Who have fought so well in their hospital clothes.

Where Does Republican Party Stand on Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley, from the Boston Daily Globe of November 25, 1943:

WHERE DOES REPUBLICAN PARTY STAND ON INFLATION?

(By Ernest Lindley)

Traditionally the Republican Party has regarded itself as the party of "sound money." It will present itself to the Nation next year as the party which knows how to manage the domestic economy of the United States.

What does the recent record show? It shows the Republicans in Congress aligning themselves overwhelmingly against effective controls over inflation. It shows them voting in the large majority for measures which would force up the cost of living and hold the danger of serious possibly uncontrollable, inflation. It shows them ducking the tax problems, while voting to increase the cost of the war and the weight of the national debt.

Not many are likely to be deceived by the efforts of some of them to dramatize "economies." Of course, all unnecessary expenditures should be eliminated. They mean the use of manpower and perhaps of materials which should be employed for more essential purposes. But in the aggregate they amount to practically nothing, relative to the cost of the war. A small increase in the price level would wipe out these trivial savings.

This is not intended to be a partisan attack. It applies also to some of the Democrats on the Hill. Nor is it intended to excuse the delays, weaknesses, and mistakes of the administration in dealing with inflation and related domestic problems. The administration's record in this respect has not been good. But faulty as it has been, its program has been more comprehensive and stronger than any other which has been able to muster more than a scattering of political support.

For a year and a half the large picture has been this: The administration, on the whole, attempting to control inflation in the face of strenuous and growing opposition from Congress, and especially from the Republican Party. Both the administration and Congress have been subjected to heavy inflationary pressures from special interests. the administration has given ground but, compared to Congress and especially to the Republican Party in Congress, it has been a rock.

It takes courage to try to sit on the lid, to turn down demands and claims on all sides, to ignore political threats. It takes some capacity to look ahead and a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. No group of men who lack these qualities can be considered capable of governing well.

This failure in the Republican Party is not confined to Congress. The Republican Governors have stood aside or remained silent. This is politically understandable. It is not their fight directly. And yet it is, in the same way that the resolution adopted at Mackinac was their fight

It is hard to see how Wendell Willkie, the the Republican Governors, the Republican Senators and Congressmen can either work for inflation or duck the issue and still claim either the knowledge or the courage necessary to take control of the National Government.

An Outline of Plans for the Post-War Period by the National Council of American Veteran Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, an outline of plans for the post-war period, recently formulated by the National Council of American Veteran Organizations, which met in Washington, D. C., November 9–10, 1943, has recently been brought to my attention by its executive secretary, Millard W. Rice, who is also the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans.

The many different points in this outline of plans for the post-war period are so well balanced that I believe they deserve wide attention and careful study and I, therefore, quote such outline as follows:

Realizing that the welfare of any one group of Americans is inevitably linked up with the welfare of all other groups of Americans; and

Firmly believing that it is vitally important to America, and to all groups of Americans, in the final analysis, that America's discharged servicemen and women be enabled quickly to become useful, self-sustaining, self-respecting civilians; and

Being convinced that more freedom and higher standards of living for all Americans—including America's discharged servicemen and servicewomen—are dependent upon the full conservation and technological development of America's natural resources and of its production potentialities under our representative form of government; and

Assuming that these desirable objectives can be fulfilled only by reason of detailed, correlated, advance planning:

Now, therefore, the national representatives of the several national veteran organizations affiliated with the National Council of American Veteran Organizations, do hereby declare that as to America's disabled defenders and their dependents:

1. Those American veterans who are handicapped by service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities should be provided, through the Veterans' Administration, with—

A. Adequate compensation for their total or partial service-connected disabilities, supplemented by decent dependency allowances * * * with the basic amounts thereof to be increased approximately proportionately with the increases in the cost of living.

B. Prompt needed medical treatment, hospitalization and domiciliary care, preferably in Veterans' Administration facilities.

C. Appropriate vocational rehabilitation courses to develop their potentialities for suitable, useful, gainful, permanent employment.

D. Special assistance in securing suitable employment, facilitated by:

(1) effective preferences for all governmental positions—Federal, State, county, and municipal—for which qualified; and

(2) reimbursement by the Veterans' Administration of all State Workmen's Compensation Act payments made as to any service-connected disabled veteran employed in private industry.

2. Decent death pensions should be extended by the Veterans' Administration to the widows, children, and dependent parents of—

A. Veterans who have died during service or by reason of service-connected disabilities; and

B. War veterans who, at time of death, were suffering with service-connected disability, but who have died by reason of other disabilities.

3. Pensions of $60 per month, supplemented by dependency allowances, should be paid by the Veterans' Administration to all unemployable war veterans without regard to service connection of their disabilities, with the basic amounts thereof to be increased approximately proportionately with increases in the cost of living.

4. Laws as to the various similar classifications of disabled veterans and their dependents should be uniformized, and then followed up their simplified administration and liberalized application by the Veterans' Administration, supplemented by the advice

and assistance of experienced veteran organization representatives.

As to America's veterans, every serviceman and woman is entitled to, and should be extended:

1. Adequate pay, supplemented by dependency allowances while in service.

2. A 3-months furlough with pay before final discharge.

3. The opportunity, in service and after discharge, for completion of educational courses or for suitable vocational training.

4. Full, suitable, useful, gainful employment, facilitated by—

A. Effective preferences, secondary to service-connected disabled veterans, as to all governmental positions for which they may be qualified;

B. Reemployment by former private employers; and

C. Preferred placement as to all new employment for which qualified.

5. Special loans for acquisition or improvement of farms, stock, equipment, homes, or private business, and to liquidate prior private obligations protected during service by special moratoriums.

6. Accrued unemployment compensation protection, accumulated to his credit for the period of his active service, with shortened waiting period and increases minimum and maximum amounts payable during his unemployment; and

7. Accrued old-age insurance credits with the Social Security Board, accumulated on the basis of his period of active service, and continued basic coverage under the Social Security Act.

As to the future protection of America:

1. The full mobilization of America's potential war matériel and manpower must continue to be developed quickly and efficiently, until victory in World War No. II has been completely attained.

2. America's specialized armed services should, following the termination of hostilities, continue to be maintained on a modernized basis in sufficient force to guarantee America's protection from all possible enemies, supplemented by—

A. Maintenance of adequate matériel production plants;

B. One year's military or naval training and service for all young men sometime before their twenty-fifth year; and

C. Cooperation with other free sovereign nations to facilitate:

(1) mutual inter-nation adjustments of irritating frictions and problems;

(2) elimination of unnecessary internation trade barriers, and excessive tariffs, which hinder full access to needed materials for any nation;

(3) amicable settlement of disputes between two or more nations by a court of international justice; and

(4) collective action against any aggressor nation.

As to the economy of America:

1. All governmental expenditures must provide full value in exchange therefor.

2. Current costs of Government should be paid for, as closely as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis, out of current collections of taxes, upon individuals, corporations, and estates, imposed equitably in accordance with their relative ability to pay same, without any exemption as to income from Government bonds, but so designed as not too much to discourage full development of a free enterprise economy in America, but also so designed as to minimize the imminent dangers of inflation incident to huge deficit financing.

3. America's wage and price structures must be kept in balance, lest increasing costs of living necessitate reduced standards of living for—

A. All governmental beneficiaries—disabled veterans, the dependents of disabled veterans and of deceased veterans, civil service annuitants, Social Security Board beneficiaries, etc.;

B. Recipients of salaries that cannot be increased proportionately with increases in the cost of living;

C. Persons living on savings, insurance benefits, and inheritances; and

D. Beneficiaries of "funded" organizations.

4. Free enterprises must be encouraged, after the termination of hostilities, by—

A. All monopolistic and unfair trade practices should be prohibited and penalized;

B. Governmental surveys, technological researches, shortened patent protections, simplified taxes, more reasonable regulations, should be provided for;

C. Long-term loans for reconversion costs and construction of new production plants should be available from the Government;

D. Adjustments on canceled war-matériel contracts should be promptly paid on a basis adopted prior to the end of World War No. II;

E. Surplus war materials should be made conveniently available to all private buyers at reasonable prices and in small quantities;

F. Home and foreign markets for more of the products of agriculture and industry should be developed by elimination of trade barriers and by creation of more purchasing power; and

G. Adoption of more efficient technological devices, and of better coordinated relations between management and labor, should be encouraged, so that increased production per unit of labor can result in reduced costs for consumers, with consequent greater real wages to employees, and increased standards of living for all Americans.

5. Conservation of America's real resources, looking toward the future welfare of America, and of its citizens in the future, must be provided for, and facilitated by—

A. Appropriate governmental safeguards against undue waste of its minerals, oils, gases, coal, forest, water, water power, and the invaluable topsoil of its lands;

B. Flood control, soil conservation and reforestation programs.

6. America's surplus employables must be utilized, when no place can be found for them in private employment, for the construction, by competitive contractors, of needed modern highways, with two-level grade crossings where traffic is most congested or dangerous, governmental office buildings, hospitals, schools, public parks, playgrounds, etc., facilitated by detailed advance planning by—

A. All Federal agencies;

B. All State, county, and municipal agencies; and

C. All private agencies.

7. America's civilian unemployables must be adequately provided for by appropriate social-security benefits, financed by Federal funds matched partly with State funds.

Working together, Americans can quickly develop America's resources so that an abundance of the necessities and comforts of life can be made available for all freedom-loving Americans, while still keeping America's representative form of government and the freedoms for all Americans guaranteed under our Constitution, and, at the same time, not only thereby set an example to be followed by, and in, all other countries, but also materially to assist all peoples to attain freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech.

At its meeting, this council also adopted several resolutions:

First. Requesting amendment to the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide insurance benefits for total permanent disability.

Second. Recommending the passage of S. 263, a bill that provides for the issuance of policies under section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act as amended, and to repeal section 211 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, which takes away the right to total and permanent disability benefits enjoyed by men in the armed services for over 22 years.

Third. To provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration until modified by court order.

Fourth. To permit suit on any automatic yearly renewable term or United States life insurance policy at any time.

Fifth. To provide that Government insurance policies shall be incontestable, subsequent to one year after issuance, reinstatement or conversion and that all premiums paid on all policies canceled by the Veterans' Administration shall be returned to the veteran or his next of kin.

Sixth. To liberalize the laws as to forfeitures.

It is significant to note that there are now nine veteran organizations formally affiliated with this National Council of American Veterans' Organizations, namely, Army and Navy Union, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Fleet Reserve Association, Irish War Veterans, Italian-American Veterans of the World War, Jewish War Veterans, the Regular Veterans Association, and Marine Corps League.

The 2-day session of the council was presided over by Thomas J. Walsh, past national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, who was the first vice chairman of the council, as the acting chairman, in the absence of the duly elected chairman, Capt. Laurence R. Melton, past national commander of the D. A. V., now serving in the Air Corps in Miami Beach, Fla.

Official observers from other veteran organizations attended such portions of the deliberations as they were most interested in, with the prospects that several additional national veterans' organizations will have become formally affiliated within the next several months.

Unanimously elected as officers of the council for the ensuing year were the following: Warren E. Miller, national commander of the Army and Navy Union, as chairman; Finn Nilsen, department commander of the Regular Veterans' Association in Maryland, first vice chairman; Anthony D. Tieso, national commander of the Italian-American Veterans of the World War, second vice chairman; Joseph F. Barr, national executive committeeman of the Jewish War Veterans, treasurer; and Millard W. Rice, national service director of the D. A. V., executive secretary.

The information and recommendations in the several serious addresses made to the council conferees were probably influential in the council's formation of its plans for the post-war period. The sessions of the first day were featured by exceptionally interesting short talks on the subjects and by individuals, as listed below:

Future Benefits for Disabled American Veterans and Their Dependents, by Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Placing Veterans Into Suitable Employment, by O. D. Hollenbeck, Chief, Veterans' Employment Service, War Manpower Commission.

Selective Service Demobilization and Reemployment of Discharged Servicemen, by Col. Lewis Sanders, Director, Reemployment Division, Selective Service System.

Social Security Benefits to World War No. II Veterans, by Dr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman, Social Security Board.

Post-war Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel, by Brig. Gen. Frederick Osborn, Chairman, Armed Forces Committee on Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel.

Future Civil Service Preferences for Veterans, by Charles R. Anderson, Director of Utilization and Employment of Veterans, United States Civil Service Commission.

The C. I. O. and Our Returning Servicemen, by James Carey, national secretary, C. I. O.

Providing Opportunities for Full Employment of All Employable Veterans, by Dr. Emerson Schmidt, secretary, committee on economic policy, United States Chamber of Commerce.

America's Economy After the War, by Dr. Louis Bean, Chief Analyst, Bureau of the Budget.

What State Governments Are Doing Toward Post-war Planning, by Hon. L. Harold Sothoron, vice chairman of the Interstate Commission on Potomac River Basin, member of Council of State Governments, and of the Maryland Post-war Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Commission.

I understand that much enthusiasm was displayed by those present at the council's conferences as to the value of the information extended by the various speakers, as well as by reason of the exchange of information and opinions of the conferees who were present. It seems to me a very hopeful sign for the future that representatives of a considerable number of national veteran organizations can get together and formulate such a constructive program as has here been presented.

Address of Hon. Ralph Bard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Assistant Secretary Ralph Bard before the American Petroleum Institute, Chicago, November 11, 1943:

About a half hour before sunrise on the morning of October 5, the first American planes wheeled in over Wake Island and began to drop their bombs. That was the opening attack of a two-day plastering of the Japs on Wake Island by the largest sea-air force ever to be assembled in the history of the war.

I cannot tell you how many ships were in that task force, not even how many aircraft carriers. I can say, however, that there were more aircraft carriers off Wake on October 5 and 6 than ever were assembled in one place in naval history and you can draw your own partial conclusions from the fact that the Japs are known to have sent four carriers against Midway in June 1942. Our carriers were more than 2,000 miles from the closest American naval base at Pearl Harbor.

Placing that great armada of sea-air power off Wake Island and flying the planes in to bomb the Japs was a demonstration of the importance of petroleum to this war. The ships that steamed up to Wake were driven by fuel oil, the planes that dropped the bombs and shot down the Zeros were powered by high octane gasoline. The engines in the planes and in the ships and every moving part on both ships and planes were lubricated by petroleum products.

Before I go on to tell you more about the role of petroleum in war, let me digress and make two points about this raid on Wake.

First, it represents something new in military operations. You will realize what I mean if I ask you a few questions. Suppose you had more than four aircraft carriers and a large group of surface ships under your command and were told to attack Wake Island, how would you dispose your ships? How would you space your carriers so that their planes could fly off, rendezvous, and fly to their appointed tasks without tangling up? How would you coordinate the flights from the several carriers so that the waves of bombers arrive over their target at the correct time and not scrambled with other flights? How would you time the surface ship bombardment with the aircraft bombing? How would you protect your great aggregation of ships against enemy submarine and air attack?

The answers to all of these questions are being learned by our Navy now in actual battle and that is one reason that Wake is just a curtain-raiser for what will come later.

The second point I would like to make about the raid on Wake on October 5–6 has to do with armchair strategists not in the armed service. Perhaps you have read that carrier-based aircraft can never be effective unless they catch the enemy completely off guard, because unless they do, they will have to pull in their aircraft to protect themselves against destruction by land-based planes and thus give up their own attack. That line of reasoning has been expounded and its exponents have thereby dismissed carrier-based aircraft from all military consideration. I think these gentlemen should be more cautious.

They can be very articulate and logical in proving that the Navy cannot do certain things, but the men in our Navy may do them anyway.

For example, we did not catch the Japs at Wake Island completely by surprise. There were more Zeros hovering over the island when our bombers came in than would be normal for a dawn patrol. In fact, within a half hour after the attack began, dog fights broke out all over the sky, but within 20 minutes the dog fights were over and we went ahead with our systematic plastering of the island.

Moreover, the Japs later tried to send against our carrier force land-based planes evidently from the Marshall Islands. I am sure you have read many columns of newspaper print about how no carrier force will be able to stand up against land-based aircraft and that therefore naval aviation is impotent. Unfortunately for these armchair strategists, their theory did not work out at Wake Island. I want to admit right now that the Japanese land-based air attack against our carrier force was not a heavy one and it does not provide a conclusive test, but I also want to say very emphatically that the attack was brushed off by our carrier planes with ease and with no interruption to our own bombing. I think the gentlemen who have written off carrier-based air attack should reconsider their logic in the light of actual events.

There also has been much controversy as to the relative combat importance of planes and ships. All the actions of this war to date have demonstrated that modern sea power is a sea-air team. One without the other is inadequate. The plane is of little use in bad visibility, or in bad weather, or at night, and the ship is often slow and vulnerable without aircraft protection—the team is indivisible.

Air and sea power cannot be evaluated independently and it is well to bear in mind that air power cannot supply air power, let alone ground forces and civilian populations. Air power can strike the enemy where it hurts most, but to do so with any effectiveness it is dependent on ships.

Let me give you an example—the President of the United States recently pointed out that in a single air-raid over German territory nearly 900 combat planes took part. These planes used two and a half million pounds of bombs and almost 3,000,000 rounds of ammunition. On this one flight alone they used a million gallons of gasoline and 25,000 gallons of oil.

While 5,000 crew members were aboard the planes, more than 50,000 men were in the maintenance and repair crews back at the bases. You can be sure that all these bombs, ammunition, gasoline, oil, and personnel did not reach our bases in England by air; nor the new supplies of food, fuel, bombs, ammunition, spare parts, and new personnel to keep them in continued operation. Here is a striking illustration of how the 400-mile-an-hour airplane is strategically tied to the 10-knot ship. It is also striking proof of the dictum which says that, in large-scale war between continents, decisive victory on land is possible only through control of the sea by the indivisible ship-plane team. So much for my digression.

I cannot tell you how many thousands of gallons of petroleum were required to bomb Wake Island for 2 days because that information would give our enemy some clue to the striking range of our naval forces, but I can tell you that the amount was enormous. Our planes alone, while they were engaged on this operation, used enough gasoline to give 150 average American motorists their normal peacetime supply of gasoline for 1 year. The attack on Wake Island was the second appearance in combat of the Navy's big, fast, new fighter plane, the Hellcat. To keep a Hellcat in the air for 1 hour requires as much gasoline as you would need to drive your family car from Chicago to Los Angeles. If you drove very hard and very fast you might make the trip in something like 3½ days. A single Hellcat uses up that much gasoline in the time that it would take you to play nine holes of golf, and I can assure you that there were scores of Hellcats over Wake Island on October 5 and 6.

The cruise and attack by that task force is only one of scores of military operations, all of which drinks up enormous quantities of petroleum. Secretary Ickes has said that for 1,000 4-motored Flying Fortresses to fly a 6-hour mission requires 1,800,000 gallons of gasoline. In order to move an armored division of our ground forces 1 mile we must burn up 800 to 900 gallons of gasoline per mile and there are 150 miles between Salerno and Rome, to say nothing of the additional hundreds of miles from Rome to Berlin.

These scattered facts give you some glimpse into the enormous military demands and crucial needs for petroleum products. As you probably already know, military uses are taking more than 30 percent of the gasoline west of the Rocky Mountains and much more than 40 percent of the gasoline in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast areas. Next year these percentages will rise to 37 percent and 52 percent, respectively. In brief, modern war moves on a flood of petroleum and that flood will have to increase as the intensity of the war itself increases.

You might like to know what the armed services do with the petroleum which they receive. The largest single military use of petroleum products is for aviation gasoline. I think what happens to our aviation gasoline is fairly obvious. You read about it in the headlines every morning. It is needed not only for those battles which appear in the newspapers, but also for the multitudinous training projects which make the battles possible. I repeat that aviation gasoline is the largest military use of petroleum today, a fact which speaks volumes about America's use of air power. Of course, most of the aviation gasoline goes to the Army Air Forces, but a very sizable fraction is used by the Navy air arm.

The second military use of petroleum products is motor fuel. Most of the motor fuel goes to the Army ground forces who use it in tanks, jeeps, trucks, half-tracks, ducks, self-propelled gun carriages, and scores of other motor-driven vehicles which make up a modern mechanized army.

The third great military use of petroleum products is in fuel oil, and obviously the Navy is the greatest consumer of fuel oil. It drives all of our modern sea-going fleet.

These three uses of petroleum—aviation gasoline, motor fuel, and fuel oil—are roughly, but not exactly, equal in size. The fourth military use of petroleum products, which is less than half as large as each of the other three, is Diesel oil. The military supply of Diesel oil is divided almost equally between the Army and the Navy. The Army has hundreds of Diesel-powered vehicles including tanks. The Navy uses Diesel propulsion for vessels ranging from huge submarines to small landing craft.

The last and smallest military use of petroleum products, but one without which all the others would be unavailing, is lubricants. The volume of lubricants consumed by the Army and Navy is about one-sixth the volume of fuel oil and about half the volume of Diesel oil. In a raid like that on Wake Island our planes will use a gallon of oil for every 100 gallons of gasoline. The bulk of the lubricants, of course, goes to the Army.

These are only the strictly military requirements for petroleum products stated in terms of volume. If petroleum consumption is stated in terms of dollars and if the figures are enlarged to include lend-lease and War Shipping Administration operations, as well as those of the Army and the Navy, the division of each dollar spent for petroleum products would be something like this: 44.7 cents of each dollar would go for aviation gasoline, 18.1 cents out of each dollar would be spent for motor gasoline, 18.4 cents would be spent for fuel oils of all types, 5.9 cents would go for Diesel oil and kerosene, and the last 12.8 cents would be spent for lubricants including aviation lubricants.

Military consumption of petroleum products is large not only quantitatively but also qualitatively. The aviation gasoline which is suitable for the operation of a commercial air liner between well-developed airports over well-monitored air routes is not satisfactory for the operation of a carrier-based torpedo bomber. The torpedo bombers must have a fuel that will deliver maximum power instantaneously in order to lift them fully loaded, sometimes with 1-ton bombs as they were at Marcus Island, off the relatively short deck of an aircraft carrier. The automobile motor gasoline which satisfied the family car could be adjusted to meet local conditions of climate and altitude. Automobile motor gasoline for the armed services must give dependable service under widely varying conditions of temperature, moisture, and altitude all over the world.

The Diesel fuel that works well in a road grader will not do in a submarine. In submarines, where space is at a great premium, engines are designed to develop the utmost power in relation to size and they are extremely critical of the fuel which they burn. It must be the highest grade Diesel oil.

The fuel oil which the Navy uses in its surface warships must burn without smoke so as not to betray the presence of a ship and must be suitable for transfer from tanker to warship under difficult conditions of sea and temperature. Therefore, the Navy needs a grade of fuel oil much higher in quality than ordinary fuel oil.

In summary, all military needs require what you petroleum men call the "heart cuts" out of the crude petroleum. To obtain these "heart cuts" tends to unbalance refinery runs impairing the total output of usable products from a given quantity of crude oil. Moreover, the more of the volatile elements which are taken out of the crude oil for military use, the lower the quality of products available for civilian consumption. This statement is particularly true of refining operations which have been undertaken to obtain gasoline with octane ratings in excess of 100. In many instances, the drive to obtain these superhigh octane gasolines has resulted in a net deterioration of all other available petroleum products. Thus, military demands place an excessive strain on our petroleum resources.

Thus far we have been able to meet this strain. I know of no American combat action, with the possible exception of Guadalcanal, where a shortage of petroleum products threatened to hamper our forces. I am happy to be able to say that.

I said a little while ago that no combat operation, with the possible exception of Guadalcanal, has been slowed down for lack of petroleum products. There was a period of acute crisis at Guadalcanal but the difficulty was not supply but transportation. When the marines first landed on Guadalcanal, the Japanese were able to interrupt our unloading operations before all aviation gasoline had been put ashore. The results was that from mid-August until some time in September the marine aviators on Guadalcanal had to treasure their aviation gasoline as though it were liquid gold. As one of the officers who was there remarked, "We practically did not begin to warm up our engines until the Japs were right over the field." This was the period during which Commander John Alderman won the undying gratitude of the marine aviators by offering to run into Guadalcanal on his small transport twice as much gasoline as any other skipper had volunteered to carry. Commander Alderman loaded gasoline drums on deck, in ward rooms, and in every open space aboard his vessel, turning it into a potential torch. A near miss of a Japanese bomb would have destroyed him, his crew, and his vessel, but he took the gasoline into Guadalcanal without any incident.

Finally, to break the shortage the Navy loaded a tremendous amount of gasoline on a single freighter and sent it off. Word reached headquarters that the Japs had spotted the freighter and that she was skirting trouble. Then she disappeared from the knowledge of men for 6 days. You may be sure that those were 6 anxious days and as they ticked off hope fell lower and lower, but on the sixth day the skipper brought his vessel into Guadalcanal, and the gasoline drought was over. If you ever want to be convinced of the importance of petroleum products in this war, I suggest that you talk to some of the marine aviators who flew from Henderson Field during August and September of 1942.

I have said that thus far we have been able to meet the enormous war demands for petroleum products. We have been able to supply ourselves and, because we were closest to the atcual areas of combat, we have also supplied a large measure of our allies' needs. Our relative share in the wartime pool of petroleum products will decline now that the Mediterranean has opened and that Russia has been able to relieve threats to her oil-producing areas.

You can see, however, how this drain and the multiplied importance of petroleum to war has changed our thinking about the adequacy of our own oil reserves. Our Navy oil reserves were staked out when the fleet was converted from coal-burning to oil-burning propulsion machinery. That was many years ago and the reserves were considered more than ample in the light of the projected requirements. Next year, however, the Navy's needs for Diesel oil will be 2,300 percent of its 1941 needs, and our fuel oil needs will be 500 percent of our 1941 consumption. Moreover, air power has become a voracious user of petroleum, and the ground Army has been converted into a great oil-consuming machine.

These changed conditions inevitably change our estimate of the adequacy of our reserves. The Navy is deeply concerned over the fact that the new oil pools which have been opened recently appear to be progressively smaller in size. This trend may mean that we are exhausting our domestic petroleum resources, as Secretary Ickes has frequently warned us we were in danger of doing.

Anyone can see what a grave development that would be in this age of mechanized warfare. Therefore, you may be sure that the armed services, and indeed I believe the whole Nation, will follow with grave attention the efforts of your industry to open up new American oil reserves, whether at home or abroad.

Navy Flyer's Feat at Wake Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following account of the exploits of a son of a Member of this House, Hon. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, Jr., of Virginia.

NAVY FLYER'S FEAT AT WAKE—WOUNDED, HE REGAINS CARRIER—ENSIGN DAVE SATTERFIELD III TIES FIRST TOURNIQUET ON SELF

It was the first time he'd ever tied a tourniquet.

And it was on his own leg, gushing blood above the knee like a miniature geyser, that he tied it.

Then, gripping the twist bandage in one strong hand, with the other piloting his

humming, speeding fighter plane, young Ensign Dave Satterfield III roared up into the sky from smoking Wake Island, headed out into the Pacific, kept his buzzing head and dulling eyes clear enough for a slick job of navigation, found his carrier, and set the Grumman Hellcat down neatly on the flight deck. Then he pitched over—weak from loss of blood—but completing a fine job of working over the Japanese at Wake.

Today young Satterfield is out at the big Aiea Heights naval hospital, fast recovering from a nasty wound, already looking forward to another round with the enemy.

His left leg is still stiff from the copper-jacketed steel bullet that slashed through the plane and into the pilot, but he expects to regain its full use. And how he hates to miss this current big slash at the Gilberts and Marshalls.

A couple of days ago, Ensign Satterfield told his story to a Star-Bulletin reporter who had heard from others of the young Virginian's plucky feat. He didn't tell it very readily. He's extremely modest. In fact, only under a pretty steady fire of questioning did it come out.

So, as you read his own recital, bear in mind that he didn't talk it out just as it appears. It's the net result of many questions.

First, set the scene: Look at the map of Wake. What we refer to as Wake Island is really three islands—Wake, shaped like a wishbone; Peale and Wilkes. But in his story, Satterfield followed the usual custom and called the group Wake.

It's October 5, Hawaiian time—October 6, Wake time (for Wake is across the international date line). The big smash at Wake by carrier-based planes and warships covered most of 2 days—October 5 and 6, Hawaiian time; October 6 and 7, Wake time.

Young Satterfield—a stalwart, dark-eyed boy of 22 with a ready smile and flashing white teeth—is a fighter-plane pilot on one of Uncle Sam's big carriers.

He and his teammates had been "briefed"—told in short, terse words and sentences the job that's ahead of them.

Now, prompted by questions, it's Satterfield telling the story.

"On the first day (October 4) we took off at daybreak, covering the cruisers going in toward Wake. We cruised around at high altitude while the cruisers shelled the islands. Our job was to protect the surface craft against Japanese planes.

"It was fairly cloudy up there, but we could see the island. We were over 3 hours in the air, and of that time about an hour and a half over and near the Wake area itself.

"No Jap planes showed up. So later we went in and strafed the islands (Wake, Wilkes, and Peale) low down, making four or five passes.

"There was some action from the Japanese antiaircraft. We zoomed across and away, and when we pulled out the cruisers were still shelling the island installations.

"As we went down on our passes, we could see the Japanese in their slit trenches that criss-crossed all over the island. They had rifles and were popping away at us. But nobody minds rifle fire. I suppose it was Japanese infantry in the trenches—probably rushed into the trenches to repel expected landing forces.

"That was all for the first day. Then we flew back to the carrier."

(In all his story, Ensign Satterfield almost never used "I," though he was alone in his fighter plane, the Grumman Hellcat. He used "we" and explained that a number of fighter planes were on missions just like or nearly like his own.

"We left our carrier about 7:15 the next morning. It was a nice day for the job with plenty of clouds to go into on our approaches, some rain and poor visibility until we got close to the island. I should say there was about a 1,500-foot ceiling.

"We came in on Wake under the cloud ceiling and parallel to the beach, about half a mile out.

"Again we saw no Jap planes. The reason for that is that earlier waves on the first day had knocked down some 30 and got 31 more on the ground.

"We could see plenty of burning buildings and other installations.

"We went in that second morning escorting dive and torpedo bombers, and, after we were sure there was no opposition in the air, we turned in and proceeded to strafe and to see what damage could be done.

"My teammate this morning was Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Ralph Hanks. We flew around trying to draw a fire from the ground to disclose the location of Japanese guns. There was no sign of return fire.

"Then we saw what appeared to be munition dumps and went in to strafe them. As I pulled out from one of these passes I got hit. I didn't even see the gun firing, or a tracer—but just heard the crash as the projectile hit my plane and felt my left leg go limp after a hard blow.

"I was then only about 50 feet from the ground—must have flown over the top of a machine gun and into a curtain of fire he was laying down."

Ensign Satterfield leaned over to his bedside table and picked up a bullet. "Here it is—some of the boys found it on the floor of my plane after I landed."

It's a copper-covered steel bullet which the Japanese designate as a 12.7—about equivalent to an American .50 caliber machine gun.

Ensign Satterfield tells how he pulled on up into the clouds to get out of the fire and see how badly he was hit. Lieutenant Hanks was out of sight. Satterfield thought it likely Hanks couldn't know his teammate had been hit. It was up to Satterfield—and Satterfield alone.

He reached out and got a tourniquet that on combat missions he always kept handy. He'd never tied one on himself or anybody else, but he'd attended lectures and demonstrations—"somehow what you've learned comes back when you have to do it for yourself."

He tied it around his leg above the open, gushing wound, held it tight with his left fist, and headed for where he thought the carrier ought to be.

He felt warm liquid squirting all over him. But it wasn't all his blood. Some of it was the fluid from the hydraulic system, which had been shot up. His gas tank had been pierced, too, but that was self-sealing.

He kept his head clear enough to head for the carrier but for a while he couldn't see it. And he could feel himself losing strength.

Then * * *

"I saw the nose of a destroyer stick out from the edge of a cloud as I looked down, and boy! That was the finest sight I ever saw—I knew the carrier was close by.

"I radioed that I'd been hit and was coming in. Found I couldn't get the landing flaps open and down and the tail wheel didn't come down, but somehow I landed O. K., using the emergency release to lower my wheels."

Young Satterfield doesn't remember much after that till he came around in a comfortable cot.

He is a native of Richmond, Va., and his father is Democratic Congressman DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr., of the Third District of Virginia.

Ensign Satterfield comes of a fighting and flying family.

His father was a commissioned officer in the naval flying corps in World War No. 1, is now a lawyer and veteran of Congress. An uncle who was graduated from Annapolis, is a commander on active duty. He has a younger brother in service.

Young Dave went to St. Christopher High School in Richmond and the University of Richmond. Always interested in aviation, he volunteered for the Navy right after Pearl Harbor and came into the service in February 1943.

He first went to the naval flying school at Anacostia, D. C., and then to the great naval training area at Corpus Christi, Tex.

Ensign Satterfield speaks with affection and immense respect for the Grumman Hellcat that he flew at Wake.

"It's a great ship. It can do almost anything—and bring you through anything, no matter how hard it's hit. Some day I'd be glad to shake the hand of Roy Grumman."

There's a possibility that he'll get a leave in the States before returning to active duty. His leg won't be quite ready for a few weeks. And there are several reasons why he'd like to go back to Virginia for a few days—one of those reasons being an extremely attractive girl whose framed photo occupies a place of honor in his cool and comfortable room up in the breeze-swept Aiea Heights Hospital.

Veterans' Benefits, World Wars No. 1 and No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation receives many inquiries relative to benefits afforded veterans of World War No. 2. I have prepared the following statement so that this important information might be readily available. The material in the statement has been coordinated with the Veterans' Administration.

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has been deeply concerned to insure adequate benefits for veterans of World War No. 2. Much of the legislation it has sponsored has become law; two important measures—H. R. 3356, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act; and H. R. 3377, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes, which have been passed by the House of Representatives—are now pending in the Senate.

As I have stated on other occasions.—

No nation on earth has provided for the veterans of its various wars as we have provided for ours. While there may be some inequalities yet to be straightened out, and some legislation which we still hope to see enacted into law, the fact remains that, taken for all in all, our system of caring for our disabled veterans and their dependents has not an equal in any other country in the world.

The statement to which I have referred follows:

BENEFITS PRESENTLY AFFORDED MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

1. Pensions (or, for Reserve officers and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, retirement pay).

2. Rehabilitation:

(A) Medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care.

(B) Vocational rehabilitation.

3. Insurance:

(A) National service life insurance.

(B) Government life (converted) insurance.

(C) Guaranty of premiums, commercial insurance.

(For ready reference there is a chart following showing total expenditures and other data respecting these benefits for veterans and their dependents of World War No. 2, and comparable benefits for World War No. 1, from 1918 to August 31, 1943.)

Veterans' Administration — Disbursements made for relief of World War No. 2 veterans and dependents, December 1941 to Aug. 31, 1943

	Disbursements	
	Total to Aug. 31, 1943	During August 1943
Pensions:		
Veterans:		
Service-connected	$3,997,848.18	$749,433.78
Retired Reserve officers and enlisted men [1]	306,550.54	39,573.29
Dependents	5,352,413.00	718,966.37
Total	9,656,811.72	1,507,973.44
National service life insurance:		
Cash payments made for death benefits disbursed from national service life insurance	9,416,947.90	1,214,460.23
Approximate cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care: World War No. 2 veterans	4,501,095.86	756,748.89

[1] Retired Reserve officers included with Regular Establishment living veterans prior to fiscal year 1943.

World War No. 2 veterans hospitalized or domiciled

Admissions to hospitals and domiciliary care, December 1941 through Sept. 30, 1943:	
Type of patient on admission:	
Tuberculous	4,195
Neuropsychiatric	9,064
General	12,793
Total	[1] 26,052
Remaining under hospitalization or domiciliary care at end of September 1943:	
Hospitalization:	
Tuberculous	1,689
Neuropsychiatric	3,926
General	2,184
Total	7,799
Domiciliary care	72

[1] Includes 151 domiciliary admissions.

Disbursements for relief of World War No. 1 veterans and dependents, 1918 to Aug. 31, 1943

	Total to Aug. 31, 1943	During August 1943
DIRECT BENEFITS		
Compensation or pension:		
Death:		
Service-connected	$837,313,433.06	$4,101,973.54
Non-service-connected	51,701,352.51	934,733.10
Disability:		
Service-connected	3,579,423,438.79	13,584,158.70
Emergency officers' retirement pay	82,425,594.34	349,861.11
Disability allowance or non-service pensions	383,933,681.70	3,095,941.22
Adjusted service certificates	3,796,145,520.32	77,311.24
Adjusted service and dependent pay	55,513,490.99	19.51
Loans to veterans for transportation	76,103.36	
Insurance:		
Term	2,194,131,680.43	776,752.86
Government life (converted)	596,428,626.61	3,918,470.24
Allotments and allowances	582,933,234.19	[1] 536.50
Vocational rehabilitation	644,871,021.46	
Total expenditures for direct benefits	12,804,897,177.76	26,838,646.00
Indirect benefits [2]	2,015,964,956.57	9,749,255.58
Grand total	14,820,862,134.33	36,587,901.58

[1] Credit.

[2] Operating cost of central office, regional offices, and hospitals, burials, transportation of beneficiaries, hospital construction, etc.

I. PENSION, DISABILITY PENSION, DEATH PENSION, RETIREMENT PAY

Pensions are payable for disability or death incurred in or due to active military service, in line of duty and not the result of the person's own misconduct.

Disability pension is payable to any person honorably discharged and is based upon the degree of disablement ranging from 10 percent to 100 percent, with payments based thereon ranging from $10 to $100 per month. For specific losses, as the loss of a hand or a foot, blindness, etc., additional amounts are payable, the highest rate being $250 per month.

Retirement pay: In lieu of such pension or compensation, Reserve officers called to active duty, and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army Regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

Death pension: The death-pension rates for widows and children were increased by Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943. These rates for death in service or service-connected death are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child	65
(With $13 for each additional child.)	
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children	38
(With $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.)	
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or one only	45

Claims and effective date of awards: The effective date of an award of disability or death pension is generally the date the claim is received by the Veterans' Administration; but in the case of a disability claim filed within 1 year of discharge the pension may be awarded from discharge, and if a death claim is filed within 1 year from date of death, pension is payable from the date of death.

Except in cases of soldiers transferred by the Army to a Veterans' Administration facility, the applicant should file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' service organization.

Claims of soldiers discharged for hospitalization: Under interagency agreement when a person who is to be discharged from military service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportunity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data and to send the veteran to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. (Cf. A. R. 615–360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943.) If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

Upon death in service, the service department notifies the Veterans' Administration, and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

Groups potentially eligible for pensions: All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy.

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was not in the active service, and the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees' compensation. Legislation has been enacted making the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps components eligible potentially for pension benefits (Public Law No. 183, 78th Cong., approved November 8, 1943). The Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard is still subject to laws pertaining to employees' compensation, but legislation is pending to correct this inequality.

Awards to date: As indicated by the chart on page 2, pension payments to veterans of World War No. 2, or their dependents, total $9,656,811.72 to August 31, 1943.

II. REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation essentially consists in physical, and in some cases mental repair, plus, in the case of those with handicaps arising from service disability, vocational training.

(A) Medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care

1. Persons entitled to medical treatment, hospital treatment, prosthetic appliances, and domiciliary care: Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, having a service incurred disability requiring such care, treatment or appliance, or who has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment.

2. Persons entitled to hospital or domiciliary care, contingent upon availability of facilities: Any veteran of the present war, not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expenses therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service.

3. Service groups included: All components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the respective Women's Reserves thereof.

4. Facilities available: The Veterans' Administration maintains 93 facilities, and has

contract facilities, with a total of 87,721 beds distributed as follows (as of October 21, 1943):

Tuberculosis	5,696
Neuropsychiatric	38,279
General medical and surgical	22,330
Domiciliary	18,456
Contract—other governmental	2,615
State and private	345
Total	87,721

Diagnostic centers, with expert specialists available are maintained at: Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif., and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer Clinics—Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg., and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans' Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until long after the war or require the eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds, since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

5. Claims and numbers hospitalized: Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits and necessary clinical and service data accompany him or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office—one or more in each State in the Union except Delaware.

As shown by the attached chart, 25,901 veterans of World War No. 2 have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration to September 30, 1943, and 7,799 remained in Veterans' Administration facilities as of September 30, 1943.

6. Domiciliary care: While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

(B) Vocational rehabilitation

1. Entitlement and scope of program: Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, provides:

(1) That any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war;

(2) And who was honorably discharged;

(3) And who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; and

(4) Who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

Immediately following the passage of that legislation there was created in the Veterans' Administration a Vocational Rehabilitation Service composed of three divisions, namely, the Vocational Advisement Division, the Training into Employment Division, and the Research Division. The planning and control functions created by the administration of this act are exercised in the central office of the Veterans' Administration. All operations, including determinations of need for training, vocational advisement, induction into training, supervision, as well as the selection of training facilities, are functions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in that facility of the Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides. There are 53 such facilities. These facilities are, generally speaking, bound by State boundary lines. In a few States there is more than one facility. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability." In performing the functions imposed upon this Administration by Public Law No. 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been satisfactorily accomplished through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

2. Monetary benefits while in training: While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $80 per month, if single; $90 per month if married, with $5 additional for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

3. Service groups potentially entitled: All persons presently in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the Women's Army Corps, are potentially entitled to this benefit. The Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps are included for this benefit since the approval of Public Law No. 183, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved November 8, 1943. There is legislation pending in the Congress which would include for entitlement the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, not now entitled because of the fact that they are not, under existing statutes, entitled to pension.

4. Applications and approval of training: The program has been initiated and applications for vocational rehabilitation are being received from those who have been discharged from the armed forces. It will be observed that entitlement is contingent upon an award of pension or retirement pay. Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed, and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension, which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

III. INSURANCE

(A) National service life insurance

1. Persons eligible for insurance: Any man or woman in the active service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Women's Army Reserve, and the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard may apply for not less than $1,000 and not more than $10,000 national service life insurance without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter any such person may apply if application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

2. Applications, payment of premiums, and issuance of policies: Application forms are supplied the service departments and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

3. Coverage and types of policies: The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow (widower), child (including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated by the insured), parent (including person in loco parentis), brother and sister of the insured; and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

4. Conversion: After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

5. Automatic (gratuitous) insurance: In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

6. Number of policies, amount of insurance, and payments: As of October 30, 1943, over 12,306,342 applications had been received, representing a total amount of nearly $82,557,524,500 of insurance. The average policy is approximately $7,115; the average coverage per life approximately $8,000.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries which may be designated by the insured only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly installments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured.

For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example,

monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55–$55.10; $22.50–$45; $26.95–$53.90; $34.05–$68.10; and $42.55–$85.10.

NOTE.—All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be received from the nearest Veterans' Administration Facility.

(b) *Government (converted) insurance*

This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government (converted) insurance combined.

(c) *Insurance premiums guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, amendment of 1942*

Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said act, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash-surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

As of September 30, 1943, 60,108 applications with insurance totaling $148,343,247.70 have been approved and premiums guaranteed.

IV. GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained, in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

V. VETERANS' BENEFITS UNDER OTHER LAWS

Allotments and allowances—War and Navy Departments—Domiciliary care: United States Soldiers' Home, War Department; naval home, Navy Department. (This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans' Administration.)

Employment: Return to job after discharge, Selective Service; placing in other jobs, War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference, United States Civil Service Commission; job training, rehabilitation (non-service disability), Federal Security.

(The Veterans' Administration cooperates fully in all these functions.)

Insurance: Old age and survivors, Social Security; unemployment, Social Security; retirement, Railroad Retirement Board.

Retirement pay: Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. (For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment, and Reserve components of Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.)

Taxes: Bureau of Internal Revenue. (All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation.)

The foregoing outlines in brief form the benefits available to those serving during the present war and their dependents. Monetary benefits to veterans and dependents based upon wartime service-connected disabilities are the same for all wars and for those where disabilities resulted from service during peacetime which was extra-hazardous, including service under conditions simulating war. Rates of pension for service-connected disabilities incurred or aggravated in peacetime service are approximately 75 percent of wartime rates. Veterans of all wars are entitled to hospitalization and domiciliary care based upon service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities, and peacetime veterans if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty or if in receipt of pension for service-connected disability. Service pensions have been provided for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, and their widows and children. Pension of $40 monthly is afforded veterans of World War No. 1 who are permanently and totally disabled, subject to an income limitation. Compensation has been provided for widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1 whose deaths were not service connected but who at time of death had a service-connected disability. Yearly renewable term, automatic, and United States Government life insurance were made available for World War No. 1 veterans, and until the enactment of the National Service Life Insurance Act of October 8, 1940, United States Government life insurance was available to persons in the active service in peacetime. Since that date national service life insurance has been available during active service.

The War Bond Honor Flag

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the fourteenth naval district, with headquarters at Pearl Harbor, received on November 11 the War Bond Honor Flag for a record in support of this aspect of the war effort that deserves more than passing attention.

The flag was presented by Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, in behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral Nimitz pointed out that during the past 3 months the fourteenth naval district had stood first in all naval districts in total bond purchases.

Since the war started, the men and women of this district have put more than $25,000,000 into War bonds.

The award of this flag is made only to naval activities in which 90 percent or more of the employees reserve at least 10 percent of their payroll for the purchase of War Savings bonds. It is therefore an honor that carries with it real sacrifice.

This is but one evidence of the magnificent contribution to the war effort being made by the men—there are women on the staff, too—of the Pearl Harbor Naval Base.

The record of what they have done in the rehabilitation and repair of stricken ships is one that must be reserved for the future for reasons of national security, but it can be said for the present that it will reflect to the everlasting credit of those individuals involved and particularly to the able men under whom this work has been done.

The people who are working close to the scene of the Pacific offensive accept, without complaint, restrictions and not a few discomforts that they do not so much as mention, in the face of the first-hand knowledge that comes to them every day, of the enormous sacrifices being made by the men who are carrying the fight to the enemy in the Pacific.

I believe that the record of the bond purchases is fine evidence of the keen appreciation they hold for the heroic efforts of the men who wear our country's uniform. The fine spirit with which they are carrying on their work is one which I am sure is deserving of the appreciation of people throughout the country.

The record of the award of the War Bond Honor Flag is contained in a clipping from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of November 11, which follows:

"This war is a fight to the finish. It is a struggle which will shape the entire future, not only of the Pacific area, but of the world."

In emphasizing this point today, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, told how the purchase of War bonds is now and will continue to hasten the Allied nations toward victory.

He spoke at ceremonies at noon in front of the administration building, Pearl Harbor Navy Yard, before presenting the Secretary of the Navy's War-bond honor flag to the fourteenth naval district.

The flag, presented to Vice Admiral Robert L. Ghormley, United States Navy, commandant of the fourteenth naval district and Hawaiian frontier, was awarded in recognition of War bond purchases by officers and men and civilian employees of the district.

Since the war started this group has invested more than $25,000,000 "in the future of the Nation," as Admiral Nimitz put it.

Admiral Ghormley, in turn, presented the honor flag to Mrs. Eleanor M. Ashman, of the Kaneohe naval air station, and to Brown Simmons of the marine air station at Ewa, who represented the two activities with the highest efficiency rating in the bond program.

The presentation was a colorful feature of Armistice Day, and members of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars who are navy yard employees took part in the ceremonies.

NOT LIGHTLY BESTOWED

Admiral Nimitz' address in part, follows:

"Today I have the honor to represent the Secretary of the Navy in the award to the fourteenth naval district of the War bond honor flag.

"This award is not lightly bestowed, nor is it easy to win. The Secretary's flag is given only to naval activities in which 90 percent or more of the employees reserve at least 10 percent of their total pay roll for the purchase of War Savings bonds.

"Nor is this flag easy to keep. Your good record must be maintained if you wish to retain the right to fly the Secretary's flag. If, at any time, pay-roll reservations decline below the 90 and 10 level, the flag comes down.

"You civilian workers of the Navy are close to the Pacific battle lines. You have noted the great increase in the Navy's fighting strength, and have seen this strength used against the enemy at many points.

CANNOT AFFORD LET DOWN

"But we can afford no let down in our service, lest we be obliged to relinquish some of the gains we have already made, nor can we relax our efforts in buying War bonds if we wish to preserve our gains.

"None of us whose duties lie in the Pacific need to be reminded that this war is a fight to the finish. It is a struggle which will shape the entire future, not only of the Pacific area, but of the world.

"To us is given the privilege of serving in the forefront of that struggle. To each is given an appointed task. You have done yours well. The work of your hands and hearts and minds has hastened us on the way to victory.

"Your monthly purchases of bonds are now 30 times more than they were in November 1941. During the last 3 months the fourteenth naval district has stood first among all naval districts in total purchases. Since the war started, you have invested more than $25,000,000 in the future of the Nation.

"A quarter century has elapsed since that November 11 which all of you veterans of the First World War so vividly recall. Beginnings of a new victory for the Allied arms can now be seen.

"And now, Admiral Ghormley, I have the honor to present to you in the name of the Secretary of the Navy, Col. Frank Knox, the War bond honor flag. My heartiest congratulations to you and to the personnel of your district."

FLAG IS ACCEPTED

Accepting the flag, Admiral Ghormley said, in part:

"On behalf of the fourteenth naval district, I accept, with great pleasure, the Secretary of the Navy's War bond honor flag.

"No more fitting time for this presentation could have been chosen than Armistice Day. We honor those who made that armistice possible along with those who are responsible for this occasion.

"The following individual activities have already been awarded or are qualified to receive the Secretary's War bond minute man pennant:

"Naval air station, Kaneohe; Marine Corps air station, Ewa; naval air station, Pearl Harbor; naval ammunition depot, Lualualei; naval hospitals, Aiea and Pearl Harbor; naval air station, Puunene, Maui; naval air station, Barber's Point.

"They deserve topmost credit for winning the honor flag.

REPRESENTS SACRIFICES

"This flag represents many sacrifices—sacrifices that will continue to be made by the civilian personnel of the fourteenth naval district. It represents coordination of effort of workers with our armed forces.

"I now hand this flag to Mrs. Eleanor M. Ashman of the Kaneohe naval air station and Brown Simmons of the marine air station at Ewa, who represent the two activities with the highest efficiency rating in the bond program.

"This flag is an inspiration to all of us to continue our efforts until the last dictator has disappeared from this earth."

Work of the Southern Region, Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the work of the southern region, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1943, by Joseph C. Kircher, regional forester:

The southern region of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, was organized on July 1, 1934. This region includes 11 Southern States and its headquarters are in Atlanta, Ga., from which all the Forest Service activities of the South, except research, are handled. Forest research in the South is concentrated in two main forest experiment stations at Asheville, N. C., and New Orleans, La., and a number of branch stations throughout the States.

The southern region has two broad activities: 1. Cooperating with the various States for the protection of State and private forest lands from fire, assistance in forest planting on such lands, and advice to farmers and others in the management of their woodlands. 2. Buying forest lands for national forests and protecting and developing the national forests.

The cooperative activities consist largely of giving financial assistance to the States in forestry matters, planning the projects with the States, and inspecting them sufficiently to see that the Federal funds are efficiently spent. Funds spent by the Federal Government for this purpose in the southern region during the past fiscal year are as follows:

Cooperative fire protection	$1,427,128
Planting forest trees	32,198
Forest-management assistance	52,013
Assistance to farmers in woodland management	43,600
Total	1,554,939

In general these funds are matched by the States. They are spent on private lands and while the Federal Government receives no direct financial returns, its dollars are in reality returned manyfold through such intangible public benefits as undamaged forests leading to larger pay rolls, community stabilization, and other public benefits.

The second activity, that is, the building up and management of the national forests is different. Here the Government has direct control over forest lands it has purchased, some with remnants of timber on them, others with little or nothing. These lands are being rehabilitated. Immediately upon purchase, a system of fire control was established and the timber and other resources were developed. This work, which started in the South in a small way in 1912, has grown to where these southern national forests now contain 9,082,000 acres, all under first-class forest management.

One of the greatest forces in the past decade in developing these forests was the Civilian Conservation Corps. These boys planted millions of trees, extinguished thousands of fires, opened up the forest through road, telephone line, and other construction. Through them the forest conservation movement was advanced many years.

Now, what has all this led to? It has meant first that the 9,000,000 acres of national forests in the South had been made accessible and were being well protected. Then it meant, also, that a lot of timber was being protected against fire and was rapidly growing into useful and merchantable products. It was particularly fortunate that the Government had developed these forests sufficiently when the war began to allow them to contribute some forest products to the war effort.

The Forest Service is not in the lumber business on the national forests. It grows timber and sells the trees on the stump when ripe for private industry to log and manufacture into lumber and other useful forest products. It handles these forests on what foresters call a sustained-yield basis, that is, it allows trees to be cut only when defective or mature and the cut is never more than the growth. In this way these forests not only continue to produce timber year after year but they become more valuable as time goes on and form the basis for permanent local industries.

In the fiscal year just closed, the southern national forests contributed 246,000,000 board feet of forest products to industry largely for war use. In addition, the Forest Service did this in the southern region during the past fiscal year without cost to the taxpayers as shown by the following financial statement:

Financial statement, region 8, national forests, fiscal year 1943

	Total	Cents per acre
Operating expenses:		
Protection	$767,674	8.4
Operating	652,089	7.2
Maintenance	527,545	5.8
Total	1,947,308	21.4
25 percent to States	379,871	4.2
Total	2,327,179	25.6
Profit	67,216	.7
Grand total	2,394,395	
Receipts:		
Timber	1,762,521	19.4
Grazing and lands	52,145	.6
Cooperative work	63,297	.7
Exchanges	504,411	5.6
Other collections	12,021	.1
Total	2,394,395	26.4
Expenses, forests	1,638,539	18.0
Expenses, regional office	308,769	3.4
Total	1,947,308	21.4

Industry Hoarding Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance and hesitancy that I criticize our National Selective Service System with special reference to industrial deferments. I wish that instead I were rising in a spirit of national unity to criticize our ruthless Axis enemies who are primarily responsible for our present dilemma.

Months ago leaders of this Nation proclaimed the manpower problem as the biggest issue confronting our country. The Congress and public opinion agreed. In an address delivered before the Adjutant Generals' Association, Columbus, Ohio, on June 22, 1943, Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, said:

The most critical problem confronting our world today is the best use of the manpower of the United States. A survey of the factories shows an alarming shortage of labor today. At the rate men are being called to serve in the armed forces, the shortage in the near future will reach a critical stage. We have no time to waste; we have no men to waste—we must have the close cooperation of labor and industry if we are to win this war.

Chairman Paul McNutt and his War Manpower Commission had the No. 1 task of proper distribution and allocation of available manpower to keep the wheels of industry in full production. Statistics furnished indicated labor shortages everywhere. On April 21, 1943, the War

Manpower Commission—in addition to the Pittsburgh, Detroit, and many other industrial areas—added Des Moines, Iowa, and Pensacola, Fla., to the list of communities in which an acute labor shortage existed, making them eligible for institution of the 48-hour week. A fervent plea was made to labor and industry to give their unstinted cooperation to meet this problem, and at the same time to not interfere with the demands of the armed services for a force of 10,800,000 by the end of 1943.

As Manpower Commissioner McNutt said, "The one fixed element in allocating manpower is the requirement of the armed services." Asked whether he believed that war industry could carry on with a drastically limited number of deferments, McNutt replied, "It will have to—by using over-aged, handicapped, and minority groups, and it can join with us in breaking down prejudice against these people."

I quote Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, in his address over the Blue Network from Washington, on November 2, 1942, over a year ago:

> We are not fighting enemies whose production is free. We are fighting enemies where management is forced and where labor is forced. Both, upon pain of death, must do exactly what they are told. They are actually slaves. Forced peak production.
>
> So I ask you, all of you free men and free women, can we beat it? The answer is to be found particularly in what you men in the war production plants—management and labor—what have you done about it, now, today. I have talked to men who blame labor for lack of production. I have talked to labor leaders who blame management for lack of production. I have talked to managers who blame lack of manpower. Others blame their suppliers, etc. What have you done to settle the problem forthrightly instead of merely complaining? Have you really tried to remove the causes of just complaints against the manpower problems and working conditions in your plant?

These statements of Donald Nelson and others in authority placed this vital problem directly up to industry and labor.

The recent statement of Paul McNutt and Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, that Army quotas will require deep inroads into draft-age fathers, revived this vital issue. Deluged with many protests, I have been conducting a survey in the Pittsburgh steel industrial district to ascertain if there has been compliance with the requests and appeals of Paul McNutt, General Hershey, and Donald Nelson, for full cooperation between industry and labor.

In serious candor, I must relate to this House that industry is guilty of violating the Selective Service Act. Under the manning table—to determine the deferrable occupation of employees due for induction—wholesale replacement schedules were submitted by the major industries in the Pittsburgh industrial area to Col. R. K. Mellon, State Selective Service Director for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and with rare exceptions, the request of industry always granted. I found dozens of instances where wholesale replacement schedules included men, former employees already sworn into the Army and Navy, declared by industry to be indispensable and irreplaceable. This clearly indicated wholesale requests for deferments were brazenly being made by industry without any investigation whatsoever by the State selective-service office.

I found instances where 18-year-old youths—just out of high school—who registered for the draft one day and in a few days following were placed on replacement schedules and declared indispensable by industry.

Even though vigorous protests have been registered with the State selective service director by many draft boards and by individuals, no effort has been made by Colonel Mellon's office to sift the truth or falsity of these charges.

In one of the leading tool-steel industries in this area, hundreds of the employees have recently been placed on half-time schedules, mark you, notwithstanding this is a critical labor shortage area. Most of these men are highly skilled labor employees originally earning $80 to $100 every 2 weeks; their earnings have been reduced to $40 to $50 for 2 weeks. Yet, they cannot obtain a release from their present employment. Several of them informed me their earnings have been insufficient to maintain themselves and their families under present living costs.

Knowing these conditions to exist in the Pittsburgh steel industrial district, I appeal to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Selective Service Director, and to Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, that before they begin to disrupt American homes—the backbone of this Nation—by drafting fathers with two, three, four, and five children as has been done, they, General Hershey and Chairman McNutt, detail impartial representatives from their respective offices—whom I shall be glad to accompany into the Pittsburgh industrial area—to sift the truth or falsity of these serious allegations. If General Hershey and Chairman McNutt fail to respond, I shall submit a resolution requesting a congressional investigation. In the interest of national unity and morale this must be done.

Great Lend-Lease Balance in Favor of Britain—White Paper Reveals Huge Mutual Aid Transactions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Egyptian Mail of November 12, 1943:

GREAT LEASE-LEND BALANCE IN FAVOR OF BRITAIN—WHITE PAPER REVEALS HUGE MUTUAL AID TRANSACTIONS

LONDON, Thursday.—Britain and America have published simultaneously reciprocal declarations on lease-lend. The British Government today published a White Paper giving the first detailed report of the great contribution Britain is making to mutual aid. In Congress, President Roosevelt made his twelfth lease-lend report.

He revealed that up to June 30, 1943, the British Commonwealth had contributed about $1,171,000,000 (£292,000,000) to the defense of the United States through reverse lease-lend supplies and services.

Of this amount, he said, the United Kingdom has expended about $871,000,000 (£217,000,000), and Australia, New Zealand, and India approximately $300,000,000 (£75,000,000).

The British White Paper revealed that up to the middle of this year, payments made by the United Kingdom to other members of the United Nations, in excess of the sums received from them, amounted to the enormous sum of £2,250,000,000.

By the end of May, Britain had sent to Russia 4,690 complete aircraft—including losses in transit—under lease-lend arrangements.

One cruiser, seventeen corvettes, fourteen destroyers, and six submarines are among the large number of naval vessels loaned to the Allies by Britain.

MUTUAL AID

While the United States lease-lend to Britain is mainly in the form of contracts placed in bulk and supplies transferred in bulk, Britain's reciprocal aid is mainly in provision of services and a wide variety of items transferred in the daily course of war, such as provision of transport, accommodation of airfields, and other services.

Britain has opened a route across Persia to carry supplies to Russia and also sends large quantities of materials by the dangerous northern route.

Arms are being supplied to China, but transport difficulties restrict the flow. Chinese forces in India have been given all requirements on lease-lend terms.

FREE SUPPLIES

The bulk of supplies made to the European allies are made available free.

The nature of Britain's aid makes it difficult to measure the amounts, and any comparison of amounts provided by the United States and Britain merely on a money-value basis would lead to a serious underestimation of the British contribution, since United States prices are substantially higher.

Subject to these limitations, the cost to Britain of the reciprocal aid furnished to the United States is estimated at roughly £366,000,000.

This includes the total program of capital installations in Britain, which is in course of being carried out, the estimated value of work done by the end of last June, the total of goods and services transferred in Britain up to the same date, and the value of shipping services.

NOT TOTAL

This figure covers only United Kingdom transfers, services, and shipments to the United States and covers roughly 1 year, but does not include even under the above headings all aid actually furnished.

The amount supplied to Soviet Russia under Britain's lease-lend agreement was £187,000,000.

Credits to the Allies other than Russia up to the end of last year with lease-lend assistance total about £186,000,000.

Parapups

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received from my boy who is in the Air Corps what I at first took to be a letter but which turned out to be just an envelope, in which was enclosed a stained, wrinkled, folded page torn from some magazine.

While I was disappointed when I opened the envelope not to find a letter, my disappointment quickly turned into a joy softened and suppressed by tears as I read, yes, and reread the stained, wrinkled, folded page, because hidden away between the lines were several tender, touching missives from my boy about old Searge, the dog he left behind. No; my boy didn't have to write—probably his heart was too full to write—because he knew I would understand.

My colleagues, our dogs, true and faithful and brave and courageous in peace, are even more so in war, and today are playing an important part in stimulating the morale of our boys on the battle front and comforting those of us who are left behind on the home front. More than once when I have seen old Searge, with hope gleaming in his eyes, meet the car that arrived at home, eagerly wait to see if his pal got out, and when he realized that disappointment was again his portion, with a dejected look on his face, trot off behind the house. I have followed, and there with his paws resting on my breast we have stood, just meditating together as only those who understand can meditate together, and during these sacred meetings somehow I have always felt that our thoughts paralleled, that our hearts beat as one, and that we offered common prayers to a common and understanding God.

Something tells me that all war mothers and fathers who read the stained, wrinkled, folded page that I received from my boy, and which I am going to incorporate in my remarks, will treat the dogs their soldier boys left behind a little better, perhaps let them sneak into the house now and then and curl up on the bed the boy in khaki no longer uses, hang around the table as they did when their pals were at home eagerly awaiting the bone that a deft and skillful hand never failed to provide, and lay on the rug in front of the fire and just dream and dream and dream of the one he is missing, because I believe they will realize that old Rover, or whatever his name may be, is just as lonesome as they, and is wishing and hoping and praying just as devoutly as they for the return of their soldier boy, who, he has been trying to tell them ever since the separation, is his soldier boy, too.

And last night I answered my boy's unwritten letter, and I told him that we were taking good care of old Searge, that he was now the most important member of the family, and that though he still met all cars with hope gleaming in his eyes and then trotted around the house with the dejected look, that he was carrying on like the true American patriot that he is, and would be on hand when he returned to extend a greeting in his doggish way that would be as sincere and heartfelt as the greeting his dad will give with the big hug and kiss he is saving up for that great day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an article on Parapups written by Corey Ford and Alastair MacBain:

PARAPUPS

(By Corey Ford and Alastair MacBain)

WITH THE UNITED STATES ARMY AIR FORCES SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND.—They're going to miss Slips at this bomber base. Slipstream is his real name, but the pilots call him Slips. It could be a tribute to his ancestors' romantic lapses in the past, for Slips is part collie, part police dog, part Scotty, and the rest G. I. floor mop. His left ear lops over and his right one sticks straight out; he has a corkscrew tail, a protruding lower lip like Mayor LaGuardia's, and one brown and one yellow eye; he trots flat-footed, skidding stiffly around a corner on three legs when he races to meet an incoming plane.

Slips meets all the planes, you see. He never misses a ship that lands at the field. He was down on the line when our plane arrived, tail wagging in anticipation. One searching glance, one sniff at our uniforms, and his tail dropped, the eager light went out of his eyes, he wandered away with dull disappointment written on his absurd face. "Not very friendly?" we asked.

"It isn't that." The pilot shrugged. "He thought you might be Chad."

"Chad?"

"Went down over Hamburg last month. Slips was his dog. He still meets every plane, just in case."

Nobody remembers how Slips and Chad acquired each other. Probably it was the usual story: A rainy night, a scratch at the door of the mission hut, a whine; or else a sergeant gunner found him outside a village pub and brought him home on the handle bars of his bicycle; or else he was slinking around the mess hall, ribs sticking out, and Chad saw him. It happens all the time. We have no idea how many stray dogs there were in England when our forces arrived here, but one thing we're sure of—they're all living at the American bases by now. Today every squadron in the Eighth Air Force owns a dog, or every dog owns a squadron—owns it completely; what's more, comes and goes at will, wipes his muddy feet on any cot in the barracks, eats the prize tidbits in the packages from home, sleeps on a fleece-lined flying jacket beside the stove, is fought over, and spoiled the way only an Army dog can be spoiled.

There's something about a soldier and a stray dog. They belong together. Dogs prefer a pair of khaki pants and G. I. shoes to trot beside. They obviously love parades; the first notes of assembly will bring pups scurrying from every corner of the field. The rifles, the creak of leather, the rough male outdoor life is their idea of heaven. Dogs—real dogs, that is—don't go for cushions and soft rugs and ferns; that's for cats; dogs go for rumpled blankets, and being mauled, and ordered around and having their ears pulled or their stomachs rubbed, and sitting up with an all-night poker session waiting for the bone from a pilfered pork chop sizzling on the barracks stove at midnight. And, in turn, a soldier has something in common with a dog; maybe it's the essential homelessness of them both. When your whole personal world is a cot and a foot locker and 6 square feet of barracks floor, you and a dog depend on each other. That's what makes a real team: not a trotting-ahead-of-you-on-a-leash relationship, but the kind of team that shares out of the same mess kit, or marches together 20 miles on maneuvers, or coils up on the ground and sleeps, rain or shine. (That's one thing they have in common—soldiers and dogs can sleep anywhere.) A team like Slips and Chad.

And they do everything the flyers do, these adopted pups of the Air Forces. They show up for early-morning briefings, go aloft on practice hops, even fly combat missions over enemy territory when space and an indulgent C. O. permits. They have proper identification disks—dog tags, of course—and standard photographs for their badges. They have their own oxygen masks to wear over their muzzles at altitudes; and when they're cold they paw at the back of a crouching tail-gunner and snuggle inside his electrically heated flying suit for warmth. They even have their own parachutes, in case they have to bail out. There's Salvo, for instance, an air-wise fox terrier with over 300 flying hours to his credit. Salvo's a full-fledged parapup. His owner, Lt. Hugh Fletcher, of Cleveland, rigged for him a specially constructed miniature chute, tested for 25 pounds, with a 60-inch canopy and a static line for positive opening; and recently Salvo made a spectacularly successful test jump, landing without bruises or scratches. In fact, Lieutenant Fletcher says that Salvo loved it. Maintains he's the only dog in history ever to approach a tree from the top.

Or there's Recon, a 10-month-old Scotty owned by a waist-gunner from Texas. The gunner is a staff sergeant, and Recon has three chevrons and a single rocker clipped in the fur of his left foreleg. ("He's bucking for tech now," his owner adds.) Recon had completed five missions, and was in line for an Air Medal when he ran into trouble on his sixth raid. The Fort's engines caught fire over the Channel, and they had to ditch. The sergeant grabbed Recon under one arm, inflated his Mae West, and jumped into the drink. Recon never moved a muscle, he says; just clung patiently to his master's shoulder while he swam to the bobbing rubber dinghy, already filled with survivors. The raft was too crowded for them both, so the sergeant hoisted the pup aboard and stayed in the water himself, clinging to the rim of the raft until the air-sea rescue squad picked them up. The crew's having insignia made for Recon now. It's a Scotty's head in the center of a pair of silver wings.

A HOUND IS NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS

Or there is Steelwool, the dirty gray Spitz who belongs to a ground-crew chief, and who defends her plane vigorously against any trespassers, including on one occasion the commanding officer of the field. At least, the crew chief says, he hasn't had a wrench or screw driver borrowed without permission since Steelwool took over. Then there's G. I. Joe, the amiable Irish setter who is the mascot of a heavy bomber, and who astounded the entire crew while flying on a practice mission at 5,000 feet by giving birth to a handsome litter of seven pups in an empty ammunition box.

Or Propwash—but we don't expect you to believe the story of Prop. Prop is a brown-eyed and floppy-eared hound of sorts, and she belongs to a captain in the Eighth Fighter Command. Now, fighter planes are notoriously lacking in roominess, and there is no safe place to stow a pup; so Prop was trained to stay on the ground while her master was aloft. Prop obeyed implicity; nothing could

budge her from the pilots' ready room until the captain returned. Until one day, just before the squadron was due back from a sweep over France, when Prop rose, to everyone's amazement, and bolted through the door and disappeared. It was a full 20 minutes later that word reached the field that a plane had crashed in a nearby wood, and the pilot had bailed out; and it was another hour before the searching parties discovered the captain sitting beside his parachute with a broken leg. But how Propwash happened to be sitting there beside him lapping his face possessively, how she had known he was in trouble, and how she had found her way to his side, is something that nobody at the field can tell. Nobobdy but Prop.

There's no way of estimating the number of these Air Force pups. There's no way of estimating their value, for that matter. Said one C. O. whose bomber base was rapidly approaching the proportions of a dog pound: "One thing I know, I never have to worry about the boys' morale as long as I see a few dogs around." Rain, cold, missions scrubbed day after day, lack of mail, monotonous food, even losses in battle are more easily borne when there is a pup around the mission hut to fool with and tumble over on its back, and pull its ears. A pup like Slipstream.

It's going to be a little hard to let Slips go. Somehow he's become a fixture here at the base, waiting day after day on the line as the planes land; but they know how much Slips meant to Chad. They know the letters Chad used to write to his wife back in Oklahoma City, letters that always ended with: "Slips sends his best regards" and a muddy paw print at the bottom of the page. "Slips says he enjoyed the crackers you sent." "P. S. Would write more but Slips upset the ink." The night before that mission over Hamburg he wrote: "Don't worry if anything ever happens; Slips will take care of you okay." So they're building a little crate now, and one of the Transport Command pilots is going to smuggle Slips across the ocean and a couple of days later he'll be in Oklahoma City.

Flyers are inarticulate. It's hard for Chad's crew to tell Chad's wife how they feel, but they figure Slips can do it. Sometimes dogs can talk better than people.

Milk for New England Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include resolutions adopted by a group of agricultural officials and dairy leaders that met in Boston, November 19, 1943, to discuss the present milk shortage and consider steps to be taken to meet the situation.

The meeting was called by Hon. E. H. Jones, commissioner of agriculture of Vermont, and included commissioners of agriculture, representatives of milk-control boards, and the principal cooperative milk-producer associations of New England.

The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas prices of fluid milk have been kept frozen, while no successful effort has been made to control the cost of labor, feed, and other items entering into the cost of producing milk; and

Whereas the wages of labor and the price of feed have continued to advance, while the quality of labor and feed supplies available has seriously declined; and

Whereas prices of fluid milk have been kept low in relation to prices for livestock and other farm products, and low in relation to the levels of industrial wages; and

Whereas dairy farmers can no longer compete for the labor and the feed required to maintain the production of milk; and

Whereas the Price Control Act, as amended, provides that adjustments "shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity" where necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes or to reflect increased labor or other costs incurred since January 1, 1941; and

Whereas adjustments in ceiling prices for milk and its products, in accordance with the provisions of the Price Control Act, as amended, have been nullified and prevented by Executive decree; and

Whereas the supply of milk available in the principal milk markets of New England is now from 15 to 20 percent below the fluid-milk requirements of those markets, and similar conditions prevail throughout the Northeast, affecting the fluid-milk supply of around 40,000,000 consumers; and

Whereas failure to provide adequate prices to dairy farmers is certain to cause a far more severe shortage of milk and dairy products in the coming year than anything we have yet experienced; and

Whereas the temporary 3 months' subsidy program is completely inadequate to cover the increased costs of producing milk, or to insure a continued supply of fluid milk to consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved:

1. That an immediate increase of at least 93 cents per hundredweight in the price paid to producers for fluid milk in New England is necessary to cover the increased costs already incurred in producing milk, and to maintain the supply of fluid milk in New England;

2. We are opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of adequate prices for milk and its products;

3. We urge the Governors and the Members of Congress representing New England to use every means within their power to insure adequate prices to protect and maintain the supply of fluid milk, and to cooperate with Governors and Congressional delegates of other States in the Northeast where similar conditions exist.

Resolved, That the ceiling price for corn on the Chicago basis be raised to a level equivalent to the feeding value of corn used for hog production, in order to restore a normal flow of corn into New England.

Present and approving the above resolutions: E. H. Jones, commissioner of agriculture, Vermont; Andrew L. Felker, commissioner of agriculture, New Hampshire; Carl W. Smith, commissioner of agriculture, Maine; Dr. R. G. Bressler, commissioner of agriculture, Rhode Island; Martyn B. Kenney, New Hampshire Milk Control Board; J. C. Cort, Massachusetts Milk Control Board; Lester T. Tompkins, Massachusetts department of agriculture; Donald P. Corbett, Maine department of agriculture; W. P. Davis, New England Milk Producers' Association; C. W. Swonger, New England Milk Producers' Association; George H. Thompson, Bellows Falls Cooperative; Howard W. Selby, United Farmers' Cooperative; Paul B. Beck, New England Dairies; Carl A. Smith, Manchester dairy system; Dr. H. P. Young, Northern Farms Cooperative; N. A. Emerson, Northern Farms Cooperative; M. E. Knapp, Maine Dairymen's Association; C. L. Hamlen, St. Albans Cooperative; Ken Geyer, Connecticut Milk Producers' Association.

NOVEMBER 19, 1943.

Statement of James L. Monnahan, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. James L. Monnahan, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on October 14.

Mr. Monnahan is devoting his entire time to the welfare of disabled war veterans, and I need not say that he has done a splendid job of it. Whatever he has to say in behalf of those who have become disabled in the service of their country is worthy of our sympathetic consideration, as he speaks from long experience and an understanding heart.

Commander Monnahan's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and honored members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, your courtesy in arranging for this special meeting of your worthy committee to enable the national commanders of the major veteran organizations to make brief statements concerning our respective objectives is indeed much appreciated, as is also the cordial cooperation that you have extended to the D. A. V., and its representatives, in your consideration of the legislative proposals which our organization has heretofore submitted to you.

Inasmuch as our organization's congressional charter permits only those American citizens who have been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it during time of war, to become members of the Disabled American Veterans, it is but natural that we are particularly interested in those problems which pertain to service-connected and service-connectable disabled veterans, and their dependents. We feel convinced that the average American will agree with our contention that, since first things should come first, adequate legislation on behalf of service-disabled veterans, and their dependents, is a primary obligation of the Nation.

Most Americans have assumed that adequate legislation on behalf of those war veterans who have been disabled by reason of their service, and for their dependents, has already been legally provided for, and that it has been administered equitably. If such were actually the case, there would be no reason for the continued existence of the Nation-wide service set-up maintained by the

Disabled American Veterans. Incidentally, may I advise the committee that, although the D. A. V. is naturally the smaller of the so-called major veteran organizations, but the largest of the so-called smaller veteran organizations, it maintains a larger staff of nationally paid national service officers in the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country than is true as to any other organization except the American Red Cross. Moreover, the D. A. V. is striving to establish full time service officers in all of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, and finally in all of its other facilities, throughout the country, just as quickly as our increasing membership and finances may make that possible.

Through long experience we have found it advisable to have expert service officers to assist deserving disabled veterans in the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their equitable claims, because we have found that justice is not automatically dealt out and that entitlement to benefits provided for by law must be established by factual proof, which is frequently very difficult, if not impossible, for a worthy claimant to procure.

Our national service officers' day-by-day contacts with claimants have also enabled them to discover many inadequacies, inequalities and inequities in the basic laws extending benefits to disabled veterans and to their dependents, as evidence by the fact that this committee has found it justifiable to report out some additional beneficial legislation during every Congress since it was created and as more recently evidenced by its favorable report as to several legislative bills now pending on the Union Calendar of the House.

Probably the most perplexing problem for disabled veterans is to establish legal service connections for their service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities. In that connection, it is most regrettable that the Veterans' Administration saw fit to circumvent the liberalizations as to service connections intended by the directive legislation in Public Law No. 361, approved December 20, 1941, as the result of a bill which had emanated from this committee. We of the D. A. V. feel that it is, therefore, incumbent upon this committee to see to it that the intent of Public Law No. 361 is finally effectuated, if necessary by the enactment of such a bill as H. R. 706, which would provide for the decentralized adjudication of claims, without reference to the central office of the Veterans' Administration, under the liberalizing considerations set forth in Public Law 361, with the right, after final denial by the Veterans' Administration, to bring suit in a Federal district court to determine the question. If this legislation were enacted, we feel quite certain that very few suits would actually result and that the Veterans' Administration would then comply with the real intent of Congress as expressed in Public, 361, that service connections should be granted by local rating boards.

This matter is of such great importance because of the fact that the technical denial of hundreds or thousands of equitable claims inevitably has, following each previous war in which the United States has been engaged, led to an overwhelming demand for the enactment of a general pension system, based upon degree of disability, or age, without any requirement as to service connection.

Service connected disabled veterans ought certainly to be treated on a more liberal basis than should be the case as to veterans suffering with similar non-service-connected disabilities. We agree with the oft-repeated statement of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Gen. Frank T. Hines, that the roll of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration should be "an honor roll," but it will be an honor roll only if they are adequately compensated for loss sustained by reason of service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities, as well as for the dependents of the service disabled and of those who have died because of service disabilities.

These beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries are not now so adequately compensated. Particularly is this true as to those who have dependents, and as to those who are totally disabled. No dependency allowances are payable to veterans who receive compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings, and, therefore, it is safe to estimate that about 99 percent of them receive no allowances for their dependent wives and children, although the principle of providing dependency allowances was established several years ago as to old-age insurance benefits paid by the Social Security Board, is now being applied by the Veterans' Administration as to its vocational trainees, and is even more generously applied as to those now serving actively in the armed forces.

Obviously, a disabled veteran, who has a wife and children to provide for, cannot maintain the same standard of living, on the basis of the same amount of compensation or pension, as he could if single. The increasing cost of living has, therefore, been particularly "tough" on those compensated or pensioned disabled veterans who have dependents, and their only recourse, where they have not been able to supplement their pension income by gainful employment—which is certainly the case as to all those who are totally disabled, and as to those whose partial disabilities have rendered them unemployable—has been to reduce their standards of living, for themselves and their growing children, proportionately with the increase in the cost of living.

The proper remedy for this would be to provide substantial dependency allowances for all veterans receiving compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings. Our neighboring country to the north, I understand, provides that its totally disabled veterans receive $25 for the first dependent, $15 for the second, $12 for the third, and $10 for each additional dependent.

On the basis of the present basic rating for totally disabled veterans, they cannot possibly maintain themselves and their families on a decent existence level, and, as a matter of fact, would no doubt require about twice as much compensation to provide a fair American standard of living.

In addition to dependency allowances for all disabled veterans rated as permanently disabled, totally or partially, all compensation and pension payments should be increased by about the same percentage as the percentage of increase in the cost of living, as compared with the basic period immediately preceding our entry into this war, so that the beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration might thereby be provided with a constant purchasing power. The formula that we suggested in H. R. 1111, still before this committee, would have so provided, whereas the bill already reported out by this committee, H. R. 3356, only partially so provides.

The D. A. V. believes that many of the basic ratings of compensation or pension for disabled veterans, or their dependents, should also be increased, and that our proposed 10-percent increase in all compensation or pension payments for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living should be in addition to any increased basic ratings.

The widows of service-connected death cases ought to be increased to $60 per month, whereas the widows of those who, at time of death, were suffering from service-connected disabilities, but who died by reason of some other disability, ought to be increased to $50 per month, with the elimination of the present income limitations.

There ought to be a uniform definition as to what constitutes a widow for all death pension purposes.

The so-called presumptive service connected, and the single hospitalized veterans, ought to be restored to full compensation bases.

Veterans who have been wounded or gassed ought to be provided with a minimum rating of 10 percent.

Basic ratings for service-connected disabled ought to be increased by 20 percent for each 5 years of age, over the age of 40.

Permanent and total disability ought to be determined upon the basis of each individual's inability to follow a substantially gainful occupation, rather than on the basis of average inability.

The so-called misconduct bar as to entitlement to compensation or pension, where otherwise entitled, ought to be completely removed, such as has long been the case as to veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Government life-insurance policies ought to be made incontestable after 1 year, accompanied by a return of all premiums paid on policies canceled.

Insurance protection as to permanent and total disability ought to be provided for as to all Government insurance policies.

Permanent total disability insurance protection should be guaranteed as to veterans who have received 240 or more monthly installments of insurance benefits.

Several liberalizations as to national service life insurance granted to the servicemen of World War No. 2 have long been in order.

The pension payable to war veterans suffering with permanent and total non-service-connected disabilities, now at the rate of $40 per month, ought to be standardized with the amount payable to Spanish-American War veterans, now $60 per month, and those so pensioned ought to receive some extra additional allowance by reason of their service-connected disabilities, as would be provided for respectively by the enactment of H. R. 1370 and by H. R. 918, introduced by Mr. RANKIN, the honorable chairman of this committee.

A conscientious effort ought to be made to bring about greater uniformity as to the basis of payments to various similar classifications of disabled veterans, and their dependents, for the present very complicated system is very much in need of being further liberalized, standardized, and codified.

Although, as I understand, this committee does not have any jurisdiction concerning the matter, may I here express the conviction of the D. A. V. that all service-connected partially disabled veterans ought to be extended effective preferences for all governmental employment for which they may be qualified and for which they make application. Your committee, however, does have before it a very important bill, H. R. 2950, introduced by the chairman of this committee, which could do more than any other one measure to help service-connected disabled veterans to obtain and to retain suitable employment, by charging the Veterans' Administration with the responsibility (1) of placing disabled veterans in gainful employment; (2) for providing suitable vocational rehabilitation for all service-connected handicapped disabled veterans and, most important of all, (3) for requiring the Veterans' Administration to reimburse any private employer, private insurance company, or State Workmen's Compensation Fund for any loss sustained by reason of the operation of any State workmen's compensation act, so far as any service-connected disabled veteran is concerned.

It is unfortunate that there is not now any one congressional committee, or any one public or private agency that has assumed the responsibility of correlating the proposals of

all of the national veteran organizations and formulating plans for the post-war period as to veterans, and particularly disabled veterans, and their integration back into useful civilian life. Additional legislation designed to facilitate their readjustments after discharge from service should soon be formulated and enacted into law.

Disabled veterans throughout the Nation are eagerly awaiting the recommendations of this committee, fully realizing that as the result of your deliberations additional bills may be favorably reported and thereafter passed by the two Houses of Congress, for which there is a great need.

We feel confident that this committee will do all in its power to accomplish these ends, so that America's disabled veterans, and their dependents, may not be called upon to suffer the disillusionment of what would appear to be a Nation's ingratitude, and so that young Americans called upon to serve in our Nation's armed forces may be further assured that, if they should return with disabilities, or should die while in service, they and their dependents will be adequately provided for.

America's adequate care for its disabled defenders, and their dependents, is not only of vital importance to the individuals affected, but to their respective communities and, in the final analysis, to our fellow Americans and to America.

Ammunition for the Sheep and Cattle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, out in Montana our ranchers and stockmen need more ammunition to overcome the depredations of predatory animals. Our people have suffered the loss of much livestock because of this lack. Now, with the Government closing down some of its ordnance plants, it would seem that this lack of ammunition could be overcome by once again permitting the manufacture of needed rifle and shotgun shells in sufficiently large enough quantities to satisfy our needs. This is a serious situation with my people, and its importance cannot be underestimated. Food—in the form of livestock—is absolutely essential to victory.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., of November 25, 1943, dealing with this matter:

SHELLS FOR CIVILIANS

Some of the Army small arms ammunition plants are being closed. Their almost incredible volume of production has resulted in a stock of ammunition ample for our needs and only a limited number of plants now operating are needed for any contingency we can foresee.

That should make it possible to permit some ammunition manufacturers a much bigger volume of production for civilians. Rifle and shotgun shells are actually needed in bigger quantity. It is not just a matter of supplying sportsmen who simply hunt for the fun of it, although they deserve consideration. But the ranchers and farmers of the country are actually hampered by the lack of ammunition in the protection of their flocks and herds.

We have evidence of that in Montana because coyotes particularly have been doing an unusual amount of damage around our ranches and many farmers and stockmen have not been able to obtain adequate supplies of ammunition with which to fight them off. The conversion of some small arms ammunition plants to civilian supplies of that type should be speeded up.

What Goes On in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over the radio on November 28, 1943:

Good afternoon: The past 10 days have been very crowded days in the House of Representatives. Mail has been quite heavy. I have received a large number of letters and telegrams urging me to vote for or against food subsidies. As so often happens, the week that mail is heavy, it is important that Members of the House remain in session for long hours. Due to the program in the House, it has been impossible to do more than acknowledge this week's mail and advise my correspondents that I would discuss the subsidy bill, and state my position on the question of consumer subsidies, during the broadcast of today, and once again I am indebted to radio station WDRC.

Last Wednesday the House of Representatives concluded debate and passed, by a vote of 278 to 117 one of the most far-reaching bills considered by Congress in a great many years. This bill was known as H. R. 3477—a bill continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the Government. The heart of the bill is found in section 3, which prohibits new consumer subsidies programs from being announced and prohibits payments on existing consumer subsidy programs subsequent to December 31, 1943.

I do not think there has been a more fundamental question before Congress since the Civil War than this question of so-called consumer subsidies. I will use the term "consumer subsidies" to differentiate between that and producer subsidies.

Contrary to what many of my listeners may have heard or read, the House, by its action this week, has not outlawed all subsidies, as I am sure I can prove to you in the next 20 minutes. One of the fundamental objections to consumer subsidies is that it socializes agriculture. It is the first step toward regimentation and control, the first step which eventuates in the farmer finding himself under the yoke of bureaucracy where free enterprise on the farm is destroyed. Where the Government, through its several bureaus, tells the farmer when and what to sow, when and how much he shall reap, it tells the processor what he shall process and how he should process it, and tells the distributor how, where, when, and to whom he shall distribute the products of our farms. In other words, consumer subsidies beget control and encourage an expansion of the program.

There is nothing new in the proposal to pay consumer subsidies out of tax money. The plan has been tried on numerous occasions between the period of 800 B. C. and the present day. Without exception, every government that embarked on a program of consumer subsidies went down to complete ruin shortly thereafter.

I have received several telegrams and letters urging me to vote for subsidies to prevent uncontrolled inflation. If it were simply a choice between consumer subsidies and inflation, I assure you I would have voted for the payment of subsidies.

There have been many times during my term of service in Congress that I have been uncertain about how I should vote on a given measure, but on this question of consumer subsidies I have no doubt about the correctness of the vote I cast against consumer subsidies.

I want every constituent to have all the facts and information on subsidies that have been made available to Members of Congress. At this point, it might be well to briefly review the history of this subsidy legislation. Late last June the House Banking and Currency Committee approved a bill continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years. Included in that bill was a section that outlawed all subsidies on agricultural commodities or on any commodity processed in part from agricultural commodities. On the day the vote was taken in the House, it was known to all of us that Congress was about to adjourn for a 2 months' recess. I voted against that bill and later, following its veto by the President, I voted to sustain the President's veto. I voted as I did in spite of the fact that I had, on several occasions, expressed my opposition to the payment of consumer subsidies. At that time it was apparent that the bill, as approved, went further than seemed wise in that it would have stopped the payment of producer subsidies which were needed to make adequate food available. I felt that it was not right to say to the President that we were going to declare a 2 months' recess but in our absence he could not continue the general subsidy program on which he had embarked.

This past week the situation was different. For several months the President had known that a large majority of the Members of both the House and Senate were opposed to the payment of consumer subsidies. No one can honestly challenge not only the right but the duty of Congress to formulate policies and to keep control of the Nation's purse strings. Instead of accepting the judgment of the majority of Congress, the President has gone ahead making plans to enlarge the consumer subsidies program rather than trying to cooperate with the legislative branch of our Government by preventing the payment of consumer subsidies after December 31. By prohibiting the payment of consumer subsidies Congress has not in any way weakened the enforcement of the Price Control Act as adopted in 1942, as I will demonstrate in the next few minutes.

Many of you will recall that in January 1942 Congress passed a law which prohibited the O. P. A. from setting any price ceiling on farm commodities that would return to the producer less than 110 percent of parity price. Although not a Member of Congress at that time, I disapproved of that legislation, because I believed that if and when the American farmer received a parity price for his products he would be well satisfied and happy. At the insistence of the President, that provision of the law was repealed, and

Congress later agreed that no price ceiling should be set that would yield the farmer less than parity. That parity provision was written into the final amendments of the Price Control Act adopted in October 1942. That is the law that ordered and directed the President to stabilize prices within certain limitations at the level existing on September 15, 1942. It is interesting to observe that according to the testimony of Mr. Marvin Jones, Director of the War Food Administration, food prices in the United States have gone up 17 percent above the September 1942 level. However, that is now water over the dam and only of interest to those who may now or in the future try to fix responsibility for price increases.

It has been said by many people that Congress ordered the President to fix prices at the September 15, 1942, level. That statement is not true, as a reading of the price-control law will show. Congress knew that no determination had been made as to whether or not all prices on September 15 were economically sound, fair, or reasonable. Let's see just what language is used in the price-control law, and I quote from the amendment approved October 2, 1942, as follows:

"That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

And then, further on in the same section we find this proviso: "That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs."

As a matter of fact, in the original price control law, approved January 30, 1942, we find the following language which certainly permits producer subsidies. You will note that in all of these sections of the Price Control Act, the payment of subsidies is only authorized where it will maintain or increase the production of food or other war material. I quote again from the price control law:

"Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof."

At this point I want to cite an example of the kind of producer subsidy that is necessary to increase production of needed war material. In normal times we can produce all the copper we need from mines in Nevada and nearby States. Under present conditions, copper can be mined and sold profitably at 12 cents per pound, at western mines. However, those mines cannot produce all the copper we need for the war effort. It therefore is necessary to open up high-cost mines in the State of Michigan, where it costs 17 cents a pound or 5 cents more than in Nevada. The high-cost mines produce about 20 percent of the copper we need. Certainly it is better to pay a 5-cent-a-pound subsidy on the Michigan copper than it is to raise the price of copper to 17 cents on all sources. That is definitely a producer subsidy and paid only to get needed production of an essential war material. Programs of that kind are provided for in the price-control law, as the sections I have just read indicate.

Remember that the bill approved last Wednesday does not repeal any section of the price-control law previously enacted by Congress.

For just a minute or two let us see just what the consumer subsidy program now in effect actually amounts to in dollars and cents to each of us. The present program provides for the payment of a subsidy on meats, milk, and butter. The subsidy now in effect amounts only to $6.32 per year for the average consumer. It is going to cost the taxpayers of this Nation a minimum of $800,000,000 to finance this limited program for 1 year. That $800,000,000 must be added to our national debt, which means that we must buy $800,000,000 worth of War bonds and stamps to finance this limited consumer subsidy program. Assuming that we could retire the national debt 50 years after the war, the $800,000,000 involved in this proposition plus the interest on War bonds for a 50-year period will require the tax payment of $19 from each consumer in the United States who, during the war, benefited by a subsidy of $6.32. Will a consumer subsidy of $6.32 per consumer prevent uncontrolled inflation? I wish the prevention of inflation was as simple as that. It is my honest belief that the payment of consumer subsidies is, in itself, inflationary. We hear a lot about the inflationary gap—the billions of dollars available in the hands of would-be consumers, over and above the value of the goods and services available for consumer purchase. We are told that it is these billions of dollars that increase the danger of inflation. It is contended by the Secretary of the Treasury and others that one reason for asking for a $12,000,000,000 increase in Federal taxes next year is to drain off a part of this inflationary money. At the same time, the very same people propose adding almost a billion dollars to the inflationary threat by adopting a consumer subsidies program. It just doesn't make sense to me.

What causes inflation? We all agree it is spending by the Government. The spending by the Government, today, has caused the depreciation in the value of the currency, which is reflected in our higher prices. An increase in price alone seldom, if ever, induces inflation. It is the result of the depreciation in the value of currency by other causes that creates the threat. The payment of consumer subsidies, as I said before, begets subsidies. If we must adopt a new philosophy of Government whereby the Treasury of the United States must pay part of the food bill of any part or all of our population—why do we stop there? There are other items involved in the cost of living besides food. The price of clothing is going up. Have I not as much right to have a subsidy on a suit of clothes that I buy as I have on the food I eat?

If the people of the United States cannot afford to pay the cost of living at the present time, with family incomes higher than ever before in the history of this Nation, when can they do so? Would you want this program continued after the war? Adopt it now and it will continue as a permanent philosophy of our Federal Government for generations and maybe centuries to come, unless or until the Government collapses. Some say that a little subsidy is splendid—you will like it; you will love it. You will save yourself 5 cents on a pound of butter. That is splendid. That is easy money so why should we not continue this? Why not expand it? Why should not the Government pay a little more of my meat bill? Fine. Why should not the Government pay my bread bill? Why should it not pay my milk bill, my cheese bill, my shoe bill, my rent bill, my clothing bill?

We heard a lot during the subsidy debate about individual incomes of those living on fixed incomes. All the white-collar workers, the Government worker, as well as the annuitants, the pensioners, and so forth. Undoubtedly many of these groups are feeling the pinch and they are entitled to relief, but the type of relief they would accept could better be made available to them in some other way than by adopting a program of paying a part of everyone's food bill. The House Banking and Currency Committee now has before it a proposed food-stamp plan that has been offered as one method of aiding those who have had no increase of income since 1939. I don't know that such a plan is the correct solution, but I do know one way that thousands now employed in private business and industry could be helped without increasing the danger of inflation. Their employers could be allowed to increase their wages. I know of several cases where an employer is not only willing but anxious to give an employee an increase in wages or salary, but under present directives issued by the President, they cannot do so. No employer should be denied the right to increase the wages of his employees at least up to the Little Steel formula or by 15 percent. In that way, some of the pressure for subsidies would be removed.

Frankly, I cannot bring myself to the point of accepting an annual subsidy of $6.32, knowing that the very men and women who are now fighting our battle on 55 different war fronts will have to come home and assume part of the debt I have helped to increase. How could I look the returning soldier and sailor in the eye, after they have found out that I voted to take $6.32 out of the Federal Treasury for each member of my family, and left them with a debt of $19 that they must pay over a period of years for each $6.32 I voted for myself. How can the man and woman now working on our production lines look his son, brother, or friend in the eye, under such circumstances.

During debate on the consumer subsidy section of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, it was contended that if consumer subsidies are stopped, organized labor would strike. They would tie up our war industries. Frankly, I don't believe it. I have too much faith in the patriotism of the Americans who make up organized labor. I would not reflect on their loyalty by saying that because of the loss of a subsidy of $6.32 per year, they would try to stop our production lines and threaten the lives of thousands of their own sons and brothers.

Some of us may have seen the chart that was published in PM last week, purporting to show the cost of certain foods such as steaks, hamburgers, pork chops, butter, and milk as of today. In the next column the price that would be charged after January 1, if consumer subsidies are barred and, in the last column, the price of the same commodity a year later. In the last column of this chart the prices were shown to be more than twice the price as of today. Can anyone please explain to me how the removal of a

4-cent-per-pound subsidy on beef can cause the price of beef to go from 39 to 78 cents per pound, or for milk to go from 17 to 30 cents a quart? The only way for that to happen would be for the administration—because of the refusal of Congress to approve consumer subsidies—to refuse to carry out the provisions of the price-control law. In other words, such inflation would only come about if the President took a "dog in the manger" attitude, let the lid off, and permitted prices to skyrocket, simply to put Congress in a bad light with unthinking people. I do not, for one moment, think the President would permit such a thing to be done. It has been said that consumer subsidies are necessary to prevent an inflationary increase in the cost of living. There is, however, an alternative that has not as yet been tried and that is an honest, courageous administration of the price-control law as approved by more than 75 percent of the Members of the Senate and House.

Needed—A Secretary of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the vital importance of aviation in the years directly before us is obvious to everyone. No one can possibly ignore the tremendous impact of military air power as a major factor in the winning of this war. The possession of a great striking force in the air will be no less decisive in the maintenance of peace.

Apart from the military aspects of aviation, it is equally certain that the role of flight in commercial transport will be magnified beyond all belief within the next decade. It is startling to realize that at this late date our own Government has no clearly defined policy with respect to American aviation rights in the thousands of landing fields our men have carved from the soil throughout the world. It may be a grave disaster if we do not speedily rouse ourselves from the lethargy of this do-nothing policy.

A nation which does not recognize the overwhelming importance of a proper development of both commercial and military aviation in these times is burying its head in the sand. It is true that our several services are developing splendid aircraft for their particular needs. Army, Navy, and marine planes are being constantly perfected. But there is no agency of the Federal Government primarily concerned with aviation in all its phases.

For months I have been urging the establishment of a new Cabinet officer to be known as the Secretary of Aviation. Our British allies have enjoyed the services of an Air Ministry for a long period. It is time we caught up.

To head this office today, we have an outstanding aviation hero, who is thoroughly familiar with both the military and commercial needs of our Nation, Gen. James Doolittle. He would give aviation the importance it deserves and start America off gloriously into the age of flight which looms directly ahead.

I urge every thinking American to join with me in this effort to compel recognition of the new responsibility before us.

Los Angeles Area Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, streetcar and bus transportation must be relied upon to get a very large percentage of workers in the Los Angeles County area to the shipyards, aircraft factories, and other war plants.

There has been great difficulty in securing and keeping the services of enough competent workers to maintain this transportation service adequately. The reason, very briefly, has been that the pay of these transportation workers has been sharply below that which they could readily receive by leaving their existing employment and going to work in some of the war plants which are constantly advertising for workers.

Attempts to correct this situation have been many and earnest. By and large there has been no disagreement between the men and women and the companies for which they work. But Government agencies have spent very long periods of time considering cases presented to them for pay adjustments and have generally not approved the adjustments agreed upon by workers and employers.

There is now pending before the War Labor Board the case of the wages of employees of the Los Angeles Railway Corporation & Motor Coach Lines, in connection with which I ask consent to include herewith the memorandum filed by counsel for the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD—IN THE MATTER OF LOS ANGELES RAILWAY CORPORATION AND THE LOS ANGELES MOTOR COACH LINES AND THE AMALGAMATED ASSOCIATION OF STREET, ELECTRIC RAILWAY AND MOTOR COACH EMPLOYEES OF AMERICA (A. F. OF L.)—CASE NO. 10-5417—MEMORANDUM IN SUPPLEMENT OF UNION EVIDENCE—SEPTEMBER 24, 1943

The brief filed by the union in support of its petition for reconsideration of the decision in the above entitled case summarized the evidence submitted therewith, and set forth the union position with respect to that evidence. The evidence introduced in the public hearing in Los Angeles, on September 10 to 12, inclusive, substantiated, corroborated, and amplified that submitted with the petition for reconsideration, but did not substantially depart from the evidence already placed before the Board. The union consequently does not now desire to resummarize the evidence or offer a complete restatement of its position, since both are in the record.

This memorandum is filed only in order to state, very briefly, the criteria which the union believes should be given greatest weight in decision upon its petition for approval of the wage rates agreed upon between the union and the Los Angeles Railway and Motor Coach Companies. In view of the principles under which the Board will consider and grant appeals, and the position expressed in the opinion of the Board in this case, the union statement is limited to two general considerations; first, the conflict between the principles underlying the Watkins decision of 1942 upon wage rates of these employees and the principles laid down by the National War Labor Board, and second, the bases for judgment upon the effect of increased wages on the attainment of maximum efficiency in the national war effort.

THE WATKINS REPORT

The decision made upon the request of these employees for increases in wage rates, in 1942, lies at the root of all of the subsequent difficulties on this property and others in the southern California area. Early in 1942 the union requested wage increases which would have brought the rates of pay of the employees more nearly into line with those paid for work of comparable or similar degrees of skill in the southern California area. The report of the examiner, Dr. Gordon Watkins, appointed by the Board in that case, granted only a fraction of the increase requested, in a report which was confused and contradictory. The National War Labor Board, under the tremendous pressure of that period, approved the recommendations of its examiner; the rates thus fixed, since they applied to the largest street railway and bus operations in the area, have been highly influential in determining other rates in a wage structure the Board has held to be internally stabilized, as between individual companies.

The principles upon which Dr. Watkins based his recommendations included his estimate that the companies were unable to pay higher wage rates, and his belief that the employees were not entitled to wage rates paid for similar work or degrees of skill in industries handling war contracts upon the cost-plus basis. Thus in dismissing the union request for adjustment of inequalities in wage rates, Dr. Watkins said:

"Although the union's specific rate adjustments are understandable in the light of the high wage schedules for similar work in war-contract industries in which the cost-plus principle is operative under Government patronage, no such patronage exists in the transit industry. Hence the cases are not analogous."

No other construction can be placed upon this statement than that Dr. Watkins found the bus and railway employees being paid less than other employees for similar work in the community. He found the union request understandable—which must have meant that the rates being requested were within the range of outside rates. But the request was denied on the ground that wage rates in war industries ought not to be the standard for judging wage rates in industries where the management has no cost-plus guaranty.

Dr. Watkins clearly felt it to be unfair to the management of these companies that they should pay wage rates comparable with those paid by war industries in the area. The dominant consideration was obviously not just the ability of the company to pay but actually belief that the adjusting inequities in wage rates should depend on methods of price determination in the various industries.

The principle itself announced by Dr. Watkins is unsound, and in direct contradiction with the policies of the National War Labor

Board. Its application to a public utility, even were the principle generally just and accepted, would be highly questionable. With the increasing conversion of all American industry to war purposes, and the war service being rendered by the transit companies, the suggestion that wage rates of transit employees should not be compared with those of other war industries, or that any nonwar industries should not be compared with war industries, is wholly untenable.

Had the Watkins decision been clearly understood, and appealed to the Board under rules now governing, it should and almost certainly would have been reversed. The employees involved in this proceeding have thus not only every ground for requesting that their wage rates be increased in the agreed-upon amount but they have also suffered an apparently irremediable injury because of a year's delay in the adjustment to which they are and have been entitled. The added inequity strengthens the union position that the Board should approve the wage rates upon which union and management have agreed.

EFFECTIVE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

The Union suggests that there are certain standards of performance which the Nation has every right to expect of all American industries during the war emergency, and certain others which apply with especial force to those industries engaged in furnishing goods or services essential to the war effort. Each industry, its management and employees alike, essential to the prosecution of the war, should now be operating at the maximum of efficiency, in terms both of the quantity and quality of service rendered; all industries, however, little essential they may be, should be utilizing available manpower, equipment, and materials with the greatest effectiveness, and should be conserving labor and materials with the utmost care.

These criteria might well be applied by all agencies of Government to their own policies and decisions, in exercising the powers granted them for the regulation of labor and industry.

The operations of the Los Angeles Railway and motorcoach companies are not only essential to the war effort, in that complete cessation of their services would seriously interfere with if not wholly interrupt war production in that area, but the attainment of maximum efficiency in transit service is also of vital importance in reaching the highest possible performance in Los Angeles war plants. Any impairment of transit service means impairment of war production.

Transit service in that area has been seriously impaired, increasingly so as the requirements of war industries have mounted. That impairment now approaches complete collapse.

Furthermore, manpower is being wasted in those transit operations, first, because of the tremendous total of man-days consumed in training men who do not stay in the industry, and second because of the time lost in sickness by men who are overworked in trying to maintain transit operations.

Equipment is likewise being wasted, since streetcars and busses—of which there is a national and local shortage—are being permitted to stay idle in the barns and garages of the companies.

The manpower resources of the companies, and of the area, are being dissipated, because the long hours now being worked are inescapably reducing the ability of these workers to maintain their efficiency, or even to continue to work, through the months and years of maximum war activity which lie ahead of us.

Equipment resources are also being undermined. Busses and streetcars are not now being inspected or maintained as they should be, and the rate of equipment failures is correspondingly high and rising. The safety of employees and passengers is increasingly endangered. Increasing undermaintenance of equipment, roadway, and structures, must reduce the future utility and value of the materials which the Nation and this war-industry center will need ever more gravely as the war continues.

These transit companies are wasting manpower and equipment because they cannot hire enough men to operate and maintain their facilities, and they cannot keep those they do hire.

The transit industry is supplying insufficient service, and irregular and undependable service, to Los Angeles' vital war industries because experienced transit workers have left the industry, and even inexperienced workers either will not enter the industry or will not stay for the wage rates being paid.

Management and labor alike have done everything possible to overcome these major handicaps to their war service. They and the various regulatory agencies directly concerned with transit problems in the area have come to the conclusion that the transit service cannot be maintained, to say nothing of its being restored to the standards necessary for attaining maximum war potential in Los Angeles industries, unless wate rates of operators and maintenance men are increased. The union, the companies, the War Manpower Commission, the California State Railroad Commission, the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles, and the industries served by the transit companies are agreed that higher wage rates are an indispensable condition to the rendering of continued transportation service in the area.

Under these circumstances, prompt and favorable action by the National War Labor Board upon the request made jointly by the union and the companies will be to grant a measure of justice to the overburdened transit employees involved, and to lift from war industries in the Los Angeles district at least a part of the handicap upon them by inadequate and collapsing transit service.

Respectfully submitted.

O. DAVID ZIMRING,
ELI L. OLIVER,
Counsel for the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America (A. F. of L.).

Congress and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and timely books published in recent months is The Home Front, by David Hinshaw. This book is a sound, thoughtful, and, above all, fair report on what has taken place in America during the past 2 years. It could be read by every American with pleasure and profit. Members of Congress will be especially interested in the chapter entitled "Congress and the War." Possibly none of us will agree with all of the conclusions or recommendations of Mr. Hinshaw, but the chapter in its entirety is a balanced, honest, and constructive report of the part of Congress in the war effort. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the same herewith:

CONGRESS AND THE WAR

Despite the excellent war record made by Congress in handling most major questions during the first year of war, the voters of the country accused it of spinelessness and dereliction of duty. They asked: Did Congress let democratic institutions down by failing to perform its duties promptly and competently? Shall we put Congress on trial? Are we seeing before our eyes the break-down of legislative government?

A study of the record reveals that six factors were highly responsible for the low public esteem of the Seventy-seventh Congress. These were:

"1. Popular concern about the ineptitude of the war administration, military defeats, and even about the eventual outcome of the war.

"2. Failure of the people to realize that it was not Congress as an institution, but the Democratic Party's majority, which was responsible for the worst phases of the record made by the Seventy-seventh Congress. It yielded to the persuasion of the party's leader, President Roosevelt, to pass measures he desired or to block the enactment of those he opposed, over the majority judgment of Congress.

"3. Failure of the people to distinguish between Congress as an institution and Congressmen as individuals.

"4. A few major congressional blunders and a number of minor ones: congressional dilly-dallying; sending up too many trial balloons when it considered certain ticklish major questions, such as inflation and manpower.

"5. The archaic methods through which Congress functions. Its preservation of the indefensible seniority system. The lack of any congressional public-relations sense.

"6. The abuse of congressional powers of investigation under the protecting cloak of immunity by some braggarts, bullies, and exhibitionists in its membership."

Congress performed a function vital to democracy during the war's first year. There can be no substitute for it as the voice of the people or for executing the will of the people. And if the people are angry with Congress for good or bad reasons, or feel themselves misrepresented, they must look not only to the elections, but to the present parliamentary technique of Congress. Today its procedure in outward form is not strikingly advanced beyond its late eighteenth century beginnings. The reorganization of its technique can rejuvenate the essential democratic function of Congress, enable it not only to perform more satisfactorily, but also to give the people a livelier realization that it represents them and their power in the Government.

In a speech delivered at Muhlenberg College in May 1942, Speaker of the House of Representatives SAM RAYBURN said:

"In every great crisis in any nation's history, the men who are doing the world's great work have been attacked. The Members of Congress are today under attack, and it seems that in some quarters there is a studied effort to destroy the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives. The present Congress cannot run this war, but it has done its duty. It has given the administration every law and every dollar it has asked for to prepare the country for defense."

No man, however, would claim that Congress had lived up to the Constitution's specifications. These provided, among other functions, that it should hold the Nation's purse,

watch the President, his appointees, and the courts, and see that they performed their duties. These representatives of the people and the States are members of what was intended to be the most important of the three coordinate branches of Government.

Three wholly unrelated factors tended to weaken the preeminent position Congress held in our governmental scheme. One of thes was a popular President's occasional hostility toward it; another was the growth of executive power in every land; and the third was the nature of global war's demands. Global war places all emphasis on quick action, recognizes little need for debate. These factors, when combined as they were, might seemingly have destroyed Congress. They did not. Congress, in fact, was strengthened by this test under fire. The record shows that it:

1. Declared war against Japan in a few minutes' time and with only one dissenting vote; against Italy and Germany unanimously and immediately.

2. Passed, almost without debate, two bills which gave the President every power he wanted for total war.

3. Immediately enlarged the draft and authorized the mobilization of all United States manpower between the ages of 18 and 65.

4. Provided $135,000,000,000 for war purposes in seven appropriation bills.

5. Provided for every expansion that the Army and Navy requested.

6. Advocated and authorized the five-ocean Navy ahead of the President; earlier it had advocated and authorized the two-ocean Navy over his opposition.

Through its committee investigations of the war effort, Congress exposed administration weaknesses and derelictions of duty, thereby speeding the Government's war program; killed the O. C. D. attempt to carry on social reforms with public funds which had been appropriated for air-raid defense; forced the administration to take forthright action, bringing order and direction out of its rubber chaos; revealed improprieties on the part of both industrial management and labor unions; held up to the Nation's contempt the profiteers in war contracts, some of whom recently had been administration favorites.

CONGRESS TALKED A GREAT DEAL

The people complained that Congress talked too much. Talking, the people should realize, is the business of Congress. To watch, to investigate, and to legislate are talking jobs. The House, which represents the people, and the Senate, which represents the States, are elected to interpret the will of the people and to express it in law; to see that these laws are honestly and efficiently enforced. These duties require debate, not administration.

The Members of the House who must go before the people every 2 years, and of the Senate, who must go before them every 6 years, have found that the best way to focus public attention on a question is through debate. Argument for and against a measure brings out all shades and manner of opinion and information, which the people need as the basis for a decision. Members of Congress know that it is only through debate that the people's wisdom may be determined and incorporated in government; universal acceptance of laws secured; opposition to unsound or inadvisable laws made clear. Thus the debates in Congress had an important part in preparing the people for the war.

The people, in turn, know that democracy cannot exist unless government determines and expresses their will, captures and uses their wisdom. The fiat of bureaucrats and the Gallup poll can do neither. The fiat of bureaucrats cannot lead an independent people. Public opinion polls on important issues represent neither the will of the people nor their considered judgment. The snapshot of a public poll frequently catches little more than hair-trigger opinion. Occasionally election returns reveal the inaccuracy even of their preelection estimates. This is natural, since such polls neither seek nor pretend to represent the people's mature or settled judgment. Actually they are meager samplings of public opinion on specific issues worded in a specific manner. Throughout the year by debate, investigation, legislation, and in other ways, Congress assayed the people's will and helped them to reach a mature and settled judgment both intellectually and morally, on the war issues. By these means the legislators also were able to determine how far the people were willing to go in prosecuting this or that phase of the war program. Congress did this part of its job well.

THE RED INK SIDE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL LEDGER

A major blunder made by Congress in January 1942 was to vote pensions for its Members. There is no valid reason why Members of Congress should not be pensioned as well as other public servants. But the bill came up for a vote when the war for the United Nations in the Far East was going badly. The people were gravely concerned, and they wanted their public servants to concentrate on the war effort. Besides its unfortunate timing, the method of passing the bill was wrong. When the people learned that a few slick leaders had buried a pension provision for elected officials, including Members of Congress, deep down in a general civil service pension bill and hurried the bill through its different readings, they exploded with a bang.

This was not the time for Congress to vote itself pensions. Openly advocated, openly voted upon during normal times, the people might either have given their consent to such a measure or have accepted it without overmuch grumbling. Congress as an institution was hurt by the action and, still more, by the effort of some members to stigmatize the opposition to their measure as a Nazi plot. Although Congress repealed the law, it lost face. During the excitement of the moment, the people refused to accept explanations. But the record will be well served by transcribing here a private statement by Congressman EDWARD H. REES of Kansas:

"Last December (1942) the House had under consideration a bill amending the retirement law for civil-service employees and provided, among other things, for an increase in the amount to be contributed by such employees—whereby their benefits would be increased accordingly.

"The main feature of the bill provided that retirement payments would be increased from 3½ to 5 percent—the bill covered about 300,000 employees. It also contained a proviso that would include elective officials of the Government—who would likewise pay 5 percent of their salaries into the retirement fund, and would be entitled to retirement benefits. Such elective officials, however, were given the right to elect to come under the law—and were not compelled to do so. Civil-service employees are required to come under the terms of the law.

"In other words, this provision included Members of Congress, the President, and the Vice President. If Members of Congress wanted to come under the act—they would be required to pay 5 percent of the salary received, and would continue to do so as long as they held office. At the age of 62 years, if they were no longer Members of Congress, they would be entitled to retirement benefits that figured out, as nearly as I understand it, to about $140 per year for each $500 the Member had contributed.

"I opposed the whole proposition, mainly as a matter of principle. I did not think Members of Congress should place themselves in a position whereby they should ask the Government to contribute to funds to carry them along after they retire from office.

"Furthermore, I believe, as a matter of economy, that Members of Congress are not in very good position to demand savings of Government funds and then ask for additional benefits for themselves, even though comparatively small.

"Likewise, Congress is not in very good position to deal with a problem affecting thousands of Government employees, when they themselves ask to be included within the terms of such legislation.

"It should also be observed that the manner in which this legislation was presented to the House was not above criticism. It should have been properly presented and thoroughly debated."

TAXES

The public mistakenly gained the impression that Congress attacked the tax question gingerly; that it seemed to shrink from the task. Some of this apparent hesitation was created by the method of writing a tax bill and some of it was the method of democracy.

The job of writing a tax bill is colossal. The 1942 bill contained more than a thousand items. Each of these had to be studied from the point of view of the people's ability to pay and of equity and justice. Prolonged hearings were held to give the people an opportunity to state their objections. After the hearings came the necessary debates.

Levying taxes is the most onerous duty legislators have because a tax bill has no friends, many critics, and not a few enemies. More than this, the people could be made ready to accept new and higher taxes only as they more and more got under the burden of the war, as debate and discussion made their duty clearer. This they would do only as the war progressed, as more and more of their friends and relatives were taking part in it, as the call of patriotism become more compelling, and as they better understood their duties and obligations as free men.

The Treasury Department seriously interfered with the writing of the 1942 tax bill by insisting upon the inclusion of the Treasury's own ideas, which differed greatly in some particulars from those held by Congress. The Treasury's strong opposition, for example, to a sales tax served to hold up adoption of the whole bill. Somewhat humbled by its capacity for blundering, the Treasury at first was less cocksure and lipwise about its recommendations for the 1943 tax bill than it was when the 1942 bill was being drawn. Later, however, the Treasury Department threw the full force of the Administration's strength behind the Doughton bill in the House, which was decisively defeated. The Senate next defeated the Administration-backed George bill. The people's representatives in both Houses of Congress thus recorded the majority opinion in the Nation by defeating Administration dictated and sponsored legislation which ignored that opinion. Congress, in May 1943, worked out a pay-as-you-go tax bill which seemed certain of adoption until President Roosevelt threatened to veto it if passed. This threat forced the adoption of another compromise proposal. Congress, it is true, did fumble its way slowly toward the formulation and adoption of a tax program. This fumbling, caused largely by Administration interference, however, enabled the people through the debates and discussions to gain a clearer realization of why they must carry a heavy tax burden.

INFLATION CONTROLS

The President sparred with Congress on the question of inflation and price controls

for nearly 10 months after the war started, although Congress gave the Administration full price-control power in January 1942. It was April before the President laid down his seven-point program. When prices continued to rise, largely because of official reluctance to fix and enforce wage controls, he grew more emphatic about the need for additional price controls. He told Congress in early September 1942 that if it did not act, he would. The wage question, however, the President said he would handle himself. Congress, whose sympathies were more with agriculture, insisted that price controls should go hand in hand with wage controls. And, although Congress created the O. P. A., it wrote into the law a provision that its director, Leon Henderson, could not set prices below the parity which it had fixed on farm products. The President remained unwilling to check the rising wages of labor. Mr. Henderson thus had power over all prices except wages, which the President looked after, and farm prices, which Congress protected with parity prices.

Mr. Byrnes, who had more actual power than Mr. Henderson ever held even by assumption, later was unable to resolve the irreconcilable differences of the administration-labor and Congress-agriculture points of view.

X CARDS FOR CONGRESS

Congress was most unfairly and improperly criticized for accepting X gasoline rationing cards. Its Members did not ask for, much less demand, these cards, despite one columnist's charge that Congressmen scrambled for them. Mr. Henderson, with good judgment and a clear recognition of the fact that Members of Congress compose one of the three equal branches of Government, had sent them the X ration cards. There were extremely few other officials of Government, outside the White House, Cabinet executives, the Supreme Court, and a handful of top war agency executives, who were equally entitled to X cards. The high-ranking Government officials in all departments, including executive, legislative, and judicial, who were equally entitled to X cards, did not exceed 600. These included 531 Members of Congress, but only 260 of its Members accepted the cards. Their acceptance immediately raised a sharp and bitter storm of protest from every quarter. Members of Congress were bitterly castigated for accepting these cards but their attackers closed their eyes to the fact that a total of 15,000 X gasoline rationing cards had been issued to residents of Washington. No one of these critics of Congress asked: Who, in the District, in or outside the Government, holds an X card? Does he outrank a Member of Congress either in responsibility or in importance to the war effort?

Congress, as an institution, lost heavily in public esteem through the gasoline-rationing-card episode, even though the attack was unfair and improper. This public attitude toward Congress recalled the Will Rogers story of a decade earlier: A man who found a worm in an apple he was eating said, "Damn Hoover." Congress thus had become the whipping boy of this decade. Cussing Congress has become the Nation's safety valve.

OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS OF UNFOUNDED CRITICISM

Early in the summer of 1942, a great newspaper in its editorial columns mistakenly charged that:

"Congress' hold-out of subsistence allowances to servicemen's dependents until November 1, 2 days before the congressional elections, is just about the cheapest, most contemptible political trick on record."

Actually, Congress was neither responsible for the delay nor for fixing the date on which the payment was to be made. The War and Navy Departments had asked for the delay and fixed the date because they believed it physically impossible to get all the checks out even as soon as the first of November. Congress merely confirmed the requests of the executive departments concerned.

These and countless other critical attacks, a few fair, many grossly unfair or with flimsy foundation, flustered Members of Congress and threw them out of their stride. The calls of labor "goons" or farm lobbyists on Congressmen outside the floor or in their offices, to demand their support or to threaten reprisals if they refused, constantly harried them.

Perhaps the most human and revealing information on the question of why the people were so critical of Congress was that which Congressman Luther Patrick, of Alabama, offered in a speech in the House after his defeat for renomination. Mr. Patrick had opposed the congressional pension bill, but, said he, "Each Congressman gets blamed for the whole program, and I was the only one they could get at."

When things go wrong in Washington or in the Nation, it is the Congressman who must take the rap because the voter can get at him. In addition, for more than a quarter of a century he has been the target for every high-pressure organization which has sought to force its desires or programs upon the people. These have included temperance groups, public utilities opposing the "death-sentence" bill, labor, farm or veterans' lobbies, pro-peace or pro-war organizations, or Government agencies, such as the N. L. R. B., which reprehensibly used public funds to put pressure to bear upon the Members of Congress, threaten, cajole, and harry them.

Mr. Patrick's constituents asked him, "What about you fellows being asleep when the Japs hit us at Pearl Harbor?" Yet it seems inconceivable that any literate American would seriously ask such a question. Congress by no stretch of sound mind could be blamed for that mountainous tragedy. The Roberts Commission placed the responsibility for it upon the Army and Navy chiefs in Hawaii.

Another question hurled hastily at Mr. Patrick was, "Why didn't Congress do something about heading off this rubber shortage?" The part Congress played in the rubber mess was farsighted and wise. A full year before Pearl Harbor, Congress had given the President unlimited authority with sufficient funds to create an adequate crude rubber stock pile, and at the same time, funds and authority for the creation of a synthetic rubber industry. Congress also gave him the power to ration gasoline, rubber, or any other commodity in the Nation. The President did not name the Baruch committee until after an act of Congress indirectly made positive action by him necessary.

The people were irritated by the O. P. A. regulations and the rationing and price-control activities of Mr. Henderson, Mr. Patrick stated:

"Many do not like Mr. Henderson. They cannot vote against him, but they can vote against the Congressman. They do not like a great many things that have been done here. Each Congressman gets blamed for the whole program. In any case I was the only man running they could get at * * * whose head bobbed up above the horizon. * * * They think of Congress collectively and whatever conclusion they reach they vote upon him individually.

Other questions his constituents asked Mr. Patrick were: What have you done for small business? What about gas rationing against all of us while Congress has all the gas it wants on the floor and off? What about the Smith amendment against the workingmen of the country? Why haven't you got further along with the war program?

The "Smith amendment against the workingmen" was an effort of Congress made to control labor-union activities, an effort supported by a majority of the people of the country. President Roosevelt, however, intervened, and with the aid of Democratic leaders in the Senate succeeded in killing the proposed legislation. Mr. Patrick's constituents also criticized Congress because it had failed to get "further along with the war program." Their criticism was wholly misdirected. The executive department is in sole charge of running the war. Its failure were many and disturbing, but it and not Congress was blameworthy for these failures.

Mr. Patrick concluded his speech with this statement:

"There is entirely too much distrust and skepticism in the minds of the populace toward this Congress. To blame the public is foolish. Congress must be able to blame itself, find the trouble, find some way to overcome it. The people feel that vital information they are entitled to have is being withheld by this Congress. They do not know what it is, but they are uneasy and some are resentful."

The tide of popular criticism against Congress reflects upon the ability of the people to rule themselves. They elect Congress. If Congress were as incompetent and undependable as popular criticism indicates, it would follow that the people are incapable of ruling themselves. What's wrong is that this inhibitionless generation, born of cataclysmic change, responds to hair-trigger emotions; speaks what it feels, seldom wants to speak what it thinks when it thinks. With the aid of the radio, unparalleled newspaper and magazine circulation, and snap-judgment polls, the people of today are weighing Congress in a rigged balance. Actually, "the faults of our Congress are, in the last analysis our faults," as the eminent authority on government, Dr. Charles A. Beard, has pointed out.

Masses feel; they do not think. Their expressed feelings stimulate thinking and discussion, which in turn help to define a course of public action. But it is foolish to assume, as many do, that public-opinion polls are a doctor's diagnosis. They are, instead, an expression of passing pleasure or pain and an indication of the extent of it.

Almost every individual who ever voted for a Member of Congress seems to feel that he did the candidate a personal favor; apparently ignoring the fact that he was exercising the right granted only to freemen, the precious right of helping to decide how he is to be ruled and by whom. Too frequently he demands any and every kind of personal favor or service in return for his vote.

This peculiar attitude of the average voter is illustrated by the famous true story Joseph W. Bailey, then Congressman from Texas, told. Mr. Bailey was enroute home on a train out of St. Louis in the wintertime. He had the front berth in an old-fashioned Pullman which had a swinging door in the aisle but no vestibule. People passed back and forth through the train, each leaving the swinging door open, through which cold air poured in upon Mr. Bailey. He got up and closed it each time, until finally, when his patience was exhausted, he snapped at a big man who had left it open.

"Go back and shut that door."

The man applied his thumb to his nose in what is said to be the oldest gesture of the human race.

Mr. Bailey looked him over carefully and replied, "I don't have to. You don't live in my district."

PEOPLE ILLOGICAL AND UNFAIR

The people in their "vague unrest" are panning Congress for administrative incompetence in handling the war effort, when it is the executive department which, alone, is

in charge of its conduct. Furthermore, a majority of the Members of the present as well as of the preceding Congresses for 10 years, have been elected because they promised to support President Roosevelt's programs. The majority of the people, favoring his program in general, accepted it sight unseen. To carry it out, they sent him a mandated Congress composed of bound men.

The results of the 1942 election indicate that many people no longer want bound men to serve them in Congress; that they now want men in Congress who challenge, if not oppose, the way in which the Roosevelt administration conducts the people's business. If this is the case, the people should supplant still more bound Members with Members who will challenge rather than ratify. The people have a right to change their minds, but they have no right to attack Congress as an institution because of the pusillanimity of men elected to be administration rubber stamps.

Because of the inevitable conflict between a strong Executive and the people's Representatives, the President also is, in part, responsible for Congress' loss of public favor. He may be unconscious of this. Nevertheless, he is blameworthy, because as a determined and resourceful fighter, he frequently dramatizes his cause to the public in such a way as to make the opposition in Congress appear to be the villain in the current Government play. Immediately after the President does this, that part of the public which supports his program—and with a few exceptions during the past 10 years, that has been a majority of the Nation—immediately begins to belabor and intimidate Members of Congress and in other ways undermine its position as one of the three equal branches of Government.

Congress can win a contest with President Roosevelt only when easily demonstrable and overwhelming right gives it might, because he is both strong and politically adroit. He makes quick decisions and acts quickly. There is only one of him, and there are 531 Members of Congress, who have almost that many different ideas of political strategy, shades of politics, economic and social beliefs. Some of these 531 Members are dumb; others are inept. But few of them are anything like a match for the President in a public discussion. Certainly the straggling groups or divided forces are not. Even as a unified body, Congress is seldom his equal, and until the current year has come off second best in public esteem in nearly every contest it has had with the President.

THE VALUE OF PUBLICITY

The President always has the advantage in these contests, even though a majority of the Congress may oppose him, because his administration has at its command a most expert, extensive, and expensive publicity machine, which frequently gilds the lily or makes silk purses out of sows' ears. Some of its sections appear to have operated on the theory that "if you believe it, it's so." In time, the people have come to accept a well-told tale oft repeated.

What about sympathetic publicizing of Congress, theoretically an equally important branch of government? How much of the people's money does it spend to tell them about all the splendid things it is doing so effectively for them? The answer is: Not 1 cent. More than this, Congress leads the life of goldfish. Except for the rare executive session and for executive committee hearings, all of its work is done in the open. Five hundred and thirty-one men and women, coming from widely different backgrounds, having varying degrees of ability, some having short tempers and some having self-control, perform in public. Some of the proposals they make or the ideas they advance during their debates and discussions are those of statesmen, and some are the inanities that bespeak the vacant mind. When both are reported in the same newspaper story, it is the tripe that gets the headlines. If the people are pleased with the statesman-like expressions of their Members of Congress, they hug it as a precious secret in their heart of hearts; but if they dislike the tripe which some Members hand out, they turn their heads toward high heaven and howl their mortal anguish to the stars.

It is possible that if Congress could perform behind the scenes, as can the executive department, and annually spend millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds in explaining away its failures, covering up its mistakes, and glorifying its triumphs, as has the executive department, it, too, could gain the support of a majority of the people, create for itself a new high in public esteem. Instead, the people have recently formed their judgment of Congress on the basis of what newspapers, magazine writers, and radio commentators tell them, what the publicity machine of the executive department tells them, and on what the Members of Congress tell them.

The people, thus hearing a vastly better case made for the administration, in time begin not only to excuse it, but actually to blame Congress for the executive departments' failures. Apparently Congress needs a publicity machine of its own, perhaps not a $69,000,000 one, but one which will be responsible for helping it put its best foot forward. And it needs sound public-relations counsel to tell its leaders what pitfalls to avoid. But Congress can adopt neither of these proposals. What, for example, could a public-relations man do with 531 people, the majority of whom are individualists? How would Washington correspondents find interesting things to write about if Congress gave them hand-outs instead of the freedom of the Press Gallery? Would the people be able to keep from exploding if Congress resorted to secret sessions? They would not.

The action of Congress, when in early December 1941, immediately after Japan struck, it gave the President every war power in order that the Nation might get swift action, laid it open to the people's attack on the grounds that it created bureaucrats and did not control them. But the war crisis took precedence over everything else, and Congress acted swiftly, surely, and splendidly in delegating its power to the President. Now the people are criticizing it for having done what they are criticizing the President for not having done. The President has been far slower and more cautious about delegating his power to others in the war effort.

OTHER COMPLAINTS AND ESTIMATES OF CONGRESS

Whether or not, as some charge, Congress fails to live up to the public's conception of its functions, is debatable, because this conception varies greatly. Some of us demand that Congress stop deferring to the executive branch, to pressure groups, and to our floods of letters and telegrams. We insist that it "stand up to the Executive and the bureaucrats." But a majority of us voters have been selecting Congressmen who will follow President Roosevelt's lead and overnight expect them to veer with the political winds revealed by sampling poll findings.

In mid-June 1942, Ernest K. Lindley wrote in Newsweek:

"Within the last few weeks, Congress has fallen to the lowest estate in the public prints, and very probably in public opinion, within the memory of living men. By Congress I do not mean every Senator and every Representative but enough of them * * * to justify a generalized criticism."

In early September David Lawrence said that because Congress had dilly-dallied with the farm problem:

"It had undermined its own prestige to such a point that a strong-minded Executive feels he can venture to threaten Congress and be immune from criticism."

In the fall of 1942, PM held that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is unique—

"Because, unlike any other publication in the country, its authors cannot be held accountable for the bunk, not to say the malicious libels, they spread on its pages."

Many other critics objected to the material printed in the RECORD; others attacked Congress for the nepotism practiced by some Members; others complained because it had not legislated for greater controls over labor unions—forgetting that in December 1941, the House voted nearly 2 to 1 against the labor bloc and the administration, in support of a comprehensive bill dealing with labor union controls and regulations which, through the President's influence, was killed in the Senate. The catalog of complaints against Congress is long and varied. Fortunately for the cause of democratic government, they are aimed more at the "current Congress than against Congress as an institution." Most of the complaints recorded above represent symptoms rather than basic causes of what's wrong with Congress.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CONGRESS?

The people were right in believing that there's something the matter with Congress, even though most of them were attacking the form rather than the substance of what was wrong. Some of the basic weaknesses of Congress are:

1. Its members need the support of voters if they are to be reelected. They try, therefore, to give as little offense as possible. Frequently they are unable to determine whether expressed sentiment is natural or whether it is stimulated by organized direction of pressure groups. Also Congress occasionally does duck or postpone action on ticklish political questions because it is afraid of the voters.

2. Congress has preserved parliamentary procedure but has relinquished to President Roosevelt the function of chief lawmaker. This transformation took place immediately after President Roosevelt had assumed firm command of a demoralized people in 1933. He had the people's confidence. He appeared to know what to do. He acted vigorously. His "must" legislation, which his brain trust wrote, seemed to work. Thus, in time the people began to expect Congress to jump whenever he cracked the whip. In time the President, also, grew to expect it. Congress took its cues from him so long and passed so many of the bills his smart aides wrote, that it began to "suffer from the apothecsis of the unimportant."

3. Congress has preserved, glorified, and copper-riveted the seniority system, which serves to place Members, regardless of qualification, in all-powerful jobs as committee chairmen, merely because they have served on a given committee longer than any other member of the party in power.

4. Perhaps the worst thing Congress does to itself, a kind of frightful hari-kari, is its conduct of investigations. Its Members, protected by immunity, are free to make any charge against anyone, to blacken characters, to destroy reputations, or to commit other acts of verbal violence. Western civilization for more than 1,000 years has been slowly constructing a law of evidence and procedure which is designed to safeguard and protect the rights of the witness. These include the legal presumption that he is considered innocent until he is proved guilty. But congressional inquisitors do not give their witnesses the benefit of the laws of evidence which our forebears have created. They try to make the witness appear guilty. The worse they browbeat or misuse a witness, the more certain they are to make the newspaper head-

lines and advertise themselves and their causes. The injustice which these congressional inquisitors have done many citizens has boomeranged and done Congress serious harm with a large segment of the people. No matter what their own standards and practices may be, the people expect, even demand, that the standards and practices of their officials and their Government, at all times, and under all circumstances, be just, honest, and proper.

Congress has too long neglected the job of modernizing many of its rules, routines, and procedures, of which the seniority system is perhaps the worst.

6. Congress still carries on too many of its operations on the "by guess and by God" method. It needs the full-time services of experts in the fields of government, social and political economy, public finance, and scores of others.

7. Congress frequently fails to study the long-range aspects of legislation or to state clearly the reasons for its action. At the time—early in 1942—for example, when its investigation revealed profiteering in a few war contracts—Congress hurriedly passed a renegotiation of war-contracts provision in Public Law No. 528. This provision had the power to bankrupt every business concern holding a war contract. Instead of giving the job of collecting excess profits to the already operating staff of the Treasury Department, Congress created three new bureaucracies. The defence offered by Members of Congress for this action is that Under Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal and Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson, when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, requested that they be given the job of working out the details of the renegotiation contracts proposal. Out of their desire to cooperate, Congress accepted what the Under Secretaries proposed. They did this without realizing the threats which the law, as it stood, would carry to all concerns holding war contracts.

8. Congress wastes the time of busy Government executives by calling them to testify before many different committees repeatedly in both Houses, where at several hearings they give similar information. Some of the Members of Congress offer the rebuttal that if these top administration officials are so busy, they should not spend so much time running around the country making speeches. The Members of Congress also insist that Congress furnish a better sounding board with which these busy Government executives may reach the country than any other forum open to them.

WHAT CAN CONGRESS DO TO BE SAVED?

Outsiders looking at Congress see several steps Congress might take in an effort to preserve the great parliamentary forum for freemen. Some of these are:

1. The early discard of the seniority system and the substitution for it of a method by which committee chairmen could be selected on merit. Some such step is vital, since most of the real work of Congress is done behind committee doors. Under the seniority system, all any peewee Member of Congress need do to capture an important committee chairmanship is to get reelected often enough. In time his party will come into power, and automatically he will become chairman of the committee on which he has held appointment.

Chairmen of this lesser breed seldom are able to assemble or present information which will help Congress in its efforts to formulate a sound public policy. This activity is an important one because the debates and discussions in Congress serve the people of the Nation as the finest and most helpful educational course available to them on the subjects of social philosophy, political economy, and governmental operation in general.

Arthur Krock, writing on this subject in the New York Times of May 7, 1943, pointed out that—

"As yet no substitute for the seniority system has been suggested which does not contain flaws as basic as the system itself. And to offset the Doughtons and the Reynoldses who are among its products, there are chairmen of seniority who could not be improved on from the viewpoint of ability and a sound democratic attitude toward public matters.

"One alternative proposed is the free, secret-ballot election of chairmen by the committees, something a strong Executive would always control. Another is free, secret balloting by caucus, which would produce the same result. And if Executive influence were weak in Congress, and there were no seniority system, pressure groups would grab most of the chairmanships.

2. Members of Congress freely admit that they should make far greater use of specialists in the fields of taxation, tariff, business regulation, economics, sociology—in fact, every important field of Government activity and human endeavor. Many congressional errors in method and policy grow out of the tendency of the members to resort to intuition and communion with their political gods on questions of policy, when instead they should have and make use of the services of a good research bureau.

Congress long has made use of the services of specialists in research and of a few other experts. Congress was far ahead of the executive department in recognizing the Government's need for such services. As far back as 1887 Congress created and placed in operation the first important staff of specialists in our Government. They belonged to the then newly created Interstate Commerce Commission which Congress had set up as a continuously operating body to serve as its assistant in charge of transportation. This step had become necessary because the Nation's increasingly important railway transportation system was creating too many complex problems for Congress to solve during its occasional and brief sessions. The I. C. C. continues responsible to Congress.

Early in the Wilson administration, Congress created two other expert staffs. One of these, the Federal Trade Commission, was given the job of studying business problems. Formerly it reported to and advised with Congress. This agency, as a result of the executive department's aggressive action, has now become more of an arm of the executive than of the legislative department. Early in his administration, President Roosevelt forced this change by demanding the resignation of a Republican member of the Commission on the ground that he was not in sympathy with the President's social, economic, and political program. The Supreme Court later ruled that the President does not have the right to make such demands of members of the Federal Trade Commission.

Early in the Wilson administration, Congress also created a commission of experts to study tariff questions, report its findings, and advise with Congress upon them. This seemed an enlightened legislative step. The need was evident. The tariff always had been a political football, whereas it presents one of the most complex economic problems of government. Everyone, except a few gluttonous high-protectionists, hailed this new intelligent congressional action with enthusiasm. The life of the Tariff Commission, created by Congress as its instrument, and its gradual emasculation by the executive department, has been traced by Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, in the following statement:

"The act of September 8, 1916, created the Tariff Commission, an independent establishment of the Government. Its functions are primarily to furnish both Houses of Congress, and the public, with factual information on which to base tariff and trade policies of the United States, and to act, wherever needed, in an advisory capacity, particularly in technical matters relating to tariff legislation. The Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930 reenacted provisions similar to those in the organic act. These last two acts assigned additional duties to the Commission, notably under the so-called flexble tariff provisions constituting section 315 of the act of 1922 and section 336 of the act of 1930.

"The Trade Agreements Act approved June 12, 1934, provides that before a trade agreement is concluded the President shall seek information and advice thereon from the Tariff Commission.

"When the President in 1934 succeeded in having the Congress enact a reciprocal trade agreements law, he brought into the executive branch of government powers relative to foreign commerce and the duties thereon, and since that time the State Department has, in a way, exercised much greater power than the Congress and the Tariff Commission combined. Practically speaking, the State Department can make the final decision and not the Tariff Commission—the independent agency of Congress.

"Since 1934 many trade agreements have been effectuated by the State Department. These trade agreements are based upon the unconditional most-favored-nation philosophy. The Trade Agreement Act provides, among other things, that the President is authorized from time to time—

"(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

"(2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign-trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder. No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists. The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly or indirectly: *Provided*, That the President may suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section, and the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions proclamation. The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation in whole or in part.

"It is interesting to note that trade agreements were not effectuated between the United States and the Axis countries. And further, certain Presidential directives were issued to the Treasury against Germany. Although Secretary Hull for years contended in substance that the reciprocal trade agreement program was the one single peace-creating and peace-maintaining Government program followed during the period 1933–39, the trade agreement program, as a matter of fact, became one of the greatest diplomatic clubs ever used upon the other nations of the earth by a single great world power. The President and the State Department together were given, and they exercised, almost capital-punishment powers over the economy of industries, trade areas, and nations."

Congress also created the General Accounting Office and the Burreau of the Budget as its agencies to study all Government fiscal questions and to advise with it in the formulation of financial policies both in the fields

of taxation and expenditure. Both agencies, although they are instruments of Congress and were created to serve Congress, have been made an arm of the executive department. The steps were taken gradually, but the change now is complete. Congress now is trying to build another fiscal agency which will serve it solely. Without the assistance of such financial experts, Congress would be helpless at the hands of the financial experts who serve the executive department. Without their assistance the people, through Congress, would be at the mercy of the administration's bright young men and their financial program.

Congress has created an excellent bill-drafting service. Members of the staff of the Office of Legislative Counsel sit in with House committee members and help them draft the bills. These bill-writing experts also are well versed in all previous legislation on the subject. The result is that the bills they draw are almost universally so precise as to meaning as to avoid misconstruction of the intent of Congress by either the executive department or the Supreme Court. This cannot always be said of bills which Congress has accepted from the executive department. These frequently contain loopholes through which it takes and exercises powers and privileges which Congress never intended to grant. A case in point is the administration's $25,000 salary limitation order which Congress specifically tried to guard against, and which it was assured would not be issued.

3. Congress stands in great need of the services of a staff of experts who are familiar with the record and method of operation of every executive department. Without the aid of such men, the Members of Congress will continue unable to check the machinations of bureaucrats, to prevent duplication of effort or waste of public funds. A step to meet this need was taken by Congressman DIRKSEN, of Illinois, when on October 17, 1942, he introduced a concurrent resolution in the House which would create and set up a separate department of the General Accounting Office, staffed with experts and to be known as the Federal efficiency service. This new department, according to Mr. DIRKSEN, will be so staffed, equipped, and powered as to render expert and continuous service to Congress and the committees of the Congress as to make possible the highest quality of public service at the lowest possible cost.

In further explaining the purposes of the bill, Mr. DIRKSEN said, in part:

"While there has been progress in the reduction of nonwar expenditures, there can be even greater progress. Nor must the war effort become an excuse for prodigality and extravagance in war expenditures.

"We demand efficiency and elimination of waste, etc., but where are the facts unless we get them from the folks whom we charge with being the wasters? We want the facts about the war, but we are going to have to ask Elmer.

"We believe in criticism, but we do not have an independent set of facts on which to base that criticism.

"We demand the abolition of the nonessential functions of Government, but the very individuals who have to come and testify before a committee of Congress will be those who operate those nonessential functions, and they can think up 9,000 reasons why they are essential to Government operation."

On October 19, 1942, Mr. DIRKSEN introduced a joint resolution in the House which asked for the creation of a joint congressional committee on military and naval affairs and appropriations. This proposed supercongressional war committee, if created, could and would save the time of many busy war executives in that they would not need to appear before any other congressional committee. As proposed, the committee would consist of 42 members, evenly divided between the House and the Senate, who would serve as a congressional high command. Containing, as it would, 7 percent of the entire membership of Congress, in the words of Congressman DIRKSEN, [it] would be large enough to improve the functioning of Congress with respect to the war effort without proving unwieldy. * * *

"The essential function of Congress is to provide the sinews of war in the form of authority and funds, and then to review the application of such authority and funds without undertaking to conduct or direct the war.

"We must be geared to move with dispatch and conserve the time of busy men in the military, naval, and related agencies of Government."

On October 1, 1942, Congressman DIRKSEN submitted a concurrent resolution to the House which provided for the establishment of a joint congressional committee on planning and reconstruction, to be composed of 22 members, equally divided between the Senate and the House.

The purpose of this concurrent resolution as set forth in its text was:

"To more effectively plan and prepare for the problems of demobilization, full employment after the termination of the present conflict and reconversion of private industry, the maximum utilization of new industrial and agricultural processes and techniques, the cataloging of Federal, State, and local relief and work-relief projects, the evaluation of the usefulness and propriety of such projects, and the utilization of our national resources, and to better survey and supervise the appropriations and the expenditures made in pursuance of such appropriations that are made by the Congress for the above purposes, and to more effectively carry out any plan, plans, or programs of post-war reconstruction, there is hereby established within the legislative branch of the Government, as an agency of the Congress and exclusively and directly responsible to the Congress, the Congressional Planning and Reconstruction Service, hereinafter referred to as the 'Service.'"

These three bills, which were proposed by one Member, indicate the new temper and concern of Members of Congress. Mr. DIRKSEN and the other Members who also sponsored bills which seek to modernize the machinery of Congress so that it may better serve the people, are harbingers of its return to power and virility.

4. Congress also should create a new joint committee, staffed with experts, whose business would be to explain on the floor the reasons why it has taken any given action. These reasons now are brought out in debate, but usually they are obscured through poor presentation or by inadequate reporting. Had Congress, for example, explained clearly, simply, and fully the reasons back of its delegation of power to the President, it would have gained the people's commendation instead of their criticism; and, secondly, it would have created a public demand that the President delegate it as freely and promptly to others as Congress delegated it to him.

5. The Senate needs to tighten its rules and to create some machinery which will curb the practice of offering amendments from the floor. This Senate privilege frequently is abused by Members with queer quirks of mind, character, or peculiar interests. Such Members often offer fool amendments that snarl legislation and waste time.

The House is largely free from this evil, perhaps because the committee system there is better established than in the Senate. The House membership is large enough so that its committees are well manned and the meetings are well attended. Amendments are offered and threshed out in committee meetings, and when a bill is brought to the floor the committee members usually unite to back it as reported out.

In the Senate, however, a Member may try to tack any kind of amendment on a bill from the floor. If his proposal is a fool one, he cuts a ridiculous figure; and that great portion of the people who fail to distinguish between Congress and a Congressman, between the institution and the individual, are prone to attack the institution.

The foregoing are only five of the many ways which have been suggested to save Congress. The hope in the situation is that Congress itself is awake to its own need. Today's criticisms of Congress are new only to the people who make them. The people of every generation turn their heaviest guns of criticism on Congress whenever the public situation goes awry.

In May 1836, during the turmoil at the end of Andrew Jackson's reign, Amos Lawrence wrote in his diary:

"I have passed 2 hours in the Representatives' Hall and in the Senate Chamber today. I could learn nothing of the merits of any of the questions, but I had preference such as one feels in seeing two dogs fight, that one should beat."

In 1865, during another period of national stress, Artemus Ward wrote:

"Congress, you won't go home. Go home, you miserable devils, go home."

Henry Adams, in the The Education of Henry Adams, quoted one of the members of the President's Cabinet as having said a few years later:

"You cannot use tact with a Congressman. A Congressman is a hog. You must take a stick and hit him on the snout."

Mark Twain, in 1882, half in jest but with that impression he could give which suggested that he wasn't telling the half of it, wrote:

"Reader, suppose you were an idiot, and suppose you were a Member of Congress; but I repeat myself."

These appraisals of Congress out of the past indicate that today's criticisms are an old story. What's new in the situation is that Congress is trying harder than anyone else to correct its faults, which cannot be said of all departments of government.

Should the people's legislative representatives equip themselves with the modern and efficient implements of trained personnel and procedure, they will be able to give today's Government problems the kind of intelligent consideration and treatment which will strengthen parliamentary government. It has disappeared or has been weakened throughout all the world except in Britain and the United States. This has happened in part because it, too, insistently clings to outmoded ways, fails to adjust its procedures, rules, regulations, and methods to modern needs and demands. Congress is inadequate today, not because it debates when the people demand action, but because its debates are not geared to the needs of the times. We live in a literate, informed age—a swift age, with little time to reflect. We form our opinions from impressions, a radio broadcaster's remark, a newspaper headline, a President's dramatic statement, any Congressman's charge.

This condition and situation places new and great burdens of self-control and thoughtful action upon every Member of Congress. The people will respect the dignity and integrity of Congress only if the statements and actions of its Members individually and collectively warrant that respect. The need for Members of Congress to mend their ways and for the people to mend their manners is evident and great. This is emphasized by Speaker RAYBURN in the speech previously referred to. He said:

"A great many people cry out against dictatorships. There has never been a dictatorship built up in any land until the faith and

confidence of the people has been destroyed in the legislative branch, and the legislative branch itself had been destroyed. Take the history of the world from the Caesars to now, and you will find this to be true."

In a November 1942 issue of a trade publication, the national president of his association, the Master Plumbers, T. W. Merryman, wrote an editorial in "defense of Congress because we believe our liberties, our property, and our continuing existence are safe in its hands. We're not so sure about leaving our future in the hands of someone appointed by someone we never heard of."

The Nation and the people would be well served if millions of other citizens felt the same way about Congress.

What Kind of Subsidies Should We Have?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an item clipped from the Washington Post of November 30, entitled "Useful and Dangerous Subsidies," by Merlo Pusey. I am not accustomed to loading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with other men's views, but in this case, as it is partly an answer to questions I have had in my own mind, the thought occurred to me that it might be helpful in the thinking of others.

Sometimes I have complained, if not aloud at least to myself at the comments of critics, columnists, and news reporters, concerning legislation or public problems before the Nation. In such cases I have felt that the commentator has a very imperfect view of the problems discussed and, of course, I was more critical if his view did not coincide with my own. With that attitude I ought in fairness to be appreciative of any commentator, located in a strategic watchtower, viewing the situation from various angles who can point out to us engaged in the fray the real significance and inwardness of the struggle. This, I think, Merlo Pusey has very well done in this item.

I may not agree with his presentation entirely, as I feel that subsidies now have more than the one major objective of combating inflation. I wish he had touched more on their possiblity of inducing production. However, it is a service to have a clear distinction between useful and harmful subsidies. The article is as follows:

USEFUL AND DANGEROUS SUBSIDIES

(By Merlo Pusey)

The best approach to the subsidy muddle, it seems to me, is for legislators to ask themselves what they are trying to do. If an agreement can be reached as to objectives, it should not be impossible to determine which subsidies contribute to that end and which do not. Then it would be a relatively simple matter to keep the useful subsidies and discard the others.

Only one major reason for payment of the subsidies in question is advanced—curtailment of inflation. That is a worthy aim. Almost no one will take exception to it. Controversy arises because of the belief that some of the subsidies now in use do not effectively serve this purpose. To get at the roots of this issue, therefore, we must analyze the nature of the present inflationary threat.

Inflation usually has many causes, but chief among these causes at present is the fact that the Government is pouring out far more money than it is collecting. That money goes into the pockets of the people, chiefly in the form of wages paid for war work. Naturally, the people wish to spend this money to satisfy many wants. To some extent they are unable to do so because the war has created a severe scarcity of civilian goods. So they bid high for those things which can be bought, and the tendency is for the value of goods to go up and of money to go down.

Now the dangers in this situation could be greatly minimized by rolling back into the Treasury this surplus purchasing power that is threatening to blow the lid off from O. P. A. prices. Here is where inflation controls have most seriously broken down. Lack of political courage on the part of both the Treasury and Congress seems to have scotched the hope of enacting a tax bill that would bring the inflow of funds into reasonable relationship with the outflow. Nevertheless, the administration wishes to swell the outflow by payment of roll-back subsidies.

It is of the utmost importance to remember that subsidies are part of the outflow that feed the fires of inflation. Their effect has put more purchasing power into the hands of the people when the need of the hour is to capture the excess purchasing power they already have to help pay for the war. From this unquestioned fact we may draw the conclusion that subsidies should be used sparingly and only in those cases where there is clear-cut evidence that they will set in motion stabilizing influences more far-reaching than their inflationary effects.

Some of the subsidies which the House voted to ban can undoubtedly be justified on this basis. C. C. C. funds are now being used, for example, to reward farmers who increase production of certain crops essential for war purposes and to guarantee cooperating farmers against a collapse of prices if the war should suddenly end. These are legitimate expenses incident to the war. In some instances, too, moderate subsidies to keep the price of food from rising exorbitantly because of war conditions are useful in keeping our economy on an even keel.

The real difficulty is that the administration didn't stop with subsidies that have more pulling power toward stabilization than pushing power toward inflation. Under pressure from organized labor it resorted to roll-back subsidies which have the effect of giving all consumers more money to pay for their groceries. Here is a clear case of rolling money out of the Treasury to add to the inflationary tide without compensating advantages. Handing money to people who, taken as a group, already have more than they can spend, is a direct stimulus to inflation. In taking a stand against these subsidies Congress is fighting inflation instead of encouraging it.

Sponsors of the roll-back idea advance two arguments in its favor. First, it will help consumers whose incomes have not been increased by the war. But the roll-back subsidies are not limited to that group. They go to everyone. That is equivalent to using a steamshovel to fill a paste jar.

The principal argument for the roll-back idea, of course, is that it will aid the administration in holding the line against wage increases. In other words, subsidies are needed to appease organized labor. The facts are that average hourly wages have advanced much faster than the cost of living. Workmen have more surplus funds than they had a year ago. Yet, the administration wants to give them further help in paying their food bills. That is the equivalent of a wage increase for everyone. Hence it is a breach of the stabilization line instead of a buttress for it.

Congress is under obligation to give the President more help in holding the line against the inflationary demands of organized labor. But the help it gives should be something more tangible and less dangerous than an appeasement fund.

America's Need for Deeper Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address, which I delivered at Cambridge, Mass., on November 21, 1943, at the Unitarian Ministry for Students. The title of the address was "America's Need for Deeper Faith."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAYFLOWER COMPACT

Today is the anniversary of the Mayflower Compact. It was signed on board the *Mayflower* in Provincetown Harbor, Cape Cod, 323 years ago today. The date was known to the signers as November 11, 1620. Under our present calendar, however, that date would have been November 21, and today is the true anniversary of that historic event. In the Mayflower Compact the Pilgrim Fathers met and overcame a novel and fundamental problem of government. They cut the Gordian knot of legal entanglement with a directness and fearlessness characteristic of successful pioneers. With faith in God, in man, and in themselves, they set an example for men of faith to follow. They made the formalities of government serve the needs of man. We need to do as well today.

The circumstances were that the Pilgrims held a patent from the Virginia Company granting them rights to the soil and to local self-government in Virginia. The hazards of the weather were such that they found themselves, however, in New England, where their patent had no legal effect. Nevertheless they decided to seek their fortunes where the will of nature had led them. Being without the sanctions and restraints of established government, some restless spirits threatened to strike out for themselves and anarchy impended.

Thus reduced to the bare elements of human relationships, the Pilgrim Fathers invoked their faith in God as their common bond and, relying on their faith in one another and themselves, they established their own government, responsible to God and to themselves. Armed only with this charter, the strength of which was derived from the strength of character of its signers, they landed a few days later on Plymouth Rock and the history of organized freedom began in America.

The compact was a simple document. It said:

"In the name of God, amen. We whose names are underwritten, * * * having undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith, and the honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do by these presents solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civic body politick for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof do we enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices from time to time as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, under which we promise all due submission and obedience."

As these settlers never were able to secure a charter, this compact long remained the colony's source of authority. In the face of every possible danger and discouragement they thus began on the bleak New England coast a crusade to establish in this New World that recognition of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which derives its irresistible strength from the spirit expressed in the prayer of every Christian that the will of God be done on earth as it is in heaven and from the God-given hope for personal freedom of opportunity that fills the heart of every human being.

These fearless, religious men, when faced with the need for creating a new government, did not hesitate to create a new and simple governmental form adapted to those needs. The compact was a natural extension to civil circumstances of the customary church covenant. These men did not hesitate to apply the principles of their religious beliefs to their daily lives.

Five generations later an equally difficult crisis, broader in scope, faced the signers of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and another faced the members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Again deep faith in God, in man, and in themselves guided every act of those who met and overcame these difficulties.

In 1776, the immortal Declaration of Independence proclaimed not merely a separation of the colonies from the Kingdom of Great Britain but also the inalienable rights of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The signers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the support of their declaration that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. This has become the freeman's faith everywhere and forever.

Eleven years later, when confronted with the failure of the Articles of Confederation, the members of the Federal Constitutional Convention and then of the conventions in each of the 13 States, boldly authorized a new Federal Constitution blazing the trail for the separation of Federal and State powers under a new program that has marked the greatest and most successful movement toward free and practical self-government in the history of humanity.

Six generations later, America today looks into the face of another crisis. As beneficiaries of a great past and trustees of an infinite future, the present generation faces again the dawn of opportunity. It is for us to catch the inspiration of our time.

A somewhat similar opportunity came to humanity after the last war but the world was not ready. This time we must see and seize the opportunity with the same faith and constructve determination to develop it as was shown by the Pilgrims and by the founders of our Republic in their days of trial.

The underlying principles are the same today as then. The need is to adapt them to the facts of our time.

The elemental and guiding principles are those of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The everlasting answer to what is the great commandment of the law was given by Jesus when he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment; and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Our problem is the practical application of these elemental laws to the circumstances of our time.

These laws are reflected in the actions taken in 1620 and 1776. Let us seek to apply them today with equal practicality and vision in the United States, in our hemisphere, and in the world.

POLICY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States of America we already have the needed forms of free government. Our problem is to fill these forms with the proper spirit and effort. Both for our own sake and as an example of the practicality of what we preach, we should demonstrate in our internal affairs the wisdom and the feasibility of our faith.

As I look ahead within America, I see as one great need a need for deeper faith in God, in man, and in ourselves. Concretely, we need to emphasize the fact that ours is a government representative of all the people for the benefit of them all, majority and minority alike, regardless of race, color, creed, wealth, or occupation. The rule of majority control to which our laws properly give effect provides a mechanism of action. The views of the majority, therefore, should be fully, freely, and fearlessly expressed. The rule of the majority, while providing a mechanism of action, is not, however, infallibly right. Our safety requires that the views of the minority be expressed with equal fullness, freedom, and fearlessness, so that if those views find favor they may themselves become the majority views.

It is essential also that the constitutional rights of the minority, even if they be the rights of a minority consisting of but one person, shall be respected by the majority, however large. Our Government should be a government of and for all the people, administered for them all by those chosen as their temporary trustees by vote of a majority of the people. It should not be a government of, for, and by the majority of the people solely for themselves or for any special interests to the unfair disadvantage of others.

Our greatest internal need is for widespread understanding of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, deep faith in our constitutional processes, and deep faith by our officials in our people themselves. For our Government to succeed, our public officers must observe the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution, they must administer every law with even-handed justice, they must safeguard the expenditure of public funds as public trustees. Our people should be allowed the greatest possible opportunity for universal educational advancement, the greatest possible amount of true information as to public affairs, the greatest possible freedom of religion, thought, and expression, and the greatest possible opportunity for personal initiative and advancement compatible with corresponding opportunities for the rest of the people.

Coupled with these general needs, there is great need for cooperation, competence, and foresight on the part of organized industry, labor, agriculture, and government. A similar need exists in the highest degree in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Federal Government in their relations with the States, and with the people.

The immediate need within the United States is not for a change in governmental structure. The need is for competent use of the structure we have. We need now, with the active cooperation of industry, labor, agriculture, and government, to provide for an orderly conversion of our economic life from a governmentally financed and supervised war economy to a far freer, privately financed, privately operated, but governmentally policed, peacetime economy that will develop production of and a market for products of a value and volume substantially greater than at any time in our history.

POLICY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

In the Western Hemisphere the Pan American Union is well adapted to needs of the hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine underlies our policy in the hemisphere. As reaffirmed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull in 1940, "it is solely a policy of self-defense, which is intended to preserve the independence and integrity of the Americas. It was, and is, designed to prevent aggression in this hemisphere on the part of any non-American power, and likewise to make impossible any further extension to this hemisphere of any non-American system of government imposed from without." The Pan American Union, made up of representatives of the 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere, is an important official agency, established with a view to developing closer cooperation between the nations of America, fostering inter-American commerce, strengthening intellectual and cultural ties, and exchanging information on all problems affecting the welfare of the nations of the American Continent. It cooperates with the Pan American conferences, such as that held at Habana in 1940, which dealt especially with the plan for action regarding foreign possessions in the Western Hemisphere and with general questions of inter-American economics.

The Pan American Union is an excellent example of a natural, constructive development of an organization fitted to the needs of special circumstances. It helps to decentralize the handling of regional issues that can be dealt with to better advantage on a regional than on a global basis.

Recent developments in transportation and communication, especially by air and radio, call for man's further integration of his hemispheric relations. These can open the way to mutually advantageous opportunities to reach new resources and new markets of great value.

The elemental practical need in this hemisphere is not so much for new international mechanisms as it is for better understanding. For example, on the part of our citizens there is a vital need that we seek to understand better the history, geography, culture, languages, and commercial practices of the nations of Latin America. Increasing inter-American travel, settlement, and study, including increased use of moving pictures, news stories, and radio broadcasting will be helpful. Wide recognition in the United States of the value of substantially increased production and consumption of wealth in Latin America should contribute to the establishment of new commercial and personal relations of great mutual value.

We must let nothing interfere with the steady development of an increasingly cordial and mutually helpful understanding between all of the governments and among all of the people in the Western Hemisphere.

WORLD-WIDE INTERNATIONAL POLICY

The field of human relations that calls most strongly for new vision and new action is that of our world-wide international relations. Here the crisis is as fundamental as those which were faced by our forefathers

in 1620 and 1776, but the scope of it is thousands of times greater. Today we face the application of our principles not to a colony of about 100 people or even to a nation of 130,000,000 people, but to what have become known as the 44 united and associated nations including billions of people located all around the world. In many ways the problems are as broad as humanity itself.

It is well to remember that our Declaration of Independence was regarded by its authors as an expression of universal and everlasting truths which compelled action by the Colonies because of the extreme disregard of the fundamental rights of man shown here by the King of Great Britain.

In 1858, in the face of America's greatest internal crisis, Abraham Lincoln interpreted these words of the Declaration of Independence in their fullest and truest sense. He said of his forefathers and ours: "These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty and wise and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to his creatures; yes, gentlemen, to all his creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

It is for us to see clearly the facts and needs of our time. It is for us to fit our program to those needs and to do so with thorough consistency with the purposes and ideals to which our Nation is dedicated.

The need is for practical common sense combined with clearness of vision and depth of understanding. The time calls for a searchlight beam peering into the future directed by the hand of experience. As trustees of the purposes and ideals of America, we owe it to the people of America—past, present, and future—not to violate our Nation's purposes and ideals, but rather to live up to the constructive implications of those principles. Positive and constructive action alone will fully meet the needs of today.

WINNING THE WAR COMPLETELY

In the immediate present we must first of all win the war and win it completely in both hemispheres. There can be no hesitation or doubt on that point. We must do nothing either in our war or post-war policy, or in our internal or external planning, that will interfere with our winning of this war as quickly and completely as possible. Everything is secondary to that because we are fighting the war in order to apply the principles we support. Unless we win the war completely in both hemispheres, we shall not have the peace for which we fight and it will not be worthy of the price paid for it either by our forefathers or by our own generation.

There also will be an inescapable need for international cooperation of an emergency nature extending several years beyond the war in such fields as those of demobilization and the relief, rehabilitation, and temporary administration of areas formerly occupied by the enemy.

MILITARY STABILITY

There will be a continuing vital need for maintaining the military stability of the world. Of all the facts of the post-war period, the one that is more clear than the others is that on the day when the fighting is won and the armistice comes, there then will be temporarily, at least, military stability in the area covered by that victory. The United Nations, constituting the military championship team that will have won that victory, will provide the best assurance of the continuance of this military stability so established by them. For a short time substantial armed forces will be needed to assure law and order in some enemy territories. The greater question arises as to the best long-term program for military stability.

The need will not be for an active "police force" in the ordinary sense of local policing or of maintaining law and order. The need will be rather for a quickly available armed force representative of the military strength of the championship team that won the war. As long as the United Nations remain united and provide such a force there can be little doubt of the military stability of the world. On the other hand, to the extent that any of the United Nations cease to be united in peace as they were in war, a corresponding element of uncertainty will be introduced into the military stability of the world. Such disintegration would not, thank God, mean another war at once. It would, however, make it necessary for each nation to offset that uncertainty to the best of its ability.

As long as the Axis Powers were able to attack the free nations of the world separately, the Axis Powers were successful. When the free nations finally united their strength, then they were successful. Just as the United Nations today rely upon their unity of military effort to win this war, so must they also maintain that military unity to insure the continuance of the peace they will have won. The form of such unity is not as important as the fact of it. We have found a form of armed cooperation that has been effective in the conduct of the war. It should not be difficult to evolve from it a form of continuing armed cooperation that will be effective in maintaining the peace.

Failure to maintain this military unity in time of peace will lead to expenditures for competitive armaments. This will increase governmental expenses at the very time when a decrease will be important. It may lead to deficit financing at a time when a balanced budget will be a primary need of every nation. The increased taxes to meet this unnecessary threat to our stability might so overload our own program of recovery of private industry as to rob us of the very freedom of opportunity for which we have fought.

Special feasibility attaches to a plan for united armed forces after the war because of the improved effectiveness of air forces. Today no danger spot in the world is more distant than 60 hours, by air, from the capitals of the world. The possibility thus afforded of reaching an explosion of international aggression before it has started a major conflagration is as important to the protection of the world as is the speed of a city fire department in reaching a threatening blaze in time to put it out with a single fire extinguisher.

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL STABILITY

Beyond the military field there are the economic, social, and political fields. In them it is quite as important not to do now the things that should not be done, as it is to do now the things which should be done. On many questions it is not possible to reach conclusions in advance of the end of the war, especially where those questions involve nations whose homelands are occupied by the enemy. On the other hand, there are some international questions that can and should be on their way to solution. Among them are those of civilian international aviation and of the stability of international finances. On these questions negotiations among the nations and with the industries primarily concerned should be under way.

In many other fields, particularly those dealing with political considerations, it is important that orderly procedures rather than final solutions be agreed upon now. It is important that each nation give study to these questions and that there be preliminary exchanges of ideas upon them. In this way any temporary period of chaos or friction can be avoided. In this way mutual confidence may be encouraged now which will help in reaching final understandings later.

In general outline, it is possible from time to time to develop or to agree upon principles that will point the way to further progress. The recent agreements at Moscow and the incorporation of one part of them in a recent resolution of the United States Senate is an indication of progress along these lines. It was a historic step for the Senate, on November 5, 1943, by a vote showing a sentiment of 90 to 6 in its total membership, to advise the President, the people, and our allies "That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security." Our Secretary of State in his speech to the joint session of Congress on November 18, further emphasized the value of this action and the importance of continued progress within the scope of this policy.

As we face the long-term problems of world-wide economic, social and political stability, we face them on a new level of world-wide cooperation. It is important that we proceed with care. Where millions of people are involved, either as beneficiaries or contributors, the penalties of mistakes are too serious to justify unnecessary risks. To mislead people in distress so that they expect more than can be provided for them or so that they expect it at a time far earlier than is reasonable, is a public crime of serious proportions. To do so converts what should be a source of happiness, encouragement, and world-wide stability into one of bitterness, disappointment, and international friction. The end sought is happiness rather than physical advancement or prosperity. To that end the world will do better to assist in the sound and lasting development of well-earned human benefits than to build up unwarranted anticipation of unearned gifts.

In the determination of political issues answers should be developed through adequate study and planning rather than by recourse to improvisation. Solutions should be reached through agreement rather than dictation. In proportion, as decisions are to affect many people and to continue for long periods, the preparation for them should be

made with such thoroughness as shall reduce as much as possible the need for retracement of steps. When we march by millions, those millions can never all retrace their mistaken steps.

DECENTRALIZATION

The last 20 years have pointed more and more to the value of the decentralization of international problems so that regional problems may be handled on a regional basis. I have cited the value of the Pan American Union in the Western Hemisphere. Different conditions require different solutions. It is hardly to be expected that an organization comparable to the Pan American Union would meet the regional needs of central Europe. Yet it is clear that the prewar nations of central Europe, as isolated units, cannot maintain themselves satisfactorily in peace and much less defend themselves in war. Conditions indicate a need for some degree of federation. The nature and degree of integration is peculiarly a matter for joint determination by the members of the federation. It will be of advantage to the individual nations and to the world to assign to the region as many as possible of the regional problems that will require solution. Orderly and favorable progress rather than speed is the primary consideration in the formation of these groups. Yet the impetus of winning the war and the universal interest in recovery produces an atmosphere unusually conducive to constructive agreement on peaceful policies. There should be neither spectacular speed nor substantial delay.

Equally vital and fully as difficult as the problems of Europe, will be those of the Pacific. They may call for still another pattern to separate them from the problems of the world. Suitability is more important than uniformity.

While the character of certain issues thus suggests the immediate value of regional groups of nations to meet them, it is all important that, under the same impetus of world-wide cooperation there be developed some international organization on a world-wide basis. It should include, at least, the united and associated States, and it should be put into early operation. Provision should be made for the participation of all peace-loving States, large and small, on some basis recognizing sovereign equality, and it should emphasize the maintenance of world-wide peace and security. Provision should be made for the admission of additional States and for amendments to the original agreement.

Among the fields of world-wide cooperation there should be included, for example, the prevention and suppression of military aggression, the decision or settlement of justiciable and other international controversies, and the supervision and coordination of efforts in the fields of transportation, communication, labor, health, and research. Some international issues can be disposed of long before others. A modest fundamental structure into which new activities may be fitted has much to recommend it. The need to study plans for such a structure is immediate. The announcement of those plans should not, however, be made in advance of the opportunity for international consideration of them.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF DOMESTIC TO FOREIGN POLICIES

The internal stability and development of every nation will be closely related to the success of the world in establishing peace and stability together with reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. Our internal recovery will call for a sound and constructive foreign policy. For example, the all-important and revolutionary development of the aviation industry will everywhere depend upon the development of fair and reasonable agreements for international commerce in the air.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE ON TREATIES

With this integration of foreign and domestic policies, our ability to take prompt and constructive action in the field of foreign policy takes on new importance. The constitutional requirement of concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present in order to make a treaty is today more of a hazard than a safeguard to our Nation. It turns over the control of our fundamental foreign policy to one-third plus 1 of the Members of the Senate. It puts a premium on inaction. It enables a small combination of minorities to block, for their special interests, the interest of the Nation as a whole. It violates the principle that a self-governing body has faith in its majority. The disproportionate growth of our States would make possible the defeat of a treaty by 33 Senators representing only 8 percent of the population. The control of our world-wide policy by such a minority puts a premium on special pressures, introduces unjustifiable delays, and encourages devices to avoid submitting the issue to the Senate.

Under these circumstances there rests upon the people and the Senate an extraordinary obligation to lift the consideration of all treaties, and especially the approaching treaty of peace, above all partisanship, personalities, and prejudices. It is only thus that this provision can be made to serve the public interest. The requirement that this provision makes of a vote of two in favor of the treaty to offset every one against the treaty permits no vote to be wasted or jeopardized. At best it places a heavy handicap on constructive action in the interest of the whole Nation as opposed to active minorities within the Nation.

As long, however, as this provision stands, there rests upon America a corresponding obligation to make it work in the public interest. The reward for our successful efforts will be a new assurance of peace. The penalty for our failure will be the age-old threat of war.

This places upon us the obligation to make the provisions of the approaching treaty of peace so simple, beneficial, and clear that an aroused public will insist upon overwhelming ratification. This may call for compromises to satisfy some of the minority against the best judgment of the majority, but as long as this provision remains in our Constitution we must stand ready to compromise enough to secure at least the foundation of the future peace of the world. On the other hand, the more the public understands the true needs of America the less compromise of those needs will be necessary. America knows well that a constructive policy of world-wide cooperation is needed. The problem is to convert that knowledge into practical action. The truth and best interests of America will stand the light and if the case is clearly and vigorously made, and the public is thoroughly alive to its vital interest in the result, it may be possible to mobilize such an overwhelming sentiment that no substantial compromises of the Nation's best interests will need to be made.

America owes it to her people and to the world to take a leading part, with the other peace-loving nations, in forming now an international organization, in the common interest of humanity and thoroughly consistent with America's deepest purposes and convictions. Such an organization must be strong enough to meet the critical needs of today. It must also be malleable enough to meet the tensions of tomorrow. It must be dedicated to the maintenance and security of peace on earth and good will toward men. The opportunity calls for a renewed crusade worthy of the deepest convictions of our forefathers, the greatest sacrifices of our defenders, and the greatest efforts of us all.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NEEDED

But this is not all. A constitutional amendment is possible in the clear light of this crisis. An amendment to change the constitutional rule from two-thirds of the Senators present to a majority of them, would be a long step toward making our international policies as responsive to the needs of our people as are our internal policies. It would substitute majority rule for minority blockade. It would provide a workable mechanism for the development of our future foreign policies under the joint guidance of the President and the Senate.

A variation of such a constitutional amendment is pending in the Congress. It calls for ratification of treaties by a majority of a quorum in the Senate and also in the House. The contractual nature of a treaty differentiates it from an ordinary statute. It makes it a semi-executive act, not well adapted to the proceedings of a large legislative body with a frequently changing membership, such as the House of Representatives. Yet, if this be the only constitutional amendment that can secure the necessary vote of two-thirds of the House for its submission to the States, it will be well to accept it. It would be far more consistent with the principle of majority rule in and out of Congress than the present rule that vests final veto power on America's treaties in one-third plus one of the Senators present.

Secretary of State, John Hay, called the two-thirds rule an "irreparable mistake in the Constitution." It is not beyond repair by the people of the United States. It is time for the people to act.

CONCLUSION

This is a day of marvels. Aviation, radio, and countless other advances of science have lifted the commerce and living standards of millions of people to what would have been royal luxury a few centuries ago. They have wrought an even greater miracle in that more vital and intangible element of life—the understanding of each other by men everywhere. They have made humanity more of a family. They have advanced the brotherhood of man.

Today man knows his fellowmen, the world around, far better than he did a century—or even a generation ago. There is an ever-brightening glow of a better understanding of the oneness of God, the oneness of man, and even of the oneness between God and man.

The day when the will of God shall be done on earth as fully as it is in heaven is distant, but the day of dedication and the time for action is here.

The Patton Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address dealing with the so-called Patton incident, delivered by me in Washington yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Millions of mothers have been grieved and worried this week, and I personally have been

shocked at word from north Africa that a high-ranking officer of the United States Army struck a shell-shocked American soldier and cursed him profanely in a hospital.

I have been shocked, first, that the general could so forget the high trust and responsibility placed upon him as to let the incident happen. Second, I have been shocked that General Eisenhower not only should fail properly to punish the general, but should attempt to hush it up and conceal it from the American people. Finally, I am amazed and shocked that the War Department apparently regards the incident as closed, and is not prone to take disciplinary action.

The Articles of War are clear and specific regarding the punishment of a soldier who strikes his superior officer. They are also clear regarding conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. The Sixty-fourth Article of War, section 422, states that insulting or willfully disobeying a superior officer on any pretense whatsoever, or if a soldier even "draws or lifts any weapon or offers any violence against him" he "shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct."

In other words, had the shell-shocked boy who sat in the evacuation hospital tent in Sicily even raised his hand against General Patton to defend himself, he would have been court martialed and might have suffered the death penalty.

The penalty imposed upon an officer for similar conduct is that he shall be dismissed from the service. The ninety-fifth and ninety-sixth Articles of War are clear on this point. They pertain to conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and specify that any officer guilty of such misconduct "shall be dismissed * * * if convicted" of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. This is mandatory. The commanding officer has no option. The delinquent officer is to be court-martialed, and if convicted "shall be dismissed."

That is the law. And so strictly is it enforced in the British Army that when a British brigadier general, Drake-Brockman, hit two German prisoners after Dunkerque he was immediately dismissed. He had every reason to hit them, because they spit on his boots, then spit on him and called him a "Bloody British pig." But, nevertheless, he was dismissed, and enlisted in the Canadian Army as a private.

That is how strict the law is. And in my opinion the mothers and fathers of this country who have sent their boys into the Army have every reason to expect that it be carried out. They are not interested in picture-posing generals who coin for themselves the nickname "Blood and Guts", and who tell their men "When you reach out and put your hand into a mess, that was once the face of your dead comrade," etc. Tactics and speeches of this kind unfortunately had led the Seventh Army to rename "Blood and Guts" Patton. I learn from those returning from north Africa that his men now call him "Our blood and his guts."

How serious this question of morale is, is indicated all too clearly by the Reverend Dr. William B. Pugh, the chief executive of the Presbyterian Church who has just returned from north Africa. Dr. Pugh has stated that General Patton's striking of a shell-shocked soldier in a hospital was well known for some time among the troops and "had a very bad effect" on soldier morale.

And yet, General Eisenhower reports that General Patton is lauded by his troops. The two reports do not jibe. It occurs to me that since General Eisenhower is the man who let Mussolini slip through his fingers he may not know as much about soldier morale as a preacher who gets out and mingles with the troops.

Two important questions have been raised in my mind as a result of the War Department's strange silence in this matter. One is whether there have been other unfortunate cases involving high-ranking American officers. The other question is: Do we have the complete record on General Patton?

Many people in Washington were familiar with General Patton's peacetime record. He was stationed in and around Washington and northern Virginia for about 15 years after the last war; and among the fox-hunting, polo-playing set, he was a most colorful and controversial figure.

Now, I am not particularly interested in the General's peacetime background. Sometimes it is true, that a peacetime background is indicative of what an officer will do in battle, sometimes it is not. I am not particularly interested that he was the wealthiest man in the Army, or in how many yachts he had at Marblehead, Mass. I am not interested that he ruled the fox-hunting set with an iron hand. I am not interested in the fact that he used to dictate to Liz Whitney as to what grooms could ride in the hunt, nor that he once is reported to have whipped out a revolver and shot his polo pony when it did not turn fast enough for him to score a goal in a polo game.

I am only interested in one thing—whether General Patton is a real leader of his men and qualified to be a general in the United States Army. Regarding that I am sorely troubled. We already have reports from north Africa that his men now call him "Our blood and his guts" Patton. We now learn of the incident where the General ordered the mule of an Italian peasant shot because the peasant had crossed over a bridge used by the military. This sounds as if he repeated the polo-pony incident all over again in wartime.

I have also noticed in the Washington Star a reference by Constantine Brown, foreign editor of the Star, which arouses my curiosity and deserves senatorial attention. Mr. Brown states that when General Patton was not used in combat in recent months it was said that the reason was that "he had behaved with remarkable indiscretion and bad taste at Rabat in charge of the military forces in Morocco."

On investigating the matter, I find several interesting facts in General Patton's Moroccan career.

At Casablanca he requisitioned a palatial villa of Pierre Mas, a pro-Nazi publisher of Vichy newspapers.

Not for 1 minute do I believe that General Patton was evenly remotely pro-Vichy. Probably he was merely overcome by the gorgeous surroundings. But I do know that he became the unwitting stooge of General Nogues, a man who had ordered French troops to fire on American troops and who refused to shake hands with General Giraud because Giraud had gone over to the Americans. General Nogues had even arrested General Bethourd, the French leader who was collaborating with American Minister Murphy, and Murphy had to spirit him away and over to the United States in order to save his life. Nogues even fled inland to Meknes where he tried to persuade the Sultan of Morocco to declare a holy war against the United States.

But despite all that, General Patton became a great friend and buddy of General Nogues. They were bosom pals. And the effect upon Frenchmen in north Africa and the Arabs was most unfortunate. They immediately came to the conclusion that the American Army rebuffed its friends and rewarded its enemies. So, from that point on in north Africa there was no particular premium placed upon friendship with the United States—thanks to General Patton's boy-scout diplomacy.

General Nogues even persuaded General Patton that everything in Morocco should be left to the French military, and that no important Arabs should see an American officer except in the presence of a French officer. This left Morocco completely in the hands of the Vichyites—while General Patton enjoyed life in his beautiful villa.

I do not know whether this is the matter to which Constantine Brown refers. I understand there have been various incidents in the General's career, and that at one time, General Eisenhower thought seriously of sending him home.

All of this cannot help but be a matter of grave concern to the American people already burdened with sorrow. The American people are not in the habit of allowing their boys to be kicked around like cattle. They are not fighting this war for the glory of Mussolini-strutting generals. And they will not be satisfied until the War Department or the President of the United States himself steps in to present the public with the entire story, and to give General Patton proper punishment before a court martial.

Fifteen Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the National Grange has just closed its annual convention at Grand Rapids, Mich., where it adopted a 15-point platform which it is my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of the Congress:

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURE

1. America's first task is to win the war and to this the Grange pledges its utmost energy, with its past accomplishments affording substantial proof of its ability along all war-winning lines.

2. Agriculture's particular wartime job is the production of food, fats, and fiber, and American farmers can be depended upon to do everything within their power to produce the maximum.

3. Ample production at prices that will encourage maximum farm effort, rather than borrowing money to subsidize prices at low-cost levels, constitutes the major objective of national agricultural policy.

4. Inflation should be controlled in a practical way by bringing supply and demand into balance. This requires utmost production and a tax-and-savings program to drain off dangerous dollars.

5. Farm income should not be longer based on an obsolete parity formula, but on current prices, costs, and conditions. Price ceilings should be used only to prevent profiteering. When farmers are asked to maintain or increase production of commodities on a wartime basis, support prices should be provided which are fair to labor, industry, and agriculture; such support prices to be continued through the post-war adjustment period in order to prevent price collapse and disastrous depression.

6. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices are wrong in principle. They encourage inflation, increase public debt, are expensive to administer and open the way to bureaucratic control over those to whom they are paid. Consumers who actually need relief should receive it in the form of income tax deductions or by applying a food-stamp plan.

7. Expansion of income taxes is preferable to sale taxes which violate the long-time policy of the Grange based on ability to pay or benefits received. Enormous wartime expenditures, rapidly mounting public debt and

inflationary pressure of excess spending power demand a combined income tax and savings program applicable to individuals and to business, with such savings available in years of reduced income or for use in transition to peacetime operations.

8. Efficiency and economy in government are needed more than ever in wartime, when people have become accustomed to lavish expenditures and are ceasing to count the cost.

9. The Grange asks no special privileges for agriculture and rejects the implication that farm prices are substantially responsible for the increased cost of living. It believes that the burdens of war and peace should be borne by all alike and points out that both wages and corporate earnings have risen three to four times as fast as prices of farm commodities.

10. If farmers are to produce to the limit they must be assured of sufficient manpower, machinery and supplies, as well as prices, that will enable them to meet rising costs.

11. Direct Government lending should be discouraged and supplanted by cooperative credit, extended on a sound basis under farmer ownership and control. Crop insurance should be made available.

12. Freedom of speech, press, and radio are fundamental to American ideals.

13. A return to the constitutional form of government is imperative if the people are to be protected in the rights upon which this Republic was founded. Emergency powers delegated by Congress should be exercised in accord with the intent and purpose of Congress, should be self-terminating, and should be revocable by a majority vote of Congress.

14. With the Nation facing a transportation crisis, it must be met by voluntary adjustment of demands for service and by adequate provision for maintenance of facilities.

15. America should take its place with other nations in determining a sound economic basis for national development and commerce which will remove some of the most flagrant causes of war. World trade should be encouraged on a basis that will not injure American business, labor, and agriculture, with Congress reserving the right to revoke any trade agreement.

Liberation of Asiatics by Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which, no doubt, was read by many other Members of this body. The article appeared on Sunday, November 28, in the Washington Post, and was printed in the Sunday special feature edition under the heading "Propaganda front." The headline of the article is "Why should Asiatics be enthusiastic over 'liberation' by the Allies"?

I read the article with a great deal of interest, and I think it would be well worth the while of every Member of this body to read it. There is some good food for thought in it. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD ASIATICS BE ENTHUSIASTIC OVER LIBERATION BY ALLIES?

(By William L. Shirer)

As the war in the Far East goes into high gear, one wonders what the Allies are going to do, if anything, about political warfare.

In Europe there is no doubt about it: The United Nations stand for the liberation of all the millions under Hitler's yoke. We shall restore their freedom. They know it.

Will it be the same in Asia? Apparently the Asiatics have some doubts about it.

Some of them are said to wonder whether we are going to liberate them from Japanese exploitation only to return them to the British, French, and Dutch to exploit. Wendell Willkie found that "they all doubt, in varying degree, the readiness of the leading democracies of the world to stand up and be counted for freedom for others after the war is over."

WHY SHOULD THEY BE ENTHUSIASTIC?

And he added: "This doubt kills their enthusiastic participation on our side." Indeed the question today is whether, with the exception of the Filipinos, who are the only subject peoples in the East who have been promised their independence by our side, they have much enthusiasm for us at all, or will be willing to lift a hand to help us win back their freedom from the Japs.

Why should they, on the face of things? What hope have we held out to them? Well, there's the Atlantic Charter. It respects "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

According to a number of American observers I have talked with, the charter at first brought a great ray of hope to the peoples of the Far East. But this soon was dashed by Mr. Churchill's forthright statement that (1) the authors had "in mind primarily the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government, and national life of the states and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke" and (2) that the provisions of the charter did "not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire."

Mr. Churchill's able confidant, Brendan Bracken, the British Minister of Information, said quite flatly when he was here a few months ago that the British did not intend to give up 1 inch of the Empire. The Dutch attitude, I believe, is similar. The result must be that the Burmese, the Malayans, and the 70,000,000 of the Dutch East Indies know exactly where they stand when the Allies win. They stand exactly where they were before the Japanese conquest.

BURMESE MAY BE QUITE SATISFIED

Now, to our western minds British and Dutch rule, with all its shortcomings, is better for these people than Japanese rule.

But the important thing is: Do the subject peoples themselves see it this way?

Reports mounting up from returning observers tend to agree that the Asiatics do not, by any means, see it that way. These reports raise another interesting question. Have we underestimated Japanese capacity to knit their new subject peoples together under a political and economic rule no more distasteful, say, than that of the western European powers?

It is all right to say, as we believe, that the Japanese granting of independence to Burma is just a trick, and that we know perfectly well that the Nipponese will exploit the people of Burma much more shamelessly than did the British. But the important thing to know is: Do the Burmese think the independence which the Japanese have given them is just a swindle?

In the case of Burma, there is reason to believe that the people of that land think nothing of the kind. Some evidence points to the (for us) surprising fact that the Burmese believe they have obtained a good measure of independence and that they are downright enthusiastic about it. If this is true, then the Anglo-American forces that are soon to advance into Burma will not have as easy a time as they would were the Burmese to welcome us with open arms after sabotaging the retreating enemy.

We face a political task not only in Burma but elsewhere in the Japanese-held Far East. For, though we do not know very accurately the results, we do know that the Japanese have expended a great deal of energy in building up a political front in their conquered territories.

For propaganda purposes in general, but specifically for the military purpose of trying to acquire the loyalty and cooperation of the local inhabitants when the allied invasions come, the Japanese have recently held a series of conferences in Tokyo of various representatives from the conquered lands.

I suggest it might be well for our leaders to investigate whether or not this Japanese political warfare is having any effect on the inhabitants of the various lands we intend sooner or later to win back from the Japanese. For if the peoples of those countries are against us, resent our coming and openly aid the Japanese, any fool can see that our military task is going to be harder than if these political conditions were reversed.

Three Hundredth Anniversary of the First Holding of Law Courts and Trial by Jury in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on October 5, 1943, before a distinguished gathering of American citizens at the Hotel Warwick, in Philadelphia, Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, delivered an historic address, in which he reviewed the national history of Sweden, with respect to its influence upon the development of American culture and jurisprudence.

Among the many distinguished Americans who heard and acclaimed Mr. Jackson's address were Hon. George W. Maxey, chief justice of the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court; Hon. Richard S. Rodney, associate justice of the Delaware State Supreme Court; Hon. William W. Harrington, judge, Delaware Court of Chancery; Mr. Joseph W. Henderson, president of the American Bar Association; and Mr. Walsh E. Gibbons, president of the Philadelphia bar.

Mr. President, I feel that this address of Associate Justice Jackson might well be read by all those citizens of America who are sincerely interested in the early history of their Nation, and I ask unani-

mous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three centuries make only a short span in the long national life of Sweden, but they twice measure the entire national existence of the United States. Our annals are concentrated in so few years that our interest in particular events sometimes appears extravagant to older peoples with longer histories. An event almost unnoticed in Sweden was the establishment in 1643 by Swedish authority of a court of justice on the banks of the Delaware. But it was an auspicious event in the New World. Channels through which the struggling settlements could draw upon the established legal cultures and experiences of the Old World were badly needed on these frontiers of civilization. Colonial courts were among the first institutions to fulfill this need. It was their task to reexamine the legal traditions of European fatherlands and by selection and adaptation to unprecedented conditions build up a body of American law.

The Scandinavian settlement was made by Swedes and Finns, who comprised the Sweden of that day. It occupied a small part of the rich and varied area that now is Pennsylvania. Its existence under Swedish rule lasted only a short time. The settlement then lived under several flags and forms of government before the United States was born. Its contribution of particular laws and procedures to our present law would be difficult to trace amid competing influences. But we may discern in the philosophy of the founders of that first court much that was prophetic of the kinds of institutions that this continent was destined to create and foster. The Swedish spirit is shown by an instruction given a decade later to Johan Rissing, sent to aid the government of the colony. It reads: "Since law and right is considered and held to be one of the principal things among all people for [the preservation of] peace and good order, therefore he shall, together with the Governor, appoint such persons there, who will know how to judge according to the Swedish law and licit custom, in order that right and righteousness may have their course in the land."

When Johan Printz became Governor of the colony in 1643, he was invested with judicial as well as executive powers. The Swedish law and custom were to be followed as far as possible. He was authorized to inflict punishments for crimes by fines, imprisonment, or death, "but in the regular manner only" and after full examination and inquiry with the assistance in the trial of men to be selected from the principal and wisest inhabitants.

Printz established a formal court with stated session. It seems to have had considerable work. He was judge in most cases, assisted by a body of men, about 12 in number, and they heard the evidence and together decided the case. Printz ran into troubles as a judge. His judgments, like those of many a later judge, did not please everybody. Some of the settlers presented a bill of grievances, charging that they "were at no hour or time secure as to life and property" and that he passed judgments in his own favor against the opinion of the jury. The petition stirred the wrath of the Governor, who promptly arrested, tried, convicted, and executed his leading critic on a charge of treachery. This seems hardly convincing that the criticisms were groundless.

It is not easy to appraise Printz's judicial services against his times and vexations. But Dr. Johnson recites in his history of the colony two items which seem greatly to the credit of Printz and to the legal tradition of Sweden, which he represented, if but crudely.

Intricate cases arose, and Printz several times sought to have sent to him "a learned and able man to administer justice and to attend to the law business." Even in his colony of a few hundred people Printz found that he could not administer justice "in the regular manner only" and "according to the Swedish law and licit customs" by extemporizing judgments under the impulse of the moment. He appears to have felt that his own lay judgment needed to be steadied and his mind enlightened by reference to the accumulated learning and experience of others. Printz recognized that a system of justice under rule of law will not function uniformly without a legal profession.

But even more comprehending and statesmanlike was Printz's reason for asking professional help. He said it was "difficult and never ought to be that one and the same person appear in court as plaintiff as well as judge." I need not point out to members of the legal profession the eternal verity of this statement.

But the date of this utterance is as impressive as its insight. It comes to us out of the 1600's like a flash of lightning across a dark sky. The world was then in the chaos of the Thirty Years' War. Gustavus Adolphus, the great leader who planned the colony of New Sweden but did not see it founded, had fallen, leading the liberal western world against reactionary and autocratic forces which threatened its extinction. Printz's declaration was made a half century before John Locke published his famous Treatise On Government in which he espoused the philosophy that judicial power should be independent of executive policy. It was made a century and a half before Locke's writings bore fruit in our Declaration of Independence. It was made before the struggle of the English people against their kings ended with a victory over arbitrary power. That struggle in fact had only begun. In 1612 James I called the famous conference of England's judges and advised them that he might take any cause he pleased away from them and decide it for himself. Lord Chief Justice Coke bluntly denied such right and told the King that he was "under God and the law." It took nearly a century of struggle to make Coke's statement good.

Such statements as those of Printz and Coke are not often instances of isolated individual illumination. These sentiments well up in a man because they are implicit in the experience and discipline of the people from whom he came. These men were giving voice to convictions widely but perhaps inarticulately held in common by English and Scandinavian peoples. They both represent a tradition embodied in our Declaration of Independence and in the principles upon which our new Government was founded. One of the difficulties of identifying the influence of New Sweden upon our institutions is that Swedish contributions have great similarity to the pattern brought from England, and for good reason.

Sweden's early history is not unlike that of England, which indeed was substantially influenced by the bold, blond men from the Scandinavian countries who sometimes came to her shores without invitation and remained without welcome. Both national governments emerged from a violent contest for power between the crown and nobility, and both saw a constant struggle by the people for political and religious freedom. In neither of these lands were the people oppressed by their kings or their nobility to the same extent as people in many other nations.

The doctrine of the divine right of kings never gained a foothold in Sweden and gained but a temporary one in England. Many of the Swedish kings were elected by the people—a heritage from Viking times and this custom repudiated all assumptions of divine right. In Sweden the law, not the king, had divine sanction, and he was subject to and below the law.

Swedish law, which New Sweden was commanded to follow, has reflected in its development the outstanding characteristics of the Swedish people. They possess an inborn love of freedom—religious and political. Serfs are unknown in Swedish history, and the Swedes are so incorrigibly independent that of all Europe they alone live in a land never occupied by a conqueror. Liberal in the sense of being tolerant of change and receptive to improvement, they are conservative in preserving a continuity with the past. The Swede is typically tolerant and rarely attempts to suppress views that differ from his own. He is industrious, and work is necessary to his happiness. He is a confirmed individualist, yet none has proved so capable of teamwork in voluntary cooperative efforts and enterprises. He is intensely religious, and he has profound respect for the personality and individuality of every human being, whether he is in humble or in high circumstance. He does not believe in or encourage great disparities in wealth or worldly goods. These traits have left their mark on Swedish history and on many American communities where the Swedes have assumed leadership. I have had occasion to see something of Swedish justice in Sweden and to know the spirit of the Scandinavian as a juror and official when transplanted to this country. No man is more innately just and tolerant, none more patient to hear both sides, none more dispassionate in judgment.

When, however, we go far back in history to appraise the contributions of a migrant people to the great stream of thought which we call our law, we must seek for the spirit they imported to the law rather than for specific laws. The same institution or document may in action be put to very different ends in the hands of those whose spirit differs. Whatever of difference exists today between the constitutions, laws, and institutions of Sweden and the United States is a matter more of form than of substance. Such is the similarity of her spirit with our own that nowhere else will an American feel more at home away from home. Both countries are trying to govern men and their relations by rules of law and not by the whim of those in seats of power. In any land where this is done a just man may feel secure and free.

But we in America—and I do not think we were alone in the mistake—imperiled our heritage of freedom by taking its safety for granted. As free people we went about our daily lives thinking whatever we did think, saying whatever we wished to say, working at tasks of our choice, worshiping God, each in his own way. When on the eve of his invasion of the Low Countries, Hitler declared that upon the battle then beginning depended the future of Eurpoe for a thousand years, most of us hardly knew what he meant.

We know now. The "new order" would break down every independent judicial protection of the citizen's freedom against executive power. Only recently Dr. Rothenberger, Secretary of State of Germany, has admitted a "crisis in the field of justice." He blames German judges who, as he wrote, "have not succeeded in gaining the confidence of the Fuehrer and the party." He recomended pushing the judiciary still further "into the background" but admitted that by such a move "the present outcry about lawlessness, arbitrariness, legal insecurity, etc.," might be raised by still larger circles. This complaint about the judges confirms reports from other sources that among responsible classes the most resistance to Hitler and Nazi Party supremacy has

come from the professional judges and men of the law. It lifts up our hearts to know that even in Germany, though the lights of freedom and decency burn low, they are not extinct; and that it is men of our profession who tend them.

It is hard for free people in America, in England, or in Sweden to comprehend this authoritarian philosophy. Nor can we put ourselves in the place of those who live under it and who know not by what words or acts or attitudes they may displease those in power, nor in what hour they may without hearing, or proof or stated cause be silently hurried off to concentration camp. Nor can we measure the degradation that such undermining of a man's sense of security inflicts on his dignity and personality. We are happy that this evil system nears collapse.

The waning hour of Nazi and Fascist power is an appropriate one in which to recall the establishment 300 years ago in New Sweden of a court dedicated to the purpose "that right and righteousness may have their course in the land." We renew tonight our dedication to that old ideal, which still remains our own.

Let Us Help, Not Hinder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, how careful we ought to be in what we say and what we do. Men are giving their lives for our freedom and for the preservation of our country.

These are dying on every battlefield—our boys and men. There is not enough care for them. Too often we have to hear and read statements which can have no effect but to divide, the greatest threat to the success of our arms, certainly calculated to prolong the war, which means the sacrifice of lives not necessary.

I hope these terrible hindrances will be even now at an end.

The following editorial recently appeared in the Washington Post:

ILL-WILL AMBASSADOR

Senator BUTLER's knowledge of Latin America is no doubt as profound as that of any other tourist who has devoted a couple of months to traveling through 20 countries. His net impression of our neighbors to the south, as he informed the Senate on Friday, is that we are hated down there. If this is true, the emotion has been well dissembled. Of the 20 other republics in this Hemisphere, 19 have severed relations with our enemies and have given us exclusive access to their vital resources; 13 have allied themselves with us in declaring war against the Axis.

Hatred for us among the countries of Central and South America could seriously jeopardize our security. It would level a terrible threat at the Panama Canal. It would afford a dangerous stage for espionage and fifth column activity. It would deny us the use of strategic bases and of essential raw materials. But the fact is that none of these dangers has materialized. The countries from which an attack might be launched on the Panama Canal are assisting us in its defense. Axis agents have been vigorously expelled from all but one of our neighbor nations. Rubber, mica, quartz, nitrates, tin, and other essential materials in short supply in the United States have been forthcoming from our neighbors. They have trusted us sufficiently to let us establish bases on their sovereign soil. Ecuador has given us the use of the most important naval harbor on the South American west coast. Brazil has placed at our disposal the indispensable bastion of Natal from which our planes swing out across the South Atlantic. Cubans, Mexicans, Brazilians have been sinking Axis submarines with great efficiency.

Certainly a policy which has produced such results is not wholly devoid of merit. It is worth remembering, moreover, that the hatred of which Senator BUTLER speaks was real enough a decade ago—the heritage of a century of Yankee imperialism. The policy by which that hatred has been so successfully overcome is a simple one—the policy of neighborliness, of assisting the Latin Americans in the development of their own lands and resources. Senator BUTLER objects to this policy because we have invested some money in it. He is dissatisfied because all we have to show for our investment is the friendship of our neighbors and an approaching victory over our enemies.

In assessing this investment, Senator BUTLER has been guilty of an egregious distortion of facts. We have boondoggled in Latin America, he charged, "expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit totaling more than $6,000,000,000." To this Senator MCKELLAR promptly replied that "the entire amount spent in South America is $2,207,000,000 of which $1,004,000,000 was for materials we received. In other words, nearly half the money was spent for critical war materials which we have received to be used in the war." The other half was spent to aid the Latin American republics in their own war effort and to help them in the development of the raw materials we need so urgently.

It is worth while to trace the origin of Senator BUTLER's animus against this sort of neighborliness. His record has been one of unrelenting and unregenerate isolationism. He voted against the Lend-Lease Act. He voted against revision of the Neutrality Law. He voted against extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements. When he took his trip to Latin America he seems to have found only what he wanted to find. To the blind, all things look black.

Address at Clinton Hospital Honor-Roll Exercises, Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Clinton Hospital honor-roll exercises, Unitarian Church, Clinton, Mass., June 20, 1943:

It is surely a great honor for me this afternoon, in this historic place of worship, to join with those of you who have so thoughtfully assembled to dedicate this beautiful honor roll in honor of the doctors and nurses of the Clinton Hospital who are now in the service of our country.

A most generous thought has inaugurated this ceremony, a most patriotic motive animates it, and an atmosphere of solemn gratitude dominates the occasion which brings us together today.

Those we honor, not only serve us gloriously in war but served us faithfully and well in time of peace. Each and every one of them has played a vital part, at some time or other, in the great work of the Clinton Hospital, a work of mercy, charity, and benefaction that embraces not only the town of Clinton but many other communities in the central part of Worcester County. We had reason to know their industry, their devotion to duty, and their faithful performance of daily tasks that very often meant life itself to many of our friends and fellow citizens.

The whole community can well be proud of this gallant band to whom we pay this appropriate and well-earned tribute but our venerable and esteemed Dr. Bowers, whose long years have been marked with such conspicuous devotion and effective service, my old and valued friend Dr. Goodwin, who I am so happy to see here this afternoon, my friends, Dr. Monohan, Dr. Grady, Dr. Chase, Dr. Abbott, Dr. Mitchell, Dr. Burke, Dr. Keay, Miss Mortimer, and the entire medical and nursing staff of the hospital to which we are all so much indebted, have special and great reason to be proud of the fine record of their professional associates which we gratefully acknowledge and commemorate today.

Today we should ask ourselves two questions: Why have these most useful men and women—messengers of peace and mercy—been suddenly taken from our midst and cast into the vortex of a great and terrible global war? They join millions of others unselfishly serving their country in virtually every part of the world, on the high seas, and in the air. They have enlisted in that great and immortal force which we have every confidence will bring us glorious victory in what we hope will be the very earliest time. These brave and loyal sons and daughters of ours have gallantly answered the call to higher duty—the call of country, of democracy, of liberty itself.

In honoring them here this afternoon, it is idle for us to try to determine where responsibility lies for the unspeakable human failures that produced this terrible conflict. It is a sad commentary indeed upon the futility of higher civilization and the impotency of modern statesmen to grapple with the problem of controlling greed, avarice, and the lust for tyrannical power. It is a horrible irony that the intelligent opinion of the world was not able to suppress the impulses of power-crazed despots. The failure of modern government and statesmanship to prevent a small group of men from instituting a reign of terror, hatred, and slaughter on this earth and sending millions to untimely death, is surely a challenge to our generation.

The second question I would like to pose briefly is, What can we, what do we propose, to do about it? What power resides in us to prevent the periodic recurrence of future wars which threaten to extinguish all civilized life?

First, in justice to those who have sacrificed their lives and who are giving their unselfish, unflinching service we must wage the present conflict with renewed determination and ever-increasing zeal to overcome the brutal enemies who seek our destruction. We must leave nothing undone that can be done to support our men and women on the fighting front. They are our first line of defense and there is no sacrifice we can make that is too great or too exacting in order to ensure them the means and wherewithal to gain a speedy victory.

Secondly, we must ever be mindful of the dangerous forces of radicalism and ruin that

beset us on the home front—the apostles of alien theories of government, the philosophers of hate and discontent, the advocates of forceful overthrow and change of our beloved American institutions.

In order to enjoy freedom, we ourselves must be worthy of it, we must be willing to sacrifice for it, we must be ready to struggle, fight and die, if need be, to preserve, protect, and maintain it, and we must realize above all that in the present great crisis our first and most difficult task on the home front is to keep and save for ourselves and our children and our children's children the precious freedom that has made America the greatest country on earth.

Thirdly, we must be willing to work and strive in every reasonable and practicable way we can consistently with the preservation of our own form of government, our own sovereignty, and our own liberty, after victory has been won, to establish a just and a lasting peace, a peace that will be based on justice, mercy, charity, and righteousness, a peace that will renounce greed and avarice and recognize the right of every nation and individual to be accorded an opportunity to work out their own salvation under institutions of reason, law, and justice.

With hearts full of gratitude for the bravery and patriotism of these fine young men and women, as we dedicate this occasion and this beautiful honor roll to their memory, their spirit of sacrifice and their valor, let us resolve to do our part in every human way we can to speed the day which, pray God, may soon be at hand, when these heroes and heroines of the hospital, and all the others who are with them on the far-flung battlefields of the world will be returned to their homes, their families, their loved ones, their peaceful pursuits and a greater, finer, and nobler America which will truly guarantee to every man, woman, and child within its sacred precincts, irrespective of race, color, or creed, the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Racial Disunity and Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler which has to do with racial disunity and prejudice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 15.—Mr. Biddle, the Attorney General, made an address last week in which he deplored racial disunity and prejudice and proposed that local groups be formed across the Nation to combat this sort of thing. He should have gone into particulars regarding the sources of this dangerous agitation, for he certainly is in a position to know that the trouble is aggravated much less by the ordinary American who, undoubtedly, does have his prejudices, usually mild or dormant, than by the Communists, the Negro press, and Marshall Field, all of whom exploit for their own purposes the frictions between whites and Negroes, gentiles and Jews. It happens that all three of these frictioneers are attached or devoted to the New Deal Party.

The Communists not only address their appeals to the Negro as a Negro and the Jew as a Jew and the first victim of Hitlerism, but they constantly put forward the most exasperating individuals to be found in either group as representative, even heroic, Negroes and Jews with the very purpose of arousing hatred. Their method is to identify such individuals as typical Negroes and Jews, knowing that the most normal Americans will instinctively hate them and thus be tempted to hate all Negroes and all Jews. The Communists thrive on turmoil, disunity, and confusion, and, as even Mayor LaGuardia once remarked when they were deliberately promoting and prolonging a local problem, they never want a peaceful settlement of any issue but would sacrifice the very people for whom they pretend to fight. Their objective is violence in the streets, then the break-down of government through the weakness or hesitation of mayors and governors, then anarchy, and, finally, the dictatorship.

There is no element comparable to the Negro press in the promotion of race consciousness among the Negroes and racial distrust of the white population. These publications have a large circulation and they constantly remind the Negro that he is a Negro while calling on the white press to forego all such distinctions. They misrepresent the background facts of all disturbances so as to make it appear that, invariably, some white man was responsible for the trouble and the Negro Communists and fellow travelers always receive recognition as racial leaders. Thus white men who read this propaganda are given to suspect or believe that the whole Negro population is following men and women whose purpose in life is to destroy the American Government. This naturally does not make for that friendship and understanding by the Negro of the white man and vice versa for which Mr. Biddle pleads and all good Americans yearn.

Mr. Field is a false friend of both groups for whom he pretends to carry on unremitting war in print. He aggravates incidents into causes and, although he identifies individual Jews as Jews, he holds that it is evidence of hatred in a gentile to describe himself as such. Further to arouse hatred by an indirect but not very subtle device, Mr. Field prints inflammatory rumors in sensational style and then nails them as falsehoods. But in so doing he gives circulation to disturbing ideas some or all of which may be sheer inventions of his journalists who, at the very beginning of his publishing enterprise in New York, included many of the most conspicuous followers of the Communist Party line and adherents of the Communist leadership in the Newspaper Guild. When a man goes in for the publication of false rumors he knows nobody can check on the origin of the rumors. Thus he puts himself in a position to use his imagination and put forth terrible scares which leave an impression even though he does denounce them as false and imputes them to some unidentified person described as a hate-monger.

Mr. Biddle is not a naive man, and I am sure he knows that the most influential agitators of racial and religious hatred are to be found among these elements, all adherents of his own party and of the ruling administration of which he is a part. The standard daily press of the country has handled these very delicate problems with great tact and has even played down some incidents just because they were inflammatory. The guiltiest of all agitators are those who pretend to fight against group hatreds.

International Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "International Air Transport," written by Hon. Josh Lee, a distinguished former member of this body, who is now a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and published in the Foreign Commerce Weekly for October 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT—CHIEF PROBLEMS THAT REQUIRE SOLUTION BY THE GOVERNMENTS IF AIR CARGO IS TO PLAY ITS DESTINED ROLE IN WORLD TRADE

(By Josh Lee, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board)

Much has been written and spoken about the international air commerce that is expected to develop over and between all the continents of the world after the war is over. Aeronautically speaking, the developments of that trade appear potentially unlimited. In fact, the technical problems of operation would seem to be less than the political problems which are so very much a part of international air commerce. Therefore I am listing six of the major problems that present themselves in the development of international aviation:

I. THE FREEDOM OF INNOCENT PASSAGE, ESTABLISHED THROUGH MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT

This would mean that the nonmilitary aircraft of each country which entered into such an agreement would have the right to fly nonstop through the air space over the territory of all of the other countries which were parties to that agreement.

This policy was included in the Habana Convention of 1928, but has not been applied. Freedom of innocent passage should be established as an international policy in fact as well as precept.

If the world is to benefit by the advantages of air transportation, the shortest routes must be made available. In many cases the shortest routes cross the territory of different countries. These routes should be opened to air transportation by mutual agreement.

II. THE RIGHT OF TECHNICAL STOP, ESTABLISHED THROUGH MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT

This would be the right to stop for fuel, for repairs, because of bad weather, or because of any emergency. Such a stop would not include the right to discharge or take on traffic of any kind.

The establishment of the right of technical stop would greatly aid international air transportation because of the economy of operating in shorter stages than would otherwise be possible.

III. THE RIGHT OF COMMERCIAL STOP FOR SCHEDULED OPERATORS, ESTABLISHED THROUGH BILATERAL AGREEMENT

This is the right to land at specified bases for the purpose of discharging and taking on traffic. It would be for regular air-line operations and would include all of the rights

and privileges usually accompanying such concessions.

IV. THE RIGHT OF COMMERCIAL STOP FOR NON-SCHEDULED OPERATORS, ESTABLISHED THROUGH BILATERAL AGREEMENT

This would be for the benefit of charter and contract operators. It is the right to land for the purpose of discharging and taking on traffic. There would be no specified bases between which the carrier would be required to operate. There would be no scheduled operations. The traffic would be by contract, and the carrier could operate a door-to-door service between the two countries concerned.

V. THE RIGHT TO ESTABLISH AND USE INTERNATIONAL AVIATION FACILITIES, SECURED THROUGH MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL AGREEMENTS

Air-navigation aids, communication channels, and meterological information are essential to the operation of an air transport system.

As much freedom as possible should be secured for the United States and its carriers to establish, maintain, and use navigation aids in foreign territories to the extent necessary to supplement local facilities.

The United States has established a worldwide system of these navigation aids for military aviation purposes. By agreement with the countries involved, these facilities could be maintained and made available for international air transport operations after the war.

VI. AN INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY WITH THE FUNCTION OF RECOMMENDING "THE RULES OF THE ROAD," ESTABLISHED BY MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT

This would be the governmental machinery for establishing uniform safety rules and regulations, uniform communication procedures and standardization of weather reports.

Such an international authority could serve to bring together the aviation agencies of the different nations to work out agreements which would prevent subsidy wars and destructive competitive practices.

TO REAP FULL ADVANTAGES

Natural barriers, such as mountains, rivers, oceans, and deserts determine the courses of surface transportation. But air transportation can ignore coast lines and mountain ranges. The only barriers that seriously hinder air transportation are man-made barriers; therefore, if we are to realize the full advantages of this new and wonderful method of transportation, we must remove all unnecessary international restrictions.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF TRANS-ATLANTIC AIR EXPRESS FINDS GREAT GAIN IN OVERSEA SHIPMENTS

The first commercial trans-Atlantic air express in history was flown from the United States to Europe a little more than 2 years ago by the *Dixie Clipper*.

Since September 29, 1941, when the first international air-express shipment was landed at Lisbon—41½ pounds, including a Union Jack afghan for Queen Elizabeth of England—more than 4,300,000 pounds of vital express have been transported between the United States and Europe by one air system alone, providing an invaluable wartime link for the transportation of goods across the ocean.

One of the first international air-express shipments in aviation history was the dispatch of 146 hatching eggs from Miami in 1931, destined for a South American dealer. The successful business that followed in importing live baby chicks by airplane to Latin America to replace the tough home-grown variety was merely the first step in the development of widespread international air-express business.

By the time that the United States entered the war, airways were providing this Nation and others with dependable air-express service over all the major oceans to more than threescore countries on every continent, including Alaska, China, Europe, the American republics, Africa, and Australia.

Today planes' cargo holds are filled with priority consignments necessary to the war work of the United Nations and the defense effort of the Western Hemisphere. By such innovations as recoopering—the duration substitution of lightweight packaging for weight- and space-consuming wooden cratings—as much as nine big plane loads a month have been saved on trans-Pacific shipments destined for the war fronts.

By connection at international air gateways to and from the United States with the air express service of Railway Express, shippers anywhere in the United States can arrange for through air shipment of their goods to almost any point in the world outside the zone of actual military operations.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call your attention to H. R. 2045, a bill by my esteemed colleague, Judge JAMES V. HEIDINGER (Republican, of Illinois), to care for our aged citizens—a measure designed to preserve the dignity of men, and women, too. It requires no pauper's oath, no statement of their worldly goods; it is merely a recognition of a grateful Government to all men and all women as an award for good citizenship. It does not encourage idleness or put a premium on indolence; there is nothing to interfere with their still engaging in worth-while remunerative vocations.

These pensions do not discriminate; they go to all, whether rich or poor; they eliminate the fear for the future, and those recipients who do not need the money and are paying much more than this back annually in taxes, can if they choose devote their pensions to charity or other worthy causes. It will be a simple and inexpensive plan to administer; there will be required no horde of Government employees and investigators; and can be accepted by all with dignity and self-respect. If individual States decide to increase these amounts, then it will be a matter for the States to decide. In the minds of all responsible men, regardless of their present station in life, even in the minds of those who now are prosperous, is the lurking fear of adversity for them or their loved ones, and this bill will bring them reassurance. It is apparent that much of the greed and avarice of mankind is engendered by the lurking fear of a penniless old age. This bill is designed to eliminate that fear, and should bring comfort and happiness to all our citizens.

The bill follows:

H. R. 2045

A bill to provide direct Federal old-age pensions to all citizens of the United States 60 years of age or over

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall pay, out of any money hereafter appropriated for such purpose, to any person who (a) makes application to the Secretary for the benefits of this act, (b) makes such proof as the Secretary may require that he is a citizen and resident of the United States, and (c) swears (or affirms) that he will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, old-age pension at the following rates:

(1) Thirty dollars a month, if such person has attained the age of 60 years but has not attained the age of 70 years.

(2) Forty dollars a month, if such person has attained the age of 70 years but has not attained the age of 75 years.

(3) Fifty dollars a month, if such person is 75 years of age or over.

SEC. 2. Payment to any person of old-age pension under this act shall begin on the last day of the calendar month following the calendar month in which application for such old-age pension is received by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and shall provide application forms for the use of persons desiring to apply for the benefits of this act.

SEC. 4. As used in this act, the term "United States" shall include the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Where Stands Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Stands Rubber," written by Hon. William Jeffers, former Federal Rubber Director, and published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., for November 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE STANDS RUBBER

(By William Jeffers, president, Union Pacific System, former Federal Rubber Director)

(NOTE.—Mr. Jeffers here makes, in answer to a request by the Journal, a remarkably clear and succinct statement of the synthetic rubber program, both as he left it when he returned to the presidency of the Union Pacific, and as he foresees its further development. It is not difficult to perceive in this outline, sent from Omaha, that Mr. Jeffers thinks synthetic rubber plants are satisfactorily advanced, that tire fabric production lags behind, and that a whole-souled

cooperation by rubber company heads would be salutary.—The Editor.)

My job as Rubber Director was to bring order out of chaos, get these synthetic rubber plants built and into production, and at the same time develop the various processes for making synthetic rubber from alcohol or petroleum. The job of getting the synthetic rubber plants built and into operation was practically completed at the time I resigned. Tests of the various processes for making synthetic rubber were likewise completed.

At the moment there is more synthetic rubber being produced than is being fabricated. There is at present, as well, a serious prospective shortage of tire fabric, namely, cotton cord and rayon, the responsibility for the production of which was entirely that of the War Production Board, and, as to rayon, was in the hands of the Chairman of the War Production Board personally. As Rubber Director, I was completely without authority to suggest or interfere in the matter of production of tire fabric.

There is a shortage of manpower in these rubber plants, but that shortage is no more serious than is the shortage of manpower on American railroads. I have felt, and still feel, that output per man in the production of tires is below what it should be.

It took the rubber companies some 40 years to reach the perfection in tire manufacture that was attained prior to Pearl Harbor, and it could hardly be expected that, taking an entirely new material, we could reach the perfection of pre-Pearl Harbor crude rubber tires with synthetic rubber overnight.

I am not a chemist, and I don't even claim a speaking acquaintanceship with chemistry. Nevertheless, I am very firmly of the opinion that, if the progress is made that can and should be made in improving the quality of synthetic rubbers, a rubber tire can be produced from synthetics that will acceptably answer all of our purposes. It may well be that in heavy-duty truck and bus tires it will be necessary, for the present, to use a certain percentage of crude rubber because of the heat generated by synthetic rubbers, as we have not yet reached the ultimate in perfection with synthetics. Col. Bradley Dewey, who was Deputy Rubber Director at the time I was in charge of the rubber program, is a chemist as well as a chemical engineer, and he has with him practical as well as technical men who understand all phases of the rubber program.

There is need for continuing in effect all of the suggested means for conserving tires, and this will continue for months to come. The tremendous increase in the demands of the military for heavy-duty tires for mobile artillery, as well as for heavier tires to meet the sharp increase in the size and weight of airplanes, has further complicated the situation. This, however, is war, and it is the responsibility of industry, as well as of users of rubber, to do their utmost in bridging the present situation. I am a great believer in the willingness and ability of the American people to meet emergencies if and when they are told of the emergency and why it is necessary to conserve, and because of that I have no doubt that the tire situation will right itself.

So far as I was concerned, the synthetic rubber plants were built and in most instances in production, and increasing the capacity of rubber companies, so far as critical materials were concerned, had been cleared; and there ended my responsibility. From here on it is the job of the Rubber Director, as well as of industry, to carry on research in improving the quality of synthetic rubber and in the compounding and fabricating of this new product. It is definitely the responsibility of the Chairman of the War Production Board, on the one hand, and the War Manpower Commission, on the other, to see to it that necessary tire fabrics and manpower are provided.

The building of the greatest chemical industry of all time within the period of a year and a half will stand out as an achievement of American genius, American drive, and American manpower.

Finally, the American taxpayers have a stake of $750,000,000 in synthetic rubber plants. These plants can and should pay their way. Never again should this country be left, as it was at the time of the Pearl Harbor disaster, dependent upon rubber supply from far-away Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. We are now in a position to assert ourselves so far as rubber is concerned, and therefore can and should see to it that the interests of the American people are protected hereafter in this respect.

In the press dispatches of November 9 President Harvey S. Firestone, of the Firestone Rubber Co., had this to say: "The rubber shortage has been successfully solved; the present problem is a scarcity of fabric. There is enough cotton, but not enough manpower in the mills to produce the cord for manufacture of tire fabric."

Rotation of Troops in Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been interested in the policy of the War Department as to the rotation of troops in foreign service. I realize the difficulties of transportation and the requirements of fighting a war; and I realize that in maintaining many far-flung fronts the War Department is handling a Herculean task. Many of the men in foreign service have been at the present time more than 3 years in one post, often a noncombat post. While the morale of these men is not bad considering the length of foreign service, by simple rotation in foreign service or by moving them to another camp or place of service, it may be immediately immeasurably increased. The more so is this the case on the fighting fronts. On the southwest Pacific men have been in active service since the outbreak of hostilities. I believe some rotation or change would help them and would help the Army tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks an interchange of correspondence between the War Department and myself on this point. I also include an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Rest These Heroes," dealing with this subject.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 24, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: I have your letter of June 11, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning the health and morale conditions of troops stationed in tropical countries and in the Arctic, and the possible rotation of troops on duty in these areas.

The War Department fully appreciates your views on this subject and you may be assured that every effort is being exerted for the health, welfare, and contentment of our armed forces wherever they may be stationed. They are being constantly watched over by men long experienced in detecting any change in health and/or morale. When the situation is such that it appears favorable to make a change, the men in isolated outposts are removed to larger bases where more facilities are available. In some areas soldiers are being furloughed to the continental United States in such numbers and at such times as shipping facilities, the tactical situation, and the availability of trained replacements permit.

With reference to your inquiry concerning troops in regions which lack normal entertainment, every practicable measure is being taken to encourage self-entertainment among the soldiers. In this connection, theatrical advisers are assigned to each area headquarters whose duties are to assist soldiers in entertainment projects. A limited number of soldier kits are available and every effort is made to distribute them to the most isolated groups. These kits are of various types, some containing theatrical equipment, others radio transcriptions and turntables, music and musical instruments, games, books, or athletic equipment.

Health conditions are being closely watched and our soldiers are receiving the benefit of the best medical and scientific teaching of this country. I am enclosing copies of War Department press releases on health measures being taken overseas, which will attest this fact.

I appreciate your interest in this vital question and I am sure you understand that there is no disinclination or oversight on the part of the War Department to limit the rotation or furloughing of these isolated groups. Such limitations as do exist are imposed by the lack of shipping facilities and the strategic and tactical considerations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTIN,
Administrative Assistant.

OCTOBER 15, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
The Secretary of War,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I hand you herewith original editorial entitled "Rest These Heroes," taken from the October 10 edition of the Shreveport Times. This editorial is in line with my correspondence with you of several months ago wherein I suggested that rotation of men under fire for many months should be considered as a morale builder for the Army and an aid to our fighting men. This editorial goes very deeply into this subject, and I will appreciate your comments regarding its contents at your earliest opportunity.

I will appreciate the return of the editorial for further use on my part.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 25, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of October 15, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, with which you enclosed the attached editorial from the Shreveport Times. The editorial contains comments regarding the rotation of divisions that have been in combat and isolated areas.

The matter of providing a definite time limit for service overseas has been studied continuously since the outbreak of hostilities, but in every such plan proposed there is

the one insurmountable obstacle, insufficient shipping facilities.

The present War Department policy places upon the overseas commander concerned the determination as to when an individual should be returned to the United States. Primary emphasis is placed upon rotating personnel from station to station within the theater in order to provide relief for those on duty at remote and small stations as well as for those serving under severe climatic conditions.

Shipping conditions in the Southwest Pacific area are such that there will probably be no return of units to the United States under the rotation policy for an indefinite period. The existing policy in that area provides for the rotation of individuals and units within the Southwest Pacific area to provide relief at isolated stations and in localities where climatic conditions are severe. A similar policy is followed in the South Pacific area. New Zealand and Australia have proved to be very suitable areas for the rest and rehabilitation of personnel withdrawn from the smaller and more remote islands, and the commander in chief of the Southwest Pacific area and the commander in chief, South Pacific area, have been rotating divisions under their commands whenever possible and consistent with the over-all tactical situation in those areas.

With regard to the retention of some divisions in this country while others have been stationed overseas several months, it should be borne in mind that a division is a complicated machine consisting of approximately 15,000 men and supporting service units, and requiring detailed and extensive training before being committed to combat against a trained and hardened enemy. Each component part of the division must go through periods of small-unit training, advanced-unit training, training with the combined arms, and then extensive field maneuvers with the division acting alone and in combination with other divisions and corps and Army troops. This training may extend over 12 months or longer. In addition to this, divisions scheduled for the Pacific are given a period of intensive amphibious training to prepare the units for the type of warfare encountered there. After this period of training is completed and the division is adequately trained to engage the enemy in combat, there arises the complicated problems of preparing the organization for the area to which it will be sent and arranging for the great amount of transportation required. The over-all strategic concept and availability of shipping greatly determine when the organization will and can be sent overseas. If shipping facilities would permit, many more combat units would be overseas, and they are being sent as quickly as the necessary transports become available.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated, and you may be assured that it will continue to receive careful study in the War Department.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of October 10, 1943]

REST THESE HEROES

Home front tension over Washington neglect of the Army side of the Pacific war is increasing with the growing volume of revelations that American Army fighting units are being kept for appallingly long periods in front-line belly-fighting jungle combat while tens of thousands of soldiers are shifted back and forth between camps at home long, long after their normal training has been completed.

The demand is growing for more relief for fighting units and relief more often, especially in the Pacific where the strategy of lick Germany first, Japan later seems to have degenerated into sticking a couple or so Army divisions under MacArthur and a few more under seagoing Navy admirals and then forgetting the whole thing so far as even replacing these outfits when they are worn out. How many Army divisions we have in the Pacific now could not be stated publicly. But the Japs know they are few and it is obvious that they are so few that there can't even be release for rests at home for those dog-tired by months of the type of combat where two men grapple and only one walks away. Such a system brings mental hardship, is militarily deteriorating and wrecks bodies.

In order for front-line divisions to be given relief, without wrecking a front through substituting unseasoned men for seasoned men, it is necessary to have relief divisions near at hand—trained, acclimated, and ready to get into action. But the Washington strategy for the Pacific has not only failed to supply enough divisions to do any large-scale land fighting, but has taken very little cognizance of normal relief that every military leader knows is essential. MacArthur has been calling for relief for his men as well as for reinforcements. The blame does not rest in full with the Army by any means. It rests basically with the over-all higher-ups setting strategy and allocating forces to global areas—and keeping trained men at home from global areas.

As an example of the niggardly over-all policy of operating on a frayed Army shoestring in some areas of the Pacific without using available relief, take two divisions whose movements happen to be known:

One of these divisions already was overseas when the Japs hit Pearl Harbor. The average length of service (without relief) of men in this division is given as about 3 years now, including individual replacements of comparatively recent inductees who have been sent to it to replace casualties. After Pearl Harbor this division was at Guadalcanal and in some stiff jungle combat there. It went into another action after Guadalcanal and it is still in action at the front now. (We cannot be more specific without violating the rules of volunteer censorship.) Some units in this division are said to have lacked even proper clothing for as long as several months. Throughout much of the war they have been in hand-to-hand front-line combat or have been under the agonizing strain of waiting in the jungles for the knife, gun, and bomb attack they knew might come at any second.

Against the service of this Pacific war Army outfit is another division. It also has been in active service 3 years, being one of the first activated in the pre-war training period. But in 3 years of service the closest it has ever come to overseas duty has been a stay in Florida, where the coastline at times was visible. It trained through the 1941 maneuvers in Louisiana, then in Mississippi, then in Florida, and it is back in Louisiana now and still training. For what? Military police duty when the war ends? This sitting-out-the-war-at-home is no better for the morale of those involved than is the fighting-forever-in-the-jungles of the other division mentioned and this division has been itching since Pearl Harbor to get overseas.

The contrast between these two divisions may present extremes as to the time elements involved, but the same general condition can be cited in many other instances, both for men at the front and trained men at home.

As another example, take a certain Air Forces outfit formerly in Louisiana but which has been overseas for 22 months—nearly 2 years. The following statement (passed by military authorities) came jointly from a number of ground service men in this air outfit—not as complaining or "grousing" but simply as plain exposition of fact:

"We have moved in only one direction since the day we left the United States—forward. We have traveled approximately 30,000 miles and have seen and fought everything and anything that we have come in contact with in our forgotten war in the southwest Pacific. We say forgotten because our people at home do not realize there is a war being fought down here under the worst living conditions in the world. At times we have to plead and beg for equipment and supplies to carry on with. It hardly seems fair that in so huge an army as ours, that the greatest proportion of the soldiers should have to stay at home in the 'combat' zones from Maine to Florida, and Washington to southern California.

"Air raids (bombing and strafing), dehydrated food, canned bully beef, hard tack, snakes, jungle fevers, mosquitoes carrying 'bombs' loaded with malaria germs powerful enough to kill, quinine and atabrine 6 days a week, temperature averaging 100 on 365 days a year, to say nothing of wading in a light dew 2 or 3 feet deep, day in and day out, and living quarters that are damp and deteriorated from the New Guinea rot, are some of the conditions that Americans do not experience back home, but which we have encountered during the greater part of our stay over here. Certainly someone in Washington (or politics) should give the men back home who are eager to be in there pitching an opportunity to participate in this struggle.

"We who are exhausted from work on our planes day and night so that our pilots and combat crews can carry the fight to the enemy in this great struggle for freedom against totalitarianism, are beginning to wonder when we are going to get some relief from the exhausting grind which we have endured for the past 18 months. It seems to us * * * that with all of the facilities afforded by our greatly expanded air force, a few replacements should be available for men who do not have flying or combat fatigue, but who do have mechanic's fatigue, administrative fatigue, driving fatigue, etc., and who are suffering from dengue fever and malaria. After all, there is someone else in this Army fighting the war besides pilots and gunners, who deserve no small credit for their part in this war * * * no consideration is given to the men who made it possible for them to do their job."

Some of General MacArthur's American forces have been in New Guinea jungles as long as 10 months without relief—because Washington won't give him enough to relieve them with.

There is no contention that the conditions presented here apply to all outfits in the South Pacific. Far from it. But they apply to too many. We are aware of the many problems involved—of the difficulties of transportation, of replacing seasoned men with unseasoned ones in such highly specialized fighting as jungle warfare. What we are driving at is that the principle of keeping divisions in such combat as Pacific warfare for appallingly long periods when relief is available at home is simply dead wrong and that a Nation that could build the biggest war machine in world history in 18 months shouldn't have any trouble in taking care of relief for the pitiful handful of Army divisions now in Pacific combat areas.

The very strategy of "lick Germany first, Japan second," should in itself make it all the easier to handle Pacific relief problems because this strategy, right or wrong, has resulted in such small Army forces being placed under MacArthur and other Pacific commanders that it would take only another small handful to set up a revolving system of relief after men have been in combat for 3 to 6 months. The marines took out their original Solomon Islands forces in that time.

Rest these heroes—bring them home whenever possible within the restrictions necessarily set up by actual combat needs.

The strategy of "lick Germany first, Japan later," does not have to be stretched into a policy of putting off until "later" the problems of our Army men in the Pacific.

Dependency Allowances to Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Gardner (Mass.) News:

DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCES BILL TERMED INADEQUATE—CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN BREAKS SHARPLY WITH HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON MEASURE TO AID SERVICEMEN'S FAMILIES

WASHINGTON, October 20.—Breaking sharply with the House Military Affairs Committee, of which he is a member, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat, of Clinton, Mass.) today branded the dependency allowances bill, recently favorably reported by the committee and now pending in the House, as absolutely inadequate as a means of furnishing proper support and maintenance for the wives and children of members of the armed services.

Representative PHILBIN stated that in his opinion, while he regretted very much to differ with his colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee, he could not conscientiously support an allowance bill which he did not believe adequately dealt with the needs of dependents of servicemen.

"The rates provided in this measure as reported are substantially below those provided by the Senate," said PHILBIN, "and do not provide allowances for the wives and dependents of servicemen that I deem essential for their welfare while their husbands and fathers are away from home and to which I believe they are entitled."

Referring to the great disparity between the pay of enlisted men and workers in war industry, PHILBIN asserted that our service boys and their families have been denied the privilege of participating in the benefits of high wartime wages.

SAVING MONEY

The Clinton Congressman rejected support of the House measure merely on the grounds of economy. "I am for economy," said PHILBIN. "I am for economy as strongly as any man in this House, I am for eliminating every nonessential, unimportant, duplicating bureau and agency in the Federal Government, of which there are legion. But I am not persuaded that we ought as a Nation lay down the policy of saving money at the expense of the wives and babies of the boys who are offering their very lives on the altar of American patriotism. There are other ways of saving money that are not at the expense of these already distressed groups who have to worry continuously about the safety and ultimate fate of their beloved husbands and fathers.

"If we are sincere about our desire for economy, we can reduce the cost of government. We can eliminate unnecessary and meddlesome bureaus. We can tackle and curtail the grandiose programs of world-wide relief, world-wide reform, and world-wide largesse, which have cost and are costing us unmeasured, unimaginable, and undisclosed billions, as well as depriving our people needlessly and indiscriminately of many of the necessities of life.

"The last thing I am willing to do as a Member of this body is to be niggardly and penurious with the wives and children of our heroic servicemen."

Admitting the grounds for variance because of the difference in standards of living, PHILBIN said:

"In some cases, increased allowances may seem more than required for particular communities—I will not dispute that—but if Congress is to err in this matter, I prefer it should err on the side of giving too much rather than too little to the families and children of those who are sacrificing their careers and their lives to win this war and preserve our own democratic institutions. We cannot in justice adapt these allowances to our lowest standards. We must be liberal and generous beyond any doubt or question."

KEEP FAMILIES TOGETHER

"To keep the American family from disintegration is certainly not the least of our objectives in this legislation. The allowances proposed by some of the amendments, to be offered, particularly the Sadowski amendment, which I am disposed to support, will enable the wives of servicemen to be free to provide care and supervision of their young children and thus keep families together under proper parental controls while fathers are in the service of our country.

"For the most part, the higher allowances which I am urging will relieve the necessity of any wife of an enlisted man leaving her family to supplement the family income by working in outside employment whether this work is in defense plants or elsewhere."

Pointing to the fact that the Military Affairs Committee had ample evidence before it indicating the insufficiency of the rates provided for by the pending bill, PHILBIN said: "Moreover the increases I advocate are consistent with estimates furnished the committee by statistical experts of the United States Department of Labor as being necessary and essential to minimum healthful, comfortable and decent standards of living and are the very least we should, in conscience, provide for the dear ones of our global heroes.

"We have heard much talk about the gratitude and appreciation the people feel because of the sacrifices of our boys and because of the great unpayable debt we owe them. Let no decent American have any doubt about that debt."

NOTHING TOO GOOD

"On every hand we hear the phrase, 'Nothing is too good for them.' Let this Congress practically demonstrate some living, actual and tangible evidence of that oft expressed sentiment of gratitude and appreciation, which surely is shared by all of us, by voting in a true spirit of generosity, justice and patriotism for genuinely adequate and liberal allowances.

"If this Congress can authorize more than $1,000,000,000 a month for lend-lease bounties, gratuities, subsidies and gifts to foreign peoples, it can provide at least $1,000,000,000 a year to nourish, care for, and adequately maintain and support at decent American standards of living, the wives and children of the gallant boys who are fighting to save the country."

Congressman PHILBIN first voted for the Sadowski substitute which contained the highest rates proposed. When this was defeated he then voted for the Clason amendment fixing the rates the same as the Senate bill and finally voted for the adoption of the bill as amended at final passing.

Federal Control Over Air Transport Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from G. W. Vaughan, president, Curtiss-Wright Corporation:

NOVEMBER 15, 1943.

Representative CLARENCE LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtiss-Wright Corporation strongly endorses the principles of strengthened Federal control over air transport operations embodied in H. R. 3420.

CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION,
G. W. VAUGHAN, *President.*

Some Premises of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able and challenging address delivered by Hon. Wiley B. Rutledge, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, before the assembly of the American Bar Association on August 25, 1943, and published in the American Bar Association Journal for November 1943. The address is entitled "Some Premises of Peace." I have been informed that the cost of printing the address will be approximately $57.50 over the limit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME PREMISES OF PEACE

(By Hon. Wiley B. Rutledge, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States)

A year ago, when you met in Detroit, it was doubtful whether you would meet again during the war. There was a prevalent feeling against unnecessary congregations; and some made plain that lawyers' assemblies were of that character.

They were honest, sincere, moved by the thought that every energy should be devoted to the single, immediate compelling task. For support they had semblance of reason in our inauspicious start; the age-long months required to overcome that handicap; the inconclusive nature of our military successes to that time; the tenuous hold we had on vital positions; the corroding doubt which yet remained whether we, and our valiant allies who

had borne so much more of the earlier burden, had strength or time to overcome their near-exhaustion, and our initial blunders. So it was said no effort should be diverted from the basic business of waging war. And, among the things marked to eliminate were lawyers' organized activities.

That view reflected, as a mirror, the time's unspoken mood. Then we were living more upon hope than by faith; more in determination than in confidence. The world hung still too much in balance for creation of a sense of inner knowledge of the outcome. Stalemate was yet within the lay of the board. This we dared not utter, so we spoke with confident words. But we disclosed our inner uneasiness, and our lack of assurance founded in fact, by some of the things we said and did, perhaps more in none than the suggestion that lawyers should suspend professional meetings for the duration.

Your President and his associates wisely did not yield to this pressure. This was an evidence of deeper, more prophetic understanding. It disclosed two things. One was a more confident assurance that things would come out better than the rejected notion promised. They have. The other was a more basic belief. It was that, however hard the course of the war might be, short of final disaster, there was, there always would be, work for the organized bar to do; work of transcendent importance in winning the war, in keeping our legal machinery in function; in resolving the myriad of legal problems created by the war effort; in mobilizing under law a nation at arms; and at the same time in seeing to it that, in all the stress of conflict, the rights of individuals and of groups should have the maximum protection consistent with the Nation's primary effort and interest. These war tasks of the lawyer in themselves justify your coming together to consider them. The time of greatest peril is, least of all, the time to surrender the lawyer's essential, though then subordinate, function.

It is likewise not the time to forego consideration of its place in the future. For, when hostilities end, authority returns to civilian hands and the lawyer resumes his accustomed primary place in the functioning of government and the limitation of its operations. For these tasks forethought is required, unless we are to approach them unprepared, and that can be had best by exchange of ideas and information through such media as your meetings afford.

Your officers, therefore, took the sounder view. It and the opposing one represent opposite perspectives of the lawyer's place, and, therefore, the place of law, in our institutions. The one classifies them as frills, as nonessentials. That is a philosophy of might or of fear. The other view comprehends that the sustained, uninterrupted performance of the lawyer's function stands in the center of all this war is fought to preserve and create. It envisages also that consideration and discussion are necessary for its most effective operation.

It is fitting, therefore, rather in my view it is a duty, that you meet and continue to meet while the war goes on. And I hope the notion will not be voiced again, certainly not accepted, that any other course be pursued. It is preeminently appropriate also that you have invited to share your deliberations the distinguished leaders from overseas and above our border, who grace this and your other meetings with their presence. They bring assurance that men of law, wherever law yet reigns, seek with us a larger and, if law in the sense of a foundation for liberty is to survive, an essential fulfillment of our function. In particular I wish to extend to them the cordial welcome of our courts.

A DIFFERENT SPIRIT AND A CHANGE IN EMPHASIS

Furthermore, we gather this year, by contrast with last, in a different spirit and with a change in emphasis. The events of 12 months have fulfilled our hopes, and more. The present hour is pregnant with victory. Now we know, as we could not know then, that this will be no half-won war. The stalemate is out. Fact has given foundation for assurance that hope, however courageous, could not supply. And for this we give grateful tribute to the valiant men, of our own and other nations' forces, whose courage and sacrifice have brought our fortunes so soon to this high place.

We assemble, therefore, in elevation of spirit, though we do not let it blind us to the danger of expecting an end too soon or predicting when it may come. That question is not within our province, and there is peril in all such talk by men and women who have not all the facts and, with them, the expert judgment to form a reliable opinion. Few are qualified in either respect. And, for others, the only secure course is caution, lest we bungle again by overconfidence as disastrously as we have done before. But uncertainty of time cannot diminish the confidence which certainty of the result induces. Nor can it reduce our effort, either for what remains of the work at arms or for what will come after that. Rather assurance of the result requires that we be about our business with even greater intensity, for ending the present phase and entering the next.

AN OLD FALLACY AND A NEW PHASE

Our increased assurance not only has justified the lawyer's continued and organized activity in the war effort, it has brought a new emphasis, one peculiarly within his province. We are conscious that the more immediate business of the Nation, and of others with whom we fight, is prosecution of the war to an early termination. By now, too, it should be clear that every effort will be subordinated to this until that initial end is achieved. But, before the pressures created by our uncertainty of the outcome in this phase were released, we were told often, and by some in high authority, especially among our military men, that we had no business, while the war continues, to discuss, even to raise the question of what should be done about the post-war world. How familiar became the admonition that the business of war is war and nothing else; that the peace could not be made before the war had ended; and that any consideration of its character would divert energy from that primary labor, would bring only division and disunity and, therefore, should be put under taboo for the remainder of the phase at arms.

That also was a reflection of uneasiness, but it was more. It was a voicing of our accustomed mode of thinking that war and peace are entirely separate, disjointed phenomena; that they are walled-off eras; and that, in each, thinking and action must be limited to the task immediately in hand.

It was this fallacy which brought us into the war wholly unprepared, though we had ample warning against it from the highest sources and from the gigantic facts of the pre-war period, flaunted daily before our eyes for all to read their meaning. Some did. But not enough to ward off the peril. Large segments of our leadership and of our people wanted nothing more to do with war, and concluded from that desire that nothing more was needed to avoid its horrors than simply to decide we would not have it again. The desire was high-minded, admirable; the conclusion drawn from it, as events have shown, became our hugest blunder in national logic. By wishful thinking, we formulated the policy of "never again," and followed it until the enemy suddenly disclosed the decision was his more than our own. And so, by shock, we learned that the business of peace is not always peace alone; that the strongest will to peace cannot secure it if others are free and powerful to disturb it. That day in December destroyed premises of peace upon which we had acted for a century and a half. Among them were the idea of our own security in geographic isolation; the notion we could escape the flame when all the remainder of the world was in conflagration; the delusion that power-drunk tyrants, openly proclaiming democracy's decadence and the determination to destroy it, would leave us to pursue our own destiny. We thought that we might have liberty though the Fascist heel should grind all other peoples underfoot.

CAUSES OF WARS ARE CREATED IN PEACE

Pearl Harbor was a rude awakening. It brought down much more than battleships. Outworn ideas and ancient dogmas were among the wreckage left that day. And from this one might suppose we had learned that the fallacy which led us into war so unready may lead us also into peace, equally unprepared. We should have been taught, by this if nothing else, that war and peace are not wholly segregated things. They are rather but different phases, inseparably connected in influence and consequence, of single, though vast and complex movements. The causes of wars are created in peace. And the failures of peace are germinated in wars and in their settlements. The present stage is but the inexorable culmination of a vast conflict of forces which has been accumulating for a century or longer. The lines of the ultimate struggle were fixed with general clarity, though obscured in some anomalous detail, in what we have called, under short perspective, the First World War. Actually, it was only the prelude to the present finale But, as is the function of preludes, the broad themes were stated clearly. And for a time, during the struggle and afterward, they were heard and understood. But soon they were forgotten. The word, though spoken and heard, did not become flesh and dwell among us.

The idea that war is war, and peace is peace, and never the twain shall meet, adds into fallacy as vast and fatal as Kipling's eternal severance of east from west. It subsumes only differences in stages of human action, as in men themselves, and ignores the common influences, forces, and connections that run from one to the other and bind them together. The men who make war will make the peace. The nations who fight will make the end of fighting, and what follows. What we think and do in the war largely will determine what we shall think and do in the making of the peace. For that comes too close to the end of battle for discarding altogether the influences the battle itself engenders. And so it is right, it is essential, in the course of hostilities, while the conflict at arms continues, that we give thought to what shall come afterward, if there is to be hope that the vast errors of another day will not be repeated.

That is true not alone for the reasons already stated. It is true also because now we have a created unity among our own people and among the United Nations, which we shall not have when the pressures of war have been released, unless beforehand action is taken to perpetuate this force for the stage of the peace. How absurd that we unite for the work of war, when it comes, but divide and separate for the creation and maintenance of peace. How costly "union every 20 years." If, with others, we are subjected to common dangers and must join, when they fall, to survive the danger, why should we not unite to ward them off and avoid their incidence? The force of the unity forged in war is one which can be used to prevent its recurrence. But it cannot be so applied if it is lost by waiting until the factors which create it have ceased to exist. In short, the stage of war itself is the first of the stages for making the peace. And in

that opportunity, while the soldier performs his function, the lawyer also may exercise his own peculiar capacity, for the common and more permanent advantage of all.

THE LAWYER'S TASK

That work is essentially the lawyer's task. I do not mean, of course, that it is one to be performed for his peculiar benefit. I mean rather that his is the special art by which institutions of government are conceived and erected. He is the instrument through which, with the aid of others, the aspirations of a people devoted to the rule of law are realized in the creation of workable institutions. That high function is at once the special competence and the commonly conceded trust of our profession, more than any other's. The lawyer's art must devise whatever arrangements may replace the soldier's authority, unless indeed the world shall continue indefinitely to be an armed camp. This is now the main business of our profession. Unless it is done, done well, and done while it can be performed, we and the world will have only a mirage of law, because we will have only a mirage of peace. The task has not been begun too soon. My hope, though not my assurance, is that it has been begun soon enough.

It is not yet the time for formulating the plan which will be accepted. That perhaps can be done only when hostilities have ended. But it is not too early for those who are free to advance their ideas, if in doing so one precaution is taken. None now should insist his scheme, in detail or perhaps even in larger outline, is the only workable one. That way lies the division which will defeat the major object. But, from discussion of proposals, tentatively submitted, will come two things at least. One will be a general stimulus to thinking about, and in favor of, the essential principle of effective organization for peace. The other will be thought, and some crystallization of opinion, concerning the larger outlines of the structure desired. In this discussion one in my station hardly can go far.

But there is real work to be done before the final stage of planning can be reached. And there are a few things upon which most of us now can agree. There are also some obvious dangers we should unite to avoid. Some should be made explicit, that we not blindly run into division over them which will defeat the large objective before the crucial work is done. May I state briefly a few of the things I have in mind? I start with certain premises I believe are fundamental.

SOME AFFIRMATIVE PREMISES

There is now, among the United Nations and within each of them, a vastly preponderant will for a permanent structure of law in the world for the maintenance of peace.

Any such structure, to succeed, must include at least all powerful nations, that is, all nations capable of disrupting the peace and the law of the world. So long as one nation capable of precipitating a conflict having potentiality for spreading to world- or continent-wide proportions remains outside, the structure cannot be secure. That means, at the least, any such union at the beginning must include China, the British Commonwealth, Russia, and the United States. If any one of these remains aloof, there can be no real assurance of success. For each will have the power, when the conflict ends, if it maintains its strength, to defy the others in large regions of influence or aggression.

The defeated nations cannot be kept in perpetual subjection, however exhausted they may be temporarily when fighting ends. Nor can, or should, they be exterminated. Germany and Japan are peopled with virile races. In time, as before, their strength will recuperate. When that happens, they, too, must be received into whatever union may be formed, and eventually accorded full and equal participation. Otherwise, the second premise will apply in their case as in those of other powers. But their admission must await a period of probation which will demonstrate their will to peace.

Small nations, it has been shown twice this century, can put no trust alone in treaties, when they are vulnerable to attack from aggressive larger ones. Nor do Switzerland and Sweden prove the contrary. They have protection, large or partial, in peculiar locations of natural advantage for defensive purposes. The only general security for small nations lies in their adherence to such a union.

Whatever union is formed cannot be made out of whole cloth. This means some type of federated system. There are existing examples of success, upon a lesser scale, in the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States. These work, though they differ in structure and in tradition.

The institution must provide instruments for decision of conflicts arising among the member nations, and effective sanctions for enforcement when decisions have been rendered. The creation of machinery for enforcement presents the most serious problem.

This implies as a corollary that each member must surrender a portion of its sovereignty. That is no more than acceptance and extension of the rule of law to nations as it has been extended to men and to states. It is an expansion of the principle in the British Commonwealth that each dominion, and all its citizens, owe allegiance to the Crown. In our analogy, it extends the principle of supremacy of the Constitution, both as to citizens and as to States, to the Nation itself.

NEGATIVE PREMISES

I turn now to premises of a negative kind. The first is that institutions of peace cannot be made by a treaty, any more than our own were made by the document we call the Constitution—not as much. A treaty may formulate them. Only the adherence of the people to whom its terms are applicable can make them living institutions.

A treaty of peace is in truth not a contract. It is an imposed obligation. That is why such treaties so often turn out to be germinators of other wars. The rare exception is the most generous, and, therefore, the most just, of treaties. But, at best, a treaty is, from the viewpoint of the vanquished, a forced assumption of duty. And it is always an expression of the victor's spirit of triumph, however generously made, a symbol of defeat to the conquered country.

Peace cannot be made by such an instrument. Durable peace is not the work of a moment, or a month, or a year. It is rather an unending effort, a continuous process. Eternal vigilance is the price of peace as it is of liberty.

TREATIES DO NOT GUARANTEE PEACE

All this I mention that we may begin to discard the idea that peace is made by a treaty. That only formally marks the end of hostilities; and the end of war is but the beginning of peace, not its creation. War must be ended; and, therefore, treaties must be made. But we have now learned, or should have learned, we cannot put our trust in any treaty as a guaranty of peace. We have learned also that a treaty can be itself a source of new and continuing conflicts, ending in new and horrible wars.

For this reason, not because it brings peace, whatever treaty may be made must not be cast in the terms or spirit of revenge. For that only generates the spirit of rebellion, which breaks loose when strength has been gathered again to resist. This is the first hard task, beyond the hatreds created by war, to draw from the deeper springs of justice and generosity, that new hatreds be not created, and thus the vicious circle rounded again.

I specify two things. The next treaty should impose no mandate of any conquered area in the hands of any single, victorious nation. Experience in the last peace has shown that mandates so reposed, in a spirit of trust, become in some instances, at any rate, but means for abusing the confidence and annexing the territory so entrusted for administration.

The nations defeated will be what we have come to call the have-not nations. They were that before this outbreak. Their own resources were not equal to sustaining their peoples. They were cut off from colonies and from free or fair access to other nations' raw materials. They turned to the smaller, the more defenseless nations, to take them, when necessary, by force. The conditions within which they were hemmed gave both occasion and susceptibility to the temptation to plunder. The last treaty imposed both impossible burdens of reparations and intolerable conditions of living. Unless the consequences of that policy are to be repeated, the defeated nations must be given adequate access to materials of others for supplying their essential civilian and peaceful needs.

I state two other negative conditions.

Peace cannot be made in partisanship, or in its spirit or for partisan advantage. Nor can it be achieved by pessimists. At bottom there must be the belief, the faith, that its creation is possible, and in this, rather in what I fear is its absence, as a settled conviction of strength which will not degenerate into weakness, is one of the gravest dangers. Wars are not won by men who think that victory is impossible, nor can peace be accomplished by men who doubt its achievement, who look only at the obstacles and find their sum insurmountable. Sincere men, here and elsewhere, hold to the view that the differences among men, among nations, among races and cultures, and customs and religions, are so great they cannot be subordinated in a working, successful effort to live with each other without recourse to force. Others, more cynical, regard man as a fighting animal, little above the beast except in cunning. These we cannot change. The former we must refute.

Their spirit is not the spirit of the men who welded disunited States into the United States. For, when England lost its Colonies in this country, we did not acquire a nation. For more than a decade we were losing our new-found freedom in bickerings and backbitings, in what Carlyle calls governing impotences among ourselves. And there were men, some among our greatest heroes of the Revolutionary period, who would have nothing to do with the effort to overcome these dividing and stifling differences.

THE BASIC PREMISE AND THE POWER TO DECIDE

We are men of law. By our adherence to this profession, we implicitly assert out faith that the rule of law, in all its imperfection, is preferable to any rule by force. That premise we accept, with the promise it contains that time will bring perfection where imperfection holds sway. We accept it for men as individuals in society. In England and in the United States we accept it for States and for dominions, nations in all but their subordination to the principle of equality under the law with other nations.

If that premise is sound for men, if it is sound for States and for dominions, it is sound also for nations and for commonwealths of nations. It is a universal principle, to which now we have no other alternative but periodic return of strife which even the strongest, the most secure among nations cannot survive in democratic tradition. As

men of law we owe that principle our undivided, unlimited allegiance. And, if we have not the faith for its further and essential extension, demanded by the conditions of our time, we shall not long maintain our place or our function in the spheres they already occupy. For myself, I believe the task can be done.

I have one further premise. It is that the decision lies in our hands, ultimately in the hands of the American people, more immediately in the hands of the American lawyer. It is my judgment that the other nations of the united front are ready for such an adventure and that, to secure it, they will concede whatever fair terms may be needed to secure our accession. I am sure too that the vast majority of our people now stand committed to the principle that an effective organization for maintaining peace should be created when hostilities cease. They do not want to repeat the present sacrifice.

But I am not sure the commitment is permanent. I have doubt it will stand firm when armistice releases the pressures which now unite us to other peoples and sustain our good intention. Once before we had the decision. Then, too, before the armistice was signed, and for a time afterward, we had the will to organize for peace. And, in the beginning, our people were not divided seriously about it by partisan policy or other destroying force. But we waited too long. Lethargy accumulated as we drew away from war. We became involved in discussion of detail, magnifying this beyond the major end. Partisan conflict arose, not at first, nor indeed specifically at all for some years about the central need and end, but over how and by whom and under whose auspices it should be done. Costly errors were made on both sides. And so we became afraid—afraid to take the chance. Stronger, more secure than any nation, with others exhausted by their longer share in the war, we feared for the loss of some of our sovereignty, not reckoning we might lose it too by the opposite course we came to pursue. Thus we lost the main chance, and it was not long until it had faded away in circumstances, engendered perhaps by the loss itself, beyond our power to control or reverse. The direction of events had been set for another holocaust.

Now we pay the price for losing that chance. Only one thing can make that payment worth while, that by it we may purchase immunity against making it again. Who knows whether we would be able? If we are to have this immunity, we and the other peoples who have voice in the decision must not repeat the former mistakes. There must be formed, and formed soon, an invariable determination in the minds of our people, an overwhelming, irresistible, unchangeable public opinion that the main purpose of this war, and of the last one, be not defeated again; that this object shall not be sidetracked or lost, whether in lethargy, in confusion, or in misunderstanding. This means the creation of a firm allegiance to the bottom principle of our profession as a universal one, to the idea that if we will have peace and law at home, we must have them abroad. It means too the creation of the will to action, in order to secure them, and maintenance of that will against all obstacles and oppositions until the object is accomplished. The decision in the end will be made by our people, who made it finally before.

UNITY OF OUTLOOK AND RESOLUTION NEEDED

But, before that, it will be made by the American lawyer. If we divide and debate about the basic thing, if we put matters of detail and method above it, if we rest upon our oars while the flood of events rushes on, carrying us unguided, unchecked, with the current, we shall not make port safely. Upon this issue, if we have a united opinion, the people will follow. For they know our business and our tradition are twofold. They are in the creation of power to limit it, in organizing government to provide protection for freedom. That principle applies in whatever realm law, as law, may operate. It applies among nations as among States and among men, unless sheer power rules. What we propose, and what the world must have, is the rule of law, and that means limited authority, equal to the essential task and no more. If our people believe we of the legal profession, here and elsewhere, can create that kind of power and can devise restraints which will keep it confined to its proper object, they will follow our leadership.

That is a magnificent challenge. No greater has been given to any generation of lawyers. It is a responsibility of equal proportions. And it is ours, whether we succeed or fail.

The immediate duty is acceptance of the leadership events have put upon us. That requires first the crystallization of our own unity of outlook and resolution to transmit it to our people. That much should be done at once. And no agency can forward this more than this association. I am encouraged by the action already taken by your board of governors. I hope similar forthright stands may be taken by the body as a whole and by the organized bar everywhere. The American Law Institute too adds its effort in a related phase. There is discussion up and down the land. All this makes a good start.

But more than discussion and statement of ideals is needed. By unrelenting effort, an attachment to them, a demand that they be brought to being in living institutions, must be formed, unbreakable and imperative upon those who will have in hand the formulation and the execution of our official policy. No mere majority will do. This is no task for 50–50 or 60–40 division. The sentiment must be overwhelming, the insistence irresistible. To accomplish this is the first, the immediate phase of the lawyer's task. It will require all our effort, organized and individual. It is the first order of our business.

If it is achieved, then will come the more technical task, the phase more nearly and fully within our special function. For, not barring the participation of others, it will be the lawyer who will work out the framework of the new institutions, and the limitations to be imposed upon the newly created power. In that phase we have preeminent example in the work of the men who welded our disintegrating States into a Nation. Their difficulties appeared insurmountable. Their differences, and those of the people they represented, were deep. There were jealousies, suspicions which threatened to forbid any agreement. Patriots who by voice and arm had worked valiantly to create our freedom, walked out of the convention, went home, and fought to prevent acceptance of its handiwork. The voice which had been loudest and clearest in the call to arms was raised in equal protest against the work of union. Who now would say that Patrick Henry was not as wrong in his last as he was right in his first great protest? In the one he read events and their direction right. In the other he had lost touch with their meaning. So now we have patriots, men as sincere as you and I, whose vision does not run with the ways of time; who have not faith to believe that lawful power can be created and restrained; who trust not the future or the men who will have its course in control. Respecting them as we should and honoring their purpose and their motive, we cannot follow their thought. For it will lead us in the way the dissentients would have led our forefathers, with equal sincerity and patriotism, when the issue was whether our institutions should take their present form. The hopeful example, the one more true with the course of events, is that which was set by the men who prevailed when that issue was resolved. Their work was creative. It accepted the challenge and fulfilled the need of the time. It was done, as creative work always is done, in the spirit of hope, with faith in the future and with confidence in the capacity of men to live and work together, to resolve their differences, and to create and maintain a framework for existence in which they can find a satisfying, if not a perfect, way of life.

In that spirit, and with like confidence, the similar task of our day must be done. I hope, I have faith it may be so done. There are some things which give ground for this belief, advantages we did not have before.

One is the spirit, the mood, with which this war is being fought. As I sense it, there is a large and significant difference. In the last war, the old spirit of adventure in fighting prevailed. There were the wild enthusiasms of wartime patriotism, stirred to peaks of emotion where reason lost all sway. Men were anxious for the fight, until they experienced it, as boys are lured by sport. I do not find these ebulliencies in the present struggle. We do not have the parades, the cheering, the high-stirred emotions of that time. The enthusiasm, the fun, the sense of zestful adventure, have gone out of war. There is, I think, not less of determination and the spirit to win. But it is a calmer spirit. Reason holds greater sway. Men know there is a hard and nasty job to do. They devote their energies and their lives to its doing without reservation. But they know they play no game. The business is deadly serious, and so it is taken.

I think this change is for the better. It means we are keeping and using our heads. It means, perhaps, we are fashioning less of hatred, even in the heat of battle, and, therefore, will have less to overcome when the time comes for making the peace. I believe we shall come out of the war a more sober people than ever before. And I believe that means we shall approach and resolve the problems of the post-war world in a saner spirit, one in which reason may have force to put down passion and begin a new era in world relations.

There are some disturbing signs. I shall not stop to discuss them. In part, they come from the strains of a war-disrupted world. In part, they are evidence we have not yet attained full stature in democracy. But perhaps the miracle is there have not been more. For this we may be grateful, without failing to recognize the occurrences that have taken place as the essential failures they are in our way of life.

These things are the shadows. There is much more light. A new day is dawning. And it is in the hope of that dawn, not the shade of the clouds here and there, I bid you Godspeed in your task. If I know you, you will not fail.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Barry Day, A. O. H., celebration, Bancroft Hotel, Worcester, Mass., September 11, 1943:

It is most appropriate, so close to his natal day, that this fine outstanding organization,

the Ancient Order of Hibernians, whose traditions and ideals are so similar to his, should commemorate the life and exploits of that great American naval hero and patriot, Commodore John Barry.

This great naval hero who received from none other than President Washington himself the commission of captain which was marked "No. 1" of all those that had been issued by the American Government, was born in Ballysampson, County Wexford, Ireland, probably in 1745. After comparatively limited but exceptionally useful and heroic life he died in Philadelphia September 13, 1803, and was buried with all the honors the American Government could confer, in the hallowed churchyard of St. Mary's Church in that city.

While his native land had never been particularly conspicuous as a mercantile, seafaring country, possessed of the great versatility which the Creator has given the Irish race, John Barry followed the sea from his childhood. Attracted by the lures of opportunity and undoubtedly animated by a burning spirit to fight for personal liberty, he came to America as a young man and at the outbreak of the Revolution was in command of the merchant vessel *Black Prince* owned by John Mixon of Philadelphia.

About this time the Continental Congress authorized the fitting out of 2 armed vessels of 10 and 14 guns, respectively, and Barry immediately offered his services to the Government and was promptly given command of the *Lexington*, 1 of the 2 vessels purchased.

On March 31, 1776, Barry sailed from Philadelphia in command of the *Lexington*. Not many days after, off the Capes of Virginia, he fell in with the *Edward*, auxiliary vessel to the British man-of-war *Liverpool*. After a desperate fight of 1 hour and 20 minutes he captured her and brought her into Philadelphia. Barry continued in command of the *Lexington* until October 18, 1776, and during that time captured several private armed vessels.

His next command was the *Effingham* to which Congress had appointed him while she was being built. In December 1776, Barry, not being satisfied with the dashing and prominent part he was taking in naval engagements against the enemy, then somewhat in abeyance, recruited a company of volunteers for land service and took part in the important Trenton campaign. These volunteers and marines fighting with them were under the command of General Washington, and Barry was assigned to assist in the defense of Philadelphia and operations in the upper Delaware.

February 26, 1778, returning to the naval combat he loved, Barry captured the armed vessel *Alert* and 2 other ships loaded with supplies for the British Army. Barry's next command was the *Raleigh*, a man-of-war with 32 guns. He sailed from Boston on that vessel September 25, 1778, and 2 days later was attacked by 3 large British vessels. After a 9-hour running fight with the enemy he was obliged to run the *Raleigh* ashore on an island near the mouth of Penobscot Bay. Fortunately and miraculously he escaped to the mainland with most of his crew. Although he lost his ship, he was highly commended for gallantry.

This stirring epic of American history continues. In November 1780, Barry was ordered to command the Continental frigate *Alliance*, also a vessel of 32 guns, and was delegated to take a high special commissioner to France through seas infested by the enemy men-of-war. On the way over he captured the privateer *Alert* and, after safely delivering his important emissary passenger, and after setting back on the return voyage, he captured the 2 British ships *Mars*, with 26 guns, and *Minerva*, with 10 guns, which he promptly made international prizes and brought to port.

May 29, 1781, after several hours of desperate fighting, Barry captured His Majesty's war vessel *Atalanta* and later the fighting craft *Trespassy*. During the engagement with the *Atalanta*, Barry was wounded, but notwithstanding, continued in command of the *Alliance*, taking numerous prizes during the year 1782.

In March 1783, the last naval battle of the Revolution was fought by Barry in command of the *Alliance*, with the *Sybil*, a ship of 28 guns. After taking the *Sybil* as a prize and while en route to port, he was set upon by an entire British squadron and, while able to escape himself with his vessel intact, he had to abandon his prize.

In all American history, although some seek to minimize it, there is scarcely such an outstanding record of boldness, gallantry, and achievement at sea by any naval officer, in or out of actual combat. Barry was absolutely fearless and frequently attacked squadrons of vessels when he was greatly outnumbered, overpowering, capturing, or putting them to flight.

After the Revolutionary War, Barry returned from the sea to take a great interest and a formidable part in securing the ratification of the Constitution which by that time had been written and promulgated by the Federal Convention.

Early in the year 1794, when it appeared our country was about to be involved in a campaign to overpower the Algerian pirates who had been preying upon our own and other vessels, in contravention of international law, Captain Barry offered his services to General Washington. It was sometime after this that the Congress appropriated the money to fit out six ships to form a new navy. Barry was appointed first on the list of American captains, and his commission was signed by General Washington and marked "No. 1." Subsequently he supervised the construction of the large frigate *United States* equipped with 44 guns, and was placed in command of this vessel. Sometime in the following year, acting under instructions sent him by the Navy Department, he captured 4 French vessels which had been threatening the shipping of our Nation.

In the years that followed, Barry was repeatedly honored by the Government by being designated to carry out special missions abroad. He landed envoys in France, awaited despatches from Paris and returned them to America. He also commanded an American squadron in the West Indies.

In 1801 his health began to fail and he was compelled to remain at his home in Philadelphia. His indomitable spirit, however, could not be broken, and in bad health though he was, he continued to prove guns for the Navy Department as well as for the Army.

November 24, 1802, the Secretary of the Navy presented him with an impression of the golden medal awarded to Captain Truxtun by Congress, considering Barry the senior officer of the Navy, entitled to the most respectful consideration.

The following year the Secretary of the Navy notified Barry his services might be needed to take the place of Commodore Morris in the Mediterranean, but he was too ill to accept the assignment. His health failed rapidly, and on September 13, 1803, he died at his country home, Strawberry Hill, Philadelphia. Thus ended the career of one of America's greatest naval heroes, so illustrious in its exploits that it has served in the years that have intervened since his time as a model and example for the many great heroes of the American Navy down to the very present war.

Since the first clarion call of the Revolution very many Irishmen have fought gloriously for our country. Countless men of Irish blood are still emulating in this present great conflict the bravery and gallantry and devotion to duty of the immortal John Barry. So long as we have men in the armed services of our country who will exhibit his daring, his fearlessness, his intrepid conduct, who will fight for the cause of human liberty whenever it is assailed, our country will be secure from the attacks of its enemies.

It is also for those of us who are in other callings and other walks of life, no matter what our station may be, to be inspired and animated by the high ideals of Americanism, liberty, and courage which inspired and animated John Barry. So long as we follow the high example he set of courage, daring, and love of liberty and country in all our activities as Americans, our country will be safe from the schemes of visionaries and destructionists who would dismantle American democracy, internationalize our institutions, and place the shackles of economic slavery about the necks of the American people.

And so tonight, as we so fittingly and so reverently pause in our occupations to commemorate the deeds of this great Irish-American here and to acknowledge the everlasting debt this Nation owes to him, we can revitalize his spirit of sacrifice and renew his fine, brave American idealism best by repledging to our beloved country the same kind of service and loyalty that he gave so unselfishly. It is in this way that we can best assure the swift, efficient prosecution of the war and the earliest possible return of our boys to their homes.

In this time of greatest crisis the sterling Americanism of Commodore John Barry be our example and our guide. Thus, as he did, we will overpower foreign enemies. We will also overpower the evil forces in our very midst who seek the destruction of our Government. We will keep and save the precious freedoms of America. We will speed the day when our boys come back home again. We will save priceless American liberty for ourselves and those who come after us. We will truly exemplify the noble ideals of John Barry—for God and country.

States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "States' Rights," written by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, and published in the Market Bulletin for Wednesday, November 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES' RIGHTS

On Tuesday evening, November 16, 1943, I had the pleasure of addressing delegates from five States to the Farmers Guild Conference in Frankfort, Ind.

Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa are some of the best farm States in the Union.

Most of the delegates to this convention were real dirt farmers as you could easily tell by the sign of years of sunshine and cold wind on their faces and by their hard, rough hands.

There was absolute accord in the meeting. Every one was of the same mind. Without exception, it was the opinion of the meeting

that bureaucratic control of the farmers must be eliminated.

Without exception, those delegates believed that the only way to protect and restore the liberties of the people in this country is to restore the rights of the individual States.

To listen to the farmers of these five Middle Western States talk you would have thought you were among a group of good Georgia farmers.

Following is a part of the address which I was privileged to make at this wonderful gathering of farm representatives:

"Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen of the Farmers Guild, I appreciate the privilege of being with you in Frankfort, Ind., on this occasion. I deem it an especial honor that a Georgia cracker should have been invited to make the address of the evening on this occasion.

"Since reaching Frankfort I have been asked whether I would make a Democratic speech or a Republican speech.

"My reply was, 'I have never made a Republican speech in my life. Neither do I intend to make a Democratic speech, but I shall endeavor to make an American speech in the interest of America and American farmers.'

"It is quite evident from comments of the delegates to this convention that the restoration of States' rights to the people of the States is the only remedy for the serious situation now confronting American farmers.

"As a young man, in south Georgia, I was a land surveyor. In running land lines with a surveyor's compass I found it was impossible to run a straight line guided entirely by the magnetic compass.

"Any local attraction such as railroads, telephone wires, wire fences, or other metals would cause the compass to vary from a true course and throw the surveyor off his line.

"As the sun moved in its course from east to west the position of the sun would also cause a deflection of the needle and make it impossible to run a straight line if guided by the needle alone.

"I found, however, that by driving a row of stakes at regular intervals I could always look back down the row of stakes and keep the line going straight ahead regardless of any local magnetic attraction or other disturbance.

"Statecraft and statesmanship is simply running a line straight ahead through the lives of nations.

"If we attempt to set our course guided entirely by our immediate surroundings we can never get on a true course. The vicissitudes of economic conditions, the local attraction of politics, and the unstable foundation of human greed and selfishness make it impossible to set a true course in the midst of an ever-changing world.

"It is only by having a line of stakes reaching back to Jackson, Jefferson, Washington and on back to the experiences of nations of the past that we can know that we are traveling along the road of representative government in America.

"It is only by having set a line of stakes and guiding our footsteps of the future by the experiences of the past that we can safeguard the rights and liberties which our forefathers bequeathed to us and hallowed with their blood shed on many fields.

"The question of the rights of States is not new. It is almost as old as the Nation itself.

"From 1861 to 1865 the bloody War between the States was fought over this same question.

"Just after the close of the War between the States a noted Georgian was in New York. He was invited out to a meeting held to celebrate the return of peace. Toward the close of the program this noted Georgian was asked if he would care to make some remarks and this was in substance what he said:

" 'Ladies and gentlemen of New York.

" 'I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speakers who have preceded me. They have described the homecoming of the northern soldiers with victory perched upon their banners, with drums beating, with flags flying. They return to their homes, to their wives and children, to prosperity, peace, and plenty.

" 'I want to describe to you the return of another army that is ragged, barefoot, and hungry. The young men of the South have been sacrificed on the field of battle. The seed corn of the Confederacy has been ground in the red mill of war.

"The women and children are sleeping in sheetless beds and eating from bare tables, the linens having been used to bind up the bloody wounds of those heroes who have died in vain."

This great Georgian wound up his remarks to the New York people by prophesying that a great agricultural empire would rise out of the ashes of the old South. This dream of 1865 has not materialized.

The same forces which made economic war against the agricultural South immediately turned their guns, without discrimination, on the farmers of the West and the Middle West.

From that date until this, the farmers of America, north, south, east, and west, have been gradually ground down into economic dependence. The agriculture of the South has not been rebuilt.

A one-sided, controlled economy is gradually pulling the farmers of the entire Nation down to a level with the impoverished States of the South.

The control of agriculture from Washington must be abolished.

It is hard for the people in a State to know what is going on in their own State capitals. How can they know what is going on in Washington?

You have found that it is very difficult to control the affairs of your State government here in your midst. You have found it next to impossible to get any consideration in Washington.

It is now proposed in Washington to move your Government still further away for you and invest it in some international supergovernment. Such an international supergovernment would be as far removed from the voters of America as the King of England, the Premier of Russia, and the Generalissimo of China.

You may rest assured that one of two things will happen within the next few years. The tide is going out or else the tide is coming in.

Either the rights of States will be divested from Washington and returned to the States or else the States will lose their identity in a great international supergovernment.

The States of the South were not strong enough alone to secure States' rights 80 years ago. The banner of States' rights at that time went down in defeat. The matter of States' rights is just as vital and just as much alive in the North and in the West as it ever was in the South.

Eternal principles are superior to any clash of sections. Eternal principles are guided by that row of stakes reaching back through all the past history and experience of man. Eternal principles will finally prevail in spite of any local attraction, any present upheaval, or any temporary selfish interest that for the time being may deflect the magnetic needle from a true course.

In this great fight for return to the States the right to control itself the banners of freemen will stand side by side whether from the plains of the West, the cornfields of the Great Lakes section, the rocky hills of New England, or the cotton fields of the South.

"By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave-grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one, the Blue;
Under the other, the Gray.

"These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat;
All with the battle-blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the Blue;
Under the willow, the Gray.

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever,
When they laurel the graves of our dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the Blue;
Tears and love for the Gray."

—Tom Linder,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

A Voice From Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal on Capitol Hill these days about penalty mail and the hundreds of tons of propaganda that are being sent out monthly by the various Government departments and bureaus, with the consequent waste in both paper and man-hours of work. What we hear on Capitol Hill on this question of waste is but a reflection of the thought and expression of the people back home. The following letter from a constituent is an excellent sample of what the people back home are thinking and saying:

ILLINOIS MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
Belvidere, Ill., November 16, 1943.

Re: Posters.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We have your envelope containing official war posters, one entitled, "Fuel Fights! Save Your Share," and the other says, "Serve Our Fighting Men Abroad! Conserve These Services at Home."

We have no way of knowing what your mailing list includes, but undoubtedly it is a formidable one when it is shaken down to include our company.

It occurs to us the Government would be a great deal better off if it would follow out the slogan, "Fight waste," which is shown on the eagle cut in relation to these posters, if instead of using the paper included in the posters and in the envelope, they would cut out the thing entirely, and thereby allow more paper to be used in necessary business, of whatever kind, all over the country.

Is it not possible that a waste in paper is just as bad as a waste in fuel, electricity, com-

munications, water, or transportation, which are mentioned in these two posters? All of these things are essential, paper probably is as essential as any, and the waste of paper involved in sending out these millions of posters seems to me to be unnecessary in the pursuit of the business of the Government.

Yours very truly,

DONALD A. TRIPP,
Secretary.

Aviation Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial on the subject of aviation control the New York Times raised one or two important questions which I have attempted to explain in a letter to the editor of that paper.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include the very fine editorial and a copy of my letter in the belief that both may shed some light on this vital subject.

The Times editorial follows:

CONTROLLING AVIATION

The signs are unmistakable that after the war aerial traffic is bound to increase enormously. Hence the importance of the Lea bill, which will soon be the subject of debate in Congress and which would place all civilian aviation under stricter Federal control.

Now that planes can fly across the continent between dawn and dusk it is clear that there must be a considerable curtailment of States' rights. There is no reason why the States should not exercise control over airports. The Lea bill permits that control, but properly insists on supervision and regulation by the Federal Government in the interest of standardization and safety. Nevertheless, in some respects the bill needs clarification. What service charges are to be made? Will private corporations have the right to create airports and to permit their use for profit? These questions should be answered. There should be some uniformity in charges and airport management. How that uniformity is to be achieved without infringing States' rights is one of the more difficult problems that Congress must face.

The question of subsidies for the air lines also arises. Every country supports aviation directly or indirectly by cash payments to make up deficits, by mail contracts or by other devices. The Lea bill would make "direct payments" so far as they may be necessary "to promote the public interest" when foreign lines need support or domestic lines engage in experiments. In the present mood of Congress there is little prospect that "direct payments" will be granted. On the other hand, if the Government is to control fares and freight rates, as it does in rail transport, the dividends of air lines are not likely to be commensurate with the cost of research and the risk involved in establishing new trunk and branch lines. The question of subsidies in some form is therefore bound to arise. If Congress grants them for aviation there will be a hue and cry for the support of agriculture and some industries for which post-war prospects are not bright.

In its present form the Lea bill is approved by the makers of airplanes, the air lines and the American Bar Association. Opposition comes chiefly from the States and from railroads.

The following is a copy of my letter to the editor of the Times:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1943.

The EDITOR,
New York Times, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have read your editorial entitled "Controlling Aviation" appearing in your issue of November 24 in which you point out the importance of the Lea civil aviation bill (H. R. 3420), which will shortly come before the House of Representatives for action.

I am glad to see your approval of the necessary principles of Federal regulation of flying.

You raise two questions in your editorial which, you suggest, may need clarification in the bill. I offer this explanation of these two matters for your consideration.

In the first place you say that the bill does not deal with the question of service charges for airports or with the question whether private corporations have the right to create airports and operate them for private profit, and that these questions should be answered in the bill.

You will find in the bill a provision to the effect that where Federal funds are spent on or in connection with airports, the administrator shall require such conditions as will result in public use of the airport on fair and reasonable terms, suitable operation and maintenance of the airport, and the clearing and protection of the airport approaches in the interest of safety. The bill also empowers the administrator to assure compliance with such conditions by entering into contracts, including contracts with municipalities, which contracts shall be enforceable by decrees for specific performance. The bill likewise prohibits the granting of exclusive rights for the use of any airport on or in connection with which Federal funds have been spent, except where the Administrator approves the granting of such a right in the interest of safety.

It would appear that these provisions adequately take care of the question raised in your editorial. It has been the theory of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in drafting this bill that the Federal Government should not attempt to regulate airports or to determine who may or may not build airports, but should leave that matter to the good judgment of the States and municipalities. However, where Federal funds are spent in connection with an airport development, then such conditions as those specified may properly be imposed. As you know, our airport policy has for years been to encourage municipal ownership and operation.

The second question raised in your editorial has to do with the provision for direct payments to air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation or to domestic carriers for experimental operations. As you say in your editorial, every country has had to aid aviation, particularly in connection with international operations. Under our own existing law, such aid is very carefully regulated by the Civil Aeronautics Board through mail payments. However, the Post Office Department recommended that, for appropriation purposes, such as yet undeterminable aid should be made directly rather than burdening the mail appropriation therewith. The question is one of bookkeeping. The committee, therefore, felt it would be wise at least to authorize (but not to require) the provision of direct payments in the categories referred to, rather than to limit authorization to mail payments. This provision of the law represents no change of law in substance or policy. It is purely a matter of bookkeeping.

I trust this explanation may clear up the points mentioned in your fine editorial. As you say, the Lea bill has very strong support, except for the opposition you referred to. It has been very carefully drafted. It perfects and clarifies the present Civil Aeronautics Act. It will greatly improve conditions for post-war development of our civil aviation along lines which will be sane and sound. It is an exceedingly important piece of legislation, adoption of which is needed now in order that our country may be prepared in civil aviation for the armistice days which, I trust, may soon arrive.

Sincerely yours.

Henry B. Steagall, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 22, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the kind and simple heart of HENRY B. STEAGALL is stilled. A statesman has passed away. One of the greatest of Alabama's long list of distinguished sons has gone to his reward.

Some men wear their greatness externally, like a cloak, for all the world to see. Others carry it deep within them, like the strong rhythm of a beating heart or the steadying assurance of an eternal soul. They are the workers, not the showmen. Theirs is a living greatness which endures far down the years. HENRY STEAGALL wore his greatness deep.

The record of his work lives on. Strong in wisdom, patient in understanding, firm in virtue, he championed the cause of the little people and his courage never failed their trust.

We who knew him loved him. The example of his life is a legacy that each of us shall cherish.

The Remington Arms Plant, Lowell, Mass.

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Army has closed at Lowell a plant employing 7,500 people. They have closed plants in other parts of the country, including the $30,000,000 plant at Salt Lake City and plants in St. Louis, Cincinnati, Eau Claire, and Allegheny, manufacturing the same sort of ordnance equipment, that is, bullets.

At Lowell was manufactured for the first time successfully shell casings made

of steel. The Lowell ordnance plant performed a very remarkable feat, and they did very much better than our allies in perfecting that production. The Remington Arms Co. and the War Department have been delighted with the work the Lowell people have done, particularly the Lowell operators. It is a great tragedy that this employment should be taken away. The people are glad there is no need for more bullets, that there is an oversupply; nevertheless the resultant loss of employment is very severe and it makes me realize very forcibly that complete planning should have been made for the closing of these war plants and that we must see to it that the administration has a sound plan for taking care of such discontinuance of war manufacture and industries that are behind in their production should be moved into the unoccupied plants where there is fine labor available.

The appreciation of the Remington Arms and of Lowell which appeared in the Lowell Evening Sun is as follows:

A WORD OF APPRECIATION TO THE PEOPLE OF LOWELL

To the People of the City of Lowell:

The Lowell ordnance plant has fulfilled its assignment in the great production battle of World War No. 2. Shortly after receiving notice that the plant was to close its operations, I received a letter from Maj. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance, in which the accomplishments of the Lowell ordnance plant are given high praise. This letter is reproduced herewith, because I feel very strongly the General Campbell's congratulations must rightfully be shared with the people of Lowell.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1943.

Mr. C. K. DAVIS,
President, Remington Arms Co.,
Bridgeport, Conn.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The imminent closing of the Lowell and Utah ordnance plants again calls forcibly to mind the remarkable accomplishments of these pplants, their employees and of Remington Arms Co., as contractor operator, in overcoming the crisis of some months ago in small-arms ammunition.

Remington, of course, we know as one of America's reliable stand-bys whenever the United States is forced into war. It is as strange to you as it is to the rest of us to find ourselves with vast surpluses of small-arms ammunition at a time when war appears to be approaching its height. It is a happy and extremely fortunate position, which has been attained, as you know so well, by hard and tireless work.

No praise could quite express the gratitude of the Ordnance Department for the superior performance of your company and all your good people. The Nation, likewise, is in your debt. There has been no time, nor will there be such a time, in this war when a single American soldier will lack enough ammunition. When the news of the overwhelming success of the ordnance small-arms ammunition program, in which all of your people played such an outstanding part, reaches our troops overseas, I am sure it will be received with a special kind of thankful appreciation understandable only to men who daily face death in warfare.

The astonishing results of industry's job in small-arms ammunition manufacture, together with the fluidity of war, have combined, it is apparent, to cause higher authority to decrease markedly the small-arms ammunition requirements. Ordnance, therefore, acting under this directive, decreases production.

All of you should be very proud of your fine record. Will you please convey to your loyal American personnel at Lowell and Utah, our appreciation of their contribution to a speedy solution of the small-arms ammunition production problem. You and your people have helped win a vital battle.

Sincerely yours,
L. H. CAMPBELL, Jr.,
Major General, Chief of Ordnance.

As operator of the plant, the Remington Arms Co. has had the continual aid and cooperation of the people of Lowell. Without such freely given and patriotic help no industrial operation could have succeeded. You have been a major factor in the success of our production program. Your civic leaders have extended cordial cooperation from the first. Their help, guidance, and counsel I acknowledge gratefully.

Those of you who were among our employees have proved your patriotism by loyal, intelligent, and industrious application to the task. To you I convey our admiration and most sincere and heartfelt thanks.

And to all the people of Lowell, whose encouragement and hospitality have lightened our burden here so materially, I offer our enduring gratitude and appreciation.

Sincerely yours,
C. K. DAVIS,
President and General Manager,
Remington Arms Co., Inc.
REMINGTON ARMS CO., INC.,
Bridgeport, Conn.

Clearing the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very fine editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe on November 12, 1943.

CLEARING THE AIR

Almost simultaneously, the British Government at London and President Roosevelt in Washington have undertaken to set the record forth clearly with respect to mutual give and take under lease-lend arrangements. This clarification was overdue; but it is all to the good that congressional criticism has finally elicited it.

As the picture is drawn, Britain reports that she has repaid, under "reverse lease-lend," close to $900,000,000, through the furnishing of goods and services to the United States, specifically and in particular, to American forces operating or stationed in the British Isles. Above and beyond this, other substantial repayments in services have been made, some of which are calculable, others beyond specific dollar-and-cents valuation.

President Roosevelt states that in all, about $5,500,000,000 in lease-lend goods and services have gone from this country to Britain and her dominions and possessions, while about $1,175,000,000 has been received in return, to date. This, obviously, leaves the account rather formidably unbalanced. It may be doubted that the majority of Americans expect or desire any close and exact matching of dollars and pounds sterling in this enterprise of mutual aid. On the other hand, a 4-to-1 ratio is neither close nor satisfactory. The American public will feel justly entitled to insist that the gap be diminished as a matter of financial common sense and in furtherance of good relations on both sides.

The London Government recognizes the pertinence of this view already. In the report to Parliament yesterday, Sir John Anderson made it clear that Britain intends, by expansion of deliveries of raw materials and foodstuffs from herself and her empire, to take up the admittedly wide margin and bring these two accounts nearer balance. That is sound procedure, which will be welcome here.

Address of Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch, to the graduating class at the United States Naval Reserve Midshipmen's School, New York, N. Y., November 24, 1943.

A long time ago, when the commanding officer of this school and I were not much older than you are now, that officer asked to try my eyeglasses to see if they would do him any good. Unfortunately they wouldn't. His own glasses, along with all his other possessions except the battered clothes he had on his back, were at the bottom of the Atlantic in the ship he had been serving in, the U. S. S. *Jacob Jones*. I doubt if Captain Richards remembers the incident of the eyeglasses, but I know he can never forget the hours he spent in a raft in the cold waters off Ireland.

You see what you may be in for, but you knew that full well before you started on your present course. More power to you.

A man of my generation cannot honestly face men of your generation without admitting that he is ashamed; for if ever one generation fell down on the following generation, we did with you. Twenty-five years ago we successfully ended the war to end war, also otherwise called the war to make the world safe for democracy. The very names smack of cynicism today. But in 1918 we thoroughly believed that we had fully succeeded in winning a war that deserved those names. We won that war, all right, as far as we were allowed to, but we cannot escape all blame for the shameful misuse that was later made of our victory.

If General Pershing had had his way, an American army would have marched through Berlin down Unter den Linden, and you young men would not be facing me today in uniform. Again, if most anything had been done differently during your boyhood years this senseless war would not have been necessary. But in 1919 we returned from the World War to find the pacifists rampant in the land—for pacifists are always recruited from cloistered folk safe at home—and such a belief in fairy tales had taken hold of the people who had been thousands of miles from the war that they even undertook to legislate sobriety. Anyone who could believe in those things could believe that the millen-

nium had come. And so we who knew better because we had seen so much in Europe stood supinely by because we didn't have the heart to spoil beautiful dreams. Thus there followed disarmament conferences, and pacts to outlaw war, and such things almost without end; each one of them another step toward war, as may be so clearly seen now.

Of course, it is not our business as military men to have any say in such matters, but it is our duty as citizens to air our beliefs and to argue against false ones being adopted. Those of us who had been in the World War failed abjectly in that duty during the twenties and early thirties—until too late. When this war is over we shall have always before our eyes from the 1914–18 war a splendid example of what not to do when a war is over. Through this means some actual good may finally come from the dismal and cowardly years that followed the Armistice.

The fact remains that those men who lose their lives in this war could well have Kipling's bitter epitaph.

"If any question why we died,
Tell them, because our fathers lied."

You are college men. Today you successfully complete a 3 months' intensive course designed to make you officers of the Navy. Whether or not you have actually qualified is hidden within the breast of each of you. You will do well to search yourselves frequently hereafter on that score; for it is an awful responsibility to lead your fellow countrymen into battle, and Heaven help a leader who is not worthy of leading. The secret of success in war boils down to what is called cooperation. What an individual does is of no consequence—except as it inspires others. I doubt that you have been told in so many words at any time during your 3 months' course here that what has really been done to you in this course is to change your native individualism into cooperativism. Three months is a short time to accomplish that; for you spent years at college being trained as individuals. The colleges train men to succeed in life in competition with their fellows; only the two Government service academies are able from the very start to ignore this fundamentally important civilian phase, and are able to begin with the plebes the first day to make them feel that they are but cogs in a big machine. Fortunately, Americans are born wtih plenty of individuality so that a lifetime of regimentation will not wipe it out; but, on that very account, if young Americans do not get a good stiff dose of regimentation early in their military careers they may forget under stress that they must cooperate, and this at the very time when it is vital that they do co-operate. I dare say that many times during your course here you have wondered why so much of your all too short time was devoted to military drill. The answer is that until it becomes a part of your makeup to look out of the corners of your eyes, as it were, to see that you are conforming to the movements of your fellows, you are not a fellow who can be depended upon for the cooperation that must be had to win battles. Moreover, this must be so ground into you that you do it without thinking; for in battle sometimes, a man gets beyond thinking.

As a corollary—keep doping out what your boss is up to. He will tell you, but he can't tell you every little detail, and he can't tell you where the enemy is going to show up and what he is going to do. So do some speculating of your own. For example, before you know it, one of you may be commanding a PT boat on the way to make some more Jap ancestors. As you bounce along, with some hours to go before you flush the little monkeys, don't spend all your time thinking about the girl at home, but devote part of it to thinking what the squadron commander would want done if the Japs did this or that. You may be delighted some time how beautifully your random thoughts dovetail into what is done. And mental preparation is the important preparation.

By the same token, keep your men informed, take them into your confidence as far as you safely can and just as soon as you can. Appeal to their desire to fight. Remember that the men are where they are for the same reason you are, namely to lick the Japs and get this sorry business over with and go home. The sooner the better.

Since you have joined the naval service you may have heard scuttlebutt to the effect that reserve officers are merely used to do rather unimportant spade work, and are not given their full share of responsibility. That couldn't be so, for there are many responsible jobs in our great Navy of today that must be filled by reserves from sheer necessity. When a ship faces the enemy it makes no difference who does a job, the sole question is, Who can do the job best? In the *South Dakota* often I didn't even know whether an officer was a regular or a reserve and I didn't care. The main question was, Did he play with the team? I can promise you that if you perform your duties conscientiously, intelligently, to the best of your ability, and always looking to the good of the whole ship, the same will be true of your future commanding officers.

In the *South Dakota* I used to make speeches. I'll say this for those speeches—they didn't last long, and they didn't vary much. The theme was that we were out to lick Japs, that we get them or they get us, and that they are good. Speakers always think their pearls of wisdom accomplish a great deal. I think that a thought repeated often enough may have effect. At any rate the *South Dakota's* spirit was grand, and that was what counted. The Japs opened their bag of tricks on us. The more tricks they pulled the madder we got, and so we stopped them pretty cold. They didn't have any tricks that we hadn't foreseen, they merely kept at them longer than we had thought they could, and longer than they have been able to do since then.

Now let us look ahead. I said that if General Pershing had marched his Army down Unter den Linden we would not be at war today. I do not advocate that we march an American Army down the main street of Tokyo—whatever its heathenish name may be—I merely advocate that when this war is over there be no main street of Tokyo left to march down.

Beware of Bees in War Bonnets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on November 28, 1943, by James Morgan:

BEWARE OF BEES IN WAR BONNETS—GENERALS IN THE WHITE HOUSE ARE IN A STRANGE GARRET AND BESIDES, POLITICAL BOOMS FOR PROFESSIONAL SOLDIERS SHOULD WAIT UNTIL WAR IS WON

(By James Morgan)

This article has been in the works ever since the start of the MacArthur boom for President, and now it can be told. It seemed ungraciously invidious to question the bestowal of any honor on a soldier who is so gallantly holding for us and successfully extending a lonely outpost at the other end of the earth. But with General Eisenhower also entered in the Republican list by his fellow Kansan, Senator CAPPER, and with Senator JOHNSON of Colorado proposing that the Democrats should nominate General Marshall, it becomes possible to make an impersonal comment on the subject of generals in politics.

As the legendary epitaph on a New Hampshire tombstone has the deceased say of his death, we should have expected these political raids on military heroes in this war, but not so soon. It is an old American custom for politicians, ever in need of a commodity of good names. But heretofore they have bided their time until the warrior famoused for fight had been crowned with the laurel of victory. It is something quite other and quite new to suggest that commanders who are yet on the march against the enemy should be switched off to a political battlefield.

Political campaigns in favor of generals have waited in the past for the completion of their military campaigns. That was the course prescribed by Lincoln when the radicals in his party proposed that he should be supplanted by Grant in the 1864 election. "If he takes Richmond," said the President, "let him have it." But at that time the general still was battling in the wilderness. We pay a doubtful honor to any general in the war by presuming that he would be willing to exchange "On to Tokyo" or "On to Berlin" for the watchword, "On to the White House."

General McClellan, it is true, was nominated in the midst of the Civil War. But he was not on active duty in 1864 and had been relieved of his command. He became a candidate for President with the object of replacing Lincoln, who had replaced him. That is the most daring illustration of the evil of dragging the military into politics.

BREEDING GROUND OF PRESIDENTS

We are a nation of hero worshipers. But let our heroes beware. For we are also swift and ruthless iconoclasts, as some of our suddenly smashed idols have had the cruel misfortune to learn, when yesterday's shower of ticker tape turned into brickbats on the morrow. We never so far lose our heads as to forget where to draw the line and keep a hero in his place.

Under other forms of government, victorious soldiers can be made princes, dukes, earls, and counts. All we can give them is the Presidency. Nearly, if not quite, half of the 31 Chief Magistrates of this unmilitary Republic were men who had carried a sword.

Until World War No. 1, every war had begot Presidents. Washington and Monroe had worn the blue and buff of the Continentals. Jackson and William Henry Harrison were in the War of 1812, and so also was Captain Tyler for a month. Taylor and Pierce fought in Mexico. Johnson, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, and McKinley, with Arthur also serving as quartermaster general of the State of New York, were spawned by the Civil War, whose veterans monopolized the Presidency for 35 years after Appomattox except for the interloping of Cleveland. Theodore Roosevelt's roughriding in the Spanish War smoothed his way to the White House.

The first army in our history to be wholly led by professionally trained military men was in World War No. 1 and it is significant that this should have been the first war out of which no President emerged in the quarter century that followed. But since that was also our first drafted Army, the youth of the land were enrolled in its ranks, and these are only now approaching the normal Presidential age.

THE BEE IN THE WAR BONNET

It is also of significance that from George Washington to Theodore Roosevelt all the one-time soldiers in the Presidency were citizen soldiers, with but two exceptions. Both of these, Generals Taylor and Grant, proved the rule that civilian life is the better training field for Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Neither of those professional soldiers was as successful as President as he had been as general.

In three other instances where politicians sought to catch votes, even as some of them are so seeking today, by baiting their traps with generals, we found that good military campaigners can make poor political campaigners. After having denounced and opposed the Mexican War, the Whigs tried to hedge on their record by nominating its two victorious generals in succession. They won with Taylor against the divided Democrats, but only to lose so disastrously with Winfield Scott in the next election as virtually to finish their party for good and all. The Democrats, in turn, twice tried in vain to hide their political bankruptcy by wrapping about them the military cloaks of Generals McClellan and Hancock.

The latest unhappy case of the Presidential bee buzzing in a war bonnet occurred in 1920, when Gen. Leonard Wood was in the amusing situation of having to ask a Democratic administration to transfer him to Chicago that he might press closer his candidacy for the Republican nomination. The Wilson administration did him a dubious favor when it permitted him to be on the scene in the convention city and be his own manager.

WHY NO MAN ON HORSEBACK

Soldiers by profession are as far removed from and as innocent of politics as anyone possibly could be in this country. Shut up in barracks or at Army posts, they are insulated from the currents of civilian life and sheltered from the realities in the conflicts of our competitive economy. As they are shifted from one military area to another, few of them have the opportunity—or even the desire—to establish a legal voting residence.

Before Grant was a candidate for the suffrage of his fellow citizens, he himself had exercised his suffrage in but one Presidential election. And he was out of the Army at the time, when the destined Republican candidate 12 years afterward voted the Democratic ticket for Buchanan. The Whigs, when they passed over their great statesmen, Clay and Webster, to nominate General Taylor without a platform of principles, were as ignorant of his political principles as we are now of General MacArthur's, Eisenhower's, and Marshall's. At first they were not sure what the party preferences of Old Rough and Ready were, if any, until he relieved their doubts with the assurance that he was a Whig, but not an ultra-Whig.

We have been fortunate in having had so few military commanders who mixed politics with war. That has been the congenital weakness of the French Army, and it seems to have been fatal in 1940. Our Regular Army as a whole has been singularly scrupulous in respecting the supremacy of the civil authority. This is an indispensable safeguard of our scheme of Government against "the man on horseback."

ARMY RULES OUT POLITICS

Years before this war, the Army was taking measures to protect itself against party raids upon its traditional nonpartisanship. As long ago as 1925 officers on active duty were prohibited from seeking political offices. This restriction has been, in the words of Secretary Stimson, "tightened up" since Pearl Harbor, and the rule now provides that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty."

Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, in denouncing that rule as tending to militarize the processes of American democracy and implying that it was aimed at General MacArthur, declared that "if a great American emerges, for example, as the most eligible next President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him. * * *

"I deny the right of the War Department thus indirectly to control American elections." The Secretary of War replied, "I can tell you with great explicitness that I did not have General MacArthur in mind at all, or any other individual" when the order "was framed without consultation with anyone outside the service and issued under my responsibility as Secretary of War." It has been said that it originated with the Chief of Staff, General Marshall.

Meanwhile, General MacArthur has disavowed any "political ambitions whatsoever. * * * I started as a soldier and I will finish as one." That statement has the same purport if not quite the same finality as Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's historic rejection of a proposal to make him President, when he said that if nominated he would not accept and that he would not serve if elected. That remains a worthy form for declinations of political honors by generals today.

Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a very impressive, if anonymous, article headed "Missing." In these days when the list of "missing in action" is steadily mounting, bringing as it does grief and sorrow into so many families, this article is well worth reading:

MISSING

"Missing in action." You know what that can mean.

Mom says you must be brave. "It's what your father would expect of us," she tells you when it's bedtime and your chin starts to feel shaky. Then she kisses you extra hard and turns her head away so you can't see her eyes.

You've never let her see you cry. Not once, since that telegram came and she twisted it all up in a ball, then smoothed it and put it in the desk.

But, lying in bed, you play "Pretend"—pretend you can hear his step as he comes up to your room—pretend you can feel a stubble brush your forehead. And, sometimes, in the dark, you can almost smell a cigarettey suit close to your face.

Later you dream—dreams that you don't tell about. And in the morning you wake up with that funny, empty feeling in your stomach.

Poor little guy. We—all of us—wish there were something we could do. Perhaps there is. Why shouldn't it be this?

We can resolve that the plans your father had for you shall remain within your reach, that you shall have the chance to grow and learn, that your opportunities will be bounded only by your own get-up-and-go, that you will progress and prosper in direct relation to your own ability—in a land of freedom and opportunity.

Those are the things your dad valued, the things for which he gave his life. Though some may strive to change all that—provide you with the "benefits" of an all-powerful government, the "advantages" of regimentation, the "blessings" of bureaucracy—we can resolve they won't succeed.

You, son, won't read these words, and if you did, they wouldn't mean much to you now. But your father's friends—known and unknown—are making you a promise, just the same.

You may never hear it from their lips. But if you were older you would read it in their faces—recognize it in their spirit. They are determined to keep America free. To keep it a land in which the government is the servant, not the master of the people. To keep it the kind of America your dad wanted to preserve—for you.

From Where We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of my constituents of the city of De Ridder, La., I desire to include a copy of an article and answer thereto in regard to certain conditions in that city in my district.

The articles follow:

FROM WHERE WE LIVE—IN ANSWER TO FROM WHERE I SIT

"FROM WHERE I SIT"

"Stopped off in De Ridder the other day and got to talking with a feller who's lived there all his life.

" 'We have our ups and downs here,' he says. 'Business was good during sawmill days. After the timber was cut out things died down. Then they picked up right smart again when the Army camps were built near here.

" 'But then some folks signed a petition for an election and the whole parish voted for prohibition.

" 'That's the worst thing that's happened to De Ridder since the timber was cut out. First thing, they asked us to vote a 4-mill tax to take the place of taxes we had been getting from restaurants and taverns.

" 'And business just did down. Look at those vacant buildings. The bootleggers we've got now don't pay any taxes. We sure made a mistake in that election.'

" 'From where I sit, De Ridder's getting a second lesson that prohibition doesn't work—one that we all might well ponder."

The ad From Where I Sit, by Joe Marsh appeared in the Leesville Leader, June 24, 1943, paid for by Brewing Industry Foundation, Louisiana committee, Roland B. Howell, State director, 613 Louisiana National Building, Baton Rouge. The Leesville Leader printed this simply as a paid ad and no position of this paper or the people of Lees-

ville is necessarily reflected. The Brewing Industry Foundation, Louisiana committee, is responsible for the ad.

The local option committee of Beauregard Parish takes full responsibility for this reply advertisement. Statements from De-Ridder businessmen are simply their answers to our questions about the present state of business in De Ridder.

Beauregard Parish voted dry last fall and the dry laws became effective January 1, 1943. Herein we seek to present evidence on only the one issue of the condition of business in De Ridder. If other issues are raised answers are ready.

ONE APOLOGY

We make but one apology—to the many people in De Ridder who were not given opportunity to make a statement as to business in De Ridder. Time and space limited us. (Local option committee, Frank Stagg, acting chairman.)

WHAT BUSINESSMEN OF DE RIDDER SAY

Combined assets of De Ridder's two banks, City Savings Bank and First National Bank, show an increase of $1,863,494.11 according to statements published June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943.

City of De Ridder general fund July 1, 1942, showed balance of $13,304.75; $2,200 of this was paid back to special paving fund for equipment leaving $11,104.79 as operating funds. Several miles of new streets opened and built. All other streets and culverts put in condition. July 1, 1943, balance was $14,872.90. This is without liquor license. Taxes are paid 100 percent to date. De Ridder has been complimented by comanding officers of Army units stationed and maneuvering in this area. De Ridder air base reports no cases of syphilis for June 1943. (W. A. Simmons, finance commissioner.)

The Royal Cafe, West First Street, has had an increase every month over the previous month thus far in 1943. June 1943 showed 61 percent increase over December 1942. This is indicated by sales tax records. (Eldridge L. Morris.)

Sales for first 6 months of 1943 are over 50 percent ahead of the same period in 1942. (West Bros., by W. D. West.)

The volume of business for Red and White Store (grocery) is greater in 1943 than in the equivalent period in 1942. (R. R. McCain.)

June 1943 was 33⅓ percent ahead of June 1942. There was not an incident of boisterous conduct in the store. (Standard Mercantile Co.)

Our business shows a good increase over the equivalent period of last year. (Shirley Bros.)

Our business is still showing increases. June was the best month of 1943 and shows a great increase over June 1942. (Iles Grocery, by George Iles.)

I was operating a place of liquor in De-Ridder, but am now operating a cafe. When liquor was voted out they did me a favor. I am happy in my present business. We have all the business we can take care of. (The Owl Cafe, by Robert Andrews.)

Business through the first 6 months of 1943 shows 33⅓ percent increase over the first 6 months of 1942. Customers are more pleasant to wait on. (Morgan & Lindsey, by Bill Baier.)

My records show an increase over December 1942. In December 1942 we served 19,876 customers. In May 1943 we served 41,782 customers, an increase of 21,906 persons served in May over December. This increase was handled by the same number of employees. I personally attribute this increase to the additional time for service one way and another. (Busy Bee Cafe, Ray Dale, owner.)

We have been in the jewelry business in De Ridder for 21 years. Our business in June this year exceeded that of any 1 month since we came to De Ridder. (Champion Jewelry Store, by J. F. Champion.)

The laundry business is as much or more than it has been at any time. (De Ridder Steam Laundry, by Bill Cline.)

Our books show a steady increase, especially since February 1943. Business is about 20 or 25 percent better than last year despite shortage of essential items. (Youngblood Grocery, by O. B. Youngblood.)

LOCAL OPTION COMMITTEE,
BEAUREGARD PARISH,
FRANK STAGG,
Acting Chairman.

Address by Under Secretary of War Patterson at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, at a solemn ceremony held at the Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pa., on November 20, the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War for the United States.

In presenting the Under Secretary and in recommending him for this high award, the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Edward Martin, read a citation in which he called attention to the outstanding service which Mr. Patterson has rendered to this Nation, both as a fighting soldier and as a qualified jurist and administrator.

The Under Secretary, in his acceptance of the degree, delivered an address bearing upon the war effort of this Nation which, I am sure, is worthy of the careful study and consideration of every American citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the citation read by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, and the address delivered by Under Secretary of War Patterson at the Washington and Jefferson College be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION BY GOV. EDWARD MARTIN FOR HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS TO BE CONFERRED UPON THE HONORABLE ROBERT PORTER PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

It is my honor to present the Honorable Robert Porter Patterson, the Under Secretary of War of the United States. A graduate of Union College and of the Law School of Harvard University, he was admitted to the bar in the State of New York and shortly thereafter entered the Army. In the First World War he served in many different offensives, rose from private to major, was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism, was again cited in general orders for gallant and meritorious action, was again cited for gallantry in action and awarded the Silver Star, and finally, was awarded the Purple Heart decoration for bravery when wounded in action. For 9 years he has served in a most distinguished manner as judge of the United States District Court, Southern New York District. He was then promoted to the United States District Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Upon the approval of the act creating the office of Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson was chosen for that position. Here his great military experience and his eminent legal attainments have combined to equip him for the responsibilities which are now his in America's great emergency. Grateful for his skill, remembering his bravery and gallantry, confident in the service of leadership still to be rendered in the winning of the war, I present him for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT P. PATTERSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR

It gives me satisfaction to be here at Washington and Jefferson for these ceremonies. College campuses have taken on a martial air—they are geared for war, just as our factories and mills and mines are geared for war. We are all together to win the victory.

The Nation knows the history of Washington and Jefferson, the oldest college west of the Alleghenies. You have given us scientists like Dr. Jesse W. Lazear and Dr. William B. Wherry—fighters against disease to whom, the whole world is indebted. You have given us great public figures, like James G. Blaine and William H. McGuffey. The McGuffey readers educated many generations of American citizens. Your graduates shed luster on your institution.

You are making your contribution, too, in these trying and fateful times. In addition to continuing your work in civilian education, you have taken on the job of training more than a thousand soldiers—enlisted men and WAC's. The Army Specialized Training Unit here has made a fine record. And I know that everyone is satisfied with the work done in the Adjutant General's classification school.

Today I am going to talk briefly about the war and its progress. I wish I could tell you that the war is almost over. But I cannot tell you that. The hardest fighting lies ahead.

All of you, I am sure, have heard plenty of optimistic talk in recent weeks. The news, on the whole, has been good. The days of offensive sweeps by the Germans on the great scale are past. They are on the defensive; they have had hard blows from the Russians on their eastern front—staggering blows. Our bombers and the British bombers, taking off from a hundred airfields on every day of good weather, are dropping tons of destruction upon German war industries. But it must be remembered that, with winter coming on, the days of good weather, weather good enough for attacks in great strength, number only 5 or 6 days a month.

I was out in the southwest Pacific a few months ago, and I know something first-hand about the situation there. It is a tough job to fight a two-front war—and that is what we are doing. We were caught short in the first place in the Pacific and fought a series of stubborn retreats. Our troops fought hard, but they were retreats.

Now we are battling our way back again. We are driving the Japs out of one stronghold after another. The ground forces, the air

forces, the Navy are all doing an excellent job. But we are still on the edges of Japan's war-won empire. We are still a long way from Tokyo. We are pushing now against the stronghold at Rabaul. When Rabaul is taken—and it will be taken—we shall still be 3,000 miles from the heart of Japan.

The European side of the two-front war has shown more progress. The Allies have taken north Africa and Sicily. Italy is out of the war. Mark Clark's Fifth Army and Montgomery's Eighth Army, however, are inching their way up the Italian Peninsula. They have been at it for weeks, fighting in the flooded valleys and the increasing snows of the Apennine Peaks.

The Germans in Italy have chosen to oppose our advance in difficult country. They have had time to prepare defenses, to build pill boxes, to concentrate strength in every narrow pass where progress must be made. Progress from south to north in Italy's narrow peninsula can be made only along coastal routes or through the mountain passes. Lateral roads from east to west—so important to Army supply—are almost nonexistent. There is no chance for a war of swift movement there; the battle in Italy has become a slugging match.

Our soldiers in Italy have found no slackening in the morale of the German soldier. Our bombings of Germany undoubtedly have shaken the confidence of the home front. We have wiped out the great industrial city of Hamburg; we have made heavy strikes against German airplane factories, ball-bearing plants, oil refineries, and railroad centers. We shall continue to make those strikes—and in greater strength. But more German divisions have been sent into Italy, and, behind their defenses there, the veteran soldiers of those divisions fight with expertness and confidence.

Our powerful Russian allies have inflicted huge losses on the Germany Army of the eastern front. It is there that the greatest and most destructive battles of the war have been fought.

You will remember that the Germans lost 20 divisions in their disastrous defeat at Stalingrad. But not many realize that, since Stalingrad, Germany has activated or reequipped 60 more divisions. Our bombings and British bombings are cutting down Germany's productive capacity; but German industries have been able, one way or another, to furnish equipment for those troops and to manufacture in sufficient quantity such new weapons as the rocket gun and the tiger tank.

There is a hard fight ahead of us. We all should be prepared for it. The German capture of the island of Leros in the Dodecanese this week is not of great military importance. But it is a significant answer to those who have predicted an early weakening in Germany's will to resist.

The year ahead is the year of decision. It will see military operations of tremendous scope on the part of the Allied commanders. No thinking man would predict when the war will end, but I am sure that, in 1944, the blows will be struck that will determine the outcome.

The drive to victory will need the courage and determination and wholehearted patriotism of every young man and woman here—of every American soldier and every American citizens. Our first thoughts, in whatever we undertake, must be with the brave boys who are fighting for us overseas—fighting in the air at 30,000 feet, at 50 below zero—fighting on the high seas with perils lurking beneath the waves and from the skies—fighting in the hot, steaming jungles where living itself is a burden except to those of stout hearts. They have stout hearts.

Patton's Case Has Two Sides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post on November 28, 1943, by Warren Carberg:

PATTON'S CASE HAS TWO SIDES—BATTLE STRAIN ON GENERAL AND TRUE CONDITION OF SOLDIER BOTH TO BE CAREFULLY CONSIDERED

(By Warren Carberg)

When histories of the present conflict have become yellowed and brittle with age, General Patton's precedent-shattering burst of temper in the north African army hospital will remain a fresh and vivid subject for discussion.

The striking of a hospitalized soldier by a general officer is one for the book, not only in this country, but all over the world. Military men and veterans in this country have already waxed red hot on the subject. Curiously enough, along with considerable condemnation, one hears much sympathy for our short-tempered field officer and considerable speculation about the soldier who got slapped.

The incident throws into the open a subject which veterans are least likely to discuss. Stories about soldiers who are awarded decorations for bravery are told and retold. For those who could not stand the gaff of battle there is the quiet and rest of oblivion. If these men succeed in reaching the sanctuary of a hospital along with those who have been wounded or who are really ill, they are treated politely, but are firmly shunted back to the front. When they return to their outfits they are either ostracized or challenged to a free-for-all. History relates that thousands who have left the field during the heat of a general engagement on one pretext or another have been shot down in cold blood by enraged officers whose business it was to round them up.

But written history fails to recall any case where a commanding general actually invaded a hospital to vent his spleen on a poor unfortunate who, according to the records, had broken down under the shattering impact of heavy shell fire.

Even though we may be charitable enough to believe that General Patton was right in assuming the hospitalized soldier to have been a skulker and a "gold bricker," his action at the hospital will bring down on him universal condemnation. Not only did he break our own ironclad military law that an officer must never strike an enlisted man, but he also offended the unwritten precept of humanity that a soldier in the hospital is inviolate.

The border line between the so-called shell-shock case and the man who funks it through cowardice is hard to define and has long baffled psychologists and doctors. It is generally conceded, however, that there are legitimate cases where men break down under the strain of battle through no fault of their own. Our Army hospitals are still treating men who became shell-shock victims in the last war.

Fortunately, perhaps, for the success of our military efforts our high-ranking military leaders are not known for their ability as psychologists. Certainly "Old Blood and Guts" never split hairs on the subject of courage. If a man crumbled in the face of the enemy, in his opinion he deserved but little consideration.

MALINGERERS SCORNED

Furthermore, every man who has been in the service can recall that many "gold brickers" and malingerers often fake illness to get out of the lines and into hospitals. These soldiers incur the hatred and contempt of their own comrades, from whom nothing can be concealed. The wounded men treat them with harsh irony, and, in general, life for them is no bed of roses.

Let us consider the case of Sergeant B in the last war. He was an exemplary soldier in every respect until the big drive at Château-Thierry opened. He knew his infantry drill regulations from cover to cover. He got along well with his men. His personal courage was above suspicion. Nevertheless, when the drive started and the company was forced to undergo periods of the most intense shelling he broke down and had to be hospitalized just when he was needed most.

Although many of his comrades were either killed or wounded in the action which he escaped by going to the hospital, the men who survived did not forget. When he returned to the company the matter was brought up and he was challenged to a fight.

He came out second best in one of those sanguinary clashes in a place remote from the company billets. But at least his reputation for courage was partially restored and in subsequent engagements he endured the rigors of shell fire remarkably well.

In the French Army, certain of their colonial units were considered among the best of their troops in personal hand-to-hand combat, but decidedly unreliable when called on to face heavy shell fire over long periods. In one instance they broke and fled from their posts leaving an entire sector unguarded. A reserve unit had to be rushed up to cover their section of the front. The high command took action, not against them, but their officers, and some of them were relieved of their command.

The men of our own Army usually stand battle conditions as well if not better than other nationalities. Nevertheless, battle conditions are hard to take. What soldier has not quaked in his boots when he has heard his first big shell scream down on him from some great height and then has felt its tremendous concussion? Even the most stable nervous conditions are shaken by the impact of heavy shell fire.

MORALE VITAL QUESTION

But there is another side to this question—that of morale. To military men it is all important, even more so than the welfare of an individual.

Let us consider how morale works. Consider an infantry company that has been trained to fight together for a year or more. They are like brothers. They are conversant with one another's peculiarities, strengths, and weaknesses. They have shared one another's food sent from home in packages, their cigarettes, their domestic troubles, their loves, and their hates.

Then the big day comes—the day for which all have been planning. The company goes into action. Death is in the air for the first time. Individually, many of them may not be men of great courage. But collectively they are able to fight like the heroes they are.

They huddle in their fox holes waiting for the big attack under terrific shell fire. This is their big moment. Their one fear is that they will show fear. All are tense. Then someone makes a wise crack. Nerves are relaxed in a burst of merriment. H—l, who could quit with a gang like this?

But there are always a few who can't stand the gaff, and many of these men are to be pitied. I can remember a scene at Bouresches in 1918 when a runner working along

a field swept by machine-gun fire paused to give a drink to a fallen comrade.

"What's the matter, Buddy?" he inquired solicitiously, as he drew out his canteen to give the fallen one a drink.

"I think I've been gassed," the prostrate one replied. The runner jerked the canteen away. He knew that there was no gas in the air that day.

"Gas, h—l," he snorted. "This water is for guys that were hit by bullets."

Another soldier came into a dressing station where the dead and wounded lay all around on stretchers. He told a medic that a German had hit him in the stomach with the butt of his rifle. The doctor examined him and found no mark. He glared at him impatiently and then turned to an orderly.

SOME REGAIN NERVE

"Paint him with iodine, that's the right color for him," he ordered.

The aftermath of the story is worth repeating. By the time the soldier returned to his own company the story had gained wide circulation. He was challenged and beaten in fair fig't by a comrade. The next time the company went into action the soldier redeemed himself in fine fashion and finally was killed in action.

This man simply lost his nerve and later succeeded in pulling himself together. Some who break under shell fire never are able to do this, but are returned to civilian life broken men—broken because they failed the test.

Officers sometimes miss the mark, too. But it is more serious for them. They must always present a demeanor of coolness and unshakeable courage. When an officer breaks he is relieved of his command, usually for inefficiency or for physical disability.

It is to be presumed that an officer of General Patton's high standing must have been under some great nerve strain to have given way as he did. He often wept violently over the graves of soldiers killed in action. It is hard to judge any soldier in battle by any ordinary yardsticks of character measurement. In Patton's case an attempt should be made to be charitable.

A high-ranking officer spoke on the subject of courage recently. He pointed out that it is easy to be pleasant and well controlled and courageous when we are well-rested, well-fed, and under familiar conditions.

Boxers and football players enter their respective arenas and perform with skill and courage, but they are usually at the very peak of well-being. But in battle men fight under the most terrible conditions and the stakes are life or death.

In the north African campaign our troops at the front endured unspeakable hardships for many weeks. They slogged along in the cold and the rain and the mud. They ate C rations mostly and hot food when they could get it. Under such conditions a man grows sodden and numb with fatigue. He reaches a point where he just "doesn't give a damn" what happens to him.

He longs for the warmth of a home-cooked meal and the comfort of a bed with real sheets. The miracle is that when the call to action comes that so few break; that so many attain such heights of heroism under conditions that only carefully trained soldiers can withstand. With what terror the average civilian would receive a command to charge over a fire-swept field.

General Eisenhower's prompt action in General Patton's case is a fine commentary on the regard with which an ordinary enlisted man is held, particularly if he has been admitted to a hospital for treatment.

The public will always condemn an action of this kind and will feel safer that we have a man of judicial temperament in supreme command. If the unfortunate enlisted man who received the slap did not belong in the hospital and should have remained with his command, that is a question for the medical officers to decide.

The Imperial Valley of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have heard me speak with considerable pride from time to time of the Imperial Valley of California. This is one of the richest and most productive farming areas in the world. It lies entirely below sea level. The district comprises 612,658 acres, of which 472,123 are farmable, and can be watered by means of a well-developed irrigation system, the water being brought from the adjoining Colorado River. There are 4,488 farms in the district, about half of them being owner-operated and the other half being tenant-operated. The average number of acres in a farm is a little over 100 acres. The total number of acres actually in cultivation in March 1943 was 384,899 and in October 1943, 374,996.

With the thought that it may be of interest to show the variety of field crops, garden crops, and permanent crops, to which the Imperial Valley is planted, I am giving a list of the complete plantings for both March and October which will indicate why the other sections of the United States depend, to a much larger extent than they sometimes realize, upon the Imperial Valley of California, particularly during the seasons when these commodities are coming out of California. The list follows:

	March	October
Field crops:	*Acres*	*Acres*
Alfalfa	114,085	100,261
Barley	32,848	3,832
Milo	-------	20,375
Oats	3,578	221
Cotton	-------	40
Wheat	540	12
Bermuda (includes pasture)	3,090	3,270
Flax	144,618	668
Sudan	-------	1,267
Sesbania	-------	1,867
Sugar beets	7,591	2,465
Clover	1,018	222
Permanent pasture	780	1,309
Licorice	15	-------
Hegari	-------	235
Sorghum	-------	40
Waxy Club sorghum	-------	115
Blessed thistle	-------	35
Silage	-------	74
June corn	-------	22
Sugarcane	-------	102
Rice	-------	7,701
Miscellaneous grass	12	-------
Indian corn	-------	24
Total	308,175	144,157
Garden crops:		
Lettuce	17,324	16,962
Cantaloups	9,662	75
Honeydews	967	65
Honeyballs	740	-------
Peas	5,904	1,378
Carrots	10,747	5,515
Black-eyed peas	-------	626
Tomatoes	2,421	1,911
Watermelons	2,888	14
Cabbage	1,382	1,762
Squash	1,024	1,251
Mixed vegetables	183	248
Turnips	86	57
Onions	230	1,343
Eggplant	13	41
Table beets	83	137
Sweet corn	201	42
Cucumbers	52	342
Peppers	89	194
Garden crops—Continued.		
Beans	97	55
Chickory	56	60
Romaine	3	25
Cauliflower	19	7
Endive	40	227
Potatoes	1	-------
Sweetpotatoes	-------	30
Broccoli	185	364
Spinach	11	3
Casabas	14	-------
Pumpkins	2	-------
Garlic	25	2
Gladioli	23	7
Greens	415	183
Okra	-------	3
Rape	-------	82
Total	54,738	33,011
Permanent crops:		
Asparagus	261	272
Dates	156	152
Tangerines	253	248
Grapes	691	679
Pecans	402	401
Lemons	62	62
Grapefruit	3,803	3,411
Oranges	665	667
Strawberries	11	-------
Shade trees	25	5
Guayule	-------	1
Olives	1	1
Mixed fruit	10	10
Pomegranates	1	1
Apricots	2	2
Total	6,344	5,915
Total acres cropped	369,257	183,083
Less double cropped	7,503	-------
Net area cropped	361,754	183,083
Plowed, not in crop	23,145	[1] 191,913
Total area farmed	384,899	374,996
Acreage not farmed	72,502	[2] 69,354
Total reported	457,401	444,350
Acreage not farmed	14,722	27,723
Total area farmable	472,123	472,073
Not farmable	140,535	[3] 140,585
Total area of district	612,658	612,658
Number of farms reported	4,488	4,349
Owner-operated	2,248	2,230
Percent	50	51
Tenant-operated	2,240	2,119
Percent	50	49
Average area (acres)	101.9	102.1

[1] Majority of grain crops to be harvested next spring included.
[2] Acreage on accounts counted.
[3] Approximate only.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are from the annual crop survey report for 1943 of the Imperial irrigation district, and are made up from data furnished by the zanjeros. The compilation presents a picture of Imperial Valley crops and acreages that is just about as accurate as it is possible to obtain.

Evan T. Hewes, of El Centro, is the president of the Imperial irrigation district, and he and Charles Morrow, B. F. Grubel, M. Trentham, and Mark Rose, make up the present board of directors.

Concerning Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Star, of Seattle, Wash., recently published an interesting editorial with

respect to the recent vote on subsidies, which, I am convinced, will prove interesting to the majority of Congress and to the country as a whole.

The editorial is self-explanatory. Here it is:

A CHALLENGE TO FOES OF SUBSIDIES

First round in the fight for subsidies is lost. The House voted overwhelmingly yesterday to ban subsidies.

Republican Representatives HOLMES, HORAN, and NORMAN of Washington were among that overwhelming majority.

Democratic Washington Representatives MAGNUSON, as he promised through the Seattle Star, COFFEE, and JACKSON (the latter absent in the service but paired with an absent Republican) show on the vote ledger as having favored subsidies.

This was a momentous vote to you and your neighbor.

If, as many believe, your grocery, meat, and clothing bill skyrocket under the inflation that lack of subsidies may touch off, remember Messrs. HOLMES, HORAN, and NORMAN.

They, in effect, say to you "Do your own worrying."

The fight against subsidies was led by the farm bloc.

Joined with them were antiadministration forces to whom anything the administration favored is so much poison.

Oftentimes we, too, disagree with the administration, but when it is right we are big enough to agree with it.

Fighting the losing fight for subsidies is labor.

Selfishness is the guiding factor in the whole thing.

The organized farm groups want higher prices for the produce their members grow.

They have so far offered no means of stopping the inflation that must follow.

We have been for the farmer in many of his troubles, have unqualifiedly supported movements to get him additional seasonal labor, a fair price for his commodity.

We believe now that it is time for the organizations who represent him to let us in on their secrets.

How are they going to balance your income and your grocery and meat bills?

The columns of the Seattle Star are open to them and this is a challenge to them to produce such a plan.

Letter From President Hopkins of Dartmouth College to Dartmouth's Sons at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which President Ernest M. Hopkins, of Dartmouth College, is sending to all former students and alumni of Dartmouth College who are in the service anywhere abroad or in various parts of this country. This is a rather novel thing for the president of a great university to do. I think it is very commendable. I believe the letter will be of interest to the Senate and the public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOVER, N. H., *November 1, 1943.*

To Dartmouth's Sons at War:

For myself, as well as in behalf of my associates of the resident college, I wish to send Christmas greetings to each and every Dartmouth man in the armed services. To say that we at home have deep interest in you and in the records you are making is but faint suggestion of the concern we have for you and the affection with which we think of you. Because of you, among others, the world has possibility of being a far different place than otherwise it could have been. Not solely, however, with thought of the world's welfare, but very personally likewise and intimately in thought of the welfare of Dartmouth men in days to come, in many cases sons and successors of you Dartmouth men in the service, we here in your college home breathe constantly and very reverently the prayer that God will watch over you, wherever you may be. This is the word I wish I might, with a clasp of the hand, say to each one of you face to face.

And finally, I would like to offer a toast very sincerely to each one of you individually, in Hovey's phrase, "Here's luck in the teeth of all winds blowing."

ERNEST M. HOPKINS,
President, Dartmouth College.

The Petroleum Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and informative address delivered today by my distinguished colleague from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] at the dedication of the Baltimore Giant, 100-octane plant of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, located at Baltimore, Md. The address is on the general subject of the petroleum policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a boy my great-grandfather told me of reading by the light of the fireplace. Later his mother allowed him a candle. Finally came a whale-oil lamp from the Yankee whalers of Nantucket—to give place later to the kerosene lamps of my own youth. The petroleum age was dawning.

Now we gather here in the shadow of the Capitol to dedicate this latest offering at the shrine of Mars. This utterly bewildering mechanical marvel towering 253 feet in the air to dwarf the test tubes of our laboratory days in school is a guaranty that the United Nations will prevail.

Here today is symbolized the evolution of petroleum in its service to mankind.

In this century petroleum has come to reign supreme over the other elements that were long the desire of all mankind. Petroleum today is power.

The Nation shuddered 10 days ago when the Petroleum Administrator for War at Chicago declared that America would not be able "to oil another war." Obviously Secretary Ickes does not mean that we want another war but has in mind for the United States to be so prepared with petroleum resources that another war will be prevented.

As the "five innocents abroad" set out on their aerial travels around the world, Senator TRUMAN instructed Senator MEAD and myself, among other things, to look carefully into the petroleum situation. What we found gave us considerable occasion for concern.

The first impression was the profound significance of petroleum in the modern world and particularly in modern war. More than 50 percent of the tonnage to the Mediterranean theater of operations this past year has been petroleum products.

A ton of bombs on Berlin predicates approximately 4 to 5 tons of petroleum.

A modern bomber takes around a gallon of high-octane gasoline per mile. Nothing better illustrates the latent power of petroleum than to realize that one of these gigantic machines of modern war weighing 10 to 20 tons with its bomb load can be carried nearly a mile through the air at terrific speeds by a single gallon of high-octane gasoline such as this new plant turns out.

Yet this also means that a thousand bombers over Berlin require a million and a half gallons of high-octane gasoline to get them there and back.

No one begrudges our air force or our allies the enormous tonnage of petroleum to keep them in the air, but as we talk of tremendously expanded armies and navies and air forces, it behooves us to make sure we will have the fuel to keep them going.

We may have all the ships and planes and tanks in the world, but without petroleum they are nothing—they are but sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

It is both interesting and significant to note that 90 percent of the petroleum resources of the earth are controlled by the United Nations.

Germany has performed a miracle in producing high-octane gasoline from coal, but at a tremendous drain upon her other resources of material and manpower to create the facilities and keep them functioning.

Strategic studies all indicate that a petroleum economy, other things being equal, will defeat a coal economy at this stage in the world's history and this condition seems likely to continue for at least many decades.

This week I attended the commissioning of the *Hornet*, the latest word in aircraft carriers. I saw its nest for 100 planes and also the tanks in which must go millions of gallons of oil and gasoline without which its striking power is paralyzed.

Five hundred gallons of oil are required to send this ship a single mile at top speed on its long 10,000-mile journey to Tokyo. We are now told there are 40 *Hornets*, large and small, in the Pacific, and 800 naval fighting craft are mustering their strength to restore peace to the Pacific.

Meanwhile the entire economy of the United States functioning as an arsenal for the United Nations is built upon a petroleum base.

Two hundred million gallons of petroleum flow through the pipes of the United Nations every day to keep our economy functioning and to keep our ships on the seven seas and to keep our planes today over Berlin and to put them tomorrow over Tokyo.

Senator TRUMAN'S request that we look into petroleum can accordingly be understood. Everywhere we traveled on the 45,000-mile trip around the world we began and ended with petroleum. I will not soon forget the profound relief with which we sighted the west coast of Australia after a 3,200-mile flight across the Indian Ocean from Ceylon—with the Japanese-held Sumatra and Java

as the only possible places of refuge in case of trouble—and learned that our Liberator still had 750 gallons of gasoline in its tanks out of the 4,000-gallon stock with which it started.

We witnessed with amazement the 200-mile pipe line laid in 2 weeks from Casablanca to Marakesh to supply that cross roads of aerial traffic from the four corners of the world.

Our first real shock came at Abadan on the Persian Gulf where we found one of the greatest refineries in the world under British control operating far below its capacity with a potential increase of 40 percent in its output. This occasioned our first inquiry as to the sources of our petroleum supply and has led to a study of the entire situation from the standpoint of United States policy regarding petroleum.

The first great difficulty was to find out the facts. Experts from the Government before the Truman committee were not able to satisfy even themselves as to the extent of petroleum reserves in the world. One quickly becomes lost in the maze of proven reserves and estimated reserves and various other kinds of reserves which permit statisticians to prove almost anything that may be desired.

Government representatives of the highest standing whose expertness and honesty we have no reason to question give a figure of 20,000,000,000 barrels at one moment for a certain area and later reduce that figure to two and a half billion barrels.

Refining capacity also seems difficult to define as the refining capacity at Abadan varied by 75,000 barrels a day in successive reports.

The inquiries of a layman are also handicapped by the confusion existing among the various governmental agencies involved. One very naturally turns on a topic of this importance to Secretary Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War. Certainly this resounding name would seem to signify an over-all knowledge of petroleum and its products and the policy of the United States Government in relation thereto.

Yet, this past week, Secretary Ickes has testified publicly before the Truman committee that the first knowledge he had regarding the $135,000,000 Canol project in northern Canada came via the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel and that much of his other information regarding petroleum policies of other agencies of the Government comes from British rather than American sources.

The War Department and the Navy Department with their tremendous requirements in petroleum as a result of the insatiable appetite of ships and planes and tanks are proceeding apparently to a considerable extent upon their own in determining their sources although coordination with the even more tremendous demands of the civilian economy would seem to be an imperative requirement.

Meanwhile, the Office of Foreign Economic Administration is becoming concerned with the problem of petroleum reserves abroad and has been given control of a corporation to consider functioning in this field and the possibility of acquiring interests in petroleum reserves in other countries.

The State Department here becomes concerned since American interests abroad are necessarily a matter within the purview of the State Department and the actual acquisition of an interest by the United States Government in petroleum reserves in other countries would necessarily mean a radical reorientation of our entire foreign policy—first in the degree and character of whatever partnership might be involved with private interests, either American or foreign, and second in the question of the protection of those interests in the unsettled world of tomorrow.

We were subsequently startled and disturbed to find that the United States was furnishing approximately 80 percent of the petroleum consumed by the United Nations, while Great Britain was furnishing about 8 percent although no estimates indicate that the United States has 10 times the reserves of Great Britain.

The most optimistic figures do not indicate that the United States has more than twice the reserves of Great Britain and these figures are open to serious question because of their somewhat speculative nature.

No question has been raised at any time as to necessity dictating the allocation of petroleum production heretofore because of the mandates imposed by transportation and refinery requirements.

The Germans very wisely struck at our tankers in the early days and injured us far more grievously than it was prudent to admit. The recent revelation of the sinking of 14 tankers in the Atlantic last winter on their way to the Mediterranean indicates how serious was the situation and how necessary it was to conserve tanker space and mileage.

There has been in the inquiries of the Senators no disposition to upset any current apple carts or any failure to recognize the necessity of concentrating every resource without regard to country on the immediate objective of the winning of the war. With less than half of the petroleum reserves of the world, America obviously cannot go on indefiniely supplying 80 percent of the consumption.

As the Mediterranean clears and the tanker situation improves it becomes possible, however, to turn to the Persian Gulf for an increased utilization of the tremendous reserves of the Middle East. It becomes possible accordingly to consider whether an increase in the refining capacity in this area may be more prudently placed so as to utilize the British rather than American reserves of petroleum since the British reserves in this area are approximately three times the American reserves.

This problem focuses the issue as to what American policy on petroleum shall be in the post-war world.

Petroleum seems to be found between the continents as in our own Caribbean area and in the Middle East between Asia, Europe, and Africa and in the Far East between Asia and Australia. Geologists are intrigued by the potentialities of the Far North where some oil reserves have already been located and where it is thought possible additional discoveries may be made.

Accepting a Russian estimate of 40,000,000,000 barrels for Russian reserves, the concensus of expert opinion indicates about 110,000,000,000 barrels as the world oil reserve.

The Axis have available aproximately 10,000,000,000 barrels.

Of the remaining 100,000,000,000 barrels Russia has 40 percent.

The United States has about 35 percent of which about one-half is within our own borders.

Britain, in cooperation with the Dutch interests, control nearly 24 percent. This leaves a little over 1 percent for all other interests.

In addition to the tremendous reserves in Russia which would apparently be sufficient for their prospective requirements for this century, Russia is also very near to the great petroleum reserves in the Persian Gulf which are chiefly under British control but in an expanding sphere of Russian influence.

American companies have meanwhile acquired certain interests in the petroleum reserves of the Persian Gulf and here seems to be one of the first fields where the United States will need to consider seriously its world policy regarding petroleum.

Beyond question the United Nations have the petroleum resources with which to defeat Germany and Japan. This coincides with the conclusion of all concerned that we are going to win the war.

Serious concern, however, is beginning to be felt as to whether or not we shall win the peace that is to follow. Ten million American boys moving toward the fighting fronts throughout the world look to us to look out for them and their vital interest in the post-war world. They want to return to a country that shall be able to carry on with policies so directed that war-loving nations shall not again be able to threaten the peace of all the world.

In this world of tomorrow, petroleum must play a most important part. Germany has demonstrated the tremendous striking power of a nation seriously hampered for petroleum but it will be a long time before gasoline from coal or shale will supplant petroleum in world economy, and during that period petroleum seems likely always to present a great advantage over coal.

The German processes, brought to this country more than a decade ago and developed here, show the feasibility of producing gasoline from coal but the expense seems to be approximately three times as great at the point of production.

This great new ultramodern plant where we assemble today seems likely not to bow its head to coal for many years yet to come. Meanwhile, however, the United States, in spite of its great petroleum reserves, faces the necessity of evolving a petroleum policy that shall be calculated to serve our needs beyond the next decade or two.

We are using our petroleum at the present time at the rate of more than 6 percent a year of our discovered reserves which would mean their exhaustion within the next 20 years if no additional sources are found. Obviously we must find additional reserves but no one knows where or when. Meanwhile, the British Empire is using its known reserves at the rate of little over 1 percent a year which would mean they should last for nearly 100 years. The Russians are apparently in a similarly favorable position.

It is interesting to note that the British have continued to keep a substantial proportion of their merchant marine operating on a basis of burning coal instead of oil. In the post-war world this may be a competitive factor of great significance as the United States seeks to keep functioning 40,000,000 tons of merchant shipping equipped with oil burners.

The United States takes for granted a resumption of joy riding after the war on an unprecedented scale with millions of new cars just over the horizon as the automobile industry of Detroit resumes its normal functioning.

To fuel a modern battleship requires a supply of oil that would heat an ordinary American home for three and one-half centuries.

Meanwhile a great plane industry is also germinating in the American mind that will fill the air with planes and establish international air transport on a global basis.

Even assuming far more efficient utilization of petroleum products in the improved mechanisms of tomorrow, this still adds up to unprecedented requirements for petroleum. Excluding our comfort, convenience, and pleasure, the United States is also becoming persuaded that patrolling the airways of the world may be the key to peace. Yet any such development to be realistic must rest primarily upon a commercial base.

American productive capacity must seek world markets not to the exclusion of other countries but to provide those things in the mass production of which America is now supreme and an interchange of those products for other products—particularly raw materials—in which America cannot continue to be Santa Claus for all the world.

All this means world communications and transportation by sea and air. It is high time America turned its thought in this

direction in justice to the millions of American boys who are fighting to create a peaceful world.

Either the United States must get access to more petroleum reserves or must eventually restrict its own consumption.

The United States has made an extraordinary success in the development of its own oil resources under the stimulus of private competition. No other country has anything like the knowledge of its oil resources that is possessed by the United States. This is a matter of satisfaction and yet of concern since it means that our potentialities are not likely to be as great as those of other countries.

Three courses are open to our Government in justice to future generations.

One is to continue the present haphazard situation with confusion among the various Government departments concerned and with a policy which seems to promise the exhaustion of our petroleum reserves within another 20 years and the impossibility of the United States being able, as Secretary Ickes points out, "to oil another war." An America dependent upon other countries for petroleum would be an America very much less significant in world affairs than the America we know today.

America is now convinced that unreadiness for war is the surest road to war.

Two other courses are left.

One is for the Government to go into the oil business in foreign countries either entirely on its own account or in partnership with private companies. Such a project has been more or less seriously proposed although it is evident it would involve a radical change in both our foreign and our economic policies and would have implications it is difficult to comprehend.

Russia with its tremendous petroleum reserves has not been able thus far to supply its own requirements in time of war. The other United Nations have accordingly found it necessary to supply petroleum products to keep the Russian war machine functioning. This does not necessarily condemn the Russian system of complete Government operation but it is certainly in glittering contrast to the enormous production which the United States has developed under the stimulus of private exploitation.

Suppose, on the other hand, a partnership is considered and the United States Government should take a one-third interest in the oil reserves of Arabia. Let us suppose then that difficulty develops between the native tribes in this region and the oil companies concerned as to the concessions or the royalties or other rights that were involved. Great Britain and Russia are also both vitally concerned in the petroleum reserves in the Persian Gulf where are located the reserves upon which the world may depend in war or peace after the next two decades. Here America must move with infinite caution and wisdom.

Great Britain has found it practicable to have governmental ownership of shares in private oil companies and to carry on in a partnership that is a tribute to the capacity of British capital and British Cabinets to get along together. Precedents for prospects of success in this field in America are rather difficult to find.

The third course would seem to be more in accordance with American tradition and precedents and to offer surer prospects of success.

The enterprise and the genius of American businessmen have made possible the tremendous petroleum development of America in the last half century. It is not too much to say that the success of the United Nations in this war rests Atlas-like upon the potentialities of the petroleum industry of the United States. While we shudder at the drain upon American resources, we may be profoundly grateful that the refining capacity and the transportation facilities were available to enable the United Nations to win the war.

This achievement is a tribute to the vitality of private enterprise.

Would it not seem prudent and proper in the first instance for the United States to adopt a petroleum policy which encourages private American oil companies to expand interests in foreign fields and to give them the support that is requisite on the diplomatic front?

Such a course recognizes the supreme importance of petroleum in the post-war world. Such a course pays proper tribute to the genius which has developed the great petroleum industry of the United States during the last half century. Such a course demonstrates the recognition by Government of its responsibility in supporting the development of American petroleum reserves in foreign fields.

Such a course corrects the failure of the United States Government in the last two decades to take a course that was calculated to protect and preserve the vital concern of America with petroleum.

Before embarking upon Government exploration and exploitation of foreign oil reserves with all its fearsome implications in foreign policy, it would seem far better to support American companies abroad in their endeavors to acquire and develop world oil reserves and world markets. This is in more substantial accord with diplomatic precedent. This will also afford the opportunity to explore the possibilities of world trade that may be opened up along these lines as American enterprise and business genius are given scope.

What the petroleum industry has done for America in peace and war it may now do for the world in peace as well as war.

A petroleum economy built by private enterprise has made America the example and the envy of the world and has enabled America "to oil this war" to the complete discomfiture of Germany and Japan.

A petroleum economy for the world stroked by American enterprise offers a prospect of a world that will be content to stay at peace for a century or so.

Let America go forward with full confidence that the world will welcome the contribution America will offer to establish a more enduring peace—built on the firm foundation of improving standards of living for all nations, great and small, and for all mankind everywhere.

Along this path America may wisely lead the world. "And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me."

Here is a vision to invite the latent energies of America as America becomes part of an ever contracting world. Here is the America of tomorrow.

Isolationism in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on October 28, 1943, on the subject of Isolationism in the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Isolation is not dead in the United States Senate. The Connally resolution is a new Munich in the making, a concession to keep Senate peace, not world peace. It is a political umbrella for those Senators who may need to escape the rain of public indignation.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, fearing the isolationists in the Senate, dares not to offer a resolution which will definitely and positively commit the United States to a full and fair share in molding world peace and in mending the broken earth. We who know the language, the authorship, and the history of this resolution know that it is intentionally obscure, purposefully noncommittal.

We want to make it mean, to all the world, one thing; not to all men, internationalist and isolationist alike, all things. We propose that we shall join with other United Nation and with such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted to establish not just some vague international organization, a new league of nations, if you please, with no doubt about it: first, to promote cooperation among nations; second, to settle international disputes peacefully—a world court; third, to suppress military aggression if need be by military force.

Is not the Senate at last penitent? Cannot a body which bears so large a part of the responsibility for World War No. 2 at least assure its courageous leadership to prevent world war No. 3? Let us honor our dead. Let us covenant with the living that the Senate of the United States will this time dare to do right.

Elections in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Honorable Frank C. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on yesterday, Tuesday, November 30. This address is a clear statement of a vital issue facing us today—elections in wartime. It is particularly appropriate now since the Senate has voted to impose on the chairmen of the Democratic and Republican National Committees the duty of each to submit to the President the names of six members of his party from which the President must select two each as his appointments to the proposed United States War Ballot Commission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many sincere and patriotic Americans in both parties are somewhat apprehensive today. They fear the effect of a Presidential campaign upon national unity; for they know that anything that imperils national unity in this crisis imperils the lives and fortunes of us all.

I respect their sincerity and sympathize with their uneasiness, but I believe it is based on too low an estimate of the good sense and patriotism of the party leaders,

Republican as well as Democratic. It is true, of course, that if American political leadership were devoid of both sense and patriotism, it might permit the campaign to degenerate into a mere brawl over personalities, with grave damage to the country.

But in a free nation, sincere advocacy of principle, no matter how vigorous, should not lead to disunity. Our political institutions provide that at stated intervals the people shall be called upon to review the record of the party entrusted with the administration of affairs and the alternative proposals of the minority party, and render final judgment between them. I see no reason why this process should be interrupted by war; and I can see many reasons to believe that a judgment of this sort is even more desirable in time of war than in time of peace. But it should be a judgment based on principle, not on passion; it should be based on facts and not on the fancies of superheated campaign orators. For my part, I say again, I hope the campaign will be a brief one, conducted on a high plane.

I have the right to speak for one party only, but for that party I do speak here and now. I accept on our part the responsibility that lies upon all parties to bear in mind that the safety of the Nation is more important than any party. This is a responsibility that will not be hard for us to meet.

Let me digress for a moment from the discussion of principles and refer briefly to something that seems to have excited the opposition. Some of the leaders of the opposition have been gazing into the crystal ball; they see portents and tides and trends. Let me remind them that in 1944 they will not deal with local problems and local personalities, but with national issues—the social and economic welfare of our people, the winning of the war, and the winning of the peace.

The coming national election, which beyond question will be the most important in American history, will be won or lost upon the record of the party now entrusted with the responsibility of administering the affairs of government. The Democratic Party will stand or fall upon its record.

Our record is the issue and the only legitimate issue; and the test of our record is nothing less than the country itself. Our party has been in the service of the people continuously for nearly 11 years. They have been fearful years—fearful not for us alone—but fearful for every country in the world. They have been years of economic, social, and political upheavals almost, perhaps quite, without precedent in human history. Since 1932 every important government on earth has been subjected to stresses from within and assaults from without that have made the successful conduct of government more difficult by far than in any comparable period within living memory.

Coming into office at a moment when the economic structure of this country lay in ruins, when 12,000,000 able-bodied, industrious Americans were deprived of the right to earn their daily bread, when troops had been called out to battle milk farmers in Illinois, and mobs were dragging judges from the bench in Iowa, the Democratic Party from that moment has never seen a day when American institutions and American ideals were not subjected to terrific pressure, whether from the collapse of the economic system of the world, or from the blind greed of self-seekers, or from the folly of crazy fanatics, or from the weapons of gangs of organized murderers calling themselves governments, or from a combination of all.

Ours was the responsibility, I repeat, through some of the most difficult years in history. Under the impact of those years the institutions of great nations collapsed. The problem of government in such times proved too difficult for the leadership in power and it fell; too often in fire and blood. Even in the sturdiest country in Europe, Great Britain, there have been no less than four Prime Ministers since 1932. But for this country the Democratic Party has been responsible through it all.

Does the opposition ask for the justification of our record? I shall present it to them, but I shall also present it to the people of America, to whom we stand responsible.

I shall not in detail recount the great social and economic measures that came into being during the Democratic administration—a decade of advancement, the like of which has come to no nation in the world in a like period of time. I choose to call it the glorious decade, in which the friendly hand of Government reached into every humble home to bring security and confidence to families overwhelmed with adversity and stricken with fears of recurring disaster.

As this period of great social and economic progress was being rounded out, the clouds of war—long gathering—darkened the continent of Europe. Our President, and great Secretary of State, for years strained every effort to prevent the holocaust that was to come. Each new development was met with most unusual skill and determination.

War came, and with it the fall of France. Quickly there followed the acquisition of strategic bases in the Western Hemisphere, the dispatch to England of destroyers vital at that moment for mutual security, the potent policy of lend-lease, the selective-service legislation.

With lightning speed, the great industries of the Nation were converted into war plants.

These things the opposition would have us forget, but the people will not forget.

The critics condemned each step in this prudent program, as they had found fault with every step in the program for domestic rehabilitation.

Over the years the opposition fought the President's effort to build an adequate Navy. Over the years, they fought his plans to strengthen the defenses in the Pacific. Over the years, they hampered his efforts to develop our air power. Despite their protests, the administration built air fields, runways, and hangars, utilizing the unemployed millions for much of this construction. Despite their protests, the administration made and improved with this labor 640,000 miles of what are now military highways. In less than 2 years of war, we have manufactured 50,000 light and medium tanks, a million trucks, 28,000,000,000 rounds of small ammunition. Thirty thousand ships of all sizes have gone down the ways, 2,400 of which are oceangoing vessels. Six hundred are Navy combat ships. Doubled in the last year, our Navy is now the largest in the history of the world. We now manufacture and deliver twice as many planes each month as do the Axis countries combined. Hitler required 10 years to build his fearful war machine; in 2 years, the unregimented efforts of the freemen of the United States have far surpassed the arms production not only of Hitler but of all the Axis Powers. Weapons forged by freemen now rain death upon the enemy in all parts of the world.

Today we have approximately 8,000,000 men in our Army, two and one-half million men in our Navy. Men well trained, well equipped, well fed, well clothed. This Army—this Navy—have been placed under the leadership of capable, efficient military and naval men, skilled and well trained in military and naval warfare. The splendid strategy and skill of our leaders have been made manifest to the world. On all fronts in this total war, the courage, the valor, the soul, the heart, the fighting spirit of our men have won the admiration of our allies—the respect of our enemies. It is in keeping with American tradition. We at home are proud and grateful.

At this moment let me make it very plain—let me emphasize with all the power at my command, that I repudiate as infamous any suggestion that the magnificence exhibited in this war bears any partisan stamp. I can think of nothing more detestable than an effort to claim for a political party the honor that is being won by the blood, toil, sweat, and tears of the whole American people.

I do maintain that the Democratic administration was entrusted with the responsibility of leadership—that it gave leadership to the preparation and the waging of the war and that the administration has led the people ably, fearlessly, and triumphantly. The State of the Union is now the only conclusive test of the competence of that rule. I do maintain that America was never more powerful than at this moment and that American ideals never shone brighter than at this moment.

I say to you, my friends, this is the record.

I say that in the years of grave emergency the record of the Democratic Party has been a glorious one. We do and we will stand upon that record—made under the fine, able, and courageous leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief.

I am not concerned with the critics who harp on the less important things. Let us put first things first. The discomforts and inconveniences we are all suffering are trifling against the vast background of war.

The families of those with sons and brothers in the combat zones appreciate most deeply the gravity of this war. They scan the papers with anxiety day after day. The casualty lists are more important to them than the latest gossip about rationing. The plaints of the critics stir no emotions in their hearts. But they are not despairing. They have the assurance that their loved ones are provided with the best food, the best weapons, and the best medical care ever afforded fighting forces in all time.

The critics, the complainers of Washington's day harried him through all his campaigns, but, conscious of the love, the faith, and the prayers of the people, he went on to victory.

This war, my friends, is now in every home. Its shadow falls across every fireside. The people understand what it means. They understand the necessity for unity; they remember that by unity and unswerving fidelity to the Commander in Chief the Republic had its birth.

They understand that by unity—unity of purpose, unity of ideals, unity of action—and unfailing loyalty to our Commander in Chief we, too, will go on to victory.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, at American-Soviet Friendship Meeting, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered in Baltimore, Md., on November 18, 1943, at the American-Soviet friendship meeting.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Russia has saved a million American lives in stopping and hurling back the Nazi military machine on the eastern front.

Next to the heroic defense of Britain, the immeasurable sacrifice of the Soviet people have cracked and broken the Axis scheme to conquer the world.

Without Russia, the United Nations could not have won the war. Without Russia, we cannot keep the peace.

The Moscow Declaration has set at rest every honest fear that Russia was not going to do its part in winning the victory and in winning the peace. Russia has now become one of the giant pillars of a new world which we are going to build upon the tragic wreckage of the old wrought by war.

There has been a long friendship between the people of Russia and the people of the United States. It was Russia who suggested when the ownership of the Hawaiian Islands was in question that they should belong to the United States. Russia freely sold us her only possession in the Western Hemisphere—Alaska. Russia has cooperated with us in respect to commerce and conservation in the North Pacific. No nation's credit has been better with our businessmen than Russia's.

She, like ourselves, is a great land power, needing, not territory but peace and a chance to work and trade to prosper. Her future is dependent upon a secure and prosperous world as is ours.

Russia is going to be one of the giants of the world after the war, but the Moscow Declaration proves that she believes in a world wherein freedom, independence, security, and collaboration, not tyranny and conquest, shall be the rule.

Never before in history have four nations to whom collaboration is so natural and necessary emerged as the dominant nations of the world as have Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and ourselves. Through the dark corridor of the present there opens a light yet glimmering but constantly growing brighter and stronger and steadier of a new day. It is the dawn of a better world.

Resolution Adopted by Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the fourth district conference of the eighth district of the Order of Ahepa held in Worcester, Mass., on November 14, 1943:

Whereas Greece offered great services to the cause of the United Nations by defeating the Italian armies and by upsetting Hitler's timetable through their glorious and suicidal resistance to the German armies; and

Whereas the Greek Army in Africa and the Greek Navy in the Mediterranean contributed and is constantly contributing to the victories of the Allied Nations; and

Whereas the Greek people and the Greek guerrillas are continuously and effectively resisting the Axis forces; and

Whereas the Greek people, as punishment for their resistance to the Axis and their contributions to the Allied cause, have been subjected to cruelties and sacrifices equal to, if not greater than those of, any other Allied nation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress be urged to support and protect the interest of this loyal and honorable ally and comrade-in-arms of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our Senators and Representatives.

BASIL MILONAS,
District Governor.
FRED A. KYROS,
District Secretary.

Warning of Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago a number of Senators on the floor of the Senate were discussing the question of unemployment. At the time when, during the debate, I opposed the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, I took occasion to discuss the question of unemployment after the war, I made mention of the fact that Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has recently written and spoken regarding unemployment after the war. In view of that fact, and in line with what I had to say at that time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an article entitled "Warning of Future," by Mr. Raymond Clapper, appearing in the Washington Daily News for Friday, October 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARNING OF FUTURE

(By Raymond Clapper)

* * * * *

On the domestic side, neither the administration nor the Republicans are preparing for the vast unemployment that may hit the United States when Uncle Sam suddenly ceases to be the chief customer of American industry. The extent of the shut-down that the end of the war may bring is suggested by the fact that the Government has financed 534 airplane plants and, in all, more than $15,000,000,000 of war industrial facilities.

Some here in the Government fear heavy unemployment. Not much is being done about it. New Deal planners are scattered now and are either in service or in other work. Congress denies funds for planning. Mr. Roosevelt doesn't seem interested enough to make a fight for it.

Within a year Germany may be defeated and hundreds of thousands of war-plant employees may be out of jobs. An equally large number of soldiers may be coming back to civilian life, because we are not likely to maintain our ground forces in full during the war with Japan, which will require chiefly Navy and Air from us.

Are we going to be caught unprepared, as we were in the great depression when the Hoover administration did not know what was happening and tried to stem the greatest unemployment crisis in our history by the futile attempt to balance the budget?

Will our people stand for two great depressions in one generation?

The country appears conservative now. But give it a second dose of depression, and it might go radical overnight. Everything seems far to the right now, with all buying luxuries and reveling in inflation. Remember the country was conservative as it reveled in the previous Coolidge-Hoover inflation—up until the day of the October 1929 crash.

Let indifferent politicians, in and out of the administration, eavesdrop on the warning given to American industrialists and businessmen in an advertisement by James H. McGraw, head of the McGraw-Hill group of business magazines. He says industrial capitalism has within itself certain fundamental weaknesses which can lead to its destruction if they are not counteracted. This voice to American industry warns that "no democracy can survive when 20 or 30 percent of its workers cannot get jobs." He says we shall never again have such mass unemployment as we had in the depression, because if business cannot offer jobs, government will make jobs.

In other words, private industry and politics must meet this challenge or else.

Rise In Living Cost In Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper clipping from an Oregon newspaper, under the caption "State Finds Living Cost Taking Sharp Upswing." It sets forth an increase in the cost of living which is not truly represented by the weekly report of the Department of Labor with respect to the purchasing value of the dollar.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE FINDS LIVING COST TAKING SHARP UPSWING

SALEM, November 20.—The increased cost of living is being keenly felt by the State, which spends millions of dollars each year for foodstuffs, supplies, and equipment.

Estimates by S. B. Gillette and Joe E. Wood of the State purchasing department place the average increase of all items used by the State at between 30 and 35 percent above pre-war levels. The cost of some items has more than doubled. This is particularly true in the case of automobiles. One type of car which the State bought before the war for $625 cost $1,232 on the last purchase. Still another type for which the State paid $662 before the war has increased in price to $1,326, because of the operation of Government price ceilings.

Grain and grain products also have doubled in price since the war. Barley, which the State formerly bought at $21.60 a ton is now up to $52. Corn is up from $26.50 to $63, if and when any can be found. Alfalfa meal

is up from $32.50 to $48.50 a ton and hay which before the war sold for $18 a ton now commands $38.

In foodstuffs the greatest increase has been experienced in meats and meat products. Lard for which the State formerly paid $5.50 per 100 pounds is now quoted at $16. Utility beef has increased from a pre-war price of $10.75 per 100 pounds to a present price of $15 in the huge quantities which the State buys for its several institutions. Pork is up from a pre-war price of 16½ cents to a wartime price of $25.50. Bacon, No. 2 grade, formerly quoted the State at 17½ cents a pound now commands a price of 26 cents and up.

Macaroni which the State formerly bought for its wards at $6.75 to $7.25 per 100 pounds is now being offered at $9.50 to $9.75, while the price of split peas has jumped from a low of $3.75 in the prewar days to a high of $9.50 on the present market, and the humble white navy bean now commands wholesale respect at $6.85 per 100 pounds, whereas this commodity sold in prewar days as low as $3.75 per 100 pounds.

Tea now costs the State 60 cents a pound, with very little of this commodity offered, whereas before the war there was plenty at 25 to 30 cents a pound. Spices have increased in price from two to five times their prewar levels, while pickles have entirely disappeared from the market so far as bidders for State business are concerned.

Cotton piece goods which the State formerly bought for from 10½ to 11 cents a yard are now quoted at 18½ to 22 cents, and the price of work overalls has jumped from $10.50 a dozen to $18. Rockford socks which formerly cost the State 90 cents a dozen pair are now quoted at $1.85 and cotton shirts of a quality for which the State paid $4.50 for a dozen before the war are now up to $9, and underwear is practically off the market.

A Call for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Call for Leadership," published in the New York Herald Tribune of this day.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

A resolution with bipartisan sponsorship has been introduced in both Houses of Congress recommending that the President create "a commission of diplomatic, economic and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany."

If anything can be done to stop the Nazi mass murder of a people, surely the American people must be willing to take the lead in so doing. Sponsors of the resolution believe that much can be done. They believe, first of all, that such a resolution would have a great psychological effect on the Nazis, in that it would be the first official recognition by one of the Allied powers of the extermination program and, therefore, the first official and explicit condemnation of it. They believe that official silence on the part of the great nations has given substantiation to the sardonic Nazi claim that not only does the outside world not condemn, nor purpose to punish, its bloody campaign against Jews as a people, but that those who keep silence actually condone it. They believe also that once the United States breaks the official silence—the Moscow accord and the Ottawa and similar conferences have not recognized that the extermination program has made the Jewish problem a separate one—and assumes leadership in action, the other United Nations will follow. The monstrous Nazi claim may then be countered with concerted denial as a part of our propaganda war. The nations may then demand the release of Jews by Germany and its satellites with the threat of specific retribution to back it. It is thought that the satellite nations at least would respond to such a demand. United action is needed, and needed soon, if psychological force is to save lives within the Nazi citadel.

What has held up such action before this is, no doubt, the conviction, widely held, that liberation for the Jews, as for the other hostages of Europe, will be soonest accomplished by concentrating on speedy victory for the United Nations. There is difficulty in securing united action for any other purpose now. Incidentally, the fact that there is an Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has led to the supposition that something is being done, whereas that committee cannot rescue hostages from within Nazi-held Europe.

Certain it is that nothing will be accomplished to save Nazi Europe's surviving Jews from methodical extermination by doing nothing. The resolution calls for affirmation of the American position, assumption by America of leadership in doing whatever may be done to save lives now. We should not hesitate to lead in so imperative a humanitarian cause.

The Yugoslavian Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for some time past we have been reading a great deal in regard to the European situation, particularly with respect to the Balkan States, and more particularly as to the situation in Yugoslavia. I hold in my hand an article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler in regard to the Yugoslavian situation, and I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 22.—All of a sudden we in the United States of America are supposed to turn against General Mikhailovitch, the commander of the Yugoslav guerrillas, on the word of the Communists that he has secretly been fighting on Hitler's side in the Balkans and is a dirty Fascist. Very few Americans have even a map-knowledge of the country, and its politics, of course, are a complete mystery to us, so we are not equipped to form firm opinions, but we certainly do know that no Communist will ever tell the truth about anything if a lie will serve his purpose as well and that fact must count in Mikhailovitch's favor.

Somehow Miss Ruth Mitchell, the sister of our own late Gen. Billy Mitchell, got mixed up in the war over there and served with Mikhailovitch, and she is now back in this country and apparently hopping mad at the progress the Communist propaganda has made in favor of Josip Broz, better known as Comrade Tito, a roughneck who has been leading a rival army and fighting Mikhailovitch. On the other hand Louis Adamic, an American writer who was born there and whose opinion carries a lot of weight because he is rated as an authority, has approved Tito. The turn of the war in Yugoslavia thus puts Miss Mitchell on a spot, for if we believe the propaganda then we have to suspect that this American woman, who certainly showed courage in the war, is either deliberately or innocently helping a faction which is allied with Hitler, which would be pretty bad business and very unlikely.

In view of the propaganda that has been spread by the Communists and considering the fact that American soldiers may have to fight in the Balkans, I believe Miss Mitchell's story should be presented as she wired it to me a few days ago from Reno. She says if it is true that small units of Serbian Chetniks, which is the name of Mikhailovitch's people, apparently have collaborated with the Germans, she can understand that because our Office of War Information has convinced the Serbs that we intend to betray the whole Balkans to Communism. The Serbs, she says, are sincerely democratic and have been our faithful allies in this war as they were in the last one, and points out that they openly joined our side while the Communists were still friendly with Hitler. She might have added but didn't, so I will, that during that same time the Communists in France were doing sabotage in the war factories, that Communists units in the French Army committed treason and quit to the Germans and that in this country, too, they exerted themselves in every possible way to help Hitler and harm Britain and us.

"The Communist partisans in cold fact are hardly fighting the Germans," Miss Mitchell's telegram says, "but are using their world propaganda machine to credit themselves with Serbian victories. The greatest terror of the Croat partisans is a just punishment for the murder of over 600,000 defenseless Serbs, old men, women, and children. The partisan army, consisting mainly of the identical men who performed these mass murders, are calling themselves Communists to gain the protection of Russia, who supports and arms them against Mikhailovitch whom we are betraying."

It is very complex, as you see, and Miss Mitchell goes on to say that the Croats eagerly joined the Axis but are now going over to the partisans of Comrade Tito because they see Russia winning.

"The reported Chetnik Axis collaborators probably are partisans disguised to throw odium on the Serbs," she says. "Our disloyalty to the Serbs and the publicity given to the brazen falsifications of the Communist partisans by the Tiflis radio is a black disgrace to democracy and is costing us dear, as it has unquestionably long prevented a revolt by the Bulgarians and Rumanians who, with the whole Balkans, hate communism."

That is about the gist of Miss Mitchell's statement, and I am not sure it clarifies matters, but I pass it along because, whatever the rights and wrongs of the dispute, she is dead right about the Communist propaganda as to both its quality and its methods. And we do have to remember that back there when Hitler overran Yugoslavia the Communists were not in the field resisting because Russia was at peace with Germany and Mikhailovitch was a hero to us.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper of Florida at American-Soviet Friendship Meeting, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in Madison Square Garden, New York, on November 8, 1943, before the American-Soviet friendship meeting.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ten years ago the governments of two great nations, both born in the struggle for man's freedom and each dedicated to the attainment of a better life for its people, clasped hands in friendship.

Ten years ago we were proud to call Russia friend. Today we are prouder still to call her honored ally.

In that resumption of trust and good will, we in America gave recognition, under our flag, to a nation of heroes. Tonight, in saluting Soviet Russia, I am proud so to describe, so to identify, that nation and her valiant people.

For today the United States and Soviet Russia are more than friendly members of a world community, neighbors who have found a way of living in good grace together. Today those hands that reach across the sea are closed in more than a gesture. Together they are tightening in a death-grip on the throat of a common foe. They are crushing out the life of an aggressor who knows not the meaning of freedom, who speaks not the language of trust and good will.

This winter, on the white reaches of western Russia, the forces of that aggressor will be driven nearer, day by day, to the scene of their full and proper retribution. General Franco of Spain, we are told, is withdrawing his Blue Division. But in the months ahead, over those bitter, war-scarred plains, will go others, their swastika in tatters, their armies crushed. This winter in Russia there will be many very blue divisions.

Meanwhile, to the roar of the victory guns of Moscow, a new triumph, a new step toward a victorious future, has been taken together by these two nations and their other mighty allies, Great Britain and China. At Stalingrad, the military effort of fascism met its supreme test and failed. At Moscow, the political and economic effort of antifascism met its supreme test and won.

The solid reality that emerges from the Moscow Conference—four great powers molded into a mighty modern Atlas, bearing upon its shoulders a new world—is steady, stable, strong.

The architects of the peace that is to come know this well. They know that only through the good offices of realistic leadership can the confidence of nations survive. They know also the firm base of mutual trust and confidence upon which rests the abiding friendship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us examine that base. Of what stuff is it made? Why should we in America trust the Soviet Union and join her in the commitment to a lasting peace? Why should we not listen rather to the haters and baiters, the Christian Frontiers and their un-Christian backers, to the counsels of fear and suspicion, some of them emanating from high places? Why should we not be frightened by the wail of the lonely isolationist growing lonelier?

For an answer, I turn first to the Russian people themselves and the magnificient fight they are making. I do not have to tell you much about that. The world knows of the Red Army, of the guerrillas, of the matchless sacrifices of the people. Those stories have found their way into American hearts. They have blended with the epics of the ages.

Secondly, I turn for my answer to Russian leadership. I borrow the words of Premier Joseph Stalin, from an address given on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the October Revolution. I quote:

"The program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is: Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of the enslaved nations and the restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to manage its affairs in its own way; economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance in establishing their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, and destruction of the Hitler regime."

There, my fellow Americans, is another charter of aim and aspirations to which we proudly subscribe, as we did to the Atlantic Charter to which the Soviet Union has pledged herself. Those words express no new sentiments for the Soviet Union. From the time the League of Nations admitted Russia only, mind you, after the exit of Germany, the League had no more faithful friend or eloquent defender than the Soviet Union. The same League, mind you, which we did not join. And we will never forget Munich, ignoble Munich, from which the Soviet Union was excluded. The same Munich, remember, from which we were as absent as from the League of Nations. What did Russia do as the sword of Hitler was raised over the head of Czechoslovakia? Russia stood up to her enemy and her obligation. I quote from the speech, the memorable speech, of Maxim Litvinoff in the assembly of the League of Nations September 21, 1938:

"It was only 2 days ago that the Czechoslovak Government for the first time addressed a formal inquiry to my Government, whether the U. S. S. R. is prepared, in accordance with the Soviet-Czech pact, to render to Czechoslovakia immediate and effective aid if France remains loyal to her obligation and renders similar assistance, and to this inquiry my Government gave a clear answer in the affirmative."

Those words—"immediate and effective aid"—meant one thing, fight. Among the major powers, Soviet Russia alone was ready and willing to do just that in the showdown against the aggressor. And time and again, through those fateful years that led to Hitler's march, Russia alone kept the faith. Therefore I say, my friends, if past performance be the measure of fitness for high trust, let the nation with a better record than this cast the first stone.

But what of Japan? When we shall have finished with Hitler, some ask, will Russia help us do the other job of needed extermination. Why is she not pitching in there now against Tojo and his bandit gang? What assurance have we? Give us a sign.

The sign, fellow Americans, is written in the irrevocable pages of history. Russia has a Pearl Harbor of her own to remember, 37 years older than ours. Without declaration of war, without offense or justification, Japan, on February 8, 1904, struck and destroyed the major part of the Russian fleet at Port Arthur. It was the same dastardly kind of attack as she loosed upon us in 1941. And Russia remembers. Russia knows the practical, down-to-earth reasons why she may expect the stab in the back from Japan—if ever she is caught off guard—just as she knows the hard, practical reasons why she can place her full trust in America.

If you want the key to national policy, seek it in national interest. The reasons that lay behind Port Arthur have marked Japan and Russia as enemies at least through this century. They are still enemies. I have no doubt that when Russia feels safe on one frontier, she will give due attention—complete with ships, planes, and men of the Red Army and Navy—to the other. And do not be deceived, Premier Hideki Tojo himself knows that on the books of Russia, he and his worried little colleagues in crime are a piece of unfinished business. It is the old story of war strategy. Nobody, ourselves included, invites a defensive war on two fronts at the same time.

More than many of us might suspect the simple factors of the land, size, and position have drawn us and Russia together in the past. It is no coincidence that in every international crisis America has faced in more than a century past, Russia has always turned up at her side. It was no historical accident that during the Civil War the appearance of the Russian fleet in New York Harbor offered relief to the Union from a perilous strain of its outside relationships. It was no accident that when other powers, toward the end of the last century, were reaching for Hawaii, Russia, through instructions to her Ambassador at Washington, advised our Government that she would look with favor upon American acquisition of this essential outpost in the Pacific.

Certainly it is no accident that today, marching together through the ordeal of fire, these two nations, through their accredited spokesmen, are able to announce that they see eye to eye in their first look at the world in prospect after military victory. It is not by chance that the part of each in that world will be large, nor that our cooperation will be close and cordial. It is not by chance that the Russian people are today intensely interested in America, in American culture, and American science, nor that we here are listening to the songs of the Red Army, to the moving symphonies of great Russian composers past and present, and reading the deathless stories of Russian writers.

That dynamic interplay which springs from the heart of the people is already well on its way. Old fallacies and false labels fade before it. In pushing through our lend-lease program, we have cured ourselves of bookkeeper's cramps, and the Russians know that America is not measuring victory in dollars. In dollars, no nation has a better credit record than Soviet Russia. We in America believe that credit record will be as good in the priceless commodities of human understanding that dollars cannot buy.

Most of the people of the world are workers. Hence, no world organization which springs from the will of the people can fail to make one of its primary objectives—one of its most vital and real purposes—lifting up to new heights, raising to new standards of skill and living, the men and women who wear the honored uniforms of labor.

No nation has made the welfare of the common man more her national objective than Russia. In the building of that magnificent edifice of a new world order, wherein shall reside a healthy, busy, happy, and peaceful people, we know the Soviet Union will leave its own honored craftman's mark.

The great words of the Moscow Conference have found echo in a recent resolution of the United States Senate. Hardly less than the Moscow declaration has the utterance of a body which assumes to be the final arbiter of American foreign policy, a body which repudiated the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, given assurance and new hope to the world. If we keep the pledge of that resolution, there will be no World War No. 3. But shall we keep it? The vote had no more than been counted upon the resolution in the Senate before a Senator was on his feet preventing the majority leader of the Senate from notifying the President of the adoption of the resolution, as being in the nature of advice to the President. This Senator was vigorously pointing out that it was not advice in the constitutional sense of the Senate but the mere expression of opinion, with the implication that it might change like the wind.

Remember that all the way through the debate on the resolution it was insisted that it not be regarded as binding the Senate to anything not subsequently to be ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Senate.

Can the people, therefore, assure that this pledge of cooperation and collaboration can be kept to our allies and our dead, if the present constitutional provision which gives one-third plus one of the voting Senators of the Senate not only the power of filibuster and of illimitable delay, but of defeating a treaty which, like the Treaty of Versailles, had the overwhelming support of a majority of the Senate and the country and the support of the hopes and the prayers of the world?

I have been forced to the conclusion that the retention of that power in such a minority in the face of experience and the many and varied stresses and strains of our population upon which play in Senators, as in other people, the normal human frailties in a world so complex as ours, is a danger to the security and the peace of the United States and the world.

The principle of checks and balances in our system of government can be even better preserved and the menace of so great a power in the hands of so few removed by making the ratification of treaties to which we are a party depend rather upon a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives rather than two-thirds of the Senate. And, in the making of the change, the majority in either body must have the unquestionable power, not only to vote but to avoid willful and purposeful obstruction of so vital a matter as a treaty.

Let us take away so dangerous a weapon from the hands of the isolationists. It is not enough to profess democracy. It is not even enough to save democracy. We have the harder task, to make democracy work, so that its machinery shall carry out the wills and the aspirations, nay realize the dreams, of free peoples.

To those who gave their lives, to the democracy which such a rule outrages before the God who gave them their lives, squandered in war, let us make the solemn pledge. We shall not repeat the sorry performance of 1920, the minority shall not rule.

Who of us in gazing upon this new and vast thing in the earth, the Soviet Nation, can fail to hear ringing back across three centuries, the words of John Milton:

"Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation, rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. Methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means."

How Kansas Supports War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article written by A. Q. Miller, Sr., editor and owner of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans. For many years Mr. Miller has been one of the enthusiastic boosters of the State of Kansas. He has been in the forefront of every worth-while movement in the State for the past three decades. Kansas has played a most important part in our war program, and not only from an industrial and agricultural standpoint. Kansas has furnished not only a large percent of its population for the armed services but it has furnished an outstanding type of men who are bringing glory and honor to the State and Nation.

HOW KANSAS SUPPORTS WAR EFFORT

(By A. Q. Miller, Sr.)

Kansas has achieved a high position in supporting the war effort, occupying an enviable place in the sisterhood of States, and, in the opinion of this column, should receive a Government E for the State's accomplishments.

Last week Governor Schoeppel called together the heads of the State's principal agencies in charge of war activities and they held a sort of symposium by reviewing Kansas' accomplishments and contributions to the various war activities. There is no indication of complacency in the State's record, but, on the other hand, a record to be proud of, or, it might be said, a record to be thankful for on this Thanksgiving Day, and so we give over our column this week for a brief review of some of the things Kansas has done in connection with the war effort:

M. R. McLean, adjutant general and director of selective service, could disclose no figures relative to enlistments or inductions, but he pointed out Kansas had filled every quota and that a considerable number of her young men and hundreds of young women had volunteered for military service. He said Kansas had sent almost double the number of men required in World War No. 1, which was 85,000.

"In 2 years just closing," said J. C. Mohler, secretary of the State board of agriculture, "our farms yielded crops and livestock products of a value of one and three-fourths billion dollars—far beyond any previous 2-year record. The output of our meat-packing plants, flour mills, and creameries alone may be worth $700,000,000—an all-time high for the biennium."

Mr. Mohler pointed out much of the production was of surplus foods. The State produced enough wheat to feed Kansans for 160 years, and 89 percent of her cattle production was surplus meat, the State standing third in cattle. The surplus poultry was 65 percent, eggs 70 percent, milk 50 percent, hogs 80 percent, and sheep and lambs 80 percent, all above local needs.

SCRAP AVERAGE IS HIGHEST

Byron Gourley, chairman of the State salvage committee, said that in 1942 Kansas collected and shipped 414,000 tons of scrap, an average of 16¾ pounds per person, the highest average of any State. The committee now is shipping about 25,000 tons of scrap metal a month.

"We delivered 13,568 tons of old rubber; 29,220 pounds of silk and nylon hosiery; 85,000 pounds of fats a month, hundreds of tons of tin cans and in addition the people of this State saved more than 2,000,000,000 tire-miles and 138,419,000 gallons of gasoline," Mr. Gourley said.

J. E. Merriam, member of the State war finance committee, said individuals, firms and corporations had purchased $387,000,000 of War bonds.

Jess Denious, lieutenant governor and chairman of the United War Fund campaign, said Kansas had contributed $42,556,151.62 from private and public purses for the welfare of her citizens and her soldiers, sailors, and marines.

WELFARE FUNDS, THIRTY-FOUR MILLION

The largest amount, he pointed out, was the $34,000,000 in welfare funds contributed by the taxpayers through the Government, the State, and counties and spent for the care of the dependent, aged, neglected children, the blind, crippled children, the deaf and others physically handicapped or otherwise dependent.

"Kansas contributed $2,083,509.97 to the Red Cross and approximately $2,000,000 for the various war and welfare agencies," he said.

Kansas stands at the top in the 15 States of the midwestern area in subscriptions to the United War Fund campaign, now being completed in the State, he added.

Oscar Stauffer, former chairman of the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, said Kansas had almost $3,000,000,000 in war contracts up to August 31.

"Our aircraft contracts alone amounted to $2,212,187,000," he said. "Our ship contracts were $15,824,000; other contracts, $146,205,000. Industrial facilities, including cost of land, construction and equipment, amounted to $193,721,000 and contracts by the Army, Navy, foreign missions, and other agencies amounted to $2,882,196.

"Latest W. P. B. figures show the Nation's per capita value for war supply and facility contracts to be $1,079. Kansas has a per capita value of $1,621 (exceeding 39 States). This is the only State in the Great Plains region to exceed the United States averages."

Strong Men Needed in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 1, 1943:

STRONG MEN NEEDED IN CONGRESS

In filling present vacancies in the national House of Representatives, as well as in the election next November of the full membership of the House and one-third of the Senate, voters of the United States have a solemn responsibility.

Congress is not only the direct legislative agency of the American people, it is the first, last, and greatest safeguard of the people against totalitarian rule.

Only citizens of the highest qualifications, with broad understanding and having as

their primary interest the Nation's welfare, merit seats in Congress.

This reminder applies specifically to the selection soon, in the Seventeenth and Second Pennsylvania Congressional District, respectively, of successors to Representative J. William Ditter, killed recently in an airplane accident, and former Representative James P. McGranery, now assistant to Attorney General Biddle.

But it applies also to congressional districts throughout the country where existing vacancies are to be filled.

America's major need, now as always, is a Congress of strong, able Members. Our tripartite form of government, tested for more than a century and a half, consists, as every schoolboy knows, of legislative, executive, and judicial branches. But the Constitution, in article I, places the emphasis upon the legislative branch as the basis of representative government.

In country after country, during the last few tragic years, the first act of totalitarians upon seizing power has been to obliterate or to nullify the national legislature as the agency of the people's will.

In our own country we have seen, with the rise of a popular national leader, the election to Congress of men who could not conceivably have won their places except through espousal of the leader's candidacy and policies.

The result has been in the past decade that far too often Congress, many of its Members having ridden into office on the Executive's coattails, permitted itself to be made the rubber stamp of the White House rather than assert its constitutional rights.

This is not to say that only one political party has sent to Congress men who failed to measure up to their job. Both major parties frequently have elected representatives whose chief claim to recognition was their service, not to the people, but to a political boss.

America can no longer afford mediocre, politics-obsessed Congressmen, nor a Congress at times meekly subservient to another branch of the Government.

Nor can America any longer afford a Congress which blandly accepts creation of myriad Executive agencies that tend to usurp the constitutional role of Congress by handing down—by the thousand—regulations that in effect are laws.

In helping to fight a global war to victory, establish an enduring peace and build a new post-war world, the United States faces the greatest problems in its history.

They are problems for no rubber-stamp, yes-yes, politically minded Congress. They are problems that should be entrusted only to the highest-type men we can elect.

The imperative task now—a task particularly for the Nation's Republican voters—is the filling of Congressional vacancies with the very best citizens available. America's security and prosperity demand now the restoration of Congress, through a strong, capable membership, to its rightful place in our three-branched Government.

A Million a Day Runs the Voters Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote yesterday to Judge Vinson, the Director of Economic Stabilization, asking for an increase in the price of Texas crude oil, and also a copy of a letter I wrote on the same subject, some time ago, addressed to Mr. Leon Henderson.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1943.

Judge FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Economic Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE VINSON: For your information, I enclose herewith copy of my letter of November 14, 1941, to Price Administrator Leon Henderson. Even before that early date I had been calling the attention of our Federal officials to the serious conditions that were developing in my State due to the price of Texas crude oil being below cost of production.

Since that time I have continuously urged an increase in the price of Texas crude oil, but all the facts, figures, and arguments have fallen on deaf ears of our Federal officials, and the situation has continually become alarmingly worse.

Today we find our Texas oil reserves still rapidly decreasing and discovery of new fields almost stopped. A serious situation confronts us.

Texas produces more crude oil than all the other 47 States combined, and Texas has certainly done her part in furnishing the lion's share of crude oil and the products made therefrom during this serious war crisis when supplies from most other countries were cut off. Texas has certainly stood up patriotically and sacrificingly to the test, furnishing the oil, and taking our loss, in addition to taking the inconsiderate treatment accorded us by some of our Federal officials.

Let me point out to you just what this inconsiderate treatment by our Federal officials has meant to Texas.

During the more than 2-year period which has elapsed since I wrote the letter, copy of which is attached hereto, Texas has furnished fourteen hundred forty-nine and one-half million barrels of crude oil. The financial loss which all interested parties have sustained, based on 50 cents per barrel, means that the producers of oil have actually lost more than seven hundred twenty-four and three-quarter million dollars.

This oil has been furnished as one of the most essential war materials and being part of the war effort, the cost should have been borne by the people in all of the States of this Union instead of being borne by the people of just one State, Texas. Had we not been engaged in this tragic war, Texas would not have for one minute furnished this crude oil at the low price we have been forced to accept by our Federal officials. Patriotism has been our guiding motive in this matter, the same as it has been our guiding motive in all the other great contributions and sacrifices we have made to the war effort.

Some of our States, particularly those on the east coast, were confronted with higher transportation costs on oil and gasoline, and inasmuch as this condition was caused by the war and the sinking of our oil tankers, our Federal Government protected the citizens of these Eastern States by paying out of the Federal Treasury the additional cost of transporting this oil from Texas to their States and thus the taxpayers of all the States contributed equally to pay this cost because it was part of the cost of the war effort. Yet, while the Federal Government equalized the additional cost of transportation of the oil, it has failed to equalize the additional cost of producing the same oil, and has forced the citizens of one State, Texas, to stand this entire cost of increased production due to the war. That is certainly very unfair to Texas, and extremely inequitable.

But this tremendous financial loss to our Texas citizens who are owners and producers of crude oil, is not the only side to this picture, there is another tremendously important phase. The State of Texas levies a severance tax on its crude oil; it is 4¼ percent of the value of the oil. If this oil had been selling for 50 cents per barrel more than it has been selling for; in other words, if this oil had been selling for a fair price, there would have been paid into the State treasury during this period in taxes an additional amount, in round figures, of $30,000,000.

Down in Texas a large percent of this tax on crude oil goes to pay old-age pensions, aid to helpless children, aid to the indigent blind, and to care for other important obligations of the State. This $30,000,000 during this period would have enabled the State of Texas to have increased the payment of old-age pensions on a basis which would have enabled these old people to meet the increased cost of living without the necessity of depriving themselves of some of the bare necessities of life. Likewise it would have enabled the State to care for other phases of the social-security program and to do it on a more nearly adequate basis. I think there is no one who does not know that under conditions which exist today, it is extremely difficult for these unfortunate old people to live on the meager pensions which we have been able to pay down in Texas.

I think that this $30,000,000 which rightfully belongs to the State of Texas, if it had been properly used, could have also served to lighten the tax burden on many of our small taxpayers and at the same time it would have enabled us to care for on a more nearly adequate basis these old people who constitute the pioneers who transformed the great State of Texas from a wilderness into a mighty empire, and whose sons so bravely fought and helped win World War No. 1, and whose grandsons today are fighting for our freedom on the far-flung battlefields all over the world.

Furthermore, it is to be borne in mind that when this money is applied to social security, by virtue of the Federal matching of State revenues, this $30,000,000 actually becomes $60,000,000 available for these purposes. I believe, therefore, you will agree with me that in forcing the people of my State to sell their crude oil at less than a fair market price, you are causing the people down in my State to suffer not only a loss incurred by the owners of the oil fields and the producers of oil, but you are depriving our State of revenue which it is justly entitled to receive.

It has been claimed by some people that to raise the price of Texas crude oil would be inflationary. You know such a contention is false. All economists agree that to increase the stock pile of consumable goods, or decrease the supply of consumer spending money retards inflation. To raise the price of Texas crude oil would do both. The increase in price would encourage more wildcatting, bring in new oil fields, and thus increase the stock pile of consumable goods (crude oil). It will reduce the supply of consumer spending money slightly by inevitable small increases in the price of crude-oil products, and such money will flow to producers to help them liquidate already increased operating deficits, thus liquidate debts, which is deflationary. But the larger portion of this increase in price of crude, while the war is on, will be borne by our Government, and through lend-lease, by our allies. Thus much of this increase in price will presumably be paid by foreign nations who are using our oil and oil products while conserving their own reserves. The remainder will be paid for by our own Federal Government and the cost will thus automatically be leveled off equitably among the

taxpayers of every State in the Union, and the whole amount not shunted on to one State, Texas, as is now the case.

In conclusion may I remind you that there is only a definite amount of oil in Texas, and it does not replace itself, as do crops which are planted each year. When the oil is removed and put into channels of consumption it is gone forever as an asset of our State. Because our Texas crude has been more strategically available during this war crisis, Texas reserves have suffered tremendous drain, while the pools of oil in some of our allied nations have suffered no such abnormal drain. As a consequence, when the war ends, the reserves in other nations will be in good shape, while our reserves will be low. This will mean that in years to come, with decreased world reserves, on account of such tremendous quantities having been consumed in the war, prices will be bound to increase. This will leave the citizens of Texas in the unhappy position of having disposed of unprecedented quantities of our reserves at prices considerably below the prices that will then prevail, and with the knowledge that we were forced to do it by our Federal officials just because they had the authority to force that great economic loss on to our State because they knew our Texas citizens were so patriotically inclined that we would not rebel, but, if need be, we would give our entire supply of crude oil without 1 cent of pay, while our country is engaged in war.

I trust you will realize the importance of this problem, and immediately authorize an increase of 50 cents per barrel on Texas crude oil. Each day of delay is costing the people of Texas about $1,000,000.

Sincerely yours,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas.

NOVEMBER 14, 1941.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I wired you on November 10, advising that the independent oil operators, landowners, farmers, and other interested parties in Texas needed an increase of 35 or 50 cents per barrel on Texas crude oil.

I also wired Mr. Ickes along the same line. I now have a reply from Mr. Ickes, written by Mr. Robert E. Allen, Acting Deputy Petroleum Coordinator, advising that the matter of increasing these prices is entirely in your hands, and suggested that the interested parties in Texas submit to you such data as they may deem pertinent in connection with this increase. Acting on the suggestion of Mr. Allen, I have asked the parties of Texas to submit such data to you. It will be forthcoming.

At the present time I am enclosing herewith data already in my possession which consist of tissue copy of resolution from a mass meeting of independent crude-oil producers, held in Tyler, Tex., on October 7, 1941; resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America in Tulsa, Okla., on October 22, 1941; report on crude petroleum costs, submitted by the Independent Petroleum Association of America, October 1941; letter from Mr. C. V. Lee, president of the Lee Petroleum Corporation, San Angelo, Tex., dated November 1, 1941; telegram from Mr. Ray Leeman, executive vice president of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce, and others, dated November 7, 1941; and a telegram from Mr. W. M. Griffith November 10, 1941.

You will note these requests come from representatives of independent operators, farmers who own oil-producing land, and others who are interested. I do not know that the major oil corporations are interested in raising the price of crude oil, because they produce it, transport it, refine it, and retail the products. They have already increased the retail prices of their products so that they perhaps are now getting the increased price for the crude they produce.

But the independent producers who do not engage in transportation, refining, and retailing the refined products are in dire need of a higher price for the crude they produce.

Increased cost of labor, taxes, materials, and all other items necessary to drilling dry holes and producing wells has absorbed all the cushion they had, and wildcatting is almost stopped, and many producers are having to quit business.

Texas wants to contribute its fair share to the national defense program, and as crude oil plays such an important part, we want to keep on exploring new fields and keeping our potential reserve up to where it is now, at least. To do this we must have an increase of 35 to 50 cents per barrel.

In Texas our rural schools, our universities, and colleges receive support from an oil severance tax based on a percentage of the oil's value. This tax also goes to the old-age pension fund, the dependent children's fund, the indigent blind fund, and the fund to pay retired school teachers. The increased cost of living makes increased tax revenue for these funds imperative. It is highly important that you consider this phase.

Texas has willingly and graciously penalized herself by enacting sound proration laws in order to build up a reserve for just such an emergency as has now developed. In view of this sound policy, it is no more than fair now that she be permitted to enjoy her fair share of the expanded market for oil and receive a price which will at least enable the producers and other partners in the industry to at least break even. It will take 35 to 50 cents per barrel to do this.

This increase in the price of crude need not increase the price of gasoline much, if any. But perchance the price of gasoline is slightly increased by this small advance in crude, I am sure the public would voice no great protest because the public is fair-minded and they know that everything else has advanced and with the increased income many receive, they can afford to pay the slight increase in price of so vital and necessary a product as gasoline.

Because of these conditions and other conditions which will be explained to you by interested people, I urge that you give immediate consideration to their requests and advance the price of Texas crude oil 35 to 50 cents per barrel.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas.

Inflation Versus Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, numerous leaks have been occurring in the dam of inflation. The Price Control Act set by Congress operating under the President, was created to regulate living costs and control inflation. The act really has been administered to regiment the American people and not to enforce the Price Control Act as intended by Congress. The administration has insisted they need subsidies to control prices and inflation. The facts are that every subsidy granted is but another leak and a growing force for inflation. The domestic policy on food has been greatly misrepresented to the public by the administration. Certainly the termination of inflation-laden subsidies would not nullify the Price Control Act passed by Congress. If this act is properly administered it can be an effective break against runaway inflation. The officials in charge of this program have failed in doing their duty. There is not a Member of Congress or an American who wants runaway inflation. The danger to inflation in this country is the ever-increasing debt piled up by this administration.

The President asked when the Stabilization Act was passed that he be permitted to control wages. He has had the right to freeze wages and the prices of everything all along, but this he did not do.

The truth of the matter is the administration does not need to use subsidies to control prices. It has other means that would be a lot better and would be typically American. Its battery of bright young economists have adopted subsidies merely because they seemed to have worked successfully in Great Britain where conditions are altogether different. They do not trust the patriotism and judgment of the vast majority of the American people and so are unwilling to enlist the power of these forces. Then, such a plan would not give the bureaucrats the control of the economic life of the country.

I repeat, the administration has the power to control prices without the use of subsidies. By taking counsel with the leaders in production, the leaders of the meat industry, the dairy industry, the fruit growers and marketers, and so forth, it could evolve plans that would keep inflation within bounds.

Mr. Speaker, I know my words will have no effect, but before it is too late let me urge the administration to make an about face and take counsel with those members of its own party who through long experience know the American economic system and who trust the American people. Let them harken to the advice of that elder statesman who sat in the chair you now so ably occupy—the man the Democrats chose as a balance wheel to control the unstable characteristics they even then feared in the one they nominated to lead them in 1932.

If the people feel that the economic life of this country is being intelligently and fairly handled without favor to any group they will patriotically follow the lead of the administration and accept such controls as are necessary. There will be no danger of inflation.

The O. P. A. and this administration should have the courage to really fight inflation through the proper administration of our Price Control Act. The administration is apparently trying to cover up its sins by blaming Congress for inflation. The blame lies with the administration.

Congressional Reports on the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times:

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS ON THE WAR

A seven-man committee from the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee has returned from a 14,500-mile tour of Army bases in South America, Central America, and the general Caribbean area, but there will be no report on its findings until they can be drafted into a complete report and all of it made public at one time.

Doubtless the decision for the members not to do any talking individually until the complete report is made resulted from the general mix-up that came when a committee of five Senators returned from battle fronts and each spoke for himself as well as through a joint statement. The less confusion the better in such reports, but so far as is possible from the military angle they should be made public in their entirety and without trying to spare anyone from blame where matters justifying blame are found.

Another point to remember about these congressional reports is that both the senatorial committee of five and the House committee of seven are official, congressional committees, not merely groups of Congressmen on sightseeing tours. The Senate committee was chosen from vital war committees in the Senate, by request of those committees and with full approval of both the administration and minority party leaders. To call the trip it made a sightseeing junket is simply to fail to realize that there is a war going on. The House committee was sent by the House Military Affairs Committee as its official body of inquiry. Neither group was in any way a sightseeing junket. Both were official investigations by representatives of branches of Congress.

Los Angeles Times Comment on Bailey-Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial carried in the Los Angeles Times of October 31, 1943, commenting favorably on the Bailey-Lea bill:

BAILEY-LEA COMMERCIAL AVIATION BILL SEEMS SOUND

The bill amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, introduced by Senator BAILEY of North Carolina and Representative LEA of California, soon to be acted on in Congress, seems to deserve support. The aviation industry is pretty solidly for it, according to all reports, declaring the changes made by the bill to be dictated by the experience of 5 years under the present statute—a regulation which has proved generally beneficial, but still could be improved.

At least two features of the bill are of public interest. One would restore independent investigation of airplane accidents, as was formerly had under the Air Safety Board. At present the Civil Aeronautics Authority makes the regulations and also investigates accidents, with the result that the findings might be biased, even though unconsciously, by a prejudice of the authority in favor of the regulations it has made. An investigating authority with no stake in the result of its inquiry would be preferable in such an important matter.

Another feature would provide uniform regulations for aircraft on a Nation-wide basis, superseding State and local authority in such matters. While, in many matters, home rule is best, there seems to be a clear case for exclusive Federal jurisdiction over such space-spanning machines as aircraft. The States have done such a bad job of truck regulation that interstate truck traffic has been greatly impeded. A similar situation in regard to airplanes would be intolerable. Manufacturers must be able to design their planes so they may fly legally in any State if there is to be any economy in manufacture, and operators should not have to digest and remember 48 different sets of rules if there is to be economy in operation.

Other provisions of the bill seem also to be well conceived.

Roxbury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bob Coyne, from the Boston Sunday Post of November 28, 1943:

ROXBURY

(By Bob Coyne)

Someday someone will write the story of Roxbury: of the community whose historic and literary background rivals that of most New England towns. For centuries it has lived in the shadow of Boston, but even that cannot take from Roxbury its individuality. This community sent three companies to Lexington, one of which was the first raised in the defense of American liberty, and gave three generals to the Revolution.

The community whose distinguished citizens by their writings and their leadership led the van of independent thought during the last of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, that, too, was Roxbury. At least 10 of its citizens, either natives or residents, have become Governors of the State, while the roll of its private citizens who were eminent in various lines is most impressive.

Most of the early settlers came from Nazing, a rural town on the River Lee, about 20 miles east of London. They were people of substance and, being farmers, immediately took root in the soil. Their industry and enterprise developed what was incorporated as the sixth town of New England and one of the prime leaders in all activities.

For the first 150 years all except those who came by sea had to cross Roxbury Neck to reach Boston. In those days a gallows stood near the fortifications, and the story goes that a shipwrecked sailor, sighting that barbaric symbol, thanked God that he had been cast ashore in a civilized country. For that mode of execution the Neck was the appropriate site; maybe that was a sample of the sly humor of the dignified town fathers.

NOTED TAVERN

Like all communities, Roxbury had its taverns, but the gayest of all was the Greyhound. Located on the only road that led to Boston, it was a noted resort. Meetings of all sorts, political, business, and social, were held there because the excellence of its punch was unrivaled. Day and night it was crowded, for it was customary, especially for the younger men, to sit long and drink deep and thoroughly enjoy such festive hours. But the Greyhound, with its mirth and its warm content, like the gay young bloods who made it gay, has long since passed away.

Heath Street recalls the family of William Heath, major general in the Revolution. It was he to whom General Washington gave the command of West Point upon the discovery of Arnold's treason. Active in both military and civil affairs, Heath was a great influence in the community, but in later life became a bit pompous and was often referred to as the Duke of Roxbury.

Gen. Joseph Warren, another Revolutionary hero, is perpetuated in a statue which depicts the physician and soldier as a young man in his early thirties. It was Warren who tricked the British guards at the Old South Meeting House. They had prevented his entrance by the main door, but, to the amazement of the patriots assembled, Warren stepped through a second-story window, calmly took his place, and gave a stirring address.

On the eve of the Battle of Bunker Hill, he was dining at the Marshall Towle house. With uplifted glass he said to one of the young ladies present, "Come, drink a glass of wine with me, for tomorrow I go on the hill and I shall not return."

A stone house built by another Warren on the site of the general's birthplace bears a tablet which reads: "On this spot stood the house erected in 1720 by Joseph Warren of Boston, who was killed at the Battle of Bunker Hill."

One of its unique institutions was the Roxbury Latin School. It was founded by John Eliot, apostle to the Indians, through the generosity of the 60 families who comprised Roxbury of that day. For over two and a half centuries it remained the oldest free school not supported by public funds.

Of the many who brought renown to the community few did more than the Lowells. John Lowell, though not born in Roxbury, built there what was known as the Lowell mansion. An eminent lawyer, it was he who inserted in the Constitution of Massachusetts that clause from the Bill of Rights "that all men are created equal." He held many positions of trust and was a great civic leader.

His sons also proved to be men of distinction. Francis became the founder of the city of Lowell; Charles, a clergyman, was the father of Lowell, the poet, and John, Jr., like his father, was an important figure in public life. Upon the death of his father, he took over the old homestead. He was famous for letters signed "Roxbury Farmer" and also for his participation in questions of the day.

REAL WILLARD CLOCK

During the first half of the nineteenth century his writings molded public opinion to such an extent that he aroused and sus-

tained bitter opposition to many of the national policies. His integrity no one doubted and, while he invoked bitterness from one political faction, he remained in his home town one of its best loved citizens.

The First Church, known as the Church of John Eliot the Apostle, contains in addition to Eliot's chair, a unique clock surmounted by a spread eagle whose beak holds strings of gilded balls. This is one of the few authentic examples of the real Willard design. Willard, a Roxbury man, was a noted clockmaker of his day and many timekeepers on some of our old buildings were fashioned by him. He was called to many places, even to the White House, to make and to repair timepieces. Once, while working for Thomas Jefferson, the great statesman asked his advice in regard to a treaty. Willard, pointing to the parts of a watch scattered on a table before him, asked, "Could you assemble the parts of this watch?"

"No," replied Jefferson, "of course not."

"And I," said Willard, "could not write a treaty."

Of historic interest is the tablet on Roxbury Upper Fort:

"On this eminence stood Roxbury Upper Fort,
A strong earthwork started by Henry Knox and Josiah Waters,
And erected by the American Army, June 177[illegible]—Crowning the famous
Roxbury lines of investment at the siege of Boston."

It was from this point that Washington himself led the Army over the long, narrow neck to the wharves from which the British and Tories had embarked for Halifax. Washington Street took its name from that march under Washington's leadership.

One of the most famous houses of the section, the Shirley Eustis, was also one of the most luxurious of gubernatorial mansions. In its two-storied banquet hall with its musicians' gallery, Washington, Lafayette, Franklin, Webster, Clay, and Calhoun were guests on different occasions. It was the home of Gov. William Shirley, then a merchant prince able to live in grandeur, and finally of Governor Eustis. It was a symbol of an age whose manners were courtly and whose habits were dignified.

The Dudleys, Bells, Scarboroughs, Williamses, Newells and countless others were an honor to their community, a noteworthy element in its history.

The famous Mission Church, and St. Joseph's Church, built of stone peculiar to Roxbury, are part of its history. So, too, is the Garden of Death, whose gates bear these impressive lines: "I am the Resurrection and the Life" and "He that keepeth Thee will not slumber." Here lies Martin Millmore, one whose gifted hands fashioned masterpieces in stone, and above whose grave rises a monument by Daniel Chester French, portraying, "Death stays the sculptor's hand." In the shaded lanes of this beautiful cemetery many of Roxbury's great sleep.

Modern times have brought other names: the Nawns, the Kennedys, the Gastons, and many others, all adding to the prestige of what is now part of Boston. Typical of these newer names is that of the Murphy family, long associated with the Crossing. The father was a famous wagon maker and his sons, Dr. George, Dr. Edward and Dr. Harold, have been outstanding citizens. It was the late Dr. Edward who helped to introduce professional hockey in Boston and he was officially connected with many Boston hospitals. Dr. George and Dr. Harold, now of Jamaica Plain, are both leaders in their profession and in community life. So the newer families carry on, but that is only part of the story. With a real publicity agent, what a story Roxbury would have!

The Constitution Is Still the Bulwark of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we Americans justly pride ourselves on our Constitution, that great organic law of government of, by, and for the people. The signers of the Constitution, however, were well aware that this was a new, courageous experiment in human freedom. They knew also that freedom can be abused, and, from time to time, would be abused, by men craving power at the expense of their fellow men.

Many provisions of the Constitution were formulated to guard against a usurpation of power by executive, legislative, or judicial departments. They wanted to curb the Federal authorities in their relations to the State authorities. As a whole, the Constitution stands today as it was enacted, and early amended. The various amendments never changed or violated its spirit, never altered the system of checks and balances intended to put effective brakes on any dictatorial tendencies which might crop out in this country.

I want to tell you now that it is not enough that we keep our Constitution as a historic document on display in the Library of Congress. The Constitution is not dead. Its articles are not mere paragraphs of legal phrases. The Constitution and the principles it embodies are part of our very lives. It is the blueprint of the American way of thinking; it embodies the belief of every true American in the American way of Government of, by, and for the people.

Daniel Webster stated, nearly a century ago:

> It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions, real or pretended. * * * are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully—but who mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well—but they mean to govern; they promise to be kind masters, but they mean to be masters. They think they need but little restraint upon themselves. Their notion of the public interest is apt to be quite closely connected with their own exercise of authority. They may not, indeed, always understand their own motives. The love of power may sink too deep in their own hearts even for their own security and may pass with themselves for mere patriotism and benevolence.

The Constitution, faithfully upheld by the people, is a mighty barrier against any effort by anyone to usurp power and to establish any form of dictatorship in this country. In times such as those we are living through now, it is essential that this barrier hold; indeed, that it be strengthened. The whole world is in turmoil. Men and nations are intoxicated by lust for power and plunder. The most elementary principles of decent human relationships are being cast aside and trampled under the feet of marching armies and rolling tanks of the dictators. Even some people in this country seem to be trying to imitate discreditable foreign ideas of power politics.

When the floods rise and the dikes threaten to break, every man must help to reinforce those dikes to prevent inundations and destruction of a cherished way of life. So in the midst of a world crisis every American must uphold the Constitution, his only protection against destruction of the American system of government.

Assaults against the Constitution do not, these days, take the form of proposed changes or attempts at general repeal. Those who want to undermine what the Constitution stands for talk about that document with all the seeming respect due it. If they should succeed in making the Constitution a pretty corpse instead of a living force, they would achieve their purposes. No law can be enforced and respected except as it reflects the will of the people. As soon as it ceases to be the will of the people, or if it violates the public sense of what is right and just and proper, the law is dead and unenforceable, even though it still remains on the statute books. As long as the provisions of the Constitution express the will of the American people, it represents a tremendous force. If the people do not care whether the principles of the Constitution be adhered to or not, and if, conceivably, the American people of this generation should think differently about things than did the signers of the Constitution, the document itself is dead and powerless.

Among other provisions, the Constitution reserved for the Senate the right to ratify treaties. No foreign engagement, according to the signers of the Constitution, should be entered into without the consent of a two-thirds majority in the Senate. No official of this country should be able to bind the American people to foreign commitments without the consent of an overwhelming majority of our people. That provision still stands. Yet as a reality, it is now threatened with extinction. The procedure to eliminate this constitutional provision is an extremely simple one. Just change the word "treaty" to a synonymous word such as "agreement," as is now being attempted, and the American people could be entangled in questionable and controversial commitments in their relations to other nations of the world without violating the letter of the Constitution.

Tonight I want to discuss with you two Supreme Court decisions of recent date to show you in another important field, that of the relative powers of the Federal Government and the States, how interpretations, even supported by the Supreme Court, may infringe upon the rights of the States as conceived by the signers of the Constitution. I am not blind to the fact that the world changes rapidly and that conditions exist today which could not possibly have been anticipated a century and a half ago. I

appreciate that any document made by men, however, ingeniously conceived, is the work of mortals and therefore imperfect. If changes in the Constitution be required, let that be done in the manner laid down by the Constitution itself. If our Constitution is entirely out of date, let us enact a new Constitution by constitutional methods. I have no patience with those who give lip service to the Constitution while at the same time trying to undermine everything it stands for.

It is particularly unfortunate that our Supreme Court, the proper guardian of the Constitution, has been transformed into a body once described by Mr. Roosevelt himself as a "superlegislature" whose members "pass on the wisdom of the legislation on the basis of their own personal political and economic philosophy." When the personal political and economic philosophy of our Supreme Court becomes that of the New Deal, we may expect surprising decisions.

James Bryce, that great English authority on the American Government, in his American Commonwealth set forth as clearly as it has ever been expressed the functions of the Supreme Court in its relationship to the Constitution. He said:

> The Supreme Court is the living voice of the Constitution—that is, of the will of the people expressed in the fundamental laws they have enacted. It is, therefore, as someone has said, the conscience of the people, who have resolved to restrain themselves from hasty or unjust action by placing their representatives under the restriction of a permanent law. It is the guaranty of the minority, who, when threatened by the impatient vehemence of a majority, can appeal to this permanent law, finding the interpreter and enforcer thereof in a court set high above the assaults of faction.
>
> To discharge these momentous functions, the Court must be stable, even as the Constitution is stable. * * * It must resist transitory impulses, and resist them the more firmly the more vehement they are. Entrenched behind impregnable ramparts, it must be able to defy at once the open attacks of the other departments of government, and the more dangerous, because impalpable, seductions of popular sentiment. (American Commonwealth, p. 266.)

Now let us look at a recent Supreme Court decision. In the United States against Wrightwood Dairy, the question was whether a dairy in Chicago buying all its milk from Illinois farms and selling it in Chicago, was subject to Federal price regulations under the Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act. There is no doubt that this dairy was engaged in only intra-State commerce. It, therefore, maintained that it was subject to State laws and regulations only. The Supreme Court, however, held that this particular dairy sold milk in competition with milk shipped to Chicago from the States of Indiana, Wisconsin, and elsewhere. Without Federal control, the shippers of milk from outside the borders of Illinois would not be able to compete successfully with the company dealing in locally produced milk. The Supreme Court, therefore, decided that the activities of the Illinois dairy affected interstate commerce in such a way that it should be regulated by the Federal Government.

If this way of reasoning were applied to all goods produced and marketed locally as well as on a national basis, it is quite obvious that no business activity would be immune against Federal regulation, and that State authority in the field of the business activities of the citizens of the State would vanish.

Another case to which I refer is Kirchbaum against Walling. Two loft buildings, one in Philadelphia and one in New York, the latter a 22-story building, were rented out to tenants, most of whom were in the clothing business. Employed in the Philadelphia building were an engineer, 3 firemen, 3 elevator operators, 2 watchmen, a porter, a carpenter, and a carpenter's helper. In the New York building the controversy involved 2 firemen, an electrician, 14 elevator operators, 2 watchmen, and 6 porters. To quote the Supreme Court opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

> These employees performed the customary duties of persons charged with the effective maintenance of a loft building. The engineer and the firemen produce heat, hot water, and steam necessary to manufacturing operations. They keep elevators, radiators, and fire sprinkler systems in repair. The electrician maintains the system which furnishes the tenants with light and power. The elevator operators run both the freight elevators which start and finish the interstate journeys of goods going from and coming to the tenants and the passenger elevators which carry employees, customers, salesmen, and visitors. The watchmen protect the buildings from fire and theft. The carpenters repair the halls and stairways and other parts of the buildings commonly used by the tenants. The porters keep the buildings clean and habitable.

The question was whether these men employed—not by the tenants but by the owners of the lofts—were engaged in interstate commerce and thus subject to Federal law—in this particular case the Fair Labor Standards Act—or whether they were subject to New York or Pennsylvania laws only. Mr. Justice Frankfurter held, and the Court held, that these men were engaged in interstate commerce and subject to Federal regulations.

Under such an interpretation it would, indeed, be difficult to locate a person in the United States who could not by a liberal interpretation of the facts be described as engaged in interstate commerce. The rights of the States to govern the local activities of their citizens is, by such a decision, practically nullified.

It is worth mentioning that Mr. Justice Roberts had this to add to the judgment:

> I dissent. I think the power of Congress does not reach the purely local activities in question. If it did, the commerce power alone would support regulation of any local action, since it is conceivable that such activity, however remotely, "affects" commerce or is "necessary" to the production of goods for commerce.
>
> But I am convinced that Congress never intended by the statute to reach the employees of the petitioners. Neither the words of the act, nor its legislative history, nor the purpose to be served, require the application of the statute in these cases.

The voice of Mr. Justice Roberts was a lonely one, but it was the voice and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. It is up to you, my listeners, whether that voice shall be silenced by the agents and the appointees of the New Deal or any other administration, or whether the true voice of America shall prevail in this country.

Robert E. Gross on Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Mr. Robert E. Gross, president of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, a concern located in my congressional district, expressing his views concerning H. R. 3420:

BURBANK, CALIF.,
November 19, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Member of Congress,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

I have noted with interest the consideration that is being given to air problems by your committee in Congress and at this time I should like to add my endorsement of your bill. I have a strong feeling that discussion of these problems should continue and that the subject of future air policy for this country will not be finally disposed of with the passage of your bill. Indeed it has features about which I have some reservations. It would appear impossible to predict now all of the conditions aviation will face and unquestionably the law will be modified as these conditions develop. It seems to me that the important thing now is to get a statute which gives the public, industry, and Government a clear basis for going forward and I think your bill provides the best pattern possible under present circumstances.

ROBERT E. GROSS,
President Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.

Address of Hon. Lloyd Thurston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House who were in Congress with Hon. Lloyd Thurston, of Osceola, Iowa, will recall his outstanding leadership and ability. He did not seek reelection to the House and I have the honor to represent the district which he served so ably for many years. Although he holds no public office at the present time he has not lost interest in public affairs and Government problems. A soldier of two wars and a student of world politics he has definite and constructive ideas on post-war policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a personal letter from Mr. Thurston and a news story from the Osceola (Iowa) Sentinel relating to an address he delivered on Armistice Day at Creston, Iowa:

OSCEOLA, IOWA, *November 24, 1943.*
Hon. K. M. LECOMPTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: Am enclosing excerpt from remarks I made at an Armistice meeting at Creston, Iowa.

It seems to me that when we erect monuments to the heroic and to the creative, it would be logical in reverse to have lasting memorials to the despised and to the destructive. Doubtless, more attention would be paid to the latter.

Sincere regards,

LLOYD THURSTON.

[From the Osceola (Iowa) Sentinel of November 18, 1943]

THURSTON WOULD PUNISH GERMANS—SAYS THEY SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO REBUILD OR REPAIR THEIR CITIES FOR 20 YEARS

The Germans should be prohibited from rebuilding their cities for 20 years after the war as a punishment for their crimes against humanity and, at the same time, be forced to reconstruct the cities and countries they have destroyed, said former Congressman Lloyd Thurston in an Armistice Day address before the American Legion and Auxiliary in Creston last week.

German cities damaged by our bombs would be a constant reminder to the Germans for the next two decades of the punishment that comes to peoples who plunge the world into bloodshed and suffering for their own selfish gains.

Mr. Thurston, veteran of two wars, suggested that if the planes being used to transport Government officials and members of their families could be utilized to send rifles and ammunition to China that the effectiveness of that country's army against the Japs would be greatly increased.

It takes 13 to 15 tons of equipment and food to supply one United States soldier overseas a year. Fifteen tons of rifles and ammunition would supply 300 Chinese soldiers with arms for a year, he pointed out.

Speaking of post-war problems, the speaker said the relocation of war factories should be given careful consideration. Since the entire Nation will pay for these plants, an equitable division in the relocation should be made. Congress should specifically direct the allocation, rather than allowing interested districts to select officials who will make the distribution.

The Administration Is Preparing a Constructive Program for Service Men and Women

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, while war is all that General Sherman declared it to be, the lot of the man in combat and of the returning soldier differs greatly from what it was three-quarters of a century ago.

Despite the fact that our armed forces now exceed by many millions the number of United States men engaged in any other war, and that the battles are being waged the world over, the loss of life is comparatively much less. This is due in part to modern surgery, to the discovery of new drugs, to the best of hospital care and to well-balanced food for both the sick and the well. Statistics show that the health of the men in service is far superior to that of the civilian. He is taught how to keep fit, and if taken ill or wounded everything possible is done to add to his recovery. Shell shock and nervousness are given special consideration. As a result, it is hoped and believed that after this war the number of physical and mental patients may be reduced to a minimum. At least we know that whatever the disability of the returning veteran, there will be sufficient hospital facilities for his comfort and care.

I have spoken of food, of its superiority and abundance. A far-seeing Government and a generous response on the part of the growers of crops, together with dehydration and other more modern methods of food processing, packing, and shipment, have made this possible. "Embalmed beef," still a memory of some who fought in the Spanish-American War, has no repetition in the present war and will have in no future war, if wars there continue to be.

The Washington Post of last Sunday, in its magazine section Parade, carried a full-page story, with pictures, telling of how a wounded soldier had written his folks in Missouri about the care he is being given in a Walter Reed Hospital Annex here in Washington. The Post story goes like this:

As an example of how the United States Army is caring for its wounded, take Corp. Thomas S. Young, of Missouri.

Eighteen, Corp. Tom Young enlisted in the Army a month before Pearl Harbor. Last December he saw combat in the Rabat area of French Morocco. Early this year he was wounded in the leg. Now he is convalescing in the new annex of Washington's Walter Reed Hospital—a former girl's college located in the suburbs at Forest Glen, Md. So little is it like a hospital that its patients call it Holiday Inn.

Here, on landscaped grounds covering 183 acres, he and 500 other convalescent patients are quartered in the buildings of the former National Park College for women. There's a swimming pool, athletic fields, and modern gymnasium where men who must get weak or stiffened muscles back into shape can work out. The meals are prepared by the same chef who used to cook for the college, and all the latest medic ' procedures and equipment have been installed.

So when Corporal Tom arrived, his reaction was typical. His first letter home began:

"Dear MOM: This is a hospital, but it hardly seems like one at all. I'm getting better fast, and I'm anxious to return to duty, but honestly, I'll almost be sorry to leave when the doctors say I'm cured.

As a Missourian, I was doubly interested in Corporal Young's description of Holiday Inn, and here is why. The president of National Park College at the time the Government acquired the parklike grounds and many buildings was Roy T. Davis. Mr. Davis was for several years prominent in our Foreign Service in Latin-American countries and is, I believe, at the present time on an important assignment for which his training fits him. Before coming to Washington, a few years ago, his home was in Columbia, Mo., where he was connected with Stephens College, which now has an attendance of more than 2,000 young women.

When the men of this war return there will be no veterans selling apples on the street corners in the National Capital as was the case after World War No. 1. If the President, who only a few days ago sent a message to Congress, has his way regarding the financial needs of the men, there will be no reason why veterans should worry over money in the weeks or months immediately following their discharge. The object of the President's proposal is to make the change from military to civilian life as easy as possible.

That the President's suggestion will meet with a ready response from Congress seems assured. Bills to provide such aid have been introduced in both the Senate and the House. Administration plans, generally speaking, call for mustering-out pay ranging from $100 to $300 to meet immediate readjustment needs and in addition it is proposed that there be security benefits and unemployment allowances of $15 to $25 a week. Under the provisions $300 would go to enlisted men and commissioned officers, including the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps, or lieutenant in the Navy who served for 6 months or more, $200 to those in service under 6 months but more than 4, and $100 to those with less than 4 months of service, and would affect all who were discharged honorably after December 7, 1941. Servicemen would not receive the pay, as they would be receiving a steady and assured income immediately after discharge. Those in the $300 class would get $100 on discharge and the rest in two monthly installments. Those who have already been discharged would receive their pay 1 month after Congress passed the bill. Provisions would be made for the payment of the mustering-out allowance to the beneficiary of the serviceman, be it wife, children, or parents, if he died after discharge before receiving his full amount. Of course, these bills are still to take final form, but there is no doubt about the determination to look after our men.

All that is being done is in keeping with the more liberal provisions for care of families while the men are away from their homes. Never before has any government so splendidly provided for wives, children, and other dependents of the men on the fighting front. Whatever is being done in this respect deserves to be. No contribution that the taxpayer can make, no sacrifice of those of us at home, can compare with what the men in uniform, and in many cases the women, too, are doing to bring the war to a speedy and successful close. It is gratifying to know that the program of the Commander in Chief is meeting with the approval of the public as a whole. It seems safe to say that all this will have the endorsement of Congress. The men who are winning the war have not been forgotten and will not be forgotten.

Economic Democracy in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, President Calderon Guardia, of Costa Rica, smallest of the Latin-American countries, declared war on Japan on Sunday evening, December 7, 1941, only a few hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The United States declared war about 18 hours later. Costa Rica proudly claims that we were her first ally.

Costa Rica is first again and has adopted an industrial code embodying the principles of social justice proclaimed by Pope Leo XIII, designed to end the "strife of the classes." This law of industrial relations defines the rights and responsibilities of labor and capital alike.

I am sure this statement seeking justice and equity will be of interest to all readers. If we are to remain a nation of free people, capital and labor should find a way to reach these solutions themselves, rather than have them forced upon them by government, but the objective sought in this new law of Costa Rica is admirable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the Latin-American editor of America for North American readers in the Catholic weekly of November 20, 1943. The author of this article, W. Eugene Shiels, was formerly professor of Latin-American history in Loyola University, Chicago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY IN COSTA RICA

(By W. Eugene Shiels)

Costa Rica, the progressive Republic in Central America, is the first country in the Western Hemisphere to write into its laws the Christian concept of social justice. By an act of August 26, 1943, this most democratic of American democracies put an official end to the "strife of the classes." The act, too, is working. It has teeth in it, and it is fitted exactly to the problem.

Many of the provisions of this new code have been advanced by leaders of labor and industry in our country. The Institute of Public Affairs, held annually at the University of Virginia, has heard them proposed on occasion, as various statesmen and scholars went on record for a betterment of our affairs. The press has carried similar discussions from time to time. But it was left to our neighbor Republic to make the leap from talk to deed. That rugged nucleus of American freedom had anticipated our own declaration of war against the Axis by a full 18 hours on the fatal December 7, 1941, thus honoring its inter-American agreement in the van of its sister republics. It now gives all others the lead in the critical question of our epoch.

The enactment of the new code—El Código de Trabajo (the Code of Labor)—has even in so very brief a time produced a striking political effect in the country that mothered it. For the Communist Party, seeing its thunder completely stolen and its only remaining plea a plea for disorder, gave up its special platform and subscribed to the program of the Social Justice Party called Vanguardia. Vanguardia itself backed the candidate of the rival party, that of the President, Señor Calderón Guardia, who sponsored and signed this legislation. Hence in the national election this latter party, the National Republican Party, finds the entire electorate behind it as its presidential nominee, Teodoro Picado, goes to the polls.

Costa Rica struck frontally at the great problem of our times. Leo XIII had pointed out the absolute necessity of settling the social problem. While other nations were attempting to meet this crisis by various compromises or ideologies, this land of 600,000 souls, small in size but one of the best educated sections of the globe, managed to untangle the diverse claims of ownership, workmanship, and consumer, and to draw up a model instrument of industrial relations.

The crucial political question can be stated quite simply. Democracies are ruled by the votes of their constituents. Most of their constituents are found among the working classes, and their votes count equally with all others. Constitutional governments cannot hope to continue unless their economies reflect, not a machine run by business for the sake of business—the Manchester notion of a century ago—or one run by labor for the sake of labor, but a harmony between the just claims of all parties who work for a living. Lacking this harmony, the vote is dangerous and may easily bring in a dictatorship of either party, a thing desired by no sensible man. The remedy lies in a frank facing of the fact, and a willingness to make the State the guardian of the rights of all rather than the totalitarian master of its subjects.

How does Costa Rica meet this need? The Código de Trabajo lays down the rights and duties of all parties to the economic process. It provides guaranties of these rights and duties through an enforcement and a separate system of labor courts whose operation is at once rapid, straightforward and sovereign over all the clamor of groups in every sector of the national economy. Ever in mind is the goal of economic democracy, the step beyond political equality and social harmony by which the right of everyone to work, to own, to improve his lot, and to find security is recognized and upheld.

In its 614 titles the code takes up in turn the following divisions: (a) General principles; (b) contracts and agreements of labor; (c) hours of work, days of rest, and salaries; (d) protection of workers while at work; (e) social organizations; (f) collective conflicts in socio-economic matters; (g) special tribunals of labor; (h) servants of the state and of its institutions; (i) administration of labor organizations; (j) prescriptions, sanctions, and responsibilities. A final division ties up this code with the general law of Costa Rica on social justice—in matters such as benefits connected with social security, mentioned in title 96—and with other pertinent legislation.

Appended to the code, as printed, are three documents illustrative of the progress of the code through Congress. These papers reveal the interesting fact that the code was submitted to a panel of Roman experts in the social doctrine of Leo XIII and Pius XI, and that Pope Pius XII gave it his explicit approval.

Clearly, the law is too lengthy for detailed exposition here. It is to be hoped that the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, or some like official, will have it translated into English and circulated among our industrialists, labor leaders, and men of government. But a rapid overview of its provisions may offer some idea of what it aims to do.

The dominant note is that no individual or group owns Costa Rica. Everyone is under the law, and the law is not only of the people and by the people but for the people. The interests of groups may differ. There will always be clashes of opinion and attempts at the use of force. But the whole people will give its decision through its government and its appropriate channels of expression.

The central theme of the code is the organic unity of economic interests in Costa Rica. Capital and labor may not carry on a warfare, because they are not two naturally opposing classes. They are, moreover, not the only two parts of the one national society. All the people have a vital concern in the producers and distributors of commodities.

Titles 7 and 8 recognize that everyone has the right to do business, to work and to make a decent living so that he may live decently. In title 262, we find it ordained that, for the common good, both business syndicates and labor syndicates must incorporate. By title 274, their papers of incorporation must show statements of assets, liabilities, schedules of payments, methods of administration, by-laws, and lists of officers. All important decisions on industrial relations must be transmitted to the official council of labor and social prevision.

Neither owners—nor their agents—nor labor may dodge responsibility for their actions In every case the law favors the weak, so far as law rightfully can, but there is no more room for mass intimidation, violence, or crime than for improper use of ownership or the power of management. Individual rights, whether of human dignity or of property, are upheld wherever they lie. However, no rights, real or imagined, may prevail over the good of the body politic.

In the case of labor unions or syndicates, all members of a union are bound to abide by the majority decision so long as they are members, and thus they must strike if a legal strike is ordered. On the other hand, no one may be forced either to enter a union or to remain in it. Yet while they enjoy membership they owe support, loyalty, and trust, and must act with the union in its proper decisions.

Any labor contract that violates the code is null and void, whether it favor owner or worker. A defective contract is interpreted in favor of labor, and the deficiency is imputed to the owner. But neither owner nor worker may arbitrarily terminate his labor contract before due time; penalty for this breach of contract is a severe fine and loss of social-security rights (title 31). And copies of all labor contracts must be deposited with official agencies.

No contract may ordinarily call for more than 48 hours a week, nor more than 8 a day or 6 at night, in factory work. In agriculture and herding, fixed hours and vacations are more elastic. A person who must travel more than 10 kilometers—6 miles—to work gets full travel pay. Contracts of women and minors are more strictly limited in point of hours and environment of work. If one-third of the workers belong to a syndicate (nothing is said for or against the closed shop) and ask for a collective agreement to improve working conditions, the owner must hear their petition. And if within 30 days no agreement is reached, either party can bring suit in the court of labor to settle the case (title 56). The owner may not force the workmen to buy in any store, to quit their union, to vote for any party, or to modify their religious views. Minimum wages are fixed by law and reviewed at stated times by special commissions.

Workmen are obliged to respect the proper rights and directive authority of the owner of an enterprise. They may not slow down, stop or abandon work, do political canvassing during work hours, or oppose in any way the democratic institutions of the country. A workman may quit for well-defined reasons; if he quits otherwise, he pays a large fine and loses his rights to various social benefits.

Owners may discharge workers, but only for shoddy work, absenteeism, personal attack, injuring the morale of the working force, or damaging the property of the industry. If worker or owner appeal such a case to a court of labor and lose the verdict, he is ipso facto fined.

In this connection there is a complete system of labor courts entirely separate from the general judicial set-up. Titles 379–577 explain the system, the steps through conciliation, arbitration, and trial, the superior court of labor, the qualifications of judges, the processes and competence of these courts in their special sphere.

Vacations with pay for at least 2 weeks annually are mandatory. Expectant mothers receive a month with pay both before and after childbirth. Employers of more than 30 women must maintain a free day nursery. Employers must insure their workers against accident in the Banco Nacional de Seguridad; otherwise they must pay medical costs and funeral expenses in case harm arises through sickness or accident due to working conditions. Finally, the owner deducts and pays the workman's dues to his cooperatives, those units of Costa Rican life that do much to balance the national economy.

Regarding the operation of unions, labor syndicates may engage only in activity of a socioeconomic nature. They must act democratically, voting by secret ballot, person by person, and only after free and open discussion of points at issue. Their assets are not taxable, their corporate acts punishable only by fine; but in cases involving infringement of property or personal rights, their directors are held responsible under the criminal code.

Most interesting is the procedure in strikes and shut-downs. "The right of the owners to shut down, and of the workers to strike, are equally inalienable" (title 382). Both strikes and shut-downs may be legal or illegal. A legal strike is defined as a "temporary abandoning of work in an enterprise, establishment, or business, agreed to and executed peacefully by a group of three or more workers, with the exclusive intention of bettering or defending their common economic and social interests" (title 364). Illegal strikes and shut-downs are penalized by fines.

For a strike to be legal, at least 60 percent of those working in the enterprise must vote the strike, and this after open debate and secret vote (titles 264, 366). Sympathy strikes are implicitly banned. The strike must be confined strictly to cessation of work; acts of violence, or coercion against persons or property fall under the criminal code.

In the public services no strikes are legal; they are held to be against the common good. Nor may agricultural workers strike, for the same reason. Their complaints are handled like those of Government employees. This is also true of herders, forest workers, transport workers while in transit, and those employed in clinics, hospitals, social and relief work. The national executive is empowered in time of distress to designate any other areas as of public interest.

When a conflict arises, the parties must first meet personally through committees. If that fails to remedy the cause, a process of conciliation is ordered. Should arbitration be agreed upon, its conclusions bind. Failing agreement, a 20-day period is allowed the workers to post notice of a strike. When a strike is concluded, the owner may not modify the contract of labor to the detriment of the workers. Nor may he discharge them, seeing that during a strike the contract is held to be merely in suspension, not dissolved.

The aim of this code is freedom in a productive economy. There are no tyrants under the system. The powers of ownership, and of collective bargaining, are held in check just as their respective rights are guaranteed. And in a country which has the outstanding banking practice of Central America, the best credit, the most alert citizenry, the finest record for peace and sound political life, the people quite reasonably hope for success in this new venture in economic democracy.

Why Military Preparedness Is Our Christian Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD at this point an article, which I wrote for a New York newspaper 25 years ago during the First World War, and which I recently received in the mail from a friend in New Jersey.

The fundamental issues as I saw them confronting our people at that time confront us today still unsolved. Because we then failed to meet the challenge of world change as affecting our country the whole situation has become infinitely more complex, difficult, and urgent.

The one great reassuring element in the problem today is the fact that our citizens and their leaders in public affairs are beginning to think unitedly in terms of reality.

As our understanding develops and confidence and courage replace vacillation and timidity, our beloved country will surely assume its place of leadership in the new world economy.

The article follows:

WHY MILITARY PREPAREDNESS IS OUR CHRISTIAN DUTY

(By Rev. Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, pastor of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, New York)

America is now a world power. This is the great revolutionary fact which the war has brought home to our minds and hearts, and which contains within itself our destiny as a nation. It is this sudden call to new and untried duties and relationships which has sobered our public opinion and raised the question of preparedness as the supreme issue of the hour. The war has so enlarged, emphasized, and complicated our relations with other nations that we never can go back to the old days of comparative isolation.

If henceforth we are to play our part on the world stage we must change our whole mode of thought and life. We must achieve a new point of view; learn a new language; master a new method of national expression. Our statesmanship must include world politics and world commerce. Our public opinion must be enlightened enough to achieve a world standard of international morals and a working knowledge of the policies, ambitions, and needs of all other nations. It is as though a domestic company, long famed as the successful owners and operators of a river line of steamers, should suddenly find themselves driven to undertake a deep-sea service. Their beautiful river steamers would be useless in the new trade. Their inland seamanship would not be equal to ocean requirements; their methods of domestic merchandising would fail when applied to unknown markets in unknown and distant lands.

This new strain upon our machinery of government may become a grave danger or a great blessing. All depends upon whether our people possess the spiritual stamina and resource to meet the situation as it ought to be met. Every man must realize his duty to think clearly. We must cultivate our moral sense until we are able to discern and do what is right as world citizens.

For over a century our national policy has been to avoid entanglement with the rest of the world. Our chief concern has been with the development of our own ideals, institutions, and material resources. We were unconscious of provincialism because the rest of the world lay far beyond the oceans, and we possessed a vast and varied empire within our own domain. Wide acres of empty and fertile land called for settlement. Our best markets were among our own people.

But we have been living in a fool's paradise. We did not see that every day the world was getting smaller and the nations and races drawing closer to each other. We did not stop to think that a hundred millions of free, intelligent, and prosperous people could not long exist apart from the rest of mankind. We did not see that the world's burden is one, that the process of human advance is a world process, and that a nation can realize its destiny only in and as a part of this process.

We did not believe that a world war could happen. And if it were to happen we saw no reason why America should take any part in it other than to observe strict neutrality. We were blind to the great truth that life is a struggle between ideas and ideals, and that these principles upon which our Nation was builded and for which we thought we stood might come to their supreme test somewhere beyond our borders, and that then we might have to stand up like men and accept responsibility for our spiritual possessions and beliefs.

The war has happened. Our most precious principles and ideals are now being tested upon a thousand battlefields across the sea. Men are dying for what our fathers bought with their blood. Reluctantly, but nonetheless surely, we have been forced to face our responsibility—and we find ourselves unprepared.

It is not simply a matter of soldiers and ships, of munitions and money. We can get these if we have a little time. But the lack is deeper and more vital. It lies in the very essence of the life we have chosen for ourselves during the last two generations. The red glare of a world in flames reveals America to herself, and we are startled at what we see.

We find ourselves in a condition of appalling social confusion and inefficiency. We have been absorbed in getting and spending. Our interests have been personal and sectional. Thoughts of defense against military attack, or of preparation for rebuilding a ruined world when peace comes are foreign to our social mind. We cannot as yet think in world terms. We cannot even think in national terms. We are not a nation in the sense that France and Germany are nations.

Our very prosperity is a menace, because it invites aggression on the part of those strong enough to take what they want under the ancient jungle law that might makes right.

We must prepare for peace even more thoroughly than for war, for we realize that the nations must find some way of living together without war. Civilized society has no future unless it can escape from the burden and curse of militarism. It has no future even if it does get rid of war unless it can resist the dangers of peace and prosperity undisciplined by moral responsibility.

The situation that confronts us as a nation at the present moment is as difficult and dangerous as any in our entire history. We have been drawn into the vortex of world relations, and we cannot escape. We must face these larger responsibilities with intelligence, courage, and a strong sense of right

and honor. We are unprepared for this supreme trial of our institutions and national character because we have neglected our own inner life as a people. A strain will be put upon unprepared American democracy, by the demands of a world peace equal to that put upon unprepared British democracy by the World War.

We first need spiritual preparedness—a profound moral and intellectual awakening. Following this as its moral expression we need military preparedness sufficient to protect our citizens in their rights anywhere on earth, and to defend our country and commerce from wrongful aggression. Industrial preparedness which shall cure the confusion and inefficiency of our economic system and place its resources behind the Nation at a whole is absolutely essential, if military preparedness is to be anything more than a form.

And we must give attention to our machinery of government so that all these other defensive agents shall not fail because we lack a form of Government truly national, which shall combine strength with justice and authority with freedom.

Food and Nutrition Studies at Montana Agricultural Experiment Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a letter from Dr. Clyde McKee, Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Montana State College, Bozeman, and some studies connected with food handling conducted by Dr. Jessie E. Richardson of the Department of Home Economics in the same institution. It is my firm belief that Montana State College is to be congratulated on carrying out research of this type because it does help many people in our State to understand more fully the nutritive values of food and how to preserve the vitamins so necessary to health. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this is only one of the many fine contributions that the staff at Montana State College has given to the people of the State and Nation:

MONTANA STATE COLLEGE,
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Bozeman, November 27, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MANSFIELD: I am attaching a copy of a brief item prepared by the Department of Home Economics Research of the Agricultural Experiment Station of Montana State College.

The present World War has emphasized the importance of research on foods and nutrition. I would like to call special attention to the last paragraph in Dr. Richardson's statement, which emphasizes the importance of continuing fundamental research on foods and nutrition in order that agricultural experiment stations may be prepared to supply information needed in the future.

Very truly yours,

CLYDE MCKEE, *Director.*

FOOD AND NUTRITION STUDIES AT MONTANA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

Owing to the geographic location of Montana, its growing season extends over only a short summer period. This necessitates the preservation of large quantities of vegetables and fruit for use during the long winter season. To find whether preservation impairs the nutritive value of these foods (especially their vitamin value), the department of home economics research for the past 18 years has been making an intensive study of the effect of the various preservation methods on vegetables and fruits.

These studies have included (1) the effect of winter storage on the vitamin content of potatoes, carrots, rutabagas, parsnips, cabbage, and onions; (2) the effect of canning on the vitamin content of carrots, corn, peas, snap beans, and strawberries; (3) the effect of salting on the vitamin content of corn and snap beans; and (4) some work on the effect of dehydration and freezing on vegetables and fruits. The materials have been tested in both raw and cooked forms.

In general, these studies have shown that storage under good conditions is the most satisfactory method for keeping the vegetables and fruits adapted to this type of preservation. Canning causes little or no loss of vitamin A, losses ranging from 15 o 40 percent in vitamin B_1, and from 30 to 80 percent in vitamin C in the vegetables and fruits. Salting vegetables results in small vitamin losses. Dehydration and freezing appear to cause a progressive loss of vitamin C.

These studies represent only preliminary steps in assembling the mass of information needed to aid families in the efficient handling of their food materials. The expenditure of great amounts of energy, time, and money in the development of gardens and orchards deserves parallel efforts to conserve the nutritive value of the products.

JESSIE E. RICHARDSON,
Department of Home Economics Research.
NOVEMBER 23, 1943.

Address by Louis Johnson at American Legion Dinner, Omaha, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Louis Johnson, past national commander of the American Legion and former Assistant Secretary of War, on the occasion of the Legion's guest dinner held in connection with the twenty-fifth national convention of the American Legion at the Fontenelle Hotel, Omaha, Nebr., on September 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. Commander, distinguished guests of the American Legion, in this twenty-fifth national convention of the American Legion we should celebrate our silver jubilee. Instead the American Legion meets for a second time in the shadow of war. As young men we fought beyond the seas for the defense of the United States. Now, older and more experienced, we are using the talents given to each of us again to defend the United States beyond the seas. The lesson has been plain for all of us; the successful defense of the United States means defense beyond the seas. It means that the most vital interests of the United States are bound up with what happens beyond the seas; that we cannot leave the world alone, because the world will not leave us alone. It means that we cannot sleep within our borders if we are to be safe.

Just as war casts a long and recognizable shadow before the outbreak of actual conflict, so today the problems of readjustment are showing themselves in advance of the victory on which we are determined. Already we know that victory alone is not enough. The primary objective at this time is winning the war—winning it decisively. That we shall do. But then the United States must take a leading part in winning the peace

We owe a debt to the many thousand Americans, young, clean, and vigorous, who have found soldiers' graves in Morocco, Algiers, Tunisia, and Sicily; in Attu and the Aleutians; in Wake, Midway, the Solomons, New Guinea; as also to the millions of young Americans who are fighting on every continent of the world to wipe out a threat to American safety. These men have saved our country, our homes, and our lives. They have saved the Nation. We must never forget what we owe to them and to their families.

How best can we repay that debt? Surely it must be by so handling the affairs of the United States in the coming readjustment that the vital interests of the United States shall be safeguarded. I think we shall find that, properly understood, those interests, if well guarded, will contribute mightily toward the well-being of our neighbors and the rest of the world.

No Legionnaire, I think, will deny the appropriateness of our considering here, in convention assembled, the principles and policies we should advocate and support.

It has been said, and truly, that every nation must act in its own interest; and that no other type of action can be valid. We shall be on sound ground in supporting the principles and policies which serve and protect the interests of our own country. In estimating these interests, however, we must be enlightened and broad-minded, in making sure that we do not sacrifice long-run interests for temporary advantage.

The basic interests of the United States are changeless; they are independence, freedom, and security. These we cannot permit to be threatened from any quarter.

We know, now, that as a matter of military technique threat can arise by air from practically any part of northern and western Europe; and from the western shoulder of Africa. We know, too, that within a few short years a like threat could arise in the Pacific. Air warfare has torn up our old geography books and is writing them over with vivid new colors. The next Singapore could well be in the Yukon, or in Labrador; in the far-away Aleutians, or on the shoulder of South America. In effect, there is no safety in geography; even the illusion of distance we have had will vanish as the postwar years come, and new developments in aviation leave the drawing boards and traverse the sky.

We know now that if there is to be a third world war, we shall never again be given several years time to get ready. We shall not be the last to be involved, since after World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, any aggressor will know his first task must be to knock out America. He will come by air and by that time a surprise attack might be 50 Pearl Harbors happening all over the United States.

But if this is true of the United States, it is even more true of practically every coun-

try on the globe. None is now immune from military threat; all are seeking as are we, arrangements which will safeguard their independence, freedom, and security, just as we are. Economically, we are perhaps less subject to menace at the moment, because of our productive power, our vast internal market, and our hemispheric arrangements by which we cooperate with the other American republics and with Canada. Yet plainly we did not enter and are not fighting this war for the purpose of limiting our economic life to the Western Hemisphere. Hitler was prepared, somewhat contemptuously, to concede us the Western Hemisphere in the days when he boasted that he would divide the world to suit himself—though we know now that even that contemptuous offer was made in bad faith, and that he had already made his plan to invade the hemisphere. Further, we know now, that the security of the United States could not have been maintained without materials from outside the country. Those who laughed at the pioneers of the good-neighbor policy have lived to see the day when South American materials saved the situation for the arsenal of democracy. Even so the materials we needed from the Far East were cut off and have cost us dear in time and treasure to find replacements.

We cannot, therefore, establish the true interest of the United States by merely drawing a line around our borders; nor even by merely drawing a line around the Western Hemisphere.

This situation leaves us, in effect, a single choice. Either we must mark out, by conquest or alliance, a huge area, and stand to arms continually; or we must find some means of dealing with the world by which any menace to our safety, economic or military, can be prevented or eliminated at its earliest stage. All of the discussions boil down to this primary choice. Alone, or perhaps with an ally, we must hold a huge area by military means; or else we must find some system of relationships by which this country, endowed with the force it possesses, can expect to live in a peaceful world.

To me the answer is plain. The United States, historically and by conviction, has sought to maintain her position by pursuing principles which are of equal application throughout the entire world. She has endeavored to construct those principles so that at all times it was to the interest of the nations of the world to remain friendly with the United States; and at the same time she has maintained herself well enough armed so that she could deal with the occasional threats which might arise.

Not being diplomats, we here can use the blunt language of common speech.

When victory shall have smashed our enemies there will be a small number of great powers in the world. These will be the custodians of the overwhelming military force of the earth. There will be many smaller nations each of which will have its part to play. No one of these smaller powers, and probably no combination of them, is likely to challenge the peace of the world. Temporarily, the great powers will be chiefly responsible for world order in the immediate post-war period. This will happen by sheer force of circumstances, and nothing can prevent it. So we shall be, in fact, acting together with our great allies, as well as with a great number of small allies, to recreate peaceful life on this planet. It is a large assignment.

There are some who hold the view that we should forthwith seek to ally ourselves with one of those powers, Great Britain, for common protection. These advocates say that after we have done that, we can then seek understandings with our other allies, and with the smaller nations. But while this process is going on, I wonder what our other allies in this war will be thinking about their position after it is over. When you ally yourself with someone it has commonly been because you were afraid of someone else. Against whom might this single alliance be directed? To start the discussion that way is merely to draw in advance the outlines of another world conflict. For what we really want out of this is not a good and advantageous position from which to win a new war. We want a set of arrangements by which there shall not be another war.

We do have, and shall have, a particularly close relationship with Great Britain, and with the British Dominions. We are neighbors in the Atlantic. We have a magnificent record of friendship with Canada. Our armies are working with theirs in Italy and north Africa, in Australia and in the Pacific. We have common tasks, and we are working together on these. We have common interests, and these are guarded and forwarded by the committees which plan operations, the committees which take care of civilian supply, the action of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, and the many working committees, military, economic, and political, by which we are winning this war, and by means of which we shall have to take care of a great interim period after the war.

Our other allies enter these relationships where they likewise have common interest on an equal footing. As the world has grown smaller, we can count on a need for cooperation steadily to increase the field of common action.

To the extent that what used to be called alliance is necessary and workable and to our interest, surely the substance of it lies in this common action. And thus acting, we do not depart from the traditional American desire to deal with all nations alike.

I think we are entitled to ask a specific statement from those who favor a system of world alliances. You do not solve anything by saying "alliance." We are entitled to know what the alliance means: and to have at least a recognizable chart as to how we proceed from there. Already it is being explained that this is not an old-style alliance, but a new-style alliance. Surely in considering so grave a change in national policy we are entitled to know the main heads of the obligations we are expected to undertake. Our unity with Britain is stronger than any mere alliance. We run real danger that an alliance, European style, would not strengthen, but rather weaken, the deep and abiding bonds which have led us to find common interest in two world wars, and which are likely to lead us into even closer relations as time goes on. In raising a question, therefore, as to the form of relationship, I think that my devotion to the substance of an ever closer Anglo-American relationship cannot be doubted.

We have a pretty good record of being able to get things done in that way. More than 50 years ago we formed what was called the Pan American Union, in company with the other republics of North and South America. Slowly and steadily this discussion group—for it started by being in substance a conference with a permanent secretarial office—grew until it became an institution which has steadily made for peace in the Western Hemisphere. There were just as many tensions and disputes and rivalries between the 21 American republics as there are between any group of 21 countries; but, with occasional lapses, the disputes did get settled, the tensions were eased, and the problems were worked out. There were occasional conflicts, but these were localized and eventually brought under control. Perhaps from this great experience we can draw some lessons which will be useful to us now that airways have brought Europe, and even Asia, closer to us than South America ever was a few years ago.

A second common-sense angle on this situation is that there can be no way of preserving peace unless force is available to stop an outbreak of hostilities by an "outlaw nation." No debating society can stop a country which has decided to use force to break the law. But who is to have that force, and how is it to be used?

To my mind one thing is certain. The United States is not going to relinquish control of its own armed force. Neither is it going to reduce that armed force to a point which again endangers our national safety. The day may come when there is an internationally controlled police force, but that day is not yet. Nor, for that matter, have we of the American public any reason to believe that our friends in Great Britain or the Soviet Union will take any other view of the matter. They, too, will wish to keep their lives in their own hands.

But without surrendering a single weapon we ought to be able to work out agreements by which we can act together when there is trouble in the offing. We ought to do this in the interest of world peace in general, but we ought to do it still more in our own interest—the fundamental interest of self-preservation. Every country in the world is interested in its own safety, and the safety of everyone is now threatened by any peace breaker. It should, therefore, be possible in this universal interest to agree that when there is a threat to peace by anyone the peace-loving nations will use their force in agreement with others to stop an outlaw nation.

Is not this the outline of the program we ought to support? Its elements are three:

First, a general good-neighbor policy effective throughout the world;

Second, an arrangement for more or less continuous discussion and examination between all nations of any situations which may give cause for trouble or which may menace war;

Third, an agreement that all the nations will use the force they have to assist in seeing that the law is kept and the peace maintained. In each case measures can be adapted to each problem as it comes up; we do not have to foresee in advance every sort of case which will arise.

Out of this very simple structure other functions can be evolved as time and circumstances and the general desire of nations permit. The Pan American group of nations has developed a great number of cooperative agencies which work together in various fields for the common welfare; public health, commercial exchange, cultural relations, and so on. These did not spring up at once; they came as they were needed, and became permanent if they could be permanently useful.

The United Nations will wish to attack a good many problems when the war is over. Whenever they can they may proceed by this method both now and in the future.

To those who are presently urging a British alliance, we can say that within the general framework such as is here outlined nothing prevents us from having the closest possible working relations with Britain. We have achieved that relationship because of common ties and blood and friendship and interest. We know that the safety of Britain is one of the great bulwarks of the United States. We can safely rely on the long history of common interest, the increasing commercial interest, and the great awareness that our destinies are entwined to assure that relationships with Britain will be as deep and as intimate as may be needed. Within the framework of arrangements of general application we can confidently be sure that the British family of nations and the American family of nations will have the fullest cooperative relationship justified by their common interest. But we need not

in doing so exclude like relationships with the other nations of the earth.

Fellow Legionnaires, may it not be that the great mistake of Hitler and Hirohito has been in bringing on this World War No. 2 while we who fought World War No. 1 are still active as citizens and voters, and while we still remember, not alone the horrors of World War No. 1, but the mistakes of our fathers and ourselves upon our return.

The generation that now fights as our young generation fought in '17 and '18 looks to us—and we owe it to them and the generations yet unborn—to do a better job than our fathers did in preparing for and preserving the peace.

If when, exalted by victory, our sons come marching home a year or two from now, we of our generation urge them to return to illusory normalcy as we were urged, while the politicians again squander the peace, we shall not have earned—indeed, we shall not have preserved for our grandchildren—the heritage of freemen.

Fellow Americans! Twice in a lifetime America has fought against a dangerous foe. We fought to smash the German militarists in 1917; we fight now to smash the Nazi menace. But the time has passed when we merely fight against something. This time we are fighting for something. We are fighting for the opportunity to re-create an order of things which shall not lay the burden of a new world war on the shoulders of the children of Americans who fought in Bataan and in the Solomons, in the Aleutians, and in New Guinea; in Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy. Dictates of idealism no less than those of common sense counsel us to advocate and support a wise and prudent policy aimed at the safety and well-being of the United States, which should assist the safety and well-being of all the nations on this earth.

Men of '17 and '18, I firmly believe that our Nation has been established and honored not alone for its own sake but for the sake of the world. God has made us powerful, and rich, and free, and exalted—powerful, not to make subject, but to serve; rich, not to make greater gains, but to be the more efficient; free, not simply to exult in freedom, but to make free; exalted, not to look down, but to lift up.

With confidence, I assert that, not wanting in this hour, the American Legion will lead the way; and that future generations will arise to call it a good and faithful servant of its country and its kind.

A Senator Visits the Theaters of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] entitled "A Senator Visits the Theaters of War," published in the Postmaster magazine for November 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR VISITS THE THEATERS OF WAR

(By JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York)

Confidence in the leadership of a nation in time of crisis is an invaluable asset and to insure victory it is an indispensable need. If that high degree of confidence is buttressed by both experience and proven ability, that nation is most fortunate. Incident to any trip around the world, and more especially at a time like this, one has abundant opportunities to observe and to gage the stature and the capability of the leaders of nations. One likewise has opportunity to compare them with the leadership possessed by other nations.

The names and the activities of men like Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, and our own President naturally become household words and are the subject of conversation everywhere. Weak statesmen with big tasks to perform in these times pass from the stage and strong leaders come forward to take their places. It was my opportunity on our recent trip to confer with responsible leaders in the United Kingdom, French north Africa, Egypt, China, India, Australia, and in other countries. I know their estimate of our leaders and I also know something of what the peoples of these countries think of our leadership. Further than that I have been very close to this war. I have a deeper sense of my obligation as a representative of a people whose heart and soul are in that war. Having all this in mind prompts the observations I am about to make.

Here in America and everywhere throughout the world there is a profound admiration for the devotion and the service rendered by our enlisted personnel. There is likewise great pride manifested in the accomplishments of American industry and of American labor. That the military and naval forces of our country are ably directed by a splendid officer corps is now well established by an exemplary performance record. If, adding to all this, there is faith and confidence, reinforced by reason and by understanding in our leader, then we are indeed a favored people and our cause, being in good hands, will triumph in the shortest period of time.

No reasonable critic reviewing the record of the United Kingdom in this struggle, with its long, patient period of travail and sacrifice, can but admire the heroism of its people and the capability of its Prime Minister. Churchill's leadership in this war has received abundant approval from both Parliament and the people.

China, in her long desperate struggle lacking the trained personnel and the modern equipment of its powerful foe, is stronger and more confident today than at any time since the cruel invader set foot upon her soil. The people of China and of the United Nations ascribe in most part this unparalleled record of military achievement to the leadership of the Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek.

Although our committee did not visit Russia, we are all aware of the superb performance record of its indomitable armies, and we know that with such a record their leadership must be strong and effective. The Russian people have confidence in Stalin.

But wherever I traveled throughout our military theaters, in my conversations with officials and laymen in every country, the leadership of our own United States was not only held in great respect and in deep admiration, but it is actually accepted as being the most influential and effective in the world today. This widespread manifestation of confidence in our leadership coming from the rank and file as well as from the public officials and from the leaders of the United Nations, was naturally a source of gratification to me and I am sure must be a source of great pride to the citizenry of our country. Our Commander in Chief's foresight, evidenced before and since Pearl Harbor and indicated in the steps he has taken for our defense and our protection which have included the creation of the United Nations Council, the organization of lend-lease, the trade of destroyers for bases, all aided in preventing catastrophe for the United Nations.

The United Nations' strategy outlined last year has successfully wrecked Hitler's program for victory. This has changed the whole picture for the United Nations and now leaves our enemies on the defensive everywhere. Today, north Africa is on our side, and so are the Navies of France and of Italy. The Mediterranean is likewise ours and the long, time-devouring ocean trip around South Africa is no longer a necessity.

This defeat of Hitler's victory program so near to realization only last year, coupled with the miraculous development of our own industrial power and military strength has brought us to the beginning of the last chapter of the war; namely, the march on Tokyo and Berlin.

Of course, our committee found some problems that require attention just as we did here throughout the United States when our Truman committee visited production plants and camp-construction projects; and we will, in finding a solution for these problems, discuss them freely with the agencies and the departments affected and, in that way, we shall endeavor to make another contribution to the Nation's war effort.

Fortunately, in most instances, the problems we discovered are not the direct responsibility of agencies of our Government, but even in those cases they can be taken up with our representatives who hold membership on one or the other of the boards and commissions created by the United Nations. There is one important matter which would aid our representatives now serving in foreign countries and that is for the Congress to take some action with reference to the establishment of a foreign policy to guide those who are serving us in distant places. After the last war, we decided, by action of Congress, on a policy of isolation, and this action necessarily restricts the activities of our representatives and it likewise affects the decisions of foreign countries in matters where our interests and our future welfare are concerned. This is a problem for Congress to determine.

Lastly, I have been too close to the combat zone, I have seen too much of the sacrifice and suffering going on there to do anything or to take any action except that which will advance our cause and help our war effort. My desire to cooperate with the leaders and especially with our Commander in Chief has only been intensified by my recent studies.

Having all this in mind, I want to leave this observation with the American people. Our leader, the Commander in Chief of our Army and of our Navy, is admired and respected throughout the world. He is the most powerful political leader on earth today. We have every reason to take pride and to have confidence in the leadership that directs our Republic's war effort. Hitler planned well, but he failed to take cognizance of the power of our industrial plant, the toughness and the invincibility of our military and he failed to realize the vision and the leadership of President Roosevelt.

Here is a photograph of President Roosevelt and the Belgian Ambassador, Count Robert van der Straten-Ponthoz, exchanging autographs, taken on the occasion of the first day of issue of the Belgian stamp.

Standing at the President's right, and making sure that the Ambassador signs on the dotted line, is our own Third Assistant Postmaster General, Ramsey S. Black, and watching the proceedings is Deputy Third Assistant Postmaster General Roy North.

Third Assistant Postmaster General Ramsey S. Black, who, incidentally, before appointment to this office, was postmaster at Harrisburg, Pa., and an officer of Pennsylvania Chapter, N. A. P. U. S., in reporting this incident said:

"This picture was taken on September 14 when the news from Salerno was not so good and I'll tell you, Phil, you got to hand it to

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he certainly is a leader and can take the good with the bad in stride. He was just as gracious, interested, and friendly as if the post office were the principal matter of the moment.

"God has truly blessed our country and its people with a brilliant, sound, and wise leadership during these perilous times."

President Roosevelt is a lover of knick-knacks, and your attention is directed to the numerous articles on the desk of the busiest executive (and in our opinion the best) in the world. This is a particularly fine photograph of the President's desk.

Finland and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a gentleman by the name of John O'Donnell writes a very interesting column every day for the Washington Times-Herald under the headline "Capitol Stuff." Last night I read a most interesting statement by him in his column, and I ask unanimous consent that the portion of it I have not deleted be published in the Appendix of the RECORD. It gives an idea how people change their minds.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

* * * * *

And here is what today's makers of history were solemnly writing down as history 4 years ago. We quote from a sardonic file, clipped 4 years ago, whose only value is that it may suggest that 4 years hence the same worthies—Franklin and Winston et al—may be whistling on the other side of the historic fence

So here's what the big shot boys thought about Soviet Russia 4 years ago when the hard-boiled ally of Hitler invaded Finland and his American fellow-travelers picketed the White House in protest against United States intervention in what the "reds" denounced as an "imperialistic war."

Franklin D. Roosevelt: "The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, known to you and known to all the world, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world * * * It has invaded a neighbor (Finland) so infinitestimally small that it could do no injury to the Soviet Union, and that seeks only to live in peace as a democracy and a liberal and forward-looking democracy at that."

Winston Churchill: (This is from the first edition of Blood, Sweat, and Tears, but our spies give the tip that it will be expurgated for the duration, then pop back later in the post-war definitive writings of the brilliant Churchill—just to keep the record straight and by way of giving the wartime propaganda boys a kick in the pants that will go keyholing down the corridors of time). Said brother Churchill, grabbing the lapels of his double-breasted blue serge and letting fly these swackeroos into the benign and paternal mustaches of Pal Joey:

"Only Finland—superb, nay, sublime—in the jaws of peril—Finland shows what freemen can do. The service rendered by Finland to mankind is magnificent * * * Everyone can see how communism rots the soul of a nation; how it makes it abject and hungry in peace, and proves it base and abominable in war.

"We cannot tell what the fate of Finland may be, but no more mournful spectacle could be presented to what is left to civilized mankind than that this splendid northern race should be at last worn down and reduced to servitude worse than death by the dull, brutish force of overwhelming numbers.

"If the light of freedom which still burns so brightly in the frozen north should be finally quenched, it might well herald a return to the Dark Ages, when every vestige of human progress during 2,000 years would be engulfed."

Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia, of New York City: "When 3,500,000 people are attacked by a nation of 160,000,000, you can't invoke the laws of neutrality, for in such a case only the laws of decency and humanity may be invoked."

Matthew Woll, New Deal labor leader: "For sheer mendacity, for cynical contempt of the good opinions of mankind, the assault on the Finnish Republic by Soviet Russia reaches a new high in international affairs."

* * * * *

Herbert Hoover: "Even if Finland falls, the day will come when it will rise again, for the forces of righteousness are not dead in the world."

Bishop William T. Manning: "I say that as Christians and Americans we are untrue to our ideals and traditions unless we give Finland * * * funds to enable her to purchase the arms necessary for her continued resistance and defense. * * * I say this as a Christian and as a bishop of the Christian Church."

The Old Kentucky Home's "Good Night"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Old Kentucky Home's 'Good Night'," by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of Thursday, December 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD KENTUCKY HOME'S "GOOD-NIGHT"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—In many respects the by-election of a Republican Representative in Congress from the Fourth Kentucky District is the plainest sign thus far manifest that the political trend is running against the New Deal and the administration in Washington. The opinion is based on long and intimate acquaintance with the district and its people, among whom this correspondent had his beginnings.

Nowhere in the United States are there stancher Democrats, with whom the party label has nearly always counted more than the candidate. In many areas of the Fourth District to vote for a Republican is a grave social error; to be a Republican, a social blemish. The devotion of the people to a Democratic President has been perennial, and merely to invoke his name—especially in time of war—has been all the platform required by a candidate for Federal, State, or even local office. Yet in the congressional campaign preceding yesterday's by-election the name of Mr. Roosevelt was invoked in vain.

It is true that among the chief supporters of the beaten Democrat, Mr. Talbott, were politicians who would not pass a true test of inner fealty to the President and the New Deal, and this was known among the voters. It is also true that Mr. Talbott belongs to a Democratic faction which has been for years in bitter controversy with another, and this was responsible for some defection. But neither element explains the size of the majority given to Representative-elect Carrier by the 19 counties, approximately 13,000. The larger part of that could have come only from deep dissatisfaction with Washington and its ways.

A SWEEPING OVERTURN

The transformation of a 1942 Democratic majority of 4,800 into a 1943 Republican majority of 13,000, in a district so abidingly Democratic, reveals a trend. Many had been waiting for years for a chance to "single-shot" Mr. Talbott, and this was it. But not by thousands could they have been so many. And the Republican nominee had been chosen in a sharp contest, too.

Should they examine the constituent parts of the Fourth District, the national political management of the Democrats, and those urging the President to run again, will find causes for real anxiety. If the result did not foreshadow a certain Republican national victory next year, it increased the prospect of one. For the Democrats who voted were besought to show that the November State election had turned on local and not Federal issues.

The Fourth District, which has retained the heart of the former third—long a Democratic Gibraltar—extends from the bluegrass region on the east to the Pennyrile and the Green River Valley on the west, from the Ohio River on the north to the Barrens on the south. Its activities include distilling, tobacco growing, oil drilling, lumbering, and quarrying. In 1940 the population was 280,609, overwhelmingly of the native American stock.

Salt River, the traditional Styx of politics; the farm where Lincoln was born and on which a temple houses the log cabin that was his birthplace; the vast Army establishment of Fort Knox; the Treasury gold that is buried there; the oldest courthouse in Kentucky; the first oil well in the United States; the stone house built at Glasgow by General Spottiswoode and his pioneering Virginians; the Trappist monastery of Gathsemane, and the College of St. Mary's—all these historic and modern things and places are in the Fourth District. The geological wonder known as the Mammoth Cave is on its rim. Bardstown, Nelson County, seat of the earliest American Catholic bishopric beyond the Alleghenies, contains the Old Kentucky Home where Foster wrote his immortal folksong. And in Lebanon the young Proctor Knott practiced law.

TYPICAL DEMOCRATS

Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, who led a Democratic national revolt against free silver in 1896 but held to the party label with the prefix "Gold," was born and buried at Glen Lily in Hart County, and went from there to his command at Fort Donelson. The Orphan Brigade, C. S. A., so-called because of the high mortality of its commanders, held its reunions to the end at Glasgow, in Barren County, the home of its last brigadier, Judge

Joseph Lewis. All that has been implied in rural, border America by the word "Democrat" is personified by the average citizens of the Fourth District.

When Democrats fail to carry political divisions of this kind, and lose in the Farm Belt and New York and New Jersey also, the party portents grow dark indeed. Perhaps the President could reverse the trend with respect to his own candidacy in 1944. But this Kentucky result, crowning those that have gone recently before, seems to foretell the loss of the House and even the Senate by the Democrats next year.

Though it is often said that Democratic loss of the Senate in 1944 is a mathematical impossibility, that is not so. Of 21 seats to be filled that are now held by Democrats (including Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky) only 6 will be rated by cold calculators as certain to be retained: In Arkansas, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, and, because of the record of Senator TYDINGS, probably Maryland.

Termination of Army-Navy Contracts With Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters which may contain information of value to administrators of colleges and universities who must readjust their programs when their contracts with the Army and Navy are terminated:

NOVEMBER 16, 1943.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There are several colleges in my district in which Army and Navy units are being trained for the various services required by the present war. These colleges are ready and willing to offer their facilities for these purposes.

It has come to my attention, however, that these institutions would suffer undue hardship in the event that their contracts with the Federal Government were terminated during the course of a school year or so near to the beginning of a school year that adequate preparation could not be made for civilian students.

The financial aspect of a school's operations cannot be overlooked but must on the other hand be taken into careful account.

I am writing, therefore, to ask whether it would not be possible for the War and Navy Departments to agree on a policy with reference to this matter, so that the colleges which now depend on income from these units might know definitely and in sufficient time the tenure of their contracts.

Thanking you for your consideration of this matter, I am,

Sincerely,

HENRY O. TALLE,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 20, 1943.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: Your letter of November 16, relating to the possible termination of Army-Navy Training Unit contracts with collegiate institutions, raises some very important questions. Some 6 months ago Secretary Stimson and I appointed a Joint Army-Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts to insure uniform contractual policies covering the use of collegiate institutional facilities. This board presently consists of the following: Mr. Robert B. Stewart, comptroller of Purdue University, chairman; President R. G. Sproul, of the University of California; Mr. Horace Ford, treasurer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; President Rufus C. Harris, of Tulane University; two Army representatives and two Navy representatives (among whom is the counsel to the Bureau of Navy Personnel).

The uniform contract as approved by this joint board has the following clauses directly bearing on the termination problem:

"At any time and from time to time the Government may terminate all or any part of the Government's rights to use the contractor's property and to receive the services to be rendered by the contractor under this contract by giving to the contractor 90 days' notice in writing.

"Upon any termination of this contract the Government will pay to the contractor such sum as is agreed upon as reasonably necessary to compensate the contractor for loss in any commitments with the contractor's personnel where such commitments do not extend beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is terminated and are for the purpose of furnishing instruction in accordance with the provisions of this contract; provided, the contractor shall at first have used due diligence to avoid personnel commitments beyond the term of this contract, and provided further, that the contractor shall use every effort to relocate the personnel in other employment."

Both the Army and Navy are cognizant of and sympathetic to the problems which the collegiate institutions will face when, if, and as the services terminate the existing contracts. We recognize that there are definite starting times at which institutions may draw new students from the secondary school system under normal conditions. We recognize that teaching contracts run normally for an academic or a calendar year from the normal opening date. We recognize that it will take time for an institution to recruit new students when the service contract is terminated and that this time will vary depending on the relationship between the date of termination and the opening date of the normal academic year.

I believe that the contract clauses quoted above provide for consideration of these questions and permit negotiations thereon. However, I am sending your letter to our Joint Army-Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts for any additional consideration they feel is necessary and that Board has a meeting scheduled for Monday, November 22.

There is one vital question bearing upon this problem of termination of collegiate contracts which cannot be handled until the Congress shall have taken some action upon post-armistice education and retraining for civilian life of the servicemen to be demobilized and upon the rate of demobilization. Should the Congress, for instance, decide that the Army and Navy were to be responsible for such educational and training program prior to discharge and that the Army and Navy should coordinate their educational and training programs with whatever Government agency might be charged with the post-discharge education and training of the veteran, then the Army and Navy might consider continuation and gradual reduction in size of these collegiate program contracts. Such an arrangement, should it come to pass, would materially improve the continuity of higher education for our people and ease the institutional problems of readjustment both educationally and financially.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

THE PENTAGON,
November 26, 1943.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: The Secretary of the Navy has referred to the Joint Army and Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts your letter to him of November 16 with his reply to you of November 20, on the subject of possible termination of Army and Navy training unit contracts with collegiate institutions.

The Board felt that the Secretary's statement of the situation was a correct one and directed the Secretary of the Board to inform you that it was giving further study and consideration to the question.

In the event you feel that the present provisions in the Army and Navy training unit contracts do not adequately protect the Government against excessive expenditures, or the colleges against unreasonable termination of these contracts, your views would be most welcome to the Joint Army and Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts.

For the Joint Army and Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts:

R. B. STEWART,
Chairman.
B. R. VAN LEER,
Colonel, G. S. C., Secretary.

The Nonoperating Rail Wage Scale Deadlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., November 13, 1943:

THE NONOPERATING RAIL WAGE-SCALE DEADLOCK

The crisis now confronting the Nation over the wage controversy of the 15 nonoperating railroad unions, which after all is not a controversy at all, stems from two things, as this newspaper has observed, the lack of a labor policy on the part of the administration, and the conflict of Government agencies, laws, and orders. Something will, of course, have to be done about it if the undesirable resort of Government operation is to be avoided, and something ought to be done pretty quickly as the unions are now spreading a strike ballot.

A fact-finding board appointed by the President has investigated the controversy which did exist between these labor organizations and the railroad managements and recommended a uniform increase of 8 cents an hour. Such an increase the railroads have been willing to pay and in August both sides agreed to that settlement. Settlement of the controversy on that basis, however, was presented by the action of the Economic Stabilization Director, Judge Vinson, who reached the conclusion that he was impelled, by the statute and Executive orders which govern his action, to withhold approval.

Judge Vinson has since suggested a rearrangement of the wage increases agreed

on so that those on the lower pay levels may obtain the largest per hour gains—beginning with 10 cents at the bottom of the scale and tapering off at the top. But this proposal has been roundly condemned by spokesmen for the unions affected. They contend that the proposed readjustment is destructive of the wage structure and that it will multiply "inequities." It is easy to understand that contention.

The union spokesmen mean that Judge Vinson's scale would cut down the differentials in pay for the various classes of jobs, which are at least theoretically based on differences in skill and training required. Unionists have always jealously guarded the differential principle and apparently are still determined to protect it from harm through application of the substandard of living idea, which would in a measure constitute need for skill as a wage criterion. The flat increase of 8 cents an hour for all, which was agreed on by both sides last August, would have reduced the differentials percentagewise, but not nearly as much as would the Vinson scale.

The aggregate money difference between the August agreement and the Vinson scale is only that between an estimated $204,000,000 a year for the former and $184,000,000 for the latter, which does not seem a serious difference for the railroad companies nor a dangerous addition to the so-called inflationary gap.

Commenting on the deadlock, the Wall Street Journal says that "if, as seems likely, all labor organizations are to guard skill and experience differentials as zealously as the railroad men appear disposed to, the result will be their demand for a greater rise in the general level than would follow from a policy of wage adjustment based on the relief of those leading 'substandard' lives. That would mean that as far as wages are concerned, stabilization must be abandoned. If wages are not stabilized, there will be no price stabilization."

It is difficult to follow that reasoning, just as difficult as to refuse to accept the meritorious stand of the unions for maintaining their differential system. It seems to spring from a confusion of what is equalization and what is stabilization of wages, the latter being the objective in the present instance rather than the former. It seems as queer as it is unfortunate that an agreement reached by both sides to the original controversy, which ought to be sufficient, cannot be put into effect.

Hydroelectric Power Development in Russia—Answering Misleading Article in Public Utilities Fortnightly Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I attempt to answer an attack made on me in a magazine article, but when one appears that is so misleading as to be detrimental to the national welfare during these critical times I feel it my duty to make reply.

On June 8 of this year I addressed the House on the power resources of Russia. My purpose was to present factual information showing how the world was moving into a major power economy. Earlier, I had presented the same picture on the Japanese industrial changes, and how this transition was linked to hydroelectric power. I then, from factual information, was able to point out that the Japanese, as long ago as 1926, were planning modernizing their industrial set-up in order to be prepared to fight a modern war.

All who are informed on the relationship between the various types of industries and defense, know that prior to 1940 this Nation was ill prepared to defend its shores or to fight a modern war because of the lack of electrometallurgical and electrochemical industrial capacity. Hitler and his Jap ally counted on this weakness continuing and, therefore, felt secure in attacking us. Fortunately, this country had the men, the "know how," the will, the resources, and the available federally owned hydroelectric capacity to make such a quick plant-expansion program possible, through the T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Boulder Dam, and other similar projects.

MODERN MATÉRIEL

The matériel for our air, marine, tank, and munitions program is nothing more than frozen kilowatts. The power requirements of the basic light metals and modern ferro alloys are so large that a differential of 1 mill per kilowatt in the power cost adds a cent a pound to the metal. This fact, as well as capability requirements and immediate availability, forced the use of the Federal hydro plants as a contribution to the war effort. At least 70 percent of the light metal requirements of our air program comes from Boulder Dam, the T. V. A., the Columbia River plants—Bonneville and Grand Coulee—and the numerous smaller plants constructed and operated by the War Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. Likewise a large proportion of the ferro alloys required for marine and tank requirements and the supermodern chemical munitions come from these plants.

Generally, the significance of these facts has been missed. Our world position in the years to come will rest on the proper utilization of our resources. Any tampering with the fundamentals of this broad proposition is bound to affect our future world position and our national security. It was, therefore, with this in mind, that I addressed this House on the utilization of power and other resources by our ally, Russia, and our enemy, Japan.

A RECENT TILT

As I said, my attention has recently been called to an article appearing in the Public Utilities Fortnightly of October 14, 1943, entitled "Mr. Rankin's Recent Tilt With the Private Power Windmills." This article is so full of misrepresentations, erroneous statements, false inferences, and irrational conclusions that it really has no value, except for the harm it may do—a nuisance value.

As written, it constitutes dangerous propaganda. It was evidently intended as private power propaganda, but the ones who have some measure of responsibility for such publications should realize that such propaganda constitutes a national disservice in these times. Ordinarily, I would ignore such an article, but national interest requires that the effect of such propaganda be nullified. A few years ago I mentioned on this floor the far-seeing comment of the English writer, T. B. Macaulay, who stated that if it were of a pecuniary advantage to some men they would attempt to disprove the universal law of gravitation. The cited article falls within such a classification.

MISSTATEMENTS

For the purpose of the record I will briefly point out the gross misstatements and inaccuracies in this article.

On page 486 the writer stated:

> It might be observed that Representative RANKIN in admiring this progress did not note that manufacture of the original installation was the product of the electric manufacturers here in the United States, whose names are household words and whose advertisements have for years been familiar in the very pages of the magazine in which these lines appear in print. He did not tell his colleagues that the construction of the vast Dnieperstroy project was supervised by an American engineer, the late Colonel Cooper, and that American technology and research developed by the American capitalists really gave Russia its start along the road toward progress in electrification.

This is a deliberate misrepresentation, as I covered Colonel Cooper's connection with the Russian project in my remarks, which appear in the Appendix of the RECORD of June 10, 1943, at page A2904. On this same page I also cited the facts in regard to the construction of all the Dnieperstroy units. It is well known that there are now men in the service of our Government who worked on the hydroelectric developments on the Dnieper and on the other Russian rivers. The men who erected the water wheels, the generators, the governors, transformers and like equipment in some of these Russian plants are in this country. Some of these engineers have been working on erecting such machinery in the Federal hydro plants. The subject matter contained in my speech of June 8 was covered with some of these American engineers in order to make the presentation as factual as possible and to eliminate all propaganda.

FEDERAL HYDROS

On page 487 of the Fortnightly article the writer asks the question, "Is it a fact that Government ownership has always resulted in development of great capacity?" In attempting to answer this question negatively, by indirection and by inference, the author of the Fortnightly article quoted some statistics from a 1934–35 publication of the United States Department of Commerce. This information, as far as Russia is concerned, has questionable value. I have this data in my files and my office made inquiry to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce who advised me that the sources of such information available to them did not warrant the conclusion that these statistics could be matched against the reasonable outputs of known installations. The data I pre-

sented included the name of the plants their size, and the computed reasonable output. Furthermore, the data used by the writer of the Fortnightly article covered a period before the results of the Russian first 5-year plan was known.

Indirection is not necessary to answer this question. It can be answered from our own well-known experience. In addition, the Federal Power Commission, as of January 1, 1941, published a directory of electric power stations in the United States. This publication indicates that nowhere in this country has private capital been able to develop a project such as the T. V. A., or to build such large stations as Boulder, Grand Coulee, and Bonneville. In addition, the Federal Power Commission publication shows that the number of large-capacity steam plants in this country is small, indeed. There are only two steam plants in the country comparable in size to Bonneville, which is the smallest of the Federal plants I have noted. Obviously, private industry has built a large number of small plants, as their systems cover the largest part of this country.

However, there is a very important element which this publication ignores, and that is the price per unit of power. In order to compete in the world markets in the fields of electrometallurgy and electrometachemistry, power costs going into the products must be below the price at which private companies propose to produce power at steam plants, when we know that certain Scandinavian plants and certain proposed South American plants can produce 1-mill power. The largest and best steam-plant production in this country is two or three times this 1-mill figure. The unit energy cost of these large steam stations is going up instead of down. With large capacity, low-cost hydros operating under the self-amortizing principle unit costs go down. The proof of this statement can be found in the fact that such large producers as Alcoa have been purchasing huge blocks of power from the Government plants at T. V. A. and in the West. It is silly to infer that large-capacity Government hydro developments are only possible in a regimented state.

This Government has built such capacity under democratic processes without interfering with individual welfare. In addition, we have accomplished these results within the four corners of our Constitution. This has been passed on numerous times by the Supreme Court when the private companies attempted to halt this progress. It is misleading to offer suggestions contrary to such established facts. My presentation was a factual statement of actual performance and not what the writer attempted to twist into my remarks.

PROPAGANDA

On page 483 of the Fortnightly article, it is inferred that I used Russian propaganda material. If the writer wanted to be fair, he could have pointed out that I cautioned against such procedure on page A2904 of the Appendix of the RECORD of June 10, 1943. The data that I used, as I then pointed out, had been checked. It was covered by engineers who were familiar with the Russian construction and who in turn checked this data with the American engineers who actually worked on the Russian projects.

As is well known, the third world power conference was held in Washington, D. C., in 1936. This was a series of technical and scientific meetings. All presentations were open for discussion by representatives of all nations. The accuracy of statements were insured by discussion. At the conclusion of this conference it was thought wise to have this material published. My help in securing funds for the publication was sought. A few of us in Congress were ultimately successful in making the technical publication possible. This was my first source contact with details that I discussed on June 8. On page A2904 of the Appendix of the RECORD I merely called attention to the Russian publication entitled "Electric Power Development in U. S. S. R." so that those who wanted to follow the detailed technique of the subject further could do so. The information I used came from many sources and was checked, as I noted on page A2904 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

POWER CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

On page 488 of the Fortnightly article, the attempt is made to create the impression that all of the war electrical contributions were supplied by the private power companies. If the author of this article wanted to be fair, he could have shown the actual major contributions made by the Federal plants, as this is a matter of record.

If he wanted to be factual, he could have further covered the efforts made by the private power companies to destroy these Federal hydro projects by congressional and court action. All such facts are in official records.

As a result of such faulty presentation, the question arises "Where would our air program be today if private power attempts to prevent the development of the T. V. A., Bonneville, Grand Coulee, or Boulder Dam from 1933 to 1940 had been successful?"

The subject matter of this article giving credit to Russia's contribution was mainly lifted from the context of my speech.

Let me repeat that we are in a new electric age. The prosperity and progress of a nation in the future will be determined largely by its available sources of cheap electricity, and especially its water power.

While we are now leading the way in this onward march of modern progress, do not overlook the fact that Russia is making tremendous strides in the development and use of her vast water-power resources.

A One-Nation World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning from the Chicago Tribune:

CHARGES F. D. R., WILLKIE PLOT ONE-NATION WORLD—WOULD END RIGHTS OF AMERICANS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 31.—In an appeal today to Illinois voters to mobilize aggressively for the 1944 Presidential election battle, Representative STEPHEN A. DAY, Republican of Illinois, charged that the Roosevelt-Willkie program for a one-nation world represents a conspiracy to abolish forever the rights, privileges, and protections of American citizenship.

As the first step in carrying out the project, according to DAY, President Roosevelt is seeking renomination for a fourth term by the Democrats and also maneuvering to bring about the nomination of Wendell Willkie by the Republicans.

BIPARTISAN TEAM

"Roosevelt and Willkie are a bi-partisan team," Congressman DAY said. "If their joint program should be ratified by the voters the Bill of Rights no longer would have any real force and effect, for the American Constitution would be but a city ordinance under the Roosevelt-Willkie league."

The Illinois Representative at Large issued his letter on the eve of final action by the Senate on the Connally resolution declaring for international collaboration to preserve peace through constitutional process without surrender of American sovereignty. The effort of Willkie followers and other extreme internationalists to put the Senate on record in favor of a superstate and international police force to police the world is doomed to defeat. Their amendment squinting in this direction is expected to command only about 15 votes.

NEW AMENDMENT READY

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, Democrat, North Carolina, will offer an amendment proposing a guarantee of the independence of Poland and other nations Russia proposed to annex or sovietize. He also will offer a substitute resolution conditioning our international cooperation on renunciation by all powers of territorial aggrandizement, on self-determination of nations, freedom of the seas and the principles of the American system.

If the voters are given a chance, said Congressman DAY, they will overwhelm the world government scheme in the 1944 election.

"But as events are now shaping up," the Congressman went on, "the grave danger we face is that no opportunity to pass upon this epochal issue will be afforded the American people. Every effort is being made to offer the same program simultaneously on both the Democratic and Republican tickets.

WANT ONLY WILLKIE

"The new dealers want only Willkie for the Republican nominee. To that end they already have unleashed the full power of the Federal propaganda machine in Willkie's behalf. Through the press, over the radio, and on the screen, every Roosevelt supporter now is maneuvering to win the Republican nomination for Willkie. That is the only way the new dealers can contrive to deny the American people a vote on American issues and American policies next year.

"Once the new dealers have placed Willkie on the Republican national ticket, they can relax. Their work will be done. For they will know that they will never be confronted by anything more convincing, genuine, or dangerous than the old Willkie campaign oratory of 1940."

The most recent report of the National Resources Planning Board, "top holding company for New Deal 'brain trust' operations," presents the detailed plan "to reduce the United States to a mere province in the world superstate," DAY said.

THINK UNITED STATES MUST CHANGE

The National Resources Planning Board is headed by Frederic A. Delano, uncle of President Roosevelt. Its latest report, issued in January 1943, said that "the organization of a jural order of the world from which aggression is effectively eliminated will require many adjustments in the arrangements of the United Nations and all its units, and will of course profoundly affect the political and economic life of the United States."

At another point, the National Resources report quoted by DAY, calls for an unlimited expansion of the lend-lease program as a permanent part of the new world order.

"This report of the National Resources Board," said Congressman DAY, "is the Democratic version of Willkie's book, 'One World.' Fundamentally, it all comes out at the same point—direction and control of American economic and political affairs by a world parliament. But the American people would not be entitled to elect directly even one member of this world parliament. It would be made up of delegates appointed by the rulers of the several provinces.

WARNS OF DANGER

"Any American can see at a glance how dangerous it would be to permit voters to pass on such a proposition in 1944.

"So, despite the war, the Presidential campaign has been launched a year ahead of schedule, to afford the new dealers an opportunity to once more maneuver their stooge onto the Republican ticket.

"Although Willkie has been a candidate before the American people for more than 4 years, he never has uttered a word of discouragement or restraint against those who would transfer American rights to the custody of the proposed global legislature. Indeed, in a national magazine still on the newsstands, Willkie says that the only thing wrong with the New Deal is faltering and incompetent management. In matters of legal or moral principle he finds no issues between himself and Roosevelt, at home or abroad—and this after more than 10 years of systematic administrative violence to every basic concept of American constitutional government on the part of the New Deal bureaucrats.

GLOBAL SHELL GAME

"Such is the nature of the bipartisan conspiracy forming once more against the precious heritage of American citizenship and freedom.

"But I don't believe for a minute that the Roosevelt-Willkie team will succeed again in their global shell game. The American people now are alive fully to the issues of this hour. They know that the preservation of world peace and order does not require the abandonment of American citizenship or the scuttling of American liberty under law."

Control of Opium Traffic in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1943, I spoke on the control of opium traffic in the Far East and closed my remarks with this statement:

This is one of the problems for post-war settlement which could be settled now by these few simple words on the part of the United Nations: "When territories belonging to any member of the United Nations are reconquered, government opium shops will be closed and will remain permanently closed." Let us have an agreement now.

On November 10, 1943, the British and Netherlands Governments announced their decision to adopt a policy of total prohibition of opium smoking in far eastern territories now in enemy occupation and that government monopolies for the sale of opium to the populations would not be reestablished when these territories are liberated.

The London Times of November 29, 1943, carried an editorial stating that the new British policy will remove a cause of Anglo-American friction. The editorial spoke of Chinese efforts to counteract sinister encouragement given to the drug traffic in China by Japan. It pointed out that any improvement achieved in opium conditions in the Far East had probably suffered a setback during Japanese occupation, asserting that this should be only temporary and that final solution of the problem cannot rest on prohibition alone but on improvement in far eastern employment and food conditions.

The editorial drew attention to a letter published in the London Times from Sir Malcolm Delevingne, British representative on League of Nations Opium Committee for 13 years and British delegate to three opium conferences, part of which is quoted below:

This announcement appears to have passed unnoticed here, but it has an important bearing not only on the welfare of those whom it is designed to protect against a habit which is a great social evil in the Far East, but also on the relations of this country with its great allies, the United States and China. It will be warmly welcomed in both those countries. The step now taken by our Government is the climax in the movement which in the international field began with the Hague International Convention of 1912 and has given rise at times to a great deal of heated controversy in which we and the United States have often been found on opposite sides. The decision of the Government, by removing a cause of disagreement between the two countries, out of which a good deal of capital has been made in the past, will make a not unimportant contribution to the cause of Anglo-American cooperation, particularly in the Far East. That it has now become practicable to take the final step from regulation and restriction to complete prohibition—as in this country—is due in great measure to the fact that in China, from which so much smuggled opium flowed into our territories in the past, a vigorous campaign has been conducted during the last 9 years by the present Chinese Government against the cultivation and use of opium, to the results already achieved by that campaign and the promise it holds for the future. Credit must also go to the colonial administrations whose efforts for controlling the use of opium and raising the standard of living of the population have done much to restrict the spread of the habit. * * *

At the stormy opium conference at Geneva in 1924–25 the American delegation sought to put an end to opium smoking by the restriction of the production of the drug to scientific and medical needs. This was the ultimate aim of every government represented there, but there were great practical obstacles to its attainment. Apart from the difficulties of prohibition, of which the layman could have little knowledge, there were serious political and financial impediments. Such were the production of opium for export by greedy Chinese war lords, the opposition of the poppy-growing Persians to restrictions—unless the United States should finance a substitute form of agriculture—and the fact that the administrations of Malaya and Hong Kong derived substantial revenues from the opium monopoly. These considerations led the British and other governments to reject the American proposal and the United States and China withdrew from the conference. It was an unhappy ending. The British refusal to adopt measures which seemed impracticable and the concentration of British effort on control instead of prohibition for a period of 15 years aroused abundant criticism in the United States and did not fully satisfy the public conscience in this country.

Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1943, the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., hailed the British and Dutch announcements as a diplomatic triumph for the United States which for many years has been waging a world-wide fight against opium.

During a long series of negotiations leading up to this victory, meeting with representatives of foreign governments concerned were held in the office of Hon. Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, who is largely responsible for this diplomatic triumph.

Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared under date of November 23 in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich.:

A DUE FEDERAL JOB

Word comes to this paper from Washington of a Michigan attorney who is down in the Capital attempting to sort o' terrorize Congress with the view that fair treatment of the air lines will result in putting the railroads at a great disadvantage.

The attorney is making the contention that airplanes should come under State jurisdiction, while the railroads continue under Federal regulation.

This paper submits that it is just as strong for State rights as the attorney for the railroads. However, we are strong for Federal rights, too. This Nation when it was organized was framed on the assumption that some things should be done by the National Government and some other things left to the State for control. If it is not impious, the State Journal would paraphrase a bit of familiar scripture and say, "Render unto the Federal Government the things that pertaineth to that jurisdiction and unto States and local governments the concerns that belong to them."

The consistent and enduring fight the State Journal has been making in behalf of State rights does not mean that we would subtract an iota from the Federal Government of the powers that belong to it. The constitutional rights ascribed to the Federal Government are just, right, and wholly expedient. Let them remain.

The fight this paper has been making through the last decade has been in behalf of powers that belong to the States. Just as we have strongly and consistently opposed Federal encroachment on the powers of the State, so we oppose State encroachment on Federal powers. Any intelligent person knows full well that such distinctions must be made.

Bringing the foregoing contentions down to particular application, there is pending before Congress what is known as the Lea-Bailey bill. If passed, it will extensively amend the Civil Aeronautics Act, under which the growing air transportation systems of the Nation function. Considerable opposition is being voiced against the amendment on the ground that a further encroachment of the Federal Government on the sovereignty of the States is embodied.

The Michigan attorney is reported circulating State utility commissions urging them to fight for control of air lines. It will occur to most citizens that there is no more sense in trying to bring airplanes under State control than to bring railroads back to similar restrictions.

The State Journal esteems itself the friend of transportation. We are frequently engaged in putting in a good word, we hope, for the railroads. By the same token we are for the airplanes. If the railroads had had their way 30 years ago, they would have kept trucks from the highways and greatly limited the scope of passenger cars. Now we all know that transportation has been furthered for the good of us all by the automobile.

After the war we are all expecting great things of the air lines. We hope the air lines will employ as many as 2,000,000 of those who are now busy on war jobs with airplanes.

Most of us believe that the greater use of airplanes will promote heavy haulage and even passenger traffic on the surface lines. Regulation of transportation is distinctly a Federal function. The Michigan lawyer is doing what lobbyists do for their clients. Let him try as he may, we of the public do not have to go along with his pretended thinking. The public is for transportation, not a phase of it.

Regulation of the airways is distinctly a Federal function.

Tribute to the Late Joe D. Chittenden, Director of the National Service Bureau of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I desire at this time to eulogize the memory of a World War No. 1 comrade-in-arms who suffered by reason of service to his country, and yet through his years of suffering rendered valuable and intelligent aid to thousands of disabled and needy veterans.

In these stirring days, when hearts and minds are tuned to the valor and sacrifices of those serving in the various theaters of the present war, we are prone to forget there are many who still live, suffer, and die as the result of disabilities incurred in previous wars. Such a man was my recent comrade and friend, Joe D. Chittenden.

Struck down by a burst of machine-gun fire in the Aisne-Marne offensive, July 1918, while serving in the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry, Forty-second (Rainbow) Division, Joe Chittenden was severely disabled, and after 30 months of weary, continuous hospitalization, suffered periodically for the rest of his life until those old wounds ended his mortal existence at 1:15 a. m., Sunday, November 28, 1943, in the Mount Alto Veterans' Hospital, Washington, D. C.

Joe Chittenden did not despair and surrender all hope because of his crippled condition; neither did he whine or demand sympathy and attention. Although he was the possessor of a Purple Heart and the right to wear wound stripes, a stranger would never know that Chittenden's condition was the result of combat wounds in the service of his country.

Equipping himself for useful service after honorable discharge from the hospital, Joe Chittenden early became interested in the problems of disabled, ill, and needy veterans. For several years he served his local posts and departments of both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion in Florida in a modest capacity, until his work and knowledge of veteran benefits attracted the attention of State officials.

He was appointed State service officer and headed the State veterans' rehabilitation office in Florida for 5 years, until his successful administration of that office attracted the attention of the major veteran organizations and he was appointed Director of the National Service Bureau of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States by a former Member of this House of Representatives, the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, in November 1934, when Van Zandt was commander in chief of the V. F. W., and continued in this capacity by your speaker during the time he was commander in chief in 1936 and 1937.

For 9 years Joe Chittenden handled the claims and problems of thousands of disabled veterans in his capacity as service director for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The present war brought increased demands for service from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and, guided by the wisdom and experience of Chittenden, that organization was in the process of establishing a Nation-wide field service, with trained claims officers to handle the load. At the peak of his career, with his vision being fulfilled, the old combat wounds struck him low. Death followed shortly.

Joe Chittenden was a wholesome and inspiring example of those who serve in war and suffer, and live to serve his fellow man afterward. His work and knowledge will be keenly missed by the veterans of both World War No. 1 and No. 2. The family tradition of service to country in time of war is being carried on by a son, Joe D. Chittenden, Jr., private first class, in the Army Air Forces.

Born in Hornell, N. Y., in January 1890, Joe Chittenden spent his early life in the East, later moving with his parents to Sanford, Fla., where he enlisted in the Infantry in August 1917. He is survived by his wife, Ruth Jones Chittenden, an Army nurse during World War No. 1; a daughter, Mrs. C. B. Hall, both of Arlington, Va.; the son, Joe, Jr., now in service; and two sisters and two brothers, to whom I extend my deepest sympathy.

Good-bye and good luck, Joe.

Revenue Act Provisions on Government Travel To Be Extremely Costly to the Government and Will Increase the Number of Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read section 504 of the Revenue Act passed by the House, which is not only an authorization of appropriations to pay certain excise taxes with respect to which Government exemption terminated but also it carries provisions which in my opinion will cost the Government a large amount of money to comply with. At the present time Government travel is exempted from the excise taxes. I am quoting paragraphs B and C of section 504, which I refer to:

(b) Government travel: On and after March 1, 1944, the tax imposed by section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to amounts paid by the United States for the transportation of persons and for seats and berths, shall be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated for that purpose.

(c) Report of amounts paid with respect to Government travel: Each disbursing officer of the United States shall transmit at least quarterly to the Comptroller General of the United States a statement setting forth—

(1) Each payment by him for the account of the United States under section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the transportation of persons) during the period not covered by any previous such statement; and

(2) The name of each official, employee, or person with respect to whom any such payment was made (excluding members of the armed forces traveling under orders pursuant to a transfer from one post of duty to another post of duty), the dates of the travel by such official, employee, or person, the destination points of his travel, the total transportation charges (exclusive of tax) paid for such travel, and the total amounts paid for subsistence for such official, employee, or person in connection with such travel. The Comptroller General of the United States shall include in his annual report to Congress the information contained in the statements so transmitted to him by the various disbursing officers.

Of course, the Government reimburses itself when the excise taxes are collected for the transportation of officials and employees of the Government. In other words, the individual does not pay the tax, but the Government does, and of course the money collected for the tax reverts to the Government. I have not

been able to learn why this provision was placed in the bill except that it might relieve the Bureau of Internal Revenue of issuing the tax-exempt certificates for the Government officials and employees. The cost, however, of issuing those tax-exempt certificates is minor in comparison with the cost that will result under paragraph C of this section. Paragraph C requires every disbursing officer of the United States to file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth each and every payment made, including the name of each official, employee, or person, with respect to whom any such payment was made, the dates of the travel by such official, employee, or person, the destination points of the travel, the total transportation charges exclusive of tax, and the total amounts paid for subsistence for such official, employee, or person, in connection with the travel, and then in conclusion it provides that the Comptroller General shall include in his annual report to Congress the information contained in the statements submitted to him.

Just conceive the cost of getting up such reports and the cost and the size of the annual report of the Comptroller General.

Congress is complaining about the number of Federal employees and here we enact a provision that will require hundreds of additional employees to comply with.

I cannot conceive of any sound reason why such reports should be filed with the Comptroller General. Of course, the records of each disbursing officer will always be available if they are desired. It seems to me, in the interest of economy, that even if those who travel are required to pay the tax, there is no reason why paragraph C of the section should remain in the bill. If we can save money by relieving the Bureau of Internal Revenue of issuing tax-exempt certificates to Government officials and employees by requiring the tax to be paid knowing that the money will revert back to the Government, well and good, but to require the reports to be filed certainly in my opinion is a provision that cannot be defended. I hope the Senate will take notice of this provision and at least strike out paragraph C of section 504 of the act.

Address of Geraldine Larkin Recknagel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Geraldine Larkin Recknagel, wife of a Toledo war hero, at the English and speech section of Northwestern Ohio Teachers' Association:

Out of college during the boom of the last post-war period, I came to teach in a school where one of my colleagues recently returned from a wonderful trip to the Orient. She came to school laden with beautiful pictures and countless lovely and interesting gifts from the Japanese children to our school children. We, in our enthusiastic, trusting way, turned wholeheartedly to making portfolios and gifts for the Japanese school children which we sent them through our Red Cross. We were filled with a spirit of love for our fellow man, a spirit of tolerance and peace that wanted to span the oceans. Our ideals and thoughts were of a world now safe for democracy.

Today those same Japanese school children, now grown to soldiers are desperately trying to destroy your son, your brother, and your husband; trying to crumble your school, your church, and your home.

Something was wrong, very wrong, with that teaching technique of a dozen years ago. It didn't go far enough. We know that now. We have had plenty of time to figure that out. Teachers do think a lot. But teachers do have the ability to turn their thoughts into actions. You have proven this convincingly and concretely this past year, despite the comments and wordiness of unthinking and misinformed laymen and politicians.

This past summer you have gone en masse from the classroom into the factories, stores, farms, and homes.

You caught on quickly to the drill presses and the "arm busters" in the factories. You "made production" with the best and most skilled factory hands this summer. Your foreman came to you and told you that you had a job in that factory whenever you wanted it. They could use good workers like you.

You brought yourselves recognition and honor in your store work, no matter whether you sold handbags to crochety rich old ladies or did floating floor work for the executives. The store men told you that they wanted teachers any time, any place, and in any capacity in their stores. You have proven your value.

You grew bigger and more vegetables than your neighbors grew. You produced fine poultry and your hens laid dozens of eggs to aid the food supply of your country at war. Your county farm officials told you you worked scientifically.

You flew planes, ran tractors, and drove jeeps.

You managed your homes efficiently, expertly, and harmoniously, despite the turmoil of a war-torn world. Your friends and neighbors came into your homes and asked you how you did it.

But when school opened this autumn you came back to the classroom, not because you were paid more money but because you loved your job. You thought building good American citizens just as important as building bombers or making spark plugs.

You have much to give your immediate community, your State, your country. Continue to take active part in all the affairs of your community. Teach adults, as well as children, what your ideals are by your actions, as well as your words.

A long time ago some wit said, "Teachers teach because they can't do anything else."

Today the fallacy of this statement is glaring.

Now, keep this convincing evidence of the truth constantly before the people.

One field you have not gone into is politics.

I heartily agree with the lad in the student forum a few moments ago when he said politics are rotten. I agree with him, too, that the hot dogs and the pop we drink at the political "shindigs," as he called them, at Walbridge Park cost us far, far too much in the end. We are wise enough to see that now. But I do not agree with the lad who said in his talk that teachers could not afford to get into politics.

Friends, I am at the stage where I can afford anything that is right and the truth. I did not sell scrap to the Japs before this present world conflict started. Did you? Before Pearl Harbor came upon us, all I knew of the Finns was that they were an honest people who paid their war debts and lived up somewhere near the North Pole. The Russians, to me, were people who had cleaned up illiteracy in their country, and where, according to the movies, women were streetcar conductors. I could not understand why or how we could sell American airplanes to loyal Finn pilots who had but ½ to 3 hours of combat experience to fight Russians, who in turn fought them in bombers built in Russia under American license. It didn't make sense to me. Now we lease-lend butter and Airacobras to the Russians to fight the Germans, and this crazy pattern of war would not surprise me if, before it ended, we would be lease-lending Bofors and B–29's to the Germans to fight our own Airacobras in Russia. Allow me to quote from a newspaper clipping I took from a Boston newspaper this morning wherein "told that some women were opposing the establishment of an international police force because they felt it would keep their sons away from home longer, Mrs. Roosevelt chided them for their personal viewpoint. 'We in the United States have got to stop looking at things so personally,' she declared. 'The real question is whether a police force will help to insure a peace in the world. Whether we see our sons once in 3 days or don't see them for 3 years is not so important.' "

To Mrs. Roosevelt I kindly say "tolerance" and "love your neighbor as yourself" and "do unto others as you would they would do unto you." I have always taught and believed with Abraham Lincoln that ours is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and I shall continue to teach this until my last mortal breath is drawn.

Take part in politics. In this new problem is a new opportunity, a chance once again to prove your intelligence and ability.

To date you have with a calmness and a quiet dignity ignored the lies and the lack of logic of some shouting, table-pounding, politicians who do not know how to manage their own family affairs, let alone manage a state or world family.

The success you have had in the factory, shop, farm, store, and home is yours too in politics. It is reasonable that it would be. Be as willing to serve your country in its lawmaking agencies as you are in its production and training phases.

The United States as never before needs honest, freedom-loving men and women who have the high courage of real ideals to guide their Nation to an eternal world peace.

If you do not feel at this time qualified to run for some governmental office, then by all means deliberately cultivate and develop a warm, true friendship with the men and women, the honest men and women, who do have the destiny of your country in their hands, and actively support honest men and women who seek public office. Do not be afraid to campaign vigorously for reliable, trustworthy citizens of the United States who seek office. Also miss no opportunity to impress upon your political friends your ideals. Clearly help them to know how to vote and how to act in the interests of a world peace, an effective and lasting peace this time.

Whatever you have thought, or heard, or been told heretofore, now is the time to change your thinking and your actions regarding teachers activities in politics. Be active, either directly or indirectly, in politics.

As you have worked for peace and orderliness and the respect for other people's property and rights in your classroom, now work for these ideals in the world family.

With the strong hands, the steady and firm hearts you have, together with an abiding

unflinching faith, know "that with God all things are possible."

I was startled at a recently captured German soldier's comment to a news correspondent. The prisoner said that he knew the Germans lost the First World War in 1918, and it was slightly possible that the Germans would loose this present war, but the Germans would not lose the next world war. What next world war?

Right now, begin to think and act with all the power and courage and strength your Creator has endowed you with to make the mortal thought of that German prisoner resolve into its nothingness, error that it is.

Exemption of Fire Insurance Companies From Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pointed Questions by O'MAHONEY," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 30, 1943, and an editorial entitled "O'MAHONEY Turns the Tables," published in the Chicago Sun of December 1, 1943. Both editorials relate to the pending bill before Congress relating to the conduct of the business of insurance companies.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 30, 1943]

POINTED QUESTIONS BY O'MAHONEY

The Senate Judiciary Committee was ready to follow the example of its counterpart in the House by approving the bill to exempt insurance companies from the antitrust laws when Senator O'MAHONEY brought up a few questions that made all concerned stop and think. His warning against hasty action has been heeded, and there will be another public hearing, to search for the answers to the Senator's pointed queries.

How is the insurance business conducted, anyway? This was one of O'MAHONEY's inquiries. Certainly Congress ought to know before voting it a grant of immunity from an important Federal law. Should Congress declare it a matter of no concern, he asked, whether the companies engage in monopolistic practices, in restraints upon business, in rate-fixing agreements, in conspiracies to put the squeeze upon independent firms? If Congress passes the bill, O'MAHONEY warned, that will be exactly the policy it indorses.

Every Member of Congress who has been tempted to vote for the bill conferring this sweeping grant of immunity ought to ponder long upon O'MAHONEY'S searching questions.

[From the Chicago Sun of December 1, 1943]

O'MAHONEY TURNS THE TABLES

All is no longer beer and skittles for the fire-insurance lobby. The lobbyists, seeking to save their billion-dollar business from application of the Federal antitrust laws, have suffered a major set-back. Senator O'MAHONEY—who learned about insurance in a monopoly inquiry—has forced the Bailey-Van Nuys bill back to a subcommittee for reconsideration.

The risk firms, having plenty of policyholders' money to spend, have waged a terrific fight for the Bailey bill and companion measures. They preferred not to face an impending Supreme Court review which might upset an archaic immunity based solely on a thin judicial distinction between insurance and commerce. Mobilizing all their resources and raising the banner of States' rights, they attempted to get their supposed immunity written into the statutes. They rammed their proposals, after sketchy hearings, through a House committee and Senate subcommittee.

Now Senator O'MAHONEY has called a halt. There will be new hearings, and this time the insurance firms will have to answer pertinent questions.

Why, for example, if their business is exclusively a matter for State regulation, do they transfer into the Federal courts so many cases in which they are sued?

Why do the companies operate their own national organization if, as they urge, Congress should deny the people the protection of national antitrust laws?

Why are there rate inequities from section to section, apparently depending upon whether so-called State regulation is weak or relatively vigorous?

To pass the lobby's bills, in a shameless attempt to forestall a Supreme Court decision in a pending case, would be an intolerable triumph over the public interest. Mr. O'MAHONEY has performed a notable service. And he has scored a crushing blow by warning that, even if the insurance firms had previously been pure as the driven snow, enactment of the proposed bills would virtually license whatever monopolistic and conspiratorial rates the risk companies pleased, without fear of the antitrust laws.

Capt. Stephen S. Yeandle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Capt. Stephen S. Yeandle, the United States Coast Guard has lost one of its most efficient officers. He died Monday evening in St. Louis at the time when he was occupying the important assignment of district Coast Guard officer of the St. Louis naval district. For 32 years he had been an officer in the Coast Guard. His remains will be brought to Washington and buried at Arlington Cemetery. Captain Yeandle was 54 years of age. In speaking of his service the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in Tuesday's paper said:

He was senior naval officer of this area, under the wartime merger of Navy and Coast Guard, and had been stationed here since July 7, 1941, directing the development of the Coast Guard in his 22-State territory from a relatively small unit to its present wartime strength.

CAPTAIN YEANDLE'S JOB

Primarily his assignment was to protect dams, power stations, and industrial plants along 7,100 miles of inland waterways, in a territory comprising the area between the Rockies and Appalachian Mountains, from possible sabotage. He also had the job of maintaining navigational aids to facilitate barge-line transportation of more than 100,000,000 tons of essential materials and commodities annually. He directly supervised the enlistment of thousands of men and women added to the service in the last 2 years.

From his office in the Old Customs House, he directed the operations of a large fleet of patrol boats on the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. He was concerned also with supervising ice-breaking operations, keeping river freight moving during seasons when it ordinarily would not be shipped by water.

As senior naval officer in the St. Louis area, Captain Yeandle took precedence at official ceremonies and prescribed the uniform of the day. An excellent speaker, he frequently represented the service at public meetings and he attended many conferences of shippers and rivermen.

Prior to coming to St. Louis he was captain of ports in the Chesapeake Bay district and was in charge of the seizure of interned German, Italian, and Danish ships off Hampton Roads. He was promoted from commander to captain several months after arriving here.

EXCITING CAREER

A recipient of the Congressional Gold Life Saving Medal, for saving 2 men from drowning during a hurricane off the South Carolina coast while directing removal of 200 persons from the foundering steamer *Lexington*, Captain Yeandle had a varied and exciting career. Like many naval seamen, he came from an inland State, in his case a small Georgia town, but he saw service all over the globe. He once was shipwrecked off the Aleutian Islands while on the Alaskan fur-seal patrol. His experiences in the Aleutians enabled him to prepare a book on navigation there which still is in official use.

During the World War he was a lieutenant and executive officer on destroyers and transports on convoy duty and later was division commander of a Coast Guard destroyer force. In the prohibition era he was intelligence officer of the eastern area.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure a few years ago to meet Captain Yeandle when he was commanding officer of the United States Coast Guard cutter *Hamilton*. The ship was at that time assigned to duty off the Azores. They were at sea 30 days and then would spend 30 days in port. Their duties were to advise airplanes of weather conditions in a certain area of the Atlantic. The cutter, a new one, was manned by what Captain Yeandle said was as fine a crew of officers and men who ever served aboard ship. He told me that in a year's time he never was required to reprimand a member of the crew. Having performed the necessary time at sea he was transferred to shore duty.

Captain Yeandle visited my office during the present war. Shortly before that the *Hamilton* had been destroyed by a submarine. It was assisting in protecting a convoy that was on its way to Iceland. One of the ships became disabled and the cutter was ordered to tow it to port. While moving at a very slow rate of speed a submarine made a perfect hit, the ship was destroyed, many members of the crew were killed, and others maimed for life. Tears came into his eyes as he told me of the incident and the loss of his friends. He said she was a perfect set-up for the submarine at the speed she was going, and that the casualties were terrific, a few being saved who were not injured, while many who

were scalded as a result of an explosion would be crippled for life.

It is such men as Captain Yeandle who have made the Coast Guard what it is, and his loss is a most severe blow to this great organization at this time.

Poland Has Not Yet Fallen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech given by me at Manhattan Center, New York City, on Sunday, November 21, 1943, where the twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of the independence of the Republic of Poland was held:

Some Washington officials privately criticize the Moscow agreements, saying the Moscow Conference was a victory for the Axis. They contend that because it was agreed to let the first Allied Nation that reaches a liberated country occupy it until elections are held, the effect is simply to transfer Europe from Hitler to Stalin because Stalin will be the first nation to reach most countries and will use the elections to seize control of each country the way Hitler did it in Austria and Stalin himself did it in Poland.

They argue that those Europeans who fear both Hitler and Stalin may now fear Stalin more than Hitler because Hitler is already doomed to defeat by overwhelming Allied forces while Stalin will rule Europe after his own fashion with his rule guaranteed by the organization of Allied Nations.

This shocking reversal of sentiment, it is felt, should not be revealed to the American public at once but only gradually. Some Washington columnists have begun to hint it. I know that Washington underestimates the ability of the American people at home to face the truth with the same indomitable bravery with which Americans now fighting all over the world face death.

Americans know that the reason our diplomats when they go to European conferences usually stumble is because until lately it seemed unimportant for anybody in America to become expert at European politics. We have not bothered to insist that our two-party political system be used to the extent of protecting us against mistakes in foreign policy. With respect to domestic policies, our two-party system works vigorously. The political party which is out of power, wanting to get reelected, vigilantly objects to mistakes made by the party currently in control of the Government and makes the administration afraid not to correct mistakes. Probably the chief reason a party out of power seldom bothers to investigate thoroughly and complain against mistakes in foreign policy is because it is thought that most Americans are not interested in complicated political problems involving foreign places and persons having unheard of names. Besides, it requires a lot of research.

This week, as usual, the Congress directed criticism against domestic policies only. Congress engaged in a spirited debate over the subsidy question, arguing hotly whether or not the price of milk, meat, and some vegetables should be increased slightly to avoid Government debt or shortage. Down the street, at the same time, frantic people who know Europe intimately, urged that something be done by America to correct a mistake in foreign policy which, they said, would cost America billions of dollars and millions of lives.

The argument goes like this: Moscow was another Munich, only worse because the excuse for Munich was that the democracies were not prepared for war. If the Allies do not protect the independence of European nations now that they have a huge army in Europe and lend-lease supplies, without which Stalin cannot seize control of Europe, what protection can there be after he is permitted to gain control of Europe and it takes a war to uproot him? Stalin's army will be the first to occupy most countries. Just as Hitler, after occupying Austria, used an election as a means of exterminating Austria and Stalin himself used an election as a means of exterminating part of Poland, Stalin, having obtained this permission at Moscow, can now seize control of most every nation in Europe. He has Communistic organizations already set up ready to win the elections in Yugoslavia, Germany and most other nations—even including France, since DeGaulle, though himself, according to some sources, ambitious to become a dictator, is evidently operating at present as a part of the political machine of Stalin whom he, apparently, considers the future master of Europe. There is nothing to prevent Stalin taking over the Baltic Republics, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. If Stalin takes over Poland, a country of 35,000,000 souls—almost as many people as there are in France—he has Europe, because Poland is the key to Europe. He will then move into Finland, then into Sweden and Norway unless Sweden decides to fight. England, to save England, has always gone to war unless, without going to war herself, she can prevent the European continent being dominated by any one European power.

The conclusion is that unless something is done now to preserve the independence of all these nations, the revolutions in Europe are likely to go on continually.

Obviously, this fear, since it seems to have a reasonable basis, must not be permitted to spread. The American people should insist that something be done now, before it is too late, to remove the basis for such fears. Americans, no doubt, have been given a false picture of the situation, often by people who did not know any better. Poles, for instance, say that Mr. Willkie, whose book paints an enthusiastic, detailed account of the part of Russia called the Republic of Yakutsk, evidently missed seeing the mammoth forced labor camps there where Polish prisoners are treated worse than slaves because they hold anticommunistic political opinions. Poles say that they, who were the first citizens of Europe to fight rather than surrender their country to Hitler, will never let themselves be ruled by any dictator. They prefer death to slavery.

For America, or any nation, the safest foreign policy is justice. America stands for justice for every person or group of persons at home and abroad—always has, and, I trust, always will. To the extent that it is consistent with justice to our own American citizens, we wish to be as friendly as possible with every nation, helping Russia now to regain her own sovereignty and, after the war, helping the Russian people achieve the political, economic, and spiritual development they have never yet had the chance to enjoy.

We have, however, something better to do with American men and American money than help Stalin or anybody else rule people, however weak or strong, who prefer to be free. That Poland prefers to be free has already been proved by the millions of Polish men, women and little children who, to save their country from both Hitler and Stalin, have endured every kind of cruelty villainy can devise. It is not consistent with American principles to finance or aid in setting up the same kind of union or alliance Europeans set up after every war—this one intended to get America into every war hereafter automatically and this one a means which will enable European plunderbunds to use American food, supplies, and armies to play the same gory kind of politics which has made Europe a war-worn battleground which our ancestors left in disgust.

The American people, when they know the truth, arrive at a mighty common sense which is wiser than any official or group of officials they ever elect. All Americans need now is the truth in order that this Nation can hit on all 130,000,000 mental cylinders.

By firm adherence to the American principle of justice for every person or group of persons at home and abroad we can and will win the kind of peace through which we can press on to a higher stage of civilization.

Passage of Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420, Recommended Editorially in West Virginia Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two recent editorials from the Charleston Daily Mail and the Wheeling News-Register urging enactment of H. R. 3420.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail of November 24, 1943]

FREEDOM OF THE AIR

Of a piece with the widespread concern about the world of tomorrow when aviation will be a compelling force in the everyday lives of the people of the world, there is a current tendency to look closely at aviation, its problems, and what can be seen of its future around the corner of time. A part of this notice of a new factor in our existence is the pending Lea-Bailey bill; if enacted in Congress, it will do for aviation what creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission did for the surface carriers. It will, among other things, accomplish the highly desirable end of reestablishing the Air Safety Board and will change the name of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to Civil Aeronautics Commission, giving that body an independent status above and beyond the capricious whim of any member of the executive branch of Government.

Among its more important provisions, however, is its clarification of domestic freedom of the air. It will establish once and for all—as such a point should be established—the national and international character of air transportation. Even the most fanatic friends of decentralization of Government will be forced to admit that there are some matters for governmental regulation which do not fit into any scheme contemplating a voice of State governments. Such chaos existed prior to the war in the field of highway transportation; for instance, that legislation recognizing the interstate aspect of truck transportation was a very real possibility.

An airplane flying from coast to coast in 9 hours obviously cannot be subject to State

laws governing its operation during the 50 or 60 minutes it would take that particular plane to cross West Virginia's territory. To free that plane from whimsical restrictions that a State legislature might place upon its crew, mechanical condition and operation during that brief time when it is within a State's particular section of the atmosphere is the object of the Lea-Bailey bill.

It is sound statesmanship to anticipate these sort of situations before they arise by enacting their solutions. For that reason the Lea-Bailey measure needs to be passed while there remains a minimum of problems. The solution will be much easier of attainment at the present time than at a later date.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of November 24, 1943]

CIVIL AIR CONTROL

Enactment of the Lea-Bailey bill is vital to the sound promotion and development of all phases of civil aviation.

It is most important that the necessary foundation for the immediate post-war period be laid now. Other nations are preparing for rapid development as soon as the war is over. We must be ready to maintain our leadership.

Under this agency, the multitude of details needed to assure orderly development of aviation would be planned and carried out. It would not interfere with State rights, but would provide for uniform rules and methods so there would be no handicap to flying in different States.

The act would make permanent the Civilian Pilot Training Act, provide for aviation instruction, work out long-range programs for airport and route construction, plot development of air-mail contracts (which it is believed will soon include carrying all first-class mail by air) and many other details required for smooth progress in aviation.

Furthermore, civil aviation must be ready for immediate expansion, on a sound basis, at the war's end in order to provide enduring jobs for thousands of returning soldiers. A long-range program of airport construction and development, a growing market for aircraft factories manufacturing both private and commercial planes, and an expanded commercial national and international air-transport system, if worked out in an orderly way, will offer tremendous new opportunities for stable employment.

Missouri Valley Association Urges Construction of Bull Shoals Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following resolution which was adopted by the Missouri Valley Association at St. Louis on October 19, 1943. This resolution was presented by Mr. Ray R. Ramey, Sr., of Mountain Home, Ark.:

In view of the enormous crop losses and widespread devastation occasioned by the recent floods along the lower White River in Arkansas, it is deemed consistent by this body that we urge upon Congress the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam on the White River, which has been duly authorized, on which all of the preliminary work has been completed, and for which complete detailed plans and specifications are ready in the hands of the United States engineers as an immediate emergency project, for which the expenditure of the necessary money, critical materials, and manpower-hours is justifiable at the present time.

Permanent Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 1, 1943:

PERMANENT STAFFS

Nothing is more evident in Washington than the necessity of revamping a great deal of our governmental machinery after the war. The emergency of the last 2 years has brought to light critical weaknesses and at the same time has shown how some of those weaknesses can be corrected. The Government has been buttressed at many points, but largely through improvisation. Its reconversion to peacetime requirements will be a great opportunity for the establishment of improvements that the war has shown to be necessary.

One of these improvements, we think, will be the installation of more expert personnel in the executive departments. At the New York Herald Tribune Forum recently Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal advocated permanent staffs in all of the departments "headed possibly by a permanent Under Secretary." Such an official would be in charge of a department's fiscal affairs, its accounts, its personnel and its organization. Of course, he would not be entrusted with the making of departmental policy. That would be left to the department head and the President. But the permanent Under Secretary would keep the department working as a going concern and thus avoid the serious loss of experience and momentum that a change of administration usually entails.

Great Britain has found her permanent ministers to be indispensable. There are dangers, of course, that such officials will fall into a deadly bureaucratic routine, that they will assume an ivory tower attitude, or merely enthrone mediocrity in government service. But safeguards can be erected, as Mr. Forrestal points out, against all of these difficulties. The loss of experienced personnel and of continuity of internal policies is probably much more serious than the danger of bureaucratic domination.

Under Mr. Forrestal's plan, moreover, the permanent Under Secretary would be the head of a permanent staff chosen on the basis of merit and advanced on the basis of achievement. The Government is desperately in need of a personnel system that will attract and hold able men of special training. We cannot expect departments and bureaus to be operated as efficiently as private businesses until they are in a position to pay much better salaries than are paid at present and to advance their best men to permanent positions without the necessity of political "clearance." As soon as it gets around to consideration of this problem, Congress would do well to call upon Mr. Forrestal for further details of his suggestion.

The Lea Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of November 13, 1943. The editorial concerns the Lea bill:

THE LEA BILL

The House of Representatives will probably vote next week on the bill of Representative CLARENCE LEA, of California, which provides for revision of the over-all Federal regulations of air transportation. The bulk of the existing industry of transportation by air wants the bill passed. As the business has been under rather comprehensive Federal regulation since 1925, when there was little or nothing to regulate, we can assume that there is no chance now for a period of real "freedom of enterprise," such as the automobile industry enjoyed in this country in its earlier years.

It may be regrettable that a comparatively new industry should not only seek but apparently seek with great eagerness to be regulated at all, but nowadays "freedom" has come to mean relative immunity from the dead hand of statism. Therefore, after examining the rival proposals now in Congress, we are forced to the conclusion that the Lea bill, or a measure of substantially the same nature, should be passed now, so that the air lines and their allied businesses and activities may be properly squared away for progress when the war ends.

The air lines believe that a law on the lines of the Lea bill would prove to be a more effective safeguard against sabotage by complex and conflicting regulations by the States than the present Federal law. Air transport is mostly interstate commerce in the most complete sense of the term. In a trip from New York to Los Angeles via Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Kansas City, an air liner spends the following number of minutes in the air over the following States respectively: New York, 3; New Jersey, 13; Pennsylvania, 59; Ohio, 47; Indiana, 31; Missouri, 48; Kansas, 54; Oklahoma, 21; Texas, 41; New Mexico, 79; Arizona, 72; California, 54.

We believe that such a list speaks for itself, in the interest of enough over-all Federal regulations to assure simplicity. No constitutional right of any State can, of course, be minimized by the Lea bill; but unless Federal regulation is comprehensive, the number of States listed above suggests how State regulations could become burdensome to the point of sabotaging the development of air transport.

The Lea bill would take the regulation of air transport out of the Department of Commerce and place it again under a wholly independent body like the Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulates the railroads. Air transport enjoyed that form of control before President Roosevelt's bill aiming at a general reorganization of the Government was passed. We believe that public opinion will back the rule of air transport by an independent air-minded commission not interlocked with any departmental bureaucracy, especially since the reorganization law has proved to be an abortive measure that has effected no real simplification or economy of government.

The Lea bill provides for no changes in the relations of surface carriers and air carriers. The present law, passed in 1938, per-

mits the Civil Aeronautics Board to authorize surface carriers to get into air transportation only when such action would not restrain competition, and when such air services would be incidental to the surface carrier's main operations. We believe that such safeguards are necessary for air transport in its present formative stages.

There is a long scroll of unfortunate history in railroad ventures into river steamboating, canal control, coastal shipping and even trolley operations, in the heyday of the "interurban" electric railroad. While here and there a railroad like the New Haven came near to developing into a general transportation agency, too often the auxiliary railroad-owned service mainly acted as a bar to competitive capital. At the same time the railroads were extremely laggard in promoting overseas ship lines as feeders for their import and export trade. With the great decline of foreign financial influence in American railroads due to the war, we wonder if our railroads will overcome tradition sufficiently to overcome their apparent allergy to blue water?

Hitler's Jewish Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of November 24, 1943:

HITLER'S JEWISH VICTIMS

Two million Jews have been exterminated by the Nazis. Four million are left in Europe. They are homeless and destitute. Hitler boasts he will get rid of them. Some will be murdered, more will be tortured, and many will die of neglect. Unless, that is, the United Nations provide temporary havens for those who can get out of the Nazi countries.

The problem is immediate. It is humanitarian, not political. It is as much a Christian as a Jewish problem—more, in the sense that any solution depends on the conscience, the initiative, and the action of so-called Christian governments.

To the honor of the United States, our Congress last March by concurrent resolution condemned the "mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children" by the Nazis.

Now Congress is considering House and Senate resolutions which urge "creation by the President of a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany." The resolution authors include Representative BALDWIN of New York, and Senators GILLETTE, TAFT, RADCLIFFE, MURRAY, GUFFEY, FERGUSON, DOWNEY, ELLENDER, VAN NUYS, THOMAS of Utah, JOHNSON of Colorado and CLARK of Missouri.

We hope this resolution passes, and that the President moves promptly.

The mere fact that the United States Government is concerned may have some effect in modifying wholesale brutality, especially in such Nazi satellite states as Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Vichy-France, where there is growing realization that the Allies are winning the war and will hold criminals to account.

But also the suggested commission would find ways to provide temporary refuge in nearby neutral and Allied territory for all those who can get out of the Nazi-controlled countries. As a practical matter, Britain should be asked to set aside its White Paper ban and to permit entry into Palestine of many such refugees for the duration.

This is not to be confused with the dispute over the future of Palestine, over a Jewish state or a Jewish army. Non-Zionists support this resolution as vigorously as Zionists. The issue is not sectarian. The sole object here is to rescue as many as possible of these Hitler victims, pending complete Allied victory and the liberation of Europe from barbarism.

Americans cannot be indifferent in this terrible emergency.

The Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a protest in the form of a resolution adopted by the Stream Control Commission of the State of Michigan.

This resolution expresses the opposition of the commission to H. J. Res. 148, which would permit the additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the city of Chicago. This proposal has been referred to the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The resolution follows:

Whereas this commission is vested with the control of water pollution in this State, and its members collectively head a broad segment of the State government of Michigan interested in and affected by both the stage and quality of water of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas diversion of water from Lake Michigan is subsequently reflected throughout Michigan's long shoreline on Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie, and their connecting waters, adversely affecting local sources of industrial and municipal water supplies, resort interests, navigation, and wharfage; and

Whereas adequate lake-front revetment or the placing of permanent structures well above the effect of wind and wave occurring during high-cycle stages of the lakes, not increased diversion, is the answer to currently reported incidents of shoreline damage; and

Whereas no evidence has come to this commission that Chicago's drinking water is polluted in such a way as to adversely affect public health, but on the contrary, it has knowledge of assurances, made both by its mayor and health commissioner, that the water furnished its citizens was and is satisfactory from a public-health standpoint; and

Whereas Indiana's pollution of southern Lake Michigan unquestionably offers a threat to the safety and acceptability of certain local Indiana municipal water supplies and, to a lesser extent, to those of Chicago's South Side and is, therefore, in no way to be excused, most of Chicago's recently reported difficulties would appear to be directly traceable to its disregard of or delay in complying with specific directions of the United States Supreme Court; and

Whereas the provisions of the joint report to the President of the United States, dated August 6, 1943, by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, on the subject of Chicago's water-supply problem, adequately meet, in our opinion, Chicago's recently claimed emergency; and positive, permanent protection of southwestern Lake Michigan as a source of public-water supply can be effected, without the aid of additional diversion over and above the amounts now decreed by the United States Supreme Court; and

Whereas, finally, this commission is convinced that increased diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan is unnecessary, even temporarily, for the adequate protection of municipal water supplies taken from the southwestern portion of Lake Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this commission, meeting in Lansing this 18th day of November 1943, That the commission be opposed to and protests against the diversion of water by the city of Chicago greater in amount than that allowed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and that the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, at Washington, D. C., be called upon to report unfavorably upon House Joint Resolution 148 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, in the event any report is made; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to the following:

Hon. Harry F. Kelly, Governor of Michigan.

Hon. J. J. Mansfield, chairman, House Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Hon. Edward I. Jeffries, mayor, city of Detroit.

Michigan's representatives in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Members of the Great Lakes Sanitation Agreement.

Port of Detroit Commission.

Detroit Board of Commerce.

City of Chicago.

Chicago Medical Society.

United States Public Health Service.

T. W. A. President Declares Passage of Lea Aviation Bill Vital to Development of Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following telegram from Mr. Jack Frye, president of T. W. A., Inc., in which he urges enactment of H. R. 3420:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *November 19, 1943.*

CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE F. LEA,

Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.:

In my opinion the enactment of H. R. 3420 will provide an essential clarification of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 necessary to the development of civil aviation and to the proper growth of air transportation, and will further provide for better performance of present wartime functions, as well as future aviation expansion, which is obviously in the public interest.

JACK FRYE,

President, T. W. A., Inc.

Heroes Yesterday—Tramps Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, every day that passes the President or some Congressman or Senator, with his eyes on the next election, comes out with a statement regarding the great and many things we are going to do for the returning veterans. So far all of these statements, including those by the President, are all baloney and a lot of promises and hot air. Promises are one thing, but performance is another. Returning broken-down veterans cannot live on hot air and baloney. This is true even if it comes from a President.

All these loose promises talk about what we are going to do when the veterans start coming back home. The men who make those promises are ignorant of the fact that already 600,000 veterans have come home from this present war. We have already made 600,000 tramps out of yesterday's heroes. While the President and Congress are promising, already 600,000 returned and discharged veterans are treated worse than convicts.

Every hour of the day at least 12 men are discharged from the armed forces. The total number discharged already exceeds 600,000. These men are discharged on psychoneurotic grounds. Military life cracks them mentally. Thousands of others are discharged for physical unfitness—they just cannot stand the grind—and never should have been taken in the first place. Already 600,000 of our young men have been taken and broken down—mentally and physically. By the end of this year the figure will probably reach 1,000,000.

What happens to these 600,000 discharged veterans? The truth is they are treated worse than convicts. They are the unwanted battalion. They are kicked around worse than dogs. They are shunted out of hospitals. They are told that the hospitals are overcrowded. They are shunted back to their homes—to their mothers and fathers—and told to look after themselves. In fact, these men are told that they cannot even wear the clothes on their backs when they leave. These discharged veterans are told that it is a criminal offense for them to wear their army uniforms after 90 days.

We treat our convicts better than that. When a convict is released he is given a suit of clothes and some spending money to hold him over. In many cases convicts are even assured of a job before they are released. But our soldiers, sailors, and marines who served their country honorably and heroically are discharged without a penny and we even strip them of the clothing they have on their backs 90 days after they are discharged. What a national disgrace!

Oh, yes, we heard a lot of bunk about all these boys coming back home being sure of getting their jobs back. Here is another laugh. The rigid labor standards imposed by safety legislation makes it impossible for industry to take these broken boys for jobs. Insurance regulations in plants are such that these boys cannot meet the requirements for a job. Accident regulations in plants likewise hinder these boys' chances of getting their jobs back.

So here we already have 600,000 of yesterday's heroes without a chance for a job, broken down physically and mentally, without even a suit of clothes 90 days after they are discharged, without one red penny in their pockets. Here we have 600,000 tramps—yesterday's heroes—and this under a government that spends billions a year feeding every foreigner all over the world. We worry and spend billions to feed every foreigner all over the world—but we squeeze every penny, every ounce of blood, every stitch of clothing, and every ounce of energy from our discharged, broken-down veterans.

Oh, yes; we are told that there is disability veterans' compensation. But it takes 6 months to get these boys a rating. I had one case just recently. It took 8 months to get that veteran a rating, and when he got it it was for $10 a month. For 8 months this boy had absolutely nothing to live on, and now he gets $10 a month. Even the Jap prisoners in America get more than that. They do not have to starve 8 months to get it either.

More than several score cases have already come to my attention of young men who were forced to liquidate their business and enter the armed forces. They gave up families and all they had, to meet their country's call. In my district they have taken boys weak physically, without fingers, with tuberculosis, and with heart ailments. In my district they took a boy—pronounced him physically perfect in every respect—only to find that the boy dropped dead of a heart attack on the way to his first camp.

I have a case of a boy who was drafted and in the 8 months he was in service he was a patient in 12 different hospitals. I could go on and cite scores of cases like it. What happens? Eventually these boys are discharged. They gave up their jobs and incomes and business places to enter service. When they are discharged they are told to go home and shift for themselves without a penny and without even a suit of clothes.

Then they are given the run-around and plenty. I wonder how many people know the red tape connected with the securing of a veteran's disability pension. To get a settlement in 4 months is most unusual. The average is 6 months. In that 6 months what do we expect the veteran and his family to live on? In that 6 months these veterans are the worst treated and most abused group of people in our country. Prisoners of war and convicts get better treatment than they do.

Yes, it is time for action. Soft words by the President and by Congress do not put bread in these boys' mouths or clothe them. These boys have had enough soft words sweetly spoken. These 600,000 discharged veterans are a monument to criminal negligence on the part of this administration and this Congress. These boys are fed up with promises. They want to see some action.

There is no excuse for not giving these discharged veterans regular military pay for 6 months after they are discharged until their cases for compensation are settled. There is no excuse why their dependents should not receive their allotment for the same period. There is no excuse whatever why these boys should not be given an extra two or three hundred dollars so that they can adjust themselves properly into normal life again. The amount of money we would give these boys under such a system would be only a drop in the bucket compared to the billions we are squandering on foreigners.

Handbills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of November 22, 1943:

HANDBILLS

Some eastern Republicans who fancy themselves as politicians and political leaders have shown a disposition to crawl under the furniture whenever they have been threatened with the terrible wrath of the New York Herald Tribune or even the New York Post.

This timidity always seemed funny to us and never funnier than since the last election, when the whole smear brigade was utterly discredited. From the way some of the politicians had behaved, anyone might have been justified in assuming that these two little newspapers amounted to something. They didn't and they don't.

Here are some figures of circulation:

Newspaper	Circulation	
	Daily	Sunday
News	1,923,838	3,135,597
Mirror	757,489	1,719,147
Journal-American	623,527	1,100,835
Times	428,980	844,203
World-Telegram	376,521	.....
Herald Tribune	293,304	546,705
Sun	276,620	.....
Post	225,954	.....

Why any one should ever have feared the displeasure of such little handbills as the Herald Tribune and the Post is a mystery. Their influence was negligible in any reckoning and particularly in relation to that of the big newspapers of New York, and notably the News, with its towering leadership.

New York was Democratic as long as the News was Democratic and has switched with the News. Whether public opinion followed the News, as we believe, or the News followed public opinion as its detractors pretend, is immaterial for the purposes of this argument. In either event the Herald Tribune and the Post can be ignored as out of step with the voters and inconsequential in politics.

America's Air Lines in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, much has been written and said about the part being played in our war effort by the railroads, trucks, busses, and steamships. They have all done a splendid job and deserve commendation. However, air transport is the only industry that is at the same time both a civilian commercial unit and a vital cog in the machinery of our armed forces.

At a moment's notice, our transport planes can land, pick up military equipment and fly it thousands of miles beyond our borders to our far-flung battlefields This service has been essential to the successful prosecution of the war and has been carried on most effectively.

It is easy to understand, in view of this dual role being played by air transport, why it has been necessary for the Government to be unusually careful in refraining from publicizing this industry's war effort. It is a pleasure for me at this time to be able to bring this to the attention of the Members.

In this connection, I include herewith pertinent excerpts from remarks of various prominent officials:

AMERICA'S AIR LINES IN THE WAR

Excerpt from President Roosevelt's annual address to Congress on the state of the Nation, January 6, 1942:

"Only this all-out scale of production will hasten the ultimate all-out victory. Speed will count. Lost ground can always be regained—lost time never. Speed will save lives; speed will save this Nation, which is in peril; speed will save our freedom and civilization—and slowness has never been an American characteristic."

Excerpt from address by the President of the United States to the National Aviation Forum on January 24, 1939:

"The country's welfare in time of peace and its safety in time of war rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air-transportation system, both domestic and overseas."

Excerpt from message of President to both Houses of Congress, dated September 17, 1943:

"But when the war ends, we do not want to be caught again without planning or legislation, such as occurred at the end of the last war."

Excerpt from joint letter, dated September 13, 1940, from the Secretaries of War and Navy to the Secretary of Commerce, jointly stating the official Army and Navy policy with respect to the relation of the armed forces to the air-transport industry:

"The War and Navy Departments consider that the air transport industry is a necessary adjunct to the national defense * * * it is both necessary and practicable to allocate available aviation personnel and matériel in such a manner as to insure the maintenance of air-line service without reduction in its safety and reliability."

On August 9, 1940, Secretary of War Stimson said to Congress:

"Air power today has decided the fate of nations."

Excerpt from a letter dated April 1, 1942, from the Secretary of War to the commanding general, Army Air Forces:

"Civil air transportation is of vital importance to the war effort. * * * Key air-line personnel should be encouraged to stay at their posts. * * *"

Letter from President Roosevelt to the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first air-mail flight, May 15, 1943:

" * * * air transport * * * has become a necessary adjunct to our war effort * * * the ability to move men and materials to any part of the world in hours, rather than weeks and months, is vital to our military strategy.

"It has enabled the Allied Nations to keep the closest sort of personal contact among the commanders of armies thousands of miles apart. It has speeded the delivery, both at home and abroad, of essential war materials.

"Commercial aviation has surrendered many of its peacetime rights to the necessity of war, and, in doing so, has made a great national contribution.

"With the dawn of peace, commercial aviation will have new and greater opportunities for which it will be all the better prepared by reason of the training and experience it is now getting.

"Will you * * * be good enough to express to the industry * * * the appreciation of all the people of the United States for a job well done.

Extract from address by the Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, August 20, 1940:

"The gratitude of every home in our island, in our Empire, goes out to the British airmen, who are turning the tide of the World War by their prowess and by their devotion. Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few. * * *"

Quotation from the Honorable L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, in his address delivered at Oklahoma City, Okla., on August 2, 1943:

"Air transportation has gone to war. It is not generally appreciated how completely it has done this. As one of our important national assets, it had to do so."

Extract from address by the Honorable L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered at Denver, Colo., July 22, 1943:

"All this (air transportation) amazing service to the Nation under the difficulties imposed by war has been performed with safety. * * * Our domestic air-transportation system stands as a tribute to our American system. Its excellence is known the world over. Inventive genius, resources, and great distances supplied the sinews for the development of this superlative system."

Extract from address by the Honorable L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered at meeting of the Los Angeles Aviation Forum in Los Angeles, Calif., July 27, 1943:

"Transport aircraft make up a vital national asset today. What would we not have given for more of them sooner. * * * They constitute a line of fast communications generally which is indispensable to modern war."

In the letter of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, in paragraph 2 thereof, the Secretary said in each letter as follows:

"Continued uninterrupted service by domestic air lines is essential in the interest of national security."

Quotation from a report to the Secretary of the Treasury by the committee on intergovernmental fiscal relations of the Treasury Department, dated January 1, 1943, Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, volume I:

"Aviation is essentially an interstate enterprise and the licensing of airplanes and the regulation of air travel are already national."

Quotation by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones on May 15, 1943, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration of air mail service in the United States:

"Aviation is the biggest industry in the world today. * * * This year, $20,000,000,000 will be spent in the United States alone for all forms of aviation. * * * Commercial aviation has done magnificently in developing air transportation. * * * Our transport planes are carrying everything from jeeps to medical supplies, from road machinery to presidents and prime ministers. They are delivering these things wherever they are most needed."

Excerpt from letter dated November 6, 1942, from Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, to the president of the Air Transport Association of America:

"This job (transportation by air by America's air lines) * * * is essential to our business of getting on with the war."

By order of the Secretary of War, signed by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, War Department Circular No. 211, dated July 1, 1942, directs:

"In the performance of its mission, both within and without the continental United States, the Army Air Forces will utilize to the fullest extent possible the services, facilities, and personnel of the civil air carriers."

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, stated on the morning of September 27, 1943, before the War Department conference of industry, labor, and newspaper leaders:

"Without global air transportation America could not have fought the type of global war it is now waging. Air transportation is what made possible both the quick organization of our Army from a peacetime footing to one of wartime, as well as the type of war our country is now waging."

Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System, January 26, 1942:

"Air transportation is a vital and necessary adjunct to our defense and war effort. Almost daily the military services are calling upon the air lines to perform special missions in connection with the urgent and expedited transportation of personnel (including the transportation of troops and their equipment) and matériel necessary to our war effort. * * * The air lines are increasingly being called upon to perform vital maintenance, airplane assembly, weather forecast, and communication. * * * Delay of above services will impede the war production program, and in that sense will endanger the national safety."

At his press conference on January 8, 1942, Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, stated:

"Efficient transportation is just as important to the war effort as the furnishing of machine tools."

Excerpt from the report by the Office of War Information entitled "American Air Transport" and dated June 7, 1943:

"The Army and Navy Air Transport Services have been greatly aided in their work by the past activities and by the personnel of the commercial air lines."

At his press conference on January 8, 1942, Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, stated:

"Efficient transportation is just as important to the war effort as the furnishing of machine tools."

Quotation from Report on Air Transport, by Office of War Information, June 7, 1943:

"The Army and Navy Air Transport Services have been greatly aided in their work by the past activities and personnel of the air lines."

Quotation from Report on Air Transport by Office of War Information, June 7, 1943:

"This country is fortunate in having had such a high development of air-line operations at the beginning of the war."

Excerpt from an address of the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, at the dedication of the LaGuardia Airport, New York City, October 15, 1939:

"The very existence of these air lines, with their excellent equipment and personnel, is a strong guaranty of the Nation's peace and safety."

The Honorable KARL STEFAN, United States Congressman from Nebraska and member of the House Committee on Appropriations, in speaking to the Honorable William A. M. Burden, Assistant for Aeronautics to the Secretary of Commerce, said of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its administration of the Federal Airways System and of the traffic over it (p. 125 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations, Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1944):

"You are more in the war than the railroads."

During the debate of the House of Commons in London on February 25, 1942, Mr. Hore-Belisha, Secretary of State for War in the Chamberlain government at the outset of World War No. 2, declared:

"There is inadequacy of machines of the kind to carry parachute troops, and not enough transport-carrying airplanes."

Excerpts from column 2, page 366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1943, from the speech of the Honorable CARL VINSON, United States Congressman from Georgia:

"Aviation, we all know, has advanced by leaps and bounds. It will continue to grow. After the war it may become the chief common carrier within and to points without our borders. * * *

"The Congress has established in recent years a Civil Aeronautics Administration and Civil Aeronautics Board. That legislation originated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce * * * and for it the country should be profoundly grateful to that committee's great chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and to his committee colleagues for their wisdom and foresight. Its value in this war situation has proved to be immeasurable. * * *

"The civilian pilot-training program, the development of landing areas, the installation of air navigation facilities, and the development thereof, including communications and directional guidance, and the accomplishments of the Civil Aeronautics Board, have all been of the greatest value to the country in the prosecution of the war, and every phase of the work of these agencies today is performed under the closest kind of cooperation with our military and naval air arms. In time of war, in fact, they may be said to be adjuncts of our defense arms, like the Coast Guard, for example, is of the Navy. They are part and parcel of the defense establishments."

Quotation by Rear Admiral John S. McCain, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Aeronautics, United States Navy, on May 15, 1943, on the occasion of the inauguration of air mail service in the United States:

"Air transport * * * has reduced the world to the size of an overnight bag. Guadalcanal * * * was saved by * * * supplies delivered by air. * * * Air transport will swell into astronomical proportions."

Quotation by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, on May 15, 1943, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration of air-mail service in the United States:

"Air transport has become a mighty force for unity among the Americas. * * * The network of air lines connecting the Americas is indispensable to the security of the hemisphere. * * * Air transport possibilities of the Americas had been recognized by the pioneers. * * * The role of air transport cannot be overestimated."

Extract from New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1943, quoting Maj. Gen. Harold L. George, commanding general, Air Transport Command, United States Army Air Forces:

"If it had not been for their (air lines in world-wide air transportation) wholehearted spirit of cooperation, it would have been as nearly impossible as anything can be impossible for us (the Army) to carry out the job in the way it has been done."

Extract from statement by L. Welch Pogue, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, September 1943 issue of Air Transport:

"If anyone thinks that our domestic airline service could be eliminated temporarily without dire consequences, that person simply does not have knowledge of the importance of the work actually performed by our air lines. It is no crime to be uninformed but it is unpardonable to remain so about a matter of so much moment."

Quotation from memorandum by Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney General, for his staff outlining transportation plans (p. 212 of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, U. S. Senate, 78th Cong., on S. 942, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act):

"Scarcely imaginable developments are inevitable if the air-transport industry be kept free from the stifling restrictions of older forms of transport and if vigorous healthy competition within the air-transport industry supplies its tried and proved stimulus."

Address delivered by Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, at the dedication of the Civil Aeronautics Authority's experimental station at Indianapolis, Ind., on May 29, 1939:

"With the air-transport industry thus forging ahead in its mission of public service, we are extremely fortunate in having as our Federal charter of regulation a new Civil Aeronautics Act, in the drafting of which the statesmanship of foresight was employed in liberal degree, and in the support of which the President and the Congress, after a patient, long-continued, and conscientious study, made an immeasurable contribution to the needs and aspirations and the future welfare of our commerce, our Postal Service, and our national defense. Already America has recognized their action as just and wise. The brake has been taken from the wheel. Already we are progressing readily but deliberately, bravely but conservatively, to a determination of problems of a new and matchless age. Civil aeronautics did not trust its country in vain."

A Call for Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 1, 1943:

A CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

A resolution with bipartisan sponsorship has been introduced in both Houses of Congress recommending that the President create "a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany."

If anything can be done to stop the Nazi mass murder of a people, surely the American people must be willing to take the lead in so doing. Sponsors of the resolution believe that much can be done. They believe, first of all, that such a resolution would have a great psychological effect on the Nazis, in that it would be the first official recognition by one of the Allied Powers of the extermination program and, therefore, the first official and explicit condemnation of it. They believe that official silence on the part of the great nations has given substantiation to the sardonic Nazi claim that not only does the outside world not condemn, nor purpose to punish, its bloody campaign against Jews as a people, but that those who keep silence actually condone it. They believe also that once the United States breaks the official silence—the Moscow accord and the Ottawa and similar conferences have not recognized that the extermination program has made the Jewish problem a separate one—and assumes leadership in action, the other United Nations will follow. The monstrous Nazi claim may then be countered with concerted denial as a part of our propaganda war. The nations may then demand the release of Jews by Germany and its satellites with the threat of specific retribution to back it. It is thought that the satellite nations at least would respond to such a demand. United action is needed, and needed soon, if psychological force is to save lives within the Nazi citadel.

What has held up such action before this is, no doubt, the conviction, widely held, that liberation for the Jews, as for the other hostages of Europe, will be sooner accomplished by concentrating on speedy victory for the United Nations. There is difficulty in securing united action for any other purpose now. Incidentally, the fact that there is an Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has led to the supposition that something is being done, whereas that Committee cannot rescue hostages from within Nazi-held Europe.

Certain it is that nothing will be accomplished to save Nazi Europe's surviving Jews from methodical extermination by doing nothing. The resolution calls for affirmation of the American position, assumption by America of leadership in doing whatever may be done to save lives now. We should not hesitate to lead in so imperative a humanitarian cause.

Walter Lippman Writes About the House on Tuesday and Wednesday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the closed rule on the tax bill which the House passed last Wednesday, I said in part the following:

At this point I should only like to say that it is important that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle make up their minds whether they were right yesterday or whether they are right today; were they right yesterday when they told us there is an abundance of surplus buying power in the hands of the people, so it did not matter whether there are means or machinery for

keeping down prices to consumers, or are they right today when they tell us a great and terrible Government is, in order to try to finance the greatest war in history, taking more money out of the pockets of the taxpayers than can be justified?

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks herewith Mr. Walter Lippmann's column, Today and Tomorrow, for Tuesday, November 30, which expresses more completely and effectively than I was able to do the same general idea that I was attempting to set forth:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

HOUSE ON TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY

On Tuesday the House voted about subsidies and on Wednesday it voted about taxes. Unless Congress means to go on record as determined to weaken the existing wartime control of the effects of inflation without putting any better control in its place, the action of the House will have to be reconsidered. For the action of last week is so incoherent and so confusing that it cannot possibly be the last word by Congress on the subject.

No wonder that Senator TAFT, who will hardly be suspected of being a New Dealer planning a fourth term, has already felt it necessary to break away from the position taken by his party in the House, and to seek a more constructive solution.

On Tuesday, the House voted to outlaw what is called consumer-subsidy programs for agricultural products, arguing the people have lots of money and can afford to pay higher prices for food. The next day, on Wednesday, the House voted against a substantial increase of taxes, arguing that the people now have so little money left that they cannot pay more taxes. On Tuesday, when the subject was subsidies, the cry went up that the billion dollars for food subsidies must not be passed on to future generations to pay. On Wednesday, when the subject was taxes, the House voted to pass on to future generations an extra eight billions of debt rather than vote that amount of taxes now.

When the Treasury presented its tax proposals, it was said, and I believe correctly, that in relieving the 9,000,000 smallest taxpayers of the obligation to pay a direct tax, the Treasury was politically minded. But a comparison of the excise taxes and postal rates proposed by the Treasury and those actually voted by the House will show that when it came to levying new taxes which fall upon the mass of the voters, to levying what are in effect selected sales taxes, the House was just about half as brave and nonpolitical as the Treasury.

The Treasury called for an additional two thousand five hundred millions of excise taxes on articles of general consumption. The House was willing to vote only one thousand three hundred and seventy-eight millions. The details are interesting. The Treasury wanted to slap an additional seven hundred and fifty-eight millions of taxes on alcoholic drinks; the House voted only four hundred and sixty millions. The Treasury wanted another four hundred and eighty-five millions on tobacco; the House would not vote any new tobacco tax. The Treasury wanted an additional three hundred and sixty-seven millions on soft drinks, candy, and chewing gum; the House would vote none. The Treasury wanted another one hundred and sixty-seven millions on jewelry; the House cut this down to eighty-two millions.

Now, if we are going to tax consumption, which all who favor a sales tax agree is necessary to discourage inflationary spending, then the obvious place to begin taxing is on the consumption of luxuries like drink, tobacco, candy, and jewelry. But the House, which on Tuesday did not object to raising the price of bread, meat, milk, and vegetables, was on Wednesday opposed to raising substantially the price of cigarettes, cigars, whisky, gin, beer, wine, soft drinks, candy, chewing gum, and jewelry.

The position of the House on subsidies is so shot through with self-contradiction that it is not intelligible. It was supposed to be outlawing "consumer-subsidy programs" on "any agricultural commodity." But it exempted subsidies on competitive domestic oils and fats and oil seeds. It did not outlaw the subsidies which keep down the price of mineral oil in the Eastern States, or of coal. It did not outlaw any subsidy to producers or any subsidy used "to support prices." It outlawed only subsidies which are designed to protect the consumer against rising prices.

The idea that the House was voting against what we have been told is the immoral, uneconomic, un-American, wasteful, inflationary use of public funds for subsidies is, therefore, not true. What on earth was it voting against? It was supposed to be voting against "consumer subsidies."

This means, presumably, subsidies like that for butter, bread, and part of the meat subsidy, which are designed to give the consumer these necessaries of life at a somewhat lower price than the prices paid for them to the producers and processors. If this is what the House was objecting to, the matter is certainly debatable, and it may be that on careful consideration they ought to be modified or perhaps even abandoned.

But the House legislation did not discriminate against subsidies of this type. It outlawed subsidies which, though they are paid to producers to cover differentials in cost, are set up so as to stabilize prices for consumers. The larger part of the subsidies outlawed by the House are of this type—these are the subsidies for potatoes, truck crops, corn, hay, feed wheat, fluid milk, onions, lard, sugar beets, canned vegetables, and that part of the meat subsidy paid to nonprocessing slaughterers who would otherwise be closed down.

Subsidies of this type, designed to induce greater production, to make up differentials between one section of the country and another, and between low cost and high cost producers, certainly inure to the benefit of the consumers. But surely that is not an objection to them unless it is the view of the majority of the House that subsidies are desirable if they raise prices and are vicious if they stabilize prices.

The action of the House on subsidies and on taxes cries out for reconsideration. The whole subject, the most critical on our home front, needs to be subjected to much more informative and searching reporting and interpretation by the press and the radio than, owing to the drama of the war news, it has as yet had. And then when the facts and the issues have become better understood by all of us, the subject needs a more thorough debate in the Senate than it got in the House.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln is of the ages. His name will last forever.

What a privilege to study those kindly features in the memorial out yonder. What an inspiration to read his words engraved on the walls of the Nation's beautiful shrine. Imperishable words cherished in the hearts of freemen everywhere. Yes; words expressing the hopes, the aspirations, the principles of an entire Nation; words which stir the souls of men.

November 19, 1943, was exactly fourscore years after Abraham Lincoln delivered his immortal Gettysburg Address. No doubt the anniversary was fittingly commemorated in every city and hamlet throughout the United States. In this Chamber the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, spoke eloquently of the event. In San Francisco the Henry F. Budde Publications carried an editorial entitled "Gettysburg, 1863."

As part of my remarks, I quote the article herewith:

GETTYSBURG—1863

Eighty years ago—November 19, 1863—on the chill fields of Gettysburg, a gaunt, gangling man addressed a crowd gathered to dedicate that bloody battlefield of the Civil War.

His speech was an anticlimax to the brilliant oratory of the great Edward Everett. Comparatively few people heard him in that radioless day. But the ages were listening, for he spoke in the eloquence of eternity.

Down through the decades this utterance has echoed and re-echoed in ever-growing beauty, hope, and prophecy. Yet Lincoln's own concept of the words spoken that day was strikingly unprophetic.

"The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here * * *." But the world did note and did remember, because it could not ignore and could not forget the soul-stirring, timeless phrases that fell from the lips of that sad-faced giant, stooped with the burden of his day.

Behind him lay the many long years of his own fight to preserve the Union and to abolish slavery. Before him lay the few brief months that yet remained to him to carry out that great cause.

Said he, in words which speak for our day as well as his own, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion * * * that the government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Brains of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper, from the Washington Daily News of November 30, 1943:

BRAINS OF O. P. A.

(By Raymond Clapper)

The real fight about subsidies is to wreck price control. O. P. A. is represented as a collection of nitwits and theorists.

Yet Chester Bowles, head of O. P. A., in 4 months here has brought in some 40-odd

businessmen. Leon Henderson, in his day, was denounced by Senator GUFFEY, and by people around Democratic National Committee headquarters, for loading O. P. A. up with too many Republicans. Probably four out of five of the businessmen brought in lately voted against President Roosevelt and possibly two-thirds of the O. P. A. personnel, both paid and volunteer, are Republicans.

At any rate, the bulk of the keymen are, as Chester Bowles says, only interested in trying to do a difficult and thankless job in the most efficient way possible "and then to get the hell out of Washington and back to somewhat more pleasant tasks."

Here are some of the businessmen who have been employed full time since August 1:

James F. Brownlee, Deputy Administrator, Price Department; formerly president, Frankfort Distilleries; vice president, General Foods Corporation; sales manager, American Sugar Refining Co.

Milton A. Rosenfeld, Chief, Restaurant Branch; formerly president, Blue Kitchen Restaurant chain, New York.

Reagan P. Connally, Director, Consumer Goods Price Division; formerly president, Interstate Department Stores, New York.

Albert A. Kaplan, Chief, Manufactured Articles Branch; formerly assistant superintendent C. Kenyon Co., clothing manufacturers, Brooklyn; operating manager and assistant to the vice president, R. H. Macy Co.

Daniel L. Jacobs, senior price analyst, Radio and Miscellaneous Manufactured Articles Branch; formerly manager, New Jersey office, York Automotive Distributing Co.

Byres H. Gitchell, Chief, Retail Distribution Branch; formerly president and managing director, Golden Rule Department Stores, St. Paul.

Russell A. Walkey, price analyst, Primary Products Branch; formerly office manager, H. C. Godman Co., shoe manufacturers, Columbus, Ohio.

Jean F. Carroll, Director, Food Price Division; formerly branch manager, Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., Cincinnati.

Geoffrey Baker, Assistant to Director, Food Price Division; formerly assistant national manager in charge of Government sales, General Foods Sales Co., New York.

Max A. Christopher, Chief, Distribution Branch; formerly president, Symms-Shafer Merchandise Co., Colby, Kans.

Raymond A. Meserve, head, Distribution Price Section; formerly manager and meat buyer, George C. Shaw Co., retail grocery, Portland, Maine.

Thomas R. Bradley, price analyst, Meats, Fish, Fats, and Oils Branch; formerly manager, Rath Packing Co., Waterloo, Iowa.

Colin S. Gordon, Chief, Cereals, Feeds, and Agricultural Chemicals Price Branch; formerly vice president, Quaker Oats Co., Chicago.

Ralph E. de Ong, price analyst, Cereals, Feeds, and Agricultural Chemical Price Branch; formerly secretary-treasurer, Pacific Insecticide Institute, San Francisco, insecticide manufacturers' association.

Carl N. Lovegran, head, Processed Fruits and Vegetables Price Section; formerly president, Canners League of California, and general manager, Hunt Brothers Packing Co., Hayward, Calif.

Prosper Lettunich, business specialist, Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Price Branch; formerly general manager, Watsonville (Calif.) Apple Growers and Packers Association.

Frank E. McSweeney, head, Miscellaneous Petroleum Products Price Unit; formerly Michigan division manager, Shell Oil Co.

There isn't space to go on, although I have several pages more of such names.

These men must succeed. If they are rendered ineffective by hostile congressional action or lack of public support, then you will pay and pay.

Our Millions in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

OUR MILLIONS IN CANADA

Secretary of the Interior Ickes denounces the expenditure of $130,000,000 of this country's money on Canadian oil and pipe-line developments and the subsequent purchase of the oil at $1.25 per barrel as indefensible waste. His criticisms are upheld by Senator TRUMAN, head of the Special Senate Committee Investigating War Operations.

The War Department justifies the project on two grounds: First, on the basis of military necessity; second, even at $1.25 a barrel it is contended the oil will cost much less than if delivered by other routes.

It is quite true that when the project started the Japanese menace in the North Pacific was much worse than at present. It is also pointed out by defenders of the project that two-thirds of the length of the pipe line is along the Alcan Highway, only one-third from the oil wells to the highway, and this two-thirds will certainly be useful to somebody, in the future operation of the highway and the airports it serves.

The project will be useful to somebody. Whether the highway to Alaska on the interior route will be of much use, for truck or tourist travel, after the war is over, is extremely questionable. But certainly the airports which it now serves, on a military basis, will be valuable on the commercial air routes of the post-war period.

The question is, Who will operate on these air routes? And that question and similar ones provide the nub of nearly every issue that has been raised in connection with wartime expenditures by the United States in Canada.

As matters stand the United States has no positive assurance that it will reap any permanent benefits from the immense expenditures on the Alcan Highway, on the Fort Norman wells, on the White Horse refinery, or on any of the other incidental developments. Even the Haines Road, a connection with the Alcan Highway which offers a highly advantageous new route from the end of the inside passage to the interior of Alaska, has a highly problematical future, since the route passes through a section within Canada which is almost without population, and arrangements are yet to be made for permanent upkeep.

Whether the United States gets any substantial benefits from these developments depends upon arrangements between the Governments of the United States and Canada. And these arrangements, in turn, may depend very largely upon the extent to which the business interests on both sides of the line recognize the advantage of working together.

The Canadian government probably could gain a certain temporary advantage by standing on its legal rights and allowing Canadian air lines and oil companies to reap all the benefits of our wartime expenditures in Canada. The Canadian authorities might argue that the expenditures, although in Canada, were as much for our safety as for theirs, and ought to be written off as a form of lend-lease.

The Canadian Government might take this stand. But we don't think it will. We believe the Canadian Government, and Canadian businessmen, and the Canadian population generally, recognize that United States and Canadian interests are intertwined in peace as well as in war, and that any action to take an undue advantage of the other, on either side, would bring repercussions, unfavorable to the peoples of both countries.

There is no necessity to belabor this point. Businessmen on both sides of the line appreciate it. They have indicated their feeling by organizing the transborder Pacific Northwest Trade Association.

The problem now is to implement the friendly feeling that prevails on both sides of the boundary. Practical formulas must be developed for the future use of facilities established during the war emergency.

There is no need to wait for the war's end to find these formulas.

Eventual governmental agreements will be required. But such groups as the Pacific Northwest Trade Association might well develop the formulas upon which formal agreements will be based.

We can think of no better time and place for starting this than at the forthcoming Pacific Northwest Trade Association meeting at Spokane.

Butter in National Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the recent activities of groups and individuals to promote the consumption of vegetable oils in preference to animal fats, prompt me to ask these Federal agencies for an explanation why they are trying to work both sides of the street.

For example, the W. F. A. is paying $1.25 a pound for powdered eggs. This is a good food. Fifteen percent of the powdered eggs is set aside for our armed forces and 83 percent is allocated to lease-lend. There is a total of 354,000,000 pounds allocated for the year. The powdered egg contains 48 to 49 percent of protein and 40 to 41 percent of animal fat and 3.5 minerals.

While this product is a splendid source of animal protein, I also wish to call your attention to the animal protein in powdered skim milk. Powdered skim milk has 35 percent of a most excellent animal protein. This powdered skim milk has an O. P. A. ceiling of 12.5 cents per pound for roller and 14.5 cents per pound for spray process.

The protein in the pound of powdered egg can be purchased for about 25 cents in the form of skim milk protein. But you say, yes, but the powdered eggs have 41 percent of fat, and this makes it much more valuable. I subscribe to that statement. On this basis nearly a dollar is being paid for the 0.41 pound of animal fat, or about $2 per pound for fat. I believe these animal fats have proper-

ties which make them excel vegetable oils.

After the W. F. A. follows this procedure and produces and allocates 354,000,000 pounds of powdered eggs in a year, and pays on the basis of about $2 a pound for the fat therein, it is not evident to me how in the name of common sense the same W. F. A. can claim that butterfat—46 cents per pound for butter 80 percent fat—at 57 or 58 cents per pound should be replaced by a vegetable oil.

It would sound rather ridiculous to suggest using vegetable oils in place of the natural animal fat in powdered eggs. It is just as illogical to make the suggestion to replace butterfat with vegetable oils.

One fact is evident—the W. F. A. cannot in conscience be both fish and fowl. The W. F. A. most assuredly should not pay $2 per pound for one animal fat that is only of equal food value to another animal fat that they erroneously contend is not even worth 57 cents to the consuming public of America. The W. F. A. leaves one with the impression that they do not wish to approach these food problems either on a scientific, practical, or common-sense basis. The W. F. A. seems more desirous of the political approach to these food problems. They should get on one side of this street or the other and not be trying to mislead the American people.

The following article by Chris L. Christensen, formerly dean of the Wisconsin Agricultural College, gives the facts in connection with this great food known as butter.

[From the Wisconsin Medical Journal]

BUTTER IN NATIONAL HEALTH

(By Chris L. Christensen, formerly dean, college of agriculture; director, agricultural experiment station, University of Wisconsin)

Butter is a tasty, highly concentrated food product, with great nutritional values. It furnishes large quantities of heat energy, ranking far ahead of sugar in caloric value, and it is an excellent source of certain vitamins and accessory food substances which promote the growth, health, and well-being of man. As butter is easily and almost completely digested, these nutritional substances are made available for utilization by the human body.

Those are some of the chief reasons that butter is regarded by scientists as a valuable addition to any menu, and those are the reasons given by Conrad Elvehjem, nationally known biochemist at the University of Wisconsin and member of the Food and Nutritional Committee of the National Research Council, for regarding butter as a good food product for all ages.

WISCONSIN HAS HIGH STANDARD

Although butter is uniformly good as a food, different samples vary in composition and quality, according to Elvehjem. Butter produced under different conditions may contain anywhere from 70 to 90 percent fats. State laws, however, protect the consumer by requiring that butter for public sale must contain at least 80 percent fats. The natural color of butter may vary from deepest yellow to almost white.

VITAMIN A AND CAROTENE

While vitamin content may also vary in different butter samples, vitamin A, the fat-soluble food substance necessary for the prevention of certain types of skin disorders and eye conditions such as night blindness and xerophthalmia, is found in all butter. Its occurrence in nature is associated with the yellow plant pigments, the carotenes, which are converted in the human or animal, yielding vitamin A.

The measurements of the vitamin A content of butter are complicated by the vitamin A-carotene relationship.

Butter with a high carotene content, and consequently bright yellow in color, may have a low vitamin A content, and still have a high potency, since carotene is converted to vitamin A in the body. Vitamin A itself is a colorless, oily substance, and butter with a high vitamin A content, and virtually colorless, has a low carotene content. Therefore, while a good natural dark yellow tone is a good indication of the presence of carotene, absence of that color does not mean that the butter is deficient in total vitamin A.

JUNE SETS PATTERN FOR WINTER FEEDING

A change in dairy ration will alter the vitamin content of the butter produced. By taking dairy animals off pasture a source of carotene is removed from their diet, and the vitamin A value of the butter produced from their milk drops off as much as 50 percent. However, dairymen, now recognizing this fact, are taking measures to prevent this decrease by supplementing the winter feeding with rich, green alfalfa hay or other products high in carotene.

BUTTER AS A SOURCE OF VITAMIN D

Vitamin D is also present in butter, and while it may vary in amount in different samples of butter, all butter is a fair source of this vitamin which is so essential to the bony structure. The natural source of vitamin D, of course, is sunlight, and thus it has been found that butter produced during the winter months from the milk of animals deprived of sunlight and pasture is lower in vitamin D content than is butter produced during the summer months when the animals are on pasture and in the sunlight.

Physicians recognize, of course, that fish liver oils are far superior to butter in supplying the antirachitic factor so important in preventing rickets and osteomalacia. However, butter furnishes an auxiliary supply of vitamin D, and artificial enrichment of it by ultraviolet rays makes it an even better source.

NEW BUTTER FACTOR

Most recent research has revealed a new factor in butter, as yet unnamed. The substance has never been isolated, and although work is now going ahead rapidly on it, all that is yet known is that young animals grow much better when supplied with it than when fed only vitamins A and D and supplementary fats of a nondairy origin.

DIGESTIBILITY OF BUTTER

The digestibility of butter is uniformly good. All fats with a low melting point are easy to digest, and butter is in this class of fats, ranking second only to fish liver oils in ease of digestion and completeness of utilization. Besides, butter on digestion yields fatty acids of low molecular weight, which play an important role in the process of metabolism.

HUMAN REQUIREMENTS

About 2 ounces of good butter daily will supply the vitamin A requirements of an average child, and 2 to 3 ounces of butter with a pint of whole milk daily will be quite adequate for an adult's vitamin A requirements. Butter is not to be depended upon alone for an adequate supply of vitamin D, although its value as an accessory source of vitamin D is very important. Just what amount of the newly discovered butterfat growth factor is required for normal growth, and to what degree butter is adequate in supplying it, have not been established. However, research indicates that butter may prove adequate to supply man's requirements of this substance.

The importance of the nutritional value of butter was not always as fully recognized as it is today. Scientists had known for years that fats are needed for human growth, but until the early part of this century, when E. V. McCollum made his first studies at the University of Wisconsin, little else was known, and no attempt had been made to determine which fats are needed and why.

ORIENTALS FOUND WAY TO PREVENT BERIBERI

It was through a sequence of experiments performed over a period of more than a quarter century that there was ultimately brought to light the present, though yet incomplete, knowledge of this unnamed factor present in butter, which we do know to be essential to growth. Included in this series of investigations was the search for the cause of beriberi.

When beriberi and other nervous disorders were taking their yearly toll of human lives in Japan in the 1870's it was suspected that this disease was the result of some undiscovered micro-organism. That suspicion was substantiated by the fact that the disease appeared among the low-class fishermen, farmers, coolies, and river-dwellers, who lived in crowded areas in Japanese villages. The disease took its biggest toll immediately after heavy floods, and this again confirmed the bacterial theory, since almost all diseases caused by bacteria make their heaviest ravages in flood time when drinking water and food are apt to be polluted.

When the disease broke out, during the Russo-Japanese War, and despite isolation, spread rapidly among the sailors in the Mikado's navy, a more concentrated effort was made to determine the nature and cause of the disease. Reference to earlier medical records revealed that a Dutch scientist named Eijkman, working in the Dutch East Indies, had made experiments on pigeons, producing a disease not unlike beriberi. Eijkman had produced this disease spontaneously in birds isolated from any chance of contagion, and his final conclusions were that the disease was a result of feeding the pigeons polished rice. This lent impetus to the search being made by the Japanese admirals, since the staple food on their navy's ration was polished rice. With a change in their ration to unpolished rice the disease subsided, and thereafter the sailors were served unpolished rice.

While this brought to light an important feature of the disease, it still had not revealed the fundamental cause of beriberi. Scientists began a search for the element, apparently present in the outer shell of unpolished rice, which prevented beriberi, and the first suspect was phosphorus. Fraser and Stanton discarded that view, however, when they found that an extract from rice polishings containing only 15 percent of the total phosphorus would still prevent beriberi, while the remaining 85 percent phosphorus extract had no control over the disease.

Meanwhile Funk, in Poland, had isolated a compound from rice polishings, which within a few hours restored the ability to fly to a pigeon, paralyzed by neuritis. However, he had neither identified nor analyzed his new vitamin.

WISCONSIN INVESTIGATIONS FUNDAMENTAL

At this time E. V. McCollum, a young Yale graduate, was just entering the field of nutritional investigation at the University of Wisconsin, working under the direction of Profs. E. B. Hart and the venerable Stephen Moulton Babcock. While taking his apprenticeship at the Wisconsin Experiment Station, young McCollum read with interest these reports of the search for the food factors so vital to life and good health.

One item in particular interested him; the story of the German scientists who had fed rats a diet completely balanced but containing phosphorus only in the inorganic state. The German scientists had reported that their animals died for the lack of this phosphorus, but McCollum questioned their findings. He tried the test himself, and discovered that the rats he fed lived and grew to be fat and healthy. One animal nearly doubled its weight in less than 2 months on this same diet, which the German biochemists had claimed was fatal to their rats.

Osborne and Mendel, American scientists, trying a similar experiment and following the procedure of their tests, had the same results as the German scientists. This was perplexing to McCollum, as well as to other scientists, and he proceeded to determine wherein his experiments differed from those of the other workers. He compared the rations used, and found that in his own ration he had used butter for the source of fat in the diet, while the other two experimenters had used lard. From this McCollum learned that butterfat is essential to growth and health, and tests conducted later by himself and a coworker, Margaret Davis, verified this conclusion. Osborne and Mendel worked independently, and shortly after McCollum and Davis published a report in June 1913, they told of a butterfat and egg yolk factor which greatly promoted growth, revealing that certain eye conditions and skin disorders could be traced to a deficiency of that butterfat factor.

ONE VITAMIN OR TWO?

At first scientists wondered whether McCollum's discovery involved the same element which Funk had found in rice polishings. However, experiments were performed, and rats from the same litter placed side by side, one living on a diet which included only rice polishings, and the other on a diet including butterfat alone, made minimum growth gains. Only the animals which received both compounds were strong and healthy. These results indicated that there were two factors involved. In 1916 McCollum further clarified the matter by naming the element which Funk had discovered vitamin B, and the butterfat factor vitamin A.

Vitamin B, then believed to be a simple compound, but now revealed to be a complex collection of separate vitamins, appeared in green vegetables, eggs, nuts, and liver. That is the reason beriberi had followed floods, which had destroyed vegetable gardens and poultry houses, leaving only polished rice and fish for the people to eat.

Tests performed to determine the source of vitamin A had revealed its presence in quantity in the fish-liver oils and in butter. Later investigations to determine the source of vitamin D revealed that butter was also fairly rich in the sunshine vitamin.

BUTTER CONTAINS A GROWTH FACTOR

After these experiments the scientists were satisfied that they knew all there was to learn about butter, until Edwin Bret Hart, University of Wisconsin biochemist, began some additional experiments. Some of his experiments, together with other work carried on in the biochemistry department, convinced him that there was something yet unrevealed in butter; that there was an accessory growth substance which did not occur elsewhere. This factor is as yet unnamed.

Research workers began work on the problem and obtained evidence that this factor exists, and so far tests have not shown its presence anywhere except in animal fats. At this time experiments are being made to isolate and identify the factor, and after that more tests will determine its source and what quantities of it are needed for normal growth. Deficiency in what the scientists now call the butterfat growth factor shows its greatest effect in new-born animals. The new growth factor is no known compound, but is some new type of saturated fatty acid, the presence of which encourages normal growth and development, and a deficiency of which results in poor health and stunted growth.

Butter, therefore, performs an important part in the promotion of growth and good health by supplying heat energy and essential vitamins. Its potentialities are not yet fully revealed, but what we know of butter justifies the claim that it is not only an excellent but an essential food for growing children, and that it is a tasty and healthful food for adults of all ages.

Extracts From the Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations Adopted by the Executive Committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, November 18, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to read to the House two short paragraphs from a letter which I received yesterday. This letter was written by a very thoughtful constituent, a veteran of the last war, and a man whose opinion and judgment I respect. I quote:

In spite of Mr. Hull's denials (which do not flatly deny anyhow) it looks as though Great Britain and we were flirting with the idea of peace with Germany. Warning of worse terms later unless the Germans change their government now presupposes their free will to make terms—and that is very far from unconditional surrender. In fact, the "unless" is in itself terms! Worse yet, changing their government would be as futile and fatal to us as were their promises made to each of their victims in turn at the beginning of this war, as faithless as their promises at Versailles. It is even suggested that someone speaking for Germany might be present at the next conference of the Allied representatives.

This is hideous. I hate war, of course, but why go through 80 percent of the agony and then stop—and have 100 percent to be done over again by the next generation? Moreover, next time we might be the first attacked.

These two paragraphs not only speak for themselves but they also express my views on this subject.

While giving thought to this subject my colleagues may be interested to read extracts from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., November 18, 1943:

To spare the next generation what we are going through now is our greatest objective. There are two chief essentials to this—to win the war so thoroughly that there can be no doubt about it and to create a peace which is one in fact and not merely in name.

Our international relations, and therefore our citizens, will be affected for generations by whether peace comes as the result of complete victory or is merely a premature product of war weariness. To hesitate, with our goal in sight, could only mean greater bloodshed and destruction.

The American Legion believes in facing facts, even when unpleasant. There is no doubt that Germany now is fighting for a deadlock in order to gain better peace terms, and there is real danger of her accomplishing this if we relax our efforts for a single instant. Another certainty is that Germany is seeking a negotiated peace, as a foundation on which to build prosperity for herself at the expense of other nations. Before this war began, Germans were continually boasting that they won the peace in 1918 even though they lost that war. It will pay us now to remember how they accomplished it then, in the light of the propaganda campaign which they are already beginning. They did it then by tiring out the Allies until they accepted a soft armistice and a softer peace; by playing upon our sympathies, and especially for the German children, whom they were planning to build up into soldiers for the next war; by laying the blame upon one man, the Kaiser, and claiming that the German people themselves were not guilty; by promises and false statements which led to the forgiveness of indemnities and to huge loans which were never repaid. Indeed, by constant repetition of clever propaganda they actually succeeded in turning the picture around, so that they came to be looked upon almost as victims instead of as the aggressors.

In the light of our own experience, it is our duty to warn our fellow citizens against this danger. At this very moment the Nazis are destroying hundreds of precious American lives; they are ruthlessly turning Italy into a shambles; they are cruelly starving those peoples whose lands they occupy—all with the deliberate purpose of wearing us and our allies down until we are ready to accept a negotiated peace. In reply they should be told in unmistakable language that the harder they make it for others the harder it must go with them. They will try to placate us by getting rid of Hitler, and probably by dissolving the Nazi Party, but they will remain the same Boche—bent on world domination and self-profit at the expense of other nations. Japan, too, is dangerous, deadly dangerous, but at least we see that danger and realize their crude brutality. Germany is cleverer and more plausible, but both nations are a world menace. Both nations must be completely beaten down and not given a breathing spell when they cry "kamerad." This is neither a doctrine of revenge nor of hate; it is merely the same common sense that stops the criminally insane so that they cannot go on killing others.

American-Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the American-

Soviet friendship meeting at Philadelphia, Pa., on November 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On June 22, 1941, Adolf Hitler, after due consultation with his intuitions, took the plunge into the deepest military quagmire known to modern man. It was a proud army which he sent on that day into Soviet Russia, though not too proud to follow the prescribed Axis pattern of the treacherous sneak punch in violation of past agreements.

At that time we in America heard the prediction of certain home-grown experts on international affairs—the prediction that Hitler's war machine would crush the Red Army—and I quote, "within 2 months."

It has been a long 2 months.

I am not one of those experts. But I welcome, along with millions of other Americans, the opportunity which this occasion offers, just after the most triumphant of all missions to Moscow, to look back over the inspiring record of our gallant ally in war, and to look ahead to the no less inspiring certainty that she will be our ally in peace.

The tradition of friendship between these two great Nations, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dates back years beyond the attacks which have made us warring allies. And events of the last few days, the signal victories that have been achieved both on the battlefield and at the council table, are enough in themselves to fill our hearts with gratitude to our own national leadership which a decade ago committed our country to the recognition of and establishment of firm friendship with the Soviet Union.

The character of that recognition was realistic, as has been the character of dealings between these two Nations ever since—and as we feel both confident and gratified that they will continue to be. For realism, which has never sat well among the myths of Berchtesgaden nor attended the hemispheric pipe dreams of Tokyo, is the very substance and lifeblood of a lasting friendship among nations.

For it's own good reasons—especially collective security and aid in its own industrialization, the Soviet Union sought collaboration with us. And for our own reasons—our foresighted suspicion of possible trouble with Japan and also for the give and take of commerce in prospect, we welcomed that collaboration.

On November 18, 1933, 2 days after the reestablishment of diplomatic relations, President Roosevelt summed it up by declaring that the impelling motive of the Soviet-American conversations was, I quote, "the desire of both countries for peace and for the strengthening of the peaceful purposes of the civilized world."

That desire still lives. Through the ordeal of fire, through the hour of mounting doubt as the aggressor made his terrible bid for supremacy, it turned from desire to an unshakable resolve. Today, as the armies of four great powers score triumph after triumph over the breaking ranks of that same enemy, it turns from resolve to certainty.

As one of the terms under which diplomatic relationship was reestablished, the Soviet Government undertook to "respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way." Among other promises, both parties to the agreement were pledged to refrain from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention. This latter has been regarded by many specialists in international law as equivalent to a pledge of nonaggression.

Both nations have lived up to their word. And the accord which was entered 10 years ago by men and peoples of good will has, in peace and in war, brought forth a harvest in these intervening years many times richer than either party could have foreseen.

What momentous years they have been. They have brought us, here in America, through the passing of an old, an outworn set of traditions and practices, and into the path that leads our people toward a greater share in the four freedoms. We have witnessed, in those years, a vast resurgence of the democratic spirit, a renascence so insistent that total war, world war, cannot permanently hold it in check.

In that renewal of hope for the common man, the Soviet Union and the United States have worked and marched side by side. Today, with Great Britain, China, and their other allies, they are fighting side by side. Lest anyone doubt the program of action of our Soviet ally, let me quote from an address by the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, given on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the October Revolution. I quote:

"The program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is: Abolition of racial exclusiveness, equality of nations and integrity of their territories, liberation of the enslaved nations and the restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of every nation to manage its affairs in its own way, economic aid to nations that have suffered and assistance in establishing their material welfare, restoration of democratic liberties, and destruction of the Hitler regime."

During the 10 years of our good-neighborhood with the Soviet Union we have mutually lived up to other obligations. Long before the inception of the lend-lease program—before there was need of that—America was supplying goods and services and the skills of men to help speed our neighbor's tremendous program of industrialization. Our engineers helped to build the great dams and power projects and factories, helped set up the originals after which others, dotting the vast expanse of the Soviet Union, were modeled. And in business as in political commitments, the Russians have kept their word. No nation's credit has been better than that of Soviet Russia.

It was fitting that there should have evolved this meeting of minds, this recognition of mutual purposes, between the United States and the Soviet Union. Behind it there had been a long tradition of friendship—again based solidly on the realism that some care to call self-interest, but which, among nations, is the only tradition of friendship which has any real insurance value.

There are many of these practical, down-to-earth common denominators, the most striking, of course, being the fact that these great powers are the world's two dominant continental nations. There is more in this than geography. For this kind of geography overlaps into and vitally affects the thinking, the planning of these nations for the future of their peoples. The Russians, like us, must do everything in a big way. They have gone into the vast stretches of Siberia, through the forests, their great mountains and long rivers, much as we swashbuckled into the frontier of our great West. Even when they stage a Stalingrad, they stage a good big one, bagging Nazi troops by the hundreds of thousands, and not failing to come home with everybody from the generals on down.

This way of thinking, of doing, draws us together. It is no mere coincidence that in every great international crisis that we Americans have had to face over the past hundred years, the Russians have always turned up at our side.

It was no accident of history, therefore, that during the Civil War, at a time when relationships of the Union with powers outside its borders were in a particularly shaky state, the Russian Fleet appeared in New York Harbor. It was no accident that when other powers were reaching out for the Hawaiian Islands toward the close of the last century, Russia, through instructions sent to her Ambassador at Washington, advised our Government that she would look with favor on American acquisition of the islands, and, in giving us this assurance of her attitude, strengthened our own determination to add this vital defense outpost.

When Russia sold Alaska to us—not for love but for money and for common sense practicality—she knew that in relinquishing her only territory in the Western Hemisphere she would be in no way endangering herself, but, on the contrary, adding to her own and our own safety. It is 10 minutes by air from American territory to Soviet Russia. On a clear summer day an American, standing on the shore of the Bering Straits, can see the faint blue outlines of Russian mountains on the Asiatic Continent.

Across that narrow strip of water the bond has been one of good living together, cooperation in respect to the business and commerce of the north Pacific, peaceful conduct of the fishery and the sealing industry, and the building up of a long tradition of good will.

The recognition of Russia in 1933 was a wholesome and fitting revival of that tradition. Within 10 years we have seen it grow until, under stress of attack by a common enemy, it has come to magnificent fruition in a relationship that goes deeper than the ties of geography or commerce, more meaningful than the mere coexistence of neighbors at peace. This newer, more intimate relationship is certain to continue and to grow. The Moscow Conference is only one expression of it. There will be others—in action as well as in words.

Of course, this growth has not been free of opposition, of set-backs, of all sorts of hazards. All along the way it has run into the constant need of public education. And we have among us today—particularly in the remaining hard cores of isolationism—those who cling to their suspicions, their prejudices, their frayed and shoddy weave of outworn fears, their tall tales of the red bogyman.

Herr Goebbels is not unaware of the presence among us of this bogy brigade. Up until a few days ago he believed the game was still worth playing—the effort to reach them with anguished warnings of the "coming bolshevization of Europe." When the results of the Moscow Conference were made known that game was up.

But while diplomatic missions can act in good faith and act quickly, divisive fear and studied hate do not vanish overnight. The minorities that have nursed these fears, this bias, have been at work a long time. In his book, Mission to Moscow, Ambassador Joseph Davies said:

"What if Stalin defeats Hitler? Will not communism then sweep Europe? * * * Hitler stooges have been trying to frighten us into the belief that communism will destroy our form of government if the Soviet Union defeats Hitler. That is just plain bunk. It is bad medicine. It is as unintelligent as it is unpatriotic and un-American."

Over and above its value as an instrument of common accord, I believe and hope the Moscow Conference will prove of needful service in speeding along this public education. I do not expect the career isolationists to give up their unsavory work as a result of it. But I do not see how they can well answer the compact point if they are confronted with it. Their fears all look to the future and ignore the past. Certainly none of the nations signatory to that compact can present a more convincing exhibit of evidence

of good intention, based on the record since Hitler went on the march, or even since the last World War, than can Soviet Russia.

Let us glance back, then, over that record, and examine the basis of the Soviet Union's claim to good faith in once again espousing the cause of collective security against aggression. This nation, which, we must remember, was not admitted to the League of Nations until Germany withdrew in 1934, sent Maxim Litvinoff as its representative in the Council of the League. On March 17, 1936, Litvinoff told the Council:

"We are for international agreement which would not only fortify the present mainstays of peace, but would if possible set up new ones. We are for participation in such an agreement of all countries desirous of doing so. But we are opposed to granting to a state withdrawing from the League of Nations, grossly violating international treaties and engaged in sword rattling, the privilege of dictating to all Europe its conditions of negotiation. * * * I declare on behalf of my Government that it is ready to take part in all measures that may be proposed to the Council of the League by the Locarno Powers and will be acceptable to the other members of the Council."

In July of 1936, Litvinoff told the League:

"If I say all this in the interest of strengthening peace, I cannot do otherwise than mention the measure which the Soviet Union has always considered the maximum guaranty of peace, I mean complete disarmament. * * * But while this radical measure is in abeyance, all we can do is to strengthen the League of Nations as an instrument of peace. To strengthen the League of Nations is to abide by the principle of collective security. * * * We must recognize that at the present time there is not one state, large or small, that is not open to aggression, and that even if the next war spares one state or another, she must, sooner or later, attract the longing eyes of the victorious aggressor."

On March 17, 1938, after Austria had been invaded and while Czechoslovakia was threatened, Litvinov told the foreign press correspondents:

"I can say on behalf of the government that, on its part, it is ready as before to join in collective actions which, decided jointly with it, would have the purpose of arresting further development of aggression * * *. It agrees to proceed immediately to discuss practical measures, dictated by circumstances, with other powers in the League of Nations or outside it. Tomorrow may be too late, but today there is time yet, if all states, particularly great states, take up a firm, unambiguous standpoint on the problem of the collective salvation of peace."

Of such does the record consist. Can we show a better one? Can any other nation on earth now come forward with the record of its efforts to avert war, and offer better proof of its intentions for the future, in the form of actions of the past? In the preface to his biography of Litvinov, Arthur Upham Pope includes this paragraph:

"One thing is clear—the statesmanship of the last 30 years is bankrupt. It was powerless to stay the disaster that all feared. The foreign offices which demanded to be let alone to arrange affairs as they saw fit can no longer request, 'leave it to us.' Their policy of appeasement led straight to catastrophe, a lesson too slowly learned."

When the foreign policy of Russia, under the stress of threatened attacks from two sides, took on the color of isolation, it was hardly the becoming part for American accusers to point out the beam in her eye. Surely we had a visible mote in our own.

What was the character of that involuntary isolation into which the Soviet Union took last resort after her best efforts at collaboration and collective security were coolly set at nothing by her reluctant neighbors? Why did her foreign policy take a new direction from Munich?

Suppose that where the Pacific washes the shores of California, there was more dry land, enough land to support a compact nation of some 80,000,000 people. Suppose that nation was made up of people who despised us, regarded us as barbarians, and—last but not least—would like very much to grab our land and enslave our people. Suppose that nation began preparing itself to do just that.

Then suppose, off the shores of our Atlantic States, there lay a string of islands, on which lived other millions, another compact nation, with pretty much the same ideas about us, and with a record of past treachery matching perfectly the attack on Pearl Harbor. Suppose this nation was also getting ready.

I suspect that under those circumstances we would be the world's greatest advocates of collective security. And I suspect further that if our appeals for collective security were to fall on the deaf ears of Soviet Russia on the one side and Britain and continental Europe on the other, we, too, would begin to display a certain noticeable degree of defensive isolation.

Against one of her enemies, the one on her western frontier, Hitler, the whole world knows and honors the magnificent victories of the Russians and their unrelenting determination with us to destroy utterly the military and war-making power of that enemy. That will free one Russian frontier from the ever-constant menace of another sneak attack.

But some ask, What about Russia's enemy on her eastern boundary? Will she help, when Hitler is crushed, Britain, China, the Dutch, and us to destroy the evil common enemy Tojo and his international bandit gang? Remember that it was the Japanese Navy which, on February 8, 1904, without a declaration of war, without offense or justification, opened fire upon the Russian Navy at Port Arthur and began the Russo-Japanese War by the same dastardly kind of an attack with which she launched this war upon us at Pearl Harbor. You would not suppose that Russia has forgotten that. Nor would one believe that when Russia, with us, has an opportunity to eliminate that ever-constant menace to her security in the east that she will pass it by. It is safe always to read national policy in terms of national interest. Japan and Russia have been enemies at least through this century. They still are enemies, and I have no doubt that when Russia feels that when one frontier is safe, that she will turn her mighty strength toward establishing an equal safety and security for the other in the east. For none of us, you know—and that includes the Germans as well as the British and ourselves—like to fight a war on two fronts at the same time when we can help it. It is almost always necessary, at least, to concentrate and to emphasize war on one front if it is to be well fought.

Now from Moscow comes one of the greatest and heartening declarations of our time. We cannot suppress a great pride in what our aged but active and honorable Secretary of State has accomplished in the name of our country. He comes home to read gratitude in a Nation's admiring eyes. And he brings to his fellow countrymen assurances and solemn promises about a great many things which have been the occasion of honest concern to some, and the fuel for prejudicial and partisan fire for others. Nobody can read the Moscow Declaration without a new certainty in victory for the United Nations' cause, without new confidence that the victory we win this time shall not go with the wind. Listen to this joint declaration of Russia, Britain, China, and ourselves:

"1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

"2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

"3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

"4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

"6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

"7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period."

While we are fighting the war we are laying the structural foundations of the peace for which we fight. These four national cornerstones are great enough and mighty enough, indeed, to hold up like a new atlas, a new world.

We in the Senate by the accord of all who are not still chained by the sentiment of isolation, have agreed upon a Senate declaration which specifically incorporates point No. 4 of the Moscow Declaration, which of the seven points is the pivotal one on post-war organization. It is the intention of the Senate speaking, to echo the sentiments of the Moscow Declaration, to give assurance to our cosigners of that new charter of a new world that America has at last rid and purged itself of the virus of isolation and it stands today a stalwart protector of world peace, one who will do its honorable and great part to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare of mankind.

Yet my fellow Americans, this pledge of the Senate can be kept only if it is guaranteed by a public opinion which will never allow it once to waiver. Our constitutional requirement that treaties be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting in the Senate when the vote is had, in a country like ours of many religions, many races, of intense political partisanship, of many emotional and economic stresses and strains, is a precarious foundation for any sustained and forthright foreign policy by our Government. It would seem only fair to say that if the Senate is to insist upon its prerogative, which the Constitution clearly gives it, to be the final arbiter of American foreign policy, that that prerogative must be exercised before treaties are made as well as afterward. Surely the Senate can ill-afford to say that however many nations may gather together in common counsel, however momentous may be the issues that they decide, however delicate may be the equilibrium which wise statesmanship and common sense comprise may bring about, however great the need for haste in reaching international accord may be, that the Senate may comfortably sit by and see all of such a great drama relatively unmoved, and then in due course when the document is presented as a

formal instrument, as the curtain of the conference falls, bring it under the dissecting scrutiny of the Senate and subject it to the legislative technique in the Senate which provides for leisurely consideration, protracted hearings, unlimited debate, and finally the requirement of a two-thirds majority for ratification, without taking very great and dangerous responsibility.

I might as well say, my friends, that I do not believe that the present senatorial power of ratification is consistent with the national safety or world peace. A technique which might well have applied to bilateral treaties of moment only to the contracting parties is no longer adequate or effective as was proved in what the Senate did to the Treaty of Versailles, to treaties signed by one or two score of nations, which set up world settlement and which alone are the vehicles of world welfare and world peace. Surely the requirements of our system of checks and balances would give the people adequate safeguard against executive action in the making of treaties, if the power of ratification were given to a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House of Representatives, and if each body by a majority vote had authority to fix the time when the final vote upon ratification or not should occur. This would take away from 17 Senators in the Senate a theoretical power to shatter the hope of the world. It would take away from 12 Senators, constituting a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, the power to thwart the plaintive appeal of the Nation and the mute call of the dead. It would deprive perhaps a lesser number, who might constitute a subcommittee, of the clutch which might choke world hope and aspiration.

In this great Nation where democracy stands, thank God, still secure against every onslaught and attack, where the people are sovereign in power, the people must also bear the heavy weight of responsibility for the conduct and the course of their country. We must not only will the kind of a world which our gallant fighting men and all who have sacrificed deserve, we must in the democratic way we find the means through which to build that world. It is not enough to profess democracy. It is not enough even to save it. We must make democracy work at home and abroad.

Let the people, therefore, search out every danger to the kind of a world they want, whether it be prejudice, ignorance, shortsightedness, or whether it be techniques outmoded and outworn which might deprive the victors of their just gains, might make futile and vain all that they have given, whether of treasure or of blood.

My fellow Americans, as you have today commemorated a great friendship with a great people, go out to make that opinion which shall keep that friendship and, better, deserve it; and go out, my fellow Americans, to your other great tasks which beckon and challenge you; and walk firmly and thoughtfully as you go, for you must know that it is history which follows after you.

Inter-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and suggestive address delivered by the Reverend Dr. Joseph B. Code, director of the Inter-American Institute, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, at Habana, Cuba, on September 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here in this ancient city of Habana where so much of the New World's history had its beginning, I am bringing to a close my visit to the peoples of America. This trip has taken me from Mexico as far south as Chile and the Argentine, and then northward to the Caribbean, in the hope of finding out how the Inter-American Institute may best serve the cause of peace and unity in the Western Hemisphere.

I have been in large cities and in little towns; on the big estancias and on little chacras. I have visited thatch-roofed villages in the Tropics and mud dwellings in the Andes. I have talked with whites and blacks, and with browns of every conceivable shading. I have been received by heads of governments and have listened to an appreciation of them from many of those they govern. I have discussed problems with dignitaries of the church and with priests and educators. I have spent hours with fathers and mothers, and with young men and women, in groups and individually. I have talked with diplomats and politicians, with writers, poets, social workers. I have listened to labor leaders, to laborers; to their plans and projects.

Everywhere I have found friends. I have found intelligence, sympathy, and the desire for cooperation. Differences of opinion, even regarding fundamentals, were not avoided; they were threshed out in friendly candor. But always I came away convinced that most of our differences are superficial. Not that principles were thrown overboard, but that principles were clearly understood and remained fixed in our discussions.

As a priest, I found myself in a particularly happy position to be understood, as well as to understand many attitudes, many problems. I was a "padre," only incidentally a foreigner. My priesthood was the open sesame by which I approached many, even those not particularly religious. All this reminded me of what the late cardinal archbishop of Rio de Janeiro once said to a friend of mine: "The spiritual highway is the only enduring way." Cardinal Leme not only knew his people, he knew the correct approach to the unity of the Americas.

But the unity of the Americas cannot be achieved unless there is a better understanding among the peoples of our hemisphere. Much has been accomplished to bring the governments together, but much has to be done to influence public opinion. This is not impossible, because of what the Americas have in common—our heritage of freedom, our civilization, our common need of regional security. And yet there are factors which tend to divide us; and no intelligent plan for unity can afford to ignore them.

Undoubtedly the first and most important of these factors is that of religion and morality. There is a great deal of misunderstanding among both North and South Americans on this subject. A forthright examination of the problem, and an honest attempt to arrive at a solution of it is the first requisite for hemispheric unity.

First of all, it must be made clear to Latin Americans that, despite their differences in religion, the majority of North Americans condemn that which would destroy morality or spirituality among their fellow men. The United States of America was founded on Christian principles, and although there is a separation of church and state, there is no official attempt to separate the people from religion. On the contrary, more than ever before do those in authority pay tribute to the value of fixed religious principles in the lives of the people.

Secondly, it should be emphasized that the United States is not a nation of materialists simply because of its material advancement. Rather should this advancement be looked upon as an indication of what has been achieved in the past through cooperative action. It may also be regarded as a signpost of what might be expected, even in a material way, through a closer cooperation among the nations of this hemisphere.

Nor should Latin Americans be allowed to think that the United States believes in encouraging the undermining of the spiritual forces of another nation, or of turning into a market-place of contending religious groups any nation which for centuries has had religious unity within its boundaries. Those who might be engaged in such activities, if they be Americans, are not representative of that which is solid or respectable in their own country; and because of whatever resentment they arouse among those who have given them hospitality they do irreparable harm to the cause of religion, as well as to the cause of unity. As a matter of fact, the United States has had sufficient experience of its own of what division among religious groups can do to national unity without being unmindful of the danger to international unity should this unfortunate commodity be exported. Today the United States encourages every effort to unite men of good will for the sake of civilization.

Neither is the United States a country of agnostics, of scoffers of religion, or of frivolous men and women impervious to morality. On the contrary, it is a nation much different from that which is so often pictured on the screen, in the press and in much of the literature regarding it which reaches Latin America. Unfortunately, the real United States is scarcely known to the south of us—our institutions of learning, of charity, of social welfare; our love of fellow man, often for the sake of God, which inspires thousands of men and women to sacrifice time and income for things which will be paid back only in eternity. Indeed, the United States may provide examples of heroic sacrific—heroic holiness—unsurpassed elsewhere in America. Yes, much is to be seen beyond the smoke-screened skylines of northern cities—an America of little towns and simple living; of honest, hard-working men and women; of simple pleasures and much liberty; of all those homely things dear to man everywhere.

But, to effect a considerable change in attitude among our Latin-American neighbors, we on our part must understand and respect their mentality. Any attempt to change or modify the fundamental structure of this mentality becomes a boomerang to slap the future.

First of all, it should be understood that the mentality of Latin American is Catholic, even though many Latin Americans take no part in the life of the church or are even religious. Yet to understand even them we must understand Catholicism, whatever our preconceived ideas might be regarding it. To ignore the moral position of the Church in Latin America would be fatal to hemispheric unity, since the church, Catholicism's collective institution, is too great a part of the average Latin American's life to neglect it in any serious study of this problem. For that which the state represents as decisive for an understanding of the political position of the nations to the south of us, the church represents as decisive for an understanding of their moral position.

It is not without comfort to know that this moral element stems in great part from an institution whose background is global, established in every country of the Americas.

This is where the church of the United States can play an important role, for more than any other agency, it knows how to enrich a Latin culture with an American spirit, blending the two so that there is no loss to either; in short, to effect that which ex-President Marco Fidel Suarez, of Colombia, proposes as essential for inter-American relations, a New World cultural harmony which would include Latin, Saxon, and truly American elements, a harmony which must not include merely material things but also spiritual.

To multiply efforts toward closer cooperation without taking this into consideration would result only in an increasing alertness on the part of Latin Americans; even a noticeable shifting to the defensive on the part of that great number of them who cherish their faith and culture as priceless heirlooms.

It is not sufficient, therefore, to strike upon a working policy with the governments of Latin America, for sometimes governments express poorly the moral sentiments of even the majority of the governed; the people of Latin America must be convinced of the value of a united hemisphere.

Throughout my travels I saw a growing determination that out of the present crisis a new order must be established, an order based on Christian freedom, not a freedom of economic imperialism or individual selfishness, not a freedom which is determined by a few to use power regardless of the general welfare; but a freedom which would not allow the strong to oppress the weak, or the rich to get richer at the expense of their fellowmen.

Many expressed themselves quite clearly regarding matters of world policy. They insisted that no longer may the claims of Christianity be dismissed as irrelevant to international problems. They are convinced that religion is the only power which can repair the ruins brought upon our heads by secular civilization; and democracy, worthy of the name, can only exist if man is regarded as an eternal being. In effect, that the reconciliation of the world and its unity can only be accomplished on a deeper plane than that of economic power or worldly interest.

The experience of the past months has shown me quite unequivocably that just as love of freedom and democracy has bound the countries of the Western Hemisphere in a destiny which must be shattered by separation or disaffection, the spiritual forces of the Americas must be utilized to defend these principles. As Pope Pius XII has pointed out in his encyclical, Darkness Over the Earth, "the loss of faith in God is followed by a loss of moral principles and finally by the loss of all that binds man to man in a spiritual brotherhood."

America still has faith in God and in what binds man to man in spiritual brotherhood. That is why she intends to erect her great lighthouse cross in the Dominican Republic, as an act of gratitude to her Christian discoverer, and as a sign of the only true basis for unity in the Western Hemisphere; furthermore, as a challenge to the new barbarians of Europe and Asia that the cross which Columbus planted has taken on a new significance; that through a united America it will redeem those held in bondage and once more save man and civilization.

The night before I left Rio, a member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, and a great intellectual, said to me: "Carry in your heart, Father, with our friendship, our southern cross. And may the cross once more illumine the world and guide poor men."

This is the farewell of a poet. Brazil is full of poets and so is all of Latin America. But a poet's soul cannot be touched by money; nor a warm sentimental heart won with a cold 20-year contract. Twenty years mean nothing in Latin America; only mañana is real. But in the depths of their Catholic souls, drenched with centuries of timeless truths, they understand eternity. And so we, their brothers in Christ, can couch the terms of our contract of fellowship in the common tongue of faith, sign it with the cross of Christ, and bind it in eternity.

This is the contribution of the Inter-American Institute to the unity of America.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with the subject of subsidies addressed to me by Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1943.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I wish to thank you most heartily for your letter to Mr. Brown of October 14, bringing to his attention Mr. Stanley S. Langendorf's letter supporting the use of subsidies. As you say, his arguments confirm the convictions of many people throughout the country. They demand the serious consideration of all who are sincerely interested in the successful carrying out of the stabilization program.

The fact that subsidies cost far less than the price increases which would occur without them is, unfortunately, not very widely recognized. There are many economic and institutional factors in our economy that cause one price increase to give rise to others. The use of subsidies at strategic points in the economy thus prevents not only one price increase but a whole series of price and wage increases.

While this fact is often referred to in a general way, I have the impression that the full force of these interrelationships between prices and wages and the many forms they take are not appreciated by those who have not had intimate day-to-day contact with price problems. It may be worth while, therefore, to put down on paper some of the many reasons why subsidies can forestall price increases that far exceed them in amount and consequently give rise to savings on consumer and Government expenditures far in excess of their cost.

1. If a cost increase at an early stage of production, such as the manufacturer or processor level, is met by a price increase, this increase may have to be passed on to succeeding wholesale and retail stages of business with the percentage mark-ups over costs that are customary in the trade. As a result of the application of standard percentage mark-ups, the retail price increase will exceed the original cost increase in dollars and cents. A subsidy, however, would not have to be greater than the original cost increase.

2. In most industries there are fairly wide differences in costs between firms or, as in the case of the mining industries with which you are so familiar, between different parts of the output of a given firm. To meet the high costs of a fraction of the total output by a price increase, which would ordinarily have to be given on an industry-wide basis, would be to require buyers to pay not only the amounts necessary to cover the high costs but also to pay a higher price to low-cost producers who do not need it. A subsidy, on the other hand, can be confined to that portion of the industry that really needs the additional return. You are, of course, familiar with the enormous savings that arise from this fact in the case of the premium price plan on copper, lead, and zinc. It is estimated that if the high cost of producing the marginal output of these metals were met by granting a uniform price increase to the entire industry the costs of these metals to the buyer—who today is principally the Government—would be raised by approximately $1,000,000,000. Under the premium price plan, however, which confines the additional returns to the high-cost producers, the additional cost is about $80,000,000. While this is a particularly spectacular case, substantial savings are also being realized in many other cases.

These two forms of savings are direct in the sense that they are realized upon the commodity with respect to which the subsidy is paid. More important are the indirect effects, which reflect the interrelations between the price of the commodity being subsidized and the other prices and wages in the economic system. The following are the main interrelationships which give rise to indirect savings:

3. Price ceilings on farm commodities may not, under the statutes, be set at levels which reflect less than parity prices to agricultural producers. Consequently, any price increase for a commodity that enters into the index of prices paid by farmers and raises parity prices may force the O. P. A. to raise ceilings on commodities which are controlled at levels close to parity. This means higher food prices to consumers.

4. A rise in price ceilings on agricultural commodities which are important costs in the production of other farm commodities will have further repercussions. For example, if the price of feeds has to be raised, it may become necessary to raise the prices of meats, poultry, and dairy products. But all these prices can remain undisturbed if higher returns to feed producers take the form of a subsidy rather than a price increase, since a subsidy does not mean higher costs to users of feeds.

5. Another important type of price relationship exists between commodities that have the same use, either actually or potentially. If grain feeds go up, for example, those who use them will turn to protein feeds. This may give rise to a wasteful use of the latter feeds. In the many cases where rationing is not possible, such wasteful use can be discouraged only by permitting a corresponding price increase. A most striking example of this occurred in Germany during the last war, when the price of grease for lubrication was permitted to rise, while the price of butter was held down. As a result of the discrepancy between the prices of grease and butter, it became cheaper for farmers to use butter for lubricating their machinery. This wasteful use of butter would never have occurred if the returns to producers of grease had been raised by granting them a subsidy instead of a price increase.

6. Competition between commodities for the use of the same productive resources involves another type of price relationship. For example, corn and soybeans are grown on the same type of land. It is said that a rise in the price of corn would cause farmers to shift acreage out of soybeans into corn, and that if corn rises this result can be prevented only by permitting a corresponding rise in the price of soybeans. If returns to corn producers are increased by a subsidy instead of

a price increase, then the price of soybeans as well as that of corn can remain stable.

7. Then, of course, there is the familiar relationship between the cost of living and wage rates. If prices entering into the cost of living go up, the wage stabilization program cannot be maintained. If this program breaks down, costs of doing business will rise. The increase of labor costs, it should be noted, would not necessarily be confined to industry and commerce. Farm operators have often pointed out that rising wages in the city tend to force up wage rates on the farm. The general effect of higher labor costs on our price ceilings would be a major threat to the entire stabilization program. There would unquestionably have to be price increases over a wide area. Once this occurred, there is no telling where the increases would stop.

This last point is generally familiar, but I think it important to note that it is only one of many. I have pointed out six other obvious reasons why the cost of subsidies would be less than that of the price increases which are alternative to them, but I could undoubtedly think of several more factors if I took the time. It is because of these interrelationships that we regard the power to use subsidies as essential to the stabilization program.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Report of Committee on Foreign Relations of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. DANAHER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the executive committee of the American Legion met in Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18, 1943. A report was submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the acting chairman was Col. Anson T. McCook, of Hartford, Conn. Colonel McCook has sent to me an extract from the report of the committee. Because of Colonel McCook's distinguished service rendered to his country, and his status as a citizen of my State, his words are entitled, it seems to me, to more than usual credit. On that account I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the extract from the committee's report to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To spare the next generation what we are going through now is our greatest objective. There are two chief essentials to this: To win the war so thoroughly that there can be no doubt about it, and to create a peace which is one in fact and not merely in name.

Our international relations, and therefore our citizens, will be affected for generations by whether peace comes as the result of complete victory or is merely a premature product of war-weariness. To hesitate, with our goal in sight, could only mean greater bloodshed and destruction.

The American Legion believes in facing facts, even when unpleasant. There is no doubt that Germany now is fighting for a deadlock in order to gain better peace terms, and there is real danger of her accomplishing this if we relax our efforts for a single instant. Another certainty is that Germany is seeking a negotiated peace, as a foundation on which to build prosperity for herself at the expense of other nations. Before this war began, Germans were continually boasting that they won the peace in 1918 even though they lost that war. It will pay us now to remember how they accomplished it then, in the light of the propaganda campaign which they are already beginning. They did it then by tiring out the Allies until they accepted a soft armistice and a softer peace; by playing upon our sympathies and especially for the German children whom they were planning to build up into soldiers for the next war; by laying the blame upon one man, the Kaiser, and claiming that the German people themselves were not guilty; by promises and false statements which led to the forgiveness of indemnities and to huge loans which were never repaid. Indeed, by constant repetition of clever propaganda they actually succeeded in turning the picture around, so that they came to be looked upon almost as victims instead of as the aggressors.

In the light of our own experience, it is our duty to warn our fellow citizens against this danger. At this very moment the Nazis are destroying hundreds of precious American lives; they are ruthlessly turning Italy into a shambles; they are cruelly starving those peoples whose lands they occupy—all with the deliberate purpose of wearing us and our allies down until we are ready to accept a negotiated peace. In reply, they should be told in unmistakable language that the harder they make it for others, the harder it must go with them. They will try to placate us by getting rid of Hitler, and probably by dissolving the Nazi Party, but they will remain the same boche—bent on world domination and self profit at the expense of other nations. Japan, too, is dangerous, deadly dangerous, but at least we see that danger and realize their crude brutality. Germany is cleverer and more plausible but both nations are a world-menace. Both nations must be completely beaten down and not given a breathing spell when they cry "kamerad." This is neither a doctrine of revenge nor of hate; it is merely the same common sense that stops the criminally insane so that they cannot go on killing others.

Polish Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my very able colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] at Manhattan Center, New York, on Sunday afternoon, November 21, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Polish independence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this twenty-fifth anniversary of Polish independence the petition of Poland for world sympathy does not fall upon deaf ears.

The world has been gradually awakening to the realization that the peril of Poland was the peril of the world.

Suppose Poland had yielded to Hitler in September 1939. Suppose Poland had not fought the overwhelming might of the invader with a courage that was sublime.

No one can now doubt that France would then have been the first victim of the blitzkrieg and the inevitable Battle of Britain might then have taken a very different course.

Poland saved France from a surprise attack. Poland gave France and Britain time to mobilize. Poland made it possible for the world to have 9 months in which to arm. One shudders to contemplate the isolation in which America might well have found itself if Poland had not chosen to resist.

Poland is the symbol of the spirit of the world that is to be. For Poland, France, and Britain chose to fight. Because of Poland aggressors everywhere are now face to face with doom.

Mussolini marks the path down which Hitler and Hirohito must march. Their funeral dirge is sounding in factories and forges everywhere around the world.

Two million Polish victims of German aggression will not have died in vain. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the deliverance of freemen everywhere.

Five million Americans of Polish extraction may count with confidence upon the sympathy and support of their fellow Americans in the restoration of the Republic of Poland.

American independence owes much to the assistance of Kosciusko in its great hour of peril. On this great Polish patriot George Washington relied for the training of the Continental armies in the terrible ordeal of the American Revolution.

A statue in Lafayette Square opposite the White House bears eternal testimony to America's debt to this freedom-loving son of Poland.

Poles still fight in the cause of freedom. More than a thousand German planes have been shot down by the Polish Air Force.

Small units of the Polish Navy helped the United Nations in the landings in Italy.

Cordell Hull has made it clear that there has been no compromise or sacrifice of the rights of any nation in the discussions incident to the Moscow Pact.

On the basis of the high principles for which America is fighting and within the frameworks of those principles as announced in the Moscow Declaration, Cordell Hull can be depended upon to persist in his efforts to attain the liberation of all oppressed peoples and the establishment of international peace and security, based on sovereign equality.

Unilateral declarations cannot bind the United Nations. The new spirit of mutual confidence emerging from the Moscow Conference will reassure those who have long sought security in vain in geography.

Millions of Americans will watch with jealous eyes the implementing of the Moscow pledges in the developments of each passing day.

America is united as never before in its determination to eliminate the fruits of aggression as the only way in which aggressors can be taught that aggression does not pay.

International law and order are the only guaranty of peace.

Poland has priority in its claim for consideration before the tribunal of world opinion.

Poland has shown sublime fortitude in fighting for its freedom and has earned the gratitude and admiration of liberty-loving people everywhere.

A century ago Thomas Jefferson denounced the partition of Poland as a crime. A century later Woodrow Wilson characterized it as "one of the great crimes of history," and the people's commissars in Moscow in 1919 termed it "contemptible imperialism."

Poland comes to the peace table clothed in all the majesty of its tragic sacrifices as the first of the United Nations.

Poland comes in the undivided garment of its sovereign equality seeking only justice at the hands of its allies whom it has so greatly served.

The test of the possibility of world order may well be found in the consideration of a nation that has sacrificed so much in the cause of liberty and independence.

Poland will live, because for it so many were willing to die.

The Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able radio address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the night of December 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, irrespective of politics or of the views of various pressure groups, it is the solemn duty of every Member of the Congress to exert every effort at his command to the end that inflation does not engulf our economy.

I do not like subsidies. Nevertheless I strongly support the present subsidy program. I do not like war, either, but I nevertheless support wholeheartedly the expenditure and other programs necessary to win the war. I support subsidies because they are an essential tool to do the stabilization job which must be done if we are to win the war and win the peace.

There is absolutely no doubt that the only alternative to subsidies is higher prices of consumer goods. Higher prices of consumer goods means a higher cost of living, and a higher cost of living will beget higher wages, and higher wages will again mean higher costs of consumer goods, and soon our economy will become enmeshed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people but will curtail our productivity now, and almost destroy it in post-war years.

There are many methods by which subsidies have been paid but all of them have a very simple purpose—to prevent this upward spiral. Inflation itself is simply this upward, self-propelling spiral, which everyone agrees ends in disaster. Subsidies prevent it by means of Government payments to bridge the gap which inevitably arises in wartime between rising costs of production of essential commodities and stable prices to consumers.

For every one of us, as taxpayer, consumer, worker, businessman, or farmer, subsidies mean simply an insurance policy—a small payment made to avert an infinitely greater one which would have to be made if we should be forced to pay inflated prices for our staggering war program. It has been conservatively estimated that our war cost would have been increased by $68,000,000,000 had we paid for material at World War No. 1 inflated prices. It is amounts of this magnitude or larger with which we are dealing when we question whether it is wise to spend a few hundred millions to hold back the tremendous forces which are now pent up in our economy.

I come from an agricultural State. I am a farmer myself. I am, therefore, particularly concerned with the welfare of farmers, both now and especially after the war is over. What I want to stress with all the force at my command is that subsidies are an insurance policy for the farmers as well as others.

I myself think the farmers realize this. I venture to say they are being misrepresented by those high-pressure lobbyists who pretend to speak for farmers and descend upon us in Congress and the Senate like a cloud of locusts. I have talked with the farmers in my State, and I know that the majority of them understand the part which subsidies play in the stabilization program and understand what the stabilization program has done to keep down the prices of the things they buy without unduly restricting the prices of the things they sell. They agree that the stabilization program, and the food subsidies which are a vital part of it, should be retained. I know they fear inflation. They do not favor run-away prices. It is my contention that if we let the bars down and permit the cost of living to rise—as it will, as sure as night follows day—the chief sufferers, when judgment day comes, will be the farmers of our Nation. I believe the farmers know that.

I should like to take this opportunity to point out to the farmers of this Nation just what they have at stake.

1. If the subsidy program is thrown out, many of the price-support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are in danger.

2. Farmers should realize that it is the price-stabilization program which accounts in considerable part for their present prosperous position. Notwithstanding the fact that, as a rule, prices of what farmers buy usually keep pace—or more—with the rise in prices of what they sell, prices of commodities that the farmers must buy have risen only 34 percent in this war, as compared with a rise of 119 percent of the things the farmers sell. In World War No. 1, on the other hand, while prices farmers received rose 91 percent, prices farmers paid rose 71 percent. This is why the farmer is well off today. Once the stabilization lid is off, the prices of the things farmers use on the farm will rise and eventually overtake the prices of the commodities they sell. If, as is certain, industrial wages rise when the price lid is taken off, labor costs will also go up, much higher than they are now, because of increased attractiveness to jobs in the cities.

3. When the inevitable deflation sets in, farm prices will fall more rapidly than the prices of the things the farmers buy. We all remember what happened to farmers after the last war. After the inflation had burned itself out in 1920, prices received by farmers fell by 41 percent from their high point within a year, whereas prices paid by farmers for what they need on the farm fell less than half as much—only 18 percent—in the same period. And that is not the whole story. The prices farmers received maintained a steady downward fall and remained at low ebb until the present war broke out, whereas the prices farmers paid stayed up for many years. American agriculture could not stand a repetition of this disaster. The way to avoid it is to prevent inflation.

Finally, if the stabilization lid is removed, the cost of the war and hence the level of the national debt will rise by scores if not hundreds of billions, and the interest burden on this debt will be crushing on all producers. All of us will suffer, but especially the tillers of the soil, as they did after the last war.

In short, farmers of America, the whole country will lose by the elimination of the subsidy program; but you yourselves, taking the long view, have more to lose than any other group.

For the future of free America and free American agriculture as we know it, inflation must be prevented at all costs. That is why I am convinced that all true and real friends of the farmers of our country should be for the subsidy program. For without the subsidy program inflation cannot be prevented.

The Murray-Wagner-Dingell Social Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Senator to the Doctors," from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 29, 1943, having to do with the Murray-Wagner-Dingell social security bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR TO THE DOCTORS

At the conclusion of an address last week before the Association of Internes and Medical Students of New York, Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, after discussing the Murray-Wagner-Dingell social-security bill, issued a challenge. "I invite the medical profession to study the bill," he said. "I ask them to give us their help in improving it * * * so that it will be the best measure that doctors and the public can work out together."

The bill, more often referred to as the Wagner bill, is the one which its opponents, including the American Medical Association, have been attacking on the grounds that it would bring about the socialization of medicine and would interfere with the patient's free choice of a doctor. In a recent editorial, we observed that while most of the professed objectives of the measure seemed desirable, the bill as presently constituted is of highly doubtful merit from both economic and administrative standpoints.

However, those who are in sympathy with the proposal to extend some form of medical insurance to the many who need it (only about 3 percent of the population is enrolled in voluntary insurance plans) are becoming impatient with the continued attacks on the Wagner bill which appeal almost wholly to the emotions. Waldemar Kaempffert, of the New York Times, observes in the November American Mercury that the free choice argument with which the A. M. A. and others are so much concerned does not bear scrutiny. "There is no free choice in the wards and public clinics of municipal and incorporated charitable hospitals," he says. Nor does free choice exist in the Army and Navy, he adds, whose doctors have been earning "hosannas of praise." Mr. Kaempffert declares that physicians are rarely chosen intelligently by the patient; often the meeting of the two is haphazard.

He is arguing against voluntary insurance based on free choice of physician, since he

regards it as placing actuarial soundness above quality of medical care. The country is not now prepared to go as far as Mr. Kaempffert proposes, but it ought to be told the facts about free choice, and it ought to recognize that private physicians, hospitals, and clinics can operate successfully in competition with public medical centers. In addition, Senator MURRAY'S invitation to the doctors ought not to go begging.

Assistance to European Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials, from three Washington papers, and one New York paper, relating to the extending of assistance to the surviving Jewish people of Europe.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of November 24, 1943]

SAVING THE SURVIVORS

It is a rare occurrence in legislative history for a bill or a resolution introduced in either House of Congress to have multiple sponsorship and the backing of members of both parties. This, however, is precisely what happened in the case of the resolution introduced in the Senate on November 9 urging the creation of a commission "to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany." Bearing the name of Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, this resolution is cosponsored by Senators TAFT, THOMAS of Utah, RADCLIFFE, MURRAY, JOHNSON of Colorado, GUFFEY, FERGUSON, CLARK of Missouri, VAN NUYS, DOWNEY, and ELLENDER. A similar resolution has been introduced in the House by Congressman WILL ROGERS, Jr., of California, and JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, of New York. Hearings on the resolution are now under way.

The fact that so many distinguished lawmakers are backing this resolution suggests the urgency of the move they recommend. Even though faced by the certainty of ultimate defeat, the Nazis are not abandoning their murderous practices against the conquered people. And now, as in the past, their sadistic fury is being vented with particular ferocity against the Jews. Last March the Congress by concurrent resolution strongly expressed its condemnation of this "mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children." But resolutions have not and cannot stay the hands of Hitler's executioners. If any portion of Hitler's intended victims are to be saved, they must be saved now. And, as Senator GILLETTE has pointed out, the Allies are not altogether helpless. There are several things they can do.

They can, in the first place, make clear to the peoples of occupied Europe and to the enemy that the provisions of the recent statement on atrocities signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin also apply to the Jewish people of Europe. Secondly, according to the Iowa Senator and the cosponsors of the resolution bearing his name, reservation camps under the control of such a commission as he recommends could be established in Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, and north Africa. Already Sweden, by permitting entry of 6,000 Danish Jews, has set an example which Europe's other neutrals could well be urged to imitate, although the costs of taking care of such refugees should be shared by the United Nations until such time as they can be moved to areas suitable for temporary or permanent abode.

[From the Washington Star of November 28, 1943]

EUROPE'S JEWS

Hitler has brought suffering and death to many peoples, but to no people more than to the Jews. They are the special object of his insensate, psychopathic wrath. Two years ago, when he set in motion his atrocious plan to exterminate them, they numbered 6,000,000 in the European lands he occupied or dominated. Since then, directly and indirectly, through cold-blooded slaughter and methodical maltreatment, he has managed to kill off about 2,000,000 of them, and unless something is done at once to impede him in this murderous course, he may be able to destroy many hundreds of thousands more before he himself finally goes down.

There is no way to rescue these unfortunate people until their persecutor is destroyed. But it may be possible to mitigate the worst and most cruel aspects of this appalling problem. According to the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe—a group made up of distinguished Americans of different faiths—two main courses of action could be followed now. The first of these would be for the United Nations, particularly Russia, Britain, and the United States, to make clear that although the recent joint warning to the Nazis on atrocities did not specifically name atrocities against Jews, the warning was nevertheless all-inclusive. The second would be to try to effect the transfer of Jews from Nazi-dominated countries to territories beyond Nazi control.

In line with this approach to the problem, there are now pending in both Houses of Congress identical resolutions recommending that the President establish "a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany." This is perhaps a helpful move, serving to speed up the official adoption of a rescue program that is sorely needed. The plight of the European Jews cannot be exaggerated; their lot is worse than that of any other group within the reach of Hitler.

[From the Washington Daily News of November 24, 1943]

HITLER'S JEWISH VICTIMS

Two million Jews have been exterminated by the Nazis. Four million are left in Europe. They are homeless and destitute. Hitler boasts he will get rid of them. Some will be murdered, more will be tortured, and many will die of neglect. Unless, that is, the United Nations provide temporary havens for those who can get out of the Nazi countries.

The problem is immediate. It is humanitarian, not political. It is as much a Christian as a Jewish problem—more, in the sense that any solution depends on the conscience, the initiative, and the action of so-called Christian governments.

To the honor of the United States, our Congress last March by concurrent resolution condemned the mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children by the Nazis.

Now Congress is considering House and Senate resolutions which urge creation by the President of a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany. The resolution authors include: Representative BALDWIN of New York, and Senators GILLETTE, TAFT, RADCLIFFE, MURRAY, GUFFEY, FERGUSON, DOWNEY, ELLENDER, VAN NUYS, THOMAS of Utah, JOHNSON of Colorado, and CLARK of Missouri.

We hope this resolution passes, and that the President moves promptly.

The mere fact that the United States Government is concerned may have some effect in modifying wholesale brutality, especially in such Nazi satellite states as Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Vichy-France, where there is growing realization that the Allies are winning the war and will hold criminals to account.

But also the suggested commission would find ways to provide temporary refuge in nearby neutral and Allied territory for all those who can get out of the Nazi-controlled countries. As a practical matter, Britain should be asked to set aside its White Paper ban and to permit entry into Palestine of many such refugees for the duration.

This is not to be confused with the dispute over the future of Palestine, over a Jewish state or a Jewish army. Non-Zionists support this resolution as vigorously as Zionists. The issue is not sectarian. The sole object here is to rescue as many as possible of these Hitler victims, pending complete Allied victory and the liberation of Europe from barbarism.

Americans cannot be indifferent in this terrible emergency.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 1, 1943]

A CALL FOR LEADERSHIP

A resolution with bipartisan sponsorship has been introduced in both Houses of Congress recommending that the President create a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany.

If anything can be done to stop the Nazi mass murder of a people, surely the American people must be willing to take the lead in so doing. Sponsors of the resolution believe that much can be done. They believe, first of all, that such a resolution would have a great psychological effect on the Nazis, in that it would be the first official recognition by one of the Allied Powers of the extermination program and therefore, the first official and explicit condemnation of it. They believe that official silence on the part of the great nations has given substantiation to the sardonic Nazi claim that not only does the outside world not condemn, nor purpose to punish, its bloody campaign against Jews as a people, but that those who keep silence actually condone it. They believe also that once the United States breaks the official silence—the Moscow accord and the Ottawa and similar conferences have not recognized that the extermination program has made the Jewish problem a separate one—and assumes leadership in action, the other United Nations will follow. The monstrous Nazi claim may then be countered with concerted denial as a part of our propaganda war. The nations may then demand the release of Jews by Germany and its satellites with the threat of specific retribution to back it. It is thought that the satellite nations at least would respond to such a demand. United action is needed, and needed soon, if psychological force is to save lives within the Nazi citadel.

What has held up such action before this is, no doubt, the conviction, widely held, that

liberation for the Jews, as for the other hostages of Europe, will be soonest accomplished by concentrating on speedy victory for the United Nations. There is difficulty in securing united action for any other purpose now. Incidentally the fact that there is an Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees has led to the supposition that something is being done, whereas that committee cannot rescue hostages from within Nazi-held Europe.

Certain it is that nothing will be accomplished to save Nazi Europe's surviving Jews from methodical extermination by doing nothing. The resolution calls for affirmation of the American position, assumption by America of leadership in doing whatever may be done to save lives now. We should not hesitate to lead in so imperative a humanitarian cause.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent radio interview of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., by Earl Godwin, on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GODWIN. One of the big domestic problems since the outbreak of war has been the alarming rise in youthful violators of the law. No one in the country is more concerned or is closer to this problem than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We have discussed this problem many times and tonight I am happy to have Mr. Hoover here in the studio with me to discuss this problem for you. Now Mr. Hoover, just what is it about the rise of juvenile delinquency that causes you and your men of the F. B. I. the greatest concern?

Mr. HOOVER. Frankly, Earl, the heartbreaking thing about the juvenile crime situation today is the fact that we know it is just the forerunner of a more serious crime situation as these youthful violators grow older. The present situation cannot be charged entirely to wartime laxity of morals and a last-fling philosophy of life. That may be the case with the older violator, but when mere children turn to crime there is a more sinister reason. This condition did not come on us overnight. It is deep-rooted and does not forecast a very bright picture for the future. Something has happened to the moral stamina of America when the conventions and principles of honesty and common decency are regarded as "old fogey" and "antique." There are certain fundamentals in life that are essential.

Mr. GODWIN. And right here, Edgar, let me say that what you told me on the way to the studio about the increase in arrests of girls certainly proves your point.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes; in the first 9 months of this year the arrests of girls under 21 years of age for offenses against common decency increased 69.6 percent over the same period last year, while arrests of girls under 21 for crimes against property such as robbery, burglary, larceny, and other related crimes increased 33.6 percent. But that does not tell the whole story, because in 1942, arrests increased over 1941, and so on. Even today, more boys and girls 18 years of age are being arrested than in any other age group. As a matter of fact, 17-year-olds alone accounted for a 25.3 percent increase in arrests in the first 9 months of this year over 1942. We have just completed a survey of actual arrests in 18 leading cities, representing a population of 10,000,000 inhabitants, which reflects a 42.7 percent increase in the arrests of boys under 18 years of age and a 43 percent increase in the arrests of girls under 18 years of age in the first 6 months of this year over a corresponding period in 1942. In the face of these facts, I have been amazed to note a tendency on the part of social theorizers and foggy-minded performers to say that juvenile delinquency figures are not as alarming as they sound. In fact, they seek to justify their ostrich-like attitude by saying that the rise in the arrests of youthful offenders is due to increased law enforcement, which is definitely not the case.

Mr. GODWIN. Right along that line, Edgar, I know of a minister who said only a few weeks ago that the problem of delinquency is not so serious when you consider that there are over 135,000,000 people in the United States.

Mr. HOOVER. That is an astounding observation, and it represents a viewpoint that must assume a great burden of the responsibility for the present trends. Above all, we must face the stark facts and the grim reality that if only 100,000 crimes were committed a year, that would be too many. But, last year alone, an estimated 1,436,000 of the more serious crimes were committed and there was a total of 16,000,000 lesser offenses committed. We know from actual case studies that persons under 21 years of age account for 13 percent of all murderers arrested, 40 percent of all robbers, 56 percent of all burglars, 65 percent of all car thieves, 27 percent of all forgers, 29 percent of all arsonists, and 37 percent of all thieves arrested.

Mr. GODWIN. You don't need to go any further. No thinking person who knows the facts will argue with you on that point. But I wonder if you will tell us of a few cases that come over your desk each day.

Mr. HOOVER. It is a discouraging story, and comes from all sections. In an Ohio city, enough dynamite caps and detonators to blow up a good-sized building were stolen by two boys, aged 12 and 14. In another midwestern city, several blasts occurred in a vacant lot which the authorities promptly traced to a group of boys who were playing pranks. In a southern city, the plans of a youthful gang of over 30 youngsters led by an adult were nipped in the bud when it was revealed that they were buying uniforms in order to get into theaters, dances, and other places of amusement for half price. That would have led to other activities of a more venturesome and violent nature. Then, there was the 15-year-old girl who was arrested in the Southwest who had teamed up with a gang of professional criminals. Her father was a drunkard who had deserted his family. Her mother let her shift for herself. The young girl began her sordid career when she started to smoke marihuana cigarettes. It's the old story. First some adult fails to live up to his parental responsibility, then a youth is allowed to do as he pleases.

Mr. GODWIN. You certainly are right. And I wonder, Edgar, if you have a word of advice for our listeners?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes; I do. Our country's future rests in the hands of the youth today. In order that they may be prepared to carry that great responsibility it is the sacred duty of every mother and father and, as a matter of fact, of all adults to prepare them for it. We must give them every advantage and aid and example within our power to develop within this youth the fundamentals of honesty and integrity in dealing with their fellows. We must instill in them the principles of freedom and liberty and patriotism to carry on the ideals of the founders of this great Republic. Our democracy has been established—whether it stands or falls depends upon those who follow us. If they are not prepared by us, it is we who have failed.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to provide useful, constructive, and valuable employment for our men in the armed forces when this war is over, it is going to be necessary to develop our inland waterways.

There is no project under the shining sun that will yield greater returns, in shortening transportation distances and in reducing transportation costs, than the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, which has been rendered doubly feasible and necessary by the developments on the Tennessee River, as well as on the Ohio, the Cumberland, the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, and their tributaries.

As has been pointed out, the bed of the Tennessee River is on a plateau about 100 feet above the bed of the Tombigbee where it is formed by the confluence of Brown and Mackys Creeks about 20 or 25 miles from the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, the northern terminus of this proposed inland waterway.

When the Pickwick Dam was constructed, just a few miles below the mouth of Yellow Creek, it raised the water level on the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek by something like 50 feet, and thereby eliminated the necessity for locks to raise south-bound traffic from the Tennessee River to the level of this proposed canal, and, as I said, rendered this project doubly feasible, as is evidenced by the report of the Board of Army Engineers approving it.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the statement of Col. P. A. Feringa, United States Army, resident member, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, made before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, October 20, 1943.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF COL. P. A. FERINGA, UNITED STATES ARMY, RESIDENT MEMBER, BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HAREORS

Colonel FERINGA. Is it your wish that I just go ahead and briefly describe the project, like the other projects?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; if you will.

Colonel FERINGA. The Tombigbee River rises in northeastern Mississippi. The point where it rises is about 20 miles from the Tennessee River. It flows in a generally southerly direction for about 410 miles until it joins the Alabama River, and from its confluence with the Alabama River it becomes the Mobile River and flows to the south 45 miles to enter Mobile Bay.

The Mobile-Tombigbee-Warrior system is a more or less parallel developed river system serving Birmingham. It is a developed waterway 9 feet deep, minimum width 200 feet. I looked up the latest figures before us and I found that in 1941 that developed waterway carried over 2,000,000 tons of commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, which one was that?

Colonel FERINGA. That is the Mobile-Tombigbee-Warrior system. I thought the figure would be interesting as the actual figure of traffic that is moving over an existing waterway generally in that area, although possibly it is not as fortunately situated.

The Tombigbee River itself has 4 feet of water from its confluence with the Alabama River to Columbus, Miss.

However, that 4 feet is available only about 4 months of the year. That, again, is a waterway which is hindered by the lack of all-year-round water.

The Tombigbee is further developed slightly, just by snagging and removing of obstructions, for the next 135 miles above Columbus, Miss., so that there presently exists a waterway from the Gulf through Mobile Bay, the Alabama River, the Tombigbee River above Columbus, Miss., to fairly close to the Tennessee River. That waterway farther up its length, though not developed, through its tributaries reaches within 20 miles of the developed Tennessee River. The basin, like the Alabama-Coosa River, is rich in resources. Foremost would be agriculture, and when I was stationed in that area not so many years ago I was struck by the richness of the soil. It goes through parts of Alabama and Mississippi where some of the most prosperous looking farms are located that I had seen up to that time. They call that part of the country the Black Belt, and it is remarkable for its development. They have recently gotten much into cattle raising, and it is a wonderfully prosperous country.

Mr. RANKIN. It is called the Black Belt because the land is black?

Colonel FERINGA. That is right, sir. It is also rich in timber resources and in minerals. The principal minerals are coal, sand and gravel, limestone, copper, zinc, iron ore, and in addition to those principal minerals there is a long list in the report showing the lesser minerals that could be developed if it were economically feasible to do so.

Before this report was submitted to Congress, to your committee, several routes were given consideration in order to develop the best one and that there might be no hesitancy on account of lack of information. It was found that the best route was from the Pickwick Pool in the Tennessee River, then down Yellow Creek, which flows, or flowed originally, into the Tennessee River and now flows into the Pickwick Pool, and Mackys Creek—Mackys Creek flowing into the East Fork of the Tombigbee, down the Tombigbee into the Mobile River and down the Mobile River to Mobile Bay and into the Gulf.

The construction contemplates a cut through the summit. That cut would be about 39 miles long and would provide a waterway 12 feet deep by a minimum width of 115 feet. I would like to mention the fact that although this report was made some years ago, even at that time consideration was given and the figures which support this report were based on a 12-foot excavation through the cut, possibly the most expensive part of the work, and also through the lateral canal. That was done, as it was seen that 12-foot navigation probably would be a fact in the future, and that therefore any of these expensive cuts or locks should be developed to their logical dimensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Colonel, that 39-mile cut, how deep would that cut have to be made?

Colonel FERINGA. That is 39 miles long, and at its deepest portion, but a comparatively short portion I think, would reach around 175 feet from the very top of the existing ground to the very bottom of the proposed canal.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the bottom of the 12-foot cut?

Colonel FERINGA. Of the 12-foot cut. And that canal would be dug deep enough so that we would have 12 feet of water throughout its length, even though the Pickwick Pool might be lowered, due to possible inordinate low stages of water in the Tennessee River.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the bottom of that cut be on a level with the pool, Pickwick Pool?

Colonel FERINGA. The bottom of the cut would be 12 feet below the lowest possible elevation in Pickwick Pool, so we would have slack water navigation from Pickwick Pool through the summit cut until we came to the dam and lock at the end of the summit cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Where would the first lock be down from Pickwick Landing?

Colonel FERINGA. The first lock would be at a high dam and lock which would be constructed at a location called the Narrows, and that would be on the southerly end of that land cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Of that 39 miles?

Colonel FERINGA. That is right, sir. After we go through the summit cut we come to a point where there now exists the East Fork of the Tombigbee River.

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel, I think you ought to explain to the judge at this point that the bed of the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this cut begins, is more than 100 feet higher than the Tombigbee River 20 miles away, so while we must have a lake-level canal down to the first lock, there will be a drop of 100 feet down to the level of the Tombigbee. That is correct, isn't it?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. The Tennessee River is up on a plateau 100 feet above the Tombigbee just 20 miles away, but by cutting through this sand ridge, the peak of which you said would be a little over 100 feet—by cutting through this sand ridge the canal would be on a level with the Pickwick Lake from the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, down to the first lock, where it drops down to the level of the Tombigbee River.

Colonel FERINGA. That would be the high lock and dam. The proposed waterway would then join the present valley of the East Fork of the Tombigbee. The East Fork of the Tombigbee has a comparatively wide flood plain and is a tortuous, winding stream, so it has been found cheaper and in the interest of the project to dig a lateral canal rather than develop this tortuous part of the river. This lateral canal would be 41 miles long, again would be 12 feet deep and a minimum width of 170 feet.

If I may, I would like to digress back to where I described the Narrows and say that that waterway, although narrow, 115 feet, would have passing places about every 4,000 feet, so that up- and down-bound tows would be able to negotiate the waterways successfully.

The CHAIRMAN. They can do that on 115 feet, can't they, without difficulty?

Colonel FERINGA. I think they could, sir, but it might possibly be desirable to have a tow tie-up, and there would be passing places. I think it depends a whole lot on how wide the tows are that will be carried. It was found better to have passing places available.

Mr. RANKIN. What width do you provide for these locks; 110 feet?

Colonel FERINGA. Seventy-five feet.

The CHAIRMAN. On the Intracoastal Waterway the channel width in some places is only 90 feet.

Colonel FERINGA. Yes, sir.

The lateral canal which I have been talking about would have at its lower portion one lock and dam at the mouth of East Fork, and the drop of the lateral canal to its southerly extremity would be accomplished by a series of 10 locks. From the lateral canal you go into the main stream of the Tombigbee River, which flows 211 miles to Demopolis. However, it is also a tortuous stream, and it is proposed by a series of cut-offs to reduce its length to 180 miles. This stream would be developed to 9-foot depth and 170-foot width. The locks, however, would provide for future improvement to the full 12 feet.

There is also proposed in the bill a new dam at Demopolis, and that dam would have a decidedly beneficial effect for this proposed project, and by means of that new dam at Demopolis and six other locks they would have slack-water navigation all the way up to where the Tombigbee joins the lateral canal.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Demopolis a place where the Tombigbee and the Black Warrior join?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes, sir. The total number of locks proposed for the project is 18. The locks would be 75 feet wide and 450 feet long. That is inside dimensions of the lock chamber.

The total cost of the project, which has been conservatively determined, is $66,000,000, and $500,000 for annual maintenance.

I think I have given you the over-all picture.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so; yes. Thank you very much, Colonel.

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel, this connection with the Tennessee and Tombigbee River here would shorten the water distance from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico by 630 miles, would it not?

Colonel FERINGA. I think that is right, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. And it would shorten the distance from the Tennessee River to Mobile itself by approximately 1,000 miles?

Colonel FERINGA. The water distance; yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, traffic going from Mobile at the present time to the Tennessee River would have to go across to the Mississippi River and then up that tortuous stream to Cairo, Ill., and then go up the Ohio for a short distance and then up the Tennessee River. It would have to travel upstream on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Tennessee, and go approximately 1,000 miles out of the way; whereas, if this project were completed, it could go up, as you say, the slack-water route on the Tombigbee less than half the distance, and the fuel cost for propelling the barges, boats, and so forth, would be infinitely less than it would going around the other way.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the water distance from the Tennessee River to Mobile down this Tombigbee inland waterway is about as far as it is from Vicksburg, Miss., to the mouth of the Mississippi River on the other route. So you can make those comparisons and see the vast difference it will make when this inland waterway is opened up. It will not only provide a shorter route, cut the distance for all downstream traffic on the upper Tennessee River as far up as Knoxville, and all traffic going upstream to points on the upper Tennessee by anywhere from 6,830 to 1,000 miles; but it would also save fighting this terrific current on the Mississippi. It would have the same effect on traffic going down this stream from the mouth of the Ohio River. It would save more than 200 miles in distance, and the

up-bound traffic would probably save 50 percent of its fuel cost.

In other words, all the ascending traffic on the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Allegheny, the Monongahela, and the Wabash would use this inland slack-water route, and traffic going up, even to Memphis, Tenn., from Mobile could much better afford to follow this slack-water route to the mouth of the Ohio River and then down the Mississippi to Memphis. There is only 8 miles difference in the distance of the two routes between Memphis and Mobile.

It would really be much cheaper for them to follow that route than it would to go up against the current of the Mississippi River to Memphis.

This would also furnish a protected inland water route and at the same time greatly shorten the distance from all these points, even from Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Gulf, by more than 200 miles, and it would also furnish an additional route for this traffic and furnish a slack water route for the ascending traffic. It would be of untold advantage to the shippers who are bound to use those streams in the years to come.

Now, the engineers have gone over this proposition time and time again. There was a proposition to bring this route down what they call Bear Creek, which empties into the Tennessee River exactly on the line between Alabama and Mississippi; but it was found that in order to do so we would have to have a lift coming up to the top of the ridge from the north as well as one from the south, with no sufficient water supply at the summit.

Individuals appeared here to advocate cutting across from the Warrior River to the Tennessee, but they found it would be impractical because they would have to have lifts through that mountainous country in there, hilly country—they would have to have lifts from the Warrior River up to the crest of the ridge, and also would have to have lifts from the Tennessee up to the crest of the ridge——

The CHAIRMAN. Those routes have all been rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. And there was no water supply at the summit, but on this route your summit is in the Pickwick Lake, so you have ample water, all the water that is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. How high is Pickwick Landing Dam? Do you recall, Colonel?

Colonel FERINGA. I have seen it, but I don't know its height.

Mr. RANKIN. The Tennessee River, I will say to the chairman, was about 100 feet above the Tombigbee before the Pickwick Landing Dam was built. The Pickwick Dam raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 50 feet. So really, the Tennessee River now is approximately 150 feet above the Tombigbee.

All the locks on the Tennessee above Pickwick Landing are narrow, I believe, 60 feet. That is right, isn't it?

Colonel FERINGA. I think you are right.

Mr. RANKIN. And the ones below Pickwick Landing are 110 feet. There are only two below Pickwick Landing—Pickwick and Gilbertsville; and they are both 110 feet wide, so these 75-foot vessels would have no trouble in going into the Mississippi River coming from the Tennessee, and all the vessels that now use the Upper Tennessee would be able to use this Tombigbee route.

The CHAIRMAN. If I remember correctly, the locks on the Warrior River are about 50 feet, are they not?

Colonel FERINGA. They are, sir. There is one larger one, but all of them except one are 50 feet.

Mr. RANKIN. With the exception, Mr. Chairman, of one other place, and that is the connection of the Don and Volga, there is no other place on earth that I have ever been able to find, where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to the other with so much saving in distance, so much ease, and so little expense.

So there, with a short connection and with these locks down to the mouth of the Warrior River on the Tombigbee, we can complete one of the greatest inland waterways in the world and connect it up with the entire inland waterway system of the whole United States. I hope I have not overdrawn that picture, Colonel.

Colonel FERINGA. I don't think you have a bit, Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important waterway projects in America. With the possible exception of the one in Russia, connecting the Volga River with the Don, which I have mentioned before, there is no other place on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, at so litle expense, and with such enormous saving in transportation costs and distances.

It is now 1,121 miles by water from the junction of this proposed Tombigbee inland waterway with the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek, to the Gulf at New Orleans, and 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile.

By this new Tombigbee route, it would be 491 miles from the Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek to the Gulf at Mobile, or 630 miles nearer than to the Gulf at New Orleans down the present route, and 786 miles nearer to Mobile. In other words, instead of following the old route down the Tennessee, the Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers down to New Orleans, 1,121 miles, and then going along the Intracoastal Waterway 156 miles to Mobile, a total distance of 1,277 miles, traffic would simply go down this Tombigbee route to Mobile, a distance of 491 miles, saving, as I said, 786 miles, or almost two-thirds of the distance.

All points on the upper Tennessee River clear to Knoxville would be 786 miles nearer to Mobile by water then they are today and 630 miles nearer than to the Gulf at New Orleans.

All points on the Ohio above the Paducah would be 356 miles nearer to Mobile and 200 miles nearer New Orleans.

All points on the upper Mississippi and its tributaries, all the way up to Chicago, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, would be 108 miles nearer to New Orleans by water and 264 miles nearer to Mobile.

Even Hickman, Ky., which is on the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Ohio, would be 36 miles nearer to New Orleans and 144 miles nearer to Mobile; while Memphis, Tenn., would be 33 miles nearer to Mobile via the Tombigbee route than it is by the present route, and only 123 miles farther from New Orleans.

This new route would reduce the water distance from Birmingham, Ala., to the Tennessee River from 1,687 miles by the present route to 441 miles by the Tombigbee route—a saving of 1,246 miles, or approximately three-fourths of the distance. It would place Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, and Demopolis 1,246 miles nearer to Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia, Gunthersville, Chattanooga, or Knoxville, by water transportation than they are now, and provide a slack-water route for the ascending traffic that would greatly reduce the fuel cost per mile traveled.

It would restore navigation on the Tombigbee and cut the water distance from Columbus, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,635 miles to 133 miles, a saving of 1,502 miles, placing Columbus 1,502 miles nearer Chattanooga or Knoxville.

It would reduce the water distance from Aberdeen, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,673 miles to 95 miles, placing Aberdeen 1,578 miles nearer all points on the upper Tennessee, and greatly reduce the distance to all points on the upper Ohio, clear to Bittsburgh, Pa., as well as to all points on the upper Mississippi and its tributaries.

It would cut the water distance from Amory, Miss., or Cotton Gin Port, to the Tennessee River, from 1,690 to 78 miles, placing it 1,585 miles nearer to all points on the upper Tennessee, to say nothing of the saving in distances to all points on the upper Ohio and the upper Mississippi and their tributaries.

It would cut the water distance from Fulton, Miss., to the Tennessee River from 1,711 miles to 57 miles, placing Fulton 1,654 miles closer to all points on the upper Tennessee and likewise reduce the distances to all points on the upper Ohio and the upper Mississippi.

Columbus, Aberdeen, Amory, or Cotton Gin Port, and Fulton were at one time served by steamboat traffic on the Tombigbee River. This project will restore that traffic with these enormous savings in distance, as well as in the costs of transportation.

I know it will be said that the Army engineers never approved this project until 1939. But it must be remembered that it was not considered as feasible as it is now until the present dams were constructed on the Tennessee River. Those dams not only made the Tennessee River navigable but the Pickwick Dam raised the water level 50 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek, the terminus of this Tombigbee Canal, making it possible to construct and operate this project without any lifts from the Tennessee River, since the summit of the project will be in the Tennessee River, in the lake behind Pickwick Dam. The water level in the Tennessee River at this place is now about 150 feet above the level af the Tombigbee River, only a few miles away, with just a slight sand ridge to cut through to make the connection.

Again, I say, it is the most feasible project of its kind to be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any way to overdraw that picture, and I don't think anything can be added to what JOHN RANKIN has said. He has been making a study of this all his life and certainly has it welf in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been very long.

Mr. BOYKIN. No; not very long, and when he gets to talking about this he gets younger, and what I hope is that we will be able to put this in pretty soon, while we are all here to see it. It is just what he says about it, one of the greatest undeveloped waterways on earth.

Mr. RANKIN. It will provide employment, Mr. Chairman, for about 6,000 men. Is that right?

Mr. BOYKIN. I think the figure has been stated at 6,000 that it will employ. Is that right, Colonel?

Colonel FERINGA. I think that figure has been stated, but I really don't recall.

Mr. RANKIN. Between five and six thousand, if I remember correctly.

Colonel FERINGA. I think it practically stands on its own feet regardless of the employment feature, and the employment benefits will just be an added feature.

Mr. RANKIN. I think you are entirely right, but I want to add this proposition: One of our greatest problems when this war is over is going to be the absorption of unemployment.

Mr. BOYKIN. And that is one thing this committee wants to do.

Mr. RANKIN. This is one project that will take up five or six thousand men and keep them employed for several years, until this project is completed.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McGann has given me the figures on the Pickwick Landing Dam. The height of it is 110 feet, and the lift at the lock is 61 feet.

Mr. RANKIN. Pickwick Landing is some little distance below the mouth of Yellow Creek, and my recollection is that it raises the water only about 50 feet at that point, so it makes the Tennessee River at that point about 150 feet higher than the Tombigbee

River, 20 miles away. That is my recollection, Colonel.

Colonel FERINGA. I don't know the exact figures, but it will be taken care of by the high dam and the canal through the narrows and the slack-water pool, which is really an extension of the Pickwick Pool.

Mr. RANKIN. That's right. Down to where the first drop takes place it will merely be an extension of the Pickwick Pool. Now, some gentlemen from Tennessee got excited for fear we were going to take water out of the Tennessee River and let it go down to the Tombigbee, but this will just take enough water to run that first lock. The water used for operating the other locks on this project will come from Browns Creek, Mackys Creek, and the Tombigbee River itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any portion of the Tombigbee above Demopolis now under improvement for navigation?

Colonel FERINGA. Yes; there is 4-foot navigation for 4 months of the year from the confluence with the Black Warrior all the way to Columbus, Miss. For 4 months of the year there is 4 feet of water.

Mr. RANKIN. And the river is legally navigable up to the confluence of Browns Creek and Mackys Creek.

Colonel FERINGA. That is about 160 miles further up.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the decision in the New River case it is navigable anywhere.

Mr. RANKIN. But the point I make is that in the old days when my grandfather first went there the steamboats during the high-water season, in the latter part of the winter and early spring, navigated that river up to a place called Walkers Bridge, just a few miles below the confluence of Browns and Mackys Creeks.

I can remember when the steamboats came up above Aberdeen. There was a time when they not only navigated the main stream of the Tombigbee, what the chairman calls the East Fork, but they also navigated the West Fork of the Tombigbee, which doesn't show on this map, to a place called Comargo. That was my great-grandfather's shipping point. He shipped his cotton from there to Mobile, up to about the time of the Civil War. The Mobile & Ohio Railway went through there in 1856, and the railroads have been fighting the waterways ever since. But up to that time that river was the main artery of commerce, and by putting in these locks and making these improvements you will not only add a most necessary length to our present inland waterway system, but you will also provide one of the most necessary and most feasible developments of its kind on earth, as I said before, except that one connection between the Don and the Volga River down near Stalingrad, I believe it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, who will we have next?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as the lawyers say, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur takes care of this proposition. That is that the thing speaks for itself, and with the colonel's explanation, and with those maps and the physical facts, I think they are sufficient to answer any arguments against it.

Colonel FERINGA. Mr. Chairman, Mr. RANKIN asked me, with your permission, to put into the record the saving in waterway distances to Gulf ports. May I place that table in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

(The table of waterway distances to Gulf ports referred to and submitted by the witness is as follows:)

Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway

WATERWAY DISTANCES TO GULF PORTS

From—	To Gulf at New Orleans via Mississippi River	To Gulf at Mobile via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings	
			Miles	Percent
Minneapolis-St. Paul	1,718	1,610	108	6
Chicago	1,398	1,290	108	7½
St. Louis	1,043	935	108	10
Cairo	860	752	108	12½
Hickman	824	788	36	4
Pittsburgh	1,841	1,641	200	11
Cincinnati	1,379	1,179	200	14½
Louisville	1,236	1,036	200	16
Paducah	906	706	200	22
Chattanooga	1,370	740	630	46
Wilson Dam	1,165	535	630	54
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal	1,121	491	630	56.2

DISTANCES VIA TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY VERSUS EXISTING WATER ROUTES

From—	To—	Distance via present waterways	Distance via Tennessee-Tombigbee	Savings in miles via Tennessee-Tombigbee	
		Miles	*Miles*	*Miles*	*Percent*
Junction of Tennessee River and Tombigbee Canal.	Fulton, Miss	1,711	57	1,654	96.7
Do	Aberdeen, Miss	1,673	95	1,578	94.3
Do	Columbus, Miss	1,635	133	1,502	91.9
Do	Demopolis, Ala	1,507	261	1,246	82.7
Do	Birmingham, Ala	1,687	441	1,246	73.9

Some time ago Mr. Simpson and, I think, Mr. Carter, asked for a comparison of costs, and at that time I referred to an index which is carried by the Engineering News-Record. I would like to put it into the record, because I think it would be in answer to your questions. It is a report of April 22, 1943, which carries a construction-cost index. It uses the year 1926 as a cost of 100 percent. It then gives a tabulation starting in 1931, when the cost had declined to 87.1 percent. The cost declined further in 1932, to 75.4 percent. From there on there is a general rise until we come to the years 1939 and 1940. I would like to state that most of these reports which you are now considering in this bill were written in about that era, some the year before and some a year later. In 1940 the cost index had risen to 116.3 percent; in 1941, to 124 percent, and in 1942 to 132.8 percent.

I ask that the table be incorporated in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

[From the Engineering News-Record, April 22, 1943]

Construction cost index

[1926=100 percent]

	Percent
1931	87.1
1932	75.4
1933	81.8
1934	95.2
1935	94.4
1936	99.2
1937	112.7
1938	113.3
1939	113.2
1940	116.3
1941	124.0
1942	132.8

Colonel FERINGA. I would like to point out that therefore there is a curve which, in 1926, hit 100 percent. It went down gradually, evidently, until the year 1932, when it was 75.4 percent, and from there on rose gradually.

The question was asked, I think, Mr. Simpson, what the cost would be 2 or 3 years from now. I think it would be entirely conjectural whether that curve would tend to rise, or whether, after the tremendous pressure on business has been removed, after new machinery becomes available in large quantities, it would decline. It might decline. It would be my guess, having done much construction work in the Corps of Engineers, that after the war construction costs will decline, although wages might not decline as much, because there would no longer be the tremendous quantity of work and instead thereof there would be tremendous means. It would be my guess that after the war there will be a decline; and I think that the estimated costs that we have been talking about are a fair index of what they will be.

Mr. CARTER. I think I asked the question which the colonel has ably answered.

Mr. RANKIN. Colonel Feringa, I wish you would insert, at this point, a statement of the comparative average costs of water transportation via existing routes and via the proposed Tombigbee-Tennessee waterway.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

COMPARATIVE AVERAGE COSTS OF WATER TRANSPORTATION VIA EXISTING ROUTES AND VIA THE PROPOSED TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY

The following computations are based on the average performance of a representative tow of one 1,200-horsepower Diesel towboat and 8 barges of various standard types and dimensions loaded with a typical mixed cargo, at 55 percent load factor, of 3,500 revenue tons, to and from locations previously mentioned:

Over-all cost per hour	$21.25
Average speed of tow in slack water (miles)	5½
Cost per mile in slack water	$3.86
Average current in Mississippi River below Cairo (miles per hour)	2½
Cost per mile against 2½ miles per hour current	$7.08
Cost per mile with 2½ miles per hour current	$2.66
Average lockage time:	
Tennessee-Ohio River section 30 minutes	$11
Tombigbee section 45 minutes	$16
Warrior section 1 hour	$21
New Orleans to Cairo via Mississippi River, 860 miles in slack water (no lockages	$6,273
New Orleans to Cairo via Tombigbee-Tennessee, 908 miles in slack water, $3,504; 24 lockages, $364	3,868
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,405

New Orleans to Paducah via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current	$6,273
46 miles in slack water	177
2 lockages	22
	6,472
New Orleans to Paducah via Tombigbee-Tennessee:	
862 miles in slack water	3,327
22 lockages	342
	3,669
Saving in cost per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	2,803

New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Mississippi River:	
886 miles against current	$6,273
261 miles in slack water	1,007
4 lockages	44
	7,324
New Orleans to junction of Tombigbee Canal with Tennessee River via Tombigbee River:	
647 miles in slack water	2,497
20 lockages	320
	2,817
Saving per trip in favor of Tombigbee route	4,507

Similarly the cost comparisons between other points on the inland waterways via the two routes are as follows:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi River			Via Tombigbee River			Saving per trip via Tombigbee River
		Running	Lockages	Total	Running	Lockages	Total	
Mobile	Cairo	$6,875	0	$6,875	$3,221	$364	$3,585	$3,290
	Paducah	7,052	$22	7,074	3,044	342	3,386	3,688
	Tombigbee-Tennesee junction.	7,882	44	7,926	2,214	320	2,534	5,392
Port Birmingham	Cairo	8,458	279	8,737	2,710	579	3,289	5,448
	Paducah	8,635	301	8,936	2,532	557	3,089	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	9,465	323	9,788	1,702	535	2,237	7,551
Demopolis	Cairo	7,763	32	7,795	2,015	332	2,347	5,448
	Paducah	7,940	54	7,994	1,837	310	2,147	5,847
	Tombigbee junction	8,770	76	8,846	1,007	288	1,295	7,551
Columbus	Cairo	8,257	96	8,353	1,521	268	1,789	6,564
	Paducah	8,434	118	8,552	1,343	246	1,589	6,963
	Tombigbee junction	9,264	140	9,404	513	224	737	8,667
Aberdeen	Cairo	8,403	128	8,531	1,375	236	1,611	6,920
	Paducah	8,580	150	8,730	1,197	214	1,411	7,319
	Tombigbee junction	9,410	192	9,602	367	192	559	9,043
Fulton	Cairo	8,546	224	8,770	1,229	140	1,369	7,401
	Paducah	8,726	246	8,972	1,051	118	1,169	7,803
	Tombigbee junction	9,556	268	9,824	221	96	317	9,507

It should be noted that the cost tables have been prepared using the best figures presently available. An average current of 2½ miles per hour against upstream traffic has been set up for the Mississippi, this rate of flow being assumed in the tables to compensate for the necessary double-tripping through the cut-offs and crossing from bank to bank to avoid breasting the full force of adverse currents. Arbitrary time factors for lockages of one-half hour for Ohio River type; three-fourths hour for the proposed Tombigbee type; and 1 hour for Warrior type locks have been used in the absence of any definite figures therefor and lack of time for having test runs. No time was available for field check hence the figures were prepared from composite office data.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to me under date of November 3, 1943, Colonel Feringa also submitted figures to show the cost per ton-mile of transporting oil by rail, by tankers, by pipe lines, by barges, and by railroads. I quote from that letter as follows:

There is also herewith a table showing comparative costs per ton-mile of tankers, barges, pipe lines, and railroads. These figures were used by the Chief of Engineers in his address at Corpus Christi, Tex., on April 18, 1942, at the dedication of the extension of the Intracoastal Waterway:

	Mills per ton-mile
Rail tank car	8.3
Deep draft tanker	1.25
Pipe line	3
Barge	2–2.5

Thus it will be seen that this great project will not only furnish water transportation for a great section of the country that is in dire need of it, and greatly shorten the water distance from between all points on the Gulf of Mexico and all points on the Tennessee River, the Ohio River, the upper Mississippi River, and the Missouri River, and all their tributaries, including the Cumberland, the Wabash, the Allegheny, and the Monongahela, but it will also furnish the cheapest possible method of transporting the great oil supplies of the South and Southwest to the markets of that area.

It is the most feasible and the most desirable inland waterway project to be found in America.

Missouri Farmers' Association Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Farmers' Association is the most successful farm cooperative in the Union. It has had an especially phenomenal growth in the last 3 years. Its business turn-over has increased from $55,281,587, with a net saving of $1,068,566 in 1940 to a total turnover of $104,000,000, with net saving of $2,500,000 in 1942, and estimates for the current year far exceed that record. Under the administration of President F. V. Heinkel its membership has grown from a roll of 26,659 members in 1939 to 63,572 in 1943. The circulation of the official organ, the Missouri Farmer, edited by H. E. Klinefelter, has increased from 51,600 copies in 1941 to 66,500 copies of the current issue.

The association is composed of 823 local farm clubs, supporting 257 local exchanges and elevators, with central produce plants, creameries, feed mills, oil stations, stockyards, and livestock and grain commission companies on the principal markets. It maintains its own oil refinery with 118 miles of pipe line, its own tire and recapping plant, and one of the few cooperative printing plants in America.

Beginning with the work of William Hirth, who more than any other one man, was responsible for the passage of the first McNary-Haugen bill, the association has exerted a profound influence on State and national farm legislation. Under leave just extended I include as a part of my remarks a letter received this morning from Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the association, outlining its legislative program as follows:

MISSOURI FARMERS' ASSOCIATION LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

DEAR MR. CANNON: There are a number of subjects confronting Congress which are of vital concern to Missouri farmers and their hundreds of cooperatives. It occurred to us that you might welcome having the thoughts of the Missouri Farmers' Association's legislative committee pertaining to them.

Briefly, here is how we size them up.

ANTICOOPERATIVE CAMPAIGN

Some 25 years ago when farmers began organizing local cooperatives throughout Missouri, local private merchants became alarmed; they feared these new agencies would put them out of business. They fought us, viciously. A quarter-century has proven that they were unduly alarmed—we are still in business, but so are they. Now that farmer-owned cooperatives have begun invading the field of the monopolies and trusts, these big operators are becoming alarmed, just as the local merchants did 25 years ago. Their fears are equally unfounded, for none of us will live long enough to see cooperatives replacing these big operators. The most cooperatives will do is force them to narrow down their margins of profit, but won't this be a healthful thing for the country?

These alarmists have organized an anticooperative movement under the name of The National Tax Equality Association, with offices at 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago. They have employed lobbyists who are at work in Washington. Realizing they cannot bite off too big a chunk at one swipe, their strategy is to whittle on us piecemeal, and their first step was to induce the House Ways and Means Committee to vote out the revenue bill with a provision to force coop-

eratives to make out income-tax reports, even though they are exempt. We understand the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives did not oppose this move, except to point out its futility and the cost of making out the reports in these days of manpower shortages.

The M. F. A. legislative committee believes it should have been opposed, for it is the entering wedge by which means they expect to unravel the farmer cooperative movement in this country. As evidence that this is true we quote from a special bulletin issued on November 18 by the Illinois Petroleum Marketers' Association, an organization of oil companies, which tells its members: "First step in the direction of taxing these organizations was taken when the Ways and Means Committee * * * voted to make them (cooperatives) file income-tax returns, not for tax purposes right now but to get information on their income. The House Ways and Means Committee has its eyes on these tax-exempt nonprofit organizations as big revenue producers, which would include labor unions, farm cooperatives, building and loan organizations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, civic organizations," etc.

In the first place Congress exempted farm cooperatives in order to help farmers to help themselves out of a bad economic plight. Farmers are not yet out of the woods, and during the post-war era agriculture is in for another tail spin, as you well know. But aside from this, farm cooperatives do not operate for profit, and we maintain there is no profit to tax as there is in private business concerns. The most of our farm cooperatives here in Missouri are organized under the Nonstock, Nonprofit Act. All savings in a cooperative belong to the farmer in proportion to the business they respectively furnish, and the place to tax these savings is in the farmers' own income. Farm cooperatives are merely an extension of the farming enterprise—farmers merely organized to do something for themselves they cannot do as individuals.

This war on cooperatives, it now appears, is a life-and-death battle for the farmer-owned cooperatives in Missouri, and we respectfully urge that all Missouri Congressmen watch it closely. If you need any further information on the subject, be sure to write us.

PRODUCTION CREDIT

During the depression, Congress, as a means of helping farmers to help themselves, established F. C. A. with its four branches. This was one of the greatest aids Congress ever gave to agriculture. Now the enemies of cooperatives have started out to disorganize F. C. A. by piecemeal measures. Their first attack is on Production Credit Administration, which is controlled by farmers who borrow to finance their production. They have included F. S. A. in their attack, presumably because F. S. A. is in disrepute with some Congressmen. The strategy appears to be that F. S. A. will help them tarnish P. C. A. and catch more votes among Congressmen. The M. F. A. looks upon this attack as a piece of the pattern cut out by anticooperative proponents, and we hope every Missouri Congressman will stand by farmers in this hour of need.

CRUDE OIL PRICES

The farmers of Missouri own a refinery and an oil company. Thus we feel competent to have ideas in this field. There is actually a shortage of petroleum products, and this is not due exclusively to the war, but to crude oil prices as well. Oil producers had their prices fixed early in the war, and petroleum prices are about the only ones that have not risen since Pearl Harbor. Meanwhile, production costs have gone up. Oil producers now find themselves squeezed between a low ceiling and high costs. Hence they have, of necessity, slowed down production. If they do not produce now, the oil will still be in the ground later on when prices are more favorable. Hence it is our considered judgment that crude oil prices should be allowed to rise, and the price of gasoline and other refined oils should proportionately increase because refining costs have also materially increased in the meantime; it is better for us to pay a little more for gas and oil and have it, than to have prices low and not have it at a time when it is so vital to our agricultural production.

THE TIRE BILL (H. R. 2817)

This is a selfish bill. It would give independent tire dealers a monopoly on the sale of tires, and on the retreading and recapping business. A farmer-owned cooperative, for example, which was not in the business prior to June 1, 1942, would be permanently eliminated, and the same would apply to any private dealer as well. This bill ought to be defeated.

THE OLEOMARGARINE BILL

This bill apparently has been killed in this session of Congress, but it will confront Congress again sooner or later. Its importance to Missouri agriculture is great, for $1 out of every $5 Missouri farmers take in is derived from the sale of dairy products. Removal of the oleo tax would deal a hard blow to Missouri's dairy industry which has been growing, and which must be encouraged if we are to conserve our soil resources. We do not object to the oleomargarine people selling their product with any color except yellow. If they will color it red, or green, or blue, some color which will not imitate genuine butter, then we have no objections.

We know that oleomargarine interests have alined cotton producers against dairy-producers on the pretext that a lot of cottonseed oil is used in oleo manufacture. Before the war cocoanut oil was mostly used, because it does not become rancid as quickly as other oils, and we wonder if this will not be the case after the war. In any case, dairy farmers who use cottonseed cake and meal in feeding are the best customers cotton farmers have for their product, and we think it exceedingly unfortunate that they have been misled in this fashion.

Yours sincerely,

F. V. HEINKEL,
President,
Missouri Farmers' Association, Inc.

Vegetable Oils and Animal Fats

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the Food Administrator supporting vegetable oil in the form of oleo in one breath and then turning around in the next breath and paying twice as much for one animal fat as an equal animal fat is, to say the least, confusing.

For example, the Food Administrator is paying from $1.10 to $1.25 a pound for powdered eggs. These powdered eggs contain 48 to 49 percent of protein and 38 to 41 percent of animal fat. This is a good food.

Butter is 46 cents per pound, Chicago, and the powdered skim has an O. P. A. ceiling of 12½ to 14½ cents per pound.

Let us compare these two products purely from a financial standpoint. We can use round figures.

For one pound of powdered eggs then the War Food Administrator is paying from $1.10 to $1.25 a pound according to season.

The 0.5 pound animal fat and the 0.4 animal protein in one pound of powdered eggs is costing W. F. A. at the minimum $1.10 per pound when purchased in the form of powdered eggs. This same amount of animal fat and the same amount of animal protein can be obtained from milk in the form of butterfat—0.4 pound butterfat in one-half pound of 46-cent butter, Chicago; or for 23 cents plus the animal protein in skim-milk powder—0.5 pound protein from powdered skim which had 35 percent animal protein and O. P. A. ceiling of 14 cents per pound, which would be some 21 cents, or a total of 44 cents for the same amount of animal fat and animal protein that the W. F. A. is paying twice as much for, of $1.10 to $1.25 per pound.

About 15 percent of these powdered eggs are used by the armed forces and 83 percent are going to lease-lend. I question in no way the use of this great food known as powdered eggs. Four hundred and fifty-three million pounds of powdered eggs are being produced and allocated this year. I am not criticizing the egg program. I am, however, giving you definite proof that the War Food Administrator and others in high Federal office who are supporting a program to replace butterfat with oleo are in a rather embarrassing predicament if they try to justify their position.

No one can successfully contend or prove that the fats and proteins in milk are not equal to the fats and proteins in the powdered eggs so that can afford no escape for anyone.

For 50 years the Congresses have been appropriating millions upon millions of dollars to the agricultural colleges and experimental stations of our Nation. The scientific facts discovered in these institutions should be put to work to best help furnish food for this war. Cheap politics should not supplant scientific facts during these serious days of war. We should make the best possible use of this food knowledge.

We should not be misled by any individual or group that does not base their food facts on scientific facts and common sense.

Are we to believe that it is a desirable governmental policy to pay $1.10 per pound for one product to send to other peoples, when the roll-backers do not seem to believe that the American people can or should pay 44 cents for the same amount of fat and protein and in an equally desirable form?

Fire Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as the result of a concerted drive on the Congress by the big fire insurance companies, it is being seriously proposed to pass legislation to exempt fire insurance companies from Federal control under the provisions of the anti-trust laws on the grounds that they are not engaged in interstate commerce, and on the further grounds that State laws are adequate.

This is something rather novel and bold in legislative procedure; especially since they are operating without regulation of rates in 25 States, only partial regulation in 9 others, and in all but 3 States their rates are fixed by rate-making bureaus set up by the companies themselves. They are not asking for State control; they apparently want to be free from any control.

Under the clamor for "free enterprise," they apparently feel now is the opportune time to seek this legislation. There is nothing "free" about turning over to them a monopoly, unregulated, to charge the home owner and business firms any rate they choose. America to me is constitutional representative democracy. This is the source. Free enterprise is the byproduct. The enemies of both are monopoly and bureaucracy. Monopoly can destroy or absorb free enterprise; bureaucracy can place it in shackles. We want neither monopoly nor bureaucracy.

I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States for their earnest consideration a letter from me to the Governor of Idaho of October 4, 1943; a news article in the Washington Daily News of December 1, 1943; and my letter of December 3, 1943, to Senator O'MAHONEY, all of which follow in sequence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1943.

Hon. C. A. BOTTOLFSEN,
State Capitol, Boise, Idaho.

DEAR GOVERNOR BOTTOLFSEN: I am in receipt of letter of September 28 from your director of insurance requesting my support for bills S. 1362, H. R. 3269, and H. R. 3270, the purpose of which are to remove all Federal supervision of fire-insurance companies and place regulation exclusively in the States. As you are aware, I am ever ready to support any legislation which I believe to be beneficial to the people of Idaho, but I am not as yet convinced that these bills are beneficial.

The charges have been made that in Idaho with premium rates of $1.02 per $100, only 30 cents was paid back in losses, or 29.5 percent of the premiums, and on municipally owned property the record seems to be worse, the charges being that in Michigan, for example, only 8.13 percent of premiums on municipally owned buildings came back in shape of fire losses. If these figures are correct, and I have not seen them disputed, then the people of the United States, and particularly the people of Idaho, are being flagrantly overcharged.

The charge is made that the Council of State Governors are sponsoring these bills on the grounds that regulationary legislation should be invested only in the States, which on its face sounds reasonable, but I am advised that fire-insurance companies are operating without any regulation of rates in 25 States and with only partial regulation in 9 more States, and that in all but 3 States their rates are fixed by rate-making bureaus set up by the companies themselves, and that competition has been eliminated by agreements among themselves that are strictly enforced by boycotting anyone who refuses to cooperate. In 1941, 10 big companies allegedly earned $19,000,000, but only reported one-eighth of it to the State regulatory commissions, which does not have the power to control them even if they really tried.

As you are well aware, I have long been a champion of State rights, but if as alleged, the fire-insurance companies are collecting from the American people $1,000,000,000 annually in premiums and only paying back $400,000,000 per year in losses, then I must qualify my remarks on the subject in the words of that great President, Theodore Roosevelt, who said, "State rights when it means the people's rights, but not when it means the people's wrongs."

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Daily News of December 1, 1943]

FIRE INSURANCE LOBBYIST TO FACE SENATE GRILLING

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

A lobby by fire-insurance interests, reminiscent in political pressure methods of those which fought stock market, bank, and utility regulations a few years back, will be called to account here Friday before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

This lobby, directed by Edward L. Williams, chairman of the Insurance Executives Associations, is trying to put over a bill which would completely remove fire-insurance companies from jurisdiction of the antitrust laws and, by obvious implication, all other insurance companies.

They were doing nicely, having got hasty approval of the bill by the House Judiciary Committee, and were about to get the same quick and easy treatment by a Senate Judiciary subcommittee when a halt was called suddenly by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming.

The spunky little Senator became stirred up over the possible higher cost of insurance to the public by congressional exemption for insurance companies from the antitrust laws, which is something rather novel and bold in legislative procedure.

DUE FOR GRILLING

So on Friday he will twirl his shell-rimmed glasses, with the long black cord, and wave them before Mr. Williams with a few pointed questions as to what the insurance companies are up to, how they fix rates through the various member associations, and how much Mr. Williams is getting for directing the lobby, and how the lobby is working through the old familiar ways of bringing pressure upon members of Congress.

Mr. Williams, a smooth-talking gentleman from Virginia, is reported to be getting $125,000 a year for his job, which salary comes from levies on various affiliated insurance groups. He left an upper-bracket New York law firm to undertake the job. He rented himself a room in one of Washington's swank hotels and got busy.

TURN ON HEAT

The lobby is not only active here in direct contact with Members of Congress, but uses what is known as the prairie fire method to apply heat on the Congressmen from back home. It is particularly effective because of the ramifications of the insurance business into many other types of business, and because a million or so insurance agents, who have been enlisted, can talk glibly to the folks along main street. They are a potent political force, as Congressmen know.

TELEGRAMS POUR IN

So the canned telegrams have been pouring in from Bill and Joe and Tom back home, ready to do a small favor for Frank, the insurance agent.

Furthermore, some Members of Congress own stock in insurance companies, or are partners in law firms which have insurance company clients. Pressure has been brought through this route, as Representative LA FOLLETTE, Republican, Indiana, revealed, citing his own case where an effort was made to influence him through his law partner back home. There are numbers of such cases.

The bill is a negative sort of action. It grew from an indictment by an Atlanta grand jury in November 1942 of 195 fire insurance companies in the Southeast and 27 individuals on charges of conspiring to fix rates in violation of antitrust laws. A Federal judge in Atlanta granted a demurrer to the companies, which claimed insurance was not a business in interstate commerce, and the Justice Department, which instituted the case originally, has appealed to the Supreme Court where the case is to be argued in January.

Immediately, the insurance companies got busy. A bill was introduced in Congress exempting fire insurance companies from the antitrust laws. It was sponsored by Representative WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, and HANCOCK, Republican, New York, and by Senators BAILEY, Democrat, North Carolina, and VAN NUYS, Democrat, Indiana, chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am glad to note that someone has the courage to challenge the insurance lobby. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to the Governor of Idaho dated October 4, 1943. The prairie fire has been kindled and almost every mail brings a deluge of letters inspired by the insurance companies and directed through their agents.

The article by Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Daily News of December 1 is particularly descriptive of the insurance companies' campaign, where he says:

"The lobby is not only active here in direct contact with Members of Congress, but uses what is known as the prairie fire method to apply heat on the Congressmen from back home. It is particularly effective because of the ramifications of the insurance business into many other types of business, and because a million or so insurance agents, who have enlisted, can talk glibly to the folks along main street. They are a potent political force, as Congressmen know."

I am in favor of fire insurance; I appreciate its value and necessity; but in the interest of the insurance companies themselves, it would seem that this is an opportune time for the insurance companies to bring out the facts on the question. The insurance companies do not want State regulation as they pretend; they want no regulation, and that is what they will have if they get away with their proposed legislation.

With much admiration for your splendid courage, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Enough Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no longer is the New Deal a Democrat-Republican issue. Many Democrats are more outspoken in their criticism than are Republicans.

As an illustration, printed herewith is a statement by Samuel B. Pettengill, former Democratic Congressman from Indiana, who voluntarily retired a year or two ago. He writes:

WHAT DEMOCRATS SAY

"All the independent oil men swear vengeance and they are sure going to work at it. The administration cannot give 35 cents a barrel increase for petroleum but it can for whisky." (Congressman WESLEY E. DISNEY, Oklahoma.)

"Had an industrialist sabotaged the war effort to even a fraction of the degree John L. Lewis has done, a President would have held him up to the most severe public condemnation as a traitor to his country." (Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia.)

"The Socialist, Communist, and 'fellow travelers' have managed to maneuver themselves into key places of power, and brand every man as a traitor who is not willing to walk down the Communist aisle to the tune of God Save the King. The fair-haired boys are planning a socialized industry and a collective society for America when the war is over." (Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Texas.)

"A political revolution comparable to the Harding landslide is sweeping this Nation—the New Deal is through. If the Democratic Party persists in hanging onto its dead corpse it will lose the Senate, the House, and the Governors of every Northern and Western State in the next election." (Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado.)

"The higher hierarchy of New Dealers are taking advantage of the terrible tragedy and disaster of war to further their own political theories and philosophies. From this confusion they hope to develop national chaos which would enable them, in the end, to force regimentation on the people and thus establish a form of government in which their little handful of muddlers would rule supreme over this Nation." (Congressman CHARLES E. MCKENZIE, Louisiana.)

"The States can never again be brought into their own until the greatest lobbying power in Washington—the Federal bureaus—have been overcome. The bureaus are making extensive plans for the post-war period. When the peace comes, they will be all set to take over public services and regulate business on a far greater scale than ever thought possible a few years ago." (Governor Maw of Utah.)

"We need a great crusade to restore America to its own people. Constitutional Americans in both parties in 1944 can only restore a government of, by, and for the people by uniting their efforts, their strategy, and their votes." (Former Secretary of War Harry Woodring.)

"We have got to settle this question as to whether or not the people are going to control the Government or whether the Government will control the people. That's the greatest domestic issue that we have faced since the Civil War." (Congressman LYLE H. BOREN, Oklahoma.)

"America is being made over—and we don't like it!" (Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming.)

"If this country ever gets a system of governmental regimentation, labor will suffer most. Labor, therefore, is deeply interested in the preservation of private business; and labor should everlastingly maintain that the owners and managers of business are entitled to a fair and just return upon their investments." (Wm. Green, president, A. F. of L.)

"I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration * * * in all our history. One which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayers." (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sioux City, Iowa, September 29, 1932.)

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

The Situation in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of hearing a number of interesting addresses at a meeting held under auspicies of the United Nations Forum in Constitution Hall here in Washington. One of the most interesting and informative addresses was by Dr. T. F. Tsiang, a representative of China at the United Nations Food Conference at Atlantic City.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer Dr. Tsiang's speech, which is as follows:

HOW CHINA LOOKS AT U. N. R. R. A.

As I was about to leave Chungking, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek called me in for a final interview on Chinese objectives in the first session of the council of U. N. R. R. A. I had had previous interviews with him during which we had covered, I thought, all the important aspects of the forthcoming conference. I was, therefore, curious to know what further instructions the Generalissimo had for me. What he said at the final interview turned out to be only an emphasis on certain principles which he had mentioned before. For one thing, he stated that international cooperation was an objective in itself, to be promoted by the Chinese delegation. He said, "U. N. R. R. A. will be the first piece of international constructive machinery to be set up by the United Nations. If we cannot cooperate on relief and rehabilitation, there will be little else on which we could cooperate. We must not fail." The second principle which the Generalissimo emphasized at that final interview was to the effect that relief and rehabilitation should be promoted on a generous scale, but on whatever scale, within whatever scope, U. N. R. R. A. must be world embracing, for, the Generalissimo said, "Distinctions of region, nationality, or religion belong to the pre-war area and cannot serve as a basis for the new era which, we hope, will come after this war."

We have just now heard my distinguished colleague from the Netherlands tell us about Europe under the heel of Nazi war lords. I will now try to tell you something of the Japanese activities in the Far East during the last 6½ years, when Japan was supposedly trying to create the eastern Asiatic sphere of coprosperity.

JAPAN DESTROYS AND ENSLAVES FAR EAST

Due to the stupidity of the far eastern peoples, Japan has had to start creating her eastern Asiatic sphere of coprosperity by brutal and indiscriminate destruction. The brutalities which the Japanese army committed in China some 6 years ago were demonstrated very distinctly after the capture of Nanking. I need not say much about that shameful episode because, I understand, your newspaper correspondents and official observers in China kept you well informed. I must, however, call your attention to some features of Japanese warfare which persist to this day. Japan used and is still using aerial warfare as an instrument to terrorize the civilian population. Some of you may have noticed a dispatch of Mr. Brooks Atkinson published in the New York Times on November 17, in which he described air raids in the city of Yungan, in the province of Fukien. I have visted that city myself. It is in the western and hilly part of Fukien. It has no fortifications, no armed forces stationed in or near it. It has no factories. It is a small city of merchants, residents and civilian administration. One recent Japanese raid over that city destroyed one-third of its houses. Mr. Atkinson thinks that the Japanese did that simply for the purpose of giving the Japanese air force practice and training. In a similar way, scores of other cities and towns have been destroyed.

Some observers have been puzzled by Japan's way of fighting the war in China. There is, however, some method in Japan's madness. Before the war the school population of China was the foremost to demand a war of national resistance. Colleges and Universities were the centers of agitation. As soon as the Japanese got the chance, they struck at these centers, and struck hard. In Tientsin, on the very opening day of the war, the Japanese sent a squadron of bombers to destroy Nankai University, located about 4 miles from Tientsin. The Japanese bombers concentrated their bombs on the library and the science hall. Since the occupation of Peiping, the Japanese have paid particular attention to Tsinghua University, about 10 miles from the city. The buildings of the university have been used for military purposes. The contents of the library have been taken out and distributed among Japanese institutions in Japan and among puppet institutions in north China, including Manchuria.

I mention Nankai and Tsinghua because I was once a professor in these universities and I have personal knowledge of them. But in Central China the same thing has happened. The library of Hunan University has been destroyed, partially by bombs and partially by the resultant fire. In Chungking the Japanese air force once staged a raid over Shapingpa, which is the cultural suburb of the wartime capital, distant from it by 7 miles. One of the schools in Shapingpa is the Nankai Middle School, the head of which is Dr. Chang Po-ling, whom some of you know. I am interested in this school because at one time three of my children studied in it. After that raid I rushed to the school to see what had happened. I found that one bomb had fallen in the middle of the football field. Another fell about 30 yards from one of the girls' dormitories. A third struck one corner of the science building. A fourth shattered the assembly hall. Numerous other bombs fell on various vacant spaces on the campus. There is no military establishment of any kind within 3 miles of Nankai.

The Japanese Army has occupied mainly the eastern coastal provinces and the regions along the principal railways and rivers of

China. Although the total area under Japanese occupation today is less than one-third of China, it contains more than 40 percent of China's population, 70 percent of China's industries, and 80 percent of China's railways. The economic burden imposed by this occupation far outweighs the percentages of population or of area.

In addition to war, we have suffered from 6 years of blockade. This word "blockade" means much more than you think. If you remember what blockade did in the last European war, as well as in previous wars in Europe and America, you may get the meaning of blockade.

Japan is now paying more attention to economic warfare. In the vast dominions now held under Japanese control, Japan has access to large supplies of rice, but in order to economize on shipping Japan prefers to suck all the rice possible out of China. Before the war Japan imported cotton from India, the United States, Egypt, and China to nourish her large textile industry. She has had to shut down many of her spinning and weaving factories because the war has deprived her of many markets, but she still has to meet the needs of her army and civil population. She has, therefore, resorted to both force and economic inducement to extend the area under cotton in both north China and the Philippines, without regard to the food requirements of the local population. Today in north China large numbers of the people are half starved. Friends who have recently escaped to free China from Peiping and Tientsin tell me that in these cities the common people have to live on kaoliang, mixed with peanut shells pounded to flour.

Six years of war and blockade have created in China, both occupied and free, a grave economic situation. Prices all over China are between 100 and 150 times the pre-war level.

To give you a total picture of China's situation today I give you a few statistics. Of the estimated population of 460,000,000 approximately 200,000,000 have or had their homes in occupied China and the war zones. Two hundred and twenty million live in free China. Forty million are what we might call displaced persons. Of the 200,000,000 in occupied China, about 30 percent will need relief; that is, 60,000,000. Of the 40,000,000 war refugees, about 60 percent will need relief; that is, 24,000,000. The total population needing relief comes to a figure of 84,000,000. This is an enormous number, but the Chinese Government has no intention of loading U. N. R. R. A. with this big burden. Whatever food, clothing, and shelter can be procured in China with Chinese currency, the Chinese Government intends to procure them itself. Only that part of the supplies and services which China cannot produce and must be procured from foreign sources will be requested of U. N. R. R. A.

CHINA WEIGHS HER NEEDS

Of the relief and rehabilitation needs in China, transport comes first. Without transportation facilities, whatever supplies and services U. N. R. R. A. might send to China, they will be piled up at the ports and will be of no use to the Chinese people.

Secondly, we will need large supplies of medical and health articles. Before the war China was almost totally dependent on foreign supplies for modern medicine. Although we have made serious efforts to manufacture some medicines in China, we have not achieved much. After years of war and undernourishment, plague, and pestilence will spread unless checked. This time the Chinese Government sincerely hopes that the Chinese people will be spared post-war plague and pestilence. In this respect we must add that the services of trained doctors and nurses will be as valuable to China as drugs and surgical instruments.

Thirdly, China needs cotton and cotton cloth. At present in China 1 yard of cloth sells for the equivalent of $9, your money.

Fourthly, China will need food and agricultural rehabilitation. During the first 6 months after the war some food must be shipped to China, especially to the coastal provinces of Kuangting and Fukien, where the local production of food has been and is short of demand. After the first 6 months China might get along without food relief in large measure if agricultural rehabilitation should have been properly managed in the meantime.

Fifthly, China will need certain minimum aid in the restoration of city power plants and waterworks. If we could get certain machinery for flour mills, our food situation could be greatly improved.

I have not mentioned the matter of shelter because the experts on the China delegation have figured out that the tonnages required for this purpose is so great that it is almost an impossible task. If we shall be supplied with nails, hinges, door knobs, and certain quantity of cement or cement manufacturing machinery, we will try to meet the problem of shelters by ourselves.

After the war the Chinese Government must and will undertake a large program of economic reconstruction. But we recognize that this program of economic reconstruction is beyond the scope of U. N. R. R. A. Therefore, we hope that rehabilitation will be so wisely managed that where U. N. R. R. A. leaves off the Chinese Government can take up.

OTHER FAR EASTERN LANDS SUFFER EQUALLY

What I have said tonight about the conditions in China apply to all the other far eastern lands where the Japanese war machine has spread. If I had time, I would gladly give you more information about the other regions in the Far East. Aside from the fact that large numbers of Chinese emigrants live in Malaya, Thailand, Burma, French Indochina, the Philippines, and the Dutch East Indies, these regions have had their share of suffering and deserve their share of aid from the United Nations. Through this war we have found the importance of those far eastern regions which will, no doubt, figure largely in the future world economy and polity which we hope to create after this war.

The Japanese sphere of coprosperity has been and can only be a sphere of comisery for the far eastern peoples. If there will ever be a real sphere of coprosperity, it must be one that includes the whole world and must be based on the principles which the United Nations adopted in their declaration of January 1, 1942.

U. N. R. R. A. is the midwife who will assist at the birth of the new world of coprosperity.

World Organization: An Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, before the Federation of Women's Clubs of Ohio, in the city of Columbus, Ohio, December 1, 1943:

The honor of addressing you on this occasion is greatly appreciated.

Wherever Americans meet today they assemble in an hour of great decision and supreme challenge.

All of us are actors in humanity's greatest drama. It is a tragic drama, enacted on a world stage and against a background of horror and hate; of suffering and destruction; of bloodshed and death.

A cataclysmic clash of conflicting forces in world civilization has for the second time in a generation threatened the very foundations of organized society and has thrust the darkening shadows of total war across every threshold into every home.

The combined energies and efforts of mankind, which should, by every right be exercised and devoted to the creation of those things which contribute to the peace, happiness and security of the peoples of the world, are now being directed almost exclusively to the grim and bloody business of war and desolation.

While the youth of great nations goes forth to be slaughtered on bloody fields of battle, civilians suffer and starve in many sections of the world, and if we could see no further than the present moment the picture before us would be dark, dismal, and depressing beyond measure.

The eminent American historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, has said that one of the four great lessons which history has taught mankind is that:

"When it is dark enough you can see the stars."

And out of the darkness of this global war there comes today a gleam; a gleam which will lead us, if we are wise enough and courageous enough to follow it, to a world of law and order and peace and decency.

It is not the light of some new ideal nor the fancied theory of some new or ancient dreamer, but an extremely practical idea whose time seems to have come in our generation.

More than 100 years ago Alfred Lord Tennyson wrote in Locksley Hall:

"'Til the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled,
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world,
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapped in universal law."

A century of alliances, balances of power, aggression and attrition, war and strife, has passed since those lines were written in 1840. But instead of slumbering under the protection of universal law, the "kindly earth" trembles from pole to pole in the mighty grip of Mars, and cringes before an onslaught of chaos and darkness.

During that century the collective intelligence and ingenuity of man was not devoted toward the establishment and perfection of any workable machinery by and through which the "common sense of most" could be brought to bear with force and resolution enough to hold this "fretful realm in awe."

Speaking in Omaha, Nebr., only a quarter of a century ago, Woodrow Wilson solemnly warned:

"I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it."

With what prophetic truth he spoke we are now sorrowfully well aware.

It is altogether unnecessary here to review in any detail the two decades which followed

in the wake of the tragic blunder we made by failure to assure our rightful place in world collaboration in 1919.

The Covenant of the League of Nations was not a perfect document, nor was the machinery set up by its authority without weakness. But the League did not fail because of weakness in its Covenant.

Even without our moral and actual support, if the pledge of article 10 to defend each member against external aggression had been kept, the aggressors would have been stopped long before they brought the whole world into war. The League failed primarily because it possessed no power, no sovereignty of its own. And we recognized all too late, as did other major powers, that Manchuria, Ethiopia, and Munich had real and tragic meaning for all the world.

But we gain no strength or resolution for our present and future duties and responsibilities by brooding over and rehashing past mistakes.

If the history of the last quarter of a century has taught us one thing above all others, it is that mere agreements alone cannot make peace secure. We are convinced now, even if we may have been doubtful at times in the past, that there must be a force created to guarantee the permanency of any settlements or agreements reached, and such a force must be greater than that of any nation or alliance of nations.

In analyzing our present situation someone whose name I do not recall very aptly said that the League of Nations tried to achieve justice without force and failed. Into the vacuum thus created stepped the Nazis and Fascists and tried to achieve force without justice. We must now combine justice with force.

The heart of any effective organization when this war is over must be an agreement among the nations of the world which will govern their dealings and regulate their relations with one another. There must be a court or tribunal for judging and deciding disputes, with an international force adequate to enforce those decisions and back up those judgments. The creation of such an international force, by whatever name we may decide to call it, is one of the absolutely essential requirements of any world organization that will work.

If we are to prevent wars in the future the creation of such an organization, next to the smashing of our enemies, is our most urgent imperative.

If we fail to do so we have two other possible choices. Let us briefly examine these alternatives.

1. We may choose to play a lone hand in the world.

To play alone means that we must always be prepared to play by ourselves against the rest of the world. To do that we must of necessity be ready at any time to mobilize and transport speedily very large forces of armed might which must be kept ready for action anywhere in a world that has shrunk to very small dimensions.

The shrinking of the world today under the influence of technological advances in transportation and communication is having a powerful impact on our thinking. Our concepts of distances in the world are given rude jolts by these frequent reminders that no matter where we may be there is no other point in the world more than 60 hours away.

Huge forces of bomber planes go forth each day and night to smash our enemies, and they can do this because, for the time being, we have supremacy in the air. Under other circumstances it is conceivable that other bomber fleets might be visiting our own country.

If we should choose to play a lone hand, we must accept the cold fact that it will be necessary to levy heavier and heavier taxes and devote more and more of this Nation's energies and efforts toward keeping ourselves ready to come to grips with any nation or combination of nations.

Do we want that plan? I do not believe we do.

2. The only other choice, unless we perfect a real world organization, is the formation of alliances. This will lead inevitably to counteralliances as other nations seek to preserve a balance of power.

I shall not go into any discussion of the evil consequence of such a choice because the whole record of history argues against such a method of preventing wars.

And so, in our search for a remedy we come to the conclusion adopted in the Moscow Conference, and later approved as a part of the revised Connally resolution by the Senate of the United States. That is of "the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security * * * and with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

More important than the fact that delegated representatives of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States reached and signed such an agreement is the fact that the work so well done by these representatives at the same time represented the wills and the wishes of a vast majority of the people in their respective countries, as well as the hopes and aspirations of millions of people in the smaller nations of the world.

And in our thinking and planning we must not forget these smaller nations. In the past, as the history of the League of Nations shows, these smaller nations have shown far more willingness to submerge some of their sovereignty to a world organization than have the larger nations.

The smaller nations perhaps have suffered more at the expense of national sovereignty, and even today we can find among them a very strong spiritual leadership for world organization.

When by a very large majority the Senate of the United States approved the heart of the Moscow Pact—that is, the proposal for a world organization—the Senate not only erased the mistake of 25 years ago but it gave immmeasurable amount of added strength to the pact.

The action of the Senate went a long way toward assuring other nations of the world that the body of our Congress, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of ratifying treaties, was ready thus in advance of the ending of the war to pledge itself to a real effort to organize the world on the basis of a community of power rather than on the basis of a balance of power.

This action, and earlier action by the House of Representatives in approving the Fulbright resolution, give us courage and encouragement; courage to fight with all we have until Hitlerism and Tojoism are crushed completely; encouragement to believe that our military victory will be followed speedily by international accord and understanding, implemented by adequate machinery to save civilization from a spilling of precious blood every quarter of a century.

And so we have today this comforting feeling that the world is emerging toward that time envisioned by the poet when "the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe."

But we must apply common sense to this gigantic problem.

We are laboring under dangerous misapprehension if we believe that the job is nearly done, that passage by the Senate of the Connally resolution gives full assurance that this Nation will play a man's part in the coming world.

We like to believe that the extreme isolationism of 25 years ago is dead. I hope it may be, but I fear that much of it only is sleeping, and perhaps with one eye open.

The position taken by Russia, Britain, and our own country at Moscow leads us to believe that these three nations, and China, are now ready to form some new League of Nations or a similar organization under some other name.

The question we ask in all sincerity is: Are these and other nations ready to perfect an organization that will work?

And we are wondering if there is still a feeling, unexpressed perhaps, but deep-seated nevertheless, in all of the nations that each may reserve unto itself the right to take whatever action it may desire when the peace of the world is threatened or when aggression by one or another nation upsets orderly and peaceful relations.

Realistically we must ask ourselves the question whether in this air age we want to depend for our security upon an organization in which unanimous consent may be required by the governing body before any action can be taken, or in which any member, not pleased with the way things are going, may withdraw and shuffle off any responsibility under a collective agreement.

These are some of the questions we must face, and we must face them now.

Mighty military developments are under way and others are impending. On some day, and it may come before this time next year, a flash will encircle the globe that Germany has agreed to terms of unconditional surrender. On some other date, either earlier or later, the world will be electrified with the news that Japan has capitulated or literally has been wiped out.

When that news comes—and may a merciful God grant that it be soon—we will be confronted with many problems more complex actually than are those of fighting a war. It is comparatively easy for nations to work in close harmony in fighting a death battle with a common enemy. Causes of friction and misunderstanding may be minimized while the shooting is in progress, only to reappear with greater danger when peace comes.

We must then make up our minds now what we shall expect of the world organization that will follow the fighting. It is no less than a matter of life or death for civilization that we do so, and that we come out with the right answer.

We hear a great deal about national sovereignty, so much, indeed, that we are prone to ask just what is sovereignty.

In its essence is not sovereignty the right of the people in whom it resides to do what they want to do?

And if that be true, is it not logical to say that if the people in the nations of the world want to protect themselves against future wars by yielding some of their freedom of action, they can do so without affecting sovereignty.

In fighting a war we find it necessary in many instances to yield much of our freedom of action, and we do so without murmur or complaint.

Is it not just as sensible and practical and necessary that we be willing to yield some of this freedom of action in keeping the peace? I think it all comes finally to the simple question of what a sovereign people wants.

This coming world organization must depend for its success largely on two factors.

In the first place, the machinery of the organization must be so perfected as to give it sufficient strength to withstand the dangers that will grow out of divisions among the

nations upon whom we must depend to maintain it as an effective organization. And these differences will come. We are not approaching any millennium nor Utopia.

We will deceive ourselves if we expect perfection. No physician would predict that a patient who was as bruised and bleeding and sick as our world is today could recover in a day. No; the differences will come, and we may as well expect them. That is all the more reason why we must establish wisely and well the agency through which they may be peacefully handled.

The second factor in the success of this world organization is the international will to preserve the democratic ideal. In the long run an international spirit of freedom and democracy may be of greater importance even than the machinery itself.

Without such a spirit and a firm resolve among the peoples of the world to foster that will the machinery of whatever organization may be established in the end would prove as weak and as ineffective as the League of Nations.

In the last entry made in his journal before his death Victor Hugo wrote in substance that there is nothing else in the world so powerful as an idea whose time has come.

Men wagged their heads and dismissed it as an impractical dream nearly 2,000 years ago when the Man of Galilee said: "One is your master and ye are brethren."

The time of that idea had not come then. Neither had it come 100 years ago when Tennyson wrote Locksley Hall, or 25 years ago when Wilson predicted with unerring accuracy what is happening today.

The strongest conviction of my being today is that the time of that idea that nations of the world may unite to keep the peace of the world has come. I think the hour has struck, is now striking and the very thought is thrilling and challenging beyond measure or description.

On every battle front of the world soldiers of the United Nations are on the march. From Pacific jungles and desolate isles we hear their shouts of triumph as they close in on the Axis wolfpack.

On fields of Europe which have for centuries soaked up the blood of dying men our soldiers and those of Britain and Russia are unleashing storms of lighting as they forge rings of steel and high courage around the Nazi butcher-birds.

The banners of freedom and democracy are on the march. Our swords will never be sheathed until complete victory is achieved.

Let us solemnly resolve that America, under God, shall do her part in leading the world to permanent peace.

Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following excerpts from a radio address made by Mr. Edward Tomlinson, noted newspaperman, commentator, and outstanding authority on South American affairs, over the Blue Network on November 13:

Secretary of State Cordell Hull came home from Moscow this week to find himself a hero. As an unprecedented tribute to his courageous 24,000-mile trip to the Soviet capital, and the overwhelming success of his efforts, President Roosevelt himself, with members of the cabinet, Republicans as well as Democratic Members of the Senate, and several diplomats, met Mr. Hull at the airport. Senator BYRD of Virginia has proposed that the Congressional Medal of Honor be bestowed upon the Secretary.

All who know the inside facts, and developments before and during the conference, know that the Secretary was not only the architect of the Moscow Declarations as adopted. They also know that the preliminary drafts of the documents, which he took with him, were also conceived and planned by him. But already there are some elements, both in the press and on the radio, who are trying to give credit to various other parties here at home.

Although I've had considerable experience in the Nation's Capital, it is always a strange thing to me, that so many top-flight Washington observers, can so often appear to be ill-informed about what is actually going on. In Mr. Hull's case perhaps there are reasons for such misapprehensions. The Secretary is the world's most modest public figure. I have seen him operate in every conference he has attended except this one. I was a correspondent at the ill-fated London Economic Conference. I was present at Montevideo, Uruguay, in 1933, the first time he visited South America. I traveled to Buenos Aires with the Secretary and his delegation in 1936, and also to Lima, Peru, in 1938. Again, I was in Habana when he attended that conference in 1940. The Secretary was, of course, the dominating figure at every one of these gatherings. And yet at each one he gave credit to his colleagues from other countries, for nearly everything that was accomplished. Just before the 1936 conference, for the maintenance of peace, at Buenos Aires, which was attended by President Roosevelt himself, the Secretary's name was proposed for peace prize. Mr. Hull not only maneuvered against it, but was instrumental in having it presented to the then Argentine Foreign Minister—Dr. Carlos Saavedra Lamas.

Then, too there are so many others in Washington, both in the Department of State, and in political circles outside, ready to blow their own horns or to circulate information, not to say rumors, which perfectly honest observers sometimes believe, that the work of a modest man is often overlooked.

Nevertheless, anyone who has known Mr. Hull, personally, over a period of years, and especially anyone who has seen him in operation at international gatherings, knows that, in spite of his modesty and his complete indifference about receiving credit for anything, he does not go to any gathering without a perfectly clear and precise idea of what he wants. That is to say, what he thinks should be done. What's more, he goes into conference battling for his aims, and he seldom comes out without having them fulfilled. As I have said once before, when he heads a delegation, he heads the delegation.

Mr. Hull has the keenest political discernment of any man in Washington. He is sensitive to what people think, but like any great statesman, he leads instead of follows political and public opinion. The men around him or who have succeeded in staying around him, will tell you that he is no "yes man." Patient, long-suffering, yes. He has been in politics long enough to know how to wait. Furthermore, he knows that in these times, miracles seldom happen overnight. At any rate, to say that Cordell Hull took somebody else's ideas and proposals to Moscow, and got them accepted, borders on the absurd.

As one high personage who was with our delegation in the Russian capital, and who has also been with the Secretary on most of his other missions, put it: "The Secretary was interested only in results. He didn't go to Moscow looking for credit. His purpose was not to gain notoriety or to promote himself. He went to promote victory in this war, and to be instrumental in laying the foundations for a just and durable peace afterward. He went to do what he thought to be for the best interests of his country, for the Western Hemisphere and the peace-loving peoples of the world." This man went on to declare that, "the Secretary knows that in the long run, truth will prevail, regardless of who gives or takes credit for the results."

Speaking of the best interests of the Western Hemisphere, I repeat what I said last Saturday evening, "the language, the terms, the phraseology contained in the Moscow declarations, are so reminiscent of those found in the various inter-American agreements, that no one familiar with the New World documents, can mistake them. No treaty or alliance, or exclusive pact, peculiar to Old World diplomacy, came out of Moscow. The results were declarations reminiscent of the declaration of Lima and others, open to all peace-loving nations. No diplomatic machinery, by which a few great powers may sit in closed session, and order the shaping of the world was set up. Contrary to European tradition, the declarations of Moscow are not exclusive. There is no bloc or balance-of-power idea. The declarations are not only open to all the United Nations, but to all peace-loving nations. The 19 republics to the south of us, the 12 which have broken relations, as well as the 7 which have declared war on the Axis, may join on the basis of sovereign equality, great and small.

The phrases in the main declaration are those of Cordell Hull. They are found in practically all the recent instruments of cooperation among the American republics, which he helped to write and to get adopted. Here are some of them: "They (which means those adhering to the declarations) will consult with one another." This was the basis of the Buenos Aires resolution on consultation. "Sovereign equality" and "peace-loving nations" are well-known Hull phrases.

Yes, the Secretary of State of the United States went to Moscow and induced his colleagues to accept the American way and method of carrying on international relations. This American diplomatic way may not be perfect, and it may not bring peace to all the world. But nobody can deny that Old World methods have failed. And no one should be too blind to see that the American way has borne fruit in the Western Hemisphere. Today, 19 out of 20 of our neighbor countries are standing firmly on our side in the war. What is more, ours is the only great power in the world that is completely surrounded by friends.

The main architect and builder of the policy which produced these results is the Honorable Cordell Hull. The official who conceived, and has so far succeeded in projecting, the same idea into the balance of the world is our Secretary of State. The man to whom this Nation can well afford to give credit, and to pay tribute for all of this, is a tall, gray-haired gentleman, who grew up in the mountains of Tennessee, and who has given all of his active 72 years in complete, unselfish service to his Nation. We honor ourselves when we honor him.

Admiral Hustvedt Receives Legion of Merit Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of our Nation were delighted to learn a few days ago that Rear Admiral Olaf M. Hustvedt, of the United States Navy, had been given the Legion of Merit award.

Everyone who knows Admiral Hustvedt is eager to congratulate both him and the Navy on the granting of this award. My home town, Decorah, Iowa, is proud to claim him as her son; the Navy has expressed its pride through the granting of this award and the Nation is grateful to him for his outstanding service.

He comes from good stock. Since I have known him and his kin for many years, I take genuine personal pride in submitting the following account of his naval service to date as well as facts pertaining to his family which was supplied at my request through the courtesy of Capt. Leland P. Lovette, of the United States Navy:

REAR ADMIRAL OLAF MANDT HUSTVEDT, UNITED STATES NAVY

Rear Admiral Hustvedt was born in Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1886. He attended public and private schools and Luther College in Decorah, Iowa, and was appointed to the Naval Academy from the Fourth District of Iowa in 1905. He won the "N" in football at Annapolis, commanded the color company and was on the lucky bag committee. After graduation in 1909 he was assigned to the U. S. S. *West Virginia* and in 1912 was transferred to the U. S. S. *Raleigh*. During 1914 and 1915 he served on the U. S. S. *Utah* and during the next 2 years was aide on the staff of commander, Battleship Division 6, Atlantic Fleet, and was awarded a special letter of commendation for his service during the World War. In 1918 he joined the U. S. S. *Oklahoma*, of Battleship Division 9, which operated with the British Grand Fleet. After duty in the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, from 1919 until 1922, he was in command of the U. S. S. *Burns* until 1924, when he returned to the Bureau of Ordnance. He was gunnery officer of the U. S. S. *Colorado* in 1927; in 1928 was aide and divisions gunnery officer on the staff of commander, Battleship Divisions, Battle Fleet, and in 1929 had similar duty on the staff of commander, Battle Fleet.

From 1930 until 1933 he was on duty at the Naval Gun Factory, Navy Yard, Washington, D. C., and from 1933 until 1935 was executive officer, U. S. S. *Louisville*. He was attached to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations from 1935 until 1938, and during part of that tour of duty was Director of the Central Division. He was commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Detroit* from July 1, 1938, until April 6, 1939, when he was assigned to duty as aide and operations officer on the staff of the Commander in Chief, United States Fleet. He returned to duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations in February 1940 and in June of that year reported to the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., for the senior course of instruction.

He was in charge of fitting out the U. S. S. *North Carolina* in the New York Navy Yard and served as her commanding officer from her commissioning on April 11, 1941, until October 1941. Following that duty he served as Chief of Staff and aide to Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet. He now has a command at sea.

He was awarded the Legion of Merit with the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, United States Atlantic Fleet, during the period October 25, 1941, to May 4, 1943. Intimately concerned with all activities of the Atlantic Fleet, Rear Admiral Hustvedt rendered invaluable assistance in the exacting task of organizing the fleet and its bases and in establishing sound command relationship in the early months of the war. His judicious counsel and clear perception in escort of convoy and antisubmarine operational problems contributed vitally to the successful conduct of fleet operations in the western Atlantic area."

Rear Admiral Hustvedt has the following medals and decorations:

Mexican Service Medal.
Victory Medal, Atlantic Fleet Clasp.
American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp.
American Area Campaign Medal.

His home address is 401 Grove Street, Decorah, Iowa.

On January 7, 1941, Rear Admiral Hustvedt was advanced to the rank of rear admiral (temporary) to rank from November 20, 1941. He was appointed rear admiral (permanent) on September 14, 1942, to rank from June 30, 1942.

Rear Admiral Hustvedt is the son of Halvor B. and Anne Marie (Reque) Hustvedt.

He married Irene Sherwood Cooper of Honolulu, T. H., on February 16, 1912. His children are: Virginia Isabel, wife of Lt. Comdr. Philip F. Hauck, United States Navy (Naval Academy Class of 1935); Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Erling Halvor Hustvedt, United States Naval Reserve; Stephen Roald Hustvedt.

Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution recently adopted at a meeting of New England radio stations:

WTAG,
Worcester, Mass., December 1, 1943.

The Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a copy of resolution adopted by a group of New England radio stations at a meeting held in Boston on October 7 which is self-explanatory.

Several committees in both the Senate and House are at present holding hearings on the subject of proposed radio legislation. Your active cooperation and support will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

E. E. HILL.

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in the so-called network regulations case places in the hands of the Federal Communications Commission practically unlimited regulatory powers over the radio-broadcasting industry; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this group that such powers were neither authorized nor intended under the provisions of the radio law of 1927 (amended in 1934) as enacted by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned stations, severally and collectively, communicate with their representatives in Congress urging the enactment of new legislation clearly defining and limiting the duties and powers of the Federal Communications Commission.

E. J. FREY, *WBRY*.
C. P. HASBROOK, *WCAX*.
FRANKLIN M. DOOLITTLE, *WDRC*.
DAVID CARPENTER, *WKNE*.
WARREN GREENWOOD, *WMAS*.
W. T. BUSH, *WPRO*.
E. E. HILL, *WTAG*.

Forgive Me For Forgetting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as the Christmas season approaches and our hearts swell with praise and thanksgiving to the God of the universe for the manifold blessings of another year, let us hope that we shall never forget the marvelous "mercies of the Lord, so bountifully bestowed."

It is all too easy to remember the unhappy little things that we should have long ago forgotten and to magnify their seeming importance; yet, we are so prone to forget the bigger and better things that make life worth while. Oft times, too, we forget to tell our tried and true friends how deeply we appreciate them. We expect them to take that for granted. In all humility we join at this season in saying: "Lord, forgive me for forgetting."

With the dark clouds of war hovering low over all the world, those of us on the home fronts must not let down the bars of faith, nor forget those on the many far-flung fronts of the world who have staked their lives for the cause of liberty and freedom. Let us breathe a solemn prayer for their welfare and that ere another Christmas season comes they will be returned safely to loved ones and that a war-weary world will have a just and durable peace on earth, goodwill toward men.

In the meantime, let us not forget during the dark and trying days ahead of us, that God still reigns and that His spirit lives. Let us go forward in all that we do with our chins up and our eyes straight ahead. Let us not forget that the God of the ages is still master and

maker of the universe from whose hands the spheres are rolled to their orbits and whose voice has been in harmony with His word since the morning stars sang together.

Last Sunday I shared the privilege with several hundred other men of hearing one of America's outstanding Boy Scout leaders and executives, Linn C. Drake, deliver an inspiring address at the Vaughn Bible Class, Calvary Baptist Church, in Washington, D. C., where Mr. Drake is the regular teacher. As a fitting climax, he gave the class a beautiful and appropriate poem that he recently composed on a train while going to officiate at the funeral of a life-long friend. It is not only a gem of literature, but the sentiment expressed therein would be appropriate for the Christmas season or for any day of the year.

Under the leave granted me, I am including the poem as a part of my remarks. It follows:

A MEDITATION

(As a result of a phrase used by Homer Rodeheaver when he found himself in bed on a Pullman train, having forgotten to say his prayers, and exclaimed: "Lord, forgive me for forgetting!")

If I forget Thy mercies, Lord,
So bountifully bestowed,
Thoughtless and worn and almost crushed
Beneath life's heavy load.

Forgive me for forgetting!
My heart is still Thine own
And surging from its inmost depths,
It worships Thee alone.

If I let down the bars of faith,
And fears come flooding in,
And weakness haunts my troubled nights,
And stains my days with sin,

Forgive me for forgetting;
Renew my faith and trust;
Strengthen my soul with self-control;
E'en punish, if Thou must!

If, heedless, I give scant acclaim
To those who toil for me,
Or stake their lives for freedom's cause
By air, or land, or sea.

Forgive me for forgetting!
I, too, have debts to pay!
The cost of blessings we enjoy,
I share, as well as they!

If I neglect my long-time friends,
Absorbed in newer tasks,
Unmindful of their worth to me,
My heedless spirit asks:

Forgive me for forgetting!
Keep channels open, free;
That love may flow from me to them,
And from them back to me.

—*Linn C. Drake.*

NOVEMBER 25, 1943.

Hold That Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, every American, whether living in the city or on the farm, should be vitally interested in the conservation of our priceless rich soil.

History records that with no exception every nation that lets its soil become depleted has been rendered helpless in holding a decent standard of living, many of them falling to the very depths of starvation simply because of their negligence in keeping mother earth in a healthy, productive condition. It must not happen here.

Flood control and soil conservation are just as closely related as blood and flesh and must be treated as one problem, otherwise the cure will only be temporary, and most costly in the long pull.

We are spending for the fiscal year of 1943 for soil conservation service for the whole United States less than $21,000,000. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, here is one place where even I, who have been called a nickel pincher by some of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, am willing to spend quite a little more in order to insure adequate help and additional soil experts to assist the farmers in proper soil conservation practices and to work in conjunction with the Army engineers in all flood-control problems. I trust the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations will see fit to be more liberal for this service in the 1944 appropriations, even if they find it necessary to make cuts in other parts of the bill to make it up.

Here is an editorial from the weekly Kansas City Star of November 3, 1943, sent to me by Mr. Tom Powell, district soil conservationist, and a good one, of Shenandoah, Iowa. This editorial tells the story most effectually and well. Mr. Powell writes me:

Ben, I believe this article expresses the thought of midwestern farmers and agricultural workers.

The article follows:

A LOOK INTO THE POST-WAR ERA—SOIL CONSERVATION, AN INTEGRAL PART OF FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

(By Roderick Turnbull)

Despite all the money that has been spent for flood control, for dams, levees, channel clearance and so forth, this country continues to have floods. They seem to get bigger and occur more frequently. This last summer has served to emphasize this fact throughout a good part of the four States served by the Weekly Star.

Congress now has under study legislation for an over-all flood control program, designed not only to reduce damage from floods but as part of a post-war employment plan. Information on the contemplated program to date has dealt mainly with the usual flood control devices—dams, reservoirs, and other highly expensive engineering accomplishments.

MUST HOLD WATER ON HILLS

Interested persons watching the development of the program in Congress, including a group of crops and soils men at the Missouri College of Agriculture, are insisting that no flood-control plan can be complete unless it includes soil-conservation practices on a large part of the Nation's land. It is the water run-off from the hills that floods the streams and it is the soil washed from the uplands which fills the reservoirs built to catch and hold the flood waters. These students and observers of the flood problem are urging that Congress tie in soil conservation with flood control to make soil conservation as much a part of the whole program as the building of dams, floodwalls or floodways. Such a program, financed by the Federal Government, would give soil conservation on farms the greatest boost in history.

It would not be an entirely new program. Soil-conservation practices were not new when the present administration included them in its farm program through the A. A. A. and S. C. S. Nor has Congress been unaware of the relation of soil and water control on farms to flood control. Several steps already have been taken, particularly as to surveys on the effect of erosion and speed of water run-off, especially in watersheds where flood-control projects have been established. But despite all that has been done in recent years, only the surface has been scratched. In almost every community one can find farms which are terraced, being farmed on the contour or have the soil under control through proper rotation and cover crops, but their number is small in comparison to those where the fields are farmed in line with the field boundaries.

FLOODS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Floods are a national menace and that is why they are to be fought with national money. National interest is aroused by such floods as occurred in the lower Mississippi in 1927, the Northeast in 1936 and 1938, the Ohio Valley in 1937, Southern California in 1938, the Missouri Valley in 1942 and 1943, and the Arkansas River Valley in 1943.

One of the men at the Missouri College who has given serious study to the flood problem is Dr. W. C. Etheridge, head of the field crops department. Dr. Etheridge points out that the increasing frequency of the floods is not caused by great variations in climate. Floods are growing in number and volume principally because the watersheds are pouring into the streams an ever-increasing amount of the rain which falls upon them. This is a result of denudation of the watersheds. It is a result of cutting the timber from the hills and plowing up the grasslands. Roads are a contributing factor.

Can anyone imagine a better surface for shedding water than a paved highway with clean drainage ditches on either side?

KNOW IT CAN BE DONE

Perhaps nothing can be done about water running off roads, but the agricultural colleges, the Soil Conservation Service and most farmers know that there are ways of holding more water in farm soil.

Erosion, the washing of topsoil, can be stopped almost entirely.

In summarizing soil and water saving practices, Dr. Etheridge mentions that a well-wooded hillside with its multifold obstructions and spongy absorbent soil commonly allows very little water to run off the surface; good grass is equally effective; a correctly planted rotation of crops, aided by terracing and contour farming, loses only an insignificant amount of water and soil. But when the hillside is cleared, plowed and intensively cultivated without any attention to the continuity of surface cover and the saving of water, the loose, absorbent surface soil soon is washed off, the whole slope becomes eroded, and water falling on the denuded area quickly flows down rows to ditches, from ditches to streams and on into rivers to help create floods.

It is extremely fortunate from the farm standpoint that the measures which help hold water in the soil on the farms and thus deter floods, form what are recognized as the principles of a first rate soil-conservation program. As Dr. Etheridge lists them, they are (1) the reforestation of public lands and the planting of farm woodlots in strategic places, to break, obstruct and absorb moving water as well as to redevelop the passing natural resources of timber and wildfire; (2) the fill-

ing and stabilizing of farm gullies, to spread water over the soil surface instead of giving it channels in which to run to the creeks; (3) the improvement of permanent pastures, to hold the soil in place as well as to give better support to livestock; (4) the correct rotation of crops to provide a maximum continuity of soil cover as well as to give good yields; (5) the improvement of the soil tilth to increase soil capacity for absorbing and holding water; (6) the construction of farm ponds to provide many thousands of effective small catch basins as well as furnish water for livestock; (7) the terracing, contour farming and waterway grassing of farm fields, to slow the downward course of water so that it may evaporate or be soaked up by the soil sponge instead of running off.

COMPLETE EROSION CONTROL

At various experiment stations where measurements have been taken over a period of years, it has been proved that proper practices will stop soil erosion almost 100 percent. Similar measurements have shown the maximum run-off of rain water from fields intensely cultivated and not continuously covered by good crop rotation or grass, is about 25 percent of the total. By proper soil-conservation practices this run-off can be reduced to 10 to 15 percent of the total, or just about half the run-off where these practices are not carried out.

This half held in the soil often could be the margin of safety against a flood. As long as the river stays within its channel or between the levees, flood damage is nil. It is when the river creeps up the last few inches to break over the levee that it spreads ruin.

SOIL CONSERVATION NO CURE-ALL

There is no contention that soil conservation on the uplands would completely control floods or supplant structural works downstream. Nor is an effort being made to persuade Congress that the engineers with their dams and floodways are wrong in their methods. But what Dr. Etheridge and the others are contending is that the engineer must have help if his work is to be effective, that there must be control of causes as well as effects. The reservoir filling in with silt holds less and less water. When a channel shoals up, the levee must be built higher.

"The engineer can build the dams and the levees, but he has not yet been able to deal effectively with soil as a detriment in flood control by engineering works," Dr. Etheridge asserts. This is a job to be done on the farm, and it must be done on a wide scale.

Dr. Etheridge estimates proper land and crop management would need to be practiced on from 75 to 90 percent of the total area of upland farms to have noticeable effect on floods.

The consummation of such a program, he says, would call for large and effective organization, wise and experienced administration, much technical knowledge, intelligent and devoted leadership, and a great deal of money. However, it isn't contemplated that the farm end, or soil-conservation work, would entail anything like the expense that would be required by the engineering works if the two phases were joined in an over-all flood-control program. Soil conservation requires little or no construction materials, no extraordinary equipment, a moderate number of high-priced technical directors and supervisors, and only moderate wages for labor. As to equipment, Dr. Etheridge sees employment for many of the machines now used in construction and maintenance of Army camps in post-war soil work on farms.

PERSONAL BENEFIT TO FARMER

It could be argued, and with purpose, that farmers themselves could afford to adopt all the recommended soil-saving practices. Many thousands already have their farms under control and are benefiting thereby. Then why propose Federal aid? Dr. Etheridge explains that it is to the public interest to get the job done in a short period of years. Farmers attempting to adopt the necessary measures for their own personal interest probably could not afford to proceed so rapidly.

As previously pointed out, the methods tending to hold water back on the uplands and thus aid in flood control are one and the same as those assigned to save the soil and conserve moisture. The public is interested in the maintenance of the soil. Our national well-being depends upon the productivity of the soil. One thing this war has proved definitely is that when all America is working and eating heartily, our farms produce no surpluses. We need all we can raise in the best of years.

LOSE FAITH IN DAMS

Many farmers of the flooded lowlands have little trust in big dams and lakes as flood deterrents. The layman may not understand the technicalities of engineering, but when a lake gets full and the water starts pouring over the dam, anyone can see it flooding the lowlands below. It is obvious to a layman that a lake built to create electric power or fishing resorts is not going to whip any flood. In fact, a full lake merely causes the river to flow more slowly upstream and spread out over the land rather than get away quickly in a natural channel. A dam and reservoir for flood control must be utilized as such.

A dam built to save farms and communities down below from floods often penalizes the upstream farmer.

Talking on this subject the other day, Dean M. F. Miller, of the Missouri College of Agriculture, remarked:

"No doubt many an upstream farmer who has to sell out because his farm is covered by water after a dam has been built, feels he is just as important as the fellow downstream whose land is protected by the dam."

SOIL CONSERVATION PAYS FARMER

In order for soil conservation work to be practiced sufficiently to be effective in controlling floods, it would of necessity have to be accepted in principle by a great majority of farmers. The facts on the cost of soil erosion would indicate that such acceptance should be forthcoming, especially if the public were to bear part of the expense of bringing it under control. Soil conservation officials estimate that as huge as the damage is from floods, the damage to farms from soil erosion is four times as much. Also that the annual amount of soil fertility lost from erosion in the United States is six times greater than the amount removed by the growing of crops and of pastures.

In urging that Congress put soil conservation on farms together with engineers' plans for streams in one flood control program, Dr. Etheridge proposes no forms of compulsion on farmers. He declares he would rather not go along with the program than have one that forced the farmer into any manner of Federal control.

New Generator at Grand Coulee Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to draw attention to a news release recently issued by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior which announces that another new generator has been put into service at Grand Coulee Dam, in my district.

The addition of the seventh generator, rated at more than a hundred thousand kilowatts, brings the installed capacity of the power plant to more than 700,000 kilowatts, the fourth largest in the world. The installation at Grand Coulee constitutes one-fourth of the federally operated hydroelectric capacity in this country. Nearly all of the energy is being transmitted to war industries in the Pacific Northwest. These plants are producing, among other things, one-third of the national output of pig aluminum.

However, the irrigation in the post-war period of 1,200,000 acres of fertile land—one of the two major objectives of the undertaking—is in my humble opinion of paramount importance in the orderly development of that fine section of the country.

Because of the war, however, the power phase of the Columbia Basin project, of which Grand Coulee Dam is the key structure, has somewhat overshadowed the other benefits that this great development will bring to the people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been hard at work preparing the plans for starting the construction of the irrigation features of the project immediately upon the successful conclusion of the war. It is awake to the need for employment and settlement opportunities that will arise when our soldiers return from the fighting fronts and the many workers in our war plants are demobilized. In the States of Washington and Oregon, the population has shown an increase of nearly 200,000 since 1940 due to the expansión of industries resulting from the war.

At full development the project will support from 300,000 to 400,000 people on the farms or in the towns on or near the project area. In the construction of the canal system, reservoir dams, pumping plants, and other structures necessary to bring water to the land, work for thousands will be provided. For every person at work at the site, one will be employed elsewhere in the manufacture and transportation of raw materials, and of equipment and supplies needed in the construction.

The Columbia Basin will become one of the most productive irrigated areas in the United States. I can speak about this from personal experience, for my home is on the Yakima project, situated but a comparatively short distance from the Columbia Basin. Soil conditions, climate, topography, and other relevant factors in these two areas are very similar.

On the Yakima project the average per-acre crop return in 1942 was $128, the second highest of the 44 irrigation projects which the Bureau of Reclamation operates in 15 Western States. Although the fruit acreage on the Columbia Basin will not be as abundant as on the Yakima project, high per-acre returns may be expected on the basin lands. Never self-sufficient, the West,

with its increased population in the post-war period, will have need for every bit of food produced on the project area.

The power produced at Grand Coulee is of vital importance to the irrigation of the Columbia Basin. Not only will low-cost energy be available for project farms and industries but the revenues will repay a significant portion of the cost of constructing the irrigation system, thus greatly reducing the financial burden on the settlers.

The news release describing the addition of the new generator at Grand Coulee Dam follows:

Keeping abreast of the steadily mounting power demands of Pacific Northwest war industries, the Bureau of Reclamation has put another giant generator at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington into commercial production, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today. The addition brings the installed capacity of the plant to more than 700,000 kilowatts, third largest in the United States and fourth largest in the world.

Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore reported to the Secretary that nearly the entire output of the new mammoth hydroelectric machine, rated at more than 100,000 kilowatts, together with that of six other generators now operating, is being transmitted to war plants.

"The power installed at Grand Coulee during the 2 years since the first large generator was put in service and the installations at Bonneville Dam, farther down the Columbia River, has met a definite war need and has been in a large measure responsible for the establishment of major war factories in the Pacific Northwest," the Secretary said.

"The increase in power capacity at Grand Coulee is significant from another standpoint. It brings the rated capacity of the Bureau of Reclamation's 30 power plants in 11 Western States to more than 2,000,000 kilowatts. This installation is equivalent to the total capacity of all public utilities in the 11 far Western States in 1920 and is nearly as much as that of all plants in the United States when Federal reclamation was established in 1902."

Today's event is important for still another reason, Commissioner Bashore pointed out. "It means that the Bureau has made available in less than 2½ years for war production in the West more than a million kilowatts of new hydroelectric power," he said. "Many of the new generators were added 2 to 5 years ahead of schedule to meet the anticipated demands."

The present capacity at Grand Coulee is surpassed in the United States only by that of the Boulder Dam power plant, another Bureau of Reclamation development, and by a steam plant serving the New York metropolitan area. The installation exceeds that of all utilities in any one of 30 of the 48 States in the Union.

The Grand Coulee Dam is the key structure of the Columbia Basin project which, in addition to power production, is designed to irrigate 1,200,000 acres of potentially productive land. Construction of irrigation features of the project has been interrupted by the war, but studies of settlement and development problems and preparation of designs of the canal and lateral systems are being continued as rapidly as funds and personnel permit. The objective of these activities is to be prepared for early construction of the project either as a war-food measure or during the post-war period to provide employment and settlement opportunities for demobilized servicemen and industrial workers.

The Bureau of Reclamation this year provided irrigation service to 4,000,000 acres of land in 15 Western States. Construction recently cleared as a part of the Bureau's war-food program will extend the service in 3 years to more than a million additional acres.

The Strange Case of Mr. X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., entitled "The Strange Case of Mr. X":

THE STRANGE CASE OF MR. X

Mr. X, a former resident of this county and a man of excellent character, intelligence, and ability, is employed now in another county by a railroad company. He has been so employed for the last 11 years. He is, of course, compelled to hold membership in a labor union.

Mr. X has a wife and a son of school age. He is paid $106 a month, and not allowed to put in any overtime. If he works in an emergency on Monday and puts in 3 hours overtime, he is required to work only 5 hours on Saturday. The 3 hours he is idle on Saturday offsets the extra time he put in on Monday and he gets no overtime pay.

Mr. X is assigned to work in a small town. He has been procuring a hovel in which to live for $15 a month. His earnings do not permit him to pay more. Now, even this shelter is no longer available. He must move. There is absolutely no other available place in the village.

Mr. X, being obsessed with the old-fashioned notion that a man's first obligations are to his family, must seek a humble rooftree for them in the larger city not far distant. This necessitates change of employment.

Mr. X finds that there is available to him in the larger community not only living space but employment in another essential industry at a wage substantially 40 percent greater than his present pittance.

Mr. X cannot avail himself of the opportunity. Who says so? The Government of the free country to which he has always given his undivided loyalty.

Mr. X finds that if he quits his present job to accept one that is adequate, even though in another essential industry, he is fined $212. That is, he must lay idle for 60 days before he is allowed to take another job.

It's even sillier than a fine. No one, no public treasury, gets that $212 fine. Worse than that. During this payless period Mr. X and his family must subsist on public charity—either that or decently starve to death.

There is little or nothing Mr. X can do about it except continue in his present underpaid job, let his houseless family shift as best they may. Oh, he might get out his copy of the Declaration and the Constitution and strike out such passages as these:

"All men are created equal and endowed with inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

"The blessings of liberty."

"The right of the people to be secure."

"Involuntary servitude shall not exist."

The present crisis restrains further comment, but the case of Mr. X and others similarly affected should command the earnest attention of those who now stand charged with so administering public affairs that free America and free Americans may continue to exist.

Radio Talk by Price Administrator Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by Price Administrator Chester Bowles over the Blue Network, 10:15 p. m., eastern war time, Tuesday, November 30, 1943:

Good evening, everybody. Tonight I am going to talk about your meat supply. I am going to talk about beef cattle and hogs, about pork chops and pot roasts, and finally I'm going to give you some good news about your ration points in December.

We all like meat and today most of us are getting less than we would like. It seems to me that you are entitled to everything I know on the subject and I shall give you the whole story in as much detail as my time will permit.

First of all, we should all understand that the basic problem of meat supply is a responsibility not of the O. P. A. but of the War Food Administration. I would like to say right here and now that in my opinion the people in the War Food organization have done a magnificent job of maintaining supplies under the most difficult circumstances.

While the War Food Administration is responsible for our basic supply of meat, the O. P. A.'s responsibility is the distribution of that part of our supply which is allotted to us civilians. In other words, it is up to us to see that the amount of meat which is available to civilians, after the needs of the Army and Navy are taken care of, is distributed as nearly as possible on a share-and-share-alike basis to all of us in all parts of the country—through rationing.

Now, first of all, let's see exactly how much livestock we now have available and how much we're likely to have available during the coming year. There have been a good many rather crazy stories printed on this general subject during the last 6 months. For instance, I saw a statement in the paper some time ago that we have 80,000,000 head of cattle in the country and that for this reason we civilians should have all the beef we can possibly eat.

With stories like that flying around it's no wonder you folks get confused. Here are the actual facts. On January 1, it is true, that we should have eighty or eighty-one million head of cattle and calves. But here's the catch. More than 40,000,000 of those cattle, or 50 percent of the total, are dairy cattle. About 40,000,000 are actually beef cattle. And of these, 19,000,000, or almost half, are reserved for breeding purposes.

The number of cattle and calves available as a source of meat supply during 1944 will total 33,000,000 head. While that's a far smaller number than the wild estimate I

quoted a few minutes ago, it still represents the biggest slaughter herd in all history.

Now our hog population is also at an all-time high. In 1943, we had roughly 93,000,000 available for slaughter.

Our supply of sheep and lamb is also at record levels with about 25,000,000 animals headed for our grocery stores and butcher shops this year, and about 22,000,000 expected during the coming year.

If you take into account all the beef cattle, hogs, sheep, and lambs, you can hardly see that we have a huge supply of meat in this country. I think we all should take our hats off to the cattle raisers and hog raisers who have done such a magnificent job during the last year in making this record supply available.

If all that meat were available to us civilians, we could probably throw all this rationing business right out the window and all begin to eat like kings as far as meat is concerned. But again here is the catch. Our supplies of meat are at record-breaking levels, but our demand for meat is unbelievably greater.

First of all, we must provide for our soldiers and sailors, more than 10,000,000 of them. I'm not telling you any military secret when I say that those boys of ours have developed some pretty big appetites during the last couple of years. Actually, our soldiers and sailors are eating on an average of 50 percent more meat per man than they ever ate in their lives, and there isn't one of us who will begrudge them a single ounce of it.

So, as you can see, a big share of our meat supply must be set aside for our Army and Navy. Another sizable amount of our meat is set aside for our allies. British soldiers and Russian soldiers have appetites, too, and those appetites cannot be wholly satisfied through the home resources of these war-torn countries.

Four-fifths of all the meat that is shipped abroad for lend-lease, by the way, is pork. And I believe I should also point out that these lend-lease shipments work both ways. For instance, the folks who work in Australia and New Zealand are eating less meat today than normal for the simple reason that they are sharing their own meat supplies with our American boys serving under General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey.

As you can see, that record supply of meat of ours begins to dwindle by the time we get our own boys fed and pass on essential supplies to our allies. Three-quarters of the total supply, however, is left and that amount is alloted to the O. P. A. to be shared by you and by all the millions of people like you throughout the United States—through rationing.

Now, here is a fact that is going to surprise you. The average civilian family is actually eating more meat than it ate in any year between 1935 and 1939. At first that's hard to believe. But the explanation is very simple. In 1935, 36, or 37 there were relatively few of us who could afford to serve meat regularly to our families. As a result, those of us with money to spend could get all the meat that we wanted.

But there were many more of us Americans who were less fortunate. Between 1935 and 1939, it is estimated that our unemployed averaged about eight or nine million. In addition, there were millions of families who were working only part time or who for other reasons were forced to get along on very limited incomes.

Joe Jones, struggling to raise his family on $20 a week, couldn't afford to go in for any T-bone steaks or lamb chops. When meat was served in his home, it was the very cheapest cut and then only on rare occasions.

Today, everyone has a job and a far greater number of us are working for decent wages. Our friend, Joe Jones, now working in a shipyard or airplane plant, may today be earning three or four times his old $20 weekly wage. That means that he and his family are in the market for meat now in a big way * * * good meat and lots of it. And today there are millions upon millions of other Joe Joneses who have the money to pay for the best cuts and are naturally anxious to get them.

With all this wartime purchasing power laying around, you can easily see what a bad mess we'd be in if we hadn't decided to share our meat supply through rationing. We'd be in an even worse mess on prices, with everybody bidding against his neighbor to get the best cuts and the biggest roasts.

So it's up to the O. P. A. to take the same amount of meat we had before the war and to see that it's shared as equally as possible among 128,000,000 of us whose incomes and appetites have both increased substantially. But how do we know how much to ration and how to establish ration points so that everything will be as fair as possible?

First of all, the War Food Administration tells us how much meat will be available for civilians. Then, in order to find out how meat supplies are actually moving, we examine our reports from grocery stores all over the country, and from meat distributors and others who have a first-hand knowledge of local supplies.

Our best source of information, however, and certainly the most interesting, comes directly from housewives. Some time ago we worked out an arrangement with 3,000 families scattered all over the United States, some in large cities and some in small towns and rural areas. Each day, these housewives make out a careful record of their food purchases and then send these reports to us in the O. P. A. in Washington. The shopping experiences of these women are much like those of the rest of us. So by glancing over the incoming records every day we can tell what people like yourselves are buying and what you are unable to buy. In that way we are able to get a pretty clear picture of what goes on in most family households.

With the help of these records, we work out point values which you find tacked up in your grocery stores around the first of every month. In general, it seems to me, the men responsible for this work have been doing a sensible and painstaking job.

Right now, our meat supplies are in pretty good shape and for that reason I am glad to say that we are going to be able to cut the points on meat rather substantially during the month of December. This reduction in point values will give each member of your family about 30 percent more meat during December.

I'm particularly glad that we can distribute this extra meat for all of us to share during the Christmas season for I know you'll all be wanting to entertain your friends and do some extra neighborly calling around.

The new point values will be in effect when you shop next week. You will find that most beef cuts in your store will be two or three points lower. You will find that some so-called variety meats require no points whatsoever. With one or two exceptions you will find all pork cuts continuing at the lower point values which we put into effect on November 19.

However, let me make one thing clear. Although there's going to be about 30 percent more meat for each of us during December, there's no guaranteeing how long this extra supply may last. We may have to raise point values again in January, or perhaps in February. And, much as I hate to say it, by spring, I believe, our meat supplies are going to be definitely less than they are today.

The War Food Administration will continue to do everything in its power to even out our meat supplies as far as possible. But in spite of their best efforts, our supplies are bound to fluctuate somewhat throughout the year as they always have done in normal times. The safe thing for us all to do is to enjoy the present extra supply while it lasts.

I'm well aware that this extra meat during December still isn't going to give you or me or any of the rest of us all the meat we'd like to have or all we could afford to buy. But the fact that after 2 years of war we can get more of anything is good news. I'm sure you will agree on that.

Now let me say just a few words about butter. There's nothing in the world that we would rather do than to reduce the present high point value on butter. Sixteen points is a lot of points. But the trouble is that the butter supply just isn't there on a national basis. Of course, in the butter-producing areas, there is an abundance of butter. The point value was raised to assure fair distribution throughout the country. In this way all the butter doesn't stay in the butter-producing areas, while the rest of the country suffers a butter famine.

I know that if War Food Administration could have seen their way clear to increase the supply for us civilians they would have been only too glad to do so. And if the supply were increased, you can be sure that we in the O. P. A. would at once reduce the present high point value, just as we did 2 weeks ago, when we reduced the pork points.

So there's the story on meat and butter, and I am very glad indeed that I have been able to give you some good news for the holiday season.

I have just one final word, and that is about the prices which you pay for meat. Those ceiling prices are fair prices, and most grocers and butchers will respect them and maintain them. However, there'll always be some chiselers and profiteers even during wartime. It's up to you and your neighbors, both in your own interests and in the interests of the overwhelming majority of honest retailers, to see that price ceilings are maintained in all stores.

When sales are made over ceiling prices, it's a community problem and it can only be met on a democratic community basis. Get to know the price panel of your local war price and rationing board. Work closely with them in their efforts to protect you and your neighbors against overcharges and profiteering. That's the right way and the democratic way, as I am sure you will agree.

No Black Markets in San Francisco for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of black markets. Much has been said of how O. P. A. will not accept constructive suggestions from practical men. But a letter reaching my desk yesterday gives credit to all parties. It is from Palmer C. Mendelson, of San Francisco, representing the San Francisco Wholesale Perishable Food Committee.

Believing information in Mr. Mendelson's letter and enclosures mentioned therein may be useful in many congressional districts, I am asking that all be printed as part of my remarks:

A. LEVY & J. ZENTNER CO.,
San Francisco, Calif, November 30, 1943.
The Honorable THOMAS ROLPH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: Please accept my sincere thanks for your letter of November 23, together with the letter from Mr. Chester Bowles. You can imagine that I do appreciate the thoroughness with which Mr. Bowles discusses the matter and I will be very happy if you will advise the Administrator that since he has taken over the position we have definitely seen a marked difference in the attitude of O. P. A. toward industry and, in our own case, of industry toward O. P. A.

As a member of the national executive board of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, I might say that we have all been very happy to see the adoption of a policy which permits O. P. A. to consider industry other than a man with a blackjack behind his back.

It seems to us that the contemplated citrus ceiling is a step in the right direction and as indicated to you, the lettuce ceiling has worked better than any. I must, in all fairness, criticize the apple regulation, which is still causing no end of grief. I can well understand that it is necessary to have increases in the ceiling from month to month, but I claim that such increases should not be published earlier than a week before the change is effective. We have seen some very serious gaps in the supply of both apples and citrus where these monthly changes have been known to growers.

I agree that it is inadvisable to establish a different price for each variety. The main complaint is between loose fruit and packed fruit and I am glad to read that O. P. A. is considering changes along this line.

I know it will be interesting to Mr. Bowles to learn that here in San Francisco we have never had a black market for fresh fruits and vegetables. At the very start of price control, the writer organized a committee known as the San Francisco Wholesale Perishable Food War Committee. The committee consists of eight market men, taken from each phase of distribution. We issue interpretative releases brought down to common English language and I enclose two copies herewith. If anyone on the market is reported violating a ceiling, a member of the committee contacts him, points out the mistake, suggests a check with O. P. A. on the proper ceiling and then if violation continues, the committee reports his name to O. P. A. The success of the plan has been phenomenal. We have tried to maintain a sense of humor throughout and have found that the men on the street, comprising 80 firms, have completely gotten within price control and are using the services of the committee continually to get the proper price. Checks of State and city authorities have shown that all ceiling prices have been maintained.

The success of the plan has been such that New York City has adopted it under the name of the San Francisco Plan and we have been advised Newark, N. J., has likewise adopted this policy.

Of course, such a program can only succeed where you have proper businessmen at the head of O. P. A. We have been very fortunate in dealing with Mr. Breton and Mr. Henning here, who have cooperated 100 percent to help us put this program over.

I can only repeat, Tom, that if Br. Bowles continues in his present policies that he will deserve and will definitely receive industry cooperation as far as the fresh fruit and vegetable business is concerned.

Yours truly,

PALMER C. MENDELSON.

WHOLESALE PERISHABLE FOOD
WAR COMMITTEE,
San Francisco, November 4, 1943.

To the Trade:

There are several vitally important matters which you must take note of immediately. We have been called by the O. P. A. on some of them and as usual we want to correct these minor infractions in order to keep the street where it has been—100 percent in cooperation.

Apples: We have had reported to us two instances of apples which were billed out of Yakima at 44 pounds and when they went through the wholesale market here were handled as 46 pounds. It is very important that you do not do any chiseling at all on this weight proposition. The O. P. A. is now checking retail stores and in doing so the lots will be followed back by weight to their origin. Be sure you are right on the weight you take.

Sales tags: Further, with regard to O. P. A. checking in retail stores, we are advised by them that they cannot check items such as lettuce or grapes because your invoices do not carry the size of the lettuce or the weight of the grapes. According to law, you must show this. An instance was found where a box of grapes showed 26 pounds on the box and yet the wholesaler charged on a 28-pound basis. Unless you can definitely prove that it is regulation, 28 pounds net crate, you must sell on a pound basis, and above all show on your tags weights and sizes. This is for your own protection.

Peas: Your ceiling is approximately 15 cents a pound. Some people have absorbed a part of the commission and thus returned more to the grower than he is rightfully entitled to. This is the story on peas. The most that you can return to a grower is 13.7 cents per pound less the freight to San Francisco. It is illegal to return more than this.

Grapes: The new November ceiling on grapes is 25 cents per crate higher than October.

Carrots: The eighth region has issued an amendment on an f. o. b. basis only. The most you should pay for them now is as follows:

Six dozen bunches, $3.50 f. o. b., plus top ice if used.

Bunched carrots with full tops, in containers other than L. A. crates, 58 cents per dozen, top ice extra, each bunch to weigh not less than 12 pounds.

Clipped top carrots, $4 per 100 pounds.

Top carrots, $3 per 100 pounds.

Your own selling price on carrot sales reverts back to your highest price of February 1943. If your selling price does not let you out on this f. o. b. cost, apply immediately for relief.

Car embargoes: For your information a number of eastern receivers are now prevented from receiving carlots of merchandise because they abused their privileges and took too long to unload. The Interstate Commerce Commission is much concerned with the possibility of car shortage and are cracking down on those who use cars for storage purposes.

The much advertised 16 vegetables soon to be under ceiling are apparently ready to come out at a minute's notice.

The f. o. b. prices that you can expect. Nothing definite but you can plan accordingly.

Tomatoes: $3 f. o. b.

Peas: September to March, $3.50 f. o. b.; April to August, $2.80 f. o. b.

Peppers: October and November, $4 f. o. b.

Celery: $3 f. o. b.

Cauliflower: $1.45 f. o. b.

Lima beans: November, $3; December to April, $4.

Cabbage: For November, $47 per ton; December to April, $58 per ton.

Cucumbers: November–December, $3.40 per bushel.

I repeat, these are not issued as yet.

Yours truly,

PALMER C. MENDELSON.

P. S.—There is no ceiling on crab apples or lady apples.

WHOLESALE PERISHABLE FOOD
WAR COMMITTEE,
San Francisco, November 23, 1943.

To the Trade:

Oranges: You probably have read that the new citrus ceiling is about to be released. The new regulation (if it succeeds in running the gantlet in Washington) has made new and welcome changes from any previous set-up.

It is apparent that the citrus deal is being put on a far sounder basis.

1. The retail ceiling will be expressed in terms of cents per pound.

2. There is definitely a ceiling at the grower level which will prevent much black marketing now rampant.

3. The old 9½ percent to cash-and-carry wholesalers and 21 percent to delivery wholesalers will be done away with and in its place a flat dollars-and-cents mark-up. This will react greatly to the benefit of San Francisco which has been forced to a 9½-percent mark-up. Anticipated wholesale mark-ups per box are, oranges, 75 cents; grapefruit, 65 cents; lemons, 90 cents.

It is not official yet. We give you this so you can be posted on what's in the wind. Most important announcement in connection with the new regulation is that of Judge Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization. Mr. Vinson said if "it should appear that existing distributive system is being bypassed by direct buying or other devices, W. F. A. will issue orders or a licensing plan to prevent this."

Tangerines: We are trying mightily to get a revision of the present tangerine price. We are in direct contact with Washington and the local O. P. A. officials have appealed for us likewise.

Cabbage: Your price to retailers and procurement agencies is 3.2 cents per pound.

Peas: We are conferring with O. P. A. now on a revision of the present regional order on peas. Under the present price San Francisco is penalized due to the fact that other cities deliver and therefore are able to charge the service jobber mark-up. We are pressing this all possible.

Potatoes and onions:

Penalties: It is significant to note that in New York City one firm (three partners) was fined $10,000 each and 60 days in jail for paying over the ceiling. It evidently works both ways—and evidently there is only one right way—very much the cheapest one—complete compliance.

General list: We have been asked to issue a complete list of all prices to date. That request "is not hay." It will take a lot of work but it is hoped that we will be able to do something along this line before long.

In the meantime we have asked you to keep these releases. A proper file of them will give you all you need to know. The odds of 100 to 1 that not 1 house in 50 has kept them (and that includes the writer).

At the same time there are so many new ceilings under contemplation that we would rather defer this list until we can give you the whole slug at once.

Take your bow: It is with no little pride that your committee is able to advise that

at an enormous mass meeting in New York City last week it was unanimously voted to adopt the San Franlisco Plan in O. P. A. enforcement. This is definitely great tribute to you who have helped us put over this self-enforcing program and which has kept San Francisco one of the few white markets in the United States.

We have also advices that Newark and Jersey City, N. J., are likewise forming committees under the San Francisco Plan and the writer has been asked to deliver an address to the united convention at Chicago in January dealing with the success of our O. P. A. relationships.

I think your compliance and willingness to play ball will bring huge dividends in publicity for Washington Street and also in the knowledge that no fingers can be pointed at San Francisco in the current O. P. A. drive for better enforcement.

Yours truly,

PALMER C. MENDELSON.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, post-war problems are entitled to the utmost possible discussion by Congress and America. Second only to the winning of the war itself is the great question of how to make our certain victory permanent, so as to justify the great sacrifices made by our fighting men. Only through discussion can we hope to formulate legislation that will achieve that end. I wish to call to the attention of the House a radio address upon this subject given recently by Mr. Charles Nelson, of Willmar, Minn. Mr. Nelson is one of the leaders of the Townsend movement in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota.

Friends in the radio audience in the Seventh Congressional District and adjoining districts, district council members, officers and membership in Townsend clubs, I greet you in the name of the founder of this great movement, Dr. Francis E. Townsend.

In a conversation with a businessman in Willmar a few days ago, I asked the question, "What do you think of the Townsend plan?" He said, "I believe in a generous pension for the worthy old folks, but why $200 per month?" I said, "That was a part of the first Townsend proposal for recovery from the depression. It is now based on what a 3-percent gross income tax will provide." My subject for this broadcast is Post-War Problems.

Is a depression inevitable after a war? What is the cause of a national depression? May I offer a few comments: During World War No. 1, the United States got involved. We furnished men, supplies, and money to win this war "to end war." We did win it but we have not ended war. Full employment then resulted in purchasing power and rising prices. The armistice was signed, but we neglected to contribute our influence to secure peace after the victory was won. People invested freely, thinking that prosperity should continue as it did for 2 years after the war. Groups controlling the money supply planned different, however, and forced deflation and liquidation on the Nation. Agriculture took the first blow with millions losing their equity and farms. Organized industry, however, soon began rebuilding the depleted supplies of necessities and mass production enabled labor to become quite fully employed with prosperity till 1929 when the stock market collapsed. Investors withdrew their capital, factories closed, and discharged employees, industry and transportation did likewise. Farm products sold for less than cost of production, 15,000,000 unemployed labor had no buying power. Bread lines, soup kitchens, holiday movement, and rebellion faced the Nation.

Idle dollars, idle plants, idle men. Want in the midst of plenty. New Deal agencies were set up which brought relief but not a cure. Our national net income had dropped to $43,000,000,000; now it has risen to about $140,000,000,000 annually. Production enormously stepped up to meet war needs; labor fully employed and with buying power. Did we not have the same abundant natural resources in 1933?

Our forefathers founded this Nation on faith in God. Life liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was to be the heritage of posterity. You know the scriptural injunction: "If the Lord buildeth not a city, the workmen laboreth in vain who buildeth thereon." Let us then seek divine direction. God-life says: "I have provided lavish abundance for all the sustenance of mankind, and yet a few of mankind claim control of it, and leave their brothers and sisters to starve for the lack of the exchange to buy it when it never belonged to any of them. Let us understand life, and in your call to life, life will become your almighty council of defense. Then you will know your dominion; then you will know that in attention to life is the fullness of everything you require."

Dr. Townsend has suggested to call a conference of leaders in the Nation—Government officials, economists, industrial executives, bankers, educators, scientists, and clergymen—to consider post-war problems, to continue production and prosperity. If we can attain full production and buying power during war with identical resources which we had during the depression, why can we not do it in peacetime, when there is no need of wasting for destruction? I am glad to note that the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Manufacturers Association are planning for post-war production. They do not like Government bureaus to "hamstring" business, but desire free enterprise. We had it after the last war and during the depression. When industry fails to provide full employment, Government must step in to supplement it.

Let me quote the growing viewpoint of great corporations. General Electric issued a bulletin 2 years ago saying: "If the great corporations would get together and see that every family in America has an income of $1,500 per year, there would be no depression." David C. Prince, vice president of General Electric, said recently at such a conference: "The country needed consumer purchasing power to give industry the come-back it needed to open jobs for the unemployed in the depression period"; and added, "Problems of the same magnitude would follow in this post-war period"; and he called on industry to develop its reserve to employ people when the war ends: "If we fall far below, then the Government will have to pour in lots of money, and they will get the money right from us."

Henry Ford saw this a few years ago when he raised the minimum wages of his employees to $5 per day and later to $7 per day. Mass production enabled him to cut the price in half so his employees and the common man could afford to buy and run an automobile. Competitors followed, and the public was served.

The Townsend national recovery plan fits into this picture to provide purchasing power for the products of the farm, factory, and business enterprises. A leading politician has recently stated that "the Townsend plan will provide no new purchasing power." Well, let us see. The 3 percent gross income tax proposed by the Townsend bill on all income from business, farms, wages, and salaries, dividends or interest, according to our best economists, should yield about ten billion above exemptions. That prorated among our aged above 60 years of age and the totally disabled of any age would yield about $80 per month at present, but, geared as it is to our national income, would be ample for a decent American standard of living at any time. In normal times we may safely assume that $50 per month would accrue to each annuitant. No strings tied to it, except that he must be an American citizen and retire from competition with business and labor. Six months after the war he must spend the monthly annuity within 30 days.

The Census Bureau reports that 12 to 13 percent of our population is over 60 years of age. Some are self-sustaining and will not call for the pension but about 10 percent will. Let me compare in Kandiyohi the two systems: Population 26,000 and 10 percent is 2,600 annuitants drawing monthly $50 equals $130,000 per month or $1,560,000 annual income for the country. During December we had 595 aged drawing $23.11 from our present old-age-assistance Social Security, or $13,751 for the month. The difference is just $116,249 new purchasing power monthly or $1,395,000 for the year for Kadiyohi County. Would our merchants and farmers welcome such added buying power? There are about 300,000 people living in the Seventh District. Thirty thousand would be eligible to pensions and about $18,000,000 would be distributed among annuitants.

What effect would a 3-percent gross income tax have on our people? Right now we have a Victory tax of 5 percent which is absorbed into a 20-percent gross income (pay-as-you-go tax) with cost-of-living exemption. Some of us have 4 percent deducted from the salary for retirement fund with no exemption. Railroad pensions are based on 3½ percent from employees and 3½ percent from the employer. No exemption. Social Security is based on a contributing tax of one-third percent from the employees and the employer. Now that the veterans and disabled are to be included, Senator WAGNER of New York introduced a bill calling for 6 percent from the wage earner and 6 percent from the employer. No exemption. Why should we complain on the Townsend 3-percent gross income tax? The first $100 (considered living cost) is exempt monthly or $1,200 for the year. Why should anyone object to paying that tax toward his own retirement? Many farmers and salaried people have no provision for retirement; why should they object to a 3-percent tax above $100 per month exemption? The manufacturer and merchant is able to pass his tax on to the consumer. A 3-percent tax is not paralizing to business. It may slightly increase the cost of living but should be offset by creating a cash market for factory, farm, and merchandise of merchants. It should abolish the sales tax which is runing at the rate of one-third percent in some States and up to 20 percent on gasoline.

Friends in the radio audience, is it not a fact that we as people have had our attention centered on our limitations with all of its ramifications instead of on abundance for all. Youth and even the veterans coming

back from the armed service are not calling for a dole or charity but for an opportunity for service and development. The Scriptures tell us that "without vision the people perish." On his eightieth birthday Henry Ford was asked what he thought of profit in business. He said: "I look at profit as service to consumer. Money is a measure of value. It should be servant, not master."

Henry Kaiser, the noted industrialist, contributing so wonderfully to our production effort in factories, shipbuilding, and developing new industries, gave the commencement address at the University of Oregon. He said: "During the next 25 years I see the greatest prosperity for our people which they have ever experienced. Our peacetime effort must first supplement the world's needs, but in America the riches of our soil, mines, and forests must be converted into peacetime needs with the same skill and ambition as applied to our wartime needs." The Townsend plan can contribute mightily in aiding distribution, providing a stable economy and dignified security to those who have labored for a generation to build this Nation's prosperity.

Resolution of Foreign Trade Association of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we on the Pacific coast are aware of the fact that after the war in the Atlantic is finished there will be a gradual shift on the east coast from wartime to peacetime production, while the Pacific coast will still be converting all of its efforts toward war production. In view of this fact and the results after the Japanese have been defeated, we, on the Pacific coast, must insist that there be no discrimination against producers and manufacturers. This is already going on as the Panama Canal Commission is purchasing materials on the Atlantic coast and from the Gulf ports of the United States, not considering low bidders and ignoring the Pacific Coast States.

I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California:

Resolution relating to the practice of the Panama Canal Commission of allotting purchases of miscellaneous materials and supplies required for maintenance and construction purposes, etc., on the Canal Zone to manufacturers and producers located adjacent to Atlantic and Gulf ports of the United States

Whereas the practice of the Governor of the Panama Canal, Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, United States Army, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, in the purchase of materials and supplies is to send the requests to B. F. Burdick, 411 Tenth Street, Washington, who is the general purchasing officer, and he submits invitations for bids to various manufacturers located in different sections of the United States; and

Whereas the following is an excerpt from a letter written by B. F. Burdick, general purchasing officer of the Panama Canal, under date of August 5, 1942 (revised August 2, 1943), to the United States Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, at Washington:

"Until further notice all f. o. b. works orders will be shipped on Government bill of lading to the Transportation Officer, New Orleans Port of Embarkation, New Orleans, La. The bill of lading shall be furnished by the inspector when he has inspected and passed the material"; and

Whereas the effect of this letter has made it compulsory for all shipments to be routed via the port of New Orleans, thus depriving Pacific coast manufacturers of durable commodities, whether they are low bidders or not, from securing or participating in any of the Canal business; and

Whereas the natural rail and ocean movement of durable commodities produced in the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, particularly the Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington should be through the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle to conserve transportation haulage to New Orleans; and

Whereas (illustrations) B. F. Burdick, general purchasing officer of the Panama Canal, opened bids under date of August 14, 1943, Schedule No. 7056, for 50,000 barrels of cement, and under date of October 25, 1943, Schedule No. 7139, for 50,000 barrels of cement, and we are informed that regardless of the California mills, who were the low bidders, and advised in their bids and through the Grace Line—agents for the War Shipping Administration—of the steamship service available from Pacific coast ports to take care of the quantities in both cases, the orders were awarded to eastern cement mills for movement via New Orleans; and

Whereas World War No. 2 has developed a two-ocean Navy, Army, Air Corps, etc., and a large merchant marine, a reasonable portion of the Panama Canal requirements of material and supplies should be allotted to manufacturers, producers, etc., in Pacific Coast States who are located adjacent to the principal Pacific coast ports—Los Angeles, Long Beach, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle—and the matter should be drawn to the attention of the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, the California, Oregon, and Washington congressional representatives, and the general managers of the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle Chambers of Commerce, and the Governors of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, urging their cooperation with the interested parties that the Pacific coast ports be used for the movement of Pacific coast products to the Canal Zone, especially in view of the fact that steamship service is available, and as far as can be ascertained no ships have been lost through submarine or other warfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California, at a regularly authorized monthly meeting, held at Los Angeles, Calif., Wednesday, November 10, 1943, That a resolution was adopted that the matter be presented to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, the California, Oregon, and Washington congressional representatives, the general managers of the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle Chambers of Commerce, and the Governors of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, urging their cooperation with the various Government agencies that a reasonable portion of the Panama Canal Commission's requirements of durable and other commodities be allotted to Pacific coast producers and manufacturers, especially when they are the low bidders, and same should be routed through Pacific coast ports; be it further

Resolved, That the president and the executive secretary of the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California be authorized to write an individual and personal letter to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, the California, Oregon, and Washington congressional representatives, the general managers of the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle Chambers of Commerce, and the Governors of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington urging their cooperation with the interested Government bureaus that a portion of the Panama Canal requirements of durable and other commodities be allotted to Pacific coast producers and manufacturers (especially when they are low bidders) and routed through Pacific coast ports.

Corn Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Robert E. Kennedy in the Chicago Times, November 28, 1943, gives the O. P. A.'s side of the much-discussed question of raising corn prices:

TO MARKET, TO MARKET

Last week farmers sent so many hogs to the Chicago meat packing plants that the Chicago hog marketing council had to ask farmers to give them a breathing spell. The fat hogs were going to market in such quantities because hog prices, according to O. P. A. charts, have been higher than they should be in comparison with other farm products.

While the Chicago slaughter pens were packed to capacity with grunting porkers, on the floor of Congress the cackling of dissatisfaction from poultry growers and moos of distress from dairy men continued unabated. Because Middle West farmers have found it more profitable to turn their corn into pork instead of selling it at the O. P. A. ceiling price as dairy and poultry feed, there has been a feed shortage for the cows and chickens in other parts of the country. Of course, in Congress and in farm circles, the whole blame is placed on O. P. A. The inflationists, who want to discontinue food subsidies being used to hold the line against a soaring cost of living, have only one answer to any problem—raise the price. Their answer to the pork-versus-chicken problem was: Raise the O. P. A. ceiling price of corn so farmers would make as much money selling it as feed as feeding it to hogs.

Seldom does O. P. A. get its side presented in Congress. A telephone call to O. P. A.'s consultant, Richard V. Gilbert, shows this picture: The O. P. A. ceiling price of corn is $1.07 a bushel at Chicago, which means less than $1 in the Corn Belt.

If the farmers feed the corn to the hogs they get more than they do selling corn on the market. So instead of shipping it to the dairy and poultry farmers on the coasts the farmers have fed it to hogs or stored it in bins hoping the pressure thus built up to get corn prices raised would break the O. P. A.'s ruling and the farmers would make a killing.

Now, actually, $1.07 a bushel is parity price, which means a fair return based on the present cost of living. At that price, corn is a fairly profitable venture. But this was not the main reason why O. P. A. has re-

fused to raise the ceiling. O. P. A.'s solution to the problem was: Don't raise the price of corn—lower the price of hogs. Hog ceiling prices were inordinately high and the question at stake was: Shall all other prices be allowed to rise and break through the line set by the President or should hog prices be lowered?

If corn prices were raised, the price of eggs, poultry and milk would go up. Better, said O. P. A., thinking about the cost of living and inflation instead of farmers' profits, that pork prices be lowered instead of corn prices hiked.

So, first it was determined that we actually had enough corn. Last year we had 3.1 billion bushels, and 3.08 billion this year. Uncle Sam didn't want any more corn. The land would be better sowed with wheat and soybeans which we need. Next, it was made less profitable to sell overfat hogs than moderately fat ones and average hog weight was reduced from 255 to 230 pounds since September. This kept 250,000,000 bushels of corn from the pigsties. If it hasn't left the corncribs, it's because farmers are holding out in hopes O. P. A. will be ruled out. With so many hogs in Chicago last week, the price would have broken below the Government guaranteed floor—$13.75 support price. Nex year's support price, effective after September 1944, has already been reduced to $12.50 and farmers are breeding fewer sows for next spring's crop. This reduction is expected to pick up another 250,000,000 bushels of corn.

Maybe the farmers don't like the O. P. A.'s methods of solving problems but workers don't like frozen wages, either. Stern as they are, they are better than runaway inflation with butter at $1 a pound.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House can find the time for consideration of the subject of national military cemeteries. Plans should certainly be made now to advance the national cemetery idea; many organizations and individuals are interested. As an example, there is included as a part of this extension of remarks a resolution:

Resolution adopted by the national executive committee meeting Military Order of the Purple Heart, at meeting held in Chicago, November 20 and 21, 1943

Whereas many of the States within the United States are at present without national cemeteries for the burial of war veterans; and

Whereas Congress has failed to heretofore enact legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to acquire suitable sites for the establishment of national cemeteries in all States; and

Whereas the necessity for such national cemeteries is daily becoming more urgent owing to the added millions of veterans from the present World War No. 2; and

Whereas there is now before Congress H. R. 3582 introduced by the Hon. EARLE D. WILLEY, which bill, if passed, will mandate the Secretary of War to acquire suitable sites for the establishment, care, and maintenance of such national cemeteries in all States for the burial of war veterans. Be it

Resolved the Military Order of the Purple Heart earnestly favor and support H. R. 3582 instructing our representative, the national service director in Washington, to request the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that a hearing be held before that committee on this bill, and that our representative appear in support of the proposed legislation urging the committee's favorable report on the bill and their full support on the floor of the House.

Submitted.

THE MILITARY ORDER OF
THE PURPLE HEART,
FRANK HALEY,
National Service Director.

Flag Presentation at Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an account appearing in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of November 17, 1943, of a ceremony at Pearl Harbor in which Rear Admiral William R. Furlong, commandant of the United States navy yard, and brother of ROBERT GRANT FURLONG, of Pennsylvania, received a Hawaiian flag in commemoration of the birthday of King Kalakaua who was responsible for the treaty under which the United States first obtained coaling rights at this great naval base.

PAGEANTRY REVIVED AS BANNER OF OLD HAWAII IS PRESENTED TO CHA3

In a ceremony replete with the color and pageantry of old Hawaii, and which witnessed a reunion of dignitaries 32 years after the first United States warship of appreciable size entered Pearl Harbor, the flag of Hawaii was raised in the Hall of Flags in Civilian Housing Area 3 at Pearl Harbor Tuesday night. It was a scene that will stamp itself vividly on the minds of those who witnessed it. Past and present was mingled in the gathering of distinguished guests who paid honor to the flag that had woven into its furls the romantic and enchanting history of these islands.

PRESENTED BY KAI

Presentation of the flag was made by Ernest K. Kai, Acting Governor of Hawaii, in the presence of an assembly of Hawaiian societies that included the Daughters and Sons of Hawaiian Warriers, Kaahumanu Society, Hale o Na Alii o Hawaii, and the Order of Kamehameha, Hawaii chapter 1.

Presenting the flag to Rear Admiral William R. Furlong, United States Navy, commandant of the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard, Mr. Kai said:

"This flag is unique in that it not only represents the most recently incorporated and integral part of our Nation, but it represents a Territory whose history as an independent nation extends over a much longer period of time than that of any other single part of the Union."

Accepting the flag, Admiral Furlong said the first United States warship of considerable size to enter the Pearl Harbor Channel after it had been dredged was the armored cruiser *California*. That was on December 14, 1911.

"There is present tonight," he continued, "Maj. Gen. Ross E. Rowell, commanding the marine aircraft wing, Pacific, who was a lieutenant of marines serving on the *California* at that time. Lieutenant Rowell took the 3-inch field guns from the *California* ashore at Pearl Harbor and fired the salute as the *California* came in.

MANY WERE ABOARD

"Also on board the California at that time were Mr. and Mrs. Walter F. Dillingham, who are present this evening. It was Mr. Dillingham's company that dredged the channel, and it is he who has taken a major part in most of the improvements of the channel and harbor since that time.

"Also on board the *California* that day, and present with us this evening, are Vice Admiral and Mrs. Robert L. Ghormley, former Governor and Mrs. Walter F. Frear, former Chief Justice and Mrs. A. G. M. Roberston, Mr. and Mrs. A. Lewis, Jr., Vice Admiral W. L. Calhoun, and former Senator John C. Lane.

"And now 56 years after King Kalakaua agreed to the establishment of a coaling and repair base at Pearl Harbor, there are assembled here tonight hundreds of men from every State of the Union who work at Pearl Harbor in the prosecution of the war; they are here in the Hall of Flags to receive the flag of Hawaii and to add it to the flags from their States.

DESCENDANTS OF CHIEFS

"There are present, too, the descendants of the kings and chiefs and early people of Hawaii.

"There are with us also men and women whose fathers were the sugar planters, businessmen, and professional men who took an active part in Hawaiian affairs in the time of King Kalakaua.

"The fathers of some of those present went to Washington to negotiate the treaty of annexation.

"There are present the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, the commanding general, United States Army forces, central Pacific area, and other high-ranking officers.

"In accepting this flag of Hawaii on the birthday of the king who authorized the use of Pearl Harbor, I am impressed with the thought of how greatly do the acts of one generation affect the life and welfare of generations to come."

Homer Tyson was master of ceremonies.

BAND, CLUBS ENTERTAIN

Before the ceremony, the gathering was entertained by a concert by the Royal Hawaiian Band under the direction of Bandmaster Domenico Moro, and by songs by the boys' and girls' glee clubs of the Kamehameha schools directed by Frank P. Kernehan and Miss Laura E. Brown, respectively.

After the presentation, the Hawaiian Girls' Glee Club, under the direction of Miss Julia Doyle, and the Royal Hawaiian Band Glee Club, directed by Mike Hanapi, entertained.

The playing of the national anthem by the band closed the program.

Sponsors from the eight Hawaiian islands represented at the presentation were: Miss Rose Vivian Kinney, Oahu; Miss Roberta Winn Apaka, Hawaii; Miss Marjorie Kanae, Maui; Miss Leila Hohu, Molokai; Miss Florence Akina, Kauai; Miss Pearl Sousa, Lanai; Miss Elizabeth Beirne, Niihau, and Miss Julia Stewart, Kahoolawe.

The committee on arrangements included John C. Lane, George Mossman, Henry A. Nye, John R. Desha, William K. Taylor, William Chung Hoon, Jr., and Commander John H. Kangeter, United States Naval Reserve.

Representing the societies as officers were Princess David Kawananakoa, regent of Hale O Na Alii; Miss Esther Ainoa, president of

Hale O Na Alii; Miss Lahilahi Webb, president of Kaahumanu Society, and Wilfred K. Richardson, president of the Order of Kamehameha.

Dr. Homer S. Barnes, principal in charge of the Kamehameha schools, also contributed to the program.

Statement of R. J. Thomas, President of U. A. W., C. I. O., on Brewster Aircraft Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to incorporate a copy of a letter that I have received from R. J. Thomas, president of the U. A. W., C. I. O., and which letter was sent to all the members of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs investigating the Brewster aircraft problems. This letter is very informative and enlightening and contains valuable facts which I feel should be made available to every Member of the House.

The letter follows:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.),
November 28, 1943.

Hon. P. H. DREWRY,
Chairman, Subcommittee
House Committee on Labor,
Washington, D. C.

I have your telegram of November 17, in which you, for the second time, decline to permit me, as president of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O., to appear before the subcommittee which has been investigating production problems in the plants of Brewster Aircraft Corporation.

Your statement that I "have had no direct or indirect connection with Brewster", is inaccurate, as I could have shown to your satisfaction had your committee not arbitrarily refused me the right to a hearing. It so happens that I helped negotiate and was one of the signatories of the 1939 contract between the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and Brewster Local 365, U. A. W.-C. I. O. Since that time, I have had several occasions to acquaint myself with specific problems involving the Brewster contract. In the final analysis I am the chief spokesman for the Brewster workers as well as all other members of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. I therefore feel it was completely unfair and not in the best interests of an important investigation for your committee to refuse to hear me.

Furthermore, I cannot subscribe to your statement that your investigation has limited itself purely to production problems in the Brewster plants. Members of your committee, as well as some witnesses before it, were permitted to stray far from the subject purportedly under investigation. You permitted arguments in favor of the open shop; you permitted criticism of the Wagner Act and the War Labor Board; you permitted attacks on features of Brewster contracts which are common to most labor-management contracts in our country; you entered into personal matters which you failed to show had any connection whatever with production at Brewster. Your refusal to hear me, even on the mistaken supposition that I had no direct information on the Brewster situation has, therefore, no legitimate justification.

Your refusal to hear me, together with the reading of the testimony before your committee, leads me to feel that the investigation which you have conducted cannot accurately be called a sincere effort to improve production in the Brewster plants.

I will grant that you have produced a large amount of information dealing with reasons for lack of greater production at Brewster, but you have also permitted your inquiry to degenerate into a labor-baiting affair which could not help but have the effect of vitiating, perhaps completely nullifying, the constructive features of the hearings.

Any fair-minded person reading the testimony would be struck immediately with the persistency with which you tried to badger witnesses who did not agree with you, tried to misinterpret their remarks, and tried time and again to put in the mouths of witnesses attacks on the Brewster local union which they did not desire to make.

Your examination of three union spokesmen whom you chose to hear, Messrs. Thomas V. DeLorenzo, Paul J. Krebs, and Gabriel J. DeAngelis, was accompanied throughout by bullying, by threats, by personal abuse, and by impugning of motives. I have no desire to justify Mr. DeLorenzo's answers on certain questionnaires, but I maintain that you did not prove in any way that any of his acts reflected in any way on Mr. DeLorenzo's record as the leader of the Brewster local, or his efforts to maintain production in the Brewster plants.

By contrast with the abusive manner in which you interrogated witnesses who did not agree with you, you were most kind and solicitous of those witnesses who supported the apparently preconceived conclusion of the committee. In view of these facts I am constrained to observe that your committee was only secondarily interested in Brewster production, and primarily considered itself a "hanging committee" for the Brewster local union in particular and the labor movement of the country in general.

Reading the testimony, I was shocked to learn that you refused to display any interest in or make any effort to obtain probably the most authoritative survey of employment and production problems of the Long Island City Brewster plant. I refer to the investigation by the Division of Manpower Utilization of the Manpower Commission, region 2A. Since your committee failed to visit the plant, or send its own investigators into the plant, it seems to me that you might at least give consideration to a thorough investigation which was made by another Government agency.

The determination of your committee to bar out any facts which would not serve to blacken Brewster workers, their union, and their leaders, is evidenced also by your refusal to receive in evidence and make part of the testimony a careful, detailed, objective report made by labor members of the Brewster labor-management production committee.

I urge that in all fairness these two reports be made part of the records of the proceedings of the committee, and given their merited consideration in your final report.

On the basis of these two reports, and on the basis of testimony by officers of the United States Navy and officers of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, it is obvious that the production deficiencies which prevailed in the Brewster plants can in no way be charged to Local 365, U. A. W.-C. I. O. On the contrary, it appears that production failures were the responsibility of the managements, and of the Navy Department itself which sponsored some of the managements.

In this connection, I would direct your attention particularly to the testimony of Mr. Ralph Singer, a former president of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, who stated that the company set about making planes without blueprints and without engineering.

Mr. Singer said: "There have been no airplanes of that design; there has been no engineering data of any kind other than, as I say, a rough sketch and this mock-up; so that you can readily see we were going into production on something that did not exist." The confusion which resulted from this preposterous situation should be understandable to all reasonable men. Mr. Frederick Riebel, another former president of Brewster, told your committee that engineering changes numbered from 500 to 1,200 per week. Mr. Riebel also indicated that there was considerable labor hoarding at the plant. It was also testified that the flow of materials was irregular and inadequate and that the physical lay-out of the Long Island City plant was far from conducive to top production.

In view of these circumstances, I do not see how any labor union could be held responsible for production failures. Under the circumstances recited to your committee, there can be no legitimate charge made of loafing on the part of workers. I have, at times, worked in mass-production plants, and I know that bad engineering and lack of parts give workers no alternative but occasional idleness. This was obviously true in the Brewster Long Island City plant. What happened there cannot properly be called loafing; more correctly it should be labeled "enforced idleness," for which the management was solely responsible.

I reject as unsound and unfair the suggestion that workers prefer idleness to meeting fair production standards; had members of your committee any experience with mass-production plants, they would know that idleness, under these circumstances, is more difficult, more wearing, on the worker than activity.

Your committee devoted a great amount of time at its hearings to an attack on features of the contract which covered the Brewster workers. These contracts were signed by the managements, as well as the Brewster local. In your attack on some features of these contracts, as I said before, you do not merely attack the Brewster local but you attack and seek to undermine similar contracts which cover the majority of our country's 13,000,000 organized workers.

You seem to ascribe production deficiencies to the union shop, and the requirement that all workers shall, as condition of their employment, be members of the union. I must remind you of the obvious fact that union-shop contracts are fairly common in our country and exist in plants whose production not even your committee could find grounds to criticize. The union shop is the ultimate form of recognition which a labor union can obtain, and is necessary if the union is to fully accept its responsibilities for maintaining smooth labor relations and continuous production.

Your committee devoted much time to attacking the shop-steward system which exists in the Brewster plants. Your members take particular objection to the fact that stewards, on company time, handle labor problems for the workers. Your objection to this procedure, which is also common in labor-management contracts reveals that you do not have even an elementary conception of the role of shop stewards. The handling and adjustment of employee grievances is an integral part of the problem of maintaining continuous production in the plant. It is just as important to keep the labor force working smoothly as it is to keep machinery and equipment in functioning order. Since maintenance of machinery is a cost properly charged to management, so, also, the cost of maintaining labor-rela-

tions machinery should be borne by the management.

Your committee has sought to arraign the union on the alleged charge that it dictated hiring and blocked the discharge of incompetent employees. You sought to convey the impression before ascertaining the facts that the local union, or Mr. DeLorenzo, were executing some sort of dictatorship that tied the hands of the management and caused it to retain incompetents on the pay roll. Members of your committee persisted in this charge, although figures furnished you showed that this was clearly not the case. The testimony of witnesses who were in a position to know the facts disproved such contentions. For instance, you, as chairman of the committee, declared to Mr. Singer: "You could not hire without getting permission from Mr. DeLorenzo, according to that contract." Mr. Singer replied: "I do not think that was the case." You then persisted: "They had you give him a list of whom they intended to fire; they had to give it to the union before they hired." Despite your unfair, leading question, Mr. Singer replied: "Well, we never did that." At a later point Mr. Singer said: "We hired anyone we could get during the time I was there."

As I have said, the figures supplied you by the spokesman for the local union further disproved your contention that the contract saddled the managements with workers who should properly have been discharged. Your committee was offered copies of the company's official discharge slips, which indicated that during a 14-month period there were from 1,500 to 2,000 discharges. (You refused to accept this evidence.) The Brewster Corporation then employed 13,000 workers. I believe this heavy turn-over should set at rest any charges that the contract clause covering discharges operated to any appreciable extent in restricting functions of the management.

You are, of course, aware of the fact that the discharge clause has now been modified in such a way as to deprive the local union of some of its previous powers. Nevertheless, from the remarks of some of the members of your committee at the hearing, your committee is not satisfied. This again leads me to the conclusion that it is not so much alleged union malpractices to which your committee objects but rather to the existence of the union in the plants of the Brewster Corporation.

Your committee devoted much time also to a discussion of strikes and slow-downs in the Brewster plants. I want to make it perfectly clear that the international union, U. A. W.-C. I. O., is absolutely opposed to strikes in wartime. We have voluntarily given a pledge to forego our right to strike so long as the war continues. I challenge any member of the committee to show where a strike was called or authorized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O. I know that some strikes have occurred. In most cases these stoppages of work have been caused by failure of management to live up to its responsibilities. Nevertheless in all instances, including those at Brewster plants, the international union, with the cooperation of the locals, has always succeeded in terminating such stoppages.

I believe the good faith of the Brewster local with regard to carrying out the "no strike" pledge is shown by the fact that the local has invested its strike fund in War bonds. Certainly, if the local union contemplated ignoring the "no strike" pledge, it would not have diverted its strike fund, but would have kept it intact for its original purpose.

In the strike which resulted from the treatment of the guards in the Hatboro plant, as well as in other circumstances which brought interruption of work in Brewster plants, I have always asked the officers of the local to bring about resumption of production, and they have in all cases cooperated to the best of their ability.

Your committee made much of the fact that the Brewster local sought a voice on recommendations for selective-service deferments for essential workers in the plants. I have no apology to make for this. The local was merely following some excellent suggestions on policy which have been clearly enunciated by Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

Were your committee not intent upon smearing the Brewster local, and, incidentally, the rest of the labor movement, you could find more than sufficient testimony given at the hearings to justify the conclusion that labor was not the factor responsible for the failure of production. You have been informed that the production record in the Newark plant of the Brewster Corporation was highly satisfactory, yet this plant operated under the same contract and under the same set of officers that prevailed at Long Island City and Hatboro plants.

In this connection, I would refer you also to the testimony of Rear Admiral Sydney Kraus, of Lt. J. J. Reynolds, Jr., and of other witnesses. These witnesses refused to be pressured by members of your committee into stating that the contract of Local 365 was a major cause for the lack of production.

Rear Admiral Kraus stated, "I do not say that the union contract, or the union was solely or singly responsible for the condition that existed." Again he stated, "Labor is by no means solely responsible for the conditions that grew up in the Brewster organization." Admiral Kraus put his finger on one of the sore spots of the situation, when he stated, "Brewster wage scales were low and remained low, and contributed to bad morale for a long time." In this connection, Admiral Kraus declared also, "They (the management) got away for a considerable time with a wage scale that was below par. That condition cannot exist indefinitely and retain either an adequate or a contented force of employees." These fair statements so annoyed your committee that one of its members permitted himself to tell the Admiral, "I think you know a great deal you are not telling."

Lt. James Reynolds, Jr., who is naval industrial adviser to the general inspector of naval aircraft, eastern district, gave testimony similar to that of Admiral Kraus. Lieutenant Reynolds felt it fair to say, "I don't think Thomas DeLorenzo and those other men are quite the scoundrels they are being painted." He added, "In my opinion the fault really rests with management, way back. In my opinion if you have capable management, you have capable, responsible union leadership." He also said, "I believe that in the hands of an intelligent, enlightened management they (the union) can be made a very strong force to make Brewster a fine productive element in this country."

In apportioning blame for the kind of management with which Brewster was saddled, I believe the Navy Department cannot be absolved. I think it perfectly obvious that Mr. C. A. Van Dusen and Mr. F. Riebel, two of the most recent presidents of Brewster, were certainly not equipped for the tasks with which they were entrusted. Yet these men were the choice of the Navy Department. I have received sufficient first-hand reports to indicate what members of your committee must also know—that Mr. Riebel, in addition to being incompetent on production, had no conception whatever of how to deal with men and labor.

Both Mr. Van Dusen and Mr. Riebel, as your committee was informed, had in their employ capable labor relations men who were paid good salaries. These experts were apparently ignored by Mr. Riebel and Mr. Van Dusen, men who had no conception of the problems involved. Mr. Riebel's recital to your committee regarding the so-called declaration of war by the Brewster local, was silly, childish stuff which I am sure must have embarrassed your committee, eager as it was to give an air of credence to the witnesses' wild attacks on the Brewster workers and their union.

Management of the Brewster Corporation has now been entrusted to Mr. Henry J. Kaiser. The officers of Brewster Local 365 have pledged Mr. Kaiser their utmost cooperation. For the first time they have a production man in whom the workers can have faith. Already Mr. Kaiser's management has been able to report a substantial increase in production and steadily improving labor morale and labor relations.

It is disconcerting therefore to note the cynicism with which members of your committee regard the introduction of Mr. Kaiser into the Brewster management. If the object of the committee's investigation is truly the adjustment of production problems and the obtaining of vital aircraft for the war effort, it seems to me you would welcome his appearance in the picture. On the contrary members of your committee have sought to belittle Mr. Kaiser's record. One member of your committee betrayed your committee's objections to Mr. Kaiser when he said, "Don't you think Henry J. Kaiser's reputation with labor is one of concession, and that accounts for his good relationship?"

Obviously, members of your committee do not like the idea of concessions to labor; yet concessions—give and take, on both sides—are the very kernel of successful labor-management relations. The attitude of members of your committee toward Mr. Kaiser's taking over the Brewster plant and the pledges of cooperation given him by Brewster Local 365, suggest that you would rather have the Brewster plant close down than have it proven that a combination of good management, fair labor relations, and a labor union can put the plant on a productive basis.

I have written this letter in these frank terms because I feel strongly that the conduct of your committee, if unchallenged, would constitute serious injury to the labor movement and therefore necessarily to the war effort.

We of labor do not claim infallibility. Where mistakes are called to our attention in good faith we attempt to correct them. However the conduct of your committee cannot accurately be described as conduct in good faith. I hope your committee and its members will be able to forget, at least for the duration of the war, their animosity toward American labor, and will refrain from further hindering the possibility of obtaining the cooperation of labor, of management, and of Government, which is essential to winning the war in the shortest possible time.

Very truly yours,

R. J. THOMAS,
President, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O.

Why the Oil Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Marion Daily Republican, Marion, Ill.:

Oil men and responsible public authorities have pointed out that rationing of fuel oil

and gasoline is in no sense attributable to any failure on the part of oil companies.

The facts are simple. To run a mechanized war requires literally billions of barrels of oil. No other nation was as well equipped to produce oil either by nature or by the enterprise of its citizens as this Nation was when war came. We had huge oil reserves in the ground and, equally important, we had an efficient private industry operating under competent management, which knew how to get that oil out of the ground. And it got it out in astronomical quantities upon very short notice.

Moreover, this is not all the oil industry had to do upon short notice. A thousand bombers during a single 400-mile raid over Germany burn approximately 1,000,000 gallons of 100-octane gasoline. The oil companies had to develop refineries to produce such high-test gas, in itself a staggering job. Before the war 100-octane gasoline was not produced in quantity. Suddenly the whole war effort depended upon getting it in quantity quickly. It was up to the oil companies to get it. They got it—and in time.

Many months ago oil men began warning that the Nation's oil reserves were being used faster than the rate of discovery. The discovery rate of new oil reserves has not stepped up to meet increased demands for the simple reason that the cost of "wildcatting" is far too high in relation to the price of oil which is set by Government decree. Until the price is adjusted oil will continue to become more scarce.

Continued Government-imposed handicaps on oil production will cost our Nation daily.

Rehabilitation of Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been desirous of making every possible provision for the rehabilitation of our veterans. In this the Veterans' Bureau has already also made substantial and effective contributions.

Many programs have been inaugurated and are being carried out to provide adequate hospitalization, medical care and treatment, vocational guidance and training, and other desirable opportunities for returning veterans.

I believe that the Government has provided and will additionally provide adequate hospital facilities, but I am disturbed that it has not made special and extraordinary plans for the treatment of thousands and thousands of boys who will be returned to us suffering from battle fatigue or other nervous or mental maladies.

Most boys of this group will be shell-shocked, battle-fatigued, if you will; many of them will be suffering from psychoses or neuroses in various forms which will disable them from immediately resuming their civilian occupations. Some of these cases will have to be hospitalized permanently. For some the light of reason will have been forever extinguished. Most of them will require sympathetic treatment and scientific care for sometime to come.

In my opinion, the institutional veterans' hospital is not the proper place to treat curable mental cases. I believe their problems will be largely for the ministrations of the psychiatrist and the neurologist. The Government ought to establish institutions in appropriate places throughout the country removed as far as practicable from the congestion, the noise, and confusion of the city, preferably in some quiet country district where these boys can forget the horrors and cruelties of war and be treated scientifically and rehabilitated. These institutions should not even be known as hospitals but as rest homes or retreats. They should have as few of the characteristics of medical institutions as possible. There should be many smaller such places rather than a lesser number of large ones. The dominating idea should be to give the disabled veterans a sense of privacy, normal living, and separation from the aspects of routine hospitalization that is difficult, if not impossible, in a regular regional or State government institution.

Rest, good food, wholesome surroundings, fresh air, and scientific psychiatric treatment and every other care that may be necessary will undoubtedly salvage thousands and thousands of these cases and restore them to useful civilian pursuits. Best of all, it will lift the curtain of fear, doubt, and uncertainty overshadowing their minds. It will revive self-confidence and the will to live a fruitful normal life.

For these reasons it is the absolute duty of Congress—and the job should be tackled at once—to insure the establishment of an adequate number of rest homes so that such facilities may be ready as the need grows. From now on these mentally upset boys will be returning to this country in larger numbers. The routine, impersonal environment of the large hospital is probably the worst place in the world for these boys. Each individual problem of the mind is different, and each requires special and highly competent treatment and care in a home-like environment of privacy and relaxation. Effective psychological therapy is impossible unless the environment, the treatment, and the skill and experience of the psychiatrist are appropriately combined.

I urge upon the Veterans' Bureau the importance of establishing such rest centers at the very earliest date and serve notice that unless this policy is adopted and followed within a reasonable time I propose to introduce appropriate legislation in Congress looking to these ends.

Over half the wounded in this war will be psychiatric cases. With the right kind of treatment and care many of these can be redeemed. It is surely the solemn obligation of Congress to overlook no type of facility or treatment which holds promise of the restoration and speedy rehabilitation of these fine young men who have been so unfortunately and disastrously afflicted in the service of their country. That is a primary claim upon our affections, our gratitude, and our national purse.

The Cattle Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the RECORD straight, I would like to refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will refer to Members from their State rather than from the town or city from which they come. A reference to Members as coming from towns or cities is not proper.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the Speaker, I did not intentionally violate the rules. This is the first time I have violated the rules. I try not to violate them in any way.

Mr. Speaker, there is no use making such ridiculous statements as have been made here on the floor today in connection with this food program. I do not worry so much about the fellow who is producing it, but I do think it is well to worry about the people who want to eat. When one says there are 50,000,000 more head of cattle in the United States today than there was at any other time, he is just not familiar with the facts. The point is there never has been over 78,000,000 head of both dairy and beef cattle in the United States. We used to be an exporting Nation. We have been importing beef ever since 1913. 1942 is the first time we have ever furnished all of our own beef since 1913. We had 40,000,000 beef cattle in 1920 and in 1943 we have 38,000,000 head, with nearly a third more people in our country to feed.

I do not think we are going to solve this problem by dealing with a lot of figures that are not in keeping with the facts. The problem can be solved, but it is not going to be solved by making it a political issue.

War Savings Bonds

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent necessity for increasing bond sales to individual citizens and in view of the urgent necessity for those individual citizens to hold their bonds, I am introducing a bill providing a system of premium payments to owners of War Savings bonds.

This is not a lottery, not a game of chance where the purchaser of a losing ticket finds himself in possession of a small piece of worthless paper. This is an added inducement and a stimulus to fulfill patriotic obligations in purchasing and holding the best equity in the world today—a United States savings bond.

Aside from the honor of making a victory contribution, the honor of vicariously fighting the war, what better inflation hedge than bonds? What better means to painlessly syphon off excess purchasing power, now sifting into taverns, slot machines, and luxuries? The excess dollars that feed the inflation fires. What better or sounder social security device to comfort that rainy day, than Government bonds? To cover sickness, ease unemployment, and soften old age? The age old wisdom of laying by a store in the fat years against the coming of the lean.

Mr. Speaker, there is no argument against the virtue of buying bonds, or at least I have not heard any. There is no argument against buying more bonds—and still more bonds. There is no argument against the virtue of spreading these bonds as widely as possible. Unfortunate, but true. In spite of terrific and high-powered sales campaigns using all the blandishments known to man, from patriotism to Hollywood, Guadalcanal to Dorothy Lamour, the last bond drive sold only $3,000,000,000 to individuals—the balance of the $15,000,000,000 to banks, insurance companies and institutions. Not very good, and next time it will be even harder.

Also bear in mind that one hundred and fifty million a month are being cashed in—one billion eight hundred million a year.

Now, what about this premium plan that is an inducement but not a lottery?

Periodically at intervals not greater than 3 months, the Secretary of the Treasury makes a drawing. All registered owners of United States Savings Bonds, series E, are eligible. A series of premiums, the highest being not less than $25,000, the lowest not less than $100. Perhaps five hundred or even a thousand United States citizens receive a premium, a prize reward in the form of tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds. For some few, a fortune, for others an exceedingly welcome nest egg, for still others the hope of another drawing—and nobody loses. Cannot lose because a ticket is a bond, not just a piece of paper. By reason of this plan, will people buy more bonds? Will people hold more bonds? Well, when the news reels show blindfolded Mr. Morgenthau reaching into the bowl, followed by Mrs. John G. Zilch and her seven children receiving $50,000; when commentator Doakes socks it to his listening audience; when the papers run a page of victory drawings, will people buy more bonds? Anyone who says "No" just does not know his American people.

How much will it cost the Government? As costs go these days—not much. As an extreme figure, about half the current annual cost of selling bonds. Not over a half million a drawing—six million a year on a monthly basis. Compare if you will a half million a month, the cost of this drawing, to the $155,000,000 a month being cashed in.

We have got to win the war, we have got to finance the war, we have got to sell bonds and keep selling bonds to as many people as possible and we have got to do everything possible to persuade people to hold their bonds. This plan is not a sure-fire solution for all the ills of mankind. This Victory premium plan is not going to be the one cure for inflation and it is not going to be the solution for financing the war. But it will help and help a lot in a very practical way. It will help finance the war, help hold inflation, help the post-war period.

It is a new plan, of course it is new, but this is a new kind of war. Skipbombing is new, the bazooka is new, paratroopers are new, total and complete war is new. Victory premiums are new, but make no mistake, human nature being what it is, this plan will help sell bonds—lots of bonds.

Some Thoughts on Recent Democratic Party Reverses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, an enterprising daily newspaper, the News-Tribune, in my home district of Tacoma, Wash., recently carried an editorial which, in my judgment, puts its finger on some of the principal causes for Republican victories on November 2 and, subsequently, at the special election in the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, which occurred on November 30. I am appending the editorial herein below.

As a Democrat, I freely admit that this administration has permitted certain abuses to occur which are most reprehensible. We Democrats should be the first to clean our own stables. We should beat the Republicans to the punch. We should weed out the dollar-a-year men, replacing them with practical, sincere, and fair-minded individuals, to whom we will pay a compensation worthy of their talents—men who will look upon the public as inclined to be honest and fair and will not assume that the average citizen is a criminal, skulking behind various excuses as an alibi to justify his alleged unwillingness to make sacrifices. Let us freely recognize that regimentation is something to which the normal, red-blooded American is inherently opposed. We all know that it is necessary that a certain minimum number of restrictions must be imposed in wartime, but the objective, at all times, should be to keep these restrictions reduced to the absolute nadir and then to administer them with sympathy, understanding, and practicality in such a way as would most effectively cushion the blow. Too often dollar-a-year men have used their powerful posts, consciously, or otherwise, as an excuse for further entrenching and extending monopoly and to undermine, if not stifle, small business and, to that extent, destroy free enterprise.

It is time that the leaders of the Democratic Party take stock of the situation at home, view it realistically and set about determinedly to correct the all too palpable petty tyrannies which prevail in many Government bureaus. Let some of the leaders devote more attention to the home front. Important as it is to carry on negotiations for the post-war world, charity does begin at home. If in the process of saving the world we stifle and submerge at home some of the very principles for which we are fighting, we do not accomplish our objectives in our desire to spread the blessings of the four freedoms throughout the world.

The editorial to which I have heretofore adverted is reasonable in its analyses. It recognizes that many citizens are impatient and discourteous and provocative in their attitude in dealing with Government officials, but it points out most persuasively that such provocative action on the part of certain citizens does not justify tyranny or despotic action on the part of bureau chiefs, nor their principal subordinates.

Here is the editorial:

PETTY TYRANNIES

Jay Franklin, columnist, has been one of the strongest advocates for Roosevelt and the New Deal. So when he raises his voice in criticism, he deserves a hearing from both sides of the political fence. This former New Deal columnist in a recent article declares it to be his opinion that Americans in general are getting tired of being pushed around by bureaucrats. Of small businessmen he says:

"They, too, are pretty tired of being pushed around in the name of the war, while all who have eyes and ears are aware that somewhere in this country about $50,000,000,000 of war profits have been piled up, and not by the coal miner, the farmer or the small businessman.

"If the Democratic administration wishes to continue in power after 1944, it would be wise if it did a little listening at the grass roots and began to deal with the rising volume of complaint from the mass of people that the war is one thing and some of the war measures are another. We'll fight and we'll win, but we're hanged if we like being gypped in the process."

Some of these measures have been ill-advised, but the basic trouble seems not so much their intent as the petty tyranny with which many new offices have been administered. Men and women, unaccustomed to executive power, have been put in jobs too big for them to handle. Citizens may not be any too patient or courteous and these officers take their gripes personally and get mad. Unused to power before, they tend to tyrannize those under them and to lay down autocratic rules. Naturally, they make trouble.

At the war's end, all these agencies should vanish like the mushroom growths which they are. The difficulty will be that bureaucrats once entrenched in power are loath to give it up. The fight to regain our liberties at home is likely to be long and severe.

Meanwhile, more care should be used now in management of the innumerable bureaus which have been set up. Shakespeare, as usual, had a word for it: "Drest in a little brief authority, doth use it as a tyrant."

Ceiling Price of Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Star December 2, 1943, concerning a proposed raise in the price of corn to the farmer. The same governmental authorities who are giving attention to this matter should interest themselves in materially raising the price of cotton to be received by the cotton farmer. His cost of production has gone up and he needs a raise in his price as badly as any group.

The article follows:

BOOST IN CORN CEILINGS TO $1.16 EXPECTED WITHIN FEW DAYS—AGENCY WILL PLACE OTHER GRAINS UNDER CONTROL SHORTLY AFTERWARD

(By James Y. Newton)

The Government will announce within a few days an increase in the ceiling price of corn to approximately $1.16 a bushel at Chicago, 9 cents above the present maximum price. The action is planned to free livestock feed for shortage areas, long advocated by farm representatives.

Shortly after the announcement of the new corn prices the Office of Price Administration will place other grains and feeds under control, including hard wheat, oats, barley, and hay.

The new corn price represents a compromise between the hold-the-line policy of O. P. A. and the higher price views of the War Food Administration. Both agencies, it was said, have reached agreement on major points of the new regulation and only a few minor details remain to be determined.

DECISION EXPECTED THIS WEEK

Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson has been the arbiter in the corn-price controversy and probably will announce a decision before the week's end. The new prices are far below those sought by farmers and farm-State Members of Congress.

Farm ceiling prices for corn will be fixed for each county in the producing area. Officials said the approximate range will be from $1.07 to $1.10 a bushel. When corn is shipped from one area to another the maximum price will be the ceiling in the original locality, plus transportation costs.

A main point of contention between O. P. A. and W. F. A., it was said, was whether there should be a monthly charge or increase of a half cent a bushel for shrinkage in storage. O. P. A. contended the allowance would only encourage holding.

Another point of contention was the amount of differential between farm and country elevator prices.

PUBLIC HEARING HELD

Meanwhile W. F. A. moved ahead today in its proposed program to establish controls over the distribution of protein feeds as a means of getting this vital meal to deficit areas. A public hearing on a suggested set-aside order was held in the Agriculture Department, with Food Administrator Marvin Jones addressing a group of 500 feed manufacturers and feeders from all sections of the country.

Close on the heels of Mr. Jones' admission that regulations on feed will bring complaints and "headaches," spokesmen for the Feed Industry Council and other groups strongly opposed the proposal, claiming that certain phases of the order would freeze protein feeds in the areas of production and further disrupt their flow to feeders of the country.

J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, told the group that, while the voluntary conservation program among feed manufacturers had helped the situation somewhat, it now appeared that regulations would have to be ordered on a more stringent basis.

Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore given me to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Austin Statesman of November 24, 1943, by Raymond Brooks.

In placing this editorial in the RECORD, I do so because it fully explains the feelings of the people of the States who have been the bulwarks of Democracy and who have throughout all the years carried the banner of the Democratic Party.

It further shows, Mr. Speaker, the sentiment of the people with reference to some of the unconstitutional measures which are also punitive in their set-up and character, which are for the purposes of punishing the real Democratic States of our country. These people who have been weighed in the balances and never found wanting cannot understand why a Congress, predominantly Democratic, will try to pass a punitive measure unconstitutional as it is against the section that has done so much for our party.

I join with this sentiment. I cannot understand why people who claim themselves to be Democrats can sponsor and vote for such legislation as the editorial is written about.

The editorial follows:

Congress has been very zealous in trying to pass a law to abolish the poll-tax requirement for voting in the eight States which enforce it. But a congressional committee promptly disapproved a resolution for a constitutional amendment to abolish this prerequisite of voting.

That reflects something of the political hypocrisy behind the legislative effort.

The Federal Constitution not only did not assume to say who should vote, but expressly declares that the qualifications of voters shall be determined by the States themselves.

Thus, a Federal law attempting to override State laws and constitutional provisions would seem to be void. Under the theory of the reservation of powers, it would be void, if the Federal Constitution said nothing, but with affirmative language in that Constitution, the case seems doubly strong.

But the Congressmen aren't worrying about that, and apparently the committee which killed the constitutional amendment proposal had its own ideas of the means of encroaching on State sovereignty.

It has been suggested the amendment plan brought up a new element for the States to consider which do not have the poll tax. That is, that the other States are no more anxious than the eight poll-tax States to have Congress interfering with their rights to determine the qualification of voters.

Thus it was believed that even if Congress should submit such an amendment, in its zeal to blow to the Democratic poll-tax States the other States would be reluctant to open the door to Federal domination in a field so far accepted as exclusively within State sovereign power.

So, there will be no ratification project before the State legislatures.

It is significant that during the times the House and Senate of Congress have been operated by Republican majorities, there was no such attack on the poll-tax States, the bulwark of Democratic strength, as there has been during the Democratic majorities, and from Democratic figures in Congress.

The Dam Must Not Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a recent issue of a bulletin which receives wide circulation among the retail grocery stores in certain sections of California. A careful perusal of this particular edition should impress upon all of us the vital necessity for taking immediate steps to forestall the possible dumping of surplus food products on the retail market.

In my humble opinion the Congress should give this subject prompt consideration and if legislation is found necessary it should be immediately enacted. In connection with the important matter of Government-held surpluses, I believe we can all profit by a careful study of the report recently submitted to the House by the Boren subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—House Report 808, part I. It is my hope that this committee will soon recommend the remedy for a problem that is rapidly increasing the dangers of economic chaos after the war.

The bulletin referred to follows:

We come back to one element in the food situation that no thoughtful grocer can afford to overlook. No matter how cheerful the present ring of the cash register indicating normal or above-normal sales, here is something in our business that has not been emphasized and which will become very emphatic in the days to come. We refer to the overwhelming amount of food held by various Government agencies for Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease distribution, which may some day return like a boomerang and nick the neck of the farmer who produced it and the grocer who distributes it.

Any community living in the valley below a dam in which is impounded tons of water becomes used to the idea and goes about its

normal life up to the moment that the dam breaks and wipes out everything and everybody in its path. In the same way we grocers, living our lives on today's buying and selling may forget that hanging over our heads are millions and millions and millions of cases, billions of pounds of food that have been produced and not yet consumed. They may burst out if not properly handled to overwhelm the value of the inventories upon which we depend for our daily bread.

The goods are there and the suspicion is dawning now that there are too many of them. You don't have to be an economist to know what will happen to you when Washington begins to dump all over the country. The reason we bring the matter up now is that very definitely the tide has turned in the accumulation by the Government of the supplies they need. Furthermore the indication is that it is going to come out now as we have suspected all along, that these supplies were far greater than they needed. Somewhere along the line somebody is going to give the order to "let 'er go boys—get rid of these goods while the getting rid is possible." The first gun of this situation boomed a week or so ago when the Army came out with the announcement that they were going to sell some of the goods that they had in stock; that they were going to dispose of a million cases of canned peas and about the same amount of canned peaches and 100 carloads or so of catsup. Some of these they have in warehouse and some were part of the allotment demanded from canners from the 1943 pack. Fortunately this is not a very large quantity compared with our total production, but this is just a little straw in the wind to show what might happen if this Government dumping becomes more general, covering more commodities and in larger quantities.

Now here is another one that also indicates what may develop—2,700,000 cases of grapefruit juice from last year's pack—over a year old now—released in one bang; goods that have been stored all that time in excess of what was needed. Packers are ready to start their new pack and ready to make their new prices and come out with a new campaign to sell the idea to us distributors, wholesale and retail, that we can take a lot of grapefruit juice; but the Army has 2,700,000 cases of old juice that nobody wants, packed in Government cases, packed with Government labels, sold as is, without any claims for swells or bad condition. The packers don't want it. The wholesalers don't want it, and surely the retailers dont want it, and so this lot will kick around and probably will finally be sold to some speculator or other at a ridiculous price. The Government may lose $400,000 or $450,000 on this lot. And after it has been disposed of it will appear at some big discount at various points of the country and disrupt the orderly sale of merchandise. They figure that out of 20,000,000 cases of grapefruit juice 2,000,000 cases isn't so much of a factor. But add that much to something else and you bet it becomes a decided factor toward discord and trouble.

There comes a third warning. The Food Distribution Administration is releasing large amounts of dried beans, dried peas, rice, dried fruit, and Cheddar cheese. In other words, the Government agencies don't want them. They have plenty and they are letting a lot of this go by the board. And we grocers are going to get these quantities and presumably will be able to turn them over for the benefit of our fellow citizens who are not in the services.

No mention has yet been made of what the Government's stock condition may be on other items. How much corn have they got? How many tomatoes? How many tomato products? How much grapefruit in sections? How many peaches? How many pears and apricots? What about some of the less essential foods like carrots or beans or asparagus? What is the whole picture anyway? Well, we are going to find out something about that. Mr. Byrnes, we believe it is, has ordered a thorough immediate investigation of the stock pile held by every Government agency. There are probably now a good many officials shivering in their boots waiting the time when it may be common knowledge that they have bought many times as much as they should have bought because they had the money and because nobody said no. We will all know a good deal more about it when this survey is made and if it is released to the public as it very probably will be. We may be reassured by the information or we may find that a mass of accumulated food is hanging over our heads and the dam may just be ready to break. Now what will break the dam? What is the most likely thing to happen that will precipitate the danger? As long as the European war goes on and we have the need of keeping supplies on hand to be sure that every sailor, soldier, and marine has all the food he needs at any time and any place that he needs it, there won't be much change. It is when this war situation changes that we grocers will need to worry and we will need to worry plenty. There will be some system devised to control it. Goods won't be thrown on the market the way they were at the end of the last war to everybody with money in the bank to speculate and to disrupt for months and years to come. Plans are being laid, and we hope effective ones, by which cooperation between Government agencies and canners who sold the goods and other canners who might be interested, and wholesalers with a legitimate output, and retailers who are the logical avenue of distribution. With all these factors they will work together to see that these millions of cases go out without disrupting American business life and the life of the community.

Already the handwriting is on the wall about the end of Germany. Industry is beginning to anticipate what will happen. Every week's delay in its happening means a better chance to be forewarned and to soften the shock. It will be a shock the day you read in the headlines that the fighting war has stopped in Europe. There will be a period of uncertainty. Nobody will know whether to buy or sell or stand still. That uncertain period may last for a long time or it may be swallowed up in some other condition. It is coming, but with it will come the danger that your inventory, so carefully cherished and accumulated with such judgment, will go down the kitchen sink with a lot of other things in the world.

That is the set-up. We had better get used to the idea. To use another figure of speech, we are operating on a floor that covers the bottomless pit. As long as the floor holds, fine. But if it cracks at the wrong time, we can all slip off into space. We are not writing this to frighten anybody. Certainly, as distributors ourselves, a hearty note of optimism, with a slogan "sell them all you can while they want it" would be more productive in dollars and cents. But neighborhood-store veterans have a pledge between us. We believe that every dealer should know that this abnormal situation means something else besides trying to grab off all the merchandise we can get and sell it where the eager public will buy because their purses are full and because they don't worry much about the future. We have a responsibility in our own business, toward one another and toward the public. We may be downtrodden and oppressed, we may be kicked around and browbeaten, but nevertheless we remain the great artery that supplies food to the country from the farm to the table. They can beat us but they can't lick us. They can make it tough but they can't make it impossible. They can shilly-shally and hesitate and obscure but they can't take from us the knowledge that, after all, upon us depends the fair and square feeding of the people of America. If we are going to face that responsibility and if we are going to stand up under that responsibility, it must be because our eyes are open to every phase of the conditions under which we are operating. As far as possible we are going to tell our neighborhood group what we think about it, whether it is easy to take or tough to swallow.

Against Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 23, 1943:

AGAINST SUBSIDIES

More than 2 years ago when the first serious thought was being given to means of avoiding the inflation which for 8 long years the administration had sought to promote, Bernard M. Baruch made the following observation about price controls that proved wiser probably than he knew:

"I do not believe in piecemeal price fixing. I think you have first to put a ceiling over the whole price structure, including wages, rents, and farm prices up to the parity level—and no higher—and then to adjust separate price schedules upward or downward if necessary, where justice or governmental policy so requires."

But for reasons which are well understood the administration refused to act on Baruch's advice. Because of its desire to pay its political debts to major pressure groups it took no action either to hold down wages or farm produce prices. In fact there was a considerable period in which it was the policy of the administration to encourage higher wages and higher prices of farm produce, while professedly combating inflation.

With a price ceiling here and a subsidy there the Offices of Price Administration and of Economic Stabilization hoped to hold the line, But their piecemeal measures proved of little avail in the face of inflationary borrowing to finance the war, diminished supplies of consumer goods, and increases in costs which in greater or lesser measure are among the unavoidable concomitants of war.

This flimsy structure of piecemeal price control virtually collapsed with the settlement of the mine wage controversy. With this settlement the Little Steel formula became a scrap of paper, as the impending rise in the price of coal to compensate for the noninflationary increase in miners' wages and other probable wage increases clearly indicate.

Because of the collapse of the inadequate controls heretofore employed the administration is turning with ever greater vigor to subsidies. Yesterday's papers carried the appeal of O. P. A. Director Chester Bowles for the subsidy program, with the representation that if it fails increases in a wide list of food products will follow as a matter of course.

But the subsidy is also a piecemeal approach to the problem of rising prices. As long as the public has billions in buying power and the supply of goods is limited, prices somewhere along the line will advance.

It may be possible by subsidies to hold down the price of vegetables, for example, but the price of fruit will rise. When fruits are placed under a ceiling and their producers are subsidized, surplus buying power will be directed into still another channel. By some means, legitimate or illegitimate, goods and money will meet in a manner which takes full cognizance of the scarcity of the former and the abundance of the latter.

The Plain Dealer is opposed to subsidies because it is convinced, first of all, that far from preventing inflation they will promote the broad inflationary process both by increased borrowing and restricted production. It is opposed furthermore because the subsidy is the tool of one of the pressure groups which almost without exception has been strong enough to dictate administration policy, however unsound.

Finally, we are opposed to subsidies because we are convinced that once they are abandoned the administration will then be forced, in self-defense, to adopt the sound fiscal measures and policies which alone can be relied upon to counteract the inflationary forces so long at work.

The fact that the subsidy is one more way of paying out public money, when the need of the domestic front is for retrenchment both in public and private expenditures is one of the strongest arguments in favor of abolishing it. We hope the opponents of subsidies will stand their ground. If prices threaten to run away when subsidies are discontinued, sound and comprehensive measures of controlling them heretofore held in abeyance may then be adopted.

Cotton Cloth $9 Per Yard in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1943, the able and distinguished Congressman from Oklahoma, Representative JED JOHNSON, extended his remarks and included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Dr. T. F. Tsiang, a representative of China at the United Nations Food Conference at Atlantic City. In his address, Dr. Tsiang listed five things badly needed by China. I wish to quote the third reference made by Dr. Tsiang:

> Thirdly, China needs cotton and cotton cloth. At present in China 1 yard of cloth sells for the equivalent of $9 your money.

China has 460,000,000 people approximately. No wonder they are in the direst poverty; no wonder many of them are devoid of the necessary food and clothing. I dare say many of our 130,000,000 people in this country would be without proper clothing if cotton cloth sold for $9 per yard in this country.

It is my earnest hope that those in this country who are advocates of a program of scarcity concerning cotton will take particular note of this phase of Dr. Tsiang's speech and will do all within their power to see that the cotton farmers of this Nation are given an opportunity to supply this great potential foreign market, China, with some of the cotton she doubtless needs to clothe her millions; indeed, this should be done instead of restricting the family size cotton farmer to the point that he has great difficulty in earning enough dollars to justify his remaining on the farm.

Soldier-Vote Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, dated the 22d of November.

This editorial shows that my native State still believes in the Constitution and doing things in the constitutional way.

The editorial is as follows:

SOLDIER-VOTE PROBLEMS

Seldom has Congress tackled a knottier problem than it has encountered in its effort to establish workable rules under which millions of men and women in the armed forces would be enabled to participate in the 1944 elections. The view that those who are fighting to preserve a government are entitled to a voice in the conduct of that government seems well nigh unanimous. But setting up practical machinery to effectuate this purpose poses many perplexing questions.

One of the things those in service are fighting for, they have been told, is the preservation of the American way of life, which means, among other things, our constitutional form of government, both State and Federal. Under the Federal Constitution, Presidents are chosen by the electoral votes of the States. Names of Presidential nominees do not appear on the ballot. Political parties in each State nominate Presidential electors, one for each congressional district and two at large, and it is for these that the voters cast their ballots. Electors of the party receiving the highest popular vote in each State meet in their respective State capitals some weeks after the general election and there cast the State's electoral votes. The nominee who receives a majority of the electoral votes wins the race. It is possible for a candidate with a minority of the popular vote to receive a majority of the electoral vote and thus become President.

This system may be cumbersome and archaic, but it is the law of the land. Adoption of a constitutional amendment by three-fourths of the States is the only lawful means of changing it.

The Lucas-Green bill to provide a uniform method for servicemen's voting, already approved by the Senate Elections Committee and apparently headed for passage by both Houses of Congress, brushes this section of the Constitution aside as of no consequence. The bill provides for those away from home in the service of the Government to be supplied with blank ballots, on which they will write the names of their choices for President, Senator, and Representative. The ballots are to be returned to a war ballot commission in Washington, assorted, and forwarded to secretaries of the 48 States who in turn would assort and forward them to the election officials of each county, which also is a cumbersome process. If many millions of ballots are received, some might yet be in the sorting stage after the date set by law for the Presidential electors to meet.

The bill also would brush aside the clause in the Texas Constitution which specifically precludes all soldiers, marines, and seamen employed in the service of the Army or Navy of the United States from voting in this State, as well as the statutory requirement making payment of a poll tax a prerequisite to voting. It might be argued that these provisions, too, are archaic, but they still are in the law.

It may be that exigencies of the occasion, to say nothing of political expediency, warrant such nullification of our constitutional processes and disregard of the established order. It involves partial destruction of something we are fighting to preserve. Can we eat our cake and have it, too?

Problems of War Contract Termination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me before the Indiana Manufacturers Association, November 23, 1943, Indianapolis, Ind.:

If there is one subject of such wide general interest that it competes in the headlines with war news, it is the general subject of post-war planning. We are interested here in just one phase of post-war planning, but certainly one of the most vitally and immediately important phases. Our problem in this discussion is the termination of the thousands and thousands of war contracts and subcontracts which practically every American industry from our giant corporations down to our smallest enterprises now hold.

I shall, for the most part, avoid statistics, since figures can be used here for nothing more than to prove how unimaginably big and vital this problem of contract termination actually is. The simple facts are that practically every American industry today is directly or indirectly producing totally or in large part for war; and that there are millions of prime contracts with Government agencies, subcontracts between one industry and another, and working agreements or commitments touching equipment, supplies, materials, and services for war production.

If you cared to dwell on statistics you might translate all classes of such commitments in a money figure which would approximate $100,000,000,000. If you were to attempt to complete a statistical picture you would also have to consider the problems of contract termination in human, social terms, for this is a problem of the deepest concern to each one of our 130,000,000 citizens.

Important in your statistics, therefore, would be the fact that about one American in three is employed in war production. That immediately suggests the tremendous employment problem, for any unusual delay in industrial conversion to peacetime pursuits will inevitably mean unemployment for as many as 40,000,000 people. On the one hand, that figure can be trimmed sharply, for we know that there are a high percentage of irregularly employed, notably among them

wives and mothers and older people, who will at the first opportunity drop out of the labor market. On the other hand, however, we must add into this employment equation the bulk of the 10,000,000 men and women who will be released from military services rapidly at the end of the war.

I said a moment ago that practically one worker in three in America is in war production. That, of course, is a figure for the Nation as a whole. Actually our problem right here in Indiana is going to be considerably more serious than in most parts of the Nation for the simple reason that we have here one of the highest concentrations of war production in the whole country. Actually, every other person now gainfully employed in Indiana industry is working on a war-production job. One person in two in our State, therefore, has a vital stake in this problem of returning to peacetime production. There, in a rough way, is the outline of this huge problem. It touches practically every private enterprise and practically every community, large or small, in the United States; and it touches in a very real way at least 40,000,000 working Americans whose peacetime jobs will largely depend upon the effectiveness of our industrial demobilization.

As you know, my own Committee on Military Affairs has been looking into this problem of contract termination with a view to formulating specific legislation to ease the problems and speed the return of industry to peacetime operation. Speaking frankly, I can tell you that we have not as yet found any ready-made answer to the problem. I can state emphatically, however, that our studies have led to the inescapable conclusion that we must find a way to bring all types of contracts and commitments to prompt and final settlement after termination.

These contracts and commitments simply must be terminated quickly and in such a way that every individual industry will be entirely free to devote its talents, energies, and resources to peacetime production the first possible moment after it quits producing goods or services for war.

There is simply no other way in which the average war industry can return to peacetime production, for it is my studied opinion that not more than one industry in five can survive its extraordinary wartime expansion and return to normal operation if its war contract settlements become involved in Federal red tape and controversy. I know I do not need to go into a detailed explanation why that is so, for I believe most of you know this to be true in your own industries. There are, of course, still a few industries doing no war work. There are other types of industries doing contract work so nearly like their peacetime production that they will have no particular conversion problems. Notable among these, of course, are the food processors, such as the canning and dairy industries. In varying degrees there are other industries in which the problem of conversion will be comparatively simple, notably the type of company which may be doing some war work but whose main production is still for civilian markets.

There are two vital interests involved in this problem. We want war contractors to survive and we want to get them back into peacetime production with minimum delay. On the other hand, we want to protect the Government or the taxpayers in washing out this war business. Right there lies the whole problem. It would be relatively simple and easy if we could just automatically accept every contractor's cancelation claims, pay him off in full on those claims, and release him then and there without recourse and fully capitalized to reenter his old civilian markets. Unfortunately, however, there must be some effective system of checks and audits provided to protect the public interest.

Immediately, of course, the private industrialist is alarmed at the prospect of facing a prolonged Federal accounting, and rightly so for Federal accounting is almost certain to mean terrible costly delay, confusion, and controversy. But since we know that above everything else, it is vital in contract termination to insure prompt settlements, I think we can find a uniform method of negotiating final termination agreements which will protect both the private industry and the public interest.

I shall propose as a basic provision of any legislation we write on this subject that there be established a contract termination board, this board to be completely independent, and to function as an agency of Congress and of the people. Its members, who will be appointed by the President, subject to approval by the Senate, shall be men who have no direct connections either with the Government procurement agencies or with interested industries carrying war contracts, so that they may be depended upon to function fairly and impartially in all claims and settlements.

This board, with the advice and assistance of the procurement agencies and the war contractors, shall set up rules of procedure for the negotiation of termination agreements, which in turn shall be followed by the contracting officers of the different Federal procurement agencies responsible in each contract-settlement claim. The contracting officer in each case shall have sufficient authority to negotiate with each contractor a termination agreement, such agreement to become final upon review and approval by the central board.

In other words, the central board shall sit as a court of review, with authority to complete the termination agreement upon the joint statements of procurement agent and contractor that a just and fair settlement has been reached. This approval by the central agency shall thereafter be final, subject to further review only upon presentation of evidence of fraud, collusion, or gross negligence on the part of procurement agent or contractor.

Included in the procedure outline by the central board there should also be clear provision to protect and expedite the claims of subcontractors. Insofar as possible, I believe that settlements between private contractors and subcontractors should be made without Government interference. I do believe, however, that the central agency should establish the subcontractor's rights to enter into negotiation with the responsible Government agent in any case of controversy with his prime contractor.

It is my opinion that the vast bulk of contracts can be settled quickly and satisfactorily by this uniform simplified procedure. I hope, therefore, that there will never be more than a relatively small percentage of contract claims on which prompt agreements cannot be reached. For that group of claims, however, I think the central agency should also provide a definite formula for settlement, to be applied by the contracting officer upon the contractor's claims, based upon an independent audit or properly certified information regarding the contractor's operation.

It goes without saying, of course, that the private company with any important claim in suspense will be confronted with serious financial problems. In fact, the average company in this position will probably find its total assets so completely frozen that it could not possibly continue operation without adequate help from Government. Numerous proposals have been offered, and I am frank to tell you that I do not know what type of financial aid might serve this class of company most effectively. It has been proposed that Government advance a large fixed percentage of the contractors' claims, perhaps somewhere between 75 and 100 percent of the total. Very probably the advance could be made on a sliding scale, depending upon the nature of the contractor's operation and his company assets. This method of assistance, however, has obvious draw-backs, for many contractors may be so many times expanded beyond their capacity or their own capital structure that they would find themselves unable to liquidate their commitments and inventories, even with advances on their claims running 75 percent or more of the total.

As an illustration, suppose a $100,000 industry is handling a couple of million dollars worth of war contracts and at the termination date finds itself with 25 percent of that $2,000,000, or $500,000, tied up in inventories and commitments. It becomes apparent immediately that even a 75 percent advance would be insufficient in such a case to permit that industry to liquidate its commitments and inventories and still have its own capital free for conversion operations.

I think that illustration is fair because all of us know that it is only the exceptionally old and solid company which has not been carried far beyond its depths in its war contract operations. It goes without saying, of course, that if Government advances a large percentage of the claim to any contractor, the mere fact that the entire claim is in controversy, and the further fact that the Federal Government, by reason of its advance, holds a prior lien that will automatically preclude that contractor from securing loans through normal banking channels. It seems obvious that the average contractor having a termination claim would take a direct advance from Government against its final settlement if that advance would cover its immediate needs. If the available advance, however, is inadequate for the company's requirements, we must obviously find some other effective means of assistance. It occurs to me that it might be found desirable to continue for companies claims in suspense something like the present VT-loans, by which contractors are now able to secure Government guaranteed loans through their regular banking channels.

I cannot repeat too often, however, that the main problem is not one of finding a way of extending financial relief to war contractors, but of winding up and washing out war contracts with complete and final settlements, reached with a very minimum of delay in every case. Our one and only job is to cut the red tape and the encumbrances; and to release private industry in a way to get it back to normal production.

No matter how effectively we may organize for contract termination, however, there will, of course, always hang over our war contractors the ominous shadow of tremendous arbitrary Federal authority. That such authority can be, and often is, abused, is too well known to all of you here to need any lengthy comment from me. Doubtless many of your own companies have in recent months gone through the renegotiation mill with the Army or Navy Price Adjustment Board in a way to leave you shuddering at the mere thought of any further arbitration with a Federal agent clothed in almost unlimited power. If you have had no such experience personally, I am sure all of you have seen instances in which the Price Adjustment Boards have dealt in the most arbitrary manner with contractors, who have found themselves utterly powerless in the Boards' hands.

That is the very sort of thing I hope we shall be able to prevent in negotiating contract terminations, by setting up this central termination board in a way to make it entirely independent of the procurement agencies and other administration influences. Incidentally, I have learned a little from our early experiences in contract terminations which I want to pass along to you because it will prove vitally interesting to you, I am sure.

As you probably know, we have already to date in this war negotiated the termination of contracts amounting in dollar volume to about $8,000,000,000. In the War Department alone up to August 31, there had been 8,520 contract terminations in which the uncompleted portions of the contracts totalled about $5,800,000,000, That is a sufficient volume of termination to give us some idea, at least, how future terminations might go. I understand that to date, the final settlements made to contractors have averaged between 75 and 80 percent of the claims submitted. That, by the way, is just about the average rate at which settlements were made on the claims arising from contract terminations in the last war.

There is, of course, no real basis of comparison in any of the statistics from the last war or from those available to date in this war. For one thing the settlements made to date have more nearly been conversion than termination settlements. By that I mean that in a high percentage of cases, one contract has been terminated only to be replaced by another.

Extremely important to bear in mind here, in my opinion, is the probable change in official attitude from the present to the period of demobilization following the war. Now, the procurement agencies are concerned in treating each actual and potential war producer as an asset well worth carefully preserving, since it may prove desirable or necessary to turn to any or all of the potential producers again in this war.

Will these same negotiating agents continue to deal as equitably as possible during that demobilization; or will they, if left free to wash out the tremendous volume of war business, become increasingly inclined to deal arbitrarily in all termination matters.

It is my own fear of arbitrary power, and my own certain knowledge that unlimited power is too frequently abused, which leads me to seek to place every possible restraint upon the agency and the individuals who will undertake the tremendous job of contract terminations.

I hope we may find some method of providing individual contractors ready recourse to a review of their claims in district courts or the United States Court of Claims. When we provide such recourse to private contractors, however, we automatically open the door to further review of individual claims on the part of government. Thereupon, of course, the finality of settlement which is the thing we are striving to insure at once, is jeopardized.

I would like to say again in closing that my own views and opinions are by no means fixed, in fact it is my desire to throw this whole question open for discussion here. I hope you people who have tremendous stakes on this question may be able to offer specific suggestions which will be helpful.

End the Big Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Daily American, West Frankfort, Ill., of Wednesday, December 1, 1943:

END THE BIG WASTE

A news item out of Chicago has dramatically called attention to the fact that hunters with no ammunition are watching approximately 150,000,000 ducks flying south this fall, the biggest flight in 43 years. The article declared that the hungry birds in some Western States have caused heavy losses to farmers by damaging unharvested crops. In South Dakota, it said, the pheasant hatch was so great this year that some counties have open seasons extending over several months, with hunters privileged to kill seven birds a day.

This is only part of the story of the effects of restriction of ammunition for hunters but it furnishes some idea of the vast amount of food which waits in vain for the harvest. In America there has been so much talk of conservation of game in recent years that the necessity for the control of flocks and herds has been underemphasized.

When the amount of game is not controlled by a reasonable amount of hunting farmers must suffer loss of crops. In time of war this means a double loss to the Nation as a whole. Not only are crops damaged in an era when food is at a premium but the vast amount of food represented by the game animals and birds is unavailable for the inhabitants of a Nation and a world sorely tried by shortages.

There is little point to Government suggestions urging that the people shift their diet from pork and beef to cereal grains, soybeans, peanuts, and rice while game birds and animals which live, in part, on farm crops are permitted to range in fabulous numbers uncontrolled by a sane amount of hunting.

The War Production Board may have had good and sufficient reason for denying ammunition to hunters, save in slight amounts, for a long period after Pearl Harbor. The first call on ammunition was for the vast army being trained and for the troops going forth to battle. But today the drain on ammunition for shotgun and rifle is not so great, as evidenced by the closing down of a half dozen or more big ammunition plants.

It is in the national interest, therefore, to make such ammunition available in as large quantities as feasible to hunters so that the country may not suffer a colossal food waste. If the ammunition is available, the hunters can be depended upon to keep the flocks and herds under control, and the States, as regulatory bodies, can best determine the hunting privileges to be permitted, changing them as conditions indicate.

A Strange Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward F. Jones from the Washington Times-Herald of December 5, 1943:

A STRANGE PLEA—W. R. A. ASKS JAPS TO TEACH OUR FARMERS HOW TO BATHE—APPEAL MADE IN REGIONAL PUBLICATION IS DISCLAIMED BY TOP AGENCY OFFICIALS

(By Edward F. Jones)

The spectacle of the United States Government apologizing to interned Japanese and literally pleading with them to accept transportation to Midwestern States "for the purpose of teaching cleanliness and culture to American farmers" was revealed yesterday with the discovery by the Times-Herald of a new undertaking by the War Relocation Authority.

"THEY DO NOT BATHE"

In a new publication which W. R. A. officials admitted was not intended to reach the hands of "newspapers or prying Congressmen," American-born Japs now interned in W. R. A. relocation centers are advised:

"Believe it or not, some few tenants and seasonal workers (in Ohio and Michigan) do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living."

LAUDS JAP FAITHFULNESS

The publication, christened Midwest Frontiers, lauded the faithfulness of the Jap to his job in contrast to the carelessness of Midwestern American workers and in urging more of the Japs to relocate themselves in Ohio and Michigan, pointed out:

"We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture as well as the science."

CONGRESS RESENTFUL

Discovery of the publication, produced and written in the Cleveland office of W. R. A., brought an immediate resentful response from Members of Congress, one of whom declared he was going to follow up the matter with demands that this and other types of administration propaganda be junked.

Confronted with the fact that the publication had "reached newspapers and prying Congressmen," Harry Weiss, editor of the paper, defended the text of the publication and said he "wasn't afraid to say that we can learn things from the Japs."

Weiss said the article had been written by Everett L. Dakan, W. R. A.'s relocation officer in Columbus. The article carried Dakan's byline.

Dakan is on leave from the Ohio State University Agricultural Extension Service, where he heads the poultry division.

"MEANT AS WISECRACK"

Weiss said it never occurred to him when he approved the story that anyone would be riled at the remarks about sanitation "because I thought Mr. Dakan intended it as a wisecrack." Dakan could not be reached last night.

In Washington headquarters of W. R. A., however, officials jumped at the opportunity to say it was an "inadvertent statement and does not reflect the opinion of the W. R. A. as a whole."

One official said he was "mad as hell," and admitted that the story should never have appeared. He said the Cleveland office had been ordered to clear all copy for the issue with headquarters here, but had failed to do so.

CALLED INSULTING

This official admitted that the story was "insulting to every Midwesterner."

Ohio's Senator TAFT, when shown a copy of the story, declared:

"It must be a revelation to the Middle West farmer to discover that he is neither clean, sanitary, careful, nor painstaking, and must now take lessons from the Japanese. This patronizing opinion of the American farmer, coming from inside administration sources, perhaps explains the New Deal's determination to tell every farmer how he must farm and what he must raise. What American farmers need is not Japanese advice, but a new Department of Agriculture in Washington."

Representative JOHN R. COSTELLO (Democrat), of California, who heads the committee investigating policies and procedures of the War Relocation Authority, said he would ask W. R. A. Director Dillon S. Myer about the publication Tuesday when Myer is scheduled to appear before the committee.

WOODRUFF OF MICHIGAN ANGERED

Particularly angered by the story was Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF (Republican), of Michigan, who vowed to do something about it.

WOODRUFF pointed out that last year the Federal Treasury lost more than $119,000,000 in postal revenue through skyrocketing distribution of franked Government mail, and commented that he supposed the W. R. A. was now going to help boost that loss even higher with more new publications such as the Midwest Frontier.

He branded the publication as ridiculous, contemptuous, and misinforming, adding:

"In an apparent attempt to induce Japanese to leave the west coast and come into Ohio and Michigan to work on the farms, the W. R. A. is indulging in statements which stamp the editors as being utterly incompetent to speak in any way for any department of this Government.

"REALM OF FANTASTIC

"I'm sure the farmers feel edified to learn this New Deal outfit believes the Japs of the west coast can teach them the fundamentals of sanitation and good farming.

"This publication, while it is typical in some ways of other Government publications paid for by the American people, goes far beyond anything I've seen. It approaches the realm of the fantastic."

WOODRUFF said he thought the matter should be referred to the Byrd committee investigating Federal expenditures, and said he was going to "see what can be done to stop this waste of the taxpayers' money."

The issue of Midwest Frontiers containing the remarks considered insulting by the Congressmen was the first issue of the publication dated December 1, which announced that it would appear every 2 weeks hereafter.

RESTRICTED TO JAPS

Editor Weiss explained that its circulation is restricted to the American-born Japs in W. R. A. relocation centers and to those Japs already relocated on farms in the Cleveland area of W. R. A. This area includes all of Ohio and Michigan and parts of Pennsylvania, New York, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

Weiss said about 2,000 Japs have already been moved from W. R. A. centers to jobs on farms and claimed "the farmers want all they can get." He admitted that some trouble had been experienced with resentful American workers, but said "we've been able to straighten this out in most cases."

He admitted, too, that circulation of the story reflecting on the sanitation and integrity of Midwest farmers "probably won't help matters much."

National W. R. A. officials here said they were going to take steps to prevent a recurrence of this type of story, but would not say what action would be taken, if any, against those responsible for the Cleveland incident.

W. R. A. UNIT BEGS JAP INTERNEES TO TEACH MIDWEST FARMERS CLEANLINESS, CULTURE—NEW GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION LAUDS JAP INTERNEES

"We will not have to explain to you what we do in the wintertime. You will find out that our large barns are full of livestock, our cows must be milked, our chickens fed, our machinery repaired, and plans made for another year. Then some of us sleep later in the morning in the wintertime and listen to the radio longer at night. You will discover that many of our houses were built in pioneer days. That rural electrification is mostly a new thing. That many tenant houses do not have bathrooms because they were built before bathrooms came into style. They have not been remodeled because the war has made it impossible to get material. Then, believe it or not, you have some few tenants and seasonal workers who do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

"We need to know something of your skill in packing and grading, your artistic sense of orderliness. We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture as well as the science.

"Finally, let me repeat, the only way to find out about Ohio and Michigan is to come and live here. Then you will know. You cannot get it out of a story book."

JAPS GET LOWDOWN ON MIDWESTERN FARMERS

In this the living habits of American citizens are held up to the ridicule of our interned enemies by a Government-employed writer.

Subsidies and Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as the question of subsidies and socialized medicine is now before the Congress, I am pleased to submit to my colleagues a very sound editorial on these subjects from the Wayne County News, published in Wayne, W. Va.:

CITIZENS MUST DECIDE

Our citizens in all parts of the Nation must decide in their own minds whether we want to change our form of government or stick to the tried-and-true principles of individual initiative and free enterprise, ingredients of the system that has made this Nation the greatest and most powerful on earth.

Stateism rears its ugly head on all sides. There are proposals that we rely on the State (the Government) for this service and that service. If we are not careful, if we do not recognize these proposals as highly dangerous to the system of individual initiative and free enterprise, we shall soon find our lives in all details, both large and small, from the cradle to the grave, controlled by stateism. When this happens, we shall have forfeited all our liberties and destroyed individual initiative.

The question of subsidies is the question of stateism versus free enterprise. There can be no doubt about it. Under subsidies, the Government will be paying part of the grocery bill for every man, woman, and child in America. This sounds good to most of our citizens, but in the long run is an unwise policy. It is always unwise to let the Government do anything for you that you can do yourself. To let the Government pay part of our grocery bill will cost us more in the end, as Government is operated by politicians, and politicians are sometimes wasteful and extravagant.

Another proposal that would certainly push us farther along the road to stateism is the bill to set up a socialized medical system that would ultimately destroy the independence of medical men, the present high standards of the medical profession. The new system that is proposed would place in the hands of one man, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the responsibility for administering free of charge to the medical needs of more than 110,000,000 people. He would have at his disposal, to be used as his judgment indicated, approximately $3,000,000,000 to be collected annually from the taxpayers.

It is estimated that, at the present time, there are in the United States, available for civilian practice, 120,000 effective physicians. With $3,000,000,000, the Surgeon General could, after allocating 20 percent for administration costs, hire every physician in the United States at an average salary of $5,000 a year; buy every available bed in every non-Government-owned hospital 365 days each year at $5 per day; pay $2.50 per day for each and every Government-owned bed 365 days in the year, and still have left for drugs and medicines, $168,565,887.50.

It does not seem possible that free American citizens want a one-man medical system any more than they want a one-man Government.

Endicott Furlough Club Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following furlough club program, broadcast over Station WNBF Thursday evening, December 2, 1943, on the occasion of their organization banquet held at Moose Hall, Endicott, N. Y.:

SPEECH BY RAY YOUMANS, MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my duty and privilege this evening to preside over a most gala occasion. We are gathered here in the Endicott Moose Hall to observe the founding of the Hall Furlough Club of Endicott.

Assembled here tonight is a typical American group of young men and women. The young ladies are charter members of this new organization which has for its objective the building of sentiment and support for the Hall furlough transportation bill, introduced in Congress by our own Congressman from Binghamton, the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

May I pass a brief word in the way of description of these charming ladies. They are most attractively dressed and doubtless for good reason because they are being escorted this evening by fine clean-cut fighting men of the United States armed forces.

Yes, it is indeed a delightful occasion, and one which is dedicated to the very thing we are all interested in, namely, strengthening the morale and improving the lot of those valiant Americans in our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

There is not a young woman in this great room tonight who does not have at least some member of her family, either a brother, father, husband, or son fighting somewhere on our far-flung battlefronts all over the world. She is therefore vitally interested in an organization striving for the servicemen

and backing them up with all her courage, faith, and patriotism.

Therefore, I call the attention of our great unseen audience throughout the Triple Cities to the importance of this occasion. It is fitting and proper for me now to ask the president of the Hall Furlough Club to describe the program of this patriotic group. Before I call on her, however, I would like to say that she is a most charming, capable young lady who has a whole family of soldiers for brothers and is imbued with a great fervor to help win this war. She typifies the reason for the high morale now existing among our fighting men because there are millions of other girls just like her on the home front working, striving, and hoping for the day of victory to come and come soon. Therefore, our servicemen are lucky indeed to have women like you, Miss President, and your friends to back them up and look after their welfare here at home. But let me now call upon her, ladies and gentlemen, so that she may tell in her own words, more effectively than I can, I am sure, just why these fine young American women are sponsoring a patriotic movement of this kind. Without further adieu, I give you Miss Septemia Morlando, president of the Hall Furlough Club, of Endicott. Miss Morlando.

SPEECH BY MISS SEPTEMIA MORLANDO, PRESIDENT, FURLOUGH CLUB

Ladies of the Hall Furlough Club, of Endicott, honored guests, servicemen and women, Congressman HALL, on the evening of the founding of the Hall Furlough Club, of Endicott, I greet you. I greet you in the name of all patriotic women on our home front. I welcome you in behalf of the 100 charter members of the Hall Furlough Club, of Endicott. As president of this group, I invite you to join with us in the endeavor closest to every American woman's heart today, that of supporting our loved ones who have gone to the battle areas throughout the world to give their lives, if need be, for their country.

In order to show our love, our loyalty, and our admiration toward our men, we realize that mere words are not enough. Deeds are what will win the war and make a better America for those heroes to return to. In every woman's heart there burns the desire to hold aloft the sacred torch of high American tradition, to preserve for our fighting men the American home, the system of free enterprise, and the perpetuation of the church.

We have named our club in honor of our distinguished Congressman, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who has represented this district for many years in Congress. It is hardly necessary for me to point to Mr. HALL'S outstanding record of service to the parents, wives, and children of our fighting men which he has established since the war began.

We know how quickly he has responded to the requests of mothers for him to locate their sailor sons, of wives to find the whereabouts of their soldier husbands. We know how gladly Mr. HALL springs to the aid of the little children of our servicemen. I personally know of scores of families here on the north side of Endicott who have written to our Congressman, asking for their allotments which they had been unable previously to obtain. Just a few days after writing Mr. HALL their money was sent them. These good deeds, and many, many others have proved to his district year after year that Congressman HALL is on the job in Washington, fighting for the people of the Triple Cities and of the other areas he represents.

Sometime ago Congressman HALL introduced the furlough transportation bill in the House. This measure seeks to give to our own American soldiers, sailors, and Marines the same privilege of free railroad or bus fare during furlough which is enjoyed by the armed forces of all other nations. If the English, the Russians, the British dominions, yea, if even the enemy give their soldiers free transportation during furlough, and they all do, certainly this Government should do the same for our boys.

Our club is dedicated primarily then to backing Congressman HALL'S fight for this worthy measure. We are not alone in our effort. Already clubs have been formed in Oneida, Utica, and are being contemplated in Johnson City and Binghamton. The members of Furlough Clubs outside Mr. HALL'S Congressional district plan to inform their own Congressman of the personal interest both they and their friends are taking in the Hall bill.

This club is not a political movement, as some people have suggested. It is being founded to dedicate ourselves to the welfare and betterment of the boys in service of the United States of America, thus hastening the victory which must and will come for our cause. We are further dedicated to winning the war by looking after and watching over the helpless dependents of the men in our armed services by aiding and succoring the wives and children of these men and seeing to it that our Government does everything in its power to preserve them while their men are fighting in the four corners of the earth and on the seven seas for liberty and freedom. We have all experienced our Thanksgiving dinner and recognize that day as being a national holiday commemorating the fine harvest reaped by the Pilgrims in 1623 after a winter of great suffering. Now in 1943 Americans are giving thanks in a similar manner as their children go to and from their homes to school and church without the fear of dodging bombs.

The men are depending on us women to do our part in this fight. Yes; we are doing our share by defense work 10 hours a day, but that is not enough, as our servicemen have no special schedule. Their day never ends, but they continue to hope for a better tomorrow. Let us not just keep wishing in our idle time to see our hopes and prayers come true.

We are also dedicated to the maintenance and perpetuation of constitutional government in America to the end, that we on the home front may save our beloved fathers, brothers, husbands, and relatives that same free system they left behind them and for which they are fighting.

We further pledge ourselves to continue the organization of units of our clubs, keeping ever in mind our objectives, not stopping on the free-transportation bill, but to continue doing things for the boys, such as service clubs and getting together and honoring them as we are this evening.

Sometime ago when we girls were planning this party I wrote Congressman HALL in Washington, telling him about our club and expressing the hope that he would be able to attend. Imagine my surprise and satisfaction when I received an immediate answer from him accepting our invitation. I am happy to say that Mr. HALL has not let us down. He has honored us with his presence even though he had to make a special trip from Washintgon for this occasion. He will strengthen this club's efforts for the servicemen greatly by telling us of his future plans in the Nation's Capital.

And now it is my distinct honor and special privilege to present to you people of the Triple Cities a man who is known to be a friend to everybody in this section, whose name is a household word to those in trouble and distress, a man whose good works shine forth to light the way for the hard-pressed and down-trodden.

Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you, your Congressman, the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

Miss Morlando, members of the Endicott Furlough Club, honored guests, soldiers, as I view this charming and intriguing company of patriotic young women, gathered here for the common purpose of strengthening the morale of their fighting men, I am struck with the same captivating force which seized Admiral Sims upon his first visit to London. He was presented to the British court with all its pomp and circumstance, its imposing nobles and gentlemen. In the galleries overhead he beheld the brilliantly colored post-Victorian gowns and exquisite features and figures of the beautiful English ladies. Sweeping the proud court with a glance, the gallant admiral raised his face to the galleries, filled to overflowing with feminine charm and exclaimed, "God created man just a little lower than the angels." If you of the radio audience could view this lovely group here tonight, you would hasten to express with me the very words of Admiral Sims.

To tell you that I am honored and impressed by this singular meeting would be an understatement. Suffice it to say, as I look into your sincere, earnest faces, I feel both proud and encouraged that you have interested yourselves enough to join me in the most worth-while fight that Americans can wage on the home front. I speak of the fight to gain for the boys in the armed forces the fairest, most just and equitable treatment they so richly deserve.

May I, at this time, good ladies, express my deep appreciation to you all for the invaluable support you have given me in my work since I have been in Congress? You will be glad to hear that the Hall furlough transportation bill has been widely discussed in Washington and all over the country. It is true, there is opposition to this idea from a few people in high places who are fortunate to have enough money to pay for their boys' train fare home during furlough. I can truthfully say to you, however, that by far the great majority of American mothers, wives, and relatives of our fighting men are for this bill and want to see it become law.

As I stand here before your patriotic group tonight I solemnly promise and pledge to you that I will continue to fight unceasingly in Congress for the welfare of your brothers, your sons, your husbands, and relatives now serving with distinction in the armed forces of the United States.

Your enthusiastic president, Miss Morlando, mentioned in her fine speech that the United States is the only Nation in the world that makes its soldiers pay their way home during furlough. She is absolutely right.

Through the efforts of your Congress the American soldier, sailor, and marine are among the best paid of any fighting men. It is obvious, however, that when one considers the average serviceman is shipped a thousand miles away from his home, he has very little left from his pay to buy a train ticket when his commanding officer grants him a furlough. Nor do the great majority of the American people, exerting as they are the patriotic effort at home, have enough to spare to send their boys even though they go out and borrow a few dollars so that Tom or Jack or Joe can come home for Christmas.

The answer, then, is that these boys ought to have free furlough transportation now. Any further delay is neglect on the part of those who have the power to give it to them. I sincerely hope they wake up to this fact before the war is over.

I am not seeking any glory for Congress when I call your attention to the pay raise it gave the soldiers. The truth is that Congress would be letting the boys down if it did not do everything possible in their behalf. Some may think because we have raised the soldiers' pay, increased the allotments of their loved ones, taken steps to rehabilitate those who will be maimed and disabled that we can sit back and boast of a job well done. But, sad to say, Congress has only accomplished a portion of what should

be accomplished. To my way of thinking, we have only scratched the surface.

Therefore, it is my purpose this evening to discuss ways and means of restoring to a place in the sun after victory the millions of young Americans who are giving up so much for their country.

When anyone talks about post-war planning, there is often raised a hue and cry that it is too early. Let me say to those concerned over this, I am afraid we are not starting early enough. Congress too a great step forward a few months ago when it appropriated several million dollars to train partially disabled men sent home from the front in vocations suited to their own cases. This is a great start. If we can develop highly specialized training in many different subjects for our men physically handicapped by the ravages of this war, we will kill two birds with one stone. Not only will we save these disabled heroes from total uselessness to society but we will bring them back to their own self-respect by assuring them of their independence and ability to make a living.

It will be a different situation then, and a happier one also, for the disabled veterans of World War No. 2 than it was for those shattered men who returned from France in 1918 and found the doors of many shops and factories closed to them.

Congress has already set up machinery to take care of this partially disabled group. I hesitate to say how many there will be. Along with the rest of the American people, I hope and pray the number is small. Time alone will tell.

But the total number of men in the armed forces by the end of the war is an easier conclusion to reach. We know there will be at least 12,000,000, Army, Navy, and Marines and the rest. This group is the bulk of our youthful population. This group will not be denied. It behooves us, therefore, to plan carefully for the days when they will be mustered out by the millions to return to their homes. Those days must be the happiest if we plan now. Every veteran of this war has the right to look forward to occupying a productive place in post-war reconstruction. I refuse to be like many who do not believe there will be enough jobs to go around. With business, industry, private enterprise, and Government all joining hands to solve unemployment, I believe we can bring forth after the war the greatest era of prosperity the world has ever seen.

But first, we must let the law of supply and demand in relation to peacetime goods take hold. The result will be tremendous. You and I know there is no limit to the demand which people will have for things that bring a higher standard of living.

There will be no limit to our demand for food for ourselves and the rest of the world after the war.

There will be no limit to our demand for decent homes, furniture, refrigerators, radios, furnaces, ranges, and household appliances.

There will be no limit to our demand for automobiles, machinery of all kinds, and a thousand and one other things to make life worth living.

There will be no limit to our demand for the manufacture of these peacetime goods and I sincerely hope that no power of reaction or selfishness in or out of the Government ever prevents the American people from enjoying to the fullest the fruits of their peacetime effort.

We maintain, then, that since the demands for these goods will be greater than ever before in history, there need be no limit on supply if we utilize our great industries, our huge agriculture, and reconvert the skills we used and developed to destroy our enemies in war to rebuild our Nation in peace.

Our country will have use for every returning soldier to occupy a place in her blueprint for destiny. Of those twelve and more millions who come back, a substantial number will wish to return to agriculture. In order to assure the Nation of excellent food production and to encourage private ownership of our farms which has been the secret of our success in food getting, I propose that Congress place every veteran who so desires on at least a 50-acre plot and assure him of a start on that farm with arrangements for adequate loans or grants to acquire him farm tools and machinery. And while he is farming, or before if necessary, he should be given the chance to improve his knowledge of agriculture to prepare himself scientifically and practically for his life's work.

I am a firm believer in the ability of the American farmer to operate the family-size farm successfully if he is given half a chance by those in authority in Washington. The post-war farmer will be in the same boat.

As to how many ex-servicemen will pursue the occupation of farming, I do not know. If they are properly encouraged and aided by the sympathetic support of Congress, I feel certain they will prosper. Their success will be likewise the success of the whole country.

But what of the remaining millions of veterans who will choose endeavors other than agriculture? What of the countless young men who dropped their half-completed education to rush to their Nation's defense?

The answer is that we must reeducate them. They should start in the classroom and the laboratory where they left off. They should have the change to renew their studies in some similar arrangement.

It has been estimated that advanced and secondary education in America has declined nearly 50 percent in the past 2 years of the war. If that is true, the responsibility of those in authority is clear cut. The most necessary phase of post-war reconstruction will be making up for lost time in the education of this age. It constitutes a double burden upon society because the war will have stolen several precious years from the present generation.

Therefore, in the interest of 12,000,000 service men and women, I believe Congress must immediately consider proposals to make it possible after the war for them to study, or to be trained, or to specialize in order to prepare themselves for a definite place in peacetime America. This study or training should be of a thorough nature which will equip everybody for a useful occupation, pursuit, or profession. With this in mind, I plan to introduce upon my return to Washington in a few days the following measure which I will read to you now. It is entitled "A bill to equip properly veterans of World War No. 2 for peacetime pursuits by providing them with practical or advanced education":

"Whereas the years of war have deprived many in our armed forces of the knowledge and training they might have acquired had peace remained; and

"Whereas it is vitally necessary that in order to make their way in American post-war life our service men and women must be given the chance to start where they left off to serve their country; and

"Whereas these same veterans hold the destiny of the United States in their grasp of things, it behooves us while war is still going on to prepare our country for a glorious peacetime future: Therefore

"Be it enacted, etc.,

"SECTION 1. Any veteran of the Second World War in good standing who at the cessation of hostilities wishes to begin or to complete vocational training or advanced education may enter immediately or not later than 3 years after the war accredited institutions of learning for the purpose of obtaining instruction in skilled crafts, trades or vocations, or for a general education, or for the purpose of specializing in the professions or the studying of advanced subjects.

"SEC. 2. As soon after the termination of armed conflict as may be deemed practicable, any veteran of World War No. 2 who becomes eligible for an honorable discharge and who wishes to avail himself of the foregoing educational opportunities and is accepted and enrolled properly in an accredited institution of training may remain on the pay roll of the War or Navy Departments at the $50 a month base pay until his completion of the specific courses in which he has been admitted. Likewise allotments payable to his dependents at the time of his matriculation shall be continued in the same manner.

"SEC. 3. The tuition and expenses for all books, materials, and supplies necessary for the veteran to carry on his studies shall be assumed by the United States Commissioner of Education. No provision shall be made for his board and lodgings, but he shall have the privilege of obtaining these necessities as a member of his particular branch of service at any military or naval post adjacent to his place of schooling.

"SEC. 4. (a) All medical attention and service as well as hospitalization given to the veteran during illness while he is studying shall be assumed by the medical and hospital authorities under the Surgeon General of the United States.

"(b) Reasonable loans and grants shall be available to those veterans who wish to assume them for additional living expenses not contemplated under this bill.

"SEC. 5. Upon satisfactory completion of his studies as outlined in this bill, the veteran shall be eligible to receive such degrees, honors, or privileges as are commensurate with his educational attainments and with the standards of the institution he attends. With respect to skilled, craft, and vocational courses, the veteran shall be eligible likewise to such avenues of advancement as are open in the following section.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of the courses of study under this bill and attainment of accompanying degrees and advantages, the veterans shall be given preference for such positions, jobs, or situations as may be available in the buillding of the new peacetime America."

Any long-range plan for educating an Army for the peace to come is apt to have many imperfect details. In submitting these proposals to give back the soil to the soldiers and to restore the divine light of knowledge to untold millions of servicemen as well as to complete training of unknown thousands of war crippled and disabled, I realize many details and phases will be imperfect.

Rather then, it is my wish that you people listening this evening will accept only the general outline of a humble attempt on my part to be helpful in solving the greatest problem any nation ever faced.

If we are able, we Americans together, to set up now the proper approach to aid, guide and enlist the post-war energies of our men fighting all over the world for freedom, we will have cemented the foundation of a glorious future, and assured the progress of this land of ours for a century to come. Thank you.

When Workers Quit, Soldiers Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Daniel J. Tobin ranks among the great labor leaders of this country. He is president

of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers. The official publication of this organization is the International Teamster. In the December issue Mr. Tobin contributes an article entitled "When Workers Quit, Soldiers Die; Tell That to the Rat Who Advocates Strikes." Under the permission granted me, I include that article as part of my remarks. It follows:

What good is all the money that you get or that you can save; what good is all the glory and the patting on the back that you give yourself, if we lose this war?

Everything you have will be wiped out if we lose this war.

Money will be worthless—as I have seen it in Germany in 1922. I bought a million-mark bill for five cents in the lobby of the Adelon Hotel in Berlin. I bought it as a souvenir; but it reminds me—and it should you—of how little good money is when liberty and freedom are lost.

About a year after the last war ended in 1918 Germany disavowed all her indebtedness and all of her money. In other words, they said it wasn't worth anything to the people.

During 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917 the German kaiser, with Hindenburg and others, had promised the people everything. The result was they got nothing and the workers were practically enslaved.

The German Government began then to tax the people so heavily that there was no encouragement to go ahead in business.

However, by disavowing their obligations as agreed to in the Treaty of Versailles, they secretly set aside their newly created money, again hired millions of workers, and began to build the present war machine.

When this war ends, if Germany loses—as we hope and pray she will—the German people will again be impoverished perhaps for generations, and will have to work harder than before in order to eke out an existence.

The trouble in our country is that everybody believes there is no chance for us to lose the war. The American workmen are intelligent and understanding beyond those of European countries but because of the success we have had in creating and continuing and improving our freedom since 1776, we have a feeling that it is impossible to defeat us.

Overconfidence is one of the greatest weaknesses any nation can possess. Any prizefighter entering the ring believing there is no chance for him to be defeated is in great danger.

Any nation believing that it is unconquerable is on the verge of defeat.

This was demonstrated in England very thoroughly when Hitler started out on his rampage to destroy the civilized nations bordering on Germany.

I was in England addressing the British Trades Union Congress about the time Austria was trampled upon. Then Czechoslovakia, in violation of all the pledges, promises, and treaties of the Germans, was ruthlessly taken over and its businessmen and patriots tortured and murdered. Then Poland was brutally destroyed.

About this time the labor delegates attending the British Trades Union Congress shouted from the housetops about the failure of the British Government to do something.

The truth of the matter is this: That Chamberlain, a pacifist and a compromiser of the worst kind, had a disarmed, weak country considering the military strength of Germany. Worse than all that, instead of preparing, Chamberlain and his government refused to believe that England was in any danger.

Again the sin or crime of cocksureness prevailed. Chamberlain and his associates believed that any nation would be committing suicide if they attempted to attack England, on her own shores or even in her possessions or territories. What a foolish pipe dream this was, because at that same moment Germany was laying out the roads and maps preparing to destroy England.

I have repeatedly said that Frenchmen—I mean the politicians of France—were worse than those who are in a trance as a result of opium. They were doped completely with their Maginot Line, as time has since proven.

It was an easy walk-away for Germany to conquer the so-called proud, fighting French and their leaders.

A year before this, meeting the French labor leaders in Geneva, they delighted in telling you how all-powerful France was and how impossible it would be for Germany to again bring about an invasion of France.

Again the sin, again the crime, of overconfidence.

The truth of the matter is this: That if Hitler and Goebbels and their associates hadn't blundered after completely overrunning France even before the date they had set out to do so, they could have gone right on into England.

While it would have been difficult to subdue the British, who will fight even after the last man is wounded, Hitler could have conquered England. But he blundered by delaying. He was too confident.

Again let us remind you of the crime of government leaders feeding themselves on the propaganda that they cannot be overcome or conquered. This same condition obtains among 95 percent of the American people today. It may lead us all to danger.

Of course we do not want to discourage the American people. We like them to have a certain amount of confidence in themselves. We ourselves believe that we will win this war, but it can only be won by careful planning and by endless toil and suffering and by constantly watching our every move, to the end that there will be nothing left undone. Then and only then can we win this war and save our Nation and the world.

No one can make me believe that if truck drivers or coal miners fully understood the danger of stopping work because of some grievance, that they would stop work and risk the lives of our men who are defending our country and the world on innumerable battle fronts.

The price we are paying now is greater than we paid 1 year ago, in lives and suffering, as well as money. Money is the least thing to be considered in this war.

Yes, our indebtedness will pile up and it will take perhaps a century to pay off the debt, but if we lose the war we do not need to worry about our debts or our money or our property. The enemy will take care of that.

You have read of the destruction of whole towns and villages in Poland, where all the inhabitants were taken out and shot, slaughtered, murdered ruthlessly for some offense or perhaps the death of some German officer who was brutal in his tactics.

Those reports are not exaggerated. There are many of those cases that you have never heard of and perhaps will not hear of until the history of this war is written.

You saw in the papers the other day where 60 of our bombers did not return from one single raid made on Germany. Each of those bombers carried at least 10 men whom it had taken months to train for such dangerous work. This is happening every day.

The bomber itself may have cost over $200,000 but the loss in money means nothing. It is the time it takes to build them, to send them over there, and to equip them for action.

But worse and most important of all is the training of those young men, 600 of them, all highly efficient, all courageous, all composed of the best blood and brains of our country. Lost to us forever.

This is only a drop in the bucket compared to what is going to happen and the price we will have to pay. We will be extremely fortunate if we come out of this war with not more than a million lives lost and perhaps 2,000,000 wounded.

How then can you on the trucks, or in the fields, or in the factories, or in the mines, stop work for 1 day and thereby prolong the war perhaps 6 months or a year longer than it should last?

But worst of all, how can you stop work and by so doing deprive those fighting heroes, the flower of the world, many of them your relatives, 102,000 of them your brother union teamsters. How can you stop work and endanger their lives?

Think seriously before you listen to agitators and some willful, disloyal Americans, ambitious to get control of your union.

Don't stop work. Bear your troubles if you have any. Your troubles are insignificant compared to the sufferings and hardships of our men over there.

Tell the rat who advocates strikes that the blood of those young men across the seas fighting a fight for our freedom will not be on your hands or on your conscience.

And when this conflict is ended you can look into the eyes of your children and into the faces of the mothers whose sons did not return and tell them you did not help to kill their boys by stopping work.

H. R. 3734, the County Industrial Rehabilitation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 2, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to and to request particular study of H. R. 3734, the County Industrial Rehabilitation Act, recently introduced by me. H. R. 3734 is intended to provide Federal aid to the States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in their respective counties.

In virtually every State there are counties which have failed to develop industrially, or which have become incapacitated industrially. The bill would assist these counties which need rehabilitation and which offer reasonable possibilities for industrial development an opportunity to provide employment for their people in the post-war period without resorting to W. P. A. or similar programs.

Before any county can participate in the program, the State must have passed enabling legislation and must match Federal funds allocated. In addition, participating counties must have shown a definite decrease in population as the result of labor migration, and they must have a definite unemployment problem.

In brief the plan provides that the Federal Government shall provide for properly qualified counties in participating States, funds in the amount of a designated percentage of the total tax evaluation. Funds so provided may be expended in seeking and encouraging

private industry to locate in the designated county, or they may be used in developing cooperative enterprises to utilize local resources or materials. Plans for industrial rehabilitation must be approved by a designated administrator. Included in the scope of plans under the bill are promotion, research, advertising, and other activities designed for the expansion of existing industries or the development of new industries through utilization of the resources and labor of the several counties.

Obviously such an undertaking will not be without its difficulties, but at the same time it offers a challenge and an opportunity for counties which seek to be self sustaining. The smaller counties which have been adversely affected by labor migration during the war and which do not have a strong agricultural back-country will have particular need for industrial rehabilitation during the post-war period. If the plan is successful, it will result in diversified, community industries which have long been held desirable.

A Library and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Carroll Kilpatrick appearing in the Birmingham Age-Herald-News entitled "A Library and the War." It is a very constructive article and should bring about a much better understanding of the functions of the Library of Congress and the opportunities for service which it presents:

A LIBRARY AND THE WAR

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Across the street from the Capitol, where news is made every hour of the day, is a formidable old building housing a goodly number of scholars and a noted poet; but it is not on any newsman's beat. Neither press agents nor press conferences are a part of its paraphernalia.

A visitor looking for a war agency would never be directed to that building. Perhaps he would be sent to one of the dozens of temporary structures on the Mall, or to the new Social Security Building which accommodates the War Production Board, or to the enormous Pentagon Building across the Potomac River in Virginia where the Army has its headquarters.

Few people even in Washington know that the Library of Congress, America's greatest library and probably the world's largest, is the brain-center of this Nation's war program. More than almost any of the established Federal agencies, the Library of Congress, under Archibald MacLeish, the poet-librarian, has become an essential force in the war against the Axis.

The Army and the Navy rely heavily upon it. The State Department has turned over considerable sums of money to the Library so that it can pursue certain specific tasks for the Secretary of State. The Office of Strategic Services, the highly secret research organization serving the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has taken over rooms in the Library for its work. The Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs has transferred funds to the Library for studies in connection with his war work.

But despite the demands of war the Library has still another great function, according to the Librarian of Congress. It must never forget its obligation to future generations. It is the trustee and guardian of the culture of the past and present. Today it is the trustee and guardian of the three principal documents of freedom in the Atlantic world—Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

In all it has more than 18,000,000 books, pamphlets, manuscripts, prints, photographs, films, and public documents. It is the most important producer of chamber music in the country. On its staff are some of the world's most eminent scholars.

Four years ago when President Roosevelt appointed Archibald MacLeish Librarian for Congress there was a great cry that he was not a librarian—and some Members of Congress suspected that he was a new dealer like the President. But his appointment was confirmed by the Senate and today it is recognized that the library profession has benefited rather than been slighted by his activities in their ranks.

Having seen the approach of war sooner than most Americans, Mr. MacLeish prepared the Library for its war role. His first task was to protect the Library from the war. Thousands of valuable books were stored in safe places far from Washington. Irreplaceable documents were locked in vaults for the duration.

Early in the war the importance of the Library's map and film collection was realized by the Army and the Navy. The Library has more than 1,500,000 maps and views and 24,000 reels or rolls of microfilm. The Alien Property Custodian has turned over to the Library more than 1,000 reels of enemy-produced film.

The heaviest demands on the Library have been in the Maps Division, the Aeronautics Division, the Slavic Division, and the Asiatic Division. Mr. MacLeish tells one revealing story of how important some collections can be. When the war began, he recalls, the War Department discovered that it had no complete census of the Japanese Empire. The Library did not have a complete set either. But it located a set of Japanese censuses for 1920, 1925, 1930, and 1935 in a private library and microfilm copies of the entire set were made. A much-needed Egyptian census of 1937 was obtained in the same manner.

The war, of course, has made it extremely difficult for the Library to obtain publications and materials from foreign countries. The Air Transport Command, the State Department, the Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of War Information, and the Office of Strategic Services have all lent a hand. Dr. John K. Fairbank, noted Harvard student of the Far East, who is now with the Office of Strategic Services, collected, with the aid of the great Chinese librarian, Dr. T. L. Yuan, a total of more than 500 volumes, nearly 3,000 periodical items, and 149 issues of official Chinese publications. In Lisbon an official of the Library has collected another 5,000 titles.

The Interdepartmental Committee on the Acquisition of Foreign Publications has furnished the Library of Congress with nearly 100,000 issues of foreign newspapers and periodicals. Many important military, naval, economic, and scientific publications from Axis countries have been obtained in this manner, and the war agencies have examined them with extreme care.

Mr. MacLeish said that some conception of the purchasing problems of the Library may be gained from the fact that he had to ask the State Department to handle for the Library's account 99 payments in 42 countries, including points as remote as French Equatorial Africa, Mozambique, Senegal, Greenland, Afghanistan, and New Caledonia.

In 1942 Mr. MacLeish went to London and soon thereafter appointed a librarian there to collect documentary materials for the library.

The war, the Librarian of Congress said, has made him aware of the weakness in the foreign collections. Military and naval requests for detailed information about the most remote places, about the health and climate of individual cities, about the population, the habits of the people, the governmental structure, the industry, the agriculture, the language, have kept the research fellows in the library at their desks long hours of the day and night.

The Legislative Reference Service is a division to which the Librarian has devoted particular attention. It has been assigned almost exclusively to the war, he says. Its most extensive undertaking was the preparation of a Bibliography of the World at War for the Office of Emergency Management. It was published in 30 volumes. The following are some of the chapter headings: Political Developments and the War, Agriculture in a War Economy, Natural Resources and Raw Materials, Industry in Wartime, and Postwar Planning and Reconstruction. The Library is the world's largest publisher of certain types of documents.

The Legislative Reference Service also has issued sizeable bibliographies, some of which are: Selected List of References on the Economy of Sweden, Great Britain in the War, A Select List of References on the Economic Situation of the Kingdom of Greece, Economic Conditions and Economic Policy in Italy, and Patents on Communications Equipment.

In the last year the Library has continued to expand. In 12 months it received 213,061 books and pamphlets, 1,132,032 periodicals and newspapers, 221,371 manuscripts, 31,568 maps and views, 22,374 volumes and pieces of music, 9,290 reels of microfilm, 15,698 phonographic recordings, and 3,035 prints.

The total cost of running the Library is about $4,000,000 a year.

Austrian Stamp Issued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 23 the Collectors Club, branch No. 5, Society of Philatelic Americans, held a meeting honoring the issuance of an Austrian stamp by our postal officials. At this meeting Dr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer delivered an address on Austria. This address was summarized by William M. Stuart in the Washington Post. By leave granted me, I include the article by Mr. Stuart with my remarks:

The Moscow Declaration on Austria has brought Hitler's first victim back on the map, and it will stay there for good, stated Dr. Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer, unofficial ambassador of Austria on the occasion of the issuance by the Post Office Department of a

stamp in honor of Ausaria, before the Collectors Club, branch 5, Society of Philatelic Americans, in Washington on November 23.

"The free world has at least realized that peace is impossible without Austria which, for hundreds of years, has been one of the centers of world civilization. The declaration of the Austrian annexation by Hitlerite Germany as null and void constitutes the belated reparation of one of the greatest injustices committed during the era of appeasement," he said. Continuing: "For 5 years Austria had resisted unaided by the democracies and practically single handed the tremendous pressure exerted by the Third Reich. In defiance of Hitler's policy of intimidation unsurpassed in history, the Austrian Government had called a plebiscite which would have shown the overwhelming opposition of the Austrian population against the incorporation into Hitlerite Germany. This gave Hitler the cue for his armed intervention and occupation of Austria. In the light of subsequent events it is almost incomprehensible that a great number of countries acquiesced in this development and recognized de facto or even de jure one of the most blatant breaks of international law committed in modern history.

"From a territorial point of view," the speaker continued, "the new post-war Austria will have only few claims. It will accept the frontiers of 1919 with but one rectification. Austria has never recognized the cession of South Tyrol to Italy made in disregard of the principle of self-determination for purely strategic reasons. Wilson himself, whose reluctant approval to the Brenner frontier brought about the cession, later confessed that his decision was based on 'insufficient study,' and that he regretted it afterwards. Austria expects that this province, of course without the Italian-speaking Trentino Province—which had been Tyrolese for about 1,300 years, will be restituted and that in the meantime no arrangement will be made or measures taken by the victorious Allies when further advancing on the Italian Peninsula, which would prejudice the return of this province to her motherland."

Discussing the movement for Anschluss, which had agitated Austria in the years between the wars, Dr. Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer pointed out that it was the product of despair.

"Austria had found herself suddenly cut off from her historical, political, and economic bonds with the neighboring nations without any alternative having been offered or suggested by the victors. In order to prevent a recurrence of a similar movement it is of the greatest importance that ways and means be found to integrate Austria into a greater economic unit than that constituted by its own frontiers. The Moscow Declaration seems to indicate the solution by alluding to Austria's future relations to its neighbors. It would be desirable that this collaboration should be more far reaching than a mere economic arrangement with its neighbors. Important as it would be, it is, however, doubtful whether Russia would be prepared to give its consent to a political federal organization in this region, in view of its fears of a cordon sanitaire—a fear which the speaker considered unjustified. It is inconceivable that the peoples in the Danubian Basin would ever dream of a policy directed against Russia.

"In reading excerpts from the Soviet press one might sometimes gain the impression that the Kremlin has not fully gaged the changes which have occurred in the attitude of the European peoples toward Russia."

The speaker saw no justification for the nervousness displayed in certain quarters regarding the question of a Hapsburg restoration. "The problem is of no actuality at present. It will be for the Austrian people to decide the character of the region they desire under conditions of absolute free speech and liberty of assembly."

Dr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer concluded by expressing the hope that the Moscow Declaration will facilitate the way for the establishment of an all comprehensive Austrian political representation.

"Such a recognized authority could be of great assistance to the other members of the United Nations in bringing about the unconditional surrender of Germany and might help to save the life of thousands of Allied soldiers," he said.

The speaker is convinced that such an Austrian representation would function more smoothly than most of the governments in exile officially recognized by London, Washington, and Moscow.

"It would greatly facilitate the establishment of such a national representation if the authorities of this country would inform the recognized leaders of the free Austrian movements of their desire to see such a body start its work without delay."

Censorship Violation by Reuters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a news broadcast by Ray Henle, commentator, over the Blue Network System on Thursday, December 2, 1943:

Good evening, the subject on which I've been reporting to you for several nights broke out into the open today, ladies and gentlemen, and, before the day was over, we had it debated in the Halls of Congress here in Washington, in Parliament, the House of Commons in London, and in the British and American Offices of War Information. I am referring, of course, to the battle of censorship caused by the unauthorized and premature dispatch about the Cairo Conference put out by Reuters, the British news agency.

You, the public, were informed last night beginning at 7:30 o'clock, informed officially and authoritatively, that the President, the Prime Minister of England, and the Generalissimo of China had met and had reached important decisions regarding the war on Japan and the future of oriental people.

BOUND BY AGREEMENT

American newspapers and radio stations were bound by an agreement with their Government not to divulge any information regarding the Cairo Conference until 7:30 o'clock, and that agreement was kept to the letter. Inside Britain, British newspapers and radio stations—radio in Britain is controlled by the Government; newspapers are not—British newspapers and radio also were bound by an agreement with their Government not to announce the Cairo meeting until 12:30 o'clock this morning, London time, which, of course, is the same as 7:30 here. And that agreement was kept to the letter.

To have announced the Cairo meeting before it was officially announced would have been a violation of the voluntary code of censorship in this country and deliberate violations have been few and far between. There never has been a violation in connection with an incident of the importance of the Cairo Conference. I presume the same holds true in Britain.

However—30 hours before the official announcement was made, the British News Agency, Reuters, transmitted a dispatch from Lisbon—a dispatch which said Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek had met in Cairo and were on their way to meet Marshal Stalin in Persia. The dispatch was sent from Lisbon to London—cleared there by British censorship for transmission to the United States and other countries—but was not cleared for publication by newspapers inside Britain, nor for broadcast by the British Broadcasting Company.

ENTERPRISE A VIOLATION?

Now the question is: Was this a case of enterprising journalism, or was it a case of deliberate violation of a censorship agreement into which both British and American newspapers, radio stations, and news agencies had entered in good faith, at the request of their governments at war? That is the question which has caused all the uproar.

To get the picture clearly, we've got to keep in mind that Reuters—being a world-wide news agency—has bureaus and offices in all principal capitals and cities of the world. So do our own American press associations like the United Press and the Associated Press. The American press agencies and the British press agency, Reuters, compete for business in many parts of the world. They sell their news reports to newspapers and radio stations. The United States does not have the cable and wireless facilities to compete with Reuters in some countries—for example it is very difficult for the United Press to sell news to clients in India, China, and other parts of the Orient—but in South America, the competition is pretty keen. Reuters also has wire facilities in the United States, and Reuters news service is purchased by some American newspapers, but is not widely published in this country.

UNDERLYING EFFECT BIG

Now, is all this competition merely commercial—just one company trying to out-sell another in some foreign country—like one American automobile manufacturer competing with another auto maker? Outwardly—that is all there is to it—but as to the effect of all this—there is a great deal more to it.

If commercial competition is all there is to it, why did we have examples of some very uncommercial competition in South America before the present war started? Before 1939, not only Reuters and the American press agencies were trying to sell their news reports in South America, but D. N. B., the German news agency, and Domei, the Japanese official news agency, were practically giving away their news reports in order to set their stuff into newspapers which used the American United Press and the British Reuters.

And incidentally, it may be said that while our American Government never was very eager to fight any battles for the American press agencies in South America, it came to be grateful for the type of news report they sold down there. The American news report—and the British also—was truthful and accurate. The German and Japanese reports were filled with subtle propaganda. South Americans were able to tell the honest from the fake—and American honest reporting of facts, without propaganda, did more to make the good-neighbor policy an actuality than any deliberate propaganda of any government commission.

INSIST ON FAIR COMPETITION

So there you have the background and the meaning of competition among news agencies throughout the world. There can't be any doubt that if the United States has a story to tell to the world—if we're going to tell that story after the war—if we're going to get our side of any argument over to other countries—then American authorities are going to have to insist on fair competitive practices in the distribution of news on the international scale, just as they demand fair competitive practices among industries right here at home.

If the United States is about to take a much greater part—perhaps even a dominating part—in world affairs after this war is over, then American thought, and practice, and policy, must be relayed promptly and accurately, and honestly, to people in other countries.

The best way to get that result is to give our American news agencies a chance to compete fairly in any foreign field. If the British news agency, Reuters, can distribute its news report in the United States, then the American United Press and Associated Press should have the chance to compete with Reuters in Britain, India, China, South Africa, South America, or wherever else it may be. The fundamental principles involved will become even more important in the days after the war when international radio will play such a vital role.

Because the fundamental principle is so important, is why I've been reporting to you on this censorship development ever since Reuters sent that dispatch out of Lisbon in advance of the hour agreed upon by British and American Governments to give out official word of the Cairo meeting. When Reuters sent out that dispatch, it obtained an unfair advantage over other news agencies with which it is competing in foreign countries. Today, tomorrow, and next week Reuters will be able to "point with pride" among its clientele in South America and wherever else it competes with our American United Press and Associated Press—that it obtained a great "beat" or "scoop" over its competitors.

O. W. I. ACTED RIGHT

The moment that dispatch was cleared by British censorship in London—not for publication in Britain, but for distribution in the United States, South America, and elsewhere—our own Office of War Information—the O. W. I.—immediately broadcast it over its radio waves to all countries. Why? Because the secret now was out—the minute that Reuters dispatch was distributed, that moment the Axis knew about it. So O. W. I. lost no time in making the best capital, in the way of pyschological warfare, that it could out of the situation. By international agreement, it was still bound to hold the official announcement until 7:30 o'clock—but it took what it had—the Reuters dispatch—and made the best of it. The Office of Censorship, meanwhile, didn't try to stop anybody in the United States from publishing or broadcasting the Reuters dispatch.

Last night I reported to you that the director of O. W. I., Mr. Elmer Davis, was supposed to have made a protest about the Reuters dispatch to Mr. Brendan Bracken, the British Minister of War Information. This afternoon, Mr. Davis informed us that he has made such a protest. Mr. Davis announced that he has told Mr. Bracken the premature disclosure of the Three Power Conference at Cairo has seriously jeopardized British-American understanding, and he demanded that the British Government act to prevent such a breach of the rules in the future.

Over in House of Commons, Mr. Bracken was interrogated about the dispatch—in Commons, however, the members were angry—not because Reuters distributed a premature announcement but because the dispatch was withheld from newspapers and the radio inside Britain.

In reply, Mr. Bracken stated that the British Government had no control over Reuters. He said it was a private agency. This of course is true. Even though the British Government does give Reuters preferential cable rates and in some other ways assists its overseas business—help our American agencies do not have—the British Government does not control the news policy of Reuters. In many respects it's as free from control as the American press.

DAVIS—THIS IS WAR

But the point Mr. Davis attempted to make in his protest to Minister Bracken is that these are war times—and because we are at war the American press and radio accepted controls, and bound themselves by agreements which they would never dream of doing in peacetime, and which nobody could make them do. In the United States, press and radio have lived up to their agreements. Mr. Davis is trying to make sure the British press and radio do likewise.

Mr. Davis told the British Government that the psychological warfare value of the conference was injured by the Reuters dispatch, and that amounts to saying that the dispatch interfered with conduct of the war. This is a very serious indictment to bring against anybody and it should be taken for granted that Mr. Davis would not bring such an indictment against Reuters unless he intended to see the matter through and get a firm understanding for the future.

There's a chance that it may turn out to have been a good thing this matter developed in the way it did—it may lead to a clearer understanding of the value of competitive communication systems in the world. If that happens in this country, we may have an expert on communications at the peace table when it comes time to write the peace terms. Incidentally, at the peace conference after the last war, we had no such communications authority—indeed, the American delegation, and the American people for that matter—were not in the least bit interested in the subject.

The Silver Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because I deplore the possibility of silver being shelved as a medium of currency I am, under unanimous consent, inserting in the RECORD an editorial by Harry Kelley, editor of the Flathead Monitor, Kalispell, Mont., and a resolution of protest from the Kiwanis Club of the same city. The editorial and the resolution state, far better than I can, my position on this vital subject. Silver to Montana and the Rocky Mountain States is not a luxury but a necessity. We deplore any attempt to do away with its use at this time. With our debt rapidly mounting we need silver as a backing for our currency. Let us keep it.

The editorial and resolution follow:

[From the Kalispell (Mont.) Flathead Monitor]

THOSE PAPER DOLLARS

During these wartimes we are forced to accept many strange bedfellows, and practically all of us accept the situation without a murmer. But when it comes to forcing us Montanans to accept the shiny plaster dollar for the silver dollar on the ground that it will be a relief to the girls employed in the Federal Reserve bank at Helena, we wonder if that is the real reason, or if it is the purpose of the enemies of silver to cut off the coinage of the white metal into silver dollars for good and all time. After we have viewed Montana farmerettes pitching hay, lifting heavy shocks of grain, and doing a man's work on the farm in the Flathead we just can't visualize a Montana girl balking at emptying a box of silver dollars. No, we don't know of any Montana girls who are too weak to lift silver dollars. We don't produce that kids of gals in the Treasure State. If there is any truth in the flimsy excuse offered for the change it must be that the bank has imported some weaklings from the East. Most Montana girls would resent that charge as an insult to their physical prowess.

Whereas the silver dollar has, from earliest pioneer times, been the basic medium of exchange in Montana, and has become one of its most cherished traditions; and

Whereas the free and general use of the silver dollar has long been one of the chief attractions of Montana and the West to tourists from Eastern States, and has been an incentive to their travel and liking for the West, and is a considerable stimulation to tourist travel in Montana; and

Whereas the reasons assigned for the proposed withdrawal of the silver dollar from circulation seem insufficient, and such withdrawal would break this ancient tradition, seriously impair one of Montana's tourist attractions, and might tend to destroy confidence in our monetary system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Kiwanis Club of Kalispell, Mont., in regular session, That the proposed withdrawal of the silver dollar from circulation be, and the same hereby is, protested most strenuously and vigorously; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Helena branch of the Helena Reserve Bank, and to the regional office of the Federal Reserve Bank at Minneapolis, Minn., to the district governor, lieutenant governors, and secretaries of the Montana District of Kiwanis International, and to the several Kiwanis clubs of the Montana district, and to the Montana Senators and Representatives of Congress.

HAROLD TERRY,
President.
E. B. FOOT,
Secretary.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 3582, providing for the establishment of national cemeteries in all the States and Territories, there is included as a part of this extension of remarks a resolution adopted by the American Legion, as supplied by Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of its national legislative committee. With all of our great veterans organizations having indicated their interest, it is hoped that hearings upon the bill may be held at an early date.

The resolution of the American Legion, adopted at the annual convention October 22–25, 1934, follows:

Whereas a large number of American war veterans are dying in hospitals and sanitariums far from home and without funds or other means available for appropriate

burial—especially in those sections of America to which sick and disabled war veterans go in their quest for recovery: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Federal Government to take such steps as may be necessary to establish and maintain with perpetual care at appropriate points in the United States suitable cemeteries where these deceased war veterans can find their final resting place in appropriate surroundings.

Important Principle Is Embodied in Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the restoration of an independent Government commission for civil aviation is a vindication of a most important legislative policy to which Congress has adhered. Such a policy is contained in the pending Lea aviation bill.

A tribute to the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in presenting this measure has just been paid at the annual meeting of the Air Industries and Transport Association of Canada, a group composed of the Canadian aircraft manufacturers and transport companies. According to an announcement by the association on November 16, it has decided that—

It would recommend the immediate creation of a central, free, and independent Government authority for civil aviation, with wide powers to promote, administrate, and safeguard the development of air transportation in Canada and on the international routes from and through Canada. This recommendation is highlighted by the apparently impending establishment in the United States of a Civil Aeronautics Commission with powers similar to those of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as adopted by Congress has been acclaimed throughout the world as a model of aviation legislation. H. R. 3420 perfects and extends that act, and is drawn with the same care and fidelity to providing the best possible regulation and development for civil aviation which characterized the drafting of the original act.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, America's civil aviation has attained a position of preeminence and has become the envy of the world. With the passage of such a bill the maintenance of that position will be assured.

The adoption of H. R. 3420 will also reaffirm the position to which the Congress has so long adhered, that regulatory commissions should be independent agencies of Congress and not subject to political control of executive departments.

Constructive amendments will probably be offered during floor debate and reading of the proposed legislation. Cooperative effort can and must be applied in constructive fashion.

Thou Shalt Not Covet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I heard a most remarkable message delivered by Mr. Roscoe I. Downs before the adult Bible class of the Arlington (Va.) Baptist Church. Mr. Downs' subject was Thou Shalt Not Covet. Because of the intrinsic worth of the lesson, so ably presented by Mr. Downs, I include the full text of his remarks:

We shall endeavor to give a lesson on the extent of covetousness and how it has and is pervading the lives of all people everywhere, from national policies of all nations down through every strata of life to every individual. There seems to have been a direct purpose—as we are sure there is a direct purpose in all God's works—in the arrangement or the order of the Ten Commandments. It is fitting that this commandment against covetousness should be the final one, for it seems to be the one most prevalent in our minds this day and all days since the beginning of time. Everywhere and in almost all of us there seems lurking a desire to possess that which belongs to another, be it property, or goods, or position, or honors. The commandment as given to us from Exodus 20, the seventeenth verse reads: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." Listing in this manner are the things that were the possessions of men: the personal belongings that men had acquired by their toil and application. We are sure that by this listing we may rightly apply it to all the possessions of people everywhere, in every age and under all conditions and circumstances of life. God's commandments are as apt and fitting today as when given from Sinai centuries ago. God's laws never change and His purposes are the same today as they were yesterday, will be tomorrow, and throughout eternity. We can never escape the application of those laws no matter in what generation we may exist. They are just and right in every instance, and as we have said, with God as the Interpreter of those laws to our understanding, God as the righteous and all-wise judge, His judgments are right and just and the penalties He shall inflict shall be measured with truth and justice, always tempered with love and grace to the repentant soul.

Again let us go to the dictionary to find the meaning of the words, "covet" and "covetousness." The word "covet," a verb, does not carry in an evil sense, except when that action is diverted toward evil, and that is the sense in which God meant in His commandment, and that is the reason he stated it so completely in the sense that he desired us to receive it. In that sense of condemnation for coveting that which belongs to another; that unrighteous desire to take or acquire the belongings of another. One may covet things, or position, or advantages in life with a wholly righteous and worthy desire, with no wrong intent or sinful purpose. it is well that we differentiate between that which is just and worthy, and that which is sinful and unjust. Remember, it is the commandment against coveting that which is another's that we are considering, and not confuse that with desiring worthily and honestly to possess those worth-while things of life that God intended us to seek. Covet as a verb may be used in a worthy sense without condemnation, but in an unworthy sense with all the censure and condemnation that a wrathful God can ascribe. Covetousness, the noun, in almost every manner in which it is used means in an evil sense, and that is the manner in which we must speak of it in this lesson.

In summing up all the Ten Commandments it seems that the tenth carries a great deal of all the negative ones: I think it is safe to say that a great majority of the murders are committed on account of covetousness—a desire to possess something that another possesses or to rob another of something one may desire, be it goods, money, station, or honor. "Thou shalt not commit adultery," the commandment says, and with that uncontrolled desire they are enticed and yield to the sin that God so severely condemns. In this tenth commandment that we study today God specifically states, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," but we find in our today that men and women are changing their marital status with the least provocation. Men desiring other men's wives and women in like manner becoming tired of their husbands and coveting some other, throw off the bonds of holy matrimony with little regard to even the loosely held modern customs.

"Thou shalt not steal," says the eighth commandment, and I am sure each of you will readily see the close connection between the eighth and tenth. It could scarcely be possible for one to steal without first having a covetous desire to possess that which belongs to another. This might be carried to the fullest extent, from the individual to our nations of the earth as well. And I am sure we can readily see the close connection between a covetous desire and a weakness to violate the ninth commandment about lying. Man first covets wrongful possessions and then it is easy to go to the extreme of lying to fulfill his evil desire. So in truth this tenth commandment seems to be the base upon which all the negative commandments are builded.

May we paraphrase this tenth commandment into words that fit into the scheme of nations as we are witnessing today, and as has been throughout all history? Nations are but peoples, and the conduct of nations but reflect the desires and the aspirations of its citizens. God's tenth commandment speaks to the individual, but in like manner it applies to all people in a collective sense. When God speaks to an individual and says, "Thou shalt not steal," it applies in the larger sense and forbids nations of peoples as well. When He says, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his wife, nor his manservant, nor maidservant, nor anything that is thy neighbor's," He is speaking in an individual sense, but it is meant to nations as well. Thus the tenth commandment as paraphrased might read: "Thou shalt not covet they neighbor nation's land, nor its people, nor its oil, nor its iron, nor its coal, nor anything that is thy neighbor's."

A decade ago there came into being a man and an idea, neither of which was new in any sense of the word, but are only reflections of countless other such couvetous men and nations all down the ages of man. Today the world is drenched in blood, and carnage and destruction has come to the entire world. Everywhere men are devising and using every means that science and invention can engender to kill and destroy. Fire and destruction have ravaged peaceful lands; innocent and helpless people have been murdered in a wholesale manner. Cathedrals and monuments that it has taken centuries to erect have been reduced to rubble and ashes in a single day. Homes that have been built by sweat and toil have been destroyed, and the occupants ravaged, raped, and murdered and

scattered abroad as chaff before the wind. All of this and more beyond the power of words to describe solely because a man with a warped mind and a heart of the devil, backed by a people just as guilty and just as depraved allowed their souls to covet their neighbor nations' possessions. But today, as in all times past, a just and relentless retribution has set in, and we are convinced that before peace shall again come to the world that that relentless, couvetous nation and that warped and devilish mind behind all this destruction, and hate, and death, and famine shall have been made to pay to the last bitter drop.

Only this week the world has been heartened by the United Nations' statement that came from Cairo that spells the doom of another ruthless marauder nation that for half a century has allowed its covetous eyes to wander over nearly half of the world and take for itself that which belonged to others. We need not go into the complete details of these great and righteous acts that bring into condemnation the covetous and aggressive actions of the robber nations and promises actions of force sufficient to bring execution to this nation of Japan, and we but await another declaration that shall in like manner condemn and foretell the execution of the nation of Germany. All nations, as well as all individuals, shall be made conscious of the power of God and that His commandments shall and will be enforced. May I give you at this time my own personal opinion and view, gained by a half century of study and thought, and patriotic devotion to my country.

I love my country and am willing to give to it my last and full measure of devotion and service. Whatever my Nation desires of me that will I do. I have laid on the altar of my country the greatest sacrifice that man can give with no reservation. I have asked God daily to use my boys in whatever way He and the Nation sees fit. I have not asked that they be shielded from danger, but that they render every service to which they are called, though I have asked humbly and gratefully that they be protected by His loving care and that He watch over them. And somehow I have been heartened by the circumstances that have assured me that God is not unmindful of my prayers. In some mysterious manner that nephew of mine, dear to me as my own son, as he waged battle over Germany a month ago was prompted to change seats with the head pilot of the Fortress for some unaccountable reason and within a short time a German rocket shell pierced the side of the plane and exploded within the cockpit, instantly killing the head pilot and seriously wounding my nephew. We do not know what circumstances caused them to exchange seats, but we do know my nephew lives and the other died. We would not attempt nor do we know the reason for this, but we somehow believe that God had something to do with it. This is no different from thousands of other such occurrences and my nephew and my son are no different from millions of other sons. All of us are giving our full measure of devotion and no sacrifice of one is greater than that of any other. I merely tell you this to give force to the declaration that I shall make:

I ascribe to the statement of the patriot who said: "My Nation; may it always be right, but right or wrong, my Nation." So long as we are citizens of this Nation we should and must give it full service and support in all its acts. If those acts be wrong we must change these wrongs. We have it within our power to do so. Practically every war in which our Nation has been engaged have been wars for the defense of humanity and for the good of mankind, and not for aggression. We have not coveted our neighbor's lands. We have been content to live in peace and harmony with our neighbor nations and the nations throughout the world, nor casting covetous eyes toward their lands nor their possessions. We have been prosperous and have become rich and powerful, and today have the privilege and the opportunity to render magnificent service to a wrecked and bleeding world, without asking reward. I hope and trust that shall be the policy that our Nation shall pursue in this great event of the world's history, and that nothing shall be done or even suggested that shall lend a thought of covetousness. I feel that this Nation has been successful and that God has blessed us because we have been true to our unselfish purposes.

Nations lose their souls by disobeying God's commands just the same as do individuals. I firmly believe that this Nation of ours was established by God for the express purpose of leading the world to the full knowledge and enjoyment of liberty and justice, and as an example and a pattern for the self-government of all people everywhere.

I think the most heartening and encouraging thing that was said in the declaration that has just come from the meeting of our President, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the President of China, at or near Cairo, is that in which each of them pledges his nation against territorial expansion. I quote the exact statement: "The three great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion."

So much for the evil of covetousness as it applies to nations. May we think of this sin of covetousness as it applies to the individual and to each of us in particular.

I have two stories based on personal covetousness that I wish to recount that I am sure will give an accurate picture of what personal covetousness is:

I recall an instance that happened when I was a boy that has remained in memory since. In this small Kentucky town there was a banker, who was what is usually referred to as the leading citizen. He was deacon in our church and also superintendent of the Sunday school. Always his name led all the others on every subscription pledge that went the rounds. Being president of the town's only bank, he had it within his hands to direct the finances and I might say the very lives of its citizens. This is an accurate picture of the man and it is a composite picture of many such small-town leading citizens. There was a family living on a small farm near the town and they owned this farm without debt. It was rich land and well located, though the house and buildings were not of the best. This family earned their living from this farm and were thus independent and happy. This banker (our leading citizen) wanted this farm, but these people did not want to sell it. Then the banker pursuaded them to borrow money from his bank to build a new house and barn, taking a mortgage on the farm. This was done and then at the first opportunity, when the seasons had been bad and crops had failed to materialize, when this family's tobacco failed to bring a sufficient amount to pay the mortgage, immediately the banker, our leading citizen, the deacon in our church, and the superintendent of our Sunday school, foreclosed the mortgage on the little farm and took possession. Of course, it was done in a strictly legal and legitimate manner. The banker coveted the farm and that covetousness brought fruit in this dishonest, if legal, act. I might go on and conclude the story, and tell of the retribution that inevitably came, but that would be beside the point.

One of the late books of fiction, Martha Ostenso's O River, Remember, is based around such a scheme of covetousness. I quote from the review of this book: "The conflict between the two families went back to frontier days in the Red River Valley. Ivar Wing had emigrated from Norway in the 1870's. He loved the land, but he didn't want any more of it than he could work himself. To his wife Magdali, however, it spelled wealth and power, and she rode roughshod over the Shaleens, their dreamy, easy-going neighbors, to acquire vast holdings. But in the end her greed brought nothing but tragedy and unhappiness to her children." Thus we have a lesson that has been repeated in every generation of time. Coveting lands and possessions of others, desiring property and wealth that power and domination may sway the lives of all concerned.

This other story was told me by a Jewish friend with whom I work. It came to my memory when I first began the study of this lesson and I had him repeat it to me the other day. I give it to you as he told it to me:

In the lower East Side of New York there lived an Italian family, with a little shop on the narrow street with living quarters in the rear, but this little house and shop had a large rear yard and in the midst of this yard grew a wonderful magnolia tree. This family had nurtured and guarded this magnolia and when in bloom it shed its perfume upon that crowded street like a breath from heaven. It was a magnificent tree some 60 feet in height and its branches spreading out and bloom-laden.

One day a wealthy man chanced to come along and seeing this glorious tree in full bloom, and breathing its fragrant perfume desired it for himself. He coveted it for his own great mansion grounds up the Hudson and he sought out the Italian shopkeeper and offered to buy it, but the man refused to sell. A thousand dollars was offered and refused. With his covetous eyes fixed upon the magnolia, the rich man began bidding higher and higher for the tree, but each offer was refused. In exasperation the rich man who thought everything could be bought for a price asked the shopkeeper why he would not sell it for such an enormous sum and the Italian replied:

"I have raised my family here in this crowded street and have earned my money by this little shop. I have sat under my magnolia tree with my little babies in my arms after closing the shop in the evening and have breathed the perfume from its flowers. It was just a little tree when I first came here, but it has grown so tall and big as my children have grown and become men and women. My wife, Maria, and I have sat under this tree through many years and have enjoyed the peace and happiness that our love held for each other."

The old Italian paused for a long time in his narrative, as his old eyes gazed into the branches and the blooms of his magnolia. Presently he brushed his eyes with his sleeve and continued:

"My children are all gone now. Married and have little babies of their own, and Maria is gone also. I still come out here in the dusk of the evening and sit under my magnolia, and somehow it brings back to me the remembrances of the days that are gone. I can hear little Petro as he laughs and chatters, and I can hear all the others as they used to scamper and play about my feet as Maria and I sat here long ago. I can come out here now and be with my Maria and we talk over the old days when we were young and I can see her with a little one in her arms as he tugs at her breast and we talk just as we used to talk long ago."

"No, Mister, I no sell my magnolia."

But the rich man with his covetous eyes upon the magnificent tree which he wanted for his own spacious lawns could scarcely appreciate the love and the sentiment that the old Italian shopkeeper had for it, and again, unmindful of the story and love that the old man had for his tree, offered him $25,000 for it and could not understand why he still refused to sell it.

Food Distribution Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Food Distribution Administration has, in my opinion rendered the farmers of America an outstanding service in administering section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. In the 1938 act, it will be remembered, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to make complaint, and to cooperate with and assist cooperative associations of farmers in making complaint, to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to "rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products, and to prosecute same before the Commission." Due to the Department's activities under this section, the producers and shippers of agricultural products have been saved close to one hundred million dollars during the past 12 months.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a letter from Mr. C. W. Kitchen, Deputy Director, Food Distribution Administration, under date of December 3, 1943, in which is set out the major activities of the Administration during the past 12 months and the estimated amount of money saved to producers and shippers of agricultural products because of these activities:

DECEMBER 3, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: This has reference to our conversation in your office Saturday, November 27, at which time you expressed considerable interest in the activities of Food Distribution Administration in administering section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Administration of this legislation has been assigned to the Transportation Rates and Services Division of the Transportation and Warehousing Branch, Food Distribution Administration.

We are listing a few of its major activities during the past 12 months and the estimated amount of money saved to producers and shippers of agricultural products because of these activities. This work has been done with a personnel which has never exceeded 16.

1. ELIMINATION OF SURCHARGES

As a result of the hearings in Ex Parte 148, the railroads were permitted horizontal increases in freight rates of 6 percent on all commodities except agricultural products, which were held to 3 percent on basic agricultural products and 6 percent on some manufactured agricultural products. The railroads had asked for a flat 10-percent increase on all commodities to offset the wage awards of 1941. Through the activities of the Food Distribution Administration savings of 7 percent and 4 percent were effected in the transportation charges on agricultural products for the period March 18, 1942, until May 15, 1943.

Prior to that date, due to the increases in the railroads' earnings, which were far in excess of what had been expected, the Food Distribution Administration conceived and carried into effect a plan to have the surcharges lifted entirely from all agricultural products, basic or manufactured. The Interstate Commerce Commission ruled favorably and on May 15, 1943, suspended these surcharges until January 1, 1944. It has been variously estimated that this latter move effected a minimum saving of approximately $75,000,000 annually to agricultural producers.

2. HALF-STAGE ICING

In cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, and as a result of transportation tests made by the latter agency, the Administration took the initiative of obtaining the approval of half-stage refrigeration in refrigerator cars hauling perishable foods. This action resulted in a considerable saving of ice which is of importance at this time, and a reduction of 22 percent in the cost of refrigeration services. It is estimated that the results of this action will save about $2,250,000 annually if used to fullest extent possible.

3. LIVESTOCK TO, FROM, AND BETWEEN POINTS IN THE SOUTH

The Administration prevailed upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the rates on livestock as applicable to, from, and within the South as compared with prevailing rates in western, southwestern, and eastern territories. As a result of this investigation the livestock rates in the South were reduced to a considerable extent and the rules and regulations governing the transportation of livestock were ordered changed to more nearly conform with those in effect in other territories. There is no way of estimating the amount of money saved to producers and shippers, but it may well be said that it runs into millions of dollars annually.

4. FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FROM IDAHO, UTAH, AND COLORADO

In the early part of 1942 the railroads serving Idaho, Utah, and Colorado published increased rates on fresh fruits and vegetables amounting to $40 to $60 per car. The Administration requested the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend these increases and subsequently, after much negotiations, the carriers were induced to withdraw these proposed rates. During 1942 these States shipped a total of 63,118 cars of fresh fruits and vegetables upon which the increases would have applied. This represents a saving, in that year alone, of approximately $3,200,000.

5. COTTON, SOUTHWEST TO PACIFIC COAST

The railroads operating from Texas to the Pacific coast attempted to increase the freight rates on cotton moving westbound 19 cents per hundredweight. The Division, after much negotiations with the railroads involved, succeeded in having this increase canceled. Approximately 500,000 bales are moved annually between these territories; therefore, a savings to producers approximating $500,000 annually resulted.

6. CANNED CITRUS JUICES FROM TEXAS

From the inception of the canned citrus juice industry in Texas, the movement from Texas to points in Northeastern United States has been entirely by steamship. With the withdrawal of the steamship service due to the war, it became necessary to move this commodity by rail, and the rail rates were too high to permit proper distribution. The Division supported a proposal filed with the railroads, and as a result adjusted rates were published, resulting in reductions of approximately $58.50 per car.

7. RETURNED EMPTY USED FRUIT AND VEGETABLE CONTAINERS

Due to the war a severe shortage has occurred in new wooden fruit and vegetable containers. A serious hardship confronted producers and shippers in the Southeast, particularly Florida. A program was inaugurated by the Food Distribution Administration for the reuse of these containers and the Administration, after a long series of negotiations, succeeded in obtaining from the railroads publication of a very low rate on empty used containers from terminal markets in the North to producing districts in the South. A fairly large movement of these containers has developed and it is evident that the favorable freight rate which was obtained will be of great assistance to southern producers in marketing their crops this shipping season, and for the duration. Similar action is now being taken in behalf of the southwestern fruit and vegetable producers.

8. LIVE POULTRY CARS

The owners of the special equipment which is used for the transportation of live poultry by rail attempted to dispose of all their remaining cars. With a diminishing of available motor-truck transportation, this would have worked a severe hardship on live poultry producers. The Division succeeded in having the War Production Board freeze 200 of these cars in service. They have continued to operate and within the past 3 months even this number has not been sufficient to supply the demands of producers and shippers. As a result of the Division's action, a new corporation has been formed to own and operate these cars and they will remain available to live poultry producers indefinitely.

In addition to its other assignments, the Division has undertaken and completed a large amount of work for other Bureaus in the Department, such as the Commodity Credit Corporation, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, for whom great studies and transit surveys have been made, as well as the furnishing of many rates and various rate information for the branches of War Food Administration itself. The Division has actively cooperated with the Office of Defense Transportation, War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and other wartime agencies who have requested and received their counsel in connection with the shipping of agricultural products.

It is conservatively estimated that during the fiscal year just past the Transportation Rates and Service Division has been instrumental in establishing over 280 separate rate adjustments with 150 adjustments pending as of June 30, 1943. These adjustments include such items as: Fertilizer from Canadian points to destinations in the United States, raw materials for the manufacturer of synthetic rubber, and transit arrangements authorizing storage, processing and partial unloading in transit of agricultural products.

The activities of the Division have been national in scope, and it can be said that at least four projects have affected producers of agricultural products in each of the 48 States.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. KITCHEN,
Deputy Director.

Victory, What Then?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Neal W. Workman, of Newberry,

S. C., at Laurens, S. C., on Armistice Day, November 11, 1943:

Mr. Post Commander, fellow legionnaires, members of the Auxiliary, ladies and gentlemen, it is with peculiar pleasure that I respond to the kind invitation of your post commander to speak to you on this splendid occasion.

Armistice Day, 25 years ago. A great day—that, filled with memories that have lingered ever fresh in our every mind. To us over there that morning, the air was fresh and crisp; the sun seemed unusually late in getting up and out on his daily rounds. After so long a time he slowly dragged himself over hills, and more slowly still climbed the sky, making bold, now and then, to look over the tall timbers and even to peep through the clouds which so recently had watered the countryside. All along the battle line, on the hill top and in the valley, the roar of battle grew in intensity; the boom of cannon, great and small, increased at an ever rapid rate, for each belligerent vied with the other in sending over the greatest possible number of shot and shell that morning. Men, many, who had lived through it all to see the dawn of that very day, fell and joined the ranks of the dead, while others, until then whole and strong, had their bodies broken and maimed. While thus the battle raged, the atmosphere was tense with expectancy, for 11 o'clock was the hour in every mind. At intervals, ever shorter between, officers and men alike glanced at their watches over whose faces the hands seemed to move with incredible slowness. The seconds lazily ticked themselves out into long and lingering minutes, the minutes dragged themselves out into hours, and the hours into days. Finally, at long last, the awaited hour came. Of a sudden, everywhere, with unbelievable abruptness, the firing ceased, and the roar of battle moved off into the silent past. Peace again had come to earth; in man reason once more had climbed upon the throne and judgment prepared to take command. So we hoped and so we dreamed. The war was at an end, so we thought. A war to end all wars had been fought, so we were told. Here on the home front many of you will recall how the bells rang and the whistles blew that morning, and how joy reigned supremely in the hearts of men. Such was Armistice Day 25 years ago.

Yes, an armistice had been arranged and now was in force and effect. Armies about-faced, and men, with high hopes and lofty dreams of a world henceforth free from war, began a journey that was to lead back to billets and then to their respective homes. Our own General Pershing, and Marshall Foch had advised against such an armistice, and urged that the war be continued on German soil. Their advice was not heeded. In the light of what since has happened, we now full well know that in failing to heed that advice the Allied Nations erred. We also knew that that armistice marked, not the end of that war but only the beginning of a truce; that the years which have since passed have been years of truce and not years of peace. We had won that war, but we did not keep it won. We failed, and failed utterly to win the peace. The conduct of the Allied nations then and down through the years since made possible the rekindling of the flames of that unfinished war. The warmongers across the Rhine, foreseeing for themselves defeat and ruin, had sued for peace—not because they had lost their will to fight, nor yet because they wearied of their war-like way, but rather that they might live and prepare the better to fight another day.

With shattered hopes and unfulfilled dreams, we again find ourselves at war—not in World War No. 2 as we sometimes are told, but in the rekindled flames of that other and unfinished war. Indeed, why longer call this Armistice Day, when in fact there is no longer an armistice? That armistice lasted so long, and only so long, as it suited the wish and whim of the haughty Hun.

Today, in the midst of these rekindled flames of war, in accordance with our long-standing custom, we meet to pay tribute and do honor to our comrades who did not come back 25 years ago, as well as those who since have fallen by the wayside. But as we do this, we are reminded that another generation has come upon the scene. Boys—then in their mothers' arms, or yet unborn—today are men. In the air, on land and sea, they boldly carry the fight to the enemy in every part of the earth to which these rekindled flames of war so widely, so swiftly have spread. They have taken up where we left off. They have put their hands to the plow to complete that which we left unfinished. Some of them, so soon, too have fallen and joined the ranks of the dead. May we not also pause to pay them tribute and do them honor! And those that live, let us bid them God's speed in their great task. For the moment let us forget the dead and think of the living. Let us cease to think and talk of that armistice of yesterday, and think of and labor for a victory day of tomorrow. Not again must there be an armistice with the Hun. For him, surrender—unconditional surrender—only must be his terms.

Are we giving these boys now in uniform that material and moral support they need and must have if that victory day shall come? Or do we, by our actions say, this is their war, let them fight it? No; this is not their war. It is our unfinished war. Had we finished that war, and won and preserved the peace, there would be no war today. Twenty-five years ago we brought the Hun to his knees and took from him his arms. Mystified at what since has happened, today we ask: How did he so quickly rise? Upon what meat has he fed so quickly to grow and become so great and strong? The answer is not difficult to find. During the last days of that war the Allied military forces effected a fairly well unified command and concert of action, but the Allied Nations themselves never effected any such unity of purpose or of action. But so soon as the fighting stopped they each went their own way without making any effort for unity of thought or of action, either to win or preserve the peace. Cross-purposes at once developed, and as a result Germany was soon free to burst the bonds of the Versailles Treaty and go back to her war-making business.

The continued discord and lack of unity among the Allied Nations made his task all the easier. When Hitler first denounced that treaty and marched in the territory by it forbidden to him, the French wanted to stop him, and they had the Army and the tools to do the job and do it well. But England said, "No." Hitler, expecting England and France to act, gave to his Army two sets of orders—one to advance so long as there was no resistance, the other to withdraw if and when resistance should come, while he himself, trembling with fear, went to bed and required a shot in the arm.

Who among us would say that had he been stopped still in his tracks that day, it would not have had a salutary effect on his subsequent career? Before that, on the other side of the world, in Asia, the Japs moved into Manchuria. Mr. Stimson, then Secretary of State, now Secretary of War, wanted to stop them. England said, "No." Later, one Benito Mussolini, dreaming that he was one of the immortal Caesars and the greatest of them all, must have an empire commensurate with his greatness, too began to march. He moved into Ethiopia. This was too close to the British possessions in Africa for comfort, so they said "Let's stop him." America said, "No." As a result of this lack of unity of purpose and of action, the embers of that war were fanned into living coals of fire and later into flaming war. A war that need not have been. A war that should not have been. A war that easily could have been prevented, but was not on account of the jealousies and suspicions of the Allied Nations. All the while the Germans were busy on two fronts—on the home front making tools of war and on the foreign front fanning the fires of discord and disunity among the Allied Powers. Not only did we, in the long run, lose that other war but by reason of this discord and disunity we came dangerously near losing this war even before it burst into open flames.

Let us remember and not forget, that civilization has hung in the balance; that we and our allies, until recently, have been on the losing side of this war; that we are not yet out of danger; that victory still lies far away, and that the road that leads thereto is long and rugged; that before that goal is reached many that today live, then will be dead.

And too, let us remember that in this war—as in the last—the real struggle is not tank against tank, nor plane against plane, nor yet man against man, but idea against idea, philosophy of government against philosophy of government. This struggle is not confined or limited to the war between the Axis against the Allied Nations, but is going on within the respective nations on each side. In this war it is our task—those of us who stay at home—not only to support those boys now in uniform with our prayers, with our every resource and every energy that victory may the sooner and surer come, but to defend, protect, and preserve the Constitution of these United States and the American way of life. Let us face the facts and openly admit, that during the last 25 years in general and the last 10 years in particular, this Nation has been filled with saboteurs—with men and women who have been engaged—not in dynamiting factories, and trains and bridges, to be sure, for they played for higher stakes than that—but who, in season and out of season, by day and by night, with all their might and main, have sought to destroy the Constitution of this Nation and the liberties and freedoms by it vouchsafed to the American people. As great as is our first duty—to furnish these boys with tools to do their job; the second duty, namely to preserve the American way of life, is even greater. Is it not time for us to pause and ponder the question propounded many years ago by that keen analyst of human destiny when he asked, What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? We are going to win this war if it takes every dollar of our wealth and every mother's son and daughter of us to do it. But what then? Of what value will victory on the battle front be to us if we lose our American soul—our American way of life?

When this war is over and these boys come back, to what kind of country will they come? To a country whose government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed? Or to a socialized country fashioned by bureaucracy, whose unjust powers are derived from the consent of the planners? From the planners—the reformers—Gracious God deliver us! In his little book entitled "When a Man Comes to Himself" by our Commander in Chief of the other war, Woodrow Wilson, he had this to say about reformers: "Men come to themselves by discovering their limitations no less than by discovering their deeper endowments and the mastery that will make them happy. It is the discovery of what they cannot do, and ought not to attempt, that transforms into statemen; and great should be the joy of the world over every reformer who comes to himself." Great would be the joy in America today if some of the self-appointed remakers of America could only find themselves. We have no right to wish or expect these boys to win the victory on the battle front, unless we, at every necessary cost, win this battle on the home front. Will we win that battle for them, as well as for ourselves and

our posterity, or will we unconditionally surrender to the superimposed new order? Will the pertinent question asked in the tomorrows be, Were we weighed in the balances and found wanting? Shall men in other lands and in other ages answer this question in the affirmative, or will we, in this land and in this age, meet the challenge and answer it in the negative? Frankly, my friends, are we fighting this war to preserve the American way of life, or to make America safe for bureaucrats?

Just what the outcome ultimately shall be I cannot tell you for I do not know. But this I can tell you, for this I do know: To this land liberty came to live. Your duty and mine it is to see to it that here it shall not die. In this land freedom made its home. It is your duty and mine to see to it that it shall not be banished from these shores. I claim no ability to walk with unstumbling feet the uncertain paths of prophecy, but I make bold to predict that when the smoke of this war's battles shall have cleared away it will clearly be seen that Old Glory, unstained and untorn, will yet be waving over this land—still the land of the free and home of the brave; that when the constitutional infidels and saboteurs, the liberty thieves and freedom's foes, are dead and in their forgotten graves, the Constitution, unaltered and unchanged, will be the supreme law of this land, and the liberty-loving, God-fearing men and women of this Nation, unashamed and unafraid, will still put their unfaltering trust and unfailing faith in that Constitution and pay undivided allegiance and unstinted tribute to that flag. May God grant it so!

Resolution Adopted by Associate Bankers of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Associate Bankers of St. Louis at their meeting held November 18, 1943:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Associate Bankers of St. Louis that the national farm loan associations serving St. Louis County and adjacent counties are further broadening their lending services in that they are now holding themselves out to make Land Bank Commissioner loans to part-time farmers and suburban residents whose principal income is derived from sources other than farming, and on small, improved suburban tracts of several acres or more; and

Whereas this activity on the part of such national farm loan associations is a further encroachment by governmental sponsored lending agencies in the field of chartered bank lending: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Associate Bankers of St. Louis view with alarm, deplore, and express their unalterable opposition to the action of the national farm loan associations in further broadening their lending services in making Land Bank Commissioner loans to part-time farmers and suburban residents whose principal income is derived from sources other than farming and on small, improved suburban tracts of several acres or more, for the reason that such action constitutes a further encroachment by governmental sponsored lending agencies in the field of chartered bank lending; and

Resolved, That the president and secretary of the Associate Bankers of St. Louis be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration; president of the Federal Land Bank, St. Louis, Mo.; president of American Bankers Association; president of Missouri Bankers Association; president of Independent Bankers Association; and such other persons as the executive committee of the Associate Bankers of St. Louis may hereafter designate.

United States and World Protest Shocking Arrest of Students at University of Oslo

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the mass arrest of students at the University of Oslo, Norway, for deportation to concentration camps in Germany has rallied further feeling against the Nazis. By piling wrong upon wrong, the Hitlerites themselves marshal all the forces of right to overthrow them. They literally construct their own defeat.

This conflict between the so-called Nazi masters and the students and professors of the University of Oslo began back in 1940, when the invaders tried to take over the control of the university and institute a philosophy entirely foreign to the peace-loving Norwegians.

There have been many arrests in recent months, but on November 30, nearly 1,500 students were forcibly taken into custody, and the majority of them will end up in concentration camps in Germany, according to information received in the United States.

Protests have been made, not only in Norway, but from the people of the nations which still can adhere to principles of fair play and the right of educational freedom.

In this time of terror and executions, these students who have the courage to stand up and fight for their convictions, even though it means prison camps and hard labor, have and are receiving the real sympathy of the rest of the world.

The story of the shocking mass arrest of the young students of Oslo University is told in an article which appeared in News of Norway, the December 3 issue of a bulletin issued by the Royal Norwegian Information Service, 3516 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. The article follows:

ALL MALE STUDENTS AT OSLO UNIVERSITY ARRESTED

Between 1,200 and 1,500 students of Oslo University were arrested by the Germans on November 30 and are to be sent to a concentration camp in Germany. The number represents the entire male section of the university's enrollment with the exception of those students who are of Nazi stripe. Also arrested were virtually all members of the faculty.

Wilhelm Rediess, Gestapo chief for Norway, described the university as a hotbed of resistance to Germany and the Quisling government throughout the entire occupation period. He made it clear that the immediate cause of the mass arrests was the incendiary fire which last week damaged the university's famous Aula auditorium, favorite rallying place for the Nazis during the past 3 years.

The arrests began at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning when the Germans descended simultaneously on the scattered university buildings at Blindern and in downtown Oslo. Laboratory workers and premedic students at the Rikshospital were seized at the same time. The University and Deichmanske libraries were surrounded by Germans and all students ordered out into the street. Students not trapped in these raids were later fetched from their homes.

The arrested were taken in cars and trucks to the Aula auditorium, where they first learned of the reason for their arrest as well as of the fate awaiting them. At about 2 p. m. Gestapo Chief Rediess mounted the stage, still badly scarred from the fire, to deliver an angry speech.

GESTAPO CHIEF TELLS STUDENTS WHY THEY WERE ARRESTED

"During the whole occupation," he said, "students of Oslo University have formed a resistance group which has conducted propaganda and illegal activities against Germany and the Norwegian State. There has been no lack of warning, but nevertheless the number of sabotage acts has increased, as has the number of students who have helped lead these organizations and have participated in the publication of illegal newspapers."

Rediess recalled that a few months ago the students had protested vehemently against Nazi attempts to introduce new qualification for admission to the university. (See N. of N., October 8, 1943.) "Students had revealed their mental attitude," he shouted, when they objected to the admission to the university of "those who did their duty as Europeans, who fought as volunteers against bolshevism and thus distinguished themselves as brave Norwegians."

The Gestapo chief went on to say that the arrest of the students and the deportation of them to Germany was being undertaken to protect the interests of the occupying power and to secure law and order in the country. He said that women students were being ordered to return home and to report to their local political authorities. (A few women students had been arrested during the morning, but were soon released.)

Rediess said that all students who proved "loyal or friendly" (to the Nazi cause) would be released as soon as possible during the day. He also promised that the Norwegian students would get "the best possible treatment" in Germany, and that "no measures would be taken against them except those absolutely necessary for preserving the interests of the occupying power."

STUDENTS LOCKED UP NEAR OSLO PENDING TRANSFER TO GERMANY

The Oslo correspondent of the Swedish Tidningarnas Telegrambyraa reported that the students were first gathered in camps near Oslo "for sorting out," and that those not coming under the "loyal" category would then be sent to Germany. This correspondent said the students would be interned in a special camp "where internees will get better treatment in all ways than ordinary political prisoners."

No indication has been given as to when the university is to reopen or how long the students are to be interned. It is said the

arrested faculty members are to be "released gradually."

While the action against the students was taking place, hundreds of persons who had gathered on Karl Johan Street outside the university were taken into custody by German soldiers and kept confined in a place behind the university while the crowd was carefully sifted for students. Other crowds which sought to gather near the university were kept moving by police.

As a forerunner to Tuesday's drastic action, the Nazis arrested 14 university faculty members and more than a hundred students about six weeks ago. Prior to that arrests of students and professors were reported at frequent intervals. Dr. Didrik Arup Seip, president of the university, has been a political prisoner of the Nazis since September, 1941. He was deported to a concentration camp in Germany in April, 1942, and is still held there.

The fire in the Aula auditorium last Saturday night was brought under control before it caused serious damage. A section of the platform and the front rows of seats had apparently been soaked with petrol and paraffin. At first authorities declared the fire had been set by Communist elements and that it had no connection with the current university struggle. In other quarters the Aula blaze has since been described as another Reichstag fire set by the Germans themselves in order to provide a pretext for the wholesale arrests of Tuesday.

ST. OLAF CLUB ADOPTS RESOLUTION OF PROTEST

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Minnesota, at Northfield, is a fine Lutheran Church-sponsored higher institution of learning called St. Olaf College. I was graduated from St. Olaf College in 1927.

The name St. Olaf College and its famous choir is a household word in most Scandinavian homes in the North Central States of the Nation, and the faculty and students have always felt a close kinship to the University of Oslo. The St. Olaf College Choir and the St. Olaf College Band have appeared in Oslo while on European trips in years past.

The St. Olaf Club of Washington, D. C., is composed of former students and graduates of St. Olaf College. At a meeting held in Washington, Saturday, December 4, 1943, the assembled 100 or so members passed the following resolution:

On Tuesday, November 30, 1943, the Germans arrested between twelve and fifteen hundred male students at the University of Oslo in what has been described as "a last, convulsive effort" to crush organized resistance to nazi-ism in occupied Norway. These arrests are continuing even today, and it has been officially stated by the Nazi authorities that all students arrested will be deported to Germany and placed in concentration camps there. In addition to the students, virtually all members of the faculty are also under arrest and face a similar fate.

Since St. Olaf College has always felt a close kinship with the University of Oslo and since it is utterly impossible for civilized men and women to look with calm upon the flagrant violations of the freedom of education now occurring in Oslo, and since it is equally impossible to remain silent in the face of such indomitable courage and such loyalty even unto death for democratic principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the St. Olaf College Club, of Washington, D. C., join with students of Sweden, Denmark, Iceland, Great Britain, and other countries in protesting this latest Nazi atrocity in Norway and go on record as expressing not only its sincere sympathy for the arrested students and teachers of the University of Oslo, but also its profound admiration and gratitude for the stand taken by these Norwegian students and teachers, and by all the people of Norway, in their never-ending fight against nazi-ism and nazification; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the president of St. Olaf College and to the Norwegian Ambassador to the United States.

Memorial of Illinois Truck Operators Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, upon three separate occasions I have stood in the Well of this House and pointed out the fact that the motor-transport industry faces destruction unless serious consideration is given its needs. Until this time no apparent effort has been made to render assistance.

In an effort to again call to the attention of the Nation the seriousness of this situation, I am inserting a memorial published in the November edition of the Illinois Trucking News:

JAMES BYRNES, *Director and Chairman, Office of Economic Stabilization;*
BRADLEY DEWEY, *Rubber Administrator;*
JOSEPH B. EASTMAN, *Director, Office of Defense Transportation;*
HAROLD L. ICKES, *Secretary of the Interior; Petroleum Administrator;*
PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman, War Manpower Commission;*
DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman, War Production Board:*

In approaching the several authorities which hold the motor-transport industry in their keeping, we who labor in that industry do but follow precedents established by the American system of jurisprudence. We submit this brief with every confidence that indisputable evidence is forerunner of relief.

Our motor-transport facility faces extinction. Our crippled equipment foreshadows disaster. Denial of material replacements must result in economic starvation. Not we alone will suffer dire consequences: Most vulnerable is the war effort. American railroads already are overburdened and cannot, appreciably, increase their load. Motor transport thus becomes of greatest importance—most of all to the Federal Government and its war needs.

In simple illustration, it is obvious that food growing in fields is far removed from the stomachs of armed forces. Castings in foundries remain castings until transported to machining plants.

Food originates in rural sections: Fifty-five thousand such sections have no railway facilities and must depend upon motor transport for outward food shipments as well as for many of their daily living needs.

Figures from Government sources reveal that the motor-transport arm of service carries approximately 70 percent of war freight in and out of war plants; despite that fact, we have been subjected to manpower loss to the number of 325,000. And our present need is 338,000. That number is required to restore normal strength.

Training courses and conversion of drivers into mechanics, cannot fill that gap. The first proposal is a slow process; the latter will but add to the need for drivers.

We of the motor-transport effort are simple folk. We read instructions and make every effort to comply. We labor long hours of days and nights. We strive to be civilian soldiers willing to sacrifice all for success at arms. That, we see as the cogent reason for this memorial. Certainly then, this is not a plea for selfish advancement; rather it asks that we be made able and be sustained to a point of total usefulness.

We cannot believe that our Government would wish the public to fix upon us responsibility for a situation in which we have a minor part and no control. We are confused by an incomprehensible situation and ask for needed relief and greater clarity. We are not complaining; we are groping. We cry out in the language of the wisest man the world has ever known: "I am but a little child: I know not how to go out or come in."

ILLINOIS MOTOR TRUCK OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,
WALTER E. MCCARRON,
General Manager.

A Voice From the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield, from the Boston Herald of December 5, 1943:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ONE FACT CLEAR AS TO FOOD SUBSIDIES; MUCH NONSENSE TALKED ON BOTH SIDES

(By Louis Bromfield)

Whether food subsidies go into effect or not, only one fact concerning them is certain—that a great deal of nonsense has been talked on both sides, and that much of the nonsense has been purely partisan. On the one hand, the interests affected economically have persistently opposed subsidies and the interests affected politically have been persistently for them.

In between there has been a small group of honest nonpartisan citizens sincerely concerned over the dangers of growing inflation. Over all lies the same smoke screen of contrived and needless confusion which obscured the pay-as-you-go tax reform battle. I suspect the truth is that no one, least of all the administration economists, know exactly how subsidies will work.

Meanwhile the attitude of the average voter seems to be one of indifference or cynicism. He seems to be thinking and saying, "It doesn't make much difference whether we have subsidies or no subsidies. They're just one more contribution to the general confusion." Beneath this attitude lies another, less clearly stated if stated at all—and that is an attitude of weariness and of waiting for something. That something, I suspect, is a chance to wash things up and begin all over again.

BEFUDDLED CONTROVERSY

Out of all the confusion, and obscurantism, it is not easy to sift out the primary elements of a thoroughly befuddled controversy. Certain things, however, seem to be apparent, as I believe they must be apparent

to anyone who shuts off the radio and sits down to think.

One is that the President's statement about Congress taking the responsibility for inflation if subsidies are not approved, is a fallacious and purely political statement of the case. At the time of Pearl Harbor, and even before, there was a big opportunity to establish a sound plan for preventing or at least checking inflation. The President, to whom Congress had delegated all the necessary powers, had before him two courses, one to follow the advice and plans of Mr. Baruch and similar sound and experienced advisers, the other to turn over the whole thing to a group of amateur economists to tinker with.

The President chose the latter course, and inflation promptly and inevitably got under way and as Mr. Henderson, one of the more notable of the amateur economists, observed, "You can no more have a little inflation than you can be a little pregnant." Instead of building a solid dam based upon sound economics, the administration contrived a structure of unrelated and sometimes rubbishy experimental ideas, through which the waters of inflation began trickling at every point.

ONLY COURSE LEFT

Considering the flaws in the original dam, there was no course left but to keep trying to plug the dam with improvised and hasty measures like subsidies and Little Steel formulas and roll backs, none of them effective for very long because we were already caught in the vicious circle of rising wages and living costs. First labor gets a raise (as in the coal situation) and immediately payment for that raise must be passed on to the public, with the result that living costs go up, if production and the life of our economy are to continue. Immediately living costs go up, labor makes a fresh demand for higher wages and the ugly business begins all over again.

That cycle has been in operation for well over 18 months and it is growing in momentum exactly as water more and more rapidly tears away a faulty, porous dam. No man in his right mind believes that the administration will not presently grant another wage increase to labor, if not openly and honestly, then hypocritically as in the 15 minutes for lunch settlement. Incidentally the Solid Fuels Administration has demanded an immediate rise in the price of coal greater than that proposed by the O. P. A.

WHO PAYS SUBSIDIES

Subsidies have to be paid out of your pocket and mine, one way or another. There are only three ways of paying them: (1) by additional direct taxes, which cannot be done politically; (2) by borrowing money from banks, which produces the worst kind of inflation; (3) by the sale of more bonds, which adds to our already colossal debt and passes on the burden both of interest and debt to our soldiers, our children, and our grandchildren. This is not a nice choice but I have heard of no other being offered.

There is another element, no more vague or problematical, and this is that subsidies are dangerous both to democracy and to national economy. They are difficult to get rid of, they make the citizen the servant of the state (which is the principle of both fascism and communism) and they become an economic cancer, taking money from the pockets of every citizen and putting it into the pockets of special classes. The process can continue to the point where the whole economic structure devours itself.

I do not know what the immediate effects of subsidies would be, nor does anyone else. One of the weaknesses of the proposal is that subsidies can be argued too many ways. If the idea were sound, the arguments could not be so varied, so intricate, or so confusing.

The trouble is that the laws of economics are as immutable as those of mathematics. There aren't any short cuts or panaceas. And worst of all is the fact that we already have inflation and there isn't any such thing as a little inflation. For this Congress is certainly not responsible.

Jersey City and Fred M. Vinson Versus United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement concerning the case of Jersey City and the Honorable Fred M. Vinson versus United States Interstate Commerce Commission and the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co., as follows:

The program to keep down the cost of living secured an important judicial victory as a result of a recent suit instituted by the city of Jersey City, joined in by Economic Stabilization Director Vinson and Price Administrator Bowles when a three-judge Federal district court, on Friday, November 26, temporarily enjoined the enforcement of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission authorizing increases in downtown fares from Jersey City to downtown New York on the ground that the national interest required that the fares charged on September 15, 1942, remain in effect pending final hearing. The court also held that the Commission had denied to Jersey City and the Stabilization Director a fair and full hearing.

In May 1942 the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad requested the Interstate Commerce Commission to increase the downtown fares on its line from Jersey City to New York from 8 cents to 10 cents. These fares had been increased in 1938 from 6 cents to 8 cents. Protests were made by Jersey City and other communities. The Director and Price Administrator protested against the increase before the Commission under the Inflation Act of October 2, 1942, prohibiting increases in utility and common-carrier rates without notice to the President or his agent and consent to their intervention before the agency having jurisdiction over their rates.

On June 8, 1943, the Commission authorized an increase from 8 to 9 cents and by subsequent orders, culminating with the final order on November 2, the Commission changed its order by permitting the sale of 11 tokens for $1 or a 10-cent cash fare instead of the 9-cent cash fare previously authorized. At the last hearing, the attorneys for Jersey City and the Price Administrator were denied an opportunity to show that the income of the railroad had improved so that no increase was justified when the Commission refused to receive such evidence.

As a result of these orders, the suit was instituted and the injunction obtained. The final hearing is set for December 14. The court entering the injunction consisted of the Honorable Gerald McLaughlin, circuit-court judge, the Honorable Guy L. Fake, and the Honorable Thomas F. Meaney, district court judges.

Jersey City was represented by Charles Hershenstein and Charles A. Rooney and Director Vinson and Price Administrator Bowles by Harry R. Booth, utilities counsel. The Department of Justice, which ordinarily is required to represent the Interstate Commerce Commission in these cases, filed an answer that it would take a neutral position in the case. A copy of the court's findings and order is attached herewith.

CITY OF JERSEY CITY, PLAINTIFF, AND FRED M. VINSON, ECONOMIC STABILIZATION DIRECTOR, BY CHESTER BOWLES, PRICE ADMINISTRATOR, INTERVENOR, V. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, AND HUDSON AND MANHATTAN RAILROAD CO., DEFENDANTS—INTERLOCUTORY INJUNCTION AND RESTRAINT

FINDINGS AND ORDER

This matter coming on to be heard before a statutory court consisting of Hon. Gerald McLaughlin, judge of the Circuit Court, and Hon. Guy L. Fake and Hon. Thomas F. Meaney, judges of the district court, upon the application of the plaintiffs to enjoin pendente lite the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission bearing dates of June 8, 1943 and November 2, 1943, in the presence of Charles Herschenstein, Charles Rooney and S. S. Eisen appearing for the plaintiff, city of Jersey City, Harry R. Booth appearing for Economic Stabilization Director Vinson and Price Administrator Bowles, intervening plaintiff, and John Finerty and John Buck appearing for the Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co., and E. M. Reidy appearing for the Interstate Commerce Commission, defendants, and the Court having heard the argument of counsel and considered the briefs, being of the opinion that:

1. The plaintiffs, city of Jersey City and the Director are proper parties to bring and maintain this proceeding as plaintiffs herein.

2. That under the Interstate Commerce Act and acts amendatory thereof, and supplementary thereto, the Interstate Commerce Commission was and is required to afford all parties properly before it a fair and full hearing.

3. That the City of Jersey City and the Director properly appeared as protesting parties before the said Interstate Commerce Commission and were and are entitled to the aforesaid full and fair hearing.

4. In addition to the above, the Director, representative of the President, under the act of October 2, 1942 (c. 576, 56 Stat. 765, 50 U. S. C. (App.)), intervened in said proceedings with the consent of the railroad company, defendant herein as required by law, for the purpose of preventing an increase in the fares of said railroad to the extent that such fares would conflict with the stabilization legislation enacted by Congress, to aid in the prosecution of the war, and under said legislation the Director was entitled to a fair and full hearing.

5. That the pleadings and the argument herein and the record before the Interstate Commerce Commission discloses that neither said city of Jersey City nor said Director, jointly or individually, was afforded a full and fair hearing by the said Commission, in that they were individually and jointly denied the opportunity to present evidence and testimony, including the right to cross-examine witnesses on material matters of a probative nature bearing upon the right of the said railroad to an increase in its fares over and above those in effect on September 15, 1942, under the said Interstate Commerce Act, acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and the said act of October 2, 1942.

6. That the national interest requires that the fares of the said railroad be maintained as currently in effect, which present fares are the same as those in effect on September 15, 1942, pending final hearing of this cause.

7. That irreparable damage to the said city of Jersey City and the said director will result if the reports and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission dated June 8, 1943, and November 2, 1943, in this proceeding, are not temporarily restrained and enjoined.

Now, therefore, good cause appearing therefor,

It is on this 26th day of November 1943, ordered that the defendants, the United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission and Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co., be and they are hereby restrained and enjoined, pending the final hearing in the proceeding entitled above for a period of 50 days from the date of this order, and until the further order of the court, from putting into effect the report and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission bearing date June 8, 1943, and November 2, 1943, insofar as such orders permit the establishment of any local interstate fare in excess of 8 cents for transportation on the downtown line of defendant, Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co.

It is further ordered that final hearing in this cause will be had December 14, 1943, at 10:30 o'clock in the forenoon at the Post Office Building, Newark, N. J.

GERALD MCLAUGHLIN,
Circuit Judge.
GUY L. FAKE,
District Judge.
THOMAS F. MEANEY,
District Judge.

A Country Editor's Opinion of a Smear Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mark P. Haines, editor and publisher of the Sturgis Daily Journal, Sturgis, Mich., in the Fourth Congressional District, an editor who is close to the grass roots, tells you something about the man who says he wrote Under Cover. The source from whence came the money to finance the publication is not disclosed by Derounian but may be guessed. The editorial is as follows:

The author of a new smear book entitled "Under Cover" purporting to expose fascistic activities in the United States, has been disclosed as Arthur Derounian, a foreign-born hack writer of many aliases.

Derounian hid behind the pseudonym of John Roy Carlson in attempting to escape the blame while collecting royalties for the diatribe against his adopted Americans. But his true identity and his background were brought to light by investigation in various quarters.

By his own admission, Derounian was an editor of the Christian Defender, a violent anti-Semitic publication, and has written anti-Jewish articles in which he referred to the "Yiddish Spittle press" and to "Jew stooges."

His book purports to tell of his several years of snooping into the workings of numerous organizations and his contention that they are plotting to destroy the United States. It has been widely hailed by Communist and other left-wing publications, but its publishers have been repeatedly warned that it is libelously untrue.

Although Derounian has admitted that much of his previous writing was untrue, he now asks the public to believe that this time he is writing facts.

According to his own account, Derounian is an Armenian born in Alexandroupolis, Greece. He has given his age variously from 27 to 34. To escape conditions from which thousands of Armenians perished, he and his parents emigrated to America in 1921.

At present he is living with his parents at 3436 Ninety-third Street, Jackson Heights, New York City.

In the parlance of his kind, Derounian is known as a toomler, a person who accepts odd jobs of writing or investigating to make a few dollars. He has had a variety of jobs, including that of a $25-a-week snooper, but now is employed as an investigator at $50 a week by the Friends of Democracy.

The organization, a haven for variegated leftists and foreign-born vilifiers of Americans, is headed by the Reverend Leon M. Birkhead, the Kansas City cleric who once declared the Bible was unfit for youth, who stated publicly that we need the shock of sex novels, and who advertised his church for rent and allowed it to be used for Communist meetings.

For a 3-month period Derounian was employed as a researcher on the staff of Fortune magazine, a connection that brought him across the path of Editor Russell Davenport, who, incidentally, propagandized the ill-fated launching of Wendell Willkie on the national scene.

When Derounian left there he began his double-faced career of working both sides of the street insofar as inciting religious prejudice was concerned.

He became associate editor of the Christian Defender, a mimeographed sheet published for a time as the official organ of the Christian Front in New York. From there he moved to the Christian Mobilizers, headed by Joseph McWilliams, where he continued his anti-Jewish activities, particularly smearing the Jewish press.

Much of the information concerning these activities came from Derounian himself as he testified last month at the New York police board trial of a patrolman charged with un-American actions.

Derounian endeavored to excuse his anti-Jewish activities by saying that he joined both the Christian Front and the Christian Mobilizers to spy on their memberships.

He also claimed to have worked as a snooper for the Department of Justice at a salary of $25 a week, but the F. B. I. office in New York denied that he ever was one of its regular employees.

Derounian contended in an interview that he never had been married, but his 3-A status in the draft derives from his claim that he is married and has a son, Robert, born April 2, 1939.

Derounian admitted that he has used seven different names. In addition to his real name he has been known by the aliases of George Pagnanelli, by which he identifies himself as a lead character in his book; his pen name of Roy Carlson, and Thomas L. Decker, George Page, John Correa, and Rudolph Eibers.

Resolution on the White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted at the twenty-ninth annual convention of Hadassah, New York City, October 27, 1943:

The twenty-ninth convention of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist organization of America, meeting in a world at war and at a time of unbounded tragedy for the Jewish people; when 3,000,000 of Europe's Jews have perished at the hands of the Nazis; when for many of those who will survive the future holds hope only as they may look forward to starting life afresh in their own homeland;

Bearing in mind the historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and their right to reconstitute there their national home, as recognized in the Balfour Declaration and in the Mandate for Palestine—a right endorsed by 52 nations of the world and by unanimous resolution of the Congress of the United States;

Mindful, further, of Great Britain's solemn covenant and undertaking contained in these two instruments to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine;

Condemns as legally, morally and humanly indefensible, the White Paper of May 1939, which threatens to close Jewish immigration into Palestine, restrict and limit land settlement and render impossible the full development of the Jewish National Home, and

Appeals to the conscience of the British people and to their government to abandon forthwith the policy enunciated in that White Paper, and urges our own Government and the American public to add its voice in support of our just demand.

Amazing W. P. B. Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER
PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 27, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: Attached is a copy of an amazing document.

It was the subject of much discussion at the recent regular quarterly meeting of our State advisory council and executive committee.

By unanimous action, I was instructed by them to call this attached document to your attention for action.

It is their desire that you cooperate as a member of the California delegation to Congress in appropriate action to get the War Production Board to rescind this.

You will note that the Federal Criminal Code is invoked, anticipated guilt under which must be admitted by a newspaper publisher before the manufacturer of newsprint can ship him rationed newsprint under a complicated order, answers to questions about which W. P. B. officials themselves have not yet produced.

Also please analyze the inventory rule.

Practically all of our California newspapers get their newsprint from the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia; there is no coastwise shipping; rail facilities here involve one-track mountainous rights-of-way.

Where and how do we get any newsprint when the military commandeers this rail transportation for the promised all-out Pacific war offensive which communiques even now indicate is at hand?

Shipments of newsprint orders in California under existing war traffic conditions even now require from 2 weeks to a month, C. N. P. A. publishers report.

By their unanimous action I was instructed to call this situation to your attention, also expressing their desire that you join with the other members of our California delegation in Congress to impress upon the War Production Board, with sufficient emphasis to secure favorable action, the need of relaxing newsprint inventory restrictions on the Pacific coast and particularly in California, Arizona, and Nevada, to protect the flow of available newsprint to the presses that must keep our public informed.

Please will you keep me advised of the action that you and your fellow California Congressmen take on these two problems, which I assure you are of public interest?

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. LONG,
General Manager, C. N. P. A., Inc.

[Enclosure]

Signed certification must accompany newsprint orders: All purchasers of newsprint must accompany each order with a signed certification that they are not violating paragraph D of the War Production Board Order L-240.

(iii) On and after November 3, 1943, each order by a publisher for delivery of print paper shall contain substantially the following certification, signed manually or as provided in Priorities Regulation 7 (944.27) by an official duly authorized for such purpose:

"The undersigned hereby certifies, subject to the criminal penalties for misrepresentation contained in section 35 (A) of the United States Criminal Code, that acceptance of the print paper covered by this delivery order will not result in a violation of paragraph (d) of War Production Board Order L-240, as amended November 3, 1943, with which the undersigned is familiar.

"The amended paragraph D of L-240 is as follows:

"'(d) Restrictions on deliveries. (1) On and after November 1, 1943, no publisher, unless specifically authorized by the War Production Board, may order or accept delivery of print paper in any calendar month in excess of 33⅓ percent of his quota for the consumption of print paper (plus 33⅓ percent of any additional tonnage allowed on appeal) for the current calendar quarter: *Provided, however,* That orders or deliveries limited by the foregoing to a fraction of one carload may be increased to one full carload in any month.

"'(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (d) (1), on and after November 1, 1943, no publisher, unless specifically authorized by the War Production Board, may order or accept delivery of print paper if his inventory of such paper on hand, available for use, or in transit is, or by virtue of such order or acceptance will become either:

"'(i) In excess of two carloads or

"'(ii) If in excess of two carloads, more than 40 days' supply in the States named in list A below or 65 days' supply in the States named in list B below, computed on the basis of his average daily rate of consumption during the first 6 months of 1943, less 10 percent.'"

California is in list B.

Midwest Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we had thought the New Deal planning cult had just about reached its limit in devising means and ways to regiment the farmer and boss him around. The bureaucrats tell him when to plant and when to sow and what his day's labor shall fetch. But now comes the War Relocation Authority with an entirely new proposition. It begs the Japanese in the West to come East and teach Ohio and Michigan farmers how to keep clean.

This is brought out in one of the planning publications called Midwest Frontiers, of which one named Harry Weiss is editor and who is responsible for this undertaking. In appealing to the Japanese to come to Ohio and Michigan to teach our farmers how to live, he says to them:

Then, believe it or not, you have some few tenants and seasonal workers who do not bathe! They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living. * * * There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. * * * Finally, let me repeat, the only way to find out about Ohio and Michigan is to come and live here. Then you will know. You cannot get it out of a story book.

Mr. Speaker, one would think there is a limit to the devilish things the bureaucratic planners can devise, but from this one must wonder if there is such a limit.

Plans and Blueprints for a Lasting Peace After Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, while I have always been concerned since I came to Congress and long before in the problem of a lasting world peace and how such may be best obtained, I have been giving much more thought to this matter in recent months. The terribleness of this war and the critical hour of decision with which we are confronted grows upon us, or at least it grows upon me. A reading of some of my earlier statements on the floor of this House will show that I have all along had fairly keen perception of the significance of this momentous struggle, but I confess I did not in the beginning sense the full awfulness of this thing. Probably I was like the average American, not sufficiently informed and awake to the meaning of world conditions, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am getting more and more informed every passing day. However, as a Member of Congress I have done my full part in preparing for and waging the war.

The reason why I feel satisfied that I have done my patriotic duty in Congress for the past 7 years, first in national defense, and then in every necessary legislative step to carry on the war, is that I have voted for every important war measure and have sponsored many such measures, as the RECORD shows. Long before Germany invaded Poland in September 1939, in fact, from January 1937, I worked earnestly with Congressman JAMES SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, and others to lay in stock piles of strategic and critical war materials and to provide for the home production of such as far as possible against the day of grave emergency. May 18, 1937, found me before the House Military Affairs Committee in the interest of stock-piling what we needed in case of war. February 18, 1938, found me before the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Military Affairs speaking for four military appropriations all of which were obtained and two especially had great part in the conduct of this war. These two were a beginning order for the newly invented Garand rifle, and the modernization and motorization of several thousand French 75's and other artillery.

In the spring of 1938 in 1 month's time I was found voting for an authorization for a two-ocean Navy and for an Army appropriation, and for a naval appropriation the largest in America's peacetime history, all three of which totaled more than $2,000,000,000. In due course I favored the improvement of the harbor at Guam, the enlargement of the Panama Canal; I voted for all of the lease-lend bills, following the repeal of the so-called neutrality acts, and then for the passage of the Selective Service Act, together with the extension of the selective service as necessary measures for our Nation's safety. To be brief, it is a matter of historic fact that Congress has voted every dollar necessary for conducting this war and my vote as a Member of Congress has been recorded in favor of every such appropriation. Of course, I shall continue to vote as necessary to carry on this war from here on out so long as I am a Member of Congress, but now the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for me to place the emphasis on thinking of something else which must follow.

I was one who hoped that the other World War would outlaw war, or at least minimize such wars if not entirely prevent them. What a cruel awakening we have had from such Utopian dream. Of course, I do not know that if America had played her part in joining the League of Nations and upholding it, that this war might have been prevented, but I have a feeling in my heart that if we had done the thing we should have done then, this war might have been prevented or at least certainly postponed for a number of years later. However, it is vain to have such thoughts unless having them fixes our determination on a different conduct after this war.

I have listened to my colleagues and many other thoughtful persons, in session and out of session, on the record and off the record, as to the best plan for the victorious nations to follow now to give us a more lasting peace following the unconditional surrender of the Axis enemy. Occasionally I have been distressed to hear some say the best plan is

to have no plan at all. Such a one says, "Let's win the war first." Obviously we will have to win the war first before we can put any plan into operation, but to put off all planning for peace until after the end of the war seems to me to be the sheerest folly. The United Nations are all still in a desperate situation right now and would be far more willing to plan for peace while longing for it than they will be when the war is ended and the great danger from the German and Japanese war lords is removed. Right now all of the Allies are apt to be far more sensible about such matters and they are later quite apt to be far more selfish.

I have heard it said by some that we ought to have a cooling off period, or static war condition, or a long armistice of 10 or a dozen years after which we can write a better treaty of peace. I am very doubtful about that proposal, for I can imagine what certain victors will be doing during those 10 or a dozen years to get into a position to write what would be for them a more favorable treaty. There should be a happier middle course between fashioning the old-type treaty in haste and hate as one alternative, or leaving so large a part of the world in virtual chaos while history ripens into more equitable conditions. Who can tell how history is going to ripen?

The friends of the League of Nations suggest that it ought to be revivified, but I think to reorganize the League of Nations now would be less effective, even with the United States in it, than it might have been in the first instance with the United States in it. Certainly there were some objections, reasonable objections, to Woodrow Wilson's dream of a quarter century ago. While I might be willing to enter into an international organization and even for America willingly to surrender some of our so-called sovereign rights, I do insist on retaining as much of sovereignty for America as possible, within the effective framework of joining with others in keeping peace. Much as I admire the United States of America, I do not think the world is yet ripe for a united states of the world on the same pattern with so much central power gathered in a body where America would be far outnumbered in the system of representation. I would rather have America voluntarily submit herself to the decisions of an international tribunal than to have her agree to conform to legislation of a world lawmaking body in which we were in the minority. I am yet hopeful that our great objective may be gained without too much risk for our country—but how?

Last summer I got myself criticized by a statement I made in Tucson, Ariz., to the effect that Pax Americana is better than no peace at all. That statement taken out of its context does not look so good, though it is the truth. Now, I am no imperialist and I would not advocate our using the great military power which we have built up—everything considered we have the greatest military machine on earth at this hour—to impose America's will upon other nations. In that same speech I did express a hope that the United Nations would keep united in peace to outlaw war and put aggressors in a strait jacket.

In that same speech I also expressed the hope that China, England, Russia, and the United States, having fought as allies to overcome the aggressors, should be united after the war to preserve the peace, without any one of them becoming a dominating force which might menace future peace. That, I think, is the most desirable thing, and it would be only if there was an absolute impossibility of getting the fair and right kind of united action among the big four during the decades to come that I would be willing to have America use the force she has now built up for defense to impose a Pax Americana upon the world. Of course, such is big talk and it is as foolish as it is unethical, for I would never want America to attempt to rule the word. I think it not likely that the four great peoples who have fought this war will hesitate in a fair, equitable, sane way to join in forcing peace through a long future, for the four could impose peace without even a joint attempt to rule the world.

Some time ago I talked with Clarence Streit, who is the author of Union Now, and found his solution would certainly not be my first choice. Of course, in a pinch, I would rather join with the English-speaking people to preserve the peace of the world than to have America attempt to do it alone. Being of Scotch blood and English cultural inheritance I am not afflicted with Anglophobia, nor am I afflicted with Anglomania. I have been terribly distressed to see evidence of such ill will toward England on the part of some of my friends that it seems some would rather have Germany win over England in this epic-making struggle. Well, I am of the frame of mind to want to cooperate with all English-speaking peoples but not to the extent of being their dupes. For that reason I have considered and rejected Union Now as the best answer to our post-war peace problem.

Recently I talked with Ely Culbertson, whom till then I had never met but with whom I was favorably impressed. I am not thinking about the card game of bridge, but about his thoughtful, scientific views on a post-war world organized for peace. I refer to his world federation plan. I may have average intelligence but I have never regarded myself as capable of working out details of a plan which will guarantee what we want—a lasting peace. It is going to take more than average intelligence to do that. I have studied Culbertson's blueprint and find myself agreeing with him to a remarkable extent.

In a vague way I have felt that we must have a world police force and that the United States must furnish a large share of that force to preserve order. I know, of course, that we cannot have a lasting peace based on injustice and therefore continued disarmament of probably dangerous peoples is not all. I know, of course, that so long as men are animals they will fight even with their fists or small weapons. However, I have the impression that modern science has so revolutionized warfare by bringing in great engines of death and destruction which only an industrial nation can build and that only with vast outlay of capital and unconcealable factories. In my vague way I felt that after unconditional surrender of the enemy there must be a careful inventory of all the heavy weapons of war to be used on land, sea, or air, and that a certain part of such equipment must be had in the hands of an international police to enforce peace. Nobody else should be permitted to have such or make such. The manufacture of such implements of war as tanks, bombers, submarines, and the like must be outlawed and severest penalty assessed upon any individuals or nations who manufacture such unlawfully.

This is about the way I had the first step tentatively in my mind before I talked to Ely Culbertson and I find that he has evolved the same more fully in his quota scheme. I note too that he would permit the United States 20 percent whereas England and Russia are to have only 15 percent each and I have wondered whether those powerful allies would agree to such a ratio. Of course, for a while after 1922 we had a 5–5–3 ratio on warships until one designing power repudiated the ratio. Will such ratios work if established? It may be the only hope.

Occasionally we hear it said that isolationism in this country is dead, but I doubt it. I think there are tens of millions of Americans who feel that America could and should draw within its shell, protect itself from the rest of the world, and keep our nose out of other people's business while seeing to it that they kept theirs out of ours. Such citizens have no adequate conception of this dwarfing world and of the implications of the airplane and radio. I can understand such feeling but cannot sympathize with it. What kind of organization, acceptable to the great majority of Americans, will effectually enforce world peace over a long period with the least subtraction from American sovereignty? With grim determination I am looking for it.

Opportunities in the West for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for some time we have been hearing the assertion that the American frontier has disappeared, and that the great West, which once offered new homes and a new future for those denied opportunities in our crowded industrial areas, can no longer be regarded as a haven for the unemployed and the homeless.

Last week I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 1569, extending the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation to improve vast stretches of cut-over timber

lands, and to construct drainage canals and drainage facilities reclaiming enormous areas of land now lying useless. Under this measure, the Bureau of Reclamation will be able to provide homes and employment for thousands of returning soldiers.

Take my own State of Montana as an example. Montana is the third largest State in the Union, with a population of only 550,000. Its growth has not yet really begun. It is a source of vast supplies of raw materials and minerals. Its principal industries are agriculture, livestock, wool growing, and mining. Thus far, it has existed wholly on the basis of a raw-material economy. It has immense hydroelectric power potentialities, and with the development of this cheap power, an industrial growth will begin.

Here is a practical program to meet the demands of the post-war period in finding jobs and homes for our returning soldiers and unemployed.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able article by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, published in the magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, December 5, 1943, describing the possibilities offered by this new frontier. The editors, in introducing Mr. Ickes' article, have this to say:

Have you heard the gloomy talk that America is "all washed up"; that when our soldiers get back home they will find hard times—no jobs? This outspoken writer [Ickes] has an answer to such talk.

"I am tired of that kind of defeatist nonsense. I happen to be in on some of Uncle Sam's definite plans for returning soldiers."

Here he reveals some of those plans. His article will reassure you and make you proud. Read this story of America's post-war frontiers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS, HERE'S YOUR EMPIRE!—A VAST AREA, INSIDE THE UNITED STATES, WILL BE OPENED UP: IT'S EIGHT TIMES AS BIG AS PRE-HITLER GERMANY—WILL GIVE SUPPORT TO 4,000,000 PERSONS! HERE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DESCRIBES A RECORD JOB OF POST-WAR PLANNING

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Will there be work for everyone in the United States when the war ends?

Some amateur curmudgeons suggest that the answer to that question is "No." They say that this country has already been fully developed. They intimate that our natural resources are all but exhausted. They would have us believe that victory will find America a dry hole and that our ex-servicemen had better drop off elsewhere—in Burma, maybe, or Rhodesia—for a better chance of finding jobs.

I am tired of that kind of defeatist nonsense and I have an answer to it. I do not know everything that industry is going to do to provide post-war employment, of course, but as head of an important department of the Government, I happen to be in on some of Uncle Sam's definite plans for the returning soldiers.

First of all, right in my own Department of the Interior, in just one of its bureaus, we are planning an empire for Johnny Doughboy to start building as soon as he arrives home. We are charting a new frontier for him. That is top news of the moment and I welcome this opportunity to tell This Week magazine's readers about it.

This empire will lie west of the one-hundredth meridian of longitude, which runs down through North and South Dakota, Nebraska, western Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. Look at a map and you'll see what that means.

In this great western region, which covers all or parts of 17 States, is situated one-third of the land area of the Nation. Here the rainfall, except in the high mountains and on a narrow strip of Pacific coast, is inadequate to maintain normal agricultural production. Consequently, the conservation of water resources is absolutely essential.

Yet only 20,000,000 out of more than 900,000,000 acres (many of them publicly owned) are now irrigated—and these irrigated acres are the major support of the 15,000,000 people who live there. Without the agricultural output from this acreage, Los Angeles and other cities and industrial centers could not have reached their present size.

DOUBLING THE WEST

It is in this vast region of wide-open spaces that we are planning our new empire. Department engineers tell me that water can be made available to transform nearly 20,000,000 additional acres of arid land into prosperous farms. This would permit the West to double its present population.

This western land will present us with one of the greatest opportunities in the world when the war ends. West of the one hundredth meridian we have a land area eight times the size of pre-war Germany, and it seems probable that if Germany had it, even Hitler would ask for no more.

The plans of the Department of the Interior to convert, through irrigation, these great tracts of sagebrush and cactus into fertile fields and farms are neither newly hatched nor half baked. For several years now the Bureau of Reclamation has been getting ready to meet just such a situation as will face the country when peace comes. The plans for the vast enterprise are more than half completed right now, and any time that Messrs. Hitler and Hirohito decide that they've had enough, the Bureau will be ready to translate these plans into action and take an enormous bite out of the post-war employment problem.

Here is the idea: During the 3 years following the end of hostilities, the Government would invest up to $3,000,000,000 in a broad reclamation program which would directly benefit everyone living west of the one hundredth meridian and, indirectly, provide jobs and opportunities to earn a living throughout all of the 48 States. By far the major part of the investment would be returned to the Federal Treasury directly from irrigation and power revenues. Indirectly, the gain in the national wealth through increased taxable values and purchasing power would pay big dividends.

MAZE OF WATERWAYS

With Congress willing and supplying the necessary funds, work would start immediately on programs interrupted by the war in the Columbia Basin in Washington, in the Central Valley of California, at the Gila project in Arizona, and elsewhere. At the same time, other new programs would be begun on both sides of the Continental Divide—in the Great Plains along the upper reaches of the Missouri, and in the lands drained by the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, the Colorado, and many other rivers. Dams, reservoirs, and power plants would be built, and thousands of miles of new canals and irrigation ditches constructed to carry water where it is needed most.

This enormous building job would put 480,000 men directly to work for 3 years—225,000 of them at construction sites and 255,000 in the plants and factories that would provide materials for the developments. This army of nearly half a million men would transform by irrigation 6,000,000 additional acres of desert and sagebrush to production farm land. This would be a substantial start toward the reclamation of the nearly 20,000,000 acres that I have mentioned as susceptible of irrigation with available water supplies. The program would also provide supplemental irrigation of another 10,000,000 or more acres that are not getting enough water to produce maximum crops to support the present population of the areas.

The irrigation of the 6,000,000 new acres would provide ample farms for 125,000 men and their families. The supplemental irrigation would make available 40,000 more farms, because, with an adequate water supply, great tracts now inadequately irrigated could be cultivated more intensively than at present. The supplemental service would also give greater security to more than 100,000 families on established irrigated farms.

But putting 480,000 men to work at construction, and locating another 165,000 men and their families on farms where they could become self-sustaining, is only the beginning. For every family that would take up land, one additional family would find a livelihood in the villages and towns that would spring up in the wake of the development, and a third family, elsewhere in the Nation, would gain a living by providing the farm implements, automobiles, clothing, etc., which residents of the new communities would require.

Here, then, we have one answer to the gloom-mongers who maintain that America will have nothing to offer its ex-fighting men and war workers—the greatest reclamation development in history—new fields, towns, factories, offering opportunities that challenge the wildest imaginings.

CHEAP POWER

At this time the Bureau of Labor Statistics is counting on the probability that Uncle Sam will retain 2,500,000 men in the armed forces in peacetime. That means that there will be approximately 8,500,000 demobilized. Directly and indirectly, the Bureau of Reclamation alone is preparing to take care of approximately a million of them. Which means that 4,000,000 men, women, and children would be assured of the necessities and comforts of life as the result of one Government program.

The reclamation and irrigation of desert and sagebrush lands would go hand in hand, of course, with the development of water power. Electric energy would be an indispensable tool in carrying forward the project. Low-cost power not only helps repay the Government's investment but it furnishes energy for the operation of the project itself. In addition, this power would prove a priceless asset in the processing of many ores and minerals. Thus, the new West would have industry, too, with which to build a well-balanced economy.

Speaking of water power, there are rivers waiting to be harnessed everywhere. We have been getting along on about one-fourth of our potential capacity. And more than two-thirds of our undeveloped water power is in the West. I offer this morsel of information to those who say that the end of the war will find the Nation barren of opportunities.

In discussing the coming development of the West I have not been indulging in wishful thinking. Expert engineers and technologists of my department have been making field investigations and formulating definite plans for many years. We know what we are talking about. We are ready to

start digging as soon as Congress gives us the "Go" sign.

Yet, great as this reclamation and power plan is, I cannot emphasize too strongly that it is only one of many which are being blueprinted by the Government to assure postwar employment. An enormous amount of work needs to be done in reforestation, in soil conservation, in improving rivers, harbors, and highways, in eliminating slums and rebuilding cities, in creating national parks and recreational facilities. On every side, big jobs are beckoning—not only for the immediate post-war period but for many years to come.

A SECOND "EMPIRE"

In the Mississippi Delta alone lies another potential agricultural empire—at least 5,000,000 acres which could be reclaimed through adequate drainage and flood control. It would create thousands of rich farms all the way from southern Missouri to the Gulf, thus providing livelihoods for more millions.

Then, to any soldier who may be listening to the voice of despair, I have this to say: "Alaska has scarcely been touched. In Alaska, as Delegate ANTHONY M. DIMOND emphasized in these pages recently, there are fertile lands that could support an agriculture equal to some of the best in the States; there also is untold wealth in forests and fisheries, in coal, iron, petroleum (we hope), and other minerals. It will be crying for pioneers."

I cannot begin to discuss the many other opportunities which I see awaiting the men who return from the war.

Take our forests, for instance. We have wasted them shamefully in the past, but they still cover 630,000,000 acres—about one-fourth of the entire national terrain. Approximately three-fourths of this forest land is capable of producing commercial timber, and the present growth is less than half of what it would be if the forests were adequately stocked. Moreover, the forests of the future will produce not only building lumber, pulp, and fuel, but raw material for plastics and countless other synthetics just being developed.

And then look at coal. We have used about 30 percent of our anthracite, it is true, but we have burned only 1.9 percent of our enormous reserves of soft coal. It would take a complete article to deal adequately with the possibilities of coal as a raw material for hundreds, eventually thousands, of manufactured derivative articles; such manufactures would give employment and would add to our economic well-being.

What about iron? Some pessimists point with alarm to the fact that our high-grade Lake Superior iron ore may be all but exhausted in another 40 or 50 years, but we need only to discover economical methods of utilizing lower-grade ores—which we will—to have all of the iron and steel that we could use for as long a time as one can foresee.

Much of the same may be said of oil. We haven't the reserves that we used to have, but scientists are achieving promising results deriving gasoline from natural gas and liquefied coal, as well as by retorting the oil locked up in oil shales and tar sands. Far from being near the end of an oil era, we are probably on the eve of a far greater, if different, one.

Do I need to present further evidence to prove that this great country is not washed up? I do not believe so.

When your boy, and mine, and the millions of others come home from the war opportunity will knock at their doors, not once but many times. As in the past, energy and initiative, and honest-to-God free enterprise will be rewarded handsomely.

I can see them now—marching into the new empire in the West, into Alaska, into the fields and forests and factories of their native States. America is not all washed up!

Editorial Tribute to Senator McCarran by the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Voice of Big Business," from the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News, dealing with the work of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and what he is doing toward the recentralization of industry.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF BIG BUSINESS

Editor of the Iron Age, mouthpiece of the steel industry, sends us from New York the answer of big business to our proposal that the Government ought to help such plants as Inglewood Steel Co. get into production. This is the typical big business slant:

"Senator PATRICK J. MCCARRAN, of Nevada, has made a proposal which, we understand is being taken seriously, not only by his home constituents but also by a number of his fellow legislators. It is that somebody, preferably private enterprise, immediately start to build big steel producing plants in every State of the Union, the capacity of these new plants to be equivalent to our total steel-producing capacity.

"Naturally, since normal demands for steel for peacetime operations have never been able to utilize full capacity of existing facilities—pre-war utilization over a 10-year period has been about 60 percent—this means splitting up or abolishing present units. And this reminds me of a story.

"Once upon a time, long before the first man introduced himself to the first lady of that day with the statement: 'Madam, I'm Adam,' the current ruler of the animal kingdom, who was an advanced thinker, got a bright idea. 'There is too much variation in size between the various members of my kingdom,' said he. 'Take elephants and ants. The latter are at a great disadvantage because elephants can step on them and put them out of business without even knowing it. We should even things up by making elephants smaller and the ants bigger, thus giving everyone a fair chance.'

"Now it so happened that the differences in size between elephants and ants and between other members of the animal kingdom were not matters of chance or choice, but functional differences that were dictated by natural laws. However, what chance has a natural law when it bumps up against the opinions and desires of an unnatural law maker? So the ruler proceeded to pass a law.

"He waited several months to see what would happen, but, of course, nothing did. Ants continued to be small and elephants large. So he called a meeting of his wise ones and councilors and laid the problem before them.

"Said the wise ones: 'O King, we do not know how to make ants large, but we do know how to make elephants small. Let's cut them into little pieces so that each big elephant will become a lot of small ones.'

"So the chief veterinarian was called and instructed to carve up the elephants. But alas, after he had done so it was found that the dismembered parts were no longer elephants but unrecognizable pieces of flesh that had no more life in them and had to be buried quickly to keep the atmosphere from being polluted.

"This taught the would-be maker of unnatural law a lesson. He learned that some animals have to be big to fulfill their intended functions and some small.

"Perhaps we can apply that wisdom today. The public might indeed be well served by having a peanut stand on every corner but would be indeed ill served by applying this procedure to steel plants."

By the same token, there ought to be no little newspapers, or banks, or grocery stores, or theaters, or gasoline dealers, or market operators.

We ought to kill off all canaries to make way for bigger vultures, and if any little fellow has the temerity or audacity to improve upon any method now being used by big steel, he ought to be compelled by statute to give the method to big steel to be placed in the archives so as not to disrupt the present method of collecting profits on a job half done.

The defense by the editor of the Iron Age corresponded to the defense of monopoly sounded in the late 1930's by Fritz Thyssen, industrialist, of Germany, which finally resulted in the creation of the Nazi philosophy of government to stifle individual initiative.

America ought to be eternally grateful for its Senator MCCARRANS; may their tribe increase.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, made an able statement at a hearing on December 2 before a subcommittee appointed by the Committee on Education and Labor to inquire into the problems of juvenile delinquency. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F. B. I., would be included in any list of first Americans on the basis of his profession among the criminologists of the world. We have never heard a statement made by J. Edgar Hoover called in question. He is the court of last resort on all matters relating to crime and juvenile delinquency, and what he has revealed within the last few days is more startling than the sneak attack upon Pearl Harbor so far as it relates to the future of the United States.

Famine and pestilence have never been able to destroy nations. Terrible as is this scourge of war, no nation has perished as a result of war. Many believed that Germany was down and out at the end of World War No. 1. She came back in 20 years more powerful than ever. France is down but not out, and if her light ever goes out it will not be extinguished by German arms. Poland will live again.

Nations like Rome, mistress of the world, die of moral cancer, as did the civilizations of ancient history. And that disease is eating at the heart of America today as never before. Nothing has been more startling and fraught with greater consequences to our freedoms, than the recent facts disclosed by J. Edgar Hoover, as of November 18, on the crime front, and his revelations of juvenile delinquency. They should be repeated again and again until the entire Nation realizes that we are in danger of becoming a nation of criminals within the next generation.

Let Mr. Hoover tell his own story, he says: "Frankly, the heartbreaking thing about the juvenile crime situation today is the fact that we know that it is just a forerunner of a more serious crime situation as these youthful violators grow older. The present situation cannot be charged entirely to wartime laxity and a last fling philosophy of life. That may be the case with the older violators, but when mere children turn to crime there is a more sinister reason.

"This condition did not come on us over night. It is deep rooted and does not forecast a very bright picture for the future. Something has happened to the moral stamina of America when the conventions and principles of honesty and common decency are regarded as old fogey and antique. There are certain fundamentals in life that are essential."

STARTLING FIGURES

"In the first 9 months of this year, 1943, the arrest of girls under 21 years of age for offenses against common decency increased 69.6 percent over the same period last year, while the arrests for girls under 21 for crimes against property such as robbery, burglary, larceny, and other related crimes increased 33.6 percent.

"But that does not tell the whole story, because in 1942 arrests increased over 1941, and so on. Even today more boys and girls 18 years of age are being arrested than in any other group. As a matter of fact, 17-year-olds alone accounted for 25.3-percent increase in arrests in the first 9 months of this year over 1942.

"We have just completed a survey of actual arrests in 18 leading cities, representing a population of 10,000,000 inhabitants, which reflect a 42.7-percent increase in the arrests of boys under 18 years of age, and 43 percent of girls under 18 years of age in the first 6 months of this year over a corresponding period of 1942."

WAKE UP AMERICA

"Above all, we must face the stark facts and the grim reality that if only 100,000 crimes were committed in a year, it would be too many. But, last year alone, an estimated 1,436,000 of the more serious crimes were committed, and there was a total of 16,000,000 lesser offenses committed.

"We know from actual case studies that persons under 21 years of age account for 13 percent of all murderers arrested, 40 percent of all the robbers, 56 percent of all the burglars, 65 percent of all the car thieves, 27 percent of all the rape, 29 percent of all the arsonists, and 37 percent of all the thieves arrested.

"It is a discouraging story when it comes from all sections. In an Ohio city enough dynamite caps and detonators, to blow up a good-sized building were stolen by 2 boys, ages 12 and 14. In another midwestern city several blasts occurred in a vacant lot which the authorities promptly traced to a group of boys who were playing pranks. In a Southern city, 2 boys, 10 and 9, derailed a freight train; in a northern city, the plans of a youthful gang of over 35 youngsters led by an adult were nipped in the bud when it was revealed that they were buying uniforms in order to get into theaters, dances, and other places of amusement for half price. That would have led to other activities of a more venturesome and violent nature.

"Then there was the 15-year-old girl who was arrested in the Southwest who had teamed up with a gang of professional criminals. Her father was a drunkard who had deserted his family, her mother let her shift for herself. The young girl began her sordid career when she started to smoke marihuana cigarettes. It's the old story."

HOPE OF TOMORROW

"Our country's future rests in the hands of the youth of today. In order that they may be prepared to carry that great responsibility it is the sacred duty of every mother and father, and as a matter of fact, of all adults, to prepare them for it. We must give them every advantage and aid and example within our power to develop within this youth the fundamentals of honesty and integrity in dealing with their fellows. We must instill in them the principles of freedom and liberty and patriotism to carry on the ideals of the founders of this great Republic. Our democracy has been established—whether it stands or falls depends upon those who follow us. If they are not prepared by us, it is we who will have failed."

ALCOHOL AND CRIME

In other words, what this country is suffering from is adult delinquency. If we are to keep youth out of the electric chair we must begin in the high chair which is in the home. Mr. Hoover's startling disclosures do not tell the part that intoxicating liquor plays in juvenile delinquency, but the F. B. I. reports on liquor offenses do give "certain trends" among the oldsters which clearly indicates where the youngsters will arrive, if their start was due to befuddled brains and the creation of appetites which lead to depredations and dangers on the highway. The ratio of arrests for drunkenness per 100,000 of the population was two and one-half times as great in 1942 as in 1932, representing the growth of arrests for drunkenness during the 10 years since the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

Taking the last year of the eighteenth amendment as a basis, which was prohibition at its worst, the F. B. I. reports show a steady increase of arrests for drunkenness per 100,000 of the population from 22.7 percent in 1933 to 174 percent in 1942, with a jump of arrests for driving while drunk from a decrease of 3.8 percent for 1933, the last year of prohibition, to an increase of 97.2 percent for 1942.

The detailed reports would cover several pages, including accidents resulting in injury and deaths and those in which liquor was a contributing factor. Every table emphasizes the growing delinquency and arrests among women and girls. It is not so far back when fingerprinting was unknown among women. A detailed report of fingerprinting among arrests for drunkenness shows the percentage for men in 1932 was 3.66 percent and for women 3.38 percent, while for 1942 the percent among those arrested for drunkenness for men had increased to 26 percent and women to 16.4 percent. Of the total number arrested who were fingerprinted in 1942, of 585,988, 70,953 were women, representing an increase of 27.7 percent among the women and a decrease of 10 percent among the men.

The two startling facts in the entire study is the increase of crime and drunkenness among the teen ages and women. These figures make dry reading, but they point to worse tragedies than those occurring in war, whether we win or lose; and the tragedy of it is that these moral losses on the home front can be prevented.

I have listened to the testimony of many witnesses before this committee and the relation of liquor has scarcely been mentioned, even by indirection. Mr. Chairman, if all of the proposed remedies suggested as a cure for juvenile delinquency were adopted, including all of the curatives which I will subsequently propose, unless we include the relation of liquor and gambling so as to eliminate those two prime factors, we would still have with us the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Platform of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the National Grange at its seventy-seventh annual meeting, at Grand Rapids, Mich., on November 18, 1943. The meeting was attended by several thousand members of the Grange from 40 States, and the program here summarized was adopted in almost every particular by unanimous vote. The declarations are sound, practical, and progressive, and express the sincere belief of this great organization of rural people.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURE

1. America's first task is to win the war and to this the Grange pledges its utmost energy, with its past accomplishments affording substantial proof of its ability along all war-winning lines.

2. Agriculture's particular wartime job is the production of food, fats and fiber, and American farmers can be depended upon to do everything within their power to produce the maximum.

3. Ample production at prices that will encourage maximum farm effort, rather than borrowing money to subsidize prices at low-cost levels, constitutes the major objective of national agricultural policy.

4. Inflation should be controlled in a practical way by bringing supply and demand into balance. This requires utmost production and a tax and savings program to drain off "dangerous dollars."

5. Farm income should not be longer based on an obsolete parity formula, but on current prices, costs, and conditions. Price ceilings should be used only to prevent profiteering. When farmers are asked to maintain or increase production of commodities on a wartime basis, support prices should be provided which are fair to labor, industry, and agriculture; such support prices to be continued through the post-war adjustment period in order to prevent price collapse and disastrous depression.

6. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices are wrong in principle. They encourage inflation, increase public debt, are expensive to administer and open the way to bureaucratic control over those to whom they are paid. Consumers who actually need relief should receive it in the form of income tax deductions or by applying a food-stamp plan.

7. Expansion of income taxes is preferable to sales taxes which violate the long-time policy of the Grange based on ability to pay or benefits received. Enormous wartime expenditures, rapidly mounting public debt, and inflationary pressure of excess spending power demand a combined income tax and savings

program applicable to individuals and to business, with such savings available in years of reduced income or for use in transition to peacetime operations.

8. Efficiency and economy in government are needed more than ever in wartime, when people have become accustomed to lavish expenditures and are ceasing to count the cost.

9. The Grange asks no special privileges for agriculture and rejects the implication that farm prices are substantially responsible for the increased cost of living. It believes that the burdens of war and peace should be borne by all alike and points out that both wages and corporate earnings have risen three to four times as fast as prices of farm commodities.

10. If farmers are to produce to the limit they must be assured of sufficient manpower, machinery, and supplies, as well as prices, that will enable them to meet rising costs.

11. Direct Government lending should be discouraged and supplanted by cooperative credit, extended on a sound basis under farmer ownership and control. Crop insurance should be made available.

12. Freedom of speech, press, and radio are fundamental to American ideals.

13. A return to the constitutional form of government is imperative if the people are to be protected in the rights upon which this Republic was founded. Emergency powers delegated by Congress should be exercised in accord with the intent and purpose of Congress, should be self-terminating, and should be revocable by a majority vote of Congress.

14. With the Nation facing a transportation crisis, it must be met by voluntary adjustment of demands for service and by adequate provision for maintenance of facilities.

15. America should take its place with other nations in determining a sound economic basis for national development and commerce which will remove some of the most flagrant causes of war. World trade should be encouraged on a basis that will not injure American business, labor, and agriculture, with Congress reserving the right to revoke any trade agreement.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE FAVORS

Protecting the family-sized farm against encroachment by corporate interests.

Increased availability of farm machinery, repairs, and parts to insure maximum 1944 food production.

Complete withdrawal by the Federal Government from the field of automotive taxation, leaving the State the sole taxing agency.

Expansion of rural mail routes so that rural citizens shall not have to travel farther for their mail than the nearest point on a public highway.

Extension of telephone facilities within the rural areas.

Providing incentive payments to agriculture and a two-price system of farm marketing.

Continued internment of all Japanese in concentration camps, under control of the United States Army.

Agricultural representation in any agency clothed with authority to make trade agreements.

Continuation of crop insurance and that, following the war, it be placed on a self-sustaining basis.

The private ownership of railroads and adequate reserves to permit needed railroad rehabilitation after the war.

Adequate supplies of fertilizers, spraying materials, etc., for 1944 crop needs.

Removal of all governmental restrictions on the production of sugar beets.

Immediate lowering of ration points for butter to same level as butter substitutes.

Active support of Russian War Relief, especially urging contributions of clothing and garden and field seeds.

National legislation and increased educational programs to facilitate eradication of the pink boll worm menace.

Making all glass containers in standard sizes and with standard covers.

Elimination of unnecessary functions and duplicating Government agencies.

Practical means for land banks and associations to share losses, and banks with ample reserves to pay dividend.

Continued adequate appropriations and authorization to carry out the purposes of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Completion of the St. Lawrence seaway for navigation and power purposes.

Consolidation of the F. S. A., the feed and seed loans, and the R. A. C. C. loans, to promote greater efficiency in administration and economy in personnel.

Continued use of war prisoners and soldiers in essential farm work.

Congressional investigation to prevent unwarranted Federal regulations that restrict radio privileges of free speech.

A cooling-off period after the war before final peace terms are arranged.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE OPPOSES

Use of any grains for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors for the duration of the war, and thereby releasing this great supply of grain to food channels.

Any change in immigration laws at the present time.

Price ceilings except to prevent profiteering.

Federal regulation of insurance.

Attempts of governmental agencies to change the dietary habits of the American people to consume grain rather than meat and meat products.

All importations of fresh or frozen meats from Argentina.

Continuation of the triple A in view of changed conditions in American agriculture.

Any let-down in educational opportunities and standards during the war period.

All barriers to the free movement of persons and goods over the highways between States.

Further cost-plus war contracts, and that those now in force be terminated as soon as possible.

Further extension of Federal control of wildlife on public lands within the several States.

Efforts of labor unions to organize farmers or farm workers.

Further break-down of Clear Channel radio facilities.

Following the energetic farm leadership which National Master Albert S. Goss has displayed at Washington, the action of the Grand Rapids session in overwhelmingly reelecting Mr. Goss was highly significant, and expresses the Nation-wide approval of his course felt by the Grange membership in every State. Few changes in the official personnel of the organization were made, and the reelection of Eugene A. Eckert of Illinois as a member of the executive committee for a 3-year term puts the stamp of approval upon another prominent Grange leader, who has served in the same position for a score of years.

In spite of the emphasis placed on war-winning activities, the preservation of constitutional government, the necessity for curbing wasteful spending, and many other pending questions of public policy, the National Grange reaffirmed the continuance of its educational features, particularly the work of community service, as carried on constantly by the almost 8,000 subordinate units of the order in nearly 40 States. The record of such accomplishments during the past year is impressive and indicates the definite position of leadership for rural betterment which the Grange occupies.

Making special trips to address the Grand Rapids session were three prominent figures from the National Capital—Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator; Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; and Hon. George D. Aiken, United States Senator from Vermont. Gov. Harry F. Kelly, of Michigan, and Gov. J. M. Broughton, of North Carolina, were welcome guests at the session, and both brought cheering messages heartily approving the Grange program for a more prosperous agriculture and rural life.

The National Grange pledged anew its support to the Red Cross, civilian defense, War bond and stamp sales and other patriotic projects; while the remarkable record of subordinates from coast to coast in promoting such projects during the past year has been given wide publicity and indicates the fine, patriotic spirit of the organization.

The invitation to hold the 1944 session of the National Grange in the State of North Carolina was unanimously accepted, with the location of the convention city to be determined later by the executive committee. An invitation was also received to hold the 1945 session at Sacramento, Calif.; and for 1947 the Ohio State Grange presented an invitation, inasmuch as that year will mark the seventieth anniversary of the Ohio State Grange.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, at this meeting the national master of the Grange, Albert S. Goss, of the State of Washington, made this statement, which was unanimously endorsed by the convention:

BACK TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Any executive encroachment on the rights of the people or the powers of Congress leads to breaking down the balance of power, to building up centralized control, and is a step toward dictatorship. The trend in that direction is too strong to be ignored. Abuses are occurring which seriously impair our rights and affect our daily lives. Some of these abuses result from direct law violations, while others arise from indirection. Congress should take whatever steps are necessary to put a stop to them as soon as they appear, for they are rapidly building up a bureaucracy which is taking unto itself the power to make its own laws. The spread of this is becoming so common as to give real cause for alarm.

Instead of a government by law, we are rapidly becoming a government by regulation and Executive order. It has been stated that the volume of regulations and Executive orders issued during the past year exceeded the total volume of laws passed by Congress from the time of George Washington to date.

It is high time that we get back to constitutional government if we wish to preserve the liberties and rights of a free people.

Army Construction Work in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have heretofore placed in the Appendix of the RECORD three radio broadcasts by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the subject of Army construction work in Hawaii. I now ask unanimous consent that a fourth radio broadcast by Mr. Lewis on the same subject, made on December 2, 1943, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The police department here in Los Angeles, after 24 hours of very admirable and thorough investigation, still say tonight that they are unable to find any cause for the fire which occurred in one of the bedrooms in our hotel suite here early yesterday morning. As I reported to you last night, that fire suddenly burst forth at about 8 a. m. yesterday in the bedroom which I normally would have been occupying. The main source of the fire seemed to be under the bed in which my assistant, Fred Morrison, instead of I, was sleeping. The whole under side of the bed and the springs and the under side of the mattress particularly were badly burned and the chair-board along the bottom of the wall where the head of the bed was, was almost completely burned through, indicating that that was the most intense part of the fire. Investigation showed that there were no electric wires that could have produced a short circuit; it could not have been caused by a cigarette, because Mr. Morrison had been asleep for about 6 hours when the fire took place and even before he went to bed he did not smoke a cigarette. No one was in the room in the meantime. If there had been a cigarette dropped by him before he went to sleep the fire would have developed unquestionably in a lot less than 6 hours. Furthermore, a hotel attendant who opened the door early in the morning to deliver a newspaper at about 6:30 said that at that time there was no trace of smoke at all.

The chief chemist of the Los Angeles police department, after careful examination of the charred remains of the rug that was under the bed, reported that he was unable to find any traces of gasoline or other inflammable material. The police say frankly that they are stumped as to what the origin of the fire really was. I might add that both they and the hotel management have been extremely cooperative and diligent and very sincere in their investigations. I want to take this opportunity of thanking both of them.

I will say this much: That if anyone ever came closer to death than Fred Morrison did yesterday morning I don't know how it could have happened.

In Washington today Secretary of War Stimson had official comments to make regarding the Army construction contracts about which I have been reporting to you from this city of Los Angeles, the contracts which Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., of the United States Army Air Corps, made for secret defense installations near Pearl Harbor and in other islands of the Pacific, and the fact that those contracts were with the Hawaiian Constructors, one of the heads of which was Hans Wilhelm Rohl, a German alien. Secretary Stimson said the letting of the contract on the Hawaiian construction work was inappropriate. He said that the work was on secret installations in Hawaii and the South Pacific and that Mr. Rohl was not allowed to supervise the work personally until after he became a citizen. Mr. Stimson said that the contracts had been investigated by a committee of the California State Legislature—it is from the records of that committee that I have been reporting to you all this week—and that it was definitely established that the contracts were not the result of any favoritism on the part of Colonel Wyman. I think I should interject here that Senator Jack Tenney, the chairman of this State legislature investigating committee to which Secretary Stimson referred, made the following statement today, and these are direct quotations. Said Senator Tenney:

"I am at a complete loss to understand where Secretary Stimson received such an impression or information. The statement he makes is absolutely untrue if he means to indicate that my committee in any way found that the contracts in question between Rohl and the Government were all right. On the contrary, the records of the committee clearly indicate procedures that are questionable and that should be thoroughly investigated. The records of this committee certainly do not provide any vindication or whitewash of Colonel Wyman or anyone else concerned." That is the end of the question.

Secretary Stimson said that while Colonel Wyman was not guilty of any negligence in connection with the contracts to Rohl and others in the Hawaiian Islands, it has been decided by the War Department that Colonel Wyman will not in the future be assigned to direct large public works. Instead, he has been assigned to other Army duties. Secretary Stimson said that the investigation of Colonel Wyman's activities in Hawaii did indicate a lack of proper attention to organization and administrative detail.

Now, there is more on this. I learned this afternoon from Washington that the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives has requested that the War Department furnish Colonel Wyman in person to the committee for questioning and for investigation in connection with this case, although I was unable to determine what the War Department has replied, whether it has or has not agreed to do so.

Apropos of all these investigations by the committee in Washington and here in California and by the War Department and other Government agencies, there was introduced into the record of this investigation here in California an excerpt from the Federal statutes concerning secret Army contracts, and in order for you to know exactly what the law provides it might be well to read it to you from the record at this time. Mr. Rohl, Mr. Hans Wilhelm Rohl, was on the witness stand at the time and he was being cross-examined by committee counsel, Mr. R. E. Coombes. It had been established that this confidential contract for work in the Hawaiian Islands had been awarded to the Hawaiian Constructors, in December 1940, a year before Pearl Harbor. It had been established that Hawaiian Constructors was made up of the Rohl-Connolly Co., of which Mr. Rohl was the head, and the W. E. Callahan Co., and it had been established that from the time the contract was signed in December 1940 until the following September 15, 2½ months before Pearl Harbor, when Mr. Rohl was made a citizen of the United States, Mr. Rohl was still a German alien, but Mr. Rohl had insisted in the record that he was very careful to have no knowledge of the Hawaiian project and to have absolutely no first-hand connection with it during all that time, that it was not until after he became a citizen that he went to Hawaii and began supervising the work. From here on I am going to read from the actual record of the sworn testimony. This is Mr. Coombes asking the question:

"Mr. Rohl, why didn't you apply for citizenship between 1931 and 1941?" That was a period in which Mr. Rohl was getting Army contracts.

"Answer. Negligence, busy traveling, never gave it a thought.

"Question. When you first obtained the contracts for the construction of military installations did you tell Major Wyman that you were an alien?

"Answer. I did on the Hawaiian Constructors.

"Question. But you didn't on any other projects?

"Answer. We don't have the—there are no restrictions—I mean on a Government contract you are not questioned as to whether you are a citizen or not, but on this particular contract, Contract 602, it being a secret contract, of course I told him. I had to tell him.

"Question. Are you familiar with the provisions of the law regarding such contracts?

"Answer. Secret contracts?

"Question. Well, secret, confidential, or restricted contracts.

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. I will read the law to you and see whether or not this is your understanding of it," and this is a quotation from the Federal Statutes:

"No aliens employed by a contractor in the performance of secret, confidential, or restricted Government contracts shall be permitted to have access—to have access—to the plans of specifications or the work under such contracts or to participate in the contract trials unless the written consent of the head of the Government department concerned has first been obtained. Any alien who obtains employment on secret, confidential, or restricted Government contracts by wilful misrepresentation of his alien status or who makes such wilful misrepresentation while seeking such employment shall be penalized by a fine of $10,000 or 5 years in the penitentiary. For the purpose of this section the term 'person' shall be construed to include an individual, partnership, association, corporation, or other business enterprise."

And then said Mr. Coombes: "Is that your understanding of the law?"

And Mr. Rohl replied, "Absolutely."

Getting around to the Canadian oil project in Canada which the Truman committee of the United States Senate went into about 10 days ago and which started this whole ball rolling, I have some additional information tonight which I have checked partially in Washington and partially with the Army engineer headquarters in Edmonton, Canada. You recall, of course, the case of the building in Edmonton, Canada, which was built at a cost of $259,000 by the contractors who were building the 500-mile pipe line for the oil project. That is the building that becomes the property of the city of Edmonton as soon as this oil project is completed, with a proviso that we have to spend about $4,000 more on it to stucco the outside of that building to make it acceptable to the city of Edmonton. That must be done in order for us to turn it over to the city of Edmonton, or there is this alternative: that we can tear the building down after the contract is over and ship the California redwood, of which it was made, back to the United States as second-hand lumber and therefore avoid the necessity of the additional $4,000.

The contractor on that pipe-line job is the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co., Callahan being the same Callahan Co. which was in partnership with Rohl's company on the famous Hawaiian Island venture, and I was told on first-hand authority that in addition to the construction of the office building, the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co. also bought a whole Jesuit college in Edmonton to serve as an additional office building. I was told that included in the college were some 12 or 13 different buildings, including classrooms, dormitories, and various other establishments. I checked that information by telephone with Brigadier General Worsham, who is in command at Edmonton, this afternoon and he tells me that the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co. did buy a Jesuit boys' college there in Edmonton. It was not, however, 12 or 13 buildings; it was, instead, only one single but rather large building, and one of my assistants in Washington found from the records of the Truman investigating committee of the Senate at the Capitol there that the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co. spent a total of some $925,000 on the Jesuit school and the office building and the other facilities in Edmonton, and that city of Edmonton happens to be 1,000 miles from the nearest point on the pipe line which the Betchel-Price-Callahan Co. is constructing.

The contract, by the way, is signed on behalf of the Government by Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr.

The Battle of Tarawa

REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, Jim Lucas, a constituent of mine, a fighting marine, participated in the Battle of Tarawa. He wrote the most brilliant account of an action that has appeared in any newspaper in some time. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert his account in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star of December 3, 1943]

FIRST MARINE WRITER TO LAND ON TARAWA TELLS OF FIERCE BATTLE—FORCED WAY ASHORE AND FOUGHT FOR DAYS UNDER WITHERING JAP FIRE

(This graphic eyewitness account of the blood conquest of Tarawa was written by Master Tech. Sgt. Jim G. Lucas, Tulsa, Okla., the first Marine Corps combat correspondent to land on that little Gilbert Island.)

TARAWA, November 23.—Five minutes ago we wrested this strategic Gilbert Island outpost and its all-important air strip from the Japanese who seized it from a few missionaries and natives weeks after they had attacked Pearl Harbor.

It has been the bitterest, costliest, most sustained fighting on any front. It has cost us the lives of hundreds of United States Marines. (Official reports listed 1,026 Americans killed.) But we have wiped out a force of 4,000 imperial Japanese marines—we expected to find only 2,000—mostly dead.

Before we started it was great fun. We grinned and chortled. We said, "There won't be a Jap alive when we get ashore."

That was the plan. Naval and air bombardment was to all but destroy the island. The few living Japs were to be so shell-shocked there would be no opposition. I recalled Major Mills' instructions:

"We don't intend to neutralize the island. We don't intend to destroy it. We will annihilate it."

BATTLESHIPS POUND SHORE

As dawn broke, Tarawa was completely enveloped in smoke and flame. Japanese gun emplacements—8-inchers—continued to reply. Our battleships looked like sullen, defiant bulldogs as they ignored them and continued to pound the shore.

At dawn, our planes came in. We could see them disappear into the smoke and flame. We could hear the sputter of their machine guns. We could see the debris raised by their bombs. It was wonderful.

But something suddenly appeared to have gone wrong. We learned H hour had been delayed 31, then 45 minutes. The pounding continued. There was little doubt there were still living—and fighting—Japs on the island.

Our assault waves were in the water, ready to hit the beach. We were in the second wave, due to hit after the first men reached shore. Without warning, an 8-inch shell hit and exploded 10 yards off our side. We dived behind a hatch, laughing at each other as we came out. A second shell hit 5 yards off, killing a sailor and spraying our deck with shrapnel and salt water. We upped anchor and steamed out of range.

FIRST CASUALTIES SEVERE

Fifteen minutes later we climbed into our tank lighter, sharing it with many other marines, a truck, and a trailer.

"We have landed against heavy opposition," came the first word from shore. "Casualties severe."

It came over our radio as we moved in. We looked grimly at each other.

As we pulled from the beach we were met with enemy shellfire. A boat on our starboard side received a direct hit. Five men were killed. We pulled alongside and dragged in the survivors. There was no chance to salvage their equipment. Swiftly we moved out of range.

A control boat roared by, a naval officer screaming at us to "stay back" until we received word it was safe to go in. That was 10:30 a. m.

At 1 p. m. we started in again, moving toward the pier which appeared undamaged. We were stopped by machine-gun fire. Corp. Raymond Matjasic, 23, Cleveland, one of our combat photographers, who had been seated in the cab of the truck, fell to the floor. The truck's windshield was knocked out.

UNABLE TO PICK UP SURVIVORS

At 3 p. m. we tried again. Shells tore the water on all sides. Two more boats went down, and more marines died. We backed out again, unable to pick up the survivors. Many of them swam to us, and were later moved back to their transports. Many of the wounded drowned.

The sun was punishing. There was no shade. We broke out our rations and nibbled at them. At 5 p. m. the control boat pulled up.

"Do any of you have ammunition," the naval officer yelled through his megaphone. "We've got to get it ashore at all costs."

"We have a truck," we answered.

"To hell with that," he said, and roared away.

At dusk our battleships and cruisers opened up a terrific antiaircraft barrage. There was only one answer—Japanese planes.

"Prepare to go over the side," a lieutenant said quietly. "They'd strafe us if they get through."

We inflated our lifebelts and waited. They never got through. We were glad. We'd seen two sharks before dusk.

At midnight the control boat appeared out of the darkness. We were to try again.

SNIPERS OPEN FIRE

We inched toward the dock, partially wrecked by our own shelling. The hulk of a Japanese merchantman loomed to the right. Two direct hits from our destroyers had put it out of action. On the lookout for snipers, we covered it with our machine guns.

When we reached the dock snipers in the wrecked ship opened up, but they were firing over our heads. We climbed on the dock, and more snipers fired. We hit the deck. We moved down the docks 10 feet. Japs on the beach began throwing mortars our way. We hit the deck again.

Minutes later a second mortar hit directly beneath us. I felt the blast and was sprayed with salt water.

Someone yelled:

"Get on the other side! The next one will be right on!"

We were uncertain where to go. The Japs lines were only 50 yards past the end of the pier, and there was no command post. Matjasic and I discarded our typewriter, our packs, and our field glasses and started to the shore.

SILHOUETTED BY MOON

The last 75 yards of the pier was white coral grit. There was a brilliant moon—at home I would have called it beautiful. We swore at it viciously. We were perfect targets.

Crouched, we sprinted down the pier, silhouetted against the coral. Snipers opened up, and six men fell, screaming in agony. We lay like logs.

"We can't stay here," someone said up the line, "they'll shell hell out of us and we'll all be gone.

"Advance slowly. Five feet between each man. They won't get us all that way."

We started. Three more marines fell, and we hit the ground. Inch by inch we moved up. Each 10 yards cost us the lives of more marines. Each time I expected to get mine. Finally we were within 15 yards of the beach. Ahead were shadows.

"Throw away everything, including your camera," I told Matjasic. "We'll come back and get it if we can. We're making a run for it."

A sergeant beside me cracked:

"Take your rifle. You'll probably never get to use it, but you might."

STEAM ROLLER OFFERS SHELTER

I grinned. Ray and I ran for the shadows. It was an anticlimax. Not a shot was fired at us.

On the beach, the fire was still hot. We ducked behind the wreckage of a Japanese steam roller, which appeared to be between us and the enemy. I found a shovel and began frantically to dig. Within 5 minutes we had our first fox hole on Tarawa. It turned out to be the safest spot on the island.

There we spent the night. It was 4 a. m. when we got to lie down.

At dawn we found our position precarious. Our own men were on the left of us, the Japs not more than 50 yards on the right. We were in no-man's land.

At 6 a. m. a fight began over our fox hole. Scores of bullets nicked off the big steam roller while we burrowed deeper.

Shortly before noon the Japs were driven back and we came out of hiding.

Our cruisers and destroyers resumed their shelling of the Jap half of the island, knocking out the last remaining big guns. The concussion was terrific, for the shells were landing not more than 100 yards away. Our planes came in strafing.

I waded and swam through a small bay to reach the opposite shore but was unable to find anyone. Virtually everyone I knew was reported dead or missing.

TOLD HE WAS DEAD

Far down the beach (not more than 50 yards but it took me 2 hours to cover it), I saw a marine with a camera. Painfully I crawled to him, for my body was one mass of bruises.

He was a stranger.

"Where'd you get it?" I asked.

"From Lucas," he replied.

"Where is Lucas?" I asked.

"Over there," he replied. "Dead."

"I'm Lucas," I told him.

From his description I decided he meant Sgt. Ernest J. Diet, 36, Hammond, La. Later, I found a body I thought was that of our sergeant-photographer. I was almost hysterical when Diet showed up 24 hours later. He learned finally that it was someone else's camera, and that he had found some of my papers. But meanwhile he had officially reported me killed in action.

I left my fox hole at noon, went 100 yards, and returned at 6 p. m. It was that tough.

The night was hellish. More men came in, and more were killed on the pier. I slept until 1 a. m., and Matjasic from 1 a. m. until dawn. We had had enough experience with the enemy's infiltration tactics. We had orders to shoot any man who came toward us. During the night we learned that guards on the pier killed a Jap who had sneaked in with a drum of gasoline, intending to set the pier afire. It would have been the end of us, for the pier was loaded with high explosives.

ENEMY SENDS BOMBERS

At dawn the enemy sent its first bombers. There were only two of them, and five men were killed.

We awoke to one of the strangest sights in history. We badly needed replacements. Men were being landed 500 yards from shore in the surf at low tide and were wading in past enemy machine-gun emplacements. Many men fell before they reached shore. In the afternoon marines were still staggering ashore, carrying the limp forms of buddies between them.

The heaviest fire came from a Jap sniper's nest in the beached enemy merchant ship. Assault waves were held up while our dive bombers went to work on it, dropping high explosives in its hulk. And yet, when the next boat came in, machine-gun fire continued from the blazing ship! We settled the matter by sending aboard men to wipe out the snipers in hand-to-hand combat, and to hold it as an outpost.

Shortly before noon the Japs opened up on us with mortars. One landed near enough to tear the top off our steam roller and to deafen me for 2 days. A marine who occupied the fox hole next to ours was killed by shrapnel. We dug deeper.

HEAVIEST FIGHTING ON THIRD DAY

By now, however, the Japs were being forced steadily back. We were able to move about. Snipers continued, but we ignored them. One was killed in a coconut tree 50 feet away.

Still, our naval and air poundings continued. On the third day the heaviest fighting took part in a cleared space around the air strip. One of our tanks lumbered into the clearing. A Jap broke from the bush and tried to throw a grenade in its tracks. He was shot down.

Suddenly there was firing at our rear. Seven Japs had been found in the ruins of a dugout less than 10 feet from the command post from which our officers were directing operations. They were wiped out.

I went with Chief Pharmacists Mate Roy J. Barnhill, 33, Salt Lake City, Utah, to the front, where our men are blasting out a Jap pill box. Last night Barnhill went back of the Jap lines to pick up six wounded marines. A Japanese sentry tossed two hand grenades in their direction. Both were duds.

PRISONERS KILLED BY OWN SNIPERS

I returned to the beach to find snipers again sweeping the pier where ammunition was being unloaded. They fired from the wreckage of one of our boats 50 yards away. I ducked into water on the opposite side, and found five husky military policemen herding a convoy of Japanese prisoners toward the beach in water up to their waists and up to the Japs' shoulders. Three dead marines were in the water. The M. P.'s herded the Japs out to a waiting landing barge. As the frightened prisoners climbed aboard, they were subjected to murderous fire from their own snipers. Three were killed.

I got back in time to be in on the battle that broke Japanese resistance on Tarawa. Several hundred Japs were holed up for 2 days in a bomb-proof shelter at the end of the airstrip, holding up our advance.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Robert Harper, 22, Houston, Tex., and Sgt. John Rybin, 25, Laurel, Mont., dashed forward with their flame throwers while automatic riflemen covered them. At the entrance of the bomb shelter, Harper threw his flame on a Jap machine-gun nest, charring three enemy marines beyond recognition. He poured on more fire. There were screams inside the shelter and the marines rushed forward to capture their objective.

Harper returned to our post.

FLAME THROWERS TURN ON HEAT

"They were all huddled in there scared to death," he said. "I turned on the heat and that was all."

From this point on our advance was rapid. Following our advancing troops, I came upon 1 position we had held less than 5 minutes and counted 27 Japanese who had committed suicide by strapping their feet to the triggers of their rifles, placing the muzzle in their chests and pulling the trigger with a kick.

During the night, the Japs made a final desperate bayonet charge. They killed two of our flame throwers but were repulsed.

And this morning the island was secured. For the first time we were able to sit up without ducking. There were a few desultory sniper shots, but no one noticed them.

Staff Sgt. George Stutsman, Natchez, Miss., brings us two cartons of cigarettes and a carton of matches. We get a 5-gallon keg of water—a real luxury. It rains briefly, and we stand in the open, soap and shower ourselves off.

This is civilization.

My Constant Efforts Will Be To Help To Keep the Cost of Living Within the Means of the Masses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 23, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in voting on this bill today to put an absolute ban on subsidies I am restricted to a choice between two evils. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. We must vote either for subsidies or for inflation. There is no other choice. If subsidies go out, inflation comes in. There is not a particle of doubt about that. Members who vote to pass this bill to outlaw subsidies may honestly say that they are not in favor of inflation but that is exactly what they will be voting for.

I hate subsidies. No Member who votes today to put a ban on subsidies hates them any more than I do, but there is one thing I hate more than subsidies and that is inflation that would crush the heart out of every person in this country who is on a fixed income and that is precisely the sort of unspeakable disaster we will be inviting if this bill becomes a law.

I believe that under the peculiar circumstances the country is now facing the enactment of this bill would be a major blow to the poor and middle classes and a calamity to the entire Nation for the reason that it would immediately start an upward spiral of prices, the end of which no man can foresee. I would not think of voting for a continuance of limited subsidies if I were not positively certain that by discarding subsidies we shall get something infinitely worse.

In this connection an editorial published in the Indianapolis News on November 16 last is well worth perusal. That editorial said:

Governments from time immemorial have tinkered with inflation because it seems so painless, yet it has been the one thing more than war that has destroyed nations. Prices rise and governments simply print more paper money, but the real value of things never changes. The President has talked about averting inflation. Congress has shouted and stormed about its desires for economy, but neither has done much about staving off inflation or effecting real economies. Until they do act the cost of living will continue to mount higher and higher.

In endeavoring to hold the price line by the limited use of subsidies the President and Members of Congress who are supporting him in this fight are trying to do something about inflation because subsidies, as bad as they are, are nevertheless the antidote for inflation.

Chester Bowles, the Price Administrator, has told us that all will be lost as far as any control of prices in this country is concerned if this bill becomes a law. The "hold the line" efforts of the Government will be completely nullified, he says. The Government has been making strenuous efforts to hold the price line and it has succeeded wonderfully well. If you doubt it, compare present prices with the prices during and at the close of the First World War. Sugar which now costs 7 cents a pound cost 30 cents then. A pair of shoes that costs $5 now, cost $18 then. The same comparison holds over the entire range of prices. If this bill passes many persons will use it as an excuse to raise prices and wages and put the blame on Congress and the price line will crack immediately. The administration has a definite plan to keep prices at the present level, or lower. I am not going to vote to destroy that plan. I am not going to cast a vote that would break down that dam and open the way to galloping, run-away inflation and an orgy of rising prices. Representing a great consuming district I feel that I would be recreant to the trust vested in me if I did not do everything I possibly can to keep the essential items of the cost of living within the means of the masses of the people.

Reply to American Legion Resolution Relative to Alleged Abuse of Franking Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before a meeting of the national executive committee of the American Legion, held at Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18, 1943, where I appeared on invitation of the committee.

By a mail vote of 60 to 5, the national executive committee had extended to the Honorable HAMILTON FISH the privilege of addressing that body on the subject of resolution No. 296, adopted by the twenty-fifth annual national convention, in Omaha, subject: Guard Against the Misuse of the Frank-

ing Privileges for Subversive and Un-American Activities (report of the convention committee on Americanism). Following his appearance a motion was adopted that the commander be empowered to secure and proceed to get further evidence regarding this resolution, possibly through the medium of a proper subcommittee, and report back to the May meeting of the national executive committee.

Congressman FISH addressed the national executive committee as follows:

Mr. Commander and members of the national executive committee of the American Legion. I want to take this opportunity at the outset to thank you for inviting me here to answer the charges contained in resolution No. 296 adopted by the American Legion convention held at Omaha, relative to certain charges made against me, without any hearing whatever on my part. I denounce these charges specifically and categorically as lies from beginning to end. There is not one iota of truth to them beyond the fact that my frank was used and sent out by a certain party named in the resolution, which is perfectly legal in every respect under the law and under the Constitution.

Mr. Commander and fellow Legionnaires, I feel compelled to say something about myself, because there are so many new faces in this room since I was really active in the higher circles of the American Legion. Many of you belong to the opposite political party. Many of you have listened to radio attacks on me emanating from radical and Communist sources. I have been a special target and I am rather proud of it, because back in 1930 I was appointed by the House of Representatives to head a committee to investigate Communist activities and propaganda, which is now a matter of record, and I have opposed communism in every possible way since then. I do not recognize any possible compromise between communism and Americanism in the United States. But ever since that time I have been singled out by all Communists and fellow travelers as their pet target, and I confess that I consider that condemnation from such sources is the highest possible commendation.

Like you, I served in the World War, and I happen to have served on the other side and was decorated both by the French and American Governments for gallantry on the field of battle. That is a matter of record that anyone can look into.

I happen to have been a very active Legionnaire in the early days. I am a loyal Legionnaire today, but not as active, because I made up my mind, after attending two or three State conventions and national conventions, that, being in politics, it would be better for me not to attend, because if I went to these conventions I might be suspected of having some ulterior motive.

At the first Legion convention in May 1919, held at St. Louis, I was a member of the committee on the constitution, as a delegate from New York. As a member of that committee, I was appointed by the chairman as chairman of a subcommittee of three to write the preamble to the American Legion constitution, and empowered to appoint the other two members of that committee.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I appointed two other members, Jack Greenway, of Arizona, and Judge Davis, of Portland, Oreg., and who now, I believe, lives in Wilmington, Del. That subcommittee of three wrote and rewrote for 48 hours the preamble until we had it just the way we wanted it, and I reported it back to the committee on the constitution, where not a single change was made. You have all seen claims of various individuals that they were the author of the preamble of the Legion constitution. I could name a half dozen, because I have heard numerous rumors as to its origin and relative to persons claiming to have had something to do with writing it. No one had anything to do with it except those three members of that subcommittee, and we reported back to the committee on the constitution, which approved it without changing an "i" or crossing a "t." It was reported to the St. Louis caucus and became the preamble of the Legion constitution by a unanimous vote.

I attended the next Legion convention because I heard that Eric Fisher Wood, of Pennsylvania, wanted to change the preamble and to write a completely new one. I was placed on the committee on resolutions, to which the proposed new preamble was sent. Mr. Wood presented it, written by Mr. Elihu Root, and all I did was to tell the story and say that the preamble was so written that if they took out one word or changed one line, it would destroy its entire spirit. A vote was taken, and I think there was one vote, Mr. Eric Fisher Wood's, for changing the preamble at the Minneapolis convention.

I am not only telling you that as a matter of interest but also as regards my own activity as a Legionnaire. Naturally I have been a devoted and loyal Legionnaire since that time.

I dislike very much speaking about myself, but I have been advised to do so because so many people here do not know me or my background. My people have lived in this country for over 300 years. My father was a Member of Congress. My grandfather was a Member of Congress, Governor of New York State, and Secretary of State of the United States for 8 years. His father before him was an officer in the Revolutionary Army. At 18 years of age he was a major and fought all through the war, with a gallant record, and was the first adjutant general of the State of New York.

Yet, in spite of my American heritage, a totally false and scurrilous resolution, emanating from unfriendly sources, ill-conceived, and hastily considered, was adopted without any hearing or evidence.

I confess I was shocked when I read the Legion resolution in the newspapers, indirectly impugning my loyalty, my integrity, and my Americanism by inferring that I had used my frank to spread un-American and subversive propaganda and propaganda inimical to the United States.

I have written to every member of the Americanism committee and most of them say that my name was never mentioned; that simply the "whereas" was read about the abuse of the franking privilege; and some say it was casually referred to at the very end. But it was passed without one iota of corroborative or substantiating evidence of any kind. I admit the fact that my frank was used, as it is every day, and will continue to be under the law, to send out my speeches, but they are my speeches, and I believe half the Legionnaires, including the national commander, were under the impression that my franking privilege was used by some subversive source by inserting their literature into it and sending out something they had written.

I have been in Congress a long time—24 years. The first piece of veterans' legislation I introduced was back in 1920 to bring back the body of the Unknown Soldier for burial at the Arlington Cemetery, and it was the last bill signed by Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1921. I have made many speeches since that time, on numerous topics, but I challenge anybody to find even the slightest tinge of any un-American thought in any speech that I ever made.

I would not know how to make one. I couldn't conceive of making an un-American speech by thought or word. All the speeches that have gone out over my frank, with one or two possible exceptions, have been my own speeches—my own remarks—and 100 percent American. I think I have sent out—I tried to check up—one or two speeches over my frank that were not made by me. The only one that I can recollect is one made by Herbert Hoover that I had put into the RECORD and franked out.

I have a speech here that I made in 1932 in defense of the Legion. The Legion was attacked for lobbying. I made this speech in Congress and sent it out over my frank. Many other speeches have been sent out by the Legion, as they are today sending out speeches of Members of Congress.

Let us take up the resolution specifically. It says:

"Whereas one section of the Postal Laws and Regulations of the United States of America to wit: chapter 4, section 613 (1932) reads as follows:

"'It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to the use of a frank, to lend such frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization, or association. This provision shall not apply to any committee composed of Members of Congress.'"

That is the first part of the resolution. That applies to someone putting something of their own into franked envelopes, some of their own literature, but it does not apply in my case, as it was not done, but I will take that up a little later.

"Whereas Congressman HAMILTON FISH"—it mentions my name—"of the Twenty-sixth District of the State of New York." In my district everybody knows me, my record, and my background, and they know where I stand. I am not here to defend my political reputation. I am here to answer false, vicious, and malicious charges that impugn my Americanism, my patriotism, my character, and which actually constitute defamation of character and are utterly libelous.

"Whereas Congressman HAMILTON FISH of the Twenty-sixth District of the State of New York heretofore, with certain other isolationist Members of Congress"—I am defending them, too, to show you what a smear attack this is, emanating, gentlemen, from a Legionnaire, as far as I can find out, by the name of Lewis Hayd Leve, of the Fremont Post of Palo Alto, Calif., whom I have never seen as far as I know. To show you what a malicious smear attack this is, it does not simply mention my name, gentlemen, but it goes on and says, "with certain other isolationist Members of Congress." At one time before the war 75 percent of the Members of Congress were isolationists, at least in the House of Representatives. Of the party I belong to 90 percent were. That is why I am here, not only to defend my name but because if something is not done about this it will be a political issue in every Legion post, not of your making or of my making but raised by the Communists, the Reds, and the pinks who will take advantage of this false and malicious resolution and use it in every post against not only me—I am not concerned with my election; I have been in Congress 24 years and the people know me—but there are others from close districts, Legionnaires like myself, who may be unfairly attacked unless this smear is exposed.

Then it goes on "* * * allowed his congressional frank to be used by certain groups and individuals, including George Sylvester Viereck and the America First Committee." In the first place, both of the charges are lies, and malicious ones. George Sylvester Viereck never wrote anything for me or suggested any speech for me, or sent out any speech for me, nor did the America First Committee. I am not here to defend George Sylvester Viereck, but that was put in for smear purposes. Not one iota of evidence was presented to show that he ever wrote any speech for me or used my frank or sent out any speeches, nor did the America First Committee.

If he or both had, they would have been within the law, because this was 4 years ago, or more than a year before Pearl Harbor. I

haven't seen Mr. Viereck for 3½ years; that is, a year and a half before our entrance into the war. He was an American citizen for 50 years, and has two sons in the Army. What has happened to him since is his business, but as an American citizen he had a right to his views. If he had views as between Germany and England on the side of Germany, that was his right. I happen to hold the other way. I am not here, certainly, to defend him, but I am just showing what a smear this is.

Then it goes on "* * * and the America First Committee." What right has the Legion to denounce the America First Committee when some of its highest officials, past commanders, like Hanford McNider, were on the executive committee? General Wood was the president of it. I was not a member, but am just answering these smear charges. I believed in what it stood for. I believed in national defense. I believed in keeping out of war until we were attacked, and I believed then in America first just the way I believe in it now. That is my political creed today. I admire Winston Churchill. I admire him because he is for Great Britain first and the British Empire. As much as I loathe communism, I admire Joseph Stalin because he always puts the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics first. I have always been for America first. I am today and always will be. If there is treason in that, let anyone make the most of it; but I believe 100,000,000 Americans today are for putting the interests of America first and keeping them uppermost.

Then the resolution continues, "Whereas, it has been proved by documentary evidence (see exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein), there was mailed from the city of San Diego, State of California, without any stamp and under the free frank of said Congressman HAMILTON FISH, a reprint of the remarks of the said Congressman in Congress on April 6, 1943, on proposed amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act of the United States; and

"Whereas the said franked envelope bearing the name and frank of the said Congressman FISH, which was mailed from the said city of San Diego, Calif., on April 14, 1943, was mailed on a mailing list of the pro-Nazi editor of the Broom, to wit: One C. Leon de Aryan, who is under Federal indictment for sedition, and who is now out on bail still pursuing his activities."

I have not seen the evidence, but I am perfectly willing to admit that there were some franked envelopes of mine that were mailed from San Diego by a man called de Aryan. I had never seen him, never heard of him, but if he sent for some of my speeches and I sent him those speeches to be mailed out, I have no reason to deny it as it was both legal and in accordance with the usual practice. I do not care whether he is indicted or not or whether he is in jail or not. They were my speeches, American speeches, and if they go out to seditious people, so much the better, because that is the best way to convert them through American principles. I want to discuss the constitutional end of it for a moment.

I know nothing about the Broom, either. If it is a subversive paper, I doubt it could continue to circulate.

The resolution says: "Whereas the proposed amendments to the said Alien and Sedition Act proposed by the same Congressman FISH would make it impossible for the United States Government to obtain conviction against certain persons now indicted for sedition and would cripple the Department of Justice in its efforts to convict enemies of the United States: Now, therefore, be it resolved," and then it goes on about what action the Legion should take, and so on, a very long resolution. You are all familiar with it.

That speech and bill of mine applied only in time of peace, not in time of war, and it was an effort to bring the peacetime sedition law within the confines of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. Your own Legion preamble reads "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States." I am against these peacetime sedition laws or trials, except for overt acts where people go out and spread propaganda or distribute leaflets inciting mutiny upon warships or in Army camps. And I am against indicting anybody in peacetime contrary to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, or denying them the right of free speech because they may criticize the administration, the President, the New Deal, communism, or even if they are anti-Semitic. I am not the slightest bit anti-Semitic, but there is nothing in the Constitution that relates to it, and I agree thoroughly with Thomas Jefferson about the dangers of peacetime sedition laws and trials and limiting free speech in time of peace.

Gentlemen, I feel, as a Legionnaire, that the Legion has been made use of to attack one of its own members, to smear a fellow Legionnaire, to smear all isolationists, to smear the America First Committee, and to impugn their motives, their Americanism, and their patriotism, with not an iota of evidence.

Now I am going to quote from the law, and I am going to tell you where this resolution came from. I had a great deal of difficulty finding out who sponsored it, until the national commander told me he had received a letter from Lewis Hayd Leve, who said that he had sponsored it. Then I found out that this resolution was largely based upon articles in a magazine called the Reporter, published by Henry Hoke. This same magazine contains an article in its issue of September 1943 asking for subscriptions for the Friends of Democracy, signed by Rex Stout, who, in my humble opinion, is a fellow traveler of the first water, not of the second. The organization is headed by Dr. L. M. Birkhead. I do not want to take the time, and I do not think it is up to me to criticize anyone else, but I will read to you what Mr. DIES, of the Dies committee, had to say about this organization, Friends of Democracy.

It is the same story from the beginning. It is all aimed to attack Congress, not only me, but to attack Congress and to break down the faith of the American people in their elected representatives. That has been the purpose of it from beginning to end of these attacks, whether they are over the radio or whether they are from the Friends of Democracy or dozens of others. Here is what Representative DIES says about it in the House of Representatives: "This organization on December 30 merged with the Friends of Democracy, Inc., to form one national organization to be known as the Friends of Democracy.

"The Coordinating Committee for Democratic Action, like its coconspirators, the Union for Democratic Action, the Citizens for Victory, and the New Republic, issued a special supplement to the public on the so-called voting records of the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It, like the Union for Democratic Action-New Republic supplement, attacked Members as obstructionists and Fascists in an effort to undermine the people's faith in Congress."

Mr. DIES goes on at length in the main part of his speech and says, "I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to what I conceive to be a well-organized and highly financed conspiracy on the part of devotees and followers of totalitarianism to discredit individual Members of Congress, to discredit committees of Congress, and to discredit Congress as a whole. It is a very clever piece of strategy, one with which I have been familiar for some time, a strategy that I knew 4 years ago would inevitably be used in this country when the occasion made it appropriate, the strategy of attempting to pin the Nazi or Fascist label upon all those who do not agree to certain principles or certain policies of the present administration."

That is not a Republican talking. That is Mr. DIES, chairman of the Dies committee, which the American Legion endorsed at the Omaha convention.

The alleged facts in the resolution against me, I am told, were taken from the Reporter, the same organization asking for funds for Friends of Democracy. Last May, long before the Legion, and I suppose any Legion post, acted upon this resolution, this same Reporter carried an article and a letter addressed to Hon. Frank Walker, Postmaster General, Washington, D. C., signed by the Jacoby Organization, Emanuel Jacoby, president, referring to this alleged abuse of my frank, "Last month the Reporter reproduced an envelope bearing the frank of Congressman HAMILTON FISH * * * mailed from San Diego, Calif., on April 14, 1943, to a 'dummy name' placed on the list of C. Leon de Aryan, who is under indictment for sedition, but who is now out on bail. We revealed how HAM FISH is again allowing his frank to be used by seditious characters * * * and how HAM FISH is trying to defend the 33 people who are now under indictment."

Then they wrote to the Post Office Department, asking if there is any violation. I quote further from the Reporter: "Third Assistant Postmaster General Ramsey S. Black replied:

"'With respect to the matter referred to which was mailed under the franking privilege of a Congressman, you are advised that under the provisions of paragraph 3, section 612, Postal Laws and Regulations, a Member of Congress may send a bulk shipment of franked articles properly mailable under his frank to one addressee, who, on receiving and opening the package, may, on behalf of the Member of Congress, place addresses on the franked articles and remail them for carriage and delivery to the respective addresses. This contemplates that the person who addresses and mails the matter is doing so as the representative or agent of the one whose frank appears on the matter.'

"Study that paragraph carefully. That is exactly what the Reporter has been beefing about all these years. What moral right has HAMILTON FISH, or any other Congressman, to appoint an addressing agent far removed from his own congressional district? Why shouldn't the Government or the Post Office Department have some rights to inquire about the status of the agent appointed by the Congressman? Under the present laws and regulations, HAMILTON FISH is entirely within his legal rights." In spite of the antagonistic attitude of the Reporter, the editor had to admit that I was entirely within the law. The Post Office Department stated that I am absolutely within my rights in sending these speeches out in bulk form. Of course, I do not even know this fellow, de Aryan. I do not know whether he got 25 or a hundred of my speeches. I do not care, but what I want to bring home to you is the reason I think the Legion acted ill-advisedly, because they acted with practically no consideration, with no facts before them, and no testimony or evidence. It now turns out that the charges were based on alleged abuse of the franking privilege, which the sponsors knew were not true, thus making it clear it was nothing more or less than a smear attack on me and other Members of Congress.

It is pretty hard to defeat any resolution when it comes out on the floor, because the delegates feel it has been considered thoroughly, and I probably might have voted for the resolution on the floor myself on the assumption that there had been a hearing and the facts properly considered. But I believe everybody thought, including the national commander of the Legion, that I had permitted these people to put something of

their own in my franked envelopes and to send out their own literature. It was my speech. It always has been my speech and never has it been anything else. They have always been 100 percent American, and yet the Legion fell for this smear attack without a single bit of evidence outside of a reproduction of my frank, which I admit was my frank. It could not have been sent out otherwise. If someone had put anything in that franked envelope, then it would have been a violation of law and he would have been guilty of violation of the Postal Laws and Regulations.

That is the story. That is the true story from beginning to end. Someone may ask then, How is it that a Congressman sends speeches outside of his district? We do not merely represent our own district in Congress. We do not just represent our State. We represent the whole United States when we legislate. The bills that we introduce, the speeches that we make generally about bills and legislation are usually bills that cover the entire United States. So it is the custom of every Member of Congress to send out speeches. We haven't lists, say, of bankers or businessmen or Legionnaires or farmers or railroadmen to whom to send out copies when we make speeches on those topics, but they ask for them and we send them to them in bulk packages to be remailed.

I paid for these speeches. I think there were 5,000 of these particular speeches. It cost me $30 or $40, and I sent them out to anybody who asked for them, and I want to emphasize again and again that I do not give a darn whether the man is indicted or in jail or who he is, if he wants to send them out, because they are my speeches, and I repeat, they are 100-percent American. I defy anybody in the long time that I have been in public life to find one word or one thought or one statement of mine that is un-American or against the interests of my country. Of course, you and I might have differed in the past about keeping out of war. I admit that I committed in some people's minds a mistake—well, I won't go into that. It may be political. I am leaning over backward not to be political here, because this should not be a political question in any respect. What we are talking about is above party and affects free speech in America.

I am trying to defend my own name against false and malicious charges, every one except the proper use of my frank, which I admit and which is perfectly legal, and I have sent to you copies of the law about sending out congressional speeches to be readdressed. That is all it is about.

Now let me go further and say this to you who are such great upholders of American institutions and the Constitution. Article I, section 6, of the Constitution, says: "Representatives and Senators, for any speech or debate in either House, shall not be questioned in any other place." This is in the Constitution, yet I have been questioned about a speech that I made in the Congress, which I am proud of in every respect. It is also part of the Constitution that every Member of Congress shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America against its enemies, foreign and domestic, and those are my firm convictions and always have been.

I should like any Legionnaire, if he knows of anything that I have ever said that is seditious, un-American, or against the interests of my country, to say so.

I don't want to blame the Legion—I am too devoted a Legionnaire—for these hasty and malicious charges that were slipped through the Legion, utterly false and baseless, impugning my character, all isolationists, and members of America First Committee, those and millions and millions of Americans who felt like we did.

I thank you for this opportunity to answer these charges and to ask you to take definite action, whether it is action here now, giving me a clean bill of health, or probably, preferably, the appointment of a committee to investigate, to get at the facts of these charges, every one of which I have denounced as malicious lies, so that not only those whose acts have been impugned will be cleared, but so that the Legion will be cleared and that is no small issue. I am not going any further, but I could read you resolutions from Legion posts in Minneapolis and other places, denouncing this as a contemptible smear from beginning to end and letters by the hundreds.

This isn't politics, but I know enough about the workings of politics, and that if something isn't done to correct this record the Legion will be in politics, head over heels, in every Legion post in this country, not of your doing, and certainly not of mine, but every Red, Communist, and pink will use this resolution to denounce me, the party I belong to, all former isolationist Members of Congress and of the America First Committee. They will spread it all over the country and bring it into Legion posts, and they will be divided on both sides, fighting over an issue that is utterly false and scurrilous, a complete and contemptible smear attack.

I thank you, Mr. Commander, for your spirit of fair play, and the members of the national executive committee for permitting me, just a humble Legionnaire nowadays, but a devoted one and a loyal one, to come here and give my side of the case and the true side of the case. I will, with the permission of the commander, answer any question.

I believe that most Legionnaires thought my frank was used by someone inserting his own literature and not mine. I want to reiterate and emphasize that I have never made any speech that wasn't 100 percent American. Members of Congress are and should continue to be entitled to the franking privilege unless you want to curtail free speech, which is the essence of free America, without which there would be no longer a free America. As long as I am in Congress—and I expect to be there a long while—I shall fight to uphold free speech, a free press, and representative and constitutional government and the inherent right of every American to criticize the administration and to express his own views publicly.

In conclusion, just to make my position clear, I want to read an amendment I sponsored that expresses my own views which was incorporated in a recent bill in the Congress of the United States and indicates what I have been fighting for: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any citizen, or citizens, or any newspaper or other publications, at any time from freely discussing or openly criticizing the domestic or foreign policies of the administration or the Federal Government or of any public official, or from discussing or criticizing any existing or proposed law, regulation, directive, or Executive order." That amendment was offered by me, debated and adopted by the House.

Also, I want to include two short statements, one by the Speaker of the House, who said in a speech at Muhlenberg College recently:

"The Members of Congress are today under attack, and it seems in some quarters there is a studied attempt to destroy the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives. Congress cannot run this war, but it has done its duty. It has given the administration every law and every dollar it has asked for, for the purpose of defense of the Nation."

The other is by a Member of Congress who has been there even longer than I have. He says, "The whole Congress has been subjected to attack by left-wing, un-American groups in this country, which has manufactured malicious lies as a means of weakening and destroying the confidence of the people in their representatives."

I haven't the time to submit all the data I have here, including the speech I made when war was declared, over the radio and in the Congress of the United States, pledging my support of every administrative measure to win the war to which I have adhered in every possible way.

Mr. Commander, I would appreciate it if you would grant time to any member here to ask me any questions that may be on their minds, because it is generally easier and more direct to answer questions than simply to speak and present the facts without fear or favor.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Homer L. Chaillaux, director of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, dated November 29, 1943, in which he states:

The committee named by the national commander to investigate the charges made in resolution No. 296 is as follows: Henry W. Colmery, chairman, 138 Greenwood, Topeka, Kans.; Edward A. Mulrooney, 101 Orange Street, Wilmington, Del.; W. H. Hargraves, 2437 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Deduction of Insurance Premiums From Income Recommended as Far Back as 1799

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to two letters received by me in support of my bill, H. R. 3736, providing for deduction of certain amounts of insurance premiums from income taxes, as follows:

DETROIT, *November 30, 1943.*

In re H. R. 3736, by Wickersham, providing deduction of insurance premiums for income purposes.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I happen to have a copy of the First English Income Tax Act, of which item (5), under "General deductions from income," reads as follows:

"5. Persons who have made or shall make insurance on their respective lives, or on the lives of their respective wives, shall be at liberty, in addition to any other deductions, to deduct the amount of the premium of such insurance for the current year."

This information probably will assist you in the passage of your bill providing for such deductions. I thought it might be of interest to you to know that there was a historical precedent. The date was 1799.

Very truly yours.

FRANCIS E. ROSS.

JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL
LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., November 30, 1943.

In re: H. R. 3736, introduced by yourself, providing for certain deductions of insurance premiums from income taxes.

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: I was mighty happy to learn that you had introduced House bill 3736 providing for the deduction of life-insurance

premiums for income-tax purposes and I sincerely hope this bill receives enthusiastic support from the House and the Senate.

As you know, dollars paid into life-insurance companies are really triple-duty dollars. First, the life-insurance dollars are largely used for defense. Life-insurance investments are a potent force in financing our war effort. I am sure you have available the figures showing the amount of money life-insurance companies have loaned the Government and the volume of life-insurance dollars invested in Government bonds is increasing daily. Second, life-insurance dollars are anti-inflationary dollars because every dollar which goes into life-insurance premiums is a dollar invested in thrift, rather than a dollar spent in a time of decreased production for civilian needs. Third, life-insurance dollars are dollars for family security, because life insurance is a vital factor in the economic stability and security of the individual and the family. The strength of America is the strength of the American family.

Your experience in representing this company has, I am sure, given you first-hand knowledge of the facts I have just outlined and I know, from your past performance, you will put your enthusiasm and untiring efforts into the job of getting this legislation approved.

Do not hesitate to call on me if I can be of help in any way.

Sincerely yours,

FERREL M. BEAN,
General Agent.

Argentine Turkeys

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 1943, there appeared in the Chicago Tribune, of Chicago, Ill., the following news item:

BUY ARGENTINE TURKEYS TO GIVE CREWS OF ALLIES

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 16.—The Roosevelt administration has taken funds from the United States Treasury to pay for more than 2,000,000 pounds of turkeys bought by the British Government in Argentina, it was learned today.

The purchase was made from the British by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It turned the turkeys over to the War Shipping Administration. The War Shipping Administration put them in an Allied food pool, where they will be available for stocking British, Russian, or any other Allied merchant ships at no cost to that nation. Food for Allied ships is paid for with lend-lease funds.

BROUGHT TO THE UNITED STATES

The turkeys, along with some other South American poultry, were brought to the United States in refrigerated boats.

The price paid for the turkeys remains unannounced, with both Commodity Credit Corporation and War Shipping Administration officials unwilling to reveal them. A War Shipping Administration official said, when pressed, that the prices were lower than the current market prices for domestic birds.

OUR CREWS HAVE TROUBLE

But while the United States was making it easy for the Allied Nations to obtain food for their boats when they dock here, it was learned authoritatively that United States merchant ships were forced to go into the black markets in some foreign ports to get food.

War Shipping Administration officials said every effort is being made to avoid the necessity of Americans having to frequent black markets for food.

I have official information that this story is incorrect. The information I have received is as follows:

That the British Government had nothing to do with the purchase of the turkeys mentioned in this item. The transaction was negotiated by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Of the turkeys purchased, 85 percent were released to the United States Army and 15 percent were released to the Maritime Commission and were used by the Maritime Commission to victual American ships. The turkeys supplied to the United States Army were shipped to overseas theaters of war, such as and including Guadalcanal, to supply our boys with turkey for Thanksgiving. These turkeys came into market in August, which is ahead of our turkey run. This early purchase of turkeys, therefore, made it possible for us to supply distant areas with turkeys for Thanksgiving. The same reason applied to early turkeys furnished maritime ships which are on long voyages.

I was also informed that these turkeys were furnished Allied ships and therefore no lend-lease funds were involved.

The only thing about this story which is correct is the fact that the turkeys were brought to the United States in refrigerator boats. As a matter of fact, that is the only way that they could be preserved. There is relatively little use for refrigerated space on ships making the return trip from South America and this fact presented an opportunity to take advantage of the refrigerator space for these turkeys.

I am also informed that the price paid was slightly under our ceiling price.

If the Chicago Tribune acted in good faith in carrying the incorrect story as referred to in the above item, the only honorable thing for this newspaper to do is to retract the story and to give as wide publicity as possible to the incorrect information conveyed to its readers in the news item which appeared in the issue of November 17, 1943. Newspapers wield a tremendous influence. They possess a great power. That power is a trust. The exercise of that power, at all times, and particularly during wartimes, should be done with extreme care and caution.

A Sound Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on November 26 the Indianapolis Star printed an editorial that rings true to the needs of our country. It dealt with the tax problem in a way which I think is sound and constructive. I have long believed that the best way to meet the financial exigency that faces the Nation is to cut appropriations drastically instead of piling on more taxes to drain individual resources and stifle private enterprise.

Our subcommittee on deficiencies made a good start in that direction recently when we reduced one appropriation bill almost a $1,000,000,000 below the estimates that were sent to us by the Bureau of the Budget. I hope that rather amazing record will be a prelude to a general policy of cutting appropriation estimates to the very bone wherever that can be done without impairing vital activities.

I commend the editorial of the Indianapolis Star as an exemplification of sound philosophy at this critical time when straight thinking is so much in demand. Especially do I call attention to the last sentence of the editorial which I regard as an accurate and concise summation of the tax policy that should control Congress:

Individuals and industry, as well as the Government, are entitled to a chance to remain solvent.

By unanimous consent of the House, I present the Star's editorial for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SECOND WARTIME TAX BILL

The House Members have served notice on the administration that it is time to take a practical down-to-earth view of war financing. The Treasury Department requested a second wartime revenue bill calling for an increase of $10,500,000,000 a year in taxes. The House, acting with little loss of time in debate, passed a bill, 200 to 27, that will yield $2,139,300,000 additional income.

The measure, as it goes to the Senate, makes comparatively little difference in the sums individuals will be called on to pay in personal income taxes. The new money will come largely from increased levies on so-called luxuries. More will be collected on liquors, on jewelry, furs, on admission taxes, on transportation and other items that are not considered absolutely essential in the cost of living.

Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, said of the administration's proposal for a $10,500,000,000 increase in Federal taxes: "In my opinion, such a crushing burden of taxation would be far worse than any real or fancied danger of inflation now facing our country." It is bad enough to pile a crushing public debt on posterity. We also should guard against levies that will weaken our present economic structure.

The proposed $2,139,300,000 bill will raise the Federal revenues to well over $40,000,000,000 annually. That is more than half what the national income was in prewar times. It is just as well to give consideration to the fact that national income will be subject to important variations along with changes in the war situation and with the coming of peace. We should cut our tax garment according to the cloth we may have at our disposal.

The heads of the War Department, for example, recently admitted that they were authorized to spend $13,000,000,000 more than will be needed. It is becoming apparent that we have reached or passed the peak of war production. The trend from this time is

likely to be downward. It is high time to trim expenditures to fit needs and to keep taxes as low as possible. Individuals and industry, as well as the Government, are entitled to a chance to remain solvent.

A Report for Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of November 13, 1943:

A REPORT FOR EXPERTS

When lend-lease settlements are being worked out sometime after the war will all the experts be present?

For example:

Will mothers—mothers of men who have floated to safety on the 1-man dinghies developed by the British for their parachutists but supplied to American aviators?

Will wives—wives of fliers who owe their lives to special radio equipment provided under reverse lend-lease for American air forces battering Germany?

Will fathers—fathers of men who survived the cold of high altitudes in specially heated suits made available by America's chief ally in the air?

Will children—children of men who came home again because of the improved armor produced for fliers—British or American—in British plants?

The interested governments may continue to make their reports. They may even stress, as President Roosevelt's report to Congress on reverse lend-lease does, the intangible factors which comradeship-in-arms imposes in any fair-minded calculation of post-war obligations among the Allies. They may point out as the British White Paper on the same subject does, that "The principle of the transfer of goods and services without charge or calculation is a necessary part of the efficient planning of the war. * * *" But the experts who know best what all this means—the experts we have named above—must make their voices heard in the settlement.

Nevertheless, the submission of the reverse lend-lease report—with some figures—by the President is a timely act. It is becoming every day more necessary that some idea of the aid the United States is receiving from its allies be offered the American people.

Washington's attitude toward the lend-lease problem is sometimes misunderstood as being a sort of loose and sentimental one. But it is nothing of the sort. Where American supplies, or airfields, or bases exist and represent a real post-war value to countries in which they are situated, settlements will be worked out on the basis of value. In other cases the supplies will be sold by American agencies to the nearest and most profitable markets for them. Where goods have been used up in warfare the accounting will be more delicate. But the final settlements will be arrived at with a view to stimulating prosperous world trade.

The American people, and other peoples, need to know that Washington is looking forward to a businesslike settlement that is also a statesmanlike settlement. The new Under Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, with long experience in lend-lease, is the type of man to reassure Americans on this point. A fair-minded settlement is becoming daily more possible, even on the basis of figures. If all peoples after the war remember what their pooling of resources has bought them, the settlement will only bind them closer together in peace.

A Plan To Solve the Oil Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to two letters from Sam P. Shelburne, Oklahoma City, Okla. They are as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
November 20, 1943.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am herewith enclosing a copy of a letter I have written to Fred M. Vinson et al., in which I have made a simple suggestion which, in my opinion, will solve the perplexing oil reserves and price-increase questions.

I would appreciate your giving it your earnest consideration.

Yours very truly,

SAM P. SHELBURNE.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
November 20, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my opinion that you can solve the declining oil reserve and price controversy by the following simple process:

"Raise the price of crude oil 50 cents per barrel; earmark 40 cents of such raise to be spent back in drilling for new production, and any part thereof not so spent to bear a 100 percent Federal excise tax. Exempt stripper wells, that is, wells which make under five barrels a day. They are now operating at a loss."

This plan will put the money into the hands of those who know best how to spend it to bring in new oil wells. It adds nothing to profits. It is not inflationary.

Gasoline prices would be slightly increased to the public, but they won't mind since it is being spent to relax rationing.

The Government, which now purchases about one-fourth of all petroleum produced, would pay a slight increase. This would be partially offset by the tax money received for that portion not spent in drilling.

I am one of the small oil producers, yet from the wells I operate we produce and market enough oil each month to provide fuel for 110 four-motored bombers, round trip, from London to Berlin; also, to run 3,000 jeeps from New York to San Francisco; and in addition, to sail the Queen Mary across the ocean.

For the past 10 years I have run from one to three strings of tools, continuously looking for new oil. With the present high operating costs and low market price, it is now hard for me to keep even one going. With the adoption of the above-mentioned plan, I could keep two, perhaps three, running.

I am inclined to believe that most producers' problems are about like mine. This plan, I believe, will solve mine. I submit it to you for your mature consideration.

Yours very truly,

SAM P. SHELBURNE.

The Patton Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John G. Bragaw, from the Washington Daily News of Washington, N. C.:

NOW AND THEN

(By John G. Bragaw)

I have been reading and listening and thinking about this Patton affair. I have heard or read it seems to me every possible angle of it. And I am left with two very distinct impressions.

One is that, after all is said and done, it is a matter for the War Department to handle, and not the newspapers or the commentators or the Members of the National Congress.

The other impression is one of curiosity as to how many of the editors and commentators and Congressmen and Senators who are condemning, and private citizens who are writing frenzied letters to the papers demanding this and that dire punishment for General Patton have ever been in a condition similar to or even remotely resembling that in which General Patton was when the incident occurred. It is the easiest thing in creation to say what another man ought to do or ought not to do. It is easy to say after a crisis has passed involving someone else just what that other person ought to have done in that crisis. What you or I would have done, or what those who are heaping abuse upon the man would have done if placed in the same position, is another matter.

It is one thing for a man to be under the strain and emotion and physical and nervous tension General Patton was under, and an entirely different thing for editors and Congressmen and private citizen writers safe and comfortable 3,000 miles away from danger to sit in their chairs and judge.

And yet in one respect it is an age-old situation—an old, old story. Let a man live an exemplary life and then make one mistake and we forget all the good he has ever done and point our fingers at his one error. Do a man 500 favors and he thanks you—refuse him once and he forgets all you have ever done for him and abuses you.

One thing General Patton did: When he realized the mistake he had made he came out like a man and apologized to the one he had injured, and then made public apology to his army. It required moral courage to do that—and there are some of those who are abusing General Patton who have never had the moral courage or the sense of honor to make apologies when they have been found in the wrong.

We are to assume, I suppose, that none of those who are demanding General Patton's head have ever made a mistake; that each of them, in every act of his life, has done exactly the thing he should have done; that each of them knows precisely what needs to be done at every turn, every day, in every way.

If it were not tragic it would be amusing. It carries us back to a memorable scene in which one Person said to a group of frenzied self-righteous people. "Let him that is without sin among you first cast a stone at her."

"A commonplace life," we say, and we sigh:
But why should we sigh as we say?
The commonplace sun in the commonplace sky
Makes up the commonplace day.
The moon and the stars are commonplace things
And the flower that blooms and the bird that sings,
But dark were the world and sad our lot
If the flowers failed and the sun shone not;
And God, who studies each separate soul
Out of commonplace lives makes His beautiful whole.

—*Anonymous.*

Address of Hon. Clifford Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an address delivered recently by my distinguished colleague, Hon. CLIFF DAVIS, of Tennessee, before the annual meeting of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Association at Memphis, Tenn.

For the second time since the turn of the century we are locked in a death struggle with the huge forces of evil which seek to dominate the entire world. The present struggle differs from that of 25 years ago, not only in ferocity but in scope. In 1917-19, American soldiers fought on a battle front of 102 miles while the entire battle line was little more than twice that. Today, our armed forces are fighting on the seven seas and the five continents which comprise the world.

It requires not only bravery but pure grit and determination on the part of our servicemen to fight this war. Those men of ours have stood long, weary watches at bleak, outlying posts all over the world. They have fought endless hours in the jungles of the Southwest Pacific, the deserts of Africa, the mountains of Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy, and the snow-capped peaks of the Aleutians. They have been too hot, too cold, too weary, never wholly comfortable. Yet, despite hardships, they have battled on because they are fighting for a priceless heritage.

Eventual victory requires more than courage, more than the will to win; it demands strong and healthy bodies for our fighting men. From the countless island bases, from lonely outposts, from the battle fronts, these soldiers of democracy look to American agriculture for the food that makes and maintains those strong and healthy bodies. They do not, and I am confident that they never will, look in vain.

In this mighty struggle to establish once and for all freedom of all mankind, none plays a more important part than the American farmer. It is his toil and sweat and ingenuity that provides our fighting men with the world's best food, wherever they may be. It is the fruits of his labor that feed the millions of men and women in the Nation's war plants who are turning out the ships, planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and other items of war. It is through his effort that some measure of relief is being carried to the starving men, women, and children of less fortunate countries.

I frankly stand in awe of the accomplishments of American agriculture during these critical times, of the results achieved despite what seemed unconquerable handicaps. Even before this Nation entered the war, it was foreseen that the United States would be called upon to produce more food products than had ever been dreamed of. We called upon you to produce more. You did produce more. Each year you continued to produce more despite the havoc wrought by weather conditions, the increasing shortage of farm labor, the alarming lack of new machinery and replacement parts. In 1943, for the fifth straight year, the men and women of the soil broke all existing production records.

In the light of these facts, there is no reason why I should exhort new efforts or plead for increased vigor on your part. Your record tells the world that you are willing, yes, even anxious, to do more than would normally be demanded of you. Instead, I want to pay tribute to the splendid job you have done; I want to tell you how your work has helped the war effort. If there are any in this audience who modestly think that what they are doing is not fully as important as work in the war plants or service at the battle fronts, let me undeceive them once and for all.

Soldiers at arms must fight on the battle fronts; soldiers of production must fight on the home front. Food, however, must fight on both fronts. More men and women are working today than ever before in the history of our Nation, toiling at jobs of which many are harder than any they had ever before known. Health and stamina of these workers require that they eat more than in normal times when life moves more smoothly for most of us.

Also, vast amounts of productive land which belonged to or which was controlled by our allies, and many smaller nations which supplied them with many food products, are in enemy hands. Those nations can look no place except to America, the most productive country of the world, for subsistence aid. This aid we are giving through lend-lease.

Then, too, when the United Nations have rescued and set free once more the lands conquered by the enemy, it is found that the retreating enemy has stripped such lands of food and other products, and, not content with looting, he has applied the scorched-earth policy, burning all that he could not conveniently take with him. We must help them to become self-sufficient again.

Most important of all—and I mention it last because I wish to discuss it at length—are our own armed forces, which unquestionably represent the greatest mass-feeding operation in world history. This task is performed by the Quartermaster Corps—that great supply branch of the Army Service Forces which feeds and clothes our Army and, in addition, supplies it with tens of thousands of other items.

The story of the achievements of the Quartermaster Corps is truly an amazing one—how, today, it is feeding more than 7,000,000 soldiers in camps, posts, and installations at home and along a 56,000-mile battle front. You will see how important your effort is to the Army as I tell you that story just as the records of the office of the Quartermaster General revealed it to me.

All of us know that the fighting man eats more during his military service than he did as a civilian worker. The average soldier, under normal conditions, eats a little more than 5 pounds of food every day. In cold figures, this means that our Army at its present strength requires more than 35,000,000 pounds of food every day and nearly 13,000,000,000 pounds a year. And this figure does not include the food needed by the 3,000,000 in the Navy, marines, and other military services.

In order to assure that our armed forces will have enough food at the right place at the right time, the Quartermaster Corps must have considerable amounts on hand at all times. In the case of seasonal foods, enough must be bought to last from one season to another.

Usually, a 2½-month reserve at any specified time is enough backlog for the troops stationed or in training within the continental United States. But, as you know, the supply lines that carry the food to our men overseas are long and dangerous; there a somewhat different situation obtains. In order to be sure that our expeditionary forces will be fed properly day after day, the Quartermaster Corps must have on hand, or under contract, a 247-day supply of food.

Here is how it is figured. First of all, a 15-day supply is constantly in transit, from the markets to the depots or the depots to the ports of embarkation. An additional 65-day supply must be on hand at the great Army depots or the ports of embarkation. An amount equal to a 30-day supply is always somewhere on the high seas, bound for foreign ports, some of which are as much as eight or ten thousand miles away. Still another 70-day supply must be on hand at the big receiving depots on the other side of the world, while another 45-day supply must be at the advanced dumps and with the troops in the battle area. Finally, there must be available a 22-day supply to cover possible losses from ship sinkings, bombing attacks on depots, dumps, and supply lines and from other combat causes.

This job of planning and buying food for millions of men, sometimes as much as 9 months in advance, is a big one, but it is only one of a string of factors which must be achieved in keeping our Army the best-fed Army in the world.

Fresh meats and vegetables are provided for the troops whenever possible. In the zone of the interior, that is, the continental United States, this is a reasonably simple matter but in the theater of operations it is more difficult. Most of the countries, aside from the fact that they have been robbed by the enemy, are barely self-sustaining in normal times.

In order to supply soldiers with fresh food they might not otherwise receive, the Army has cultivated Victory gardens in plots behind barracks in the United States, artificial oases on desert islands, and Pacific outposts. The Quartermaster Corps has been sending seeds and gardening tools to areas where a little garden-fresh food is needed to relieve the monotony of food from cans and packages.

Not all of these so-called Victory gardens were of the tiny plot variety so common to American backyards this past summer. Some of them in camps ranged from 1 to 40 acres. Maj. Gen. Robert Littlejohn reported recently that upward of 14,000 acres were in cultivation in Great Britain, raising vegetables for the American troops.

Notwithstanding these facts, a large portion of the servicemen's food outside the continental United States is necessarily of the canned, frozen, dehydrated, or powdered variety. Increasing use by the Army of frozen foods has brought about a decrease in the amount of canned food per man to meet subsistence needs. Frozen foods are distributed to the continental camps, posts, and installations to save canned goods for the men overseas. These vegetables include peas, snap beans, lima beans, corn, spinach, asparagus, kale, broccoli, beets, cherries, blueberries, and raspberries. Frozen foods are packed in a variety of packages ranging from 12 ounces to 40-pound drums.

Another development which has had a tremendous effect on food for the fighting men is dehydration. It is not new, for many of you have practiced it in your own

homes for years. However, you called it drying instead of dehydration. You dried your corn and peaches and apples by exposing them to the natural rays of the sun. Now the process is accomplished by mechanical means. It got a small start as a commercial industry in the First World War, but until recently the need has never been sufficiently great for it to compete successfully with other methods of processing.

When World War No. 2 began, however, we didn't have much choice in the matter. We had to make the most of shipping space. Subsistence experts of industry and the Quartermaster Corps set about finding a method of removing water from food which would still leave the flavor and the nutrition value—and they succeeded.

This development has been a valuable contribution to the war effort. It has enabled the Army to use less cargo space on our ships for food and devote more to munitions and other supplies. For instance, 100 pounds of eggs as they come from the hen houses take up about 4 cubic feet of shipping space; the same amount when dehydrated weighs about 22 pounds and needs only 1 cubic foot of space. Many other items, such as potatoes, onions, carrots, beets, cabbage, and so on, are largely water and can be reduced from 80 to 90 percent in weight and volume.

These foods produced and prepared for our troops overseas must arrive in good condition whether the destination is a torrid jungle zone or some spot in the frozen north. They must be packaged in containers to meet all requirements and which can be readily handled under almost unbelievable conditions. Sometimes food must be dropped by parachute from planes to isolated units which cannot be supplied in any other manner. Mountain and cold-climate troops must have their food packaged so that it can be transported by pack mule, by dog sled, or even on their own backs. In the Attu campaign food was transported on the backs of the soldiers themselves, who crawled through the snow over the treacherous mountain peaks and lowered it with ropes to their waiting comrades under the overhanging cliffs, while constantly under enemy sniper fire.

In the offensive against the Japs in the Owen Stanley Mountains and during the period of the ensuing Buna campaign, most of the transportation of supply on land was also by man. Fortunately, however, it was possible to hire Papuans as native bearers. Since the normal load which they were capable of carrying averaged only about 40 pounds, it is readily seen that all the packages had to be compact.

Sometimes food packages must be tossed from ships into offshore waters to be floated to the beaches by the tide. Such packages must be light and watertight. This is not an unusual procedure during the landing of invasion troops when every second of time counts and munitions necessarily carry a high priority on the space available on the landing barges and boats.

Because of these varying ways in which food is distributed and transported, the Army has had to standardize its packages in sizes which could be easily and quickly handled whether shipped by rail or truck, boat or plane, carried by animal or man. Concentrated emergency rations have been developed by the Quartermaster Corps to the extent that a soldier can carry a day's supply in his pocket; regular rations have been packaged in such a way that 1 man can easily carry enough in 1 container to supply 10 men for 1 day.

But there are many other things besides food which the farmers are producing for the war effort. One group raises cotton which goes into clothing needed by both civilians and soldiers; it is also used to make life rafts, raincoats, explosives, tires for our cars and jeeps, and for hundreds of other items of equipment such as belts, canteen covers, and cartridge cases. Another group raises the sheep which produce our wool. Grains are converted into alcohol and synthetic rubber; soybeans produce glycerin for explosives, while flax provides linseed oil for camouflage paint. Peanuts and other products give us cooking oils. And so it goes with almost every product raised on the farms.

As I mentioned at the beginning, I am not going to urge you to new efforts for I know that you do not need such an admonition. You have given generously of your toil for production. You have purchased many War bonds to help finance the war. You have given your men and women to the military services, and some of them in turn have given their lives that not only ourselves but all men and women shall have liberty, religion, and freedom from fear. We have not, we will not, relax or think of ourselves until the goal is reached.

Price of Crude Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Gov. John J. Dempsey, a former member of this House, to the other Governors of these States on the subject of the price of crude petroleum, and a list of the Governors who responded:

NOVEMBER 19, 1943.

DEAR GOVERNOR: This letter, sponsored by Governors Coke Stevens, of Texas, Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas, Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana, Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Lester G. Hunt, of Wyoming, John W. Bricker, of Ohio, and myself, is the result of a recent conference and an exchange of correspondence in which we discussed the extreme seriousness of the oil situation.

The outlook for sufficient oil supplies for the Nation's fuel and essential driving needs is rapidly becoming so critical that we have deemed it advisable to bring the matter to the attention of all the Governors.

Gasoline rationing was initiated originally in the East for lack of transportation facilities, and throughout the rest of the country as a tire conservation measure. Tighter rationing of gasoline and fuel oil later became necessary because of continual decreases in storage reserves. Now, increasing demands of the military forces have reached the stage where even stricter rationing is necessary on a Nation-wide basis because of actual shortages for civilian use.

Depletion of available reserves has continued to the extent that we face the condition where production is not able to take care of demand.

With continued heavier requirements of the military forces, we may expect to reach by spring a truly precarious situation in the oil industry, which will inevitably make necessary further reductions in fuel and gasoline for civilian use.

To provide for military requirements and the essential driving and fuel needs of the American public in 1944, production of oil must be increased. But production cannot be increased or reserves built up without new discoveries.

Under present price control ceilings, exploration is virtually at a standstill. Increased costs of material and labor, coupled with arbitrary price restrictions, have stifled incentive for new development. Since much crude is being produced below the cost of operation, there is little inducement even to bring in a producer. While the bigger companies might be able to offset such losses through profits in many outlets, the independent, who produces crude oil only, is in no such favorable position and is facing elimination from the oil industry.

In addition, stripper wells, which individually yield only a few barrels daily, but in the aggregate account for a considerable portion of our Nation's total output, are being abandoned due to excessive production costs.

The situation is really critical, but the solution is so simple that we continue to be amazed that prompt action is not taken.

We are asking that the price of crude oil be brought up to parity.

Unless higher production costs can be offset in some way, we have no hope of stimulating discovery and new production. So far we have the choice of further depletion of reserves and lowered production, or offering an incentive for new discoveries and new production. This can be accomplished either by an increase in the price of crude oil or a program of Government-financed drilling.

The Government recognizes that something must be done to remedy the situation. Federal officials have advocated a subsidy. We want to do it the time-honored American way—through encouragement of private initiative.

We do not believe there is any State in the Union which would advocate turning the production of oil over to the Government and eliminating this great industry from the business scene.

In normal times, only the oil-producing States would be greatly interested in exploratory work and the expansion of existing fields. Now, however, with the Nation facing an acute shortage of crude oil, every State has a vital interest in this problem.

As Governors of the respective States, we feel that it is our responsibility to see that civilians obtain sufficient gasoline to perform essential duties and to make certain that sufficient fuel oil is available for industrial and domestic purposes. This is an obligation that must be fulfilled if our present economic system is to be preserved. If the motor car disappears from our streets and highways our whole economic structure will have to be reorganized. We are sure that you share this view of the problem confronting us, since this problem is common to all the States

Final solution must rest with Congress, because recommendations of the oil industry, the oil-producing States and the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War have gone unheeded by the Office of Economic Stabilization.

We feel that united action on the part of the Governors of the 48 States will have great influence in relieving this grave situation. There is no doubt in our minds that through our united action Congress will authorize the requested increase in the price of crude. Once the price is increased we are confident that wild-cat operations will bring in new fields and assure sufficient oil for essential civilian needs, and, of course, continue to provide all the oil necessary for war purposes.

We therefore urge that in behalf of the people of your State you bring this matter to the attention of your State's congressional delegation with the recommendation that prompt action be initiated to avert a crucial gasoline and fuel-oil shortage in the United States in 1944.

We will appreciate your advice and any suggestions you have to offer which will carry forward this program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor.

Name of Governor, State, and reply:

Coke R. Stevenson, Texas	Yes.
Andrew Schoeppel, Kansas	Do.
John J. Dempsey, New Mexico	Do.
Lester C. Hunt, Wyoming	Do.
Sam H. Jones, Louisiana	Do.
Robert S. Kerr, Oklahoma	Do.
Dwight Griswold, Nebraska	Do.
Dwight H. Green, Illinois	Do.
Edward Martin, Pennsylvania	Do.
John C. Vivian, Colorado	Do.
Homer M. Adkins, Arkansas	Will reply later.
Earl Warren, California	Do.
Thomas E. Dewey, New York	Do.
Greek L. Rice (attorney general), Mississippi	Governor Johnson ill—unable to answer.
Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia	No.
Sam C. Ford, Montana	Do.
John W. Bricker, Ohio	Yes.

The above are replies from Governors of oil-producing States.

Oil letter

Name of Governor, State, and reply:

M. Q. Sharpe, South Dakota	Yes.
Olin D. Johnston, South Carolina	Do.
Raymond E. Baldwin, Connecticut	Do.
Robert O. Blood, New Hampshire	Do.
Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland	Do.
Walter S. Goodland, Wisconsin	Noncommittal.
Forrest C. Donnell, Missouri	Do.
Sumner Sewall, Maine	Do.
B. B. Hickenlooper, Iowa	Do.
Prentice Cooper, Tennessee	Do.
Arthur B. Langlie, Washington	Do.
Ellis Arnall, Georgia	Do.

The above are from Governors of non-oil-producing States, and original letters are attached.

Army Construction Work in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 3 (legislative day of Thursday, November 18), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, for 3 consecutive days, beginning on November 29, 1943, Fulton Lewis, Jr., a radio commentator, addressed himself to a condition which is giving no end of concern to Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that each of the broadcasts be printed in the RECORD.

I have been advised that the three broadcasts will exceed two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have had an estimate made of cost of printing the broadcasts, which is $157.50.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

This broadcast tonight, ladies and gentlemen, is originating from Los Angeles, Calif. So you see we did get here to the Pacific coast after all, in spite of no air travel priorities. Thanks to the personal assistance of Mr. William M. Jeffers, the former Rubber Administrator in Washington, now back at his job as head of the Union Pacific Railroad, I arrived here yesterday morning.

Ever since that arrival I have been digging through the sworn records of a special investigating committee of the California State Legislature headed by State Senator Jack Tenney. I have interviewed the committee counsel and investigators, I have cross-checked with Washington and with Army engineer officers and with contractors in Canada and elsewhere, and while the story that is here is so weird as to be almost fantastic in its complications and ramifications, I will try to tell it to you as simply as possible.

You probably are familiar with the development before the Truman investigating committee in Washington last week in connection with the $134,000,000 oil development by the United States Army in northern Canada, the wells that were drilled and the pipeline that was installed and the refinery that was set up at White Horse near the Alaskan border, all of which was done on the orders of the Chief of the Services of Supply of the Army, Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, after one 20-minute conference. You remember the $259,000 office building at Edmonton, Canada, which reverts to the city of Edmonton about the 1st of January of next year, made entirely of California redwood shipped from the United States.

It was brought out in the Senate hearings that the Canadian oil project is only part of some very extensive construction work which the Army has been doing in western Canada and Alaska, including the Alcan Highway from the continental United States to Alaska, about which there has been such intense secrecy, and also a series of Army airfields along the same general route. Records in Washington show that one of the principal contractors on that work (and the total contracts run into many hundreds of millions of dollars) is a concern by the name of the Bechtel-Prince-Callahan Co. Last night, by long-distance telephone to the city of White Horse, Canada, I was informed by Gen. James A. O'Connor, who is in charge there, that a man by the name of Hans Wilhelm Rohl, R-o-h-l, whose headquarters are here in Los Angeles, also had a very considerable contract there in the course of this work, and the records show that the contracts of both of these concerns were awarded under a Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., who was the Army engineer in charge before General O'Connor got there and took over. There is the cast of characters: Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., of the Army Engineers; the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co., of Los Angeles, and Hans Wilhelm Rohl, R-o-h-l, also of Los Angeles.

With that introduction, let's cut back into the past and from here on everything I say except where it is otherwise specified is in the sworn records of this special investigating committee of the California State Legislature.

Hans Wilhelm Rohl was a German-born alien who entered the United States perfectly legally in 1913. About 1924 he went back to Germany on a German passport, stayed a few months, and returned to this country, again perfectly legally, at which time he set himself up in the contracting business. About 1935, young Theodore Wyman, Jr., who was then a captain of engineers, was assigned to Los Angeles in charge of some rather extensive flood-control work, and at that time he and Hans Wilhelm Rohl met and became close friends. According to the record they were frequent drinking companions. Mr. Rohl entertained Captain Wyman on various occasions on his several yachts, and the Rohl Construction Co., of which Mr. Rohl was the head, did a considerable business in Army contracts of various kinds. Mr. Rohl has a distinct German accent, I talked to him by telephone last night, asking if he had any comment to make, and the accent was quite noticeable, but according to his testimony in the sworn record Captain Wyman, who by this time had become Major Wyman, never questioned whether Rohl was an American citizen or not, and he just went on performing Army contracts up until late in 1940. Then in December of 1940, according to the records, the Army had a contract to be let for some very secret installations and other work on the airfields on the island of Oahu, the main island of the Hawaiian Islands, where a year later almost to the day the Japanese were to make their attack on Pearl Harbor and those Army air installations; and if you remember, the advance information which the Japanese had about Pearl Harbor and the surrounding airfields was an amazing thing to the entire world. President Roosevelt himself said afterward that we had definite information that the Germans had helped the Japanese.

When this highly confidential contract came up, according to the records, Hans Wilhelm Rohl did tell Major Wyman that he was still a German alien, this in 1940, and immediate steps were taken to get citizenship for him so that he could do the work. In the meantime, Mr. Rohl joined with the W. E. Callahan Co. (that is the Callahan of the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co. that has the huge contracts now in Canada and Alaska, the company that is building the pipe line and which built the office building at Edmonton) and another company under the name of Hawaiian Constructors, and Major Wyman, who by that time had been put in command of the Hawaiian Department of the Army engineers, awarded the contract to Hawaiian Constructors. The record shows that Rohl was a partner in Hawaiian Constructors and that even though he still was a German alien the company was given this highly secret contract and went to work on it, as far as that goes, early in 1940.

Mr. Rohl says in the record that he was careful not to have any knowledge of what the project was as long as he remained an alien. His wife, Mrs. Rohl, says on the record, however, that Mr. Rohl and his partner, Connolly, and Wyman negotiated the contract for this Hawaiian deal in San Francisco. So the situation now, as of early 1941, is that Hawaiian Constructors, of which Hans Wilhelm Rohl, still a German alien, is a partner, is performing the highly secret contract in Hawaii while Mr. Rohl's application for citizenship is pending. The records show that the local office of the Immigration Service in Los Angeles made an investigation of Mr. Rohl's background. They established certain facts about his private life before he married the present Mrs. Rohl, which cannot be discussed over the radio, but which she documented in the records. They reported that since Rohl reentered the country in 1924 from Germany legally, he has been in and out of the United States on frequent occasions and

that on at least 10 occasions he has reentered the United States illegally; that two of his yachts were in violation of alien laws—the law forbids, for obvious reasons, that any alien shall have a yacht more than 75 feet long, and these two were more than 75 feet. All this is in the Immigration Bureau file, which has been put in the record of this State legislature investigating committee, and the immigration investigator, instead of recommending that Mr. Rohl be granted citizenship, recommended his immediate arrest and deportation. The record shows that the recommendation was made by an investigator by the name of Shaw to his superior here in Los Angeles, a man by the name of Carmichael. The record then shows that Carmichael made the same recommendation to his superior in San Francisco, a man by the name of Leland B. Schofield, who had figured more or less prominently in the Harry Bridges deportation case. The record also shows that Major Wyman wrote a letter to the Immigration Service, urging that Mr. Rohl be granted citizenship. The record further shows that that letter from Major Wyman to the Immigration Service in support of Mr. Rohl now is missing from the files of the Immigration Service here.

The committee records then show that Mr. Rohl paid a $25,000 fine to the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the yachts and that on September 15, 1941, 2½ months before Pearl Harbor, a special hearing was held before Federal Judge J. F. T. O'Conor, who in the earlier days of the Roosevelt administration was Comptroller of the Currency in Washington in the Treasury Department, as you probably remember. The hearing before Judge O'Conor was held here in Los Angeles, and on September 15, 1941, Hans Wilhelm Rohl was granted his citizenship by Judge O'Conor.

I talked with Judge O'Conor yesterday and asked him if he recalled the case. He said that he had never heard any of the facts as they appeared in the Immigration records and that he was sure that the case and the facts had never been presented to him. The committee records show, however, that the Immigration Bureau file contains the following official memorandum:

"The above-named filed petition for naturalization No. 83608 in the United States District Court, Los Angeles, on March 10, 1941, and special hearing thereon was held September 15, 1941, the Honorable J. F. T. O'Conor, judge, presiding. All the facts in the case were presented to the court and no objection was made to the granting of the petition. The court, after considering all of the facts, entered an order admitting Mr. Rohl to citizenship on September 15, 1941." That is the end of the memorandum.

In any event, the record shows that Judge O'Conor did grant the citizenship to Mr. Rohl and that Mr. Rohl thereupon went to the Hawaiian Islands and began active work on the scene on the secret contract of the Army. He was there at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor December 7, 2½ months later, and so was Colonel Wyman, and according to Mr. Rohl's own testimony in the record the day after Pearl Harbor, December 8, Colonel Wyman, under General Short, canceled all Army contracts with everyone else in the entire Pacific Ocean and gave all contract work in all of the islands of the Pacific to the Hawaiian Constructors in which Mr. Hans Wilhelm Rohl was a partner.

Unofficial estimates are that the total amount of the contracts which the Hawaiian Constructors got in the Pacific islands all piled up on this one original contract for confidential work which came to just a little more than $1,000,000, amounted all told to considerably more than $100,000,000. The record shows that Colonel Wyman remained in Hawaii until April 1942, when he was shifted to Edmonton, Canada. That was just about the time the Canadian oil project and the Alcan Highway got under way and Colonel Wyman was put in complete charge of all those ventures; in fact, he negotiated and signed some of the contracts. Among the contracts was one with the Bechtel-Price-Callahan Co., the Callahan being Rohl's old partner in Hawaiian Constructors, and others were Rohl-Connolly & Foley Bros., Rohl-Connolly being Wilhelm Rohl's parent enterprise. The Army informs me that Colonel Wyman was moved from his command at Edmonton in March of this year and General O'Connor was sent in his place. Mr. Rohl last night refused to give me any details of his Alaska contract except that he has finished his part of it. He said the project was strictly confidential. General Wyman told me they were working in conjunction with Foley Bros. The Bureau of Public Roads in Washington today said, however, that they, the Federal agency of the Government which ordinarily builds all roads, began some months back building a 140-mile spur road from the Alaskan Highway to the coast of Alaska, but they were suddenly pulled off by the Army and the contract was given to a concern called Rohl-Connolly & Foley Bros. They said the contract was for about $10,000,000.

There it is. That is all there is time for tonight, but there is plenty more to come.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

I have considerable further information for you this evening, ladies and gentlemen, on the subject about which I reported to you last night. First, however, there is one official announcement out of Washington today which I want to have the personal pleasure and pride of passing along to you even though you may have heard the official information earlier today.

Some 14 years ago Mrs. Lewis and I met a couple of our new neighbors in the little community into which we had moved in Washington. He was a major in the Marine Corps and he had a very charming wife and we all became very, very fast friends, a friendship that has grown constantly over the years. It was only a few months after we met them that I offered one evening to bet the Major in the Marine Corps a hundred dollars to one that some day he would be the Commandant of the entire Marine Corps. A couple of days before, I had made a similar bet with a commander in the Navy whom we also knew very well and who lived not very far away, and I might add that those are the only two prophecies or bets of that kind that I have ever indulged in. The commander in the Navy was named Ernest J. King and you know quite well what has happened to him. He today is Admiral Ernest J. King in four-star command of the entire American Navy.

This afternoon in Washington it was announced that Lt. Gen. Alexander Archer Vandegrift will become Lieutenant General Commandant of the United States Marine Corps on January 1 succeeding Lieutenant General Holcomb, and I have won my second dollar. What's more important, the American people have won a great a wise and honorable leader at the head of the most famous, fightingest arm of the American services. If he happens to be listening to this broadcast this evening, I think he knows how proud I am to be able to give you this news over the air.

Getting back to the subject matter of last evening by way of a very brief review, I told you about the sworn records of the special investigating committee of the California State Legislature headed by State Senator Jack B. Tenney, which showed that an officer of the United States Army Engineers by the name of Theodore Wyman, Jr., first a captain back in 1935 here in Los Angeles, then a major and lieutenant colonel in charge of Army construction work in Hawaii, then a colonel in charge of all Army construction work in western Canada and Alaska—that this Theodore Wyman, Jr., was a close personal friend of a contractor here in Los Angeles by the name of Hans Wilhelm Rohl, R-o-h-l, and that Mr. Rohl, who was a German alien, received many large contracts for Army construction work under Colonel Wyman; that about a year before Pearl Harbor Colonel Wyman had some very secret construction work to do in connection with defense installations in Hawaii, and that Mr. Rohl's construction firm actually had begun work while Rohl himself was still a German alien and had not even applied for American citizenship; that the immigration authorities here investigated Mr. Rohl's past, found that he had made at least 10 illegal entries into the United States, established other violations and objections against him, and recommended his immediate arrest and deportation (that was in September of 1941), but that after Colonel Wyman wrote a special letter urging citizenship for Mr. Rohl, which letter, according to the records of the Tenney committee, is now missing from the files, Rohl was granted citizenship in spite of the adverse recommendations; that Hans Wilhelm Rohl immediately went to Hawaii after getting citizenship and went to work on the secret installations and was there at the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor; that the day after the attack, December 8, 1941, all Army contracts with everyone else in the Hawaiian Islands were canceled by the commanding general there acting through Colonel Wyman, and that Hans Wilhelm Rohl, who became an American citizen only 2½ months before, was given all Army construction work in the entire Pacific Ocean through the Hawaiian Constructors, which was Rohl's construction company, and the W. E. Callahan Co., also large operators in California headed by one Paul Grafe, in a joint enterprise; that the total of these contractors is unofficially estimated at considerably more than $100,000,000; that when the Alcan Highway and the Canadian oil project were getting started in early 1942 Colonel Wyman was shifted from the Hawaiian Islands to Edmonton, Canada, where he was put in command of the Army engineers there and given authority over all the work of the Army on those projects, and that under Colonel Wyman's command in Canada two of the contracts that were let were as follows:

One was for the construction of a spur road of about 140 miles connecting the Alcan Highway with a seaport town in Alaska, let to the Foley Construction Co., about $10,000,000—let to the Foley Construction Co. and Rohl's construction company as a joint venture of the two. The second was the contract for 500 miles of pipe line and the one that involved the construction of the $259,000 office building at Edmonton, Canada, which building was constructed of California redwood shipped into Edmonton, Canada, from the United States. That contract, which is the one that the Truman investigating committee in Washington exposed in recent hearings, was let by Colonel Wyman to a three-way joint venture, one of the three companies being the W. E. Callahan Co., which was Rohl's partner in Hawaii.

Secretary Ickes told the Truman investigating committee several weeks ago during these hearings that the whole Canadian oil project should be stopped and junked immediately, that he and his Petroleum Administrator for War have disapproved it from the beginning, and that the whole thing was manifestly unsound.

There is the background as stated last night. Let's go on with additional new facts now from the record.

Getting back to Colonel Wyman and Hans Wilhelm Rohl and these contracts, the records of this California State Legislature investigating committee show that in the years before Rohl got his American citizenship,

2½ months before Pearl Harbor, he stated on his income-tax returns to the Federal Government that he was a naturalized American citizen and had been granted his citizenship in 1921. The record shows that Rohl himself admitted on the witness stand that this was untrue, that he was not granted citizenship in 1921. The record also shows that from 1935 on, when Hans Wilhelm Rohl owned a succession of three yachts, he was making frequent trips out of the United States and back again, and that every time, with one exception, that he reentered the United States his name was missing from the manifest sheet of the immigration authorities, showing who was on board when the boat docked in home waters. The manifest showed the names of Mrs. Rohl and all guests and all members of the crew, even including six alien members of the crew, but with one exception the name of Hans Wilhelm Rohl never appeared on these manifests. The one exception was on an occasion when his yacht went to Hawaii and the record shows that on that occasion Mr. Rohl's name was listed, but he was listed as a native-born American citizen, having been born in Iola, Kans., born there on September 26, 1886. Mr. Rohl testified under oath in this record that while that is the correct date of his birth, that he was born in Lubeck, Germany, and that his wife was born in Iola, Kans.

As I told you yesterday afternoon, the contract for this secret construction work in the Pearl Harbor area was awarded by Colonel Wyman to Hawaiian Constructors, which was Rohl's company, and the two other companies about a year before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and all through early 1941 while Rohl was waiting to get his citizenship papers the Hawaiian Constructors were working on the secret contract work in Hawaii, despite the fact that Rohl, still a German alien, was part of the concern. Rohl testified that he was very careful to have no knowledge or connection with the work in Hawaii until he got his citizenship papers, and yet in another part of the record Mr. Rohl testified under questioning that Colonel Wyman in Hawaii in January of 1941, after this secret construction work had been started, wrote him a letter, which letter is in the record, ordering Rohl to come to Hawaii at his earliest convenience to consult with Colonel Wyman about ways and means on how to carry out this contract.

As to whether Mr. Rohl had telephone conversations with the people in Hawaii who actually were working on the contract through 1941 up to the time Mr. Rohl got his citizenship and went there in person in September, in other words, whether Mr. Rohl was talking by telephone from Los Angeles during the time he was still an alien, to the people who had first-hand contact with this secret construction work in Hawaii, that probably could be determined easily enough by the Truman investigating committee in Washington by subpenaing the records of the Los Angeles telephone exchange and looking at the records of telephone calls, if any, from Mr. Rohl's office and home here to the offices in Hawaii.

The record also shows that for some time prior to Pearl Harbor there was a man in the Los Angeles area by the name of Werner Plack, P-l-a-c-k, a German alien, who was seen frequently in public. Mr. Rohl testified on the witness stand that he does not remember Werner Plack, but other witnesses testified under oath that they had seen Plack and Mr. Rohl together on a number of occasions, and one witness went into considerable detail about an occasion at a Hollywood night club where the two men had come in together with a third man, at which time there was considerable fanfare and ceremony on the part of the orchestra leader by way of welcome to Mr. Rohl. The record shows that Werner Plack left the United States and went to Japan and thence back to Germany in early 1941, and that he was made an important official of the German Foreign Office in Berlin, and so far as the records show he still holds that position.

Regarding the contract on the Alaskan Highway which Mr. Rohl's company got in conjunction with the Foley Bros. Construction Co., the contract having been awarded by Colonel Wyman, once again I talked with Mr. E. T. Foley, of that company, today and I have a signed statement from him. He verified the fact that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads did start the work on this project, as I told you last night, but that Colonel Wyman took the job away from them to do it the Army's own way, that Colonel Wyman called in his company, the Foley Co., which by the way is some 70 years old and enjoys a very distinguished and enviable engineering and construction reputation—Colonel Wyman called them in and told them that they were to do this job of road construction and insisted that they do it in conjunction with Mr. Rohl's company. Mr. Foley said that his company wanted to do the job alone, without any connection with Mr. Rohl's company, but that there was nothing much that they could do about it in view of Colonel Wyman's insistence, and so Mr. Rohl supplied the floating equipment, barges and tugs, and what-not for the work.

In March of this year, 1943, the Foley Co., according to this statement, got wind of Mr. Rohl's background as a German alien and the fact that the State legislature investigating committee was investigating him, and they went immediately to Edmonton and told the Army engineers there that they didn't like the arrangement and offered to withdraw from the contract. The Army engineer officer there who had succeeded Colonel Wyman told them not to do so, and it was agreed that they would carry on and finish this spur road, which they have done, with the understanding that Rohl was not to have any personal connection with the work and was not to be on the scene there.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1943

We have had some excitement here, ladies and gentlemen, since I was on the air last night. At 8:30 this morning, the room in my suite at the hotel here—the room in which I ordinarily would be sleeping—suddenly became a blazing inferno. It was completely gutted by fire, and Mr. Fred Morrison, my assistant, who happened to be sleeping there in my place, escaped being burned to death by a matter of only a very few seconds. The bed in which he was sleeping was completely destroyed; when he woke up, it and the entire room were completely ablaze and his pajamas were completely burned off him. By a miracle he escaped with only a few minor burns. Fortunately, while some of our papers were burned, the important papers and documents in this case were in another room in which I was sleeping, so nothing important was lost. The police department of the city of Los Angeles made an investigation and immediately turned the case over to the arson squad for investigation.

In Washington this afternoon, the House Military Affairs Committee announced officially that it has assigned special investigators to the west coast to go deeply and thoroughly into the case on which I have been reporting to you for the last 2 nights—the case of Hans Wilhelm Rohl, the former German alien who was granted American citizenship just 2½ months before Pearl Harbor, and whose construction company, under the name of Hawaiian Constructors, was given, immediately after Pearl Harbor, a complete monopoly on all secret Army construction work—air fields and secret installations of every kind—in the entire Pacific Ocean. The counsel for the committee announced that the Military Affairs Committee, which has been granted special powers to investigate matters of this kind, has had its eye on this case for some weeks and is now going to make an intensive and diligent and thorough investigation of every phase of it. That means that a committee with Federal powers of subpena will take over from here on, and that Federal power of subpena is vitally important, because there are records and information in this case which the Tenney committee of the State legislature has been unable to get.

As a matter of fact, I have an appointment tomorrow afternoon with one of the special investigators for the House Military Affairs Committee here in Los Angeles, and I was requested by the committee counsel in Washington today to give that agent a complete fill-in and report of everything I have been able to find out in the matter. I shall, of course, be happy to do so. All of this means that at least all of the facts are going to be brought to light and that, of course, is all I want and all you want.

The committee announcement today said that they are going to begin public hearings on this entire matter, looking into the implications and issues growing out of relations actually maintained over years between Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., of the Army Engineers, and Hans Wilhelm Rohl, in connection with Government contracts involving the utmost military secrecy. In the meantime, the Department of Justice in Washington stated its investigation of Mr. Rohl is extremely active at the present time and that it is pursuing the investigation from three standpoints.

Now, I have a lot more material on this case from the records of the state investigating committee.

You remember from last night and the night before that Hans Wilhelm Rohl and his Rohl Construction Co., a Rohl-Connally Construction Co., joined with the W. E. Callahan Co., which is headed by a man by the name of Mr. Paul Grafe, who is now in Edmonton, Canada, with a contract on the Canadian Oil Project pipeline, and that, so joining, they formed the Hawaiian Constructors to which was given by Col. Theodore Wyman, Jr., a contract for some highly secret Army work in the Hawaiian Islands. This contract was awarded to Hawaiian Constructors, in which Rohl was one of the partners, so to speak, some 10 months before Mr. Rohl became a naturalized citizen.

As I said before, the records show that on the day after Pearl Harbor, December 8, 1941, all contracts with all other contractors were canceled by the commanding general in Hawaii, General Short, acting through Colonel Wyman, and the Hawaiian Constructors were given a complete monopoly on all Army construction work in the islands of the Pacific. The records show that Mr. Rohl directed most of the construction work in the island of Oahu in the Hawaiian group, and, as you may recall, at the time huge gangs of construction workers were shipped from the west coast to Hawaii to help out in that work.

I have before me tonight the printed records of the sworn testimony taken before the State investigating committee here in California, and I want to read for you, word for word, the testimony of a witness by the name of Ray Anderson, an expert electrician in Santa Monica, Calif., who went to Hawaii in one of those shiploads of workers and stayed for some months working for the Hawaiian Constructors. He testified he knew Mr. Rohl and Colonel Wyman, too, and the record shows that he told the committee that Colonel Wyman at one time was drunk for 5 days.

Here is the exact, verbatim record of the testimony of this witness, Ray Anderson:

"Question. Now, while you were over there, Mr. Anderson, did you ever have any occasion to see Major Wyman in an intoxicated condition?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. When was that?

"Answer. During February and March, and 5 days before Colonel Wyman left his job he lay in the hotel drunk all the time.

"Question. For how long?

"Answer. Five days.

"Question. Do you know that of your own personal knowledge?

"Answer. Yes, I can prove it.

"Question. Mr. Anderson, how do you know Colonel Wyman was intoxicated for 5 days?

"Answer. Well, I saw him up there three or four times and everyone that is in there—the place was run for that purpose, practically; Japanese girls hanging out there every night for that crowd, and the ones that stay in the main part of the hotel—you see, the hotel is split up into several large bungalows and dormitories outside of the hotel proper was occupied by Army officers and Colonel Wyman.

"Question. Including Colonel Wyman?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. What was his general reputation among the employees of Hawaiian Constructors for sobriety?

"Answer. Colonel Wyman was a man who liked liquor exceptionally well. He may never get drunk, but he likes it.

"Question. What do you mean, 'he may never get drunk'?

"Answer. A lot of them can carry a lot of liquor and you don't think they are drunk.

"Question. But you testified he was drunk for 5 days.

"Answer. Yes, he was.

"Question. Have you seen people in an intoxicated condition before?

"Answer. Oh, yes.

"Question. And that would be your opinion of his condition during those 5 days?

"Answer. Absolutely."

Mr. Combs, counsel for the committee, asked:

"I think that is all, unless you have something to add that you think might be helpful to this committee.

"Answer. Some of the stuff wouldn't have anything on this matter, but I wish this thing could be brought to the attention of Washington.

"Question. We wish so, too.

"Answer. Things are rotten out there. There is no kidding about it. I was an American, 61 years old, and I went to Honolulu with the idea of helping out, and I tell you honestly once I finished that job there it done no good. I tossed up a part there five and six times and put it together. There was never any reason for it. Charlie Winstead, who I was speaking about, treated me fine, but still down in the man's heart he is not an American in any sense or form, because he believes the Japanese is the right fellow, and I know he is not. There isn't a question on earth but everything has been blocked up there either from Washington or from some other position, and it's about time somebody did something about it. Emmons"—that is General Emmons—"is absolutely helpless now. I hear a lot of things in that tunnel, because I worked in those offices with them while business was going on, and we hear a lot of things that we can't talk about any place unless it goes into the place where something will be done about it. I made three reports to G–2, because I would walk right into them and talk to them. They knew of the things that happened, but there was never anything done about it.

"Chairman TENNEY. Was there any discussion with reference to the loyalty of these men to the United States?

"The WITNESS. I will tell you candidly, as far as our men were concerned, Senator, I don't think there was any of them—the majority of the men that went over there were men over 40 years old, and the only reason they were there was because they could not take a gun. I have been quite a bit here in southern California, and worked on these defense jobs, and I couldn't understand why the young men didn't want to go to war, but that gang of men that went there really wanted to go and do some good. Most of them were so disgusted after 6 weeks they didn't know what to do, and it was our idea the thing was done with a purpose of making us disgusted and they could put it down that we wouldn't work.

"Now, I have been in defense work since December of last year with the idea of trying to help out. I'm an electrician, and a good one. I have a contractor's license in this State and I know what I am doing, and when you turn around and find things like that, it hurts down deep, because you know that certain men for money or other reason are destroying the morale of the workers.

"Chairman TENNEY. What I mean was, Mr. Anderson, is there any reflection or opinion expressed in reference to the loyalty of the men who were in charge of this work?

"The WITNESS. The men out there thought Wyman and the whole gang ought to be shot.

"Chairman TENNEY. Do you know that of your own knowledge?

"The WITNESS. Yes, I do.

"The CHAIRMAN. And upon what did they base that particular opinion?

"The WITNESS. The accusation of them. We couldn't get paid; we couldn't get our overtime; we couldn't get nothing at all. We would get, 'This is a new set-up. This is this and that is that,' and other things. One man told me out of his mouth that we were at sea 4 days before they knew we were coming and they didn't know how many men were coming until we actually landed.

"Chairman TENNEY. I am referring more specifically to the progress of the work and the way that was carried on.

"The WITNESS. The work has dragged; they will be another year. They have moved hills and moved them back again, and they have filled holes and dug them out again, and I swear that runway, from what I can hear about it, at Bellows Field, has been done a dozen times.

"Chairman TENNEY. Do you think it has been done intentionally?

"The WITNESS. I do. I honestly believe that it is intentional. After the Battle of Midway, it was a great thing while it happened, and those planes came in and out of there for 3 days. We needed the fields, but they weren't ready. They sent a man here to be superintendent who belonged to the Musicians' Union, Local No. 47. They put him on the job and they shipped him home after 3 days.

"Chairman TENNEY. What's his name?

"The WITNESS. I will think of it in a minute. His name is on the tip of my tongue. Going over on the boat he sent for me. He was making up a gang.

"Chairman TENNEY. You can't recall his name?

"The WITNESS. Not just now. He worked for the Abbott Kinney Co. in 1921 as a maintenance electrician. From there he went into a dance band and carried a card in Musicians' Local Union No. 47.

"Chairman TENNEY. I think that is all, Mr. Anderson. We thank you very much for coming before this committee.

"The WITNESS. I hope you can do something about it."

Contract Termination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an important and timely address by the Under Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, at the University of Pennsylvania on November 23 discussing contract termination and related subjects.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Contract termination, which you have asked me to discuss today is only one aspect of the problem created by the return of segments of American industry to normal activities.

It is a subject which I approach with reluctance because any discussion of it is bound to carry the implication that the war, if not over, at least is so close to being over that we can afford to relax the intensity of our efforts and coast to victory. That is not the case.

The fact is that we are now sure of victory but there may be and probably will be a hard and tragic road to that victory. It is right and proper that we should begin planning for the heavy task of swift reconversion of industry to peace production, but it would be truly tragic, ingratitude to our fighting men, if our preoccupations with these problems, were to relax the drive of management and labor for the war production which we still need.

The fact is that the great industrial giant which is America, always capable of miracles in the past, has again done the miraculous. To the astonishment of our enemies, we have swung from an economy of peacetime production to an all-out effort for war in a space of time they did not believe possible. With giant strides, we have made up the lead which the Germans and the Japanese had acquired in 10 years of war planning.

The speed with which we have built since December 1941, is properly evidenced by the growth of the Navy itself. The Secretary of the Navy announced last spring that the number of combatant vessels to be built this year would be equal to our combatant Navy in being at the beginning of the year. He soon will be able to announce that we have fulfilled that forecast ahead of schedule. That prodigious achievement was, of course, only possible because of the fact that American industry had geared itself totally for total war.

Our basic raw material situation is well in hand. Aluminum, magnesium, copper, alloy steel, and other basic materials which were a problem to us a year ago, are no longer troublesome except in a few semiprocessed forms. I should say with the exceptions of carbon steel and of the ball bearing and drop forging industries, where we still have deficiencies, there are few problems.

Also, certain phases of the war have undergone changes. The curbing of the submarine menace, the elimination of Italy as an enemy, the shifting of emphasis have indicated changes in our production program. Also changes in strategy and tactics have brought certain changes in weapons.

All of this adds up to the fact that we are beginning to have changes in contracts—sometimes outright cancelations, sometimes

substitution of one form of weapon or supply for another. I take it what you are interested in hearing about today is: What is the pattern being evolved in Washington to provide for such contract terminations or changes and ultimately for the return to the economy of peace?

It seemed to me that the most useful course, from your point of view, would be to outline various steps that are being considered both in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, because both branches will have a hand in what finally evolves as a plan for contract termination, facility disposal, etc. I shall talk about the selection of contracts for termination, the method of financial settlement and the disposal of surplus materials and facilities.

In the first place, I think it is fair to say that there is general agreement on a central agency to fix policies on contract termination. This has been suggested by the Senate Post-War Policy Committee, the House Small Business Committee, the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees, and the War and Navy Departments. Under Mr. Bernard Baruch, acting for Mr. Justice Byrnes, the major procurement agencies already are working jointly to evolve uniform practices in dealing with termination. The policy evolved, of course, in the last analysis, must be applied by the contracting agencies.

I want to pause here for a moment to say that it is my belief that the ultimate pattern to be followed in cancelations will have to evolve on a pragmatic basis, that is, on experience accumulated as we go along. The Army already has accumulated a good deal of such experience in the handling of the $8,000,000,000 in contracts which it has terminated and we are in the process of acquiring a good deal ourselves in the destroyer escort curtailment.

I think Mr. Baruch and under him, Mr. Hancock, both responsible to Mr. Justice Byrnes in the Office of War Mobilization, share this view and that both will be reluctant to announce a detailed blueprint of their plans but will rather be inclined to let such a blueprint evolve out of experience.

So far as the order of cancelation of contracts is concerned, I think it is the general consensus that cancelations should occur first in plants which can be reconverted to civilian production, gradually concentrating war production in Government-owned plants. This principle, of course, should not be followed at the expense of efficiency and must also be modified in areas of labor shortage.

The War Department, for example, has cut back its tank program by canceling contracts held by railroad equipment plants. This carries out in practice a policy stated by Judge Patterson before the House Small Business Committee. He proposed cancelation first of contracts held by "privately owned plants not normally engaged in production of a military character in order to facilitate reconversion to civilian production." In other words, the War Department, in cutting back its tank program, insofar as possible, canceled contracts in private concerns, thereby permitting those industries to return to their normal production of railway equipment.

The only program upon which the Navy has had to cut back in major degree has been destroyer escort construction in which cancelations to a total of about $1,400,000,000 have been put into effect. In these cancelations, we endeavored to have the reductions made in the shipyards of lowest efficiency and in areas such as the Pacific coast, where there was a labor shortage.

From the Navy point of view our first interest is that we shall have the right to make our cuts with those concerns which have given us the least efficient and most costly production. I may say in passing that we are concerned more and more with the question of cost. Under the pressure of the dangers with which we were confronted in this global war, our paramount concern in the past 2½ years has been to get out the ships and the planes and the guns that our fighting men need. With this first necessity on the way to fulfillment, we are now asking the whole Naval Establishment to give the most intensive study to costs. Insofar as we can, we propose to reward those who have brought costs down even while responding to our steady and urgent pressure for production.

One of the biggest jobs will be synchronizing the resumption of production of civilian goods with war-contract termination. As you have seen in the newspapers, we now are experiencing in Washington a new wave of requests for reopening civilian plants, and, because it is related to war-contract termination, I should like to discuss it briefly.

In 1941 the predecessor agencies of the War Production Board, on which the Navy is represented, began curtailing civilian production by a series of orders limiting or prohibiting the output of certain end items and by another series conserving the use of critical raw materials. The limitation orders are known as "L orders," and about 300 of them are now outstanding. The conservation orders are called "M orders," and there are another 300 of them. They cover the whole gamut of industrial production.

Perhaps, in view of the raw material situation which I mentioned and the termination of war contracts, the time has come to review these orders in the light of foreseeable conditions. If this reexamination is conducted, it should not arouse too great hope for the return of business as usual. There are three limiting factors and one immutable principle by which revival of civilian production must abide. The three limiting factors are:

1. The military demand for materials next year apparently will be as large as it was this year. The Navy program will be about $3,000,000,000 larger in 1944 than in 1943. The Army program, which is now being resurveyed, may possibly be smaller by about the same amount, making the total Army-Navy demands for 1944 virtually unchanged from 1943. If more civilian production is feasible in 1944, it will be because of increased material supplies, not because of markedly lower military requirements. The war is not over.

2. Although raw material supplies may be easier next year, the supply of some fabricated components still will be tight. The impact of shortages still must be borne by the civilian economy, not by the military program. Although we may have enough sheet steel to make refrigerators in 1944, we still may lack sufficient motors and bearings. We cannot take motors out of landing craft or bearings out of aircraft engines just because we have sheet steel with which to make refrigerators.

3. Labor is at present the controlling factor in production. Civilian production cannot be resumed, even though raw materials and components are available, if it would suck needed labor away from war plants. This problem is not solved merely by placing civilian production outside the labor shortage areas. Even though civilian production is placed in a surplus labor area like Scranton, the reopening of jobs there may draw back home from Pittsburgh men and women whom the war plants in Pittsburgh cannot afford to lose. Very careful protection of war plant labor supply will be necessary.

These are the three limiting factors on relaxing the "L" and "M" orders. The principle underlying them is simply this:

War demands must come first until the day of victory.

Recently the Navy had difficulty placing an order for Navy shirts and pants. Clothing manufacturers, busy with civilian business and conscious of preempting post-war markets, weren't interested. Similarly the Navy has had trouble buying serge in time to meet its needs because textile mills, released from wool restrictions and busily spinning civilian textiles were reluctant to fill the Navy's order—even though it bore a W. P. B. priority rating—until next year.

We cannot fight a war in our spare time. We cannot fight a war and have business as usual. We want no return of too little and too late. Army and Navy orders must be filled promptly and completely.

You doubtless all read the newspapers' reference to the apparent conflict between the Comptroller General's Office and the War Department on the method of handling financial settlement of terminated contracts. The General Accounting Office, of which the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, is the head, took the view that settlement would have to be accomplished by precise auditing. The War Department took the view, which we share, that termination would have to be dealt with on a business basis, that is, more or less by the same business methods of negotiation by which the contracts were originally entered into.

My own guess is that there are not enough accountants in the world, let alone this country, to apply an acccunting approach to the termination problem without causing something approximately paralysis of American business for several years. Mr. Warren is a reasonable man and I am sure that he will come to the sme conclusion as the magnitude of the problem develops.

More recently, the suggestion has been advanced that the contractor be permitted to appeal the settlement arrived at with this procurement agency to an independent tribunal. I personally have some reservations about the practicality of a special appeal—aside from the normal one to the courts—but probably the desires of contractors, who would have to bear the delay and expense of an appeal, should be controlling.

This question of method of settlement is linked up to some extent with the question of how war contractors are to be financed in the interval between cancelation and the final clean-up of their accounts.

One instrument to be used, obviously, is loans by the governmental agencies to contractors. In general it has been agreed that arrangements should be made for Government-guaranteed loans to the contractors during the settlement period. As you know, both the Army and Navy, operating under limited legal authority, are now guaranteeing loans for this purpose and have asked more specific authorization. The Navy has authorized or is considering $23,000,000 of such guaranties.

But loans in themselves do not solve the problem because the loan still stands as an obligation which must be met. A second expedient therefore is necessary—immediate payment of a part of the sum claimed by the contractor. There is agreement that partial advance payments must be made pending final settlement, but legislation specifically authorizing such payments has yet to be enacted. Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate and also a member of the Military Affairs Committee, has shown great interest in this problem, as have the members of the Truman committee. Senator MURRAY'S proposal is that the services be required to pay a contractor 75 percent of his claim as soon as it is filed, but the Army and Navy have not concurred as yet in compulsory advance payments.

Dealing with subcontractors will be one of the most difficult of the problems involved in the final clearing up of the business and financial aspects of the war. The scope and size of this problem can possibly best be visualized when I tell you that General Motors alone has in excess of 19,000 separate subcontractors. It is our hope that we can come to some arrangement with such con-

cerns as these to handle the subcontractor problem for us. Here again I believe there are not enough trained accountants in the world for us to deal directly with each subcontractor. I believe we shall have to rely upon the trained organizations of the large prime contractors in order to come to speedy and equitable arrangements with our subcontractors.

It is important to prime contractors that settlements should be speedy, because in many cases the subcontractors are the suppliers of accessories for the prime contractors in normal times. It is equally important to them and their subcontractor suppliers to see that they do not become involved in a welter of financial controversy with the Government.

We are exploring the possibility—after the cessation of hostilities—for over-all settlement on a company basis, rather than contract by contract. These over-all settlements would be handled by the service with the dominant contractual interest. Such consolidated settlements might, to some extent, ameliorate the subcontractors' situation, and still other helpful measures may be evolved.

American industry cannot stand a prolonged delay in settling its war contracts. Five automobile companies, which in 1939 had $3.30 of current assets for every dollar of current liabilities, had by the end of 1942 only $1.96 of current assets for every dollar of current indebtedness. Ten manufacturing companies in the electrical, steel, rubber, and other industries, with $4.26 of current assets for every dollar of current liabilities in 1939, now have only $1.86. Industry has insufficient fat on which to live during a prolonged thawing out of frozen war contracts.

Another aspect of the termination and reconversion problem is the disposition of surplus stocks of material. Generally speaking our view in the Navy is that this should be handled as follows:

That each department concerned should certify what stocks of materials or of finished products it regards as unnecessary for its program. When so certified, the items themselves should be turned over to some other Federal agency, which should handle the public sale or disposition. The Navy wants to retain the right to certify what is surplus to its needs. Once that is done, the Navy would prefer to have the responsibility for disposition given to someone else.

In this connection, we should consider accumulating out of our surplus war materials a stock pile of critical raw materials, especially those which are not produced within our continental limits, as well as those domestic items the production of which cannot be quickly accelerated. Possession of these critical materials, together with certain facilities I shall mention, will be our best insurance against a future need for them.

There is another aspect of the reconversion problem in which I know you, in common with every other citizen, has a vital interest—the question of what is going to happen to the $15,000,000,000 of new facilities built for war production. This is a problem obviously charged with the most profound implications for the future of the country. As for myself, and I am speaking purely as a private individual now although I shall do all in my power to advocate this point of view in the Government, it is clear to me that each of these plants, insofar as is possible, should be returned to the national economy for private ownership and operation, with this one qualification:

That the Navy should retain as permanent parts of its arsenal those special plants which it seems essential to both peace and wartime operation of the Navy. I refer to large ordnance plants like those at Detroit, Louisville, and Canton, torpedo plants like those at Highland Park and St. Louis, aircraft engine plants like the one at Kansas City, ammunition handling and storage facilities, and in some instances repair facilities for its ships.

As to the details of the method by which other facilities should be disposed of, the problem is not simple. To help deal with it, we in the Navy have prepared a factual statement of each facility which we either own directly or for which we have advanced money through the Defense Plant Corporation.

In many cases contractual relations entered into between the contractor and the Government will prevail. The problem is least difficult where there is a single wholly Government-financed plant built as an entity or as a self-contained addition to an existing facility.

In these instances, the contracts usually provide that contractors who now lease or operate the Government-owned facilities have the first option to purchase them, especially if those facilities happen to be, as they frequently are, on land owned by the company. If the contractor does not exercise his option, the Government usually has a secondary option to purchase the land from the contractor. If neither of the options is exercised, then the Government usually is obliged to remove the facilities from the contractor's land.

But the so-called scrambled plants present a definite problem—that is, plants where we installed machinery which became more or less an integral part of an existing factory operation. We realized at the time the complexities that would result from such scrambled installations, but they were necessary in terms of economy of time and of management personnel.

For example: We have made rather extensive installations in the plants of General Electric in connection with the production of fire-control apparatus and other ordnance items. By doing so we were able to avoid construction of new buildings and to utilize existing personnel in that company; had a completely new plant been built it would have meant a greater outlay of money, more time to complete, and an additional staff of executives and technicians. What we have done with General Electric has been done also in many other concerns throughout the country—General Motors, Chrysler, Westinghouse, Fairbanks Morse—to name a few.

One of the great tasks of reconversion will be the speedy clearing out of these scrambled facilities. To clear this machinery from the floors of the plants concerned with the greatest possible speed is obviously of utmost importance and points up again in a really definite way the necessity of dealing with this whole problem on a practical business basis of negotiation rather than by delayed and precise accounting.

These problems of contract termination are only a few of the great questions which will press for answers when the war ends. We will have a whole array of problems in human relations, including employment for 19,000,000 persons and rehabilitation of veterans who have been disabled or who have simply spent 2 or 3 years of their lives in a world very different from that of normal peacetime.

However, my talk today is confined to some of the business aspects of the end of the war, and I can sum up what I have said in the following three points:

1. When programs are cut back, the first contracts to be canceled should be those in plants which can be easily converted to civilian production, with due regard to rewarding low-cost efficiency in war production and to alleviating labor shortages. Although some resumption of civilian production may be possible, fulfillment of war orders must continue to be the primary responsibility of industry until the day of victory.

2. Because speed is vital, financial settlement of terminated contracts should be negotiated by the procurement agency which placed the contracts, and the settlement should not be subject to later review except for fraud. Primary responsibility for settling terminated subcontracts probably must fall upon prime contractors.

3. After the accumulation of a prudent reserve of facilities and materials for our national defense, all surplus materials and facilities should be turned over to a central agency for disposition to private owners.

Tribute to the Late Pvt. Morris Applebaum by Herman Goldstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very beautiful and stirring poem by Herman Goldstein, written in Africa by this soldier in tribute to the memory of his comrade, Morris Applebaum, one of the brave members of the expeditionary force in Africa who was killed in action at the front while fighting for our country.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MORRIS APPLEBAUM" WAS HIS NAME

(Written September 14, 1943, in memory of Morris Applebaum by Herman "Skinny" Goldstein in Africa)

Years ago, when I joined the "Y,"
I was frail, meek, quiet, and shy;
I wanted to be like other boys,
To play each sport with excellent poise!
Each year there was basketball
To fill the spotlight in the fall;
Among the other sports I learned,
That was one for which I yearned!

Oh, how I longed to make the team,
For me alone, the crowd would scream;
But each year I was too young,
On older men the burden hung!
And yet, that did not get me down,
I kept on trying and ne'er did frown;
For I had spirit, courage, will,
To get to the top of the hill!

When finally I did make the team,
My heart was like a radiant beam;
For my efforts were not for nought,
My final goal had been wrought!
I had made the "Y" team.
It had come true, my pleasant dream;
The cause for this, I'll tell you now,
Before I eat my noonday chow!

My inspiration was a gallant man
With a sturdy body and a summer tan;
"Morris Applebaum" was his name,
The "Y's" choice for their hall of fame;
He was one to look up to,
For he was just, and right, and true;
His traits, plus his excellent skill
Were things that gave the crowds a thrill!

Every time that he would play,
I would watch his every way;
For I wanted to be just like him,
Full of courage, vigor, vim;
He was a model that I went by,
A loyal sport, a righteous guy;
'Twas he that made me make the team,
To be like him, my hope and dream!

Of course, there are others I won't forget,
"Coach Laney" is one I think of yet;
For he taught me all I knew,
Men like that, are too few!
In the year of 'forty-two,
Just the beginning of World War Two,
Our team did not end the season,
Behind this was a real good reason!

We had to play another game
Which had an entirely different frame;
To play the game for Uncle Sam,
To even eat such food as "Spam"!
"Apple" was the first to go,
In everything he was never slow;
We were just a month behind,
Ready for the grueling grind!

Some went east, some went west,
Each with the thought to do his best;
Each was a part of a different team,
This was real, and not a dream!
And so, as each one went his way,
And his folks for him did pray,
Each did his part for Uncle Sam,
And even ate such food as "Spam"!

I was soon sent overseas,
First to England in a breeze;
Then to Africa, where now I am,
Still eating that "delicious" "Spam"!
As I read my mail today,
Forgetting, for a while, this merciless fray,
I came upon a dreadful line,
Death had come to one so fine!

Yes, "Morris Applebaum," killed in action,
While fighting for our beloved faction;
This news to me was a sudden shock,
It hit me like a solid rock!
For I had lost more than a friend,
When I heard of his sudden end;
He has gone with all the rest,
For Uncle Sam, he did his best!

Some must die, and some must live,
Fate decides whose life to give;
But, "Apple" has not died in vain,
The evil will suffer for "Apple's" pain!
And when this cruel war is won,
And we have all of our work done,
We'll go back to the "Y" again,
Each basketball game for him, we'll win!

For "Apple's" spirit will live with us
Among the clamor, among the fuss;
And everytime I hit the goal,
I know that it will ease his "soul";
For even though in death, you see,
"Apple's" soul will live in me,
And give me courage, vigor, vim,
To give the other team a trim!

And so with all of God's grace,
He'll have a peaceful resting place;
He'll be guarded at night by the silvery moon,
At dawn will come the sun in full bloom!
America's son has gone to rest,
The "Y" has lost one of its best,
Regardless who puts the ball through the rim,
They'll look at them, and think of him!

Comment by Lexington (Ky.) Herald on Speech by Hon. James Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of hearing a magnificent address by Hon. James A. Farley on the occasion of a Thoroughbred Club dinner at Lexington, Ky. I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to that address by the editor of the Lexington Herald, Hon. Tom Underwood.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARLEY'S GOOD SPEECH

Jim Farley is a great American. Being a politician, and the best, he has the sense and good taste to avoid making a political speech on such an occasion as the Thoroughbred Club's dinner for Col. Matt Winn. Some few in past years have not been so wise as Jim about this.

Farley's plea for Americanism, his expressions of confidence and faith that all things will work out all right for the good of this country, and his challenge to the Nation to meet her problems are sound and straight from the shoulder.

Preservation of Jewish People in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on November 9 last the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and 11 of his colleagues, of whom I am one, submitted Senate Resolution 203 recommending and urging the creation of an agency to effectuate a plan designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany.

A few days ago I received a pathetic appeal in the form of a radiogram from the chief rabbi of the Holy Land, Isaac Herzog, on behalf of the remaining Jews in the European slaughter pen.

I have been so deeply impressed by this earnest, prayerful appeal that I desire to have it published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where all may join me in giving thought to this desperate cause.

There being no objection, the radiogram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JERUSALEM, *November 22, 1943.*

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON,

Emergency Committee, New York:

From the Holy Mountain of Jerusalem my fervent prayer goes forth to our Father in Heaven that the greatest success crown you and your colleagues United States of America supreme effort to rescue the remnant of Israel given over to cruel torment and death in the clutches of the Nazi fiends in human guise. Grave is the responsibility weighing upon all nations. Time there was when preventative intervention might have helped and nations beheld with equanimity the beginning of Jewry's unequaled tragedy. Let them confess with Joseph's brothers of old, "Verily, we are guilty concerning our brother in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us and we would not hear." Let them even at this the eleventh hour fling wide all gates, open wide their hearts, and bestir themselves to the uttermost and ways and means of rescue will be found. The innocent blood of millions of our brothers and sisters, men and women, old and young children, babes and sucklings, tortured in infernal fashion, shot in cold blood, slaughtered like sheep, gassed en masse, drowned, burnt, and buried alive, cries unto you all from Europe's sin-laden soil groaning under the unbearable load of Nazi inhuman crime, bidding you in God's name salvage remnants of Israel palpitating between life and death. Pray, recall immense debt mankind owes to Jewish people, the lofty teachings and messages of whose prophets consciously or unconsciously inspire, rouse and brace this day the United Nations in sacrificing the flower of their youth for liberty, justice, and humanity in the titanic struggle with the still formidable forces of darkness. We refuse to believe that nothing can be done. In the multitude of counsel there is salvation. Men and women of the United States whose glorious civilization rests upon religio-ethical foundations, bestir yourselves with all heart and soul to save and Providence will grant you counsel and strength. Save from Satanic destruction great ancient people the source of the true spiritual ethical values of the world's civilization. God be with you all and be blest.

ISAAC HERZOG,
Chief Rabbi of the Holy Land.

Haines Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Territories, I had occasion last summer to make an inspection trip through Alaska and was privileged to travel over a considerable portion of the Haines Highway, going as far as the summit. The road was not then completed, but is now in full use for military purposes, and Major General O'Connor has stated that it will be fully completed this month.

Alaska is not only a Territory of immense distances, of magnificent scenery, with a wealth of mineral resources, fish, and animal life, and forestry products, but it also has great agricultural possibilities. Just now, however, it occupies a most important position in our war efforts and will continue to be a most important link in our national defense. The air route over the top of the world now established from continental United States over British Columbia, Alaska, across the narrow waters of Bering Strait to Siberia and on to Central Asia has contributed more than most of us are permitted to know at this time in the success of our fighting forces, and particularly those of our allies. This great air route, affording us the quickest and most available contact with Asia, is now serviced by the Alaska Highway and the airfields along its course. This highway was strictly a military project, put through by Army engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads as an outstanding military

achievement in road construction in a short space of time under most adverse circumstances over a forbidding terrain—2,000-mile wilderness of forests, mountains, ice fields, and muskeg. As a part of this gigantic road project is what is known as the Haines Cut-off, to which I have called attention. This road affords a direct connection between the inside passage and the Alaska Highway above Fairbanks, forming a direct route to Fairbanks—the hub of our air-transport service in Alaska.

Richard L. Neuberger, aide to Major General O'Connor, has written a most interesting and factual article on the Haines Highway, which appears in the December issue of the territorial life magazine known as Alaska. I include this article as a part of my remarks, which is as follows:

HAINES HIGHWAY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Three passes lead from the waters of the Inside Passage to the high plateau behind the Alaskan Coastal Range. One is the Chilkoot, of dreadful memory, the most famous and also the most heartbreaking path to the riches of the Klondike. Another is the White Pass. These two breaches in the mountain wall tap the headwaters of the Yukon River. They point toward Whitehorse and Dawson, the principal settlements of Canada's vast Yukon Territory. They have long been the beaten trails to the Klondike gold fields.

But there is still a third pass—the Chilkat. This points not toward Whitehorse and Dawson, but toward Fairbanks, the strategic hub of Alaska.

For three decades, Alaskans have dreamed of a line of communication and transportation over the Chilkat Pass. In 1913 the Alaska Railroad Commission recommended to William Howard Taft, then President of the United States, that a railway be built from the Inside Passage across the Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes and thence via the Dezedeash, Donjek, and Tanana River Valleys to Fairbanks.

Today, the United States Army has nearly completed a road which follows substantially this route. Already the road is in use. By December it will be entirely finished. This is the Haines Military Road, the only link by road between the 1,630-mile Alaska Highway and the waters of the Inside Passage.

The road starts near Haines, Alaska, which is 14 miles south of Skagway at the head of Lynn Canal. It ascends the Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes and connects with the Alaska Highway 108 miles northwest of Whitehorse. From this junction between the Haines Military Road and the Alaska Highway, it is 520 miles on the highway to Fairbanks. This means that the total distance from Haines to Fairbanks is 685 miles, for the Haines Military Road itself is 165 miles in length.

The road was first authorized late in 1942 under a directive issued by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding the Army Service Forces. It has been constructed under the general direction of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commanding the Northwest Service Command.

General O'Connor recently told the Vancouver, B C., Board of Trade: "The Haines Military Road cuts off the long open-sea haul across th Gulf of Alaska. It makes maximum use of the Inside Passage, the fabulous mountain-protected arm of the Pacific Ocean, which may be navigated by barges, tugs, and small inland steamers. This road is of great significance to Vancouver, Seattle, and Prince Rupert."

And Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, has stated in the New York Times: "The Haines Military Road will provide an alternative to the all-land route, and will permit the use of the protected waters of the Inside Passage to barge supplies from Prince Rupert, Seattle, and Vancouver. The Haines Cut-off will make close contact between the Alaska Highway and southeastern Alaska. It will permit supplies unloaded at Haines to travel by truck directly to their destination, provided that destination is on the Alaska Highway, or on one of its branches or extensions."

The Haines Road is by far the most important subsidiary unit of the Alaska Highway system. It will be the main link between the highway and salt water. Cargo unloaded at Haines will be transferred to trucks for the haul to Fairbanks, with no other transshipments required. The often stormy open-sea voyage across the Gulf of Alaska will not be necessary; this will make it possible for barges and tugs to serve the port of Haines.

"Trucks have gone the full distance from Haines to the junction with the Alaska Highway," General O'Connor declared at Vancouver. "In 14 hours trucks have traveled the 268 miles from Whitehorse to Haines. The road will be fully completed some time in December, but already it is in use."

William S. Howland, correspondent for Time, journeyed by Army carry-all between Whitehorse and Haines in 12 hours, an average of better than 22 miles an hour. And a few weeks later Col. K. B. Bush, chief of staff of the Northwest Service Command, covered the distance in 11 hours and 45 minutes in a sedan.

During the past summer two Members of the United States Congress traveled on the Haines Road all the way across the summits of the Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes. One was ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Alaska's veteran Delegate in the House of Representatives. "The Haines Military Road," he said, "is destined to be of first-rate importance as a connection between the Alaska Highway and the seaports of southeastern Alaska. I also believe it will be one of the great scenic drives of the North American continent."

Not long after Delegate DIMOND'S trip on the Haines Road by Army jeep, his words were echoed by Representative HOMER D. ANGELL of Oregon, a member of the House Committee on Territories, which has jurisdiction over Alaska.

"The Haines Road," Congressman ANGELL told newspaper interviewers at Seattle, "will be an important arterial route, utilizing the inside passage for transportation to Haines from the Pacific Northwest and then by a direct connection with the Alaska Highway, giving a quick through route to Fairbanks. And the road ranks in scenic grandeur with the Columbia River Highway and the Canadian roads to Banff and the Columbia icefields."

Representative ANGELL is an authority on majestic roads, for the most spectacular portion of the celebrated Columbia River Highway, that featuring Multnomah Falls and Crown Point, is within the boundaries of his own Third Oregon Congressional District.

The Haines Military Road twists up Chilkat Inlet from the sea, and then hugs the shore of the Chilkat River. Snow-capped mountains rim both sides of the stream. Where draws and gullies divide the peaks, huge glaciers twist out of the Alpine setting like white dragons. Here and there are gaunt pebbled moraines, gouged out by glaciers of long ago, glaciers which ate greedily at the granite mountains for infinite generations but are no more. The rich green of the spruce and jackpines sets off the dark rock and the white snowfields.

All the way to the Canadian border, a distance of 42 miles, the Haines road traverses one of Alaska's most magnificent Alpine regions. This section of the road was originally pioneered by the Alaska Road Commission. The Army, with its subordinate civilian contracting firms, has widened, straightened, and improved the original road. At the border is Pleasant Camp, where nearly half a century ago the red-coated Mounted Police checked in the gold-seekers as they sought a route to the Klondike.

One of the Mounties stationed for a time on the Alaska-British Columbia line at Pleasant Camp was a tall young constable named George R. Pearkes, now Maj. Gen. George R. Pearkes of the Canadian Army, commander of Canada's Pacific Command and one of the few British general officers wearing the coveted Victoria Cross, for valor above and beyond the call of duty.

From Pleasant Camp, for 43 miles, the Haines Military Road is built on the soil of British Columbia. This is the most stirring section of the journey. The traveler's pulse beats faster as the highway ascends the passes The tall trees of the seacoast give way to stunted spruce and hemlock warriers which must hold their own against wind, cold, and drifting snow. The meadows of wild flowers recede before frowning cliffs and crags. The scene grows wilder. The triple summit of the Three Guardsmen stands watch like a sentinel. On a clear day, the traveler can look back down over the Chilkat watershed all the way to the sea.

Eighty-five miles from Haines the road crosses over into the Yukon Territory. This means that it passes through three separate geographic entites—42 miles in Alaska, 43 miles in British Columbia, and 80 miles in the Yukon. The Yukon, too, is the scene of the junction of the Haines Road and the Alaska Highway.

This newest of Alaskan roads—a road which may play a vital role not only in the transportation of essential military supplies but in the post-war development of the north—has a rich historic background. The Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes are actually the famous old Jack Dalton Trail. What speaker of the English language is not familiar with the villain's ringing curse in the Arctic melodrama: "Curse you, Jack Dalton."

And Haines, scene of the road's salt-water terminus, is also the site of Chilkoot Barracks. This is the oldest American military post in Alaska. After the United States took over its largest territorial possession following the $7,200,000 purchase from the Imperial Russian Government, Chilkoot Barracks was the first post to be built. As late as 1938 it was the only Army establishment in the North, a fact emphasized by Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. H. H. Arnold, Delegate Dimond, and Governor Gruening as they urged further defense of America's principal rampart in the North Pacific.

At Chilkoot many illustrious soldiers, including Generals Richardson and Seward, served their military apprenticeship. The cream-colored barracks, with the broad green parade grounds, lie in the shadow of the mountains which guard Chilkat Pass. On clear, bright days the dazzling summits are reflected in the sea. Few posts have so stunning a setting. When the Haines Military Road is formally opened in February of 1944, with governmental representatives of Alaska and British Columbia and the Yukon participating, Chilkoot Barracks will also be formally taken over by the American Army's Northwest Service Command.

Then once more, as trucks commence the winter drive to Fairbanks, will the clear notes of the bugle and the tramp of marching feet sound on the parade ground, where two generations ago the old blue-coated cavalry wheeled and trotted.

Forehandedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, among many newspaper editorials that have been published in support of the Lea civil aviation bill, the one published Monday by the Washington Post is very convincing and logical.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include that editorial which follows:

FOREHANDEDNESS

The most important task of Congress, next to strengthening the administration's hand in the unequal battle against inflation, is to ready the country for a smooth transition to a peacetime economy. In this respect Congress has hitherto been unsystematic. In the Senate, to be sure, there is a subcommittee on post-war problems under Senator GEORGE. But, with comprehensive demobilization dependent upon a whole series of enabling acts, a joint committee of Congress is needed for the purpose of developing a legislative program. It is to be hoped that the legislators without further delay will appoint such a committee. In the interim, time has been taken by the forelock—and in the House, not the Senate—in regard to one of the most vital elements of post-war adjustment. We mean air transportation. The initiative is due to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which, in the so-called Lea bill, seeks to bring Federal regulation abreast of post-war requirements. Debate may start today, and if the bill is passed, as it should be, the House will have given our preparedness a flying start.

It is a platitude to say that we are now in an air age. What we do not yet recognize is that that fact is hidden from the people by military restrictions on civilian travel and on the improvement of civilian aircraft. The effect of the end of the war upon air transport will be something like the lifting of a curtain upon the air age. Then we shall realize in experience what we as yet realize only by assurance. No place in the habitable world, as our peregrinating military officers are vividly aware of already, will be farther away than 48 hours. At home distances will be shrunk by the same measure as soon as the air transport industry is enabled to take advantage of wartime technological advance. Clearly, the fillip to the use of aviation and to the speed and size of aircraft will demand up-to-date Federal regulation. That is what the managers of the Lea bill seek to provide. The bill would extend Federal jurisdiction to all commerce anywhere in the air space of the United States. This greater responsibility would call for better administration. So the bill would set up a Civil Aeronautical Authority as an independent agency similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Such changes are not as drastic as they might seem. Already, as a practical matter, Federal regulation of the American air has been the rule, and this bill would formalize existing practice, as well as regularize a score of procedures which, as a result of the rapid growth of aviation, have not been written into permanent law. Passage of the bill would remove the danger from the air transport industry of that deterring and conflicting State regulation which formerly held back rail and motor transportation.

There is, of course, some opposition to the Lea bill from vested interests in the States, as well as from rival forms of transport. Some of it is based upon misunderstanding. The Lea bill, far from destroying States' rights in respect of aviation, recognizes those rights over functions which constitute the bulk of present State activity. States and municipalities would still build, administer, and operate airports. They would still regulate purely intrastate private and miscellaneous flying, but in a way consistent with Federal safety codes. They would still be responsible for the zoning of airports. Beyond these and similar activities, however, authority is vested in the Federal Government, on the undeniable assumption that any other course would sabotage all progress in air transport. Imagine aviators having to face different requirements, makers different specifications, commercial operators doing business according to 49 different laws. This very recital is its own rebuttal. The only course compatible with common sense is the provision through the Lea bill of a coordinated and simplified code instead of duplicating and conflicting State codes. But to this newspaper the chief argument for an over-all authority situated in Washington is that national defense requires it.

In the Lea bill the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has again demonstrated its industry and forehandedness. From the outset flying, as we have said before, has had no firmer or more enlightened friend than this committee. It was ahead of developments in the framing of the Air Commerce Act of 1926. When the group began work on this legislation, there were hardly any civil aircraft, no air lines, and civil flying was largely barnstorming. There was a similar forehandedness in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That our civil aviation leads the world in quality and volume of service is largely due to the way that this act facilitated development. Now, in the Lea bill, the committee has again acted betimes, and the House, as a result of the committee's vision, is given the same opportunity to be of service to a future America. The Lea bill, by ushering in the air age at home, would show the soldiers on service that while they have been fighting, the legislators have been preparing the country for their return.

Yes; Whose Grocery Bill Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Pathfinder magazine, that widely known weekly publication of the Nation's Capital, is a brief and clear-speaking editorial on the subject of subsidizing our grocery bills.

Under unanimous-consent request, I submit it here for your consideration:

WHOSE GROCERY BILL IS IT?

Still before Congress and therefore before all the people is the food-subsidy question. The proposal is that, out of money the Government has to borrow, part of the cost of food shall be paid. The ostensible purpose is to reduce the danger of inflation either from higher farm prices, or from the probable resulting demands for higher wages.

Of course, having to borrow more money can also contribute to inflation. Borrowed money has to be paid back. Much of it will have to be paid back from the future earnings of the young men who are now in the fighting forces.

Since most Americans are well able to pay their grocery bills these days, this subsidy plan seems to be of pretty doubtful merit. Most of us would rather pay for our own meals now than to have the privilege of charging them to the boys, for payment after they come home.

Sending out a few million subsidy checks might make a lot of votes but, under the circumstances, it doesn't make much sense.

Radio as an Instrument of Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 5 (legislative day of Monday, October 25), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Radio as an Instrument of Free Speech," delivered by C. J. Durr, Federal Communications Commissioner, before the Third Free World Congress, Freedom of Speech Panel, at the McAlpin Hotel, New York City, October 29, 1943. The cost of printing the speech is estimated by the Public Printer to be $105.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty-six years ago we entered the last war with a slogan. We were fighting "to make the world safe for democracy." It was a simple slogan, but it was effective because we believed in it. We believed that human beings everywhere were fundamentally decent, and intelligent enough to direct their own destiny if given the chance. We also believed that if given the chance they could work out a method of living together in peace, irrespective of race or nationality. Our territory had not been attacked and we had no reason to fear that hostile armies would soon invade our shores. But we had a cause that was good enough for most of us and that was worth fighting for.

Then came the end of the war and shortly afterward the fatal illness of President Wilson, who had been so effective in putting our ideals into words and action. Our practical men took over. They told us that our slogan was silly; that human beings were not fundamentally decent but were divided generally into two classes, the stupid and those who were out to get what they could for themselves. We were made ashamed to admit that we had ideals. The peoples of Europe, we were told, were a particularly sorry lot, given from time immemorial to the habit of squabbling among themselves for the pure job of squabbling. Their problems were no concern of ours and the smart thing for us to do was to forget about them and look out for ourselves. At home we had to prove that we were not stupid, so we started to get what we could for ourselves and to get it the easiest way possible. This business of producing our way to prosperity took too long and was hard work. Besides, if we started producing

too much we would have to reduce prices at home or find new markets abroad. We couldn't get into the foreign markets because we had hemmed ourselves in with tariff walls and the foreign countries, of course, could not buy from us unless we bought from them. So we plunged into an orgy of speculation. Listed securities, corner lots, farm lands—anything would do, even foreign loans. What difference would it make if we bought at prices having no relation to values? A "sucker" would always come along upon whom we could unload at a profit. We, of course, were not "suckers." We belonged to the smart branch of the human family. There were such a select few of us and so many of the other kind who only thought they were smart that we couldn't possibly lose.

And so we went on our merry way to economic collapse and to another war dwarfing all others by its horror and magnitude.

We are fighting this war without a slogan. Possibly we would be less confused and more sure of ourselves and our destiny if we had one. But we and our allies all refer to ourselves and to each other as the "democratic nations." Perhaps some of us still have quite a way to go before we are in fact democratic nations, but the claim is itself evidence of the ideals and objectives of our peoples. So we are in fact fighting again to make the world safe for democracy, even if we feel that the slogan of the last war has been too shopworn for further use. If democracy were not the stake, the war would not be worth the cost, for if we are to be ruled by a fuehrer or a group of fuehrers, the choice of whether they shall be German or Japanese, or American or British is hardly worth fighting for.

We cannot think of democracy without thinking of freedom of speech, for the two are inseparable. The fundamental principle of democracy is that the people, if informed and given a reasonable choice of alternatives, will in the long run choose wisely. Information and free discussion are the food upon which its life depends. No one of us is wise enough to decide what the rest of us should know and think.

The author of the first amendment to our Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech and of the press, warned us against becoming complacent in the belief that these rights were secured to us for all time. We do not have to look overseas for constant reminders of the wisdom of his warning. Thomas Jefferson's pledge of "Eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man" is a pledge that should be taken anew by each generation.

When we begin to think about the kind of world we want to live in when this war is over, it is necessary that we should think in terms of world-wide instrumentalities of speech and how they can be most effectively used, and the limitations upon their use, as well as in terms of freedom of the individual mind. For, as the world has contracted through the development of rapid means of transportation and communication, the audiences that can be reached have increased correspondingly, and so has the importance of reaching them. The number of people that could be reached by the old-time speaker was limited by the power of his lungs and vocal cords. Today radio provides a means for world-wide discussions.

I will speak primarily in terms of American radio broadcasting as an instrumentality of free speech. This is not only because I know little about the situations in other countries but also because it seems rather presumptuous to concern ourselves about how the peoples of other countries should prepare for the post-war world until we, the people of this country, have made up our own minds about the kind of world we want and the responsibilities we are willing to assume and the sacrifices we are willing to make in order to get it.

In the United States, we have endeavored to obtain the maximum of freedom of speech through a diversification of ownerships and controls of the radio outlets. We have rejected the idea of any monopolization, whether by private groups or the Government. In an attempt to avoid both types of monopoly, we have placed the operation of broadcasting stations under diversified private control, but we have reserved title in the people to the radio channels, which are the highways over which the broadcasts travel. Congress has expressly provided that the channels shall not be privately owned. It has also provided that they must be used in the public interest. As an assurance that they will be used in the public interest, Congress has directed that no license be issued for a period longer than 3 years, so that if any licensee fails to recognize his public responsibility the channel assigned to him may be placed in the hands of another operator who will recognize this responsibility.

But what happens when the various licensees, through whom we are seeking this diversification, surrender their responsibility, or bind themselves together by common understanding to follow uniform restrictions in determining what shall or shall not be heard over the air?

In an effort to assure diversity, licenses have been issued for more than 900 standard broadcasting stations. But the number of stations does not measure the degree of diversity for over 575 of these stations, which together utilize nearly 95 percent of the nighttime broadcasting power of the entire country, are affiliated with one or more of the 4 Nation-wide networks. The network technique has made possible both nation-wide programing and a quality of program which could not have been afforded by individual stations acting independently, but it has also made the Nation-wide networks the big business of the radio industry.

An affiliation contract with a network is, next to its Government license, the biggest economic asset a station can have; many stations could not survive without network affiliation. The networks, therefore, with this power of economic life and death in their hands, are in a strong position to influence if not control the program policies of their affiliated stations.

In 1941 the Federal Communications Commission adopted regulations dealing with the relationship of the independent stations to the networks. The regulations were designed to prevent contractual restraints upon the free flow of programs and to give the independent stations a little more control over their own time. The hold of the networks over the stations was thereby weakened a little, and naturally they did not like it. Still more serious to them was the fear that once the value of the regulations to the independent stations, as well as to the listening public, should be proved, the way might be paved for further inroads on their power, so they began to raise the old cry that the F. C. C. was stifling their "freedom of speech." The two largest networks resorted to the courts in an effort to have the regulations declared invalid, and succeeded in delaying the effective date for nearly 2 years. At the same time they appealed to Congress for legislative relief, but without success. Ultimately, the United States Supreme Court, by a decision handed down in the spring of this year, held that the F. C. C. was acting within its authority in adopting the regulations and that the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and the press was in no way impaired. So the networks are now raising the cry that the Supreme Court itself is trying to suppress freedom of speech, and the appeal to Congress has been renewed.

The Code of Ethics of the National Association of Broadcasters is another illustration of what may happen to the diversification in broadcasting control which we are seeking. The code is a voluntary one, and unlike an affiliation contract between a network and a station, has no legally binding effect upon its subscribers. It merely sets forth a common understanding among members of the Broadcasters Association as to the program policies which should be followed. The restrictive effect of some of the provisions of the code was brought clearly into the open for the first time only a few weeks ago in the public testimony of an official of the Blue network. He stated that while his network did not follow the N. A. B. Code absolutely, there was no substantial conflict between its program policies and the policies laid down by the code.

According to this witness, the function of radio is the sale of goods and services. It is primarily an advertising medium and time will therefore not be sold to anyone having ideas to present. As he put it:

"We are selling time for one specific reason, and that is to sell goods, manufactured by American manufacturers, to the public."

But ideas may be thrown in as the free prize in the box of crackerjack. He was asked, "The only method by which you can get an idea out is by selling it along with a package of goods," and he replied, "That is the only way."

The rules determining who shall or shall not have time on the air as described by the witness, are highly selective. No time will be sold for the discussion of "controversial issues." A reasonable amount of free time will be made available for such discussion. The network, of course, determines what issues are of sufficient public interest to warrant discussion over the air and also affords time for the opposing point of view to be presented. It is admitted that, as a rule, programs of this kind are not carried over as many affiliated stations as sponsored programs, but the witness was not able to give any figures as to the number of stations which have carried any particular program. No solicitation of memberships whatsoever is permitted, either on free or paid time, except for organizations such as the American Red Cross.

Labor unions, according to the witness, are controversial per se, and consequently even a symphony orchestra, if sponsored by a labor union, becomes controversial. However, the views of Mr. W. J. Cameron are not controversial when he is sponsored by the Ford Motor Co., for Ford Motor Co., is not controversial and Mr. Cameron, presumably, is expessing his own ideas and not the ideas of Ford. It is conceded that the views of commentators sometimes happen to correspond rather closely with the views of their business sponsors, but this is merely a fortuitous coincidence.

The network, according to the witness, would sell time to General Motors to sponsor Vandercook as a commentator, but would not sell time to the A. F. of L. to sponsor the same commentator, because that would be controversial, although the witness is sure that Vandercook broadcasting for the A. F. of L. would say the same things as Vandercook broadcasting for General Motors.

The witness repeated that the function of radio is to sell time for advertising goods and services. General Motors, he admits, has nothing to sell to the public at the present time because its entire production is devoted to military goods, but, nevertheless, time would be sold to General Motors to enable it to acquire goodwill and to tell the public about the contributions of General Motors to the war effort. Time, however, would not be sold to the United Automobile Workers in order that they might attempt to acquire goodwill and to tell the people about their contributions to the war effort, because this would be controversial.

The witness admitted that, on occasions at least, some business organizations, as, for example, electric-power companies during the

period of debate on the holding-company act, are controversial per se. The network would not, of course, sell time to a power company under such circumstances, "to further any legislative program," but it would be all right for the power company to buy time for a program by a philharmonic orchestra. The C. I. O., however, could not buy time for the same philharmonic orchestra. Apparently, there are subtle distinctions of controversiality even as between controversial organizations.

According to the witness, time, of course, cannot be made available on any basis to a consumers' cooperative because cooperatives solicit memberships. But time will be sold to mutual insurance companies, for this is an entirely different matter. Mutual insurance companies also solicit memberships, but people are inclined to think about insurance policies rather than membership when mutual insurance companies are mentioned. The membership is merely incidental. It is admitted that in the case of consumers' cooperatives, the membership is incidental, and cheaper buying is the main thing, but still there is a difference which is apparent enough to those versed in such matters. But the network is broadminded. It has no objection whatsoever to consumers' cooperatives selling their goods provided, of course, they don't advertise them over the air. As the witness said:

"We have no objection to their selling goods because that is the business we are in, but you would soon find out that if you opened the door to that extent, they would be stepping beyond the principle of selling goods, as such, and begin selling memberships in their organizations. All you have to do is open the door once, and you have them in."

Apparently the witness is not afraid that if the door is opened to a business concern to sell advertising, it might go a little further and start selling ideas.

Again there are subtle distinctions even as to cooperatives and other membership organizations. If the cooperative is a producers' cooperative and is big enough, it is all right. For example, there is no objection to selling time to the Land O' Lakes Dairy Association and, of course, it is all right for an industrial concern to advertise for employees and tell them of the benefits which go with their jobs, such as vacations, medical care, and disability insurance. A labor union, however, cannot buy time to say anything about the benefits its members receive in the way of medical care, insurance, etc., even though it does not ask its listeners to join the union.

The N. A. B. code manual, in its discussion of the complicated subject of labor unions and controversial issues, warns N. A. B. members:

"The situation is further complicated by the fact that employers, as a rule, won't discuss their labor problems on the air and are inclined to frown on those stations, especially in smaller communities, which open their facilities to labor unions."

I think we are warranted in accepting with some degree of skepticism the assurance that this attitude on the part of employers, who may also happen to be advertisers, has nothing whatsoever to do with the amount of free time made available for the discussion of union problems or with the policy against the sale of time for such purposes. We may ask, too, whether the attitude of the large advertisers has anything to do with the policy relation to consumer cooperatives.

The Blue Network has recently changed hands and fortunately the new owner has stated that he will consider all requests for time strictly on their individual merits and without arbitrary discriminations. This policy should result in a real contribution to a freer discussion of public issues and it is to be hoped that his lead will be promptly followed by the independent stations as well as by the other networks.

Another development which may have an important effect upon the discussion of public issues over the air is the recently adopted program policy of the Columbia Broadcasting System. C. B. S. disclaims for itself all right to an editorial policy, except as to radio (I am not certain that I understand all the implications of the exception). It also requires commentators to eliminate all personal opinion from their comments. A strong argument made in support of this restriction on commentators is that it minimizes the opportunities for business concerns, under the guise of advertising, to buy up time for the exposition of their own philosophies. I will not attempt here to argue the merits or demerits of this policy. The commentators themselves have taken up the cudgels and it looks as if this is an issue that will be adequately aired. C. B. S. should be commended for making its facilities available for the discussion of its own policies.

The question which immediately arises, however, is, even if the elimination of all editorializing is desirable, is it possible? Editorializing exists in the mere decision as to what is or what is not newsworthy and the emphasis placed on one item of news as against another. For example, the Washington Evening Star, which also happens to own radio station WMAL, Washington outlet for the Blue Network, didn't bother to write an editorial in defense of Blue's policies as outlined in the testimony of the official I have been referring to. It was much simpler not to mention the testimony in its news columns.

Another question is, if public issues are to be discussed only on free time will a sufficient amount of free time continue to be available? Radio broadcasting has long passed the trial period as an advertising medium. The demand for advertising time is constantly on the increase. Broadcasters can well afford to be generous in making time available for the discussion of public issues when no buyer for the time is in sight. But as advertising demand has increased the unpaid time available tends more and more to be the poorest time, from the standpoint of reaching the widest audience. We may well reach the point, and in the not far distant future, when broadcasters will be able to find a profitable market for every single minute of the broadcasting day. What, then, will be their policy? Can they be relied on to resist the pressure to make the maximum profits which, after all, is what they are in business for? The Blue Network's time sales in 1942 increased 22.7 percent over 1941, and the sales for the past 6 months of 1943 were almost 70 percent higher than the sales for the corresponding period of 1942. Already, according to its witness, it is seeking a commercial sponsor for its Town Hall program, which would mean that the selection of subjects and speakers would be brought within the influence of the sales and business policies of the sponsor. The increase in the time sales of the other networks has not been as spectacular as that of Blue, which has in the past been at a commercial disadvantage because of its affiliation with N. B. C., but the general decrease in time left unsold has been rapid, and there is no reason to believe that the trend will be reversed after the war, when the large advertisers will have specific goods to sell rather than mere goodwill.

Even if we assume that the broadcasters and their sponsors are concerned only with the sale of goods and not the dissemination of any ideas of their own, what does the present trend of radio promise for the future in the way of a positive service in the public interest? We have made our decision that the greatest safety lies in having our radio outlets privately operated. They must rely upon advertising for the money with which to operate. But what will our civilization be like if the culture and ideas which we receive from radio are merely a byproduct of the advertising business?

The problem of freedom of the air is not limited to what shall be said or heard over our domestic broadcasting stations. We also have the problem of what we shall say to and hear from the peoples of the other nations of the world.

Prior to the war, international broadcasting from this country was in private hands, but the broadcasting stations were few in number and there was not enough advertising to sustain them. Since the war, they have come under Government operation and the number of stations has been markedly increased. What will our international broadcasting policy be after the war? Will the Government continue to operate these stations, or will they be returned to private hands, or will we have both Government and private stations operating side by side? Whatever alternative we choose, will we recognize that listeners abroad, like listeners at home, are entitled to receive a fair presentation of the news and a well-rounded discussion of the public questions in which they may be interested? Should we have one standard for what we shall hear from our domestic broadcasting stations and another for what we shall beam to the people of other countries? And should we not expect the same standards to be observed in the broadcasts beamed from other nations to this country which we observe in our broadcasts to them? We have never denied to our citizens freedom to listen to all broadcasts, irrespective of the source from which they are beamed. Can there be any freedom of discussion on a world-wide basis unless the other nations grant the same freedom to their citizens? And, finally, can we afford to let democracy's story remain untold or be misrepresented to the people of any nation merely because it is unprofitable, from a business standpoint, to operate the facilities with which to tell that story?

We have always hoped that every war would be the last one, and that is our hope about this war. Civilization cannot hold up under many more, if even one more, like it. We cannot let the point that there have always been wars deter us in our determination to obtain an enduring peace. No enduring peace can be made solely by compact among rulers. It must be based on the desires and beliefs of the people themselves and an understanding by the peoples of each nation of the problems and aspirations of the peoples of the other nations, accompanied by a common determination to get along with each other. There can be no enduring peace unless it is a democratic peace.

Alien Property Custodian Establishes Northwest Field Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the announcement has just been released that Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, has completed arrangements for the establishment of a Northwest field office of the Alien Property Custodian, located in Portland, Oreg. In this office

will be located a library of between 40,000 and 50,000 patents and patent applications which were seized from enemy aliens and nationals of occupied countries. The office is being set up and maintained in conjunction with the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing program.

This move is one of significance to Northwest industry and the utilization of the great natural resources of that area in connection with low-cost Bonneville power generated in the Columbia River. Without doubt many of these patents will be found most serviceable in the development and use of these resources. The placing of them in a public library and office where they will be available to engineers, scientists, and others engaged in the development and use of our resources is most appropriate.

I include as a part of my remarks the release of the Bonneville Power Administration Information Service, dated December 1, 1943, which is as follows:

Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver announced today that arrangements had been completed with Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, for the establishment of a Northwest field office, including a library of between 40,000 and 50,000 patents and patent applications seized from enemy aliens and nationals of occupied countries.

Mr Roy Shawcross, a chemical engineer, has been appointed Northwest field representative of the Office of Alien Property Custodian's division of patent administration to assist in the use of these patents, which are available to American industry.

This office is being set up in conjunction with the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing program to enable Northwest business and industrial leaders to take full advantage of the vast store of inventions and information represented by these patents. The Northwest field office will be associated with Bonneville's market development section on the third floor of the Guardian Building in Portland, Oreg.

Commenting that the field office would be an important asset to private enterprise in the development of Northwest resources, Administrator Raver pointed out that "many thousands of patents of untold value in the field of chemistry, metallurgy, plastics, electronics, and other fields of applied science will be available to assist in the development of a sound, diversified industry in the Pacific Northwest. The swiftly growing industrial empire in this region should provide a vast field for valuable utilization of these enemy patents not only in the present war emergency but in the conversion to peacetime industry. Mr. Crowley, the Alien Property Custodian, also has expressed the belief that collaboration of his organization with the Bonneville Administration in this project will be of great benefit to industry in the Northwest area."

Patent holdings now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian constitute the largest number of United States patents under one control. They include inventions of the leading scientists of Europe and cover virtually every field of science. These patents have been seized for the three-fold purpose of increasing the effectiveness of United States war production, stimulating basic and applied research in the fields covered by these inventions and assisting in the development of new production technics for sound business in the post-war world.

The Northwest field office will be the first established by the Alien Property Custodian's Division of Patent Administration and will serve the area west of Chicago. In order to make the patents available as widely as possible, the library will be exhibited in various Northwest industrial centers in cooperation with the Bonneville Administration's district offices.

Copies of all patents vested by the Alien Property Custodian will be available for inspection by the public at the Portland office. Classified patent indexes and catalogs will be available through Bonneville's district offices.

John Clifford Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, Mr. John Clifford Folger has recently been elected president of the Investment Bankers Association. It has been my privilege to know Mr. Folger for a great many years. He is an outstanding, public-spirited citizen of the District of Columbia, having been chairman of the Community Chest. He is now the chairman of the District of Columbia Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Prior to Mr. Folger's election as president of the Investment Bankers Association, an article was printed about him in Finance. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORTHRIGHT MR. FOLGER—THE NEXT PRESIDENT OF THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA BELIEVES IN "HOME SECURITIES FOR HOME FOLKS"

There is a singleness of purpose about John Clifford Folger that is impressive.

The handsome, prematurely gray Washingtonian, who is slated to be the next president of the Investment Bankers Association of America, has a direct, forthright way of getting at anything. He drives ahead straight to the goal, without detouring. Yet he has the happy faculty of being able to illustrate his point by telling a homely, human-interest yarn * * * he believes wholeheartedly in the survival of the country merchant in securities.

Perhaps the first time that John Clifford Folger came into the national spotlight was when he was testifying before the Securities and Exchange Commission in opposition to the practice of competitive bidding for security issues.

"My old grandfather out in Iowa always advised me never to buy a horse at an auction sale," "Cliff" Folger confided to the S. E. C. "He said that most of the bidders at an auction sale usually took a nip or two, so that it was easy to get excited and bid too high for the spavined critter."

The national magazines such as Time featured the telling story, which illustrated his reason for opposing the auction sale of security issues.

AN EASY NATURALNESS

There is an easy naturalness about the 47-year-old Washington investment banker, who is destined to succeed Jay N. Whipple, of Chicago, as the standard bearer for the investment bankers of the country. He is smart and articulate—he is an interesting speaker, with a flair for the orderly presentation of a subject and a gift of phrasing that commands attention. Sincerity is one of his outstanding characteristics—Cliff Folger could never qualify for the fairly populous order of the stuffed shirts and there is nothing pontifical about his delivery.

Cliff Folger was born at Sheldon, Iowa—a thriving little town in O'Brien County in the northwestern part of the State near the Minnesota border. His father was engaged in the lumber business, dealt in farm lands, and was one of the pioneer livestock raisers. His older brother had responded to the call of the great Northwest and had settled in the State of Washington. He painted such a glamorous picture of the opportunities and of the charm of life in the Northwest that the Folger family was persuaded to follow his lead. They settled at Pullman. Here Cliff Folger attended high school and then entered the State College of Washington.

It was in college that he first demonstrated his qualities of leadership. He was president of his senior class. A member of the Sigma Nu fraternity, he was elected president of the Pan Hellenic Council, which was composed of all the Greek letter fraternities at the State College. Like other successful bankers, he can lay claim to the fact that he used to be a newspaperman. For while he was an undergraduate at college, he served as correspondent for a number of newspapers, and managed to make $40 or $50 a month at space rates. He was particularly active in affairs on the campus—he liked to stir up the animals and keep up with what was going on.

There is something about a certain type of training that gives precision to thinking—where the mind is controlled more by facts than by hunches. It is interesting to note that "Cliff" Folger not only won a degree of Bachelor of Science but that he also gained a Master's degree as well.

HIS FIRST JOB

Pullman is in the great apple-growing section of the Northwest. Living in this environment, he acquired an on-the-ground knowledge of the problems of the producers of this money crop, particularly about the shipping of the fruit. Shortly after graduation, he landed a job in Washington with the United States Bureau of Marketing in the Department of Agriculture. This was in the nature of a statistical job—so he spent the first 2 years of his career in government learning about bureaucracy at first hand.

He left the capital to go to Rochester, N. Y., where for several years he served as assistant general manager of the Internal Shippers Association, which was a sort of trade association for the shippers of apples, perishable vegetables and other such commodities. In this capacity, it was necessary for him to make frequent trips to Washington to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission to discuss freight rates as well as to testify before Congressional committees in advocating legislation that would protect the interests of the members of the association.

In Washington, Cliff Folger made many warm friends and formed a love for life in the Capital. In 1929—at the height of the stock market boom—some of his friends in the security business persuaded him to enter the investment field. It seemed like a golden opportunity and an easy way to make a fortune—so Cliff Folger decided that he would embark upon such a career. On November 2, 1929, he embarked upon another career that has proved to be a notably happy one—he married Miss Kathrine Dulin, whose family had been prominent in Knoxville, Tenn., and in Washington. On his wedding day, the stock market had one of its most critical sinking spells—another break after the memorable "Black Thursday" in October.

He confides that he got a lifetime's experience compressed into a very few weeks during

those tumultuous days when securities plummeted—and fortunes vanished as the ticker recorded lower and still lower quotations.

It will be recalled that the security business during the years of 1930 and 1931 was not any bed of roses. In the latter year Cliff Folger with James Nolan formed the firm of Folger, Nolan & Co., which today is one of the most successful investment security firms in Washington. In the reconstruction of various enterprises, Mr. Folger has had an oportunity to demonstrate his resourcefulness. The Mayflower Hotel in Washington ran into trouble during its first few years. The bonds went in default. The bondholders looked around for an able and resourceful reorganization manager and appointed Cliff Folger to this post. He had the satisfaction of seeing the great hotel property in Washington work out of its difficulties and be released from receivership. He still serves as treasurer and director of the Mayflower Hotel Corporation.

The Potomac Joint Stock Land Bank, which had made mortgages on numerous farms in Virginia and Maryland, shared the experience of other farm mortgage companies and found the going rough during the years of the depression. When its outstanding mortgages had been reduced to about $1,500,000, Folger, Nolan and Co. purchased the assets of the company and formed the Piedmont Securities Co. to wind up its business in this field. Thus, as a trouble-shooter "Cliff" Folger acquired a reputation and also gained an experience that proved to be valuable in the years that followed. The firm has done a considerable amount of local financing and, as he modestly puts it, has distributed the "general run of mine" type of securities. It is quite likely that his firm would rank first in the sale of high-grade bonds in the District of Columbia but with characteristic modesty, he states that it is "one of many excellent investment houses in Washington."

While nomination as head of the official ticket of nominees as approved by the association's board of governors for submission at the annual meeting at New York next November is considered tantamount to election, the man who is destined to be the new leader of the Investment Bankers Association is naturally reluctant to outline what his policies will be. However, it is known that "Cliff" Folger believes that the investment bankers should give a great deal of thought to the manner in which they will function during the post-war years. The various committees of the I. B. A. have already started research to determine what the probable needs of American industry and business will be in the various fields which must, of necessity, rely upon the private capital market. There is no one who is a more ardent champion of the institution of free enterprise than is the next president of the Investment Bankers Association. What is more, he has the knack of getting along with Government officials and working in harmony with them.

HAS STRONG VIEWS

His philosophy as to the place of the sound local security houses situated throughout the country, which afford a personal relationship between the customer and the dealer, was well expressed when he tectified before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"I grew up in a small town of about 3,000 people in the State of Washington," Cliff Folger told the S. E. C. "Since most of my life was spent in that community I naturally relate my experience to small-town merchandising. My family owned and operated a country store for a generation, and I have always been interested in the life and future of the small merchant. I think the trend away from the country merchant generally is most unfortunate. One of the few trends in the opposite direction is in the securities business, where during the last 9 or 10 years the small dealer has come into his own. This system of security distribution I think is wholesome and sound.

"The principle of having a securities salesman live with and be responsible primarily to his customers is good. Formerly the allegiance was to out-of-town employers. The local dealer realizes his best friends are his customers. They are the ones we have to live with and face every day, if a deal goes sour.

"Any system of merchandising should rise or fall on the soundness of the system and the manner in which it serves the public interest. The local dealer cannot claim protection simply to help him make a living. On the other hand, I feel that the success of the local dealer goes hand in hand with public interest. I should greatly deplore it if those in the securities business in Washington and other cities should be obliged to return to the employ of big city houses and big city bosses. As it now stands, the trend has been all toward our independence.

"In the case of competitive bidding, however, the principle runs counter to all of my early training and merchandising experience. My father and grandfather were pioneer livestock men, first in Iowa and later in Washington State.

ATTENDING THE HORSE SALES

"I don't know how many of you ever grew up on a farm or lived on a farm, but in the rural communities, it is customary for the farmers to have livestock sales in the fall. Everybody attended these sales, partly to get a free lunch, and sometimes to bid on livestock. I learned later on that there was sometimes a bottle in the barn, but I was too young in those days to realize what it was. That was to stimulate the bidding.

"My father and grandfather never bought livestock at these auctions and one of my first lessons was that such purchases were unsound, since a man would become so interested in beating out his neighbor and showing everybody that he had as much money and could bid as well as the next one that he would find himself paying $60 or $70 for a horse that was probably worth $50. When he got the horse home he might find it had a spavin.

"Under the auction method, stress is on the top dollar rather than on quality merchandising. There may be some exceptions, but I don't think the securities business is one of them, especially if we consider country distribution. The reason so many country merchants are going under is their inability to buy on the same basis as the chains. In the bond business, as it now exists, the country dealer knows what the spread is on new issues and he can buy as cheaply as his competitors. It is true that under the selling group he doesn't get all of the spread, but the speculative risk is not so great since he has an option for several hours within which to do his merchandising. It is more important for a small business to make a small sure profit than it is to take large risks for larger profits. The country storekeeper generally never knows just what his competitors are paying for goods. There are several price levels. In our country store, we were in the smallest. We bought out of Spokane, and I suppose that the Spokane house bought from some wholesaler in Chicago or some place like that.

"In the selling group, we do not take the risk of the underwriter. We can stand by and sell our bonds and do the merchandising job during the few hours when we have those bonds firm. With our business the local dealer knows exactly what his competitors pay and he competes on the same basis.

"I believe that under compulsory competitive bidding, underwriting would resolve itself into a few large bidders, who would not be selling their services and who would not be performing the merchandising job now done by the local dealer. They would simply be speculating in a large block of securities, which they would distribute as quickly as possible without great regard for geographical or other consideration except to sell to the buyer who moved most quickly. Our clients do not act as rapidly as the retail buyers in the large city. The present system of distribution tends to protect the country buyer and to insure that he will have an opportunity to buy first grade securities. I believe under competitive bidding there would be an inevitable enlargement of the selling forces of large distributors. Securities salesmen would then work for large city bosses.

"I don't think that the pressure on the country dealer with respect to his syndicate participations is one fraction of what it was on a fellow who worked for a city boss. If he did not succeed, he would look for another job. But with us as dealers, we turn the things down because we realize that these fellows may be here today and gone tomorrow, but if we can satisfy our customers, they will live with us and trade with us.

AN UNFORTUNATE SITUATION

"When you get up to the large selling organizations, the rewards and promotions come through pleasing those employers rather than pleasing the clients. That is an unfortunate situation—this may run counter to my friends here who have large organizations, but if it is treason, well it just is. A large selling force brings the temptation to set up deals to pay overhead and keep the selling force employed. The local dealer is more resourceful, more versatile, and can keep his overhead within bounds. He is more like the country doctor. All he has is his horse and wagon and his time, and if things get tough, what he does then is to just tighten up his belt.

"Under the present set-up, we are all for the big city houses if they have a good deal and we are critical of them if they have a poor deal—and we don't hesitate to show our feelings. The local dealer is a wholesome brake on the underwriter. He is a valuable buffer between a remote seller and a local buyer. He has to make the decisions with respect to the securities he sells, and he has got to live with that fellow, play golf with him, and see him every day at lunch around town. The fellow in New York or Chicago is not particularly concerned whether the deal goes pretty well in Albany or Los Angeles, or anywhere else. It is a sort of a general dealing. He is not in the front-line trenches and living with the fellow with whom he trades. The independence of the local dealer, I think, is most important in the securities distribution business. If my philosophy about the horse is right, maybe this competitive bidding will get the prices higher and would probably speed up the distribution. It might also help the stockholders in these holding companies, but I don't think it would afford the protection that exists in the present system against overpricing and against imperfectly set up securities. The present trend toward the local dealer is the evidence of the satisfaction on the part of the buyer.

"This auction block method in merchandising puts price above quality. It puts speculation above merchandising. It puts in the big city distributors over the local dealers, and I am against it with all the emphasis at my command."

FOR HOME SECURITIES

On another occasion, he inveighed against the practice of private placements. For a period of time, the best utility issues in and around Washington were sold direct to the large insurance companies. By this practice, the utility companies did not have to register the issues with the S. E. C. "Cliff" Folger explained to the Commission that this deprived the local investors of sound investments—and constituted an unfair practice. Insisting that private placements should be

put on a parity with issues registered with the S. E. C., he said: "The present situation results in a condition whereby the big buyer gets the wholesale rate and on the best securities, while the little fellow gets the retail price on the seconds and thirds. If this trend continues, the high grade issues will be bottled up forever in the hands of the big buyers * * * the home folks will have what the big buyers do not want."

He has been quite active in the affairs of the Investment Bankers Association for a number of years During the past 2 years, he has served as one of the five vice presidents and is the chairman of the I. B. A.'s Federal legislation committee. He has been a member of other important committees within the I. B. A., such as the securities act committee, the education committee, and the public information committee.

In Washington, he has been long prominent in civil activities. In 1940, he served as general chairman of the Community Chest Drive and he imparted such enthusiasm to his coworkers that for the first time in many years, the Community Chest topped its quota. In war financing, he has served as vice chairman of the War Savings Bond Committee of the District of Columbia, co-chairman of the Washington Victory Fund Committee and is a member of the executive committee of the Victory Fund Committee of the Fifth Federal Reserve District. Since 1942, he has been chairman of the Red Cross Chapter of the District of Columbia.

It will be recalled that President Roosevelt in 1941 publicly criticized the citizens of Washington for their meager response to the Red Cross Drive. In 1942, with "Cliff" Folger spark-plugging the campaign, it proved so successful that Mr. Roosevelt publicly awarded a kudo to the leaders of the money raising campaign.

He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the Washington Cathedral and is on the executive committee of the Garfield Hospital.

While he has been president of Folger, Nolan & Co. since 1931, he has extensive business interests. He is a director of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and the Appalachian Mills of Knoxville, Tenn. He and the members of his family have substantial holdings of stock in the leading commercial banks in Washington, and Knoxville, Tenn., where he is president of the Cumberland Trust Co.

"Cliff" Folger is most approachable, has a warm personality and is exceedingly diplomatic. He has a way of going direct to the heart of a problem with little lost motion. Consideration for the other fellow's viewpoint has long been one of the characteristics that has made it easy for him to win and hold friends.

Golf is the sport that carries the greatest appeal for him and he will be frequently found on the links at Chevy Chase Country Club. While not one of the best players in the club—he shoots around 90—he is known as a tough trader on the first tee. "Cliff" Folger goes on the theory that he "would rather have an opponent's hatred than his contempt."

The Peace To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from Mrs. Charles F. Bailey, of Ballinger, Tex.:

NOVEMBER 22, 1943.

Representative O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER: We observed in our town world community day on November 11, with an interracial, interdenominational prayer service for peace. Three hundred attended and a ballot was taken at the close of the service. I am sending you a sample of the ballot and there was not one who voted against the two proposals.

This is our way of telling you we want a just and lasting peace for all nations. We know the price and demands of an abiding peace, which are more deep-rooted in sacrifice than war, and we are willing to meet those demands.

We know that the best statesmanship will be ineffective without the animating will of the peoples. We vote for "liberty and justice for all," and mean all.

Sincerely yours,

KATHLEEN BAILEY.

SAMPLE BALLOT

1. Would you be willing to instruct your Senator and your Representative in Washington to vote for a bill which would authorize the United States to join a world organization for the purpose of insuring a just and durable peace, and share in its expense and all other responsibility involved? Yes.

2. Would you be willing to continue for a period after the war such wartime regulations as the rationing of food, gasoline, and restrictions of travel, etc., if such were necessary to relieve distress, restore order, and help other nations? Yes.

Informal Addresses to Soldiers at Teheran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following informal addresses by the President to the soldiers at Teheran:

Officers and men, I seem at this moment to be thoroughly equipped with the weapons of war (two microphones).

If you had said to me or I had said to you 3 years ago that we would meet in Iran today, we would have probably said that we were completely crazy.

PARLEY HAD TWO PURPOSES

I got here 4 days ago to meet with the Marshal of Soviet Russia and the Prime Minister of England to try to do two things.

The first was to lay military plans for cooperation between the three nations looking toward the winning of the war just as fast as we possibly can, and I think we have made progress toward that end. The other purpose was to talk over world conditions after the war, to try to plan for a world for us and for our children when war would cease to be a necessity.

We have made great progress in that, also, but, of course, the first thing is to win the war, and I want to tell you that you, all of you, individually and collectively, are part of that purpose.

All of you who are here today and all of you who are farther south in Iran can always remember that you have taken a very necessary and a very useful part in winning the war.

When I woke up this morning in this camp and looked out, I said to myself, "I am back in Arizona or New Mexico." And then I suddenly realized how far away from home we are.

America is proud of you and proud of what you are doing in this distant place. I wish that great numbers of our people could see this work of getting necessary equipment and supplies through to our ally who has had very heavy losses, but who is licking the Nazi hordes. And so I am on my way home and I wish I could take all of you with me.

The people back home know what you are doing and how well you are doing it. They, too, are proud of you.

All I can say is, may you get back home to our good America just as soon as you can.

Good-bye and good luck.

ADDRESS AT CAMP HOSPITAL TO AMBULATORY CASES

This place is a good deal like home. I landed about 10 days ago over in Morocco and this is the nearest thing to the United States that I have seen yet.

I wish the people back home could all see what we are doing here and how well we are doing it.

I want you boys, all of you, to remember that back at home we are thinking of you. I know you wish to get out of the hospital as soon as possible and come back to the United States just as fast as we can lick the Nazis.

I have had conferences with Marshal Stalin and Mr. Churchill during the past 4 days, very successful as to laying plans as far as we can to make it unnecessary for us again to have Americans in Iran just as long as we and our children live.

I think that is worth fighting for, and even being sick for in Iran.

It is good to see you and I wish I could stay longer today. It is good to see a lot of fellow Americans, even in Persia.

Get well as soon as you can and come back home.

New Deal Agency's Slur on Michigan Farmers Borders on Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the nefarious slur against Michigan farmers by the New Deal's War Relocation Authority, as uncovered this week by newspapermen, borders on treason against the United States through giving comfort to the enemy and the responsible parties should be appropriately dealt with immediately.

Note these two sentences, directly quoted from this publication paid for by American taxpayers and laudatory to our enemy, the Japs:

You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

These statements are taken from the December 1, 1943, issue of Midwest Frontiers published by the United States Government's Cleveland Area War Relocation Authority and which I am advised was mailed to Japs in American internment camps.

Imagine the newspapers in Tokyo with glaring headlines, based on this ill-conceived brain child of a New Deal theorist. The Japs are probably being told today that their race has taken over control of the great agricultural industry in Michigan and Ohio. They are probably pictured in the land of their fathers as the exaltation of the "super race"—elevated to high positions of instructors by the enemy, the United States.

What tremendous propaganda the race of yellow men will find in this warped scheme of a New Deal dreamer. What greater comfort for the homeland could the Japs provide than that found in the words of the article referred to and written and published at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

Mr. Dakan, or whoever wrote the article, either deliberately concocted the slur or is grossly ignorant about the State of Michigan.

This is to serve notice on that author, his ilk among the New Deal theorists, or any other bureaucratic Utopian visionaries that the citizens of Michigan do not need any little yellow devils running around the country telling them how to bathe, how to farm, or how to do anything else.

If the slurmonger who said Michigan farmers needed a lesson from the Japs in sanitation would refer to the United States census records he would find how ignorant his own words have proven him to be.

On such items as farm homes having inside running water, flush toilets, and bathtubs or showers, Michigan farmers are above the average for the Nation. Ten percent more Michigan farms have inside running water than the national rural average; over 6 percent more Michigan farm houses have inside flush toilets than the national average, and the number of Michigan farm homes equipped with either a shower or a bathtub are over 4 percent above the national rural area average.

So where does the War Relocation Authority get the idea Michigan farmers need anyone to talk sanitation to them?

The Eighth District of Michigan, which I represent in Congress and which includes Saginaw, Shiawassee, Gratiot, Clinton, Montcalm, and Ionia Counties, stand well above the national average of sanitation equipment on rural farms to which I have referred. Shiawassee County, for instance, has nearly twice as many farm homes equipped with running water as the national average.

These counties in the Eighth District of Michigan contain 21,821 farms, representing a real-estate value of farms and buildings in excess of $121,000,000. A great percentage of 1,576,677 acres making up the farm lands of the Eighth Congressional District are drained by some 1,507 drainage enterprises carried on by the county drain commissioners and the farmers.

Furthermore, for the information of the War Relocation Authority, which believes Michigan farmers should be taught something about soap and water, the United States Army and selective-service officials have not hesitated to draft Michigan farm boys and send them into the far eastern war zone to face these treacherous yellow killers.

No, Mr. Dakan and Mr. Weiss; it did not make any difference at Guadalcanal, Sicily, or in the Solomons whether these Michigan farm boys had a bath for days and days. These boys, whom you try to make the public believe come from unsanitary homes, showed superb fighting qualities when they faced the Japs in the Pacific. And they do not need any Japs sent into Michigan to show their parents how to live.

In order that the Michigan farmers may know how their tax money is being used to praise the abilities of the Japs and to slur tillers of the soil of the great Wolverine State, I submit the following excerpt from the War Relocation Authority's publication to the Japs:

> We will not have to explain to you what we do in the wintertime. You will find out that our large barns are full of livestock, our cows must be milked, our chickens fed, our machinery repaired, and plans made for another year. Then some of us sleep later in the morning in the wintertime and listen to the radio longer at night. You will discover that many of our houses were built in pioneer days. That rural electrification is mostly a new thing. That many tenant houses do not have bathrooms because they were built before bathrooms came into style. They have not been remodeled because the war has made it impossible to get material. Then, believe it or not, you have some few tenants and seasonal workers who do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.
>
> We need to know something of your skill in packing and grading, your artistic sense of orderliness. We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture as well as the science.
>
> Finally, let me repeat, the only way to find out about Ohio and Michigan is to come and live here. Then you will know. You cannot get it out of a story book.

Mr. Speaker, the authors of this publication should not go unpunished. Congress should make a thorough investigation of this slur and this act giving comfort to the enemy. The author should be called before the Appropriations Committee to explain his philosophy which prompted him to write as he did and heads of the Authority should also be made to reveal why they permitted it.

Promotion in Rank of Soldiers in the Hands of the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the first 2 years after Pearl Harbor. Since that fateful day, we have constantly urged more and greater and speedier action, and more vigorous efforts directly against Japan. With Christian fortitude, the mothers and fathers and relatives of our Bataan boys now in the hands of the Japanese have waited and watched and refrained from public outcry, lest we give comfort to the enemy. With bleeding hearts we have had to reconcile ourselves to the necessity of waiting until it is possible for us to strike with reasonable assurance that we will not be sending brave boys to perish in futile slaughter and disaster, such as that barely averted at Tarawa only a fortnight ago.

But tense forbearance can be forced to explode with incalculable consequences by thoughtless, ill-advised, and careless language such as that used by the War Department in discussing the Chavez bill (S. 1374).

I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Las Vegas Daily Optic of December 3, published in Las Vegas, N. Mex. I select this editorial from many which have come to my attention because it is from the pen of a man who is considered one of the best-informed editors in the State, and because it reflects the temper of the people, and the need for a more frank revelation of the problems and difficulties facing the country's effort in the war with Japan—a war being fought on the other side of Pearl Harbor, rather than on this side, only because of the heroic defense at Bataan and Corregidor.

This editorial reads as follows:

AWAITING AWARD

Refusal of the War Department to approve the proposed law for awarding promotions in rank to Bataan's defenders, has aroused a bitter criticism on the floor of the Senate. It has also brought expression of the thought which irks thousands of citizens who resent delay in offensive action for the Pacific theater of war.

The proposed law would have permitted the War Department to award advances in rank and higher commissions for the fighting men who offered the first great sacrifices in defense of the Nation. Secretary of War Stimson, objecting to the proposal, inferred that such promotions might offer a premium for quitters or those who prefer becoming war prisoners of the enemy to fighting to the death. The inference was most unfortunate under the circumstances. Certainly the survivors of Bataan and Corregidor who laid down their empty guns at the command of General Wainwright in surrender to the Japanese after 5 months of terrible suffering from lack of food, arms, and medical care invited no slur from anyone, much less the head of the War Department.

All United Nations citizens know what happened on the island of Luzon from December 7, 1941, to May 6, 1942. They know that the meager forces of our fighting men, including the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, were trapped because of the failure of someone in high authority to anticipate the Japanese sneak attack. They know that the 1,400 or more New Mexico men and their officers who were hustled off to the Philippines without sufficient training or armament, stood up like the bravest of American fighting men to battle the overwhelming hordes of the enemy until there was nothing left to fight with, and there were no food supplies nor sufficient medical service. Only 104 of those men and 3 of their officers fled Bataan to Corregidor. The rest stood up and fought to the last.

Only one of New Mexico's delegation in the Congress [Senator CHAVEZ] has seen fit to castigate the Secretary of War for the insulting inference. The others appear to be fearful that they may be listed among those who deplore our Government's persistent ignoring of Pacific war needs.

Those men on Bataan and Corregidor were written off the War Department's lists as being readily expendable but nothing has been reported officially or otherwise to rate them as despicable quitters who sought surrender rather than heroic sacrifice. Certainly nothing has been reported to even infer that any of them quit during those 150 days and nights of terrific struggle from the hour of the first Jap attack until General Wainwright raised the white flag.

The proposed law may not be acceptable to the War Department because of the possibility that some craven fighter might lay down his arms to become a prisoner of the enemy. But that fear should not have been expressed in any reference to those who fought on Bataan. Apology from the Secretary of War is something less than required by the circumstances. What is really needed is a change in our Government's entire attitude toward the war in the Pacific and the situation of war prisoners now held by Japan. That change seems unlikely. The latest declaration from those who are planning the war is that our fighting men in the Pacific must go on waiting until the territorial interests of our allies have been completely secured, before they can move to avenge and reward the men trapped at Bataan and on Corregidor.

Poland Chose Not To Compromise With Her Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the President of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent:

POLAND CHOSE NOT TO COMPROMISE WITH HER HONOR

Year after year, since that glorious day in November 1918, when Poland regained her freedom after 150 years of slavery under the joint imperialisms of Germany, Austria, and Russia, we here have been in the habit of celebrating Poland's anniversary of independence—each year with rising joy and admiration at the sight of the most remarkable recuperative power of peaceful reconstruction ever shown by any nation in history.

Alas, this twenty-fifth of these proud anniversaries is overshadowed and almost obliterated, because it is also the fifth anniversary of Poland's new struggle against the same dark forces of the past, only in their new cloak of totalitarianism and communism.

To the heroic resistance of the five Polish generations of the past are being added 5 long tortuous years of suffering and ruthless extermination which will fill with horror the bloody pages of the annals of this war.

But Poland's pages will not be stained by either cowardice or dishonor, treachery or compromise. The Polish soldier, wherever he is, symbolizes the indomitable spirit of Poland inculcated in the nation by its great emancipator, teacher, and leader, Marshal Joseph Pilsudski.

The glory of the Polish soldier—the most unknown and unrecognized soldier—whether he died in the heroic defense of Warsaw, or on the abandoned fields of France, in the hot sands of Tobruk or on the snowy peaks of Narvik, in the deeps of the ocean lanes to Murmansk, or in the air above London, where the Poles were so many among the so few—that glory stares the world in its face and shames it from barter with Polish blood.

Therefore, our first duty today is to pay homage not only to him, who wears with honor the Polish uniform in Allied ranks, but to him and her, still more unknown, who keep the fires of resistance burning in the homeland regardless of cost.

Let us rise and bow our heads in silent tribute. Thank you.

When one scans the endless sacrifices made by the Polish people in the long years of this war, one must ask: "Had they a choice?" to which I must answer: Yes, they had a choice. They chose when Hitler offered Poland the chance to join Germany in her attack on Russia. Poland chose not to compromise with her honor and her treaties and refused.

Time and again, whenever the moral line of the Allies would seem to bend, Germany tempted the Poles to reconsider. They are still choosing to refuse in spite of their neighbor's brazen interpretation of the principles agreed upon in Moscow to the effect that the Atlantic Charter gives them the right to half of Poland.

We respect and shall respect Russia's contribution to the defeat of Germany to that extent, and only to that extent to which Russia shall respect and honor the contribution of Poland.

Can we here in whose veins flows the same blood so lavishly spilled over there, accept in silence this renewed attempt to despoil the country of our proud origin?

Could this country of ours depend on us, her new citizens, if we were to abandon the just cause of our old country?

Can our fathers and mothers, hundreds of thousands of whose boys are ready to die in the American Army and Navy, not protest against attempts to degrade their victory?

You have answered and it is this answer, transmitted to Poland, which will bolster their courage, justify their hopes, and sustain their strength and faith in the sanctity of our own country's and England's pledge.

No Bonus March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that Congress passed legislation making definite and specific provision to meet the problems which even now are confronting thousands of veterans of the present war every day.

Men are being discharged from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for disabilities incurred in line of duty. And while the Congress has provided for them the same benefits accorded to veterans of the World War and has made a start at setting up a system of vocational rehabilitation, there remains a tremendous job to be done, particularly, I think, as to those young men who were taken out of high school and college courses to go and fight for their country.

Many months ago, I introduced three bills into the Congress. One of these bills provided 26 weeks of unemployment insurance for veterans of this war to remain available to them until exhausted. Another one provided for crediting their entire military service under the terms of the Social Security Act for purposes of establishing entitlement to old-age annuities. The third provided educational grants of $500 per year for veterans desiring to resume their education in any institution of their choice. Since these bills were introduced the President has twice addressed Congress on this subject and legislation has been introduced by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and also by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], one of the best friends of the veteran that has ever held a seat in Congress.

In a recent issue of Click magazine, our colleague, Mr. PATMAN, has an article entitled "No Bonus March After This War" which outlines a program for veterans of this war which, in my judgment, is the most comprehensive and the best proposal yet made as to this all-important duty of the Congress.

I am, therefore, inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks this article by the Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN in the hope that it will receive the careful and immediate attention of the Congress and that legislation of the character outlined by him becomes a first order of business of the Congress.

NO BONUS MARCH AFTER THIS WAR—THE NATION'S DUTY IS TO TAKE BETTER CARE OF ITS RETURNING VETERANS

(By Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Congressman from Texas, author of the World War Bonus Act of 1936)

The problem of the returning veteran is already with us. Every week, 8,000 men are being discharged from the services and the total number released so far—for disability, age, and all other causes—is nearing the million mark. These are but the vanguard of the millions who will follow, but already they are of sufficient number to pose the problem: What shall a grateful Nation do in appreciation of their sacrifices?

Are we going to give them the same shoddy treatment their fathers received after the last war?

Let's recall what happened. When veterans of World War No. 1 were mustered out in 1918–19, they were handed $60 apiece and a train ticket home. Some of them celebrated and awoke next morning with little left but a headache and a train ticket. Even their uniforms did not help in finding employment, for the public had tired of uniforms and jobs were not yet ready for them. So they

roved the streets, sold apples in the square, lived off friends and relatives—former heroes, embittered, disgruntled, and disillusioned.

They went through the depression of 1921–22 without governmental assistance. In 1924 they received a sop in the form of adjusted compensation certificates which were nothing more than Government promises to pay each veteran an average of $1,000—not then when they needed it, but 20 years later in 1945. The law provided they could borrow on these certificates but only from a bank and at compound interest that ate up the principal. This was the intolerable situation which led to the so-called bonus march.

When the depression struck, veterans descended upon Washington. As author of the bill providing for full payment, I appealed to them to stay away, but they came regardless. That sultry June day in 1932 when they were evicted from the Nation's Capital remains one of the darkest days in the history of the land. Their hovels were burned by United States troops. And the next morning, unarmed and unprotected, the marchers were seen in retreat. For miles around the city, veterans and their wives and children were on the move. They slept in parks, in fields, and on the grass by the side of highways. Eviction of the bonus marchers placed a tremendous strain on constitutional government. The Nation has lived to regret it.

This must never happen again.

HOW TO AVOID POST-WAR BONUS MARCH

Instead of a bonus, the veterans of World War No. 2 want an opportunity to get jobs and to create jobs. Instead of a dole, they want the opportunity to make a living.

On July 28, President Roosevelt outlined a broad program of assistance to returning servicemen. Once more, he assured them that the American people "would not let them down." After that speech I discussed the veteran's problem with the President, and drew up a bill which incorporates the 6 points which he suggested. That bill, introduced on September 17 and known as the Demobilization and Surplus Property Act (H. R. 3200), provides:

1. A 3-month furlough with full pay and allotments to dependents, whether or not the veteran is privately employed upon his return. This avoids the mistake made last time when the $60 severance pay was made in a lump sum.

2. If the veteran has not landed a job within the 3-month furlough period, he will be entitled to unemployment insurance for 6 months to give him a further chance to locate himself. If still unemployed at the end of that period, he will enjoy unemployment compensation, which will be paid by the Federal Government through existing State machinery.

3. The war has interrupted the education of millions of our fighting men. I propose they be given an opportunity to complete their education and obtain vocational training. This will have the added advantage of withholding veterans from the labor market until reconversion of industry is complete.

4. Upon entering the armed forces, millions of men and women were deprived of credit toward their old age benefits under the Social Security Act. My bill proposes to give them credit based on the amount of $1,700 a year for the time they serve.

5. Homecoming veterans will need legal aid, insurance counsel, and assistance in numerous ways. The measure would authorize such appropriations as the Veterans' Administration may need.

6. Disabled veterans will have a particularly hard time getting jobs, but I have suggested that every large employer be required to hire at least one disabled veteran out of every 100 employees.

The foregoing provisions embody the six points suggested by the President in his July 28 speech. If enacted into law, these benefits will prevent the apple-selling and disillusionment that caused the Nation so much concern during the 1920's and 1930's. They will aid veterans in finding their rightful niches in the community.

In addition to all this, however, I propose that we regard these men and women as something more than just potential employees who will return to work for somebody else rather than for themselves. We must take cognizance of the fact that many of these veterans are fully capable of becoming their own employers if given the tools and the means of entering business in their own right.

SET UP VETERANS IN BUSINESS

For that reason I have gone beyond the President's six points to add to my bill three other provisions.

These three provisions are based on the sobering fact that the Federal Government now owns and will have on hand at the end of the war a veritable mountain of materials, supplies, tools, airplanes, automobiles, and plant facilities. If this material is dumped on the market, as it was after the last war, it can cause serious economic disturbances. To the salvage dealers who would like to buy it up and to the large concerns who would like to get it for a song it will bring golden profits. But to the small businessman who does not have the cash to purchase it in large quantities it will mean economic competition and perhaps disaster.

My bill, therefore, provides that this property be made available on easy-payment terms to veterans who want to set themselves up in business. The property would be sold—not given away. It would be disbursed with a view to building more local enterprises and decentralizing business activities of a local character. This would create more employment. It would assure use of the Government's stock pile for productive, rather than competitive purposes.

Already I have received letters from veterans over the country asking how they can buy machine tools and equipment to set up garages after the war; how they can get restaurant equipment to open restaurants. My bill calls for establishment of an agency headed by the Custodian of Surplus War Property to dispose of such surpluses.

Many veterans will want to go back to the farm, whence they came. Naturally, they will want to own their own land. I have added a second provision to the President's original program, authorizing an appropriation of $100,000,000 a year up until the end of the war, and $1,000,000,000 a year for 5 years after the war, to be used exclusively to enable qualified veterans to purchase farms under terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The Farm Tenant Act, passed in the peaceful thirties, has demonstrated that the Government will be repaid for money advanced to make landowners out of landless tenants and sharecroppers.

SPECIAL PREMIUM ON WAR BONDS

The third additional provision of my bill would give veterans a 10 percent premium on all War bonds they have purchased, if used to buy farm lands, property, and equipment under terms of the act.

"But what about the cost?"

This question is already being asked by a few among the many of us who can't go to war—a few who stayed at home to profit and whose greatest sacrifice was to forego pleasure driving.

To them I say that veteran benefits are now a settled national policy. The bonus march, born though it was of desperation and dangerous as it was to stable government, settled that issue.

But the advantage of the bill I have introduced is that it is not a dole. It will further free enterprise. It will foster productivity. It will offer freedom of opportunity. If veterans are given the chance to establish their own business, they will generate the profits and the taxes to pay their own way. And those who succeed will help pay the way of those who will never be able to work again.

We Will Not Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of Pearl Harbor. I well recall that sunny December afternoon of 2 years ago when my wife and I walked down the main street of Missoula, Mont., our home town. A friend came along and excitedly asked "Did you hear the news?" "What news?" I answered. "Pearl Harbor has been bombed," he replied. The full import of what he said did not sink in immediately but when it did, I was worried, frightened, and horrified. Worried about our small garrisons in China, the Philippines, Wake, Guam, and Midway; frightened as to the possibilities of a long-drawn-out war with Japan; and horrified that such an act of treachery could occur.

As my wife and I continued our walk to the lodge where I was scheduled to give a memorial address, many thoughts flashed through my mind, and of them all, one stood out above all others. How was it possible, I asked myself, for Pearl Harbor to be attacked so quickly and successfully without our being prepared? I could not find the answer to that question then and I have not found the answer today.

It is inconceivable for me, even yet, to understand how this action was so successfully carried out. Pearl Harbor and Oahu were the most strongly fortified positions on the face of the globe and they had everything they needed to take full and ample care of themselves. How Japan completely caught us unprepared still remains unknown, but it will not remain so forever.

The Roberts report implicated Admiral Kimmel and General Short in Hawaii, but it also, by inference, indicated that Washington must share a part of the blame. Because of the many unknown factors involved, I stated on the floor of the House on October 7, 1943, that—

A real investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster and the needless loss of lives caused by this tragedy will have to, and must, take place at the first appropriate opportunity. It is a story which America is entitled to know, and I intend to do my humble best to see to it that the whole shame-ridden tale is told in full.

It was with real pleasure that I supported Congressman SHORT's resolution of yesterday, which made known the intent and desire of Congress to bring all persons connected with the Pearl Harbor incident to trial within 1 year after

the formal declaration of peace with Japan had been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, before this action was taken, I had communicated with the Secretaries of War and Navy on the statute of limitations, and I here include in the RECORD my letters and their replies:

NOVEMBER 20, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SECRETARY: I was very much interested in recent newspaper accounts to the effect that Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short had waived the statute of limitations involved in his proposed court martial. I am much concerned about the Pearl Harbor incident and I should like a specific statement from you as to whether it is true that General Short has waived the statute of limitations and also if it is true that at some date after December 7, 1943, his court martial will take place.

I should appreciate hearing from you about this and any other related material about the Pearl Harbor affair that you may have at your earliest convenience.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 26, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In reply to your letter of November 20, I wish to advise that Major General Short has agreed to waive the statute of limitation in bar of his trial for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

I assure you that this postponement will not affect the existing rights of the Government nor those of General Short.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

NOVEMBER 20, 1943.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was very much interested in recent newspaper accounts to the effect that Admiral Husband E. Kimmel had waived the statute of limitations involved in his proposed court martial. I am much concerned about the Pearl Harbor incident, and I should like a specific statement from you as to whether it is true that Admiral Kimmel has waived the statute of limitations and also if it is true that at some date after December 7, 1943, his court martial will take place.

I should appreciate hearing from you about this and any other related material about the Pearl Harbor affair that you may have at your earliest convenience.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 22, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of November 20 making inquiry concerning Admiral Kimmel. It is true that Admiral Kimmel has waived his right to demand a court martial on or before December 7. This was done because it was impossible to hold a court martial in the midst of war without recalling a great many officers from active duty in various theaters of the war, and without seriously disrupting the war effort.

It is our purpose to hold this court martial as soon as it is possible to do so without incurring the above stated difficulties.

I trust this statement answers your two questions.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. Speaker, this day of infamy will never be forgotten, and those Americans responsible for this disgrace—whether they be in Washington or Honolulu—will have to pay for their mistakes. They must be brought to justice and the Japanese to complete defeat.

Activities of Our Armed Forces Under Wartime Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, during almost 2 years of this country's participation in the Second World War, our armed forces have shown themselves to be the equal or superior to the best that our enemies could place in the field against us. Even though the final peace is still "a consummation devoutly to be wished," nevertheless the victories won by our arms have added many glorious pages to American history. These victories can be attributed in no small measure to the fact that our forces, be they ground troops, air forces, marines, or Navy, have always acted as a team when operating in any common theater. The work of one branch complements that of another in building toward final victory.

You have read in the public press about the exploits of the Army Air Forces over China, in the southwest Pacific, at Kiska, in north Africa, Italy, and particularly their bombing of Germany. You have heard of the critical victories scored by our naval forces at the Coral Sea, at Midway, and off Savo Island. You have been told of the outstanding bravery and gallantry of the marines at Wake Island, at Guadalcanal, Bougainville, and other places almost too numerous to mention. The Army Ground Forces, too, have been eulogized in motion pictures, press, and radio for their defense of Bataan and Corregidor and for their offensive victories in New Guinea, north Africa, Sicily, and elsewhere.

All of this praise for these branches of the service expresses only meagerly my own admiration and gratitude for their glorious exploits. I arise today, however, to pay tribute to one of the newest units of our armed forces—one whose contributions have not yet been fully recognized but whose function is vital to the success of amphibious operations being carried out all over the world. I refer specifically to the Navy's construction battalions, popularly known and referred to as the Seabees.

These Seabees carry on the work of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department in building bases in the combat zones. They build the naval air bases which serve to bring our bombers and fighters ever closer to their targets. They build the fleet's fueling bases and machine shops. They race against time and under enemy bombs unload ships of their precious cargoes. They build the roads, the utilities, the docks and wharfs, the warehouses, and all the other installations needed to backstop our fleet and our operations. What is more, they have been trained how to fight and how to defend what they build.

The development of the Seabees goes back to the days just before Pearl Harbor, but what gave this newest branch of the Navy the impetus which rushed it to its present size and efficiency was the tragedy of Wake Island, of Guam, and Cavite. The construction workers trapped on those islands by Japan's treachery knew how to build, but they had never been trained to fight. And although they were eager to help in the defense of these bases, permission was denied them because they did not have the protection of a military uniform. Armed, they would have been shot as guerillas.

The Seabees are the Navy's pledge that never again will its builders of advance bases be unable to defend themselves and what they have built. Today, more than 200,000 fighting builders are ready to avenge those helpless construction workers. Well over 100,000 are overseas doing it now, while as many more are in training here for the day when they can join them.

These Seabees are skilled artisans who in peacetime worked as mechanics, as construction workers, as heavy machinery operators, and at some 60 different trades. They came from mines and factories, from garages and building jobs. They came with years of experience behind them. More than a few are veterans of the First World War who saw in the Seabees a chance to serve their country again—to contribute the skill in building which the intervening years had given them.

To command and administer these Seabees came experienced engineers and construction superintendents who were commissioned in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy—the same corps which did such a remarkable job in executing the program of naval shore construction in this country. Thus skilled men and skilled officers were brought together in the naval construction battalions. Enough different skills were assembled so that a battalion is qualified to tackle any construction job it might be expected to meet.

The first battalions sent out proved that the basic conception of the Seabees was sound. Even though they were not equipped or organized as well as they are now, due to the urgency of those early, dark days, they went to work building bases to protect our tenuous supply line to Australia. What they lacked in equipment they made up for in resourcefulness. The result was that

the bases they built sent our fighting fleet into the Coral Sea battle in the best of trim.

That was just the beginning. Guadalcanal came next, with the Seabees moving in on the first assault. With their bulldozers they completed Henderson Field and then later maintained it under almost nightly bombings. Yes; they built companion air strips on Guadalcanal, and roads and bridges and wharves. They built fuel-storage tanks capable of holding hundreds of thousands of gallons of gasoline and oil—with Japs bombing them all the while. With their bulldozers they contributed fully as much to the successful defense of Guadalcanal as the Marines and Army did with their artillery and rifles, or the Air Corps did with their bombs. Each branch would have failed without the support of the others.

Then, with the rise of our own offensive, Guadalcanal's air strips and supply facilities backstopped our attacks on Japan's island bases to the northwest. New Seabee battalions arrived on the scene to consolidate each advance by building new bases. At Rendova, the fighting builders moved in with the assault troops under a rain of Jap bombs. The troops managed to land all right, but getting the critically needed artillery ashore was a different matter. The beaches were too swampy to get the guns through, and as the situation grew more desperate, the Seabees rushed in and commenced felling palm trees with bulldozers and axes. The trunks they laid into a corduroy road strong enough to get the guns and supplies in. The beachhead was secured.

Later, as our forces closed in on Munda and captured it, the Seabees were given the job of speeding it into a base for its own defense. They had a double job and little time to do it. They had to repair the damage done by our own bombs, and they had to make up for the Japs' poor construction in the first place. Eight days after the Seabees went to work, the field at Munda was able to receive our planes.

With Munda ours, the Seabees moved in once more with assault forces at Vella Lavella. By nightfall of the day of invasion, they had unloaded all supplies and equipment. They had hauled the heavy artillery to emplacements. They had established supply dumps and set up temporary camp. They had located a water supply and put it in operation. But more amazing than anything else—and this despite four bombing and strafing attacks—they had roughed out 9 miles of road.

Their feats in the Solomons have been equaled by other Seabee battalions in the Aleutians. There instead of combating heat and disease, they fought gales and tundra. They took over the unfinished work of civilian contractors and carried it on without interruption. And when we counterattacked Attu and Kiska, the Seabees had their bulldozers at work before the last of the landing craft had reached shore. Once again theirs was the job of rebuilding the flimsy facilities the Japs had constructed. Even the Jap roads were inadequate. Laid as they were on top of the tundra, they could not support the weight of our equipment. The Seabees had to tear the tundra away and do the job right.

In the Aleutians they have built airfields, docks, fuel tanks, and warehouses in the teeth of "williwaws," gales whose force sometimes exceed 100 miles an hour. Their regimental commander explains it simply by saying, "We've built everything but skyscrapers, and there's a zoning law against them up here, enforced by the air wings."

While the construction battalions found their first vital assignments in the Pacific, they have also established an equally fine reputation in the Mediterranean combat zone.

Starting with the initial invasion of Africa, the Seabees have been in the thick of every amphibious action. But more than that, they have done the unglamorous job of building airfields and port facilities in preparation for both the Sicilian and Italian invasions.

When "D" day dawned on the beaches of Sicily, the Seabees were in front with their pontoon equipment preparatory to getting the heavy equipment and artillery ashore. And before they had finished, their bulldozers played a critical role in maintaining the beachhead. At one point German tanks almost drove our forces back into the sea. The fire power of naval vessels offshore had to be supplemented by shore artillery in order to stop the attack. And the artillery had bogged down in the deep sand back from the shore. It required quick work with bulldozers to drag these guns into position. But the speed that was required the Seabees had. Their years of experience in handling 'dozers showed when the chips were down.

At the same time other Seabees were swinging their pontoon causeways into position to unload more landing craft. A Nazi bomb crashed down into an LST and set the ship, loaded with men, tanks, and ammunition, ablaze. Quick-thinking Seabees reasoned that if pontoons could bridge supplies ashore they could bridge men to safety. They swung the pontoons against the side of the burning ship, and our troops raced across to the Seabees' ship. It was a part of the day's work to these fighting builders, just the same as their salvage of half a million dollars' worth of landing craft from the surf.

But the Seabees really showed themselves on the bloody beaches of Salerno. They went in with the British Commandoes and the American Rangers when the beaches were an inferno of bursting bombs and shells. The Commandoes and the Rangers moved forward to attack and silence the entrenched enemy. The Seabees had to remain right there on the beaches and take it. They had to get the mechanized equipment and artillery and ammunition and supplies ashore. And when Nazi bombs smashed these into junk, the Seabees had to clear it away in order to keep fresh equipment rolling in. They laid down steel mesh so that the wheeled vehicles would not bog down in the sand. They drove their bulldozers even out into the water to rescue equipment that had mired at the ships' ramps. Nor is that all—the fighting builders constructed lean-to's for the wounded and set up supply depots. They even dug trenches in the sand for our dead.

Out of that holocaust, a base of operations was built. The Seabees kept the supplies coming in, and finally, when the Nazi counter attacks failed and their retreat began, the Rangers and the Commandoes took the offensive, while the Seabees unloaded some 10,000 pieces of equipment to back their attack.

Unloading supplies in advanced areas has been one of the most tragic bottlenecks in the war. After millions of Americans have sacrificed their materials and labor to produce war equipment, after precious ships have run submarine gantlets to get this equipment to the port of supply, the ships could not be unloaded fast enough. As a result they rode at anchor loaded to their plimsoll marks, tempting targets for bombers.

Drastic action was necessary, and it was decided that Seabees could be trained as longshoremen as well as builders and fighters. They were given the job of breaking the bottle neck. The cooperation of steamship and stevedoring companies was obtained in recruiting the skilled executive personnel necessary, and thus were the Seabee "special battalions" organized.

The first of these "specials" arrived at Guadalcanal when fast unloading of ships was of critical importance. The Seabees went to work, and despite the lack of facilities, Jap bombings, and having to operate in choppy seas, the speed of unloading compared very favorably with the best obtainable at any port in continental United States.

Another Seabee "special" arrived in the midst of a ship traffic jam at another South Pacific port. Sixty-six loaded ships rode at anchor. The Seabees unloaded 31 of those ships during the first month with hatch gangs having a race with each other to see which could discharge cargo the fastest. Around the clock they worked, and today that port is receiving and unloading ships as fast as they dock, and the Seabees are asking for more.

Soon there will be some 25 of these Seabee "special battalions" distributed at every bottle-neck port in the combat zones. And they will join the rest of the Seabees in maintaining the proud slogan of their service. That slogan is "Can do." It springs from the determined effort on the part of this newest of the Navy's branches to prove itself. It represents acceptance of any challenge that the enemy or Nature can contrive.

The Navy Department's Bureau of Yards and Docks directs, the Civil Engineer Corps executes, and the seabees perform the tremendously difficult assignments connected with building our advanced bases. From Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, who is Chief of the Bureau, as well as the founder of the Seabees, down to the most recent "boot" recruit, these men are content to do an all-important job well. They do it knowing that the nature of their work is such as to rarely make the headlines, yet, for the

difficult and hazardous feats they have performed, nearly 400 individual Seabees and 103 of their Civil Engineer Corps officers have earned commendations. In addition, 58 of the battalions have received 1 or more commendations for the work of their units as a whole.

Despite the fact that the Seabees are essentially construction workers, five of them have been awarded the Silver Star for outstanding heroism. Seaman Lawrence C. Meyer, of Toledo, Ohio, dropped his construction work on a Solomon Islands airfield long enough to man a machine gun and bring down a Jap Zero. Shipfitter Howard L. Osborn, of Cleveland, Ohio, risked bombs and heavy machine-gun fire to extricate seven of his mates from a debris-covered fox hole, and there are others whose heroism under fire has proved the Seabees can fight as well as build.

Possibly the best criterion of the work of these Navy Seabees is the opinions of the men who work with them—the men who are in position to know the facts. For example, I would like to read you a few commendations which the Seabees have received from high-ranking officers, not only of the Navy but of the Army and the marines.

Lt. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, commanding general of the First Marine Amphibious Corps, had this to say:

I wish to commend the wisdom that foresaw the need for such an organization. In the war in the Pacific, in seizing one base after another, few of us realized the great amount of construction which would be necessary. Need for this arises immediately after the initial landing, and becomes greater as the area seized is developed into a real base. I do not know how we would have gotten along without the Seabees and trust that they will be participants in every future operation in even larger numbers than at Guadalcanal.

In a letter written to Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Maj. Gen. R. J. Mitchell, commanding general of the First Marine Air Wing, said:

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to pass on to you, as a result of my recent visit to the south Pacific, the very favorable impression I obtained of the work being done by the construction battalions in that area. Without fail, every military commander mentioned these fine organizations and everyone was loud in his praise of accomplishments. It appears that the units have served a splendid purpose, that they have been carefully organized with highly skilled personnel, that they have been intelligently equipped, that they know their business, and that their ingenuity and speed of work have been, indeed, remarkable. The only complaint heard, if this could be considered a complaint, was we need more of them.

In another letter received by Admiral Moreell, Maj. Gen. H. M. Smith, of the Marine Corps, wrote from Alaska that:

Your Seabees are doing a magnificent job up here—as they are everywhere. It would do your heart good to hear from impartial sources the high praises bestowed upon them. There is no job which is not done in an outstanding manner. In my humble opinion they are the find of this war.

Similar high praise was received from Maj. Gen. Charles F. B. Price, of the Marine Corps. In a letter dated September 11, 1943, he wrote Admiral Moreell:

In war nothing counts but the final results, so we keep plugging away to make sure that end is to our credit. In such an effort, it is always nice to know that we have the support of a couple of Seabee battalions.

The Army, too, joins in praising the Seabees. Maj. Gen. A. M. Patch, commanding general on Guadalcanal, stated:

It has been a constant source of wonder to me how one unit could possess so many skills and accomplish such a huge amount and variety of work, all at the same time, and under the existing difficulties of weather, inadequate equipment, and heavy traffic. I especially want to commend the spirit of cooperation that pervades your whole command, which on more than one occasion during the recent tactical operations was of inestimable value to our united effort.

The Navy, of course, is proud of its newest branch, and evidence of this is found in commendations from top ranking admirals. In a letter to Admiral Moreell, Chester W. Nimitz, admiral of the United States Pacific Fleet, on October 5, 1943, wrote:

The Seabees continue to distinguish themselves wherever they may be found throughout the Pacific Ocean areas, as do also your officers of the Civil Engineer Corps.

A week later Vice Admiral W. L. Calhoun, commander of the Pacific service force, wrote that—

Seabees that we bring out here make our job, Cinpac's job and your job that much easier; * * * believe me in all sincerity, I really mean the statement that the Navy will remember this war by its Seabees.

In tribute to the work of the Seabee special battalions, Rear Admiral C. H. Cobb, commander, Service Squadron, South Pacific force, said in an official letter of commendation:

This command has noted with satisfaction the remarkable improvement in cargo loading and unloading since the arrival of the Second Construction Battalion. Through the fine work of your battalion you have helped eliminate one of the principal bottlenecks in the war effort in the South Pacific.

These are but a few of the sheaf of commendations which have been received, and to all of them, I would like to add my own. I have no hesitation in predicting that when the history of this war is written, the contribution of these fighting builders of the Navy will be recognized for what it has been. The courage, the resourcefulness, the sweat, and the blood of the men who can do—and did—will not be forgotten.

Allotment of Shotgun Shells for Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD the following article from the Marion Evening Post, Tuesday, November 30, 1943:

MORE SHOTGUN SHELLS NEXT YEAR, SAYS CONGRESSMAN BISHOP

WASHINGTON, November 30.—Representative C. W. BISHOP, Republican, Illinois, said today that the War Production Board had informed him it was initiating plans to make more liberal allotment of shotgun shells to civilians for the 1944 hunting season.

The House Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources several weeks ago asked the W. P. B. to step up shell production. BISHOP said the Army had no objection to converting small plants to produce shotgun shells and cartridges for civilian use since its requirements in small-arms ammunition were met.

BISHOP said the W. P. B. informed the committee there was not sufficient time to convert plants for production this season. Some 100,000,000 shells were allotted this season to civilians.

Bases of Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I had been invited by the National Broadcasting Co. to participate in their program, For This We Fight, on December 4, 1943.

The particular subject of the evening was Bases of Permanent Peace.

The following are the formal remarks which I made on that occasion:

Any discussion of the peace of the future must recognize that it takes place against a present minute backdrop of events of world importance; even as we speak—although I do not wish to seem to predict—it is not entirely impossible that we are very much closer to the peace we discuss than we realize. Events of the next 48 hours may give our discussion an immediacy taking it entirely out of the realm of the future.

I shall confine this opening statement, Mr. Grauer, to a basic 15 sentences. In those 15 sentences we can find, I believe, general agreement as we humbly feel our way along a road to permanent peace, conscious of the traps on every hand.

Here are the 15 sentences:

1. I believe that the United States must play a major part in the planning of world peace.

2. I believe that it is of paramount importance that we retain United States sovereignty.

3. I believe that the right to maintain full sovereignty must be extended to all other nations, large and small, and participation in any world order must be extended to all nations with equal voice.

4. Any international organization which hopes to perpetuate peace should recognize as separate entities the nations which have lost their freedom through aggression and which deserve to enjoy again the right of self-determination.

5. There must be some general arrangement among nations, though the name matters little.

6. I believe that it is possible to maintain peace.

7. I believe that it is necessary to fully disarm and disorganize the military establishments of the present aggressor nations.

8. I believe it imperative that we maintain strong United States Military and Naval Establishments.

9. I do not believe we can play a major role in world peace unless we are strong at home.

10. I am absolutely unwilling to submit the United States to world or mutual citizenship with any other nation.

11. We cannot renounce our sovereignty to any superstate.

12. I do not believe the peace would last long under a system of military alliances since such alliances but breed defensive counter alliances.

13. It is unthinkable that we should engage in another manslaughtering war.

14. Being a peace-loving Nation, the American people can certainly hope that it will not always have to support a mammoth military organization.

15. Finally, a period of trial is imperative before we can again place any kind of trust in even the peoples of the aggressor nations.

Those 15 sentences, I believe, state truths on which all America agrees. They are new thoughts only in the sense that it is a trail but lightly trod by American feet. For my own part, I wrote for publication as early as last August—before we had reached general agreement on the subject—that, and I quote, "our Nation is committed to play a much greater role in the world family of nations. It is important that we should play a role which promises a reasonable solution of the world problem of peace. America must chart a path which will lead to the desired results and at the same time preserve the sovereignty and reestablish the economic stability of the United States. Unless we become stronger, our place in the post-war world might fade into insignificance."

Those words I wrote months ago. I am willing to stand on them tonight. I stand as willingly on the American post-war policy plank in the 1942 Missouri State Republican platform, which asserts that the war effort must not destroy self-sustaining freedom and opportunity—the very lifeblood of our national strength.

In summation, if we stand strong at home and travel the pathway to world peace with humility, but a sovereign-wary eye, we can hope with justification for an end to the scourge of war.

Governor Ely and the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful people are addressing themselves to the problems confronting our Government, not as partisans, but as American citizens—with the best interests of our country and people at heart. To me, the Government of the United States of America means constitutional representative democracy—planned and brought into being by the founders of this Nation, who were guided by the experience and wisdom of the ages when they established this Republic on principles that have been the source of opportunity and free enterprise—principles that made United States citizenship our most prized possession. On the eve of a national election—in the midst of a global war—I most seriously commend for your thoughtful consideration the following quotation from the Honorable Joseph B. Ely, former Governor of Massachusetts, entitled "Disciplined Democracy?":

Within a few months we are required by constitutional provision to enter into another political campaign for the election of a President to serve from January 1945 to January 1949. We do not know when the war will end, but it is not unlikely that this election will settle the political control of the United States for 1 year, 2 years, or even 3 years after the war is over. It comes at a most unfortunate time in the affairs of this Nation for two major reasons. The first reason has to do with a possible weakening of a united front in the prosecution of the war. The second reason has to do with the reelection of a leadership which is committed to the firm establishment of a new order here which we would probably not otherwise accept.

BIRTH OF THE NEW DEAL

In 1932 the movement toward the New Deal was on its way. The Republican Party had pressed its political advantage too far in holding to the status quo. It had ignored the constantly rising tide of dissatisfaction with the evils which big business was imposing upon the people. The steam engine had no safety valve, with the result that the depression of 1929 blew it to pieces. This left our American world disillusioned, desperate, dejected, and groping for the new leadership.

Just as the business tycoons sloganed the country on the tariff and "the full dinner pail," chose and made Presidents, so in our day zealots of the "social viewpoint" of governmental action at last found a national leader in 1932 in the then Governor of New York to lead the movement which they had cultivated for social and economic reform according to the socialist viewpoint. This did not just happen. Someone planned it that way.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

At the risk of seeming commonplace, let us review very briefly the elemental and fundamental facts of our basic conception of constitutional Government in order that we may have them at the front of our minds in answering the grave political issues which now confront us.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that "Governments obtain their just powers from the consent of the governed." It was upon the basis of this formula that the Republic was formed. It was, comparatively speaking, a new formula that we tried. Only in rare historical and comparatively unsuccessful instances had either Europe or Asia or Africa known or believed that governments obtained their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Note that this formula says "just powers." When Genghis Khan mastered the eastern world, when Alexander marched his Macedonian phalanx across the domains of the then civilized world, both conquering people by the power of the sword, the powers which they exercised were neither just powers nor obtained by the consent of the governed. When Cæsar's legions conquered Gaul, the power of the Emperor was not from the people but by the sword. When Napoleon led the armies of France across the battlefields of Europe, the powers he exercised over Spain and Italy, as well indeed as his sway over France, were not exercised with the consent of the governed. The old world knew only the doctrine that the king could do no wrong and most people believed in the divine right of kings. Each emperor or king, therefore, was a dictator in his own country. He was the governor, he was the power and the glory of his nation and that theory seems to have returned, under a veiled disguise, to the European scene. Only in England had the people themselves been successful in claiming the right to control the government under which they lived.

THE AMERICAN WAY

Here in America the 13 colonies took a fresh start to establish the theory that governments indeed derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Under this formula, those who administer our laws, those who make our laws, are our servants and not our masters.

Now, then, in order that we, the masters should not wake up some morning to find that our servants had stolen the government, those learned men, wisest students of their day in the art of government, who framed the Constitution, divided the responsibility of our various officials. They did so that no one of our servants could steal the government. To the President they gave the power to recommend and a limited veto on laws and a divided power on war or peace and the obligation to execute the laws of Congress. The people then were jealous of their consent and strove to protect it. They gave to Congress legislative power, the sole right to appropriate money and levy taxes and other various and sundry powers of legislation. To the courts, supposedly free from political bias, they gave judicial authority, even to deny the validity of a law if that law offended constitutional limitations. But the people did not delegate all their rights to one government—the Federal Government. All others were reserved to the States.

The one great object of all this was to preserve that great fundamental formula which the circumstance of a new Government in a new country gave them such perfect opportunity to put in force—a formula worked out after centuries of struggle for the right of man to govern himself and to protect those certain inalienable rights with which man is endowed. Closer to the struggle for the establishment of these inalienable rights than we are, liberty was passionately cherished. It was the dearest of all earthly possessions, without which life was not worth while. It burned deep in their souls. It went with them into the wilderness. It was a living fire that furnished the courage to suffer the privations of the frontier and in time it built cities and spanned a continent with vast acres of grain. It built factories with smoking chimneys. It harnessed the power of streams. It created highways and canals and railroads, and withal it created an abundant life. All this energy adapted to a simple formula of existence, a simple formula of government together with the love of work and the freedom to exercise one's faculties, created in this country undreamed of wealth.

KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENT

It would seem impossible to adjudge properly the effect upon the structure of this country of specific laws without a working knowledge of this Government of ours as it was contemplated by the founders. One must know and realize the significance of the Constitution. Without this knowledge one will never know when the country is being despoiled and constitutional government broken down. If one does not know in the beginning its basic characteristics, one cannot know when these characteristics are being tampered with.

Whether a man is right or wrong in holding fast to his faith in the American way of life as he understands it, there is one thing of

which he may be certain—that faith and the ideals which it embodies have made this the greatest country in the world and the American people have accomplished so much living under and by it that it ought not to be charged or taken away and some other method substituted for it without a full and free discussion. It is a precious heritage which must not be lightly forsaken under any pretext. If such a danger exists, even though it be only a danger, then no man has the right to silence full and free discussion of that danger even in the presence of war. That would be very close to treason.

Thus was created constitutional balance. It is also necessary to appreciate that this constitutional structure rested upon a system of stable laws. The average person may not fully recognize the vital part which a system of stable laws plays in the social and economic life of a nation. Consider the years, yes, the centuries, of effort expended by the courts, the lawyers, and the legislative bodies working upon the foundation of the English common law to codify, refine, and declare the legal rights of an American citizen. One will then have some idea of the stability of our law reached by a slow and arduous process for our rights and obligations to be generally known and commonly recognized. These laws are based on custom and usage. They are sensible and stable because of that. They are sensible because the great majority of the people have recognized the duties and obligations which the law has imposed upon them from generation to generation.

In spite of that general acquiescence in the law, how many stop to consider how necessary a system of stable law is to the social and economic life of a nation? The individual in planning his tomorrow does so in confidence that the laws which govern his conduct will not change to upset his plans. The corporate enterprise relies on the stability of the fundamental conditions of its planning. The laws, the customs, and usages of trade are stable and can be relied upon to remain so with but slight change to insure progress. This is the essence of security. It gives ambition free play within the law and stimulates enterprise and progress.

In a nation of such diverse citizenship as the United States, while no group can establish a claim to any greater loyalty or patriotism or love of country than any other group, it is more essential to protect minorities and their rights than in a country of more homogeneous citizenship such as England. Majority rule is not given free play in the United States as it is there. The majority here acts within the limitation of the Constitution while the majority in England is controlled by tradition and the continued power of a class whose life is devoted to government.

DEMOCRACIES ALL DIED

Democracies which had no basic law other than the will of the majority never lived. They all died. This historical failure was an added reason for the controls which the Constitution and the Bill of Rights provide against unbridled action by the majority. To break down these limitations on majority rule established to protect minority groups would make this country subject to the same weakness that destroyed all other historical examples of democracy.

In the push toward socialism an inflamed majority will deem it necessary to break through some or all of the protections which the Constitution has set up for: (1) Freedom of speech; (2) the right of assembly and petition; (3) the protection of the home search and seizure; (4) the safeguard of grand-jury indictment and trial by jury; (5) the protection of private property against confiscation; (6) and even the prohibition against the enactment of any law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; because government by rule and regulation is in its nature progressively severe. One rule inevitably leads to another. To enforce the first rule requires the second rule until, finally, to enforce any rule requires dictatorial or centralized power, with restraint upon organized protest, free speech, and the right of assembly, together with the confiscation of property or property right and rigid laws of quick penalties violations. The present attempt at price control and rationing furnishes numerous examples how bureaucratic control requires progressively stringent rules, an army of enforcement agents, high-handed methods against the individual, without suitable or expeditious remedy being made available to test the legality of the rule or order.

STUPID OR CORRUPT

Human nature being as it is, such a government must in time become stupid or corrupt, or both. It is a fatally dangerous method of government for a country which is addicted to the idea that "to the victor belong the spoils." Such a method of government furnishes plenty of spoils. Under it special favor, special privilege, will flourish. "Whom do you know in Washington?" will be the question and also the answer to an inside track to profit.

Under the laws to regulate business the largest units of enterprise—big business—will enjoy the special privilege of bureaucratic favor and the benefit of operating under price fixing calculated to permit the mere continued existence of small and, therefore, less effective units. This will result in furnishing to big business a margin of insured profit, substantial profit. Such regulation will naturally not be strongly repudiated by the leaders of big business once they appreciate the protection which they will gain from such operations but small business will be slowly crowded from the picture. These new business laws are a permanent suspension of the value of the anti-trust laws, the laws against moncpoly in trade, which were set up not as the creation of socialism but as the safeguard erected by Jeffersonian democracy to prevent monopoly and then socialism.

UNKNOWN MEN OUR MASTERS

Unknown men for whom the people do not vote are the executive agents who will run your Government and you. Does all this furnish the sinews of political and financial power? Do these laws create a Federal political machine? Do they spell the doom of the theory that our officials are our servants and not our masters? Do they break down the balance of our constitutional government? Do they make for stable laws? Do they make for personal initiative? Do they nurture freemen? Is it this ideology something to fight for or is it something to fight against? The answers to these questions are to many men self-evident.

National, State, and County Elections in Illinois in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD the following information concerning National, State, and county elections in Illinois for 1944:

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY AND ELECTION CALENDAR FOR 1944

April 8: Election of school directors; of president and members of board of education in districts of population between 1,000 and 100,000; of all high-school boards of education; of boards of education of non-high-school district; and of community consolidated boards of education.

April 11: Primary for the nomination of candidates for State and county to be voted for on November 7, 1944.

November 7: General Presidential, State, and county election.

STATE AND COUNTY ELECTIONS AND OTHER DISTRICTS LARGER THAN COUNTY—OFFICERS TO BE NOMINATED

Primary, April 11, 1944

President of the United States (advisory vote).

The following officers from the State at large: United States Senator, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, secretary of state, auditor of public accounts, State treasurer, attorney general, clerk of the supreme court, Representative in Congress, State at large.

One State central committeeman to be elected from each congressional district.

The following congressional officers: One Representative in Congress from each district, delegates and alternate delegates to national conventions.

The following appellate court officers: Clerks of the first, second, third, and fourth districts.

The following senatorial officers: One State senator in each even numbered senatorial district; one, two, or three representatives in the general assembly in each district (number to be determined by senatorial committee); senatorial committeemen elected (see sec. 5 of art. 8 of election code).

The following county officers: Circuit clerk, recorder of deeds (in counties of 60,000 or more population), State's attorney, coroner, county auditor (in counties of over 75,000 and less than 300,000 inhabitants), 1 county commissioner in counties not under township organization, 1 ward committeeman in each ward in the city of Chicago and 1 precinct committeeman elected in each precinct down-State.

Minimum number of signatures required for nominating petitions for delegates and alternate delegates to national nominating convention and Representatives in Congress

DEMOCRATIC

District:	Number
1	132
2	595
3	588
4	310
5	154
6	809
7	1,005
8	173
9	223
10	517
11	205
12	156
13	74
14	165
15	159
16	147
17	102
18	146
19	233
20	143
21	213
22	301
23	206
24	129
25	190

REPUBLICAN

District:	Number
1	118
2	556
3	601
4	95
5	57
6	568
7	914
8	50
9	206
10	753
11	505
12	346
13	240
14	244
15	245
16	256
17	212
18	274
19	278
20	173
21	269
22	318
23	255
24	193
25	269

NOTE.—Delegates and alternate delegates at large are nominated at the State convention of each political party.

Minimum number of signatures required for nominating petitions

STATE SENATOR AND REPRESENTATIVES IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

DEMOCRATIC

District:	Number
1	53
2	97
3	126
4	264
5	304
6	316
7	384
8	153
9	189
10	151
11	445
12	79
13	463
14	127
15	75
16	82
17	40
18	175
19	618
20	118
21	217
22	140
23	307
24	115
25	712
26	101
27	88
28	184
29	64
30	169
31	309
32	89
33	191
34	101
35	98
36	142
37	98
38	160
39	118
40	147
41	218
42	146
43	116
44	153
45	191
46	121
47	228
48	143
49	253
50	221
51	102

REPUBLICAN

District:	Number
1	45
2	65
3	116
4	122
5	341
6	588
7	704
8	311
9	85
10	219
11	529
12	137
13	542
14	234
15	34
16	131
17	32
18	189
19	361
20	169
21	183
22	154
23	317
24	143
25	804
26	138
27	26
28	179
29	79
30	155
31	411
32	132
33	182
34	109
35	198
36	148
37	156
38	167
39	150
40	137
41	377
42	140
43	151
44	189
45	234
46	120
47	181
48	143
49	182
50	214
51	128

CLERK OF THE APPELLATE COURT

DEMOCRATIC

District:	Number
1	4,428
2	876
3	938
4	826

REPUBLICAN

1	3,831
2	1,932
3	2,253
4	1,035

Presidential petition: Not less than 3,000 and not more than 5,000.

State and Federal officers: Not less than 5,000 and not more than 10,000.

State central committeemen: Not less than 100.

Senatorial committeemen: Not less than 10.

Ward committeemen: Not less than 10 nor more than 16 percent of primary electors.

Precinct committeemen: Not less than 10.

DATES GOVERNING STATE AND COUNTY PRIMARY

For primary to be held April 11, 1944

(Polls open 6 a. m. to 5 p. m.)

February 5: First day for candidates to file petitions in the office of the secretary of state or in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–11).

February 11: First day for candidate for precinct and ward committeemen to file petitions in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–12).

February 21: Last day for candidates to file petitions in the office of the secretary of state and in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 8–9).

February 26: Last day for candidates to file withdrawal in the office of the secretary of state, or senatorial committeeman with county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–12, 8–9).

March 2: Last day for candidates for precinct and ward committeemen to file petitions in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–12).

March 7: Last day for senatorial committee to meet and by resolution, fix and determine the number of candidates to be nominated for representatives in the general assembly (ch. 46, par. 8–13).

March 7: Last day for county candidates to file withdrawals in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–12).

March 7: Last day for State primary certifying board to certify to the county clerks the names of candidates who are to be voted for in the several counties of the State (ch. 46, pars. 7–14, 7–60, 8–10).

March 9: Last day for State committees to file call for State conventions in the office of the county clerks (ch. 46, par. 7–9).

March 11: Last day for senatorial committee to file resolution determining the number of candidates to be nominated for representative in general assembly, in the offices of the secretary of state and county clerk (ch. 46, par. 8–13).

March 11: Last day for county clerk to certify to board of election commissioners names of candidates for senatorial committeemen (ch. 46, par. 8–10).

March 11: Last day for city, village, or town clerk to certify to the election commissioners the names of candidates (ch. 46, par. 7–14).

March 13: First day voter may file application for ballot under Absent Voting Act (ch. 46, pars. 19–2, 19–4).

March 14: Last day for registration in office of county clerk (ch. 46, par. 4–6).

March 14: Last day for transfer of registration (ch. 46, par. 4–16).

March 17: Last day for county clerk to certify to the board of election commissioners the names of candidates to be voted on in the city or village under the jurisdiction of the board (ch. 46, par. 7–14).

March 20–21: Days upon which to file application for hearing where registration is "incomplete" (ch. 46, par. 4–10).

March 22: Last day for county clerk to prepare notice of the primary (ch. 46, par. 7–15).

March 27: Last day for posting notices of primary (ch. 46, par. 7–15).

March 27: Last day for county clerk to post an announcement of the colors of the primary ballots (ch. 46, par. 7–18).

March 27–28: Days upon which to file application to erase names from registry (ch. 46, par. 4–12).

March 30–31 and April 1: Hearings on application filed before county clerk (ch. 46, par. 4–13).

April 6: Last day for delivery of specimen ballots to primary judges (ch. 46, par. 7–21).

April 6: Last day for posting specimen ballots and cards of instruction (ch. 46, par. 16–10).

April 6: Last day to apply by mail for absent voter's ballot (ch. 46, pars. 19–2, 19–4).

April 8: Last day to apply in person for absent voter's ballot (ch. 46, par. 19–4).

April 10: Last day for delivery of official primary ballots to primary judges (ch. 46, pars. 7–35, 16–5).

April 11: Primary election (ch. 46, par. 7–5).

April 13: Last day for delivery of primary returns to county clerk (ch. 46, par. 7–55).

April 24: County conventions to be held at county seat (ch. 46, par. 7–9).

April 28: State conventions to be held (ch. 46, par. 7–9).

May 1: Last day for officers of State convention to file with the secretary of state certifi-

cates of candidates nominated (ch. 46, par. 7–9).

May 1: Last day for outgoing chairman to notify newly elected members of State central committee of time and place of meeting to organize (ch. 46, par. 7–8).

May 11: Last day for senatorial committee to meet and organize (ch. 46, par. 8–5).

May 11: Last day for State central committee to meet and organize (ch. 46, par. 7–8).

NATIONAL, STATE, AND COUNTY OFFICIALS TO BE ELECTED

Election, November 7, 1944

President and Vice President of the United States (by electors).

State officers as follows: United States Senator, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, secretary of state, auditor of public accounts, State treasurer, attorney general, clerk of the supreme court, trustees of the University of Illinois (three to be elected), Representative in Congress, State at large.

Appellate court officers as follows: Clerks of the first, second, third, and fourth districts.

Congressional officers as follows: One Representative in Congress from each district.

Senatorial officers as follows: One State senator in each even numbered district, three representatives in the general assembly in each district.

County officers as follows: Circuit clerk, recorder of deeds (in counties of 60,000 or more population), State's attorney, coroner, county auditor (in counties of over 75,000 and less than 300,000 inhabitants), one county commissioner in counties not under township organization.

DATES GOVERNING NATIONAL, STATE, AND COUNTY ELECTIONS

For election to be held November 7, 1944

(Polls open 6 a. m. to 5 p. m.)

August 9: Last day for county clerks to send notices to registered electors (ch. 46, par. 4–15).

September 2: Last day for county clerks to publish notice of first precinct registration date if county board determines two precinct registration days (ch. 46, par. 4–7).

September 8: Last day for filing petition of public policy (ch. 46, par. 28–1).

September 8: First day for filing certificates of nomination or nomination papers in the office of the secretary of state or county clerk (ch. 46, par. 10–6).

September 18: Last day for filing certificates of nomination or nomination papers in the office of the secretary of state (ch. 46, par. 10–6).

September 20: Last day for county clerks to publish notice of second precinct registration date or single registration date if county board determines two precinct registration days (ch. 46, par. 4–7).

September 23: First precinct registration day, if county board determines two precinct registration days (ch. 46, par. 4–7).

September 23: Last day to file withdrawal in the office of the secretary of state (ch. 46, par. 10–7).

September 23: Last day for filing objections to petitions (ch. 46, par. 10–8).

September 28: Last day for filing certificates of nomination or nomination papers in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 10–6).

October 3: Last day to file with county clerk objections to petitions (ch. 46, par. 10–8).

October 3: Last day for State certifying board to certify names of candidates to county clerk (ch. 46, par. 10–14).

October 3: Last day to file withdrawal in the office of the county clerk (ch. 46, par. 10–8).

October 7: Delivery of election notice by county clerk to the proper officer (ch. 46, par. 12–1).

October 9: First day for absent voter to file application for ballot (ch. 46, pars. 19–2, 19–4).

October 10: Last day for registration in office of county clerk (ch. 46, par. 4–6).

October 10: Second precinct registration day, if county board determines 2 precinct registration days (ch. 46, par. 4–7).

October 10: Single precinct registration day, if county board determines (ch. 46, par. 4–7).

October 10: Last day for transfer of registration (ch. 46, par. 4–16).

October 16–17: Days upon which to file application for hearing where registration is "incomplete" (ch. 46, par. 4–10).

October 17: Last day for board of registry to file their reports with county clerk (ch. 46, par. 4–14).

October 23: Last day to post election notice (ch. 46, par. 12–2).

October 23–24: Days upon which to file application to erase name from registry (ch. 46, par. 4–12).

October 24: Last day for county clerk to have precinct list printed or typed for distribution (ch. 46, par. 4–11).

October 26–28: Hearings on applications filed before county clerk (ch. 46, par. 4–13).

November 2: Last day for posting instruction cards and specimen ballots (ch. 46, par. 16–10).

November 2: Last day for absent voter to file application for ballot by mail (ch. 46, pars. 19–2, 19–4).

November 4: Last day for absent voter to apply for ballot in person (ch. 46, par. 19–4).

November 6: Last day for publication in newspaper of list of nominations (ch. 46, par. 16–10).

November 6: Delivery by county clerk of official ballots to judges of election (ch. 46, par. 16–5).

November 6: Delivery of duplicate registration cards to precinct judges of election (ch. 46, par. 4–20).

November 7: Posting of at least four cards of instruction around polling places and one in each voting booth (ch. 46, par. 16–10).

November 7: General, national, State, and county election (art. V, § 3, ch. 46, par. 2–1).

November 8: Last day for delivery of election returns (ch. 46, par. 17–22).

November 14: Last day for board of election commissioners to certify election results to county clerk (ch. 46, par. 22–9).

November 14: Last day for county clerk to canvass returns of election (ch. 46, par. 22–1).

November 15: Last day for county clerk to mail abstract of votes cast for Presidential electors (ch. 46, par. 21–2).

November 17: Last day for county clerk to determine by lot a tie vote (ch. 46, par. 22–3).

November 27: Last day for State canvassing board to canvass returns (ch. 46, pars. 21–2, 22–7).

December 2: Last day for publishing results of Presidential election by Governor (ch. 46, par. 21–3).

SCHOOL ELECTIONS

For elections to be held April 8, 1944

(Polls open during hours fixed by trustees of schools or by the boards of education (including that of non-high-school districts) and school directors, respectively, except township high schools and community high schools, which must open not later than noon and close not earlier than 7 p. m.)

March 18: Last day to file petitions for nomination for president and member of board of education in districts between 1,000 and 100,000, and township high-school districts organized under laws of 1909 (ch. 122, par. 135).

March 24: Last day for candidates for members of board of education of non-high-school districts to file petitions with the county superintendent of schools (ch. 122, par. 101).

March 29: Last day for posting notices of election (ch. 122, pars. 23 and 115).

March 29: Last day for filing petitions of candidates for members of board of education, where such are necessary, respectively, except in districts between 1,000 and 100,000; also township high-school districts and community high-school districts; and high-school boards of educaton, except boards in high-school districts organized under laws of 1909, and validated high-school districts governed by section 126a, or other designated sections of the school law (ch. 122, par. 22).

April 8: Election of school directors, president and members of board of education in districts between 1,000 and 100,000, members of board of education for community consolidated school districts, members of board of education for township high-school districts. Members of board of education of community high-school districts, members of board of education for non-high-school districts, 1 trustee of schools (to fill vacancy only) (ch. 122, par. 114).

NOTES.—School elections required to be held upon the second Saturday in April may upon adoption of an ordinance, be held on the first Tuesday in April (ch. 46, pars. 2–34).

The primary and election calendar herewith presented includes the Presidential preference primary, State and county officers, school elections, but does not include officers local to Cook County, nor does it include officers of sanitary or park districts.

Statement of Attorney General Biddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Attorney General Biddle before the House Naval Affairs Committee, December 8, 1943:

I appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee and to contribute whatever I can toward a satisfactory solution of the problem of the maintenance of naval petroleum reserve No. 1—the so-called Elk Hills properties. I understand that the committee is primarily interested at this time in the proposed agreement between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California for operation and protection of the reserve as a unit. I shall devote myself principally to a consideration of the question of the legal authority for the proposed agreement, which was submitted to me by the Secretary of the Navy for an opinion.

Before discussing that question, however, I should perhaps explain to what extent the Department of Justice has been concerned with the problem of Elk Hills since it was determined by the Secretary of the Navy during the summer to rescind the old contract of November 20, 1942. You will recall that I advised the Secretary of the Navy that the contract of November 20 went beyond the authority of existing law.

The decision to rescind the contract raised two important and difficult questions. The first had to do with readjusting the interests of the Navy and Standard which had developed as a result of operations under the old contract. For example, a number of new wells had been drilled, some on Standard's land and some on Navy's land, the cost of which was to be shared ratably under the old contract by Navy and Standard, regardless of their location. In addition substantial quantities of oil had been withdrawn from wells both on Navy's and on Standard's lands. These operations under the old contract presented complex accounting problems. The second major question which was raised by the decision to rescind had to do with the method of operating the reserve in the immediate future. The Navy was not disposed to attempt to return to the old practice of leasing portions of its land for the operation of offset wells to prevent drainage caused by Standard's production on its land. I understand that the Navy has regarded offset drilling as unprofitable to the Government, since the United States receives only a modest royalty; besides, those operations are not entirely successful in preventing drainage from the Navy to the Standard lands. The only practical alternative, in the view of the Navy Department, were condemnation and some form of unit-plan agreement with Standard.

Immediate condemnation would have given us control over the whole field and would have meant shutting down the wells on the entire reserve, including that portion now belonging to Standard. This is so because under existing law there is no authority to produce oil from Government land in the reserve for the sole purpose of using the oil, but only as an incident to protecting the Government's supply underground. Condemnation would thus have involved a basic decision to cut off 15,000 barrels of oil a day from existing production. Congress was to be in adjournment until the fall, and it was thought particularly desirable to make no ultimate decision of policy until there was an opportunity for congressional consideration of the matter.

Accordingly a rescission and temporary operating agreement was worked out by the Navy, with the active cooperation of representatives of the Department of Justice. This agreement took care of the two major problems which I have outlined—an accounting for prior operations under the old contract, and a temporary or interim agreement, for a 90-day period, limiting operations on any part of the reserve. The rescission and temporary operating agreement was approved by me on August 18, was agreed to by Standard, and was submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to the President. The President referred the agreement to Secretary Ickes for his approval. He made one or two suggestions, with which Secretary Knox and I concurred, and these were embodied in the agreement, which was accepted by Standard and approved by the President on September 8. It thus expires on December 8.

In brief, the rescission and temporary operating agreement does these things:

1. It cancels the old contract by consent, without the need of litigation.

2. It requires Standard, in the event that no permanent agreement is executed with respect to the reserve, and condemnation proceedings are not brought, to account to the Navy for Navy's share of the oil produced from the reserve since November 20, 1943. The oil to be so accounted for is the amount produced from wells on Navy's land, or Navy's ratable share of production in the reserve as fixed under the rescinded contract, whichever amount is larger. Payment is to be made to Navy of the net value of that amount of oil, measured by the average posted market price paid in Kern County, Calif., by the major oil companies, excluding Standard. Fortunately, during the period in question the price of crude oil is in fact a uniform price determined by the O. P. A. ceiling, so that we did not have to face the problem of determining a true market price in an unregulated market.

3. The rescission and temporary operating agreement provides that in the event of condemnation the net value of Navy's share of the oil withdrawn by Standard, the value determined as I have just explained, is to be deducted from the amount of the judgment which the United States must pay in the condemnation proceeding.

4. The cost of drilling wells on Navy's land, which was in fact borne by Standard, is to be repaid to Standard only if an appropriation for that purpose is passed by Congress.

5. The agreement permits production from the reserve at a rate not to exceed 15,000 barrels a day, but it forbids the drilling of additional wells upon any part of the reserve (whether Navy's or Standard's land) without the approval of the Navy. It is my understanding that no approval has been given for the drilling of wells since the rescission of the old contract.

In short, the rescission agreement settled the rights and obligations of the parties under the rescinded contract in a way which amply protected the Government's interest, and it held the situation for a short period in the future until some more definitive solution of the larger issues of policy could be worked out, as this committee is now attempting to work them out.

During the period provided by the rescission and temporary operating agreement, Navy prepared the present unit-plan agreement. In the drafting of that agreement and in the negotiations with Standard which I understand were carried on, the Department of Justice did not participate. I understood, however, that such a proposed contract was being drafted and would be submitted to me for an opinion on its legality and would be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

In its final revisions the drafts of the new contract were submitted to the Department of Justice for legal study, and on November 4 Secretary Knox sent me the final draft with a request for my legal opinion. The proposed contract was carefully studied in its legal aspects and on November 24 I transmitted to Secretary Knox my formal opinion. The opinion summarizes the essential provisions of the proposed new agreement and then considers the question whether there is adequate authority for it under existing law.

With the consent of Secretary Knox, I shall give the committee the content of my opinion:

NOVEMBER 24, 1943.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In your letter of November 4, 1943, you requested my opinion concerning the legality of a proposed unit plan contract with Standard Oil Co. of California relating to naval petroleum reserve No. 1. Because of the length and detailed character of the provisions of the proposed contract, it seems desirable to give a summary of its essential terms before proceeding to consider the question of a statutory authority for its execution.

I

The proposed contract provides for the development and operation of the reserve as a unit, making all wells, equipment, and facilities on the lands of either Navy or Standard available for use by Navy or by the operator selected by it. The interests of Navy and Standard in the oil and gas within the reserve are defined by percentages, initially determined to be the following (omitting fractions): Shallow oil zone—Navy 64 percent, Standard 36 percent; dry gas zone—Navy 77 percent, Standard 23 percent; Stevens (deep) zone—Navy 65 percent, Standard 35 percent. These percentages are subject to revision by an engineering committee as further data become available concerning the commercially productive formations underlying the surface of the respective parties. Such adjustments are retroactive to November 20, 1942, the date as of which operations under the rescinded contract began. The engineering committee consists of six members, all required to be experienced petroleum engineers or petroleum geologists—three appointed by Navy and three by Standard. Determinations by the committee are to be binding if unanimous. If not unanimous, the committee must refer the matter to the Secretary of the Navy who on his own motion may, and on request of Standard shall obtain an advisory report from an independent engineer, and thereafter the Secretary is to make a binding decision.

Production from the reserve is to be allocated in the following manner: During a primary period Standard is permitted to receive from the shallow oil zone 15,000 barrels of oil per day, on a quarterly average. The primary period is defined as the shortest of the following three periods: (a) until 6 months after cessation of hostilities between the United States and all countries now at war with us; (b) until Standard shall have received from production from the shallow oil zone 25,000,000 barrels of oil; (c) until Standard shall have received from production from the shallow oil zone one-third of its share of the estimated recoverable oil in that zone, as determined by the engineering committee. All oil received by Standard during the primary period is charged against its interest in the shallow oil zone. Navy has the privilege during the primary period of causing production to be increased for itself until the amount received by it equals its share under the percentage participations established; thereafter production would be allocated currently between Navy and Standard in accordance with their percentage participations, saving to Standard the right to its guaranteed production during the primary period. After the primary period Navy is authorized to suspend production from the entire reserve, subject to the right of Standard to receive daily sufficient oil to cover its current costs of operation in the reserve and its current taxes upon its lands, equipment, and interests under the contract. In no event may Standard, without approval by Navy, receive production from any zone after its withdrawals therefrom have equaled one-third of its share of the estimated recoverable oil in that zone. Navy may permit production from the reserve after the primary period in excess of that to be taken by Standard under the foregoing authority to meet costs and taxes. In that event Standard may receive only one-third of what its percentage participation in the production from any zone would have been if the amounts received by Navy and Standard from such zone were in balance with their percentage participations therein; Navy is to receive the remainder of the production from such zone until it has brought its share into balance with the percentage participations in that zone. (Thus, apparently, if Navy permits 9,000 barrels per day to be withdrawn after the primary period, and if its percentage participation is 66⅔, Standard could withdraw not 3,000 barrels but only 1,000 barrels per day.) The same formula is to be employed during the primary period if Navy permits production from a zone other than the shallow oil zone. After the parties have come into balance with their respective percentage participations in any zone, all production therefrom is to be received by them, respectively, in accordance with their percentage participations. Whenever any zone shall become substantially exhausted, and the production received by Navy and by Standard has not, for any reason, been in balance with

their percentage participations, an adjustment is to be made in future allocations of production from other zones; and on termination of the contract when the field is exhausted there shall be an appropriate cash adjustment if necessary.

Operations are to be carried on under the direction of an operating committee composed of two members, one appointed by Navy and one by Standard. This committee is to determine the number of wells, their location, depth, rate of production, and the like. Any disagreement is to be referred to the Secretary of the Navy for final determination.

Neither party is to have an exclusive or preferential right to purchase the share of oil produced by the other. Navy may employ Standard or any other operator to carry out the contract, but if Standard is selected, its compensation is limited to cost to itself.

Costs are to be borne ultimately by Navy and Standard in accordance with their relative percentage participations in production. Current payment of costs, however, follows a different pattern. In general, each party is to pay costs currently in proportion to its current production. The cost of drilling exploratory wells is dealt with by special provisions, described below in connection with a more detailed discussion of the expenditures involved under the contract.

The contract is to remain in effect so long as oil, gas, and associated hydrocarbons can be produced from the reserve in paying quantities. There is no provision for earlier termination.

II

The question whether the contract is authorized does not present simply a question whether administrative action is within the scope of the powers conferred by Congress. The problem relates more specifically to the authority to enter into a commitment involving the expenditure of public money and the disposition of public property. It must be viewed, therefore, in the light of the general principle requiring express sanction for the disposal of such property, and the restrictions on contracts involving expenditures. Revised Statutes, section 3732, 41 United States Code, section 11, provides:

"No contract or purchase on behalf of the United States shall be made, unless the same is authorized by law or is under an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment, except in the War and Navy Departments, for clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, transportation, or medical and hospital supplies, which, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current year."

The authority contemplated by R. S. 3732 must be one which "expressly or by necessary implication" authorizes the transaction in question. See *Chase* v. *United States*, 155 U. S. 489, 502, holding that statutory authority to "establish post offices" does not give sanction to a contract for the lease of a building to be used as a post office. The act of June 30, 1906, 34 Stat. 764, 31 U. S. C., section 627, further prescribes a canon of statutory construction:

"No act of Congress passed after June 30, 1906, shall be construed to make an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, or to authorize the execution of a contract involving the payment of money in excess of appropriations made by law, unless such act shall in specific terms declare an appropriation to be made or that a contract may be executed."

It is pertinent, consequently, before examining the statutory authority, to consider in what measure the proposed contract involves the expenditure of public money. Ultimately all costs of production, drilling, and development are to be borne ratably by Navy and Standard. Initially the expense of guaranteed production is to be paid currently by Standard, since it is Standard which will receive such production. Those expenditures will affect Navy's subsequent outlays, however, when it is determined to extract some or all of Navy's share of the oil in the reserve. If at that subsequent period costs are relatively lower, Navy will nevertheless be bound to account to Standard in equalizing the aggregate costs on the basis of their respective interests in the reserve. This contingency is not described by way of criticism of the cost-sharing formula, but in order to make clear the nature of the financial obligations involved. Moreover, it will be essential to drill exploratory wells for the purpose of securing additional data on which to base revisions of the percentage participations in the several zones; without such periodic revision there could be no sound operation of the plan. Where such exploratory drilling is approved by the engineering committee, the cost is to be borne currently by Navy and Standard in proportion to their interests. Where it is not so approved, but Navy determines that such drilling should be carried out, Navy is to pay the entire cost currently. Only if Standard determines to utilize an exploratory well in the shallow zone for productive purposes is the Navy relieved of the necessity of paying therefor currently. Also, in the event that Standard is permitted to produce from the Stevens zone to meet its guaranteed production when production from the shallow zone is suspended, the cost of drilling exploratory wells in the Stevens zone is to be met currently by Navy, until there has been absorbed ratably a credit to Standard of more than a million dollars, expended by it prior to the contract in drilling four wells in the Stevens zone.

It is thus evident that substantial expenditures by Navy will be necessary both for the successful functioning of the agreement and for meeting its obligations to Standard, quite apart from the expenses which would be involved should Navy produce for its own requirements some or all of its share of the oil in the reserve. The contract, it should be noted, does not require or purport to authorize Navy to produce any of its share of the oil, but it imposes obligations on Navy toward Standard concerning the rate and allocation of production, and the payment of costs, in the event of such production. The contract thus attaches binding proprietary and financial rights and obligations to any future program of production for Navy's account, though such production itself would have to be authorized by Congress, since, as will be seen, existing statutory authority requires that the reserves be maintained with a view to conserving Navy's oil underground.

For existing statutory authority we must turn to the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), set forth in pertinent part as an appendix hereto, which brought together and clarified the powers of the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the naval petroleum reserves. That statute made it clear that in exercising power over the reserves the Secretary must have in view the dominant purpose of conserving oil in the ground. The statute gives power to deal with the reserves "directly or by contract, lease, or otherwise," for "the protection of the aforesaid reserves * * *." Several specific kinds of arrangements are then mentioned, namely, an exchange of lands with private owners in order to consolidate the respective interests; contracts with adjoining owners or lessees for conservation in the ground of oil and gas and for compensation for estimated drainage in lieu of drilling or operating offset wells; and condemnation or purchase of adjoining private lands. The committee reports and the hearings include discussions of each of these specified measures (S. Rept. 317, 75th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Rept. 2672, 75th Cong., 3d sess.; Hearings, Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, S. 1131, 75th Cong., 1st sess.; Hearings, House Committee on Naval Affairs, 75th Cong., 3d sess.).

Authority to enter into unit-plan agreements is found specifically in the statute only in a proviso relating to cooperative agreements among lessees on Government land and adjoining owners. The proviso, in its context, reads:

"Leases of lands of the United States within the naval petroleum reserves, in existence prior to July 1, 1936, excepting those leases which have become a part of an approved unit or cooperative plan and agreement, shall terminate at the expiration of their initial 20-year periods, and the lands covered by such terminated leases may be re-leased upon such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, with the preferential right in the former lessees to leases of the same if and when the lands are released: *Provided*, That every unit or cooperative plan of development and operation entered into after July 1, 1937, and every lease entered into subsequently to July 1, 1937, with respect to lands owned by the United States within the naval petroleum reserves, shall contain a provision whereby authority limited as provided in such plan or lease is vested in the Secretary of the Navy, subject to approval by the President, to alter or modify from time to time in his discretion the rate of prospecting and development on, and the quantity and rate of production from, such lands of the United States under said plan or lease, any law to the contrary notwithstanding."

Earlier authority for the Secretary of the Navy to approve unit plans on behalf of lessees, limited to the life of the lease unless otherwise provided, was contained in an amendment to the General Leasing Act, adopted March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1523, 1526); that amendment was occasioned by apprehension of the Navy Department that it might be bound by statutes dealing generally with the public domain and providing that agreements for cooperative development should extend for the life of a pool. The act of 1938 restricted the authority to approve such unit plans among lessees by requiring that the Secretary, with the approval of the President, must retain power to alter or modify from time to time the rate and quantity of production from lands of the United States embraced in such a unit plan of operation. (See Senate report, supra, p. 7; House report, supra, p. 8.)

The only discussion of unit plans is contained in that portion of the committee reports devoted to leases. After an exposition of the specific powers which I have enumerated above, the reports, under the heading "Additional provisions," contain the following paragraph:

"Provision for more advantageous leasing and greater control of operations under any new leases or agreements entered into involving the Government's lands is necessary in order to strengthen the Government's position in naval petroleum reserve No. 1 in the event that no satisfactory exchange of lands can be arranged, that no purchase or condemnation of private lands in the reserve can be made, and that no other agreements to protect the Government's interest can be entered into to conserve the oil in the Government's lands. This provision is a precautionary measure designed to remedy what the Navy Department has found to be the most objectionable features of the present leases—i. e., lack of any authority to regulate or control the operations of a lessee when they are not in the lessor's interests. The Navy Department recognizes that as long as some of its oil lands remain interspersed among lands owned by others it may be necessary at any time to lease or otherwise operate such parts thereof as are vulnerable to drainage or to unite with owners or operators on adjoining private lands for the cooperative or unit development of their respective holdings in order to avoid waste, destructive competition, excessive investments in development, and to regulate production to the mutual advantage of all those concerned.

Such unit or cooperative operations result in greater efficiency, higher percentage recoveries of oil and gas, and consequently greater benefits to all. However, the committee is of the opinion that authority should be definitely vested in the Secretary of the Navy to regulate the rate of development on and the quantity and rate of production from the Government's lands in its naval petroleum reserves at all times and under all conditions."

The proposed contract thus cannot be supported by the proviso dealing specifically with cooperative or unit plans of operation; and doubtless it was not meant to be, since it does not reserve absolute authority in the Secretary, subject to approval by the President, to regulate the rate and amount of production on the Government's land within the reserve, but to a large extent delegates that responsibility to an engineering and an operating committee.

Authority must therefore be discovered in the more general provision of the statute authorizing contracts for the protection of the reserve. At the very least the proposed contract must have conservation as its dominant object and effect. Conservation would be achieved under the proposed contract in two essential respects: (1) Elimination of loss through drainage, by operation of the field as a unit, and (2) limitation of production by Standard from any part of the reserve during the primary period to 15,000 barrels a day, and thereafter the suspension of production, except to the small extent guaranteed to Standard, within the discretion of the Navy. In these respects the contract would provide one form of solution to the persistent problem of drainage and offset drilling which has been at the core of the difficulties attending the management of Elk Hills.

I am not prepared to say that such a form of contract is unauthorized by the statute. Doubt must exist, however, in view of the considerations to which I have adverted. Other means were expressly referred to in the statute and the discussions thereon, while the device of a unit plan was considered only in relation to agreements by lessees on Government land, who would presumably be operating offset wells near the boundary line between the Navy and Standard lands. The proposed contract covers, of course, a much more extensive area than that embraced by offset leases. Moreover, its operation would involve substantial and continuing expenditures, for which appropriations would be needed. It fixes rights and liabilities in the event of production of Navy's share of the oil in the reserve, and congressional authorization for such production would have to be secured should Navy desire, in the interest of prosecution of the war, to undertake it.

In the light of these circumstances, I am impelled to conclude that the contract should not be executed on behalf of the United States without more specific approval by Congress than is found under present statutes.

It is perhaps appropriate to add that the proposed contract, I am aware, was finally worked out in its details during the period covered by the rescission and temporary operating agreement of September 8, 1943, which agreement received my legal approval. The contract represents a carefully considered unit plan of operation, which now furnishes a concrete basis for congressional consideration.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

APPENDIX

The act of June 30, 1938, 52 Stat. 1252, provides in pertinent part:

"The Secretary of the Navy is directed to take possession of all properties within the naval petroleum reserves as are or may become subject to the control and use by the United States for naval purposes; to conserve, develop, use, and operate the same in his discretion, subject to approval by the President, directly or by contract, lease, or otherwise, such use and operation to be for the protection of the aforesaid reserves or for carrying out the provisions of this act; and to use, store, exchange, or sell the oil and gas products thereof, and those from all royalty oil and gas from lands in the naval reserves, for the benefit of the United States, subject to the applicable limitations and restrictions of this act; and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction and control over those lands within the borders of naval petroleum reserves Nos. 1 and 2 which are embraced by leases granted pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 25, 1920, entitled 'An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain' (41 Stat. 437).

"In order to consolidate and protect the oil lands owned by the Government the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to contract with owners and lessees of land within or adjoining such reserves for conservation in the ground of oil and gas and for compensation for estimated drainage in lieu of drilling or operating offset wells, and to exchange Government land in naval petroleum reserve numbered 1, the right to royalty production from any of the naval petroleum reserves, and the right to any moneys due to the Government as a result of the wrongful extraction of petroleum products from lands within naval petroleum reserve numbered 1, for privately owned land or leases within naval petroleum reserve No. 1: *Provided,* That no lease of any portion of the naval petroleum reserves, no contract to alienate the use, control, or possession thereof from the United States, no contract to sell the oil and gas products thereof, other than royalty oil and gas products, no contract for conservation or for compensation for estimated drainage, and no exchange of any land, any right to royalty production or any right to any moneys as hereinabove authorized shall become effective until approved by the President: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy shall report annually to the Congress all agreements entered into under the authority herein granted.

"In the event of the inability of the Secretary of the Navy to make satisfactory exchanges of land or agreements for the conservation of naval petroleum with the private owners of lands or leases within or adjoining naval petroleum reserve No. 1, as provided for in this act, he is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, to acquire such privately owned lands or leases in naval petroleum reserve No. 1 by purchase or condemnation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such sums shall be expended under the direction of the President, who shall submit to the Congress estimates therefor in the manner prescribed by law: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy shall report annually to the Congress all purchase and condemnation proceedings entered into under the authority herein granted.

"Leases of lands of the United States within the naval petroleum reserves, in existence prior to July 1, 1936, excepting those leases which have become a part of an approved unit or cooperative plan and agreement, shall terminate at the expiration of their initial 20-year periods, and the lands covered by such terminated leases may be re-leased upon such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, with the preferential right in the former lessees to leases of the same if and when the lands are re-leased: *Provided,* That every unit or cooperative plan of development and operation entered into after July 1, 1937, and every lease entered into subsequent to July 1, 1937, with respect to lands owned by the United States within the naval petroleum reserves, shall contain a provision whereby authority limited as provided in such plan or lease is vested in the Secretary of the Navy, subject to approval by the President, to alter or modify from time to time in his discretion the rate of prospecting and development on, and the quantity and rate of production from, such lands of the United States under said plan or lease, any law to the contrary notwithstanding.

"Citizens of another country, or corporations controlled by citizens of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny the privilege of leasing their public lands to citizens or corporations of this country, shall not by contract made subsequent to July 1, 1937, or by stock ownership, holding, or control, acquire or own any interest in or right to any benefit from any lease of land in the naval petroleum or other naval fuel reserves at any time made under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, or of this act, and in the event of any violation of any of these provisions, the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right to cancel such lease forthwith.

"The Secretary of the Navy, subject to approval by the President, is hereby authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary or proper to accomplish the purposes of this act. All statements, reports, and representations required thereby shall be under oath, unless otherwise specified, and in such form as the Secretary of the Navy may require.

"Except as otherwise provided in this act, all moneys which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of this act, or of the said act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), from lands within the naval petroleum reserves or other naval fuel reserves on account of the petroleum products extracted therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts; and any or all oil, gas, gasoline, or other hydrocarbon substances accruing to the United States as royalties from leases of lands within the naval petroleum reserves or other naval fuel reserves under authority of this act shall be paid for in money or be paid in kind as the Secretary of the Navy may elect."

In the proposed contract the Navy has succeeded in eliminating a number of objectionable features in the old contract which were pointed out by the Department of Justice.

1. The old contract put pressure on the Navy to allow production after the primary period. Two-thirds of the 27,000,000 barrels of oil to be taken out by Standard during the primary period was charged to Navy's share and was to be repaid by Standard out of one-third of Standard's production of its own share after the primary period. In other words, the contract involved an advance by the Navy of part of its oil, which could be repaid only by permitting substantial production thereafter. There was an alternative provision for repayment in refined petroleum products, but this involved a dubious pricing factor, since if the price of refined products increased the repayment in such products would be relatively less.

2. Just as production in the primary period was to be charged in major part to Navy's share, so the cost of production was to be charged in the same way to Navy and was to be paid by permitting Standard to credit to itself a proportionate part of Navy's oil as it was produced. That is, Navy's share of costs of drilling and production were to be paid for out of Navy's oil, rather than in cash, and were to be paid in advance.

3. The old contract gave Standard a monopoly, or at least a preferential right, with respect to the purchase of Navy's share

of the oil. This was one of the most disturbing features of the old contract. The new contract expressly denies any such preferential right. It may well turn out, of course, that because Standard is in the field as an owner and has facilities there, it will be able to purchase the Navy's oil more readily than other companies.

4. The basic percentage participations which were initially established were subject to revision only by mutual consent, and it was not provided that revisions should be retroactive to the beginning of the contract. The new contract gives much greater control to the Secretary and makes revisions retroactive. Since the data on which the percentage participations have been estimated are admittedly incomplete, it is of the essence that there be this full opportunity for adequate readjustments as more data become available.

I shall not discuss the details of the proposed contract, nor am I competent to judge its engineering aspects. I can, however, present a few questions and suggestions in the event that you wish to consider the contract more closely.

One question which suggests itself relates to the inclusion of the entire reserve under the unit plan, rather than only that portion, in the eastern part of the field, which is peculiarly checkerboarded and thus subject to drainage. If this is a conservation contract, we must be sure that the inclusion of all of the Navy's 35,000 acres as well as Standard's 3,000 acres is appropriate to protect the Navy's underground oil. I raise this point as a question for engineering advice, without venturing an opinion on it.

The limiting lines of the productive areas in the field, as presently estimated, likewise present an engineering question. It seems clear, however, that revisions will be necessary from the outset, for example with respect to the western line, which simply follows a section line. I, therefore, suggest that the contract should require the engineering committee to consider such revisions immediately upon the going into effect of the contract and at periodic intervals thereafter.

Another feature which you may wish to consider is whether more responsible authority should be given to the Navy, particularly with reference to such basic matters as revisions of the percentage participations and authority to drill new wells. In such matters the engineering representatives of the Navy on the joint committees might be given only power to advise the Under Secretary, who would speak for the Navy; and in case of disagreement with Standard, reference could be made, as the contract provides, to the Secretary for final decision.

The provision for ending the primary period of operations at the cessation of hostilities, among other alternatives, could, I am sure, be made more definite. A proclamation by the President might be taken as marking that date for purposes of the contract.

Finally, the absence of a termination clause ought to be considered. The contract has no time limitation and is operative as long as any oil is left in the reserve. If the contract were executed and it was subsequently determined to condemn, the United States could, without doubt, condemn the Standard's interest in the contract. Such a course, however, might involve more substantial damages than if the land were actually condemned; and, in any event, the execution of the contract for an indefinite time involves the United States in a policy of joint operation which would make it, morally at least, difficult for the Government to change at a subsequent time.

I suggest, therefore, that the contract should not be approved unless it contains a cancelation clause, such a clause to provide a reasonable time in which either party could give notice of termination, and appropriate provisions for an accounting of all operations under the contract.

Moreover, the contract with such a cancelation clause would be the expression of a temporary policy; that is, that the United States enter into a unit plan of operation calculated to conserve oil at a time when the actual value of the oil in the ground had not been ascertained. Operation under the contract would undoubtedly give the Government far more accurate knowledge of the actual oil resources than can now be ascertained. With that knowledge ascertained over a given period of time, the Government would be in a much better position to determine whether an ultimate condemnation would best serve the national interests.

To pass from the specific provisions of the new contract, the question of policy which is now before you is a choice between condemnation and a unit operating agreement. Both alternatives involve some uncertainty. In the case of condemnation the uncertainty is primarily one of dollar cost. We do not have sufficient information at the present time about the content of the various zones underlying Standard's surface to be able to estimate with any assurance what it would cost to condemn Standard's lands in the reserve. I am told that it would require 60 to 90 days to make the studies which would be necessary to secure the required information. Even then, the information might be inadequate without drilling additional test wells. Another aspect of condemnation which ought to be considered is the withdrawal of Standard's lands from production, unless Congress grants authority to produce. Specifically, this raises the question whether 15,000 barrels a day which Standard has been producing out of its own share should be withdrawn from current production.

When we turn to a unit agreement, other uncertainties arise. The fairness of the plan depends, of course, on confidence in the percentage participations which the engineers are to establish and adjust from time to time. Slight differences in the estimate of commercially productive sand would result in substantial changes in the participations allotted to the parties. It should be remembered that for purposes of the unit agreement it is necessary to do more than estimate the content underlying Standard's lands, as in the case of condemnation. For purposes of the contract it is necessary to estimate also the content under Navy's lands, which comprise a much greater area and which have been less developed than Standard's. For the most part, it would be necessary under the contract to determine only the relative amounts of oil content and not the absolute amounts. But the contract does require a determination of the absolute amount of Standard's oil to the extent that Standard would be limited to producing one-third of its ultimate share in each zone without securing the approval of the Navy for further production.

To state it just as fairly as I can: Condemnation would give us definite ownership and control over all the oil in the reserve, at a cost which is necessarily uncertain until resolved by the verdict of a jury. The unit plan agreement would give us substantial control over the oil in the reserve after a maximum of 25,000,000 barrels had been taken by Standard out of its share, the shares of ownership, however, necessarily remaining uncertain during the life of the reserve except as they are resolved by the engineers' committee (and in case of disagreement, by the Secretary of the Navy).

Whatever may be the final choice between condemnation and a unit agreement, our immediate problem requires a temporary extension of the interim operating agreement. Condemnation itself could be instituted and possession of the property taken at any time, without an appropriation, under the Second War Powers Act. But by deferring this step an opportunity is provided, first, for additional cost studies bearing on condemnation, which studies would require about $50,000; second, for consideration of the question whether some production should be authorized by Congress even if condemnation is in fact decided upon; and third, for consideration of the unit plan agreement, subject to termination at a later date if condemnation should eventually be decided upon, as an alternative to immediate condemnation.

Under the temporary operating agreement oil from the reserve is being produced and sold. The agreement is a stopgap measure, and therefore an early choice by the Congress between condemnation and a permanent agreement would be in the public interest.

F. E. P. C. Answers Dr. Goebbels and Radio Tokyo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday there appeared in the Washington Post and several other newspapers throughout the Nation a statement issued by the Provisional Committee to Organize Colored Locomotive Firemen of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, as follows:

BY THIS GREAT DECISION AMERICA'S HONOR IS VINDICATED, AMERICAN LIVES ARE SAVED, AND RADIO TOKYO IS ANSWERED

Tokyo and Berlin were listening, you may be sure, when the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices held its long-delayed hearings on the case of the colored locomotive firemen. But neither Dr. Goebbels nor Radio Tokyo, which for many months has been shrieking its malignant version of the all-too-ugly facts of race discrimination on the southern railroads, will wish to broadcast the truth of what happened at those hearings.

What happened was that a committee of seven members, representing industry, labor, and the public, and including two Negroes, strove in all honesty and good faith to execute the terms of the President's Executive Order No. 9346, which says:

"There shall be no discrimination in the employment of any persons in war industries or in Government by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin."

The committee sat for 4 days, in open meetings fully reported by the press, while a parade of white and colored witnesses piled up a massive record proving beyond any doubt that there was and is discrimination.

No, this could not have happened in Tokyo or Berlin.

Imagine Hitler's kept judges or Tojo's military courts permitting Polish Jews or Korean patriots to testify in open hearings concerning the injustices and the outrages which had been perpetrated upon them!

But it could and did happen in Washington. And already it has done more to restore the belief of Negro Americans in the genuineness of their country's democratic faith and aspiration than anything that has happened since the President issued his original antidiscrimination order in June 1941.

Cited in the complaint filed with the F. E. P. C. were the following railroads and railroad unions: New York Central, Pennsylvania Railroad, Central of Georgia, Georgia Railroad, Union Pacific, B. & O., Seaboard

Airline Railroad, Southern Railroad, Jacksonville Terminals, St. Louis-San Francisco, Atlantic Coast Line, Norfolk & Western, Norfolk Southern, Atlanta Joint Terminal, Illinois Central; Gulf, Mobile & Ohio; Chesapeake & Ohio, Louisville & Nashville, Missouri, Kansas & Virginia, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, International Association of Machinists, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and nine other unions.

At the close of the hearings the spokesman for the carriers made no attempt to deny the charges of discrimination made by the committee's staff. Said Mr. Alderman, counsel for the Southern Railway:

"Mr. Chairman, we have no evidence to offer. * * *. These witnesses by and large have testified to facts * * *. I would like to thank the committee for the courtesy it has shown us * * * and to express my personal view that they have kept the presentation of this case on a very high plane."

As for the all-white unions, they conspicuously failed to participate in the hearings. While lawyers of the unions were present as observers, the unions made no statement at any point in the hearings, presumably because they did not wish to deny or to defend the discriminatory acts of which they were found guilty. In brief summary, the evidence presented to the committee proved beyond question:

That for the past 30 years experienced and competent Negro firemen, switchmen, brakemen, and other Negro railroad workers have been systematically eased out of their jobs in flagrant violation of their legal and moral rights, for no reason other than that the all-white railroad brotherhoods had decreed their elimination.

That in the execution of this policy the all-white unions have employed countless devices of intimidation and chicanery; that while denying union membership to Negro railroad workers they nonetheless assumed to represent them in negotiating agreements with the carriers, the object and effect of which was to bring about the progressive expulsion of the Negroes from the jobs which had furnished livelihoods to members of their race for a hundred years.

That the railroad managements, with few exceptions, made no attempt to protect their Negro employees, and in many cases collaborated actively in their displacement by inexperienced whites whom the discharged Negroes frequently were obliged to train.

That responsible Government agencies, including the National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board, both staffed to a considerable extent by former railroad workers and members of the all-white brotherhoods, were aware of and failed wholly to prevent or protest the ruthless purge of colored railroad workers.

That thousands of trained Negro workers were driven out of employment—often into homeless destitution. Between 1920 and 1940 the percentage of Negro firemen employed in the southern roads dropped from 41.4 to 29.5; of Negro trainmen from 22.2 to 15.1. If this trend had been continued, colored workers would have been almost completely eliminated from these jobs by 1950.

That when railroad employment declined during economic depressions, Negro firemen were literally shot out of their cabs. In all, 15 Negro firemen were killed and 29 injured during two outbreaks of violence in 1921 and again in 1931.

That the price of this sordid struggle was death for the whites, too, but in a different way—when upgrading was denied to experienced Negro railroad workers and, instead, six untrained white boys were employed as switchmen, three of these boys lost legs and arms and another was cut in two.

That the war and the boom in railroad employment has not improved the lot of the colored railroad worker. As late as February 1941 the most infamous of the anti-Negro pacts was negotiated with the southeastern carriers. This and subsequent agreements, made it practically impossible for a Negro fireman working on a steam or stokerized engine to be transferred to a Diesel engine, and thus sealed the ultimate doom of 2,400 colored firemen still employed in the southern lines since these lines will soon be Dieselized.

That in June of this year, with railroad traffic at an all-time peak, Negro firemen were still being eased out of their jobs on the southern lines, though 850 more firemen were needed and the total shortage of railroad workers had reached 80,000. It was even proposed to use women and war prisoners—this in preference to hiring thousands of available Negroes, many of them with years of railroad experience behind them.

That during this period railroad accidents and delays have increased, racial tensions have been exacerbated, and the war effort has suffered both at home and on the fighting fronts.

A SHAMEFUL RECORD—SHOT THROUGH WITH LIGHT AND HOPE

If the record showed only this monotonous sequence and prejudice, chicanery, and injustice, Berlin and Tokyo might well gloat and repeat their jeers at the "American hypocrites." But it shows more—a good deal more. It shows that many of the white railroaders didn't like or want this callous purge of Negro fellow workers, whom they had come to trust and like, and that they rebelled against it, often at considerable personal cost. Here, for example, is George M. Bruce, Jr., white locomotive engineer, age 35, answering Radio Tokyo in the only way it can be answered:

Question. Did there come a day when you did get displaced from position as a main-line engineer?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What was the occasion of that?

Answer. Well, I was asked to roll a senior colored locomotive fireman and I refused to do it.

George Bruce didn't seem to think he was a hero the day he testified. Yet if the morale of Bruce's Negro fellow Americans is a factor in the fight against the Axis, as it is, that one courageous act was worth more than an armored division or a squadron of planes.

Negro Americans will not forget George Bruce, just as Mexican Americans will not forget William W. Jeffers. When Mr. Jeffers was convinced by evidence given at the hearing that Mexican American workers on the Union Pacific were being discriminated against, he telegraphed that such practices violated the policy of his road and would be immediately corrected. They were corrected. "Such problems cannot be solved overnight by a stroke of the pen," declared Sidney Alderman, spokesman for the Southern Railway System. "They can only be solved by the civilization as a whole." But Mr. Jeffers didn't know that. So he solved the Union Pacific problem overnight by a stroke of the pen, thereby striking another solid blow at the Axis and enabling every Mexican in this country and across the border to think better of the "Yanquis."

There were Negro voices, too, that helped to redeem the record. Here is R. H. Russell, Negro switchman, telling how 16-year-old inexperienced white boys were hired over the heads of experienced Negroes, including his own son:

"We trained those white young boys. We gave them the best on the job, knowing that they were displacing me and my boys. Nevertheless, I wanted to do the very best I could. And we trained those boys up, several of them, and after we got through training them so they could take care of themselves, why, quite naturally, they wanted to do some training themselves.

"Every young boy we trained is alive today and doing fine, but those that was trained by the ones that we trained are the ones who got killed—seven or eight of them. And I believe if they would have let us continue to train them, those men would not have been killed."

Much of the record is like that, whether it is a black man or a white man who is speaking. Reading it, one sees again and again, through the murk of prejudice and greed and fear, a white hand extended in the fellowship of a responsible and dangerous craft, and always a black hand outstretched to clasp it. For American civilization, North or South, just isn't as mean and hypocritical and helpless as that statement of the carriers—and radio Tokyo—would have us believe. If it were, the railroad hearing would not have been held at all. What seemed the most powerful political and economic forces in America were mobilized to stop them, and to destroy the F. E. P. C. itself. On January 11, 1943, Paul McNutt announced the indefinite suspension of the railroad hearings. The propagandists of Berlin and Tokyo rubbed their hands and the next morning the shortwave listeners of three continents—black, brown, and yellow—heard all about the debacle of America's democratic pretensions on the racial front.

Then America was heard from. Detroit labor came to Washington, white and black, side by side—the same Detroit labor that wrote and signed the magnificent Cadillac agreement—and spoke its fearless and uncompromising piece. With labor and beside labor in the fight stood the leaders of the three great religious faiths. On February 12, Lincoln's birthday, a little group of these religious liberals—white and black—marched in solemn pilgrimage to the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, as they intend to march next year and every year, so long as the memory of Abraham Lincoln is held in honor in this country. "There can be no second-class economic citizenship, no ceiling on color or creed in the defense of democracy," declared the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish churchmen in an open letter to President Roosevelt released on this occasion.

Four days after the President returned from Casablanca he announced that the suspended hearings would be resumed. They were held September 15–18, and on December 1 the F. E. P. C. announced its findings and directives.

The notorious southeastern conference agreement of February 1941 was the chief grievance of the Negro firemen who filed complaints with the F. E. P. C. The committee found that "its sole purpose and effect is to restrict the employment opportunities of Negro firemen solely because of their race." Ten railroads and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, parties to the agreement, have been ordered to set it aside.

In relation to the railroad companies the committee directed: That the carriers instruct all agencies through whom they employ workers that they will in the future accept needed workers in all classes of employment without discrimination.

That no new agreements between the carriers and unions may contain discriminatory clauses.

That each carrier found guilty of discriminatory practices report to the committee within 30 days what steps it has taken to insure fair practices.

In relation to the railroad unions, the committee found them guilty of many discrimi-

natory practices against Negro workers. A frequent charge against a union was that "it denies them membership in its organization; refuses them any voice or part in the negotiation of agreements * * * and refuses to represent them in respect to their grievances."

In each instance the committee ordered the union to cease and desist from such practices.

In respect to the 23 carriers cited by the committee, one railroad, the Virginian, reached a settlement with the F. E. P. C. before the hearings. Final action in the case of the Pennsylvania and New York Central roads awaits the outcome of discussions between the carriers and the committee.

WILL AMERICA'S GREAT TRAGEDY BECOME AMERICA'S GREAT TRIUMPH?

Thus, with brave and forthright words, the President's Committee on Fair Economic Practices answered Dr. Goebbels and Radio Tokyo. But great words must be made good by great deeds. Will the Committee's directives be obeyed?

We who sign this, Negroes of the South and the North, would be fools if we permitted ourselves to believe that our struggle has ended with the committee's decision. How long will it be before the great and powerful railway brotherhoods can be brought to abandon the tragic error which has so deeply stained an otherwise splendid record? How long before the carriers stop passing the buck to the civilization—and to the unions—and start brightening the corner where they are?

We cannot say. But this we know: That we can go in only one of two ways in this matter of race relations, and it must not be Hitler's way. We who sign this are Negroes whose grandfathers and great-grandfathers were slaves. There is no power great enough to make us slaves again; no power great enough to forbid our claim to the equal rights for which every other oppressed American minority has fought and for which we pledge ourselves to fight, as long as we have breath of life.

Our tragedy, so richly documented in the railroad hearings, is not our tragedy alone. It is your tragedy, too. It is America's greatest tragedy. And it is for America—all America, white and black and brown, "with charity to all and malice toward none"—to transform that tragedy into a great American triumph. There can be no victory without that victory, no peace without that peace.

A. PHILLIP RANDOLPH,
International President,
MILTON P. WEBSTER,
International Vice President,
ASHLEY TOTTEN,
International Secretary-Treasurer,
B. F. MCLAURIN,
International Organizer,
The Provisional Committee to Organize Colored Locomotive Firemen of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Is This Nepotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, Webster's dictionary defines nepotism as: "Favoritism shown to nephews and other relations; bestowal of patronage by reason of relationship rather than of merit." Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following letter written by me on December 7, 1943, to Drew Pearson in refutation of his statement in the Washington Merry-Go-Round on December 4, 1943, regarding personnel in my office:

DECEMBER 7, 1943.

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Care of Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to your Washington Merry-Go-Round column of December 4, in which reference was made to alleged nepotism involving several Members of the House. You refer to me and state that "Mrs. Dworshak is a $1,200-a-year assistant."

Such statements, without an explanation, have sinister implications. In this case, by the use of the present tense, you have stated a falsehood. If you had access to the records, you could have ascertained that, although my wife did help out in an emergency during the mid-summer recess, she has not been on the pay roll since September.

When the House recessed on July 8, I returned to Idaho and endeavored to secure stenographic help, as we had one vacancy in my office here, and it was deemed advisable to pick up a temporary stenographer in the District. However, after a week's search, it was evident that I could not secure a stenographer, and my secretary suggested that possibly my wife, who does stenographic work, might be willing to do this work during the 2 months' recess. She was placed on the pay roll and did handle this work in Idaho.

During the recess my secretary endeavored to get a clerk in Washington, and did employ a young lady on September 17. This clerk was placed on the pay roll on October 1 and is still on the pay roll. The foregoing facts show that Mrs. Dworshak merely helped to alleviate an employment situation, which is common as a result of the acute manpower shortage.

Since I assume you would not intentionally penalize a Member of Congress and embarrass his family, I am giving you this information. Surely a Washington columnist has more important activities than to attempt to undermine the integrity of the legislative branch of government.

The Income Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of December 3, 1943:

THE INCOME CEILING RIGHT NOW: $23,984

The eight groups, including the C. I. O., the Farmers Union, and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, which came out Monday for a $25,000 ceiling on net incomes after taxes, are under a complete misapprehension as to the present Federal tax burden on incomes above $25,000 a year.

In the case of any individual whose income has been approximately constant, and under the present tax law the absolute maximum net income which a married man without children can have in 1944 is $23,984, which would be left from a net income of $101,200.

The same thing will be true in 1945, because in that year, as in 1944, income-tax payers must pay half of the unforgiven 25 percent of the tax on 1942 incomes.

The war may be over by 1946, or it may not.

If it is—well, nobody has seriously advocated a ceiling on individual incomes except in wartime.

If it is not, nobody can foretell now what kind of income taxes will be desirable to finance it.

Here is a table showing the amount of Federal income taxes payable in 1944 under the present law (the Revenue Act of 1942), by a married man with no dependents and with a wife having no income (assuming that his 1944 net income is the same as his net income in 1942 and 1943 and that his 1944 Victory-tax net income is the same as his net income for normal and surtax purposes):

Net income after deducting Minnesota State income tax	Total 1944 Federal income tax	Unforgiven portion of tax on 1942 income (payable Mar. 15, 1944)	Total 1944 Federal tax payments	Net income after taxes
$1,500	$74		$74	$1,426
$2,000	181	$17	198	1,802
$3,000	395	40	435	2,565
$4,000	633	66	699	3,301
$5,000	877	93	970	4,030
$6,000	1,153	124	1,277	4,723
$7,000	1,437	155	1,592	5,408
$8,000	1,753	191	1,944	6,056
$9,000	2,077	228	2,305	6,695
$10,000	2,433	269	2,702	7,298
$12,000	3,193	356	3,549	8,451
$14,000	4,033	454	4,487	9,513
$16,000	4,965	563	5,528	10,472
$18,000	5,969	681	6,650	11,350
$20,000	7,033	806	7,839	12,161
$25,000	9,951	1,152	11,103	13,897
$30,000	13,085	1,525	14,610	15,390
$35,000	16,339	1,913	18,252	16,748
$40,000	19,713	2,317	22,030	17,970
$45,000	23,213	2,735	25,948	19,052
$50,000	26,809	3,166	29,975	20,025
$60,000	34,460	4,061	38,521	21,479
$70,000	42,424	4,994	47,418	22,582
$80,000	50,688	5,965	56,653	23,347
$90,000	59,252	6,973	66,225	23,775
$100,000	68,028	8,007	76,035	23,965
$150,000	113,004	13,317	126,321	23,679
$200,000	158,980	18,751	177,731	22,269
$250,000	205,468	24,250	229,718	20,282
$300,000	251,968	29,750	281,718	18,282
$400,000	344,968	40,750	385,718	14,282
$500,000	437,968	51,750	489,718	10,282
$600,000	530,968	62,750	593,718	6,282
$700,000	623,968	73,750	697,718	2,282
$800,000	716,968	84,750	801,718	[1] 1,718
$900,000	809,000	95,750	904,750	[1] 4,750
$1,000,000	899,000	106,750	1,005,750	[1] 5,750
$2,000,000	1,799,000	216,750	2,015,750	[1] 15,750
$5,000,000	4,499,000	546,750	5,045,750	[1] 45,750

[1] Deficit.

An exception to the above would be in the case of individuals with tax-free income received from ownership of tax-exempt Federal, State, municipal, and other governmental bonds. Another would be in the case of capital gains from the sale of stocks, bonds, etc., held more than 6 months, which are taxed at a maximum rate of 25 percent.

We have stopped issuing tax-exempt Federal bonds.

Maybe we ought to stop issuance of tax-exempt State, municipal, and other governmental securities.

But for Congress to tax income from State, municipal, and other non-Federal governmental securities would probably require a constitutional amendment, and the administration, in urging taxation of income from bonds now tax-exempt, has not fathered or proposed any such amendment.

And taxation of income from bonds which were issued as tax-exempt would be an act of obvious bad faith.

As Secretary Morgenthau himself testified, more than four-fifths of all the national income is in the hands of individuals having less than $5,000 a year. But instead of suggesting that taxes be increased to reach that preponderant segment of increased spending power, Mr. Morgenthau proposed changes which would free 9,000,000 present taxpayers from payment of any income tax.

The only practical way by which substantial additional revenue could be raised is from a sales tax. And the administration has consistently opposed this, although Congressional leaders have indicated that such a tax could be enacted, and the Gallup poll shows that 53 percent of the American people would prefer a sales tax, as a means of raising increased Federal revenue, against 34 percent who would prefer increasing income tax rates.

In view of all the facts, it is difficult to draw any other conclusion than that Mr. Morgenthau and the Roosevelt administration are less interested in sound war financing than in vote getting.

Commodity Credit Corporation and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on November 30, and made a very fine statement with respect to the Steagall-Bankhead bills continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation and forbidding the use of Government funds for consumer subsidies. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. O'Neal's statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now that victory on the war front draws inevitably closer, the problem of producing enough to eat has become the No. 1 concern of this Nation and of all the world. To clinch the victory and forge a lasting peace, an ample supply of food is of paramount importance. In addition to our own, the hungry peoples of half the world are now looking hopefully to the American farmer to feed them. Never have so many depended upon so few to provide them with the necessities of life. Our farmers' answer is that they can and will do the job if given a fair chance.

Unfortunately, the ability of farmers to meet this need is gravely jeopardized by confusing and hampering price policies and orders; shortages of farm machinery, farm labor, and supplies; the multiplicity of agencies; and the division of authority dealing with policies affecting the production, processing, and distribution of food. It is imperative that immediate action be taken to provide a constructive, practical, and coordinated war food program.

We heartily commend the recent action of the House of Representatives in approving by the overwhelming vote of 278 to 117—more than a two-thirds vote—the Steagall bill (H. R. 3477), which is a companion bill to the Bankhead bill (S. 1458). This large and bipartisan majority by which the House approved the Steagall bill is a fitting tribute to the able, brilliant leadership of that great statesman, the late Chairman Henry B. Steagall of Alabama, who gave his life for his country during the stress and strain of this crucial struggle. The large gain in support of this measure as compared with the vote last June is significant of the rising trend of public sentiment against subsidizing people's food bills out of the Public Treasury in a time of unprecedented high incomes.

Passage of this legislation by the Senate by an equally large majority would be extremely heartening and reassuring to millions of farmers in every section of the Nation who are looking to Congress to remove the handicaps which are interfering with the ability of farmers to achieve maximum production of food. Enactment of this legislation will slash away many of the most serious handicaps that are hamstringing the farmer in trying to do his full job.

In the farmers' interest, in the interest of our boys in uniform, and in the public interest, therefore, we need to get the Commodity Credit Corporation and its activities back on the track laid down by Congress. To this end, we strongly support the following basic policies, which are embodied in this legislation pending before your committee:

1. Continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation: We strongly favor the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but we insist that this agency be required to adhere to the basic purposes which Congress has authorized; namely, to help stabilize and safeguard farm prices and help assure adequate, stable supplies of agricultural commodities, instead of using these fund to subsidize the grocery bills of consumers.

Originally, historically, and fundamentally, the Commodity Credit Corporation is an agricultural agency set up to help restore and stabilize farm prices at parity levels and to assure abundant stable supplies. The Corporation's commodity loan program is a keystone in the farmers' price and production structure. It is the agency used to carry out the price support program, which is the first essential of the program of assuring abundant production.

Unfortunately, attempts have been made to use the Corporation for purposes not intended by Congress when it established this agency. The objective seems to be to attach more importance to maintaining bargain food prices to the consumer than to obtain adequate production of food. Instead of confining this agency to its legitimate objectives, attempts are being made to convert the Commodity Credit Corporation into a colossal Santa Claus to distribute rebates to the public at large, whether they need them or not.

2. Continuation of necessary legitimate support, or floor prices, as distinguished from consumer subsidies masquerading under the guise of "support prices."

We favor also the continuation of necessary legitimate support or floor prices at adequate levels to assure the necessary production. Such prices constitute the foundation of a program to assure abundant production and stabilize prices. Such support prices should be announced early and should continue long enough to protect farmers through the postwar period. If production should exceed demand, temporary surpluses of perishable commodities might result in some losses to the Government. Such losses, however, are not subsidies in the true sense, as they are unintentional and incidental losses incurred by reason of unexpectedly large supplies or a sudden and unforeseen curtailment of demand. Such losses are justifiable in the public interest in assuring adequate food supplies. In such instances the Corporation should be permitted to dispose of such surpluses and reduce prices, if necessary, in order to avoid loss of perishable food.

The foregoing principles are carried out in the pending legislation before the committee.

These necessary legitimate support prices should be clearly distinguished from consumer subsidies masquerading under the guise of "support prices." The public is being confused by the attempts of subsidy advocates to label these consumer subsidies as "support prices" and the claims that these consumer subsidies are necessary in order to obtain the necessary production of food.

There is a vast difference between true support prices as intended by Congress and prescribed in the Steagall Act of 1941 and the phony support prices which are in reality consumer subsidies sailing under false colors. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, Congress provided a system of mandatory commodity loans for the so-called basic agricultural commodities at not less than 85 percent of parity. Later in 1941 Congress passed the Steagall Act, which required the Secretary of Agriculture to support the prices of any nonbasic agricultural commodity at not less than 85 percent of parity whenever necessary to secure increased production and this protection is to continue until 2 years after the termination of the present emergency. The American Farm Bureau Federation sponsored the mandatory 85-percent commodity loan plan and the mandatory 85-percent price-support plan, and supported their enactment by Congress. We also supported the action taken in the act of October 2, 1942, in raising these support levels to 90 percent of parity, but we did not favor the discrimination against corn and wheat price supports in that act.

These measures were intended strictly as price-supporting and price-stabilizing measures and to help assure adequate production; they were not intended to be used for the purpose of fastening upon us a system of consumer subsidies. Under present conditions of increasing consumer demand and growing shortages of supplies, there is little likelihood of losses, if price policies are properly administered.

The present system of subsidies, aggregating about $800,000,000, which are being paid out of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C., stand in an entirely different category. These payments are being made for the purpose of holding down prices to consumers below the levels which they otherwise would have to pay in the market place.

It is now conceded that higher prices are required for some commodities to offset increased farm labor costs and other costs and thereby enable farmers to produce to capacity, but instead of passing this cost on to consumers in the prices in the market place, and avoiding any subsidy payments, price adjustments to consumers are avoided by using borrowed funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C. to pay this portion of consumers' food bills.

Farmers rightly resent these attempts to mislead the public into believing that these subsidies are necessary in order to assure adequate food production, when in reality they are being paid in order to provide bargain prices to consumers at the expense of the Public Treasury, at a time when consumers are abundantly able to pay the entire cost of their food out of their current incomes.

3. Adjustment of ceiling prices to offset increased costs, secure maximum production, and avoid subsidies.

Ceiling prices should be adjusted sufficiently to offset farmers' increased farm labor costs and other costs, to assure the necessary production, and to avoid subsidies. Under no circumstances should the ceiling price be placed below the floor price. Subsidies to roll back prices or to maintain price ceilings

in lieu of price adjustments are unnecessary and inflationary, and should be abandoned.

The fact is, we would not have this consumer subsidy issue with us at all if the responsible administrators had carried out the laws which Congress enacted, in the manner intended by Congress.

The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942 was not a price-freezing act nor a wage-freezing act. It was intended to be a price-stabilization and wage-stabilization measure. It appears clear from the provisions of the act as well as the debates in Congress that a rigid, universal freeze of all prices and all wages was not intended. Congress had earlier rejected that approach in the Gore bill. It is equally clear that Congress not only expected that some adjustments would have to be made in prices and in wages, but also made special provision for such adjustments in the act itself, and even set up standards to guide such adjustments.

In the case of agricultural commodities, the law specifically provided:

"Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor."

These provisions of the law have not been carried out as intended by Congress. Instead of making these adjustments in maximum prices to offset increased costs and to secure the necessary production, a system of consumer subsidies has been launched to hold down prices to consumers below the levels called for under the foregoing provisions.

The law clearly intended that price ceilings should be adjusted to whatever extent necessary to offset farmers' increased labor and other costs since January 1, 1941. This was agriculture's Little Steel formula for price adjustments. Similarly, the law specifically authorized the President to "adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

If the provisions of the law had been properly carried out, and the price adjustments had been made to offset increased costs and to obtain the necessary production, these consumer subsidies would have been avoided, because consumers would have paid these adjustments out of current incomes instead of passing them on to future generations through subsidies paid out of the Treasury.

In the President's recent food message to Congress, it is conceded that higher prices are required for some farm commodities in order to offset farmers' increased costs and obtain adequate production, but instead of making these price adjustments as called for in the foregoing provisions of the law, subsidies are being used to avoid raising prices to consumers.

4. Prohibition of subsidies in lieu of fair prices.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of subsidies in lieu of fair prices in the market place, especially at this time when consumers are fully able to pay fair prices. We aggressively insist that present experiments in this field be abandoned and that the provisions in section 3 of the pending legislation, recently approved by the House, be retained in the bill so as to prohibit the use of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the R. F. C. or any other Government agency from being used to pay losses or to make subsidy payments on any agricultural commodity or product thereof, either to reduce or maintain or in lieu of increasing maximum prices on such commodities.

We also favor the provision which permits the subsidy programs which were announced on or before October 13, 1943, to continue to be maintained to the extent funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943. The purpose of this provision is to provide a definite date on which such subsidies are to be discontinued.

We favor also the other provision of section 3, which make clear that nothing in this measure is to interfere with the continuation of the issuance of support prices as required under the Steagall Act as amended or the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, which provide for conservation payments and parity payments as required by existing law or the provisions of the Sugar Act.

Some of the subsidy advocates have attempted to make capital out of the provision which makes an exception in the case of payments or losses incurred with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed. The purpose of this provision is merely to make it possible to incur such losses as may be unavoidable in maintaining the necessary competitive relationship and balance between the prices of competing vegetable oils and fats and at the same time secure the enormous expansion in the production of the oil-bearing seeds and nuts required to meet our needs. The cost of production of some of these oil-bearing materials is higher than others and because of the great complexity of the competitive situation with respect to this whole group, there appears to be no way of avoiding some losses in order to maintain the proper price relationships between these competing products.

The provisions authorizing the sale at a loss of perishable fruits and vegetables in order to avoid substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage is likewise desirable and necessary to protect the public interest and avoid loss of needed food.

5. Full reimbursement of the C. C. C. for services performed or operating costs or losses incurred in lend-lease and other operations for other agencies.

We favor the provision in the bill for full reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation for services performed, losses sustained, and operating costs incurred for commodities purchased or delivered to or on behalf of the Lend-Lease Administration, the Army or Navy, the Office of Economic Warfare, the R F. C., or any other Government agency.

6. The vital issue: The vital issue is the roll-back in prices or the question of consumer subsidies in lieu of necessary price adjustments. The American Farm Bureau Federation is definitely and unequivocally opposed to this uneconomic, wasteful, and destructive policy. We are opposed to these consumer subsidies for the following reasons:

In the first place, these consumer subsidies will not encourage the necessary production. The only effective way to secure adequate production is to support prices and to adjust price ceilings at levels that will take care of the farmers' increased production costs in the war emergency. A fair price is the best possible incentive to farmers to get production.

Farmers do not want subsidies in lieu of fair prices, and they resent the persistent attempts to force this system of consumer subsidies upon them and the country. Farmers in every section of the Nation are strongly opposed to these subsidies in lieu of fair prices.

The consumer subsidy program is highly inflationary. By reducing the cost of consumer goods, it increases the amount of excess purchasing power in the hands of consumers and to that extent increases the inflationary pressure upon prices. On the other hand, it adds still further to the public debt and helps to promote debt inflation. Based upon recent estimates from Government sources, consumers in 1943 will have $36,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power after paying their taxes and after making all consumer expenditures; and in 1944, their excess purchasing power is estimated at forty-seven billions. On the other hand, our national debt is soaring daily to unprecedented levels, reaching a total of $185,000,000,000 on October 31, 1943, or an average of $1,204 per capita, or $4,816 for a family of four.

We are told on the one hand that large increases in taxes are necessary in order to recapture the enormous excess purchasing power in the hands of consumers and thereby avoid inflation, while at the same time other branches of the Government are busily engaged in increasing this inflationary gap through payment of consumer subsidies.

The passage of this bill will lessen this inflationary gap and contribute to the control of inflation. Let us not forget that, of all forms of inflation, there is nothing more disastrous than debt inflation.

Consumer subsidies are unnecessary under present conditions. These subsidies to consumers are totally unnecessary under present conditions. The average consumer is better able to pay the entire cost of his or her food bill than ever before in our history. Government statistics published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that despite increased food costs, the wage income of the average consumer has risen so much more that the average consumer is paying only about 19 or 20 percent of his income for food, which is the smallest percentage on record.

Consumer subsidies will make post-war readjustments more difficult. If we cannot maintain fair farm prices without consumer subsidies now when we have full employment at high wage levels and record national income, what can we do in times of unemployment, low wages, and large surpluses? If we permit this system of consumer subsidies to become established now when consumer incomes are at record high levels, it will lead our Nation to the brink of ruin when the period of reduced employment and surplus production returns.

It is cowardly and unfair to pass part of our grocery bill on to our returning soldiers: Stripped of all camouflage and fancy terminology, this subsidy system simply means that we are going to pass part of our grocery bill on to our returning soldiers who are fighting amid such hardships and sacrifices on the battle fronts of the world, while we on the home front, free from the dangers of battle and receiving the highest level of income on record. It is a criminal and cowardly thing for those of us on the home front to dodge our opportunity for equality of sacrifice, to fail to pay our honest bills, and to pass the burden on in future years to the boys now offering their lives for free government on a salary of $50 per month. American farmers do not want this stigma, and they will fight this vicious subsidy system with all their strength.

I do not believe that the average consumer wants this stigma, either. I cannot help but feel that the average American consumer would hang his or her head in shame if they understood that these subsidies meant passing on part of their grocery bills to their sons

and brothers when they return from the battle fronts.

Campaign of fear and misrepresentation: Unfortunately the whole issue has been beclouded with a campaign of fear and misrepresentation. The advocates of subsidies have poured out a veritable torrent of dire predictions and visions of frightful calamities ready to engulf us if this bill passes—all obviously designed to frighten the consuming public.

We are told, for example, that if this bill passes, (1) it will cost the American people $10,000,000,000; one estimate even went as high as $15,000,000,000; (2) that if these price adjustments are made in lieu of subsidies, it would turn loose the floodgates of uncontrolled inflation; (3) that these subsidies must be continued in order to hold the line against general wage increases; (4) that this bill will wreck the whole economy of the country, etc.

What are the facts? First, as to the cost of making these necessary price adjustments: According to a recent estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the total justifiable cost to consumers, if prices are raised sufficiently to avoid subsidies, would amount to $1,300,000,000. This is only about 1 percent of the total consumer expenditures for goods and services. Certainly a 1-percent increase in consumer expenditures at a time when they have billions of dollars of excess purchasing power is not any undue burden.

Next, as to the charge that these price adjustments will be pyramided many times over before reaching the consumer. The O. P. A. has full authority and responsibility under the price-control laws now on the statute book to control the margins of processors and distributors all along the line so as to prevent pyramiding. Hence, there is no occasion for these adjustments to cost consumers more than the $1,300,000,000, unless the responsible officials fail to do their duty in preventing pyramiding to consumers.

These figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics also disprove the widely circulated claims that these consumer subsidies result in saving from five to thirty dollars to the consumers for every dollar spent for subsidies. The fact is, the ultimate cost to the public will be more than the cost of the subsidies paid out, as it is admitted by subsidy advocates that the extra costs of government in paying out the subsidies and in collecting the taxes later will result in a total cost of $2 for every dollar of subsidy.

As to the other charges that these price adjustments if made will result in general wage increases, which will let loose a flood of uncontrolled inflation, again the facts do not warrant such conclusions unless the responsible administrators are going to abdicate their duties and responsibilities and refuse to deny unjustifiable wage increases.

Government statistics show conclusively that these relatively small increases in consumer costs can be absorbed by consumers out of their present high incomes without justifying any general wage increases. Despite this slight increase in cost the average consumer would still be better off than before the outbreak of the war and would be in a relatively favorable position.

From the pre-war period, 1935–39 down to August 1943, the wage income per employed industrial worker increased approximately 91 percent; while during the same period, the cost of living increased only 23.2 percent, so that the real income of workers was 54.9 percent better than it was at the outbreak of the war. Government statistics further show that you can take any period you wish since the outbreak of the war down to the present time, and it will show that the wages of industrial workers have increased more than either the cost of food or the cost of living.

In view of these facts, there is no justification for making general wage increases if these relatively few adjustments are made in the prices of a limited number of farm commodities. It should be clearly understood that what is involved is not a general increase in farm prices, but only such adjustments as are necessary to offset increased costs, and to prevent reduction in production through shifts to other commodities.

That such adjustment means a wild orgy of inflation is of course preposterous, unless responsible officials fail to carry out their duties under the law. These adjustments are nothing more than Congress intended within the framework of the Stabilization Act.

It is equally preposterous, of course, to charge that the passage of this bill would mean wrecking the economy of the country. The fact is, I know of nothing which will be more likely to wreck the economy of the country than the establishment of a system of consumer subsidies at this time when incomes are at record levels. Historically, food subsidies to consumers have been one of the most dangerous threats to the preservation of democratic government.

This whole subsidy system is a move to cover up the failure to prevent the worst wage inflation and the worst debt inflation in our history and a move on the part of a few labor leaders to obtain a disguised wage increase at the expense of the public treasury—under the guise of holding the line against inflation and under the guise of getting the necessary production of food. The same forces who are leading the fight for these consumer subsidies opposed the inclusion of wage controls in the first price-control bill, and they opposed the Gore bill to freeze all prices, wages, and profits. They did not favor the inclusion of wage controls in the second price-control bill, although they finally accepted it, only to break out later with demands for subsidies to roll back prices.

This subsidy scheme was launched to appease the unjustifiable demands of these labor leaders for price roll-backs and to cover up the failure to control an unprecedented wage inflation.

Within 5 months after the passage of the first Price Control Act, the O. P. A. Administrator issued one of the most sweeping decrees ever issued in this country, freezing virtually all prices with only a few exceptions. It should have been obvious to anyone that a general freeze of prices could not be maintained without control of wages. It was only a short time until rapidly rising costs began to squeeze many people out of business. Something had to be done. Then this subsidy scheme was concocted to hold the line on the price freeze, without raising prices to consumers to offset rising costs due to spiraling wages. Congress refused to grant funds to the R. F. C. and the C. C. C. in the summer of 1942 for this purpose. They went ahead anyway with these subsidies and used the funds of these Corporations for this purpose.

Congress sought to stop this policy by inserting a prohibition in the O. P. A. Appropriation Act, a few weeks later, prohibiting the use of any of the administrative funds to approve or promote subsidies. Still they went ahead with subsidy programs. They even sought to use the funds of the A. A. A. to hold down prices to consumers, particularly in the case of wheat and corn—even fixing the prices below parity, despite the specific prohibitions against this in the law. They went even further and announced an entirely new program of subsidies called incentive payments, but Congress refused to appropriate the money for such payments.

In the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, as already pointed out, Congress directed that price adjustments be made to offset higher costs; but instead, this system of subsidies was extended. Finally, when the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation came up for renewal by Congress last spring, Congress voted to prohibit such subsidies and only a Presidential veto stopped enactment of this legislation.

The same issue is again before Congress. We sincerely hope that Congress will take the necessary action to stop this system of consumer subsidies and see to it that price and wage stabilization is carried out as intended by Congress.

We therefore respectfully urge that Congress enact this legislation at the earliest possible date.

Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Department of Public Utilities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Whereas the Lea aviation bill (H. R. 3420), pending in the Congress of the United States, contains the following declaration of policy, which it endeavors to carry out in detail in numerous provisions of the bill: "The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States;" and

Whereas this exclusive claim of jurisdiction is directed against the jurisdiction of the several States to regulate aviation companies operating on routes solely within their boundaries in the same way in which they regulate intrastate railroad and bus routes and other public utilities operating solely within the several States; and

Whereas this commission has no objection to the Federal Government asserting jurisdiction exclusive of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of interstate commerce, including interstate aviation, and recognizes that interstate airplanes should not be interfered with by different State regulations; but, nevertheless, considers the regulation of the routes and rates of aircraft operating only within the Commonwealth in intrastate commerce as an important State function, which ought not to be taken away, and regards as exceedingly dangerous to State independence the doctrine that the air above this Commonwealth is subject to exclusive Federal jurisdiction, as affecting the height of buildings, and in other respects: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the commission of the department of public utilities oppcses the Lea aviation bill (H. R. 3420) and calls upon the Members of Congress from Massachusetts to oppose said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing resolution be sent to each member of Congress from Massachusetts.

CARROLL L. MEINS,
Chairman.
FRANCIS M. MCKEOWN,
JOHN M. WHOULEY,
DAVID M. BRACKMAN,
GEORGE P. DRURY,
Commissioners of the Department of Public Utilities.

Address by Senator Wiley Before Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a talk I delivered last night before the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply cognizant of the distinction which you have conferred upon me by asking me to address your fellow members of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia. It is good to be here. I share a like honor to that which was given to Col. Peter G. Washington, who spoke before the distinguished membership of this organization on the occasion of the first anniversary of its establishment on December 7, 1866.

There is a striking contradiction in my speaking to you as oldest inhabitants. What has always impressed me most concerning all of you has been your youthfulness of outlook. Within your membership is represented District of Columbia business institutions whose names have been household words for many generations. The press, the professions, Federal employees, and the Christian ministry draw prominent men (and women) from your ranks. You have been alive, you are alive, and you will continue to be alive to the needs of your community and your Nation. It is that quality of "aliveness" which makes possible your eternal youthfulness of outlook.

Oldest inhabitants have still another quality—one which establishes them as oldest inhabitants: They have stayed where they are for a long time. The mythical "oldest inhabitant" of Wisconsin, Paul Bunyan, had something to say about this quality. I have been told that while on the famous Round River Drive, Paul Bunyan's lumberjacks reported seeing a lone man standing in the middle of a swamp. Over a month later, Paul's lumberjacks brought back the story of having seen the same man in the same place, and that he did not appear to be moving. Paul Bunyan is said to have remarked: "Either that fellow is stuck in the mud or he likes it there."

After due examination of the two alternatives, I have come to the conclusion that the Oldest Inhabitants are the oldest inhabitants because they like "it there." Washington is your home—the only place you can enjoy corn on the cob and soup.

You have good reason to like it here. You are not only the repositories and guardians of the traditions of the District of Columbia. You, yourselves, are these traditions. These traditions live within you. It has been your treasured experience to watch your community grow from a dream in the minds of the fathers of our country. There are few greater experiences than that.

Your first president, Col. B. Ogle Tayloe, witnessed President Jefferson's second inauguration. He saw his fellow observers fight their way through brush and slashings and stand in the mire of Washington's unpaved streets to see the ceremony. There was a farm on the present site of the Willard Hotel when Colonel Tayloe attended the Jefferson inaugural. It is widely rumored that suggestions have been made concerning the return of the location at Fourteenth and Pennsylvania to its former productive capacity.

In size, the District of Columbia has grown beyond the dreams of its founders—beyond the imagination of L'Enfant and Washington. But the mortar of tradition has firmly bound the growing community together so that when each new stone was added, the structure in entirety was as strong as before. The contribution of the Oldest Inhabitants to this community adhesion has been of immeasurable importance.

The best insurance against departure from our tradition as a republic has been provided by the Oldest Inhabitants. I refer to your observance of Independence Day, Washington's Birthday, and New Year's Day. To me, your honoring of these particular days is symbolic of your mission to your fellow men. You celebrate Independence Day; and by doing so you pay tribute to the timeless virtue of liberty. You honor the devotion of the individual to the greater cause—the welfare of his countrymen—when you observe Washington's Birthday. Your observance of New Year's Day is significant of your faith in the future of your community and your country. The unbroken chain of these observances over a span of nearly three-quarters of a century maintains these great traditions while, at the same time, reflecting the heart interests of the membership of this organization.

The innate feeling of patriotism which pervades all actions of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia has been concretely expressed in campaigns initiated by this organization. I recall that one of the finest gestures of respect brought about by any group in this vicinity came from you. To others, it may have seemed a small gesture. To me, it was a respectful acknowledgment which all Americans everywhere owe to a truly great man—George Washington. The Oldest Inhabitants originated the movement to toll the bell on all steam craft passing Mount Vernon. It was from this company, also, that the successful idea emerged to place the American flag atop all public schools throughout the city of Washington.

The gifts of this group have been both tangible and intangible. But, in either event, your community has profited by them. Yours is the quiet, inward satisfaction of people who have planned well and accomplished much.

Through Washington—heart of our Nation—has coursed our country's lifeblood. The perpetual youth of the United States has helped to keep you young. Members of this organization have heard Lincoln herald the "Rebirth of Freedom." You have watched the rise of great movements. You have witnessed wars and the problems of reconstruction which inevitably followed wars. You have ridden in carriages and automobiles. You have seen the opening of the new world of the air. These developments have preserved your youthfulness of outlook; the developments of the future will continue that youthfulness.

An appreciation of the essential basic Americanism of the District of Columbia is more than ever necessary since this community is becoming more and more the hub of world activity. Yours is a greater challenge to duty today than it was yesterday. Upon you has fallen the responsibility of maintaining traditional American independence while, at the same time, furthering the spirit of cooperation between nations. I have every confidence that the goal of a better future for your countrymen is worthy of the responsibility which you have assumed.

This brings me to this idea. I believe the citizens of Washington are entitled to representation in the House and the Senate. My own idea is that the Constitution should be amended to give the District of Columbia one Senator and one Representative, though I believe Congress should retain its constitutional control of local government of the District.

Even the date of your origin as an organization is a historic one. The 77 years of your existence have been intimately connected with the destiny of our country. On your founding day 2 years ago, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor.

On this day each year from now on your founders might inaugurate another "first" which would light a flame for all America. On your anniversary you might rise en masse and pledge as follows: "I pledge Almighty God that as long as I live I shall stand on guard for my beloved country against the possibilities of a treacherous attack by enemies, domestic or foreign. So help me God, and keep me steadfast in the observance throughout life of this pledge."

Yes, if I had my way, on every December 7 hereafter I would have every American, especially the youth, stand in silence and repeat audibly or silently this pledge. Why? Because if Pearl Harbor taught us anything, it was that from henceforth on through all generations to come, America must not again be sabotaged into a false sense of security. We must remain alert and on guard, recognizing that in a changing and a contracting world if we are to keep America secure the lesson of Pearl Harbor must be forever alive in our national consciousness, and we must see to it that competent men—not mere theorists, synthetic thinkers, sleeping brass hats—are in position of authority and command.

It is my heartfelt prayer that on other founding days the Oldest Inhabitants may serve a District of Columbia blessed with normal and secure living by perpetuating the American traditions of liberty in a world at peace.

Now, I know there is another reason for this gathering—a very human reason. It is good to break bread with those who have traveled a long way together. Hand clasps hand here, and pleasant recollections and memories form a panorama of Washington's yesterdays. You have learned with Emerson that the only way to have a friend is to be one, "and how good it feels, the hand of an old friend."

"Friendship is indeed the mysterious cement of the soul, sweetener of life and solder of society," and tonight you fervently say old acquaintance should not be forgot and should ever be brought to mind.

"Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be, the last of life for which the first was made."

And we who are privileged to companion with you on this occasion are uplifted and strengthened to meet the challenges of the present and the future. With Browning, we know that life has meaning and that it is just the stuff on which to try the soul's strength.

I shall always think of my friends, the members of the Oldest Inhabitants Association of the District of Columbia, in the words of a Wisconsin poet:

"Time and man have changed the beauty
that I found when I came here,
Changed a dream into a city, hidden sites
that I held dear.
Gone the proud, familiar landmarks that I
knew but yesteryear.
Yet, it's right; of course it's right,
Time nor man may change my glory.—I was
first—the pioneer."

The Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sauce for the Producer, but Not for the Consumer," appearing in the editorial column of the Advocate, a daily newspaper printed in the city of Baton Rouge in its issue of November 24, 1943, and also a letter commenting on said editorial by Mr. C. A. Ives, appearing in the same newspaper in its issue of November 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Advocate of November 24, 1943]

SAUCE FOR THE PRODUCER, BUT NOT FOR THE CONSUMER

We dislike to appear obtuse, but we must confess that we still can't share or quite understand the horror which so many members of the congressional farm bloc and so many farm organizations seem to feel at the mere thought of the administration's subsidy program. The point over which we stumble is this:

If it is all right to pay subsidies to keep the farmer's income up, why is it so communistic, un-American, extravagant, dictatorial, and dastardly to use subsidies in an effort to keep the cost of food to the consumer down?

These same groups that so bitterly oppose the use of subsidies as a price-control measure at the same time support the triple A program, remind their members of the "benefits enjoyed by farmers" through the triple A and allied programs, and demand as an encouragement to production a vast system of price-support programs.

Under the triple A program and the various soil-conservation programs and price support programs several billions of dollars already have been paid out to farmers.

No one denies that the farmer needed help during the depression and many believe that these programs resulted in considerable benefit to the entire country but no one can deny that no matter what the title of the act under which they were made, these payments were subsidies pure and simple, paid at the expense of the public with the object of increasing the farmer's income. Many millions of dollars were paid out in Louisiana alone under these programs.

Subsidies were used then for the benefit of the farmer. Why is it so objectionable now to use them for the benefit of the consumer?

If subsidies are uneconomical and inefficient now, were they not equally so then? If the farmers deserved help in the early 1930's when surpluses drove farm prices to ruinous levels, are not consumers equally deserving of help now when shortages threaten to drive consumer prices to ruinous levels?

This is not to say that there may not be other arguments against any subsidies at all, on economic grounds, but we will be a great deal more interested in the moral points of the matter when the congressional farm bloc, now so dead set against use of subsidies for the benefit of the consumer, comes out against their use for the benefit of the producer.

Can the fact that the producers are much better organized have anything to do with the matter?

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Advocate of November 26, 1943]

EDITOR, MORNING ADVOCATE: It seems to me your position is sound in the editorial in the Morning Advocate today on the matter of stabilizing food prices through subsidies as one means of combating inflation. No particular group can expect or have a moral right to hope for run-away prices for itself alone. That would not only be impossible but an evidence of an inadequate concern for the national war effort in this supreme crisis and a lack of concern or understanding of the general welfare.

Among the many measures put into operation by the Government to give farmers needed relief for excessive production and low prices that existed between 1929 and 1933, two were outstanding:

1. The Government purchased and withdrew from market surplus cotton, wheat, tobacco, etc.

2. Farmers were paid a subsidy at so much an acre not to plant staple crops.

These were direct forms of relief and were, it would appear, quite acceptable. The present sensitiveness about the use of the term "subsidy" would therefore seem surprising. It may arise not so much from a matter of principle as from a belief that run-away prices for farm products would be for the present more profitable.

Well-informed farm leaders cannot have too much faith in the position to which they are being drawn. They know that inflation is no more discriminating than fire, and that at some time in the future direct relief measures may be desired and that it is not wise to protest too much now.

C. A. IVES.

The White-Collar Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk which I delivered over Wisconsin radio stations on December 4 last, entitled "Forgotten Man—The White-Collar Worker."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, what has happened to that phantom figure, the forgotten man, society's specter of neglect for the past 11 years and some months? He is still with us, but as a new group, the white-collar worker. Forgotten? He is, indeed. Recalled to our attention some months ago, with great sympathy by the President in his veto message on the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidies bill, again he is in limbo.

To my mind, we no longer can call him the forgotten man. He has been disinherited, abandoned. Ye have cast him aside. This group constitutes one of the greatest sections of our consuming purchasing public. Fifteen million heads of families are involved, but to this moment none of them, or at least a very few, have found any, or but little, increase in the weekly pay envelope.

Since they are clerical, white-collar, and unorganized employees, they are unable to take advantage of the National War Labor Board's good offices. They are victims of prosperity, unable to compete as individuals for the better things of life or to voice their demands as a group. They are penalized for their own individuality, and we are allowing a growing problem to get beyond control.

This group is slowly being forced to write its living standard downward, and in the meantime they are being forced into debt to maintain even their present standard, while their laboring brother climbs higher and higher, day by day, into the brackets of high incomes and proportionately higher living.

What we do not realize is that it is not alone the white-collar classes which will suffer. We reduce their purchasing power and what happens? Obviously labor is affected; agriculture, industry, commerce are affected. Everyone, including Government, is eventually affected.

The farmer does not sell his products to another farmer, nor labor the result of his toil to a fellow worker. They may interchange it, but in the ultimate end, it is this much-forgotten, unorganized group which furnishes the real profit margin.

But theirs is a lonely, divided cry for help, dimly heard against the united cry of agriculture and labor, industry, and commerce, all those groups fortunately so constituted as to allow of organization.

There have been rapid and constant increases in the pay and compensation of organized labor. The average earnings in this group increased between August 1939, and August of this year by 41.8 percent, and their weekly earnings by 69.3 percent. Labor has fared well indeed under war conditions, with these increases. Compare them with the rise in cost of living which has been estimated at approximately 22 percent.

The forgotten, neglected, abandoned clerical or semiprofessional white-collar worker, largely unorganized, can cite no remotely comparable rise to offset his equally increased cost of living. Yet, he is paying the major portion of the tab on increased living costs, costs largely traceable to this 69.3 percent increase in the wages of his fellow employee, the worker in the industrial plant. He must pay not only his own additional costs, but those of his fellows.

As it now stands, it might be said that the white-collar worker and other unorganized groups are virtually subsidizing the workers of the organized groups. They are paying a penalty for their specialized, skilled knowledge and, in many instances, their higher educations. By our very Government, or rather let us say, by the administrations of the War Labor Board, we have adopted a procedure prejudicial to the unorganized forgotten man who, in the past, relied upon his individual efforts to gain for him an increased standard of living. We know the difficulties of obtaining rulings from this Board on matters pertaining to large organized groups. Imagine, then, the difficulties attendant upon obtaining the settlement of questions involving only the individual. The War Labor Board is chronically and notoriously behind in its docket.

What chance has Mary Jones, the school teacher; Pete Smith, the bookkeeper; Carl Brown, the clerk; or Susie Brown, his sister, in a city, county, or State office to receive prompt attention to her or his individual problem? The far-reaching effects of the neglect of this class will soon become apparent.

We have already pointed out that industry, labor, and agriculture will feel the backbite of these neglected millions whose only fault is lack of organization.

If there is a concrete incident of this situation required, look to your educational system. Many teachers throughout the country are leaving their schools for jobs in war

plants. Normally, the turn-over is approximately 10 percent a year, but the turn-over in the past 12 months has been more than 20 percent. This is particularly true of the rural areas where Government figures show that of school staffs of 894,000 persons, from janitors to principals and supervisors, about 360,000 earned less than $1,200 a year in 1942–43.

During the period 1939–43, salaries of teachers increased less than 8 percent—based upon the fact that 66,000 teachers received less than $600 a year—while the wages of industrial workers increased during the same period 37 percent.

It might be pointed out, too, that government is defeating its own purpose by not taking immediate steps to ameliorate the condition of the white-collar worker. We are urging higher and higher education, but in taking from this class, which includes the highest percentage and the highest average of education and intelligence, we are depriving them of the means to continue their children into higher brackets of learning—and of the incentive to do so.

What is the cure, the solution? From our seeming inability to face it, it must be an obscure one. But in reality, it is not.

Will subsidies for the stabilization of wages of the white-collared worker do the job? No. Not food nor wage subsidies will do it. Only one thing will do it—a fair and equitable additional increase in their weekly pay envelope. They are wage earners, just as labor, and they are entitled to a just, and adjusted, wage to give them their full share of the earth's bounty in return for their toil. That, after all, is the measure of a man's value—his equity in the world's bounty. Increasing the wage of an underpaid person to where he gets reasonable and fair compensation, does not make for inflation. The laborer is worthy of his hire. The white-collar worker is worthy of his hire.

My own State of Wisconsin does not look too happily on the fact that they must withhold their cheese and butter from a civilian market while their potential market is destroyed by substitutions which the public is being taught to accept as just as good.

Whatever our plan, our post-war economic security depends upon immediate action. The problem of the forgotten man cannot be solved by forgetting it. No one is to profit if this great important group in our economic fabric is to be ignored, resulting in a very low standard of living, or else a greatly increased individual debt. Billions of dollars in savings and war surpluses will be of no value if we are to destroy one of our greatest purchasing markets or destroy within them their self-respect as a class because they cannot hold their heads high with their fellow citizens—the laborer, the farmer, and the industrial worker.

The square thing, the fair thing, to do is to permit the white-collar worker to get reasonable compensation for his labor.

This is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, signing off and saying thank you.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address on the subject of subsidies delivered last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen today marks the second anniversary of Japan's cowardly attack at Pearl Harbor. Her treachery caused our people instantly to become united for a common purpose—Victory—and we are now on the march.

I am sorry to advise you however, that our unparalleled progress is now being threatened on the home front. Efforts are being made by a most potent group in the Congress to eliminate the payment of subsidies and thereby seriously undermine and jeopardize our stabilization program.

Many of you may ask, what are subsidies? As a rule they are payments made from the Federal Treasury to assist in the support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public. Government in aid of transportation as to ships, canals, air transports, etc., are common examples. The A. A. A., the Soil Conservation programs, reduced interest rates on farm mortgages, crop insurance, commodity loans without recourse, disposal of surplus productions, the Food Stamp plan—all of these programs involved subsidies so as to improve the position of farmers and to help them farm better and get more returns from their products and reduce their expenses. Some of these programs were of great benefit to many of the consumers of our Nation.

Today, inflation is being prevented by subsidies or Government payments which are being made to bridge the gap which inevitably arises in wartime, between rising costs of production of essential commodities, and stable prices to consumers.

I do not like subsidies. We from the South are traditionally opposed to any form of subsidy. However, I am unable to devise any method that will more effectively stave off inflation than the utilization of subsidies in our fight for stabilization.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the only alternative to subsidies is higher prices of consumer goods. Higher prices of consumer goods means a higher cost of living and a higher cost of living will beget higher wages, and higher wages will again mean higher costs of consumer goods, and soon our economy will become enmeshed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people, but will curtail our productivity now, and almost destroy it in post-war years.

The opponents of subsidies have no plan except higher prices for consumer goods. They are in reality advocating that the consumers of the country should pay at once, 1 to 2 cents more for each loaf of bread, 10 cents more for each pound of butter, 1 to 2 cents more for each quart of milk, 10 to 15 percent more for each pound of meat, 10 percent more for canned vegetables, 2 to 3 cents more for each pound of sugar, 3 to 4 cents more for each pound of potatoes, and so on. In short, under their plan the cost of living will rise rapidly soon after January 1 and there is no doubt that wage earners will have a just cause for increased wages, and with that, our stabilization program will receive a death blow. My desire is that we hold prices at their present levels and not increase wages beyond that provided under the Little Steel formula. Should that formula not be adhered to, then I will oppose subsidies to the extent of my ability.

In order to appraise the value of our present program we need but compare the prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 1, when we had very limited price controls and no subsidies, with prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 2. In terms of the total cost of living, World War No. 2 is 25.4 percent less than World War No. 1; wholesale prices have risen 59 percent less; steel plates, which are so widely used for the manufacture of tanks, ships, and other implements of war, 187 percent less; copper 76 percent less; wool blankets 115 percent less; blue denims, so widely used by workingmen, have risen 147 percent less, and so on. To express it in another way, our present system of price control has saved our Government sixty-seven billions, and the consumers twenty-two billions, in contrast to what the same program would have cost at World War No. 1 inflated prices.

On the other hand, prices received by farmers for what they produce have risen 28 percent more than those received by them during World War No. 1. And that is not the whole story. Farmers are now paying 37 percent less for what they buy for use on their farms, and for interest and taxes.

I am unwilling to believe that the farmers of our Nation are opposed to subsidies during this emergency. I feel certain that the so-called farm leaders who make Washington, D. C., their headquarters and who have been making such strenuous efforts to break the Government control of prices, do not represent the opinion of the real hard-working farmers.

I know that the farmers are just as patriotic as the soldiers on the battlefield. They have done a marvelous job of expanding food production primarily because they know it is their patriotic duty to do so. Their total food production in edible crops, dairy and poultry products, and meat, combined, was one-third larger in 1943 than it was before the war. They know that food is as much a weapon of war as are tanks, ships, and guns, and I am confident they will continue to produce.

As I pointed out a bit ago, farmers have greatly benefited during this conflict in contrast to World War No. 1. Net farm income has tripled since before the war. Every type of farming shared in the gain, with net cash income doubled for cotton, tobacco, and dairy farmers, and tripled or more for livestock and cash grain farmers. To express it in another way, the average aggregate net income of farmers for the 5 years preceding the war was $4,668,000,000. This year it will be over $12,000,000,000, or almost a 300 percent increase.

With such huge gains, I am confident that the vast majority of farmers are satisfied and I would advise them to contact their representatives in both branches of Congress at once, before it is too late. God forbid the destruction of our stabilization program by removing its chief prop—subsidies. In the wake of an orgy of high prices that is bound to follow, farmers will be the chief victims.

When the inevitable deflation sets in, farm prices will fall more rapidly than the prices of the things the farmers buy. After inflation had burned itself out following World War No. 1 prices received by farmers fell 41 percent from their high point within a year, whereas prices paid by farmers for what they need on the farm fell only 18 percent in the same period. And that is only a part of the story. The prices farmers received maintained a steady downward fall and remained at low ebb until the present war broke out, whereas the prices farmers paid stayed up for many years.

Generally speaking, most of the subsidy programs have worked well and had as their main object the reduction of retail prices to consumers, while maintaining fair prices to farmers. In some cases, such as cabbage and other fresh vegetables, retail margins and marketing costs had gone up to unjustifiable levels. In those instances, lowered price ceilings were used to reduce the ceiling prices at the grocery stores without any reduction in farm prices.

In meat and butter, prices had increased to consumers because of the great demand

for those products, yet marketing margins were no higher than normal. As to these products, the Government reduced the retail prices but prevented that action from reducing farm prices by making a direct payment to the processors of the full amount of the reduction in retail prices. In the case of butter, a subsidy of 5 cents per pound was paid. Both retail butter prices and the marketing margin were reduced by the amount of the subsidy payment. Farm prices of butterfat in the 4 months since the subsidies averaged almost exactly the same as they did in the same period before them.

The subsidy on pork and beef also served to reduce retail prices with little reduction in the farm prices. In the case of hogs, however, the very heavy run this fall has forced some decline in both farm and retail prices. On cattle, the average prices paid by packers for all beef steers bought for slaughter in the 4 months since the subsidy, have averaged only 57 cents a hundred pounds lower than the average price paid in the 4 months before the subsidy, while the average retail price of beef to consumers was reduced almost 3 cents a pound. In meats as in butter, the subsidies have served to reduce the cost to consumers without any appreciable reduction in prices to farmers.

Beef-cattle producers, especially the raisers of feeder cattle, had quite a speculative boom last spring. Although prices of fed steers had shown little advance during the spring, prices of feed cattle soared up and up until they were selling almost as high as fat cattle. Long before the subsidy went into effect, the prices of feed cattle began to sag off. That took the steam out of the feeder cattle speculation, and feeder cattle dropped back to the normal margin of two or three dollars below slaughter cattle. That decline in feeder-cattle prices was what upset beef cattle producers and made them so critical of the subsidy—when really the previous boom, and not the subsidy, was responsible for the price drop. Time will not permit me to go into more detail as to the working of subsidies.

I, for one, do not believe that most farmers want to profiteer by obtaining extortionate prices during the war. I do not think that they want to use the sacrifice and the blood that their sons and relatives are shedding on the battlefields as an excuse to get rich quick here at home. Patriotic people know that wars are won only by sacrifice. They could not be won if everyone used them as a chance for private gain.

What Congress does about subsidies within the next few weeks will have long effects on the future of all of you who are listening to me. If Congress takes steps that launch us off on an inflationary course, it will make it more difficult both to win the war and to establish a workable peace. It may create great depression and distress after the fighting stops. The responsibility as to what decision to make rests not only on us here in Washington, but on all American citizens to inform their representatives in Washington what to do.

If the stabilization lid is removed, the cost of the war and hence the level of the national debt will rise by many billions, and the interest burden on this debt will be crushing on all producers. All of us will suffer, but especially the tillers of the soil, as they did after World War No. 1.

In short, farmers of America, the whole country will lose by the elimination of the subsidy program, but you yourselves, taking the long view, have more to lose than any other group.

For the future of free America and free American agriculture as we know it, inflation must be prevented at all costs. That is why I am convinced that all true and real friends of the farmers of our country should be for the subsidy program. For without it, inflation cannot be prevented.

Incidence of Venereal Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WARNED OF SOARING RATE IN VENEREAL ILLS

(By Fred Pasley)

An alarmingly persistent incidence of syphilis on the American home front, both in its industrial centers and the armed services training camps, has resulted in a concerted drive by the high command of the Navy and War Departments and the United States Public Health Service to warn the country's citizens of the menace to the war effort in any further spread of venereal disease.

A Nation-wide survey by Surgeon General Thomas Parran's agency was the direct cause of the unprecedented action, which comes exactly 2 years after full mobilization of America's civilian and military forces.

INCREASE OF 500 PERCENT

While specific figures were not released either for the various production lines or individual training camps it was announced that in 2 of our biggest industrial plants—du Pont and General Motors—the civilian rate now stands at between 30 and 40 persons per thousand employees with the average Army rate at 30 per thousand.

Projected on a national basis the incidence at these 2 plants would show that syphilis has increased nearly 500 percent in this country since Pearl Harbor. In other words, the rate for America in 1939 was 8 persons in a thousand compared with between 30 and 40 persons today.

It is a rate that closely approaches that of the southern tier of States, which always held the national record for high incidence of syphilis. The general average is 53 per thousand for such States as Florida, Virginia, Maryland, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Alabama.

ARMY RATE SOARS

Equally alarming is the Army syphilis rate of 30 per thousand, representing an increase since 1941 of around 400 percent. The syphilis rate early in that year stood at 8.1 per thousand.

Incidentally, the figures on syphilis released yesterday are the first that either the Army or the Navy have let out since the United States started its military training program prior to Pearl Harbor. A tight military censorship was clamped down because the authorities feared disclosure of such statistics would affect morale.

This hush-hush policy, which has been concurred in reluctantly by Surgeon General Parran's United States Public Health Service, is now realized to have been the wrong approach to the venereal-disease problem. It is for that reason that the belated drive has been undertaken.

LOSS HELD INCREDIBLE

"Syphilis is rampant and must be curbed if we are to maintain our war effort at its present peak," declared a high authority. "The loss of man-hours being sustained in our industrial centers due to syphilis alone is incredible. If the figures were broken down and presented to the American people, they would be astounded."

Spearheading the drive will be a two-reel film directed by Walter Wanger, famous Hollywood producer, who is not only donating his own time but that of his assistants and the entire studio. Jean Hersholt, star of Country Doctor, portraying the birth of the Dionne quints, will have the chief speaking role.

A highlight of the film will be a comparative analysis of the syphilis rate for New York State and that of the three Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway in 1939, the last year for which the figures are available, due to German occupation.

SCANDINAVIAN RATE LOW

New York State, on a basis of 12,600,000 population (1930 census), had an incidence in 1939 of 4 cases of syphilis per thousand, or 52,000 cases. Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, whose total population almost exactly approximated that of New York, had an incidence of about one-sixth of a case per thousand, or a total of 2,000 cases. New York, in other words, had 26 times as many cases as the 3 Scandinavian countries.

The reason for this vast difference is that the Scandinavian people have been educated in the venereal disease problem to a point where they have no hypocritical or hush-hush attitude toward it. They attend their clinics in as matter-of-fact fashion as they go to their dentists, and they discuss syphilis and gonorrhea as frankly as they would an aching tooth.

"A blood test is nothing to be ashamed of," said Dr. E. J. Burney, of the United States Public Health Service, who is cooperating with Wanger in the production of the film. "It is also something that we should take periodically—all of us. In that way syphilis can be prevented and much heartbreaking tragedy averted."

The Serviceman's Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the recent Gallup poll shows no justification for either Republican confidence of victory in 1944 or for Democratic defeatism today. After all, regardless of party, we are, first and foremost, Americans. With set-backs this year, due to a natural trend in an off-Presidential year, citizens have gone to the polls to express freely their reactions to necessary, and some unnecessary, wartime restrictions.

In an off-year the issues relating to the war and its conduct seem to exercise a minimum influence. This will not be the case in a regular election year when domestic and war conditions must of necessity be considered together. Then all questions affecting the welfare and future of our country will be aired and the electorate, more fully informed, will make its choice.

In this respect I should like to call attention to an appraisal of the political

situation—as of today—compiled by the American Institute of Public Opinion. This survey stresses the opinion that if the citizens in our armed forces all have the right to vote they could determine the outcome of a national election. These men and women should be given every opportunity to express their choice of leaders because they are our most important citizens today. If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote. On their bayonets rests our destiny; in their hands and brains, lies our future.

[From the Boston Globe of December 5, 1943]

PRINCETON, N. J., December 4.—An appraisal of the political situation—as of today—indicates that the two parties are running virtually neck and neck in terms of voting strength among the civilian population.

DECISION WITH SOLDIERS

If the presidential election were being held at this time, the outcome would therefore be determined by the soldier vote.

If absentee voting procedure is simplified to allow soldiers to vote in large numbers—as bills now being debated in Congress seeks to do—the millions of men in uniform would have it in their power to break the deadlock between the parties. On the other hand, if the servicemen's vote is no larger in 1944 than it was in 1942, the election outcome today looks like a toss-up.

There are three groups of voters.

First, 25,000,000 "habitual" voters—who turn out to vote regularly in off-year elections as well as in Presidential years. The following results of an institute survey indicate the relative party strength in the group:

Group I—today

Off-year votes (25,000,000):	Percent
Republican	53
Democratic	47

Second, 15,000,000 civilians who do not regularly vote in off-year elections but who will turn out in 1944 because it is a Presidential year. The poll shows:

Group II—today

Additional voters in Presidential year (15,000,000):	Percent
Republican	40
Democratic	60

Third, the soldier vote; nearly 2,000,000 servicemen will be unable to vote next year because they are under age. Another 2,000,000 come from the South, where their vote would not greatly affect the national results since the South is overwhelmingly Democratic.

That leaves approximately 6,000,000 servicemen whose vote would be politically effective. The poll shows:

Group III—today

Servicemen (6,000,000 estimated effective voters):	Percent
Republican	39
Democratic	61

If voting in the election were confined to the first 2 main groups listed above, in other words to the civilian vote totaling 40,000,000, the race would be close:

Today

Total estimated civilian vote (40,000,000):	Percent
Republican	48
Democratic	42

With the soldier vote added to the civilian vote, the balance would be tipped in favor of the Democrats, although by a very slight margin:

Today

Combined civilian and soldier vote (46,000,000 estimated):	Percent
Republican	47
Democratic	53

Furloughs for Members of the Armed Forces in Overseas Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great many communications from parents of boys in overseas service against their indefinite retention in the combat areas. Many cases have been brought to my attention of soldiers who have been in Australia, for instance, for 2 years with no sign or indication as to when they might be transferred back to the States or given individual furloughs to come home for a visit.

There have been some in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have been outside of the United States now for 3 and 4 years, as there were many thousands on duty in Panama, Hawaii, and Alaska before the war who have been retained on foreign duty right straight through. It was readily understandable that for the first year or so of the war that it was impossible to bring troops back from combat areas to the United States; first of all, because more and more troops were needed on the various fronts and because there just was not the shipping space available to transport their replacements to the combat areas. This situation no longer appears to exist, at least to the layman who hears daily of our enormous production of ships and who knows of the almost complete mobilization of those of military age in the country. It would seem reasonable and logical that a policy of rotation of troops from the combat areas back to the United States could be inaugurated. We are not fighting with our backs to the wall and, therefore, do have considerable leeway in the movement of our troops. Certainly the morale of those in the combat areas will be vastly improved if they knew that there was a certainty, after a definite period in combat or combat areas, that they would be returned to the States for a definite period. The proportion of the total mobilized strength of the Nation in actual combat is very small, and it seems unfair to place the entire burden of action on the few. This burden should be distributed through rotation of duty with the many. There are literally millions of men in uniform being held back in this country who are impatient for an opportunity for action. There are thousands upon thousands who have seen most of the action and who are battle weary, tired beyond comprehension, and who are entitled to relief from combat and combat areas when there are men available to relieve them. The submarine menace has been largely licked and there appears to be adequate shipping space to make it possible for a reasonable relief of these men in the combat areas and to return them to the United States. Certainly these men with battle experience would be far better instructors to those who are being trained for eventual combat. I strongly urge the Army and Navy to immediately work out a joint policy in this matter and so far as possible set definite periods for retention in the various combat areas and types of sea duty.

Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, my views on the so-called soldiers' vote bill are the same now as they were when a similar bill passed the House during the last Congress. I believe everyone in the military service should be given the opportunity to vote and by the simplest possible method which can be devised. Obviously, with our forces scattered all over the world, unnecessary red tape must be dispensed with to accomplish this. Without a constitutional amendment this would, of course, apply only to those 21 years of age on Election Day. It has seemed to me that the Federal Government, through its various military services, could distribute a simple ballot, collect them and, after sorting, refer them directly to the proper heads of each State.

Our Latin-America Boondoggles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

OUR LATIN-AMERICA BOONDOGGLES

Senator HUGH A. BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, we think, is just after performing a service of enormous value to the American people.

Born in Iowa in 1878, Mr. BUTLER worked variously as a railroad engineer and grain miller before forming the Butler-Welsh Grain Co., at Omaha, Nebr., in 1908. Since that time he has been a director in various flour-mill companies, a member of the Omaha

Board of Education, chairman of the board of Doane College, president of the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, and a member of the board of Rotary International. Senator BUTLER, elected to the United States Senate in 1940, is a Congregationalist, a Mason, an Odd Fellow, and a Modern Woodman of America.

His biography reads like that of a man who has succeeded in business and gone into politics, and who retains in politics the successful businessman's dislike of waste and extravagance. And this public service Senator BUTLER has just performed is typical of such a man.

The BUTLER service is outlined in the opening paragraph of the Senator's article in the current (December) Reader's Digest, entitled "Our Deep Dark Secrets in Latin America":

"NEITHER GOOD NOR NEIGHBORLY

"I have returned from 20,000 miles of inquiring travel in 20 Central and South American countries, astonished and appalled that our good-neighbor policy—backed by six thousand million United States dollars—has widely become a hemispheric hand-out that is neither good nor neighborly."

As most of us have been vaguely aware, the United States Government a few months before Pearl Harbor set up the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, with Nelson A. Rockefeller as Coordinator. The idea was to buy good will for ourselves in wholesale lots all over Central and South America, in anticipation of getting into the European war sooner or later.

Pearl Harbor threw us into the war, and turned the European war into a world war; and the O. C. I. A. A. stepped on the throttle. Senator BUTLER made this recent trip of his (at his own expense) to find out on the spot how the buying of good will was coming along, and at what cost.

His findings are sensational.

Over a period of 3 years, says Butler, we are to spend $6,000,000,000 in Central and South America, or $50 for every one of the 120,000,000 people in those areas.

FRIENDSHIP AT $50 PER

Commented one Latin-American editor: "If our friendship were actually for sale, $50 would not be enough. But if we would sell it, $50 would be too much."

For this money, we are buying a multitude of things, many, if not most of them, boondoggles of the old time W. P. A. variety. A dozen or more Government agencies have now muscled in on Nelson Rockefeller's original bailiwick, and among them they are running more than 12,000 projects of about 1,000 tppes. Among these are a lot of guidebooks, folk music collections, etc., of the kind the W. P. A. writers' and artists' projects used to compile in this country—and that interested almost nobody.

On many projects we are paying three to seven times the local wage scales. This has two effects. We get very little work out of the labor we hire, because Latin-American laborers by and large believe in working just enough to keep oneself alive. And we make the other workers in the same area dislike us because their pay stays at the old low levels.

Hordes of United States Government jobholders are in Latin America trying to run these good-will endeavors, and mainly getting in one another's hair and irritating local authorities.

We have started a boom all over Latin America, Senator BUTLER reports, but we are not getting any good will from it now and never shall. Canny Latins distrust prodigal spenders; and if we quit spending the boom will burst, Latin America will nosedive into a depression, and we'll be blamed by the Latin Americans for it.

All this has been carefully concealed from the United States taxpayers who, of course, are paying all the bills. It took a United States Senator's grim on-the-spot investigation to let our taxpayers in on the secret of what is being done with six billions of their hard-earned dollars.

Senator BUTLER's charges are now being denied. We think a Senate investigation is called for.

Silver—A Metal of Growing Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 7, 1943

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Silver—A Metal of Growing Importance," published in the Mining Congress Journal of November 1943. The article, which is by a special correspondent, is an unusually fine and enlightening one.

I am advised by the authorities on printing that the cost of printing this article will be $112.50. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed with that estimate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER—A METAL OF GROWING IMPORTANCE

Prior to Pearl Harbor, considerable experimental work was conducted in an effort to find suitable substitutes for copper and other strategic metals. It was discovered that silver could assume these new responsibilities, and today it is proving indispensable to American industry. No longer is silver used only as a standard of values and a base in our monetary system and in the manufacture of jewelry and tableware. Silver and silver alloys are used extensively in every phase of our war industry. They are employed in ships, airplanes, tanks, guns, torpedoes, bombs, and shells. Silver wire is superior to copper wire, and no other metal has proved as efficient as silver in bearings used in tank and aircraft motors. Silver is being used advantageously where tensile strength and high electric and thermal conductivity are a prime requisite. The superiority of silver for electrical purposes has long been recognized. It is a better conductor of electricity than copper, the relative conductivity being 100 to 92.7. In the electrical industry silver is used for contacts in layers, inserts, and buttons, only the contact areas consisting of silver. Electrical contacts are also sometimes made of alloyed and powdered silver mixed with other elements. It is also used in telephone and telegraph systems, railway signaling devices, refrigerators, washing machines, air-conditioning units, and for soldering purposes. In telephone apparatus, contacts on relays are in the form of buttons of silver welded on contact springs. Thus only a few grains of silver are used in each of the millions of contacts that are required in making telephone connections.

The principal properties of silver, upon which much of its usefulness rests, are (1) its resistance to a wide variety of corrosive agents; (2) its strong bonding power; (3) its electrical and thermal conductivity; (4) its remarkable optical reflectivity; and (5) its ability to form salts and compounds with valuable photosensitive and bactericidal properties.

Because of its resistance to alkalies, organic acids, and certain mineral acids (including many products which attack tin), silver found wide use in the chemical industry as a lining for equipment, such as stills, condensers, autoclaves, tanks, piping, heating coils, and reaction vessels, even when tin was readily available. Besides being used as a lining for aircraft bearings it is also used in bearings for Diesel engines, tractors, trucks, and busses.

The ability of silver to make strong, leakproof, and corrosion-resistant joints has led to wide use in marine and Navy piping, high-pressure boilers, transformers, bus bar assemblies, and oil floats.

The photosensitivity of silver salts is the basis upon which the photographic industry has been built. The important role that photography plays in this war has greatly increased the demand for silver in this field.

In the pre-war period about 30,000,000 ounces of silver were consumed annually and of this quantity approximately 30 percent was recovered each year. It is difficult and sometimes impossible to reclaim the silver used in many of the newly developed uses. Such large articles as bus bars for electric current will remain intact, but it is unlikely that silver used for brazing parts for airplanes, ships, and bombs will be recovered.

In some uses, such as photographic film, there are as yet no acceptable substitutes for silver. For many other purposes for which silver is eminently fitted, the effectiveness of the metal rather than the price has been the determining factor. Performance is the primary objective. Electric bus bars containing tons of silver would not be economically feasible if the silver had to be purchased outright. But it is being loaned by the Government and will later be returned to the Treasury and replaced by copper with no loss of silver.

Further experiments with silver are being concluded almost daily, which means the consumption of silver in war industry will increase steadily. Additional opportunities for the application of silver have been found by coating with it electrolytically, by alloying it with other metals, and by sintering or mixing it with other metals in a powdered form.

Since 1934, when Congress passed the Silver Purchase Act, the Treasury has purchased newly mined domestic silver at prices fixed by Presidential proclamation, by the act of July 6, 1939, and foreign silver at various prices.

The silversmiths, jewelry-ware, fountain pen, mirror, electroplating, photoengraver, and watchcase manufacturers, until recently, purchased all their requirements from foreign countries at the open market price quoted in New York.

The expanded utilization of silver for use in the war effort and the scarcity of available supplies impelled the War Production Board to issue a directive on July 29, 1942, which provided that after October 1, 1942, all foreign silver imports were to be allocated for use solely in war production. On February 25, 1943, this order was amended, to the effect that, except for the filling of orders bearing a preference rating of A-1-a or higher, manufacturers were restricted in the amounts of domestic silver they might receive or process to one-half of their 1941 or 1942 consumption, whichever was the higher. These were the peak years for the silver products industry. The order was further amended by the W. P. B. on May 10, 1943, when the quota period was changed from a monthly to a quarterly basis, and certain changes were made in the method of arriving at the quotas which further restricted the use for nonessential purposes.

The Treasury, which formerly purchased all newly mined domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce and was an important buyer of

foreign silver at 35 cents an ounce, has made no new contracts for the purchase of foreign silver since November 1941, and has bought but little newly mined domestic silver since August 1942.

This newly mined domestic silver is now in great demand by manufacturers who do not have priority ratings for the purchase of foreign silver. On March 23, 1943, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of specified lines of silver articles, such as jewelry, fountain pens, silverware, mirrors, watch cases, and insignia, which contained newly mined domestic silver, were permitted to increase prices by 36 cents for each troy ounce of such silver contained.

In spite of the increased demand for silver in the United States, the price of domestic silver has not increased since the act of Congress of July 6, 1939, which established a net price of 71.11 cents an ounce. However, the maximum price of foreign silver was raised on August 30, 1942, from 35 to 45 cents an ounce. Before this official action was taken, competition among domestic manufacturers had grown so keen that some concerns were reported paying as high as 65 cents an ounce in Mexico.

The Metals Reserve Co., a subsidiary of the R. F. C., has been authorized to maintain a stock-pile reserve of silver not to exceed 20,000,000 ounces, for release as needed to meet war requirements. Since November 1942, they have been purchasing foreign silver, including frozen foreign stocks, for this purpose. Metals Reserve Co. will continue to take up excess foreign silver, if any, as it comes into the country and stock pile it for allocation by the W. P. B. for consumptive uses in the war effort.

The Treasury Department on May 6, 1942, made available a minimum of 1,000,000,000 troy ounces of its "free silver" stocks—i. e., metal not held as reserve against silver certificates—for release, in the form of loans. In addition, "silver ordinary," consisting of silver recovered from melting and coining processes, totaling slightly less than 5,000,000 ounces, was made available by the Treasury, in late 1942, at 45 cents per ounce to industrial users with high priority ratings who were recommended by the W. P. B. This silver was formerly available for making medals and for similar uses by private organizations

Still further supplies were made available on July 12, 1943, when an act of Congress authorized the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the W. P. B., to sell at 71.11 cents an ounce for war uses and civilian needs Treasury stocks of silver not required for redemption of outstanding silver certificates, and to lease to war plants monetized bullion silver for a period not to exceed 5 years. This act will expire December 31, 1944.

On July 29, 1943, the W. P. B. revised its regulations covering the distribution of silver and stated the specific uses which might be made of Treasury silver, foreign silver, and domestically mined silver. Treasury silver may be used in the manufacture of engine bearings, brazing alloys, solders, and official military insignia; foreign silver may be used in the manufacture of medicines and health supplies, electrical contacts, and other miscellaneous products, and domestically mined silver may be used—upon the basis of 50 percent of 1941 or 1942 consumption—in the manufacture of such articles as silverware and jewelry.

Table 1 shows the gross amount of silver used in United States industries in the calendar years 1929–42, the amount returned to the refineries by manufacturers and dealers in the form of new scrap and old material, and the net consumption. The amount of material returned had increased markedly between 1930 and 1939 but it lessened somewhat during 1940 and 1941. Substantial quantities of silver that are being used now will not be recovered. Moreover, the quantity of old material turned in by owners may decline somewhat because of the increasing inability of civilians to obtain new table silverware and other silver products to replace the old. If prices should advance materially the return of old material might increase.

Nearly 60 percent of the silver consumed by private industry in the United States in 1942 is estimated to have gone into products classified by the W. P. B. as essential to the war effort and thus covered by priority ratings. Consumption by the silverware industry, formerly the largest users of industrial silver, reached a high level in 1941 but declined in 1942 because of the scarcity of silver and the increased restrictions governing the use of foreign silver. Total consumption in 1943 is expected to reach abnormally high levels while production will show a marked decrease. The largest increase in use, as indicated by trade reports and estimates of the W. P. B., are in bearings, photographic goods, brazing alloys, solder, electrical contacts, and dental and surgical supplies.

TABLE 1.—*United States consumption in industry and the arts, calendar years 1929–42*

[In millions of troy ounces]

Year	Total issued by refineries	Scrap and old material returned to refineries	Net new material
1929	42	11	31
1930	36	9	27
1931	33	9	24
1932	24	10	14
1933	29	18	11
1934	40	28	12
1935	41	36	5
1936	36	17	19
1937	51	23	28
1938	39	19	20
1939	70	25	45
1940	67	23	44
1941	93	20	73
1942	[1] 115	[2]	[2]

[1] Handy & Harman estimate.
[2] Not available.

Source: Annual reports of the Director of the Mint; Handy & Harman annual reviews.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated gross consumption of silver, by selected industries, calendar years 1929, 1931, and 1939–43*

[In millions of troy ounces]

Industry	1929	1931	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Bearings						10	25
Photographic goods [1]	8	7	13	12	18	20	20
Brazing alloys						[2]	20
Contacts						10	10
Dental and surgical supplies	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	2	5
Insignia	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]	5	5
Solder	1	1	[4]	[4]	[4]	1	4
Chemical products, n. e. s.	2	2	1	2	3	3	3
Sterling, silverware	10	9	11	14	50	[5] 30	[5] 30
Silver-plated ware	4	2	5	4	5		
Jewelry	3	2	3	3	3	10	5
Unclassified	2	1	1	6	1	30	32
Total	30	24	34	41	80	121	159

[1] Figures for 1939–41 represent silver nitrate. By far the largest use of silver nitrate is for photography; other uses are for silvering mirrors and in pharmaceuticals.
[2] Not shown separately; included in "Unclassified."
[3] Estimated at less than 1,000,000 ounces.
[4] Not available, but known to be small.
[5] Figures include estimates of silver used in the production of silver-plated ware for the Army and the Navy.

Source: Data for 1929 and 1931 are estimates of Charles W. Merrill, U. S. Bureau of Mines, and are based on questionnaires received from the industries concerned. Estimates for later years are based on data of the American Bureau of Metal Statistics, Handy & Harman annual reviews; and for 1942 and 1943 totals, statements of G. H. Niemeyer, representing Handy & Harman, and Richard J. Lund, War Production Board, in hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U. S. Senate, 78th Cong., 1st Sess., Apr. 28 and 29, 1943.

TABLE 3.—*United States consumption of silver in domestic coins, fiscal years 1929–42*

[In millions of troy ounces]

Year	Quantity
1929	5
1930	7
1931	[1]
1932	[1]
1933	[1]
1934	2
1935	23
1936	20
1937	24
1938	14
1939	8
1940	19
1941	33
1942	79

[1] Less than 1,000,000 ounces.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Mint.

TABLE 4.—*United States silver production and Government purchases, calendar years 1934–42, and by months, January 1942–June 1943, and net imports, 1934–40*

[In millions of troy ounces]

Year and month	United States production	Net imports of silver (except coins) [1]	Government purchases			United States production + net imports — Government purchases [2]
			Newly mined domestic	Foreign	Total	
1934	32.0	154	22.0	172.0	[3] 305.0	−119
1935	46.0	515	38.0	404.0	[3] 534.0	+29
1936	63.0	234	61.0	272.0	333.0	+35
1937	71.0	154	71.0	241.0	312.0	−87
1938	62.0	243	62.0	355.0	417.0	−112
1939	64.0	172	61.0	283.0	343.0	−107
1940	67.0	157	68.0	140.0	208.0	+16
1941	69.0	[4]	70.0	73.0	143.0	
1942	54.0	[4]	48.0	14.0	62.0	
1942:						
January	4.8	[4]	6.0	3.3	9.3	
February	4.5	[4]	4.7	3.4	8.1	
March	5.3	[4]	5.1	2.8	7.9	
April	5.6	[4]	6.4	3.2	9.6	
May	4.9	[4]	7.0	1.7	8.7	
June	4.5	[4]	4.0		4.0	
July	5.0	[4]	5.5		5.5	
August	4.4	[4]	2.9		2.9	
September	4.6	[4]	2.5		2.5	
October	3.8	[4]	2.0		2.0	
November	3.3	[4]	1.2		1.2	
December	3.7	[4]	.5		.5	
1943:						
January	3.7	[4]	.1		.1	
February	3.5	[4]	.1		.1	
March	3.8	[4]	.6		.6	
April	3.6	[4]	1.6		1.6	
May	3.8	[4]	1.3		1.3	
June	3.4	[4]	1.2		1.2	

[1] Imports of base and refined bullion minus similar exports.
[2] A negative quantity indicates that Government purchases during the year were greater than current annual supply; a positive quantity, that they were less; excess purchases must have been made from stocks within the country.
[3] Includes 111,000,000 ounces in 1934 and 2,000,000 ounces in 1935 of nationalized silver acquired at 50 cents per ounce by Executive proclamation of Aug. 9, 1934.
[4] Import data beginning with the last quarter of 1941 are confidential and not for publication.

Source: Bulletins of the U. S. Bureau of the Mint, official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce, and press releases of the U. S. Bureau of Mines.

WAGES IN CASH INCREASES SILVER COINAGE CIRCULATION

Demand for silver for coinage purposes has increased greatly due to wages being paid largely in cash rather than by check and the increased payment for purchases with cash instead of through charge accounts. Of 2,114,690,662 coins of all kinds produced during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, approximately one-fifth, or 449,336,162, were silver coins. Seventy-nine million ounces of silver were required for domestic coinage purposes in 1942 and 12,000,000 ounces of silver

were minted in the United States mints for foreign countries. Roughly, half of these foreign silver coins were for the Netherlands Government and Australia. The silver required in the production of coins for a foreign government ordinarily is deposited by the government with the United States Mint.

In December 1942 the Secretary of the Treasury announced that silver for coinage (whether minted here or elsewhere) would be supplied to Great Britain, Australia, and certain other countries on a lend-lease basis. On July 2, 1943, it was announced by the Office of Lend-Lease Administration that shipments of silver totaling 3,075,000 ounces had been supplied Great Britain by the United States. This is to be returned to the United States on an ounce-for-ounce basis after the war. Further shipments of lend-lease silver to Great Britain and other countries will follow.

Dollars, half dollars, quarters, and dimes are made of silver 0.900 fine. The fine silver content of the dollar is 0.7734 ounce. No dollar coins are now being minted. In March 1942 the Treasury stopped making the old 5-cent piece which contained 25 percent nickel and 75 percent copper. The new 5-cent pieces now being coined contain 35 percent silver, 56 percent copper, and 9 percent manganese. This will save all of the nickel heretofore used in the coins (450 tons in 1941), and 19 percent of the copper formerly required for their mintage. In the fiscal year 1942 the new 5-cent piece consumed more than 5,000,000 ounces.

Table 3 shows United States consumption of silver in domestic coins in the years 1929–42.

There has been a decided decline in silver production in the United States in 1942 and 1943 due partly to shortage of manpower and partly to the closing of gold mines which produced some silver.

Thus far in 1943 there has also been a decline in imports due in part to a lack of transportation, labor difficulties, and increased coinage demand in those foreign countries which export silver to the United States.

Total requirements, however, are expected to be even larger than in 1942. In the calendar year 1942, 54,000,000 ounces of silver were produced in the United States; 47,800,000 ounces of this domestic silver and 14,000,000 ounces of foreign silver was purchased by the United States Treasury. Actual gross industrial consumption was estimated at 121,000,000 ounces, most of which was obtained from imports, or stocks held by the Treasury and those acquired by the Metals Reserve Company. In addition to industrial consumption, the Government consumed approximately 91,000,000 ounces in the manufacture of subsidiary coins, which brings the total industrial and coinage consumption in the year 1942 to about 212,000,000 ounces.

It has been estimated that the industrial consumption for 1943 (both for strategic and nonessential products) will be from one hundred and fifty-nine to one hundred and sixty-nine million ounces, including about 30,000,000 ounces for nonessential purposes. If coinage requirements should be the same as in 1942, the total requirements for industrial use and coinage in the United States should be somewhere between two hundred and fifty and two hundred and sixty million ounces. In addition several million ounces of Treasury "free" silver will be shipped overseas for coinage and industrial purposes.

A higher price for foreign silver would serve to stimulate production in the silver-producing countries of this hemisphere, though it is improbable that even if our imports of silver do increase that this will offset any considerable part of the disparity between current requirements and current supplies—other than Treasury silver—in the United States. And there is little possibility of increasing our domestic production for the duration.

The black production outlook, however, is brightened considerably by the existence of large stocks of silver in the hands of the Government. On July 15, 1943, the Treasury had 1,251,000,000 ounces of "free" silver all of which has been earmarked for essential use, nonrecoverable or recoverable. Of its reserves of "free" silver, the Treasury has allocated 1,000,000,000 ounces to the Defense Plant Corporation for recoverable use in war industry, 700,000,000 ounces of which are already in use. The balance of the stocks of "free" silver are available for other industrial uses, minting, or loan to other governments under the Lend-Lease Act.

The future holds many and varied opportunities for silver. Silver in industrial uses will assume a position of paramount importance in the post-war period. There will probably be a much larger demand for silver for electrical purposes and for bearings than even before the war. Many nonessential uses which were beginning before the war will be resumed, and the silverware industry will have accumulated a considerable backlog of orders which will require substantially larger supplies of silver than the pre-war average of about 30,000,000 ounces annually.

From the foregoing facts it is obvious that the industrial demand for silver during the past few years has materially changed the course of the white metal, but its functions in the monetary systems of the post-war world will not lose importance as a result of this new role.

Don't Tear Old Glory Down!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, delivered at the launching of a patrol craft for the United States Navy by the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co. at Lake Calumet, Ill., November 14, 1943.

Colonel McCormick has distinguished himself as a proven fighter, both in war and peace, for America, her people, and her interests.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was in 1775 that Patrick Henry said:

"The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American."

And later in the same year:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Liberty came to most Americans, but death came to many. Among the first was Nathan Hale, who, with his hands bound behind his back and the noose around his neck, said: "My only regret is that I have but one life to give for my country."

Of others who died, Paul Jones wrote:

"No one was now left aboard the *Richard* but our dead. To them I gave the good old ship for their coffin, and in her they found a sublime sepulchre. She rolled heavily in the long swell, her gun deck awash to the port sills, settled slowly by the head, and sank peacefully.

"The ensign, shot away in action * * * had been put in place after firing ceased, and our torn and tattered flag was left flying when we abandoned her.

"As she plunged head down at the last, the very last vestige of the *Bon Homme Richard* was the defiant waving of her unconquered and unstricken flag. I bequeathed to my immortal dead the flag they had so desperately defended for their winding sheet."

That ensign was the Stars and Stripes.

Some years ago, when it was planned to wreck the frigate *Constitution*, Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote the following poem:

"Ay, tear her tattered ensign down!
Long has it waved on high
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky;
Beneath it rung the battle shout
And burst the cannon's roar:
The meteor of the ocean air
Shall sweep the clouds no more!
Her deck, once red with heroes' blood,
Where knelt the vanquished foe,
When winds were hurrying o'er the flood
And waves were white below,
No more shall feel the victor's tread,
Or know the conquered knee:
The harpies of the shore shall pluck
The eagle of the sea!

Oh, better that her shattered hulk
Should sink beneath the wave!
Her thunders shook the mighty deep,
And there should be her grave:
Nail to the mast her holy flag,
Set every threadbare sail,
And give her to the god of storms,
The lightning and the gale!"

The flag is holy. It has been hallowed by the thousands of men who gave their lives for it. Therefore men who demand that it be torn down from every ship in the Navy and taken away from every regiment in the Army are not only treasonable but blasphemous.

On July 4, 1776, Jefferson took up his pen to write:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

He concluded:

"We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

It took 7 years of bloody war to establish that freedom, after which the States formed the Confederation and then the Consitution, as it said, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

After the Constitution had been adopted in the Convention, a friend asked Franklin as he was leaving the hall:

"What kind of a government have you set up?"

"A republic," the great statesman replied, "a republic if you can keep it."

This Government is still "A republic if you can keep it."

Later 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, were added, upon the insistence of the republicans and over the objections of the monarchists. These amendments, enforceable by the courts, make us the only free people in the world today.

The first amendment says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It is by virtue of this article that we are here and I am speaking to you. But for that, this peaceful meeting would be forcibly broken up and I would be imprisoned * * * imprisoned for speaking up for the freedom of my country and its people.

Many statesmen have defined and described our Government. Daniel Webster once declared: "Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

At Gettysburg, in the midst of our great Civil War, it was Lincoln who said:

"Four score and seven years ago, our forefathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty."

Gladstone, no friend of the United States, wrote:

"I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect."

Let no one, therefore, try to deny that our institutions are all self-made and that they constitute a Republic.

Under the free doctrines of our Constitution, the American people spread across the continent and offered hospitality to the oppressed of all nations and races who fled from domestic tyranny to enjoy our freedom.

Our Republic became a challenge to all governments. In consequence, certain of its institutions, but only some, have been copied abroad by European kingdoms. These are now called democracies, but hereditary monarchies with titled aristocracies, are a long road from our free Republic with a Bill of Rights enforceable in the courts. Anyone who calls the United States a democracy shamefully traduces our Republic.

We read in Hazen's "Europe Since 1815" that when Norway won her independence in 1905:

"There was a strong feeling in favor of a republic, but it seemed clear that the election of a king would be more acceptable to the monarchies of Europe, and would avoid all possibilities of foreign intervention."

At this time, King Edward the Seventh, the ablest of modern kings, said:

"A republic would be very unfortunate. * * *"

Whatever one finds of democracy anywhere in the world has hailed from this country.

Beware of this word "democracy" used subtly to water down the sturdy word "republicanism." Especially beware of the users of the word. They are plotting the destruction of the Republic.

I am speaking here today because this ship is to fly the American flag and go to the succor of our hard-pressed forces. I would not speak at the launching of a ship to be given away.

I am one of those sharing the Nation's generous indignation at the information brought back by the five Senators who have been investigating conditions around the world. They have reported that our resources and the products of our labor are being distributed with utter profligacy to any foreign nation which will take them on the understanding that it is to pay nothing to us in return; that ships and airplanes have been going freely to other countries while our forces in the Pacific, short of airplanes, short of ships, short of everything, have been fighting a heroic and desperate campaign, quite neglected by their own Government.

It is time to speak up for America and Americanism. It is time to insist that all of our war production be sent to rescue MacArthur's needy forces battling overwhelming odds.

During the years of our national youth, of our comparative weakness, the hatred of the monarchies welded the patriotism of the people of this Republic. It was only after we developed our great strength that conspiracies were formed to break down our national feeling and pass us under various foreign yokes.

Now we know that for 40 years, American citizens have been hired and educated abroad to become alien agents among us.

Even in our own city, the center of American patriotism, a college is conducted to teach sedition and treason.

I have no sympathy and little patience with people who blame all the evils of the world on my country. If they are foreigners, they are objectionable, but their attitude may be natural. If they are American citizens, their conduct is unnatural. There is much precedent for them to copy. Millions of men born abroad but preferring this country have become naturalized citizens. Therefore let those born Americans who prefer other countries become naturalized aliens. It is not to be countenanced that they remain here and use their citizenship to betray your country and mine.

As a humble disciple of George Washington, I believe with him that:

"A passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils—sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists * * *."

So let Mr. Wendell Willkie speak for the Chinese, Mr. Earl Browder and Mr. Harold Ickes speak for the Russians, Mr. Clarence Streit and Mr. John Davis speak for the British.

I will speak for the Americans and only for the Americans. The foulest tongues and vilest pens will not deter me.

The American people, long subject to a subtle and most insidious and violent campaign of vilification and intimidation, are seeing the light more and more clearly. Soon the conspirators who have been denouncing patriots will be themselves denounced and cast out.

The plans to change our form of government will fall to the ground; the plan to make us a subsidiary state will fail, in spite of conspiracy and treachery, for in the words of the immortal Lincoln:

"We here highly resolve that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom * * * and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Crisis on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last evening over a Nation-wide broadcasting system by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because we now know that we can win this war, too many of us are acting as if the war is already won. It is not. The most critical and the bloodiest battles of the war are ahead of us.

Our boys at the front are not fighting as if the war were already won. They know that much fighting and dying must come before victory brings peace. They are fighting harder than ever.

We on the home front must also fight harder than ever to win the war and stop the dying—to win the peace and make it lasting.

We have come a long way since Pearl Harbor. Instead of an army of 1,635,000 today we have an army of 7,390,000. The army is better equipped and better trained than any army in history. Our progress in production is as encouraging to us as it is discouraging to our enemies. We produced last month almost as many airplanes as we had in our Army Air Forces at the time of Pearl Harbor. Instead of 330 fighting ships our Navy can now boast of 840 fighting ships. Instead of 4,812 airplanes the Navy now has approximately 25,000 aircraft.

We began our production program June 1, 1940. On this anniversary of Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbor I am happy to announce, for the benefit of Hirohito and Hitler, that our one hundred and fifty thousandth airplane came off the assembly line today.

Now, 2 years after Pearl Harbor, we are approaching full mobilization for war. We are devoting more than 50 percent of our national income to war.

The results of full mobilization have been tremendous. But we cannot afford to rest on our oars. Full mobilization does not necessarily mean that we are producing as much as we can or exactly the things we need most. The requirements of our war strategy are constantly changing.

Program review boards have been set up by the War and Navy Departments to function under the General Staff working in close cooperation with the Office of War Mobilization. Through these continuing reviews we already have been able to eliminate or reduce certain war programs in the staggering amount of $16,000,000,000. But a very considerable part of the savings achieved will be offset by the enlargement of other war programs which are essential to victory and which we were not before in a position to undertake.

This is no time for us to take our eye off the target.

We are streamlining our programs not to reduce our over-all effort but to increase it and make it more effective. If we abate for a week or day our production effort, if we take time out for pleasure or strike, we will weaken our fighting strength and expose our boys to injury and death when they most need our help.

We are taking steps to guard our economy from the shock of sudden changes occasioned by revisions in our war strategy. We are also working upon the problem of the prompt termination of war contracts so that when the war comes to an end industry may be promptly converted from war to supply our peacetime needs in order to avoid unemployment and the collapse of markets for the products of our farms and factories.

A unit has been established by the direction of the President in the Office of War Mobilization for the development of unified policies and programs to be pursued by the

various agencies in dealing with these problems. Mr. B. M. Baruch is in charge of the unit and has assisting him Mr. John Hancock.

A Contract Termination Board, composed of representatives of the various operating agencies, has been established. That Board is at work developing uniform and expeditious procedures for the termination of war contracts. The proposals of the Board will be submitted to Mr. Baruch and me within a week and shortly thereafter will be finally determined and announced.

Studies are likewise being made of the best methods of handling and disposing of surplus properties. We must see that at the earliest moment the sword is turned into a plowshare. We must see that the contractor is promptly paid; that the war machinery of the Government is promptly removed and the factories returned to the making of those things our people need and which have made our standard of living the envy of the world.

But I should be less than frank if I did not express the opinion that we are now facing a crisis on the home front which may deprive us of the very things for which we are fighting—a stable, peaceful, prosperous world. There is little chance of such a world unless, after this war, we can have a stable, peaceful, and prosperous America. The prospect of a stable, peaceful, and prosperous America is far from bright simply because the American people apparently do not realize the supreme importance of holding the line against inflation.

I do not want to paint the picture blacker than it is. On the contrary, I think that the American people sometimes tend to disparage how much has really been accomplished on the home front. Our food production has been greater than the most optimistic would have predicted 2 years ago. Our living costs and production costs have been kept in line much better than most economists would have dared to predict 2 years ago. Our war production has attained a speed and volume that caused Premier Stalin in a toast at a Teheran dinner to say "without American production the United Nations could never have won the war." It was a toast to American industry and American workers in factory and on farm.

We can be proud of having held the line as well as we have in face of the enormous increase in Government expenditures and the enormous increase in the purchasing power of our people—far in excess of the available goods and services for consumers' use.

We as individuals and as a Nation must save. Our war expenditures are now running at a rate in excess of $90,000,000,000 a year. Our national debt is increasing at a rate in excess of fifty billion a year. There is not the slightest ground for believing that the cut-backs in our production program or any other possible economies will relieve the urgent need for greater savings and greater taxes in the near future.

We obviously have failed to adopt a tax program adequate for our war needs. But despite the failure to impose adequate taxes, we have done a much better job than we did during the last war in keeping costs down and in conserving the purchasing power of the people for their post-war needs. Although the income of our people as a whole has doubled since the outbreak of the war in 1939, the cost of living has increased only 26 percent.

When prices reached their peak following the last war, the general price level was double what it was in 1914, and the value of the dollar—the value of the people's savings—was half of what it was in 1914. When prices collapsed in 1920 they dropped 45 percent bringing with them widespread unemployment, foreclosures, and bankruptcy.

If we now abandon our efforts to hold the line, there is no reason to believe that we would fare better than we did after the last war.

It would therefore be tragic if after having held the line as well as we have, we should let it go as we start on what we hope is the final lap of the war. Tragic, because increased wages and increased prices will mean a price structure so high that at the end of the war we will not be able to sell in the markets of the world. When we cannot sell our goods it will mean unemployment. Tragic, because at a time when we should be using the power of a great and prosperous Nation to insure permanent peace, we will be forced to devote our energies to establishing relief projects to provide temporary jobs for returning soldiers.

A year ago last October the Congress authorized the President to stabilize wages and prices on the basis of the levels prevailing on September 15, 1942, and authorized the use of subsidies when necessary to obtain needed production without increasing the cost of living. Of course, the administration of that law was not easy, but the cost of living has risen only approximately 5 percent during a year of drastic readjustments.

Holding the line may have caused some hardships here and there. But, by and large, there has actually been less economic hardship on the home front during the war than there was before the war.

Since December 7, 1941, the American people have paid off $4,000,000,000 of debts. They hold $20,000,000,000 of Government bonds above what they held December 7, 1941. They have accumulated in reserves for social-security pensions and in reserves for insurance $10,000,000,000. Yet today they have in bank deposits and currency $18,000,000,000 more than on Pearl Harbor day.

There is no evidence of hunger or of great privation among our people. The lines of people you see in the streets of our cities are not bread lines. They are people seeking an opportunity to spend their money at the movies or restaurants.

Having done as well as we have, are we now going to throw aside the safeguards which have protected all of us, just to get a temporary, illusory advantage for the social, political, or economic group to which we belong?

If we do not hold the line now, I confess I do not know how or where we are going to hold back the floodgates of inflation. There are no prepared positions to which we can retreat. Some talk of controlled inflation. Such talk is just as criminally reckless as a proposal for a controlled flood or a controlled forest fire or a controlled epidemic of smallpox.

The primary issue before the American people today is whether we are going to keep down the cost of living.

Most items in the cost of living have been held in check. Rents, bus and streetcar fares, house furnishings, and clothing have been held fairly well. But I know that when a man talks about the cost of living, he does not think of these things. He thinks of food, and generally he talks about the price of oranges. He thinks only of the cost of food as the cost of living because he pays rent and other bills once a month and he buys food every day.

It is true that since our entrance into the war in December 1941, food has gone up 22 percent. The increase is a great hardship to people with fixed incomes, to the preacher and the teacher, the policeman and the fireman, the white-collar worker, the dependents of men in the services, the veterans, the taxi drivers, and others in services whose rates are fixed by regulations of local governments.

If the Congress kills subsidies and raises the price of bread and butter, meat and milk, sugar, and other staples, these people will suffer greater hardship. It will result in demands from organized workers for increased wages for workers in shipyards, munitions plants and in other industries. If the War Labor Board grants the increases it will help the workers in those industries but will be of no help to the unorganized millions whose incomes cannot be raised by that Board. Their plight will be worse.

The Commodity Credit Corporation bill as now written is in effect a bill to increase the cost of living. If it becomes law, it will immediately increase food prices 7 percent and the cost of living more than 3 percent. But those increases would be only the beginning.

The President has stated, and the War Labor Board has issued solemn warnings that it will be impossible to hold the Little Steel formula and to deny general wage increases if the cost of living is not held down at least to the present level. If the general wage increases in excess of the Little Steel formula are allowed, retail food prices will rise still higher, clothing prices and furniture prices will rise still further. The Government will have to pay more on its war contracts, and billions will be added to the costs of running the war and to the Government's war debts.

The cost of the administration's limited program of subsidies will be small indeed compared to that increase in the Government's war debt. That increased debt will be an additional burden for our soldiers to bear in the years to come. To kill subsidies will be a hardship to their families now. A short time ago Congress voted a small increase in the allowances for the dependents of men in the armed services. Kill subsidies, increase the cost of living, and we will take that increase away from them.

Killing subsidies will hurt everybody. It will ultimately increase the cost of everything we buy. When we cash our Victory bonds we will find that the dollars we get will buy only a part of what they would have bought at the time of our investment. We will find that the amount of our insurance policies is no longer sufficient to protect our families.

Killing subsidies will hurt the farmer. For years the farmers have been paid subsidies of various kinds. It was essential in order to preserve American agriculture. It is essential today to provide support prices in order to insure production. But farmers will realize that the legislator who is persuaded today that the subsidy for meat and bread is unwise may be persuaded tomorrow that the subsidy or support price for potatoes and peanuts is unwise.

Upon the recommendation of the President, Congress in 1942 wrote into the Stabilization Law a provision that farmers shall receive a guaranteed price of not less than 90 percent of parity for staple crops for 2 years from the first day of January following the declaration of the termination of hostilities. It provided encouragement to farmers to take the risks of increased production. It was supported by representatives of labor as well as of farmers.

To make that provision effective will require appropriations by a future Congress. If the present Congress now refuses to make the appropriations required to make the stabilization program effective, a future Congress may hesitate to make the appropriations necessary to support farm prices as a part of that program. That must not happen.

Farm leaders who spend their time criticizing labor and labor leaders who spend their time criticizing farmers are not helping either farmer or laborer and in time of war certainly not helping the United States.

There are some who say: "I favor the Commodity Credit Corporation bill to do away with subsidies. But I am only against subsidies. I do not favor raising O. P. A. ceilings. They are already high enough. I am not for wage increases. Wages are already too high."

If those who support legislation against subsidies do not want prices to go up and wages to go up, they should provide specifi-

cally in the law that the removal of a subsidy shall not be ground for raising O. P. A. ceiling prices.

They should provide that further increases in the cost of living shall not be recognized by the War Labor Board as ground for approving wage increases.

They would then take the responsibility for depriving the farmer and the manufacturer and the retailer of a fair return. They would take the responsibility for denying the wage earners increases to compensate them for the rise in the cost of living.

We must make up our minds whether we want to hold the line or break the line.

Lack of firm support for the stabilization program and for the efforts of the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Labor Board to hold the cost of living and wage costs as nearly as feasible at the levels prevailing on October 2, 1942, has caused some labor groups to determine to abolish the Little Steel formula. They say that the Congress is not supporting O. P. A.'s effort to hold down the cost of living and that they must consequently be allowed to secure wage increases in excess of the Little Steel formula. That seems to be the position of the steel workers who ask an increase of 17 cents an hour. They do not threaten to strike. But there are others who do threaten that they will strike unless requests before the War Labor Board for increases above the Steel formula are granted.

I know that there are those who say that wage increases should be granted because the administration has already yielded to the coal miners. The increases to the coal miners were not general wage increases in excess of the Little Steel formula. They were increases granted for additional hours to be worked by the miners except in the case of those whose travel time was more than the average travel time. Those having more than the average travel time were given more on the ground that the previous method of computing their pay unfairly discriminated against them. At the request of the War Labor Board the President has appointed a committee to investigate and report on what is the actual travel time in the mines so that the contracts with the miners may be related to the actual travel time.

It is said that Secretary Ickes gave the miners a general wage increase. It is even said that he did so by direction of the President. The Secretary says that the agreement was not known to anyone other than the conferees until after it was agreed to. The agreement did not provide for a general wage increase. It provided for an additional 15 minutes of work and an increase of 37½ cents for that additional work. That was the rate for overtime work.

The decision made by the War Labor Board in the coal miners' case was confessedly a very close one. The Board was reluctant to sanction the agreement because of the failure of the men to return to work before it was made. The Board has stated that in the future it will not approve any agreement made under the threat of a strike.

But the lesson to be drawn from the coal case is not that we should hold the line less firmly but more firmly. It illustrates the danger of trying to find ways out of hard cases.

There is pending in the Congress a bill to increase the price of milk. There are also several bills to increase the price of oil.

The operating railroad workers feel aggrieved. A panel awarded to them an increase of 4 cents an hour—on the ground that it was all they were entitled to under the Little Steel formula. This award was approved by the Stabilization Director. They say others have fared better than they have. It is always easy to point to those who have fared better than we have. It is not so easy to dwell on the plight of those who have not fared so well. They threaten to strike unless the executive branch of the Government approves a greater increase for them than has been awarded.

The nonoperating railroad employees also feel aggrieved. A panel recommended for them an increase of 8 cents per hour, but the recommendation, although later accepted by the railroads, was set aside by the Stabilization Director on the ground they had already received what they were entitled to under the Little Steel formula. The Stabilization Director indicated, however, that he would allow increases to remove substandard wage conditions and taper those increases off for the higher wage brackets. A second panel accordingly allowed 10 cents an hour to the lowest paid workers, tapering those increases down for the higher paid to 4 cents, the same amount given the operating employees. In aggregate the nonoperating employees will get nearly as much as was recommended by the first panel, but more of the increase goes to the lower paid workers. The nonoperating employees are now appealing to the Congress under the threat of strike in wartime to give them an 8-cent increase instead of the 10- to 4-cent increase awarded to them.

It is one thing for the Congress to repeal the law or to revise the general policies which it has entrusted to the Administration to administer. It is quite another thing to enact a special law for a special group without laying down a general policy applicable to all.

It is one thing for the Congress to declare by law that the Stabilization Director shall approve every request for an increased wage where employer and employee agree. It is quite another thing to enact a special law approving an increase because of such an agreement in one case and to fail to pass laws granting increases in other cases.

Thousands of requests are submitted to the War Labor Board for approval of wage increases. Ninety percent of the requests are in cases where employers and employees agree. Today employers agree in most cases because they can pass the increase on to the consumer—generally the Government—and in addition they fear if they do not agree the employees will go to an employer who will do so. The War Labor Board must now determine whether these increases are in accord with the stabilization law enacted by Congress. That law covered all workers. If Congress fixes the wages of one group that is dissatisfied with the decision of the Stabilization Director how can it refuse to fix the wages of other groups?

If Congress fixes the price of oil because some producers are dissatisfied with the decision of the Stabilization Director, how can it refuse to fix the price of wheat and corn, of cotton and tobacco, if the producers become dissatisfied?

It is truly impossible for any administration to attempt to administer equal justice under law if special groups, be they oil or coal producers or coal miners or railroad employees, can get special treatment.

No group has a right to hold a political pistol at the head of the Congress or of any administrative agency and say that they will strike. Any group which threatens to strike in wartime unless the executive or the legislative branch of the Government meets its demands, is using a political pistol. The Government must say to any such group, "Lay that pistol down."

Tonight American soldiers from factory and farm are fighting to preserve freedom for factory and farm. Fortune may favor some and death may beckon others. But they do not complain. Tonight wherever they are, they are happy to learn that the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China are united in plans for victory and peace. That unity should inspire greater unity at home.

I know the power of the leaders of labor, agriculture, and industry. I also know their patriotism. I appeal to them to exercise their great influence in support of the wise restraints we have imposed upon ourselves. I appeal to them to help their Government hold the line so that we will not lose the peace while our boys win the war.

Strikes in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there have been many speeches and comments pertaining to the amount of strikes that have taken place prior to and during the war period, and I quote from information supplied by Mr. Paul Scharrenberg, director of industrial relations of the State of California.

The report of the industrial relations section states that the number of strikes since the start of the war has actually been greater than in pre-war times. To support this statement the following figures are given:

The average number of strikes per month for the 5 years 1935–39 was 239. In 1942 the average was 247; in the first 6 months of 1943, 309; and in June 1943, there were 400 strikes. Workers involved, per month: Average 1935–39, 93,764; average, 1942, 69,996; average, first 6 months 1943, 329,000; June 1943, 950. Man-days idle per month: Average 1935–39, 1,412,394; average, 1942, 348,546; average first 6 months 1943, 1,258,333; June 1943, 4,750,000.

I call attention to the fact that the foregoing figures cover the Nation as a whole and I should like to point out most emphatically that the trend in California has been just the reverse as is indicated by the following data for California compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Man-days idle per month as a result of strikes

Average, 1935–39	107,726
Average, 1942	18,678
Average, January–June 1943	5,713
June 1943	3,409

Decrease June 1943 below 1935–39 average, −96.8 percent.

Number of workers involved in strikes per month

Average, 1935–39	5,138
Average, 1942	2,192
Average, January–June 1943	1,570
June 1943	887

Number of strikes per month

Average, 1935–39	16.2
Average, 1942	12.2
Average, January–June 1943	7.3
June 1943	9.0

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my compliments to organized labor in the State of California for the splendid manner in which it has cooperated with the wartime defense program. I submit that California can well be proud of this splendid record.

Federal Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to set forth in full the following resolution and letters, with reference to House Joint Resolution 149, the purpose of which is to effect an increase in the salaries of the judges of the United States district courts from $10,000 to $15,000.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it has been a matter of common knowledge that the salaries of Federal District Court judges for more than 15 years last past have been grossly inadequate; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Brooklyn Bar Association Congress at the earliest possible moment increase the salaries of our Federal District Court judges from $10,000 to $15,000 per year; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of this association that Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED of Illinois has introduced a bill to so increase said salaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Brooklyn Bar Association endorse Representative REED's bill and that the secretary of this association be, and he hereby is, instructed to inform Congress of this association's endorsement and that on behalf of this association he write to all Members of Congress from Brooklyn, to work for the passage of this bill.

NOVEMBER 20, 1943.

JOHN P. MCGRATH, Esq.,
Brooklyn Bar Association,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR JOHN: I received the copy of yours of November 15 with reference to the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Brooklyn Bar Association.

I shall be glad to do all that I can in this connection. I think that I shall proceed to insert the resolution in the RECORD as well as to call it to the attention of the committee before which the resolution is pending.

If I can be of further service, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. KEOGH.

BROOKLYN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Brooklyn, N. Y., November 15, 1943.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Brooklyn Bar Association held on November 10, 1943, it unanimously endorsed Joint Resolution 149 of the House, introduced by CHAUNCEY W. REED of Illinois, to increase the salaries of the Federal District Court judges from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. A copy of said resolution is enclosed for your information.

It is earnestly desired by the membership that you work for the passage of said resolution.

As you no doubt know, the Federal judiciary has been shabbily treated by Congress for many years. The last increase in salary was given to them in 1926. The salaries of our State justices doing a similar type of work is $22,500 a year. The association feels that the present salary is so inadequate that you will see the necessity for your cooperation in this most important matter.

Will you be kind enough to keep our association informed as to what it may do to assist you to further the passage of this resolution?

Assuring you of our sincere appreciation of your cooperation on behalf of the Brooklyn Bar Association, I remain

Yours very truly,

JOHN P. MCGRATH,
Secretary.

Judicial Decision Affecting O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has in many places and instances bypassed or ignored constitutional restraints, but the Nation's faith in our Federal courts and constitutional protection was partially restored by a decision in California on the day I addressed the House, November 30, on the kangaroo courts of the O. P. A.

The news story, as it appeared in the Kansas City Star of December 1, follows:

A JUDGE JARS THE O. P. A.—RULES IT CANNOT ENTER AT WILL TO EXAMINE RECORDS—LOS ANGELES BRANCH NOW LOOKS TO WASHINGTON FOR SIGN WHETHER TO FIGHT THE FAR-REACHING DECISION

LOS ANGELES, December 1.—Los Angeles O. P. A. officials looked to their superiors in Washington today for a decision on whether to fight one of the most important rulings made in Federal court since O. P. A. began.

Pierson M. Hall, Federal judge, ruled the O. P. A. has no right, either in a civil or criminal case, to go into a man's place of business, or his home, and there examine or take from him records of his business or his personal affairs.

Judge Hall held that the O. P. A. like other law agencies must obtain its evidence through subpena and based his ruling on provisions of the law. "The war can be won without destroying the Bill of Rights," the judge said.

The decision was made in dismissing two suits for treble damages over alleged ceiling violation brought by the O. P. A. against Glick Bros., lumber dealers, and Bee Rey, uniform and cap manufacturers. The O. P. A. had sought $30,000 from the Glicks and $4,000 from Bee Rey.

The O. P. A. admitted in court the Glick concern was entered without legal authority but said the company had agreed to permit examination of records.

Judge Hall declared that Congress had in mind black-market operators or bootleggers when the treble damage action was originated and said the O. P. A. had no right to bring treble damage suits against other than black-market operators or bootleggers.

That this decision apparently meets with approval in the Middle West, particularly Kansas and Missouri, is shown by the following editorials: One from the Kansas City Star of December 2, and the other from the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of December 4:

[From the Kansas City Star of December 2, 1943]

ISSUE OF AUTHORITY

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

So reads the fourth amendment to the Constitution as a part of the Bill of Rights. Federal Judge Pierson M. Hall, of Los Angeles now rules that "the war can be won without destroying the Bill of Rights." This is an extremely important point to be established. The case in which the court delivers its opinion arose from the action of O. P. A. representatives in entering two places of business to obtain evidence for support of charges as to violation of price ceilings. It was admitted that one place had been entered illegally, the defense being that the company had agreed to an examination of its records.

The court had its own view of it and so dismissed the suits against the alleged offenders. Now it is up to the O. P. A. to decide whether it will appeal and ask for a test in higher courts. Making a genuine test of it would be desirable. Over and over again, in Congress and out, the charges have been made that various Government agencies were exceeding their authority—authority granted by the Constitution and by Congress itself in the laws it enacted.

In this particular case now at issue, it might be readily understood that Congress, in providing for the enforcement of O. P. A. regulations, obviously assumed that the Constitution itself would not be violated in the act of enforcement. Whether it has been and whether the Los Angeles court should be sustained are matters that ought to be cleared up. Somewhere the line must be drawn between authority that is properly delegated and authority that is merely assumed or usurped by an agency of Government.

[From the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald of December 4, 1943]

BLOW AT SNOOPERS

A judge at Los Angeles has taken a rap at the O. P. A. that O. P. A. has deserved, and one that has been too long delayed, in his decision that the O. P. A. has no right, either in a civil or criminal case, to go into a man's place of business or his home, there to examine or take from him records of his business or his personal affairs. Pierson M. Hall, a Federal judge, held that the O. P. A., like other law agencies, must obtain its evidence through subpena. "The war can be won without destroying the Bill of Rights," he declared.

That last sentence was a mouthful. Numerous instances have been reported of O. P. A. snoopers exercising a high hand in making investigations. They have not bothered about getting subpenas for evidence, assuming the right to enter homes and to demand records of businessmen. There have been thousands of such cases, in all probability. Some instances have been reported in Ottawa.

These violations of the rights of citizens have been made on the ground that the war effort was being furthered. The war effort comes first at all times, as every good citizen will agree. But even the most patriotic citizen is outraged when a bureaucrat assumes high and mighty authority in the name of helping to carry on the war. There are hints that the O. P. A. may fight the Los Angeles decision. If another court should find that wartime bureaus are in actual possession of powers that violate the Bill of Rights, Congress ought to change the law which created authority. But Congress probably will deny it ever intended to give these Federal snoopers powers not accorded civil officers.

Mr. Speaker, it is probable that the editor of the Ottawa Herald had in mind,

when this editorial was written, the occurrences in Ottawa, reported in his paper in October and included in my extension of remarks in the RECORD on November 1, 1943. This was where O. P. A. snoopers were reported to be using master or skeleton keys instead of search warrants to enter private homes.

In connection with these matters it might be well to recall the words of Mr. Justice Davis, in the famous case of Ex parte Milligan, the recognized precedent holding that wars do not suspend the Constitution:

> The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequents, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of Government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it, which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution still lives.

Tribute to a Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently in the city of Little Rock, Ark., a large group of men, all members of a Sunday school class in the Second Baptist Church, paid an interesting tribute to a remarkable citizen, Dr. J. J. Doyne, an associate teacher of the class and a beloved leader of educational forces in the State. The class is composed of men from all professions and businesses. Among them are doctors, lawyers, newspapermen, salesmen, plumbers, teachers, executives, students, railroad men, and one can hardly find a more representative group in Arkansas.

It was my pleasure for many years to share the teaching responsibilities in the class with Dr. Doyne and Charles T. Evans, one of the State's most brilliant speakers and an outstanding civic leader; consequently, I had more than a passing interest in the tribute to my friend. It was the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday.

J. J. Doyne has made a highly significant contribution to the religious and educational life of the State and region, and while nominally retired is still an active force in public life. He has served as State superintendent of public instruction, as the first president of the State teachers' college, and president of the Arkansas Education Association. He has received high honors in educational circles, and is regarded as the dean of Arkansas schoolmen.

Yet the facts of a man's life, his offices, honors, and places of work, tell little about him. President Garfield told a lot about one schoolman when he replied in response to a request for a definition of a college, "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a farm boy on the other."

That could apply to Dr. Doyne. Many an Arkansas boy had his first inspiration under his instruction. The foundation for many successful careers was laid in his classroom. His guidance in character building established a splendid standard.

Teacher, school administrator, and youth adviser—in these positions he trained three generations of Arkansas students and left an impression upon our institutions that time will not efface.

The American public-school system and its tradition of democracy were built by such men, and we are greatly in their debt.

In his retirement, which is for him "a good and a pleasant time," he enjoys the organizations which are still his principal interest, his church, the Kiwanis club, and the Arkansas Education Association, but he will find in any group of Arkansans evidence of the warm and affectionate regard in which he is held by our people.

Raymond Clapper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Clapper's apologies have long interested me, as I am convinced that, according to his light, he intends to be fair and objective in his writings.

In the appended article Mr. Clapper shows real comprehension of things that have long been evident to many of us here in the Congress. I am not speaking of the recent elections, but rather of the long continued inching in of authoritarianism in this still-democratic country of ours. It is nothing new, but Mr. Clapper's realization of it will help to bring it to wider public knowledge. More power to Mr. Clapper, for his strong pen can help prevent our losing popular control. I am not as convinced as he is, however, that popular control is really safe. The power of the Executive office is enormous.

Mr. Clapper's article in the Washington Daily News of December 7, 1943, follows:

POPULAR CONTROL SAFE

(By Raymond Clapper)

In the nature of things, some important decisions taken at Teheran may not be revealed for the time being. The work of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin at that meeting will be judged, not on the basis of comment today, which is necessarily uninformed, but later when the nature of the decisions and their effects are known.

There is something just a bit disquieting in the atmosphere of oriental vanity and arrogance that seems to hang over these meetings, in the martial way in which these meetings are carried off, with barbed-wire barricades and bayonets against the press, and with some of the civilian political heads of states wearing military uniforms.

I do not wish to labor the point and perhaps I am mistaken, but I have a strange, inexplicable feeling of disquiet as I look at the martial pictures and read the descriptions of the treatment of the press at these meetings. Reporters are not privileged individuals in themselves. They are the eyes and ears of the people back home. Perhaps the military has spoiled us, but war correspondents are trusted and given cooperation by military and naval headquarters in a way totally lacking at these conferences by our political heads of states. These are strange signs in heads of so-called democracies.

Yet such conferences are necessary, and no obstacle and no prejudice should thoughtlessly be raised against them.

Perhaps it is a paradox of this period that in order to win the victory necessary to the democratic way of life, and to organize the post-war security necessary to that life, we must for the time being work through four men who have the personal leadership of the war. It almost amounts to depending on four personal dictators, for in such conferences as these the three or four principals present have the power to make irrevocable decisions. The decisions are irrevocable because the train of events necessary to effectuate the decisions can be put into effect without recourse.

This is almost saying that we are at the mercy of four indispensable men. I cringe from the phrase, yet it is almost that, in the sense that these four men are the best available instruments for the job. They are the best men because they are there. Willkie might have been better than Roosevelt—if he had been put in there in 1940. But so much consists in being there. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said in commenting on John Marshall: "A great man represents a great ganglion in the nerves of society, or, to vary the figure, a strategic point in the campaign of history, and part of his greatness consists of his being there."

Perhaps this crisis period will pass soon. Perhaps another year will see the fundamentals disposed of so that it would matter less if we put in a new man who did not know so much about the inner and unwritten history of this crisis.

To a greater degree by far than ever before we have placed our destiny in the keeping of one man. What Roosevelt has agreed to at Teheran we may not know entirely for a long time to come. He has cast the die for the United States perhaps in decisions from which there can never be any turning back. In that sense we are completely at his mercy.

But when we see votes cast as in New York State last month, and as in Kentucky, and all over the country, I don't believe any of us can seriously feel that the American people are in danger of losing fundamental control of their Government. All except one of the big northern industrial States are now Republican. The switch to Republican control in Congress is expected by almost everybody in politics. With that change already in progress, we need not worry about the danger of losing popular control.

The Late Hon. Edward W. Creal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, his colleagues who knew him best heard with profound sorrow of the death of Edward W. Creal, Representative from the Fourth District of Kentucky since the Seventy-fourth Congress.

Although Mr. Creal had not been in robust health since he entered Congress and the able and vigorous manner in which he discharged his duties must have been a great burden upon him, he made a deep impression on his colleagues because of his ability, his candor, forthrightness, and his skill in debate. Ed Creal was a man of the people and he spoke their language, simple, clear, and direct. He was an able lawyer, proud of his profession. When he first came to Congress he was appointed as a member of the Judiciary Committee, which by reason of his long legal experience and profound knowledge of the law, must have been very congenial to him. However, because he represented a farming district and was desirous to subserve the best interests of his people, after he had acquired considerable seniority on the Judiciary Committee, he voluntarily resigned from that committee and became a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

He was born and always lived in Larue County, Ky., the county of the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. That section of the country produces men who speak simply and candidly. Abraham Lincoln and Ed Creal both exemplified this virtue.

For years Ed Creal had been a Commonwealth attorney. His experience in that position, together with his natural and homely wit, made him a ready and forceful speaker. Ed Creal was a vigilant and hardworking Representative. He sincerely believed in and advocated those measures which he thought were the best for all our people. He was an ardent Democrat and believed in the fundamental principles of the Democratic Party as the best means by which to attain our prosperity and happiness and to work out our national destiny.

When Mr. Creal came to Congress he rapidly gained the confidence and respect of his colleagues which increased with time, and he always held to a marked degree the affection and the confidence of his constituents. His district was almost entirely a farming district. His wise counsel and sound advice will be missed. His experience, his constant study and accumulated knowledge of legislation will make his services difficult to replace. When he should have been taking care of his health and having a rest he richly deserved, his fealty to his people and faithfulness to his trust caused him to stay at his post of duty. He is a casualty of the emergent times and the war as much as if he had fallen upon the field of battle.

Notwithstanding his district has elected a member of the opposing party, I am confident had Ed Creal lived, he could have retained his place in Congress as long as he desired.

San Francisco: City of Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on October 28 last, I received unanimous consent to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Daily Commercial News, of San Francisco, entitled "San Francisco: City of Industrial Peace." The article draws attention to harmonious relationship existing between employer and employee in my home city.

Pursuant to unanimous consent granted today, I attach release from the Department of Industrial Relations, State of California, head office in San Francisco. The release, captioned "Strikes in California," carries interesting data by Director Paul Scharrenberg as presented December 1, 1943. While the average number of strikes in the United States for the first 6 months was 309, average in California was 7.3, and actually there were only 9 strikes in the entire State of California for the month of June 1943.

I echo Mr. Scharrenberg's comment when he says, "I submit that California can well be proud of this splendid record."

STRIKES IN CALIFORNIA

(Statement by Paul Scharrenberg, director of industrial relations, before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, December 1, 1943)

The report of the industrial relations section states that "the number of strikes since the start of the war has actually been greater than in pre-war times." To support this statement the following figures are given:

"The average number of strikes per month for the 5 years 1935–39 was 239. In 1942 the average was 247; in the first 6 months of 1943, 309; and in June 1943 there were 400 strikes. Workers involved, per month: Average, 1935–39, 93,764; average, 1942, 69,996; average, first 6 months 1943, 329,000; June 1943, 950,000. Man-days idle per month: Average, 1935–39, 1,412,394; average, 1942, 348,546; average, first 6 months 1943, 1,258,333; June 1943, 4,750,000."

I call attention to the fact that the foregoing figures cover the Nation as a whole, and I should like to point out most emphatically that the trend in California has been just the reverse, as is indicated by the following data for California compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Man-days idle per month as a result of strikes

Average 1935–39	107,726
Average 1942	18,678
Average January–June 1943	5,713
June 1943	3,409

Decrease June 1943 below 1935–39 average, 96.8 percent.

Number of workers involved in strikes per month

Average 1935–39	5,138
Average 1942	2,192
Average January–June 1943	1,570
June 1943	887

Number of strikes per month

Average 1935–39	16.2
Average 1942	12.2
Average January–June 1943	7.3
June 1943	9.0

I submit that California can well be proud of this splendid record.

Letter to Citizens of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following letter, which I am sending to citizens of Louisiana:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: It is my earnest desire to see and talk with you and every other member of the School Bus Drivers' Association of Louisiana, but, fearful that time and the amount of my work will not permit, I am taking this opportunity to write you a personal letter.

From my inception in Louisiana politics down to the present time, I have been most keenly aware of the negligent manner in which the school-bus drivers of Louisiana have been treated. I have always been fully cognizant that the school-bus drivers have been underpaid, never given certain rights which their position entitled them to and overlooked by all politicians of every political creed.

You, who are responsible for the safety of our children in going to and coming from school, in whom we place such a confidence and trust with reference to the physical well-being of our loved little ones, are entitled to those means with which to earn a decent livelihood for yourself and your family.

In Washington I have fought long and hard against the O. P. A. for more liberal gas allowances for the Louisiana school-bus drivers, for additional tires, parts, etc. I have always insisted that you use your busses in whatever manner you see fit when not carrying school children. The betterment of the position of the bus drivers of Louisiana is so important in my viewpoint that I have included the same as an important part of my platform.

I pledge unhesitatingly to do everything within my power as your next Governor to remedy the evils that beset you at this time and to improve your working and living conditions. Your support and that of your friends will help me to help you.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—I am enclosing herewith copies of my speeches which I recently made on the floor of the House of Representatives. If I can be of any service or assistance whatsoever to you at any time, please do not hesitate to call upon me either in Hammond, La., or Washington, D. C.

Wage Advances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leo Wolman from the Washington Post of December 5, 1943:

HOW FAR HAVE WAGES ACTUALLY ADVANCED?

(By Leo Wolman)

Current attacks on the Little Steel formula are concerned not only with the relation between wages and living costs but also with the amount by which wages are estimated to have advanced. Some critics of the formula complain that the official measure of prices has not kept abreast of war developments and is, hence, an unreliable index of the true increase in living costs. Others claim that wages themselves have increased far less than is commonly supposed.

Whatever the cost of living may have done, what substance is there to this belief about wages?

One difficulty is that wages are measured in a variety of units—by the piece, the hour, the week, the year. Thus a piece-worker who receives a 10-percent increase in his piece-rate may see his hourly wage go up 15 percent because he has been put on a more efficient and faster machine; his weekly wage 20 percent, because he is working more hours per week; and his annual wage 25 percent, because he is working more hours and more weeks per year. Using the term "wages" in a loose way, as it often is, this operative's wages may be said to have risen 10, 15, 20, or 25 percent.

ALL OF THE FACTORS ARE AT WORK

Another difficulty arises from the fact that many diverse factors contribute to wage changes. If, for example, one undertook to study the increase in the average hourly wage of factory employees since January 1939, it would soon become evident that one part of the recorded increase was due to rate advances, another part to the increasing use of overtime for which penalty rates are paid, and still another to the large-scale shift in employment from the light to the heavy, or from low- to high-paid industries.

In so complex a category as factory employment, covering hundreds of industries and some 14,000,000 wage earners, it should be clear that all of these factors have been at work and that it is a matter of great scientific and practical importance to be able to say how much of a contribution to the total wage increase each of them has made.

In the November issue of the Monthly Labor Review, a most enlightening article prepared in the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics undertakes to deal with this question. It presents for the period, January 1939 to July 1943, the increase in the average weekly earnings of factory employees, in the average hourly earnings, in the average hourly earnings less premium overtime payments, and in average hourly earnings corrected for both overtime and the shift in employment into the war industries.

SCHEDULE OF INCREASE IN WAGES

The increases in wages shown by each of these measures are as follows:

	Percent
Weekly earnings	84.4
Hourly earnings	52.4
Hourly earnings, less overtime	45.1
Hourly earnings, corrected for overtime and employment shifts	32.1

There is much to be said about these figures. But one conclusion flows inevitably from them. It is that any estimate of the fairness of the Little Steel formula depends upon which of these measures is compared, in the same period, with the rise in the cost of living. For it is only the last measure of hourly earnings which from January 1941 to July 1943 increased 27 percent and barely exceeded the increase in living costs.

The choice of one of these alternative units of wage measurement involves a major decision in wage policy. It amounts to deciding whether a wage increase is justified and, if it it, how much it shall be. It also amounts to deciding whether labor's gains in war wages should be considered temporary, to be relinquished when the war is over, or whether they shall be permanent additions to basic wage rates, to be carried over into the post-war years.

Des Moines' Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Alex Fitzhugh, executive director of the Greater Des Moines Committee, of Des Moines, Iowa. This group is doing some very active work on post-war plans, and the letter contains valuable information which I feel will be of interest to other planners:

GREATER DES MOINES
COMMITTEE, INC.,
Des Moines, Iowa, December 1, 1943.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PAUL: I was sorry not to have the pleasure of a visit with you while home last summer. On two separate occasions I called you up to try and get you to come up as a guest of the Greater Des Moines Committee at one of our regular Monday meetings; but both times, unfortunately, found you out of the city.

We are doing some very active work here on post-war plans, as probably you know. Have set up a strong joint post-war committee of 21, representing both this body and the chamber of commerce, and they, through several subcommittees, are busy on detailed plans.

As a result of meetings held with over 500 of our employers, including every large employer in the city, and questionnaires received from them following these meetings, we are promised an increase of 11 percent over the number of employees these same folks had in 1940. That, of course, is only a start to take care of the boys coming home from the Army, and a vast number who will be released from war work.

We have a strong subcommittee also working on post-war public buildings and highways. There are 11 highway projects for the city which have already been submitted to the State highway commission and favorable action obtained on 6 of them, and consideration being given the remainder.

On public buildings we have at the top of our list a new coliseum—and, of course, we anticipate that the new State office building, for which plans are already drawn, would be promptly started; and there are several others, including the Edmundsen Memorial Building, the Hawley Welfare Building, and others, for which plans are practically completed.

Another important group of projects are 11 important sewers for the city, particularly valuable as they would represent, if contracts are drawn with that thought in mind, a large use of manpower. The City Engineering Department is hard at work on these, with part of the plans already well under way.

Of course all our proposed highway improvements are based on the hoped-for passage of the bill now pending before the Congress for a sizable appropriation for post-war work. The $60,000,000 appropriation already made for plan drawing has been most helpful along that line.

Other Federal funds to help on various local projects will also, of course, be necessary, and doubtless be made. On this objective we find a very general hope expressed among taxpayers, both large and small, that any such appropriations will be made so as to avoid another W. P. A., with all its many evils.

In fact, if any such Federal appropriation would be made on the basis of dividing the total amount pro rata among the States; they to distribute it on a fair basis among the municipalities of the State, there would seem every probability of getting far more effective returns from the money with infinitely less red tape and boondoggling possibilities. It would tend also to return once more the control of public activities to the several States, and lessen the present overwhelming tendency to increase Federal supervision of everything we do—a desire that I think is daily growing in strength among voters throughout the country.

So in considering legislation covering the appropriation of Federal funds along this line, I would appreciate your keeping this thought in mind and giving it your careful, and I hope favorable, consideration.

With personal regards, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

ALEX. FITZHUGH,
Executive Director.

Federal Budget Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a splendid article written by the Honorable Perry Belmont, of Newport, R. I., a Democratic Member of Congress from 1881 to 1889.

The article entitled "Federal Budget Making," was written for the Providence Journal-Bulletin and printed in its editions of November 8, 1943. It is very timely and, I believe, will prove interesting to all who read it. It follows:

FEDERAL BUDGET MAKING — CONGRESS AND TREASURY SHOULD PLAY LARGER PART IN IT

(By Perry Belmont)

Officialdom on the air through the radio in the early years of the great war consisted chiefly of a limited number of individual representatives of executive power. Later, the air was echoing with numberless voices from every known quarter of the globe. What had been a miraculous wonder in human affairs became a familiar daily occurrence.

An identical evolution has been taking place in officialdom in the air by plane. It had at first a powerful effect upon the imagination and can also be of priceless value as in the case of Secretary Hull's flight to Moscow. His long and distinguished service in the House and in the Senate was of great advantage to the country in the performance of his mission.

But, unlike Mr. Hull, the great majority in the executive departments, from the President down to the minor officials, who have exercised emergency or war powers, gradually have assumed an attitude of superiority over the legislative branch, collectively or individually, intolerant of criticism or any form of opposition.

Because it is constantly ignored, it cannot be too often repeated that the Secretary of the Treasury is the one member of the Cabinet who has a different relation to the legislative branch than has any other head of an executive department. At the very moment Congress is engaged in inquiries in regard to governmental expenditures, endeavoring to reduce them whenever they prove to be unnecessary, in the consideration of increased taxation or sales taxes, the Secretary of the Treasury finds occasion for a flying trip abroad. His right to do so need not be questioned at this time.

IS NOW DUTY OF PRESIDENT

Congress in 1921 placed in the hands of the President the preparation of the National Budget and its submission by him to Congress. The original purpose of Congress, under the leadership of Senator Medill McCormick, of Illinois, was that the preparation and submission of the Budget should be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury. The reason for that proposed procedure is that the law establishing his office provides for his report to either House, in person, in regard to anything appertaining to the duties of his office and that his presence will be "required," not merely requested, according to the wording of the law. Unfortunately, Senator McCormick's purpose was defeated in conference between the two Houses. "The preparation and submission" of the Budget was placed under control of the President where no such direct responsibility exists. This has been, time and again, made clear. In every free government on the American continent and elsewhere the national purse is in the hands of the popular branch of the legislature and so it should be, as a matter of course, under our Constitution.

The practical merging of the Executive and the Treasury has often been denounced by competent authority. President William H. Harrison, in his inaugural, said:

"I am not insensible of the great difficulty that exists in devising a proper plan for the safekeeping and disbursement of the public revenue. It is the unhallowed union of the Treasury with the executive department which has created such an extensive alarm. To this danger to our republican institutions and that created by the influence given to the Executive through the instrumentality of the Federal officers, I propose to apply all the remedies at my command. It was certainly a great error * * * not to have made the officer at the head of the Treasury entirely independent of the Executive. He should, at least, have been removable only upon the demand of the popular branch of the Legislature."

This message to Congress was delivered 101 years ago, a period too remote to suit those who would reconstruct the United States to suit their theories. They label the statesmen of our Revolution as founding fathers, too antiquated to serve as guides. They would prepare the way for post-war settlements upon the assumption that a more modern and up-to-date conception of the American Government demands that our executive department should be in dominating control of the negotiations. They are so obviously advocating such a procedure, a contrary current of opinion is gathering strength that the limit has been reached to any further extension of executive authority.

The legislative branch of our Government is daily becoming more conscious of the absolute necessity of taking the initiative in the imposition of taxes and the enactment of revenue laws.

That the Secretary of the Treasury has been abroad at such a time may be satisfactorily explained, and is it not possible that he will, on his return, make a personal report to Congress in accordance with the law establishing the duties of his office?

SECRETARY SHOULD GO TO CONGRESS

The personal appearances of our Secretaries of the Treasury before Congress have hitherto only partially met the requirements of the law. They take place before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the corresponding committee of the Senate. These interchanges of views and information are, of course, of value and ought to be continued.

They are convenient for the congressional committees as well as for the head of the Treasury and are also attended by the experts of the Treasury and by the House and Senate experts, who are of great assistance. These committee hearings are printed as congressional public documents and are accessible to those who desire to read them. It cannot be expected that the general public should give attention to such bulky printed documents nor can the country at large obtain in this way any information about what so directly concerns it. Nor should the press be expected to give the same importance and space to such hearings, however useful they may be, that they certainly would to the head of the Treasury before either House to answer interrogatories in accordance with the fundamental law creating his office. Should the present Secretary of the Treasury decide to comply with that law, his decision would be welcomed with popular approval and bring about the cooperation with Congress which has been lacking and yet so necessary throughout the long crucial period of a world war.

We should keep in mind that, unlike parliamentary governments which are not bound by law to fixed periods of election and which may be removed from power by a vote of lack of confidence and forced to appeal to the country in a general election, the Secretary of the Treasury would have a much more grateful task in personally appearing before our Congress than any English Chancelor of the Exchequer before Parliament.

The party in power has a majority in both Houses. The rules would require that the financial committees should first have the opportunity to submit questions to the Treasury head beginning with members of the majority party. Time would be given for the Secretary to prepare for his appearance to suit his convenience. He would be accompanied by the experts of the Treasury. What is called "heckling" in Parliament would be out of place, would serve no purpose, and could not possibly aid in bringing on a national election as in other countries. As to the minority, its members of the financial committees of either House would first be recognized by the Speaker of the House or by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

PRESENT IS AN AUSPICIOUS TIME

In facing the present war conditions, political and personal controversies sink into comparative insignificance and there is every reason to be confident that the head of the Treasury could successfully inaugurate a long-needed and much-desired closer contact with the legislative branch. This could be done above all in time of war when patriotic considerations appeal to every American worthy of the name.

Proposed Repeal of Federal Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address I delivered over a Wisconsin radio station on the subject of pending oleomargarine legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, there is pending in Congress a bill to abolish the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Why is this bill introduced now? If it becomes law, what will be the effect? Why should a Federal tax of this nature be imposed upon a domestic product? What is the tax? These, and other questions, I propose to answer in this brief talk.

At the present time there is a 10-percent Federal tax on oleomargarine which is colored to resemble butter and only a quarter of a cent on uncolored oleomargarine. The question at issue in the oleomargarine fight is largely a question of color. The oleomargarine industry, which consists of 18 manufacturers and their subsidiaries, produces all the oleomargarine made in the United States.

Many people have been deceived by the propaganda put out. It is deceiving and unfair; the public has been led to believe that they are not able to get oleomargarine because of a 10-percent Federal tax which is applicable to oleomargarine colored yellow—an imitation of butter. Ninety-nine and eight-tenths percent of all oleomargarine sold for civilian use in the United States is uncolored margarine which I repeat bears a tax of one-fourth of a cent per pound. This small tax is absorbed by the manufacturer, who makes a tremendous profit on the oleomargarine produced from vegetable oils.

The production of oleomargarine for the year 1943 is estimated at 650,000,000 pounds, or more than one-third of the total butter production in the United States. The people can now buy all of the oleomargarine they want to buy at from 19 to 29 cents a pound; and I reiterate that the tax is only one-fourth of a cent per pound on this oleomargarine, which is absorbed by the manufacturer and paid by him.

The margins of profit for the wholesaler and retailer have been stated before the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives to be 3 cents a pound for the wholesaler and around 4 cents a pound for the retailer. Therefore, it is quite obvious that the tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound is absorbed before it reaches the consumer.

Now, the oleomargarine manufacturers have only one objective, which was clearly indicated by Dr. Carlson, the chief spokesman, before the Senate Finance Committee at hearing on the Maybank bill last week.

He stated that he "advocated that all whole milk should be used and consumed as whole milk, and I repeat Carlson said that oleomargarine colored yellow should take the place of butter in the diet of the American people." Do the American people want this? The answer is a decided "No." We have been regimented enough without being ordered what to eat.

It is quite obvious that the sole intent of the oleomargarine industry is to perfect a synthetic product called oleomargarine, and to make it taste, smell, and look like butter so as to deceive the public—having in mind a complete change in the diet of the American people from butter to oleomargarine, thereby increasing the sales and profits of the oleomargarine manufacturers and destroying the dairy industry in this country which consists of nearly 5,000,000 farmers and which is the principal and the largest source of cash income for American agriculture in the Northern States—5,000,000 farmers and families and tens of thousands of communities of the Nation are involved.

This whole thing is just a deception. Color is the issue. The people who don't get colored oleomargarine are not subject to the 10-percent tax. The Federal tax on the retailer is $6 a year or 50 cents a month. That is about 1½ cents a day. If the retailer sells 1 pound of oleomargarine a day and makes a margin of 4 cents, he doesn't have any difficulty in paying his tax. I repeat, the tax is not an issue. The tax on the manufacturer of $640 a year is so small that when you consider the large volume of production for these 18 manufacturers, 640,000,000 pounds, it doesn't amount to anything and it isn't passed on.

The question was raised that the hospitals couldn't get butter. Well, of course, they couldn't get butter the same as the rest of us, because the administration took 456,000,000 pounds of butter from the market between February and October 1 of this year, and how much more the Army and Navy purchased we don't know. But what the Government took off the market was about 35 percent of the production in the flush period of the year; and that, of course, just knocked out the ability of the civilian population (including hospitals) to get any.

I shall not discuss the merits of the two products. It suffices to say that margarine has as its base vegetable oils such as cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and when available coconut oil was used. The product is white in color, and now some of the margarine has certain vitamins shot into it.

Butter and cheese come from the milk of cows and contain animal fats so necessary to human health. They are nature's food. In the summer, out of the juicy grass, out of the sweet-scented clover, out of the luscious alfalfa and cool spring waters, the greatest chemist in the world—the milk cow—makes this food; and in the wintertime, out of the silage from nut-brown corn, out of good wheat, oats, barley, and corn, and out of hay and alfalfa, she turns out the same product.

Butter is invaluable in our diet, because it promotes health, supplies energy, and is a body builder. It is an invaluable nutrient for young and old, sick and well, and active and inactive persons.

Oleomargarine, of course, is not butter. It has its place and purpose, and is entitled, when wholesomely produced, to share in the American market. But it should not be sold as, nor represented as butter. Butter has a distinct color and it is recognized by its color, and the real issue is just here; shall oleomargarine be permitted to be colored and sold in packages so as to resemble butter? As all housekeepers know, you can buy oleomargarine with a bit of coloring and they can color their own oleomargarine and make it resemble butter in appearance. But the oleomargarine people want this changed so it will be colored before it is sold and the customer will buy it in place of butter. The whole plan is to get the public, which is now used to the rich, yellow, nutritious butter, to substitute oleomargarine for butter now that butter is scarce and the Government has taken so much of it for our troops and for lend-lease. Then, when the war is over, if the people have been taught to eat oleomargarine, where is the market of the dairy farmer—America's greatest farm group?

A few years back, when the farmer was selling his milk at 95 cents to $1.25 per hundred pounds, which cost him from $1.80 or more per hundred pounds to produce, the economy of the farm segment of the country was becoming paralyzed. Permit oleomargarine manufacturers to capture the butter market now, and when the war ceases every dairy State will skid into another depression. If that occurs, everyone will suffer—labor, business, professional men, as well as the farmer. Give the farmer the cost of production, and the rest of our economy will be healthy.

To color oleomargarine to look like butter, and sell it in the stores as a butter substitute, is unfair practice. Let those who want oleomargarine on their tables buy it and color it. This they can easily do. But do not take a product which isn't butter, and permit it to be pawned off as butter. That is neither fair dealing nor sound business practice. Such a practice strikes at the security of millions of America's best citizens—the backbone of the Nation.

We shall do our best to defeat this measure. We want no economic paralysis to affect any segment of our society.

Feed Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, we are told the State of Oklahoma has been officially declared a drought-stricken State, with the exceptions of the three northwestern counties, but notwithstanding these findings of facts, cattle will be dying for the need of feed due to a ruling in allocating of protein feeds in a very short time. The Honorable Joe C. Scott, president of the State Board of agriculture, and the entire Oklahoma delegation are, and have been, putting forth every effort to get an amendment to the present allocation of protein feed in Oklahoma, but of no avail. In the vicinity of Ardmore 60,000 cattle are being only half fed. In the vicinity of Le Flore County, the cattlemen say no feed can be had until after the first of the year, with a general snow and freeze throughout the State.

Mr. Speaker, cattle cannot wait upon the slow ruling of those in charge of the allocation and distribution of protein feeds and if favorable action is taken immediately the shortage of food for human consumption will be the result of the delay. If ever in the history of this Government big two-fisted practical cattlemen and businessmen were needed at the helm of the distribution of feed, it is right now.

We are not and have not been mad at anyone but we are only typical of those in Oklahoma—pro-Oklahoma and pro-American—and only ask and fight for equal rights and if any should entertain an idea to the contrary they are very wrong. A subsidy will not do the organized labor groups any good if all the cattle in the country starve while these unpractical bureaucrats procrastinate in their rulings while cattle die for the want of feed.

I received three telegrams which tell the story. Mr. Scott speaks for the State at large and 20 cattlemen and businessmen from Ardmore describe a critical feed shortage situation in southern Oklahoma, and Mr. Adam W. Curry, of Poteau, relates a much more critical situation, in that, no feed will be available until after the first of the year.

These bureaucrats should listen to those who live in the pastures and ride the range who know the cattle industry and get down to business. It is evident that a civil-service status without such knowledge is not workable. We want protein feed and we want protein feed right now. Congress cannot bring life back to a dead cow but Congress can take immediate action and keep a lot of cattle from dying.

The three telegrams I have made reference to are as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
December 2, 1943.

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

I sent the following telegram to Marvin Jones and J. B. Hutson recently: "The livestock and feed situation in Oklahoma is so critical that I am compelled to wire you the condition and ask for some type of immediate relief. It is snowing and freezing in the northern part of Oklahoma and raining in the central and southern part. The Federal Weather Bureau has just released forecast that it will be freezing in Oklahoma City by night, with a hard freeze in north and northwest Oklahoma now. There is practically no protein feed or roughage in western and northern Oklahoma and practically no winter pasture. There is a shortage of protein feed all over the State. Under present weather conditions livestock are going to die for want of feed by the hundreds. Can you give us immediate relief? Can some agency in Oklahoma be authorized to distribute the manufactured feed now in stock in Oklahoma in some equitable manner over the State? Our situation is both critical and urgent." Can you help in any way to get this done? The situation is critical.

JOE C. SCOTT,
Oklahoma State Board of Agriculture.

ARDMORE, OKLA., *December 7, 1943.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You remember that on insistence of cattlemen and dairymen of this section and your help a quantity of soybeans was allotted to Ardmore Cotton Oil Mill in order to make available a supply of cake and meal for cattle in this territory. Relying on this, the mill is crushing soybeans only and has allowed all cottonseed and peanuts to go elsewhere. The mill has now received an order limiting sales of soybean cake and meal in this vicinity to

50 percent of its output and freezing balance for Government-supervised distribution elsewhere. As mill is making no other oil cake, this takes 50 percent of its supply. The full 100 percent would have been insufficient. On 50 percent, our cattle will soon starve. Sixty thousand cattle in this territory depend chiefly on this product. Please see J. B. Hutson, President, Commodity Credit Corporation, and insist on release of this mill's product for this territory. Will phone you Tuesday.

Guy Harris; C. F. Mock; Scott Dennis; Wilton Howard; D. C. Fitzgerald; Wilmar Seay; Ray Colvert; Sam Daube; P. T. McHee; John Bob Dulaney; Sam McDaniel; Ludie Parker; Guy Sigler; Joe Forbes; Dorris Coffey; G. E. Johnson; H. W. McGill; Deveney Dairy; L. V. Hubble; Harrison Smith.

POTEAU, OKLA., *December 7, 1943.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Paul, the weather is bad here; storming; cannot buy feed. Mills have to have order from Commodity Credit Corporation before clearing it. A. A. A. office here says it will be first of year before we get the orders. There is no feed here. Stock is suffering and will be dying. Need order for 50 tons or more of soybean cake and meal now to sell to stockmen in Le Flore County.

ADAM W. CURRY,
Poteau Peanut & Feed Warehouse.

Elk Hills Oil Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, months ago the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Navy refused to make an appropriation of approximately $2,000,000 to consummate a contract for the joint operation of oil lands of the Standard Oil Co. of California and lands owned by the Government as an oil reserve in what is commonly termed "Elk Hills" in California. At that time attention was called to various provisions of the contract which, in our judgment, made the original contract illegal and invalid.

Subsequently the Department of Justice and attorneys in the Department of the Interior termed the contract illegal on the same grounds raised by our committee and the contract was rescinded as announced by mutual consent. Since that time the field has continued to be operated under a temporary agreement, which contains the same percentages of division between the Government and the Standard Oil Co. of California as did the illegal contract. While we might not like this arrangement, it is based on the fact that the field must be operated and oil must be taken from it to meet the urgent and immediate requirements of the Navy in the Pacific, no other oil in sufficient quantities being available.

Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department was authorized under the terms of the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), to secure the lands of the Standard Oil Co. in the confines of the naval reserve through condemnation. The need for the Government to gain control of the Standard lands in order to conserve the oil in the naval reserve has been continuously recognized. No one questions that need today.

After the first contract was held illegal, the Secretary of the Navy has made no move to condemn and now comes forward with another contract calling for joint or unit operation with the same percentage of division as the original contract. The Attorney General of the United States has rendered an opinion in which he states that while he will not term the new contract illegal yet he says legislation must be passed authorizing it before such new contract should be entered into. True, under the new contract we save several millions of dollars as against the terms of the original contract, which was held illegal.

In support of his new contract the Secretary of the Navy says that we should not condemn the Standard property because the minute we condemn this property we must stop the operation of the wells, since there is no authority to operate a Government oil reserve.

Mr. Speaker, if legislation must be passed to put the new joint operation contract into operation, could not legislation authorizing the operation of the field after condemnation be put through the Congress just as quickly as could legislation authorizing the new joint operation contract? The contract is bound to be the subject of controversy and we all know the Navy Department would have a much harder fight to get legislation authorizing it than they would have in securing authority from the Congress to operate Government oil reserves in this time of emergency.

The Secretary of the Navy further says that we should not condemn the Standard lands because we do not know how much oil is under Standard's part of the land.

If that be true how does he know that a division of the total oil produced of 64 percent to Navy and 36 percent to Standard as provided by the contract he sponsors is the proper division?

Standard Oil Co. has only about 20 percent of the total land involved and Navy about 80 percent yet under the terms of the contract Standard gets 36 percent and Navy 64 percent of the oil. I know it is said that these figures represent correct division according to the proven field. Yet all of the Navy land was obtained because the evidence showed that it was oil-bearing.

In condemnation the court must find the value of Standard's lands, minerals included, of course.

In a joint-operation contract, not only must the oil under Standard's 8,000 acres be determined but that under Navy's 35,000 as well. So if expense of determining values is the determining factor, you can easily see it would be much cheaper and easier to condemn.

Also, if the Navy Department has enough information on the Standard lands and their oil content to fix the percentages of division, of necessity they have enough information to condemn. It follows that if they do not have available information to condemn, they are in no position to fix percentages in joint operation.

Under this new contract sponsored by the Secretary of the Navy, Standard may obtain the first 25,000,000 barrels of oil at the rate of 15,000 barrels per day. Under the percentages fixed by the contract of 64 percent to Navy and 36 percent to Standard, 16,000,000 of the total of 25,000,000 barrels, worth roughly $16,000,000, would be Navy's oil loaned to Standard. Standard would pay no interest on that sum. True, the contract provides for repayment by Standard at the rate of one-third of its part of the oil taken after the primary period. Under the contemplated operation of the field after the primary period Standard's so-called payment would not equal a reasonable interest on this $16,000,000 worth of oil, and thus, in effect, the Government would never be repaid for its $16,000,000 worth of oil.

I know percentages are used frequently because they will cause no furor nor objection as would the quantities the percentage represents. It is easy to overlook what they mean. From the evidence it is estimated that there is at least 650,000,000 barrels of oil roughly worth $650,000,000 in this field. One percent of that sum is $6,500,000. If the percentage fixed in the contract sponsored by the Secretary of the Navy is only out of line by 1 percent and should be 65 percent to Navy instead of 64 percent and 35 percent to Standard instead of 36 percent the Government would lose $6,500,000. If the division of oil should be the same as that of land then it would probably be out of line to the Government's loss of approximately $85,000,000. I have no basis to say the percentage of the take in oil should be the same as that of the ownership of land, yet there is no proof that all the Government's land does not have oil under it, and though under the proposed contract the percentage may be changed under the terms of the contract, if additional Government lands are proven, there is no intention to prove the Government's lands.

This is an oil reserve and it has been admitted that further development of the Government or Navy lands is not contemplated so we may expect the percentage of division of oil taken to continue 64 percent to Navy, 36 percent to Standard. Who can say that is the correct division? If the Secretary of the Navy can so say, he is then in position to condemn as some think would be done if this were some individual landowner. That is what was done with the small owners in this field but condemnation was held up after the Navy Department became interested in a joint operation contract with the Standard Oil Co. of California.

The original object of the act of 1938 was to obtain the Standard lands in order to conserve the oil in the naval reserve and to give the Navy control of the oil in that area. What the object of the proposed contract is I do not know, though it is claimed to have the same object.

The Attorney General in his opinion states that before the new contract is entered into it should be amended to authorize termination of the contract by either party. He admits however that if such a clause should be added to the contract and Standard at a future date should terminate the contract, the Navy nor the Government would have any control over Standard's lands nor oil and consequently Standard could use the wells on its lands to drain oil from the naval reserve.

True it is that the Attorney General stated that in his opinion the Government could still condemn the Standard lands at any time even if the contract proposed by the Secretary of the Navy is entered into.

Mr. Speaker, by that time we may have an Attorney General who is opposed to condemning property of Standard, we may have a Secretary of the Navy who is opposed to condemnation, and even a President who would be opposed to condemning property of the Standard Oil Co. If that should come to pass we would be in a worse fix than we are now.

Authorities have stated that we have in sight only a 13 or 14 years' supply of oil. If that be true, certainly the Navy Department should lose no time in acquiring title to the Standard lands checkerboarded through their reserve. Then we know they can control the oil in the area. If they need authority to operate the naval reserve in this emergency, the Navy Department and the Secretary know that such authority would be granted in short order.

Mr. Speaker, I have the temerity to suggest that without the termination clause in the contract, as recommended by the Attorney General, in the future we might not be able to hold the Standard Oil Co. to the contract which permits Navy control after the primary period. Much would depend on the court

I have never known of the Federal Government to be so hesitant to take over property for public use.

They have not hesitated to take over farm lands for Government projects in many cases of doubtful public benefit. They have not hesitated to take over an entire town in my district.

Yet in this case, where the future operation of our fleet, the very safety of our Government and people are involved, we find the Navy Department hesitant to act after having already delayed action since 1938. I hope that the Committee on Naval Affairs will see fit to call on the Navy Department to condemn, and thus assure us of protection for the naval oil reserves.

Hitler and the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a unique and plain-spoken poem composed by an old-time friend of mine, Forrest Jones, of Marlow, Okla., in which he pays his respects, or lack of respect, to Hitler, Tojo, and others. It follows:

HITLER AND THE DEVIL

(By Forrest Jones)

The devil in hell
We are told was chained
And there 100,000
Years he remained.
He did not grumble
Neither did he groan,
But was determined to start
Him a hell of his own.
Hitler said to the devil
Have you any more land?
And the devil said, yes plenty
In Germany and some more in Japan.
Then old Hitler went down and
Looked at the truck
And said if I can get it
As a gift I am stuck.
Then the trade was made
And the deed was signed.
And he started him a hell
On the banks of the Rhine.
Then Hitler and Tojo
Appeared on the scene
And the devil said I'm afraid
You boys are too mean.
Then Field Marshal Goering
Spoke up and said
We can conquer this world
If we will go right ahead.
Then Hitler and Goering
Began to prepare
For World War No. 2
On land, sea and air.
He first took Austria
Without the fire of a gun,
And when he hit Poland
The trouble had begun.
Then the civilized world
Began to unite,
For we had our choice
To be enslaved or fight.
Then Belgium and France
Were soon overrun,
And by this time
The trouble had really begun.
And the English canal
Was the next point of attack
And this was the first time
Hitler's bloodhounds turned back.
Then he turned like a snake
And began to coil
And struck and landed
On Russian soil.
At first Stalin's army
Really reeled on their feet,
Then they came back afighting
Through rain, snow, and sleet.
Napoleon once made
The same mistake,
When he rattled his sword
On Russia's front gate.
Now Stalin knows
That Hitler can't win
And Italy's troubles
Are about to begin.
Now the United States
And the United Nations
Are all lined up
In the same occupations.
And that occupation has
A blueprint plan
That will stop Hitler's hell
And mop up Tojo's Japan.
I am neither a prophet
Nor a prophet's son,
But I have tried to keep posted
Since the war first begun.
I don't know the future
I can only guess
But old Hitler knows his hell
Is in a hell of a mess.

H. R. 3270

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 3270 which has been reported favorably by a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary, and likewise to the companion measure pending in the other body, designated as S. 1362, introduced by Senators BAILEY and VAN NUYS. I am opposed to the passage of this legislation on three separate grounds which I shall state now and hereafter discuss in the order in which I have stated them.

First, I am convinced that H. R. 3270 is deliberately worded for the purpose of preventing the Supreme Court of the United States from having unfettered judicial freedom of action in deciding the case of United States of America against Southeastern Underwriters Association, et al. now pending in that Court. If this is the purpose of the legislation, then I think it legally and morally unconscionable and contrary to every concept of independent unfettered judiciary, the preservation of which is necessary for our freedom.

Second, recognizing that other lawyers have different opinions as to the effect of this legislation, and assuming, for the purpose of argument solely, that my above analysis of the effect of this legislation is incorrect, nevertheless, if the effect of the legislation is merely to grant special immunity to the insurance business from the antitrust laws, which will permit it to engage in monopolistic practices which are burdensome upon the small policyholder and the small independent businessmen, and consequently interfere with the development of a monopoly-free, democratic, capitalistic economy in this country, then I must oppose the proposed legislation, notwithstanding the fact that the presently popular claim of States' rights is being carefully raised and nurtured throughout the country in favor of it.

Third, and finally, as a Republican, a member of the party which, in my opinion, has established its greatest traditions when it fought monopolies, I am opposed to this legislation as being contrary to the finest historical traditions of my party and contrary to the course of action which it must pursue today if it is to save the people from the establishment of a totalitarian economy.

POINT ONE

The reported bill is so short that it would seem proper to set it out:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in anywise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States.

The tremendously significant language in this proposed legislation are the words "shall be construed to apply" to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business, and so forth, and within these quoted words the particularly significant words are the words "be construed to."

I am driven to a conclusion, which I feel that I can sustain, that it is the purpose of this legislation to have the Congress of the United States, in the exercise of its legislative power, interfere with the orderly course of justice in behalf of a litigant, an action which, in my opinion, would be destructive of every concept of judicial procedure and judicial dignity which I consider inviolate.

The language "shall be construed" is so unusual, and, in fact, the whole structure of the proposed legislation is so unusual that it is difficult to escape the conclusion that it is used very carefully and for a designed purpose. The most logical reason for such careful use of language would appear to be that it is an attempt by this legislation to bring the legislation squarely within a ruling precedent of the Supreme Court. I think that this has been done, and that I can demonstrate that it has been done, for the express purpose of forcing the Justices of the Supreme Court to hand down an opinion on behalf of that Court under a clearly controlling and established precedent where exactly the same language has been used for an exactly analogous purpose, namely, to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to decide a case pending before it. I think that I can establish this as the purpose to the satisfaction of every lawyer capable of logical reasoning, despite the protests to the contrary of the congressional proponents of this legislation. I have been informed that the lobbying exponents of this legislation very frankly admit that the legal effect of this legislation, which I shall demonstrate, and its purpose are exactly the same.

The case of Hollingsworth et al. against Virginia, decided in the February term of the Supreme Court in 1798 and reported in 3 Dallas at page 378, 1 L. Ed 644, is the controlling precedent. In that case the Supreme Court construed the effect of the eleventh amendment upon cases pending before it at the time the amendment was duly adopted. We all know that the eleventh amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and adopted for the purpose of correcting an unsatisfactory condition in article III, section 2 of the Constitution disclosed by the ruling of the Supreme Court construing that section in the case of Chisholm against Georgia. When the eleventh amendment was adopted other cases similar to Chisholm against Georgia were then pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, among them was the case of Hollingsworth against Virginia. The then attorney general of Virginia, Mr. Lee, appeared before the Supreme Court and, in effect, moved a dismissal of the Hollingsworth case on the ground that by virtue of the adoption of the eleventh amendment, the Supreme Court had been deprived of jurisdiction to consider that case then pending before it on appeal.

To demonstrate the proposition I am making, it is proper to set out the language of the eleventh amendment, the issue presented to the court, the arguments advanced before the court, and the decision of the court.

The eleventh amendment reads as follows:

> The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law and equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States, by citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

Mr. Lee, the attorney general for Virginia, appeared before the court and submitted the following question to the court:

> Whether the amendment did, or did not, supersede all suits depending, as well as prevent the institution of new suits against one of the United States by citizens of another State.

In arguing for his proposition, he advanced the following argument:

> From the moment those who gave the power to sue a State, revoked and annulled it, the power ceased to be a part of the Constitution; and if it does not exist there, it cannot in any degree be found, or exercised, elsewhere. But whatever force there may be in the rules for construing statutes, they cannot be applied to the present case. It was the policy of the people to cut off that branch of the judicial power, which had been supposed to authorize suits by individuals against States; and the words being so extended as to support that policy, will equally apply to the past and to the future.

The decision of the Court was handed down the next day. It is very short and reads as follows:

> The Court, on the day succeeding the argument, delivered an unanimous opinion that the amendment being constitutionally adopted, there could not be exercised any jurisdiction in any case, past or future, in which a State was sued by the citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

Is it not clear that the Supreme Court there squarely held that if a case was instituted at a time that the Constitution gave the Supreme Court jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties and thereafter was appealed to the Supreme Court and was pending therein when the eleventh amendment was adopted, saying that the "judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend"—that the Court squarely held that the effect of the adoption of the eleventh amendment, which carved out of the total grant of jurisdiction given to the Supreme Court by the Constitution that part of that jurisdiction upon which the case then pending before it had been originally instituted, was to immediately deprive the Supreme Court of the power to further consider the pending case because the amendment deprived it completely of jurisdiction; and therefore, from and after the time of the adoption of the amendment, it had no authority to act with reference to litigation pending before it, which litigation was dependent upon that part of the original jurisdiction of the Court of which it had been deprived by the enactment of the eleventh amendment?

In the instant case, it is admitted by all lawyers that the commerce clause of the Constitution is not self-executing. In other words, the courts of the United States never attain jurisdiction over cases under the commerce clause until the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation, under its power to govern commerce, and therefore creating rights or obligations or liabilities, the decision of which require the exercise of the judicial power of the United States operating through its courts, including, of course, the Supreme Court. The Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, and more particularly, of course, the Sherman Act, is an all-inclusive congressional enactment prohibiting the doing of certain acts in interstate commerce which, by their nature, confer the broadest possible grant of power to the Federal Government to prevent monopolistic practices or to punish for monopolistic practices in all matters of commerce. Consequently those acts have the same effect of conferring broad jurisdiction upon the Supreme Court as section 2 of article III of the Constitution originally had in conferring original jurisdiction upon the courts, including the Supreme Court. Now then, we come along with legislation which is specifically designed to carve out of the original grant of jurisdiction, arising out of the enactment of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, the power of the United States to prevent monopolistic practices in connection with the operation of the insurance business, broadly speaking. And, of course, when we carve that out of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act we immediately carve out of them existing jurisdiction of the courts of the United States including the Supreme Court, jurisdiction over prosecutions under the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act which arise out of the conduct of the insurance business.

Now comes the convincing proof or, in common parlance, the "pay-off." In proposing this present legislation we find used the words "shall be construed" which are most unusual words and are the exact words which were used in the eleventh amendment which, as I have pointed out, was simply an amendment having for its purpose also, the carving out of the original jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, including the Supreme Court, a certain part of that jurisdiction; so, that if, in construing the eleventh amendment, which had the same purpose as the present legislation and which has the same language as the present legislation, the Supreme Court held that the eleventh amendment deprived it of jurisdiction over pending case, how can we avoid the conclusion that this language is used expressly in this bill for the purpose of requiring the Supreme Court to follow the precedent established in Hollingsworth against Virginia and deny to itself jurisdiction to further consider the case of United States of America against South-

eastern Underwriters Association et al. now pending before it?

Whatever may have been the great questions of public interest which justified the citizens of the various States of the United States to rectify the condition disclosed by Chisholm against Georgia by the adoption of the eleventh amendment in language designed to immediately deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over such litigation, it certainly cannot be said that there is any such great question of public interest or public morality involved in the situation which gave rise to the proposing of this legislation.

Now, there may be those who will say that since the Hollingsworth case involved an amendment to the Constitution, while the pending legislation only involves a change in statutory regulations, that a true analogy is not created and therefore my argument must fall because of the absence of a true analogy. The fallacy of such an argument may be demonstrated by a consideration of the true nature of the sovereignty of people and the methods by which they delegate it. There can be no question that the cornerstone upon which the American system of government is built is the supreme dignity and sovereignty of each individual citizen. We believe that every individual is sovereign unto himself, that he creates governments for his better living by a delegation of part of that sovereignty. No one can read the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution understandingly without admitting this truth.

But man may delegate his sovereignty in many ways. In the case of the Constitution of the United States he delegated part of his sovereignty for the purpose of forming a permanent government and providing that the extent of that delegation should be reduced to writing in order that his then present thinking might not only be concisely stated, but permanently preserved for the purpose of recording the extent to which he had thereby delegated his sovereignty. Furthermore, in order to provide flexibility, he provided methods of amendment by which his original delegation of authority might, from time to time, be amended by succeeding generations. This being true, if in the original instrument he acted in a certain manner in conferring jurisdiction upon the courts of the United States, including the Supreme Court; if man decided to withdraw some of that jurisdiction which was originally set out in the original written instrument known as the Constitution, he had to follow the methods of change or amendment which he had set up in that Constitution. But the withdrawal of jurisdiction under the eleventh amendment was simply a withdrawal of jurisdiction by the use of the method required by the Constitution itself.

But man, in creating the Constitution of the United States, again said: "I shall create not a pure democracy, but a representative form of government. I do not wish to encumber my normal activities by being constantly forced to make all laws which shall govern me by enacting changes in the nature of amendments to my Government under the methods for amendment provided in the Constitution. I, therefore, create a legislative body which shall be designated as the Congress of the United States, and I confer upon it the power to make laws which are simply rules and regulations which shall govern me within the limitations of the Constitution." Man also provided the method of choosing or electing those who were to represent him and placed limitations upon the period of time which they were to continue in office. But it is clear that under the Constitution itself man created the Congress of the United States as his representative to act in all matters upon which authority was conferred upon it as his representative and in his stead. Consequently, when this representative body enacted the Sherman Act it acted as fully for man, in its legislative capacity, as the body created by the Constitution to act for him, in creating a body of law which conferred jurisdiction upon the courts of the United States, including the Supreme Court, as though man had acted himself, so that its action was binding upon man as an exercise of authority which he had previously delegated to the Congress of the United States when he created the Constitution. Consequently, when that body, the Congress, seeks to carve out of the body of law which it previously adopted, a certain part of that law which, in turn, directly has the effect of carving out of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court part of its authority to rule upon or decide disputes presented before it, man acts just as fully, in the withdrawal of a delegated jurisdiction, through the body to whom he had previously delegated that part of his sovereignty—the Congress—as he does when he withdraws jurisdiction, originally conferred by the Constitution, by means of an amendment, adopted in the manner provided for amending the Constitution.

In other words, by either method, the citizens of the United States are withdrawing jurisdiction from the Court through the exercise of delegated sovereignty. The difference is that the means for withdrawing jurisdiction are simply controlled by the means or methods of change, or the delegation of the power to change, which the citizens of the United States originally established when they originally delegated their sovereignty by the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

It must follow, therefore, that neither the Justices of the Supreme Court nor any other lawyer can, in the exercise of intellectual honesty, avoid the inescapable conclusion that the case of Hollingsworth et al. against Virginia is a controlling precedent, binding upon them in their construction of the proposed legislation, if it should ever be presented to them for construction, and that consequently the effect of this act, if passed, will be consistent with its purpose; namely, to prevent, by legislative enactment, the Supreme Court of the United States from passing upon a case now pending before it.

This legislation is simply the unconscionable and immoral attempt to interfere with orderly judicial procedure, to strike at the very roots of the existence of an untrammeled and unfettered judicial system by legislative enactment, which is equally as subject to public censure as the attempt made in 1937 to do the same thing by executive interference.

The action in 1937 occasioned a tremendous debate in the Congress of the United States and awakened a dormant public consciousness of the principles inherent in our Government, to a realization of the importance of maintaining inviolate the concept of an untrammeled judiciary, without which there can be no freedom in a constitutional democracy such as ours. For that reason it is surprising to find among the proponents of this legislation, which proposes legislative interference with judicial processes, just as destructive of the principle of an unfettered judiciary as executive interference, those who most vociferously opposed the latter form of interference. I was opposed to executive interference, and I am equally and as emphatically opposed to the establishment of a precedent of legislative interference, which is the fundamental, governmental, and moral issue involved in this legislation.

The congressional proponents of this legislation, of course, do not say that they want to prevent the Supreme Court from passing on the pending case because they disapprove of the legal reasoning of the present Justices of the Supreme Court who, by their reasoning, render the opinions of that Court. But this was exactly the underlying reason behind the attempt by the Executive to interfere with the Court 6 years ago, and some of the proponents of this legislation were most ardent in denouncing that form of interference on the grounds that it impugned the motives of the then Justices of the Court and sought to personalize the Court by failing to distinguish between the concept of the Court and the personalities of the Justices who administer it. But a court is an institution created out of our concept of constitutional democracy as the institution in which disputes between individuals and between the Government and individuals must be settled. We cannot operate our system unless we hold fast to our belief that the system must not be tampered with, without regard to the personal opinion of any person as to the character, the capacity, or the ability of the Justices who administer the Court. A Court goes on, Justices change, but if we would live in a democracy such as ours and if we believe that our freedoms are dependent upon maintaining the concept of a judicial system which is inherent in our beliefs, then we must adhere to the theory that litigants are bound to submit their cause to the Court without regard to the personalities who administer the Court as its Justices, just so long as those Justices were legally appointed.

I hold no brief for certain of the men who presently are Justices of the Supreme Court; particularly I hold no brief for those who participated, either openly

or in the background, in the attacks which were made in 1937 against the nine so-called old men on the theory that those Justices were committing a grievous error by writing their social philosophy into the law, and who now today, in the opinion of many lawyers, are themselves committing most flagrantly the same sin which they charged against their predecessors on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. But, nevertheless, the present Justices were duly and legally appointed by a President who was duly elected by the people of the United States, whether I like it or not makes no difference, and therefore the Supreme Court of the United States, as an institution, operates and functions through Justices duly chosen and placed thereon in the manner provided by the Constitution of the United States.

This being true, if I am to hold fast to my belief that men are only free when they are ruled by a government of law and not of men, that men are only free when the concept of a court as an institution for the arbitration of disputes must be upheld from attacks upon that concept no matter from what direction they may come, I am obligated to denounce any legislation which deprives the court of jurisdiction over pending cases by legislative interference without regard for any personal opinion with reference to the qualifications of the justices who administer that court. This is the fundamental and inherent reason for my objection to this legislation.

The case in the Supreme Court is purely pending upon a ruling on demurrer. Not a single one of the facts alleged in the complaint has, to date, been supported by any evidence introduced or sustained as to its truthfulness by any court; yet now, under this state of the record, the fire-insurance companies involved are seeking by the use of clever language in this bill to prevent the Supreme Court even from ruling upon the pending case. Under these circumstance shall intelligent men forget the teaching revealed first in Proverbs, chapter 28, verse 1, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth"?

Before leaving this point, it is proper to consider some of the arguments advanced for this legislation, because if they are demonstrated to be false, then the proponents are left only with the naked and bare purpose of interfering with the exercise by the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction in the pending case and cases like it, which is the only legal issue actually involved here.

It is said in the Majority Report, among other things, that this bill does not grant an exemption of the insurance business from the antitrust laws since the antitrust laws have never been applied to the business of insurance. This statement standing alone, of course, is a fallacious argument because the failure to invoke a law is never considered conclusive evidence of the lack of existence of a law. But, in effect, more is attempted to be made by this statement, namely, that the antitrust laws never were intended to apply to insurance. The bare statement alone, again, does not constitute argument, but constitutes a begging of the very question which the proponents of this legislation advanced, namely, that at the time of the enactment of the antitrust laws involved, the business of insurance was not subject to their operation.

In anwering this question for myself, I am not satisfied either with the arguments advanced by the proponents of this legislation in favor of it or with those advanced by the Attorney General against it. For reasons of my own I do not believe that the arguments of the proponents are sound.

Briefly, the proponents, citing Paul against Virginia and the six other cases which follow it, which are set out on page 4 of the report, take the position that those cases hold that insurance is not commerce. As I construe the argument advanced by the Attorney General and his assistants, they point out that in each of these cases a State law was involved and that therefore the power of Congress to regulate the insurance business under the antitrust laws has never been before the court; that in all the cases cited by the proponents, State laws were involved and that therefore the cases cited by the proponents are not applicable.

The error in this argument of the Attorney General arises from the failure to understand or state the fundamental proposition that unless the business of insurance is commerce, the antitrust laws cannot apply because they are based upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce and unless the business regulated is commerce, then the antitrust laws cannot apply and it makes no difference whether the Supreme Court has ever construed a case arising under the antitrust law, because the ultimate fact to be found is whether or not the particular business being prosecuted under the antitrust law is commerce within the meaning of clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Likewise, my answer to the proponents of the legislation is that they overlook the fact that what the Supreme Court passes upon in any case, under the commerce clause, is a question of ultimate fact and that a question of ultimate fact arises, both from the evidentiary facts involved and the reasoning with reference thereto by the court which made the finding; and that if the facts in the case now before the Supreme Court are different from those in any of the cases cited by the proponents, then the actions of the courts in the preceding cases, in determining the ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts then before it, do not constitute a precedent which is binding upon the court, if the evidentiary facts are different.

Second, and this is even more important, assuming that the evidentiary facts in the instant case are exactly similar to the evidentiary facts in the cases relied upon by the proponents, nevertheless, if the reasoning by which the court in the preceding case or cases determined that a business was not commerce, as an ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts before it, was marked by the exercise of judgment or reasoning processes, which were not "in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning," then the ultimate fact, found by the court in the preceding case, is a decision reached by fallacious reasoning processes and such a decision cannot acquire the dignity of stare decisis and be binding and controlling upon a court or the justices thereof, in performing their duties as the deciders of that fact in a subsequent case, where the same evidentiary facts are presented anew to the court for decision.

I am convinced that the action of the court in deciding a case under laws enacted by Congress in the exercise of its power under the commerce clause must first decide whether the subject matter is commerce, but that this decision is not a decision of law, but it actually is a determination of ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts then before it. This is true because, of course, the Congress cannot, by any enactment, exercise control over anything which is not commerce between States so that this provision of the Constitution, in effect, is written into every enactment of the Congress under the grant of power given it to regulate commerce between the States. Consequently, when a case is brought before a court for decision, the court must first determine whether or not the business as to which Congress has enacted legislation is commerce. But this is a decision of ultimate fact in order to bring it under the law and this decision must be made in the affirmative before a court can then proceed to the determining of questions, either of law or fact, arising out of the interpretation of the nature of the offense described or the regulations prescribed by the Congress with reference to the particular business its laws are addressed to. So that it follows that every decision involving legislation based upon the commerce clause requires first that the Supreme Court, by reasoning processes from the evidentiary facts in the record, determine whether or not, as an ultimate fact, a business is commerce. I believe that thinking men will accept as true the analysis which I have laid out, but I am not unmindful of the fact that I am in Washington, D. C., and in Washington, D. C., the rather generally accepted mode of thinking is not what a man says but rather who is the man that says it. This is an unfortunate reasoning habit, but one which is indigenous to the locality. Therefore, I present as my authority Mr. Justice Holmes, who is considered by most everyone to have been a very able lawyer and Justice. In *Swift & Co.* v. *United States* (196 U. S. 375, at p. 398), he said:

> It is said that this charge is too vague and that it does not set forth a case of commerce among the States. Taking up the latter objection first, commerce among the States is not a technical legal concept but a practical one drawn from the course of business.

I am sure everyone will understand that, in effect, the Justice was saying exactly what I have said—that the determination of this question is, in reality, a determination of a question of fact from the evidentiary facts presented upon the record.

From this it follows that when the Supreme Court of the United States

makes a finding of ultimate fact upon a question of whether a case of commerce between the States is presented to it, it actually acts as a fact-finding body just exactly the way a jury acts as a fact-finding body in determining the ultimate fact from the evidence before it, to which ultimate fact it is required to apply the law as given it by the court. Therefore, if there are certain rules of law which determine the validity of the action of a jury in finding a question of ultimate fact, these same rules of law apply to a court when it is exercising a fact-finding function. I think it is universally accepted as the rule that a Court of Appeal in determining whether or not a jury has been justified in finding the existence of an ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts before it, has held that the inference drawn by the fact-finding body from the evidentiary facts in order to reach a conclusion as to an ultimate fact must be measured by standards which require the exercise of correct and common modes of reasoning in inferring the ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts before it. This rule has been announced by the Supreme Court of Indiana as well as by practically every other court of final jurisdiction in the United States, but, in my opinion, it has been best stated by the Appellate Court of Indiana, an intermediary court of appeal, in the case of *Russell* v. *Scharff* (1921), 76 Indiana Appellate 191 at page 197, where it says:

> We are not unmindful of the settled rule that, in determining what has been established by the evidence, courts and juries may consider not only the facts directly proved but also all reasonable inferences that may be properly drawn therefrom. However, this rule cannot be applied arbitrarily but judgment must be exercised in so doing, in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning.

In conclusion, therefore, I do not believe that the proponents of this legislation, as a matter of law, are entitled to say that the Supreme Court of the United States is bound by the decisions of that Court in any of the cases relied upon by them—and I have read them all—either because the evidentiary facts then before the Court are so dissimilar to those presented in the instant case that the Court in the prior decision may have correctly found a question of ultimate fact from the facts in the record before it, but that finding, being a finding of ultimate fact from evidentiary facts entirely different from those in the instant case, does not make such a case a ruling precedent.

In the second place, I am aware of the fact that in *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Deer Lodge County* (231 U. S. 495), the evidentiary facts before the Supreme Court might fairly be said to closely proximate the facts alleged in the instant case. But, if the conclusion of ultimate fact reached by the Supreme Court in that case will not stand up when tested by correct and common modes of reasoning, then I am of the opinion that the case is not controlling and that the doctrine of stare decisis does not apply, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court in that opinion held that it was bound by the cases which preceded that case under the doctrine of stare decisis.

Lawyers have a great obligation as officers of courts in making our judicial system operate; we have the obligation, if we can possibly avoid it, neither by advertence nor inadvertence, to persuade a court to reach a wrong conclusion. But judges have even a greater responsibility, having in mind the operation of the rule of stare decisis—and I have not the time to explain why I do not think the rule is controlling in the instant case—because any student of history knows that most of the inequalities in life and the errors in the operation of either our judicial or our economic system are thrust upon us because we continue to perpetuate past errors which, entering into the premises from which we presently reason, without re-examination, force new generations of society to assume the burdens of erroneous thinking which took place in the past. Therefore, it seems to me that unless we are to perpetuate error, we must not continue, as a precedent under the law, a conclusion of ultimate fact which was reached by thinking processes "not" in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning, merely out of a blind deference to the rule of stare decisis. It is proper to say as a corollary that it is equally improper to abandon a decision reached "in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning" and substitute for it one not reached by that method, particularly because the present-day thinkers, out of their own intellectual arrogance, flippantly sweep aside as old fashioned the great truths of the ages.

I am not attempting to give my opinion as to what the decision of the Supreme Court will be in the instant case; I definitely do not profess to advance an opinion, but I am pointing out that, by the exercise of logical reasoning from proven and accepted legal concepts, the proponents of this legislation cannot say, as a matter of law, reasoning from the cases they have cited, that the business of insurance is not commerce; and if they cannot say that, then they cannot claim for their legislation that which they do claim for it, namely, that it is but a restatement of that which has always been the law. The answer to my position here stated must be made, in any event, by impassionate logical argument, not by name-calling.

One of the arguments which I have just advanced is this: That the case of Paul against Virginia, in the first place, was not a ruling upon a question of law but a finding of ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts then before the court—it follows therefrom that I attach no importance to the claim that the congressional intent, with reference to the application of the Sherman Act to the business of insurance, is clearly and definitely established by the statement of Senator Turpie during the debate in the Senate attending the passage of the legislation.

I reached this conclusion by the following reasoning process: First, Paul against Virginia was simply a statement of ultimate fact, from the facts then before the court. Being a finding of ultimate fact, it is not controlling upon the court in the future, in any event, unless the same paucity of evidentiary facts is before the court, subsequently, that was before the court at the time of the decision in that case. This being true, the ultimate effect of what Senator Turpie said, as a matter of law, is this: The Supreme Court has found, under the facts which were before it in Paul against Virginia, as an ultimate fact that the business of insurance was not commerce. This being true, I am perfectly willing to read such legislative intent into the Sherman Act. But that is a very different thing from saying what the proponents of this legislation are saying, namely, that this legislation but restates the intent of Congress at the time of the passage of the Sherman Act, when the only evidence upon which that statement is based is the statement of Senator Turpie and the opinion in the case of Paul against Virginia. If that is the sole purpose of this legislation, then I am willing to accept it, if the proponents will rewrite it in accordance with what they are saying; and, as so rewritten, the legislation would read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in anywise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States: *Provided*, That the exception to the operation of said acts herein provided for shall apply only in those cases where the evidentiary facts hereafter presented to the Court as to the manner of conducting the business of insurance are exactly similar to those which were before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168): *And provided further*, That the Court shall find that the inferences, by which the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* found as an ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts then before it, that the business of insurance was not commerce, were drawn in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning.

I think that this is the law and that under the law this is all the congressional intent that can be found in the statement of Senator Turpie. If I am correct, then we can test the bona fidas of the proponents of this legislation by their willingness to accept such an amendment to it.

Finally, as disturbed as I am over the ethics involved in legislation, which I am convinced has for its purpose legislative interference with the untrammelled right of our judicial system to dispose of cases pending before it, and which I think, if established as a precedent, would prohibit us from ever in the future denouncing legislation of a similar type advanced by any other special pleader or pressure group; nevertheless, I am still not as much disturbed by this as I am by the tremendous stupidity evidenced by the insurance companies in proposing legislation which strikes at the cornerstone of all that we hold dear in America—an untrammelled judicial system—for, unless we remain constant in our

faith that the judiciary of America cannot be tampered with, either by the executive or by the legislative branch of the Government, we will have little with which to oppose the forces in America who are seeking by every means possible to destroy the faith of the masses in our system of government. I doubt if all the Communists in America could do more to destroy the people's faith in our constitutional democracy as a system under which greater freedoms can be worked out for the common man than the fire-insurance companies of America are doing by proposing this legislation, cleverly designed to bring them within the ruling precedent of Hollingsworth against Virginia.

It is incredible to me that at a time when the right to acquire, accumulate, hold, possess, and transmit property and the freedom to enjoy it is being questioned, and, in effect, destroyed all over the world, except in those countries where a democratic political system permits a capitalistic economy to survive, there are people, particularly those who have been some of the greatest beneficiaries of that system as evidenced by the wealth which they have accumulated, so unaware of the fact that this right in this country depends more upon the maintenance of, and the reverence for, an orderly judicial system, operated without favoritism toward any litigant, than upon any other concept inherent in our constitutional democracy. No freedom will be safe if our allegiance to the principle that freedom under law requires the maintenance of the concept that every litigant, rich or poor, is best protected by the maintenance of a judicial system in which there is an orderly presentation and disposition of litigation without either executive or legislative interference. If that system falls, all of our freedoms fall with it—our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, and all of the other great personal freedoms which arise out of the concept of the dignity of the individual inherent in our system. But certainly, if these freedoms fall, even before they fall the freedom to acquire and hold property is bound to fall. It is incredible to me that those who obtained the greatest economical benefits under our constitutional democracy should now propose a course of conduct calculated to destroy the cornerstone of that system, an independent judiciary, without which the concept of impartial application of the law becomes a meaningless mouthing of words. In all probability it is my selfish fear of the consequences of the adoption of this legislation upon my own personal liberties which drives me to oppose it so strenuously.

POINT 2

Let us assume that the conclusion which I have reached under part 1 is not correct, that this proposed legislation is not designed to prevent the Supreme Court from passing upon the case from the District Court of Georgia now pending before it. If this is true, then we must assume that it is solely the purpose of this proposed legislation to remove the conduct of the insurance business from the prohibitions against monopolistic practices provided in the antitrust laws. It then becomes proper to consider whether or not it is in the public interest to enact this legislation solely for that purpose.

From a study of the hearings I have reached a conclusion that generally the arguments in favor of this legislation follow three general lines. First, that unless the insurance business is taken out from under the provisions of the antitrust law, prosecution under that law will interfere with State regulation of the insurance business and a chaotic condition will arise; second, that State regulation is fair and adequate; and, third, that if the insurance business is made subject to the antitrust laws, then Federal regulation of the business will be bound to follow as the next step and that this regulation would be bad.

Actually it is very difficult to separate or classify the arguments advanced for this legislation because a discussion of one very often involves a discussion of one of the other two. But since the divisions chosen seem to fairly state the nature of the arguments, it seems proper to discuss them under the stated divisions, although the discussion will result, of necessity, of certain arguments against one of the divisions being applicable likewise against another.

The first general division, in truth, to some extent partakes of two arguments. First, that prosecution under the antitrust laws will interfere with State regulation of the insurance business and, second, that because under certain State regulations agreements made by the companies would be valid under the State law and yet invalid under the antitrust act, would, in turn, create a chaotic condition in the conduct of this industry.

In the first place, this is not the first time that prosecutions have been instituted under the antitrust law for monopolistic practices of businesses which were, and are, at the same time subject to State regulation. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has furnished the following information upon this subject matter, which I adopt as part of my own statement:

FEDERAL ANTITRUST LITIGATION AGAINST STATE-REGULATED INDUSTRIES OR TRADES

An examination of a list of cases instituted under the Federal antitrust law (act of July 2, 1890, 26 Stat. 209) against particular industries shows numerous instances of prosecutions of trades which would seem to be outside the sphere of Federal regulation (appendix G, T. N. E. C. monograph No. 16 (1940)). Such industries as ice, fertilizers, meat packers, kindling wood, corn flakes, fruits and vegetables, jewelry, drugs, hay, credit information, and many others against which antitrust suits have actually been brought would not to the layman appear to be activities subject to the Sherman Act.

The act, however, is aimed at contracts and combinations which, by reason of intent or the inherent nature of contemplated acts, prejudice the public interests by unduly restraining competition or unduly obstructing the course of trade. *Sugar Institute* v. *United States* (297 U. S. 553, St. Ct. 629). In other words, a trade or industry wholly State regulated might bring itself within the jurisdiction of the Sherman Act and subject to prosecution thereunder by improper trade practices which restrains interstate commerce or destroys competition.

We therefore select a few industries, trades, or professions against which antitrust suits have been brought but which were at the time of instigation of such litigation wholly State regulated or at least not federally controlled:

1. MEAT PACKERS

United States v. *Swift & Co.* (276 U. S. 311, 286 U. S. 106 (1928, 1932)).

These cases were first instituted in February 1920 under the Sherman Act to enjoin violations of that act. Previous to that time, antitrust suits had been filed in 1902 and 1911 against Swift & Co.; 1906 against Armour & Co.; and in 1910 against the Cudahy Packing Co. These suits against the illegal practices of meat packers antedated Federal regulation of that industry under the Packers and Stockyards Act of August 15, 1921 (42 Stat. 159.)

2. COAL INDUSTRY

U. S. v. *Reading Co.* (226 U. S. 324 (1912)).

U. M. W. A. v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U. S. 344 (1922), also 268 U. S. 295 (1925)).

All of these cases were prosecuted previous to the enactment of the Guffey-Snyder Coal Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 991) or the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72) which inaugurated Federal regulation of the coal industry. In fact, the earliest prosecution under the Sherman Act is recorded in 1891 against the Jellico Mountain Coal & Coke Co.

3. LABOR

U. S. v. *Workingmen's Amalgamated Council* (54 Fed. 994 (E. D. La. 1893), 57 Fed. 85 (C. C. A. 5, 1893), cf. 34 Illinois Law Review 769 (1940)).

The above proceeding was the seventh instituted by the Government under the Sherman Act. Later, under the Clayton Act (October 15, 1914, sec. 6, 38 Stat. 731; 16 U. S. C. 17), it was intended that the antitrust laws were inapplicable to labor organizations. The Federal Government has subsequently regulated national labor relations through the Wagner Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 449).

4. MEDICAL SERVICES OR PROFESSION

American Medical Association v. *U. S.* (decided January 18, 1943, 317 U. S. —; 11 U. S. L. W. 4147).

Petitioners were tried and convicted of conspiring to violate section 3 of the Sherman Act by restraining the trade or activities of the Group Health Association. The medical profession is generally recognized as under the control of State boards or commissions.

It would seem to follow from the historical information above set out that prosecutions under the Antitrust Act do not interfere with or abrogate State regulation of businesses or the State's power to tax businesses, as long as the regulation affects purely State matters and does not constitute an undue or an unfair burden upon interstate commerce. And the same may be said of State taxing regulations, which again have been upheld repeatedly, unless it was clearly demonstrated by certain inequities in the taxing legislation that the taxation was but a subterfuge for the actual purpose which could be discerned from a study of the legislation—namely, to place an unfair burden upon interstate commerce coming into or being conducted within the confines of State boundaries. If this is true, it rather follows that chaos is not likely to arise unless we also say that, in the conduct of this business under State regulation, certain monopolistic practices are permitted to go on which, by their nature, not only affect the interests of insurers within the particular States, but the interests of in-

surers outside of the boundaries of the particular State; but, if we assume that this is true, then we are rather driven to the conclusion that if there are monopolistic practices which affect policyholders or agents generally in the United States which are, at the same time, permitted by State laws that the chaos can be greatly reduced by the abandonment of these permissible acts.

But, assuming that this argument is not completely sufficient, assuming that there are certain acts required to be done under State regulations which the courts of the United States would consider to be monopolistic, and assuming again that the State statutes are not so drawn as to come within the protection of the rule announced in *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 431) then would it not be fairer and more orderly and more consistent with a due and proper respect for the maintenance of an untrammeled judicial system for the fire-insurance companies involved to come before the appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States, after the Supreme Court had ruled against them in the instant case—assuming that it will only because the insurance companies, by their conduct, already seem to anticipate such a ruling—and ask the Congress of the United States to pass legislation staying temporarily, until a solution for this alleged chaotic condition could be found, the execution of any judgments rendered in cases similar to that now pending before the court.

If the situation then made out on a record then laid before the proper committees of the Congress of the United States which justified the enactment of legislation necessary to meet a condition which was detrimental to the interests of the people of the United States, as well as to the investors in the insurance companies involved, it may fairly be assumed that the Congress would readily enact legislation designed to abate the execution of any judgments rendered until a reasonable opportunity had been afforded the companies, the States, and the Congress, acting cooperatively, to find an equitable solution of the problem. Such conduct would be consistent with the proper utilization of the legislative power of the Congress without establishing the very bad precedent of legislative interference with judicial processes, which is inherent in this legislation.

It is next argued by the proponents of this legislation that it interferes with States' rights, and that the States can, and are, adequately meeting the situation.

The issue of States' rights is not an issue which is actually presented in considering this particular legislation. For, if the Supreme Court should hold, in its decision of the pending case, that insurance was commerce under the provisions of this act, then clearly the country would know that the insurance business is commerce. That would be the time for the people to decide whether the insurance business should continue to be subject to the provisions of the antitrust law. To raise that issue now, in conjunction with legislation, which I think is definitely designed to prevent the Supreme Court from determining that question while litigation is pending before it, is to anticipate an issue before it arises solely for the purpose of beclouding the real issue—the ethical propriety of legislation designed solely for the purpose of interfering with orderly judicial processes.

But, again, the question of States' rights is not in issue because the question is not whether we approve of States' rights, but whether there is evidence developed by the hearings in this case to justify the conclusion that State regulation is adequate to handle this problem, or whether, under the regulation by States, practices have developed which require the application of the antitrust laws to the conduct of the business.

I am well aware of the philosophy of individual responsibility which the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee has repeatedly and brilliantly expressed, not only from the floor of this House, but in magazine articles which have been recently published and given wide circulation and prominence, particularly. Although the Members of this body do not know it, I, too have long been an exponent of that theory and particularly an exponent of the theory that we cannot have a democracy unless we have a society composed of independent individuals. I think no one in modern times has expressed the philosophical and psychological truths inherent in this philosophy more adequately than Henry C. Link in his Return to Religion which was first published in 1938. That book is almost a second Bible to me. But, if we are to have a society and an economy in which the individual may have the benefit of the development of his individual personality, which, in its final analysis, should be the basis of this "free enterprise" of which we hear so much, then, we must have an economy in which neither private nor governmental monopoly is permitted to prevail. For it is useless to advocate the development of a sense of independence and responsibility in the individual if we permit economic barriers to exist which prevent the full development of that individual. In other words, if our actions do not permit the bringing about of a situation which our words advocate, then we are confronted with the inescapable commandment, "Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." It is futile to talk about the dignity of the individual, the development of local responsibility, if we permit inequitable monopolies to exist which prevent the individual or the local sphere of government composed of individuals from receiving the full benefit of their efforts because of the existence of monopolies beyond their power to control.

Prior to the time that I received the hearings on this case and studied them, I was opposed to this legislation purely on the first ground which I have discussed, namely, that it seemed unconscionable to me that any litigant should come to the Congress of the United States and ask the Congress to intervene in its behalf in the matter of pending litigation. However, as I read the hearings, I came to the very definite conclusion that there was ample evidence in this record to lead a reasonable man to conclude that practices were being permitted in the conduct of the fire insurance business which justified investigation by the courts, through the medium of antitrust prosecution.

I am convinced that if the people of America were not obsessed at this particular moment with the cleverly thought-out appeal to their local pride involved in the States'-rights argument, that they would immediately become suspicious by the very action of the companies involved in proposing this legislation, where even before a single witness has been put on the stand, a defendant in pending litigation seeks to avoid trial. Men have been convicted and ordered hanged on not much more evidence than that, and the courts have upheld those convictions. Why? Because human experience has taught mankind that flight before trial may constitute convicting evidence of guilt.

However, it is said again that certain States, by their insurance laws and their State regulations, have adequately protected the policyholders within their States and that therefore, on the theory propounded most persuasively by the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, other States which have not preserved the interests of their policyholders adequately should not come to the Federal Government and say "prosecute the insurance companies under the antitrust law," but that in the interest of developing individual responsibility and, in turn, State responsibility, that the people of those States, which have not adequately regulated the insurance business, should enact proper laws and demand of their legislative bodies and their elected officials that they do adequately regulate the insurance business in the interest of the people. This, I think, is a fair statement of the philosophical argument most often advanced during the hearings in favor of this present legislation. The argument appears sound, but it will not stand up in the face of certain facts presented in the record and in the face of an adequate analysis of the argument.

I shall not concern myself with arguments of the amount of profit made by insurance companies. I reached this conclusion for several reasons: First, I do not think it is necessary, in order to make my case against this legislation, to get into an extended debate over the fairness or unfairness of those profits; second, such an argument, at its best, always is based upon creating a spirit of envy and constitutes an emotional appeal of hatred and envy which I do not think can ever permanently settle any of our problems. By that statement I do not say that I condone excessive profits which are incompatible with social justice. But, the real question in any case, to me, is not so much what some other man has taken from me as the question of whether I am being treated fairly with all other people and whether rights of mine have been taken from me wrongfully by some other person in the conduct of a business which is fraught with the public interest. In

this view, I think I am supported by the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius X. Furthermore, from a practical consideration, there is adequate evidence in this record to refute the arguments of the States' rights proponents without resort to an arousing of the destructive emotions of hate and envy.

I adopt here table 5, which appears at page 148 of the hearings:

TABLE 5.—*Premiums and fire losses, by States*

[10-year average, 1931-40]

	Premium per $100 of insurance	Fire loss per $100 of insurance	Percentage loss to premiums
	Cents	*Cents*	*Percent*
Alabama	99	47	47.0
Colorado	84	28	32.9
Florida	100	35	34.4
Georgia	99	51	50.9
Idaho	111	50	44.8
Indiana	68	29	42.2
New York	57	24	43.1
Pennsylvania	69	24	35.0
South Carolina	101	51	50.6
South Dakota	93	37	39.8
Texas	98	48	49.2
Wisconsin	63	27	43.8
Wyoming	100	33	33.4
District of Columbia	43	10	24.5

Source: Record of Fire Insurance by States published annually by the Weekly Underwriter

This table clearly demonstrates the fallacy of the argument of certain northern advocates of States' rights made against this bill, namely, that its defeat would inure to the profit of the Southern States.

Considering the percentage of losses paid in the respective States to the premiums collected, the States of Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas and the policyholders of those States have received much better treatment from the fire insurance companies than the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Florida, Pennsylvania, and, similarly, the District of Columbia. In the States first mentioned, the premiums charged were such that 50.9 percent, 50.6 percent, and 49.2 percent of the premiums collected were paid back respectively to the insurers in losses incurred. But, conversely, the States last mentioned were charged premiums which were so high that only 32.9 percent, 33.4 percent, 34.4 percent, and 35 percent of the premiums collected were paid back in the form of losses; while the poor residents of the District of Columbia received only 24.5 percent back in the form of losses paid back out of the premiums charged them. My home State of Indiana did not fare very well either when compared with the States of Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas, receiving back, according to the above table, only 42.2 percent of the premiums charged to policyholders in the form of losses collected.

These figures, to me, indicate that the problem is not to be solved by the individual States bearing down upon the insurance companies within their boundaries, because it seems rather obvious that the States which bear down the hardest will receive the greatest benefits, or that the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Florida, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia are today paying part of the insurance burden of the residents of those States which are much better treated. Furthermore, if the answer to that should be, "Well, let your State of Indiana bear down harder," then I am entitled to point out to the insurance companies that if they are afraid of chaos unless this bill is passed, they will really be subjected to a chaotic situation if the peoples of all of the 48 States are aroused by this legislation and aroused by the arguments in favor of States' rights to the point where the insurance companies are confronted with the insatiable demands of the insurance commissioners of 48 States to make their rates in their respective States more favorable than in any other State, which must be the logical end which would result if the States'-rights argument is carried out to the degree now advocated by the proponents of this legislation.

This seem to have been the view of the insurance companies in the period around 1904 and 1905 when the executives of those companies were advocating Federal legislation and Federal regulation, saying then that they desired it in order that they might treat their policyholders throughout the country more uniformly and fairly. From a consideration of these facts and this change of position, it seems logical to follow that the only reason that the fire-insurance companies today are raising the cry of States' rights is because they are able to play one State off against the other and to pass on to the policyholders of one part of the United States the favors granted to the citizens of some other States of the United States. Truly we have chaos now, but the chaos is at the expense of the policyholders, which is a form of chaos that does not seem to concern the proponents of this legislation. I am wondering whether we are elected to serve the people of the United States or the fire-insurance companies of the United States.

Furthermore, we have heard a great deal in this Congress, and we hear a great many cries about the protection of the small businessman. There can be no question that, despite all of its arguments to the contrary, there has developed a tremendous growth of large, private monopolies and their control over the essential economy of the country during the reign of this administration, and particularly now, under the impact of a war economy; and these monopolies have grown up because economic conditions have been permitted to exist which made the opportunities for profit more favorable to the big companies than to the small companies.

Let me now insert table 7 found at page 148 of the hearings, so that all may see what the facts are:

TABLE 7.—*Loss ratios on large and small businesses—brick construction*

	Percentage loss to gross premiums
Large factories:	
Leather-bag factories	131.92
Boot and shoe factories	150.61
Cigarette factories	114.36
Soap factories	160.84
Enameled-plumbing factories	103.97
Builders' hardware	103.97
Can factories	103.97
Gas and electric fixtures	103.97
Metal office furniture	103.97
Showcase factories	103.97
Small factories:	
Battery service station	53.34
Blacksmith shops	53.34
Concrete block manufacturing	53.34
Cobblers	53.34
Electric shops	53.34
Paint shops	53.34
Stone crushers	53.34
Tin shops	53.34
Mercantile buildings:	
Retail	17.42
Wholesale	23.71

And, remember, there is not one word of evidence in this record challenging any of the figures in any of the tables which I have inserted. In other words, as I take it, the proponents of this legislation have blithely proposed it in the face of the most damaging figures which they do not even bother to challenge.

I do not think that any thinking person can escape the enormous significance of these figures, particularly people who spout off all the time about preserving small business and then do nothing about it. These figures show, first, on the basis of the premiums charged 10 large industries, apparently national in scope, that they are so disproportionately small that they failed to pay the losses incurred by those large manufacturers. By percentage they range from 150.61 percent down to 103.97 percent, and the average is 118.16 percent. The figures next disclose that in eight types of small businesses operated by small businessmen the average percentage of loss to premium charged is 53.34 percent. Can anyone escape the conclusion that under the fire insurance business as conducted today, the large manufacturers, the monopolistic industries, are being assisted by the fire insurance companies in their process of putting out of business the little man, because they are being permitted to shift from 100 to 50 percent of their fair insurance burden onto his back and forcing him to carry it?

But, even more significant than this is the thing that is done to the yet smaller businessman. The retailer gets but 17 percent of the premium charged him back in losses paid, which clearly indicates that the premiums so charged this type of businessman—the retailers in the small town, the druggists, the grocery storekeeper, the haberdasher—are so inordinately high in proportion to the losses which arise in his business that he, too, is carrying on his back the insurance burden, not only of big manufacturers, but also of the small manufacturer in his community. And the wholesaler is not much better off. He also is a small businessman about whom many tears are being shed. The premiums charged him are so high under States' rights regulations that only 23.71 percent of the premiums which he pays are paid back to him in the form of losses sustained.

Now, revert back to table 5, which I first introduced, and we will find the 10-year average of the ratio of losses sustained to premiums charged; and referring also to other tables which have heretofore been presented both in this House and to the other body, we will find the average for all the States to be 44.4 percent. It is increasingly clear to me, although there are no figures appar-

ently available upon the percentage of losses paid to the individual owner of homes or household furniture to the premiums charged him, that all the little people in America are treated so disproportionately under the present operation of the fire-insurance business under States' rights, that they are carrying an unconscionable part of the insurance load of the big monopolistic industries of this country, and also, to a smaller degree, of the small manufacturers in this country. I have reached this conclusion without figures as to the small home owner who insures his house and his furniture, because no figures on the ratio of losses paid to him to premiums charged him have been advanced either by the opponents of this legislation or its proponents, the fire-insurance companies involved. But, I must conclude from an analysis of the figures available, that the conclusion which I have drawn is true. If it is not true, I will retract it when the fire-insurance companies introduce into the records before the committees in this case, or in the debate upon the final passage of this bill, figures showing the proportion of losses paid to premiums collected from the small householders of America which will refute the logical inference which I have drawn from the figures which are now available.

In the face of these figures and my analysis of them, which is correct, I am at a loss to understand why over 50 percent of the letters which I have received from my district urging my support of this legislation have come from retailers, wholesalers, and little businessmen who are the very people who are being "rooked" under the operation of the present system. I hope when they know the facts that they will not be willing to continue to pay the price for the shibboleth of States' rights which applicable enough in its place, is so ineffective here against the apparent monopolistic practices of this business. From an analysis of this evidence, which I repeat again, is not refuted by any proponent of this legislation, it appears conclusive that State regulation of the insurance business does not present a picture showing adequate and equitable treatment of policyholders, not only within States, but, as shown by the second table, between groups or classes of society present in every State.

There is also evidence in this record that under the practices of insurance companies, local agents are prohibited from taking on any companies which are not members of various bureaus, even though those other companies, which are not all mutual companies, but some of which are small stock companies, are willing to pay the agents a greater premium. And, in the light of this fact, which again is not disputed, I am at a loss to understand why 20 agents in my district have written me asking me to support this legislation, when actually it appears from the records of the hearings of this legislation, that the business is presently conducted so as to be against their own interests. In this connection, I wish to insert at this point a letter from an agent who is capable of factually appraising the situation from the standpoint of the agents' own best interests, because part of the basis of the pending litigation in Georgia is the charge that in the operation of the business, certain companies, through the power of cancelation embodied in their contracts, have forced agents to cease representing companies which paid them higher rates of commission than the companies supporting this legislation. I fail to understand why agents operating under the present system have been induced to fall for the propaganda which is urging a false application of the perfectly justifiable doctrine of States' rights as a reason for supporting the present legislation and against their own interests. This agent, who has his eyes open, says:

I understand that you are one of the few Members of Congress opposed to the pending bills proposing to exempt insurance from interstate commerce. I am writing you as an insurance agent to say that I am one of the few insurance agents who oppose these bills and to offer what small encouragement I may to you for your stand. I feel the National Association of Insurance Agents are guilty of "letting down" the rank and file of the agents and selling out to companies for the sake of politics and that it will mark the end of the real influence of the national association.

I oppose the proposed bills because—

1. The Sherman antitrust law is too good and time tested a law to have any national business exempted from it.

2. The courts could decide whether or not insurance is interstate commerce.

3. The insurance companies are undoubtedly guilty of violation of the Sherman Act on many counts.

4. The companies did not dare to go to trial and defend their position on the merits of the charges.

5 The companies have tied agents hand and foot by virtually forcing agents to represent only underwriter association companies.

(a) Consequently there are few other competing companies and an agent has no choice.

(b) This monopoly gives the companies the power to determine agents' compensation.

(c) This monopoly has held the fire insurance business in a static state for years to the detriment of the agents and the public.

6. The companies have influenced the Agents' National Association to intimidate the rank and file of unthinking agents into taking sides with the companies.

(a) Pretending great love for the agents and falsely stating that the Government's next move (after convicting the insurance companies) is to sell Government insurance through the Post Offices and thereby ruin every agent.

(b) Pretending great love for States' rights when in fact they offer as an excuse for not being able to reform their business practices the fact that they are hamstrung by the vicious regulations of 48 different State Insurance Departments and State laws.

The truth of the matter is that the companies have never found any method of selling their insurance contracts for as low cost as through agents, so that their professed love for and fear for agents' welfare is a sham to enlist their support in this, their crisis, and the great threat to the agents lies in the monopolist strangle-hold they have built up by their agency agreements. If they are found guilty and if they have to reduce rates the first thing they will do is reduce agents' commissions and agents will have to sit and take it because these same companies have prohibited agents from representing any companies other than the groups of companies combined in their underwriters associations. Consequently there are no other companies now for the agent to represent. So to me the threat to the agent's future lies in the continuation of the monopoly rather than the threat that Congress will vote, indirectly, to put the agents out of business by establishing Post Office insurance policies.

Furthermore, how is the agent and the public going to fare if aviation insurance is regulated by 48 different State laws? Automobile insurance is bad enough and it doesn't begin to offer the complexities that will confront aviation.

But as a past president of the Maine Association of Insurance Agents and a past chairman of the New England Associations of Agents, I cannot refrain from writing you to let you know that not all agents see eye to eye with the National Association of Insurance Agents in their stand with the companies on these bills and I wish to offer you my congratulations for your courageous stand against these vicious bills.

Third, and finally, under this point, it is urged by the proponents of this legislation that unless this legislation is adopted, Federal regulation of the insurance business is bound to follow. In the first place, this argument is completely fallacious because there is nothing in the pending legislation to prevent Federal regulation of the insurance business if the Supreme Court of the United States upholds the case now pending before it—Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America against National Labor Relations Board—in which the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit squarely and distinctly held that the conduct of the insurance business was commerce. This legislation simply says that the antitrust law shall not apply to the conduct of the insurance business. It is admitted that the antitrust laws are not regulatory legislation; they simply permit prosecutions by the Federal Government against monopolistic practices of businesses which come within the purview of the commerce clause of the Constitution. This legislation could be passed tomorrow and it would in no way prohibit the Congress of the United States from adopting legislation to regulate the business of insurance, provided the Supreme Court upholds the decision in the case last cited. I do not know why the insurance companies involved did not simply come to the Congress, if they wish to avoid regulation, with a bill simply stating that the Congress of the United States does now declare that the conduct of the insurance business is not commerce for any and all purposes, and that no law heretofore enacted by the Congress of the United States, exercising its power to regulate commerce, shall apply to the insurance business, and that the Congress shall hereinafter not enact any legislation which shall apply to the insurance business.

As a matter of fact, if the Supreme Court holds that the conduct of the insurance business is commerce in the Polish Alliance case, then that case alone clearly demonstrates that the Congress at this present moment has the power to regulate the business of insurance.

But, assuming that this legislation should not pass and assuming that the Supreme Court rules in the case from the District Court of Georgia now pending before it, that the antitrust laws apply

to the conduct of the business of insurance, and further assuming that thereafter this Congress adopted legislation regulating the insurance business, it does not follow that that would be the end of State regulation. It does not follow that agents would have to come to Washington in order to get their licenses; it does not follow that the States could not continue to tax the insurance companies doing business in their States, and in this connection I include as part of my own remarks a very brief analysis of this question by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

INDUSTRIES OR TRADES SUBJECT TO BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATION

Many examples of industries or trades subject to both State and Federal regulation may be found. For instance:

1. BANKS

Federal regulation of banks is controlled by title 12 of the United States Code. In the same manner, the States provide for banking commissions or boards. In many cases, a bank may be subject to both Federal and State regulation at the same time, as for instance, a State-regulated bank which might also furnish its customers deposit insurance under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. (June 16, 1934, 48 Stat. 969).

2. RAILROADS

Railroads have always been subject to Federal regulations under the commerce clause of the Constitution (art. I, sec. 8, clause 3). Direct control was provided by the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 (24 Stat. 379). The various States have also created commissions or boards to deal with railroads, street railways, motor carriers, or other forms of transportation facilities.

3. LIQUOR

The Federal Government has entered this field since repeal of prohibition (Constitution, amendment XXI) to exercise control over the liquor traffic through regulation of interstate shipments and excise tax laws applied by the Internal Revenue Bureau. The States have retained the power to provide for or exclude alcoholic liquors within their borders in addition to regulating sales, local option, State dispensaries, etc., by appropriate law.

4. COPYRIGHTED MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS

By article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution, Congress is delegated power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." This power in Congress is exclusive. In addition six States have enacted antitrust laws prohibiting combinations for the purpose of fixing license fees, or other charges for the use or rendition of such numbers for public or private use. These States are: Florida, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Washington (State antitrust laws, prepared by the Marketing Laws Survey, Works Progress Administration, G. P. O., 1940). The Florida and Nebraska statutes have been upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *Watson* v. *Buck* (313 U. S. 387), and *Marsh* v. *Buck* (313 U. S. 406). The Court in Watson (Florida) case said specifically: "We are pointed to nothing either in the language of the copyright laws or in the history of their enactment to indicate any congressional purpose to deprive the States, either in whole or in part, of their long-recognized power to regulate combinations in restraint of trade" (p. 404).

Does not every Member of this Congress know that, although the railroads are subject to Federal regulation, there are many counties and townships within almost every State in the Union which could not keep their schools open if they did not have the power to tax the property of those railroads which run through their counties and townships? Does not every Member of this Congress know that State banks, even though subject to Federal regulation under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, are taxed by the States? But, likewise, does not every Member of Congress know that the bank presidents or the cashiers or the tellers of those banks are not required to come to Washington to get a license to conduct the banking business in any State in the Union which is under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and neither do the station agents in every hamlet in the United States find it necessary to come to Washington in order to get a license to be a station agent in his own home town, and yet the Congress has repeatedly legislated upon the conduct of interstate commerce by the railroads? Again it seems to me that this furor being raised back in the States about the passage of this legislation arises from a complete lack of thought or understanding of the nature of the fallacious arguments which are being advanced in support of it.

But, finally, does not a Member of Congress who advances the argument that the passage of this legislation is necessary in order to prevent Federal regulation of the insurance business—and I have demonstrated that that is not true if the Supreme Court upholds the case now pending before it from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals—admit, by such argument, his own intent and design and purpose to enact Federal legislation of such scope that it would destroy every vestige of State regulation of local matter, that it would destroy the power of the States to tax the insurance business? You cannot have regulation unless we in the Congress pass it.

To me, a person who says he is fearful of Federal regulation and sits in the Congress of the United States admits his own inability, as an individual Member, and admits as against this Congress, a design and a purpose to enact legislation venal in its purpose, calculated to injure or destroy the insurance business and the proper scope of the States with reference to the regulation of those aspects of the conduct of the business which are purely local in character. How else would this legislation be enacted except by Members of the Congress of the United States? Are we fearful of ourselves? Are we going to say to our people that we are incapable of intelligently appraising this problem and limiting the Federal power to regulate a question of guarding against discrimination in rates, not only between the citizens of various States, but between classes of citizens all over the United States? It is incredible to me that men would sit in the Congress of the United States and so condemn themselves by their own words as to admit their own impotency, or, indeed, if we listen to some of these arguments, we would be admitting a venal purpose, which I think is foreign to any Member of this Congress.

I do not apologize for this statement. It is logically sound, and I will submit the logic of my position to any impartial judge. I have no desire to state it, but I cannot sit supinely by and permit my friends in this Congress who are being swept away by the propaganda advanced in support of it to take a position which I am convinced, if they utter it, causes them to be condemned by their own words. This is the time for men to think clearly; this is the time for men to analyze the significance of their own statements and to determine the logical conclusions and consequences which intelligent people would draw therefrom.

Let me say one thing further; I notice that the Governor of the State of Indiana, who advocates this legislation, says that the failure to pass it would deprive the State of Indiana of $3,000,000 of income. In the first place, of course, as I have demonstrated, the Democratic Governor of the State of Indiana does not know what he is talking about, because this legislation is absolutely incapable of preventing Federal regulation if the Supreme Court upholds the doctrine announced in the Polish Alliance case heretofore referred to. In the second place, and I wish that every policyholder in the State of Indiana would give consideration to this thought, it is now, and has always been, unsound taxation to tax a business under the guise of regulatory legislation to an extent calculated to raise general revenue in excess of the revenues necessary to pay for the regulation. In other words, unless it costs $3,000,000 a year to pay for the conduct of the Insurance Department of the State of Indiana, and of course it does not, then every home owner in the State of Indiana who carries insurance on his home is paying a disproportionate share of the costs of operating the government of the State of Indiana not borne by people who do not carry insurance, because he may rest assured that the taxes paid by the insurance companies are carried over to him in the premiums charged. So it is all right with me if the Democratic Governor of the State of Indiana wants to publicly declare to the insurance policyholders of the State of Indiana that he approves of their paying an unfair part of the costs of the government of the State of Indiana, particularly those who are careful enough, industrious enough, and provident enough to carry fire insurance on their possessions.

But, finally, by opposing this legislation, I refuse to be driven to the position of advocating Federal regulation. It does not necessarily follow that Federal regulation must follow a holding by the Supreme Court, in the case now pending before it, adverse to the position taken by the insurance companies before the District Court of Georgia. It is true that there is evidence in this record of discrimination between classes of policyholders which is very analogous to the discrimination by the railroad in freight rates between classes of citizens which forced the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And, if an investigation by this Congress, through its proper committees, should

discover that this discrimination is so great that it cannot be cured in any other way, then if something comparable to the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission must be adopted by this Congress, it is only the insurance companies who have themselves to blame by reason of the discrimination between rates which is evidenced in the hearings in this case. But, there is no evidence, to date, of any kind that the conditions involved and the facts alleged in the case in Georgia or the conditions presented by the evidence in the record of this case cannot be reached and corrected by prosecutions under the antitrust act. And it is idle to talk of Federal regulation before the necessity for that regulation is clearly developed, and the people who have it within their power to avoid that necessity are the fire insurance companies themselves and no one else.

Incidentally, what I have just said is in application of the doctrine of the development of character and essential responsibility of the individual which is the cornerstone of the arguments advanced by the States' rights advocates. "Doctor, cure yourself. Insurance company, clean your own house."

I ask all of the Members of the House who believe as I do about individual responsibility and the duty of the individual to fight his way out of his own troubles, if they will not join me in an application of our mutual philosophy and say to the insurance companies seeking this legislation, "We believe in the doctrine of individual responsibility, out of which the doctrine of States' rights springs. The complaint in this case pending in the Supreme Court alleges that you have done certain acts which, if true, may make you liable under the antitrust laws. Do not come to us in the Congress to help you out, for we believe in the individual working out of his own destiny. Take your medicine, you brewed it. It will be good for you."

Is not that an application of the doctrine of individual responsibility upon which the doctrine of States' rights rests? Why cry "States' rights" when in so doing we are repudiating by this legislatior the very philosophy upon which it rests? I do not intend to be driven into that position. I am for applying the doctrine of individual responsibility where it will help the fire-insurance companies develop their own character by taking the consequences of their own acts. In short, I am for the States' rights doctrine, but I think it should be applied in every case where it is needed.

POINT 3

Finally, I want to discuss this legislation from the standpoint of the traditional position of the Republican Party upon the question of monopolies. This is the party which enacted the Sherman Antitrust Act. It was enacted under the administration of Benjamin Harrison, a Republican President from the State of Indiana; its champion was a Republican Senator. Upon the passage in the Senate the total vote was 52 yeas and 1 nay. Twenty-eight Republicans voted in favor of it and 24 Democrats voted for it, and the only vote cast against the Sherman Act was cast by a Democrat. The bill passed the House by a vote of 242 yeas and no nays, and again 125 Republicans voted for it and 117 Democrats voted for it.

Thereafter the most glorious period in the history of the Republican Party, after the death of Abraham Lincoln, was the trust-busting era of Theodore Roosevelt and the progressive thinking of great Republicans like William Howard Taft, who was a sound man on this question of monopolies; Albert J. Beveridge, one of the greatest Republicans ever produced in the State of Indiana, or of any State; and the late William E. Borah. Again, for the benefit of the record and for the study of my Republican colleagues, may I quote some of the Republican leaders upon this question of monopolies:

First. President Harrison, first annual message, December 3, 1889:

Earnest attention should be given by Congress to a consideration of the question how far the restraint of those combinations of capital commonly called trusts is matter of Federal jurisdiction. When organized, as they often are, to crush out all healthy competition and to monopolize the production or sale of an article of commerce and general necessity, they are dangerous conspiracies against the public good, and should be made the subject of prohibitory and even penal legislation. (Source: Messages and Papers of the President, by James D. Richardson; vol. XI, p. 5478. New York, 1897.)

Second. John Sherman, speaking on trusts and combinations before the Senate, March 21, 1890:

If the concentrated powers of this combination are entrusted to a single man, it is a kingly prerogative, inconsistent with our form of government, and should be subject to the strong resistance of the State and National authorities. If anything is wrong this is wrong. If we will not endure a king as a political power we should not endure a king over the production, transportation, and sale of any of the necessaries of life. If we would not submit to an emperor we should not submit to an autocrat of trade, with power to prevent competition and to fix the price of any commodity. If the combination is confined to a State the State should apply the remedy; if it is interstate and controls any production in many States, Congress must apply the remedy. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 21, p. 2447.)

Third. President William McKinley, message to Congress, December 5, 1899:

It is universally conceded that combinations which engross or control the market of any particular kind of merchandise or commodity necessary to the general community, by suppressing natural and ordinary competition, whereby prices are unduly enhanced to the general consumer, are obnoxious not only to the common law but also to the public welfare. There must be a remedy for the evils involved in such organization. If the present law can be extended more certainly to control or check these monopolies or trusts, it should be done without delay. Whatever power the Congress possesses over this most important subject should be promptly ascertained and asserted. (Source: Richardson, *op. cit.*, vol XIII, p. 6361.)

Fourth. Albert J. Beveridge, speech opening the Republican campaign for the Middle West, Chicago, September 22, 1906:

The people, through their Government, should not permit individuals or associated individuals to practice business methods that will be unjust to all. But the people's Government should not own any industry which private enterprise can efficiently manage and whose abuses Government regulation can prevent.

Government regulation will never be felt by the managers of great business enterprises who conduct business as trustees of the people, just as criminal laws are not felt by the citizen who attends to the duties of citizenship.

Government supervision is a recognition of that American principle and the application of its corollary that a business which affects all the people should be regulated by the government of all the people.

Government supervision leaves business in individual hands, but requires that individual to act as a trustee for the people and thus prevents abuses hurtful to the people. (Source: The Meaning of the Times, by Albert J. Beveridge. Indianapolis, 1908. Pp. 268–269, 273.)

Fifth. President Theodore Roosevelt, seventh annual message, December 3, 1907:

A combination should not be tolerated if it abuses the power acquired by combination to the public detriment. No corporation or association of any kind should be permitted to engage in foreign or interstate commerce that is formed for the purpose of, or whose operations create, a monopoly or general control of the production, sale, or distribution of any one or more of the prime necessities of life or articles of general use and necessity. Such combinations are against public policy; they violate the common law, and I believe the Congress can close the channels of interstate commerce against them for its protection. (Source: Richardson, op. cit., vol. XIV, p. 7078.)

Sixth. President Taft, special message to Congress, January 7, 1910:

Through all our consideration of this grave question, however, we must insist that the suppression of competition, the controlling of prices, and the monopoly or attempt to monopolize in interstate commerce and business, are not only unlawful but contrary to the public good, and that they must be restrained and punished until ended.

If the prohibition of the antitrust act against combinations in restraint of trade is to be effectively enforced, it is essential that the National Government shall provide for the creation of national corporations to carry on a legitimate business throughout the United States. The conflicting laws of the different States of the Union with respect to foreign corporations make it difficult, if not impossible, for one corporation to comply with their requirements so as to carry on business in a number of different States.

To the suggestion that this proposal of Federal incorporation for industrial combinations is intended to furnish them a refuge in which to continue industrial abuses under Federal protection, it should be said that the measure contemplated does not repeal the Sherman antitrust law and is not to be framed so as to permit the doing of the wrongs which it is the purpose of that law to prevent, but only to foster a continuance and advance of the highest industrial efficiency without permitting industrial abuses.

Such a national incorporation law will be opposed, first, by those who believe that trusts should be completely broken up and their property destroyed. It will be opposed, second, by those who doubt the constitutionality of such Federal incorporation, and even if it

is valid, object to it as too great Federal centralization. It will be opposed, third, by those who will insist that a mere voluntary incorporation like this will not attract to its acceptance the worst of the offenders against the antitrust statute and who will, therefore, propose instead of it a system of compulsory licenses for all Federal corporations engaged in interstate business.

A Federal compulsory license law, urged as a substitute for a Federal incorporation law, is unnecessary except to reach that kind of corporation which, by virtue of the considerations already advanced, will take advantage voluntarily of an incorporation law, while the other State corporations doing an interstate business do not need the supervision or the regulation of a Federal license and would only be unnecessarily burdened thereby.

The Attorney General, at my suggestion, has drafted a Federal incorporation bill, embodying the views I have attempted to set forth, and it will be at the disposition of the appropriate committees of Congress. (Source: Richardson, op. cit., vol. XV, pp. 7455–7456, 7458.)

Seventh. William Borah, address before the Union League Club, Baltimore, February 12, 1913:

If I had my way I would make every corporation convicted of wrong-doing, or subject to the control of an interlocking directorate, every corporation voting the stock of another corporation or guilty of monopolistic practices, after a certain day be fixed in advance, an outlaw to the channels of interstate trade until it should purge itself of all these powers and practices. When I see a great corporation condemned in unmeasured terms by the Supreme Court of the United States, which never speaks but with ample justification, and against which a decree has been entered, still openly, brazenly, defiantly, brutally putting aside all principles of justice and ignoring every provision of the law, there is nothing I would not do, in a legal and orderly way, to destroy it. Men who set such an example of lawlessness and anarchy in a government of law ought to end their days in a prison cell and go broken and bankrupt to a pauper's grave. My friends, we will either change these conditions or these conditions will change the Republic. The war between the Republic and monopoly is a war of extinction—there is no neutral ground, no place for parley. (Source: Bedrock. Views on Basic National Problems by William E. Borah, Washington, D. C., pp. 12–13.)

I extremely regret that I have not had the time to search out a direct statement by Abraham Lincoln, but surely no one who has any understanding of the belief in the common man possessed by the founder of this Party who, in my opinion, is the greatest American who ever lived, would have any doubt as to his stand upon the question of anti-monopoly legislation.

It is too often charged that we Republicans worship the past too much. I do not think that is true. I think the tragedy of the Republican Party today is that it does not worship the past sufficiently, so that it has forgotten its history, the purpose for which it came into existence—to serve the common man, the little man, and the hopelessly enslaved black man; it has forgotten Lincoln, it has forgotten Harrison, it has forgotten John Sherman, it has forgotten Theodore Roosevelt, it has forgotten William Howard Taft, it has forgotten Albert Beveridge, and it has forgotten the elder La Follette, who only left his party's household when driven from it by those who would not follow his efforts to keep it true to its great traditions. No; we Republicans as a whole are not guilty of gazing too fondly on the past; we are only guilty of a near-sightedness because when we do gaze backward, too many of us are so near-sighted that we can only see Harding and Coolidge. Truly a great day will arrive in the Republican Party when it actually does become guilty of the charge of grandfather worship and returns to the traditional position of Abraham Lincoln, and to an understanding and worship of the other tremendously great figures of its historical past. So that I am not afraid of the charge of unthinking people that in opposing this legislation, I am not following Republican tradition. In fact, the tradition is on my side of this question, and I challenge any Republican to prove me wrong before the bar of intelligent public opinion.

And, finally, I wish to speak as a Republican of Indiana. Benjamin Harrison is on my side and Albert Beveridge is on my side, but more than that, the facts developed by this record are on my side.

I want now to refer to table 6 on page 148 of the hearings and to include that in this statement:

TABLE 6.—*Insurance rates on brick buildings and fire losses by cities*

City	Premium per $100 of insurance	5-year average per capita fire losses
	Cents	
Cleveland	15.9	$2.48
Milwaukee	17.0	2.89
Cincinnati	16.9	2.76
Akron	16.9	1.52
Toledo	16.0	3.48
Columbus	18.0	2.55
Detroit	30.7	3.48
St. Louis	35.0	3.54
Kansas City	37.0	6.22
Louisville	24.5	1.52
Omaha	27.6	4.84
Indianapolis	23.0	3.01

Source: Stone's Fire Insurance Classification of Cities and Fire Loss.

It should be easy to understand this table. It shows the relationship between the premium charged on brick buildings and the experience of 12 cities with reference to their per capita fire losses.

Now, suppose we admit that engineering services of the insurance companies has had something to do with the lowering of the fire losses per capita in these cities. Nevertheless, fundamentally, it must be said that this is the result of local effort; in the case of lower rate per capita, it must be the result of adequate fire-prevention training in those cities, of adequate water supply, and of a competent, well-managed fire department, as well as the result of local fire-resisting construction. These are all the results of intelligent effort by people in the local communities, but it does not take much of an analysis of these figures to show that there is very little, if any, relationship between the rates charged to the cities with the best record to the rates charged proportionately to the cities with the worst record. Again, I ask my "home rule" friends, I ask the leading exponents of the philosophy of individual responsibility to explain, if they can, why they uphold a system and seek to protect fire insurance companies which, by their very actions, have been able to deny to those communities which have put forth the best effort in fire-prevention work and in protecting their own property, rates of insurance which should be comparably low to reward that individual effort.

I would like to be permitted to harken back to my previous statement on this question of individual responsibility, out of which the States' rights argument arises, in which I said that the argument is a mere statement of words and useless sophistry as long as its advocates at the same time advocate the protection of the fire insurance business in practices which clearly fail to reward local communities for their local efforts. Again, may I quote from the first chapter of St. James, the twenty-second verse:

Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.

I think it is fair to paraphrase this statement for the benefit of the individual responsibility, States' right advocates, who propose legislation which will not permit the prosecution of insurance companies for practices which fail to reward the individual communities for their own individual efforts and say "Be ye doers of the word and not just talkers only, deceiving not only yourselves, but your constituency."

But I find something more significant in these figures. It is unfortunate that there are no cities in my own Eighth District of Indiana included, but there are figures for the city of Indianapolis, Ind., and these figures, when studied and analyzed, produce very interesting information for the residents of Indianapolis, Ind., the home city of the senior Senator from Indiana, who also advocates this legislation. It is possible by a study of these figures to point out to the people of Indianapolis, Ind., the relative benefits or losses which they are at present receiving under the operation of the insurance business as it is presently being conducted under State regulation without the operation of the antitrust laws upon it.

If we divide the rate of premium per $100 of insurance on brick buildings in each of the other 11 cities by the rate paid in Indianapolis, we will get the percentage of the rate charged in these other 11 cities to that charged in Indianapolis. Again, if we divide the 5-year average per capita fire loss in each of those cities by the 5-year average in Indianapolis, we will get the percentage of that fire loss in each of those 11 cities to that in the city of Indianapolis. From which, it will follow that, if the percentage of premium paid in any of these cities to that paid in Indianapolis is less than the percentage of the average per capita fire loss in each of these cities to that in the city of Indianapolis, just to that extent the residents of the city of Indianapolis are being discriminated against in the rate charged them and are not getting the full benefit of their own efficient operation of their local ef-

forts to keep down fire losses. By the same token, if the percentage of premium charged in any of these cities to that charged in the city of Indianapolis is higher than the percentage of the average 5-year per capita loss in any of those cities in relationship to the average in the city of Indianapolis, then those cities are being discriminated against and the citizens of the city of Indianapolis are benefiting therefrom. I herewith set out a table showing this percentage as the result of my analysis of table 6 above.

Indianapolis

City	Percent of premium per $100 of insurance to premium per $100 of insurance in Indianapolis	Percent of 5-year average per capita fire losses to 5-year average per capita fire losses in Indianapolis
Cleveland	69	82
Milwaukee	74	96
Cincinnati	74	92
Akron	74	51
Toledo	74	116
Columbus	78	85
Detroit	134	116
St. Louis	152	118
Kansas City	160	207
Louisville	107	51
Omaha	120	161

It appears from the above figures that in Cleveland, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Toledo, Columbus, Kansas City, Omaha, the percentage of the 5-year average of fire loss per capita to that in Indianapolis is higher than the percentage of the premiums paid in each of those cities to the premiums paid in Indianapolis on the same type of structure, brick buildings. From this it must follow that the people of Indianapolis who, by their fire prevention efforts and the efficiency of their water distribution system and fire departments, all of which they pay for either directly or by taxation, are not getting the full benefit of their own efforts. This is an example of local efficiency and responsibility for which the States' rights people speak, frustrated by the operation of the very States' rights regulation which they advocate. The reverse of the above situation is true as to the cities of Akron, Detroit, St. Louis, and Louisville; but as far as Indianapolis, Ind., is concerned, it is significant that out of 11 other cities listed, its citizens are worse off than those of 7. Can we not ask, "How well are you served, citizens of Indianapolis and of Indiana, by the present States' rights system? You pay the bill. Are you willing to pay the price to support those who becloud this issue with an appeal for the misapplication of the perfectly sound doctrine of States' rights? Can you afford to oppose prosecution of alleged monopolistic practices including apparent discrimination just to hang onto a slogan, true in its place, but used wholly as a smoke screen here?"

But no one has told the citizens of Indianapolis this. No proponent of this legislation has pointed out to the citizens of Indianapolis the very fine beating they are taking under the operation of the system which the Democratic Senator from Indiana and the Democratic Governor of Indiana are asking the Congress of the United States to continue to impose upon them.

Also, as a Republican it is incredible to me that a Republican newspaper of Indianapolis should support this legislation; it is incredible to me that it should support it by the use of figures which utterly and absolutely reveal nothing with reference to the fairness of the rates charged in the State of Indiana, but which only have the effect of positively misleading the people of Indiana with reference to this issue and by statements which cannot be sustained by the record in this case. Mr. Maurice Early, a political writer for the Indianapolis Star, in his column of November 29, 1943, made the following statement:

Insurance experts say that under Federal control the Hoosier policyholders would have to contribute to pay for the greater hazards in careless States. That this would be so is shown by a study of the average fire-insurance rates in Indiana and other States.

From 1939 to 1942 the average fire rate in Indiana was 60 cents, compared with 62 cents in Illinois and 73 cents in Kentucky. Other Southern States have higher rates because of less substantial building construction.

At present fire-insurance rates are established by rating bureaus in each State and are subject to State approval. Insurance men are urging the enactment of the Van Nuys-Bailey bill which would prevent Washington taking control of the insurance business by bringing it under the operation of the antitrust laws.

From a casual examination of this statement, it would appear that the people of Indiana are much better off than the people of Illinois and the people of Kentucky. But the average fire rate charged is a meaningless figure unless we compare it with the proportion of loss paid out of that rate back to the insurers and extend our comparison to the percentage of loss paid in the State of Illinois and the State of Kentucky out of the rates charged in those States. For it is obvious that unless we know what percentage of the premium paid comes back to the policyholders in Indiana out of the rate charged them and the percentage of premiums coming back in the other States out of the rates charged them, we cannot know whether the people of Indiana are better or worse off than the people of Illinois or the people of Kentucky.

The figures supplied to Mr. Early, which he unquestionably was asked to use without being informed of their inadequacy to prove anything, are positively misleading. However, we find from a study of the tables introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] in his argument against this bill, and appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 30 at page 10146, figures which have never been challenged, that the percentage of loss paid to premiums charged in the State of Illinois, is 45.7 percent, in the State of Indiana, it is only 42.2 percent and in the State of Kentucky, it is 49.7 percent for the 10-year average from the year 1931 to the year 1940. With these figures before us we can determine by mathematical deduction whether actually the people of Indiana are better off or worse off than the people of Illinois and Kentucky under the 60-cent rate about which Mr. Early boasts in his article. What we in Indiana want to know is this: If the people of Illinois get 45.7 percent of the total premiums charged them paid back to them, what should the rate in Indiana actually be since we are only getting 42.2 percent of the premiums paid by us into the insurance companies in order to be as well off as the people of Illinois.

The formula used is the following: 45.7 is to 62 as 42.2 is to x, which formula, when applied, will disclose that if the people in Indiana are to be as well off as the people in Illinois, when we consider that the people in Indiana get a lower percentage of their premiums paid back to them in losses, we will find that the average rate in Indiana for fire insurance should be 57.25 cents and not 60 cents. Applying the same formula to the State of Kentucky, we use the formula 49.7 is to 73 as 42.2 is to x, and we find that if the people of Indiana are to be in the same position as the people of Kentucky, they would be paying 62 cents instead of 60 cents. But, when we get through with these figures, we find that the people of Indiana are .0275 cents worse off in their rates than the people of Illinois and only 2 cents better off in their rate than the people of Kentucky. But Mr. Early's figures would have the people of Indiana believe that they are 2 cents better off than the people of Illinois and 13 cents better off than the people of Kentucky, which actually is not true at all.

Furthermore, Mr. Early's article says that the other Southern States have a higher rate of insurance and therefore the passage of this legislation is desired by the States of the South and would be detrimental to the States of the North. I do not know what States Mr. Early means by Southern States, but I have taken from the table submitted by Mr. Russell the following 17 States, including the State of Indiana, most of which are Southern States, but I have included the border States of Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Oklahoma to make sure that I do not do Mr. Early an injustice. Here is a table showing the truth about the relative position of the people of Indiana with those living in the Southern States:

State	Average rate of premium per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums	Descending order of—		
				Average rate of premiums per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums
Alabama	$0.99	$0.47	47.0	17	16	21
Arkansas	1.18	.65	55.4	4	3	1
Florida	1.00	.35	34.4	14	31	47
Georgia	.99	.51	50.9	16	8	8
Indiana	.68	.29	42.2	39	40	38
Kentucky	.79	.39	49.7	32	24	14
Louisiana	.90	.42	46.5	24	20	25
Maryland	.63	.27	42.7	46	43	36
Mississippi	1.37	.73	53.3	2	2	4
Missouri	.77	.42	53.9	33	21	2
North Carolina	.81	.40	48.9	26	23	17
Oklahoma	.81	.37	46.0	27	28	27
South Carolina	1.01	.51	50.6	13	7	10
Tennessee	.96	.49	51.2	19	12	7
Texas	.98	.48	49.2	18	13	16
Virginia	.81	.37	45.6	28	27	29
West Virginia	.91	.41	44.9	23	22	30

The table shows that out of all these States, when we consider the true measurement of the fairness of rates charged to the people of a State, namely, the percentage of the premiums paid which they get back to pay the losses in their States, we find that every one of these States, except the State of Florida, is better treated on the matter of ratio of losses paid to rates charged than the State of Indiana; and we also find, when we study that part of the table which shows the descending order in which the States are well off, that Indiana, out of 48 States, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, making a total of 50 subdivisions, ranks thirty-eighth, only 12 States and subdivisions being worse off. Under these facts I can't understand why a Republican newspaper should lend itself to supporting a Democratic measure. And this is a Democratic measure; it is supported in the other body by the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator VAN NUYS, and the senior Senator from North Carolina, Senator BAILEY, and the bill now pending before the House is the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Democratic Representative, Mr. WALTERS. This whole legislation is Democratic legislation designed to interfere with the orderly prosecution of insurance companies under the Antitrust Act. And the record disclosed on the hearings shows that as far as the people of Indiana are concerned, after 11 continuous years of administration of the State by a Democratic administration, the people of Indiana find themselves in the thirty-eighth worse position of the 48 States in the Union and the Territory of Hawaii and the District of Columbia, only 12 of these being worse off.

Finally, I offer a table, taken not from any New Deal figures but from the record of fire insurance by States for 1942, copyright 1943 by the Underwriter Printing and Publishing Co., 116 John Street, New York, N. Y. This table conclusively shows that under the operation of the fire-insurance business under the States' rights system, without any interference whatsoever by the application of the antitrust laws, the people of Indiana have been progressively worse off in the ratio of losses paid to premiums collected from the 10-year period 1900 to 1910, when they got 49.3 percent of their premiums back in losses paid to the 3-year period 1940–43, when they got only 38.1 percent back. Truly the blessings of States' rights under a Democratic administration since 1933 are wonderful—just like getting your arm cut off gradually.

Indiana, business 1900–1942, inclusive

Year began	Risks written	Number of years	Net premiums written	Net losses paid	Percent loss paid to premiums
1940–42	$6, 147, 326, 886	3	$36, 685, 780	$13, 969, 092	38.1
1930–39	15, 567, 644, 232	10	109, 671, 169	49, 670, 536	45.3
1920–29	15, 429, 738, 364	10	142, 273, 254	74, 091, 213	52.1
1910–19	8, 324, 713, 067	10	82, 606, 115	40, 690, 158	49.3
1900–1909	4, 928, 637, 642	10	57, 338, 223	28, 291, 681	49.3

The Republican Party, like all democratic organizations, is big enough and broad enough to include within it many people who, with equally honest motives, have widely divergent views upon questions of government and economics. I will not, and do not, question the good faith of those who disagree with me, but I am not precluded from examining their reasoning, their arguments and their conclusions. For, if that were true, Party membership would restrict a Member to the thinking of some small group which claimed or asserted the right to impose their opinions and their will on others as a condition precedent to Party membership.

This would be but the Party line with vengeance. The Republican Party could not take such a view and consistently attack the same policy, as one of the evils inherent in the Communist Party. For a party line is a party line no matter what party asserts it.

It is a sufficient justification for Party membership and Party allegiance that a member of the Republican Party today find historical authority for a present position. Therefore, as an Indiana Republican I am not only justified, but content, to follow the position which my Party in Indiana took on the question of monopolies under the leadership of Benjamin Harrison, its President, and Albert Beveridge, one of its many great Senators.

My Work With the Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "My Work With the Truman Committee," delivered by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] at Washington, D. C., over the network of the National Broadcasting Co., on December 3, 1943.

The address relates to the work of the Truman committee, and in particular to the activities in connection therewith of the junior Senator from Michigan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, I would like to visit with you in your homes tonight and tell you something of the work of the Truman committee of the Senate. The committee had been at work for about a year and a half when I was appointed to it this past January. As a freshman in the Senate, I considered it a great privilege to serve on this committee, and I undertook the job enthusiastically.

In the course of catching up with my colleagues, it was necessary to study very carefully the work of the previous years. Then, entering the committee deliberations fresh from what might be called the outside world, I was able to observe the abilities and qualities of the other members of the committee with something of an outsider's point of view.

My first definite impression was one of great admiration for the unity within the committee resulting from good leadership and the cooperation of its members. The committee is composed of 10 Senators—6 Democrats and 4 Republicans. It takes its name from HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, the chairman. Its official title is the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

This committee, at its inception, was set up by the United States Senate to investigate all phases of the war program. It was empowered by the United States Senate with more authority, and its scope of investigation was greater than any other committee ever conceived on Capitol Hill.

I found the committee members determined not to abuse their powers. They had started out and continued without any preconceived ideas, trying only to make their actions purely constructive.

To that end, the committee members have avoided all partisan considerations. There has never been a minority report out of the Truman committee. We have yet to find a subject, affecting the war effort, on which reasonable, sincerely motivated men can disagree—no matter what their politics.

Thus, when I became a member of this committee, I found nine other men from all parts of the United States with a single aim in view; that was to devote themselves to our Nation's speedily winning the war. There is no one who comes before our committee, on any matters, who has anything to fear except the truth.

When we ask Government officials to explain their activity, we feel that we are asking on behalf of the whole country. The information which the committee has is for every American citizen. Its recommendations are made in the interest of the whole country.

The committee has reported on such basic subjects as manpower, steel, rubber, conversion to war production, and, most recently, problems relating to conversion to peacetime production. In such studies, the committee attempts to review the over-all policies and steps relating to the major war programs. On the other hand, the committee does not attempt, at any time, to run any part of the Government or to substitute its judgment for that of the administrative officials.

Another function of equal importance has been to serve notice to all concerned that it is an ever-vigilant watchdog, guarding the public interest. When it finds that an agency of the Government, a war plant, or any official charged with certain duties is not performing these duties to the best interests of the Government, our committee will bring any or all of them before us to account publicly.

We have attempted to confine our public hearings to cases where, in advance, we have made a thorough investigation and where it is desired to give the official in question an opportunity to state his position and to give the American people an opportunity to know it. In fact, the public hearings and public reports of the committee represent only a small portion of its work, much of which involves painstaking detail and study of matters which can be and are corrected without the necessity of any further action. Most of the officials with whom we deal are cooperative and well-intentioned and welcome sincere criticism. In every investigation, it has been determined to obtain the

facts and, after obtaining the facts, to let the facts determine the conclusions. Where the facts will not speak for themselves, no amount of argument will serve as a substitute.

By vigorously investigating and then bringing to light improper conditions, the committee hopes not only to correct the specific evils with which it is dealing, but to discourage others. Early this year the committee found and denounced the faking of steel tests at the Irwin plant of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation. A short time later the committee discovered that defective engines were being produced at the Lockland plant of the Curtiss-Wright Aircraft Corporation. Then the committee investigated the gross mismanagement in the Sunflower Ordnance plant and in the North American Aviation Co.'s Dallas plant. Most recently the committee has publicly disclosed its investigation of inexcusable waste on the part of the Army in connection with the Canol project.

In order to carry out such investigations thoroughly, as well as to continue with the great mass of other work constantly on the agenda of the committee, it is divided into a number of subcommittees, whose purpose is to study specific subjects more intensively than they could be pursued by the entire committee.

It has been my privilege to serve as a member of a number of the subcommittees which conducted the investigations about which I have told you. With Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE as chairman of the subcommittee appointed to investigate military installations in Alaska, I was able to visit every important point in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands and to see the fine work which our boys have been accomplishing in these remote places. We met the men who had wrested Attu and Kiska from the Japs. We visited the battlefields on Attu. We saw these once Japanese strongholds being rebuilt into strongholds of American striking power in the Pacific.

During this trip we investigated and inspected the so-called Canol project. We held hearings in the remote town of Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory, right at the scene of the project.

As a result of that tour of inspection and those hearings we were able to bring to the full committee our report leading to the disclosure of the wasteful and inefficient manner in which the Canol project was conceived and built. This was an undertaking whereby the United States Government was making an investment of $134,000,000 to prospect for oil in Canada, to build a pipe line which will be entirely in Canada, and to build a refinery which is located in Canada.

Already, our investigation has shown tangible results. Under the agreements which we found had been made by the War Department, the United States loses all its rights in the oil reserves 6 months after the end of the war even though it is our money and our efforts which developed and discovered the oil. Since we brought the facts to light, Under Secretary of War Patterson has announced that the War Department would seek to revise these contracts and obtain post-war rights for our Government.

I have felt that one of the greatest contributions of our committee to the war effort has been the investigation of the Curtiss-Wright Lockland plant, where the Subcommittee on Aircraft, under the able chairmanship of my colleague, MON C. WALLGREN, of Washington, made amazing discoveries which were acknowledged by the War Department to be a bad situation. In my opinion, the conditions we found at that plant were inexcusable and deplorable. Through extensive hearings held at Cincinnati and at the Lockland plant, we found that inspectors of airplane parts and engines were passing defective parts and that these parts were getting into airplane engines. The result was that dangerously defective engines were shipped out of the plant and that replacement parts had been shipped that were defective. Fortunately, and this is the most important part, the conditions were completely cured as a result of the committee's investigation and the War Department took every possible precaution for the safety of the men that fly American planes in the air.

As usual, when the subcommittee reported to the full committee, we had the solid backing of the chairman of the committee and of each member in insisting that the disgraceful condition at the Lockland plant be immediately cured. Such solidarity and unity of purpose have been the essence of the committee's success.

This same Subcommittee on Aviation traveled to Dallas, Tex., a little over a month ago, held hearings for 4 days and 4 nights—and when I say nights I mean just that—and returned to Washington with a report which resulted in the elimination of 10,000 workers from the requirements of North American Aviation in Dallas. This result was soon followed by a decrease in manpower requirements for the entire west coast aviation industry, and this was at the very time when the Government was considering cutting down on the production of airplanes because of the critical shortage of labor in a great many areas.

While tracking down such specific instances of waste and malfeasance, the committee cannot afford to lose sight of the large important issues which will have a great effect on all of our lives in the future.

We are currently investigating and holding hearings on the conversion of the industry of this country back to the production of essential civilian commodities after the war. The United States is fighting this war in order to achieve a worth-while and lasting peace. When peace comes, we must be prepared for it. Even a short period of hesitation will bring confusion and breed untold suffering.

It will take months to reconstruct complicated industries, such as the automobile industry, back to the production of peacetime products, but this time can be decreased if the Government will aid and not put pitfalls and hurdles in the way of business. American business and labor are vigorous, intelligent, and enterprising, but we must assure them the facilities to maintain sound industrial progress after the war. To this end it is essential that private industry know when Government machinery and partly manufactured war goods owned by Government will be removed from plants to clear the way for peacetime work. Industry must know how much raw material will be available, and when it will receive the cash to pay labor still on the job. Industry must have some idea of the taxes it will have to pay and the conditions it will have to face.

When the boys coming home from war have jobs—and they will have jobs—they will be in the market for all the things they have missed. People will need homes, automobiles, vacuum cleaners, ice boxes, and hundreds of articles which are not on the market today. Cities, counties, and States will be ready for and in need of many new improvements. My own city of Detroit, alone, needs new airports desperately. Every other city, I know, has accumulated a list of essential improvements deferred only until the end of the war.

The war has taught us that we can produce. If we believe that the road to prosperity is a road of plenty and not of scarcity, we will arrive at our goal. Let the Government keep the rules of business fair and let the American people conduct the business.

Address by Dr. Frank W. Ballou at Testimonial Dinner in His Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. Frank W. Ballou, who recently retired after many years of distinguished service as superintendent of schools for the District of Columbia. The address was delivered at the testimonial dinner given in his honor by the Washington Board of Trade, on December 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests and friends here assembled, and ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience:

I am exceedingly gratified that so many of my friends have gathered in this beautiful banquet hall of the Mayflower Hotel to do me honor. Eight speakers have described in 4-minute speeches what they think of me and my services as superintendent of schools in the Nation's Capital for 23 years.

Preparation and preparedness have been watchwords for me all my life. I acquired the best preparation available to qualify to become a school administrator. Wherever I have appeared as a witness for the schools I have always tried to go adequately prepared to testify. However, I now feel wholly unprepared to make adequate reply to all the evidences of kindness and friendship that have been showered on Mrs. Ballou and myself since the announcement of my retirement on October 20.

We have been the recipients of a house full of flowers, a check for nearly $1,500 from the school personnel, a great volume of kindly letters from my associates and other friends, a tea where nearly a thousand teachers and officers gave us the privilege of greeting them and shaking their hands, a scroll of resolutions, and a dressing case, and finally this inspiring banquet with its additional presentations.

The kindliness and comfort which personal associations and friendships can give are conveyed in lines which I memorized many years ago, and which have always been an inspiration to me. I want to share them with you:

"It's the human touch in this world that counts,
The touch of your hand and mine,
That means far more to the fainting heart
Than shelter or bread or wine;
For shelter is gone when the night is o'er,
And bread lasts only a day,
But the touch of a hand and the sound of a voice
Sing on in the soul alway."

For the evidences of your kindness, Mrs. Ballou and I are now and always will be profoundly grateful.

I wish to express my grateful appreciation that the board of trade is the sponsor of this dinner. I want to thank every member of every committee who has had a part in making the arrangements for the dinner, and

especially do I wish to thank each one of you for gracing this occasion with your presence.

No one can regret more than I do the termination of my official associations with the people of Washington and especially with the personnel of the school department. I personally regretted having to retire while the Nation is at war; others have hoped that I would continue as Superintendent in order to complete work already initiated, such as legislation covering an improved salary schedule for teachers and officers; but circumstances of health do not recognize such considerations.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that an up-to-date school system is always in the process of change and must be looked upon as a growing, expanding, evolving, and improving organization. In such an organization no superintendent is likely to find the day when he could reasonably say his work is completed and the school system is finally established.

I am reminded of a story which many of you have already heard me tell, but it is pertinent to my retirement, and a good story is always worth repeating. The story is told of a colored preacher who was asked by one of his parishioners how he managed to be successful in his ministry. He was in charge of a large church and was highly respected by the large congregation. The elderly minister scratched his head, thought a few minutes, and then said, "Well, Mose, it seems to me that it am something like this: I have never attempted the impossible, and I have always cooperated with the inevitable." This is certainly a fine philosophy of life, provided one could always be sure that he could recognize the impossible as well as the inevitable in every situation. The fact is that my retirement was ultimately inevitable, controlled as it might have been by time rather than as it was by health considerations.

I wish to say to each and every one of you assembled on this occasion that my health is continuing to improve and that after only 6 weeks of retirement I already feel 10 years younger. I shall have to be careful that I do not let my rejuvenation go so far as to take me back into childhood!

We here in the banquet hall have listened to the president of the board of education, the superintendent of schools, a representative of the board of commissioners, a spokesman for the Rotary Club, a spokesman for the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, a representative from the Office of Education, the president of the D. C. Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators. All of the Government agencies referred to as well as the Bureau of the Budget, officially participate in making appropriations for the public schools of the District of Columbia as well as in the enactment of legislation affecting the public schools.

While I am the recipient of these honors because I have occupied a high official position, nevertheless I know that similar credit is also due to each one of the official agencies and the personnel of these agencies for the successes and achievements in the school department since I have been superintendent. I wish to commend heartily and without reservation the fine spirit of cooperation which now exists between the school department and the Government agencies having to do with the schools. I gladly share the successes and achievements of my administration with those who have been parties to it—namely, the school personnel, the Board of Education, the Board of Commissioners, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Committees on Appropriations and on Legislation of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

Here I also wish to recognize and pay tribute to the intelligent interest and active support of parent-teacher associations and citizen associations during my service as superintendent.

If Professor Hanus of Harvard, under whom I learned much of what I know of the theory and practice of school administration, were alive today, I am sure he would characterize the school situation here in Washington as a worthy example of an important principle of school administration which he defined in his usually succinct manner as "cooperation under leadership."

I may be wrong, as I admit I sometimes have been in the past perhaps because I could not differentiate between what was "inevitable" and what was "impossible," but I thought that you might expect me to say something about education on this occasion.

The public-school system of America recognizes and fosters in its educational program the dignity and value of human lives and encourages the maintenance of those political, religious, social, economic, and educational conditions which are able to sustain life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness among a free people.

Free people must first be informed; in addition, they must be prepared to perform their individual part of the world's work; they must be able to function politically; they must have health and strength, both physical and mental; and they must have spiritual stamina.

The freemen who are to build our society, man our defenses, decide our policies, labor in our mills and fields and homes need all of these freedoms: intellectual, economic, political, physical, and spiritual. These constitute our heritage, and deficiency in any one of them will jeopardize the others.

The public schools are concerned primarily with the education and training of youth in the schools of the Nation. Other agencies should obligate themselves to perform corresponding public service for the adult citizenship of the Nation. If adequate national defense is to be secured and maintained generation after generation, the radio, the press, civic forums, the homes, the churches, and all other educational and social-service agencies must develop a common purpose and a systematic program of information and enlightenment for the people. The mobilization of these resources in an unselfish service for the common good is as important as are the public schools in the creation of a citizenry competent to find the answers to the pressing questions of public policy.

At this time of national emergency we do well to remind ourselves that national character is the heart of national defense. National character is something that Congress cannot vote, and that national appropriations cannot buy in the market place. The development of national character is a social, political, economic, educational, and spiritual process, inherent in a society of free people, and indispensable for national unity. National character is systematically developed, day by day, year by year, and generation after generation, in the established institutions of the Nation—the home, the church, and the school.

In an adequate American home are taught the essential truths of democratic living—namely, love, respect for one another, justice, thrift, and tolerance. The mothers who teach their children responsibility, faith, and discipline in the home life are giving their children the ideals and the character which build the Nation's strength. Sound homes will help to produce not only manpower but also the patriotic determination to protect and defend the American way of living.

America was built on a spiritual foundation by earnest pioneers seeking to govern themselves and an opportunity to worship God in their own way. In their Declaration of Independence from the mother country, they defended their action in belief in God as well as a belief in the transcendent importance of human beings and the capacity and the right of a free people to self-government. Belief in God is fundamental in the American way of life.

The war is generating a revival of the spirit of patriotism such as inspired the colonists to heroic deeds which have been recounted in the school books of the Nation for each succeeding generation of young people to read, to appreciate, and to emulate.

The Nation also needs a revival and a restoration of those religious precepts and practices which where fundamental in the lives of the colonists. The concept that man is a child of God should again become the compelling principle in the actions and lives of men as it was in colonial times. It is more compelling than any feeling of patriotism and more exalted than any human institution devised by man.

The American spirit is the spirit of unselfish service for the common good. The American spirit is ennobled by aspiration, fortified with patience, hallowed through sacrifice and sustained by a dauntless courage. It has given to men, women, and children of every land opportunities such as they never before enjoyed at any time anywhere. It still holds promise of greater things to be.

The American Nation has built and operated at public expense a system of public education extending from kindergarten through the university. No other nation in the world has thus recognized the importance of universal public education or established any such comprehensive system of public schools. The public-school system represents sacrifice, faith, and the idealism of America.

Every generation witnesses a race between ignorance, chaos, and bondage on the one hand and enlightenment, high purpose, and freedom on the other. Eternal vigilance is the price which we must continue to pay for the maintenance of an adequate system of public education.

I confidently believe with all my heart that what the American way of life has already achieved for our people is only a prelude and a promise of what is possible of future achievement; and that it may well be that in the world-wide war in which our Nation is now engaged, our armed forces are fighting not only to preserve the American way of life for America, but are serving a larger purpose, namely, helping to save civilization for the world.

Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a copy of a letter written by Mr. Herschel A. Hollopeter, traffic director of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, on the subject of freight rates:

INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, Ind., November 8, 1943.

Mr. WALTER LECKRONE,
Editor, Indianpolis Times,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. LECKRONE: I was amazed to read in the Saturday, November 6, issue of Washington Calling (a weekly size-up by the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard

newspapers) the item headed "Rate Question May Be Solved." It is short, but so utterly unusual for the customarily factual and nonpartisan Scripps-Howard news columns, that I am quoting it as a basis of what I am going to say:

"Southern Congressmen, fighting for fair freight rates, are being advised to stop pushing legislation to eliminate interterritorial differentials which burden their industry until they see what the I. C. C. does in pending big class rate case. If I. C. C. decision is favorable to South and Southwest, legislation may be unnecessary."

Does the Scripps-Howard staff imply that we have already lost everything for which we have sent our boys to be killed on foreign soil to preserve? Are we already being governed by passions and prejudices instead of by law? I think not. If the I. C. C. decision is favorable or unfavorable to any section of the country, that very definitely will make legislation absolutely necessary. This I. C. C. decision, in a free America, must be based only upon facts and evidence. The I. C. C. has before it 5,490 pages of legal record of oral testimony and more than that many pages of exhibits—written evidence—upon which it must render its decision in this case. Everyone from every section of the country has had every opportunity to submit every pertinent fact he had.

It shocks me to learn that anyone who has enjoyed even a few of the benefits of our American way of life can now threaten, even subtly, that unless the I. C. C. shows favoritism for certain sections, rather than bases its decision on whatever the evidence justifies, it may be necessary to have someone who has not evaluated that evidence tell it what to do about it. That certainly is the most liberal interpretation that can be placed on the natural inference from the statement that "if I. C. C. decision is favorable to South and Southwest, legislation may be unnecessary." No one could say any more plainly that they think if I. C. C. does not favor those sections legislation will become necessary.

The Scripps-Howard item implies that only southern congressmen are fighting for fair freight rates. Certainly congressmen from other sections also are fighting for fair freight rates. I know of many from the North and East who are also fighting for fair freight rates that will be fair to all sections. That is exactly why Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has always carefully scrutinized the character of every member, in its confirmation of his appointment, to see that such men are statesmen and not sectionalists. Therefore, that bureau has established and maintained for over 50 years an unquestioned reputation for being the fairest and most unbiased agency our National Government has ever created.

The gravest implication is that southern congressmen are being advised on this. By whom and why, may I inquire? Does someone claim to know now what the Commission is going to do in this case even before it has attempted to consider and evaluate the evidence It must mean that, because while three of the commissioners heard most if not all of the testimony, the evidence has not yet been submitted to the commissioners, a majority of whom will have to determine what the weight of all the evidence justifies. Does it mean that someone thinks a majority of the members of the Commission will not only weigh the evidence with a definite purpose to find for the contentions of certain interests, but if the evidence will not support such finding, will cast their vote contrary to the weight of the evidence? If the staff knows of such an attempt to thus destroy the bulwarks of our cherished institutions is it not its duty to expose it?

Certainly all that anyone in the North or East asks is that the I. C. C. decision shall be just what the weight of the evidence we have all submitted from all sections justifies. If any party feels it is not what the weight of the evidence justifies, he has ample recourse to court review and the usual processes we have always maintained to secure justice in this country. Certainly our established courts and legal processes for determining and dispensing fairness and justice should not be overturned by procedures that are only responsive to pressures and biased views and ambitions of sectional groups.

And what, may I inquire, other than the mere claim of agitators, is the basis for the reference to differentials "which burden their (the South's) industry"? It is quite obvious to anyone who makes even the briefest attempt to find out, that the South has been progressing much more rapidly, under these so-called differentials, than any other section. We do not deplore that—we desire it to progress as rapidly as possible—but it needs not, nor is it entitled to, favoritism. Another fact, just as obvious, is that as many specific instances of rates lower in the South than in the North exist as have been propagandized by the agitators of this sectional strife showing reverse conditions. These facts are all before the Commission for judicial determination. May we not leave them there to be determined without attempted outside influence or pressure?

And finally may I humbly recommend for your guidance the position taken by our Governor, the Honorable Henry F. Schricker of Indiana, on page 5088 of the record in this "pending big class rate case." I quote:

"I assume that the Governor of any State has so many weighty problems of government pressing for his time that it is impossible for him to arrive at any unbiased or judicial determination of all the varied and complex technical angles of freight rates as they are involved here. * * * the people of Indiana desire, in this controversy, only complete fairness and justice based on all the facts and conditions that are involved or have a proper bearing on this freight-rate problem. Desiring that for ourselves, we just as ardently desire to see exactly the same fairness and justice given to the people of each and every other State and section of the country. * * * I think that we should all rely explicitly on the fairness and integrity of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the orderly processes through which we have always obtained justice in this country rather than to attempt to stir up passions and prejudices, in the various sections of the country, on a question that is so technical and involved that it is impossible for the layman to grasp the significance of the various parts thereof and consequently unable to reach a fair conclusion."

Cordially yours,

HERSCHEL A. HOLLOPETER,
Traffic Director.

Man's Inhumanity to Man Makes Countless Thousands Mourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 1, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in looking back over the long and tortuous road that humanity has trod in our progress toward civilization, we are appalled at the anguish and misery that have attended human advancement.

At this time when a terrible conflict is raging throughout the world, many thoughtful people are devoting their time and attention in an effort to devise some plan and establish some order that will save humanity from the terrible scourge of war in the future.

There is inserted herewith a letter from a California pioneer calling attention to the futility of war and making a plea for civilization, which I commend to the consideration of thoughtful people everywhere:

HEADED FOR THE JUNGLE

EDITOR PRESS AND ENTERPRISE:

A recent issue of the Press contained a picture called murder in the zoo, which depicted a polar bear that had so severely wounded its mate that it lay gasping for breath, which the aggressor precluded by dragging the helpless victim to a pool of water and holding its head under.

Shocking brutality of bears. But the humiliating thing is that the human breed is no better. In fact under national authority humans are now using and expanding to world proportions a system of mass murder, starvation, and torture that beats the bears for brutality.

Certain it is that so long as war continues to be the most important thing in national life, civilization has not bettered the animal way, and certain it is also that the present trend to use brute force as the final arbiter between nations will end in world chaos unless the people speedily come to see that a world court and a world police force operating under a code of international law is even more necessary to civilization than municipal courts and municipal peace officers. The need for such is seen when it is realized that the principal nations of the world, including our own, are inevitably being drawn into a brutal animal conflict, and there is now no power on earth to prevent it. Even if we should miraculously escape the actual fighting, we would have to stand by and see the people of other nations fight to a finish, with those few left alive having nothing left to live for, and our own condition but little better. The human feeling that cannot stand to see two dogs fight should be moved to find a way to prevent millions of humans from killing and crippling each other.

That efforts to this end heretofore have not succeeded is no reason to quit trying. Few inventions of value were ever made without continued and patient effort. Whether it was wise or otherwise to scrap the Wilson League of Nation's model is not the question now. The question is, Must the world march down the bloody road to jungle town to the very end without making an honest effort to find the road to a peace that can endure?

If our political leaders cannot or will not find the way out of endless war, depression, and animal ways of living, our inventors should be drafted to solve the problem. The brains that could build machines to fly better than birds, boats to swim under water as well as fishes, harness the lightning, and draw music and speech from the air, can devise a way to prevent their inventions from being used to destroy the world, instead of benefit it. And as human lives and happiness is more important than machine, drafting brains for this purpose would make it unnecessary to continue drafting bodies for death.

W. B. EDWARDS,
Blythe, Calif.

My peace plan follows:

CONGRESSMAN WHITE'S PLAN FOR A NEW WORLD ORDER

NO SUPERGOVERNMENT AND THE RETENTION OF COMPLETE SOVEREIGNTY OF EVERY NATION

Establish a world court to be composed of proportionate representatives of the several nations, with an international world commission with power to settle international grievances and prevent aggression and invasion of any nation, implemented with an international army and navy, each country to have proportionate representation on the commission and supply a relative quota of the policing force.

The personnel composing the policing force not to be permitted to serve in the country of which they are nationals.

The commission to maintain freedom of the air and seas with universal disarmament.

No nation to be permitted to maintain a navy or armed force above its domestic policing requirements.

All international disputes to be settled by the commission under the rules of judicial procedure with right of appeal to the world court, whose decision shall be final and enforced by the international commission.

Law by Press Release

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, administrative lawmaking, by piling Executive order and directive upon Executive order and directive, and multitudinous administrative rules and regulations upon multitudinous rules and regulations, followed by decisions and rulings upon the rules and regulations is bad enough, but now we come down to making law by press release. Perhaps the next thing will be amendments to press releases and rulings and decisions upon amendments to press releases, or does this correspondence sum up to just that?

If it were permissible and if I were a cussing man, I would enjoy injecting a bluish tinge into the staid atmosphere surrounding this august body this morning, for I hold in my hand a letter signed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which states unmistakably that the Treasury has given the force of law to a press release. What is the matter with first amending the regulation, publishing same in the Federal Register, and then telling the people about it in a press release. The published amendment has the force of law, not the press release.

I wish that I could express myself adequately and in full. Listen to this quotation from the Treasury Department:

By press release dated November 14, 1943, employers were granted authority to make certain bonus payments without prior approval, which were not so specified in the regulations, T. D. 5295.

Mr. Speaker, the correspondence, which I defy anyone outside the Treasury to comprehend without most careful study, is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 8, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: Reference is made to your letter dated December 1, 1943, with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Paul V. Kirsh, Los Angeles 24, Calif., relative to the salary stabilization regulations, T. D. 5295, and the press release dated November 14, 1943, with respect to bonuses.

This office recently received from Mr. Kirsh a duplicate of the letter sent to you, and a reply was made thereto on December 3, 1943, copy of which is enclosed herewith.

Mr. Kirsh's letter is returned herewith, together with a copy of this letter.

If further correspondence relative to this matter is necessary, please refer to SSU:WAG.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. HANNEGAN,
Commissioner.

NOVEMBER 22, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW.

DEAR SIR: I have just been informed of the new directive issued by the collector of internal revenue regarding bonuses payable. This directive in general will revert back to a 1941 basis with a possible maximum allowable payment of 15 percent as against 1941 bonuses.

This directive is not fair in any way, as I feel that it is issued in a very discriminate way. You well know that all salesmen's commissions were put back on the 1943 basis.

No. 1. It has been department stores' practice for at least 50 years to pay a bonus, which is a part of our earnings. My base salary is not as much as my bonus.

No. 2. This directive should not come at the end of a fiscal year, so that is not fair in any way, and is strictly satisfying some selfish interest. Also, I feel that dating it back to 1941 is very wrong.

No. 3. We have subnormal years as well as abnormal years, and in the subnormal years we received no bonus or extra compensation, as from 1930 through 1937.

No. 4. I have worked very hard for what money I have earned, buying War bonds, and paying a very high income tax, which is our way of helping the war effort. Also, I have contributed materially in getting merchandise to this vital war area, and I do not feel that I should be penalized at this time for something that certainly will not help the war effort in any way.

No. 5. This directive, while it comes under a false heading of war effort, was not passed by the people who represent us, the Congress of the United States, and this is supposed to be a free country, by the people, for the people, and of the people. Such things as this should never happen. It would kill all the incentive a person has to work hard and get proper renumeration after 30 years in my respective business.

No. 6. I have a written contract with my employer, dating back to 1940, and this should be considered legal, and not completely voided by the directive issued, as this directive states.

No. 7. I have a family of three children, and we had planned on using the money earned through my bonus, to build a new home, and with this directive, it would severely alter my plans for my entire future.

No. 8. I am sending this letter to you stating facts of the case, so that you may use your good office at once to help me, as well as many others who will write you.

Your prompt attention in this matter will be greatly appreciated, and I sincerely believe that this is a grave injustice to those who will be affected by this new Treasury directive.

Thanking you for your efforts, I am,

Respectfully yours,

PAUL V. KIRSH,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DECEMBER 3, 1943.

Mr. PAUL V. KIRSH,
Los Angeles, Calif.

SIR: Reference is made to your letter dated November 20, 1943, relative to the salary stabilization regulations, T. D. 5295, and the press release dated November 14, 1943, with respect to bonuses.

You state that under these regulations the maximum additional bonus allowable in any year over that paid in 1941 is 15 percent; that it is unfair that this directive should be issued at the end of the year; that you should not be penalized for something that will not help the war effort, and that you should be permitted to receive any amount of compensation payable under the terms of the contract entered into with your employer, irrespective of the amount. You also indicate that in your opinion the regulation is not legal.

It is believed that you have misinterpreted the effect of this regulation and release, especially with respect to the 15-percent limitation referred to in your letter. It is suggested that you read the press release dated November 14, 1943, copy of which is enclosed. You will note from this release that bonuses may be paid on several different bases without prior approval other than the one referred to in your letter.

Under section 1002.14 of the original Salary Stabilization Regulations, T. D. 5186, promulgated on December 2, 1942, bonuses or other forms of additional compensation which exceeded the amount of the bonuses or other additional compensation paid to employees for the employer's last bonus-year ending before October 3, 1942, required approval. It is apparent that employers understood this provision of the regulations due to the fact that applications for approval of the bonus payments that employers desired to make in 1942 were filed with the appropriate offices of the salary stabilization unit. Rulings granted in these cases were not considered as rulings for any period or year other than the year 1942, the year for which the application was filed. Furthermore, in most cases the ruling letters contained a paragraph which specifically stated the ruling was limited to the year 1942.

The regulations, T. D. 5295, promulgated September 4, 1943, do not change the requirements of T. D. 5186 with respect to bonus payments of this nature. All bonus payments based upon percentages of profits, percentages of sales, and on other bases required approval under T. D. 5186, and require approval under T. D. 5295 if the dollar amount to each employee exceeds the dollar amount paid to such employee for the employer's last accounting year ending prior to October 3, 1942.

By press release dated November 14, 1943, employers were granted authority to make certain bonus payments without prior approval, which were not so specified in the regulations, T. D. 5295. Any bonuses which exceed the dollar amounts provided for in this release require specific approval.

It should also be borne in mind that the limitations of the regulations in the bonus section of the regulations and in the press release, do not prohibit the payment of bonuses in amounts different from those outlined therein. However, in those cases where the amounts exceed the amounts

which may be paid without approval, it is necessary that the employer file proper application with the appropriate regional office of the Salary Stabilization Unit for approval thereof.

With respect to the legality of the regulations, your attention is directed to the fact that Congress, by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong., 2d sess.) authorized and directed the President to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living. The pertinent provisions of that act are quoted below:

"Be it enacted, etc., That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities; * * *."

Pursuant to the above act of Congress, the President issued Executive Order 9250 under date of October 3, 1942, outlining the policies to be followed in administering this act and delegating authority to the several agencies charged therewith.

Under authority of the Executive order, regulations were promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Director which were approved by the President on October 27, 1942. Under this regulation, the term "salary" is defined under section 4001.1 (e) as follows:

"The term 'salary' or 'salary payments' means all forms of direct or indirect compensation which is computed on a weekly, monthly, annual, or other comparable basis, except a wage basis, for personal services of an employee irrespective of when rendered, including bonuses, additional compensation, gifts, loans, commissions, fees, and any other remuneration in any form or medium whatsoever (excluding insurance and pension benefits in a reasonable amount)."

Since commissions and bonuses are specifically included in the definition of the term "salary" or "salary payments", under the provisions of the regulations of the Economic Stabilization Director, commissions and bonuses are held to be subject to the same rules and regulations as any other form of compensation.

Your attention is also directed to the fact that the matter of contracts as affecting salary adjustments has been considered by Congress. When this act was before Congress, the following amendment to section 4 thereof was offered but rejected:

"(b) Nothing in this joint resolution shall prohibit the payment by any employer, or the acceptance by any employee, of (1) any wages or salaries provided for in any contract entered into in good faith in the ordinary course of business prior to September 15, 1942, or (2) any wages or salaries provided for by the terms of any option, renewal, or extension provision contained in such contract; except that adjustments may be made by the President with respect to any such wages or salaries to the same extent that adjustments may be made by him with respect to wages and salaries in other cases under this joint resolution."

It appears clearly from the debate that the act of October 2, 1942 was intended to prohibit salary increases provided for in written agreements entered into in good faith prior to October 2, 1942, unless such increases could be approved on other grounds. The act directs the stabilization of wages so far as practicable on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

Respectfully,

A. D. BURFORD,
Deputy Commissioner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, *October 7, 1943.*

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Guy T. Helvering today granted employers approval to pay, without formal application, any commissions due to employees for September or October, in all cases in which neither the rate of commission nor the amount of any other compensation has been increased since October 2, 1942.

Except in cases where there has been an increase in the rate of commission or in the amount of any other compensation—such as base salary—Mr. Helvering has, in effect, authorized for the 2 months payment of commissions on the same basis permitted earlier in the year.

The approval was granted under revised salary stabilization regulations issued September 4, 1943, which required approval before the payment of commissions exceeding in dollar amount the payments in the last accounting year prior to October 3, 1942.

The salary stabilization unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has under consideration future policy regarding the stabilization of commissions, bonuses and similar forms of compensation. These problems have been discussed in the unit this week with representative employers. A further statement to the public on these matters will be made as soon as practicable.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON, *October 30, 1943.*

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Robert E. Hannegan announced today that employers may pay to employees any commissions earned on their own individual sales during the calendar year 1943, provided the rate of commission and the amount of any other compensation has not been increased since October 2, 1942.

In making this statement, the Commissioner extended for the rest of this year a statement of approval for similar commissions earned during September and October which was issued on October 7 by former Commissioner Guy T. Helvering. The extension includes payments which, in the normal course of business, may be made subsequent to December 31, 1943, on account of commissions earned during 1943.

The approval which Commissioner Hannegan extended does not apply to overriding commissions such as commissions to an employee which are based on the sales of other employees. This type of commission also may be paid without approval if authorized by regulations issued September 4, 1943.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 14, 1943.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Robert E. Hannegan today issued more comprehensive rules to guide employers in determining what bonus payments may be made to employees under his jurisdiction without formal application for approval under the salary stabilization program.

Subject to certain limitations, the general effect of today's statement is to enable employers to pay bonuses without obtaining prior approval if the bonuses do not exceed amounts paid in the 1941–42 period.

The bonus statement includes payments based on percentages of profits, percentages of salaries, percentages of sales by other employees (commonly called overriding commissions) and similar percentage payments, but does not include ordinary commission payments to salesmen based on their own individual sales. In the case of commission payments to salesmen based on their own individual sales, Commissioner Hannegan has previously granted approval for the payment of any commissions earned through December 31, 1943, provided that the rate of commission and the amount of any other compensation has not been increased since October 2, 1942.

While today's statement outlined the conditions under which bonus payments may be made without prior approval, Commissioner Hannegan explained that other types of bonuses may also be paid if submitted to him for approval and receive his approval. The purpose of the statement is to advise employers that no application for approval is necessary to pay bonuses for the bonus year 1943 or subsequent years if such bonuses meet any one of the following conditions:

1. If the employee's base salary has not been increased since October 3, 1942 (in the case of salaries of more than $5,000 per annum) or October 27, 1942 (in the case of salaries of $5,000 or less per annum), as the case may be, he may be paid a bonus which does not exceed the higher of the following amounts:

(a) The dollar amount paid for the employer's last accounting year ended prior to October 3, 1942, or (b) the dollar amount of a bonus authorized under the salary stabilization regulations for the employer's first accounting year ending after October 3, 1942, provided the bonus does not exceed 50 percent of the base salary.

2. If the employee's base salary has been increased since October 3, 1942, or October 27, 1942, as the case may be, he may be paid a bonus not to exceed the same dollar amount of bonus paid him for the employer's first accounting year ending after October 3, 1942, provided the bonus does not exceed 20 percent of his present base salary.

3. If the employee has been paid regularly, in accordance with an established policy of the employer, a bonus based on a percentage of base salary, such bonus payment may be made, regardless of dollar amount, provided the percentage has not been changed since October 3, 1942, or October 27, 1942, as the case may be.

4. An employee may also be paid a bonus which, together with all other compensation for personal services, does not increase his total compensation for the current year over the total earned in the calendar year 1941 by more than (a) 15 percent if the total compensation for the year 1941 was $2,400 or less, (b) 10 percent if the total compensation for the year 1941 was over $2,400 but not over $4,000, (c) 5 percent if the total compensation for the year 1941 was over $4,000 but not over $7,500.

Base salary for purposes of this statement means salary exclusive of bonuses and other forms of additional compensation.

Mr. Speaker, please note, first, that the President has "defined" salaries to include commissions and bonuses, which is making law by Executive definition; and, secondly, that because an unnamed branch of the Congress turned down a certain amendment to a certain bill the Treasury assumes that the Congress intended to prohibit the carrying out of certain written agreements between our citizens that had been entered into by them in good faith, and therefore the Treasury is warranted in throwing bona fide agreements of that kind into the ashcan. If that is not negative administrative law—you name it.

Roll-Back Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of today which has to do with holding the line in regard to roll-back subsidies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLDING THE LINE

Under our system of divided powers, Congress can prevent the President from doing as he wishes but cannot make him do what it wishes. The President, on his side, can block the wishes of Congress but cannot force it to act in accordance with his own. The result of this situation, as Bryce pointed out more than a half century ago, is that the Nation does not know "how or where to fix responsibility for misfeasance or neglect," and that "no one acts under the full sense of direct accountability." Under the strains of total war and of Government control unparalleled in our history, the dilemmas with which this situation presents us become incomparably graver than in the past.

We are confronted with such a dilemma today on the issue of subsidies and inflation. Speaking for the administration, James F. Byrnes, the War Mobilization Director, has in effect said that if Congress does not accept the main proposals of the administration, both on taxes and on subsidies, then Congress and not the administration must be held responsible for the ensuing inflation.

Now to decide the precise share of responsibility of Congress and the President for the inflationary situation with which we are threatened would not be an easy task. Neither has made a correct public diagnosis. Neither has had the political courage seriously to try to put into effect the proper remedies. The administration has, it is true, proposed a drastic increase in taxes. But it has refused to accept the only tax that could really reach the mass of the country's income at this time—a general sales tax. Congress would undoubtedly pass such a tax if asked to do so by the administration. But individual Congressmen are afraid to endorse such a tax as long as they feel, not only that it would be vetoed, but that the administration would then accuse them of "trying to raise the poor man's cost of living."

The administration has proposed that the cost of living be held down by the payment of a flat roll-back subsidy to processors or producers. There would be more persuasive argument for limited subsidies of this kind if the administration could show that it had tied in wages closely with the cost of living and that the only alternative to such subsidies was in fact a general wage increase. But unfortunately nothing in the administration's policies warrants such a claim. Between August 1939 and August of this year, according to the Government's own statistics, the cost of living has increased 25 percent, while average hourly earnings in manufacturing industries have increased 51 percent and average weekly earnings have increased 76 percent. The War Labor Board has repeatedly broken its own Little Steel formula, but, even if it had not, the formula itself is so elastic and full of loopholes in its method of application as to allow all sorts of inflationary wage increases.

To pay flat roll-back subsidies, not instead of, but in addition to, the industrial wage increases that have already taken place and that are likely, under present "stabilization" formulas, to take place in future is to risk compounding the evils of inflation. The whole Nation cannot subsidize itself. True, we can for a short time conceal the chief symptom of inflation—a rising cost of living—by pouring in Government subsidies. But we can do so only at the cost of building up a greater inflation in the end. For roll-back subsidies are merely the reverse of taxation, especially of sales taxes. They put more excess spending power into the hands of the population. They encourage the consumption of scarce goods in wartime, leave less of such goods to go around and increase the necessary area of rationing.

In sum, certain kinds of subsidies can play a useful temporary role in a controlled economy provided they are limited and are merely supplementary and subordinate to other types of controls. There is still time for a constructive program of this kind. But to attempt to use roll-back subsidies to offset the natural consequences of a loose fiscal policy and a loose wage policy would be to court great danger.

As a Bar to Higher Prices and Inflation, Consumer Subsidies Are a Fake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk about consumer subsidies, there has been little discussion of the natural laws involved. Those favoring these subsidies claim that consumer subsidies will prevent inflation by holding down prices. Those opposing subsidies claim that abolishing consumer subsidies will prevent inflation by stopping that drain on the Treasury and removing excess purchasing power through consumer purchases unswollen by Federal contributions.

Let us study the cause of higher prices. Suppose A and B have potatoes for sale, and C and D want to buy potatoes. If potatoes are plentiful generally, C and D can buy from sellers A and B the needed potatoes at a reasonable price, despite the fact that C and D have plenty of money to pay more if it were necessary. But if potatoes are scarce, A and B will hold out for a higher price. Then as long as C and D each have plenty of money, they will bid against each other to obtain the potatoes, and the price will rise. The spiral of higher prices has begun.

How can the price rise be stopped effectively? By Government order? Not unless a Gestapo is used, because both seller and buyer will contrive to evade the order. One way to stop a higher price for potatoes is to increase the supply of potatoes. That is obvious.

A second way to stop a price rise in potatoes is to remove from C and D's pocketbooks the abundant funds with which they are bidding up the price of potatoes. Obviously if neither has more than 75 cents which he is willing to spend for a peck of potatoes, that price will become the market price. There can be no sustained price rise if buyers generally will not pay the advanced price. That is natural law.

Consumer subsidies attempt to defy these natural laws. First, they discourage increased production. Ask a farmer whether he favors a plan whereby he will be taxed so that the Government refunds to a war worker with a swollen income 5 cents a pound on the war worker's butter purchase. The farmers are violently opposed to this scheme, both in its principle and in its plan of operation. So consumer subsidies block increased production.

Second, consumer subsidies actually increase the money in the pockets of buyers C and D. Instead of being restrained by limited funds, subsidies operate to provide C and D more money to bid prices up, either in the legitimate market or the black market.

There are only three genuine methods of stopping higher prices and inflation, as follows:

First. Lowered incomes for people generally—pay cuts.

Second. Taxes which take more of people's income.

Third. Increased production.

Any plan to combat inflation not based on one or more of these methods is a fake. I will show why, and I challenge any administration expert, from Byrnes on down, to produce an effective program which does not use one of these three principles.

Look them over carefully. Number 1 is both impractical and currently impossible. Number 2 is difficult, as demonstrated by administration opposition to a sales tax and the congressional tax bill. Number 3, increased production, is the solution to this problem that is both possible and practical.

Beyond this immediate problem, however, the long-range difficulties facing America in the monetary field remain unchanged. Consider this fact—every disastrous inflation in history has resulted from one basic and fundamental cause, large-scale deficit financing by the Government over an extended period. Until America faces that fact realistically, the deterioration and dilution in the purchasing power of our currency must continue.

The 1932 Democratic platform contained this pledge: A sound currency to be preserved at all hazards. It is time for the President to make some substantial effort to carry out that pledge. Freedom cannot flourish in an economy where the currency has lost its value as a medium of exchange. That value is the base of both civilization and liberty.

Shall We Saddle Our Soldiers, Sailors, Children, and Grandchildren With Our Food and Clothing Bills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, for months I have been showered with telegrams and letters by an idle bachelor bureaucrat who is constantly beating his breast, pulling his hair, and wailing that I should vote billions of dollars in subsidies to help feed and clothe him. He is on a bigger Federal salary than he could get from any private employer and time hangs heavy on his hands. I have used more shot on him than I ordinarily fire at a pewee.

The proposal, however, that this Government pay billions of dollars it does not have on the food and clothing bills of those who are able to pay for their own grub and clothes is a big question. Those who are asking for billions to pay the living expenses of the rich and the prosperous are saying this:

"We have the money to pay our grocery bills and to buy our raiment—but instead of paying today's cost of living with money we now have—we want the Government to borrow billions of dollars and use it to pay the grocery bills and clothing bills of the Rockefellers, Henry Ford—and the millions of other American citizens who have more money than they ever had before."

Below is my answer to the latest effusions of Mr. Norman G. Moore, a sojourner among my people:

DECEMBER 3, 1943.

MR. NORMAN G. MOORE,
Knoxville, Tenn.

MY DEAR MR. MOORE: I received your telegram of November 22, in which you urge, to use your own language, that I "support price control by voting necessary funds for operation and enforcement of subsidies on food and consumer goods."

I also received a letter from Carolyn Finkelstein in which she uses this language:

"I demand you vote for the Commodity Credit Corporation bill without the ban on subsidies."

Who is Carolyn Finkelstein, and where did she come from that she "demands" that I vote according to her dictation on any matter?

I also have another telegram from Mr. and Mrs. O. Falkovich, urging that I "vote against the anti-subsidy bill."

I also received your letter of November 29 in which you state that my vote against subsidies has "lent support to the selfish farm and commercial interests of this country that want all price control eliminated so that they may push prices to the ultimate limit in order that profits may be correspondingly high. For their own reasons, they want inflation; they don't want subsidies because they know that they stand to gain more by forcing a general price advance."

There is not a word of truth in these statements of yours. The farmers of this country are patriotic. But few of them are making any money. The farmers of this country and the men and women engaged in commercial enterprise are not opposed to price control. They do not wish to push prices to the ultimate limit in order that they make excessive profits. Neither the businessmen nor the farmers of this country want inflation.

Under our present tax system it is not possible for anyone to make excessive profits. And the inflation which the bungling of the New Deal has brought about, if it is increased by the spending of billions of dollars which we do not have for subsidies for everyone, would ruin the farmers and the commercial interests of this country along with everyone else.

If we have inflation it is due to the wasteful extravagant policies of this administration for the past 11 years.

I know that you are a consumer but I did not know that you are plural and that you constitute a "consumers council." I am informed that you are a bachelor, and are an employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I also know that the Tennessee Valley Authority pays its employees good salaries. I also know that you are not a producer.

According to the figures and record put out by the officials of the New Deal wages of most of the employees of this country have advanced more than has the cost of living during the past year.

According to these figures furnished by New Deal agencies in January 1943 the weekly earnings of industrial workers had increased 42.3 percent and the cost of living in that month increased 19.7 percent. In February the weekly earnings of industrial workers increased 43.3 percent and the cost of living had increased 20 percent. In March weekly earnings had increased 44.7 percent and the cost of living increased 21.8 percent. In April weekly earnings had increased 47.1 percent and the cost of living had increased 23.1 percent. In May weekly earnings had increased 50 percent and the cost of living had increased 24.1 percent. In June weekly earnings had increased 50.8 percent and the cost of living had increased 23.8 percent. And in July the weekly earnings had increased 50.6 percent and the increase in the cost of living was 22.8 percent. And in August, without any decrease in weekly earnings, the increase in the cost of living was 22.2 percent. These figures are furnished by the United States Department of Commerce. The Little Steel formula allowed for an increase in wages of 15 percent to take care of the increase in living from January 1, 1941 to September 15, 1942. Actually, average weekly earnings increased 37 percent compared with an increase of about 17 percent in the cost of living.

In the face of these facts you are insisting that part of the cost of your food and clothing, and the cost of the food and clothing of the Rockefellers, Henry Ford, and the other thousands of millionaires of this country, and the tens of thousands of men and women worth more than $100,000, be passed on to the men in our armed forces who are fighting and dying all over the world for $50 per month. You make this request of your Government to help pay your food and clothing bill, although you are drawing a salary of more than $2,000 per year. You, as a grown man and a bachelor, are making the insistence that a part of the cost of your living be saddled as a debt on the children and grandchildren of those who are not asking to be put on a W. P. A. program. Your false and libelous statement that the "selfish farm and commercial interests of this country want all price control eliminated so that they may push prices to the ultimate limit in order that profits may be correspondingly high" is untrue and without any foundation whatever. The businessmen and the farmers of this Nation are endowed with common sense. They are patriotic and devoted to the welfare of their country. Not one of them desires inflation. And not one of them, under present conditions, can profit by inflation. They have sense enough to know that it's better to pay their grocery bill and their clothing bill with money they now have than to pay it later in taxes with interest.

The great majority of the people of this country, businessmen, laborers, and farmers and their families, are making a magnificent and patriotic contribution to the war effort. And the overwhelming majority of them are not asking that our fighting forces and our children and grandchildren pay for their food and clothing. And you should be ashamed of yourself for asking for such a dole at a time like this, or at any time for that matter. It is the business of the people of this country to support the Government. It is not the business of the Government to support the people.

The farmers of this Nation, and especially the farmers of my section of the State of Tennessee, are not making profits out of the war. Their farms have been stripped of manpower through the operation of the Selective Service Act. And they are unable to compete with the high wages paid in war industries. The farmers of the Second District of Tennessee, their wives and children are working from before daylight until after dark in order to produce the food necessary to win this war.

We cannot win this war without the food and the fiber produced by our farmers. Many of them are losing money and many of them have been forced out of business.

I now favor and have always favored high-living standards for our people.

I now favor and have always favored such increase in wages and salaries as is necessary to bring this about.

I now favor and have always favored a fair return to those engaged in business in order that they may be able to pay good salaries and good wages and make a fair return on their investment and the personal effort that they put into their business and its management.

From the Second District, as of October 31, 1943, there were 34,326 young men in the armed forces of this Nation. Many of them have already given their lives for their country; others have been wounded in action; others have been captured by the enemy; others are missing in action. Throughout this district many of the stars on the service flags in the homes of our people have turned to gold, representing a boy who has given his life in defense of his country. Your attack upon these brave people is malign, vicious, cowardly, reprehensible, false, and a reproach to the man who makes it. The House of Representatives, without regard to party lines, voted against your proposition that the Government pay your grocery bill and buy your clothes by a vote of 278 to 117. This was an issue in the November 2, 1943, elections in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Kentucky. In those States people with your point of view and your un-American philosophy of life and government were overwhelmingly defeated by the red-blooded Americans of those States.

And on Tuesday, the 30th day of November, in the Fourth Kentucky District that has been consistently Democratic by overwhelming majorities ranging as high as more than 16,000 votes, elected a Republican over his Democratic opponent by a majority of 12,593 votes. The American people are awake. They are aroused. They are determined to preserve free enterprise in this country, individual initiative, and to save this Nation as a solvent nation of free men and free women. You ask in your letter what I propose to do about your request that I vote to have the taxpayers of this Nation borrow money and buy your clothes and pay for your food.

I propose to continue to work and vote to preserve the solvency of this country to the end that those who are buying its bonds may be paid the principal of these bonds together with the interest thereon in money

worth 100 cents on the dollar. I propose to work and fight against the inflation you advocate asking this Government to borrow money with which to clothe and feed you.

In the consideration of the measure you asked me to vote against these undisputed facts were developed:

1. The income of the American people for this year will be approximately $150,000,000,000—greater than it ever was before.

2. The debt of our Government is now more than $169,000,000,000. It will go to more than $300,000,000,000 before the war is won. The total assessed valuation of all property in this country is only $300,000,000,000.

3. Federal taxation is now higher than it ever was before. The Federal Government this year will take from its people more than $43,000,000,000 in taxes. The Government does not have the money to pay billions of dollars on the clothing and food bills of men like yourself and the millionaires and the wealthy of this country. There is not even a proposal to raise this money by taxation. It can only be obtained by the sale of bonds. And a billion dollars in bonds, before they are finally paid with interest, will amount to three times that sum.

4. The Government is asking its people to buy billions of dollars of its bonds. Those who buy them must be paid the principal and interest thereon.

5. There is no warrant whatever for the assertion that the further expenditure of borrowed money to pay the food and clothing bill of men like yourself will prevent inflation. Such action is inflationary. There is in this country today from fifty to sixty billion dollars of so-called dangerous money in the hands of the American people. The scarcity of consumer goods and this large amount of money is what causes inflation. To borrow money to pay for your food and your clothing will further contribute to the disaster of inflation. The subsidy that you are asking the Government to pay for your food and clothing is unjustified. It applies to the rich and the poor alike.

6. It is estimated by those in favor of this billion-dollar beginning of subsidies that each individual in the country would benefit from 1½ to 3 cents per day; that the total benefit to each individual in the country would amount to $6.32 per year. So that, if you wish to buy a Coca-Cola, you would have to wait from 2 to 4 days before you would have enough to buy a bottle. If you wish to buy a hamburger, you would have to wait from 3 to 6 days before your subsidy equaled the price of one. The truth of it is, your proposition does not arise to the dignity of respectable nonsense. There are thousands of underpaid people in this country—the so-called white-collar group, school teachers, policemen, firemen, and others working for abnormally low wages and salaries that have not kept pace with the advancing wages. The only fair remedy for them is to increase their pay. Your proposition is but the beginning of an inflation spiral that will bring to this country an inflation which wrecked the currency and the economy of Germany after the First World War.

There is not a single instance in history where a food subsidy has worked out to the good of the people who thought they were getting something for nothing.

If necessary, to help those in the lower income brackets, I will support a measure designed solely to help them. I will not vote to bankrupt this country for the benefit of those who do not need it.

There are 1,000,000 unnecessary bureaucrats, many of them parlor pinks and many of them outright reds, now on the Federal pay roll. They should be discharged and put to work producing food or at some other productive industry. Millions of tons of food have spoiled in this Nation through the bungling and inefficiency of this administration. I intend to work and vote to discontinue squandering of billions of dollars of our people's substance in South America and throughout the world. I intend to work and vote in favor of waging this war to a complete and overwhelming victory as quickly as possible, at the least possible cost in blood and treasure. And I am in favor, within constitutional limitations, of this Nation joining hands with its allies in the establishment and in the enforcement, by force if necessary, of a just and enduring peace.

Yours very truly,

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.

The Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

STATES' RIGHTS PREVAIL

If there was any doubt that the Lucas-Green soldier vote bill was anything but a New Deal device to corral a lot of votes, it was quickly dissipated by the quality of the effort made by New Deal stalwarts to get it written into the law. They didn't have the interests of those in service at heart. They were after votes wherever they could get them, and they evidently saw opportunity to get some they had never had before.

Fortunately for the American electorate and for sectional peace and good order, the device was recognized by a majority of the Senate for what it was, and the bill was thrown out. In substitute, the senior House passed the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan bill which leaves the handling of service ballots to the individual States. The Lucas-Green bill would have created a Federal commission which, once it had gone into operation, would have tossed the principle of States' rights out the window.

Substitution of the bill by the Midsouth group avoids legal disputes which might well have created chaos after next year's presidential election. The Lucas bill was so palpably unconstitutional that it is doubtful that even the New Deal-inclined Supreme Court would have upheld it. Actually it was a Federal political effort to seize control of election machinery.

Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, will spearhead what is hoped will be a successful effort to pass the substitute measure in the House, and is doing the same yeoman service for constitutional elections there, as Senators MCKELLAR, EASTLAND, and MCCLELLAN did in the upper chamber.

Incidentally, the Senate vote contained an implied warning for those sponsoring the pending and bogus anti-poll-tax measure, action on which has been delayed until after the holidays. If its sponsors then press for a fight, they are going to get one from the southern group and others favoring constitutional government. The vote on the ballot bill proved that opponents of the anti-poll-tax measure have the strength to defeat that parliamentary trick known as cloture, without whose imposition the anti-poll-tax measure is already doomed.

In opposing administration wishes as to the service ballot bill, the southerners and their friends flew in the face of whatever may be the New Deal's providence, but their stature in the eyes of their constituents and of Constitution-minded Americans has increased immeasurably.

Resolution of Los Angeles County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Los Angeles County Council:

Whereas the first flags adopted by our forefathers were symbolic of their struggles with the wilderness of a new land; and

Whereas the first flag to have any resemblance to the present Old Glory was first flown by the Colonial Fleet in December 1775; and

Whereas for more than eightscore years it has been the banner of hope and freedom for generations after generations of Americans; and

Whereas there is now a committee afoot dedicated to giving us a new banner in place of our beloved flag; and

Whereas Congress on June 14, 1777, adopted a resolution giving official recognition to Old Glory, thus creating its first birthday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we protest all activities of any committee, person, or group of persons, intended to propose any change in the American flag or substituting for it some other flag of different design; and

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, with our commendation for his action in the Congress on this subject; and

Resolved, That copies also be sent to the Los Angeles County Members of this Congress, soliciting their support to protest and prevent any change in our present flag.

By this Los Angeles County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of the United States, on this twenty-second day of October 1943 A. D.

By command:

CECIL A. NORTON,
Commander.

Official:

H. L. HAVERLEY,
Quartermaster-Adjutant.

Radio Broadcast by Hon. Thomas J. Curran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Thomas J. Curran, chairman of the New York Republican County Committee, on station WNYC, Sunday, November 21, in which Mr. Curran continues his answers to the political broadcast of Mayor LaGuardia,

made on November 7, over this same station:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. On Sunday, November 7, Mayor LaGuardia made certain charges against the Republican Party in his broadcast over this station. I demanded an opportunity to refute those charges. While the Mayor was shadowboxing before replying to my request, Station WHN offered me time to answer the accusations. I accepted the offer of that station and replied factually to most of the charges last Monday night over WHN.

Last Sunday, acquiescing in a suggestion made by Chairman Fly, of the Federal Communications Commission, the Mayor announced that I would be afforded an opportunity to use the facilities of this station today if I so desired. I am not here to answer those charges which time did not permit me to respond to last Monday evening over Station WHN.

The broad accusation was made by the Mayor on November 7 that the Republican Party was responsible for the election of Aurelio. I assume the Mayor charges the Republican Party with that responsibility because, first, the Republican Party failed to endorse or to support Matthew Levy, the candidate of the American Labor Party; and second, because the Republican Party affirmatively supported the independent candidacy of George Frankenthaler.

Why didn't the Republican Party support Matthew Levy? The Republican Party did not support Levy for the reason that we believed him unqualified, because of his praise of George Browne given at a convention of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Operators of the United States and Canada. This praise was given at a convention of that said organization held in January 1940. I now quote what Mr. Levy said of Mr. Browne:

"The growth of your organization is a living monument to the organizational genius of your international and district officers, executive board, and members, under the leadership of modest, earnest, effective, devoted George Browne."

Now, at the time of this convention, Willie Bioff, Browne's associate, was a convicted pander, and both Bioff and Browne had been charged publicly, and by at least one national newspaper syndicate for a period of over a year, of vicious labor racketeering. No matter what any other group might think, this praise of Browne was sufficient to render it impossible for the Republican Party to support Mr. Levy.

On the other hand, what is the background of George Frankenthaler, the man we nominated?

George Frankenthaler is a lawyer of the highest character and integrity. In 1903, at the age of 16, he was graduated with honors from City College, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He graduated from Columbia Law School in 1907, and was admitted to the bar the same year. Since then he has been engaged in the practice of law, his professional attainments and ethics winning him universal respect and admiration. His candidacy was endorsed by all the bar associations, and by such outstanding men as James W. Gerard. In addition, his candidacy was endorsed and his election advocated by the following newspapers: The New York Herald Tribune, Daily News, Daily Mirror, World-Telegram, the Sun, and the Journal-American. Would anyone be rash enough to say that all these papers were interested in the election of Aurelio? If they advised their readers to cast their votes for Mr. Frankenthaler as the best method of defeating Mr. Aurelio, it is the best possible indication that we had proposed the ablest and best qualified candidate for the office of justice of the supreme court. For whatever responsibility I may have had in bringing about the nomination of a candidate of the caliber and quality of George Frankenthaler, I feel distinctly proud.

Finally, the mayor goes out of his way to proclaim that the Hanley landslide was in no sense a New Deal defeat. He would have been better advised to leave this unsaid. For it was not the Republican Party that injected the New Deal issue into the campaign. Governor Dewey and his associates insisted again and again that the only issue was good government in New York State. The New Deal issue was brought forward by the mayor's own party, the American Labor Party. It was the representatives of the American Labor Party who linked Haskell with the New Deal, and sought to bolster a despondent cause by wrapping it in the mantle of the Commander in Chief. On August 25, the legally constituted representatives of the American Labor Party stated, and I quote:

"The labor party nominating convention last Saturday deemed the election of a lieutenant governor as a curtain raiser to the 1944 elections.

"General Haskell's joint designation by the American Labor Party and the Democratic Party assures the unity of the New Deal forces in President Roosevelt's own State.

"This will be an unbeatable coalition of labor and liberal voters which guarantees General Haskell's election as a prelude to a New Deal victory in the crucial elections of 1944."

If Haskell had won, the skies would have resounded with the shouts of New Deal victory. But Haskell lost by 350,000 votes, and the mayor must hasten to protest that the New Deal was not rebuked.

The election of Joe R. Hanley was a magnificent vote of confidence in the Governor and those associated with him in the grand job that he is doing in Albany. The American Labor Party, however, of which Mayor LaGuardia is a member, and in whose councils he stands within the inner circle, immediately upon the beginning of the last campaign, undertook what practically amounted to a political crusade, crying out from one end of the State to the other that a vote for Haskell was a vote for the New Deal. I have no doubt whatever that, had the result of the election been the other way round, not only would these same American Labor Party leaders be screaming from the housetops that the election result was a glorious New Deal victory, but that Mayor LaGuardia would be right in the midst of them shouting it the loudest. However, when we view the results of the election in New Jersey, Kentucky, and throughout the Nation as a whole, a very different picture presents itself. In almost every instance where a clear-cut issue of New Deal versus anti-New Deal was involved the new dealers were beaten. This is the dark and desperate situation that caused the mayor, in wild hysteria, to make the proclamation that had the President himself been running this year he would have carried New York City by a majority of 750,000. In whatever else the mayor may be lacking there is certainly nothing wrong with his imagination. And here once more he pleads with Commissioner Fly that this statment could not possibly be described as political since there is no Presidential campaign this year. In this, as in so many of his statements, the mayor again assumes that his listeners have just exactly no intelligence at all. For the mayor knows fully as well as every informed citizen knows that the Presidential campaign of 1944 is from the New Deal standpoint already well under way and has been for some time. In every Presidential election, campaigning in some form or other is always in full bloom for a year or more before the conventions actually assemble to make the nominations. And the mayor's comment just referred to was of the very essence of politics, because it was made for the purpose of trying to restore the shattered confidence of all the despairing cohorts of the New Deal who were driven into their cellars by the great anti-New Deal cyclone of last election day.

This about concludes what I felt were the most important points of the mayor's original statement that required comment from me. I do not like to engage in personalities because individuals are always less important than principles. The individual may be in power today and gone tomorrow, but principles are eternal, and each generation must deal with them in its own way. So let me say right here that I am by no means unmindful of the constructive side of Mayor LaGuardia's administration. I feel that the real tragedy is that a man of the unassailable material honesty of Mayor LaGuardia cannot at the same time show a little intellectual honesty to match it. It is unfortunate that the mayor cannot possibly believe that anyone can differ with him and at the same time be as honest as he is.

The American people will never have anything to fear from the presentation of facts in any controversy where both sides of the question are permitted to be heard. Facts are the food upon which not only the brain of the individual depends, but the mental well-being of the whole State as well. There cannot be too much light thrown on any public question. Misrepresentation is the poison which contaminates the wellspring of truth, and we must ever be on our guard against it. It is all the more dangerous when exercised by those claiming an exclusive right to be heard, and it becomes the medium through which democracy is literally clubbed to death. It is this ideology that has made Europe a shambles.

Nothing that has happened in this whole discussion has been as significant as the attempt that was made to deny to me the right to state my side of this case. None of the points that we have discussed compares for a single instance with the seriousness of the threat to our American institutions that was involved in this particular incident. I very much fear that had it not been for the outspoken protest of the public and the press, the courage of the management of Station WHN, and the ruling of Chairman Fly, of the Federal Communications Commission, this attempt might have succeeded.

In conclusion, therefore, I hope that this situation may never arise again with respect to the right of any individual or group to be given an equal opportunity with any public official, however highly placed, to state their side of the case in any controversial matter that goes to the character and integrity of the person or group. Given full information on all matters of public concern, the people may usually be depended upon to act wisely. This is the essence of democracy. If we never permit the violation of our basic rights of free speech and public discussion, the future of our city, our State, and our Nation will remain secure. Now, as always, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Thank you and good afternoon.

What Indian Independence Means to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an address delivered

by Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE at the conference on the Pacific area, sponsored by the Institute of Pacific Relations and the University of Rochester, on November 18, 1943:

One-fifth of the human race lives in India. One out of every five people is an Indian. He inhabits a country vast in size—all of continental Europe, excluding Russia, would tuck comfortably into it. India is a country of prodigious physical variety, like her neighbor China, which is also vast and houses one more fifth of the human race. India has a far-flung seacoast, studded with fine harbors. She has rivers nearly as great as our Mississippi. She knows torrential rains and devastating droughts. She has impenetrable jungles and deserts as flat, stale, and unprofitable as the Mojave. Her people live by low-lying swamps, on broad fertile plains, and in the rich soft valleys of mountains eternally crested with snow as mighty as our Rockies. There are, broadly speaking, 12 major Indian dialects. Although some of the most learned men in the world are Indians, more than 88 percent of the people are illiterate. Some of the richest men in the world are Indians. Among her 563 princes are rulers whose birthday gifts from their subjects are their own weight in gold. But 61 percent of India's inhabitants live at a bare subsistence level; 25.4 percent at a semi-starvation level. Seventy-eight percent of the people of Bengal are undernourished. Great famines are the frequent precursors of great plagues. And yet, the cruel economic paradox is that this vast land of 390,000,000 souls, ruled today by not more than 150,000 white men, is, next to the United States and the Soviet Union, the country with the most abundant natural resources in the world.

India has one of the greatest iron-ore fields in the world, with conservatively estimated reserves of more than 3,000,000,000 tons, averaging more than 60 percent iron content. Her coal resources range from thirty-six billion to seventy-seven billion tons. She possesses large quantities of bauxite, manganese, chromite, mica, and other minerals and crude elements upon which industry depends. Her potential hydroelectrical power is second only to that of the United States, though she uses only 3 percent of it. She is the world's second largest cotton producer. She has almost a monopoly of jute production. She once grew the most tobacco, could rival the world in the production of sugarcane, has vast forests and wheat and rice fields, tea, linseed, rubber, coffee, indigo, maize, barley, castor seed. She is a leading producer of hides and skins, tanning material, turpentine, and bamboo pulp.

Her people are historically exquisite craftsmen and hard workers. They were once great forgers of fine steel—from India came the Damascus blade. And yet this land of incalculable potential wealth in manpower and raw materials today houses one of the poorest people on earth. Sunk in a quagmire of debt, disease, and poverty, 80 percent of their work largely agricultural, the vast majority of Indians live on from 2 to 4 cents a day. Or rather they die. The average life expectancy of an Indian is about 25 years compared to our 62. And in some cities their infant mortality rate is the highest in the world.

India can continue to be the world's most tragic and gigantic economic paradox, or the benevolent dynamism of modern industrialization can resolve that paradox in our time.

For here is a country which beyond dispute for those who bow only in argument to facts and figures, could not only feed and clothe and house herself, but with modern machine tools made by her own people in her own factories, could possibly feed and clothe and supply with commodities and manufactured products much of Asia.

What Japan did industrially, India can do on a hundredfold scale, since her natural industrial resources are far greater. The successful industrialization of India, which could surely follow Indian independence, could raise the living standards of the whole Orient unbelievably, and in so doing, raise the living standards, and therefore the buying power of the whole world.

Quickly you ask, will only the independence of India guarantee the certain industrialization of India? Again, you ask, can the independence of India ever be achieved short of revolution against the British Raj? Will only bloodshed purge India's backwardness from her before she, too, can rise, as Russia did after its revolution against the Imperialist Czars, to become one of the mightiest countries of the Far East, perhaps of the world? These are pregnant questions, fraught with enormous historic meaning for the whole world, and, therefore, for America. But they are not the question of the evening. For our topic is not how India gets her independence but what would it mean to all of us if one-fifth of the human race came into its own?

But, ever before we can essay a partial answer to that question, common courtesy and national prudence require us first to ask another. What would the immediate loss—the outright loss of India—in short, unconditional Indian independence at the victorious close of the war, mean to the British Empire? It is only fair to ask this question because today India belongs to the British Empire.

Let us take the short view of what unconditional independence might mean to the British Empire, if there were no compensations for that loss of an economic, territorial, or spiritual nature. While it is well nigh impossible to obtain accurate figures on India even from official sources, it is estimated that before the war, under imperial preference tariffs, 7.2 percent of United Kingdom exports went to India, and 34 percent of Indian exports—with far less favorable tariffs—went in turn to the United Kingdom. Fifty and eight-tenths percent of the merchandise imported into India before the war came from the rest of the Empire. Fifty-two and five-tenths percent of all Indian exports went to the Commonwealth. It is safe to assume that with unconditional independence, India herself, so naturally endowed to do so, would begin to manufacture many of the articles she imported before the war from the rest of the Empire. Certainly India would manufacture at home all her own cotton goods, a no more difficult matter for her than it was for Japan. In any case it is reasonably certain that, once free to manufacture and sell into her own markets, India would for some years import far less from the Commonwealth of anything she could manufacture at home. Commonwealth export trade would be certain to suffer.

Before the war British capital investment in India was estimated at approximately £1,000,000,000, or approximately one-quarter of Britain's total overseas investments. With independence might come expropriation, slow or rapid. Great Britain would certainly lose some millions of pounds which she in the past has received in annual payments, transferred in one way or another, from India.

England emerged from the last world depression in better shape than the rest of the world. This was managed partly because, from 1931 to 1935, about £203,000,000 in gold went to London from India. England can, and does, manipulate the exchange rate of Indian currency because she almost completely controls its banking structure. In the last world depression millions upon millions of Indians sold even their tiniest gold trinkets to pay their long-in-arrears taxes. Naturally, most of this gold flowed into the economic blood stream of India, which is largely British, and debouched eventually into the Thames. Come unconditional Indian independence, Great Britain's hold on India's banking structure would be weakened to an incalculable extent. To reestablish herself from the economic rigors of this war, she would have to find her gold elsewhere.

No argument the British can present against immediate and unconditional Indian independence is so sound and overwhelming as the one they seldom offer—it could be a very serious economic blow to every inhabitant of the United Kingdom and Commonwealth. No less an authority than Winston Churchill himself said in a broadcast on India in 1935: "If we lose India, 2,000,000 breadwinners in this country would be tramping the street and queuing up at the labor exchange."

But there is one other aspect which, from a British point of view, would be even more serious than the economic one: The strategic aspect of unconditional Indian independence.

With the physical loss of India, Great Britain would lose her whole strategic base of global operations. India is the precious pivotal point of British dominance of the Near, the Far and the Middle East. It is from territorial India and Indian naval bases and ports, and in a great measure with Indian troops, that Great Britain in the past has been able to hold Hong Kong, Burma, Singapore, control the whole Middle East and the Arab worlds, dominate Suez and the Mediterranean, and defend Australia and New Zealand and her smaller, though also rich, possessions in the Southwest Pacific. In short, the mere strategic loss of India as a British-controlled sea and air base of military operations and a vast recruitment center for Empire troops, would not only split the Empire structure in twain, it would shatter it to pieces. This, far more than the economic liquidation involved, is what Churchill meant when he said he did not intend to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Any soldier will tell you that the day India becomes free of the British officer, even though the British banker should stay and should even thrive, that day the sun will set forever on a great many places which are now British soil. India is the one and only indispensable strategic keystone of the whole arch of the British Colonial Empire. Churchill is a soldier, a British soldier. That is why he is an unreconstructed and unreconstructable imperialist where matters concern India.

So here is the problem which confronts every American who plunks for immediate and unconditional Indian independence: As things stand today, the outright severance of India's political ties with Great Britain could do two things to the United Kingdom and Commonwealth: First, it would utterly collapse the British Empire structure strategically; and, second, the loss of British economic control of India could seriously reduce the living standards of many a Britisher.

Now there is one thing which cannot be said too often or too clearly in this historic moment when Americans have at last decided not to be isolationists—that is, when they have decided to participate to a greater extent in world politics and world business: The United Kingdom has no choice if she wishes to maintain her present economic way of life; to live by past living standards she must export and export and export—she must export comparatively more productionwise than any other great power in order to earn the money with which to import food commodities, and still have a balance to pay for the consumption at home of her own manufactured products. British domestic living standards, yesterday, today, and tomorrow are almost wholly dependent on the volume of her export trade and on how advantageously it is handled. I am told that the United Kingdom has remaining today only 5 percent of her pre-war world export trade. When the war is over she has somehow to get that other 95 percent back—and a large part of it she

must necessarily be counting on getting back via her preferential exports to India.

If Great Britain doesn't get her Indian export trade back, where will she make up the difference in the years ahead? Will we Americans cheerfully allow Great Britain a still larger share than she has so far claimed of the potential post-war European and African and South American and Russian and Chinese markets? In the Halls of Congress today one hears many a complaint even now about Great Britain's anxious efforts to develop new export markets. Shall we Americans then say to Great Britain: "You must give up India now, and thus risk the loss of one great and safe haven of export trade you had before the war; you cannot compete in our domestic markets; and you must also fight us every inch of the way in the rest of the world's markets, including India?" To urge this harsh course upon her would surely doom Great Britain to a far worse industrial depression than the one she knew after the First World War. Some economic extremists, arguing the British economic case against Indian independence, claim that immediate Indian independence would result not only in socialism in Great Britain but might even in the end reduce the whole United Kingdom to the status of an agricultural community. England, they say, would then become a little green island with a vegetable vengeance.

To state the Indian-independence problem thus in realistic economic terms is to cut through all the sentimental persuasions by which the British, in their natural pride, try to conceal its true nature from us. When the British talk of their humanitarian obligations to India, many of them are utterly sincere. But I question deeply how seriously Great Britain's statesmen, or, for that matter, the statesmen of any nation, including our own, ever accept sheer humanitarian obligations toward people of another race and culture if those obligations did not overwhelmingly coincide with their nation's own economic and political self-interest.

Therefore, I think the time has come to state the facts as they are: If American moral and diplomatic pressure helps 390,000,000 Indians to obtain their natural desire—independence—America risks condemning 45,000,000 of the greatest people on earth, in one of the greatest democracies on earth, Great Britain, to a severe economic depression. And if, furthermore, Indian independence results, as it must, in the retirement of all British troops from India and the end of British control of India as a base of military operations—we risk the accomplishment of what the Germans and Japs failed to do—the destruction of the British world power structure.

Dare we Americans who urge Indian independence take this risk, even in the name of freedom? And what do we Americans stand to gain—what does the world stand to gain, which will offset the physical and economic dangers to Great Britain and the Commonwealth implicit in unconditional Indian independence? Well, obviously we will gain a better world—to the extent that it will be a better world for one-fifth of the human race, who will then be free at long last to work out their own cultural, spiritual, and economic destiny. And if such nose-counting of free men is wrong, then there is no morality on this globe, and the dream of universal freedom, the idea of raising world living standards is a mockery.

And yet and yet, this simple arithmetic of how many men are free and thriving and how many slaves and impoverished is not answer enough. It plainly is not. For our own self interest, we Americans dare not dangerously weaken the British Commonwealth. We dare not destroy an economic and political power structure which, in spite of all the evils of its imperialism, has helped to keep order and decency in the world, and spread techniques of industrialization. For the Empire has been not only a power structure, but a power line, on which has been transmitted ideas of freedom and progress around the globe.

What are the answers? There must be answers; for the heart cries out, and the head argues, too, 390,000,000 men who want to be free and self providing and prosperous, must be free and self providing. And if it is not good that they should be free and prosperous, then all notions of progress and freedom are lies, and religion itself is a lie, and surely all the great spiritual things we claim we are fighting for in this war are lies. And that just cannot be so.

I believe there are answers. But these answers will be wholeheartedly accepted only by those who are sincere in their desire for Indian independence as a means to a better and more prosperous world. If we want Indian independence, and want that independence to be fruitful to ourselves and mankind, America must be prepared to do three things.

First, we must compensate Great Britain for any immediate and disastrous loss of export trade and revenue from India by opening to her and to the Commonwealth far freer markets than ever before in our own country, and we must aid her to share in all the new markets that can be opened elsewhere on the most generous terms.

Are Americans prepared to do this? I believe Americans should be prepared to do so, wherever, and however it does not depress our own living standards, for it is my unshakeable credo that any policy which weakens America, weakens the world.

Secondly, if we want the independence of India—and I repeat I think we should want it, because nothing else is consonant with American ideas of expanding areas of political freedom and the benevolent dynamism of the industrial age—we must aid the Commonwealth to the utmost to accomplish the achievement of Indian independence by means as peaceful and smooth as possible. I believe that this could best be done by giving India a date line in the not too distant future for complete independence, as we gave the Philippines.

It must have none of the tricky strings tied to it, such as have been tied to every offer of self-government which the British have made to India, because they feared Indian independence for the two reasons I have outlined.

And thirdly, we must guarantee jointly with the Commonwealth the continuation of the strategic and political independence of the free India we so profoundly want. We must be willing to guarantee conjointly with the Russians and Chinese, that a free India shall not fall a prey to aggressive and greedy powers, while in her early stages she is working out her economic and political destiny. America must, in short, take over the problem of keeping the military peace in the whole Pacific.

Short of such participation on our part, the consummation of unconditional Indian independence would merely destroy Great Britain and the Commonwealth strategically and economically, and short of it we would have no certainty that in the end we would not be helping to create in a free India a political and industrial Frankenstein such as we helped to create when we set militaristic, totalitarian, and undemocratic Japan on the road to industrialization a century ago.

I leave this great problem, having, at best, skimmed its surface more lightly than any bird ever skimmed the shark-infested waves of the Indian Ocean. Essentially it is the problem of how America can help to pass on to one-fifth of the human race the great torch of freedom, while not, at the same time, causing that great torch of freedom, which has never burned brighter anywhere in all the world in all history than in the British Isles themselves, to flicker and die down. How to help give 390,000,000 Indians the great chance to be self-supporting and self-governing without damaging material safety and the living standards of 45,000,000 Britishers? In short, America's problem in the so-called Indian question is how to help spread economic universals everywhere without curtailing them anywhere, including our own dear country.

Meanwhile, let us have an end to the cant, whether expressed by British or American, of "the white man's burden," and of our humanitarian obligations to rule people who plainly wish to rule themselves. Let us all have the courage to say that we must find other ways to keep our industrial machinery at home going at its highest level of efficiency than by oiling it with the sweat and blood of millions of men of other races overseas. And let us agree that if we urge upon our friends of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth that they take the great risk, embark on the great adventure of giving India her freedom, that we must then play our part and pay our share in underwriting for them the great transition period from imperialism to world democracy in order that in the end not only they, but we shall benefit.

For Indian independence, peacefully consummated and guaranteed for a decent length of time by the great nations who will win this war, would mean they really had won the greatest war in the world for democracy, and that we had at last taken a great step in raising the living standards of the world by helping one-fifth of the human race to help itself out of its own economic quagmire.

If America has neither the wish nor the will to play her part in this noble and also profitable venture, then insensibly America will be conspiring in the continuation of human slavery and exploitation and in the depression of a wide area of economy. We will be condoning what we claim to hate—political and economic imperialism, simply because we have not the brains nor the will to liquidate it intelligently.

In the final analysis, the future physical safety, the spiritual safety and the economic safety of America rest in a great measure on America's ability to help in the creation of a strong, progressive China and a strong, progressive India—in order that almost one-half of the world's population may be, in the years to come, friendly to America's wide and prosperous Pacific shores and able to traffic profitably with her, as is the custom of free men, with money of their own making in their pockets.

Are we up to this vast task of constructing a better and a safer and a vastly more prosperous world? I do not doubt it, if we will see the problem without racial prejudice or national passion or blind sentiment or economic selfishness.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Hon. Clyde T. Ellis, a former Member of this House, and now executive

manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

As every Member of the House knows, rural electrification has been my dream. In my opinion, it is one of the greatest economic movements of modern times. Its development will mark a turning point in the history of our civilization, and will have a more far-reaching effect on the future of this Nation than any of its advocates originally contemplated.

I hope every Member will take the time to read Mr. Ellis' speech, and that we may have the full cooperation of every Member of this body in the promotion of our program for rural electrification, now and in the post-war period.

The matter referred to follows:

THE RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS AT WAR AND AFTER

America's rural electric cooperatives are playing a major role in one of our most dramatic war production records. For "food will be the dominant world problem in 1944."

It cannot be said that food is more essential than bullets, any more than it can be said that oil is more essential than battleships, but more food can shorten the war and save millions of lives. "Food is as important as any other weapon in successful prosecution of the war."

Authorities of the Department of Agriculture state that American men in the service are eating approximately one-fourth more than civilians and that civilians are enjoying a better diet than ever before. And 10 percent of this year's production must go into lend-lease. All this explains the record goals, for 1944. Next year we must exceed the 1943 planting by 16,000,000 acres.

By pouring rations and seed into north Africa we saved thousands of liberated peoples from starvation. We are doing the same in Italy and in the southwest Pacific. We will be doing it on an ever-increasing scale for whatever number of years it takes to reach Berlin and Tokyo—and perhaps for many months thereafter.

And here is where the co-ops come in. The daring, the adventure, the pioneering that have characterized their phenomenal growth and their amazing contributions in a mounting food crisis constitute a new chapter in the romance of America.

But what they are doing goes far beyond the mere production of food. They are creating a new way of life, a new spirit and a new hope, a new self-confidence, which, in turn, generate a morale that reflects itself not only in the agricultural production of the home folks, but also in the front-line victories of the farm Yanks abroad. Farm boys have more to fight for now.

Before the advent of rural electrification, practically all farmers counted their existence until that uncertain day when they could leave the farm. For that was their dream. Now things have changed. The 4,000,000 farm people who enjoy the blessings of co-op electricity today do not entertain such a thought, because they have every convenience of the city, and many more. Typical of how they feel are these words from a letter received by the Northfork Electric Cooperative at Sayre, Okla., from one of its members, Mrs. Ernest Landtroop:

"My servant, electricity, in running my milkers, pump, cream separator, fly killer, radio, iron, washing machine, chicken brooders, lights, yard and barn lights, heating pads, and refrigerator, is not only furnishing more food to help save America but at the same time is affording my husband and me and our two small children so much pleasure that it is showing us more each day that America is worth saving."

The simple fact is that Edwin Markham's "Man With the Hoe" has discovered a new 24-hour-a-day servant to replace his sons in khaki. More than 1,000,000 farm families have discovered that this servant, the same one that has enriched both labor and capital, has lifted them from a nineteenth century servitude to a twentieth century independence. Tired farmers of 3,658,000 other rural homes are pleading for the same opportunity.

ELECTRICITY IS KEY

Mass production is the secret of America's industrial greatness and mass production is possible only by electrically-powered machines. Machines alone are not enough. They must be electrified. The farmer had long employed some machinery, but it was not electric. Electricity and the perfection of machinery had brought the cost of industrial production down continuously. The farmer, on the other hand, unable to take advantage of electrical appliances, saw certain factors, including rising labor standards, increase his cost of production. More than a decade ago it was recognized that a penny's worth of electricity would achieve production in excess of a man-day, but the farmer couldn't get his penny's worth, for he had no current available.

HOW WERE THE FOOD INCREASES POSSIBLE?

Therefore, when record food goals were announced for 1942 it was generally believed that they could not be attained. From all directions came observations that nearly one farm worker out of four had gone into either the war plants or the armed forces. How then could the remaining three out of four set a new record in food production? Yet, somehow, it was done. Again this year there was skepticism about the possibility of meeting further record goals. Had not more people gone from the farm? Then, to add to gloom, there came unprecedented floods in several States, only to be followed by disastrous droughts in some areas. Commercial farm labor was disappearing. Many plantings were short and valuable crops rotted in the fields. Dairymen were selling their herds and hogs were being marketed too young.

In spite of all these handicaps, production of food, including livestock and other war products, in both years amazed the world. The increase in 1942 over 1941 was from 112 on the 1935–39 Department of Agriculture index to 125, or an increase of 12 percent.

The figures for this year are more amazing than last in view of conditions generally, for the 1943 increase over 1942 was 5 percent. But the increase on those farms that were electrified in the early months of '43 was 34 percent. Deputy R. E. A. Administrator William J. Neal has stated: "Spot checks in representative areas have been made to determine the effect of the electricity on farm production among these newly connected farmers. These spot checks indicate that the benefit to livestock production through the ability of the farmer to maintain his present production with decreased labor, or increased production with present labor, is equivalent to 34 percent. The labor saved by the availability of electricity may have been almost equally reflected in increased production of field crops."

These figures reveal a major factor in the tremendous production of both '42 and '43. They also explain why the co-ops used 60 percent more power in the fiscal year '43 than in '42.

The question is raised immediately, How could this be done? The answer is that farmers have found more than 200 uses for electricity. Formerly, they hauled their feed to town for the grinding. Now they grind it in small mills with electric motors. Once it took several men several hours to milk the cows on an average farm. Now, with electric milkers, it takes fewer men fewer hours. The milk is immediately cooled in electric coolers, reducing bacteria, and the farmer usually realizes enough premium on the cooled milk to more than pay his entire electric bill. If he sells cream instead, he separates it with electric power. In 1 hour he can pump as much water for his cattle as one man could formerly pump in a full day, and at one-hundredth the cost. Furthermore, he has the hot and cold running water in the house, reducing the housewife's hours. He saws his wood and sharpens his implements with electric power. His refrigerator is a food saver. His washing machine, electric iron and stove are labor savers. His radio gives him weather forecasts and the news. His electric brooders for both chickens and pigs make possible tremendously increased production. His lights in the chickenhouse bring him more eggs. All these labor-saving devices enable him to work longer hours in the fields. In some States co-op power, pumping huge streams of water for irrigation, has turned semiarid lands into farmers' dreams.

This newly discovered farm servant works not 8 hours a day, but 24. It is ready at all times. Senator George W. Norris, coauthor of R. E. A., said of this new servant at the annual convention of the co-ops in St. Louis on January 19 of this year. "* * * electricity * * * means a new helper in that home, and she is a remarkable helper, too—the harder she works, the better she likes it, and the longer she works and the more she works, the less she charges for it, and she never takes off any Thursday afternoon or forenoon either. She works 24 hours a day and enjoys every minute of it. That is the kind of helper the Rural Electrification Administration has brought into the farm home. The helper is grinding the feed, pumping the water, doing all kinds of work, and the more he does, the better he gets, the cheaper he gets, the more efficient he becomes."

PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES HAVE ALSO BENEFITED FROM PROGRAM

In addition to funds which private power companies have borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration, and in addition to their being able to take advantage of engineering developments and operation methods pioneered by R. E. A., the private power companies sell the co-ops more than one-half the power they use. For the year ending June 30, 1943, the cooperatives purchased 1,618,985,910 kilowatt-hours, more than 60 percent of which came from private companies. The other 40 percent was purchased from T. V. A., Bonneville, and other public sources. The cooperatives themselves generated only 167,046,148 kilowatt-hours.

WHENCE CAME THIS NEW ENTERPRISE?

By 1935 less than 1 farm in 10 was connected with any kind of power system—and usually that one was not really a farm, but an improved acreage outside the city limits. Power companies had not found the extension of lines into rural areas profitable. Amazing as it may seem, however, the rural areas of several European countries were from 80 to 100 percent electrified. Holland's farms in 1935 all had electricity; nine-tenths of the German and French farms were electrified; four-fifths of the Swedish and seven-tenths of the Danish farms had central station service. The comparison constituted some kind of an indictment against us. In Europe there had been very little government financing. Most of their accomplishments had come about through cooperativese and public power districts—by the efforts of the farmers themselves. In this country, however, various factors, particularly the attractions of the American city, had discouraged our farm people from similar efforts.

In 1935 President Roosevelt, by Executive order, set aside emergency relief funds out of which were loaned to farmers $13,931,671 at 3 percent to begin farm electrification. Progress was slow but the experiments were successful. Result: The Seventy-Fourth Congress in 1936 enacted Public, No. 605, providing for rural electrification. The act cre-

ated the Rural Electrification Administration and permitted R. E. A., and R. F. C. through R. E. A., to lend farmers $50,000,000 for the next fiscal year and authorized appropriations from the Treasury for loans up to $40,000,000 for each of 8 years thereafter.

It is significant that Congress did not give the farmers anything. It merely made the funds available as loans. (Farm cooperatives were not new in America. Already there were 15,000 of them with 3,000,000 members doing a $2,000,000,000 annual business with $25,000,000 annual savings.) The Government of the United States placed its faith in farm cooperatives. It would let them build and operate their own Government-financed power systems.

The co-ops have justified that faith. In 7 years they had built and energized, as of August 31, 383,671 miles of line and were serving 1,054,306 farms in 46 States. R. E. A. had made additional allotments sufficient to bring the mileage up to 415,306 to serve a grand total of 1,361,438 members. R. E. A. has advanced the cooperatives since 1935, $369,152,562 for construction of distribution, generation, and transmission systems, acquisitions, and appliances. The loans, part of which have not been advanced, total $415,000,000. (R. E. A. has loaned to private power companies for rural electrification $4,840,089.)

Eight hundred and fifteen cooperatives have been incorporated in 45 States; 741 cooperatives are in operation. Even when considered as strictly business enterprises, they are highly successful. All persons served by them are members. They elect their own officers at annual meetings. As of September 30 they had met their scheduled payments on loans and had made prepayments before maturity dates on their loans in the amount of $14,094,419. They also had approximately $7,000,000 in the banks and had purchased approximately $5,000,000 in Government bonds. Only a very few co-ops were in arrears with their payments and the total amount was only $118,125, or only four-tenths of 1 percent of the amount due. Most of these defaults were caused in one way or another by the war, as, for instance, because construction had been stopped or because a war plant had taken part of the area. In all the history of Government lending, there is not a better record of repayments than that of the rural electric cooperatives.

The cooperatives have become one of America's major industries. The gross revenue of the cooperatives for the last fiscal year was $51,826,960.

They have electrified 29 percent of America's 6,096,789 farms. But 40 percent are still unelectrified. Farms and rural nonfarm homes still without electric service total 7,000,000.

These cooperatives are private, nonprofit enterprises. When they pay off their loans they will be wholly independent. A few of them have already paid out.

The War Production Board by its P-46 order of July 21, 1942, stopped completely all construction of new lines to connect more farmers. War Production Board said copper, aluminum, and steel were needed abroad and for war equipment. Gradually, however, as it became possible to make these materials available for farm use, the War Production Board, by a series of orders, beginning in January, permitted limited construction. Rural Electrification Administration has announced that as of October 28 it has approved this year 43,056 estimate work orders for the co-ops to connect 53,000 farms. Most of these already have been connected and hundreds are being added each month. For the last quarter of 1943, 1,000,000 pounds of copper was made available for farm connections and 8,000,000 pounds of copper wire was placed on the open market. Most of this, too, will be used by the cooperatives. Private power companies are making some connections.

R. E. A. AND COOPERATIVES PIONEER MANY NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Many new developments which have simplified the whole electric distribution problem, and which have resulted in lower operating costs, have been developed by R. E. A. and the co-ops. For instance, R. E. A. was solely responsible for the development of a comparatively inexpensive meter from which any layman can tell exactly what he is using. Its hands do not run in opposite directions, like the old ones, and it is read like a speedometer. Farmers are now reading their own meters 11 months out of 12, thus saving the cost of meter readers. Rural Electrification Administration pioneered the reduction of over-all construction costs from approximately $2,000 per mile to less than $1,000 per mile.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION IS ORGANIZED

Why, then, should any person, group, or interest in America challenge the right or attack the existence of so successful and invulnerable a farm enterprise. Wherein could this great development that has so completely remade rural life in America—wherein could it be treading upon anybody's toes. Why should any group envy its progress in the sparsely settled territory where private capital for half a century declined to venture?

It is generally recognized that the most powerful lobby in the Nation's Capital is that of the private utilities, and usually the private utilities maintain the most powerful lobbies around State capitals. The cooperatives have no fight with the private power companies, yet these powerful lobbies have struck with all their vengeance in dark alleys and in divers ways against the co-ops. Many people cannot understand why.

Time has revealed some of the reasons:

1. Private power companies hate public power in any form. They see nonprofit electric cooperatives, even though they are privately owned corporations, as a form of public power. They realize that for many years there has been a trend toward public power. Cities have been "going municipal." In the States of Washington and Nebraska, public-utility and public-power districts have been voted by the people, and these districts buy out, by negotiation or condemnation, all private utility properties in the area.

2. Private power companies fear the yardstick rates of the co-ops. Throughout the country the cooperatives are purchasing their power from private power companies at the companies' own prices, then distributing that power, always in comparatively sparsely settled country, at rates which in many instances are lower than the rates of the power companies in nearby towns—all of which is conclusive proof that the power companies are making fabulous profits from the consumers. They do not like for the utility commissions to know this. Furthermore, the cheaper rates of the cooperatives—and, of course, they are much cheaper in areas where the cooperatives can purchase cheaper wholesale power from public sources or generate it themselves—the cheaper rates of the cooperatives tend to create a restlessness among city consumers. They don't want the folks to realize, for instance, that by comparison with the yardstick rates of the co-ops of the Tennessee Valley the people of the United States were overcharged for electricity last year more than $1,000,000,000.

3. The cheap rates offered by the cooperatives are quite an inducement to small industries. New industries that grow up in the country or move to the country will use electricity which private power companies would like to sell them.

4. They fear that the co-ops are becoming strong enough to begin generating and transmitting their own power. Indeed they are already doing it in isolated instances. They know the co-ops are not going to continue to pay 9, 10, and 11 mills for wholesale power when the officials of the power companies admit the cost of generation and transmission is less than 3 mills per kilowatt hour.

These are doubtless only a few of the reasons but they are sufficient to help explain why in the early days of the rural electrification program, the power companies built spite lines down the main highways and into the better settlements in order to disrupt and prevent the organization of cooperatives. Some of this is still going on. These reasons may also help to explain why the power companies have staged campaigns to bring the co-ops under the jurisdiction of the various State utility commissions; why the power companies have sought to prevent the co-ops from serving even small industrial loads in rural areas; why the private power companies have insisted upon the co-ops paying higher and higher taxes; why the power companies have tried—and successfully in some States, notably Massachusetts—to prevent the organization of rural electric cooperatives.

Last year in nearly half the States, bills were introduced in the various legislatures designed to cripple the cooperatives.

The power companies usually succeed in getting their men on the various State "regulatory" commissions. They often succeed in landing them in high places in the Federal Government. For instance, they landed C. W. Kellogg, then president of Edison Institute, as head of the Power Division of O. P. M., predecessor to W. P. B. They succeeded in landing their man, Col. John C. Damon, stockholder in and former head of Utah Power & Light, as chairman of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. This board has extensive control over copper and other materials, and these two gentlemen completely stopped rural electrification in America until they were removed—the former by the big utility men with whom he filled up the power division, the latter personally. I has been only about 18 months since the officials of a certain Texas city were in conference with one Elsworth J. Hand, an official of W. P. B.'s Power Division, formerly of Potomac Electric Power Co. The following conversation is reliably reported to have taken place:

"Then your position is that these engines can stand on the floor of the factory and deteriorate and no preference rating will be granted for their use."

"Yes," Hand shot back.

"Then," said Mr. Hogan, "the way the situation stands is that this country has been turned over to the private utilities?"

"That's right," replied Hand, "the private utilities will run this country at least until the war is over."

Now, however, those gentlemen are gone and we are happy to report that W. P. B.'s Power Division is, in our opinion, treating both the private power companies and the co-ops fairly.

General Counsel and Deputy R. E. A. Administrator Vincent D. Nicholson stated at the Florida State-wide meeting November 3:

"In my opinion the road ahead will be rougher still for the co-ops; for the power companies apparently have just begun to fight us."

These various campaigns of the private utilities threw the cooperatives of many States together in a common defense and thus were organized the first State associations. A similar national campaign of the private utilities in which they sought to embarrass the cooperatives because of false claims that they were hoarding copper resulted in an investigation by the House Appropriations Committee of the Congress

during the winter of 1941–42. This brought together in Washington cooperative leaders from several States. There they began the organization of the present national association of the co-ops.

The association was organized exactly as the co-ops were organized—by a few of the leaders becoming the incorporators, for incorporators must always be individuals, and then providing, as the local co-ops do, that as soon as a sufficient membership could be had the co-op members of the national association should elect their own board of directors. This was done in a series of regional meetings a year ago. We are now engaged in the holding of this second series of regional meetings and in these meetings directors are again being elected. Incorporated on March 20, 1942, your association has had a phenomenal growth in its 20 months of existence. Its membership today is 560 cooperatives, representing 654,688 farm members.

Perhaps the greatest value of your association comes from its very existence as a watch dog and as a warning to any who would seek to destroy the co-ops. But the association has rendered many constructive services to the cooperatives. The question has been asked, Why can't R. E. A., a Government agency, render the services of the national association?" The simple answer is just that R. E. A. is a Government agency and as such cannot participate in many fights to which the co-ops are subjected. Sometimes other Government agencies, such as the W. P. B. Power Division of 2 years ago, have their differences with the co-ops. If a fight ensues, R. E. A. cannot fight another Government agency.

Your National Association, for instance, took the lead in asking the President to dismiss Colonel Damon and other Power Trust representatives, who as Government officials were apparently endeavoring to kill off the co-ops.

Your National Association sponsored and is sponsoring the campaign to permit continuation of the construction program.

Your National Association is sponsoring a program to reduce the insurance costs of the cooperatives with the result that today the association is saving the co-ops at the rate of $200,000 a year on this one item. Usually the savings are more than their dues in the National Association. All this was made possible simply by the National setting up an agency to pool the cooperatives' insurance and letting it to the lowest bidder.

The National Association has sponsored and is sponsoring other campaigns. For instance, to make electric dehydrators available, to make refrigerators available, to have washing machines, motors, and other equipment manufactured again, and to obtain clarification of the Federal tax status of co-ops. Never a day passes but that co-ops come to the National Association, usually by letter, for individual services. They are gladly rendered.

The Association prints a monthly bulletin, 10,000 copies of which are sent to all managers and directors, keeping them constantly advised of what is going on in their interest, to Members of Congress, governors, utility commissioners, and power leaders everywhere.

When the last appropriation bill was up in Congress the National Association advised the cooperatives and they in turn advised their Members of the House and Senate of the advantages of continuing the program. There was no high pressure and the Association was complimented by our friends in the Democratic, Republican, and Progressive Parties.

The National is today cooperating 100 percent with the War Production Board and the War Food Administration. It cooperates 100 percent at all times with the Rural Electrification Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration is cooperating 100 per cent with N. R. E. C. A.

I am happy to advise you that in terms of amount of dues received, September was the National's biggest month since January, and October exceeded September. Very few cooperatives are delinquent with their dues.

Your National Association has made mistakes. It will make others, as will any organization, especially in its early days. We don't intend, however, to be caught making the same mistake twice.

Every group, corporation, business or other interest widespread throughout the States has its national organization. The future of rural electrification in America is bound up in no small way with the existence and success of the National Association of the Cooperatives.

Every cooperative in the country has benefited from the association thus far, but not all of them have borne their proportionate share of the expense. All non-members tend to detract from the effectiveness of the association because, for instance, when we have to appear before various congressional committees, we point out that we represent so many co-ops and so many farm members. That sounds good; but we also have to point out that we represent only 68 percent of them; that is not so good.

We sincerely trust therefore that all nonmember cooperatives will become members as quickly as possible. If there is anything about the association they want changed, by being members they can help change it. After all the very essence of all our work is cooperation. Cooperation in this instance demands the unified efforts of each and every one of us.

THE RUSSELL-RANKIN BILL

The Russell-Rankin bill affords us a golden opportunity to pull together. We appeal to you today, whether you are members or nonmembers, to join in a concerted effort to advise all Senators and Congressmen of the wisdom of S. 742 and H. R. 878. They provide, among other things, for a reduction of interest rates on co-op loans. The co-ops pay the Federal Government interest ranging from 2.46 to 3 percent. Uncle Sam accepts the securities of the cooperatives, reissues them and sells them into the short-term money market and pays interest on them at less than 1 percent. As of today loans are being made to the co-ops at 2.67 percent, but the money loaned costs the Government only 8.7 mills. Thus the Federal Government makes a tremendous profit on co-op loans. It is estimated that even if we deduct the total cost of R. E. A. administration to date, the Government has already made on these farm loans a net profit of more than $7,000,000. The Russell-Rankin bill provides for a refunding of all outstanding co-op indebtedness, at the election of the co-op, and that the Government shall lend them for this purpose at the same rate that the money costs the Government. Hence, if loans were being made today as provided by the Russell-Rankin bill the rate would be 8.7 mills. The bill also provides for amortization of R. E. A. loans in 50 years, again at the co-op's election, rather than 25 years as provided now by law. The co-ops are setting aside funds for depreciation and maintenance and their systems will be as good at 50 years as at 25. In addition to interest rates and a longer period of amortization, the bill would permit rural electrification in many sparsely settled parts of the country where it will not otherwise be possible. It would permit immediate rate reductions.

If you have not already done so, won't each of you go back home and write your Congressman and Senators, not merely urging immediate passage of this bill, but pointing out its benefits. Won't you also urge every one of your members to do likewise. That will get the job done, for, having served with them, I am convinced that a majority of the members of all parties will be with us every time we show them we are right. That is our responsibility. If we can't show them we don't deserve to win.

THE OMNIBUS FARM BILL

I call your attention to H. R. 7532 which was introduced on November 1 by Congressman FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It was requested by the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of eliminating points of order on agricultural appropriations. Section 3 deals with rural electrification. This bill will likely be enacted. It provides for three changes in the R. E. A. Act:

1. Continuation of R. F. C. loans.

2. The substitution of the Secretary of Agriculture for the President of the United States as the official to request and approve the authorization for R. F. C. loans.

3. Continuation of the 3-percent R. F. C. interest provision with the exception that "with interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent" is substituted for the flat 3 percent.

If these basic changes could be made then I think other very necessary basic changes should be made at the same time. Since this series of regional meetings began, your national association was given permission to testify before the committee and President Tate came up from Atlanta and in cooperation with Congressional leaders appeared before the committee and urged the adoption of certain amendments. Still other amendments now appear to be in order and advisable. I list all of them here:

1. An amendment striking all reference to 3-percent interest and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"With interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its obligations issued during the preceding fiscal year."

2. An amendment striking the 10-year limitation in the R. E. A. Act—for the appropriation to be made this coming year for the fiscal year 1945 is the last one authorized in the R. E. A. Act—and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"For the fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary for the purposes of this act is hereinafter provided."

3. An amendment providing for reduction of interest rates on each R. E. A. loan already made and to be made to the rate of interest which the Government paid or will have to pay on the money loaned to the co-ops.

4. An amendment permitting services by co-ops in towns of up to 10,000 population.

5. An amendment eliminating the prohibition against the co-ops serving anybody but "persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

We urge you to get several letters written to your Senators and Congressmen, calling their attention to the benefits of these amendments in your particular area. We may not get them all—we may not even get any of them, but I am convinced that Congress will be fair with you if the Members know what you want and of the benefits to be obtained. Co-ops from more than 20 States have already passed resolutions endorsing these amendments.

THE TAX BILL

I call your attention also to the new revenue bill which has passed the House and is pending in the Senate, H. R. 3687. Electrical World says the "R. E. A. cooperatives face Federal income tax" and base their reasoning on what they assume will happen under this bill. We are afraid they are right. Section 112 would require the filing of intricate and complicated income-tax state-

ments by the cooperatives including "gross income receipts and disbursements, and such other information * * * as the Commissioner * * * may by regulations prescribe and shall keep such records, rendering under oath such statements, make such other returns, and comply with such rules and regulations as the Commissioner * * * may from time to time prescribe." To say the least, such a requirement would add a considerable burden to the co-ops without benefiting the Government or anyone else.

Co-ops are now exempt from Federal taxes on the theory that they are simply organized by members to provide themselves with a service without profit. Nothing, in our opinion, is more fundamental to the whole theory and practice of cooperatives. In Electrical World a Member of Congress is quoted to the effect that this pro-ision is really aiming at Federal taxation of cooperatives. If you think section 112 of this bill should be amended to exclude cooperatives along with religious and educational organizations from the requirements of the section, you could write your Senators about it.

THE MIGHTY CRESCENDO OF TOMORROW

Another thing we can do now is to get ready to go with a vast program of new construction. You are in the midst of an unelectrified farm survey to determine the number and location of farms yet unelectrified. R. E. A. and you are developing to blueprint stage complete plans to reach them all. We join with R. E A. in urging you to complete this job as quickly as possible, for we now think this development will not have to await the end of the war. Even the construction is under way at this hour on a small scale and must accelerate as materials become available.

In Europe one of the first strokes by which Hitler destroyed all semblance of democracy was the crushing of all cooperative and public power projects of Germany and subsequently of every country he overran. In America today we of the rural-electric crusade are delivering one of the most powerful strokes in the destruction of the heathen tyrants of Germany, Italy, and Japan. At the same time we are building a better way of life for the democracy of tomorrow.

Our hopes for steady progress in the mighty crescendo of rural electrification were never brighter. Our goal is to make 1-cent electricity available to every farm home in America. If our enemies divide us, we may fail; if we remain united—and we shall remain united—we cannot fail.

Midwest Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 4, there came to the attention of the Congress an example of the depths of ineptitude and asininity to which the New Deal bureaucracy can sink in its attempt to control with an iron hand conditions in the several States. This information reached us through the medium of the Washington Times Herald, one of their reporters having somehow, somewhere, acquired a copy of Midwest Frontiers, volume I, No. 1, a new publication issued through the Cleveland office of the War Relocation Authority which admitted the document was not intended to reach the hands of newspapers or prying Congressmen. The article, written with a view of inducing interned Japanese in the West to go to Michigan and Ohio, locate permanently, and work on the farms of those States, displays more vividly than any comments thereon could do, the determination of the New Deal to move thousands of individuals of a race with which we are in deadly war, into various communities throughout the country without even taking the trouble to inquire whether or not it met the approval of the people residing in those communities. It is simply another indication of the determination of the New Deal to rule the people with an iron hand. The publication is ridiculous, contemptuous, and untruthful. It brands those responsible as being utterly incompetent to speak in any way for any department of this Government. While it is typical in some ways of other bureaucratic publications paid for by the American people, it goes far beyond anything I have seen. It approaches the realm of the fantastic. The article follows:

W. R. A. UNIT BEGS JAP INTERNEES TO TEACH MIDWEST FARMERS CLEANLINESS, CULTURE—NEW GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION LAUDS JAP INTERNEES

We will not have to explain to you what we do in the wintertime. You will find out that our large barns are full of livestock, our cows must be milked, our chickens fed, our machinery repaired, and plans made for another year. Then some of us sleep later in the morning in the wintertime and listen to the radio longer at night. You will discover that many of our houses were built in pioneer days. That rural electrification is mostly a new thing. That many tenant houses do not have bathrooms, because they were built before bathrooms came into style. They have not been remodeled because the war has made it impossible to get material. Then, believe it or not, you have some few tenants, and seasonal workers who do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

We need to know something of your skill in packing and grading, your artistic sense of orderliness. We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio, and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture as well as the science.

Finally, let me repeat, the only way to find out about Ohio and Michigan is to come and live here. Then you will know. You cannot get it out of a story book.

JAPS GET LOWDOWN ON MIDWESTERN FARMERS

In this the living habits of American citizens are held up to the ridicule of our interned enemies by a Government-employed writer.

The lengths to which the New Deal has gone in sending out under Government frank propaganda of every description, nearly all of which apparently is distributed with a view of perpetuating the New Deal administration, can be had from the files of the Post Office Department, which disclose the loss of postal revenue, through departmental and agency mail, of $110,000,000 per annum in excess of that of the previous administration. The loss of revenue from this source in the fiscal year of 1932 was $9,151,899; in the fiscal year of 1943, the loss was $119,485,392. These figures do not include the cost of preparing and printing the propaganda, but they clearly show the scandalous lengths to which this administration will go to propagandize the people of the country.

Gallup Poll on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the Gallup poll taken from the Washington Post under date of December 8, 1943. I know the Members of the House will be interested in noting that among the persons interviewed who understood the issue of subsidies, more than 2 to 1 of the nonfarm population favor them. In the case of farm population, the interviewers for the poll report that those having an understanding of the issue report that about as many farmers favor the food-subsidy program as oppose it.

It is to be hoped that the great amount of debate that has taken place on this subject and the excellent information in the press by both reporters and columnists will help to acquaint the public with this vital and important issue.

THE GALLUP POLL

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 7.—Claims made by farm leaders that the farmers of the country are opposed to the food-subsidy program must be accepted with important reservations, a survey of farm opinion indicates.

This study finds that, first, not many farmers have followed the discussions of the subsidy issue closely enough to have a very clear idea of what subsidies are.

Second, those farmers who do know about the subsidy program are by no means universally opposed to it. The opinion of those questioned in the survey seems to be about evenly divided at present, with a slight preponderance in favor.

In conducting its study, the institute first sought to determine just how many farmers interviewed had any sort of idea what the term "farm subsidy" might mean.

The results show that 35 percent of those questioned—or about one-third—appeared to have some understanding of the term, including 13 percent who indicated a fairly exact knowledge—the remainder—65 percent—either could not define the term or gave an incorrect definition.

In short, the subsidy issue has apparently not penetrated very deeply into the thinking of the great mass of farmers up to the present, though, of course, it may do so as time goes on.

Much of the same situation prevails among the nonfarm population as well. Interviews with a cross-section of the urban, small town and rural nonfarm population show that only about 29 percent seem to understand what is meant by food subsidies, while 71 percent do not.

Farmers and others who did indicate a knowledge of subsidies were then asked in the survey to give their ideas on what Congress should do about the subsidies program.

In the case of the farm population, interviewers report that up to the present about as many farmers favor the food subsidy program as oppose it. In the case of the nonfarm population, however, the division is 2 to 1 in favor of subsidies.

Rural Electrification

REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by W. D. McAfee, Chief, Construction Materials and Tools Division, War Food Administration, delivered at a regional meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in Fort Wayne, Ind., on November 8, 1943. I had the pleasure of attending this meeting as the guest of our former colleague, Clyde T. Ellis, and was favorably impressed with the proceedings:

I need not take much of this group's time to talk about wartime shortages and what they have meant to various phases of our national agricultural programs. War has brought tremendous change to all national effort. And before peace comes, we can expect nothing else but continued change, and adjustments to change.

Rural electrification has been one of the activities vitally affected by the inroads of the Nation's war program on our supplies of essential raw materials, especially the critical materials most in demand for not only war production, but also for essential civilian output.

The years immediately preceding the Nation's entry into the war saw rural electric lines built at an accelerating rate by the Rural Electrification Administration and private utilities. This was exceedingly desirable, for none would deny farmers the labor-saving benefits of electricity. With the advent of an unprecedented war program, however, the supplies of many materials—notably steel, aluminum, and copper—were seriously curtailed for other than nonmilitary uses. Consequently, production for civilian use has had to be gaged to absolute need in general, and specifically for farmers to the equipment needed for essential food production purposes.

With this short résumé, I want first to deal briefly with the manner in which critical materials are handled currently before we go into the details on the present situation on supplies for farmstead wiring and electricity.

Copper, aluminum, and steel are the basic materials which automatically control the use of other metals and materials. The War Production Board controls the use of these three metals through the controlled materials plan. Fundamentally, the purpose of this plan is to assure a balance between supply and demand of controlled materials so that they will be available in the quantity and form and at the time required to meet authorized programs and schedules.

Materials needed for providing both military and essential nonmilitary goods must, of course, come out of the national pool of steel, copper, and other critical materials. The War Production Board must divide the pool of materials among specified claimant agencies, of which the War Food Administration is one, along with the Army, Navy, and others. The needs of all agencies regarding the use of materials must be considered very carefully in relation to the total supply, since the claims have consistently exceeded the supply available. The requirements of the military for making guns, planes, tanks, and ships, the needs of agriculture for machinery—in short, all military and civilian requirements—are weighed from the standpoint of their contribution to the war. When all factors have been considered fully, and adjustments made where necessary, the necessary amount of steel, copper, and other materials are allotted to each agency for use in carrying out its programs during a stated period.

The controlled materials plan makes it possible for the War Production Board to divide controlled materials among the various claimant agencies in the interest of their most efficient use, and provides appropriate methods of accounting, so that no agency can overdraw its allotment. Centralized control is lodged in the War Production Board, but distribution of controlled materials through specific allotments to programs and schedules becomes the responsibility of claimant agencies. Accordingly, claimant agencies must adjust programs and schedules within the limits of controlled materials allotted to them.

To illustrate, the War Food Administration must provide material from its allotments for the farm-machinery program. As a claimant, the War Food Administration submits estimated requirements for the three controlled materials—copper, steel, and aluminum—to the War Production Board. In the case of steel, for example, the War Production Board assigns a certain amount to the Food Administration. This steel is then turned over to the Farm Machinery Division of the War Production Board for distribution to manufacturers of farm machinery.

Now let us consider agriculture's materials and procedures for furnishing essential electrical service:

Farmstead wiring: The War Food Administration is now responsible for the distribution of copper wire allocated for farmstead wiring. The present procedure for distributing wire for farmstead wiring was made necessary when the controlled materials plan went into effect July 1, 1943. It replaces Order P-144 and enables both old and new users to secure copper wire in the same manner. A certain amount of copper wire is allocated quarterly to the War Food Administration. This allotment of wire largely determines the amount of electrical wiring that can be installed on farms, and indirectly, the number of farms to which new power-line connections can be made. It is estimated that the current allotment of copper will permit the wiring of about 16,000 farms during the fourth quarter of 1943. Part of the War Food Administration's allotment of copper wire is required to supply additional wire for farms already connected for electrical service to expand its use for essential food production.

The main portion of the wire allocated for agricultural use is distributed to farmers through U. S. D. A. war boards. State and county quotas are established and county war boards may issue allotment certificates for permitted uses in quantities within their current quotas. Farmers receiving these certificates are assured delivery of copper wire in the amount approved through regular channels.

A portion of the W. F. A. allotment of copper wire is released to farmers through W. P. B. field offices. This applies to copper wire to be used in new farm construction, which requires W. P. B. approval under Conservation Order L-41. The wire and other materials required must be shown on the application for approval to begin construction. If the construction is approved, and the use of the wire permitted, the W. P. B. issues the necessary allotment number to the applicant with his notification of approval.

In order to secure the best use of the limited wire available, the amount released to any one farm must be limited to the minimum that will take care of the most essential needs for the duration. The present program authorizes up to 75 pounds of copper per farm for new users, and up to 50 pounds per farm for old users. County war boards are not permitted to issue allotment certificates for the following purposes:

1. Wiring of farm buildings.
2. Small purchases which can be secured under PR-19.
3. Farmstead wiring to be used in new construction requiring W. P. B. approval under Conservation Order L-41.
4. Farmstead wiring on farms which cannot secure a power line connection.
5. Farmstead wiring on farms now served with electricity but which would not qualify for a new power line connection under present standards.
6. Other uses which would not contribute to the food program by reducing labor requirements or increasing food production.

Household wiring: State and county war boards are not permitted to issue allotment certificates for wire to be used in dwellings. You may be assured that the benefits and need for electricity in farm homes is fully appreciated, but since materials are, by necessity, limited, preference must be given to uses that contribute more directly to food production or to reducing farm-labor requirements.

The War Production Board, through Controlled Materials Plan Regulation No. 9, has made substantial quantities of wire available for household wiring and other civilian needs. Through this regulation, dealers are permitted to place controlled material orders for $100 worth of copper wire, or one-eighth of their 1941 copper wire sales per calendar quarter—whichever is the larger. There are no restrictions on the use of this wire, and it is anticipated that most farmers who need it for household wiring purposes can secure it from local dealers' quotas. Some 3,000,000 pounds of copper per calendar quarter have been earmarked for this program.

War Food Administration's quota: During the third quarter of 1943, the War Food Administration authorized distribution of about 1,953,000 pounds of copper wire through the war boards. However, not enough applications from eligible farmers were submitted to use the entire amount. This is no doubt due to the fact that a portion of the wire was released late, with the consequence that there was not full opportunity to use the entire amount. Roughly, about three-fourths the total amount was distributed. It would appear, however, that the third quarter distribution was sufficient to take care of the most essential current farm needs, and outstanding P-144 certificates which could not be filled on preference rating certificates after July 1 of this year.

Since a new national distribution system for copper wire was introduced during the third quarter, it was difficult to establish

accurately the quotas for all States and counties, and it has required considerable time to get the procedure under way at the county level. There also was some confusion in many areas due to misunderstanding of the regulations and the transition from the preference rating system under the production requirements plan to the controlled materials plan with allotment symbols. As farmers, as well as those who handle it, become more familiar with the new distribution system, there is no reason to believe the State and county quotas will not be utilized more efficiently.

Allotments of 1,000,000 pounds of copper wire have already been distributed to the States and counties for release to farmers during the current quarter, which began October 1. An additional 200,000 pounds of copper wire may be available, but the total fourth-quarter allocation is considerably less than that received for the third.

Other electric wiring materials: Under War Production Board priority regulation No. 19, a farmer may obtain small amounts of copper wire and certain types of equipment by certifying that he is a farmer and needs the equipment for operation of his farm. Dealers who have these supplies in stock must fill a farmer's order on such certifications, and if he does not have the equipment, he can take the farmer's order and place it with his supplier to obtain the equipment. Under priorities regulation No. 19, a farmer can obtain up to 75 feet of BX, nonmetallic, or weatherproof copper wire, and wiring materials and fixtures, such as switches, wall plugs, sockets, porcelain knobs, or tubes.

Power-line connections: You are all more or less familiar with the provisions of War Production Board order which provides standards under which a farmer may obtain a power-line hook-up for essential food-production purposes.

If a farm applicant qualifies under the provisions of Order U-1-c, the electric cooperative or company is automatically authorized to install a power-line connection or extension, provided the county war board certifies that the applicant has the livestock on hand which, together with his estimated production, meets the standards set up in the order.

Where a new farm power-line connection cannot be made under provisions of order U-1-c, the cooperative or company should submit an application to the Office of War Utilities, WPB, Washington, D. C., on Form WPB-2774, provided the essentiality of the connection to the food-production program can be shown. County war boards may attach a certification showing the livestock units or any other supporting information they may deem advisable. Each application is reviewed individually by the Office of War Utilities. This office may approve extensions, even though they exceed the 5,000-foot limitation under order U-1-c, provided the required number of animal units are on hand (1 animal unit to each 100 feet of extension). Where an application involves a number of extensions, each farm should have the required animal units to support its respective connection.

In case a new power-line connection is necessary for construction which required WPB approval under Conservation Order L-41, the construction applications should be accompanied by: (1) two copies of a letter from the cooperative or company certifying that they can make the connections under the provisions of order U-1-c, or (2) two copies of the cooperative or company application (Form WPB-2774) whichever is applicable. Where this procedure is not followed, final processing of the construction application by the WPB is necessarily delayed until additional information is secured on the line connection.

These, then, are the outlines of the procedures established for handling essential farm needs for electric service that can be provided in a manner consistent with the national program for distributing critical materials.

As to the current outlook, I think it is reasonable enough to say that the copper supply has eased slightly, although our requirements still exceed the supply. On aluminum, indications are that there is a little better balance between supply and demand than exists on copper.

On the basis of these somewhat improved situations, I believe we can reasonably hope for a continuation of allocations of these two materials on the present, or perhaps a little better, scale.

National Commander Atherton of American Legion Vigilant in Behalf of Veterans of World War No. 2

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, a fellow townsman of mine is the national commander of the American Legion. His name is Warren H. Atherton. The Legion feels that it is its duty to protect the interests of World War No. 2 veterans. In the ranks of this war are millions of sons of veterans of the First World War.

For some weeks past the Legion has been conducting a survey throughout the Nation. It showed that in many cases there was a big delay between the dates of a veteran's discharge and the adjudication of his claim.

The national commander, Mr. Atherton, called the attention of this fact to the Senate Military Affairs Committee on December 1 and supplied copies of the survey to appropriate Members of Congress. The results of this survey were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8 by Mr. PLOESER of Missouri.

The national commander urged that service people about to be discharged from the service be fully advised as to their rights and priviliges as World War No. 2 veterans. He recommended that representatives of the Veterans' Administration be assigned to discharge centers to supply proper information to prospective dischargees. He further recommended that service officers of the American Legion and of the other veterans' organizations be permitted to go to the Army and Navy hospitals and assist in supplying proper information to service people before discharge. This latter, of course, would prove a great saving in personnel and money to the Federal Government.

Nation-wide publicity was given to National Commander Atherton's assertions on the deplorable time lag which occurred between time of discharge and of adjudication.

It was heartening to me to learn that on December 4, 1943, the War Department issued Circular No. 315, which grants authority to United States Veterans' Administration personnel to function at military installations. I ask permission to insert a copy of War Department Circular No. 315 in the RECORD at this point:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1943.

CIRCULAR NO. 315

* * * * *

VI. Veterans' Administration: 1. The expeditious consideration of claims of military personnel being discharged on a Certificate of Disability for Discharge is of vital importance and is of great concern to the War Department. To facilitate this processing, authority is granted for Veterans' Administration personnel to function at military installations. Such personnel will be assigned by managers of Veterans' Administration facilities normally to installations, such as general hospitals, from which men are discharged in considerable numbers. They will perform duties relating to the adjudication of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

2. Commanding officers of military installations will cooperate fully with authorized Veterans' Administration personnel and will provide space upon request of the manager of a Veterans' Administration facility. The commanding officer will also furnish necessary equipment within his available means.

3. Where Veterans' Administration personnel are functioning at a military installation in accordance with this circular, such personnel will be construed as being the nearest Veterans' Administration office for the purposes outlined in paragraph 16e (1), (2), and (3), AR 615-360 (C-4).

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:
J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

It was of further encouragement to me to learn that the first United States Veterans' Administration rating board at an Army discharge center started functioning at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., on December 8. I sincerely hope that these rating boards will be established at all other necessary points as rapidly as possible.

The American Legion and its national commander are to be heartily commended for their excellent work in remedying this injustice to veterans of this war.

The Late Honorable Lawrence Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable LAWRENCE LEWIS, Representative from the First Colorado District, comes to me as a grave personal loss. Other Members have spoken of his outstanding

characteristics: His industry, his integrity, his kindness—all the traits that are summed up in saying that he was a true gentleman. I knew this from personal experience. When I first came to this House in 1939, I was assigned an office near his; and we remained neighbors through all the intervening years. On my arrival he at once offered me, with the utmost generosity, all the assistance that an older Member can render to a newcomer; had I been from his own State and of his political party, he could not have done more. As time went on I hope that I succeeded in repaying some of his kindness; but his passing leaves me with a deep sense of my lasting indebtedness to him. In his passing I have lost a dear friend, whose memory I shall always cherish; and his district and the Nation have lost a public servant whose devotion to the duties of his office were outstanding.

Rear Admiral William H. P. Blandy

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on yesterday the Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., to be Chief of the Naval Bureau of Ordnance. Admiral Hussey has been the Assistant Chief of this Bureau, under Rear Admiral William H. P. Blandy, and, knowing Admiral Hussey, as I do, I am sure we may look forward to a very splendid administration.

In the summer of 1940, Mr. Speaker, our Navy antiaircraft program was not making satisfactory headway. At that time there was out in the fleet a young, aggressive Navy captain who was well known throughout the service as an excellent skipper and an expert ordnanceman. His name was Blandy, commanding the U. S. S. *Utah*, the Navy's experimental antiaircraft ship; the same Blandy who is now relinquishing the chiefship of the Bureau of Ordnance, at his own request, to get back to sea and personally to engage in combat with the enemy. This is the same Blandy who, back in 1913, graduated from the Naval Academy at the head of his class, and who ever since has been one of our younger naval leaders.

Blandy was called to Washington to take a special assignment, which was to bring about improvements in the antiaircraft program. He tackled the job vigorously, as was his wont, and immediately set out to find the best weapons to be had regardless of source, and then proceeded with their adaptation to our needs. So well did he perform his assignment, that it was natural that the administration turned to him to head up the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance in February 1941, when the whole program needed a driving force of Blandy's demonstrated capabilities. When he took over, almost immediately there ensued a marked acceleration in procurement and production. As a consequence, the fleet today is not lacking in ordnance, either in quality or quantity, nor will it be, under the procedures Blandy either inaugurated or developed.

The admiral has accomplished his special mission in the Department and is now about to return to sea, not as a captain, but as a rear admiral. For what he has done, the Navy and the country owe him much. He took immediate advantage of any improvements discovered in captured enemy material, and he collaborated with and encouraged and aided such research activities as might lead to improving the striking power of our forces or providing them with exclusive, superior weapons.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with Hanson Baldwin's recent article in the New York Times criticizing the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance. It was not up to the Baldwin standard. It sounded more like a fishing expedition by one seeking to elicit secret information.

I have been in rather close touch with the production of all kinds of naval ordnance matériel since Admiral Blandy took over direction in early 1941, and I have sound basis for the assertion that naught but high praise should be forthcoming from any quarter. I am confident that I will be supported in that assertion by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the Honorable JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, who preceded me in my present position as chairman of the Naval Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Senator SCRUGHAM is a noted engineer and an ordnance man himself, having served as an assistant to the Chief of Army Ordnance during World War No. 1.

As I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, Admiral Blandy is going back to sea. When he gets back, which will not be far hence, he personally will direct the use by some of our forces of the products under his stewardship here in Washington. I venture to predict that he will employ them well and find them more than a match for the forces he may be called upon to combat. He has all of the qualities we would expect to find in top naval leadership, and, with firepower at hand of his own production, plus his extended fleet training, I have nothing but faith in the accomplishments he will achieve.

The Moscow Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star and an editorial from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Star]

WILLKIE ASSAILS POLICY EXPRESSED BY LANDON

NEW YORK, December 6.—Wendell L. Willkie, 1940 Republican Presidential nominee, said today that if recent speeches of Alf M. Landon, Republican presidential nominee in 1936, represent the thinking of the Republican Party, some one other than Mr. Willkie should lead the party in 1944.

Commenting on published reports that Mr. Landon predicted Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, would be the Republican Presidential nominee next year, Mr. Willkie said:

"Predictions are hazardous. This much, however, is certainly true—that if Governor Landon's recent speeches, particularly the one last Saturday on the Moscow agreements, represent the thinking of the Republican Party, then certainly someone other than myself should lead the party in 1944.

"For the statements, inferences, and implications of the Governor's speech would take the party in a different direction from that in which, in my judgment, it must go if it is to deserve to assume the leadership of this country."

[From the Washington Post]

A NEGATIVE STAND

Alfred M. Landon, who speaks for an important segment of the Republican Party, has taken a position with respect to the Moscow agreements which is difficult to reconcile with the vote of the Senate Republicans who supported the Connally resolution embodying the essential features of the Moscow Declarations.

Mr. Landon, the G. O. P. Presidential candidate in 1936, hopes for the best, but he is apprehensive. He finds no evidence in the agreements or elsewhere that the Russians have abandoned any of their well-known territorial aspirations or political ambitions. He detects in the whole business an inconsistency with the Atlantic Charter, and he cautions his fellow Republicans against taking a stand in support of the agreements.

The announcement of views such as these is a matter for concern. If Mr. Landon is not willing to endorse the achievements at Moscow, for what does he stand? And what position does he want his party to take?

There are but few who would contend that the Moscow agreements are a complete and entirely satisfactory answer to the perplexing questions that will confront the world after the war. But they do represent a measure of accomplishment, and they set out a basis for hope that is not to be found elsewhere. In their own party interests, and in the interests of the United States, the Republicans can ill afford to be content with a stand-offish policy which neither endorses what is being done nor proposes any tangible alternative. At this critical juncture in our national affairs, a brand of leadership that is purely negative can hardly be expected to commend itself to the American people.

The Subsidy Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I find from a few letters that have come to my desk that certain well-

meaning persons would like to have the Government pay their grocery bills with a subsidy drawn from the Treasury of the United States. This money, with which to pay this proposed subsidy, if such a plan were to be adopted, would have to be borrowed by the Government from the people, thus increasing the national debt to the amount of the subsidy, plus the cost of bureaucratic administration.

A feature of the subsidy plan seldom mentioned is: Who will eventually have to pay this debt, contracted for the payment of the grocery bills of the people at home while millions of our boys are fighting in the vermin-infested jungles and fox holes abroad? The fact is that this debt for groceries, if allowed, will be a financial burden which our returning soldiers will be obliged to pay. I did not vote to saddle such a financial load upon the backs of our fighting men, and it is my hope that such an injustice will not be tolerated by the people of this country.

I insist that the cure for the type of inflation which now threatens the consumers is not a subsidy, paid for with borrowed money, but, instead, a greater production of the necessities of life, not less production. It is self-evident that greater production requires a fair price for farm products in order to make greater production possible. It is obvious that the present plight of those who feel the pinch of advancing food prices has been created as the logical consequence of a long-continued loose fiscal policy which has been in operation under the New Deal for the past 10 years.

To be more specific, the country has been on a New Deal inflationary drunk for 10 years and now it is thought that by indulging in the same intoxicant in larger doses the inflationary headache can be cured. I have fought, in season and out of season, to prevent the very predicament in which the New Deal has placed all those who stand to lose everything they have saved for their old age. The devastating effect of inflation, if it were to get out of control, would be as disastrous to me as it could possibly be to every person whom I have the honor to represent, and it was with this thought in mind that I voted against the proposed inflationary subsidy.

Subsidies are inflationary because they increase available purchasing power, of which there is an excess. They increase Federal expenses, the borrowings from the banks, and increase bank deposits.

The subsidy subterfuge is a device of the New Deal, designed to cover up the inefficiency of its three-term program. Suppose we "look at the record." President Franklin D. Roosevelt has never sponsored nor put into operation an effective "hold the line" program to prevent inflation. His program since 1933 has been to encourage inflation. The fire of inflation feeds on waste, extravagance, boondoggling and deficit financing, and these contributing factors to inflation have been supplied in abundance by the New Deal. Moreover, I know that instead of establishing a "hold the line" resistance to inflation, the Roosevelt administration is now conducting the same wild, reckless, loose fiscal policy as heretofore, except as brakes, now and then, are applied by Congress to the wasteful spending program.

The most effective and only sure anti-inflationary policy to adopt to protect the consumers is to stop the New Deal boondoggling and waste, insist upon retrenchment in all spending that is not essential to the all-out prosecution of the war and remove the totalitarian bureaucratic strangle hold from the threats of the food producers of this Nation. Abundance of food, not scarcity, is the best cure for inflationary food prices. Subsidies drawn from the Treasury in an amount sufficient to keep pace with the past and present program of waste and extravagance of the administration, if adopted, will of necessity accentuate inflation, not check or defeat it.

Mr. Speaker, when the Roosevelt administration took out of production more than 36,767,000 acres of farm lands and destroyed 6,400,000 hogs, 1,300,000 head of cattle, and 2,190,000 sheep, it laid the foundation for inflationary prices of these essential food products. Realizing its mistake, but not admitting it, the Roosevelt planners hurriedly arranged to import, and did import, 86,000,000 bushels of corn; 47,000,000 pounds of hams, shoulders, and bacon; and 90,000,000 pounds of canned meat. This hedge against the inflation of food prices was only a temporary expedient, so that now there is an acute shortage of food and as a consequence an advance in food prices. This shortage of food production, caused by eliminating farm land from use, and the destruction of cattle, hogs, and sheep—necessary for breeding purposes—is inflationary.

I might add also that the New Deal crop-reduction plans threw 3,500,000 men out of work and into bread lines. This added to one of the many causes leading to inflation. The Roosevelt philosophy that by destroying food, taking land out of production, stripping the farms of labor, shipping farm machinery abroad, and regimenting the few men and women left to work the farms, would usher in a period of plenty has been exploded, and stands revealed as pure sophistry.

I repeat that any attempt to further add to the national debt by food subsidies to pay any appreciable part of the grocery bills of 130,000,000 people will be just another step in promoting uncontrolled inflation—and it will be asking the boys who are fighting the war to also pay the check.

The shipment of essential war material to use against us, such as scrap iron, copper, tin, oil, gasoline, planes, and engine parts created a shortage of these materials in the United States, such shortage adding to the cost of prosecuting the war, hence inflationary in its effect.

It was also inflationary for the Roosevelt administration to finance the Japanese by bidding up the price of silver to enable Japan to sell her Manchurian silver stocks to the United States, and also to sell to the United States the silver taken by Japan from China. When the United States Treasury bid up the price of silver, Chinese speculators acquired and exported silver out of China, causing a run on Chinese banks, thus assisting Japan with her war preparation by weakening China. This, too, has paved the way for further inflation in the United States.

Inflation in the United States was greatly furthered when the United States Treasury purchased gold from Japan at $35 an ounce, which cost Japan only $8 an ounce to produce. It was highly inflationary for the New Deal to equip the Axis enemies.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to "hold the line" against inflation by limiting the holding to just part of the line; to be effective the whole line must be held.

An Eminent Catholic Divine Philosophizes On the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great minds in the clergy of America is that possessed by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, Bishop of Chicago. Recently, he visited the National Capital, where he delivered a learned and thoughtful address before the Charles Carroll Forum. He spoke on the subject of social implications of today. I recommend its reading to all thinking Americans.

Some of my friends have asked me to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Note the literary quality of the phrases employed. Note the philosophical and spiritual aspects of the address. It is exalting and uplifting and worthy of respectful attention of all Americans. The Bishop's penetrating analyses of the war, its possibilities and its dangers, its domestic and international aspects, make this address one of the most outstanding contributions yet made by any thinker in America.

Here it is:

Abraham Lincoln once said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history—the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation—we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

These words are genuinely historical, because with sure intuition they focus the present in the light of both past and future, because with practiced ear they interpret the temporary as counterpoint to the permanent. For Lincoln but echoed the thoughts of the founding fathers—of men like Washington and Jefferson, who, with unerring vision, saw the role which history had assigned to America. It was to be a unique role. Unlike many of its historical predecessors, unlike many of its powerful contemporaries, America, if true to its destiny, was not to travel the road of world empire. That was and remains a seductive road, strewn with ruins, magnificent perhaps, but inevitable. That was and remains the road upon which the

latest traveler, in whatever moments of introspection wisdom grants him, may envision the farthest ruin as the landmark of his own endeavors. For those who doubt, we have Herr Hitler, wrapped in mystic intuition, evoking ancient Saxon shades in a futile attempt to oppose the inevitable.

No, America was to seek its goal, to find its destined greatness not by conquest, but by example, not in force, but in persuasion. For America was to draw its didactic strength from an idea passionately believed in by its founders. Basically, that idea was a religious one. It proclaimed that men were created free and equal, that they were endowed with reason, that they were morally responsible. Freedom, therefore, was both an inalienable right and an essential characteristic of man. That idea expressed a faith and nurtured a hope. A faith, because it crystallized deepest convictions; a hope, because it dared encompass within its courageous vision the day when all men would walk the earth in freedom and equality. The idea was judged revolutionary. As a matter of fact, it was conservative in the most basic meaning of that term, because it sought to conserve, to guarantee those human values, those human rights, without which man loses his distinctive dignity and his very meaning.

The words of Lincoln were spoken at a critical moment in the life of the Nation. It is significant, yet historically characteristic, that at such a time Lincoln should have made appeal to the people's sense of ineluctable moral responsibility. "We cannot escape history." In other words, nations, like individuals, shall be judged according to the moral consequences of their actions. And from that judgment there is no escape. Good is good; evil remains evil. Neither does expediency nor political casuistry change that objective fact. As Jefferson said of Napoleon: "Had he reflected that such is the moral construction of the world, that no national crime passes unpunished in the long run, he should not now be in the cage of St. Helena."

Once again, this Nation has entered a critical phase of its history. Our territorial integrity has been basely attacked. That is sufficient warrant for war, but it by no means offers a complete explanation of the struggle now raging. Beneath the din of battle and the clash of arms, there is the concurrent conflict in the spiritual realm, in that intangible sphere of ideals and beliefs. It is there that we must seek the real significance of this war. It is revealed in the unprecedented challenge made to our ideals, to those philosophical concepts which are the very well-springs of our national life. Democracy must not only prove its military strength; it must justify its moral prestige in the realm of the spirit which is not circumscribed by any line of battle, by any geographic limit. In its martial aspect, this war is global; in its philosophic connotations, it is universal, because it involves these common truths which touch human existence at its very roots.

There is abroad a rather complacent tendency toward oversimplification. This is a frequent result of wishful thinking, and it may cloud our vision of basic issues. This tendency finds articulation in two widespread opinions, both of which I firmly believe are unwarranted and dangerously erroneous.

The first of these judges fascism to be an overnight phenomenon, a historical "sport," or a malignant cell that has developed and grown independently of the main body of western European thought and progress. The second opinion more commonly held, and much more mischievous, maintains that a military victory for democracy, complete and unconditional, will effectively silence the underlying conflict of ideas. Both these views are superficial, short-sighted, and grossly unrealistic. If they are to be adopted as premises for planning the world of the future, then some of us will have to bear with good grace the label of pessimist.

It is important here to distinguish sharply reason and emotion. Our deep hatred of fascism and all its works and pomps must not be allowed to blind us to the fact that it is a logical product, or, if you prefer, a by-product, of the evolution of modern western European thought, that corrosive compound of crass materialism and mechanistic determinism. To say that man is the creature of the state, that he has no destiny outside the state—this is simply to express in totalitarian terms the current philosophical concept which, with the cold detachment borrowed from natural science, sees man as a meaningless complex of atoms, a blindly determined animal, struggling for sheer physical survival within the framework of an equally meaningless universe.

The second opinion envisions total military victory as the end of the ideological conflict. Those who reason thus are afflicted, I fear, with acute historical myopia. They fail to distinguish the cultural forces that are the true dynamics of history. More immediately, they ignore two recent and compelling factors that set off sharply the modern phase of history. One is the awakening rather, the undeniable restless stirring of the masses of people everywhere in the world. The other factor is the strong, I might even say, lusty, challenge of collectivism. Both merit detailed consideration, because failure to grasp their import guarantees complete misunderstanding of the world of today. Concomitantly, this failure precludes any possibility of laying a solid foundation for the house of peace of the future.

It is a commonplace of history that the genesis of popular movements is to be sought in the expressed desire of people for a return to fundamental human values. The banners of revolution usually have emblazoned on them such essentially spiritual slogans as freedom, brotherhood, equality, peace—those basic spiritual realities that touch the very core of life. Thus it is that the thoughts and ideals of the people so often are a more realistic and more reliable guide to truth than the laboriously academic opinions of experts and phrase makers.

The awakening and awareness of peoples everywhere today are no exception to this incontrovertible fact. The unprecedented phenomenon which we are witnessing enjoys many interpretations—none, I think, closer to the truth than that which measures the movement in terms of a popular demand, often scarcely articulate, for a return to tradition. By this I mean a return to a human and humane evaluation of man, his individual worth and dignity, his place in the universe, and his spiritual destiny. For people are becoming conscious that much of modern thought, in itself representing a final break with tradition, has succeeded in eliminating the essential meaning of man. This is the inevitable effect of a false humanism; it begins by apotheosizing man, and ends by destroying him. Not that modern thought has neglected man. On the contrary, it has consciously studied, analyzed, and dissected him. Inspired by an unparalleled passion for objectivity scientists, scholars, thinkers of varied hues have applied to man the technique of the laboratory and clinic. He has been subjected to almost unlimited experimentation. The result in many instances has been the destruction of man's inner integrity, of that intangible humaneness, which is not amenable to scalpel or retort. The anatomist who boasted that he had found no evidence of man's soul presents strong evidence both for the spirituality of the soul and for that pompous foolishness possible only to the pseudo-educated.

It is as if each branch of human knowledge, working within its own consciously imposed bounds, has produced an equally limited view of man. It is as if these various scholars have collaborated in writing a volume entitled, "Man"; the assigned chapters are present, and the result may be called a volume. The difficulty is that there is no plot, no thread of integration which gives meaning to the story. Thus, certain influential protagonists of the scientific school present man as essentially an animal, or as a group of reactions, or as a bundle of reflexes. He is blindly determined by blind forces which he neither understands nor controls. This current version of man is sufficiently bad in concept; it is worse in practical conclusions and applications to human life. If man is merely an animal, predetermined to struggle for sheer survival, then the struggle can only become sharper, more constant, and more widespread as man utilizes his ingenuity for creating the implements of destruction.

Peace, then, becomes an illusion, and plans for a better world have no foundation in the nature of man himself. If man is hopelessly caught in the meaningless labyrinth of life, then cynicism may well be the only intelligent attitude to adopt. If freedom of will is an archaic superstition, concomitantly there is implied the denial of all human capacity for good, for improvement. Futility becomes the guide to the future and the literature of despair is amply justified as the modern textbook of human existence.

The corrosive intellectual environment in which we have lived for so many years has had unbelievably wide influences. Education, the prime purpose of which is to provide the necessary integration, has in great part simply formalized the dehumanizing of the humanities. Its outstanding contribution has been to foster the cult of the open mind, whose primary dogma tenaciously, almost fanatically, asserts that there is no dogma. All absolute truths are condescendingly labeled metaphysics, and as such are relegated to the interesting but archaic realm of alchemy and witchcraft. The inevitable result of this soothing subjectivism has been that intellectual and moral relativism which ultimately destroys all objective standards of truth and conduct. A doctorate of philosophy is hardly required to see that if there is no unchanging measure, no static norm, then it is futile to argue about truth and falsity; it is idle to dispute about right and wrong. One is apt to lose patience with the academicians who fail or refuse to realize that their speculations blindly carried on in the aseptic atmosphere of pure reason do entail practical considerations. Thus the Fascist propagandists, with their perverted gift for opportunism, make the literal, you might say the brutal, applications of these modern philosophical principles. With amazing mental complacency they were able to speak of peace when they really meant war. They could propose a new order which in essence was the old order of oppression. In their dialectics, protective security became the new label for ancient tyranny; aryanism the symbol of racial and religious persecution. We of the democracies stood aghast, our sensibilities shocked at this appalling subversion of fundamental concepts. Instead, we might well have reexamined the principles which provided the dynamics for a great part of our educational system. David Hume confessed that he was appalled at the complete skepticism which was the relentless result of his own philosophical premises. Many of our educators and our intelligentsia may well pause to contemplate the tragic, the disastrous consequences of that chaos which calls itself intellectual liberalism.

It is time, I think, for us to recognize and especially to interpret correctly the almost universal awakenings of peoples today. It warns us in unmistakable accents that the hour has long since struck for a return to fundamental truths and traditional values. Despite the intellectual snobbery of experts

these still constitute and energize the moral strength of nations. By them, we must reorientate ourselves and set our course for a difficult future. I say a difficult future purposely because it seems obvious that this war, although it will solve some immediate problems, will at the same time engender others requiring a deeper and more lasting solution.

We Americans have a unique, an almost sacred obligation to heed the wishes of the people. The builders of this Nation sunk its foundations deep in democratic principles, an important one of which was the belief that the real strength of the country lay in its citizens. Always this was to be the touchstone for America. Thus, the power of governing—not without bold opposition—was finally and irrevocably placed in the hands of the people themselves. All the machinery of government was to be but a practical medium for expressing the popular will. At various times in our history, individuals, groups, even governmental agents, moved by the will to power, have attempted to contravene or to ignore this basic American principle. Always the attempt failed; always, the final solution had to be sought in a return to the people, to their judgment and expressed desires.

As Woodrow Wilson once said: "Nobody who cannot speak the common thought, who does not move by the common impulse, is the man to speak for America, or for any of her set purposes. Only he is fit to speak who knows the thoughts of the great body of citizens."

Today we hear much about the people's war, the people's peace, the century of the common man. These are gratifying phrases. They possess the authentic ring of true democracy, and if they are to be evaluated as more than graceful slogans of discredited demagogery, they merit close scrutiny. There is little question that this is a people's war. All wars are. Always it is the people who make the sacrifices, who bear the sorrows, who carry the heavy burden of war. Always it is people to whom the casualty list spells bitter reality.

A far more important concept is the people's peace. This implies that the forthcoming peace, which is to be the first step in the planning of a better world, shall give expression to the deep desires of people throughout the earth. It is imperative, then, to know and to satisfy these wishes. One thing is certain, the universal desire of the common people of the world is for a peace that will guarantee peace for the future. For only in peace can people find their fulfillment and work out their unique destiny as human beings. But such a peace is impossible, unless it be founded squarely upon the fundamental virtues of justice and charity. Any blueprints for the future which omit these are worse than futile. They are but guaranties of greater mischief. It is possible to rear the building, to call it a better world, even to inscribe over the portals the beautiful word "peace"; yet, unless justice and charity be the foundations, it can only be a whitened sepulcher, a mocking mausoleum of the sacrifices and the hopes of men. This is a platitude; yet, like most platitudes, it happens to be true. More, it lays one open, I fully realize, to the condescending charge of idealism, which in the idiom of materialism is synonymous with idiocy. Yet it would not be too difficult to prove that idealists are the only true realists, simply because they measure and judge things by unchanging principles, by true reality. To which I might add the further thought: In the end we never escape principles, whether we be individuals or nations. For the real world, that is God's world, is a moral construct. In it there operates moral law, the constant expression of divine will. That law cannot be circumvented nor violated with impunity. Retribution, though late, is never absent. For this reason, expediency, which basically is moral cowardice, and which has been elevated to a high position in modern diplomatic circles, can never finally succeed. It begins in exaggerated pragmatism, it ends inevitably in moral chaos, the potent seed of future conflict.

This is a time for plain speaking, for a critical appraisal of our principles and policies. It is my conviction that the common people of the world are not interested in power politics, that cynical relic of outmoded imperialism. For essentially, power politics is a practical denial of that freedom for which people are supposedly fighting. More, it is a rejection of a fundamental truth of Christianity, which is the very core of our traditional western culture. Power politics views and evaluates individuals not as individuals with a unique spiritual value, but as pawns in a gigantic game of power. Nor does the ponderous label, geopolitics, change its nature. If there are people who are thinking in such terms—and there is more than a suspicion that they are—then they are going contrary to the wishes of the people. They are helping to provide for a peace that will be but a melancholy prelude to a more terrifying conflict.

Nor do I think that the common people of the world are interested in a peace written in the ledger-language of commerce, or the stilted syllables of economics. People have not suffered, young men have not died in order to make secure international cartels. No, people have sacrified, and young men have spilled their blood for the courageous belief that men—all men—should exercise and enjoy freedom within whatever social and political framework they agree upon; free from the dominance of any master who seeks to violate this freedom in the name of race, country, empire, conquest, or commerce.

Of its nature, freedom can have only a spiritual justification, because it rests upon the absolute worth, the transcendent, the innate dignity of the individual human being. As such, it goes far beyond all material limits and considerations. It and it alone gives man the opportunity to live as God intended—literally, not by bread alone, but by the breath of that spiritual liberty which is the endowment of his creator, and not the gift of any paternal government, nor benevolent social organization.

There are abroad in the weary world today many experts whose thinking is quantitative rather than qualitative. They envision a peace premised on the essentially materialistic, and hence rigidly narrow, view of man as purely an economic animal. They would have us believe that man's varied aspirations will find normal satisfaction in electric refrigerators or plastic buttons, provided these be produced in almost limitless lots. The crassness of such an opinion is equaled only by its naïveté. Again, if certain people are wording the peace in these terms, they have failed to pierce the inner meaning of this war. They have completely misinterpreted the desires of the people of the world. They are merely loading the gun for a more stupendous global conflict, which presumably would decide—only temporarily, of course—who is to hold mastery over the economy of the world. I repeat, the common people of the world demand a return to fundamental truths, to traditional values. Above all, they seek the restoration of the individual human personality to its rightful place in the hierarchy of creation, whose beginning and end is God. All other values, political, economic, social, must be subjected, must be subordinated to human values. Only through this restoration can human solidarity be achieved, and human solidarity is the only effective gateway to a peace founded on the unique nature of man himself. This is the desire of the people. Let their leaders attend them, lest disaster engulf us all.

The second factor essential to an understanding of the current phase of history is the challenge of collectivism.

Collectivism has many faces and as many names. It may appear as communism, national socialism, fascism, or state capitalism. The points of resemblance and divergence between these need not concern us here. To answer the purpose of our discussion it is sufficient to recognize collectivism—whatever its form—as an offspring of statism, and to interpret it as a reaction, a countermovement, against that individualism which has characterized the modern economic era. Like most reactions, collectivism represents an extreme. It places all the emphasis on man, not as an individual, but as a social being. Such a viewpoint would not necessarily cause undue perturbation, were it not for the fact that collectivism tends ultimately to identify man, the social being, with man, the creature of the state. This constitutes its inherent danger. The state, then, ceases to be a social instrument. It becomes, instead, the dynamic source and the absolute arbiter of all human rights. Inevitably, the dignity and worth of the individual are no longer judged absolute, but relative to the so-called good and the official purposes of the state. Once the initial premise of the supremacy of the state is admitted, relentlessly every phase of the individual citizen's life is brought under the control of the state; the state, in turn, becomes, of necessity, an impersonal and remorseless bureaucracy.

It is quite obvious that collectivism rests upon a concept of man and of the state which is essentially opposed to our traditionally Christian and western philosophy. Yet, strangely, this does not preclude the fact that collectivism offers a formidable challenge to us. This it does, I believe, because it possesses a strong popular appeal, at once psychological and economic. It is an appeal moreover, which explains the contradiction of people seeking a return to tradition by embracing a philosophy totally alien to that tradition.

The challenge of collectivism is subtly psychological because it plays upon a basic instinct in man. For man is a social being, not merely because he tends to form a part, a unit, of society; rather, he is social in the deeper sense that he wishes to be conscious of playing a part—of contributing something to the system in which he lives. The propagandists for collectivism have made constant and insistent appeal to this normal human aspiration. To masses of confused people they have held forth the opportunity to participate, to cooperate, in the creation of what is termed, perversely enough, a new order, in which every individual is important because he contributes to the whole. The fallacy, of course, lies in the attempt to achieve human completeness by surrendering those essential human rights which alone can guarantee the full development of the human personality.

No less seductive is the economic aspect of collectivism. Here the attraction lies in the promise of superficial security. Again, we are face to face with a fundamental fact of human existence. Most people do desire economic security. That is quite understandable. The disturbing factor is the increasing tendency of the people to seek it by relinquishing to the state those rights which are the basis of their freedom. In a kind of bilateral contract, the state guarantees a measure of security in exchange for increased powers.

There are those who hold that this bartering of liberty merits severe condemnation because of the defeatist attitude which inspires it. It is closer to the truth, I think, to level criticism at the faults of a social system which, in some instances, has forced people to make the critical choice between freedom and security. Unrestrained economics individualism, devoid of social consciousness and responsibility, cannot be absolved of its failure to provide the desired security for those who are frequently called the underprivileged, but whom I prefer to

name the misguided—and this in its literal sense. Many of us forget that even economic systems can never be completely autonomous; they, too, operate within the delicately balanced framework of society whose end and purpose is the common good of all.

Nor is the charge answered by seeking cover in an evasive appeal to certain mythical economic laws, which supposedly function with the impersonal detachment of physical laws. Economic systems are the creation of human intelligence and ingenuity; they can be established, changed, and destroyed by the free actions of men. More, since they are essentially human, they must be measured and judged according to the rigorous standard of morality. Business ethics can only be personal virtues applied to commerce; they are not a distinct science of moral opportunism.

Neither should we be too impressed by the ardor with which certain individuals espouse the cause of liberty. Too often, in the immediate past, this pious enthusiasm has been identified with zealous opposition to ends socially desirable and popularly demanded. To invoke the right of free speech, of private property, of freedom of enterprise as a screen for purely selfish objectives, either of gain or power, has had a most serious consequence. In the minds of people, these rights are becoming synonymous with weapons of reaction. Again, lack of social responsibility has resulted in a lessening of popular regard for liberty. Here, I am convinced, is to be found another potent factor influencing people to value security above freedom.

This, then is the challenge of collectivism, a component part of a global conflict which, as I have said, is essentially ideological. It is a challenge that democracy must meet squarely and vigorously. Military victory alone will not decide the basic issue. Much less will it be solved by minimizing the appeal of collectivism, or by recourse to comforting slogans. The challenge can be met, and the issue decided, only by proving in action to the people of the world that democracy holds the best promise of attaining, not Utopia, but a way of life consistent with the deep desires and the normal aspirations of humanity. There need be no heightened cleavage between freedom and security. In fact, security is an ephemeral dream, if it be not founded on human freedom. Democracy professes the religious principles, and it possesses the political structure necessary to secure liberty to its people. By consistent loyalty to these principles and by means of thoroughly democratic processes, it can make possible a security sufficient for the development of human potentialities. The answer to collectivism is not expediency nor casuistry: it is not pseudo democracy, which speaks the language of liberty and uses the methods of totalitarianism. The most convincing answer is and can only be democracy itself, full dynamic, without shadow of fear or compromise. If this be not our conviction, then we had best admit that the American ideal is a myth, based on a naive belief and an empty promise.

In the present struggle and the coming reconstruction, the responsibility of America is grave and inescapable. Today, as in the past, the essential America represents a vision of hope to oppressed people everywhere. In our hands rests the future faith of the democratic ideal and the very concept of human liberty. We can best serve these by following the path of those who conceived of the American experiment, and by remaining true to our traditional role as example to the world of a people governing themselves in justice, seeking the common good of all within the framework of personal freedom. The twentieth century must be the American century only in this sense; any other ambitious interpretation embraces a violation of our fundamental principles. This is not a plea for narrow nationalism, nor for selfish isolationism; neither is it a rejection of cooperation with other nations in the interests of solidarity, which the common people of the world desire. It is the expression of a belief that America can contribute most by preserving intact those democratic institutions which are her peculiar possession and he. basic strength. Those institutions are grounded in religious principles, and are buttressed by moral virtues.

The judgment of history shall be a moral one. Need I repeat: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history."

The Too Farsighted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

THE TOO FARSIGHTED

(By Walter Lippmann)

In traveling about a bit lately I have been struck by meeting, in almost every gathering where men and women were talking about affairs, at least one or two who were so weighed down by the unsolved problems of the future that they could find little satisfaction in the results achieved at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran. They are the too farsighted. And though they mean very well, perhaps even too well, they have such a long view of the distant future that they have little attention left for the nearest future and the immediate present.

A few months ago these farsighted people were able to take no satisfaction in Stalingrad and the great Russian counteroffensive; they were brooding on the chances of a separate peace between Russia and Germany. They were brooding also on their apprehension that Great Britain would default on the Pacific war and that Britain and Russia would never restore the integrity of China or admit China to full equality among the great states.

Now that these farsighted forebodings have not come true, they have forgotten they ever had them. They have a new set of forebodings. They find that while the Cairo conference settled the boundaries of Japan, it did not settle the future of Hong Kong, Burma, Indochina, and of the whole colonial and dependent world. They find that while the Teherân conference settled the military issues which threatened to divide Russia from the western Allies, this is not a sufficient interesting achievement. The Teheran conference, they find, did not declare on the future of defeated Germany, the status of the contending forces within Greece, Yugoslavia, and central Europe, etc.

They are farsighted to the point where being farsighted can easily become a kind of nervous disease which paralyzes their will, their faith, and their practical resolution. They are like a man and woman who would feel they could not get married until they had agreed on the number, the dates of birth, the sex of their children, the make of the car, the refrigerator, and the radio they would buy when Johnny was old enough to go to college and Sally was ready to go out dancing with her friends. I have been meeting people, who were shaking their heads because no one had told them who would succeed Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, Churchill, and Roosevelt, and how, they asked me, can we be sure that anything has been achieved if we cannot see clearly the future of mankind.

The manner in which we are dealing with the future after this war is indeed quite different from the settlement of the other great war. The last time we tried to settle the whole war after we had finished fighting it. This time we are making specific settlements as we approach the climax of the war. Moreover, and this is for the excessively farsighted the most novel and puzzling aspect of the matter; we have learned that it is better to settle one question after another than to try to settle all of them at once.

For we have learned to our great advantage that if we deal with all questions at once, they may all become insoluble. The difficulties of each issue multiply the difficulties of every other issue. If on the other hand, we settle questions in their right order of importance, each settlement makes the next settlement easier. When Stalin and Churchill had agreed on a common strategy and a working partnership in great matters, they found it much easier to agree on the future of Iran. If they had started with Iran before they had resolved their more important differences, they might never have agreed on Iran.

There is here not only a sound rule of diplomacy; it is elementary practical wisdom in all the affairs of life. If, for example, a young man in high school wishes at the age of 40 to be the vice president of the First National Bank, the worst way to realize his ambition is for him to try to decide at the age of 15 whether for a vice president of the bank it will do him any good to study botany. He had better do as well as he can what he has to do immediately, be it botany or basketball, that will prepare him better for the bank than being too calculating and farsighted about his career.

My impression, indeed my firm conviction, is that our own people will gain confidence in a settlement which is made in this practical and specific way. They would shrink from grandiose and global plans which professed to settle everything for ever; our people are too shrewd to put much faith in such plans. On the other hand, they will, indeed they do, approve and support a method which consists in crossing bridges when you come to them, a method which does not pretend that there is a single carpet by which mankind can overlap the jungles and the mountains and land plump and breathless in the promised land.

Religious Liberty the Only Basis for a Just and Durable Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist:

[From the Alabama Baptist of December 9, 1943]

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY THE ONLY BASIS FOR A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

(By L. L. Gwaltney, editor, the Alabama Baptist)

In America the correct ideal with reference to religious freedom has been attained. Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Baptists, and

people of all faiths have agreed to disagree and disagree agreeably. They all live at peace under one flag just because they are all free to hold and propagate their peculiar faiths. Hence the strong political unity of America is due to a lack of any governmental coercion in a wide diversity of faiths.

The utmost freedom of religion should be attained by the present global war. As such, this boon should have first place in post-war considerations and plans. For, if the minds and souls of men are not free, no other permanent freedoms can be established.

ERROR OF STATE CHURCHES

Now wherever state churches exist there is and can be no religious freedom in the truest sense. These churches are found in the British Isles and in Europe. In some instances they are Protestant, in others Catholic, and in still others they are the Greek Orthodox. But wherever they exist it means that the state fosters one church in preference to others and to the degree in which it favors one it opposes all others. That simply is not religious freedom.

The clergy of such churches are conscious that others are being taxed for the support of their peculiar faith, and they raise no protest against it. Yet the most avaricious corporation does not ask others to pay its expenses and in that a secular corporation exercises a higher sense of ethics than do the state churches.

The clergy of state churches are usually possessed of a superiority complex and an ecclesiastical pride which is expressed in intolerant dogmatism, all of which is rooted in the secular power and glamour of the state and is foreign to the spirit of Christ and to the spiritual democracy of all believers.

The clergy of such churches are prone to sell out their own liberty to the state for a mess of pottage and, in turn, are inhibited from attacking the social evils and sins of the state. Isaiah, the prophet, foresaw the watchmen who were blind. He said they were "dumb dogs, they cannot bark * * * shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way, everyone to his gain from his quarter"; and the state treasury is the quarter to which such clergy look.

State churches lean upon the arm of Caesar (the state) for their support because they lack both faith in God and confidence in the people to support them out of their voluntary contributions. A great many of the devotees of such churches frankly admit that they do not believe the people would support their churches apart from funds coerced by the state. But in such coercive measures the grace of giving is negated and thus the funds for said churches come from secular and not sacred sources.

State churches impose a religious act upon irresponsible infants, which they are pleased to call baptism, and in so doing they not only place upon infants the tag of a particular church but also the imprimatur of the state which is a political institution only.

THREE VIEWS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

There are three views which men have held as regards religious freedom: The first is mere toleration, the second is freedom of worship, and the third is the freedom of religion itself. These three views are vastly different.

First, toleration is based upon the false assumption that some political or ecclesiastical organization arrogates to itself the authority to tolerate others in matters of religion while the freedom of religion is a natural right given by God to all men. Hence it is both preposterous and utterly false for any church or state to assume that it has any authority to tolerate others in their exercise of a natural right.

Secondly, the freedom of worship goes further than mere toleration but this comes far short of the freedom of religion. For it is true that in state churches the powers that be may be willing that others have a certain freedom of worship, and so other ministers may read and pray and preach to local congregations. But when these begin to defend and propagate their faiths, evangelize others, and build institutions for the furtherance of their religion, and the process goes far enough to threaten in the least the control exercised by state churches, the ecclesiastics of such churches almost invariably suppress them. The most recent illustration of this ancient proscription was seen in Rumania when the Greek Orthodox Church closed the churches and theological schools and suppressed the publications of certain dissenters. Historically the same was done for centuries both all over Europe and in the British Isles. Thus the freedom of worship may be granted while the freedom of religion is lacking.

Third, the total and absolute freedom of religion for all faiths is the only thing that satisfies the American conscience. This means more than toleration and more than the freedom of worship. It means the right to worship and to preach and to practice, to send out missionaries, to build institutions and to found publications for the propagation of their particular faith. It is to the everlasting glory of America that this is possible, and possible not only for Catholics, and Protestants and Jews, but for Buddhists, Mohammedans, and for the devotees of any other pagan faith in the world.

ANGLO-SAXONS LEAD IN FREEDOM

The vast majority of Americans are actively and aggressively pro-British. For, whereas, nearly all races and peoples have combined in making America, it was Britain that transmitted to America its language, customs, much of its law, and the most of its culture. More than that, it is perfectly clear that Britain and America, the two great Anglo-Saxon Protestant and democratic nations, aided by Russia and China, are saving the liberties of the world at the present time. These liberties are certainly not being saved by the nations of Europe or by the huge ecclesiastical system that practically controls that continent. And since it is true that the United Nations are now saving human liberties, it is to be devoutly hoped that they will all collaborate in a post-war effort to preserve the peace of the world. But whether others do or not, it is of the greatest importance that Britain and America enter into an insoluble union that they will forever remain friends and cling together if, indeed, Anglo-Saxon civilization is permanently to survive.

Nevertheless, it is certainly true that England is the obstructionist above all other nations in tenaciously holding to the anachronism of a state church in the modern world. England is fighting for liberty along with America and yet it does not grant complete religious freedom to all of its citizens. What nation, except England, in a modern world would hold to an outmoded idea of an act of Parliament making its King both the head of a church and a state at one and the same time? Who would ever suppose that an act of Parliament could add or detract one whit from one's religious status?

AMERICAN CONGRESS VERSUS BRITISH PARLIAMENT

It is against the fundamental law of the United States for Congress to interfere with religion in any way whatever. It is stated in the first amendment to the Constitution (Bill of Rights) that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or preventing the free exercise thereof." That means that should Congress make a law touching religion it would be in violation of the Constitution and it would immediately be invalidated by the Supreme Court of the United States. The founders of the American Government, led in this by Thomas Jefferson, saw that the freedom of religion was a natural right bestowed by God upon all men and, as such, Congress should have nothing to do with religion. That makes religion free for all America and yet the parliaments of England and of Europe are still making laws with reference to religion which, in itself, is proof that said parliaments have no conception of what is meant by the actual freedom of religion.

Should the question be raised as to why the American people are so intensely interested in the separation of church and state, and especially as that regards Great Britain, the answer is that the war is being fought in order that freedom may obtain over the world. That includes the utmost religious freedom, the very thing England does not grant to its religious minorities. In all countries where state churches exist, religious minorities are not free, and inwardly and silently they revolt against the ecclesiastical tyranny which they know is being imposed upon them.

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER AND THE FOUR FREEDOMS

The four freedoms were first promulgated in the President's annual message to Congress on January 6, 1941. (Note that date.) The Atlantic Charter was signed by the President of the United States and by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, August 14, 1941, more than 7 months after the four freedoms were first mentioned. But in the Atlantic Charter there is no mention of the freedom of religion. In the sixth article only two of the freedoms are mentioned, namely "freedom from fear and want." It is a matter of conjecture as to whether or not in the signing of the Charter the President, out of deference to the Prime Minister, failed to insist upon the freedom of religion since it is certain that the freedom of religion does not prevail in the Prime Minister's own country. Now in the President's radio address of February 23, 1942, 6 months after the Charter was signed, he again mentioned the four freedoms. His exact language in that address said, "The Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world; disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples, and the four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear." Hence mention was made of the freedom of religion both before and after the Charter was signed while there is no mention of it in the Charter itself. This means that should the Charter, in principle, be adopted by the parliaments of the world it would have no reference to the freedom of religion to say nothing of the separation of church and state.

THE SIX PILLARS OF PEACE

The "six pillars of peace," propounded by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, has nothing to say of the separation of church and state which, as has been shown, must be accomplished before there can be absolute religious freedom for all. The sixth pillar reads as follows: "The peace must establish in principle and seek to achieve in practice the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty." That most probably means nothing more than toleration of religious opinion or the right of worship. It certainly falls far short of the freedom of religion which gives to all men the right not only to worship but to propagate their faith. If nothing more than that is to come out of the peace conference, so far as the freedom of religion is concerned, the war will be lost and millions of men will have died and yet will have failed to attain and preserve the greatest of all freedoms.

HISTORICAL ADDENDUM

It should be remembered that state and church were first united by Constantine (the Roman Emperor) in 325 A. D., and the unholy union soon brought on a relentless persecution of nonconformers and dissenters. The Inquisition, with all of its horror, was rooted in the state church. After the union was once effected state and church were

never again separated anywhere in the world until 1663 when Dr. John Clark procured a charter from Charles II of England which made the Providence Colony, founded by Roger Williams in 1638, (1) independent of the Puritan Colony in Massachusetts, and (2) granted religious freedom to all men in the Providence Colony.

It should also be remembered that the Church of England was established as a state church in Colonial Virginia when that colony was founded by the British in 1607 and that there was a religious revolution against the colonial state church long before there was a political revolution against the British Government. This religious revolution lasted from shortly after the founding of the colony (1607) until the adoption of the Virginia Statute for Religious Liberty in 1786 by the legislature of that State. Then, following the Revolutionary War, the Bill of Rights was adopted in 1791.

This means that church and state were separated in America: (1) in the Providence Colony in 1663; (2) in Virginia in 1786; (3) in the United States in 1791. It means that after state and church were united in 325 A. D. it was 1,338 years before they were separated in Providence; 1,461 years before they were separated in Virginia; 1,466 years before they were separated in the United States.

During these long centuries state churches cast a stream of blood and gore across Europe, the British Isles, and Colonial America. The union of state and church has, therefore, been the evil of all evils ever inflicted upon Christendom. Let it be earnestly hoped and devoutly prayed that at this epochal juncture in the history of the world tendencies and means may be somehow started which will bring about separation of church and state over the whole world and thus permit men everywhere to enjoy that religious freedom which God had bestowed upon them as a natural right.

Prisons Have Made Great Advance During War—Statement by President—Rights of Labor Should Be Protected—American Prison Congress Address of Hon. Maury Maverick

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a part of the proceedings of the Congress of Correction, sponsored by the American Prison Association, in their final meeting in New York City the night of November 22, 1943, at the Pennsylvania Hotel. Included is a statement on prisons and prisoner cooperation in the war effort from the President, also two letters on the same subject by Under Secretary Patterson, of the War Department, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, and an address by Mr. Maury Maverick, now Director of the Government Division, War Production Board, and a former Member of this body.

I pause to refer to the statement of the President, who since he entered public life over 30 years ago, has favored intelligent prison reform. It will be noted that he insists that "Labor shall be adequately guaranteed against the threat of unfair competition of prison industry," and that "our free enterprise be protected." To this I fully agree.

On the occasion of this Congress of Correction, many of the leaders of the prison improvement and correctional world were present. Included were State and Federal wardens as well as many progressive superintendents of local jails, places of detention, and county or city prisons. Besides these people of the professional field were also many penologists, criminologists, and sociologists from universities, and colleges, including many others of the same category who follow such fields as a hobby or a matter of interest in humanity only.

HON. SANFORD BATES PRESIDES

This meeting was presided over by the Honorable Sanford Bates, who is well-known as the original Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice. Mr. Bates was appointed to this position by President Coolidge and reappointed by Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt and made a splendid record.

Mr. Bates introduced the Honorable Maury Maverick, my friend and former colleague in Congress, and I take pleasure in introducing a stenographic report of some of the remarks:

Mr. BATES. When someone in the future wishes to write a history of penology in this country, I am sure they will find it reflected in the message of our president, Mr. McGee, which covers penology for three-quarters of a century.

We now come to a very pleasant part of this program when we are about to make recognition, a true recognition I really believe, symbolic of the recognition we would like to give to all who have taken part in this accomplishment—recognition to some of the leaders in this progress which we have made in the treatment of prisoners.

The man who will confer this distinction is a man who has made himself felt in the civic life of the State, and of the Nation, a former Congressman, a militant Congressman; a mayor of San Antonio, Tex., a militant mayor of a militant city; and now a militant champion of the rights of the forgotten man. I want to introduce to you the Honorable Maury Maverick, of Texas.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MAURY MAVERICK

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President (Hon. Richard McGee, superintendent of institutions, State of Washington), and Mr. President-elect (Hon. Joe Sandford, warden of the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta), and fellow members of the American Prison Association: I'm a little bit embarrassed in making this talk tonight. But I assure you that it is not on account of the fact that I am ashamed of anybody up here at the head table. It's only because I'm new in this field.

Sanford Bates said this is a historical occasion. Well, in order for you to know that I really believe what he said, I bought one of those flashlight pictures of this occasion [laughter], and it is the first time I've done it in about 15 or 20 years. You know what usually happens to these photographs—but I'm going to keep this one, with names attached, and years hence when great accomplishments have taken place which were germinated here, I am going to look at the picture and proudly say, "I was there."

Another thing I want to mention is what Mr. McGee, your president, said about us all being dead when these prison reforms are accomplished. I saw the sad and apprehensive looks on your faces—Mr. McGee, you depressed them when you said that. Yes, you intimated that all of us will be dead when these reforms take place. As far as I'm concerned, I want to say I expect to live to see most of them accomplished, and I think we will, too. [Applause.] Of course, I know Mr. McGee didn't exactly mean that; it was sort of a joke.

Now, I have been a penologist for about 2 weeks. [Laughter.] I have been through a great deal of hardship and sacrifice in order to obtain this unique position. I have read Teeters and Barnes' book New Frontiers of Criminology. It is 1,000 pages long, so I have all the basic knowledge. But besides that, I have read a lot of books by those present, including Messrs. Bates, Lawes, and others. Now, I want to quote some figures but not out of any special book. I collected these myself. These are index figures and I believe them to be fairly accurate. But listen.

Number of civil prisoners drops in wars, rises afterward

Let us take the year 1861, the beginning of the War between the States—using that as an index of 100 civil (not military) prisoners in the United States; that is, 100 prisoners in 1861 in the northern prisons, as I have no southern figures. In 1863, about the time of the Battle of Bull Run, when most of you all were getting scared up here and we southerners had been running you around, the people got a little tense up north of the Mason and Dixon line, and the index dropped down to 80. [Laughter.] It must have been a "manpower problem," though big words were not used in those days. Anyhow, we fought a few battles, most of which we southerners won—at least, we kept you busy—in 1865, when the war closed, the index had dropped to 60; that is to say, it was a 40-percent drop in civil prison population in State penitentiaries, and, as you know, there has been a great drop in State, Federal, and local prisoners in this war.

But, now, get these figures—they are postwar figures: In 1867 the prison population jumped back to 100, which, from the index of 60, was a 66⅔-percent jump. In 1869 it was 140, as against 100 in 1861.

Now, I don't know what this means in this war. But it shows civilian prison populations go down during a war, and then go up immediately afterward, and as much as 5 or 6 years later the populations are still rising.

By the token of war and great upheavals, it is common sense to know that we must have preparations; we've got to make preparations in this present war, and a great deal more than ever before, because this is a global war and there are more problems than in any previous war.

Prison wardens are good people

Now, I want to say some personal things, because I've been connected with a great many movements in my life, but this has been the most inspiring thing I have ever been connected with. I think the first man who came to see me at the War Production Board suggesting prisoners had rights, and that they ought to be allowed to make the contribution in war production, was John Ellis, of New Jersey; then Mr. Lewisohn, and then Major Burke, of Michigan; Dick Wall, of Indiana, and Bergan, of New York. I think Jim Bennet came in with Lewisohn.

All these friendships I treasure very deeply. I have met many wardens, superintendents, and heads of prison industries. I like them, and they are fine people. I see a lot of fine people here. I see Jackson, of Michigan, over there; also that handsome man Ashe, of Pennsylvania, sitting near to him. I see Ed Cass. I see my distinguished friend Lewis Lawes, formerly warden of Sing

Sing. I see many more, good men, courageous, brave, and sensible, and my association with them means more to me than any other associations in my life.

Now, the reason I am making personal statements is that when a movement is unified not only by a great ideal but also by personal friendship, it can be of incalculable benefit. Great progress has been made in this prison work; but I can see even greater progress in the future, because of the high type of personnel engaged in this work.

Three letters: Under Secretary Patterson, Assistant Secretary Bard, and the President

Now, before presenting these four certificates of merit from the War Production Board, I'm going to read three letters; one from the President, one from the Army, and one from the Navy, concerning this work.

First I will read the letter of Under Secretary of War Hon. Robert P. Patterson.

Here is what he says:

"When you address the American Prison Congress in New York this month, please deliver this message to the gentlemen assembled there for me.

"The Secretary of War, the Army procurement officials and the writer are deeply grateful to the management and inmates of the American prisons for their patriotic contribution to the war effort.

"I also want you to know that the program for the induction of men with prison records has our approval. Necessarily, it moves slowly because it is new in American history. However, as we gain greater understanding and because we will receive your continued cooperation, the results will be even better in the future.

"It is most gratifying to know that we live in a country where the prisons have gone all-out on a helpful program in the prosecution of the war." [Applause.]

Now there is an opening for us to go after the War Department again so they will step up the induction program. Not enough men have been taken in the Army, as you all know and as we have all agreed. Fortunately, however, although we see that the Army is cautious, since the policy is new, the leaders are sympathetic.

Letter of the Assistant Secretary of Navy, the Honorable Ralph Bard

Now the next letter I'm going to read is from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He says the record of institutional achievements to date in the war production has been impressive.

"The record of American prisons, both Federal and State, in this war is an impressive one. The patriotic and enthusiastic participation in the war by prison administrators and prisoners themselves has contributed directly to the successful prosecution of the war. I want to congratulate the Government division of the War Production Board for its part in helping to plan and direct the program of prison industries in the various prisons.

"We in the Navy Department are especially grateful to the prison industries for producing many types of goods which have been most helpful to the Navy and the men in its service. I hope it may be possible to pass on this message of appreciation to the men actually engaged in producing these goods.

"In addition to our recognition of the direct contribution of the prison industries to our wartime needs, we are also conscious of the far-reaching improvements which have been made in prisoner morale and prison administration. Because of the farsighted activities of the War Production Board and because of the enthusiastic cooperation of prison administrators and prisoners, both Federal and State, it is not too much to hope that out of the gains of the last 18 months will come permanent results. Success in the present program offers every expectation that the rehabilitation of prisoners can be accomplished with more definite results than ever before.

"Please extend my congratulations to everyone connected with this program and express to them my sincerest good wishes for the future." [Applause.]

That is the official statement of the Navy. You will note the Assistant Secretary didn't mention the induction of "men with records" into the Navy. As you know, the Navy has never knowingly taken any man with a prison record. This policy is so well established that high naval officials know little of the new Army policy in this matter, or I might say, policy of the Selective Service System, as it was this group that initiated the policy.

Anyhow, I said to Mr. Bard: "You know about the induction program—whereby the Army is accepting 'men with records.'" I had been writing to Secretary Knox, various admirals, although I had not written to him. It appeared he was not familiar with all the details of the induction program, and this is our fault for not going after him, as well as the high naval officials, in order that they understand all the facts. Of course, it is not surprising, as the program is new. But, I assure you, Mr. Bard was very polite and seemed glad to listen; I cannot tell you what his final attitude will be.

At any rate, I offer these conclusions or suggestions: First, the letter I have just read shows the Navy is generally sympathetic and highly appreciative of the industrial program; second, I suggest that since the Navy appears to be sympathetic we approach them on the induction program concerning which I understand a resolution will be offered tonight.

Statement of the President of the United States

Next, I have the honor to read a statement by the President of the United States:

"The enthusiasm of both prison authorities and the prisoners in taking part in wartime activity has been most gratifying. The Federal Prison System had already worked out an admirable industrial program before we entered the war. I am glad to learn that the Government Division of the War Production Board has been able to help the State prisons in progressive development in prison industries. This improvement of prison production and morale in wartime is an achievement of great immediate moment. But prison reforms is a problem which will have equal importance in planning for peacetime activities. The curbing of delinquency is one of our great public issues, and our post-war programs must reckon with it. The wartime gains in this respect must be consolidated and perpetuated.

"An improved system of prison industry and agriculture is vital to any program not only of reformation of prisoners, but of crime repression. In any plan for more efficient and productive prison industry in peacetime, it is also essential that our free enterprise be protected and that labor shall be adequately guaranteed against threat of unfair competition by prison industry. I am sure, however, that this can be accomplished without in any way denying prisoners their just and fair right to work, to be healthy, and to be rehabilitated for law-abiding existence upon their release." [Applause.]

Presentation of certificates of award

My friends, I am now about to present certain certificates of the War Production Board, Government Division, although several of them haven't been issued. Rather, I mean they are not all going to be distributed tonight—but here tonight are four stars, to whom we will present certificates of merit. It is for their great work in America for prisons; principally for their unselfish and noble service for unfortunate men and women who suffer penal servitude and whom these men have materially helped.

The last man is a very handsome fellow, and I will hold him out to the last for presentation. I don't mean to say the first one isn't handsome. I don't want you to cheer when I give out the first three certificates, but when I hand out the fourth, cheer four times as much.

The first one will be to Dan Turner. Will you come up, Dan? I want to say what this symbolizes. This symbolizes that he was the first head of the Prison Industries Branch. He came to the War Production Board as the former Governor of Iowa, where the tall corn grows.

This symbolizes the connection of the Government and the prisons with the civilian world. I want to thank you very much, Dan, for the contribution you have made to prison industries, but particularly in developing agricultural production in State prisons throughout the United States.

Now the next one is to another good man. He started his work in the Newgate Prison and has been in prison work for 175 years, I think, but anyhow, to be quite serious, he is a good man and he helped us much by hard work and friendship, and occasionally by chiding me a little, which I deserve; and this one we want to present to my very good friend, Mr. Edward Cass, the executive director of the American Prison Association, and the tried and true friend of us all.

The next one I want to present is—one that deserves this more than anyone else—oh, not more than anyone else, but deserves it, and it is a symbol of the friendship that we have among the various branches of government—the Federal, State, and local. This one is to the Honorable James V. Bennett, Director of United States Bureau of Prisons. Wait a minute, Jim, you'd better shake hands with me.

The one I'm going to present now is to someone I'm going to praise. He is going to say a few words and when he gets through, I'm going to conclude my remarks.

I'm not going into any details about our great friend, Mr. Lewisohn. We looked in Who's Who and started to go into details about who he is, when he was born, how hard he studied at college—but we found on the side he didn't study so hard at college—what we know is that he is a good man, with a good heart, who has helped lots of people when down, and I want to express to you the deep felt gratitude that all of us have toward Samuel A. Lewisohn. [Prolonged applause for four recipients of certificates of merit.]

HON. SAMUEL A. LEWISOHN ACCEPTS CERTIFICATES OF MERIT; HIS RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point the Congress of Correction was addressed by the Honorable Samuel A. Lewisohn, chairman, committee on national defense, American Prison Association. Mr. Lewisohn has long been one of the leaders in modern penology, a member of the bar, and a distinguished business statesman, who has devoted his life to the correction of the abuses of humanity. He has provided the leadership for many programs for the betterment of the less fortunate members of the human family.

A member of the New York State Commission of Correction, Mr. Lewisohn was appointed by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1930 as chairman of the Informal Committee to Study the Parole System and also appointed by Governor Roosevelt as chairman of the Commission to

Investigate Prison Administration and Construction.

His prominence in civic affairs, however, has not been confined to penology. He has served as a member of the Regional Labor Board of New York City and of the advisory council on economic security, while he is currently serving as a member of the board of directors of the Federal Prison Industries Corporation, in which capacity he has contributed valuable service not only to the Federal prison industrial system but in developing industrial war production within State penal institutions.

During the course of his remarks outlining the rapid strides taken by the prison industries in producing food and war materials for our armed forces, Mr. Lewisohn accepted the award of the War Production Board made by the Honorable Maury Maverick, Director of the Government Division, in the form of a certificate of merit which reads as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD, PRISON INDUSTRIES BRANCH, CERTIFICATE OF MERIT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

This is to certify that Samuel A. Lewisohn is hereby cited for an award of merit for outstanding service to the Nation through participation in the development and administration of the program for the utilization of the industries and farm lands of the reformatories and prisons of the various States and the labor of their inmates for the production of foodstuffs, materials, and supplies as an essential contribution toward the war effort.

MAURY MAVERICK,
Director, Government Division.

Mr. Speaker, similar awards were accepted by Mr. Lewisohn in behalf of the following distinguished contributors to the prison war effort:

James V. Bennett, Director, Federal Prisons Bureau, Department of Justice.

Edward R. Cass, general secretary, American Prison Association.

Hon. Dan W. Turner, former Chief, Prison Industries Branch, Government Division, W. P. B.

CONCLUSION OF REMARKS BY MR. MAVERICK

Thank you, Mr. Lewisohn.

Before I conclude my talk I want to thank the many people here, both for having assisted me personally and for assisting the War Production Board. I don't want to mention them by name because there are so many, and besides I'm liable to forget someone. But I want especially to offer my personal congratulations, as well as those of the War Production Board, to those who are elected as officials of the American Prison Association.

To Mr. Joe Sanford, the new president, all congratulations and good wishes for a successful year to come. He is assured of the cooperation of all of us in the War Production Board. He is assured of my good will and cooperation.

Great Christianity came from miserable catacombs

As I stand here I think of the serious job and the huge task that we have ahead of us. Now, I wouldn't compare this banquet hall in the Pennsylvania Hotel to the catacombs. It's a little bit too luxurious for that, but this is a small group of inspired people who can, with unity and sacrifice, do a globally important job, just as the Christians of the catacombs did.

Our outgoing president, Mr. McGee, said something that made me think of little beginnings and how things can become great and of enormous value to society. He spoke of how our physical frontiers have gone. This is true.

And I believe that we are entering a period in which crime, as well as any human acts, will have their effect on people throughout the world. The Hottentot's good or bad act will cause repercussions in the Bronx or down in my Texas by the Rio Grande.

We have heard about geopolitics, and I believe we are now entering an age in the geopolitics of crime, or geopolitical penology or just geopenology. And as surely, if everybody in this group will accept the ideal of world service, with a world viewpoint, the achievements we can mark up for the whole world will be something human imagination cannot envision at this time, and I want you to bear this in mind for the rest of your lives.

World trouble and psychology of isolation

Let us talk briefly about this question of "trouble," readjustment of human beings, penology, criminology, prisons, prisoners, juvenile delinquency, crime prevention, or whatever all those things are, from a broad, world viewpoint, including incarceration or isolation of man, whether originally brought about by conviction of crime or not.

Take a man put in a Nazi prison camp. He is guilty of no crime but is treated in a brutal manner by his enemies, starved, generally mistreated, and kept there for years—perhaps since 1939 until some day from now until we know not when. Some have been in Franco's Spanish concentration camps, jails, and dungeons, since 1937. That's 6 years in prison and miserable isolation already. The Nazis have Poles and Frenchmen incarcerated starting in 1939 by the hundreds of thousands.

The psychological and physical fact is a man gets in prison. How he got in is not the major fact; the effect upon the human being is the thing. And the situation based upon this major fact of isolation is that we are developing throughout the world, and with tens of millions of people a "psychology of isolation" brought on by lengthy isolation, incarceration, or repression which inevitably will have profound and serious effects on the behavior of tens of millions of people everywhere in the world.

Take our own boys now serving in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard all over the world. Some have already lived on isolated South Pacific islands for 2 years, never having seen a member of the opposite sex. Families are separated, even though for just and necessary reasons. Whole nations and whole peoples now live as in prisons, and it will be the same, or worse, after the war. The readjustment processes will be so great as now to be impossible to conceive.

Gigantic world burden of readjustment

Indeed, there is being developed a burden of gigantic proportions which will be something that all of the psychologists, wardens, members of the American Prison Association, social workers, thinkers, and just any good citizen can spend a lot of time studying and attempting to solve. The thing that we must realize is the fact that our task is huge, global, world-wide, and yet it is an inspiring job. Let us all be proud of what we have done, but resolve to do much more and work with still wider vision, and then keep on working.

I will never be connected with this work as a career. But as a matter of deep interest, it is the most inspiring job I have assumed in my life, and I hope I can be of some help to the people who are in this great work as a career, in order that we may all help in the readjustment of mankind to normal living.

Get the politicians in on this

I have heard a lot about politics having a bad effect on correction of crime, on prison management. Well, it depends on what you mean. If there are corrupt politics, of course, the effect is bad, just as in any other endeavor. But the simple fact is that great reforms have been made by politicians; some have been by Democrats and some by Republicans, and some by members of other political groups.

It ought not be necessary to say that we have a political form of government, and that reforms are necessarily accomplished through our political system. If the politicians are against prison reform, there won't be any reform. The thing to do is to get the politicians in on this movement, and I am positive that, if they get any public backing, they will be glad to do so.

I say the politicians will be glad for selfish and unselfish reasons; this is something I know, having held elective office for 10 years. For selfish reasons, if correctional institutions are properly organized, with sensible penal codes, with proper prison management and honest boards of pardon and parole, the officeholder will not be constantly harried by petitions and appeals which are so difficult to analyze or investigate and which take an enormous amount of time. This has been proved in the Federal prison system, where Congressmen never interfere with and always give their nonpartisan cooperation. For unselfish reasons, deep in the heart of every public official is the feeling that he or she wants to see humanity get a chance. And every public official knows the best way is through fairness, firmness, and honesty.

Thus let us say we want the politicians to help in this movement; and no more than in any other movement, we naturally want corrupt politics eliminated. Our job, then, is to build public opinion in all the fields of penology, juvenile delinquency, and criminology.

We have about 400,000 in prisons and jails in America now

There are today some 16,000 Federal prisoners, but there are some 125,000 State prisoners, and 250,000 local ones. The State figure has jumped at times to a hundred-and-sixty-odd thousand, and it is said that local jails have had a population of as high as 400,000. If history repeats itself, after this war the numbers now incarcerated will jump back to their former high figures, and then beyond.

Against this eventuality society must prepare itself. We must attempt as far as possible to keep people out of jail instead of getting them in; that is, we must create a fair society where men can live and work in peace; I mean also our job is crime prevention even more than just running prisons.

But as I said earlier, even though our specific problem is great, and will be greater, the whole problem of the psychology of isolation and its effects on the world, plus the letdown after the war, is so great as to be beyond the ken of human imagination.

Fellow Americans, I repeat, this is a great work, a great movement. Let us stick together in the years to come, and with decent modesty, we can be very proud. Thank you.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE at United Every

Member Church Canvass, Klein Memorial Hall, Bridgeport, Conn., November 28, 1943:

Within the last few years, we have seen a revival of the religious spirit in all the so-called civilized nations. From the skepticism of the twenties and the atheism of the thirties, the people of many countries have turned again to God. They have turned, strangely enough, to Him who said: "The earth is not accursed," in the very hours when the world was accursed, as never before in all man's history, by brutality, murder, rapine, and war.

In Soviet Russia, God had been officially exiled for many years—exiled not just to Siberia, but beyond the utmost borders of the land. If Russians continued to worship God during the Soviets' exultantly atheistic thirties, they did so secretly and in fear of their lives. Religion, said the Bolsheviks, was the opium of the common people.

But, from all accounts, the Russian people are not quite the same people today that they were 3 years ago. They have been through the ordeal of battle. And as they walk through the final fires of that ordeal, we hear them speaking openly again of "Holy Russia." We see them restoring the altars of their fathers In their most mortal fight, the Russian people seem to be turning, with new faith to their fathers' faith in Heaven. Their rulers on earth have now officially allowed the Divine Exile to return to Russia. It is beside the point to say that the Soviet Government simply found the return to religion politically expedient. The significant thing is that atheism did not survive the great test of war. Atheism seemed spiritually inexpedient to the Russian soul in its darkest hour.

Why is everything else but faith in God inadequate when men are facing their greatest trial? The answer is simple: Powerful though the mind of man, and prodigal his brains and arms to produce weapons with which to defend himself against his enemies, in the final analysis today, yesterday, tomorrow, as Paul said: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death"—and only a belief in God can destroy death, the ultimate enemy of all mankind. In hours when men are moved in great masses to contemplate wholesale death, they all realize that he who does not envisage immortality is already living in his grave.

Nazi Germany did not exile God, as did the Russians, to shift for Himself. Not even having the Communist credo of the brotherhood of man on earth, they dared not abolish God. But they persecuted Him and crucified Him on their crooked swastika cross. They imprisoned or murdered His outspoken priests and ministers and slaughtered His people by the thousands. At first subtly, and later frankly, the Nazis warned the German people that Christianity and Naziism, the Bible and Mein Kampf, were incompatible—as, indeed, to the greater glory of God they most surely are.

But in Germany, as throughout Europe and the occupied countries, it has been the church in all its denominations which has most outspokenly defied the Nazis, and given the people faith and courage to resist them, by preaching that the new order could never last, because it had no spiritual validity. All reports from underground sources in Europe indicate that church membership has increased greatly during the Nazi occupation. In the United States in the last few years, church membership has increased at the rate of more than a million a year.

The usual explanation of this return to religion, this world-wide revival of faith, is generally given in the remark of a soldier on Bataan: "There are no atheists in fox holes."

Today, our own country has not been bombed nor invaded and we civilians are in no immediate physical danger from the war, but our loved ones are. Each of us has someone, a son, a brother, a husband, a close friend, who faces the fortunes of the multitudinous fox holes of war. Because they are in danger, they are now not atheists, and we dare not be.

The return to God may perhaps be explained by the fox hole. But how shall the fox hole itself be explained, unless we admit that fox holes got dug because men had abandoned God? The fox holes of war are dug by atheists, and though we return to God in them, they shall be dug again and again, war without end, unless, emerging from them, we stay with God.

Yes, the church is of vital and immediate service to the war effort, as a spiritual restorative to people who are crushed by the horrors of war. Yes, the church is a present and sturdy staff to help on the long climb to victory, even a vaulting pole to naturally believing peoples like the Russians, to aid in leaping over the bloodiest obstacles between them and the day of triumph.

But we shall not be true to the church, nor the church to God, unless we find in the church more, much more than temporary comfort. We must find in the church enduring guidance in the post-war world. For the church is the true conscience of the world. Statesmen, diplomats, politicians, economists, however clever they may be with their shrewd and patriotic games and their quod erat demonstrandum figures around the peace tables of the future, will inevitably make amoral or immoral decisions there if they are not constantly informed by the conscience of the church, rooted in a belief in God. Only the churches, as the Pope says, can propound the principles of "peace with justice." It is the duty of the church, in the words of the Federal Council of Churches, to propound a just and durable peace. The church alone is the surviving, indissoluble link we people of the democracies have with the people of Germany who go to church furtively, loving God more than they fear Hitler's concentration camps. And only the resurrection of Christ in Russia can close the great gap between us and the disciples of Karl Marx. It has been the saving grace of communism that it does proclaim faith in the brotherhood of man. But the brotherhood of man must presuppose the fatherhood of God. In the end, we need not tremble and sicken with fear at the word communism, if this communism holds fast to the basic Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man, in the fatherhood of God.

Yes, we need the inspiration of the church now but we will need even more the teachings of the church, the basic principles of our religion in the post-war days. Only the Christian philosophy can serve to stop us from exacting some terrible vengeance from our conquered enemies, some vengeance, which will make us seem as Nazis ourselves, acting in such a sense that there would really be no more hope of peace on earth than the time it takes for beaten and bitter nations to rearm. For the question is not what to do about the Germans—the question is what to do about ourselves. If we are truly Christian, and only our churches can make and keep us so, we shall have small trouble deciding what to do about our enemies. World police forces, great power politics, combines, are in the end un-Christian answers, and every Christian who falls on his knees in the quiet of his room knows this. In the words of the Federal Council of Churches, only a just, a Christian peace will be durable. The city of man can only be built by the inspiration which comes from the house of God.

Once a member of a delegation visiting Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War remarked: "We trust, sir, that God is on our side." To which great Lincoln replied: "It is more important to know that we are on God's side."

Today, judging by the attitude of our enemies toward God, and religion, and the ersatz substitutes they have futilely offered to their people—emperor worship in Japan, Teutonic paganism in Germany—we suspect that we may be on God's side—at least to a greater extent than our enemies are.

We must stay there. For perhaps, after all, this war has a divine purpose. It has been said, "God presseth the nations together . . ." He presseth them everywhere into a common world-body soul. Let not His purpose escape us. Everywhere today there is passionate talk of unity—unity among men on the political level, unity among men on the economic level, unity among the United Nations on the military level and the post-war diplomatic level—but nowhere is there a more desperate and noble need than for unity among all men on the spiritual level. To achieve this unity, in blood and agony, God today presseth the nations together—in order that all men's churches and every spire may point a way to agreement on the great essentials common to all faiths in God. Our meeting today is a beginning toward that unity which transcends political and economic unity, and any secular unity which mechanical-minded and so-called practical men can devise: The spiritual unity of kingdom come, of peace on earth to men of good will.

Blueprints Today—Highways Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the annual convention of the Associated Pennsylvania Contractors in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, December 9, 1943:

Not many months ago, people were hesitant about devoting time, energy, and thought to the problems that are bound to occur at the end of the war. Many people were saying "Let's win the war first." Fortunately, we've gotten away from that idea that this Nation can deal with only one problem at a time. Winning the war is the No. 1 job, but believe me, winning the peace is a job that runs a close second.

When the war plants slow down and stop, and when the million of servicemen about face for home, we had better be ready with economic plans that will take the place of our concentrated war effort. If we are not ready, then this democracy our boys have been fighting to preserve is very likely to deteriorate into an "ism" of some kind that will cause us to wonder just who did win the war.

That's the gloomy side of the picture. I shall not dwell on it because I have a positive faith in this country's ability to meet and solve any economic problem. We've gone through many trying periods, from the time of Valley Forge, and on up through the War of 1812, the Civil War, World War No. 1, and the depression of the thirties. For each of those serious economic disturbances, the solutions were forthcoming. Sometimes they came slowly, but they came. This war, of course, is of such tremendous dimensions that it blots out all other trying periods. It will tax our ingenuity to the utmost. It will require that we dispense with some of our traditional concepts, but it need not lead us to make one single change in our Constitution or in our democratic form of government. When I say we must break with some of our traditions, I mean we must unleash

our imaginations and broaden our view. To be more specific, we must, for instance, give aviation headway. We must encourage its development at home and in the international skyways. Aviation, and all other businesses, must be permitted to proceed unhampered on the path of full and fair private enterprise.

Certainly, a nation which within the short space of 2 years can turn its effort into a war production of such tremendous size is also a nation that can do a better job than it has ever done before in providing the necessities and comforts of life.

Through the medium of the Committee for Economic Development I am sure the businessmen of this country are accomplishing one great thing, and that is they are getting rid of cobwebs that very plainly marked so many of them during the last depression. Business and industry are raising their sights; they are doing a splendid job of re-creating interest in private enterprise; they are teaching themselves how to quickly reconvert to peacetime production and selling; they are informing the Government, and rightfully, of the changes that should be made in the laws of the land to nourish business health.

But business cannot do the job alone. There are those who would cut Government spending to the bone. I am for that, but with this important reservation: government must continue to bear its rightful, natural responsibilities. It must invest public money in those essential services which only government can provide, and which in themselves generate jobs and private business. Business cannot travel far in a 1944 or 1945 car, while government trails along in a model T. Government, as well as business, must raise its sights, not for the sake of spending, but in point of service, if there is to be full employment and prosperity.

During these war years, there has been waste, for war itself is nothing but waste. You can't figure closely when battles are to be won. But after this war all governments must hew closer to the line of efficiency. They must keep their debts and their taxes to the very lowest possible levels. Yet, I repeat, they must not evade those responsibilities which have a direct bearing on the welfare of the Nation's business.

All of you, I'm sure, are familiar with the post-war highway program of the American Road Builders' Association. Discussion based on some of the fine thinking that has gone into that sound proposal will, I trust, illustrate what I mean about government's responsibility.

Wartime rationing has driven home to everyone the fact that the Nation's economic structure is built up around the motor vehicle. Every business, every industry, every individual, is dependent to a very large degree on the passenger car, the bus, and the truck. Yet, as is so well pointed out by Charles Upham, engineer-director and author of the association's plan, never in all history has there been a highway program adequate for the traffic we generate in our daily business.

In 1941, 7,000,000 people, nearly one-seventh of the employables of that year, had jobs which were dependent upon highway transportation. That figure includes the automotive workers, the road builders, the garagemen, the truck and bus drivers, the machinery makers, and the salesmen who talked you into buying a more expensive car. Those 7,000,000 jobs didn't just happen only because Henry Ford and others figured out how to make good cars cheap. Those jobs came about in large part because this Nation started a program of building good roads.

Yet we have never had enough good roads. We all know that from our own driving experience. We realize it even more deeply when we look at the highway death and injury figures; in 1941, nearly 40,000 killed; more than 1,000,000 injured.

Road inadequacy is placed in understandable terms by Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of the United States Public Roads Administration. "Before the war," he said, "we were slipping behind in construction of the State highways alone at the rate of 17,000 miles per year." By that he means that roads were wearing out faster than they were being replaced or reconstructed. When we come out of this war, county and local roads and streets as well will be in a really deplorable condition, for war restrictions don't permit us to build roads and streets. Manpower and material shortages are even severely restricting maintenance or preservation of the roads we have.

Furthermore, enough good local roads have never been built for the farmers, and it is plainly evident that only the surface has been scratched in building modern arteries in and near cities. Clearly, the farmers' purchase and use of the motor vehicle will be dictated by the kind of roads available. Likewise city people won't buy cars to drive over rough, bumpy streets or to fight their way through the congestion that I have seen in Chicago, New York City, Detroit, and in many other cities large and even small.

So to preserve the Nation's number 1 manufacturing industry and largest employer, we've got to build modern highways wherever they are needed, and we must be ready to start that program almost the moment the war ends.

Under the war's stimulus this country is in its greatest period of prosperity. The number of employables has increased by some 10,000,000. What most of our 62,000,000 workers are creating does not add to the Nation's wealth. We're doing a mighty fine job of keeping this Nation free from the tyrannical grasp of European and Asiatic mobsters. But when that work is done, we must face a transition period of far greater problems than those that followed the First World War.

We must admit that we didn't fight our way out of the last depression unaided. In 1938 there was a recession. Unemployment was rapidly increasing. It was the impending war that reversed the trend and finally placed this Nation in the position of having more jobs than workers.

Realizing that actually we didn't cure the last depression we should face this post-war period with grim determination to correct previous mistakes and to do those things which best point the way to a balanced production, consumption, and employment.

It can be done. And one of the starting points is improvement of transportation. Construction is the chief user and vitalizer of the durable-goods industry. At the depth of the depression, employment was down relatively little in businesses devoted to supplying our daily wants and in the service industries and businesses. The big dip was in construction and durable goods. When construction drops, you can expect a depression. When the construction volume is high, there is prosperity and plenty of jobs.

Private construction fluctuates widely. You can't depend on it and you can't regulate it. But public-works construction can be easily controlled. By reason of the widespread needs, and speed of getting started, emphasis must be placed on highway construction.

Consequently, a first order of post-war planning is that of establishing a highway program, which above all must be gaged, not to unemployment possibilities, but to actual needs, as is emphasized in the American Road Builders' Association plan. All levels of government, Federal, State, county, city, and local, must participate in this highway program. Many highway agencies, I am told, are doing little about highway plans, because they don't see the construction money on the table. That's a defeatist attitude. To my way of thinking, one of the best insurances against a return of the wasteful C. W. A. or W. P. A. days of relief work is to get the plans and blueprints ready, and now.

It is amazing to me how so many people confuse public-works construction with improvised relief work. While no doubt much good was accomplished by the relief work projects of the last depression, nevertheless there is a wide gulf between giving men jobs with shovels and wheelbarrows on minor projects and giving men jobs on planned public-works projects.

Whatever good is accomplished on the made work project is done at a cost inconsistent with the benefits. The tendency here is to stretch out the construction period so that men will have jobs for as long a time as possible. Working for the Government, the men look upon it as just another form of charity—which it is. Relief work requires little or no machinery or materials, and so no men are given jobs manufacturing tractors, earth movers, cranes, fabricated steel, or hundreds of other items.

When a planned public-works project is constructed, a whole chain of operations is started which not only gives jobs on the site but in the mines, mills, factories, and on the railroads. Being of a solid substantial nature, the public-works project brings with it long lasting benefits and at a cost commensurate with those benefits.

Of utmost importance is the fact that the planned public-works project built under the contract system provides he-man jobs. The worker, far from feeling that he has a charity job, knows that he has work as individualistic as the man employed by a factory or a railroad.

In planning for the future we must recognize private enterprise in government activities just as we must in business and industry. By awarding the contract for construction to the low bidder, the public expenditure then is actually handled through the machinery of private enterprise. The contractor handles his own purchases and hires his labor forces. He pays the prevailing wages. The men who accept the jobs work willingly and to the best of their capabilities. Certainly public-works construction is an ideal way for government to hold up its end in any unemployment crisis, and is an ideal way to further encourage private enterprise.

There are other ways in which government can help in the task of building a future of prosperity, and full employment. I am very familiar with one way by reason of the fact that I have made a special study of the complicated rubber problem. Perhaps no other domestic subject has occupied the attention of the public so much as has rubber since the beginning of the war. We passed through a trying period when conflicting statements were being issued by experts as well as by self-styled authorities. There continues to be some confusion, but I assure you that the rubber problem is one that has been licked.

When the war broke out and our source of supply was cut off, this country's rubber reserves were very meager. Faced with wartime requirement of more than 1,000,000 tons per year, something had to be done and to be done fast. Quickly investigations were made on the processes for making synthetic rubber, and quickly the answers came to light. In 2 years our Government has spent $750,000,000 or more for the production of synthetic rubber. Today 59 plants are either in or soon will be in production. Synthetic rubber is now coming out of the plants at the rate of 437,000 tons per year. By the end of 1943, the production will be at the rate of 646,000 tons per year. By mid-1944, the rate will be 850,000 tons, when all plants will be operating at full capacity.

That is an achievement in production of a new material which I believe sets an all-time world record. Obviously, in attacking this

gigantic problem, there was waste but that necessary waste was inconsequential when we consider that our Army and Navy now are getting sufficient rubber for carrying on the war. I take a great deal of personal pride in this accomplishment, not so much as to what little I may have contributed but for the superlative job done by my fellow Nebraskan, Bill Jeffers, who worked almost day and night on the job until the problem was whipped.

Today the cost of producing synthetic rubber ranges from about 20 to about 65 cents per pound for the various processes as contrasted with the pre-war price of about 20 cents per pound for crude natural rubber. However, new processes are now being perfected, which will enable us to produce synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol at a cost which will make possible competition with raw rubber. With this process, 7 pounds of rubber can be made from 1 bushel of corn, with a byproduct of high-protein livestock food.

The significance of all of this is that before long we will be producing sufficient synthetic rubber to meet our peacetime needs. We can produce it at a cost as low or lower than what we might otherwise expect to pay the British and Dutch rubber companies.

The question then arises, What are we going to do with these Government-built synthetic rubber plants after the war? Will we junk them, or will the Government operate them, or shall we do the sensible thing and sell them on reasonable basis to private industry?

I make the declaration that we must not only preserve these rubber plants for the American people and put to use all of our natural resources but we must encourage the improvement of these plants and make them flow into private channels of American industry in order that they will be part of the gigantic program to solve the economic war which will face us in the post-war period. We must never again face the pathetic situation as regards rubber as we were faced with before Pearl Harbor.

The Federal Government has the duty of seeing to it that these rubber plants continue to operate for the good of the Nation. These plants should be sold under agreements that assure fair prices and on a basis wherein the plants can be made self-liquidating.

The demand for many years after the war for all kinds of rubber will be very great. Products in the hands of people of the world are being used up and are not being replaced. That demand is going to be big enough to absorb the supply of crude and synthetic rubber for several years to come. By that time the United States will have gained a great amount of experience in the use of synthetic rubber. The quality of synthetic rubber will be improved. The special purposes of synthetic rubber now may prove superior to crude rubber, and vice versa. Is it not logical and wise to let synthetic rubber and crude rubber compete, both as to price and usefulness? Usefulness for the hundreds of purposes for which rubber is produced today and for the hundreds of new uses which will be found in the future?

Operated as private enterprises, these synthetic rubber plants can play a vital part in our transition from war to peace. Not only will they supply thousands of jobs but they will assure this Nation of a continuous supply of cheap rubber, a thing we have not always had. In supplying this cheap rubber, it is only natural to expect a broadening of our rubber consumption. As you know, when we broaden the use of a material, jobs multiply and a further contribution is made to the standard of living.

There is one other striking benefit. For many years we have been worrying about overproduction on the farms. That problem will confront us again after the war, but if private enterprise can go forward with the manufacture of rubber, a whole new market is opened up to the farmer. I envision the erection of processing plants near the sources of raw material—in the farming centers. Certainly that outlet for farm produce alone justifies every action that will make this new business a fact.

This new home industry would have many ramifications. When we cheapen the cost of rubber, we expand motor-vehicle transportation, for certainly tire expense looms as a large item in the minds of those of moderate and low incomes. So here again, we must have better local roads so that farmers may reach their markets and reach the processing plants. When we do that we have increased the need and usage of the automobile.

In conclusion, I want to reemphasize that Congress, busy as it is with war problems, is doing a lot of thinking about the post-war period. Proposals of many kinds are even now being presented to us Members of Congress. Some are good, some perhaps not so good, but all of them demonstrate that the best minds of the country are giving serious thought to our Nation's future. From all of these suggestions, a sincere effort will be made to select a proper and reasonable course that the Federal Government may follow in establishing the kind of future everybody wants.

I want to pay a special tribute to the highway industry for the sensible and practical post-war highway program that has been drafted and presented to the public by the American Road Builders' Association. For many years, your parent association has been very helpful to the Members of Congress. We have come to look to the association whenever we need facts for dealing with the many problems attendant with highway transportation. The post-war highway program, born of the knowledge accumulated by the highway officials, highway engineers, and road builders, is of such merit I am sure it will awaken the Nation to its highway needs and responsibilities.

The Government in the Business of Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, now that our country is in war and the volume of credit and currency has been expanded to inflationary proportions, the banks of this country, dissatisfied with the Government's agriculture financing program, are making a determined drive to have the Government agencies withdraw from the field and permit the business to be turned over to the banks.

In reply to one of the many letters received uring this withdrawal program on the Congress, I have stated my views on this subject to the Nebraska Bankers Association, which I submit herewith for insertion in the RECORD. The letter and my reply follow:

OMAHA, *December 4, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: We take the liberty of sending to you the enclosed leaflet on the subject of subsidized credit as it affects farmers and small bankers in the Middle West. We know that you have a deep interest in the problems this subject presents. The bankers of Nebraska oppose subsidized lending, not primarily because it is harmful to small bankers but because we believe it is fundamentally unsound and un-American. Our position on the Fulmer bill has been made plain in the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the return by the Production Credit System of the total subsidy to the United States Treasury in a single lump sum at once, but if this subsidy is to be returned in installments, as provided in the Fulmer bill, that the P. C. A. be required to pay not less than 3 percent interest on the unreturned portion."

We hope your interest in this vital subject will lead you to read this question and answer folder in its entirety.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT MAULEY,
Secretary, Committee on Subsidized Lending, Nebraska Bankers Association.

DEAR MR. MAULEY: As one of the Members of Congress, being a member of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee dealing with money legislation, who is addressed in your series of letters on the subject of Government farm financing through the operation of the Production Credit System, I assume you will be interested in my reaction to the position taken by your bankers association on this program.

In the first place, I believe in a Government program that would give the Nation a sound, workable, adequate, monetary system that will provide cash sufficient in volume to transact the Nation's business, and with this, I am opposed to any participation of the Government in the financing of private business.

However, until the banking organizations of this country can be induced to relinquish their concession to create and circulate the Nation's currency, and get behind a plan to give the country such an interest-free circulating medium—then I see no safe way to permanently insure the credit needs for agricultural production by the withdrawal of these Government agencies from this field of financing any more than it is possible to insure the financial stability of our national economy by the permanent withdrawal of the R. F. C. from the field of business financing. The banks have insisted on having their way in designing our present money system—they have it—and it appears you will have to bear with the expedients the Government has been forced to use to meet the deficiency resulting from the defects existing in the present financial and monetary system.

Trusting I have made my views clear on this vital issue, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Strike Proposed Against the Renegotiation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House today, I place in the RECORD two articles written

by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American, commenting upon certain statements relative to the renegotiation statute:

[From the Chicago Herald-American of November 22, 1943]

LINCOLN URGES STRIKE AGAINST GOVERNMENT

(By Vanderpoel)

Americans, with few exceptions, are indignant at strikes during wartime. They feel that even though workers may have just complaints such interference with the war effort may cost the lives of American boys on the fighting fronts and comes close to treason.

Last week we heard an American businessman urge a strike by industrialists against the Government.

James F. Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio, at the conclusion of an address before the Purchasing Agents' Association of Chicago, at Hotel Sherman, declared that if a thousand industrialists refused to accept the renegotiation settlements they could break the renegotiation law within 60 days.

Lincoln did not say so, but the facts are clear that in so doing billions of dollars would be added to the cost of the war, and this additional burden would be saddled on the backs of the people.

Renegotiation, it should be borne in mind, is a law passed by Congress, the purpose of which is to prevent war profiteering.

Lincoln is not worried about war profiteers, but he is very much worried about "government by formula."

The Naval Price Adjustment Board demanded a refund of $3,250,000 from the Lincoln Electric Co. This the company has refused to pay and is now testing the constitutionality of the law in the Federal courts.

REFUSED FIGURES

We asked Mr. Lincoln what profit his company would have made on its total invested capital after this renegotiation charge and after taxes. He replied:

"Very little."

But when we explained that "very little" might cover a multitude of sins and what we would like is exact figures, Lincoln declared he didn't have them and that he would not give them out if he did.

Lincoln said that a local representative of the Treasury Department had declared that the company had paid its workers too much, an average of something more than $100 a week for factory hands. He said that his workers were worth that much because they produced three times as much as men working in similar positions in competitive plants.

A question we should have liked to have asked him was, Did he pay these men this much when he was operating in a competitive market and not working at capacity on Government orders?

More than 20 percent of the industrial plants of the Nation, Lincoln said, are now owned by the Government, adding, "If a Government plant loses money the private plant makes it up." What he failed to say was that these Government plants are privately operated and are making private profits on Government-invested capital.

PURE BUNK

Lincoln stated that the Government attitude was:

"If you are efficient, do a good job and make profit, you are a profiteer, there is something wrong with you. No matter how inefficient you may be, no matter how little you may produce, if you don't make a profit you are all right."

Obviously such a statement is the bunk. The Government attitude is nothing of the sort.

Lincoln said further:

"They make no attempt to increase the amount of goods produced."

Could any statement be further from the truth? Lincoln continued:

"As of today, the vaunted freedom of the American people is gone."

Including, we presume, freedom of speech.

He had high praise for the illustrious President whose name he bears, but he failed to mention that Abraham Lincoln, too, was charged during a critical war period with having usurped "the vaunted freedom of the American people."

As a matter of fact, one would hardly have known from Lincoln's talk that his country was engaged in two wars for survival, and certainly there was no hint that love of country might be an incentive for some people to do a good job in the field of production as well as on the field of battle.

[From the Chicago Herald-American of December 8, 1943]

THE ONLY REASON WE ARE WINNING THE WAR

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

Last evening as the radio blared "Pistol Packin' Mamma" we got out some of our home work and began to read the transcript of a debate that took place recently in Cleveland before the City Club on the renegotiation of war contracts.

James Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Co., only manufacturer in the United States as far as we know who has refused to accept renegotiation findings and is testing the constitutionality of the act in the courts, was the speaker for the negative.

Carman G. Blough, chief of the contract review branch, Procurement Policy Division of the War Production Board, made a temperate explanation of the background and principles of renegotiation. He told of the rapid growth of the procurement job, how despite the efforts to secure experienced purchasing agents, it was impossible to obtain sufficient men who were experts in buying the type of goods the Government needed.

LITTLE IDEAS OF COSTS

The job was further complicated by the fact that many concerns had no experience in manufacturing the goods they were suddenly called upon to produce and consequently had little idea of what their costs might be. In other cases the quantities ordered were so large that great efficiencies were possible, sharply reducing costs.

The contracts were not placed on competitive bidding. There was no time for trial runs, extensive costs computations, and analysis.

The reasons for the reasonableness of renegotiation became crystal clear.

It wasn't the way we would do things in normal times, but these aren't normal times. Renegotiation was a war measure to meet war conditions.

"MEANS A RAW DEAL"

Lincoln spoke next. One would hardly have known from his address that the United States was engaged in a war for survival and that things were not as usual. It was his position that renegotiation was unfair and placed a premium on inefficiency. He declared that "renegotiation means a raw deal."

Dramatically, Lincoln said:

"I speak to you now not as a manufacturer, but as an American. If it is possible to have five men without recourse to step into any plant and say, 'We will take so much,' where is your vaunted liberty? Of what use is your Constitution?"

At that very moment he was testing the constitutionality of the law in the courts.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

There came the question period.

Lincoln was asked whether he was in favor of the American Legion program of conscription during wartime of wealth and labor as well as men, and therefore possibly eliminating the necessity for renegotiation.

Apparently he didn't like the question. He asked if it were germane. The Chair ruled that it was. Here was his answer:

"Don't forget this, gentlemen: The reason that the United States is the arsenal of democracy, and the only reason, is this, and I think it would be a good thing to recognize just what the facts are, and remember this, of the Allies about one-tenth live in the United States of America, yet the machines on which the Allies depend for the fighting of this war are largely made here. We have 130,000,000 people and relatively limited natural resources, yet we have to furnish the arms for Russia, with 200,000,000 people and unlimited natural resources. We have to furnish arms for China, with 400,000,000 people and unlimited natural resources. We have to furnish the arms for the British Empire, with 650,000,000 people and unlimited natural resources.

"Why is it?

"It is because of the outstanding genius of the American manufacturer, and nothing else.

"Now, I warn you, that is the only reason why the Allies are winning this war. Now you can't kick those people around as you are doing and expect to win it."

GUESS HE DIDN'T MEAN IT

We reread the words. Yes, it was clear that Jim Lincoln had said:

"The only reason why the Allies are winning this war is because of the outstanding genius of the American manufacturer, and nothing else."

At this moment there came to us over the radio the voice of an American marine who had gone through the battle of Tarawa.

Our boys had fought and won and died. We wondered how they would react to the words of the speaker in the City Club of Cleveland who declared that the only reason the Allies are winning is the outstanding genius of the American manufacturer.

We wondered how the Britons who through one long crucial summer stood up against the Nazi hordes would react, how the Russians, who had died by the millions, who had seen their territory overrun and their people murdered, would react.

We wondered how those who had worked long and hard in American war plants would react.

We guess Jim Lincoln didn't mean what he said. If he would like to make a public apology, and at the same time answer the question directed to him in Cleveland, we offer him the facilities of this column.

Social Security and How To Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD the presentation made on December 4 before the Senate Finance Committee by Arthur L. Johnson, national executive and legislative secretary of the General Welfare Federation of America.

I do this for the reason that too few people in America have made a study of

the present Federal tax and social-security systems with the object of dovetailing them in such a manner as to bring real social security to most of the adult population of the Nation without the imposition of any new tax. The simple expedient of refunding a portion of the Victory tax, now being integrated into the income-tax structure, in post-war annuities when those paying reach the age of 65 would remedy most of the defects of our present social-security set-up. I do hope that some attention will be paid to this problem right at this time when the adjustment could be so easily made.

If nothing is done by the Senate Finance Committee toward a solution of this problem, about the only way it can be taken up will be through the discharge petition, No. 4, that I have filed in the Well of the House, which now has around 135 signatures on it. The remaining 83 signatures could be secured if all those interested in social security throughout the Nation would write their Congressman asking him to sign this discharge petition if he has not already done so. Let us all work together for action in this very important matter, which constitutes one of our main domestic problems and which has received little or no attention from this Congress.

Mr. Johnson's presentation, which was necessarily limited to the tax phase of the problem, was as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on May 12, 1941, and again on April 17, 1942, before the House Ways and Means Committee and on August 14, 1942, before your honorable committee, I advocated a 5-percent tax somewhat similar to the Victory tax later adopted and suggested that 40 percent of it be refunded in post-war social-security annuities. The arrangement that was finally approved provided for a cash refund instead, and this is still the law. I understand that in the bill now before your honorable committee the Victory tax is being integrated into the income-tax structure but this does not alter the principle involved, and I again respectfully urge that 40 percent or two-fifths of the present 5-percent Victory tax, when it is incorporated into the income-tax structure, be set aside for a refund in post-war social- security annuities, the money to be placed in the Social Security reserve fund and borrowed by the Government to use in the war effort, just as is being done with the pay-roll-tax money today.

I desire to call the committee's attention to the fact that Secretary Morgenthau, in his presentation of October 4 to the House Ways and Means Committee, suggested a refund in life insurance, and that when Economic Stabilization Director Fred Vinson was asked while before that committee a few days later as to the possibility of a refund in annuities, he stated: "That would be all right."

We therefore have a trend in official thinking toward the proposition which the General Welfare Federation of America has been advancing for the last 3 years of a refund in social-security annuities.

For the second time we beg your committee to give some thought to this suggestion. It would solve many a problem in the tax field, and it would be the first big step toward overhauling our Federal tax and social-security structures and dovetailing them into one solid mass that will sustain the weight that is to be placed upon them in the years that are to come.

It would, moreover, be a big step toward combating the menace of inflation, both now and after the war. Now is the time to siphon off excess purchasing power as the most effective way to prevent inflation, and after the war this stored-up purchasing power should be returned, not in one lump sum, as is possible in the case of War bonds, but in reasonable monthly installments when those paying are of the age of 65. Even life-insurance companies discourage lump-sum payments as tending toward reckless spending, and the Government should do the same.

Such an arrangement would not be difficult to work out, as it would mean merely extending the present refund system over a longer period of time. The refunds could even be made through the Treasury Department, as at present, if there is any objection to placing the money in the Social Security reserve fund and borrowing it to use in the war effort. It would then merely become an obligation of the Government to refund when the taxpayer reached 65 and filed his claim for a refund in monthly annuities to protect him from privation and want in the sunset of life.

Our suggestion is not a complex one and is one which has already been approved by your committee in a more extreme form, as the committee, when it voted the Victory tax of 5 percent, ordered a refund in cash of 40 percent to married men and 25 percent to single men immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, which refund has now by act of Congress been ordered advanced to March 15 of next year. Our suggestion is, therefore, far more conservative than the system now in effect, as we have contended right along that the refund should be in post-war annuities, maturing at the age of 65 and not conditioned upon retirement, in amounts ranging from $30 per month to $120 per month depending upon the amount contributed and the number of quarters the taxpayer was contributing.

This arrangement would tend to popularize the income-tax system as nothing else would do, as the clamor would be not to raise the amount of the exemptions but to lower it so that all adults would ultimately come under the protection of this annuity system that would combine a sugar-coated taxing system with an inflation-preventing social-security system that would guarantee protection in old age to all of America's citizens, not just half of them, as any system geared to pay rolls does.

Our idea is that if this simple expedient of a post-war refund in annuities is adopted, the pay-roll tax system could easily, by a proper and fair readjustment of equities, be relegated to its proper sphere of protecting employees against the various hazards of life which face them while they are such employees and while their employers are still interested in them as such. This could include coverage for sickness, other disability, and hospitalization, as contemplated by the Wagner-Dingell bill, with the Government merely paying the bill at a private hospital if Congress wants to avoid the issue of socialized medicine, which is already stirring up considerable controversy.

In any event, the ultimate 3-percent pay-roll tax on employees and 3-percent pay-roll tax on employers, plus the 3 percent imposed upon employers in most States for unemployment compensation, if used to protect the employees against unemployment, sickness, and accidents, and to protect their families in the event of their death, should be sufficient for these purposes.

This would result in the employer paying a 6-percent pay-roll tax and the employee paying a 3-percent pay-roll tax for protection against life's hazards while an employee, plus a 2-percent income tax on the employee for protection against privation and want in old age, which is common to all groups. The 2-percent income tax allotted for this purpose could be increased to 3 percent after the war when more revenue will be needed to sustain the system, or it could even be made 3 percent now by allotting three-fifths or 60 percent of the present Victory tax to this purpose when this tax is combined with the income tax, as it will be under the terms of the bill now under consideration.

This would mean that the employer and employee would each pay, in effect, a 6-percent pay-roll tax, which is the goal of the Wagner-Dingell bill. The only difference would be that no new taxes whatever would be necessary under this arrangement, as all of these taxes have already been imposed by Congress although some of them are not effective as yet, the pay-roll tax being scheduled to rise in 1949 to a total of 9 percent, that is, 3 percent on the employee and 3 percent on the employer, plus an additional 3 percent on the employer for unemployment compensation. In fact, the whole thing could be accomplished without any increase whatever in taxes since under this arrangement we suggest the 40 percent or two-fifths of the present Victory tax would be utilized for the purpose we have set forth.

This should interest the proponents of the Wagner-Dingell bill as a means of accomplishing their objectives without a new tax during wartime or even after the war. Their task of trying to raise the pay-roll tax to 6 percent for the employer and 6 percent for the employee during wartime is indeed a stupendous one and the suggestion we are here making is at least worthy of their study, especially since it would result in real social security for most of the people of this Nation, while their proposal would leave out many large groups, such as the farmers, casual laborers, housewives, nurses, ministers, and the unemployed, and would bring in farm laborers and domestics only by taxing their employers without giving any protection whatever to these employers, who would be forced to pay directly a 6-percent pay-roll tax in addition to the indirect pay-roll taxes they now pay.

There is no reason why we in America cannot devise a system that will give social security to all, not just half of our people. The Constitution guarantees to all the equal protection of the laws and yet for 8 long years we have permitted a condition to exist in this Nation whereby one-half of our people are denied the right to the social security guaranteed to the other half. The Nation should not continue to remain half slave and half free and your committee today has an ideal opportunity to correct this great inequality while at the same time satisfying the American public with the tax program Congress is adopting through the bill now under discussion as nothing else would do.

We, as a nonprofit benevolent institution interested in the welfare of humanity and the well-being of all citizens, make this suggestion on behalf of the 14 large groups of the public barred from the protection of the Social Security Act, which include the farmers, farm laborers, casual laborers, housewives, domestics, nurses, teachers, church employees, employees of nonprofit institutions, government employees of cities, counties, and States, professional men, businessmen, the self-employed and the unemployed. These groups now help to pay in passed-on taxes four-fifths of the present 5-percent pay-roll tax and get absolutely no benefits while the two groups covered by the Social Security Act—the office workers and industrial workers—get four different kinds of protection under the law—a temporary pension called unemployment compensation upon loss of position at any age, a permanent pension at 65, a pension for wives at 65 and survivorship benefits upon death at any age. This constitutes one of the most glaring inequities of all time and we plead with your honorable committee to correct it by the simple expedient of voting a refund of two-fifths of the equivalent of the 5-percent Victory tax in post-war annuities in accordance with suggestions now emanating from Government sources, which suggestions bolster up the suggestions we made originally before this

committee on August 14, 1942, a few weeks before the Victory tax was adopted with its lump-sum refund rather than reasonable monthly payment post-war refunds. We still feel that our original suggestion, which the committee adopted in part, is sound in its entirety and we plead again for its adoption at this time as a means of popularizing the tax levy you are making on the people, as a means of combating inflation and as a means of guaranteeing, without cost to the Government, social security to all of America's citizens in the sunset of life.

I might add that if this suggestion of ours is given consideration, we would commend to you the schedule of annuities set forth in H. R. 836, known as the General Welfare Act, now supported in writing by over one-third of the Members of the House, whose actual signatures I hold here in my hand—150 of them. This schedule calls for a minimum annuity of $30 per month plus $1 per month for every full $2 above $5 per calendar quarter that is paid as such refundable annuity tax by any individual for at least one-half of the quarters such individual is subject to the tax, with a maximum of $85 per month, which maximum we would be willing to see raised to $120 per month in conformity with the Wagner-Dingell bill.

Can We Win the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very challenging address on the problem of winning the peace, delivered November 8, 1943, by Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., LL. D., of the University of Notre Dame, at the State Education Building, Harrisburg, Pa.:

There are two tasks of supreme importance now facing the people of America and of the United Nations. The first is the winning of the war. The second is the winning of the peace. The latter is not less important than the former. For we know from the tragic experience of World War No. 1 the futility of winning the war only to lose the peace.

I remember back in 1917 seeing my students leave their books and their classrooms at the University of Illinois, with the smile of crusaders on their young faces, as they marched off to fight the war to end all wars. I remember as though it were but yesterday the exultation of spirit and the vision which lit their faces as they flung their energies and their lives upon the altar of their country's cause. They were determined to stamp out once and for all the vicious practice by which nations from the immemorial past had attempted to decide questions of justice and right by seeing which side could slaughter the larger number of young men.

The victory, bought at the cost of millions of lives and untold treasure, proved to be hollow and empty. We continued the blockade of Germany for 6 months after the armistice, and thus starved uncounted thousands of women and children after the firing had ceased. We fastened upon the prostrate foe the galling chains of the Versailles Treaty, and sentenced them to reparations of astronomical proportions. We sowed the seeds of rancor, vengeance, and hatred. We reaped the inevitable harvest—a second world war. War criminals, leaders who are guilty of crimes against humanity, should and must be punished. But whole nations, tragic victims of misleadership, cannot be kept in slavery. From World War No. 1 we learned that a military victory can yield vengeance or peace. We may have either one. Both we cannot have.

REMOVING THREAT OF AGGRESSION

We are determined this time to win not only the victory but the peace. By winning the peace, we mean that we are going to establish a world order which will guarantee security for nations and freedom for human beings everywhere. We are going to stamp out forever the institution which is now setting the world in flames. We are going to remove aggression and the threat of aggression upon any nation, large or small. Unless we achieve a world order which will remove the causes which lead to the recurring catastrophes of ever-increasing global wars, our blood and our treasure will be poured out once again in vain.

How are we to win such a peace? We can throw some light on this problem by inquiring why we failed so abysmally in 1918. We have already indicated one of the causes of that failure. We did not wait for a cooling-off period. We went into that conference with blood in our eyes and vengeance in our hearts, determined to strangle the foe economically and to make them the door mat of Europe.

Another reason is that while we denounced and outlawed war, we provided no effective, functional substitute for it. We looked upon the bodies of 10,000,000 soldiers killed in battle and upon cities and towns laid waste by artillery fire, and we denounced war with its violence and brutality in unmeasured terms. But there was a certain lack of realism in our analysis of war and in our way of exercising it.

We failed to perceive that force can be outlawed not by words, agreements, covenants, but only by a greater force operating quickly and effectively as the sanction for such agreements. You cannot outlaw war, rooted in the biological instincts of the race and buttressed by the practice of centuries, with a pious platitude. With no effective sanctions in the way of force to implement its decisions, the League of Nations dwindled to an empty platitude at which first Mussolini, then Hirohito, then Hitler shook his fists in derision.

THE NATURE OF WAR

Let us look now more closely into the nature of war. For it is a curious fact that while war is as old as history there has been no thoroughgoing effort to understand it as a technique and instrument of politics until our own day. In the middle of the nineteenth century the German military expert, Clausewitz, first pointed out in his book on war, the relation between politics and war, showing that war is the continuation of policy speaking a different language and using a different medium than in the peacetime dealings of one nation with another.

This is the concept that is enshrined in international law and in the practice of nations. Indeed the greater part of international law deals with the conditions under which war is waged, the limitations imposed by agreements with reference to neutrality and the like. The basic presupposition underlying the whole fabric is that war is a legitimate instrument of national policy, the prerogative of a sovereign state. This is but the enactment into law of the practice of nations which follow politics of power.

While this line of reasoning drew the fire of moralists, it was not until 1898 that it was attacked, as Prof. James T. Shotwell points out, as a method of politics that was inherently invalid, because it could not be counted upon to achieve the ends for which it was waged.

In that year, Jean de Bloch, developed the thesis that war was bound to become impossible ultimately because of its increasing cost in lives and property. The work, published under the title, La Guerre, influenced Czar Nicholas II profoundly and was at least partially responsible for his calling the disarmament conference at The Hague.

In 1901 Norman Angell published the Great Illusion, in which he attacked the validity of war not only because of its suicidal nature but also, because owing to the ever-growing interdependence of nations, it was bound to cost the victorious nation more than would be gained by the victory. With a good deal of eloquence Angell showed that war as an economical and effective method of national policy was an illusion, from which the modern world must rid itself.

SCIENCE MAKES WAR TOTALITARIAN

The institution of war, however, was too deeply entrenched in the customs, literature, songs, stories, and imagery of the immemorial past to be uprooted by a single blow. Angell was a voice crying in the wilderness, and few hearkened to it. The German Chancellor, Bethmann-Holweg, acknowledged after the war that no one in power in 1914 questioned the legitimacy of the appeal to arms to decide the controversy.

It was during the First World War that the nations gradually came to perceive that the concentration of military forces on the field of battle was not the only factor in determining the outcome. The war was being fought on the home fronts as well. The application of science was making the war a totalitarian one, because the scientist was able to make war supplies out of practically everything in the world. To do this he needed the labor, or at least the cooperation of practically everybody. One of the first to preceive this was the German industrialist, Dr. Walter Rathenau, who organized the Division of Raw Materials for the Ministry of War. By 1917, it was applied by the Allies.

It was the vast resources of the United States which tipped the scales. The German military machine was still intact. Her soil had not been tracked by an invader's foot. The trenches were outflanked not at Ypres or Verdun but in the steel mills of Pittsburgh and Gary, in the shipyards of Philadelphia and in the wheatfields of Kansas.

To clarify these issues the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace made a comprehensive analysis of World War No. 1, especially in Europe. Begun in 1918 the survey ultimately took shape in 150 volumes of the Economic and Social History of the World War. While too vast and technical for the general reader, the fundamental conclusion of the whole world is that modern war, embracing not only the economic but the moral, intellectual and political fields of national life is no longer the sharp-edged instrument of national policy which the statesmen of the past turned over to soldiers to use in order to attain some definite end. Modern war is like a wildfire. Statesmen can no longer say to their professional soldiers: "Burn our enemy's field." For the fire which guts the foe's field spreads like wildfire, refuses to be confined, and returns to burn the field of the incendiary as well. Modern war is a war of whole populations in which there are no noncombatants. The cost of modern war in lives and property will vastly outweigh whatever material goods or property so obtained, even by the winner.

"This conclusion, drawn from the study of the World War," points out Professor Shotwell, "immediately implies another. If war is no longer a directable and controllable instrument of national policy, it follows that it should be renounced. If, while the soldier is achieving his goal, the Nation behind him is traveling, perhaps unconsciously, in another direction, then his oldest of all the instruments of politics

should be discarded as inadequate and outworn. The conclusion is not unlike that of M. de Bloch or Sir Norman Angell, but with more definite reference to the implications of science. For, if in these first years of the scientific era, war has already begun to change its nature, the inevitable advance of science in the years to come will bring greater an ' greater change in the same direction; war will be less and less applicable to the pur uit of definite aims of governments, because it will more and more escape control and involve consequences that do not lie in the orbit of military action."

Reflecting the conviction of statesmen and of people everywhere that war had outlived its usefulness and was now an obsolete relic of a barbarous past, M. Aristide Briand invited the people of America to join with France in renouncing "war as an instrument of national policy." Secretary of State Kellogg responded enthusiastically in behalf of the American people and was largely instrumental in having the Paris Pact for the Outlawry of War signed in 1928 by 55 nations. It seemed like the crowning with glorious history of humanity's long struggle to outlaw this savage institution from the blood-stained past. World-wide rejoicing ensued. People breathed easier again. In the presence of a vast assembly of statesmen, faculty, and students at the University of Illinois, I had the honor to confer upon Mr. Kellogg the Cardinal Newman Award for 1932 for his work for world peace.

WHY PACT FAILS?

Here again was a pact solemnly signed by representatives of practically every nation in the civilized world, solemnly pledging its word of honor to renounce war and to submit all controversies to friendly arbitration. As in the case of the League of Nations Covenant, it, too, failed to hold in leash the angry passions of war. Why? For substantially the same reason why the League of Nations failed in its basic purpose. Because it lacked specific provision for the application of force to compel a signatory to abide by its pledged word. Time showed that it was a noble sentiment, a glorious aspiration, a beautiful platitude, but alas, nothing more.

Once again we see that in this strange world of human beings, agitated by passion, jealousy, and greed, characterized by inconstancy and unfaithfulness, a law, a covenant, a pledge of an international character is not worth the paper upon which it is written if it lacks the sanction of armed might to enforce it. No single truth stands out more clearly from the history of all the efforts of the nations to eradicate the cancer of war from the face of the world than this: Failure will crown every effort if it does not provide for the application of overwhelming force under the direction of law by the orderly processes of government.

NOTHING GAINED BY WAR

In the summer of 1939 I knelt in the Vatican at the feet of the Vicar of Christ, to receive his blessing. A look of anxiety was upon his careworn face, as he perceived from his watchtower the darkening clouds and the ominous rumblings of the approaching storm. A few weeks later, just before the thunderbolts of war were released, he addressed a moving plea to the rulers of Europe, begging them not to plunge the peoples of the Old World once again into the miseries and the horrors of war. In that address he uttered a sentence which ought to be inscribed over the portals of every school and every Government building, and placed in illuminated lettering upon the desk of every ruler in the world. "Nothing is gained by war," said the pontiff, "that cannot better be achieved by peace. In war all is lost."

In those solemn words, his holiness epitomized the lesson learned in the blood and agony of the World War. In those simple words were reflected the aspirations of the peoples of every land. In those words there echoed the voice of Christ, who said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God", and whose proudest title was the Prince of Peace.

Did any ruler or statesman doubt the truthfulness of the Holy Father's utterance? A few weeks later I sat in a sidewalk cafe in Paris and read in the Echo de Paris the exchange of letters between Deladier and Hitler. Both ended with substantially these words: As an old front-line trencher, I ask you to yield, as the only victors from recourse to arms will be death and destruction.

In his appeal to Hitler and to Mussolini not to attack other countries, President Roosevelt had echoed the same sentiment, declaring a military victory to be sterile.

That Sunday morning I said mass at the main altar of the Church of the Madeleine where the people were praying for peace. That afternoon I went up to the great pilgrimage church of the Sacre Couer, standing on Montmartre like a white sentinel watching over the capital of France. Cardinal Verdier was leading a vast assembly in prayers for peace. Their prayers were echoed by some ten thousand people gathered on the outside.

With the ominous rumblings still increasing, and with the English Channel about to be closed, I flew over to London. That evening I went to the great Westminster Cathedral where crowds were praying before the Blesesd Sacrament throughout the night for peace. The people of France, England, Italy, Germany remembered the horrors of the previous war and they wanted none of them again.

GOT WAR—WHY?

They wanted peace, peace, peace. They got war. Why? Because the Nazi ruler invaded Poland and set Europe and the world in flames. True. But I ask: Why was it possible for one man or a group of evil men to set the world in flames? The answer I would like to write across the skies of America and of the world. I would like to weave it into the consciousness of the people of every land. The answer is: Because of the complete lack of international machinery that would compel rulers to submit their controversy to a court for adjudication and to abide by the decision rendered. A state of anarchy in international relations prevailed. There was no world court with mandatory jurisdiction. There was no world sheriff with power to enforce the verdict.

In the 21 years that had elapsed since the World War, we had nullified the League of Nations and had erected no effective machinery to lubricate the frictions which lead to the catastrophic explosion of a global war. We had been asleep at the switch and had been caught napping. We had ignored the most obvious lesson that we should have learned from the blood and agony of the first World War—that war cannot be averted by words, no matter how eloquent. It can be averted only by the establishment of an adequate alternative—an international organization with legislative, judicial, and executive powers.

Why, you will ask, have we any more reason to believe that any such organization would be more effective than the League of Nations? We know now the reasons for its failure. They were the failure to provide effective sanctions for its decisions, the failure to use it to adjust growing grievances and inequalities instead of using it merely to perpetuate the status quo, and lastly, the failure of America to join it. By correcting these errors we have every reason to believe that it can remove the frictions that lead to war. In fact the human mind can think of no other way out.

The establishment of such an international organization will necessitate a modification in the traditional concept of sovereignty. In the past a nation has claimed to be the sole and supreme judge of the rightness of its acts affecting other nations. It constitutes itself the judge, jury, and sheriff. It undertakes to impose its decision upon other nations at the point of the sword and the bombing plane. This concept of absolute sovereignty has spawned the characteristic nationalism which issues in such slogans: Deutschland, Ueber alles; Ueber alles in der welt—Germany above all—Brittania rules the waves; Our country—right or wrong. That concept with its brood of fanatical and irrational loyalties must go. In a closely interwoven world, where nations are brought side by side through the marvels of modern transport, and communication, nations now occupy the place of states in a federal union.

Let me use a few illustrations to show you how reasonable, how practical, and how essential is an international organization with judicial and executive powers. Let us suppose the courts in any county, as well as the sheriff and police forces were abolished. How long would you have peace and order? If two citizens have a disagreement and have no court to settle the dispute, they take to their shooting irons, and soon the whole county would be a bedlam of strife and disorder.

What would happen to cities like Chicago or New York if the agencies of law and order were removed for 1 month? Al Capone or Roger Tuohy would vamoose with the wealth of Chicago and the scalps of half of its citizens at his belt. If we cannot expect a city, or even a small town, to preserve peace and order in the absence of all the machinery for peace, how can we expect a community of nations with 2,000,000,000 citizens to preserve peace and order in the complete absence of peace enforcing agencies? I can summarize a hundred volumes on the theme of international peace by saying: As the peace and order of a county demand a county court and a county sheriff, the peace and order of the world demand a world court and a world sheriff.

SENATE DECLARATION

A milestone in the long struggle of mankind for collective security and peace was reached when on November 4 the United States definitely pledged: "That the United States acting through its constitutional processes join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The Moscow Pact, committing Great Britain, Russia, China, and the United States to the same cooperative undertaking, shines as a rainbow in a darkened sky, giving promise to mankind of deliverance from the long desert of chaos, anarchy, and war into the Canaan of security and peace.

Long ago Isaiah spoke of the day when nations "shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they be exercised any more to war." From time immemorial man has dreamed of the dawning of the day when he could walk out under the open sky, sing his songs, say his prayers, whisper love's age-old story into the ear of his beloved, rear his children, and enjoy the comforts of the family life, without the sword of Damocles in the form of war hanging forever over his head.

By winning the peace and anchoring it, not on the shifting sands of empty platitudes, but on the solid rock of an international organization representing all the peace-loving nations of the world, we shall go a long way toward freezing man's age-old dream of permanent peace into an abiding reality. All who are striving to achieve that peace are fighting for America not less truly than those in the munition factories or on the battlefronts. They are fighting for America, for the United Nations, and for all mankind. What we want for our soldiers to return to is not the old world of their fathers, but a better

world, a world in which they can live in security and lasting peace.

AN AGE-OLD DREAM

Some of you may say, however, that there have always been evil and wicked men, and that there always will be. Yes; let us admit there will be Hitlers, Tojos, and Mussolinis. But we will deprive them of the instrument by which they have turned 200,000,000 of their subjects into automata to execute their crimes.

Evil minds and wicked hearts will always be with us. We can deprive them, however, of the instrument by which they have written their villainies on the mangled bodies of millions of men, women, and children, on the smoldering ruins of the bombed cities, and in the wreckage of planes falling in flames from the skies. We shall remove firebrands from the hands of the world's incendiaries and dynamite from international brigands. Instead of inflicting their evil upon the world, they will be merely private villains in a hick town with the constable just around the corner.

For let me say it with all the emphasis I can command: Worse than Hitler, worse than Tojo, worse than Mussolini, yes, a thousand times worse, is the international anarchy which has permitted a single, half-mustached incendiary to set the world in flames. That anarchy is the real criminal that must be driven forever from the face of the earth. That is the festering sore which has spawned the cancer of war which must be cut once and forever from the organism of international life

To accomplish that, faith, courage, and a new spirit are needed. The optimism of the idealist and the courage of the realist are needed to fuse the ideal into the shape of things to come. Faith in God, in the power of righteousness, and in the fundamental rationality of mankind, is indispensable. The pessimist is whipped in advance. The spirit of Christ must pervade the relations of nations, for it alone can give life and binding force to the dead letter of the law. That spirit, declares Pope Pius XII, must comprise three elements: "A sense of deep responsibility, which measures all human statutes according to the law of God, a hunger and thirst after justice, and that universal love which is the compendium and most universal expression of the Christian ideal." The breath from heaven will accomplish more than a multitude of dead legal prescriptions. As a Chinese poet puts it:

"A thousand dipping oars can less avail
Than heaven's breath that fills one ragged sail."

The challenge facing the people of America today is twofold: To win the war and to win the peace. The winning of the peace will mean the fulfillment of humanity's age-old dream—the dawning of the day when war will live in the memory of the race only as a nightmare, recalling the tragic anarchy in international relations which so long survived in a world otherwise civilized.

The Teheran Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Polish Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk on the Teheran agreement, which was released through the Polish Telegraph Agency of New York:

The Polish attitude on the Three Power Declaration at Teheran was given today by Polish Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, in a statement released through the official Polish telegraph agency.

Seeing the promise to strike at Germany from every side and to destroy the German war machine as portending a coming end to the war in Europe, the Polish Government head averred that peace will be all the more lasting if—as the Three Power Declaration states—real cooperation and active participation by great nations and small exists among the family of democratic nations.

Poland has proclaimed her membership in the world family of democratic nations, from which tyranny, slavery, oppression, and intolerance have been driven, the Premier stated. We also express the conviction that in liberated territories these democratic principles will be put into practice immediately.

In the agreement guaranteeing Iran's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, as well as in the Cairo resolution providing for the return of all territories seized from China, the Polish Premier saw the fulfillment of basic conditions for true peace, which, if it is to be lasting, cannot be built on any wrongs, including territorial wrongs.

A Spirit of Cordiality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Press-Register of December 7, 1943:

WHEN A SPIRIT OF CORDIALITY ABIDES

It is a source of particular pride to every patriotic-minded Mobilian that ever since the attack on Pearl Harbor 2 years ago today, this community has labored in the front ranks in producing American war materials and servicing the Nation's Military Establishment.

One of the most extensive and vital contributions from Mobile to the needs of war has come from the operation of Brookley Field, important supply and service institution of the Army Air Forces and headquarters of the Mobile Air Service Command. For obvious reasons, we cannot go into details about Brookley Field activities, but there is no secret of the fact that it ranks among the highest among Army centers of its kind, both in scope and efficiency of performance.

Along with the pride they take in the military service rendered by Brookley Field, Mobilians are extremely proud of the cordiality existing between its uniformed personnel and the civilian population. It is to be doubted that the spirit of mutual good-will and cooperation prevailing here is exceeded in any comparable community anywhere.

For the magnificent example set by Brookley Field in this respect the credit must go to the administrative policies adopted and practiced under the leadership of Brig. Gen. James A. Mollison, commanding general at the field and of the Mobile Air Service Command.

General Mollison has been exceptionally responsive whenever opportunity arose for Brookley Field to assist in any civilian undertaking for advancement of the war effort. He has not hesitated to go beyond the sphere of his actual official duties to do this. He has held steadfastly to a policy of doing whatever he could, whenever he could, to make Mobile feel that Brookley Field is a real part of the community and to promote the feeling at Brookley Field that the people of Mobile are genuinely interested in the well-being of its personnel.

It is noticeable, too, that General Mollison has been cooperative with the civil authorities as well as with civic interests of Mobile. By reason of his attitude of all-around cooperation and readiness to serve, the commanding general at Brookley Field has done a job in public relations that speaks highly for him and earns for him the esteem in which he has come to be regarded by the civilian population of Mobile.

Brookley Field, although actually a War Department property of the United States Government, is indeed a Mobile institution, closely related to the everyday life of the community. Especially in view of the fact that it will continue as a permanent operation after the war, General Mollison has rendered a lasting service in the public-relations job he has done at Brookley Field.

Halsey Reviews Year of Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article released by the Associated Press entitled "Halsey Reviews Year of Victory," by Admiral William F. Halsey, United States Navy, commander of the South Pacific force and the South Pacific area:

HALSEY REVIEWS YEAR OF VICTORY—BARES GREAT OBSTACLES OVERCOME IN CONQUEST OF SOLOMONS—TOKYO GOAL OF NEW OFFENSIVES

(By Admiral William F. Halsey, United States Navy)

The year of South Pacific warfare that ended on August 6, 1943, had been a difficult one for the Allied forces. Looking back upon it, from initial set-backs to the moment when, at 15,000 (3 p. m.) on August 5, last, our combined Army and marine units, supplemented by our New Zealand, Australian and Fijian associates, completed the capture of our second Solomon Islands objective, Munda airfield, we can take deep pride in the knowledge of having achieved much against great odds.

FIRST SOLOMONS ATTACK

It is an established military axiom that a firmly entrenched defender holds the initial advantage against an attacker.

Well aware of the odds to be faced, the newborn South Pacific force moved against the lower Solomons on August 7, 1942. History shows that this force, then under Vice Admiral Robert L. Ghormley, United States Navy, accomplished its mission. Guadalcanal, Gavutu, and Tanambogo were surprised in a perfectly-timed, well-coordinated early-morning assault.

Perhaps we should have wished to postpone our entry into the Solomons until a later date, when our strength in aircraft, ships, and men would have been greater. It is no secret today that we had little choice in the matter.

AIRFIELD NEAR COMPLETION

At the very moment that Gen. A. A. Vandegrift's marine shock troops swarmed the beachheads of Guadalcanal, the airdrome, now famed as Henderson Field, was receiving its final touches from enemy graders and rollers. Delay would have jeopardized the security of the islands to the south, as well as Australia and possibly New Zealand. We did not delay.

Then began the long, long struggle which can only end with the annihilation of the Japanese Imperial Army and Navy.

In the prosecution of the Pacific war, which encompasses almost 70,000,000 square miles from the Aleutians to New Zealand, and from the China Sea to the west coast of the Americas, we have now made an earnest offensive beginning. Our first year of South Pacific sea warfare alone has accounted for what can be regarded as an impressive enemy fleet of combatant and noncombatant ships sunk and damaged in air and surface engagements since the inception of the Guadalcanal operations.

LIST OF VICTORIES

Our victories in 1942 included the battle of the eastern Solomons, August 23–25; Cape Esperance, October 11–12; Santa Cruz, October 23; Guadalcanal, November 13–15; Lunga Point, November 30–December 1. This year we can look with satisfaction on a tough job well done in the initial Kula Gulf action, March 5–6; battle of Kula Gulf, July 6; Kolombangara, July 12–13; Vella Gulf, August 6–7. We have made the waters of the middle Solomons costly and dangerous for the Japanese.

I regret that security does not permit a break-down of submarine action in our theater. This much I can say without aiding the enemy: Our underseas forces grow daily; they strike him hard and often, where it hurts most—in his military bread basket. His attenuated supply lines which he must frantically guard in his efforts to pour more men and materials into his cracking perimeter-defenses, provide a 3,000-mile target for us. I call to witness the exploits of such submarines as the *Wahoo*—which disposed of a whole convoy of badly needed Japanese supplies.

ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED PLANES SHOT DOWN

In the air, our Navy, marine, and Army pilots, generally outnumbered but never outfought, shot down more than 1,800 enemy planes of all categories. We can say with pardonable pride that, on August 6, this year, 1 American was worth at least 4 Japs in aerial combat.

As our forces grow, we have been able to send heavier aerial concentrations into the skies against the enemy. The final days of our unrelenting onslaught against Munda saw more than 200 aircraft bringing our wrath down upon his head in the form of high explosives, cannon fire, and machine gunning.

The Jap found his own attempts at mass aerial attack devastating—to himself. Witness his rout on April 7, June 16, and June 30, on which 3 days he lost a total of 234 planes.

UNITY OF COMMAND

Early this year the South Pacific force, which has always been and remains an integral part of the United States Pacific Fleet, came under the strategical command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Each of us, he in his theater, and we in ours, had long been aiming at the same ultimate objectives.

Coordination of our efforts was nothing new. This unity of command was the natural outcome of our northward progress.

Throughout our entire South Pacific operations, Army bombers under General MacArthur's command played an essential role in the successes we attained here. Teamwork has always been of the highest order.

NEW PHASE OF CAMPAIGN

We have begun a new phase of the campaign in the waters and on the islands of the southwestern Pacific.

Many months of unrelenting labor brought us to this desirable stage in the conflict. These were hard months of preparation, made harder by the fact that we started from scratch. We went into harbors where little if any docking facilities existed—and built them. We cut the turn-around time of cargo ships carrying vital supplies from weeks to days.

Our magnificent engineers, Navy Seabees, and Army units hewed airfields out of jungles—and we got planes into them in time to stem all enemy counterattacks against our hard-won new advanced positions. Sometimes it was touch-and-go. Often sheer guts, as exemplified by the marine fliers who ferried gasoline drums into Guadalcanal in unarmed transport planes during the dark days of October 1942, tipped the scales from defeat to ultimate victory.

TRIBUTE TO ALL

It is with the deepest gratitude that I pay tribute to all these components of the South Pacific force.

Thanks to their labors, we now have these springboards from which our future offensives must be launched.

This I can promise: We shall have offensives. It is not the nature of Americans, Australians or New Zealanders to sit idly by while the enemy overruns their lands. Nor does any one of us feel that he has begun to win until he reaches enemy soil. Taking back what was ours originally is just the start. Each of us has an appointment in Tokyo.

The Nation's Teachers Must Be Protected To Safeguard Educational Foundations From Undermining

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include below the remarks of Belmont Farley, Director of Public Relations of the National Education Association, which were made yesterday before a meeting of Congressmen gathered to hear representatives of consumer groups and white-collar classes in regard to subsidies and holding the line against the rising cost of living. In this short address Mr. Farley had something to say with regard to the need of action on the part of Congress to help the great American public-school system, while also showing the need of shielding the Nation's teachers from the ravages of inflation. As I have myself been a school teacher and interested in the cause of education all my mature life, I recognize the gentleman's logic in both these respects and take this opportunity to furnish this important information for the public.

As a Member of Congress I recognize the need and obligation of the national lawmaking body to encourage the vital work of public education in every possible way. Of course, I take pride and satisfaction in what has been done through the years—although it is not as much as I should like to have seen done—by the National Government to promote universal, free, public education. I heartily endorse the plea of the National Education Association for additional financial support of schools by the Federal Government in peacetime and more particularly now in wartime.

In this matter of combating inflation I most heartily concur in the work of teachers, as one element of our white-collar class, whose proper functioning is so significant in the very existence of our Government and of our country, in their attempt to mitigate the evils of runaway prices and to hold the line to the greatest possible extent against the rising cost of living. I unqualifiedly condemn any species of war profiteering and the coining of blood into money by whatsoever individuals or groups. I feel the same understanding sympathy for overworked, underpaid, faithful servants on the home front second only to those of our fighting men on the battle fronts giving their very lives for our Nation's existence.

Mr. Farley's address follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Nation's teachers offer no panacea either for the cure or the prevention of inflation. However, teachers are among those who are ground between the upper and nether millstones of mounting prices and static wages. They are seriously concerned about inflation and feel that every possible move should be made to avert it. Wartime administrative agencies have been authorized to protect the wages of workers in this critical period. That is a wise national policy. The services of the schools are essential; too. The Nation's children are no less valuable than the products of its open hearths and rolling mills. Yet the teachers of children are protected by no Little Steel formula or any other formula. While the cost of living has gone up approximately 26 percent on an average throughout the Nation, the income of teachers has increased only about 8 percent. The situation in the schools is critical. Every move we make to relieve the crisis in education is a service to that future for which we fight.

Teachers are the lowest paid professional group in the United States. When school began last September, 254,000 teachers were employed on contracts of less than $1,200. There are 44,000 teachers, who preside over the educational careers of at least a million American children, whose annual salary is less than $600. Half of the children in one State are being taught by teachers getting less than $600. Barring all consideration of fluctuation in living costs and the disastrous effect upon teachers of not being able to meet them, there is not a Congressman in office nor a member of this audience who would willingly place the chances of a fair start in life for his own child in the hands of a person whose skill is measured by $600 a year. Within certain limitations which everybody understands, you get in education just what you get in buying anything—what you pay for.

For a nation espousing a kind of government the success of which depends so largely upon the enlightenment of its citizens, the American people have through the years shown singularly little faith in the education of their children. Let's take a look at those years. In 1870 the average annual salary of teachers in the United States was $189. In 1903 the average salary had leaped to $361. In 1911 it had advanced to $491. As we entered the last war in 1917, the average annual salary of teachers was $606. Such an

accepted economic status for teachers has hardly marked the school as an institution taken seriously by the American people.

It is an alarming but not a surprising fact that many teachers, too, are today not taking it so seriously. There is an exodus from the schoolroom to the factory and office where the teacher may expect an income consistent with the prices he has to pay for the necessities of life. This school year there were 170,000 teachers new to their positions. In several States some 30 to 40 percent of the teachers are new this year. Such a turnover robs the services of education of stability and continuity. A destructive amount of turn-over exists in those communities classified by the Bureau of the Census as rural. In these areas more than one-half of the Nation's children live. In these areas teachers in normal times are the most poorly paid. In these areas the school term is shortest. In these areas the educational offering is the most meager. The wartime teacher shortage has further reduced educational opportunity for these rural and village children. To provide the least educational opportunity where the most children are, consistently and through the years, is an effective way to sabotage our Nation's future.

Not only are trained teachers leaving the profession but capable youth are refusing to get ready to take their places in it. Enrollments in teacher training institutions have dropped alarmingly. Where there were 5 students enrolled 4 years ago in the teachers colleges of the Nation now only 2 are enrolled. The situation is extreme in some places. In one state the teachers colleges will graduate next spring only 79 elementary school teachers. Sixteen hundred are needed.

The American schools will be short this year at least 68,000 qualified teachers. About 50,000 of these positions have been filled by granting emergency certificates to persons who cannot meet the qualifications for teaching in normal times. Few qualified teachers are coming in to fill up the ranks. There will be more vacant chairs at the teachers' desks next year than there were this. The situation is more complicated by the fact that in recent years there has been a decided increase in the birthrate which will soon bring demands for more teaching personnel.

It is time that the American people took the education of their children seriously. The people of other nations are doing so. The British Board of Education has recently issued a comprehensive statement on the reorganization of education following the war. China is doing the same thing. Russia is pushing forward a major program of education tested in the crucible of its succession of 5-year plans. We have long talked about the advantages of education to an individual in achieving individual success. It is now time that we place more emphasis upon education in the maintenance of the leadership of the United States among the nations of the world. If this war has taught us anything, it has taught us the importance of manpower—trained manpower and womanpower—on the battle fronts, in the factories, in the offices, in the homes of the Nation.

This national leadership is a charge upon Congress, if it is a charge upon anybody. Congress is in a position to do something, if it will. For 5 days in the United States Senate the friends of education tried to induce that body to assume a portion of that responsibility through provisions for Federal aid to education. The measure was not dealt with on its merits, but by legislative manipulation was turned back to the committee from which it emanated. Neither Congress nor the people can afford to turn their backs upon the responsibility for educating their children, assumed by the founders of this Nation and supported, in theory, by their successors for more than a century and a half.

We are not here to prescribe for the control or prevention of further inflation. We do feel it is our duty to say to you that unless the rising cost of living is brought under control, the destruction of our educational system will be accelerated. School systems which have lost only a few teachers so far will lose hundreds of teachers. School systems that have lost hundreds of teachers will lose them by the thousands. Teachers cannot continue indefinitely to carry the burden of increasing living costs on stationary incomes. Through the National Education Association teachers have appealed to Congress for relief. Congress has thus far refused to act. If in addition to refusing to face the question of Federal participation in school support the majority of Congress permits living costs to rise still further, the teachers of America will have to conclude that Congress does not care much whether school keeps or not. If it is true that the antisubsidy measure now before Congress would increase the cost of living immediately by 8 percent, we can only warn that many teachers will be unable to hold out any longer. They have already made as many sacrifices as they feel able to make. Perhaps Congress can devise some new measures which will prevent further sharp and destructive increases in the cost of living. If there are more effective measures of preventing or checking inflation, let us have them. To date these subsidies have resulted in a certain amount of price stabilization. Those who oppose them have an urgent and solemn responsibility to offer an equally effective means of controlling prices.

The Late Honorable Lawrence Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following poem written in memory of our deceased colleague, Hon. Lawrence Lewis, of Colorado, by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, which I am sure expresses the sentiments of everyone who knew Mr. Lewis:

CONGRESSMAN LEWIS

Lawrence Lewis, Colorado's
Noted Congressman's not dead—
Tho he's left the Halls of Congress,
He has just gone on ahead,
Gone to that Celestial City,
In response to Death's demands,
To abide in Faith's eternal
Mansion, builded not with hands.

Lawrence Lewis was anointed,
At the hour of his birth,
By his Maker, to be reckoned
As the real salt of the earth—
He had but one rule of action,
To which he was ever true,
"Do ye, likewise, unto others
As ye'd have them do to you."

Lawrence Lewis left for others
To tell of his noble deeds—
He cared little for professions
In established man-made creeds—
But his secret prayers, at evening,
Were, methinks, always begun,
And always devoutly ended,
With "Not mine, Thy will be done."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Louisiana Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I wish, in fairness to my home State of Louisiana, to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Statistics on the condition of various State treasuries were inserted in the RECORD on October 15, 1943, by Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, who explained that this information had been furnished him by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress. The statements included the following:

Louisiana: Expected deficit fiscal year 1944 of $16,818,000. (Bureau of the Census: State finances, State budgets for 1944 and 1945, p. 14).

While I am sure there was no intention to mislead anyone, an erroneous impression is conveyed. I am advised by the Honorable Martin L. Close, director of finance of Louisiana, that the figures quoted in the paragraph above were taken from the executive budget for the 1942–44 biennium submitted to the 1942 session of the legislature by the Governor. The expected deficit mentioned was predicated on recommended appropriations and existing sources of revenue. By no means could it be considered as an indication of the expected financial position of the State at the end of the biennium after the legislature had enacted appropriation and revenue measures.

Many of the recommended appropriations were reduced by the legislature and others increased. A war emergency sales tax, which yielded more than $6,000,000 in 1942–43 and is expected to yield $8,500,000 in 1943–44, was adopted. A gas gathering tax, estimated to produce over $3,500,000 during the biennium, was reenacted. All major taxes in the State have produced more revenue than were estimated at the time the executive budget was prepared.

As a result of these developments there was a total unencumbered surplus in all expendable funds, at the end of the fiscal year of 1942–43, of $15,008,926.59. Of this sum there was $7,467,748.62 in the State general fund. The director of finance anticipates a further increase in unencumbered surplus during the current year.

In view of the figures submitted by Mr. Close, it can be seen that instead of the fiscal year of 1944–45 indicated in the statement in the RECORD, the reference should have been to the fiscal year of 1943–44, and furthermore that the expected deficit was based only on appropriations being considered and the sources of revenue in sight at the time the figures were submitted to the legislature. As a matter of fact, the State records show there was an unencumbered surplus of $15,008,926.59 at the end of 1942–43, with prospects of this large amount being increased during 1943–44.

Resolution of Illinois Legislative Commission on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas huge stock piles of merchandise now in use or procured for use by the armed forces are of a nature that they will be usable for consumer consumption after the war; and

Whereas this stock pile, variously estimated up to $60,000,000,000 in quantity, represents a very serious hazard to labor, manufacture, and industry of this country unless wisely disposed of; and

Whereas no plan has yet been developed to distribute this vast amount of goods throughout legitimate channels; and

Whereas a disorderly distribution of such merchandise would cause widespread unemployment to the detriment of the laboring man; and

Whereas such distribution or dumping of merchandise would cause much standard merchandise to be sold at below cost and substandard prices to the detriment of the retail business of the country; and

Whereas the combination of cheap labor caused by inevitable post-war adjustments; low rentals caused by the already noticeable increases in vacant store buildings, and an almost inexhaustible supply of merchandise which might conceivably be bought from Government at low prices, represents a serious combination of circumstances; and

Whereas these results would be harmful to the interests of labor and business in the State of Illinois, which it is our privilege to represent in the general assembly: Be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Legislative Commission on Small Business urge the immediate consideration by Congress of a pre-post-war solution to this problem with due regard for the serious maladjustment which would result without proper planning and preparation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress consider ways and means of reducing this tremendous surplus and thus at least partially minimizing the problem, and at the same time consider specific methods of intelligently distributing the remainder; and be it further

Resolved, That it be the recommendation of this Commission that the Congress consider disposal of these surplusses by four methods as follows:

1. Retaining of a needed part for the future use of the armed forces of this country to protect the sovereignty of these United States;

2. Distribution of another part to legitimate agencies for use in future disasters throughout the world;

3. Distribution of another part to the inhabitants of this world who have suffered because of the effects of World War No. 2; and finally

4. Distribution of the remainder, gradually, through the established channels of distribution; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be asked to give due consideration to the smaller merchant in the release of this merchandise, either through direct contact with an established Government agency and/or through a system whereby such surplus goods would be released, gradually, with the highest bidder given preference and all retailers given a specified length of time to present their bids to such an agency, which would insure against discrimination and wholesale dumping of low-priced merchandise on the market; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the entire delegation in Congress, to the press and to all interested trade and labor groups, in an effort to stimulate immediate thinking on this important subject; and, be it further

Resolved, That the commission recommend to the Illinois Legislature at its next regular session consideration of legislation designed to prevent dumping, after the duration, of such surplus goods on the Illinois market at a price below that stipulated either by the Government agency in charge or by common business practice in the event the Government fails to act on this important question.

Legion Survey Discloses Shocking Condition and Delay in Claim Settlements for Discharged Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, apropos of our recent discussion on the floor and the legislation pending to provide effective means for giving immediate allowances to discharged servicemen, I am just in receipt of a report from the national headquarters of the American Legion discussing this important subject at some length. I am sure that all of you, my colleagues, will agree that the situation is shocking and that we must make immediate provision to remove these difficulties so that discharged veterans may receive proper allowances immediately upon being discharged, without having to wait through interminable delays caused by red tape and through unnecessary bureau hurdles. I urge, Mr. Speaker, the mustering-out-pay legislation be called up without further delay and passed.

The report to which I refer is as follows:

DELAYS IN CLAIM SETTLEMENTS HOLD UP AID TO WAR'S DISABLED—LEGION SURVEY DISCLOSES SHOCKING CONDITION—ATHERTON FILES REPORT WITH CONGRESS—ACTION BY DEPARTMENTS NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

(Statement by Warren H. Atherton, National Commander of the American Legion, on results of survey of World War No. 2 claims, December 2, 1943)

Situation in nutshell: One thousand five hundred and thirty-seven cases of delay compiled in survey; 34 States covered; 15 specific instances cited; average time of delay per case, 3 to 4 months; maximum time of delay found, 11 months; representations by department commanders to Members of Congress asked now.

A telegraphic and air-mail survey of American Legion service officers on pending World War No. 2 claims show that there has been and still is considerable delay from the time these men are released from service, file their claims, and receive the first check in settlement thereof. This delay is attributable to a number of circumstances according to these service officers. Some States report no undue delay, but most of them have cases of record filed 3 to 7 months ago and not yet settled. The American Legion feels that all Government agencies concerned should coordinate their activities to the end that men and women released from service because of disabilities shall not be subjected to inconvenience, embarrassment, and at times distress, because their claims for disability compensation are not settled promptly. The American Legion has clearly in mind that a great number of these claimants have been in service for several months, have become incapacitated in training or combat, and are now back in civil life or back in hospitals and institutions because the armed services has no further use for them. While in service they made allotments to their dependents to which was added the Government allowance. This benefit is discontinued in each case upon discharge. Having no other income the disabled dischargee must rely on financial assistance from private or charitable sources. Such a situation, especially for the combat disabled, should not be tolerated. Based upon the findings of the survey just completed, and upon the experience of the organization in claims and rehabilitation fields, the following recommendations are made by the American Legion to the Federal Government:

1. Every serviceman whose disabilities or physical condition are reparable should be retained in the armed services to receive the maximum benefits of hospitals and medical care. If there is need for further convalescent or institutional care the liaison between the Army and Navy, on the one hand, and the Veterans' Administration, on the other, should really function and be applicable in each case. Men should not be returned to civil or State authorities unless so desired expressly by the folks at home.

2. The Veterans' Administration hospital bed capacity, especially for the nervous and mental cases and the tuberculous patients, should be enlarged so that all those released from service and in need of further care may be accommodated. The American Legion is committed to the proposition that the Veterans' Administration be a war agency for the duration of hostilities and 6 months thereafter, to assure its proper place in the priorities rating for construction material, equipment, personnel, and supplies.

3. As a direct contribution to the informational and advisory service to prospective dischargees the Veterans' Administration should have contact representatives at the larger discharge centers, especially those handling combat troops.

4. To obviate delays in adjudicating claims for obvious and indisputable disabilities the War and Navy Departments should permit the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at the larger discharge points or demobilization centers.

5. Mustering-out pay in amounts dependent upon length of service should be made available with a portion payable at discharge and the balance within 30 and 60 days thereafter. The national commander of the American Legion testified before a Senate committee on such a proposal December 1, 1943.

6. The furnishing of medical and clinical records from service hospitals at which the disabled person may have been treated before he reached the discharge center must be speeded up. It is understood that such records may be essential in the adjudication of many cases, but in many others they would contribute little or nothing to the identification and evaluation of the disability causing discharge. Another bottleneck was found in the furnishing of photostat copies of induction or enlistment examination reports. As the result of a former survey made by the American Legion the War Department was furnished with findings upon which officials took action. It has been reported that this

bottleneck is now eliminated and that requests for these photostat records will be handled within 5 days from date of receipt.

7. The present arrangement of sending records and reports of disabled dischargees to the nearest regional office of the Veterans' Administration should be changed so that these records are dispatched promptly to the Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction in the man's home State. This change may require Veterans' Aministration contact people at the different discharge points as recommended above.

8. The lack of sufficient trained personnel in the adjudication field is a cause of delay in handling these cases in most stations. The manpower situation is recognized, but yet the Legion cannot refrain from urging and exhorting the Veterans' Administration to authorize the additional help requested by field offices, and to immediataly step up recruitment and training programs for this purpose.

9. Some service officers have reported the lack of complete and clarifying instructions from the central office of the Veterans' Administration to the regional offices on the adjudication of the new claims has been an element of delay. Certainly this should be overcome immediately.

10. Each claim is assigned a C-number or claim number. So far this is done by the central office. Complaints have come in that the delay in assigning these numbers has held up adjudication of cases for as long as 2 or 3 weeks. The Legion feels this is an administrative problem that could and should be met and solved right now.

11. The present fiscal arrangement whereby disbursement on vouchers and rolls certified by the Veterans' Administration are made at disbursing offices, one in each Federal Reserve district, also contributes to delay the issuance of the initial check and settlement of the claim. Up to about 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration had its own disbursing officers. Reverting to that arrangement now should serve to expedite the payment of individual and new claims.

These conclusions rest upon observations sent in by trained service officers in 34 States. They cited by name and number (if assigned) 1,537 cases of disabled men. It is understood that many cases may require development of pertinent information, but that should not be permitted to slow down the whole rating machinery. Another factor cited is that of settling the question of waiver of premiums on insurance during period of total disability. Also the payment of insurance benefits and pensions to the dependents of those dying in service. The jurisdiction over both these is in central office, and the many delays reported call for prompt improvement in the system of disposing of these cases.

There may be many other considerations touching upon the broad question of delays in the settlement of disabled veterans' claims. The American Legion submits, however, that if all Government agencies concerned would redouble their efforts to effect complete coordination much will have been accomplished toward the goal sought by the dischargees themselves, their folks at home, their representatives, and the Federal Government.

Attached hereto are brief summaries of cases taken from those submitted in the survey. They illustrate many of the points set forth above.

Related to this question are those other important programs of employment and unemployment protection. As to these the American Legion has proposals which are being introduced in Congress and on which further detailed data will be given.

Case 1: In this claim the veteran served honorably in the Navy from March 4, 1932, to February 8, 1938. He reenlisted on May 4, 1938, and was honorably discharged on medical certificate on account of active tuberculosis, incurred in line of duty, on April 6, 1943. The form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on April 21, 1943, and it has not been adjudicated as yet on account of the fact that complete records have not been received from the Navy. Contact was made with the adjudication officer about the delay in this claim on October 22, 1943, and again on November 29, 1943.

Case 2: This veteran was discharged insane, unable to sign his discharge. Claim was filed April 12 and we have not yet been able to get this veteran examined. While it is true that the Veterans' Administration wrote to the sister and a service officer, no letters were written to either or anyone in the months of September and October. Request was made for an attendant by this office on August 2 and the Veterans' Administration under date of November 9 finally complied with this request and wrote the veteran.

Case 3: This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1943, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat against the Japanese in Guadalcanal, penetrating wound right parietooccipital region produced by grenade. Diagnosis, hemiplegia, spastic, left." He was honorably discharged on C. D. D. July 3, 1943, and his claim was filed the same date. He was rated 50-percent disabled October 25, 1943, and advised of this rating on November 4, 1943, with rating effective from July 5, 1943. Vocational rehabilitation recommended.

Case 4: Claim was filed in this case July 3. The case file was transferred to central office for consideration by the Veterans' Claims Service on October 6, 1943. One reason for the delay in this particular case is that the veteran had a claim pending for officers' retirement pay which had to be disposed of.

Case 5: This claimant was discharged from the hospital on August 16, 1943, and on November 11, 1943, an office of the Veterans' Administration had to make a second request of the War Department for a medical report. He was examined at a Veterans' Administration hospitl and some adjustment was made.

Case 6: This claimant was discharged August 15, 1942, from the Army Nurse Corps, and claim was filed February 4, 1943. Reports from the Adjutant General's Office, for which requests had been made several times, were not received until the latter part of August 1943. The decision has been deferred until completion of the requested neuropsychiatric examination by the Veterans' Administration.

Case 7: This veteran was discharged from service July 27, 1943, with a diagnosis of dementia praecox, paranoid. The handicap estimated by the Rating Board is 100 percent. Action toward releasing payment on the veteran's behalf apparently is not to be expected until the Facility is informed officially with respect to the character of the veteran's discharge. It seems quite evident that this veteran served honorably, but the authorization unit has refused to release the payments until officially reported that discharge was honorable.

Case 8: Discharge from service in this case was effected July 26, 1943. Decision by the rating board on October 7, 1943, recognized the veteran's entitlement to pensionable rating for weak feet. Release of payments in this case, as in the case to which reference is made immediately above, awaits the receipt of official information of the man having been discharged honorably.

Case 9: Claim for pension was filed by this veteran at the time of discharge on June 11, 1943. Before conducting the studies the medical authorities thought it advisable to have a social-service investigation made. It seems probable that another 3 or 4 months will elapse before a decision can be effected in the circumstances that exist, due to the accumulated load and number of orders for investigations.

Case 10: Claim was filed June 17, 1943. Several follow-ups by a Veterans' Administration facility have not brought the receipt of War Department reports.

Case 11: This veteran enlisted October 25, 1941, and was honorably discharged on C. D. D. December 23, 1942. Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on January 4, 1943. On January 5, 1943, service records were requested from the Adjutant General's Office and were received in this office on February 19, 1943. Under date of April 10, 1943, the rating board requested supplemental service records from the Adjutant General's Office which were received in the Veterans' Administration on May 7, 1943. A second supplemental Adjutant General's report concerning alleged treatment at Fort Custer was requested May 10, 1943, and on June 14, 1943, a third supplemental report of clinical records of treatment at Fort Custer was requested. Complete records of the claimant's treatment at Fort Custer were received in the Veteran's Administration on July 26, 1943. August 3, 1943, an examination and psychiatric social history were requested by the rating board and the latter was received on September 12, 1943. Then on September 14, 1943, the rating board requested an examination based upon psychiatric social report. The claimant was examined at a Veterans' Administration facility on October 14, 1943, and report of this was received November 15, 1943, in the regional office. On November 20, 1943, the rating board rated the claim and granted service connection for a nervous condition, incompetent, and in need of a guardian. On account of the claimant's having been declared incompetent, chief attorney requested that a fiduciary be appointed under date of November 24, 1943. No check has been issued as yet.

Case 12. In this case the veteran, totally blind was discharged from an Army hospital on June 30, 1943; the Army service records were not received in the regional office until the week of November 22, 1943; therefore the veteran has not as yet, and probably will not for 30 days, receive the pension check to which he is entitled.

Case 13. This veteran was discharged from service March 31, 1943. Form 526 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration on August 9, 1943. The regional office has only a dummy file on this case. The principal folder was sent to the Index Division, Office of Chief Clerk, on August 9, 1943, for the reason that, in addition to the veteran's service in the Navy in World War No. 2, he had also had peacetime service in the Army, just prior to World War No. 2. Under date of September 14, 1943, the Chief Clerk advised the regional office that the veteran's file was being referred to the insurance claims council for attention to the veteran's claim for waiver of premiums.

Case 14: This veteran was discharged from service on March 4, 1943. He has been granted service connection for tuberculosis, pulmonary, active, under date of May 5, 1943, and has been rated 100 percent from March 5, 1943. His claim file was sent to the Director of Insurance on September 25, 1943, for action on a question of entitlement to waiver of premiums. The file has not been returned to this date, November 26, 1943, and no action has been reported by the Insurance Claims Council.

Case 15: A recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined therein because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

Treasury Employees in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted by the House, I desire to place in the RECORD the following letter from the Treasury Department giving a break-down on the number of their employees in the State of South Dakota. It will be noticed that this constitutes a revision of the estimate of 500 made by the Civil Service Commission. The letter referred to follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 6, 1943.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives;
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: This has further reference to your letter of October 22, 1943, in which you requested a break-down by office of the number of employees of the Treasury who are located in South Dakota.

The Treasury has only three offices in South Dakota, as follows:

Comptroller of the Currency	2
Bureau of Internal Revenue	118
War Finance Division	14
Total	134

This figure does not agree with the estimate of 500 which was furnished to you by the Civil Service Commission.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES S. BELL,
Acting Administrative Assistant to the Secretary.

A Case for Speed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily News of December 7, 1943:

A CASE FOR SPEED

Congress should pass without delay the Gillette-Taft-Baldwin-Rogers joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to devise and execute measures for the rescue of as many as possible of the 4,000,000 Jews in Axis-controlled Europe, most of whom may be massacred or starved.

The House is now holding hearings on the resolutions, but what is there to argue about? Scarcely anybody could be opposed to the resolution. As to what can be done, leave that to the commission. Even if little can be done, that little should be done and quickly. The moral effect of declaring our willingness and purpose to do anything possible, is well worth while. We suggest that readers drop a line to Senators BROOKS and LUCAS, and to their District Representatives, urging speedy action on this resolution.

Vitality for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Vitality for All," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by the Carolina Political Union at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., December 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here near Raleigh, N. C., it gives me profound pleasure to salute that grand old man of the South who embodies in his very being so much that is fine and human and progressive—Josephus Daniels. Here at the University of North Carolina, it is gratifying to find the brand of liberalism which has made the South famous since the days of Thomas Jefferson. No one can measure in dollars the contribution made to the South and to the Nation by the practical idealism of such men as Frank Graham and those who serve with him.

Our soldiers and sailors are winning this war. Our energies are devoted to giving them every possible assistance now, and all possible aid in the future. They, their families at home, and the generation coming up are entitled to live in a healthful land. I propose tonight to talk about vitality—physical and spiritual—which is the birthright of all the people—North and South, rich and poor, Jew and Gentile, white and black.

Disease itself must be eliminated wherever it is preventable. This includes both communicable disease and disease due to vitamin deficiencies. We will not get rid of tuberculosis, syphillis, and malaria by merely vitaminizing the population. We must wipe out the external causes of disease; we must make the environment safe for democracy, before vitamins can be used in all of their power. It does no good to feed vitamins to a syphilitic baby.

If we had an adequate system of hospitals in the United States syphilis and gonorrhea could be completely stamped out within 10 years. Dr. Herman N. Bundesen, commissioner of public health of the city of Chicago, has already demonstrated in Chicago that with the modern combination of chemicals with fever artificially produced and precisely controlled the 1-day treatment will make infectious patients noninfective. This treatment may be still further improved by the use of penicillin and other devices. But as it stands today, it would be possible, if there were proper backing by the medical profession working in conjunction with the city, State, and Federal health authorities, to eliminate syphilis and gonorrhea as a public health problem in the United States within 10 years at an annual cost of not more than $150,000,000 for the first 5 years and much less than that later on. This is a fraction of the current cost of maintaining the disease.

The white plague—tuberculosis—which still kills about 40,000 of our people annually, while incapacitating hundreds of thousands, can be reduced toward the vanishing point within a generation if all early cases are found, as they can be by X-ray, and if a minimum of 3 TB beds per annual TB death are made available, and if active treatment to heal all TB cavities from which TB is spread is instituted promptly. Adequate food and rest will stop many cases of TB which are caught early enough. If the Federal Government would spend as much money in aiding the States and communities in their fight on human TB as it has already spent on TB among cows, the disease could be eliminated in a generation.

Today thousands of American soldiers fight in tropical jungles and other fever-infested areas. Among the many dangers and hardships which our boys endure, none is more insidious than the scourge of malaria. This disease is the most widespread in the world, and causes more loss of human vitality than any other. The fact that 800,000,000 people the world over suffer from this disease every year is the greatest challenge to organized medicine.

There are two medicines used to combat malaria. One of these is a natural remedy—quinine. The other is a synthetic drug called atabrine. Ninety percent of the world's quinine was produced on the island of Java under the control of a Dutch monopoly group. The Dutch monopoly maintained a rigid grip on the production and price of quinine. They even built a wall around the cinchona trees from which the quinine comes, in order to keep the secret of their cultivation from the world. With this control the Dutch cartel rationed quinine to all the countries of the world at outrageous prices. Surplus supplies were even burned in order to prevent any excess from affecting the market. The Dutch cartel distributed quinine not so that it would do the most good, but to insure their monopoly profits.

The synthetic substitute for quinine—atabrine—was also controlled by a cartel, in this case the great German chemical trust, I. G. Farben. I. G. Farben dictated the terms upon which atabrine could be manufactured, and gave permission to produce to only one American manufacturer. When war came we were dependent upon this single source of supply. As a result of vigorous action by the Government, there are now 11 companies manufacturing atabrine, but 6 months after the war they may find themselves automatically put out of business, for their licenses from I. G. Farben's American cartel partner are good only until that time. The fight against malaria will not stop with the end of the war. We owe it to our people, therefore, to see that these manufacturers are permitted to produce after the war. In justice both to the chemical companies and the Government it should be said that the price of atabrine is now only a small fraction of what it was 10 years ago, and that the low price now makes it possible to treat a malarial case at a cost only one-fourth that of quinine.

It is part of our task in winning the peace to see that neither quinine nor atabrine nor any future remedy for malaria is again restricted by cartel control. The power to condemn millions of people to suffering because they cannot buy health at monopoly prices must be eliminated. We must not allow special privilege here or abroad to stand in the way of the struggle against disease.

Many of the people of the United States possess superabounding physical vitality. They seem never to get tired and work enthusiastically from early morning until late at night. And then there are other people who are not exactly sick but who drag around, dead on their feet. Undoubtedly some of these half-alive people are that way because they were born with a specific physical handicap. But in my opinion the great majority of them can be given a sense of abounding well-being if they are given the right kind of physical and spiritual food. When I talk about food I am going to talk mainly about vitamins. First I shall talk about the older

people, second about the young people, and third about the children. From experience, observation, and talking with vitamin experts, I am convinced that men and women past 40 years of age are more likely to be lacking in the essential vitamins than are younger people. Many of them eat less and on that account their vitamin intake is reduced. Perhaps the aging human mechanism needs more vitamins than in youth. Whatever the cause, I personally am convinced that the vigorous productive life of the average American can be extended perhaps 10 years by greatly increasing his vitamin intake. The benefits will be greatly increased if from childhood on he has been getting plenty of milk and vitamins. Some individuals may require even three or four times the quantity of vitamins they are now getting if they are to have the physical basis for abounding vitality after the age of 50.

It is no favor to anyone to give him an extra 10 years of dragging around. But if he can have the health which he had in his thirties plus the experience which he accumulated in his forties and fifties, then we shall have a contribution to our national strength of the utmost importance.

Young people and children, if they eat plenty of milk, eggs, meat, tomatoes, fruits, green leafy vegetables and either whole-wheat bread or vitamin enriched bread, need not worry as a rule about vitamin deficiency. In the case of nursing mothers, however, Dr. Bundesen has some strong evidence to indicate that the addition of considerable quantities of vitamin E to the diet in the form of wheat-germ oil increases and prolongs the milk flow. Chicago has done more to make human milk available to babies than any other city in the world and Dr. Bundesen knows what he is talking about. There is good reason to believe that the pregnant mother will give her child the maximum vitality if she has adequate quantities of milk and vitamins in her diet.

With children, of course, even more than with young people, cow's milk is the most important single answer to the food problem. Next after milk come eggs, green leafy vegetables, tomatoes, and the citrus fruits. With plenty of these foods there is no need to worry about vitamins for children. Perhaps the most important single vitamin for children is the bone-building vitamin, the sunshine vitamin, the vitamin which is found in fish livers or which can be made cheaply by the irradiation of food with artificial light. Fortunately the South abounds in sunshine.

During the past 10 years tremendous progress has been made by the chemical companies in the synthetic production of vitamins which are identical with the natural vitamins. Thus far, the cheapest source of vitamin A is fish liver. But vitamin B_1, which might be called the optimistic vitamin, because of its stimulating effect on the nerves and the appetite, is made synthetically at continuously less cost. Several years ago it cost $4.50 a gram to produce. Today the selling price is 20 cents a gram and the cost of production is less than half that. I won't go into the details of the cost of production of each of the different vitamins but will sum it all by saying that the wholesale cost of producing enough of the six leading vitamins to take care of the vitamin deficiency of the average person of the United States is less than a cent a day. There is good prospect that the cost within 3 or 4 years will be cut down to less than one-half cent a day.

Most of these people under 40 years of age who have enough money to buy the kind of food they want and who buy it with dietary common sense don't need to worry about extra vitamins. But there is enough variation in individuals so that now and then we find among well-to-do young people, and especially among those who drink, signs of obvious vitamin deficiency. Such symptoms are much more frequent among poor people who can't buy the food they would like to eat. Probably half, and possibly two-thirds, of the people in the United States do not buy enough of the right kind of food to furnish the necessary vitamins. One of the cheapest ways of adding to the total energy of the people of the United States is to make sure that absolutely everybody in the country gets in addition to his regular food small quantities of the six leading vitamins, vitamin B_1, riboflavin, niacin, vitamin C, vitamin A and vitamin D. To make sure that absolutely everyone gets enough, perhaps foods which are natural sources of these vitamins should be fortified with an excess of them. The first step, still inadequate, has been the enrichment of flour.

Vitamins are especially important to the vitality of the South because, partly as a result of dietary custom, partly as a result of the one-crop system and no gardens, and partly as a result of poor pastures and lack of livestock, the people of the South suffer more from a lack of vitamin B_1, riboflavin and niacin than people elsewhere in the country. Some people say it costs less to live in the South than in the North. Perhaps this is true so far as fuel and shelter are concerned, but food is just as expensive, or even more so, and when we take into account that the average southern worker has only about one-half as much to buy with as the northerner, we can readily see why vitamin deficiency is a more serious problem in the South than in the North. If you want to find out the whole truth about vitamin deficiency in the South, go over to the Hillman Hospital at Birmingham, Ala., and talk to Dr. Tom D. Spies, or have him give you an illustrated lecture with colored slides showing you how to recognize the different types of vitamin deficiency. In the past 6 years the death rate from pellagra severe enough to require hospitalization has been reduced from 50 percent to zero—at the Hillman Hospital.

I hope to see the day when no one will talk any more about poor white trash. I deny that any human being is trash. Of course, there are people both white and black, in both the North and the South, who don't know how to read and write and who have never had enough of the right kind of things to eat. If you and I had been raised the same way, we would lack ambition, too, unless we happened by rare good luck to be one of those unusual individuals who can utilize his vitamins better than the vast majority of his fellow citizens. I am confident that the poorest people of the South, given education and decent food, will contribute just as much to the future of America as the people of any other region. The one practical way to see that they get the necessary energy-giving food is to make sure that the corn meal and wheat flour they buy contain adequate quantities of the leading vitamins. At the present time the wheat millers are adding some vitamins, but they are not adding enough. Nor are the corn millers adding the necessary vitamins to corn meal.

When I say that vitamins are a food and ought to be sold incorporated in all bread and flour, I am not saying that the drug store vitamin business ought to come to an end. I recognize that last year the drug stores sold about $200,000,000 worth of vitamins and that this business represented perhaps one-fourth of their sales. The drug stores in their vitamin business catered for the most part to the ten or fifteen million people who get the best diets in the country. Some are people who have learned about the power of vitamins to increase their vitality. Others have been found by the doctors to be suffering from one of the forms of dietary deficiency.

Some people require two, three, or four times the normal vitamin dosage in order to live in health. An excess of vitamins doesn't hurt anyone, so there seems to be no reason why those who like to do their own experimenting with vitamins should not continue to do so. The drug stores have their own unique field of service and there is no reason why they should not continue to sell $200,000,000 worth of vitamins a year. But it would also seem that vitamins will be more and more recognized as food rather than as drugs and that they might be made available to the public not only through drug stores but in other ways. The objective of all of us, of course, is to make our maximum contribution to the vitality of the American people, and we shall use whatever mechanisms are best fitted for this purpose.

In the manufacture of vitamins it is important that the United States maintain her lead and not fall into the hands of German cartels. It is important that the Federal Government should keep continually posted as to the relationship between our leading vitamin manufacturers and I. G. Farben. It is important that the Government make sure that practices are followed which lead to the maximum use of vitamins by the people of the United States at a fair price. Nothing must stand in the way of vitamins doing their part in furnishing abounding health to all our people.

The greatest fear of most families in the United States is getting caught with a huge hospital bill, which can be paid off only by long years of hard labor. An unexpected accident or disease may send the most healthy, moderately well-to-do family into grave financial difficulty within a few months. To meet this fear many types of group-health schemes have been worked out by fraternal insurance associations, by employers like Kaiser, and in Cuba by the poor people themselves. Modern medicine properly applied in an up-to-date hospital is such a powerful tool that a campaign should be launched at once to build hundreds of hospitals where we now have tens. The hospitalization cost can be borne evenly by large numbers of people either associated together or through their employers. The cost need not be prohibitive if some organization like the Federal Housing Administration makes money available at low rates of interest. Moreover, the improved vitality of the people will pay all costs of a greatly increased medical service several times over. We must not allow selfish groups to pass State or Federal laws interfering with progress of this sort.

Last Sunday I read in the New York Times the following:

"The heart attack that transformed Mr. Z at 48 from a vigorous, active man to an invalid and the pneumonia that sent Mrs. Z, also 48, to the hospital, brought economic ruin in their wake. Months of hospitalization exhausted the Z's savings, and those of the two married daughters, who can help no longer."

There are many more cases like this described in last Sunday's Times. Every community has so many cases of this sort that each one of us can say with a deep feeling of thanksgiving, "There but for the grace of God go I." But it is not enough to give thanks for our own temporary good fortune. We must make peacetime planning for the welfare of all of us as exciting as planning for the enemies' destruction in time of war. We

must put our backs at once into a hospitalization and medical-care plan for the whole country which will not be a burden but a lifter of the terrible load of sickness which weighs down humanity. It is ordinary, hard-headed business sense to do this job. Every big employer of labor at a war plant knows I speak the truth.

On this occasion I do not propose to go any further into physical vitality. Spiritual vitality is just as important as physical vitality and is closely linked with it. Some people have found spiritual vitality to be an amazing source of health-giving power. Tonight I wish to emphasize that the United States might perhaps reach the maximum of physical vitality and yet be on the point of utter destruction. Something of that sort happened in Germany 10 years ago. Great efforts were made to build up the physical vitality of the youth, and those who saw the German youth at that time on their long hikes were greatly impressed. Curiously enough, the German youth also had a kind of spiritual health. They believed they were part of a movement, that they were appreciated, that they were going places. This gave them buoyancy. The German youth have the spiritual vitality of Satan. They believe in their dark religion with a tremendous faith. Believing in it, they are not greatly bothered with psychiatric disorders at the front. When you really believe in something you don't mind dying for it. Hitler's contribution to Germany was to give her spiritual vitality—but of the wrong kind—a vitality on the basis of the old German gods.

Our spiritual vitality in the United States will be higher when everyone of us feels that he is needed and wanted and when each one of us develops a keen desire to serve the general welfare to the best of his ability in sincerity and in truth. No nation can long maintain spiritual vitality which does not have full employment of men, resources and skills.

Fundamental to spiritual vitality is belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—not wishy-washy belief, not mere lip service—but a respect for others based on the conviction that they are all images of God which have not yet had opportunity fully to express their Creator. We cannot hate people of other religions, races, languages or nations without expressing contempt for God. But we can hate with an unmerciful hate the doctrine that any race, nation, or individual is superior to all other races, nations, or individuals. Some of us have better health and upbringing than others. That does not make us superior except from the standpoint of opportunity to serve the general welfare. The unforgivable sin is to deny the sacredness of the individual human soul. Every individual is born with unique potentialities. These are as great a source of national strength as the richness of the soil and the extent of our coal, iron, and oil deposits.

If America is to serve herself and the world to the full extent demanded by this historic hour, it is essential that maximum physical and spiritual vitality pull together. Each one of us has a physical vitality which can be greatly increased by adequate food, sensible exercise, and in some cases hospitalization or medical advice. Each of us can enhance his physical vitality by building up his spiritual energy. The surest way to build spiritual energy is to work for the general welfare. If each of us feels he is part of a movement serving the general welfare, we shall have a strong Nation.

Already we are a Nation of great physical and moral vitality. We can have an even greater energy. Let's go! Our children shall be better than we!

Address by H. S. Roberts at Memorial Service for the Late Representative U. S. Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Wyandotte County, Kans., Bar Association, on December 1 conducted a memorial service honoring the late Representative U. S. Guyer, of Kansas City, Kans. Representative Guyer died on June 5, after having served in the Congress of the United States for 17 years. Today being the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address of his long-time law partner and friend, H. S. Roberts, of Kansas City, Kans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The highest tributes I heard paid to Congressman Guyer after his death came from R. C. Jones, who was his secretary during most of his service in Congress, and Eddie Phippen, his friend of long standing. One said, "He was a prince among princes," the other, that "He was a great guy."

Of the two I think the latter would have suited him better because he was a "great guy." He liked people, he loved a crowd. He was a man among men and in the language of the Apostle Paul, "He was all things to all men."

Guyer was a good man—a kindly man. There was room in his heart for all. He had the soul of a poet, the heart of a philanthropist, and the mind of a statesman. Never a day goes by that I do not think of him, and many a night I see and talk with him in my dreams. No person, however lowly, ever asked him for alms in vain, "and would everyone for whom he did some loving service take a blossom to his grave he would sleep eternally beneath a wilderness of flowers."

He held many offices, and was clothed some times with absolute power, but he never abused it. The more prominent he became, the more kind hearted and sympathetic he became.

"It is difficult to estimate a man of genius properly who is daily before our eyes." I have mingled with him a lot in my time, and I have been almost "withered by the shade into which he cast me for there is nothing so baleful to a small man as the shade of a great one." Truly, he and I were friends, intimate friends, close friends, yet never, that I can recall, did he call me "Harry" or I call him "Sam." He was an inspiration to me.

From him I learned that "there is a healthful hardiness about real dignity that never dreads contact and communion with others, however humble." I wish, yes pray for his wisdom and understanding. If with the ribbons of the rainbow I could draw aside that mystic curtain that separates the living from the dead I feel sure I would find out that "the idea of eternal life was not born of any book, that that wave of hope and joy ebbs and flows as long as love kisses the lips of death."

"There is a sweetness about death that is difficult to understand." To his dear sister and his beloved wife I would say with Washington Irving, "though it may sometimes throw a passing cloud over the bright hour of gaiety or spread a deeper sadness over the hour of gloom, yet who would exchange it, even, for the song of pleasure."

Mr. Guyer lived in St. John, Kans., only about 4 years. He was neither born nor reared there, yet for some reason to him it was the center of the universe. Around it revolved sweetest memories, youthful ambitions, and it is the resting place of his father, mother, and a beloved sister. He left there at the turn of the century "to seek renown in the outside world and reap a full harvest of worldly favor only to find, that after all, there is no love, no admiration, no applause so sweet to the soul as that which springs up in his native place.

"It is there that he seeks to be gathered in peace and honor among his kindred and his early friends, and when the weary heart and failing head begin to warn him that the evening of life is drawing on, he turns as fondly as does the infant to the mother's arms to sink to sleep in the bosom of the scenes of his younger days."

Twenty-fourth Broadcast to Japan by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my twenty-fourth message to the people of Japan broadcast on the 7th of December.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Two years ago, there were two wars raging in the world. In the Western Hemisphere, Germany was attempting to conquer Europe and Africa. In the Eastern Hemisphere, Japan was in the midst of a 10-year attempt to add China to its list of colonies, which was obviously impossible.

Suddenly Japan succeeded in making these two wars one war, by an act of aggression against the United States. Japan joined the Eastern and Western Hemispheres in a conflict between all the peoples of the world who believe in freedom, justice, and equality, and on the other side three nations whose governments had been seized by power-mad leaders intent upon destroying the ideals and the accomplishments of civilization in order to replace them by their own personal power.

When first I began this series of messages to you, the people of Japan, I said to you what I have repeated many times since then, and which I shall now repeat once more. I said:

"On December 8, 1941, your war lords committed the most colossal suicidal act in the history of nations. No single act recorded by man has been 'more filled with signs and portents for the soul,' more fraught with tragic consequences. With that act your military masters set forces in motion so mighty that all the strength of your nation,

coupled with all the strength of your Axis partners, will seem like broken toys."

People of Japan, will you not consider the remarkable fact that 2 years ago we in the United States were telling you, as I told you in the statement which I have just quoted, exactly what has been borne out by the developments in this war since then?

In reality, there is nothing remarkable about what has happened. The really remarkable thing, people of Japan, is that your war lords, your military masters, your leaders who look upon you as slaves, should commit such a foolish and shameful act.

Just a few days ago the news was received by you and by us of the recent events relating to the parley among President Chiang Kai-shek, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt. That news will bring despair to your hearts when you consider it. You have become part of the movement of your war lords to destroy civilization, and it is inevitable that you will be also a part of the destruction which will come to Japan.

You, people of Japan, have been deluded and in many instances unaware of the manner in which your war lords have been willing to sacrifice you and your sons in order to achieve a goal which would be of no benefit to you, even if it could be achieved.

The communique from Cairo tells the story of what is taking place. In few words, and without apologies, it shows you what is in store for you. The entire scheme of conquest designed by your military masters is in the process of being destroyed. You, the people of Japan, will find yourselves part of the unconditional surrender which is a sure eventuality for you.

For a great many years I have been a friend of the Japanese people, as many of you know. At this point friendship based on the past is something which must be deferred. You, the people of Japan, have allowed yourselves to become part of the movement to destroy civilization, because the war lords of Japan have decreed that you and your families are their slaves and are subject to their wishes.

The conference at Cairo was most fateful for you, people of Japan. In that conference decisions were made which you may not know, because your military masters are unwilling to allow you to hear the facts about the developments of the war. The time will come when you will know all, and you will be staggered and dismayed. At this time, for example, your newspapers and your radios have been telling you stories about current events which are entirely false. When you find out their falsity you will understand.

Today, 2 years after the beginning of your attack on Pearl Harbor, we have made good every pledge we made at that time. Your war lords, blinded by greed, plunged into war without a realization of the facts. In attacking Pearl Harbor and other Pacific points 2 years ago, they thought that they could destroy the defenses of the United Nations in the Pacific theater of war. They failed in their purpose, and their early victories are now being made of no consequence.

People of Japan, you are the victims of the greatest deception in the history of nations. By being victimized, you do not escape responsibility, and you will be forced to pay the price of your submission to a gang of thieves. It was your own choice and submission that enabled your war lords to act as they have acted. You did not revolt and you did not audibly object. Because of this, you have made yourselves, people of Japan, part of the movement to destroy civilization.

It is not enough for you to say that you obeyed orders. Your leaders could not have become leaders unless you were willing. So the destruction of the Japanese Empire is inevitable.

Today marks the beginning of the third year which you, the people of Japan, initiated by allowing your rulers to send your sons to their death. Like you, your Emperor has been deceived, just as he was deceived 12 years ago when your war lords told him that it was right to invade the northeastern provinces of China, and just as he was deceived again in 1937 when the war lords of Japan told him that they could conquer China.

Because of my own deep interest in Japan and my hope over the years that your nation might join the rest of civilization in a belief in what is courteous and worthy, I am deeply distressed by Japan's actions in this war. You, the people of Japan, are going to suffer hardships beyond any that you have known before.

Post-War Oil Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday appeared excerpts from an article by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, on the very serious situation confronting the United States regarding oil. Mr. Ickes is not only Secretary of the Interior and therefore charged under the law with conservation, he is also Petroleum Administrator, and is also the head of the Petroleum Reserve Corporation. Consequently no one speaks with greater authority on this subject. I believe this article is something which every Member of the Senate should read and learn and intimately digest. I therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ICKES STRESSES UNITED STATES POST-WAR OIL NEEDS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Tell me the sort of agreement that the United Nations will reach with respect to the world's petroleum resources when the war is over, and I will undertake to analyze the durability of the peace that is to come.

Let us make no mistake about it—the accessibility of oil to the nations that want it after the war is going to be one of the most important and knotty problems that the Allies will have to face.

We furnished 80 percent of the petroleum that was used in winning World War No. 1, and I believe it will be shown ultimately that we are putting up 95 percent of the aviation gasoline which is being used to blast the Hitlers and Tojos from their strongholds and the Quislings from their burrows.

It did not take so much oil to win World War No. 1, and at that time we were still comforting ourselves with the assurance that we have more oil than the rest of the world together. Fortunately, we have been awakened, even if rudely, from that enervating delusion. We know now that we are passing over the threshold from an oil-exporting nation to an oil-importing one.

UNITED STATES STILL HAS OIL

The United States, of course, will continue for many years to be important as a producer of oil. Any country that has 20,000,000,000 barrels of proven oil inside of her cannot be counted out in the near future. And it is reasonable to expect that we shall continue to discover new oil pools, perhaps even substantial ones.

Nevertheless, America's crown, symbolizing supremacy as the oil empire of the world, is sliding down over one eye, for the obvious reasons that our development has been much more intense than that of any other country and that consumption has been outdistancing our new discoveries. We have been, in other words, living on our fat.

The United States has been the oil center of the world—not because there has been more oil here than elsewhere, or because we have more than all of the rest of the world combined, but because we have had the enterprise, the technical genius, and the resourcefulness to produce it.

We have also been using it faster on highways and railroads, and in ships, planes, homes, and factories—so fast, indeed, as to be prodigal. Although we shall continue to meet civilian and industrial requirements after the war, even though they are sure to be greater than we have ever known them, the American oil industry will gradually but inevitably migrate abroad. The capital of the oil empire is on the move to the Middle East—to the Persian Gulf and countries adjacent thereto, such as Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrein, and perhaps even Afghanistan. Nor is it traveling on a camel.

MUST GO WHERE SUPPLY IS

If we are to maintain and extend our gasoline civilization we must be prepared to go where gasoline is to be had. I am speaking objectively, not imperialistically, and with the fixed conviction that the petroleum of the world, as with all other great natural resources, belongs to the people of the world on some basis that will be equitable, considering all of the circumstances.

As Petroleum Administrator, I can say authoritatively that the petroleum which lies within our continental limits cannot be depended upon to supply us forever, or even for long. On the contrary, we cannot be certain that our known reserves have a relatively short life expectancy of 14 years and it is up to us to take out some form of mutual insurance. Fourteen years are little enough in the life of an individual; in the life of a nation they are as a short click at the hand of a telegrapher.

If I may suggest—again nonimperialistically—the kind of insurance we ought to have, it is that Uncle Sam formulate and adopt a foreign oil policy consistent with our democratic principles and with due regard to the just claims of others. John Bull has been doing this for a long time, with striking benefits both to himself and to the British oil industry.

SHOULD BE REIMBURSED

In view of the alarming rate at which our petroleum reserve position is being weakened by the abnormal drain due to our own and other allied military demands, it has been suggested in some quarters that it might help to balance our petroleum budget if, at the end of hostilities, we were to be reimbursed in kind from reserves which have not taken the punishment that our own have.

So badly has our natural crude supply been hit that there can be no doubt as to our future dependence upon imports or synthetic production. Repayment in kind would ease the pressure, which is certain to increase as known reserves decrease and demand shows no signs of falling off.

One of our very first undertakings ought to be to store in this country vast quantities of crude and even, if necessary, of refined products. We should store underground where possible and above ground where necessary. This is not only a practical measure, it will be an urgent thing to do as soon as peace comes. We shall be carelessly exposing curselves to grave risks unless we build up and maintain reserves that will last at least 20 years, regardless of what the demands may be. We can all remember the day when we had known estimated reserves for 20 years, and we have anxiously learned how rapidly a supply of even that amount can be diminished.

So far as oil is concerned, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China should mutually covenant: (1) to share as a post-war responsibility the rehabilitation of war damage to oil facilities in all parts of the world, including Russia, the Dutch East Indies, Rumania, etc.; (2) to make oil supplies available upon fair and equitable terms to all nations and peoples; and (3) to forbid oil supplies to any nation which violates the basic principles of international law as defined by the United Nations at the peace table.

ADMINISTRATION ACTING

Naturally, the administration in Washington is keenly aware that the day is rapidly approaching when this Government must take more than a casual interest in foreign fields where concessions are or may be acquired by American interests.

If the British oil industry and the British Government are satisfied with an arrangement that protects the oil interests and assures the British Government of oil when it needs it the most, why might it not be possible to work out an equally advantageous understanding between the American Government and the American oil industry wherever it seems to be to their mutual interest?

This is the question that we are asking ourselves. It has been carefully pondered to the extent that the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, a Government agency, was born a few months ago—born but not yet weaned. Its officers are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. The Secretary of the Interior is the president of the corporation.

The Petroleum Reserve Corporation will attempt to explore and encourage the national interests of the United States in the petroleum fields of the world where private industry is willing to go, and to propose safeguards for those interests.

Carnegie Institute Founder's Day Address by Ambassador Carlos Martins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a short time ago the distinguished Ambassador from Prazil, speaking at Carnegie Institute, in Pittsburgh, on Founder's Day, delivered an address which attracted my attention when it was referred to in the editorial columns of the Washington Post. I invited the Ambassador to send me a copy of the address. I thought it so intimately related to the objectives of the Americas that it was worthy of preservation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, on acceding to the invitation extended me by the president of the Carnegie Institute, to come to Pittsburgh and deliver the Founder's Day address at this time, an initial and natural feeling of constraint, in view of the responsibilities thereby involved, gave way to my desire to fulfill, within the measure of my abilities, the wishes of those who have bestowed upon me and my country so gracious a distinction.

The passing years have brought the Institute enhanced prestige among cultural and political circles everywhere in this country and abroad, in the wake of the assistance and generous support which it has continually administered, in the manifold fields of the arts and sciences, for the victories of the spirit.

I shall not review at length the significance which the greatness of such a humanitarian emprise bears for us, illustrating as it does the benevolent personality of Andrew Carnegie. Outstanding figures in the political scene of the Republic, foreign representatives, scientists and artists, philosophers and sociologists have been privileged, before me, to render tribute here to the compelling individuality of a man who, after a lifetime of intense struggle, considered his fellow men and directed toward that realization of the happiness and well-being of humanity the strength of an ideal which will enshrine his memory. Andrew Carnegie and his work are one: On this Founder's Day of the great institution which bears his name, it is more than ever fitting that we honor a deed so typical of the celebrated benefactor—his contribution to the idea of pan-Americanism.

When the American republics first aimed at continental balance through continental organization, Andrew Carnegie gave them significant support. Initially outlined as a sentimental formula in opposition to the expression of egotism, the breeder of rivalries holding sway over other continents, pan-Americanism has emerged from that vague theoretical form to become a vital reality. Its evolution was sure though deliberate. Broadening the field of its activities it did not jeopardize in problematic enterprises the substance of the prestige acquired, and for this very reason it has not known failure. Today, in the midst of the dynamic development of continental life, pan-Americanism is the reality that shields us from the threat of overwhelming upheaval; from its monumental headquarters in Washington, a lasting tribute to the donor, radiates the spirit of the juridical, economic, and political union of the New World.

In these days of storm and stress, when nations which have held in trust the destinies of mankind are snared in a welter of destruction, it is our bounden duty to center our aims and thoughts on the ideal that was Carnegie's vision, namely, to conjugate all efforts toward a peace that would not be an extended armistice merely, but a brotherhood unrestricted by exclusive interests; not a representation of a temporary state of mind but the evident and abiding manifestation of a consciousness of solidarity and interdependence.

The justness of warfare is measured by the degree of violated rights which has determined combat. Reestablishment of international order is the goal, the limit beyond which no struggle is permissible. Sanction and reorganization must mark the advance of the hosts of righteousness. Within the past 5 years, however, flagrant and repeated violations of solemn commitments have occurred. We have seen treaties repudiated, in atmosphere of treachery and of reckless disregard of juridical principles. The eruptions, ignoring boundaries, have transgressed not only the laws of peace but even the laws of war. Nameless cruelties perpetrated against civilian populations and prisoners of war, arbitrary expropriations and extortions—these are the elements conjured by the forces of evil to implant and systematize terror on earth.

The day is to come when order, justice, and decency will be restored, but up to now we have been unable to discern the redeeming aspects of the struggle. It may be that, without full realization, we are witnessing the terrible and sanguinary dawning of a new form of organization of the community of peoples. It has been stated that to attain universal peace it might be necessary to resort first to universal war—a barbarous condition for the achievement of a consciousness of solidarity and interdependence. It might be that only then would the peoples really feel such solidarity and such interdependence; that new interests arising from the struggle itself would expand and provoke the inevitable application of new regulating principles.

A bloody prelude, the First World War—as Nicholas Politis remarked—caused an alteration of the very fundamentals of international law and made evident the urgency of a revision of the notion of sovereignty, of the principle of equality between states, and of the laws relating to their obligations and privileges. The state is not above the law and free of its sanctions; it has the faculty of changing and reforming the juridical order, of choosing this or that form of government, this or that constitution, but inevitably it will encounter a juridical limit in the establishment of such order, under penalty of the inescapable sanction of war. In order that no conflict might arise between states preserving, or desirous of preserving, intact such respective sovereignty, nonexistence of relations between such states would be necessary, which is an absurdity under present world conditions—no state, however powerful or rich, has sufficient power or wealth or even interest to be able to attain this perfect autarchy.

International society is a reality as vivid as is the national entity. The experience born of the present struggle will be fruitful only if this idea of international unity be made a general policy, equivalent to a practical acknowledgment, by all nations, of the existence of a supreme law, common to all, the only means to prevent universal anarchy. It is pressing, therefore, to establish an international equality in principle and therefore in representation, within an inequality of resources, powers, situations, levels, and degrees of progress; neither great nor small states, neither strong nor weak, but states only, all equally desirous of creating and maintaining a lasting peace. If the First World War revealed, in proportions theretofore unknown, the economic solidarity of peoples, spontaneously and unconsciously achieved in times of peace, the present catastrophe proves that any war between great powers is always bound to develop into a universal war. Thus, with tragic reality, is President Coolidge's phrase confirmed that "an act of war in any part of the world is an act of war against the interests of my country." This trend of the interests of the great

powers toward universal pressure explains the enthusiasm with which the small states hailed the creation of the League of Nations in 1920 and their eagerness today in concentrating on its revival all their hopes for a security, once considered definite but now dispelled by reality.

It is for us to avoid raising again the old obstructions, persisting again in the same mistakes. There is no denying that vacillations, uncertainties, and errors attended the creation of the League, accompanied all phases of its development, and contributed toward its inefficiency. It is to be exaggerative, however, to attempt to indict such vacillations, uncertainties, and errors as inherencies of the League.

The war of 1914, despite its global name, affected directly the European Continent only. Although outwardly invested with universal attributes, the League of Nations suffered all the qualifications arising out of its origin and of problems created by the European war. Consequently, the actions of the League were ever animated by narrow regionalism, even when they overstepped the orbit of the Old World. The situation was completely defined by the withdrawal of the United States, not so much in consequence of the opposition in principle, as in view of the European character of the League, capable of entangling America in the subtleties of European rivalries and interests and eventually dragging her into a foreign war.

The present war, however, has overrun the geographical economic and political borders of the European Continent and has spread over land and sea and air to all the world in more than a military sense. Even the most primitive populations, in the farthest corners of the earth, participate today either directly or indirectly, either directly or passively, in the conflict.

Without exception and irrespective of latitudes, this war creates daily, in its tragic generalization, new phases in the problem of organizing universal peace.

It is not a matter of mere cessation of hostilities, nor even of the prevention of a new war. Negative issues results in the enslavement of the acts of peace to the problems of war and render peace but a subsidiary condition of endemic wars. The peace to be secured must be a permanent and positive one, derived from the principle of interdependence between war and peace and not from the subjection of peace to the dictates of war.

The oppositions of war must be replaced by the organization of peace, and general participation in the struggle by a general representation in the peace.

Today, the common denominator of war and peace is necessarily the world in its entirety, despite a political diversity of peoples and nations with their particular interests, revindications, protests, aspirations and rights. In this sense, war and peace are indivisible.

A hasty organization of powers would not constitute in itself a positive peace—it would project into peace the very root, the essential principle of universal wars, that is, the ambitions of the powers, the pressure of their interests in accelerating the natural development of their wealth. I quote a pertinent thought of Walter Lippmann in this connection:

"It is evident that a nuclear alliance of Britain, Russia, America, and, if possible, China, cannot hold together if it does not operate within the limitations of an international order that preserves the national liberties of other peoples. Nor could the nuclear allies combine to oppress and exploit the rest of mankind. For, in the last analysis, the resistance would disrupt the alliance: One or the other of the great powers would find that its interests and its sympathies lay with peoples resisting oppression.

In no other way but by supporting a worldwide system of liberty under law can the great powers win the consent, earn the confidence, and insure the support of the rest of the world in the continuation of their alliance.

The League of Nations awakened the hopes of the small states for a balance capable of eliminating prepotencies. But bitter disillusion came when the League was transformed into a tool for unbridled tyrannies or an instrument of a policy of expectation and inaction under the guise of legality. The dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, though responding to the ideals of oppressed nationalities in the righteous vindication of liberty, precipitated the formation of the Germanic bloc and the Third Reich. The allocation of the former German colonies under the juridical form of mandates provided Japan with strategic positions for naval bases in a war against the United States. The inefficiency of the League made possible the rearmament and the "white" conquests of Germany, as a prelude to armed invasion. A peace benefiting the great powers only or tolerating the fulfillment of ambitions within a hegemonic policy would be a peace to breed new wars in line with the coming of new derangements in the balance of power.

Let us show and use the precious quality of being able to learn. May the errors of the past be a lesson to us, that the ideal of peace, of liberty, of respect for the liberty of all, based on law and justice, may secure for future generations a world of decency, beauty, and faith.

Excerpt From Poem by Capt. Claude B. Morris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a part of a poem written by a young friend from Utah, Capt. Claude B. Morris, attached to the Second Corps Headquarters. He writes his impressions from somewhere in Italy. Captain Morris has written us from England, north Africa, Tunisia, Sicily, and now Italy, and his letters have been thoughtful examples of the spirit of our fighting men. To those of us who ask, What are we fighting for? this young captain's answer will be an inspiration and a challenge.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE ITALIANS

This is the land of the Decameron,
  Where Boccaccio's people dwelt.
Are the furies of Dante's Inferno gone?
  Or is it just their spirit I felt?
This land is the land of Caesar's might
  When Rome was the center of all;
Now, Caesar's victim, its naked plight
  Is the oracle of another's fall.
This is the land of Michael Angelo,
  Of Leonardo da Vinci's art,
Of Galileo, de Medici, I know
  Them all. Was this their part?
This is the land of the gondola
  And serenades soft in the night,
But is that a gun in the cupola?
  Is the song a song of a bomber's might?
This is the land of volcanos' wrath
  Where now only ashes are laid,
But is it so different, that bomb-strewn path,
  Where armies have for their victories paid?
And, yet, this is the land set free,
  Which some day will rise from its dust,
And loudly proclaim its liberty
  By abiding in its people's trust.

TO THE AMERICANS

There isn't a war that's won by ease,
  You people at home, safe and sound;
There isn't a way, a monster to please
  Unless all your ideals are drowned.
And, yet, when the armies who fight have gone ahead,
  Shrieking, screaming, groaning, in the lightning's streak,
Somewhere, from the scorched earth's running red,
  Surges a strength, unknown, unplumbed, and from the weak.
And we, who are here in the rear, are sure
  That out of the wreckage will rise a new home, a new ship, a new peace;
For we see the people scratching at the rubble; we see the dead buried and the gates closed;
  And the people slowly straighten up and lift their burdens,
Harness their oven, reap their harvest, store their produce, mend their buildings, bake their brick, and build again their bridges.
  We hear the faint soft trembling of a new song until full throated they sing
At their work, and the earth is turned, and the streams run pure again,
  And the seeds are planted, and smoke again comes from the chimney,
And the ever glorious miracle of a new life begins amidst the groans of the pain of rebirth.
  So shall it be among all nations when the sky is blue again, when once more the bells of Noel ring out clear and free: Peace on earth, good will to men.

Problems of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, December 7), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting letter I have received from Roy A. Kistler, of Colby, Kans., one of the prominent citizens of the farm belt, who sets forth the viewpoint of the western farmers with respect to the farm problems which confront our part of the country at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLBY, KANS.,
December 1, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I should like to tell you what I think of the A. A. A. In the spring of 1942 the A. A. A. measured my farm for 400.6 acres of wheat and demanded

I destroy 92.4 acres of excess wheat, which I refused to do, and from which I eventually harvested about 3,700 bushels of wheat. Thanks to Governor Ratner, some in Congress, and a few more that had some brains, I was allowed to store that excess wheat, which I still have. That 400.6 acres of wheat produced 15,887 bushels of wheat in 1942, and what I sold averaged $1.07 per bushel. I also fed 1,200 lambs that fall. If I had sold all my wheat (which I did not) along with the lambs, hogs, butter, and eggs my gross income that year from July 1, 1942, to July 1, 1943, would have been well over $25,000. As it was, I sold enough to bring my income taxes to over $2,100. Last October I received a Government A. A. A. check for $364 which I knew nothing about, did not need, nor want. I was going to send it back, then changed by mind and donated it to U. S. O. and two families whose homes burned, the bulk going for funeral expenses of the mother and two children who burned to death in the one home. That has got to stop. The people must support the Government, not the Government support the people, or our heritage and freedom will be gone forever. We will not stand for dictators or communism in this good old U. S. A.

ROY A. KISTLER.

P. S.—The spring of 1942 two of my closest neighbors destroyed 10,000 bushels of wheat each to comply with A. A. A. and they will want to put us on bread ration by the end of 1944.

World Leadership in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very interesting letter in the St. Louis Post Dispatch written by Mr. Sidney R. Baer, vice president of a great department store in my city. It is full of common sense. Coming as it does from an outstanding merchant, employer of thousands, his suggestions are worthy of most careful consideration. Under the permission granted me I include the letter as part of my remarks. It follows:

WORLD LEADERSHIP IN THE MAKING

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

Justice Brandeis made the statement, "Truth is less than truth unless it is expounded in language people can understand." This observation is particularly applicable to much that is written and stated publicly today concerning the many and marked economic and social changes which are being experienced throughout the world.

While some technical discussion is helpful and necessary, it can be carried to excess, with the result that the citizen is confused, and, instead of looking forward into the future with a feeling of security, he hesitates to plan ahead. Such psychology destroys incentive and stimulates extravagance instead of encouraging thrift. Without incentive and thrift, no sound basis for future prosperity is possible.

Why Americans should fear that this great Nation may pursue some path of radicalism, realizing, as they must, that the standard of living in America has for almost a century been the highest in the world, is hard to understand, except as it indicates a lack of clear understanding of what is going on.

A STRUGGLE TOWARD JUSTICE

This generation of Americans must face the future with the realization that, as a result of the present world crisis, a better world can be won only by some material sacrifice. Certainly it will be necessary to throw away some old prejudices and dislikes, both social and economic. We must still struggle, as Lincoln expressed it, "to develop in the world that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men, to lift artificial weight from their shoulders, to clear the path of laudable pursuits for all, to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life."

When the present conflict has ended, if we here in America maintain and increase the confidence of the peoples of the shattered and backward nations throughout the world, the leadership of America will be dominant and the principles of our democracy will, without question, permeate the earth. This is what Wendell Willkie means when he refers to the "reservoir of good will" which we enjoy today, which must remain clean and not be tainted in postwar plans through materialistic or power politics.

After a world conflict wherein wealth is destroyed, whole peoples are uprooted from their firesides, families are separated, mountainous debts are placed on the backs of groaning nations, a chaos results which cannot be dissipated overnight. Economic, social, and spiritual wounds must be cleansed and then healed.

A CONSTRUCTIVE MONETARY SYSTEM

Inflation must be prevented. An international monetary system must be developed through which sound national credits may be developed, permitting the building of trade among nations. Practical plans of national and world reconstructio.. must be formulated to bolster employment in the transitory period, both for the benefit of the men and women who have fought the battle of the home front and, in particular, for those millions of our youth in the armed forces, to whom our first debt must be paid and our eternal obligation fulfilled.

A helping hand must be extended to small nations to create stable, representative government, through which the will of the people may be coherently expressed, so that never again can tyrants capitalize upon discontent. Some means of reasonable limitation of armament must be found, so that the productive abilities of the peoples of the world may be utilized for the creation of wealth rather than for the creation of instruments for destruction. International machinery whereby this may be achieved must be perfected, wherein the voice of every nation may be heard.

HOW TO GAIN OUR ENDS?

Economic security from unemployment, illness, and old age must be guaranteed to all without destroying incentive, the stimulus through which industry creates wealth and makes social progress possible. Slum clearance must go forward and modern housing must be encouraged, so that all families, without respect to their means, may live decently. The means to conserve the national resources for future generations and minimize wasteful exploitation must also receive first consideration. Finally, education must be encouraged throughout the world, so that the individual may learn to think for himself—the best insurance that he will not permit himself to be led by Machiavellian statesmen.

These objectives are continuously discussed, but the methods through which they may be accomplished are not yet formulated and few if any of us know the answer. The solution can be found only through study by those best fitted, men with trained minds and practical experience.

Economists, students of political science, businessmen, industrialists, financiers and, above all, statesmen, must be welded into an organization, so that their crystallized thinking, through coordinated action, may be integrated and coherent. This can be done only through the agency of government which, in America and Britain fortunately, represents the will of the people.

THE FUTURE IS BEING WROUGHT

The prime responsibility of Americans today is to see to it that an able, farsighted, conscientious leadership in public life and in private enterprise is created. This leadership is being developed now. Its character is entirely dependent upon the interest which the American takes in his Government.

The importance of leadership is not limited to government. It is a prerequisite of private enterprise as well. Government must cooperate with private enterprise, and private enterprise must cooperate with government.

The primary purpose of everyone today is to win the war. Nothing must be done which in the slightest way may impede a victorious conclusion. We must also, however, win the peace if the fight is not to be in vain. The anvil on which the postwar world for a generation or more will be forged is in the making today. It is to be hoped that Americans will see to it that the anvil is strong.

SIDNEY R. BAER,
Vice President and Treasurer,
Stix, Baer & Fuller Co.

America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the holiday season, it occurs to me that fitting season's greetings and best wishes for a 1944 which will produce a world in which our kind of America can be preserved are incorporated in the following statement summarized from the Railway Employees' Journal:

When hysteria and confusion are rampant in the land, that is the best time for us Americans to pull up a chair and do a little sane and sober thinking. Have you ever seriously asked yourself what it is that makes our country the best place on earth to live?

Are we really hungry for money, or is it the things we spend our money for that makes up our American way of life? Suppose we take an inventory of our traditions and customs, our freedoms and privileges to see just what makes life in America tick.

The freedom to worship God in the church of our choice. The right to vote and for whomsoever we please. The right to give 'em a piece of our mind and still have a peace left.

Here we can call the Governor "Pete" or don't have to call him at all. No doffing the cap or bending the knee. Every man in his own right to king and his home his castle.

A breakfast of pancakes, sausage, and maple syrup. The good old county fairs. A few exciting harness races.

Fishing from a boat or wading a trout stream. The razzle-dazzle of football and the humpty-dumpties of the cheer leaders. Baseball with its peanuts, popcorn, and a couple of digs at the umpire. Shooting the tails off a few bunnies or bagging a deer in the fall.

The annual picnic where bank president and building janitor slap each other on the backs. Those spectacular tenth round knock-outs when millionaires and mill hands both stand up and cheer.

No separate upper or lower berth for those of upper or lower birth. Where a seat in the movies has one price tag no matter what your role or roll.

Cooking with gas on the front burner. Good old apple pie a la mode. A steady job. The best pay workers get anywhere in the world. An automobile to go rubbernecking around the country. A radio to tune in and out as we please.

The glorified hot dog with all the trimmings. A couple of hamburgers bathed in catsup. The good old pulsating pastime of "strikes and spares, splits and errors."

A garden to plant and putter around. The happy thought that our sons can be Fords, Chryslers, Woolworths, Firestones, Edisons, and Lincolns of tomorrow.

These are merely a few things taken at random that make America and make us Americans. Maybe no one else cares for these things. But we do. And how!

America to us isn't a lot of abstract theory. It's a 7-day-week way of life. We don't dream about doing things. We dream after they're done. We're not selfish. We're the biggest hearted people on earth. We'll help anybody any time. We merely ask to be let alone so we can help ourselves.

We like to work hard. We like to play hard. We like to live and laugh. But, above all else, we Americans were never made to be pushed around by anybody here or anywhere else.

Why Are They Starving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have purchased billions of dollars' worth of food to feed the starving peoples of the Old World. Time and again the President has said that an essential part of the war effort was to feed the people of conquered nations. Upon his insistence there has been set up a national organization, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association, with former Governor Lehman at its head, to spend as an initial sum, two and a half billion dollars, for the benefit of peoples of countries other than the United States of America.

We will shortly be asked to appropriate a billion and a half dollars of that sum. For weeks, yes, for months, in fact ever since former President Hoover advanced a plan whereby the starving in France and the low countries of Europe would be fed without aiding the Germans, Great Britain, we have been told, has objected to that plan.

Appropriating billions of dollars for the relief of foreign peoples and then denying food and clothing to the children and the mothers who are starving just does not make sense and before I vote for the appropriation of millions or billions of dollars to be spent by Lehman's organization, I want to know that at least a part of it is going to be used to keep these mothers and children from starving; that it will not be used in boondoggling.

In the Times-Herald of Sunday is a thought-producing article, which is printed herewith:

A letter has just come to hand from a Canadian priest who studied at Catholic University here and is now a chaplain abroad with the Canadian forces.

Here is one paragraph:

"Everything I've seen over here has more or less confirmed what those five Senators had to say, and more.

"Too many people here who are in power seem to be too interested in keeping their bloody empire today and in extending its boundaries of influence tomorrow, to be interested in moral principles or in ideals, though they have been able to make certain sections of the people think they are fighting for such things as justice, democracy and morality.

"I'm disgusted with what I've seen and heard, and by the less obvious implications of what goes on amid a self-imposed aureole of righteousness."

Never mind where this letter came from, but it was somewhere on the Allied side of the war front.

It didn't come from the ranks of Hitler. It came from the ranks of what are called the "United Nations."

It was written, just to emphasize the point, by a Canadian priest educated here in Washington at Catholic University, which signifies that he must be a man of high intelligence and excellent training of mind, as well as a scrupulous priest.

And he says the much maligned Senators—who went around the world war fronts and reported America is being made Uncle Sap again—were right.

Friends, we have rushed off in all directions to let the world know we are in this war for moral purposes only.

At least, the Roosevelt Administration which tries to do all the talking for us, has said that.

We have renounced in advance any claims we could make for territory or material profit out of victory, though why is a puzzler. After all, we have won and taken many such a profit out of war in the past.

We built our Nation to its present strength by killing people of other races and nations, taking their property and parceling it out among ourselves.

But now we claim we're too noble to do that any more. We are now, being richer than we once were, and lazier, also inclined to claim a special morality.

Well, why aren't we moral enough to do something specifically moral?

Let us now start food to the starving children of France, Belgium, Holland, and other countries of Europe occupied by the Nazis.

At the insistence of our British allies, and for reasons of theirs which have never been explained to the American public, we—we people of the United States—are allowing European children to starve.

Do you think we should? All this talk about morality as an explanation for anybody's war is 99 percent conscious or unconscious hypocrisy, anyhow. There is just enough truth in such stories to make them triply deceptive to innocent minds.

But do you think we should, in our own material self-interest, let those children starve this winter?

Some of them will survive, you know. Some of their relatives and friends will live through, too. And they will remember. They will hate the Nazis, all right, but the Nazis will be dead and gone, for the most part.

We, however, will still be here, relatively fat and well-fed. We will have been parties to the starving of Europe. And the survivors will hardly praise us.

The occupied nations of Europe every one have money on deposit in the United States. That money could be spent now to buy from Latin America food that is piled high and wasting because of inability to get it to the places where it could be eaten.

The occupied nations' money in the United States could buy Argentinian wheat and beef, ship it to Europe in Swedish and other neutral vessels, and that food could be distributed to the children of Europe.

The Germans could not get the food, nor could they draw off food from the other nations equal to it. This food would be plainly and openly distributed as extra rations for European children by internationally trusted agencies of mercy.

The why's, how's, and wherefore's of all this have been made public for test and disproof, if that were possible. Dr. Howard E. Kershner, director of the Friends' Service Committee, and Maurice Pate, director of prisoner-of-war relief for the American Red Cross, have spread the facts before Congress.

These are two world-recognized experts in their line, which is getting food to the hungry.

They say food can be got to the children of Europe this winter without benefit to the Nazis, and by the method above outlined. They say a test case has already been proved, that of Greece, which is being fed by the International Red Cross.

Our own State Department has certified the Greek experiment as "satisfactory."

There is only one reason why these children do not get food, therefore. It is that the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain object.

Do you object? Do you think it right that those children shall starve this winter when we could help them with their money, other peoples' food and other peoples' ships, simply by nodding our okay?

Now is the time to think this one over seriously and then to write the President, the State Department, and Members of Congress how you feel about it.

Let's find out how moral our morality is, and let's be smart enough to realize that after this war we will still be around to answer for what we have done during it. Only the dead and defeated will be able to escape responsibility for the winter of 1943–44.

A Word in Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials, one from the New York Herald Tribune of December 11, 1943, and the other from the Baltimore Sun of December 11, 1943:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 11, 1943]

A WORD IN SEASON

When Speaker SAM RAYBURN came down to the floor of the House to address its Members he did not indulge in oratory. But what he said caught the imagination of the Representatives, as their applause at-

tested. They recognized that there was need for someone to speak in the name of national unity at this time—the beginning of the third year of a war for national survival. There was need for someone to protest against partisan backbiting and the ugly wrangles for selfish advantage that are mocking the sacrifices of the men in uniform.

The war has rolled away from American shores. It is Japan, rather than the western portion of this country, that peers seaward for the ominous shapes of hostile craft. Atlantic beaches are no longer marked by mourning bands of black oil, telling of ships sunk and men drowned. The war has been pushed back after a savage and costly struggle by American fighting men and their Allies, and some in this country are again under the spell of the illusion of distance that was so rudely shattered by Pearl Harbor and its aftermath.

In the peculiar light of that illusion events lose their perspective and false prophets take on an unreal stature. It seems logical to harp upon American errors, to the exclusion of enemy guilt. The importance of the dead upon Italian mountain slopes or in Pacific waters diminishes in the presence of the burning question of the value of a blue ration stamp. The Gestapo and the Japanese police who once threatened to bring Americans under their ruthless sway become handy epithets to apply to any American official who interferes with the comfort of the home population. Victory itself appears of less immediate significance than the poll tax, the law of supply and demand, portal-to-portal pay, the Illinois primaries, cartels, or railroad freight rates.

These are important matters. Even more important are the general trends—the grave strains placed upon the American way by New Deal practices, and the danger of excessive "right-wing reaction" against which Mr. Charles E. Wilson warned the National Association of Manufacturers. Yet when millions of Americans are in the presence of a savage and determined enemy, the supreme necessity is to give them all the material and moral support they need to win—and this cannot be accomplished by dissipating the national energies in quarrels over lesser points or by grumbling over petty deprivations.

The House of Representatives has done its share of the quarreling and grumbling; few Americans, indeed, are guiltless. Nevertheless, Mr. RAYBURN'S plea won an instant response, suggesting that congressional consciences may be somewhat troubled. The Speaker helped restore perspective; helped his fellows adjust their sights again to the target of a global war. The truth can never be too often stated that while war does not demand the abolition of a single fundamental right of American citizenship, it does demand that every right be exercised responsibly and with the great goal of victory ever in mind. At this moment of the war Mr. RAYBURN has spoken a word in season.

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 11, 1943]

MR. RAYBURN READS US A SALUTARY LESSON

Speaker SAM RAYBURN deserved the applause he got for his speech on "dangerous trends" in the House the other day. In blunt language, he read his colleagues and the country as a whole a salutary lesson and injected a new note of honest self-appraisal into discussion of home-front problems.

He hit, and hit hard, a point becoming ever more painfully apparent during recent months when he stated that those making the greatest sacrifices are complaining least. As a matter of fact, he said, "we in this country would not know a war was on if we did not read the papers, hear the radio, and see the vacant chairs in the homes."

It is no answer to assert that technically, in strict interpretation, that is not true. It is overwhelmingly true in the sense in which it was offered, that the stern pressures of deep personal sacrifice are not battling against us here in the United States, that the war has not cut sharply into our accustomed ways of living.

It is no answer, again, to assert that the Congress of which Mr. RAYBURN is a responsible leader has itself shown little awareness of late of the real meaning of war and the dangerous forces war inevitably unleashes. It has, indeed, shown instead a remarkable tenderness in seeking to help certain portions of the population avoid any possible immediate sacrifice at whatever future costs and whatever future risks. But because Congressmen shirk their responsibilities is no reason for other citizens to do the same. It is nothing less than an indication that a majority of the people are doing the same. Let the temper of the country change and the temper of Congress will change with it.

All of us would benefit if we should follow Mr. RAYBURN'S example and courageously assess our individual positions. "I am wondering," he said, "what sacrifices I have made, and I cannot think of a single one * * * Maybe I have been slightly inconvenienced. * * * But I have eaten well and plenty, as has every other American citizen." In any similar analysis, the majority of us would come to the same conclusion. We have worked harder than before, but that is a privilege in time of emergency, not a sacrifice, especially when pay envelopes expand in proportion or, by overtime benefits, ever more rapidly. But when you've said that you have told just about the whole story.

A Tactless and Unnecessary Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

A TACTLESS AND UNNECESSARY PUBLICATION

There is every reason to believe that Mid West Frontiers will have about as short a tenure as any publication on record.

In fact we are informed the publication has been ordered discontinued. Volume 1, No. 1, seems to be the finish.

The paper was published in Cleveland by the War Relocation Authority. A story written by former Ohio State Professor Everett L. Dakan inflamed the farm bloc. The story urged Jap internees to come to the Midwest for farm jobs. In the article Professor Dakan wrote that "some few tenants and seasonal workers do not bathe * * * think it is unhealthy." This statement was too much for some Members of Congress.

In commenting on the publication, Mid West Frontiers, the Cleveland Press pointed out that the Cleveland branch of the Office of War Information was abolished when Congress cut down the O. W. I. appropriation. Employees of the O. W. I. in Cleveland remarked at that time that though the public might think it would be saving money it would really not be. Those employees predicted that they would find other Government jobs which would cost the taxpayers just as much as the O. W. I. jobs.

The Cleveland Press editorial said in part:

"Editorially, we agreed about this, but expressed hope that they might do less harm, directly attached to particular bureaus, than as a caste apart, pestering miscellaneous executives with impertinent offers of undesired services.

"We were right in predicting that no money would be saved. But we were evidently wrong in predicting that the boys would do less harm working for specific bureaus than as stumbling blocks for all.

"These reflections are inspired by the achievement of Harry Weiss, a former employee of the local O. W. I. office, now editor of Mid West Frontiers, a publication of the War Relocation Authority. He has contrived to bring down on his boss a really majestic load of grief.

"Mr. Weiss was the editor of an eight-page magazine mailed to nine relocation centers, urging Americans of Japanese descent to come to Ohio and Michigan and work on the farms. They were advised that they could teach our farmers a good deal about the art and science of agriculture, and the art and science of personal sanitation. Bathing, the magazine said, has been too much neglected on Ohio and Michigan farms.

"It is undoubtedly true that many of our fellow citizens from California, descendants of Jap ancestors, possess extraordinary skill in truck farming. Also, they do bathe frequently, a practice that seems to do them less harm than some of our own old friends down on the farm might imagine.

"Still and all, it added up to a very tactless document that raised a storm of protests from Congressmen and Senators representing Ohio and Michigan. So the document was finally recalled."

Some members of Congress have objected to the publication on the basis of the content of the lead article, its reference to bathing or the lack of it in these parts. This in our opinion is only a tempest in a teapot. It is generally recognized that there are a lot of people in all parts of our country who might bathe a little more often with good results. Those who are making studies of social conditions in our land constantly refer to the need for better housing and they never fail to stress the fact that a relatively small percentage of homes throughout America are equipped with bathrooms. We know people who don't worry too much about the matter of bathing and we judge that even if their homes are modern in every detail they are just a little bit careless.

Be that as it may and it seems to be only an incidental item in this discussion, we are deeply concerned about some other phases relative to the launching of this new publication.

We would like to know a lot of things, to wit:

What is the motive in launching such a publication?

What is the need for it?

How many people would it serve?

What type of people would it serve?

How is it consistent to launch such a publication today when the Government is demanding that all existing publications cut down on paper consumption?

How many more publications are springing up through the sponsorship of governmental agencies?

In these days when we are asked to save waste paper and to produce more pulpwood why should we increase the use of print paper by launching new Government agency publications?

When commercial printers are asked to cut down on paper consumption why should such new publications be started by Government agencies to compete for the available supply of paper?

When we are short on manpower, typewriters, and office space why should such a

publication be started to further add to the production problem?

Not so long ago a great commotion arose over the announcement that a movie actor would head up a program of interpretative dancing as part of the program of training for our soldiers. This proposal was ridiculed out of existence. This new publication venture of the W. R. A. in Cleveland seems to us to be just as foolish.

Why the New Deal Is Losing Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

WHY THE NEW DEAL IS LOSING GROUND

The other day we got a letter from a client who wanted us to know how he felt about things. He wrote: "There are a great many of us in this country who are not prolabor, although we work at skilled trades with our hands (and minds); who are not procapital, although we own some stocks and bonds; who are not for regimentation or governmental socialistic totalitarianism, although we occasionally voted for Roosevelt. Our difficulty seems to be that we don't know what we are."

If we had been asked to explain to this correspondent what he was, we should have said that he sounded to us like a good American, trying to get along, play fair with other people and resist the Old World tendency to shove everybody into a group with a name—Fascist, Communist, bourgeois, proletarian, aristocrat. In fact, we might have gone further and explained that one reason why the American electorate dealt so harshly with New Dealers last month was that they suspected the New Deal leadership had forgotten that there are still a lot of people who cannot be stuffed into economic or social categories and then dealt with exclusively in job lots.

The persistent refusal of New Deal supporters to understand the stubborn Americanism of Americans accounts for their bewilderment at their setbacks. For example, in a strongly prolabor city like San Francisco the election of Roger Lapham, who has long fought the unions in California, ought, on form, to have been impossible. The American Labor Party in New York ought to have turned the tide against the Republicans. In Kentucky, the Confederate tradition plus Federal patronage ought, on form, to have saved the State from "Ole Debbil" G. O. P. But, in all these places, it must be obvious that the voters, like our correspondent, didn't line up as prolabor or antilabor, pro-New Deal or anti-New Deal, but acted simply as citizens anxious to make an honest decision from the facts available.

It looks to us as if the American people were saying that, although they want labor to have a fair shake just as much as they did in 1936, they are highly resentful of the manner in which the leaders of labor have used the vast powers conferred upon them by the Wagner Act, by administrative rulings of the War Labor Board and other agencies, and by Supreme Court decisions. You don't have to be antilabor to resent official indifference to the monopolistic practices of certain labor groups. In fact, they are resented by a considerable number of those who "work at skilled trades with their hands and minds." If that were not so, the election returns would have been different.

This is not, of course, the only explanation of the people's anger. There are all sorts of gripes and miseries connected with the war which bulk large with some voters. But if we were general counsel to the New Deal, we should certainly point out the danger of assuming that every man who wears overalls votes as directed by the union magnificoes. To assume that is to assume that America has given up the American dream and has accepted the European class system, in which, once you know the numerical strength of the various social groups, you can predict elections with an adding machine.

In America, thank God, you can't. You must sell your cause to some pretty critical people. In 1932, millions of Americans who might be described as businessmen, property owners, capitalists, or bourgeoisie, voted for President Roosevelt because they regarded the Republican leadership as inept and bankrupt, and because they thought the rights of the ordinary man needed a little brushing up. But that didn't mean that they could be put in the bag permanently as New Dealers or that they would not vote against the New Deal when they thought a touch of conservatism was needed to redress the social balance.

All this is discouraging to people who want to "deliver" this group or that. Whom can they "deliver," anyway? The answer is that the deliverable vote is not the whole story in this country, that some men who carry their lunch to work vote for Republicans, and other men who ride to their offices in taxis vote for New Dealers. And, while this remains true, the United States of America still stands, and continues to make its splendid and unique contribution to the art of human association.

War Food Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under existing procedure several governmental agencies are handling the many war food problems. The question of production has been the responsibility of the War Food Administration, working in conjunction with the Commodity Credit Corporation. All matters pertaining to the establishing of price ceilings and rationing is under the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Administration. Other features of the food program are in still different agencies. The attendant confusion and duplicated effort has caused many to conclude that it would be desirable to place the jurisdiction and responsibility for the production and distribution of all foods in one person or one agency.

Chairman FULMER, of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill for this purpose on June 1, 1943. The committee favorably reported the bill out of the committee on June 24, 1943. Since that time Congress has taken no action on the legislation. This week the House Committee on Agriculture voted to instruct the acting chairman to appear before the Rules Committee and ask for a rule so that the bill may be brought before the House for an early vote.

In 1942 America produced the greatest supply of corn and wheat in history. Notwithstanding this fact, corn-processing plants have had to close because they could not obtain corn. With the largest supplies ever known of hogs, livestock, and poultry, the country faces a critical situation in supplying the armed forces, lend-lease, and the civilian population with essential foods. Legitimate processors and distributors of food products are having to go out of business because a large percentage of food is finding its way into the black market. The Secretary of Agriculture has estimated that about 20 percent of the cattle, sheep, and hogs that are being slaughtered go into illegal marketing channels. While there is a shortage of food for the consuming public in this country, large quantities of foods have been wasted in the fields due to a shortage of labor and lack of proper transportation, distribution, and handling.

The chief reason for the food crisis with which the country is confronted is the chaos and confusion due to a multiplicity of agencies who are attempting to deal with food production and distribution. There has been a lack of coordination, delays in formulating policies, and the failure to consult food experts and farmers.

There are three major objectives to the whole problem, and they are maximum food production, price stabilization, and a fair and just return to the farmers and processors. In order to combine these objectives into a workable program, a centralized authority is essential. This single agency should be presided over by one sole administrator who should not only have the responsibility but the authority to put into effect a definite and unified policy over food production, distribution, food prices, and rationing.

The W. I. V. E. S. Speak for a Genuine Soldier Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter signed by Mrs. Pearl Rubenstein and other members of the W. I. V. E. S. on the question of the soldier vote bill as well as a brief description of the organization and a list of the names and Army service of the husbands of the women who are members of this patriotic organization:

DECEMBER 13, 1943.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am both frightened and proud to be here. I am frightened because I realize that many of the greatest speeches in our country's history have been made in these very

halls, and I know that what I have to say will be far less memorable.

I am proud, because I realize that only in a democracy such as ours would it be possible for a simple citizen to have the opportunity to address the elected legislators of the Nation.

I am proud too because I am the wife of a soldier in the American Army.

It is as his wife that I speak to you today.

I have come to the Capitol to urge upon you the passage of the original Green-Lucas bill because I feel that the men of our Nation who have dedicated themselves to fighting fascism and restoring the franchise to the oppressed peoples of conquered nations abroad, deserve the right to vote in an election in their own country.

Anything short of this would be tantamount to stripping a serviceman of his inalienable right of citizenship, and would make it a mockery for him to fight for this right for others while forfeiting his own.

Because I felt this so strongly and because the organization of Army wives I represent believes it so sincerely, we felt compelled to exert our constitutional right of petition, and wrote to the House Elections Committee, urging passage of this bill. We also wrote to Representative JOHN E. RANKIN decrying any effort to kill the original Green-Lucas bill by substituting in its stead a bill which would hamper rather than facilitate the right of suffrage.

Together with fellow members of this wives' organization, I mailed a post card to Representative RANKIN requesting that the National Government, through the Army and Navy, administer the serviceman's vote.

It was the first post card I have ever sent to a Congressman. Representative RANKIN received my post card, I know that, because he singled out for ridicule my name and those of other persons of my faith, to illustrate to you the type of persons who had written to him. But, in attempting to make this a racial point of view, Representative RANKIN has ignored Americans of every faith who feel as I do about the soldier vote.

Yes, Representative RANKIN, we're all a type. We're the type of American who believes in the Constitution of the United States. We're the type of American who believes in fighting for what he believes in.

Those of us who fight on the home front have a right to vote. Those of us who fight on the production front have a right to vote.

Together we demand for those who fight on the battle front their right to vote.

It is my responsibility to my husband and your responsibility to the people of America to guarantee for every citizen now bearing arms for his country his right to vote.

Certainly, gentlemen, if we are willing to trust our soldiers to preserve our democracy with the bullets we give them we can trust them to preserve our democracy with the ballots we give them.

Mrs. PEARL RUBENSTEIN.

LIST OF DELEGATION OF THE W. I. V. E. S. TO PROTEST ACTION OF REPRESENTATIVE RANKIN IN RIDICULING THEIR APPEAL TO CONGRESS FOR PASSAGE OF THE GREEN-LUCAS SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

Mrs. Pearl Rubenstein: Husband, Corp. N. Rubenstein; in the service 9 months; Finance Department.

Mrs. Pearl Preiss: Husband, Pvt. E. Preiss; in the service 4 months; Quartermaster Corps.

Mrs. Shirley Orris: Husband, Capt. H. Orris; in the service 15 months; Medical Corps.

Mrs. Elaine Suss: Husband, Lt. H. Suss; in the service 1 years; Army Air Force.

Mrs. Blanche Brody: In the service 13 months; Coast Artillery Antiaircraft.

Mrs. Muriel Lowenstein: Husband, Sgt. K. Lowenstein; in the service 20 months; Air Corps.

Mrs. Charlotte Bonime-Ditzer: Husband, Sgt. M. Bonime-Ditzer; in the service 8 months; rehabilitation.

Mrs. Naomi Nash: Husband, Sgt. H. Nash; in the service 9 months; Air Corps.

Most of the husbands of the group are overseas. The W. I. V. E. S. was formed last May for the threefold purpose of bolstering up the morale of their husbands, keeping up their morale and helping in the war effort by giving their fullest support to the Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. They write a weekly paper, the Home Edition, which is sent to their husbands with latest news; send their husbands Christmas and birthday presents. They meet together every Saturday night, "The lonesomest night" for a soldier's wife; give parties to raise money for the National War Fund and Allied War Relief. They have contributed blood to the Red Cross; are active in civilian defense work and other war work. They have combined apartments, found jobs for wives who had to take jobs, etc.

Churchill and United States Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Moline (Ill.) Daily Dispatch:

CHURCHILL AND UNITED STATES ELECTIONS

A London editor made a 10,000-mile tour in the United States sounding out sentiment concerning American politics as affected by Britain's Winston Churchill. He returned to his tight little isle with the impression that Mr. Churchill could bring about the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term merely by visiting Washington at the psychological moment.

His statement to that effect created a great uproar in the United States. Republicans urged Mr. Churchill to stay away, and some Democrats also chimed in, inviting the Prime Minister to make himself absent consistently.

Those who are interested in Churchill's effect upon an American election might interview themselves and their friends. Ask yourself: If Mr. Churchill were to visit Washington near election time, would that visit make you vote for Mr. Roosevelt? Your answer might be as follows:

"If I were going to vote for Mr. Roosevelt, I would do so regardless of Churchill's presence; but if I were not going to vote for a fourth term, Mr. Churchill couldn't change my mind."

The British editor seems to have said nothing about Mr. Churchill's influence in British politics. If the Prime Minister's political influence is strong enough to swing an election in the United States, then it ought to be strong enough to do so in England. But England has not had a general election since before the war, and is not going to have one until afterward.

WHO EVER TRIED ISOLATIONISM?

HENRY WALLACE makes the following statement:

"Americans have learned at last that we cannot isolate ourselves from the world. It is no longer a question of whether isolationism is good or bad. Isolationism is impossible. The airplane and radio settled that."

Mr. WALLACE is fighting a straw man. The United States never tried isolationism in the sense that we sought to build a wall around our part of this hemisphere. Japan tried it and got away with it for centuries until an American naval squadron made the Emperor come to terms.

Ever since the United States has had a Government we have had diplomatic representatives in all countries we recognized; we have had trade relations with all countries that would buy our goods, or to which we could sell ours. The Monroe Doctrine was not an isolationist attitude because it made us responsible for the safety of countries south of the Rio Grande. An American President made possible the Treaty of Portsmouth, which ended the Russo-Japanese War at the turn of the century. There are other instances of international relations which cannot be listed owing to space limitations.

What Mr. WALLACE was trying to say, whether he knew it or not, is that whenever there is a war anywhere on the face of the globe, we are isolationists unless we intervene; that we should judge the issues involved in the war, make our decision, and throw our economic and armed forces into it to make it end our way. Getting down to brass tacks, Mr. WALLACE'S attitude means that he would draft American men and money and throw this country into a quasi dictatorship in order to make foreign wars end according to the wishes of whatever administration happens to be in power at the time. That is his idea of the opposite of isolationism.

In regard to international friendships this country never has been tinged with so-called isolationism. But with regard to wars in which we were not directly involved—where American interests were not threatened immediately—we have been like other countries. We have stayed out until overt acts were committed against us. In the War of 1812 we fought against the British practice of seizing American seamen on the high seas and impressing them into the British Navy or merchant marine. Our part in that war was a sideshow to the greater war that then raged between Napoleon and England.

In the First World War we insisted upon what might be called roughly the freedom of the seas. The sinking of American ships by the Germans, contrary to the then-recognized rules of war, caused us to declare war.

In the present war we remained out again until an overt act was committed at Pearl Harbor.

Now some time before the outbreak of the Italo-Ethiopian War we had made a queer experiment in war isolationism. Congress had enacted, and the President had signed, a bill to the effect that if other countries went to war, American ships could not go rambling on the high seas carrying goods to the wicked belligerents, and thus be subjected to torpedoes. It was the prevailing impression then that we got into the World War as result of the plots of naughty munitions manufacturers who wanted to get rich by selling cannons abroad. The Neutrality Act was designed to prevent a recurrence of a war brought on by the desire to trade. The belligerents could buy things here—but they had to come and get them in their own ships, and pay cash.

Mr. Roosevelt signed that bill with the puzzling remark that it was not perfect. This newspaper, in this neck of the woods, opposed it. We said American ships should be protected in all trade recognized by international law and permitted by the rules of blockade.

The neutrality law was in operation with regard to Italy and Ethiopia, and during the Spanish Civil War, but the President refused to make it operate with regard to the China-Jap War. We sold stuff to Japan that later was used against us.

Have you ever seen a country that was strictly neutral in any war? Some have been neutral officially, but not in public sentiment. In the Russo-Japanese War we were all rooting for Japan, but officially no one said we simply had to get into it to help the Japs. Fortunately we remained officially neutral. Otherwise we'd have made Japan more powerful than she actually became.

Bill of Rights Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press:

BILL OF RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY

December 15 will bring the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the Bill of Rights. No proclamation in all the history of this Republic was ever so important, not even the Declaration of Independence. The Bill of Rights has been the soul and the spirit of our form of government down through all the years.

In these parlous times in which the plain citizen's interest is submerged in the interest of central government, necessary in wartime, but also creating a dangerous precedent for the peace to come, we should have the Bill of Rights engraved upon our hearts as a perpetual test of government and governmental measures.

In simplest terms, the great American Bill of Rights follows:

"1. There shall be freedom of religion, speech, and press in the United States. The people have the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"2. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"3. No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner.

"4. Right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.

"5. No persons shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property other than by due process of the law.

"6. Every citizen has a right to trial by jury in criminal prosecutions. And no private property shall be taken for public use without just compensation.

"7. In common law where the value of the subject of controversy shall exceed $20, suits shall be heard by jury.

"8. Excessive bail and fines shall not be imposed; nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

"9. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"10. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

For greatest simplicity of analysis, we point out that there are but two poles of government known to history of this earth. One is total ascendancy of central government over state and local rule in which that government, whether it be of one man or a number of men, is supreme, and to that all-powerful central government the individual must bow in all things. He has no rights that government is anywise bound to respect.

In the beginning of governmental centralism, in some instances, the individual is bludgeoned into yielding his rights by force when a group, such as in Nazi Germany, has seized power.

In other instances, the individual is lured to yield his rights by the expectation that government can solve his economic problems. Many believe the American people are moving toward ism government by this route. At first the supreme state may solve the individual's problems, but in the end the individual is bound and gagged by regimentation and buried under titanic taxation.

At the other pole of government is democracy or an approximation of it such as was conceived by the founders of this representative republic. In democracy, the people control their government and are not controlled in all the infinite aspects of life by it. The government may regulate, but it does not confiscate by taxation nor operate by possession. The individual may have to grub for his livelihood which is not assured except by his own efforts, but he remains free to be more intelligent, more industrious, and more efficient than his fellows and to be compensated the greater therefor.

He is of America, a part of a beautiful way of life. "In America," as an immigrant Irishman once said, "ivery man is as good as ivery other man—and if you ask me, a dom sight better." In this country, men born on the wrong side of tracks can by their effort move over to the other side. In a regimented America, that would cease to be possible. Under the onerous taxation of centralism, a hot-dog stand can't be run into a chain of restaurants.

If we want America to stand for individual freedom and a people mightier than their government, we must never cease to protect the Bill of Rights. As opposed to the derogatory view of HENRY WALLACE, we need to be more Bill of Rights conscious, not less. As the Bill of Rights anniversary nears, it is wise to remember what it has stood for in past freedom and will stand for in the future if we do not yield to the opiate lures of the isms.

Consumer Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, speaking of unholy alliances in an effort to obtain their objective, I think the public should be informed as to the identity of those who are alined in exerting pressure for consumer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following enlightening article on the subject:

ERSATZ CONGRESS COMMITTEE WAGES WAR ON SUBSIDY BAN—SELF-ORGANIZED GROUP BORROWS AUTHORITY TO ATTAIN ITS ENDS

The ersatz congressional committee—latest administration propaganda and pressure weapon—last week staged a campaign in behalf of food subsidies that left Capitol Hill veterans gasping.

The fake committee of Congress is something comparatively new to Washington, but becoming increasingly popular.

GO THROUGH THE MOTIONS

A group of Congressmen, anxious to obtain some objective, adopt a high-sounding committee title, meet in regular committee rooms of House and Senate, hold hearings and issue reports with all the apparent authority of regular standing committees, and in general employ the prestige of Congress to the gaining of their ends.

But the so-called congressional committee for the protection of the consumer went to unprecedented extremes in its frantic efforts to reverse the overwhelming sentiment in Congress against subsidies which was evidenced in the 278–117 House vote.

Larger than most such groups, with 70 Members of Congress claimed as supporters, this aggregation calmly took over the largest meeting room in the House Office Building, the caucus room, which can accommodate about 500 persons.

OUSTED REGULAR COMMITTEE

In doing so it ousted a regularly appointed committee from its customary meeting place. The select committee to investigate unauthorized acts of executive agencies, headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH (Democrat), of Virginia, was relegated to a small, top-floor chamber.

To get large audiences, the committee listed the names of prominent persons as expected witnesses. A big crowd thronged the caucus room on Wednesday in the hope of seeing Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann, newspapers columnists, who, it had been announced, would appear. Neither showed up, but several representatives from Communist-front organizations seized the opportunity to make inflammatory speeches.

Under the urging of these speakers, the crowds spent the noon hour recess between hearings prowling House and Senate Office Building corridors, baiting legislators, invading their offices, and uttering loud threats concerning the political future of any Senator or Representative who voted against subsidies.

NAMES "CONTINUING COMMITTEE"

Representative THOMAS E. SCANLON (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, "chairman" of the committee, introduced something new even to ersatz committee procedure, when he appointed a "continuing committee" composed not of Members of Congress but of representatives of outside groups. Six of the twenty-five members of this group are listed in the files of the Dies committee on un-American activities as Communist-front followers.

The usual communistic procedure of enlisting Negro groups in a movement wa followed in the appointment of this committee of outsiders. Three Negro associations, all known to be dominated by Communists, according to Dies committee records, were represented.

Fiery accusations were the rule at the hearings.

Danger in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the New York Daily Mirror of November 30, 1943:

DANGER IN THE AIR

"Where the press is free all is safe." Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Colonel Yancey, in 1816.

If the father of American democracy were alive today, he would be compelled to revise his truism to "where the press and radio are free all is safe."

The radio now plays such an important part in the daily lives of all of us that when freedom of opinion is limited on the air it is tantamount to a violation of the Constitution, which guarantees to the American people in article I of the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech.

That certainly applies to the radio—or else the word "speech" in the Bill of Rights means nothing.

That the air waves are in danger of becoming a powerful propaganda medium of those who would foist on us alien-minded doctrines—whose very essence is the destruction of freedom of speech and the press—was startlingly evidenced when T. A. M. Craven, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, told the special House committee investigating the F. C. C. that that enormously important governmental agency is pervaded with "the doctrine of institutional social reforms through seizing powers not granted it."

THE SO-CALLED REFORMS

Those reforms, of course, are state socialistic and communistic in tendency—reforms with which the New Deal, from top to bottom, has been tainted for 10 years.

When the counsel for the committee asked Mr. Craven whether he had noticed any "earmarks" in the agency's policies of "communistic technique," Mr. Craven replied that that "was a matter of opinion."

As a member of Mr. Fly's commission, it is obvious that Mr. Craven was merely endeavoring to be polite to his superior.

Mr. Craven, however, further definitely asserted that the Commission had "undertaken upon itself legisative acts and adopted policies not granted it by Congress."

Nothing better than that statement indicates the length to which the irresponsible bureaucrats in Washington are going.

This un-American and undemocratic flouting of Congress "constitutes in a sense," said Mr. Craven, "a trend toward 'cessation of gradualism,' which I interpret as a method by which you impose 'social reforms' of your own choosing without consulting the chosen representatives of the people."

And this further statement of Mr. Craven's sounds as if this were Russia, Japan, or Germany:

He urged "limitation of F. C. C.'s control over radio," charging that "stations live in constant fear of Government reprisals."

Now, this steady absorption of congressional powers by executive ukases and communistic-minded cabals in Government bureaus and agencies is precisely what the American people have sensed and on which they so vigorously registered their No! in the elections of 1940 and 1942.

The founding fathers, when they came to make a Constitution, thought primarily of Congress.

It is the first, the dominant power in the Constitution.

Congress is more powerful than the President and his Cabinet and all bureaus and commissions.

If power is slipping out of the hands of the people today, and the radio and the press feel a cumulatively restraining hand upon them, it is the fault of Congress, itself.

TOO MUCH POWER

The Congresses of the last 10 years—sometimes under the threat of political purges and reprisals—have delegated too much power to the President and have credited too many bureaus and agencies, which are mainly politically dominated.

These bureaus and agencies have become a supergovernment in the United States.

The F. C. C. is a striking example of how one of these agencies has inspired fear, according to a member of the commission itself, in radio stations throughout the country.

While we grandiloquently talk about guarantes of free press throughout the world at the peace table, our own radio fuehrers are evidently trying to destroy free speech on the air in America.

The F. C. C. has too much power.

Congress should strip it of some of the dictatorial costuming.

And Congress should also reread the Constitution and reassume some of the legislative powers bestowed upon it by the founding fathers.

Post-war Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I include therein a letter from myself in support of proposed favorable action in the Missouri River Basin for flood control, irrigation, reclamation, and power purposes and addressed to the Montana State Reclamation Association, now in session at Bozeman, and read at that meeting, be printed in the RECORD together with a letter from the Army engineers and a memorandum from the Bureau of Reclamation on that subject, all of which shows a proposed post-war plan for the Missouri River Basin:

DECEMBER 11, 1943.

Mr. WESLEY A. D'EWART, *President,*
Montana State Reclamation Association,
Bozeman, Mont.

MR. D'EWART, OFFICERS, MEMBERS, AND GUESTS OF THE MONTANA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION NOW MEETING IN BOZEMAN: I note with satisfaction the interest your organization is showing over a proposed project of vital interest and incalculable concern to the State of Montana. I refer, of course, to the proposed Lower Canyon Reservoir near Livingston, Mont., and ask your kind indulgence for a few minutes so that I may, in presenting an over-all picture of everything involved, bring you up to date by a truthful presentation of the facts.

The people of Montana have been vitally interested in the conservation of water ever since the first settler camped on our plains and in our mountains. This conservation is vital to our daily lives and to our future as a State. Knowing this fact, I have constantly worked to obtain the necessary legislation to use our existing water resources for the maximum beneficial results to our people. Back in 1936 when the Flood Act of that year was being formulated, I was careful to see that items were placed in that bill for examinations and surveys of the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers. In 1937 I was responsible for the adoption by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives of a resolution calling upon the Corps of Engineers to review their "308" report on the Yellowstone, House Document 256, Seventy-third Congress, second session, to determine what modification should be made in that report to bring about the over-all use of the water of that river at the present time for flood control, irrigation, power and allied purposes.

When that review report on the Yellowstone was finished by the Corps of Engineers late in 1940, I was instrumental in having a public hearing held at Billings, Mont., by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. I am sure that you will all remember that hearing. When it was finished, it appeared that the best plan to follow at that time was for the Engineer Department to wait until the Bureau of Reclamation completed its studies of the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers so that the maximum benefits could be secured to the State of Montana, especially from the irrigation standpoint.

In the spring of 1943 disastrous floods inundated large sections in the Missouri Basin, caused tremendous damages, great human suffering and definitely deterred our war effort. The people of southeastern Montana can testify as to the severity of the flooded, rampant Yellowstone where at Fallon, Mont., a five-span bridge was washed out causing great damage and hardship.

Following these floods, the people of the Missouri River States requested Congress to have the Corps of Engineers review its previous reports on the Missouri to find a practical solution to that great flood problem. I was a member of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, which, on May 13 of this year, passed a resolution calling upon the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to make the necessary studies and to submit the required report. In compliance with that resolution, Col. Lewis A. Pick, who was the division engineer of the Missouri River Division, finished that report just this past August and submitted it to Washington. The report is now in the hands of other Federal agencies for their comments so that it can present a coordinated basin-wide plan for the complete utilization of the water resources of the Missouri Basin. I have seen that report and given it very careful study, and it is my considered opinion that an unbiased study of that report will clearly show, not only the necessity, but also the advisability of going ahead with the program as outlined.

For that reason it was with genuine regret and a sense of bewilderment that I read an article given prominent attention in the Great Falls Tribune of November 30 entitled "Ford Assails Army's Plans for Missouri River Basin." Apparently the intent of the article is to lead people to believe that the Army engineers are trying to put through a plan detrimental to Montana's best interest, that our irrigation projects and the development of hydroelectric power are to be relegated to an inferior position.

Having read that report, I cannot agree with such a contention. In fact nothing could be further from the truth, and to substantiate that statement I am herewith submitting a letter which I ask to be read into the record at this time. It is from the War Department and is signed by their Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. E. Reybold. I also ask that a memorandum, submitted to me at my request, from the Bureau of Reclamation, be read into the record at this point. One part of that memorandum deals with the views of the Bureau of Reclamation on this proposed reservoir, and the other part concerns itself with the Fort Peck Dam power for irrigation.

I say that a careful analysis of the survey and report of the Army engineers on the Missouri Basin shows very clearly that the

plan itself is flexible and provides for such changes as future conditions may dictate; therefore, the quantity of storage behind these dams can be utilized to the maximum extent consistent with the needs of the surrounding territories. Of course, there are flood-control and navigation benefits from the dams, but I think we should all know that the latter two benefits will be definitely subsidize the development of power and irrigation.

Now the question naturally arises in your minds—what will be done with all of the reports of these various agencies when completed? In accordance with usual procedure in such matters, they will be filed with the House of Representatives and the Speaker of the House will refer them to the Committee on Flood Control of the House, of which committee I have the honor of being a member. Upon such reference no doubt extensive hearings will be held and a pattern will be developed for the purpose of introducing a bill covering what is ultimately decided upon. You will observe, as I said before, from the report of the engineers that the plan is flexible. At the hearings before the Committee on Flood Control all persons will be given plenty of chance to be heard and to make such recommendations as they deem advisable for the development for multiple purposes of the waters of the Yellowstone and its tributaries.

I regret also to note in the article referred to above that Governor Ford is quoted as saying: "that no provision has been made to date for use of the waters impounded at Fort Peck for irrigation." I doubt if the Governor would have made such a statement if he had taken the trouble to inform himself of the appropriations made by Congress and the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of power for irrigation purposes at Fort Peck since the passage of the above act. Fort Peck already is generating power, but due to the war this generated power is being put to war use and Montana will have to wait until after the war to benefit directly from power for irrigation. Fort Peck is truly a multipurpose dam and after the war will be so used.

It seems to me that the only sensible course to follow at this time is to take advantage of these flood control and navigation subsidies which Congress has written into the law of the land. In this way, we in the upper States can get our irrigation and our power at considerably less cost than we could if those two uses of water had to pay their own way without these recognized and legitimate Federal subsidies. Thus, opposition to the two dams in the Pick plan will only result in denying to the States of Montana and Wyoming a rapid, efficient, and economical method of getting what the citizens of those States want; that is water for irrigation and for power with flood control and other benefits for our neighbors down the stream.

Having had a part in the development of this whole program as the record shows, I felt it my duty to try to clarify some of the apparent misconceptions of what has been done and what is intended to be done in the development of the Missouri River Basin and Yellowstone and tributaries.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'CONNOR.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, December 11, 1943.

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: Reference is made to your recent telephone conversations with this office regarding the Department's investigations in the Yellowstone and Missouri River Basins. As requested by you, I am pleased to furnish the following information to supplement the telephonic data given you on those occasions.

In accordance with a resolution of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives which you sponsored and which was adopted on August 18, 1937, and also pursuant to other directives from Congress, the district engineer at Omaha, Nebr., and the division engineer of the Missouri River division made thorough and careful investigations of the entire Yellowstone River Basin and a separate study of its principal tributary, the Big Horn River. The division engineer in August of this year also submitted a report on the entire Missouri River Basin made pursuant to a resolution of May 13, 1943, by the Committee on Flood Control which called for a review of previous reports with a view to determining appropriate measures for flood control from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the Missouri River.

All of these reports are comprehensive in scope and consider not only flood control but also irrigation, hydroelectric power, navigation, and all other beneficial water uses. The reports all recognize the necessity for the development of additional water supplies to meet water shortages for irrigation projects in the upper Missouri Basin and the projects proposed therein are carefully developed with the needs of irrigation in mind. In the Yellowstone River survey a number of proposed reservoirs outlined by yourself and upon which you submitted valuable data were carefully studied and the report of the division and district engineers stated that the proposed lower canyon reservoir near Livingston, Mont., is a necessary unit in the continued development of the Missouri River Basin for all purposes. The report is also favorable to the construction of a reservoir on the Big Horn River in Wyoming to meet the urgent needs of that area. The division and district engineers also recommend local flood protection projects at Billings and Miles City, Mont., and Greybull, Wyo., to provide positive flood protection for those important communities.

The reports of the division and district engineers on the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers were referred to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for review as required by law. As you will recall, the local interests requested a hearing, and the Board, at your request, held this hearing in Billings, Mont., on January 30, 1941, at which time the interested local parties were given full opportunity to express their views. It appeared from the tenor of this meeting that the local interests preferred that the Board withhold its action on the repotrs until such time as they had had an opportunity to examine the reports which the Bureau of Reclamation was then preparing on those streams. Since the Bureau has not yet completed its reports, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is still holding the reports of the division and district engineers without final review by the Board.

The report of the division engineer on the Missouri River made in response to the flood-control committee's resolution of May 13, 1943, is also a comprehensive report which gives full consideration to all of the water uses in the basin. The report proposes projects to provide a large amount of storage in multiple-purpose reservoirs on the main stem of the Missouri River and on tributaries for all of the beneficial water uses of the area. The plan contained in the report is designed to be a framework on which all Federal and State agencies concerned with the development of the Missouri Basin can build additional projects for the best use of the stored water. The plan is entirely flexible to meet changing conditions and to meet the unforeseeable needs of the future, and it provides for desirable modifications as the projects are built and as other conditions show to be advisable. It provides also for further expansion by all agencies in the fields with which they are directly concerned. It in no way precludes the development of single-purpose development may not be feasible. A definite part of the plan is the use of existing storage for multiple purposes. The report treats all water uses on a comparable basis and does not restrict the use of the projects to any single purpose.

Throughout its investigations in the Missouri River Basin and in fact everywhere in the West, the Department cooperates fully with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies in order that the plans proposed in the Department's reports may be fully coordinated with the plans of all other agencies and that they may clearly fit into the best development of the water resources of the region. For several years the Department has had definite agreements of cooperation with these agencies which provide for free interchange of factual data, cooperative investigations, and review of conclusions. The Missouri River report is now with the Commissioner of Reclamation for his review and comment. The Department of Agriculture has advised the Department of its concurrence with the plan contained in that report. The comments of the Federal Power Commission are expected to be received within a very few days. As soon as the views of these agencies have been received and carefully considered, the full report of the Department will be completed and submitted to Congress.

It is essential to the success of the development program as outlined in the report of the Department that there be the fullest cooperation among all of the Federal agencies concerned, and with the officials and organizations of the States and local communities. Full opportunity exists for constructive action by all agencies. I am certain that as the plan proceeds it will become increasingly more clear that the interests of each region are served best by the development of projects through the combined efforts of everyone throughout the entire basin.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION SURVEYS IN YELLOWSTONE BASIN AND ELSEWHERE IN MONTANA

The Bureau of Reclamation, as rapidly as funds and manpower would permit, has been pressing the completion of basin surveys of the water resources of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries in Montana and Wyoming. These surveys as well as those on the main stem of the Missouri and its tributaries are primarily directed at maximum irrigation development but other purposes such as power production and flood control are considered.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the potential additional area above Fort Peck Dam which can be irrigated from the Missouri and its tributaries is about 1,200,000 acres, the greater part of which is in Montana.

The Bureau of Reclamation is prepared to integrate the results of its surveys with those of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, for the early recommendation of a comprehensive program for the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. This program will comprehend irrigation, power production and flood control, navigation, silt detention, and other purposes.

THE YELLOWSTONE BASIN SURVEYS

Preliminary data only are available from the surveys of the Yellowstone Basin. These

surveys include the main stream, the Powder, Tongue, Big Horn, Clarks Fork, Stillwater, Boulder, and Shields Rivers and minor tributaries. These preliminary data indicate possibilities with the full development of the waters of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, as follows:

Irrigated acreage: The total acreage would be increased from 984,530 to about 1,700,000.

Reservoirs: Twenty-seven new multiple-purpose reservoirs with a total capacity of 4,250,000 acre-feet as compared with 26 existing major reservoirs with a total capacity of 935,000 acre-feet.

Power: The potential power connected with the developments indicated in the Yellowstone Basin would be 287,000 kilowatts—8 plants with an annual output of more than 1,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Reports are being prepared by the Bureau on two major dams and reservoirs in connection with the over-all basin survey of the Yellowstone. These are the Boysen on the Big Horn River, the largest tributary, and a dam at the Mission site near Livingston on the main stem of the Yellowstone.

THE BOYSEN DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Boysen would be located near Boysen, Wyo., and would be the key structure on 13 dams on the Big Horn system. The system would make possible the expansion of irrigation to about 440,000 acres—double the present irrigated area—in the Big Horn Basin, both in Wyoming and Montana.

The proposed Boysen Dam would be an earth-fill structure 130 feet high with a crest length of about 780 feet. The construction of the dam would require 900,000 cubic yards of earth embankment. A preliminary estimate indicates that the dam, reservoir, and power plant of 10,000 kilowatts capacity would cost about $8,000,000. The Boysen Reservoir as proposed would have a total capacity of 730,000 acre-feet, of which 400,000 acre-feet would be utilized for silt detention, 300,000 acre-feet would be used for flood control, and 30,000 acre-feet would be used for irrigation development. The right-of-way required would amount to 20,600 acres and 12 to 15 miles of railroad relocation would be required.

Since the completion of the Big Horn Basin report in 1942, engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation have proceeded with detailed surveys of the dam and reservoir. A large-scale topographic map of the dam site has been completed and foundation conditions determined by a large amount of core drilling. The railroad and highway relocation surveys have practically been completed. These detailed surveys place this development well along toward the completion of final planning for post-war work.

THE MISSION DAM NEAR LIVINGSTON

A survey has been made of the reservoir site in the vicinity of Mission on the main stem of the Yellowstone east of Livingston. The estimated capacity of the reservoir at this site would be 890,000 acre-feet and a power installation of 50,000 kilowatts is contemplated.

The reservoir would aid in extending irrigation to 166,800 acres and increase by 70 percent the presently irrigated area of 236,500 acres in the valley of the main stream. The reservoir would also serve flood control, silt detention, and other purposes.

OTHER MISSOURI RIVER SURVEYS IN MONTANA

Other surveys in the Missouri River Basin and the preliminary data available in connection with a comprehensive plan for the development of the water resources of the basin is summarized as follows:

Great Falls to mouth of Yellowstone River, including the Milk, Musselshell, Marias, Teton, and Judith Basins. Here the irrigated area could be increased by 255,000 acres from the present total of 270,000 acres. One reservoir on the Marias wtih a capacity of 915,000 acre-feet and four on the Judith with 23,400 acre-feet are proposed.

Three Forks to Great Falls, including the Sun, Smith, and Dearborne Basins, an increase of 243,000 acres from the present irrigated total of 129,900 acres is proposed with three reservoirs of a total of 180,000 acre-feet.

Above Three Forks, including the Madison, Gallatin, and Jefferson basins, an increase of 145,000 acres from the present total of 512,000 acres is possible. Ten additional reservoirs with a total capacity of 247,000 acre-feet are included.

Two reservoirs on the main stream in the Helena Valley area would have a total capacity of 2,002,600 acre-feet.

FORT PECK DAM POWER FOR IRRIGATION

Under the provisions of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403), the Bureau of Reclamation was authorized and directed "to provide, construct, operate, and maintain such electrical transmission lines and substations," etc., as it finds necessary for the transmission of electric energy produced at Fort Peck Dam. While the War Department operates the dam and power plant, the Bureau of Reclamation sells and distributes the power.

In anticipation of the completion in June 1943 of the Fort Peck power plant, the Bureau had planned a transmission system for the distribution of Fort Peck power to points in eastern Montana and western North Dakota for irrigation pumping, rural electrification, and other uses. It was planned to serve irrigation projects in operation, under construction, or proposed in the vicinity of Miles City, Glendive, Glasgow, Poplar, and Medicine Lake, Mont., and Williston, N. Dak.

War conditions delayed the construction of new irrigation projects and materials required for the new transmission system were required for war purposes. As a result, the Bureau was denied priorities for critical materials and was refused authorization by the War Production Board to undertake the construction of the transmission line.

When the Fort Peck power plant went into operation in the summer of 1943, a wartime contract was made for the sale of the electrical output to the Montana Power Co., which required the supply to meet war loads of industries on its systems. Energy is delivered to the company over an existing line.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to construct the new transmission system to serve irrigation loads of projects now in operation or under construction as well as others in Montana and North Dakota which have been proposed as soon as critical materials are available. An unexpended balance of an appropriation of $494,000 made in 1942 is available to begin the construction of the transmission system.

Resolution of Lackawanna Valley Underwriters Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas certain bills have been introduced in Congress to affirm the intention of that body that the Federal antitrust laws are not to be construed to apply to the business of insurance or impair in any way the regulation of that business by the States; and

Whereas these bills are in the public interest to the extent of conserving States' rights to regulate the business of insurance conducted within its own borders: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the desire of the Lackawanna Valley Underwriters Exchange and others of Lackawanna County interested in the business of insurance to respectfully petition your support in favor of Senate bill S. 1362, BAILEY and VAN NUYS, and House bills H. R. 3269 (HANCOCK) and H. R. 3270 (WALTERS).

It is further a recognized fact that the business of insurance, from a standpoint of rate fixing and monopolistic tendencies, is constantly watched over by the 48 States of the Union with the thought that no such thing as a trust of monopoly can exist in the business. For over 75 years the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that insurance may be regulated by the States. For over 90 years insurance has been regulated by the States, each State acting in its own way to meet local conditions in the best interest of its citizens. Throughout these years a network of State laws and regulations has grown up, which, for the most part, has proven a most satisfactory control of the operations of the industry.

Total War—Total Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch is one of the finest fighting men of the Navy. He was in command of the *South Dakota*, one of the newest and most modern battleships in the battle of Santa Cruz Islands October 26, 1942. Some 40 Jap planes were shot down, largely by the antiaircraft of the *South Dakota*. As a a result of the explosion of an aerial bomb he was severely wounded. With his arm in a sling, as a result of wounds, he was still in command of the celebrated battleship *South Dakota* in the surface battle of Guadalcanal November 14–15, 1942. In these engagements several enemy capital ships were sunk. The battleship in these engagements came into its own and thoroughly demonstrated again that battleships in naval warfare are fundamental.

The Navy Cross was conferred upon him as a result of heroic and distinguished conduct in each of the said famous battles. Because of wounds he is now assigned to shore duty, and on September 1, 1943, he became Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an address delivered by my gallant friend, Rear Admiral

Thomas L. Gatch, before the regional war meeting of the American Bar Association, Birmingham, Ala., December 9, 1943:

I remember years ago on a drowsy summer day shortly after the noon recess an attorney who was about to argue a case before one of the highest courts in a western State remarking with disgust: "Just look at our bench. One of them is asleep, one is deaf, and the third doesn't know anything anyway." I feel perfectly safe in this company on the latter two categories, but should I have the temerity to talk about the law, after the excellent dinner we have just eaten, I should not feel so safe regarding the first.

So with your kind permission this evening I shall not talk on legal topics. Instead my subject is:

TOTAL WAR—TOTAL PEACE

The most fervent desire of this great, peaceful country of ours, is a quick and satisfactory peace. We were deliberately forced into war by a dastardly attack upon us on the "day that will live in infamy"; but despite the fact that we are now up to our necks in war we like it no better than we did the very first day. We should like nothing better than to be out of war as soon as can be. Our enemies are going to play upon this well-known national desire. It may be that we shall find that a quick peace and a satisfactory peace are incompatible. If so, the former must give way; for if we do not get a satisfactory peace at the end of the present war we condemn our sons and grandsons. I ask you gentlemen, as leaders in your communities, to bear that message home. This war must be fought through.

The phrase "total war," which has been uttered so frequently in the past 4 years that it is now hackneyed, was originally contributed to our idiom by the Prussian militarists. This phrase was a reassuring battle-cry for the Axis nation at the time when their military might was achieving easy victories over poorly equipped Poland, overrunning such helpless nations as Norway, Holland, and Belgium, grinding to bits the hollow strength of France, and giving the unprepared British Empire the scare of its long life. Today, the words "total war" must leave a bitter taste in the mouths of their inventors and their Japanese allies, now that it describes better the types of warfare being waged against them by the United Nations. However, unless we accept a negotiated peace that our present enemies with their crooked thinking will twist into something tantamount to victory for them, a long period of total war, both on the home fronts and the fighting fronts, lies between us and the day when we shall see the crooked cross of Naziism straightened, and the setting of the Rising Sun.

Without discounting the importance of our glorious victories during the past year on the Russian front, in north Africa and Italy, and the aerial blitzkrieg against German industrial targets, we would be unfair to ourselves if we are deluded into believing that we are on the eve of final military victory over either of our enemies. The consensus of intelligence reports is diametrically opposed to any such rosy daydreams. With a decade of intensive preparation, and despite recent losses, Germany still has one of the best trained armies in the world. As the Under Secretary of War recently pointed out, although the Wehrmacht lost 20 divisions in their defeat at Stalingrad, it has activated or reequipped 60 new divisions since that time. Those who are in a position to know have repeatedly warned that internal collapse of Germany cannot be expected in the near future. And in the Pacific war, after 2 years of fighting, we have done little more than secure our own supply lines to Australia, and take small nibbles along the outer edges of Japan's war-won empire.

As illustrative of the type of warfare that will be necessary for final victory, I need only recall to your minds the newspaper accounts last week of the landings in the Gilbert Islands. On Tarawa Island, one of Japan's smaller central Pacific outposts, the Marine Corps casualties were 1,026 dead and 2,557 wounded. That price was necessary because the Japanese garrison of approximately 5,000 had to be completely wiped out before Tarawa was ours. Practically no Japanese prisoners were taken. I have seen the suicidal fanaticism of the Japs in action, and can quite understand the order of the day issued by a marine colonel to his men just prior to the Tarawa landings: "The Japanese have been taught that their highest duty is to die for their emperor. It is up to you to see that no Jap soldier fails in this duty."

Total war is just as necessary on the home front as it is on the fighting fronts. The events of the past 2 years have proved that, man for man, Americans are better fighters than any of our enemies. But the victory that will surely come for the the Allied cause will not be attributable solely to the blood and guts of our men. A large part of the credit for the victory will be due to Yankee technological superiority. The planes, tanks, and guns that American factories are turning out today are the finest in use by any army or navy. This country has the potential productive capacity to produce all of the equipment that the soldiers of the United Nations require to lick the Axis. Any deficiency in equipment has to be made up by flesh and blood. Every person on the home front should constantly remember that his shortcomings are going to cost American lives. To the men "over there," in Italy and the South Pacific, we "over here" must often present a sorry spectacle, with our complaining over gasoline and food rationing, our greediness for material gains out of the war effort, and our political bickerings.

You gentlemen here tonight can make very real contributions to the war on the home front. Your generous donations of your time, energy, and professional skill to the legal assistance programs of the Army and Navy have been and will continue to be of invaluable aid to our fighting services. Just as a sick man cannot be an efficient soldier or sailor, so a man harrassed with worries over his personal problems at home cannot devote his full energies to the task at hand in the trenches or aboard ship, that of killing Japs and Nazis. In assisting our men in the solutions of their personal legal problems, you are building morale, as essential an item to a fighting force as food and guns.

Few in this audience are actually engaged in war production, in the limited sense of the word. But this does not relieve you of the responsibility of doing all within your power to see to it that the battle on the home front is as total as that on the battle fronts. The legal profession has always prided itself on the fact that its members are the leaders of their respective communities. As the leaders of your home towns and cities, it is up to you to see that there is no slackening of effort in the production of the materials of war, no break-down of civilian morale, and that public opinion shall be united in pledging that the energies of every American shall be utilized to the fullest to bring about the complete defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time.

The logical result of a successful total war should be total peace for the victors. You have heard it said many times, with reference to World War I, that we won the war, but lost the peace. At the conclusion of the last war, we accepted half-way measures in our post-war arrangements, with the result that war on a larger scale engulfed the world 20 years later.

The only sure method to insure peace for our country after this war is to see to it that our potential enemies do not possess or acquire the means of making war on us. We failed to do this during the 1920's and 1930's, because of a mistaken belief that the millenium was at hand. As early as 1929, one of our greatest jurists, Mr. Justice Holmes, saw the fallacy of our national attitude on foreign policy, as he pointed out in his dissenting opinion in the case of *U. S.* v. *Schwimmer*, "I do not share that optimism which believes that war will disappear and that the impending destiny of mankind is to unite in peaceful leagues, nor do I think that a philosophic view of the world would regard war as absurd."

At some far-distant Utopian day the time may come when the world will be so organized that there will be permanent peace among the nations, without force to support it. But that date is so distant that we would be fools to rely again on such a supposition as a basis for post-war planning.

Right now, perhaps, too much of our thinking is being turned to post-war problems. First we must be doubly sure that the war is going to end the right way; for otherwise there will be no post-war problems for us. Nothing can be allowed to detract from our primary effort. Few intelligent persons, other than congential optimists, can see any speedy end to this war at this time. In fact there are many Americans who think that a speedy end of the war in the Pacific would be a calamity to us. Japan started the war; we have to finish it, and finish it in such wise that the Japs will know for generations that if they ever pick trouble with us they are going to get plenty of it. For make no mistake that however this war ends—except in a Jap victory, which is unthinkable—the controlling motive of Japanese thought from now on is going to be revenge on the United States. Japanese children are going to be weaned on that thought. We cannot blink that fact. Therefore, we must so end this war that Japan is powerless to take aggressive action and then we must see to it that she remains in that condition.

Absentee Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of Tennessee's absentee-voting law, chapter 8 of the Code of Tennessee, which is as follows:

CHAPTER 8, CODE OF TENNESSEE: ABSENTEE VOTING

2228. What absent voters may vote: Any voter, only when required by his regular business or occupation and his habitual duties to be absent from the city or county in which he is registered or is entitled to vote by law in this State, may vote at any election held in his precinct or district for any purpose whatsoever, provided such voter complies substantially with the following conditions, to wit (1917, ch. 8, sec. 1):

2229. Voter intending to vote must give notice: Such voter shall give notice in writ-

ing of his intention to vote by registered mail to the registrar of his precinct, provided the general registration laws apply thereto, and if said registration laws do not apply in his precinct or district, then such written notice shall be given to the secretary of the board of county election commissioners of his county, hereinafter called the secretary, if there be one, otherwise to the chairman of said board hereinafter called the chairman, not less than 10 days nor more than 30 days prior to any legalized or other primary or general election in which he desires and is entitled to participate; provided he be within the confines of the United States. But if such voter be outside the limits of the United States, in any of its Territories or elsewhere, then he must give such notice not less than 30 days or more than 90 days prior to the date of such primary or general election. (Ibid., subsec. 1.)

2230. Ballot to be mailed to voter upon receipt of notice delivered in person or by registered mail; postage to be furnished by voter: When such notice is filed, either with the registrar or secretary or chairman for the county in which such voter claims the right to vote, such registrar, secretary, or chairman shall promptly forward by registered mail a legal ballot to be cast by such voter, in such primary or general election, with all necessary blanks and full instructions to the voter to enable him to comply fully with all the provisions of this statute. But the voter making such application shall furnish to the registrar, secretary, or chairman the required amount of postage to be used by such officer in forwarding such ballot, together with definite information as to the exact address to which such registered ballot shall be mailed. Such written notice by such voter shall be delivered in person or be sent by registered mail to such officer, and may be addressed to and received by either of them, and a registry receipt signed by such officer shall be evidence of the receipt of such written request. (Ibid., subsec. 2.)

2231. How the ballot shall be mailed and addressed: When the voter is within the United States, or any of its Territories or dependencies, such ballot shall be enclosed in a sealed envelope and this within another envelope addressed to the voter at the post office designated by the voter in his written notice; and when the voter is not within the jurisdiction of the United States the envelope enclosing the ballot shall be directed to the voter in care of the nearest American consulate, and when the voter is in the service of the Army or Navy same shall be directed to him in care of his commanding officer. (Ibid., subsec. 3.)

2232. Ballots shall be opened and filled up in presence of whom, and returned by registered mail: Upon receipt of such registered letter forwarded by the registrar, secretary, or chairman, the voter shall not open the sealed envelope containing the ballot, except it be in the presence of the postmaster or assistant, or of an officer authorized by law to administer oaths; and when in the presence of such official, and in his full view, such sealed envelope shall be opened and shall then and there, in the presence and view of such official, be marked or filled up by the voter, or in case of his inabilty to do so, by the official, under his direction, and said ballot shall then be folded and placed within an envelope provided by the registrar, secretary, or chairman, for that purpose, and the same shall then be carefully sealed, and the official shall write his name across the seal of the envelope enclosing the ballot, and sign the voucher printed upon said envelope, and the voter shall likewise sign a voucher, as hereinafter indicated; such envelope enclosing the ballot to be enclosed within another envelope directed to the registrar, secretary, or chairman, and sent by registered mail immediately thereafter, such registration to bear the same date as the voucher of such official. (Ibid., subsec. 4.)

2233. If voter be outside of the United States, his ballot shall be prepared and mailed back, how: A voter receiving his ballot outside the limits of the United States, except when in the service of the Army or Navy, shall prepare and seal his ballot in the presence of the American consul or his assistant, if the letter was mailed in care of the consulate, preserving the secrecy of the ballot, and it shall then be forwarded by the consulate, within 2 days thereafter, in the sealed envelope provided, addressed to the registrar, secretary, or chairman. If the voter is in the service of the Army or Navy, his commanding officer, or some other officer duly delegated by him, shall witness said register the return envelope by the first mail leaving his command or ship, after having complied with all the requirements of this law. (Ibid., subsec. 5.)

2234. Name of applicant eligible to be enrolled, and certificate to be made and forwarded, with return envelopes and instructions: The registrar, secretary, or chairman, upon receipt of the written application for a ballot to be so voted, shall satisfy himself that the applicant is entitled to vote in the election in which he seeks to participate, and shall enroll his name and address, if found eligible, in a book to be provided by the municipality or county, as the case may be, and make out the certificate and coupon attached, hereinafter provided, and forward same to the applicant voter by registered mail, as above set forth, and shall also enclose in said letter, the following:

(a) An envelope containing the folded ballot, sealed and marked "Ballot Within."

(b) An envelope for resealing the marked ballot, form of which is hereinafter provided, and therein called "Voucher."

(c) An envelope properly addressed to such registrar, secretary, or chairman, in which the sealed envelope containing the ballot is to be returned to the officer by the voter.

(d) A printed slip, giving full instructions, stating the offices to be filled, the number to be voted for in each instance, how to mark the ballot, how it must be prepared and returned, and all other necessary information to enable the voter to cast a legal ballot under this statute. (Ib., subsec. 6.)

2235. Form of certificate: The certificate shall be substantially as follows:

"This is to certify that _____ is a qualified voter in the State of Tennessee, county of _____, city of _____, ward or district No. ____, and is entitled to vote in a (primary or general) election, to be held on the ____ day of _____, 19__. Application for ballot was received on the ____ day of _____, 19__, from _____ (post office) and mailed to the applicant at _____ (post office) as requested, on the ____ day of _____, 19__. A copy of this certificate is filed with the letter of application. No. _____.

"Signed: _____ _____,

"Registrar, Secretary, or Chairman."

(Ib., subsec. 7.)

2236. Envelope not to be opened except in whose presence; witness as to ballot: The voter shall not open the sealed envelope marked ballot within, except in the presence of a postmaster, his assistant, or an officer having authority to administer oaths, who is to witness and certify the act of preparing and sealing the ballot as above stated. (Ib., subsec. 8.)

2237. Ballot may be marked how; certificate by officer: The voter may mark his ballot secretly, to the extent that the officer may not know the names of the candidates voted for, if the voter so desires; but this is at the option of the voter. When the ballot has been marked or prepared and folded and sealed in the envelope furnished for that purpose, the officer shall fill out the following blank, detach the coupon from the certificate, and place it within the return envelope containing the sealed ballot, viz.:

"The name given by the voter is _____; his color is _____; height ____; age ____; color of hair _____; color of eyes _____; his weight estimated at _____ pounds; his State, county, and precinct where entitled to vote _____.

"To the best of my knowledge the above information is correct, and the applicant has complied with the requirements of the law of the State of Tennessee.

"(Signed) _____ _____.

"Postmaster, clerk, notary or other official designation."

The certificate made in territory without the jurisdiction of the United States, shall be signed by the consular officer; and if the voter is in the service of the Army or Navy of the United States, it shall be signed by some commissioned officer or other person duly delegated by him. (Ib.)

2238. Voucher certificate by voter, and witness thereof: On the back of the return envelope containing the marked ballot, shall be the following voucher:

"This is to certify that the enclosed ballot was received by me as per my application. The envelope marked "Ballot Within" was opened by me in the presence of _____ (stating the officer's name and official designation) and was marked or prepared or filled by me, or under my direction, and then and there sealed as provided by the law of the State of Tennessee.

"This ____ day of _____, 19__.

"Attest: _____.

"Official designation.

"(Signed) _____ _____ (Voter's name)."

The voucher shall be written or printed in substantially the foregoing form on the back of said envelope and the name of the officer, or some part of it, shall be so written across the seal as to prevent the same being tampered with or opened without detection. (Ib., subsec. 9.)

2239. Ballots, etc., to be furnished by comptroller; how prepared; unused ballots to be returned.—It shall be the duty of the comptroller of the State to have prepared all necessary blanks and information slips and furnish same, at the expense of the State to all registrars and county boards of election commissioners in this State; however, the ballots to be voted under this statute shall be prepared under the direction of the county board of election commissioners, who shall furnish to the registrar a sufficient number of ballots, each properly sealed in the envelope marked "Ballot Within," and take his receipt for the same. Within 5 days after the election, the registrar shall return to the commissioners of election, all unused ballots in their original sealed envelopes, and a certified list of voters with their addresses who have received ballots to be so voted. Where the ordinary three by seven ballot is prepared, no names shall be written or printed thereon before the same is received by the applicant voters but only the offices to be filled shall be written or printed thereon, and where the registration laws of the State apply, the names of the candidates for the various offices as have been then certified under said law will be written or printed thereon, leaving sufficient space for the voter to write a name or names not found on said ballot. (Ib., subsec. 10.)

2240. Ballot to be recorded and deposited in sealed box, with certificate; notice for sealed ballot boxes—which shall be delivered when; seal broken, when: Upon receipt by the registrar, secretary, or chairman of the registered letter containing the sealed ballot, properly authenticated, as prescribed, such

officer shall note on his record, opposite the name of the voter, in ink, the date of the receipt thereof, on which date he shall deposit in a sealed box furnished by the county for that purpose, the envelope containing the ballot, without opening or changing the envelope in any way whatever. This sealed box for each of the wards, voting precincts or districts, shall be delivered by the officer having same in his custody to the officer, or one of the judges holding the election, not later than the closing hour on the day of the election. The registrar, secretary, or chairman must furnish to the officer or judge holding the election, along with the sealed box, a certificate as follows:

"I hereby certify that I received out of the United States post office all the sealed envelopes contained in the sealed box this day delivered to ------ (name of officer holding election) there being ------ (number of) ballots therein, without the same having been altered since they were received by me, or being out of my possession after having been received. Witness my hand on this ------ day of ------, 19--.

(Signed) ------ ------,

Registrar, Secretary, or Chairman.

It shall be the duty of such registrar, secretary, or chairman, to give notice to an officer or judge of election at all voting places where voters desire to cast their ballots by registered mail, under the provisions of this statute, in ample time for the sealed boxes to be delivered to the proper election officers. These sealed boxes may be delivered not more than 3 days before the day of the election, and not later than the hour for the closing of the polls according to law. The election officer or judge, when receiving such sealed box containing the sealed ballots, shall retain the same in his possession until the seal is broken in the presence of all the judges and clerks of election immediately after the polls are closed on the day of election. (Ibid., subsec. 11.)

2241. Notice of names of applicants as absent voters to be posted: At least 7 days prior to the election in which the ballot is designed to be cast, the registrar or other officer to whom application for ballots has been made under this statute, shall post in a conspicuous place at the courthouse and also at the municipal hall, in the case of a city election, a full and complete list of the names of these voters so making application for ballots, stating the district or ward in which each desires to vote. (Ibid., subsec. 12.)

2242. Election officer or judge to receipt for sealed ballot box: When the sealed box is delivered by the registrar to the officer or judge of election, such officer or judge shall give a receipt for the same, stating the condition of the box, the date of its receipt, and shall preserve the same and have the same at the polls on election day, in order that the ballots therein may be properly deposited and counted. (Ibid., subsec. 13.)

2243. Sealed ballots received after delivery of sealed ballot box to be delivered to election officer or judge: In case any sealed envelope should be received by the registrar, secretary, or chairman, after the sealed box has been delivered to the officer of election, it shall be his duty forthwith to deliver same in its sealed condition to such officer or judge of election, to be deposited in said sealed box, if this can be done by the exercise of due diligence, before the polls close on the day of election. A like receipt shall be taken for same. It shall be the duty of the officer designated to hold the election, or the judge, to keep said sealed box or sealed envelopes in his own possession, securely sealed, and have the same present on the day of election, as hereinbefore stated. (Ibid.)

2244. Box to be opened and voters registered as if present: At the close of the regular balloting, the sealed box is to be opened by the judges of election in the presence of all the judges and clerks and the officer, as each envelope is removed from the box, the name of the voter is to be called and checked as if the voter were present voting in person. If it is found that he has paid his poll tax as required by law, or that he is not liable for poll tax, and that he is otherwise qualified and is legally entitled to cast his vote at the time and place where his ballot is thus offered, the envelope is then to be opened, the folded ballot taken therefrom and deposited in the regular ballot box, without being examined or unfolded. But if the judges of election shall determine that the applicant is, for any reason, not entitled to vote, the envelope containing his ballot shall in no case be opened, but the same, in its sealed condition, shall be returned along with the other records of the election, as part thereof, and shall be preserved by the officers whose duty it is to have custody of all said records. (Ibid., subsec. 14.)

2245. Ballot envelopes and records to be certified; misdemeanor to receive illegal ballot or to reject legal ballot: When all ballots have been accounted for and either voted or rejected, the empty envelopes from which the voted ballots were taken, as well as the sealed envelopes containing the rejected ballots, if any, together with all other records relating thereto shall be made part of the election records, and certified to the proper authorities. The judges, or a majority of them, shall certify their reason for rejecting each and every ballot rejected by them. They shall be guilty of a misdemeanor if they receive any ballot from an illegal voter, or reject any ballot from a legal voter, where he has complied with the law governing his application to vote. (Ibid., subsec. 15.)

2246. Fee of registrar, secretary, or chairman: The registrar, secretary, or chairman shall receive a fee of 25 cents, to be paid as other expenses of election, which shall be in full for all his services in connection with the record of each voter at each election. (Ibid., subsec, 16.)

2247. Felony for illegal voter to vote or attempt to do so, or for another to aid or abet therein; imprisonment; venue: It shall be a felony for any person who, for any reason, is not legally entitled to vote at the time and place where he votes or attempts to vote under this statute, to vote or to offer to do so. It shall also be a felony for any person to aid or abet another in so voting illegally or offering to do so, and every person connected therewith, with knowledge of its illegality, shall be sentenced to the penitentiary not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, or confined in the county jail or workhouse, in the discretion of the jury. The venue shall be in the county where such fraudulent ballot is offered, without reference to the place it was prepared or mailed. (Ibid., subsec. 17.)

2248. Felony for election officers to fail to perform duties; punishment: It shall also be a felony for any of the election officials connected in any way with the casting of a ballot by registered mail, to fail willfully and fraudulently to perform any act required of him hereunder, or to do any act in connection therewith for the fraudulent purpose of preventing a legal voter from casting his ballot or of causing an illegal vote to be cast or in any way or manner to do any act fraudulently, which may be calculated to affect the result of the election. Such offender shall be punished as stated in the preceding section. (Ibid.)

2249. Unconstitutionality of part shall not vitiate other parts: If any part or portion of this statute shall be void, ineffective, or unconstitutional, this shall not vitiate other portions of this statute. (1917, ch. 8, sec. 2.)

2250. Liberal construction in favor of right to vote; technical irregularities not favored; substantial compliance: Each and every part of this statute shall be liberally construed in favor of the right of the elector to cast his ballot under this law, as though he were present in person, casting the same. No mere technical irregularity shall be ground for the rejection of any ballot, but if the provisions of this statute are substantially complied with by the voter in good faith then his ballot shall be accepted and counted. (Ib. sec. 3.)

2251. Primary elections included: The provisions contained in the preceding sections shall be construed and held to apply to all primary elections to be held under and in accordance with the laws of this State. (1917, ch. 104, sec. 1.)

2252. Duties imposed upon primary election officers: Whenever a duty or duties is imposed upon or required of the chairman, secretary, or board of county election commissioners, in the above sections, the same duty or duties with respect to a primary election is imposed upon and required of all county primary election boards, their chairman, or secretaries, respectively. (Ibid. sec. 2)

2253. Violation: A violation of any of the provisions of said sections, by the chairman or secretary of the board of county primary elections, shall be deemed the same offense subject to the same punishment as is provided for the same violation by the chairman or secretary of the county election commissioners. (Ibid. sec. 3)

2254. Registration of absent voters; sworn statement: Any qualified voted who is compelled on account of the trade or occupation in which he is engaged to be absent from his home at the time voters are required under the laws of Tennessee to register in order to qualify them to vote, may register by sending by registered mail to the officer or officers holding the registration in the precinct, ward, or district in which such absent voter resides, a sworn statement that on all the days during which said registration is authorized by law to be held, said registrant was compelled, by reason of his trade or occupation, to be absent from his home. Said statement shall also recite that the person so desiring to register is entitled to be registered in said precinct, ward, or district. Said sworn statement shall give the place of residence of such absent voter, his occupation, his age, race, whether married or single, and the time of his residence in the State, and the county and city or town and ward or district in which he resides.

2255. To be enrolled and certificate of registration issued: On the receipt of the sworn statement so made out, it shall be the duty of the officers holding the registration in the precinct, ward, or district in which such absent voter desires to be registered, to enroll the name of said voter on the list of registered voters and issue to him a certificate of registration similar to the certificate issued to other registered voters, which certificate shall recite on its face that it was issued to a voter required to be absent on account of trade or business. Said registered list of voters shall also show that said voter was registered as an absent voter. (Ibid., sec. 2.)

2256. Sworn statement must be received before closing registration, and must be preserved; certificate of registration mailed: The sworn statement, referred to above, shall be actually received by the officers holding said registration before the expiration of the time during which said registration is authorized by law to be held, and no certificate of registration shall be issued by said officers if the sworn statement referred to above has been received after the time of the closing of registration.

2257. Certificate: The certificate of registration issued in conformity with the above provisions shall be mailed by the officers holding said registration to the place of residence of said absent registrant as given in the sworn statement above referred to. All such sworn statements shall be carefully preserved by the officers holding said registration, and shall by them be delivered to the election commissioners of the county. (Ibid., sec. 3.)

2258. Registering or attempting to do so by an unqualified person a misdemeanor: If any person registers or attempts to register under the provisions of this statute when he

is not qualified to do so, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and punished as provided by law for false or fraudulent registration. (Ibid., sec. 4.)

Wilson's Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following article from the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper, under date of December 10, 1943, entitled "Wilson's Rebuke":

WILSON'S REBUKE

(By Raymond Clapper)

This week I saw the new restricted War Department motion picture which is soon to be shown to war-plant workers around the country.

Everyone should have an opportunity to see it and I hope the War Department will release it generally. Especially it should be seen by the pressure groups around Washington, and some of those industrialists and others who are, in the words of Charles E. Wilson, of W. P. B., "trying to position themselves for the post-war period long before the country is out of danger and long before our fighting men have any chance to position themselves."

This War Department motion picture shows many German and Japanese newsreel shots. Mussolini is seen being rescued by Nazi paratroopers. There is the actual German film of this bedraggled, haggard figure in shabby civilian clothes as he meets Hitler. Hitler appears somewhat stooped and paunchy, not the trim, erect, overconfident figure I saw in Berlin in 1937. He and Goering and other high Nazis shown in the film looked like worried men to me.

Yet nothing about the film as a whole suggests an early end to the war. On the contrary, it shows both the Nazi and the Japanese as vicious and excellently equipped fighters. It may be that Germany will collapse in the next few months. Japan can go on a long time. The War Department picture makes it clear how the Japanese have spun a web of outer defenses covering thousands of miles of the Pacific. We are going to have many Tarawas before we even get at the real Japan. As Secretary of War Stimson says, the worst is yet to come.

The War Department picture was so rich in fresh material that you instinctively began to applaud at the end—yet the applause didn't really come off. Several hundred persons who saw the picture at the National Press Club felt, I suppose, much as I felt. You could not applaud when for an hour you had been seeing how our men are dying and how they will have to go on dying for quite some time. I saw familiar shots, taken in Sicily about the time I was there with the Seventh Army last summer. It all came back again, what I felt there and what I forget back here in the cozy warmth of home and friends—the hard chilling fact that war is killing and being killed.

Why did Charles E. Wilson, who resigned his $175,000 job as president of General Electric to work for $8,000 pushing production for W. P. B., feel impelled to go before his former industrialist associates at the convention of the National Association of Manufacturers and voice a sober rebuke?

Wilson said that from where he observed in Washington, it was appalling to see cliques and special interests separating out of the main body of the American war effort to work for their own private interests and ambitions. He said some of these want to win complete victory for themselves, regardless of the consequences for others and for the Nation. Wilson said that not since the Civil War has there been such need of unity and so few signs of it. He spoke with scorn of "an American breed of maggot," of men ready to spread the poison of hate at every turn, ready to plunge us into disastrous internal strife.

What Wilson says privately goes even beyond that. He has never voted for Roosevelt and probably never will, but he is shocked at the readiness of some industrialists to place their hate of Roosevelt above the Nation's war needs, and who regard nothing so important as getting him out of the White House. That was behind Wilson's remark in his N. A. M. address that this is a time when industrial leaders owe it to themselves to exercise temperate judgment and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity.

Apprehensions voiced in speeches this week by Speaker RAYBURN and Justice Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, who condemned pistol-packing pressure groups, together with the anxiety expressed by Wilson, reveal the deep concern of responsible men over the drift of affairs at home.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following by George Gallup entitled "Majority of Farmers Who Understand Subsidies Are in Favor of Them," dated December 8, 1943.

THE GALLUP POLL—MAJORITY OF FARMERS WHO UNDERSTAND SUBSIDIES ARE IN FAVOR OF THEM

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 8.—Claims made by farm leaders that the farmers of the country are opposed to the food-subsidy program must be accepted with important reservations, a survey of farm opinion indicates.

This study finds that, first, not many farmers have followed the discussions of the subsidy issue closely enough to have a very clear idea of what subsidies are.

Second, those farmers who do know about the subsidy program are by no means universally opposed to it. The opinion of those questioned in the survey seems to be about evenly divided at present, with a slight preponderance in favor.

ONE-THIRD UNDERSTAND

In conducting its study, the institute first sought to determine just how many farmers interviewed had any sort of idea what the term "farm subsidy" might mean.

The results show that 35 percent of those questioned—or about one third—appeared to have some understanding of the term, including 13 percent who indicated a fairly exact knowledge. The remainer—65 percent—either could not define the term or gave an incorrect definition.

In short, the subsidy issue has apparently not penetrated very deeply into the thinking of the great mass of farmers up to the present, though, of course, it may do so as time goes on.

NONFARMERS IN DOUBT

Much the same situation prevails among the nonfarm population as well, interviews with a cross section of the urban, small-town, and rural nonfarm population show that only about 29 percent seem to understand what is meant by food subsidies, while 71 percent do not.

Farmers and others who did indicate a knowledge of subsidies were then asked in the survey to give their ideas on what Congress should do about the subsidies program.

In the case of the farm population, interviewers report that up to the present about as many farmers favor the food-subsidy program as oppose it, in the case of the nonfarm population, however, the division is 2 to 1 in favor of subsidies.

Nullifying a Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of Dec. 10, 1943:

NULLIFYING A FREEDOM

Legislation is being considered in Congress which may determine within a few weeks whether or not the American people are to retain for themselves the fundamental freedoms for which our armed forces are supposedly battling in distant and alien lands.

The measure under discussion is a bill to amend the Federal Communications Act relating to the ownership and operating of radio broadcasting stations.

Unquestionably, the act greatly needs to be revised.

This is true because the Federal Communications Commission has arbitrarily misinterpreted and misapplied the law in such a manner as to confer totalitarian powers upon itself.

It is even more true because the Supreme Court has upheld this policy of bureaucratic usurpation of unauthorized powers, and there can be no redress except by another act of Congress.

And it is a matter of the gravest concern to the people of the United States because the Supreme Court, in order to arrive at its decision, had to disregard the Constitution and misconstrue the law as originally passed.

What Congress wisely sought to do in establishing the Federal Communications Commission was to abolish a chaos of conflicting wave lengths and radio frequencies which was making radio useless to anyone a few years ago—a simple problem of mechanical or technical regulation.

The Communications Commission was accordingly authorized to grant, withhold, revoke, or renew radio broadcasting licenses.

The act itself, as approved by Congress, expressly forbade Federal censorship.

With no more foundation than this, the Communications Commission committed its

deed of usurpation by asserting an ungranted power to dictate the kind of contracts made by broadcasting chains with their client stations.

When this aggression was carried into litigation, the New Deal's Supreme Court added an aggression of its own.

The court ruled that, when Congress empowered the Commission to license broadcasting stations, it also bestowed upon the Commission authority to determine the composition of radio traffic.

Obviously, therefore, according to the Supreme Court's interpretation of the statute, the Communications Commission may decide who shall or shall not have access to radio and to decree what shall or shall not be said by them.

The short and simple name for that kind of regulation is Government domination and censorship.

And what the Supreme Court has said Congress did was actually beyond the powers of Congress to do—for the first amendment to the Constitution specifically ordains that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech."

Under the usurpations of the Communications Commission and the Supreme Court's reactionary ruling, however, an extra-legal and extra-constitutional situation has been created which makes it necessary for Congress to amend the statute so as to prevent the Communications Commission from exercising censorship—and, incidentally, so as to bring the Supreme Court back within the confines of the Constitution.

For if bureaucrats are to make rules contravening the laws passed by Congress, and if the courts are to cloak these irresponsible ukases with superlegislative authority, then constitutional government is near its end in America and there is no right or liberty belonging to the people which may not be taken away from them without their assent.

This danger can be checked, and the freedom of radio speech fully safeguarded, by enactment of the Wheeler-White bill which the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce is considering.

In this particular matter, Congress would be best guided by accepting the experienced advice of a noncommunistic member of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. T. A. M. Craven.

In a recent appearance before a congressional investigating committee, Mr. Craven testified that the Communications Commission, which is strictly under New Deal domination, has repeatedly gone beyond the law in arrogating power to itself.

He said the Commission has undertaken upon itself legislative acts and adopted policies not granted it by Congress.

Mr. Craven emphasized the menace implied in the Supreme Court decision that the Commission may regulate the composition of radio programs.

The decision, he said—

"* * * strikes at the very core of free radio in a free democratic country like ours."

Mr. Craven likewise warned that there can be no real freedom of radio so long as the Communications Commission is permitted to use its authority to license broadcasting stations as a weapon of coercion.

A free radio cannot exist, he maintained, unless there is freedom from fear of Government reprisal.

Finally, declaring that the public interest calls for reasonable regulation by reasonable men, Mr. Craven told the congressional committee that the Federal Communications Commission as now constituted is actuated by the doctrine of instituting social reforms through seizing powers not granted to it—which is, of course, a major communistic malady of the whole New Deal.

The foregoing testimony recalls a speech made by Commissioner Craven in November before the section on administrative law of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

"This situation," he said, "should be clarified by legislation which prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the composition of radio traffic or in any other way, directly or indirectly, promulgating any regulations or fixing any condition which would interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

The American people should realize the importance to themselves of this issue.

It is not now merely a technical question of how radio broadcasting shall be regulated.

It is much more a question of whether or not radio broadcasting is to be perverted into an instrument of totalitarianism in America.

More broadly still, it is a question of whether or not bureaucrats shall transgress the legislative powers invested solely in Congress; or whether or not Federal courts shall observe the provisions of the Constitution in construing legislative and departmental orders, and of whether or not the Bill of Rights shall be preserved or be stealthily sapped away.

Farmers' Tax Dead Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, day after tomorrow, December 15, is the dead line for the farmers of this country to file their 1943 income tax estimates. It is important that these returns be filed on time. But, it is also important that the farmers be properly informed as to when and where and how these returns are to be filed in order that they not be subjected to penalties with which and about which they are not familiar. We must bear in mind that thousands of farmers who heretofore have not been subject to income tax payments are now required to file returns and pay an income tax. To this end I believe that the Treasury officials should bear in mind the lack of facilities available to the farmers to acquire proper information as to procedure and be as lenient as possible with those few who may not meet the exact dead line. I do not believe there is a farmer in the United States who does not want to pay his just tax and do his full part in the prosecution of and payment for the war, but he must be properly advised.

The following editorial from the Madison Journal, a rural newspaper published in Tallulah, La., will, I am sure, be of interest to Members of this Congress:

FARMERS' TAX DEAD LINE

On or before December 15, farmers must file a declaration of estimated 1943 income, since they were not required to file a tax return on September 15. No forms or material will be mailed, yet those required to file will incur penalties if they fail to make their returns by December 15.

Instruction pamphlets on this subject have been sent to agricultural extension county agents and home-demonstration agents, who are entrusted with the task of acquainting farmers with their obligation. The agents will not, however, supply material or forms, which must be obtained from the nearest deputy revenue collector's office, either by applying in person or by mail. These offices are located at Baton Rouge, Monroe, Shreveport, Alexandria, Houma, Lafayette, Lake Charles and Bogalusa. The chief collector's office is in New Orleans.

Farmers, after filling out their returns, may submit them to county agents solely for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are properly executed. The agents are not permitted to make out returns. They will, however, supply desired information on procedure.

Two other groups besides farmers must also file returns: (1) Persons whose incomes did not require filing in September; and (2) persons who substantially underestimated their tax when they filed in September and now must file an amended declaration to avoid penalties.

For people who filed a declaration on September 15 but paid only part of their tax bill, December 15 will be a tax payment date. This group will be mailed a bill for the amount they owe. These will also be subject to a penalty if they do not pay by December 15.

December 15 declarations and tax payments are another step in getting all taxpayers on a substantially current basis on their income tax; it is part of the transition to pay-as-you-go. The taxes withheld from wages cover only minimum tax rates. And of course withholding does not cover certain types of income (incomes from farming, investment income, earnings of professional men and people who own their own businesses, etc.). Declarations and quarterly payments are a means of getting people with such sources of income and wage earners not in the minimum tax brackets on a substantially current basis with their taxes.

Columbia River Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the means and the spirit developed here at home to win the war may be used also as we prepare and work for the winning of the peace.

The Columbia River is doing a great service to this Nation today—let us keep that river at work—to win the peace.

In this connection I call your attention to this splendid editorial from the Spokane Spokesman-Review:

WESTERN POWER MAY HELP PAY OFF DEBT

There is some sound economy and good logic in the recent utterances in Spokane of Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville power administrator, who takes the long-range view of power development in the West. With a national debt of $300,000,000,000 facing us, he says, the one hope of paying it off is to produce more goods to sell.

That is where western power comes into the picture. It is both cheap and abundant. Grand Coulee-Bonneville power is the cheapest wholesale power in the world. It offers a potential power resource on the Columbia River alone equal to half the total present development in the United States.

There are some pessimists who fear the end of the war will leave the West with a vast unneeded supply of power. They wonder

what will be done with it. Dr. Raver says the advent of new industries attracted by this cheap power will more than compensate and outweigh any temporary loss of the power market following the cessation of war.

The huge national debt, he says, will hang over the head of western resources as a great mortgage until it is paid off. To pay it off, in part at least, western resources must be turned into goods to be sold.

Many of these lie at Spokane's doorstep. He mentioned new ore discoveries at the Metaline Falls district which will be good for 80 years. He cited the dolomite mountains in Stevens County, the magnesite deposits, the country's greatest phosphate beds and the unlimited possibilities of the 1,200,000 acres to be irrigated in the Columbia Basin. Free enterprise, he says, will bring about their maximum development before long.

It is well to note his observations. He does not believe in selling the western part of the United States short.

Harsh Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, timely and to the point, the attached editorial appearing in the Daily Oklahoman offers much food for thought. I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all who run may read:

HARSH WORDS

Harsh words are employed by Senator GUFFEY when he imputes a lack of patriotism to those who rewrote the Federal absentvoters bill and charges all of those who opposed the original bill with entering into an unholy conspiracy. It is neither unpatriotic nor conspiratorial to differ from the loquacious Senator from Pennsylvania.

Harsh words are employed by Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma, when he charges that the original bill was a deliberate attempt to steal a Presidential election. He is speaking of some of his fellow Senators when he makes that charge, and the country will be slow to believe that a stolen election was the objective of those who fashioned and supported the original absent-voters bill.

But regardless of the motives and conceded honesty of the bill's supporters, the bill itself was the most amazing legislative offering in our history. Actually it sought to place the ballots of possibly as many as 10,000,000 voters in the hands of one of the Presidential candidates. He was to name four commissioners to direct the election, supply the ballots, collect the ballots, count the ballots, and make out returns from which there could be no appeal. The bill further provided specifically that "no mere informality" could invalidate any vote that was cast. And the four appointees of the candidate were to be judges of all informalities.

Nor was the privilege of voting confined to men and women in uniform. The privilege was extended to Red Cross workers the wide world over. It was extended to the merchant marine. It was extended to workers in the ambassadorial and consular services, some of whom have lived abroad for perhaps 20 years. Of course no mention was made of anybody except the man or woman in uniform. It was counted more effective to wrap this legislative wonder in the uniform and the flag.

Moreover, the supporters of the bill fought with an almost insane fury every effort to make the bill fair and honest and decent. In every contest between possible crookedness and probable honesty, the bill's supporters voted as a unit in favor of the provision that left the bill wide open to possible electoral frauds. And while we believe that Senator MOORE was too harsh and entirely wrong when he said the purpose of the bill's promoters was to steal an election, it must be conceded that the content of the bill and the tactics of its supporters supplied some reason for wondering if the bill submitted was not literally crowded with crawling bugs.

Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, quoting from your stirring address before this House on Thursday, December 9, 1943: "If the Army and Navy cannot run this war better than any civilian, then we should have done away with West Point and Annapolis a long time ago."

Graduates of the academies are maintaining every tradition of the two services. American officers are demonstrating the wisdom of highly specialized training. Former midshipmen and cadets, now admirals and generals, are directing our boys and our girls in each war theater. On land, on sea, and in the air, graduates of Annapolis and West Point are carrying the fight to our enemies. They are battling to preserve those ideals which make America the world's greatest democracy.

Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, commandant of the Twelfth Naval District, justifies every confidence the Nation has reposed in him.

With a background of his Annapolis education Sailor John W. Greenslade has made an enviable record. Among many coveted service-medal awards are—

Spanish American War, 1898.
Philippines.
Cuban Pacification.
Mexican Service.
Victory With Mine Layer Clasp.
Distinguished Service.
American Service.

Since April 29, 1941, Admiral Greenslade has been in charge of the Twelfth Naval District with headquarters in San Francisco—one of the most important assignments in the whole world. He has handled the thousand-and-one details incident to operating and convoying the gigantic fleet of naval and merchant vessels operating out of San Francisco. He has supervised construction of fighting ships building on San Francisco Bay. He has arranged for construction of great shore improvements—notably the Hunters Point repair basin, which is destined to be the greatest base of its kind on either side of the Pacific.

Admiral Greenslade should be kept in active service, and I am attaching an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco News as of Monday, December 6, 1943. The article is captioned "We need the admiral":

WE NEED THE ADMIRAL

Solely because we believe he is and has been doing a vital service to the bay area, we hope the reports are wrong about the Navy planning to retire Vice Admiral John Wills Greenslade, the Twelfth Naval District commandant, early next year because of his reaching the statutory age limit.

Of course, the Navy's affairs, particularly in wartime, are largely the Navy's own business, but we admit we would like to "put in an oar" enough to at least keep Admiral Greenslade available to lend his sound advice and vision to the problems San Francisco and northern California face now and in the post-war period.

He has been a powerful and intelligent influence for this area, much more than the public can be told in these times. He has been commandant during the period when San Francisco Bay has become one of the world's leading naval bases.

And his advice has been sought and given on some of the most perplexing problems our civilian leaders have encountered. The admiral, we feel, can walk our bridge just about any time he so desires, and we hope that if the Navy Department changes his status in any way, we'll have Admiral Greenslade still standing by, whether in gold braid or civvies, as one of our community leaders.

Extended Compensation for World War No. 2 Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have given a great deal of thought to the moral responsibility of the Representatives in Congress toward the veterans of this global war which we are now engaged in. I feel that we have a duty and a responsibility to introduce and pass before the end of this war proper legislation to provide adequate protection and to a certain extent at least compensate the members of our armed forces during the period immediately following demobilization day.

In reviewing the suffering and dislocation following the post-war era of World War No. 1, we certainly have a background of what not to do. We all recall the long period of unemployment and discouragement which many of our soldiers endured after their discharge and before they could readjust themselves to civilian life. We also recall the bitter strife and confusion aroused by the adjusted compensation drive, or as it was more popularly known, the so-called bonus plan. For 17 years, this question was footballed politically, causing alternate feelings of hope, discouragement, and bitterness in the minds of our returned veterans. It was finally settled, after a fashion. How much better would it have been had this question been disposed of before the soldiers had returned.

In order to avoid history's repeating itself, I deem it the duty of Congress to

take action now. I have confidence that Congress will take action this time, before the war ends. Many bills have been introduced along this line already. On April 21, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2559 for the purpose of settling this important question. After a great deal of study and consultation with the attorneys of the different veterans' organizations, whose help and advice I thankfully acknowledge, I introduced a substitute bill, H. R. 3735, which I believe is worthy of consideration.

My new bill (H. R. 3735) was introduced on November 24, 1943, and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I request that the bill be printed in the Journal.

H. R. 3735

A bill to provide for the readjustment and rehabilitation of veterans in the present war, during the post-war period by the extension of compensation after honorable discharge from the service, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in section 3, as additional compensation for service in the land and naval forces of the United States during the present war—

(1) to every individual who (A) serves in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending with the date on which the President proclaims the termination of hostilities in the present war, and (B) is separated from such service under honorable conditions or is released from active duty, the sum of $100 per month for 12 consecutive months (hereinafter called the "payment period");

(2) to the person or persons entitled under part II of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a) to receive a pension on account of the death of any individual who (A) serves in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending with the date on which the President proclaims the termination of hostilities in the present war, and (B) while so serving dies as a result of an injury or disease received in the line of duty, the sum of $1,200 in the aggregate, to be distributed among such persons (in case there is more than one) in the ratio in which they are entitled to receive such pension; and

(3) in the case of any individual described in paragraph (1) who dies before receiving the amount he is entitled to receive under this act, to the person or persons who are entitled under part II of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a) to receive a pension on account of the death of such individual (or would be so entitled if such death had resulted from an injury or a disease received in line of duty during the present war), the sum such individual was entitled to receive under this act minus the amount received by him thereunder prior to his death, to be distributed among such persons (in case there is more than one) in the ratio in which they are entitled to receive such pension.

(b) The payment period provided for in subsection (a) (1) shall begin on the 1st day of the first month beginning more than 30 days after whichever of the following dates is the later—

(1) the date of separation from service or release from active duty; or

(2) the date 15 days after the date of enactment of this act;

except that the individual concerned may, by filing notice with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in such form and within such time as the administrator may by regulations prescribe, postpone the beginning of the payment period to the 1st day of any future month of his own choosing.

(c) When the beginning of the payment period has been postponed the aggregate amount which the individual is entitled to receive during the payment period shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum during the period for which the beginning of the payment period is postponed, and such interest shall be paid biannually during such period of postponement.

(d) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall promptly notify the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the separation from service or release from active duty of every person entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) (1), and of the death as a result of injury or disease received in the line of duty of every person on account of whose death any other person is entitled to the benefits of subsection (a) (2).

(e) Payment under subsection (a) (2) and (3) shall be made only after claim therefor is made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs containing such information as the administrator may prescribe as necessary to prove that the claimant is entitled to receive such payment.

(f) Payments due or to become due, and payments made, under this act shall be subject to the provisions of section 3, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pensions, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1935.

SEC. 2. The payment and acceptance of the additional compensation provided in this act shall constitute settlement in full of all claims by the recipient for extended or adjusted compensation not now provided by law, or other like payments not so provided which are based upon service in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war and are not compensation for, or incidental to compensation for death, injury, or disease incurred in line of duty during the present war.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The prime purpose of this bill is to provide for the readjustment and rehabilitation of the veterans of the present war, during the post-war period, by the extension of compensation, payable monthly for a period of 12 months after discharge. I have made this payable to every individual who serves in the armed forces during the wartime period, without regard to length or point of geographical service. My justification for this is threefold:

First. The disruption of their private lives.

Second. Their availability to the Government and equal chance of exposure to danger.

Third. Simplicity of administration.

BILL PROVIDES FOR FLAT SUM OF $100 PER MONTH FOR 12 MONTHS

The bill provides for a flat sum of $100 per month for 12 months, regardless of rank or pay of the individual during his term of service. My reasons for this are as follows:

First. The aggregate amount of $1,200 was approximately the average amount received by those in the service during World War No. 1, and therefore has the prestige of precedent.

Second. The amount involved is a reasonable amount from the standpoint of legislative approval and a readjustment cushion for the individual.

Third. The fact that those who are now serving overseas or in foreign service draw 20 percent additional pay is justification for the same severance compensation for all.

I have included in sections 2 and 3 the proper protection in regard to the rights of heirs.

I have included in section B (2) page 3, lines 17–21, the privilege of postponement of payment period by the veteran to a period of his own choosing. In case of postponement, the aggregate amount of $1,200 shall yield a rate of interest of 3 percent per annum during the period of postponement and, of course, shall remain in trust of the Government.

On page 4, paragraph F, lines 17–23, I have included the usual "fraud" protections.

In section 2, pages 4–5, I have included what may be the most controversial part of the bill, although I think such a provision may be necessary to obtain legislative approval of such action. Briefly, it provides that the payment of the sum of $1,200 shall "settle in full all claims for monetary compensation" as a result of service of the individual in the armed forces. It is my understanding that this clause applies only to those who are discharged in good physical condition.

It does not preclude hospitalization, etc., along this line. It is my further understanding that it would not preclude the acceptance of vocational or educational training, either to able or disabled soldiers. As I understand it, the settlement-in-full clause applies only to those who are discharged in good physical condition and refers to "monetary" claims only.

You will note that I have specified that the administration of this act shall be charged to the Veterans' Administration, in order that their accumulated experience and established personnel might be utilized.

It is my opinion that, in order to prevent the recurrence of the bonus problem, with its attendant evils and social complications, as demonstrated following World War No. 1, some well-defined, easily administered plan should be decided on now before the war is over. I fear for the effect upon our democratic institutions if we leave this inevitable problem to the mercies of those who will use it for a political football in the critical years following the present war.

I do not take the position that this bill is perfect, but I have presented it after a great deal of thought, in a spirit of earnestness and solicitude for the veterans of this war, with the sincere hope that it may be the entering wedge of a plan of readjustment for the returning soldiers.

I earnestly solicit the consideration of my colleagues on this important subject. I hope the important Committee on Military Affairs will allow hearings and report this bill if they deem it fulfills the purposes I have noted. The important thing to America is that this principle of

extended or discharge compensation be enacted into law before the end of this war. I intend to support this principle whether my bill is reported or not.

The adoption of this principle will be a great force in improving the morale of our troops and removing the fear and uneasiness from their minds, when they think of the uncertainty of their financial and economic status during the post-war demobilization period.

What Started Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope of November 18, 1943. It was written by A. Q. Miller, Sr., and has been copied generally by the press in our State:

WHAT STARTED INFLATION?

(By A. Q. Miller, Sr.)

There is a growing rift between the President and Congress because the President persists in blaming the law-making body for the short-comings of the New Deal. The latest move on the part of the White House is to blame Congress for the impending inflation which is bound to come, because of the administration's policy of pandering to organized labor and granting this specially favored group one wage increase after another—which is a sure road to inflation.

Congress has declined to subscribe to the philosophy that creating an artificial or real shortage of commodities by Executive order, then rationing the scarcity, is a sound solution of our economic problems. A majority of Congressmen believe in the fundamental law of supply and demand, with limited governmental reservations, and in the principle of more production instead of less production.

The conflict between the President and Congress for the moment has drifted into an argument over the policy of subsidies to control prices, which means the taking of tax money out of the Treasury and handing it over to processors, manufacturers, and producers instead of stabilizing both commodities and wages. The promised roll-back of farm prices which is urged by organized labor, is also involved in this controversy. The War Labor Board is constantly changing the Little Steel formula and raising wages of certain groups of organized labor, completely ignoring the great middle class, known as the white-collar group, which is not organized to put pressure on Washington.

Admittedly, inflation is caused by too much buying power in the hands of the people—more money than goods available—but farm groups and certain Congressmen contend that the President seems willing to increase the buying power of labor groups without conceding the same privilege to farm groups or producers. They fail to see that there is any difference in the inflationary influence of money whether it be in the pockets of the farmer or laborer.

The President has told Congress and the country that he proposes to go ahead with his subsidy program roll-back of farm prices regardless of what farm groups or Congressmen from agricultural States think, when it is generally admitted that such a course will be a sure road to inflation.

Now let's take a look at this thing called inflation—increased buying power—and see how it got started. The New Deal which has been none too thrifty or zealous about saving the taxpayer's money, started inflation when it permitted contractors to bid up prices on Government contracts and approved the cost-plus policy. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it encouraged a 40-hour week and time and one-half for overtime when there was a shortage of manpower in the country. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it permitted defense workers and other Government employees to draw exorbitant wages, including the payment of union racket fees for the privilege of working for the Government. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it drew Government workers from the farm, factories, and private industries and paid them exorbitant wages, while it denied this same right and privilege to private industry. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it permitted the willful and deliberate waste of lumber, steel, and other critical materials in war contracts and used public funds to replace this profligate waste. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it picked out special labor groups, ignoring the white-collar group, and increased their wages beyond the Little Steel formula, which was the standard or yardstick set up by the War Labor Board. The New Deal encouraged inflation when it employed at high wages 3,000,000 Government clerks, stenographers, auditors, inspectors, lawyers, publicity directors, public-relations officials, so-called efficiency experts and technicians to write complicated Government regulations, formulas, questionnaires, and letters to further confuse and perplex the tired, overworked taxpayer on the home front who is working 50 or more hours a week—without overtime—struggling to keep his business from bankruptcy.

So it comes with poor grace for the President or anyone else to charge Congress—the only remaining link between the people and their Government—with being responsible for inflation. Every American citizen should search for the truth in this critical hour—because "the truth will make them free."

Bureaucracy Run Rampant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in my hand I hold a short Associated Press release which states that Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut, has been informed by the Director of Office of Economic Stabilization, Fred M. Vinson, that the Governor's request for a Federal-State conference about Connecticut's milk problems "cannot be granted at this time." The reason given the Governor was that such a conference "would leave the door open for any and all Governors to ask for and receive similar treatment."

This is an example of bureaucracy run rampant. It is a fine state of affairs when the Governor of a sovereign State cannot confer with a bureaucrat in the Federal Government, particularly when the subject of the desired conference is of such vital importance, not only to the milk producers of Connecticut but to every consumer of milk. If this Congress ever relinquishes control of the purse-strings it will see the day when these same bureaucrats will refuse to confer with Members of Congress:

VINSON REFUSES TO TALK WITH GOVERNOR ON MILK

HARTFORD, CONN., December 9.—Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin reported yesterday that he had been informed by the Office of Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson that his request for a Federal-State conference about Connecticut's milk problems "cannot be granted at this time."

The reason given, the Governor said after a telephone conversation with Mr. Vinson's secretary, was that such a conference "would leave the door open for any and all Governors to ask for and receive similar treatment."

He said he was "by no means giving up the fight" to present a picture of Connecticut's milk production problems to Washington officialdom and to get an answer to producer demands for higher ceiling prices.

No Subsidized Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Hartford Courant of December 9. I do not know when, if ever, this bill to subsidize a nondaily newspaper will be brought up in the House, but I want the RECORD to show that this editorial expresses my views exactly:

NO SUBSIDIZED PRESS

The House Ways and Means Committee has killed three bills, including the one passed by the Senate, which would provide Government payments for advertisements of War bonds in daily, triweekly, semiweekly, and weekly newspapers in communities of less than 10,000 population, and in nondailies in larger cities. The committee apparently was not influenced by the argument that the Government needed this coverage to promote the sales of its securities in the smaller communities.

That argument is pure bunk. In the first place the homes in those communities are reached through the larger newspapers and the radio. Furthermore, the records of bond sales do not disclose that the inhabitants of Crow Creek or Red Hill are remiss in their duty to support the war financially. In fact, right in Connecticut it is probable that the small towns are as fully and as well organized to promote sales of War bonds as are the larger cities. Nor should the fact be overlooked that the war is as close to the millions of homes in the villages and rural areas of the Nation as it is to the urban dweller. Millions of sons and daughters of those communities are in the services. No special treatment, advertising or otherwise, is required to

make suburban folk as war conscious as are other people. They are not parochial and uninformed, whereas those are characteristics of the supporters of the bills now pigeonholed by the Ways and Means Committee.

So transparently unsound is the argument for special consideration of the smaller papers that suspicion is cast upon the purpose of the bill. It smacks too much of subsidization. However, it would be surprising indeed if any considerable numbers of editors of those newspapers desired or sought to be placed in a category apart from their metropolitan colleagues. The small-town newspaperman is usually a rather independent and courageous individual, pleading for no special favors, Government bestowed or otherwise. His patriotism is not measurable in dollars and cents invested by the Treasury Department in the advertising columns of his publication. We expect that when the Fourth Bond Drive opens these editors will again give ample space to the campaign. Only those who place a dollar sign on their public service will view with resentment the action of the Ways and Means Committee.

Thinking It Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas F. Woodlock, from the Wall Street Journal:

THINKING IT OVER

(By Thomas F. Woodlock)

We had, last week, the somewhat unusual spectacle of a member of an administration agency telling a committee of Congress that the agency in question had been seeking to accomplish "social reforms" by usurping powers not delegated to it by Congress or misusing the powers that it lawfully possessed. The agency is the Federal Communications Commission, and the member who thus impeached it is Commissioner T. A. M. Craven. His statement was made in the course of a hearing by a committee of the Senate on the Wheeler-White bill which deals, among other things, with the matter of radio broadcasting. Another witness made similar charges against the Commission.

Under the law creating this Commission, broadcasting stations must obtain a license from the Commission before they can operate. Licenses are granted for 6 months and must be renewed at the end of that period. The power of the Commission to grant licenses, to deny them, to grant renewals, or deny them is very wide in scope and leaves a broad field for action either way without clear limitations on exercise of that power. Anyone who knows anything of the broadcasting industry knows that it lives always in fear of this power against which recourse to the courts of law is available only upon evidence of gross misuse. The burden of Mr. Craven's charge and of the charge of the other witness at last Wednesday's hearing is that the Commission has used this power to control the programs distributed by broadcasters over their respective stations by holding over their owners' heads the threat of termination of their licenses if they do not arrange their programs to suit the taste of the Commission.

This writer will not, of course, assume the truth of these charges. But he will assert that this Commission's general behavior and its general attitude on this question as expressed, in particular by its chairman Mr. Fly, discloses a concept of its duties which is, or should be, inadmissible in administrative law in general and in the case of this particular agency especially improper, seeing that it involves the freedom of speech. It exemplifies what is perhaps the greatest danger in the whole question of administrative law; that is, what Mr. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, felicitously termed "zealotry" on the part of the administrative officials. This expresses itself in the attempt by "zealous" advocates of social reforms to employ the necessarily large powers entrusted to them for the purpose of advancing such "reforms" in ways never intended by the Congress which gave them those powers. The simple and fundamental fact is, as Mr. Eastman said, that such "zealotry" is a disqualification for administrative office which admits of no exception. Exactly the same principle was enunciated nearly a dozen years ago in no uncertain terms by the British Parliamentary Commission on Ministers' power. Readers may remember that what this Commission had to say on this subject has been several times quoted by the present writer. He will not now quote it again; it can be found on page 78 of that report.

Now in the light of that principle Mr. Fly, and the members of the Commission who agree with him, stand disqualified for their positions on the Commission. This is in no sense a reflection on their character, for "zealotry," as such, is no defect in a man or woman, in fact, quite the reverse. But it is a reflection upon the propriety of their appointments, and, therefore, upon the concept that dictated those appointments. Moreover, the case of the Federal Communications Commission is not an isolated case. We have had in the last dozen years other instances, too many of them, and everyone knows it. And this sort of thing must be eliminated from our governmental system if we are to escape what might develop into a system of bureaucratic despotism.

There are places for the zealot in our political structure, namely, the legislatures. But he must be kept off the court benches and out of the administrative agencies. Only public opinion, however, can do it and it is high time that public opinion woke up to the need for doing it.

Statement of Hon. Marvin Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Hon. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator:

I hope we may have early action on the subsidy question.

Whatever the result, final action should be had at the earliest possible date.

We can't continue to fight for months while production waits and expect the full production that is so vital to the war effort.

The farmer needs to know now so that his production plans can be made.

Extreme statements have been made on both sides, and this has added to the confusion.

There is nothing new about a subsidy. It is as old as the tariff. Selective subsidies can be used to advantage, but their too general use might destroy the advantage to be gained from them.

This is not the only problem of the farmer. He needs machinery, repair parts, labor, feed, seed, and fertilizer materials. In addition, he must face the uncertainty of the seasons.

The subsidy fight has clouded these other needs.

The farmer will produce if we see that he gets the tools, labor, and other essentials, and then get out of his way. He has done his part in every emergency since the birth of the Republic. He will do his part in this the greatest of all emergencies. But he needs to know.

The present program has produced results. We have the food. We cannot afford to take chances on future production. Support prices have proven their value. They assure the producer through the planting, harvesting, and marketing season against the added hazards and risks of expanded production. At the same time they help to stabilize prices generally. Above all, the producer needs to know definitely in advance what he can rely on.

Food is not a political issue. It is a critical war material, and I respect it as such.

I appeal for an early decision. Then I hope we can unite in securing all-out production. Politics can wait. Food can't.

Blue Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles pertaining to the Blue Star Mothers, published in the Flint News-Advertiser, of Flint, Mich.

The Blue Star Mothers organization was first organized in the State of Michigan, and the organization has spread in leaps and bounds due to the wonderful work that it is doing for our fine boys in service, and also in building up morale of the folks on the home front:

GOVERNOR PROCLAIMS DECEMBER 7 BLUE STAR MOTHERS' DAY

Michigan is the birthplace of a national organization of mothers who have one or more sons in the armed forces of the United States. Known as the Blue Star Mothers of America, this organization has, in a brief time, created a noble tradition of service.

Feeling the full weight of the worry and anxiety imposed by their motherhood, the members of this organization have, nevertheless, dedicated themselves to the task of subjugating their personal benefactions to broader demands of service. And they have achieved this objective in a sense which holds to the finest traditions of the State and Nation.

No home-front war effort has been without their accord and their active support. In addition they have initiated and carried to successful conclusion many projects for the comfort of our men at arms or in the interests of victory.

Theirs has been an inspiring example of the support and encouragement which so

clearly tells our fighting men that those at home are in this war with them to the end.

Therefore, I, Harry F. Kelly, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim December 7, 1943, Blue Star Mothers' Day, and I call upon all citizens to pay honor to this inspired group of women and to their achievements.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-three, and of the Commonwealth, the one hundred and seventh.

HARRY F. KELLY,
Governor.

By the Governor:

HERMAN H. DIGNAN,
Secretary of State.

GET MESSAGE FROM LEADER—GOVERNOR KELLY PROCLAIMS FATEFUL DECEMBER 7 BLUE STAR MOTHERS' DAY

Flint members of the Blue Star Mothers of America today will join with members of the service mothers' organization throughout Michigan and the Nation in prayer for their sons and daughters in the armed services following a message for such observance from Mrs. Esther M. Whetzel, of Mount Clemens, State Blue Star president, and Governor Kelly's proclamation declaring December 7 Blue Star Mothers' Day.

In her message, Mrs. Whetzel called for a renewed consecration of service on the part of the mothers to their fighting sons and daughters.

"The hearts of mothers of fighting men are wrung with the ravages of war, and their souls bleed from the cruel price of a world of tyranny, injustice, greed, and the lusts of power and ambition of Axis dictatorship," Mrs. Whetzel stated.

"Peace is no thing remote from individual concern or practice," she said. "While war is national, the causes of war trace to the lack of human integrity, the absence of an ingrained philosophy of decency and fair play in the social, economic, and political practices of domestic and international affairs, and in individual relations."

Mrs Whetzel asked for a return of individual integrity and a practice of justice and fair play in every human relationship.

"Pearl Harbor and peace point to national preparedness and world cooperation," she advised her Blue Star Mother membership.

Governor Kelly issued a proclamation last week in Lansing designating Pearl Harbor Day as Blue Star Mothers' Day.

As secretary of state, Governor Kelly was the principal speaker at the first convention of this war mother's organization at the time the national association was established.

Sponsored by the Flint News-Advertiser, through the efforts of Capt. George H. Maines, one of the founders of the American Legion, the Blue Star Mother movement grew from a small unit in Flint, to become an organization with members in every State. There are more than 500,000 Blue Star mothers.

Groups have spontaneously been organized everywhere as a result of the News-Advertiser's early sponsorship. The Cleveland Plain Dealer, crediting this newspaper and its enterprise, sponsored Blue Star Mothers in Ohio and more than 80,000 members have been enrolled in Cleveland and vicinity.

Newspapers and radio stations across the Nation heralded the movement, and supported the program. Hundreds of Blue Star Mother units sprung up that were not affiliated with each other, representing thousands of war mothers.

The Flint national office has been swamped with request from these mothers to affiliate and it is for this purpose that a national charter from the Government is being sought. A bill, Senate Resolution 1269, is now before the United States Senate Judiciary Committee for consideration.

If this bill is reported out, and passed by Congress, it will be possible to merge all Blue Star Mother units into one national organization.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following letter that appeared in the Peoples' Forum of the Hartford Courant of Saturday, December 11, on the subject of subsidies. Also an editorial appearing in the same paper on the same date which seems to quite adequately answer the argument advanced in the letter to which I have referred:

PRO-SUBSIDY ARGUMENT—NORTHWEST CONGRESS CLUB CITES O. P. A. TABLES IN DEFENSE

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

The Northwest Congress Club has as its aim discussing and acting upon issues pending in Congress that affect the average citizen vitally and aid in strengthening our administration's anti-inflation program. Toward this end we have taken a definite stand on the current subsidy program. Without subsidies it would be impossible to hold the line against inflation. The entire price structure would collapse. This is the opinion of President Roosevelt and Price Administrator Chester Bowles. To quote Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture: "Without subsidies to hold down consumer prices, the cost of food must go up both to producers and consumers. As a result, there would be higher wages permitted. That would be the start of an inflationary cycle."

A frequent argument against subsidies is that the entire cost is borne by the consumer in the form of taxes. This is not true. The following table by O. P. A.'s Robert Pettengill proves that even if it were true the net saving to the consumer would still be great.

Without subsidy	
Producer's cost	$1.00
Plus wholesale mark-up—percent	20
Plus retail mark-up—percent	30
Cost to consumer	$1.56
With subsidy	
Producer's cost	$1.00
Government subsidy, minus	.20
	.80
Plus wholesale mark-up—percent	20
	$0.96
Plus retail mark-up—percent	30
Cost to consumer	$1.25
Cost to consumer without subsidy	1.56
Cost to consumer with subsidy	1.25
Gross saving	.31
Cost of subsidy	.20
Net saving	.11

Our organization has circulated throughout the city a leaflet stating in substance the above information urging citizens to register their support of the subsidy program with their Congressmen. The response to this leaflet has been highly successful, and more letter writing to Congress will insure the maintenance of subsidies as a method for controlling prices.

(Mrs.) ELIZABETH LITTLE,
Secretary, the Northwest Congress Club.

PHONY SUBSIDY PROFITS

In the People's Forum today is published a letter from the Northwest Congress Club in support of subsidies. By the use of an ingenious table of figures, Hartford housewives are told how profitable subsidies are for the consumer. But will the main thesis and the deductions therefrom stand up under analysis?

To begin with, both the without subsidy and the with subsidy examples assume that the producer sells at cost. Is not the producer entitled to a profit? How is he to stay in business without it? We have, in discussing the subsidy issue, always distinguished between consumer and producer subsidies. We have approved, for instance, the subsidy to copper miners as entirely justified in the national emergency. Production was needed, and there was no other reasonable way to get the copper.

We simply suggest that, if we are to have any economy to subsidize, even by the O. P. A.'s inflationary plan, Mr. Pettingill, author of the illuminating examples of profitable (?) subsidies, should have permitted the producer to make a small profit or at least paid him one just to keep him in business. Neither industry nor agriculture can continue to operate on the principle of simply one new dollar for every old one. If the farmer, for example, spends a dollar to grow a bushel of potatoes, it makes no financial difference to him whether he sells that bushel to a wholesaler for one dollar, or to the wholesaler for 80 cents, and a 20-cent Government subsidy to make up the difference in costs. In either case he has no profit on which to live.

Mr. Pettingill should have, in this instance, first applied his subsidy as a profit and then allowed the mark-ups on the $1 cost to the wholesaler and the retailer. Figured that way—and that is the only method in the given example to keep production going—the consumer's cost price would be $1.56, cost plus profits, plus the 20-cent subsidy—a total of $1.76.

However, being human, we are fascinated by the proposition that we can have a net saving from any amount that we may invest in subsidies. If the argument is sound, if the example cited in the letter stands analysis, it is as certain as are death and taxes that this country has neglected a lush source of income. In fact, by placing a few dollars in a subsidy pool, we might have made enough money to pay all our taxes. Especially do we wish we could take care of Mr. Morgenthau's little December 15 assessment that easily. Just why didn't somebody think of this subsidy pot of pure gold long ago? Perhaps we were wrong in calling subsidies fool's gold in the recent dark ages before Mr. Pettingill enlightened us.

Just what, however, do these savings figures here reveal? Simply that the consumer has taken 20 cents from his or her purse, handed it over to Uncle Sam who, in turn, pays it out in a subsidy so that the consumer can have a net saving of 11 cents. Yes, that is precisely the true situation—you spend 20 cents and get back 11. The pot of gold has vanished. In fact, 9 cents of your hard-earned wages has gone with it.

Our correspondent tells us that the response to this leaflet (telling people how to get back 11 cents on a 20-cent investment)

has been highly successful. Well, what Mr. Barnum said about one being born every minute may still be true. But we doubt if any person who takes even a few minutes to study the figures will be taken in by them.

What does amaze us is that the O. P. A. should deal in such deceitful propaganda. For several weeks past Mr. Bowles of that agency has been proclaiming that a billion dollars spent for subsidies would save the consumers several times that amount. In that claim we can take no stock whatever. Since one of his assistants has so kindly reduced that financial legerdemain to a concrete illustration, we now know that Mr. Bowles is altogether wrong.

Finally, the O. P. A. is guilty of perpetrating a cruel hoax upon the Nation by the manipulation of these figures. The attempt to mislead American citizens, whether deliberate or not, is absolutely indefensible. The Nation and all the States, so far as we know, have laws against misrepresenting investments. The way Mr. Pettingill has presented this subsidy investment comes very close, to speak charitably, to the perpetrating of a fraud. A securities salesman or a corporation selling debentures under such a standard as the O. P. A. now employs would be haled into court and deservedly given the limit under the law. Truly, the administration's case for subsidies must be desperate when it indulges in such a tricky argument as the Northwest Congress Club has been misled into circulating.

Dictatorial Powers Assumed by the F. E. P. C.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope when President Roosevelt returns, which I trust will be very soon, he will clean out this bunch of radicals down here known as the Fair Employment Practices Committee, which is assuming dictatorial powers never attempted by anybody in this country.

They are stirring up race trouble in the South and throughout the Nation as nothing else has ever done. Their unlawful meddling with the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods is threatening to paralyze our transportation system.

As I have said before, this F. E. P. C. is a rump organization. It really has no legal existence. It was set up by Executive order without authority of Congress and never was endowed with the tyrannical powers it now attempts to assume over the railroads and the brotherhoods and other private establishments throughout the country.

It is really hurting our war efforts. What they are doing is merely bringing about dissension and disunity in times of war, hampering our transportation system and threatening the country with race riots all over the Nation.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a press release issued by the southeastern railroads presidents' conference, which I hope every Member of the House will take the time to read.

The matter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, December 13, 1943.—Sixteen railroads and terminal companies today told the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, in a letter of response, that they cannot comply with the committee's directives of November 18, 1943, regarding the hiring and promoting of Negro railroad workers, because to do so would seriously and irreparably prejudice the war effort, would be impracticable and impossible, and would violate the Railway Labor Act. These railroads also denied the jurisdiction of the committee to issue the directives.

After a 4-day hearing in Washington in September the committee made both specific and general findings, holding that 22 railroads of all sections of the country, including these 16 railroads, and also that 7 railway labor unions were guilty of discrimination against Negroes in various respects, and made both specific and general directives that the labor unions admit Negroes to membership and that the railroads employ and promote Negroes in and to all positions without discrimination.

Although most of the evidence at the hearings concerned certain agreements between the railroads and the labor unions restricting employment of Negroes as firemen and as trainmen, the directives issued by the committee are not so confined but undertake broadly to require the railroads to employ Negroes in and promote them to positions as locomotive engineers, train conductors, yard foremen, station agents, clerks working with white clerical personnel, and, in fact, any and all positions without exception.

The impossible practical position in which railroads would be placed by attempting to comply with these directives was presented by the response filed by the 16 railroads today.

"These railroads," they said, "are engaged, with all their energies and abilities, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, in carrying on the most vital business of transportation in the war effort. They are contributing their part to the total war effort of the railroads of the country, which has been acclaimed as an unprecedented accomplishment by all branches of the Government and of the armed services. The manpower situation on these railroads is not preventing their most excellent accomplishment in this regard. This accomplishment has been achieved by peaceful and harmonious relations with railway labor and by patriotic and wholehearted cooperation between these managements, labor, and the shipping and traveling public. We wish it to be clearly understood that any disruption of these peaceful and harmonious relations and of this patriotic cooperation which may result from your committee's directives is not the responsibility of these railroads."

Pointing out that their employment relations are governed by collective bargaining agreements reached under procedures of the Railway Labor Act and that any change therein is a matter of immediate and vital concern to their employees and their labor organizations, the responding railroads said, "Railroads are forbidden by law to interfere in any way with the self-determination or self-organization of their employees and are entirely without power to dictate to their employees, or to effect by unilateral action, any changes in such agreements."

"Any attempt," they said, "to comply with those directives, for instance to promote Negroes to locomotive engineers or train conductors, would inevitably disrupt their present peaceful and cooperative relations with their employees, would antagonize the traveling and shipping public served by them, would substitute conditions of chaos for the present condition of harmony, would result in stoppages of transportation, and would most gravely and irreparably impair the whole war effort of the country."

Asserting their readiness at any time to confer with their employees under the Railway Labor Act, to see if any more generally satisfactory solution of the racial problems of employment can be worked out by mutual agreement, the 16 railroads said:

"However, frankness compels these railroads very respectfully to state to your committee that it is utterly unrealistic to suppose that these railroads and their employees can agree to comply with the breadth of your directives or that problems of such delicacy, controlled and governed by a special act of Congress, can be solved out-of-hand by the fiat of your committee's directives."

The railroads filing this response were: Atlantic Coast Line; Atlanta Joint Terminals; Central of Georgia; Georgia Railroad; Jacksonville Terminal; Louisville & Nashville; Norfolk Southern; Frisco; Seaboard; Southern; Chesapeake & Ohio; Gulf, Mobile & Ohio; Norfolk & Western; Illinois Central; Yazoo & Mississippi Valley; and Gulf & Ship Island. Among other railroad unions against which the directives were issued were: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America; Order of Railway Conductors; and Brotherhood of Railway Carmen.

Soldiers' Absentee Voting Bill—Radio Address of Senator Millard E. Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting some excerpts from a speech made by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, over the radio in Baltimore, Md., on December 12 on the subject of the pending soldiers' absentee voting bill.

MILLARD TYDINGS is well known to the servicemen of this country. During the time he served in the House he was a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am chairman. His intense interest in the affairs of the servicemen and his intimate knowledge of their problems have been outstanding.

Senator TYDINGS entered the service in the last war as a buck private, and by force of his own efforts and ability he gradually rose to the rank of colonel in one of the outstanding fighting units of the Army.

His address on this subject of soldiers' voting is simply unanswerable. I hope every Member of the House will study it carefully.

It reads as follows:

Today I want to devote all my time to a discussion of the pending soldiers' vote bill. I believe that everybody in America favors giving the millions of men in our armed forces the right to vote in the coming elec-

tions. I am heartily in favor of doing that. Indeed, there is not a single Member of Congress who does not favor giving the ballot to our soldiers, sailors, and marines and others attached to our armed forces.

Since all are agreed that this is a desirable thing to do, all we have to bother about is how it can be accomplished without question.

Therefore, if Congress simply by passing a law could extend the right to vote to all members of the armed services, our task would be an easy one. But, unfortunately, Congress has no power to do this. All that Congress can do by law is to set up the machinery which will assist our soldiers in getting and casting their ballots next year so that they may be counted in that election. Only the State governments have the constitutional authority to extend the right to vote to those who are in the armed services.

The attorney general of Maryland, in a formal opinion, ruled to that effect last year. His ruling says that Congress does not have the authority, to confer the right to vote on our absent soldiers. The States themselves have all the authority to do this. The Congress, he says, has none.

Therefore, if the National Congress does pass an act purporting to give to our absent soldiers, whose homes are in the State of Maryland, the right to vote in next year's Presidential election, the attorney general has already held that such a law will be invalid, that is, that it will not be good. The soldiers who come from Maryland could not vote in any Maryland election for President, or for any other purpose, he holds, simply because the Federal Government said they could do so. The power of granting the right to vote, says the attorney general of Maryland, resides entirely in the State government of the State of Maryland.

In his written opinion the attorney general of Maryland calls attention to the very definite provisions of the Constitution of the United States concerning just who has the power to say who can vote in any election. He points out that in the very first part of the Constitution of the United States, in section 2 of article I, Congress is prohibited from saying who are and who are not qualified voters.

That section of the Constitution of the United States says: "The voters in each State shall have the qualifications necessary for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Let me repeat that provision of the Constitution of the United States again. It says: "The voters in each State shall have the qualifications necessary for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Therefore, says the Constitution of the United States, that unless a voter is qualified to vote for the members of his own State legislature, he has no qualifications to vote in any national election at all.

The attorney general of Maryland, in this ruling, said: "A person who is not properly registered in accordance with the laws of Maryland is not entitled to vote for candidates for the Senate or House of Representatives of the Congress or for Presidential or Vice Presidential electors." Still quoting, he says: "Those conclusions are supported by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court said: 'The States define who are to vote for the members of their legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons may vote for Members of Congress.' "

Now, what are the qualifications, for example, which a citizen of Maryland must have in order to vote for the members of the Maryland Legislature? These are fixed by the State law of the State of Maryland. Here they are: He must be at least 21 years of age, he must have lived for a certain specified period of time in the election district and precinct in Maryland where he wishes to vote. He must present himself in person to the election officials of his election district and precinct, and he must answer certain questions, sign his name to the voting list before he is qualified, under the laws of Maryland, to cast a vote. After he has done all of that, and only after he has done all of that, can he cast a vote for members of the Maryland Legislature.

As I have pointed out, the Constitution of the United States says that any citizen, either of Maryland or of any other State, cannot vote for President, or Vice President of the United States, or for a United States Senator or Representative, unless he is qualified to vote for the members of his own legislature.

Therefore, you can at once see that if Congress passes a law conferring the right on soldiers to vote, they could not vote anyhow unless they were registered and qualified to vote for the members of their own State legislature.

If, in spite of this constitutional provision, the Congress, went ahead anyhow and passed a law giving a right to the soldiers to vote, that law would be no good. If the National Government sent ballots to the soldiers and the soldiers voted them and returned them, they could not be counted by the State election officials in each State. As the attorney general of Maryland and other States have already said these ballots would be illegal, they would not be counted. Thus, millions of ballots sent back by soldiers would be thrown out. The whole election for President would thereby be thrown into confusion, in which case, under the National Constitution, the House of Representatives here in Washington, and not the people, would decide who would be President.

That has already happened once in our history, in the famous Tilden-Hayes contest. Most people believed that Samuel Tilden, the Democrat, was that year elected President. He certainly got more votes than his opponent, but the House of Representatives declared that his Republican opponent, Rutherford Hayes, had been elected and Mr. Hayes became the President of the United States. The smell of that fraud still emanates from the pages of American political history.

Further than that, section 4 of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature, thereof." The Constitution provides that Congress can, by law, make the time for holding an election uniform, but the Constitution also provides in that same section that Congress cannot change "the places for choosing Senators." The attorney general of Maryland points out all of this. From all of this you can see what a farce it would be, to lead our men in the service to believe that because Congress passed a law that gave them the right to vote, they could really do so.

The only sure and legal way that the right to vote can be given to our soldiers, therefore, is through the laws of each of the States where the men in the armed forces formerly lived. Many States have already passed such laws permitting the soldiers to vote. In the State of Maryland the legislature has gone part of the way to do this, but it has failed to provide a method by which men who were not registered and qualified when they were drafted can now be registered and qualified so that they may cast a legal ballot, one that will be counted. As there are 11 months now before the next election, those States which have not provided the machinery conferring the right to vote on all soldiers are planning so to do. In the State of Maryland, this matter is also being considered so as to formulate a law in Maryland which will confer the right to vote in the Presidential election on our absent soldiers, sailors, marines, and others attached to our armed forces.

The point to remember is simply this: The Constitution of the United States provides that no one can vote in any national election who is not qualified to vote for a member of his own legislature. This power to qualify persons for voting under our Federal Constitution resides exclusively in the State governments. The Attorney General of Maryland, in accordance with these provisions, has already held that a Federal act purporting to qualify soldiers with the right to vote in Maryland is illegal, and that only the State governments can so qualify them so that the votes of the soldiers will be legal.

There you have the matter, ladies and gentlemen. If further proof were necessary, let me call your attention to the votes cast by two United States Senators against the national law, because each claimed it was unconstitutional as I have herein set forth. These two United States Senators, who voted against the so-called Lucas-Green soldiers' vote law, were Senator GEORGE of Georgia and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Each of these Senators already has had a son killed in this war. Do you suppose that these men would vote to deny soldiers a vote when they have already each given a son in this war? Of course not. They have voted against the Lucas-Green soldiers' vote bill simply because such a law would be no law at all. It would be a farce and a sham. The only way a soldier can get the right to vote is by State and not by national law, for the reasons I have given you. That is why a majority of the men in the United States Senate, with many of them having sons themselves in the service, voted against this law and put it squarely up to the States, where the authority exists, to confer the right to vote on the soldiers. I shall aid in every possible way in having Maryland provide this right to vote to all Marylanders.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Lucas-Worley bill, in addition to violating the Constitution, and in addition to usurping the election machinery of the various States, provides for giving the soldiers the right to vote only for candidates for President, Vice President, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress; while the substitute bill that passed the Senate, and which I introduced in the House, would enable the men in our armed forces to vote for State, county, and local candidates also.

The man in the service who has a brother running for sheriff, a father running for county clerk, or relatives and friends running for other local offices, is often far more interested in voting for them than he is in voting for candidates for national offices.

There will be a far greater number of men in the armed forces who will cast their votes in the coming election if the measure which passed the Senate is passed by the House and becomes law, then there would be if the Lucas-Worley bill should pass.

Besides, if this substitute bill which passed the Senate does become a law, there will be no question as to its constitutionality, there will be no danger of the contests and confusion that might result under the unconstitutional Lucas-Worley bill.

In other words, this substitute measure which passed the Senate, and which we

are supporting, would provide the soldiers with an opportunity to vote for national, State, county, and local officials; it would not violate the Constitution of the United States, and there would be no danger of its throwing the country into confusion and bringing about such a condition as the country faced in the Tilden-Hayes contest.

It would preserve the rights of the States and would not disrupt the States' election machinery. It would preserve American institutions for which our boys in the armed forces are now offering up their lives.

Dangerous Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Christian Science Monitor and the Boston Post:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 10, 1943]

AMERICA NEEDED IT

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is normally the Member who doesn't make speeches. When a presiding officer of the House leaves the rostrum and takes the floor it is a rare occasion. Thursday, December 9, 1943, was such an occasion. Seldom in recent days has the House been better filled as the Members gathered to hear a quiet, soft-spoken Texan appeal to them and to the American people to take a more positive and united stand in support of the war.

SAM RAYBURN had observed the total effect of a multitude of complaints about small war sacrifices which make patriotic folk appear opposed to one segment or another of the war effort and in combination weaken national effectiveness. He had become aware of the bickerings and the bitter divisions over one policy or another and of the hatred and suspicion voiced toward one ally or another which undermine united action. He sought earnestly to awaken Americans to the folly of worrying so about the perils of peace that they forget to fight or produce with all their might to win the war.

The Speaker, watching Congress and the country, had come to feel that thoughtlessly voiced suspicions about what England will do after the war or what Russia will do, deserve especially to be classed as "dangerous talk" at a time when what England and Russia do today so largely affects what America will have to do in the final defeat of the Axis. He took the affirmative position that America need not be afraid to sit around a peace table with anybody on earth. Considering the power of America today that does not appear a boastful confidence.

This is a timely appeal. Citizens may not realize the effect of negative thinking which picks up minor objections and loses sight of that main chance which Americans are traditionally expert at following. Few Americans do not need to awaken to the way in which discontent passes beyond supposedly harmless griping and finds expression in selfish resistance to necessary controls, chiseling on rations, patronizing black markets, loafing on the job, or strikes.

It is an old theme, but we should welcome a new voice and a dramatic occasion for its repetition. The home front, because it is so far from the danger which nerves and unites the men in battle, must put an extra tax on its imagination and intelligence if it is to come anywhere near matching their devotion and submergence of self in the common cause.

The boys at the front are "agin" the enemy. They are not anti-Russian or anti-British. Indeed, they are poor subjects for the infection of "anti-ism." And the answer at home is to keep on the main line, to think more positively, to be actively for the concepts of liberty and justice which this war is about, and to support persons, policies, and nations who in their principal effect advance the United Nations' basic purpose.

[From the Boston Post of December 10, 1943]

DANGEROUS TALK

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, one of our elder statesmen and Speaker of the House, descended from the chair yesterday to the floor and made a speech at the Capitol.

There would be little newsworthy in that if SAM RAYBURN was a constant talker. But his speeches are and have been so few that it was something pressing which made him drop the gavel and talk.

In what he said there was nothing particularly eloquent or oratorical. The words and phrases which he used will probably be forgotten tomorrow. But there was a lot of sense in what he said, and the thought should linger on.

It wasn't a speech he made. It was a warning, a warning against a wartime danger which crops up from time to time, particularly when the war is going well for our side and somebody thinks the moment opportune to speak out.

He warned about talk such as "what are we going to do with England after the war" or "what are we going to do about Russia after the war."

It came at an opportune time, that warning. President Roosevelt has just finished some big business which has needed attention for a long time, the get-together of the leaders of the Allied cause for a face-to-face talk.

By all accounts, at Cairo and Teheran he was successful. The leaders participating decided what everyone hoped they would decide. At Cairo they concluded to smash the Japs. At Teheran they concluded to smash the Nazis.

And in both places they came to the master decision—they agreed to sit down together again when the war was over and straighten out all the things which have caused war before and will in the future unless the next peace conference really settles them.

In other words, the nations that are lined up on the side of freedom are to tackle their mutual enemies not as individuals giving lip service to fraternity but as a team really playing together for one purpose, victory, for one future peace.

Months back in Russia a Red magazine flayed the American-British military government in Sicily for not allowing the inhabitants free speech. Months back eminent Englishmen, including Mr. Churchill, until Mr. Churchill caught on to himself and stopped it, flayed the United States Senators who toured the world front and talked.

We in the United States did not like the Russian magazine editor butting in with high talk about what we are doing in Sicily. We in the United States thought that the Englishmen, including Mr. Churchill, went a bit too far in chiding the Senators.

But frequently distinguished and undistinguished Americans forget that and haul off with a punch at our allies which gets us nowhere and only gets them angry. And SAM RAYBURN called that dangerous talk.

Our enemies are Hitler and Hirohito. Our friends are England and Russia. The kind of talk that pleases our enemies and enrages our friends is dangerous talk.

No New Jazz Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Goldwyn from This Week magazine of December 12, 1943:

NO NEW JAZZ AGE

(By Samuel Goldwyn)

Hollywood is approaching the greatest crisis of its existence. It is a crisis which is going to affect every picture you will be seeing in your movie houses next year and the years to come.

It will be a crisis far greater than the one which followed the last war when the jazz age and jazz age thinking, with its sex and crime waves, almost wrecked Hollywood.

I know what I am talking about because I've been through every crisis Hollywood ever had. I was in at the start. I stayed through them all. And I'm still in. I have seen the industry grow up from the days when pictures were made in cow pastures and livery stables and shown to people sitting on boxes placed on peanut-shell-strewn floors.

Since then Hollywood has grown up—and Hollywood must admit it. The motion picture is one of the most tremendous forces in the world for influencing public opinion. It is time Hollywood learned to respect its own power.

The greatness of that power was summed up by a Frenchman who said that the United States has brought about a cultural colonization of the world through its movies. Wendell Willkie made me realize that again. After he had seen Pride of the Yankees, a simple story of Lou Gehrig, baseball player, he said to me: "You have done something important here. You help democracy everywhere by showing what opportunities there are in America. I like it because I can think of the influence it will have when people all around the world see it."

ASK THIS QUESTION

Next time you go to the movies, remember that comment by Mr. Willkie and ask yourself what the people of South America or Italy or Russia or China will think of that picture when they see it. That's the test. And when you ask yourself that question, you are stating the new problem the movies now face: They have global influence—is each picture's influence good or bad?

Already we have reports from our boys overseas. Those soldiers have been living with foreigners—sometimes they glow with pride, but often they are embarrassed by what their hosts must think of America and Americans after seeing some of the movie versions of our life and people. Our troops say sharply: "Some of our movies make us squirm in our seats." Sometimes here in the United States, I squirm, too.

They bitterly resent, for example, the smugness with which many Hollywood pictures depict all American soldiers as stal-

wart, unconquerable heroes and all Nazis as ludicrous fools. They also realize the gigantic harm done by movies which place the people of other nations in a false or ridiculous light.

Our soldiers are closer to the problems than we are. Already they are aware of the global implications of our pictures. What's more, those boys are coming home and will be a big part of the audience of the future. Hollywood must get wise to itself. Its pictures must be in harmony with the world and the world's future.

Don't get me wrong. I know that the main job of the movies is to entertain. But, in entertaining, we must not cheat for the sake of easy box-office profits.

We are approaching the end of another war. We cannot forget the experience of last time when the armistice brought an expression of demoralization and a break-down of old standards. The jazz age burst into full flower with flasks on hips, sensational sex crimes, cynicism, and general abandonment of restraint. At the start, movies did little to fight that trend; instead they helped to push us further and further down into the trough. And they almost wrecked themselves doing it. This time Hollywood cannot repeat. It must not indulge in another jazz age. It must hold the line. If we lower the bars again, we'll be threatening not only our own society, but the society of the world.

SEX ON THE RAMPAGE

It's not hard for me to remember those frenzied days after the last war. If people were cynical, the movies were more so. If people talked about loose morals, the movies pictured it for them. If you want a clue to those times, look at these movie titles: Living Lips, Mad Love, Temptation, Passion Flame, Twin Beds, Flaming Youth, Children Not Wanted, On to Reno, Trifling Women, Why Be Good?

You can guess the result. In 1 year—1921—indignant groups saw to it that State legislators introduced nearly 100 censorship bills in 37 States. Most of them were defeated and, fortunately, the industry took the hint and set up a code of its own with the Will Hays office to administer it. That was the beginning of a slow upward climb toward the respect and solidity Hollywood has today. It didn't happen at once. It wasn't easy.

There was the gangster phase, for example, that came with the depression. Gangsterism had become big business—movies were accused of glorifying it. All of you must remember the deluge of crime pictures. Little Caesar—in 1930—started the cycle. Those were years of cynical disillusionment and the films' constant exposition of the gangster philosophy reflected them. Everything was stripped down to the bare essentials of might over right—and the people flocked to see such films.

Here is one thing I must say—and I can't say it too strongly: You, the movie audience, are to blame, too, for what Hollywood has done. When it made sex pictures and crime pictures, it did it because you supported them. Don't support them—and they won't be made. You helped, too, when you supported double-feature bills. A lot of bad pictures have been made so that you can see two movies on one program. It's up to you to stop patronizing theaters with double features—and bad pictures.

Yet, during the crime cycle, many movie makers did not realize that audiences could insist on respect and would slap back when they didn't get it. The industry lost out in two ways: Moviegoers got fed up with crime pictures before movie producers stopped making them. And, in 1934, new pressure groups were created to clamp down on them. It was another crisis which threatened the existence of Hollywood, but the industry got the point and began making, more than ever before, pictures of which we're all proud—David Copperfield, Mr. Deeds Goes to Town, Winterset, Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, Juarez, How Green Was My Valley, and many more.

Now that we've come that far we cannot afford to repeat the mistakes we made once. We dare not mark the end of this war with another jazz age or crime wave in movies.

We of Hollywood must keep in mind the fact that we control the world's greatest medium for idea transmission. We must remember the soldiers who were embarrassed by American movies abroad. We must remember the Argentine critic who once spoke of: "* * * Your terrible movies; * * * sex, loose women, jazz, gangsters, stupid slapstick comedy. How can you understand us, or we understand you, without effort?"

Ask anybody connected with Hollywood and he can give you hundreds of examples of the influence of movies. The cable, back in silent days, from a business house in Greece ordering 30 barber chairs like the one they'd seen in a movie. Our pictures have started fashions abroad—in clothes, cars, plumbing, housing, language. There was the English constable who complained bitterly about some lads on his beat, who, students of our movies, snarled: "Lay off, cop—or we'll bump you off."

But now, with the possibility of world peace hanging in the balance, our role becomes tremendously more important. I remember the day the news broke in Hollywood that the Allies had landed in Sicily. Every studio rushed to make Italian versions of their important films. You can imagine what a great part those movies can play in winning back the people of Italy to a democratic way of life. And what a part movies will play in the near future in winning back the people of all Axis countries. But to do it, our movies must be an honest reflection of that democracy. They must be an honest picture and a potent spokesman for the ideals that the whole world must live by in the future.

AMBASSADORS FOR GOOD—OR ILL

Our movies can be the most friendly, most important ambassadors we have. They can work for us—and for peace and understanding—all over the world. But, like our Government's Ambassadors at the Court of St. James or at Moscow or at Chungking, their conduct must be above reproach, must be statesmanlike in every old and true sense of the word.

Again please don't get me wrong. I still believe that movies must be produced for entertainment. But no producer, for the sake of any temporary box-office success, can run the risk of offending any nation or of lowering the moral standards of the world.

Pictures speak louder than words. There is no better way of acquainting the world's people with us than our movies. In the past, through a lack of scholarship and statesmanship, movies have often painted a false picture of us and our country. But now, we must never allow ourselves to go back to the old ways. We must please not only the Hays office and the F. B. I. but we must also please an imaginary League of Nations and its members.

Hollywood need not concern itself with reforming the world. But there is much it can do to help establish better standards of living and to help the people of the world understand and respect each other. Hollywood can help cement the world together, or it can help sow the seeds of disunity.

Keep that in the back of your mind every time you go to the movies. It will be the sum total of the judgment of all of you which will help hold Hollywood to the right path. Movies will still be your greatest entertainment. But with your help they will discover that, with a sense of statesmanship as well as a sense of salesmanship, they can also be your greatest ambassadors abroad.

Statistics Concerning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, most of us are headline readers, and probably, therefore, entertain many assumptions not jusitfied by the precise facts. I believe that may be particularly true as to the extent of our Nation's expenditures on behalf of its veterans and their dependents, currently, and as to past years.

Recently, I observed some rather pertinent statistics concerning these matters in the annual report of Millard W. Rice, national service director for the Disabled American Veterans, as published in a recent issue of its national publication, the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly.

Mr. Rice is well known to many Members of Congress, not only in his present capacity as national service director for the D. A. V., but as a former national legislative representative for the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The statistics compiled by Mr. Rice have been secured from several sources, primarily the Veterans' Administration, but also including the War Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department.

It is significant to note that less than 1 percent of all Federal appropriations for the current fiscal year will be expended for ex-servicemen and their dependents, a percentage, by the way, which will almost inevitably undergo an increase as our participation in World War No. 2 becomes more intensive and more extensive, in America's all-out efforts speedily to win World War No. 2, to preserve our democratic ideals and freedoms, to perpetuate our beloved country, and to help to protect the United Nations associated with America in its war against wanton aggressors.

It is significant to remember, I believe, that an important factor in our all-out war efforts is for America adequately to provide for its present defenders, and their dependents, as well as for its disabled defenders and their dependents.

Less than 9 percent of the veterans of World War No. 1 receive compensation for service-connected disabilities, and about 60 percent of them receive less than $40 per month by reason of their partial disabilities, whereas more than 80 percent of them receive less than $60 per month.

Less than 10 percent of all living World War veterans receive any kind of monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration.

The peak in the number of World War No. 1 veterans in receipt of compensation, 350,000, was passed shortly prior to Pearl Harbor, since which time an increasing number of partially disabled veterans of World War No. 1 have waived their compensation in their determination again to become active participants

in World War No. 2, again serving some place in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

It is interesting to note that the average age of World War No. 1 veterans is now about 50 years, there are still about 238,000 who are less than 45 years of age, whereas only 1,755,000 have passed the age of 50.

The compilation by Mr. Rice, of the D. A. V., is as follows:

VETERANS' STATISTICS AS OF JUNE 30, 1943

Certain veterans' statistics, compiled as of June 30, which I believe to be of interest to veterans generally, have been secured, with the kind cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, War Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department.

Cold statistics, as such, are not generally interesting. These statistics, however, indicate the extent of the human aftermath of America's wars, campaigns, and expeditions, and the costs thereof:

4,757,240 served in United States armed forces during World War No. 1.

4,057,101 served in Army; 2,059,629 overseas.

596,073 served in Navy and 104,066 in Marine Corps, about 50 percent overseas.

24,234,021 registered for the selective draft.

2,810,296 were inducted after draft selection.

250,240 were discharged from the draft after being called.

10,250 Army men were dishonorably discharged.

130,128 total deaths.

39,362 were killed: 37,658, Army; 1,454, Marine; and 340, Navy.

14,009 died of wounds: 12,942, Army; 1,008, Marines; and 59, Navy.

53,371 were combat deaths: 50,510, Army; 2,462, Marines; and 399, Navy.

75,460 died of disease: 69,446, Army; 701, Marines; and 5,131, Navy.

1,297 died of other causes.

201,325 wounded, not mortally: 193,611 in Army, and 7,714 in Marines.

341,456 World War No. 1 veterans—less than 9 percent of all—received compensation for service-connected disabilities: 8,643 on temporary partial ratings; 762 on temporary total ratings; 297,513 on permanent partial ratings; and 34,538 (10.11 percent) on permanent total ratings.

27 percent of all service-connected disabled World War No. 1 veterans receive less than $20 per month compensation; 46 percent less than $30; 59 percent less than $40; 66 percent less than $50; 81 percent less than $60; 91 percent less than $100; and only 9 percent received compensation of $100 or more—an average as to all of $39.85 per month ($39.74 a year ago).

84,824 World War No. 1 veterans receive pensions for permanent total non-service-connected disabilities of $6, increased to $8 by Public, 144, July 13, 1943 (single men, without dependents, in facilities) or $40 per month.

43,199 disabled regulars were receiving pensions averaging $32.05 per month ($31.77 a year ago).

625 Civil War veterans were receiving pensions.

1,475 Indian-war veterans were receiving pensions.

140,093 Spanish-American War veterans were receiving pensions (Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion) averaging $57.80 per month ($57.02 a year ago).

2,581 emergency (including 8 provisional, probationary, and temporary World War No. 1 officers were receiving retirement benefits, also 181 retired Reserve officers.

164,700 World War No. 1 service-connected death claims have been allowed; 89,722 are now active, providing pensions for 29,894 widows, 22,999 children, and 69,583 parents, at an average monthly payment of $46.99 per case.

26,418 deceased World War No. 1 veterans who died by reason of some disability other than their service-connected disabilities, provide pensions for 22,685 dependent widows and 32,385 children at an average monthly payment of $34.35 per case.

64,157 deceased Spanish-American War veterans provide pensions for 62,072 widows, 5,752 children, 224 parents, and 5 others, a total of 68,053 dependents.

3,319 deceased Indian-war veterans provide pensions for 3,293 widows, 50 children, and 10 others, a total of 3,353 dependents.

32,552 deceased Civil War veterans provide pensions for 30,708 widows and 1,996 children, a total of 32,704 dependents.

81 widows and 1 child of Mexican War (1848) veterans are receiving pensions.

1 deceased War of 1812 veteran provides pension for 1 daughter.

222,274 veterans received hospital treatment during the last fiscal year, of whom only 27,387 were for service-connected disabilities.

56,850 persons were in hospital on June 30, 1943, of whom 14,580 were veterans with service-connected disabilities.

45,496 were World War No. 1 veterans, of whom 10,262 were service-connected, 35,084 non-service-connected, and 150 observation and temporary hospitalization cases; 5,152 were World War No. 2 veterans; 3,148 were other war veterans; 2,801 disabled Regulars, 21 Allied veterans, and 232 miscellaneous.

36,345 were neuropsychiatric patients, 14,857 general medical and surgical patients, 5,159 tubercular patients, and 499 observation and non-VA, not classified.

18,031 veterans were admitted for domiciliary care last fiscal year; 9,069 remaining on June 30, 1943, of whom 8,247 were World War No. 1 veterans (7,752 non-service-connected).

80,129 beds—61,764 hospital and 18,455 domiciliary—in 93 Veterans' Administration facilities.

1,693 beds in other Government hospitals utilized (Army, 347; Navy, 627; Federal Security Agency, 719).

38,927 veterans were under guardianship.

4,122,544 veterans and dependents have applied for adjusted compensation, involving $3,767,161,943.

4,500,000 World War No. 1 veterans applied for war-risk insurance, involving $39,000,000,000.

586,590 Government life-insurance policies were in force, with face value of $2,499,603,842.

238,382 World War No. 1 veterans were less than 45 years of age, 1,934,814 between 45 and 50, 1,663,313 between 50 and 60, 3,692,647 more than 45, 1,757,833 more than 50, 94,520 more than 60, and 35,538 more than 65.

3,931,029 living veterans now constitute about 3 percent of the total population and about 4 percent of total adult population of the United States.

7,000,000 were serving in United States Army in World War No. 2.

2,000,000 were serving in United States Navy.

300,000 were serving in United States Marines.

600,000 have been discharged from active service.

16,476 have been killed.

22,374 have been wounded.

31,800 missing.

21,955 prisoners of war.

9,395,647 national service life-insurance policies in force, with face value of $65,447,084,870.

16,172 national service life-insurance death claims allowed for total benefits of $105,613,800, averaging $32.71 per month per case.

2,053 waivers of premiums granted covering national service life insurance of $9,268,500.

74,724 claims filed by World War No. 2 veterans.

12,637 World War No. 2 veterans receive pensions, 161 of them served during World War No. 1. Six of them served during Spanish-American War, 3,856 of them served in Regular Establishment.

$40.01 is average monthly pension of World War No. 2 veterans.

5,152 World War No. 2 veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

2,338 of them service-connected.

2,735 of them non-service-connected.

79 of them under observation.

37 World War No. 2 veterans receive domiciliary care.

14,386 death claims as to World War No. 2 veterans filed.

8,187 such claims have awards.

$22,500,000,000 was cost of World War No. 1.

$92,000,000,000 so far expended for World War No. 2.

$7,600,000,000 was cost of World War No. 2 during June.

$887,087,000 appropriation to Veterans' Administration for year ending June 30, 1944, is only about 0.85 percent of all Federal appropriations for year. $25,904,000,000 has been expended because of relief to veterans and their dependents since the Nation was founded, which, however, is only about 8 percent of the grand total of all Federal expenditures of about $331,000,000,000 of which more than 72 percent was incurred directly because of preparation against or for war, participation in war, and to provide for the aftermath of war.

Age and death ra[illegible] in 1943

	World War	Spanish-American War	Civil War	Indian War
Average age of all veterans in 1941	49	67	97	82
Average age of all widows on rolls in 1941	48	63	80	-------
Average age of emergency officers in 1941	34	-------	-------	-------
Estimated number of veterans dying per day in 1941	105	25	3	1

Estimated number of living World War No. 1 veterans at the beginning of each calendar year, by age groups

Attained age	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
35-39	56	2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
40-44	238,326	90,036	10,691	1,366	236	54	2	-------	-------
45-49	1,934,814	1,655,710	1,254,991	735,415	394,322	228,655	86,295	10,242	1,308
50-54	1,301,575	1,507,983	1,743,152	2,008,021	2,037,762	1,842,698	1,574,670	1,191,978	697,802
55-59	361,738	526,354	709,554	898,946	1,048,225	1,221,810	1,414,901	1,634,450	1,881,052
60-64	58,982	67,827	78,937	101,514	206,514	330,950	480,839	646,753	817,375
65-69	23,611	28,353	33,968	38,334	44,167	50,653	58,288	67,902	87,451
70-74	8,546	9,792	11,255	13,209	15,293	18,453	22,175	26,551	29,881
75-79	2,734	3,258	3,702	4,173	4,725	5,647	6,481	7,439	8,727
80-84	577	708	844	1,003	1,207	1,376	1,643	1,861	2,092
85-89	67	78	107	125	143	188	229	274	324
90-94	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	12	14
95-99	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	3,931,029	3,890,105	3,847,205	3,802,111	3,752,600	3,700,491	3,645,531	3,587,462	3,626,029

Hon. George Mahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from last Sunday's Washington Star regarding my colleague and intimate friend from Texas, Hon. GEORGE MAHON. As chairman of the Texas delegation, I am sure I voice the sentiment of every Member of the House from that State in expressing our appreciation for this deserved tribute to our colleague:

REPRESENTATIVE MAHON

It is a matter of genuine regret to the people of Washington that Representative MAHON, of Texas, is leaving the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations. He made a splendid chairman. He was fair, friendly, and far from regarding this local assignment as thankless drudgery, was keenly interested in his work, anxious to improve the local government, and proud of an opportunity to do constructive work for "My Capital." He and Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, who, fortunately for the District, is remaining as ranking minority member, made a fine team, giving local officials the same cooperation they received. Mr. MAHON is going far in Congress for he has the right stuff in him. It is gratifying to receive his assurances that resignation from the local appropriations committee by no means terminates his cordial and helpful relations with Washingtonians.

Brumidi's First Effort in Capitol Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

BRUMIDI'S FIRST EFFORT IN CAPITOL ART

The exiled Italian, Brumidi,
Past-master in creative art,
Found in this Republic a speedy
Response to the call from his heart—
The Capitol of our young Nation
Was needing a talented man,
One gifted to put in creation
A marvelous artistic plan.

So he, with an urgent ambition
To sing from the walls with his brush
The songs of triumphant tradition
Too richly for hist'ry to hush,
Began, in the southwestern corner
Of our Nation's Capitol, where,
Above the rebuke of the scorner,
He climbed to the glory-heights there.

With Nature's and history's flowers,
Of which he delighted to dream,
Brumidi spent many grand hours,
Bewildered by their glory-gleam,
Until, on the walls and the ceiling
Of this ageless Capitol room,
He lastingly placed them, revealing
American life in full bloom.

He, while learning life's living story
By living so close to the sod,
Caught inspiring glimpses of glory
By lifting his eyes toward his God,
By whom he had been educated
To use his expressible brush
In making what God has created
Sing on, after Death whispers "hush."

As long as in grandeur and beauty
The National Capitol stands,
As long as devotion to duty
Stands first in the country's demands,
Brumidi, whose rare art creations
Yet live, to be never outclassed,
Majestic in time's estimations,
Continues to speak from the past.

Like Lincoln, enshrined in the pages
Of history, and in our hearts,
Brumidi "belongs to the ages"—
And his recognized greatness starts
With his first, unfading creation,
In this city, tactfully planned
To be, throughout time's whole duration,
The Capitol of our great land.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Address of Hon. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Gov. John W. Bricker before the Pennsylvania Society on December 11, 1943, in New York City:

We meet tonight assured of ultimate victory. The cost will be stupendous and the toll of life and property heartbreaking. As the forces of freedom move inexorably forward our purpose becomes clearer.

Millions of people around the world, some who have lost freedom and others who have always lived under the heel of tyranny, are rising up to claim the soul's highest right—to live by some inner sovereignty rather than by outside regimentation. Never in the history of the world has this longing of people to govern themselves welded together such a mighty army as now fights under the banner of freedom. The winning of complete military victory transcends all other purposes.

Every meeting of Americans today should express deep gratitude and lasting obligation to the men and women in our armed forces. Their steadfastness, their courage, and their heroism must be matched by our determination to make the Nation worthy of their sacrifices. We also pay high tribute to the millions of men and women in shops and factories, on farms, in laboratories, in hospitals, and in management who tirelessly labor to meet the demands of total war. Never has American manhood and womanhood so demonstrated and so enabled the character of our Nation.

The strength and honor of our Nation have stemmed from a mighty faith. We have had faith in ourselves, faith in our Government, and faith in Divine Providence. Today America needs a strengthened faith. To achieve that faith we must meet a threefold challenge beyond winning the war.

First. We must devote all our ability and energy to establish a just and lasting peace in the world.

Second. We must set America free from economic and political totalitarianism.

Third. We must lift ever higher the moral and spiritual standards of our people.

This is an American creed both for today and after victory. It embraces a basic philosophy of government at home and abroad.

I

Turning first to our position in the postwar world, we are encouraged by the conferences that have been held with our allies. They strengthen the war effort and assure unity of action. They set a pattern for developing mutual understanding among nations and for building an orderly peace.

America needs a forthright foreign policy. There is nothing mysterious about foreign policy. There is no secret formula by which it can be determined. Our foreign policy should be an adaptation of farsighted domestic policy to world relationships. Honesty, fair dealings, promises wisely made and faithfully kept know no geographical lines and are not spoken in any one language. A sound American policy in international affairs means that we shall deal as a strong independent nation and that other nations of the world shall deal with us on the same basis.

Such a positive policy must be followed in the years ahead—that America's voice might be heard, our position respected, our Nation defended, and our people kept proud of our position among the nations of the world. Such policy will recognize that a prosperous America requires a prosperous world. It will recognize that in rehabilitating America the rest of the world must also be rehabilitated. Peace throughout the world must be built upon the right of other people to live their lives, build their cities, replant their fields, restore their homes. All the people of the world must get down to hard work and work constructively and hopefully.

The United States must help in every possible way to restore order and decent living throughout the world. We must do our full share in maintaining adequate instrumentalities of peace. And for these purposes, the United States will take her place in a cooperative organization among sovereign nations after this war.

Our desires for peace must be implemented by a practical and definite program. The details will be worked out in the light of developing conditions and after full conference and open discussion. Our peace must ultimately rest upon the understanding and approval of the people of the United States. The preservation of peace is a constant and continuing obligation.

We want no supergovernment—no dictatorial state to which we are subservient. We want no central world authority over us. Nor, do I believe, does any other sovereign nation want a central world authority over it.

An international cooperative organization, whatever precise form it may take, can wield a tremendous influence toward peaceful solution of the international problems which have led to war. These problems include trade barriers of all kinds, access to raw materials, exploitation of undeveloped resources, commercial rivalries, air and water rights, especially monetary stability. Such an international organization must be founded on continuous close-working collaboration.

This would be a long step and it is realistic. It respects the American point of view, and it has a background of experience that shows its worth. With such a forum established international disputes can and must be settled by arbitration and judicial decisions. When such habits of peace are formed and supported by the strong nations, we can again hope for relief from the burdens of war.

We must move forward with the confidence that the American people will work in full cooperation with the nations of the world in the days of peace. Only in that hope and confidence can we plan or establish a just order of international relationships. A confidence in the people and their leaders in the years ahead as well as in ourselves requires that we do not attempt to place this or any other nation in an international strait jacket. A will for peace must be transmitted by us to those who follow.

II

But we know that it is the domestic policy we live by here at home which in the long run will largely determine the part this Nation will play in world affairs. We cannot carry out our promises or fulfill our ideals unless America is strong. We can give only when we have something to give. We can inspire others to achieve liberty only when we keep it here. We cannot lift the standards of living of other peoples of the world unless we keep our own standards high.

During the past 10 years our Federal Government has been launched upon a course leading to the destruction of our form of government and to the loss of our freedom. I realize that total war necessitates mushroom growth of wasteful bureaucracy and temporary regimentation of the people. It is one of the cynical consequences of war that our democracy is compelled to adopt some of the despotic measures of our enemies in order to defeat them. But it is high time that we awaken to the fact that the war is being used as an excuse to further many dangerous pre-war policies. We have been living for a decade under a growing absolutism. Unless these policies are reversed by the American people, they will unmistakably lead this Nation to national socialism.

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that government must derive its powers from the consent of the governed. Consider what this means. It means that the people must be supreme rather than the Government. It means that government exists for the protection and benefit of the individual—not that the individual is one of the herd which exists for the benefit of the Government. Ours has been a government supported by the people. As long as it remains such, the people will be supreme. Should it become a government which supports the people, then the Government and not the people will be supreme and we shall no longer have a government which derives its powers from the consent of the governed.

You will remember that one of the indictments in the Declaration of Independence charged the King in these words: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance." The men who built the framework of our Government did not propose to set up a representative system framed upon the old patterns. And so they set up a government with powers both divided and balanced. They deliberately framed a system in which government could respond to the forces of public opinion. They separated the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government. And what is even more important, they provided that all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government should be reserved to the States or to the people. Through their wisdom, they brought into being a larger measure of freedom than any people had ever experienced.

Never until this decade has there been a lowering horizon here. Our eyes have been on ever higher goals. The pattern of absolutism has been foreign to our political philosophy. But during these past 10 years, the Executive has sought to relegate Congress to a subservient place. An attack was made on the Supreme Court. Then followed a deliberate program of tearing down State and local government. A planned economy by which the people of the country were to be made dependent on Washington was put into operation. We are thankful today that Congress is again taking its proper place in government, supported by an aroused public opinion.

For over 10 years we have been governed largely by independent bureaucrats. They are not accountable to the people. They are not directly accountable to Congress. They exercise their power through decrees, orders, and directives that are issued in the name of the executive branch of government. They make governmental policy. They administer that policy. They exercise the judicial function of interpreting that policy. They are legislature, administrator, prosecutor, judge, jury, and sheriff all rolled up in one. They are the personnel of the expanding power of government. This means the rule of men even by whim or caprice rather than by law. All this is not necessary to win the war; it is a method for limiting the liberties of freemen. These bureaucrats, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, are "taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our government."

According to recent figures issued by the United States Civil Service Commission, the number of civil employees of the Federal Government multiplied more than 5 times between 1933 and the first of this year. In June of 1933 there were 572,000 employees. By the end of November 1941, 1 week before Pearl Harbor, there were 1,500,000 of them. By January of this year, this number had increased to almost 3,000,000. At the present time, according to latest estimates, the figure is 3,500,000.

All of these figures are exclusive of persons in the military service and relate to civilian employees only. In Ohio alone we have today 100,000 Federal civilian employees as against 22,000 State employees. I venture the observation that our forefathers would have considered their phrase "swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance" a gross understatement in the light of these facts.

But this does not tell the whole story. Shortly before it expired, a few months ago, the National Resources Planning Board predicted: "Congress will surrender to the Executive the power to tax, and while appropriating huge sums of money, will surrender its power of directing how it shall be spent."

Thank God, that a senatorial committee recognized the potential tyranny in such a sweeping grant of power. It replied that this proposal "would require a virtual abandonment of our present constitutional form of government."

So much for executive usurpation of the legislative process. Consider for a moment the concentration of power in the Federal Government and the relegation of the States to a minor role. If there has been a dangerous accumulation of authority in the hands of the President to the prejudice of Congress, it is precisely because of the shifting of power from the States to the Federal Government.

A pertinent statement of the evil of centralization of power in the Federal Government is contained in this quotation:

"There is a present dangerous tendency to forget a fundamental of American democracy, which rests on the right of a locality to manage its own local affairs, the tendency to encourage concentration of power at the top of a governmental structure, alien to our system and more closely akin to a dictatorship. * * * Let us not at this time pursue the easy road of centralization of authority, lest some day we discover, too late, that our liberties have disappeared."

Those words were not uttered by one of the founding fathers. They were uttered by the present Chief Executive of the United States when he was Governor of the State of New York.

You know what has happened. Step by step, and with relentless determination, the New Deal has sought to arrogate unto itself all power. Sometimes the method has been arrogant and brazen. More often it has been cunning and subtle.

All of this has resulted in a loss of confidence by the people in the executive branch of government which has so long dominated them. And now with many in authority talking about rationing far beyond the war, about permanent controls and restrictions, there is a growing loss of confidence in the ability of this leadership to solve the problems of reconstruction and bring about the full return of American liberty.

A loss of confidence inevitably comes from promises made and not kept. The American people have a right to look upon campaign promises and platforms as solemn covenants to be faithfully performed. We are awakened when the tentacles of bureaucracy tighten around our daily lives. That awakening is here today.

If America is to remain a dominant force for good in the world, if our people are to continue to enjoy self-government, policy-making power must be taken from the hands of bureaucrats and returned to the elected representatives of the people.

The war power of our Government must be adequate. But the growth of Federal power should be restricted to necessity. It must be honestly and efficiently administered. It must never be used to engraft an un-American philosophy of socialism or absolutism on our people. These powers are only loaned for the war period and must be dissolved as soon as the war is won and liberty restored.

Great impetus would be given to the war effort by ending now the administrative chaos, confusion, extravagance, incompetence, and bureaucratic oppression at home. It is irony enough that those who are now fighting for us will come home to a national debt under which they will labor throughout their lives. We should not add to it by wanton waste. In an awakened new faith the people everywhere should demand that initiative be encouraged; that business, including small business, be strengthened; and that State and local governments be restored to their proper place of power. Open our courts to all who have been deprived of their rights by orders and directives and where redress is now denied or discouraged. We want the shackles of bureaucracy removed and the creative genius of our people set free.

And the creative genius must be set free. Our depleted resources must be replaced. We can make the products and materials that other people want. We have proved our power to build machines—to expand beyond the comprehension of defeatists—and to build as no people on earth the things that will raise the standards of living here and in the other nations. This does not mean the loss of any social gain but it would prevent perpetuating the causes of poverty and distress.

Tomorrow can mean greater international trade than ever before. That trade will be in new fields and in new things. It will enlarge the commerce of other nations. It will lift the standards of others without tearing ours down. But these new horizons cannot be reached unless the creative genius of our people is released and encouraged. That genius will not be released and investment will not be encouraged unless Government refrains from regimentation and from taking too much of the income of the people for the ordinary functions of Government. We can now only estimate what our national income should be in the years ahead. But it must be at a higher level than prevailed in 1940; and it must be based upon an expanded agricultural and industrial economy in our country which has already gone beyond the

dreams of those who have planned for America.

The American wants to work. He doesn't mind hard work. He never has courted ease and he doesn't today. Tomorrow cannot be built upon a life of ease and scarcity. It must be built upon work and abundance. The returning soldier wants security through opportunity. The thrill of his life will came from working—from accomplishment. He wants life to be worth living. He wants a hand in building the great industrial machines of tomorrow—in creating a better community and nation—and he wants a life of peace for himself and his children.

III

And this leads me to my final thought. Our moral and spiritual standards must be strengthened. Corruption in public office, greed for money and power in time of danger, disregard of life and human welfare, breach of public and private trust are evidences of moral and spiritual degeneration.

The strength of America rests upon reverence and consecration in every-day human relationships and the practice of the human virtues of truth, love, kindness, and abiding faith.

America will in the years ahead reflect the personal lives of our people, the strength of our homes, the spirit of our churches, the patriotism and work of our schools. In recent years terrifying rifts have been created among the various groups and classes within our Nation. The rift between management and labor, between various groups in our economic and social life, between races and religious faiths, has weakened America. Tomorrow these grievances must be healed and a roadway of goodwill built among all our people. Then truly will the dream of America come to pass and the hope of the founding fathers be realized. More boys and girls and men and women than ever before in our history are offering their lives that this dream may become real. When millions have faith enough in an ideal to die for it, the rest of us must have faith enough to consecrate our lives and our services for it.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the greatest disservices that the New Deal party has done to this Nation has been as the result of its refusal to argue anything purely on its merits. The sneer and the slur, the appeal to class consciousness and prejudice, seems always to be an indispensible part of its so-called logic. No one, it seems, can ever have an honest difference of opinion from their opinion. Oh, no! According to them, their rhetorical adversary is always a tool of the interests, a voice for the selfish minority, the stubborn satanic whisper of reaction, or the unholy alliance of government and big business. In fact, if even a Democrat disagrees with a new dealer, it cannot be because of sincere conviction, but must be because he is a southern Democrat or an unholy conspirator.

Mr. Speaker, I have resented this as a private citizen and taxpayer; I have resented it as a Representative in Congress; and I resent it now on behalf of my constituents when it is applied to the present question of subsidies. Such name calling and demagogic appeals are, of course, particularly ridiculous where any aspect of inflation is concerned, since even the New Deal economists will concede that, under inflation, the more you have the more you can lose.

In any event, we are all agreed that we do not want inflation, and that all the constituents of every Representative in this Congress have a complete community of interest in its prevention or control. The problem is simply how to prevent and control it, and subsidies have been offered primarily as one method of accomplishing it by implementing the hold-the-line policy. Up to this point practically all of us are in agreement, but from the same sets of facts our conclusions vary. About three-quarters of the membership of the Congress believe that subsidies are more likely to prove, in the final analysis, to be the poison itself rather than the antidote, inflationary rather than anti-inflationary. And that is why most of the Representatives view them with genuine misgiving. Many of us believe, too, that even should it be admitted that there are weak links in the hold-the-line chain which might possibly be strengthened by certain explicit and limited subsidies, that to leave discretionary administration of those subsidies to such a bureau as the Commodity Credit Corporation would be truly an invitation to chaos and disaster. This is the New Deal bureau, we cannot forget, which perhaps more than any other, exposed us to the ridicule of the rest of the world and the disgust of our constituents. It is the bureau which administered the philosophy of a prosperity of scarcity. The bureau which paid us for the pigs and cattle we destroyed and the cotton and other crops we did not plant and plowed under and shortly thereafter spent huge sums for the importation of pork, beef, and crops.

Of course, the very fact that the New Deal administration, through its "Assistant President," can now tell us that the very life or death of the administration's hold-the-line policy depends on subsidies, is no doubt an unintentional confession of its failure. It is a confession that the construction of the dikes has been faulty, and that now there has to be some finger-plugging of the holes that are beginning to appear in order to keep a vast flood from completely engulfing us. It is a confession of what all of us have known but some of us have denied: a complete failure of the administration to tie wages to the cost of living. The Congress was ready to do this but the President intervened, saying let me do it my way.

There is no use arguing over this milk so long spilt, however; there is no use day-dreaming over what might or should have been; the people do not want recrimination, they want action and results. We are squarely confronted with the problem and the only question is, What are we going to do about it? I say that we all want to do something about it, whether we happen to be Republican or Democrat, liberal or reactionary, minority, majority, unholy conspirator, or southern Democrat. This sincerity and integrity of purpose the New Deal will never concede us, because we do not quite see eye to eye with it on how it shall be done.

The problem is first of all, twofold. The administration has confessed that its anti-inflation dam has proved inadequate. Well, we suspected so from the start. Now the question is, Are we going to tear down this one because it was never built on a proper foundation in the first place in order to build a proper one in its place, that is, tie wages firmly to a cost of living index, or patch up the one we have now as best we can? Reluctantly, we must conclude that the hour is late to do ourselves what the President promised he would do if we would, as we indeed did, give him the power.

The patching methods are, then, left to us. In a general way, fair-minded Members will agree that there are three: Additional taxes, increased production for domestic consumption, as so concisely put the other day by my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] and the substitute for controlled wages, subsidies. Of these, the closest the administration has come to the first alternative was in the offering of a fantastic ten and one-half billion tax gouge, which was overwhelmingly rejected in committee. At the same time, the administration flatly opposes the only anti-inflation levy probably even worth talking about, the sales tax. Hence alternative No. 1 has been ruled out—by the administration, however, and not by Congress.

Alternative two is, of course, emphatically ruled out by the still rising graph of the demands of our war production.

So we end up, finally, with consideration of alternative No. 3—subsidies. Now there is a very serious school of economic thought that believes that subsidies, far from being anti-inflationary, are actually outright inflationary in nature. In fact, I believe the only economists who maintain anything else are conspicuously of the New Deal's own school. The sound logic, reduced to simple terms, which leads inevitably to this conclusion, is as follows: Subsidies, instead of blotting up increased purchasing power by the high prices they seek to hold down, actually accelerate inflation by putting more money into circulation by means of borrowing without a present additional tax to balance this borrowing. It is just another mortgage on the soldier's earnings which they will have to pay after they come home.

This is what I believe, and I believe it is what a majority of the Members of Congress believe. Nevertheless, I also believe that in the end we will, because it is too late for any other choice, accept the third, or subsidy, alternative. They will, of course, be limited in number and the Commodity Credit Corporation will be largely stripped of any indiscreet discretion in paying them. And about the most that can be said in its defense, if this does turn out to be the final action of Congress, is that a little evil is at least better than a big evil, and that subsidies may serve as a strictly temporary—and

temporary only—finger plug in the administration's crumbling anti-inflation dam.

But I believe that the taxpayer, citizen, and voter has a right to be disturbed that such fumbling, bungling, and quasi-solutions have to be found by the Congress of the United States in their behalf during a time when this Nation and the entire world have faced one of the greatest crises in their respective histories, and I believe they have a right to inquire why this should be, and a right to a clear and forthright answer. And that answer I am perfectly willing to make.

The presently existing threat of inflation, with all its vision of possible hardship, suffering, financial and physical privation, chaos, and disaster, the possibility of which is now flashed across our mind's eye by the instant discussion, is once again the sure result of the New Deal's addiction to demagogery and politics, and its stern adherence to the policy of appearing to give something for nothing.

It refused to be realistic in fixing wages, for fear of antagonizing labor. It refused to consider a sales tax, because it is a tax that is not hidden, and that everyone would know they were paying. It offered an additional $10,500,000,000 tax request while at the same time telling small wage earners that their taxes would, under some half-baked plan, be less instead of more. So, in a typical and natural reaction the New Deal pulls another of its New Deal rabbits out of the New Deal hat, and it turns out that it is the same old New Deal rabbit. "Spend Your Way Out of Trouble" is its name, another name, too, for subsidies. And until the people realize that whether you are rich or poor, merchant or farmer, laborer or businessman, you can never get anything from government for nothing in the last analysis; and until the people so clearly recognize the demagogery and name-calling of the New Deal for the cheap and meaningless politics it is—that it becomes ineffectual as a constant method of day-in-and-day-out campaigning—then, and then only, can the people's elected representatives serve their country with a maximum of accomplishment and a minimum of hokum.

Ours is a great country and a great people, but even here there can be limits to the sly smallness of politics that our greatness can take and still endure.

Subsidies—The Cost and the Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on December 10, 1943, clearly and concisely set forth in the preceding remarks the principal causes of the inflationary threats which now confront us. Both wages and the cost of living have for many months been rising.

On the one hand it is said by one group that wages have increased more rapidly than has the cost of living. On the other hand, another group denies that statement and insists that the cost of living has outstripped the increase in wages. Both statements are true in part.

The price of some foods has gone up out of all proportion to increases in some wages. Some wages, notably those in war industries, have increased far more than has the cost of some food products.

One group, made up principally of white-collar workers, of professional men and women, of those living on fixed incomes, has not received any increase in their wages or the returns from their investments and beyond question are suffering hardships because of the rise in the cost of living.

The remedy is not subsidies, which would but create another spiraling increase in both food prices and wages, but is in the use by the President of the power which the Congress, at his request, gave him in January of 1942—a power to fix the price on all those things which enter into the cost of living and to fix or stabilize wages. The record shows that the President has made but a half-hearted attempt to fix the cost of living—prices; made practically no effort at all to stabilize wages.

When the people once understand the situation, they will cease to demand subsidies; they will insist that the President use the powers which he has to prevent inflation—to make it possible for everyone to enjoy, if not the former American standard of living, at least a standard which will prevent suffering on the part of anyone in the continental United States.

Challenge to Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 11, 1943:

CHALLENGE TO INDUSTRY

Charles E. Wilson has presented a dual challenge to the industrialists of America. Facing the cream of the crop on Wednesday at the forty-eighth annual meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers, he told them that war production next year must top the record levels of 1943 by about 20 percent. At the same time he called upon them for something even more difficult and more important than a production miracle. He asked of them self-restraint, political statesmanship.

No one has a better right than Charles Wilson to make such a demand. Himself a great industrialist, he laid aside private concerns to devote his energies and abilities exclusively to the service of his Government. For him there was no division of allegiance. He has learned a good deal about governmental problems and about politics, although he does not speak either as an official or as a politician. He knows industry well. And he is gravely disturbed by the cleavage which he discerns between industry and the Government.

"I tell you frankly," he declared, "that I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it." The alarm is not groundless. There is an extremist element which has indefatigably fought the social changes of the past decade and which seeks still to bring about a reversion to the past. It sees in the approaching national election a chance, not to build upon the beginnings which have been made, but to overthrow them. As Mr. Wilson puts it, some "special political and economic groups want to win complete victory for themselves regardless of the consequences for others and for the Nation."

We have not yet won the war, and we have by no means solved the acute problems which are bound to follow it. For both purposes we shall stand in very real need of unity and of mutual trust. "This above all," Mr. Wilson told the N. A. M., "is a time when the industrial leaders of America owe it to their country and to themselves to exercise temperate judgment, to practice the arts of compromise, to avoid the temptation of sacrificing enduring values for temporary gains, and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity."

Next year's election may seem to some businessmen an opportunity to end all Government impingements upon free and unfettered enterprise. If they view it in this light, they will injure their own real interests as well as the national stability. For their proper place is as one of the coordinate elements in our economic life. They have an adjustment to make which will require some self-discipline. In large measure, throughout most of industry, the adjustment has already been made. Mr. Wilson is warning against reaction. He thinks and speaks as a patriot—in the old, unsullied sense of that word.

Pumping a Dry Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, having once started on a campaign of falsehood and vilification, Jergens' hired man, Winchell, advertising a commercial product which we hope is less odorous and irritating than his chatter, is constantly under pressure to manufacture petty discord-provoking gossip.

His imagination is exceeded only by his disregard for the truth and his insane desire to injure. His warped brain is constantly taxed to find new individuals to slander. His Jergens' broadcasts bring to mind a moronic child who gains pleasure by impaling flies on pin points or torturing small animals. Apparently, he derives a sadistic pleasure when he thinks

he has injured someone by his malicious half-truths or complete falsehoods. If Jergens' products are no more soothing or healing than are Winchell's broadcasts, Grand Marais folk will have none of them.

Winchell's difficulty in finding something to write about is evidenced by two paragraphs in his column of December 2, 1943, purporting to come from Chicago and which read:

The following isn't important enough for your column but might give you a chuckle. Your admirer in Congress, CLARE HOFFMAN, owns a small cottage at the edge of the little village of Grand Marais, Mich., on the shores of Lake Superior, where he has not endeared himself to the inhabitants. When HOFFMAN arrived this summer there was a new captain at the life-saving spot—pardon me, Coast Guard. But HOFFMAN didn't care anything about that—just his own pleasure. He proceeded to go fishing without going through any permission formula, etc. The captain there sent for HOFFMAN. He had him brought in. Unexplained boats are not wanted on Lake Superior, he was told. The great obstructionist HOFFMAN was furious. Didn't the cap'n know who he was? He was Congressman HOFFMAN, by heck! He could do as he pleased. Such an insult to him! etc., etc., ad infinitum, blah, blah.

The captain listened in silence, and the more insulting HOFFMAN got the cooler became the cap. Then, with one softly spoken sentence, the captain did the trick. He cooed: "Wouldn't Walter Winchell enjoy knowing this?" That's all, brother. HOFFMAN actually became polite. Having stirred up so many waters till they were troubled, it seemed as if you might be pleased to learn of one time when you acted as the oil that smoothed them down.

I sent Vice Admiral R. R. Waesche, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, a copy of Winchell's column containing the foregoing and asked for a report from the commanding officer at Grand Marais. Vice Admiral R. R. Waesche advised me as follows:

I am pleased to quote hereunder the statement of Ensign Stanley E. Plastner, U. S. C. G., who at the time of your visit to the station was serving as commanding officer:

Headquarters is advised that the facts are as follows:

"Last July a patrol, on his regular rounds, stopped a launch proceeding out of Grand Marais Channel into Lake Superior on a fishing trip. When the patrol discovered that the operator of the launch did not have the usual Coast Guard identification he was escorted to the lifeboat station. Congressman HOFFMAN was informed of the regulations governing such cases and was furnished the necessary credentials. In Mr. Winchell's article the following quotations are untrue: 'Didn't the cap'n know who he was? He was Cong. HOFFMAN, by heck! He could do as he pleased. Such an insult to him! etc., etc., ad infinitum, blah, blah.' 'Wouldn't Walter Winchell enjoy knowing this?' The Congressman said no such thing.

"Until headquarters letter was received by me, I had no intimation that the visit of Congressman HOFFMAN at the Grand Marais Lifeboat Station was known to any others than myself and the men stationed there. I have no idea of how such a twisted account could have emanated from this occurrence."

As usual, Winchell cannot tell the truth, even about an unimportant matter.

Mr. Speaker, when a commercially paid commentator, claiming so many listeners, finds it necessary to use and distort an ordinary conversation which occurred months ago between two individuals, and to use it to injure a community and its people, it is evident that his prejudices and sadistic impulses continue to shape his statements.

For years, in an Old Town sponson 20-foot canoe with an inboard motor, I have gone in and out of the harbor at Grand Marais, on the south shore of Lake Superior, to fish for Mackinaw trout—6 or 8 miles out on Superior.

Later, one of the friends of FRED BRADLEY, who represents so ably the people of Alger County, gave me an old lifeboat and since then I have been using it on my trips past the Coast Guard station, out through the channel and on the lake.

Until this year, as I recall, no check was ever made of small boats entering or leaving the harbor, except as a crew at the lifesaving station checked boats in and out so as to be able to aid them in case of distress or break-down.

This summer, running out between the piers on a fishing trip, I was signaled to stop by a member of the Coast Guard, who asked to see my permit. I had no knowledge of any restrictions. I had no permit and so, upon being told that the harbor and the adjacent waters had been declared a restricted area, I asked to be taken to the office of the commanding officer so that I might obtain a permit.

The young man on Coast Guard duty took me over. He was courtesy itself, as was the commanding officer, who, when I inquired what sort of a permit I needed, told me that I must be identified. I had never met him before. I gave him my name, my address, and when he asked for paper identification, presented to him the identification card containing my photograph, which was issued by the Capitol Police Board here in Washington. That is a card which all Members of Congress for a time were required to show before they were admitted to their offices here in Washington.

The officer in command stated that that was all that was necessary; that I should sign a blank which he presented, which I did, and he added that, for the record, I should send him a photograph. I later did that, but some officer who had succeeded him wrote saying that the photograph sent on was not of the correct size.

Not long ago other photographs were ordered, and for the Coast Guard permanent record and to avoid any delay next summer, if I am privileged to go to Grand Marais, such a photograph will be forwarded and the proper permit will, if necessary, be obtained here in Washington.

There was no argument at the Coast Guard station; no one could have been treated more courteously than was I; no impertinent or improper questions were asked.

Grand Marais is a little village in northern Michigan, on the shores of Lake Superior. At the western edge of that village I own a fishing shack—an old house which I purchased for $100. Grand Marais is a beautiful village. It lies at the foot of the bluff which encircles the Harbor of Refuge, in which many a vessel in years gone by has found safety in time of distress.

Once upon a time, Grand Marais was a lumbering town, with a railroad, busy mills, stores, churches, lumberjacks in plenty, docks crowded with shipping; but when the softwood was exhausted, lumbering activities ceased; the business of two mammoth general stores—one conducted by Mr. and Mr. Schneider, with the help of their daughter, Gertrude, a graduate of the University of Michigan; the other by Mr. Hill and his son, dwindled. The saloons moved out with the railroads. Many of the young folks sought opportunity and advancement in other localities.

Grand Marais became a quiet, peaceful town—26 miles north of the railroad at Seney, reached only, in 1916, when I first went in, over poor, winding sand roads.

But Lake Superior—deep, clear, almost ice cold, with schools of red-fleshed Mackinaw trout—was there; the harbor and the bay and East Bay, the cold, pure streams pouring in from the high back country. The little lakes hidden back in the remaining hardwood were there.

Best of all, the few hundred people who remained loved the town and the surrounding country. To them it was home. They wanted less fortunate people to come to Grand Marais and share in their advantages. Visitors were welcomed as neighbors, and that trait of kindly hospitality has existed, to my personal knowledge and I have been a beneficiary of it, for the last 37 years, during every one of which but one—1917—I visited the town and enjoyed associating with its people, whom I came to regard as members of my own community.

During the 36 years when I have spent a week or more each summer or in the fall with the people of Grand Marais, never once has anyone in that village expressed to me or toward me, so far as I ever heard, anything but the kindliest feeling.

True, the people at election time cast a Democratic vote and I was an outspoken Republican; but I was on a vacation and, believe it or not, no political disagreement ever arose with any of the citizens.

If I wanted to know, as I often did, something of the history of Grand Marais, of the wrecks which when first I went there were on the beach, I had but to consult Captain Truedell. The captain had long served with the Coast Guard and knew many of the stories of the vessels which the northwest winds had cast upon the beach when they turned too late to enter the Harbor of Refuge.

Captain Truedell, while a busy man, was always willing to tell a stranger or an old friend, as I came to be, most interesting tales of the early days of the village, when Coast Guard crews went out in open boats to challenge the storms which turned Superior into a boiling caldron—it was Superior, you will remember, which made the German admiral who had sailed on the high seas for years, seek the lee rail when he took a pleasure trip on its restless waters.

And Coast Guardsman Chilson, who served for years at Deer Park, was another who knew from personal experience of the mighty power of Superior when lashed by a snow-laden northwestern gale. Chilson, years before, because of age had retired, but lived on the bluff overlooking the harbor and lake, and to the last was a Paul Bunyan of a man.

The owner of a small, open 24-foot boat with an inboard motor, he often took trips up and down the shore to hunt and to fish. Lucky it was that Chilson—and we called him captain—past his eightieth year—one November was hunting with his son, Charlie, some miles west of Sable Light, which juts out into Lake Superior 7 miles west of Grand Marais, and had pitched his hunting camp at Sullivan's Landing.

Offshore one morning, stranded on the rocks, they saw a mammoth freighter, two of whose crew had earlier abandoned the ship in a lifeboat seeking to reach the Coast Guard station at Grand Marais. They never reached it, for they froze to death before making port.

But Chilson, though his eyes were old and dim, saw the boat, ice-covered and helpless on the rocks. With almost superhuman effort, aided by his skill and experience, he launched his open boat and, with his son Charlie, went to the rescue. His seamanship brought him to the side of the wrecked ship, where he attracted the attention of the ice-imprisoned crew.

Memory fails me as to the number rescued, but I do know, for I heard it not from Chilson alone but from many others who knew the facts, that, because of what the captain and his son did that day in snow and ice and tossed by towering waves, 10 or more men lived to see another day.

I do know that, had it not been for the heroic efforts of those two, the captain's skill, his hardihood, and his perseverance, all would have died, for the lighthouse crew at Sable Light had no way of reaching them, and the signals sounded by the Sable officer were, because of the storm, either not heard at Grand Marais by the lifesaving crew of the Coast Guard or were misunderstood, for no help came until Chilson with his small boat had taken off the crew of the wrecked tanker.

The story was so simply, so modestly told; an example so typical of Grand Marais Coast Guardsmen, of heroic conduct on the part of two average Grand Marais men, that, at my request, it was retold to my sons and still later to my grandsons.

It was my privilege, in later years and after Captain Chilson had gone, to be able to assist his widow, who still lives in a house overlooking the scene of her husband's exploits, in securing a pension due her.

It was also my privilege to help another widow, whose man was taken by the cold waters of Lake Superior, obtain the payments due her for a piece of land which she had sold to a local resident.

All days and all nights at Grand Marais were not happy ones, for often old Superior awakened in her might, took toll of the village folks. Well do I remember one late fall day when Superior waters were rolling white for miles on each side of the harbor, driving at times over the light at the end of the pier, three fishing boats—the *Isabel*, the *Josephine*, and I think it was the *Lydia*—could not make the harbor, and lay for shelter behind Caribou Island, in Canadian waters.

One—the *Lydia*, I believe; in any event, the boat commanded by Captain Larson, with his crew of four—undertook before the storm subsided to cross the lake to the home port. Captain Larson was accounted the best sailor on the south shore of Lake Superior. He was familiar with Superior, its treacherous storms, and the channel at Grand Marais, which sometimes was shallowed by sand; but the captain, eager to be home, with faith in his boat—and it was the most seaworthy of the three—made the attempt.

In the evening twilight his boat was seen approaching the harbor mouth. Charlie Mattson and some others of us saw the light as the boat turned to come through the channel, but three or four hundred yards off the pier saw it disappear, and that was the last of the *Lydia*.

The waves were beating over the breakwater east of the harbor, and some of us went down into the bay to see if perchance someone might be rescued. Fish, fish boxes, lunch baskets, net boxes, all sorts of gear, came pounding over the breakwater into the bay and the ice floating there. Some of us with waders up to our armpits and ropes around our waists, searched along the ice cakes and the floating wreckage to see if one of the crew might be found and resuscitated, but none survived.

The next spring miles down the shore toward the Soo, three bodies were found, but the other two were never given up by the lake.

Others of Grand Marais, like Mrs. Matillas' man, shared like fate, and more recently two others, caught in a burning boat, jumped overboard and before the craft could be turned, sunk beneath the waves.

The lake is beautiful when peaceful; it is grand in time of storm, but when lashed by fall or winter gale it is tragic and exacts its toll in repayment for the pleasure and the livelihood it gives.

The people of Grand Marais were, and they are industrious; they are thrifty, they are God-fearing, as is shown by the fact that the little town of 535 inhabitants has not less than three churches, and those well attended. The men work in the woods, some fish and some engage in other occupations. Wood and Touzell run a garage, repairing anything and everything from a wheelbarrow to the most complicated marine engine, and, in addition, operate a trucking service to the nearest railway point at Seney.

There are fishermen—Endress, Pettipren, Niemi, and a half dozen others—who catch and ship out tons of lake trout. Others like Grump, Carter, the efficient game warden, operate fast cruisers for deep-sea fishing. In short, practically every man in the village is skilled in one or more trades. All are self-reliant, forehanded, and well able, as were the pioneers, to care for themselves and all who may call upon them for help.

Yes, there are many friendly people in Grand Marais—the Niemies, with three or more boys in the service, at least two of them officers; Wicklund, on the farm just west of my shack, has boys in the service. Any one of the Mattson boys, Oxell, Fred, Charlie, or John, is ever ready to show you a stream where brook trout can be caught, a stand in the woods near a deer run; and, if you want a flashlight, a reel, or an electric motor repaired, call Neuberg or one of his sons, if all have not gone to war.

Nor, if you visit Grand Marais, should you overlook Charlie Goodman, who, when lumber was king, fished and hunted for the lumber camps, and today, almost ninety, is still tough as a pine knot.

Yes, for 36 years, in summer and sometimes in the fall, I have spent happy, restful, health-giving days and weeks at Grand Marais. My sons and their wives have come to look on Grand Marais as a second home, and three of the grandsons, though the youngest is but 4, have learned to take the speckled trout from the sparkling streams; and one, Sam, 15 last summer, took a 16-pound Mackinaw from Superior.

It is my hope that in the years to come the grandchildren may have the high privilege of taking their children—yes, their grandchildren—to this harbor of refuge, to the village of Grand Marais, where nature restores to all the good, hard, common sense which this country now, of all times, needs, where all can learn again from restless Superior, from the shifting sand dunes, from the changing streams, from the glorious sunsets, that, while we think we are important, we are in truth but as the passing shadows in the forest. Like the Indians, the lumberjacks, and those who followed, we, too, will soon be of the past. But Old Superior, the sand dunes, the rivers and streams, the storms, the sun going down in the lake will give pleasure to countless generations. Would that here in Washington we might build with that thought in mind.

If you wish to rest, if you wish quiet and contentment, if you want to hunt or fish, fish on streams or on the tossing waters of Lake Superior, go to Grand Marais and there you will find a friendly, considerate people, ever anxious to make your stay a pleasant one.

Winchell's attempt to slander the good people of Grand Marais by intimating that they, as a whole, approve of him or his malicious broadcasts in the interest of Jergen's lotion, his false and malicious charge that they are unfriendly and discourteous to visitors or vacationists, will not keep anyone who enjoys fishing for brook trout, deep-sea fishing, hunting, or just a quiet, peaceful vacation from visiting that delightful community. Yes, Winchell, the keyhole peeper, in his effort to defeat antinew dealers, is, as usual, just pumping a dry hole.

American-Soviet Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 7, in the city of Chicago, in the great Orchestra Hall, the tenth anniversary of the recognition of Russia, and of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the founding of the Russian Soviet Union was celebrated by nearly 4,000 people, liberty- and freedom-loving Americans, whom I had the honor to address before the American-Soviet Friendship meeting. I have received many requests for copies of that speech; and I also have been asked to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted.

Since making that speech events of great importance have taken place, in fact, the most important in the history of our country, and perhaps the world, namely, the conference of our President, Premier Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill at Tehran, and the conference with the other great representative of a great nation, Chiang Kai-shek, of China, at Cairo.

Naturally, I am immensely pleased that my oft-repeated assurance that Russia will never be inveigled into a separate peace with Germany and will stand honorably and steadfastly with the United Nations, not only to accomplish complete destruction of the Nazi-Jap militarism, but also to bring about a lasting and just peace, and freedom and liberty to the Nazi-overrun nations. And, furthermore, that there will be complete cooperation to reestablish their freedom and liberty and a real democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the address which I gave at Orchestra Hall:

I appreciate the courteous invitation extended to me and consider myself honored to be present at this gathering of our liberty-loving Americans who are celebrating the tenth anniversary of American-Soviet diplomatic relations and the twenty-sixth anniversary of the founding of the Russian-Soviet Union.

I am taking advantage of this opportunity not only for the purpose of giving you a brief summary of some of the important factors that have united these two great republics in the present historic conflict between humanity and barbarism, but I also wish to give expression to America's profound admiration of Soviet Russia, which, under the consistent and most brilliant leadership of Marshal Joseph Stalin, has so ably united over 170,000,000 of Russian people and inspired the gallant Russian Army with such devotion and heroism in this great struggle for independence of their motherland and world democracy.

I recollect that in October 1918, over the protest of certain statesmen, I arranged a conference with President Wilson for Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, world-known statesman, liberator, and first president of Czechoslovakia, who was just returning from Russia. During his conference with President Wilson at the White House, in discussing the critical situation in Russia, Masaryk made this interesting statement:

"Collaboration, instead of intervention, in Russian internal affairs would be more helpful for consolidation and the progress of democracy in Europe."

His statement attracted the attention of diplomatic circles in Washington and was transmitted to Paris and London with the result that all preparations for military invasion of Russia were canceled.

It should be remembered that since the two most despotic maniacs, Hitler and Mussolini, appeared upon the stage of world prominence, it has been Soviet Russia that has repeatedly and persistently demanded collective security and the formation of a protective alliance of the peoples and governments of European democratic nations to challenge fascism and nazi-ism and to stop the expanding and approaching danger of vicious aggressive conspiracy.

Had the alliance of European nations, as sponsored by the statesmen of Soviet Russia—Stalin, Litvinov, and Molotov—been effected in time, and had President Wilson's plea been heeded by our Senate to enter the League of Nations, it would most probably have prevented this terrible global tragedy.

Those of you who have followed my activities in Congress will recall my activities in behalf of the independence of the smaller nations and my continuous and urgent demands for unity and collective security among those European nations who wished to defeat Hitlerism, and I am taking the liberty of repeating my remarks made on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 18, 1938:

"Three years ago (that was in 1935) I voiced the belief that a secret or tacit agreement existed between Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, but my warnings went unheeded.

"* * * There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Hitler, Mussolini, and the raving-mad Japanese war lords are in conspiracy to divide the entire world among themselves, or at least as much of it as they can manage to grab."

Again I call attention to the fact that I made this statement in 1938.

I recall that I was urging in Congress and stressing the importance of reestablishing commercial and friendly relations with Soviet Russia ever since 1920, but our reactionaries succeeded in defeating my efforts. It was not until President Roosevelt assumed the responsibility as Chief Executive that the policy of mutual collaboration between the United States and Soviet Russia was adopted, and I fervently hope it will continue to the mutual advantage of both countries.

Since the European war broke out it was my firm belief that, for our own defense and in our own interest, we should give all possible assistance to the United Nations fighting Hitlerism. Most of our Fascist and Nazi ideologists and isolationists refused to recognize, and, in fact, minimized, the approaching danger to us until Pearl Harbor. Then some of them were finally convinced that Hitler, Mussolini, and the imperialistic Japs would dare to attack the United States. Before then they neglected our dangerously exposed geographical position in the North Pacific, and were completely oblivious to the fact that Siberia is separated from the American-owned Aleutian Islands and the coast of Alaska by only a narrow strip of water. They paid no heed to the obvious—that Nazi-Japan victory over Britain and Russia would bring our enemy forces to the very shores of Alaska and our Pacific coast.

You will recall how the Nazi-Fascist conspirators and propagandists acting under the cover of neutrality, patriotism, and the slogan "Keep America out of the war," fomented a sensational campaign against President Roosevelt when, after the collapse of France and the British disaster at Dunkerque, he tranferred 50 of our destroyers to Britain to aid her against the threatened German invasion. Looking back today, in the light of our experiences in this war, it is clear that the wise and farsighted foreign and domestic policies of the President have been fully vindicated, and, as Americans we are proud of our contribution toward the approaching victory of the United Nations.

In their contemptible and cowardly efforts to promote disunity and keep America unprepared, and foment disorder and chaos, the Nazi-Fascist conspirators in America followed the Hitler pattern and organized an underground campaign of anti-Semitism and race hatred and even fostered conflicts between our industrialists and labor, with the deliberate intention to destroy our war machinery, paralyze our war production, and undermine the confidence of the people in the President and his administration.

Meanwhile the German industrialists and the Junkers inaugurated a fraudulent bankruptcy to deceive American creditors, alleging that Germany was not in position to continue paying reparations and the American creditors, in consequence, treated Germany with all possible consideration, disregarding the fact that Germany was the only nation that had profited in the war. Germany had paid some reparations in the sum of $4,400,000,000 and in return received loans in the sum of $6,400,000,000, which she never repaid.

You will also recall that it was President Hoover and his administration that granted Germany a moratorium whereby further payments on reparations were suspended for a year, thus giving Germany an opportunity to reorganize their industry for rearmament production, and to finance and mobilize the Nazi forces for this global war, in direct violation of the Versailles Treaty.

Their pretended fear of communism served the Nazi propagandists as a camouflage to conceal their dastardly intention to create disruption and disharmony among the nations of the world, to strain friendly relations between the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. For years they have been consistently repeating their astounding falsehoods, accusing Soviet Russia of instability, religious persecution, and of the intention to communize America and the European Continent. The latest expression of the Russian leaders and their policies have demonstrated to the world that there is not, and was not, a shred of truth in the charges.

The most vicious campaign was carried on with the obvious purpose of inducing our American people to believe that the Communists, acting under the direction of the Russian Soviet Government, were contemplating the overthrow of our constitutional government. They heralded all over America and in neutral countries the bug-a-bear that on the defeat of Germany the whole of Europe and America would be dominated by the international Communist dictators. This was answered by Stalin's dissolution of the Communist International Comintern. He made this statement:

"The dissolution of the Communist International Comintern facilitates the work of patriots in freedom-loving countries in uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp for national liberation, for unfolding the struggle against fascism, against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, thus clearing the way to future organization of companionship of nations based upon their equality. I feel that the dissolution of the Communist International Comintern is perfectly timely because it is

exactly now, when the Fascist beast is exerting its last strength that it is necessary to organize the common onslaught of freedom-loving countries to finish off this beast and deliver the people from Fascist oppression."

It is also timely to quote from Stalin's statement made only yesterday regarding Russia's war aims. They are—

"1. Liberation of occupied European countries—including Poland, France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Greece.

"2. Liberated countries must be allowed to choose their own form of government.

"3. All war criminals must be punished.

"4. Such order must be created that no future attempt at world domination can be made by Germany.

"5. Establishment of full collaboration among the nations of Europe on the basis of full mutual trust, which will make any future aggression impossible."

For years the Nazi-Fascist propagandists were spreading falsehoods and misrepresentations of facts in an effort to influence our people into believing that the government of Soviet Russia is not founded upon democratic principles of justice, that freedom is brutally suppressed, and that only a small minority of the Russian people are loyal to the Soviet system of government. The facts are the exact opposite. No government enjoys the whole-hearted support of its people as does the Russian government. I wish to God we had the unity the Russians enjoy.

There are no Quislings, no traitors, no fifth columnists in Russia. When the German Army treacherously invaded Russia it was met by the Russian people, 170,000,000 of them, united in courage, in spirit, and in determination. They are heroically ridding their beloved country of the barbaric invaders according to plan. Yes, the Russian plan!

Hitler invading Russia reckoned upon the collapse of the whole Soviet Union with the first blitz which was struck against the Russian army. Hitler's "intuition" proved to be a ghastly illusion; instead of collapse, Russia, notwithstanding one defeat after another, progressively gained strength. Its forces brilliantly defended Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad, and, finally, turned the tide of battle and now—with the fall of Kiev—the arrogant monster is on the run. The stability of the Russian Soviet Government, the bravery and heroism of the great Russian Army, and, indeed, of the Russian people, in the face of the greatest hardships and the severest atrocities, is little short of the miraculous. It has convinced the most pessimistic observers and critics of the solidarity of all Russia and of its unswerving confidence in her great leader, Marshal Stalin. Two years of war has not weakened the Russian power to carry on in this greatest of all wars, and has demonstrated to the world the strength and determination of its people. The hour of decisive victory and durable peace is approaching.

Again, I wish to quote Stalin in connection with the pernicious accusations by the Nazis that Russia is secretly trying to communize the world and dominate the European continent and America:

"We haven't, we can't have, such a purpose in this war as the conquest of foreign territories, of foreign peoples in Europe, Asia, including Iraq. We cannot have such a purpose as to impose our will and Slavonic regime on the other enslaved peoples of Europe."

Of course we all know that Russia was compelled to enter into its treaty of nonaggression with Nazi Germany to gain time. She was not prepared for war, and she used the precious intervening time to mobilize her army, organize her industry, and fortify her frontier. This, however, did not prevent her from giving continuous aid to stricken China.

President Roosevelt in acclaiming the results of the Moscow Conference expressed the belief that Soviet Russia is anxious to cooperate with the United States, Britain, and all United Nations in the war and peace. The accomplishments of our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, the British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, and the Soviet Foreign Commissar, V. M. Molotov, have completely demolished the Nazi charges that Russia wants a separate peace and that the conference would end in disunity.

In conclusion, permit me to assure you all who are gathered here today to celebrate the great accomplishments of Russia that you and the people of Russia will appreciate the fact that you have in our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, a sincere and loyal friend who recognizes the heroic efforts and great sacrifices on the part of the Russian people, as well as their unanimity for complete joint cooperation, and the tremendous aid they have thus far given to the United Nations. I feel confident that the American people are now convinced that their President made no mistakes, as originally charged, when he advocated giving aid to Russia, and has, in fact, given Russia all possible aid and assistance. I am sure that even his bitterest critics and haters must concede, if not in the open, then in their hearts, that this cooperation has materially aided in assuring positive defeat of the Nazi-Japanese brutal military gang, and I am indeed gratified that the confidence in Russia that I have entertained steadfastly has been fully justified.

I am satisfied that the vast majority of our American people fully recognize the great achievements and progress made by the Soviet Government within the short space of 26 years, and that they, too, hail the Moscow Conference as a harbinger of a new world cooperation and everlasting peace.

The hour of Russia's triumph over German greed and barbarity is not far distant. I am proud, indeed, to have been privileged to make some little contribution to the better understanding of that great and gallant people. They have earned the right to the fullest measure of lasting peace and prosperity. God grant that what is coming to them—and to the whole world—be not long delayed.

Where Have Our Courthouses Gone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Kansas, Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel, recently made a very interesting and significant address at Des Moines, Iowa. In this address Governor Schoeppel discusses in an able and informative way a question which is now very much in the minds of the public and which is of great interest to all of us. I believe that Members of Congress will be interested in reading this address, and I submit the same herewith under unanimous consent previously granted by the House:

I am honored to have this invitation to appear before this distinguished group. I am happy to be here to meet you. It is a genuine pleasure to come to the State of Iowa and to have the opportunity which has been presented to me here today, to meet a group of outstanding citizens such as this.

But more than the privilege of meeting with you upon an occasion of this kind, I am particularly pleased to be here because I feel that there is a great deal to be gained from an interchange of our ideas and our viewpoints.

I expect that everyone making a public speech these days takes occasion to mention the gravity of the situation facing the world today. We all know how desperately true this is. The seriousness of our mutual problems seems to me to make a joint consideration of them particularly apropos.

I come from the State of Kansas. Kansas, like Iowa, is a great agricultural State. We both belong to the great central western part of our Nation. In many respects our problems are identical. While Kansas is not quite as widely diversified in her agricultural activities as Iowa, nevertheless we do grow, produce, process, and manufacture many things. Kansas is the leading wheat-producing State of the Nation, furnishing approximately one-fourth of our Nation's entire supply. And while we cannot vie with Iowa for honors, Kansas also produces corn which we think is of good quality and very considerable quantity. Kansas is the forefront in the production of livestock. Kansas produces oil and gas, coal, and salt, lead, zinc, industrial clays, and a host of other products. Kansas leads the Nation in flour milling, and is second in meat packing.

I mention these things not simply to catalog the attributes of my native State, but because I believe the enumeration of them will demonstrate the important fact that your State and mine, located as they are in close proximity to each other, are primarily interested in the same things and are called upon to meet the same problems. And we certainly do have problems. Let me point out one or two of them.

In the 2-year period between 1940 and 1942 the State of Iowa lost 3¾ percent of its population. Kansas fared even worse and lost 4½ percent of her population. With Iowa, this trend was relatively new, for during the preceding decade the population of Iowa increased slightly although it did not nearly keep up with the national average. During the preceding decade, Kansas, our mutual neighbor, Nebraska, and several others of the Midwestern States experienced actual losses. Every one of us is familiar with the trend toward concentration of population in big industrial centers and these centers are not located in either of our States.

Let me mention another difficulty which we are experiencing in common. We have witnessed the decline of our small towns; a tendency to leave the farms and go to the cities either in our own State or elsewhere. We have improved the highways, and we have rounded the curves. We have made it possible for our people to get away from the farms and villages with the greatest of speed. With the advent of improved transportation we have left many of our small communities high and dry. And the ownership of our land is concentrating in fewer and fewer hands.

We could go on and on pointing out these particular disturbing trends which call for and require adjustments. But merely naming these over does not result in settling them.

We could spend hours discussing any one of these, or any one of a host of others. We could discuss the advisability of further industrializing this area. We could consider the needs of our States for a readjustment of our transportation rate structure. We could talk over the fuller utilization of our natural resources for the benefit of this area. But time will not allow us to take the whole

world as our province here today. We can only barely scratch the surface of just one of our problems, so let us address ourselves to it.

The topic which I am scheduled to particularly discuss with you today is labeled "Where Have Our Courthouses Gone?" I can see that some of you seem to be wondering just a bit about what such a title could mean. It seems to have a vague similarity to an old ditty that has been the subject of many barber-shop quartets, close-harmony sessions, concerning the whereabouts of the vocalists' dog. On the other hand, I imagine that a number of you are inclined to advise me that the courthouse is at the same old place, located in the town square of the county seat, and, with the exception of the usual ravages of time and weather, it is much the same as always.

But I believe that upon closer inspection you will agree with me that there has been a change, and a very important change, at that. Let me illustrate.

About 20 years ago I graduated from college, and, armed with my sheepskin and an appropriate certificate from the supreme court of my State, I returned to my home town to engage in the practice of law. And following the ancient and time-honored custom in vogue in small rural counties in my State, in due time announced myself as a candidate for, and was elected to, the office of county attorney. I might mention that that was the only elective office which had a salary connected with it that I ever held until I became Governor.

I recall at that particular time our country was a relatively independent government agency. It was self-sustaining. Problems presented themselves and were met right there in the courthouse. We were able, I believe, to do a reasonably good job of local government. In meeting and solving our problems, we looked to the State government very little and to the National Government not at all. The citizens of the county knew who their elected officers were. They came in and talked with us frequently. We knew their difficulties. We dealt with them across the desk or over the counter, and sometimes, down at the corner drug store.

The individual citizen knew, understood, and had a definite opinion about the affairs of the county. They spoke their minds freely and they registered their approval and disapproval directly at the polls on the second Tuesday of the next November of an even numbered year. There was no doubt and no uncertainty about it. It constituted, as I can now clearly see, a perfect working example of democracy.

And, strangely enough, we got along very well. We performed the functions required of local government. We performed them to the best of our ability and in accordance with the will and the desire of our constituents.

Now that has been a matter of only about 20 years ago—a short time indeed in the history of a people. But in that 20 years there has taken place a most astounding change. The courthouse is the same. The same offices are filled by elected officials. The theoretical structure of county government is unaltered. But in practical operation the picture is now very different.

Federal agencies are all around us. There is scarcely a single problem presented to the county officials of today which is not either directly or indirectly involved with implications and issues related to occasionally State, but more often to Federal, regulation.

There are Federal offices in the basement and in the corridors on the second floor. Except during the regular term of court, there are some extra employees of some Federal agency in the courtroom. A couple of Federal auditors or investigators are usually temporarily using the jury room. The whole warp and woof of local government is enmeshed in the coils of bureaucratic regulation and control.

And that is only the story so far as the county government is concerned. You know that similar parallels could be drawn in our cities, in our educational districts and even more clearly in our State capitals.

Let me cite just one example. In 1874 the western part of Kansas suffered a very severe calamity in the form of a horde of grasshoppers. Our State was young, only 13 years old to be exact, and the settlement of the western part was very new indeed. The ravages of the grasshopper invasion threatened the livelihood of many of the settlers. The problem was very real and important to the people of my State.

Upon that occasion the Governor called a special session of the legislature. It met, considered the problem, and enacted proper legislation for the relief and aid for those in distress, and the necessary steps were promptly taken, the necessary relief was extended, and a calamity was averted.

If that same situation should occur today, we all know what would happen. It would take practically a photo finish to determine which would land first—the grasshoppers or a horde of Federal agents. The State and the county would have absolutely and exactly nothing to say about it. The policy and the means and the method of dealing with the problem would all be determined by the occupant of some swivel chair in Washington, D. C. The benefits—all from the Federal Treasury—in such manner and such form as Washington should dictate, would come to the farmers with their scarcely knowing what it was about—and we take it for granted.

The other day a great number of farmers in my State did receive Federal checks, and dozens of them were wondering what in the world they were for, as they knew of no payment which was due under any of the existing programs in which they were participating.

I believe this is indicative of at least one of the most serious problems which is facing Iowa and Kansas and our sister States today. It is foolish not to meet it squarely. Nothing can be gained by emulating the ostrich and sticking our heads in the sand. Through recent years, and most particularly during the past decade, we have been moving steadily toward a greater concentration of power in the Federal Government. Step by step we have watched this become an accomplished fact. Today our counties and our States are rapidly approaching the point of being nothing more or less than departments of the Federal Government. The question is whether or not all initiative and all freedom of choice is to be centralized in Washington or whether we are to continue to rely upon local government agencies as active and dynamic forces in our scheme of constitutional democracy.

Let me pause at this point to make one thing definitely clear. I do not want to be misunderstood in what I am saying. The prosecution of the war is a duty which imposes primary responsibility upon the Federal Government. Such steps as are necessarily taken to accomplish that end meet with the approval of all. To the limit and the extent necessary, we certainly do not object to Federal activities relating to the war program.

Personally, I wish it were possible for more of the responsibility for certain phases of the American war effort to be left with local government. Candid observation makes me feel that more of the details could be left with our counties and States without endangering the war program. The great difficulty is, as I see it, that our Federal Government, for the past decade, has been becoming too "centralization minded," if I may be permitted to coin a phrase. Nationally, we are not attempting to find ways to delegate functions to local government—quite to the contrary, we are actually seeking more and more centralization of authority.

But again I recognize that these are elements which are related to the actual prosecution of the war and are matters in which the Federal Government should be granted some latitude. Simply because some of us hold a contrary opinion as to the advisability of a particular phase of the program may offer no valid excuse for making an issue of the method adopted.

And let me further say that the people of the United States are not engaged in fighting a New Deal war, or a Democratic war, or a Republican war.

Politics and political views have no place in the struggle in which we are engaged. We are fighting an American war. We are united as Americans. We are going to win a complete and total victory. And the victory that we are to achieve must not inure to the benefit of any political party, group, or philosophy. It will be a victory demonstrating the power of free men and free women when their rights, their freedom, their country, their homes, and their loved ones are put in jeopardy. I sincerely trust that you will not misunderstand me in what I am saying in this regard. I do not for one moment object to the actual and necessary war activities of the Federal Government.

But the question which we are considering is more serious and far reaching. It is not a temporary matter which will disappear when the war is over. Let me point out a few of its manifestations.

Perhaps one of the most basic concepts we have is related to the ownership of land. Since the beginning of time men have struggled to possess a little portion of the earth's surface—for a home, for a farm, for a store building, or a factory. The ownership of land has been to a certain extent an index of the worth, the possession, and the power of individuals. Have you considered the extent of the ownership of the land of this Nation today? Do you realize that an accelerated rate, and in some instances, contrary to the expressed will of the Congress, the various agencies of the Federal Government are taking over more and more of the land of the United States? This has been pointed out many times before, and I recognize that I am no pioneer in calling it to your attention today. But it is so important that I would like to again remind you concerning it. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, in his committee report to the Senate, gave us this graphic illustration of the situation. This trend has gone on until today the Government either owns outright, or is acquiring, the grand total of 395,978,724 acres. Just how much is this roughly 396,000,000 acres? Well, let's put it another way. The Federal Government and its agencies either own, or are now acquiring, land sufficient in area to comprise the following States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana. Twenty-one States in all. Imagine, if you will, a map of this country with these 21 States blocked out. And that still is not quite enough, because in addition to these 21 States there would be enough left over to create 32 Districts of Columbia.

Think of it—that area comprises approximately one-fifth of all the land in the entire United States—about 20 percent of the total area of the Nation belonging to the Federal Government.

With this concentration of property in the hands of the Federal Government has come

another inevitable effect. That one-fifth of the Nation's land has gone off the tax rolls of the State, the counties, and the townships except for occasional token payments. The control of it has passed away from the agencies of local government. It is no longer subject to the fundamental police power of the communities and States in which it is situated. In effect, one-fifth of the country's land has been taken completely away from all local government.

But land alone is not the only criterion. Let us look at the matter of the sheer size of government as reflected in the number of employees. The original plan for our form of government contemplated a relatively small Federal Government created to perform the necessary centralized functions, and expected to operate on a modest budget and with reasonably few employees. An all-time high in number of employees were reached during the last World War, when the Federal pay roll rose to a little less than a million individuals—to be exact 917,760. Following that, the number was sharply reduced to around 500,000. But what is the situation today? In June of this year, the grand total of Federal employees was 3,233,218. And remember this does not include military personnel. These are the civilian employees only. About three and one-quarter million of them.

Consider again what was intended by the signers of our Constitution. They expected to have the bulk of government handled by the counties and townships, the States and cities. They expected the bulk of public moneys to be collected and expended close to the people. They anticipated that public servants would be responsible directly to the people.

But today, in 1943, taking all of our city, our State, our county, and our school employees, we find that we have only 3,053,800. The application of simple mathematics will demonstrate that there are today 179,418 more Federal employees than there are employees of all forms of local government.

These examples which I have mentioned, the concentration of property in the hands of the Federal Government, and the unprecedented growth of Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies are only 2 among many items we have experienced. New cases arise almost daily, each demonstrating over and over again, the plain and undisputed fact that local government is being put on the shelf.

I do not know how many instances I have encountered since I assumed the office of Governor last January. A Federal agency claiming exemption from the State sales tax on a housing project being built in competition with private enterprises one day, and a Federal agency claiming preference on utility rates the next. Time after time we get these evidences that the purpose and intent of the bureaucrats is to regulate, control, and administer from Washington with absolute disregard for the institutions and the laws created and established by the people in the State and in the counties.

I do not mean to be facetious, because I do not think that this is a matter to joke about. But in all candor, I want to say to you that we have gotten ourselves into a position where governmentally speaking "the tail is wagging the dog." Gradually, but nevertheless, definitely, step by step, and bit by bit, we have developed in this country a Federal Government which is encroaching upon us, and is crowding local government completely out of the picture.

I do not believe that this is wise. I feel that it is contrary to the very fundamental concept of a democracy. If the people are expected to govern their own affairs, we must have a plan of government which the people can understand. No man, no matter how wise and no matter how diligent, can understand all the ramifications of a Federal Government employing three and one-quarter million people and, incidentally, in its functions, owning one-fifth of a territory as big as the United States. And, if there exists no one sufficiently wise to understand such a government, how is it possible to expect the average citizen to diligently exercise his right of franchise and thereby correctly direct the course of his Government?

I was very much impressed, as I am sure many of you were, by an article recently published, written by Congressman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas. HATTON SUMNERS is an outstanding Member of Congress and is chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House. He is recognized as one of the most learned Members of that body. In the course of that article Mr. SUMNERS said, and I quote—

"The promoters of centralization are more and more resorting to the exercise of another unlimited power against which no constitutional barrier will ever stand—the control of the purse strings. By making the units of State government financially dependent on the Federal Government, that Government is acquiring the power to control the units of State government. When this is fully consummated, the sovereignty of the State governments will be liquidated.

"This job will have been done with money sent by Washington in the form of loans and gifts to States, towns, school districts, individual citizens. This money has served to attach all these interests directly to the Central Government and make them subject to its power—

"In weakening the States, we weaken the whole fabric of free government. The inescapable price of free government is that we exercise it. The most destructive force in the world is nonuse. If we do not use our powers of self-government in the States we will awake one day to find that self-government has passed irrevocably out of our hands.

"Government is exercised best in the local community. There the problems are perceived with greater clarity because they are close to the people and on a scale within their grasp. The self-reliance of the individual, town and State is being destroyed as they are being relieved of the necessity of governing themselves. When people stop thinking for themselves, there is always someone willing to step forward and do their thinking for them."

I believe that this statement by Mr. SUMNERS clearly shows the problem which we are facing. I am not making any charges against anyone. I merely ask that, as responsible citizens, interested in the welfare of your State and your Nation, you draw your own conclusions and determine for yourselves the wisdom of this course of affairs.

The tempo of our lives has been increased tremendously. I cannot help but recall the little story that came from the blue grass region of Kentucky, famed far and wide for the fine horses which it produces. Retired there from the race track was that great champion, Man-of-War. Over the stable a sign has been painted reading, "This is the fastest horse the world has ever seen." Some bright young college boy thought that the statement should be expanded somewhat, and so he carefully added to the sign by printing right under it this statement, "And this is the fastest world this horse has ever seen."

Certainly I do not mean to suggest that we can, or that we should attempt to, slow down this pace. The whole scheme of our life has been stepped up, and probably will maintain the increased tempo. I do not recommend that we turn the clock back 20 years, or 50 years, or even 1 year. There lies ahead of us a great future that will be ours if we are but capable of mastering it.

The issue that we must face is the determination of the method and the manner in which we shall seek to cope with coming events. Shall we adopt a policy of "big government," wherein a gigantic, centralized agency, or rather a mass of agencies, shall direct the activities of our people in all of their phases? Shall we have planned production and planned consumption? Shall we completely forsake the principle that has brought us thus far along the path, and by which we have grown from a completely undeveloped territory to the greatest Nation on the face of the earth? Shall we say in substance, "The plan of local self-government, maintained close to the people, wherein they can intelligently express their freedom of choice and make the decisions as to the course of things, has served us well, but we have now outgrown it; we will discard it, cast it out, and embark upon a new and different course, wherein a huge superstate will plan, will determine, and will direct the course of our daily lives"?

Or shall we resolve to continue with the framework of our form of government, and make it our business to see that the proven and accepted agencies are made to function under these new conditions? I firmly believe that we can so streamline our Government that we can meet the challenge of today with the same implements of public expression that has served us since the adoption of our Federal Constitution. And I further believe that such a method will produce far better results. It alone will permit the private initiative and the rugged individualism which are so peculiarly native to America, to exert themselves and to accomplish for us that which they are capable of performing.

On the one hand, we throw overboard the safeguards that have kept us free, and accept as a substitute a policy necessarily calling for the surrender of our individual liberties and freedom of action, which policy is untried here, but which has led to disaster throughout the pages of history. On the other hand, we maintain the principles of our heritage, and rely upon their basic soundness to adapt them to new problems.

And then what should we do about it? How shall we meet this issue? Shall we accept this situation as inevitable? I think not. I believe that we should squarely face the problem and seek to reestablish, even in this wartime, the identity, the position, and the integrity of local government.

I would suggest that this may be accomplished by doing two things. First, we must fully and conscientiously analyze the proper scope and function of our State and local governments. We must decide what services they should render to the people. We should define the sphere of their activities. And then we should authorize them to occupy that sphere and hold them responsible for so doing.

That means that we must quit passing the buck. It means that we must in our own States, in our own counties—yes, and even in our own cities and our own school districts—meet the problems that present themselves and work out our own solution. If we are going to restore local government, we will have to quit running to Washington for help. We must expect the burdens which will devolve upon us from that decision.

That is not always easy to do. The people have been led to think that there is some sort of magic in the Federal Treasury. We are prone to forget that after all the 48 States can draw from it only so much as the people of the 48 States put into it.

But I have said there were two things that we must do. The second is just as important as the first. It is, in a word, the making of our State and local government more efficient, more responsive to the needs of the people, and more capable of fulfilling its obligation. If we are to have local self-government, then the units of local government must act the part. If we are unwilling to do this,

we must expect, as HATTON SUMNERS said: "There is always someone willing to step forward and do (our) thinking for (us)."

I believe that out in this great midwestern territory, we are doing a constructive job of making State and local government more efficient. The most notable strides have been taken by States in this territory. For example, our mutual neighbor, the State of Nebraska, is experimenting upon the subject of a unicameral legislature. Whether this is a progressive step, remains to be seen. But that is beside the point. In adopting this system, the people of Nebraska were earnestly seeking to improve the quality of their State government.

In my State of Kansas, we have long been noted for our progressive spirit.

I must confess that sometimes we have been exceedingly happy to get rid of some of our experiments. But in any event, we have and we are earnestly seeking improvements. We are proud to have been among the first States which enacted a blue sky law to protect investors from unscrupulous promotion schemes; a measure which, by the way, has been adopted by virtually every other State.

Today, we are dealing with another new and progressive agency. We have long felt—as many other States have felt—that legislation was too hurriedly considered and enacted. Legislatures convened once every 2 years, met for some 90 days amid a welter of confusion and beset by a host of lobbyists, furiously enacted hastily prepared measures and adjourned with most of the members having a very hazy conception of what had been done.

To alleviate this condition, Kansas has set up a legislative council. It consists of 25 members, of which 10 come from the senate and 15 from the house. This body meets from time to time and has standing committees which consider broad legislative programs almost continuously. It maintains a permanent research staff with offices to assemble data and information and to prepare various proposals.

The result has been that when the legislature meets it can consider a well-thought-out and well-rounded program with factual data upon which solid judgment can be formulated. I mention this only in passing, because I feel that this represents one of the ways in which State government can make itself more effective and can rise to meet the challenge of bureaucratic Federal control.

Have you considered the aim of government? We have talked a great deal about our new social concepts—about broader horizons and about new responsibilities of society. If you will add them all up and consider this five-point program, see if it will not meet the test:

1. Abolition of war.
2. Land ownership, for more individuals.
3. Better care for the sick and the insane.
4. Wider educational advantages.
5. General improvement of the common life.

Doesn't that reasonably well fulfill our desires in government? Would not the government that achieves these five purposes be satisfactory with us? And yet, ladies and gentlemen, that is not a new program. As far back as 1737—200 years ago—L' Abbe de Saint Pierre, in Paris, advocated exactly these five points.

The problem is not "what shall government do." It rather is how shall government accomplish the answer, the desire, and the purpose of mankind? We are not breaking a new trail. The desire to better the lot of the common man is as old as civilization itself. Those of us in America believe that this can best be accomplished under our form of constitutional democracy. We have a glorious record over the last 165 years to justify our faith. But we must be vigilant to protect our heritage and to make our form of government achieve the ends we desire.

As responsible citizens, I sincerely urge that each of us must give increased attention to these matters. I believe that our success will depend in no small degree upon our ability to move our Government back to our courthouses and our State capitals, where government can aid private initiative to grapple with the problems of the hour. I urge that this is worthy of your consideration and attention. And as a reward for our efforts, if we are successful, we know that we may continue to live under the greatest Government on earth, and to enjoy to the fullest, the generous bounty that belongs to America.

The Gold Standard and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, with gold and silver money withdrawn from circulation and replaced by paper currency in most every country, we find that practically every nation is in the throes of inflation, and is suffering from the effects of price maladjustments and the distress that attends the enforced use of unredeemable printing-press money—a condition that has been brought about by accepting and following the monetary policies advocated by the financial experts and economic advisers, as presented in a letter from Rollin M. Gallagher, which is submitted for the consideration of the Members of the House:

PIOCHE, NEV., *December 5, 1943.*

Mr. JOHN MACDUFFIE,
Eaton & Howard, Inc.,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: The article you sent me prepared by Dr. Kemmerer has had my careful attention, and I thank you for sending it to me.

I have been following Dr. Kemmerer's career as a monetary expert. He was monetary adviser for 17 nations, 16 of which shortly thereafter became bankrupt. He advised the manipulative gold standard which put them at the mercy of the London financial clique.

His High Spots in the Case for a Return to the International Gold Standard seems indicative of the trends in intellectual preparation of the public for such steps. The Luce publications, notably Fortune, have contained articles, the gist of which are the Keynes Plan, the White Plan, which of the two is the one that ought to be adopted. Both of these plans would subject our property values to artificial manipulations from which the paper-money clique alone could benefit. The Keynes plan and the proposed international paper-money currency scheme (of private issue) is most significant in this respect.

The records of the Congress of the United States show in its suppressed archives the havoc that has been wreaked to business by currency manipulations on an international scale during the past 150 years. This knowledge, while it has never been publicized, is gaining ground in many sections of the country, including New England.

I imagine that Dr. Kemmerer's society, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, has been founded to foster a return to the old, defective brand of gold standard, so-called; in view of the possible congressional obstacles to our getting aboard some such absurdly un-American and unconstitutional bandwagons as the White or Keynes plans. These would sell the American people down the river to a group of international manipulators, but Kemmerer would help them along by muddying the waters.

Under section 8 of our Constitution, Congress is charged with the duty of "coining money, regulating the value thereof, and of foreign coins." The present monetary scheme, arrived at under the same kind of chicanery and confusion, was apparently written in London, rushed through Congress without ever being debated in the House except for a couple of hours of sham debate, and signed by the President without his even having read it, according to his boast at the time.

Dr. Kemmerer's plan would seem to contemplate a general debasement of our currency in terms of gold, but leaving gold subject to the same manipulations as before. This, of course, favors the British Empire at the expense of American business and the American producer of commodities. England produces five-eighths of the world's gold and will profit on that side in another way by gold being the key to such a value control.

Dr. Kemmerer brings in such outworn errors as bimetallism-with-a-fixed-ratio-of-gold-and-silver as an easy target to shoot at, but there he is on dangerous ground. It was gold as a standard which discredited Kemmerer before the Seventy-second Congress when the stabilizing effect of silver as a flywheel to the gold standard was before the Congress, and I will quote from some of that RECORD a little later on in this letter.

At that time Dr. Kemmerer failed completely to make any mention of controlling the exchange value or buying of gold or the gold demand factor which was the cause of the greatest depressions in history. A measure was then pending before Congress which proposed that the plan of English financiers for manipulating gold should be kept in reverse by having the United States Treasury buy silver at a world market price, put it in the Treasury as a reserve, and issue storage certificates against it, redeemable in silver at its gold value, until the corner on gold was broken. The value of gold can be accurately measured against the general index of commodities of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, if thus stabilized, and the Seventy-second Congress fully explored this area of monetary exploration.

To anyone acquainted with the monetary use of silver in past manipulations of gold by the English clique, as applied to property value landslides, as Dr. Kemmerer must be, it can be reckoned that his position at Princeton would vanish into thin air if he espoused any sound gold-standard basis.

So it follows that the old gold standard, where the value of currency is varied by simply increasing or decreasing the demand for its gold equivalent will, under his present plan, keep this country in exactly the position it has been in since the Napoleonic wars, namely, that of having its currency value fixed from London, instead of having its money values regulated by Congress. This would be the feather bed we would fall into should the Keynes plan fail.

Dr. Kemmerer must be aware of the fluctuations in the value of gold. I quote him:

"The gyrations in the value of the gold dollar since the end of the last century have been fully as violent as during any equal period in the history of our country. * * * It is to this unsteady monetary unit that our financial and economic systems are tied."

Montagu Norman has said, I quote:

"Real stabilization will come about only when we realize that gold itself fluctuates in purchasing power as does silver, and copper, wheat, and cotton, and when we have

taken steps to make our money systems really the servants instead of the masters of society."

Yet we find Dr. Kemmerer in April 1932 testified before the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee of the House to the effect that gold is stable and that world production suffices to meet any demands on it. He came in for scathing criticism from one of the witnesses who appeared later before the committee.

I quote the record as follows:

"The WITNESS. You have a chart here in testimony, in your record, which one of the witnesses introduced in evidence.

"The CHAIRMAN. That was Dr. Kemmerer who appeared here and presented that chart, which I think is called chart C. Have you a copy of that chart? [Chart produced.]

"The WITNESS. This chart (Dr. Kemmerer's) purports to show that there is an abundance of monetary gold, basing the conclusion on the relation between monetary gold and productive industry. It seems to me this is subject to serious questioning. Productive industry constitutes a large demand for gold, of course. But it is a steady demand. It is a demand that does not vary so abruptly, because productive industry has a tendency to continue even after the profits are impaired. The demand for gold that produces the great fluctuations in its value arises principally from other sources.

"If the chart were not incomplete as to these *important* omissions, it would show a tremendous shortage of gold in proportion to recent extraordinary demands, and thus explain the depression by a fact rather than a theory.

"Among the sources of the demand for gold are the sale of securities for foreign account; that is to say, securities owned in foreign countries, capital flights, cover operations, withdrawals of foreign deposits in our national banks, the sale of new issues of bonds of the United States Government, States, and municipalities. The principal demand for money comes when there is a rush to sell securities where the money is removed from active channels and deposited in savings banks or put into other liquid forms. This drains commercial banks of cash and lowers their reserves. This calls money from operating uses that give employment to take the place of money withdrawn through the sale of securities; and exported or held in savings banks or hoarded or held in other liquid state. This forces the sale of additional securities and one block knocks down the other.

"I would say that if chart C had been based upon a computation that included these variable demand factors, the result would be highly illuminating.

"But these important factors are left out and the break-down has come at exactly that point.

"If an engineer in calculating the dimensions of a bridge neglected to take into account the weight of the live load, the bridge would stand all right until the train came along, then it would crash.

"Imagine the engineer who designed that bridge saying that he did not compute the live load because he had no index numbers. Yet when Dr. Kemmerer was asked by the chairman of this committee if he had taken into consideration these demand factors, his reply was that he had no index numbers as to them, and therefore did not take them into account."

I should like to quote Dr. Kemmerer's answers or evasions of certain direct questions placed to him by this committee, along with the remarks of other witnesses and committee members.

The witness here quotes from Dr. Kemmerer's statement to the committee previously given:

"The CHAIRMAN. If silver was stabilized, wouldn't it tend to protect gold under certain abnormal demand?

"Dr. KEMMERER. I do not know. I think the stabilization of silver would be good for China and India; it may be good for the silver industry.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would it help China and India in international trade?

"Dr. KEMMERER. China, yes; more than India. It would only help India in its trade in the sense that it would help these people at the periods of fluctuation. India has not been on a silver standard since 1892.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would you be opposed to the United States taking protective measures to safeguard the commodity price level if a sound plan could be evolved?

"Dr. KEMMERER. As I said before, I do not think anything could be done.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would silver be used in any way that may occur to you to augment the metal reserves?

"Dr. KEMMERER. No.

"The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the silver were deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a metal reserve, assuming some plan could be worked out for its use that was entirely sound in every way, would its increase in the money supply tend to elevate the commodity price level? That is, in your opinion?

"Dr. KEMMERER. I think the silver in the Treasury is inert and useless. It performs no office there. I do not think there is any hope in that direction.

"The WITNESS. You will note the question is, 'Assuming some plan could be worked out for its use that was entirely sound in every way'; and in answer Dr. Kemmerer fixes his mind on the present state of the silver in the United States Treasury; and his answer is perfectly correct, assuming silver is to be put into the Treasury under some plan such as Senator Pittman proposes, as it would be inert and useless. But the question is, 'Assuming some sound plan could be worked out.'

"Congressman FEISINGER. He cannot conceive a sound plan. He discards that entirely from his mind. He was asked the direct question about silver, and he says in so many words, 'Forget it.'

"The CHAIRMAN. So that using silver as a reserve for metal value, and retaining the single gold standard as a yardstick, would you or would you not take away from other nations the power they have assumed to control money volume, and hence the commodity price levels?

"Dr. KEMMERER. We have more control over that than any other country has.

"The WITNESS. As I see it, there is only one possible answer to the question: 'Would you or would you not take away from other nations the power they have assumed to control money volume and hence commodity price levels?'

"And the answer is, 'Yes; we could take the power away from them.'"

These two episodes finished Dr. Kemmerer and exposed him to the entire Congress as either an incompetent theorist or a deliberately subsidized fraud. Little or no attention was paid to him thereafter on the money question.

It is beginning to look to me as though one of the situations outlined in my letter to you of June 28—that is, another devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold—would eventually result if Professor Kemmerer is being drummed up as the spearhead of this gold-standard movement without some means of stabilizing the value of gold when the new value of the dollar is determined. From this new point, the value of gold, and hence the currency to which it is attached, will be manipulated up and down, as it was from the Napoleonic wars on.

I am certain that this material will interest you all when tied up with my letters of June 28 and July 16.

Sincerely,

ROLLIN M. GALLAGHER.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a letter written to the St. Louis Star-Times by Mr. Albert L. Lindel, a resident of my district, on food subsidies. It follows:

EDITOR, STAR-TIMES:

I have been extremely interested in two manifestations of public thinking recently. The first is the attitude of Congress toward subsidies; the second is an article in the current issue of Collier's magazine by Cecil Brow nentitled "Do You Know What You're Fighting?"

Cecil Brown gives a definition of a Fascist as "a person, anywhere in the world, who wants special privileges for himself and denies to others the simple rights of a human being." He says, further, that a steelworker in Ohio has summed up fascism for him in the single word "hoggishness."

The other day I saw a newspaper item that said the wholesaler charges the storekeeper $2 more for a box of oranges than the oranges cost him, express paid, in St. Louis. Is this wholesaler a Fascist? The farmer gets only about half the money the consumer pays for a quart of milk. Is there a Fascist in this set-up?

This Nation is mortgaging its future for a full century in a war against fascism. While we little people go about our business we expect the experts to protect us from the enemy within. We expect protection from the man behind the counter who belligerently excuses his hold-up prices with the query, "Don't you know there's a war on?" We expect protection from a Congress that is all too eager to grant wage increases to any group that threatens to throw enough votes to the other party.

Now let us go back to the milk, the oranges, the coal, the fresh vegetables, the meat. These are the basic commodities that we dare not withhold from the people if we are to remain a healthy Nation. Certain long-term planners have proposed subsidies in some of these fields. They explain them thus:

1. Milk can be produced only with feed and labor caring for the cows;

2. Both items have almost doubled in cost since Pearl Harbor;

3. The farmer charges more for a quart of milk;

4. The milk dealer charges more for this same quart;

5. John Smith, with 5 children, needs 5 quarts of milk per day. He pays 25 cents more per day for milk than he used to. This is about $8 per month.

When the prices of all the other basic commodities are added to this total it is not difficult to tell what John Smith will do. He will demand an increase in wages. And he will get it. But before he receives his first check under the new wage rate the feed dealer hears about it and charges the farmer more for feed and by the time John Smith pays his next milk bill he is paying another nickel per quart. So he asks for more wages—and gets them.

If Congress steps into this picture, the American Fascists bring pressure to bear on our Congressmen, political pressure, economic pressure, yes, even social pressure. And we little people who are hurt are never consid-

ered. Why should we be? We say nothing to our Congressman, and he, busy at his job, thinks the pressure-bringing Fascists represent his constituency.

So Congress yields, inflation is started, and everyone loses.

The case for subsidies is very simple. The United States Government, from its war chest, pays the farmer 2 cents for every quart of milk he produces. The farmer has enough money to pay his bills and the price of milk remains the same. The constantly recurring demands for wage increases are stopped because they are not necessary. And 130,000,000 people help to defray the cost of feeding our children milk—the whole load is not thrown on the family with children. Inflation is stopped in its tracks.

* * * * *

ALBERT L. LINDEL.

It Is Now "Flood-Free Johnstown"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on November 28, 1943, entitled "Flood-Proof Johnstown":

FLOOD-PROOF JOHNSTOWN

Johnstown, Pa., is finally about to emerge from the shadow of a tragic 54-year-old memory. On May 31, 1889, the South Fork Dam let loose a flood that took 2,300 lives in the valley where the little city stands. Since then it has prospered moderately, about doubling its population, but at every heavy rain strangers have dashed for the hills and cautious industrialists have sometimes avoided the city, in spite of its iron and coal. Another flood in the freak year 1936 inundated one-third of the area. Though only 15 lives were lost, the property loss was $40,000,000—more than three times the loss in 1889.

Now Johnstown is about to celebrate the completion of an $8,600,000 river channel flood protection project, built by the United States Army engineers. Johnstowners hope that this time the flood tradition is laid for good. They intend, according to Tom Nokes, president of the Advertising Club of Johnstown, to spend about 6 months notifying their friends and relatives that the city is now "flood free" and then "drop the word flood for all time, remove flood markers in the city, and point with pride to a rejuvenated Johnstown." It seems like belated justice. More power to them.

Mr. Speaker, it is now "Flood-Free Johnstown."

This Pennsylvania city of soft-coal mines and steel mills nestling in the Allegheny Mountains of scenic grandeur, twice devasted by major floods in less than 50 years, no longer has any reason to fear high waters. The flood problem has been effectively solved, say the United States Army engineers.

Johnstown's $8,670,000 river channel flood-prevention project has just been completed by the United States Army engineers after 5 years of work. Approximately 9 miles of river channels extending through the city—two mountain streams form a junction in the very heart of the city, 1,162 feet above sea level—have been widened, deepened, and realined in many places. The banks have been paved with sloping concrete walls 8 to 12 inches thick and 37 to 67 feet in height. There were over 3,000,000 cubic yards of excavation. It is the biggest and best channel improvement in the United States. An examination of the features of 26 projects involving channel improvements which have been completed or under construction in the United States under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, confirms this statement.

A committee of 400 citizens, representing all walks of community life, has launched a 6-month observance to appropriately express appreciation to all who contributed to the wonderful flood-control project, and also inform the outside world that Johnstown is now flood free and a good place in which to live, to work, and to do business. Because of the exigencies of the war program, no definite dates have been fixed for the visits to Johnstown during the next 6 months of many interested National and State notables. It is planned to enlist 100,000 men, women, and children of the community in the program to remove the flood-city stigma from Johnstown by having each one write to his friends and relatives all over the United States that Johnstown is now flood free and then drop the word "flood" for all time, remove the flood markers in the city, and point with pride to a rejuvenated Johnstown. The plan has already met with general approval, and much favorable comment has been received. The New York Times said editorially: "It seems like belated justice. More power to them."

The officers of the community group handling the flood-free Johnstown observance include: Chairman, Walter W. Krebs, publisher, the Tribune; cochairmen, Ralph E. Hough, general manager, Johnstown plant, Bethlehem Steel Co.; P. H. Harris, president, Pennsylvania Electric Co.; Ralph B. Porter, general superintendent, Lorain Division, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co.; secretary, Tom Nokes, secretary-treasurer, Johnstown Poster Advertising Co.; treasurer, Frank G. Mattern, secretary, Johnstown Bank & Trust Co.

Johnstown became known as the Flood City following May 31, 1889, when the South Fork Dam, a great body of water impounded 9 miles up the Conemaugh Valley, as a feeder for the old Pennsylvania Canal, burst its confines without much warning and flooded Johnstown; resulting in the loss of 2,300 lives—777 of them unknown and buried in one plot in a graveyard on a mountaintop. The property loss was about $10,000,000. It just happened that this was the first major catastrophe that occurred in this country after the establishment of telegraphic wire services to newspapers, and news of the tragedy was flashed instantly to all parts of the country. Clara Barton and the Red Cross moved in for the first big peacetime relief job of this organization. Books were written about this flood, exhibits featured at world fairs, many flood stories invented, and later motion pictures were produced. Other towns suffered from bad floods at intervals, but people and capital investment were not frightened away as in Johnstown.

Then came the disaster that finally aroused the community to action. The freak weather conditions that caused much of northeastern United States to be flooded in March of 1936, also resulted in the rivers at Johnstown raging over their banks. On March 17, 1936, about one-third of the city area was inundated, 15 persons lost their lives, and over $40,000,000 worth of damage was listed. Again the sympathy of the country was aroused and relief was rushed to Johnstown from all parts of the Nation. High-ranking Government officials and the United States Army engineers visited the stricken community. Congress recognized the need for some measure of flood protection in Johnstown and appropriated sufficient funds and gave authority for the Army engineers to construct the necessary project. After 5 years work on the project, it was completed. The United States Army engineers now say that Johnstown is flood free.

Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with post-war planning on many occasions I have stated we can win or lose the fight by the way we handle our surplus property. Under permission granted me I include as part of my remarks an editorial printed in the Daily Metal Reporter in its issue of December 10. It follows:

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD PASS LEGISLATION NOW ON WAR SURPLUS MATERIALS

Post-war planning or rather the lack of planning seems to be following the same pattern as the lack of planning before the war, and what a price we paid for our initial unpreparedness. The question uppermost in the minds of industry and labor is, What plans are being formulated now to reconvert industry from war to peacetime production and what procedure is to be followed in liquidating the tremendous war surplus materials at the end of the war?

Members of Congress, industrial leaders, representatives of labor and small business are worried over the post-war problem that will be created by the surplus war supplies. Hearings have been held by congressional committees. Testimony has been taken in order to get the views of experts. Voluminous facts and opinions have been compiled, all of which may be a necessary prelude to definite action, but what appears to be the most important thing at the moment is that action be taken immediately. Time is just as much of the essence now as it was before the war because unless this aggravated problem is solved we may be inviting economic disaster on the home front after we have achieved victory on the battle front.

Neither labor nor management has forgotten the chaotic conditions that prevailed at the end of World War No. 1 when the Government being saddled with $6,000,000,000 worth of surplus war materials threw it on the market haphazardly. This lack of planning and foresight was partly responsible for the depression that ensued and that lasted several years. How much more dangerous therefore is the absence of planning involving the disposal of approximately $75,000,000,000 worth of surplus war materials of every description with which our Government will be saddled at the end of the present war? This surplus will consist of steel, metals, ships, planes, machinery, chemicals, textiles, apparel, food products, and hundreds of other items.

If these surplus war materials are dumped on the market indiscriminately they are bound to disrupt our economy and kill any chances of providing jobs for our demobilized forces. This question of disposing of the war surplus has been rightfully called the No. 1 post-war problem confronting this Nation. It merits immediate attention on the part of Congress and should quickly follow congressional action on the war termination contract-cancelation bill which our legislators are now considering.

There has been too much loose and confused thinking concerning this No. 1 post-war problem, the failure to realize the tremendous inventories that are represented by $75,000,000,000 worth of surplus war materials, nor is it generally realized the stupendous problem that will be created when some 300,000 war production plants holding contracts valued at $100,000,000,000 as against $8,000,000,000 at the end of the last war have to be reconverted from war to peacetime production, involving the additional disposition of their own inventories of raw, semifinished, or finished war goods. It is no wonder that many an industry is proceeding most cautiously and hesitantly in making plans for the post-war period because of the uncertainty as to the nature and the extent of the legislation that Congress may enact to cover the disposal of this war surplus.

There is but one means of overcoming this uncertainty and of lifting the cloud which overhangs the entire industrial field, and that is for Congress to pass legislation creating a surplus war materials board or commission now while the war is still in progress. Doing that now is none too soon for it will require considerable time for this board to plan on how to handle the job in such a manner that industry and labor can be assured that the effect of the liquidating process will not upset our national economy. The day the war ends industry and labor should not only know but be assured that the surplus war materials board is in control of the situation and that its plans are of such a nature that industry can proceed with its reconversion to peacetime production without having to worry about the unhealthy competition that they may buck up against by Government's haphazard liquidation of war surplus supplies.

It is not sufficient to know that we have $75,000,000,000 worth of surplus war materials that must be handled judiciously and scientifically. To liquidate these stupendous war surpluses without upsetting our national economy probably is the greatest merchandising job that this country will face, a job that will necessitate supersalesmanship and ability not even second to that which was necessary in providing the materials with which to prosecute the war.

If this job is to be done adequately, politics can play no part in it. If a surplus war materials board is to undertake this work, it must be clothed with the necessary powers to handle the job. In order to safeguard our national economy and to avoid widespread unemployment and industrial chaos, the board may decide to freeze or stock-pile some of these war surplus materials or sell certain supplies at once to alleviate the shortages of civilian goods, or withhold from sale certain materials depending upon the needs of the situation.

The objection has been heard in some quarters that if a surplus war materials board were to be appointed now as a result of congressional legislation it would be most difficult to secure the necessary personnel since even those who are now serving the Government in many of its agencies are anxious to get back to their respective business desks and the exodus is likely to become accelerated once the war spirit evaporates when peace is declared. All the more reason, therefore, for setting up this much-needed machinery now.

That not only industry but labor has studied the problem and is seriously concerned with the war surplus materials is evident from a report the American Federation of Labor has submitted to Senator GEORGE, Chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Post-War Planning. In this report the American Federation of Labor warns against the repetition of what occurred at the end of World War No. 1. It goes a step further and recommends that the War Production Board, in cooperation with a proposed citizens' policy board, be charged with the problem of reconversion to peacetime production. Thus we see that labor, realizing the difficulties of creating new staffs of experts, wisely turns to an existing Federal agency already staffed by experts who have the confidence of both labor and industry. There is no doubt that industry will unhesitatingly endorse labor's recommendation.

The suggestion by labor that the W. P. B. be designated as the agency for disposing of the war surplus is no doubt based on the fact that this agency was the one that was in charge of making possible the accumulation of these surpluses and that the W. P. B., through its various branches, knows more about the different types of war supplies than any other agency is ever likely to know. As now constituted, the W. P. B. not only has experienced businessmen in key positions, but has the benefit of trade advisory committees. It would be most difficult, if not virtually impossible, to duplicate such an organization were Congress to decide to create a brand new War Surplus Sales Board. In the entire country it would be difficult to find a group of experts who know as much about their respective fields of activity as those who are now connected with the W. P. B. True, many of them would like to be relieved of their responsibilities, and it is extremely doubtful whether they could be induced to come back if they resigned when peace was declared. But if Congress took action now by creating a War Surplus Sales Board clothed with proper authority and authorized to begin functioning through the present W. P. B. set-up, many of the W. P. B. personnel could no doubt be prevailed upon to continue. However, if Congress has in mind any other agency for handling the surplus war materials, that agency should be created now, with its powers so well defined as to take it out of the realms of politics in order that the agency may function efficiently and have the confidence and backing of business and labor.

There is no gainsaying the fact that it is wise to perfect plans for feeding and rehabilitating the war-torn world, but why should we not use the same farsighted policy in mending our own economic and industrial fences before they collapse? Common sense would seem to dictate that there should be a close correlation between planning for the reconversion of our domestic economy and production on a peacetime basis at the same time that we are planning for the rehabilitation of Europe. Unless we put our own house in order first, we may find ourselves seriously handicapped economically and industrially after the war is over.

This country lost precious time in preparing for war. Let's not lose any in preparing for peace. Handling the war-surplus problem looms very large now, and it should be tackled immediately.

Unjustified Criticism of Congress—Democratic Methods Worth Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note an appreciation of the Congress in an article by Merlo Pusey appearing in today's Washington Post. The article follows:

STROKE FOR DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

A great deal of nonsense has been written about the Senate breaching the anti-inflation line and upsetting Stabilization Director Vinson's apple cart by its vote on the railway wage resolution the other day. Actually the Senate didn't vote for inflation. It didn't take back authority previously granted to Mr. Vinson. It didn't take over the job of adjusting wage disputes. Nor did it surrender to the demands of strikers threatening to sabotage the war effort, as did the President and Secretary Ickes in dealing with John L. Lewis.

STABILIZATION ACT OF 1942

What the Senate did, by the overwhelming vote of 74 to 4, was to uphold an agreement that had been made in full accord with the terms of the law. If that is a rebuke to Mr. Vinson, it rebukes him only for attempting to use powers that Congress had denied to him. When Congress passed the Stabilization Act of 1942, it authorized the President to suspend certain provisions of the Price Control Act. Then it added this stern prohibition: "* * * but he may not, under the authority of this act, suspend any other law or part thereof."

RAILWAY LABOR LAW

In two different Executive orders concerning the adjustment of wage disputes the President recognized the intent of Congress thus expressed to keep the railway labor law intact. Then suddenly he presumed to set that act aside and settle the dispute between the railroads and their nonoperating employees in his own way. Now the only authority that he or Mr. Vinson could draw upon to take such a drastic step was that given them in the Stabilization Act. And that act specifically forbade suspension of any law other than certain provisions of the Price Control Act.

It was this situation that confronted the Senate. What the Senate has now said in effect is: "When we say not to suspend an act of Congress by Executive decree, we mean it."

NOT MORE INFLATIONARY

Congress might be asked to refrain temporarily from even this mild assertion of its rights in the making of our national policy if the result would be disastrous inflation.

But the indisputable fact is that the Vinson formula would be almost as inflationary as the legal settlement which the railroads and their employees favor. The first would add $167,000,000 to pay envelopes; the second, $185,000,000. That is a rather trifling difference on which to justify executive violation of the law.

Nor can it reasonably be said that the Senate has created a precedent for congressional adjudication of wage disputes. Congress assigned the job of stabilizing all wages outside the railroad industry to the President operating through the War Labor Board and Stabilization Director Vinson. Obviously employees not affected by the Railway Labor Act would have no case to carry to Congress.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN RAILWAY WORKERS AND OTHERS

There is a good reason, moreover, for this distinction between railway workers and others. Machinery for settlement of wage disputes between the railroads and their employees has been in operation since 1926. It can be and has been used to stabilize railroad wages. There was no means of stabilizing wages in other fields until the emergency act was passed. It is elementary good sense to leave permanent machinery undisturbed, if possible, when setting up temporary controls to meet an emergency.

CARPING AT CONGRESS

The outcry against this Senate vote for law and order is profoundly disturbing for a number of reasons. It reflects a dangerous tendency on the part of many commentators to assume that our gigantic bureaucracy is right no matter what it does. It reveals a disposition to carp at Congress no matter how reasonable the action taken. And it suggests a frightening acquiescence in the scuttling of democratic processes to meet an emergency, even though the issue may be, as was the cry of inflation in this case, a phony.

DEMOCRATIC METHODS WORTH SAVING

If Congress had as many publicity agents as the downtown bureaus have, one of them might venture to make the point that democratic methods of government, as well as the value of the dollar, are worth saving.

Campaign Facts, Not Campaign Oratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the average American voter today is more interested in facts than he is in oratory. He wants to base his important 1944 vote upon facts rather than upon campaign oratory. I therefore offer the following series of observations under the general title, "Campaign Facts, Not 'Campaign Oratory'," for the consideration of my colleagues, with the hope that they may also provoke serious thought and discussion on the part of the American voters—Democrats and Republicans alike.

AMERICA'S BEST-RUN WAR

The President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Because the war is going well on all fronts we are told, "You should not change horses in the middle of the stream." The war on the battlefields is going very well, indeed, because the President has had the wisdom not to interfere either in our war strategy or in the selection of Army and Navy leaders. He has permitted Army and Navy leaders a free hand in determining both the war strategy and the selection of men to be placed in charge of important assignments.

The home front, however, hasn't been going so well as the battle front. In this field the President is in complete command. In this field he has selected his own advisers, also the keymen who hold all important positions on the home front. The list of names is quite imposing—Frankfurter, Wallace, Hopkins, Rosenman, Cohen, and others. The home front has bogged down. It has become a debacle. The President is responsible. At long last he is changing his home-front leaders and doing it "in the middle of the stream." He is belatedly placing in the saddle on the home front such men as Byrnes, Vinson, Bowles, Crowley, and Stettinius—strong businessmen who believe in our system of free enterprise and propose to preserve it. The questions that will face the American voter in 1944 are: Will a new President be inclined to interfere in the war strategy that is working out today so successfully? Will he not rather be inclined to concentrate his efforts upon straightening out our home-front mess? Will he surround himself with the strongest Cabinet he can find, regardless of party affiliation, to help him in his task and to help plan our post-war future?

OUR POST-WAR FUTURE

There are two schools of thought in Washington concerning our post-war future. The first is the socialistic school, headed by Frankfurter, Wallace, Hopkins, and their followers. Their entire program for our post-war future is based upon Government control of all business and industry. This school of thought advocates a Government program of made work—another boondoggling era—to tide us over the slack period they expect after the war. They believe we should tax away all the profits of industry and renegotiate or cancel all war contracts in order to get the money to pay for the proposed boondoggling program. The other school of thought is headed by Jesse Jones, Jimmy Byrnes, Fred Vinson, Cordell Hull, and others. They believe we should preserve the American system of free enterprise, should look to and expect American industry to reconvert from wartime production to peacetime production with the least possible loss of time, and while doing so keep employment at a high level. This reconversion of industry would be made possible by reserves that industry had been permitted to build up during peak-time production for that very purpose. This school of thought bases its program upon a huge reservoir of consumer demand that has been dammed up during the war period; an immense buying power that will be accumulated as a result of high wages and forced savings to implement that consumer demand; and industrial reserves that should be allowed to accumulate large enough to tide over the industrial reconversion period. Which school of thought do you believe should be given the task of planning our post-war future?

WHICH, WORLD BANKER OR WORLD "SAP"?

I am wondering how the folks back home will react to the Treasury's proposal for the establishment of a world bank with $10,000,000,000 in capital, to be used in repairing the devastation of war and in developing the world's resources. We are told that the proposal will be sent to the United Nations for approval, and if they approve the program will go forward. About 10 years ago Uncle Sam began buying up the world's supply of gold. The price at that time was $20.67 per ounce. Uncle Sam, who then was more prosperous than he is today, decided that price was not high enough so he raised the ante to $35 per ounce and gold began flowing in from the four corners of the world. As fast as it could be accumulated it was buried at Fort Knox, Ky., where we today have a hoard that cost us about $22,000,000,000. Naturally, the countries that sold us the gold—principally Britain and Russia—would like to have the gold back, so they are finagling to get Uncle Sam into a little poker game with the understanding that he will pay cash for his chips while they will put their I. O. U.'s into the kitty. That means Uncle Sam will be playing against his own money, something no smart player ever does. Fortunately, Congress will have something to say about this ambitious scheme to distribute the gold on a world-wide basis. I believe the project has a rough road ahead. The plan for a $10,000,000,000 world bank does not take into consideration the $8,000,000,000 world currency stabilization fund that the Treasury also proposes to create. If this ambitious program goes through, the other countries will have the gold and we will have a nice big hole in the ground at Fort Knox.

LORD KEYNES AT IT AGAIN

Lord Keynes, financial adviser to the British Government, the man who persuaded President Roosevelt in 1933 to discard the economy program he began when he took office for a spend and spend and spend program, is at it again. He now recommends that Uncle Sam in the post-war period shall lend and lend and lend to foreign nations to provide the credit they will need to buy American goods. This program would relieve them of the necessity of shipping their goods to us in exchange for our products. This Keynes plan would insure markets for American goods in the post-war era, but the goods would be paid for with scraps of paper, just as they were after the last war. At that time we lent European nations some $12,000,000,000 for rehabilitation purposes to be spent in the United States for necessary goods. We kissed that money good-bye. Do we want to repeat that mistake today, only on a larger scale? Our $30,000,000,000 lend-lease program to help win the war should be world contribution enough for us to

make without adopting the Keynes recommendation. Why not follow the advice of such men as Jesse Jones in financial matters, and tell Lord Keynes to go home where he belongs? If we did so we would be better off.

TAXATION AND POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

Federal appropriations and expenditures during the first decade of the post-war era are now planned at the rate of $25,000,000,000 per year—regular expenditures of the Government, five billion; a public-works program, five billion; an expanded social-security program, five billion; an enlarged national defense program, five billion; and an anticipated yearly interest charge on our public debt, five billion. Anyone can readily see from these astronomical figures that our tax load will continue to be back-breaking for generations and generations to come if these planners get their way. We should realize that such a heavy tax load would be a great handicap to American business and industry in the post-war period when a full employment program will be needed in order to avoid another boondoggling era. Either private industry or the Federal Government must furnish employment for citizens who want to work. Most people believe private industry should do the job. Private industry can do it if permitted to accumulate reserves for plant expansion that will be needed to meet the great unsatisfied consumer demand that has piled up as a result of priorities and shortages. What do you think?

WHY THE DIFFERENCE?

A strong, healthy, young laborer in China can earn $1 per week if he is lucky enough to have work. A strong, healthy, young laborer in the United States can earn 30 to 50 times as much per week. What makes the difference? China has everything the United States has in the way of raw products, fertile soil, coal, iron ore, oil, minerals, and 6 times as many people. China was a civilized nation 2,000 years before the United States was even discovered. China, therefore, had a 2,000-year headstart on the United States. Why, then, is China so backward? Why is it that "a Chinaman's chance" is no chance at all? The answer is that in China there is little or no incentive—no reward for working, saving, thinking, or investing. In the United States we have private enterprise and private initiative developed to the highest degree, resulting in the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Yet WALLACE and his kind would give up private enterprise and private initiative in order to experiment with some form of collectivism. After this war is over we will face a choice between the American way of free enterprise and state socialism. Will we swap independence for regimentation—progress, such as the United States has enjoyed for 150 years, for stagnation, such as China has had for 2,000 years?

UNCLE SAM'S FUTURE HEADACHE

Uncle Sam today owns a $60,000,000,000 stock pile of civilian goods that will have to be disposed of in some way at the close of the war. When this enormous stock pile of civilian goods begins to flow back into our national economy, Uncle Sam is going to have a headache the like of which he has never experienced before. In this stock pile we are told he has 60,000,000 blankets, 8,000,000 WAC shirtwaists, no one knows how many million pairs of shoes, to say nothing about canned goods, clothing, autos, and a thousand and one other articles that make up our regular commercial trade. What is to be done with this enormous stock pile? Is it to be dumped on the market after the war? Is a large part of it to be given away to the needy of other lands? Is it to become the basis for the greatest scandal of all times, compared to which the Teapot Dome scandal might be considered a trifle? A $60,000,000,000 stock pile of civilian goods to be disposed of is something to think about, something to ponder over. Our whole economy could be wrecked overnight if this stock pile were dumped on the market. At the close of the First World War Uncle Sam had $6,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material. It took about 6 years to dispose of that surplus. There is now before the Congress a resolution to give the President power to dispose of this stock pile of civilian goods at his discretion. Should this be done? Congress is moving cautiously in this matter. Who has the necessary supply of aspirin to cure the national headache that is in the offing?

WANTED, AN ALL-AMERICAN TEAM

The new President that will be elected in 1944 will face a greater task and assume a greater responsibility than any previous President in our entire history. No human being is big enough nor wise enough to handle such a task or shoulder such a responsibility. The new President, therefore, should select an all-American team for his Cabinet to share his responsibility and help him do the job that must be done. The best brains of the country, regardless of party lines, must be drafted for this team. It should be composed of stars that have distinguished themselves in the game of life and have demonstrated their ability to fill the positions on the team that will be assigned to them. The new President should act as chairman of the board of directors of the greatest corporation on earth. He should not be autocratic or refuse to delegate authority. His success will depend very largely upon his Cabinet selections, and the amount of authority he delegates to them. We submit the following names as our nominees for this mythical all-American team. They represent the type of men needed in the next Cabinet:

1. Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover.
2. Secretary of Treasury, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.
3. Secretary of War, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.
4. Attorney General, Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio.
5. Postmaster General, Congressman JAMES WADSWORTH, of New York.
6. Secretary of Navy, Admiral Ernest King.
7. Secretary of Interior, Alfred Landon.
8. Secretary of Agriculture, Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Minnesota.
9. Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, of Texas.
10. Secretary of Labor, Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Subsidies—A True Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the views of a country editor who prefers to look at the facts concerning subsidies rather than be swayed by radio and press that has chosen to present but one side of the subsidy debate. The following is an editorial written by Elton R. Eaton, editor and publisher of the Plymouth Mail, Plymouth, Mich.:

SUBSIDIES

"Am looking for you to change your mind about subsidies," said a good friend the other day to the editor. "I note that Congress is considering an appropriation to have the Government pay for all War-bond advertising. Isn't that going to change your mind?"

No, good friend; the editor's mind is not going to be changed. We have always been against Republican or Democratic political subsidies. We have never favored the proposed legislation pending in Congress for the Government to pay for War-bond advertising.

During the first 2 years of War-bond promotion, the Plymouth Mail sponsored every War-bond advertisement that appeared in this newspaper. The total cost amounted to many hundreds of dollars.

This year we asked various citizens and groups within the community to assist in the War-bond advertising campaign.

Let it be said to the everlasting credit of this patriotic city, that we have had but one refusal of cooperation in the publication of War-bond advertising. The Plymouth Mail expects to continue its policy of sponsoring War-bond advertising, in cooperation with the citizens of Plymouth.

What is a "subsidy"?

It is nothing more than a glorified dole.

If you have no scruples against putting your mother and father in the poorhouse, even though you can take care of them by depriving yourself of a few of the luxuries you have enjoyed, then, of course, it is to be expected that you favor Government subsidies.

Maybe that is a brutal way to state the case, but it is just about as we see this subsidy scheme.

A political subsidy is a charity. It is an unearned payment for something we are not entitled to. In other words, it is legalized graft, paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

The most vicious feature of the subsidy issue now pending before the United States Senate is the fact that vast numbers of people who are getting so much money they do not know what to do with it, are now demanding that Congress force our soldier and sailor boys who are shedding their blood for us, to pay our gluttonous food bill after they have won the war.

Yes, that is just what the present subsidy means. It says the Nation shall go in debt

now in order to pay the farmer a little extra money so that we overfed "hawgs" who remain secure in our homes can eat like gluttons at the expense of our boys in Army and Navy uniforms.

We have the brazen nerve to ask our boys to shed their blood for us and at the same time demand that they pay for the pork chops and apple pie we are now eating when they come home—if they live to come home.

To the farmers around Plymouth we extend our congratulations for their opposition to this proposed cheap, vote-buying, political hand-out. We have yet to talk with a farmer around here who is in favor of the subsidy bill now pending in the Senate and backed by powerful pressure groups. To the Members of the House of Representatives who had the good sense to vote against this obnoxious proposal, we say congratulations to you, too. Stand by your guns! The good, old-fashioned Americans who do not believe in shoving their fathers and mothers off to the poorhouse for the public to support, are with you 100 percent.

Little Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "Little Business," which appeared recently in the Chicago Daily News:

LITTLE BUSINESS

After floods of talk, mostly futile, we now have some comprehensive and definite data on how small business is weathering the war. The Department of Commerce has studied the records of State unemployment bureaus and commissions from July 1940 to June 1942, and reports the discontinuance of 272,690 concerns—or about 450 a day. The trend continued during the entire period.

As the study was based upon firms with one or more employees, there are no data on entrepreneurs working solely for themselves.

While businesses liquidated either by closure or by transfer to other concerns were 17.5 percent of the number operating in 1939, the actual decline of the number of business units is not so great, because some new concerns have been started since 1939, and many closings are of course temporary.

The very large number of small units employing between one and three employees that have quit suggests that the capital involved in 201,836 cases was small. These businesses are essentially personal, as a rule. They are readily closed out, but also readily resumed. It is a fair presumption that in many such cases the enterpriser quit to go into the armed forces or into war work for the duration, with the definite intention of starting up again after the war.

Previous studies of the efficiency and vitality of businesses by size made by the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies are given confirmation in the Department of Commerce study of war closures. The medium-sized concerns have had the lowest percentage of war casualties. The little fellows have suffered most, the big ones next, which again calls into question Shakespeare's lines to the effect that "fishes live in the sea, like men aland, the big ones eat the little ones."

In economic competition, as in the biological struggle for survival, the optimum size seems to be neither giant nor pygmy for any one order of creation.

If to this trend we add the innate resiliency of the individual and the resultant probability that most individual enterprises and those with one, two, or three employees will resume business at the old stand after the war, we are entitled to discount heavily the beliefs and fears of many th[illegible] the war will result in even greater concentration of business enterprise. That may be the case, or it may not be. On the evidence available to date, no one is entitled to make cocksure predictions.

Mustering-Out Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the shocking situation of more than 600,000 veterans discharged from the United States armed forces since Pearl Harbor without any pay or allowance to enable them to rehabilitate themselves in private life, is a condition which this Nation should be ashamed of. Our President has enunciated time and time again that his objective is, among other things, to establish the freedoms from fear and want all over the world. We have and are establishing all sorts of agencies to rehabilitate and feed Europe, Asia, and Africa. Never has the world witnessed such a crusading zeal to do good for others on the part of any nation in history. Woodrow Wilson's 14 points were insignificant by comparison to what many of our leaders and statesmen contemplate accomplishing. Even our Axis prisoners are so well fed and treated that many of them do not wish to return to their native lands for which they fought. Must not it seem strange to the hundreds of thousands of veterans walking the streets today to read of all these things that are going to be done for foreigners, while they are without money to buy food and clothes in order to get themselves established again in the civilian life from whence they were drafted or enlisted in the armed forces? Such a stipulation is so ironical that it is almost impossible to believe that it exists in the United States of America.

I have yesterday introduced a bill (H. R. 3836) providing that the discharged veterans receive a total of $600 to be paid in three installments of $200 each. The muster-out pay to be made effective immediately on the passage of the bill. I feel that in view of the high cost of living, the sum of $300, now being considered by the Military Affairs Committee, is inadequate. By the time a veteran furnishes himself with a complete winter wardrobe—including overcoats, suit, shoes, hat, shirts, underwear, and so forth—he would have very little left to eat with and pay his rent.

It is my conviction that we should not only give them the amount of $600, but Congress should also investigate the State labor laws of the various States so that thousands of these veterans with medical discharges will not be prevented from returning to their jobs because of physical examinations required under industrial employers' liability laws.

Some time ago I also introduced a bill providing that every discharged veteran should be given his tuition in a college of his own choosing up to and for not more than 4 years based on his length of service in the armed forces; that is the veteran will receive a full year of college education for every year of service in the armed forces or for any fraction thereof.

So long as I am a Member of Congress, the veterans will be the group of our citizens who will receive first consideration because without them, and what they have done and are doing for our Nation, there would be no country left to take care of anyone, much less the entire civilized world.

I hope that my bills will be speedily considered by the Committee on Military Affairs and reported out.

Restricting Civilian Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the resolution adopted by the members of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Lynn Post 507, Veterans of Foreign Wars, proposing that men and women in the armed forces be given preference in travel on trains, busses, and air lines, and also that civilian transportation be confined to necessary business purposes, or emergency, sickness, or death during the duration of the war. I understand that Federal employees will be required to work during the Christmas period and that a great deal of civilian travel will be curtailed as a result. However, I am convinced that there must be a great realization by all our people of the necessity of making sacrifices in this matter for the benefit of the boys in the service.

It is a pleasure to direct this resolution to your attention:

LADIES' AUXILIARY TO LYNN POST 507, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Lynn, Mass., November 28, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Congressman, Seventh District,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The members of auxiliary to Post 507, V. F. W., in their meeting of October 18, put on the floor a motion that

was passed to send to you resolutions on civilian transportation:

"*Resolved*, That men and women in the armed forces be given preference in travel on trains, busses, and air lines.

"That civilian transportation must be for business, or emergency, sickness, or death during the war."

BERTHA MACCARTHY.
MARY E. GUNDERMAN.
MARGARET BLANCHARD.

Grants-in-Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, years ago John C. Calhoun pointed out very forcefully the dangers of the concentration of power in the Federal Government. The executive branch was given certain powers and duties by the Constitution itself. In normal times the discharge of these duties would require only a modest establishment with a limited personnel. Unfortunately a great share of the powers now being exercised by the Federal Government have been taken away from the States or from the people. As Mr. Calhoun pointed out so eloquently, the authority so taken does not go to the Congress but to the executive branch. Therefore the Congress, by allowing the States to be stripped of their powers, also brings the same result upon itself.

Probably nothing ever invented has built up Federal bureaucracy so much as the so-called grants-in-aid programs. These programs operate as follows: The Federal Government goes out in the State and collects a lot of money. Then it says to the State, "We will give part of the money back upon two conditions: First, you must collect from your own citizens an additional amount; and second, you must allow us to build up a gigantic bureau to supervise the whole thing." Some of these programs in the past have been necessary and beneficial, but the whole thing is being overdone. Some day we must attack this problem of big government seriously with a determination to scrap a lot of it. If we allow it to keep on getting bigger, it will eventually destroy our resources and our liberties.

As a part of these remarks, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the Iowa Taxpayer, a publication of the Iowa Taxpayers Association:

WHY FEDERAL AID SHOULD END

There is some apprehension on the part of our good friends as to the advisability of advocating immediate discontinuance by the Federal Government of grants-in-aid to States in various social and economic programs.

One of them, the Des Moines Tribune, proposes two pertinent queries, as follows:

"Much of the money Iowa spends is siphoned off to the East. Why should we spurn money paid on the high incomes of corporations or individuals in New York or Chicago?

"To us there is nothing inconsistent about money being taken from a Pittsburgh corporation to buy food for a dependent child in Little Rock, Ark."

No one can deny that there is a basic Federal responsibility for the welfare of every citizen in America, but we must deal with conditions and facts rather than with theoretical formulas.

First of these facts is that the money collected from the big corporations and all others has not paid the operating expenses of government since about 1930, and every dollar of Federal aid for relief and other social purposes has been borrowed on our credit and must eventually be paid by ourselves or our children.

Second is the fact that the Federal Government is obliged to pay a much higher rate of interest than the State and local units of government. Therefore it can hardly be good business for us to borrow on our credit at high rates of interest and distribute this to ourselves when, if necessary, we could borrow the money at much less interest locally.

Third, there is no present need for assistance to any State, most of them being well able to handle all of their problems from current income.

These reasons leave out entirely the admittedly dangerous effect of distributing funds that seem to most of the recipients, and, for that matter, to most other citizens, to come from a remote and inexhaustible supply that can cost them nothing.

We are presumably doing our best to keep America free for our returning sons, yours and mine, and we believe those boys will also expect us to do what we can to keep it as nearly free of debt as practicable.

That there is no necessity for such aid is now generally agreed, and only the direct need can justify such help, when the helper is much more heavily encumbered than those receiving the help.

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Calumet, of Chicago:

OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

Not long since it was hard to get butter at any price. Now it's hard to part with the points it requires. One pound of butter takes a full week's allotment of points for one individual from the ration book. And with oleomargarine as the logical substitute being purchased there is extraordinary interest in the consideration of a bill in Congress for the repeal of prevailing taxes on manufacturing and selling margarine products.

There have been, these recent months, thousands of people at the family table who have tasted margarine for the first time and in most instances they thought it was butter. Not many can discriminate between the two, and the claims are made by authorities of its nutritive value comparable to butter, its fats comprising plant and vegetable oils with vitamin contents of butter added.

There being a 10-percent tax on colored margarine the coloring compound is generally furnished separately and mixed in by the householder. It is proposed in the bill to eliminate that tax together with other so-called nuisance restrictions. It has been a mystery to many householders why there have been so many of these restrictions imposed upon a good, harmless, nutritious food commodity by States and Federal Government. They are those unmindful of the power of lobbyists and interests opposed to butter competition for years back.

Several decades ago many housewives looked suspiciously on the lowly oleomargarine. Propagandists were active. It was not until this war that it started consistently coming into its own. Many families used it straight, others mixed it with butter. Consumers are entitled to the privilege of purchasing it at prices that are not pyramided with levies.

With the supply of butter as it is, its high rate of price and points and virtually no substitute but margarine this is a propitious time to remove the impositions on this poor stepchild. Its handicaps should be lifted and competitive interests muzzled. Margarine deserves to be considered by legislators on its merits; no discrimination or ulterior motives involved. Food, above all things, must not be tampered with. The family table in most homes of the Nation involves countless problems these days. Householders of this district like margarine and they should have it without unwarranted taxes and restrictions.

Priest's Excellent Pearl Harbor Address Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein an editorial of the Chattanooga Times of December 13 which highly compliments my colleague, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, upon his notable address on the floor of the House delivered on December 7. The Times editorial is typical of comments of many leading newspapers:

TO BE REMEMBERED

Members of the House of Representatives cheered Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, at the conclusion of a stirring speech Tuesday, Pearl Harbor Day. It is hoped that his colleagues will not forget Mr. PRIEST'S remarks, for they were timely and important.

He was urging that Congress recapture the spirit which it showed during the week following the disaster at Pearl Harbor.

"The spirit on the day after Pearl Harbor was not a spirit that sought, found, or permitted a place for petty partisan political consideration by any party. It was not a spirit that seized upon minor irregularities to magnify them all out of proportion to their relative importance in the whole stupendous program of hurling back the most serious threat in the history of the world to the very existence of a free people. It was not the spirit that would embarrass great military leaders by attributing to them political aspirations and ambitions in an hour when they are called upon to do the job of a soldier. It was not a spirit that thrived on rumor, suspicion, distrust, and doubt. It was a spirit that said: 'What can I do to help?' "

The young Congressman from Tennessee also urged that Congress forget next year's presidential campaign and do its full duty in backing up the Army. "In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, is it expecting too much to express the hope that we here in the House of Representatives will refrain from holding sessions of Democratic and Republican national conventions?"

But here was the heart of Mr. PRIEST's appeal: "I believe, Mr. Speaker, that everyone of us here in this war Congress will agree that, compared with the importance and the destiny of America, the importance of the Democratic Party or the importance of the Republican Party, or any and all parties, is negligible."

The news dispatches say that Representative PRIEST's colleagues jumped to their feet and gave him a thunderous ovation, but we again express the hope that they did not forget what Mr. PRIEST had said.

Merry Christmas? Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Foreign Service magazine, December 1943 issue, published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, entitled "Merry Christmas? Why Not?":

MERRY CHRISTMAS? WHY NOT?

According to the Nazi timetable, prior to Pearl Harbor, Hitler and Tojo fully expected to be joint tenants of the White House by Christmas, 1943.

The Austrian paperhanger was supremely confident he would be reviewing Nazi troops from the White House balcony as a feature of the Christmas festivities in Washington, D. C.

Tojo was equally positive that the people of Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles would be kneeling humbly at the feet of Japanese war lords by Christmas, 1943.

On the contrary, after 2 years of the bloodiest war in all history not one single American home has been wrecked by an enemy bomb.

Our children continue to laugh and sing in the streets of our towns and villages—with no danger of being machine-gunned at their games.

In America our children have not been forced to watch their mothers being dragged away by brown-shirted Nazi hoodlums or savage, slant-eyed Japs.

We have not been required to camouflage our hospitals, schools, or orphanages to protect them against air-borne missiles of destruction and death.

No enemy army has had the chance to reduce our factories to ruins, plunder our farms. Our historic shrines are still intact.

This year, just as always, we Americans can put our children to bed on Christmas Eve to dream undisturbed of Santa Claus and his miracles.

Because of the courage and sacrifices of America's defenders overseas, no invading Japs have defiled the air we breathe. No Nazi boots have goose-stepped on American soil.

This is the answer to America's war weary defenders who may wonder why anyone should suggest this is going to be a "merry Christmas."

Yes—this is going to be a merry Christmas. We can say that again because millions of brave, young Americans have been willing to build a fortress of defense around the United States—a fortress that has its foundations buried in the soil of distant continents.

The parents of boys who will never come home from this war must try to find some measure of comfort in this thought.

Fathers, mothers, and grieving wives, must strive to accept the truth that their hero dead have given their lives for a purpose that has already been partly achieved—a purpose that is reflected in the happiness of little children at Christmas time.

Those men whose bodies are bruised and battered, from the wounds of war, must try to understand that their blood was not spilled in vain. Because of their unselfishness, little children can still romp and play around their Christmas trees throughout the length and breadth of America.

This can truly be a merry Christmas for every man in uniform—no matter where he is serving or how much he longs for the peace of his own fireside—if he will simply say to himself:

"Yes, this is a merry Christmas because the people I love are still safe from harm."

Flood Control, Conservation of Water Supply, and Fish Propagation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of Hon. M. H. McLean, attorney at law, of Covington, Ky., on the subject of flood control, conservation of water supply, and propagation of fish, which is as follows:

From 1930 to 1943 there have been recurring droughts in the north central region of Kentucky. Of these I know from personal observation. From reports I also know they have extended to the greater portion of the State, and that like conditions have to a greater or less degree existed in all the Central States. Such conditions have resulted in the drying up of the smaller streams which are the collective and distributable sources of water supply to our farming element. They are the water veins in which are first gathered the falling waters and flowed to the larger streams and by them on to the rivers. These streams by reason of the depletion of our forests whose accumulated mulch heretofore gathered and held great quantities thereof, are now almost depleted. The falling waters, now having lost this retarding and holding element, gather and flow in greater volume and with added speed into the smaller streams and carry on in course to our rivers causing floods and high waters. This condition existing, it is apparent that anything that can be done to retain and retard the flow of the fallen waters will aid in relieving the situation.

Our forests are almost gone. To restore them in order that they might give aid to the situation would be an insurmountable task. This being true, there is only one thing left to do, and that is to hold and control the waters in the streams after they have collected therein. This has been undertaken and used in a scattering way in the past by the building of dams in the larger streams and rivers, which is assuming control after the waters have been emptied into these larger streams. It is to the smaller streams that I wish to call attention and show how they can be used to relieve the situation.

It is in these small streams that the waters are first collected and anything that can be done to hold the waters emptying herein and to start the speed of their flow will to such extent lessen their destructive discharge. While the part played may be very small as to any single stream, when multiplied by great numbers of them they would be of inestimable value in controlling floods.

It is my opinion that in utilizing these small streams to aid in preventing floods we can in so doing retain excess waters that will be of inestimable value to the farmers in times of drought. The plan is to select the streams and/or portions of streams susceptible of use and construct therein sublevel pools, the heavier stone and debris taken therefrom to be piled at the lower end to a height in keeping with the bank terrain, leaving it some lower in the center than at the bank to prevent washings. Such a dam would not be built to permanently hold the waters in the pool but only to retard the flow; the pools, being sublevel, would retain the waters which did not gradually seep through the dam and would be at hand to supply the surrounding farmers with water for stock in times of drought. This system of collection and storage would afford a most convenient distribution to the farmers in need of water. Anyone who has observed the stress of our farmers in securing needed water for their stock in times of drought, the draw upon his time and energy, the searches he has to make and difficulties in finding accessible sources will appreciate the boon which would come to him if we could find means of retaining near at hand accessible waters which he so greatly needs.

Such an idea as I here present would be wholly utopian in times past. Then we did not possess machinery and devices for its accomplishment, but in this day and time we do have the machinery capable of undertaking and accomplishing the job if put to it under governmental control and direction. This will be particularly true at the end of the present war, at which time we will have a great amount of this kind of machinery on hand and out of employment, unless some such kind of use is made available.

The question might arise as to the authority of the Federal Government to enter into such an undertaking. That the Government has the right to do so is very plainly presented when we consider that the Federal Government is granted the right to regulate and control the commerce between the States, that commerce in great part is afforded by our rivers, hence, they being the means by which commerce is carried on, necessarily come under its control. The state and stages of the streams are the Government's concern—this applies not only to the navigable water but the waters which are tributary thereto and defect the stage of the navigable water. The Government certainly could reach out to the furthermost source of its supply and take control thereof, if deemed necessary and expedient.

The benefit which would accrue to our farmer through such an undertaking while the larger is not the only one; our people, particularly our fishermen, know that the greater portions of the food supply for our fish, which nature seeks to furnish, comes from our smaller streams. It is in these streams that the minnows and smaller fish, crayfish, and other kinds of aquatic life breed and multiply and in due course come to the larger streams and rivers to furnish a supply of food for the fish therein. In times of

drought when the pools of the smaller streams are dried up this food supply is destroyed in whole or in great part, thus great quantities of fish food are lost which would otherwise come to use in the larger streams and rivers. This may account in part to our fisherman as to why we do not have the good fishing of earlier times.

The Federal Government, if it saw fit, should enter into such an undertaking and certainly should seek State and county aid.

Beautiful Autumn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include a poem that was recently published in the Valley Times-Star, of Newville, Pa., edited by John J. Greene, written by Mrs. Lizzie Westafer, a guest at the Brethren Home near Huntsdale and a former resident of Newville. To quote from the Valley Times-Star:

On Tuesday Mrs. Westafer celebrated her seventy-first birthday anniversary. She has been an invalid for 13 years and has been bedfast for the last 7 years. Early in November, when, as she says, "the mountains and trees were so beautiful" she composed the following blank verse:

BEAUTIFUL AUTUMN

Jesus, the artist of this great universe,
Who has created the heavens, the land, and sea;
The mountains, valleys, and plains
Are all dressed in their royal colors of red and gold,
The tree at my window is showing forth its beauty of gold and splendor.
It is a beautiful picture of God's beautiful handiwork of art;
Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these beautiful trees.
Anybody that is a believer in Jesus Christ
Can see that God is in the trees,
And in flowers, and the golden grain, and in all this great universe.
This beautiful world here below is nothing in comparison to heaven.
That great white throne; the city four-square, the beautiful jasper walls, the streets paved with pure gold;
That beautiful eastern gate, that stands ajar for us.
Who will enter the pearly gate? Shall you? Shall I?
And to be with the angels and the saints, robed in spotless white, in that new Jerusalem,
And to be with God our Father;
And with Jesus Christ, His dear son, our Lord and Saviour;
Amazing grace—how sweet the sound,
That saved a wreck like me—
I once was lost but now am found;
Was blind, but now I see:
Ready to go, ready to stay,
Ready my place to fill;
Ready for service, lowly or great,
Ready to do His will.

These thoughts and the circumstances surrounding their writing should be an inspiration to many.

Six Ways To Make Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a significant statement on the constitutional and legal means of settling international problems written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer and appearing in the New York Post of December 14, 1943:

SIX WAYS TO MAKE PEACE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Whatever the intention of the founding fathers, American political practice in dealing with foreign policy is so ill-defined and varied that there seem to be at least six legal ways in which the American part of this war can be concluded.

The Senate, in all probability, will make faces, but that will not alter the facts. Moreover, in its final debate on the Connally resolution, the Senate muffed a fine opportunity to impress its viewpoint upon the President. The Senators accepted as a modification (not an amendment, please) of the original Connally text, not only the entire Moscow Declaration about the post-war world, but a clause suggested by Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS of Indiana. This clause reads, "that, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

This would have been a pretty strong reminder to Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Senate was expecting the war to end by a treaty in which it would have a hand. Instead, the usual group of ex-isolationist nationalists led by Senator BOB TAFT, of Ohio, took a hand. These nationalists intended that the Senate should not be bound for the future, not even morally, by the Connally resolution. No matter what treaty were to be presented tomorrow, whether or not it embodied the exact wording of the Connally resolution, they wished it to be known they could and probably would vote against it regardless of any previous acceptance. To this end, they succeeded in preventing the resolution from being sent to the White House as the Senate's advice on foreign policy.

Thereby they outsmarted themselves. Their aim was certainly to induce the President ultimately to submit to the Senate a treaty which they might accept or—more likely—reject. They forgot—apparently—that a resolution that does not bind the Senators who voted it certainly does not bind the President. For the Constitution provides for the President heeding the Senate's advice but not its mere opinion.

The President, remaining free to end the war in any constitutional manner, has the choice of at least six courses open to him:

1. He may, if he chooses, negotiate a "regular" treaty with other governments, subject to ratification by two-thirds of the Senators present, as the Connally resolution would authoritatively have "advised" him to do—had it been given as "advice." The danger inherent in this "normal" procedure is that 49 Senators constitute a quorum and that one-third of the 49, or exactly 17 "willful" (and ignorant) men representing conceivably no more people than live in Greater New York could repudiate the treaty, regardless of consequences.

2. The President could push an amendment to strike from the Constitution the two-thirds rule on treaty ratification and then present his treaty for simple majority ratification by both Houses of Congress. Such a procedure is, however, both long and tiresome, and perhaps too legal to strike much fire from the average citizen. It might be fatal to wait upon the Constitution.

3. The President could make an Executive agreement bypassing Congress. But such agreements are presumably only tolerated because habitually used only for convenience in oiling minor international relations—like the granting of special license plates to the automobiles of diplomats. To handle the peace settlement like a license plate would provoke something like a typhoon in Congress and very conceivably in the country as well.

4. If Congress would pass special enabling legislation along the lines of the Trade Agreement Act, the President could negotiate special agreements regulating the foreign relations of the United States. Congressional hesitancy over granting a "blank check" to the Executive should be overcome if the enabling legislation were specific enough in intention and exact in drafting. The President might well resent excessive precision, and it might curb useful undertakings on his part.

5. There might be a whole series of Executive agreements each implemented by an appropriation act of Congress. This method was followed in the establishment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Authority (U. N. R. R. A.), but is certainly not appropriate for grave matters involving serious political disputes.

6. Finally, the President might ask Congress to vote joint legislation (in both Houses) enacted concurrently by the parliaments of all the states entering into the basic agreement or agreements. Since such legislation would become valid only when passed everywhere in the appropriate manner it would not constitute a danger to the American people. We could not be "left holding somebody's baby."

While all the six methods—and possibly others—appear strictly legal, the last procedure makes a great appeal to this writer. It seems to be the simplest and most proper manner of permitting the fullest discussion of whatever is proposed, of securing international unity—and of legitimately bypassing the haunts of a group of professional wreckers in the United States Senate who seem determined that, come what may, World War No. 3 shall not be avoided.

Colonel Conroy's Death in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Brooklyn Eagle of November 26, 1943, on the death in action of my beloved friend and neighbor, Col. J. Gardiner Conroy:

COLONEL CONROY'S DEATH IN ACTION

The death of Col. J. Gardiner Conroy in action in the Pacific comes as a shock to his host of friends in Brooklyn. The terse Army announcement to his widow that he met death during the capture of Makin Island indicated that the colonel died while leading his regiment, a part of the Twenty-seventh Division which was mentioned in official dispatches about the attack on the Gilberts.

Colonel Conroy was a native of Brooklyn and throughout his life was associated with its charitable and civic affairs as well as practicing law here. His military career began in 1912 with Troop E of the old First Cavalry, as a private. He won his way up through the ranks, serving at the Mexican border and later fighting in France with the One Hundred and Sixth Infantry in the First World War. His wide experience in the National Guard was recognized in 1940 when he was given command of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth and sent to the Pacific area 2 years ago.

When Colonel Conroy's war record becomes known we are sure that it will reflect the greatest credit on the memory of an able lawyer, loyal citizen, and gallant officer.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Faith Baldwin, entitled "What America Means to Me," from the magazine Foreign Service of December 1943:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Faith Baldwin)

I have never thought about what my country means to me until recently. I always took it for granted, like breathing. But when something happens which threatens to cut off your supply of air you realize how precious it is. Being an American means life.

America means my home. It means the beauty of the land and the peace of the skies. It means the right to earn a living for myself and children, and to bring up my children as I see fit. It means my children's right to choose their means of livelihood, their homes, their church, and their politics. It means my right to walk a free woman upon free roads, under a free heaven.

I have not earned this right to be an American. I was born here, and had no choice in the matter. But now I know that I must earn the right which was given me. I must stop and think what it means to be an American today. I must act like an American—I must think like an American—I must live like an American. In short, it is not enough to have been born in America. I must be an American every moment of my waking life.

The Domestic Air Pattern for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Domestic Air Pattern for Tomorrow," delivered by Harllee Branch, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the opening session of the First National Clinic of Domestic Aviation Planning, held at Oklahoma City, Okla., on November 11, 1943.

It developed that the printing of the address would exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule. For that reason, I returned the address to Mr. Branch, and requested him to abridge it. He has done so, and I hope now the article will come within the rule.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is my first visit to this great State of Oklahoma, and I am especially happy to be visiting the home State of Josh Lee, my highly esteemed colleague. This State and this city are nationally known for their intense and continuing interest in aviation. Confidence in the future of air transportation is evidenced by the recent announcement that Oklahoma City will build a $25,000,000 air passenger and freight terminal.

The Oklahoma delegation in Congress—both Senators and Representatives—are keenly alive to the importance of aviation and are active in its support. Representative LYLE BOREN is an influential member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and is an outstanding figure on the subcommittee which is in charge of general aviation legislation, including air transportation. Governor Kerr is putting the full force of his office behind the program of aviation development in Oklahoma and the United States.

Such conferences as this—in which authorities in the several fields of aviation seek by serious, enlightened discussion and fact finding to anticipate and meet the problems of the post-war era—will do much toward bringing about an orderly transition from wartime-restricted operations and activities to unhampered peacetime developments and progress.

The views I express in this speech are my own views and are not to be construed as the official views of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The topic assigned me for discussion this morning is "The Domestic Air Pattern for Tomorrow." In addressing myself to this subject, I am thinking in broader terms than just a pattern for air routes. I shall also discuss other matters which are involved in the development and growth of our domestic air pattern. The term "domestic," as used here, includes all air transportation operations in the continental United States and its Territories and possessions, such as Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, but not the overseas operations between the mainland and our Territories.

I must at the outset confess that I do not belong to that school of aviation enthusiasts who confidently predict that within a short period after the war the skies will be so black with airplanes our view of the sun will be obscured. There is something about aviation, and more especially about air transportation, that is both fascinating and exciting to almost all of us whose thoughts and energies are devoted to it.

The view that we must approach post-war planning with sober and sane thinking is shared by many responsible leaders of the industry.

Those of us whose sincere desire it is to see the air-transportation industry grow to its deserved stature on a sound basis and those of us who have the responsibility for the development of our domestic air pattern must have vision, but we cannot afford to be visionary. Vision must be tempered by sound and practical common sense.

For several years I was privileged to have a part in the Post Office Department's sponsorship of the air lines. While the Department had a special interest in the fast transportation of mail by air, it also felt its responsibility for developing a Nation-wide air-transportation system. And with the means at hand—limited appropriations by Congress, the power to map new routes, to let contracts for the carriage of air mail over these routes, to prescribe schedules, and to require the operation of planes suitable for the safe transportation of passengers, mail, and express—the Department was enabled to make substantial progress toward such a Nation-wide system.

It was early in 1934 that I became Assistant Postmaster General in charge of mail transportation, which, of course, included the transportation of mail by air. It was about that time that the old air-mail contracts were canceled. Before letting any new contracts we sought to determine a system of air-transportation routes which would be so located and integrated as to best serve the traffic needs of the country.

We planned first to complete a Nation-wide system of primary routes and then to follow with a Nation-wide system of secondary routes. The primary routes were to be the trunk lines and the secondary routes were to be the local services. This plan was followed by the Post Office Department until 1938 when the Civil Aeronautics Board was created and was charged by the Congress, through the Civil Aeronautics Act, with the "encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service and of the national defense."

The President honored me by including me among the first members appointed to the Board so that my contact with the development of our national air-transportation system has been continuous over a period of almost 10 years.

There are now on file with the Board 233 applications for authority to operate domestic air services. These applicants desire to serve approximately 3,400 towns and cities, and the proposed new routes total approximately 310,000 miles. Every State in the Union is represented in these applications. Most of the applications cover secondary or local air routes, with 19 seeking authority to serve towns and cities only 10 to 20 miles apart. Twenty-six applications for authority to conduct helicopter service over 91,000 miles of local routes have been filed. Twenty-five applicants seek certificates to operate pick-up and delivery air-mail services over proposed new routes aggregating 54,000 miles in 30 States.

The Board has recently completed a month's hearing in its investigation designed to secure all available facts and information

which might be of assistance to the Board in determining plans and policies for a Nation-wide system of secondary routes.

There are many important determinations to be made, such as:

Shall local routes run out from a trunk-line point to a terminal point not on a trunk line in what is sometimes described as the spokes-of-a-wheel plan, or shall they run from a point on one trunk line to a point on the same trunk line and from a point on one trunk line to a point on another? When these questions are asked it is taken for granted that, regardless of how local air routes are laid out, they will serve numerous intermediate towns and cities.

It seems to be generally agreed that local air lines which connect with trunk air lines will perform a greater public service than air lines which have no such connections, for in that way local lines will feed the trunk lines and at the same time the trunk lines will feed the local lines.

Another illustration of the kind of problem to be considered is whether passenger, express, and mail services, as well as pick-up and delivery services, will be operated over the same route, and, if so, whether they will be separate operations or conducted by the same company; whether pick-up and delivery services will be performed by the same planes which provide the passenger, mail, and express service, or whether there will be a completely separate service performed by helicopters and conventional-type planes equipped only for pick-up and delivery services.

It was brought out at the recent hearing that pick-up and delivery devices can be operated on conventional-type airplanes with accommodations for a number of passengers and substantial cargoes of mail and express. Witnesses testified that within 2 years after the war, helicopters will be produced which will transport 10 to 14 passengers and quantities of mail and express. It would seem, then, that both types of planes could serve local routes—the pick-up planes, whether of the conventional type equipped with pick-up devices, or helicopters.

The former could land at towns where there are airports and employ the automatic pick-up and delivery devices at towns without airports, while the latter could land and take off from available vacant lots.

The dollar cost of operation, so important in the conduct of any business within a peacetime economy, will be an important factor in determining the scope of local air service. Every proposed route must be judged by the public service it will render as compared with the cost to the Government—which means, of course, cost to the taxpayer.

It seems safe to predict that there will be numerous charter air-transportation services. These will be nonscheduled services and the operators will be equipped with planes and experienced personnel to serve the public need for special air trips of substantial distances.

Any discussion of our domestic post-war air-transportation pattern brings forward questions such as—

Shall there be mergers of financially weak air lines, serving thinly populated territory, with financially strong air lines, serving thickly populated territory?

The position of those who favor such mergers is that they improve the financial condition of both interests involved and enable the air lines formed as a result of such mergers to provide a better public service. It is also argued that the merger of a weak carrier with a strong carrier eliminates or lessens the probability that the operation heretofore conducted by the weak carrier will require continued Government subsidy. There are some who express apprehension concerning such transactions. They fear that if mergers are permitted some carriers will obtain regional monopolies and that through mergers the domestic air-transportation industry may get into the hands of a very few powerful companies.

Of course, the Board must see to it that any change in the present pattern will be in the public interest. It took a position against a regional monopoly in the United-Western Air merger case, and it is required by the Civil Aeronautics Act to see that sound competition exists between air carriers.

There is currently an active discussion centering around the question of whether the domestic air carriers shall extend their operations into the international field. Those who favor their doing so argue that there are no natural barriers to air transportation—such as oceans and mountains—and that the public should be entitled to this inherent and special advantage enjoyed by air transportation through the medium of direct operations from important interior points over the oceans to important foreign points. Those who oppose contend that it would be a wise policy to keep our domestic and international carriers separate and distinct and that the former should be confined to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the latter should perform the overseas services and terminate at shore-line ports. The opposition further contends that if the domestic air lines go into the international field then the international air lines will be compelled to go into the domestic field, which, they allege, will bring about uneconomic conditions in both fields. This problem requires sound, intelligent thinking on the part of the industry and those in the Government who will decide the policy.

Frequently someone inquires whether there should be any imposed limit on the number of our carriers operating in both the domestic and international fields. Those who ask this question might be able to answer it for themselves if they bore in mind that the Civil Aeronautics Act requires the Board to "foster sound, economic conditions in the air transportation services."

Congress, in giving the Board this directive, undoubtedly desired to avoid in air transportation anything similar to the economic tragedy of the short-line railroads. Most of us know that 40 or 50 years ago the public enthusiasm for railroad transportation rose to such a high peak that large numbers of short-line railroads were built to serve the smaller cities and towns throughout the country. Millions of dollars were invested in these short-line railroads, and practically all of these vast sums came from towns, counties, municipalities, and individuals who had a fervent faith in the prosperity of these enterprises.

The era of the short-line railroads forms a sad chapter in our history. It is a story of failure, of bankruptcy, of great losses to investors, and, in many instances, the complete impoverishment of those who had invested their life savings in these railroads.

No one who has the sound development of the air transportation industry at heart wishes to see its future endangered by overexpansion. The Civil Aeronautics Board is duty bound to resist any pressure directed toward uneconomic or unsound expansion. Its decisions on applications for new routes must be founded on something more substantial than enthusiasm and overoptimism.

There is considerable talk these days about whether the Government should own or control the air lines. It is my opinion that public sentiment generally is against Government ownership or control. However, if air lines depend too heavily upon Government subsidy they may expect, sooner or later, that there will arise a demand that "if the Government pays—then the Government must control."

During the decade in which I have been in close contact with the air transportation industry, it has, as a whole, progressed from heavy losses and dependency upon substantial Government subsidy to excellent earnings. The majority of our domestic carriers are doing so well financially on their commercial services that they no longer have any need for a mail pay rate which includes any subsidy. Even though an air carrier earns such substantial profits on its passenger and express services that it does not require any Government subsidy, it is entitled to a fair and reasonable service rate for transporting the mail, and such a rate must reimburse the carrier for all costs properly allocable to its mail service and also provide it with a fair and reasonable profit on that amount of its investment apportioned to the mail service. A self-supporting air carrier, one which no longer requires any Government subsidy, makes a much stronger appeal to investors than one which depends upon subsidy.

Another question relating to the ownership of the air lines has arisen as a result of the active efforts of the railroad, steamship, bus, and truck companies to get into air transportation. The air lines are just as actively resisting what they consider an unwarranted and unsound encroachment. On the one hand, surface transportation companies take the position that they should be allowed to integrate air service with their surface operations, contending that the integration of such services will be in the public interest. On the other hand, the air carriers insist that the development and progress of air transportation will be greatly retarded if it is dominated by the older and different forms of transportation. The air transport industry contends that the surface carriers, having much heavier investments in surface operations than the air carriers have in air operations, will, if they are permitted to engage in air transportation, devote a major part of their energies to their surface operations at the expense of their air operations. Those who argue thus quote the Biblical assertion: "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

The Board has determined that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act rigidly restrict the participation of the older forms of transportation in the air-transport field, and this determination is amply supported by well-established congressional policy. Those who oppose ownership of air lines by companies operating other forms of transportation are equally opposed to such companies acquiring control, whether by ownership or in some other way, and the Board has concluded that control does not necessarily depend on the ownership of any specific minimum percentage of stock or other ownership rights but rather depends, in the light of all the facts and circumstances in a particular case, upon whether there exists as a matter of fact a power to dominate or an actual domination of one legal personality by another.

While we are discussing the domestic air pattern for tomorrow, it is pertinent to give some consideration to the type of planes and frequency of schedules which will be flown over our domestic air lines after the war. I feel safe in saying that within a year following the end of the war there will be at least twice as many schedules over our heavy traffic routes as were operated in 1941—the year before the air lines began to experience demands from the military services for their skilled personnel and equipment—and that there will be an increase in the number of schedules flown over practically every route. We may expect that the nonstop schedules over these heavy traffic routes will be flown by much larger and faster planes than were used in 1941. It is likely that for some time after the war the DC-3 type airplane, which for several years has been efficient and standard equipment on most of our air lines, will continue performing local service on the heavy traffic routes and all of the services on most of the trunk lines whose traffic is lighter by comparison. Higher traffic levels on all of the routes may be anticipated and it would seem conservative to estimate that the air lines will, within the

first year after the war, be doing at least twice the business they did in 1941.

Larger and faster planes will be available to the air lines very soon after the cessation of hostilities because they were projected and engineered for civilian air transportation before the war. Although some changes were made in the designs to meet the requirements of the Army air transportation services they can be quickly reconverted to the original design. Large numbers of these planes are now being operated by the Army.

Not only may we expect a greater increase in passenger, mail, and express operations, but the inauguration of cargo services on a Nation-wide scale is assured. The trail for these cargo services has already been well blazed by the Army Air Transport Command, which has flown large numbers of planes carrying heavy cargoes millions of miles over domestic and foreign routes. Considerable experience has also been achieved in the operation of special cargo services by United Air Lines, American Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines, Transcontinental & Western Air, Hawaiian Air Lines, Pan American Airways, and Pan American-Grace Airways.

Not only has experience indicated the type of planes best adapted to cargo services, but many lessons have been learned in loading and unloading; the techniques of packaging cargoes to save weight and space; storing and tying down cargoes; and in collection and delivery. Air cargo traffic is certain to loom large in the domestic air pattern of tomorrow.

Our air transportation industry seems to me to be in a most favorable position for getting quickly back into normal operations after the end of the war and for an accelerated and prosperous growth.

Certainly there is no other industry in this country which has a more assured future.

It is the congressional policy, as indicated in the Civil Aeronautics Act, to keep this industry in a sound condition if it maintains honest, efficient, and economic practices.

It has been fortunate in that throughout the war it has been permitted to carry on a substantial portion of its regular commercial operations and, in addition, has been privileged to perform important and valuable transport and other services for the Army and Navy.

It was not, like many of our other important industries, entirely converted to wartime services, and it will not, like these other industries, require a considerable period for reconversion to normal operations.

This industry will be able, because of its healthy financial condition, its existing operating organizations, and the almost immediate availability of suitable equipment, to begin operations without delay on a scale much larger than those conducted before the war.

Our air-line managements have in the past been alert in the development and advancement of their services, and I am perfectly confident that in the future they will avail themselves of every opportunity for further improving their services to the benefit of the public and the advantage of the air transport industry.

Keeping Faith With Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is one point in connection with this appropriation that, in my opinion, deserves serious consideration. The discussion of this measure has been concerned to a great extent with the amount of money involved, the number of farmers affected, and the security offered farmers by crop insurance. These are all important details but in my opinion, the most basic and consequently the most important question in connection with this proposal is, "Are we keeping faith with the farmers of this country?" All of us who have seriously considered this proposal for the revival of crop insurance and who have acquainted ourselves with the details of the program, realize that the insurance written on the 1943 wheat crop was the first year of insurance under a 3-year contract. Now, the people in the corporation who are responsible for developing these contracts knew that the Government's ability to carry out these 3-year contracts was dependent upon annual appropriations by Congress. They carefully protected the Government by inserting a clause in the contract which relieved the Government of any legal obligation under the contract unless such appropriations were made. Men learned in the law carefully took care of this detail but this detail of the crop insurance contract is very similar to the detail contained in the clauses carefully inserted in any life, accident, or casualty insurance contract. They are all put in there for a purpose. The policyholder, however, rarely knows the purpose of these many clauses and seldom, if ever, reads them until they are brought into question. All of us who know insured wheat growers know that they thought they had a contract under which their Government would insure their wheat for a 3-year period. We know that they did not read those crop insurance contracts any more than you have read your life-insurance contracts. We know that they took their end of the contract seriously and we also know that they expected the Government, regardless of escape clauses, to take its end of the contract with equal seriousness.

In the State of North Dakota, a State known as "a high risk State," farmers have taken the crop-insurance program seriously; they have depended on this protection; they believed in the future of crop insurance. While they knew that it was an experimental program, they proved that the experiment could succeed and that reserves could be built up. During these 5 years of crop insurance, the wheat growers of North Dakota have built up a reserve of nearly 2,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is true that these farmers have had good wheat years, but that alone did not do it. These farmers believed in crop insurance; they thought it was going on; they saw it succeeding in their own State, and they adjusted losses carefully and built up this reserve for protection in the bad crop year which will eventually come. They did not build up such reserves without faith that crop insurance would continue or with the thought of escape clauses in the back of their heads. They signed a 3-year contract and they thought they had a 3-year contract. Instead they found that the reserves they carefully had built up have been taken away from them. The security they felt no longer exists. The Government is 2,000,000 bushels of wheat ahead on this experiment in North Dakota—wheat which was paid in by North Dakota farmers and stored up for a year of crop failure. The farmers are out that much wheat and still have all the well-known hazards of wheat growing to face.

I believe that we have a responsibility under these contracts, not the kind of responsibility that can be enforced in courts of law, but a responsibility of far greater importance; one that is much more far-reaching in the minds of all of us and in the mind of every patriotic, God-fearing American farmer. I believe that we have a serious and sacred duty to keep faith with farmers by enacting this legislation.

Scofield Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information provided by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, explaining that legal obstacles have been cleared to permit immediate construction of major features of the Scofield project in Carbon County of my State for flood control and to increase the Nation's capacity to produce war foods.

The Bureau of Reclamation, through construction of a new dam, will safeguard from floods a vital output of coal in mines nearby, which is being shipped to major steel plants. The construction will also prevent flooding of a main artery in the railroad transportation system of the country. In addition, this project will stabilize the water supply for 12,500 acres of irrigated land in the Price River Valley on which at present intensive agriculture cannot be practiced because of a shortage of water in the late summer.

The irrigated agriculture of Utah is playing a vital role in increasing the production of war foods for our fighting forces, our civilian population, and hungry peoples in foreign lands. Last year the area served by the Bureau of Reclamation—about a quarter million acres—produced crops valued at about $12,000,000. A yield as great if not greater was harvested this season.

The need for bringing additional land under irrigation or supplementing the water supply for areas not adequately watered is gaining increased recognition. The War Production Board has given clearance in recent months on three projects in my State which will extend irrigation service to more than 34,000 acres by 1945. Additional clearances on several other projects should be granted so that Utah may make further contributions in war food. Provided with adequate storage facilities, irrigation projects never have a crop failure due to lack

of water. Droughts or not, they go on producing year after year about the same quantities of crops. Irrigated agriculture is dependable agriculture.

The Bureau of Reclamation news release follows:

Clearance of legal obstacles which permit immediate construction of major features of the Bureau of Reclamation's Scofield project in Carbon County, Utah, for flood control and war food production, was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

On the recommendation of Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore, the Secretary ruled that provisions of the amended Water Conservation and Utilization Act of July 16, 1943, under which the project is to be constructed, having been complied with, construction of the project could proceed. President Roosevelt last June authorized the construction under the original W. C. U. Act.

The amended act stipulates that no actual construction of the physical features of a project shall be undertaken until the Secretary of the Interior has found that rights of way deemed necessary for the construction and operation of major features of the projects have been secured, or sufficient progress made in their procurement to indicate the probability that all of the rights-of-way could be secured. The act further provides that no major construction may be begun until the Secretary has found that water rights adequate for the purposes of the projects have been acquired with titles and prices satisfactory to him, or that such water rights have been initiated and in his judgment can be perfected in conformity with State law or any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him.

The new Scofield Dam will replace an old dam, built by private interests in 1925–26, which is in danger of collapse. The new dam will be an earth-fill structure, 56 feet high, 420 feet long, and 30 feet wide at the crest. The total estimated cost of the construction is $720,000, of which $393,000 is allocated to flood control.

The dam will stabilize the water supply for 12,500 acres of irrigated land of the Price River Valley, now faced with shortages, and form the basis for providing supplemental water to the nearby Gooseberry project of 30,000 acres, when that project is authorized. Failure of the old dam would flood vital coal mines which are shipping to large steel plants and the main line of a major railroad, and would eliminate the supply of water for 12,500 acres of land-producing war crops.

Spanish-War Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the significance of a letter sent to me by Mr. Julian E. Cole, of Whitefish, Mont., I am inserting in the RECORD his remarks on a very pertinent matter. Mr. Cole states his case logically and I feel that what he says must be given every consideration. It is my strong opinion that the marriage date should be changed so that the care and security, which is the veterans' responsibility, could be assure to his wife as well. I am glad to report to the House the assurance from the gentleman from New York, Congressman BUCKLEY, in charge of H. R. 2350, that such was and is the intent of his committee, and is so included in the measure just passed by the House.

The letter is as follows:

WHITEFISH, MONT., *November 15, 1943.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter November 15 received and thank you for same. In answering my other questions you overlooked answering one thing that I asked about and would be glad to find out about. H. R. 2350 change in pension for Spanish-War veterans and more especially changing the marriage date for Spanish-War widows to September 1, 1938, was reported out (Rept. No. 767), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Just what does that mean? When and how will that come up and be handled? That is really what I am very much interested in, that and you doing all you can to agitate the passage of the bill which I am sure you will gladly do.

I am attaching a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoting the National Tribune which you probably have seen before, but it brings this question of different treatment for different classes of pensioners of different wars up so glaringly and can be applied so pat to the treatment Spanish-War veterans have received in the past and that H. R. 2350 would correct more especially in the case of changing the marriage date of Spanish-War widows that I am sending it to you to be referred to as the basis of righting the wrong that I am so much interested in personally. I have written you and others numerous times relative to the fact that a Spanish-War widow has to be married to her veteran husband previously to September 1, 1922, in order to come in on any pension at all on his death and then only to the extent of $30 per month. There are several thousand of these, you might say, outcast widows and widows-to-be under the present law and I having been married May 5, 1923, am one of them and my widow, if and when, wouldn't get a cent if I were to die tonight.

Now, taking our own case as an illustration of the several thousand left outside the breastworks entirely and compare it with a wife, not a widow even, of a present war veteran. A young girl can marry a soldier tonight, he leaves tomorrow, and she promptly starts drawing $50 per month pension or whatever you want to call it. If they have been married 3 or 4 years and have three children she draws $50 plus $30 plus $20 plus $20, or a total of $120. That is fine. I don't kick a bit on that or anything else that any soldier gets, but look at my wife—widow, if I should die tonight; we have been married 20 years 6 months and 10 days and Mrs. Cole, under the same high prices and everything else that applies to the young widow, don't get a red cent. Is there anything fair about that? Why the discrimination?

With that glaring comparison and except for the case of the wife with the children, the conditions are the same. I am sure you will see why I am anxious for you to raise heaven and earth to get that marriage date changed. I hope you can raise such a storm among your colleagues that the bill will be rushed through without a moment's delay, then if I take a notion to die I can rest easy in my grave. Even if you get it passed, the 5-minute wife still gets $50 and my nearly 21-year widow only $30, but I guess beggars can't be choosers.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,
Yours very truly,

JULIAN E. COLE.

Will Our War Effort Stall Because We Cannot Get All the Whisky We Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, all the agitation here in the Nation's Capital about the shortage of whisky seems to me to be drawing attention to our own lack of balance. Suppose it is a fact that there is not enough whisky around to satisfy the thirsty in the Nation. What has that got to do with our war effort? Would it be a too severe punishment if we did not get any whisky at all until the war is over—if the whisky is needed as medicine by our troops. Is there any reason why we should not give up some of our appetite to help the war effort?

It appears that we have overdone the whisky business since the war began. Estimated figures show that in a period of 12 months ending July 1, 1942, we spent $23,000,000,000 for food and $5,000,000,000 for whisky. Do those disturbed about the shortage of whisky want to increase the consumption of it until it reaches the amount spent for food? If we can get along without certain foods in abundance, what earthly reason is there why we cannot cut down on whisky. This situation reminds me of a man who, seeing a man going home with a sack of flour, remarked, "Look at that fool going home with a sack of flour on his back and not a drop of whisky in the house."

The Senate is so alarmed over this shortage of whisky that they have appointed a special committee to investigate the outrage.

How terribly selfish we have become in this war. While our boys are losing their lives, their limbs, and otherwise being shot up and disfigured, we here at home raise the hue and cry, "For our sakes, give us more whisky." Anyone would think the outcome of the war depended on whether we here at home can have all the whisky we want.

Some say there is a Whisky Trust and whisky is being purposely withheld for better prices. It takes two to make a market, and no matter how much whisky is held up for a better price, it would not mean any profit to the hoarders unless they could find buyers. Suppose we just made up our minds right now to buy no whisky until the war is over; it would be an effective way of breaking the trust.

Anyone would think, from the commotion here in the Capital, that we will lose the war just as soon as we fail to get all the whisky we want. If that is not sheer nonsense, I do not know what the term means.

A ceiling price does not affect a black market. On the black market in the vicinity of Washington, the price of whisky ranges all the way from $32.50 to $75 for a case of Scotch whisky, but these prices could not be obtained if there were

no buyers. I presume whisky is so essential in keeping up our courage that if the price on the black market were $100 per case there would still be buyers. Every patriotic citizen should be more than anxious to stop black markets—most people are of this opinion on everything except whisky. Apparently whisky we must have, whether we have anything else.

Once we wanted beer, and have it; but as the war progresses, we must have whisky. Will our entire war effort stall if we cannot get it?

House Joint Resolution 187 Would Not Set Railroad Labor Out as a Privileged Group

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the facts brought to light in the prevailing railroad wage dispute do not sustain nor support the statement made by Director Vinson before the Senate subcommittee to the effect that approval of Senate Joint Resolution 91 would make the 1,100,000 nonoperating railroad workers a privileged group.

In view of the surprisingly low wage rates found by the President's Emergency Board to exist for these highly essential railroad workers, and the relationship of their wages to those paid in the Nation's other major industries, it would appear, on the other hand, to justify reference to them as the Nation's underprivileged group.

In this connection, I call attention to the fact that the President's Emergency Board, in its extensive public hearings in this wage controversy, found that there were 120,000 of these railroad workers who were actually paid 46 cents an hour or less. This may come as a surprise to those who have been misled by the widespread propaganda intended to convey the impression that railroad workers are enjoying high wage scales. The Emergency Board found that there were 160,000 of these employees who were receiving 50 cents an hour or less, and mostly less. It found that there were 350,000 of these railroad employees who got 60 cents an hour or less.

This group of more than a million nonoperating railroad workers is composed in part of such highly skilled craftsmen as machinists, boilermakers, sheet metal workers, carpenters, blacksmiths, and electricians. It includes highly trained bookkeepers and other skilled clerical and office workers. It embraces highly skilled signalmen, telegraphers, painters, bridge foremen, building foremen, and track foremen. It includes the masters, mates and pilots, and the marine engineers in the railroad industry's barge and ferry service. It includes all classes of labor for the unskilled and semiskilled groups up to those with the highest types of skill. It includes several thousand foremen who assume the duties and responsibilities of minor supervisory officers. With this brief understanding of the type of employees involved, it may come as a surprise to learn that the average hourly earnings for this group of 1,100,000 railroad employees is a fraction under 74 cents an hour—or 4 cents less than the minimum fixed by the War Labor Board for unskilled labor for the steel industry.

In July of this present year when the average hourly rate of these railroad workers was 74 cents, the average for manufacturing industry was 96.3 cents. Adding the 8 cents now in dispute to the 74-cent average of the railroad workers, their average would then be 82 cents, which would still be 14 cents an hour less than the average for manufacturing industries.

There is nothing in these figures to indicate that the approval of the August 7 agreement with the carriers would set railroad labor out as a privileged group, but there is clear evidence that even after granting them an 8-cent hourly increase, they would still be an underprivileged group as compared with the millions who work in manufacturing industries.

On the basis of the purchasing power of their hourly wages, railroad labor is definitely substandard as compared with other workers. The purchasing power of the wages of factory workers had increased 15.6 percent in August 1943 as compared with January 1941, but during this same period the purchasing power of the wages received by railroad workers actually decreased 5 percent.

The nonoperating railway employees have suffered an additional heavy burden because the Federal Government has directed its income-tax program in such a way as to recapture part of the increased buying power of American wage earners—and railway workers consequently are paying higher taxes while the buying power of their wages has actually decreased rather than increased. The privilege of paying higher taxes on increased buying power that they do not possess must be a special privilege that produces little joy in the homes of the railroad workers.

The President's Emergency Board was very emphatic in reporting that the nonoperating railway employees were paid wages well below those received by other American workers. In this connection, the Board stated, in part:

> Various crafts or classes of railroad workers involved in this dispute, including, for example, carpenters and machinists, receive sharply lower wage rates than those paid to comparable groups in nonrailroad industries.
>
> Even when the high rates paid in swollen war industries and in such seasonal industries as building construction are entirely eliminated, railroad employees still receive substantially lower wage rates than comparable groups of employees in outside industries.

With these findings on the part of the Emergency Board, after a 44-day investigation of the railroad wage structure, there is little in the record to support Director Vinson in his claim that approval of the agreement would set them apart as a "privileged group."

Common laborers in coal mines, prior to their more recent increase, were paid 86 cents an hour according to the record made in this public railroad wage hearing. This was 40 cents an hour above the minimum rate of 46 cents now prevailing in the railroad industry and it is 12 cents an hour more than the average received by these railroad workers as a whole. This is likewise a privilege accorded railroad labor which will be of little value to them in purchasing the necessities of life at the corner grocery store.

The United States Government itself, through its various agencies, has fixed wages for employees in Government service and in other industries that far exceed the wages paid in the railroad industry. The War Labor Board set a minimum of 75 cents an hour for common labor in the California air-frame industry. As I have already pointed out, the War Labor Board set 78 cents an hour as a minimum for common labor in the steel industry. The minimum wage for unskilled labor fixed by the War Labor Board for the shipbuilding industry ran to 80 and 88 cents an hour.

In the face of this record, how can any representative of the Federal Government justify himself in saying that the adoption of the pending legislation would set railroad labor apart as a "privileged group"?

I say, in all kindness, that Director Vinson, after having acted hastily and unwisely, after having become confused as to the extent and limitation of his authority, and after having misinterpreted the intent and purpose of the Stabilization Act, now appears to be grasping at statistical straws in an effort to sustain himself in an obvious error that he has undoubtedly permitted himself to make.

With the splendid record of railroad labor, which is so well known to the Members of the House, I am not willing to penalize these railroad workers merely for the purpose of saving the face or encouraging the stubbornness of the Stabilization Director.

Adjudication of Claims of Servicemen

REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as previously announced, the meeting of the Rating Board for the Adjudication of Claims at Walter Reed Hospital of disabled servicemen met yesterday and adjudicated the first claim of a disabled veteran since the beginning of the program. I hope that this Board will

soon be able to get around to the matter of rating the claims of all disabled service men and women in this hospital and in all Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard hospitals throughout the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked General Hines to point out to me certain difficulties which his boards have found in rating promptly disabilities of those about to be discharged. He has written a letter which is as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reference to your request for information regarding the procedure established for expediting the adjudication of claims of veterans discharged from the service because of disability. It is understood you desire specific data regarding the following points:

1. The availability of records for rating purposes at discharge.

2. Does the absence of records preclude prompt adjudication?

3. Would discharges of all veterans through specified demobilization centers with Veterans' Administration boards and contact facilities at the centers afford material aid in solving the question of delay between discharge and the receipt of pension?

With regard to your first inquiry it may be stated that from information received by the Administration there is delay in furnishing the essential records upon which the veterans' claims may be adjudicated. The delay in the main appears to result from the failure of the Army authorities to furnish promptly a photostat copy of the veteran's physical examination made at the time he entered the active service to the discharging station. However, this matter is receiving intensive consideration by the Office of The Adjutant General and it is believed material improvement may be expected.

Considering your second question the absence of essential records does preclude prompt adjudication particularly in cases involving disease where there is for consideration the question of whether the condition pre-existed the veteran's entrance into the active service and whether it was aggravated during the period of his service. In other cases such as those in which the veteran's disability was incurred in combat with the enemy the claim may be adjudicated upon partial records and instructions have been prepared to Veterans' Administration personnel to adjudicate these claims upon incomplete records.

With regard to your third inquiry it is believed that the establishment of a limited number of demobilization centers and the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at these stations to rate the cases of veterans discharged for disability would expedite the adjudication of their claims. However, as you are doubtlessly aware, a board has been set up at Walter Reed General Hospital here in Washington, D. C., and the Administration will be in a position to judge the effectiveness of this procedure after the board has been in operation for a suitable period. In order to obtain more complete information in this connection, boards will be organized at other selected Army and Navy discharge centers without awaiting full data from the experimental board at Walter Reed.

Detailing Administration employees to the discharge centers would, it is thought, materially assist in speeding up the adjudication proceedings. However, in view of the enormous number of stations from which veterans are being discharged at present, to attempt to cover all of them with Administration employees would mean a large expansion of personnel. The procurement of personnel, as you are undoubtedly aware, is one of the paramount problems facing the Administration at this time.

It is hoped the above will provide you with the desired information.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

An Obvious Injustice to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under provision (d) of paragraph VI, section 13 of Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress an obvious injustice has been done to some of our deserving veterans. I felt so strongly about this matter that I took it up with Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, hoping that this inequality of treatment could be adjusted to give these veterans a fair deal. They do not seek preferential treatment but they do seek justice from the Congress of the country they have helped to defend. As a World War veteran myself, I will do my utmost in behalf of my comrades.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Charles H. Poppe of Columbia Falls, Mont., an exchange of correspondence between General Hines and myself, and a letter to Mr. Poppe:

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT., *October 23, 1943.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter with reference to Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, and for your information am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from the Veterans' Administration regarding the interpretation of the law.

Provision (D) of paragraph VI, section 13, of that law reads as follows:

"The pension of any disabled veteran who is an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on the date of this enactment, shall not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C) above."

On July 13, 1943, I was an inmate of the Montana Soldiers' Home, at Columbia Falls, Mont., but happened to be on furlough. I, as well as a great many other veterans, feel that we have been treated unfairly by this act, or the present interpretation of it. If every inmate of a home were to have his pension reduced to $20 while residing in such home, I believe the act would be fair, but for it to affect only those who happened to be on furlough on that date and those becoming inmates after that date, I believe it constitutes unfair discrimination. Why should some veterans awarded $60 per month pension receive only $20 per month, while others awarded the same pension receive $50 per month, living in the same home, under the same circumstances and conditions?

I am appealing to you to do what you can to procure a more fair interpretation of this law, one that will affect all veterans equally.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. H. POPPE.

NOVEMBER 2, 1943.

Brig. Gen. FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HINES: I am enclosing a letter just received from Mr. Charles H. Poppe, of the Soldiers' Home at Columbia Falls, Mont. I feel that a distinct injustice is being perpetrated on this veteran and, to me, the technicality under which Mr. Poppe is deprived of his pension is pretty far fetched.

I realize that according to the present regulations and interpretations of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Poppe would be reduced in pension while in a State or National soldiers' home under Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, because he was on a furlough of more than 29 days in length at the time Public Law No. 144 became effective. Had his furlough been for less than 30 days, he would not have been affected.

This seems to me to be splitting hairs, and I do hope that there is a chance, and a good one, for changing this ruling. When I was in the service, if I was on furlough, regardless of the length of time, I was still considered a member of the Army, and I should think that Mr. Poppe, regardless of the length of his furlough, would still be considered a member of the soldiers' home during that period, and his pension should not be reduced as was the case. I am quite positive that the view taken by the Veterans' Administration in this matter does not have the tacit approval of Congress and I wish that something could be done to overcome the technicality on which the Veterans' Administration seems to be resting.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

NOVEMBER 11, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your letter dated November 2, 1943, in the interest of Mr. Charles H. Poppe, Columbia Falls, Mont., C-2,398,357.

The matter presented is whether paragraph (D), section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, may be interpreted to permit a veteran who was in a furlough status for 30 days or more from a home, on July 13, 1943, to continue to receive the full rate of pension upon return to the home, regardless of the length of his furlough.

In this connection, in the report of the Committee on World War Legislation which accompanied H. R. 2703, on page 16, in explaining the meaning of paragraph (D), it is stated as follows: "It is proposed, however, by the new subparagraph (D) to save from reduction or discontinuance the pension of any such disabled veteran who is in the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home on the date of enactment of the amendment."

It becomes necessary, therefore, to determine what was meant by the expression "in the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home." Normally this would mean a person who was actually present at the home on the date of approval of Public, No. 144, or July 13, 1943. However, the Veterans' Administration in applying the reduction provisions of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, on account of hospital or domiciliary care and in reducing the pension of veterans in the United States Soldiers' Home or in a National or State soldiers' home to $50 monthly, adopted the liberal

provision of considering a person whose furlough was for less than 30 days as being in the hospital or home and no adjustment was made because of furloughs for less than 30 days.

With this practice in effect for several years, it was considered that the Congress had this in view when reference was made to the veteran being in one of the homes specified and in adopting the instructions placing into effect section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the former liberal practice of considering veterans in the hospital or home if furloughed for less than 30 days was continued. It was not considered, however, that the law authorized the classification of those on furlough of 30 days or more as being in the homes on the date of the approval of the act. It was accordingly provided in the instructions that those on furlough of 30 days or more would be subject to the reduction provisions of section 13 upon readmission to the home after July 13, 1943. In other words, a furlough of 30 days or more in the administration of the reduction provisions of effective laws relative to hospitalization or maintenance was considered equivalent to a discharge and the law does not contemplate conferring greater benefits upon those furloughed because of certain administrative practices of the institution where maintained than upon veterans who were discharged from other institutions where the same practices do not obtain.

The veteran's letter of October 23, 1943, is returned with a copy of this letter for your use, and I desire to thank you for bringing this matter to my personal attention.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

DECEMBER 13, 1943.

Mr. CHARLES H. POPPE,
Columbia Falls, Mont.

DEAR MR. POPPE: Don't think because you have not heard from me recently that I have lost interest in your case. On the contrary, I am in contact with it every day.

It is hard for me to believe that a veteran could be caught in such a trap.

I am enclosing a letter I received from Frank T. Hines, Administrator, on November 11. The letter is not very encouraging. However, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, D. A. V., and other interested organizations are working on a case identical to yours. Should the appeal result in a favorable decision, it will no doubt benefit all those in your situation. I do not know just when this hearing will take place, but I have reason to believe it will be in the near future.

You may rest assured of my interest in your case, and I will communicate with you again as soon as I hear the result of this veteran's appeal.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

A Masterful Paper on a Famous Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. W. Fesler, of Indianapolis, recently read a paper on the Gettysburg Address before the Indianapolis Literary Club which, from the standpoint of information and literary excellence, will take high rank as a contribution to Lincoln lore.

Mr. Fesler's interesting paper throws a flood of light on the circumstances under which the Gettysburg Address—the greatest classic in secular literature—was written and delivered and the lukewarmness with which it was originally received—a lukewarmness which speedily changed to unstinted praise, and adulation when the incomparable beauty of the address was fully appraised and realized.

As a compilation of information from many sources on the most famous address in history Mr. Fesler's paper should be read in every school and home in the land and by unanimous consent of the House I present some of its most salient parts for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Fesler said:

Any adequate discussion of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address would seem to include not only reference to the occasion of the address and some incidental mention of the events which inspired the thoughts to be expressed, but also something of the story of the preparation of the address, the circumstances in which it was delivered, the manner in which the address was received at the time and immediately following its delivery, and the place universally accorded the address in later years, together with its relevant implications to present world conditions; thus, all these matters are properly within the field of discussion of the subject of this paper. * * *

A formal invitation to be present was sent to the President of the United States and to the members of his cabinet, to Maj. Gen. George C. Meade, who commanded the Federal troops in the battle of Gettysburg, to the diplomatic corps, representing foreign governments, to the members of both Houses of Congress and to other distinguished personages. These invitations and all arrangements for the dedicatory exercises were considered and decided upon by the Board of Commissioners of The Soldiers' National Cemetery and were carried into effect by Judge Wills, president of the Commission.

The decision to ask Mr. Lincoln to speak was an afterthought. In fact, it did not seem to occur to any one that he could speak upon such an occasion. Besides, it was said that, with his important duties and responsibilities, he could not possibly have the leisure to prepare an address for such an occasion. Nevertheless, with some reluctance and, perhaps, as a concession to his office, it was finally decided to ask President Lincoln, "after the oration, as Chief Executive of the Nation, to set apart formally these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks"; but the invitation was not settled upon and sent to Mr. Lincoln until the 2nd of November, more than six weeks after Mr. Everett had been invited to speak and but a little more than two weeks before the exercises were held. However, this hesitancy and caution on the part of the cemetery commission mattered not to Abraham Lincoln. Here, again, his deep humility was apparent and, as John Bigelow, in an appraisal of Lincoln, once wrote: "He was so modest by nature that he was perfectly content to walk behind any man who wished to walk before him."

The President arrived at Gettysburg on a special train on the evening before the exercises and was driven at once to the residence of Judge Wills, whose guest he was during his stay in Gettysburg. Judge Wills relates that at about 9 o'clock, the President sent for him and asked what was expected of him. The President, Mr. Wills says, had some paper in his hand and, after explaining the part that he was to take in the proceedings on the following day, he left him. At about 10 o'clock the President sent for Judge Wills again and asked him where Seward was. Upon being informed that the Secretary of State was at the home of a neighbor, the President, accompanied by Wills, called on Secretary Seward, and remained with him for an hour. Obviously, the President was now engaged in the preparation of his speech. It is known to have been Lincoln's custom to consult Secretary Seward on his public utterances and this was the first unofficial address that he had been called upon to make since he had assumed the duties of the Presidency.

How, when, and where, then, did Mr. Lincoln prepare the "few appropriate remarks" he had been reductantly invited to deliver and which, in after years, were to be given the superlative praise of being "the supreme masterpiece of the English language"? The best authority on these questions, and manifestly, the one most competent to speak, was John G. Nicolay, the President's private secretary. Fortunately, Mr. Nicolay published an article on this subject in the Century Magazine in November 1893, in which he says that "there is no decisive record of when Mr. Lincoln wrote the first sentences of his proposed address," but he does speak of Mr. Lincoln's custom of "using great deliberation in arranging his thoughts and moulding his phrases mentally, waiting to reduce them to writing until they had taken satisfactory form." There was even greater necessity of precaution in this case because the invitation to speak specified that the address should be only "a few appropriate remarks." After speaking of "the want of opportunity for Mr. Lincoln even to think leisurely," Mr. Nicolay concludes his article by saying: "All this strongly confirms the correctness of the statement made by the Honorable James Speed, one time Attorney General in President Lincoln's Cabinet, in an interview published in the 'Louisville Commercial,' in November 1870, that 'the President told him that the day before he left Washington he found time to write about half of the speech.'" Manifestly, there should be no further doubt as to when and where the first part of the speech was prepared.

"It was after the breakfast hour on the morning of the 19th (the day the address was delivered)," continues Mr. Nicolay, "that the writer went to the upper room in the home of Mr. Wills, which Mr. Lincoln occupied, to report for duty, and remained with the President while he finished writing the Gettysburg address, during the short leisure he could utilize for this purpose before being called to take his place in the procession which was to move at 10 o'clock.

"There is neither record evidence nor well-founded tradition," Mr. Nicolay adds, "that Mr. Lincoln did any writing or made any notes on the journey between Washington and Gettysburg. The train consisted of four passenger coaches, and either composition or writing would have been extremely troublesome amid the movement, the noise, the conversation, the greetings and the questionings which ordinary courtesy required him to undergo in these surroundings. * * * Mr. Lincoln carried in his pocket the autograph manuscript of so much of his address as he had written at Washington the day before." Obviously then, no fact could be more indisputably established than "when and where" the first part of Mr. Lincoln's address was prepared.

Mr. Nicolay's article in the Century Magazine also contains a facsimile reproduction of the address, which, as he declares, he, then, "for the first time made public and printed in this article, one page of which is written in ink in the President's strong clear hand, without blot or erasure and the remaining

pages written with a pencil. The latter were no doubt written at Gettysburg." * * *

On the day after the address was delivered it appeared in full in every leading newspaper of the United States. Even then those who, in a high degree, appreciated it were comparatively few. It was generally assumed that the President would, in what he said, simply dedicate that ground to the sacred purpose for which it had been set apart. But as the people read the printed speech, it gradually dawned upon them, that the President had solemnly dedicated those who heard him, and not merely those who heard him, but all his people, to the cause for which the martyr heroes about him died, and that this was the underlying thought and object of his address.

When Dr. Everett read the address he began to realize something of its merits, and on the following day in a note to the President, mostly about other matters, he said: "Permit me also to express my great admiration of the thought expressed by you with such eloquent simplicity and appropriateness at the consecration of the cemetery. I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came so near the central idea of the occasion in two hours as you did in two minutes."

To which compliment President Lincoln graciously replied on the same day: "Your kind note of today is received. In our respective parts yesterday you could not have been excused to make a short address, nor I a long one. I am pleased to know that, in your judgment, the little I did say was not a failure. Of course, I knew that Mr. Everett would not fail; and yet while the whole discourse was eminently satisfactory, and will be of great value, there were passages in it which transcended my expectations."

In this connection it is interesting to note the change in Dr. Everett's opinion of Lincoln. As President-elect, after having read some of Lincoln's informal remarks to the public, as he journeyed to Washington for the inauguration, Everett noted in his diary this estimate of Lincoln: "These speeches thus far have been of the most ordinary kind, destitute of everything, not merely of felicity and grace but of common pertinence. He is evidently a person of very inferior cast of character, wholly unequal to the crisis."

Everett's attitude changed, however, as soon as he came to know Lincoln personally, and he spoke about his "intellectual capacities" and how "his kindly spirit mingles its sweetness with the austre cup of public duty." After a formal dinner at the home of Mr. Wills, at Gettysburg, on the evening before the consecration ceremonies, Dr. Everett said: "In gentlemanly appearance, manners, and conversation, the President was the peer of any man at the table."

While our people gradually began to appreciate, in some degree, the high character of the address we did not at all realize at the time how sublime and how comprehensive it was. Not until it had been read and commented upon across the Atlantic did we, generally speaking, place it in our minds among the masterpieces. * * *

I stated at the outset that the relevant implications of the Lincoln Address to present world conditions are properly within this discussion. Almost every word of the Address is, indeed, as pertinent to the life and death struggle in which we are now engaged for the preservation of our democratic form of government as it was to our duties and obligations following the battle of Gettysburg eighty years ago.

It is an interesting fact, in this connection, that Sun Yat-sen's plans for China's democracy were inspired by this address. Lincoln's phrase "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" was paraphrased by Dr. Sun as "the people are to have, the people are to control, the people are to enjoy," and these eventually were presented to the Chinese people as the Three Principles of the People—the cornerstone of democracy which free China is now fighting to defend and to perpetuate.

It is worthy of note that wherever one happens upon the text of the Gettysburg Address, particularly in public place, today, he finds others thoughtfully and contemplatively reading again the immortal words of consecration and dedication. An outstanding instance of this can be observed in the beautiful and impressive Lincoln Memorial Building in Washington, which contains only the statue of Lincoln and the texts of his Gettysburg Address and his Second Inaugural. Bernard De Voto, a recent visitor, has thus described his experience:

"Impressive as the statue is, one presently ignores it; the texts count more. One sees them working an effect on the uniformed boys. On the approaches and the steps there is a good deal of talk, laughter, and horseplay. It becomes a whisper and presently dies out; the place is quiet. They stand reading those texts, they loiter for a while, and few of them say anything as they go away. There are those ribbons and stars—North Africa, the Solomons, the Aleutians, the sea frontiers, Sicily, the sky over France and Germany. Some of these boys have been there, the rest are on their way—and they might have spent this half-hour with their friends, their wives, or their girls. They don't talk much as they go away, and one becomes aware that they came here to be in touch for a moment with the highest expression ever made of what gives them meaning. A man is speaking to them out of an earlier testing, an earlier proof. They know what he is talking about."

In truth, Abraham Lincoln is with us still—more than any man in our history.

If one does not look beyond the words of this address and thinks only of its simplicity and its rare rhetorical perfection, he will lose much that thoughtful contemplation will suggest. In this view of the address, I venture finally to say that the unfathomable mystery in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is not when or where he wrote any part of it, but how, in his circumstances from birth through the formative years of his young manhood, with his limited educational opportunities, as we know them, and having neither varied nor extensive experience in his later years, beyond the routine practice of law in the pioneer days of a hundred years ago in central Illinois—with such a background, how could he produce, in a few days, "The supreme master-piece of the English language" in 10 sentences, of 266 words, of which 194 are words of 1 syllable. True, he had read Aesop's Fables and biographies of Franklin and Washington, and Burns was his favorite poet. He was also a student of the Bible and he read Shakespeare—both, competent guidance to good English composition—but the Gettysburg Address is more than English composition. It is, commonly speaking, so all-inclusive, so far-reaching in its implications, so lofty in its conceptions, and withal, so profoundly moving in every sentence that its creation by one of Lincoln's limited background, is beyond understanding.

I am not unaware that this unparalleled achievement has been attributed to preparation that began with Lincoln's birth and continued to the moment he rose to consecrate the Gettysburg battlefield to the cause of the war and to dedicate all his people to the principles of free government and political equality. It has been said also that every experience of Abraham Lincoln throughout his life was reflected in his sublime pronouncement at Gettysburg. Nevertheless, such observations do not account for, or explain such power. The ability to write "pure English undefiled" as exemplified in the Gettysburg Address cannot be attained by absorption of physical conditions reflected in a background marked by the deprivations of poverty and the hardships of pioneer life. The classic in English letters is not evolved through such methods. Again, Abraham Lincoln defies analysis.

The mystery becomes even more inexplicable as we recall the qualifications of Edward Everett for his part in the consecration exercises and realize that his oration of two hours is long since largely forgotten, while Lincoln's address of two minutes has become immortal.

Everett seemed educated and culturally trained for what he regarded as the supreme achievement of his life—his Gettysburg oration. The son of a Boston clergyman; graduate of Harvard; early widely known in the Unitarian ministry; returned to Harvard as professor of Greek; subsequently a Member of Congress for 10 years; Governor of Massachusetts four terms; Minister to England; again back to Harvard, as president; Secretary of State in President Fillmore's cabinet; and finally United States Senator from Massachusetts, and after a distinguished career there he retired to follow his literary predilections, in the course of which he was nominated in 1860 for Vice President on the Constitutional Union Party ticket with John Bell for President and ran against Lincoln and Hamlin. Naturally the high spot in the program for the consecration ceremonies would be the oration of one thus qualified to speak; for, compared with Everett's long and impressive record, Lincoln's four terms in the Illinois Legislature and one as a Representative in Congress seem insignificant.

So, the more one reflects upon this incredible performance of Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg—so perfect in composition that the addition, or omission, or substitution of a single word would destroy its literary perfection and impair its sublime spiritual quality—the more incomprehensible it becomes, unless, perchance, we adopt the hypothesis of James Russell Lowell, as expressed in the verses on Lincoln in his "Commemoration Ode, Recited at Harvard Commencement," July 21, 1865—3 months after Lincoln's death.

Is it possible that the mystery is solved in these lines:

"Nature, they say, doth dote,
And cannot make a man
Save on some worn-out plan,
Repeating us by rote;
For him her old world molds aside she threw,
And, choosing sweet clay from the breast
Of the unexhausted West,
With stuff untainted, shaped a hero new,
Wise, steadfast in the strength of God, and true.
How beautiful to see
Once more a shepherd of mankind, indeed,
Who loved his charge, but never loved to lead;
One whose meek flock the people joyed to be,
Not lured by any cheat of birth,
But by his clean-grained human worth,
And brave old wisdom of sincerity!
They know that outward grace is dust;
They could not choose but trust
In that sure-footed mind's unfaltering skill,
And supple-tempered will
That bent like perfect steel to spring again and thrust.

* * * * *

The kindly-earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, the first American."

Commenting on Mr. Fesler's paper the Indianapolis Star said editorially:

James W. Fesler, attorney and leader in civic and patriotic activities, read a paper recently before the Indianapolis Literary

Club on Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. The paper revealed careful research into the background of that brief dedication address, which has become a gem of the English-speaking world, and substituted facts for some of the tradition associated with the observance 80 years ago.

The author of the article showed that the Civil War President did not jot down the immortal words on the back of an envelope during the train ride from the National Capital, but had prepared an outline in Washington. Lincoln completed the draft early in the morning of the day the speech was made. This was done at the private home where he was staying. Mr. Fesler's paper included the comment of prominent men on the stand immediately after the conclusion of the brief lines dedicating the memorial cemetery.

Interest of our present frenzied, high-pressure existence, aside from Lincoln's words, must include the physical punishment which the throng at Gettysburg on that day endured. Estimates of the number range from 70,000 to 100,000. There were no benches. The audience had to walk some distance to the area around the speakers' stand. Dr. Edward Everett, hailed as the outstanding orator of the land, gave the principal oration. Remarks by Lincoln were not considered at first and he was added to the program later and somewhat reluctantly. Everett talked for 2 hours. One's feet and legs grow weary today at the thought of standing that long to hear a flowery peroration. No wonder the President's remarks did not reveal their full beauty, dignity, and inspiration until the audience had rested its groaning "dogs."

Soldiers' and Sailors' Voting Rights

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, for quite a long period of time the matter has been discussed relating to a plan for our soldiers and sailors serving in the armed forces voting at the coming elections. The fathers and mothers of the soldiers and sailors are deeply interested in this question. The soldiers and sailors are interested in this matter. I am convinced the people, generally, are deeply interested in this same question.

It is my desire that the country and the people may know that I am wholeheartedly in favor of every soldier and sailor, who has attained the proper age and has an established residence, casting his vote at the coming election and at all succeeding elections. I want every one of our servicemen, engaged in this war, to have the right and privilege of casting their vote and of expressing their choice for the various officers at the coming election, and at all elections as long as this war continues. This must be accomplished without the involvement of any red tape and complicated methods. Our people want our servicemen to have the right to vote, and they want their ballots recorded and counted as those of every other citizen.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want any law passed upon this important subject which will require any complicated method to be pursued in order for our servicemen to vote. We do not want any supercommission in Washington to handle this question, and to control this matter of our soldiers and sailors voting, and the handling of their ballots and making distribution thereof after they have been voted. But we do want a simple, positive, and efficient method prescribed by law which will make it possible for every soldier and sailor to cast their vote, as they may see fit to cast it, and that such ballots, when so voted, will be sent to the several State in which each such voter resides, and properly distributed by the State election commissioners, or some other proper officer, to the proper voting precinct so the ballots will be properly recorded and counted.

Mr. Speaker, our servicemen do not want any complicated or confusing method prescribed for their voting. Many of them are serving on the battle fronts of the world, and a complicated method would simply mean that many of them would be unable to vote. They want a simple and easy method established whereby every soldier and sailor, regardless of where they are serving—whether on the home front or on our many battle fronts—may be able to meet the requirements and cast their vote, and return their vote to their own State for distribution by the proper officer or board of election commissioners for distribution to the voting precinct where such soldier or sailor resides.

Heretofore our several States have had the full control over the election within the State. Any plan to set up a commission in Washington, to govern or control the votes of our servicemen would be entirely contrary to every precedent established. Our several States should continue to handle and control the elections within the State, and this should remain inviolate without any control or direction from any commission sitting in Washington. Our several States can easily handle this question of voting, as they handle and control the elections respecting every other qualified voter within the confines of the State. Therefore, there should be no vastly different rule established in this particular, except the method prescribed for our servicemen to vote should be made very simple and very easy of accomplishment, and that the ballots, when so voted, shall be properly transmitted to the several States in which each voter has a voting residence, so the ballots may be distributed to the proper voting precincts where such voters reside, so their votes will be counted with those of every other voter therein.

Mr. Speaker, when a law is passed by Congress on this subject—and it is my hope that a sane and sensible measure will be passed upon this subject—it is my hope that the requirements under the law for our servicemen to vote will be made simple, positive, and efficient, and that no complicated requirements will be provided therein. We do not want any more boards, bureaus, or commissions in Washington. We have all too many of them already; we do not want any confusing requirements contained in this proposed legislation. I want our soldiers and sailors to vote at the coming election, and at every succeeding election until this war is over. Let us do just those things which are essential to accomplish that end, and let the red tape be entirely forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to every soldier and sailor, and let us do for them, in this instance, the very least we can do—let us provide a simple, easy, and direct method for their voting so they may be assured of casting their ballots at the coming election as every other American citizen will have the right to do. Let there be no confusing requirements contained in the measure which the House will pass on this subject which will have the effect of disqualifying them as voters.

The Good-Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of State relative to the good-neighbor policy, and following that, an article on the same subject published in the New York Herald Tribune of today.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

"The unfair attack recently made on the good-neighbor policy by Senator BUTLER was a matter of general astonishment throughout the Western Hemisphere. It was imperative in our national interest that these charges be analyzed and answered—answered so completely as to leave no grounds for their reiteration. Senator MCKELLAR has provided such an answer. With painstaking analysis he has demonstrated, I believe to the satisfaction of everybody, the inaccuracies, the fallacies, and the misstatements of Senator BUTLER'S unfortunate allegations.

"We in the Department of State are as much opposed to extravagance and waste in Government expenditures as anyone can be. We have consistently practiced a policy of economy. But the question here presented is whether, especially at this serious stage of the war, we shall forget the broad essential nature of our cooperative activities in the other American republics and turn to a controversy over a limited number of items of wartime expenditure. Senator MCKELLAR ably and effectively presented the matter in this light. It would, of course, be too much to expect that no errors of judgment have been made in the conduct of programs conceived and carried out under the pressure of wartime emergency, but I believe that Senator MCKELLAR has effectively demolished the

figures and conclusions on which Senator BUTLER based all, or virtually all, his indiscriminate attacks.

"Senator BUTLER now protests that he had no intentions of misrepresenting or injuring the good-neighbor policy. Whatever his intentions may have been, the effects of what he said, its manner, and its implications were such as to constitute a most unfair and unfounded attack calculated to injure the whole policy.

"Beginning 10 years ago at Montevideo, we of the Americas have built a cooperative relationship to increase our trade and raise our standard of life and as a bulwark in the defense of our independence and freedom.

"At Buenos Aires we established the procedure of consultation before the menace of overseas aggression. At Lima we proclaimed the solidarity of the Americas and our determination jointly to face common dangers to our security. After war broke out in Europe in 1939 we had two special meetings, one at Panama and another at Habana, where we concerted measures of mutual assistance. We agreed to consider an attack against one as an attack against all.

"On December 7 attack came, and with it the sternest test of inter-American solidarity. The other American republics realized that the Axis attack against the United States was only part of a plan to conquer the entire world. Now 13 are in a state of war with the Axis and 6 others have broken diplomatic relations with the Axis. Argentina alone has failed to act.

"We in the United States are proud of our membership in the inter-American system through which the 20 American republics have so decisively met the challenge of our times. At the blackest moment of the war during the meeting of foreign missions at Rio de Janeiro our sister republics raised their banners alongside ours. They opened their ports to our ships. They welcomed and quartered our troops on their soil. They devoted their mines, their forests, and their fields to the intensive production of strategic war materials. They rounded up Axis spies and saboteurs, and they shut off trade of benefit to the Axis. They cooperated in the defense of the Panama Canal and in the suppression of the submarine menace. All of this and much more they did as their contribution to victory.

"The plain truth is that without this cooperation the course of the war in highly essential strategic areas might have been different. For example, consider the situation in the Near East. When Rommel was hammering at the gates of Egypt it was planes and light-tank ammunition ferried via northeastern Brazil that helped turn the tide. The value to our cause of the use of these Brazilian airports, and the cooperation of the Brazilian Army and Navy, cannot be overstated.

"It is distressing that at a time when the Nation is engaged in a gigantic effort to defeat the assassins of civilization a wholly indefensible attack should be leveled at a policy so universally acclaimed. It is a tribute to the good sense of the people of the Americas, who have now had 10 years of experience with the good-neighbor policy, that these gross misrepresentations were not generally believed."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 15, 1943]

HULL DENOUNCES BUTLER VIEW ON LATIN AMERICA—SAYS BOONDOGGLING CHARGE IS UNFOUNDED AND MAY INJURE HEMISPHERE AMITY

WASHINGTON, December 14.—Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, branded as "wholly indefensible" tonight charges by Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, that the United States has engaged in a $6,000,000,000 boondoggling project in Latin America.

In a strongly worded rebuttal he caustically rejected Senator Butler's explanation that he had no intention of misrepresenting or injuring the good-neighbor policy.

"Whatever his intentions may have been," Mr. Hull said in a statement, "the effects of what he said, its manner, and its implications, were such as to constitute a most unfair and unfounded attack calculated to injure the whole policy. * * *

"It is distressing that at a time when the Nation is engaged in a gigantic effort to defeat the assassins of civilization a wholly indefensible attack should be leveled at a policy so universally acclaimed."

He said it was a tribute to "the good sense of the people of the Americas * * * that these gross interpretations were not generally believed."

Mr. Hull lauded Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee, who on Monday submitted to the Senate figures showing that expenditures in Latin America from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1943, totaled only $324,135,000—and not $6,000,000,000, as Senator BUTLER asserted in a report of his 55-day tour of Latin America. Senator MCKELLAR also suggested that Senator BUTLER drafted the report before making the tour and that his mission was inspired by political motives—with next year's election in view.

TEXT OF HULL STATEMENT

The text of Secretary Hull's statement follows:

"The unfair attack recently made on the good-neighbor policy by Senator BUTLER was a matter of general astonishment throughout the Western Hemisphere. It was imperative in our national interest that these charges be analyzed and answered—answered so completely as to leave no grounds for their reiteration. Senator MCKELLAR has provided such an answer. With painstaking analysis he has demonstrated, I believe to the satisfaction of everybody, the inaccuracies, the fallacies, and the misstatements of Senator BUTLER's unfortunate allegations.

"We in the Department of State are as much opposed to extravagance and waste in Government expenditures as anyone can be. We have consistently practiced a policy of economy. But the question here presented is whether, especially at this serious stage of the war, we shall forget the broad essential nature of our cooperative activities in the other American republics and turn to a controversy over a limited number of items of wartime expenditure. Senator MCKELLAR ably and effectively presented the matter in this light. It would, of course, be too much to expect that no errors of judgment have been made in the conduct of programs conceived and carried out under the pressure of wartime emergency, but I believe that Senator MCKELLAR has effectively demolished the figures and conclusions on which Senator BUTLER based all, or virtually all, his indiscriminate attacks.

"Senator BUTLER now protests that he had no intentions of misrepresenting or injuring the good-neighbor policy. Whatever his intentions may have been, the effects of what he said, its manner, and its implications were such as to constitute a most unfair and unfounded attack calculated to injure the whole policy.

"Beginning 10 years ago at Montevideo, we of the Americas have built a cooperative relationship to increase our trade and raise our standard of life and as a bulwark in the defense of our independence and freedom.

"At Buenos Aires we established the procedure of consultation before the menace of overseas aggression. At Lima we proclaimed the solidarity of the Americas and our determination jointly to face common dangers to our security. After war broke out in Europe in 1939 we had two special meetings, one at Panama and another at Habana, where we concerted measures of mutual assistance. We agreed to consider an attack against one as an attack against all.

"On December 7 attack came, and with it the sternest test of inter-American solidarity. The other American republics realized that the Axis attack against the United States was only part of a plan to conquer the entire world. Now 13 are in a state of war with the Axis and 6 others have broken diplomatic relations with the Axis. Argentina alone has failed to act.

PROUD OF MEMBERSHIP

"We in the United States are proud of our membership in the inter-American system through which the 20 American republics have so decisively met the challenge of our times. At the blackest moment of the war during the meeting of foreign ministers at Rio de Janeiro our sister republics raised their banners alongside ours. They opened their ports to our ships. They welcomed and quartered our troops on their soil. They devoted their mines, their forests, and their fields to the intensive production of strategic war materials. They rounded up Axis spies and saboteurs, and they shut off trade of benefit to the Axis. They cooperated in the defense of the Panama Canal and in the suppression of the submarine menace. All of this and much more they did as their contribution to victory.

"The plain truth is that without this cooperation the course of the war in highly essential strategic areas might have been different. For example, consider the situation in the Near East. When Rommel was hammering at the gates of Egypt it was planes and light-tank ammunition ferried via northeastern Brazil that helped turn the tide. The value to our cause of the use of these Brazilian airports, and the cooperation of the Brazilian Army and Navy, cannot be overstated.

"It is distressing that at a time when the Nation is engaged in a gigantic effort to defeat the assassins of civilization a wholly indefensible attack should be leveled at a policy so universally acclaimed. It is a tribute to the good sense of the people of the Americas, who have now had 10 years of experience with the good-neighbor policy, that these gross misrepresentations were not generally believed."

Taxation To Create Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, December 8, the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] engaged in a discussion with Mr. C. W. Hazelett, author of Dynamic Capitalization, on the subject of incentive taxation as a means of creating employment. The discussion took place under the auspices of the National Radio Forum and was broadcast by the Blue Network.

Probably no Member of the Senate is better able to discuss such a subject than is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, and Mr. Hazelett is also well qualified to participate in such a debate. The discussion was timely and of great interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it

be printed in the RECORD, together with the introductory statement.

There being no objection, the discussion and introductory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. This is Washington—history in the making! On the battle fronts around the world and on the home fronts in this land of the free—Americans fight! Americans fight and achieve for a common cause. The National Radio Forum tonight is presided over by Edward Boykin, well known historian and author.

Mr. BOYKIN. If you've ever been to the Capitol at Washington, you've no doubt heard the big bell that calls your lawmakers to their desks. And that's the sound of history in the making! Tonight, the Washington Evening Star asks you to join us again here in the shadow of the Capitol to meet the history makers of today—your Senators, your Congressmen, and your Congresswomen.

These men and women represent you—they make the laws of the Nation—and what they say and do today, the schoolboy of tomorrow will study in his textbooks. Our country needs your intelligent cooperation in making this history—a history of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The recent meetings of the leaders of the Allied Nations at Tehran closed with a declaration that guaranteed victory and an enduring peace. But victory and peace will bring a new crisis to challenge to this Nation. Jobs, work, must be found for the millions of men and women now serving so gallantly in the armed forces of the United States—new kinds of work must be provided for those now employed in war industries that must necessarily close down.

Every American citizen is obviously deeply concerned, consciously or unconsciously, with this vast post-war problem. It is a challenge to the best minds of the Nation. On the solution of this problem of post-war employment really depends the continuance of the American system as we know it today.

Recognizing the supreme importance of this problem of providing jobs for the boys when they come home from war, the United States Senate recently created a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning. The purpose of this committee was to find ways and means to meet the employment crisis that must confront the Nation when peace comes. One of the guests of the National Radio Forum tonight is a distinguished member of that special committee of the Senate. The other guest is an economist, an author of considerable note and a specialist on taxation.

Before introducing our first guest, let me tell you he comes from Wyoming. Today, as senior Senator from Wyoming, he occupies the same office in which he served as secretary to the Senator who preceded him when he came to Washington 25 years ago. While carrying on his duties as secretary to his predecessor, he found time to get his lawyer's degree at Georgetown University. A constant student of economic conditions, a patient, thorough investigator, a sound thinker, his recent report to the Senate post-war committee was a masterpiece. It is entitled, "A Program for a Dynamic Democracy."

Outstanding among his achievements as United States Senator was his work as chairman of the National Economy Committee, whose purpose was to determine the status of competition and monopoly in American industry.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When 10,500,000 servicemen come home from the war and other millions of workers are demobilized from war plants, this country will be faced with the most acute employment problem in history. The market which has been swallowing up the huge output of our vastly extended industrial plant will have been suddenly closed. The Government will no longer be buying bombs and bullets for its own armies and the armies of its allies. It will no longer be buying food and fabric to clothe its servicemen. It will no longer be purchasing the services of millions of civilian workers now engaged in the war effort. If these people are not to be idle, we have somehow got to find a way of creating new jobs—19,000,000 of them, according to best estimates.

There can be no clear understanding of the gravity and extent of this problem unless we first understand that our entire economic structure is now based upon the most gigantic Government debt that has ever been incurred. Pockets are full of money. Pay envelopes are bulging. Producers of all sorts of commodities are receiving higher prices than in a quarter of a century. Unused and idle money in the banks amounts to twice as much today as the entire national income 10 years ago, but the Government owes more money than any government in history. It has been borrowing against the future to equip the navies, the air fleets, and the armies which are destroying the enemy.

The war has been financed with red ink and unless we are ready, long before the termination of hostilities, to substitute a new market for the war market, the whole economic machine will be in danger of collapse. The national debt will remain at the towering level of $200,000,000,000 or more, but the income of the people will fall off and the revenue of the Government will shrink unless we find a way now to create new jobs to take the place of the war jobs which peace will destroy.

Economies in government are highly desirable to be sure, and we should all rejoice that Congress is trying to cut expenditures wherever it can and eliminate waste, but this should be understood: All of the savings that can possibly be made by reducing the cost of government are less than the proverbial drop in the bucket when compared with war expenditures; and even their total elimination would be absolutely ineffective so far as creating new jobs is concerned.

It was recently announced, and the story was carried with a great flare of trumpets by the press and the radio, that War Department expenditures this year would be $13,000,000,000 less than had been anticipated. No solution of our financial problem can be found in that fact. If peace were to come tomorrow and all spending by the Government were stopped, we would still have a national debt of at least $164,000,000,000.

Of course, the war isn't going to stop tomorrow. Expenditures for the Army and the Navy, even after making allowance for this recently announced reduction, will amount to approximately $92,000,000,000. Government receipts this year are estimated at only $41,000,000,000. Now, if we add to the war expenditures the $4,500,000,000 for general Government maintenance and, approximately, $3,000,000,000 for interest upon the public debt, even after allowing for about a billion and a quarter profits earned by various Government corporations, it will still mean that by the end of the year we shall have added almost $57,000,000,000 to the national debt—a debt the future must pay.

Secretary Morgenthau has asked Congress to levy an additional tax to raise ten and one-half billion dollars toward the cost of the war, now, when we have more money than we can use. His recommendation should be followed because every penny of the cost of this war that we do not pay by taxation now means that the difficulties of the post-war problem will be increased by just that amount.

Failure to increase the Government income now means only the postponement, until the soldiers come back from the war, of the grim task of meeting the debt we have incurred.

It means refusing to pay now while we are all working, while we all have money in our pockets or in the banks, in the belief that we shall find it easier to meet this debt when the factories are closed, when servicemen are returning from the front (thousands of them sick and wounded, and other thousands in need of the educations they are giving up today), and, finally, when millions of our people and demobilized servicemen will be looking for jobs.

Let every citizen ask himself the question, Do I want to pile upon the backs of the returning soldiers, who are doing the fighting, the additional burden of paying for the war?

There are two courses which, in my judgment, should be adopted immediately to avoid a crisis after the war:

1. Increase the revenue of the Government by higher taxes.

2. Adopt a system of incentive taxation to stimulate the investment of private money in the creation of the jobs that will be needed to provide work for returning soldiers and demobilized war workers.

I shall not take the time tonight to discuss ways and means of increasing the Government revenue. I shall only say that a compilation published in the New York Times last Sunday shows that "in spite of heavier taxes and higher costs of labor and materials" the profits of 287 industrial manufacturing companies were 12 percent higher for the first 9 months of 1943 than for the same period in 1942. They had a combined net income of $968,000,000 for the first three-fourths of 1943, as compared with $863,000,000 during the first 9 months of 1942. These were profits that were made out of the Government's borrowings against the future. It certainly requires no argument to prove that unless we make some effort to pay the Government borrowings back out of present earnings, the task for the future will be difficult indeed.

I want to devote this period to a more direct discussion of ways and means of creating jobs for the peace that is to come. These jobs will be created either by private industry or by the Government—because the soldiers are not going to be idle. But if the Government is to create the jobs, the Government will have to increase its already huge debt. Surely, there must be another alternative. There is, and it is to be found in the principle of incentive taxation. That is to say, in a revision of our tax system so as to give the owner of capital a reason for investing it in new industries.

The creation of new jobs is about the most important social service that can be performed by any citizen in the period following the war. We have recognized the principle of rewarding social contribution in the present tax system. There has been, for example, an earned income credit because Congress has felt that the person who actually earns an income by his labor deserves a credit for the effort. We have also the exemption for dependent children, because Congress recognizes that it is distinct social service for the head of a family to maintain his family.

It is also a distinct social service when the owner of capital invests his money in new local independent enterprise, and I firmly believe that Congress should now declare by law that profits which are made after the war out of new independent enterprise will be less heavily taxed than other profits. In other words, I believe that we should reward the men who, by their ingenuity and the use of their capital create new jobs. So, tonight we have invited one of the Nation's

outstanding experts on incentive taxation, Mr. C. W. Hazelett, of New York, to come here to this studio and discuss this principle to which he has been giving so much attention. He is the author of several books on incentive taxation; he has appeared before the tax committees of both the House and the Senate. He has an idea which I believe will not only help to solve our problem of creating jobs, but which will help to preserve the system of private enterprise.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. HAZELETT. Thank you, Senator O'MAHONEY. Out of the T. N. E. C. hearings under your chairmanship, and particularly in your monograph No. 25, came the unmistakable indication that we were at last on the track of the answer to our devastating unemployment problem, a problem which has not been solved by any great nation except by waging war. It is good to join you in telling our radio audience that full and permanent employment can be secured by the simple application of the principles of incentive taxation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Without going into too much detail as to the mechanism, how would you describe incentive taxation?

Mr. HAZELETT. It is a tax device which requires us to spend or invest our money promptly in a way that will provide jobs, create income for the people, and, because more people will be working and earning, will actually lower our individual tax rates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How would incentive taxation stimulate private investment?

Mr. HAZELETT. Idle money does not provide employment. When it piles up in the banks or in hoards, it becomes an obstruction to prosperity because it is withdrawn from the economic system. One of the chief faults of the present tax system is that it tends to prevent the investment of private money. Incentive taxation, if properly devised, will stimulate private investment and thus remove the obstructions to employment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been my experience that many owners of capital decline to invest, because they say under the present system they take all the risk while the Government takes most of the profit. Therefore, they tend to hold on to their money until they see a sure thing. Thus the willingness to take a risk in new enterprise is reduced and we become dependent upon the Government or on monopoly for the investment which provides jobs. How would incentive taxation apply to business?

Mr. HAZELETT. We would require every corporation and business to use its money to employ men, to convert its plant, expand its production, improve its facilities and working conditions, do research or to promptly pay its profits out in dividends, or temporarily lend its funds to other businesses, in order to lower its tax rates. It would be more expensive not to use money than to use it. Thus we would put money to work to keep our labor force on the job and to reemploy our heroes as fast as they are demobilized. Industry would then offer them jobs and opportunity, rather than charity or Government hand-outs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Incentive taxation would apply to individuals as well as corporations?

Mr. HAZELETT. Definitely. If I have money and I do not use it to buy something, someone is out of a job and is without money to buy from another. Then the latter is out of a job and so on. Incentive taxation requires me, you, and anyone else who might control any substantial amount of money either to spend it promptly, thus creating markets for business, or to invest it directly or through the savings banks or insurance companies, in creating new business, new enterprise, new development, new jobs. In this manner the money promptly and continuously flows back to both big and little business, to provide them with capital to convert and expand their plants, or to buy their products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, you give the workingman what he wants, the assurance that whoever has the money must continuously use it to give him a job and at the same time you assure business not only that it can get needed capital, but that it can sell its products and securities all the time. Surely capital and labor would desire to unite on such a program as of benefit, not just to one or the other, but to both. Since the farmer is both a capitalist and a worker, how would it affect him?

Mr. HAZELETT. It would benefit the farmer by making more stable the employment of men and women in industry. What the farmer needs is just what the businessman needs—a sure and certain market for his products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that any system which keeps the worker employed in a stable job for good pay helps the farmer because the well-employed person eats more and wears more than the idle man or the W. P. A. worker.

Mr. HAZELETT. Precisely. The real farm problem has always been in the cities rather than on the farms, and incentive taxation by solving the problem of employment in the cities will also help to solve the problem of surplus crops from the farms.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have thought of stimulating the investment of idle funds by reducing the tax rate on the profits of new enterprise. You have suggested a tax on idle money. Doesn't that have the effect of encouraging spending and thus directly increasing prices? Suppose people do not buy bonds but spend their money for consumption goods, our listeners will want to know how you would counteract that inflationary tendency.

Mr. HAZELETT. It is acknowledged by all observers and all experts that the present income-tax system has become so complicated as to threaten our ability to understand it, let alone to administer it. An incentive taxation system could be so written as to be utterly simple. We could levy a tax upon the complete spendings of a taxpayer which would be a substitute for the present system with proper exemptions, so as to take account of reasonable savings against a rainy day. By graduated rates upward as spending increases, it would be possible for every taxpayer to determine for himself precisely how much taxes he would pay by controlling his expenditure on ordinary consumers' goods. He could increase his living standard or decrease it at will and all the money which he did not spend for living he would have available for investment in productive business enterprise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How would this plan affect the purchase of Government bonds?

Mr. HAZELETT. It would promote the sale of Government bonds because funds so invested would be treated just like funds invested in business and would be an antidote against inflation. When the Government has to rely on bank borrowings in any large amounts it is creating new money and the more new money created this way the greater is the tendency of prices to rise. When Government bonds are purchased by money that has already been earned this inflationary tendency does not develop. Therefore, a tax system that encourages people and corporations not to allow their money to remain idle would promote the sale of war bonds and would be a positive preventive of inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It must be clear to all that employment depends on one thing—people using their money. Isn't it clear, Mr. Hazelett, that our ability to collect revenue for the Government is also based wholly on the extent of employment? When we have idle money, men are idle and there are no pay rolls to tax for either social security or revenue; there are no normal or excess profits to tax; there is little consumption of goods subject to excise taxes. So, if we are to solve the tax problem, we must solve the unemployment problem first. If we do not have a high degree of employment, the Government cannot pay its debts, and the value of its bonds will be lessened.

Mr. HAZELETT. The security of all investments depends on employment, whether the investments are in Government or other securities. No private enterprise investment is secure unless other people use their money continuously. Bank deposits, insurance policies, indeed all savings and investments will be threatened if we again permit both men and money to become idle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would any person or any class be harmed by incentive taxation?

Mr. HAZELETT. Everyone will welcome a tax on idle money when it is understood. Where is the worker who does not want the people who have the money to use it to employ him all the time? Where is the businessman who does not want the people with money to promptly furnish him capital or buy his products? Where is the farmer who does not want his customers continuously employed in the cities so that they can pay good prices for farm products and increase the production of industrial products for him? Where is there a government which does not want money to circulate to produce maximum national income to tax? An idle dollar brings no goods, no services, no interest, and no dividends to its owners and no revenue for the Government.

Therefore, we may say that everyone would be benefited by incentive taxation. We can go further and say that there is no positive answer to the problem of unemployment unless money is positively required to stay in productive circulation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. Hazelett, can you explain to our listeners why you believe that the principle of taxing idle money will produce results?

Mr. HAZELETT. There are many limited applications of this method which prove the point. Every tax return carries an extra penalty for failure to make a return or to pay taxes on time. The result is that we all file our returns and pay our taxes so as to avoid the penalty.

Many States grant a discount, or a lower tax rate, on real estate if the taxes are paid promptly, and levy a higher tax if the owner is delinquent. Here again the system works.

The cash discount in business is based upon the same principle. It is a monetary concession for paying bills promptly. It works. After you create a system in any activity which gives the person engaged in that activity a monetary reward for a certain course of action, or a penalty for not following that course of action, the result is always the same. People would like to earn the reward and avoid the penalty.

This proposal, stated in its simplest terms, is merely to reward the owner of capital who puts his money to work to keep the economic system running. That will be our greatest need after the war. Everybody knows it will be our greatest need, and we should waste no time in getting ready to meet it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then you agree that our country may have a post-war prosperity if we adopt sound tax policies.

Mr. HAZLETT. I do, indeed. When we now that this war is over the greatest thrill that ever rose from the depth of men's souls will arise, but behind it will be the chill specter of unemployment to destroy our great exaltation, unless we know how to compel our money to be used to provide work and opportunity for all. I believe that no one in public life is more dedicated to the problem

that will really win the peace than you, Senator. Your report to the Senate Post-War Committee is the most important document in this field which has been laid before Congress and I believe that with the support we have now from business and labor leaders, farm leaders, and publicists, we may be able to assure our soldiers security for the home they visualize for the girl of their dreams, and for the preservation of private enterprise—which is economic freedom. We have the greatest opportunity ever offered a nation to exert constructive leadership throughout the world. We cannot do this if we fail to solve the problems of employment and inflation at home. All mankind is looking to us for this leadership. We must not fail them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is more than a tax problem—it is even more than a problem of creating jobs for returning soldiers. It is a problem of preserving the institutions of private property. There is no way of preserving the system of private enterprise except by making it work.

We must take the steps that are necessary to pay the public debt. That means raising more tax revenue. We must take the steps that are necessary to reestablish local enterprise and to provide opportunities for the investment of private capital. That means incentive taxation.

The alternative is more Government borrowing, a growing national debt, decreasing safety of all savings and greater centralization of Government power.

Incentive taxation points the road to economic freedom as well as employment for returning servicemen.

Waterways and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of William H. Webb, executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, before the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association at the Union League Club, Philadelphia, Pa., Tuesday, November 9, 1943:

Mr. President and members of the general board of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, it is a great privilege for me to be with you today and to bring you a few cheering words concerning our national waterways. I am grateful for the opportunity which Mayor Moore has afforded me to meet with you and to learn from him and the other leaders something of the cause to which he has given so many years of devoted labor.

I bring you the greetings and cordial good wishes of the officers and directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I had hoped that Congressman DEWEY SHORT, our president, could appear here with me today but he is out of the United States on an official inspection trip of our air bases with his subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee. Before leaving he asked me to extend to President Moore his affectionate greetings and best wishes for a most successful meeting.

As members of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, you are meeting here today to discuss primarily one subject—waterways. You will no doubt look back at the work already accomplished and evaluate the part our waterways have played in advancing the development of this continent. You will discuss their contribution to the war effort. At the same time, you will desire to look ahead, to plan, and to visualize the program that lies ahead for river and harbor works.

I propose to review briefly the existing and recently completed waterway improvements and then look into the future post-war river and harbor projects. Today along the Atlantic coast we have a fine system of harbors, many rivers leading into the interior, and several canals connecting coastal waters. As one of the principal sponsors of waterway improvements along the Atlantic coast, you are well acquainted with its existing harbor facilities, now points of embarkation to the fighting fronts. Some of these harbors have been subject to Federal improvement for more than a century. Your efforts and those of navigation interests in general to develop them have been repaid in the knowledge that they have become vital stepping stones on the paths leading to Berlin and Tokyo. You also know what it has meant to coastwise traffic during the darkest days of the submarine warfare to have in existence the Cape Cod Canal and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. While statistics on traffic using these canals during that trying period have not yet been made available to the public, I understand that the extent of their use lends an air of deep satisfaction to all who have supported such connecting waterways.

The Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and its companion, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, have grown as the result of this war from seemingly unimportant waterway routes to vital transportation arteries. As you well know, in 1942 Congress took cognizance of their importance by the enactment of special legislation authorizing the enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to make it comparable to the Atlantic intracoastal system. In addition, Congress authorized the extension of the Gulf waterway to the vicinity of the Mexican border and a barge channel across northern Florida to connect these extensive coastal waterway routes.

In view of the necessity of conserving manpower, equipment, and materials for construction indispensable to the war effort, the progressive development of our rivers and harbors as a whole has been rudely interrupted. This we must accept as an inevitable consequence of war; we have no choice but to await peace before continuing the planned developments. In accordance with the policy governing wartime construction, river and harbor operations during the past year were limited principally to the improvement of main channels serving shipyards, the removal of obstructions to deep-draft vessels, the provision of additional anchorage areas in the port of New York, the dredging of a seaplane channel on the west coast, and other work of similar importance to the war effort.

The timely completion of the MacArthur lock in the St. Marys Falls Canal—that vital connecting link between the upper and lower Great Lakes—is perhaps the greatest single waterway achievement of the year. This additional deep-draft lock at the Soo, made possible at this time through a special legislative provision, is considered an outstanding contribution toward winning the battle of transportation on the home front. Likewise, the recent completion of the authorized 12-foot channel in the section of the Gulf intracoastal waterway east of New Orleans is worthy of special note. During the past year the Corps of Engineers has also prosecuted certain projects required by the Navy Department and other Federal agencies in connection with the war effort. These projects were undertaken with funds transferred to the Corps of Engineers by the respective Federal agencies requiring the additional waterway improvements to serve their wartime activities.

Leaving the curtailed present-day river and harbor program, let us look into the future of waterway improvement. It is recognized that the development of our transportation facilities has been the most important factor in the advancement of our national prosperity. To that progress waterways have made a remarkable contribution; they are well known as the commercial highways of the Nation offering equal facilities to all free from tolls for the transportation of bulk commodities cheaply and safely.

Congress very wisely and at an early date enacted legislation and appropriated funds which inaugurated the Federal Government on a firmly established policy of public improvement in the interest of commerce and navigation. Systematic, energetic, and comprehensive methods of improvement have been employed throughout these many years under the able supervision of the Corps of Engineers and the increased water transportation facilities resulting therefrom have kept pace with the demands of industry, agriculture, and foreign trade.

After the war will our rivers and harbors as now authorized meet the demands of industries striving to replace our worn-out cars and radios? Will our waterway channels adequately serve the transportation needs of the farmers who will be called upon to help feed the freed peoples of the once enslaved countries? Will our harbors handle with ease a foreign trade that should be the greatest any country ever experienced? Definite answers to these questions and others regarding waterways and the future must await the post-war era. We can, however, by proper planning and guidance see to it that the ground work is laid for prompt resumption of local and Federal river and harbor improvement programs as may be required to keep pace with post-war activities.

There is every indication that much will need to be done to improve our waterways and harbors and terminal facilities to provide for peacetime enterprise. This country is building a huge merchant fleet. It is being used now to transport and supply our armies fighting in distant lands and to carry lease-lend goods. While this fleet at present may be able to squeeze into and use the existing harbor facilities, there will surely be need for the further improvement and enlargement of these facilities in order to accommodate conveniently every Liberty ship that will be built. I understand that there is a growing demand for greater depths at several of our harbors to provide for the new deep-draft tankers. The shippers know the advantages of the deeper draft bottoms and it is likely that large tankers will be the trend. There are other considerations that will warrant an active post-war river-and-harbor program.

The amount of unfinished river and harbor works heretofore authorized by Congress is exceedingly small compared to the dollar value of projects recommended in reports now before Congress. It is apparent that projects yet to be adopted by Congress comprise the bulk of post-war river and harbor construction. As Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, stated in a recent speech on navigation and flood control, the proposed navigation improvement program for the Nation as a whole constitutes a potential post-war program of over $1,000,000,000 and it could be quickly expanded to $2,000,000,000. The potential post-war flood-control program amounts to more than two and one-half billion dollars. Quoting the Chief of Engineers, the combined navigation and flood-control

programs "translated into time-proved, sound benefits, and direct and indirect manpower employment * * * stand as splendid, already-planned, post-war projects."

Yes; the Corps of Engineers has investigated, planned, and recommended to Congress during the past 5 years a large number of meritorious river and harbor projects which are awaiting congressional approval. Among the larger projects along the Atlantic seaboard contained in the list awaiting authorization are the Connecticut River above Hartford, Portland Harbor, New Haven Harbor, the port of New York, the New Jersey intracoastal waterway, the Delaware River, the Cape Fear River, and Charleston Harbor. As you well know, there is also included in the list the recommended project for completing the missing link across New Jersey—the New Jersey ship canal.

Strange as it now seems, there has been no general river and harbor authorizing legislation since the National Defense River and Harbor Act of 1940 and no omnibus legislation since the act of 1938. In the interim a huge backlog of projects has been created, and there is nothing the Corps of Engineers can do to further these projects, even after the war, without additional legislation. The preparation of detailed plans and specifications for such projects must be deferred until the projects are specifically authorized by Congress. Funds for such advance planning as is now under way may be applied only to adopted projects. Under the provisions of the last appropriation act for rivers and harbors, the Corps of Engineers is now preparing construction plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal, authorized by a special act of Congress in 1942.

While the majority of the recommended river and harbor projects consists for the most part of dredging operations and no considerable amount of advance planning is required, yet their authorization by Congress at this time would pave the way for early initiation of work after the war. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors has recently been holding hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill. Even so, the outlook for authorizing legislation in the near future is not promising. If we are to have a fully prepared program of ready-to-go projects providing for more and deeper waterways and harbors to better serve our greatly expanded merchant fleet after the war, we should have river and harbor legislation now. Your organization can do much to impress upon our representatives in Congress the advisability and advantages of early enactment of such legislation. The passage of an omnibus river and harbor bill at this time would pave the way for more planning by the Corps of Engineers, more reports to Congress, and more favorable recommendations for its consideration during the post-war period. It is up to us, our organizations, to see that our waterways and harbors, which have contributed so much to make this the most progressive country in the world, are not neglected.

As we approach the third year of active participation in this global war, we look back at the troubled road over which the Nation has traveled and realize more fully the countless sacrifices along the wayside. Total war, with desolation and death at every turn, has retarded our civilization; it has momentarily shackled our progress toward a better way of life. In the midst of war that was not our choosing, we are cheered on, however, by the series of victories won by our glorious armies and navies. We eagerly look to the future, straining to see the light of total victory that will restore the world to the lasting peace for which we are fighting. The road ahead, as mapped by the Moscow Pact just concluded, should lead us to a post-war era of great promise and advancement in which our system of national waterways will make a major contribution to the prosperity and development of the country in peace as it has contributed to our success in time of war.

May our two great organizations continue shoulder to shoulder as they have in the past to fight for the fullest possible development of this great system of waterways.

Future Land and Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the West is intensely interested in what officials of the Government in Washington are thinking about the development and use in the post-war period of the vast land and water resources of the arid and semiarid regions which lie west of the one hundredth meridian.

For this reason the West should have access to the address recently delivered by Hon. Michael W. Straus, First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, on Future Land and Water Development, before the National Reclamation Association at Denver, Colo., on October 29. At Denver were gathered reclamation leaders from the 17 States bisected by or west of the one hundredth meridian, and I am sure they were impressed by the forthright statements of Mr. Straus as to the close relationship between irrigation and power development to insure maximum economic use of the water resources of the region.

In Montana, for instance, the proposed Canyon Ferry project is an example of this relationship, and I hope to see its construction one of the first projects in the post-war program of the Bureau of Reclamation. I ask that this very able address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have had made an estimate of cost of printing the address, which is $126.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This gathering of the National Reclamation Association and the key personnel of the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation comes under unprecedented circumstances, and I am fortunate in this opportunity to meet with you. The Department of the Interior feels that our reclamation program is at a crossroads, one fork of which leads to a continuation of present performance, and the other fork of which leads to a brighter future in a kaleidoscopic world where we must seize and secure our destiny.

On this occasion, I wish to present to the National Reclamation Association a decentralized, reorganized and streamlined Bureau of Reclamation ready to go down the path of promise. I also wish to discuss with you two problems with which we are confronted, having to do with the best use of water for the areas in which you are interested and the electrical energy generated by that working water.

The water problems of this country are nowhere nearly solved, and the bits of mosaic of eventual solution which we so far have fitted into place are only a start. We have floods as well as droughts, and drowned areas as well as arid areas. Because of these paradoxes a few have the misconception that there is some sort of inherent and irreconcilable conflict between consumptive use of water for irrigation or power and the control of water to prevent floods and for navigation. Our engineering profession in this land is not so devoid of inspiration that it cannot devise developments that serve all needs. Your Government cannot recognize the existence of any such inherent conflict because it is a government of all the people and all the areas, and it is necessary to serve all the sincere interests at stake.

Plans are now under way to control many streams and that control must be of floods as well as droughts. Various agencies of government and various local organizations have a vital interest in these programs and if you or your government permit these divergent interests to develop into deadlocks, it will do the most harm to the most people instead of the greatest good to the greatest number. One of the great river systems for which comprehensive plans are in the making is the renegade Missouri River, which last spring went beserk so that it flooded hundreds and thousands of fertile acres at a time that production was most needed. Despite the many millions of dollars this Government has spent to tame the Missouri River, it is obvious that further action is necessary. To the able Army Engineers Corps, with its distinguished record, will go the responsibility for that phase of the planning that deals with flood control and such navigation as is possible.

To the Bureau of Reclamation goes the responsibility for developing a comprehensive program which certainly without prejudice to flood control or navigation will require the wisest use of the waters of the Missouri for irrigation, plus power generation. Because irrigation with power generation are positive benefits looked forward to and dreamed of by many communities in which you have your roots instead of the negative benefits of flood control, there has been some fear that those phases of the Missouri River development might be overlooked. In many ways the Missouri River with its 2,475 miles of length, straddling both arid areas and regions of more generous rainfall, is the greatest stream left by nature on which the Bureau of Reclamation can still perform a major operation. The bureau has given endless study to this problem, reconnoitered the land that can be made to bloom, taken the river's pulse and temperature, read its history, and stands ready to counsel with you as to the development and utilization of these waters. The bureau stands ready to present a program to meet the challenge of these waters—a program that can be dovetailed with the work of the Army Engineer Corps. As technicians will present details at this gathering, I shall not attempt to do so. But I bespeak for the bureau your support of a plan which will achieve this purpose so hoped for by the upstream States and communities in Montana and the Dakotas. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior will labor with you faithfully to secure these positive benefits of irrigation and power that are there for the taking.

In Washington we have been hearing reports that a few of you feel too much attention is being paid to the power phase of the Bureau of Reclamation's activities. We are not astounded at such reports, but frankly I want to tell you that the Department is getting a little worn from hearing that there has been an "over-emphasis" of power development compared with irrigation development on some of our dual-purpose-projects

in the last few years. Now, I'll tell you why we are as little impressed by such declarations as we might be if told that appreciation for eggs spoils the ham in ham and eggs. The progressive purposes of the Bureau of Reclamation laws were to permit the irrigation of broad areas of lands and their farming in reasonable sized units that would sustain American families in health and happiness. It was their progressive purpose that power development would bring about economic balance between industry and agriculture in a consequent enrichment of life in the West. But rather than proclaim, let me quote an excerpt from an address by an author of the National Reclamation Act, Francis G. Newlands of Nevada, before the Sacramento Valley Development Association, speaking on October 1, 1905, about the Sacramento River Project in California: "I believe in this project. I believe it is the most magnificent project in the United States today. (How many times have orators said this about reclamation projects and how truly they believed it.) It involves large areas of land, a part of which you wish to cover with water, and part of which you wish to protect from the floods, which can be accomplished only by putting in harness and controlling the Sacramento River. Besides this, you have within reach immense possibilities in water power, furnishing that which has been so essential to the development of this State, lacking as it does both water and power, which will set in motion the wheels of manufacturing institutions throughout the State, and water for irrigation which will bring agriculture and its vast productions to the aid of commerce, thus securing an equal and harmonious development of the State."

Senator Newlands, one of the founding fathers of Federal reclamation, made no foolish comparisons between the importance of power, irrigation, and the other multiple purposes of reclamation projects. The value of each purpose merely enhanced the value of the whole. I suggest that we take a leaf out of that same book and not let ourselves be deterred or confused by those who tell you there is some new policy and those who attempt to drive wedges between the several purposes that complement and support each other in multiple-purpose developments.

We have just about finished up with the era of the simple project that turns some water out on arid land and does nothing more. Good as those projects were, there remains no great opportunity for your National Reclamation Association or for the Department's Bureau of Reclamation in that field. We already have built the best of those projects, and I think that we all agree that our future and the future of your communities lies in the multiple-purpose project. Call the roll of the great developments that the Bureau of Reclamation now has under way and which you have supported—Grand Coulee, Colorado-Big Thompson, Central Valley with the Shasta Dam, and Boulder Dam—all multiple-purpose projects. None could have been justified or could have lived on water alone, and none would have been built for power alone. In each case it was the sure team of power and water that made them the wonders of the world and make your bureau the greatest single power and water agency in that world. Take a look behind this roll call and see the purposes they are serving today in this hour of national need. Power from Coule and Boulder is sparking our war effort and pouring out the torrent of electrical energy that has made possible the startling industrial development of the Northwest and the Southwest when we were mobilized to produce as we never had to produce before. Shasta power is about to come in in the nick of time to prevent a power famine in northern California. And one plant of the Colorado-Big Thompson is now operating in this area where we meet today. In the development of each of those projects, there has always been raised at one time or another the challenge that there was an over-emphasis of power at the sacrifice of irrigation. In each instance time has proved that charge untrue, but we still hear it and we will hear it because power is not only a priceless industrial resource, but also a politically explosive resource and probably will remain so for several years. That cannot deter us and it should not deter you. Those of you who are primarily interested in putting water on land, and those of you who are primarily interested in putting power to industry, must stand shoulder to shoulder for mutual support. Each kilowatt of power is as much a resource as is each acre-foot of water, and both must be protected from its source through all the long route of perils until it goes to work for its final consumer.

There are special interests in this great West, and there are special groups among the members of this association. They are sincere and honest groups, but we cannot be shortsighted, and such an association as the National Reclamation Association cannot be a victim or a tool of any limited interest. Because power happens to be a subject of political controversy and thereby commands attention which some describe as "overemphasis," the cure for those concerned only with irrigation is not to seek to assail power, but to build up the emphasis on the benefits of irrigation.

Don't be trapped by any pressure group that seeks to tell you that power development challenges the success of irrigation development. Recognize the good old "divide and conquer" scheme when it comes up and hits you in the face. We have seen it in many guises and this is just another guise in which your association is cast in the role of the divided and conquered. In other words, I plead with this association if any section or segment of it loves the water twin more than the power twin, don't shoot one of the Siamese twins.

Bu more important to you and to the Department of the Interior, as well as to all the great West than these incidental conceptions of misguided conflict between various factions in our midst, is what lies ahead of us in the way of opportunity for all. We have been pondering this problem and I wish to seize this chance to formally express my Department's appreciation for the invaluable assistance and support and wise counsel that the National Reclamation Association has rendered. At no time in my brief decade of experience as a Government official has it been more difficult to surmount the apparently endless obstacles which stand between our desires to get projects under construction and completed and into operation. This is only natural, for never have there been such crosscurrents and strains on our economic system and our democratic Government as there have been in this all-engulfing war. Also, never has there been a greater need for the benefits that reclamation can bring to your communities and to the victory to which we are all pledged in this world conflict. With those strains there have been blunders. I think a blunder was made a year ago when, with good intention, construction on virtually all reclamation projects was halted with no discussion of how we would eat, because of the great need at the moment for steel, material, and machinery for munitions. Little consideration was then given to the need for food-producing acres and electrical energy, and we were determined to get our soldiers planes, tanks, ships, and guns. We were just learning how total war is. I fought through that fight alongside of officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and representatives and friends of your association. That many of these shutdowns were unwarranted and unwise has been established to some extent by the fact that some blunders were corrected and construction of certain of these projects has been started again—but not before a great loss was caused by closing them down for a period of time. No works of the size in which we are interested can be turned off and on like a faucet. It is a waste of money, as anybody knows who signs the contracts with skyrocketing figures to restart the construction—skyrocketing figures that will slowly but surely be passed on as a burden to future water and power users in the years ahead. Soon, because of growing manpower shortage, I fear we won't ever be able to restart construction during this war on a project which has been closed down.

Sufficient national recognition has not yet been given to the part that western reclamation can play in feeding our country and feeding our allies. And what we will have to do to feed the world and how long and how much we should feed it is a matter on which you can speculate as well as I can. While I don't happen to think there are enough new acres being brought into cultivation by irrigation right now to meet our immediate wartime feeding problems, my Department is not confining its horizon to what we can do through reclamation during this war. We are looking far beyond that.

It was with that vision that Secretary Ickes surveyed the Bureau's organization over a period of many months and totaled up its many great accomplishments against the probabilities of what it may be called upon to do in the future. He found that the Bureau of Reclamation had performed miracles with a machine and organization that was laid out at the turn of the century for the development of the West in the hay age before transportation and communication had telescoped time and space in a rapidly changing world where what occurs on the Dnieper River in Russia today may govern what happens on the Colorado River tomorrow. He also remembered his experience as Federal Public Works Administrator when in a period of depression the Congress voted the Executive an initial $3,300,000,000 for the building of useful public works and that task was turned over to the Secretary of the Interior. He looked around for those much-advertised but ill-defined useful public works and the state of our national unpreparedness was pitiable. I happen to know whereof I speak because I was the first official appointed to the Federal Public Works Administration. The communities of this country—communities such as you gentlemen represent—had many good ideas but they had very few completed plans, blueprinted, engineered, and ready to go into immediate construction. Many a community did not know whether it wanted a dam, a canal, a hydroelectric plant, a hospital, or a school, or which it wanted most and first, when the public-works program went to work. If it happened to be a school they wanted, they didn't know whether they wanted a consolidated union school, a township high school, or a grammar school. And if it happened to be a township high school, they didn't know whether they wanted it in Pineville or Spruceville. And if in Spruceville, they didn't know whether they wanted it north or south of the tracks; if south of the tracks, they didn't know whether they wanted it in the first or second ward; if in the second ward, they didn't know how many rooms they wanted in it and whether they would prefer to have it brick or stone. In other words, the communities were not prepared and ready to step up and lay on the line their decisions—decisions that must precede construction. They hadn't gone through our essential democratic processes. They hadn't gotten their enabling legislation. They hadn't held their bond elections. Or if it was a water project, they hadn't

formed their conservancy or water district. And they weren't set to go. They are in little better shape today.

It happened that the Federal agencies were somewhat better prepared because they indulged in the horrible practice referred to sometimes as planning, but they weren't in any too good a shape. The Bureau of Reclamation was one of those Federal agencies. Geared to a program that required them to make wise expenditure of about three and a half million dollars in 1933, in addition to the then-current construction on Boulder Dam, the Bureau suddenly was slapped into a tempo that required, for example, a $90,000,000 expenditure in 1940, and it had to do it with the same machinery and organization issued to it at the turn of the century. That it did it was no credit to the governmental machinery with which they were equipped and through which they had to operate. It was a credit to the devotion of the personnel that manned the machinery. Those men did it the hard way. It was a shotgun job that required hurry-up design, hurry-up investigations, hurry-up specifications, and high-pressure contracts, burning the midnight oil, working 'round the clock, and breaking men under terrific pressure. Now, that P. W. A. program was a great thing for the West. It was a great thing for your communities. It happened that statistically a compilation shows that the total investment in all Bureau of Reclamation projects in the 31 years of the Bureau's existence, prior to 1933, was $250,000,000. But in the past 10 years that investment in the West has increased to $870,000,000—an increase of 230 percent.

As a matter of fact, it is that continuing program in terms of the Central Valley, Colorado-Big Thompson, the Columbia River Basin, and many other projects that still forms the backbone of the reclamation program today. And as a heritage of that performance we have some of those projects under construction or completed in advance of any agreement as to how they shall be placed into operation and operated. Getting the dam before the plan makes getting the cart before the horse seem like a minor miracle. We don't want to have to repeat that again, but even with that experience until this month we did not seek to remedy the basic difficulties in organization. And, also, in that great construction program born of the depression, the National Reclamation Association, by fortuitous circumstance found that the end boss of the Bureau of Reclamation, who is the Secretary of the Interior, was also the Federal Public Works Administrator, and, therefore, was in a position to make funds available for these reclamation projects whether or not all the steps of planning and preparation had been completed, and that is just what he did. The Bureau and the National Reclamation Association have no right to expect to find such a friend and defender as the Secretary of the Interior in such a dual position the next time a great national construction program is launched.

So, in looking backwards with the benefit of hindsight through a rear-vision mirror, the Department and the Bureau saw how close they had come to missing the boat because of the form of the Bureau's organization and its machinery in the last decade which has in truth been the golden age of reclamation to date. But looking ahead the Bureau and the Department saw no reason why it should feel its duties dwindling. The main task still lies in the future. Inevitably, there is a day for which the whole world awaits, when peace comes, and with that blessed day, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Reclamation Association are going to meet a challenge such as they have never before encountered. The Bureau is going to be called upon to step up and lay on the barrel head plans forming a designed and engineered program far beyond any program it has ever undertaken heretofore. That will be a major contribution to this country's reconstruction era. In my opinion, the scope of this program is going to be staggering. You don't have to take my word for it, look back at your own experience and the experience of this country in the past 15 years. Don't take your experience and my word for it. Take the foresight of such a friend of the West and reclamation as Senator CARL HAYDEN, who a couple of weeks ago came down from the Senate and told us to get ready for the storm. Ask Senators JOE O'MAHONEY or GENE MILLIKIN, who are with us at this gathering. Don't take my word for it, or your experience, or the Senators' judgment for it; take the President's word for it. He has already formally and publicly stated that public-works construction—and that in your lexicon means reclamation construction—is going to be one of the first fronts opened by the United States in meeting its post-war problems. And this isn't any partisan view. Regardless of political affiliation or economic conictions, there is a concurrence on a public-works, including reclamation program as a post-war necessity, in fact the initial necessity. What you saw and what we thought was a pretty sizable program in the thirties is no criterion of the size and scope of the program that certainly will be called for.

If the scale of the last decade is going to be the extent of our vision in the days to come, I think we will probably be qualified as myopic.

Therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior have put their house in order. We have decentralized and reorganized the Bureau of Reclamation, which is the agency through which most of your communities work on the problems which we are discussing here today. We have sought to make the Bureau less remote and bring it closer to you and your people. We have established regional directors for each region of the West. We have established a clean line of authority from those regional directors to the Commissioner, the Department, and the Congress. We have enjoined those regional directors to work in their communities to hammer out a program within their regions for the development of the West. We have secured and saved the organization here in Denver, where we have the greatest group of reclamation technicians and engineers that have ever been assembled and made essential counsel and wisdom available both to the Government and to the communities which you represent in preparing this program. The regional engineers are here today. Through them you can get the assistance of the wizards of Denver. Through the regional engineers' own efforts and your efforts there can be developed the program planned and engineered and worked out in detail which you will need and which your Government will need and which the world will need when peace comes.

I do not want you to think that the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Reclamation set up this new machinery merely as a money-grabbing device to get a slice of the pie at the pie counter when that counter opens. It is going to be necessary all right to get authorizations, allotments and appropriations to do the job you want done. But we cannot be satisfied and you cannot be satisfied merely to know what we want to build and the price tag on it. You must know why we are going to build it and what is going to be done with it after it is built. Those questions are being asked more and more in recent legislative debate over development of our natural resources.

It is unescapable that such questions will be asked of you with greater frequency as this country struggles with new problems such as what to do with returning soldiers, how to spread the industrial areas, how to use manpower, how to demobilize America, how to utilize resources in some post-war world operated on some post-war patterns of land economy. Each answer will affect our projects which will have to run the gantlet of many a challenge and be measured by many a yardstick before they win through. We cannot ignore such questions and must offer our own answers—answers that will stand examination in the light of day as bringing the greatest good for the greatest number. Unless we can provide the answers to those questions and have those answers accepted, so that we can live with and work with our own solutions, the answers of others will be written into national policy and law and those answers will prevail, whether we like them or not. The regional directors can help you struggle with that problem.

The decentralized, reorganized Bureau of Reclamation is a new and staunch framework on which we can build and develop plans and projects of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the requirements of the program that inevitably and unescapably will be imposed upon us. We present this new organization with pride. In it and its key positions you will find men you know—men of experience, knowledge, and sympathy with your problems. The communities supporting the National Reclamation Association and the whole West are invited to use it in that fashion as a support and bulwark to sustain coming burdens which otherwise might be crushing and to carry forward reclamation in the United States to its destiny.

O. P. A. Regulation of Stockmen and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Lee A. Snyder, of Fairbury, Nebr., expressing his disapproval of certain requirements of the O. P. A. and other developments of the Federal Government which work against the interests of stockmen and farmers of Kansas, Nebraska, and other States. This letter which was published by the Fairbury Journal, of Fairbury, Nebr., sets forth the views of a large number of farmers and stockmen of the farm belt, as shown by the many letters I have received from that part of the country complaining about the O. P. A. and other departments of the Government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE HOME FRONT

EDITOR JOURNAL: We have become confused and have been debating whether we have been patriotic or just mentally deficient. We have been farming and feeding cattle quite extensively for this part of the country and the last few years it has been almost impossible to get any hired help or extra machinery, but by struggling along from sunup till sundown, and I might add here, during harvest until nearly midnight, and by using my 9- and 11-year-old boys to drive tractor, plow,

cultivator, pulling combine, and the like, we somehow managed to get by.

As some of our farms are 8 miles from the home place I had the oldest boy use the car or pick-up truck to take fuel and repairs to the different places. We have been personally operating 2,680 acres and feeding out around 1,000 head of cattle and hogs each year, besides have holdings in three other States that require a little personal attention.

We have bought war bonds ever time we were asked to and even told them that if they did not get the quota to come back and we would try to buy more. We have donated to the war fund, U. S. O., Red Cross, and other like institutions. Now what little time we had to read the papers or listen to the radio it made us feel pretty good, because we thought we were doing everything they asked for, from producing food, buying bonds, down to having an 11-year-old boy taking a man's place in the field and on the road.

We didn't like for our boys to put in such long days on tractor machinery through the hot weather at their age, but our President declared everything a war emergency, so we stayed right in the buggy without looking up until we were reminded of a few things. Now here are a few of the many things that confuse us.

First. We were coming home from town with our groceries and supplies for the coming week and it happened that I was letting my boy drive. I suppose we were going about 20 miles per hour when a highway patrolman stopped us and arrested me for letting my boy drive. So, I know now that some of the things I've been doing to keep this outfit running do not come under the 1001 emergencies we read about or hear over the radio.

Second. I finally saw that I could not keep this outfit going so I rented out about 1,000 acres of farm land and had a sale of most of my farm machinery so other people could have it. Included in this machinery was a tractor for which I was offered $1,200, but under one of the New Deal emergencies there is a ceiling price on it of $787.50. There were a lot of farmers who wanted the tractor, so to decide who would get it I told them that whoever donated the most to our war fund would get the tractor.

I thought this would help a little on the war effort, so the purchaser made out a check to me for the ceiling price and one to the chairman of the War Fund drive for the amount of the donation. Then after the sale some gentleman reported it to the O. P. A., and they informed me that I was subject to a fine for three times the amount of the donation, plus all court costs and attorney fees, so I know now that doesn't come under the emergencies.

Third. My feed yard here at home is about 15 miles from the Kansas State line. I have bought corn around here for 25 years for my feed yard, but now the New Deal makes me subject to the penitentiary and a fine if I meet competition or pay over 95 cents per bushel for corn. Now, that ruling is closing most every elevator and feed yard that happens to be just north of the Kansas line. Of course, I don't think there is any ruling that would prevent me from hiring a trucker to go down across the line and bring back some of the corn, but it would cost about 20 cents per bushel more plus the transportation, and I can't see where that would help the war effort.

Fourth. This summer I asked a fellow who had been shelling corn for me at various times to come and shell about 3,000 bushels of corn. He said he couldn't afford to shell corn and I asked him what he was doing. He told me he was working at the Bruning air base with his truck and pulling down $750 per month and went on to tell me that some days they would haul a little lumber and the next day might haul it back, but he said that was all right because there were plenty of men to help load and unload it. Then he said some days he didn't do anything except sleep in the cab of his truck and draw his pay.

I have heard of dozens of cases just like this from people I know personally, but I guess instances like this come under one of the emergencies on a cost-plus basis.

I also read in the paper the other day where two contractors have been charged with defrauding the Government of $30,000,000 through waste, padded pay rolls, and other means, have been awarded another $13,000,000 contract on the same plan. I suppose that comes under an emergency on a cost-plus basis.

Now if we are not deficient of mind, we wonder when the American people will get tired of this waste, corruption, and inefficient dictatorship—but I suppose until such a time, we had better just keep on donating and buying bonds.

LEE A. SNYDER.

War Profiteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the provisions of the law relating to the renegotiation of contracts have resulted in the saving of billions of dollars to the Federal Government. It is therefore with some alarm that I understand that the Finance Committee of the Senate will report such modifications of those provisions of the law as to render the renegotiation of contracts rather ineffective. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Profiteers," published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR PROFITEERS

Evidence of the right-wing reaction on the part of business against which Charles E. Wilson inveighed in a recent speech may be cited right here in Washington. We offer the action taken Monday by the Senate Finance Committee on the tax bill. The committee, responding to business pressure, decided to liberalize the law providing for the renegotiation of war contracts. But the dose of liberalization was big enough to kill the entire renegotiation process.

Three changes were adopted which warrant that statement. The committee decided to permit reopening in the Court of Claims of all renegotiation settlements, to require the War and Navy Departments to consider estimated Federal and local taxes before fixing renegotiation profits and to exempt from renegotiation firms making what are called standard commercial commodities. The first change opens the door of the Court of Claims to every war contractor who has had to refund some of his profits as a result of renegotiation with the armed services. Why should not the businessman have access to a judicial review of settlements attained before an administrative tribunal? This provision seems fair enough till you hear why the House Ways and Means Committee refused to consider it. That committee, with more sense of responsibility, knew that the Court of Claims would be bogged down by such a burden. In that event there would be no decision for years on refunds of excess profits which had been agreed upon by the renegotiation parties.

Accordingly, the House committee decided that only impasse cases should be remitted to the Court of Claims. These cases are those in which a firm under renegotiation takes issue with the administrative decisions. There are only a few of them. Both at the War and at the Navy Departments the renegotiation tribunals are staffed by businessmen of the highest standing and integrity. And the decisions in the great majority of cases they have handed down have been accepted by the war contractors concerned. Maybe these latter would not take advantage of the Senate committee's decision to throw open the Court of Claims to all. But there is no such guaranty. If a firm finds subsequent renegotiation in other cases too lenient, it would clearly be tempted to seek judicial review of its own settlement.

The Senate committee voted for inflation when it decided that renegotiation should be based upon profits after taxes had been calculated. This is the final acknowledgment that neither in the letting of contracts nor in their renegotiation are prices scrutinized. Prices over much of the war business are more or less arbitrary, which means that they are too high. It is left to the renegotiators, theoretically, to reduce those prices by reducing the profits which have resulted from the war contracts. But the process leaves a good deal of profiteering untouched. What happens in the intervening stage is that the war contractor, in order to justify the high contract prices, is under temptation to pad his costs so that only the minimum of profits will have to be refunded. Not all contractors, of course, do this. But that many of them pad their costs is shown by any number of developments—the strange anxiety of employers to raise wages, labor hoarding, accumulation of materials, big expense accounts, bloated salaries.

The source of inflation lies in this more or less arbitrary way of letting contracts. For it is these inflated costs that make up the bulk of the spending stream which is constantly pressing upon the limited market for civilian goods. They are spent as wages, expenses, competitive prices for materials. Now, with the Senate committee's blessing, contractors would be able to add their taxes to their inflated costs before submitting themselves to the renegotiation boards. They would be enabled, in other words, to go to the renegotiators with all their costs taken for granted. For it would be literally impossible to figure out proper prices when the tax burden varies from one manufacturer to another. We have heretofore suggested that a paring of costs rather than a recognition of costs is the prime job of those in charge of procurement and renegotiation. Cost analyses should be required before prices should be O. K.'d in the war contracts. Then the water could be squeezed out of them. With prices so held down, and with renegotiation aimed at getting refunds beyond a reasonable rate on capital, business could then be acquitted of any war profiteering.

The final bit of foolishness to be perpetrated by the Senate committee was the exemption from the renegotiation process of the makers of "standard commercial commodities." Presumably what is meant is any commodity which is used by the peacetime consumer. The latter uses small motors, textile goods, hand tools, and thousands of other things. Should the makers of these escape renegotiation? Such an exemption would completely frustrate the intent of the renegotiation law, which was to prevent profiteering on all business having anything to do with war. It is difficult to think of any standard commercial commodities to which war profits

don't adhere. Profits on hand tools and small motors, for instance, have been as great as in what might be called pure munitions.

The Senate committee did not define what a standard commercial commodity is. That would be so much of a headache in itself that one can only think that the Senate committee simply resigned its function as a group of responsible men and underwrote the provision at the behest of interested groups. As to these, they ought to turn to Mr. Wilson's address before the N. A. M. "This above all," he said, "is a time when the industrial leaders owe it to their country and to themselves to exercise temperate judgment." Do they want to be certified as war profiteers when the fighting men return?

Admission of Refugees to the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the statement appearing in the press as released by Breckenridge Long, the Assistant Secretary of State, is significant not in what it states, but in what it implies. After all the many weeks of public discussion, the clamor in the public press, newspapers, and radio comments, which disclosed a situation which would have saved many innocent men, women, and children who are about to be extirpated by Hitler and his satellites, we find a bland statement to the effect that in the last decade, meaning the last 11 years, the total number of all refugees admitted to the United States from all nations, both permanently and temporarily, is 580,000.

If we consider the fact that the average admission would then be at the rate of less than 58,000 per year, it is clear that the organs of our Government have not done their duty. The existing quotas call for the admission of more than 150,000 every year, so that if the quotas themselves had been filled, there would have been a total of one and one-half million and not 580,000 during the period mentioned.

But that is not the whole story. There was no effort of any kind made to save from death many of the refugees who could have been saved during the time that transportation lines were available and there was no obstacle to their admission to the United States. But the obstructive policy of our organs of Government, particularly the State Department, which saw fit to hedge itself about with rules and regulations, instead of lifting rules and regulations, brought about a condition so that not even the existing immigration quotas are filled.

To boast of the proceedings, as the State Department seems to indicate in its press release, is more than strange. Stranger still that the press release carried on December 12 from Australia to the effect that that country is now seeking more immigrants. At the Bermuda Conference, as you recall, the British Government insisted that there be no discussion of any admission of refugees to any part of the British Empire, and now Australia is clamoring for immigrants.

It is a strange commentary on the workings of our official departments, that at a time when there is a definite solution possible, it not only is not taken advantage of, but no mention of any kind is made as to any possibility of a solution, and our State Department simply is throwing the burden on small countries like Sweden and Switzerland to settle a condition which these countries are absolutely incapable of handling. There is a total absence of good faith on the part of our authorities as well as on the part of the British authorities, to solve the problem of refugees, and neither our Government nor that of Great Britain is helping to any considerable extent.

Mustered-Out Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, a serious condition exists as far as the mustered-out veterans are concerned. We have discharged some 900,000 men and have made no provision for them. Some of these men have been overseas and have seen the worst there is to see. As the Speaker said the other day, in comparison with their sacrifice our sacrifice has been small. I feel the time has come that something should be done. Unless we make some reasonable and intelligent arrangement to muster out those men with proper pay, the responsibility will rest on Congress. Up to this time I do not believe that Congress is to blame, and I do not believe the President is to blame, but I do believe that the War Department and the Navy Department have been negligent in this matter.

I quote from a news item in the Chicago Herald American:

CHICAGO, December 14.—The fighter on the home front is for his comrade on the battle front.

He wants the road back for the veteran cleared of the morass and red tape.

Labor leaders, representing more than 700,000 workers in Chicago and throughout the Nation, meeting in extraordinary luncheon session here today, resolved, to demand of Congress that it pass immediately bills providing mustering-out pay for war veterans, assuring them of a merrier Christmas than the clouded one now on the horizon; to demand of Congress that America's unwanted battalion be given a new lease on life; that jobs be afforded them in the post-war period, and that all veterans' problems be handled under a unified program.

Said William L. McFetridge, president of the Building Service Employees International, chairman of the meeting:

"Labor has millions in the ranks on the battlefield and millions more in the working home guard, and it cannot stand aside in the comparative peace of its big cities and forget the men stumbling down the road back. We must see that the veterans, now leaving the services by the thousands, are given a helping hand—and not the hand of charity."

Arthur Canty, head of the School Engineers Union and vice commander of the Illinois Department of the American Legion, declared:

"I have been studying the plight of the veteran closely, and the full truth has not been revealed. The situation should be remedied without delay. Those who fight for their country abroad should be treated decently at home."

Seconding him was William Lee, head of the Bakery Drivers' Union, who said:

"I fought in the last war, and I remember only too well the treatment given veterans after that one. It was outrageous. We must not repeat the evils. We must see to it that veterans find America a haven after their deeds on the battlefield."

Speaking as a veteran, also Don Burroughs, of the Auto Mechanics' Union, said:

"Anything the laborer can do now is vital to the welfare of the veteran. Let us unite to petition Congress for instant action."

The score of labor leaders passed a resolution commending the Herald-American for its fight in behalf of the veterans. The group took practical action for the benefit of the veterans of this war by purchasing a large block of tickets to the Christmas gifts for wounded servicemen show to be held at midnight, Friday, in the Palace Theater.

Others who expressed indignation over Congress' lack of action and supporting the resolutions for passage of mustering-out pay are: Thomas Gorman, head of the Meat Cutters and Butchers International; Albert Matha, of the Elevator Operators and Starters Union; Arthur Swanson, of the Retail Clerks' Union; Earl Jimmerson, head of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters' Union; Ira S. Turley, head of the Teachers' Union; James C. Kennedy, of the Milk Wagon Drivers' Union; Charles Youngblood, head of Local 147, of the Painters' District Council; Stanley Johnson, of the Carpenters' District Council; Leslie Goudie, of the Teamsters' Council; and Patrick Sullivan, of the Building Trades' Council; William Cleary, of the Electrical Workers' Union; John R. Bray, head of the Coal Teamsters' Union; and E. G. O'Toole, of the Plumbers' Union, Local 150.

The United Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The United Americas," by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, of Emmitsburg, Md., published in the Catholic Courier Jubilee magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED AMERICAS

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning)

OUR NEIGHBORS TO THE SOUTH SEE VICTORY IN UNION WITH US

Will the American republics and Canada cooperate in the post-war world? May we expect the newly won solidarity of the Western Hemisphere to grow and expand? What forms of collaboration are apt to survive the

war? Will the new world adopt a charter or a constitution? Can the Americas develop the framework of a federation of free peoples, sovereign and yet united? These are questions which concern the life, liberty, happiness, and prosperity of every American.

I will try to submit an outline of what "our America" (nuestra America, as it is called south of the Rio Grande) is likely to resemble in an era of victorious peace.

I write these lines not from a penthouse on Park Avenue, but from a conning tower in the Caribbean. Looking out over Habana harbor, I can see PT boats, destroyers, and subchasers. Overhead there is the occasional drone of a dirigible, punctuated by the fierce whir of bombers and fighters flying in formation.

America united in a posture of defense is no mere matter of declamation for school boys, but rather a solid reality. The armies, navies, and air fleets of the Americas are being welded into a powerful shield. Last year our professors and students in the Sign Seminar at the University of Habana had a grandstand view of the campaign against the U-boat. We saw cargo ships in closely guarded convoys thread their way past Morro Castle at dusk and heard the dawn patrol each morning as it swept down the coast or into the Gulf of Mexico to head off trouble in the happy hunting grounds of the Axis.

Those waters are no longer private preserves of the pigboats. Rarer and rarer are the tales of fishermen who spot a hostile prow. Fewer and fewer the sailors who relate stories of running fights with marine wolf packs. Concentration of air and surface craft, swift completion of airdromes and dock installations have reduced the U-boat peril to the vanishing point. Is it any wonder that the most popular slogan in the American republics today is the following: "Las Americas unidas—unidas venceran." (The united Americas will find victory in union.)

In my judgment, this military, naval, and air collaboration will be maintained in the post-war world. The airports will remain; the naval bases will be consolidated; the army camps will be put on a permanent footing. Why? Geography and the speed of modern transportation are twin facts transcending the nature of the present emergency. Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa have some choice as to the form of post-war reconstruction. The Americas have none. Their destiny is one. And nowhere is there a deeper, keener realization of that unity than in the minds of the general staffs of each nation.

Economically, the case for unity is equally strong. Temporary cessation of supplies from the Orient has taught the American people how important are the quinine of Ecuador, Peru, and Brazil; the tin of Bolivia; the sugar, tobacco, and fruits of Cuba; the oil of Venezuela and Colombia; the copper, nitrates, lead, and vanadium of Chile; the hides and wool of Uruguay; the woods and coffee of Central America; the timber and nickel of Canada, as well as the possibilities of Mexican guayule as a source of rubber.

In culture and art, too, the Americas have much to learn from each other. It is significant that in South America the poet is esteemed as the supreme exponent of what is true and beautiful and good in life. The artist gives testimony to the paramount nature of spiritual values over those that are material.

The North American has much to learn from his good neighbors in the domain of good taste, good manners, and respect for the dignity of the individual citizen, while the South American can acquire, with benefit to himself and to his institutions, a sense of organization, the desire for public service divorced from personal profit, and ambition to translate social legislation of undeniable value into the reality of comfortable homes, a correct diet, decent food, honest, democratic participation in government, and a respect for manual labor, whether in workshops or on farms.

It seems to me that the open forums in which these gifts can be exchanged, with mutual benefit, are the universities of South, Central, and North America. And, in this cultivation of an intellectual and moral climate essential to the practice rather than the mere rhetoric of democracy, justice, liberty, we, Americans, owe it to ourselves, our ancestors and our followers to remember that the alma mater of the university system in the Old World and the New was Christianity.

With hope and love, inspired by faith in God, we can create "Nuestra America," a family of nations, free, independent, enlightened, and sovereign. The solidarity and friendship of the American republics and Canada, suggested by good politics, stimulated by the necessities of war and heightened by the prospects of victory can be perfected by brotherly love. A family that works together is invincible.

One of the most interesting efforts to develop this family spirit among our good neighbors has been the movement for "spiritual Inter-Americanism," sponsored by the Committee on Cultural Relations With the American Republics and Canada. This committee, organized by the editors of The Sign, a national Catholic magazine, has been active for 3 years under the leadership of Msgr. William Barry, founder of Barry College for Women and rector of St. Patrick's Church, Miami Beach, Fla.

Recently, on a tour of inspection of the Sign seminars at the Universities of Havana and Mexico, Monsignor Barry explained the main features of the movement for spiritual inter-Americanism. He said:

"Our committee emphasizes three points: (1) The importance of spiritually minded young men and young women in key positions in the good-neighbor policy; (2) the value of university education in the institutions of Central and South America for young people from the United States and Canada; (3) the need for greater attention for the Spanish and Portuguese languages which can only be mastered and perfected by long periods of residence in foreign countries."

Monsignor Barry also asserted that, although the movement of students from south to north was notable, there was as yet no correspondingly strong circulation of young people from North to South America. It is this condition which the Sign seminars try to remedy.

The seminars, composed of professors and students from the United States and Canada, have to date been established at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru (1941); the National University of Mexico (1942 and 1943); and the University of Havana (1942 and 1943). The members of the various groups are obliged to register for work on the university level, to attend classes regularly, and to stand an examination at the end of the courses in Spanish, Portuguese, economic geography, diplomacy, constitutional law, and South American history, literature, and art.

Some of the results are worthy of record here. Mr. George M. Widney, A. B., of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and a product of the Sign seminar at the University of San Marcos, is now an assistant to United States Ambassador R. Henry Norweb in Lima, Peru. Miss Ellen Collins, A. B., of St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and an M. A. of Columbia University, is the first woman cultural-relations officer in the history of our country. She is likewise a graduate of the Sign seminar, having served as executive secretary at San Marcos and the University of Mexico. She is serving at present in the Division of Cultural Relations, attached to the United States Embassy at Quito, Ecuador.

In the current year two Sign seminar graduates have been engaged to teach at St. George's College, Habana, Cuba. One happens to be Miss Jane O'Brien, A. B., of Nazareth College, Rochester. The other is Miss Jule Downey, of Maryland State Teachers College, Cumberland. Both attended the University of Havana summer session in 1943 as members of the Sign seminar. After a year or two in Habana, Miss O'Brien and Miss Downey will be qualified for further advancement, as well as for richer opportunities for national service. As the Most Reverend Manuel Arteaga y Betancourt, archbishop of Habana, declared to the members of the Sign seminar last summer, "Our youth, trained on the university level and inspired by apostolic ideas, must be our leaders in the 'inter-American century.'"

War Taxes and Post-war Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my colleague, Mr. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, in Roanoke, Va., December 15, 1943, under the auspices of the extension division, University of Virginia, and the Roanoke City-County Public Forum:

Some years ago a Speaker of the House told a new Member: "Learn taxation—it is the Government." While taxation is still a major governmental function, our domestic economy has in recent years become so complex it is difficult to understand taxes without understanding correlated factors, and difficult to discuss taxes without going beyond that immediate field. The principal theme I wish to develop tonight is the preservation of our system of private enterprise within the framework of American constitutional liberty. In doing so I plan to cover the following points:

1. The division of powers under our Constitution.

2. Our remarkable industrial development under that plan of government.

3. The theory of certain self-anointed reformers that our system of private enterprise has failed and a new and different system would contribute to our happiness and prosperity.

4. Their effort to use the taxing power for purposes of social reform.

5. Wartime taxation with reference to its post-war implications.

6. Foreign commerce from the standpoint of domestic prosperity as well as that of an enduring peace.

In the discussion of those general topics I will stress the fact that the two issues of highest priority on our program are:

First. To win the war.

Second. To win the peace through preservation of our system of representative democracy under a constitutional form of government, which places due and proper limitations upon the powers and functions of the central government and preserves in the remaining field of political, social, and economic activity the sovereignty of the component states.

It goes without saying we are going to win this war, although we may not win it as quickly or as easily as some optimists now think. I have no inside information on how

long the war will last, nor do I care to assume the role of a prophet; all I know is that those in charge of the fighting are of the opinion the major part of the conflict is in front of us and not behind us, and that we will be fortunate if we can knock Germany out of the war by the summer or fall of next year and Japan out of the war by the summer or fall of the following year. We have done a fine job on the home production front but not the best of which we were capable. Notwithstanding a solemn no-strike pledge, there have been many injurious strikes and new strikes are now occurring at the rate of 10 a day. On far-flung battlefronts the personal bravery and cooperative efficiency of the men in all branches of our military service have added new luster to the glorious record of the American fighting man. The sacrifices made by us on the home front, including the taxes we must pay both now and in the post-war era pale into insignificance when compared with the sacrifices of our boys on the fighting front. On Bataan they held their foxholes, knowing the promised relief would never come. From the frozen wastes of Attu to the tropical beaches of Guadalcanal and Tarawa, in Tunisia, Sicily and Italy, they have advanced disdainful of the fact they had a rendezvous with death. Like the young men of Athens:

"They gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

Inscribed upon the foundation of the Archives Building in Washington, which houses the vital records of our democracy, are two quotations from Shakespeare: "Study the past," and "What is past is prologue." We have no present problem the solution of which would not in large measure yield to a proper application of the fundamental principles of the founding fathers. In political science, as in religion, we proceed from the known to the unknown and bridge the gap by faith.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."

By faith Benjamin Franklin, on September 17, 1787, signed the Philadelphia Constitution, but in doing so remarked:

"I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults, if they are such, because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered: and believe further, that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

The faith of the founding fathers in the plan of union they formulated in Philadelphia was justified. Our representative democracy and plan of constitutional liberty has endured unchanged for a longer period of time than any given form of government has endured in any other country of the world. Under that form of government we have been the freest, the happiest, and the most prosperous people in the world. For a century and a half we have tenaciously clung to the fundamental principle that the two major functions of government have been to furnish certain public services, such as defense, police protection, education, etc., which of necessity must be nonprofit community enterprises, and to supervise competition between individuals and corporations but not enter into competition with them.

In 1930 our system of private enterprise was put to the severest test in its history. Our foreign trade was virtually gone and our domestic commerce had become stagnated. Our banking system was threatened with bankruptcy, while millions of able-bodied workers walked the streets of our industrial cities unemployed. In the fall of 1932 the people wanted a change and got it in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, namely, through the medium of the ballot box. Numerous reforms were proposed, some well-considered and others ill-advised. The proposals I deem to be ill-advised clearly sprang from a lack of faith in a just and proper division of power between the central Government and the sovereign States, a lack of faith in the American system of private enterprise, and in some instances even a lack of faith in the efficacy of democratic institutions.

I hold no brief for the ruthless manner in which capital accomplished the industrial expansion from the latter part of the nineteenth century through the first quarter of the twentieth century. Tax laws, labor laws and tariff laws were framed to give the maximum advantage to the industrialists, the maximum power to concentrated wealth, and a minimum share in a great program to agriculture and labor. But in attempting to correct recognized abuses we have conferred new powers upon labor without adequate safeguards against their abuses. Business has become so entangled in labor problems, tax problems and Government red tape, production—the foundation of all real prosperity—has ceased to be the major concern. Without in any sense disparging the patriotism and loyalty of the American worker in this war effort, I share the general belief that the leaders of organized labor have in this emergency failed to measure up to the standard set by Samuel Gompers in World War No. 1. It was that immigrant from London's east side, finding in this new land rare opportunities for the reward of personal effort, who said:

"Only development based on voluntary institutions holds promise of permanent progress, for such development is responsive to developing technology and cultural advance of individuals and group activity."

In my opinion, the production of war goods would have been stimulated and fewer problems created for the post-war era had we at the commencement of war spending in 1940 adopted suitable amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and suspended the operation of the 40-hour week for the duration of the war.

Since the start of World War No. 2 in August 1939, to September 1943, hourly earnings in industry have increased 59 percent and weekly earnings 87 percent, while the cost of living has increased only 26 percent. The marked increase in weekly earnings over living costs accounts for a substantial portion of what is now called the inflationary gap between money available to be spent and goods available to be purchased, the total of which varies anywhere from twenty billion dollars to forty billion dollars according to the varying estimates of what will go into private savings. In an address before the Roanoke Rotary Club last August I pointed out at length current factors in the inflation equation, and the failure of the Administration to successfully come to grips with the problem. At that time I indicated the need for a comprehensive system of wage and price control; a tax system that would syphon off a substantial portion of excess purchasing power; a larger sale of Government bonds to private investors; and strict economy in war as well as peacetime expenditures to reduce the amount of deficit financing. Much of what I said on that occasion, but expressed in a more expert way, you will find in an article by Samuel Lubell, entitled "Higher Taxes or Else," published in the December 4, 1943, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The administration would have been on stronger ground in its recent subsidy fight in the House had it previously exercised the inflation controls mentioned above. I have always supported a limited subsidy program as an essential war measure where the subsidy was paid to the producer to stimulate production, but I have never believed in the soundness of using consumer subsidies as an indirect method of increasing real wages. It merely hides the price inflation that has already occurred, passing the difference to the national debt, to be financed by still more borrowed money, and giving no assurance that the first shot in the arm will not have to be followed by bigger and better doses until the subsidy program has become a major item of expense to all taxpayers.

With respect to governmental regulation of business, we all recognize the necessity of wartime control and accept such control as a proper contribution to an all-out war effort, although offering up a few prayers now and then for better administration. In fact a major part of current regimentation grows out of the effort to control inflation, and in urging increased taxation to head off more regimentation, Mr. Lubell said:

"There isn't a single domestic war problem that would not be eased somewhat by the calcium and vitamins in a stiff dose of taxes."

But governmental interference with business did not commence with the war, and some fear it may not end with it. War has no virtue commensurate with its vices, but the necessity during this war period of extending governmental control into the life of the humblest citizen may prove to be a blessing in disguise. I am convinced that as soon as we are safely past the dangers of inflation in the post-war era, the American people will promptly repudiate leaders who seek to impose upon them Federal regimentation as a normal peacetime panacea.

The average citizen does not understand the part taxation plays in a free economy and in the preservation of the American system of free enterprise. He has not understood the full implications of the efforts made in recent years to use the taxing power, which Chief Justice Marshall said, in the famous case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, "Involves the power to destroy," to accomplish social reforms. And, incidentally, before the imposition of current war taxes, some were led to believe they could get something for nothing from the Federal Government and that the debt created in the process would not be theirs to pay.

The reformers knew what they had in mind when they induced the Congress to pass the undistributed-profits tax, since repealed. That taxing device would have prevented all corporations from accumulating adequate reserves for purposes of expansion and would have struck a death blow to many closely held and highly successful corporations. Under the guise of raising necessary revenue, the Congress passed in 1934 an excise tax on dividends from corporations in the hands of the shareholder, and in 1936 made such dividends fully taxable. That system of double taxation was aimed at what was supposed to be concentrated wealth, but, as we now know, fell with great severity upon thousands of shareholders of very limited means. The present need for revenue is too acute to give up any sources of revenue now, but certainly in the post-war era that system of double taxation should be eliminated. Inheritance taxes, higher than in any democracy in the world, were proposed ostensibly for the purpose of raising revenue, but actually for the purpose of breaking up estates, liquidating family-controlled enterprises, and forcing

new business to look to the Government for financing. The effort to place an arbitrary $25,000 limitation upon earnings after taxes was of the same pattern. The pressure applied to the Ways and Means Committee to tax the normal earnings of corporations 55 percent and excess profits from 90 percent to 100 percent did not grow solely out of desire for revenue. Some wanted to force corporations to turn to the Government, in the post-war era, for reconversion and operating funds. But if industry is to escape Government regimentation, that job must be done by private capital. Alfred P. Sloan says reconversion will cost General Motors $500,000,000. That company is willing to put it up if the Government, through war taxes, does not render it powerless to do so. Plant reconversion is not the only industrial problem in the post-war era. A cancelation of fifty or more billions of war contracts will be a post-war headache for many industrialists. Settlement of those claims must be prompt and fair.

High taxes is one of the inescapable burdens of making war.

"War," said Thomas Paine, "involves in its progress such a train of unforeseen and unsupposed circumstances that no human wisdom can calculate the end. It has but one thing certain, and that is to increase taxes."

In 1933 our total tax revenue was approximately $2,000,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1944 the tax yield is now estimated at approximately $45,000,000,000, which is exclusive of the approximately $10,000,000,000 to be paid in State and local taxes. In 1932 we had less than 2,000,000 individual income taxpayers. This year there are about 40,000,000. Since 1932 personal income taxes have been frequently increased, reaching this year the unprecedented rate of 19 percent on the first $2,000 of net taxable income, with an 82 percent rate on surtax net income in excess of $200,000, to all of which must be added a 5 percent Victory tax.

This year the Congress will pass two tax bills in 1 year. The first dealt with the transition to a so-called pay-as-you-go system. It provided for two returns in 1943 and one in 1944 on 1 year's income, two guesses on what the income would amount to with a 6 percent penalty if you missed by more than 20 percent, and added 12½ percent to the tax burden for 1944 and 1945. With all due deference to the distinguished Senators who framed that scheme, I respectfully submit that the Robertson pay-as-you-go plan was better as well as infinitely simpler. Incidentally, the pay-as-you-go system recently adopted in Great Britain was along substantially the same lines as I proposed to the Congress last spring. There are those who complain more of the present complexity of our tax system than they do of the increased rates. But it is difficult to frame a simple income-tax law and not make it arbitrary.

Recognizing the fact that a large proportion of the 40,000,000 income taxpayers would need the assistance of a lawyer or a tax accountant in rendering "unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's," I proposed last summer a very simple and easily operated tax known as a retail sales tax. At the same time I proposed that all taxpayers who owed nothing above the basic liability of 19 percent, and had that collected at the source, be relieved of the necessity of filing an income return. Neither of those proposals was adopted. The Treasury Department was on sound ground when it urged our committee to use the taxing power to curb inflation, but not on sound ground in opposing a sales tax on the basis of its being inflationary. All economists are agreed that a sales tax tends to curtail buying. Of course, a sales tax could be made inflationary if wage increases be granted to offset it, but that could likewise be said of any other war tax. The sales tax is the most feasible way of reaching the war spending in the hands of those who have the major portion of the new war income.

The second tax bill passed this year by the House, and now pending on the Senate side, raised the corporate tax on excess profits from 90 to 95 percent, while retaining the present over-all effective rate of 80 percent. The bill continues the present 10-percent post-war refund of excess-profits taxes. Small corporations were given some assistance through the increase of the fixed exemption of $5,000 against excess profits to $10,000. As to the tax on individuals, the integration of the Victory tax with the regular income tax adds very little to the total of the present burden, and, in our opinion, imposes the burden in a fairer way than is done by the combined income and Victory tax.

The present tax burden is heavy, but so is the present war debt. In the first year of the war, which really began on July 1, 1941, although war itself was not declared until the following December, war spending amounted to $28,286,000,000. The second year spending was increased to seventy-five billion eighty-seven million. In the third year, which commenced last July, we reached the monthly rate of $8,000,000,000 last month, or an annual rate of $96,000,000,000. In the fourth war year, assuming that Germany will be defeated by next summer or soon thereafter, war spending is expected to drop to $75,000,000,000, although the Budget to be presented to us next month by the President will probably total ninety-five billion. Those years of war spending add up to $277,000,000,000, and if Japan is able to continue the struggle beyond July 1945, the sum may easily reach $300,000,000,000. The Congress already has provided war agencies with $340,537,000,000, and, as the Director of the Budget recently pointed out, the recent Army refund of $13,163,000,000 was little more than a book entry. On any basis you figure it, we will end the war with a staggering national debt, and the necessity for the continuance of heavy taxation in the immediate post-war era. The only way our post-war economy can stand such taxation will be on the basis of a national income in excess of $100,000,000 per year. And the only way, in my humble opinion, we can hope to have such an income will be through giving full play to American inventive genius and technical skill in mass production—in a word, the American "know how" under the tried American system of free enterprise. Pump priming won't do the job and Government spending on the present lavish scale is out of the picture, because, as our former colleague from Pennsylvania, Bob Rich, so often asked the House, "Where are you going to get the money?" With all due deference to the recognized patriotism of the American citizen on the home front, we had to turn just a little heat on him late last summer in order to sell $18,000,000,000 of War bonds, and even then 38 States failed to reach their E bond quotas. Next month he will be called upon to come across with an additional $14,000,000,000. By the time our war debt has reached the figure previously indicated, I fear some of our good citizens are going to be like Will Rogers when invited to join a new fraternal order. "I am sorry," said Will, "but I am out of dues."

We must steadfastly repudiate the suggestions of left-wingers and theoretical "do-gooders" that our economy is mature, that it is static. "What is past is prologue." Given the same opportunity, the American people who perfected the steam engine, and spanned a vast continent with steel rails; who built and consumed 75 percent of all the motor vehicles in the world, so say nothing of washing machines, mechanical refrigerators, radios, and a thousand and one other things that have given us the highest standard of living in the world, can go forward again to new horizons, changed in kind but not in degree.

"To him," said Thoreau at Walden Pond, "whose vigorous and elastic thought keeps pace with the sun, the day is a perpetual morning."

Hand in hand with the post-war restoration of our domestic commerce must go the restoration and expansion of our foreign commerce. If we are to sell abroad we must be willing to buy from abroad; else there will be no international trade on a mutually profitable basis. Our hoard of gold is useless while buried in the ground at Fort Knox. In addition to furnishing a backing for a sound currency, it must likewise be translated into international exchange and become the mainspring of an ample flow of international dollars. By that I do not mean that if there is to be an international bank we are to furnish the major part of the capital while nations with unsatisfactory collateral are to do the major part of the borrowing.

Based upon 20 years of painstaking research, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce has recently published a brochure entitled "The United States in the World Economy" in which Under Secretary Wayne C. Taylor stated in the foreword:

"Although numerous salutary lessons are to be drawn from the experience of the past, the conclusion that emerges most emphatically from the survey is the fundamental importance of maintaining conditions conducive to a more stable and ample flow of dollars in our transactions with other countries. The most essential of these conditions lies not in the field of foreign economic policy as such but in the attainment of a more fully and more smoothly operating domestic economy—the major determinant of the volume and course of our purchases of foreign goods and services. In addition, a more adequate supply of dollars should entail both a freer flow of imports and a renewed and sounder participation of American capital in international investment."

The epoch-making Atlantic Charter and the mutual-aid agreements of our lend-lease plan clearly indicate the objective of those who, putting isolation behind them, have promised to the American people a post-war type of international cooperation calculated to make the peace we will win on the battlefield a lasting as well as a just peace. Points four and five of the Charter read as follows:

"Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

"Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

Article VII of the Lend-Lease Agreements contains the following statement:

"In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of ------ in return for aid furnished under the Act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and ------, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all

forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the joint declaration made on August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

"At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two governments with a view to determining, in the light of governing economic conditions, the best means of attaining the above-stated objectives by their own agreed action and of seeking the agreed action of other like-minded governments."

Commenting last July on those covenants and objectives, our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, said:

"One of the greatest of all obstacles which in the past have impeded human progress and afforded breeding grounds for dictators has been extreme nationalism. * * *

"No nation can make satisfactory progress when it is deprived, by its own action or by the action of others, of the immeasurable benefits of international exchange of goods and services. The Atlantic Charter declares the right of all nations to 'access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.' This is essential if the legitimate and growing demand for the greatest practicable measure of stable employment is to be met, accompanied by rising standards of living. If the actual and potential losses resulting from limitations on economic activity are to be eliminated, a system must be provided by which this can be assured."

With respect to access to raw materials, many of you no doubt recall the statement by William Hard in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, to the effect that a peace to be enduring must be endurable. Economic distress breeds discontent, and discontent often eventuates in violence.

This year we have enjoyed the greatest volume of export business in our history, amounting to more than $12,000,000,000. About 80 percent of those exports moved under lend-lease agreements. Our highest peacetime exports were in 1929, when they amounted to over five billions. There is a very definite relationship between domestic prosperity and our foreign commerce. When we are prosperous we buy more from abroad, establishing international exchange which enables foreign countries to buy more from us. Many nations need our motor vehicles, electrical equipment, office machinery, and, of course, any surplus food that we can spare after the war. Under the stern lash of war necessity certain so-called backward nations, as India and China, are becoming industrialized. In the post-war era they will furnish, along with Latin America, new markets for us. In those markets we will meet the competition of the United Kingdom and Russia. It is essential to our future well-being to meet that competition in a just and friendly way.

Our post-war trade will likewise be influenced by the far-reaching changes in the debtor-creditor relationship of various nations. Prior to World War No. 2, for instance, the British industrial budget was balanced by an income of about $5,000,000,000 a year from foreign investments. Most of those investments have been liquidated, either voluntarily or involuntarily, and the loss of that source of outside income must be replaced by increased production at home. During the period between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, about 70 percent of the dollars we spent for foreign goods and services, and on long-term investments came back to us in payment for exports of United States merchandise. Most of the remaining dollars which we spent abroad in this way were used by foreigners to pay interest on their debts to us and to purchase services in the United States. But the dollars we made available to foreigners annually after we had fully embarked on a program of isolation and implemented it in 1930 with the highest protective tariff in our history, amounted to only 54 percent of those made available annually from 1922 to 1929. The contrast between single years is even more striking. In 1929 the United States through purchases of goods and services and long-term investments supplied $7,400,000,000 abroad, and in 1932, when we reaped what we had sowed, only $2,400,000,000, or less than one-third of the prosperous year of 1929. Being the richest of all nations and with more dollars available for foreign purchasers than any other nation, this drastic decline in American dollars available to foreigners was a major factor in the disruption of all foreign trade. Exports of foreign nations, especially of raw materials, fell more rapidly than their imports, but to continue those imports, foreign nations drew upon their liquid reserves of gold and foreign currency and then adopted tariffs, embargoes, and other restrictive measures.

I do not place all the blame for disruption of foreign trade upon our own shoulders because the depression following World War No. 1 was world-wide, and many foreign countries had domestic dislocations as well as the dislocation of their foreign trade. But I trust we have learned the futility of exchanging consumable goods for gold, later to become sterilized and buried in steel and concrete vaults. If, in the post-war era, we are to have an export trade commensurate with full employment and a high standard of living, to say nothing of insurance against World War No. 3, that may end civilization as we know it, we must import goods and services to create American dollars for foreign purchasers of our exports. Our major investments abroad should not be in bonds, but rather in the industrial development of friendly and cooperating countries like China, for instance. A higher standard of living in China could automatically provide a new and ever-expanding market for many of our export articles.

We must get away from the theory of high protection days when it was considered that our foreign commerce was profitable only when our exports exceeded our imports. That theory never was sound because it involved for us the accumulation of unusable gold and meant the end of our foreign trade when the other fellow ran out of gold. Our international bankers never showed to worse advantage than when they induced us to lend foreign customers about $7,000,000,000 with which to buy our goods. That was a subsidy program without parallel in international finance. True to the Shakespeare formula, we lost both the loan and the friend. On the assumption we had an inexhaustible supply of oil, copper, and other strategic materials, we kept our imports with high tariffs while exporting those products to every available market, taking gold in return. This war has made such an inroad into our available supplies of oil and copper neither would last for 20 years at the present rate of consumption.

It is entirely practical and feasible in the framework of rising domestic consumption to extend to foreigners a share in our domestic market without cutting into the market for domestic producers, offsetting any reduction in employment resulting from the competition of imports by increased employment in export trades. In the long run, dollars paid to foreigners for imports are spent by them on United States exports. In a word, we must fully implement in the post-war era the Hull principle of reciprocal-trade agreements, the full benefits of which so far have never been realized because of war conditions existing throughout the world long before we entered the struggle in December 1941.

A candidate for the Presidency says he is for international cooperation without commitments. It would be more to the point for him to have said: "I name hearts trumps in the international bridge game, but reserve the right to renege the first time trumps are led." Isolationism is not dead. It sleepeth—until after November 1944.

The House took pride in the passage of the Fulbright resolution on the subject of international cooperation, and the Senate took pride in the passage of the Connally resolution, which included section 4 of the Moscow Pact. What both House and Senate should have done was to frankly admit they had belatedly caught up with public sentiment in America on that vital issue.

Isolationists in both House and Senate were vigorously fighting the principle of reciprocal trade agreements long after the American press and all national polls showed public sentiment overwhelmingly in favor of that type of international cooperation. The earnest pleas of Cordell Hull that international trade on a live-and-let-live basis would promote international peace were ridiculed.

Many of the boys fighting World War No. 2 are the sons of those who fought World War No. 1—the sons of those who were promised in 1917 they would go forth to war to make the world safe for democracy. The fathers of the veterans of World War No. 2 are determined that their sons shall not be betrayed, as the veterans of World War No. 1 were betrayed. They will support a program for a just and lasting peace. They believe in the American system of private enterprise. They believe that system offers the best opportunity for post-war employment of the veterans of World War No. 2. In the post-war era they will resist any further encroachment upon the rights of sovereign States. And, lest faith in God become the major casualty of the conflict, they will seek to implement the advice of Woodrow Wilson, who, in his last message to the American people in the summer of 1923, said:

"If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually."

"Why I Want To Be a Congressman From California"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the following essay, written by a young constituent of mine, Mr. John Y. Mills, of San Diego, in connection with an essay contest sponsored by the boys' State program of the American Legion, Department of California, in all the high schools throughout the State on the subject Why I Would Like To Be a Congressman. From the hundreds of boys who participated, this young man, who was sponsored by San Diego Post, No. 6, was declared the winner from the fifth area:

The ideals of a Congress that undertakes to solve the problems of our post-war world must be contrastingly different from those held by the Congress which attempted to bring about world peace at the close of the First World War. That legislative body of over a quarter of a century ago seems to have

had as its chief interest, keeping our country exempt from international obligation and free from world responsibility. The future Congresses should put ahead of everything else, not that which best helps America, only, but the policy that will further the progress of the citizens of each individual country, regardless of size or power. Toward the accomplishment of this important ideal must go all efforts of a peace-making Congress, the Members of which should be guided by these three things: Understanding, cooperation, and determination. The policy for which I stand in my desire to serve California as its Representative is the furthering of these standards.

Future Congressmen, in order to meet the requirement of the first standard, that of understanding, must possess a well-balanced knowledge of every-day living and events, coupled with an understanding of the problems of all nations. In this way, Congressmen would be less liable to fall prey to pressure groups and lobbyists.

As the past is our best forecaster of the future, men thoroughly acquainted with the past know how to deal more accurately with the future. As an example, the coming peace Congress must remember what occurred when a peace pact was attempted in the last post-war period. Practically all through that war, Congress more or less gave President Wilson's policies the right of way. At the end of the war, however, Congress was determined to exert its authority and show that its word still held the power it once had. As a result, all of Wilson's ideals for world unity went for naught. Now in this war, we have a strong President and a relatively cooperative Congress. Following completion of hostilities, however, dissension must not arise between the executive and legislative branches of Government. True, the executive body must not be given too free a hand and must be checked if it should stray from the way on the road to peace and freedom. On the other hand, Congress should not resent the past powers of the President to the extent that the two will not work together in cooperation.

Cooperation cannot stop at the doors of our Government, however, but must be carried on throughout the world in order to secure an enduring peace. In some way, either by a world court or international communication, all major problems, such as boundaries and rights, should be settled. To secure this understanding and cooperation are two main goals I wish to achieve in Congress. I know that never again can a nation be a recluse and assume the "I can look after myself" attitude. It would be my purpose to see that an active part and an equal share in world events are taken by the United States Government.

The third factor to guide the future Congresses is all-important determination. Determination not only to pass the right measure for the right problem, but the determination to uphold that measure, once passed, should be incorporated into the philosophy of coming sessions of Congress.

The best comparison I have heard on post-war determination was the likening of avoiding uprisings to the duty of a fireman. When a fireman receives a call it makes not the least bit of difference whether he is in the middle of a card game where the fire is or whose house is on fire. His only concern is that there is a fire and that it must be extinguished as quickly as possible. An uprising of conquered nations must be treated in the same manner. All countries must come to the aid of the nation whose peace has been broken. Aid should be sent immediately and effectively, not after pacification and deliberation.

This idea lays a suggestion for an international police system. Continual subjugation, replaced by gradual emancipation of the people, is a slow but certain method of remodeling the lives of the vanquished. As they have been educated for war and racial superiority, we must slowly reintroduce to them the doctrine of equal creation and the habit of peaceful living.

The road to peace, lasting and eternal, will present problems far more baffling than those of the concluding war. The conception of its finish is, in my mind, as in many others, freedom of speech and of religion and freedom from want and fear. This simple statement is the inspiration and dream of our fighting forces from the shifting sands of Africa to the dense jungles of the Indies, from the blazing skies of the Pacific to the ice and snow of the Arctic, from the waters of the Atlantic to the countrysides of England.

I have let my beliefs and convictions speak for me in why I wish to be a Congressman from California. To indoctrinate three factors by which a successful peace plan could be reached, understanding, cooperation, and determination, is a purpose that should be not only the platform of one candidate, but the ideal of all future Congressmen. A peace in which America plays an active part can be made everlasting only if the American Congress resolves to serve the interests of the world, foremost, then those of its country and State. The furthering of these principles and national policies is the reason I would like to represent the State of California in Congress.

Mustering-Out Pay for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to read a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.:

DECEMBER 14, 1943.

To all Members of Congress:

Any halfway gesture in the matter of mustering-out pay for veterans of World War No. 2 which may be made at this time will surely be followed by another demand at the close of the war. These men will not be satisfied with something that does not even closely approximate the adjusted pay consideration given World War No. 1 veterans. Why not do a good job while you are at it and base the mustering-out pay on length and type of service, with a fair minimum and reasonable maximum?

The following section, which we believe will be applicable to most of the mustering-out pay bills now pending, or about to come, before both branches of the Congress, is offered by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as something more than a halfway gesture and one which we believe, if adopted, will meet the need, not only now, but later. This section could well be offered as a substitute for most of the second sections which we have seen in pending bills.

Amend section 2 by striking out the entire section and substitute the following:

"SEC. 2. Mustering-out pay for persons eligible under section 1 shall be computed by allowing the following sums for each day of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war, as shown by the service or other record of the person:

"(a) One dollar and fifty cents per day for service outside the continental limits of the United States as defined by the War and Navy Departments for the issuance of theater service ribbons.

"(b) One dollar per day for service within the continental limits of the United States.

"*Provided*, That the amount payable to any person who performed service outside the continental limits of the United States as defined shall be not less than $400 or more than $1,200; and the amount payable to any person who performed no service outside the continental limits of the United States as defined shall be not less than $200, or more than $800. Each individual eligible to receive mustering-out pay shall receive the minimum amount payable, either $200 or $400, according to type of service, at the time of discharge or relief from active duty. The remaining amount, if any, of mustering-out pay shall be made in monthly installments of not to exceed $100, from the date of the original payment until exhausted: *Provided further*, That in the case of persons selected for training under the Servicemen's Educational and Training Act of 1943, all payments under this act shall be suspended during the time such persons have been selected for attendance at an approved educational institution."

This Unbelievable Showing of Irrigated Lands Indicates What May Yet Be Expected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, many, many times since I have become a Member of this House I have called attention to the great productive possibilities of irrigation and not only of its possibilities but its actualities. Usually I pointed with pride to the premier irrigation project of our entire country, the Salt River Valley project in southern Arizona. I still contend that it is the premier irrigation project and I have asked permission to include in my remarks a statement from the Department of the Interior giving facts and figures to confirm my estimate. What other lands will produce $128 worth of food each 12 months?

Before doing that, however, I want to digress a little at this moment to call attention to the fact that now in this period of great food crisis our irrigation system as a whole, and every project in particular, is measuring up to its responsibilities in the production of food and fiber. At the same time, I want to point out that additional projects long ago started and now about to be completed constitute our best hope to meet the increased food production which the war so imperatively demands. How fortunate we have been that we had this productive equipment already going to such a large extent before the war, and how doubly fortunate we are that so much new acreage can at small expense

and in a short space of time be made equally productive for next year.

I can understand the opposition which we westerners encountered 5, 6, or 7 years ago from those of you who did not want to appropriate money for the cause of reclamation, but in view of the statistical facts of the already great accomplishment of irrigated lands, I cannot see how anyone understanding the need of food for war now could hesitate a moment to demand completion of those projects almost finished and bringing them into quick and full productivity.

Although the W. P. B. issued a stop order about a year ago halting all construction which required critical materials, Donald Nelson and other high officials have recently removed these restrictions on certain of the most feasible reclamation projects at the request of the War Food Administration. It seems to me but good judgment that we quickly appropriate the money necessary to carry on to completion those projects which are declared to be the most feasible. I do hope the House will agree to the necessary funds for these projects and that without further delay.

Members have heard me declare that the Valley of the Sun surrounding Phoenix, Ariz., is the garden spot of America. The release from the Bureau of Reclamation, which I wish to include herewith, proves conclusively that such is the case. This irrigation project, including about 226,000 acres, is paying back every cent that Uncle Sam has invested in it. Last year it produced crops valued at almost $30,000,000; thus in 1 year's time this everlasting development produced wealth far in excess of its total cost to the United States Treasury. This remarkable record is due to efficient management in the past, and from this release it appears that wise management is planned for the future. The release follows:

In harmony with the announced governmental policy of directing as much of the national income as possible into nonInflationary channels, the Salt River Valley Water Users Association of Arizona is paying its irrigation construction charges as far as 3 years in advance, Commissioner Harry W. Bashore of the Bureau of Reclamation today advised Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

The association, which operates the 226,000-acre Salt River reclamation project in south central Arizona, has sent the Bureau a check for $602,406.22 to cover installments due December 1, 1944, 1945, and 1946, as repayment for the cost of building the various features of the project (exclusive of Bartlett Dam).

Commissioner Bashore, in a letter acknowledging receipt of the check, said:

"The association is to be commended on utilizing increased returns accruing under present agricultural conditions to make advance payments in extinguishing its obligations. It is a sound financial program for the war period and in accord with national policy of guiding purchasing power into anti-inflation channels."

Mr. Bashore explained that the project is one of the most productive of the Bureau's 44 irrigation projects in 15 western States, last year producing vital war crops valued at $29,195,000. This year it is again making major contributions in foods for the armed forces, lend-lease, and the civilian population at home.

The association advised the Commissioner that it had increased the assessments of its members because of the higher prices being paid for farm products in an effort to create a "cushion" of at least 3 years' duration as protection against times of low farm prices when payments may be difficult to make.

As part of the Government's Nation-wide program to prevent inflation, the Bureau of Reclamation for the past 1½ years has urged that water users on reclamation projects apply available surplus income to prepayment of construction charges. It also advocated that water users set up a reserve fund for the accumulation of money to be used to meet unusual operation and maintenance expenses and that, as such reserve funds accumulate, they be invested in War bonds. A number of irrigation districts are using their surplus funds in this manner.

Farming on the Salt River irrigation project is carried on 12 months of the year, and is the major supply of a population on and adjacent to the project of about 200,000, including the city of Phoenix, the capital of Arizona. Crops produced on the project include lettuce, alfalfa, grain, cotton, citrus fruits, dates, figs, and grapes. In 1942 the crops raised on the 226,661 acres in cultivation on that part of the project served entirely by the Bureau system were valued at $128.81 per acre, the highest per-acre return of any of the Bureau's large projects in the West.

Cairo and Teheran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles from the Washington Post for today:

CAIRO AND TEHERAN—FUTURE WORLD TAKES FORM

(By Sumner Welles)

Now that the tumult and the shouting attendant upon the meetings of Cairo and Teheran have died, the positive accomplishments which these meetings represent can be analyzed more objectively.

The results of these meetings assure not only a coherence and unity in military strategy on the part of the four major powers which had by no means previously existed, but they also imply an extent of effective cooperation in the task of safeguarding peace and order in the post-war transition period that seemed far from certain a few months ago.

They have finally destroyed the illusory hopes to which Germany and Japan so stubbornly clung, that suspicion between the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the United States and the British Commonwealth on the other, or friction between Great Britain and China, might bring about so great a weakening of the war effort of the United Nations as to pave the way for a compromise peace.

The President has made no greater contribution to Allied unity, and has rendered no more far-reaching service in the attainment of the war aims of this country, than he has by his participation in these two epoch-making conferences.

The meeting with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo was held upon the friendly insistence of President Roosevelt.

Many causes for Chinese misapprehension have now, due, at least in part, to the influence of the President, been dispelled.

If the Chinese people are obliged to await the final all-out and concerted American and British attack upon Japan until the war in Europe is won, they are nevertheless assured not only that the pressure against Japan will be unrelenting, but also that it is constantly rising, and that it will continue to rise until Japan is crushed.

At the same time, the United States and British Governments promise the people of China that they seek no territory in the Pacific themselves, and that all of the regions which Japan has seized from China during the last 60 years, and some of which China had lost the hope of regaining, will be restored to them.

In the same manner the doubts which some members of the Chinese Government have had as to the future objectives of the Soviet Union in the Far East have been allayed. For while Russia clearly could not participate in the Cairo meeting so long as she is not at war with Japan, it is equally evident that the promise made to China that Manchuria would be restored to her could not have been made save with the prior knowledge and agreement of the Soviet Government.

When these terms shall have been carried out, once Japan has been expelled from all other territories which she has taken, China will become the dominant, and we have every reason to believe, a cooperative and pacific, power in Asia.

Finally, with the restoration of Korean independence, one of the great crimes of the twentieth century will have been rectified, and another stabilizing factor will have been added to the new international system which must be constructed in the Pacific.

At Teheran the long expressed desire of the President to meet alone with Stalin was at last realized. This opportunity of the heads of the Russian and American Governments to talk directly—to discard intermediaries—to discuss face to face the fundamental issues of the present and of the future, was not only in general salutary, but it was in particular, the most effective method of ending, once for all, the disastrous lack of close understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union which had persisted for more than a generation.

The basic objective of the Teheran meeting was accomplished. It is found in the final words of the President, Stalin and Churchill:

"We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

If there is any cause to cavil at the announced results of the two historic meetings, it lies in the fact that there has been as yet no indication given by the four great powers as to the manner in which the remaining members of the United Nations are to be afforded the opportunity of participating in the political decisions which must be reached, in ever-increasing number, as the war finally draws to its close. Nor is there announced any form of mechanism by which the assurances proclaimed by the four powers are to be carried out.

At Teheran the British, Soviet, and American Governments declared that they sought the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples * * * are dedicated * * * to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression, and intolerance. They concluded by stating, "We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations."

The question of what part they may be permitted to play, and what influence their voice may have, once they have entered this family of democratic nations, is very obviously a matter of supreme moment to the

other members of the United Nations, whether they be large or small. On that no light is as yet thrown.

The peoples who are fighting to destroy tyranny and slavery support, I believe, wholeheartedly, the political objectives announced at these two meetings; they support the principles of the Atlantic Charter, now once more reaffirmed. But they are already asking for more than generalities. They are asking how these objectives in the field of post-war political organization are to be secured. It surely is already time to tell them at least how it is proposed to constitute an initial executive agency of all of the United Nations and how it will function; and how an international trusteeship such as that which must aid the Korean people back to liberty is to carry out its responsibilities.

We may hope that fundamental and far-reaching plans such as these may soon be determined, and soon be made known, so that much unnecessary, and frankly dangerous, suspicion and uncertainty on the part of other members of the United Nations may be avoided.

Bureau of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a news release which announces the regionalization of the Bureau of Reclamation, the agency of the Federal Government which is charged with primary responsibility for the conservation and development of the water resources of the 17 Western States that are bisected by or lie west of the one hundredth meridian.

Secretary Ickes, in announcing the regional plan, declares that it is intended to bring the Bureau of Reclamation closer to the people it serves in the arid and semiarid regions of the West. He points out that the plan was developed largely by former Commissioner John C. Page, whose retirement as Commissioner I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several months ago, and that it was presented to him by the present Commissioner, Harry W. Bashore.

Mr. Speaker, any move to bring the activities of a Federal agency closer to the people so that it will be responsive to their wishes is a wise and sound course. It is welcomed by the people of my State of New Mexico, who look to the Bureau of Reclamation to lead the way to the full development of the water resources of the Rio Grande River and its tributaries. I am gratified to note that Mr. Wesley R. Nelson, who has been chief of the Engineering Division of the Bureau in Washington, is to be the regional director, with headquarters at Amarillo, Tex., for region No. 5, which includes the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and my own New Mexico, as well as parts of Colorado and Kansas. Mr. Nelson would perhaps have been closer to the scene of major potentialities in reclamation had his headquarters been placed in Santa Fe or Albuquerque, but he will soon become acquainted with our needs and will serve us well. The news release to which I referred is as follows:

Decentralization of the Bureau of Reclamation to assure a full utilization of the land and water resources of the West to meet war and post-war requirements was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. The reorganization plan, presented to the Secretary by Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore, establishes six major field offices headed by local representatives of the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"The increasing number of interrelated and complex problems arising from the construction and operation of the many Bureau of Reclamation projects for irrigation, power, and related purposes makes it imperative at this time in the interest of maximum efficiency to establish area offices to coordinate the organization's activities in each of six areas," Secretary Ickes said.

"The plan, developed by the Bureau under the former Commissioner John C. Page prior to his resignation in June because of ill health, will bring the Bureau in closer touch with the people affected by its functions. It will provide for a more thorough understanding of area problems and of the needs and potentialities of each area than has been possible heretofore through the Washington, D. C., headquarters and the Denver engineering office. Close coordination of Bureau operations and a full consideration of local expression, essential in meeting the Bureau's wartime responsibilities and in the preparation for post-war needs will be realized. To facilitate this program another office of Assistant Commissioner was recently established with the appointment thereto of William E. Warne."

The regional directors will be under the direct supervision of the Commissioner of Reclamation. They will have extensive latitude for independent action. Subject to Bureau policies and programs and to direction and assistance in the execution of technical phases, the regional directors will be responsible for coordinating all Bureau activities in their respective regions. They will carry out power development and marketing programs, including the negotiation of power sales contracts in accordance with departmental policy established by the Secretary through the power division, and will negotiate construction repayment contracts with water users. Under their jurisdiction, but subject to the technical control of the functional branch heads, will be the execution of investigative programs to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of proposed projects, the execution of required agricultural and other economic development programs, and the supervision of the operation and maintenance of completed projects. They will also coordinate and integrate construction projects with other Bureau operations in their regions. In addition, the regional directors will disseminate public information concerning Bureau activities and provide the administrative management required in their respective regions.

The Bureau now has 72 projects in operation, under construction, or authorized in 16 western States. Many of these are multiple-purpose projects involving irrigation, power production, flood control, and industrial and municipal water. Its irrigation facilities on 44 projects serve nearly 4,000,000 acres of highly productive land, formerly desert, now producing at peak capacity to meet the goals of the western States for food and fiber for war. Through post-war construction on 75 or more new or existing projects, potential self-sustaining homes for 50,000 to 60,000 returning servicemen and emergency war workers can be provided, and the livelihood of 100,000 to 125,000 other farm families, now faced with drought or water shortages, made secure. As an incident to its major function, irrigation, the Bureau has become the largest producer of power in the United States, with 30 operating plants rated at 1,845,000 kilowatts. The addition of 900,000 kilowatts in the last 2 years has made possible the tremendous expansion of war production and development that has taken place in the West. Closer integration of the Bureau's multiple activities is mandatory.

Commissioner Bashore described the boundaries of each of the six regional field areas and announced the appointment of six Regional Directors of Reclamation as follows:

REGION NO. 1. HEADQUARTERS: BOISE, IDAHO

State of Washington; Oregon, including that part of the Klamath project in California; Idaho, excluding the Bear River Basin; and the Snake River Basin in Wyoming.

Director: Frank A. Banks (construction engineer in charge of the Columbia Basin project, Grand Coulee, Wash.).

Assistant Director: R. J. Newell (construction engineer in charge of the Boise (Idaho) and Owyhee (Oregon-Idaho) projects.

REGION NO. 2. HEADQUARTERS: SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

State of California, excluding the Klamath project for the time being, excluding the watershed of the Lake Tahoe area, and excluding the San Diego and Colorado River projects.

Director: Charles E. Carey (consulting engineer for the Bureau and former Budget examiner, Bureau of the Budget).

Assistant Director: Robert S. Calland (district engineer of the Central Valley project, Calif.).

REGION NO. 3. HEADQUARTERS: BOULDER CITY, NEV.

State of Arizona; the San Diego project in California; and the Colorado River projects in California, Nevada, and New Mexico.

Director: Ernest A. Moritz (director of power, Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada).

Assistant Director: Leo J. Foster (construction engineer, All-American Canal and Gila projects, Arizona-California).

REGION NO. 4. HEADQUARTERS: SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

State of Nevada, excluding the Colorado River projects therein; the Lake Tahoe area watershed in California; Utah; the Bear River Basin in Idaho and Wyoming; and the Colorado River Basin in Wyoming and Colorado, excluding the Colorado-Big Thompson and the Blue River-South Platte projects.

Director: Ernest O. Larson (construction engineer in charge of the Provo River project, Utah).

REGION NO 5. HEADQUARTERS: AMARILLO, TEX.

States of Colorado and New Mexico, excluding all of the Colorado River projects, except the Colorado-Big Thompson and the Blue River-South Platte projects; Texas, Oklahoma; and the Arkansas River Basin in Kansas.

Director: Wesley R. Nelson (Chief, Engineering Division, Commissioner's Office, Washington, D. C.).

REGION NO. 6. HEADQUARTERS: BILLINGS, MONT.

States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota; Wyoming, excluding the Snake River Basin, the Bear River Basin, and the Green River Basin; Nebraska; and Kansas, excluding the Arkansas River Basin.

Director: Harold D. Comstock (superintendent of the Riverton project, Wyoming).

Assistant director: William G. Sloan (senior engineer, Bureau of Reclamation).

In addition, the reorganization plan establishes four branches, all located at Denver,

Colo., under the direct administrative supervision of the Commissioner of Reclamation. These are the Branch of Design and Construction, which will assume the design and construction responsibilities of the Office of the Chief Engineer at Denver; the Branch of Project Investigations, which will perform the work now done by the Project Planning Section of the Chief Engineer's Office; the Branch of Operation and Maintenance, which will carry out the functions of the Operation and Maintenance Division, as presently constituted, for irrigation activities; the Branch of Fiscal and Administrative Management, which will assume the duties of the Office of the Chief Accountant, including the central accounting office, and those of the general clerical section of the Office of the Chief Engineer.

Commissioner Bashore announced the respective heads of the branches and their titles, as follows:

Sinclair O. Harper, Denver, Colo., chief engineer, to be in charge of the Branch of Design and Construction;

Erdman B. Debler, Denver, Colo., director of project investigations;

John S. Moore, Denver, Colo., director of operation and maintenance;

William F. Kubach, Washington, D. C., director of fiscal and administrative management.

These men and the regional directors named above are at present employed in related capacities by the Bureau and have outstanding performance records.

Nebraskans Want Private Enterprise to Have a Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce at Fairbury, Nebr., passed a resolution at their annual meeting on December 7, 1943, which merits our attention. It deals with the fundamentals of our American way of life. I wish to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including that resolution:

Realizing that the responsibility of post-war adjustment and the employment of labor should, and will, naturally fall upon American business, particularly the comparatively small business concerns of our country, and believing in the principle of individually owned, operated, and controlled business, and in view of the fact that the method, extent, and character of taxation is a dominant and vital factor in all business life, your committees on legislation respectfully present for your consideration the following resolution, to be brought to the attention of each of our Nebraska Congressmen and Senators:

"Whereas the winning of the war and the adequate financing of the war efforts of our country and its allies is of first importance; and

"Whereas the ultimate object of our war effort is to preserve to us and to our posterity the American way of living and the continuation of our constitutional right of the pursuit of happiness, and the right to live as a free people with the opportunity to fortify ourselves and our posterity against the fear of hunger and fear of encroachment upon our religious liberty; and

"Whereas the United States of America has attained its present place among the nations of the world by means of the development of its natural resources by private enterprise, free from unnecessary governmental control or undue burdens brought upon it through taxation; and

"Whereas it is our sincere hope and belief that, in the not too distant future, private enterprise will need to undertake the problems of post-war adjustments in order to preserve our American way of living; and

"Whereas the ultimate well-being of American labor, American agriculture, and American business depends upon a sound Governmental economic policy, no one class being able to enjoy lasting prosperity at the expense of others: Be it, therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States shall continue to make such appropriations as may be necessary to adequately finance our present war effort, and to assist our allies in such manner as in their opinion will result in the earliest possible termination of our present conflict; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws as will foster and encourage individual enterprise in our country, relieving such enterprises, insofar as possible, from unnecessary governmental interference, and from the danger of governmentally subsidized competition; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws, as will relieve American business from the burden of taxation made necessary in financing or supporting any plan, or scheme, of socialistic economy, fostered and promulgated by bureaucratic control, regulation, and interference in private affairs, all in conflict with the fundamental principles of our free American Government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary in connection with post-war planning to assure that any plan, or system of public works to provide mass employment, shall be limited to work, public in nature, and permanent in character, and shall be carried out by means of private contracts let on the basis of competitive bids, free from unnecessary Government regulations and/or interference; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States enact such law or laws, as will further permit and encourage the building of capital reserves by private enterprise, through a medium of reasonable profit, for use in the financing by such enterprise, post-war adjustment and activities, thereby enabling private enterprise to furnish maximum employment for those now in our armed forces, or engaged in war industries; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States take such steps as may be necessary to make available funds for the war effort through domestic economy, thereby eliminating the necessity of increasing the tax burden upon either corporate or individual incomes, and in this connection, during the present emergency, and the period of post-war readjustment, we make the following suggestions:

"1. The freezing of present rate of social-security tax.

"2. The elimination of unnecessary, obsolete, and overlapping bureaus.

"3. The elimination of governmental activity resulting in competition with private enterprise.

"4. Turning back to the respective States the responsibility of regulating and controlling all affairs not necessarily national in scope.

"5. Rewarding, rather than penalizing, individual effort, initiative, and economy, thereby increasing the number of potential taxpayers."

Dated this 7th day of December 1943 at Fairbury, Nebr.

Unanimously adopted at regular session on the above date.

RUSSELL A. DAVIS,
Secretary, Fairbury Chamber of Commerce.

Policy and Procedure for the Disposal of Government-Owned Machine Tools and Production Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD what seems to me is a very constructive and well thought out opinion in relation to the disposal of Government machine and production tools. It is the work of a very eminent citizen of my congressional district and one in whose judgment and observations I have the utmost confidence. Believing that his ideas will be of use to the Nation in solving a very difficult problem, I offer them for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The enormous quantity of surplus production equipment now owned by the Government can either be a constructive factor of great force in the reconversion and post-war recovery period, or it can be an equally negative and disturbing factor, depending upon the policy adopted by the Government for its redistribution or disposal. The economic and social aspects of this problem are far-reaching. The importance of establishing a sound policy now, while the problem is still before us, can hardly be overemphasized.

There are now in the industrial plants of this country great quantities of tools and equipment that were built in the days before the modern high-speed cutting processes were developed. The operation of such equipment can only result in an inefficient use of manpower. Inefficient use of manpower is not conducive to high standards of living or a favorable competitive position in world trade.

In general, the equipment now owned by the Government, built for the prosecution of this war, represents the latest developments in this field. This equipment should be made available to industry on an equitable basis, in exchange for the obsolete equipment still in the hands of industry, especially smaller industries which are often handicapped in keeping abreast of the latest developments.

If such a general policy could be immediately adopted, the details of an equitable and practical procedure could soon be in operation. The machine tool industry should be used both in determining the degree of obsolescence of any equipment and in its rehabilitation and redistribution.

The first immediate step is for the various Services, Army, Navy, Air Corps, etc., to make lists of tools which they wish reserved for future war purposes. This would include special-purpose tools. All obsolete tools in arsenals should be scrapped and replaced by modern equipment. Also, the latest modern equipment should be made available to educational and training institutions. The importance of this should be emphasized. The moral effect of precision and accuracy in youth training cannot be realized with old-fashioned, discarded equipment. The Government-owned equipment turned over to industry must be on a basis that insures the scrapping of the obsolete equipment it replaces. This is most important. All possibility of speculative profits must be eliminated. To accomplish this, the Government should retain an option for a period of years on every Government-owned tool turned over to industry, thus preventing the purchase of

tools for resale at a speculative profit. The procedure outlined below should accomplish these objectives:

1. All Services—Army, Navy, Air Corps, etc.—to make a list of tools and equipment to be put into a war reserve to maintain our defenses and be available for the next war.

2. Retool and equip all arsenals, proving grounds, etc., with modern equipment.

3. Replace obsolete tools and equipment in all educational and training institutions operated at public expense; endowed institutions at the discretion of the committees described below.

4. Set up a Central Redistribution Committee composed of five members, one each representing engineering, industry, labor, the Government and the public, this committee to be appointed by the commander in chief of the Army and Navy, this committee to have full and complete authority for the redistribution of all Government-owned equipment, within the rules and regulations as adopted, and without further review.

5. Divide the United States into districts and set up a redistribution committee within each such district to operate under the authority of the central committee. The decisions of the district committee to be final, except in case of appeal to the central committee.

6. The policy and organization required for the equitable distribution of Government-owned property should be established at once and personnel appointed and trained for the work. The plan should start operating on equipment declared excess before the war ends. This would accelerate immeasurably the reconversion of industry to peacetime operation.

7. The selling price to industry of all Government-owned production equipment should be on a basis of 50 percent of its appraised valuation (or some definite percentage to be fixed by the central committee) before rehabilitation, the appraisal to be made by the District Redistribution Committee.

8. All applications for equipment would be made on a standard form, this information to be checked by the district committee. To be eligible for equipment, any industry would have to establish the following:

(a) That the purchase is not for speculation.

(b) Any Government-owned equipment purchased must replace existing equipment not now efficient, or incapable of quality production.

(c) All equipment replaced by Government-owned equipment must be turned over to the district committee and be scrapped or otherwise put out of use, at their discretion.

(d) The product must be essential to a sound peacetime economy.

(e) Before any application for Government-owned equipment would be considered, the applicant must show that the Govment equipment will effect an appreciable saving in cost or an increase in quality. This determination to be at the discretion of the committee. It is obvious that the objective of the policy set forth herein would not be reached unless a definite over-all saving or improvement was accomplished by the exchange.

9. A standard form of application prepared by the Government, clearly indicating the essential information required, should be distributed as soon as the policy and procedure is approved. The manufacturer requiring Government-owned production equipment would then be given 60 days in which to make application for tools and equipment which he may require, and which will show a substantial saving over his existing equipment, as outlined. After these applications are received they will be checked against the inventory of tools and equipment available in the district. The work of verifying the information contained in the applications and the advisability of making the transfer can then be started immediately by the district committee. In cases where the applications for any particular equipment exceed the inventory supply of the particular district, that district will make applications through the central committee for equipment which may have become excess in other districts, and so reported to the central committee. Where the applications exceed the total available excess equipment, then the allocations shall be made on a proportional basis beginning with the smaller plants within the discretion of the committee. This is most important for the smaller industries.

10. Provision should be made for tools now installed to continue under a lease until their status under this or some accepted policy can be determined.

11. Further provision should be made for a lease or a partial payment plan for qualified industries unable to finance the exchange.

12. The success and speed of any plan will depend on its administration. The central committee should be given wide authority to establish and administer the work of the district committees without hampering restrictions. We now have an opportunity to raise the over-all industrial efficiency of this country and at the same time clear out much of the obsolete equipment that will have no place in a highly competitive future.

Deduction of Life-Insurance Premiums From Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter from Mr. L. C. Mersfelder, State manager of Kansas City Life Insurance Co.:

KANSAS CITY LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., December 13, 1943.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I have just read with a great deal of interest your news release of November 27, 1943, regarding your introduction of H. R. 3736, providing for deduction of life-insurance premiums from income-tax returns. To me this is very, very important legislation.

I consider the dollars a father and husband puts into life insurance to help keep his widow and orphans from charity institutions just as sacred as the dollars he contributes in the name of charity to help the unfortunate widows and orphans of others who have already been forced to seek such charity relief. Therefore, I heartily favor your H. R. 3736, which is devised to remedy injustice.

The principle is fundamentally sound and will strike a responsive cord in the heart of the average American to a greater extent than any legislation proposed in a generation.

In this office, we service over 19,000 citizens of this State and I know that I speak their sentiments in my hearty approval of this important measure.

The people of Oklahoma will deeply appreciate your efforts in behalf of this all-important measure.

Sincerely yours,

MERSFELDER AGENCY,
KANSAS CITY LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
L. C. MERSFELDER, *State Manager.*

Senator McKellar's Voting Record on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have received several letters concerning my labor record. I have had the accomplished Librarian of the Senate, Mr. McArdle, prepare an epitome of that record, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MCKELLAR'S VOTING RECORD ON LABOR LEGISLATION BOTH AS A REPRESENTATIVE AND A SENATOR IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1911–43

KENNETH DOUGLAS MCKELLAR was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-second Congress, second session, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. George W. Gordon, and Mr. MCKELLAR took the oath of office on December 4, 1911. He was reelected to the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses and served from date of his election until March 3, 1917; he did not seek reelection as a Representative in 1916, but became a candidate for United States Senator that year and was elected, for the term beginning March 4, 1917; he took the oath as Senator March 5, 1917, to which office he has been successively reelected and holds at the present time.

Senator MCKELLAR entered the Senate with the inception of World War No. 1 and was an able and loyal supporter of President Wilson in his conduct of the war, as he was of the Democratic administration's domestic policies while he was a Representative. An idealist by nature, he has kept step with the march of progress, his eyes on the stars, but has always kept his feet on solid ground. A liberal Democrat by choice, he has supported all humanitarian measures whenever they were in the best interest of the common country. In thought and action he has been independent, voting as his conscience dictates, and has not hesitated to vote to override vetoes of Presidents when he felt that his course was in the best interest of the country.

Senator MCKELLAR, both while in the House and Senate, has been a consistent and loyal friend of labor and has sponsored and voted for many measures in the interest of the working classes, as his record will show. He has not, however, hesitated to vote for legislation which he found necessary to regulate the conduct of strikes which may impede or be hurtful to the war effort.

Mr. MCKELLAR has been a loyal supporter of President ROOSEVELT in carrying out his domestic policies and in the conduct of the present war.

The following record of Senator MCKELLAR's votes on important legislation will reflect his attitude on these public questions:

LABOR'S MAGNA CARTA—CLAYTON ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL, H. R. 23635

Sixty-third Congress, second session, June 5, 1912: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 15657, "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and moncpolies, and for other purposes." The so-called Clayton Anti-Trust Act—Labor's Magna Carta—Act of October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731), section 6 of which declares "That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce * * *". Bill passed House May 14, 1912. Senator MCKELLAR voted "Yea."

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Sixty-second Congress, second session, February 9, 1912: Vote on consideration of bill 252, "To establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a Bureau to be known as the Children's Bureau." Bill passed House same day by a division vote, no roll call. "Yea."

LABOR'S MAGNA CARTA—CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACT, H. R. 15657

Sixty-third Congress, second session, June 5, 1914: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 15657), so-called Clayton Antitrust Act, "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes." This is the act referred to as "labor's Magna Carta." Act of October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731), section 5 of which declares "That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce * * *". Bill passed House June 5, 1914. Senator McKELLAR voted "Yea."

IMMIGRATION (LITERACY TEST)

Sixty-third Congress, second session, February 4, 1914: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 6060) "To regulate immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States." Passed. "Yea."

CONVICT LABOR GOODS

Sixty-third Congress, second session, March 4, 1914: Vote on bill (H. R. 1933), "To limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured or produced by convict labor in any prison or reformatory." The legislation proposed that all convict-made goods manufactured in any prison or reformatory when shipped into any State or Territory, shall be made subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State or Territory. The bill was intended to prevent cheap convict-made goods from being put on the market at prices lower than legitimately made goods can be bought for. Bill passed house. "Yea."

IMMIGRATION

Sixty-third Congress, third session, February 4, 1915: Vote on motion to pass over veto of the President the immigration bill (H. R. 6060). "Yea."

The House refused to pass bill over veto.

WORKING HOURS OF WOMEN, SENATE BILL 1294

Sixty-third Congress, second session, February 12, 1914. Vote on passage of the bill (S. 1294), "To regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia." Bill passed. Mr. McKELLAR voted. "Yea."[1]

[1] Reflecting his attitude about women who have to work, during consideration of this bill, Mr. McKELLAR said: "I am thoroughly and heartily in favor of this bill, because I believe it to be an act of long-delayed justice to the workingwomen of this city. * * * It is so obviously a just act that I believe if women had the right to vote they would have had such laws a law on the statute books long ago. Men have had an 8-hour law in nearly every State of the Union—probbaly in every State of the Union—and men who work for the Government here work only 8 hours, and yet here in Washington, the seat of Government, we have no law regulating the hours during which women may work. It is needless for gentlemen to talk about what women ought to do or what they ought not to do, whether they ought to work for a living or whether they ought not to work for a living. That is beside the question. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. The fact that confronts us in the face is that they do work, and they are made to work longer than men work, ordinarily, and that we owe it to them to fix for them reasonable hours.

CHILD LABOR

Sixty-third Congress, third session, February 15, 1915: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 12292), "To prevent interstate commerce in products of child labor, and for other purposes." Bill passed. "Yea."

Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, February 2, 1916: Vote on H. R. 8234, "To prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor," etc. Bill passed. "Yea."

IMMIGRATION—H. R. 10384 PASSED OVER PRESIDENT'S VETO

Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, February 1, 1917: Vote on passage of immigration bill over veto of President. "Yea."

STOP-WATCH SYSTEM

Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, May 22, 1918: Vote on amendment (to Post Office appropriation bill) by Senator Gallinger (New Hampshire), to strike from the bill the provision prohibiting the use of the stop-watch system. Amendment rejected. (The Senate refused to strike this provision from the bill.) Senator McKELLAR voted against the amendment. "Nay."

MINIMUM WAGES FOR WOMEN AND MINORS

Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, September 13, 1918: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 12098) "To protect the lives and health and morals of women and minors working in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum wage board and define its powers and duties and provide for the fixing of minimum wages of said workers," etc. Bill passed. "Yea."

AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FROM AFFILIATING WITH ORGANIZED LABOR

Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, April 3, 1920: Vote on amendment of Senator Myers (Montana) "to prohibit Federal employees' organizations affiliating with organized labor." Amendment rejected. "Nay."

CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT, H. J. RES. 148

Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, June 2, 1924: Vote in Senate on H. J. Res. 184, proposing amendment to the Constitution providing for prohibition of child labor. Passed. "Yea."

NOTE.—This is the amendment of joint resolution proposing amendment to the Constitution which passed both Houses of Congress in 1924 and is now pending, not having been ratified by the required number of States to become law.

MR. McKELLAR'S VOTING RECORD IN THE SENATE ON LABOR LEGISLATION, 1930–33

NOMINATION OF JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER (ENEMY OF LABOR)

Seventy-first Congress, second session, May 7, 1930: Vote on confirmation of nomination of John J. Parker to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Rejected. "Nay."

Senator McKELLAR voted against the confirmation of this nomination.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT—POCKET VETOED BY PRESIDENT HOOVER

Seventy-first Congress, second session: Vote on bill (S. 3060) "to provide for the establishment of a national employment system, and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system," and so forth. Passed. "Yea."

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF, S. 4860

Seventy-second Congress, first session: Vote on passage of bill providing loans to the States for relief and destitution and suffering from unemployment, and so forth. Passed. "Yea."

FIVE-DAY WEEK AND SIX-HOUR DAY BILL—SO-CALLED BLACK 30-HOUR WEEK BILL—SENATE BILL NO. 158

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 6, 1933: Vote on passage of Senate bill 158, "to prevent interstate commerce in certain commodities and articles produced or manufactured in industrial activities in which persons are employed more than 5 days per week or 6 hours per day: Yeas—53; Nays—30; not voting—12. Bill passed. "Yea."

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 5, 1933: Vote on amendment of Senator Lewis (Illinois), providing that the provisions of this bill (S. 158), calling for 30-hour labor week, shall not apply to perishable products of livestock, poultry, milk, or their products: Yeas—34; Nays—44; not voting—17. Amendment rejected. "Nay."

NOTE.—This amendment, as its author admitted, was intended to be in the interest of the big packers of Chicago, whom the Illinois Senator represented—not in the interest of labor; Senator McKELLAR helped to defeat it by a margin of only 10 votes.

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 5, 1933: Vote on amendment of Senator Goldsborough (T. Alan Goldsborough of Maryland, Republican) providing that the provisions of this bill (Senate bill 158), calling for a 30-hour week, should not apply to canneries: Yeas—37; Nays—43; not voting—15. Amendment rejected. "Yea."

NOTE.—The effect of this amendment would have been to exempt canneries in Maryland from the provisions of the bill—which the author of the amendment urged was necessary to the development of the canneries of that State. Senator McKELLAR voted for this amendment, no doubt, because he felt that helping to develop the canneries of Maryland was a very different proposition from helping to add to the swollen fortunes of the packing industry, which did not need help—and did not deserve it at the expense of labor in that industry.

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 6, 1933: Vote on amendment of Senator Joseph T. Robinson (Arkansas), providing a 36-hour working week instead of a 34-hour working week as provided in this bill (Senate bill 158): Yeas—41; Nays—48; not voting—6. Amendment rejected. "Yea."

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 6, 1933: Vote on amendment of Senator Hatfield (West Virginia), who proposes to insert a new section at the end of the bill as follows: "This act shall not apply to the following commodities or articles produced or manufactured in any foreign country: Tea, coffee, tin, sisal, rubber, fruits, not produced in the United States, and unmanufactured spices not produced in the United States." Amendment rejected. Yeas—39; Nays—41; not voting—15. "Nay."

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 6, 1933: Vote on amendment of Senator Reed (Pennsylvania), who proposes that no manufacturer who is bound by an existing contract to furnish goods or materials for a specified time in definite quantities shall be included by the provisions of this act in the shipments of said goods or materials or any goods or materials which it is necessary to produce to carry out the provisions of such a contract. Amendment rejected. Yeas—28; Nays—54; not voting—13. "Not voting."[2]

Seventy-third Congress, first session, April 17, 1933: Vote on motion of Senator TRAMMELL (Florida) to reconsider the vote by which the bill (Senate Bill No. 158) was passed. Motion rejected. Yeas, 31; Nays, 52; Not Voting, 12. "Nay."

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—RELIEF OF DESTITUTION—SENATE BILL NO. 812.

Seventy-third Congress, first session, March 30, 1933: Vote on passage of bill (Senate Bill No. 812), "To provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia

[2] Necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes." Bill passed. Yeas, 55; Nays, 17; Not Voting, 23. "Yea."

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING STANDARDS AND CONDITIONS

Seventy-third Congress, second session, June 16, 1934: Vote on passage of the bill (Senate Bill No. 3794—House Bill No. 9620 substituted), "To encourage improvement in housing standards and conditions and to provide a system of mutual mortgage insurance, and for other purposes." Yeas, 71; Nays, 12; Not voting, 13. Bill passed. "Yea."

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 143

Seventy-third Congress, second session, June 16, 1934: Vote on amendment of Senator LA FOLLETTE (Wis.), providing that "nothing in this resolution shall prevent or impede or diminish in any way the right of employees to strike or engage in other concerted activities." (Amendment proposed to Senate Joint Resolution No. 143, "To effectuate further the policy of the National Industrial Recovery Act." Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES BETWEEN CARRIERS AND EMPLOYEES—RAILWAY LABOR ACT: SENATE BILL 3266.

Seventy-third Congress, second session, June 18, 1934: Vote on motion of Senator DILL (Washington State), to proceed to consideration of the bill (Senate Bill No. 3266), "To amend the Railway Labor Act approved May 20, 1926, and to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees." Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

NOTE.—The House bill, House bill No. 9861, was substituted for the Senate bill, and was passed by the Senate the same day, without a yea and nay vote—by a voice vote; and the Senate bill (S. 3266) was indefinitely postponed.

RAILROAD EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM, S. 3231

Seventy-third Congress, second session, June 14, 1934: Vote on passage of the bill (Senate bill No. 3231), to provide a retirement system for railroad employees, to provide unemployment relief, and for other purposes. Bill passed. "Yea."

FIVE-DAY-WEEK BILL, S. 87

Seventh-fourth Congress, first session, April 8, 1935: Vote on motion of Senator Black (Alabama), that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 87) to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of certain articles and commodities, in connection with which persons are employed more than 5 days per week or 6 hours per day, and prescribing certain conditions with respect to purchases and loans by the United States, and codes, agreements, and licenses under the National Industrial Recovery Act. Motion rejected. "Nay."

WAGNER-CONNERY LABOR DISPUTES SETTLEMENT BILL—CREATING NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, S. 1958

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, May 16, 1935: Vote on passage of the bill (S. 1958), to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a national Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes. Bill passed. "Yea."

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT—RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES: WAGNER BILL, S. 3151—CROSSER BILL, H. R. 8651

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, August 19, 1935: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 8651, substituted for the Senate bill, S. 3151) to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. Bill passed. "Yea."

SOCIAL SECURITY BILL—OLD-AGE BENEFITS, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, ESTABLISHING THE SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD, H. R. 7260

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, June 19, 1935: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 7260) providing for old-age assistance and unemployment insurance. "To provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment-compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes." Bill passed. "Yea."

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, June 19, 1935: Vote on amendment of Senator CLARK of Missouri providing for the exemption of those employers who maintain or operate a plan providing annuity to employees which is certified to the Board as having been approved by it under section 702, if the employee performing such services has elected to come under such plan, etc. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, June 19, 1935: Vote on amendment of Senator Borah (Idaho), providing for old-age assistance at $30 a month for those 65 years of age or over. Amendment rejected. Vote: Yeas, 18; nays, 60; not voting, 17. "Nay."

Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, June 19, 1935. Vote on amendment of Senator Hastings, of Delaware, proposing to strike out title II of the bill providing for Federal old-age pensions. Amendment rejected. Vote: Yeas, 15; nays, 63; not voting, 17. "Nay."

HOUSING BILL—CREATING THE UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY—WAGNER LOW-RENT HOUSING BILL (LOW-COST PROGRAM), S. 4424

Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, June 16, 1936: Vote on bill (S. 4424) to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low incomes, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States housing authority, and for other purposes. Bill passed. "Yea."

HOUSING—CREATING THE UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY (WAGNER-STEAGALL LOW-COST HOUSING BILL) S. 1685

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, August 6, 1937: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 1685) to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes. Bill passed. "Yea."

LIMITATION OF COST

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, August 4, 1937: Vote on amendment of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that no contracts for loans, annual contributions, capital grants, sale, lease, mortgage, or any other agreement or instrument made pursuant to this act shall be entered into by the Authority with respect to any project costing more than $4,000 exclusive of the cost of the land and cost of removing old buildings, less value of salvage, per family unit of more than $1,000 per room. Amendment agreed to. "Nay."

THREE-YEAR TENURE

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, August 4, 1937: Vote on amendment of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, providing that this act shall expire 3 years after the approval thereof; provided, however, that all contracts entered into and all commitments made by the board shall be carried out by such agency or authority as the Congress may designate. Amendment rejected. "Nay."

LOW-COST HOUSING—EXTENDING FACILITIES, H. R. 8730

Seventy-fifth Congress, second session, December 21, 1937: Vote on passage of the bill (H. R. 8730), extending the facilities of the National Housing Act to insure loans and advances of credit to July 1, 1939. Bill passed. "Yea."

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, December 21, 1937: Vote on amendment of Senator LODGE proposing that the rate of pay for persons employed upon the construction of property covered by a mortgage insured under this title shall be not less than prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality, as determined by the Department of Labor with the approval of the President; and that adequate labor standards shall be maintained on all construction of property covered by a mortgage insured under this title. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

Fair Labor Standard Act—(Fair Labor Standards in Interstate Commerce), Senate bill 2475.

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, July 31, 1937: Vote on passage of the bill (S. 2475), "To provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes." Bill passed. "Yea."

CHILD LABOR

Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, July 31, 1937: Vote on amendment of Senator Johnson of Colorado, providing for the regulation in interstate commerce of goods produced by child labor. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

WORK-RELIEF—(RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF), HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 678

Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, June 3, 1938: Vote on passage of the bill (House Joint Resolution 679), "making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects." Bill passed. "Yea."

THE RELIEF BILL—(ADDITIONAL RELIEF APPROPRIATION), HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 596

Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, February 23, 1938: Vote on the passage of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 596), "making an additional appropriation for relief purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938." Joint resolution passed. "Yea."

WORKS FINANCING ACT—(PROGRAM FOR FINANCING RECOVERABLE EXPENDITURES), SENATE BILL 2864

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, July 31, 1939: Vote on passage of the bill (S. 2864), to provide for the financing of a program of recoverable expenditures, and for other purposes. Bill passed, "Yea."

OPPRESSIVE LABOR PRACTICES BILL, S. 1970

Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, May 27, 1940: Vote on passage of the bill (S. 1970), to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes. Bill passed, "Yea."

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS THAT IMPEDE OR DELAY NATIONAL DEFENSE

Seventh-seventh Congress, first session, June 12, 1941: Vote on amendment of Senator BYRD (Virginia), to Senate bill 1524, providing that strikes or lock-outs in industries that impede or delay the national-defense effort are contrary to sound public policy, and are condemned. Amendment agreed to, "Yea."

CONNALLY ANTISTRIKE BILL, S. 796

Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, May 5, 1943: Vote on passage of the so-called Connally-Smith antistrike bill (S. 796), relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense. Bill passed, "Yea."

LOW-COST HOUSING—AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT OF 1937, SENATE BILL 591

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, June 8, 1939: Vote on the passage of Senate bill No. 591, "To amend the National Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes." Bill passed. "Yea."

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, June 8, 1939: Vote on amendment of Senator TAFT (Ohio), proposing to reduce the contribution from $45,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year, and the total amount authorized to be cut from $800,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year. Amendment rejected. "Nay."

THE RELIEF BILL—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 83

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, January 27, 1939: Vote on amendment of Senator MCKELLAR (Tennessee) to increase from $725,000,000 to $875,000,000 the proposed appropriation carried in the relief bill. The vote was: Yeas, 46; nays, 47, and Senator MCKELLAR'S amendment was therefore rejected by 1 vote. Amendment rejected. "Yea."

NOTE.—Later, Senator MCKELLAR voted "Nay" against an amendment by Senator PEPPER (Florida), proposed to another relief bill (H. J. Res. 246), proposing the same increase of $150,000,000 as was provided in MCKELLAR'S amendment, because in the meantime it had become evident that the House would not agree to more than $100,000,000, over the $725,000,000, as provided in House Joint Resolution 326; so Mr. MCKELLAR supported that measure, as did the majority of the Senate.

MAKING A FURTHER ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR WORK RELIEF AND REFIEF, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 326

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, April 11, 1939: Vote on amendment of Senator PEPPER (Florida) providing for the appropriation of $150,000,000 for W. P. A. instead of $100,000,000. Amendment rejected. "Nay."

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF, RELIEF, AND TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT BY PROVIDING LOANS AND GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS, FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1940, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 326

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, June 28, 1939: Vote on committee amendment providing that 25 percent of the total costs of all non-Federal projects approved on and after January 1, 1940, shall be borne by the States. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, June 28, 1939: Vote on passage of House Joint Resolution 326. Joint resolution passed. "Yea."

SOCIAL SECURITY—AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, H. R. 6635

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, July 13, 1939: Vote on the passage of the bill (H. R. 6635), to amend the Social Security Act and for other purposes. Bill passed. "Not voting."

NOTE.—Mr. MCKELLAR was absent on this vote due to the fact that he was on a committee attending the funeral of Representative McReynolds, of Tennessee. For this reason Mr. MCKELLAR is recorded in the RECORD as "Not voting."

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, July 11, 1939: Vote on committee amendment to title V, providing for increased authorizations for appropriations for maternal and child health, vocational rehabilitation, and public health as authorized in the original Social Security Act. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

AMENDMENT TO ADVANCE TIME OF PAYMENT OF OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, July 11, 1939: Vote on amendment proposing that the monthly benefit payments to the aged provided under the law would begin in 1940 instead of 1942. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING—AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL NO. 1524

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, June 12, 1941: Vote on amendment of Senator LA FOLLETTE (Wisconsin), proposed to Senate bill 1524 (a bill to authorize the deferment of men by age groups or groups under the Selective Service Training Act of 1940). The La Follette amendment provides:

"The Congress hereby further declares that complete cooperation between government, management, and labor can best be achieved by the wholehearted acceptance of the principles of collective bargaining and the recognition of the rights of employees to designate representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of collective bargaining, without interference through unfair or oppressive labor practices."

The La Follette amendment was agreed to. "Yea."

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, June 12, 1941: Vote on amendment of Senator CONNALLY (Texas), proposed to Senate bill 1524, giving the President authority to take over defense plants if production were tied up by strike, lock-outs, or other causes, which would result in delaying or impeding the conduct of the war. Amendment agreed to. "Yea."

Hospital Facilities in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Department of Disabled American Veterans.

The resolution petitions for the establishment and construction of a national tubercular hospital under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, to be located within a 20-mile radius of the statehouse, Boston, Mass.:

Whereas there is at present a great lack of hospital facilities in Massachusetts and more particularly as pertains to beds for tubercular patients; and

Whereas it is particularly difficult and expensive for the family members and friends to reach Rutland Heights Hospital, we, the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, hereby—

Resolve, that we are in favor of and hereby respectfully petition Congress and the Executive Department to arrange for the establishment and construction of a national tubercular hospital under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, to be located within a 20-mile radius of the statehouse, Boston, Mass.

Votes for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley from the Washington Post for today:

SUITABLE LEGISLATION—VOTES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

(By Ernest Lindley)

Provision for voting by men and women in the armed services surely cannot, and will not, be left where the Senate left it by adopting the Eastland-McClellan plan. This is not a bill to facilitate the exercise of the ballot by members of the armed forces. It is a bill to leave them effectively disenfranchised. Few people pretend that it is anything more.

It is true, of course, that the provision of a Federal ballot, or its equivalent, to soldiers and sailors raises many legal and practical difficulties. The Green-Lucas bill may be open to question on constitutional grounds, although it is noteworthy that most of the best constitutional lawyers in the Senate voted for it or refrained from voting.

The argument that the Green-Lucas bill infringes the rights of the States has received a telling answer from Senator Carter Glass, one of the most stalwart defenders of State rights. Senator GLASS points out that there is already on the books a Federal law specifying that no member of the armed forces shall be required to register or to pay a poll tax in order to vote in a Federal election or in primary contests for Federal offices. This law was adopted in 1942—it became effective September 16. It was adopted by a vote of 47 to 5 in the Senate and 134 to 19 in the House. The conference report was adopted by the House 248 to 53 and by a voice vote in the Senate.

The vote on the anti-poll-tax amendment, which was tacked on in the Senate, was 33 to 20. Because the conference committee adopted this clause, Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, moved to send the bill back to conference, but was beaten 244 to 56.

Inasmuch as this is the law of the land, Senator GLASS writes that he "cannot see that the rights of the States are either jeopardized or in any way involved" in the controversy over the Green-Lucas bill. Senator GLASS favors giving "our armed forces away from home in the Federal service the right to vote in Federal elections for Federal officers under Federal authority and responsibility." He favors the Green-Lucas bill "without any emasculating amendments."

The 1942 bill proved inadequate. It struck down certain State barriers to the effective exercise of the franchise by the men and women in the services, but it did not go far enough. It did not set up machinery to facilitate voting. Under the 1942 bill only about 28,000 valid ballots were cast.

Congress has no higher duty than to facilitate the exercise of the franchise by the men and women who are doing the most to defend the democratic system, of which the ballot is the symbol. There are certain basic eligibility requirements which it cannot sweep aside. But surely it can see that all lesser obstacles are cleared away, that tape is cut, that ballots are placed in the hands of the men and women in the services in good time, and that they are returned to the proper dis-

tricts and fairly counted. This was the purpose of the Green-Lucas bill.

There may be other slightly different means of getting approximately the same result. If, as some of the opponents of the Green-Lucas bill maintained, the States can be relied upon to pass suitable legislation to enable soldiers and sailors to vote, they might be given the opportunity to do so within a fixed period. A Federal law might be enacted giving the individual States until May 1 to adopt legislation conforming to certain standards set forth in the Federal law. The States which met these requirements could then proceed to distribute their own absentee ballots, while a central Federal board would supervise the balloting of soldiers and sailors from States which failed to pass laws meeting the requirements.

In other words, the Green-Lucas scheme could be made to apply to all States which by a given time had not amended their own absentee voting laws to conform to the standards set forth in the Federal law. These standards should be approximately those of the Green-Lucas bill, requiring, for example, that ballots be mailed in good time and that provision be made for voting by party instead of by name. This last provision is necessary, because some nominations are made too late to permit the printing and distribution of ballots containing names to soldiers and sailors overseas.

Such a compromise would give individual States a chance to take care of the problem if they chose to do so, but would at the same time safeguard the ballot for soldiers and sailors from other States. The standards set for the States would have to be drawn carefully to assure that they were not evaded.

A straight-out Nation-wide system such as the Green-Lucas bill proposes, is the safest and most direct way of enabling soldiers and sailors to exercise their rights as voters. A substitute of the sort set forth above is surely the minimum which Congress can enact without shameful dereliction.

Proper Distribution of Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea resolving that the attention of the Office of Price Administration is called to the necessity for a redistribution of milk and its products and a revision of orders pertaining to civilian use.

Whereas the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea realize that the paramount issue of all America is the proper and successful conclusion of the war, nevertheless, there must be a proper distribution of milk so that the sick, the aged, and babies should not be deprived of the proper amount of milk: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the attention of the O. P. A. is herewith called for a redistribution of milk and its products and a revision of orders pertaining to civilian use. There have been reports that certain families have been deprived of the proper amount of milk for babies; and further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the O. P. A. and also Senators WALSH and HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., and Congressman LANE.

Anniversary of the Surrender at Yorktown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1943, I addressed the House briefly on the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the surrender at Yorktown, Va. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on that subject in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein greetings from President Roosevelt and other remarks and material which were a part of that occasion.

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution deserves the highest praise for the patriotic manner in which they have annually held commemorative ceremonies on this historic day and for their work in keeping Yorktown before the old and young as the symbol of freedom. I know that this great organization will recognize that I could never do complete justice to its noble efforts, yet I would do a great injustice to the Comte de Grasse Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, located at Yorktown, Va., and to its patriotic and self-sacrificing members, particularly the Regent of the Comte de Grasse Chapter, Mrs. George Durbin Chenoweth, if I omitted to mention them as worthy of especial commendation for their untiring efforts to keep Yorktown, its memories, and its inspiration ever alive before the American people and the world in order to secure our rededication to the concept of liberty and the ideals of freedom for which Yorktown will ever stand.

My mind reverts in glorious memory to those exercises organized and held on October 19, 1922, under the inspired leadership of the Comte de Grasse Chapter and presided over by Mrs. Chenoweth for the first time. For twenty-one years since that day she has presided over similar exercises and has become, herself, a part of Yorktown. By her fidelity, her inspiration and her unwavering loyalty, she has instilled in all of us during these passing years the conviction that there should be established at Yorktown some memorial to testify always to her labors even though those who have been privileged to work with her are convinced that, after all, Yorktown with its historic relics and monuments will ever constitute her best memorial.

On October 19, 1943, President Roosevelt extended hearty greetings through Secretary Early, and Mrs. Chenoweth acknowledged those greetings.

Greetings from me were read to those assembled by Mrs. A. J. Renforth, Chaplain of the Comte de Grasse Chapter.

Mrs. Chenoweth opened the ceremonies with remarks which were followed by the address of Mrs. William H. Pouch, President General of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and the speech of Captain R. D. Kirkpatrick, commanding officer, United States Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va., which is omitted in this extension but appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4592. There were informal remarks by Baron de Lustrac, a major in the French army who is commanding officer at the French Military Mission in the United States, located at New York City. His remarks were greatly enjoyed and were highly inspirational but they are omitted herein as I do not have a copy.

Pursuant to leave granted, I extend in the order stated the letter from Secretary Early for the President, Mrs. Chenoweth's reply, my own greetings, the address of welcome by Mrs. Chenoweth, Regent of the Comte de Grasse Chapter, and the remarks of Mrs. William H. Pouch, President General of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 16, 1943.

Mrs. GEORGE D. CHENOWETH,
Regent, Comte de Grasse Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Yorktown, Va.

DEAR MRS. CHENOWETH: The President desires to extend hearty greetings to all who gather at Yorktown on October 19 to commemorate the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. He hopes the event will be a patriotic inspiration to all who participate.

Very sincerely yours,

STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President.

YORKTOWN, VA., *October 26, 1943.*

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept our sincere thanks for the kind message you conveyed, through Mr. Early's letter of October 16, to all who gathered at the meeting of the Comte de Grasse Chapter, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Yorktown on Yorktown Day, October 19, in commemoration of the victory at Yorktown, October 19, 1781.

We believe that the victory at Yorktown "by which the independence of the United States of America was achieved" sustained for all times those fundamental principles on which our Nation is founded and for which American patriots are again sacrificing their lives and fortunes—this time for the freedom of all mankind. It has been a long cherished wish of the Comte de Grasse Chapter that Yorktown Day should have national recognition and observance. Your message to us on the 162d anniversary of the surrender gives us hope that a definite step towards this end has been taken.

It was our privilege again this year to have with us our President General, Mrs. William H. Pouch, of New York, whose office is in Memorial Continental Hall, Washington. She brought us inspiring knowledge of the wartime activities of our national organization. Capt. Robert D. Kirkpatrick, United States Navy, retired, commanding officer of the United States Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, was the principal speaker. He delivered an outstanding address, with special reference to the significance of the part played in the achievement of the 1781 victory by the famous French admiral, the Comte de Grasse, for whom our chapter is named, and the important contribution of our Navy in the present war.

With renewed appreciation, and best wishes, to you, sir, believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. GEORGE DURBIN CHENOWETH,
Regent, Comte de Grasse Chapter,
N. S. D. A. R.

GREETINGS FROM CONGRESSMAN S. O. BLAND

Today as never before we should meet in memory of Yorktown. I regret that I cannot be with you but I know that so long as her life lasts you will hold exercises such as these under the gracious auspices of Mrs. George Durbin Chenoweth who has done so much for Yorktown and who makes these exercises a religious service.

We are fighting today for freedom as our forefathers fought on these fields 162 years ago. The memories of the past will ever live, and I hope and pray that the ceremonies in commemoration of the surrender here may become in time an annual celebration. I earnestly hope the victory for freedom which we won in 1781 may inspire the victory for freedom eventually of all nations in the world and that some time the principles for which we fought may be universally accepted.

I regret that I cannot be with you today. Although I am absent in the flesh, I assure you that I shall always be with you in spirit and doing what I can to preserve the freedoms which we won here.

REMARKS OF MRS. GEORGE DURBIN CHENOWETH, REGENT, COMTE DE GRASSE CHAPTER, N. S. D. A. R.

Captain Kirkpatrick, Our Beloved President General, Baron de Lustrac, Members and Friends of the Comte de Grasse Chapter:

Today, my twenty-first program on October 19, I greet you with reverence for the occasion, and with many reminiscences of former observances of this historic date.

Somehow, my mind particularly reverts to that first October 19 for our chapter—October, 1922, when seven battleships were in York River under command of Admiral Hilary P. Jones. It was at that time, and it has been all through the years at Yorktown—the Navy, and we did well to honor that distinguished French Admiral, the Comte de Grasse, in naming our chapter to whom this Nation owes profoundest gratitude, and to whose descendants our chapter owes much for the many valuable souvenirs of the French Admiral which they have consigned to the care and protection of the Comte de Grasse Chapter in their museum established in the first customhouse in America—owned and restored by the chapter.

In October 1922 the Navy provided music and tea aboard ship, and speakers from the staff of officers on the ships.

The Chapter at that time entertained the Virginia State Conference, Daughters of the American Revolution. It was the first time our society as a body ever visited Yorktown. Your regent was overwhelmed with correspondence—inquiries from all parts of the State. Please tell me how to get to Yorktown. Today all roads lead to Yorktown.

To you, members of the chaper, all credit is due for the effort on your part to arouse interest in the observances and to perpetuating them as you have all through the years. These are a few of the results of that October 1922. This date has been kept sacred all through the years in the hearts of our people and of our Nation. In this, we have had the heartiest cooperation of our Representative in the Congress from this district, the Honorable S. O. BLAND, whose address some years ago, "Faith of Our Fathers," was without doubt the finest address ever delivered in Yorktown in tribute to our forefathers. Mr. BLAND cannot be with us today, but he has sent a greeting which our chaplain, Mrs. A. J. Renforth, will read later in the program.

We have had large gatherings in Yorktown on October 19 under the auspices of the citizens of Yorktown and of the Colonial National Historical Park. However, always our society, The Daughters of the American Revolution, have been active participants in these observances.

To you, Madam President General, we are deeply grateful for your presence today, and for your loyalty to Yorktown.

I am certain that Yorktown Day is now established and that future generations will carry on for us, and with this assurance, I know the day is not far distant when another victory will be accredited to our Navy, and another record for loyalty will be recorded in the books of history for our society, The Daughters of the American Revolution.

REMARKS OF MRS. WILLIAM H. POUCH, PRESIDENT GENERAL, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Madam Chairman and friends, it is an honor and pleasure to be here in historic Yorktown on this one hundred and sixty-second anniversary. No one can stand in this historic spot without a feeling of reverence and thankfulness for those men and women of Revolutionary days. Every inch of Yorktown soil should be sacred to Americans and it is a blessed opportunity on this commemorative date to gather as we have done today to think of those heroic men and women who gave their lives that America should be free.

In Faneuil Hall on Constitution Day this year the Sons of the American Revolution of Massachusetts entertained many of the hereditary societies. This was a most inspiring meeting and one could almost hear the echoes of voices of the past—of those men and women of Revolutionary days from whom we will always be thankful.

Let us pray that we of this day and age may be imbued with their noble sentiments and enthusiasm for the right. It was in this very building in Dock Square, known as the Cradle of Liberty, that men talked about independence and freedom. They did more than talk—they acted, and gave their all, their homes, their fortunes, and their lives, that Americans might be free to follow their individual inclinations.

We, the inheritors of that liberty and freedom which they gained, should all be very careful of what we allow anyone or any group to do to curtail that liberty and the "four-freedoms" mentioned in the Bill of Rights. Every patriot will again sacrifice and give his or her life, if necessary, to preserve the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom of assembly, and the freedom of religion.

These are the "four freedoms" which we, the Daughters of the American Revolution, intend to keep inviolate and which our members will preserve and protect to the full extent of their powers.

Our feeling is the same regarding our wonderful Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

We believe, as does every American, that our Government and our way of living is the best for us—but we must be careful in this day of post-war planning that we do not consider ourselves omnipotent and all-wise. It is not reasonable for us to endeavor to impose our successful form of government upon other nations whose religion, living conditions, and outlook on life are so very different from those which we enjoy.

Is it wise for any one or group of persons to decide what conditions are best for citizens of other lands whose present ideas and backgrounds are so unfamiliar to the men and women of this country?

It is because of such circumstances that we Daughters of the American Revolution have appointed a peace-planning committee under the able direction of our organizing secretary general, Miss Marion Mullins, of Texas.

We believe, as does she, that education regarding the peoples and countries is necessary so that we may know to some degree just what led up to the war of 25 years ago, and now to this frightful one of the present.

In this connection, a list of books for chapter discussion has been compiled which we feel certain will prove interesting and of great value of our society.

We will do well if we study the remarks and talks given by Winston Churchill and Governors and Senators and men of wide experience in the customs and policies of other nations.

We are very certain that our American women will and must have a voice in plans for peace.

One young girl said to me, "You know, Aunt Helen, it is we young people who are fighting this war, and we are going to have something to say about the peace plans when it is over."

When we consider the thousands of WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and WAMS who are giving grand service to the country by releasing men who can go into the thick of the fight, we must admit their right to at least express an opinion about the kind of peace we shall have.

What about those heroic nurses, nurses' aides, and the unsurpassed devoted service of the Red Cross workers and those in similar organizations of mercy?

The story told of the nurse who, having never before been in a plane, flew back and forth with the hospital plane down in the Solomons, the only one to care for over 40 wounded men, should go down in history as a truly wonderful service.

Women everywhere are working in machine shops, shipyards, railroad yards, aircraft factories, munitions plants, and steel mills and foundries. Many of our members are doing similar things. They drive trucks and busses and ambulances in the war zones. They are part of the war.

Our 150,000 members are all doing their part in active service and on the home front. They sew and roll bandages, give their blood for the greatest blessing of the century—blood plasma. They raise money for ambulances, mobile units, blood centers, station wagons, and surgical and medical equipment for the armed forces; send clubmobiles overseas and in out of the way camps and provide entertainment and hospitality for the enlisted men and officers throughout the country in U. S. O. and recreation centers.

Day and night the womanpower never rests. It is keeping abreast of the men by giving its strength of mind and body in active service; sacrificing all comforts—encouraging the men at the front by the knowledge that their womenfolks are behind and with them in this global war.

What is it we are all fighting for?

We are fighting for the privilege of living our lives as we choose.

Fighting to keep our homes and our women safe from the ruthless enemy who would degrade and destroy all home life and shatter the future safety of our children and young people.

We are fighting for our flag which has protected our men in these long months of savage warfare.

Fighting to preserve that flag whose stars and stripes have also protected men and women of other lands who came to America for refuge and happiness when they found their homeland too dangerous and despotic.

Who can ever deny the fact that America has welcomed and given of her bounty to all who asked for and needed it—until this generosity was abused and America betrayed by those whom she had sheltered.

What are our men and women fighting for? They are fighting to keep inviolate the Constitution of the United States of America and the Bill of Rights which give us privileges

and opportunities for development and independence such as no other nation possesses.

This independence and freedom from oppression are gifts from the Lord and we must guard them with our very lives.

The future is withheld from our ken but we know that there are difficult days ahead for America and Americans.

There are problems concerning France, India, Finland, Poland, and other nations which must be solved.

How is it possible to have a world peace which will satisfy all countries?

When peace has come how can it be enforced, and what part will the United States take in that enforcement in Europe, Asia, and Africa?

This can only be made possible by strength, adequate defense, and preparedness for peace.

We must maintain strength on land, on sea, and in the air in order to insure any security against any attack.

We must preserve our independence of decision—and above all, we must avoid entangling alliances which might restrict our freedom of action in world events. Peace by strength rather than peace by pacts will keep America secure. Following the peace, let us put our own house in order before we attempt to plan in detail for other nations.

Government under the blessed Constitution will keep our America still the greatest democracy in a republic in all the world.

This year of our Lord, 1943, finds America still holding aloft the torch of liberty, which was kindled by the fiery hearts and spirits of the men, women, and children of 1776. Let us not forget that our duty on election day is to vote for men of integrity, who think and act in the American way.

We shall remember always the bloodshed of 1776 and those who fell in the siege of Yorktown, giving their lives that we might inherit this goodly land.

They and those who died in World War No. 1 and in this war must not have died in vain.

We must work and pray without ceasing—for to God alone all things are possible. In these hours of trial which are with us and before us, we must beg for strength of spirit and understanding of our fellow men.

All things material will eventually crumble into dust. It is the things unseen which are eternal.

Therefore, with faith, hope, and charity in our hearts, and protesting with our utmost power the sacred document—the Constitution of the United States—and our glorious flag, we shall ever remain a free and independent people—a strong united American Nation.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks at Yorktown tell the story of Yorktown and show how clearly the struggle there is linked with the fight for freedom throughout the world today, and that Yorktown is a milestone in the unending fight for freedom which is coming now to a glorious culmination with a promise of freedom to be enjoyed by many who have heretofore never known its meaning.

May Yorktown carry inspiration to all the world for, after all, how eternally true are the closing words of Mrs. Pouch's most excellent address:

All things material will eventually crumble into dust. It is the things unseen which are eternal.

B'nai B'rith Record of War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the war service record of B'nai B'rith to date:

18,816 MEMBERS OF B'NAI B'RITH AND YOUTH AFFILIATES IN ARMED FORCES; 131 KILLED OR MISSING, 22 PRISONERS, AND 67 DECORATED

WASHINGTON, D. C.—There are 18,116 members of B'nai B'rith and its three youth affiliates, the Aleph Zadik Aleph, Hillel Foundations and B'nai B'rith Girls, serving in the Nation's armed forces, and of these 131 have been killed in action or in line of duty or are missing in action, 22 are prisoners of war and 67 have been decorated for bravery, Henry Monsky, president of B'nai B'rith and chairman of its national war service committee, announced yesterday in making public a statistical report of B'nai B'rith's war service record 2 years after Pearl Harbor. B'nai B'rith has a membership of 175,000 men, women, and young people.

The report also showed that B'nai B'rith groups had equipped 625 recreation facilities for the armed forces at Army and Navy installations in 38 States, in addition to 34 in Canada; 79 naval vessels being served with recreational and musical equipment and reading material; 46,000 blood donors provided for the Red Cross; $172,000,000 in war bonds sold; 171 Torah scrolls obtained for use in Jewish religious services at Army chapels, with 97 already dedicated, and 48,000 members serving in voluntary civilian defense jobs.

Other figures stressed in the report were:

Fourteen hundred members of B'nai B'rith serving in home guard and State militia units in 35 States; 3,500,000 surgical dressings and 250,000 sewed and knitted garments turned out for the Red Cross in 274 B'nai b'rith women's production units; 16,000,000 pounds of scrap metal and rubber collected in salvage campaigns; $700,000 contributed to the Red Cross and other war relief agencies since September 1939; 43 pieces of mobile equipment presented to the American and Canadian Red Cross; 350,000 comfort kits and gift packages provided for servicemen and women in the United States and Canada; 6,000,000 packages of cigarettes sent abroad to men in uniform; 1,000,000 books and games contributed to the armed forces; 1,250,000 servicemen in the United States and Canada entertained at B'nai B'rith sponsored parties, dances, shows, and other forms of hospitality.

Mr. Monsky also pointed out that the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations are now serving 128 college campuses with spiritual and welfare programs for thousands of Jewish student trainees in uniform; the Aleph Zadik Aleph is maintaining B'nai B'rith youth houses for community war service; the B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau is giving wartime job information to tens of thousands of youth and adults through its group vocational counselors and through the Career News.

In addition to Mr. Monsky, members of B'nai B'rith's National War Service Committee are: Maj. Elliot Niles, Boston; Leo Ascherman, Cleveland; Congressman Samuel A. Weiss, Glassport, Pa.; Herman Lewkowitz, Phoenix, Ariz.; Dr. Joseph Weil, Gainesville, Fla.; Bert Broude, Milwaukee; Gust K. Mark, Hattiesburg, Miss.; and Maurice Bisgyer, Washington, D. C., secretary.

A Periodical Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, having been granted unanimous consent by the House, I extend in the RECORD the following letter I have written to the general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

These extensions are on a matter of public concern about which I made remarks contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of November 4, page 9153; November 19, page A4979; November 26, page A5135; and December 1, 1943, page 10186.

The letter and editorial follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1943.

Mr. CRANSTON WILLIAMS, *General Manager, American Newspaper Publishers Assn., New York, N. Y.*

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: I appreciate your letter of December 13, calling to my attention an article in the Washington Daily News, Thursday, December 9, 1943, under the by-line of one John F. Cramer, apologist for bureaucratic bungling, who seeks to refute my charges in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 4 and 19, 1943, to the effect that Uncle Sam is the number one publisher in this country.

Mr. Cramer's article attempts to refute my charge by (1) showing that some of the items in it are out of date, (2) that there appears to be a few duplications, (3) that many Government periodicals are required by law. Through these arguments this apologist seeks to establish a justification for all Government publication activities.

In refutation, I would like to point out that I was very careful in my remarks contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to anticipate these objections, to enumerate them myself, and to point out that they beg the real issue which Cramer does not deny, namely, that Uncle Sam is the number one publisher.

To be more specific, in reply to Mr. Cramer's first objection that some of the items are out of date or possibly duplicated, I stated in my speech, "Of course, bureaus are created and abolished so frequently in Washington that any list is subject to daily change. * * * I could not be expected to get up a list of periodicals that would be correct to the dotting of an 'i' and the crossing of a 't.' That is Mr. Davis' job. Yet, I repeat, this is a more comprehensive list than any Government agency can furnish you this afternoon." In reply to Mr. Cramer's third main objection, let me quote from my speech a little further. "Some of these periodicals are obviously needed and are required by law. Others are not. I seek only to indicate the magnitude of this Government enterprise and to

submit that it needs review from the standpoint of wartime value and legitimate Government activity."

I think that the important thing in the whole picture is not that my list of Government publications is incomplete, which I freely admit. The important thing is that the accuracy of my charge the Government is the biggest publisher, that it has increased consumption of paper at a time when private publishers have been reduced, that the whole situation merits review from the standpoint of wartime value and legitimate Government activity, that this charge is not denied by anyone and, in fact, is admitted by an order issued by Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, who subsequent to my first charge has ordered a survey of the field and effective November 30 required that all Government publications be submitted to O. W. I. for approval in an express and admitted effort to conserve materials, manpower, and money. If my activity on this question helped to produce that order, and it appears to have done so, and if that order produces the results which public pressure and competent administration of it can bring, my efforts on behalf of the publishers and taxpayers of this Nation will have been wholly justified by events. If not, they will have been justified on principle.

I might, in conclusion, help to emphasize the inadequacy of my preliminary survey of the field and the importance of my insistence that consumption of paper by the Federal Government merits review by the responsible authorities of the executive department by pointing out some figures revealed by newspaper reporters who continued my investigation when I stopped at 441 Government publications.

For instance, an article in the Baltimore Sun, November 30, 1943, and read to the United States Senate at the request of Senator DANAHER (p. 10186, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 1, 1943), states in part as follows:

"A few days ago Representative BENNETT (Republican, Missouri), a freshman Member, after a one-man investigation into the matter, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 441 Government periodicals. He admitted that it probably wasn't complete but reported that no one, including Elmer Davis, Director of War Information, or any agency had a complete list. He was correct on both counts. But, from what O. W. I. does know, Mr. BENNETT's list was very conservative, for there are more than 600 separate publications printed by the various agencies and departments of the Government * * * In 1940 there were 226,000,000 copies of publications issued."

The O. W. I. is now apparently making a conscientious and effective effort to correct this situation. If its employees and their apologists will spend the time they devote to confession and avoidance to encouraging enforcement of the O. W. I. Director's new order, still more wholesome results can be expected.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

MARION T. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 3, 1943]

WASTING GOOD PAPER BY THE TON

When Government agencies that send out barrels of questionnaires for others to answer are forced to do some questionnaire answering themselves it's good news for weary businessmen. And if this dose of the agencies' own medicine brings about the reform Representative BENNETT is seeking, all taxpayers will have the right to rejoice.

Mr. BENNETT is from Missouri and he wants to be shown why the bureaucrats have to issue more than 600 regular publications, especially at a time when the Government is so sharply rationing print paper for other users.

So he has persuaded an interagency committee to put out a questionnaire with plenty of pointed inquiries as to the need for so many publications and what they are costing the taxpayers. According to the Public Printer, the Government used 161,000 tons of paper or 40 percent more in the last fiscal year than in the preceding 12 months.

The Government issues 9 dailies, 48 weeklies, 241 monthlies, and numerous other publications whenever somebody gets a bright new idea, such as brought forth 5,000,000 copies of Our Schools in Wartime, and the illustrated periodical entitled "Indians at Work."

In the latest issue is a picture of a Blackfoot Indian, sitting under a palm tree and perusing its pages with the remark: "Gee, but it's great to get 'Indians at Work' over here in North Africa. Thanks a lot." But his jubilation will hardly be shared by the palefaces who have to put up the wampum for this expensive publication and scores like it that are wasting thousands of tons of good paper every year.

Has Idealism Died Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Idaho Daily Statesman on December 11, 1943. This editorial is timely, as it warns the American people of the need to insist on those principles for which we entered this global conflict:

HAS IDEALISM DIED AGAIN?

Upton Close, who has four sons in the armed forces, declared the other day that the high idealism with which we began this war is now no more. As he put it, Roosevelt took over the idealism of Woodrow Wilson and this led to the Atlantic Charter and some other pronouncements; but all the while a bitter fight has been going on between the idealists and the realists. In the Roosevelt crowd, says Close, Wallace represented the former and "worldly wise" Harry Hopkins the latter. Hopkins won.

Hopkins won not single-handed but with the help of two famous gentlemen known as Churchill and Stalin. Close believes that Roosevelt has been struggling against those two hard-headed advocates of the status quo—plus a little more if they could grab it; and Roosevelt has lost. He has been forced to come around to their way of looking at things and that is why there has been such harmony in Cairo and Teheran. The idealism has perished, says Close, and "international power politics is again in the saddle" with the victors determined to get their share of the spoils.

Undoubtedly there is truth—we are afraid a lot of truth—in what Close says. It doesn't follow yet that the Atlantic Charters are to be completely scrapped or that this war is going to degenerate to a militaristic level with the spoils of victory the reward for Great Britain and Russia and China, and poor old idealistic naive Uncle Sam rubbing his perplexed brow and returning home to think things over. Nevertheless, we believe that the final results will not be far from all that.

And we're not surprised. We have pointed out—how many times we do not remember—that we entered this war as crusaders imbued with the spirit of constructing a better world. Russia entered it because she had to. Great Britain entered it to fight while she could to keep what she had. The crusader always loses. While he thrusts his head into a cloud and tries to scan the future, the realists scurry around to grab what they can while they can.

If we expect this war to produce more than power politics and spoils, the people of this Nation will have to demand more than that. If the President still clings to the workable part of the idealism, the people ought to back him up, and if he no longer clings to it, the people ought to make an effort to restore him to those principles for which we have believed or tried to believe we are fighting. If Russia gets all she wants, and Great Britain gets full status quo, plus probably some mandated areas to exploit, Uncle Sam will again have to bow his old gray head in defeat.

Personally we intend to get behind him if and when it becomes absolutely clear that all the idealism and high purpose are being carted off to the morgue.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's press there appears a full-page advertisement by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. It states:

What we seek is a coordination of interests between an established air line and our rail and highway systems. * * * Surely America's victory in arms through coordination of ground and air forces should point the way to a post-war policy of rail-air-highway coordination. If it works in battle * * * it will work in peace.

A lesson graven deep in the hearts of our doughboys is the imperative need for air power free of control and domination by the ground forces. Until America's air forces were given an increasing degree of independence, and were finally, in the latest Army organization, placed upon a basis of equality with the ground forces and were freed of subordination to the ground commanders, we fumbled and failed in the use of air power.

If this war has taught us nothing else, it has certainly proved that no country on earth can survive if its air power is absorbed into the organization of ground forces or is treated as a subordinate.

So in peace, if we permit surface transportation to control air transportation, we will invite disaster. An air line owned or controlled by a railroad will develop air transportation about as effectually as an air force controlled by the cavalry would develop air power.

Under the present Civil Aeronautics Act coordination of air and rail services

is governed through joint boards consisting of representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission, having jurisdiction over matters relating to through service and joint rates between air and rail or motor carriers. And effective safeguards are written into the law to guarantee against control or domination of an air carrier by a railroad, except in circumstances where competition would not be restrained and where the air service is supplementary to the rail service. Such safeguards are in accordance with our long-standing transportation policy to prevent a new form of transportation from being dominated and controlled by an older form of transportation.

In the pending civil aviation bill, H. R. 3420, this traditional transportation policy remains unchanged. A minority report on this bill, however, seeks a drastic change in that policy. The minority report advocates that railroads be permitted to engage in air transportation, through subsidiaries, without regard to the relationship between the air and rail carrier. It advocates that Congress depart from its long-standing policy and permit surface-dominated air lines. Such a philosophy is exactly the same as the philosophy which for so many long years crippled our air power by leaving it subordinated to and controlled by our ground forces.

Such domination did not work in battle—and it will not work in peace.

In striking contrast to the backwardness of our ground-dominated air force in the days before Pearl Harbor were the progress and growth in our civil air-transport system which had developed free from the control or ownership of surface carriers and whose independence was protected in the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Let this independence be preserved for our civil air power in the future. The need for independence from domination by surface interests has been proved in the fiery crucible of war.

National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Department of Disabled American Veterans at a regular meeting of the executive committee held at the State House, Boston, Mass., on October 9, 1943.

The resolution favors a national lottery with War bonds as prizes as a means of raising new revenue to bring about an early conclusion of the war and is a means of aiding the American taxpayers:

Whereas Congress must raise an additional $12,000,000,000 by imposing further taxes on the American people; and

Whereas the American people are eager to participate in games of chance which are now prevalent with no income to our Government; and

Whereas a national lottery is a voluntary tax which would help prevent inflation, and render unnecessary a Federal sales tax; and

Whereas the cost of conducting a national lottery could be reduced to a minimum as tickets could be distributed by United States mail and existing Federal, State, city and town agencies; and

Whereas lotteries have been conducted in the past with great success by some of our leading colleges, as well as many churches and organizations of all denominations; and

Whereas the Father of our Country, George Washington, clothed his Continental Army through the process of a lottery: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Massachusetts Department of Disabled American Veterans at a regular meeting of the executive committee, held at the statehouse, Boston, Mass., on October 9, 1943, favors a national lottery with War bonds as prizes, as a means of raising new revenue of many billions of dollars to bring about an early conclusion of the war, and as a means of aiding the American taxpayers, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, and to Members of Congress from Massachusetts.

The Jewish Problem of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by me before the Young Men and Young Women's Hebrew Association on Sunday, December 12, 1943 in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.

Opinions may differ as to the best method to rescue human beings from death and slavery, but we cannot differ in plan. I believe that the American people as a whole are completely convinced by now that the Nazi oppressors of the world mean the destruction of every human being they can reach. They wish to convert the world into a place where the Nazi rulers will have control of every human activity. All those who are not Nazis and all those who do not believe in the Nazi way of life are to be exterminated or enslaved.

Eleven years ago Hitler proclaimed this program to a world which did not have the courage to resist him and did not for a moment believe that he meant what he said. The people of the world were so convinced of the utter impossibility of carrying out such a program that they felt that no person in his right senses could believe in its possibilities.

We, of all people, have always been a patient and forgiving lot. The long story of Jewish persecutions and the belief that somehow and in some fashion rescue would come drowned our senses and made us oblivious to the real facts.

Hitler was determined to carry out his program no matter at what cost. It made no difference to this monster of humanity whether or not the world would aid him in his program or would put obstacles in his path. Hitler swept aside all obstacles. He organized the German people into a mighty military machine. He perfected the art of war. He created new means of destruction by way of the blitzkrieg and the ruthless destruction of soldiers and civilians alike.

He caught the world unprepared, and the world, instead of taking proper measures in its own self-defense, allowed Hitler to rise and organize his military machine without offering any obstacles to his boundless ambition.

Hitler himself in his book said that a big lie is better than a little lie, because a little lie can be found out, but nobody would believe a big lie. His big lie was the statement that Germany desired no conquest, was a peaceful little nation, that she just wanted to be left alone, and that she had no territorial ambitions. She just wanted the Germans to get together in one nation and that there was no desire for aggression on the part of Germany. This was the big lie which the world swallowed whole.

There were a few of us who believed that lie at the time, but the responsible statesmen of the world did nothing to counteract Hitler's preparations for conquest or stop the organization of his army and air force.

Mine was the small voice which was uttered in 1934, forewarning the American people as to what was in store for them if they let Hitler's ambitions go unchecked. But like all voices which were not popular to others, it was a voice crying in the wilderness. Like the prophet Isaiah, I went from city to city and spoke in the halls of our legislative bodies, warning continuously against the menace of Hitler. I received neither support nor assistance. Some of the people whom I am now addressing undoubtedly thought that I was exaggerating the danger. I remember very well how at a number of public meetings I was charged with seeing conditions too black and that times were not as bad as I depicted them.

Not in a spirit of "I told you so," but in a spirit of one who has been a champion of the cause, I now say that my worst fears were realized.

For 11 long years we gave Hitler the opportunity to accomplish his evil designs, and probably destroy all that was left of the Jewish people in those parts of Europe which have come under his sway.

Recently I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives known as House Joint Resolution 154, the object of which is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our immigration laws.

As you know, a conference was held in Bermuda last summer which sought to find some solution to the problem of refugees from Hitler's oppression. In spite of the fact that representatives of the two great English-speaking nations, our own and the British Empire, attended this conference, and in spite of the fact that these two nations offer the only means of a possible solution to the problem, this conference came to no conclusion and in many respects its work was extremely disappointing. The principal reason why this conference was foredoomed to failure, at its very inception, was because this conference immediately limited itself by proclaiming that it would not tackle the question either of American immigration laws or of the resettlement of a large portion of Jewish people in Palestine.

The very thing that the Bermuda Conference should have done was to find a way to save human lives through our immigration laws and through Britain's opening the doors of Palestine. After all, here we are, the two greatest nations on earth, each of whom had in its power some practical solution to the problem. Instead of solving this problem within the framework of our immigration laws, a swell as Britain's possibilities, the conference decided to omit these two possible solution from it program.

What the Bermuda Conference failed to accomplish, I set myself out to bring about,

at least within the framework of our immigration laws. I feel that my resolution suggests a very definite and immediate program, and gives us the opportunity of paying, at least some of the debt, which as a great humanitarian Nation, we owe to those who cannot otherwise help themselves.

I am addressing myself to you, both as an American statesman and a Jew. By accomplishing the program under my resolution, we shall be acting within the well established traditional policy of the United States.

It has always been the boast of the United States that we furnished sanctuary for the oppressed, and an asylum for those who were seeking to escape persecution.

About 100 years ago, in the famed year of 1848, when all of Europe was convulsed by revolutions which sought to establish constitutional governments in those countries which stuck to the principles of absolute monarchy, it was our country which offered asylum to the great leaders of liberal thought. Later on when Europe was again ravished by anarchy and when massacres were the order of the day in such countries as Russia and Rumania, we again opened our doors to refugees from that terror and permitted many persons to escape persecution and find homes in America.

Again in 1917, when our immigration law was amended so as to impose a literacy test on prospective immigrants to these shores, we saw fit to put in a provision in the law to the effect that people escaping religious persecution should not be subject to the literacy test. This provision proclaimed to the world our determination to act as an asylum for persons who escaped from religious persecution. In 1917 religious persecution was confined to Jews and Armenians.

This time, religious persecution covers a more extensive area in that not only Jews but Catholics, not only Catholics but Protestants are persecuted, and in general religious persecution today dovetails into other types of persecution. Racial persecution is as potent a weapon in the hands of the Axis Nations as it was in the days of Czarist Russia or when a benighted Turkey saw fit to persecute Armenians and others for their beliefs.

Hitler's policies were closely copied by his admirers and satellites. Whenever Hitler succeeded in attacking or appropriating a country he brought into this country his own ideas of racial persecution. All of the countries of central Europe and the countries of western and northern Europe which were overrun by Hitler's military might have adopted their own brand of religious and racial persecution.

There is, however, one difference between the type of persecution which Hitler indulges in and the type which his satellites have aped. Hitler knows no mercy. He has exterminated or is about to exterminate every non-German within his borders, except such people as he can use in performing slave labor for the Reich.

Hitler's satellites have not gone quite so far. They have denied human and political rights to their minorities, they have trampled under foot any pledge they had made in the peace treaties to treat their minorities fairly, but they have not quite seen fit to exterminate their minorities by massacres and killings. There is, therefore, this ray of hope left. We may still rescue individuals who have fallen under the tyranny of Hitler's satellites but who have been able to escape with their lives. Some of the subject countries are willing to enter into a kind of bargain with their minorities. They will let them go, provided somebody else will undertake to receive them and assume the responsibility of their removal.

This gives us the opportunity to show the fine and exalted spirit of America which has always risen to sublime philanthropy when the opportunity presented itself to rescue human beings from death.

I believe that the resolution introduced by me will go a long way toward this purpose, even though we cannot possibly hope or expect to save everyone of the many human beings whose lives will be snuffed out if Hitler and his cohorts have their way.

Hand in hand with the American solution of the problem, by way of a procedure initiated under our immigration laws, we should strive in every possible way to accomplish the repeal of the nefarious British White Paper. Britain does not own Palestine. She is only the trustee of that country for humanity. Britain was made a mandatory power under the League of Nations for the sole purpose of organizing and ruling Palestine in the best interests of the inhabitants of that country and not for the best interests of the British Empire.

In addition to that phase of the mandate, Britain is particularly charged in the very terms of that mandate to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Now, a homeland means exactly that. A land in which people can make their home. If there was reason for establishing this policy in 1917, when the Jewish people of the world did not suffer any extensive persecution on the style made fashionable by Hitler, there is so much more reason for a Jewish homeland in these days, when there is no other place to which the Jewish people can go.

It is ridiculous and futile to talk about establishing homes for Jewish refugees in Switzerland or Sweden. True, both countries have done an extremely fine piece of work in connection with this program. Both countries deserve our sincerest thanks for all they have done for Jewish refugees.

Switzerland has done all that could possibly be expected from a little country surrounded by enemy territory. Sweden has done an exceedingly fine job by admitting into its country all the Jews whom Hitler tried to exterminate in Denmark during his recent campaign there.

You see, wherever Hitler goes, or whatever territory he is about to relinquish, the first thing he does is to get rid of the Jewish population by murder and massacre. It all begins by herding the Jews into ghettos, and then killing them off in every manner which German brutality can devise.

The place in which the most horrible destruction of human lives occurred was the old Polish capital of Warsaw. In 1939 this city withstood a siege by the Germans which lasted some 3 weeks and only after the most thorough destruction of all of the city's streets and buildings, did the Polish people surrender to the fury of the German invaders. Thereafter, Warsaw was made into a central concentration camp for the Jews from all parts of Poland.

A ghetto was established in the city, separated from the rest of the country by an 8-foot wall. Into this ghetto were crowded all the Jewish refugees from every portion of Poland and all the Jews from Germany and other western countries were likewise shipped into this ghetto. Eventually the population of this small area was increased to a tremendous figure and almost a million people were compelled to live in the territory which was originally designed for less than a hundred thousand.

By July 1942, the population of the Warsaw ghetto had dwindled down through starvation and disease to about 400,000. It was at this point that the head of the German Gestapo, Himmler, took charge.

Hitler and his henchman, Himmler, did not want the Jews to die without suffering agony and the worst possible tortures. Himmler, therefore, paid a personal visit to Warsaw and supervised the massacres there. From October 1942 to January 1943, more than 300,000 Jews were put to death in the most horrible manner that could be devised by the minds of madmen. By February there were only 35,000 Jews left in Warsaw. Throughout the ghetto no food was available.

It recently became known that practically all the Jews have been exterminated in the various cities of Russia which Hitler overran in 1941 and which the Russians are now recapturing. Only a few days ago it became known how Jews were slaughtered in the city of Kiev, where the entire Jewish population was annihilated. I believe we will have to wait until the war is over to find out how many other Jews were killed in the cities occupied by Hitler like Kursk, Kharkov, and other places where Hitler still maintains himself, but from which we hope the brave Russian Armies will soon dislodge him.

So, you see, that there is no way by which the Jewish people can possibly return to the scenes of European carnage. The many hundreds and thousands who have been uprooted from their homes can only look with fervent eyes to the country which forever held a soft spot in the hearts of the Jewish people, Palestine.

True, the country is small and cannot hold all of the Jews in the world. But it is not our intention to transplant the whole Jewish race into Palestine. We wish to provide a homeland for the uprooted individuals who have no other place to go. This homeland can only be that country which today proudly carries the banner of the Jewish people.

Palestine is the seat of the Hebrew University, which is the center of Jewish learning for the world. Palestine has given rise to many industries which will not only bring prosperity to the Jewish inhabitants of Palestine, but to all of its inhabitants. It is not true that the Arabs of Palestine will resist a sizable immigration of Jews into the country. Quite the opposite, I am sure the Arabs will welcome the Jews and that the two nations can live side by side without any friction between them. The two groups can supplement each other. It can be said that since the Jews came to Palestine many of its Arabian inhabitants have grown rich and prosperous. The Jews have made that country bloom in places where it never bloomed before, and the Arabs have derived the benefit of this development. I am not worried about the Arab problem. I do not believe there is anything to fear from the Arabs. I think that some of these fears are largely imaginary and are stimulated by the enemy who does not wish the Jewish people to be settled anywhere and only hopes that the Jewish people will be destroyed.

We must, therefore, attack the entire problem from two angles; from the angle of our immigration laws, as well as the angle of the prospective settlement of Palestine.

Our immigration laws are sufficiently elastic, without any further amendment, to rescue many Jews from destruction. I believe it is the duty of everyone in this auditorium to communicate with his Congressman and ask him to give me his support so that my resolution, House Joint Resolution 154, may be passed by Congress, and that our enforcing authorities do all they can to carry out both the letter and the spirit of this resolution.

We must not relinquish for one moment every possible effort to let Britain open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration which will rescue those who are in a position to leave Europe by overland routes through the Balkan countries and enter Palestine.

The important thing for Jewish groups, in order to make our program effective in every way, is to strive for complete unity. Only by harmonious and untiring effort in the direction of a program of rescue can our groups accomplish the aims and purposes in which we all are interested. Let us have unity, for only in unity is there strength, and a house divided against itself cannot stand.

A Summons Against the "Kiss of Death"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Summons Against the 'Kiss of Death,'" written by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and published in the New York Times Magazine for December 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMONS AGAINST THE "KISS OF DEATH"

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, Senator from Florida)

The commanding officer of a big military installation was looking over a long, elaborate report of attempted sabotage in his unit. Glancing down the index, his eye lit on this item:

"Private Quirk, his great mind * * * page 122."

Now, it was Private Quirk who, while on sentry duty, had allowed the would-be saboteur to slip in. The C. O. was therefore a bit startled by the reference to Private Quirk's "great mind." Curious, he turned to page 122, and there read:

"Private Quirk testified that he had a great mind to stop the intruder but was too sleepy to realize the situation."

There have been obstructionists of our war effort and there will be obstructionists of our struggle to win the peace. Whether these latter succeed will depend on how many of us turn out to be Private Quirks—that is, with a "great mind" to join other peoples of the world in seeing that the peace is kept, yet "too sleepy to realize the situation" when those who would destroy the peace are at work.

These forces which would frustrate peace are preparing their attack now. The recent Moscow agreement dealt them a stiff comeuppance, but while it served to clear the air internationally, it did not fumigate where we need it most.

We who saw the League of Nations emasculated and peace dealt a death blow in 1920 can observe today, even as our country pays with the life of her youth and the heartbreak goes on, these same forces at work, this same hand raised and ready to strike. To let ourselves be lulled by the Moscow agreement, or by the endorsement of it by the United States Senate, would be doing our country a disservice as serious as that of a sleeping sentry.

It is well to remember that when the Senate overwhelmingly approved the resolution embodying the gist of the Moscow agreement, no sooner had the vote been taken than a leader of the isolationist forces was on his feet to block unanimous consent for a proposal that the resolution be conveyed to the President in the nature of advice.

Getting away from the language of Capitol Hill, what does this mean?

In the business of treaty-making, to "advise" the President and to "consent" to his negotiations with foreign powers are constitutional functions of the Senate. They require a two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting. The isolationist leader was quick to remind us that despite the 85–5 approval of this resolution, a two-thirds vote had not been asked, and therefore this was not "advice" in the constitutional sense. It was, he said, merely an "expression of opinion." He wanted that understood. And he refused to give consent to anything more than that.

Now, it would be natural to expect that a Senator who was so careful to prevent this resolution from taking on any legal or constitutional weight would be among those who had voted against it. Why vote for a measure and then insist that it have no real application? Yet you will find the name of this Senator, not among the 5 who voted nay on the resolution, but among the 85 yeas. You will find, also, among those 85 yeas, a number of other names that look out of place in that column, names of men who before the war had opposed our getting into it and after we were in it, did not cease to attack either the administration or our allies.

To those of us who are determined that the American people shall not be caught asleep at the switch in 1943 as they were in 1920, this vote-for-and-act-against strategy in the Senate was worth noting, and, I suspect, worth watching from this time on.

In the light of past word and deed, one cannot assume that the isolationist Senators who voted approval of the Moscow agreement did so of personal conviction. No enlightening angel has fluttered down out of the sky and touched them one and all, giving them to see the light.

It is harsh, perhaps, to point this out. But when the lives of future American boys are in the balance of what we decide now, I can see no reason why we should speak less than the full truth about those who endanger the peace, whether we find them on the soap box or in the Senate. It is only fair and accurate to assume that in this sudden turn-about after the Moscow Conference, the bloc which had been traditionally and consistently isolationist gave its approval to the Moscow agreement only because it had suddenly become politically unsafe not to do so.

This is important, because if we understand this we shall be on guard against any attempt by these same isolationists to sidestep their answerability to the people when the time comes to make a treaty and build a peace. We shall not accept political strategy for statesmanship. We shall not be beguiled by techniques. If we can look into their parliamentary legerdemain in advance, by exposing it perhaps we can prevent it from coming to pass.

With the way open at last toward the peace that we have so long sought, how can we safeguard it from this minority strategy, these obstructionist techniques?

Our attack on the problem must be both direct—that is by legislative reform—and indirect, through full expression of the popular will.

The direct attack, long needed in our democracy, is to put an end to the two-thirds rule whereby one more than one-third of the Senators present and voting can prevent ratification. As 49 Senators constitute a quorum, a bloc of only 17 have in their hands the power to negate any peace this Nation may negotiate.

In a democracy issues must be decided vote for vote. There can never be democratic rule where one vote of "no" counts for two of "yes." That is rule of the minority over the majority, and by no stretch of reasoning can the meaning of democracy be made to embrace such rule.

Approval or rejection of a treaty, therefore, should be decided by simple majority, and because these agreements with other nations are the supreme law of our land and are of primary importance to our people, the vote deciding them should be as broadly representative of the popular will as the machinery of one government can make it.

Hence both Houses of Congress should share equally in the exercise of this power, with a simple majority of the membership of each House carrying the decisive weight. Surely it is not too much to ask that the House of Representatives, the vote of which is essential to a declaration of war, should have a part in the making of peace.

The two-thirds rule was workable and valid at the time it was included in the law of our land. The treaties which our forefathers were called upon to ratify were bilateral and the purpose in most cases was to effect some temporary agreement—an alliance, trade pact, or the settlement of a border or fishery dispute.

Today, as in 1920, the treaty which will embody the peace of the world will be multilateral—that is, a settlement and agreement not between two nations but many. When America was asked to sign the Versailles Treaty 26 other nations were already signatory. So all-pervasive was it in the world of international politics, so deep in its application to our own life as a nation, that the older, earlier conception of a treaty, the conception that made a two-thirds rule seem wise, scarcely could encompass it.

The Senate received the Versailles Treaty on July 10, 1919, and held it until March 19, 1920—over 8 months, while 26 other nations waited for peace and our own Army of Occupation waited for orders to come home.

In the United Nations coalition there are now some 35 nations. When victory comes, we shall be dealing with several other world powers on an equal footing with us. In any task of statesmanship so large in import, so broad in the scope of interests involved, so burdened with almost endless ramifications, the odds that one-third of the membership of the United States Senate present and voting will find one reason or another for opposing it are almost overwhelming.

In a peace settlement of this sort, several elements that should not intrude themselves always do so. Party politics tries to make political capital of the situation in any way possible; intolerance and prejudice add their burden of obstruction. All these magnify the task of ratification—to say nothing of the more honest objections which occur to the legal mind, or the habit of some lawyers among whom it is almost traditional to disagree. The sum total of all these sources of opposition will almost always equal one-third.

But if one-third of the Members in the United States Senate are to be the arbiters of American foreign policy, then it becomes practically impossible for America to have a foreign policy. The objecting minority, when foreign negotiations come up for ratification, will shift in identities and interests, but so often will it exceed one-third on the most important issues that the end result is no foreign policy.

In this split-second world we live in, the time required for this Nation to act under its present handicap places not only our own country but all others with whom we would negotiate at an intolerable disadvantage. In the formation of a world agreement, our neighbor nations are unable to take our position into account in forming their own, for too often we can take none.

To make this change in our law a constitutional amendment is required. This means either that two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives must vote to propose the change, subject to ratification by three-fourths of the States, or that two-thirds of the States through their legislatures must require the Congress to call a convention for proposing the amendment.

The Senate cannot be expected to give up voluntarily its exclusive power under the law as it now stands; therefore the feasible course

is to see if two-thirds of the States, through their legislatures, will require Congress to submit the change to a convention.

Whether through this tedious procedure a change in the law can be brought about in time to meet the needs of the world crisis that is ahead of us, no one can now predict. But certainly that is no cause for resigning ourselves to an undemocratic decision of the greatest issue our democracy will face in our time. The thing to do is to try, and the time to start trying is now.

The indirect attack on isolationism—through the voicing of the popular will and the constant hammering of that will into the consciousness of our public servants—must go on at the same time that we are trying to change the law. We must see to it that those public servants do not, by virtue of an ancient anachronism not yet corrected in our law, attempt to assert themselves as our masters. We must see to it that they do not dare.

What can a Senator do, how can he kill something which he knows the majority of the people want and at the same time escape the political consequences of his act?

There are several techniques. Sometimes, for this or that Senator, the sectional interest of his constituency solves the problem. In the case of a peace treaty which embodies the hope and ideal of civilized man, the tried and true method is not to oppose it but to marry it, embrace it, smother it with words, and bury it in counsels of perfection.

Is this how the isolationists intend to deal with an organization of nations and its aim of lasting peace? When the time comes to say yea or nay to the age-old aspiration of mankind, will there be those in the United States Senate who will neither openly approve nor oppose, but in saying they approve, attempt to stifle it with fine protestations? Will they kiss it to death?

This is what happened in 1920. The so-called irreconcilables—those in the Senate who would under no circumstances vote for a treaty embodying the League of Nations and who said so in so many words—were not the men responsible for the final failure. They were not enough in number.

No; the Versailles Treaty was taken up in the loving embraces of men who were not its outspoken enemies and there gently strangled to death. The mailed fist strikes no blow so deadly as the caress of friendship demanding perfection.

When, against the will of the American people, this country was maneuvered into the isolationist position in 1920, the one mind that had most to do with directing the strategy in the Senate was that of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. Senator Lodge, leader of the Republican majority and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, more than any other figure of his time killed the chance of American participation in the League. Yet never once, in public utterance, did Senator Lodge place himself openly on record as opposed to either the League of Nations or to ratification of the Versailles Treaty. All that he required was perfection.

An unpublished prize thesis which is now held in the library of Harvard University gives some interesting details on Senator Lodge's role and his attitude. It is entitled "The Treaty of Versailles in the United States Senate," by John McCook Roots, who interviewed many Senators and other leaders on this subject.

After Senator Borah had made his attack on the League Covenant, on February 21, 1919, Senator Lodge, according to this paper, said to him: "My dear fellow, I agree with you absolutely, absolutely, but we can't beat the thing. Eighty-five percent of the Senate are for it. The best we can do is to get changes that will emasculate it as much as possible."

Again, Senator James E. Watson of Indiana, in his book As I Knew Them, tells of an occasion when Lodge asked him (Watson) to lead the organization of the Senate against the League. Watson thought the League could not be defeated. He told Lodge so. "Eighty percent of the people are for it," Senator Watson said. "Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war and who imagine this opens a way to world peace are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it."

To this Senator Lodge is reported to have answered: "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

Amendment and reservation. In other words, to kiss it to death. Why, one might ask, should not those who are opposed to a peace treaty come out and say so? The Members of the United States Senate are honorable men. Why say they are for it when they would act to kill it?

There are three reasons: First, it is difficult if not impossible to justify an act by the elected representatives of the people if that act runs counter to the popular will. If the people say, "Let us try, let us go out to the other peoples of this world and join forces for peace," the Senate cannot well answer, "That is what you want, but we know it will not work. Therefore, we are denying you your will to try." No minority in its senses tries to say this to the majority, for if the minority, through some legislative technicality, really has the power of enforcing its will, it is doing and saying what the ruling cliques in Germany and Japan do and say: "We know better than the people. Our will must prevail over theirs." That is one of the tenets of fascism. Senators are honorable men. They do not resort to the tenets of fascism.

The second reason for kissing the peace to death instead of coming out in battle formation against it is the political price. In an issue as important as this, few Senators, even in the isolationist bloc, are willing to face the music. This was true 24 years ago and it remains true today. In a letter to George Harvey about the Republican platform in 1920, Senator Lodge wrote:

"I want to get the convention to give a full approval of all that the Republican Senators did, drawing no distinctions between their differing opinions as to the final result. That is, I seek to make my speech, and I hope the platform, so broad that those of us who have fought the treaty for a year in the Senate can all stand upon it (the platform) without any difficulty."

The third reason for an isolationist approach to the peace treaty "by way of amendment and reservation" is that by amending and "reserving" the very life and meaning out of any treaty which originally embodied real peace, by hedging and mutilating it so that it must finally be unacceptable to the administration which has initiated it, the responsibility for rejecting the finished product is thus shifted from the wreckers to the wrecked. In 1920 the party opposition wanted the satisfaction of seeing President Wilson kill his own creature. If a treaty is so altered as to subvert the peace rather than insure it, then it is the Executive who must reject the treaty. Thus, today, the minority in the legislative branch which has done the real damage hopes to crawl out from under.

The enlightened electorate of America must not let this happen again. Much depended on its not happening a generation ago—how very much, we are learning in the tragic terms of blood, sweat, and tears today. Too much, a generation hence, depends on its not happening now.

I am confident of our electorate. I do not think our people will allow the isolationist minority to get away with it again. I do not think any of the old tricks are going to work.

But to prevent, we shall have to keep hammering away, to confront that isolationist bloc again and again with the strong, simple mandate of a people whose minds are made up. We shall have to let our Senators know that they will be held accountable, "yea" or "nay"; that none of them can escape that clear-cut issue by dodging into realms of perfectionism; that "amendment and reservation" are not avenues of sabotage, and that any attempt to use them as such will be recognized and punished accordingly.

We, the American people, have "a great mind" to end war. To that, let us now add an unshakable will and a sharp eye.

District of Columbia-Virginia Boundary Line

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about H. R. 3664, a bill which according to its title is for the purpose of establishing a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia and other purposes. That title to me seems to imply considerably more than some of the claimed difficulties over criminal jurisdiction.

I have made some study of this matter and I am worried about constitutional questions involved in it. Therefore, I feel the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

It is generally felt that the District-Virginia boundary line was established many years ago by what is known as the Potomac Flats case, and it has been recognized since in numerous decisions. There have been many attempts made recently to make some change in that boundary, based on various excuses. The fact remains, however, that I feel that the line still is "The high-water mark of 1791 on the Virginia side of the Potomac," as clearly recognized and stated in the House report.

The reason I participated in holding up the passage of this legislation recently on the grounds of constitutional questions is that the District of Columbia is fixed by the Constitution. But many years ago—long before the Potomac Flats decision—some of the original area of the District was ceded back to Virginia. One of the grounds urged for the passage of H. R. 3664 is that the State of Virginia has passed a related act, designed to fit a proposed act of Congress. It would seem certain that in these circumstances if there is any question of passage of land to Virginia under the act if passed, it will be claimed that the State and the Federal act taken to-

gether will amount to a cession of land from the Federal Government to Virginia, notwithstanding the bill does not appear to provide for that.

In recent years, due to Government work and heavy expenditures, there has been much land filled in and reclaimed on the Virginia side; and it seems safe to assume reclaimed land may lie on both sides of the line established at the high-water mark of 1791. The reclaimed land includes construction of the Washington-Alexandria-Mount Vernon Boulevard, the National Airport, representing a $16,000,000 investment, and other improvements. It may be that reclaimed land is included which is not part of or necessary to any of the Government projects.

For these many reasons I feel that the bill is too important to pass hurriedly in the House and should have further study by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Since this matter has come up, some interesting questions have been asked, and I include them in my representation for the information of the House:

"What difference is there, if any, between the 'present mean high-water mark' as used in the bill and the high-water mark of 1791 as fixed by the Supreme Court of the United States?

"Does not section 102 expressly provide for the cession of land to the Commonwealth of Virginia, in line with the change in the boundary line?

"Why could not Coast and Geodetic Survey mark suitable boundaries on the 1791 high-water mark course, and let it go at that?

"Retention of jurisdiction merely over the boulevard and National Airport—apparently for criminal purposes—might imply that title to those properties, now in the Federal Government, may be expected to pass to Virginia—something unheard of. The old road constructed from the District line through Virginia to Fort Humphries, in World War No. 1, remained in the Federal Government, with criminal jurisdiction over it, and still does, so far as I am advised. That is in keeping with other acts giving criminal jurisdiction over Federal properties, of which we now have far too many.

"Why should we give the land to Virginia, as the bill apparently would, and then 'accept' jurisdiction over such as the State might see fit to hand back to the Government?—Section 201, Miscellaneous.

"Is not the bill objectionable for having multiple objects? It deals with boundary, acceptance of jurisdiction from the State, the division of the State into different judicial districts, and the like.

"If the Government has reclaimed any land between the river and the high-water mark of 1791, fixed by the Supreme Court, certainly there is no sense in giving any of it to Virginia.

"If some of the reclaimed land lies above the 1791 mark, why the necessity for ceding it to Virginia?

"Many other questions suggest themselves, but the bill has an odor hardly to be ignored—it should be studied.

"Why was the bill, in the first instance, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, rather than to the Judiciary Committee? It deals with constitutional matters, and with matters affecting the Federal courts of Virginia."

Railroad Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post December 16, 1943:

RAILROAD PROTEST

Sixteen railroads and terminal companies have announced that it is "impracticable and impossible" for them to bring their hiring policies into conformity with democratic principles. They were directed to do so by the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. Their response reveals an arrogant and cynical contempt for the Committee's purposes, as well as for its authority. They do not evince even a desire to cooperate. They have not denied that their hiring and promotion policies discriminate against Negroes. The simple fact is that for years they have had an agreement with the railroad brotherhoods to decrease the number of Negro firemen and give their jobs to white workers. As a result, Negroes have been progressively squeezed out of a type of employment in which they have been traditionally engaged for 50 years.

The brotherhoods are, of course, no less to blame than the railroad managements. This is not a racial issue. It entails no question of displacing whites with Negroes. It is a matter of the monopoly control of jobs by a union working in cahoots with its employers. The degree to which the employers have entered into the conspiracy is manifested by their distortion of the issue at stake. They argue that fair employment of Negroes would disrupt peaceful relations with their employees and antagonize the traveling public. This is a conjuring up of bugbears. For half a century white workers and travelers have been accustomed to Negro firemen on the railroads.

But jobs for firemen—the nub of the problem because these are the jobs Negroes want and are trained to fill—are ignored by the complaining carriers. Instead, they dwell on the possibility that Negroes might want to become engineers or conductors. Even such eminence, one might suppose, ought to be open to workers in a democratic society without regard to race, creed, or color. At the moment, however, it does not happen to be a real problem. The problem is to make available to Negroes jobs as firemen and trainmen—jobs for which they are qualified and in which the exigencies of the war effort make them urgently needed. There is a real shortage of workers for such jobs. We could give greater credence to the good faith of the railroads if they cooperated with the F. E. P. C. in persuading the brotherhoods to cease discrimination against Negroes in these categories.

What the F. E. P. C. has demanded is by no means unrealistic. This is borne out by the fact that four important railroads—the Virginian, the Pennsylvania, the Union Pacific, and the New York Central—have moved to comply with its directive. In wartime we cannot permit prejudices or monopolies to keep skilled and willing workers out of essential jobs. As a democracy, we cannot, at any time, permit racial intolerance to govern our economic opportunities. The F. E. P. C. has come to grips courageously with a tough problem. It should have the full support, against the obstructionism it has encountered, of the whole Federal Government and the American public.

Mustering-Out Pay for Members of Our Armed Forces

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the time has come for Congress to enact legislation offering a guaranty and a protection for our fighting men as they are released from military service. There is, however, no justification in the charge that Congress has been remiss in presenting and enacting legislation toward that end. The distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has made it manifest to all who would charge this body unjustly that the House of Representatives has been foresighted and thorough in making provisions for the many problems and contingencies which the fighting man, by reason of his service, is subject to. Strong criticism has been made without justification that this body has been remiss and this criticism has certainly not taken into consideration the careful and complete provisions that have been enacted.

However, it is now apparent, as I say, that the question of mustering-out pay for discharged servicemen must be studied and the same thorough and comprehensive treatment of the problem involved must result. To have attempted to formulate just provisions previously would have been premature and might have resulted in inconsistencies and piecemeal legislation.

But now the problem has come to a head and now is the time for action. I do not want to recommend hasty and ill-considered action resulting from the often overbearing insistence of extraneous organizations and would-be benefactors of our servicemen. Hasty action would reap a poor harvest of inequities and injustices. But the attention of the Nation and our fighting men is focused on this issue; we have had time to study the ramifications and intent of the various measures which have been proposed and studied.

We should strike while the iron is hot and if this demands extra effort, then I am for it. Let us have night sessions if necessary in order to complete action before the end of the session. We have had sessions lasting well into the night in the

past when the nature of legislation demanded it. I believe that this does.

Approximately 900,000 men have already been discharged. The present rate of discharge is about 10,000 per week. This should not cause any panic or grave concern. Employment opportunities are good and the existing machinery designed to protect discharged veterans has furnished necessary protection.

But the year 1944 will be crucial. Casualties will be greater, as we have been repeatedly warned. The war with Germany will probably end victoriously and the rate of demobilization will be stepped up. The men themselves know this and look to us for action. A letter I received this morning from a soldier advised me that he spoke for his entire battalion in urging immediate action on mustering-out pay and other benefits. Let us not delay. The focus of attention on this question makes action now imperative, not that we should be stampeded, but that we should manifest our alertness and ability to act judiciously and quickly. Let us get on with our business.

Mustering-Out Pay for Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday during debate here in the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] referred to the veterans organizations as demanding hearings on an adjusted-compensation bill.

What the gentleman from Kentucky had in mind I am sure was the demand for hearings on this discharge pay bill. The American Legion is not demanding the passage of an adjusted-compensation bill at this time.

All of the veterans organizations, so far as I am able to find out, are very much interested in a reasonable discharge pay bill for the men in our armed forces. For that reason I am inserting at this point a telegram from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, executive director, national legislative committee, The American Legion, to that effect:

DECEMBER 16, 1943.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Representative ANDREW MAY, chairman House Military Affairs Committee, asserted on the floor of House, December 15, 1943, "The groups representing the veterans organizations * * * demanded hearings on an adjusted-compensation bill." Attempted to reach Congressman MAY this morning but informed by his office he is out of town. The American Legion would appreciate it immensely if the record will show that the American Legion has not requested hearings on an adjusted-compensation bill because our organization has taken no stand on this subject. Our organization on record as favoring the principle of strictly mustering-out pay as incorporated in original May bill, H. R. 3742. Would appreciate it if you would make certain this information brought to the attention of the House of Representatives today.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee, The American Legion.

Return of Japanese to the West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly made statements on the floor that the people of California were unanimously opposed to the return of Japanese to the coast during this present war. This resolution signed by three Democrats and two Republicans of the State Senate of California should be evidence of the unanimity of opinion:

Washington dispatches published here today that Army has already permitted the movement of Japanese back to west coast and some Japanese reported already here, and that the western defense command has adopted a policy of permitting Japanese evacuees to return to this area in opposition to the often-expressed convictions of the overwhelming majority of the people of California that no Japanese should be allowed on the Pacific coast during the continuance of the war.

The California State Senate fact-finding committee on Japanese resettlement, in session in San Francisco, unanimously and vigorously protests such action and policies. After several months of investigation throughout California, and the holding of numerous hearings, this committee fears and knows that the relocation in this State of the Japanese during the war will inevitably lead to violence and bloodshed, thus creating an excuse for the mistreatment of American civilian and military prisoners in Japan, many of whom are citizens of this State. Furthermore, because of the extreme difficulty, if not impossibility of determining the loyalty of any Japanese, foreign- or native-born, we believe that such action would further the dangers of sabotage and espionage, endangering the security of a vital and important military area on the Pacific coast. Peace officers of California in every hearing have strongly urged that Japanese be not permitted in California during the war period. We urge you to do all in your power to prevent any such unfortunate and disastrous action or policy as that indicated by the Washington dispatch.

Senator HUGH P. DONNELLY,
Chairman,
Senator HERBERT W. SLATER,
Senator IRWIN T. QUINN,
Senator GEORGE J. HATFIELD,
Senator JESS R. DORSEY,
California State Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement.
DECEMBER 11, 1943.

The Czecho-Soviet Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Washington Evening Star on the Czecho-Soviet Treaty:

THE CZECHO-SOVIET TREATY

The text of the treaty just signed between the Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Government in exile bears out forecasts of the document put forth in anticipation of the visit to Moscow of Mr. Benes, the Czechoslovak chief executive. The treaty is a 20-year pact of mutual friendship, assistance, and post-war collaboration, its general structure patterned after that signed a year ago between Britain and the Soviet Union. The Czecho-Soviet instrument is specifically designed to checkmate all future potential German aggression in eastern Europe. The contracting parties agree not to intervene in each other's internal affairs, this being interpreted as a promise by Moscow not to encourage Communist activity in the restored Czechoslovak state. Close economic as well as political relations between the two countries are provided for in the post-war period.

The most interesting part of the document is undoubtedly the protocol annexed to the treaty itself, whereby it is provided that "should any third power bordering on the U. S. S. R. or the Czechoslovak Republic, and representing in this war an object of German aggression, express a desire to join the present agreement, the latter will be given the possibility of signing, thus making it a tripartite agreement." Only one country fits that description. This is Poland. Diplomatic relations between Moscow and the Polish Government in exile have been broken for many months, chiefly over the question of the Polish-Russian frontiers. If the Russian claim prevails, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will have a common border, which will tend to implement more effectually the present treaty's military, political, and economic clauses. But the existing Polish Government in exile shows no signs of admitting Moscow's claim, so the likelihood of its adhesion is problematical.

The benevolent attitude displayed by London and Washington toward the Czecho-Soviet Pact would seem to indicate a closer understanding between the British and Soviet Governments on the post-war settlement of eastern Europe. Earlier in the war, London favored the idea of a central European federation built around the nucleus of a military and economic alliance between Czechoslovakia and Poland. Moscow, however, strongly opposed the idea, and it was dropped. There is evidence to sustain the contention that London did not initially look with favor on the Czecho-Soviet treaty as an alternative, chiefly because of its effect upon the Poles. Now, however, London makes no objection and indicates its approval. This is an important factor to be borne in mind regarding the political repercussions to the treaty which are logically indicated throughout eastern Europe.

H. R. 3677

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion has arisen over H. R. 3677 introduced in this House on November 16 by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. I received in the mail today an open letter to Mr. KLEIN published in the Southern California Business. Inasmuch as this is an extremely important subject at this time, I am asking that this be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that arguments on both sides can be available to Members of Congress:

To the GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK:

By introducing H. R. 3677, Mr. KLEIN, you have rendered a service to your fellow citizens as well as to your fellow Congressmen.

You have brought into bold relief a common fallacy which either goes unnoticed or is little understood when practiced in moderation. This fallacy concerns the relation of short hours and high wages. Admittedly it is confusing; its exposure difficult. But you have hit on the plan of taking a bad idea and expanding it honestly and logically so that the badness is apparent to everyone.

Perhaps we are too imaginative out here. We got to thinking how people would have reacted had you added 30 more paragraphs to your bill so that in 35 years after its enactment no one could work at all unless paid time and one-half for every hour worked.

Then we got to thinking, after hitting the zero workweek, how you could have added a lot more paragraphs, progressively increasing the rates of pay one and one-half times for the zero year, two times for the next year, two and one-half times, three times, etc. The expansion of the fallacy would have been just as logical and just as honest, but possibly your more moderate attack on it is more effective.

WHY NOT BONUSES FOR OTHERS?

Here's another idea: Why not introduce a companion bill to H. R. 3677 on behalf of another deserving class—the savers, or investors? They also are people. There are millions of them, mostly in humble circumstances, and their services are essential to industry and to jobs. On the average it takes $5,000 or more of savings to build plants and provide tools and equipment for every single job provided for a wage earner. Those who provide these savings forego many immediate satisfactions and sacrifice many pleasures in the hope of providing future income for themselves and their families. Of course, you know all this.

Your new bill, therefore, should have in its preamble something about providing greater happiness and a more abundant life for those who save and sacrifice, for those who invest, so that our wage-earning classes may have workbenches, tools, equipment, fireproof buildings, and good working conditions. Stipulate in your bill the maximum amount that any saver may put to work without a bonus, just as you stipulate the maximum hours any person may work without a bonus. Provide that any producer who wants to borrow more savings than this maximum must pay interest at not less than one and one-half times the regular rate.

POPULAR AND CURIOUS SUPERSTITION

Isn't this plan an honest and logical development of the notion that the abundant life can be provided by making goods and services less abundant? Or by any kind of legislative fiat?

This fallacy we are writing about and you have been working on is in the nature of a popular and a curious superstition. It is expressed in the trade-union slogan, "the shorter the hours, the higher the pay." The popularity of this fallacy or superstition is attested by the way the restrictive provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act are commonly accepted as social gains.

Proponents of this measure say, "It does not restrict working hours per week. It merely requires time-and-a-half pay for extra hours."

But if the time-and-a-half provision does not reduce average working hours then neither do fines for speeding cause traffic to slow down.

You probably laugh along with us at the insincerity of those who argue that this law does not restrict working hours. These very same people advocated the measure in the first place for the express purpose of reducing working hours per worker so they could spread employment. (Most of them didn't realize they were spreading unemployment.)

REMEMBER WAR PRODUCTION TROUBLE?

If we needed any proof that this law restricts working hours we would have to look back only a year or two. Remember what a time we had, after we got in the war, raising hours above 40 per week? We finally did it but only by resorting to wasteful cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, by reckless expenditures of Government funds and by radical and un-American extensions of bureaucratic controls over the labor market.

There is little doubt that the Fair Labor Standards Act held back war production 10 to 15 percent in 1940 and 1941. It is impossible to estimate what this lost production cost in lives. How much later the war will end because of it cannot be guessed.

Since then this act has been a leading factor in promoting costly and dangerous inflation by raising the cost of extra production. You certainly are right in doing everything you can to expose its fallacy.

Perhaps you and some of your colleagues in Washington and some of us can get together and portray successfully the only condition under which a reduction in working hours can justly be called a social gain. Can there be a true social gain unless it results from a well-performing economy? Can it be achieved in fact unless machinery, good management, the efficiency of the worker and other devices increase the productivity of labor so that employers in their competition for employees can offer lower hours as an inducement? Offer lower hours as an inducement just as they offer higher wages as an inducement? And isn't this the way the average daily and weekly hours were reduced by at least one-third during the century from 1830 to 1930? It's awfully simple but it's hard to get across. Higher wages and shorter hours are the result, not the cause, of higher production. No labor union, however powerful, can extract high wages from industry when the product per worker is low.

UNEMPLOYMENT SHARED BY COERCION

But it's no use showing how a real social gain is made unless we show how differently things work out if done by coercion, whether by Government or by trade-unions. Coercive restriction of hours is nothing but a job-sharing device. It compels workers with jobs to give up part of their employment to the unemployed.

When weekly output per worker is reduced, while Government or unions insist upon weekly wages remaining the same, restriction of hours increases unemployment. It raises labor costs per unit of output and puts more employers "in the red" thus reducing the demand for labor. Reduced demand for labor puts workers "in the red."

Coercive restriction of hours also adds to unemployment by creating industrial bottlenecks. When bricklayers lay fewer bricks does not the demand for hod-carriers and brickmakers decline?

We wish there were some way to show how this fallacy is the result of confusing cause and result. We thought of a story but maybe you can't use it in Washington. It's about Joe Doakes who became wealthy. He built a mansion, bought a Rolls Royce and took a trip around the world. He overspent and went broke. He also went crazy. For, wishing ardently to become wealthy again he borrowed some money, bought a new Rolls Royce and encircled the globe a second time. Thus by spending as he did when wealthy, he thought to restore his wealth.

LOTS OF JOE DOAKES' PROGRAMS

Joe Doakes' recovery program is like the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. It is also like all the other scarcity devices. Like killing little pigs and not growing wheat in order to keep prices up. Like trade barriers and N. R. A. monopolies to keep prices up. Like featherbedding and slow-downs to keep wages up.

For don't nearly all pressure groups reason about the same? Like Joe Doakes they say, "When times were good, then prices and wage rates were high and the working week was growing shorter. Therefore, to assure good times after the war, or at any other time, all we have to do is to raise wage rates and reduce working hours. Merely fix the symptoms of prosperity. Ignore the causes."

One fact can never be denied. Prosperity and high wages result only from high production. Restricting output means restricting prosperity and progress. It means narrowing distribution. The war has shown that more than 40 hours per week are necessary if the country is to attain full production. Any reduction below that point most assuredly reduces output and thus reduces labor's opportunity for high real wages and full prosperity.

You know, Mr. KLEIN, as every thinking man knows, that opportunities for human achievement are limited only by men's capacities for work. Perhaps we could, after the war, produce a 1930 level of living, including its poverty, on a 30-hour week. But who in the name of humanity would be satisfied with 1930 standards of living for American workers?

LET'S UNLEASH POWERS OF FREEMEN

For 1950 we will want levels of living that are 20 years ahead of what we knew in 1930. We will want goods and services as yet undreamed of. And no man worth his salt wants his opportunities for these—and more—to be restricted by laws which put penalties on work.

America can abolish poverty. She can show the world new levels of human achievement. Let's unleash the full powers of freemen to build the best they can for all the people.

Some day every worker may have earned and built a home of which any man may be justly proud. Every family may be able to afford the best of schooling for its children. Every person may have the chance to travel and explore which now only the few can afford but all at some time want. Then there may be none who is ill-clad, ill-fed, or ill-cared for.

When that day comes let us then take stock. If our scientists and inventors have run out of ideas for better ways of living, if our merchants can no longer offer us new enjoyments and pleasures, if ambition has

died down and men want only to spend more time sitting in the sun—then workers will not ask for higher wages. Instead, they will ask only for shorter hours and employers will have to grant their requests if they want to hold their workers.

YOU WANTED TO SHOCK US

A free economy will give workers shorter hours—if that is what they want in place of higher wages. But today workers want higher wages, even when it means longer hours. We believe they still will want higher wages after the war. As long as that is what they want, you will not wish to deny them the opportunity to get it. Neither will you try to trick them into thinking they can get these higher wages by reducing hours.

This is why we feel certain you introduced H. R. 3677, not to put a new law on the statute books, but to shock the American people into realizing the folly of scarcity policies as methods for promoting prosperity and progress.

Again, we say, we owe you our thanks for this public service.

How About Congress' Alibis on Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Blair Moody, ace reporter of the Detroit News:

THE LOWDOWN ON WASHINGTON—HOW ABOUT CONGRESS' ALIBIS ON INFLATION?—PRICE-CONTROL RECORD EXPLODES CHARGE THAT ONLY THE PRESIDENT IS TO BLAME

(By BLAIR MOODY)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—"Let him enforce the law," has become the standard alibi of Congressmen who voted—deliberately, politically, or simply because they didn't know any better—to kill hold-the-line subsidies, the only device yet proposed which in the current emergency can check a runaway cost of living.

This alibi is by no means confined to one Congressman. Several Michigan Republicans are using it, now that the public is aroused to its danger, as a cover-all generality to explain why their pro-inflation vote was not a pro-inflation vote.

Their story is that Congress has already given President Roosevelt ample authority to control prices, and therefore if prices rise it is all his fault.

"We gave him all he asked for," they say, "but he didn't have the guts to hold the line. Now he is asking for subsidies which the taxpayers will have to pay for, to cover up his own blunders and lack of courage."

IT ISN'T TRUE

The only trouble with this is that it just isn't true.

Congress has never yet passed a law which could prevent inflation without the use of subsidies.

On the contrary, the record shows that there has been strong resistance in Congress to every measure proposed to curb inflation, and that no such law has ever been passed until its provisions were so diluted with special provisos and tangled by complex exemptions that a really tough and effective job of controlling prices was all but impossible.

The record shows that Congressmen repeatedly put pressure on O. P. A. to break the anti-inflation line in favor of their personal favorites. While Michigan's former Senator Prentiss M. Brown was price administrator, more than 200 Members of Congress called at O. P. A. to get price boosts for individual products, and not a one ever called in behalf of holding the line.

Among those who tried to get Brown to break the line were included some of the Michigan Republicans now sanctimoniously accusing the President of "not having the guts to hold the line."

THE SAME ALLIANCE

The RECORD also shows it was the same bipartisan alliance of Democratic farm-bloc stooges and politicking Republicans that loaded the law with these "provisos," who are now seeking to smash the line against inflation, and who are at the same time complaining because the President does not enforce the law to prevent inflation, which they are deliberately or ignorantly trying to torpedo by refusing subsidies.

It is this same Republican farm block Democrat combination which continually burrows in behind the scenes in the War Food Administration to undermine O. P. A.'s efforts to keep prices from shooting up; and which because it cannot smash through the determination of O. P. A. to hold the line, has sought by law to remove control of food entirely from O. P. A. and place it under a food administrator, who would presumably be more amenable to farm bloc pressure.

The same crowd has just forced a House vote, due next week, on a bill to take all price control over oil from Price Administrator Chester Bowles and Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson, who are holding the oil price line, and place it under Fuel Administrator (Honest Harold) Ikes, who has been jockeying for months to win for the oil industry an inflationary 35-percent boost in the price of oil.

When these Congressmen, in the face of such a record, rise in mock horror to accuse the President of "not having the guts to hold the line," they are stamping themselves by their own acts as hypocritical.

PATTERN IS PLAIN

For the pattern of deliberate plan to smash down the people's defense against inflation is too plain to be mistaken. There undoubtedly are a few Congressmen who are voting with this grasping alliance of politicians and war profiteers without fully realizing the import of their acts, but such lack of perception scarcely commends them as fully qualified in intellect and viewpoint to represent the people in time of crisis.

The present Price Control Act is better than nothing, as is evidenced by the fact that price increases in this war are far below those of the last war. Some of the provisos which have made holding the line a much more difficult and complicated job are doubtless justified. One, for example, forbids the establishment of a ceiling price on any farm product that does not reflect a parity price return to the farmer.

"Parity" has for several years been a symbol of justice for rural America which went through nearly two decades of depression getting over its last inflationary war spree.

But even though some of these provisos may be justified, that scarcely justifies the men who wrote them into the law criticizing enforcement officials for not taking action which their own provisos specifically prevent.

UP TO CONGRESS

Since Congress decided to set parity and other limitations on the Price Administrator's legal authority to establish ceilings—since it rejected the Baruch theorum that the way to stabilize an economy in wartime is to stabilize it where it stands excepting only gross inequalities, and instead wrote into the law as an integral part of the Nation's machinery to stabilize the wartime economy a collateral goal of economy and social justice, such as parity—then obviously Congress must also make provisions for holding in check the changes which automatically take place as various products move toward that goal—either that or abandon the idea of holding back an ever-swifter increase of prices.

It is these provisos written into the law in most instances by the insistence of the very congressional clique now fighting subsidies, which make subsidies absolutely vital to avoid inflation, and which make the statement that the executive branch has all the power it needs to avert inflation without subsidies so misleading.

For no proposal has ever been suggested as to how the line can be held except by subsidies, and the alternative to holding the line is to let the cost of living move upward and adjust wage levels commensurately.

The bipartisan inflationist bloc knows this; any Congressman not intentionally an inflationist who has been voting with them has been sound alseep on the job.

THIS IS INFLATION

And this series of upward adjustments, which inevitably would speed up as goods grew scarcer and a flight from the dollar started, is inflation.

It is the sort of thing they tell you might happen to prices from the pressure of extra dollars in excess of buyable goods.

In this case it would be happening directly and would bring a painful squeeze to nearly all American families, and downright suffering to many much more quickly.

Now let's see just what the law says, and then set its provisions against actual conditions and see just what they mean.

When Congressmen ask, "Why doesn't he enforce the law instead of asking for subsidies?" they point out that the law directs a stabilization of price and wage levels "so far as is practicable" on the levels of September 15, 1942. They say to read section 2. The key sentence of that section says:

"The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this act through such department, agency, or official as he shall direct."

Then they ask: "What more does he want?" Isn't that as complete a grant of power as any man could ask?"

At this point the article quotes in detail the provisions of the law:

SPECIAL CONCESSION

Brown fought for an enforceable law, but the same forces which now would like to crack the price line by defeating subsidies had enough strength then to block any law which did not have the following special concession to the farm bloc:

"No maximum price shall be established or maintained below the highest of any of the following prices: One hundred and ten percent of parity; * * * the prevailing market price on December 15, 1941 * * * or the average price for such commodity during the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929."

This, mind you, was supposed to be a bill to control, not promote, inflation. Yet it specifically forbid any ceiling on any food below a level 10 percent above the parity sliding scale which had so long been held forth as almost utopian.

This 110-percent clause made food ceilings practically unenforceable, since parity itself

for any crop varies with the cost of things the farmer buys, and every time city prices rise, parity rises.

Thus, 110 percent would always be just a little ahead of the ceiling fixers and Congress had established a virtually automatic formula for inflation.

This law, passed in January 1942, proved so bad that the second and present Price Control Act had to be passed little more than 9 months later.

It was during this fight that former Senator Brown made the speech denouncing Ed O'Neal and the other farm lobbyists by name as they glowered at him from the gallery.

COSTS GO HIGHER

But in those 9 months, the cost of living, wages, and costs continued moving upward. In some cases wages moved beyond what was later set as the Little Steel standard of 15 percent over the level of January 1941. As hourly wages rose, wages, including overtime, rose faster and so did farm costs, and farm income reached a point never before approached.

The farm bloc and the unions are currently flooding Congress with statistics, each to prove that the other led the spiral which then was gathering speed upward and is now being checked only with difficulty.

But the net result was clear: A vast number of dislocations and pressures, each mutually tending to force some other facet of the price-wage economy upward.

This early inflationary spurt was in large part due to the failure of both the President and Congress to take Bernard M. Baruch's advice to resist the political pressures of both the farm and labor blocs in 1941.

The farm bloc would not let food prices be "flexibly frozen" and Mr. Roosevelt would not let wages be "flexibly frozen," and as a result the chance to shut off inflation at the fount was lost.

But the President's political enemies, and especially the farm-bloc inflationists who are looking for any excuse available to wreck all controls so prices will zoom up, are now seeking to hang all the responsibility for everything that has happened since, and everything that will happen if they now prohibit subsidies, on this early error of the President's.

BLAME IS SHARED

The facts clearly are that Congress not only shared in this error, but that the President has since 1942 stood firmly against pressure from the farm bloc to lift price controls, and against labor efforts to crack Little Steel, and his No. 1 home-front mobilizer, James F. Byrnes, has just served notice that he will continue to stand firm whatever the political consequences.

It is true that the President has been decidedly favorable to labor, but even his best friends in the unions have failed to crack him on Little Steel, which, with subsidies, constitutes the guts of the line against inflation, and even counting his damaging Fabian policy in 1941, his courage on this issue in 1943 gives him the public stature, in comparison to the congressional inflationists, of a giant at a convention of political pygmies.

Now why do the provisos of the Price Control Act require subsidies if the cost of living line is to be held?

Just why is the implication that the President can hold down prices if he wants to by "enforcing the law"—a charge which manifestly seeks to transfer to him all political blame for the ruinously higher living costs which would follow rejection of subsidies by Congress—such canny demagoguery?

DOUBLE OBJECTIVE

First, because if the inflationist-G. O. P. alliance can make that charge stick, they will have engineered in one coup the double triumph:

1. Assuring their inflationary wartime killing through higher prices, and

2. Damaging the President politically perhaps beyond recall.

Second, the very intricacies of the law itself seemed a safe shield for this maneuver. For politicians would scarcely expect the public to take time to understand this issue.

But, as Byrnes declared on the radio, the cost of living is the No. 1 issue in this country today. And the law is not really so complex. It may be over the heads of some congressmen but their constituents can grasp it.

To understand why subsidies are necessary in order to stabilize the price line at the level of September 15, 1942—which is what the law basically requires—it is necessary only to analyze the interlocking effect of the various provisos limiting the O. P. A.'s power to fix ceilings.

THE LAW REQUIRES

The law requires (1) that ceilings must be no lower than a price reflecting parity to the farmer; (2) that ceilings must reflect any increases in the cost of production since 1941; (3) that they must not be below the highest price of January 1–September 15, 1942, and (4) that they must be such as to stimulate wartime production whenever desirable.

Now, let's see what happens when O. P. A. tries to hold a ceiling on food, knowing that each break in the price line forces other breaks, and that a series of breaks may affect the cost-of-living index so seriously as to break the Little Steel formula and dynamite the whole anti-inflation bulwark.

The farm prices of most meats, poultry, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, and other items are now far above parity. One Michigan Republican points out that average farm prices are at 117 percent of parity, and declares:

"The law limits the President's power to establish price ceilings only to parity. If he had the guts to enforce the law, he'd cut prices back without any subsidies."

A FALSE STORY

If that is the story going out to Michigan voters from their Congressmen, it is a false story.

For the provisos of the law which constrict O. P. A. in establishing ceilings go far beyond the parity limitation. They impose other limitations, and these interlock, and since the cost of one farm product often affects another, the net effect is that if any one of four or five limitations hits a single product, a whole series of products is affected.

Since the parity base period of 1910–14, the cost of producing various agricultural products has changed, for technological and other reasons.

In some products parity now scarcely represents a fair price, as in milk and meat. In others, it leaves a substantial margin above cost of production, as in most feeds.

The prices of most feeds were, therefore, until recently below parity. But the parity proviso in the law prevented O. P. A. from setting a ceiling on them. As farm production increased all over the country, demand for feed increased and feed prices jumped. O. P. A. was powerless to stop the rise.

This, of course, increased the cost of producing milk, butter, cheese, and other dairy products; of meat, chickens, turkeys, and other items.

ANOTHER LIMITATION

But the law also specifically directs O. P. A. to set no ceilings which do not reflect increased costs of production. Therefore, because feed went up, which could not be stopped, because the price was below parity, costs went up, and O. P. A. was thus powerless to halt increases in a whole string of dinner-table products because of this interlocking cost proviso.

This same cost proviso, which of course includes higher farm labor costs, hit heavily among fruits and vegetables, some of which shot up to prices 150 or 160 percent of parity.

O. P. A. was again powerless to act. This clause, be it noted, does not provide merely that no ceilings shall be set below a farmer's cost of production; it provides that prices cannot be held until they have advanced over the 1941 level sufficiently to reflect any increases in costs which producers can establish.

Meat prices are held up by still another of the interlocking provisos—that which declares no price ceiling shall be set below the highest level of prices between January 1–September 15, 1942.

To stimulate production, the Government early in the war announced floor or support prices for several important items. This policy has proved so popular with the farmers that they are trying to have the supports extended all along the line. It has brought the greatest food production in history.

SUPPORT PRICES HIGH

But these support prices in some instances were so high as to knock other prices out of balance. They could not under the law be reduced except by a finding of gross inequity.

These support prices, particularly that on hogs, drew the price of feed upward, but the hog price was set so high—the purposes being to increase production of fats needed for war—that it was still more profitable to feed corn to hogs than to sell the corn.

The result was widespread dislocation and shortage of feed in many dairy and poultry areas and beef-feeding lots.

But the farm bloc, acting through its friends in War Food Administration, steadfastly bucked every move to cut down the inflated support price of hogs.

This was the basic reason the President fired Chester C. Davis as head of the W. F. A. The corn-hog feed situation is now being adjusted, under the gross inequities provision of the law, by knocking down the price of hogs to more equitable levels.

Thus the advances in food prices to date have not taken place because the President or O. P. A. failed to enforce the law, but because costs have advanced and ceilings could not be imposed in the face of those higher costs; because the law itself by its parity limitation helped to increase those costs; and because under no circumstances except a gross inequity could any farm price be reduced once it had been established.

BLOCKED BY LAW

Even if it were desirable to cut back farm prices from 117 to 100 percent of parity, as the tongue-in-cheek Michigan Republican suggested as a way to avoid subsidies, it would be utterly illegal to do so under the very law that the same Congressman was complaining had not been enforced.

And another provision of the law forbids O. P. A. to establish any ceiling below a price set by the Secretary of Agriculture as necessary to stimulate war production, and requires O. P. A. to modify upward any price which is so low as to retard production needed for war.

Of course any move to slash back the general level of farm prices now, even if it were legal, would make it impossible for many

farmers to produce and our whole food production machinery would break down.

Even though the law did not forbid it, even to consider thus wrecking food production, at this time above all others, would be manifestly ridiculous.

Yet what else could the Congressman have meant, if anything, by saying "if he had the guts to enforce the law, he'd cut back prices without any subsidies"?

Under all these pressures, and with O. P. A. under so many restrictions against holding them except under certain conditions, farm prices therefore have in many instances advanced substantially beyond the levels reflected in retail ceilings.

COST-OF-LIVING LINE

But these retail ceilings are the cost-of-living line. On that line, a rough formula for a national wage policy has been based. While neither has been enforced perfectly, in a very real sense the maintenance of one means the maintenance of the other; and the breaking of either means smashing the whole structure.

But the differential between the higher farm price and the lower retail ceilings in many important commodities must be met somehow, for the law provides that processors can't be squeezed out of business either, even if anyone wanted to. There are therefore, only two alternatives. Either let retail ceilings go up, or hold them down by the payment of subsidies.

How seriously would these differentials affect the cost of living? How many prices would have to rise at retail if subsidies were withdrawn?

To mention a few, milk, bread, and meats of nearly all major kinds; edible dry beans, cheese, and butter; a long list of vegetables for canning and dried fruits. In short, most of the staples of the American dinner table.

Obviously, therefore, the President cannot carry out the order of Congress and stabilize at the level of September 15, 1942, without subsidy money to cover the differentials between the farm and retail prices.

And the effect of the denial by Congress of subsidy money would not just be the impact of a single price rise to cover the differentials which now exist.

INEVITABLE RESULT

For, obviously, any general jump in the cost of living will smash the Little Steel formula and result in a general wage increase. That would increase costs to everyone, including the farmer.

Obviously that would move up the very parity prices on which the price law is basically calculated, since parity is a relationship between what the farmers sell and what they buy. It would also bring into play the cost proviso of the Price Control Act.

If run-away inflation comes, no one can win. Even those doing their utmost to bring it about will ultimately suffer. If Little Steel is smashed, it will be a black day for labor. If the farmers force sky-high prices now, they will regret it bitterly when their bubble bursts.

To the people generally, who will pay the heaviest toll, it will matter little whether the Congressmen who voted for inflation did so because they were recklessly superficial, or viciously political, or tragically misinformed, or just dumb. The net effect will be equally painful to those they represent.

The answer to Mr. McCosker's question is that the price control law is being enforced as it was written by Congress. It cannot prevent inflation if Congress now fails to provide the subsidy weapons which are needed to hold the line.

Creed for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, in Illinois we are all proud of Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune. He is a great American whose devotion to the Constitution of the United States cannot be surpassed. I take pleasure in having included in the RECORD the following article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of December 16, 1943:

COLONEL MCCORMICK TELLS HIS CREED FOR AMERICANS—OFFERS CONFESSION OF FAITH AT DETROIT

DETROIT, MICH., December 15.—Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, presented his creed of Americanism and his views on international affairs in an address today before the Detroit Athletic club. He advocated a forthright and realistic foreign policy based on this Nation being true to itself, and he called for an amendment to the United States Constitution limiting the number of terms a President may serve.

"Last spring I was invited to address this meeting," he said. "Then a few weeks ago, letters from some of the members protesting my coming were sent to me. A few days later a friend called on me and suggested that I speak on inflation or on labor conditions in war plants.

"I replied that I am no authority on either subject and that insofar as I am known at all it is for my opinions on Americanism and international affairs."

CLEARS UP MISREPRESENTATIONS

"He then observed that these were difficult subjects in your club because a number of your members are from Windsor. I then said that if I should speak in Detroit I should wish to present my views and the information upon which they were based in the fullest possible form so there could be no further misapprehension as to my opinions—and especially would I like to do so before the members from Windsor because their press, under the censors' control, has been compelled to misrepresent them.

"Let this then be my confession of faith:

"'I believe in the American political doctrine as conceived by the great Virginia philosophers, as expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, codified in the Constitution, perfected in the Bill of Rights, interpreted by John Marshall, and expounded by Abraham Lincoln.'"

FAVORS FIXED PRESIDENTIAL TERM

"Since later amendments have extended the Bill of Rights to all citizens, I see the need of but one more amendment—a provision to limit the presidential term.

"Lincoln, at Gettysburg, epitomized our American doctrine when he said: 'Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

"I believe in this doctrine—all of it. I believe in the first principle of the Declaration of Independence, 'that all men are created equal,' as strongly as the men who wish to rule others and those who buy into the foreign nobility—and their hangers-on—disbelieve in it."

HAVEN OF EQUALITY

"Millions of men have come to this country in search of equality. Some thousands have gone abroad to avoid it and to assert arrogant superiority over the many by accepting servile subserviency to the few. Many of them are back here now as refugees and prating, of all things, of patriotism.

"Where else in this world will you find the doctrine that all men are created equal? Perhaps in Switzerland and possibly in Norway. Elsewhere the doctrine of superiors domineering over inferiors is universal.

"The doctrine of equality never was attained in France. Oceans of blood were shed in the attempt to establish it, but every Frenchman retains in his own mind his own particular place upon the social ladder. That is why the French republic could not last."

GERMAN MARRIAGES DISSOLVED

"During the period of the German republic the courts held that marriages contracted between the high born and the low born were illegal.

"I believe that 'all men are created with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"At times of clear and present danger, these rights have to be suspended where the danger exists. Many lives are taken in war. When our fleet was surprised and destroyed in Pearl Harbor, and great peril came upon the Hawaiian Islands and the Pacific coast, many liberties were suspended and many unavoidable injustices were done, but soon the American spirit asserted itself, the courts began to function, and liberty is being restored where it is due."

HELD IN CHECK BY COURTS

"In other parts of the country, efforts to invoke arbitrary arrest and banishment were overcome. Attempts by the Department of Justice to imprison political dissentients have been defeated by the courts up to the present. The tyrannies of the unconstitutional alphabet-governments are meeting with increasing resistance and will be swept away.

"Compare this with all of the other warring countries, where imprisonment without warrant and without trial is universal.

"I believe that 'in all criminal prosecutions the accused should enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed,' and I regret that our courts have seen fit to violate this amendment."

RECALLS PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

"I have personal reason to believe that 'no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury.'

"I believe that governments should 'derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.'

"I believe in the republican form of government. I believe in an elective Senate and House and an elective President, and that the President is President, not 'the chief of state' nor 'the ruler of America.'

"I believe in courts empowered to interpret the Constitution.

"I believe in separation of the powers of government into legislative, executive, and judicial, and in the right of the first to impeach the other two."

OPPOSES TITLES OF NOBILITY

"I do not believe in any one supreme governmental body and I do not believe in titles of nobility such as are forbidden in our Constitution.

"I rejoice in the provision of our Constitution that the terms of Members of Congress and of the President are fixed and cannot be extended. A self-perpetuating government, under whatever form, is not a free government.

"I believe that 'the United States should guarantee to every State a republican form of government,' but I do not believe that it should guarantee this form of government to any outside state. If we do not guarantee our own form of government to an alien state, certainly we cannot guarantee to an alien state any other form of government."

ENDORSES CERTAIN FREEDOMS

"I believe in freedom of religion, which I distinguish sharply from mere toleration of dissent.

"I therefore, of course, believe that all citizens should have the right to bear arms and that this right should not be a privilege limited to any religious or political faction, as obtains elsewhere.

"I believe in freedom of speech and have spent a large part of the last 20 years defending the freedom of the press.

"Freedom of speech and of the press include freedom to remain silent. Therefore, if you, or I, or anyone ask candidates or ask publications what is the backing behind them, they have the right to refuse to answer, and the public has the right to put its own interpretations upon this refusal."

NOT AFRAID OF TRUTH

"I believe, with Jefferson, that 'here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it.'

"Do we not perceive that the smears of the Winchells and the Ickeses, the misstatements of the Willkies, and the falsification of history of the Lippmanns have served at great expense to them to furnish audiences for men to refute them which otherwise might not have been obtained?

"I have no inclination to repudiate the sage advice of Washington when he said in his farewell adress:

"'We may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies. It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.'"

WELCOMES BATTLE ALLIES

"In war I believe in taking allies where we can find them. In the Revolutionary War we had as allies France and Spain, nations with more tyrannous governments than that of Great Britain. I recall that these allies interfered in our political affairs, and that, in consequence, we went to war with both of them.

"I believe in very definite commitments with allies, such as we had with France during the revolution, but I do not believe in making commitments which we cannot fulfill, as we did in that war. In that treaty with France, we guaranteed to maintain the French in possession of the islands she occupied in the Caribbean Sea. Later, when the war arose between the French directory and Great Britain, we could not and did not attempt to carry out this obligation, and the failure caused us both ill repute and humiliation."

CZAR'S FLEETS IN UNITED STATES HARBORS

"During the Civil War we had an agreement with autocratic Russia, revengeful for the Crimean War, that in the event of English and French intervention Russia would make war on them. The Czar went so far as to send his Navy to New York and San Francisco Harbors to be in places where they could oppose a British landing in Canada and could prey on British commerce. This prevented the intervention, and in compensation we purchased Alaska.

"In the last war our Government not only made no arrangements with its allies, but refused to inform itself of the arrangements made among them.

"In the early days of our participation in that war, when I was the American liaison officer with the French Army, its liaison officer handed me all of the secret treaties, and I, in turn, delivered them to our headquarters."

REASONS SET FORTH

"The reason for the French action was obvious. The British Empire and its ally, Japan, had agreed to divide the German-held islands in the Pacific. The French Army, charged with defense of French islands in that part of the world, felt it would be in a better position to hold them if the United States insisted upon possessing its fair share of the German-held islands.

"I do not take any exception to the French and British foreign offices double-crossing our State Department—because they thought it to their advantage to keep us in the dark, and the doctrine of diplomacy is to 'see to it that the sucker never gets an even break'—but I cannot forgive the officials of our Government who refused to take advantage of the momentous information brought to them by the Army, a refusal which, of course, primarily was responsible for all of the catastrophes in the Pacific.

"Lincoln said in his first inaugural address: 'This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it.' It does not belong to the mendicant group of nations whose representatives lately have been living lavishly in Atlantic City at our expense.

"I will say this much of the post-war world: We should insist on retaining such of the islands as we have saved from, retaken, or taken from the Japanese as will secure our future safety from attack; we should retain air bases wherever we have built them; and we should secure now, by treaty, the right to fly directly everywhere we want to go. We should make such other arrangements as will provide for our security. After that is taken care of, we may do what we can for the general welfare of the world."

BLAME WHERE BLAME IS DUE

"As one means to that end, I think all European governments should be required to liquidate their holdings in this hemisphere.

"I have no sympathy and little patience with people who blame all the evils of the world on my country. If they are foreigners they are objectionable, but their attitude may be natural. If they are American citizens, their conduct is unnatural. There is much precedence for them to copy. Millions of men born abroad, but preferring this country, have become naturalized American citizens. Therefore, let those born Americans who prefer other countries become naturalized aliens. It is not to be countenanced that they remain here and use their citizenship to betray your country and mine.

"The League of Nations failed because its members would not stand by their agreements. It is utterly false to say that our nonparticipation had anything to do with the failure."

REVIEWS TREATY BREAKING

"We became one of the parties to the nine-power agreement to protect the integrity of China. When we wished to act in accordance with that agreement and stop the Japanese aggression, all the other parties, including the British Empire, refused to keep their agreements.

'Nothing could be more fatal to our country, and for the countries which some of our citizens prefer to our own, than some grandiose scheme of world government.

"Our soldiers are enduring great hardships in this war, and after it is over they will not allow themselves to be used as Hessians to carry out the ambitious views of people at home who are thoroughly enjoying the war.

"You will remember that with the armistice in 1918 the Army in this country practically disbanded, and that although the high-ranking officers overseas wished to prolong their tenure of power, the insistence of the soldiers was such that they were hurried home as fast as shipping could be provided.

"This history will repeat itself when this war ends.

"You also will remember that Winston Churchill wrote in his autobiography that there was mutiny in the British Army immediately after the armistice. There also were mutinies in the British Navy."

GENERAL WOOD QUELLS STRIKE

"There were two other incidents following the peace, which not many people remember. The first was the attempted Communist revolution in the United States in 1919.

"The Communists incited a strike at Gary, Ind., and planned to disrupt the railroad center of the country by violence in order to break down our economic life and open the country to revolution. Gen. Leonard Wood, by tact and firmness, suppressed the attempt without bloodshed.

"You may have forgotten the tremendous tension that arose between Great Britain and this country over our naval building plans before the treaty limiting our Navy was adopted. Both countries regret the treaty now, but Great Britain's insistence forced it.

"At that time the tension was so great that our general staff feared an army of 300,000 Regulars, then in England, would be landed in Canada and marched against this country, which had completely demobilized

"The idea appears fantastic, but it did not appear fantastic to our general staff at that time. I know, because I worked with the general staff on plans of defense—for the defense of Detroit.

"As long as our foreign policy was realistic and patriotic, it was enormously successful.

"During the Revolutionary War it brought France and Spain into the war on our side. At the conclusion of the war it achieved a highly satisfactory peace. Later it purchased Louisiana, expelled the Spaniards from Florida, annexed Texas, secured Oregon, and occupied all of the territory to the Pacific.

"The Monroe Doctrine, which was a distinctly unilateral American declaration, and by no stretch of the imagination could be called a treaty, firmly backed up by Presidents Johnson, Harrison and Cleveland, has prevented the many attempted aggressions of European nations upon this continent.

"In our time an American foreign policy drove Spain from the Western Hemisphere and providentially secured the Hawaiian Islands."

SENATE PROTECTS CANAL

"Since then the record has been as uniformly bad. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty provided that the Panama Canal should not be fortified. Fortunately, the Senate corrected that. It is terrible to think what would have happened to us after the fleet at Pearl Harbor had been sunk if Panama had been left unfortified.

"Later the United States Government, unknown to its citizens, notified France and Germany that if they came to the aid of Russia, hard-pressed by Japan, the United States would join the Japanese-British alliance and make war on them. In consequence, Japan won the war and occupied Korea. The United States Government thus was largely responsible for launching Japan on her career of conquest.

"In the treaty of Versailles, the Shantung Province of China and German-held islands in the Pacific were yielded to Japan, and while the Senate refused to ratify the treaty it had no power to prevent the transfer of the islands from which the successful attack upon Pearl Harbor was launched and from which we still are threatened.

"Is it not plain that the trouble in which we find ourselves came from overambitious Presidents who fished in troubled waters?

"I can see no encouragement for further grandiose operations from the two futile invasions of Russia in 1918.

"Russia's failure to aid in our war with Japan may be due to our three uncalled-for aggressions against her."

ASSAILS FOREIGN "ISMS"

"Our history appears to me plain. As long as this country was true to itself it prospered and waxed as no other country ever did; but when it accepted foreign tutelage, when foreign ideologies and foreign systems of government were pressed upon it, it fell into these catastrophes, the end of which is not in sight.

"However, I believe devoutly in the American system. I believe in the American spirit. I believe that we will recover from the calamities that have been brought upon us and that we will continue, long after the foreign "isms" have been forgotten, to be the free Republic of the United States.

"To this end let us '* * * here highly resolve * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.' "

What Is Wrong With the Lea Civil Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the opposition to the Lea civil aviation bill is based upon certain fundamental principles contained therein, as follows:

First. It destroys States' rights.

Second. It creates confusion by reorganizing during the present emergency the aviation regulatory system, thereby retarding the war effort.

Third. It tends to promote a monopoly for existing air lines.

Fourth. It authorizes subsidies that will greatly increase our tax burden.

Fifth. It authorizes the training at public expense of new aviation employees to compete for jobs with the millions of veterans after the war.

An explanation of these views appears in the minority report on this bill, which will be found at pages 41 to 49 of House Report 784 on this bill.

The opponents of the Lea bill are not against the development of air transportation. They are anxious to assist sound aviation development in every legitimate way, as evidenced by the introduction of a substitute bill—H. R. 3491, the Reece bill. This substitute bill adopts all the 21 principles of the Lea bill except the five above set forth.

We believe our objections are sound. We believe the adoption of the Lea bill containing these objectionable features will tend to retard rather than to develop civil aviation.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA has prepared and circulated a pamphlet in which he attempts to answer the above objections. In my opinion his answer is incorrect and misleading. It does not make an adequate answer to a single one of the objections contained in the minority report.

Aviation can be considered from two standpoints: First, from the standpoint of developing existing aviation transportation companies; and, second, from the standpoint of the development of aviation in the public interest. The opponents of the Lea bill are interested in developing the aviation industry in the public interest, not merely from the standpoint of a few existing companies.

The Lea bill is aimed more particularly at the development of existing aviation transportation companies, as evidenced by the advantages it bestows upon existing companies of the Air Transport Association and the additional powers conferred upon a new powerful Federal bureau which it creates. This result is not strange when it is understood that an attorney for the Civil Aeronautics Board and an attorney for the Air Transport Association sat in executive sessions of the subcommittee during the drawing of this legislation, making suggestions and providing language. The bureau got a new and enlarged agency, and the Air Transport Association received many concessions for its member companies.

No one has heard any complaint or objection whatsoever from the Air Transport Association concerning this bill. Of course not. It is drawn in a manner that coincides with its viewpoint. The member companies are getting what they want regardless of the effect on the public interest. You will find, however, that those interested in aviation who are not connected with the Air Transport Association have raised serious objections to it. The National Aeronautic Association passed a resolution on November 13 reading as follows:

It is hereby resolved that the board of directors of the National Aeronautic Association announce that the association has never hitherto taken an official position for or against the bill (H. R. 1012) and subsequent drafts covering the same legislative considerations; and in this connection, that a recent statement appearing in a committee report on the bill to the effect that this association had approved the bill is incorrect; and that copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It was then moved by Mr. Harry K. Coffey, of Portland, Oreg., that the board of directors of the National Aeronautic Association go on record against the bill (H. R. 3420) in its present form and that a committee be appointed by the president of the association to make a detailed study of the bill and to report upon these features of the proposed legislation which, in the judgment of the committee, were either constructive or not constructive.

The State utilities commissioners through their national association oppose the bill, together with numerous State directors of aviation and many, many other persons, private flyers, small airport owners, and the like.

NO IMMEDIATE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Lea pamphlet states—

The committee's bill now presented, H. R. 3420, deals with the problems which are of pressing importance. It will be too late if we await the end of the war to meet them. * * * The time has come to act.

What is there in the present situation which requires the immediate passage of this legislation with its objectionable features?

Colonel Gorrell, the chief sponsor of this bill, testified at page 136 of the House hearings on H. R. 1012 that the international problem of aviation "is not soluble now by legislation in my opinion." He is right, for such international matters are in the province of the State Department in negotiating treaties.

This leaves only domestic transportation to be dealt with in this legislation.

In the introduction to the Lea pamphlet this sentence is contained:

Although the committee's bill is long, much of it represents merely codification and clarifying revisions of existing law which do not result in important substantive change.

The opponents of the Lea bill do not object to codification or clarifying provisions of the bill, although, if these are not adopted at this time, no great harm will be done. We do object, however, to the radical changes that are being made by the Lea bill in the fundamental principles of existing aviation law.

In the 1942 report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, it is stated:

In view of the existing demands upon the efforts of all concerned arising from the national emergency, the Board does not urge, in presenting these amendments, that they be considered at the present time by Congress. However, it is believed that consideration should be given to them as conditions permit.

No hearings were held on H. R. 3420. Only 8 days of hearings were held on H. R. 1012—predecessor of the Lea bill. Some subsequent hearings were held last March for 3 days in the nature of ex parte proceedings which were limited almost exclusively to the proponents of the legislation then being proposed, viz H. R. 1012. The present Lea bill was not then in existence and did not come into existence until months afterward without further hearings.

It is interesting to note that in February 1943 the committee enthusiastically reported H. R. 1012, and in October, without any hearings on H. R. 3420, reported the bill with many substantial changes in the present law not contained in H. R. 1012. The difference between these two bills is startling. If the committee in 8 months could have such a change in viewpoint, it is believed the provisions of the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, should be studied further before it is brought to the floor of the House for consideration.

In this connection it is interesting to note further that while H. R. 1012 was reported unanimously, the Lea bill, H. R. 3420, was reported by a divided committee. The Lea pamphlet claims the bill was reported by a vote of 17 to 2. This is not a correct statement of the facts. Many, if not a majority, of those who voted for the bill did so with reservations as to certain provisions therein. It is these provisions that form the basis of the objection to the Lea bill.

The chairman only permitted the members of the committee to see the ma-

jority report for 24 hours before filing. Had further time been available, it is not impossible, and quite probable, that the majority of the committee would have signed the minority report, as objecting in whole or in part to the provisions opposed by the opponents of the Lea bill. The fact that, in the few hours available to obtain signatures to the minority report there were nine who signed the same is an indication of the widespread opposition in the committee to portions of the bill.

Mr. LEA'S pamphlet states:

We do not assume that H. R. 3420 meets all the civil aviation legislative needs. Many matters not dealt with in this bill require more study.

This conclusion is correct, but it is also believed that as H. R. 3420 deals with many matters concerning which insufficient study has been had and insufficient facts have been obtained that the provisions of the bill itself should have more study.

In all sincerity, I ask again what is there in the present situation that requires legislation at this time? The matters to which objection is made are wrong in principle, and would not be right at any time.

The effort of the group interested in having the Lea bill adopted without change is to take advantage of the war situation and the present interest in aviation to accomplish things which would not be seriously considered in normal times. Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which is the existing law, the aviation industry has been developed, stabilized, and strengthened. Because of this fact, it has been able to assist materially in the war effort. The service it has rendered and continues to render is commendable. We owe much to the aviation industry in the worth-while help it gave to our war effort in the early stages of the emergency when we were unprepared, and it has continued to render such service. All this was made possible as a result of the stability given to the industry by the act of 1938. If all this could be accomplished under the present act, it removes any argument based upon a claim that present conditions make necessary immediate changes in the basic law.

Let the service the industry has already rendered be the answer. All that the industry has been able to accomplish in the war effort was made possible because of the provisions of the present Aviation Act. It would seem that the air transport companies are seeking to capitalize for their own benefit the favorable opinion the air industry has gained as a result of its war activity.

INDEPENDENCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY REGULATING CIVIL AVIATION

The Lea bill, H. R. 3420, creates a new agency known as the Civil Aeronautics Commission. What facts have been found to show that the present organization has worked to the detriment of aviation and which require the creation of a new agency?

We had experience under an independent administrative agency from 1938 to 1940. In 1940 Reorganization Plan IV placed this agency under the Department of Commerce, where it has since continued. Contrasting these two periods, namely, 1938–40 with 1940–43, what has the committee shown that has occurred in the latter period that requires a return to the former set-up? There have been no facts presented. This matter was never the subject of hearings before the committee, and yet it constitutes a major operation on the present organization in a time of great emergency.

The President wrote a letter on June 4, 1943, to Chairman LEA, which was not read to the committee until over 4 months after its receipt and not until the committee had acted on the bill. The President in his letter states:

I question, moreover, the advisability at a time when there is a paramount need for the performance by the Administration and the Board of services of vital importance to the armed forces, of providing, in a measure otherwise restricted to the accomplishment of more or less recognized betterments in the operative procedures of the existing agencies, for such a major reorganization of these agencies as would be contemplated by the proposal in question. I fear that the consideration, enactment, and putting into operation of such a reorganization plan would so distract the attention of officials and employees of these agencies, and so impair their working efficiency as to seriously interfere with the contribution that they could otherwise make in the interest of securing successful civil aviation assistance in the conduct of the war.

We all recognize that a new era will dawn upon the aviation industry at the conclusion of the war. However, it is not necessary at the present time to make radical changes with respect to the reorganization of the department to accomplish this purpose, particularly in view of the fact that under the wartime powers of the President the aviation industry and its operations is to all intents and purposes under the operation of the armed forces, and the President with his wartime powers can make any of the changes that are necessary to alter or improve the functioning of the present set-up during the emergency.

INDEPENDENT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

The Lea pamphlet, at page 7, states:

The minority proposes to retain the present method and deny to the traveling public and to aviation the benefits of fearless, independent investigation.

This is not true. Under the present system of investigating accidents, the traveling public has never been denied the benefits of fearless, independent investigation. A statement of this character shows a lack of confidence in accident investigation by the present Civil Aeronautics Board. No facts have ever been presented to the committee, nor could any be presented which would justify such a serious charge against the Board in its investigation of air accidents. The Board has faithfully, conscientiously, and fearlessly performed its duties with respect to the investigation of air accidents. Its record in this respect refutes any statement to the contrary. The statement contained in the Lea pamphlet that the traveling public has been denied by the present Board the benefits of fearless investigation is not only unwarranted and unfair, but an unjustified attack upon an honorable body.

The proponents of the Reece bill resent the charge, and show their confidence in the service rendered by the present Board by providing for its continuance.

PROPOSED SURFACE CARRIER CONTROL OF CIVIL AVIATION

The Lea pamphlet states:

The committee bill proposes no change in the present law as to surface carriers.

Neither does the Reece bill—H. R. 3491—except to provide for a better administration of the present law. Section 401 (d) of the present Civil Aeronautics Act sets forth standards under which the Board may issue certificates for new operations. It contains no limitation on the identity or affiliation of applicants. It reads as follows:

(d) (1) The Authority shall issue a certificate authorizing the whole or any part of the transportation covered by the application, if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to perform such transportation properly, and to conform to the provisions of this act and the rules, regulations, and requirements of the Authority hereunder, and that such transportation is required by the public convenience and necessity; otherwise such application shall be denied.

Thus, as the law now is, surface carriers of every kind and character, or anybody else, have a right to receive a certificate to operate an air line when the requirements of this section are met, viz, that the applicant is "'fit, willing, and able to perform such service * * * and that such transportation is required by the public convenience and necessity."

It therefore can be readily seen that it was the intention of Congress that the door of opportunity to enter the air industry should be thrown wide open. In adopting this provision, Congress believed that the development of air transportation would be more readily and quickly developed by such an "open door" provision than by a "closed door" policy that would preclude surface carriers. There is much that could be said in support of this theory, but it is unnecessary at the present time, because neither the Lea bill nor the Reece substitute bill changes this policy.

The only change that is made by the Reece bill with respect to the above is to deny the right of carriers under parts I, II, III, and IV of the Transportation Act from going into the business of air transportation directly. It requires that it shall be done by a subsidiary corporation. This was modeled after the Freight Forwarder Act of 1942, by adopting its language. This method had been suggested by Commissioner Joseph B. Eastman as the policy to be adopted in that act, as it would be best suited for administrative purposes.

Thus the Reece bill does not liberalize section 401 of the present act, which covers granting of certificates to surface carriers for the institution of new operations, but merely provides a better and easier method of administration for the regulatory body.

FEDERAL VERSUS STATES' RIGHTS

The Lea bill deliberately and intentionally destroys States' rights. It runs

all through the bill. This is evident by the language contained in section 4, which reads as follows:

The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States—

And so forth. Under the provisions of the Lea bill a Federal board will have complete jurisdiction over the granting of certificates, permits, and rates in solely intrastate commerce by air, as well as other matters normally subject to State regulation of intrastate operations. The intent to make Federal control dominant over the rights of the State is further evidenced by the repeal of the definition in the present law of "interstate, overseas, and foreign commerce" and the substitution in lieu thereof of definitions of "domestic and foreign" commerce. A reading of the present law will show that a distinction is recognized between the right of a Federal body to regulate interstate operations as distinct from intrastate operations. The definitions, however, in the Lea bill which change "interstate" to "domestic" eliminates this distinction. The definitions in the Lea bill read as follows:

"Air commerce" means domestic or foreign air commerce.

"Air transportation" means domestic or foreign air transportation.

"Domestic air commerce" means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property for compensation or hire or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce between a place in the United States and any other place in the United States, whether such commerce moves wholly by aircraft or partly by air-craft and partly by other forms of transportation.

"Domestic air transportation" means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce between a place in the United States and any other place in the United States, whether such commerce moves wholly by aircraft or partly by aircraft and partly by other forms of transportation.

In adopting the above language, the Lea bill casts aside entirely the provisions of the Constitution that clearly distinguish between interstate and intrastate commerce. Thus the Lea bill seeks to give a jurisdiction which even the Constitution itself does not give. Never has a committee of this House heretofore sought to obtain a constitutional amendment by a legislative act.

A further evidence of the intent of the committee to broaden Federal jurisdiction is its reference to taxation. Section 802 (c) directs the Civil Aeronautics Board to consult with State and local authorities with a view to developing means for eliminating and avoiding multiple taxation of the air industry, and adds "which has the effect of unduly burdening or unduly impeding the development of air commerce, which taxation is hereby declared to be inconsistent with the public interest."

At a time when an attempt is being made for a return to the States of their constitutional rights, it seems strange that a congressional committee should attempt such a disregard of States' rights.

AIRPORT REGULATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PROTECTION

The Lea bill places this entirely in the hands of one man. The one-man administrator created by the Lea bill may plan airports, airport zoning, and issue regulations controlling airports and airport zoning. He is authorized to condemn the property of anyone, private or public. He may confer with local authorities, but his decision is final. The expenditure of Federal funds for airports is not only authorized, but encouraged.

Under this situation what becomes of local authority?

FEDERAL FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Lea bill could result in tremendous Federal subsidies running into billions of dollars.

A Member of Congress stated in the last month there should be 17,000 more airports.

Who is going to pay for them? The present Civil Aeronautics Act, in section 302, provides "The Administrator shall not acquire any airport by purchase or condemnation." The Lea bill repeals this provision. In addition, it authorizes Federal funds to be used to acquire airports. It is an authorization with no limit.

Modern airports cost from $500,000 to $100,000,000 each. LaGuardia Field in New York cost about $45,000,000. It was opened in 1939. Now the Federal Government is putting large sums into the development of another airport for New York City, which will eventually cost $100,000,000.

CIVIL PILOT TRAINING

The Lea bill will deprive veterans of jobs after the war.

Proponents of the Lea bill claim that it merely continues the present law to advance civil pilot training. This is true, but it entirely overlooks the fact that, when this training was started, the Federal Government contributed to the expense for the purpose of training pilots, technicians, and mechanics in the light of the approaching war. Now that we have over 3,000,000 men trained in aviation in the armed forces, it is not only unnecessary to continue such training at Federal expense but it is an injustice to train pilots and mechanics to compete with returning servicemen who already have been trained and will be looking for jobs.

The effect of this is to deprive, or at least to make it more difficult, for the flying veterans of our armed forces to obtain jobs in the air industry when the war is over. I cannot believe Congress is going to appropriate Federal money to train aviation employees to compete with the millions of veterans who are ready, willing, and able to hold the jobs which will be available. In fact, even if the veterans have all the jobs which will be available in commercial aviation after the war, there will only be about 1 job for every 100 men who have served in the air forces. The backers of the Lea bill have shown a total disregard of the welfare of the returning veterans in the indifferent manner in which they treat the veterans of our air service, who have added such glory to the air branch of our armed forces.

There again, why should the Federal Government train employees for any industry? They do not do it for other forms of transportation, nor do they do it for any other business. The commercial air industry should train its own employees, and not expect the Federal Government to pay for such training.

ALIEN CONTROL OF AVIATION

Mr. LEA's pamphlet states that the—

minority report, perhaps inadvertently, would destroy the present limitations against enemy control of aircraft engaged in commercial transportation by air between points in the United States. In attempting to curtail Federal jurisdiction it would clothe the States with power to permit alien operation of our domestic transportation in intrastate operations.

The Reece bill does nothing of the kind. It leaves the provisions in existing law as they are.

REGULATION AS TO AIR MAIL

The Lea pamphlet states "the minority bill fails to make any provision for the transportation of mail by air between points within a single State." It is difficult to understand how any intelligent person can make a statement such as the above. The transportation of mail has always been a Federal prerogative, whether it is interstate or intrastate, and no additional legislation is necessary to enable the Federal Government to transport mail anywhere and by any means.

CONCLUSION

The Lea pamphlet is full of inaccurate and misleading information. The references that have been made to some of its statements are sufficient to demonstrate this fact. The truth is that the Lea bill, by its provisions, seeks to advance the interests of existing air lines at the expense of the public interest. The Reece bill seeks to advance air transportation in all its branches, but is not willing to sacrifice the public interest merely for the benefit of existing air lines.

The future of aviation cannot be overestimated. The opponents of the Lea bill seek to develop it along sound lines that will, at all times, promote the public interest. We sincerely believe that there should be a more careful and comprehensive study and consideration of the numerous and varied problems that will arise and call for solution in the post-war period. To accomplish this, we believe that the powers and authority granted by House Resolution 307, adopted unanimously by the House on October 19 of this year, should be utilized. This resolution provides:

That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation and study of such matters related to present and probable future conditions and developments in and affecting air navigation and domestic and foreign air commerce as it may deem advisable.

The unanimous adoption of the above resolution by the House is a clear indication of its desire that a complete investigation should be made of the entire

subject of aviation. It is, therefore, strongly urged that, before any action is taken by the House on the Lea bill, such a study as is contemplated by House Resolution 307 shall be made.

The opponents of the Lea bill desire to avoid retarding the growth of aviation, as would be the case, by the adoption of premature and ill-considered legislation. We therefore earnestly seek the aid of those who recognize the great future of aviation in all its branches and desire to see its development in a manner that will promote the public interest.

Furloughs Now for Overseas Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to tell our military authorities how to conduct the war. It is, however, my plain and simple duty to bring to their attention some matters that have a bearing upon the final outcome of the present conflict. Once notice has been given we can only hope it will meet a favorable response by those in authority.

Mr. Speaker, in the past several months, I have received many letters from men in the service and from constituents who have loved ones in far-distant parts of the world urging that our war authorities provide some well-defined program for furloughs for men who have been stationed in the Tropics and in the Arctic. Thousands of boys have been on duty in these God-forsaken areas for many months without relief. The situation is serious and it has a direct connection and bearing upon the morale of both Army and Navy. These boys are not only subject to attacks by the enemy, but they must be constantly on the alert against tropical disease and deadly cold of the far North. Morale, Mr. Speaker, is most important on any front, and especially where our men are constantly in a position to give their lives that we may live.

Men who have been away from the United States 18 months or longer are entitled to furloughs home. Many of them have been away so long that they have but vague ideas about their homeland. Some men have been in the service for more than 2 years, yet have never been assigned to foreign service. These men want to go, and stand ready to relieve the boys who have been away for so long a time. Certainly it would seem possible that a system of furlough rotation can be devised by the authorities if they have a mind to do so. The men are available, as are the ships, if we can believe the reports that emanate from the War, Navy, and Maritime Departments.

Mr. Speaker, in support of my statement that the morale on the fighting fronts is impaired and getting no better fast, I desire to incorporate in these remarks excerpts of letters received from soldiers, sailors, and from parents on this subject. These boys mince no words; it is a serious matter for them and they are very earnest. Here is an excerpt from a boy who has been in the southwest Pacific almost 2 years. On the 10th of October he wrote:

It has been raining ever since we hit this place. We are in mud over our ankles. We can't even use our jeeps in many places as most of the streams have no bridges. This sure is a rotten place to stick a man after he has already been up here (New Guinea) for about 9 months. I would like to know how much the officers think a man can take. I would like to see them take a few of those big-shot desk officials and hike them around this place for awhile. I am sure they would get some valuable ideas. At times we get so disgusted we feel like throwing the towel in and call it quits.

Every time you pick up a paper from home we read where some big shot says we have it fine here and that our morale is high. But when some of them come here you never see them talk to anybody who has been here as long as we have. I think that is one of the reasons they aren't sending troops from here home. They are afraid we might talk too much. When we arrived here it was generally understood that 6 months in the Tropics was a long hitch. Some units have been here 16 months without relief. In our unit over 50 percent of the men haven't had a leave yet, and we have been here over 8 months. The main thing now is to get home on a furlough, and nobody will say a thing.

At the rate they are keeping the troops at home you would think that they are fighting the war back there.

And on October 16 this same soldier wrote me, as follows:

I received your letter in which you enclosed the copy of the letter from the War Department. It certainly did not make us feel very happy. It looked to me like a form letter, the kind they send to everyone who writes on that subject. All I can say is that if we continue to live much longer in the Tropics, none of us will ever be any good. We can't get any kind of rest within 10° of the Equator, and there is always the constant threat of malaria. Our unit is the oldest one over here, and we have spent more time in the field than any other.

An anxious parent writes me under date of December 2, 1943:

This inquiry is being made, because I have a son with the Thirty-second Division in the southwest Pacific war area, made up to a great extent of the National Guard of your State. Press dispatches and other reports that we hear outline the unhealthy and malarious conditions there, and if you know that these boys are to be returned after a specified length of service in that zone, I should appreciate your advising me.

A sister of a boy on New Guinea forwards two letters that she recently received from her brother:

I hope someone does something about getting us guys home pretty soon, because if they don't they're going to have a bunch of mental cases on their ——— hands.

And this same boy in another letter said:

If all the people back home who have sons and relatives in the ——— would get after the Senators, then maybe we would have a little chance at least to get home after almost 2 years overseas.

A very recent letter from a soldier in the southwest Pacific confirms what these other boys have said. I quote part of his letter:

Again I am writing you about this coming home business and the letter you received from the Secretary of War. If there is anything that makes my blood boil, that is it. It is not what they say in those letters, it's what they don't say that makes a person mad. They give you a bunch of words telling why we can't be sent home, and then they turn around and tell you that if some guy sees fit, you might possibly be sent home. So after you read the letter, you know just as little as you did when you started. That is the trouble with many of the things back home today, a bunch of guys throwing a lot of words at the people, knowing that the average man won't delve into them to see what they mean. It's just like some of the phony news reports that they give out. Why don't they get wise to themselves and be honest and frank about these things that affect the masses.

Another thing that makes me mad is when they talk of sending us to Australia for rehabilitation. Don't they realize that there is not so much wrong with us, but that we just want to get home for a few months so we can refreshen our memories as to what we are supposed to be fighting for? We listen to a bunch of speeches about what they are going to do for us after this war is over. Well, why don't they start worrying about what they can do for us now? It's not that we have such a tough time of it or anything like that, but just that we have been gone so long. There are units that have really had it tough and they are also crying to get home. One thing about being in the Infantry unit is that you only stay in the Tropics for a few months, but a unit like ours that doesn't actually go into the firing lines is kept here for an indefinite length of time. You must know that just living in the Tropics is a battle in itself. You can sit up here and watch the outfit slowly disintegrate with fellows being evacuated for medical care, and the longer we stay here the better chance we have of being hospitalized. You say that it is up to the theater commander, but how can MacArthur be a judge of how we feel when he has his loved ones on hand and can go and see them whenever he wishes? It seems to me that before a man can be a judge of those things, he has to go through the same experience that we have.

There always seems to be the old excuse they don't have enough shipping to send us back. To most of us that is the biggest laugh of all. We read articles where it is stated that there is plenty of shipping and hundreds of ships they are turning out back there, yet when you ask to go home, they tell you they don't have enough shipping. The first thing that the new men from the States ask us is how come we haven't been relieved yet. They tell us of all the troops back home and the fine times they are having. They almost drop over when we tell them we have been here for almost 2 years.

Just today I received another letter from a boy in the southwest Pacific and he, too, confirms what the other boys have said about the effect which a long stay in the Tropics has upon the minds of these lads. I quote:

We are still laying around in the same area and wasting our lives and the taxpayers' money. It seems very asinine to me that anyone should have to lay around in New Guinea for 4 months with nothing to do. If they don't have a job for us, they could

have sent us to Australia to rest up until something came along. It wouldn't be so bad if we were just new troops, but we have been here so long it wears down one's mind. If you look at the thing clearly, you can see that they must be keeping us here for some coming campaign which will probably mean at least another stay for 5 or 6 months more in the Tropics. That will mean that we have been here 15 or 16 months in New Guinea. Now I would like to know if that is what they call rotation of troops. If it is I would like the phonies who thought up that plan to come over here and live by it. The more one thinks over here, the more futile things seem to get. Sometimes I feel as though my head will split wide open.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the position taken by my distinguished colleague Hon. MELVIN J. MAAS in this matter of furloughs for members of the armed forces in overseas service. Colonel MAAS is a distinguished soldier in his own right, and he has taken the floor of this House to present his views on this important subject. He commands the respect and admiration of every Member of this House, and I urge with him that the Army and Navy Departments proceed at once to inaugurate a joint policy on furloughs to the end that it will give our fighting men something to fight for. Let us not devote all of our attention to doing something for them after the war; let us show our appreciation by doing something for them now, while they still render an unselfish patriotic service.

Staff Sgt. Thomas W. Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by the Disabled American Veterans:

The first formal hearing by the Veterans' Administration under the new procedure of having disability ratings of disabled soldiers made at Army hospitals occurred this morning at the Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, D. C., in the case of Staff Sgt. Thomas M. Day, Jr., who lost a leg in the north African campaign.

Sergeant Day was represented before the Veterans' Administration Rating Board by Thomas J. Kehoe, assistant national service director for the Disabled American Veterans—a congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

The new procedure of having disability rating hearings held at Army hospitals is designed to speed up the adjudication of disability claims and to provide the most prompt service possible to men who are being discharged for disability incurred in the service.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has announced that other Veterans' Administration boards will be installed at other Army discharge centers just as soon as this is feasible and sufficient personnel is obtained for this purpose.

Staff Sergeant Day was a member of the First Engineers, First Division. He was wounded at Mateur, north Africa, by a German land mine, which resulted in the amputation of his left leg above the knee.

As a result of the hearing the rating board advised Sergeant Day that a total rating would be awarded to him for a period of at least 6 months, and that he was considered to be so vocationally handicapped as to entitle him to vocational rehabilitation.

Prior to his enlistment on October 16, 1940, Staff Sergeant Day was a resident of New York City and a student at Fordham College. He has been awarded the Purple Heart and several campaign ribbons, having participated in the initial invasion at Oran and in the battle of Kasserine Pass, El-Guettar.

Scheme To Force High Living Costs Greeted by Curious Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, good editors and good newspapers contribute much to our country through their columns and free Americans who read a free press reach valuable decisions from them. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article by an able newspaperman, Mr. R. O. Zollinger, of Austin, Tex., appearing in the Austin Statesman of December 8, 1943:

NONCHALANCE—SCHEME TO FORCE HIGH LIVING COSTS GREETED BY CURIOUS APATHY

(By R. O. Zollinger)

A majority of the House only the other day voted, to the tune of 278 to 117, to adulterate your dollars. It voted for inflation. This vote was only the preliminary to the organized effort to do away with all price controls whatever.

The consumers of the Nation are about to have their hands tied behind them while organized pressure groups raid their pocketbooks.

Hardest hit in this conspiracy which finds the congressional majority arrayed on the side of the groups demanding that the lid be taken off prices and "free" enterprise be permitted to assert itself will be some 18,000,000 individuals in the so-called middle class—small businessmen, professional men, white-collar workers—deemed by Congress unworthy of attention or importance because, being unorganized, they are not a political asset.

If you found someone taking a gallon of gas out of your car's tank and pouring in a gallon of water to take its place, or if you found someone taking the cream off the bottle of milk on your doorstep and pouring in water to take its place, you'd probably rush to the closet, drag out "Old Betsy," and take a potshot at the plunderer.

Yet it is a remarkable fact that comparatively few persons appear to be indignant over the scheme to shove up the cost of their living. The scheme to take the lid off living costs and finally to do away with all controls whatever, on the plea that this is the American way, not only is reprehensible, it is dishonest, and as such it should have the major concern of every consumer, and particularly of that group of 18,000,000 of white-collar persons on fixed income who are being regarded by the pressure groups as their legitimate prey.

Admitting the numerous errors of administration of Federal agencies set up to cope with the problem of fair and equal distribution of a greatly restricted quantity of civilian goods, it does not follow that the remedy calls for abandonment of all controls, ballooning of prices, and fantastic raids upon the consumer's purse.

We must accept the necessity for these controls, even while knowing that many errors and instances of ineptitude and incompetency have been and are being committed in administering them. We should know that we cannot give an exhibition of national intelligence and responsibility to our obligations if we insist that the war and the national distress is something to mine for gold. We can accept these restrictions in good grace now, or in refusing to accept them we can force even more drastic imposition of controls later on if we are to avoid a national calamity.

The campaign against administration of controls has been adroit and persistent and calculated. Day in and day out for years assaults have been made upon the domestic side of the war effort by a species of inspired propaganda by those with axes to grind. The penalty for such a campaign is inevitable. That penalty is weakened confidence in all central government controls. The only agency which can stop inflation is government.

The Lower House of Congress has turned the consumers of this country over to the inflationist rabble. The vote was heavily Republican, with a sprinkling of Democrats, as gullible as a country boy at a city fair, joining with them in the vote.

Yet the Republicans may be hoist by their own petard. If a Republican is elected next year to the Presidency, with a heavily supporting House and increase in the Senate, they may take office just at the time the inflation cycle breaks into full storm. Those who want inflation so they can raid the country are not apt to care much who occupies the White House. But they'd feel safer in carrying out the scheme if an inflation-minded Republican President supplemented an inflation-minded Republican Congress.

Letter to Railroad Employees of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following letter, which I am sending to railroad employees of Louisiana:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RAILROAD EMPLOYEE: I have endeavored while serving as Congressman here in Washington to do everything possible to aid and cooperate with all railroad employees. I have introduced a bill asking that the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to provide that anyone with 30 years of service could be retired regardless of age. As the law now stands, an employee must have, in addition to 30 years of service with the railroad, attained the age

of 65 years. My bill removes the 65-year provision.

Also the bill which was introduced by me provides that any man who has had 20 years of service with a railroad and becomes disabled is entitled to retirement disability pay, whereas the law as it now stands provides that the man must have 30 years' service.

Another feature of my bill provides that if a man has reached the age of 50 as an employee of the railroad, regardless of his years of service, if he becomes disabled he will be entitled to disability pay. The law as it stands today provides for an age limit of 60 years.

All in all, I think you will agree with me this is very constructive legislation.

I supported vigorously the 8 cents per hour increase for all nonoperative employees, as you will see by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I am enclosing. Enclosed also is a copy of the bill which was taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As you no doubt realize, I am a candidate for Governor in the coming election and will appreciate your vote and support. I assure you as Governor I will work just as hard and long to protect your interests in that office as I have done here in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn of the sudden passing of my good friend, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, at the Medical Center, New York City, on Tuesday, December 14, 1943, as a result of a heart attack. She had gone to New York with her husband, George Sanford Holmes, civilian member of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell's Public Relations Staff, for a conference of the Second Service Command in New York.

Mrs. Holmes was among the leading Washington correspondents, and she wrote under the name of Kathleen Sexton. She was the Washington correspondent for the Jackson, Miss., Daily News, a member of the board of governors of the Women's National Press Club, and a member of the White House Correspondents' Association.

There was no more popular correspondent in Washington than Kathleen Sexton. She wielded a facile pen and had an attractive personality. She was cultured and broadly and liberally educated. There was no more popular member of the press in Washington than Kathleen Sexton. She was a favorite in Mississippi congressional and official circles.

Kathleen Sexton was a native of Hazlehurst, Miss. She attended school in New Orleans and at Sweet Briar College, Virginia. Her father, the late James S. Sexton, was one of the outstanding members of the bar of Mississippi and of the South.

I am glad to join in paying my tribute to the memory of one of my best friends. Kathleen Sexton was among the most accomplished women of my acquaintance. She will be greatly missed in Washington and in Mississippi.

Report of Area Labor Supply Committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Claude Gillette, who was in industrial command of the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard during the early trying days of the war, is now the industrial manager of the important navy yard at Puget Sound. He is doing the same fine job there he did at Pearl Harbor. I would like to insert in the RECORD a report by a civilian committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce who are doing the vital work of aiding in the manpower crisis in our area. This report amply points out the industrial work of the Navy there under Gillette and the aid our citizens are trying to give him:

Thousands of additional men and women are needed urgently now at the Puget Sound Navy Yard to repair naval vessels damaged in war in the Pacific.

For the yard must operate at peak efficiency as the Navy comes to close grips with Japan.

These are the outstanding facts revealed in a recent tour of the yard by the Area Labor Supply Committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The purpose of the tour was to gain firsthand knowledge of the type of work being done at the yard, the working conditions there, the facilities for handling additional workers, and other knowledge essential to the organizing of a coordinated program of labor recruitment.

The findings contained in this report are based on the tour of the yard which was conducted by Rear Admiral C. S. Gillette, the industrial manager, and members of his staff, and on which the committee was accompanied by representatives of Seattle newspapers and radio stations. In this survey, the committee also had access to numerous other sources of information, including workers at the yard.

The Puget Sound Navy Yard is one of the most important installations of its kind in the United States. By the quick and efficient repair of warships, it directly has made possible many of the victories which have been achieved by the United States Navy over the enemy in the Pacific. When the full story of its wartime role is told, it will constitute a bright and significant chapter in naval industrial history.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox recently made the following statement: "Keeping the Navy at the highest possible level is not alone the responsibility of the superb officers and men who manage ships. The Navy also must rely upon the efforts of thousands of civilian workers whose jobs are to repair ships damaged in action, and to build new ships. Fortunately for the Navy, and for the whole world of freemen, these civilian navy yard employees thus far have done magnificent work. On every ocean today there are American ships that have been returned to action in record-breaking time after suffering serious damage in battle. Without these ships, without the men and women who restored them to duty, the war already might have been lost."

The Pacific Northwest should take pride in the fact that the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton has contributed in remarkable measure to the successful operations that have been carried on by the Navy.

As war activity in the Pacific increases, the Puget Sound Navy Yard will assume an even greater and more dramatic role. The demands made upon it by the Navy for fast and efficient work will be intensified. It is imperative that the yard be geared immediately for the increased repair load it must carry. Damaged capital ships must be repaired quickly, and according to Navy schedules.

In order to make this possible, the area manpower priorities committee has given the yard an employment ceiling 8,000 persons higher than the present pay roll. It is necessary that a net gain of these additional 8,000 persons be obtained as rapidly as possible * * * and that the employment be maintained at the peak level for the duration of the war.

That is the great task to which the chamber's Area Labor Supply Committee has been assigned. It has assumed it at the request of Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Rear Admiral S. A. Taffinder, Commandant of the Thirteenth Naval District. In approaching it, the committee realizes that it has undertaken a grave responsibility. The length of the war can be shortened if our objective is achieved. At present the yard installations have idle machines because no workers are available. Because the yard, in emergencies, has too few workers, it must abandon one important job to handle another. If the yard were manned to capacity, as set by the War Manpower Priorities Committee, all jobs could be handled at the same time and vitally needed warships returned to battle areas.

In going through the yard, the committee was impressed with the high degree of efficiency to be observed on all sides. It is modern in every respect. The machinery and equipment are described by Navy officers as the best obtainable anywhere in the world. Morale among the workers is high. Both men and women appear aware of the important work they are doing. Everywhere among employees and officers the spirit on the job was excellent.

It is a great credit to the yard and to the workers that, in every phase of the operation which the committee observed, there was no idleness. Everyone was working and gave the impression that he knew his work constituted a direct contribution to the winning of the war. This doubtless accounts for the fact, in large measure, that the Puget Sound Navy Yard has an unusually low rate of labor turnover.

The committee finds that the wage rate at the yard compares favorably with other war industries in this area.

The yard has an extremely capable staff working on a comprehensive and ambitious training program. Opportunities are available for training in virtually all trades. Every effort is made to place employees in those jobs for which they are fitted, and a full-time placement staff is at work on this problem. It is not necessary, however, for new employees to have had any experience. The management of the yard is interested in having new employees placed in jobs in which they will be happy and in which they will do the best work. In its survey the committee also found that the older workers at the yard go out of their way to give help and guidance to the new employees. It should be pointed

out in this connection that the training program at the yard, which is considered to be one of the best in the Nation, involves free instruction. Employees are paid while they learn.

The Puget Sound Navy Yard also offers excellent opportunities for advancement. If, after a trial period, a particular worker shows aptitude for a more important job, he may be enrolled in free classes. Upon graduation he is qualified to receive journeyman pay in his special field.

Workers have the added advantage of governmental employment involving such things as the accumulation of 26 days' annual vacation with pay, and sick-leave credit with pay at the rate of 15 days per year. It must be realized, of course, that wartime emergencies interrupt full vacations, but the credits accumulate for the future.

The yard has cafeterias and portable lunch wagons in operation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with adequate facilities for serving three meals a day to all employees who require them. Food at the yard is exceptionally good and is furnished at reasonable prices.

The yard has an outstanding safety record. Extreme care is given to the manner of preventing accidents to workers and first-aid stations are available throughout the various operations.

Lighting throughout the various shops and buildings of the yard is of high order. Employees are free to smoke on the job, except in work involving inflammable material.

Numerous types of recreational facilities are furnished to workers. Bremerton also offers complete medical and hospital facilities. And the yard offers a low-cost medical plan. It also should be emphasized that kindergartens and nurseries have been established to provide for the care of preschool children and for older children before or after school. In addition, shops and stores of all types are available in Bremerton and offer a wide range of all types of merchandise. They are close to the yard.

Adequate transportation facilities for all workers living in or near Bremerton are supplied by Navy bus or by local transportation systems. Puget Sound ferries running between Seattle and Bremerton maintain fast schedules and are in a position to handle additional traffic. They operate on an average of about every 40 minutes. Commuter rates are 10 rides, with a 10-day limit, for $2.

The Government has built extensive housing projects in the Bremerton area to take care of the influx of workers for the yard. At the present time there are approximately 1,000 family units and more than 1,000 dormitory spaces available for immediate occupancy. Additional housing is under construction.

The Puget Sound Navy Yard has made a practice of employing women wherever possible. It now has a large number of women workers and they are performing unusual and important jobs. There are accommodations for a substantial number of additional women in the Bremerton district.

Also, the yard follows a practice of using part-time workers. This indicates that everything possible has been done, and is being done, to utilize all types of employees.

It also should be pointed out that the mechanics of obtaining employment at the yard are extremely simple. Applications which may be made at the yard or at branch recruiting stations, or at the U. S. E. S., or Civil Service Commission, are processed rapidly. No stringent examinations are involved.

Although this report covers only a few of the outstanding features of the Puget Sound Navy Yard, it demonstrates that it is an excellent place in which to work. Every conceivable incentive exists there for additional citizens to join with those already there in making continued naval victories possible.

This committee will press its recruitment drive with unremitting vigor so that this great naval establishment may make the largest possible contribution to the winning of the war.

In conclusion, the committee believes the Puget Sound Navy Yard permanently will remain an integral part of the Navy and continue to offer long-term opportunities for employment after the war has been won.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph Gandy, deputy regional director, War Production Board; W. A. Castleton, regional director, Smaller War Plants Corporation; Frank West, president, Manufacturers Association of Washington; Harry Carr, Chairman, War Labor Section, Civilian War Commission; J. E. Ryder, assistant State director, War Manpower Commission; John Heily, chairman, Seattle Textile and Apparel Committee; Christy Thomas, vice president and general manager, Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Chris Gilson, assistant general manager, Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Clarence R. Innis, chairman, war industries and resources committee, Seattle Chamber of Commerce and Seattle Civilian War Commission.

The Late Kathleen Sexton Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of Congress, it has been my privilege and pleasure to be closely associated with Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, a member of the press from my district and State. Words are not at my command to express my feeling when I was advised of her sudden and untimely death.

Kathleen's heritage is from one of the outstanding families of the South. Her father, Judge Sexton, during his entire career was one of the South's most respected members of the bar. Kathleen, whom I have known since childhood, was endowed with that same intellectual ability as her father, which was displayed and exemplified in her reports to the outstanding daily paper of my State, the Jackson Daily News. Its subscribers uniformly and eagerly watched for her column, which appeared about twice a week in addition to her daily reports.

Her reports were informative and couched in an unusual language, which created the interest of the people who read them. The Mississippi delegation will miss her, because of her unbiased and corrective reports of their activities as representatives of the people of their State. I personally and probably more so than any other Member will miss Kathleen and her courteous greetings, because of the long and close personal friendship that existed among her, her brother, her father, and myself.

Another Bureaucrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Boston Herald:

ANOTHER BUREAUCRAT

The appointment of Richard H. Field, of Weston, as legal adviser and acting general counsel of Chester Bowles, of Springfield, head of the Office of Price Administration, puts an additionally sharp edge on a recent remark of Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and himself a first-class lawyer. Mr. MacLeish said that it was inaccurate and unjust to stigmatize Federal officials in general as bureaucrats. The persons doing the war's work in Washington include many of our finest citizens, women as well as men. They keep long hours. They are not in politics and they are not feathering their post-war nests. Believing that they have an obligation to do something behind the lines when they are not qualified for battle-front duty, they are contributing all they can to Federal administration of the war program.

Mr. Field is merely the latest of the brigade of Boston and Massachusetts lawyers who have given up good private practice to help out in the Washington bureaucracy. The list is long, notable, and honorable, and the silence which envelops most of these men after they leave us is an intimation of the intensive work they are doing in key positions. They may be bureaucrats, but they are not bureaucratic. Patriots is more descriptive.

A Prayer for Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter speaks for itself, and I recommend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Congress and the people of the country:

FORDHAM PREPARATORY SCHOOL,
Bronx, N. Y., December 15, 1943.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAD: As one of your constituents, but not eligible to vote for 6 years, I wish you would take the leadership in a movement to unite all of the people in the United States in a prayer of thanksgiving upon the safe

return, from the battle fronts, of our beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I think Christmas Day would be the appropriate time for our citizens to gather in our churches and in our homes, to pray according to their religious beliefs for the continued health, strength of character, and wisdom of our great President. I am sure that every person here and in the lands of our noble allies throughout the world admires the courage, daring, self-sacrifice, and patriotic zeal of President Roosevelt. His visit to the war front is one of the noblest examples of statesmanship.

I am sure, here in school, all the students will gladly join in a prayer of thanksgiving for our beloved President.

Your loving son,

JOHN.

Bill To Amend Security Laws Is Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 16, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, of December 9, 1943:

BILL TO AMEND SECURITY LAWS IS INTRODUCED—REPRESENTATIVE MAURICE SULLIVAN SEEKING RELIEF FOR MINER

A bill providing for amendment of the Securities Act of 1933 has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, of Nevada, who, as a mining attorney and mine operator, has long resented the restrictions imposed on the mining industry in the administration of the act, including the prohibition of public financing of mining projects.

As outlined in a news release, the amendment is designed to exempt mining and oil development and securities from the supervision and licensing authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Congressman SULLIVAN made the following statement as to the desirability of the proposed amendment:

"We hear a lot about 'free enterprise' nowadays, but under the existing law there is no such freedom. The prospector who has developed the West must either sell out to concentrated capital in the East on its own terms, or go unrewarded through inability to incorporate and sell shares of stock, inasmuch as administrative red tape surrounding the issue of permits is prohibitive.

"The theory of the existing act is that mining and oil development can be made a 'sure thing' and investors can be protected by supervision. The theory is fallacious because one man can see no farther into the ground than another.

"Mining and mining-stock buying is and always has been a gamble. There are and always have been men willing to risk a small amount on the prospect of a tenfold return. It is this tendency that has developed not alone mines and oil wells but all our major industries.

"When our Government undertakes to protect against loss and guarantee success to every citizen, the pioneer spirit of this Nation will die and progress will cease. Oppressive visitatorial powers by government are no less odious and destructive than private monopoly.

"Restraint of free enterprise is no better than unreasonable restraint of trade and commerce. The existing law has been tried and cries loudly for amendment."

Soldiers' Absentee Voting Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in the last few days the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has taken the floor to criticize the Rankin bill, which is the same as the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan soldiers' voting bill which passed the Senate a few days ago to give men in the service the right to vote by absentee ballots in the coming elections.

I am tired of hearing that bill criticized by men who either know nothing about it or do not seem to care anything about preserving the constitutional rights of the American people. Remember that two of the leading Senators who voted for that measure have already lost sons in this war—Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Don't you think they are as much interested in the soldiers as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

What we are trying to do is to give the servicemen the right to vote in a legal manner. We are trying to give them the right to vote for President, for Senator, for Representatives in Congress, for Governor, for sheriff, for county clerk, and for all State and county officers. We are trying to do that without violating the Constitution of the United States, or disrupting the election machinery of the various States.

Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm the statements of men who say that we have the right to override the Constitution of the United States and the laws and the constitutions of States, as a war measure, as the Green-Lucas bill would do. If we have a right to set aside, or violate the Constitution under the guise that this is a war measure, then we have a right to go further and set aside the Constitution and call the elections off entirely.

This Green-Lucas bill is one of the most dangerous measures that has been proposed in Congress in 50 years.

The Rankin bill, as he calls it, will enable these men to vote by absentee ballots without running any such risks, and more of them would vote under it than under the Green-Lucas bill, for the reason that they would be able to vote for State, county, and other local officials.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting at this point a radio address which I am delivering tonight over a Nation-wide hook-up on this subject:

My fellow Americans, I have come tonight to talk to you upon the subject of providing the men in our armed forces with the opportunity to vote by absentee ballots.

What we are trying to do is to make it possible for these men in our armed forces to vote by absentee ballots in a legal election, without violating the Constitution of the United States; without overriding the constitutions and laws of the various States; without usurping the election machinery of the States, and without setting up an unlawful, unnecessary, powerful, and probably dangerous Federal election bureaucracy here in Washington to usurp the functions of the State governments.

The so-called Green-Lucas bill provides only for permitting the men in the service to vote in the national election; that is, for candidates for President, Vice President, Members of the United States Senate, and for Representatives in Congress. In fact, it would provide a national ballot without the names of any candidates on it at all. The soldier would either have to write in the names of candidates for Federal offices, or just vote a blank party ticket, which would not cover State, county, and other local officials at all.

The substitute, known as the Eastland-McKellar-Rankin bill, would permit them to vote for candidates for State, county, and other local offices, as well as for national officers, by name, and would leave the election machinery in the hands of the States, where it belongs.

Our bill directs the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to do everything possible to expedite getting these absentee ballots to the men in our armed forces, and getting them back, and also provides free air-mail service for these ballots, and for communications in connection therewith.

Practically every State in the Union has already made provisions for their men in the armed forces to vote by absentee ballots, and the Governors of those States that have not made such arrangements, or that need to make minor changes in their laws, are willing to call extra sessions of their legislatures for that purpose, unless there is a regular session scheduled to convene at an early date. In fact, every Governor that we have heard from is willing and anxious to cooperate in every possible way.

The Green-Lucas bill would usurp the election machinery of the States, and attempt to prescribe qualifications for electors for United States Senators and Representatives in Congress in flagrant violation of the Constitution.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution says that the electors for Representatives in Congress in each State "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The Green-Lucas bill would violate that section, and would therefore be null and void.

Congress has no right, and no power to change that provision.

After that provision had been in the Constitution for 126 years it was readopted verbatim in the seventeenth amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by popular vote.

The Green-Lucas bill would violate both of those provisions. If any of the States refused to comply with this unconstitutional measure, as they undoubtedly would, the election next year might be thrown into confusion, producing a dangerous situation such as we had in 1876 that brought about the Tilden-Hayes contest.

The Constitution also provides that "each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may prescribe, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the States may be entitled in the Congress," and that the "Congress may determine the time of choosing of electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes," but leaves the manner of their selection to the States themselves. The Green-Lucas bill would violate that provision also.

But the advocates of that measure contend that Congress has the right to pass such an unconstitutional bill, as a war measure.

What nonsense.

If Congress had the right to pass this unconstitutional bill, as a war measure, it would have the right to call the election off entirely. The Green-Lucas bill is not a war measure; it is a political measure pure and simple.

This Green-Lucas bill provides penalties for the humble election holders throughout the Nation of a $5,000 fine, or 5 years in the penitentiary, or both, for minor violations of its provisions, and for their prosecutions in the Federal courts. It would be impossible to get men to help hold the election in many precincts with that threat hanging over their heads.

Yet the propagandists for that bill are trying to arrogate to themselves a monopoly of the friendship for the servicemen of the Nation, and to make you believe that they only are the friends of the men in the service.

As many of you no doubt know, I am chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in Congress. You ex-servicemen know of me, JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi. You remember the various Rankin bills. I have put through more legislation for the benefit of our fighting men, and their dependents, than any other Member who has been in Congress since the close of the last war.

You remember it was my amendment that raised the base pay of the men in our armed forces in this war to $50 per month. Up to that time they were getting $21 per month. I offered that amendment and fought it through the House, and through the conference until it finally became a law. Yet we find that some of the very men who voted against it are now posing as the real friends of the servicemen, and criticizing me for trying to make it possible for them to vote in a legal election in which they have a chance to vote for their choice for State, county, and other local offices, as well as for candidates for Federal positions.

We all have loved ones in the service. Two of the Senators who voted for this substitute as against the Green-Lucas bill had already lost sons in this war.

The Green-Lucas bill strikes at the very heart of our form of government, at the very life of those institutions for which our men in the armed forces are fighting, while the Eastland-McKellar-Rankin bill would not violate the Constitution in any way, nor would it interfere with the election machinery of the various States.

A far greater number of them would vote under it than would vote under the Green-Lucas bill, because of their interest in local affairs; and there would be no danger of having the law declared unconstitutional, or the election thrown into chaos and confusion next year.

But above all, our bill would preserve those American institutions that our forefathers built, and for which these young men are now fighting and dying. We cannot afford to strike one stone from the superstructure of our system of constitutional government, for, if it is once destroyed, it will be gone forever.

As Daniel Webster once said:

"Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture, which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

Thus spoke Daniel Webster, one of America's greatest statesmen. His words hold good today.

God protect our brave men who are fighting the enemies of our American institutions from without.

God help us to save those institutions from those elements that would destroy them from within.

Summary of Findings by President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, and Letter from Railroad Executives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the findings of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice on the hearings concerning railroads operating largely in southern territory, and also a letter from the executives of the railroads protesting against the findings. The matter is a fear-reaching one, and one of very great importance, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed for the information of the Congress and the country.

The newspaper statements regarding this matter have been brief. This summary relates to fundamental policy in my section of the country. It was submitted to the Public Printer, and he reports that it will occupy six pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is estimated its publication will cost $270. I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding this estimate of cost, since the matter is official, and of great importance.

There being no objection, the summary and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE IN PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 15–18, 1943

Summary, findings, and directives relating to the following parties to the Southeastern Carriers Conference or Washington Agreement: Atlantic Coast Line Railway Co., Atlanta Joint Terminals, Central of Georgia Railway Co., Georgia Railroad, Jacksonville Terminal Co., Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Southern Railway Co., and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Issued by order of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice November 18, 1943.

MALCOLM ROSS,
Chairman.

The principal grievance of Negro firemen who submitted complaints to the committee and testified at the hearings related to an agreement generally referred to as the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement or the Washington agreement, hereinafter referred to as the agreement. The charge was that the carriers and the union entered into this agreement February 18, 1941, which became effective February 22, 1941, that the agreement, among other things—

(a) Restricts the proportion of Negro firemen and helpers to 50 percent or less in each class of service;

(b) Prevents the hiring of Negro firemen until the number of white firemen employed is 50 percent or more; and

(c) Requires the filling of new runs and vacancies created as specified in the agreement by "promotable men" who are not and may not be Negroes.

The complainants charge that Negro firemen are displaced regardless of seniority, fitness, and ability by junior white firemen, although in many instances Negro firemen are not permitted to displace junior white firemen. In admitting this charge the carriers point out that the condition complained of results from the operation of the 50-percent rule set forth in the agreement.

The complainants also charge that under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, locomotive firemen employed by the respective carriers are represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen which, under its constitution, bylaws, or other regulations, prohibits the membership of Negro firemen therein, because of which Negro firemen employed by the carriers had no voice or part in the negotiations of the agreement; that Negro firemen were not advised of the negotiations and their employment rights were restricted without their participation or consent solely because of their race, and in violation of the provisions of Executive Orders 8802 and 9346.

The carriers admit that they are parties to the agreement and that by virtue of its provisions, the employment of Negroes as firemen is restricted. The respective carriers admit that all the firemen, both white and Negro, employed by them are represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. However, they disclaim any knowledge of the provisions of the constitution of the Brotherhood or whether Negro firemen are prohibited or prevented from having a voice or part in the negotiation of agreements.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen filed no answer to any of the charges.

Analysis of the agreement and the uncontroverted testimony of the witnesses reveal that actually there were two agreements, the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement, or Washington agreement, dated February 18, 1941, effective February 22, 1941;

and the other, a mediation agreement, dated and effective on the same dates, by which it was agreed that the proposals of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, hereinafter set forth, were disposed of by the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement.

The mediation agreement indicates that prior to its execution the general grievance committees of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen submitted to 21 carriers, including the carriers referred to herein, the following proposals for agreement:

"1. Only promotable men will be employed for service as locomotive firemen or for service as helpers on other than steam power.

"2. When new runs or jobs are established in any service, only promotable firemen or helpers will be assigned to them.

"3. When permanent vacancies occur on established runs or jobs in any service, only promotable firemen or helpers will be assigned to them.

"4. It is understood that promotable firemen or helpers on other than steam power are those who are in line for promotion under the present rules and practices to the position of locomotive engineer."

When the parties were unable to agree, an application for mediation, dated January 15, 1941, was made to the National Mediation Board under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. The first three of the above proposals were rejected by the carriers, the fourth proposal became a part of the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement, the pertinent provisions of which are as follows:

"1. On each railroad party hereto the proportion of nonpromotable firemen, and helpers on other than steam power, shall not exceed 50 percent in each class of service established as such on each individual carrier. This agreement does not sanction the employment of nonpromotable men on any seniority district on which nonpromotable men are not now employed.

"2. The above percentage shall be reached as follows:

"(a) Until such percentage is reached on any seniority district only promotable men will be hired.

"(b) Until such percentage is reached on any seniority district all new runs and all vacancies created by death, dismissal, resignation or disqualification shall be filled by promotable men. A change in the starting time of the same run or job will not be considered as constituting a new run.

"3. Except as provided in items (2) (a) and (2) (b) men now holding seniority as firemen, or helpers on other than steam power, shall be permitted to exercise seniority in accordance with their seniority and the rules of their respective schedules.

"4. It is understood that promotable firemen, or helpers on other than steam power, are those who are in line for promotion under the present rules and practices to the position of locomotive engineer.

"5. It is understood and agreed that on any road having, in the opinion of its B. of L. F. and E. committee, more favorable rules or conditions than above stipulated, such rules and conditions may at the option of such committee be retained in lieu of the above provisions.

* * * * *

"7. It is expressly understood that in making this agreement representatives of the employees do not waive and are in no way prejudiced in the right to request agreements on the individual carriers here represented which will restrict the employment of helpers on other than steam power to promotable men; and it is agreed that this question is to be negotiated to a conclusion with the individual carriers."

Had the carriers agreed to the Brotherhood's first three proposals, it is clear that Negro firemen would have been rapidly eliminated. Being non-promotable, no more could have been employed and those already on the rosters could not have survived the proscription against their assignment to new runs and permanent vacancies.

Under the agreement finally entered into, it is apparent that the situation is only slightly less serious than that intended to be created by the Brotherhood. In the first place, according to the agreement, white firemen are virtually guaranteed at least 50 percent of the jobs in each class of service, regardless of seniority, whereas there is no floor whatever under the Negro firemen. Secondly, the agreement ended the employment of Negro firemen wherever they exceeded 50 percent. The ban against such employment has not been removed, even though their numbers are now below 50 percent of the total, and despite the existing firemen shortage. The carriers and the union have preferred to struggle along with insufficient and inexperienced men rather than utilize the services of experienced Negro firemen ready and willing to work. Thirdly, the agreement sanctions prior contracts in force on some roads under which employment of Negro firemen is more severely restricted or has been eliminated entirely. One example is the Southern Railway agreement which, depending on the district involved, limits Negro firemen to proportions ranging from 10 to 50 percent. Another is the St. Louis-San Francisco agreement of 1928 which flatly prohibits their employment altogether. Fourthly, the percentage rule and the provision relating to vacancies and new runs have so greatly impaired the seniority rights of Negro firemen and inflated those of junior white firemen that the better jobs have become or are rapidly becoming the monopoly of the white firemen. Consequently, Negroes have been and are being relegated to the lowest paid, least desirable jobs, to part-time work, and to extra or even emergency status.

A more detailed analysis of the evidence relating to the actual operation and effect of the agreement on the various railroads which are parties to the agreement is contained in the separate summaries, findings, and directives issued by the committee with respect to each carrier. Among other things, the evidence establishes that Negro firemen are not promotable to positions of locomotive engineers, under the existing rules, practices, and procedures recognized and followed by the carriers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. The application of the definition of "promotable firemen" in section (4) of the agreement thus prevents the hiring and limits the promotional opportunities of Negroes solely because of race.

By virtue of the authority conferred upon it by Executive Order No. 9346 to "make findings of fact and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of * * * discrimination" forbidden by the order, the Committee makes the following findings and issues the following directives:

FINDINGS

1. The Committee finds that the carriers referred to herein and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen are parties to an agreement entered into February 18, 1941 (effective February 22, 1941) known as the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement or the Washington agreement, which discriminates against Negroes because of their race in that, among other things, it (a) restricts the proportion of Negro locomotive firemen and helpers to 50 percent or less in each class of service; (b) eliminates the hiring of Negro locomotive firemen and helpers until such proportion or percentage is established; and (c) provides for filling new runs or vacancies, created as specified in the agreement, by "promotable men" who, under present rules, practices, and procedures, are not and may not be Negroes.

2. The Committee finds that said Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement contains no provisions with respect to wages and hours, and that except for the provision relating to examinations for firemen, its sole purpose and effect is to restrict the employment opportunities of Negro firemen solely because of their race.

3. The Committee finds that the said South eastern Carriers Conference Agreement is in conflict with and in violation of Executive Order 9346.

4. The Committee finds that by continuing after the effective dates of Executive Orders 8802 and 9346 to recognize and operate under said Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement, the carriers referred to herein and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have violated and are violating the provisions of Executive Order 9346.

5. The Committee further finds that said Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement may, under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, be renegotiated, modified, or set aside by agreement between the parties thereto.

6. The Committee finds that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen has been recognized as the bargaining agent and grievance representative for all locomotive firemen employed by the carriers referred to herein.

7. The Committee finds that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, while purporting to bargain for and represent the Negro firemen employed by the carriers referred to herein, nevertheless discriminates against said Negro firemen, because of their race, in that it denies them membership in its organization, refuses them any voice or part in the negotiation of agreements or changes therein, affecting working conditions, employment opportunities, policies, or practices, and refuses to represent them with respect to their grievances when such grievances conflict with the interests of junior white firemen.

8. The Committee finds that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, by continuing to engage in the practices set forth in finding No. 7 above after the effective dates of Executive Orders 8802 and 9346, has violated and is violating the provisions of Executive Order 9346.

DIRECTIVES

1. The Committee directs that the carriers herein referred to and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen immediately cease and desist from their discriminatory practices affecting the employment of Negroes.

2. The Committee directs that the carriers referred to herein and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen forthwith set aside the agreement dated February 18, 1941, and known as the Southeastern Carriers Conference Agreement or Washington agreement.

3. The Committee directs that the carriers adjust their employment policies and practices so that all needed workers shall be hired and all employees shall be promoted or upgraded without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

4. The Committee directs that should the carriers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen enter into any agreement in lieu of the said Southeastern Carriers' Conference Agreement or Washington agreement, the new agreement shall contain no provisions or terms discriminating against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

5. The Committee directs that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen

cease and desist from the discriminatory practices set forth in the foregoing finding No. 7, including the cessation of all practices which deprive Negro employees of the same opportunities afforded their white fellow workers in choosing and conferring with bargaining representatives in respect to the adjustment of grievances and the negotiation of any agreements with said carriers concerning hiring, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment.

6. The Committee directs that the respective carriers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen advise the Committee within 30 days from the receipt of these directives of the steps taken to comply therewith.

SUMMARY FINDINGS, AND DIRECTIVES IN RE ATLANTIC COAST LINE CO., BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN, AND BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

SUMMARY

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. was represented at the hearing held September 15–18, 1943, by its general solicitor, Mr. Thomas W. Davis. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen entered no appearance either by counsel or otherwise.

Since two employee job classifications (locomotive firemen and trainmen) were involved in the complaints heard by the committee, the evidence as to each will be summarized separately.

I. Locomotive firemen

Evidence before the Committee resulting from complaint filed and the preliminary investigation showed six charges involving locomotive firemen. The following is a statement of said charges and the answer of the company thereto:

1. The first charge was that the company and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen are parties to an agreement entered into February 18, 1941 (effective February 22, 1941), between the Southeastern Carriers Conference committee and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen which, among other things, (a) restricts the proportion of Negro firemen and helpers to 50 percent or less in each class of service; (b) eliminates the hiring of Negro firemen and helpers until such percentage is established; and (c) provides for the filling of new runs and vacancies, created as specified in the agreement, by "promotable men" who may not be Negroes.

The answer of the company admitted that it is a party to the above-mentioned agreement (this agreement is known by some as the Washington agreement and by others as the Southeastern Carriers' Conference Agreement) and also to a mediation agreement dated February 18, 1941.

2. The second charge was that the company in 1940, 1941, and 1942, refused to permit senior Negro locomotive firemen, because of their race, to receive instruction or work as helpers on Diesel-engined locomotives.

The answer of the company stated that "the assignment of runs in each class of service during 1941 and 1942 was made in accordance with the terms of the mediation agreement referred to above, and in 1940, the basis of assignment of runs was the same as incorporated in that agreement.

3. The third charge was that the company refuses to permit Negro firemen, because of race, to exercise full seniority rights against junior white firemen.

The answer of the company was that Negro locomotive firemen employed by the company may fully exercise their seniority rights to all assignments in accordance with the memorandum of agreement dated February 18, 1941.

4. The fourth charge was that the company in 1941 and 1943 refused to hire competent Negroes as locomotive firemen, because of race, although in the same period white men were being hired as locomotive firemen.

Answering the fourth charge the company stated:

"The employment of white firemen in 1941 was made necessary to replace other white firemen who had been advanced to position of locomotive engineer.

"No Negro firemen have been employed in 1943 because of grievance filed November 1942, which was in December 1942, taken to the National Mediation Board, where it is still pending."

5. The fifth charge was that the company denies to its Negro locomotive firemen, because of race, the right to qualify for and be promoted to the position of locomotive engineer.

The answer of the company was as follows:

"The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. has never employed a Negro as an engineer. The operation of railroads in the South requires the management to observe the customs, manners and racial, social and economic conditions existing throughout the territory in which the Atlantic Coast Line operates. The employment of a Negro engineer, who, in accordance with the seniority rule, might be placed upon the same locomotive or train with a white fireman, white conductor, and white train crew, would result in discord, discontent—and in all probability, of boycott and serious trouble with the members of the crew. In the South, any attempt to use a Negro as locomotive engineer would be bitterly resented by the public."

5. A supplemental summary of complaints charged that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the recognized bargaining representative for Negro firemen employed by the company, refuses to admit Negroes to membership in its organization, refuses to represent them with respect to their grievances when such grievances conflict with the interests of junior white firemen, and denies to them any adequate voice or part in the negotiation of agreements with the company affecting working conditions, employment, opportunities, and practices.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen filed no answer to any of the above charges.

Since the Southeastern Carriers' Conference agreement and the effect thereof have been considered and summarized generally in a separate document, it is only necessary here to set forth the evidence which reveals specifically the situation created by the operation of that agreement and other agreements on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.

In a letter dated December 27, 1942, to the former executive secretary of the committee, the president of the company wrote, "This company has an understanding with the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen that white firemen will be assigned to Diesel engines and such assignments charged against the ratio of runs to which the white firemen are entitled under the terms of the mediation agreement of February 22, 1941."

Mr. Henry A. Dawson, a fireman employed on the south end of the company's Richmond district, and who has seniority dating from 1919, testified that in 1940 his application for assignment to a Diesel engine run was denied and the assignment given to a junior white fireman. He referred to five other Negro firemen, one with seniority from 1910, who suffered the same fate. According to Mr. Dawson, no Negro fireman is permitted to operate a Diesel locomotive in his district in main-line service. He stated that he protested against this practice to the roundhouse foreman, but that the latter referred him to the local chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, who stated that according to a ruling the company Negroes could not work on Diesel locomotives.

As to the company's hiring practice, Mr. Dawson stated that between 1924 and 1942, the company hired no Negro firemen, that in December 1942 it hired 4 such firemen and would have hired 11 others except for a strike threat by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. According to Mr. Dawson, at the time he was employed in 1919, Negro firemen were 85 percent of the total in his district, but that now the proportion has dropped to about 33⅓ percent. There are in his district 81 regularly assigned runs of which 32 are held by Negro firemen.

Regarding membership in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Mr. Dawson testified that in 1919, he inquired of its local chairman whether he might join that organization, but that he received a negative answer. Mr. Dawson stated further, that the said brotherhood would handle grievances of Negroes only when they were between the Negro firemen and the company and not when they involved the interests of white firemen. As to receiving information from the brotherhood concerning agreements with the company, and the operation of the extra board, etc., Mr. Dawson stated that the brotherhood furnished the Negro firemen no such information and that he was able to secure a copy of the current working agreements only by going to an engineer like Jesus Christ went to Nicodemus in the night.

In connection with Mr. Dawson's statement that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen threatened to strike in 1942 should the company hire Negro locomotive firemen, reference is made to certain correspondence (attached to which was a strike ballot) dated December 11, 1942, addressed to the officers and members of the Brotherhood, and signed by the Brotherhood's general chairman, Thad S. Lee. The correspondence in substance recited that the Brotherhood's former general chairman, R. L. Glenn, in 1925 reached "a gentlemen's agreement" with the company that only promotable men would be hired; that the agreement with few exceptions had been observed until the latter part of 1942 when management, denying any knowledge of the agreement, began hiring additional Negro firemen. The Brotherhood's members were therefore asked to vote on the question whether the general chairman and other officers should be authorized to call a strike on the company's property unless a satisfactory settlement was agreed upon.

It is noted, according to the company's answer, that the matter is now before the National Mediation Board.

Mr. V. T. Snowden, a fireman employed on the company's Waycross district, with seniority from 1918, testified that when a Diesel locomotive was placed on his run the run was, without any notice to him, given to a junior white fireman and that when he, Snowden, requested assignment to other runs operated with Diesel engines, his request was refused. He stated that the reason given him by both the master mechanic and the local chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen was that no Negroes were to be allowed on Diesel engines. Mr. Snowden also stated that the Brotherhood refuses to handle grievances of Negro firemen where such grievances conflict with the interests of junior white firemen.

II. Trainmen

Evidence before the Committee resulting from complaints filed and the preliminary investigation presented four charges involving Negro trainmen. The following is a statement of said charges and the answers of the company thereto:

1. The first charge was that in 1941, 1942, and 1943 the company refused to hire competent Negroes as trainmen because of their race, although during the same period white men were being hired as trainmen.

The answer of the company was that no colored brakeman (trainmen) was employed by the company in 1941 and 1943, but that Negro brakemen were employed in 1942.

2. The second charge was that the company, by agreement with the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, refuses to permit its Negro trainmen, because of their race, to act as flagmen.

The answer of the company thereto was as follows:

"On July 2, 1910, this company entered into an agreement with the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen under the Knapp-Neill mediation (United States Government conciliators) which does not permit Negro trainmen in its employ to act as flagmen."

3. The third charge was that the company denies to its Negro trainmen, because of their race, the right to qualify for and be promoted to position of conductor.

The answer of the company was as follows:

"The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company does not employ Negro conductors. The operation of railroads in the South requires the management to observe the customs, manners, and racial, social, and economic conditions existing throughout the territory in which the Atlantic Coast Line operates. The employment of a Negro conductor, who, in accordance with the seniority rules, might be placed upon the same train with a white engineer and a white train crew, would result in discord, discontent, and in all probability in boycott and serious trouble with the members of the crew. In the South any attempt to use a Negro as a conductor would be bitterly resented by the public. In order to properly operate its trains to the best advantage of the public, there must be harmony among the crew."

4. The supplemental summary of complaints charged that the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the bargaining representative of all of the trainmen employed by the company, discriminates against the company's Negro trainmen in that it refuses to admit them to membership in its organization, denies them adequate voice or part in the negotiation of agreements affecting working conditions, employment opportunities, practices, etc., and refuses to represent them with respect to their grievances when such grievances conflict with the grievances of white trainmen.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen filed no answer to any of the above charges.

There was placed in evidence article 29 (c) subparagraphs 1, 2, and 3 of the current agreement between the company and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The provisions of article 29 are: (1), no larger percentage of Negro trainmen and yardmen will be employed on any district or yard than was employed January 1, 1910; (2), that Negroes are not to be employed as baggagemen, flagmen, or yard foremen; and (3), that when Negroes performing service as flagmen or yard foremen become separated from the service their places will be filled by white men.

Mr. J. Wyman Jones gave testimony illustrating the hardship caused to Negro trainmen by the operation of the above-referred-to article 29. Mr. Jones testified that he was employed by the company as trainman in 1939, and that he worked on the extra board prior to September 10, 1942, when he received a regular assignment as a brakeman. He stated that while on the extra board his earnings amounted to sums ranging from $25 to $40 per month; whereas the extra board white trainmen earned about $200 per month. He accounted for the difference in earnings between him and the white trainmen as follows: According to the rules, both he and the white trainmen were supposed to work "first in, first out," but since a Negro could not work as a flagman or baggageman, he could not take his turn in instances where flagmen or baggagemen jobs were to be filled, even though he might stand "first out." Where a brakeman's job was to be filled, according to Jones, he could not always fill it even though it was his turn to do so, because an older white trainman, holding a regular flagman's job, could in the exercise of his seniority demand the extra braking job and leave the flagman's position to be filled by a white trainman below Jones on the extra board. Mr. Jones said that this practice sometimes caused him to be without work for as many as 13 successive days, though on each of these days it was his turn to fill the first available job. He stated that this condition still obtains in the case of colored men now on the extra board.

In addition to the portions of the answer above referred to, the company submitted certain additional matters for the committee's consideration, some of which are quoted below:

"1. The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. operates in six Southern States: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. Most of its territory is agricultural country. In each of these States there is a large Negro population, and conditions among the races are different from those in some other sections of the country. In the South there is no social equality among the races.

"2. The Southern States have in effect laws requiring the segregation of white and colored races. These have been on the statute books for many, many years, and there has been, up to the present time, no attempt to repeal these laws. They have been recognized equally by the white and colored races as the proper solution of the Negro problem in the South.

"3. Railroads have an important and distinct obligation as common carriers of persons and property to continuously perform the public services required of them. Their managements, over years of experience, have learned how best to operate and serve the people of the sections where they find themselves, and how best to adapt their operation and employment practices to the social solution of the racial question as worked out by the prevailing manners, customs, and system of the States they serve. In the solution of its social and racial problems, the South has adopted the solution of segregation of the races, and this segregation of the races on railroads has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Supreme Court of the United States. Whether the laws relating to segregation in the South are wise or unwise is a matter solely within the sound discretion of the legislatures of the Southern States, and is not a matter for this company to pass upon. This company has adapted its operation practices to accord with the laws in force in the States in which it operates.

"4. This company's binding agreements with the labor organizations representing its employees, arrived at by processes under the Railway Labor Act and earlier controlling United States labor laws, and often with governmental assistance and approval, are made in the light of the social environment as it exists in the South and deal realistically and fairly with the racial problems referred to above. This company is not at liberty to disregard and violate these agreements.

"This company avers that its employment practices, as hereinbefore set forth, are in accordance with and abreast of the social and legal solutions which the civilization of the South has worked out for delicate racial problems which all the wisdom and statesmanship of America have not yet been able fully to solve; that its said practices are fair and in compliance with law; that the said practices are not detrimental to, but contribute to, the prosecution of the war, the workers' morale, and national unity."

The Committee is aware of the laws relating to racial segregation in the States in which the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. operates. We do not, however, understand, nor does the company explain, that these laws prohibit it from hiring Negroes as firemen and trainmen. Neither does the Committee believe that these laws have anything to do with the company's practices of refusing to Negro firemen employment on Diesel locomotives, or otherwise restricting such firemen's work opportunities and rights relating to seniority. The same observation is made regarding the company's practice which limits Negro trainmen to front-end brakemen's jobs, while according to white trainmen the right to act as brakemen, flagmen, or baggagemen.

No good purpose would be served by joining in a discussion of the "prevailing manners and customs of the civilization of the section" in which the company carries on its business. It is sufficient to point out that the public in that section has never objected to Negro firemen and trainmen and that, on the contrary, it has freely sanctioned their employment for over half a century. Present policies of restriction are comparatively recent developments, and, as the company well knows, they are developments created wholly by it, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen for reasons entirely disassociated from the social problems referred to above. For the company to refer to its practices as those which are but "in accordance with and abreast of the social and legal solutions which the civilization of the South has worked out" is to ignore these facts, as well as the realities of the situation upon which the company appears to rely.

By virtue of the authority conferred upon it by Executive Order 9346 to "make findings of fact and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of * * * discrimination" forbidden by the order, the committee makes the following findings and issues the following directives:

FINDINGS

1. The Committee incorporates herein by reference the findings set forth in its summary, findings, and directives relating to the Southeastern Carriers' Conference Agreement.

2. The Committee further finds that the company and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen discriminate against Negroes, because of their race, in that they are parties to an understanding or agreement providing for the assignment of only white firemen to Diesel engines in road service.

3. The Committee finds that the company discriminates against Negroes, because of their race, in that it refuses to employ them as locomotive firemen and trainmen.

4. The Committee finds that the company and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen discriminate against Negro locomotive firemen, because of their race, in that they do not permit Negro firemen to exercise seniority rights and to enjoy freedom from displacement on their runs to the same extent that white firemen may exercise seniority rights and to enjoy freedom from job displacements.

5. The Committee finds that the company denies to its Negro locomotive firemen, because of their race, the right to qualify for and be promoted to the position of locomotive engineer.

6. The Committee finds that the company refuses to permit its Negro trainmen, because of their race, to be employed as flagmen or baggagemen.

7. The Committee further finds that the company and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are parties to an agreement (art. 29 (c), subpars. 1, 2, and 3 of the trainmen's agreement, effective February 1, 1927), which provides that no larger percentage of Negro trainmen and yardmen will be employed on any district or yard, than was employed January 1, 1910; that Negroes are not to be employed as baggagemen, flagmen, or yard foremen; and that when Negroes performing service as flagmen, baggagemen, or yard foremen become separated from the service, their places shall be filled by white men.

8. The Committee finds that the company denies to its Negro trainmen, because of their race, the right to qualify for and be promoted to the position of conducter.

9. The Committee finds that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, while purporting to bargain for and represent the Negro trainmen employed by the company, nevertheless discriminates against said Negro trainmen, because of their race, in that it denies them membership in its organization and refuses them any voice or part in the negotiation of agreement or changes therein affecting working conditions, employment opportunities, practices, and policies.

10. The Committee further finds that the several agreements referred to in the preceding findings may under their terms and the provisions of the Railway Labor Act be renegotiated or set aside by parties thereto.

11. The Committee further finds that the discrimination referred to in the preceding findings is in conflict with and in violation of Executive Order 9346.

DIRECTIVES

1. The Committee incorporates herein by reference the directives set forth in the summary, findings, and directives relating to the Southeastern Carriers' Conference Agreement.

2. The Committee directs that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen immediately cease and desist from its discriminatory practices affecting the employment of Negroes.

3. The Committee directs that the company adjust its employment practices and policies so that all needed workers shall be hired and all company employees shall be promoted or upgraded without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

4. The Committee directs that the company cease and desist from its discriminatory employment practices which prevent Negro trainmen in its employ from working as flagmen or baggagemen.

5. The Committee directs that the company and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen forthwith set aside, the understanding or agreement between them whereby Negro firemen are barred from working as helpers on Diesel-electric locomotives.

6. The Committee further directs that the company and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen forthwith eliminate Article 29 (c) subparagraphs 1, 2, and 3, from the current trainmen's agreement, effective February 1, 1927.

7. The Committee directs that should the company and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen enter into any agreement or agreements in lieu of the agreements referred to in the preceding directives, the new agreement or agreements shall contain no term or provision discriminating against any company employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

8. The Committee directs that the company issue formal instructions to all of its personnel officers and employees, having authority to hire and upgrade workers, to carry on their activities in the recruiting, training, and upgrading of workers or prospective workers, solely on the basis of the qualifications of applicants or workers and without regard to race, color, or national origin.

9. The Committee directs that the company give formal notice to all employment agencies, public or private, including the Railroad Retirement Board, through which the company recruits workers or trainees, that it will accept needed workers for all classifications of employment without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

10. The Committee directs that the company give formal notice to all labor unions with which it has contracts that it will comply fully with its obligations under Executive Order 9346 not to discriminate against workers because of race, creed, color, or national origin, in recruiting, upgrading, or in any other terms or condition of employment.

11. The Committee directs that the company give written authority to all public and private employment agencies, including the Railroad Retirement Board, through which it recruits workers, to make the company's requisitions for employees available to the Committee upon the Committee's request.

12. The Committee directs that the company submit to the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices copies of each of the above instructions and notices.

13. The Committee directs that the company, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen report to the Committee within 30 days of the receipt of these directives, the steps taken to comply therewith.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 13, 1943.*

President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices, Executive Office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This is the joint response of those of the undersigned railroads which are parties to the Southeastern Carriers' Conference, or Washington agreement, responding to your summary, findings, and directives dated November 18, 1943, directed against those railroads and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen with reference to that agreement, and is the joint and several response of all and each of the undersigned railroads to your respective summaries, findings, and directives of the same date directed against each of the undersigned railroads and various railway labor organizations regarding various other matters.

These railroads have no response to make to your findings and directives addressed exclusively against various railway labor organizations and dealing with their practices concerning failure to admit Negroes to their membership, or to consult them in representation of employees, etc.

These railroads are engaged, with all their energies and abilities, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, in carrying on the most vital business of transportation in the public service and in the prosecution of the war effort. They are contributing their part to the total war effort of the railroads of the country, which has been acclaimed as an unprecedented accomplishment by all branches of the Government and of the armed services. The manpower situation on these railroads is not preventing their most excellent accomplishment in this regard. This accomplishment has been achieved by peaceful and harmonious relations with railway labor and by patriotic and wholehearted cooperation between these managements, labor, and the shipping and traveling public. We wish it to be clearly understood that any disruption of these peaceful and harmonious relations and of this patriotic cooperation which may result from your Committee's directives is not the responsibility of these railroads.

The employment relations of these railroads are governed by collective-bargaining agreements reached under the controlling procedures of the Railway Labor Act. Any change in those agreements is a matter of immediate and vital concern to our employees of various crafts and classes and to their organizations and representatives as well as to these railroads. Railroads are forbidden by law to interfere in any way with the self-determination or self-organization of their employees and are entirely without power to dictate to their employees or to affect by unilateral action any changes in such agreements. Such changes are controlled by, and can only be accomplished by, the procedures of the Railway Labor Act.

It is wholly impracticable and, indeed, impossible for these railroads to put into effect your Committee's directives addressed against them. Any attempt on their part to comply with those directives, for instance, to promote Negroes to locomotive engineers or train conductors, would inevitably disrupt their present peaceful and cooperative relations with their employees, would antagonize the traveling and shipping public served by them, would substitute conditions of chaos for the present condition of harmony, would result in stoppages of transportation, and would most gravely and irreparably impair the whole war effort of the country. These railroads cannot assume the responsibility for precipitating such disastrous results.

These railroads are ready at any time to confer with their employees of various crafts and classes to ascertain whether, under the orderly and controlling procedures of the Railway Labor Act, any more generally satisfactory solution of the racial problems of employment can be worked out by mutual agreement. However, frankness compels these railroads very respectfully to state to your Committee that it is utterly unrealistic to suppose that these railroads and their employees can agree to comply with the breadth of your directives or that problems of such delicacy, controlled and governed by a special act of Congress, can be solved out of hand by the flat of your Committee's directives.

A number of your findings and directives against some of these railroads undertake to deal with classes and crafts of railway employees which were given no notice of your charges or hearings, which were not represented, and which were given no opportunity to be heard, and with practices concerning such classes and crafts as to which those railroads were given no hearing. Manifestly, such findings and directives are wholly lacking in due process of law and for that reason are without legal effect.

And, finally, with great respect the undersigned railroads submit that your committee was and is wholly without constitutional and legal jurisdiction and power to make and issue the directives which it made and issued, and for this reason the said directives are without legal effect.

Very truly yours,

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.; Atlanta Joint Terminals; M. P. Callaway, trustee, Central of Georgia Railway Co.; Georgia Railroad; Jacksonville Terminal Co.; Louisville and Nashville Railroad Co.; Norfolk Southern Railway Co.; J. M. Kurn and Frank A. Thompson, trustees, St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., debtor; Seaboard Air Line Railway; Southern Railway Co.; The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.; Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co.; Norfolk & Western Railway Co.; Illinois Central Railroad Co.; the Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co.; Gulf & Ship Island Railroad Co.

Two Major Problems: Winning the War and Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Association of Finance Companies, at Milwaukee, Wis., on December 11 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The privilege of addressing an organization of this type is one for which I am very grateful. In Washington, as in Milwaukee, we are concerned with two major problems; paramount, winning the war, but n less, winning the peace—a just and lasting peace with none of the economic chaos that was the aftermath 24 years ago.

Briefly, a few words in connection with the imminent problem of winning the war. Because the war is progressing satisfactorily on all fronts, there is a common tendency here at home to relax; to feel the end is a matter of months or even weeks. This is an erroneous and reprehensible conclusion. It is erroneous because we have a tough, hard road to travel before victory is assured. It is reprehensible, because if we fail to realize it, we fall down in our production of necessary war material, which means delay of the peace, each day, each second of which is nothing short of catastrophic.

We cannot permit ourselves to become sabotaged by overoptimism. It is foolhardy t become overoptimistic and bring about a lessening of the Nation's effort.

In the words of the battle communiques, the war effort in Europe and Asia is "proceeding satisfactorily"; but unless we break the backbone of German morale by our intensified bombing of Germany's cities, we can expect that the march to Berlin will be a tremendously costly one. And after the defeat of Germany, we face the long, costly march to Tokyo. Obviously, then, every one of us must, more than ever, dedicate himself without stint to everything and anything necessary to the end that victory will be ours in as short a time as possible. The waste of precious American live that might otherwise be saved will be the toll to pay.

This second problem—the winning of the peace—calls, too, for our best efforts. It is a job to try our very souls, although I am sure America will meet the challenge head-on. The peace, more than ever, means using our heads—not losing them. We will face a national debt of possibly $300,000,000,000. That in itself is not an insurmountable task, if we pull together, work together, and have the will to persist. But, if we fail in any of these vital matters, chaos will result.

The Government, industry, labor, and many great civil organizations, are planning transition from war to peace. We are all thinking about the demobilization of our men from the armed forces and from war plants. We are planning the demobilization of war plants and machines, the cancelation of war contracts, and the termination of wartime economic controls.

In this tremendous job of demobilization—and it is a tremendous job because it involves 135,000,000 people who have been geared to a war effort—we will need unity of mind, soul, and spirit. We want no little Hitlers arising to take command of the show. We want no monkey-throwing racketeers in any segment of our society disrupting our demobilization concepts.

If the war in Europe should cease before the war in the Orient (and I think it will), it should mean that the demobilization of our armed forces will begin, and it should mean the absolute cessation of inducting fathers and even married men into the services.

Of course, when victory is ours, we will have to maintain, perhaps for a long time, a considerable portion of our armed forces to supervise the chaotic conditions throughout the world.

One of the foremost problems America will have to face is the disposal of the vast amount of surplus war material on far-flung battle fronts and here at home, including the war plants which the Government will own at the close of the war. This presents a basic, most urgent problem. There are those who want the Government to operate and expand these mammoth plants in competition with private enterprise. And there are those who want the Government to go into partnership on a large scale with the citizens of the country, meaning virtually Government control, and in effect the aggrandizement of superbureaucracy. On the other hand, there are those who feel that America should continue to be the land of the free as well as the home of the brave. In other words, that we should take all necessary steps to keep away from state-owned and operated plants in competition with the citizens; to keep away from state socialism and reduce state controls to a minimum.

In connection with meeting the post-war problems, of course, we have to think in terms of maintaining employment. There are those who feel that to do this Government must in a big-hearted, paternal manner absorb its citizens, give them jobs, and pay their wages. They contend that private enterprise will not be able to provide jobs for American citizens. They wave the problem, as a problem, aside. The Government, they say, must provide supplemental activities and employ all job seekers.

After the peace there will be adequate work to do, adequate money with which to buy adequate tools, and manpower with which to accomplish the job in the post-war period. If we all pull together, Americans can provide their own solvency. Americans will have a saving of some $40,000,000,000, maybe more, which will provide a great demand for goods—goods such as automobiles, washing machines, farm machinery, airplanes, radios, electrical equipment of all kinds, buildings, etc.

There will be great expenditures for reconversion of war plants to a peacetime economy. There will be the need for rebuilding our transportation system. Great public works, like transcontinental highways, reconstruction of highways, millions of new homes, expansion of airports—all this will create a great demand for labor—creating jobs for those who want work.

It will be a serious mistake for Government to enter that picture, except where it is absolutely necessary to compete with the citizen. The Government will need taxes, and government can only get them from the earnings of its citizens. We should have, after the war, if we maintain only those controls which are necessary, a national income of $120,000,000,000. Out of that income we can pay our overhead in government, interest on our national debt, and still have $100,000,000,000 left for our citizens. Of course, this all assumes that we will, as I said before, work together.

We will see an expansion of the social-security program. There will be plans put into effect for underwriting employment if nonemployment should become a serious menace.

If the local governments and the States, practically all of whom during this period are accumulating surpluses, expend their funds with judgment and common sense, we may find that the problems of the Federal Government will be considerably minimized.

A great many of the activities into which the Federal Government has poked its nose during these last years can be handled more efficiently by the local and State governments. From my own experience in Washington in the past 5 years, I would say that a good many of our people have lost the original concept the founding fathers had when they formed this Government. That concept was that the States must reserve to themselves those fields of governmental activity not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution. Many of us, as a result, have gotten into the habit of leaning on Washington; and that, as we well know now, means more bureaucrats, more interference with our individual lives.

In times of great stress, such as economic depression or war, it becomes necessary to put into effect centralized effort. Our people have responded gallantly during this war crisis. They have good-naturedly, enthusiastically surrendered many of their inalienable personal rights. But when peace comes, I am satisfied they will insist that those things that can be done better and those activities that can be performed more efficiently by local government and the States, shall be handled by these and not by the Federal governmental agencies.

Anyone who has eyes with which to see knows that in many European countries, when a central government took unto itself the power to become the "great father" of its subjects—paternalistic government, in other words—that very soon the government became the master of the people instead of the people being the master of the government. We have had many symptoms of that condition in our own Government; but America is still a free land because her people love freedom and abhor slavery.

You are men whose lives are devoted to handling local financial matters. Much of your business has been that of looking after installment credits. Of course, you are interested as to what role installment credit will play in the post-war period. I might give you some facts concerning that subject.

1. Installment sale debt has been reduced by about $3,000,000,000.

2. Total short-term consumer debt has been reduced by almost $5,000,000,000 since 1941.

3. If Government restrictions are removed, we can expect to see that trade in installment credit will be reversed upward.

4. The increase in installment debt will be slow right after the war, by virtue of the fact that many consumers, as I have mentioned before, have built up savings in banks and in Government bonds which they will probably spend first before going into debt. Perhaps in this connection there will be presented a great opportunity for cooperation between your group, the purchaser of goods, and the Government. I have reference to this situation—that instead of individuals who own bonds throwing them into the Treasury all at once and getting funds for the purpose of buying goods, it might be worked out that these very bonds could be used as collateral for loans obtained from banks and finance companies. This is something about which you should be thinking, and the Government should be thinking as well.

5. Costly items, such as automobiles, will undoubtedly be bought on credit in spite of this backlog of spending power.

The general opinion seems to be that there will be an expansion of installment credit

after the war which will make for vigorous business activity for at least several years. Of course, there is ever before us the specter of inflation; and in the immediate post-war period it is possible, and highly probable, that Government will, of necessity, retain some restriction and control over installment sales.

I believe that reasonable control during that time will prove beneficial. However, we want to make sure that some of our planners when they talk about "control" do not mean "mastery." There is no question that in a world crisis such as will confront us in the post-war period, Government has an important role to play. But it must be constructive; it must have for its objective that of fostering and encouraging the activities of its citizens. And fostering and encouraging must not be interpreted to mean taking over the legitimate activities of private citizens in our cities and States or unduly influencing them. Neither does it mean that the Government should expand its lending policies.

Obviously, the private financial institutions of this country would fade out of the picture if the Government were to develop a financial system in competition with private enterprise. Government financial institutions must be required to confine their activities to a minimum, making way for private enterprise. They must be limited in existence only as it is apparent that they are absolutely needed where banks and finance concerns cannot serve. An economic house divided against itself cannot stand.

You are naturally interested in that vast amount of goods and materials the Government will have on hand in this country when the war is over. This must be handled with extreme care. It should be disposed of in foreign trade through foreign business channels, in rehabilitation of foreign countries. If distribution takes place in this country, it should be through regular business channels and not dumped, as was done after the First World War.

As individuals and as businessmen, you are interested, of course, in what the tax policy of the Government will be after the war. If we have the income we hope to have, our present tax program must be revamped and everything possible done to permit capital to earn a reasonable income. This would make for a healthful economy. Our tax burden should be gradually reduced to the point where we can take care of the overhead of government, interest charges, and begin the reduction of our national debt. The income tax will be the chief source of revenue for the Government and there will undoubtedly be a sharp reduction in consumption taxes.

I believe that America is now fully cognizant that she cannot live unto herself alone, economically or politically.

We have been drawn into two world wars in large measure because the world has been contracted by invention. Time and distance have been practically annihilated. Therefore, there must be an earnest attempt toward international collaboration, to promote peace, to promote active employment, to promote world trade, and to promote the general welfare. Peace—continuous peace—means there must be the will to peace by the nations of earth, followed by action, right and necessary action of such nations.

However, pursuing this course, every American, and particularly those public servants whom you have delegated to handle your big business of government, must be constantly on the alert. This war will not bring about the millennium. Racial hatreds will not be wiped out. Unless Christian principles can root themselves in the hearts of all the peoples of earth, there will continue to be great challenges to peace.

Pearl Harbor woke America from a mesmeric spell. We were not prepared for war in spite of the fact that we had been given over 2 years and 3 months of warning. We thought we were secure in our own house. We were the last great nation to be awakened out of this dream of false security.

Now that we are awake, we must not permit ourselves to be mesmerized again. Next time there may be no R. A. F. I heard a gentleman say to an audience before which I spoke in New York recently (and I agree with his conclusion) that America must ever remain on guard. The developments that are taking place in the airplane (and every plane now flying is out of date compared with blueprints) are such that unless we are in a position to handle an invasion from the air, in a few years such an invasion could take place from any country in the world and we could become a conquered nation overnight.

Our post-war settlement must provide against any invasion of that character, against invasion of any character, not alone invasion of war but invasion of any kind that threatens our rights * * * of life or to live. We must never again be mentally sabotaged into the self-satisfied, sodden condition of the democracies when Hitler marched into Poland. This, I repeat, is the responsibility of every American citizen. It is the heritage we must leave to all the peoples of the world and all the generations of the future.

Statements by Senator Hill and Representatives Eaton, May, and Bloom on Anncuncement of Teheran Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Monday of last week, December 6, at 1 o'clock p. m., at the time of the announcement of the Teheran Conference, the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. ANDREW JACKSON MAY, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Representative EATON, of New Jersey, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Representative BLOOM, of New York, and I made statements commenting on the Teheran declaration, over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System. I ask unanimous consent that these statements may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LISTER HILL

The declaration of the three great leaders of the United Nations shows the absolute unity of the nations and that in the strength of that unity we are marching down the last long road to the complete defeat of the German military machine, and the utter destruction of nazi-ism and its dream of world domination. The declaration insures that Germany will not again be in a position to bring the scourge of war upon innocent peoples. The Moscow Conference, the Cairo Conference, the Teheran Conference constitute the greatest diplomatic victories of our time. They lay the foundation stones for the building of an orderly and peaceful world. When we consider the terrible danger that confronted our country just 2 years ago this day, the American people may well thank God for the strength and courage that He gave us which has made possible our breathtaking record of stupendous achievements.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES A. EATON

The achievement of complete agreement at Cairo between the United States, Great Britain, and China guarantees the wiping out of Japan as a world menace and full participation of all Pacific races and countries in post-war policies and programs of world freedom and international cooperation.

The Teheran Conference guarantees complete destruction of the German military machine and when this has been done the setting up of a new world order in which men everywhere may live free lives untouched by tyranny.

Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin on behalf of their respective governments and countries solemnly agree to cooperate in world leadership for the final establishment of democratic free principles as the common basis for a new world order of understanding, unity, and progress.

I consider this communique, if its pledges are fulfilled, to be one of the most momentous documents ever penned. It marks the beginning of a new, and I hope a nobler and happier age for all mankind.

STATEMENT OF HON A. J. MAY, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This declaration means that the military despotisms of Germany and Japan have now reached the crossroads of the world and they must now atone for their sins. The conflict will be vigorous and bloody and the inevitable result will be the complete destruction of military despotism in all the earth. With the wise leadership of the Allied Nations we must and will build a world democracy that will be strong and vigorous and that will guarantee complete accord in fulfillment of the ideals and purposes of the Atlantic Charter.

This document might well be called and hereafter known as the Magna Carta of the twentieth century. The accomplishment of its objectives will make effective throughout the world the fundamentals of the American Declaration of Independence. The enslaved peoples of all the nations of the world will rejoice.

STATEMENT OF HON. SOL BLOOM, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The solemn hour is approaching when the free nations of the world will crush the enemy and establish a peace of good will. This is the momentous declaration today of the spokesmen of freedom. They have met, in spite of enemy predictions that they would never meet; and their minds and hearts are in accord on the aims of war and peace.

This day's declaration sounds the doom of German power. The free world moves to its appointed security and peace, in obedience to the will of Providence. It has been ordained by the Almighty that freedom shall not perish, but shall overcome its tormentors. God has smiled upon the sacrifices of our free nations. They are saving themselves and all humanity, even the enemy peoples.

Victory will sound the beginning of long and prosperous peace. We thank God for the harmony, resolution, and foresight of the great men who announce the fixed determination of the forces of freedom that now dominate the world.

A 1944 Program for the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A 1944 Program for the Republicans," written by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. THE POLITICAL ISSUES OF 1944 ARE DOMESTIC

The administration which is elected in 1944 will have the power to make over America. We have had to tear our business and economic structure to pieces in the interest of war production. It must be made over for peace production either on the basis of individual freedom or on the basis of Government control. We have had to surrender many individual rights and submit temporarily to Fascistlike regulation. The new administration will determine whether these controls are permanent or whether the multiple freedoms intended by our Constitution and Bill of Rights are restored to our people as the basis of liberty. There has never been a time when we have had such a momentous choice to make as to our own future. It is the issue which underlies every other issue in 1944.

That is the reason why I am going to discuss the domestic issues, when most of the sound and fury in the press is devoted to differences on our future foreign policy.

I do not depreciate the importance of the problems of war and peace. Of course, the first plank in the platform of any party will be to win the war as quickly and as completely as possible. But there is little disposition to criticize the great job of organization done by our Army and Navy officials since June 1940. They will be supported to the limit by every party, and by any man who may be elected President in 1944. It is not a controversial political issue on which the election can be fought.

So, also, I believe that the question of political reorganization of the world will not be an issue between the parties, and therefore will not decide the election. The action taken by the Republican Post-war Advisory Council at Mackinac tends to remove any differences between the parties which did exist. On the one side it excludes a policy of isolation, and on the other it excludes the fantastic Stassen plan for an international state with an all-powerful international police force, and an international bureau operating our seaports and our airports. Secretary Hull's speech of September 12, 1943, also excludes these two extremes. Both parties are tending toward a league of sovereign nations, undertaking to prevent aggression by the use of their national forces. I doubt if either party will endorse a British-American offensive-defensive alliance, in spite of the current popularity given to the theory by Mr. Walter Lippmann's book.

For these reasons foreign policy may be entirely removed from politics, as it often has been during our history. I doubt if any detailed plans for an international political organization will even be formulated before the 1944 election.

It is quite true that behind a front of simple cooperation, the President may conceal a real intention to bring about an international state or an imperialist British-American control of the world. In 1932 the New Deal was hidden behind a program of economy and State rights. In November 1936 the 1937 attack on the Supreme Court was completely masked until after the election. In 1940 a war policy was denied by pledges that no American boys would be sent to fight in foreign lands. If there is any evidence of a secret intent, the Republicans can make that an issue, but there will be little difference between the declared policies of the two parties.

II. THE BASIC ISSUE IS THE RETENTION OF FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

What kind of a country are we and our children and our grandchildren going to live in? That is the question to be decided in the 1944 election. The liberty and the happiness of the American people at home must be the ultimate goal of any war policy, any peace policy, or any foreign policy. Why do our boys fight on every continent in the world, except to preserve in the United States the freedom and the liberties which, for more than 150 years, we have associated with the American Republic? Our people did not go to war to establish freedom or freedoms throughout the world, but because they believed that the aggression of Germany in Europe, and Japan in Asia, was so dangerous and so likely to be successful that our own safety was threatened. We are fighting now in order that in the future this country and its people may be left free from war and threats of war to work out the destiny of the American Republic. But 1944 is the time when we must decide what that destiny shall be.

The threat to the American type of democratic existence is not imaginary, nor can it be easily dispelled. The trend of thought on forms of Government throughout the entire world has been pushing all peoples consciously or unconsciously away from democracy to different form of totalitarianism. In Europe, democratic ideals were crushed between the dynamic dogmas of communism and fascism. In the United States, we often lose sight of the real nature of the principles on which freedom depends, in our desire to remake our world according to the popular methods of the day—methods formulated for the most part by the European Socialists. The microbes of totalitarianism are well entrenched in our own processes of thought, and they are encouraged eagerly by many active groups in the United States, of whom the most vociferous, but not the most dangerous, are the Communists.

Nevertheless, 90 percent of the people don't want to sacrifice the liberties which are inherent in our republican Constitution for any New Deal methods or philosophy. I am always impressed with the fact that even in the recent Democratic Congresses there have not been more than 20 percent who are New Dealers at heart. For one reason or another, they have been persuaded to go along; but without the President's support, the New Deal would have ended with its early reforms.

What do the great majority of American people want? They want the basic system under which this country has prospered for 150 years, but they want that system improved. They want to eliminate the hardship and the injustice of depressions and hard times. They want to eliminate undeserved poverty. They don't want a lot of men abusing the system by seizing special privileges for themselves and feathering their own nests when they don't deserve it. They want prosperity, good wages, good farm prices. But they want these things together with the freedoms and the liberties which were established by their forefathers. They don't want Government agents overrunning their farms and telling them how to run their business.

And I think there is something more in their thoughts than a New Deal nirvana of wealth and leisure. Undoubtedly, we desire to go forward to create a more prosperous people with a higher standard of living. So much emphasis has been put on this material side, however, that we are in danger of losing sight of the greatest purposes of life and the greatest causes of true happiness. Before our system can claim success, it must not only create a people with a higher standard of living but a people with a higher standard of character—character that must include religious faith, morality, educated intelligence, self-restraint, and an ingrained demand for justice and unselfishness. In our striving for material things, we must not change those basic principles of Government and of personal conduct which create and protect the character of a people. It may be perfectly possible, in a Fascist or Communist regime, to create a higher standard of living, although history does not bear out any such idea, but no matter how successful that regime may be in material things, it cannot create a nation of free men who are masters of their own destiny. We cannot hope to achieve salvation by worshiping the god of a standard of living.

III. THE NEW DEAL PROGRAM FOR 1944 IS BASED ON UNLIMITED SPENDING AND SOCIALISM

The New Deal platform on this question has been written in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, the board of which Mr. Delano, the President's uncle, was chairman until it was abolished this spring by an indignant Congress. That report provides for the restoration of all the New Deal agencies—the W. P. A., the P. W. A., the C. C. C., the N. Y. A., and all the others—except that all of them are to be federalized on a bigger and more elaborate scale. It provides Federal aid to education and the socialization of medicine. It provides for an increased Government regulation of everyone. It recommends a Government transportation agency to control and presumably to manage the railroads, busses, air lines, and other forms of transportation. It provides for the operation by Government corporations, or by corporations in which the Government is a partner, of all the power companies, aluminum companies, magnesium companies, and even shipbuilding and aircraft companies. Underlying the entire plan is the theory of unlimited Government spending, the theory that a debt owed to ourselves is no debt at all, the theory that public debt can go on increasing indefinitely. In all these vast reports of the National Resources Planning Board there is not a word said as to how the programs are to be paid. And those programs will cost more than $30,000,000,000 a year.

Anyone who reads these reports will see that the inevitable result of the program is the tremendous expansion of all Federal activities, the piling of more bureaus on the bureaus that exist, the addition of millions of Federal employees. He will see that it can lead only to the complete elimination of local self-government and destroy the independence of the States. It can lead only to a general socialization of industry. Either the whole plan will be a vast failure or it will be carried out by a complete centralization of arbitrary power in Washington. It is the pattern for a totalitarian state.

IV. A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM OF PROGRESS

The Republican Party has no quarrel with the alleged ultimate purposes sought by the New Deal. We are just as anxious to bring about Utopia as anyone else, but we realize that progress is a long, difficult matter, and one which can be brought about on a sound and permanent basis only if we keep constantly before us the necessity of individual

freedom and local self-government. When peace comes and we seek to reconstitute America, the Republicans feel that progressive methods can be adopted and every improvement secured within the framework of the American Constitution. The Republican Farty intends that all improvement shall be guided by the philosophy of the American people, and not by the philosophy of a small group with imported and alien ideas of a socialistic state. Its program is one of affirmative progress.

A. Substantially full employment by restoring private enterprise

Substantially full employment must be restored and maintained through free enterprise, with only such assistance from Government as is proved to be absolutely necessary. Men should be demobilized gradually, so that they can be taken up in peacetime industry. Plants must be rapidly returned to private ownership and operation, in order that men may be put to work and production increased.

I do not think that it is going to be necessary to proceed with any vast system of public works undertaken by States and municipalities through handouts from the Federal Government. I am convinced that the backlog of civilian demand will bring on for a while a period of intense activity by private enterprise. If we can't get on without Government spending in the 3 or 4 years after the war, then no time will ever come when we can do without it. The public-works-program idea was initiated by those who, as a matter of policy, desire to substitute huge peacetime deficits for huge wartime deficits. Unfortunately, many people who ought to know better are encouraging it, because they hope to get their own hands or the hands of their community into the Federal grab bag.

Of course, a reasonable Federal public-works program should be prepared and pursued, and should certainly be ready to be carried out when business activity shows signs of declining, but only those public works should be included which are going to be of value for their own sake.

A public-works program as a cure for major unemployment is bound to be a wash-out, like any other plan of spending Government money for the sake of spending. It does not give enough employment for the money expended. Prosperity can't be restored simply by a free use of the public purse.

To enable private industry to give employment, regulation of business should be promptly reduced. Production restrictions should be removed at once, and as soon as a reasonable supply of any article is available, price restraints should be removed. After a careful study, all powers of permanent regulation which are not clearly necessary should be repealed. I believe that the only regulation of importance which ought to remain is that required to prevent fraud, monopoly, and unfair competition, and to require collective bargaining with employees. Even this kind of regulation can be done by specific statute, without delegating to Government boards and bureaus the power to write new regulations at will. It can be done without the necessity of requiring the filing of monumental reports, and without sending Government controllers and snoopers into every plant and every store to regulate profits and practices and tell every man how to run his business.

A great deal more is known now regarding inflation, deflation, and depressions. Certainly we are not going back to any laissez faire policy in finance. Tax policy, currency policy, control of bank credit through regulation of reserves and open-market operations, control of foreign balances, and the flow of gold, all must be coordinated to prevent the recurrence of such a collapse as occurred from 1929 to 1932. But the success of any such policy cannot be automatic. It depends entirely on the ability of those who control the fiscal policy of the Government. If wise men administer the fiscal affairs of Government, even under present laws, I believe the business cycle with its recurrent depressions can be largely eliminated. With impractical men in charge, inspired by the unsound fiscal panaceas of the Federal Reserve Board and the National Resources Planning Board, no kind of legislation can prevent disaster.

An absolute essential of general employment through the growth of free enterprise is a free capital market. Money must be available for every kind of production which will put men to work, and it will not be available unless there is an open market for capital where investments are readily salable to provide new money. The Securities and Exchange Commission should be reorganized and many of its regulations rescinded to permit freer capital markets, particularly in the smaller cities and in the securities of smaller companies. Its purpose should be to prevent fraud in the sale of securities, and manipulation; not to direct the flow of capital in the United States as some juvenile board in Washington thinks it should flow. If control is to be exercised over the forms of corporate organization—and I believe it ought to be—it should be done by providing for Federal incorporation of interstate corporations and writing definite statutes prescribing what forms of organization and securities may be used.

We cannot escape a heavy post-war taxation, but it should be levied in such a way as to encourage saving and the investment in new projects involving risk. A high progressive income and inheritance tax must be continued, and consumption taxes, except on luxuries, reduced. Today our tax system discriminates in favor of the bondholder and against the stockholder, because the stockholder, the real owner of the business corporation, is taxed twice, once on the corporation income and once on his own.

That double taxation should be reduced or removed to encourage people who are willing to risk their money in business enterprise. The capital-gains tax should be repealed. It does not exist in England. It yields negligible revenue. It has almost brought an end to private investment in new industry.

In short, our program for full employment through free enterprise is one of progress within the framework of the American Constitution—limited regulation by specific law and not by fiat of boards and czars; opportunity of individuals to make a success of their own lives without Government interference. The people of this country realize today how liberty can be entirely destroyed by the steady extension of bureaucratic regulation.

B. Program for social welfare

In the field of social welfare we must go forward constantly in our effort to improve the condition of the lower-income groups. There is no reason why, in this country, extreme poverty should not be largely abolished, except for those shiftless and worthless people who will not work when given the opportunity.

I believe in the principle of insuring to everyone, unless he refuses to work, a minimum standard of living, but it must be held within a reasonable cost, without setting up a vast Federal bureaucracy, without destroying local self-government, and without removing the incentive to work, which is the very keystone to adequate production.

We should go forward with an improved plan of old-age pensions. We can extend the principles of unemployment insurance to a much more extensive group of employees, but it should certainly be under State control and not nationalized as the National Resources Planning Board proposes, for we have now a system well able to meet the emergencies which may arise. The State-Federal Employment Service should be restored.

When unemployment does occur in great volume, beyond the ability of the unemployment compensation system to deal with it, there should be a State-Federal plan for direct relief and work relief. I am absolutely opposed to another Federal Work Projects Administration. I believe that the unemployment problem can be best met by each community dealing with its own peculiar circumstances. In fact, only local initiative in dealing with its own unemployment can adequately solve the infinitely varying conditions. But because of the great expense and the inability of the States to finance this additional activity, both direct and work relief should be largely financed by Federal funds, with some State matching. In the State plan could be included a provision for relief to those poverty-stricken farmers who have been furnished rehabilitation by the Farm Security Administration.

There should also be some extension of Federal aid to make more adequate and complete the State and local systems of health and medical care and hospital service, without the Federal Government bossing the job or socializing medicine. I have always been in favor of a housing program, and I believe that we should make definite plans today for the tremendous volume of housing which will be necessary after the war. As far as possible, it should be done through private enterprise, but, in the case of the lower-income groups, I am convinced that a program of public housing should be continued. The size of the Government subsidy should be reduced, so that the cost will not prevent the construction, within a reasonable time, of all the public housing which may be required as part of the general plan.

But every social-welfare program must recognize two principles, and the new dealers recognize neither. In a broad sense, only those who are working today can support by their labor those who are not working today. Government assistance of any kind to those who are not working or working inadequately must come out of the earnings and the standard of living of the workers of the country. The theory advanced by Mr. Yantis, one of the members of the National Resources Planning Board, that leaf raking itself creates wealth must be recognized as nonsense. Unless we are going to remove all incentive to work, and endanger the whole principle of reward for ability and hard work and education, the burden of the social-welfare program cannot go beyond a reasonable expense. Vast expenditures for relief involve either heavy taxation, affecting every worker, or they involve the danger of inflation, which taxes the worker through increased prices. Social-welfare measures are necessary to prevent hardship and injustice. The theory that in some way they stimulate employment, or prime the pump, or benefit the rest of the population, is a dangerous fallacy. Not only does it offend every principle of common sense but when we tried it in the 30's it resulted only in the continuance of unemployment. We must approach every social-welfare program with the question: Can the rest of the population afford it without dangerous and discouraging burdens?

In the second place, if we are going to put a floor under wages, a floor under housing and a floor under medical care for those who are unable to earn an adequate sum to pay for them, we must see that the people who do work, who do save, who do provide their own homes and their own doctors, are better off than the Government beneficiaries. Otherwise, we shall remove every incentive to work and work harder. We cannot exag-

gerate the importance of that incentive. On it is based all the progress we have made. If we are going to give a man who has never worked a pension of $45 a month when he is 65, then we should give practically the same pension to the man who has worked and saved enough money to build himself a home or provide his family with a small income. If that makes a program of $40 a month too expensive, then we had better start with a program of $30 a month.

In short, a social-welfare program must avoid the destruction of local and state responsibility. It must not impose an intolerable and discouraging burden on those who really bring about progress in America. It must continue an adequate reward to the man who, without Government assistance, fights through his own life and passes on to his sons and daughters advantages which he himself never enjoyed.

C. Aid to foreign nations, but without reducing our own standard of living

Regardless of the nature of any ultimate association of nations, we should avail ourselves of the opportunity given by Allied victory to assist every nation during the interregnum to bring about its own economic recovery as rapidly as possible. This is a complicated and difficult task, but it must be directed to assisting each nation to stand on its own feet and work out its own salvation after the peace is finally made.

The new dealers apparently contemplate a world in which our bureaus are extended to operate all over the world, lend-lease expanded to all peacetime needs, Government billions used to guarantee the stability of all currencies, and vast loans used to build up a tremendous export trade in goods which the recipients are wholly unable to pay for. The Republicans are absolutely opposed to any such international W. P. A. It is based on the same old theory that the more our Government spends, the more our debt grows, the more prosperous we become. The United States, with 130,000,000 people, cannot possibly play Santa Claus to the other 2,000,000,000 people in the world. It would bankrupt us in 5 years. It would produce a vast, unhealthy, and unsound inflation of our production just as the foreign-lending policy of the twenties intensified the crash of 1929 and 1930. It would use up our natural resources, which, as we now realize, have very definite limits. It wouldn't work, anyway, to bring about any permanent good, for most people do not appreciate outside help or intensify their own efforts to deserve it.

I don't mean to say we should not give some direct financial help. We should not hesitate to make loans or even grants in reasonable sums for emergency relief and emergency reconstruction, for the establishment of a sound currency, and for such credit as may be necessary to set in motion the machinery of international trade. I would even continue some limited aid in the future, rather in the form of grants than loans, to assist nations to make themselves more selfsufficient by industrialization. But all such aid should be conditioned on the nation which asks for it putting its own house in order, balancing its budget, stabilizing its currency, and developing a sound plan to pay for its imports.

The total cost to this country of all foreign aid should be limited to two or three billions in the first year or two, and should rapidly decline to less than half a billion a year. We should certainly avoid any general unconditional commitment to stabilize the currencies of the world, which is the effect of both the Keynes and the Morgenthau plans, or to underwrite all the food or materials needed for reconstruction by some international pool.

The Republican Party believes in the principle of a protective tariff. It is definitely opposed to free trade, which is the ultimate goal sought by Mr. Willkie and Mr. Hull. I cannot see how tariffs can be removed on agricultural products without forcing down to confiscatory levels the prices which our farmer receives. I cannot see how we can admit to this country, free of duty, products manufactured by labor which receives from one-half to one-tenth what our labor receives, without killing our industries and reducing our wages. It may be that our labor is more productive, but not that much more productive. Whether it is more productive at all is not certain in these days when machinery for mass production can, at small cost, be set up in Russia or China or India.

But the Republicans do not believe in prohibitive tariffs or rates representing more than the difference in cost of production, and have always favored reciprocity treaties to reduce even that level. We are prepared to do our share in making such reductions as may be necessary to enable other nations to establish a sound economy and pay for the materials they must import. It seems that, in most cases, with the whole world to choose from, those markets can be found in countries which do not compete in the production of the same article, but we should be prepared to do our share in accepting certain imports for which no other market can be found.

To sum up: Reasonable tariffs, straightout financial assistance in limited amount to countries that prove they deserve it, reciprocity agreements where they benefit both parties, but no global plans to distribute milk to every Hottentot or vast international cartels and other methods of controlling food and raw materials, particularly when they depend, in the last instance, on the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States.

D. Sound money, economy, thrift, and hard work

But the key to any post-war program is sound finance. We shall come out of this war with a public debt approaching $300,000,000,000. It is not impossible to pay the interest on this debt, if we do not constantly increase it. Why do we have inflation today? Simply because we have been forced by the war into a deficit policy. The same policy in peacetime, when we certainly cannot impose the arbitrary control on prices and wages that we are now attempting, would soon raise prices to the sky and depreciate our money as it was depreciated in Germany. All savings would be destroyed. All life-insurance values would melt away. All incentive to any man to begin again the accumulation of property and capital would vanish. We should face the collapse of the whole system built up for 150 years, and bankruptcy and hardship for the average worker instead of the Utopia visioned by the spenders.

Unless we stand on the rock of financial solvency, prepared to pay our debts and balance our budgets instead of constantly increasing the public debt, we cannot hope for success in any of the post-war policies I have outlined. We cannot restore free enterprise or the employment which depends on it. We cannot hope to set up a permanently sound program of social welfare. We cannot long help other nations to help themselves. We cannot even maintain democratic freedom in the United States, for once the Nation is bankrupt the logical step is some form of national socialism to be built upon the ruin.

But above all, unless we exorcise the spending theory from our political thinking, the American people will lose their souls. It is an attractive theory to politicians. They can spend all the money they want on favorite projects without taxing anyone to pay for them. It is a demoralizing and tempting theory to the people. There would be no longer any merit in hard work or reliability or thrift or self-sacrifice. For the Government might as well borrow the money and pay it out, and then the lazy and the reckless and the spendthrift will be as well off as anyone. There is no standard by which to judge the merit or the worthwhileness of any project, because the spending of money is enough merit to justify it. We can't begin to make a plan until we crush the fallacy of unlimited public deficits for either foreign or domestic purposes. It looks forward not only to the ruin of the country and its form of government, but to the destruction of the moral character of its people. No people can hope for progress or salvation as long as they expect, without effort, to get something for nothing.

Angels at Meaux, France—A Christmas Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a very lovely short Christmas story captioned "Angels at Meaux, France," written by Joe Mitchell Pilcher, a member of our armed forces. I ask unanimous consent that this short story may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANGELS AT MEAUX, FRANCE—A CHRISTMAS STORY [1]

(By Joe Mitchell Pilcher,[2] B. D.)

It was Christmas 1918, and messengers of glad tidings hovered near. The place was Meaux, France, where angels were heard singing above the ancient French city, with Paris some 30 kilometers away.

There was the noise of jollity and happy laughter of Frenchmen and American soldiers stationed there, celebrating the season of "peace on earth, good will to men." Children sang carols in the streets, and the bells of the ancient cathedral tower of St. Stephens announced "joy to the world, the Lord has come."

The singing of the people and the ringing of the bells seemed to wipe away the tears and anxiety of 4 long years of fighting. Lighting the faces of the French people was a solemn joy, suggesting a Bach chorale, a Mozart quintet, or a Spinning Song by Mendelssohn.

We entered Meaux from the Paris road, where the towers of the medieval cathedral of St. Stephen stood sentinel-like above the historic stronghold. The old city presented to us a warren of mean streets and great

[1] The story first appeared in the Christian Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., December 23, 1938, and has since been quoted and copied in other publications of national circulation, besides having been condensed for radio script over a national hook-up.

[2] Served with the A. E. F. in France, Battery E, Sixty-fifth Coast Artillery Corps, Thirty-second Brigade, First Army Corps, attached to the Seventeenth French Army Corps under General Alexander at Verdun, 1918.

traditions, with modern trappings and military setting. Once the threat of German invasion faced the inhabitants of Meaux. The armies which had swept down like an avalanche ceased to thunder at her gates. American soldiers had seen to that. The invading Germans were prisoners behind barbed-wire enclosures.

Located on the right bank of the Marne River, Meaux crowns an eminence overlooking the ristoric old suburb of La Marché, united to it by an ancient sixteenth century bridge. The cathedral of St. Stephen, begun in the twelfth century, is the seat of a bishop. The choir enclosure contains the tomb and statue of famous Bishop Bossuet, known in French history as The Eagle of Meaux. From the ancient hand-carved pulpit of that great cathedral, Bishop Bossuet thrilled his listeners with eloquent sermons and oratorical exhortations.

The good Catholic priest who acted as our guide also told us the story of Meaux. In the Roman period a small Gallic tribe of the Meldi established here their capital. On the highroad of armies marching to and from Paris, Meaux had seen and suffered much. During the Hundred Years' War, the city was ravaged by the invaders.

Here Frenchmen plotted "the enterprise of Meaux," but failed in their attempt to seize Catherine de Medici and her son, Charles IX, King of France. The king and his courtiers escaped to Paris!

Later the Napoleons laid the city under heavy requisition, and in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, Meaux was surrendered to the Germans. French soldiers were prisoners in their own stronghold. But the tables were turned in the encounter at the Marne, during the opening of hostilities in 1914, when the French Sixth Army turned the German advance decisively and effectively.

The rest of the good man's story of Meaux related how American rifles and bayonets, machine-guns and grenades and field artillery, had hurled back the onrushing Germans at the Second Battle of the Marne, keeping them a second time from overrunning the city. American soldiers had written a page in the history of Meaux, now a place of concentration for Allied troops. A familiar sight to us was German prisoners, in the barbed-wire enclosures, others marching in single file under guard to and from "the rock-pile."

One of these German prisoners stands out in bold relief—a young officer who could play the piano. His playing carried us "on wings of song" across the miles that separated us from home and loved ones at Christmas time!

In the Y. M. C. A. hut, where we gathered during leisure moments while marking time until orders came to return home to the good old United States of America, this young staff officer, a prisoner himself, made our spirits free. When he played the piano for us, the music broke the bonds of boredom, and changed the lonely waiting hours en route home into holiday joy and wholesome entertainment.

I can see him now as he seated himself at the piano, on the night before Christmas, in that Y. M. C. A. hut in Meaux, France, 25 years ago. There he was, a stiff conventional figure, with long supple hands touching the piano keys, running up and down the keyboard. The magic and the thrill of his music spread like Christmas cheer on the crisp evening air. He was playing something by Mendelssohn, the Jewish composer, and with him we forgot our surroundings.

In the mood of the composer we became carefree and lighthearted. The night seemed changed into day. The "Y" became an enchanted setting, with the sunshine breaking upon and brightening the morning of peace. And as the man played on we envisioned our homefolks and firesides enlivened by the cheer and warmth of Christmas at home, far across the sea.

The men became less noisy—a strange, unforgettable feeling gripped us and permeated that stuffy "Y" hut on that weird and memorable night. All who could lingered there a while, remaining behind until the last possible moment. A German prisoner and pianist, playing the music of a Jew on the birthday of our Christian Lord and Saviour. How like David of old, driving the evil spirit from Saul with his harp playing.

Outside the hut, I remember standing for a moment, looking up at the stars on that cold December night. From those same stars, I thought, echoed the angels' chorus on just such a night as this, when shepherds watched their flocks above Bethlehem, and found the babe in the manger of the stable at the inn.

The old familiar carols came faintly, then clearly on the night air, from the direction of the cathedral. "Noel! Noel! * * * Glory to God in the highest." And the swinging, ringing bells from the towers of St. Stephen's replied: "Peace on earth, good will to men!" echoed by the angel chorus singing over the city of Meaux, France, at Christmas 1918!

We Need an Adequate American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, Vice Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration, before the University Club, New York, N. Y., on Saturday December 4, 1943:

Next Tuesday will be the 7th of December, the second anniversary of one of the blackest deeds in history—Pearl Harbor. In the annals of the war effort of America and her allies during the past 2 years, many chapters have been written, both gloomy and bright. Certainly none was darker than the crucial shipping situation during the early months of 1942. The merchant tonnage of the United Nations was running a grim race against time, with our enemies picking off ships faster than new ones could be built. And yet there has been no brighter chapter than the one which followed—the magnificent accomplishment of American merchant shipyards.

Helen of Troy has long been known, among other things, as the girl with the face that launched a thousand ships. Now anyone would think that the faces of Hitler and Tojo would only be good for stopping clocks, but as matters stand today, the ships they have caused to be launched make Helen look like a piker.

In the spring of 1942, the President established as the merchant shipbuilding goal, the construction of 24,000,000 tons deadweight during the years 1942 and 1943. Of this total, 8,000,000 tons were scheduled to be built during 1942 and 16,000,000 this year. As an index to the immensity of this undertaking, I'd like to point out that during the entire year 1941, there were completed in American yards only 103 merchant ships of little more than 1,100,000 tons deadweight. And even during the month preceding Pearl Harbor, the total output was only 9 ships of some 106,000 tons. To be sure, on December 7, many new shipbuilding facilities were in operation, or under construction, and quite a few hulls had been launched. But in the Maritime Commission, we've stopped talking about launchings; a delivered ship is the only kind that counts.

By September 1942, shipyard output had topped a million tons a month—almost equaling the deliveries for the entire year 1941. American merchant shipyards not only met their 1942 goal, but even exceeded it. And this year, they have really turned on the power. It so happens that this morning I received the final results of ship construction during the month of November and I would like to take this occasion to announce the score.

The number of vessels delivered into service by American merchant shipyards last month was 164, their aggregate dead weight was 1,692,763 tons. Included in these totals were 16 high-speed vessels of the Commission's unexcelled C types and 19 fast tankers. Also there were completed 23 vessels of various types for military and special uses, 89 Liberty ships, and 17 tankers adapted from the Liberty design. The November deliveries brought the total tonnage of ships completed during the first 11 months of 1943 to 17,194,387 tons. So with a month still to go, and 25,284,387 tons delivered so far since January 1, 1942, I am happy to be able to announce that the 24,000,000 ton goal set for last year already has been beaten by a substantial margin.

And yet even this does not tell the whole story. It became evident many months ago that the merchant shipyards had more than enough capacity, given the necessary materials, to build the tonnage called for by the Commander in Chief's directive. Advantage has been taken of this surplus shipyard capacity by diverting a sizeable portion of the facilities to the construction of special types of ships for the armed forces, and by utilizing a number of the yards for converting merchant vessels to military types prior to delivery. Invariably, these diversions have required more time, and the vessels usually have had less dead-weight tonnage than those originally scheduled. Actually, therefore, the shipyards not only have completed ahead of time the job assigned to them early in 1942, but, in addition, have accomplished a decidedly more difficult assignment than that originally contemplated.

Notwithstanding even these factors, had it been possible to supply the shipyards with additional components, principally steel, they could have built substantially greater tonnage. More than five ships a day has long been routine, and if tanks, guns, and warships didn't need steel too, six ships a day could have been just as commonplace, months ago, without the addition of any facilities.

This, of course, implies no criticism of the suppliers of materials and ship components. In fact, the very success of the merchant shipbuilding program is evidence of the splendid job they have been doing. The astonishing performance of the shipbuilders in general, and the spectacular feats of certain yards in particular, have received wide acclaim—and well they should. The breaking of records, however, does not begin on the shipways, but in the steel mills, engine factories, and boiler shops, for the modern shipyard is merely a final assembly line of a Nation-wide plant.

But the actual construction of the world's greatest merchant marine has been the handiwork of farmers, shopkeepers, and housewives, workers recruited from every walk of life to learn and carry out one of the most difficult jobs in industry. The extent of their contribution toward victory may be visualized by imagining the ships they have built since December 7, 1941, steaming in a column and spaced at mile intervals. An unbroken line would be formed extending from Maine

to Scotland, or, if you like, from Dutch Harbor to Tokyo.

And what of the ships themselves? The most famous type, of course, and the one which has been built in the greatest numbers is the Liberty ship. This, as you probably know, is a standardized cargo vessel of a type which was rather common before the war in world trades where high speed was not the first essential. Basically a British design, it was selected as the principal emergency type for the Commission's program and modified to meet American shipyard practices, primarily because of its reciprocating steam-engine propulsion. For at the time the Liberty-ship program was inaugurated, the steam-turbine machinery used in the fastest and most efficient vessels could not be obtained in the necessary quantity. The choice of engine drive was a hard one to make, but it cut the Gordian knot. It made possible the vast fleet of Liberty ships that today covers the oceans of the world as they have never before been covered by a single type. To date more than 1,700 of them have been placed in service, each representing 10,800 tons of carrying capacity.

I wonder if you realize what 10,800 tons really mean? It would take four long freight trains, each of some 75 cars, to carry such a load. As another example, one Liberty ship can pick up and walk away with 2,840 jeeps, or 440 light tanks. In one voyage it could supply our troops "over there" with 230,000,000 rounds of 30-caliber ammunition, or "C" rations sufficient to feed 3,440,000 men. Such are the ships that the yards have been turning out, month after month, in an average building time of little more than 40 days from keel-laying to delivery.

The importance of the part the Liberties have played in this war can hardly be overstated. These ships, which seem to be everywhere at once, now constitute approximately a quarter of all the world's tonnage and, naturally, a much larger proportion of the shipping available to the United Nations. It needs no imagination to realize that the Allied successes during this past year would have been just plain impossible without the Liberty fleet.

And don't let anyone tell you that Liberty ships aren't rugged. One of the toughest, of which I have heard, is the *William Williams*, built by the Permanente Metals Corporation, Richmond, Calif. Steaming through the South Pacific one afternoon, she was struck by a torpedo on the port side aft. It blasted a hole big enough to drive a truck through. Rapidly the ship settled until the stern was submerged, only the raised gun platform being above the sea. The deck was at such an angle that the entire bow and much of the forepart of the keel were completely out of water. One could row a skiff over her taffrail and beach it on the main deck. The crew took to lifeboats, standing by to await the end of the apparently doomed vessel. But she refused to sink, and after some 12 hours, a skeleton crew returned aboard to see if she could be saved. Miraculously, the propeller and shafting were not completely knocked out, so that boilers were fired and steam was raised. With engines turning over at half-speed, despite her grotesque position, the *William Williams* got under way. The steering gear was wrecked, and the course was maintained by an assisting naval vessel which nudged the Liberty on one side or the other, as required. For 72 hours she staggered on doggedly. Her crew, exhausted from shock and lack of sleep, brought this gallant ship safely into port, the Stars and Stripes still flying.

Of course this account illustrates far more than the toughness of a Liberty ship. The best ship can be no better than the men who sail her. I believe I would be remiss if, in passing, I did not say a few words about the role of American seamen in this war. Their deeds are not heralded like those of our soldiers, sailors, and marines, but they have done their job too, and have gone about it in a quiet and determined manner. The fact that they have continued to deliver the goods, where needed, and on time, speaks for itself.

Again referring to the types of ships being built, it is obvious that a fast ship is more valuable, both in wartime and for peacetime commerce, than one of medium speed. With this in mind, the Commission has expanded to the limit the facilities for the manufacture of turbine propulsion machinery, and has built as many high-speed ships as the growing capacity of these plants would permit.

Concurrently, therefore, with the emergency program, the Commission developed the Victory ship to take the place of the Liberty in shipyard schedules as additional turbines became available. The new type, although designed for ready construction in the yards now building Liberties, is very much faster and incorporates various other features which will enhance its utility after the war. A substantial number of them will be completed next year and it may interest you to know that the keel of the first Victory ship was laid about 2 weeks ago by the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation. Oregon, by the way, is the champion of all the merchant yards, and during September, established an all-time record by delivering 24 ships from its 11 ways.

The backbone of the American merchant marine of the future, however, will be the famous C-type ships developed to fulfill the aims of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. These splendid vessels—there are no finer ships afloat—have been built in ever-increasing numbers since the inception of the Commission's long-range building program which was initiated in 1937. Today, of course, a great many of them are serving as military and naval auxiliaries, for which they are eminently suited. Some have been converted to aircraft carriers, others to troop transports, and still others to special-purpose ships of a wide variety. All are hard at work in the most vital jobs of the war at sea. Upon the cessation of hostilities, we can count upon them to carry our flag on the sea lanes of the world in any competition.

Perhaps Americans have felt the impact of the unavailability of tanker tonnage more than any other phase of the shipping problem, especially those who have "A" cards. Let me assure you that tankers of the latest types form an important segment of the Commission's program, and are being built at an accelerating rate. Despite the mounting tempo of the war and the insatiable thirst of our war machine, tanker production continues to keep pace with the requirements of the armed services. And when the war is over the American tanker fleet, in its speed, modernism, and efficiency, will be unsurpassed.

While I have mentioned in detail various types of ships we are building, there are others about which I shall say nothing except that we are trying not to miss any bets. Meeting both domestic and military requirements now, the composition of our post-war merchant marine will be well rounded and designed to meet any type of competition now conceivable. Who would dare say that anyone has finer railroads than we have in this country, better automobiles, or more modern air transport? The answer is obvious; in fact, we frankly admit it. Let it suffice to say that the American merchant marine, like our other forms of transportation, will be in keeping with American traditions.

In the First World War we also undertook an unprecedented shipbuilding effort. While few of those vessels were delivered before the armistice, ultimately we completed a tremendous fleet. But the experience in the years that followed might be likened to the story of the young fellow who hoped to win the hand of a girl while depending upon his rival to furnish the automobile on those vital Wednesday and Saturday nights. You don't have to guess the identity of the eventual bridegroom. We acquiesced in permitting the ships of others to carry the bulk of our commerce, and before we realized what was happening many of the ships we had built were tied up to rust in our rivers and harbors. In addition, much business which normally would have fallen to the farms and factories of America slipped away to other countries, whose enterprise did not stop at the seacoast. Our merchant marine became impotent and outmoded. It all but ceased to exist through disuse. At the eleventh hour the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 supplied the necessary transfusion. Making a mistake once may be understandable, but certainly there can be no excuse for repeating it. Now that we have built and are still adding to the greatest fleet in history, let us hope that we have learned our lesson.

As more than 30 years a sailor, I am afraid I feel a proprietary pride in the glorious accomplishments of the United States Navy, and yet I know that my pride is shared with some 130,000,000 other Americans, each of whom knows that it is his or her Navy too. But did you ever stop to think that our Navy, which we recognize as indispensable to our national security, would be like a suit of clothes without the trousers if it did not have the merchant marine to supply its needs. Obviously, a battleship can't steam back from the Solomons when her fuel oil, ammunition, or provisions run low, nor can aircraft carriers be spared for the job of ferrying planes.

Now the Navy, while a source of protection always, really comes of age only in time of war, and yet we cheerfully give it our continuous, unstinting support. Just because the merchant marine has a dual function—as a wartime auxiliary, and a commercial emissary in time of peace—should it be less deserving of our support? Our British allies have said that, however important a merchant marine may be to any other nation, to Britain it is indispensable. For centuries they have depended upon a navy, backed up by merchant ships, for their security, and certainly they should know whereof they speak. I, too, should like to go on record, here and now, by saying that as long as the Stars and Stripes fly over an American Navy, a strong American merchant marine will continue to be indispensable to the defense of our own United States.

No one complains, or should complain, that the Army and the Navy are not self-supporting. The merchant marine, on the contrary, can pay its own way to a large extent. All of us are proud of our American way of life; our standard of living is the envy of the world. But that means higher wages, and accordingly, ships that cost more to build and crews that cost more to employ. Who would want our shipbuilders or our merchant sailors to receive wages that are not commensurate with those paid by other industries? In order to keep our ships at sea, therefore, the Congress has seen fit to establish subsidies for both shipbuilding and ship operation.

As applied to shipbuilding, this means only that a ship built in an American shipyard by the Government is sold to the operator at a price comparable to that which the foreign competitor pays for this ship built at home. In ship operation, the subsidy paid, in general, is the difference between what the foreign competitor pays those who man his ships and the wages paid our own seamen. The word "subsidy," however, has come to be looked upon as an odious one. To strip it of all its mysteriousness, insofar as the merchant marine is concerned, it can best be expressed as the payment of an equality wage.

It should be remembered in this connection that a subsidy is paid a ship operator only when he can prove that he is unable to compete without it. Now it costs

almost as much to operate a ship with her holds half filled with cargo, as one fully laden. Accordingly, the more cargo, the greater the revenue and the less the need for a subsidy. Since the American people, as taxpayers, are the ones called upon to defray subsidies, it is to their own very real advantage to take the trouble to give greater support to their merchant marine through increased patronage. To back the American merchant marine is good business, any way you look at it.

A prime factor in the success of American enterprise has been service. But it must be more fully exploited in order to encourage the patronage of American ships. For example, in this war much effort has been spent on coordinating transportation from factory to battlefield, and from farm to foreign shore. Why can't the same idea of an integrated chain of transportation be profitably employed afterward? I should like to see shipments booked from Minneapolis to Melbourne, for example, in a single transaction. Perhaps there could be developed something like a single bill of lading covering truck, rail, and ship transportation. Voluntary cooperation between carriers could eliminate yards of red tape, obviate pyramided overhead expense, and result in greater benefits for all concerned.

And while on the subject of service, I want to take this opportunity to say that, in my opinion, one of the bang-up jobs of this war has been done by the railroads. In 1918, sidings were filled with freight cars all the way from here to Buffalo, and our warehouses and piers were glutted with cargo. This time, under a much greater strain, the railroads have functioned as a single well-oiled machine and have kept the flow of traffic from bogging down. I believe in addition, however, that one of the factors which has helped to make this possible is that as fast as the railroads have been able to move cargo to the seaboard, ships have been there to pick it up and take it away.

But notwithstanding the job that is being done and the proven necessity of maintaining an adequate merchant marine at all times, there still remains the problem of determining the actual disposition of the vast fleet this country will possess at the end of the war. In over-all size it will exceed the requirements of the trade routes formerly served by United States flag vessels. Yet there should be a way in which the ships which have done so much toward winning the war may be utilized in the job of making victory permanent.

Just as a thought in this regard, I would like to bring up the matter of the trade routes formerly maintained by Germany and Japan. It is hardly conceivable, in my opinion, that these nations could again be allowed to become naval powers. When you consider the treacherous use they have made of merchant shipping, in both a commercial and military sense, it seems equally inconceivable that they could be trusted to resume their former places in the maritime world. Hence, we and our allies might well help in serving some of the routes they formerly dominated.

Perhaps the knottiest problem in the conversion of the merchant marine to a peacetime basis will be the Liberty ships. Built for the purpose of helping to win the war, they are fulfilling their mission with unqualified success. The ships themselves, however, will not cease to exist when the war is over, and undoubtedly the United States will have on its hands a fleet of emergency-type vessels alone comprising more tonnage than the largest merchant marine any nation ever possessed prior to the present war. Liberties are altogether outclassed on routes where high speed is a major factor. Naturally, both the Government and industry are giving much serious thought to their peacetime disposition and various plans are being studied. But it must be recognized that the successful solution to the problem requires widespread public appreciation of the basic factors involved.

Even the disposition of the Victory ships, C-types, and tankers will not be without its difficulties. The Maritime Commission, under the policies enunciated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, is committed—yes, dedicated—to an American merchant marine, privately owned and privately operated. The sale of ships presently owned by the Government must be made on a basis that will enable private enterprise to succeed. That basis must be geared to the long-range view, and a flurry of temporary prosperity among fly-by-night operators does not fit into the picture. The sale of tonnage at bargain-basement prices could only weaken the merchant marine in the long run, and would ruin investors who have had faith in America as a maritime Nation. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that ships built during the war are substantially more expensive than if constructed a few years ago, or in the post-war era. Shipyards are operating on an extended work week, are paying shift premiums, and are employing an overwhelming preponderance of newly trained workers. These extra costs, in my opinion, are part of the expense of fighting the war, and I think when victory comes, Congress can well afford to write them off.

But commercially, ships in and of themselves mean little. It is the manufacturing, the trade, and the commerce behind those ships that count, for the merchant marine is but the tool of foreign trade. A more active exchange of goods and commodities, in my opinion, will mean greater prosperity, not only for America, but for all those with whom such intercourse is carried on. I like to think that a world where all are better acquainted, and everyone is busily engaged in producing and exchanging goods, will be a happier world in which all people may expect more security and a more peaceful way of life. America has unequaled potentialities for contributing to such a world. But past experience has shown that we can have but limited control over our participation in foreign commerce unless we carry in our own ships a proper share of our imported and exported goods.

I am glad that there seems to be a wider realization now than ever before that America cannot go her own way independent of the rest of the world. What may not be so well understood, however, is that our merchant marine—ships that spend most of their days beyond the horizon—is the principal medium through which our actual, rather than theoretical, foreign relations will be established. If our aims for the future are to be realized, if the promises we have given the rest of the world's free peoples are to be carried out, Americans will have to stand squarely behind the ships that go forth carrying the Stars and Stripes to other lands.

And so in closing, remember that we have the ships, the men to sail them, and we have great industries eager to do business. For defense, for prosperity, and for a lasting peace, I say, let us have an adequate American merchant marine.

Post-War Plans and Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Alfred H. Stone is the editor of the Staple Cotton Review, the official organ of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association of Greenwood, Miss. He is an able statesman, an excellent administrator, and a practical economist. He has had wide experience in the production and marketing of cotton, and wide experience in public affairs. At present he is chairman of the Mississippi State Tax Commission. He is one of the leading tax authorities of the United States. He is a man of keen insight and marvelous foresight. He is familiar with the lessons of history.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by Mr. Stone in the November 1943 issue of the Staple Cotton Review, which editorial contains the gist of an address by Mr. Stone at a southern conference on post-war problems in the States, at New Orleans, La., November 5 and 6, 1943, to wit:

POST-WAR PLANS AND PLANNING

In all our planning for the future, in all our post bellum theories and philosophies, we cannot escape, nor should we seek to evade, the responsible duty of determining whether, in the final analysis, under our plans the people are to support the Government or the Government is to support the people.

"Exalt the citizen. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant, and responsible. Let him cultivate independence to the point of sacrifice, and learn that humble things with unbartered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price." (Henry W. Grady.)

"The lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government, the Government should not support the people. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character." (Grover Cleveland.)

"No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from local self-government. The national administration is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government. The States should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management of their own affairs." (Calvin Coolidge.)

"We therefore call upon the people to assemble at Clay Statue, Canal Street, and declare that they mean to be free." (The White People of Louisiana, September 14, 1874.)

I

This conference of Southern States is sponsored by the Council of State Governments, which, in turn, represents and speaks for executive and administrative officials of all the States of the Union. It is a body of dignity and standing, with definitely important purposes and objectives. Its executive director, Mr. Frank Bane, is one of the outstandingly useful men in the country today. Any program proposed here is entitled to serious, impartial, and unprejudiced consideration.

Certainly there can scarcely be any question of greater importance to all our people than that before us this morning. As I understand it, we are not here to pass on any certain cut and dried plan of post-bellum economy, taxation, or general readjustment. I take it that all we are supposed to do, or can do, today, within the limits of common-sense procedure, is to have a frank interchange of ideas as to future policies, applicable to whatever problems and situations we may be called upon to face at the conclusion of the war. And I say "policies" advisedly. I do not believe that it is within the range of human limitations for any individual or group even to forecast the future with sufficient accuracy as to know in advance what

our problems will be, much less to write in advance a prescription for their relief.

II

There is nothing new about this future planning business, to cure the ills of the aftermath of war. Mr. Wilson tried it after 1918. During the First World War he had one of the ablest commissions ever set up in this country for any purpose. This was the War Industries Board, under the chairmanship of Mr. Baruch. This Board was continued after the war, as a planning commission, for the purpose of studying post-bellum problems, with a view to facilitating the transition of the country from a war basis to that of peace. The Board was composed of men eminent in many lines of business, industry, manufacturing, labor, and what not. They had ample funds for employing the services of technical experts in every field of human endeavor. I had several friends on this Board, one of whom was particularly close to me. This was George R. James, of Memphis, subsequently a member of the Federal Reserve Board. I kept in touch with the work of the Board through frequent contacts and correspondence with Mr. James.

In the summer of 1919 Mr. James described in detail the operations of the Board to a small group of us at an informal luncheon in Memphis. He drew a gloomy picture of the present and of the long-time view of pretty much of everything. I personally was particularly concerned over the cotton situation. I had some 1,600 bales which I could not sell and against which no bank would make a loan. Mr. James dwelt eloquently and in great detail on the plight of cotton. His Board had called into counsel experts from America, England, and the Continent. They had secured the advice of all the leading cotton manufacturers of the world. He told us that cotton did not have a friend on earth, and that there was no hope of its recovery within anything less than 5 or 6 years. He said that if there was any one economic problem about which his Board had definite and absolute knowledge, it was that relating to cotton—in all its ramifications.

Just after the conclusion of my good friend's discussion, I received an offer by wire of 20½ cents for the best 300 bales of my 1,600. I knew so much more about cotton, I had so much more confidential, inside information about it, than the man who made the offer, that I had some compunctions of conscience when I wired him my acceptance. Cotton went on a boom the next day, and finally reached a point at which I could have sold at about double the price which I had accepted for the cream of my crop. And by the way, it was out of this general situation that, 2 years later, an outstandingly successful cooperative organization of farmers was born—the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association.

Of course, this incident is conclusive of nothing—unless it be of the futility of trying to play human judgment and human plans and planning against the imponderable and fateful factors which shape the destinies of a wicked world and bring to naught the schemes and machinations of men. The future is just as uncertain, just as unpredictable, today, as it was after World War No. 1.

III

Please do not misunderstand me as being opposed to all or any planning for post bellum problems. Although afflicted with an intensely practical mental attitude toward all human problems, I realize also the value of giving free play to the imagination in our efforts toward their solution. The Declaration of Independence could not have been written by a man with a one-track mind. My only suggestion is that we do not take ourselves too seriously, that we be realistic in our thinking and that we keep our feet on the ground. And above all, I would urge that in our planning we do not overlook the fundamentals—that we put first things first. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." As I see it, our greatest need today and for the future is a return to faith in the God of our fathers and to the basic principles of the governmental structure which they erected in that faith. You may recall that at a critical juncture in the sessions of the Constitutional Convention, at Benjamin Franklin's suggestion they turned to God in prayer. It may be worth our while also to remember that in his darkest hour at Valley Forge, and in every other crisis, George Washington's mainstay, the bulwark of his immortal soul, was his reliance upon his God. Andrew Jackson slept with his Bible as well as his pistol by his bedside.

We talk about our liberty, our independence, our freedoms, and all the rest of it. I often wonder, when I hear or read fervid appeals for their preservation, what will be required to bring home a realization of the fact that in a measure we have in reality already sacrificed some of these fundamentals upon the unrighteous altar of selfishness and greed. In planning for the future, we need frankly to ask ourselves how far have we already bartered away these priceless jewels of the past—and what shall we do to obtain their restoration and to make them once more secure for the generations which are to follow after us.

My philosophy of goverrment, the principles for which I would plead as for something sacredly essential to the perpetuity of the Nation of our founding fathers, was simply summed up many years ago by one of the outstanding men of his day and generation, Henry W. Grady:

"Exalt the citizen. As the State is the unit of government, he is the unit of the State. Teach him that his home is his castle, and his sovereignty rests beneath his hat. Make him self-respecting, self-reliant, and responsible. Let him lean on the State for nothing that his own arm can do, and on the Government for nothing that his State can do. Let him cultivate independence to the point of sacrifice, and learn that humble things with unbartered liberty are better than splendors bought with its price."

IV

This conception of the relationship which should exist between the citizen and his Government, both Federal and State, was once emphasized by a greater man than Henry Grady. On February 16, 1887, Grover Cleveland sent to Congress a short veto message which has been frequently quoted, and often misquoted, during recent years. The present Department of Agriculture, dealing in hundreds of millions of money, was then merely a Commissioner of Agriculture, without Cabinet rank. The sum involved was trifling, a pittance, as such things are measured by current standards. The difference between the sums dealt with then and now, great as that difference is, is dwarfed by the difference between the governmental concepts expressed by Grover Cleveland and the theories and practices of a later time. Congress had passed a bill to authorize the Commisisoner of Agriculture to distribute seed in certain drought stricken counties of Texas, and had appropriated $10,000 for the purpose, not ten million. Mr. Cleveland wrote:

"And yet I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the plan, as proposed by this bill, to indulge a benevolent and charitable sentiment through the appropriation of public funds for this purpose. I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and duty of the general Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that though the people support the Government the Government should not support the people. * * * Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character."

V

Fifty years later, on October 31, 1936, another American President gave utterance to another conception of the duties, functions, and responsibilities of this Government of ours. Mr. Roosevelt was addressing the American people, on the eve of a momentous national election. His enumeration of the things which he thought the Government should do marked the culmination of the tendency against which Grover Cleveland had warned and against which he had implacably set the full force of his rugged and uncompromising character.

Mr. Roosevelt's declaration of governmental objectives marked the full bloom and flower of all that men may hope and seek and desire upon this earth. The appeal was so plain, so simple and direct, as to need neither explanation nor argument. No time was wasted in discussing such abstractions as whether the objectives so declared, the hopes so held out, the purposes so expressed, fit in with the scheme of government under which we live, or run counter to the organic law which supports the framework of the established order under which these things were to be made to come to pass. Those who agree with Mr. Roosevelt's conception of governmental functions may call this progress. Those who believe in the general governmental principles laid down by Mr. Cleveland regard it as something potentially dangerous, if not actually destructive of the living roots of our governmental system. In all our planning for the future, in all our post bellum theories and philosophies, we cannot escape, nor should we seek to evade, the responsible duty of determining whether, in the final analysis, under our plans the people are to support the Government or the Government is to support the people. These are not differences of honesty or patriotism or political morality or personal character, as between individuals or parties or groups of men. The differences of which I speak transcend all personal considerations, qualities, and attributes. They go to the very fundamentals of governmental theory and policy and reach down to the bedrock foundations of the relationship between the citizen and the State, between the Government and the people.

VI

In 1939 I wrote: "I am not an alarmist, but the trend in American life is increasingly in the direction of self-indulgence and away from the habits of self-help. This trend is particularly marked in the matter of getting the Government to gratify our desires, to give us what we want, with the expenditure of a minimum of effort upon our part. The change of attitude and outlook toward the functions of government, at all levels, which has gradually come over the people of this country, and with increasing emphasis in recent years, is the greatest of the underlying causes of the constant expansion of governmental services, which is in turn, the primary cause of increased governmental costs, with the inevitable sequence of greater tax burdens, larger bond issues, and greater public debt. And more than all these combined, this change of attitude means a gradual undermining of the moral fiber of our people, a loss of stamina and of the vital spirit of individual independence upon which this Government was founded—a trend toward the drying up of the source and substance of the qualities which have made us great.

"This is old stuff, you say? Perhaps it is—more's the pity. But if the real heart of this country is to endure, if it is to continue as the great outstanding example of liberty and democracy achieved through sacrifice and made secure through the preservation of undying ideals—if this is to be accomplished, it must be through a return to the consecration of our fathers. There must be a regeneration of faith in the individual man as a symbol of American destiny and achievement. Tennyson's poetic utterance, 'The individual withers, and the world is more and more,' may be true in abstract fact, but it sounds a false note as an expression of governmental philosophy."

This was just 2 years before Pearl Harbor. I do not think that any great calamity or harsh dispensation to mankind is ever wholly without its compensations. The changes which the remorseless necessities of war have forced upon us have arrested some of the more dangerous of the tendencies and practices to which I referred 4 years ago. This fact alone, if time proves it to be a fact, may be the means of making possible the restoration in peace of the realities for which in principle we fight in war. If this be accomplished, then, in a very vital American sense, this war shall not have been fought in vain.

VII

We are, or at least we should be, concerned more with a philosophy of government than with the mere implements of governmental operation. Within the past decade we have witnessed the process of a gradual but sure decadence, if I may so express it, a certain lowering of the standards, of a liberty-loving, individually independent, self-reliant people, into grasping masses and groups, bringing upon the Nation and the State every conceivable form of pressure for securing for themselves every conceivable form of governmental service or benefit. We have seen enacted before our eyes the tragedy of a bloodless revolution, through which all units and levels of government, even sovereign States themselves, apparently have come to be willing to sacrifice their pride, and all but literally subscribe to pauper's oaths, in order to obtain what they call "our share" of public bounty. In some measure, as just suggested, this apparently has been stopped by the exigencies of war. It remains to be seen whether the change is permanent or only temporary.

Looking to the future, as a practical man, I know that we have long ago gone too far afield to permit an orderly return to the ultra-conservative position held by Grover Cleveland. I have no such thought in mind. I would make no such suggestion. Revolutions do not work backward. On the other hand, we have gone far enough in the opposite direction, far beyond the limits of prewar emergency excuse, to realize the dangers involved in attempting to give effect to new and radical visions and ideals of service through their incorporation into permanent policies of government. There must be found some sane and substantial ground between the two extremes. To discover and determine the location of this zone of safety, to fix its reasonable bounds and by fair trial to prove it—this is the duty, as it should be the privilege, of all patriotic Americans who believe in the preservation of our fundamental ideals of government—the ideals for which our fathers fought and for which we of this generation claim to be fighting now.

VIII

One of our troubles is that we have forgotten the lesson of history. I am appealing to all of you problem solvers that you forget not and remove not the ancient landmarks—that in planning for the future you frankly face the facts of the present and the recent past. I make no apology for quoting my own words, written for other times and purposes, so long as they may point a moral for the present situation. Eight years ago, in a discussion of States rights, I made the following observations, which I commend to your consideration now:

"It is apparently becoming fashionable to cry down any attempted reversion to or exhibition of reverence for the ancient landmarks of our people, as a return to the horse and buggy stage of civilization. The faith of the fathers would seem to mean less and less to the children of the third and fourth generations. I shall not stop to quarrel with this modern doctrine, even though to us it seems a desecration of that which has been the very ark of the covenant of this Government of ours,—'the shadow of a great rock in a weary land,' and all who have longed for something better than tyranny and despotism under which to rear our children, and under which we ourselves may live and die. Perhaps it is foolishly archaic to talk about States' rights at a time when the very hairs of our heads are numbered in Washington and the hour of the sparrow's fall is fixed by the hands of a Government clock. Why waste time in idle talk about the rights of the States in a country in which the farmer's furrow is measured by a Federal rule and the crop which he may grow and gather and sell is fixed by a Federal law." Please keep in mind that this was written 8 years ago.

"Making allowance for the hyperbole here used to illustrate a point, it would seriously seem that, before it is too late, we should seek a middle ground, somewhere between the two extremes of unrestricted and destructive competition, on the one hand, and unrestricted and destructive regimentation, on the other. It is not the purpose of these reflections to attempt to explore this middle area for a safer anchorage for our ark. Our thought goes no farther just now than to venture a suggestion, after this fashion: In our pursuit of a plan for promoting the general welfare, let us not forget the fuller, larger implications of the phrase which we use to justify our ends and the means of their accomplishment. The general welfare means more than is expressed in better prices for cotton and hogs. It has to do also with the continued existence of the governmental structure under which and through which the ultimate results of material betterment may be realized and made secure.

"The consent of the governed, is a foundation stone for self-government, is without substance or significance unless it serves first the cause and right of the people to be secure in the control of their local affairs. National self-government cannot long exist without a foundation of local self-government. This is the heart and soul of the whole doctrine of States' rights. It extends through all the fabric of the Nation's life. There can be no 'indestructible Union,' to borrow Daniel Webster's phrase, except it be 'composed of indestructible States.'

"The central thought in all that as here set down has nowhere been more finely expressed than by another of New England's sons, Calvin Coolidge. Speaking at the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., on May 15, 1926, he voiced these convictions, which not even John C. Calhoun could have more definitely enunciated, and which are as vitally true today as when he uttered them:

"'No method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from local self-government. No plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction, and decline. Of all forms of government, those administered by bureaus are about the least satisfactory to an enlightened and progressive people. Being irresponsible, they become autocratic, and being autocratic they resist all development. Unless bureaucracy is constantly resisted it breaks down representative government and overwhelms democracy. It is the one element in our institutions that sets up the pretense of having authority over everybody and being responsible to nobody.

"'While we ought to glory in the Union and remember that it is the source from which the States derive their chief title to fame, we must also recognize that the national administration is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government. It is too far away to be informed of local needs, too inaccessible to be responsive to local conditions. The States should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management of their own affairs.'"

IX

In Mr. Coolidge's own State "liberty" and "local self-government" have from time immemorial been synonymous terms. There has not been an hour since the Revolution in which these twin attributes of freedom have been denied to the people of Massachusetts. Only the people of the Southern States have ever been made to wear the yoke of bondage of outside control of their internal affairs. If any people in America should know and appreciate the significance and value of the freedom of local self-government, it is the people of the States and section represented at this conference—for they alone of all Americans are the only ones to whom since the foundation of the Government it has ever been denied. They above all others should jealously guard and defend it.

When our distinguished chairman, Hon. Francis J. Whitehead, told us in his opening remarks of the many things of historic interest and value to be seen in Louisiana and in the city of New Orleans, my own thoughts immediately turned to a modest marble shaft which stands near the foot of Canal Street, just a few blocks from where this conference is being held. Once or twice in every year for the past 40 years or more, I have stood before it with uncovered head, to read its simple but significant inscriptions, and ponder the names of those who there laid down their lives. It is the only monument in America of which I have any knowledge which has been erected in commemoration of the valor and heroism of the men who during the reconstruction period died for the cause of liberty and self-government in the Southern States. Two years before the general uprising of the southern people, in the Presidential election of 1876, the white people of Louisiana determined that they would regain the right of local self-government—the liberty of which Mr. Coolidge speaks—or would die in the attempt. In this purpose they called a meeting in these simple words:

"We therefore call upon the people to assemble at Clay Statue, Canal Street, and declare that they mean to be free."

This meeting was called for September 14, 1874. Think of its purpose—to "declare that they mean to be free." And this was 9 years after the close of the Civil War. They did assemble and make their declaration, in spite of Federal troops and State militia under outside control. They were fired on while in peaceable assembly, and 16 of them paid the penalty with their lives. But the flame which was lighted in their death was not extinguished until the liberty of local self-government, after more than 10 years of oppression, had again become a living reality, from the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico, and from Tide Water, Va., to the Rio Grande. Our people here in the South knew the full meaning of blood, sweat, and tears two generations before Winston Churchill coined the phrase. They had drained the cup of political tyranny to its bitter dregs before he was born. The grandsons and the great grandsons of the men who fought for and won the liberty for which they paid so great a price, are now fighting for its preservation on all the battle fronts of all the world. Let

us not here at home sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, no matter how savory, and regardless of its substance or form.

As far as my own vision of planning for the future is concerned, it is to these young men and to the legions of others like them throughout America, that I look for the preservation of the government of their fathers, and for the assurance of the perpetuity of its institutions unimpaired.

X

So, in all our post-war planning, whether for the States of this conference, or for any other States, or for the Nation as a whole, whatever else we do, let us keep Mr. Coolidge's warning words in mind, that "no method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty could be divorced from local self-government; that the national administration is not and cannot be adjusted to the needs of local government; that the States should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management of their own affairs."

Business Invites Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of December 17, 1943:

POLITICAL AMMUNITION—BUSINESS LEAVES SELF OPEN TO ATTACK IN FIGHTING WAR PROFITS RENEGOTIATION

(By David Lawrence)

American businessmen who have exerted themselves to get a repeal of the present law governing renegotiation of war contracts and, failing in that objective, have persuaded the Senate Finance Committee to emasculate the measure with exemptions and exceptions will find they have supplied opponents of the American free enterprise system with considerable ammunition for political attack.

The theory that American business can restrain itself from inordinate profits and accept during wartime a Government readjustment of profits will have evaporated if all the amendments before the Senate are adopted. It will prove instead that business and government could not get together on a sensible plan for taking the big profits out of war.

Renegotiation is a word that merely means the belated negotiation of war contracts—the attempt to find out after the goods are manufactured what the real price should have been. This is due to the need for haste in getting war munitions produced and the impossibility of determining in advance what the real costs of a new weapon or article would be after it got into quantity production.

The renegotiation machinery has resulted in much controversy and there is no doubt that the businessmen have had considerable justification in their complaints as to lack of a formula or guiding principles—though lately much has been done by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to remedy those defects.

Businessmen, to be sure, do not want arbitrary action in renegotiation procedures but, at the same time, any system that results in the earning of large profits will not stand public scrutiny. And it's the result figures that will be tossed up in future congressional investigations, and business again will furnish the whipping boys of future political contests. When the servicemen get back home and read the headlines of congressional inquiries into war profits, they will wonder what was done back home when they were at war—how much, indeed, was charged up against the taxpayers by a Congress that didn't look out for the broad public interest.

A certain company, for instance, made both in peacetime and during war a kind of metal article. Its 1942 volume of business is less than double the 1937 to 1940 average. But the 1942 profit of that business after taxes and before renegotiation is about 233 percent of what its profit after taxes averaged during the 1937 to 1940 period.

Another company changed over from making a commercial product used widely by consumers, but now prohibited because of raw material shortages and began to make bombs and ammunition. This company's 1942 gross volume is about two and a half times its 1937 to 1940 average. Yet its 1942 profits after taxes but before renegotiation is nearly four times its average profit after taxes during 1937 to 1940.

Another company, making valves, with a similar story of two and a half times its average of 1937 to 1940 in volume, finds itself with 350 percent of its average profit in 1937 to 1940 after taxes have been deducted in both cases.

The War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission have had a number of instances of this kind and generally, their spokesmen say, corporations are not only doing a larger volume of business, but also are making a larger profit on this volume even after taxes.

There are cases in which this high range of profit will not materialize. All that the armed services want is the authority to look at all instances and renegotiate those that are out of line. The men charged with the job of renegotiation are for the most part businessmen.

Undoubtedly there have been some injustices and these ought to be revised by The Tax Court or even some special court. But when a man like James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, whose peacetime job is investment banking in Wall Street, cries out against the efforts to emasculate the renegotiation law, other businessmen will want to ask themselves whether their tactics may not lead to a reaction and another wave of radicalism and antibusiness legislation when the servicemen come back home and get all the facts about wartime profits.

Question Period Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot under date of November 26, 1943.

KEFAUVER'S QUESTION PERIOD PROPOSAL

Secretary of State Hull's report on the Moscow accord—the first appearance of a Cabinet member before a joint session of Congress—throws into sharp relief the resolution offered by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, which would amend the House rules so that at brief intervals Cabinet officers (and heads of agencies as well) would be allowed to appear on the floor and answer in person both oral and written questions propounded by the people's representatives.

Efforts to mesh legislative and executive wheels more effectively by this means have had an unhappy history in this country. The first Congress provided, in the act setting up the Treasury Department, that its Secretary should appear in person from time to time to report to Congress, but a few years later the jealous House refused to allow Alexander Hamilton this privilege and thus set a precedent which has endured to the present. The Constitution itself forbids any Federal officeholder from being a member of Congress and thus, by implication, from participating in congressional functions.

Even Presidents have felt the weight of this chary, Montesquieu-inspired insistence on the separation of powers. From the time of Jefferson to Taft not even the Chief Executive appeared in person before Congress. Wilson broke the taboo in 1913. Ten years before his election to the Presidency he had observed dryly in an article that "The Houses find out only piecemeal what is going on at the other end of the Avenue. * * * Members have been known to grow uneasy and even indignant if Cabinet officers followed the debates from the galleries."

Coming, as it does, in a critical period, when the time of governmental executives has been stretched to the limit by the competing demands of congressional committees (former Rubber Director Jeffers' appearance five times in 10 days and on the same problem, is an example), the Kefauver resolution has much to commend it. But will the Kefauver resolution succeed where so many others have failed?

As early as 1864, Representative George Hunter Pendleton, of Ohio, proposed that under rules similar to those of the House of Commons, Cabinet members might sit at all times and should be required to sit on certain days in Congress to answer questions and participate in debate. Nothing came of it. In 1881, 1922, and 1925 similar proposals came to naught. The latest such move, urged by another Ohioan, Representative Harlan, developed in 1935 but fared no better than its predecessors.

Why, in view of the smoothness with which the British system works, can't a similar system be modified to American requirements? The answer seems to lie in the organic difference of the two Governments. British Cabinet members are chosen from Parliament. British departments, too, have, in effect, dual heads—a permanent undersecretary (the "expert") and the parliamentary undersecretary (the "debater"), who answers questions from the floor. It should be noted that strict rules are thrown about this questioning. Answers may not be immediately debated, and the questions themselves may not contain "argument, inference, imputation, epithet, or ironical expression," by specific rules of Commons.

Here is a hint as to the complexity and delicacy of the question. So far, as Walter Lippmann pointed out the other day, congressional debate on the Kefauver plan has been conducted on a high plane, worthy of the importance of the subject. Everyone agrees on the desideratum; how to deal with it is the question. But if this Congress could solve the problem, and permit Cabinet and administrative appearances without impairment of the historic separation of powers, without making administrative heads subject to time-killing hectoring and without upsetting the balance between the purely appointive and responsible elective branches, it would make an important improvement in the technique of government.

Rumanian-American Citizens of Salem, Ohio, Prove Their Patriotism

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1943, I was invited to be present at Salem, Ohio, at the presentation to the Army Medical Corps of a complete field ambulance by the Salem Rumanian-American Alliance for Victory. This Army field ambulance, costing almost $1,600, was purchased by the voluntary contributions of citizens of Rumanian birth residing in the city of Salem, Ohio, and was given by them as a tangible expression of their feelings of intense devotion to the land of their adoption and as an expression of their will to complete victory in the present struggle against the Axis nations of the world. These citizens made this contribution to our ultimate victory notwithstanding the fact that their native land is alined with the ranks of our enemies.

The Rumanian people—as distinguished from their present pro-Axis government—have had a long and notable history. Before the rise of Greek civilization, the progenitors of the present-day Rumanians developed a civilization of their own along the lower reaches of the Danube River. Later, they came in contact with, and to a great extent absorbed, the civilization and the culture of Greece. Still later, they came in contact with the civilizing influences of the Roman Empire and absorbed much of that civilization. Indeed the name of their country, Rumania, is derived from the name of the capital of the Roman Empire. And it became the proud boast of the people of Rumania that they constituted the easternmost outpost of the great Roman Empire.

When that empire fell to pieces, the people of Rumania kept alive the torch of civilization as an oasis in a great desert of barbarism in eastern Europe. Truly, the people of Rumania have had a distinguished history.

And now, in America and as American citizens, they are proving themselves worthy of their age-old traditions and of their fighting ancestry. The service flag which represents their contribution to the armed forces of the United States contains, from the small colony of Rumanian citizens in Salem, Ohio, 29 stars—29 of their sons are now enlisted in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this unique contribution of the Rumanians of Salem, Ohio, to the cause of Allied victory represents real sacrifice on their part, and it seems to me is so noteworthy and praiseworthy that their action in so contributing to the cause of Allied victory should be known throughout the Nation in order that it may inspire other groups of our foreign-born citizens to similar contributions.

Mr. Speaker, it is inspiring to learn of the patriotic devotion of our citizens of Rumanian birth to the principles of freedom which are the common heritage of us all, and I wish to pay my tribute of respect, confidence, and admiration for the peoples of Rumanian birth in the city of Salem in my district who have so nobly demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism, and I commend their action to the attention of others who might be thus inspired to make similar contributions to victory.

Is Dementia Praecox Indicated by Delusions of Grandeur?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Burlington Free Press, of Burlington, Vt., entitled "By What Authority?" The editorial particularly well illustrates the opinion which a great majority of the American people entertained and still have as to Mr. Landon's qualifications for leadership, which was an issue once before, if I recall the name correctly.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

Alf Landon, Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1936, is reported in news dispatches to have told Secretary of State Cordell Hull that before Republicans could agree to the proposal for identical foreign policy planks for the two major parties, they must have complete reports on background and implications of "any agreements or understanding that have been arrived at, either orally or in writing."

Landon has stated that he further told Secretary Hull that, in order to have identical planks on foreign policy, every word and every comma in such planks, as well as the exact meaning of the words used must be agreed upon by the representatives of the two parties.

"Third," said Landon, "having agreed to such wording and its meaning, if the Republican Convention adopted the plank, there would have to be a firm commitment—a commitment the keeping of which would not be open to question—that the Democratic Party in its convention would adopt the same plank, without so much as the change of a word. And if there was so much as the change of a word, we would have to have a commitment that Mr. Hull would repudiate the plank."

Whether identical planks on foreign policy in the two party platforms may be advisable or not, it must be obvious that such a proposal as Landon makes is absurd. Nobody in either party has authority to commit its convention in advance on such a proposition.

And for that matter, by what authority does Alf Landon speak for Republicans today? As the party's candidate in 1936 he was defeated in one of the worst beatings the Republican Party ever received in this country. Since then nobody has delegated him to represent the party, so far as we have heard. Until he can show that he represents any large number of Republicans now, his effort to speak for republicanism in 1943 or 1944 should be severely discounted.

EMPTY NOTHINGS

You see, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot take this man Landon seriously, nor take advice from him with placidity.

I recall with some embarrassment that I drove 400 miles to hear him speak at Portland, Maine, and as the story goes, "I might just as well have 'et.'" I am sure that had he spoken twice in Maine he could not have carried that State.

We Vermonters almost stultified ourselves in the interest of the party to do as much as we did for him. He has a lot of nerve, granted, as a political accident, and a repudiated and buried would-be leader, to try to resurrect himself, so long after burial, at nobody's request.

When former President Hoover, whom I regard as one of the outstanding men of our time, who did not look too happy being photographed with a political corpse, undertook to explain what Mr. Landon meant by what he said concerning foreign affairs, and so forth, he made bad matters worse for Mr. Landon, because in effect and in substance he said: "Forget it; Landon does not know what he is talking about, or what he means, but he means what he says; but does not mean what you think he said; if you know what I mean, which I do not."

Sure, "we get you."

CORROBORATIVE

Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., corroborates the opinion of the editor of the Burlington Free Press, at least indirectly, by telling the truth, which one does not have to run to read. So I am inserting the editorial, which is as follows:

"SPARKS" TO THE WILLKIE KINDLING

A smear campaign is now on against Willkie. It's a good way to nominate him, Willkie, and help to defeat whomever the Republicans nominate.

Consequently, both Democrats and Republicans are involved in this latest attempt to "stop Willkie," by fair means or foul.

A Republican by the name of Sparks, long identified with the reactionary element of the party, has written a book called One Man—Wendell Willkie. Sparks charges Willkie's nomination in 1940 was the result of a drive. So what?

Almost every nomination for President in the history of this country was the result of some sort of a "drive," including Lincoln's.

The "drive" which resulted in the third-term nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt was somewhat notorious.

Sparks, former mayor of Akron, Ohio, and campaign manager for Frank Gannett, when a "stop Dewey" campaign was on in 1940, charges no dishonesty against the Willkie supporters.

It is, of course, significant that Sparks' book and charges do not appear until now, when the campaign he describes, and the charges he makes, are almost 4 years old.

If Sparks and his associates in the "stop Willkie" smear had good intentions or even good memories, they would recall that it was just such a drive against Willkie in 1940 that helped and may have caused Willkie's nomination.

The public likes fair play and suspects, instinctively, there must be something to a man, whom others try to beat by the methods Sparks and his group are using against Wendell Willkie.

Today also Willkie is far better known than he was in 1940. He has made some new

enemies, but he has made vastly more friends and supporters.

The Sparks campaign will backfire and—add Sparks to the Willkie kindling.

It is an outrageous bit of old-line Republican tactics.

Will the old-line Republicans never learn?

Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, the immediate inspiration for this discussion of bureaucracy is the leading article in the September issue of the Reader's Digest written by my friend and distinguished colleague from Texas the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Dallas, entitled, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats." The very title of the article incites one's curiosity, since we have come to blame the bureaucrats for most governmental ills and inefficiency.

Knowing Judge SUMNERS to be a man of highest character and statesmanship, knowing him to be a sound philosopher of government, his article was read by me with great care and interest. Since its publication numerous people have sent me copies of the article, evincing their great concern with the problem of bureaucracy. Since bureaucracy may well become a Frankenstein growth within our democracy, the purpose of this discourse is to explore the subject a little further than was done in Judge SUMNER'S article. Notwithstanding the wisdom and logic of his discussion, I cannot bring myself to completely exonerate the bureaucrats of all blame for bureaucracy.

First, let us define the terms to be used and the limits to be given in this discussion. In a technical sense if all Federal bureaucracy were eliminated all Federal government would be eliminated. Our Constitution provides for bureaus and the various Secretaries in the President's Cabinet are themselves heads of bureaus of government. Bureaucracy as herein used means government activity and expense over and above that which is necessary in a democracy.

As a further predicate for the remarks to follow, and by way of further defining bureaucracy, we insert here data on the approximate increase in expenditures and personnel of the Federal Government since 1900, years of unusual military activity being purposely omitted:

	Persons employed	Appropriations
1900	250, 000+	$698, 000, 000+
1910	390, 000+	1, 044, 000, 000+
1915	425, 000+	1, 122, 000, 000+
1922	515, 000+	3, 909, 000, 000+
1930	565, 000+	4, 665, 000, 000+
1935	800, 000+	7, 527, 000, 000+
1939	920, 000+	10, 338, 000, 000+

The story is told that following the first billion-dollar Congress in 1910 a Member running for reelection was attacked on the grounds of the gigantic and unprecedented appropriations for which he had voted. When accused of being a Member of a billion-dollar Congress he replied, "This is a billion-dollar country." If this were only a billion-dollar country in 1910 it could hardly have become a $10,000,000,000 country in 1939. However, the number of people employed and the amount of money expended by the Federal Government on normal peacetime activities has increased tenfold in the last 30 years. We now have more than 140 separate and distinct executive bureaus and agencies issuing orders and directives, many of which have the force and effect of law, from many of which there apparently is no appeal, and too many of which are unnecessarily harassing the people whom the Government seeks to serve. This is what we call bureaucracy.

Two major causes of bureaucracy are suggested. The first has to do with the nature of people, the second with the nature of the bureaucrats, both are equally to blame.

Cause No. 1 for the growth of bureaucracy is described by Judge Sumners in his article, an article some people contend exonerates the bureaucrats themselves of blame. In Don't Blame the Bureaucrats, Judge Sumners states that bureaucracy has grown up in response to the demands of the people, because the people have dumped all of their problems in the lap of the Federal Government, to be handled largely by officials whom the people did not elect and who do not feel responsible to them.

After enumerating a number of the recognized evils of bureaucracy, Judge SUMNERS adds:

> The bureaucrat is blamed for this, but he is not the cause, he is the effect. The seat of the trouble lies far deeper. Our whole political system is based on the principle of local self-government, but two forces have been destroying this principle. One is the demand of the people for the Federal Government to intervene in problems of every community in every class; the other is the ever-growing practice of passing all these problems on to the Government in Washington.

Thus the Judge has given us only one of the major causes of bureaucracy. The bureaucrat himself is the second major cause. The bureaucrat himself has initiated much of this governmental expansion. In the same magazine with Judge SUMNERS' article appeared a speech delivered by Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, to the British Association of Chambers of Commerce in London. In this address Mr. Johnston said, "The normal American is a natural boomer and booster." That's true. That's the key to our second major cause of bureaucracy. The average, ordinary American is a dreamer, an organizer, a promoter. He wants to have vast wealth and great power. He wants to run a hundred dollars into a thousand, a thousand into a million, and so on. He wants to do something different, something bigger and better than his neighbor. This initiative has had much to do with the development of our tremendous economic resources and with the building of this great industrial empire we call America. This promotional genius of the every day American, when confined to his farm, factory, business, or profession is a laudable characteristic. When devoted to private enterprise and honest competition it is to be applauded.

Now take this same American, and these folks who work in Government—these chiefs, directors, executives, these heads of Government bureaus and agencies whom we call bureaucrats—they are all Americans who came from the ranks of private life, from business, industry, agriculture, and the professions. When this fellow starts working for the Government he does not change his stripes. He is still a promoter, an organizer, an expansionist. His chief difference now is that he operates with Government money, with little feeling of caution in its use. He gets himself an office. He starts expanding his staff. He begins seeking new fields to conquer. He wants to blaze new trails. He wants to make his job vastly more important. This year he gets a modest appropriation for his activities and is careful to use it all. Otherwise he could not seek greater appropriations and more authority for a bigger and allegedly better job. When his office grows sufficiently large, new divisions and sections of his agency are set up, with their chiefs and directors. These in turn start the expanding process. Thus a twig becomes a tree.

The bureaucrat is an expert salesman who believes in advertising. During recent years the public relations offices, the publicity departments, of the various administrative bureaus have spent some $30,000,000 annually, reporting on and advertising their various achievements. This is bureaucratic sales promotion. This is nearly twice as much money as it costs to operate the entire Congress, or legislative branch of the Government. You never heard of a bureaucrat boasting that the size of his office has been reduced through efficient methods, or that any money has been saved in operations. Instead of doing a modest, efficient job of a particular assignment, instead of confining his activities to a particular task, the bureaucrat begins immediately to enlarge and expand his field of endeavor. He goes out looking for business. Thus what in private enterprise is a virtue, in Government becomes a vice.

Now, in addition to the above-mentioned major causes, let us enumerate briefly some of the minor causes for the growth of bureaucracy.

In many instances the Civil Service Commission permits Government employees to redefine their jobs, and in effect to promote themselves. The so-called merit system is not always a merit system. In many instances a person's salary is dependent on the size of the office under his supervision. The more folks he hires the bigger job he has. The overstaffing of offices itself results in waste, inefficiency, and confusion.

Again, emergency conditions often arise making necessary the temporary creation of a new board, bureau, or agency. When one is created, in 99 cases out of 100 the head of this new agency and all of its employees immediately begin to seek permanent status. When the reason for its creation ceases to exist the agency hangs on. It is difficult to discharge employees with permanent civil-service ratings. If their status is temporary they fight all the harder for the continuance of their bureau. For bureaus, birth is exhilarating, death excruciating.

Aggravating this situation is another matter of which little note has been taken. In recent years there has grown up in this country powerful unions of Federal employees, many of whom are affiliated with the C. I. O. or the A. F. L. I have before me a list of 19 separate unions of Federal employees, representing over a half million individuals. Recently when the Smith-Connally antistrike bill was before the Congress, the United Federal Workers of America—C. I. O.—circulated among their members a bulletin saying, "Are you fighting for democracy on the home front? Write your Congressman to protest the Smith-Connally bill."

Two examples of how Federal employees may retain their positions have recently come to my knowledge quite by accident. Some time ago an employee in one of the departments in Washington was caught stealing from a blind man who ran a confectionery counter in the building. This thief was not fired, but simply transferred to another building and another job for which he was wholly unfitted. Recently a colored employee of another department was caught in serious violation of rules, and discharged. Within 2 weeks she was back on her job with no loss of pay because of pressure brought by the Government employees' union.

But, you say, the Government employees have a right to organize just the same as any other group for the purpose of improving working conditions. Perhaps, but how far does this justification go? You will remember the firmness of Calvin Coolidge in dealing with striking Boston policemen while he was Governor of Massachusetts. His famous declaration, "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time," made him President. If present tendencies continue we may see the time when even Federal employees strike against the Government.

One reason for the growth of bureaucracy is the difficulty the Congress has in abolishing bureaus. Generally speaking, bureaus perpetuate themselves through extremely active and influential lobbies, and through the assistance of other bureaus with whom they make common cause. Almost any Congressman will tell you the most effective pressure group in the country is the personnel of the various Government agencies. In addition to other influence, Government agencies are said to control about 20 percent of the votes in the country. When an agency is about to be eliminated, a Congressman is deluged with wires and letters from his most influential constituents expressing alarm. The agency on the execution block is always represented as the best of the lot, and one rendering indispensable service to the people.

Another reason for the growth of bureaucracy is that our system of checks and balances has got out of balance. To be specific, Congress is no longer able to deal adequately as a check on the bureaus, agencies, and departments in the executive branch of the Government. The reports and the records of the various executive agencies of the Government will annually run into several hundred thousand volumes. Congress has to operate through committees. To know all about the work which it is the duty of his committee to do, a Member of Congress would have to read thousands of reports, many of them technical and wholly outside the field of his training. Often a bureau will bring before a committee of Congress a bill upon which its attorneys and experts have worked for many months. The committee is expected to act within a few weeks. The bureau is perhaps sincere and honest in its proposal but may have permitted its enthusiasm for a particular job entirely to distort its point of view and to cause it to lose sight of the general welfare. The committee must rely upon the bureau for information. The Congress must rely upon the committee. Improper legislative action may result.

Still another reason for the growth of bureaucracy is the folks who plan it that way. We have in this country a small minority who believe in communism or fascism and who would completely regiment the lives of the people through Federal bureaucracy. The danger from these individuals lies in our failure to recognize them as wolves masquerading in sheep's clothing.

It is not my purpose to be a prophet of gloom. Two-thirds of the civilians now employed by the Federal Government, and most of the new bureaus, are incident to the war program. Most of them are scheduled to go with the coming of peace. However, many of these agencies, including the Office of Price Administration, will put up a great fight for perpetuation. This battle between bureaucracy and democracy will involve the future destiny of this country.

What can we do about bureaucracy? Some possibilities are suggested as follows:

First. When the purposes for which a bureau was created cease to exist, the bureau should be abolished, lock, stock, and barrel, the offices closed, the furniture sold, and the employees returned to private life.

Temporary buildings, constructed for the housing of war agencies, should be torn down and removed immediately following the war.

Second. There should be a general reorganization and consolidation of bureaus and of agencies within the bureaus.

Third. The Congress should arbitrarily cut and limit appropriations, with directions that activities be efficiently curtailed within the limits of available funds.

Fourth. No social experimentation by bureaus under the guise of war or other emergency should be tolerated.

Fifth. Each committee of Congress should employ as many full-time expert clerks as needed to check and investigate everything coming before the committee for action, as well as to audit the activities and affairs of the particular agencies whose business this committee handles. These experts should have their offices in the House Office Building, should be carried on the legislative pay roll, and should be responsible only to the Congress.

Sixth. There should always be a right of appeal to the courts of the land from any fiat or decree of any bureau which deprives any person of liberty or property.

Of course, we can do nothing about bureaucracy unless we set our hearts to it. The lessons of history are plain. Some 150 years ago that degenerate Bourbon, Louis XIV, spoke for the rulers of France with his famous pronouncement, "After us the deluge," meaning to the devil with future generations, our only concern is for the present. Sordid, shortsighted selfishness will destroy any people. If such is the spirit of the American people, the battle of bureaucracy is already lost.

However, a nation whose sons are fighting so nobly for democracy on the battlefields of the world will surely not lose democracy on the home fronts. If we will devote to the battle of peace a little of the courage and heroism which our boys are giving to the battles of war, then surely we can face the future with confidence, and their sacrifices will not have been in vain.

Our Job Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, on November 27, 1943, in Sheffield, Ala., for the regional meeting of the N. R. E. C. A.:

Mr. McWilliams, distinguished guests, and R. E. A. friends in Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee, I bring you greetings from the Department of Agriculture and the Rural Electrification Administration. It is a privilege to salute the leaders of the R. E. A. cooperative movement in Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The 103 active R. E. A. cooperatives in this region have made outstanding achievements in bringing electric service to more than 219,000 farmers in the territories they serve. I want to assure you that you shall have our fullest cooperation in your efforts to continue this real progress which has been made in the face of sometimes formidable

opposition: opposition that claimed rural electrification in most of this region was not economically feasible because the people did not want electricity and even should they have electric power made available to them, they could not pay for it.

I could not come into Region 3 without feeling both pride in what has been accomplished and deep concern over some of the problems confronting us, and the immensity of the challenge of the job that remains to be done. This region, composed of four progressive agricultural States of the Nation, holds top rank in the rate of percentage increase in farm electrification since January 1, 1935. It was during that memorable year that President Roosevelt established the R. E. A. with its program of rural electrification. I know that our program is very close to the heart of the Secretary of Agriculture and to the President.

During the past 8 years the R. E. A. program has been in operation the number of farms receiving central station electric service in your four States has risen from 37,000 to 219,000. This is an increase of slightly less than 600 percent. That is a record of which you may be justly proud.

The job of bringing electric power to all the farmers and rural communities in these forward-looking States is far from completed. This region is still next to the bottom of the list among the 10 R. E. A. regions in the total percentage of farms electrified. Only 21.4 percent of the total number of farms in the region have electricity. The national average is 40 percent. I see no reason why 100 percent of the farmers and rural people of this great country should not have electric power with all its modern conveniences. We know that the unserved farmers and rural peoples in areas served by your cooperatives want electricity, will use electricity, and, furthermore, are paying for it once the R. E. A. cooperative builds a highline to their farms.

Frequently there are those who challenge the soundness of R. E. A.-financed cooperatives. You will be interested to know how the more than 800 cooperatives which R. E. A. has financed are handling their affairs—where they stand financially—whether the approach to the problem of rural electrification is sound. Since 1935 we have advanced for the construction of distribution systems, generation and transmission systems, acquisitions, wiring and appliances—$372,361,136. Repayment of these funds is scheduled over a 25-year period. As of September 30, 1943, the cooperatives had met their scheduled payments and, in addition to this, have to their credit in prepayments to R. E. A. $14,094,419, as compared with delinquencies of only $260,299.

To the 103 cooperatives in this region $42,245,456 have been advanced to build 46,486 miles of line. The latest figures available show that all cooperatives are current in principal payments to R. E. A. on construction notes, with no exceptions, and these cooperatives have repaid to R. E. A., ahead of schedule, $2,005,618. In addition to their cash reserves the amount held in Government War Loan Bonds is substantial. This splendid financial record is in keeping with what we consider to be a fundamental step in the development of a post-war program that has as its objective making electricity available to every rural home in America. During this emergency period of the war every effort should be made by the cooperatives to bring their engineering work up to date, to establish the best management practices, and to keep their financial house in order.

In addition to this effort to conduct your affairs prudently and to extend service to all farmers who qualify under present restriction, there is an added responsibility of making plans for post-war rural electrification development. In behalf of R. E. A. I want to take this opportunity to urge the representatives of every cooperative here to do their utmost, within the limit of the necessary Federal regulations, to see that electric service is made available to the presently unserved farmers of this four-State area. In this region where you have brought service to more than 219,000 rural families, there are yet unserved—according to recent Census figures—1,337,831 farms and rural homes. In addition to the two and a half million farmers in America now receiving central station service (served in about equal numbers by private utilities and R. E. A. financed cooperatives), available data indicate that there are more than 5,000,000 farms and rural nonfarm residences and other establishments nearly all located within the area of R. E. A. cooperatives, to which electricity should be made available as rapidly as possible after the close of the war.

That is the reason why R. E. A. is working with its borrowers in making the unelectrified farm survey. Congressional foresight provided in the R. E. A. Act authorization for the Administrator to make studies, investigations, and reports concerning the conditions and progress of the electrification of rural areas. Under this authority the Post-War Planning Program is being conducted. A part of the program is a survey of the unelectrified farms in the United States.

R. E. A.-financed systems conducting the unelectrified farm survey under our suggested procedures are receiving the cooperation of many county agents and interested organizations. This survey, when completed, is placed on a map showing the location of the unelectrified farm, as well as the location of the transmission and distribution lines of both private utilities and R. E. A.-financed systems. To date, more than 450 counties in various parts of the country have been completed. Many of the progressive cooperative leaders are already planning to bring information on the unserved area in their territory up to the pre-allotment stage so that a construction program may proceed at once when victory has been won, and labor and material again become available. Second only to our interest in furthering the U-1-c program is our interest in seeing the unelectrified farm survey completed in every county in the land.

One of the principal objectives in R. E. A.'s plan for the development of a program of post-war rural electrification would enable R. E. A. to effectively cooperate with its borrowers in bringing the basic data of the unelectrified farm survey up to the pre-allotment stage. This plan has been submitted to the Department in line with the recent request of the President.

This objective would achieve a two-fold purpose. First, through the early availability of central station electric service to millions of rural homes it would provide the basis for a more profitable agriculture and richer rural living, so abundantly deserved and won by the sons and daughters of these same families now serving the Nation in this world-wide conflict. Second, in a program of immediate large-scale construction there would be provided by direct construction activities and through the manufacture of materials and the new market for consumer goods an opportunity for profitable private employment for thousands upon thousands of our returned soldiers.

This great region offers unlimited opportunities directly related to this two-fold purpose. It is noteworthy that the Tennessee Valley area is rich in developed hydroelectric power resources. It was for this area that dire predictions were made that the T. V. A. hydro dams would be "white elephants," that "existing facilities" were adequate, that there were no markets for additional power and "the poverty-stricken farmers" of the area could not afford electricity.

Today—in 1943—the farmers of this section, and the whole country, are building the foundation of a new agriculture, an agriculture that holds the promise of real parity, not only parity of price, but parity of production tools and methods as well as parity in all the good things of daily life. I am proud that electric power, distributed to nearly a million farms over lines financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, is helping to make this possible.

Frequently in the past, the availability of electric equipment has been the deciding factor in setting up a specialized dairy or poultry farm. The family of J. M. Brown, members of the Coast Electric Power Association of Bay St. Louis, Miss., has set up facilities for producing 250,000 pounds of broilers a year. In addition they are keeping 10,000 laying hens. These people say that they could not operate this modern "broiler factory" without electricity. Their farm is equipped with electric egg graders, electric chicken pickers, an electric refrigeration plant, and other electrical devices.

I understand that a similar situation has existed among farmers of this area who decided to go into the dairy business. With electric water pumps, electric dairy water heaters and other electrical equipment, they were able to carry on large scale operations, impossible, or not practical, before.

Electricity has played an important role in implementing diversification. For 30 or 40 years, the Agriculture Department has been talking about substituting diversified farming for dependency on a single cash crop. It is not correct to say that electricity has, itself, brought about diversification, but it has certainly helped. The T. V. A. area and this region has established the national pattern in this respect. And, the benefits of farm electrification extend beyond the individual farm, to every rural community where service is available.

Experience gained in the T. V. A. area has shown that low cost electric power encourages new rural industries and brings even greater benefits to farms because of the influence of low cost power on farm production and farm income. The greater use of power when the cost is lowered is evident by a comparison of power consumption of farms served by R. E. A. cooperatives in the T. V. A. area with that of the farms in Region 8 of the Arkansas Valley area. The highest average consumption in the T. V. A. area according to recent data, is approximately 90 kilowatt-hours per month, the lowest 82. Compare that figure with the low of 45 kilowatt-hours and the high of 57 kilowatt-hours in Region 8. While part of this may be due to unseen factors, I am confident that the primary explanation is the variation in rates. The Arkansas farm uses, on the average, only 45 kilowatt-hours of electricity per month; the Mississippi R. E. A.-served farm in the T. V. A. area uses double this amount—90 kilowatt-hours. The Arkansas farmer paid $3.18 for his 45 kilowatt-hours, while the farmer in Mississippi, for 37 percent less money, or $2.01, receives twice as many kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Important, no, I should say of high importance, is the news on the trend in wholesale power rates just handed me as I left St. Louis. Since R. E. A. started its program the wholesale power rate to cooperatives has decreased more than 31 percent. While the increasing number of farms enjoying modern benefits of electric service is one measure of the success of our program, I believe this steadily decreasing wholesale power rate to be our best measure of how well you and your cooperatives are succeeding in bringing electric power to the farms of America at the lowest possible cost. Here are the figures: 1939, 1.21 cents

per kilowatt-hour; 1940, 1.09 cents per kilowatt-hour; 1941, 1 cent per kilowatt-hour; 1942, 0.94 cent per kilowatt-hour; and for 1943, 0.83 cent per kilowatt-hour. That, my friends, tells the significant story, and I especially note the vast difference between the wholesale rate of power from publicly owned suppliers, 0.68 cent per kilowatt-hour in 1943, as compared to the 1943 rate of privately owned suppliers of 1.05 cents per kilowatt-hour.

This is not, of course, noticeable to you who are enjoying T. V. A. benefits. After all, about 21 percent of the power purchased by R. E. A. cooperatives in 1943 was supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and at the exceptionally low wholesale rate of only 0.54 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Although we are limited as to funds and much of our St. Louis staff is working extra hours to give the necessary assistance to the cooperatives, I am happy to tell you that we have a number of people who are devoting much time and thought to the development of a sound program for post-war rural electrification. We are not making plans to be able to make more plans after the war. We are making plans to be ready for action. While there is still considerable work to be done, our present studies indicate that with a minimum of expense and effort, R. E. A., its cooperative borrowers and others, working together, can have available at a moment's notice a post-war construction program of well over $500,000,000 in the first 3 years. And it should be borne in mind that such a program will open a market for at least an equivalent amount of farm and home appliances.

This program of post-war rural electrification will have immediate benefits to labor that would otherwise be released from war plants now producing war materials. This program will also be of benefit to those concerned with the processing, transporting and manufacturing of poles, conductors, transformers, line and generating equipment, as well as the processing and manufacture of the tremendous volume of electrical appliances and farm equipment that R. E. A. experience indicates will be purchased after the facilities are constructed.

There is only one other matter of which I wish to speak today, and that is the relationship between the Rural Electrification Administration and its borrowers. The funds which R. E. A. has at its disposal for the active program that it is now expected to carry on are very limited. Every effort is being made to use these funds to the best possible advantage. Even with this, if we are to get on with this program, it is necessary to have the best possible cooperation between our borrowers and this Administration. It is necessary to have the best possible cooperation between R. E. A.—a Federal Administration in the Department of Agriculture—and other Administrations and bureaus within the Department. I have every reason to believe that we are going to receive the best possible cooperation from all Federal agencies with whom we come in contact.

Rural Electrification Administration's position in carrying out the mandate of Congress to bring electric service to rural homes is different from that of almost any other public agency. In a measure, our relationship to the cooperatives is that of a friendly banker loaning funds, but by reason of the fact that the building and managing of electric lines is a relatively new type of cooperative endeavor, we try to render a considerable variety of services that will insure the successful operation of these lines upon which we have loned money. I want to make this very clear, however, that it is not the desire of the Rural Electrification Administration to run the business of its borrowers.

We recognize that that can be done much better by the local board of directors and the local manager than it can be by anyone from Washington or St. Louis. You know what the problems are. You are constantly gaining experience, and with the assistance we are able to provide, I am sure that if the sturdy farmers who make up these boards of directors cannot run these cooperatives and make them measure up to our fondest hopes, then no one else can. The record which I have already cited for this region and the Nation proves that you're doing a good job.

I do want to point out, however, that when the Rural Electrification Administration, after attempting to interest the private utilities in furthering the rural electrification program established the policy of loaning to rural cooperatives, it in effect placed its faith in cooperatives to bring electric service to rural families of the Nation. For that reason I cannot but feel that you managers, directors, and members of successful operating cooperatives have assumed a moral obligation to make central station electric service available to every rural home that it is possible to serve.

We have had ample warning, however, that the cooperative movement will be subjected to more and more intense and bitter attacks on wider fronts than we have ever experienced in the past. Attacks will not be limited to R. E. A. cooperatives. They will be directed specifically at all cooperative enterprises, including marketing co-ops, as well as consumer, credit, and production cooperatives. It can be anticipated that R. E. A. and R. E. A.-cooperatives will be a major target of this well-planned and financed campaign, which is a continuance of the old fight by private utilities that has but one major post-war incentive, and that is to live, which means kill the program which has taught the people so much, in so short a time, about cheap public power. The old guard is marching again. Leaders of cooperatives and the farmers of this Nation are well aware of this situation. Through our mutual efforts we can and will meet this intensified opposition.

If R. E. A. performs its functions with efficiency and decisiveness, I am confident that so long as member interest in the cooperative's affairs is maintained, and that so long as the officers and directors which they select exercise their best judgment as public-spirited citizens, the President and the Congress can be assured that, as rapidly as conditions permit, dependable electric power will be made available to every rural home in America.

In Praise of the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Bill of Rights occupies our thoughts, I offer the following poem as a small contribution to the celebration of Bill of Rights week:

IN PRAISE OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The Bill of Rights is a bill we pay for,
A bill that always comes due:
A blessing to thank God night and day for,
A boon to pledge the American way for,
To toil and build, to fight and pray for—
All of us—me and you.

To all who hunger and hope you contend for,
You shine like a glorious beacon
All wrongs to petition in peace and amend for,
Secure in our person and conscience to fend for,
Democracy's strength our strength to expend for,
No tyrant shall ever weaken.
The Bill of Rights is the people's to bless for,
Their shield, their armor, their light;
Religion and speech and the freedom of press for,
Due process of law to invoke and redress for,
The people's charter their dream to express for,
Guarantor eternal of right.

MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
Member of Congress.

Milk Shortage in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, to the editor, from the Boston Sunday Globe of December 12, 1943:

INCREASE PRICE OF MILK TO PREVENT SHORTAGE IN NEW ENGLAND, VERMONTER URGES—ONLY 2 CENTS MORE PER QUART OF MILK WILL SAVE NEW ENGLAND FROM SHORTAGE

To the EDITOR:

Too little—too late. How often we have read these words in reference to the production of war goods and their availability where needed. Right now they may be applied on the milk front. Farmers in New England and, I presume, nationally, are getting so little for their milk or milk products that they are reducing or dispersing their herds.

What is the answer? The answer is an ever-increasing milk shortage until the consumer's milk is rationed and the consumer will pay considerably more than he needs to if action is not taken now. The question is yours, Mr. Consumer, to answer.

Under present regulations Federal milk-marketing boards are setting the ceiling prices which farmers receive for their fluid milk, fat, or milk products. These ceiling prices are only slightly more than farmers received before Pearl Harbor—and no one has ever known of farmers getting rich. In the meantime, various business indexes agree that farmers' costs of production have increased more, percentage-wise, than any other business. At the same time, incomes in all defense industries have gone sky high.

If you were a farmer getting up before dawn every day, regardless of weather, and worked 12 to 14 or more hours per day, Sundays included, and couldn't even break even on your investment, what would you do if Uncle Sam came along and offered upwards to $100 or more for half the number of hours and no investment? That's right. You'd sell the cows and maybe the farm and take a war job, to pay the family bills and buy your wife and kids some new clothes.

Farmers are jacks of all trades. Every one could serve in almost any type of skilled job. With shorter hours and big money in war jobs versus long hours and financial embarrassment on the farm, the bureaucrats wonder why milk supplies are dwindling.

Here is a simple economical theory, as old as civilization—the law of supply and demand. Wholesale milk prices are kept below the farmers' costs of production. Farmers reduce or disperse their herds, milk supplies become inadequate to meet consumer de-

mands. Prices are held constant by ceilings. Milk shortages become acute. Available supplies are rationed. Eventually, Mr. Consumer, you will get sore and want to do something about it, when you see your kids lose weight for lack of milk. By then the supply of milk-producing cows is going to be so far reduced that all the best feeds in the world or a dollar a quart will not increase the milk supply sufficiently to satisfy your requirements for 3 years. Get that, 3 years. All that time you will pay many cents per quart more than you are now paying, while the farmer is raising cows from calfhood.

Why 3 years of waiting? Because it takes 3 years to produce a milking cow.

Why doesn't the farmer raise his heifer calves now? Because he can't afford to, with help scarce and existent labor costly, to say nothing of the added costs of inadequate grain, scarcity of machinery, red tape in securing it, and so on. Maybe I should tell you that we farmers actually receive only about 6½ cents per quart, after various deductions, for milk which costs you 16 cents per quart, sometimes more.

I was born and brought up on a dairy farm in Vermont. I was 13 when the United States entered World War No. 1. My father and I, frequently without extra regular help, operated a farm maintaining 150 head of cattle. I know farming and know what it is to work long, hard hours every day.

Four years ago I lost my dad. Mother and I now carry on. It is the only home she has ever known, the only life she knows or wishes. At 74 she works harder than most men in industry. Unfortunately, she is not paid proportionately. Still she is uncomplaining.

We still own 700 acres of good old Vermont and a few over 100 head of purebred Holsteins.

If you agree that my qualifications as a farmer are acceptable then you may feel my suggestions should be instructive. I previously referred to the 3-year cycle. No dairy or milk program can be designed which does not take this fundamental qualification into consideration.

That is why subsidies cannot and will not prove effective in relieving the milk shortage. Subsidies are political footballs to be kicked around. They can be put on and taken off at the whimsical will of the politicians in power. The farmer must be guaranteed an adequate price for his milk over a 3-year period or longer, to induce any effort on his part to plan for increased production.

Congress apparently appreciates the farmer's plight and is willing to play ball. In fact, sufficient legislation has already been passed. Laws now authorize the executive department to increase milk prices sufficiently to insure adequate production. But the trouble is that the executive branch now in control is more interested in catering to the demands of labor and votes of labor than in giving farmers the necessary income to keep them on the farm.

Now is the time, Mr. Consumer, for you to speak your piece or suffer in the following years. Why now? One reason is that the commodity credit bill must be killed or cured in some form before January 1. This is the bill which will make or break milk subsidies. What are your instructions to your Congressman? The other reason is that if farmers are given a living price for their milk now, more of them will stay on the farm and continue to produce, not dispersing their herds.

Why don't the farmers retail their own milk, you might ask. Because your State legislatures have passed so many sanitation and hygienic laws requiring that milk be pasteurized, bottled by machine, automatically capped, and even recapped without being touched by human hands. Farmers can't afford such an overhead. Soon only big corporations will be retailing milk, even in comparatively small towns, unless you buy your milk over the store counter in a package. This is a dangerous trend, from a consumer's point of view.

Give the farmer, on the average, 2 cents more per quart now, and you will get milk. If other costs continue upward, that advance must remain proportionate. Put that in a legislative guarantee, and the farmers will feed the world.

ROBERT W. PIERCE.

BELLOWS FALLS, VT.

Results of Cairo and Teheran Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Sumner Welles from the New York Herald Tribune of December 15, 1943:

WELLES SAYS PARLEY DASHED FOES' HOPES FOR A COMPROMISE—RESULTS OF CAIRO AND TEHERAN CONFERENCES SEEN ASSURING COHERENCE IN MILITARY STRATEGY AND COOPERATION IN POST-WAR TRANSITION

(By Sumner Welles, Former Under Secretary of State)

Now that the tumult and the shouting attendant upon the meetings of Cairo and Teheran have died, the positive accomplishments which these meetings represent can be analyzed more objectively.

The results of these meetings assure not only a coherence and unity in military strategy on the part of the four major powers which had by no means previously existed, but they also imply an extent of effective cooperation in the task of safeguarding peace and order in the post-war transition period that seemed far from certain a few months ago.

They have finally destroyed the illusory hopes to which Germany and Japan so stubbornly clung, that suspicion between the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the United States and the British Commonwealth on the other, or friction between Great Britain and China, might bring about so great a weakening of the war effort of the United Nations as to pave the way for a compromise peace.

The President has made no greater contribution to Allied unity, and has rendered no more farreaching service in the attainment of the war aims of this country, than he has by his participation in these two epoch-making conferences.

The meeting with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo was held upon the friendly insistence of President Roosevelt.

CHINESE REASSURED

Many causes for Chinese misapprehension have now, due, at least in part, to the influence of the President, been dispelled.

If the Chinese people are obliged to await the final all-out and concerted American and British attack upon Japan until the war in Europe is won, they are nevertheless assured, not only that the pressure against Japan will be unrelenting, but also that it is constantly rising, and that it will continue to rise until Japan is crushed.

At the same time the United States and British Governments promise the people of China that they seek no territory in the Pacific themselves, and that all of the regions which Japan has seized from China during the last 60 years, and some of which China had lost the hope of regaining, will be restored to them.

In the same manner the doubts which some members of the Chinese Government have had as to the future objectives of the Soviet Union in the Far East have been allayed. For while Russia clearly could not participate in the Cairo meeting so long as she is not at war with Japan, it is equally evident that the promise made to China that Manchuria would be restored to her could not have been made save with the prior knowledge and agreement of the Soviet Government.

When these terms shall have been carried out, once Japan has been expelled from all other territories which she has taken, China will become the dominant, and we have every reason to believe, a cooperative and pacific, power in Asia.

KOREA TO BE FREED

Finally, with the restoration of Korean independence, one of the great crimes of the twentieth century will have been rectified, and another stabilizing factor will have been added to the new international system which must be constructed in the Pacific.

At Teheran the long expressed desire of the President to meet alone with Stalin was at last realized. This opportunity of the heads of the Russian and American governments to talk directly—to discard intermediaries—to discuss face to face the fundamental issues of the present and of the future, was not only in general salutary, but it was, in particular, the most effective method of ending, once for all, the disastrous lack of close understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union which had persisted for more than a generation.

The basic objective of the Teheran meeting was accomplished. It is found in the final words of the President, Stalin, and Churchill:

"We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

If there is any cause to cavil at the announced results of the two historic meetings, it lies in the fact that there has been as yet no indication given by the four great powers as to the manner in which the remaining members of the United Nations are to be afforded the opportunity of participating in the political decisions which must be reached, in ever-increasing number, as the war finally draws to its close. Nor is there announced any form of mechanism by which the assurances proclaimed by the four powers are to be carried out.

MORE LIGHT NEEDED

At Teheran the British, Soviet, and American Governments declared that they sought "the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples * * * are dedicated * * * to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance." They concluded by stating, "We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations"

The question of what part they may be permitted to play, and what influence their voice may have, once they have entered this family of democratic nations, is very obviously a matter of supreme moment to the other members of the United Nations, whether they be large or small. On that no light is as yet thrown.

The peoples who are fighting to destroy tyranny and slavery support, I believe, wholeheartedly, the political objectives announced at these two meetings, as they support the principles of the Atlantic Charter, now once more reaffirmed. But they are already asking for more than generalities. They are asking how these objectives in the field of post-war political organization are to be secured. It surely is already time to tell them at least how it is proposed to constitute an initial executive agency of all of the United Nations and how it will function;

and how an international trusteeship such as that which must aid the Korean people back to liberty is to carry out its responsibilities.

We may hope that fundamental and far-reaching plans such as these may soon be determined and soon be made known, so that much unnecessary and frankly dangerous suspicion and uncertainty on the part of other members of the United Nations may be avoided.

Votes for Soldiers and Sailors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Maryland News, of Silver Spring, Md.:

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

In scores of conversations with neighbors here at home everyone has strongly contended that the younger Americans on the fighting fronts throughout the world are completely entitled to vote in the 1944 Presidential and congressional elections. Each citizen has expressed amazement that opposition should have developed to this proposal which opposition now appears to have been so adroitly led in the United States Senate that the United States Congress seems in effect about to vote lip approval of a plan which will actually deny the servicemen an opportunity to vote next November.

Last year well before the 1942 congressional election both Houses of the United States Congress enacted Public Law No. 712, which both set up a permissive method through which the United States Government could handle the mechanics of enabling the servicemen to vote and which, to quote Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, further "specifically provided that no member of the armed forces was to be compelled either to register or pay a poll tax in order to vote in a Federal election."

Senator GLASS continues in a letter to Senator LUCAS, printed in this issue, "I cannot see that the rights of the States are either jeopardized or in any way involved in the present controversy."

We agree with the observations of that great statesman and Democrat, the senior Senator from Virginia.

The complete proof of the failure of both the Federal and State governments to provide a workable plan for the voting of the servicemen in the last congressional election so that the servicemen both could and would vote is attested by the fact that the votes of only 28,000 servicemen were counted in the 1942 congressional and senatorial elections from the 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men then serving in the armed forces.

In 11 months the citizens of the United States will elect both a Congress and a President whose actions will decide the fate of our own people for generations to come and whose decisions will greatly affect the future of all the peoples of the world. Their actions will prevent or make certain World War No. 3. The men who are fighting and dying in this war must be allowed to register through their votes their share of the decision concerning both the future of America and the future of the world. The Congress must provide them with as real a chance to vote as it has provided them to fight. There has been no talk, even in the United States Senate, that this is a State's war. Everything that has or will happen to these young Americans in this war has been voted by this Congress to be a completely Federal and national responsibility and function. This war is a complete national effort. To work at all, the method through which the servicemen are to vote must flow along the same channels.

No real opportunity to vote will be allowed those serving in the fighting forces if the States are "requested" by the United States Congress to set up machinery for the conduct of the voting. The reason is simple and easy to understand. Those on the fighting fronts are in the Federal Army and Navy. The United States Army and Navy are as far removed from the sphere of State government and participation therein as any American activity can possibly be. The men in the Army and Navy are not allocated to services, divisions, units, or ships with any regard for their State or voting residence. Finally, the leadership of the Army and Navy have no concern whatsoever for State governments or election laws or voting procedure.

The 48 States as individual agencies of local government can no more conduct an election among the members of the armed forces of the United States than they can conduct the supply system, the hospital system, the mail system, or any other of the systems or services that affect all of these men. The States will not be able even to find out where their soldiers and sailors are for months after the next Presidential election. Only the Army and the Navy know where these men are and only the Army and Navy can distribute or collect their mail, their ballots, their food, their ammunition, their clothing, their weapons, or their wounded. The Congress has set up this method for all the tools of war. Why change the method for the distribution of the great weapon and privilege of free citizens—the ballot?

The American Army and Navy are both decent and efficient enough to conduct an honest and secret election among those serving in the armed forces.

The Senate of the United States before the 1942 congressional election did not worry about preserving the States' rights involved in the holding, through Federal military and naval officials, of an election among the members of the armed forces. In fact they authorized the holding of such an election did not require it. The Federal officials and those of the Army or Navy did nothing. The men did not vote. The Congress failed to see that they got ballots but voted them plenty of bayonets and machine guns and saw that they got them.

Many States made nearly all of the effort in 1942, through enacting special election laws for servicemen, to help their men to be able to vote that they are now capable of making in 1944. The result was that between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 Americans who were on the fighting fronts or on their way to the fighting fronts were actually disfranchised in the last congressional and senatorial election and that only 28,000 servicemen had their ballots counted. All this, while as individual Americans, these men were completely in Federal service.

If those who have been elected to pass the laws for the United States intend to allow the soldiers and sailors to vote they will have to enact a Federal law that makes it mandatory for the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government and the chain of command of the Army and the Navy to both give a definite opportunity to vote to each man and then to transport the ballots when voted to the respective home States of the men serving with the fighting forces of the Nation in time to be counted in the election.

The people here at home will see to it that the votes of these men are counted if the Congress allows their votes to get back home.

J. William Ditter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 22, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a mighty oak in the forest of men has fallen. A stalwart has passed from our midst. A sharp tongue has been silenced. An active mind has been granted surcease. A noble soul has gone to its reward. In that day of resurrection, in which he so devoutly believed, his song will blend with the requiem of the angels and his effort will still be to help establish the kingdom of God on earth.

Early this morning my secretary called and asked, "Have you heard about Congressman DITTER?" There was an ominous tone in her voice. My heart stopped for an instant and then began beating like a sledge hammer. Blood ran through my veins like quicksilver. I turned hot and cold in the same moment. I gulped and almost choked when I replied, "No," and nervously asked, "What about him?" She replied, with some hesitancy and more emotion, because she knew him too, "He was killed last night in an airplane crash over Pennsylvania."

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday I returned with seven of our colleagues from a 15,000-mile airplane trip through Mexico, Central, and South America. When we landed at the National Airport in Washington after flying for many days and nights over high mountains, wild jungles, and open seas, I knew as never before how good it is to be alive.

A long trip by plane at all altitudes, over every kind of terrain and in all kinds of weather, will make any man think thoughts that he had never dreamed before and will bring him a little closer to God, whose hand he feels at times he can almost touch. It will render the strongest weak and make the proudest humble.

Imagine, sir, my reaction when, less than 36 hours after our landing, I learned of the sudden, unexpected, and, to our finite minds, the untimely and tragic death of our colleague. Doubts arose in my mind, skepticism seized me, and I found it difficult not to yield to rebellion, cynicism, and despair. After all, can there be a God? Is it fair? Is it just? Why would a Supreme Being to whom truth, beauty, and goodness are the summum bonum of life, snatch suddenly away one who believed the same? In an hour of national peril—when all we hold dear and sacred, when freedom and justice weep, when the pagan forces of might and materialism are running ruthlessly and roughshod over the world, why, when love is slain by hate, when virtue is raped by vice, and right is ravished by wrong, should one so strong, brave, and true, in the heyday of his powers and in the prime of his life suddenly be snatched from us?

O Mr. Speaker, it is difficult not to become bitter. But something outside us, yea, something inside us, much bigger than ourselves, whispers, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. God works mysteriously his wonders to perform. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: Now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."

O world, thou choosest not the better part!
It is not wisdom to be only wise,
And on the inward vision close the eyes,
But it is wisdom to believe the heart.
Columbus found a world and had no chart,
Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
To trust the soul's invincible surmise
Was all his science and his only art.

Our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine
That lights the pathway but one step ahead,
Across a void of mystery and dread.
Bid, then, the tender light of faith to shine
By which alone the mortal heart is led
Unto the thinking of the thought divine.

Mr. Speaker, the heart has reason that reason knows not of. Life is deeper than logic. BILL DITTER knew this, but it did not keep him from being logical. He was a logician by nature. Born with an extraordinary mind, he cultivated it. He possessed enormous powers of analysis and was blesesd with a retentive memory. His penetrating philosophical insight and lucid way of expression were convincing to the toughest agnostic. He won his opponents not only by his sound reasoning and his literary ability but also by his ingratiating personality and his fair play.

BILL DITTER was no dilettante; he was a bulldog. Always he hit hard but never did he hit below the belt. He could oppose you and make you like him. Whenever he reprimanded me, I wanted to beg his pardon. I loved him. Truly he was great.

It was my good fortune to have spoken in Mr. DITTER'S district. He represented one of the wealthiest districts in the United States. But never did he lose the common touch. He was of the earth. Like Lincoln he thought, "God must have loved the common people because He made so many of them." He was no silly sentimentalist. He did not believe in a patronizing, paternalistic bureaucracy and had little faith in or respect for professional uplifters and moral reformers. His hard common sense told him that "God helps them who help themselves." Yet, he was full of the milk of human kindness. His faith was in God, the Bible, home, mother, the Constitution, and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, often late in the evening when most Members had left their offices and gone to their homes, as we also should have done, BILL DITTER would drop by my office for a friendly chat. We naturally would connive to some extent against the New Deal since he was chairman of the National Republican Congressional Commitee and I was a member of the same. But the Democrats of this House would be surprised to know how little we discussed politics. Bill and I were friends and always we welcomed the opportunity to discuss the little but personal and very important things of life. After 5 minutes on the state of the Union and 3 minutes on the cosmic situation we would spend sometimes hours on the commonplace things that affected BILL DITTER and his ordinary friends—Henry, Tom, and Joe.

Mr. Speaker, Members who heard BILL DITTER on the floor, the rough-and-tumble fighter, the invincible debater, quick at repartee, keen of wit, well informed, with a disarming smile and a gracious manner, which would melt the bitterest opposition, did not know him. Only the few who were privileged to have spent days and nights with him in fair weather and foul, who had gone through bitter defeats and glorious triumphs with him, who were admitted to his close confidences, will ever know what a Nobleman of God BILL DITTER really was.

BILL DITTER loved to fly. He never chased any rainbows in Congress, but he chased them in the sky. He was a daredevil. He enjoyed floating with lazy clouds and racing with swift winds. Up and down the stairways of heaven he ran with boyish glee, and if Bill had to fall from heaven there is no spot here or in paradise he would rather land than Pennsylvania. How he loved his State, and its people. He was the soul of loyalty to what and whom he loved.

I like to think of Bill and the many other fine Americans who have lost their lives in airplane crashes, in war and peace, on land and sea, as heroes of an infant industry which will transform the world and determine largely the destiny of man. We all know that space has been annihilated, and time has been conquered by this new medium of transportation. True, it is being used at the moment to bomb, blast, and kill; but when man will learn to control the power this new industry brings, he will turn to construction and build a world of peace, progress, justice, and good will. BILL DITTER and other victims of air crashes have not died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, the richest compensation of a Congressman's life is the friendship he forms with his colleagues. Nowhere else on earth will one find a more wholesome or helpful fraternity than in this House. We have our differences, but we know each other and we understand. BILL DITTER was one of the best among us. He was my friend. I loved him and shall miss him dreadfully, but until the day when I hope to see him again, I shall always believe that the Prophet Micah had BILL DITTER in mind when he wrote:

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Spanish War Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, up in my district the State of Ohio maintains a home for war veterans. It was there from early youth that I learned to personally know the men of the Spanish War. They were once young and the flower of American manhood, but they laid aside the ambitions of youth and gave their services to our country as one of the greatest volunteer groups in our history.

Upon their return from service, many of the sick, lame, and disabled were simply mustered out with a flare of drums in their own home town, and suddenly back in civil life.

The bonus and adjusted compensation were words yet to be coined, and many a veteran found it difficult to secure a place in civil life. It was some years before the disabled were slightly recognized and many years before the great masses of these war veterans were compensated by pensions for the part of their physical lives and future health given to our country.

And along with these patriots were their attentive wives who ministered to them throughout these years, many of whom are now widows.

This increase in pensions to these patriots comes in the evening of life, and should have been given long ago. For many it has come too late.

I hope it will brighten and ease the remaining years of these veterans of the Spanish War, their wives, and their widows.

Montana War Board Would Lift Pork Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimcus consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Helena Record-Independent of December 11, 1943, pertaining to the present pork situation. The Montana U. S. D. A. war board has recommended to Food Administrator Marvin Jones that ration points on pork be removed until the present overabundance on the market is relieved. I have received many letters and telegrams on this subject and I want to go on record as endorsing the stand of the Montana war board.

The article follows:

MONTANA WAR BOARD WOULD LIFT PORK RATIONING

BOZEMAN, December 11.—The Montana U. S. D. A. war board has recommended to Food Administrator Marvin Jones that ration points on pork be removed until the present glut is alleviated, R. J. McKenna, board chairman, announced today.

He said the State board also had recommended that the 3-percent hauling tax on exchange or noncommercial hauling of raw farm products be canceled.

"Present indications are that sufficient credit will be available to farmers out of existing facilities, and special provisions for financing 1944 Montana farm production will not be necessary," McKenna continued.

An increase in livestock to a point where feed supplies are out of balance was reported, and charged with being the hold-back of normal movement of Montana stock to feed lots.

"The board feels that a removal of ration points on pork would result in a sufficient quantity of the meat going directly to consumers to materially relieve the situation," the chairman explained. "Actually, there is no surplus of meat, but temporarily an adjustment in the flow of live animals to market is essential."

What Inter-American Cooperation Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, at the American Legion Dinner, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 26, 1943:

Commander Atherton, distinguished representatives of the other American Republics, honored guests and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be with you this evening and to have the opportunity to listen to the statesmanlike and eloquent remarks of Bishop O'Hara, Senator BARKLEY, and yourself, Commander, on the significance of inter-American solidarity and to have a chance to add a few words about what inter-American cooperation means to this country.

As veterans of the armed forces you Legionnaires know what it takes to win a war. You appreciate the importance of offensive and defensive bases of operations. You understand how precious are the essential materials from which the weapons of war are forged.

You know that without the twin shields of food and health no man can either work or fight. You know that victory lies in mobilization—mobilization of all the forces that spell victory.

No one knows better than you the importance of national and international solidarity in time of crisis. Nations next door to one another must be secure and firm in their joint support of a common cause. That security and that firmness do not develop overnight, they are the result of patient and painstaking preparation.

As citizens you Legionnaires are further aware that the people of the United States demand a durable peace. No American today questions the necessity of standing solidly with the other peace-loving nations of the world, large and small, for the years to come.

It is highly significant that the Legion and its women's auxiliary—about 1,800,000 people—representing an important cross section of opinion in the United States, have undertaken as one of their major objectives the development of inter-American cooperation.

Our good-neighbor policy as proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1933, was based on foundations laid during the past century by leaders throughout the American republics. Today it has been accepted as a fundamental national policy which should be beyond the reach of partisan debate.

Why are you Legionnaires so earnestly concerned with the good-neighbor policy?

I think the answer is very simple. It is a practical policy and it works and there have been many mutual dividends. The other American republics are pulling their weight and doing their part in this struggle and we in the United States can well be proud and grateful that we are a part of this family of nations.

Let us look at a few facts of first importance.

There are 20 other American republics in this hemisphere. Nineteen of them have broken relations with the enemy and have given freely of their resources to the cause of the United Nations. Twelve have declared war.

As a result we have the use of military, naval, and air bases which have enormously simplified our strategic problems. In a very real sense the great base at Natal on the bulge of Brazil, where our planes swing across the South Atlantic, could be called Victory Corner.

Without hesitation, Ecuador, occupying a strategic position in relation to the Panama Canal, gives us the right to use the Galapagos Islands for an outpost of defense, and the port of Salinas, the most important naval harbor on the west coast of South America.

Cuban planes and subchasers are hunting down U-boats.

Mexican merchant sailors have lost their lives at sea by enemy action.

Brazilian airmen are blasting German submarines to the bottom, and Brazil is preparing troops for overseas service.

The other Americas have smashed centers of espionage and sabotage on two continents.

They have stepped up production of strategic raw materials throughout the hemisphere.

In the words of that distinguished Legionnaire, Louis Johnson, we can say: "Those who laughed at the pioneers of the good-neighbor policy have lived to see the day when South American materials saved the day for the arsenal of democracy."

But memory is an uncertain thing, today's deeds dwarf the past. Let us take a minute to look back only 3 years.

The grand strategy of the Germans and the Japanese for their attack against the United States recognized that our vulnerable flank was the other American republics.

The Axis had been working for years in every one of those countries to create the conditions that would favor the plans for their aggression. In this work they expended millions, and took full advantage of every past error of the United States policy toward those countries.

Difficult it is, I admit, to recapture the realities of the summer of 1940. Yet realities they were.

In that summer of 1940 the Axis was winning the war. And if we were reckoning in tangibles alone we could only observe that the enemy had all the advantage of anticipation, preparation, and position—and that therefore there was good reason to believe they would keep on winning.

In those bleak days—under this mortal threat to the free existence of the United States and the other American republics—there was raised the standard of faith—the sheer, moral courage of strong people.

The Nazis and Fascists depended upon our inertia and our softness. The other American republics depended on our word. Our neighbors were right. Meeting at Panama in 1939, and at Habana in 1940, the foreign ministers of the American nations acted as one for the defense of the hemisphere. But a far greater test lay ahead—Pearl Harbor.

On that day, December 7, 1941, there was anguish and anxiety in the United States. The enemy might be coming through the door—a threatened Japanese invasion of the Pacific coast.

The enemy might be coming through our windows—potential trans-Atlantic air raids.

The enemy might be coming through the floor—a possible fifth column in the other Americas, or an attack on the Panama Canal.

None of these fears materialized. Joint action, conscientious effort, and the many preliminary steps to success on the battlefields saved untold millions in lives and money.

And remember at Rio de Janeiro in 1942 the representatives of the other American republics—only 6 weeks after Pearl Harbor—pledged their aid to us at a time when our record showed nothing but defeat on land and sea.

So we see the results and we recall the conditions under which they were obtained. We may rightfully ask: How does this policy of inter-American cooperation work? How is it administered? What is the specific share of the United States?

We have purchased materials from the other Americas and have made expenditures to develop their production.

In this way we have gotten rubber for airplane tires, mica for radar equipment, quartz crystals for radio communications, diamonds for machine tools, fibers for ropes on battleships, copper for munitions, nitrates for explosives, tungsten for hardening steel, etc.

We have built naval and military installations at strategic points and we have provided lend-lease military equipment for the defense of the hemisphere. We have engaged in training programs to increase the skill of soldiers, farmers, factory workers, and technicians. We have helped to accelerate the output of key foods.

But let us go back for a minute. The story of the war might have been different. Instead of fighting on the islands of the Pacific, hundreds of thousands of our men might have been fighting side by side with the soldiers of our neighbors in the jungles of Brazil in the east and Ecuador in the west.

We anticipated the possibility of this situation and undertook cooperative programs of health and sanitation to combat malaria and other tropical diseases.

We helped to build hospitals and clinics, which, if fighting had come to this hemisphere, would have made the difference between life and death to your sons or my brothers.

As it is, this work in health and sanitation has saved the lives of thousands of workers producing raw materials so essential to our war program.

Those of you who know the Tropics also know that the Panama Canal itself is less an engineering triumph than a victory over disease.

There has been considerable talk and speculation about the cost to the United States of this program of cooperation. Uninformed estimates have ranged all the way to $6,000,000,000—a figure I read in a magazine article just the other day. That figure was said to represent a 3-year outlay, not including, mind you, the sums spent for goods, food, and raw materials.

That guess of $6,000,000,000 is a misrepresentation of the facts.

The truth is that all expenditures and commitments to spend made during the past 3 years by all Government agencies, including military and naval installations, total less than $600,000,000.

And after these 3 war years, United States Government loans to the other Americas, including lend-lease materials and Export-Import Bank loans, total $603,000,000, of which less than half has actually been disbursed.

It is interesting to note in this connection that up to date the other American republics have paid back to the Export-Import Bank loans totaling $107,000,000.

As in the case of that $6,000,000,000 mentioned in the article, the figures I have just

given do not include the sums spent for goods, food, and raw materials.

You and I know that we could not buy with money what the other Americas have given so willingly.

You and I know that a dollar value cannot be put upon faith and sacrifice—faith and sacrifice which have been translated with such reality and effect into the weapons of war. The American nations have contributed to a common effort for the attainment of a common goal.

From all of this experience we have drawn important lessons. As President Roosevelt said in a message to Congress last September 17: "The policy of the good neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step."

The attitude of the American Legion toward foreign affairs has been both consistent and constructive.

I recall the resolutions of your Boston convention of 1940, which took a bold stand against the menacing might of Germany and Italy.

I have seen the crystallization of your views and your forthright call of 1943 for a world organization with the force necessary to maintain peace.

In your silver jubilee convention at Omaha you of the Legion not only endorsed the good-neighbor policy as such—by resolution—but you also gave to our American partners in war a message of inspiration for the future when you said:

"We warmly endorse the good-neighbor policies which have strengthened the bonds of friendship throughout all the Americas. We urge continued effort to break down every difference of whatever nature that may now—or hereafter—threaten the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. We recommend every honest effort to remove all cause of misunderstanding, so that the nations of all the Americas shall speak and act as one in the cause of liberty and justice."

It is my belief that the principal of cooperation based so firmly in the Americas upon knowledge, understanding, mutual trust, and confidence will serve as an inspiring model for the world of the future.

From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of Christmas, that holy season, our thoughts and hearts turn to the thousands of our boys and girls in the armed forces all over the world, who are fighting for us, and of their parents and families, and of the vacant chairs on this Christmas at the tables of nearly every family in the United States. Mr. Speaker, I know that they know that we are thinking of them, and praying for them, and all of us write to them as often as possible, and it is my privilege to write to many of our boys from my district overseas, and they write to me. Typical of many of the letters which I receive from our boys overseas is an excerpt from a letter from Sgt. Harold Hill Comeau, of Opelousas, La., my home town, as follows:

Now that I have adjusted myself to being overseas, I must admit, that it is not so bad. We who are overseas also know how fortunate we are to be American soldiers, for the American soldier's food, clothing, and equipment is far superior to any other soldier's in the world. Those things may not be appreciated so much until you leave the States, then you realize how lucky you are.

Thanksgiving Day Uncle Sam came through with the turkey he had promised us. Yes; we had all the turkey we could eat plus all the trimmings that go with it. You can imagine how much that was appreciated, and how much it helped morale that day.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great consolation, I am sure, to the Congress, and the mothers and fathers of our boys and girls to know this.

Better Teamwork Between Congress and the Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an address by Dr. Frank W. Prescott, head of the Adolph S. Ochs department of government of the University of Chattanooga, delivered over station WDOD, Chattanooga, Tenn., on December 16, 1943. This is a very thoughtful discussion of the pending proposal to amend the rules of the House to establish a question period for Cabinet members and heads of departments and independent agencies.

The address is as follows:

In a recent broadcast on the subsidy question I was quite critical of the action taken by the House of Representatives. This action is an example of how our Government works when the executive and legislative branches are at loggerheads; when President and Congress are too often occupying "two islands of separate and jealous power." If the present session of Congress seems futile, fretful, and somewhat frustrated it is not alone due to the membership, but also to the feeling that Congress is not adequately equipped to solve the problems emerging in a rapidly changing world. Congress has only what amounts to an item veto of administration measures; it is isolated from the main currents of governmental action, and its waste motion is perennial and firmly embedded in the formalism of its outworn conventional rules. It has become increasingly evident during the war that ways must be found to bridge the gap between the two branches of the Government. One hopeful sign is the attitude of a rather large group of younger Members of the House who recognize the defects of congressional procedures and want to do something constructive about it.

The recent appearance of Secretary Cordell Hull before a joint session of both Houses served to draw attention to a resolution introduced on October 19 in the House by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER. This resolution has been discussed twice in the last month and is now before the Committee on Rules, where it will soon come up for hearing.

Mr. KEFAUVER'S plan is simply this: The House rules would be revised so that once a week or once a fortnight there would be a 2-hour period in which the heads of departments and of the independent agencies would answer in person and orally both written and oral questions propounded them by Members of the House. The Committee on Rules would determine the date and the length (not exceeding 2 hours) of question period and allot the time to each department or agency to be heard. The written questions would be filtered through the appropriate committees of the House before being sent to the department or agency heads. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, for example, might have a question before it on our relations with the Fascist Government of Spain. The Member who wanted that question asked would file it, and then, prior to 2 days before Mr. Hull was to appear, the committee would go over the questions, or it might originate one on its own initiative, and then the question would be sent over to the Secretary of State, and copies would be sent to the Rules Committee. After consideration of the importance of the subject matter and the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the time would be allotted to Mr. Hull. If he were given 2 hours (the maximum) time to answer, one-half of this time would be spent in answering the questions already submitted to him and published in the RECORD for 2 days, and the remaining half (1 hour) would be consumed by answering questions from the floor of the House. The time for the latter would be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee so that the minority members would have a fair chance to put their questions. Thus the first part of the period would be a sort of "full dress" appearance, while the second half would be more informal.

Congress has an insatiable appetite for detailed information. In the Seventy-seventh Congress there were 217 resolutions filed for special investigations; 37 requests for specific information from the departments, and the present Congress has continued 16 special committees. It is urged in favor of the Kefauver plan that it would help eliminate the many special committees. It would also tend to save the time of busy administrators. For in one recent month an administrative officer appeared seven times before House committees and gave substantially the same information to each one. Nor would the plan add to the work of the department heads. They are increasingly called before the regular committees; they are often to be seen in the lobbies or cloakrooms and sometimes on the floor of the Congress itself.

Under ordinary conditions the administrative heads would not need to attend every week; perhaps only once or twice a month, certainly no more time than they now sacrifice to the visits of the Congressmen to their offices. The trouble with the existing system (apart from the excess number of committees, and the lack of joint Senate and House hearings) is that Members of Congress are unable to hear more than a small part of the discussion in committee sessions, the reports may not be printed for weeks or months after the hearings have been held, sometimes not at all. In practice, few Members can spare the time from errand running for constituents and regular routine work, to read the voluminous proceedings. So the Members would get better, more timely, and more adequate information on large issues of policy if they could have the chief administrators up for a free, frank, and open discussion with them on the floor of the House.

The Kefauver resolution raises a problem that is as old as the Government itself. In the first 2 Congresses which created the executive departments and worked out the precedents for relations between executive

and legislative branches, there are several instances of secretaries appearing before one or the other House to present information and reports, and the act creating the Treasury Department evidently had this in mind when it authorized the Secretary of the Treasury "to make report and give information to either branch of the legislature in person or in writing, as may be required." That statute as amended is still in force. But it would appear that owing to the tactlessness of Hamilton or fear of his persuasiveness, the House was unwilling to admit him to the floor to urge action on measures he desired. Since that time several attempts have been made to secure the adoption of some plan which would establish closer working relationships between the 2 branches. In 1864, Mr. Pendleton (Ohio) introduced a resolution providing that the heads of the departments be granted seats on the floor of the House to participate in debate, and it made attendance obligatory on stated days for the purpose of answering questions. A similar proposal was made in 1881 by the same Mr. Pendleton, then a Senator, who would give Cabinet members access to both Houses. A committee of the Senate made a long report covering all the constitutional and legal questions involved. Adoption of the bill, though the committee, would be the first step "toward a sound civil-service reform" in which Senator Pendleton was greatly interested at the time. It was revived in 1912 by President Taft who strongly urged its adopted in a special message to Congress. When the Budget Act was under consideration in 1921 the discussion of the matter was renewed by those who felt that the heads of executive departments might wisely be allowed to appear in person before Congress to defend the Budget estimates affecting their work. From 1921 to 1943, inclusive, no fewer than 28 separate bills were introduced to effect this same purpose. The plan has been endorsed by 3 Presidents, by an outstanding senatorial committee, by 2 Chief Justices of the Supreme Court (Taft and Hughes), and by distinguished scholars and publicists.

In all of the plans except that of Mr. KEFAUVER there was provision for a modified form of the British Cabinet system and this appears to have been its greatest obstacle. As one writer acutely observes:

"If the situation were clearly analyzed it would probably appear that the failure to adopt even the mildest of the proposals to put the Cabinet in closer touch with Congress is not due in any preponderance of belief in the disadvantages of the plan but rather to political inertia coupled with the vaguely uneasy feeling that the change would unwisely upset the established and traditional relationship between the executive and legislative departments with consequences which cannot be accurately foreseen and appraised."

The Kefauver plan does not upset the balance of power between the two branches, it violates no tradition unless it be the almost traditional chaos of the House legislative process. This plan is not designed to make the cabinet a dictator to the House, as it obtains in the House of Commons in Britain. In exchange for the right to call up the Department heads and the chief administrators of the great new agencies like Social Security, Federal Works, and Housing—to mention no others—these executives can defend themselves on the floor, rather than taking the roundabout method of the radio or the press. One of the great advantages would appear that by this simple, workable device the common citizen would find it much easier to discover what is going on in Washington. The whole matter rests on the voluntary cooperation of all concerned: The House cannot compel the attendance of the executive chiefs for questioning. It would not need to. On the part of the Congressmen, working through their established committees, the irrelevant and immaterial questions would clear through the appropriate committees as an essential safeguard for orderly procedures. It would tend to cut down on the amount of irresponsible criticism of administrators which is now so prevalent. The Cabinet members' press conferences and the committee hearings go only part way in the direction of improved communications.

Government in a democracy should be allowed to experiment. If the device should work well in the House, it would readily appear feasible in the Senate. Thus, while the Kefauver plan is no panacea for all the ills of Congress, there is good reason to believe that the reforms would not stop here, but would move into the field of other badly needed changes. Congress, like many another of our political institutions, is in a transitional period. It must be adapted to an age of technology. It must meet the challenge of Presidential leadership, not with guerrilla-like sniping at the Chief Executive but by the creation of a responsible, responsive leadership of its own. To this end, Mr. KEFAUVER's plan is a modest but hopeful step in the right direction.

The Silver Dollar in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of my interest in silver, I am inserting in the RECORD a leter from Carl Trauerman, secretary, Mining Association of Montana, and one from M. S. Eccles, chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering this matter. I am sure that my colleagues will find the communication interesting and informative. We, in Montana, value silver highly and we want to see it continued in use as a medium of exchange. Few silver dollars are ever shipped out of Montana as the records indicate that a constant influx is received into the State. We are very much attached to the use of the white metal and we want to see it continued in use.

The letter follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
WASHINGTON, *December 14, 1943.*

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This is to acknowledge your memorandum of November 30 enclosing a letter from the Mining Association of Montana questioning the advisability of the local banks making a special effort to reduce, as a war measure, the use of silver dollars in Montana. This is a most courteous letter, and the objection raised appears to rest entirely upon the question of whether, as a matter of fact, there is a genuine wartime problem of handling silver dollars. I am enclosing for your information a copy of correspondence we have had with Mr. John Peyton, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, who, it seems to me, makes clear that there is a real problem involved for the Helena branch of the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank.

It all boils down, as I understand it, to the fact that in the Helena branch, as is the case in banks generally, the war has necessitated the employment of women workers instead of men. I am told that the silver dollars are packed by the Denver Mint in sacks of 1,000. These bags weigh close to 60 pounds apiece, and as Mr. Peyton points out in his letter, it is estimated that an average of 2,000 to 3,000 pounds of silver dollars are handled daily by women in the employ of the branch.

As you will also note, Mr. Peyton emphasizes that the idea is not in any sense to deprive anyone in Montana of silver dollars who desires to have them. As his last paragraph states, "Once again, let me assure you there has never been any suggestion or idea of depriving anyone of silver dollars in Montana. We only seek to use paper dollars in such instances as they are acceptable. Silver dollars are always available for those who prefer them."

I trust that this information will give you the data which you desire to have, but if there is anything further you wish, please do not hesitate to call upon me. As you requested, I am returning herewith the copy of the letter from the Mining Association of Montana.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES,
Chairman.

MINING ASSOCIATION OF MONTANA,
BUTTE, MONT., *November 27, 1943.*

CONGRESSMAN MIKE MANSFIELD.

SIR: A short time ago the Federal Reserve bank courteously requested the bankers of Montana to give their customers paper dollars instead of silver dollars, as the Federal Reserve claimed it took less manpower to handle the paper dollars than the silver dollars. There may be some substance to this claim, but we are informed that the manpower shortage in Montana banks is as critical, if not more critical, than the stated shortage in the Federal Reserve bank, but the commercial banks of the State have so far experienced no trouble in handling silver dollars. Therefore, the request seems entirely out of line with the war effort, and the bank manpower statistics prove this.

By custom and usage the people of Montana and other Western States have become accustomed to using silver dollars, and they are demanding them now. When the banks refuse to give them silver dollars, the customers believe that the banks are trying to deprive them of one of their rights, and the general public has not been convinced that the deprivation of this right is a contribution to the war effort. This is especially true in Montana, where the general public knows that our State normally ranks second in the United States production of silver with an annual output of between 8,000,000 and 12,000,000 ounces of the white metal.

The Mining Association of Montana, which represents the small operators, who employ 300 men or less in the mining industry in this State, has among its members a number of silver producers. From the standpoint of the producer, it does not make much difference whether the public uses silver dollars or paper dollars backed by silver bullion in the United States Treasury. However, if silver dollars are withdrawn from usage, there might be a tendency some day for the Government to issue paper dollars not backed by silver bullion, and that would seriously affect the silver producers. The withdrawal of silver dollars from circulation, especially in this western country, would tend to aid the future issuance of Federal Reserve dollar bills rather than dollar bills backed by silver bullion.

While we admit that the issuance of Federal Reserve dollar bills is only a remote possibility, the Mining Association of Montana, besides being interested in the welfare of its members, also is public spirited enough to be interested in the welfare and hap-

piness of the general public of Montana, and it is from the latter standpoint that we urge you to get in touch with the Federal Reserve bank in Washington, D. C., and ask that institution to please rescind its request that silver dollars be withheld from circulation in this State, and present the argument outlined in this letter.

If we can be convinced that the withholding of silver dollars from usage will help the war effort, our banks and people will be more than willing to cooperate. However, at present our citizens are demanding silver dollars and are paraphrasing a well-known expression: "We are from Montana, and we must be shown."

Thanking you for giving this your consideration, with kindest personal regards, we are,

Respectfully yours,
MINING ASSOCIATION OF MONTANA,
CARL J. TRAUERMAN, *Secretary.*

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD the following statement by Frank W. Hancock, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, presented before the special committee of the House Committee on Agriculture investigating the Farm Security Administration, Monday, November 22, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for your generous remarks, and I hope I can live up to the nice things you have said about me. You gentlemen understand the North Carolina technique and, of course, know of our close friendship.

This is my second appearance before a congressional committee since I assumed the responsibility as Administrator of the Farm Security Administration. I appeared this morning before the Senate Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations in the interests of securing the additional or supplemental appropriation recommended by the President and urged by Judge Jones, War Food Administrator.

Having just entered upon my duties, I am sure that this committee will bear with me in an effort to try and give you my attitude toward the farm-security program and the manner in which it should be administered.

I have, of course, quite properly given immediate study to the supplemental appropriation request which is now pending before the subcommittee of the Senate. In my appearance there this morning I tried to approach this important matter as if I were a member of the committee, in order to determine in my own mind the justification for the additional funds.

As all of you probably know, I have been on both sides of the fence, having served for 8 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, about 6 of which were as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency under that distinguished statesman and lovable character who passed away today, Hon. Henry B. Steagall.

I can appreciate the responsibilities of the members of the various committees in both Houses. I also will know what you are up against and especially in these critical times and unparalleled conditions.

Later it was my good fortune to serve as a member of the Home Loan Bank Board, and as a director of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Therefore, I can appreciate the problems of administration and policy that confront the Government executive in carrying out the laws enacted by Congress.

I should like to say a few words regarding my own attitude toward the program generally and my reason for accepting this appointment. I am not unfamiliar either with the program or the field in which it operates. I have known something of this work in my own section in North Carolina, and I have personal knowledge of many of the difficulties and disadvantages which the low-income family-type farmer faces in agriculture today.

As a Member of Congress, I supported the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the appropriations thereunder. To me the act and the considerations that led to its adoption represent the ultimate objective of this program—that of the opportunity to attain debt-free, fee-simple farm ownership. I believe in home ownership as the desirable goal on the farm as well as in the city. I am a strong advocate of the individual family-type farm, and I believe that the man who tills it should either have security on it, or should own it.

At the same time, this objective implies, as you well know, many other things. Farm ownership is a status to be achieved through industry and effort, not presented as a gift. Among the members of this committee are some of our best-informed authorities on the problems of tenancy and rural poverty, who have long recognized the Nation's stake in the family farm. I need not labor the point, therefore, that we have had and still have a large number of farm families faced with obstacles to progress which are not of their making and which they cannot overcome unaided. The purpose of this program as I understand and interpret it, is to enable them, through their own labor and development, to overcome those obstacles and become more useful and productive citizens.

We cannot accept the low living standards of a large group of our farm families as representing the best that America can offer or the most that these people can achieve. Most of us, I am sure, feel deeply that the owner-operated family farm is the most desirable type of farm enterprise in an American democracy. The family farm has always been and should continue to be the backbone of American agriculture. To allow our family farmers to slip into landlessness and become work gangs, as many of them did during the depression, dependent on the work offered by a relatively few landed overlords, would be a national tragedy. It would mean the reversion of the democracy which we have worked so hard to build and are fighting to defend, back to a state of feudalism. The task of the Farm Security Administration, therefore, is to provide family farmers with the type of assistance they need to overcome their handicaps and to enable them to obtain the credit, the managerial guidance, and the services that bring to farm and home efficient methods and machinery, health, and sanitation, so that they can increase their production, improve their living, and rehabilitate themselves. Along such a road those who persevere can expect to achieve self-made security with its ultimate goal of farm ownership.

The rehabilitation and tenant purchase programs of the Farm Security Administration have been designed to achieve these ends and have demonstrated their value in opening the door of equal opportunity to a large group of our farming population. This objective is as important in war as in peace. Men do not work willingly when they lack the incentive of obtaining a better living for their work. Men do not fight willingly just for a boarding house. The fundamental purpose of Farm Security, in my opinion, is to provide those incentives and opportunities which thousands of small farmers have lacked.

I conceive the Farm Security Administration to be neither a relief agency nor a banking institution. It is neither a W. P. A. nor a community chest, nor is it a National City Bank. The loans it makes are to be used toward worthy specific ends and are to be repaid. We know that when such loans are not repaid, the cost comes out of the labor and energies of someone else. I expect this work to be put on a sound, practical basis and to be directed by the head as well as the heart.

At the same time, this agency is not in business to make a profit. Its success is not to be measured by the amount of interest it can exact, but by how much can be achieved in family improvement at the least possible cost both to the borrower and to the Government. Credit is only one tool in rehabilitation. The program exists because of the fact that credit alone, in the commercial sense, is not enough. As a matter of cold fact, credit by itself in this program could be more harmful than helpful. The important thing is the wise and successful use of that credit, for the sake of the family's betterment, society's good, and of the Government's investment. Supervision is the sine qua non of the success of this operation, and is absolutely essential as an educational and training tool. Efficiently administered and practically applied, it is worth many times its cost. Its objective, however, must ever be to graduate borrowers into independence of the Government as well as of their past inadequacies.

I hope to make the fullest and most effective use of the experienced personnel that the Farm Security Administration has developed. As you probably know many of the policy making top officials have recently resigned. I am particularly eager to make full use of the local county committees and to maintain the greatest amount of local determination consistent with effective administration and legislative control. While here and there some transfusion of new blood may be needed, it is my purpose not to disrupt the existing organization and trained personnel, but rather to tighten it up and streamline it wherever that can be done in the interest of efficiency and economy.

In making this personal statement of my views, to which you are entitled, nothing that I say is intended either to post judge the past or to prejudge the future. Rightfully, I shall look to the Congress to define the scope and purposes of our activities and I shall always conform to the best of my ability to the expressed wishes of the people's representatives.

Many different approaches to the problems of rural poverty have been tried since this program was undertaken. Regardless of motives or merits, certain types of activity are not now favored by the Congress. One of the difficulties, I believe, has been the fact that Congress has not been explicit with regard to certain policies. Its history may be somewhat responsible for this situation. We should like to have these policies clarified to the end that we may carry out the intentions of Congress as diligently and effectively as possible.

Congress has, for instance, given a mandate on the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of certain projects owned directly or indirectly by the Government. I appreciate the wisdom of this decision for I do not believe Uncle Sam should be in the farming business. There remain, however, varying interpretations as to what is meant by liquidation in the appropriation act. Our legal advisers interpret this to mean the disposition of these projects in line with the tenant

purchase procedure and consistent with the objectives of rehabilitation. This is a logical application of the principles embodied in the Bankhead-Jones Act, and is so I am advised, the basis on which present liquidation plans are being prosecuted. If Congress wishes some other interpretation to prevail, I trust it will say so, and whatever its determination may be, we will strictly adhere to it.

At any time it is desired, I will, of course, be glad to offer suggestions or recommendations regarding this program in the light of the problems and the administrative operations that come to my attention. In the formulation of future legislation affecting this operation, I should like to suggest that consideration be given not only to the elimination of unapproved practices of the past, but also to the strengthening of those activities approved for the future. As an example, I should like to mention a problem to which some of the members of this committee have already given serious thought. That is the problem of farm land for returning veterans. Applications are already being received in our county offices from veterans who have been incapacitated in combat and want to return to farming. What is a trickle today can surely be expected to be a flood when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOLEY). Before you go, Mr. Hancock, I am sure the committee would like to have an expression of your views—although it is a matter with which we are not immediately concerned—about the financial needs of your organization as you see it at the present time, having in mind the fact that Congress only provided $20,000,000 for administrative funds and in the same legislation authorized the Administrator to spend at a greater rate for a period of 4 months.

That leaves your organization now operating on an inadequate amount of administrative funds. That is perfectly obvious.

If Mr. Jones has authorized the agency to spend at the rate of twenty-six and one-half million for 4 months, that certainly depleted your funds and they are depleted at the present time. I wonder if you care to express to this subcommittee your views on the needs at the present time, as you see them.

Mr. HANCOCK. I would be glad to do that, and with your permission I will take a leaf or two out of the same statement which expresses my views on that matter for administrative and also for lending purposes.

I told the Senate committee this morning that my study and findings convinced me this is more than a reasonable request for funds. It is a plea to Congress to determine that the Farm Security program shall be continued. Denial of these funds would be tantamount to the destruction of its most important functions and the elimination of most of its operating organization.

Let me go into that further. The supplemental request for additional funds for Farm Security is a critical one. Without these funds the agency will be severely crippled—and I am not saying this in the nature of a threat or to be construed as the statement of an alarmist.

Various controversial questions have been raised in consideration of this additional request for funds. I am not in a position to argue those questions before this or any other committee at this time. I do know enough, however, to state that time is of the essence, if we are to save the Farm Security Administration from irreparable damage from which it could never recover.

I revert again to the crucial fact that without these requested funds the Farm Security Administration will become the Farm Insecurity Administration. Its capacity to get increased food production will be destroyed and the Government's outstanding investment in loans and properties of nearly a billion dollars will be jeopardized with the chance of losses many times the amount of the requested funds.

There is serious question whether we can, without these funds, carry out effectively the program authorized by the Congress. To be perfectly frank, after serious study of this whole proposition, I am convinced that many of the fundamentally important phases of the work would have to be eliminated.

I make this statement in order to leave no doubt in the minds of the Members of Congress as to the probable consequences of the denial of this request. After all, it is our care, but it is your responsibility. At a time when this Nation has joined with its allies to provide relief and rehabilitation to the stricken people abroad, it would seem to me to be a tragedy to deny rehabilitation to our own people and thus deprive them of the opportunity to contribute their share to our food needs at home and abroad.

The request which has been made is for $6,500,000 additional for administrative and servicing functions and an authorization to lend an additional $37,500,000 under our rural rehabilitation program.

You will be interested to know that in the past 2 years the rural rehabilitation staff of F. S. A. has been reduced from something over 17,000 to less than 10,000 on the pay roll at the present time. If an additional $6,500,000 is not provided, it will be necessary to cut the existing staff by more than 50 percent. The Farm Security Administration has made or is servicing loans in every agricultural county in the United States. It now maintains about 2,000 county offices to carry on this work, and approximately three-quarters of its employees are in the district and county offices.

Without further funds it will be necessary to close up about half of these offices. This makes it clearly evident that supervision will be imposible and little more can be carried on than the collection and liquidation of outstanding loans, and even that on a basis of questionable efficiency. And here is another serious angle to it. In my judgment, from the information I have been able to garner since assuming this responsibility, I think it is fair to state that unless these funds are forthcoming, serious impairment of the recoverable value of the Government's assets will result.

The request for additional loan funds is simply a question of whether approximately 50,000 farm families without means of adequate assistance will receive the credit and assistance they need to increase their production of necesasry war foods during the coming year.

The amount asked for administrative and other purposes was determined, as Congress requested, by the War Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones. From a survey to determine the necessary level of operations for this agency, Judge Jones has recommended a total appropriation for the year of $26,500,000. This is $3,100,000 less than the Senate previously voted for the agency. The entire appropriation was eliminated on the floor of the House on a point of order. The loan request provides for exactly the amount of loan authorization previously approved by the Senate which was reduced as a compromise in conference.

The recommendation transmitted by the President on this request stated that "to reach the food-production goals of 1944 necessary for the successful prosecution and conclusion of the war, it is vitally essential that the maximum number of low-income farmers be assisted in increasing their production through guidance and adequate credit."

The recommendation pointed out that during 1942 rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase borrowers of the Farm Security Administration, representing only 7.6 percent of all farmers in the country, accounted in dollar value for 9 percent of the total increases in production of the nine most essential food products.

I think that is all I should say about the necessity for additional funds. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of this special committee for the privilege of appearing before you and making this general statement.

Altus Project, Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Altus project was authorized for construction in 1938 and work was begun in 1941. Construction during the war was limited by a "stop construction" order issued by the War Production Board in December 1942. The order and subsequent amendments limited construction of Altus Dam to a height sufficient to store 11,000 acre-feet of water—to furnish a potable supply for the city of Altus and its adjacent Army air base. This work was virtually completed in July 1943.

In July 1943, a plan was submitted to the War Food Administration which proposed completion of Altus Dam and enough of the distribution system to provide an irrigation supply for 43,000 acres of land. The War Food Administration recommended the extension of the project to the War Production Board in October and an informal discussion of the project was held on October 19 at the office of Mr. E. D. White of the War Food Administration. This meeting was attended by Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma, Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, of Oklahoma, and representatives of the War Production Board, War Food Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The discussion led to a better understanding by all interested parties, and, as a result a revised recommendation was submitted by the War Food Administration on November 1. The Facilities Committee of W. P. B. has scheduled a formal hearing of the case at 3:30 p. m., December 17, 1943.

The project is located in Greer, Kiowa, and Jackson Counties, Oklahoma, between the North Fork and the Salt Fork of the Red River. The project area will eventually be composed of 66,000 acres, of which development of only 43,000 acres is contemplated as a war food measure. The project will obtain its water supply from the Altus Dam on the North Fork of the Red River. This dam, eventually to be 100 feet high with a crest length of 1,160 feet, is now about 75 percent complete. Additional work to complete the project as a war measure entails completion of the dam, construction of a 4-mile main canal, construction of two branch canals, 11.5 and 21.5 miles long, respectively, and con-

struction of lateral and drainage systems.

The total cost of the project will be approximately $7,760,000, of which the water users will repay $2,000,000, the City of Altus will repay $1,080,000 for its municipal supply, and the War Department will contribute $1,300,000 for flood-control benefits. The cost of additional work necessary to complete the wartime development will be $3,070,000. The materials to be used include 1,505 tons of steel, of which 1,209 tons will be comprised of reinforcing bars, which are not understood to be critical at the present time. The construction period will be about 17 months and it is expected that the work can be completed by April 1, 1945, in time for the 1945 irrigation season. For construction, it is estimated that 125,000 man-hours of labor will be required; the maximum employment will be 575 men and the average 325.

The War Food Administration has estimated that about 50 percent of the expected food increase from the new development will accrue in 1945, and that the full increase can be expected in 1946. The full increase in agricultural products will be approximately 54,000 tons annually.

Current Prostitution and Venereal Disease Conditions in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much contradictory information relative to health conditions here in the District, particularly in the matter of prostitution and venereal disease, that I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD today a year-end summary report from the District Social Hygiene Society which is clarifying:

SOCIAL HYGIENE SOCIETY
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1943.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: Washington has been on the receiving end of many distorted facts and unsound statistics insofar as local venereal disease and prostitution conditions are concerned. You may be interested in the attached copy of my year-end summary to be presented to the society's board at their meeting Tuesday, December 14.

Cordially,

RAY H. EVERETT,
Executive Secretary.

WASHINGTON'S PROSTITUTION SITUATION

Despite the notoriety attained because of a few sensational cases that received Nation-wide publicity, Washington now rates as one of the cleaner large cities of the country insofar as professional prostitution is concerned. As for the volume of so-called amateurs, i. e., pick-up girls and juvenile sex delinquents, that is an all-community problem rather than one specifically for the police to handle. The police have been vigorous in detecting the law-breaking prostitute and her exploiters, and in bringing them to justice. So effective has their work been that investigators report "most prostitutes have been driven from the streets, bellboys and cabdrivers in general are unable to act as go-betweens, and finding prostitutes is a very difficult task." Washington's situation shows a considerable improvement for this year, concludes the statement.

In essence, continuous police pressure on commercialized prostitution has reduced that offense to a low minimum in Washington, though greater progress is noted in repressing white prostitution than in dealing with its Negro counterpart. In a mid-year study made by a Negro investigator, the findings revealed "many soliciting streetwalkers, and many tavern and night-club habitues catering to both Negro servicemen and civilians." He also observed that "most of this night life is located between U Street NW. and Rhode Island Avenue, also along parallel thoroughfares from Seventh to Fourteenth Streets."

Rip Van Winkle legislative processes

Certain legislative gaps in Washington's prostitution defenses have been brought out in hearings of the Senate and House District Committees; some over a year ago. The findings of the D'Alesandro investigation (June 1943) made the following specific recommendations:

"Venereally infected selectees, unfit for military service, be held by the military and given compulsory treatment;

"That all women taken in raids by the vice squad should be given a complete medical examination; and if necessary the laws should be amended making such examinations compulsory;

"That the law relating to the soliciting of prostitution be amended so as to make this practice a violation whether the solicitation is done inside a building or enclosure or out of doors—the present law covers only soliciting on the streets and does not cover soliciting in beer parlors, taverns, eating places, theaters, or similar places.

"That persons known or believed to be suffering from venereal disease in a contagious or infectious stage be taken into custody and committed to an institution for a period not to exceed 10 days for observation and treatment without the necessity of a court order before commitment;

"That there be established a definition of a habitual misdemeanant who on conviction will be given a mandatory sentence of 1 year in the workhouse."

An inquiry on the progress of this legislation brought a reply from the Corporation Counsel's office that "S. 2819, Seventy-seventh Congress, a bill designed to remedy the inadequacies of the present (prostitution) law * * * has not been reintroduced up to the present time." A copy of this bill, it is stated, was forwarded to Mr. D'Alesandro shortly after the hearings last spring, with the suggestion that it be reintroduced.

The venereal disease situation, after much discussion with the Federal Security Agency and United States Public Health Service, was dealt with in a draft of a bill amending the D. C. communicable disease law so as to give the health officer broader authority. After the several agencies had agreed on the essential wording, the draft was forwarded in July to the Budget Bureau for approval. "However the draft has not yet been approved by the Budget Bureau, as the Attorney General has raised a number of objections to the proposed bill", says the Corporation Counsel's office, where the matter "is now being given further consideration."

Meantime the health department is definitely handicapped in its efforts to control recalcitrant disease carriers and to prevent them from spreading their infections. Thus a distinct menace to public health is permitted to continue.

WASHINGTON VENEREAL DISEASE SITUATION

Contrary to some alarming reports that have been given national circulation, Washington's venereal disease situation has shown steady and notable improvement this year. Particularly is this noticeable in the lowered incidence of syphilis and gonorrhea in the Washington Military District concerning which the commanding officer, Maj. Gen. John T. Lewis, U. S. A., recently wrote, "During the early part of the year, the venereal disease rate of the military personal of the Military District of Washington was great enough to make it compare unfavorably with other service commands; but, during the last 4 months, the rate has been low and our position is most favorable."

Acknowledging to Dr. George C. Ruhland, Washington Health Officer, "the excellent work of your Venereal Disease Control Division," General Lewis adds: "We consider that the thousands of examinations for tuberculosis, the thousands of blood tests, the increasing activity in sanitary inspections, and the energetic measures in venereal-disease control by the local health department are a valuable contribution to the health of this command and to the war effort."

Treatment records for the 21 District of Columbia clinics show decided increases in the numbers of syphilitic cases receiving eight arsenical treatments or more, and fewer cases where no medication has been received. In both classes Washington shows one of the best records of progress in the entire country. Commenting on these treatment advances, Assistant Surgeon General J. R. Heller, Chief, Division of Venereal Disease, United States Public Health Service, says "The improvement shown in the percentages on both tables is indeed gratifying."

District of Columbia Health Department statisticians say they see no indications of any increase in venereal disease locally. "With our stepped-up clinic program and more efficient case-finding procedures, we are discovering and treating more cases of syphilis and gonorrhea," says Dr. F. G Gillick, Chief, Bureau of Venereal Disease, "but this does not mean that there is a greater prevalence of these diseases in Washington. It merely means that more diseased persons are being located, diagnosed, and treated. Part of the increased clinic attendance is due to our cooperation with selective service and military authorities. Selectees rejected because of venereal infections are being rehabilitated in our clinics."

Asked about the need for greater efforts in controlling the high prevalence of venereal disease in the Negro population, the Health Department official pointed to the latest published departmental report. This shows that of a total of 6,279 syphilis cases treated in the clinics last year, 91.5 percent or 5,740 were colored, and 8.5 percent or 539 white. Approximately the same ratio appears in the gonorrhea statistics, i. e., about 10 to 1. Health workers hasten to observe, however, that a far higher proportion of Negroes than whites are in such low-income brackets that they can't afford private treatment and must go to clinics or remain untreated.

Negro leaders constantly point to syphilis as one of the great scourges of their race, and urge provision of increased facilities, funds, and personnel to combat its spread. The Journal of the National (Negro) Medical Association calls attention to the great differential in the syphilis rates of the two races in urging a more energetic campaign. Of the first 2,000,000 selectees blood-tested for syphilis, says the Journal, 45.3 per 1,000 were found infected. "For white selectees the rate was 17.4 per 1,000, while the rate for Negro selectees was 252.3 per 1,000." As

Hazen observes in his handbook, Syphilis in the Negro, "the greatest single reservoir of syphilis in America is the Negro." But, he points out, "the most outstanding characteristic of areas of high prevalence—for both Negro and white—is a low economic status in a large proportion of the population." Those sections of a community where the Negro syphilis rate is high also have higher rates in the white population. "Negroes in higher economic brackets—just as white persons—have much lower syphilis and other morbidity rates," adds the Washington syphilologist.

Confronted with facts such as these, Washington's public may as well realize that, like other States and cities with large Negro populations, Washington will continue to have comparatively high venereal disease rates until the incidence of these diseases in the Negro population is reduced. That means, as Dr. Hazen points out, better economic opportunities as well as more health education to stimulate clinic attendance and treatment by qualified private physicians, as well as avoidance of infection.

The Social Hygiene Society is gratified to note the increasing use of trained Negro physicians and follow-up workers in clinics whose patients are predominantly from the colored population. They hope this practice will be continued and expanded as long as the need appears and trained personnel is available.

Likewise the Society believes that, just as long as the incidence of tuberculosis, venereal disease, illegitimacy, and other physical and societal maladies continues many times higher in the Negro group than in the neighboring population, just so long should we concentrate more medical, educational, and economic therapy to improve their lot. Such ameliorative processes are not merely altruistic. They can be justified on a dollars-and-cents basis in that they will reduce the total of community ills, thereby safeguarding the entire population. Whenever we lower the rates of disease, illegitimacy, and crime, we save on such tax-paying items as health and police protection and institution care. In the long run prevention is much cheaper than salvage.

With the completion of the new 50-bed wing at Gallinger Hospital for the isolation of patients having acute venereal infections, Washington now has 100 hospital beds available for this type of quarantine. Plans are under way for utilizing the latest developments for rapid treatment in cases where this intensive therapy can properly be given. These new institutional facilities rank well with the best in comparable cities.

In closing we would say that, based on the best data and statistics available, Washington's venereal disease situation and Washington's prostitution situation are being handled as well as or better than those of comparable cities, if similar criteria are used in the evaluation and the cities compared have approximately similar population compositions.

Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, Oreg., Favors Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution adopted December 1, 1943, by the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, Oreg., in my congressional district:

Whereas the individual economic welfare of the American people and the citizens of the State of Oregon is of paramount concern to the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, and it is the earnest desire of the organization to aid in governmental efforts to curb the rising cost of living throughout the United States; and

Whereas the majority of the people of the State of Oregon are receiving fixed incomes with no means of increasing wages, salaries, or other income to meet any increase in the cost of living; and

Whereas great hardship will be imposed on the lower income groups of the State of Oregon by any increase in the cost of living; and

Whereas it is deemed of utmost importance to maintain at a minimum level the public indebtedness from wartime expenditure: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County hereby register its urgent opposition to any congressional action favoring abolition of the present subsidy program now in effect.

Basic Facts on Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials selected from representative newspapers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts citing the reciprocal benefits of lend-lease. The editorials have been selected from the Gazette of Worcester, the Boston Post, the Brockton Enterprise and Times, and the Worcester Telegram. These editorials appearing in papers with wide circulations have served to inform the people of Massachusetts of mutual benefits derived by all countries participating in the lend-lease program. This program has been an outstanding source of harmony among the Allied Nations as well as a system of mutual aid.

The editorials follow:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of November 12, 1943]

BASIC FACTS ON LEND-LEASE

The President's report to Congress yesterday on lend-lease in reverse, as between ourselves and the British, went right to the point. He set forth available figures on British repayments, and with little elaboration permitted those figures to argue for themselves. They argue well.

Thus, he presented simplified accounts showing that the British Commonwealth's expenditures for lend-lease aid to America as of June 30 were approximately $1,171,000,000, of which $871,000,000 came from the United Kingdom, $196,000,000 from Australia, $51,000,000 from New Zealand, and $56,900,000 from India. At present the British Commonwealth's reverse lend-lease outlay runs at about a billion and a quarter dollars a year, in addition to the raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs provided for in program expansions now being set up.

Similar information appeared a few hours earlier in the British Exchequer's white paper on the same topic. The President sought to estimate the money value of the reciprocal part of the system—of the barracks, hospitals, services, equipment, foodstuffs, clothing, and other items. Sir John Anderson introduced "the money sign" reluctantly and stressed rather the common effort. But both official utterances were to the same purpose, directed at the misgivings which certain Members of Congress hold lest the United States give all and get nothing.

The President's figures are welcome and illuminating. The key to lend-lease, forward or reverse, is found, however, in two of his sentences. He said at one point, "There is, of course, no physical or financial standard of value by which we can measure the military contribution to the war on land or sea or in the air which has been made by our allies or ourselves." At another point he said, "It (the statement of British expenditures) is an indication of the extent to which the British have been able to pool their resources with ours so that the needed weapon may be in the hands of that soldier—whatever may be his nationality—who can at the proper moment use it most effectively to the defeat of our common enemies."

Inquiries into lend-lease by Congress are fine. So vast an operation requires scrutiny. The Truman committee and the McKellar Senate Appropriations Subcommittee have a legitimate field for intelligent investigation. But certainly it cannot, as the first Truman report did, ignore mutual aspects of the operations. It cannot ignore the immense saving in ships and time which reverse lend-lease has given. It cannot ignore the great factors that dollars and cents will not measure.

The primary yardstick of lend-lease is its parts in winning the war. If our allies are contributing their utmost in proportion to their resources (and they are) lend-lease books are in balance, even though British reverse payments shown in the President's report may be but a fifth of America's $5,500,000,000 outlay to the British.

[From the Boston Post of November 13, 1943]

REPORTS ON LEND-LEASE

The President's report to Congress and the British White Paper explaining the workings of lend-lease, published almost simultaneously, appear reasonably satisfactory; although it is likely the recent criticism by the five Senators who toured the war fronts brought about some improvement in the means and methods whereby Great Britain now supplies a larger proportion of raw materials in reverse lend-lease than she had been doing.

It might seem that, whereas the United States was extending to the British Empire about $5 lend-lease for every $1 they paid us, we were overgenerous. But it must be recalled that it was never intended that lend-lease should be a 50–50 proposition.

As the British White Paper courteously points out, the lend-lease was established by Congress in March 1941 as an act to promote the defense of the United States. That was 9 months before we entered the war. But even thus early it was realized that unless we aided the nations that were combating the Axis aggressors these defenders might be wiped out and we be left alone to thwart any further Axis aggression.

Perhaps there was some hope here that if we furnished sufficient aid to the Allies they might defeat the Axis without our getting directly into the war. But, at any rate, lend-lease was considered a good investment in that it helped hold the Axis at bay until

we had time to complete preparations for our own defense.

It may be pointed out, too, that the Allies were fighting and dying long before we got into the war, and that it is impossible to evaluate their efforts in dollars and cents. We may be sure that not only in the case of Britain, but also Russia, China, and other beneficiaries of lend-lease we shall pay out much more than we shall receive in material reimbursement.

At the same time, when transactions are carried on on such a huge scale, it is well to keep a close check on them in order that each nation will, at least, do its fair share in carrying out this mutual aid compact.

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Enterprise and Times of November 13, 1943]

BENEFITS UNDER LEND-LEASE

The average newspaper reader skips such matters as the President's report to Congress on the scope and operation of lend-lease. Unfortunate, this trait of the average reader. The President gave it vitality and significance.

"One thing is clear," he told the legislative branch of government. "By the help which our friends and the Allies have given us, and by the help which we have given them in the common cause, we have not only made progress in the war, but we have saved the lives of many of our own boys as well as those of our allies."

It is not possible to epitomize the report in a few words. But lend-lease can be likened to something with the common experience of cities and towns.

Aid calls come to Brockton when serious fires threaten neighboring communities. Would any citizen withhold this aid? No, because when this town's fire-fighting facilities must needs be supplemented, aid comes as readily.

Lend-lease is not a one-way process. Its beneficiaries include the United States.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of November 12, 1943]

WHAT AMERICA GETS BACK

The operations of the lend-lease agreements with our allies have for the most part been set up in the public mind in a false light. It has been made to appear that it was a case of all give and no take for this country and that there was no guaranty that lend-lease goods would ever be paid for. President Roosevelt's message to Congress partially listing goods and services that have already been given in return should stop the grumblers' careless talk.

Complete figures are impossible to assemble. Many services that have been given in reverse lend-lease cannot be computed in dollars or tons. Roughly Britain and the Commonwealths of Australia and New Zealand have contributed and are contributing about a billion and a quarter dollars a year value to American war costs. That may not seem large in comparison with the scores of billions this country is spending to get its own war machine in working order. In comparison with the resources of the givers, and their own huge burdens of war costs, they are not inconsiderable. The details of what has been contributed are in the President's message which should be read by all who desire to have intelligent opinions of the lend-lease in actual operation.

There are considerations that outweigh in importance the actual figures. In Australia and New Zealand they have rationed food and clothing to the point of hardship for the native populations to provide full soldiers' rations to our troops, without cost to us. Certain British equipment proved superior to the American types. These included fighter plant gun sights, interplane radio communication devices, heated clothing and body armor for our flyers. These have been provided in large numbers not only increasing the efficiency of the men of the Eighth Air Force but also saving many men's lives.

Greatest of all in the way of contributions is what Britain and Russia have given in sacrifices to hold the enemy at bay until our forces could join in delivering the killing punch. Every ruined city in both those countries is a sacrifice that is part of the cost of beating down Hitler, a loss which America will not have to endure in kind. All the hundreds of lives, soldiers and civilians, which Britain and Russia have sacrificed without faltering, is a contribution to the victory that will be America's victory as much as it is theirs. Before the war ends our battlefield losses will in some degree measure up to those of our allies. But our sacrifices here at home can never compare with theirs.

In dollars and cents the American contribution will of course be by far the greatest of all. But taking all things into consideration in estimating the true value of what has been done and what has been given, it is far from unlikely that when the war is finally over, honest opinion will have to be that the overall balance sheet is somewhere near even as between the fighting Allies.

Charles G. Tomerlin, of Union City, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution recently adopted by the Rotary Club of Union City, Tenn., and a copy of the article recently appearing in the Rotarian relative to the patriotic services of Mr. Charles G. Tomerlin, of Union City, Tenn., who originated and manufactured the first service flags:

Whereas Rotarian Charles G. Tomerlin originated and manufactured the first service flags which are used throughout the United States in honoring the personnel of the United States Army and Navy, which service flag was formally adopted during World War No. 1 by the Secretary of War, Baker; and

Whereas the Union City Rotary Club is very proud of this signal contribution that Rotarian Tomerlin has made to our Nation: Be it

Resolved, That the Rotary Club of Union City hereby expresses its appreciation to Rotarian Tomerlin for the public service he performed in designing and originating the service flag; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished the Department of Archives of the State of Tennessee, in Nashville, Tenn., as a permanent record and memorial of said accomplishment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, together with a copy of the article appearing in the Rotarian in its December issue, 1943, be furnished our Congressman, Honorable JERE COOPER, with a request that it be entered and made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a permanent record of this signal accomplishment of Rotarian Tomerlin, and that a copy of this resolution be furnished the press and a copy furnished Rotarian Tomerlin.

RE SERVICE FLAG

(By Charles G. Tomerlin)

I refer to your article in the October Rotarian regarding the Father of the Service Flag. Naturally, I would like to see the authorized facts as you state them there.

I wish to relate here my version of the service flag. In 1917 I was the merchandising manager of William Taylor, Son & Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, and an associate of mine, Clyde DeAcre, now of Los Angeles, suggested to me that what this country needed was a service flag, that the pennants then in use were of no significance. I sent my advertising manager, Ralph Boal, to the local library in Cleveland to look up the service flags of all countries. He returned with a drawing of the service flags of seven or eight countries, including France and Japan.

I used these two designs, in the summer of 1917, in rearranging our three national colors into the present service flag. I sent our buyers to New York to buy all the bunting that could be bought and bought several Singer sewing machines and installed a manufacturing plant for service flags on the eleventh floor of the William Taylor Son & Co.

These service flags were immediately in demand, and I sent a representative to Washington to see Newton D. Baker, of Cleveland, who was then Secretary of War, and asked him to declare the flag that I had designed as the national service flag. He agreed, provided I would not seek to copyright or patent it and would ask for no royalties, and permit anyone to manufacture it. On these points we agreed, and Secretary of War Baker had his picture made holding the service flag I designed and made. The picture then ran in many papers, including the Cleveland afternoon papers.

A check-up on the William Taylor Son & Co. advertising for the late summer of 1917 will verify my statements, and I know Mr. DeAcre will also verify my statement. I never heard of Mr. R. L. Queisser or any activity on the part of anyone regarding the service flag until I brought out the one Secretary of War Baker approved. The gold star was also my own idea. Would you check my statements and, if you find them correct, will you then correct your statement you made in the October Rotarian? I am also a Rotarian, being a member of the local Rotary Club.

Denver Poll—Nine Out of 10 in United States Condemn Increased Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, of December 12, 1943:

DENVER POLL—NINE OUT OF 10 IN UNITED STATES CONDEMN INCREASED PRICES

DENVER, December 11.—While the battle over subsidies rages among legislators in Washington, while arguments pro and con are advanced by leaders throughout the Nation, the American public condemns higher food prices, which it considers as a prelude both to increases in prices generally and to higher wages and salaries.

Today less than 1 person in each 10 thinks higher food prices a good thing for the Nation as a whole. An overwhelming majority—

9 out of 10 Americans—believe unequivocally that any increase in food prices will be a bad thing for the country, according to a telegraphic spot-check survey just completed by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver.

Almost 8 out of 10 Americans are convinced that if the prices on even some foods are allowed to rise further, increases will follow in the prices of commodities other than food. Eight out of ten believe increased wages and salaries would result from upward spiraling food costs.

Trained interviewers asked a Nation-wide cross-section of civilian adults the following questions:

"If food prices go any higher than they are now, do you think this would be a good thing or a bad thing for the country as a whole?"

	Percent
Good thing	5
Bad thing	88
Neither	3
Undecided	4
	100

"If some food prices do go higher than they are now, do you think this would affect prices on other things or not?"

	Percent
Yes	76
No	18
Undecided	6
	100

The 76 out of each 100 who answered "Yes" to the preceding question were then queried:

"Would prices on other things go up or down?"

	Percent
Up	74
Down	1
Undecided	1
	76

The same representative random sampling of rich and poor, young and old, men and women, Democrats, Republicans, and non-voters from Maine to California were also asked:

"If some food prices do go higher than they are now, do you think this would affect wages and salaries in any way?"

	Percent
Yes	73
No	21
Undecided	6
	100

The 73 percent who answered "Yes" were then presented this question: "Would wages and salaries go up or down?"

	Percent
Up	70
Down	1
Undecided	2
	73

These questions reveal that the public realizes rising food prices affect the whole price and wage structure and that they believe this is detrimental to the country as a whole.

Asylum for the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of December 9, 1943:

ASYLUM FOR THE JEWS

It was in 1933 that a war of annihilation against the Jewish people in Europe—some 8,000,000 persons—was systematically begun by the newly risen powers in Germany. Today, 10 years and more than 3,000,000 victims later, the United Nations still have failed to take any direct decisive action to rescue the innocent subjects of the Nazis' blood purge.

An opportunity to redress, in a small degree, this sin of omission is offered in the resolution recently introduced in both Houses of the United States Congress proposing the establishment of an American commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to provide for immediate action to rescue surviving Jews. A multitude of plans worked out by various organizations, Jewish and Christian, are available, but the chief obstacle has been an unwillingness on the part of responsible nations to guarantee asylum.

Sponsors of the resolution recommend that the commission work out with neutral countries bordering occupied Europe a system of temporary reservation camps to which Jewish refugees might escape or be sent, to be cared for until permanent settlement could be arranged elsewhere. Such camps would be financed largely through private sources.

It is doubtful what effect this would have on the Jews in Germany whose rescue depends almost solely on the force of United Nations' arms. But in the light of the Nazis' worsening position, it is felt that political pressure can be brought to bear on the satellite nations, where more than a million Jews are in danger of extermination through hunger, mistreatment, or outright massacre. Legislative action strengthening the official threat of Allied reprisal might also serve to deter Nazis in occupied countries from committing further atrocities.

Unless, however, the resolution receives prompt congressional approval, and the commission is appointed and moves forward with the utmost dispatch, the effort will amount to little. For the Allied advance has markedly accelerated the Nazi determination to clear all Jews out of Europe before the war's end.

Day Demands $500 to $1,000 Muster-Out Pay for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, more than 800,000 United States soldiers, sailors, and marines of World War No. 2 already have been returned to civil life without adequate Government assistance. For almost a year the New Deal has obstructed all legislation designed to reestablish these veterans in the home communities.

I insist upon prompt muster-out pay of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 for overseas veterans, and $200 to $800 for domestic service. There must be provided immediate clothing and hospitalization facilities for our discharged servicemen; the wounded and mentally sick must be cared for at once.

There has been some talk of leaving these problems to be worked out through the National Youth Administration, a revived Civilian Conservation Corps, or the Farm Security Administration. I am unalterably opposed to placing our returning veterans in the class of relief workers.

These men do not want to be forced into the ranks of Government dependents. All they want is a chance to get back to work in their accustomed trades and callings. Veterans are not to be regarded as recipients of an unemployment dole. They must be offered substantial assistance, and at once—assistance commensurate with the sacrifices they have made in this war.

Proposals for such legislation have been pressed in Congress for many months. But the New Deal has sidetracked them all. Not until the present month did the wheels begin to turn on this urgent national problem. It is another unhappy demonstration of the New Deal approach to every problem of administration—too little, too late.

I have the honor of presenting to the House a letter from Leonard W. Esper, of Bloomington, the Illinois department commander of the American Legion, setting forth details of many personal hardship cases among discharged war veterans. This is supported by a telegraphic survey conducted by the American Legion throughout 34 States. Many men partially incapacitated in the war have been returned to civilian life without adequate rehabilitation care and training, this report charged.

Proper legislation to handle these cases could have been in form months ago, ready for the assistance of veterans now returning to civil life by the hundreds and thousands each week. But the administration had no program, and it would not allow legislative action on the program advanced by the veterans' organizations. By January there will be almost a million war veterans released from the services, with no adequate Federal machinery ready to assist them in training for new jobs and readjusting themselves to civilian life.

I gratefully call attention to the accomplishments of the Illinois State Government under its emergency division of rehabilitation, department of registration and education, as organized and administered by Director Frank G. Thompson. Governor Green and his education director have been far ahead of the National Government in their program for veteran assistance. The division of veterans' service in Illinois has been functioning for more than 2 years.

Today the Federal Government is discharging certain types of disability cases from the military services, only to leave the men dependent upon their home States for hospitalization and rehabilitation training. With billions being squandered in reckless Federal waste and extravagance, it is only proper to demand that the National Government give immediate attention to the urgent needs of these discharged servicemen.

With other Members of the House and Senate who have studied veteran needs and legislation, I welcome the expansion of the present United States Veterans' Bureau to handle the training and placement of men and women discharged from the armed services in

World War No. 2. The House will take up such legislation early in January, and will do full justice to all veterans. The following is the letter from Commander Esper:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
Bloomington, Ill., December 11, 1943.

Hon. STEPHEN A. DAY,
Representative at Large,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a result of increasing complaints from all over the Nation about delays in the settlement of compensation claims of disabled World War No. 2 veterans, the American Legion made a telegraphic survey of conditions in 34 States, and furnished it to each of the departments of the organization.

This survey discloses that inefficient methods of transmission of records, inability to secure competent personnel in adjudication divisions of the Veterans' Administration, as a result of lack of personnel priorities and inadequate salaries and lack of medical examiners, especially in the mental and nervous group, as mainly responsible for such delays.

We are enclosing a copy of National Commander Atherton's statement, and ask that you personally support immediate action to eliminate, as far as possible, these many errors.

The 96,500 members of the American Legion in Illinois will appreciate your wholehearted cooperation and after all, the immediate concern of the Nation should be not only to win the war, but to take care of the boys who have so valiantly given of their service to the Nation.

Mr. McCauley, Mr. Benston, Mr. Stelle, Mr. Mundt, and I will be in Washington early in February, at which time we hope to meet with our Illinois Congressmen and discuss the legislative program.

Respectfully,

LEONARD W. ESPER,
Department Commander.

Nevada Congressman Merits Vote of Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mining Record, Denver, Colo., of December 7, 1943:

NEVADA CONGRESSMAN MERITS VOTE OF THANKS

Our hat is off to Congressman MAURICE J. SULLIVAN of Nevada, who has introduced a bill in Congress to amend the Federal Securities Act to exempt mining and oil development from its provisions. He is one western Congressman who knows what is wrong with the mining industry in Nevada and the West and who also knows that the price of oil is not the principal reason for the lack of wildcatting in the oil industry. The Congressman knows that it was not necessary to stop all mining and oil financing in the Nation to prevent fraud in these industries. He also knows that there are sufficient criminal laws on the Federal and State statute books to handle any fraudulent practices if these laws are enforced. The great mining State of Nevada is practically stagnant from a new mining development standpoint and while other Congressmen continue to preach about relatively unimportant matters, Mr. SULLIVAN has hit the bull's-eye with his needed legislation.

Colorado and the West will hold a mining convention in Denver in January and it is to be hoped that the committee on arrangements will ask Congressman SULLIVAN to be a speaker on the program to explain his bill. We have in the past had spellbinders from the Securities and Exchange Commission at the convention to lull us into stupor while the Federal securities law turned western mining towns into graveyards of inaction. Even the oil industry is suffering because wildcatters are not allowed to finance their drilling operations and bring in new oil fields. Where formerly the promoter financed wildcat wells, it is now proposed that the price of oil be increased to entice producing companies to risk some of their funds in this needed wildcat drilling. The record shows that the wildcat oil companies drilled in most of the new oil fields in Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Wyoming, and the West. That was done before the Federal securities law stopped the financing of companies of this speculative class. Congressman SULLIVAN is evidently hopeful of new oil fields being drilled in Nevada and his hope may be a vision of reality.

The congressional delegations from all Western States and patriotic Congressmen from the entire Nation should back Mr. SULLIVAN'S bill.

Speech of Hon. Foster Stearns, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had an opportunity to read a speech delivered before the Veterans of Foreign Wars of New Hampshire on June 15, 1940, by Hon. FOSTER STEARNS. I found this speech of such historic interest in the light of subsequent events, that I am including it in my remarks under leave granted to me.

Twenty years ago we came back from an attempt to make the world safe for democracy. It was a genuine and sincere attempt, and I hope there is no man among us who feels any least shadow of shame or regret for his share in it. Unfortunately, it did not succeed. I am not going into any discussion of the reason for that failure—that is water over the dam now. I just want to say that we as a Nation have our own share of the blame to bear, and that in discussing it we had better be accepting responsibility for our own shortcomings rather than seeking to find a scapegoat among those who were associated with us in that effort and in that failure.

As a matter of fact, there were few to realize the depth or the power of the forces that had been unchained by that conflict or to comprehend the feebleness of the steps that were taken to control them. The historian will perhaps not linger long over the details of the last 20 years and their mistakes. It is more likely that he will see them merely as an interlude in a great period of transition in the history of civilization, and will find that dislocation and suffering in some sort were an almost inevitable part of that transition. For a hundred years thinkers have realized that the advances of science and technology were bound to lead to vast changes in our pattern of living. The question that is before us today is whether those changes are to proceed gradually and by a normal process of evolution, or whether they are to be brought about by violence and revolution. It is at least in part because the democracies have been too indifferent and self-satisfied to work heroically at making these changes by methods of peaceful evolution that the dictators are now threatening the peace of the entire world. If the right men do not lead, the wrong will.

Let no one think that this is just a struggle between two European power groups, to the outcome of which we can remain indifferent. On the one hand we have a group of nations with whom, whether you call them democracies or not, a democracy like ours could live on terms of harmony and good will, with only the petty jealousies of international trade to come between us. And on the other hand is another group which is frankly and formally dedicated to a change in the whole world order and to domination for their particular ideas of government. It is like the difference between a neighbor in our own community who may fail sometimes to pay his bills promptly, or may beat us in some trade, but who sends his children to the same schools as ours and votes at the same polls, and the gangster who says that the community owes him a living, and proceeds to collect it at the gun's point. The fatal difference being that our town has a police force to protect it from the gunman, whereas in world affairs peaceful nations must be their own police.

Last summer I was one of the delegates from the American Congress to the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo. On my return to this country, after the outbreak of the war in September, I gave out a statement in which I said:

"I cannot conceive that any American can be blind to the character of the issue involved in the present conflict or that he can have the slightest doubt on which side our every interest lies. The course of our Government should not be entered on hastily, but should represent the careful judgment of the American people, regardless of party, how best to protect our national welfare, and contribute to preserve that Christian civilization of which we are a part, and whose very existence seems to be threatened."

That statement appears in the press on September 11; and I believe that it still represents the spirit in which we should face the problems that lie before us. At that time I made another point which has received a good deal more popular recognition in these last months than was accorded it at that time. I said:

"The United States now has one battle fleet. It is in the Pacific. It is in the Pacific because the British Fleet controls the Atlantic. If the British sea power were in other hands, the United States would be spending billions of dollars for a second fleet."

And in this connection, perhaps I may be permitted to remind you that I voted for the repeal of the arms embargo at the regular session of Congress in the spring of 1939, when its passage might have at least postponed the outbreak of war and of course voted for it again when it finally passed last September.

In view of this record, I hope it is clear that I am in entire sympathy with the swelling tide of American sentiment for all possible aid to the Allies; I hope it is also clear that I still believe that the crucial decisions which the Nation is being called upon to

make should be made calmly and without hysteria.

The only change since last autumn is that events have moved more rapidly than anyone anticipated, and that we are having important decisions forced upon us instead of having all the time in the world to think them over. Time is today the dominating factor.

The first task that lies before us, and one on which there is no dissenting voice, is the necessity for a strengthening and even reconstruction of our national defenses as we had hoped would never be called for again. On this principle there can be no question—only possibly on matters of detail. It must be clear to all that we are entering on an era when force will rule the world; and we must be prepared to meet it. If anyone questions whether we may not go too far along this line, I can only say that in my judgment we are confronted with a situation where it would be far better to go too fast, and do too much, than to go too slow and do too little.

One question that arises in some minds is whether aid to the Allies is compatible with adequate rearmament at home—they think they sense a conflict here, and that those who want to send munitions to Europe are endangering our own safety. I believe that the two things are parts of one whole. The armies of France constitute our first line of defense; her sons, and the sons of Britain who fall in battle, are dying for our protection. Under such circumstances, the extent of our aid to the Allies is purely a military problem, to be decided by military experts, rather than newspaper columnists. England, threatened with invasion, has to determine what aid she can safely spare for beleaguered France. Our own problem differs only in degree; the threat to our shores is more remote—but also our degree of preparedness is far behind. The terrible fact is that we are not in a position to render any great amount of help and may not be until it is too late.

Our problem is far less one of building up great reserves, whether of planes, guns, or ammunition than it is one of increasing our production capacity. Given an increase in our plane factories that would put us on anything like a 50,000-plane basis, the question of what proportion of these planes can be safely and profitably sent to our friends across the water is, I repeat, one for decision by our military experts. I shall use every energy I have to see that our output expansion is not hampered by sloth or by red tape; and then I shall urge that every bit of that output that can be spared go to our first line of defense in Europe.

Let no one think, however, that it is an easy road that lies before us. We are too apt, I fear, to think that Congress has only to make an appropriation and the thing is done. On the contrary, it is going to call for a girding of our loins and a generation of concentrated national effort such as we have never known. It is going to call for change in our way of life, sometimes perhaps in unexpected quarters. Take our educational system for instance; shall we not have to turn out fewer lawyers, doctors, and white-collar workers and teach our young people a new respect for the types of skilled labor whose shortage in the present crisis is one of the bottlenecks to be overcome in attaining quantity production?

Another problem that must be faced is that of financing. The country which entered the last war with a national debt under $3,000,000,000 has seen it mount to the point where it is knocking at the roof of $45,000,000,000, which is the limit now set by law. It shows a healthy state of public opinion that popular pressure should have practically forced the administration and Congress into the enactment of new tax legislation—almost an unheard-of thing for an election year. But we must not let this lull us into a false idea that we have done what is needed. The present tax bill is hardly more than a gesture; our whole tax structure is going to have to be revised and new sources of revenue discovered to meet the calls that will be made upon the Treasury by any really adequate scheme of national defense.

We are moving into dark and difficult days; and you may think that I am rash to paint for you what may seem like a pessimistic picture. I do not see it so at all.

There are some who think that the American people has been spoiled by the efforts that have been made to solve some of their economic problems, and that they have grown too soft to meet the stern duties of the future. In my opinion, the American people are away ahead of their representatives in Congress today in their readiness to cooperate with strong and determined leadership in the task of getting the Nation into condition to meet a bad new world.

I have been both in Germany and Italy under their present regimes. I detest, as any free-born American must detest, the regimentation and the suppression of individual freedom that are essential parts of totalitarianism. But the fact remains that many of their people, and especially their young people, have found joy and satisfaction in the feeling that they are devoting themselves, even to the point of sacrifice, to the service of their country.

Perhaps you saw mention of the recent speech of President Vargas, of Brazil, which has attracted much attention. He affirmed his solidarity with other American nations; but then he went on to express admiration for what he called the virility of the new governments in Europe, and to refer to the sterile demogogy of political democracy. There is no question that the Nazi-Fascist vigor and power of concentrated effort is winning their respect, which we cannot afford to let them get away with.

In almost every school there is a bully, who is able to annoy and persecute his fellows until the day comes when his quiet, peace-loving comrades decide that they can take no more from him. When that day comes his downfall is generally swift and sure.

It is up to us as a nation to show the world that democracy can be just as tough as dictatorships. We are moving into an era of increased taxation and intensified industrial effort, when many governmental luxuries will have to be put aside until a better day. (I may refer to the President's veto of the rivers and harbors bill as an illustration of what I mean). But I believe that along with the hardships, along with the regret at having to expend our energies on engines of destruction, there is coming to the American people a new unity of purpose, a drawing together on a common effort, which will do away with some of the doubts and uncertainties of our recent divided counsels and bring the real satisfaction that comes from translating merely potential strength into the bone and sinew of a nation prepared to face unflinchingly whatever fate may bring. As I have said before, I believe that the American people are asking today to be called on for greater efforts than their leaders have yet dared to ask of them. And when the call comes I have no question what their response will be. I have confidence in the future of America, because I have faith in the American people. And I know that you, my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, will be leaders in your communities in all that will strengthen the hands of our Government and will insure that, in God's good providence, all that we mean by Americanism shall not perish from the earth.

Facing the Facts on War Contract Termination and Renegotiation and Its Impact on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts of a talk given by Harry Fiterman, tax consultant and finance analyst, before the Hennepin County Bar Association, Tuesday, November 30, 1943:

I. THE PROBLEM

A. The Government of the United States and the Nation's business and industrial leaders are today confronted with two major problems:

1. How to prevent a runaway inflation, and

2. How to cushion the impact of demobilization of war plants and war workers.

B. Immediately involved with these two grave problems are:

1. What kind of a tax program the Nation needs to provide revenue on one hand and to curb inflation on the other, and

2. What type of machinery must be set up to provide for an orderly method of war contract termination and a more workable plan of settling the many thousands of pending cases of contract renegotiation due to the Government's claim of excessive profits.

C. Any one of the subjects just stated need separate treatment, and provide ample opportunity for a prolonged discussion. However, my intentions are not to enter into a detailed presentation of each subject, but rather to present a brief picture on the problems that appear most pertinent at this very moment.

II. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

A. For the 1943 fiscal year ended June 30, the Federal Government had expended about $78,000,000,000, which was more than double the 1942 figure when expenditures approximated $32,000,000,000. Of the $78,000,000,000 spent during the current year 92 percent was for war activities, while revenues provided around $22,000,000,000 and $56,000,000,000 was the resulting net deficit, as compared to a $19,000,000,000 deficit a year ago.

B. Those who are familiar with the Government operations realize that the large cost of Government is represented by extensive war contracts and the cost of maintaining a large Army and Navy. They recognize that expenditures of $8,000,000,000 a month, which is about what we are now spending, cannot be continued unless the public is prepared to pay for it in the form of high taxes and the purchase of bonds for the difference. However, at a time when the Treasurer is asking for higher taxes of both corporations and individuals, another branch of Government is preparing for wholesale cancelation of war contracts, which would make a higher tax on corporations a practical impossibility.

III. WAR CONTRACTS—TERMINATIONS AND RENEGOTIATIONS

A. It is estimated that there are approximately 250,000 prime contracts, with nearly 5,000,000 subcontracts, involving between forty-five and seventy billion dollars of war work. The war goods manufacturers are at this time totally unprepared and know not

how grave is the problem that faces them on "cancelation day."

B. The contractors who have successfully completed their war contracts and have realized a reasonable or substantial profit are likewise faced with the problem of settling with the Government by way of renegotiation the realized profits which the Government claims are excessive. Thousands of contractors are today unprepared to negotiate with the Government agencies as to their just share of realizable profit or on how to best protect themselves in meeting the post-war reconversion problem, and at the same time pay the Government a large excess-profits tax after returning to the Government a substantial share of the realized profits from war contracts.

C. Few people are aware of the fact that as of November 1943 contract terminations in dollar value have already exceeded that of the total amount involved in terminations experienced at the end of World War No. 1, when 27,000 contracts, amounting to $7,500,000,000, were canceled.

IV. CONGRESS AND TAXES

A. Briefly, here is the picture. The United States Treasurer wants $10,500,000,000 more in revenue to help finance the war costs of $8,000,000,000 a month and help curb inflation. Industry, on the other hand, is faced with more than $50,000,000,000 of war contract cancelations and $20,000,000,000 of contract renegotiations. They also owe the Government a large amount of excess-profit taxes and to the R. F. C. and their individual banks billions of dollars in notes payable on long- and short-term loans, while at the same time they are faced with termination of contracts and untold difficulties during the period of reconversion and readjustment.

B. The Nation's responsible leaders, both in and out of government, recognize this dilemma. Congress, therefore, refuses to provide the revenue demanded by the Treasurer, and industrial leaders who have until now held ranking positions in the Government as civilian experts in the several war agencies are today quitting their jobs and returning to their companies in order to lay plans to meet the great problem of sudden contract cancelation and to help reconvert their plants for the production of civilian goods when peace comes.

V. AN APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

A. Two steps are now being considered by the Government to meet the unexpected onslaught of terminations:

1. To provide a standard form for contract cancelation.

2. To finance the war contractor to the extent of 75 percent of the claims that he may have against the Government, in the event his war contract is canceled, before final adjustment.

B. While it is true that the responsible governmental agencies and the War and Navy Departments are anxious to settle the claims in both renegotiation and contract cancelation at the earliest possible date, it must be recognized that the problem is so great, so involved, and in many instances so confused as a result of the millions of subcontracts, that the task of meeting this confronting emergency is replete with many practical difficulties.

C. There are Federal agencies and some manufacturers who appreciate or understand the steps that must be taken to accomplish the desired settlements without too much loss of time. The legal, accounting, and engineering professions will, in my opinion, be the agencies that will be called upon to help meet this great national contingency.

VI. THE PICTURE IN BRIEF

A. To summarize: The Nation today is faced with:

1. A possible runaway inflation due to lack of understanding on the part of certain Government officials, politicians, certain labor leaders and misinformed business leaders of the great disaster that may overtake all of us if proper steps are not taken at once by the adoption of:

(a) A sound and effective tax program to apply to all classes of taxpayers.

(b) An enforced ceiling on wages and on prices of consumer goods and foodstuffs.

(c) A compulsory savings program of not less than 10 and not more than 20 percent of gross income in Government bonds; and

(d) Public exposure of all pressure groups who are doing their utmost to influence Congress and Government to gain selfishly in the Nation's most critical period in history by price and wage increases.

2. A realistic and practical approach to meet war contract termination by adopting a program such as—

(a) Accepting a certified and sworn-to statement under penalty from the contractor of—

(1) The contractor's actual investment of—

(a) War goods actually finished.

(b) Work in process of completion on the day of cancelation notice.

(c) Unused inventory in connection with his war contract.

(d) Required pay roll for a period of 1 month in order to give reasonable notice of termination to his employees and protect himself at the same time from expending his working capital on pay roll, which might bankrupt him.

(e) A statement of his liabilities, resulting from his war contracts, to Government agencies and banks.

(f) His claim of profit that he might have realized if the contract had been completed in full and on his share of profit for the part which is only partially completed, and a presentation of figures to prove an overall profit or loss on the basis of the condition of the contract at the time of termination.

(g) An advance of 90 percent of the claim as certified without interest.

3. To provide a more workable machinery for contract renegotiation by establishing a program such as—

(a) Release of payment of 75 percent to the contractor of all his claims before renegotiation.

(b) Provide the Government with an accurate picture of the company's operations since 1936 to the date of renegotiation of the contract under consideration.

(c) Establish a system of regional renegotiation agencies or boards that will relieve the burden of the responsible war agencies who are now operating out of Washington and in two or three other key centers in the United States.

(d) The Government to adopt a more uniform policy with regard to percentage of profit, minimum or maximum, allowed to certain industries on their war contracts by consulting and by placing competent industrialists or businessmen on renegotiation boards in the newly established regions.

VII. CONCLUSION

A. While it is recognized that this war is far from won and that the task of providing the necessary war equipment for our armies and navies for at least 1 or more years is still a big factor, nevertheless the rapidly changing picture from week to week and the fear that is overtaking American business at this moment due to possible contract cancelations and the processes of reconversion calls for the establishing of machinery that will meet every possible contingency by the adoption of a program of demobilization of industry as well as manpower and for the reconversion of war plants to peacetime needs, and by settling of claims against the Government which otherwise would take 10 years or more to achieve on the basis of existing procedures and processes. To that end it behooves Government and business and the leaders of labor to work together and to prepare the Nation not only for V day, the day of victory, but also for C day, the day of wholesale cancelation of war contracts with an effective program for action on termination, reconversion, and demobilization of war plants and war workers.

Bonneville Takes a Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Oregon Journal of December 12, 1943:

BONNEVILLE TAKES A BOW

(By W. O. Silverthorn, Bonneville Public Relations Staff)

With the flick of a switch in the big powerhouse at Bonneville Dam, day after tomorrow, another 74,000 additional horsepower from the Columbia's mighty flow will be harnessed at the dam—and the occasion will mark, too, the tying in of the tenth and final generating unit, and completion of the 10-year program of construction at Bonneville.

The new load of power to be cut in Tuesday will step up the power capacity of Bonneville Dam from 464,400 kilowatts to 518,400 kilowatts, every bit of it needed by power-hungry war industries.

Known officially to United States engineers as improvement of Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg., the project was started in September 1933, in the depths of the depression, under provisions of the National Recovery Act. The greatest significance of the project at that time, in the minds of many, was that it provided desperately needed jobs. Conditions were just the reverse of those of today. Now industries are crying for more and more workers to man plants using Bonneville power. So Bonneville, which provided hundreds of jobs in depression days, is indirectly the source of thousands of new jobs today.

The war has speeded things up but this trend of job creation and multiplication is no mere accident. The engineers, who have watched the dam grow from the blueprint stage, will tell you that it is all a part of the plan for improvement of the Columbia River. There is much more to come.

Bonneville Dam consists of two main parts, the spillway dam between the Washington shore and Bradford Island, and the powerhouse and navigation lock between the south side of Bradford Island and the Oregon shore. Of the total cost of the dam, $81,366,000 in round figures, the powerhouse and navigation facilities account for $44,844,414, while the spillway, fishways, and other features cost $36,541,584. Approximately 48 percent of the project's total cost is for power facilities, now complete and ready for full capacity operation.

EMPHASIS AT PRESENT IS ON POWER

To the people of the Pacific Northwest, Bonneville means more than the sound financial investment it is proving to be;

something more even than its contribution to the United Nations in the war. It is the symbol of industrial development and the promise of future industrial expansion with the aid of abundant cheap power. Also important is improved navigation, but for the duration, at least, the emphasis is on power—power to operate aluminum plants, power to build and launch ships, and to make innumerable things that are needed in the war effort.

The ninth generating unit was turned on the line last September, boosting Bonneville's rated capacity to 464,400 kilowatts. This power is thrown on the same transmission circuit that carries power generated at Grand Coulee Dam, and that produced by the steam plants of the private power utilities. The comparatively small private power units do "pinch hitting" in periods of peak power demand.

The first power unit at Bonneville was completed June 6, 1938. That was unit No. 2. Unit No. 1 followed July 18 of the same year, and unit No. 3 was not completed until January 9, 1941, unit No. 4 preceding it in 1940 on December 23. The other units followed in order: Unit 5, September 5, 1941; unit 6, May 18, 1942; unit 7, March 31, 1943; and unit 8, June 15, 1943.

With oil and other fuels on the scarcity list this winter, completion of the final generating unit at this time is especially timely as it will relieve the power plants of the private utilities of a large part of this added burden imposed by wartime conditions. It will also make it possible to turn other units for repairs and maintenance work without seriously curtailing the power supply.

As viewed by United States engineers, the improvement of Columbia River at Bonneville is only one step in a comprehensive plan looking 100 years into the future. They already are deep in the study of the next step—the Umatilla Dam. This project, estimated to cost $49,470,000, would provide 600,000 kilowatts additional power and extend commercial navigation on the Columbia to the mouth of the Snake River. The long-range plan calls for a commercial waterway on up the Snake as far as Lewiston, Idaho, and the program involves construction of several dams on the upper Snake. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee has approved the Umatilla Dam project.

BONNEVILLE STARTED IN SEPTEMBER 1933

But while these things yet to come are stimulating to the imagination, a glance backward at what has been accomplished at Bonneville, and how it was done, might also be of interest.

Bonneville Dam was planned and built by the United States engineers and is operated by the Portland district, of which Lt. Col. Ralph A. Tudor is the district engineer in charge. When the project was started in September 1933, Col. C. F. Williams was district engineer and Thomas M. Robins, now a major general and deputy chief of engineers in Washington, D. C., was division engineer in Portland. General Robins saw the first turning over of the ninth power unit at Bonneville September 3 of this year, just before it went on the line September 15.

Henry J. Kaiser, not so well known then as he is now, was president of the Columbia Construction Co., which received the contract to construct the spillway dam. This was the most spectacular part of the job, and involved the building of a cofferdam to unwater the main channel of the Columbia in order to build the spillway on solid dry foundation.

Three contracts were let for construction of the powerhouse. The first went to General Construction Co., Seattle, and J. F. Shea, Inc., Portland. This included the foundations and substructure. The second contract, for the next unit of the superstructure was awarded to L. H. Hoffman, Portland, and the third, calling for the powerhouse addition, went to Puget Construction Co., Seattle. General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y., received the contract for furnishing all generators, and S. Morgan Smith Co., York, Pa., furnished the turbines.

The unwatering of the south channel of the Columbia, between Bradford Island and the Oregon shore, was undertaken first to start excavation for the powerhouse foundations. Two earth-fill dams were built, one upstream and the other downstream from the powerhouse site. The contractors went down as far as 139 feet, or 84 feet below sea level, in some places before striking the right material for a solid foundation. The average depth was 115 feet, or 60 feet below sea level. This part of the channel was kept dry for nearly 2 years while the powerhouse was being constructed. Later, when the foundations and substructure were in, the river was permitted to flow through the powerhouse substructure while the main channel was being diverted. The earth-fill dams were removed by dredges in a simple operation.

CONSTRUCTION JOB WAS COMPLICATED

Unwatering of the north or main channel was more complicated. Never had a dam been constructed before in any river where water flowed with such velocity and in such volume. The problem was solved by the use of wooden cribs which were floated out into the river, filled with rock trucked out on a trestle, and then sunk at the proper position. The cribs were cubicle in shape, 60 by 60 by 60 feet, and tailored to the contour of the river bottom as the bed tapered off to the shore line. Huge 3-inch cables held the giant cribs in place as they were filled with rock and sunk in position. The cables were strong enough to withstand a 1,000,000-pound pull.

There were 21 cribs in the cofferdam, 7 upstream, 6 in the middle, and 8 downstream. When all the cribs were in place steel interlocking piling was placed around them to make the cofferdam as nearly watertight as possible. It was not practical to try to keep water out during the flood season of the year, however, and work was temporarily halted during the high water crest while a steady flow poured over the cofferdam. The passing of water over the cribs caused no material damage, although the water that year was one of the highest flood marks on record in recent years.

The work had been plotted so that no delay was occasioned in the construction schedule during high water. Other parts of the project were advanced in the interim and no man-hours of work were lost. Pumps were put to work when the flood season subsided to the point where it was again practical to resume construction of the spillway within the protecting enclosure of the cofferdam.

Many of the intricate engineering problems at Bonneville were worked out with hydraulic models. J. C. Stevens, Portland consulting engineer, conducted a special study on models in a laboratory built at Government moorings, near Linnton. All essential features of the dam, powerhouse, locks, and accessory structures were studied in detail with miniature replicas of the project. The studies started early in 1934.

Bonneville is said to have been one of the first projects of such magnitude planned and constructed by hydraulics model studies, a comparatively recent development which has progressed parallel to the development of aeronautics. Principles of aeronautics and those of hydraulics are similar, each dealing with fluid flow. The use of models, engineers say helped to reduce costs and speed construction while assuring greater efficiency.

One important study with the models was that of scour prevention—seeking to prevent or minimize the washing away of the ground formation in the river bed below the spillway and jeopardizing the safety of the dam. Scour also would absorb the energy of the overflow. Baffles, or jutting concrete protuberances, were used to break up the flow of water and dissipate the energy. The models were, of course, precise replicas as to dimensions, flow, velocity, time, and forces of the dam itself, all proportioned by the laws of similitude. Thus, it could be assumed that the miniature would behave in all respects as the actual spillway dam.

It was possible in these experiments to produce flood cycles in accordance with experience as shown in records in anticipation of future floods. In this manner cycles which covered a period of many months were reproduced in miniature in a few hours. Floods were anticipated greatly in excess of any on record, including the greatest flood of all recorded time in 1894.

Numerous articles have been published in technical journals on the subject of these model studies. Engineer Stecens prepared a three-volume report covering the experiments in detail with charts and illustrations. The hydraulic laboratory has been moved to Bonneville and will be used to work out similar problems in connection with the Umatilla Dam.

When President Roosevelt visited Bonneville Dam August 3, 1934, he spoke prophetic words, "More power to you," he greeted his audience. It is my belief that there will not be enough power for a long time to come.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT STRESSES NAVIGATION

The President spoke also of the need for improved navigation on the Columbia and on up the Snake River. He said he favored improvements which would make it possible for barges to pass into the upper reaches of the two rivers in Washington and Idaho, into the great wheat country. But he placed the greater emphasis on power—"power and more power," that would stem from Bonneville and Grand Coulee. The latter was then in its early construction stage.

Despite the President's enthusiasm for power, it is doubtful if even he really hoped for the realization of his dream in so short a time. Those with lesser vision thought the Bonneville-Grand Coulee power program fantastic. They were not able to visualize great aluminum plants dotting the Pacific Northwest, much less conceive the picture of an industrialized Portland area with six shipyards launching new ships daily in the Willamette and Columbia.

None could predict Portland's 150,000 increase in population by reason of new war industries attracted by abundant power. And now that these newcomers are here it is vital to find permanent employment for them. "Power and more power," in the words of the President, is still the slogan. It is a goal, together with navigation, irrigation, and flood control toward which the United States engineers still are working.

Bonneville's 10 generators came from Schenectady, N. Y., where they were manufactured by the General Electric Co. The huge machines had to be shipped in sections.

Each of the generators cost about $750,000 and required about 1 year to build after the various materials for it were obtained. Another 5 or 6 months were required to install each machine.

POST-WAR PROGRAM IS ELABORATE

All 10 generators in the Bonneville plant were installed under the supervision of General Electric construction engineers. Each machine was thoroughly tested under load conditions before it was turned over to the War Department United States engineers.

Approximately $72,000,000 had been invested in the Bonneville-Grand Coulee transmission network as of July 31, 1943. This included approximately $39,000,000 in construction work in progress. Because of the necessity of curtailing all construction to

projects essential to the war effort, no money has been budgeted for further expansion. A budget reserve of $26,000,000 is available for the post-war continuance of Bonneville's peacetime program.

A preliminary post-war construction program, including approximately 35 individual projects that could be included under this $26,000,000 has been outlined by Bonneville engineers. This backlog represents about 35,000 man-months of labor and expenditure of at least $15,000,000 for equipment and materials. More than $25,000,000 more will have to be spent following the war on Bonneville's huge network of transmission lines if Congress appropriates funds for additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam and for construction of Umatilla Dam or other Northwest power plants.

Combined power generation at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams now is running consistently over 1,000,000 kilowatts. Present peak-power demand of 1,249,000 kilowatts was reached on November 22. Industrial customers are taking approximately 800,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power, while public agencies are taking a total of approximately 43,000 kilowatts.

At present the Bonneville transmission network consists of 2,524 miles of lines and includes 1,056 miles of 230,000-volt construction, 1,103 miles of 115,000-volt construction, and 366 miles of lower-voltage lines. Total substation transformer capacity approximates two and one-half million kilovolt-amperes.

BONNEVILLE GENERATOR NO. 10

Electricity produced by this 1 generator in a year is sufficient to produce enough magnesium for 25,000,000 incendiary bombs.

The total consumption of electrical energy in the city of Portland in 1939 was 397,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The new generator will produce 475,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, or enough to supply the total needs of the city of Portland with its surrounding suburban territory.

It provides enough electrical energy in 1 day to keep a 60-watt electric bulb lighted for more than 2,400 years.

The energy generated by the new unit will produce enough aluminum in 1 day to make 12 heavy bombers or 4,300 every year; of the lighter fighter planes, it would make 42 per day or 15,300 per year.

The power of the new generator will be sufficient to create new jobs for 10,000 men in industries feasible of establishment in the Pacific Northwest.

The Reclamation Program in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the people of New Mexico are vitally concerned with the conservation of the water resources to the end that they may be put to practical use for irrigation and other beneficial purposes which will aid in the development of the State. For that reason especially there was significance in the address of Mr. Wesley R. Nelson, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation for region No. 5, before the New Mexico State Reclamation Association at Albuquerque on December 10.

Mr. Nelson's jurisdiction in reclamation matters extends to the entire State of Texas, Oklahoma, practically all of New Mexico, southern Kansas, and eastern Colorado. When his headquarters are established at Amarillo, Tex., soon after January 1 he will be in close touch with the people of this region and have opportunity to be brought into closer touch with their hopes and aspirations. For that reason his address on the reclamation program in New Mexico was of great interest to the people of my State. The outline given by Mr. Nelson of potential projects the Bureau is considering on the Rio Grande, the Pecos, and other streams is important.

Mr. Nelson is widely experienced in the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. He is a westerner, a veteran of World War No. 1, assisted in the construction of Boulder Dam, and in recent years has been chief of the Engineering Division in the Washington office of the Bureau.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address delivered by Mr. Nelson:

My mission today is to talk with you about the background of the Bureau of Reclamation in the field of irrigation and hydroelectric power production that enables it to make outstanding contributions to the prosecution of this global war. I shall outline, with particular relation to New Mexico, what the Bureau, provided with funds and manpower, is prepared to do in the post-war period to assure employment and settlement opportunities on irrigated land for a substantial number of returning servicemen. I also shall tell you something of how the regionalization plan of the Bureau is expected to operate for the advancement of water conservation and irrigation in the West.

All of us who are interested in western water resources feel at home in New Mexico—the oldest area of continuous irrigation in the United States. The Pueblo Indians were practicing irrigation here in the Rio Grande Valley when Coronado led the Spanish explorers northward over the deserts more than 400 years ago.

Modern irrigation has transformed more than half a million acres of sagebrush and desert into productive farms which constitute the backbone of the agriculture upon which your State's economy is based. The double use of water on the Rio Grande project for irrigation and for the production of hydroelectric power points the way for a wider use of electrical energy in the development of New Mexico.

The Department of the Interior, of which the Bureau of Reclamation is a part, has a particular interest in New Mexico, for it has loaned, so to speak, the Honorable John J. Dempsey, its former Under Secretary, to serve as your Governor. The New Mexico congressional delegation in Washington is effective in the field of national legislation. Senators HATCH and CHAVEZ and Representatives ANDERSON and FERNANDEZ are in the forefront of the advocates of Reclamation. The influence of these gentlemen has been an important factor in concentrating western thought on the national irrigation policy.

Under this policy, which was energized by the Reclamation Act of 1902, the Bureau of Reclamation in 1943 provided irrigation service for about 4,000,000 acres of productive land in 15 western States. The output of this acreage assures increased quantities of food, which General Marshall, the Army Chief of Staff, declares to be a critical war material. Increased production of commodities like beans and potatoes, and alfalfa for livestock feed, has been made possible by the water storage facilities of Federal reclamation projects, which assure adequate irrigation supplies.

In the field of hydroelectric power, the Bureau is making equally vital contributions. Since 1941 it has more than doubled the installed capacity of its plants. Today the output of its generators, rated at more than 2,000,000 kilowatts, is driving the wheels of war industries producing the magnesium, aluminum, airplanes, and ships which are making powerful the war sinews of the United Nations.

Two outstanding reclamation developments in New Mexico have a high place in the Bureau's war record. These projects are the Carlsbad project in Eddy, Guadalupe, and De Baca Counties, and the Elephant Butte district of the Rio Grande project in Socorro, Sierra, and Dona Ana Counties. In addition to the wide variety of foods, the long-staple cotton these projects produce is an all-important war commodity.

The Elephant Butte power plant, which began operating in 1940, is serving war, industrial, and military loads in New Mexico and Texas. When peace comes it will offer low-cost energy for the development of your mineral resources, the operation of processing plants, for rural electrification, and the normal residential and commercial uses.

Irrigation construction on the Tucumcari project and on more than 15 other Bureau projects was halted last fall despite our representations that the Nation must look to irrigated land in the West for increased supplies of potatoes, beans, and livestock forage. The Bureau held itself in readiness to resume, as soon as the green light should be given, the construction on projects where work had been stopped. Early this year a program was submitted under which irrigation service could have been extended to more than 2,000,000 additional acres by 1945 if funds, materials, and manpower were provided promptly. So far, clearances have been given for work on 15 projects which will enable us by 1946 to extend irrigation service to nearly a million acres.

The Tucumcari project was called to the attention of the War Food Administration, which has the responsibility for passing on and recommending to the War Production Board irrigation projects proposed for construction during the war. This agency recommended the project to the W. P. B., the final authority in these matters, but the Board was not satisfied with the Tucumcari plan and denied clearance. We are submitting a revised plan and are urging that materials and manpower be allotted.

The War Food Administration has before it a proposal to construct the Fort Sumner project in De Baca County to provide supplemental water from the Pecos River for 5,000 acres of productive land now inadequately irrigated. This project may go before the War Production Board shortly.

I am indeed hopeful that the Bureau will be permitted to complete the irrigation systems on these two projects to the end that New Mexico water may make even greater contributions to the prosecution of the war.

In the event, however, that we cannot complete the Tucumcari and Fort Sumner developments as war measures, both will be high on the list of projects scheduled for early post-war construction. While the Bureau has concentrated its activities on producing more power and food for war, it is mindful too of its obligation to be prepared with a post-war public works program. We have been developing a shelf of projects that will provide employment for demobilized servicemen and also will offer them opportunities for permanent settlement on irrigated land suitable for themselves and their families.

I am sure you will agree that our returning servicemen deserve opportunities not only to become self-sustaining but to maintain

standards of living worthy of the men who have fought their country's battle.

Recent estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that more than 33,000 sons of New Mexico will be released from the armed forces when peace is declared. This total is about 24 percent of the number of persons employed in your State in 1940. In addition many men, now working in emergency industries at distant points, will want to return here.

You are entitled to ask what the Bureau of Reclamation can do in the way of providing employment on public works for these men—employment which at the same time will aid in the stabilization of the agriculture and livestock operations upon which the continuing development of your State depends. To the extent permitted by funds for investigations and surveys, we have moved to inventory the irrigation and power possibilities of New Mexico, and to spot the feasible projects which will serve not as emergency or stopgap construction but will assure permanent settlement benefits.

The place New Mexico will assume in this picture will depend in no small measure on your concentration of thought and action, in a united front, on translating into reality the water conservation possibilities of your State. It is the job of such organizations as the State reclamation association to crystallize public thinking in behalf of comprehensive practical plans for maximum irrigation and power production to further your agricultural and industrial development. These uses, when possible, should be combined with flood control to protect life and property, and with soil conservation to continue the fertility of your land. The building of dams for the storage of water and silt, the drainage of lands and conservation of soils, the stabilization of stream channels, and the control of water-consuming plants are some of the means we must employ.

Bureau of Reclamation engineers estimate that the area presently irrigated in New Mexico—540,000 acres—could almost be doubled if every drop of water were utilized and the proposed water-importation projects were built. The Bureau's estimate that an additional 430,000 acres can be irrigated is approximately the same as that made by the National Resources Planning Board in its 1934 report.

From the standpoint of power, the opportunity for expansion merits attention. The present hydroelectric development in the State is confined almost entirely to the plant at Elephant Butte Dam which has 24,300 kilowatts of installed capacity. A few small plants are located elsewhere in the State. The Federal Power Commission estimates that the potential water power available 90 percent of the time is 56,000 kilowatts, with possible installations totaling 124,000 kilowatts which would be available 50 percent of the time. This would represent at least a 100-percent increase in hydro capacity.

The power developments of the Bureau have come about through the recognition of the value of multiple-purpose projects to assure the double use of water for irrigation and to insure the widest possible use of hydroelectric energy. Aside from the war factor, power is a long-run peacetime aid to the development of the West. Just as the Elephant Butte plant is providing low cost energy for the Rio Grande Valley, other potential power developments can make essential contributions, as I have explained, to the recovery of your mineral resources, the operation of processing plants, rural electrification, and other residential and commercial needs.

The Rio Grande development by the Bureau is an excellent example of a multiple-purpose project. Elephant Butte Dam stores water for irrigation and power development. Caballo Dam, downstream, makes possible the firming of power at the Elephant Butte plant and provides flood control. Electrical energy is made available to the consumers at a reasonable rate and the revenues will pay the major part of the construction costs of Elephant Butte Dam, thus lightening the burden on irrigation water users.

The future expansion of irrigation in New Mexico is closely linked with the multiple use of water in the same sense that the expansion—and even the maintenance—of your agriculture is dependent on irrigation.

This latter observation is confirmed by the fact that about 75 percent of your agricultural production comes from irrigated land. Of the 1,370,000 acres of cropped land in New Mexico, 540,000 acres, less than half, are irrigated. Yet the crop values from the irrigated land are more than twice those from the nonirrigated land. The average per-acre value of the irrigated crops is four to five times that of the nonirrigated land.

On the Carlsbad and Rio Grande reclamation projects the average crop values per acre are nearly 10 times the average of the dry lands in the State. This exceptional showing is due to the storage facilities which assure a regulated supply of water in the growing season. The Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs in New Mexico provide 2,834,000, or 87 percent, of the storage for irrigation in the State. Through this storage the Bureau projects in New Mexico, embracing less than one-tenth of the irrigated acreage in the State, produce more than 25 percent of the total crop values.

The Bureau of Reclamation takes pride in the part it has played in the expansion of irrigation in New Mexico since the turn of the century. Its plans for the future envisage an even greater participation in programs that comprehend the conservation and economic use of every drop of water available to the people of this State.

For the post-war program, the Bureau has under consideration 11 projects and also some miscellaneous construction. At prewar or 1940 prices, the total cost involved in the potential program exceeds $46,000,000. The projects listed are:

Alamagordo Reservoir enlargement for greater flood and silt control and improved regulation of the Pecos River.

Black Mesa for irrigation on the Cimarron River near Clayton.

Capulin for irrigation on the Cimarron near Folsom.

Cliff Reservoir to furnish supplemental irrigation and power on the Gila in western New Mexico.

Hammond for irrigation on the San Juan River.

Middle Rio Grande for flood and silt control and for the protection of irrigated land.

Mora River for supplemental irrigation supplies on the Mora River.

San Juan-Chama diversion, Navajo, Willow, and Rio Blanco River for power production and river regulation to aid irrigation.

Shiprock for irrigation south of Shiprock by utilizing the flow of the San Juan River.

Springer for supplemental irrigation on the South Canadian River.

Ute Creek for irrigation on Ute Creek, a tributary of the Cimarron River.

Tucumcari and Fort Sumner also will be included if we are not permitted to build them during the war. Another project in the post-war program whose construction will benefit New Mexico is the Wagon Wheel Cap Dam of the San Luis Valley project in southern Colorado, which will improve the control of the headwaters of the Rio Grande.

In noting these projects as potentialities for inclusion in the post-war program, I am well aware of the explosive character of some of the proposals. The Bureau of Reclamation can and will provide its services to the extent permitted by the Congress and acceptable to the people of New Mexico, but that is not enough. Many of these projects never will be brought to fruition unless those who are to be benefited by them will make an extraordinary effort to settle their differences.

By current standards of economic feasibility of irrigation projects, which is based on the ability of the water users to repay the entire cost of construction, few of the undertakings can qualify. These projects will provide employment, conserve your water and land resources, stabilize the livestock operations through providing supplemental feed, and assure a permanent means for a decent livelihood for a considerable number of families. With full recognition of these contributions to the national welfare, consideration may be given to modification of the present standards. Of course, where there are flood-control benefits, the traditional policy of the Federal Government recognizes the national considerations and provides nonreimbursable funds for construction. Irrigation is not so favored, and power developments, too, must pay their own way. The far-reaching importance of some of the projects, like the Middle Rio Grande improvement, is recognized, and we are seeking down-to-earth facts as to the physical situation and other factors as the basis for a comprehensive report, which I hope will be available in a few months.

The projects which I have listed, together with miscellaneous construction, will utilize less than half of the unused waters that can be made available in New Mexico. It is only a start, so to speak, and it will be my duty as reclamation director for region 5 to uncover additional potential irrigation and multiple-purpose water developments and coordinate construction activities when the projects are authorized and funds are provided for the work.

Slovaks Buy $11,386,700 in War Bonds To Top $6,000,000 Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hammond (Ind.) Times of December 15, 1943:

SLOVAKS BUY $11,386,700 IN WAR BONDS TO TOP $6,000,000 GOAL

The Reverend John J. Lach, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church of Whiting, Ind., and National War bond chairman for the Slovaks of America, announced today that the Slovaks went over the top in their Nation-wide drive by purchasing $11,386,700 in war certificates to top the $6,000,000 goal in the Third War Loan campaign.

The drive closed last Armistice Day, but it was not until yesterday that final tabulation was made from practically every city in the United States. * * *

In recognition of his leadership and success in directing the bond sales, the distinguished service of Reverend Lach was hailed by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, in citing the Whiting priest and presenting him with a Minute Man citation.

Another citation was presented the priest by Wm. C. FitzGibbon, chief of the United Nationalities section. It read:

"In token of appreciation for distinguished services rendered on behalf of the war savings program, it is my pleasure to present to you

the United States Treasury Department's citation of award.

"While this citation is for outstanding patriotic work well done, it also serves as a commission for you to lead the Slovaks of America in a crusade to support the Treasury Department's Fourth War Loan drive which starts January 18, 1944."

Father Lach said that the success of the campaign resulted from a carefully laid-out program that was studied for 3 months before a contact was made on a Slovak in the country to make a purchase.

First, approval was obtained from the United States Treasury, Henry J. Morgenthau, Secretary, and William C. FitzGibbon, chief of the United Nationalities Section of the War Finance Division, Washington, D. C.

Father Lach was chosen to lead the campaign by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. F. J. Dubosh, president of the Slovak League of America, Cleveland, Ohio.

The chairman explained that the money is to be used for the construction of Liberty ships, Father Lach stated:

"When a small racial group of American citizens responds to an appeal by our Government for war funds by oversubscribing its quota, it is an exhibition of good citizenship and loyalty. When its quota is exceeded it demonstrates an eager desire to support the Government in its war effort. When the quota is oversubscribed to the splendid extent of 90 percent, it is a striking evidence of patriotic generosity.

"Meanwhile," the priest continued, "let me congratulate my fellow workers upon the happy result of their labors in the recent drive. I wish to thank them all in the name of the American Slovak War Bond Committee for their invaluable zeal and persistence in bringing home the facts of the Nation's need to every adult Slovak, and also to the children of Slovak families who responded as freely in the purchase of War Savings stamps as the enthusiastic youngsters of larger racial groups. Our Slovak workers could not have been more faithful and loyal than they were throughout the period of the drive. From the bottom of my heart I thank them, as well as the many citizens of other races who assisted us by voice and pen in the sale of bonds."

* * * * *

Tribute was paid to the Slovak-Americans serving in the various branches of the armed forces and the young women in the WAVES, WACS, and other auxiliary branches.

The Week's News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address by Mr. Leon Henderson, delivered over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., on the evening of December 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The news this week struck clear notes of harmony and harsh notes of discord.

President Roosevelt returning from Europe and Africa brings with him the highest confidence in unity to date between Russia, China, Great Britain, and the United States. Every scrap of official and byproduct news of the great conferences testifies to the unity achieved in the leadership of the United Nations.

But President Roosevelt returns to a Nation in which signs of discord and disunity are so evident that they cannot be ignored. To home front leaders, Charlie Wilson of W. P. B. and Speaker RAYBURN of the House of Representatives did not ignore these signs. Without the slightest collaboration, as far as I can discover, Wilson and RAYBURN warned the country that these growing divisions might bring enormous harm to a Nation that needs harmony and understanding for the days ahead.

Charlie Wilson and SAM RAYBURN, as I have come to know them over a period of years, are not professional alarmists. Neither man speaks publicly unless he feels overwhelmingly the necessity for speaking. So what they say is news and should be measured against the hopes of a peace-seeking world.

Let's not deceive ourselves. President Roosevelt was making commitments for us at Cairo and Teheran—military and diplomatic commitments. If the home front decays behind him, as it did behind President Wilson, then the hopes of sound and sustained peace will be weakened.

The report of the conference between Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill was strikingly different from the report of the Cairo meeting on Japan. The public announcement about Japan gave specific details, but that from Teheran gave very little that either Germany or the citizen at home could get teeth into. The Nazi rulers expected an appeal over their heads to the German people, similar to President Wilson's appeal over the head of Kaiser Wilhelm. It was known that our leaders had been urged to spell out what unconditional surrender meant for Germany and to indicate that delay meant harsher terms and wider punishment of individuals.

But no such appeal was issued, and it looks now as if the propaganda value of this decision was high. Perhaps the leaders agreed on a statement to come about Christmas time, after Bulgaria and Rumania have experienced the joint terror of bombings and fear of Turkey.

The big sentence in the Stalin-Roosevelt-Churchill statement to me was the one declaring that the military staffs of the three powers had agreed on the scope and timing of operations which will be undertaken from east, west, and south. That means that Stalin has accepted the logic of our invasion from England, and it must be read in connection with stepping up our production of landing boats—boats which cannot be delivered for a few months. Hitler and the general staff must be wondering whether this means delay in invasion or whether it's a gigantic bluff in our war of nerves. I think we at home should recognize that our leaders have the initiative in psychological warfare now and that many things must be kept secret from us. I say "many things" because I'm just as sure as I'm here tonight that Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill decided many more items than their announcement covered. These will be revealed just as earlier decisions made at Casablanca and Quebec are now unfolding.

All the conferences produced high notes of unity, and I would expect the President to emphasize them soon. Perhaps they will soften the discords at home which trouble Charlie Wilson, SAM RAYBURN, and many others whose fears are just as great.

RAYBURN, in one of his rare few speeches, had the undivided attention of the House, which has been bitterly divided for months. He spoke to all Members, and not merely to the Members of the Democratic majority which has deserted his leadership. RAYBURN said it was dangerous to talk in terms of fear of England and Russia. He scoffed at gossip that our form of government could be changed unless a majority of the people so willed it. Without bitterness, he compared the improved position of those who stay at home and complain of sacrifices with the supreme sacrifice being made by our soldiers and sailors. The Speaker at one point said, "I think some groups in this country, at the expense of unity in the war effort, are thinking more of their position after the war than they are of winning the war now."

A Democratic politician, SAM RAYBURN, and a Republican top businessman, Charlie Wilson, said almost exactly the same thing. Wilson was speaking to the National Association of Manufacturers, and said, "Too many people are trying to position themselves for the postwar period long before the country is out of danger." Wilson went further and expressed his alarm lest—and again I quote—"a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it." That would be some form of American fascism, as I analyze it.

You listeners should ask to know more about such terrific pressures falling on Congress, on the War Production Board, and other Government agencies. I know, for example, that powerful industries are demanding higher prices from top O. P. A. officials on the simple basis that political control is shifting, that the new political control when it comes will permit higher prices and bigger profits, so why not do it now.

There are two dominant ideas which influence the individuals and groups who alarm men like Wilson and others in the top drawer of responsibility. First, there is the feeling that the war is already won, and therefore it is smart to scramble for post-war advantages, or to find ways to protect war gains. Second, there is the feeling that the political drift to the right will continue, and next fall there will be an entirely new set of political controllers. So the scrambling and gambling for post-war business and political power is cutting across all established lines of control and discipline—ideas of disciplining labor and paying off old scores are cropping up. Some of the evidences are just plain ugly and some are just the interplay of selfish forces seeking to beat the gun. That's why I am pessimistic about a quick reconversion from war to peace, with reasonably full employment. All the major problems involve intense conflicts of policy and conflicts of power groupings. All questions must run the gantlet of Congress, and with 1944 electioneering already started, every question is knee-deep in politics, and will be chin-deep later. Good sound economic policies will be hard to get.

The inflation fight provides a preview of conflicts to come. Do you suppose for one minute that those four Senators who voted against the railway wage resolution are the only Senators who know the dangers involved?

The food subsidy fight in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was melodramatic at times. Walter Reuther, representing the auto workers' union, charged that several big food concerns combined with the farm bloc to use their political power for higher prices. Reuther named General Foods, Swift & Co., California Packing Corporation, Heinz, the Borden Co., Pillsbury Flour, and National Biscuit. So far I've seen no denial. Another high spot was the campaign conducted by housewives and veterans to convince Congressmen that higher food prices would be disastrous.

As it stands, there is strong sentiment for some kind of a compromise on subsidies. An

amendment will be offered to limit the amount of money to less than O. P. A. Administrator Bowles feels necessary, and to tie this amount to a ceiling on wages. There is difference of opinion about wage control. Some wish to fix the law so that if the Little Steel formula is broken, all food subsidies are canceled. Others favor letting wages go up when the cost of living goes up, as Canada does. Canada, by the way, has just forbidden any other wage increases except for gross injustice, and even in cases of gross injustice, wages cannot be raised unless the employer can pay it without raising prices.

If the antisubsidy bill passes, several powerful labor leaders and some advisors to the President will urge him not to veto the bill, but to let it become law and fix the responsibility on Congress. This would be a hot potato for Congress, which already has several flaming timbers in its lap right now.

One is the soldiers' vote bill, which raised such a ruckus in the Senate that it split the Democratic party right down the center, with the line drawn almost parallel to the Mason-Dixon line. The Republicans in the Senate joined with the poll-tax southerners to preserve States' rights. But over in the House the Republicans are worrying as to whether it's good strategy. Some Republicans question the value of following the leadership of Democratic Congressman RANKIN. They might be misunderstood, because RANKIN'S name is sometimes associated with antagonism to Wendell Willkie, the utility companies, the Negro voters, and the Jewish vote.

All Congressmen are beginning to find out that most soldiers, sailors, and marines have two parents of voting age. The mail urging Federal Government supervision of balloting is increasing, even from Texas, the home State of Congressman WORLEY, who is sponsoring the Green-Lucas bill in the House.

The labor organizations have indicated their strong support of the Green-Lucas-Worley bill, but the Congressmen wish they knew the position of the veterans' organizations. So far the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have not been active.

Certainly it looks to me as if more soldiers and sailors would have the privilege of voting if special arrangements were made. In the 1942 fall elections, only 28,000 voted out of 7,500,000 in service.

I said that the labor organizations were supporting the soldier vote bill. The Senate vote gave the new C. I. O. political action committee a chance to show itself. This committee is under the direction of Sidney Hillman and it's becoming more and more evident that the political action committee does not expect to be a stepchild of any major party. It is well financed, and Hillman is attracting competent assistants. Last week former Congressman Ray McKeough joined the organization.

Hillman's endorsement of the soldier vote is a smart bid for young voters. It is also a plain indication that the new organization will have a full-fledged political program of its own by the time the major parties hold their conventions next year.

Most of you know of the difficulties with plane production at the Brewster Co. There is another sensational case now being heard by a Federal grand jury. It's the case of the Empire Ordnance Co., and the charges of bribery and collusion involve officers of the company, War Department officials, and nationally known politicians. Some angles of the case are worse than Brewster, and I've heard nasty stories of pressure to prevent the case ever coming to trial.

I believe that when the full story is told of the buying of billions of dollars of war goods, we shall be proud that there were so few cases of fraud or failure.

Reasons for a Simplified Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered today over the National Broadcasting System, giving my reasons in support of a simplified monetary system based on the coinage of gold and silver:

In view of the proposal of the financiers of this country to use, throughout the world, paper credit tokens as money, I should like to discuss with you briefly my reasons for enthusiastically supporting a simplified monetary system based on the coinage of gold and silver.

The experience of the ages has demonstrated that there is no safe substitute for gold and silver money and redeemable paper currency. When the Revolutionary War was won and the Government of the United States of America was established, it was necessary to adopt a monetary unit and establish a monetary system so that taxes might be levied and Government expenses and salaries might be fixed in terms of money. To meet this requirement Congress provided that a given weight of gold and a given weight of silver of standard fineness should constitute a dollar and established the dollar as the unit of the Nation's monetary system. A dollar measured in the metric system is comprised of 100 cents—10 cents, 1 dime; and 10 dimes, 1 dollar. The dollar is the unit of measure of all monetary values in this country.

To do this the Congress by an act approved April 2, 1792, establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States, made 27 grains of standard gold and 416 grains of standard silver the dollar and made both gold and silver dollars full legal tender in payment of all sums.

The weight and ratio of gold and silver dollars was subsequently altered. In an act approved June 28, 1834, 25$\frac{8}{10}$ grains of standard gold were made the dollar, and later an act of Congress approved July 18, 1837, made 412½ grains of standard silver the dollar. That is to say, we established the ratio of 16 to 1 between gold and silver, the ratio that was maintained until the gold contents of the dollar were changed in 1934 to 15$\frac{21}{100}$ grains. Both gold and silver dollars were made legal tender, and both public and private business were conducted with this kind of money.

The Nation's money supply was continually increased by the minting of both gold and silver into money as quickly as it was brought to the mints by the miners. In minting gold, the miner was charged for the actual cost of refining the metal and for the copper alloy, which was added to the coin struck from the gold he brought to the mint. The minted coins, in turn, were delivered back to the miner to be put into circulation as he saw fit in making his expenditures.

To mint silver, the plan of exchange between the Treasury and the producer was on a slightly different basis. The mint accepted pure silver from the miner in exchange for an equal weight of coined silver dollars. Each standard silver dollar contains 412½ grains of standard silver composed of 371¼ grains of pure silver and 10 percent copper alloy. In this exchange of dollars for silver, the mint kept the difference of 46¼ grains of silver, in the form of seigniorage, out of every dollar minted.

The paper currency of that day was simple promissory notes issued by banks. Such notes might be engraved to protect the makers from counterfeiting and were based on the integrity and assets of the bank issuing the note. As all banks of that period were operating under State charters, a bank's failure destroyed the value of its notes in circulation, and this soon gave rise to the public distrust of the so-called wild cat currency. The real money of the realm was gold and silver coins.

In the emergency of the Civil War, the Government financed its expenditures by the sale of Government bonds. Due to the uncertainties of war and the heavy drain on investment money, the value of Government bonds was impaired, and, as the bonds declined in value and Government expenditures increased, the administration of President Lincoln was forced to the expedient of issuing noninterest-bearing legal tender, United States Treasury Notes—commonly called greenbacks. These Treasury notes supplied the money functions and helped to finance the Government's wartime operations.

It was during this period, to be exact in 1863, that American ingenuity came into play in the financial field, and a great monetary invention, providing a national-bank paper currency in the form of national bank notes, was devised and put into operation, under the provisions of the National Bank Act of 1863. By this plan, a banking corporation could deposit $50,000 in Government bonds with the Secretary of the Treasury, with interest coupons attached, and receive in exchange the equivalent in engraved legal tender national bank notes, guaranteed as to value by the Federal Government. These national bank notes were placed in circulation as money by the banks usually at current interest rates. In addition to the interest income received on this paper currency placed in circulation by loans to bank customers, the banks also collected the interest coupons on the deposited Government bonds. This plan worked so well for the financiers and was so profitable to the banks that a sustained campaign soon developed to replace the use of specie money with interest-yielding bank note currency, and, as a result, the demonetization of silver was brought about in 1873. This change in our monetary system brought on a series of financial depressions and a political struggle that has continued from the early seventies to this day. The establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank System and the issuance of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes, which are placed in circulation by being loaned out at interest, based on short-term commercial notes, is a revision and a refinement of the national bank note monetary system.

First the American people were told that there was need for a single monetary measure—gold—and then of the advantages to be gained by the establishment of a flexible currency system—money that would expand and contract with the expansion and contraction of business—a kind of money that could be increased in volume by the issuing banks in times of business expansion—money that could be retired by the banks and go out of existence as business decreased and loans were paid. However, when the effect of economic law came into play and a financial depression overtook business, the banks were unable to perform the money-creating function and it was found necessary to devise and put into operation a new plan to finance

business. The banks, to meet this emergency and to safeguard their interest-yielding money system from being disturbed by the Government's return to a sound, stable money program, based on the coinage and use of the precious metals—gold and silver—prevailed upon the Congress to adopt a new financial expedient by the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency created to draw on the collective credit of the American people by the sale of bonds to be used by this lending agency to finance business and commerce, supplemented by a series of other intricate credit-lending schemes managed by various Government lending agencies and financed by drafts on the national credit.

With this new Government-financing program in operation, the bankers discarded the old shibboleth of the gold standard—a single metal standard measure of value—and induced the Congress to nationalize gold, making its use as money illegal and placing on the Government the custodial expense of storing the gold metal—gold that is now actually being used as money in the form of gold certificates owned by the bank and held on deposit as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes upon which the Nation must depend, under the existing banking system, for its present money supply.

Many people in business and accumulating money, who don't have to borrow, seem to overlook the fact that when the only source of money is from the banks and the country is made entirely dependent upon the banks for the creation of its currency in order to have any money in circulation someone must borrow money from the banks and pay interest on a series of loans as long as the money remains in circulation, or, otherwise, there would be no money outside the banks. The only exception to this kind of money now in circulation is silver dollars and silver certificates—which is a very small part of the Nation's circulating medium. However, this is the one currency plan on which the Government has made a handsome profit by purchasing silver at current prices, revaluing the metal, and placing it in circulation as money in payment of Government expenses. Under this plan, by the Government's paying out its own money, the banks have lost a substantial interest yield that can easily be determined by calculating the interest on $2,000,000,000 a year, which is the amount of silver money in circulation.

A study of the fundamental principles of money and the provisions of economic law and a review of the financial history of our country and the influences that contributed to its development disclose the fact that this country used both gold and silver as money in the greatest period of our Nation's growth—during the period when we fought and won the War of 1812, and purchased Louisiana, then acquired Florida, took in Texas, fought and won the Mexican War, added California and the Northwest Territory to round out the family of States, bought Alaska, opened the great Mississippi River Valley with a system of railroads, and settled much of our farming land and built our cities. This was all accomplished when we had a bimetallic system of money before silver was demonetized in 1873.

In reviewing this record of our Nation's greatest period of growth, it is interesting to consider the effect the change in our monetary system from bimetallism to the single gold standard with the substitution of interest-yielding bank currency for gold and silver money has had on the national development. As we weigh the part this substitute money system and bank credit has played in draining money into vast reservoirs of investment capital—capital concentrated and available for financing gigantic industrial undertakings, capital used in the upbuilding, concentration, and control of all lines of industry, which has placed America in the forefront of all other industrial nations; capital that gave our Nation its captains of industry, its share of international financiers, its trusts and trust builders—it appears that our bankers and financiers, by creating and operating their money-making system, have transformed the United States from a land of prosperous burghers and farmers, which it was when we used a bimetallic system of money, to a nation of industrial and financial giants who have used the power of concentrated money to build for us the America of today. In order to obtain this might and force we have had to sacrifice the welfare of the common people engaged in our basic industries. Agriculture, for example, has been converted from the prosperous foundation of our national economy to a near liability, and so it is with the other three great basic industries—lumbering, mining, and fishing, and, in fact, with any enterprise outside the orbit of these industrial concentrations. And now that the financiers in control of the banking system, by securing the concession to create and circulate the Nation's money, have achieved these results in an era of unbalanced prosperity—which was largely responsible for the disastrous financial depression beginning in 1929 or even before, if we consider the condition of the farming industry and the decline of business in the farming States after the war, we must now consider what the continuation of this ascendency of banking influence will bring the Nation in the future under their plan, a plan that has been carried far beyond the limits of safety.

We find that the Government, in an effort to stabilize the national economy, has been manipulated into borrowing billions of dollars which is constantly undermining the base of our national credit. The question is, Can the American people borrow themselves back into permanent prosperity? Such a plan runs counter to the principles of economic law.

Now our financiers, led by the Secretary of the Treasury, propose to extend their financial control and the interest-gathering financial mechanisms operated for private profit to the rest of the leading nations of the world, and through these nations to all the people of the earth. In this scheme, paper credit tokens are to be used as money and manipulated to displace the monetary systems based on coinage throughout the world—coinage that has a recognized value as to its silver and gold content in all nations and by all people. Must we go through the disaster of a world financial depression to demonstrate to the people of this country that such a paper-currency scheme and interest-gathering mechanism, when substituted for money, will not work and will only bring revolution and anarchy? Can the American people escape the disastrous effects of inflation and business destruction by following these financial leaders further?

Isn't it time that we turn back from this mirage of frenzied finance and restore the tried and proven system of money used in building our Nation? Let us now, before it is too late, remonetize gold and silver and use the mighty influence of our country to secure the standardization and use of both gold and silver as money among the leading nations of the world, and thus do away with the interest yield to bankers as the price of issuing and circulating money and take away the profits on international exchange from the money changers in the temples of international trade.

Woodrow Wilson's Last Warning

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as we look toward the end of this war we are reminded of the mistake made by the United States at the close of the last war by failing to follow the far-seeing and wise leadership of Woodrow Wilson.

Woodrow Wilson's last message to the American people was an Armistice Day radio speech delivered from Washington on Armistice Day, 1923.

This speech calls attention to the tragic error which our country made in isolating itself from its allies and the rest of the world at the close of the last war, and which many now believe was one of the contributing causes of the present war.

Woodrow Wilson's speech follows:

The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit because of the proud recollection that it was our day, a day above those early days of that never-to-be-forgotten November which lifted the world to the high levels of vision and achievement upon which the great war for democracy and right was fought and won; although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered—chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace, or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

This must always be a source of deep mortification to us and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

And now, as if to furnish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion.

The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail.

Happily, the present situation in the world of affairs affords us the opportunity to retrieve the past and to render mankind the

inestimable service of proving that there is at least one great and powerful nation which can turn away from programs of self-interest and devote itself to practicing and establishing the highest ideals of disinterested service and the consistent maintenance of exalted standards of conscience and of right.

The only way in which we can worthily give proof of our appreciation of the high significance of Armistice Day is by resolving to put self-interest away and once more formulate and act upon the highest ideals and purposes of international policy.

Thus, and only thus, can we return to the true traditions of America.

No Federal Charges to Servicemen Visiting National Parks System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. Newton B. Drury, Director of our National Park Service. I desire to commend him and the authorities of the Department of the Interior for adopting a policy of not charging service people to visit our national parks. This is altogether fitting and proper.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., December 6, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: It was a pleasure to meet you at the delegation meeting, and I join with you in the hope expressed in your letter of November 24 that we may have an opportunity for a talk sometime soon on subjects of mutual interest.

It is gratifying to report to you that shortly after the initiation of selective service the Secretary of the Interior waived all Federal charges in the national park system to members of the Army and Navy in uniform. The Service is proud of the opportunity to be host to our soldiers, sailors, and marines. As you will note from the attached annual travel statement, approximately 2,000,000 members of the military branches enjoyed the benefits of the national parks and monuments last year. Also enclosed is a copy of a press release on soldier use issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

As to school children, in general no charge is made for special uses, such as guide service, etc., for children 16 years of age or under, or for groups of school children 18 years of age or under, when accompanied by adults assuming responsibility for their safety and orderly conduct. Elevator fees are the only ones assessed against children, and, as you will note from the enclosed copy of rules and regulations affecting the National Park Service, approved by the Secretary of the Interior March 19, 1941, such fees are less than those charged adults. Also enclosed is a mimeographed statement of amendments to these rules and regulations to March 31, 1943. I have no information concerning possible charges for soldiers and children at the Natural Bridge, Va., which is not under Service supervision. There is no charge at the George Washington Birthplace National Monument for children under 16 years of age, in accordance with the general regulation mentioned above.

Because of your broad interest in the scope of national park operations, I am attaching reprint of an article entitled "National Parks in Wartime," which was originally published in American Forests. I hope you may find time to read it, and that perhaps we may discuss more fully at some future dates some of the points therein emphasized.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

Washington Commandos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I wish to call attention to the following editorial taken from the Daily Argus Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. This daily newspaper is one of the great papers published in our midwest section of the United States, being the largest newspaper in five States of the northern portion of the Middle West.

Our drive for action committee is gratified that during the past few weeks Congress has been stepping into the traces with increasing authority, and we are hopeful that the days of problem dodging and delayed decisions are about over. This Republic is today pinning its hopes on the legislative branch of Congress, and we of the House of Representatives have an obligation to see that these hopes are vindicated.

The editorial follows:

WASHINGTON COMMANDOS

Much attention is being attracted throughout the country to the activities of a group of Congressmen who are determined that representative government shall not become a war casualty in America, and that remedial legislation needed at this hour shall not be neglected.

This group, now numbering 65, is pledged to prevent the habitual adjournments which have marked the congressional sessions since the legislative body reconvened in September. It is known in the Halls of Congress as the drive-for-action committee. Popularly, the group has been called the Washington Commandos, the Chetniks, and the Young Turks.

Members of the committee have pledged that although they may differ as to their voting, they will exercise every available parliamentary instrument to prevent stifling of important bills.

George Rothwell Brown, of the Los Angeles Examiner, describes the situation obtaining under the New Deal leadership as a "veritable logjam of greatly needed legislation," and calls the Rayburn-McCormack machine the "donothingest leadership this Congress has had."

South Dakota has particular interest in the activities of the Commandos because it was KARL MUNDT, of the First South Dakota District, who conceived such an organization. Conferring first with Congressman GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, the idea of such a parliamentary group was conceived early in November, and now with the blessing of Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, it has become an effective instrument with MUNDT, the originator, now one of its powerful leaders.

MUNDT's activities in the past have indicated his faith in representative government, supported by an intelligent, responsible electorate, and it is indeed pleasing to his friends of the first district to hear that his faith is being translated into action in these crucial hours.

Hon. Robert L. Doughton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of December 15, 1943:

WOULD KEEP MR. DOUGHTON IN CONGRESS

According to the Salisbury Post, one of the leading newspapers in the Ninth Congressional District, rumors have been coming out of Washington of late which hint that the Ninth's Representative in Congress is going to retire at the close of his present term.

Since the Ninth District's Representative is Congressman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, these rumors are of interest and genuine concern to the people of the whole State, and should be of considerable concern to the citizenship of the entire Nation as well. For ROBERT L. DOUGHTON is not merely a district or State figure. He is a national figure.

We hope the Salisbury paper is right when it ventures the prediction that "Farmer Bob, granted the continued good health we all hope for him, will lose every vestige of yen for retirement by campaign time, whatever daydreams of peace and quiet in some western North Carolina mountain Elysium may be intriguing him at present."

In this connection the Post recalls a neat phrase coined by Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas, in a speech in New York not long ago, when he referred to "the undying love in the hearts of politicians for reelection." The Salisbury paper then says:

"The Texan was not talking about DOUGHTON specifically; but if any man in public life has had more cause or opportunity to develop that particular affection for victory at the polls than our own Congressman, we cannot name him.

"But DOUGHTON'S periodic reelection has long since become far more than a public catering to the ambitions of a favored politician. It has been a habit in recognition of a sterling representation in Washington and in calculated realization that no successor for Mr. DOUGHTON, irrespective of his ability, could hope to command either the influential sway or respect of his predecessor for many years of introductory service.

"DOUGHTON'S value in experience, influence, and prestige has been augmented and mellowed by the passing of the years. Retentive of a vigor at 80 which is the envy of much of younger Washington, our Representative has

a unique combination of stamina and energy associated with wisdom and first-person intimacy with the inside of government during the past half century.

"Obviously he cannot represent this district in Congress until the end of time; but just as obviously he cannot be replaced even at his own request without a ponderable loss to the whole Nation as well as to his particular district.

"DOUGHTON could not retire anyway.

"If he were to quit Congress, inquiring reporters would without a doubt find him chopping wood, plowing his good mountain earth, and following the strenuous routine of a dirt farmer before he had been out of Washington a fortnight.

"Doubtless that would be more fun for him than is his present grind of governmental responsibilities, and DOUGHTON has long since earned the right to take his fun in any way he chooses.

"But since he has not taken advantage of that right until now, the present would seem a peculiarly inappropriate time to begin.

"They need DOUGHTON in Washington."

Resolution of Florence (S. C.) Junior High School History Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a sample copy of a bill introduced and passed by the Florence Junior High School history class.

I am proud of the manner in which the junior high school class in my home city has handled this important question, and I think they should be duly recognized for their exceptional fine work in civil government.

I think every high school in the United States should take at least 2 hours each week from its regular procedure to study the inner workings of our form of government. The United States Government is the largest business in the world, still we spend very little time in our schools in studying government. I venture to say that 90 percent of the people in the United States do not know the exact functions of the three separate and distinct divisions of our Government—namely, the legislative, judicial, and executive departments, each separate and distinct department working together collectively.

I am proud that the schools in my home city are setting a good example for the other schools in the Nation by spending more time in learning the procedure of our Government.

The sample copy of the bill follows:

Whereas during wartimes it seems to us necessary for girls as well as boys of 'teen age to be physically fit, we do hereby submit the following bill for consideration:

Under the Selective Service System for the duration all girls of a specified age passing required physical examination shall be drafted for military training for a period of 3 months during the summer months.

Item 1. The age specification shall be 14 to 20.

Item 2. They shall be paid $10 a month during the training period.

Item 3. The program shall be under the supervision of trained members of a branch of the women's army.

Item 4. They shall be allowed to visit the town nearest them once a week.

Item 5. Their parents shall be allowed to visit them not more than 3 days of the period.

Item 6. The camp shall be run on a purely army basis except for some few regulations which must be changed in lieu of the sex and youth of the trainees.

Item 7. They shall be allowed no leave, except for emergencies.

Item 8. There shall be entertainment of the best variety for leisure time.

Item 9. There shall be ranks from buck private to second lieutenant.

Item 10. At the successful completion of required training they shall be permitted to enter the regular women's army with the rank of staff sergeant.

Item 11. Special courses shall be offered to those desiring same, the courses to be offered to be selected according to desires of girls, subject to governmental approval.

Item 12. The first month of training shall be boot camp.

Introduced by Representative Rayburn, Democrat, Texas (James McLecd); Senator George, Democrat, Georgia (Harriett McInnes).

Passed by committee (House): Representative McMillan, Democrat, South Carolina (Charles Waters); Representative Hare, Democrat, South Carolina (Vance Loy); Representative Rivers, Democrat, South Carolina (Jean Williams).

Signed by Speaker Rayburn.

Passed by committee (Senate): Senator Maybank, Democrat, South Carolina (Billy Bagnal); Senator Claude Pepper, Democrat, Florida (Beth Yarborough); Senator Johnson, Democrat, California (Bobby McClellan).

Signed by Vice President Wallace, Democrat (David Broun).

Passed after three readings by both Houses.

Signed: Franklin Delano Roosevelt (Allan S. Tait).

NOVEMBER 19, 1943.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letters on the subject of veterans' legislation and in particular H. R. 1247, which I introduced last January:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COMMISSION OF MISSOURI,
Jefferson City, Missouri, March 1, 1943.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLOESER: This is written in the interest of H. R. 1247, introduced by you, on the subject of the readjustment and rehabilitation of veterans of the present war by the continuation of the base pay for a period of fifteen or ten months.

I am favorably inclined toward a proposal of this kind. Most certainly it should eliminate the need for any kind of a bonus payment and the plan set out is comparatively simple. I take it that the plan contemplates that if an individual has in the past received income less than the payment provided for in the bill, he shall file his "initial claim" in which he will recite that to be the fact and the first actual payment to him will not be reduced by any amount of earnings which he has received during the first month after filing his claim. In fact, the first payment is apparently not made for that month but is made for some preceding period, for when he gets his first check, the voucher which he receives will be a certification as to any income received during the past month.

In other words, in Section 2 (a), there is no requirement that he set out the amount of his income during the past period and therefore, it is to be assumed that there will be no deduction from his check equal to the amount of such income. I do not point this out as a defect in the bill but merely as an observation as to the manner in which it will operate. It, however, seems to me to be consistent that when he files his application he should recite the amount of his monthly income and that his first pay check would be reduced by that amount if the other checks are to be reduced by the amount which definitely seems to be contemplated in Section 2 (b).

The plan apparently contemplates that the application cannot be filed immediately upon release as he must recite that his monthly income is less than the amount of the monthly base pay which he has been receiving immediately prior to release. Thus, it would seem that it would be a month after his release before he could file his application.

If, on the other hand, it is contemplated that an individual may file the application before that time on the basis of a monthly rate of income which he might be receiving at the time of making the application, it is but a guess as to what his income will be for that month.

It seems to me that the bill is very sound in providing that the payments to be made shall take place within 15 or 10 months respectively, after the separation from the service. Thus definite limitation is placed on the provisions of the act without guaranteeing to anyone any certain amount of money.

On the other hand, it may be well argued that this bill will greatly encourage the growth of a powerful group of nonworkers receiving payments which are not greatly below W. P. A. payments in the days of the depression. The plan as provided in the bill contains no incentives for working unless the desires of the individual are such that payment provided falls so far short of meeting those desires that he is hereby encouraged to obtain employment. Some incentive to work might be incorporated in the bill by a provision on the same principle as our unemployment compensation provisions for partial unemployment.

It might be provided that where the income is from earnings, the amount of the check shall equal the difference between the amount of the monthly base pay and five-sixths of the earnings, or some such similar fraction. This should not unduly complicate administration and might be worth while. I note that the deduction is based on income and not from earnings. Under this, I assume that payments of practically every kind would be considered to be income. Thus a soldier who was separated and who because of disability was drawing monthly insurance payments would have to take those monthly insurance payments into consideration.

These observations are given to you very hastily and I sincerely hope that they will be of some assistance.

Very truly yours,

HARRY G. WALTNER, Jr.,
Director.

ALABAMA STATE MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
Montgomery, January 30, 1943.

Representative WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the October 17, 1942, number of the Army and Navy Register, I noticed an article regarding your introduction of a bill (H. R. 7688) in the old Congress on the subject of extending the pay of service personnel for a while after demobilization to assist them during their period of becoming readjusted to civil life and obtaining civilian occupations.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON also introduced some legislation on this subject in the old Congress, and I recently wrote him, submitting some suggestions on the subject, as well as a draft of proposed legislation on the subject drafted in my office. Since you are both interested in the same general subject and objective, I am attaching hereto a copy of my letter to Senator JOHNSON and of the proposed legislation drafted in my office.

I hope that the comments made in the attached correspondence will be of interest and assistance to you, and I shall be interested in your comments and reactions thereto.

Yours very truly,

BEN M. SMITH,
Brigadier General, A. G. D.,
The Adjutant General.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Boston, March 3, 1943.

Hon. WALTER PLOESER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PLOESER: Mr. R. T. Compton, of the National Association of Manufacturers, has called to my attention the bill which you introduced recently, H. R. 1247.

Due to a local legislative session, it has been impossible for me to give as much attention to this bill as I should like to. From a quick reading of the bill, it appears to present a dismissal wage plan. I am much impressed with the approach which you have taken to the problem, as I definitely feel that any plan of special allowances to the returned soldier should be kept separate and apart from the so-called social-security legislation.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. MARSHALL,
Director.

TEXAS UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPENSATION COMMISSION,
Austin, Tex., March 5, 1943.

Hon. WALTER PLOESER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLOESER: Mr. R. T. Compton, of the National Association of Manufacturers, was kind enough to send me a copy of H. R. 1247 which you introduced providing for the continued payment of base pay for men discharged from military service at the close of the war.

I have read your bill and think it very good. In fact, I do not have one single suggestion to make which would improve it. I am certain that all of the administrators of State unemployment compensation agencies will approve it and be glad to do what they can to assist in its passage.

Unless your bill or some other bill similar to it is passed by Congress, I am afraid many States' trust funds will become insolvent, because of drains arising from payment of benefits to men now in the armed services at the close of the war. It is my opinion that the problem of taking care of the soldiers upon their return from the war is a national problem and must be taken care of by the Federal Government.

Recently I had a conference with Colonel Greenbaum, executive officer of Judge Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and discussed the problem which your law seeks to solve. I gathered from my conversation with the colonel that the War Department believes that the taking care of returning soldiers is a problem for the United States Government and not the respective States. I believe the War Department and Navy Department would favor your law.

The thing I like most about your law is that it provides for a very simple method of administration. If I can be of any service to you in connection with its passage, please call upon me.

Yours very truly,

CLAUDE A. WILLIAMS,
Chairman and Executive Director.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT,
Carson City, Nev., March 10, 1943.

The Honorable WALTER PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A copy of the bill H. R. 1247 introduced by you in the Seventy-eighth Congress on January 18, 1943, has been received by this department.

You are to be congratulated for the exceptionally equitable treatment given to all military personnel by the provisions of this bill. It has been discussed at some length with Gov. E. P. Carville and he has given it his unqualified approval, as it is written.

We have for some time advocated Federal Unemployment Compensation such as you have outlined. We believe it to be the responsibility and the obligation of the Federal Government to provide some form of unemployment compensation for those discharged from military service, for the period beginning with their discharge and until they can again be absorbed in private industry.

While, in most States, covered workers now in the armed forces who had established wage credits have those credits frozen until they are discharged, yet there are a large number of workers who have not been covered by State law. Therefore, this group would be without any form of unemployment compensation during a reconversion period, unless some provision is made by the Federal Government, such as you contemplate.

Our State unemployment compensation department has a bill pending before the present session of the State legislature which provides for the retention of established wage credits of those in military service for the duration of the war and for any period during which they may be receiving unemployment allowances from the Federal Government. This is for the purpose of permitting those in military service to return to the same status under State unemployment compensation law, as when they entered such service.

We believe your bill will accomplish all that will be needed or could be expected by those discharged from service during a readjustment period. It contains no radical or theoretical ideas; also, it appears to us to be based upon sound thinking and should fit into any practical post-war business economy.

A copy of this letter is being transmitted to our congressional delegation for their information. We wish you success in the passage of this bill, which appears to be a solution to a serious problem.

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. MCGINTY,
Executive Director, Employment
Security Department.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS HAS PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Arthur G. Drefs, vice president and treasurer of McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, and a member of the post-war committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, today revealed that the N. A. M.'s program for demobilization of the United States armed forces provided for base pay up to $100 a month plus full family allowance for the first 3 months after discharge and $50 a month for the next 3 months.

Including $100 clothing allowance upon honorable discharge, the basic-pay allowances recommended by the manufacturers may add up to $550 for each veteran in addition to his family allowances.

"We must have well in advance an orderly program for the demobilization of our soldiers," Mr. Drefs said. "It must be a realistic program which gives the returning veteran the assistance he needs at the time he needs it most. It must eliminate as much of the personal hardship as possible in the immediate post-war transition period."

The manufacturers' program also recommends that each member of the armed forces be given a prompt post-war furlough of 3 weeks with pay and transportation to and from his home so that he may size up the peacetime situation to which he is returning.

"The purpose is to give the armed forces free time and pay sufficient to enable them to locate peacetime jobs without distress after they are demobilized," continued Mr. Drefs, who made public here the demobilization section of a post-war committee report which is to be submitted to the annual meeting of the N. A. M. in New York December 8–10.

He said the N. A. M. would put its full influence as spokesman for peacetime employers of some 10,000,000 persons behind this demobilization program.

"As a contribution to the present morale of our fighting men, I think they should be told now what steps are being taken to protect their return to peace," he added.

The N. A. M. post-war committee declared that "it is contrary to our ideals of individual freedom to unnecessarily hold drafted men in the armed forces after the war."

The committee recommended that any troops retained in post-war service should be volunteers where possible. Otherwise, it was urged that such troops should be chosen with due regard to family status, age, and related matters. In effect this would turn the normally deferred induction classes into the post-war classes of troops preferred for earliest demobilization.

Job training was recommended for all troops wherever located, and special provision was recommended to allow the release of any individual whose former employer certified that he was needed for the employer's business conversion to peacetime pursuits.

These N. A. M. recommendations represent an advance on the specific proposals of the late National Resources Planning Board. President Roosevelt forwarded these proposals to Congress last July urging that future veterans should not be "demobilized into unemployment, a place on the bread line or on a corner selling apples."

The N. R. P. B. would allow the base pay up to $100 only for the first 3 months after honorable discharge, and thereafter would have the veteran rely on unemployment compensation. It was pointed out that most of the veterans are young and have so little if any unemployment compensation established that it would amount to practically no allowance; hence the N. A. M. substitute of a flat rate for the second 3 months up to $50.

This demobilization policy for the armed forces was worked out by the N. A. M. after

consultation with the Government authorities involved. The program was submitted to interested Senate committees and the American Legion.

"We are all agreed," the manufacturer said, "that we shall not repeat the injustice of World War No. 1, when the veterans were given a $60 discharge allowance and turned loose. We regard the initiative and self-respect of the veterans as a precious part of the national resources. They came early in our post-war planning; and if this first declaration of our policy proves inadequate as the situation enfolds, we stand ready to enlarge it. Our intention is clear."

Speech of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, at the dinner given in honor of Orville Wright, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 17, 1943:

Fifteen years ago from today there journeyed to Kitty Hawk, N. C., a distinguished group of aviators from the four corners of the earth, as well as many prominent citizens to lay the cornerstone of a national shrine to Wilbur and Orville Wright atop Kill Devil Hill. It was then a bleak sand dune facing a mighty ocean—transportation was solely by water and roads were in the far off imagination. But a promise was then made to the Nation which has since been fulfilled and the whole area has been placed in easy access to the country at large. A place apparently secure in its isolation has been transformed to one now frequented by thousands who come to visit two of the most notable shrines in all America.

Just 3 miles distant from Kill Devil Hill, the English first came to our shores. There was born the first child of that race on the American Continent—there they set up their first government in a new land, and though they failed and their fate has always been a mystery, it was this same pioneering spirit that has always characterized the English race that a few years later made Jamestown the mudsill on which the Nation was founded.

To that spot in 1900 came the Wrights. They came to that far eastern frontier not by accident nor so much for its assured privacy, but the United States Weather Bureau told them that there the winds were found to be the strongest and steadiest. Set down on a narrow strip of beach that knew only the steady tramp of the surfman on his lonely patrol, the Wrights, while greeted with cordiality, were left strictly alone with their "foolish hobbies," and Wilbur, as he would trip along the shore with outstretched arms to determine the force of the wind, was referred to as a deluded crank.

After 3 years of experiments in gliders, after most intensive studies, after many mishaps and disheartening delays the frail craft was pronounced ready. The Wrights knew it would fly for their results had been achieved by scientific inquiry and study, and so by a flip of a coin, 40 years ago from this morning, it fell to Orville Wright to usher in one of the greatest of all epochs in history. The world was told that a man had flown in the air in a machine. Long before, most of the small group of newspapermen had deserted them. Only a few doggedly remained behind but with shaken faith. One of the greatest papers in the Nation wired its astounded correspondent to "stop sending fake stuff, for nobody believes these wildcat yarns about men flying in an airplane." Such was the humble origin of an invention whose creative worth is one of the supreme accomplishments of man.

Each year at Kill Devil Hill this anniversary has been observed and North Carolina, the cradle of aviation, is always happy in saluting and paying tribute to the Wright brothers and particularly Mr. Orville Wright, our guest of honor tonight.

Ten years in the future from today, we will observe the fiftieth anniversary. It is impossible for any of us to even visualize what the forward march of aviation will have accomplished by then, but restless, ingenuous man will always be pressing forward, and by then the airplane may be the symbol and the means for peace throughout the world as the Wright brothers always envisioned it would be.

I hope it will not be considered amiss, if I again say in this presence, that now since all misunderstandings and controversies have been settled, I fervently trust that at the spot where the air was conquered, the implements of that conquest will likewise be placed to forever repose in the shrine that a grateful Nation has built.

There has rarely been accorded to a man in the flesh the plaudits of his fellow citizens such as have come to Mr. Wright. The Nation has erected a memorial to courage, faith, accomplishment, and inventive genius. Standing there through the ages to come in all of its magnificent grandeur, may it be an inspiration to the indomitable spirit of America as graphically revealed in the lives and works of Wilbur and Orville Wright.

"The long toil of the brave
Is not quenched in
Darkness nor hath counting
The cost fretted away
The zeal of their hopes.

"O'er the fruitful earth
And athwart the sea hath passed
The light of noble deeds
Unquenchable forever."

Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association Strongly Endorses Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on page 115 of volume 2 of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the Lea civil aeronautics bill, there appears a strong letter signed by L. P. Sharples, chairman, executive committee, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, an association of over 6,000 private flyers. It would be wise for each Member of Congress to read this strong endorsement of H. R. 3420 given by Mr. Sharples in the name of these thousands of private flyers. He has since addressed a second letter to Chairman LEA reiterating his previous stand.

Also, in the December issue of the magazine called Flying, an authoritative trade magazine in which private flyers take great interest, Mr. Sharples writes an endorsement of the Lea bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an excerpt from that article and the letter to Chairman LEA.

The article follows:

Washington has attempted a step in the right direction on another matter—nationally standardized flight regulations (the Lea bill, H. R. 1012)—which, if they accomplished their original purpose, would virtually outlaw the numerous, pesky varieties of State legislation and enforce one universal code. State legislators, who usually know little about aviation, have been falling into the error of backing a whole series of State aviation laws. These have often been so varied as to create an utterly impossible situation for the interstate pilot—and what pilot is not an interstate pilot?

Strong pressure, however, has been brought to preserve States rights — the coveted rights of the States to make 48 complete sets of regulations, requiring duplicated plane inspections, duplicated physical tests, and involving 48 different "rules of the road."

Before the war there were 90,000 pilots. Now there are hundreds of thousands of really competent wartime pilots and, when private flying comes into its own again, they will not enjoy being unable to land in a State because they are not licensed there.

And we need standard laws internationally as well as nationally. Before the war a United States pilot required virtually a special dispensation to fly his own plane through Europe. Yet a British pilot could do so very conveniently. There should be an international convention, as soon as the war permits, which would not only permit convenient trips by private planes but would urge and foster them.

Following is the letter to Chairman LEA:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *December 7, 1943.*

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEA: Since the argument about the aviation legislation has waxed so hot, I thought I would write you at this time simply to confirm the sentiments expressed in our letter of April 5, 1943, to you. Those sentiments are our present sentiments.

Sincerely yours,

L. P. SHARPLES.

Mr. Wilson's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Mr. Wilson's Warning," published in the Pittsburgh Press of December 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WILSON'S WARNING

Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric and now vice chairman of the War Production Board, tells the National Association of Manufacturers he is deeply alarmed by the possibility that a "right-wing reaction" may go so far as to jeopardize our whole national future.

This great industrialist who has served America well in raising the output of munitions to its present huge volume serves well also in warning against future peril. The dangers he fears are real—that political and economic groups, struggling for selfish advantage in an election year, may divide us hopelessly; that some sections of capital, grasping for temporary gains and blind to enduring values, may be drawn so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life.

They are the dangers inherent in the tendency of public feeling to swing, like a violent pendulum, from extreme to extreme. Too far right in the twenties, when business had its own way and almost ruined the country. Too far left in the thirties, when business was banished to the doghouse and the abuse of power was on the side of labor leadership and Government bureaucracy.

The hope of the American people for the post-war forties and thereafter is to prove that they are not puppets of a law of physics—"for every action an equal and opposite reaction." Signs multiply that the pendulum is moving once more to the right, and that, within limits, seems to us both inevitable and desirable. But we are thankful for those in business and industry who recognize the necessity for limits; thankful that one of Mr. Wilson's caliber stands up and tells other manufacturers:

"This above all is a time when the industrial leaders of America owe it to their country and to themselves to exercise temperate judgment—to practice the arts of compromise—to avoid the temptation of sacrificing enduring values for temporary gains—and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity."

The Lawyer's Place in an Upset World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important address by Mr. Malcolm McDermott, of Duke University, delivered before the State Bar of North Carolina. The address is entitled, "The Lawyer's Place in an Upset World." I am informed that the cost of printing the address will be $120.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Rice, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the North Carolina Bar Association, it is with a feeling of reluctance that one rises to speak in times like these. Our hearts, our minds, and all our energies are centered upon one great objective, and properly so. The speedy and successful termination of this war must be our immediate and determined aim. Nothing must be allowed to divert us from that course.

We are aware, however, that post-war planning is being indulged in. It is said, and rightly so, that we must be prepared to insure a lasting peace. Great international problems must be solved in advance, as far as possible, to the end that this kind of peace may be realized. Insofar as this type of planning does not jeopardize our war effort, all will agree that it is sound. This time we must strive to the uttermost to win the peace in behalf of decent civilization.

But you and I know also that there is another kind of planning going on, a kind that relates to the internal economy of America after the war. There are those who for one purpose or another feel constrained, even in the midst of war, to lay plans for the future life of the American people. In fact, from all of the evidence it appears that the plan is an unfolding one. Step by step it is being put into effect. The post-war period will merely bring the finishing touches. The regimentation under the war-time emergency will, according to these planners, make the post-war achievement of their plan an easy one.

It is this internal post-war plan for America that I want to discuss, and do so as frankly, fairly, and dispassionately as I can, judging it from the point of view of the evidence that has come to light.

The danger is that amid the preoccupation of world problems, with our eyes focused on the international scene, we are going to overlook what is being done to our own country on the inside. Obviously, if America is to play her proper part in world affairs, she must be kept strong and sound within. Those qualities that have made her truly great must be preserved, not only for our benefit, but also for that of the world at large.

It is the peculiar function and duty of lawyers, I submit, to give heed to these vital matters. If our constitutional Government is endangered, if the rights of the people are being subverted, if the foundations of the Republic are being undermined, then it is the lawyers of America who must raise the hue and cry. As you know, we are the only professional group who take an oath to support, maintain, and defend the Constitution. We are the only class of citizens not on the public pay rolls who take that solemn vow. Furthermore, it is the lawyer who is best qualified for this task. He is a free lance. Schooled in a knowledge of the fundamentals of our governmental system, he can perceive what is going on beneath the surface and what others fail to note. It is the lawyer who speaks out boldly and fearlessly when all others cringe before criticism or pressure from high places.

It has seemed to me, therefore, that to the lawyer primarily belongs the duty to drag out into the open the issue I shall present, to enlighten the people thereon, and then to stand steadfast for what he believes to be the right. Such is the lawyer's place in this upset world, as I see it. From no other source can the people get such unbiased enlightenment. Of course, I realize we shall not all agree. Lawyers never do. But the lawyer, more than any other citizen, wants to hear and understand all that can be said against his own views. That is the happy quality of our profession. Hence, I am not deterred by the fact that I may here be discussing controversial issues. We are used to both controversies and issues. What we want to know is, What is the real issue, and what are the facts?

I need hardly assure you that I have not come here to speak in any spirit of partisan politics. You will give me credit, I am sure, for recognizing the proprieties of the occasion. However, let me say at the outset that I propose to speak with utter frankness, and with no apologies for the views advanced. When gentlemen in Washington make no bones of setting about to plan our lives for us, then the right to speak out belongs to the "plannee" quite as much as to the planner.

The truth is that what we are here to consider transcends party politics. If what I have to say sounds like an attack upon the present administration, let me remind you that men in the high councils of the party now in power are speaking out openly of the perils confronting our constitutional Government. If you have not already done so, read what is said by the senior Democratic Senator from Wyoming in an article appearing in a national magazine and condensed in the August issue of Reader's Digest, under the title, "America Is Being Made Over, and We Won't Like It." Then read another article, in the September issue of Reader's Digest under the title, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats," by Congressman SUMNERS, a leading Democrat in the House of Representatives. Neither of these men can be accused of being a captious, partisan critic of the existing administration. As patriotic public servants they have laid before American citizens unvarnished facts showing that, quite apart from war measures, constitutional democratic Government in this country is fast vanishing.

What kind of government is being substituted? The considered answer I have to offer to that question is that we are having foisted upon us national socialism; that is, none other than the German system of government. Now, of course, if the majority of the American people want that system, then they are going to have it. What I presently object to is having the system put over under the guise of liberalism and democracy, and without an understanding on the part of citizens of just what is involved. I have talked with some of the inner circle in Washington. In answer to my remonstrances one of them said, in substance, this: "This is a democracy. Elections are held and we get a majority of the votes. What else is a democracy? We hold a mandate from the people." If a majority vote means democracy, then I want to tell you that Germany and Italy (before her fall) were two of the most perfect democracies among the nations. There can now be no doubt of the fact that the last vote taken in Germany, showing over 90 percent of the voters behind Hitler, properly reflected the sentiments of the German people. They stuck to him throughout the decade of the thirties and they are sticking to him even in these dark hours. That is why the German collapse has been so long postponed. We are quite mistaken if we imagine that Hitler rose to power and kept that power by openly tyrannizing his people. On the contrary, he came as a savior of the people, as the friend of the poor man, and as the opponent of the vested interests. The same is substantially true of Mussolini. Even his bitter enemies told me, when in Italy in 1936, that fully 80 percent of the people idolized him. That is why he held on as long as he did.

Now, if 54 or 60 percent of the popular vote for a party in this country makes this a democracy, then we must bow to Europe's two high-powered dictatorships as the arch democracies of all time.

The simple answer is that the mere fact that a majority of the people is corralled behind a party or its leader does not make of that government a democracy. We must look deeper and find out how that government deals with its people, and especially with unorganized minorities therein.

In the years 1936 and 1937 I spent considerable time in Germany. My chief purpose was to find out, if possible, just what national socialism really means. From my

study of the situation there, from discussions with men and women inside Germany, and views of observers in adjacent countries, I came to the conclusion that national socialism, stripped of all fanfare, simply means a system of government that readily enables those who gain control to exploit the entire nation for their particular purposes. The people need not, and generally do not, know what those purposes ultimately are, but they are handled in such fashion that they willingly lend themselves to these ends. In Germany, that purpose was to build a titanic war machine and launch it upon a course of world conquest. That is quite clear now, but it was not at all clear, even to the great mass of German people, as late as 1936.

The objective of the leader or group that gains control under a national socialistic regime may vary according to circumstances. It may be a purpose to take from those who have worked and saved, and give to those who have not, or to exalt a particular person or class, or to build a political machine, or a combination of any of these.

I wondered how an intelligent people, such as the Germans surely are or were, would let themselves be thus duped. This led to a study of the various steps by which national socialism had fixed its hold upon that nation. I wanted to find out what made national socialism work. I give you briefly the results of that first-hand study.

In order for national socialism to work certain definite steps must be taken, and they are the same for fascism, for the two differ in name only:

1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

3. The centralized government, while appearing in form to represent the people, must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

4. Constitutional guaranties must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as out-moded and as obstructions to progress.

5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. Let me pause to say that these various steps as thus enumerated are not necessarily undertaken in the order in which they are here listed. In fact, the subordination of the lawyers and of the courts is likely to be one of the early steps taken by those interested in setting up a national socialistic regime. As has recently been well said, "There is no place for the lawyer in a totalitarian state." Lawyers as champions of the peoples' rights must be suppressed at an early stage.

6. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time be rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

7. Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.

8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire Nation.

9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive, so that the public may not begin to rely upon their own resources.

10. Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men and not of laws.

11. The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control, to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

I tell you I saw all of these steps consummated or rapidly being consummated in Germany in 1936. You can readily recognize them as the earmark, the vital features of national socialism. They are the cogs that made the Nazi machine work. Many a good and sensible German was drawn into its clutches, not realizing what he was getting into until it was too late to extricate himself. I came to know a German in Munich fairly well so that he would talk to me somewhat freely. I put to him this question: "What is the most significant thing you consider Hitler has done for your people?" His reply was this, "He has brought us all to a common level," and then in a whisper he added, "But, my God, what a low level."

Yes, national socialism stands for the leveling process. That makes the lower classes think they are getting something; it keeps efficient and thrifty people from rising and possibly getting out of hand. At the same time, it enriches the treasury for the spending purposes of the leader.

Perhaps as I have detailed all of this, there has flashed into your minds the deadly parallel between the national socialism of Germany and what has transpired here in the United States during the past decade. I confess it struck me with full force when I returned from Europe just at the time when the fight was launched to make the Supreme Court of the United States subservient to the will of the Chief Executive. This led me to make a comparison of details, a practice I have since continued. It has driven me to the conclusion already stated, that there is a deliberate purpose to supplant our constitutional government with the German brand of national socialism. If you will study the situation carefully, you will find that no other explanation can make sense out of the conduct of our National Government by those who have enjoyed practically complete control throughout the past 10 years.

I am not impugning the motives of any man or set of men. Motives are not the issue. These gentlemen may have the highest motives. They may sincerely believe that the German system of government will bring the greatest happiness to the American people, and that they are performing a public service in effecting the change. There are many, I am sure, who have innocently participated without knowing what was going on, such as the Senator from Wyoming and the Congressman from Texas, whose eyes are now opening. Then, too, I assume there are the usual number of selfish groups who are in on the thing for whatever they think they can get out of it by soaking the rich. All of such groups participated in the building up of national socialism in Germany. But that is beside the point. What we want to know is what these men are doing to America.

We can best determine this through testing what has developed here by reference to the essential elements of national socialism already set forth.

In the first place, you will recall that at the outset of this decade our country was experiencing an economic depression. It was by no means the first, nor yet by comparison the worst. Heretofore, the country shouldered its burdens and its losses and pulled through. This time it was asserted that the people were unable to handle their own problems and hence all must look to Washington for the answers. That was to be the source of all recovery, handed down from above. This idea was so drilled into the minds of the people that it is now responsible, says Congressman SUMNERS, for the enormous bureaucracy that exists: That is why he entitled his article as he did, "Don't Blame the Bureaucrats." His view is that under this kind of governmental nursing the people have grown more and more helpless and have formed the habit of turning over all their local problems for solution at the national capital. Certainly no effort has ever been made to discourage the habit. On the contrary, Washington bureaucracy has been more than ready to reach out and down into the everyday lives of the people, and in many cases to insist upon doing for them what they should do for themselves. The longer this continues, of course, the more dependent becomes the populace upon the arm of government.

In the next place, we find that the right of local self-government, one of the cardinal principles of American democracy, is being steadily destroyed. This has been accomplished in part by a spurious interpretation of the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. Thus it has come to pass that the central government has assumed power, for example, to regulate the amount of wheat a farmer may grow, even though it is fed to his own chickens and never touches interstate commerce. This power has been upheld by the reconstituted Supreme Court upon the ground that if the farmer did not raise wheat he might buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be benefitted, while if he did grow wheat he might not buy wheat in interstate commerce and thus interstate commerce might be depressed. Therefore, this is said to be a regulation of interstate commerce. Such is the astounding holding in the Wickard case.[1] By its reasoning practically every activity of human life can now be regulated in Washington.

Again, we have seen not only the judiciary but also the legislative branch of the National Government fall into line under the executive. For years legislation was drafted for Congress under executive direction and marked "must." Blanket appropriations were made in huge sums, the spending of which was left to executive discretion. Broad powers were granted to the President on the basis of an existing emergency, but somehow the emergency never ceased, and the powers continued. It was not until the election of 1 year ago that Congress began to reassert in some measure its true constitutional functions as the real law-making body. How long it can hold out under the enormous pressure of the executive will depend, no doubt, on what reaction comes from an awakened public.

One of the most striking similarities between the present administration and a national socialistic government is its attitude toward the Constitution. There was a time in this country when the Constitution was reverently regarded as the sacred instrument protecting the people in their rights and

[1] *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111 (1942)).

liberties even as against their own Government. But nazi-ism brooks no interference or limitations on the powers of government once it gains control. A study of the attitude of our present Government toward this great document discloses not only a spirit of disdain but even of flagrant disregard. Thus Congress was bluntly told to pass the Guffey Coal Act regardless of its constitutionality. The very principles on which the Constitution was drafted and adopted have been held up to ridicule and relegated to the days of horse and chaise. The present theory is that if the administration can push through a bill then it must be law, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

And so I might go on making the comparison down through the entire dozen points, but time will not suffice. It can readily be done, and in far more ample fashion than I have here attempted. There are two more, however, I must mention before passing on.

On the subject of taxation under national socialism, I wonder if you have had occasion to study the new $10,000,000,000 tax plan recently submitted by the Treasury Department to Congress. It was so revealing that even Democratic Congressmen were shocked. The avowed design of that proposal was not to distribute the new tax burden on an equitable basis, but rather to bring about the result that American citizens generally would all end up with an income of approximately $2,500 per year. That, you see, is getting them down to the common level. The proposal, it is said, will not be enacted into law. That may be true, but coming as it does from the very inner circles of the executive branch of Government it does disclose what that powerful group is planning for the American people. All of this is to be taken in connection with other pronouncements from the Executive. We have been told emphatically that when some 8,000,000 young men of our armed forces return home at the close of the war, private industry and private employers must furnish jobs for these men, or else Government will launch another of its vast public works programs.

Now consider the dilemma which confronts the would-be employer. He is taxed to the hilt so that he has no money left for expansion or for employing anyone, and he is going to be taxed the more to pay for a public works program since he does not furnish employment. All of which adds up to this, that under national socialism the citizen is merely a producing unit. The government that controls him will let him keep from his earnings enough for a subsistence, while all above is to be turned over to the state, so-called, to be disposed of as the party, group, or leader in power sees fit. That is about as undemocratic and un-American as anything I know. It makes one wonder what an administration spokesman really means when he solemnly announces that private enterprise must be preserved in this country.

Lastly, let me call your attention to the subject of government control over public education. If a national socialistic government is to be maintained there must be careful supervision of the education of the nation's youth so that they may be held in line, and serve to strengthen the system as they grew up.

Thus far the Washington Government has refrained from open efforts in this direction, but now the step is about to be taken. A bill has been introduced with support from administration circles providing for an allotment to the States of $300,000,000 a year to be spent on public education. How the bill may fare just at this time is uncertain, but consider the circumstances under which this proposal is being launched. Here is the Nation staggering under a public debt which will soon reach the $300,000,000,000 mark. Just the interest alone on that debt is going to cost the American people about $9,000,000,000 annually and that is a sum far in excess of the largest amount collected in Federal taxes during any year prior to our entry in the present war. On top of this enormous interest charge will be the enhanced cost of government resulting from the war. And yet, in the face of all that, the proposal is blandly made to hand over to the States $300,000,000 annually for public education. There is not a State in the Union that does not already have a creditable public school system. There is not a State that is unable to support its system. Nevertheless, there is the Federal Government submerged in debt, constantly seeking new fields of taxation, and regularly appealing to its citizens to lend money on its bonds, now proposing to pile on another $300,000,000 annual charge by way of gift to the States.

There are some things in this life that just do not make sense, and that is one of them.

Only one sane explanation can be offered, and that is that it constitutes a move to enable the Washington Government to get its hand on public education throughout the country. On the average each State will receive annually something over $6,000,000 from this fund. As soon as States have their public-school systems geared up to these additional expenditures it will be simple indeed for Washington to begin to dictate policies in education. No local officials will dare refuse to cooperate and thus forfeit the supposed benefaction. What this may lead to is a matter of speculation, but it does present the perfect pattern for national socialism in public education.

From all of the evidence the conclusion seems inescapable that the real issue on the domestic front is whether national socialism shall supplant American democracy—American democracy as we have known and grown up under it, as our forefathers established and maintained it for us. In all honesty there ought not to be any disguising of this issue. It ought to be brought directly into the open where it can be considered and discussed with all of the attention it deserves. I can think of nothing more cruelly deceitful than to tell American youths on the battle fronts that they are fighting for democracy, if in reality they are to return to be governed by a brand of German national socialism. We ought to let them know what they are fighting for.

The guise in which the movement is being clothed in this country would be ludicrous, were it not for the tragedy of the thing. The entire process of putting the citizen in a governmental strait jacket is constantly being called liberalism, when in reality it is but a reaction to the kind of autocratic government against which our forefathers rebelled. A liberal government, properly defined, is one which leaves its citizens alone to develop their own capacities and resources, to learn by their own mistakes, and to control their own earnings. Such a government interferes only to a minimum degree necessary to insure proper protection of the rights of others. It was that kind of government our forefathers sought to establish in American democracy. They know that the sweetest freedom known to man is the freedom to come and go as one pleases; to work when, where, and for whom he pleases; to make mistakes, it may be, and thus learn to stand on his own. That freedom of individual action, you may have noted, is nowhere mentioned in the Atlantic Charter. The four freedoms there set forth are readily obtainable in any government prison. By getting yourself committed to the penitentiary, you can enjoy freedom of speech and of worship, for there will be no one interested in interfering. You will enjoy freedom from fear, for you will be amply guarded and protected by governmental agents. You will enjoy freedom from want, for government will supply you not only with shelter, but also with all necessary food and clothing. As for the clothing, the stripes thereon may run the wrong way—that is, horizontally rather than vertically—but that should matter little to one who is interested merely in obtaining freedom from want.

The hitch is that in getting these four freedoms, you will have sacrificed the most precious freedom of them all, and that is just plain ordinary personal freedom.

Our forefathers were all too familiar with the dangers inherent in governmental power. That is why after setting up the machinery of government they immediately attached numerous brakes thereto, to prevent it from running away with itself; and that is why they carefully distributed the limited powers of the central Government among the several branches, reserved all others to the States and to the people. Under that kind of government America grew, waxed strong, and weathered every storm.

Do we now mean to abandon that system of government, and turn to one that has brought unhappiness and disaster to every people who have tried it?

It may be that the American people want the change, but by all the traditions of our profession, by our solemn oath to support the Constitution, you and I as lawyers are bound to see to it that the issue is fairly and squarely presented to the great body of citizenship. It is high time we began to discharge that obligation.

Our Obligation to Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short speech entitled, "Our Obligation to Our Veterans," delivered by me over the radio stations in Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We all have our problems these days—personal and public, present and future. But to me, the most important problem of the moment is that of those 10,000,000 boys now fighting on the farthest-flung battle fronts in the history of our Nation.

Not once have I looked at the photographs so often appearing in our daily papers, of these haggard, tattered, unshaven lads, who only a few short months ago enjoyed the peace and quiet and security of civilian life in our country, without thinking, "What will we offer them on their return?"

We know we have much to be ashamed of in the manner in which we handled past generations of our returning soldiers. This must not happen again. When our boys return this time, I not only want them to have money in their pockets, and an insurance policy in their deposit vaults; I want them to have a job and their self-respect the moment they doff the uniform which they have so bravely worn over the waters and on the shores of the seven seas.

At 12:35 on Thursday, December 2, this year, I introduced in the United States Senate a bill which, when passed and put into effect, will accomplish just that. It is S. 1566.

My bill will destroy the many-tentacled bureaucratic machine now handling veterans' affairs in a half dozen different departments of Government, and coordinate them under the one organization established by law for that purpose—the Veterans' Administration.

It is amazing to me how little criticism there is of the Veterans' Administration, considering the diversity of its activities and the fact that each of their problems is a personal one involving a maimed or crippled soldier, or the future of the loved ones of a man who has given his life on the field of battle. Remember, then, that this organization now administers the most personal matters of hundreds of thousands of veterans of all the wars of four generations; consider that each problem involves a widow with children who is awaiting her monthly check, or a soldier who must meet his daily expenses while awaiting his return to health, and then recall how little criticism there has been—it is a remarkable record.

Let me quote from a letter just received by me from the American Legion Post No. 30 at Kensington, Md.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your forthright and farsighted action on the problem of rehabilitation lends inspiration to every one of us concerned with this solemn duty.

"The fine record of the Veterans' Administration has earned the veterans' confidence. This is half the battle.

"Your plan is sound and holds promise of seeing this job through without the confusion which threatens to engulf this work."

We know, then, that this organization, the Veterans' Administration, has done a commendable job. My bill will give to them greater power. It will give them the authority and the tools with which to do the great job it is obviously capable of, the great job which is so vital to the future welfare of our servicemen. The passage of this bill will coordinate all veterans' activities under this one agency instead of having them scattered.

While our sons and our daughters are still under military jurisdiction, while they still must answer to military discipline, under this bill they will fill out a questionnaire giving full particulars of their qualifications and desires for employment. This questionnaire will be filed with the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration will have available another great classification of information from industry, commerce, agriculture, or "what have you" in the field of employment. We are well aware that the assembling of this data is a tremendous task, but it can be done.

Let us consider a case in point. Johnnie Jones was a farmer boy when he entered the service at the age of 19. On his induction it was found that he had a very quick mind, so he was trained as a specialist. He will be discharged from the service as an A-No. 1 expert radio operator. We can't expect Johnnie to return to his former occupation. We have done that after other wars; but we won't do it this time. Before his discharge, whether it be now from a hospital or later from a demobilization camp, Johnnie will talk to a field representative of the Veterans' Administration. They will know all about his job qualifications and capabilities. Then they will get him that job, when and where he wants it—a job to step into immediately.

Pietro, a stock clerk from New York's East Side, on the other hand may want a job on a farm. That is where Pietro will go, with a job arranged and ready for him.

Seven hundred thousand of these men are a problem today; millions more will be problems tomorrow—problems, but not liabilities. Indeed not liabilities. As a matter of fact, they are our greatest asset.

But thus far we are doing nothing to help them. We are handing them a discharge and a dime and forgetting about them. Inevitably, if action is not immediate we will again have with us the bread line and the bonus army. We owe action—immediate action—and help—not only to these boys and these girls, but to their sons and daughters of the future, and to ourselves. Remember these 10,000,000 returning young men and young women are to make the world of our grandchildren.

If we are to have a dejected, dissatisfied, unemployed, group of young men and women roaming our streets in the years following the armistice, we will have economic chaos, and a social condition too horrible to contemplate. These young people must be fitted to take our world and build for the future. Even as you and your fathers before you have passed it on to them, they must pass it on, uplifted and improved, to their children and your grandchildren.

I do not wish to paint too pessimistic a picture. I do not think it is a question of pessimism, but of foresight. If we permit these millions of young people to be discharged in our great cities, there to pile up without facilities for employment, within a few days or weeks they will be hungry; when they are hungry they will, of course, seek food. I hope then that a bread line will be the only bad result. We can take care of breadlines; but these young people will not long be satisfied with hand-outs. They will provide for themselves. They will provide for themselves honestly and decently if we give them the opportunity. We must give them that opportunity—or contemplate the possibility of one of the most serious problems in our history.

Recently I have become what the boys call a "hacker." I am one of those pests who stop servicemen on the street and ask them questions. We can be proud of them; they are soldiers and gentlemen. Not one of them has been even slightly discourteous; on the other hand, not one of them has failed to give me the answer to my question when I asked them what they wanted most on their return to civilian life. They want a job to come back to.

They want to contribute their share to the future of America—that is primarily what they have in mind—not only a livelihood, but becoming good citizens in their various communities. They don't want to be given a small amount of money and then forgotten. They are widely traveled, they come from many a far-distant country with new ideas, new thoughts, fresh understanding of those foreign peoples, which can be of inestimable value to our country in our post-war problems. The President's idea of mustering-out pay won't do the job.

These young people are alert and intelligent; they are the flower of our youth, chosen because of their sound bodies and superior minds. They have received intensive training while in the service, in highly specialized fields. They weren't trained just to fight, hundreds of thousands of them are highly skilled technicians, experts in hundreds of trades and avocations.

We must be prepared for them. We must be prepared with the functioning machinery to rehabilitate and rebuild them, to reemploy them in normal civilian life, whether that employment be a job or rematriculation in school or college. But the problem of the immediate moment is the establishment of the machinery. If we begin today, by trial and error we shall know at the end of the war, when demobilization begins, just what our problems are and what solution of them is most practicable.

Prepare the machinery. Prepare the organization equipped to handle this job—one of the greatest undertaking in the history of our Nation. We cannot afford to wait until the last moment. We must do it now. These boys of ours and the Nation are entitled to have the best job that can be done. Out of the lull of war they return to us, and every safeguard and direction and constructive help should be theirs. May God guide us in the performance of this high duty.

The Curse of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Curse of Inflation," published in the Pittsburgh Press of December 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CURSE OF INFLATION

Nobody wants inflation. We are all against it.

But too many of our people, and especially those represented by potent lobbies in Washington, are willing to risk this disaster for the sake of a few more pennies in their own pockets.

They can't see that if you raise the price of food, labor is bound to demand a raise in wages. If you raise wages, you're bound to raise the price of food. Nobody wins in the end. Everybody loses, especially the millions of Americans whose incomes have been frozen, or, in fact, cut back by the rising cost of living.

Politicians in the Government, who either can't see the deadliness of inflation or are too selfish in behalf of themselves or certain of their constitutents, lack the courage and foresight to draw a line and say, "This is it. Nothing will cross that line."

And so we have inflation. We have it now, and we are apparently headed for considerably more of it.

The administration in Washington began its anti-inflation program at a belated date. And it tried to stop inflation with half-way measures. It constantly has been permitting the ceilings to be punctured. The brave, forthright words in President Roosevelt's early speeches have not been reflected in the administration's program.

Still, the administration has accomplished a good deal. Prices are far lower than they were in World War No. 1. On the whole, we are much better off. Half and three-quarter measures have been more effective than no measures at all.

O. P. A., despite all its faults, has been a potent barrier against wild inflation. Under Chester Bowles, it seems to be settling down to a sound, simplified, sensible program.

But Congress and the pressure groups which influence it are intent on wrecking that program.

In Congress, there are Republicans, and some Democrats, who seek to wreck the administration's program because they think it will help defeat the New Deal if President Roosevelt is a fourth-term candidate next year.

And there are Democrats who would resort to extremes in subsidies just to roll back prices and make things look good before the 1944 elections.

At this late date, moderate, well-controlled subsidies have a place in the anti-inflation

program. If we had developed a genuine, hard-boiled program in the beginning, subsidies might not have been necessary. But we didn't.

Subsidies are a dangerous instrument. Like the Republicans and some of the Democrats in Congress, we think they are especially dangerous in the hands of some elements in the New Deal. Wrongly handled, they could become more inflationary than natural, unrestrained trends.

But the principal opponents of subsidies now are those who have profited most from them, in the past. Government subsidies are not new. They have been going on for many years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Any wage raise or price increase now immediately pyramids itself into a wave of price and wage increases. Subsidies have the virtue of not pyramiding, providing they are grudgingly extended solely in cases where flat ceilings become wholly unworkable.

The poorest politics is politics in the food basket. Unless Congress, the administration, the farm bloc, the labor unions, and the rest stop playing this brand of politics, full-blown, sky-high inflation will develop.

We are now in it up to our elbows. There is no reason to go utterly slap-happy and plunge in over our ears.

Adjustment of Veterans to Civilian Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Now Is the Time To Stop the Next Bonus March," published in the St. Louis Star-Times of December 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IS THE TIME TO STOP THE NEXT BONUS MARCH

With thousands of servicemen being discharged monthly for disability and other reasons, an adequate program for adjusting veterans to civilian life cannot be postponed. Numerous proposals have been made, ranging from a jeep and a chicken farm for every unemployed veteran to the program submitted to Congress last week by President Roosevelt. Nine congressional committees are considering more than 100 demobilization plans. Next year's political platforms will no doubt be covered from top to bottom with lavish promises.

Unless the task is approached on a scientific and long-term basis, there will be a danger of repeating the fiascos and compromises which characterized veterans' affairs after the last war. That experience stands as a warning lesson.

After the Armistice the discharged soldier was given $60 in cash, his uniform, and a railroad ticket. There were additional and, on the whole, satisfactory provisions for the care and vocational training of the disabled. But the average veteran, observing the inflated incomes of civilians and the prevalence of silk shirts, felt that he had not received a square deal. Then came the bonus issue, with Congress yielding in 1924 to the pressure of the veterans' lobby over the opposition of President Coolidge.

The bonus passed in that year was in the form of "adjusted compensation," or paid-up life insurance policies to mature 20 years later. It was an illogical compromise, cooked up to get rid of a troublesome issue. To obtain the cash conversion of their compensation certificates, 15,000 veterans marched in 1932 on Washington, where they lived in squalor, engaged in rioting, and were finally evicted by General MacArthur.

The bonus march was primarily a symptom of the then prevailing depression, but it also expressed the veterans' conviction that they had not been treated fairly. Full payment finally was authorized in 1936, increasing the national debt by $2,000,000,000 at a time when the Nation's resources were being strained to overcome its most severe economic crisis.

The proposals recently made by the President for immediate enactment were based in part on a report earlier this year by the now defunct National Resources Planning Board. Broad principles of the report, with the details to be filled in by Congress, should be followed in the permanent veterans' program. They are:

1. Furlough pay for an adequate period, including family allowances.

2. After that, special unemployment insurance for a specified period.

3. Special aid and counsel on readjustment and rehabilitation. (Hundreds of thousands of National Guard men and draftees are now in their fourth year of service, and to them the return to civilian life will be entry into an alien world.)

4. Tuition and allowances for those who desire to continue their educations—a permanent and constructive contribution.

5. Credit for old-age and survivors' insurance for the time spent in service.

6. Opportunities for agricultural employment and settlement for those desiring such benefits.

There is no way of adequately compensating men who risk their lives, or even of overcoming the sacrifices incidental to entering the armed services. At the best we can only make an approach.

The sensible approach is through a liberal program of constructive readjustment. The alternative is an uncertain future bonus system which, in the last instance, became a political sop and a wretched way of expressing the Nation's gratitude.

11,000,000 Votes—Shall We Allow Those Who Fight for Democracy To Vote for Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my commendation and some words of appreciation to many others from home and abroad, for the great fight that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is making on behalf of the servicemen's right to vote. Many of us who believe in extending the rights and privileges to our men and women who are in uniform are deeply grateful for his leadership and advice on this very technical question.

I believe in the theory of constitutional government. I think I realize the importance of preventing too great a centralization of Federal power, but I also realize that in the time of war, when our Nation is fighting for its life, certain rights of the individual must be relinquished temporarily for the good of the Nation.

A democracy, by its very nature, is compelled to move slowly at times if it stays within the strict confines of constitutional government. It may be necessary for it to move fast in order to preserve its national existence. We have recognized this principle every time our Nation has faced a national danger. We have made the choice time and again between strict adherence to constitutional procedure and the voluntary relinquishment of certain liberties for a temporary period. We have made the choice between the letter of the law which hindered us and the spirit of the law which gave us freedom and celerity of movement for our national perpetuation.

It is in wartime when these occasions have been most numerous, for danger to our Nation has always demanded quick and decisive action.

Martial law is a suspension of constitutional civil rights of the individual. Confiscation of property for military use or for the purpose of combatting great floods or fires or storm perils to the life and properties of communities are temporary suspension of individual property rights, and the impression of men and women into fire fighting and levee building all are infringements on constitutional civil rights. But we do these things because the Nation's life and groups of our people's lives are more important than the rights of an individual in times of peril.

Under this heading I believe lies the justification of national conscription for military service. Under times of extreme national emergency I believe that total conscription of the civilian population would be justified. Under this philosophy the Supreme Court of our land has recently declared legal the deportation and confinement in camps of certain American citizens of Japanese racial origin.

We all admit the danger of any of these measures if misused, or continued beyond the emergency period. A free people should guard jealously and yield reluctantly any of its precious liberties. But the test of a free people's right to those liberties of constitutional government is the ability of that people to use good judgment in adapting that Constitution to its national needs, and its ability to retain enough flexibility and speed of movement in times of great peril to insure its national perpetuation.

One of the greatest privileges of a democracy is the right of suffrage—the right of the individuals to choose by the ballot their public servants, their lawmakers, and their law-enforcement officials. The Constitution has for over a hundred and twenty-six years allowed

the States to set up the times, places, and qualifications of the electors. The 48 States have 48 different sets of laws in regard to voting. They vary in the extent to which they extend the privilege and right of voting to their respective electors. Many of the States' requirements are so severe that for all practical purposes absentee voting is impossible. Especially is this so when global distances and time limits are complied with or considered. These factors and many others which space does not permit me to inscribe will prevent the members of our armed forces from voting if the matter is left to the action of the 48 States. As I see it several imperatives exist:

(a) A uniform Federal ballot, approved by Federal law;

(b) Full cooperation of our Federal military facilities and personnel in the one, transportation and distribution of ballots; two, operation of polls; and three, collection and returning of the cast ballots to their respective States.

Here the Federal cooperation ceases and the States distribute to their respective election boards the sealed ballots. The local precinct election boards then perform their usual services of counting, tabulating, and certifying the results.

Thus you have joint action of the Federal and State authorities. The spirit of democratic suffrage has been maintained. The States, if they wish, could call their respective legislatures into special session for the purpose of approving, under emergency war powers, the action of the Federal Government's plan for a uniform war ballot. States' rights would be protected and at the same time we as a grateful Nation could set an example of democracy in action, an example of a democracy zealous of the rights of 11,000,000 men and women to cast their vote even in times of war. This action would prove to those men and women in our armed forces that the people they fight for have faith in the ability of a constitutional democracy to function even under great difficulties. It would be the greatest of psychological blows in behalf of the disenfranchised people of the Axis Nations, and it would be a beacon of light to the millions of common people throughout the world who, we are hoping, some day will institute constitutional democracy.

Benefits for Servicemen, Ex-Servicemen, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has several times pointedly come to my attention that benefits intended by Congress for servicemen, ex-service men, and their dependents frequently are not received by them, mostly because of the failure of the potential beneficiaries to apply for such benefits, generally by reason of their lack of information concerning such benefits.

Legislation pertaining to those serving actively in our Nation's armed forces, or to those who have so served, and their dependents is now so voluminous as to be confusing. Although I have been intensely interested in this legislation from year to year, it is very difficult for me to find these statutes without painstaking investigation. Not all of such laws are applicable to all of such persons; in fact, most of them are applicable only to certain groups, under certain conditions.

How to bring order out of this chaos so that those in each such group might be put on notice as to the rights, privileges, and benefits to which they might become eligible, without requiring them to read too much about other benefits to which they could never be entitled, has heretofore been an unsolved problem.

The key to the solution of this maze of material has, I believe, recently been fashioned by my good friend, Mr. Millard W. Rice, the national service director for the Disabled American Veterans, now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several major veteran organizations.

Mr. Rice has compiled a 31-point outline as to all such benefits, divided into 5 parts, a scanning of which will speedily inform a serviceman, a veteran, or his dependent as to what governmental benefits, if any, he or she might be entitled to under the circumstances indicated.

Those who read such outline should be cautioned that it is merely an outline, and that more detailed information concerning each such point can be secured from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Veterans' Administration, or whatever governmental agency may be concerned with the application of the particular law indicated.

It is well also to be reminded that active servicemen may request the assistance of an American Red Cross representative as to any problem or claim, whereas discharged veterans, and the dependents of veterans, have the privilege of requesting needed advice and assistance from the service officers of the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations: The Disabled American Veterans—commonly referred to as the D. A. V.—which is composed exclusively of American citizens who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving honorably in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war; the American Legion, composed of honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—commonly referred to as the V. F. W.—composed solely of America's campaign badge war, campaign and expedition veterans.

These three major veteran organizations and others have been recognized by Congress and by the Veterans' Administration as having the right, through their accredited service officers, to look through the papers in the claim folders of veteran applicants and to advise and assist them as to the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their equitable claims for various benefits potentially provided for. Most applicants would be wise to take advantage of the technical knowledge and experience of such veteran organization service officers.

Mr. Rice assures me that the outline prepared by him has been carefully checked by members of his staff and by the office of the legislative counsel of the Veterans' Administration to make sure of its accuracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the outline prepared by Mr. Rice be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, EX-SERVICEMEN, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

I. BENEFITS FOR PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES

1. Base pay for enlisted personnel, beginning with privates or apprentice seamen, and up through seven grades to master sergeant or chief petty officer, is from $50 to $138 per month. Base pay for commissioned personnel begins with $150 per month for second lieutenants or ensigns. All base pay of enlisted men is increased by 20 percent and of all officers by 10 percent while on sea duty or serving outside the continental United States or in Alaska. Active flying duty or active submarine duty increases the base pay by 50 percent, and active parachutist duty by $100 per month for officers and $50 per month for enlisted men. Certain other pay increases are provided for special skilled or dangerous types of service. Longevity pay is provided by adding 5 percent to the base pay for each 3 years of active or Reserve service, up to 30 years.

2. Allowances, in varying amount, for clothing, subsistence, and quarters made to officers and, under certain conditions, to enlisted men are not subject to income tax.

3. During World War No. 2, after June 1, 1942, any enlisted man with a wife (including a divorced wife) or a dependent child must, upon a written application therefor by himself or by or on behalf of a dependent, be charged with an allotment from his pay of $22 per month, to which is added a Government allowance of $28 per month for a wife, plus additional allowances, in varying amounts, for other dependents, and an additional allotment of $5 per month is charged against his pay, and allowances, in varying amounts, are made for his dependent parents, brothers, or sisters which may be terminated at his written request. In the event of death during active service a veteran's dependent or designated next of kin is entitled to a gratuity equal to the monthly pay of the deceased for a period of 6 months.

4. National service life insurance, obtainable without examination during first 120 days of active service, or before August 11, 1943, whichever date is later, and thereafter if found by the Veterans' Administration to be a good insurance risk (with privilege of conversion after 1 year; mandatory conversion before end of fifth policy year), in multiples of $500, from $1,000 to $10,000, for those in active service since October 8, 1940, maturable only by death of the insured, with proviso that premiums may be waived during continuous total disability, which commenced after he was insured, and before he

became 60 years of age, and which has continued for 6 consecutive months.

5. Certain protection for those in active military or naval service of the United States, and to American citizens, under certain conditions, in the active service of some country allied with it during time of war, with reference to private life insurance and property rights, and personal indebtedness, when ability to meet obligations is impaired by such service, through judicial process, under Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. (All matters affecting real or personal property rights should be referred promptly to competent local attorneys for assistance and advice.)

6. Naturalization as an American citizen by the easy petition method as to any alien while serving in the armed forces, as well as for certain war veterans.

II. MONETARY BENEFITS TO VETERANS

1. Compensation or pension for disabilities proven to have been incurred in, or aggravated by reason of, active service in the armed forces of the United States, ranging from $6 to $285 per month, depending on the nature, degree, and permanency of disability, and the time of its incurrence, including statutory awards ranging from $18.75 to $285 per month for certain disabilities, but, if single and without dependents, not more than $20 per month while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by any governmental agency.

2. Retirement benefits, at three-fourths of base pay, for certain Regular officers with permanent handicapping disabilities, or after a certain period for certain types of service, or/and the attainment of certain ages; and for certain emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers with permanent disabilities of requisite degree, clearly shown to have been acquired in active service, in fact, in line of duty.

3. Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for (1) Civil War veterans, in the amount of $75 per month, or $100, if in need of a regular attendant, (2) Indian war veterans, in amounts ranging from $20 to $55 per month, or $72, if in need of an attendant, and (3) veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, in amounts ranging from $12 to $60 per month, plus varying amounts if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but only $8 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration if the veteran has no dependents, provided that as to those in a soldiers' home continually since on or before July 15, 1943, previous pension up to $50 shall be continued.

4. Pension of $40 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or, if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to misconduct. (Only $8 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a governmental agency.)

5. Enlisted men of the Regular Army, or of the Philippine Scouts, who have served 20 years or more and who have become permanently incapacitated for active service, due to physical disability incurred in line of duty, may be retired at 75 percent of the average monthly pay received for 6 months prior to retirement. This retired pay may be waived for the purpose of receiving pension or compensation.

6. Enlisted men of the Regular Navy, whose service began after July 1, 1925, may, after 20 years service, be transferred to the Fleet Reserve at one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, and, after completion of 30 years of service, are transferred to the retired list with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions thereto. If their service commenced on or prior to July 1, 1925, they could be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon completion of at least 16 years service, with one-third of base pay, and after 20 years of service or more, one-half the base pay received at time of transfer, plus all permanent additions. This pay is increased by 10 percent for all men credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty, or whose average marks in conduct for 20 or more year shall be not less than 95 percent of the maximum. After 30 years of service they are transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy with 75 percent of the pay of their rank at date of retirement, plus all permanent additions.

7. Enlisted men of the Army or Navy are, after 30 years of service, entitled to retirement with monthly pay at 75 percent of their last base pay.

8. Statutory award of $10 per month is payable to all medal of honor men, age 65 or more.

9. All monetary benefits from the Veterans' Administration are exempt from taxation, or from attachment by claims of private creditors, or as to claims of any other Government agency, except as to overpayments by the Veterans' Administration.

10. Adjusted service credit up to $50, payable in cash, or, if more, an adjusted-service certificate based upon adjusted-service credit, for active World War No. 1 service in excess of 60 days, computed at the rate of $1 per day for domestic service and $1.25 per day for overseas service, with maximum limitations, exchangeable for United States bonds bearing interest at 3 percent, redeemable at any time.

11. Government life-insurance policies, as to death or permanent total disability, in multiples of $500 up to $10,000 for insurable veterans of (1) World War No. 1 or (2) of peacetime-service men who applied therefor prior to October 8, 1940, with lien loans permissible up to 94 percent of reserve value, at interest of 5 percent per annum.

12. Incompetent and minor beneficiaries generally receive their monetary benefits, if any, through guardians, whose accountings are periodically inspected by regional attorneys of the Veterans' Administration.

III. MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospital treatment, or outpatient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, may be furnished certain persons medically determined to be in need thereof, for service-connected disabilities. Outpatient treatment may also be authorized for any non-service-connected condition which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment.

2. Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities may be furnished, when needed, for any war veteran not dishonorably discharged, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension for service-connected disability when suffering from certain disabilities which incapacitate them from earning a living and they have no adequate means of support.

3. Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

4. Clothing may be furnished at Government expense to beneficiaries receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, when necessary for protection of health or for sanitary reasons and when such beneficiaries are without means and receiving less than $10 per month for their own personal use. Toilet articles, barber service, tobacco, etc., are furnished beneficiaries receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, whose total income is less than $6 per month.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

1. Vocational rehabilitation, including placement in suitable gainful employment, furnished by the Veterans' Administration for those honorably discharged service-connected disabled veterans of World War No. 2 who are feasible therefor, and in need thereof, to overcome a service-incurred handicap.

2. Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 55-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, and Veterans Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

3. Credit for all active military or naval service for Federal civil-service retirement purposes, with minor exceptions.

4. Credit for all active war service for railroad-retirement purposes.

5. Burial allowance, up to the amount of $100, may be paid as to any war veteran, honorably discharged or in receipt of pension or compensation, as to any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished as to any veteran, discharged honorably after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty, or as to any person who dies or has died in military service after May 27, 1941. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged as to any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial, are, within limitations, borne by the Government. Headstone or marker—stone or marble—will be furnished for the unmarked grave of any honorably discharged veteran or as to anyone who died while in the active service.

6. Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

V. MONETARY BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS

1. Death compensation or pension, under varying conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children), and dependent parents, of those deceased veterans who die as the result of service-connected disabilities.

2. Death compensation, in smaller amounts, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless

children) of those deceased World War No. 1 veterans, who, at time of death, had some service-connected disability of measurable degree, even though less than 1 percent.

3. Death pensions, under certain conditions, to widows and minor children (also including helpless children) of deceased Civil War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, and Indian War veterans.

NOTE.—Members of the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserves of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, on the basis of active duty, are eligible to all veterans' benefits.

For Better Teamwork in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article written by me which was carried in the Baltimore Evening Sun of December 8, 1943:

The workings of our form of government and our methods of administration and legislation are being challenged today by newspaper editors and columnists, by political scientists and public administrators, and by Members of Congress. It is alleged that our political machinery was devised for a simple agricultural society, but is no longer competent to resolve efficiently the issues imposed on government by the needs of a great industrial nation.

For example, the editors of Time, Life, and Fortune, in the November number of Fortune, present a large-scale report on Our Form of Government, in which they suggest various ways of achieving a more effective Presidency and of "rehabilitating Congress." Charles Beard, distinguished historian, in his new book, The Republic, devotes a chapter to a critique of the Federal system. Henry Hazlitt, one of the editors of the New York Times, in his recent book, A New Constitution Now, criticizes our system of checks and balances. Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress have introduced a score of proposals to modernize its machinery and facilitate the operations of the legislative branch. All this discussion and debate is evidence that something is wrong with our political machinery.

The need of closer collaboration between Congress and the administration has frequently been felt and voiced in the course of our national history. So long as the United States was half empty, prosperous, and well-protected by broad oceans, the old balance-of-power system was tolerable. But now that the Nation is crowded, harassed by serious social and economic problems, and deeply involved in world affairs, better teamwork between the legislative and executive branches of our National Government is essential to our welfare and security. No item on the present agenda of democracy has a higher priority than that of inducing closer, stronger, steadier, cooperation between the President and the Congress in promoting the welfare of the people of the United States and the United Nations.

Effective cooperation between the two great political branches is indispensable for successful government, which is what we need in these crucial times—government equally effective for the waging of war and the organizing of peace.

Though the Constitution in some ways makes it easier for the executive and the legislative branches to cherish their formal separation than to cooperate in the discharge of their joint responsibilities, the founding fathers intended that the Nation should never be without an effective government. They so arranged it that that need never happen.

A better ordering of Presidential-congressional relationships requires no formal amendment of the Constitution. All that is necessary is a ready determination to use the freedom open to us in the Constitution to improve and strengthen the relations already linking Congress and President. Ten years ago President Roosevelt said to the Congress, "The letter of the Constitution wisely declared a separation, but the impulse of common purpose declares a union."

In recognition of this need for closer cooperation, a variety of proposals have recently been made by responsible citizens. In the field of foreign policy, formation of a foreign relations advisory council or of a joint congressional-Presidential committee on foreign policy has been urged. Fortune advocates collaboration in fiscal management through a central fiscal bureau in the Treasury and a joint congressional fiscal committee. The designation of congressional advisers to major administrative agencies has been suggested. Roland Young, author of This Is Congress, proposes the formation of a legislative cabinet that would have a voice in the advisory councils of the administration. Senator O'MAHONEY favors the further use of mixed commissions like the T. N. E. C. on which representatives both of Congress and the administration sat. In these and other ways it is proposed to institutionalize the existing informal and extra legal relations between the two branches.

As a first step in this desirable direction, I introduced a resolution (H. R. 327) in the House of Representatives on October 19. My resolution, which was sympathetically discussed in the House on November 12, proposes to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested, but not required, to appear and answer questions.

Under this proposal, 2 hours would be set aside at least every 2 weeks, but not oftener than once a week, when Members of the House could question administrative officials on the floor of Congress. Half the time would be devoted to written questions that had previously been approved by the proper legislative committee, submitted to the official, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The latter half of the question period would be reserved for oral questions by Members of the House, control of this time being equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation and approved the written questions. The proceedings during the question period would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read, unless it is an executive session.

This is not a new idea nor is it without precedent in our history. President Washington and Alexander Hamilton, when Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the First Congress. This precedent was not followed thereafter for temperamental reasons, but select committees of the House and Senate unanimously approved proposals in 1864 and 1881 to permit Cabinet officers to participate in debate on the floor of the House or the Senate. Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Hoover favored a similar plan and on November 19 Secretary of State Hull made a personal report directly to Congress on the Moscow Conference.

My reasons for reviving this idea at this time are fairly obvious. I think it would have a beneficial effect upon Congress, the administration, the National Government, and public opinion. From the viewpoint of Congress it would enable us to become better informed concerning the operation of the executive branch and to exercise more effective oversight of the administration than the cumbersome and irksome method of special investigation permits. Spasmodic inquiries by select committees, as Woodrow Wilson once observed, do not afford Congress more than a glimpse of the inside of a small province of Federal administration. "Hostile or designing officials can always hold it at arm's length by dexterous evasions and concealments. It can violently disturb, but it cannot often fathom, the waters of the sea in which the bigger fish of the civil service swim and feed. Its dragnet stirs without cleansing the bottom. Unless it has at the head of the departments capable, fearless men, altogether in its confidence and entirely in sympathy with its designs, it is clearly helpless to do more than affright those officials whose consciences are their accusers."

Committee hearings, moreover, are poorly attended and Members of Congress do not take part in them unless they are members of the committee holding the hearing. I also believe that my plan would reduce irresponsible criticism of administrative practices to which the American people have objected.

From the administrative standpoint, the question period would provide officials with an opportunity to acquire a better understanding of the intent of Congress in passing a law, to explain the problems and difficulties that have arisen in its application, to answer charges made against them, and to justify their policies. A frank exchange of questions and answers would go a long way, I believe, to clear up the confusion and reduce the delays and bickerings that have lately characterized the so-called battle of Washington.

From the viewpoint of the general public, adoption of my suggestion, which I submit for consideration in all humility, would have the advantage of enabling the ordinary citizen to find out what is going on in Washington. Today the average man on the street often has only the foggiest ideas concerning the inner workings of the war machine, Government plans for post-war demobilization, reconversion, employment, social security, lend-lease, and the like. As the editors of Fortune point out, "there seems no valid reason, now that the United States' fear of George III and his domination of Parliament has faded away, why the tradition that it motivated—against Cabinet participation in congressional debate—should not be allowed to lapse. A monthly full-dress debate involving the Secretary of the Treasury, his Under Secretaries, and the Members of Congress should add greatly to mutual understanding, and to public understanding as well." What they say with special reference to fiscal policy applies with equal force to other public questions.

From the standpoint of the Federal Government as a whole, I suggest that it would help bridge the chasm between the two branches and make for better teamwork at a crucial period in our national history if Cabinet members and other important administrative officers were allowed on certain occasions to address the Houses of Congress and to submit themselves to questioning. They do this now at committee hearings and at press conferences, but they do not do it before the whole House. I believe that the question period would inform and reinvigorate both the legislative and the administrative process. It would quicken the pace

of Government without disturbing the balance between the two branches.

In short, my suggestion is one way of improving the channels of communication between Congress and the executive branch at a time when our salvation at home and abroad depends upon their ability to work together. And it requires no constitutional amendment, no new laws, simply an amendment of the rules of the House.

Happier New Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a plea of confession and avoidance and in humility I say that all those who know me know that I am, of course, dreaming of a white Christmas in Vermont, realizing that my dreams cannot come true.

I have a duty to do as best I can perform it which necessitates my presence here. To all my colleagues here and to all those who fight at the battle fronts and at the front here at home go my best wishes for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

The happier days of any and all new years in the future all depend on what we here do today and tomorrow on the home front to cooperate with those who on the far-flung battle lines undertake to do today to make it possible for our dreams and theirs of a better day, and a happier one, to come true.

God knows we will and shall do all we can here in order to minimize the sacrifices of blood and treasure which they are bound to have to contribute in order to shorten the length of the war, as we fully recognize the demands of those who are fighting for us and for the liberties we love as do they.

We must win this war, and we shall, in order that there shall be an end to all wars and to this recurring loss of life and blood and treasure and to the end that an enduring peace we propose shall be made secure. We must have a peace that shall be enduring, else civilization means nothing.

Our reputation and the safety and the security of those who shall follow us depends upon the outcome of this war. The determination of the issues involved and the satisfaction of the demands that are made on us for determination is our responsibility.

Let me say that we propose so to conduct ourselves on the home front that those who are fighting for us shall not be ashamed of us, and in order that in days to come every year hereafter may be marked by a merry Christmas and may be a happy new year for everybody.

Public Energy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including in the RECORD an editorial from yesterday's Washington News, entitled "Public Energy No. 1."

The editorial comments on a newspaper article written by Capt. Robert M. White, of Mexico, Mo., formerly with the United Press, now attached to the Australian Seventh, in New Guinea, describing the recent South Pacific tour of Mrs. Roosevelt, "the Aussies rightly called her Public Energy No. 1." We can all agree on that.

PUBLIC ENERGY NO. 1

The newspicture of Mrs. Roosevelt rubbing noses with her Maori woman guide in New Zealand will add to the conversation, not to say controversy, about the First Lady's penchant for going places and seeing things.

In this connection we think that one of the most interesting comments seems to have been pretty much buried, as so frequently is the case, by being embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We dig it up. It is from Capt. Robert M. White, former United Press man now attached to General MacArthur's headquarters, who drew the assignment of accompanying Mrs. Roosevelt on her South Pacific tour.

He wasn't pleased by the assignment—at first. Writing to his wife, he said:

"It's a hell of a way to kill Japs. As far as I was concerned, Mrs. Roosevelt or anybody else could come and go, but what I didn't like was to leave my post to accompany them. I traveled 10,000 miles to fight Japanese and do what I could to end the war, not to travel around with brass hats."

But the original sentiment quickly changed. And there evolved one of the highest tributes ever paid to a woman.

We quote excerpts from later in the letter: "Wherever Mrs. Roosevelt went she wanted to see the things a mother would want to see. She looked at kitchens and saw how the food was prepared. When she chatted with the men she said things mothers say. Little things men never think of and couldn't put into words if they did. Her voice was like a mother's, too.

"Mrs. Roosevelt went through hospital wards by the hundreds. In each she made a point of stopping by each bed, shaking hands, and saying something nice, motherlike thing. Maybe it sounds funny, but she left behind her many a tough, battle-torn GI blowing his nose and swearing at the cold he had recently picked up.

"I can tell you that after a year of listening to nothing but bassooning top sergeants and officers, it was good to hear a kind lady saying nice things.

"Over here she was something none of us had seen in over a year—an American mother. On the day she left I was standing with a crowd of GI's, watching her plane take off. 'Damn, she's fine, ain't she?' a Guinea sergeant said, to nobody in particular. 'Yes,' I answered, straight from the shoulder. 'And I hope she comes back.' "

But we reserve the best line in Captain White's letter for the last:

"The Aussies rightly called her Public Energy No. 1."

Publication of Income-Tax Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DUNEAN MILLS,
Greenville, S. C., December 15, 1943.

Hon. JOS. R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: Recently a check was forwarded by this corporation to the Superintendent of Documents requesting a copy of Income Tax Regulations No. 111, released October 28, 1943, and the check was returned to us with the notation that publication was not available; whereupon check was forwarded to Commerce Clearing House, Chicago, ordering a copy of the same publication, and it came to us within a week. The regulations desired is a revision of Regulations 103, known as Regulations 111.

It seems a little startling that so important a publication as this would not be available from the Government Printing Office at this time, and it will be much appreciated if you can inquire into the situation and advise us when it may be possible to obtain the official publication.

With kindest regards, believe me,

Yours very truly,

J. L. WHATLEY,
Assistant Treasurer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1943.

Hon. AUGUSTUS E. GIEGENGACK,
Public Printer,
Government Printing Office,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. GUY T. HELVERING,
Commissioner,
Bureau of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have received the enclosed letter from Dunean Mills, of Greenville, S. C., a very large tax-paying corporation. Upon receipt of this letter I called both of your offices and to my astonishment was advised that the desired publication designated as Income Tax Regulations No. 111 was not nor would not be available until after the first of the year.

It will be observed that these important documents are available through private or commercial printing houses upon payment by the taxpayer of the required sum.

Needless to say, I concur in the views expressed in the letter of my constituent and ask for an explanation as to why these important Government publications are not made available to interested parties except by purchase from private concerns. Your immediate consideration to this inquiry will be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, Advocates a German Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Emmet Crozier, from the New York Herald Tribune under date of Sunday, December 12, 1943, on The World Ahead, and suggestions by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the Columbia University, and also the head of the Carnegie Endowment, advocating a German Federation. Dr. Butler, who has devoted a large part of his active life to the cause of world peace, has followed the recent developments at Moscow and Teheran with great interest, but he sees the problem in which a longer perspective than these wartime manifestations of international amity:

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT HEAD SAYS IT WOULD BE STEP TOWARD PEACE—WHEN HE WAS A STUDENT, BISMARCK TOLD HIM SUCH A PLAN WAS NOT PRACTICAL FOR GERMANY, AND INSTEAD SET UP UNIFIED REICH UNDER KAISER

Reorganization of Germany into a federation of states with a new capital at Dresden or Frankfort-on-the-Main, establishment of a democratic monarchy in Italy, and creation under American leadership of a world organization to enforce peace in accordance with the terms of a resolution passed by Congress in 1910, are among post-war proposals advanced by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Nobel Peace Prize laureate in 1931.

Dr. Butler, who has devoted a large part of an active life to the cause of world peace, has followed recent developments at Moscow and Teheran with watchful interest, but he sees the problem in much longer perspective than these wartime manifestations of international amity. Curiously enough, it was around Russia of an earlier day that the first stirrings of an international organization for peace became manifest.

It was in 1898, Dr. Butler recalled, that a rescript of the Czar of all the Russias first summoned the leading nations of the modern world to consider cooperation for peace. The ensuing conference failed of its main objective, but, largely through the initiative and enterprise of the American delegation, it created the beginning of international order in a Court of International Arbitration. The functioning of this court so impressed Andrew Carnegie that the steelmaster and philanthropist built the Peace Palace at The Hague and subsequently endowed the great foundation which bears his name.

BUTLER'S TRIP TO EUROPE

Following the adoption of the peace resolution by Congress (without a dissenting vote) on June 24, 1910, President Taft asked Dr. Butler to go to Europe as his friendly unofficial representative and sound out other governments on the question of concerted action for peace. He journeyed to Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Switzerlund, and Italy. European statesmen were sympathetic, but none was willing to make a definite commitment.

"The gist of their answers," Dr. Butler said pensively, "was, 'Wait and let us see what happens.' They waited and got their answer August 1, 1914. That war is still raging."

The sequence of events from the Czar's rescript of 1898 to the present provided a background for Dr. Butler's thoughtfully framed question: "When this war is won by the defenders of liberty, how are we going to prevent it happening again?"

"In my judgment," he said, "there is only one way: to act in terms of the 1910 resolution of Congress under American leadership. In addition, to act so that those responsible for the crimes against civilization will be punished and to fix definitely and satisfactorily their future relationship with the rest of the world.

THREE KINDS OF PROBLEMS

"The problems to be solved are of three different kinds: (1) the military or police aspect; (2) the political aspect; and (3) the economic aspect.

"The military or police aspect can only be solved by disarming permanently the nations which have made the attacks on civilization and by putting police power in the hands of organized society or a league of nations of which the conquered nations eventually would become members.

"The political aspect can be solved by advancing in every possible way the cause of free government and democratic institutions.

"Great stress may well be laid on the federal principle, an outstanding example of which is found in the history of the United States of America. Another form is the British Commonwealth of Nations—the newest form federalism has taken.

"In my opinion it would be very wise to apply this federal principle to the reorganization of Germany. The constituent states of such a federal union are well known historically and geographically."

Under Bismarck, Dr. Butler recalled, those German states had been merged into a single empire dominated by militaristic and reactionary Prussian elements. On one occasion when, as a student in Berlin, he asked Bismarck whether he ever had considered organizing the German states into a federal union after the example of the United States, the German Chancellor replied emphatically that such a plan was not practical; Germany must be developed into a unified empire.

"I believe even more strongly now than in those long-ago days," Dr. Butler continued, "that a nation composed of federated German states, with its capital at Dresden or Frankfort and with a bill of rights similar to our own, would be the longest step forward to the elimination of the persistent danger of attack on peaceful nations to achieve continental or world domination.

"There remains the economic aspect. To deal with this, broad-mindedness and foresight are essential. Trade barriers and restrictions must be removed so far as possible. Prosperity must be spread through all the world. This cannot be done all at once, but a beginning can be made.

"It is important to preserve as an essential element of post-war society the principle of individual initiative and accomplishment. Freedom to rise in influence and knowledge is as important as to exist at all. There must be freedom from want and freedom from fear. That calls for straight thinking by the population. Every attempt to control governments by selfish organized groups and interests must be resisted and forbidden. Freedom of participation in government by all the population is a vital element of free institutions and must be taught to those peoples who do not now understand it."

Dr. Butler expressed the view that the Italian people had never accepted fascism, except as a curiosity. For them he advocated a democratic monarchy similar to the Government in Great Britain. "The monarchy would represent the unity and history of the Italian people—the Nation's emotional center; while a democratic government would be—as in Britain—an effective instrument of public administration supported and criticized from time to time by the Italian people in their elections.

GERMAN REGIMENTATION

"The problem of Germany," he continued, "is more difficult. The Germans have always been a regimented people. They have had an intellectual and artistic life of the highest order of excellence for 200 years, but this has been outside and beyond the field of political endeavor."

It would require considerable time, Dr. Butler said, to teach the German people to follow, not military and political despots, but the ideas and ideals of great philosophers, historians, and men of letters.

"The Germany to which as a student I owed so much is in a coma. Our task is to lead the way in bringing it back to life and in checking once and for all the return of military despots and politicians eagerly intent on the conquest and subjugation of central and western Europe.

"There remains Japan—a complex problem. The military Japanese have the same ambitions to control eastern Asia and the Pacific as the military Germans had to control central and western Europe. How to deal with that people is a question which must be pondered and studied with great thoroughness and determination. The Japanese, in general, present the same problem as the Germans, complicated with Oriental psychology.

"This fundamental fact in all this is that the center of gravity in world history and world politics has crossed the Atlantic; which means that the United States, Canada, and the Latin-American republics must join together without delay to formulate policies of constructive world leadership."

Resolutions of Willamette Democratic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, at a regular session of the Willamette Democratic Society, Inc., of Oregon, held December 9, 1943, in the Winter Garden, Portland, Oreg., the following two motions were passed:

Motion, That the Willamette Society of Oregon go on record as opposing the bill now pending before Congress which would discontinue the payment of subsidies for the reason that the payment of subsidies is one of the many necessary methods to prevent the disaster of inflation; and that we memorialize all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation to cast their votes against said legislation.

Motion, That the Willamette Society of Oregon go on record as favoring the bill now pending before Congress which would extend the voting day for candidates in the national elections from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m. as this would

give defense workers on the various shifts the opportunity to vote; and that we memorialize all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation to cast their votes for said legislation.

F. LEO SMITH,
President.
WILLIAM JENKINS.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Bonneville Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herbert Lundy in the Sunday Oregonian of December 12, 1943:

BONNEVILLE HITTING ON ALL 10 GENERATORS—COMPLETION OF GIANT DAM BRIDLING MIGHTY COLUMBIA AT COST OF $81,000,000 DUE THIS WEEK; UMATILLA RAPIDS NEXT ON PROJECT LIST—BORN AS MAKE-WORK PROJECT DURING DEPTHS OF DEPRESSION, ENGINEERING MARVEL IS JUST ONE LINK IN NORTHWEST'S VAST POWER CHAIN

(By Herbert Lundy)

Ten years and a month ago the United States Army engineers were instructed to start building a spillway dam across the Columbia River, where the volume and speed of flow were greater than in any river at a point where a dam had been built. The project was designated officially as "Improvement of Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg." The engineers, who don't wait for a war to keep busy, had a set of plans developed over a period of years, and not much money, because the initial authorization was made as an employment project under the dubious provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act—the depression-born, make-work bill later tossed out by the United States Supreme Court.

The original cost estimate by the Army engineers was $43,000,000. This week, Bonneville Dam will be completed at a cost of $81,386,000.

The engineers and contractors and thousands of workmen licked the mighty Columbia long ago, with wooden cofferdams and concrete and steel. Electric energy has been flowing into the war sinews of the Pacific Northwest's industries. Now, the tenth and final generating unit will be turned into the vast spiderweb of transmission network to bring the total power output of the Bonneville project to 518,400 kilowatts. With this fish fried, the Army engineers are looking upstream awaiting congressional authorization to start the $49,470,000 dam at Umatilla Rapids.

BONNEVILLE SELECTED AS DAM SITE BECAUSE OF TIDEWATER

From this time forward the people of the Northwest may as well forget about Bonneville as a project. It does not stand alone. It is one unit in a regional power, irrigation, and navigation development of the Columbia River—a development which already has cost more than $300,000,000 for the dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee and the power transmission grid which links the great hydro plants with the industrial nerve centers of Oregon and Washington; a system which is expected to bring back to the Government more than $20,000,000 in the fiscal year ending in July 1944.

The plans which the Army engineers had developed more than a decade ago called for construction of 10 dams on the Columbia, which rises in the Rocky Mountains of Canada and drains an area of 259,000 square miles as it surges 1,210 miles through majestic canyons, arid deserts, and green ranch lands to the Pacific. Those plans envisaged the use of all but 95 feet of the 750 miles of the Columbia which flows within the United States for power and navigation. Bonneville was selected for the first dam down river because it is at the head of tidewater, 140 miles from the ocean, and because Bradford Island thrust through the current at that point to divide the river and make an ideal dam site.

Among the 10 projected dams were Grand Coulee, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and Rock Island Dam, near Wenatchee, completed in 1933 by Puget Sound Power & Light Co.

GRAND COULEE OUTSTRIPS BONNEVILLE IN POWER PRODUCTION

Completed Bonneville already has been outstripped in power production by partially completed Grand Coulee. Appropriations spent and allocated for this fiscal year for Grand Coulee total $180,000,000 and the estimated total cost is now set at $215,000,000—not counting the great irrigation development which will add at least another $100,000,000 after the war. With 7 great generators now in service, Grand Coulee can produce more than 750,000 kilowatts—compared with Bonneville's 518,400 kilowatts from 10 generators. And Coulee ultimately is expected to produce 1,944,000 kilowatts.

The general public has been somewhat confused at the division of authority among Government agencies and departments engaged in development of the Columbia River—and no wonder. The War Department's Army engineers built and will continue to operate Bonneville dam proper. The Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation built and will operate Grand Coulee. But neither Army engineers nor Reclamation Bureau have anything to do with the sale of the power which they produce. That is handled entirely by the Bonneville Power Administration, with head offices in Portland. This is an agency set up within and responsible to the Department of the Interior.

Administrator Paul J. Ravers' agency has spent approximately $72,000,000 to construct a northwest network of high voltage transmission lines. This includes $39,000,000 in construction work now in progress. No funds for additional transmission expansion have been budgeted to the Bonneville Power Administration, because of the war, but the agency does have a budget reserve of $26,000,000 which it may spend on projects approved by the War Production Board as essential for war production.

ENGINEERS HAVE PLANNED POST-WAR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Engineers of the Bonneville Power Administration, with an eye toward this $26,000,000 budget reserve, have outlined a preliminary post-war construction program which would involve about 35 projects—a backlog of peacetime construction representing approximately 35,000 man-months of labor and the expenditure of at least $15,000,000 for equipment and materials. In addition the Bonneville Power Administration figures it will be necessary to spend another $25,000,000 on the transmission network after the war if Congress appropriates funds for additional generators at Grand Coulee and authorizes construction of Umatilla Dam or some other great Northwest power plant.

Without Bonneville's tenth and final generator, the combined peak power load of Bonneville and Grand Coulee hit 1,249,000 kilowatts on November 22, 1943, and has been running consistently above 1,000,000 kilowatts. Of this output, industries—virtually all of them war industries—are taking approximately 800,000 kilowatts, while the much discussed P. U. D., R. E. A., and municipal customers are getting only about 45,000 kilowatts.

The Bonneville-Grand Coulee network of transmission lines and substations, principally lying within the State of Washington but reaching as far south as Eugene in Oregon, includes 2,524 miles of lines. The break-down on these is 1,056 miles of 230,000-volt lines, 1,102 miles of 115,000-volt lines, and 366 miles of lower voltage lines. Total substation transformer capacity is approximately 2,500,000 kilovolt-amperes.

Col. Thomas M. Robins, now a major general in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., was Pacific Northwest division engineer when Bonneville was started as a make-work orphan, in the depths of the depression and the first Bonneville district engineer was Col. C. F. Williams. Bonneville did not get the approval of Congress until the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 1935 was voted. Appropriations came regularly thereafter.

The $81,386,000 cost of Bonneville Dam has been divided along these lines: $39,431,477 for the power plant, $5,412,937 for the highest single-lift lock and other navigation facilities; $36,541,584 for the spillway dam, fishways, and miscellaneous construction items.

EDGAR KAISER CUT HIS EYE TEETH ON POWER PROJECTS

Henry J. Kaiser, rising to fame as the West's greatest builder, was president of Columbia Construction Co. which was given the contract for the spillway dam, and son Edgar, now general manager of the Kaiser shipyards in Portland and Vancouver, cut his eye teeth in construction by licking the world's toughest river. The original contract for the powerhouse and locks went to General Construction Co. of Seattle and J. F. Shea, Inc., of Portland; the second powerhouse contract was awarded to L. H. Hoffman Co., Portland; and the third contract to Puget Construction Co., Seattle; General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y., built the great generators at an approximate cost of $750,000 each; and S. Morgan Smith Co., York, Pa., built the turbines.

Lt. Col Ralph Tudor, present district engineer is authority for the statement that although there are larger power projects, none is more efficient than Bonneville. Portland district Army engineers employed J. C. Stevens of the Portland engineering firm of Stevens & Koon to conduct a hydraulics model study in a Bonneville laboratory set up at the Government moorage near Linnton. The dam was built in miniature there and each step in its construction was thoroughly tested.

DAM MODELS HELPED TO IRON OUT BUGS IN CONSTRUCTION

For several months the engineers conducted studies in miniature, using confetti so that the direction of currents and eddies could be seen plainly in photographs, to prevent "scour"—the washing away of a dam's base by the torrent of water passing over the spillway. Each portion of the spillway was

reproduced and subjected to stream-flow tests based on detailed studies of the flow, velocity, time, and forces of the Columbia between Bradford Island and the Washington shore, which the spillway now spans. The spillway was designed to pass a flood of 1,600,000 second-feet, 37 percent greater than the maximum flood of record, which occurred in June 1894.

But models could not solve all the construction problems. One of the toughest was the "unwatering" of the Columbia's main river channel—an unprecedented job, since never before had a dam been built where the flow was so great. Columbia Construction Co. found the answer in the Northwest's forests. Twenty-one great wooden cribs, built roughly to the dimensions of a cube 60 by 60 by 60 feet, but tailored to fit the river bed, were constructed. The cribs were floated out into the water and held by 3-inch cables while truckloads of rock were brought out on wooden trestles and dumped in to anchor the cribs to the river bottom. When all the cribs were in place, interlocking sheet steel piling was extended around them, making the cofferdam as nearly watertight as possible.

Six cribs were sunk in the middle of the main channel, seven were placed upstream, and eight downstream. When the river flow had been completely diverted around the cofferdam, construction of the concrete spillway was started. When the spillway was completed, the cribs were removed, the downstream cribs being blasted away first.

RIVER RISE DID NEGLIGIBLE DAMAGE, THANKS TO PREPARATION

While the cofferdam was in service, engineers watched with concern the rise of the Columbia during the spring run-off to an unusual flood height. Despite the force of the current, the only damage was to the first crib, and this resulted in a delay of only 1 week while repairs were made.

The unexpectedly high water in this critical period of the dam's construction resulted in temporary suspension of work on the spillway, but this lull had been anticipated, and work boomed ahead on other sections of the project. Flood waters were allowed to pass over the cofferdam, but no material damage was done. Elaborate experiments in pumping, in anticipation of the flood, paid dividends in reducing the flood danger to the cofferdam.

EARTH FILL USED TO "UNWATER" BRADFORD SLOUGH AREA

It was a much easier job to "unwater" Bradford slough, which lay between the island and the Oregon shore, where the flow was not so great as in the main channel. This was accomplished by an earth fill, behind which construction went ahead on the powerhouse substructure.

The first 3 generators installed at Bonneville had a capacity of 42,200 kilowatts each, and the next 7 a capacity of 54,000 kilowatts each. Each required about 1 year to manufacture in General Electric's plant at Schenectady. Each, shipped in sections, required about 32 flatcars, some of them specially built, for the transcontinental trip. Five or six months were needed to install and test each generator after its arrival.

And, if you're interested in statistics, the power produced by Bonneville's No. 10 generator in 1 year would be sufficient to process magnesium for 25,000,000 incendiary bombs or supply the total needs of Portland and its suburbs (475,000,000 kilowatt-hours), or to make aluminum sufficient to build 4,300 heavy bombers or 15,300 fighter planes.

Ode to a Super-Follow-Upper, Dedicated to a "Gwibit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, vast and varied has been the response in my mail the past few days to my remarks on the floor as delivered on December 15—page 10729 of the RECORD—in definition of the All-American New Deal Gwibit and directed to the proposition that this Republic needs an American Association for Eliminating Gwibits.

In this influx of mail, Mr. Speaker, came the following poem enclosed in a letter signed by C. Young of West Twelfth Street, New York City. I am not sure whether or not the poem is original with Mr. Young but it is in all events expressive enough so that I feel I should share its preachment with others in the country and the Congress. Here it is for all who would have a part in preventing the Gwibit from becoming a permanent Government Gremlin to infect the Capital and impoverish the country.

REFERENCE: B AND B 3X–24624

FILE: INV. FORM A62B–M. Q.

(Dedicated to a Gwibit)

As head of the Division of Provision for Revision
Was a man of prompt decision—Morton Quirk.
Ph. D. in calisthenics, P. D. Q. in pathogenics,
He had just the proper background for the work.

From the pastoral aroma of Aloma, Oklahoma,
With a pittance of a salary in hand,
His acceptance had been whetted, even aided and abetted
By emolument that netted some five grand.

So with energy ecstatic this fanatic left his attic
And hastened on to Washington, D. C.,
Where with verve and vim and vigor, he went hunting for the nigger
In the woodpile of the W. P. B.

After months of patient process, Morton's spicular proboscis
Had unearthed a reprehensible hiatus
In reply by Blair and Blair to his thirteenth questionnaire
In connection with their inventory status.

They had written, "Your directive when effective was defective
In its ultimate objective—and what's more,
Neolithic hieroglyphic is, to us, much more specific
Than the drivel you keep dumping at our door."

This sacrilege discovered, Morton fainted—but recovered
Sufficiently to write, "We are convinced
That sabotage is camouflaged behind perverted persiflage—
Expect me on the 22d inst."

But first he sent a checker, then he sent a checker's checker—
Still nothing was disclosed as being wrong;
So a checker's checker's checker came to check the checker's checker
And the process was laborious and long.

Then followed a procession of the follow-up profession
Through the records of the firm of Blair and Blair;
From breakfast until supper some new super-follow-upper
Tore his hair because of Morton's questionnaire.

The file is closed, completed, though our hero, undefeated
Carries on in some department as before.
But Vict'ry is in sight of—not because of—but in spite of
Doctor Morton's mighty effort in the war!

Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here a highly complimentary and well-deserved editorial tribute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The editorial from the Washington Post follows:

MAN OF COURAGE

MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has just given his elders in the House a lesson in political courage and independence. On Monday he stood up and spoke his mind about the fat hand-out which his fellow-Oklahoman, Congressman DISNEY, had fashioned for the oil industry. If the House had been in a mood to respond to reason instead of to pressure, Mr. MONRONEY would have swayed it. He exposed the economic absurdity of the Disney bill. He pointed out its dangerous consequences—successive demands by every other commodity group in the country, wreckage of the price-control program, inflation which, in the end, would nullify all price increases and imperil the value of investments and savings. He talked as an American, not merely as an Oklahoman.

The congressional district represented by Mr. MONRONEY is one of the richest oil-producing sections of the country. His constituents, if they are short-sighted or selfish, may not like what he did. He felt, nevertheless, as he told the House, that "our responsibility not only rests with the oil industry but it also rests with the millions of consumers who will be ruined by inflation." The real and vital interests of the people of Oklahoma were far better protected by Mr. MONRONEY than by other Members of the State delegation who heckled him from the floor. However concerned they may be about oil, Oklahomans, like other Americans, own War bonds and life-insurance policies and savings accounts. It was these that Mr. MONRONEY sought to safeguard. He is a credit to the voters who sent him to Congress. We need more like him.

Opium Smoking To Be Prohibited in Far East by United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we have reason to be gratified with the decision of the British and Netherlands Governments to stop the sale of opium in their far eastern territories after liberation from Japanese occupation.

Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on the subject from the Bangor Daily News of Wednesday, December 8, 1943:

WELL-EARNED VICTORY

In the midst of the war, the first real postwar settlement has been achieved. Not at Cairo. Nor Teheran. At Washington and London. Not with artillery salvos, cameras, radios, and cables competing to reach a breathless public—necessary when heads of states meet. This settlement was effected quietly, yet it is vital.

The Governments of Great Britain, in London, and of the Netherlands, in exile, have pledged themselves never to revive their opium monopolies, forever to abolish opium smoking so soon as their Pacific and Asiatic territories are freed from Japanese bondage.

No sooner had the United States acquired the Philippines than we uprooted the drug traffic in those islands and began an earth-girdling struggle against this curse. We had seen how it takes millions of lives, ruins millions more, how its cost exceeds all counting in hospitalization, police, and prison work, trade, and professional slowups. How it stretches over all oceans, islands, continents; how no barrier of class or culture could bar it from the homes of the rich, the tenements of the poor.

The United States led an offensive at the Hague, at Versailles, at abortive Geneva conferences, the nearly successful 1931 conference, the utter failure of the Bangkok Conference. Thanks to our Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics, under Commissioner Anslinger, and to legislation it inspired, we had cleaned our own house as thoroughly as was possible so long as the traffic was fostered elsewhere. In the United States today there remains only 1 percent of illicit drugs.

Realizing the invaluable role of narcotics in medicine as keenly as we realized the plague that they breed outside their proper sphere, Anslinger and his colleagues, here at their offices and abroad at the conferences, played their cards for world-wide governmental commitments rigidly limiting narcotics' production to each nation's strictly calculated medical and other scientific needs. At the birth of New China, China herself instituted a 6-year plan for efficient cooperation; China, which had been compelled officially to feed the drug traffic as the price of her defeat in the war of 1840–42.

Always, however, there stood one stumbling block which, it appeared, nothing could remove; the opium monopolies stubbornly maintained by other governments than ours.

Two percent of the entire revenue of the Dutch East Indies was derived from smoking opium; in British Burma, 5 percent of the country's revenue was similarly derived; in the British Federated Malay States, 6 percent; in British North Borneo, 10 percent; in British Sarawak, 11 percent; in the British Unfederated Malay States, 12 percent; and in the British Straits Settlements, 20.

Small wonder that Britain, Holland, France, Germany—all the major opium-growing and drug-manufacturing nations—doggedly insisted on government control instead of accepting America's pleas for abolition. Our cause looked hopeless.

But then came the war—and, finally, America's part in it.

It is commonly said that we were unprepared for war. This settlement which has now taken place proves that, in one respect, somebody had made us infinitely better prepared than any other nation. Again thanks to the Federal Commissioner of Narcotics, the United States possessed far and away the world's largest reserve stocks of medicinal opium.

Precisely what happened, nobody outside official circles yet knows. It may be that, outside official circles, nobody will ever know. Yet what everybody who reads the newspapers does know is this:

That certain informal meetings were held in Treasury offices, attended by interested personages, American and foreign. That our Department of State sent, toward the end of last September, an aide memoire to the British, Dutch, and other concerned governments, "in regard to the suppression of nonmedical use of narcotic drugs."

Also: That the war had rapidly closed, to both Holland and Britain, most of the sources of raw opium. That, while Japan employed narcotics as weapons of pacification in conquered areas, the war's enormous casualties reduced Dutch and British medical-opium supplies. That, consequently, the British and Dutch Armies and Navies were in as desperate need of medicinal opium as of ships and guns, planes, and shells. And that there was nowhere to get medical opium except through releases permitted by only one man: an American trained in our Foreign Service, long experienced in diplomacy, a 13-year veteran fighter against governmental opium monopolies—in short, only through American releases O. K.'d by the United States Commissioner of Narcotics.

Large indeed is the diplomatic triumph involved in these latest British and Dutch pledges—and the moral triumph even greater. Just possibly, it is a happy augury of what we may expect from professional statesmen's ultimate approach to problems of colonies, frontiers, minorities, armaments. Quite certainly it is the end of a long game—with America and decency the winners.

Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to my constituents:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *Christmas 1943.*

DEAR FRIEND: You will receive this letter around Christmas time, so it carries my earnest hope and prayer that the message of Christmas time will bring you renewed hope and courage. May we all feel that our efforts toward building a world worthy of the sacrifice of so many noble young men are blessed by a power far greater than any on this earth. It is hardly right this year to wish anybody a "merry" Christmas, but the Christmas message as contained in the fundamental teaching of Christ and His own sacrifice are needed by us all more today than ever before.

As to the war, by this time I think there is no doubt about the ultimate victory of the United Nations. Since the Moscow Conference it appears almost certain that the United Nations will remain united, and their combined power is too great for the Axis to stand up against. Just when victory will be achieved, however, I cannot tell and doubt that anyone else can. The defensive armament with which Germany has surrounded herself is unquestionably very strong. Many of us have believed that the way to defeat Japan was to strike her in her home island. Some day that can be done. But there is no quick or easy road to Tokyo. Despite this we must resolve to go through to complete victory, for our task is to demonstrate to the world that the arrogant aggression which Japan and Germany have embarked upon can only lead to disaster for those undertaking it. That is the first step toward a peace which can endure.

But it is not the only one. Americans must be ready to participate in an effective international organization capable of stopping aggression in the future. This does not mean giving up self-government by our country. It means extending our sovereignty toward keeping the peace. But we will be untrue to the memory of men who have given their lives in this war if we are not prepared to stop the next war before it gets started. The present war might have been prevented had Japan's seizure of Manchuria been blocked in 1931 or effective economic measures been taken to stop Italy's Ethiopian invasion. I shall not go into further detail here about this problem of building a peace that can endure for I am just now finishing a whole book on this subject which I hope will be a worth-while contribution to this cause.

As long as this war lasts certain sacrifices will be required of every citizen. The draft law is the outstanding example of how war reaches into every home and how our country depends on its loyal citizens. And we have been compelled to organize our economic life for maximum production for the winning of the war. This has given us the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and a whole battery of other war agencies. As long as these agencies last it is the duty of Congress to see that they do not abuse their powers. This is why, in spite of the criticism I have received from some sources, I have gone ahead with my work on the Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and have signed reports pointing out where O. P. A., War Production Board, and other agencies have exceeded the powers granted them by Congress, and why I will support legislation to correct these abuses. It is never right for any Government agency to make of itself prosecutor, judge, and jury over citizens.

Congress cannot and should not try to run the military part of the war. But Congress has two duties of great importance. First, to make certain that the war ends in a firm and lasting peace which will spare the next generation the suffering and torture this one is having to go through, and second, to provide now the assurance of full employment, genuine opportunity, and solid hope for every American after victory. Everything else is unimportant compared to these two duties. The passing of the Fulbright resolution was a step toward the first one.

If returning soldiers are to find jobs awaiting them and if those jobs are to last we must be prepared to constantly maintain the total buying power of our people at the level where they can buy all the goods which American agriculture and industry can produce. This is the reason I have gone before the Ways and Means Committee and spoken in

the House repeatedly to urge a broadening and strengthening of the Social Security Act and the passage of a genuine old-age pension. It is the reason I have worked so continuously for the reform of our monetary system so that, without increasing our national debt, we could keep in circulation the money and credit required to sustain full production and "jobs for all."

But jobs and opportunity and hope there cannot be in the post-war world unless we fight hard and successfully against monopoly power wherever we find it. We now know how international cartels and American monopolies stifled our production of synthetic rubber, magnesium, tin, steel, aluminum, optical glass, and many other critical things in the period before the war. We know what monopoly power has done to small business during the war. We know monopoly can condemn a whole people to artificial scarcity. We have to conquer monopoly power or it will end freedom in America.

So I am glad I was the first Member of Congress to expose the contract which would have handed over the Elk Hills naval oil reserve to the control and operation of the Standard Oil Co. And I am thankful that as I write this letter there are indications that that long fight will finally end in success and that our Navy will acquire by outright purchase the holdings of Standard Oil Co. at Elk Hills so that it can become in truth and in fact a reserve of oil for the defense of our country.

For similar reasons I am actively opposing the bill to exempt fire-insurance companies from the antitrust laws. The Department of Justice is attempting to bring an end to monopolistic practices by certain fire-insurance companies. The Southeastern Underwriters Association has forbidden insurance agents to write insurance for "outside" companies; it has fixed premium rates by agreement, compelling certain classes of people to pay much more for insurance than its real cost. The insurance companies say that they want to avoid Federal regulation of their business. That is understandable. But the only way to avoid Federal regulation is to have the antitrust laws enforced so that monopolistic practices will not grow up in the industry. For once those monopolistic practices arise in any business then Federal regulation is the only way the people can be protected.

The only way to prevent growth of governmental power is to fight private monopoly. The Steel Trust has blocked west coast steel development; the Aluminum Trust has gotten itself an almost free dam at Shipshaw in Canada at the expense of American taxpayers; the major oil companies are dominating Government policy on oil. Democracy and freedom are at stake in this fight as well as in the war. Most sericus of all is the monopoly of the Nation's credit by the private banking system. Purchase by Congress of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks could largely end that.

At last we have a better price schedule for citrus fruit. Orange growers will receive about 30 cents more per box; consumers will pay about 20 percent less for oranges. All because middlemen's margins have finally been reduced to a decent amount. This is something I have been working for for months, along with citrus industry representatives. The Agriculture Committee held hearings and passed a resolution I offered. And at last the thing was changed.

There are other commodities besides citrus fruit where C. P. A. has allowed middlemen's margins to be far too great. Reducing those margins would be a better way to hold down the cost of living than complicated roll backs. But increases in living costs are most unfair to about 15,000,000 American families whose incomes have not increased since the war began or who have such low incomes as to be barely able to buy the necessities of life. These include old-age pensioners, veterans of this and other wars, and their dependents, many white-collar workers, teachers, ministers, and about 4,000,000 wage earners. Congress should have provided a stamp plan whereby these folks could be enabled to buy what they need for the health and nourishment of their families. This would be better than trying to subsidize all consumers. But Congress has not done so. That is the main reason I could not vote to forbid subsidies as a means of preventing price increases. Also Commodity Credit Corporation must be prepared to buy from farmers at fair floor prices food which otherwise might go unharvested as a considerable quantity of vegetables and fruits did go to waste in California last year. I am afraid the bill banning subsidies will interfere with this, which is another reason I opposed it.

We must begin now to make provision for veterans of this war—especially disabled ones. Many things are required. I have a bill in for $500 annual grants to veterans who want to continue their education.

Our primary job is to win the war as quickly as we can.

Some of my votes may be unpopular with certain groups. But I will cast them for the broad national interest of the people as a whole just as nearly as I know how.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

A Christmas Letter From Father to His Son on the Battle Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that I have listened to and read many fine speeches from the Well of this House; however, not one has appealed to me more than your own distinguished remarks delivered just a few days ago before a well-attended session of the House of Representatives. I do not need to remind you of how splendidly it was received, but I feel sure that day by day your listeners will again and again be reminded of and be impressed by the truth of your very timely and inimitable discourse on the conduct of those of us on the home front.

Today I received a copy of a letter written by one of California's distinguished citizens, Mr. Guy W. Finney of 134 North Screenland Drive, Burbank, Calif., to his son in the armed services of our country. I will allow the letter to speak for itself:

HOME, *December 25, 1943.*

DEAR SON: Christmas Day and you not with us; the first one, as I recall, that your place at the table has been vacant. Do we miss you? I'll say we do—more than any words of mine can express. What parents wouldn't on this of all days? But your good mother and I are not letting the day be cheerless around here. That, we feel, would be letting you down. Besides, we have our memories, and happy memories help a powerful lot at times like these. I wouldn't exchange mine for all the gold at Fort Knox.

Your spirit, son, is all around us, in every nook and corner of this old house. And how could it be otherwise? Weren't you here from babyhood on up through your school days, until Uncle Sam put you in uniform? Sometimes we couldn't find you for dust, but as I remember that dust usually cleared up around mealtime. Last night, after we had tucked Sis away and were putting up the Christmas tree and arranging the fixings, we had an odd feeling that you were a lot nearer home than our war map shows. Mother stopped fussing with the tree ornaments for a moment and looked at me with that funny smile of hers. I knew something was on her mind that had to come off.

"You know, John," she said, "I had a strange feeling just now—that Bob was here—yes, right here in this room. It seemed like I could have touched him if I had held out my hand. Isn't it funny how vivid such an impression can be? Why, it's positively uncanny."

Believe it or not, son, I had a feeling like that myself. If the doorbell had rung and you had popped in, I wouldn't have been surprised. Maybe that's God's way of letting us know that you are okay.

Then we went together to your room and put a Christmas package on the table beside your reading lamp. A little gadget or something that mother was sure you'd want when you got back home. Then she reminded me of that package of things we mailed you back in October, to be delivered in time for your Christmas. If it doesn't show up, you let us know, and we'll go after your A. P. O. But you ought to be opening it by now. I hope you'll like the pipe. Mother selected the tobacco pouch. I thought your initials on it looked pretty good.

All your things in your room are just about as you left them. Nothing missing or out of place that I could see. Pictures of your school chums on the wall, grinning from their frames like a bunch of healthy cut-ups; the flags and emblems from your football games, your civies hanging in the closet—even your saxophone standing over in the corner where I guess you tossed it the day your Army call came. I suppose you'll want some new duds when you get home, and maybe a new automobile. Well, anyway, you'll have a neat little bank roll to draw on, as Mother has banked your Army pay checks to your credit at the Peoples. Leave that to Mother. So from now on you're listed in the capitalist class, and that ought to put you on the velvet side. But take it from me, the poker addicts and ivory polishers in your outfit will be giving you the old gimlet eye.

Tiptoeing by Sis's room on our way downstairs, we heard her voice in earnest conversation with somebody she evidently rated a personal friend.

"Dear God," we heard her say, "when you're thinking of all those other boys out there in the war please think of my dear brother, too. He's awful precious to us here at home, so when this dreadful war is over we want you to send him back to us safe and sound."

For the first time today I saw tears in Mother's eyes. And I'll admit I felt a bit sneezy myself, but, of course, I didn't let on. I suppose mothers the world over must cry when something pulls at their heartstrings. That's their outlet. And we males, too, have our own funny way of getting out of emotional jams. We don't shed tears and thus get it over with, but we put on one of those phony hold-down-the-lid acts that rarely fools our womenfolk.

Back in the living room again we put our gift packages in order under the tree. You remember, son, how it is; presents for the family in a neat pile on one side, and those for friends (not so numerous this year) on the other side so as to have them handy when we're ready to make our Christmas calls. Then we got settled for our usual evening radio program. To my way of thinking, a lot of the radio stuff tossed at us these

days isn't worth the wattage it takes to put it on the air. Like I suppose you do with the chow of your Army cooks, we swallow the good and gag on the bad. Some of it, of course, is tops. You may think we've gone a little daffy, son, but mother and I have come to think of some of these radio personalities as our personal friends. Especially those movie people who've been out on the battle fronts entertaining you boys. Imagine us being the hot fans of fellows we wouldn't know if we met them in our lodge room.

From Washington last night came a voice that struck me as being something better than a brassy sound. No fake tremolo, none of that staccato stuff that puts your ears on edge—just the calm, earnest kind of a talk that holds you in your chair. The fact that the Government sponsored it didn't cancel its value with me, as seems to be the case with a lot of business-as-usual fellows who duck behind the Bill of Rights and toss mouth grenades every time Washington does something that hits their pocketbooks. I supposed all this rumpus is what we call our American democracy in operation. But as I view it, a democracy that can't swallow a healthy dose of self-discipline and forget its gimme-and-grab habits during a war like this—well, it had better watch its step because it won't be invited to come in on a wing and a prayer in the post-war set up. And we don't need any crystal ball to figure out that one, either, do we son?

But to get back to our radio speaker. It seems that he had made the rounds of the battle fronts—the South Pacific, China, Burma, north Africa, Italy, Russia, Yugoslavia—and the picture he drew wasn't exactly pleasant. Just a long bloody trail of horror, sacrifice, and suffering. We get the story through our newspapers—he was on the ground—and I suppose that's what makes the difference in our viewpoint at home. In a few minutes I could see he was reaching mother's sympathies. Her face showed her distress. So I reached over to tune in on another program. But she waved me aside.

"No, no—I want to hear this man's story through," she said. "It's terrible—unbelievably horrible—all this cruelty and suffering—and we here sheltered and comfortable in our homes—with everything we need. Doesn't it make our complaints sound selfish and absurd?"

"Mine is not a happy story for your Christmas festivities," I heard him say. "It would be far better on this of all nights if we could give our entire thought to the message of the Prince of Peace, for there never was a time when His counsel was more greatly needed than now. But we are denied this solace while a war of vast proportions and unbridled cruelty is raging—while free institutions everywhere are threatened—while ruthless oppressors make a mockery of our faith in Christ's mercy—while our beloved sons are fighting and dying, that we may find peace and security. But what will peace and security means to us as a Nation if by faltering with our aid and united purpose we confess ourselves unready to extend those blessings to the stricken world?

"I tell you frankly that I was both shocked and humiliated at the attitude of a great section of my compatriots toward this war when I came home recently, after an absence of nearly 3 years. Widespread complaining about food rationing, strikes, and threats of more strikes, petty political quarrels, embittered partisans spreading distrust, savage attacks on the war management, black markets, profligate spending in night clubs, special privilege seekers everywhere. Here are deficiencies, I feel, that reveal a sordid breach of faith to those gallant men upon whose shoulders we have laid the colossal burden of fighting this war. What if they should fail us? I was astounded when a prominent businessman said to me:

" 'We've got this war licked—it's in the bag now: The shooting will be over by the 1st of the year. Meantime, we'd better look at the picture realistically, put that Communist bogey out of the way, and be ready for the business boom ahead.'

"This man may believe that all that is needed to salvage this war's ghastly wreckage, and heal the spiritual wounds of its countless victims, is an all-American business boom. And he may have followers who agree with this cool, calculating logic, that America's chief concern, after all, is to see that its material benefits are not disturbed. But if a majority of our people can offer no better peace token to the tortured and dispossessed peoples of the world, then they had better not send their respersentatives to the peace table. For they will not be welcome.

"Our fighting men know the realities of war. They have seen its ruin and tragedy. They have witnessed the hatred it sows—the smoldering hatred of starved and tormented men—withered, soul-seared caricatures of their former manhood, waiting only for their day of revenge. And hatred, my friends, is a fearful thing. Once unleashed, it knows few boundaries. War-born hatreds sown in the fury of the Nazi and Japanese conquest will soon come to harvest. How do we Americans at home propose to deal with this harvest? Do we think that by standing apart we can escape its bitter fruit? That question the dispossessed, devastated peoples of the earth will confront us with. And we still have our own fighting sons to answer to. Some day those whom God has mercifully spared will be coming home. How will they feel if we have to tell them that by our half measures, our lack of a united, all-out purpose, we let them down?"

Mother and I sat in silence for quite a time after the speaker left the air. I remembered how we all went together down to the station that day to see you off. And how you gripped my hand when I said:

"Son, your Uncle Sam has given you the toughest assignment you ever had. Now show him that you've got what it takes."

I'll always remember your answer. You gave it to us pronto—right off the bat.

"Don't worry, Dad," you said. "I think I know what this war is all about. And you can bet all you've got that I won't let you down—either you or Mom or Sis or Uncle Sam. I'll be out there giving those bozos on the other side my own little idea of hell—and I'll be doing it for the finest old country on the face of the earth. I think that's the way all of our fellows feel about it."

You know, son, those words made us all feel a whole lot better when we got back home. And now I'm going to make a pledge to you. We won't let you down either—not you or Uncle Sam. Maybe we haven't been doing enough in this war. We're buying War bonds, and mother is doing U. S. O. work and Red Cross sewing in her spare time from her housework, and I'm the air warden in our neighborhood. And Sis, of course, is buying War stamps at her school. Maybe by straining a little more we can double our score. Anyway, it's a pledge. I can better now appreciate since I heard that radio talk that it's our job—the job of every parent in America—to get you boys home in a hurry, no matter what the cost. It can never be as high a price as you boys out there have already paid.

Let us know about your Christmas package—what shape it reaches you in—and let us have more of your letters. They have a lot to do with keeping up our morale around here. I'll tell you something for your private ear—the neighbors think you're quite a hero. Maybe they'll want to elect you to the city council some day. God bless and protect you wherever you go. A merry Christmas and happy New Year to you—and, of course, there's that special kiss from Mother and Sis.

Affectionately,

DAD.

Fortieth Anniversary of First Airplane Flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, December 18, 1943.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HERBERT: Complying with your telegram, I enclose herewith a copy of the remarks which I would have made at Kitty Hawk if weather conditions had made it possible to get there.

I also enclose copy of a letter that I have sent to Major General Hanley and copy of letter to Commander Burke.

All of us were deeply chagrined at the outcome, but we were simply licked by something bigger than we were. It is impossible to imagine any more difficult situation than that which confronted us. The highways were covered with ice and snow, and the runways at the airports were likewise in such condition as to make it not only perilous but virtually impossible to land. This practically wiped out the entire program.

General Hanley managed to get down there by the use of an amphibian plane through the cooperation of Commander Burke. He went to Manteo and made his speech at the base because it was simply impossible to get to the monument.

I deeply appreciate your leadership in this matter and feel that while we were defeated by weather conditions, we were well justified in the efforts which were made.

Sometime at your early convenience I would like to talk to you about the feasibility of further efforts toward getting the Wright plane located in a suitable museum at Kitty Hawk.

With every good wish, I am

Cordially yours,

J. M. BROUGHTON.

North Carolina is proud to join with the Nation today in celebrating one of the deeply significant events of history. As the State in which the first airplane flight was made by the immortal Wright brothers—here at the scene of this fortieth anniversary occasion—we gladly initiate by this program a series of events designed to commemorate a notable achievement and to honor one of America's truly great men—Orville Wright.

In the shadow of this memorial shaft erected by a grateful Republic on the site of the epochal event, our deepest emotion is one of gratitude that in this earth-shaking struggle, precipitated by greed and barbarism, the American flier and his allies in the air, implemented by the genius of the two brothers whose names we honor, are striking blows that will assure victory and enhance the ideals to which our Nation is dedicated.

To Orville and Wilbur Wright the conception of the airplane was one of peace and world neighborliness. When evil-minded men have sought to convert this instrumentality into an agency for destruction and world domination, the same America that produced the Wright brothers has been able to develop masters of production and heroes of the air who jointly are driving the European Hun and his dastardly Asiatic accomplice to defeat and destruction.

In sight of this shaft, and on North Carolina soil, at Roanoke Island, over 350 years ago there was born the first child of white, English-speaking parents in America. Ill-fated though this first English colony to land in America may have been, it demonstrated the hardihood and unquenchable spirit of the incomparable Anglo-Saxon race. The blood of this race, the descendants of succeeding colonists, have built in the soil of a new world a civilization that has led and amazed the earth by its courage and resourcefulness.

From such a race of men in this America of ours have come the brothers Wright and their world-changing invention. We hail them and their unique achievement as among the proudest products of a great people.

In the presence of these historic surroundings, in tribute to the living and the dead, may we here and throughout the Nation rededicate ourselves, our all, to the preservation of these ideals, to a glorious victory, and a durable peace.

Letter From Johnson City Kiwanis Club Endorsing H. R. 1504

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

KIWANIS CLUB,
Johnson City, N. Y., December 17, 1943.

Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: The Johnson City Kiwanis Club heartily endorses bill H. R. 1504, introduced by you in the House last January 26, seeking to provide transportation home during furlough for servicemen. Pursuant to resolutions of the club, I have today written to Senators MEAD and WAGNER expressing our sentiments relative thereto.

We sincerely hope that this bill may be reported from committee and enacted into law at an early date.

Very truly yours,

JOHNSON CITY KIWANIS CLUB,
JOSEPH P. PFISTER,
Past President.

Uncle Sam: Stop, Look, and Listen—Let Us Win the War and Keep United States Solvent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech I delivered over radio station KGW–KEX by transcription, December 11, 1943:

Good evening, I want to consider with you tonight some of the problems which are uppermost here in the Nation's Capital and what we can and should do to win the war and keep America solvent and break the strangle hold of bureaucracy on our Government and the lives of our people. During war we must lodge dictatorial powers in a centralized authority. All powers needed for the successful prosecution of the war have been granted by the Congress to the Commander in Chief. Also, every dollar necessary to finance this gigantic undertaking has been granted.

In providing these huge sums for the war, we should not lessen our vigilance to see that these hard-earned American dollars are not wasted in extravagant spending. We must, in financing the war, make certain that we maintain the solvency of America and that we do not throw the Nation into a spiral of unbridled inflation with a burden of public debt that future generations will be unable to meet. With the public debt now approaching $200,000,000,000 and with three hundred billion in prospect before the war ends, and with an annual spending approaching one hundred billions, our thinking must be sobered and we must make certain that every leak in the Public Treasury is cut off.

It may help comprehend the size of these billions to recall that if one living at the time of Christ had $1,000,000,000, and spent a thousand dollars every day from that time until now, one would still have enough of the billion dollars left to spend a thousand dollars daily for another 900 years.

Just what is meant by bureaucracy? We can see what the people themselves throughout the United States are thinking of bureaucracy by the results of the elections which have been held recently. The American Institute of Public Opinion recently made a poll. The question was asked, "What do you like least about the handling of home affairs?" It is significant to note of the five principal reasons given, the first was "incompetent and dictatorial management of home affairs; too much Government interference, too much bureaucracy, too much red tape." Second: "Disapproval of the handling of labor problems and strikes." Third, "Government extravagance; a spendthrift Government; bungling tax program." Fourth, "Failure to keep prices down and to check inflation." Fifth, "Bad job of rationing, with resulting food shortages and lack of proper controls and distribution." The poll showed these criticisms of the bureaucratic control of our Government are not partisan, because they are made by the members of all political parties. The people are just tired of being shoved around by bureaucrats from Washington and burdened with staggering debts and taxes and with shortages of foods and other necessities of life in a country where there is plenty for all.

Let us examine some of the extravagances and bungling control from Washington which justify the American people in bringing this severe indictment against the bureaucracy which now controls our Government. Do you know that we now have one employee on the Federal pay roll for every two and a half men in the Army? In Thomas Jefferson's time there was 1 Federal employee for every 5,308 persons. Today we have 1 for every 45 persons—men, women, and children—and this does not include those employed in uniform in the Army and Navy. The executive branch of the Government has so expanded that it has become 1 vast bureaucracy centered in Washington, with its tentacles reaching out and drawing within its meshes every State and community in the Union.

The State of Ohio has 25,000 employees. The Federal Government in Ohio has 90,000 employees. In Massachusetts there are 21,000 State employees, and 129,000 Federal employees. In Pennsylvania, there are 44,500 on the State pay roll, but 215,000 on the Federal pay roll. The little State of Wyoming employs 1,100 people, but Uncle Sam has 6,200 employees and snoopers in that State.

Reports here show that 100 employees in 1 unit of 1 department protested that they had no work to do from March to October 24; that the Indian Service had a record of 12,500 employees, or 1 employee to care for each group of 29 Indians under Government charge; that there are 14 agencies working on post-war planning; that there are 8 agencies collecting labor data; 23 Federal agencies dealing with fish; that 1 complaint was, "I was just 1 of more than 100 employees in that office, some of them being paid $6,000 and $8,000 a year, all sitting idle as I was."

Listen to this: An O. P. A. bureaucrat, to whom a minister with 3 parishes and 2,000 members applied for gas, said:

"Your work, as pastor of a church, is not fundamental to the war effort. I am not concerned about the churches. I am concerned about getting gasoline for the men who work in shops. In 60 days there will be no gasoline for churches and similar enterprises, and the quicker the churches close up, the better it will be, anyway."

Can we not say, paraphrasing Jefferson's indictment to King George, of England, in the Declaration of Independence:

"Bureaucracy has erected a multitude of new offices and sent thither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat their substance."

The Federal Government now has more people drawing their pay out of the Federal tax coffers than the combined total of employees of all the 48 States and all of the county and municipal governments—over 3,000,000 in all. The Byrd committee recommended that no less than 300,000 of these employees could be eliminated and shifted to essential war work. Other experts say 600,000 to 1,000,000 could be dispensed with, without crippling our governmental activities, with an annual saving of $2,000,000,000. The annual pay roll of the civilian bureaucracy is more than $8,000,000,000, as reported by Senator Byrd—or twice as much as the total cost of all operations of government in the year 1932, including the Army and Navy. He also reported that nearly 1,000,000 of the male employees are of draft age.

We have had more than 2,700 lawyers working for O. P. A., and Britain has only 10 in its entire price and rationing agencies. There are 2,241 separate governmental agencies listed in the Federal Register. Many of these agencies and bureaus are issuing directives with the full force of law. These directives almost equal in number the laws passed by Congress. These bureaucrats have usurped the powers of the Congress, and in many cases openly defied the Congress. We are becoming a nation ruled by directives and bureaucrats. Almost every act of every citizen in our country is completely controlled by a bureaucratic directive or order from Washington. A classic order had to do with fruit cake. It contains 6 pages of fine print.

You may well ask what this horde of Federal employees are doing, whom you, the taxpaying citizens, are carrying on your backs. Well, here is what some of them are doing: Government bureaus issued over 7,000 reports and questionnaires in 6 months. There is no way for us here in Washington to determine the exact number distributed, but the Office of Price Administration alone has issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, excluding rationing forms and instructions. One automobile company reported that the preparation of Government forms required from it cost it $125,000 and required 100,000 man-hours to prepare. Another company estimated the forms required 132,560 man-hours and cost it $192,500. It is estimated that 188,000 persons in industry are engaged in preparing data required by the Government, excluding the rationing work.

You may well ask what is done with these millions of reports which are required by the Government and forwarded here or to some Government agency. The answer is that these Federal bureaucratic employees must mull over, sort, tabulate, compile, digest, index, file, and distribute to various agencies and officials the data thus collected.

Some of this glaring waste of public funds has just come to light in the false Jap propaganda sent out by the War Relocation Authority to the Japanese held at Tulelake and other relocation camps. These crack-pot bureaucrats are actually circulating among these Japs held in these camps propaganda through W. R. A. publications, at Government expense, appealing to these Japs to spread among the farmers of Ohio and Michigan and the Middle West and teach them cleanliness, culture, skill, orderliness, and how to bathe, telling the Japs they are far superior to these American farmers. Let me quote the exact words your Government through these bureaucrats is using to tell the Japs at Tulelake and other Jap camps—and these are the exact words sent to the Japs through this Government propaganda, by the bureaucrats you are paying good hard tax dollars:

"Then believe it or not, you have some few tenants and seasonal workers who do not bathe! [referring to our American farmers]. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

"We need to know something of your skill in packing and grading, your artistic sense of orderliness. We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West, in Ohio and Michigan, who are not careful, painstaking and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellowmen and much for our sense of the art of agriculture as well as the science."

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, when shown a copy of the story, declared: "It must be a revelation to the Middle West farmer to discover that he is neither clean, sanitary, careful, nor painstaking and must now take lessons from the Japanese. This patronizing opinion of the American farmer, coming from inside administration sources, perhaps explains the determination to tell every farmer how he must farm and what he must raise. What American farmers need is not Japanese advice, but a new Department of Agriculture in Washington."

I ask you, will the spending of tax money—your tax money—for such bunk propaganda, help win the war? Uncle Sam, is it not time to stop, look and listen, and rid the Government pay rolls of these spendthrift nit-wits and plug the Treasury leaks?

These men sending out this Jap propaganda, insulting the American farmer, are a part of the 3,000,000 on the Federal pay roll costing the American taxpayers $8,000,000,000 a year. Is it not far better, I ask you, to cut this flagrant waste of public funds and thereby reduce the cost of Government, than to pile more taxes on the backs of the American taxpayers?

Is it not time, Uncle Sam, to stop, look and listen, and while we are listening, let us listen to the words of a great American—Thomas Jefferson—when he said:

"To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt; we must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Coming down to our own day, let us listen to Bernard M. Baruch, when he said in his report on manpower:

"Proper handling of manpower has been made impossible by the failure of Government agencies to work as a team with a clearly defined program. Measures undertaken by one agency have been undone by the conflicting actions or inactions of other agencies."

Every dollar necessary for the prosecution of the war to full victory must and will be provided. Every dollar for waste, graft and spendthrift bureaucrats, whether for war or nonwar, must be refused. Elimination of this frightful waste and useless spending would shorten the war and save many lives of our boys fighting on the battlefronts.

Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is reported to have said that we can save from $5,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 by tightening the loose war financing now prevailing in the Government. The War Department has made a reduction recently of $13,163,519,000 in the Army budget. The Navy is studying similar cut-backs. At all hazards, we must preserve our financial structure against bankruptcy, or lose all we are fighting for. Certainly, unnecessary Government deficits and ever-increasing billions of staggering public debts, together with bureaucratic control over the daily lives of the American people from Washington, can only lead to the destruction of the States and home rule and the end of free representative Government, for which we are fighting.

I agree with a former Governor of New York, when he said:

"It was clear to the framers of our Constitution, that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation would inevitably result at some future time in the dissolution of the Union itself. * * *

"Government costs too much, I shall not stop that preaching; taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, our workers may never see a tax bill but they pay it. They pay it in deductions in wages, in increased cost of what they buy. Let us have courage to stop borrowing to meet continual deficits."

The Governor who expressed that wise, Jeffersonian doctrine, is now the President of the United States. The Federal Government has first call on tax funds and we will soon be where there will be no funds left to run the States, after the Federal Government exacts its demands.

I will close with the words of Senator BYRD:

"Bureaucracy, rabbitwise, is self-multiplying. It wastes the people's money, flouts the will of the people's elected representatives, and down to the last cross-roads village is extending its power over the people's lives."

Montana Bill Musgrove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, we were all thrilled with the magnificent success our boys achieved in wresting the Gilberts from the Japanese but we are saddened also at the great loss of life incurred in the conquest of Tarawa. Many of us read with heavy hearts of the tremendous handicaps our boys had to undergo in establishing a beach head there. We cannot afford to continue losses of this kind. Let us hope, in memory of those who gave their lives so unflinchingly, that other campaigns in the Pacific will not entail such heavy losses. Our war against Japan is far from over, and the sooner all of us realize that fact the sooner the war will be won.

For over 4 years I have tried to bring before the people of my State and Nation the importance and the danger of the Japanese menace. Our future is tied up with the outcome of the war in the Pacific. There can be no turning back. We have a job to do—a tough, hard, and vicious job—but we must let nothing stop us in our determination to carry this war to the enemy until complete victory is won.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Axel Lindh, of the Forest Service at Missoula, Mont., concerning a Montana boy, Montana Bill Musgrove, who made good at Tarawa. Bill was a credit to those of us who knew him and we of Montana are proud of his exploits and grateful to him for his outstanding performance. As a former marine I am happy to report to the House an account of Bill's courage contained in the Missoula Sentinel, of Missoula, Mont., under date of December 13, 1943. Mr. Axel Lindh, who forwarded this newspaper account of Bill's exploits, knew him well in the Forest Service. His letter speaks for itself and I can readily understand Mr. Lindh's pride in his friend.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to report to my colleagues that the Marine Corps is concentrating its main energies in the Pacific. We can be assured that the corps will do everything asked of it and more besides. It has never failed us and we can always rest secure in the knowledge that its motto "Semper Fidelis" will always shine like a beacon light for all of us to live up to. More power to you, Bill, and your gallant comrades in the Marine Corps.

The letter and article follow:

DECEMBER 14, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Here's a clipping from the Sentinel of December 13 concerning Bill Musgrove.

We're proud of Bill—very, very proud. He was one of our most likely rough, tough, loyal, dependable, and skillful woodsmen. When I wrote a recommendation for his commission in 1941 I stated "without the least hesitation, I can say that if I had an extremely rough, dangerous trip to make in mountain country, I would ask for no better man to take along than Bill Musgrove. He met the hazards of mountain parachute jumping without hesitation and was always ready for action when other jumpers felt it was too dangerous for a safe landing."

I'm hoping Bill has earned and will get the biggest medal they can give him. He's really a product Montana can be proud of. He'll give the Japs hell all the way to Tokyo if they don't shoot him with too big a gun.

Sincerely,

AXEL LINDH.

NOTE.—The Forest Service wouldn't want to claim it made Bill what he is—rather our Nation, and particularly our State, made Bill.

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Sentinel]

FORMER UNIVERSITY STUDENT WITH INVADERS OF TARAWA

(The following story was written by Technical Sgt. Gene Ward, of New York City, a Marine Corps correspondent.)

"TARAWA ATOLL, GILBERT ISLANDS, November 23.—Put Montana Bill Musgrove down on your list of heroes.

"Montana Bill—more formally, First Lt. Bill F. Musgrove, of White Sulphur Springs, Mont., a former parachute jumper for the Forest Service, landed at dawn, November 20, the first day of the invasion of Tarawa.

"He went to work on the Japs by manning a machine gun on his landing craft until it was knocked out. Then on the beach he took a Garand rifle and launched a one-man war on the Nipponese defenders.

"For 2 days Montana Bill went about hunting snipers relentlessly. On the third day he procured some TNT and went about blasting Japanese pill boxes. When things quieted down today he combed entrenchments for additional targets.

"Musgrove, who attended Montana State University before entering the Forest Service, enlisted in the Marine Corps in January 1942 and was commissioned in August of the same year."

Lieutenant Musgrove was a member of the Forest Service parachute-jumping squad in this region in 1941, participating in a number of fire missions.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of December 16, 1943:

COURT HOLDS PRICE FREEZE IS LEGAL

The Emergency Court of Appeals declared yesterday that the general maximum price regulation of April 28, 1942, which froze the prices of commodities generally, is constitutional, and dismissed suits brought by the major independent producers of coke gas against the Office of Price Administration.

The court said the war powers of the President encompassed the price freeze because when it was issued the inflationary movement had so permeated the price structure that all further price increases in all commodities would have had an inflationary effect.

The opinion said the facts disclose a situation which justified the (O. P. A.) Administrator, under the authority conferred on him by the act, in imposing a general over-all ceiling upon commodities, including those whose prices had not risen or given evidence of a threat of an imminent rise. The extent of the inflationary pressure exerted by a pool of excess purchasing power as large as $17,000,000,000 in a single year staggers the imagination. Its existence presented in 1942, and still presents, a frightful peril to the Nation. Certainly the existence of this tremendous pressure justified the conclusion of the Administrator that the whole price structure was threatened with inflationary increases.

The decision of the court is bound to affect disposition of several other suits based on similar grounds, including one brought by the largest vitamin producers of the Nation.

The opinion was written by Chief Justice Albert Maris and concurred in by Justice Calvert Magruder. A separate opinion, agreeing with Maris, was written by Justice Bolitha J. Laws.

Soldiers' and Sailors' Voting and Discharge Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Christmas season, and the New Year, may I say that it has been my wish and desire that the Congress pass certain legislation before any recess is taken, and that wish still continues even in the face of the recess which has just been ordered.

Our soldiers and sailors will not have any recess at Christmas time. Many of them have been in combat duty for long periods of time without any furlough. They have no furlough now. All those who are on the home front should stay on the job and continue the march to victory—without recesses or cessation from their job.

There are two particular legislative matters that, in my opinion, should have had the very serious attention and consideration of the Congress before the end of the year 1943, and those two items are: First, the soldiers and sailors voting bill; and second, the soldiers and sailors discharge pay bill. These are very important items insofar as our soldiers and sailors are concerned. It is my hope that these two legislative matters may be brought before the House and favorable action taken thereon at the very earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, when we refer to the soldiers and sailors voting bill it is my considered judgment that our armed forces want a real and effective voting law. Our soldiers and sailors, who are legal voters, want the privilege of voting for their choice of the candidates for all the offices—those on the national, State, county, and township tickets. We must keep wholly within the provisions of our Constitution in providing the method for such voting, and we know that the Congress can only enact such laws as will control and direct the procedure of voting for Federal offices. In order that our soldiers and sailors may have the right and privilege of voting for State, county, and township offices, and their choice of the candidates therefor, the various States must correct their absent-voting laws in order to extend that right to our soldiers and sailors. It is my belief that the various States will be glad to make the necessary correction in their laws in order to extend the right of voting for the State, county, and township officers to all of our servicemen during this war. Our boys are fighting in this war to preserve our American way of life, and the very least we can do for them is to extend that privilege to them whereby they are enabled to cast their vote for all officers at the 1944 election, and at all elections as long as this war continues.

Mr. Speaker, may I urge the Members of the House that the necessary legislation be passed by this body, and the other body, so that the right of voting may be extended to all of our soldiers and sailors, who are qualified voters, insofar as the Congress can extend that right. And it is my hope that the method of voting may be made very simple and easy of accomplishment. Our boys on the battle front and those serving upon our battleships have no opportunity of complying with any confusing or complicated method in order to cast their votes, but they will have only the opportunity of complying with a very simple procedure. I am confident no Member of Congress wants to prevent our soldiers and sailors from voting at the 1944 or subsequent elections, and in order to make certain their right to vote the method should be made very simple and very easy and without any confusing requirements.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and my belief that the Congress will meet this obligation squarely, and without evasion. It is my hope that the several States will assume its full responsibility in this connection, by providing for a simple and easy, yet efficient, method whereby our soldiers and sailors will be enabled to vote for their choice for every State, county, and township officer whose name appears upon the ballot in their voting precinct, as well as the right to cast their vote for Federal officers the provision for which will be made, I am certain, by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the second legislative matter to which I refer is the so-called soldiers' and sailors' mustering-out bill, or the soldiers' and sailors' discharge-pay bill. We well remember that a similar arrangement was provided at the conclusion of World War No. 1. That measure was referred to as the $60 mustering-out bill, or the $60 bonus bill. That measure was intended to provide our boys with a small amount of money, upon their severance from the service, to bridge the gap between the date of their discharge and the date at which they could secure employment at some gainful occupation. Of course, the amount fixed by that provision at the conclusion of the last World War was very inadequate in many instances. Many of those ex-servicemen, at the close of that war, had lost their jobs; they could not obtain work; many of the returned soldiers sold apples on the street corners to make a few pennies for their own sustenance. It is my hope that such a dismal picture will not present itself at the close of this war.

Mr. Speaker, it is planned to bring this measure up for consideration in January, and I hope there will be no long or unusual delay in presenting this needed legislation. It is also my hope that a reasonable payment may be authorized for the mustering-out pay, in order that

our soldiers and sailors who are fighting valiantly for our country, and for the preservation of our liberty and freedom may have some funds provided for them so they may bridge over the gap between the date of their discharge from the service and their employment at some gainful occupation. We owe this duty to our fighting men. We will not fail to meet that duty, I am certain. We will meet this duty—we will assume every obligation—to our soldiers and sailors as Americans.

Our Boys Must Be Taken Care Of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, idle promises by those in authority must not be accepted in lieu of mustering-out pay for our men and women in the service.

I can think of nothing more inhuman than the discharge of a veteran who is totally disabled without any compensation or mustering-out pay. It is unfair to the veteran; it is unfair to his family and the community. In fact, it is a disgrace on the part of a great Nation which called him into service.

My attention has just been called to the case of a veteran who was discharged from Fitzsimons General Hospital in Colorado. This veteran spent 5 months in this hospital without great improvement. He was released from the hospital and an attendant accompanied him home to a point in my congressional district. This occurred during the month of October. His Army pay stopped November 9, 1943. He was left a charge on his parents and in a physical condition that requires continual medical care.

Is it any wonder that this veteran is mentally depressed? Our Nation owes these boys and girls a debt of gratitude. Shabby treatment must not be tolerated. I promise to do whatever I can to prevent the recurrence of cases similar to the one I have just mentioned.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter received from this veteran:

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
Concordia, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Several months ago you heard from me while I was stationed at Camp Carson, Colo., as to the possibility of me transferring to another department of the Army. Your answer to this was very much appreciated, and it developed that I was unable to transfer as no transfers were being granted at that time.

A short time after this I was taken to the hospital with a serious kidney injury; this was the result of improper diagnosis by the Army sometime previous and several months after I had entered the service. The result was that I was sent from the station hospital at Camp Carson to Fitzsimons General Hospital at Denver, and there operated on for this ailment, partly because they were unable to make proper diagnosis and partly because it would be necessary to operate to do anything for it. Upon operating, the doctors found that they could do nothing for the condition that would cure it. After spending 5 months in the hospital and condition not improving, I was released from the hospital, and an attendant brought me to the home of my father and mother.

The honorable discharge received some 10 or 15 days later under the date of November 9, 1943, was issued by the medical department of Fitzsimons General Hospital. I was informed, before leaving there, that I was being discharged from the Army by reason of total permanent disability, and that I would be unable to perform any physical labor in the future. Also that I would receive compensation from the Government for such reason.

Since coming home I find that I am unable to do any work. Army income has stopped, and I am in a position that I will need this above-mentioned compensation for support. It is beyond my power of imagination to figure out how to get along until the war is over, or until 6 months after the war is over without it. I also find that (as I was told at Fitzsimons) I shall need medical attention probably as long as I shall live.

This, Mr. CARLSON, will also be some expense. All this is beside the fact that I have been let down from an active and self-supporting life. The mental worry and physical pain accompanying this is not gratifying.

I am asking if you can use your influence to get the proposed pension through at once and without further delay. I am not pleased myself at looking to my friends and relatives for support. Feeling that you will understand all this and also have a little personal interest, I remain,

Yours truly.

Congressman Emanuel Celler Challenges Statement of Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long That United States Is Haven for Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long in an endeavor to scotch certain bills before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to effectuate the rescue of the oppressed Jews of Europe, set forth a statement which, to say the least, is unfortunate if not misleading. He claims that 580,000 refugee Europeans were admitted into the United States in the last decade and that the majority of these were Jews.

In the first place these 580,000 refugees were in the main ordinary quota immigrants coming in from all countries. The majority were not Jews.

His statement drips with sympathy for the persecuted Jews, but the tears he sheds are crocodile. I would like to ask him how many Jews were admitted during the last 3 years in comparison with the number seeking entrance to preserve life and dignity. It is not a proud record. He especially singles out the Poles, who were hunted out and killed like rats by the Nazis. How many Poles have been admitted? Again it is not a proud record.

According to Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, not since 1862 have there been fewer aliens entering the country.

Frankly, Breckinridge Long, in my humble opinion, is least sympathetic to refugees in all the State Department. I attribute to him the tragic bottleneck in the granting of visas.

The Interdepartmental Review Committees which review the applications for visas are composed of one official, respectively, from each of the following Departments: War, Navy, F. B. I., State, and Immigration. That committee has been glacierlike in its slowness and coldbloodedness. It takes months and months to grant the visas and then it usually applies to a corpse.

I brought this difficulty to the attention of the President. He asked Long to investigate at once. No; there has been no change in conditions. The gruesome bottleneck still exists.

One gets the impression from Long's statement that the United States has gone out of its way to help refugees fleeing death at the hands of the Nazis. I deny this. On the contrary, the State Department has turned its back on the time-honored principle of granting havens to refugees. The tempest-tossed get little comfort from men like Breckinridge Long.

He discloses some of the things that happened at the so-called Bermuda Conference. He thought he was telling us something heretofore unknown and secret. What happened at the Bermuda Conference could not be kept executive. All the recommendations and findings of the Bermuda Conference were made known to the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees in existence since the Evian Conference on Refugees in 1938 and which has been functioning all this time in London. How much has that committee accomplished in the years of its being. It will be remembered that the Intergovernmental Committee functions through an executive committee composed of six countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Brazil, and Argentina. True, no report of the Bermuda Conference was made public. But a strangely ironical fact will be noted in the presence of Argentina on this most trusted of committees, Argentina that provoked the official reprimand of President Roosevelt by its banning of the Jewish press, and within whose borders Nazi propagandists and falangists now enjoy a Roman holiday. I contend that by the very nature of its composition the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees cannot function successfully as the instrumentality to rescue the Jewish people of Europe. The benefits to be derived from the Bermuda Conference like those of the previous Evian Conference can fit into a tiny capsule.

He speaks of the lack of shipping space. We know that the difficulty might have existed several years ago. But it does not exist now. We have

bridges of ships reaching to all parts of the world and they come back void of passengers.

Long says that the door to the oppressed is open but that it "has been carefully screened." What he should have said is "barlocked and bolted." By the act of 1924, we are permitted to admit approximately 150,000 immigrants each year. During the last fiscal year only 23,725 came as immigrants. Of these only 4,705 were Jews fleeing Nazi persecution.

Long speaks of other Governments who have made efforts to rescue Nazi victims. He mentions Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal and Spain. He can lay no flattering unction to his soul that the United States is responsible for their proffers of help.

On the base of the Statue of Liberty is inscribed:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

If men of the temperament and philosophy of Long continue in control of immigration administration, we may as well take down that plaque from the Statue of Liberty and black out the "lamp beside the golden door."

Pending Insurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter which I have received from Bernard C. Gavit, the dean of the Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington, Ind.

I wrote Dean Gavit, with whom I attended Wabash College, on December 11, enclosing a copy of my extension of remarks which appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages A5377 to A5390, and requested his opinion as a lawyer as to the soundness of the legal position which I had taken in that statement. Dean Gavit was kind enough to reply, and I am including this letter, not for the purpose of my personal glorification but in order that Members of the House who are not members of the Judiciary Committee may have the opinion of a most competent lawyer as to the validity of the legal position which I have taken with reference to H. R. 3270. The letter reads as follows:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,
Bloomington, Ind., December 14, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLES: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 11 and a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing a statement of your position on the pending insurance legislation. I have read your statement with a great deal of interest and congratulate you upon the position you have taken and the masterful way in which you have presented and sustained your position. To my mind there can be no reasonable question about the validity of the position you have taken on this extremely important matter.

Since the book, The Commerce Clause, was written, nothing has happened to change my mind on what was stated in the book on the subject of insurance and interstate commerce. The fact is that, while I was in Washington last year, members of the staff of the Department of Justice who had charge of the litigation in question discussed the matter with me and I was convinced and still am convinced that the Government's position in this case is entirely sound. It, of course, does not follow that if it be held that interstate insurance is interstate commerce, therefore the States will be deprived of the power to make reasonable regulations to protect local interest. Certainly until Congress undertook to enact comprehensive legislation on the subject, the several States would be free to adopt such regulations as the local situation seemed to demand.

I am sure that the bill in question is subject to all of the objections you have urged. In terms and actually the bill does not purport to be and is not a regulation of interstate commerce nor can it be sustained under any other power granted to Congress under the Constitution. It is clearly designed as an instruction to the Supreme Court and, so far as I know, the cases uniformly condemn this type of legislation as an unconstitutional interference with the judicial function.

I am quite willing that you give any publicity to my views on this subject which you feel they may warrant.

With very kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

BERNARD C. GAVIT.

Before becoming dean of the Law School of Indiana University, Bernard Gavit was a practicing lawyer in Lake County, Ind. I feel obligated, particularly, to call attention of the Members of the House to his courage, in that he is and has been for years a member of the Democratic Party; he is the dean of the Law School of the State of Indiana; and yet he is willing to have the above letter published, notwithstanding his position on H. R. 3270 is diametrically opposed to that taken by the senior Member of the other body from the State of Indiana and chairman of the Judiciary Committee of that body; and, likewise, Dean Gavit's position is opposed to that taken by the Democratic Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Henry Schricker.

I relate these facts not only to commend Dean Gavit's intellectual honesty and moral courage but as further evidence of the fact that he would have no ulterior reason for taking a position favorable to mine on this proposed legislation. Under the circumstances, it would seem that Dean Gavit's position on this legislation is entitled to receive the careful study and consideration of every Member of the House.

The Greatest Menace in the Present Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by C. S. Longacre, December 11, 1943, at a mass meeting in the Masonic Temple, Detroit, Mich.:

I am going to speak to you on The Greatest Menace in the Present Emergency. The nations of earth have never faced a greater emergency than that of the present era. They are engaged in the mightiest conflict of the ages—striving for victory and mastery over each other in opposing camps. The outcome of the struggle depends not so much on superior numbers and equipment as upon ability, endurance, integrity, and the rightness of the cause.

The great American poet, James Russell Lowell, stated a great truth when he wrote:

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife 'twixt truth and falsehood, for the good or evil side."

This Nation soon will have to decide, as it did during World War No. 1, whether or not liquor is a help or a hindrance in winning this war. One of the greatest handicaps confronting a nation in any emergency is the liquor menace. Our Government has recognized the menace of liquor in such emergencies as riots, strikes, election days and holidays, and has prohibited its sale at such times fraught with danger. But, astounding as it is, thus far our Government has made no effort to control the liquor industry in this greatest of all emergencies. It is making a supreme effort to control every other activity but the liquor industry. Liquor is America's worst saboteur and fifth columnist, yet the Government has done little to curb the work of sabotage in which the liquor traffic is openly aiding the enemy by crippling our productive powers and our efficiency.

Liquor has been the primary cause of the downfall and ruin of all great nations which in the past have gone into oblivion. The wine cup, according to our best historians, has been responsible for the defeat of more armies and the ruin of more nations than any other detrimental factor. There is nothing that so deteriorates and paralyzes the physical, mental, and moral powers of a soldier and handicaps his potential capabilities, endowments, and efficiency as does the excessive use of liquor. In an emergency such as this global war presents, physical and mental fitness is a quality necessary to win in this struggle for national existence, as well as to preserve the ideals for which we are fighting. Our only safety lies in total abstinence, as in the last World War, rather than in the avoidance of excessive use of alcoholic beverages. No nation that debauches its youth with alcoholic beverages can expect to stand against a nation that practices sobriety. No nation which wastes its money annually by the billions of dollars in drink can expect to win against a nation which practices economy for the sake of self-defense.

The liquor interests should be given to understand by the strong arm of our Government that they cannot ply their detrimental trade within our military training camps. Not only should they be stopped at the border of our training camps but they should be informed that they cannot sell intoxicating liquor to men and women in military uniforms for the duration of this emergency without incurring the penalty meted out to agents who aid and abet our enemies. The liquor mongers who, during this emergency, have no concern for anything but their own pocketbooks should be given to understand by all lovers of democracy and freedom that they are enemies of the general welfare and the common defense of our country.

There are some important lessons from past mistakes which we need to heed. We were told by the President's committee that investigated the reasons for our surprise and defeat at Pearl Harbor on the night of December 7, 1941, that our military forces "were not on the alert." Ridpath, our world historian, tells us that the military forces of the Assyrian Army on the night of a national festival in 607 B. C. were not on the alert on account of liquor when the capital city of Ninevah was captured by the Babylonians and the Medes. We have the Biblical as well as the secular record that the last King of Babylon, Belshazzar, and a thousand of his military lords drank wine out of the golden vessels that were taken from the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem, and the King and his wives and concubines and military lords and soldiers were so drunk and off guard that they left the river gates of the city of Babylon wide open, and Cyrus and Darius the Mede marched in and took them all captive and overthrew the Babylonian kingdom.

The historian tells us that Alexander the Great, who conquered the entire world and wept because there were no more worlds to conquer, was himself conquered by the wine cup and his world kingdom was divided toward the four winds of heaven. The same historian tells us that while the iron monarchy of Rome conquered the world during its years of abstemious habits, industry, vigilance, and sobriety, that latter day Roman emperors and people were given to "gluttony and drunkenness," and to "frivolity, pleasure, and dissipation," and became so corrupt and dissipated through drink "that the people were no longer capable of any heroic indignation on account of the vices of their sovereigns." The great Empire of Rome was divided into 10 kingdoms by the barbarians of the north because the Romans were so "effeminated and debauched through vice and liquor" that they were incapable of defending themselves.

The Saxons were defeated by the Normans at the battle of Hastings on a night of feasting in 1066 A. D. because they were not on the alert on account of liquor. The Hessian soldiers and Colonel Rahl were not on the alert on a Christmas night because of liquor when General Washington and his patriotic Army defeated them at the Battle of Trenton in 1776.

Marshal Ney and his soldiers were not on the alert on the night of June 17 when they imbibed too freely of their favorite Burgundian wine, and on the morning of the 18th of June 1815, they were too drunk to respond to the order of Napoleon to come to his rescue at the Battle of Waterloo, and arrived too late to save Napoleon from defeat and exile.

Two divisions of the German Army which marched within gunshot of Paris in March 1918, just before the Battle of the Marne, became so drunk on the wine they found in the French cellars that the German general in command reported to the Crown Prince of Germany: "Two whole divisions were found drunk ready to be cut down by the Allied troops. * * * The wine-drenched Germans were simply mowed down by the enemy machine guns" at the Battle of the Marne.

In the present World War when 100,000 German soldiers marched into France in 1940 they took captive 3,500,000 French soldiers. Why was this possible? Marshal Petain, the French general in charge, issued an official statement saying: "Our soldiers were drunk and could not fight. Since the victory of World War No. 1 the spirit of pleasure, of riotous living, and drinking has prevailed over the spirit of sacrifice." The newspapers at the time reported that 18 percent of the French soldiers from the Maginot line were in hospitals suffering from delirium tremens at the time of the German invasion. As Marshal Petain admitted in his report concerning the downfall of the French Army, "Alcoholism was the chief cause of the French Army's moral collapse and the worst of France's four greatest problems."

Well might Americans ask why the officers and men were not "on the alert" at Pearl Harbor on that fateful morning of December 7, 1941. The fact that after the disaster all saloons were closed and the sale of all intoxicating beverages was immediately prohibited to officers, soldiers, and sailors may explain why they were not on the alert. Would it not have been better to lock the door before the horse was stolen? The enemy, knowing what was going on at Pearl Harbor, took advantage of the situation.

Our boys in the Army canteens are permitted to buy and drink all the beer they can hold. A soldier boy in charge of one of these canteens stated that the Army post of which he had charge sold more than $3,000 worth of beer on a single Saturday night to the boys in the camp. This same camp had eight such Army canteen posts where beer was sold that night. That camp was right here in your own State of Michigan. No restrictions are placed upon the use of beer in our Army canteens nor upon the brewers who consume hundreds of millions of pounds of sugar in the manufacture of beer, while all other civilians have been placed under a restricted use of sugar. Every industry, except the liquor industry, is placed under restrictive legislation as to the use of raw materials.

Why do we allow the liquor traffickers legislative immunities to exploit and debauch our soldier boys in the military camps, and outside as well, and to ply their trade without restrictions when every other commodity is regimented, controlled, and restricted in its use to the public? Why are we so blind to these perils which undermine our health, our strength, our stability, and our efficiency, when all history testifies to the fact that liquor has done more to ruin nations than any other evil agency in the world?

The liquor traffic today stands indicted before the bar of justice upon its own record of broken promises, as the most corrupt and law-defying industry in the world. It is the devil's best friend and God's worst enemy. The time is coming in the near future when no Presidential "bee" will be able to live any longer in alcohol, and when no political party which sponsors a deluge of alcoholism in the United States will be able to survive at the polls. That day is dawning and repeal is going to be repealed soon, by means of local option, unless the liquor dealers correct their abuses and mend their ways.

The repealists have not kept a single promise they made when they requested the public to repeal the eighteenth amendment and legalize again the sale of intoxicating beverages. They promised that the saloon should not come back, that liquor would be taken out of politics, that drunkenness would be reduced, that bootleg liquor would be eliminated, that our taxes would be greatly reduced, that crime and delinquency would largely disappear, and that our youth and women would not be exploited by the legalized-liquor interests, but protected and shielded. Instead of keeping any of these solemn promises they have fostered and promoted the breach of all of them. Instead of having 177,790 saloons, as we did in the old saloon days just before the eighteenth amendment was enacted, we now have 396,629 places where liquor is licensed to be sold—in restaurants, drug stores, department stores, grocery stores, hardware stores, millinery stores, gasoline stations, golf clubs, gambling dens, roadhouses, saloons, and taverns. Liquor is in politics more than ever; drunkenness has increased at a terrific rate; bootlegging thrives as never before; our taxes have been tremendously enlarged, crime and juvenile delinquency have broken all bounds, and our youth and women are being exploited and debauched by the liquor mongers on a scale that beggars all description.

As a result of the duplicity and lawlessness of the liquor dispensers, prohibition is coming back. There is no longer any doubt about that. Even the wets are admitting it. Irvin S. Cobb, the columnist, who certainly is not a dry, recently admitted in the Washington Evening Star that the wets are losing ground. He said, "Well, the next time the people of this country vote liquor out—and there'll be a next time, unless the sane men in the industry can curb the offenders within their own ranks—it'll be for keeps, no matter how deplorable the results in bootleggery and graft and crime and corruption. You can tell a lunk-headed profiteer as far as you can see one—but, unfortunately, you can't tell him anything else."

The liquor interests never seem to learn any lessons from their mistakes and abuses of the past. Money seems to be their only consideration, no matter what the consequences. In fact, the abuses and lawlessness of the liquor situation have grown so bad in certain localities that the public is taking the liquor traffic to the ballot box through local option and is giving it a good trouncing. During the last 9 years under repeal over 15,000 local-option elections have been held throughout the States, and more than 11,000 of these elections have gone dry. More than a thousand newspapers that were wet when the eighteenth amendment was repealed have gone dry in sentiment during the past 9 years of the repeal regime, and not a few of these great metropolitan newspapers even refuse to carry any more advertisements of liquor of intoxicant content. Why have these newspapers gone dry? Why do they refuse liquor advertisements? Because, day by day, and night by night, they have been printing for the past 9 years the appalling record of the fatal automobile accidents due to drink, the police and court records of the tremendous increase of drunkenness, of crime, and of insanity traceable to drink, and they have become convinced that the liquor traffic is against the public interest and the welfare of society, and that they can no longer be aiders and abettors in this awful national tragedy.

Incidents like this one, and there are thousands of them occurring in our cities annually, are helping to make wet newspapers dry. Five years ago when I was in Columbus, Ohio, I picked up a morning paper of that city which gave the account of a terrible tragedy which occurred during the night. Two young boys and two girls still in their teens had gone to a beer garden, and while returning in an automobile late at night, drunk, they had a head-on collision with another car. The 2 girls were killed outright and were taken to the city morgue, and the 2 boys were taken to the city hospital in an unconscious condition. The morning newspapers that wrote up the account of the tragedy requested the mothers of Columbus whose daughters had not yet returned from the beer gardens to go down to the morgue and identify their daughters. The

evening newspaper announced that 74 mothers had appeared in the morgue in the early hours of the morning to discover whether or not it was their daughters who were lying there. What are we coming to in America when 74 mothers go to a morgue to see if it is their daughter who failed to return home the night before from a beer garden, who is lying in the morgue?

While we are talking about fatal automobile accidents due to drink, let me give you the statistics as furnished by the National Safety Council since the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. The annual survey of automobile fatalities is given as follows: For 1933, the first year of 3.2 beer, 31,363; for 1934, the first year of repeal, 36,101; for 1935, the second year of repeal, 36,369; for 1936, the third year of repeal, 38,089; for 1937, the fourth year of repeal, 39,643. Thus for the first 4 years of repeal, there was a total of 150,202 traffic fatalities, of which 84,113 were traceable directly to drink as the primary cause. That is three times more than the number of American soldiers that have been killed in the present World War.

According to the reports issued by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the arrests of drunken drivers of automobiles were 97.3 percent higher in 1942 than in 1932, the last year of national prohibition. The F. B. I. report says, "The ratio of arrests for drunkenness per 100,000 of the population was two and a half times as great in 1942 as in 1932, and the highest since repeal." Someone may retort, "Mr. Longacre, you are not fair in giving these statistics concerning the increase of automobile accidents and the increase of drunken drivers when you omit the increase of automobiles now in use as compared with 1932." Let me give you the data on that point as issued recently by the National Safety Council, which states that wartime restrictions have cut down the use of automobiles during 1942 by 17 percent. With this statement agrees the report of Dr. T. W. Kilmer, surgeon of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police, who says: "Drunken drivers have increased 10 times as fast as automobiles in New York State."

And what is true of New York State is practically true of every other State where liquor is licensed. During the first full year of repeal, a survey was made of 226 cities in the United States where liquor was licensed to be sold, and the arrests for drunkenness had increased 224.3 percent, as compared with the first year of national prohibition. The increase of arrests for drunkenness and increase of automobile fatalities are in exact proportion to the amount of intoxicating beverages consumed.

The argument is often advanced by the wet advocates that prohibition does not prohibit and is largely responsible for all the bootlegging going on. This argument was exploded by the Brewer's Digest back in the old saloon days, when it reported that the per capita consumption of liquor in wet territory was 25 gallons, while in prohibited territory it was 1¼ gallons per capita.

The main benefits derived under national prohibition from 1921 to 1931, as gathered from the statistical abstracts and figures of the United States court records, police records, and the United States census, and recorded in the World Almanac, are that during that decade of national prohibition the death rate from alcoholism decreased 42 percent, or 200,000 deaths annually, as compared with the previous decade under legalizel liquor. During this same time, according to these authenticated records, insanity due to alcoholism decreased 66 percent, drunkenness decreased 70 percent, and general crimes decreased 54 percent. The United States census report for this decade of national prohibition discloses that 108,000 fewer people died of alcoholism than during the previous decade of licensed liquor and the old saloon days. If national prohibition had never accomplished any other benefit than the saving of 108,000 people from alcoholic deaths, the experiment was worth trying.

But the greatest evidence of all that prohibition was beneficial and did actually minimize drunkenness as well as many other evils is the indisputable fact that before national prohibition there were 60 Neal Cure Institutes for inebriates and 98 Keeley Cure Institutes for drunkards operating in the United States. During the 10 years of national prohibition, from 1921 to 1931, every one of the Neal Cure Institutes and 97 of the 98 Keeley Cure Institutes had to close their doors for lack of drunkards to cure. The Keeley Cure Institutes, shortly before national prohibition became effective, had as many as 10,526 patients annually in the 98 institutes, but at the end of the first year of national prohibition the only Keeley Cure Institute operating was at Dwight, Ill., and it had only 180 patients that year. If that is not proof sufficient that prohibition did minimize drunkenness, what will it take to prove it and convince a wet?

What has happened since repeal of the eighteenth amendment? Here are the facts. As the F. B. I. reported recently, arrests for drunkenness have increased more than 174 percent in its complete report for the last year of repeal, over 1932, the last year of national prohibition. Aside from the Keeley Cure Institutes receiving only alcoholic patients, many of our large city hospitals carry a great number of alcoholic patients besides their other class of patients. The large Bellevue Hospital in New York City claimed that its number of "acute alcoholic cases admitted in 1934 totaled 7,649; in 1935, 9,139; and for 1936, over 12,000 such cases"; and the Boston City Hospital admitted that in the first years of repeal it received over 5,000 alcoholic patients, costing the city about $370,000 for the care of inebriates. Repeal has benefited nobody but the liquor interests. The American people did not repeal the evil effects of alcohol upon society when they repealed the eighteenth amendment. They merely legalized the most corrupt and law-defying industry in the world.

Bootlegging thrives on a very extensive scale under repeal. Even the leading wets of this country as well as the licensed liquor dealers are admitting that solemn fact now. The Honorable Joseph H. Choate, Jr., who for 3 years was Director of the Federal Alcohol Control Administration, admitted that "illicit distilleries are producing many times more than their honest competitors. * * * As concerns liquor," said he, "the United States is living in a fool's paradise."

The Boston Herald, a wet newspaper, after a few years under repeal admitted that the bootlegger is now more prosperous than "he ever was during the 14 years of prohibition." The Chicago Herald-Examiner, a thoroughly wet newspaper, in speaking of the bootleg liquor situation in the early years of repeal, said: "As we stand today, we seem to have made bootlegging safer and more profitable for the crooks." And this same wet newspaper, in giving the results of a survey it made of the saloons now operating under repeal in Chicago, says: "Chicago childhood is being exposed to dangers a thousand times worse than all other dangers in this modern era combined." In closing its survey of the Chicago liquor situation it said, the saloons under repeal "were 10 times more vile and vicious than in the old saloon days."

Even some of the Senators and Congressmen who favored the repeal of the eighteenth amendment in Congress, after a few years of repeal admitted publicly that repeal has fallen far short of its promised reforms. Sneator DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts, who favored the repeal of the eighteenth amendment in the United States Senate, admitted in a speech he made that the repeal measure was "a hopeless and intolerable failure and much worse than national prohibition."

Congressman O'Connor, of New York, an ardent repealist, denounced the repeal measure he helped to engineer through Congress in the following condemnatory language: "If the condition that exists today is what we must have as a result of repeal, give me prohibition."

Congressman FITZPATRICK, who argued before Congress before the eighteenth amendment was repealed that, if it was repealed, bootleg liquor and bootlegging would be largely abolished, but what did he say after repeal operated for a few years and he had the opportunity to see his mistake? He said on the floor of Congress: "The bootleggers before the repeal of prohibition were mere pikers as compared with the (illegal) Whisky Trust today."

Everybody knows, who knows anything, that bootleg liquor is flowing freely today from the Golden Gate on the Pacific to Hellgate on the Atlantic. The worst part is that the bootleggers are not only exploiting our youth but are debauching our soldiers and hamstringing the Government on revenue and frustrating the efforts to win the war by robbing the Government of the alcohol needed to successfully prosecute the mechanics of the war. John Barleycorn always has been war's greatest saboteur.

It is high time that the people who have the fear of God in their souls, the welfare of their boys, and the honor of their country at heart do something about this greatest of all curses, the most terrible enemy within our own borders—the demon drink. Lamenting the evils of drink is not enough. It is time to make our influence count for something. We owe our boys in the service of their country protection from vice and liquor. We owe to our country and our country's honor the removal of those twin curses which are inflicting more damages than the enemies' bullets and bombs.

If by imbibing alcoholic beverages a man is disqualified to sit at the throttle of a passenger engine on the railroad or to sit behind the steering wheel of an automobile on the public highway, certainly the officers, soldiers, sentinels, and guards in our military forces, who hold the destiny of our Nation in their hands, need to be sober. Recently a drunken engineer on an electric locomotive caused a wreck through sheer carelessness, resulting in the death of 5 persons, 222 injured, 6,000 telephone trunk lines ripped asunder, 300,000 telephones put out of commission, and completely tied up downtown Manhattan and Exchange Place in Jersey City for many hours, preventing navy yard workers and defense project workers from reaching their work benches—all because the engineer drank "five beers" before entering the locomotive cab instead of eating his breakfast.

Our gravest peril today in the face of the many calamities caused by liquor is public apathy and indifference. Many people are afraid to do anything about restraining the liquor trade during this emergency for fear their action will bring back national prohibition. There are some who would rather lose the war and see our Nation fall than to see prohibition return. But it is not a question of bringing back prohibition. That is not our concern now. In this global war it is primarily a question of sharply reducing the evil effects of liquor and bringing liquor under Government control for the duration of the war, if we expect to win this war and keep the peace. It is a question of whether we shall spend, as we did last year, $9,000,000 daily for liquor to lose the war, or for defense bonds to win the war.

It is a question of whether 9,000,000 boys in the Army and Navy training camps and battle fronts shall be debauched and destroyed through beer drinking in the canteens, or trained and built up into an invincible force that brooks no defeat. It is basically a question of facing grave responsibilities fraught with tremendous eventualities for weal or for woe. It is a question of whether our appetites for drink shall lead us to ruin, or our worthy ideals for which we are fighting shall lead us through sobriety to peace, prosperity, liberty, and high honor.

The liquor dealers who ply their trade among our soldier boys with a vigor worthy of a nobler cause, claim that the boys forget their troubles by drowning them in the beer mug. But the soldier who drowns his troubles in the beer mug cares naught for the security of his country, and he drowns all that is good and noble in his own character. Such soldiers never develop enough moral backbone to stand up against anything. They drown not only their own hopes but the hopes of their country, and frequently betray their homeland through the wine cup.

There is something far greater at stake than making the entire country dry by legislation. What the fathers and mothers, and all loyal American citizens have at heart just now is the keeping of our boys in the military forces from being exploited, debauched, and corrupted by liquor and vice mongers when the destiny of our Nation and of civilization is trembling in the balances. Every lover of the American way of life is interested in defense measures which will insure our safety and our precious heritage of liberty. This heritage was not bequeathed to posterity by our forefathers without the sacrifice of all that was counted dear in life in blood and in treasure. Did they die in vain? Shall the heritage of civil and religious liberty and the American way of life be preserved? We know of no better way to honor those who in the past have made the supreme sacrifice for our benefit and comfort than to make a similar sacrifice in blood and treasure in defense of the ideals for which they fought and died. Certainly we owe a debt of gratitude to our ancestors which cannot be paid in any better way.

"But," says one, "do not men have a right to drink what they want as well as to eat what they desire? Does not our Constitution guarantee personal liberty?" No one has a personal right to inflict an injury upon another person or upon society by dethroning his reason and impairing his judgment by an excessive indulgence in intoxicating liquors. Personal liberty is not a license to infringe upon the rights of others or injure others. No person has an absolute right to do what he pleases or desires when it impairs the welfare of others. No person has the right to sell the public poisoned food. No one has a right to erect a slaughterhouse in the public square or on the bank of a city reservoir. No man has a right to sell cocaine, morphine, or any other deadly drug promiscuously to the public, no matter how much drug addicts may crave it.

Since this fundamental principle of prohibitive and restrictive legislation is justified by wets and drys alike, how then can our lawmakers justify the granting of license for the unrestricted sale of intoxicating liquors to avaricious, ruthless, heartless, conscienceless, and lawless dealers in a commodity that transforms men and women into staggering, reeling, fighting, gibbering, irresponsible drunkards, criminals, murderers, and vagabonds?

"But," says another, "the revenue on liquor greatly reduces our taxes." No greater falsehood was ever palmed off by the repealists upon the general public. They deceived the American public on that issue when they induced it to vote for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. According to Government statistics for the past 10 years, it is estimated the Government paid five times more out of our tax funds to care for the criminals, the insane, the drunkards, the paupers, the orphans, and to liquidate the damages caused by accidents due to drink than the total amount of revenue received by the Government from the saloons, liquor stores, breweries, and distilleries.

Aside from this financial handicap, the American people paid last year over $5,000,000,000 for legal liquor and a similar amount for illegal liquor. Liquor creates no economic values that can possibly accrue to the Nation or the individual in beneficial results. The more it induces a man to spend for booze the less he will have for shoes; the more he spends for the product of hops the less he will have for crops; the more he spends for wet goods the less he will have for dry goods; and the more he gives to the bartender the less he will have for the coal-vendor. A dollar spent for booze cannot be spent for shoes. That dollar is lost, and instead of leaving a blessing it leaves a curse. Remember, fellow citizens, you cannot have sunshine in your home while you have moonshine in your cellar.

A brewer recently advertised his beer as being a wonderful stimulant and as having great nourishment in it. But that theory is easily exploded. Suppose there is a hornets' nest full of live hornets sitting right here on this platform. Suppose I sit down on that live hornets' nest. That is a wonderful stimulant. It has great lifting power, but where does the nourishment come in? It will help me to get off this platform a little faster, just like applying the whip to the back of the old horse might spur him down the pike faster, but there is no nourishment or strength in the crack of the whip, nor in the sting of the hornet, nor in the sparkle and sting of alcohol.

The liquor trade is the only industry that does not put its finished product—the drunkard and the ragged bum—on exhibition at our county and State fairs. Every other industry is proud of its finished product and is not ashamed to exhibit it at our public fairs. But the liquor trade, after it has extracted the last penny out of the pocket of the poor drunkard and reduced him to a penniless bum, is through with him and throws him out into the gutter, for society to care for him and his pauperized family. It has transformed his step into a stagger, his clothes into rags, his speech into a ditty, his home into a hovel, and compels him to make his grave in the potter's field and his final rendezvous in hell.

I am going to ask four American industries some questions as to the results obtained in transforming their raw material into their finished products. I shall use these four chairs to illustrate those four industries. Listen to the questions and answers in this quiz.

"What is your name?" "I am a sawmill."

"What is your raw material?" "Logs."

"What is your finished product?" "Lumber—out of which houses and offices are built, furniture made, et cetera."

"Is your finished product worth more than the raw material?" "Yes; much more."

"Are you a blessing or a curse to society?" "I am a great blessing to society. I give comfort, shelter, and homes to needy humanity." "Then you are an honorable industry and we will enact laws to protect your business."

Second industry: "What is your name?" "I am a gristmill."

"What is your raw material?" "Wheat and corn."

"What is your finished product?" "Flour and meal."

"Is your finished product worth more than the raw material?" "Yes, worth much more." "Are you a benefit to society or a curse?" "I am a great benefit to society. Society could not get along without me. I give health, vigor, strength, and comfort to society." "Then you are a respectable industry and we shall enact laws to protect your business."

Third industry: "What is your name?" "I am a paper mill."

"What is your raw material?" "Old paper, wood pulp, and rags."

"What is your finished product?" "Fine linen paper."

"Is your finished product worth more than the raw material?" "Yes, worth much more." "Are you a blessing or a curse to society?" "I am a great asset and benefit to society. Out of my finished product they make books, newspapers, magazines, diplomas, certificates, paper money, etc. I convey information and knowledge to all the world." "Then you are an honorable and respectable industry and we shall make laws to protect your business."

Fourth industry: "What is your name?" "I do not like to tell you my name."

"Well, I do not like your smell. Tell me your name!" "I am the gin mill, and I represent the distillery, the brewery, the saloon, and all the places where liquor is sold."

"What is your raw material?" "Bright American boys and girls."

"What is your finished product?" "I am ashamed of it, I do not like to tell. If you must know, it is the bum and the drunkard." "Is your finished product worth more than the raw material?" "No; it is worth far less, I am sorry to admit."

"Are you a blessing or a curse to society?" "To be candid, I am a burden, a disgrace, and a curse to society." "Then you are the only American industry whose finished product is worth less than the raw material. Shall we make a law to protect and to preserve an industry that is a curse instead of a blessing to society?"

"Audience, what do you say? Shall we make a law to protect this industry or to abolish it?" Answer: A tremendous "No!"

Now, let me use another illustration. We will add another chair to these four, making five links in a chain. The top link represents the churchman; the second link, a wet legislator; the third link, a wet law; the fourth link, the saloon or liquor trade; and the fifth link, the drunkard, as the finished product. Shall we ask the drunkard and this Christian voter some questions?

"Drunkard, of what were you made?" "Out of a bright American boy, capable of earning wages and being a credit to my home and country."

"What are you worth now?" "Nothing. I am a burden and a disgrace to my home, my State, and my country."

"Drunkard, what made you what you are?" "The saloon over there made me."

"Saloon, what made you?" "The wet law over there made me."

"Law, who made you?" "The wet legislator over there made me."

"Wet legislator, who made you?" "The ballot in the hands of the churchman over there made me."

"Churchman, did you knowingly and consciously cast your ballot for the wet legislator and for the wet law that made the saloon and the drunkard?" "Well, I always stick to my party."

"That is not the question I asked you, sir. Did you vote for the wet legislator and the wet law that made the saloon and the drunkard?" "Yes; he represented my party, and I never scratch the ticket."

"Then your religion and your politics prevent you from scratching the ticket no matter who runs for office?" "Yes."

Now, look at this chain of five links—the churchman, the wet legislator, the wet law, the saloon, and the drunkard. Let me ask this last link in this chain a few questions.

"Poor drunkard, where are you going?" "To hell." "How do you know?" "Because

the Good Book says, 'No drunkard shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven'." "Poor fellow, would to God I might save you."

Let me go to the top of this chain: "Churchman, where are you going?" "I am going to heaven." "How do you know?" "About 40 years ago the Lord took my feet out of the mire and clay and placed them upon the solid Rock, and put a new song in my mouth." "Shut your mouth, you miserable hypocrite. I have contempt for such twaddle."

Fellow citizens, listen to this statement of mine now—if you forget all the rest I have said—remember what I shall now say. If that poor drunkard goes to hell in the judgment day as the Good Book says he will, and if that unrepentant churchman, who was an aider and abetter by knowingly and consciously voting for the wet legislator and the wet law that made the saloon and the drunkard, goes to heaven, then that poor drunkard can stand on the brink of hell in the judgment day and look straight up into the face of God and cry: "Unjust! Unjust!! Unjust!!!" until the pillars of justice tremble in heaven. But just as sure as there is a God of justice sitting on yonder throne in the final judgment, He is going to hold every voter responsible for the proper exercise of his franchise. No one can escape that responsibility when the liquor traffic is transforming millions of bright American boys and girls into sordid drunkards.

Statistics now disclose that 5,000,000 boys and girls back in the old saloon days were changed into drunkards out of a single generation. Those who have given study to present-day tendencies under repeal inform us that they estimate that 8,000,000 boys and girls out of our present generation will be transformed into drunkards. We cannot afford to have 1 bright American boy or girl transformed into a drunkard, much less 8,000,000, out of this generation in this world crisis we are now facing. All the dirty dollars we get out of the revenue are not worth the value of 1 bright American boy. How can we afford to sacrifice 8,000,000 such boys and girls?

We are under great obligation to posterity in this emergency of a global war to restrict and to reduce the evil effects of alcoholic beverages if we are to win the war and keep the peace. The welfare and safety of society in peacetime demands that the evil effects of the liquor traffic be curtailed as much as possible or our civilization will suffer a greater setback than it did in wartime. All our efforts to make this a better and a happier world in which to live after the war will fail if liquor is allowed free and unrestricted reign to carry on its body- and soul-destroying work. The liquor trade is war's greatest handicap and civilization's greatest liability. We cannot possibly win the war nor keep the peace with liquor in absolute power on the throne. Any nation that debauches and corrupts its youths and military forces through the curse of drink destroys its own future and commits national suicide.

Every one of you should write to your Senators in Washington and request them to support Senator O'DANIEL's bill, S. 860, which aims to protect our boys in our military forces against the ravages and corruptions of drink for the duration of the war, and you should also write to the Congressman from your district and request him to support Congressman BRYSON's bill, H. R. 2082, that will likewise protect our boys in military service for the duration of the war, if it is enacted into law. We protected them in the last World War, why should we not in this, the greatest of all world wars?

There is more power in the ballot than in the bullet if properly exercised. That power is in the people's possession.

Letter From California Cattlemen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged many times that certain New Deal agencies were taking advantage of the wartime emergency to further promote their cause and gain a greater control over our economy through their regimentation. I am inserting a letter in the RECORD from the secretary of the California Cattlemen's Association pointing out a specific case where the president of that association and a member of the State farm production council, in order to receive a priority for equipment, was coerced into signing an agreement to participate in the A. A. A. soil-conservation program. This was not the intent of Congress, and it is high time that we begin action to stop these dictatorial practices.

CALIFORNIA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., December 14, 1943.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: We have just recently learned of a practice being followed by war boards in connection with the granting of priorities for the purchase by ranchers of ranch equipment. This practice is bitterly resented by the farmers and cattlemen who are being subjected to it.

To illustrate this procedure, we submit the recent case of Mr. Loren Bamert, of Ione, Calif., president of the California Cattlemen's Association and member of the State farm production council.

Mr. Bamert found it necessary to purchase and install a water pump for providing water for cattle in pasture near Stockton. He applied to the San Joaquin County Agricultural Conservation Association at Stockton for a priority. The association's representative asked him to sign an agreement to participate in the A. A. A. soil-conservation program. Mr. Bamert declined, saying he did not care to participate, did not require Government assistance in his range improvement work, and, further, could see no connection between the A. A. A. program and his installation of a water pump for seasonal use in a pasture leased by him from the owner of the farm. He was then informed that no consideration would be given his request for a priority unless he signed the A. A. A. contract. His cattle had to have water, so he signed up.

We have cited this case because we can absolutely vouch for its authenticity. The practice seems to have been started in several California counties, but some local associations and war boards have refused to sanction it.

It is plainly apparent that the price we are required to pay for the privilege of operating and even of producing food for war is endorsing of and participation in the peacetime boondoggling programs of the New Deal reformers. As perpetrated here, we are simply being blackmailed into acceptance of the A. A. A. program and have no other choice open to us. Cattlemen generally have never favored the A. A. A. range program, yet our signatures, secured through bribery and coercion, are used by the bureaucrats to convince Congress that the program is wanted and needed by us.

We ask that you exert every possible effort to see that such practices are stopped at their source, the Department of Agriculture and the executive offices in Washington. If legislation is required, then we must have it through congressional action.

With the season's greetings,

Yours very truly,

DAN C. MCKINNEY,
Secretary.

Looking Over Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Looking Over Events," which appeared in the Bay City (Mich.) Times of December 12, 1943. I wish to say this editorial is highly commendable in that it discusses the Little Steel formula in a spirit of fairness, thoroughness, and impartiality not often given to this subject.

This same spirit of fairness, Mr. Speaker, is likewise disclosed in this splendid publication on the following day under the heading "A mistaken conclusion," which I also present for the RECORD. I congratulate the editor on these very timely editorials:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of December 12, 1943]

LOOKING OVER EVENTS

The Little Steel formula, Government device for stabilizing wages and preventing inflation, will face its enemies in a life-and-death struggle during the week. It may get knocked galley-west. In which case there is sure to be a wild scramble by labor unionists to send their earnings to new heights and the bosses to keep them where they are.

Millions of people have little veneration for the formula. Not because it is unjust or bad in itself but because those who have administered it have not acted fairly or intelligently in its application to large numbers of underpaid workers. The asininity of maintaining that a group earning $3 a day 2 years ago must be limited to a raise of 15 percent to cover the rise in living costs just because a similar limit is placed on those earning three times as much is evident to anyone with an ounce of brains. The Little Steel interpreters have followed that plan from the beginning.

It will be all right if they stick to their guns in the action due to open Tuesday, however. The United Auto Workers union is plaintiff. It wants more money for 300,000 General Motors employees. If the ceiling is taken off or shoved a level or two higher, as much will have to be done for the members of every other organization. They will see to that. Prices will soar accordingly. And there's your inflation ready made.

Which is not to say the auto builders are well enough paid or getting all they are worth. They possibly are not. But if another dollar a day is added to each man's earnings and the cost of living goes up $2 as a consequence, they will be worse off than before. So will all the rest of us. That is bound to happen once the lid is off.

The unorganized millions would suffer most, as they have no way of getting higher

pay. Yet they are entitled to some protection. A lot of their sons and daughters are in the war up to their ears; and they have been buying bonds and stamps and such. Besides, they are human.

A heavy advance in the cost of living would bring them to the very verge of starvation. The ones demanding more money may point out that low-wage victims are blamable for their own plight. Which isn't so. Ask the income booster if the one from whom he rents his flat, and who has no other source of income, shouldn't be permitted to collect a higher rent. Then note the reply—if you don't get a poke in the nose.

Trouble with most of the inflation shouters is that they want the prices of what they have to sell kited to the sky and of what they must buy kept at present figures or rolled downhill.

It can't be done. They should have learned that long ago.

The War Labor Board should deny the application. And directly after get together with the price fixing agencies and revise the rules so as to bring earnings and the cost of living into balance all around.

That would probably call for upward and downward shifts here and there. And having completed the job freeze prices and incomes for the duration. Leniency with profiteers for 2 years has been the cause of all our industrial and economic hardship and unrest.

It will continue to be so long as it is persisted in. Profiteers are confined to no one group.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of December 13, 1943]

A MISTAKEN CONCLUSION

Washington news dispatches were practically unanimous in describing the Senate's passage of legislation granting nonoperating railroad men a wage increase of 8 cents an hour as a new breaching of the President's hold-the-line program.

But it was nothing of the kind. This raise was recommended by a special commission appointed by the President himself to iron out the dispute, and is understood to have met with his full approval. It was rejected by Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization. Another commission granted a sliding raise of 4 to 10 cents an hour, which has Vinson's blessing. It has been rejected by the unions. The bill passed by the Senate aims to legalize the first award. The President is said to still be favorable. He has not actually said so, possibly out of consideration for Vinson.

The difference between 8 cents and sliding scale rates is very small. The larger raise would not inflate pay envelopes sufficiently to affect the market price of consumption goods or constitute a step toward inflation.

Many of the railroad workers will receive less than $30 a week even if the Senate bill goes into effect. And the highest class will draw only $1.04 an hour. Obviously the proposed award is merely a justified and necessary readjustment such as will have to be made in many lines of employment before real stabilization can be achieved.

Brief in Support of the Baldwin-Rogers Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of House Resolution 350 and a brief in support of the Baldwin-Rogers resolution submitted by me to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on December 6, 1943:

House Resolution 350

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by concurrent resolution adopted on March 15 of this year, expressed its condemnation of Nazi Germany's "mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children," a mass crime which has already exterminated close to 2,000,000 human beings, about 30 percent of the total Jewish population of Europe, and which is growing in intensity as Germany approaches defeat; and

Whereas the American tradition of justice and humanity dictates that all possible means be employed to save from this fate the surviving Jews of Europe, some 4,000,000 souls who have been rendered homeless and destitute by the Nazis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recommends and urges the creation by the President of a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany.

While ill in the hospital, I have prepared this brief in support of House Resolution 350 and House Resolution 352. I keenly regret my inability to appear before the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and so offer in lieu most respectfully my views thereon for your earnest consideration.

I am in favor of this resolution. The horrors confronting the Jewish people of Europe in Nazi-controlled territory tug at the conscience of mankind. To stand idly by and witness 4,000,000 human beings perish, joining the 2,000,000 already dead, would be to betray and outrage every instinct of decency and honor. What is their guilt save that of being born Jew?

While the resolution is limited in scope, it is nevertheless, a step in the right direction. Better half a loaf than no bread at all. It recognizes at long last what neither the Evian Conference on Refugees in 1938 nor the recent Bermuda Conference on Refugees could or would see, that, patently, the Jew is a special problem and calls for special measures of rescue. While we in the United States adhere to the traditions of equality, it is no act of discrimination to point out the urgencies in the problem of the Jewish people. While we would not have wished to view Jewish refugees and potential refugees as different from others, that difference has been thrust upon us. The lot of other persecuted minorities is not comparable in horror, ferocity, and destruction to that of the Jews. The Polish peasant, the Dutch merchant, the Czechoslovakian farmer, all have the opportunity of life and labor, brutal as it may be. The fate of the Jews is hopeless, unless we act and act now. Hitler has vowed to make Europe Judenrein and with the cunning of the beast has proceeded "according to plan." When liberation with Allied victory comes, all others will savor the lifting of oppression, the freedom to return to life and liberty, save the Jews. The non-Jews have at least a shred of hope of survival denied the Jew. The non-Jew is in a prison, the Jew in a death chamber, a charnel house. Through the 10 years of death and torture, driven from post to post like diseased cattle, the Jew has been classed, together with all other persecuted minorities, even though a very special fate has been reserved for him by the Nazi hangmen. I am happy to see that the Baldwin-Rogers resolution now being contemplated has made recognition of the vital distinction. When our esteemed Secretary of State Cordell Hull addressed the joint sessions of both Houses, he, too, stated significantly, "Hitler has reserved for the Jews his most brutal wrath."

It had previously been stated by those high in authority that no special plea can be entered for the Jews since the anti-Semites would make capital of such differentiation. Those who have given thought to the nature of anti-Semitism have long since reached the sound conclusion that the Jews are damned if they do and damned if they don't, and you will agree that when human lives are in peril, it is more important to act to save them than to sit about and contemplate possible repercussions. We are facing conditions, not theories.

We have been told so often that over 2,000,000 Jews have been slaughtered in Europe that I really believe it has lost all meaning. We have allowed repetition to dull our senses. We have lost the horror of the knowledge that 2,000,000 breathe no longer that breathed before. We cannot lose our sense of responsibility to those 4,000,000 who, too, shall die unless we act. Humbly I say, the shame is ours if we do not strain every fiber of our being to bring to safety the imperiled Jew.

While it has been said by some that the resolution is superfluous, since the United States is doing all it can to rescue the Jews, much evidence exists to the contrary. It will be remembered that the delegates at the Bermuda Conference saw no way to get food to the Jews facing deliberate starvation. It was feared that such food as might be sent, would be diverted to Germany's use. The same fear was expressed to me in a conference I had with President Roosevelt. Yet the president of the Greek War Relief Association, Spyros P. Skouras, tells us that the Germans have lived up to the terms of the agreement, and had it not been for such shipments, the Greeks could barely have survived. Is it then not worth a try? If it were discovered that the Germans are taking the food for their own use, shipments could be stopped summarily.

Certainly, the reports of W. H. Lawrence of the New York Times and Henry Shapiro, United Press correspondent, revealing that the Germans had machine gunned from 50,000 to 80,000 of Kiev's Jewish men, women, and children in late September 1941, and 2 years later when Kiev's recapture by the Red Army seemed imminent, had forced Russian prisoners of war to burn all the bodies, completely destroying all the evidence of the crime, makes startlingly clear that the fate of the Jews calls for special, urgent, and immediate treatment.

The Bermuda Conference may have done much commendable work in initiating plans of rescue, but I must admit to a somewhat skeptical appraisal of its actual achievements. It will be remembered that out of the Evian Conference grew the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees now functioning in London. It will further be remembered that the Intergovernmental Committee functions through an executive committee composed of six countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, Brazil, and Argentina. We are told that secrecy must accompany the findings and recommendations of the Bermuda Conference, lest the enemy thwart the execution of its plans. No report has been made public. All findings and recommendations, however, are known to the executive committee. I respectfully contend that by the very nature of its composition the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees cannot function successfully as the instrumentality to rescue the Jewish people of Europe. You will note a strangely ironical fact in the presence of Argentina on this most trusted of committees, Argentina that provoked the official reprimand of President Roosevelt by its banning of the Jewish press, and within whose borders Nazi propagandists and falangists now enjoy a Roman holiday. I term this "secrecy"

of the Bermuda proceedings as a mockery of common sense.

This resolution commends itself to our favor if only for the reason that it will remove the pressing problem of the rescue of the Jewish people from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. This does not necessarily mean that the suggested commission need supplant the Intergovernmental Committee. They can work together, one supplementing the other.

PART II

No approach to the problem of rescuing the Jewish people can be complete without consideration of Palestine. I have made a thorough and deep study of the subject and deem it most relevant that the one realistic, practical, and logical haven of rescue that is Palestine be included in the discussion.

On November 2, 1917, in order to enlist the sympathy of world Jewry in the fight against the enemy, England issued the Balfour Declaration wherein it was stated, "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object * * *." In 1922, 52 nations approved the British mandate of Palestine and signified consent to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jews. The same year, the Congress of the United States joined the consenting nations by a resolution of approval. In 1924, Great Britain and the United States signed a treaty wherein each signatory agreed that no one shall be excluded from Palestine on the ground of race or religion, nor were the terms of this treaty to be changed by one without the consent of the other, it was further agreed. France refrained from extending her sphere of influence into Palestine with the clear understanding that Britain in keeping with the terms of the mandate would act to establish the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Yet in violation of the Balfour Declaration, the terms of the mandate, the treaty with the United States, Great Britain issued the now infamous MacDonald White Paper in 1939, restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 for a 5-year period ending in spring of 1944, and thereafter making further Jewish immigration into Palestine dependent upon the will of the Arab majority. At a time when the driven Jew sought vainly for a land that would give him succor and make him welcome, the British Colonial Office, using the pretext of Arab objection to cover its own policy of divide and rule, set its face sternly against the utilization of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. Churchill's brilliant denunciation of the White Paper is worthy of your attention. He said:

"I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government. As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience—and it will be a vain hope—for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself, by silence or inaction, to what I must regard as an act of repudiation.

"I was, from the beginning a sincere advocate of the Balfour Declaration, and I have made repeated public statements to that effect * * *. There is much in this White Paper which is alien to the spirit of the Balfour Declaration, but I will not trouble about that. I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by an Arab majority. * * * What is that but the destruction of the Balfour Declaration? What is that but a breach of faith? What is it but a one-sided denunciation—what is called in the jargon of the present time, a unilateral denunciation of an engagement? Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must, in our weakness, make this sacrifice of our declared purpose?"

As late as 1937, the Royal Palestine Commission, headed by Lord Peel, declared that "unquestionably the primary purpose of the mandate as expressed in its preamble and its article is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home." The Permanent Mandates Commission, to which the White Paper had been referred for approval in 1939, not only refused to approve it, but unanimously rejected and condemned it, stating that the new policy "was not in accordance with the interpretation which, in agreement with the mandatory power and the council of the League of Nations, the Commission had always placed on the Palestine Mandate."

The outbreak of the war obviated the necessity of reporting back to the Permanent Mandates Commission and thus it stands today. The British Colonial Office has assumed the cloak of ownership over a strip of territory which was entrusted to her in reliance upon her pledge that she would help and not hinder the cause of the Jewish homeland. Hers is a stewardship; she is trustee, not lord and not master of Palestine to do with as she will. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that at the partition of Palestine when she marked off Trans-Jordan and fixed the boundary lines of Palestine to that area west of Jordan, our Ambassador Robert W. Bingham in a note to the British Foreign Office referred to the Convention of 1924 and reminded Mr. Anthony Eden that no change in the government of Palestine can take place without the previous consent of the Government of the United States. Our official interest, so woefully lacking in expression today, was thus made manifest. The British Government gave answer using devious arguments in defense of her position, but the partition of Palestine, nonetheless, took place.

What appears superficially to be the fumbling ineptitude of the colonial administration in Palestine is in reality the clever machinations to make the destruction of the Jewish homeland in Palestine a fait accompli in the spring of 1944. By playing the Arab against the Jew and the Jew against the Arab, by waving before Arab eyes, the come-hither dream of an Arab federation, by muting almost into silence the wondrous achievements and effective aid to the Allied cause given by the Jews of Palestine in the war, by provoking quarrels and setting Arab against Jew, the plan to liquidate Palestine as a homeland for the Jews has gone on apace.

We are told that it would be unpatriotic to speak up now in the midst of world turmoil, that the peace conference will settle the vexing problem. But when the hostilities cease the peoples who are now silenced will be presented with accomplished facts. Palestine will be closed to the Jewish people, the Jew will continue in his two-thousand-year-old trek while rehabilitation committees seek for havens everywhere but in the one place where the Jew would be welcome, Palestine. Heed now must be given to the words of David ben Gurion, Palestinian Zionist leader, who in hard-hitting words reaches the crux of the situation. He said:

"It is through our blind assumption that what happened once will happen again, that we talk today about a peace conference after the war. * * * One can say, indeed, that a peace conference is already taking place, while the war is still going on. When Churchill met Roosevelt at Casablanca, that meeting was part of the peace conference. When Eden, together with Halifax, held discussions with Cordell Hull in Washington, that was one of the sessions of the peace conference. When one of the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon world meet representatives of Soviet Russia, this, too, is part of the peace conference. The provisions of the post-war settlement are being planned now, not only in Washington, London, and Moscow, but also in Cairo, Bagdad, Jidda, and Jerusalem." "And we forget," he added, "that in fact the new order to be introduced in Palestine is absolutely ready. It bears the imprint of British authority, and it is Great Britain which rules in Palestine; and it can be safely assumed that she will rule in Palestine after the war as well. There is a declared British policy in Palestine. This declaration, unlike others, does not exist only on paper, but is being applied here energetically, consistently, and with determination. It is the policy of the white paper. The peace conference is proceeding in the very midst of war, and the provisions for Palestine's future are also made in the midst of war. The fate of this country (Palestine) is being shaped by the creation of political, military, and economic facts in accordance with the policy laid down in the white paper; Palestine is now being transformed into an Arab-British state with a Jewish ghetto."

The Englishman at home issued the Balfour Declaration and the Englishmen in the colonies put it aside. There is an old Russian saying, "God Almighty is too high in heaven and the czar is too far away," as was so aptly put by Eliahu Ben-Horin in his excellent study, "The Middle East—Crossroads of History."

When the Arabs rushed in to kill and pillage in the Palestine pogroms of 1921, 1929, and 1936, they shouted "el dowleh ma'ana"—"the government is with us." They were in possession of weapons that the Arabs purchased and gathered, weapons that were denied the Jews. How came they by such possessions? How did it happen that the Jews had to fight with bare knuckles while the administration offered no protection? Such wide publicity as was given to the recent gunrunning trial of two Jewish taxicab drivers in Palestine supports the Arab cry, "The government is with us." During the trial the military prosecutor sought to prove that the Jews were intent upon deterring the United Nations' war effort, that it was a vast Jewish scheme to seize the weapons for a reign of terror. Arabs have been tried for gun-running before, in fact, it is a frequent occurrence, but this arms trial of two Jews presented a beautiful opportunity to advertise the Arab claims.

While all other such Arab trials were buried in obscurity, it is noteworthy that prior to this trial, all newspaper reporters were "tipped off" to hasten to the scene of the trial for some "hot" news. For the crime of gunrunning conducted with the least bit of notoriety, the Arabs were sentenced from 1 to 4 years while in the case of the two Jews, sentences were imposed of 7 years to 10 years. The death of Samuel Wolinietz, shot by a British police officer during the raid in search of arms at the Jewish labor settlement Ramat Hakovesh in Palestine was again in line with the efforts to discredit the Jews of Palestine. The raid was conducted by police, Indian army units, and Polish military police who were ordered to discover deserters from the Polish Army allegedly harbored in the colony, clandestine arms caches and evidence that Ramat Hakovesh served as the training center for a secret military organization. The tone, the charges, the demonstration are all in line with the arms trial.

On the other hand, what publicity, if any at all, is given to the facts that besides the thirty-odd thousand Palestinian Jews who were taken into the Eighth British Army and into the Palestinian home-guard forces, Jewish industries, large and small, and Jewish agriculture in Palestine supplied the British armies with bandages, pharmaceutical articles, ether, sulfanilamide, benzoic acid, nicotinic acid, vitamin B complex, ascorbic acid, insulin, alkaloids, microscopic stains, precision

instruments, tobacco, boots, fruit, vegetables, wheat, wine, X-ray apparatus, cement, soap, chocolate, sandbags, timber, tents, linen uniforms and busses, laboratory equipment, electrical appliances, meat, water pipes, stationery, beer, matches, mattresses, maps? Palestinian Jews lugged the oil and gasoline from Haifa and Mosul across the Syrian and the Sinaian deserts to Montgomery's mechanized forces, furnished the British armies in Libya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somaliland thousands of doctors, nurses, and dentists. It placed the great Hadassah Medical Center in Jerusalem at the disposal of the Empire. Silence in the press met the heroic exploits of the Palestinian Jewish suicide task forces who demolished the enemy fortifications night after night in the Abyssinian campaign, the Jewish engineers, the Jewish Pioneer Corps, and Jewish pilots who fought in Greece, the Jewish coast guard that ran in hundred speed boats along the dangerous Mediterranean lines between Cyprus, Palestine, Egypt, and Libya, the Jewish units that took a leading part in the capture of Sidi Barrani, Sollum, and Fort Capuzzo. It must be kept in mind, too, that according to international law, Palestine is a neutral country and its inhabitants are neutrals, but they gave the full measure of their devotion, life, and produce to the Allied cause. While the Palestinian Jews fought and died and worked and produced for the Allied cause, the Arabs would not even give as much as a donkey or camel to aid the Allied soldiers.

The open hostility of the Arabs to the Allied fighters is no secret. The treachery of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and the revolt in Iraq are known. Yet when there is no opportunity to convoke Danish, Norwegian, and Dutch members of the Permanent Mandates Commission and when the Hague Court is not in session, the British Government called to Cairo to decide the fate of Palestine, the Prime Minister of Iraq, a country that had to be beaten into submission a few months before the call, representatives of Ibn Saud who waited until the tide turned to declare himself friend, Abdullah, Emir of Trans-Jordan, King Farouk of Egypt, who was openly pro-Axis and whose Prime Minister was caught betraying British military secrets to Axis headquarters in Tobruk and a member of the Higher Arab Committee in Jerusalem, the very organization set up by the former Mufti of Jerusalem to fight and terrorize the Jewish community in Palestine and who himself was Hitler's gauleiter in the Holy Land. Is this the honoring of a pledge given to the world?

The Jewish people placed their faith in the British promise to facilitate the building of a homeland. They bought the land, bit by bit; they husbanded the arid soil and that which was uncultivable the Jew cultivated; they brought music and science to a world that had been left behind in civilization's march; they introduced modern methods of cultivation, modern machinery, new breeds of cattle, and poultry, new plants and seed rotation of crops, hydroelectrification; they had to reclaim, drain, reforest, fertilize, and irrigate. In 1939 the Peel Royal Commission stated: "Twelve years ago the national home was an experiment. Today it is a going concern."

Nor has the immigration and settlement of Jews in Palestine been at Arab expense. The increase in the yield of the land has made it possible not merely to provide for additional settlers but makes it possible for the old settlers to enjoy a higher standard of living. The Arabs have chosen to live in the greatest numbers in the neighborhood of Jewish settlements and the increase of the Arab population has closely paralleled the Jewish increase not only through the lowered death rate but also because large numbers of non-Palestinian Arabs had seeped into the country to enjoy the highest standard of living in the Near East.

All the talk encouraged by the British Colonial Office of a Pan-Arabia has little, if any, basis in fact. The British Colonial Office knows quite well that a federation of Arabs is a fantastic conception. It merely serves the purpose of naming Palestine as the stumbling block to such federation. Most absurd it is to speak of a mere strip of 10,429 square miles that is Palestine as barring a federation of Arabs when the Arab world consists of an area of 7,114,927 square miles. Lawrence of Arabia has put it well:

"The Arabic-speaking peoples are as diverse as the English-speaking and equally distinct. From Morocco to Mesopotamia is as far, spiritually as from San Francisco to Aberdeen. Further, there is a world between the Bedouin of Azrak, and the peasant of Amman, though the journey is only 50 miles. Only a criminal would wish to make them all alike.

"When people talk of Arab confederations or empires, they talk fantastically. It will be generations, I expect—unless the vital tempo of the East is much accelerated—before any two Arab states join voluntarily.

"The nearest approach to an Arab empire at present is Ibn Saud's. It is a figment built on sand. Nothing static will rise in the desert, which has seen hundreds of such tyrannies as his, all cemented with blood. It will pass."

Aside from the medley of races to be found in the Arab peoples, we find tremendous religious differences in Islam. There are the Sumites and the mystic Shiites, the Wahhabi or Senusi brand and scores of other sects and schism. In addition, there are the political ambitions of the Arab pashas, caliphs and emirs. Yesterday it was Hussein, Sherif of Mecca. Today it is Ibn-Saud of Arabia. Arabia is a world in itself as is Europe and the warring sects, class, races, communities are as widely apart as to mores, customs, and general cultural status as the nationalities of Europe. To place the blame on the little bit of land of Palestine for lack of such unity is preposterous and sinister in purpose.

Pious protestations of the Government of Great Britain against Jewish atrocities find little credence in the wake of such episodes like the fate of the *Struma* and *Patria*, boats carrying fleeing refugees in the first 2 years of the war, seeking a haven in Palestine. The *Struma* carried about 750 Jewish refugees. It sank in the Black Sea with all but one aboard, having been denied the right to dock in Palestine. The *Patria*, on which some 1,700 Jewish refugees barred from Palestine were waiting in the Haifa Harbor for deportation was rocked by an explosion. Two hundred were killed. The survivors were then admitted but to undo the "extreme generosity" of the Palestine Government, officials therein promptly deported close to 2,000 refugees who had previously entered Palestine and been kept in a concentration camp at Atlith. These men, women, and children were taken from their cots at night and shipped to the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean. This, when even within the limitations of the White Paper over 31,000 certificates of entrance remained unused.

In the above discussion it is not my purpose to create disunity among the Allies. I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The common man in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by this greatest scourge in civilized history. I repeat my avowal of admiration for England's saintly sacrifices that have saved us and the world. But how reconcile that with her attitude toward Palestine? A halo need slip but a few inches to become a noose. "Honest and sincere criticism among the Allies," said Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, "even during the heat of war, are not out of place. Fair criticism is the life of democracy."

I am reminded of Pierre von Paassen's paraphrase of Erasmus, "Angliae amicus sed magis justiae"—"I am a friend of England, but I am still greater friend of justice."

The MacDonald White Paper must be set aside. Great Britain must open Palestine to mass Jewish immigration at once; otherwise Europe becomes a massive Jewish sepulcher.

Respectfully submitted.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

Who Says There's a Shortage of Paper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article published in the Linn County (Mo.) News on December 14, 1943, relative to the phenomenal victory of the Moore Rural School in the Nation-wide campaign to recover waste paper:

MOORE SCHOOL CENTER OF 3-DAY CELEBRATION

The littlest big radio show of broadcasting history was staged Saturday night at Moore School 81 just southeast of Brookfield, the climax of a 3-day celebration here.

The setting made it the littlest show—coming from a 1-room rural schoolhouse with all the engineering paraphernalia of a Nation-wide broadcast and the properties necessary for a 30-minute stunt show crammed in, leaving room only for Mrs. Zoe Harwood, the teacher, her roster of 12 little children, and a mere handful of parents, photographers, and newspaper personnel.

The occasion made it more than a mere Truth or Consequences show by Ralph Edwards and his crew.

It was the pay off to the Moore School for the remarkable achievement of winning a national waste-paper-collection contest sponsored by Truth or Consequences at the request of the War Production Board to meet an acute shortage of waste paper needed for war materials. Government officials all the way up were tuned in on the Moore School broadcast, and many congratulatory telegrams came from high officials.

To win this contest, the 12 pupils of Moore School were responsible for the collection of 139 tons of waste paper, a per capita average of 2,300 pounds per pupil. The excellence of this showing can be realized when it is considered that more than 4,000 schools were in the contest and the Moore School average was 4 times that of the North Dakota school placing second.

Mechanical preparations for this broadcast were enormous. A three-way copper telephone line was strung from Brookfield, electric-power lines were installed especially for the show, a sound-proof control room was built in a corner of the school, and 15 people were here for 3 full days in preparation for the affair.

Every one of the 12 children was "thrilled to death" with their part in a Nation-wide broadcast, although they may not have fully

realized that the whole Nation was honoring them and their little school as symbols of our national united effort for the saving of the Nation.

Mrs. Harwood and her pupils were the only contestants participating in the broadcast and the consequences, of course, were tempered to fit the ages and timidity of the little folks. Part of them appeared on the 7:30 o'clock broadcast over east and central chains, others appearing on the west chain show at 10 o'clock.

The roster of the Moore School 81 pupils who brought this national honor to Linn County and won national praise for themselves:

Tommy Lewis, 5, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Henry Lewis.

Richard Schaefer, 10, Ronald Schaefer, 8, and Patsy Ann Schaefer, 6, children of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Schaefer.

Ronald Lester Noah, 8, and Donald Noah, 7, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Lester Noah.

Daphne Ann Harwood, 7, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis Harwood.

Walter Bowles, 7, son, of Robert Bowles.

Evelyn North, 9, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Everett North.

Leo Walsh, 12, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Walsh.

Lyle Wayne McCollum, 7, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edmund McCollum.

Joan Smith, 7, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Smith.

Mrs. Zoe Harwood (Mrs. Francis Harwood) is a teacher and leader of proven ability. Her first school was at Boomer, where she taught three terms, then two terms at McClure, and 5 years at Moore school, one term at St. Catherine, and this is her third term after returning to Moore School.

Action Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a communication and enclosure from Mr. Herbert Kibler, department adjutant of the American Legion in Montana who calls to my attention a very serious situation concerning the men now being discharged from the service. As a veteran myself I am interested in the welfare of these boys and I am desirous of calling again to the attention of the Congress our duty toward them. We all know, after listening to the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Mr. MAY, that he and his colleagues stand ready and willing to do all in their power in behalf of our returning servicemen.

I do not believe that any Member in this House will vote against the veterans' interests. I well recall the treatment accorded those of us who served in the last war, and I, for one, am determined that such shabby consideration will not be again repeated. Let us learn by our mistakes of the past, and build for our veterans this time on a more solid foundation.

As one of seventeen who voted against adjournment last Saturday and as one of five who rose and advocated a roll call on the question, I am indeed sorry that the mustering-out measure will not be considered until after the first of the year. This question is too important to wait, and the least we could do, in my opinion, was to remain in session until this matter is settled.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended inserting in the RECORD an enclosure from Mr. Kibler showing the results of a Legion survey in relation to claims settlements for the war disabled. However, I am informed by the Public Printer that this survey was included in the RECORD of December 10, 1943, by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. I urge that the House read this comprehensive report and give its most earnest and serious consideration to its contents.

Warren of the West: Republican of New Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which its able author, Nicholas Roosevelt, has entitled "Warren of the West: Republican of a New Type."

As a Californian who is very proud of the accomplishments of our new Governor, I find much happiness in spreading this splendid tribute to the Honorable Earl Warren upon the pages of the RECORD, for, indeed, he is worthy of every word of it.

If I were to indulge myself in prophecy I would have no hesitancy in proclaiming that in him we have a President in the making.

Mr. Roosevelt's article follows:

CALIFORNIA'S GOVERNOR MAY PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE AT NATIONAL CONVENTION—HE WANTS PARTY TO FACE POST-WAR PROBLEMS IN A CONSTRUCTIVE SPIRIT

(By Nicholas Roosevelt)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., December 18.—In the East Earl Warren is known only as a Republican who was elected Governor of California just a year ago. In the West, Earl Warren has been known at least 15 years as a fighting district attorney and attorney general and as one of the sanest, soundest leaders among the newer Republicans.

Five years ago California, which then had a 2-to-1 Democratic registration, elected Warren, a Republican, as attorney general at the same time it elected a Democratic Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Last year Mr. Warren not only was nominated for Governor, by an overwhelming majority in the Republican primaries, but he received 400,000 votes in the Democratic primary to his Democratic rival's 500,000. A difference of 50,000 votes in the Democratic primary would have made Mr. Warren the nominee of both parties.

No wonder many persons look upon him as an outstanding political figure on the west coast. Some talk of him as a Presidential candidate in the Republican Convention next June, but Earl Warren has stated definitely that he is not a candidate. His present ambition is to be the best Governor that California has ever had.

WILL HEAD DELEGATION

Nevertheless, it is practically certain that Governor Warren will head the California delegation to the Republican National Convention next year. It is not impossible that he will be the choice of other Western States. Even if he is only California's favorite son candidate, he will have the control of 50 votes in the Republican Convention, which is more than the votes of any other State except New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

When he decides to throw his influence behind one candidate or another, his endorsement will in itself be a testimonial to his candidate's character.

The fact that Earl Warren represents a new element in the Republican Party also adds to his influence. Now 52, he is one of several younger men who, in the last few years, have been elected Governors of great Republican States, and who are convinced that the Republican Party must get rid of the influence of those persons whose acts and ideas justified the stigma of reaction which the party's enemies have attached to it. He believes that if the party is to return to power in national affairs it must be as a vital, progressive organization, led by forward-looking men.

DISCUSSES DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

I asked the Governor if he would discuss his ideas about post-war domestic problems.

"Out here in California," he said, "we know that we shall be facing tremendous economic problems when the war is over. One industry alone—aircraft production—has increased at least tenfold. A million people have come to our State since Pearl Harbor for war work.

"Our problem will be one of assimilation and readjustment. We have great untapped resources of raw materials on this coast. We shall have to put these to work."

"By direction of the State?" I interjected.

"The State can help in planning and coordinating," he answered, "but the stability of our economy depends upon men being able to find jobs in private enterprise—jobs which encourage the establishment of families and the building of homes. Private enterprise must always have the right of way in creating jobs, and back of private enterprise government should stand ready to help whenever and wherever it can. The best approach will always lie in a broad and cooperative attack by private industry, business organizations and enterprising individuals, assisted by agencies of government.

STATE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

"The State government can do much to ease the future strains by making itself ready to launch public-works programs and render financial assistance where most needed, but its activities should be largely supplementary—supplementary to a real determination upon the part of private enterprise to quickly reestablish itself in peacetime pursuits. When this war is over we want to see a revival in building and the return of many small enterprises which before the war we considered permanent in their nature."

Turning from domestic problems, I asked Governor Warren what he thought about post-war international cooperation.

"I am in no sense an expert on international affairs," he said, "and I do not have the necessary background to suggest a detailed program. But this much seems to me to be clear—that the people out here on the

West coast are naturally interested in what the future of the world is to be because our fortunes are so wrapped up in the possibilities of peace in the Pacific."

"Do you look forward to some sort of organization for international cooperation?"

"Yes," he answered, "but I don't think that it should be too rigid or too ambitious. Certainly the time has not yet come to set up a world supergovernment."

SLOW TO CRYSTALLIZE

The Governor spoke slowly, and it was clear that he hesitated to discuss the problem because it lay in a field in which he had had little experience.

"Have you talked with enough people out here to have an idea as to how they feel about our part in world affairs?"

"Yes," he said, "but I don't think that opinion is crystallized yet. On one thing, however, we are all agreed—that when this war is over the United States should maintain a large enough military, naval, and air force to be able to protect itself in the event that the efforts to maintain world peace fail. We don't want ever to be caught short as we were at Pearl Harbor. We must be strong enough to be able to meet any potential enemy successfully."

I asked the Governor what position he thought the Republican Party should take on these matters.

"As far as I am concerned, the resolution at Mackinac Island is a move in the right direction," he said. "But I think that when the convention meets next year it should adopt a careful statement of policy going even further than the Mackinac resolution. I am not the man to suggest just how it should be elaborated. Foreign affairs is not my field. As a matter of fact, the precise wording is so important that I hope that the party leaders will begin working on the foreign affairs planks very soon, so that they can have the full consideration of the best authorities in the country before the planks are presented to the convention.

PACT AS STARTING POINT

"It seems to me that the place to start is with an agreement between ourselves, the British, the Russians, and the Chinese, which will have as its objective to make it impossible for Germany or Japan ever to start another war. But I don't want to see us involved in any scheme of international policing which would call for the sending of American boys to the ends of the earth. At the same time I should hate to see us try to impose our ideas on the rest of the world, or make promises which we either cannot or will not make good.

"If the leaders of the Republican Party are wise, they will place before the country a concise program which is so clearly phrased that the voters will have a definite idea as to where the party stands when they go to the voting booths. What our people out here want is some sort of machinery which will reduce the chances of another war to a minimum. What they do not want is to see this country meddling in the affairs of other countries or committing itself to underwriting the status quo."

"You said that the people on the West coast are deeply concerned about the future of the Pacific," I remarked. "Do you care to elaborate that idea?"

"Yes," the Governor said. "It seems to me that it is obvious that we on the coast are sure to have steadily growing relations of all kinds with the nations in the Pacific basin. That means not only with the Far East but also with Australia, New Zealand, western Canada, and the nations of the west coast of Central and South America.

FUTURE BOUND UP TOGETHER

"Under the circumstances, we cannot remain indifferent to what happens on the other side of the Pacific. In fact, we are probably more intimately concerned about what happens in the Pacific than you in the east are concerned about Europe. To you Pearl Harbor was scarcely even a name before Japan's infamous attack. To us it has long been our principal outpost. Don't make the mistake of thinking that when the war is over we shall turn our backs on the Pacific. We couldn't even if we wanted to, because our future is bound up with the future of the other nations which border the Pacific. This is why we cannot risk a repetition of Japan's treacherous attack."

"Am I right in assuming that you do not see the problem of our relations with the rest of the world as a simple issue between cooperation and noncooperation?" I asked.

"It is a problem of the precise form of cooperation," he replied. "Our objective, as I said, is to devise some sort of controls so that it cannot happen again. That will be a hard job. Even the experts will disagree about details. The issue cannot be simplified into some sort of slogan such as 'Go in' or 'Keep out.' It is not even a question of withdrawing from world affairs. We can't withdraw, as we did after the last war. We have too much at stake. If we don't manage to keep the peace, the world as we have known it may well disappear forever, for the new powers of destruction that may be prepared in the years to come are likely to be so terrific that no nation could survive an attack. We owe it to ourselves and to the world to do what we can to make it impossible for another war to start. That is the real problem, and I sincerely hope that when the convention meets the Republican leaders will face that problem constructively and without any pussyfooting."

Justice Department Discloses Fire-Insurance Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including excerpts from an article datelined "December 18, 1943, Washington, D. C.," which appeared in PM, Sunday, December 19, 1943, edition, which read as follows:

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DISCLOSES FIRE-INSURANCE MONOPOLY—MEMORANDUM ALSO CITES HIGH PROFITS AND DISCRIMINATORY RATES OF COMPANIES

(By Nathan Robertson)

WASHINGTON, December 18.—Evidence, gathered by the Justice Department, provided a hint today on the story of monopoly operations and high profits that may be developed if Congress investigates the fire-insurance companies.

A rough outline of the story was provided by a memorandum prepared in the antitrust division asserting that "fire-insurance rates are the result of imaginary price formulas gone mad." It described the industry's methods for eliminating competition, its high profits, and its discriminatory rates.

As a result of the industry's demand for exemption from the antitrust laws, Representative WALTER LYNCH (Democrat, New York) has introduced a resolution proposing a broad investigation of the entire fire-insurance industry. He is expected to push for its approval after Christmas.

RATE SYSTEM TOLD

The Justice Department's memorandum described in some detail the complicated system of rates established by the fire-insurance industry in various parts of the country.

"The net result," it said, "is that identically constructed drug stores, for example, may pay 45 cents per $100 for insurance in one State, 70 cents in another, $1.10 in another, and $2 in another, while an interstate chain drug-store corporation owning stores in all these States gets special rates as much as 50 percent lower than the average of the miscellaneous rates applying in the various States.

"A comparison of the rates granted to great interstate chain grocery store organizations such as Safeway, A. & P., and Kroger, under the rules of the Interstate Underwriters Board, with the average of those charged on an equal number of stores of identical construction but insured individually under the rating laws of the various States, indicates that these huge interstate corporations receive from the fire-insurance companies discriminatory rates often more than 50 percent lower than those paid by individual owners.

"Similar discriminations are granted in favor of five-and-10-cent-store chains, where the rate differential is more than 40 percent lower, and in favor of interstate drug chains, where such differentials average 60 percent in favor of the chains as contrasted to rates for individual risks at similar locations.

"Agent's commissions on fire insurance," the Justice Department says, "average about 25 percent of the premiums, but the heaviest commissions are loaded onto the policies for the unorganized small-dwelling owner. In some cities, agents in a position to produce large amounts of business, get commissions as high as 35 percent to 55 percent."

I have only excluded from the article that part of it which deals with profits of insurance companies, because I have previously based my opposition to H. R. 3270 upon other grounds than profits—excluding the question of profits solely because they seem to be controversial, while the question of discrimination in rates, which is evidenced even in the limited hearings heretofore held by the House Judiciary Committee jointly with the Senate committee, seem to be established on the record to date without controversy.

The above article discloses facts which have not been disputed by insurance companies in any evidence which they have introduced before any committee of this body or of the other body to date. Therefore, at this time, we are entitled to accept the above facts as true, as well as the evidence of discrimination in rates which appears in the hearings, and which I have previously discussed in the Appendix of the RECORD at pages A5383–A5385.

With the record before Congress of this condition, surely no Member will want to go before his constituents with a record of having voted for H. R. 3270 which, in my opinion, is designed to prevent the Supreme Court from considering pending litigation, with the result that the allegations made by the Justice Department cannot be tested as to their truth in the pending litigation. Also, a vote now for H. R. 3270, before the evidence of discrimination as now before the House has been gone into by the proper committee of the House, would appear to be a vote against every little

independent retailer in America, at the very time when Congress is professing a great interest in and solicitude for the little-business man. It seems to me that such profession of interest in and solicitude for him is utterly inconsistent with a vote for H. R. 3270 on the record as it stands today.

South Carolina Boys Are Real Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of my home-town paper, the Greenville News, one of Ernie Pyle's syndicated articles appeared on the front page under the heading South Carolina Boys Are Real Soldiers.

Mr. Pyle very graphically and in his characteristic style points out a fact that has long since been well known in that no finer, more courageous soldiers have ever been born than those from South Carolina.

I am happy to insert this article in the RECORD, especially at Christmas time.

SOUTH CAROLINA BOYS ARE REAL SOLDIERS

(By Ernie Pyle)

AT THE FRONT LINES IN ITALY, December 18.—I've been living with a gun crew that has fought through four big Mediterranean campaigns. These men have been away from America for nearly 17 months.

It has been more than a year since any of them has slept in a bed. When they turned in their old gun a few weeks ago for a brand new one, it had fired more than 6,000 rounds.

Originally the whole crew was from South Carolina and they were a closely knit bunch, but transfers and illnesses over the months have whittled the Carolinians down to five. People from such strange and unorthodox places as California and Missouri have infiltrated.

But Carolina still sets the pace, and a year of rassling with French and Italian hasn't changed their accent a bit. Practically everybody has a nickname. You hear such odd ones as "Rabbit" and "Wartime" and "Tamper" and "Mote." I've noticed that most of the crew call their gun "hozer" instead of "howitzer," and they say "far" instead of "fire."

The officers are mostly southern, too, and I must say this outfit comes the nearest to being a real democracy of any I've seen in the Army. The battery officers work, live, and play with their men. It is a team, rather than a case of somebody above giving orders and somebody below taking them.

FROM SMALL TOWNS

Most of the men are from small towns. They are mostly hill people. As I wrote of them more than a year ago in England, there is something fundamentally fine and sound about their character that must have been put there by a closeness to their hills and their trees and their soil.

They are natively courteous. Most of them have little education, and their grammar is atrocious, but their thinking is clear, and they seem to have a friendliness toward all people that much of America doesn't have. They have an acceptance of their miserable fate and a sense of gaiety and good humor, despite their hardships, that you seldom find in other Army outfits.

The artillery lives tough, but it, too, like nearly every other branch of the Army, bows in sympathy and admiration to the infantry. One day we were sitting on our steel hats planted in the mud around a bonfire made of empty pasteboard powder cases when one member of the gun crew said, "We live like kings in comparison to the infantry."

"What's that you say?" burst in another cannoneer. The sentence was repeated.

"Oh, I thought you said we live like kings," the questioner said. "I thought you must be crazy in the head. But if you compare us with the infantry, that's all right. Those poor guys really have to take it."

The average artilleryman's outlook on life, I think, can be summed up by saying he's uncompromisingly proud of his battery, he's thankful and appreciative of being in the artillery, and he wants to go home so bad he talks about it nearly 20 percent of the time.

The artillery doesn't live in as great danger as the infantry. For example, not a single officer out of this regiment has been lost in more than a year of combat. They always try to lay in their guns behind a hill where the enemy's long-range guns can't reach. Also they are heavily protected by antiaircraft concentrations to drive off German bombers.

GUN BLOWS UP

But casualties are bound to happen regardless. Tragedy has struck twice in my battery of four guns since it came from Italy only a few weeks ago. No. 2 gun blew up from a premature explosion as they were putting in a shell. Three men were killed and half a dozen wounded.

Not long before that some German raiders did get through and a bomb explosion killed three men and wounded nearly a dozen others. I was told over and over the story of one of the three who died. His legs were blown off clear up to his body. He stayed conscious, but could not possibly live long.

When the medical men went to help him he raised what was left of himself up on his elbows and said:

"I'm done for, so don't waste time on me. Go help the other boys."

He lived 7 minutes, conscious all the time.

Things like that knock the boys down for a few days. But if they don't come too often they can take it without serious damage to their fighting spirit.

It's when casualties become so great that those who remain feel they have no chance to live, if they must go on and on, that morale in an army gets low.

The morale is excellent in this battery I've been living with. They gripe, of course, but they are never grim or even mad about the toughness of their life. The only thing is they're impatient for movement—they'd fire all day and move all night every day and every night if they could only keep going forward swiftly.

Because everywhere in our army "forward," no matter what direction, is toward home.

The President's Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, December 17, 1943, on the safe return of our President. I commend this editorial to the Members of this body, all of whom will, I am sure, concur in the views expressed in this beautiful tribute to President Roosevelt's participation in the recent historical and epoch-making Teheran Conference. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 17, 1943]

THE PRESIDENT BACK HOME

It is good to know that President Roosevelt is back home again, safe and sound, and still full of vigor after his long and not altogether riskless journey. As Commander in Chief, he has proved himself as hard-working and as rugged as any soldier in the field. Since November 11, he has been to Cairo, and to Teheran and once more to Cairo, and he has been to Malta, and to Sicily, and he has flown the 1,500 famous miles from El Alamein to Tunis. In all manner of conveyances, establishing any number of precedents, he has moved from one far-off place to another at such a pace as would weary most men, but he took it quite in stride. Indeed, the traveling was merely incidental, nothing at all compared to the regimen he followed as statesman and war leader—conferences with Stalin, with Chiang Kai-shek, with President Inonu, of Turkey, with General Eisenhower, with hosts of other military men, and of course with the redoubtable Mr. Churchill whose similar labors have left him seriously ill in the Middle East. Physically and mentally, Mr. Roosevelt did not spare himself, but so great is his natural vitality, he seemed to thrive on the vigorous self-usage. And for his pains he achieved rich results. With the other heads of state, he was surrounded by the forces of history, and besides helping to map new battle campaigns, he helped to make new history. We cannot know today how enduring will be the declarations of Cairo and Tehran, but we do know that they have projected a better world and a more decent future, and Mr. Roosevelt was largely instrumental in that. In sum, as Commander in Chief and President, he has returned from a good and arduous job, and there are few who will not say, "Well done." While he was away, there was much unspoken anxiety over his well-being, but now that is past, and the American people as a whole—Republicans and Democrats alike—are happy to see him back, not least of all because he may be able to do something about some of the things that have not been going so well on the home front since he left.

[From the Chelsea War Front, paper issued by Chelsea Defense Council, 266 Eighth Avenue, New York City]

BURCHILL CALLS CHILD CARE WEEK VITAL TO COMMUNITY'S WELFARE

(By Representative THOMAS F. BURCHILL)

Child Care Week, December 6–13, sponsored by the Chelsea Defense Council and endorsed by other responsible community organizations, deserves the support of every resident for focusing attention on an important problem, and for suggesting a remedy which all can appreciate.

All of us realize, of course, that there can be no satisfactory substitute for the loving care parents bestow on their children, and for the benefits their children enjoy.

But in these days, when so many mothers are turning out the munitions and other products which are speeding our Nation to victory, something must be done to relieve them of the understandable anxiety engendered by the fact that while they are at work their little ones may not be watched over

carefully enough; may not get the food and rest and general guidance which they need.

And as your representative in Congress I have had occasion to study official data. These disclose that much of the success we have achieved in obtaining women replacements for the men who have entered the services has been vitiated by the turnover among women, which is larger than among men, worried as these mothers are about their children.

Likewise, a good deal of the absenteeism among women employees—a problem which must be eliminated if there is to be no delay in our march to Berlin and Tokyo—results from the same understandable anxiety.

Clearly, then, some arrangement must be made, and promptly, to solve this situation.

That is where the child-care centers, with their scientifically trained personnel, eager and able to give the little ones loving, personal attention, can make their contribution.

Moreover, Chelsea is fortunate in having child-care centers which have been in existence for considerable periods, have proved their worth, have won community confidence, and are now prepared to embrace the larger number of children in need of such facilities today.

Because Child Care Week is intended to widen the community's use of these centers, and to provide additional facilities as requirements suggest, I am glad to endorse its program, to assure it of my support, and to wish it every success.

National Inventors Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Federal organizations making vital contributions to the successful prosecution of the war is the National Inventors Council, created by the Honorable Harry L. Hopkins, then Secretary of Commerce, and continued under the present Secretary, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones.

Patriotic citizens have by the thousands responded to the Council's appeal for inventions and discoveries that will defeat despotism and defend democracy. From every section of the country there have come suggestions and devices that their authors deem useful to our Army and our Navy. The technicians of the Council are in constant cooperation with the military and naval experts in the evaluation and adaptation of these ideas and mechanisms for the Nation's armament. Since the creation of the Council in August 1940 it has received more than 163,000 suggestions and inventions. Some of these are valuable additions to the means of offense and defense in use by our fighters. None of them, of course, can be disclosed here, but their helpfulness to the Army and the Navy has been substantial.

On the second anniversary of the Council's establishment the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy testified to the impressiveness of its achievements. In the public interest, and for the good for our morale, I deem it beneficial to record the testimony of the two Departments which have been so powerfully reinforced by the genius and patriotism of thousands of our citizens and by the efficiency of the Council. Here, then, are the statements which Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox addressed to Dr. Charles F. Kettering, chairman of the Council:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

The NATIONAL INVENTORS COUNCIL,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: It has been called to my attention that the National Inventors Council will celebrate its second anniversary on September 22. I am happy to extend my sincere congratulations.

Since the colonization of America, our people have always been the most ingenious on earth. I am pleased to recall that during the 166 years of its existence this Nation has, on the whole, devoted its inventive talents and efforts toward improvement of the instruments of peace, and not of war. When war has been forced upon us, as it has now, the genius of America can rise and has already risen to meet the challenge of the best brains and talent the enemy possesses.

In just 2 years your organization has received and sifted a hundred thousand inventions, and has selected from them the most promising for use by the war agencies. A large number of these have already been adopted and, without doubt, many more will be used before the present conflict is over. The enemy will soon learn, if he does not know already, that American genius is as efficient in war as in peace.

You have already rendered the Nation a great service, and I am sure you will continue to do so. The War Department appreciates your efforts and the fine spirit of cooperation you have shown at all times in this great undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, September 17, 1942.

Dr. CHARLES F. KETTERING,
Chairman, the National Inventors' Council,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. KETTERING: Your Council has now been in operation for 2 years and, as I understand, has examined and passed on over 100,000 cases in that relatively short space of time. It seems to me that this certainly warrants note and commendation.

I am quite aware of the important work which your Council members and its staff have done in this relatively short time and of its great value to the Navy. Not only has the Council relieved Navy officers of the onerous duty of the primary examination of thousands of inventions and suggestions which normally come to us but its individual members and staff members have given us invaluable aid in solving some of the Navy's important special problems.

Please accept and convey to the Council and its staff my thanks and that of the Navy Department for your valued assistance during these past 2 years. You may be assured of the continued interest and cooperation of the Navy Department in your future work.

I trust that you all may enjoy good health and retain that inspiring enthusiasm during the hard days to come. It will, I am sure, count much in our final victory.

Cordially yours,

FRANK KNOX.

I think it appropriate also to name the members of the Council, all of whose labors and accomplishments have come to us all without any reward except the satisfaction they have derived from their service to country.

The Chairman is Dr. Charles F. Kettering; the Vice Chairman is Thomas Midgley, Jr.; and the Secretary is Lawrence Langner. The members are George Baekeland, Rear Admiral J. D. Beuret, Rear Admiral H. G. Bowan, George Codrington, Conway P. Coe, William D. Cooldige, Watson Davis, Frederick M. Feiker, Rear Admiral J. A. Furer, Webster N. Jones, George W. Lewis, Fin Sparre, Maj. Gen. W. H. Tschappat, Brig. Gen. Walter A. Wood, Jr., Orville Wright, and Fred Zeder.

The Inn Within Our Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Country Gentleman. It carries a message from which we all can benefit:

THE INN WITHIN OUR HEARTS

"There was no room for them in the inn." So an humble manger became the place of a birth that was to bring an imperishable hope to humanity. It is the yet unfulfilled hope which the shepherds on the Judean hillside heard the voices of a multitude of the heavenly host proclaiming:

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

To the little town of Bethlehem, as its streets resounded with the clangor of the Roman legion, that hope must have seemed far away and unattainable. The Legion has vanished, with the Persian, the Saracen, the Crusader, and the Turk amid recurring wars. Now American and English boys gaze wonderingly at the scene of the Nativity, pausing on their way to another and greater war.

But the hope which came with the first Christmas abides, as steadfast as the star that guided the Wise Men. Across the war-wracked centuries men and women have never ceased to cherish it. But they saw its fulfillment no more than the shepherds on the Judean hillside, for there was no room in the inn for that which would bring it to pass. The poet who wrote "There is an inn in every heart" clothed in happy imagery one of life's actualities. As was that inn of long ago, so has the inn in the hearts of men been preempted by other guests. Self-interest, pride, indulgence, distrust, intolerance, and their uglier kin have crowded its lodging places and their stay has been overlong.

They have paid for their keep in a coin of bitter mintage. In exchange for it humanity has inexorably received the desolation and death, the pain and sorrow of war.

At this Christmas season, which should be a time of cheer and gladness, we are sharers in the tears and the prayers of a world in travail. The cries for deliverance which go up from the millions who suffer will mingle with the carols we shall sing.

But the hope which is ever a part of Christmas has not receded. It has really drawn nearer. If our eyes could but destroy it, the dawn of its fulfillment may be only beyond the war-darkened horizon. For out of the world tragedy that is being enacted we seem

to be learning in that hard way, by which mankind only seems able to learn. Men and women are thinking, as never before, about the means by which "on earth peace, good will toward men" can be made a reality. As they do, they are finding it necessary to make room in the inn within their hearts for those better occupants, which alone can bring it to pass.

The hope, of which Christmas is the symboy, and the teachings of Him, in whose name we observe it, are inseparably entwined. We cannot have one without accepting the other. What He taught was an attitude of spirit and mind and heart which, if established and put into practice, would remove the causes of war. The commandments that He stressed were: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and second only to it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." One's neighbor was not merely a member of one's own class or race or nationality, as He made clear in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

The full impact of that commandment was lost upon us until the red ruin of our day brought it crushingly home. Now we realize its terrible alternative. Bombers flying the Atlantic, voices speaking to us from Moscow and Chungking are making neighbors of us all. The mighty powers of the twentieth century, moving on as though a part of some vast plan, have become enforcers of the commandment that men shall live together as neighbors. "On earth peace, good will toward men" is not simply a hope now, but a necessity.

All along we have had a sign and token of what was needful for its attainment. Under the spell of the day we have approached nearest its threshold at Christmas. A mood, kindly and more generous, has lifted life out of the ruck of self-interest. Men and women have found happiness in thinking of others, learned the singular fact that they became sharers in the joys brought by their giving.

Strange we did not see that in opening the inn within our hearts to these friendly qualities we had got hold of the secret which had so long eluded humanity. For all the while it was the way to fulfillment of those "Good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

Power Developments in New Mexico, Arizona, and West Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Reclamation has been tremendously helpful in the Public Land States of the West by its program of the development and transmission of power.

Within recent months the private utilities have been requesting studies for the purpose of determining whether the power already developed can be combined with future power developments for the benefit of the citizens of Arizona, New Mexico, and west Texas. There have been some preliminary announcements and as a result of these announcements I have asked the Bureau of Reclamation for information as to what it is studying and how this relates to the present transmission systems.

On December 15 the Commissioner of the Bureau, Mr. H. W. Bashore, replied to me, giving an up-to-date statement of the situation. Since this is of interest to the people of New Mexico and to our neighbors in Arizona and West Texas, I include it in the RECORD as an important part of the present consideration of power developments:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1943.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Since your telephone inquiry of December 7, I have read the Associated Press dispatch of December 3, printed in the El Paso (Texas) Herald-Post, which discusses plans of the Federal Light & Traction Co. to consolidate electric systems of its subsidiaries in New Mexico and Arizona. The dispatch also emphasizes a proposed transmission system to link the Elephant Butte plant of the Rio Grande reclamation project which serves New Mexico and Texas areas and the Parker Dam power plant of the Bureau which now supplies Arizona territory. I am glad to give you information as to the Bureau's studies which relate to the transmission system.

In anticipation of accelerated construction of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects in a post-war public-works program, the Bureau has been giving attention to the effect of power and related developments in Arizona, New Mexico, and the Texas Panhandle. The studies so far indicate that the linking of the irrigation and power potentialities will materially enhance the agricultural, industrial, municipal, and rural electrification possibilities in the region. The irrigated acreage can be expanded and several times the present power supply can be made available in New Mexico, with substantial increases in Arizona as well. The Bureau is now operating the Eelephant Butte plant of 24,300-kilowatt capacity on the Rio Grande in New Mexico, 50 percent of the power output of which is permanently allocated for distribution in Texas, principally the El Paso area. The other half is allocated for use in New Mexico.

At present, certain power allocated to New Mexico is not being used in that State, and therefore Texas has been obtaining and using more than its allocated share. The Parker Dam power plant on the Colorado River (Nevada-California) has an installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. Its output is distributed principally in Arizona, where it is linked with existing public and privately-owned electric systems, including a subsidiary in Tucson of the Federal Light & Traction Co.

Construction of Davis Dam on the Colorado, between Boulder and Parker Dams, which was authorized in 1941, was halted by the war. In addition to these three projects, Elephant Butte, Parker, and Davis, the Bureau has been investigating the power possibilities of the Bridge Canyon project on the Colorado River in Arizona, the San Juan-Chama in northern New Mexico, and the Cliff project on the Gila.

The ultimate capacity of Davis Dam and the three other proposed plants is nearly 1,000,000 kilowatts. Perfection of high tension line facilities is making the transmission of power greater distances not only feasible but economical.

With the broad objective of making the present and prospective power output contribute to the maximum development of the irrigation, industrial, and other resources of the region, a major consideration has been a transmission system into which all existing and potential power developments could be fitted. The Bureau now has a transmission system extending from Parker Dam to Tucson and another from Elephant Butte to Deming, N. Mex. Thus the connection from Tucson to Deming would link existing lines and permit Colorado River power to flow into southern New Mexico. It would augment the supply of power available to communities in New Mexico and Texas now served by the Elephant Butte system. The possibility of cutting power from the proposed Cliff project on the Gila into this line is also under consideration. This is one of the connections that we have been considering as a part of our own network.

Another line contemplated would extend from the Elephant Butte plant north to Albuquerque to connect with the proposed power system of the San Juan-Chama project. Construction of this line would permit power from the Elephant Butte plant which might be displaced by Colorado River energy to flow northward toward Albuquerque. Later this same line would permit power from the San Juan-Chama plant to flow southward to augment the supply available to the Elephant Butte or Rio Grande system.

Engineering and economic studies are going forward with a view to the early determination of the financial feasibility of the proposed system. Preliminary data indicates that the low-cost power which will be available from the contemplated developments will present distinct over-all advantages for the people in the service area of the system in Arizona and New Mexico as well as El Paso. The possibilities are that power can be delivered through the system at a cost materially lower than it could otherwise be generated by local fuel-burning plants.

Work has been under way for some time on studies of present and prospective markets, the map locations for the proposed transmission lines, and the engineering features so that construction may be included on an early post-war public-works program.

The Bureau of Reclamation is not sponsoring a connection by the Federal Light & Traction Co. of the systems in New Mexico with those in Arizona.

Very truly yours,

H. W. BASHORE,
Commissioner.

Fighting Men Watch Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include what I think is a very timely and needed editorial that appeared in the Marietta (Ohio) Daily Times on December 14, regarding happenings on our home front:

FIGHTING MEN WATCH HOME FRONT

The writer of a column that appeared in the A. F. of L.'s Weekly News Service professes to be unable to understand "why the men in the armed services should be interested in reading of such petty affairs (as a milk drivers' strike in Brooklyn) which have no real effect on the war effort." He can find volumes of proof that they are deeply concerned in such matters in letters from soldiers and sailors. He can learn, too, that they are keenly interested in everything at

home that reflects the spirit of the people, as an indication of their willingness to give the fighting forces the support they have a right to expect.

In an eloquent letter, already published, Technical Sgt. Paul E. Dye, of Marietta, described his thoughts and experiences on air raids over Europe. Continuing, he touched on developments on the home front and gave the usual fighting man's view of them.

"It's these things that I go through on every mission," he says, "that make me wish the people back home could see what it's like. They yell because they can't run their cars. They yell about rationing of food. They want more money and even go on strike to get it. People don't like it because they can't get the liquor they used to, and raise hell when they are told that lots of it comes overseas to us." If people could see what actual fighting conditions are, he believes, their attitude would be changed greatly.

And here's a paragraph of a sailor's letter to his sister, written after a year in the South Pacific: "We have had some pretty rough going lately. After going through and seeing a lot of this stuff out here it gets a fellow mad and disgusted to pick up a paper from back in the States and see what the people back there do. I'd like to see some of these people that are striking for one thing or another spend 3 days straight without sleep and under conditions that I can't write about. If they didn't die of fright they would from heat stroke or exhaustion."

Perhaps the newspapers shouldn't worry fighting men by printing stories about strikes. Or perhaps persons responsible for strikes should stop them.

Christmas 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a weekly release sent to the newspapers of the Second District of Kansas for publication at this Christmas season:

Except for the younger children, upon whom, fortunately, tragedies rest somewhat lightly, Christmas of 1943 cannot be an overly merry one, with 10,000,000 vacant chairs—chairs left vacant by the cream of our young manhood. They are giving the rest of us protection from attack and invasion, and many of them, as did the Prince of Peace, will die that their friends may live.

With the entire world in the flames of war and hate, celebration of the Birth of Christ with any great amount of gay festivity doesn't seem quite proper.

It was peace He sought to bring us, although He realized that at times earthly kingdoms might resort to war. His peace was one based on love of fellow man—a love that barred the sins of lust for power, greed for another's possessions, jealousy of another's success, and hate of other persons.

Those of us who were in uniform 25 years ago, for the most part, didn't believe that that war would end wars. We knew war didn't change human nature. We knew there would be crime and war as long as the world did not accept, and live according to, Christian principles; and after our return we sought to avoid war's direst effects by an unfulfilled program of adequate national defense.

This war will not end wars unless it has the improbable result of changing human nature—of eradicating lust, greed, avarice, jealousy, and hate among men and nations. The task of eliminating these sins is a challenge to the churches and the entire Christian world.

As we think of Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, the Birthday of our Saviour, of His life, of His message, of His mission, all of us should resolve to drive from our hearts, from our community, from our Nation, and from the world, those forces which have cost us so much in pain, suffering, and humanity.

Until greed, envy, selfishness, and hate are overcome there can be no lasting peace on earth—there can be no real, true Merry Christmas.

All of us wish each of you as merry a Christmas as it may possibly be—merry in the pride of service of courageous unselfish men; merry in the memories of Christmases past; merry in the hopes of Christmases yet to come.

An Action Agenda for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I was among those on Saturday who voted against Congress taking a protracted recess at this time. Much as I would like the opportunity to spend a few weeks at home, I feel that there are unsolved problems before Congress which should be disposed of without delay, and that Congress should stay in session for that purpose.

Among the problems to which I feel Congress should give early, if not immediate, attention are the following, to which the drive-for-action committee—which has now been functioning for nearly 2 months—has devoted considerable attention. While several of the items on the program of our committee have been acted upon by Congress, the following items are among those which still demand attention:

First. Congress should act without delay to provide prompt mustering-out pay for veterans of this war who are now being discharged from service.

Second. Action should be taken to give servicemen and women an opportunity to vote. This action should permit them to vote as they please for all candidates for office including those on the State and county tickets.

Third. The Fulmer bill should be passed setting up a single food administrator for this country to bring order out of the chaos existing in the food situation.

Fourth. The new tax bill should be passed and it should be amended to produce additional revenue especially out of war profits and from luxury taxes.

Fifth. O. P. A. regulations should be simplified and their equitability established.

Sixth. Procedures should be set up to make economy in Government a reality rather than a rhetorical phrase. The Jensen resolution would do this job.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters demanding our attention but as co-chairman of the drive-for-action committee I submit that the foregoing agenda for Congress is a minimum program upon which the Democratic leadership of Congress should permit immediate action.

Manpower's Unanswered Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it reflects no great credit upon this Nation that many of the principal manpower questions which first threatened the progress of its war effort are still unanswered 2 years after Pearl Harbor. We ignore these troublesome questions because the war effort has gone forward magnificently despite them, because production has been doubled and doubled again many times. But we can never know what quantities of vital war supplies have been lost because essential manpower problems have been bypassed or temporized, but not solved.

It is not too late to solve the Nation's manpower problems, but we may soon find it necessary to solve them if we are to secure continued top-speed production in the face of a dwindling supply of available workers.

The Christian Science Monitor has recently commented ably on this subject, and I quote from its editorial:

Congress' great travail over the drafting of fathers has at least usefully focused public attention on the whole manpower problem. Mr. Baruch's level-headed report on worker shortages in west coast aircraft plants, including his priority plan, General Marshall's statements before the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees, and all the other recent developments boil down to these three conclusions:

1. American manpower has not been managed with a high degree of efficiency in the past. * * *

2. America now approaches a phase of stringency in which it can no longer afford the loose ways of the past. * * *

3. As the pinch grows tighter, more women must leave their homes to work at least part of the day; more boys and girls of high-school age must do the same; a great many draft-age fathers must leave nonwar jobs and either enter the war factories or the armed services.

Such is the blunt situation today.

It is a situation that has been long developing. Most of the remedies that are mentioned today by Mr. Baruch have been available and apparent for some months. If the administration had been alert and energetic, things might be much better today; but, on the other hand, matters could be considerably worse. On a day that the advisability of calling up some 446,000 fathers out of a pool of some 7,000,000 is debated, Berlin is reported

calling up men in the 50-to-60 age bracket without regard to dependencies.

Perhaps the biggest question remaining in America is whether the necessary corrective steps are to be taken voluntarily or under State compulsion. * * *

Another item perplexing many is the evidence of manpower wastage. To General Marshall these people might pose the question why they see able-bodied men without dependents being released from the Army after months of expensive training, simply because they have reached an arbitrary and low age limit. These people might also point out that the Army's "we know best" attitude did not stand the test of independent inquiry once before when the over-all size was scaled from 8,200,000 to the present goal of 7,700,000. Could another 400,000 be spared through better use of available men?

They might inquire of industry why there has been the delay, even the seeming reluctance, to bend working hours to suit the needs of housewives who might be able to work 4 hours a day but not 8, or of businessmen who might arrange to undertake part-time jobs. Pointed questions might be asked about the charges of labor hoarding so frequently voiced. Union leaders might face questions about rules that prohibit optimum use of workers.

Mr. Speaker, to go one step further in the military picture, I join those who are calling for the long overdue revamping of the Army's physical and literacy requirements. Standards in both have been kept consistently higher than has appeared reasonably necessary, with the result that many thousands of able-bodied young men not in essential industry have been kept out of the armed forces. Obviously these men can serve in uniform with much less readjustment than family men or men who are contributing to the war effort through essential occupation.

These are samples of the questions in the public thought. A few straightforward answers would help clear the atmosphere. This is acutely necessary because it is the stark fact that a real manpower shortage is rapidly developing. Our country is facing a show-down on how to make the best use of its available supply of workers.

In plainest language, America has scraped both the bottom and sides of its barrel of readily available manpower. Additional manpower can be provided only with the greatest difficulty. And yet more must be provided, or the present supply utilized much more efficiently if Army, Navy, and munitions schedules are to be maintained in the coming crucial year.

If Governmental Balances Are Out of Balance, Let the Restoration Be Scientific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, about a half year ago—in fact, on July 7—I felt constrained to express some of my opinions regarding the constitutional relationship between the so-called coordinate and equal departments of our Government as contrasted with the actual relationship among them at that time. On that occasion last July I expressed an opinion from my study of American political history that the usual state of affairs was not that our three great departments were equal, as the fathers seemed to have intended, but rather that the usual state of affairs was that some one of the three supposed equals towered above the other two at any given period to which one might refer in our past. Inequality rather than equality seems usually to mark their relationship.

There is no question but that the executive department now, and for some time past, stands out far in the lead of the other two departments of our Government in its power and importance. As this is the greatest war and the most significant struggle in which our country has ever engaged, it is not strange that the executive department should occupy now a place of pre-eminence. However, for more than 6 months past there has been abundant evidence of growing feeling on the part of the national lawmaking body that it must take back some of the powers which have been delegated by it to administrative agencies and curb the executive and administrative leaders of the Government in the direction of our traditional "checks and balances." With this determination—properly carried out—I agree.

While I wish to see Congress restore itself systematically and logically to its rightful place in our governmental system, I am alarmed at the feeling I see expressed day by day among my colleagues in what I fear is overzealousness toward that end. I think great danger confronts the country if Congress unwisely or untimely reasserts even its recognized constitutional rights in such a time of real emergency. Of course, the administrative agencies which have been having so free a hand will be reluctant to be curbed. Of course, they are inclined to shout emergency when there is no emergency, but surely no one need ask them whether our country is now in a critical emergency.

In my judgment it is not a question of constitutional rightness or wrongness as to whether or how far Congress shall reassert itself, but at this time it is a question of expediency and wisdom in the light of our Nation's welfare and safety. Therefore, I have no plea for the bureaucrats and hold no brief for them, nor would I have Congress abdicate further any of its powers to them. I do not want to see Congress hamper the war effort by an unwise though constitutional interference with administrative officials of the Government who are carrying out or attempting to carry out their sworn duties.

THE CHIEF IS IN CENTER OF IT

The President has just returned from momentous conferences in distant parts of the earth. Even his political foes must, although reluctantly, admit that he has done a remarkable thing toward leading us in the direction of those goals which we seek. And yet the President finds on his hands any number of difficulties as baffling to him in carrying on the war on the home front as any he had to encounter in carrying on the war on the foreign front. Some of these problems may have resulted from unwise, overzealous, or unauthorized acts of power on the part of the President's subordinates for which Congress wishes to call them to account or to reverse their actions. As a Member of Congress, I think Congress has a right to do some of these things, but it is a question of the wisdom of doing some of them at this time.

As an illustration of one of these conflicts we may point to the agricultural subsidy program. Apparently the executive department has adopted the subsidy plan as the most feasible means now of holding the line against the rising cost of living. Apparently Congress, holding the purse strings, has determined that public funds shall not be so used. Now, which cause shall prevail? There is no question but that Congress has the constitutional power to appropriate or refuse so to appropriate public funds gathered into the Treasury from the American taxpayers. Administrative agents of the Government cannot constitutionally promise and pay funds from the Public Treasury unless such funds have been duly authorized and appropriated by Congress. A question is, How far may the administrative agents, or so-called bureaucrats, force the hand of Congress by promises and commitments, or by unsanctioned shifting of funds from one purpose to another? In this case Congress directed the President to stabilize prices and ordered him to "hold the line." I feel that Congress cannot wisely stand too rigidly on its own constitutional rights in regard to any logical means used to carry out such orders.

Of course, if it can be shown that any administrative official is exercising unwarranted authority, or is plainly following an unwise or futile course, then I think Congress should be firm with such a situation. I think it is inappropriate to assume that all wisdom resides in Congress and all inefficiency and chicanery is exercised by the administrative officials. It may be political capital for those who are out of office and out of power to make it appear that all these bureaucrats are a bunch of Communists or long-haired professors who are dreamers and theorists, but I doubt whether the American people are likely to believe any such apparent political hokum.

HAVE WE NOT TAKEN THE SAME OATH?

Now, I can see some mistakes have been made and I can believe that many others have and will be made, and I can also see that for political purposes with an eye on future elections those who are on the outside looking in want to try to fool the public into believing that those who are in should be kicked out. The public understands, however, that every one of these administrative officials from the President down has taken an oath of office which is exactly the same oath which Abraham Lincoln remembered

and reminded some of his discontented fellow citizens of in Lincoln's first inaugural address. Are not our public officials worthy of some credit for sincerity? At this moment in Congress I know of no topic discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives which will bring more applause on both sides of the aisle than criticism of the bureaucrats. There does appear to be less criticism of the military and naval officials than of the civil officials, for which we ought to be thankful in the interest of needed wartime unity. However, it seems to me there is as great a need of unity on the home front in civil administration as on the foreign front in military administration. Having said this much as a plea for greater unity and cooperation, I would not for a moment condone or wink at maladministration, waste, extravagance, or inefficiency on any front.

Congress has done and is doing through various committees a great deal of checking up on both civil and military officials who are spending such astronomical sums in this global war. I heartily approve such checking and call for more of it if the object is not to whitewash somebody, not to smear somebody, not to discredit the administration for political purposes, but to expedite the carrying out of the law. The exercise of such power by Congress, or any legally constituted committee thereof, is not hampering the war effort but furthering it The crux of the problem here is the motive and the purpose of such investigation, criticism, and checking by Congress. Naturally we would like to assume that all such investigations, criticism, and checking is prompted by wholesome motives and for the proper purpose.

MOTIVES NEED TO BE STUDIED

It takes no philosopher to see that administrative agencies tend to increase their own power and to perpetuate themselves in control. Bureaucrats seem unfamiliar with self-denying ordinances, as they do not enact ordinances and would not relish enforcing such ordinances. So it is well for Congress at all times and especially at this time to look carefully at the mushroom growth of Government which we have had in recent years to see what may properly be dispensed with, and dispense with it. I think, however, that the pruning ought to be done on those functions of government which have outlived their usefulness, or which have accomplished their purpose and are no longer needed, or even on those that are less needed than are others for which the same funds could be used. I would regret to see a useful agency of the Government eliminated merely because it was started in a certain political administration, New Deal or Old Deal, or because the philosophy underlying it did not square exactly with those now shaping enactments, or because somebody said it was communistic merely because it was useful.

There seems to me to be an amazing mixture of motives prompting action these days here in Washington. The ultraconservatives deplore, condemn, and anathematize moves which they say are pretended in the interest of reform or because of the war effort, but which really are attempts to change our form of government and our American way of life. They say or imply there is a deep-laid plot of sinister significance which certain officials in high places are trying to put over in these trying times and are doing it in the name of patriotism. On the other hand, the ultraliberals are cynical, disgusted, and roundly condemn certain moves, or proposed moves, for Congress to reassert itself which are done in the name of patriotism and under the authority of constitutionality, but which is really sniping at the war effort and a betrayal of those who are dying on foreign battlefields. One is hard put these days to discern real and sincere motives and to find out what is truly in the interest of the war effort and what is actually the patriotic and constitutional thing to do.

There was a time not so long ago when we talked about adjourning politics, but that phrase today might as well be marked out of our language. Party politics have not been adjourned and partisan politics seems not to know that a war is going on. Washington is a great arena in which conflicting interests, social, economic, as well as political, battle for supremacy. The combatants are so intent on bruising each other's heads that they seem not to recognize the possibility of an outside foe putting an end to the great game of American politics.

The Bill of Rights—Heart of Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I am including an address delivered by the Honorable William H. Wills, Governor of the State of Vermont, on December 14, before the Advertising Club of Boston, Mass.:

The founding fathers of our Government left no doubt in anyone's mind what they thought of bureaucratic method. Let me read again to you the manner in which they denounced it. They said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"—and here is where those indignant forefathers of ours lashed out at the bureaucrats of King George. "He has erected," they said, "a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation."

Those words were written in 1776. It is suggested that those same words are applicable today to certain conditions with which we, of this day and age, are confronted. If that be so, we have no one to blame but ourselves. It is we who have brought it upon ourselves. It is we who have allowed bureaucracy to regain the ascendancy which our forefathers thought they had forever laid to rest. They thought they had done so by the time they had written the Constitution and the first 10 amendments had been ratified.

Tomorrow, December 15, is a day on which all America should celebrate. It should be not only a day of celebration but a day of rededication. It is the anniversary of the adoption by the States of those first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution—the amendments collectively known as the Bill of Rights and which are, in fact, the heart of that great document, comprising as they do the peoples' charter of freedom.

The Constitution, written at the convention in the summer of 1787, did not contain a specific declaration of individual rights. In the opinion of a majority of the delegates such a declaration was unnecessary; it would either reaffirm rights already existing or it would merely prohibit the National Government from interfering with them.

It was soon discovered, however, that many shared the view of Thomas Jefferson that a "Bill of Rights is what people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and which no just government should refuse or rest on inference." The Congress proposed and the States, without too much loss of time, promptly ratified those 10 amendments.

Those of you who are familiar with the early history of my own State, Vermont, know that at that time she had just been admitted into the Union as the fourteenth State, and after a turbulent 14 years of independent sovereignty. During those years, to use the words of Ethan Allen, doughty Green Mountain boy, her people had retired to the hills and waged war on the rest of the world. A war caused to a great degree by the personal convictions of the early Vermonters that they were freemen with certain inalienable rights. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the 10 amendments comprising the Bill of Rights, together with the other 2 amendments accompanying them, came to the Vermont Legislature for ratification they were given excellent treatment; they were ratified without debate, a rather unheard-of thing in those days, and the bill of ratification was passed and signed by Governor Chittenden, the first Governor of Vermont, within 24 hours. Vermonters were convinced then, as they have remained convinced to this day, that those 10 amendments are the most vital part of the Constitution.

It has been said that the Bill of Rights are "as clear as the Ten Commandments." It is not necessary for one to be learned in the law to be able to understand and interpret their provisions. Among others, the principles found in this Bill of Rights distinguish our civilization: freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, the right of peaceable assembly, equality before the law, just trial for crime, freedom from unreasonable search, and security from being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. "Herein are the invisible sentinels which guard the door of every home from the invasion of coercion, of intimidation, and fear. Herein is the expression of the spirit of men who would be forever free." Add to the foregoing the principle whereby to the States are reserved those powers not delegated to the Central Government and a further check against the tyranny of a central government of willful men is effected.

Here are rights which were no new discovery, no sudden overnight inspiration. They were established by centuries of struggle

in which men died fighting bitterly for their recognition. They are rights which in part were possessed but were lost in recent years to the people of the fascist states who listened and surrendered their freedom for false promises of economic security.

In the years since the ratification of the Bill of Rights, America has been growing up physically. With the easy carelessness of youth she has drifted into ways inconsistent with her ideals. Today, fortunately, she is becoming aware of the false position in which she finds herself. Everywhere, from all classes and ages, voices are being raised against the abuses arising from too great centralization of power in the Federal Government, and a cry is going forth for a rebirth of individual responsibility. Within the last 2 weeks, I have heard a Democrat, a Republican, industrialists, a labor leader, a college professor, a scientist, and men from our armed forces make this common plea. It is the true voice of America speaking; of average America, the ordinarily inarticulate majority, not the vociferous mincrity; the majority which, when all the shouting dies, still wields its power in the ballot box and which gives shape and substance to our Government.

At the Herald Tribune Forum, a young airman spoke for the silent hundreds of thousands of young men in our forces, men who by their deeds have a right to be heard; men who, as he said, have kept their mental sanity these many months by discussions of the kind of world they want. God knows they have purchased the right to demand it, and those who come back will be the ones who will be active in this world. What is it then to which they want to come home, these young men who are fighting centralization of power with its attendant restrictions on freedom of individual rights? Let the airman speak, "We want, first of all, security at home. Not the security gained from charity, the dole, or by Treasury raiding; not the enforced security of regimentation, nor yet a security for a few gained at the expense of many in a system of unbridled individualism—no. What we want is that security which springs from a political and economic system so constructed that the individual may stand upright in self-determination, winning his way according to his own energy, ambition, and ability, while still protecting and assisting those less fortunate and less able than himself. A security in which every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, may have the assurance that he may have a home free from the threat of sudden death, a family reared in an atmosphere of peace and freedom, schools where we may teach realities, churches where we may worship without restraint, a government following the will of the majority while yet protecting the rights of the minority. Fundamental thoughts? Yes. Fundamentals are real in a fox hole. We feel this is as it should be, for we cannot think in terms of security for the world if we are faced with insecurity at home."

So speak our young men from their fox holes. No longer can we even imply the weakness of American youth. Now the question comes, What are we here at home doing to bring about the security to which they long to return?

It is easy, too easy, merely to rant against abuses. That is the popular theme song of the present. However, we are in this position: The majority of our people find it distasteful and do not like it, but how are we to escape from our predicament?

Our form of government is still what has been called "the last best hope of earth," the great and famous example of government by the people. Because it is self-government, its only chance of survival is to be found if men prove not only good enough but wise enough to support it and make it work. Our form of government throws the challenge to civilization back on the individual man. In proving they can govern themselves man will prove they can be both moral and free.

How have we allowed ourselves to reach our present state? It seems to me to be proper to see how we have allowed it to come to pass. It has been an insidious, slow change over a long period of years, accelerated alarmingly, to be sure, in the last decade.

Government, which in the early years of our history was an intensely personal thing, has been allowed to recede further and further from the individual, until in the minds of many Washington and the Government is as remote as the fox holes of the Pacific.

Citizenship with its rights and its responsibilities, a possession so cherished by our early countrymen that they fought to protect it, has become of so little value to many of our citizens that we have to organize to bring out the vote instead of mobilizing to regulate its force.

Individuals have passed their problems on to the community. The community has passed its problems on to the State. The States, in turn, have shifted the responsibility to the Federal Government. Vital interest has become mere interest, interest has been transformed into apathy as each successive step has been taken.

Government, with a capital G, has become like some mysterious all-powerful deity and the people all over the land have been attacked with a strange enervating malady, "the Gimmies."

In the last 11 years, with the philosophy of government nurtured and allowed to remain prevalent in Washington, there must have been secret rejoicing that the initiative of the individual had become so palsied and local self-government so weakened and listless that it could be ignored, for all practical purposes, by those working out their fanciful theories of Utopia in the Nation's Capitol.

But there is a resiliency in the soul of America that apparently needed such a holocaust as this war to test and be rediscovered. The people of America have not become so weakened but that they still can resist and control the Frankenstein created through their own indifference.

During the hunting season in Vermont, within the past 2 weeks, a man shot a black bear; thinking he had killed it, he crept toward it to finish it off. A few days later he was found, having been hugged to death by the beast he thought he had slain. So will the American people arise from their lethargy to treat over-centralized government once they are sufficiently aroused and appreciative of the moral danger confronting them.

Only recently I was given reassuring evidence of the point I wish to make. There was returned to our old-age-assistance commission the monthly check sent to one of its recipients. This man, in returning the check, indicated he was well again, he no longer needed State help, he had a new job, and could be self-supporting. He was nearly 80 years old.

I have referred above to expressions of opinion by all classes of people on this subject. Perhaps we who are the executives in the several States have the best opportunity both to hear directly the voice of our people and to see, as well, the practical workings of this trend toward centralization and its baleful effects.

We have seen at first hand how power feeds upon itself—partly from the greed for power and partly, perhaps, from an innocent belief that Utopia can be obtained by dictation, directive, and coercion.

I have attended three national Governors' conferences since I have been in office. I have noticed a distinct transformation take place during that time. I have seen evolve a determination to do something, to face squarely and fight strenuously the whole problem of restoring fullest self-government to the United States. The Governors in whom such a spirit is found reflect the spirit which is today abroad in our land. It does not take one with the keenest perception to read the signs which indicate Americans have reached the realization they must free themselves from the oppressive power of centralized government if they are to progress in an orderly way for the greatest common good. They are beginning to see and act on their belief that they must break up some of these segments of Federal power and take some of the pieces back to themselves. As it has been so well said, "They are beginning to value their immortal souls more than the ease and convenience of paying Washington to take care of their problems."

They are beginning to lose their view of democracy as solely a system of government that can make men safe and comfortable, and to regain their fathers' vision of it as a spiritual ladder that can take men to the stars.

It is as refreshing as the clear air of a Vermont morning to see this attitude finding greater acceptance among the people. The Governors of your States find it reassuring; it gives them greater confidence in their belief in the orderly processes of government. One thing on which those Governors agree completely, irrespective of party, is the abused doctrine of States' rights. All too keenly do they realize that along with each forfeiture of responsibility there have been surrendered corresponding powers.

Make no mistake. I am not foolish enough to suppose we could or would wish to go back to those days when each little commonwealth acted independently of every other. We are a union of States, and in matters touching common interests we must have common action. But the balance has been too badly out of kilter for far too long.

Fortunately, we have come to the resolve that we should do more for ourselves, right at home. The best government still is that which remains closest to the people, whose servant it is and one which the people can see, feel, touch, and control. The realization has been reached that rather than shifting the burden and thereby escaping, the burden is made more onerous.

I do not wish to explore all the ramifications of flood control, but I should like to tell you of certain happenings which have recently taken place in Vermont to illustrate to you that there has been a rebirth of righteous indignation. Vermont is willing and anxious to cooperate with her neighbors; Vermont's neighbors are willing and anxious to cooperate with us. Concrete evidence of this was given when the four Connecticut River States negotiated a flood-control compact in 1937. Such a compact, under the Constitution and pursuant to the Federal statutes, requires congressional assent to become of legal validity. The effort to secure such consent met strong opposition from the present Federal administration; as a consequence assent never was secured, the matter being pigeon-holed in committee.

To show you how far the administration has gone to centralize power and control in Washington, I cite the following as evidence:

A legislative trick was used to change the basic spirit of the flood-control law, which originally provided for cooperative action by the Federal Government with the States in each main river valley. By this legislative manipulation the States were excluded from participation and, instead, the Secretary of War was authorized and directed to build dams for that purpose and for the development of public power wherever these structures might be recommended by the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission, and, in our experience, without any regard to the needs and desires of the State where they might be located.

The Federal authorities are now making preparations to build such a dam in one of our valleys which would destroy its principal values for agricultural, recreational, and

home use. The people of that valley, however, indignant, disturbed, and ready to resist encroachment, have formed a freeman's committee. And the State with its resources stands squarely back of them in their resistance. We hope that you and all true Americans will join us in our fight and that together we will be able to recapture for the States this power over their development which has been usurped by the Central Government.

You in Massachusetts and we in Vermont know our particular conditions and problems much better than does some central standardizing bureau in Washington. We should work them out, with mutual help to each other and with assistance from the Federal Government only in those cases where we are unable to complete the task ourselves.

State governments have their problems. You in the advertising business have your problems, too. And I dare say many of your problems run head-on into Government. One of your major concerns, undoubtedly, relates to another of the freedoms of the Bill of Rights—the freedom of speech and of the press.

Wartime is the period when civil liberties stand the danger of greatest infringement. Certain restrictions as to freedom of utterance, either by the spoken or the written word, appear to be demanded to make more secure the national defense. We understand the necessity and are ready to cooperate for the common benefit of all.

Beard in the Republic calls the preamble to the Constitution, a declaration of purposes used in the underlying spirit of the Grand Game, if such it may be called, of self-government and liberty to be played by the people of the United States. Clearly, in this field of man's self-expression, as in no other field, there should be untrammeled freedom if we are to keep alive a government of and by the people. In the past, the cracker barrel, the editorial column, the letters to the editor, all have marched in the vanguard of such a government here in this country. A nation does not live by bread alone, but by the words which proceed from the mouths of its leaders first and then from those of the mass of its citizens. This is a freedom which should be defended as determinedly as that of any of its fellows.

In any discussion of these 2 freedoms—the one of the press and of speech, set forth in the first of the 10 amendments, and that of the powers of the State, enunciated in the last—there must be considered one element, namely, the inherent strength of each if they are to survive.

There never was a time when leadership in constructive thoughts and spirit was so desperately needed as now. It is not for me to suggest any specific changes in a profession of which I know nothing; I can only indicate what to me as a layman would seem one way to strengthen the structure so that it could withstand the threatened onslaught on its freedom.

Selective Service, draft boards, and civilian defense have all been administered on the State level and their administration, through volunteer effort on the part of citizens has brought to the latter a sense of power they had lost, a consciousness of ability they had begun to question, and a cooperative spirit which they had forgotten. It has been well done. If only this power generated by the war can be kept and translated into the ways of peace, particularly into a vital participation in government, we shall not need to be too concerned either about States' rights or our individual freedoms. But, I repeat, there must be strength. In a chain the strength is as great as its weakest link. In a union of States it is as great as the single State. Where there is weakness, then comes danger of invasion.

How, then, can we take this people aroused by war and fit them to an alert sense of responsibility in peace? First of all, by the use of that first article of the Bill of Rights. By free discussion and assembly—assembly and discussion with a definite purpose, however. Americans are too apt to get together just to get together, without action growing out of what they hear.

We must impress in some way upon our citizens while they are still aware of the threat to its continuance the value of their vote. It is the one possession of an American of which no other man can deprive him. He alone by his actions can deprive himself of it.

We still have this right to vote if we will use it. I have more confidence yet in the common sense of an aroused electorate than in all the theoretic notions of a bureaucracy.

By the exercise of that vote we can put men in office who will lead us back to playing the grand game, and by that vote we can insist they follow the rules in the rule book called the Bill of Rights. We still speak through our elected representatives. To insure a continuation of the representative principle we must choose with care those who represent us. In this connection we must remember that the power to tax still contains the power to destroy.

This in summary means it is the people who still govern. Somehow we must stir the citizens to a consciousness of this fact. And to bring government back to the people I believe we must take a definite stand on whether we want a government by law or by man. In the final analysis it is the people who must decide. These are fundamentals I have enunciated.

In times of extreme danger men go back to fundamentals—whether in the fox holes of war or in the possession of a great ideal.

Vermont was once characterized by its son and your erstwhile Governor, Calvin Coolidge, as the storehouse of liberty. I believe the State still is such a storehouse and I believe the citizens are fully aroused and will reassert their inherited independence. Pray God it is not too late.

What are those fundamental principles which the citizens of every State in the Union might well ponder?

An article passed by the Vermont Assembly after the original 10, reads as follows:

"That frequent recurrence to fundamental principles and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and keep government free."

In 1941 upon the portico of our State House we set up a new statue of Ethan Allen, that intrepid leader of 150 years ago, who in all those years of strife never had the blood of any man upon his hands. His arm is upraised commemorating his dramatic capture of Fort Ticonderoga in the name of Jehovah—and the Continental Congress. That upraised arm bears strong resemblance to a gesture of the present—all too familiar to many a captive and conquered foe. The leader whom that upflung arm honors, cannot boast as could Ethan Allen that there is no drop of blood upon it.

America today is challenged as to whether the spirit of Hitler or the spirit of Chittenden and Allen is to prevail. Men have forgotten their duties in the demand for an exercise of their rights. The fortitude of the pioneer has been lost in the easy living brought us by the discoveries of science; the faith of our fathers has been lost in the bowing down to material gods of steel and concrete, of power, and of organization; the fervor of the Green Mountain Boy, who fought for his home and his family, has been cooled by the fancied distance of the enemy; the positive strength of democracy has been lost sight of in following after strange "isms."

In this day of uncertainty, in the confusion of many voices urging this and that cure for the ills of the world, down from the rock-ribbed green-hilled little State of Vermont still the storehouse of liberty; out of the past when its men had the courage to defy the world, out of the present, when we still hold to many of those fundamental principles, I bring you one clear mandate:

These fundamental principles of justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are still absolutely essential to preserve the blessings of liberty and to keep government free.

The Realtor and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me December 14, 1943, before the Milwaukee, Wis., Real Estate Board.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you today. It is always a pleasure to return to Milwaukee. I have a personal interest in Milwaukee now—my daughter and my two grandchildren are residents of this city. Because of them, I might say that I have a special interest in real estate in Milwaukee. Where one's loved ones reside, there is a part of one's self.

But let us discuss some of the problems especially relating to your own line of business. Of course, the primary interest of all of us at the moment, is the "big business" of winning the war; no other business would amount to anything if we should fail in that. I have said before, I shall repeat it in every talk I make—that the present satisfactory progress of our armed forces should not lull us into any slackening of our effort on this tremendous challenge to our Nation—we must win this war.

I need not tell you businessmen that this war is not won. You know it is not won. To date, we have been fighting skirmish battles. Important as they are, they are but the approach to the decisive battles which are yet to be fought. Therefore, we must not relax in the slightest degree, our efforts on the production line or the food front, nor permit the existence of any condition that would sabotage our war effort. That means that we must keep our efforts united—permit no division to creep in.

After the war is won, will come the greatest challenge of all; for the problems of the ensuing peace may be even more perplexing than those of the war. Shall we then permit ourselves to be split up into antagonistic groups, each selfishly seeking special privileges for itself—or, shall we have learned the great lesson taught by our war effort, that only by unity and cooperation, and a will to work for the good of all, can we succeed. I repeat, peace has its challenges as well as war. This may be a platitude, but it is also a verity.

Now, the problems that confront your particular segment of business are closely linked with those that will confront all branches of our economy. In other words, we are all in the same boat. Recognition of that fact will unite us in preparing to meet the impacts of the difficult post-war period.

We know that the urban America of tomorrow will be what we plan today for it to be. At the close of the war we shall probably have in this country a population of over 140,000,000 people. We shall not be building new cities; we shall be rebuilding old cities. At the present time approximately 75,000,000 of our inhabitants occupy 3,464 towns and cities, many of which are wartime communities, and others of which embrace areas which are falling into decay. Still others have incurred debts that would seem to bankrupt them. Nearly every city has housing and transportation problems, in addition to the problem of meeting the minimum standard of living for a large proportion of their citizens.

As a result, there has come into being the idea of city planning. I cannot take the time to go into the various phases of that; you are well acquainted with them, I am sure.

As we all know, most cities came into being without regard for any particular plan. Like Topsy, they "just grew." It is claimed by some that because of the rapid technological developments in transportation, particularly that of the modern airplanes, cities will lose their importance as intersection points. I remember as a boy, when the oxen and the horse team were still used as means of travel, we used to have way stations 15 or 20 miles apart. That was a day's journey. Now those stations are all gone. The railroad and the airplane have put them out of business, except as lake resorts or homes for farmers.

We are talking now about airplanes which will travel 500 miles an hour. The helicopter is no longer a fantastic dream of an inventor, but a reality. A Washington store is planning for the delivery of goods in Maryland and Virginia by helicopter.

On the outer fringes of our great cities we now have huge war plants which undoubtedly will come into competition with small, individual businesses. All this may bring about a decentralization, bringing the workers back to the land by means of quick modes of travel; and that may cause a blight of some parts of our cities. This situation presents a real challenge to men like you. There is no city of any size in the land where this situation is not becoming apparent to a greater or less degree. To meet this situation, many cities are setting up planning commissions to handle the problem realistically.

In Washington we have a group which feels that this calls for Government intervention. Undoubtedly Government intervention will follow, unless we tackle this problem with vision and with the will to accomplish results.

From the standpoint of the general welfare, there is a general recognition of the fact that no city can permit slums—those sores of vice and disease—to exist within its borders. It has been clearly demonstrated that slums are always a liability to a city. How to cure this condition in any particular city should be the problem of the folks of that city.

Many people feel that the public-housing experiment of Government has proven to be a mistake, for it has utterly failed in its first objective—namely, the clearance of slum areas. It has involved the expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money with but little real gain. The housing now owned by Federal Government should be disposed of to private enterprise. We shouldn't have Government subsidies for public-housing construction or for public-housing projects. Realtors and property owners should unite in opposition to the use of public funds for such enterprises. I am much concerned with that attitude of mind which has been bred into our people during the last decade—an attitude of depending upon Washington for help, of looking to Washington for aid, instead of an aggressive attitude of "Let's buckle down and do this job ourselves, in our own way."

I do not mean by this that if conditions should arise in an emergency, such as a great national depression or such as the present threat to our liberty, that we would not be justified in delegating to a central authority the power to handle that emergency. But I believe that the experiences of the world since Hitler came to power have clearly demonstrated all over the earth that when power is centralized the people's liberties are threatened, and that centralization of power should be permitted only as a necessary step to meet an emergency; and that when the emergency ends that power should be decentralized forthwith.

As real-estate men, you are interested in land; and, in a broader sense, in agriculture. You know that following the war agriculture will become more and more mechanized, and that there will be a reversal of the trends of urban and rural developments.

The products of the farmer will be utilized in many more directions than at present. Prof. George Carver, the great Negro scientist, demonstrated what can be done with the peanut; and we know that from the lowly soybean have come literally hundreds of new products. Modern invention and discovery in the field of plastics and building materials will play a leading part in the rebuilding of our cities. Through chemistry and invention, and the utilization of the new science of electronics, the world can become a literal fairyland. We have indeed visions of a greatly enlarged horizon.

There is in all this a rekindled hope for a more prosperous America, coupled with full employment and a wider distribution of the material things necessary to modern life. We must have a better system of education, improved health facilities, wider opportunities for experimentation. Our problem is to translate our hopes and our visions into realities. This is a field for both dreamers and realists, for men of vision and for practical men to bring those visions to life.

I have mentioned only briefly the means for city rebuilding. It has been said that we can rebuild urban America within a generation. When we look back over what we have accomplished in this war effort in just 2 short years, we can reach only one conclusion—that if we can do all that in wartime, in peace nothing is impossible.

But I repeat that all this can be done provided we pull together and do not permit division to creep into our ranks. Labor and management must work together—city folks and country folks, the laborer and white-collar worker—all must pull in the same direction.

Let me recapitulate some of the things we have accomplished during this war effort of ours. In July 1940 we had a fairly good Navy, but it was not equipped to meet the impact of the submarine, the airplane, and the aerial bomber. Today our Navy is fully prepared. Then we had only 1,875,000 tons; now we have nearly 5,000,000 tons. It is the largest and the strongest navy in the world. Then the Navy had only 1,700 planes; today it has 18,000.

As to the Army, then it was small and poorly equipped; today we have approximately 10,000,000 men in our armed forces—better fed and better equipped than any other army in the world. During these last 2 years we have expanded our Army Air Forces 12,000 percent, and the Air Forces proper 3,500 percent. This year we shall build 19,000,000 tons of merchant shipping. We have built navy bases, airplane bases, army bases, and modern harbors to handle our merchant shipping on a dozen fronts, three to twelve thousand miles from our borders. We have built huge modern production plants overnight. We have increased our food supply to provide for ourselves, our armed services, and some of our allies. We have conquered the submarine menace. These and a thousand other things have we done.

It was contemplated when we entered the war that because of our titanic war effort our standard of living would have to be considerably curtailed; but it has not worked out that way. We have shown the world that America cannot only produce enough material and manpower to carry on two major wars, but at the same time to maintain the highest living standard on the face of the globe. It was the brains and the industry of American men and women that performed this miracle which Hitler and Mussolini said never could be done. If we can produce for war, we can certainly produce for peace.

I say that the physical structure of America in the future is limited only by the will and the effort to put into the job. If we go forward in peace as we have in this war effort, we will rebuild our cities, assure provision for adequate housing for all income groups, and provide the adequate recreational, welfare, and health facilities necessary for our people.

Effective planning, of course, calls for collaboration and understanding. We are told, "by understanding an house is built." Well, America is our house; and if we bring to it the understanding that the prophet of old spoke of, we will build America into a strong, fair, healthy, and prosperous country.

But there are some things we can do right now. The threat of inflation contained in the abnormal national income of $145,000,000,000 requires immediate action. One means of meeting the situation is to produce more civilian goods to drain off some of this vast reservoir of purchasing power. I suggest the two following remedies:

1. Material should be allotted to the tooling industry so it can begin to tool up the industry of the Nation.

2. Many other lines of civilian goods could be increased without injury to the war effort. Such production would operate to stem the economic pressure against the diminished pools of civilian goods. We have gold and silver aplenty. Much of this could be put into the manufacture of jewelry without interfering with the war effort.

The primary cause of inflation is too little produce and too much purchasing power. To meet the threat, the planners in Washington and those who have to do with the allocation of strategic materials, should immediately give consideration to this suggested antidote to inflation.

When the war is over, there will be a great challenge to conserve and improve agriculturally. We have undertaken that step, but we have not gone far enough with it. The work has been curtailed by the shortage of men and materials.

There will be an imperative need for conservation of our soil; there will be increased need for soybeans, peanuts, corn, and other crops for use not only as food but commercially. We know that a considerable proportion of our population has been denied a sufficiently nutritious diet. We have observed, by the experience of our Selective Service System, how men when given proper food, became strong and fit for the service.

It has been estimated that in the past 300 years close to 300,000,000 acres of land in the United States have been damaged by erosion, and this damage to our soil has been increasing. Effective measures must be taken to correct that condition. The soil is the source of our food, our very lifeblood; and its preservation should be one of our first concerns. Fortunately, soil losses have been somewhat mitigated by the farmers' own efforts when they have understood the problem. However, there is much such land conservation that cannot be taken care of by the individual farmer. The Government has a real interest in preserving the soil.

You men know, from your own observations, of farms that have been literally destroyed by erosion. If it is at all possible, those farms should be restored. This is part of the national outlook of real-estate men who think in terms broader than simply the sale of a given piece of land.

In this connection, I presume that many of you have read in the December issue of the Reader's Digest the challenging article by Louis Bromfield entitled "The Evangelist of 'Plowman's Folly.'" It tells the story of Ed Faulkner, who makes a case against the moldboard plow, the plow that for centuries we have thought was indispensable in farming.

Reduced to its simplest terms, Faulkner says that the plow "leaves the soil naked and exposed to the erosion of wind and water, and undue evaporation from the sun and wind. This limits production, and in the long run brings about complete destruction of topsoil. There is a secondary but important evil: Buried surface sod and rubbish require months to decay; during this period the soil remains acid, and the layer of packed, sour, slowly decaying material acts as blotting paper, preventing the subsoil moisture from rising by capillary attraction to the roots of the plants on the surface above. This action, coupled with the strong evaporating action of the sun on a soil bare of all rubbish mulch, creates an artificial condition of drought between the layer of blotting paper and the sun-baked surface."

By his book, "Plowman's Folly," Faulkner has presented "a problem for the manufacturers of agricultural machinery—that of providing an implement to replace the moldboard plow. A number of disk plows and cultivators which do not turn over the soil, but simply rip or chop it up have appeared during the past few years."

To you men who are interested in real estate, I quote from this article a statement of a famous agricultural economist: "The civilization of this country is founded upon 9 inches of top soil. When that is gone, civilization will go with it."

We are indeed living in a changing world, when the very fundamentals of agriculture are changing. We can well be prepared to see changes in our economic and political conceptions. The science of electronics is destined to bring about miracles in our everyday living, in the foods we eat and in the materials we utilize.

Since many of the national aspects of the real-estate problem also apply to local conditions, let us briefly survey some of those problems which confront realtors all over the country.

At the close of the war the United States Government is going to have on its hands more real estate than it knows what to do with. It will have taken from private owners more than 20,000 city lots and better than 10,000,000 acres of farm land. On this land it will have about $20,000,000,000 worth of installations and buildings, ranging all the way from 1-room trailers to mammoth factories. So vast and varied are its holdings that no one has ever been able to count them.

Now, a big proportion of that real estate will be up for sale, and its disposal is loaded with economic and political dynamite. If dumped on the market, it can literally wreck real-estate values in many communities and cause tremendous losses to the Government. On the other hand, its retention for a long period of time will prevent the return of land and equipment to profitable business and farm use, and impede local civic construction programs. In addition to that, the holding of these vast amounts of property by the Federal Government will keep much-needed taxes from flowing into the coffers of State and local governments.

Many of these plants and buildings are convertible to civilian use, and there will be stiff fights between those who want Government operations expanded and those who want them curtailed. Private real-estate operators have long objected to federally owned projects. Many localities may have to choose between deflation of real-estate values because of knock-down sales of Government property and the loss of taxes through continued Government ownership.

As to farm land, everybody is agreed that the vast acreage now occupied by Army camps should be returned to food production. The administration may want to sell that land to lower-income groups at set prices. Congress may feel it should be sold to anyone who wants it for whatever price it will bring.

Then, there's the matter of putting a fair value on this Government property. During wartime, construction costs have been high. The post-war value of plants and improvements will, in many cases, be only a fraction of their original cost. Someone will have to decide the current market value of it, and that means deciding what loss the Government will take.

The method of sale is also open to argument. Some of the issues involved are those of negotiated bids, closed bidding to keep speculators out; some think these disposition proceedings should have all sorts of safeguards, such as mandatory requirements for advertising bids, etc. Others feel the property should be sold more quickly.

Your Congressmen feel that former owners should have the first chance to buy back their property. But the War Department says it has moved 50,000 families, and even relocated whole villages, and that it would be impossible to search out the former owners of the thousands of small tracts which are now lumped into huge reservations.

Another interesting phase of the farmland problem is that of veterans' preference. There have been various land benefits for veterans throughout our history, and there will almost certainly be some new provision—perhaps a modern 40-acres-and-a-jeep plan.

Finally, there is the question of setting up a separate organization to liquidate Government holdings, or of permitting each Government agency to sell the property it has acquired.

I understand that the National Association of Real Estate Boards is backing the formulation of a Surplus Lands and War Plants Board, representing the Government, the real estate business, and the general public.

Another suggestion is that a Federal Real Estate Corporation be set up. The instigator of this idea points out that at present there are 10 statutes affecting real estate, which he characterizes as a "crazy quilt of legal red tape." He says a Federal corporation could "carry out a nationally uniform policy, prevent the dumping of real estate, protect the Treasury against great losses such as were incurred after the last war."

No decision on any of these questions of policy has been made as yet. Basic legislation will consume many months. In the meantime, each Government agency is going along on its own. The War Department is leasing thousands of acres of land to farmers, and is already selling some of the hotels it had bought. It is felt that with the end of the German war, Army and Navy activities will gradually shift to the west coast, withdrawing from the factories, camps, and housing projects in the East.

Then will begin in earnest the job of getting the Government out of real estate it no longer needs.

CONCLUSION

Such basic real-estate problems as inflation, slum clearance, decentralization, taxation, and post-war planning can only be solved by organized effort. As I said at the beginning of my talk, if you are to bring about the kind of real-estate conditions you want, and not let the solving of these problems gravitate toward government control, you must unite your efforts and all pull together to attain your goals.

A recent editorial expressed very well indeed the aspirations and accomplishments of our realtors, when it said that, "The modern American realtor is a great deal more than a mere broker in lots and houses. He is a developer and beautifier of communities, an authority on proper housing, a practical promoter of new business and industry, and an advocate, in many instances, of progress in cultural and spiritual life. He has grasped the broader social vision, and his business is much more than a business with him. He sees in it an approach to some of the more acute problems of community life, and his philosophy becomes a blend of the sound common sense of the good businessman and the foresight and idealism of the true civic leaders."

With such an ideal as that, and with the will to implement it, real-estate men will make a contribution to the material improvement and moral uplift of our society the far-reaching benefits of which it would be impossible to estimate.

Gentlemen, I congratulate you upon your achievements of the past, and upon your opportunities of the future.

Industries of the Pacific Coast in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of most vital concern to the entire Pacific coast, but particularly to the people of the Pacific Northwest—in that vast area included in the watershed of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

Because of the war in the Pacific and the fact that we have an abundance of low-priced electric power, great wartime industries have been established in that area—shipyards, airplane factories, aluminum plants, munitions plants, airfields, and naval and Army bases.

These have created such a labor demand that this has been designated as a labor-shortage area, with the result that many of our smaller plants upon which this area normally depends have been closed or their production curtailed, and orders for products they could produce have been shifted to the Middle West. Many of these smaller plants have been practically put out of business. The Bonneville Administration advises that 97 percent of all the power generated at Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams is devoted to the war effort, including ships, planes, and one-third of all the aluminum produced in the United States.

AFTER WAR—WHAT THEN?

With the end of hostilities many war industries will be closed and hundreds of thousands will be out of employment. This means chaos unless methods are speedily devised to convert some of these large plants, like aluminum, over to peacetime pursuits, and the smaller

plants referred to, placed in operation. The hearings now being conducted under House Resolution 262 are dedicated in an effort to solve these perplexing post-war problems, as well as to develop the data for a constructive, long-range plan of future development. In this connection we wish to commend the preliminary report of an eminent industrial engineer with 40 years' successful practice who has given his services gratis to his Government in this war emergency. His report will be included in the printed hearings, and will be available for early distribution to the public by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

WHAT IS FREE ENTERPRISE?

In any discussion of post-war plans, we hear much of the term "free enterprise." But just what is free enterprise? Surely it is not free if on the one hand it can be crushed or absorbed by monopoly, or on the other hand shackled by bureaucracy. In our present mood of rebellion against bureaucracy, let us be sure we do not throw ourselves into the arms of monopoly, for both are equally repugnant to our form of government; both of them smack too much of the totalitarian state. To me America means constitutional representative democracy—that is the source, and the only source, from which free enterprise springs. As a life-long student of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, I am convinced that this thought was in the hands of the founding fathers when they set up this Republic—the greatest and most perfect system of free government the world has ever known.

SIZE ALONE NOT IMPORTANT

Size alone should not be a determining factor in defining free enterprise, because many of our great industries started small. To produce certain products at prices sufficiently low that the great majority of our people can buy, mass production is necessary, and mass production often calls for giant corporations. I contend that industry, large or small, is, when rightly conducted, the power that will set mankind free by placing within the reach of all the necessities and some of the luxuries of life. That means economic as well as political freedom.

BUSINESS COMPARISONS

However, I like to associate free enterprise with concerns where ownership and management are identical; where they know personally and intimately the rank and file of their workers.

While this definition may come under the category of small business as compared with enormous corporate organizations with entirely nonresident ownership and management whose sole objective is maximum profits for the myriad of stockholders, probably unknown for the most part to the management; yet I submit that this so-called small business is the bulwark of America—not only the safeguard of our national institutions, but the safeguard of big business as well. For if small business is destroyed—and much of it is being destroyed during this war emergency—and only giant corporations remain, how easy it will be for the demagog to arouse the unthinking against what they will describe as "giant octopi," and thereby contribute to the destruction of our American way of life.

DANGER AHEAD

With this danger in view, would it not be well for all concerned to work for a decentralization of industry wherever it is economically practicable?

I believe the enlightened big business leaders know and appreciate the danger, and, therefore, in all earnestness I leave with them this message: "See to it that small business survives; see that it is free to grow; see that it is not crushed or absorbed by monopoly or shackled by bureaucracy, for so surely as small business is eliminated, just so surely big business cannot long survive."

The Soldier Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in today's mail from William Kitay, military editor for the Toledo Blade, I have received a most interesting letter, which I believe is well worth the attention of every Member of the House. Under unanimous consent, I include this letter in the RECORD. Mr. Kitay's column in the Toledo Blade in answer to wartime questions is also of interest in connection with the question of soldiers voting. I include this material in the RECORD.

Senator CARTER GLASS, the man who wrote the poll tax requirement into the Virginia State Constitution in 1903, has sent a most significant letter to Senator LUCAS of Illinois. Senator GLASS states that, in his opinion, the issue of States rights is not involved in the present controversy of soldiers voting, particularly since the Congress has enacted last year Public Law No. 712 which has already suspended registration and poll-tax requirements for voting for servicemen. Public Law No. 712 would remain in effect regardless of what is done with this present bill.

For every soldier, there are two parents. There are many kinfolk. I have said before that more than half of the American people have blood relations in the armed services. No one will be able to explain to them why the men in the armed services cannot vote in 1944.

I trust that every Member of the House will give careful consideration to the mature judgment of the greatest living exponent of States' rights, Senator CARTER GLASS.

I include in the RECORD Senator GLASS' letter:

HON. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: I have been, and still am, in favor of giving our armed forces away from home in the Federal service the right to vote in Federal elections for Federal officers, under Federal authority and responsibility; and I was in favor of the bill reported after due hearings and consideration by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I was also in favor of it without any emasculating amendment. I am writing this brief note to you, both to keep the record straight and to inform my constituency.

I wrote with my own hand the suffrage clauses of the Virginia Constitution, but inasmuch as the Congress, more than a year ago, in what is now known as Public Law No. 712, specifically provided that no member of the armed forces was to be compelled either to register or pay a poll tax in order to vote in a Federal election, I cannot see that the rights of the States are either jeopardized or in any way involved in the present controversy.

Should this matter arise again in the Senate, I hope that you will see that I am properly paired in favor of the soldier vote.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER GLASS.

TOLEDO BLADE,
Toledo, Ohio, December 9, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENDER: It was with great interest that I read today's A. P. dispatch regarding your promise to seek the passage of a workable soldiers' vote bill.

My personal feelings in the matter and my convictions as a newspaperman are alike on this issue as it is one which concerns itself with the exercise of a vote franchise and not with party lines.

As military editor of the Blade I look upon some 30,000 or more servicemen in northern Ohio and Michigan as "my boys," and therefore am very prejudiced concerning anything involving their welfare.

I've talked to men in uniform about the soldier vote and know how they feel, how they think. But what really amazes me is how little our own legislators know about these thoughts that have disturbed our fighting men ever since this war began. It's a problem some future group of Senators and Congressmen will hate to face.

I'm enclosing my column of today on the matter. It is read by some 200,000 people every day, not counting the thousands of soldiers who read it in service camps around the world.

I hope you can use this column to good stead in your battle for the passage of a vote bill as it is not written with any political reserve. It is written by the servicemen and women themselves.

I hope that through you the other legislators in Washington will get to learn the thoughts of this column as it contains the thoughts of the fighting men themselves. There will be additional columns on the subject and I don't think I'll cease until a proper bill is passed for a uniform, simplified voting procedure.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM KITAY, *Military Editor.*

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO KNOW?

YOUR WARTIME QUESTIONS

(By William Kitay, military service editor)

That the soldier vote has become a political football is apparent. But of increasing concern to the men in uniform is the growing uncertainty as to whether they will be permitted to exercise their voting franchise at all in the 1944 Presidential election.

Our conversations with service men and women and their correspondence to us leads us to conclude there are no politics in fox holes. Nor are there party lines in bomb craters and slit trenches. The soldier wants to vote and he'll know the reason why if bickering legislators prevent the casting of ballots by American servicemen no matter where they may be in the world in November 1944.

The fighting men want a simple voting procedure. They know that conditions on the fighting fronts will prevent any elaborate voting machinery. They know that the simpler the voting the quicker their ballots will return to the home front.

Arguments by some Senators that the recently scuttled soldier vote bill calling for a War Ballot Commission would have taken away the traditional rights of States in handling the voting is a farce to the men in uniform. They know only too well how, during the last 10 years, States have been relinquishing their rights without a thought of hesitation, throwing their States' rights to the wind in a mad rush to have Washington solve the problems of their States.

The soldiers here and overseas want to vote and they are going to without the benefits of political interests. As one put it to us:

"Those guys in Washington certainly are giving us the boot. They were quick in sending us off to get shot at, but now they are talking about protecting us against political propaganda. After this is over, 11,000,000 men who have been shoved around while in uniform suddenly will start some of their own shoving when in civies again. Don't think that 11,000,000 ex-servicemen will be the bonus army that marched on Washington a few years ago, either. Guys in foxholes do a lot of thinking and their biggest thoughts are about how they will run this country when they return."

The soldiers want to vote and they want to know now, not later, whether they will or not. After all, men who have been asked to die should know what they are giving their lives for; for freedom or for legislative bigotry.

The war-ballot commission on a national basis would have guaranteed the voting franchise to every serviceman, no matter where his fox hole will be dug in 1944. But whether the serviceman's vote is conducted on a National or on a State basis, the men in uniform want to exercise their vote franchise.

If the vote is to be conducted on a State basis, every one of the 48 States will have to participate. And to prevent revolutionary confusion in our own fox holes, standards, regulations, and procedure of all States must be identical.

Question. Could you please name the different jobs members of the Women's Army Corps perform in the Army Air Forces? (Miss G.)

Answer. There are 86 different jobs members of the WAC perform in the air forces. A complete list is available at the local WAC recruiting station, 624 Jefferson Avenue. But a few are: Link-trainer instructor, airplane mechanic, drafting, communications, radio mechanic, radio operator, medical and photographic, both ground and aerial.

Question. After being drafted, how long will it be before a boy of 18 is sent overseas? I thought men were to have 1 year of training before being shipped across. (A Mother.)

Answer. Many Toledo mothers will verify the fact that their sons have been sent overseas within 3 months after they were drafted. Some men, with particular skills, are sent across quickly, as their services are needed at the battle fronts. Others are shipped across, not as individuals, but as members of a military company. Therefore, if a soldier's outfit is ordered overseas, the mere fact that he has had only 3 months' basic training apparently does not hold him back.

Question. How long are members of the Navy Seabees in boot training? (Mrs. C. H.)

Answer. The training has been cut to 9 weeks.

Question. In the classifications V–6 and V–12 does the letter "V" stand for victory and the following number for the number of months the men in that group will have to serve after victory before being discharged? (Mrs. H. M.)

Answer. Why civilians insist in dreaming up ridiculous interpretations of official classifications is beyond us. The letter "V" is for the word "voluntary." The numbers are merely numerical sequence designations of various groups.

The Post-War Housing Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein part of an address delivered by John B. Blandford, Jr., War Housing Administrator, before the Citizens Housing Council of New York and the National Association of Housing Officials on December 4, 1943. This is a challenging presentation and deserves the consideration of everyone interested in housing and cooperation between the divisions of government for the public good. His address is as follows:

The prospects of a post-war housing program of exciting dimensions are looming large in the national thinking as we enter our third year of war. Even while the American people are deep in the war effort and while the housing industry itself is engaged exclusively in building wartime shelter, the vision of large production of better housing for the great masses of the population has seized the imagination as one of the principal symbols of a better post-war world. The American people are looking to housing as one of the main post-war avenues to better living, to good jobs, and to sound investments.

This belief is having a stimulating impact on the whole network of business, financial, and social interests involved in the housing picture. It is affecting the thinking and planning of builders, the building supply industry, labor organizations, financial institutions, and all levels of government. And it is inspiring a great many proposals, plans, and predictions concerning the nature and extent of post-war housing. Some of these are thoughtful; some appear unrealistic. But the net effect is an extensive and constantly broadening discussion of post-war housing objectives that is bound to exert a healthy influence on what will actually happen in housing after victory has been won.

This growing conviction that housing will be one of the most productive areas of post-war activity is, of course, in part a reflection of our general confidence that the Nation's resources—now so impressively marshalled for the prosecution of the war—can and must be mobilized to produce a greater flow of post-war civilian goods and services than we have ever attained before.

More basically, however, I would like to feel that the increasing attention to post-war housing also springs from a recognition that housing in the past has lagged far behind the accomplishments in other important spheres of American productivity. Millions of dwellings in this country are substandard. The production of new housing in the decade preceding Pearl Harbor totaled less than 3,500,000 dwelling units—a rate which would rehouse America about once every century, even assuming a static population. Even in the 3 peak years of that decade, annual production averaged only about 2 percent of our national housing supply. And the short-lived housing boom of the middle twenties resulted in a product which in large degree was poorly built, badly planned, unsoundly financed, and generally unrelated to the true housing needs of the great mass of the people.

Let us take up this challenge of post-war housing by making large plans. Let's set ourselves big goals in the American tradition and strain all our energies to achieve them. Let's not dilute the excitement and anticipation surrounding post-war housing by giving in to timid fears based on past failures or on the presence of obstacles, difficulties, and barriers. This is no time for defeatism or timidity—working as we are in an environment of tremendous achievement on the fighting fronts and in our factories.

WE CAN'T ACCEPT THIS CHALLENGE SITTING DOWN

The challenge of post-war housing applies to all the forces on the housing front—to building labor, to builders and contractors, to lenders and to the building materials industry, to communities and to the Federal Government, to local and national organizations working on the housing problem. The failure or refusal of any one of these broad forces to face up to the future will make it just that much more difficult to transform big plans into big accomplishments.

But above all the challenge is to American enterprise and to American productive genius. This is a Nation which this year will produce 9 or 10 times as much merchant shipping as it did in the entire 4 years preceding Pearl Harbor. It is producing in a single month about 40 percent more aircraft than were manufactured in the entire year 1939. There were many obstacles in the way of these accomplishments too—many people thought they were insuperable. But the job has been done. Surely if only a due share of this mind and muscle is turned to the housing job after the war, we can produce a million or million and a half new houses each year, we can make them better houses than we have ever had before, and we can make them available at prices serving the needs of all groups within the American people.

* * * * *

While we do this, we must not have the delusion that the housing industry is the total national economy or that it can achieve full stature without full employment, large purchasing power and sufficient security so that people will be able to buy new homes. So while we labor in our own field, let us also lend our support to those who are working aggressively on all other sectors of the national economy.

The broad national outlines of the need for housing have been pretty well established. We know we have the resources of manpower and materials. But we do not have today specific community housing goals. Lacking them, we cannot know whether we have all the tools we need to tackle the job. We must identify and analyze specific problems, specific needs, and specific opportunities so that we can develop specific concrete programs and solutions. The responsibility for this job of fact-finding, analysis, and making plans cuts across the whole housing field. It is shared by builders and contractors, labor, lending institutions, real estate boards, local housing authorities, citizen organizations, and local governments. Without these steps, we will, I am afraid, find that blind faith in an automatic upsurge of good housing will prove a poor substitute for realistic preparations to overcome the many very real obstacles and problems that lie in the path of a successful peacetime housing effort.

* * * * *

But having gotten our facts, what will we do with them? Here the most important factor will be the spirit with which we ap-

proach our fact-finding and the spirit with which we will apply our information to the post-war scene. Here the decisive answer will spring from whether we have created a sane, mental attitude whereby our facts and our solutions can be examined on their merits. If we are honest and objective, then we can build realistic plans and programs, and carry them into action. But if we corrupt facts to serve merely as window-dressing for preconceived prejudices or to festooon drooping straw men, then we will have made a travesty of fact-finding.

CITIES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ARE PARTNERS, NOT COMPETITORS

I believe the most menacing barriers to effective action in housing and in other fields are the prejudices and straw men which blind us, or at least distract us, from clear, objective recognition of facts. One of these straw men, for example, is the myth that the Federal Government is in competition with cities and communities, that the Federal Government seeks to throttle local initiative in housing, that the Federal Government wants to impose its judgment from afar on the local judgment of communities dealing with local problems.

Speaking of Federal-community relationships in peacetime housing, I can state categorically that the Federal Government considers housing to be fundamentally a job for cities and communities to work out for themselves. It considers housing to be primarily a local problem; it recognizes that the basic housing facts are local facts; and it believes that every community has the responsibility of making its own housing plans and setting up its own facilities for executing those plans.

Nevertheless the Federal hobgoblin persists in many quarters. One of its most frequent manifestations is the criticism that the public housing program is a paternalistic device imposed on unwilling communities by autocratic Federal agencies. Now the truth is, as you all know, that the basic legislation for the low-rent public housing program was in the first instance voted by the elected congressional representatives of the people. The truth is that no project could be financed under that program until State legislatures had authorized the establishment of local housing authorities. The truth is that projects could not be built until the cities themselves had set up those authorities. The truth is that these locally established and locally appointed authorities were then the agencies which selected the sites, let the contracts, supervised the construction, and owned and operated the completed projects.

Criticism of the public housing program is essentially criticism of a locally controlled housing mechanism. I am not saying that the low-rent program in any sense should be immune from criticism, or that the experience under it should not be carefully examined with the thought that perhaps a better formula might be developed. Let's admit that local and Federal agencies started from scratch in public housing, made mistakes, and had conflicts. But I am saying that the broad criticism of public housing should not be based on the false premise that low-rent projects represent Federal interference with community prerogatives.

So let's not cloud Federal-community relationships and stymie effective Federal-community cooperation by accepting uncritically the illusion of competition and conflict between the two. There is too little time and too much to do for this type of profitless distraction. If we can clear this type of mental hurdle, we can begin to move together toward positive action on post-war housing.

* * * * *

LET'S ALSO GET A FRESH SLANT ON BUSINESS-GOVERNMENT RELATIONSHIPS

Another obstacle to effective cooperation for post-war is the concept of inevitable competition and conflict between business and Government. In theory, such competition might perhaps exist if the country were divided into two large utopian camps—one talking eloquently of a private enterprise economy lifting itself by its own bootstraps, the other proposing a Government-sponsored public works program after the war of such unprecedented size as to absorb most of the Nation's employment.

But what substantial groups are proposing either of these extremes with any serious thought that they will be carried out? Why further complicate the problem of business-Government relationships by talking in terms of completely illusory alternatives? Obviously we will not have after the war an economy wholly free of governmental aid or assistance. Neither will we have an economy wholly dependent upon Government help and operation.

It seems to me that we will get ahead much faster with effective preparations for post-war and with effective action when the post-war period arrives if we recognize the reality of business-Government cooperation. Call it by any name you wish, business-Government cooperation was an important force in the development of this country. It was primarily responsible for the Nation's revival from the disastrous depression of the late twenties and early thirties. It is clearly at the center of the Nation's unprecedented war effort. And it certainly will be the one practicable solution for the complex problems of demobilization, reconversion, and full production after the war.

I am convinced there is a solid core of thinking in this country—representing the big majority of our citizens—which not only recognizes the reality of business-Government cooperation but which, if given the opportunity, would strongly endorse the application of this principle on a much broader scale.

* * * * *

LET'S RENEW OUR FAITH IN DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

On a much broader scale, there is still another straw man that must be put away if we are to unite on at least the basic principles for effective action in the post-war period. I refer to the illusion that a gulf separates the citizens of this Nation from the Government they have elected in accordance with our cherished democratic principles. Certainly the antagonism toward Government and the distrust of governmental actions, both Federal and local, displayed in some quarters is a barrier to the kind of united action we need to transform the promise of a better post-war world into reality. To understand fully the subversive forces in this country, we must not overlook the citizen or the official who willfully circulates a false statement about his Government.

Perhaps this present attitude springs largely from the pressures and tensions of war. But it is nevertheless ironic that a war fought mainly to preserve and strengthen our democratic system should apparently lead some of our citizens to forget the true nature of that system. I am sure the overwhelming majority of American citizens share a common agreement and respect for the basic principles and basic framework of our democratic society. But at times we seem to take these principles so much for granted that our actions take on the semblance of factionalism rather than orderly democracy.

Please understand that I am not talking about deserved criticism of government. I believe that the great safeguard of democracy is the healthy tendency of free citizens to voice strongly their criticism of their government and that only as long as they can speak freely and have powerful vehicles for their voices, can democracy endure. I believe that all groups should watch vigilantly to see that the mandates of the people and their representatives in Congress are carried out, that those who betray them should suffer the appropriate penalties.

But I believe, too, that there should be sanity in the process, that recognition and credit should be passed out for jobs well done, as those done poorly are condemned. And I think that there is a responsibility of leaders of all groups and organizations to see that their constituents get factual reporting which will enable them to assay the truth and falseness of the rumors which confuse this country.

There is a strange tendency of many groups in this country today to regard the Federal Government as something anomalous in their lives, a great octopus which is seizing powers which should have been reserved—as something menacing which they must fight. At the same time, there is an incipient hate philosophy expressed too often in this country. You find it in conventions, in smoking cars—apparently born of deep suspicion, deep distrust, a vague fear. I think it's about time that a few leaders—and I mean leaders in private enterprise—remind people that such widespread distrust, suspicion and fear is fed to them—that it is not a reflection of their own knowledge.

Perhaps no word is so abused as "bureaucrat." I am a bureaucrat, I suppose, by common definition, since I hold a Federal Government post. But the dictionary definition of a bureaucrat says it is one who "governs by arbitrary and rigid routine." According to the dictionary, I am not a bureaucrat, then, because I don't govern—and of course, I would claim that I do nothing by "arbitrary and rigid routine."

The truth is, of course, that I and all other administrative officials carry out laws made by the Congress of the United States, a Congress which is elected by the people and is responsible to the people. There is nothing unprecedented or mysterious about this. It is essentially the same governmental procedure we have been observing since the Constitution was adopted.

CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES CAN COOPERATE

In the same spirit, I believe we should examine the validity of the claim that there inevitably must be conflict and antagonism between Congress and the administrative branch of the Government. It is my own deep conviction that this is not inevitable, that teamwork and cooperation can be achieved in administrative-congressional relations, and that such teamwork within government is essential to the most effective functioning of our society and of our economy.

I think we can all benefit from time to time by reiteration of the basic functions of these two branches of government. After Congress has established the broad policies of government and has fixed the outlines and limitations of governmental programs, it is the responsibility of the administrative branch to execute those programs and policies. Both Congress and the public have the right and in fact the obligation to demand that the administration of governmental functions not only shall be faithfully in accord with the policies laid down by Congress but shall also be carried out with maximum economy and efficiency.

I like to think there is another obligation. When governmental functions are effectively performed, they should be assured the recognition and indeed the applause of Congress and the public. And if modifications in established governmental policies should be desired, the people and the Congress should exercise their democratic right to change them, rather than merely express their discontent by criticism of administrative agencies for carrying out policies laid down by Congress.

I feel there are many concrete ways in which cooperation and teamwork between administrative agencies and the Congress can be reinforced to the mutual benefit of both branches and certainly to the benefit of the Nation at large. By establishing a separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the Constitution in no sense requires that a chasm shall separate them. Every practical step that can be taken to keep Congress fully and continuously informed of the administration of governmental programs and to keep the administrative agencies in touch with congressional thinking and reaction to governmental programs is, in my opinion, an important contribution to the effective functioning of our system of government. Regular contacts between administrative officials and congressional committees need not and should not be limited to legislative hearings.

I can personally testify to the benefit of a regular interchange of information and views. Since the spring of this year, officials of the National Housing Agency have met regularly in informal monthly meetings with the House Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, which originates the basic legislation for war housing financed by public funds. Through these meetings, the committee has kept current on all developments in the war housing program, the N. H. A. has benefited from a first-hand impression of congressional views on war housing, and the general atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation which has resulted convinces me that a broader application of this simple technique might well be appropriate. We have made a similar proposal to the House Banking and Currency Committee and intend to renew it since this is the committee which traditionally has originated legislation dealing with the total housing program.

* * * * *

AGREEMENTS ARE IMPERATIVE

I believe we in housing are operating in one of those broad fields of American activity in which common agreement on basic objectives is not only possible but imperative. Let us ask ourselves a few questions to clarify the atmosphere. Are there responsible groups which oppose raising the housing standards for the American people as a whole? Are there any who object to providing stable employment at good wages for increased numbers of workers? Are there those who fear a greatly expanded output by the building materials industry, or the investment of a greater volume of national savings in housing? Of course there aren't.

If we concentrate our energies on securing common agreement on these big housing objectives rather than on aggravating differences of viewpoint on small issues, then we can move forward on a broad scale that will provide productive activity for all elements in the housing field.

The ultimate answer rests, of course, with the American people itself. The public's attitude will determine the nature of Government policies during the post-war period, the scope of business-Government cooperation, and the outcome of all the issues now looming large on the horizon. Without assuming the role of prophet, I can safely predict that the public will demand maximum performance from government and that it will also demand maximum performance from business. In short, I feel sure that the American people will insist that the tremendous productivity we have now mobilized to win the war shall also be mobilized to win the peace.

The central fact in post-war housing, as in all other basic spheres of the economy, will be in my opinion the people's demand for good housing—for better housing than we have had in the past—for a housing program that will neglect no segment of the population. There are many important objectives in post-war housing which follow from this central fact. We want to provide good livelihoods for large numbers of building workers. We want to make possible fair profits for builders and contractors. We want to provide large, profitable outlets for the building materials industry and for the Nation's financial institutions. We want to help cities rebuild their blighted, run-down neighborhoods. But our main objective in a housing program must be to provide good housing for all American families. They are the constituents whom we all seek to serve.

Science, Faith, and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address delivered by me last night at the Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, on the subject Science, Faith, and Freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the graduating class: Service, not title, is the true mark of greatness. Thomas Edison, Charles Kettering, Henry Ford, and Orville Wright are great men without titles. They are quite real and human. Three were born in Ohio, one in Michigan. Three are living and the other died a dozen years ago. Their nearness, their modesty, and the elemental greatness of their service discourage noisy acclaim. Yet war or no war, victory or defeat, man's standard of living has been raised forever by the electric lights, automobiles, airplanes, and examples they have given to the world. Their service will survive the war, as well as help to win it.

These men are the very hands of God. They are priceless. They are worth studying. Their nearness, their modesty, and the elemental nature of their service make them readily available, if not for noisy acclaim, at least as examples. I do not suggest that you try to duplicate them precisely, for in doing so you would eliminate yourselves. I suggest, however, that all of us seek the principles by which they made so much of themselves, for it is by making the most of ourselves that we can render our greatest service. No one can do more. No one should do less.

These four men are men of science. All of you are men of science. You have much of the knowledge and the skills upon which now rest man's physical standards of living. Those standards depend greatly upon what was unknown a generation ago. Most of it still is unknown to your fellow men, untrained in science. You are trustees of this knowledge and skill. Its future value will depend upon the use which you and those like you make of it.

These four men are also men of faith—deep faith in God, and man, and themselves. They have shown perfect faith in the laws of God, and the universe. They have shown tremendous faith in themselves, and they have shown an appreciation of and a faith in their fellow workers. All of this was necessary in order to share in shaping the destiny of man as they have done, for no one man can do much alone.

Christopher Wren, the great English builder of cathedrals, one day visited one of his projects in its early stages. He stopped beside a man who was digging a foundation and said to him, "What are you doing, my man?" Without looking up the man replied, "Can't you see? I'm digging a hole." Wren replied, "Yes; so you are," and went on to the next man. Wren asked him "What are you doing, my man?" Without looking up he grunted and said, "Can't you see? I'm mixing mortar." Wren replied, "Yes; so you are," and went on to the next man. This man was chipping a great block of stone. Wren asked him, "What are you doing, my man?" The man stopped, looked up at the great architect, smiled, and said, "I'm building a cathedral." Wren smiled, shook hands with the man and said, "Yes; we are building it together." The third was the only one of the three workmen who understood his work. He saw its relation to the whole. He drew from it the great joy of the great undertaking of which it was an essential part.

With scientific knowledge and skill you can do great work. But with an understanding of the relation of your work to the needs of humanity you can see greater reason for it, feel greater pride in it, and you are better able to discover improvements that will make your work more valuable to the whole. You then may be able to lead as well as to keep step with your generation. By all helping one another, the people of the world can rise to their greatest heights. The more they thus benefit by one another's help the more necessary it is for them all to be competent and for them all to have appreciation of and faith in their fellow men.

Edison, Kettering, Ford, and Wright also are men of freedom. They are products of America's faith that the road of individual opportunity is the best road to the greatest happiness for the greatest number.

About a year ago when Henry Ford was demonstrating his new Ferguson tractors to the Truman committee of the United States Senate in Detroit, he said to me, "In industry when the cost of labor went up, we absorbed it by improving our mechanical and manufacturing processes. We did this and everybody benefited. In agriculture, although the cost of labor has gone up, we have not yet improved our scientific processes enough to absorb this increased cost, but I believe that we can do it. I believe that we can reduce the cost of production in agriculture 50 percent." I asked, "How?" He replied, "Principally by improving mechanical processes."

"We have invented and are proposing to sell agricultural machinery which is lighter, more efficient, and which requires far less maintenance than the old. The value of the scrap which we receive from the heavy old machinery will provide much of the material for the new." Mr. Ford might also have referred to improvements being made in the use of fertilizers and insecticides, and to reduced cost of administration and marketing through modern cooperative organizations. Even assuming that he spoke as the great salesman that he is and that for the sake of safety we should reduce his estimate by one-half to offset "sales talk," we still would have a saving of 25 percent in the cost of agricultural production. This might well mean the difference between abundance and scarcity, between prosperity and poverty, between happiness and misery the world around. With these possibilities and the important relation of scientific discovery to the standards of today, I urge you to look at some of the problems of tomorrow. Armed with your knowledge and skill, with faith in God and man and yourselves, and living in the land of

greatest individual freedom, I urge you to face the large problems of the future as boldly as your pioneering forefathers faced and overcame the problems of the past.

This generation is fighting the most terrible and destructive war in history. The United Nations are fighting it for personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. In order to make the victory worthy of the tragic price paid for it, the victory must be complete in both hemispheres and it must establish a just and lasting peace for many years to come, with opportunities during that peace for the men and women of today, their children and their children's children, to enjoy the life, liberty, and happiness for which this generation fights.

You must look beyond the bridge of victory to the roads to lasting peace. No one can justify the high cost of capturing a bridge merely to seize the bridgehead on the other side. We must plan our course beyond that bridge as carefully as we plan the capture of the bridge. There are two phases of that planning beyond victory which face this graduating class. The first is, Will personal liberty be possible after the war? The second is, If so, how best can it be secured and retained? The answer to the first depends largely on the scientific attainments of your generation. The answer to the second depends largely upon the depth of the faith of your generation.

Following complete victory in both hemispheres, the world will find its tremendous and growing population faced with the effects of the greatest destruction in history of food, shelter, clothing, and other facilities of civilization. In our own country, not scorched by the blast of battle, we shall face this post-war shortage with the greatest handicap of taxation in our history and a national debt 10 times what it was before the war. It will be necessary to pay these taxes and carry this debt without default. This debt will be evidenced by bonds held by every church, trustee, bank, insurance company, and practically every family in America. It will amount to about $300,000,000,000. The interest charge on it, at 2 percent, will be about $6,000,000,000, or enough to equal the entire annual cost of our Federal civilian Government. We must pay this interest and also some of the principal as it becomes due so that we may at least refund the rest. If we can do this, our credit will remain secure and in the natural course of events during the coming generation the purchasing power of the dollar measuring the fixed liability of the Nation on these debts probably will slowly reduce itself, as it has in the past, so that the ultimate burden will be more readily payable. If, on the other hand, we were to default in making any of these payments and our credit were to collapse, it not only would bring injustice and suffering to countless people dependent on this credit, but it would result in a great scarcity of food, clothing, and other properties. Faced with this scarcity and with a critical need for law and order, however arbitrary, it would be necessary to establish such a strict regimentation of our lives that we might well wonder whether our war against totalitarianism had been won or lost. This would not be the America of liberty and opportunity for which we fought.

On the other hand, to carry this load of taxation and debt successfully, it will be necessary for America to produce a national income far greater than its pre-war national income. To do this, we must find a great volume of new useful wealth. I believe we can do so. There will be no great new areas of free public land for development. There will be no great new gold mines available, and if there were they would not meet the need. On the other hand, there are "acres of diamonds" in our own back yards consisting of the tremendous discoveries making new uses of the resources close at hand. These values are to be found in the great discoveries that have been made but not yet fully developed through the tremendous mobilization of scientific knowledge and the sharing of it through the research laboratories and the scientific libraries and colleges of today. I refer to the infinite developments in the past 20 years in such fields as those of aviation, radio, electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, possibly atomic power, electric welding, the use of light metals, chemistry, including the adaptation of chemistry to agriculture sometimes called chemurgy, the development of countless plastics including the elastic plastics called synthetic rubber, fiber glass, new products of wood, new building materials and processes, improved facilities for air cooling, the development of agricultural products, not only for food but for industry, such as the soybean, the development of the sulfa drugs, and countless other advances which have contributed and can contribute to the health and productivity of man.

The recital of these limitless resources encourages us to hope that the increased wealth and national income needed tomorrow is available if man uses the proper methods to make it so. It is here that your science is needed, and I am confident that it will not be found wanting. With the development of this production, economic liberty and happiness at least is possible. The next question is: How can it be secured?

To secure it there must be peace, stability, and assurance of stability for many years to come, and there must be freedom of opportunity for many peers of Edison, Kettering, Ford, and Wright to develop. It cannot be secured by any nation alone. It can come only through such a universal unity of purpose that the resort to war will be unwise and impractical.

We shall need at least military stability, and to that end we certainly should retain the military unity that we have had during the war. As long as the championship military team of the United Nations remains completely intact there is substantial assurance of military stability in the world. If, however, this championship team permits itself to disintegrate to any degree, then a corresponding degree of uncertainty as to the future automatically appears. Each nation, large or small, will seek to offset that uncertainty with a corresponding degree of preparation. This will mean military expenditures and alliances. At the moment when decreased taxes and debts are so essential to recovery, this unnecessary expense will handicap, if not destroy, the opportunity for recovery. Let us, therefore, seek to retain military unity among the United Nations in peace as well as in war. It will be a guaranty of order and the essential foundation for reductions in armaments.

Secondly, if we are to have that assurance of continuing economic stability which is the essential foundation for capital investments in private enterprises to develop new discoveries, there must be established a means for determining international legal issues and economic and social problems in a fair and orderly manner that will command the confidence of the world. This calls for some international organization among the nations of the world.

Thirdly, within our Nation, at least, there must be developed an overwhelming personal determination to produce and to do whatever will make increased production possible and enjoyable. For example, there must be the opportunity and a natural incentive for the individual to produce. This can appear in the opportunity to share generously in the benefits and earnings from results secured. Incentive taxes can make it advantageous for the taxpayer to produce more goods, increase his facilities, or employ more people. We must adopt sound financial policies in the interest of permanent stability rather than excuse unsound financial policies on the ground that they are to be temporary. Our spendthrift days will then be done; we must not continue to pay operating expenses out of borrowed capital. The time has come to think of the future as well as of the present, and to produce as well as consume.

In peace as well as in war, we are at the crossroads of two philosophies—one totalitarian; the other democratic. One puts its faith primarily in dictation and discipline. The other puts its faith primarily in freedom and fairness. We must choose between them and then vigorously support our choice.

When Lincoln was asked to define democracy he wrote: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." What he said was, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master" of someone else to be my slave. He put his faith in the freeman, neither slave nor master. He had the faith in God and man and himself that is the foundation of democracy and he believed in freedom of opportunity.

I choose his philosophy, but to practice it on a national scale is not easy. To guide our course along this road we must protect America against political dictatorships on the one hand and against economic dictatorships on the other. Also we must constantly develop the capacity of the individual citizen and his faith in himself.

Political dictatorships express themselves through all sorts of governmental domination behind which is the theory that citizens are servants of the state rather than the state the servant of its citizens. We must resist this doctrine both from without and from within. To resist it from without we must win the war, encourage the formation of an international organization among all peace-loving states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security. We will do well to encourage the decentralization of international problems s that they may be solved as far as possible in regional areas without involving the centralized authority of the entire world for their solution. We will do well to encourage the spirit of cooperation among nations as distinguished from the spirit of domination of one over the other or a balance of competing power. Within our own Nation, we will do well to emphasize a determined policy favoring the recovery of private enterprise. We will do well to recognize the need for a transition period from war economy to private economy with appropriate boards of appeal from the decisions of administrative officers. We should include the orderly scheduling of the transition from a governmentally controlled economy to a far freer private economy including the advance designation of which Government plants shall continue to operate, the prompt settlement of claims arising from the cancelation of Government contracts, the prompt removal of Government property from private plants, and the early inventory and orderly sale of surplus Government plants and supplies.

On the other hand, it is equally important that we protect ourselves from economic dictatorships both internationally and at home. This will call for some governmental action in the public interest as to international civilian aviation, for reasonable tariffs, for the registration of international cartels, for the stabilization of international credit and exchange, for the financing of some foreign industries by American capital, for the development and use of the world's petroleum resources and for the support of the American merchant marine. Internally, it will

mean impressing business with a public interest in some cases where the economic developments of our time may place the public at the mercy of those who can exercise a dominating, vital private control over the public. The provision for Federal incorporation of companies in appropriate cases, and the adjustment of patent rights so as to reward inventors for their initiative without violating the broader public interest in the development rather than the retarding of scientific progress.

With th's protection against political and economic dictatorships goes the obligation to help each individual citizen to put to the greatest possible service every capacity with which he is endowed. To this end there is an immediate need for frank and vigorous cooperation between management, labor, and agriculture under strong leadership by the Federal Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Agriculture assisted by the freely chosen civilian representatives of these fields of modern endeavor. We shall need an orderly timing of the program of reconversion from war to private economy, a review and fair adjustment of inequities that may exist in the present levels of prices and wages all with a view to holding the approved line of prices and wages in the interests of everyone against the forces of runaway inflation. We shall need programs of fair participation by workers in the profits of their labor, the development of incentive taxation to reward those who increase production, plant capacity, or employment in their respective industries. We shall need to regulate the demobilization of the armed forces and the war workers so as to provide orderly schedules of release, adequate dismissal or mustering-out payments, prompt payment of unemployment insurance, reemployment at old jobs and training for new jobs. Special care should be given to racial questions and those of the migration of workers resulting from the changes from war to peace economy. This will call for a national reemployment service of great efficiency, discretion, and breadth of mind. There will be need for the fair allocation of early supplies of materials, labor, and other elements of production and distribution so as to help meet the tremendous post-war demands not only for consumer goods, but for semidurable and durable goods including industrial and agricultural equipment. There will be need for the development of our foreign trade, and also of building construction with special emphasis upon opportunities for private enterprise and private housing. There will be need for encouragement of the development of new inventions leading to new industries and new forms of employment. Emphasis will be needed on aviation's enormous potential influence on military, commercial, and private transportation. Small business, as well as large, should share in the recovery. Emphasis in agriculture should include efforts to reduce our cost of production and to increase our world markets. We should seek additional world trade for America growing naturally and fairly out of lend-lease obligations to America. To meet emergencies and adjust inequalities, rather than as a major element in the program of recovery, there will be need for programs of construction of public works with emphasis on those of a productive nature and which can be financed locally. Similarly, attention should be given to the provision of adequate social security and relief where the program of production may fail to prevent the need for it.

The standards of living in our civilization depend upon our men of science. The preservation of the individual liberty that has made possible our advance thus far, for which our Nation was founded and for the protection of which this war is being fought depends upon winning the war and upon the capacity of mankind in general and of America in particular to preserve the philosophy expressed in the simplest terms in our Declaration of Independence.

In this time of crisis we will do well to remember that that Declaration was not merely an act separating the American Colonies from Great Britain. It was an application to America of a fundamental faith emphasizing the equal dignity of every individual human soul. Lincoln further emphasized this in an immortal speech in 1858. He then said, in referring to the founders of American independence, "These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: 'We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty and wise and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to his creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all his creatures—to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows. They grasped not only the whole race of man then living but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages. Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths—that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built."

It is for all of us, therefore, to be dedicated here to making the most of ourselves so that we can render our greatest possible service to humanity, and especially so that when those who are fighting the battles of America on the firing lines shall return to America they shall find here the free, the beautiful, the inspiring America of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

Production of Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, high on the list of this Nation's unprecedented accomplishments in war production must be placed the synthetic-rubber program, which has virtually freed us from dependence upon our traditional foreign sources of raw rubber, now fallen under the domination of Japan.

In 2 short years, America's synthetic rubber program, due in no small measure to the able and dynamic direction of its original administrator, William Jeffers, has largely redressed the unfavorable circumstances which attended the rubber supply of this Nation shortly after the fateful and treacherous blows which were struck at us and our allies by Japan in the far Pacific.

In connection with the achievements of America's synthetic rubber program, the Kobuta Rubber Plant at Pittsburgh, Pa., is worthy of special mention, for this plant has achieved a production record in synthetic rubber of more than 50 percent beyond its original rated capacity. The workers and management of this plant, located in the heart of Pennsylvania's war production region, are deserving of full recognition for the vital wartime role which they have played in attaining this remarkable goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the appendix of the RECORD an article written by Hiram Howard, published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph on Sunday, December 19, 1943, which deals with the recognized success of this Nation's synthetic rubber program, and the part which the Kobuta plant has played in the accomplishment of those inspiring results.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOBUTA RUBBER PLANT CALLED MIRACLE JOB AS WAR OUTPUT SOARS

(By Hiram Howard)

The Nation's synthetic rubber program is now "over the hump"—more than 76 percent of the way toward the capacity goal of 850,000 long tons annually.

But of all the great chemical and synthetic rubber processing plants which have been built to achieve this goal, the one at Kobuta, operated by the Koppers United Co., most gladdens the hearts of Government officials in charge of the program.

Col. Bradley Dewey, the Government's Rubber Director, was one of the "brass hats" from Washington who recently inspected Kobuta and attended a dinner here which marked Kobuta's full-scale production at rates more than 50 percent in excess of its rated capacity. His comment was that "It's on the way to being the miracle job of the program."

PRAISE BY OFFICIALS

Stanley Crossland, executive vice president, Rubber Reserve Corporation, went even further:

"I don't think we could have gone anywhere else in the country and got the same results."

H. J. Klossner, president, Rubber Reserve Corporation, was also lavish in his praise for all those in the Pittsburgh district who helped push Kobuta to completion. And this cooperation, he asserted, included the Pittsburgh newspapers "* * * who sought and obtained the facts before they wrote their stories."

He also mentioned Pittsburgh's unsurpassed research facilities.

Crossland is known as one of the keymen in the rubber program. Both Kobuta and the giant new plant at Institute, he revealed, are now producing butadiene, the most important chemical in the manufacture

of synthetic rubber at a rate of 68 percent ahead of their rated capacity.

CHAMP PRODUCER

Kobuta, however, is the champion. One of its butadiene units was the best in the Nation during November. And its total production topped all others—more than one-seventh of all the chemicals used to make synthetic rubber.

But keen rivalry between Kobuta and other plants is expected to continue, and it will not be surprising if some more records fall soon.

Butadiene, the Government men emphasize, is the chemical most needed now to boost rubber production. It can be made either from grain alcohol or from petroleum. But the plants for producing it from oil were only 39 percent finished by the end of October, throwing the lion's share of the burden on such plants as Kobuta, which make it from alcohol.

This greatly increased demand for alcohol to make butadiene is one of the main reasons why the Nation's distilleries are now all war plants.

CONSUMES ALCOHOL

Kobuta alone digests more than 320,000 gallons of alcohol every day in its vast maze of tanks, valves, piping, pumps, scrubbers, and stills. And that's enough hard stuff to provide the alcoholic kick in at least one drink for every adult in the United States.

Kobuta is the world's largest synthetic rubber project in one place under one management located on a near-level 200-acre site facing the Ohio River between Beaver and Midland.

Its rated capacity is 80,000 tons of butadiene and 37,500 tons of styrene annually.

Construction of such a vast plant, involving so many new problems, was turned over to the Koppers Co. here.

The Pittsburgh concern had developed a process for making butadiene from benzene, which is one of the byproducts from coking coal. But the final decision was to build a plant to produce butadiene from grain alcohol, using a process developed by the Carbide and Carbon Corporation.

ENGINEERS SCARCE

Draftsmen and engineers were even more difficult to obtain than skilled workmen on the job. Obtaining the necessary valves, pumps, and other equipment was a never-ending search. And to complicate matters even further, the War Production Board issued orders curtailing and eliminating the use of steel and other metals for building shortly after work on the project started in April 1942.

So it was necessary to design the whole plant to keep the use of such critical materials at a minimum. Even the pipe lines are carried on concrete trestles.

But somehow, someway, construction forged ahead.

Frank R. Creedon, assistant rubber director in charge of plant construction, waxed lyrical during his visit here last week as he discussed the complete job.

POWERHOUSE

The powerhouse, most impressive Kobuta building, he described as "greatest reinforced concrete structure I have ever seen."

Creedon and other Government rubber officials had praise for all concerned, including the Rust Engineering Co., Gibbs & Hill, powerhouse engineers, and Prack & Prack, architects for the miscellaneous structures at Kobuta.

One of the Prack & Prack triumphs is the styrene-purification plant—a reinforced concrete tower 8 stories high, but only 16 feet wide at the top.

PUMPING PLANT

Kobuta's water pumping plant has a larger capacity than the city of Pittsburgh's. The furnaces making steam and power burn more than two barge loads of coal per day.

It takes about 1,000 persons to operate Kobuta, 300 of them women trained at the University of Pittsburgh and Geneva College.

But they're scattered thinly throughout the laboratories, control rooms, distilling towers, and powerhouse.

In a chemical plant such as this, pumps and machinery do the heavy work, and the human masters simply press buttons, watch gages, and turn valves.

POST-WAR FATE

What will be Kobuta's fate after the war?

Vice President Dan M. Rugg, of Koppers United, answered that synthetic rubber will probably be able to compete successfully with natural rubber, and in addition, other uses for both butadiene and styrene are being developed, especially in the field of plastics. He stated flatly:

"Koppers expects to stay in the rubber business."

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's 'Lend,' Not 'Give'," published in the Decatur, Ill., Herald on November 13, 1943, and one under the headline "Worth 20 billion," from the Peoria, Ill., Journal-Transcript of November 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of November 13, 1943]

IT'S "LEND," NOT "GIVE"

Nine out of every ten Americans either have an incorrect idea of the repayment terms of lend-lease or else frankly admit they do not know the basic principles of the program which involves many billions of American dollars. Only one-third of the public knows about the reverse features of lend-lease. Most of them consider the program strictly one way, a necessary expense of winning the war.

Those findings by Dr. Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion were printed in the same newspaper editions which published some of the details of the new British white paper on lend-lease, a document which shows Britain has furnished more than a billion dollars' worth of assistance to the United States and even more than that substantial figure to Soviet Russia.

Lend-lease deserves to be better understood by all Americans because it is not only a principal means of cooperative action by the United Nations leagued together to make war against the Axis, but is also an existing, working instrumentality which may be used to win and make permanent the peace which will follow an Allied victory.

When nations join together to wage war for their mutual protection they do not quibble over considerations of finances and sovereignty. They appreciate the value of cooperation and unselfish purpose. But once the war has been won they may abandon the agencies of cooperation and proceed to lose the peace.

The Russian people learned rather late in the war that vast quantities of war materials were being supplied by the United States and Great Britain. Many Americans do not realize that lend-lease works both ways—actually—and that Russia proposes to pay off every dollar of obligations. This information should be more widely known so that the United Nations may continue to stand together in the important effort to guarantee the peace of the world for more than one generation.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Transcript of November 12, 1943]

WORTH TWENTY BILLION

There is far more to the concurrent report of President Roosevelt and the British Government regarding reverse lend-lease than merely the news implicit in announcement of figures and facts regarding the procedure.

There is also an investment in mutual good will and tolerance between British and American peoples to be discerned in the careful explanation of what the British have done to help us win the war, as well as what we have done to help them. The latter aspect of our war effort is pretty generally understood. Reverse lend-lease—which the British call mutual aid is not nearly so well understood. The British white paper on the subject and the President's detailed accounting, added up not merely to further the task of winning the war, but also to provide a sound mutual understanding for steps to achieve a just and durable peace.

We have received over a billion in reverse lend-lease, Britain says. The President specifies it as $1,174,900,000, through last June.

The dollar symbol is deceptive, if not futile. We have received far more than a billion in British aid. We received a year's grace before Japan and Germany decided upon their mad course of attacking us.

That year's grace is worth twenty billion.

Alarming Tendencies in the Nation's Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "When Will America Wake Up?" from the Richmond Times Dispatch of December 19, 1943. The question asked in the editorial is very timely and important, and I shall discuss it on the floor when the Senate reassembles in January. There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN WILL AMERICA WAKE UP?

The impending railroad strike is a more lively topic of conversation, and a more immediate threat to our role in the war than certain less spectacular manifestations in other directions. Moreover, nothing said here is to be taken as in any sense excusing or condoning the announcement of the railroad brotherhoods that they will paralyze this country, unless they get the wages they

demand. It is inexcusable. Yet certain other tendencies in our national life are equally alarming.

Charles E. Wilson, who is on leave as president of General Electric in order to serve his country as executive vice president of the War Production Board, has never voted for President Roosevelt. He is a leader of industry, and not a new dealer, a "parlor pink," or a "professor." Yet Mr. Wilson felt it incumbent upon him to tell the National Association of Manufacturers at its recent convention:

"I am deeply alarmed today over the possibility that a right-wing reaction may draw some sections of capital so far away from our traditions as to imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it.

"This above all is a time when the industrial leaders of America owe it to their country and to themselves to exercise temperate judgment—to practice the arts of compromise—to avoid the temptation of sacrificing enduring values for temporary gains, and to withhold encouragement from dangerous men who preach disunity."

In view of the extreme lengths to which the national administration has gone, at times, in catering to organized labor, it is not surprising that many industrialists and businessmen have developed a fervent antipathy for Mr. Roosevelt. Yet it is highly important that this antipathy be kept within bounds, and that the "right-wing reaction" feared by the $175,000-a-year president of General Electric shall not materialize.

Mr. Roosevelt's critics should reflect that the country was in a blue funk and in imminent peril of national disaster when he took over in 1933. They should reflect further that labor, in 1933, had for many years been manhandled and kicked around in a manner which called for somebody to redress the balance. If matters now have gone too far in the other direction, as they have, it is partly the fault of those who were unwilling to make any concessions at all to labor, except under the heaviest sort of duress.

These same elements probably are, in general, the ones to which Mr. Wilson referred in his recent address. They are men who, in their blind rage against the Federal Government's policies, may imperil the entire structure of American life as we know it.

Mr. Wilson is not the only person or the only agency in high place to warn lately against such tendencies. The New York Herald Tribune, the country's most distinguished Republican newspaper, has been hammering editorially of late on the necessity for a more constructive and statesmanlike attitude on the part of Republican leaders. James F. Byrnes, O. W. M. director, whose closest advisor is Bernard M. Baruch, delivered a Nation-wide radio appeal for pressure groups to stop trying to break down inflation controls by insisting upon raising wages and prices, and abolishing subsidies. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, another far from radical Southern Democrat, left the rostrum a short time ago to address the House, and to speak bluntly of some groups "who are thinking more of their position after the war than they are of winning the war."

All this is more than food for reflection. It is an alarm bell, a danger signal, for every class of our people. The railroad brotherhoods are holding up the country, as the coal miners have just done; the farm bloc is trying to ride roughshod over certain phases of the administration's stabilization policy, in the interest of higher farm prices, and one of our most eminent industrialists thinks certain extreme reactionaries are contemplating a course of action which could be even worse, and might undermine the foundations of America.

When will this Nation awaken to the fact that it is fighting a war for survival?

Rubber From South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Douglas H. Allen, president, Rubber Development Corporation, before the Gillette committee of the United States Senate in response to a request for information concerning the procurement of rubber from South America and the expenditures connected therewith:

The actual gross disbursement of the Rubber Reserve Company and its successor, the Rubber Development Corporation, on the wild rubber program in the Western Hemisphere [1] from its inception in 1941 to October 31, 1943, including cost of rubber purchased, plus development expenditures, capital investments, loans, operating and administrative expenses of Rubber Development Corporation and all other applicable disbursements aggregate $78,208,195.79. No deduction has been made for cash in banks in Latin-American countries, or for inventories of tappers' supplies and equipment, and of foodstuffs held for sale, or for inventory of tires and tubes. The value of the inventory of tires and tubes alone amounted to $4,823,682.37 as of October 31, 1943.

It is estimated that by December 31, 1943, the total of all such disbursements, plus obligations due but not paid, will approximate $83,162,823. Out of this total, approximately $59,710,477 will have been expended in the Amazon countries.

Actual imports of crude rubber from all Western Hemisphere sources from April 1942 to October 31, 1943, aggregate 34,724 long tons, of which 15,660 tons came from the Amazon countries. If the rubber content of tires and tubes acquired is included, these totals become 40,369 tons and 21,095 tons, respectively.

It is estimated that imports from all Western Hemisphere sources from April 1942 to December 31, 1943, including rubber content of tires and tubes, will be approximately 45,000 long tons and from the Amazon 23,700 tons. Charging against these totals the total expenditures from April 1942 to December 31, 1943, gives a cost of $0.82 per pound for wild rubber from all Western Hemisphere sources, including the Amazon, and from the Amazon countries alone of $1.12.

These unit costs include charging to the cost of the rubber received to December 31, 1943, the entire cost of all capital expenditures, investments, loans and loss on sale of tires and tubes, although capital expenditures should properly be pro-rated over the total amount of rubber received during the period of the rubber agreements which extend to December 31, 1946, just as the capital investment in synthetic rubber plants is being pro-rated over the rubber produced in a 5-year period. Eventual recoveries on such capital expenditures, investments and loans will still further reduce these costs.

It is estimated that the average cost of rubber that will have been received from the Amazon during the period of the contracts will be less than $0.75 per pound after charging into the cost of the rubber all expenditures of every kind.

The initial capital investment in the Amazon was heavier than in other areas because the Amazon represents the largest potential source of wild rubber. Furthermore, the Amazon Basin is approximately equal in size to the continental United States and the main rubber-producing areas are nearly 2,000 miles from the sea, making it necessary for Rubber Development Corporation to supplement the existing inadequate transportation system with additional river steamers and aviation facilities.

The main dependence of the United Nations for their wartime rubber requirements of over 1,000,000 tons annually must of necessity be synthetic rubber. In view of the general labor shortage in the rubber-producing areas, and the fact that wild rubber trees occur on an average of only one tree per acre of forest, and because of other inherent production and transportation difficulties, Latin America could not conceivably supply more than a small part of these requirements. Natural rubber, however, remains the key to the full utilization of synthetic rubber for certain war purposes, such as heavy-duty and combat tires, in which, according to the Rubber Director, as much as 30 percent of natural crude must be used with synthetic. It is, therefore, of vital importance that all possible natural crude be obtained to provide the essential percentage that must be used with synthetic for war purposes.

Results in 1943 are encouraging and indicate that the steps taken to stimulate the production of wild rubber are having the desired effect although the quantity produced is still short of war needs.

Total imports of crude rubber into the United States from Latin America for the first 10 months of 1943 aggregate 22,380 long tons against a total for the same period in 1942 of 9,548 tons, and it is estimated that imports from Latin America for the year 1943 will approximate 26,400 long tons, compared with imports for the year 1942 of 14,486 tons. In addition to these imports of crude rubber, approximately 3,300 tons rubber content of tires and tubes will have been made available by Brazil during 1943 to supply part of the essential requirements for tires and tubes of the American republics and the United States.

Imports of natural crude from all sources, including those outside of the Western Hemisphere, for the first 10 months of 1943 were 51,008 tons. The published estimate of the Rubber Director of total imports for the year 1943 is 60,000 tons.

Below is given a detailed comparison of the imports of natural rubber into the United States from the principal producing areas of Latin America for the first 10 months of 1943 compared with the same period of 1942.

	Tons, 1943	Tons, 1942	Percentage of increase
Amazon countries [1]	11,040	3,575	209
Central America	2,049	354	478
Other America	2,668	1,407	89
Mexico (guayule)	6,313	4,188	51
Salvage rubber	310	24	1,190
Total	22,380	9,548	134
Rubber content of tires and tubes acquired	[2] 2,836	2,143	32

[1] These figures do not include rubber shipped from the Amazon but lost at sea through enemy action or other causes.
[2] 2,626 tons from Brazil and 210 from Mexico.

From April 1942 to January 14, 1943, the natural-rubber program was under the joint jurisdiction of two agencies of the United

[1] Excluding the cryptostegia plantation project in Haiti, on which has been expended to October 31, 1943, $4,832,802.53, bringing total disbursements to October 31, 1943, on natural rubber in the Western Hemisphere to $83,040,998.32.

States Government. Upon the formation of the Rubber Development Corporation on February 23, 1943, control over both policy and operations was centered in one agency of government.

Since its formation, Rubber Development Corporation has pursued a policy of spending whatever amount may be required to bring about the maximum production of natural rubber while liquidating projects not immediately and necessarily related to the production of rubber for war use, eliminating unnecessary expenditures and reducing American personnel in the field to the lowest possible minimum consistent with its obligation to cooperate with and furnish matériel and technical assistance to the governments of the 16 countries of the Western Hemisphere with which the United States has rubber agreements.

Agricultural Service by Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, many years ago I was a member of a Boy Scout troop led by an Arkansas farmer, Mr. Walter Wilson, who is still engaged in farming operations near Little Rock. Since that time I have been interested in the Scout movement.

On December 17, I had the honor of attending a breakfast arranged by members of the National Committee on Rural Scouting, where the 1943 program of Boy Scout service in agriculture was reported. Forty leading officials of Government, agriculture, and rural affairs were in attendance. Dr. Elbert K. Fretwell, chief Scout executive, Walter W. Head, president of the Boy Scouts of America, and National Rural Scouting Committee chairman, Wheeler McMillen, were special guests of honor.

My colleagues are all aware that the Boy Scout movement, to which Congress granted a charter in 1916, has taken the lead in mobilizing the Nation's boy power for wartime service. The service in agriculture has special significance to the Nation's welfare. The 100,000,000 Boy Scout hours in food production and conservation, which was more than realized in 1943, represents one of the few organized efforts to direct the country's summer boy power into war essential and war vital activities.

The Nation's boy supply, organized, trained, and made service-minded in the Boy Scout way, is a war-winning asset now and a peace-winning essential in the years to come.

Dr. Fretwell stated at the meeting:

Now most of the crops are in. We have had a part in producing enough to feed the folks at home, with some little left over for the needy across the seas. But we cannot measure the service alone in produce. Boys have had the satisfaction of doing essential work in wartime. Their normal healthy love of adventure has been guided into channels of productive enterprise through which simultaneously they have served their country and grown in self-reliance, initiative, and other qualities of character essential to our kind of a democracy. Better urban-rural understanding has come from it. Scouting has been extended. The Boy Scouts of America have contributed the equivalent services of 25,000 full-time agricultural workers for 1 year.

Excerpts from the report presented by E. H. Bakken, national director of Rural Scouting, are of current interest to everyone:

The work covered every phase of American agriculture. These are but samplings. Scouts harvested 16,800 pounds of beans in Maryland; 11,200 quarts of blackberries and 1,800 pounds of cucumbers in Arkansas; 24,405 quarts of blueberries in Pennsylvania; 18,000 bushels of seed corn in Ohio; 9 tons of beans and 30,000 pints of raspberries in New Jersey; 12,000 bushels of apples and 15,000 bushels of tomatoes in Virginia; 300 crates of strawberries in Indiana; 34 tons of cherries, strawberries, and raspberries in Oregon; 2,000 bushels of Kansas potatoes; 36,000 pounds of New Mexico cherries; 118 acres of cotton were harvested in Texas; acres of hybrid corn detasseled in Illinois; 352,000 pounds of Wisconsin cherries were picked from trees bearing only a 12-percent crop; 100 tons of prunes were harvested in California; 1,500 acres of small grain in South Dakota; 307,000 barrels of potatoes in Maine; 10,000 bushels of Vermont apples; tons of California apricots; 5 carloads of Missouri strawberries; bushels of North Carolina peaches.

In all these places and in thousands more, rural and urban, Scouts worked Victory gardens, turned backyards to food production, and shouldered tasks on American farms.

Greatest participation was in home Victory gardens, ranging from single tomato plants to gardens of several acres. Father-and-son gardens were popular. Pack and troop gardens, supplemented by home food-conserving projects, were widely undertaken. Council camps developed gardens to aid their food supply, in many cases setting objectives to grow the equivalent of food consumed.

Farm boys took over the jobs of their soldier brothers. Urban Scouts registered in thousands for placement on farms.

Individuals, troops, and councils organized day haul projects, so that boys living at home traveled to crop areas each day.

Camps in agricultural areas sent their Scouts out to nearby farms. Some councils transported their summer camps into agricultural areas. In many cases agricultural service camps were organized to work in specific crop areas, ranging in size from troop week-end camps to the council projects. The largest of these brought more than 600 New England Scouts into Maine potato regions for a month.

The written report submitted to guests came from 344, or 63 percent, of the 541 local Boy Scout councils in America and included the following:

Councils reported 326,402 Scouts as participating in Victory gardens—home, troop, or camp.

Seventy-five work camps of more than 5 days, involving 7,057 Scouts, were reported. The average camp involved 93 boys and 2 adult leaders, and operated for 23 days. Scouts paid $1.04 per day for food, and broke about even on wages. The total of 446,061 hours, spent mainly in harvesting, is impressive.

Day haul operations, where Scouts lived at home and were transported to the fields, included 5,518 projects, involving 39,558 Scouts, with a total of 4,228,496 hours were reported. The average wage was 40 cents per hour, and every conceivable type of work was undertaken.

Councils reported 60,511 Scouts living and working on farms.

In towns and cities, 57,812 older Scouts gave up vacations, in many cases turned down higher paying industrial jobs, to become farm workers. These boys averaged 26 days on the farm.

Entirely aside from the production theme, the phenomenon of town and city boys working with farmers in day haul, work camp, and farm placement projects had many far-reaching indications. A two-way educational process went on. Farm youth met city youth to their mutual advantage. Questions about farm life and rural living were matched by those about urban life and Scouting. Scouts learned that farming, in addition to being a lot of good hard work, was a highly specialized scientific industry. Farmers found out that Scouts under trained leadership were capable workers, inferior to none.

A Maine potato grower summed it up with: "Even if they'd never picked a spud, those folks would have done us a lot of good."

The program has been an immense step in rural-urban understanding. Scouts everywhere saw a lot of farming, and they liked it. Rural people saw a lot of Scouting, and they liked it.

The report indicates agricultural service and production and conservation emphasis is a long-term part of Scouting, as indicated in these excerpts:

The Boy Scouts of America entered the Food for Freedom field in 1941 before Pearl Harbor upon request of the United States Department of Agriculture. Its long-term agricultural program motivated this request.

As a part of its program the Boy Scouts of America offers merit badges in various activities. Twenty-five of the 111 merit badges are of a strictly agricultural nature, many of the others are of rural interest.

These agricultural badges are available to city boys as well as farm boys, and offer opportunity for vocational exploration under the counseling and guidance of the best of men. They are aimed to provide practical knowledge, increase vision and widen horizons.

In the last three years alone, more than 143,000 badges have been awarded in these agricultural merit badges. These awards represent pretraining for many Scouts who did their bit in food production this past season.

For Scouts also engaged in 4–H Club work or home projects in vocational agriculture, the merit badges in these projects are awarded as extra incentives, with no additional requirements.

Scout officials spoke of the future program as follows:

The need in 1944 will be greater than ever. Each captured town brings more mouths to feed. Each year of battle in Europe further ravages ruined crop lands. The demands of industry grow greater.

The slogan for 1944 is "Produce and Conserve, Share and Play Square." Victory gardens must increase in number by 10 percent, in production by 25 percent. More Scouts must grow more food. More camps must raise their own food and, if possible, some to spare.

Farmers will need more help. They will have less manpower, older machinery. More service camps and day-haul projects (more efficient because of 1943's experiences) will be needed. More Scouts must be trained, by emphasis on agricultural merit badges, by week-end visits to farms, by courses in farm machinery, by literature, by motion pictures, through help from agricultural agencies.

Bringing about rural-urban understanding, helping the farmer appreciate Scouting, educating the city boy in the ways of the cultivated out-of-doors, need not be a wartime value only. An appreciation of conservation problems and the basic nature of agriculture is vital to good citizenship.

The camp garden, the berry hedges, the tree nursery, and the conservation projects should become as important as the swimming pool or craft house. These work experiences of war years point to a new field of program for Scouting. It is a new emphasis on "doing"—make something, grow something. Millions of persons have discovered the recreational as well as economic aspects of gardening. Neither that emphasis, nor the other production aspects of Scouting's program, should die out. Decentralization of industry, reversal of the rural to urban flow—these things indicate America is going back to the soil—there to be reoriented and rejuvenated, there to take root in a more secure cultural and economic foundation.

Compromise Is Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESCTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of December 14, 1943:

COMPROMISE IS WISE

The virtue of representative government, which outweighs and enables it to surmount all of its defects, is that the heat of great controversy which it brings to bear on important public issues leads to solutions which usually are wiser than any of the disputants could have arrived at by himself.

We are proceeding toward such a solution in the controversy over subsidies. The happy likelihood is that Congress is going to consent to the continued use of subsidies on the limited basis, where they are now being used and probably in some other cases, to hold prices down.

But by its adamant stand against subsidies Congress has served notice, as it could not have done in any other way, that it does not intend to let the way be opened to the wholesale employment of subsidies to reduce living costs, because that would simply be a new form of deficit financing, susceptible to all sorts of manipulation for political purposes and leading, if unbridled, to an ultimate national inflation and collapse as disastrous as the immediate inflation which it is essential to prevent.

Whichever side one takes in the subsidy debate, he finds himself in some bad company.

Against subsidies, and in favor of letting prices rise, is arrayed the whole speculative element in our economy, for reasons which—however rationalized—are essentially selfish.

But in favor of subsidies is the group which favors unlimited public spending on any and all pretexts, and which sees in the permanent and continued increase of the national debt a chance to nullify the price system as a means for distributing goods, and to substitute permanently for it collectivized methods of distribution.

The American public does not want prices to rise, but neither does it want to see the price system destroyed.

Ninety percent of Congress doesn't want inflation any more than the public does. But it has acted, on the whole, in the public interest to make it plain that subsidies shall not be used as a new kind of deficit spending which could lead either by intent or by improvisation to a result which has little or nothing to do with keeping wartime living costs under control.

The weakness of the position of Congress has been that it has no immediate alternative to subsidies except a swelling of living costs, which inevitably would lead to higher wages, higher war costs, and an accentuation of the inflationary trend.

Having no sound alternative, Congress must consent to the use of subsidies, but it has served the Nation by making plain its objection to subsidies in principle.

A compromise serves both the immediate and the long-run interests of the people, by enabling the line to be held against inflation at exactly or approximately the point where it is now drawn, and at the same time preventing the use of subsidies on a scale which will increase the mortgage which we are placing on our future.

Sgt. George Ashworth and Lt. Hugh Barr Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in no small part are our successes on the various fighting fronts of the world due to the remarkable inherent characteristics of stamina, tenacity, initiative, and courage of our fighting men. There have been many experiences to demonstrate this fact. Recently the newspapers of the country carried stories of the experiences of two Alabama men. Believing that these articles will be found of interest and that they may serve to typify these cases of American initiative, courage, tenacity, and stamina, I include them, as follows:

HARTSELLE SOLDIER LEGENDARY FIGURE

(By William F. Boni)

SOMEWHERE IN NEW GUINEA—The big Liberator was homeward bound, its mission completed, its bombs spent. Technical Sgt. George S. Ashworth, Jr., of Hartselle, Ala., sat over his camera hatch between the two waist guns.

Suddenly over the interphone came word from the bombardier that he had sighted a Japanese tanker on the sea below. The pilot turned the nose of the B-24 toward the tanker, made a dry run to see what sort of ack-ack fire he would draw before he actually went in to strafe.

Sergeant Ashworth still was sitting over his camera hatch. He had used up all his film, done the job he was supposed to do. But near at hand he saw a few 4-pound incendiary bombs. Ashworth picked one up, balanced it in his hand. Taking a free-hand sighting, he pitched it out the hatch, followed it with several more.

As the B-24 banked and prepared to come in for its strafing run, the tanker suddenly caught fire. Ashworth, combat cameraman, had scored a direct hit.

That is one of the favorite stories they tell in the photographic section of one of the heavy bombardment outfits stationed in New Guinea—that, and the time over Wewak when Ashworth was knocked out by an ack-ack fragment which hit him in the back of the neck. When the B-24 got home, he reported sourly that he hadn't got any pictures. They checked his camera and found he had unknowingly snapped two fine ones of the required portion of the target area.

Ashworth left for home shortly after completing his 300 hours of combat flying. But the boys who have been trained in aerial photography by Capt. Frank A. McLaughlin of 124½ Lister Street, Shreveport, La., continue to bring back the pictures.

Under Captain McLaughlin's direction the photo section has expanded and improved. When it was set up at Hickam Field, T. H., in September last year it consisted of five enlisted men, including Technical Sgt. David L. Manley of Huntsville, Ala. All are still with the unit.

ALABAMA MAN TACKLES JAPS SINGLE HANDED—LIEUTENANT MILLER, STRANDED ON JUNGLE BEACH, SAVED BY RED BEARD

Tuscaloosa's Lt. Hugh Barr Miller, 33-year-old former Rose Bowl quarterback, is alive today after 43 days inside Japanese lines because he was saved by his red beard.

Lieutenant Miller's story as survivor of the sunken destroyer Strong reached Birmingham by Associated press dispatch Wednesday.

Sunk near the central Solomon's July 4, Lieutenant Miller and 22 others found temporary safety on a floating net. Six of them finally reached a beach on Japanese-held Arundel Island where 3 died. Lieutenant Miller, wounded, ordered the remaining 2 to leave him and lay in the jungle alone for 4 days—until July 18.

"On the 18th I started up to a spring we had passed," he said in an interview. "A Japanese Zero sprayed me as I was crossing an open flat. I was hit in the wrist and neck.

"For the next 7 days, until July 26, I was kept busy dodging Japs. I made a camp on the 26th. It was so well hidden the Army couldn't find it for a time later. I had fresh water and coconuts.

"The night of August 2, a PT boat shot up a Jap barge 250 yards from me. I tried to get to the PT boat but they were shooting at everything in the woods, too. I could hear the Japs screaming for miles. They do not react favorably to surprise. I never heard such screaming.

"Next morning a Jap body came ashore. I got his shoes, socks, bayonets and two hand grenades. I knew there were patrols on the island. I watched one of them jabber about the Jap's gear being gone. They knew someone was there. They sent a patrol for me that night.

"They came through a clearing toward my camp. I threw a hand grenade, then beat it into the woods after finding no one left to bayonet. I buried them the next day, taking their gear.

"There was a machine-gun nest 100 yards from me at night. The nests were put ashore to protect their barges. From August 10–15 I slipped a hand grenade into three of them in trying to capture a gun. I don't know how many Japanese were killed. I never got a usable gun. It was touch and go every day. One night a patrol came within 20 yards of me.

"I had gotten so I could identify planes and boats just by their sounds. On August

16 I heard a TBF (Grumman torpedo bomber) coming. I got onto the flat and waved a Jap towel. He (the pilot) turned low to let me have it. He told me later he saw my red beard. It saved me from getting shot.

"The pilot was Lt. James R. Turner, of Tyler, Tex. He reported back to Munda. Maj. Vernon A. Peterson, of Minneapolis, said he'd fly a plane to get me. He got two volunteers (Maj. Goodwin Luck, of Minneapolis, and Sgt. John Happer, of Kansas City, Mo.).

"They had to circle close to Vila plantation to land in front of me on the water. It would be impossible to explain how dangerous that was. The Japs never dreamed they'd be fool enough. The antiaircraft fire from Vila I knew was terrific.

"The major (Peterson) saw I was weak and called to me that he'd send a rubber boat. I beat it to camp to get my gear. It was put on the boat and taken to the plane. It was valuable to me and to naval intelligence.

"I wanted to go back again and get five skulls, but it was suggested that 'we get out of this place' so we flew to Munda in time for lunch—and that was something."

Lieutenant Miller, who wears the Purple Heart and Navy Cross for his heroism, is on leave and plans to leave for the East Friday. He said he had been recommended as a machine-gun instructor, but did not know what new duties would be assigned him.

Christmas Message of Bishop Thomas E. Malloy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, our most Rev. Bishop Thomas E. Malloy has delivered his Christmas message to the people of the diocese of Brooklyn and Long Island. It is not only a timely message, but I believe a message that contains so much food for thought. It is a message that should be read by all the people everywhere. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, include this great message in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BISHOP MALLOY'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *December 16, 1943.*

DEAR REVEREND FATHER: It is sadly true that the coming natal anniversary of the Infant God will drawn upon a global conflict which, we are told, has cost to date approximately 10,000,000 civilian lives and an equal number of military deaths.

We realize moreover that every moment this warfare continues it generates bitter hatred and destructive discord in the minds, hearts, and lives of men. No wonder then that we all ardently desire an early termination of this frightful carnage and the elimination of this seething source of human hostility.

We readily recognize that an indispensable prerequisite for the fulfillment of our fervent wishes is the winning of the war. And in reference to this objective we clearly understand that there is no justifying basis at the moment for undue optimism which might easily lead to even an unconscious relaxation of effort that may seriously delay victory.

Then again we reasonably anticipate that victory will be followed, as the distinguished authors of the book entitled "Lasting Peace" suggest, by the immediate settlement of certain problems that will not brook delay such as world-wide demobilization and reduction of armaments and the setting up of temporary de facto representative governments.

When these preliminary matters will have been settled and temporary adjustments made the paramount question of establishing a just and enduring peace will engage the attention of the leaders of the nations of the world.

The realization of such a peace program represents indeed a gigantic task and is beset with countless difficulties.

The objective of the world's aspiration in this matter is quite clear and concrete. It may be described by adapting the words of a national leader of the First World War, namely, "A gradual substitution for force; for the clash of competing ambitions; for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, of a real world partnership, based on the recognition of equal rights and established and enforced by a common will."

These words when first spoken presented a noble aim but we sadly realize that at the moment almost 30 years later they not only have been fulfilled but we are heavily burdened with a second and more terrible world war.

In explaining this lamentable failure, Father Keating, S. J., observes: "Many statesmen engaged in this attempt at world reconstruction have no faith in the possibility or even the desirability of any real approach to world harmony. They have no fixed moral standard of their own; no clear idea of the demands of justice; they were nationalists rather than patriots, basing their country's greatness on dominance over others and inspired by narrow selfishness and racial hatreds. Hence, the achievement of a result which demands the vision of a higher good than what is merely material and temporary and the practice of righteousness even when it means self-sacrifice, is desperately clogged and hampered by the immense numbers of those who are spiritually incapable of appreciating it."

Mind you in making these references I am not trying to disparage the unselfish and heroic efforts of many capable and conscientious statesmen of the past. We must indeed gratefully acknowledge and genuinely admire for instance the theory and aim of the League of Nations; of the Permanent Court of International Justice; of the Locarno Treaties, and of the Pact of Paris.

I do not wish to belittle these well-intentioned, constructive, and beneficent products of courageous and resourceful statecraft. I am simply trying to indicate that these achievements were not lasting in effect or adequate in fulfillment.

In the Christian viewpoint there can be no fully united aim and no agreement in methods and no enduring results achieved by those who are trying to rescue our contemporary world unless they possess or somehow acquire the capacity and disposition to acknowledge, accept, and apply an absolute and objective norm of justice in recognition of the rights and interests of all human beings.

The only basis of justice which must regulate all human relationships and dealings whether of man with man, of society with its members, of nations with nations, is the moral law of God.

This permanently fixed inviolable norm of righteousness alone is beyond the corrupting influence, greedy control, and deceitful manipulation of proud, selfish, and dishonest men.

The primary source, moreover, of the hatreds, rivalries, and conflicts among the nations of the earth has been the inclination or the deliberate intention to ignore or set aside God's law and substitute national interest alone as the ultimate standard and supreme arbiter in international politics, trade, finance, and territorial expansion.

Surely, then, it is most wise, prudent, and timely that we should kneel humbly during the coming Christmastide at the crib of Bethlehem and pray fervently to the infant God that good will, order, and harmony will be soon restored to an extremely embittered and fiercely embattled world.

Mindful also of the consoling fact that just as truly now as when He trod the earth our incarnate Saviour is mercifully attentive to our temporal needs as well as to our spiritual interests we shall fervently beseech Him to enlighten, guide, and strengthen the conscience of the leaders of all nations so that they will honestly formulate and sincerely uphold a just and enduring peace based on the moral law of God. Thus, indeed, may men and governments, as our present Pontiff prays: "Rule all their actions by the laws of truth, justice, and charity."

And thus may we and future generations live in a secure tranquility with all other members of the human family throughout the world under the loving and protecting care of the same eternal Father of us all.

Wishing you and your parishioners a happy and holy Christmas, I am

Faithfully yours,

THOMAS E. MOLLOY,
Bishop of Brooklyn.

Profiteering Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley from today's Washington Post:

PROFITEERING BARRIER

(By Ernest Lindley)

RENEGOTIATION

If the manufacturers, Senators, and Representatives who are trying to vitiate the Renegotiation Act of 1942 are successful, war producers generally may reap a political whirlwind. The profits made during the First World War fed political agitation up to the beginning of this one. The biggest ones were made before the United States became an active belligerent, but that circumstance did not lessen the discomfort of the big producers of the First World War who were grilled by the Nye committee and other investigators.

When allowance was made for all extenuating factors, the fact remained that exorbitant profits were made during the First World War. And as this war came into view, one of the overwhelming determinations of the American people seemed to be that that unsavory bit of history should not be repeated. One of the measures of prevention or control approved by Congress was the Renegotiation or Price Adjustment Act of 1942. This plan was brought forward by the administration to head off an arbitrary percentage limitation on profits.

Under this act some $5,300,000,000 has been recovered or saved through the rewriting of war contracts. In many, perhaps most, cases, the excessive profits were due not to deliberate gouging by producers, but chiefly to

the fact that costs of new types of production, or of making familiar articles on a greatly enlarged scale could not be accurately estimated in advance. As efficiency increased, profits usually rose, and a lower price became equitable, both retroactively and for future deliveries.

Now, under the renegotiation system, a war contractor is protected against future charges of profiteering. If his contract is renegotiated, and he accepts the revised terms and returns a portion of his profits to the Government he receives a document recognizing his act as voluntary. He may have acted unwillingly in response to informal coercion, but under the law it was a voluntary action. If anybody now or in the future accuses him of having profited during the war, he has a complete defense. He voluntarily turned back what the Government held to be an excessive profit. He has a certificate of patriotism.

If the system stand, war manufacturers generally—at least nearly all the larger ones—will emerge from the war free of the fear of a political reaction on account of war profiteering. If the system is destroyed, they will have no such protection.

The House has adopted some amendments to the Renegotiation Act; the Senate Finance Committee has approved others. Among them, these amendments would have the effect of wrecking the system. One amendment would exempt standard commercial articles. This may sound reasonable. Theoretically the cost of making these could be estimated pretty accurately when the original contracts were drawn. But there are many standard commercial articles which were made in only small quantities before the war and now, because they have been adopted by the Army or Navy, are being made by the hundreds of thousands or millions. Some of the conspicuous cases of excessive profits have been among makers of such standard commercial articles. In addition, there are sure to be differences of opinion as to whether many items were or were not standard commercial articles before the war—so a complicated dispute, with plenty of business for the lawyers, may have to be settled before renegotiation can begin.

Superficially, one of the most plausible demands is that in renegotiation, the test should be profits after taxes, instead of before taxes. The fallacies in this line of argument become clear to anyone who examines the figures. The simplest answer is that the Renegotiation Act is a repricing law, not a tax law.

It is true that part of the money saved by renegotiation of contracts would have been recovered anyway by excess-profits taxes. Judge Patterson reported, however, that $1,500,000,000 would have been. Treasury experts say that figure is the minimum. Under the tax law, businessmen can carry back their losses. Part of the money paid in corporation taxes during the last 2 years of the war will have to be refunded if we run into a bad business slump immediately after the war.

The subject is intricate. The administration of the law of this sort can never be perfect. Some manufacturers may have been treated less generously than others. In particular, producers who have earned their profits by unusual efficiency may have been rewarded less than they should have been. But the excess-profits tax also works against the extremely efficient producer.

After renegotiation, there are always profits left, in many cases handsome profits. These are profits on Government business—on war business. It is quite possible that in future years, and to many of the returning soldiers and sailors, the profits left in the hands of war producers will seem exorbitant. Under the present system, war producers have almost a perfect defense; the blame, if any, will lie with the Government. If the Renegotiation Act is wrecked, they will be free game for political agitation, whether they deserve to be or not.

Soldiers' Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have risen on the floor several times to speak on the soldiers' vote.

I trust that everyone in this House understands that almost every home in America has someone in the armed forces, and I trust that everyone now understands that the issue of a Federal ballot for our soldier citizens is being taken to the country and will be taken.

I think that it would be most unfortunate if the inability of our soldiers to vote as the result of the inaction of this Congress were to become a major political issue in the coming year. In my opinion, there is no doubt but that it will be a major issue if this House does not act promptly to pass a practical, workable soldiers' vote bill based directly on a Federal ballot supervised by a bipartisan Federal ballot commission.

This matter cannot be left to the States. to provide for an army. Every man who voted for the declaration of war and to draft our men has, in my opinion, a moral responsibility to our troops. It is our responsibility to protect their voting rights and nothing that anyone may do or say to the contrary will persuade either our fighting men or their folks at home that the Congress has not evaded its obvious duty.

It has been my good fortune to talk this matter over with President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor. I am glad to say that President Green and I believe the same way in this matter. President Green on December 15 sent a letter to the Honorable Eugene Worley, chairman of the House committee before which this legislation is pending. President Green has left it to my discretion to make his letter public. A workable Federal ballot now has the full and unqualified support of the great American Federation of Labor. I believe that its position would be of interest to every Member of the House. The text of the letter reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 15, 1943.*

Hon. EUGENE WORLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The American Federation of Labor wholeheartedly and unanimously favors the extension of the widest opportunity to the membership of the armed forces of our Nation to vote in the next election. It seems inconceivable that those who are serving in the armed forces of our Nation should be restricted, even to the slightest degree, in the exercise of their right to vote. Men who are willing to risk their lives, to sacrifice in full measure, and to die if necessary in order to protect and preserve the rights of democracy, should be accorded the widest opportunity to vote in the election.

The membership of the American Federation of Labor is opposed to the soldier vote measure as passed by the Senate. It is indefensibly restrictive, limited in its application, and highly objectionable from either a patriotic or political point of view. It is our opinion that Congress should measure up to all the requirements of the situation to respond to the call of the moment for the application of a broad and cooperative policy which will properly and adequately protect the exercise of soldiers' rights to vote. Legislation which will provide for the realization of this objective should be in simple form and character—should be based upon the exercise of the right of American citizens who are abroad serving in the armed forces of the Nation to vote.

In behalf and in the name of the 6,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, I respectfully recommend and urge that Congress enact simplified legislation which will provide for the exercise of the right of all who are serving in the armed forces of our Nation on foreign battlefields and elsewhere to cast their votes in the coming election.

Very sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Soldier Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith an editorial from one of Montana's leading newspapers entitled "Soldier Votes." I think the writer of this editorial in a concise and brief statement has stated the case 100 percent right.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of December 15, 1943]

SOLDIER VOTES

Comment has been made that Montana, unlike many other States, has provided a way for men in the service to vote. Our legislature did enact a special act for that purpose and we will do the best we can, but the fact remains that no one expects State laws to be effective as far as men overseas are concerned. Action by the Federal Government is needed so that the distribution of ballots to and the collection of them from the men may be prompt and effective. Only through Federal cooperation can the job be done thoroughly.

There is a minority of Republican leaders who recognize the justice of Federal legislation. Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, who certainly is not prompted by friendship for the Roosevelt administration, summed up the situation, after the Senate passed the Eastland amendment which turned the whole problem over to the States, by saying that the amendment would "make it practically im-

possible for Michigan absentee servicemen to vote. A man is entitled to vote as well as to fight," the Senator concluded.

Senators may storm as they will at the criticism, but this time at least Senator GUFFEY is right. The deal between Northern Republican Senators and deep South Democratic Senators to make it as hard as possible for men in the Army and Navy to vote in the next election was one of the most indefensible in recent political history. It cannot be justified on any basis.

Address by Norman H. Davis at Annual Meeting of Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, an able and interesting address was delivered by Chairman Norman H. Davis, of the American Red Cross, at the annual meeting of that organization held at the national headquarters in Washington, D. C., December 8, 1943. The address gives exceedingly valuable information in regard to the wonderful activities of this great organization for the past year. The Red Cross continues to grow rapidly, now having a membership of more than four million. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, never before has the American Red Cross operated on so vast a scale as in the year just closing. At home and around the globe, wherever American troops were stationed, the Red Cross was on duty also. I wish that I could give you the complete story today—the story of what has been, perhaps, the most interesting, challenging, dramatic, and fruitful year in our history. But so tremendous are our operations it is no longer possible to cover them even adequately except in a document such as our annual report.

In the past year we met successfully the greatest challenge in Red Cross history. We had a sound structure, tested in previous wars and in fire, flood, famine, and windstorms, which could be and was expanded to meet the grave responsibilities arising out of the war. The American people's complete confidence in the Red Cross led to the oversubscription of the 1943 Red Cross war fund. And so, experience and skill, implemented with funds provided by the people, enabled us to expand our facilities, increase our personnel at home and abroad, and greatly intensify our activities in response to the unprecedented demand.

Our domestic program bears the same relationship to our overseas workers as does the home front to the armed forces scattered around the globe. Success overseas depends upon a high rate of production at home. Since but a small proportion of our people can have the opportunity to serve upon the actual battlefield, all men, women, and children alike may serve and serve effectively by making it possible to care properly for those doing the actual fighting.

In the past year many millions of Americans performed patriotic services in and through the American Red Cross. There were 4,000,000 workers in volunteer special services alone. They made 12,000,000 garments and 2,500,000 kit bags for our uniformed men and women, not to count the millions of surgical dressings. They drove cars, ambulances, and trucks in city, country, and Army camp. They served many thousand mass emergency meals to troops and civilians. They also worked as typists, clerks, and utility helpers in Red Cross and other war-aid centers.

Home Service workers in all our chapters worked diligently to care for service men's and women's families and ex-servicemen in distress. If required, emergency financial help was given. Increasing attention was paid to returned soldiers and their problems. Through its inquiry unit Home Service lessened the strain of war for relatives of servicemen and other civilians by transmitting through the International Committee of the Red Cross messages and inquiries to and from persons in enemy or occupied countries.

About 27,000 nurses were enrolled by the Red Cross for service in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps. A hundred thousand trained volunteer nurse's aides served in veterans' and civilian hospitals. About 400,000 women and girls and men were taught Red Cross home nursing, lessening the threat of epidemics, while an expanding nutrition program helped strengthen the home front.

Through Red Cross camp and hospital councils, many citizens and organizations were able to bring comfort and recreation aids to soldiers in stations and hospitals in this country.

More than 17,000,000 members of the American Junior Red Cross produced millions of comfort and recreation articles, ranging from hospital tray favors to furniture for Army recreation rooms. Organized by schoolroom groups, their projects were carried out under teacher supervision, mainly in manual training and home economics classes. Junior members collected waste metals, textiles, paper, and fats. They promoted international friendliness by corresponding with children in other countries and presenting Christmas boxes to children in Europe and Latin America.

More than a million Americans were taught first aid and water safety, including Army and Navy instructors and essential war workers. One home in three now has first-aid protection.

All chapters maintained their service units in readiness to meet natural disasters of all types—storm, flood, fire—and to assist local emergency defense councils with civilian aid in case of enemy action. Midwest floods and Southwest tornadoes swelled the number of natural disasters. Relief and rehabilitation were offered to needy disaster victims.

Valuable as these and other contributions were and are, I feel that the response of the American people to the Red Cross appeal for blood to be used as plasma on the battlefields transcended any other voluntary service on the home front. It is the gift of life itself. Recently the secretary of a New York businessman telephoned the Red Cross blood-donor center to cancel an appointment to donate blood because, as he was about to leave, a telegram arrived notifying him that his son had been killed in action. Then the bereaved father's voice broke in on the telephone conversation. "No, don't cancel it." he told his secretary. "My boy would want me to keep that appointment; my pint of blood can save someone else's son."

I visited several base and evacuation hospitals in north Africa and Sicily this summer. More gratifying than anything else, perhaps, was the first-hand testimony of the medical officers who told me of the innumerable lives they had been able to save with blood plasma. Many a wounded youth who otherwise might have died is now either back on duty with his buddies or well on the way to recovery. If all blood donors in America could have stood beside me as I visited the service hospitals, I am sure that they, too, would have been thrilled as I was to see the living evidence of its miracle-working powers.

Plasma is like cash on hand, ready for immediate use. When the Fifth Army landed on the Salerno beaches, fighting was so furious that wounded men could not be kept in one place long enough for a transfusion. Army medical corpsmen overcame this difficulty by trotting alongside the stretchers holding the plasma bottle aloft and literally saving lives on the run. About 5,000,000 pints of American blood have been given since the Red Cross blood-donor service was started 3 years ago, and more is needed. I have no doubt that the response will be overwhelming. In anticipation of the new demands, we opened 2 new blood-donor centers and will open 2 more in January. This will bring the total to 35 centers located near enough to laboratories for the processing to begin within the required 24-hour limit. The number of mobile units was increased from 39 to 60, extending the privilege of giving to hundreds of towns and cities surrounding blood-donor centers.

Virtually all these Red Cross activities touch upon the war in one way or another, and serve the armed forces. No one, however, can be in a position to see the final effect of this tremendous home-front effort until he goes overseas. I was familiar with our overseas operations only from blueprints, cables, and reports, but felt I ought to see them at first hand.

And so, accompanied by one of our vice chairmen, I left New York by clipper early the morning of August 20. The next evening we were in London talking with Mr. Harvey D. Gibson, our commissioner to Great Britain. Mr. Gibson had our time scheduled right up to the minute, and in 2 weeks we saw a good cross section of our work in England.

I have been to Europe many times in the past 25 years, but the trip I made to England, north Africa, and Sicily was the most interesting and I hope, the most productive, of my life.

In 30 days of almost constant travel, virtually all by airplane, I saw every type of Red Cross service in action. You can only appreciate the warm, human quality of Red Cross service to our fighting men after you have seen it.

We now have over a hundred clubs in Great Britain and about 50 in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. I say "about" advisedly because the number varies from day to day. I saw a club opening in Palermo and a club closing in Rabat. Our club program necessarily is fluid to keep pace with the Army.

In size and scope of program, Red Cross clubs range from large hotels in London to grass huts in New Guinea. We now have about 350 of these clubs and recreation centers overseas. No matter where located, they are the doughboy's American home abroad. A few days after the American occupation of Bizerte, we had a club running in a partially bombed theater. It was a godsend to our soldiers and sailors because there just wasn't any other place in town for them.

Our first club in north Africa was established in an automobile showroom in Oran. Later we started another club there in a very large theater which offered every conceivable facility to our servicemen, including hot showers, which, in north Africa, is a rare luxury indeed.

Red Cross clubs serve not only men on leave but troops stationed in the neighborhood.

They offer a congenial and relaxing respite from the drabness of military life. They are attractively furnished and staffed by American Red Cross recreation and other workers. American dishes and comfortable beds with sheets are offered at prices that are below cost, the very nominal charge being made at the Army's request.

In Red Cross clubs in England, north Africa, Sicily, Italy, Australia and the South Pacific, India, and other parts of the world, our American Red Cross girls provide a cheerful atmosphere. They are on their feet 12 to 16 hours daily helping our servicemen forget the drearier side of war. If they don't have all the equipment they want or need they get it somewhere, somehow, by sheer ingenuity. One of our regional executives told me he wouldn't be afraid to put six of his Red Cross girls in the middle of a plowed field and tell them to have a Red Cross Club running in 10 days. "They would do it in 9 days and have the place full of servicemen," he said. "They are splendid. Since I have been in this place we have been bombed at least 70 times. I have yet to hear one of our girls whimper or complain."

An innovation in this war is the clubmobile, which literally is a club on wheels. It has solved the problem of bringing Red Cross services and supplies to American troops in the mudholes. One-third of the bus is a very attractive clubroom, and the remainder includes such equipment as a doughnut-making machine and coffee urn, racks for newspapers and magazines, a gramophone and records, a circulating library, a loudspeaker arrangement for entertainments.

The demand of Army and Air Force officers for more frequent visits of our clubmobiles to their camps and airfields caused us to inaugurate a new service—aeroclubs and camp clubs right in the camps or on the airfields.

These generally comprise several rooms in a Nisson hut, barracks, or tent where Red Cross recreation workers are in attendance.

Another new development was the establishment of rest homes for aviators who have done a number of bombing missions and need rest and relaxation. We operate these for the Air Force at their request. Red Cross girls provide a cheerful, homelike atmosphere, and the airmen do as they please for a week or so until they are ready to return to active duty. While at these homes they wear civilian clothes. It's amazing how quickly they recover from their fatigue.

Important as are these activities for the able-bodied, I want to describe briefly the far more vital service which the Red Cross is privileged to render to the sick and wounded in the hospitals. As you know, in this country gray ladies are on duty at all general and convalescent military hospitals reading aloud, writing letters, doing shopping errands, playing chess, and otherwise serving our wounded and sick soldiers and sailors. Other workers give diverting instruction in arts and crafts, developing interesting hobbies. In Red Cross recreation houses attached to these hospitals our recreation workers arrange concerts, movies, stage shows, songfests, and similar programs.

This service is paralleled overseas but under far more dramatic circumstances. Some of the hospitals, like those in "hospital row" near Bizerte which I inspected, are under tents. Our Red Cross workers live and share the same hardships—including bombings—as the nurses, doctors, and patients. I was impressed with their uncomplaining spirit and sense of pride in doing a difficult job. If they complained about anything it wasn't that there hadn't been enough water for a bath or laundry in weeks, but that our Red Cross supplies were not always arriving on time or in sufficient quantities.

Recreation tents used for convalescent patients in north Africa are often simply equipped—a few chairs made out of scrap lumber, a battered piano, and a couple of writing tables made out of packing cases—but they serve a real purpose. The ones I saw were crowded with convalescent patients in their bathrobes playing games or writing letters. These were the so-called ambulatory patients who could get around under their own power. But back in the wards were the bedridden patients who would have been helpless but for the Red Cross girls. They were on their feet 16 hours a day to make those lads comfortable and contented, if not entirely happy, by changing money orders, buying air-mail stamps and souvenirs, and shipping home Purple Heart Medals. They resolved worries caused by personal difficulties which threatened to retard recovery, and helped crippled men to face the future confidently. Writing letters to the wounded men's families was often a severe trial because of the sheer pathos involved. The girls write as the boys dictate. One soldier who had been so badly burned in a transport explosion that the Army surgeons had nearly despaired of his life, dictated the following sentence to his family in the States (and I quote): "I'm in the hospital now, but getting along all right. Don't worry."

Hospital service and the work performed by our field directors are the basic services of the Red Cross in this war. During the past year, Red Cross field directors were available to servicemen and women everywhere. Servicemen came to them with a large variety of worrisome problems—problems which ran the gamut of human experience, such as childbirth, sickness, injury, death, loss of family income, loss or damage to home, or trouble with the law; or problems arising out of their induction, such as delayed allotments, reports, and, if necessary, aid for their families.

When the units to which they were attached went overseas, field directors moved along to take care of the same basic needs and, in addition, needs growing out of the new environment.

When troops went into action, Red Cross field directors were not so far behind that they could not offer a word of cheer, a pat on the shoulder, or a cigarette to a seriously wounded soldier. They were ready with such personal supplies as razors, razor blades, toothpaste, and soap often lost in the midst of battle.

When the One Hundred and Sixty-second Infantry Regiment of the Forty-first Division made its push through the New Guinea jungles to take Salamaua, Red Cross Field Directors Taylor and Swartz were already there, well ahead of their unit. With a one-burner gasoline stove, 25 gallons of water, coffee, sugar, canned milk, biscuits, and cigarettes, they were established on the beach road ready to serve the troops as they passed by.

Here is what they wrote national headquarters. I quote:

"Down out of the hills, out of the jungle, and off the landing barges came the troops. They came in cautiously at first, all set for battle, and then saw us there waiting for them. All day long we passed out hot coffee, sweet biscuits, and cigarettes. It did something to you to see the expression of gratitude on the faces of the men when, coming down from the ridges above Salamaua, filthy, dirty, and hungry, they saw us there ahead of them with hot coffee and something to eat."

On Guadalcanal we had "Tiny" Montgomery, a Red Cross field director who got his nickname because of the fact that he stands 6 feet 8½ inches in his stocking feet and weighs 275 pounds. His stature kept him out of the armed services, but we managed to find him a uniform. When he came to us he asked for a hot assignment and drew it on Guadalcanal where he tempted fate every time he poked his head out of a fox hole.

One day, while wandering in the island jungle, Montgomery met a group of marines and offered them smokes.

"Say, fellows," he asked, "aren't we pretty close to the front lines now?"

They looked at him in astonishment.

"Front lines, be damned," said one of the marines. "They're half a mile behind us. This is a patrol."

One of our great services, of course, is that of aid to prisoners of war. The plight of prisoners of war strongly appeals to the humane impulses of our people. This year we have embarked upon an increasing service of distribution of food parcels for the relief of American and allied prisoners and civilian internees in Europe and the Far East. Four large packing centers in Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, and St. Louis were opened. In these plants 4,000 women volunteers have packed nearly 7,000,000 Red Cross standard food packages. They were consigned to the international committee of the Red Cross at Geneva for distribution principally in Europe. When the diplomatic exchange ship *Gripsholm* sailed from New York in September, it carried a precious cargo of food packages, medicines, etc., valued at $1,500,000 for the United States and allied prisoners of war in the Far East. For the cost of materials shipped to American prisoners of war the Red Cross is reimbursed to a considerable extent by the Army and Navy. United Nations Governments reimburse the Red Cross for food packages distributed among their nationals in prisoner of war camps.

It may be difficult for us to visualize what the receipt of a Red Cross food package means to a prisoner of war. Here is a testimonial from one of them (and I quote): "Words * * * fail to convey the feelings of my heart * * * No one can understand all that it has meant to us to receive, during our captivity, those wonderful Red Cross packages * * * I remember weeping with joy and being so excited that I could not undo the string and one of the guards had to help me * * * I do pray God's special blessing may rest upon the Red Cross and on all who subscribe to its funds."

The question may arise, Have the results overseas justified our efforts and expenditure? In other words have we done our job? I think the best judges are the troops themselves. I had not been in England a day until I began to sense that everyone—from generals to privates, from diplomats to the man on the street—was enthusiastic about our work. Most warming to me were the expressions of gratitude from the servicemen themselves. Whenever the boys found out I was National Chairman of the Red Cross they would come up to me, shake my hand, and tell me how much they appreciated what the Red Cross was doing. How many times I heard exactly the same statement: "I don't know what we would have done without the Red Cross!"

I found the same enthusiasm among the troops in north Africa and Sicily, and we have ample proof that the same feeling exists in Italy, the Middle East, India, Australia, and wherever American troops are stationed.

After my own experiences abroad, I can only add my own testimonial. I am gratified to say that everyone who serves with the Red Cross can be justly proud of our work and our devoted workers overseas. They are doing a magnificent job.

I cannot conclude, however, without adding that these magnificent services are costing tremendous sums of money.

We are approaching the time of another Red Cross campaign to raise the funds neces-

sary to continue this work on a global scale. America will be asked to give the equivalent of about $7 for each family so that the Red Cross may render these vital services for a whole year at a cost of about $25 for each man in our armed forces.

It will require a real sacrifice of time and effort in these busy days on the part of many of us to collect these good-will offerings. Surely we will not hesitate to face this task nor to make any sacrifice of time or means required, so that the Red Cross may continue, as the representative of all our people, to render these services of mercy to those who, on our behalf, are bearing the brunt of battle.

The total sum required, considered as a whole, may seem large. But I know of no contribution so useful or satisfying as the one given to the Red Cross, whose work among the armed forces is the greatest of all humanitarian undertakings.

I am sincerely convinced that there is no service in the world today that is comparable to that of the Red Cross in volume, efficiency, and humanitarian importance.

Address by Senator Murray Before Medical Society of County of Monroe, Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], on November 17, 1943, before the Medical Society of the County of Monroe, Rochester, N. Y. It deals with a subject which is vital to our country: the expansion of our present social security program in order to bring about a wider and more equitable distribution of medical care and hospitalization for the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen and members of the Medical Society of the County of Monroe, I appreciate the opportunity of discussing with you tonight the problem of finding some sound method of making medical science and hospitalization more available to the masses of the American people. I think I should first explain how I came to be interested in this question.

Several years ago, I was made chairman of a Senate subcommittee to study the subject of social security, including plans for a system of insurance for medical care and hospitalization. At that time, I conducted extensive hearings on the original Wagner bill, S. 1620, introduced in 1939 and designed to establish a national health program. A vast amount of testimony was then taken showing a real lack of adequate medical care available to people in the lower income brackets. In some sections of the country, we discovered that there were not enough doctors or hospitals. We found also in the crowded industrial areas of the Nation a serious lack of medical care and hospitalization available, particularly to the people of the lower income brackets. Even among people steadily employed, we found that sudden illness presented serious financial problems, and these conditions had very damaging effects. People avoided consulting doctors with the result that delay resulted in serious complications and much greater expense in the end. We found from those hearings that generally poor people and those in the middle brackets have more sickness than the well to do or wealthy, yet it was clear that they received much less care.

From all those studies, I became quite familiar with health problems and conditions in the country and was impressed with the necessity for legislation of some kind to make medical care more accessible to the masses of our people. Since those hearings were held, demand for legislation to meet the problem of providing a more adequate system of medical care has steadily grown throughout the country. In many sections voluntary health insurance plans and prepayment methods have undertaken to provide ways of meeting this situation, but these group insurance plans and prepayment methods appear to be reaching only an insignificant proportion of the population.

With these undisputed facts before me, I joined with Senator WAGNER recently in presenting Senate bill 1161, providing for an expanded system of general welfare, including a Federal system of medical and hospital benefits.

My contacts and experience with the medical profession in connection with the hearings on the original Wagner bill and the national hospital bill convinced me that we would have the cooperation of the medical profession and the representatives of the several hospital associations of the country in working out sound legislation of the purpose and character designed by this bill. During the time of the hearings, which I have mentioned, I had many contacts with the medical profession, as well as with representatives of the several hospital associations of the country. I found them uniformly constructive and helpful in our studies. At that time, I accepted generally the advice of the medical profession regarding amendments to the bills we had under consideration. The original health bill was supplanted by the national hospital bill and when it was finally reported, it included all of the suggestions and recommendations of the medical profession and representatives of the hospital associations. So, I want it understood here that I have always cooperated with the medical profession in the study of these problems. We all have a high respect for its great contribution to medical science, and if I considered that this proposed legislation now before the Congress would do an injustice or injury to the medical profession or cause any deterioration in the quality of medical service, I certainly would not want to advocate it or suport it. I am convinced, however, from my studies that it will not do anything like that. On the contrary, it will improve the quality of medical service as a whole and is merely a method by which the masses of our people will be protected against the emergencies of sickness and accident and be able to secure the best medical service that can be provided. That is the sole purpose and object of this proposed legislation.

With all this previous experience in mind, I have been greatly surprised to find that a large section of the medical profession is opposed to and extremely critical of the present bill. Of course, I could have avoided this task, but it occurred to me that a real problem existed which called for remedial legislation and I expected the aid of the medical profession in developing a proper program. The bill as presented, S. 1161, was intended as the basis for an honest, fair, and intelligent study of the subject. It was not assumed that it was free from any imperfection. Like all other bills, it was subject to extensive hearings and careful analysis before an appropriate Senate committee. It was my hope that a final bill could be agreed upon that would meet with the approval of the country and be of incalculable benefit to the general public.

It is, of course, essential that the medical profession and organized medical societies should contribute constructive assistance in formulating legislation of this kind. We who have been struggling to find an answer to the problem of making medical care more accessible to the general public recognize that it is an exceedingly technical and complicated problem. Health is more vitally important to our economic and social security than any other single element in life. And health of the American people is therefore a fundamental interest of every citizen in the country.

The great majority of the medical profession are men of high character and purpose, men who are anxious to improve on the present status of medical care so vital to the welfare of the country. They appreciate that the practice of medicine in the United States today is totally different from what it was many years ago when we were operating under an agricultural economy. Medical practice in the last half century has been wholly revolutionized. The great, modern advances in medical science have made medical care much more involved and more expensive. Today we are a highly industrialized Nation. This has created conditions of recurring unemployment, poverty, and distress amongst vast numbers of the population. It is obviously difficult for large sections of our people with uncertain earnings to be able to meet the emergencies of sickness and ill health and secure the kind of medical care they should have.

To you physicians in Rochester, an important and prosperous city in one of the wealthiest States of the Union, my statements may seem somewhat exaggerated. Unfortunately most of the communities of the country, especially rural regions and poorer States, do not possess the resources and prosperity which prevail here in Rochester. But even Rochester itself is not without its problems in this matter, as Dr. Smillie's 1940 survey has made clear. His Survey of Public Opinion shows that your voluntary plans in operation here do not reach those most in need of a prepayment service.

This is the very point on which the belief is based that only compulsory medical care insurance will provide adequate care to all the people. The blue cross plan, it is true, has been very successful in Rochester. A large proportion of the people belong to it. Forty-four percent of the people interviewed in the public opinion survey said that they had it. However, while two-thirds of those with incomes from $2,200 to $4,999 had joined, and six-sevenths of those with incomes above $5,000 a year had also joined, membership was reported to be slightly less than half of the families in what Dr. Smillie called the average income group ($1,300 to $2,199). Among families and individuals with incomes from $800 to $1,299, only 20 percent belonged, and among those with incomes below $800, none at all. This was the situation here in Rochester. It is worse, much worse, elsewhere.

What the selective service examinations (see Selective Service System, Causes of Rejection and Incidence of Defects, Medical Statistics Bulletin No. 2, p. 1) exposed about the health of our boys was shocking indeed. Surely we cannot be complacent when over half—52.8 percent—of the first 3,000,000

young men examined by selective service were not considered truly fit, and many had serious defects which, with proper care, could have been prevented or relieved. Of course, some of it was carelessness. They just didn't bother to secure treatment, but much of it was certainly due to the fact that they and their families just did not have the money.

The national health bill of 1939, which started my active interest in national health planning, was laid aside after the outbreak of the World War. Since 1939, the Congress has done nothing toward the solution of this problem. Certain groups in the population are prospering today, it is true, and doctors are sharing in their prosperity. But, when the war ends, there will be suddenly reduced incomes for many and downright unemployment for millions. Now, this period of prosperity is a strategic period to plan for the dangerous period we all know will soon come.

Some medical societies, as I have already said, have shown their realization of the need by setting up voluntary plans. Unfortunately, these plans are not comprehensive enough nor do they reach enough people. They cost too much to be within the means of the people who most need insurance against the costs of medical care. Even the hospital insurance plans reach only about one-tenth of our population.

Gentlemen, voluntary plans simply won't meet the need. They do not have, and cannot hope to have, a large enough coverage—a wide enough spread of risks and costs.

The European countries went through a voluntary stage and found that they had to come to compulsory insurance. In fact, the history of health insurance in Europe indicates that a compulsory system was adopted because the voluntary system had failed. Your own medical representatives on the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care pointed out over 10 years ago that if insurance is used, it had better be compulsory.

OBJECTIVES OF A COMPULSORY MEDICAL INSURANCE PLAN

Let me briefly reiterate the objectives of a compulsory medical care insurance plan. There should be:

1. As nearly universal coverage as possible to insure the widest possible spread of risks and costs.

2. Unrestricted access by the people, regardless of how low their income is to all necessary care.

3. Preservation of the personal relationship between physician and patient.

4. Preservation of standards of medical care.

5. Preservation of professional independence to the members of the medical profession.

6. Assurance of adequate payment to physicians, with financial recognition in cases of special training, as with specialists.

These objectives, I believe, are pretty well met in title IX, the medical care and hospitalization benefits section of S. 1161. I am confining myself in my address tonight primarily to this title of the bill since your interest and mine at the moment is centered in its provisions.

WHAT DOES THE BILL PROPOSE FOR THE PUBLIC?

First of all, there will be almost complete coverage on a compulsory basis of all employed workers, including groups hitherto excluded—domestic servants, farm workers, persons employed in nonprofit agencies and organizations, the self-employed, small business people, professional persons, and independent farmers. Dependents of all these groups are covered. Certain groups of employees of State and local governments may also come in under compact. States are empowered to include medical care among the provisions for persons in receipt of public assistance.

Second, contributions for all forms of social insurance guaranteed under S. 1161 will be levied by means of a single contribution, thus greatly simplifying the employer's work in making reports and payments, and resulting in low administrative costs. No contributions will be levied on that portion of wages, salaries, or incomes which is in excess of $3,000 per year.

Third, aside from the other social-security benefits, the bill guarantees under medical benefits: General practitioners' services, specialists' services; X-ray and laboratory services for nonhospitalized patients, hospitalization up to 30 days in any 1 year.

Fourth, the freedom of choice of doctor, so much prized by physicians, is guaranteed under the bill. Even more important, freedom of change is also assured to the patient.

Fifth, there will be free access to specialists on recommendation of the general practitioner. When circumstances make it advisable, specialists' services may be obtained directly.

Sixth, patients will be as free to enter the hospital of their choice as they are today—freer, because fear of the costs will no longer be involved.

WHAT DOES THE BILL DO FOR THE DOCTORS?

First, it improves the opportunity of the doctor to serve all patients who select him without any financial problem being intruded. The patient pays for services in advance through an insurance fund built up under the act.

Second, the relation of physician and patient is not interfered with as the physician, under the act, is as free as he is today to accept or reject patients and is also free to enter the system as he chooses.

Third, the method of payment to the general practitioner is left to the choice of the majority of physicians in the local area (sec. 905, subsec. 7, p. 46).

Fourth, the bill explicitly states that remuneration must be adequate, such as to "provide professional and financial incentives for the professional advancement of practitioners and to encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished."

Fifth, through their representation on the National Advisory Medical and Hospital Council, physicians will have a voice in the determination of all important policies (sec. 904, p. 41).

Sixth, specialists will be entitled to higher fees than general practitioners if their training and experience measures up to the standards established by the Surgeon General after consultation with the advisory council, utilizing the standards already established by professional agencies and organizations. This proviso is for the protection of physicians and patients alike.

WHAT DOES THE BILL DO FOR THE HOSPITALS?

First, it permits free choice of hospitals to the patient, as free a choice as he has today. It wisely provides, just as the Blue Cross Plan does, that hospitalization will be on the recommendation of the attending physician.

Second, it guarantees a fair and reasonable payment to the hospitals, the method of payment to be either on a cash indemnity or a service basis, as may seem best after consultation with the advisory council, on which hospitals will have adequate representation.

Third, it interferes in no way in the management of hospitals. The type of reports and records that will be required are no more than well-administered hospitals are accustomed to keep for themselves. A good deal has been said about the control which the Surgeon General would exercise over the voluntary hospital system if the bill became law. This is nonsense. Nothing in the bill states or implies that. The standards used in setting up the hospital lists will undoubtedly be such as are already recognized by hospital authorities, such standards as the American Medical Association utilizes in determining whether or not a hospital shall be included in its register. Provision is made, however, for the common-sense relaxing of standards in communities where hospitals are scarce or limited in the scope of their activities. No hospital of standing in its community, no hospital meeting proper professional standards, need have any fear that its name will be left off the list. Patients will have quite as much freedom of choice as they have today—indeed more, and hospitals will have a financial security which they have not heretofore possessed.

Let us now turn to the subject of standards:

WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FOR MEDICAL CARE IF S. 1161 BECOMES LAW?

I am convinced that the provisions of title IX, far from resulting in deterioration of medical care, should do much to stimulate its progressive improvement. Paragraph (6) of section 905, "Guiding Principles and Provisions for Administration," sets down very definite principles for the Surgeon General's guidance to: "Encourage high standards in the quality of services furnished as benefits * * * through the adequacy of payments to practitioners, assistance in their use of opportunities for post-graduate study, coordination among the services * * * aid in the prevention of disease, disability, and premature death."

The Advisory Council is also authorized to advise the Surgeon General in these respects, and the Surgeon General is required to consult the Council on all these important professional matters.

The practicing physician certainly should be able to do a job more satisfactory to himself and more beneficial to his patient when the state of a patient's pocketbook no longer determines the kind or amount of care his physician is able to give him.

The funds available under section 1111, "Grants-in-Aid for Medical Education, Research, and Prevention of Disease and Disability," will provide a much-needed stimulus to research and to improvements in medical education. The meagerness of the sums available for research in many medical schools and teaching hospitals is well known.

Briefly, these are the aims the bill is designed to achieve for the public, for physicians, for hospitals, and for medical progress. In writing the bill, every effort was made to meet the objections raised against the 1939 bill, to incorporate suggestions made by critics of that bill. The objections to 51 varieties of medical care which might have come to pass had the 1939 bill become law were remembered and therefore a national system is now advocated. Section 1111, making provisions for funds for research, was included as a result of medical criticism of this lack in the earlier bill.

The provisions for hospitalization benefits in our bill, as methods of administering an insurance plan, follow the points on which there was agreement at a joint meeting of representatives of the American Hospital Association, the Protestant Hospital Association, and the Catholic Hospital Association with members of the staff of the Social Security Board a year ago, as given in the approved summary of that meeting.

Of course, we do not consider the bill perfect. No bill ever is. Bills are usually improved as a result of criticisms which come out in discussions and hearings. But criticism to be helpful must be constructive. I must say I have been astounded by most of the criticism of this bill.

The attitude of the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, of which Dr. Channing Frothinghaim of Boston is chairman, and Dr. John Peters of New Haven is secretary, is a notable exception. In a letter to Senator WAGNER, Dr. Peters said, and I quote:

"The Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care wishes to congratulate you on the presentation of S. 1161, the Federal Social Insurance Contributions Act. The medical features of the bill seem to the committee broadly conceived in a spirit of service. With its general provisions, the committee is in accord. It provides a framework and a basis for discussion from which it is sincerely hoped that a constructive program for improved medical and health care of the American people may be developed. * * * The medical profession should accept the challenge. Its members have the expert knowledge required to implement the measure. This knowledge should be placed unreservedly at the disposal of the legislature."

A letter like this gives me courage to hope that a proper and effective bill can be worked out. This letter does not mean that the members of that committee approve everything in the bill. It does mean that they are willing to work with us constructively toward a common end in the public interest.

No one will question the right of anyone in this country to present to the public their point of view, in the most effective language possible—that is a constitutional privilege we all want to preserve. But it does seem reasonable to expect that those who speak for vital legislation of this kind should speak the truth—should do it impartially and objectively, instead of confusing the rank and file of physicians and the general public by a misconstruction of facts.

S. 1161 has been variously described as "socialistic," "communistic," and as "state medicine." What really is meant by "state medicine"? How often has it been actually defined? Actually, state medicine is a system of medical care paid for out of taxation, under which all physicians are salaried, all hospitals and health services are owned and controlled by the Government, and everyone receives medical care at Government (or State) expense. This is not at all what we have in mind. The bill Senator WAGNER and I are sponsoring merely sets up the machinery for distributing the costs of medical care through insurance. It does not interfere with the professional aspects of medical practice. It does not come between the patient and the physician.

The bill has been called un-American. What is un-American about enabling people to pay for their medical care? What is un-American about seeking to guard against the emergency of sickness through an insurance system? What is un-American about expanding medical care and improving the national health? All these advantages are guaranteed under the bill. If you have any doubt that the language of the bill means what I have just stated, you have only to suggest clearer and stronger language.

The Congress will have an interest in seeing that both the Surgeon General and the Social Security Board shall be responsible to the public good. Moreover, this will be no hand-out by the Government. The people who pay for medical care through their payroll deductions will have a lively interest in the type of administration rendered.

Public opinion has been registered again and again in favor of arrangements such as those embodied in S. 1161. The most recent poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion (the Gallup poll) asked the following question:

"At present, the social-security program provides benefits for old age, death, and unemployment. Would you favor changing the program to include payment of benefits for sickness, disability, doctor, and hospital bills?"

Well over half, 59 percent, answered "Yes." Only 29 percent said "No."

Under a democratic government we cannot afford to ignore a reasonable public demand.

The science of medicine has made tremendous strides forward. The distribution of medical care, its availability, has not kept pace with the complexities of modern industrial life. The public has become educated to know a great deal about what it can expect from modern science, modern medicine. It wants better medical care and better health at a price within its reach. It wants health services without burdensome costs which make such services inaccessible to large sections of our population. It wants some kind of a health-insurance system which will spread the costs and enable people to provide in advance for the sudden emergency of illness which often occurs when one is least prepared to meet it. It wants to avoid the necessity of depending upon charity by making provision in advance in times of employment and prosperity and thus procuring the best quality of medical care and hospitalization without imposing upon anyone. Here is an opportunity for the medical profession to contribute to the establishment of a system of health insurance which will make America the healthiest, in addition to being the most prosperous, Nation in the world. This is a program which calls for the intelligent cooperation of us all.

China and the Cairo Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Regaining Prestige as Result of Cairo Parley" from the very able mind and pen of James D. White, Associated Press writer, published in the Washington Star of December 19, 1943. Mr. White has recently spent 10 years in the Chinese Republic, and of course speaks with authority.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE REGAINING PRESTIGE AS RESULT OF CAIRO PARLEY

(By James D. White)

(Mr. White spent 10 years in China as a correspondent, was repatriated in 1942, and recently interviewed repatriates returning on the *Gripsholm*.)

Flying back to Chungking from the Cairo conference, Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek carried more with them than the tri-partite agreement to strip Japan of the fruits of a half century of conquest.

The conference with President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill meant more than that to Chiang, to his Government and to the Chinese people.

It was Chiang's first meeting with other chiefs of state. It confirmed the generalissimo in his role—if there have been recent doubts—as China's unchallenged national leader in war and in the peace to follow.

It was full Allied recognition of China's place as a great power, today and tomorrow.

Prestige, commonly known as "face," means much in the Orient.

REBUILDS CHINA'S PRESTIGE

The Cairo conference was the latest of a series of events which have helped to rebuild the prestige of both China and her generalissimo from the low to which it had fallen through the fortunes of war.

Americans coming most recently from Japanese-dominated Asia—repatriates on the exchange ship *Gripsholm*—express the opinion.

They say that the Cairo conference will do more than any other single factor to give the Chinese greater confidence in themselves, their allies and the future.

This is a big order.

China fought alone for more than 4 years. Chiang and many other Chinese warned repeatedly that Japan would attack the democracies of the west. After Pearl Harbor the Chinese watched with bitterness as their predictions came true—bastions of the British Empire crumbled before the Japanese and the United States and Britain could not prevent the conquest of the Philippines and the Dutch East Inides.

Allied prestige fell to an all-time low in Chungking as the Burma road was lost and China's last great supply contact with the outside world fell into Japanese hands.

CHINESE SAW CHANGE

Chiang's own prestige fell in the minds of some Chinese. The old rift between his Government and the Communists was exhumed.

Then in August 1942, American marines landed on Guadalcanal in the South Pacific. Though this was 4,460 miles from Chungking, the Chinese knew it was the beginning of the long road back to Tokyo.

The United States Army established its Fourteenth Air Force in China and almost for the first time Chinese soldiers fought with strong air support. With such help they have just turned the Japanese invaders back at Changteh in what is called the fiercest fighting in China since the battle of Shanghai in 1937.

The first big Allied gesture toward China was when the United States and Britain voluntarily relinquished their extra-territorial rights in Chna whereby their nationals were responsible to their own laws and courts rather than to Chinese.

But this fell flat in the eyes of the Chinese, according to Gripsholm repatriates. In the first place, these rights had not been fully enjoyed in Japanese-occupied China, where the majority of Allied economic interests and personnel were concentrated in the treaty ports, like Shanghai.

JAPS BEAT US TO DRAW

Furthermore the Japanese beat us to the draw on this move and not only "relinquished" their own extraterritorial rights but handed back to puppet Chinese regimes the International Settlement in Shanghai, the foreign concessions at Hankow, Shanghai, Tientsin, and elsewhere, and the diplomatic quarter in Peiping.

To the Chinese, say repatriates, it looked as though the allies were belatedly giving up what they no longer possessed.

But it was a different story when the American Congress repealed the Chinese exclusion laws. This had not been done by the time these repatriates left occupied China but word had got around that it was going to be done and the Chinese were talking about it.

Repatriates say that the Chinese are quietly jubilant that America is voluntarily wiping out what the Chinese always considered to be an affront to their national and racial honor.

The Chinese think of it as one more sign that America considers China and her people capable of pulling their own weight in the world to come.

Then China was asked to sign the four-power declaration at Moscow. To Chungking this meant that China was going places and was on her way.

Repatriates report, too, that the Chinese were somewhat surprised—and pleasantly

so—when America gave Mme. Chiang Kai-shek such a tremendous official and popular ovation during her visit here last year.

They know now we meant it.

To sum up:

The average Chinese now knows two important things, repatriates say. He is happy that Americans no longer have a law on their statute books which singles him out as a Chinese and exclude him from even theoretical residence in this country.

CALLED BEST NEWS EVER

And he knows that his leader, Chiang Kai-shek, has gone far to the west of Cairo and there conferred for days with Lu Ssu-fu and Ch'iu Chi-erh (the Chinese names for Roosevelt and Churchill), and that this has never happened before to any Chinese leader.

Chungking officials said of the Cairo conference: "The best news ever printed in the Chinese press."

The news has penetrated even to occupied China. And a measure of what the meeting means to the Orient is seen in the way the Tokyo radio handled the story.

At first Tokyo propagandists belittled the meeting and did not intimate that Chiang had attended for China. Then they mentioned, as if casually, that the generalissimo was there.

Yes, "face" means much in the Far East, and the presence of China's leader at Cairo, representing his country as one of the "big four" powers of the United Nations, gave "face" to China on a scale that can hardly be comprehended except against the background of oriental ideas and history.

The best Tokyo could do was to try to gloss it over.

Editorial Comment on Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorials dealing with the Moscow Conference, indicating why many persons feel the conference was a most constructive solution of the situation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa Tribune of November 10, 1943]

MR. HOOVER AT MOSCOW

The big man at Moscow turns out to be Herbert Hoover and not Mr. Hull. Despite the monumental flood of diabolical falsehoods which the conscienceless New Dealers have let loose against the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, in his simple capacity as a very helpful citizen, has rendered and is rendering an unseen service to our times which political littleness is studiously refusing to reveal.

At Moscow Mr. Hull and Mr. Stalin got together on high grounds. The common grounds of their agreement are precisely the recommendations and almost precisely the words of Herbert Hoover and his associate in foreign-policy advocacy, Mr. Hugh Gibson.

The Moscow Declaration is the adoption of Mr. Hoover's and Mr. Gibson's proposed methods of making peace. Their proposal was: "A temporary trusteeship of leadership by collaboration of a few leading nations, a provisional peace for each defeated country, a transition period and an ultimate world institution to preserve peace. * * * No general peace conference, no long armistice, no long-term military alliances."

In its peace phases the Moscow Declaration is notable by the absence of any reference to a general peace conference or any armistice or any long-term military alliances. Instead it envisages:

(a) The leadership by the 4 leading powers and action by joining consultation and collaboration.

(b) A "transition" period after surrender and "pending" the establishment of some sort of world organization to preserve peace during which the leading nations will establish law and order.

(c) The creation of such a world organization "based on the principle of the sovereign equality * * * and open to membership by all nations."

It is immaterial who is given credit for the creation of principles and policies that affect the people's peace here and throughout the world. The important thing is, has anyone created policies, programs, and purposes that may contribute to the permanency of peace?

[From the Kansas City Star of November 8, 1943]

THE HOOVER PLAN AT MOSCOW

For the last 18 months Herbert Hoover, with the collaboration of Hugh Gibson, career diplomat, has been pounding away at what he has called a new approach to the problem of lasting peace. As a result of the experience at Versailles, Mr. Hoover has been urging that there should be no long armistice and no general peace conference, but a transition period for the defeated nations in which the Allies should take the necessary measures to keep order and get them on their feet economically, and then should develop a world organization to preserve peace.

It is remarkable how closely the Moscow agreements adhere to this plan. At Moscow it was provided that the four great powers should fight the war to unconditional surrender and then through "rapid and orderly transition from war to peace" that they collaborate to provide against violation of the terms imposed on the enemy. Later, "at the earliest practicable date," these powers are to set up an international organization to maintain peace, to which all peace-loving nations are to be admitted.

It is impossible to know to what extent the Hoover proposals influenced the deliberations at Moscow. But it may be assumed that Secretary Hull was familiar with them, and that the former President made an important contribution to the setlement there reached.

[From the Detroit Free Press of November 14, 1943]

Then came the calm, simple, text-book-style volume of Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, entitled "The Problems of Lasting Peace." They followed this up by a brilliant series in Collier's Weekly and by radio and platform addresses. They spoke as trained historians and statesmen. The Moscow compact might have been altogether prepared from their pages both in tone and substance.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of November 19, 1943]

The Hoover-Gibson insistence that the four great powers should be the trustees of peace until rehabilitation is well along the way, was heeded at Moscow and made part of the declaration.

[From the New York Sun of November 11, 1943]

MR. HULL COMES HOME

It transpires that when Mr. Hull departed for Moscow he took with him a document which was basically almost the same as that which afterward appeared as the joint declaration * * * but in it also are ideas elaborated by * * * in particularly certain ideas advocated by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson in their book, The Problems of Lasting Peace. It was evidently a composite of what he considered the best American thought with which Mr. Hull armed himself.

[From the New York World-Telegram, San Francisco News, and Columbus (Ohio) Citizen, November 3, 1943]

Much as the Moscow conference pledges inspired new hope of total victory and a durable peace, pledges alone don't produce results. Allied unity—the key to our hopes—has been promised before without creating close cooperation. The Moscow meeting not only talked, it acted.

It apparently accepted the premise of Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, and of others, that peace making cannot be confined to a single big post-war conference which tries to settle everything; that the process should be continuous over a transitional period, in which the major powers provide prompt leadership and order to enable a stricken Europe to revive. To establish an international organization takes time; but immediate problems of restoration, after the firing ceases, will not wait.

[From the New York Times of November 11, 1943]

SOME CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

The State Department committees which, under the general guidance of Secretary Hull * * * drafted the text of the main declaration of Moscow * * * did not include Herbert Hoover. * * * Yet the text reveals how directly * * * contributed to the great achievement. * * *

The part played by Mr. Hoover, however, in association with Hugh Gibson, is not so well realized, but the blueprint of Moscow bears, among others, the Hoover-Gibson signature, and in very large letters. * * * he and Mr. Gibson offered the most detailed modus operandi.

A comparison of their proposals with the declaration of Moscow reveals a striking parellel. Except for the fact that the four powers assigned the transition world trusteeship to themselves instead of having themselves elected by the United Nations, no important disparity is visible.

They suggested the "temporary trusteeship" of the four powers, acting by collaboration and consultation; a provisional peace for each defeated country; a transition period instead of a long armistice; no general peace conference; no long-term military alliances; and an ultimate world association of nations. The Moscow Declaration omits any referense to an armistice, a long-term military alliance or a general peace conference; provides for provisional peace pacts; endorses an ultimate world association and sets up the four powers to act as peace keepers by joint consultation and collaboration.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript Telegram of November 12, 1943]

The part played by Mr. Hoover, however, in association with Hugh Gibson, is not so well realized. But the blueprint of Moscow bears among others, the Hoover-Gibson signature and in very large letters.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald of November 2, 1943]

The peace that is established following the present war must be based upon mutual understanding. The groundwork and the foundation for that understanding seems to have been established in part through the conference of American, British, and Russian diplomats who have been meeting in Moscow during the past 2 weeks.

Ex-President Herbert Hoover, who has advocated a transition period after the war for the framing of a just and lasting peace, makes this important observation in a recent address:

"After the last war the world rushed to a great peace conference with thousands of delegates from 40 nations, thinking that the signing of a piece of paper could quiet the forces which had been set in motion.

"There was idealism at that conference. But idealism died in the inevitable conflict of purpose among desperate peoples under the war heat of nationalism. The paper they signed stimulated instead of quieting many of the underlying causes of conflict in the world."

[From the Hartford Courant of November 5, 1943]

THE HOOVER-GIBSON PLAN

In May 1942, former President Herbert Hoover and Mr. Hugh Gibson, former Ambassador to Belgium, published their book entitled "The Problems of Lasting Peace." In it they dealt with the dynamic forces that make for both war and peace and described the various methods that had been employed down through the years to preserve peace. They discussed in broad outlines the efforts that had been made through the Holy Alliance, the Quadruple Alliance, the Concert of Powers, the Hague Conferences and the Treaty of Versailles to make effective the will of peace. In conclusion they suggested that there should be "a new and different approach to the whole machinery of peacemaking" following the end of the present war.

We regarded this book at the time as the most notable contribution that had yet been made to the subject of peace, and we ventured to predict that the principles it laid down would find increasing acceptance the more they were studied. It must therefore be very gratifying to Messrs. Hoover and Gibson to find that the agreement reached at Moscow so fully accords with their conception of the steps that should be taken toward the establishment of world peace.

Their proposal was for a temporary trusteeship by collaboration of a few leading nations, a provisional peace for each defeated country, a transition period and an ultimate world organization to preserve peace, but no general peace conference, no long armistice, no long-term military alliances. Conspicuous in the Moscow Declaration is the absence of any reference to a general peace conference, or to an armistice or to any long-term military alliances.

These three quoted paragraphs from the Moscow agreement are exactly in accord with the program for peace negotiations laid down by Messrs. Hoover and Gibson as outlined in The Problems of Lasting Peace and as subsequently developed by Mr. Hoover in a series of widely heard broadcasts.

"The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China * * * united in their determination * * * conscious of their responsibility * * * to continue hostilities * * * until * * * unconditional surrender. * * * That their united action * * * will be continued for organization and maintenance of peace and security * * * they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations * * * with view to joint action. * * *

"Recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace * * * that for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security * * * they will consult * * * as occasion requires * * * with view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations * * * will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy * * * will take all measures * * * to provide against violation of the terms imposed on the enemy."

"That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of peace."

In some quarters the Hoover-Gibson proposals were received with doubts and skepticism; in others they were ridiculed. But generally there was a disposition to accept them as a realistic approach to the problems of peace. It now develops that Messrs. Hull, Eden, and Molotov arrived at conclusions almost identical with those reached and expounded by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Gibson, both of whom were at Versailles and saw the forces of fear, hate, and revenge developed in a treaty that proved to be nothing but a prelude to the present war.

[From the Binghamton Sun of November 8, 1943]

THE HOOVER INFLUENCE

Adoption in the Moscow Declaration of the Hoover-Gibson proposed method of making peace has been nothing short of astonishing to admirers of the former President.

The Hoover-Gibson proposal was "a temporary trusteeship or leadership by collaboration of a few leading nations, a provisional peace for each defeated country, a transition period and an ultimate world institution to preserve peace—no general peace conference, no long armistice, no long-term military alliances."

In its peace phases the Moscow Declaration is notable by the absence of any reference to a general peace conference or any armistice or any long-term military alliance.

In the parallel Mr. Hoover's friends are finding a great deal of satisfaction. * * * Mr. Hoover advances his ideas in the line of unselfish service to his country. They have never been copyrighted. On the contrary, free use of them has been invited, with or without credit.

That the Moscow conferees have seen fit to incorporate some of them into the declaration is something of far greater significance than an indirect compliment to the one American best qualified to speak on international affairs.

[From the Virginia (Minn.) Daily Enterprise of November 19, 1943]

HOOVER POSITION STRENGTHENED IN WILLKIE'S WORLD PEACE VIEW

Instead of a long armistice and an unwieldy general peace conference such as were sequel to the ending of World War No. 1, former President Hoover long ago advocated another approach to the problems which will be begging consideration when the present global conflict bogs down to its finale, and it is evident that the mechanics which he urged are emerging in the blueprints being drafted by various statesmen among the principal Allies. Mr. Hoover put strong emphasis on a role of trusteeship for the leading victors among the United Nations, a responsibility which he believed should put upon these principals the obligation to organize a transitional period for the eventual peace, developing an accord to which all countries would subscribe and be party to, as the vehicle for sustained collaboration and cooperation were evolved.

Undeniably, the Moscow Conference has produced what may well be a beginning or a first step in the plan for organization advocated by Mr. Hoover, for in its consummation the four principals among the United Nations—the natural trustees—have reached an agreement which accents declared joint purposes, and provides the machinery for further, broad understandings and commitments, as time and occasion demand.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of November 4, 1943]

THE HOPE FROM MOSCOW

What the Moscow conferees contemplate in way of post-war readjustment and collaboration resembles former President Herbert Hoover's plan for a transition period between the end of hostilities and the writing of the peace. There seems to be acceptance of the thought that the United States, Britain, Russia, and China should undertake openly to act as trustees for world order after fighting stops, consulting, of course, with other United Nations. The declarations provide for the practice of collaboration, which Mr. Hoover suggests is the best way for nations to learn the possibilities and the problems of getting along together.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of November 15, 1943]

HOOVER AND MOSCOW

In our editorial discussion after the Moscow Conference, we suggested that the four-power declaration embodied the plan of former President Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson for a transition period between the end of the fighting and the writing of the final peace. A number of others now share this view.

Arthur Krock, writing in the New York Times, says: "The part played by Mr. Hoover in association with Hugh Gibson is not so well realized, but the blueprint of Moscow bears, among others, the Hoover-Gibson signature, in very large letters. A comparison of their proposals with the declaration of Moscow reveals a striking parallel. Except for the fact that the four powers assigned the transition world trusteeship to themselves instead of having themselves elected by the United Nations, no important disparity is visible."

The Kansas City Star says: "It is remarkable how closely the Moscow agreements adhere to this (the Hoover-Gibson) plan. It is impossible to know to what extent the Hoover proposals influenced the deliberations at Moscow. But it may be assumed that Secretary Hull was familiar with them and that the former President made an important contribution to the settlement there reached."

It takes no credit from Secretary Hull and those with whom he conferred at Moscow to say that they were influenced by the Hoover-Gibson thinking. Rather, it is to their credit that they were big enough to recognize the great good sense of the transition plan.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of November 16, 1943]

PRINCIPLES FOR A LASTING PEACE

The greatest problem that confronts this generation is the prevention of future wars. When we measure the misery and the cost of modern warfare, other problems fade into insignificance by comparison with the need for preventing a periodic recurrence of devastating struggles like that of 1914–18 and the present holocaust.

Secretary of State Hull yesterday clarified the procedure that the United Nations mean to follow in laying the basis for lasting peace. Great Britain, Russia, and the United States reached agreement at Moscow on certain basic principles.

This procedure should receive the wholehearted endorsement of all schools of opinion in the United States. In fact, it follows strikingly the conclusions reached by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson in their book on The Problems of Lasting Peace.

Naturally, difficulties will arise in applying these and other principles to specific situations. It is significant, however, that the basic points in the Moscow Declaration parallel so closely the proposals advanced by a former President of the United States who is one of the heads of the opposition political party in this country, and who has had a notable wealth of experience in world affairs. Clearly, a sound basis exists for that agreement on the principles of peace in this country which Secretary Hull asked in his press interview yesterday.

[From the Virginia Daily Enterprise]

Principal points in the understandings which have been reached convey the impression that they are singularly parallel to the recommendations which former President Herbert Hoover made only a few days ago. There is emphasis on cooperation and collaboration among the principal allied countries, and provision made for consultive action and collective effort to include all of the United Nations, "to bring about a practicable general agreement * * * in the post-war period."

Mr. Hoover appealed strongly for the kind of international cooperation and collaboration which would not subordinate nor compromise the sovereignty of any country. Newspapers which think in terms of Europe rather than the United States criticized him, yet the Moscow Conference produced just this kind of a pact, indicated in these words: "That they (the principal signatories) recognized the necessity of establishing at the earliest practical date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of peace and security." In all respects Mr. Hoover's suggestion for a transitional period to follow the war's end is substantially accepted, with the leading allies as trustee nations.

[From New York Newsweek of November 22, 1943]

Hoover (along with his collaborator, Hugh Gibson) detailed the plan for a four-power trusteeship during the beginning of the peace—the plan which became the core of the Moscow agreement.

Alley Slums in the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Washington Post condemning the shameful conditions existing in the slum alleys of the National Capital.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE PAID IN LIVES

Winter has begun early this year to take its toll of victims from Washington's wretched huts that offer so little protection against the cold. We may be sure that the two infants who died from exposure to last week's subfreezing temperatures and the woman who was fatally burned will not be the only casualties on this much-neglected home front. Housing that is not fit for occupancy by cattle always accounts for a substantial number of deaths in the Capital during the cold weather.

Most of the attention has been centered in the past on the fatal burning of slum tenants. They huddle too close to stoves or they overheat stoves in a desperate effort to escape drafts from broken windows or gaping cracks in paper-thin walls. When once a fire starts in one of these tinder-box huts, it is often enveloped in flames before the victims have a chance to escape. So death by fire—which is about as horrible as anything that is experienced on the battlefield—is a common experience in Washington when cold weather comes.

Perhaps the victims of freezing are fewer only because their deaths are usually ascribed to pneumonia or some other disease which sets in when exposure has weakened the victims. But the death rates for our worst slum areas leave no doubt as to the perilous risks that every winter brings to the inhabitants of match-box hovels. If any Washingtonian or any Member of Congress questions the necessity of resuming the work of slum clearance and building new quarters for these hapless victims of frost and fire in the Nation's Capital at the earliest possible moment, we hope that he will at least acquaint himself with the cost of past neglect in terms of human lives.

Deduction of Life-Insurance Premiums From Income-Tax Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter from Ralph H. Rice, Jr., of Oklahoma City, Okla., manager of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, in support of the Wickersham bill (H. R. 3736) providing for the deduction of life-insurance premiums from income-tax returns. It reads as follows:

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Oklahoma City, Okla., December 17, 1943.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: Received your news release of November 27, and was particularly interested in it. In H. R. 3736, providing for the deduction of life-insurance premiums from income-tax returns, naturally we are all interested in keeping inflation in check, and I firmly believe that such a bill would be responsible for the public saving a larger percentage of their excess money in life-insurance contracts.

Such a bill would not only keep down inflation but also help tremendously in the sale of Government bonds because the more insurance bought today, the more money going into bonds. For your information, all the major companies in the business have invested 113 percent of their current reserves in United States Government bonds. The reason it is running over 100 percent is that there are a lot of old investments being paid off and they, in turn, today are being invested in Government bonds. Our company alone has invested in Government bonds over $2,000,000,000.

We heartily congratulate you on this bill and sincerely hope that it will be successful.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH H. RICE, Jr.,
Manager, the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Taxes—The Best Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a question of great importance before the country is that of new taxes. It is generally felt that some kind of additional taxes must be levied as an anti-inflation aid. After all, the raising of revenue under present conditions may be secondary to the need of curbing spending in any new tax law. Personally, I feel that there may be much merit in some kind of spending tax to curb inflationary buying. Walter Lippmann treated this matter very clearly and ably in the Washington Post on December 16, 1943. I include his article, as follows:

TAXES—THE BEST SOLUTION

(By Walter Lippmann)

All the new tax plans have now been defeated. Congress has rejected the Treasury plan. It has also rejected the sales tax. Yet the tax bill passed by the House is altogether inadequate, and it seems fairly certain that the Senate version will be still less adequate.

There is, however, no use crying over spilt milk. In fact, it may well be that all the current tax plans have failed because none of them promises to do directly, efficiently, and obviously the one thing on which the great mass of our people are agreed. None of them is unmistakably a tax designed for the single purpose of controlling the wartime inflation.

Yet it is possible to set up a purely anti-inflation tax for the emergency, a tax which not only could be but necessarily would be removed when the war is over. It is a tax which, so far as I can see, meets every rational objection to any of the current plans and combines the constructive advantages of all of them. This is the spending tax—a progressive tax levied not on income nor on the sales of the bare necessities of life but on the amount of money above a minimum spent for consumer goods by individuals and families.

Only expenditures on consumer goods—above a bare minimum which would be exempt—would be taxable. Any income which had not been spent by the end of the year would not be taxable, whether it was held in cash or in a bank balance, was invested in Government bonds, in securities, or in property, or had been paid for insurance, taxes, interest, or loaned out, or used to pay off

mortgages and debts. Money spent by a farmer or a businessman in connection with his business would not be touched by the tax. Moreover, money paid out for education, for doctors' bills, and similar desirable and noninflationary purposes, could and should be exempted. What would be taxed, and that on a rising scale, would be the money spent on those consumer goods—above the minimum—which are in short supply during the war.

The Treasury in September 1942 itself proposed such a spendings tax, and it has stated that the tax, though new, "does not require an expensive additional administrative set-up, but can be administered almost entirely on the basis of the existing income-tax organization." It is probably true that the original 1942 Treasury scheme was too complicated and was too severe; a simple and moderate use of this tax system would probably serve the purpose.

The plan should now be revived, revised, reconsidered, and laid before Congress and the country. For it is the answer to the problem, and all the contending parties to this tax argument could agree upon it without sacrificing any of the principles on which they have made their stand.

Thus there has been a strong feeling in Congress that the income tax already takes as large a proportion of men's income as it is desirable to take. The spendings tax, recognizing this condition, concerns itself not with reducing incomes but with discouraging men for the time being from spending them unnecessarily. The less a man spends and the more he saves, the less tax he pays and the more of his income he preserves.

There has been a strong feeling elsewhere that the proper tax in the emergency is a sales tax because this would hit consumption directly. But the spendings tax also hits consumption directly, and so accomplishes the same result. On the other hand it can be graduated so that the more a man spends on consumption the more he pays. Therefore, it cannot be attacked as regressive and socially unjust.

There has been a strong sentiment for some scheme of compulsory saving. The spendings tax puts a premium on savings and a penalty on nonsaving by taxing that part of an income, but only that part, which is not saved.

The spendings tax, in short, is streamlined for the one necessary purpose, while the war is on, of discouraging extravagance and of inducing thrift. It need not be complicated. It ought not to be oppressive. It is by definition temporary, since no one would think of retaining it once industry had returned to civilian production and was in need of customers.

The spendings tax is not a device for transferring private incomes to the Government Treasury. On the contrary, its primary purpose is to induce the people to keep their own money until they can safely spend it. Therefore, it backs up with powerful reinforcement all who own Government bonds, all the banks, the insurance companies, as well as all our people who have fixed salaries, pensions, soldiers' allowances, mortgages, and debts.

This is a tax which, the more successful it is, the less money it will take from the people. It is a way, therefore, of protecting the people against inflation in wartime while it leaves with the people money which they can use after the war to revive private business. It should have the support of all who intend to prevent inflation, to maintain the national credit and a sound currency, and to restore private enterprise.

Pensions for Spanish-American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 15, 1943

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and his committee on their favorable report of H. R. 2350, which increases the pensions of the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and of the widows of veterans who saw service in these conflicts. I wish to especially commend the chairman [Mr. BUCKLEY] for the clear and concise answers which he has given to the questions propounded from the floor by various Members, with the result, I am sure, that we all feel that this is a most meritorious bill and should be passed.

From the time this bill was introduced I have been in favor of it. Many Spanish-American War veterans in my district have written me about it and I advised them it would be my privilege and pleasure to support it. It seemed to me that these veterans should receive an increase in their pensions, not only because of the increased cost of living today, but primarily because their ability to be self-sustaining wanes as the years bear more heavily on their shoulders. I am pleased, therefore, that this increase provided under the bill, and as so clearly explained by the chairman, is a permanent increase and not merely one for the duration of the present emergency.

Consumers' Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as junior Member of the Congress from New Mexico, serving my first term in Congress, I have listened to the debates, I have carefully followed hearings in the committees, I have made independent investigation when in doubt, and I have voted my conclusions without much ado.

There come times, however, when the question acted upon by the Congress may be of such a nature that far-reaching consequences affecting the welfare and security of our country may be anticipated. In such a case the views and reasons which guide the individual legislator ought to be recorded. It is not only desirable, but it is expected of him by the people he represents.

Such is the subsidies question on which the House recently voted, but which is still before the Congress for final determination.

On principle I am opposed to subsidies of every kind. Nevertheless, I believe that the use of subsidies is proper and judicious at times—not only in war, but in peace. The question is squarely before us whether they should be used in the control of prices. Just before the recess of Congress last summer, I voted to prohibit the use of subsidies in the control of prices. The bill was vetoed and I voted to pass it, notwithstanding the President's veto. At that time the prices of farm products, of cattle, and of sheep were good. Opposition to subsidies came from farmers and livestock men. I felt that the price level could be held and even rolled back some in places, if need be, without the use of subsidies. Most farm and livestock prices have been held and some have been rolled back without the use of subsidies.

Between last summer and this time the picture has changed. Feed is getting harder to buy. Livestock prices are beginning to need support. Relief can be given only by increase in price of produce from livestock, or by a decrease in costs. Subsidies, judiciously used, is one answer. Opponents give us none other except to turn loose the law of supply and demand.

On my visit to New Mexico last summer I was heartily commended on many occasions for my vote then, but I became convinced that the opposition to subsidies stemmed from an understandable desire to see the prices of livestock and of livestock products increase. I have attended hearings in the committees and listened to the testimony against subsidies, with particular attenton to that coming from the livestock industry, in which my people are interested. Their testimony has only corroborated the contention of the proponents of subsidies to the effect that without their use prices will go up. Their testimony has convinced me that this is what is wanted.

Like all Members of this House, I have the greatest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. The most telling argument against subsidies was made by the gentleman from Texas. And what did he tell us in his usual frank manner? I quote:

> If these white-collar fellows need more money, let them get it—help them to get it if they are entitled to more.

It stands, therefore, uncontradicted that a prohibition against subsidies must of necessity result in a demand for higher and higher wages to meet higher and higher prices, and for higher and higher prices to meet higher and higher wages.

My distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] so understands the issue, except that he has, understandingly, begun to lose faith in our ability to hold the line. I quote from his speech on the floor:

> I found during the time I was at home this summer that the farmers seemed to have

some things bothering them, and during that time I went to several farm-bureau meetings to meet with the farmers and to find out what those problems were. Every time the farmers asked me to vote against subsidies, and every time I stood up and argued with them that I had voted for subsidies to hold prices down and control inflation, and that as the matter was then being conducted, I was going to continue to vote for subsidies. But I based that on one thing, a proviso that the line be strictly held and there be no increases in wages or other prices. I do not have to tell this group that it did not take me all summer to find out that this line had not been strictly held.

It is not my desire to question the motives of anyone in the very understandable and very human desire to improve the industry's lot by better prices for its produce. Indeed that very desire arises from fear of the future, fear in part of consequences of Government interference through subsidies. I share them myself. Every single man in my State is as patriotic as I or any Member of this Congress. But I repeat that opposition to subsidy comes from their belief that the price structure for farm and livestock produce must go up or production will suffer.

Is it for me, a representative of the people, to say no to what a large proportion of them want in my State?

Said Lincoln:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

While in New Mexico, one of the men of our industry there, in whom I repose the greatest regard, said to me, in commending me for my previous vote: "What if we do have a little inflation. A little inflation is necessary. How else are we going to pay this huge war debt?"

Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous thoughts. When the soldier returns, after the loss of months and years of his precious life, he is entitled to know whether or not we here protected the economy and security of the country or whether we opened the gates of inflation in order to get rid of the war debt.

We have appealed to the millions of working people to purchase War bonds. The question is, Are we going to keep faith with them here and with the soldiers on the battlefront? When the gun is pointed at the soldier, he does not retreat.

When we are threatened by some of our constituents—no matter how sincerely they may feel about it—unless we can in conscience agree with them that the prohibition of subsidies as an evil will not bring upon the Nation a greater evil, it would be unworthy of us to capitulate.

We require of the soldier that he leave good-paying jobs—we cannot demand of his dependents that they stand the squeeze of those who remain behind clamoring for higher and higher prices.

We require of the teacher that he remain at his post, and we refuse to heed his plea for Federal aid that he may get wages commensurate with the high cost of living—we cannot demand that he absorb the impact of uncontrolled prices—certainly not from any sudden resurgence of pious considerations about paying for his grocery bill. The teacher has never been a mendicant. Let us not accuse him of being one now.

Nor can the Congress avoid this responsibility. We may direct and limit the use of subsidies. We may prohibit their use. But each of us as Members must discharge that responsibility, and it is not enough to say, "This is what my State wants."

The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] offered an amendment limiting subsidies in amount to $700,000,000, and in time to September 1, 1944. I supported this amendment. The majority in the Congress did not favor this or any other amendment. I, along with other Members of Congress who felt as I did, then voted on the record against the Commodity Credit Corporation bill carrying total prohibition against the use of subsidies, as a warning that the leaders in Congress had better begin reasonable efforts to find a working basis with our Commander in Chief. An uncompromising attitude on the part of either is harmful to the country. Our system of government requires an honest, sincere effort to adjust our differences of opinion for the common good and the common goal. Republican and Democratic leaders in the Senate opposed to subsidies have shown a commendable desire to reach a common ground with those in charge of prices and of the war economy of our country.

It is our earnest hope that agreement may result. If not, I for one shall support the President should he again deem it necessary to veto this unreasonable total prohibition against subsidies.

Newspaper and radio commentators, whose business it is to analyze the cause and effect of the news of the day, and whose motives are not affected by personal political considerations, have constantly pointed to the need for subsidies as a weapon—not new in this country in peacetimes, and made use of by every country in wartime.

In the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, November 17, 1943, Raymond Clapper had this to say:

OBSCENE GRAB

(By Raymond Clapper)

Apparently we are set to be taken for a cynical profiteer's ride into uncontrolled price inflation.

Everything around here points to that.

Unorganized consumers, unorganized workers, salaried men and women, millions of them, are for all practical purposes unrepresented at Washington right now. They are about to be handed the big gyp.

Congress is surrounded by lobbyists who know what they want. They want the lid taken off prices. That is what the lawyer representing the Texas cattle growers told the Senate Agriculture Committee this week. A Senator asked what he wanted in place of price control. He said he wanted the law of supply and demand.

That is a polite way of asking for a profiteer's market. Bernard Baruch has said a lot about that. With the Government, the war, as the big customer for everything, you cannot have normal operation of supply and demand as a price regulator. Demand is abnormal because of the war. Of course, everybody knows that. This is only a demand for collecting all that the traffic will bear under these abnormal conditions.

The figures show that what is being done now to hold down meat prices as against what happened in the last war when prices were uncontrolled, as the cattlemen's lawyer advocates now.

Here are the Bureau of Labor statistics retail price increases for the war years July 1914–18 and the corresponding price increases in the 4 years of this war. In percentages the figures are as follows:

	1914–18	1939–43
Round steak	65.2	14.3
Rib roast	59.3	16.6
Chuck roast	72.2	29.3
Pork chops	70.0	23.0
Bacon	90.9	38.8
Sliced ham	75.2	13.4

Please look back over those figures and see how much better the housewife has been protected against rising prices this time.

Ordinary meat prices went up 70 percent in many cases in the last war. This time the increases run from 15 percent, and the highest quoted is 38 percent.

With the scarcity of meat available to consumers, you can well imagine what prices would be charged if we went back to supply and demand as the cattlemen want.

They are not doing so badly either. In the last war the price of live cattle went up 58 percent, but this time they are getting 89 percent more than at the start of the war. Hog prices went up 102 percent in the last war, and this time they are up 150 percent.

The cattlemen are not the only ones who are down here with a blackjack. The labor crowd is running wild, demanding resignations from the War Labor Board, hammering Congress to overrule Economic Stabilization Director Vinson and grant a larger wage increase than he authorized. Ickes is asking higher coal prices than O. P. A. recommends because of the increased wages given to John Lewis.

It is a sickening thing to see happening in wartime, this greedy raid all around. American men are dying all around the world, and Washington is engulfed in an obscene grab for the almighty dollar.

These pressure groups are running wild. Washington is being terrorized, and every politician is fleeing for his life to fall in with the demand to break up price control and allow the cost of living to bounce up as high as the war shortages will carry it.

We are in serious danger. The greatest danger is that men in Washington are not standing up to it. We are not proving ourselves worthy of the men at the front if we give way now at home to an orgy of profiteering with everybody grabbing for rich white meat from the carcass of this war for security and peace.

Speech of Judge Charles A. Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by Judge Charles A. Graham, of Denver, Chairman of the National War Labor Board of the ninth region.

This speech was delivered at the Utah State Bar Annual Convention, December 4, 1943, and is so informative and covers

the subject so thoroughly and well that I feel that it should be read by everyone:

You in Salt Lake City are fortunate. The coming of large-scale industry has been postponed until relatively recently and you have been spared the birth pangs attending the development of sensible, wholesome industrial relations. In large industrial areas that development has been one of travail and often of violence. But our winning of the battle of production in this war means that we have at last solved the basic problems, that we have achieved maturity in labor relations. The road has been long and tortuous.

As lawyers we are all aware of the nature of industrial relations prior to this last decade. With the development of large-scale production, organizations of workingmen grew in strength and numbers until they were able to overcome the early common-law concept which branded combinations of workers to improve their conditions as conspiracy. We witnessed bloody, open strife between employers of labor and their employees. My own State of Colorado has been the site of very costly examples of this open warfare. Leadville, the Ludlow massacre, and Cripple Creek are milestones of a civil war that was being waged among American citizens. We recall, too, the deputization of private policemen, the infamous coal police which has in recent years been stamped out in Pennsylvania. The Republic Steel Memorial Day massacre in 1937 climaxed a period of fights between labor and police in many cities and in many areas.

I need not dwell upon the lore of the labor injunction, its excesses and futilities, or the use of the Antitrust Act in labor disputes.

All will now agree that this early period in labor relations was costly, senseless, wasteful, and brutal. It was a period best described as anarchic in which the doctrine of dog eat dog held away. Victory for either side was pyrrhic always, and always temporary.

Perhaps the climax of this era of anarchy was reached just prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932. There we have the cornerstone of the new orientation toward labor relations. Lawyers think now of that act as a limitation on the use of the labor injunction, but let us glance at another basic provision:

"It is necessary that he [the individual worker] have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection."

The act had no teeth. It was an expression of what farsighted labor and industry thought to be businesslike and salutary, but the concept of freedom of self-organization to the end of collective bargaining was still held only by the farsighted. In 1935 a new statute was passed with teeth, but some of the leaders of our bar thought the teeth were false and brittle and advised that they be disregarded. Other leading members of the bar in the Supreme Court of the United States saw otherwise. Suddenly the right to bargain collectively became the law of the land.

To many the concept was new, but it took on meaning at an amazingly rapid pace. For 160 years our concept of democracy had permitted employers to deal with their employees arbitrarily and individually. In the very few years succeeding the Jones & Laughlin decision in 1937 it had become common understanding that there could be no discrimination to discourage union membership, that employers might not foist dominated unions on their employees, that they might not refuse to bargain collectively with duly chosen representatives, and it became common knowledge, too, that these were not ends in themselves, that the right of labor to organize had for its objective to replace anarchy in labor relations by businesslike bargaining across the conference table.

These things became common knowledge. More significantly they became a part of our national way of life. Your State, among others, has given them State sanction through separate legislation. I do not mean that collective bargaining is now universally carried out. I do mean that collective bargaining has become established in the mores of our Nation as well as in statutory law. The most case-hardened individualist now pays lip service to the principle of collective bargaining. It has become just as much a mark of social unregeneracy to attack collective bargaining as to attack other basic civil rights—free speech or a free press.

This, then, is the law and the ethical code for industrial relations—that the techniques of open warfare are superseded by the methods of business—bargaining between the parties.

Of course, the sanction underlying the bargaining process remained the right to resort to economic force. Thus in peacetime a party dissatisfied with the progress of negotiations might resort to a strike or to a lockout.

But in time of war the national interest cannot permit the free exercise of this sanction, cannot afford interruptions of the orderly business relationships between labor and industry and the consequent interruption of vital war production. Hence, it became of paramount importance that there should be a machinery which could effectively cope with situations in which collective bargaining failed of the desired result.

The abandonment of the right to resort to economic force came quickly as a concomitant of patriotism. Immediately after Pearl Harbor labor and industry gave their no-strike no-lockout pledge and, with a notorious exception, have fulfilled that pledge. It is a matter of record and a fact to which we cannot give too great emphasis that there has not been one authorized A. F. L. or C. I. O. strike in this war period.

The machinery which was to provide a substitute for strikes and lockouts as a way of settling labor disputes not resolved through collective bargaining was set up by the President's Executive Order No. 9017 on January 12, 1942, and was confirmed by Congressional action on June 25, 1943. This machinery is the National War Labor Board. As you know this war-time substitute has worked well; it has been successful beyond the fondest hopes of the President and of industry and labor.

Perhaps this success can be attributed in part to the fact that industry was given a voice equal to that of the public representatives in the determination of the policies of the agency, and that labor was given an equal voice. The experience of the representatives of industry and of labor on the Board and the fact that they have been able to apply that experience not in partisan fashion but in a fashion calculated to aid the public interest, has, in general, meant the wisest solution of the labor problems presented to the Board. I say "wisest" advisedly because it has not been the purpose of the National War Labor Board or any of its agencies to decide a case on the premise that one of the parties is right and the other wrong. It has been the steadfast purpose of the Board so to adjust labor difficulties that the adjustment will lead to the greatest satisfaction of both parties and the greatest production for war. To this end the Board has been guided extensively by reference to the practices of industry and labor in their collective and unilateral actions in the period preceding the present emergency. The attempt has been made to adjust current labor disputes in accordance with the past practices, taking into account, also, the national interest.

Perhaps, too, the decentralization of the National War Labor Board has been effective because the men on the Regional Boards are drawn from the localities in which the labor disputes arise and know the industrial customs and practices of those localities. That is why we have attempted, in setting up the initial hearing panels for labor dispute cases, to choose men as close as possible to the community so as to secure the closest approximation of community thinking on the problem which is causing the difficulty.

The first, and with one exception, the most frequently recurring problem which has come before the Board involves the issue of union security. One is prone to overlook the fact that in the past decade a frequent cause, if not the most frequent cause, of labor disputes arose from this very issue. To employees the existence of a stable union organization means the ability, through their union, efficiently to take care of their individual day-to-day grievances which can never be disposed of by the mere signing of a union agreement. To an employer who has not been accustomed to collective bargaining the existence of a stable organization appears to threaten his ability to make unilateral determination of problems affecting his relations with employees. This is why the first thing that a union seeks to achieve is some degree of union security, whether this be as extensive as the closed shop or as limited as the maintenance-of-membership-with-escape-clause, with which those of you who have followed the work of the Board are well acquainted.

In the war period the public, too, became interested in some measure of union stability. If the employees were to give their utmost in terms of uninterrupted, interested, and devoted effort to war production, it became necessary that their time and energy not be diverted to the problem of keeping the union organization intact. If the employees and their representatives do not have to look to that problem at every turn, it was hoped—I am happy to say, realistically—that they can devote their thinking and their energies to the problem of getting more war goods off the assembly line.

The standard maintenance-of-membership clause which the National War Labor Board has made familiar is the most limited form of union security. Essentially the Board's maintenance-of-membership formula affords an employee member of a labor organization 15 days in which to decide whether he wishes to remain a member of the union, with the understanding that if he decides not to withdraw from membership he must remain a member for the duration of the contract, usually 1 year, or leave the employ of the company.

The Board's maintenance-of-membership formula thus protects the collective rights of the employees and, at the same time, gives to the individual employee freedom of choice in determining whether to remain a member of the labor organization. The organization, because of the security it has attained, can devote itself to the improvement of its efforts to win the war and to obtaining benefits for its members. The individual employee has the choice of getting these benefits by deciding to remain a member, and the return obligation, if he accepts these benefits, to maintain his membership for the duration of the contract.

Again I am proud to say that this has worked well. It was a compromise position, admittedly. As Dr. Frank Graham, of the National Board, said in the Little Steel cases:

"The Board protects the rights of the majority and the minority, rejects the union's demand for a union shop and compulsory check-off, and rejects the companies' demand for no change in present union status. The

Board decides in favor of the voluntarily accepted maintenance of membership and check-off of these members of the union who are in good standing on the fifteenth day after this directive order, or who may thereafter voluntarily join the union. This provision is not a closed shop, is not a union shop, and is not a preferential shop. No old employee and no new employee is required to join the union to keep his job. If in the union, a member has the freedom for 15 days to get out and keep his job. If not in the union, the worker has the freedom to stay out and keep his job. This freedom to join or not to join, to stay in or get out, with foreknowledge of being bound by this clause as a condition of employment during the term of the contract, provides for both individual liberty and union security."

This is one compromise that has proved worth its weight in copper.

In a number of other substantive issues, the thinking of the War Labor Board has evinced a tendency toward standardization. As an implement to the maintenance of membership provision, for example, the Board not infrequently grants the check-off of union dues. The maintenance provision itself requires union members to keep up their dues and the check-off merely provides an efficient substitute for individual dues collections. Here again, Utah law affords a parallel in the requirement that employers shall honor voluntary wage assignments.

The Board's policy on vacations has also become relatively crystallized. In the normal case, 1 week's paid vacation will be ordered for employees with 1 year's service, and 2 weeks for employees with 5 years' service.

In the absence of agreement as to the effective date of wage increases, the Board makes the new provisions retroactive to the expiration of the last contract. When the dispute involves a first contract the provisions are made retroactive to the date the dispute was certified to the National Board.

So, too, the Board has repeatedly enforced a policy of equal pay for equal work. No wage differential will be permitted where work performed by women is comparable in quality and quantity to that performed by men. Nor does this policy permit a distinction between white and colored rates.

I have mentioned a few of the substantive provisions governing labor relations which the Board has come to apply with greater or less regularity. Increasingly, both industry and labor are realizing what to expect from the Board and are settling between themselves those issues as to which Board policy appears to be relatively stabilized.

Those of you who are most intimately acquainted with industrial relations know that it is the salesman and not the engineer who makes th best personnel manager. That to me is a very interesting fact. It is interesting because it places proper emphasis upon the point that industrial relations is essentially a part of human relations and it gives us a clue to the most vital point in industrial relations, namely, that it is the day-to-day dealings and the day-to-day grievances which are important in the achievement of industrial peace. Too often it has been thought by both industry and labor alike that the signing of an agreement insured industrial peace for the duration of the agreement. That is hardly true. It is the carrying out of the agreement in all its phases which insures industrial peace.

Lawyers are perhaps best acquainted with the problems of interpretation that arise in a simple business deal. Add to the usual number of such problems a situation in which the agreement may affect some thousands of employees and some hundreds of management representatives and you have some idea of the problems of interpretation that arise in the application of a collective bargaining contract. That is why the grievance clause becomes the most important clause in collective bargaining agreement. That is why I urge all of you who have anything to do with industrial relations to make sure that the grievance clause is completely workable and completely effective.

Typically, we have a grievance clause providing for a number of steps, or levels, at which a grievance may be discussed. Employee A, for example, may feel that he was slighted in being laid off before Employee B was laid off. Under the agreement seniority may have been the decisive factor and a question has arisen because Employee A joined the company before Employee B, but had some periods of extended illnesses which led to Employee B having a longer record of working time. The grievance machinery would typically provide that Employee A discuss the matter with his foreman with or without his union representative, the shop steward, present. If they fail to reach an agreement, the matter might be discussed at the next level by the shop steward for the department and the department foreman. If they fail to reach an agreement, the next level of discussion would be between the shop steward's committee and the head of the foremen, or other management representatives at that level. If an agreement could not be reached, the matter would go to the representative of the local union and the representatives of management at the plant and, if agreement could not be reached at that level, between the representatives of the international union and the representatives of the company's president or owner.

It is no longer surprising to people to see how many and what a large proportion of grievances are settled at one level or another. There are a few, however, which remain unsettled because they may involve important matters of interpretation as to which neither side is willing to yield and thus establish a precedent. Ideally, these situations should be taken care of by an arbitration procedure which is set up as the terminal point of the grievance machinery. If the parties fail to agree at the top level of discussion provided for in the grievance machinery, the matter is referred to an arbitrator or a board of arbitration chosen by the parties for the particular occasion or set up in advance as a permanent body or permanent arbitrator, as is the practice in the clothing industry or the shipping industry on the Pacific coast, and more recently, in the Chrysler and Ford contracts.

It is more essential than ever in this war period that such arbitration machinery be provided. Experience has shown, and it is not paradoxical when you think it through, that the existence of an arbitration clause as the terminal point of the grievance machinery results in a greater proportion of settlements of grievances at some stage prior to arbitration. The reason for this is fairly clear. The parties prefer to have a hand themselves in the settlement of their problems, when they themselves can control the give and take that is necessary, rather than referring the decision to a third party. The absence of arbitration procedures on the other hand leads to a greater number of unsettled grievances, a greater number of cases for the National War Labor Board to handle and, necessarily, despite the efforts by the Board to apply community thinking as much as possible to the particular labor problem, to a greater degree of remoteness in the solution of the difficulty.

One other word of advice to those of you who may be framing a labor agreement. It is wise to define grievances. This will insure that the issues which may be presented to the arbitrator arises out of interpretation of the agreement or out of the day-to-day work of employee—not issues of changes in the basic terms and conditions of employment. If grievances are properly defined it will preclude both parties from arguing that the subject matter of the dispute is not properly a matter of arbitration.

As I have said, the attempt by the War Labor Board has been to conform to community and industry practices and to achieve as closely as possible those solutions to disputes which the parties themselves would have achieved by collective bargaining had not the war distorted the normal conditions for such bargaining.

The other, and perhaps the even more challenging tales of the National War Labor Board, has been the gigantic problem of wage stabilization. You will recall that on April 27, 1942, President Roosevelt in a radio address indicated the outlines of a seven-point program to combat inflation. Wage stabilization was one basic line of defense. The others—price control, credit control, savings, anti-inflation tax program—are also familiar to you. Of the various points of defense against inflation, the wage stabilization front has been the one most generally held. Dr. George W. Taylor, Vice Chairman of the National War Labor Board, issued on August 27, 1943, the following figures:

1. Average factory wage rates were increased by the War Labor Board less than 1 cent an hour during the first 8 months of the wage-stabilization program.

2. Average hourly earnings rose 6.7 percent in this period and average weekly earnings rose 10.7 percent.

3. In this same period of time munitions production rose approximately 40 percent.

4. This is due to the fact that men had worked longer hours, workers have transferred from lower skilled and lower paid civilian duties to higher skilled and higher paid war production jobs, and the same men on the same jobs have worked harder and produced more goods.

This is by way of National War Labor Board action. Investigation by the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the Department of Labor, who sample pretty generally the wage employment practices of the country, indicates that violations of the wage stabilization program, except in a few limited areas, are minor. The National War Labor Board is vigorously attacking that problem in those few areas. As you know, the sanctions are extremely severe and the attempt has been to seek the fullest results from an educational program before the full application of the sanctions is attempted. Nevertheless, we are going ahead with the enforcement of the national wage-stabilization program with special attention to the most delinquent areas.

I need not discuss with attorneys the details of the wage-stabilization program. Essentially, wages are to be kept stabilized as of September 15, 1942. Cost-of-living increases, based on the concept that the cost of living rose 15 percent in the period of January 1 to September 15, 1942, are permitted on the basis of the so-called Little Steel formula.

The flexibility which we are accustomed to associate with all usual wage-rate structures is still permitted in terms of appropriately checked schedules permitting merit and seniority increases. You will find all this set forth with clarity in our General Order No. 31. The adjustments which would have been inevitable in peacetime in a wage-rate structure which had different rates of pay for identical work may still be made upon approval by the War Labor Board, and we direct such adjustments for what we call intraplant inequities.

Adjustments to eliminate rates which reflect substandards of living may also be made by the regional and national boards.

The administration of the wage-stabilization program, which probably affects every family in the country, has been simplified to a remarkable degree. It has become generally known, in a period of a year (and this

is not a long period for such a basic change in thinking) that adjustments in wages cannot be made without the approval of the Board. Generally, too, it has become known that the safest procedure is not oneself to interpret the exceptions to the new principle that wages cannot be adjusted without permission, but to seek advice from the ever helpful wage-and-hour inspectors. These people in the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions have been doing a wonderful job for us, in the sense that they have been doing a wonderful job for industry and labor in advising them of the national wage stabilization program. My best advise to attorneys who have problems involving wage stabilization is to consult the local wage-and-hour office. This is not only because you will get the best advice possible, but because in following their ruling on any problem you will secure protection and insurance against penalties that are most stringent.

I have said that it is the proud boast of the National War Labor Board that it has held the line on wages. There has been unevenness in the application of the anti-inflation program and other segments of the front have not been held as well. It is basic to the fight against inflation that prices and wages be held as they were on September 15, 1942. The War Labor Board has in its wage stabilization activities been successful in holding the price of labor in the major basic industries at this level and will continue to fight to do so.

It is nevertheless true, that the pressure for increased prices has been tremendous and that increases in prices have been made far beyond the September 15, 1942, level. Chairman William H. Davis of the National War Labor Board has pointed to this very effectively in a letter to Vice President WALLACE dated November 5, 1943:

"To measure the direct effect of the increase which the Board has been able to grant to other workers under its wage stabilization policy, the Office of Price Administration has given the Board a detailed breakdown of the cases where wage increases necessitated price relief. These figures show that price relief was necessitated in only 411 out of 67,500 cases which the Board acted upon up through August. In other words, price relief was necessitated in only six out of a thousand cases. Therefore, the application of the board's wage policy has had but a minute direct effect upon the cost of living of our citizens.

* * * * *

"It is also interesting to note that 192, or nearly half of the 411 cases where price increases were necessary, were concentrated in three industries—laundries, lumber, and fluor spar—wage structures which were a handicap to the prosecution of the war.

"As the months flow by and the Board continues to hold wages at the general level of September 15, 1942, we became increasingly conscious of the fact that we are asking one segment of our society to do its part to protect all Americans from the ravages of inflation while, at the same time, a similar obligation has not been placed as heavily upon the shoulders of some of the other segments of this society."

While wages have been kept comparatively stable, more people are working than ever worked before and they are working harder and earning more. They are working longer and are taking home more. At the same time, the total amount of consumer products has been decreasing rapidly. During this period of war contracts, farm prices and business prices have risen. All of this means a tremendous increase in the amount of money in the possession of the public. People have money to pay for consumer goods and appear willing to use their money to bid competitively for the limited supply of such goods available. In consequence, prices have been forced up and some who are entrusted with the distribution of consumer goods apply even greater pressure to weaken such price-control mechanisms as we now have, in the hope that it will be to their advantage.

I need not tell you that there will be little hope of individual advantage in a wild race between prices and wages, were we to lift the controls and to abandon our hopes of stabilization. I was somewhat concerned at reading that the recent national convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations strongly advocated removal of the 15-percent Little Steel limitation on the ground that price control had not been effectuated. While I see in this an effective pressure device, I am afraid that it plays into the hands of those who seek to agitate all groups to the view that wartime controls upon them must be removed and that it is to the advantage of the particular group whom they are addressing at the moment to remove all restrictions.

Such people try to gain support for their views by playing up the grievances, the discomforts, and the discontents which are caused by the war. To businessmen they say that the war will soon be over and there is little need for the continuance of high taxes. To family people whose relatives are on the fighting front and whose relatives may be called upon to go to the fighting front, they say that there is no longer any need for a big Army. To labor people they say that the national wage-stabilization program has made working people suffer too much. To those workers who have patriotically withstood the temptation to strike because of delay which may have occurred in the settlement of their grievances, they say that the sacrifices have not been worth it.

It is never wise—it is never profitable—to encourage chaos in the hope that the solution for one's personal problems will be found somewhere in the maelstrom, yet this is what many have been urging. We must face the fact that price control is seriously threatened. We must face the fact that a solution must be found. Currently there is great debate over the subsidy program intended as a solution to the inflation problem. Chairman William H. Davis, of our National Board, has pointed out that the increasing cost of food threatens seriously the wage-stabilization program and therefore our entire domestic economy:

"The Board states with all the emphasis at its command that its wage-stabilization program calls for a prompt carrying forward of the announced policies of the administration affecting the cost of food. Subsidies are among the instruments which have proved effective to control food prices. The War Labor Board unanimously supports the administration's intention to use these and all appropriate measures in its food-price policy."

It appears evident that in the subsidy program we have a solution for the basic problem of stabilization and the defeat of inflation. To those of you who may feel that the solution is inadequate or inappropriate, I urge that you advance your position, but that you be sure to meet the basic problem of inflation. If there be another solution, and if that other solution is to be preferred, by all means urge it and press for it. But chaos is not a solution and yielding to inflation is not something for which any of us would be willing to speak.

We are at a critical point in our fight to keep our economy stable and to overcome inflation. The manner in which we meet it now will determine for a long time the shape of our economy to come. As attorneys, you and I have the major responsibility, for we are the technicians who are able to explain and simplify the problem and the proposed solutions. If we fail in that responsibility, we will have much for which to answer.

Soldiers Will Get Christmas Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone on the home front is happy to learn those in the armed forces will get turkey at Christmas. This is as it should be. It matters not whether we have hamburger, franks, or pork and beans for Christmas dinner, we all rejoice in reading the following Associated Press dispatch:

WASHINGTON, December 19.—American soldiers on fighting fronts and in Army camps will enjoy a traditional Christmas Day dinner.

Here is the Army's Christmas Day menu: Creamed celery soup with croutons; roast turkey, sage dressing, giblet gravy; cranberry-orange relish; snowflake potatoes; baked squash; creamed corn; head lettuce with Russian dressing; hot rolls, butter; mince pie, chocolate nut cake; assorted fruits, candy, nuts; coffee, cigarettes, tobacco.

Article by Damon Runyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I seriously recommend to my Democratic colleagues the following article by Damon Runyon in the Los Angeles Examiner of November 19, 1943:

THE BRIGHTER SIDE—DEMOCRATS NEED A JIM FARLEY

(By Damon Runyon)

When the great fence rider of the Democratic Party, Jim Farley, quit his job, he left what you might call an aching void that is now painfully apparent to the boys.

Jim used to keep the party fences in good order through unceasing vigilance. When word came to him of a gap anywhere, he was off buckitty-buckitty to make repairs. Now the rails are down all over the lay-out and the voting stock is escaping in large numbers and there is no Farley to mend the breaks.

And no one else, for that matter. The boss of the Democratic ranch is too busy at the big house in Washington with weighty affairs to get out and inspect and if necessary help patch the broken fences as he used to do and all his hired hands that Farley kept on the hop are too fat and contented in their political bunkhouses to move.

In short, the Democratic Party seems to be in tough shape in spots. It has no practical politician of ability, other than the man in the White House, to subdue what has all the aspects of a stampede and, as I say, he is otherwise occupied. Or it may be he does not even sense the unrest in the voting herd as indicated by recent political events, that he does not hear the menacing sound of the shifting mass that presages a sudden rush of disaster.

Farley would. Farley slept down the political wind so that the slightest rustle of discontent soon reached his ears. Farley was a great sentinel for the Democrats and a great soother of political fretfulness. The party could use him now though it may be too late for even his persuasive voice and gentling hand to do anything with the situation.

Farley led the Democrats to two great national victories. The boss and all the rest listened to him with eagerness until along in the second term when the big-brain boys moved in and gave him the elbow. We commenced to hear propaganda finally accepted as fact that it was the boss who was really the master politician and that fellows like Farley were unnecessary.

The case seemed to be established when the party rolled on to a third-term triumph with Eddie Flynn, another practical politician, in place of Farley, but I think it was the momentum set up by Farley that had more to do with the victory than anything else. Flynn had an easy task because all he had to do was sit still and let 'er roll.

Now the Democrats have Frank Walker, the Postmaster General, holding the Farley-Flynn job, probably much against his own wishes. Walker is a wealthy theater magnate, a gentleman, a fine all-around nice chap of whom I have never heard an ill word, but I cannot find that since his advent the Democrats have scored one notable victory anywhere, nor, aside from the Presidential election, did they score under Flynn.

Walker is in effect a figurehead, which is probably all that the boss and big-brain boys around him wanted because they have been deceived by the Farley momentum which is now dwindling to a crawl. The big-brain boys who were able to direct the Farley momentum at Chicago to their own purposes and took great credit to themselves therefrom have not been smart enough to hold one material advantage since.

Incidentally, the Farley momentum was so terrific at one time even Farley could not undo it, though he tried to a certain extent. His own juggernaut rolled over him and flattened him like a pancake. Unless a new Farley springs up to get the Democratic Party straightened out again, I fear its only hope is the not improbable stupidity of the Republican Party in picking a candidate next year who may be a nice show horse, but who will have no chance to win.

Crows Honor Returned Tribal Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief history of Barney Old Coyote, Jr., the first Indian to enlist in Montana. I believe it affords interesting reading, as it shows the patriotism of this great class of people that has quite generally been discriminated against:

CROWS HONOR RETURNED TRIBAL HERO

Barney Old Coyote, Jr., the first Indian soldier to enlist from Montana after Pearl Harbor, returned Sunday to his home at Crow Agency from the north African theater of operations to find the entire Crow tribe assembled at the railway station to do him the honor he so well deserved.

Young Old Coyote, Jr., was a senior at the Hardin High School, age 17, when Pearl Harbor was attacked by the Japs. While waiting for the high-school bus to take him to school he heard the President report to the Congress of the Pearl Harbor attack. At the conclusion of the President's report he, instead of going on to school as he started to do, borrowed $4 from his brother Henry and proceeded on to Billings, 75 miles away, to enlist in the Army. Revenge was in his heart. The recruiting office at Billings refused to accept him on account of his age and instructed him to return to his parents and secure their consent. This he did, but met with objections from his mother, who broke into tears when informed of his mission. He persisted—his mother persisted—but finally consented in 3 days. Young Old Coyote was accepted by the Army Air Forces; sent to Sheppard Field, Tex., graduated there and sent to the African campaign where he served his country along with his older brother Henry, who enlisted with his younger brother. The two fought the Germans and Italians side by side all through the African campaign, the Mediterranean islands and Italian campaign as aerial gunners, engineer and radio operators, respectively.

Young Barney having completed the required missions over enemy territory has returned to the States and will serve as an instructor in aerial gunnery at any station of his choice until his brother returns, whereupon they will proceed to make plans to continue their fight against the Axis.

He was decorated and cited thrice by the African High Command for extraordinary war service for his country as follows:

1. Cited for strafing the decks of a submarine while under attack. Eventually crew sank submarine with depth charges.

2. Destroying enemy aircraft in aerial battle.

3. Meritorious achievement while participating in missions against the enemy. Received 12 clusters in addition to the initial award of Air Medal for varied actions against the enemy.

This young Indian war hero brings to the fore the Indians of the United States and their unequaled war effort. The records disclose—

1. That the Indians excel and lead all other racial groups of the United States in the number of fighting men in proportion to their numbers.

2. That the Indians, in spite of their complete loyalty and war effort, are recipients of all kinds of discriminations against them on account of race.

3. That the Indians of our country are the only American citizens who have no court in this land of theirs where they can vindicate their Constitutional rights.

4. That socially they suffer ostracism.

5. That in spite of existing law to the contrary the Indians, even though they suffer the humiliations based on discrimination and the total management of their property by the Government, have demonstrated loyalty to the United States Government in the hour of its peril which is unsurpassed by any racial group in our country.

Needed Farm Machinery Should Be Manufactured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter, sent yesterday to Mr. George Krieger, Director, Farm Machinery and Equipment Division, War Production Board, and to Mr. A. D. Whiteside, Vice Chairman, Civilian Requirements, War Production Board.

DECEMBER 20, 1943.

Mr. GEORGE KRIEGER,
Director, Farm Machinery and Equipment Division,
War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRIEGER: Since our exchange of letters several weeks ago, I have been conducting an investigation of the farm machinery situation in the district which I represent—the Second District of Nebraska.

The data collected indicates that the outlook for 1944 for farm machinery in this great producing area is very unsatisfactory and it is my belief that unless a substantial "upping" of the quotas of machinery available is achieved, production may be seriously hampered. The five counties comprising this district are among the most substantial corn producers of the entire Corn Belt. A generally alarming shortage of new machinery is revealed. However, for purposes of brevity, I will outline the factual situation on only one important item—corn pickers.

My survey, just completed, shows that the United States Department of Agriculture War Boards in these counties have on file in excess of 479 applications for corn pickers for their 1944 allotments. The State chairman of the A. A. A. advises that the total allotments for these 5 counties will be only 78 corn pickers. As a matter of fact, the allotments for 1943 were a total of 102 corn pickers and this has been reduced to 78 for 1944. Incidentally, the reasoning that produced this lower than 1943 figure would interest me.

In 1942 Nebraska produced 242,000,000 bushels of corn and in 1943, 216,000,000 bushels. These figures indicate that Nebraska ranks sixth in the production of corn. Yet, I am informed that there is a corn picker in Illinois for every 118 acres of corn but in Nebraska only one for every 1,800 acres of corn.

This situation does not make sense unless one of two conditions prevail—either there cannot be more corn pickers manufactured, or, there is to be a deliberate reduction in the production of corn.

I have checked with two farm-machinery manufacturers to see whether or not they could produce more equipment so that these farmers can make plans now so as to have this necessary equipment when the corn is matured. The Ford Motor Co. (Harry Ferguson, Inc.) has written me, under date of December 4, 1943, about this problem and makes this unequivocal statement: "We are in a position to make the general statement that if cut loose without restriction we can make available all the Ford tractors and Ferguson implements required to solve our food problems."

In explanation of the foregoing, they point out that "there are tremendous surpluses of steel coming on the market at the present time and present indications are that steel mills will have substantial open time by March 1944."

The International Harvester Co. writes me under date of December 17, 1943, as follows:

"We have your letter of December 11 regarding the possibility of producing corn pickers for the 1944 harvest in addition to the current L-257 quotas.

"We have today advised the Farm Machinery and Equipment Division, War Production Board, that we can produce by September 30, 1944, in addition to our current L-257 quotas, 1,000 one-row pull-type corn pickers and 1,200 two-row pull-type corn pickers, provided we receive allotment of controlled materials for delivery in the first and second quarters of 1944 as outlined in War Production Board letter dated December 6.

"We are anxious to produce all the machines possible to meet the demands of farmers, especially labor-saving equipment such as corn pickers."

The foregoing facts and figures make it obvious that there is a tremendous unsatisfied need for corn pickers in the Nebraska counties I mention. The equipment manufacturers point out that they can turn out a much greater amount of farm machinery for 1944 production. Therefore, I am requesting that the W. P. B. reconsider this whole subject with a view toward such official action as is necessary to clear the way for larger production of corn pickers and other equipment for 1944 immediately.

Farmers will make their plans for 1944 planting in the next 60 days. If they know that corn pickers are going to be available they can arrange their planting for the largest practicable production of corn. Certainly here is an opportunity for the War Production Board to encourage and expand the production of the food which will win the war and write the peace.

Please let me hear from you about this request at the earliest practicable moment.

Sincerely,

HOWARD BUFFETT.

Social Security in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on December 4 I had the pleasure of hearing a very excellent analysis of the whole social-security problem given by Clement W. Hunt, executive director of the Capital Hospital Service, Inc., Harrisburg, Pa., at a meeting of the Torch Club in Harrisburg. While I naturally do not agree with all of Mr. Hunt's conclusions, yet I really believe that this is one of the ablest brief statements on the subject which it has been my privilege to read. With that in mind, I now include his address in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

There is nothing un-American in the Social Security Act, which is now the law of the land. Not only does it express the will of the people, as carried out by their chosen representatives; but for every service or institution included in the social-security program, there was a similar program in operation in one or more of the States prior to the enactment of this historic law.

Moreover, there is nothing undemocratic in principle in any of the social assistances, or social insurances embodied in the Wagner-Murray bill (S. 1161) now before the Congress. True, it departs from our traditional social economy in certain important respects, and the methods proposed for attaining the fundamental purposes of the bill may be neither desirable nor wise. But one of the strongest traditions of America is the right of the people, through their elected representatives, to break with traditional ways.

Failure to break with the traditional ways of administering poor relief caused much unnecessary suffering and untold waste of money, in the early years of the depression. In spite of repeated efforts to reorganize the administration of poor relief in Pennsylvania, and in other States, it had remained substantially unchanged in its set-up and provisions since 1836.

When the depression broke upon us in 1930, we were as unprepared for the social and economic catastrophe as we were for war on December 7, 1941. Poor boards quickly found themselves unable to cope with the situation and, of necessity, appealed to the State for aid. The State, unable to provide the needed money, looked to the Federal Government, at first for loans, but later for outright grants. Thus, through economic necessity, we broke with the tradition that public relief was a local responsibility.

In keeping with a well-established principle of making grants-in-aid, the granting of Federal funds to the States for local relief carried with it the inevitable right to dictate and regulate how those funds should be spent. Time does not make it possible to name and explain the functions of the various Federal, State, and local agencies which administered direct and work relief during the early part of the depression. Suffice it to say, that when it became apparent that the depression had ceased to be an emergency, Congress enacted the Social Security Law.

It is unfortunate that the present social-security program in its conception, development, and administration has been so intimately related to an avowed attempt, on the part of the New Deal, to remake America through a bloodless revolution. The Administration's motives have always been questioned by many substantial statesmen in the Democratic, as well as in the Republican Party. So it is that the Social Security Act, in itself possessing so much of merit, has had to bear the stigma of a political reform movement which has had an apparent collectivist trend.

And the Wagner-Murray bill has been received in many quarters with the same misgivings and skepticism. Yet it is not surprising that a measure so hastily drawn as was the Social Security Act should be found still imperfect and in need of change, even with the amendments to the act made by the Congress in 1939. Neither is it surprising that an expansion of the social-security program, to surpass the Beveridge cradle-to-the-grave plan, should be proposed by an Administration which has kept itself so closely attuned to the hopes and aspirations of the wage-earning masses as has the one now in office.

One must not forget for a moment, however, that our social economy has been shaken to its depths during the past 10 years, first by the devasting and prolonged depression, and now by the most destructive of all wars. Ultimate victory is assured, but there is no assurance that the post-war adjustment on the home front will be made without widespread unemployment and another depression. One of these days 10,000,000 men, who have fought to bring freedom to the conquered peoples of other lands, but first of all to preserve freedom at home, will come marching back. For them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will have little meaning unless they can attain for themselves and their families a reasonable measure of social and economic security, rather than the insecurity which our boys found who returned from the First World War.

What is a reasonable measure of social and economic security? It seems to me we have reached the stage in our socio-economic development where we can agree on certain basic principles of such a security. The following principles are advanced for consideration in this paper:

1. Our economy must provide an opportunity to work for all who are able and willing to work and who earnestly seek work.

2. When economic conditions beyond the control of the employer or employee cause unemployment, and when workers who satisfy reasonable eligibility requirements are retired, social insurance should operate to provide a subsistence income.

3. Public relief is a State responsibility, with limited Federal grants-in-aid designed to raise and maintain standards in the interests of the general public welfare.

4. Public health is not only a State responsibility but also a Federal responsibility to be promoted in every way possible to protect and improve the health of the people.

5. The health of the individual, except as it may be influenced by occupation, is a personal responsibility, but it is also a social responsibility to afford the individual the opportunity to obtain for himself and family medical care at a cost within his means.

Obviously full employment is the foundation of social security. But how stupendous the problem of providing work for all will be, after the war, is well stated by Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the committee for economic development, as follows:

"In 1940 there were approximately 46,000,000 persons gainfully employed. By the end of 1943 it is estimated that 27,000,000 persons will be in war industries, 24,500,000 in civilian industry, and 11,000,000 in the armed forces—62,500,000 in all.

"Not all those 62,500,000, however, will expect or want jobs when the war is over. Probably 2,000,000 will still wear uniforms. Many women will return to their homes. Thousands of boys will want to go to college. Many of the older workers will retire. Nevertheless, economists estimate that the United States must have 56,000,000 persons gainfully employed 2 years after the war to assure a satisfactory level of employment. That means, the United States must have 10,000,000 more jobs than it had in 1940.

"The real job for the American home-frontier then is to find work for 10,000,000 more persons than ever before were gainfully employed. We must face the fact that the most jobs ever created before in 1 year in the United States did not exceed 3,000,000, and that under the whiplash of war the armed services could absorb only 4,000,000 a year. So improved are methods and machinery of production that with eighteen or nineteen million persons out of work the production level of 1940 could be maintained, and that was twice the number walking the streets at the worst of the depression."

This is a challenge to the Nation no less real and threatening than the war itself was 2 years ago. There is not the slightest doubt that the challenge can be met just as successfully as we prepared for war. But everyone must be made keenly aware of the danger of delay and unpreparedness. Fortunately, planning for employment is already under way. Many industries are well advanced in their plans for the change-over to civilian production. The Committee for Economic Development, a purely voluntary, unaffiliated organization under the able leadership of Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation, is doing a work of tremendous importance. And the Rotary International with its "work pile project" is inviting the active cooperation of all service organizations in every city to join in full employment preparedness. If our free enterprise is to survive, business must not muff the ball in planning for full employment after the war.

The experience of the depression years taught us that when private enterprise cannot provide the jobs necessary for full employment, government must do so. Certainly we do not want a repetition of the boondoggling, leaf-raking jobs which the Federal Government provided in desperation. Wise planning for Federal and State, and also local construction projects, which can be started only when unemployment threatens, is not only desirable but essential to social security in a democracy.

Most assuredly we shall achieve approximately full employment in the years following the war. But it is inevitable that at any given time many persons for a wide variety of reasons will be unable to work. Businesses undergo reorganization; departments are abolished; seasonal slumps force reductions in staffs; and through inventive genius and labor-saving devices, sharp reductions in personnel are affected. Most of these labor casualties are unavoidable, and invariably they bring economic distress to many of those who become unemployed.

Fortunately, a way has been found through social insurance to give those who become unemployed, or whose work is interrupted, through no fault of their own, a subsistence allowance until they are reemployed. Under the Social Security Act a Federal-State system has been in operation. Each State has been allowed, within limits, to set its own rules with respect to waiting periods, duration of benefit payments, and size of benefits. One of the purposes of the Wagner-Murray bill, it is said, is to establish a uniform national system and thereby wipe out the disparities and injustices which inevitably arise through the operation of 51 State systems.

No sensible man argues against unemployment compensation today. But there are many who strenuously object to any further centralization of authority and increase of bureaucracy in Washington. Far better to take time and patiently work for greater uniformity in State plans under Federal supervision.

Essential to social security are the present State employment offices, which have been borrowed by the War Manpower Commission for the duration. This service, too, would be taken over by the Federal Government under the Wagner-Murray bill. Senator WAGNER states that "this new system would be administered by the Social Security Board and geared to post-war needs. A national employment system is the most effective mechanism to connect workers to jobs for maximum use of our country-wide productive facilities."

Opponents of the scheme to take over the State-operated employment offices, however, see in such a national system of employment offices, potentially one of the most effective mechanisms for the control of elections by a party in power, corrupt enough to use it for that purpose.

If the States continue to operate their employment offices, then they must be closely coordinated under Federal supervision. Only through such close coordination can labor be placed to its own advantage and to the advantage of industry.

It is interesting to observe that the Wagner-Murray bill does not disturb existing workmen's compensation insurance plans. This compulsory form of social security was inaugurated in Pennsylvania 30 years ago. From time to time the laws have been amended in the interests of both labor and industry. The process of improvement has been slow but it has been democratic and has preserved States' rights. Judged by present-day standards, workmen's compensation insurance laws are unique, at least in Pennsylvania, in that they permit the employer to decide whether he will carry his insurance with the State or with a private insurance concern.

In our utopia of full employment, workmen will grow old and ultimately retire. It is unfortunate, but none-the-less true, that salesmanship has succeeded in creating such a desire for luxuries, and buying on credit is so universally easy, that few lay by any more for a comfortable old age. Thrift was a virtue years ago but it never had to resist the temptations of present day advertising. Waste in the war effort is inevitable, but during the past 10 years, the Federal Government has set an example of extravagence, free spending, and indebtedness in all of its departments that has unquestionably had a demoralizing effect on masses of our people.

It can also be said that during the depression public relief in many respects was made too attractive. Many who are in the money now, and spending their all, readily admit that they are not concerned about the future. They simply say, without any apprehension, that they will go back on relief, if they lose their jobs after the war.

It is not inconsistent with social security in a democracy to return once more to those homely virtues of thrift, self-reliance, and industry. Bismarck enunciated a principle which was followed by Hitler in the training of German youth with amazing results. That principle was expressed something like this: "What you would have in your national life you must first put in your schools." Is it too much to expect that once more we could inculcate in the character of our children, if not in their parents of today, those same virtues of thrift, self-reliance, and industry? Why not start now to encourage the purchase of War bonds not only to promote the war efforts, prevent inflation, and have money to spend after the war, but to lay by for a rainy day?

Thrift alone, however, will no longer suffice to provide the aged industrial worker, in most cases, with adequate retirement means. The depression so ravaged the savings of millions that it is little wonder that many were wont to philosophize: "What's the use?" Misfortune each year overtakes thousands of worthy workers as they draw near the end of their working days. Dependency, if not public relief, is their reward for a lifetime of work.

Old-age and survivors insurance offers a sensible means of assuring the aged at least a subsistence allowance for the years of retirement. Even before 1935, Pennsylvania had set the pattern for old-age and survivors insurance in its State teachers and State employees retirement systems. These are contributory plans which have proven highly satisfactory and acceptable. And it should be observed that both are compulsory and yet they have never been thought of as un-American.

The Wagner-Murray bill seeks to broaden the coverage of the Social Security Act to include about 15,000,000 workers now excluded from the potential benefits of old and and survivors insurance. Senator WAGNER has said that "farm workers, domestic workers, lay employees of religious organizations, and persons employed by educational and charitable institutions as well as those now covered by the old-age and survivors insurance program would come under all the insurance provisions. Self-employed persons—farmers, professional men and women, and owners of small businesses—would be covered by all provisions except those concerned with unemployment and temporary disability."

In a democracy, the people are entitled to decide what forms of social insurance they want and to what classes of employment it shall be extended. But no practicable means have yet beed devised whereby scattered farm hands, house-maids, transient workers, and the like can be regimented for compulsory social insurance on a contributory basis. Within the limits of practicability and with benefits at the subsistence level, old-age and survivors insurance is essential to social security in a democracy. There can be no excuse, however, for bringing self-employed business and professional persons under the provisions of the social insurance.

The financing of this form of social insurance is a controversial subject. An evening's discussion might well be devoted to this subject alone. No adequate treatment of the issues can be undertaken in this paper. In a word it can be said, however, that an increasing number of persons favor the payment of pensions out of current payroll taxes, building up a contingency reserve in a relatively small amount compared with the tremendous pension trust funds which will accumulate so rapidly even at the present rates.

One provision of the Wagner-Murray bill has much merit as essentially related to the retirement of workers. It is said that "at least 125,000 men and women are disabled by accident or sickness each year. Their needs are as great as, or greater, than those of persons disabled by age. Yet while fairly satisfactory provisions have been made for the aged, there is no provision, except in case of industrial accident or occupational disease, for the misfortune of disability."[1] The bill would provide insurance benefits for workers permanently disabled, a provision which is found in both the State teachers and State employees retirement systems.

The bill would also provide unemployment compensation benefits for temporary disability. This type of social insurance would help many worthy people, but it would open the way for much uncontrollable abuse. This provision of the bill might well be postponed indefinitely.

The Wagner-Murray bill would also protect the social-security rights of men and women in the armed services and provide unemployment allowances on termination of military service. At this writing America is the only major belligerent which has failed to protect its servicemen in these respects. Are we to postpone action indefinitely and again meet our obligations with bonuses to those who will have sacrificed so immeasurably for us? God forbid.

Let us now turn to the third phase of social security in a democracy, namely, the social assistances. In every community, there are to be found the unemployables, the aged who do not qualify for retirement pensions, the blind, the crippled, and dependent children.

The Social Security Act provides public assistance to the needy in three categories, as follows: Old-age assistance, aid to the needy blind, and aid to dependent children, all of which Pennsylvania had prior to 1935. These assistances are in the nature of grants-in-aid to the States. It is the duty of the Social Security Board to examine State public assistance plans and their administration, and if they conform to the act, to certify to the Treasury the payment of the Federal grants due the States. The grants are now 50 percent of the benefits paid out locally by the States.

Pennsylvania now has a well organized public relief system administered by the department of public assistance through its 67 county boards. The State and county boards are appointed by the Governor and serve without pay; and the personnel are selected on the merit basis.

The Department of Public Assistance is also responsible for general assistance or public aid to the needy who are not eligible for the benefits of the social insurances already discussed nor to public assistance in any of the three categories just mentioned. Under the Wagner-Murray bill the Federal Government would assume, as a new responsibility, a share of the expense of caring for this class of dependents.

Under the provisions of the bill grants to the States "shall not be less than 50 percent and not more than 75 percent of the total expenditures under each State plan for old-age assistance, aid to the needy blind, and aid to dependent children." The grant to each State would vary with the per-capita income of the State in relation to the per-capita income of the continental United States. Obviously, the aim is to increase,

[1] Maxwell S. Stewart, Survey Graphic, May 1943.

not lessen, the dependence of the States and their people on the Federal Government. The trend in times of prosperity should be the direct opposite of any such paternalism.

All through the depression, Federal authorities gave no encouragement to local voluntary relief organizations. On the contrary, it was apparent to many that influences were at work to discourage benevolent agencies. One gained the impression that the aim was to school the unemployed and needy to a dependence on a benevolent Federal Government. There is still a place for charity, wisely administered, in a democratic social-security program. Spiritually poor indeed would this Nation become if it lost all need for its community chests.

The last phase of social security in a democracy comes under the general heading of health and welfare services. The present act makes provision for child-welfare services, services for crippled children, maternal and child-health services, retraining for disabled workers, and public-health services. All of these services are carried on by the States through their appropriate departments such as health and labor and industry, with Federal support and supervision. For many years the United States Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau have been demonstrating how the Federal Government can exert a leadership, render important services, and extend financial aid without invading State and local rights.

Before discussing compulsory health insurance as proposed in the Wagner-Murray bill, one phase of social security, not mentioned in the bill, should be discussed briefly. Much is said by the advocates of compulsory insurance about the inability of a large sector of our people to get adequate medical care. It would appear that a major emphasis should be placed first upon the abolition of slums and unhealthful environments, replacing the same with adequate, sanitary housing. Full employment with decent homes for American families would accomplish wonders in improving the health of the people. Good housing is very definitely a social responsibility.

So also is it a community responsibility to develop an adequate public-health program. Social security in a democracy calls for the effective control of communicable diseases, a high degree of sanitation, emphasis on nutrition, and adequate recreational facilities. Every city and country should also have a constructive public-health program, administered by a physician, specially trained in the field of public health, and appointed on the basis of merit alone. There is much yet for government—National, State, and local—to do to improve the health of the people, and still keep within its well-recognized field of health and welfare services.

The most controversial part of the Wagner-Murray bill is the provision for compulsory health insurance. If I am to be consistent in my advocacy of a social-security program, you might expect me to favor this form of social insurance either under Federal or State sponsorship. This I am not prepared to do.

Unemployment compensation is an essential form of social insurance in any community, State, or Nation where a considerable proportion of the people may become unemployed through no fault of their own. And because unemployment can so easily cause dependency, and even destitution, for large numbers of retired employees, old-age and survivors insurance is now a generally accepted form of social insurance. Within the limits of practicability and actuarial soundness, it is the responsibility of society to provide these forms of protection for its people, whose employment may be interrupted for reasons beyond their control, just as it provides protection against the devastating effects of epidemic disease.

But in any well-ordered society the individual is not without responsibilities of his own. Not all suffering is due to economic maladjustment; some of the causes of suffering are personal in character and can often be alleviated by the personal adjustments of the individual alone or with the aid of the physician, the social worker, or the pastor.

Nonoccupational sickness and injury are personal problems for which the employed person should be responsible within his means, and insofar as he is afforded the opportunity to provide medical care for himself and family. And in saying this I do not underestimate in the slightest degree how difficult the problem of medical care can easily be for the family of modest means.

This problem has been well stated by Owen D. Young in these words:

"The problems of illness are medical, economic, and social. The sick person needs a doctor, and perhaps a hospital. He also needs food and shelter, for himself and family, at the very time when the illness may have cut off his income. And he needs these things by methods not demoralizing to himself or the community, not unfair to the medical profession, and not incompatible with the essentially individual nature of medical care."

The solution of this problem is not to be found in compulsory health insurance at this time. Neither is it to be found in the laissez faire policy of a considerable element in organized medicine. A constructive program must be put forward by organized medicine designed to make the best of medical care easily available to the family of modest means, at a cost he can and will afford.

At the moment, the medical-care program which is being promoted by Henry J. Kaiser, for his employees in west-coast shipyards, is holding the spotlight of attention. For 7 cents a day, employees are privileged to get a form of health insurance which assures them the best of medical care. The ultimate success of this interesting venture will depend on continued full employment. Thus far, the plan appears to demonstrate that adequate medical care, including hospitalization, can be provided collectively on a voluntary basis for only 7 cents a day for the individual employee. Arrangements are now under way whereby the California Physicians Service and Kaiser's Permanent Foundation plan to make a similar service available to all of the people of the State of California.

Several State and county medical societies have inaugurated voluntary, nonprofit plans for medical care. The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania has such a plan in operation in the western part of the State. If such plans can be made sufficiently attractive, both in benefits and in cost, they will go far in affording the people an opportunity to provide for themselves adequate medical care.

It is in the field of hospitalization that the most noteworthy accomplishments are to be found in this respect. In the short space of 10 years no less than 13,000,000 persons have become members of the 77 Blue Cross plans. The membership of these voluntary, nonprofit community plans continues to grow rapidly.

But the Social Security Board complains that this remarkable growth is too slow. At one stroke of the President's pen 100,000,000 persons must be compelled to accept health insurance. What is the hurry? The excuse is that the payment of the additional payroll taxes would help prevent inflation. The reason for the hurry may well be that the people are now accustomed to regimentation necessitated by the war effort, and it is assumed they will readily submit to still another form of compulsory social insurance.

If the voluntary medical and hospital service plans are to continue to grow, then businessmen must afford their employees the opportunity to enroll in the plans. Too many employers today are denying their employees this opportunity. A goodly proportion of employed persons want protection against medical and hospital expense. Those who do not want it should be free to decide for themselves. To decide some matters for oneself is still the privilege of the American people.

In conclusion I am presenting the program adopted by the American Hospital Association in October 1942. It is a constructive plan to provide adequate hospital care for the American people:

1. The immediate establishment by each Blue Cross plan of low-cost contracts for service in minimum-rate hospital accommodations.

2. Cooperation in the development in each community of nonprofit plans for medical service for hospital cases, sponsored by the medical profession, similar to those now actively conducted and proposed in many States and communities.

3. The encouragement of local government payments to hospitals for service to needy persons whose individual or combined payments are less than the costs of necessary service.

4. Encouragement to the Federal Government to provide financial assistance, through States, to enable community hospitals to furnish hospital care for Federal and State public assistance beneficiaries including the aged, the blind, dependent children and those on general relief.

5. The encouragement of Federal grants for improvement and expansion of voluntary hospital facilities in defense areas and other communities where economic conditions and unusual health needs require such assistance.

6. The recommendation to the United States Congress that, in view of the present rapid growth of voluntary hospital-service plans, it defer consideration of the inclusion of hospitalization payments in the social-security program.

The big question in any social-security program is the long-time effect it may have on the character of the people. Initiative and self-reliance are the most characteristic traits of the American people. The expansion of our social-security program must never be carried to the point where it will even begin to undermine our Nation's distinctive greatness.

Hydroelectric Power Development in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 17, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many discussions on the national necessity for the post-war acquisition of exterior air lanes. These discussions, however, have omitted several vital components of the over-all problem. The control of air lanes alone will not provide the needed post-war security unless this Nation controls what it takes to make and operate the planes that will use such lanes, and to promote continuance of a high rate operation for the industry and business of the Nation.

Those of us who have closely watched the development of defense and war production, know the extent that our resource base is being eroded. Our post-war program must recognize this situation, or the past history of adverse results will be repeated. After World War No. 1 was concluded we threw overboard the combined production experience

gained in that effort. Future security demands that previous mistakes be avoided.

To make airplane manufacture secure, we will have to fully control the production of electric metals—metals that require processes that have advanced beyond the older conventional methods. Our automobile industry early capitalized on this principle, so much so that it has been stated that the Detroit industry would not have been possible without the higher grade, lighter metals produced in the electric cells and furnaces at Niagara. This dependence has become so great that such metals have been designated as "frozen kilowatts." Indications of future trends are definitely along the line of further development of electric metals.

On several occasions, I have commented on our pre-war lack of electrochemical and electrometallurgical plant capacity. Fortunately, when this war came we had the available federally owned hydroelectric on the Tennessee, the Columbia, and the Colorado Rivers to make good the metal and chemical deficiencies created by a pre-war scarcity program in these fields. To quickly take advantage of our low-cost energy availability, we had to rely on foreign supplies of electrometallurgical basic materials. Such supply is still controlled by other nations and we need to go much further in declaring our complete independence on materials that can be cut off in times of need. The lessons of history show that nations permitting eroding of their resource bases eventually become decadent nations.

The petroleum products that make the airplane gas engines whirl are only a valuable, easily stored form of energy, but we must recognize the fact that we are coming closer to the time when our oil supply will be depleted. We should, therefore, prepare for this eventuality by providing means to overcome such a possible national liability.

Water power is our one resource that can never be depleted, as long as the sun shines, rains fall, and rivers flow to the sea!

The natural nondepleting energy of water power is our one dependable anchor. It must be produced at low cost to overcome the commercial barriers that naturally result from conversion. We have 130,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours going to waste in this country every year that should be harnessed and put to use.

I have previously covered Russian advances in this field, and have told the story of Japan's industrial conversion preparatory to world conquest. Today I propose to develop an evaluation of South American power resources, and to continue and expand the facts that I have previously given, hoping in time to place before you a rounded picture for future use.

In my discussion of South American potentialities I am trying to approach the facts in a spirit of friendliness. I recognize that the depleting processes of war will require our future dependence on the South American countries for certain raw materials, like Brazilian iron when the Mesabi Range and our lower-grade iron deposits are dug out. We need to help South America advance, but in so doing we must not slight our own problems, and recognize that thrift, like charity, should begin at home.

It is apparent that we are financially and materially helping the South American countries in developing water-power resources, but nevertheless we should not provide funds for such outside activities unless we keep up with such advances at home. We need to balance our own resources, while we are doing this for others. It is with this viewpoint that I approach this factual presentation.

THE WORLD'S WATER POWER

In the discussion which follows I have reduced all available data to a horsepower basis, using estimated river flows occurring 75 percent of the time at 83 percent over-all machine efficiency. The composite of all the available material from such sources as the United States Geological Survey, consular reports, foreign yearbooks, the publications of the Department of Commerce, and scientific magazines indicate that the potential hydro supply of the world totals about 775,000,000 horsepower. This potential power is said to be distributed by continents as follows:

	Percent
Africa	40.5
Asia	22.5
Europe	11.0
North America	11.5
Oceania	3.1
South America	11.4
Total	100.0

Of this potential power, only about 9 percent has been developed and utilized up to 1942. However, two-thirds of this developed power has been constructed since the end of the First World War. At that time less than 3 percent of the world's potential water power was developed. The great strides made in the last 20 years indicate how the world is progressing toward the electric age, toward the light metal, power economy, which is the foundation of modern air power. This progress was taking place before the symptoms were generally recognized in this country. Two-thirds of the world's presently installed hydroelectric capacity is located in seven countries, with the United States leading with 18,000,000 installed horsepower. Canada ranks second with an installed capacity of 9,300,000 horsepower. In round numbers this country has only developed about four-tenths of its first-class potential water power.

AFRICAN HYDRO POWER

Although 40 percent of the world's potential hydroelectric power is found in Africa, this large amount is concentrated in a comparatively small and inaccessible area. Three-quarters of Africa's potential power is located in the Belgian and French Congos and the French Cameroons. This is to be expected from the largeness of the central African plateau and its proximity to the Equator, with high precipitation rates. The Congo River is said to have the greatest amount of potential power of any stream in the world. It has a drainage area of 1,500,000 square miles, with heavy equatorial rainfalls. It has a series of great falls, as exemplified by Stanley Falls, which is composed of seven cataracts with a fall of 200 feet in 60 miles. Numerous other falls exist below the Stanley pool. The Congo Basin comprises about one-quarter of the world's potential power. However, the very vastness of this power presents such construction difficulties that it is doubtful, even if a market existed, that it would be developed within the next century because of cost competition.

In northern and southern Africa the rainfall, and resulting power, is very small. The amount of potential power located in British African territory is only about 10 percent of the African total and is located in British Central and East Africa, British-mandated Cameroons, and Rhodesia. The most outstanding power site in Rhodesia is the Victoria Falls of the Zambezi, where the river abruptly drops 350 feet. Below Victoria, this river again drops 1,100 feet in 50 miles. Nevertheless, the combined potential power of the Zambezi at Victoria and the lower rapids is considerably less than the potential power now ready for machines at Grand Coulee.

EUROPE AND ASIA

The heavy industrial European countries, like Great Britain, France, Sweden, Switzerland, and Germany have developed hydro power up to the potential limit. The only large fields for further Europeon hydro development exist in Russia—which I have previously covered—Norway, Finland, and Spain.

Asiatic power, which comprises 22 percent of the world's potential supply is found principally in Russia, the Chinese Republic, India, and Ceylon. Nearly half of the Asiatic power is located in Russian territory. China with extensive areas has small amounts of potential power. Its total potential power is only two-thirds of the amount existing in this country. India's potential power is about the same as that in this country.

From such a quick survey of world potentialities it is evident that the next field of development, outside of Russia, which I have previously discussed, will take place in South America, and for information of the House I will, in a moment, briefly cover South American possibilities.

Modern civilization depends on power. The advance of civilization from slavery to comparative comfort can be gaged by the advance of mechanical and electrical inventions. England did not become a first-class power until Watt's invention of the steam engine. England's greatest strides occurred in the first half of the nineteenth century, when her industrial framework changed from manual to mechanical operation.

Lloyd George, while he guided the destiny of the British Empire, over 20 years ago, sensed what was coming, and as a result, recommended the complete revamping of English industry. Russia came to the same conclusion a few years earlier, as I have pointed out, and Japan started her industrial reorganization 3 years after the Lloyd George report, as I have also previously explained.

Lloyd George, in his report, pointed out at the end of World War No. 1, the United States was utilizing two and a half times England's per capita ration of power, and that the actual wages of American workers had this same relation to English wages. In concluding his report, Lloyd George pointed out that the greater the amount of power made available to a workman, greater will be his output, higher the pay level, and lower the cost and market price of his product. That was my contention when striving for the creation of the T. V. A. and the development of rural electrification.

The entire American mass-production system is built on mechanical power. With stilts being placed under our price levels because of the war effort and our expenditures, we cannot for a minute overlook the power possibilities so intimately tied up with our future economic welfare. To support and amortize our debt structure, we will have to move from an economy of scarcity into one of expanded production, at lower costs, an economy of abundance.

It is power-driven machinery that will create new industries and expanded outlets for employment. Those American industries now employing about one quarter of our total gainful employment were completely unknown at the time Thomas A. Edison made his great inventions. Since Tesla brought out the induction motor and Henry Ford started mass production, the use of power on the farm has increased tenfold.

With an increase in the use of power, our standard of living has increased. The increased wages resulting from the use of power has greatly benefited the lower-income group, and has resulted in a standard of living far beyond our earlier expectations.

Why consider relatively small power investment, when our place in the sun requires larger and more efficient production at lower costs and prices. This can only be made possible from the expansion of power use, and the lowering of costs.

SIGNIFICANCE OF POWER REQUIREMENTS

The 775,000,000 world potential horsepower looks like a very sizable figure when compared to the fifty-nine and five-tenths million United States horsepower supplying the electric utilities—steam and hydro combined. This world's hydro horsepower, however, if it were all developed, would supply but half of our present total over-all energy requirements. To keep all autos, trucks, and busses going requires 33 percent more power than could be furnished by the complete development of the world's entire potential hydro power. Fortunately, the gasoline consuming power operates at low hour use factors.

We are the world's greatest producing nation. To sustain this production requires over all, about 1,500,000,000 peak-load horsepower, two-thirds of which represents power used to drive automobiles, trucks, and busses, and like transportation equipment.

Our own potential high-class hydro power totals only 39,000,000 horsepower. Forty-five percent of this will be developed by the end of 1943. Our total first-class hydro capability when compared to the rest of the world is small indeed. We have only one-twentieth of the world potential hydro power, and on a square mile or population basis, we are 18 percent below the average of all other countries. This naturally follows from a location affording better climates.

If all of our first-class hydro power were developed, it would supply only 2½ percent of our total present over-all peak power requirements or 3½ percent of our peace-time requirements. This 39,000,000 horsepower only represents about one-half of the over-all energy requirements of our farms. It would only keep about 40 percent of our 45,000 railroad locomotives going and represents about one-third of our present marine energy requirements, and one-third of our industrial mechanical requirements. It is also far below the power requirements of our present wartime air program requirements and would about equal our peace-time air-power needs.

If all of our first-class hydro power were developed we would still have to lean heavily on other types of prime movers in the lesser competitive and lower-load-factor fields. However, to hold our world position in the post-war period we must look carefully at our water-power resources as a means of producing low-cost competitive power, and at linking this power to electric metal production. Progress has traveled such routes that the materials of the future must come from power produced at less than half the cost of the present best results obtained from steam-generating plants.

SOUTH AMERICAN RESOURCES

The Andean region, although mined since the days of the Conquistos, is still virgin mineral territory and is without doubt one of the world's best mineral areas. The highlands of the Cordilleron system are also rich in minerals. Gold and silver have been found in substantial quantities in all the South American highlands. North of the Akari Mountains are found the extensive high-content bauxite mines of Guiana and Surinam. Next to Malaya the world's largest tin deposits are found in Bolivia. Large petroleum sources are being worked in all the northern states extending from Peru to Venezuela. In addition, Venezuela is a source of the largest part of the world's asphalt supply.

In the Atacama and Penura Deserts of northern Chile and southern Peru occur the large nitrate deposits. Prior to the discovery of synthetic nitrates these desert states furnished the major part of the world's nitrate supply. The Chile copper mines are of a great importance because of their low-cost operations. The South American countries are also rich in iron, zinc, mercury, bismuth, nickel, antimony, and lead. Next to Russia, Columbia is the world's largest source of platinum.

The South American Continent has extensive areas of tropical forests which are rich in rubber, dyewood, medicinal plants, and special timbers. Climatic conditions and the lack of inland transportation have limited the development of these forest products. The continent is also rich in agricultural products which are mostly of the tropical or semi-tropical variety, such as coffee, sugar, cocoa, tobacco, and cotton. South of the La Plata where the climate becomes more temperate, the general lack of rainfall has retarded agricultural development such as is found in temperate regions of other continents. These areas, however, are adapted for stock raising and large numbers of cattle pasture on the plains of Argentina. Naturally, such conditions have placed Argentina in the position of being one of the world's largest sources of wool, frozen beef, and mutton, which has displaced part of our own products in foreign markets.

SOUTH AMERICAN POWER

With one-seventh of the world's land area, South America has about one-tenth of the world's potential power. This continent has 87,000,000 potential horsepower and a population of 90,000,000 people. Less than 2 percent of the South American power is developed. Its potential power per 1,000 population is three times as great as this country. One-half of the South American power is located in Brazil.

South America, as all will recognize, is largely defined by the Andes, a high volcanic ridge which extends from Panama to Tierra del Fuego. Without doubt the Andean region will turn out to be the world's greatest storehouse of critical minerals. The upper eastern slopes of this ridge are flooded with perpetual rains, which in turn provide steady flows for the large rivers which cut across Brazil. This combination of rainfalls and topography makes the Amazon Basin the largest in the world and gives Brazil a sizable amount of potential power.

North of the thirty-third south latitude circle, and west of the Andes, the rainfall is less than 10 inches per year. This area would be completely arid except for the run-off from the snow-capped mountains. Lake Titicaca on the Peruvian-Bolivian border is the largest lake in South America — area 3,261 square miles—and it is a remarkable body of water in that its water surface is 12,500 feet above sea level. It is these conditions that give Bolivia and Peru their 11.5 million potential power.

South of the thirty-third circle the climatic conditions are reversed. The heavy precipitation is west of the mountains, while the arid and semiarid regions lie east. The latter area merges into the Patagonian pampas region, which is largely a semiarid level prairie, and gives Argentina its position in agriculture and cattle.

Because of these topographical and climatic conditions, Argentina's potential power is only one-fourteenth of the South American total.

LOW-COST POWER

Because of the continuous rainfall resulting from close proximity to the equator and very favorable power sites, with ample low-cost storage and high falls, South America is in a position to produce large amounts of exceptionally low-cost power. The cheapest potential power in the world exists in South America.

The Amazon, with its size, has great power possibilities but the Parana is the great power-producing stream of the continent. This river, after its junction with the Uruguay, forms the La Plata. Where this river defines the boundary between Brazil and Paraguay occurs the Sete Quedus [Seven Falls]. At this point the river has a 400-foot fall, which can produce approximately 10 times the power potentiality of Grand Coulee, at an exceptionally low cost, as nature has provided the largest part of the required dam. The Iguassu is also a great power-producing tributary of the Parana. On this river is located the great Iguassu Falls with a drop approaching that of Niagara.

Another great power producer is the Rio Grande tributary of the Parana. On this stream, at Mariabondo, is a power site about equal in size to Bonneville. The Mariabondo site is near the Atlantic port of Sao Paulo.

The elevated plateaus of the Guiana highlands also have large power potentialities. On the Potaro River, in these highlands, is found the great Kaieteur Falls, with a drop of 825 feet. The Potaro Falls are in close proximity to the vast bauxite deposits of Surinam and British Guiana. The power sites that I have discussed have the ability to produce one mill power. They are strategically close to Atlantic tidewater, which gives them a double advantage. Venezuela, Paraguay, Ecuador, Colombia, Chile, Guiana, and Bolivia collectively have within their boundaries one-third of the South American power.

Time does not permit further detailing of other great and low-cost power sites, but, in summary, I will present a listing of potentialities by countries, which will show the extent and location of the high-class low-cost South American hydro power.

South American installed and potential power

Country	Installed capacity of water power plants	Approximate potential water power, dependable flow
	Horsepower	*Horsepower*
Argentina	67,000	6,300,000
Bolivia	37,600	4,200,000
Brazil	1,330,000	41,900,000
British Guiana	0	4,200,000
Chile	225,000	4,200,000
Colombia	25,000	6,300,000
Dutch Guiana	0	1,300,000
Ecuador	21,000	1,500,000
French Guiana	0	800,000
Paraguay	500	3,300,000
Peru	175,200	7,500,000
Uruguay	0	500,000
Venezuela	15,000	5,000,000
Total	1,896,300	87,000,000

Above estimates represent conditions as of Dec. 31, 1942.

Future gagings and surveys will doubtless increase potential estimates.

DEVELOPMENTS

Most of the South American countries have only limited commercial coal deposits and in the past have depended on British and American coal importations. War shipping restrictions have caused fuel shortages. These conditions have caused the Latin-American countries to prepare long-range plans for large hydro developments. These countries are now being assisted by our Inter-American Development Commission and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. A development report has been made to the Inter-American Coordinator by Mr. Charles A. Howard, formerly connected with the Ford, Bacon and Davis Organization of New York City. These facts are covered in the New York Herald Tribune of October 9, 1943. As a result, new hydroelectric developments are underway in Chile, Uruguay, Peru, and Brazil.

CHILEAN DEVELOPMENT

The largest attempted project on the South American continent is that proposed for the complete electrification of Chile. This proposal calls for an ultimate expenditure of around $100,000,000.

The project contemplates harnessing the west-slope rivers for the entire 2,600-mile length of Chilean territory. This work will be developed by stages and the financial set-up of the first step calls for a capitalization of 500,000,000 Chilean pesos, which is equivalent to about $20,000,000 in our currency. Ninety-five percent of this outlay is scheduled to be underwritten by a development corporation handling the over-all project. In the governmental announcement of these plans it was stated, "Chile must have the energy to put in motion its economic resources." This long-range plan contemplates dividing the country from Arica south into seven sections, the last two, bordering on the Straits of Magellan. The two south sections have not been fully explored to the extent justifying present development, but the remaining five sections are included in the over-all plan scheduled for completion in 1957.

The first power unit in this plan is located just south of Santiago and calls for an initial installation of 120,000 kilowatts with transmission lines serving the port of San Antonio. In order to expedite the construction of transmission lines this Chilean development has purchased in the United States, a complete copper plant with a capacity of 30,000 tons of finished copper per year to produce the conductors needed for this national power program.

PERUVIAN DEVELOPMENTS

The Peruvian Government is also starting a large hydroelectric development at Canyon del Pato with funds furnished by our Export-Import Bank. The work on the Del Pato project, which is located on the Santa River, was initiated last year and calls for the installation of five generators of 25,000 kilowatts each. According to the releases of the Peruvian Government, the Del Pato installation will initially produce current at an over-all cost in United States currency, of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. When the additional units are installed that Goverment estimates the over-all production cost will be reduced to three-fourths of a mill per kilowatt-hour. The construction schedule calls for the completion of the first installation by the end of 1945. The Santa River has power potentiality exceeding 500,000 kilowatts. The financial plan is based on utilizing this power to process the recent magnesium rock discoveries. A full account of this development is given in Business Week, page 64, of the June 5, 1943, issue.

UNITED STATES AIDS URUGUAY

The Foreign Commerce Weekly of March 6, 1943, states that the Government of Uruguay has completed arrangements with the United States for the completion of the Rio Negro power projects. The financial and machinery contracts have been approved by the Uruguayan Government and provides that the United States manufacturing companies will ship within a year to the port of New York the materials necessary to place the first four generators of the Rio development in operation.

In less than 2 years this project will be producing power. It is estimated that $20,000,000 will be invested in this development, $12,000,000 of which will be financed by a loan granted by the Export-Import Bank to the Uruguayan Government. According to the quoted statement of the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the United States will furnish the requisite priorities for the acquisition of this material for export, and transportation together with the necessary technicians to assure the correct installation of the equipment.

BRAZIL

The immediate Brazilian plans include the harnessing of the Sao Francisco River with multiple dams. The Paulo Affonso cataracts, with a fall of 265 feet, are located just below Itaparica, which is 140 miles from the mouth of this river. The projected Affonso project will develop 600,000 horsepower and immediately above another project contemplates 200,000 horsepower additional. The Republic of Brazil also plans on the electrification of its steam railroads. Work is already underway of the 90-mile double-track section of the state railroad, connecting Sao Paulo and San Antonio. Previously this double-track railroad used imported coal and firewood. Service has been handicapped due to the restriction on coal imports and the long haul from available timber. An account of the Brazilian developments can be found in the New York Herald Tribune of October 9, 1943.

THE AIR AGE

The map of the future is becoming more clearly defined. The entire world is rapidly moving into greater, speedier, and more pronounced progress. When the war is successfully concluded this Nation will be returning to civil activities over 2,000,000 men who are skillful pilots, navigators, mechanics, meteorologists, and ground operators. These toughened graduates of the hard school of experimentation and experience will then be ready to convert the instruments of destruction to vehicles of commerce and agencies of peace. All that will be lacking is the tools, materials, and energy to make this progress possible.

In a series of discussions, I have pointed out what has and is taking place in the world around us. To hold the high place that we have gained, will call for the exercise of greater vision than any time in our history. Congress had

the vision when it passed the Defense Act immediately following the last war, and the Thomas Act before the present war. The tools that Congress gave to the agencies were not fully or adequately used, with a resulting high cost addition of our present financial burdens.

The major factor contributing to the high cost of the present effort has been the lack of a complete national inventory of what we need and what we have. This deficiency cannot be continued. Congress must assume the burden of advanced planning. The start of such planning rests with an inventory of needs and resources. Future power needs and resources are a highly important part of such an over-all inventory.

Past commercial selfishness cannot be permitted to enter any of these determinations. There can be only one approach, and that is what is best for the Nation as a whole. If we do hold the high place that we have gained, the capitalistic system will advance, if not capitalism will decline faster than national security.

I would like to have the spokesmen of the private power companies tell us where the Nation would have been if they had been successful in their fight to eliminate Federal hydro power.

Let us develop our hydroelectric energy in this country, and supply it to the consumers at the lowest rates possible, consistent with sound economics, in order that we may hold our rightful position of leadership among the nations of the earth, and in order that every citizen may enjoy the comforts and conveniences of this coming electric age.

Our South American Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of a radio broadcast delivered by myself, in company with my very able colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, over radio stations WSOO at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM at Menominee, Mich., and Marinette, Wis., on Sunday, December 19:

Last week I told you of some of the charges of waste and extravagance in the use of our money in the Central and South American countries which had been made by Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, on his return from a 20,000-mile trip through those nations last summer. Senator BUTLER'S report has caused a storm of criticism by various officials in the administration, several news and radio commentators, and some of the New Deal Senators. Certain of his charges have been flatly denied, and as is usual with critics of the administration considerable effort has been made to smear Senator BUTLER personally. He has been charged with a lack of patriotism, and been charged with disruption of our good relations with our South American neighbors. Senator BUTLER has stated that in good time he will reply to these charges.

However, there recently returned to this country a subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee which made an inspection trip by air over much of this same territory. This committee was headed by Representative MATTHEW MERRITT, of New York, a Democrat, and has formally reported to the House. The committee reported that our good-neighbor policy has produced mutual benefit throughout the Western Hemisphere, and I think this is undoubtedly true, but the committee added, and I quote: "Bungling tactics by amateur good-will emissaries who bid against each other have created confusion and injured American standing." The committee cited an example of what, with seeming understatement, it calls poor planning. The Board of Economic Warfare, the committee said, once sought to develop a number of airports for the rubber trade, bringing in great quantities of supplies and high priority equipment for this purpose.

Actually, the committee report continued, the development of airports along the upper reaches of the Amazon is a tremendous undertaking, not at all necessary; in fact, is most inadvisable. If airplanes are required in these operations, the use of seaplanes, to take advantage of Brazil's great natural waterways, eliminates the time and cost required for airport construction. Much of the equipment sent down has never been used, the committee report said. It would seem to be quite apparent that our Government has been most reckless in its Latin-American operations.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have a treat for you today. I have in the studio with me one of my most able colleagues, and my very good friend, Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, who I am sure—having spoken there last winter—is no stranger to the people in the Soo and doubtless is well known to those of you who are listening in to WMAM in Menominee. Mr. SHORT is a member of that Military Affairs Subcommittee and I am going to ask him if he will be good enough to tell you some of the things the committee saw on their trip, because after all I am a firm believer in the old motto—that seeing is believing. And I know Dewey agrees with me because he's from Missouri.

Dewey, how far did your subcommittee travel on your recent inspection trip?

Mr. SHORT. Almost 15,000 miles, covering a period of 3 weeks.

Mr. BRADLEY. You have heard of all this turmoil created by Senator BUTLER'S report. It seems to me the most serious accusation he has made is that our spending policies in South America—principally due to our paying a higher wage scale—is apt to seriously disrupt the South American economy. The Senator further stated that that fact is recognized by some of the clearer thinking South Americans who are very much disturbed about this change being brought about in their economy. Will you comment on this, Dewey?

Mr. SHORT. There is no doubt in my mind that the excessive—or at least much higher—wage scale which the Americans have adopted will seriously disturb the domestic economy of many of the Latin-American countries. This I found was the opinion not only of many of our officers and American officials but was the opinion also of officials of other governments and of some of the domestic leaders themselves.

Mr. BRADLEY. What do you think their general attitude is going to be toward us when we quit spending all this money in South America?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, it is difficult to wean any calf, and I fear when those countries are taken off the bottle—or when our bottle runs dry—their cooperation might not be as hearty as it is at the present time.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, of course, Dewey, I presume it is perfectly fair to say that by and large the bulk of our money has not been wasted in any sense of the word in Latin America, because not only in addition to establishing a good-neighbor policy—which is vital to the over-all war effort—we have gotten much other good in the form of critical materials, and so forth, and airports and navy bases. Isn't that true? Can you elaborate on that as some length?

Mr. SHORT. Fred, Senator HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska is a personal friend of mine and for him I have the highest regard. I respect his sterling patriotism, his love of country, and his devotion to duty. In fact I campaigned for Senator BUTLER all over Nebraska when he was elected, and I am proud of it, because I consider him a valuable addition to the United States Senate. I have carefully read Senator BUTLER'S article in the Readers Digest, his speech on the floor of the Senate, and listened to him over the radio. In my opinion he has rendered a real service to the taxpayers of this country in pointing out much waste and extravagance—certainly as pertains to the boondoggling and social-reform programs, which we saw going on in South America and which are inexcusable and indefensible. I believe everyone, regardless of politics, will agree on that point. There is nothing that Senator BUTLER has said that I would specifically deny, but in all fairness to both him and his critics, as well as to the public at large, I feel that he has told only one side of the story. The two big things which he failed to mention—and which should never be lost sight of—are, first, the dire military necessity that confronted us after Pearl Harbor in preventing the Germans and Japanese from becoming entrenched in South America. Not only did we have to get rid of our enemies down there, but it was imperative that we secure bases—both air and naval—on the coast of Brazil from which we could transport both men and materials to North Africa and Europe.

Mr. BRADLEY. Likewise, in securing those bases, Dewey, we removed a very definite threat against the security of the Panama Canal.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad you mentioned that, Fred, because the Panama Canal, like the Soo Locks, is one of our life lines and is one of the vital arteries of our war effort. Senator BUTLER perhaps, included in his $6,000,000,000 estimated expenditure—but did not mention it—the vast sums which we have spent in building up our defenses at the Panama Canal, in Guatemala, at the Gallipagos Islands—880 miles out in the Pacific—where we have an enormous air and naval base. Heaven help any enemy which attempts to attack the Canal today. Naturally, some money was wasted down there, but I consider most of that particular kind of waste unavoidable, because we were fighting against time—and we Republicans, perhaps, would not have done much better. Furthermore, the defenses we have built up at Trinidad, and particularly the great air bases at Bolem and Natal—where we carved huge and beautiful new airports out of a jungle, with many runways 2 miles long and from which our transport planes take off for Africa, India, and Europe—and the naval base at Recife, were absolutely necessary. Both the Navy and the Army maintain constant and vigilant patrols over the shipping lanes off the coast of Africa to blast enemy subs and keep open the highway of the sea, in order, to bring the raw materials from South America to our own industrial centers. This, Fred, brings me to the

second great point which Senator BUTLER apparently overlooked—or at least failed to mention.

South America today is furnishing the United States with many of the raw materials for our sinews of war. We would be in an awful predicament if we could not get manganese, which is essential in the manufacturing of steel; if we could not get bauxite, from which aluminum is made, and which comes from Dutch Surinam; tin from Bolivia; some rubber from Amazonia and quinine from Ecuador. We have a fair grade of bauxite in Arkansas, but it is inferior to the South American bauxite, and 90 percent of this vitally needed ore, which goes into the manufacture of aur airplanes, comes from Dutch Guiana. Our whole war effort would have been stymied, if not paralyzed, were it not for these raw materials which we are getting from South America.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, Dewey, I realize what you say is perfectly true. I think that Senator BUTLER did not mean to overlook these features, but what he was critical of, and which I tried to stress last week, was the waste of our money in trying to change the economy of these Latin-American countries, and tell them how they should live in order to prosper and enjoy life. I want to ask you right now whether you saw any concrete examples of his basic criticisms—that we are squandering our money to the possible future detriment of our good-neighbor policy.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, Fred, we all believe in the good-neighbor policy and want to cooperate with every country on earth, but I agree with you and Senator BUTLER when you say that it is impossible to impose our culture—our philosophy of life—upon other peoples, and even if we could there is a serious question whether it would be desirable. The big impression which our committee—consisting of six Democrats and two Republicans—unanimously agreed upon was that there was much waste in social planning by the moral uplifters which could be avoided and which should be ended. We did find several New Deal agencies down there which, after being repudiated at home, had been lifted bodily out of this country to try the brain trusters' experiments on our South American neighbors just as if they were so many guinea pigs.

Mr. BRADLEY. Here's another very important question that I want to ask you, Dewey: In whom does the title to all these various bases rest? Are we going to have any use of them after the war is over or do they revert to the nations upon whose soil they are resting?

Mr. SHORT. Fred, you have hit the nail on the head. That is the big and all important question and the greatest concern of our committee was: What will become of these great airports and naval bases on which we have spent millions and billions of dollars when the war is over? Under present arrangements they all will be turned over to the government in which they happen to be located within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. It is obvious that these countries themselves can never operate such costly enterprises and it is equally true that the United States cannot allow these valuable fields and properties to fall into the hands of any potential enemy. While these fields took us closer to the enemy, they at the same time brought the enemy closer to us and we today are in more danger of attack from a hostile foe than we were before the fields were built, unless we maintain control of them. By all means, our Government should immediately begin to arrange to retain control of all these important bases after the war and put forth every effort to use them in the development and control of postwar commerce. The potential possibilities of postwar trade with South America are almost limitless. We should make the most of them.

Mr. BRADLEY. Thank you very much, DEWEY SHORT, I know you join me in wishing my good people up here as merry a Christmas as it is possible to have in these trying times and it is our fond hope and fervent prayer that by next Christmas the boys and girls, who are fighting on every front, will be able to spend Christmas with their loved ones back home.

Congressman Hébert Defends His Action in Use of Record—Answers Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I am compelled to burden the Members of this House with a matter which does not concern them directly, but I have no alternative.

While this matter does not concern you and my colleagues in the House directly, it most assuredly concerns you in an indirect manner and attacks the very root and base of the rights and prerogatives of this Congress to conduct itself in a manner which it deems to the best interests of the constituency which is represented in these halls.

There has been made a vicious and unwarranted attack on the propriety of the material which is submitted from time to time by Members for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD. This attack has been made by the New Orleans States, a newspaper of which I was proud to have been the city editor for so many years. Since my service on that newspaper, however, we have come to a parting of political ways and share a difference of opinion as to the best qualified men for public office in my native city of New Orleans and my native State of Louisiana.

I have learned, however, since I left the city desk of that newspaper that it is really a question of "whose ox is being gored," instead of what is logically, basically, traditionally, and fundamentally right or wrong. It grieves me to make this admission because I have always been proud of my newspaper association. It is with shame that I am compelled to confess here today that my old newspaper, the newspaper in which I had so much pride, has seen fit to forget, for the moment, I hope, the basic principles of honest and impartiality, in connection with a matter which of necessity must be brought before you for consideration. I had hoped I would not be pushed to this extreme. As a matter of fact, I even made a personal appeal to the editor of this newspaper, who really has fathered me in my chosen profession, in an effort to avoid this action of today. This appeal for a fair and impartial presentation has fallen on deaf ears, and perforce I am compelled to resort to the only outlet I have at my command in order to get the facts before the people I have the honor of representing in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, you know and I know and the Members of this House know that the customs and practices of this House are of years' standing in the matter of insertion of remarks in the RECORD. By the very machinery of operation and the law which provides and authorizes its operation, such exigencies have been provided for in the franking privilege of a Member of Congress. It is the only method Members of Congress have at their disposal of getting the facts before their constituents as evidenced in this particular case which I am about to lay before you.

The Members of this House are the sole judges of the propriety of any material which is to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Once this body has passed on the propriety of the request made, and the subject matter is printed in the RECORD, it becomes a public document and is lawfully and rightfully privileged under the frank of any Member of this House.

Perhaps there is some disagreement among the people of this action concerning the nature of the material submitted; perhaps, even among our own membership, some may hesitate to approve certain material which has seen the light of the printed page in the RECORD; perhaps some Members among us refrain from taking advantage of the privilege extended a Member of the Congress, but the fact remains that the Members of Congress, and the Members of Congress alone, are the sole and final judges of the material which is to be published in the RECORD. In this connection the Members of this House are as final in their decision as the Supreme Court of the United States on the question of legality of enacted legislation.

I have taken this time to give this explanation because I think it is my duty to present to the Members of this House the manner in which its customs, rules, and regulations are being attacked by an uninformed—intentionally or otherwise—section of the press.

In this particular instance the Congress itself was severely criticized and ridiculed by the editor of the New Orleans States in reference to the contents of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Unsatisfied with this initial attack, an open letter was addressed to the Members of the Congress in further castigation of their actions.

Yet, when the opportunity came to demonstrate to this editor his inconsistency and his failure to demonstrate his impartiality, he failed miserably.

The facts in the case are these.

Some months ago there was a disturbance in my district which attracted Nation-wide notoriety because martial law was declared by the Governor of the State in connection with the filling of a vacancy caused by the death of the sheriff of Plaquemines Parish.

There was a controversy and two sides to the story.

On one side was the Governor of the State, and on the other was an elected official of the State, a district attorney.

I am not of the same political faction of the Governor of Louisiana. The district attorney and the people he represents supported me in my last campaign.

Unable to get a full and complete presentation of his views through any other

media than the radio, the district attorney in question, bought and paid for time on a State-wide radio hook-up during which he undertook to explain his position in the matter.

Following this presentation he sent me a copy of his speech as his Congressman, and requested that I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was my right and privilege, as well as his right and privilege to make such a request. The material exceeded the alloted space and there was a charge which I offered to pay, but which offer I withdrew following consultation with older and more experienced Members of this Congress.

Following the publication of this speech I was attacked by the New Orleans States, both editorially and in a cartoon. At the same time the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and its contents were attacked.

I said nothing.

Subsequently I caused to have printed, not at Government expense, reprints of this extension of remarks and caused to have them mailed out under my frank in my district according to law.

I was then subjected to additional editorial and cartoon attack in a most misleading, biased, and prejudiced manner which reflected not only on me but every Member of this Congress who exercises the right and privilege of extension of remarks and the inclusion of extraneous material.

An attempt was made to have another Member of this body insert these editorials in the RECORD but without success.

In other words, this newspaper was attempting to have a colleague do something for which I was being condemned by the same newspaper and its editor.

Desiring to keep the records straight, and cherishing the hope that the editor of this newspaper would exhibit a degree of fairness and impartiality, I directed a letter to him on December 7, 1943.

To this date that letter has not been published even though I have, in addition, made a personal appeal to the editor.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that having failed in my written and personal appeal to keep the records straight, there is but one course remaining and that is to ask prmission to have the letter directed to this editor, published in the RECORD, so that future generations may know who has failed to tell both sides of a controversial issue.

It is this permission which I seek and respectfully thank the membership of this House for having it granted me.

Perhaps my reply to this editor and his newspaper will not have the wide momentary circulation which was enjoyed by his attacks on me and your Members of the House, but it will have the dignity of a perpetual record in the archives of this Nation which will far outlive the records of any individual newspaper and which will forever be a source of satisfaction to those who have desired nothing except fairness, impartiality, and justice in the presentation of news.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit a copy of the letter which I wrote some weeks ago, which speaks for itself:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 7, 1943.*

Maj. JAMES EVANS CROWN,
Editor, New Orleans States,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MAJOR: I have noticed on the editorial pages of the New Orleans States of the last several days consistent criticism of the propriety of entering into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by the Honorable Leander H. Perez, District Attorney for the Parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines, which is in the First Congressional District, the district which I have the honor to represent.

I do not challenge your right to criticize me for any act in my public life. I welcome criticism at all times, as you well know. Whether or not I did the proper thing in inserting Judge Perez' speech is, of course, a matter of personal opinion. My opinion is that it was most proper and this has been substantiated by the hundreds of letters which I have received in my office commending me and condemning the criticism of the New Orleans States.

I not only had the legal right to insert the matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to send it out under my frank, but I also had the moral right, which I exercised.

I have known you for many years and some of the most pleasant years of my life were spent on the New Orleans States. I know that you inherently want to be honest, fair, and impartial, and above all, I know your greatest desire is to be consistent. I know that you want to keep the record straight at all times and I further know that you do not want to sail under false colors and will welcome any opportunity to demonstrate your impartiality and sense of fairness.

Since you have seen fit to criticize my action in inserting Judge Perez' speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as witness the editorial entitled, "Misinformation," even before the speech was sent out under my frank, I call your attention to the following facts, which are not opinions, but merely a recitation of facts which the RECORD will bear out.

On Monday, June 2, 1941, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune relative to a Supreme Court decision on the classic case. A search of the files of the New Orleans States fails to disclose that I was criticized editorially or otherwise for inserting this article at the taxpayers' expense.

On June 6, 1941, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Times-Picayune entitled, "Hobby Day in the House." A search of the files of the New Orleans States fails to indicate that I was criticized editorially or otherwise for inserting that piece in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the taxpayers' expense.

On Wednesday, July 30, 1941, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not one piece, but three different pieces, the first a letter from Gov. Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana, the second an editorial from the Times-Picayune entitled, "One Man's Opinion," and the third, "A Ridiculous Finding," an editorial from the New Orleans States—all of these at the taxpayers' expense.

I have searched the files of the New Orleans States and I have failed to find one line of criticism by yourself for having so inserted these articles.

On Thursday, March 27, 1941, I inserted a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Gov. Sam Jones, at the taxpayers' expense, and a search of the files fails to disclose that I was criticized for inserting this letter.

On Wednesday, May 14, 1941, I again inserted in the extension of remarks observations regarding the first anniversary of Gov. Sam Jones in office which covered considerable space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A search of the files of the New Orleans States does not disclose any criticism of my having done this, while the news column discloses the fact that the New Orleans States thought enough of the insertion in the RECORD to print approximately a column of quotes from this extension of remarks.

In view of the criticism which you have directed at me for inserting a speech delivered by an elected official of the State of Louisiana, and in view of the fact that I was not criticized when I inserted editorials from the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States, and letters from Gov. Sam H. Jones, I respectfully ask that you do me the courtesy of printing this letter in order that the general public may not get the impression that the only reason I am being subjected to criticism at this time is that you are opposed to Mr. Perez politically and personally.

I am very much afraid that fair and impartial people will be unable to draw any other conclusion if you do not also condemn and criticise me for having used the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to publicize editorials from the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States and letters from Governor Jones. I am sure that if it is wrong now to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain matters relating to activities in my district, it would in your opinion, have been wrong in 1941.

I am sure you do not want to leave with the reading public that it is wrong to insert something which Mr. Perez has to say, while it is perfectly proper to have inserted something which the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States and Governor Jones had to say on another occasion.

I am further convinced that your motive in criticising now is not activated by "whose ox is being gored." I am sure an explanation by you as to why I was not so severely criticised for doing exactly the same thing in 1941 which I am being subject to such criticism for doing in 1943 would be most enlightening. I am sure the fact that different political sides were being represented has nothing to do with your present opinion or expressions and criticism, and for that reason I believe it only fair that your readers should know the real motive behind the present criticism, since bias and prejudice and different political views are not the basis of the current criticism.

In conclusion may I say this to you, that if it is your desire to have this exchange of correspondence printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I shall be very happy to do so upon your request. Further, if you care to bear the expense of reprinting and addressing of envelopes, such as Mr. Perez did, which was certainly not at the Government's expense and did not cost the taxpayers one penny, I shall be very happy to do so upon receipt of your check to cover same.

It is my one desire to give the people I represent in Congress proper representation, fairly and impartially, which I am sure is the same as you desire to do in your editorial columns.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

The Soldier-Vote Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address

delivered by me over the Blue Network Tuesday, December 21, 1943:

I should like to vote for anything that would make it easier for our soldiers, sailors, and marines to vote. But the Green-Lucas bill is clearly unconstitutional. If we are so foolish as to pass this bill, we will be paving the way for an ironclad Federal control of elections in every precinct in America. To extend the Federal power over elections would be a very dangerous thing in this Nation at this time. I do not know of a better way of creating a dictatorship. What is more, I would not want our boys to vote in what may prove to be an illegal election. American history has an example in the Hayes-Tilden election of 1876 when a civil war almost ensued because of the partisan character of the decision in that election.

The 1944 election is still 10 months off. If the war continues by then—and I sincerely hope it will not—there is still sufficient time for the States to provide the facilities, together with the military authorities, which would enable our servicemen to cast their lawful ballots. Soldier voting can, and must be done, without any violation of the Constitution of the United States. It is not only the responsibility but the duty of the States to provide means whereby our soldiers, sailors, and marines can vote. Each State can do the job a whole lot better than through a bureaucratic Federal ballot.

If the Federal ballot bill is finally agreed on, it would mark the beginning of the end to States' rights and the American way of life. Such bill encroaches upon and destroys the sovereignty of the States. The Senate rejected the Federal ballot plan and passed the amendment sponsored by Senators EASTLAND, MCCLELLAND, and MCKELLAR, which protects the rights of the States to extend the privilege of voting to all the members of our armed forces. I trust that the House will do likewise and preserve the heritage which our forefathers have entrusted in our keeping.

Iowa State Commerce Commission Opposes Lea Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Iowa State Commerce Commission opposing the enactment of H. R. 3420:

Whereas there is pending in the United States Congress H. R. 3420 relating to aviation and air commerce; and

Whereas said bill, if adopted, will completely destroy the right of the several States to regulate intrastate service, rates, and operations of carriers by air; and

Whereas the adoption of said bill would assert the right of Congress to deprive the States of the right to regulate the intrastate services and rates of all forms of transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this commission go on record as opposed to the passage of H. R. 3420 or any other bill which proposes to deprive the States of their right to regulate intrastate air or other form of transportation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Iowa and that they be urged to oppose the passage of said bill.

By order of the commission:

IOWA STATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
CARL W. REED, *Chairman*.
B. M. RICHARDSON, *Commissioner*.
DAVID B. LONG, *Commissioner*.

Attest:

GEO. L. MCCAUGHAN, *Secretary*.

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, December 6, 1943.

Christmas, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to include a letter written by a 20-year-old member of the armed forces, William Campbell, of Wellesley, Mass., to his 7-year-old brother, Craig. Their father, a captain in the marines, has been in the Mediterranean area for nearly a year.

This letter comes pretty close, by eloquent implication, to expressing the spirit of the Christmas as well as those indefinable values we struggle to preserve today:

DECEMBER 17, 1943.

DEAREST CRAIGIE BOY: Since I can't seem to get hold of any Christmas cards, and I know you would like one, this letter will have to take its place. Your wonderful card arrived yesterday, which really made your old brother awfully homesick for a few minutes. You even wrote your own name. You must be learning a great deal, and getting ahead very fast. I'll be sure glad when this war is over, then we can all be one big happy family again. How many times in one day I think of the things we could be doing together, I can't count. Decorating the Christmas tree, buying dozens of wonderful presents, skiing, skating, playing with Moo-Moo, rushing downtown to get mom's groceries, then helping her set the table—the three boys helping our darling mom.

Well, Craigie, it won't be too long before we are doing those things; we shall never look back, but look ahead. We have some grand days ahead of us.

You, mom, dad, and Sue would laugh if you could see California during Christmas. There is no snow, ice, or freezing weather; instead there are flowers around the green lawns and houses, green leaves, big palm trees, even trees with oranges hanging from the branches. In Hollywood, where most of the movies are made, the stores are filled with gay present, papers, and I saw Santa Claus in one place, but it still doesn't feel like Christmas.

I am so very glad you and Mom are going to Uncle Walts in Washington for the holiday. It will be fun for you both, for travel is always exciting, though hard in these times. Dad and I shall be thinking of you all the time, but none of us should be sad. We have much to be happy and thankful for.

Your brother is very, very lucky this year. Our company is the only one that is going to have the Christmas week end free, so we will not have to stay in this camp. Perhaps I'll go to Mrs. Mathini's, if she invites me. I haven't seen her yet, but I'm going to visit her on Monday evening. It will be so wonderful to see someone we used to know and like so well.

Craigie, I wish you could see Los Angeles. Everything is streamlined, modern, and clean, almost like a beautiful dream. I must get some pictures of it, so you can see just what it looks like. Its impossible to describe it.

We have been doing a great deal of hiking here in camp. It is getting so that a 4-mile walk is like walking around the corner, but when I come home I'll catch a darn bus before walking anywhere.

Oh, you should see the mountains here—great big jagged things, with a lovely blue sea below. Pretty colors everywhere.

Tonight I have to walk by the fence with my own rifle and bayonet, and not let anyone in or out of camp. Have to walk from 8 o'clock till midnight, and it looks as though it's going to rain.

Boy, Hash is sleepy, so I'll grab a little sleep. Take good care of Mommie and yourself, and have the bestest Christmas possible. You will receive a present, but probably after the holiday.

Your brother misses you terribly, and lives for the day when we'll be free and together again.

Always your loving and devoted brother,
"HASHIE."

Home Front Predictions After Germany Is Conquered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, much thought has been given by the American people to the conditions that will exist in this country after Germany shall have been defeated and prior to the collapse of Japan. The size of the armed forces, the components of the armed services that would necessarily be needed in fighting the war to a final conclusion against Japan, the question of reconversion of war plants, the amount of food available for civilian consumption, employment, wages, manufacture and distribution of civilian goods and their effect upon inflationary or deflationary conditions, transportation, exportation of foods and other needs for the Allied Nations, and other questions would be considerations before the country.

I will not attempt to discuss each one of these problems, however, I will undertake to touch upon some of the changed conditions which the defeat of Germany will bring about. The whole war machinery would be concentrated on an early defeat of Japan. It is known that Great Britain, who has a great deal of interests in the Pacific area, can be counted upon to join with the American and Chinese forces in the offensive against the Japanese. Some here believe that Russia, too, will assist after the war in Europe has ended. Russia is not

at war with Japan and would not want to have to fight a two-front campaign at the same time.

It is possible that some 2,000,000 men will be discharged after the war in Europe ends. Most of these men will probably be members of the ground forces instead of the Air Corps and Navy. In the war against Japan it is essential that we have a strong Navy and air branch because of the great distances and the large area over which the fighting will extend.

Plants that are now engaged in the manufacture of clothing for both war and civilian needs would be in a position to increase the amount of these goods for sale to the consuming public, due to the tapering off in war needs. By the production of more civilian goods inflationary danger would be diminished. Food reserves which the Army and Navy has may be sold to the civilian population which would drive the price of foods slightly downward. Should a bumper 1944 crop be produced, this, too, would tend to reduce food costs during the marketing season.

Automobiles, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, radios, and other such articles will not be produced for many months after the fall of Germany, and probably not until both Germany and Japan are defeated. New automobiles could not be expected at least before 1945. Tires also will continue to be scarce and only made available for essential uses.

Wages will be a big problem to consider during this period. There will be a difference in the amount paid the worker who is employed in war plants and those who are engaged in civilian work exclusively. The war worker will be given the advantage of not only higher wages, but also overtime pay. The railroads, truck, and water carriers will be pushed to the utmost to transport supplies for the needs of the Pacific war. All forms of transportation facilities will continue to feel the acute pressure which has been in existence since the declaration of war.

How the Subsidy Foes Now Explain Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clifford A. Prevost, from the Detroit Free Press of December 19, 1943:

HOW THE SUBSIDY FOES NOW EXPLAIN STAND

(By Clifford A. Prevost)

WASHINGTON, December 18.—Writing a column defending the Congressmen who have voted against subsidies, or at least explaining their position, is to invite no end of criticism. Nevertheless, that's what is proposed in this article, which is written because we still believe that a freely elected Congress is, and will always be, the first line of defense against dictatorship or an all-embracing bureaucracy.

In the first place, the vote by which the antisubsidy legislation passed the House of Representatives was 278 to 117, a formidable majority. Listed against subsidies were men who are ultraconservative, men who are not subject to the pressure groups, men who have a very definite fear of inflation. That a vast majority of them sincerely believe that subsidies ultimately would lead to inflation is apparent to anyone who chooses to read their records, some of which extend over periods of 25 and 30 years as public servants.

These Congressmen have been besieged in recent weeks with letters bitterly denouncing them for their anti-inflation vote.

People who know nothing about inflation have denounced the men who stood against the administration. All one has to do is read some of these letters to understand that the letters resulted from a hysteria created by interested parties, and were written by persons woefully misinformed.

Well, lets look at the two pictures presented by the subsidy argument. Just last spring the Office of Price Administration was telling the Congress that only $800,000,000 would be required for subsidies in order that food prices may be kept down. But Prentiss M. Brown retired some months ago as O. P. A. director and was succeeded by Chester Bowles, and the latter now tells Congress that $1,500,000,000 will be necessary to meet subsidies in the next 6 months.

Now, remember there has been no change in the Price Control Act, that nothing has been done by Congress to alter in the slightest degree the broad powers conferred upon the O. P. A. The bill prohibiting subsidies has not become law and cannot until passed by the Senate and signed by the President. Bowles is still operating under the original P. C. A.

During the period when Congress has been debating whether subsidies should be paid, the O. P. A. has had the right to subsidize.

Here are the figures as to how it has operated: In October Price Administrator Bowles permitted increases in the price of commodities in 97 instances, and he ordered roll-backs, or reductions in only 22 instances.

In November the same Bowles permitted increased prices in 45 instances and ordered roll-backs in only five instances.

There was nothing in the law to prohibit Bowles from ordering a greater number of roll-backs. There was nothing in the law which compelled him to permit price increases. He had all the authority the Administration ever sought, and the money required to pay the subsidies which in turn allow for the roll-backs. Bowles didn't choose to use the power conferred upon him.

The administration is calling upon Congress to "hold the line" against inflation. That is the cry of War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes and Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson, both speaking with the approval of the White House. But all down the line, in the coal situation, in the railway situation, and a dozen other industries, the line has not been held.

Congressmen raise what we consider to be the all important question, Where do subsidies begin and where do they end? If they vote permanent subsidies to hold down the price of foodstuffs, then why shouldn't they vote subsidies to keep down rising prices in clothing, furniture, shoes, and all the other things necessary to hold down the cost of living. Some of the best minds in Congress (and there are plenty) believe that the subsidy method is the short cut to inflation, that once subsidies are started they will expand to include virtually all industries.

"It looks to me, after 26 years in this Congress, that the administration wants to subsidize everybody," is the way ROY O. WOODRUFF, chairman of the Republican conference, puts it. "There are a lot of us who believe an automobile is essential to our way of living. I wonder how O. P. A. justifies the sale of used cars at prices formerly paid for new ones?"

Wages are going up, and from all present indications, will continue to go up, and it is generally recognized that when the pay envelope increases that prices of commodities, shoes, clothing, and everything else also rise.

O. P. A. has failed dismally to hold down prices, as every housewife knows, and the question is again asked—how many billions would be required to hold the line on everything which Americans have been taught to believe essential to our way of living. O. P. A. admits that it could do a better job if Congress would give it many more millions with which to employ an army of snoopers. That is the excuse offered, the shortage of trained investigators.

But, as pointed out by several Senators, O. P. A. has not prosecuted all big violators of the established ceilings, preferring to allow them to go free upon the payment of fines arrived at by compromise.

The wage situation fits into the entire picture but, just as an illustration, let's review what occurred when the railway workers were granted an increase of 8 cents an hour. That raise was allowed by the Railway Labor Board under an act of Congress. Stabilization Director Vinson stepped in to veto the award, thereby overstepping his authority for the act creating his office which specifically stipulated that nothing contained therein could be interpreted as repealing any previous act, which included the Railway Retirement Act. Vinson was trying to stop the administration of an act which he was specifically prohibited from interfering with.

There are 96 Senators and all but 4 of them voted in approval of the increase awarded the railwaymen. There were only two Republican votes against the measure, cast by Senators ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and both are friendly to the railway workers.

They voted against the increase hoping that they could contribute something to hold a sadly bent line against inflation. Of the two Democrats, BAILEY, of North Carolina, is an outright conservative, and will vote, we suspect, against subsidies. Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, was the only other dissenter.

VINSON'S contention was, of course, that the increase would lead to inflation. Can you imagine that there are only four Members of the United States Senate who are against inflation? It was strange that VINSON did not protest the increase granted the coal miners (and all officials believe they were entitled to it) at a time when the mines were completely controlled by the Government, and still are? It didn't make sense to the Senate that higher pay for railway workers would break the line, while a still greater boost to the coal miners would have no effect.

Other than those who blindly follow the leadership of the Administration, there are few men on Capitol Hill who believe that the furore over the antisubsidy legislation will have any beneficial effect. They point out that housewives cannot be deceived by O. P. A. statements that prices are being controlled. Because housewives know what they are paying for commodities.

It is explained that women no longer ask the price, merely the number of ration coupons required. That's true in Washington but not in the rest of the country, for Washington has no industries and is the most costly city in the country in which to live. If you know the right people, as Government officials do, there is no scarcity of anything, and black markets flourish right under Bowles' nose. But housewives far removed are still screaming about eggs at 67 cents a dozen, where the ceiling price is 52 cents.

Congressmen believe that women have been completely disillusioned about the O. P. A.'s ability to hold down the cost of living, and the Members are willing to risk their political necks on this belief.

Address of Jaime Hernandez, Auditor General of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following publication issued by Public Relations Department of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

Jaime Hernandez, auditor general of the Philippines, in a Philippine Commonwealth Day address in New York, last night declared that the destiny of the Filipino people "as the spearhead of democracy and freedom among the oriental peoples shall reappear more resplendent after the most trying and dreadful ordeal in their history."

The Philippine official said that "all the misleading propaganda used by the Japanese to cajol the Filipinos into abandoning their way of life and adopting that of Japan will not influence us in the least." "The Filipinos who are free," he added, "can see distinctly the evil and far-reaching consequences that will result from abdication of our culture and democratic principles."

Mr. Hernandez was the main speaker at the banquet given by the Filipino community of New York under the auspices of the Filipino National Council and the Philippine Center at the McAlpin Hotel.

Special Philippine Commonwealth Day messages from President Manuel L. Quezon, Vice President Sergio Osmena, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia were read during the program.

Full text of Mr. Hernandez' address, outlining the framework of the Philippine Commonwealth and comparing it with the Japanese administration in the Philippines, follows:

'We are gathered here tonight in order to celebrate the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. It is indeed most fitting that we should do so, for on that historic day the sovereign Government of the United States placed in the hands of the Filipino people the authority of shaping the course of their national destiny. The Commonwealth of the Philippines, established in pursuance of such authority, is the groundwork on which we shall erect the independent and sovereign Philippine republic. This event was originally scheduled for July 4, 1946, but it may take place even sooner as the result of a pending resolution in Congress.

"At the outset, let us review in broad outlines the framework of the Commonwealth. The foundation of this government is a constitution formulated by the delegates of the Filipino people in convention assembled for that purpose, approved by the Government of the United States, and ratified by the Filipino people in a nation-wide plebiscite. That constitution is the fullest and freest expression of the sovereign will of the Filipinos as to the kind of government they desire to establish for themselves. It is a constitution for the Filipinos, by the Filipinos, although the experiences of liberty-loving peoples throughout the ages, as crystallized in their political institutions and democratic practices, also influenced greatly in the drafting of our Constitution.

"The government established under this fundamental law derives its authority from the people of the Philippines, and exercises its functions and duties in accordance with democratic procedures. The separation of sovereign powers among the three great departments of government is faithfully maintained in order to insure to the people the preservation of democracy in the Philippines. Officials are chosen in free and untrammeled popular elections, and the constitutional processes guaranteed by the basic law are the guiding and controlling forces in the exercise of the sovereign will by the people. The phrase "government of the people" is not a mere rhetorical expression, but a working and living reality in the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. With the establishment of this government, through a most magnanimous and unprecedented act of the United States of America, the model democracy in all history, the Filipino people finally became masters of their own destiny.

"Almost at the end of the Commonwealth period, but before the Philippine Republic could become a reality, a global conflict created astounding confusion and grave disorder in the normal relations among nations and peoples. Our young Commonwealth was abruptly interrupted in its peaceful task of building a democratic nation, and was unavoidably and forcibly engulfed in the present world catastrophe. In the midst of this overwhelming world revolution, the Filipino people cannot stop by the wayside and, from a safe vantage ground, watch passively the destruction of nations and political and social institutions. We are in this tragic international upheaval, and our Nation and institutions will survive or perish according to our own ability to cope with the destructive forces let loose by this global holocaust.

"The vicissitudes of war have temporarily placed our country under the absolute domination of imperialistic Japan. Japanese political ideas and practices are completely at variance from the political thought and way of national life of the Filipino people. Imperialism and the belief in an absolute and supposedly divine head of the state are entirely antagonistic to, and incompatible with, democratic governments and the idea of the sovereignty of the people. Centuries of imperial rule by the Mikado have made the Japanese people stern, absolute, and arbitrary rulers but also submissive and servile subjects. On the other hand, four centuries of constant rebellion against despotism and autocratic rulers have made the Filipinos appreciate and embrace more dearly the blessings of democracy and popular government. The two peoples having different and antagonistic political ideologies and experiences have come in abrupt and forcible contact with each other, the Japanese as the self-imposed rulers, and the Filipinos, unfortunately, as the helpless subjects.

"Despite the wide gap that separates the two people culturally and politically, the Japanese have apparently allowed the Filipinos, under of course the autocratic and iron dictation of Japanese militarists, to set up a government in the Philippines on condition that such government shall fully cooperate with Japan in the establishment of a greater east Asia coprosperity sphere. Independence, the cherished ideal of all Filipinos for four centuries, was cleverly used as a bait, dangled before the people of the Philippines from the bayonets of Japanese militarists still dripping with precious blood of Filipino heroes. The magic word "independence" was very skillfully and alluringly used to sugar-coat the most vile design of Japanese imperialism. For the vaunted purpose of destroying and eradicating all traces of western culture and civilization in the Philippines and of making the Filipinos revert to oriental—which means Japanese—way of life, the Japanese invaders, amidst rattling sabers, have handed to the Filipinos a so-called independence on a silver platter, with a Japanese ambassador plenipotentiary and a Japanese military high command thrown in.

"Let us examine closely this made-in-Japan Philippine independent government. Above all, that government was established by the most undemocratic procedure. Its constitution was made and approved, not by the free people of the Philippine, but by the few scattered members of the Kalibapi only, an organization inspired and bolstered by the Japanese militarists. It is an organization conceived in despotism and born of war and cannot, therefore, claim even the outward appearance, and much less the substance and the spirit, of a mandate from the people of the Philippines. A constitution that is imposed upon the people by an organization based on military and despotic power cannot be made the basis of true independent government. The Japanese-sponsored Filipino independence is, therefore, independence in name only and its government is a government maintained solely by the military power of Japan.

"Besides this spurious and counterfeit constitution, the independence given by Japan requires the Filipinos to discard and to forget their training in democracy and self-expression in public affairs as being foreign to the oriental ideas of government. They must revert to the oriental political life and institutions, which simply mean utter submission of the masses to the despotic will of a supposedly divine ruler. Japan should be reminded that the Filipinos, although an oriental race, have been nurtured in Western civilization and in democratic principles. Their Malayan customs and traditions have not been unrooted nor replaced by occidental modes of life, but have been enriched and strengthened by the infusion of Western democratic principles and the doctrine of popular sovereignty in government. This blending of Malayan customs and traditions with Western democracy and popular sovereignty has made the Filipinos the only oriental people whose culture and political ideologies are molded not by the absolute will of an autocratic ruler but by the free and supreme will of the masses.

"This westernized condition of Filipino national life is the principal stumbling block of Japanese inordinate ambition to dominate all the oriental peoples. Japan fears that unless those western ideas are forever eradicated from the Philippines, they will in time shed the light and extend the hope of democracy to the less fortunate peoples of the Orient who are now struggling in the clutches of imperialistic Japan. The blessings of Christian culture and of democratic institutions which shape and guide and condition the national life of the Filipinos for generations are now, by Japan's iron will, to be abandoned and given up completely and totally in exchange for a nominal and hallow independence which Japan cynically gave to the Filipinos. It is obvious that Japan wants us to exchange our birthright for a mess of pottage.

"Amidst the confusion of the world's turmoil and in spite of Japan's will, the Filipinos should never forget that the blessings of western civilization and culture are theirs not to be easily laid aside and discarded like a worn-out cloak, but to be kept and preserved as a precious heritage for generations yet unborn. Even more, these blessings are theirs not to be preserved for themselves alone, but to be transmitted to other peoples of the east, so that they likewise may be liberated from the benighted idea of divine right of rulers and from imperialistic influ-

ences and tyranny. The Filipinos have been chosen by the forces of history, it seems, and have been privileged to be the standard-bearers of democracy and freedom in the Far Eastern world. They cannot shirk from this grave responsibility and trust.

"The free Filipinos do not have the slightest doubt as to the proper and only course to follow at this time. All the misleading propaganda used by the Japanese to cajole the Filipinos into abandoning their way of life and adopting that of Japan will not influence us in the least. We are not under the unrelenting and despotic power of Japan and we can see distinctly the evil and far-reaching consequences that will result from abdication of our culture and democratic principles. But our brothers in the Philippines have no alternative; they are not free to choose for themselves the course of action which they know and feel in their inmost souls to be the right one to follow. Whatever influence and power the Japanese are making to bear in the Philippines by superior force during the war, I am sure that, after the clouds of war shall have vanished from our skies and the liberating forces of democracy shall have destroyed the forces of oppression in our land, the Filipino people as a whole shall emerge stronger, more firm, and more determined to preserve and perpetuate the democratic way of life in the Philippines. We will be like tempered steel made strong by the intense and purifying heat of the crucible. Yes, their destiny as the spearhead of democracy and freedom among the oriental peoples shall reappear more resplendent after the most trying and dreadful ordeal in their history. That high purpose shall be carried out by the Filipino people as their contribution to the irresistible forward march of democracy and freedom throughout the world."

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including some articles written by me during the past 20 months on the general subject of China. They deal with the question of extraterritorial rights, Chinese exclusion, and our present and post-war relations with China. All of these articles were delivered over the radio at one time or another and the date on which each was broadcast is given at the start of the excerpt.

[Station WHP, Harrisburg, August 24, 1942]

INDIA—RECOGNITION OF CHINA—KOREA

The upheavals and disturbances in India culminating in civil disobedience campaign have focused our attention on Asia more than ever before. The Indian problem is peculiarly a British and Indian one. At present, in this critical stage of the war, its solution must be left to the British, the Indian Government, and the Indians. I have studied Indian-British relations enough to know that they are one of the most complicated affairs in the world. If India were a unified nation at home, then perhaps an agreement could be reached with the British Government that would be satisfactory to both sides. But India is a mass of religions, races, and parties, most of whom are at variance with each other, and the interests of each must be considered in a final solution. That is what makes the whole business so complicated and that is why even people who have spent years in that ancient nation studying its past history and its present conditions do not have a really complete understanding of the various factors involved and it is the reason why the views of these people vary so greatly one from another.

Each day it becomes more clear that one of the greatest movements of this war is the emergence of Asia into the affairs of the world. Historians 50 or 100 years hence may decide that this is the most far-reaching force of the present era. This fact was implicitly acknowledged by the British Government when it promised to give India independence after the war. The rapid growth of the nationalistic spirit in China and her modernization during the last 25 years, particularly since the start of the war with Japan over 5 years ago, is another proof of this. The basic struggle in Asia is between two ideas. First, that of Asia for the Asiatics, which means that the various nations in Asia will determine their own future for themselves—an idea in line with the announced beliefs and policies of our own Government and our own beliefs as to what world democracy should be. Secondly, the opposing view of Asia for the Japanese and every step which the Jap military machine takes is directed at the complete subjugation of the Asiatics to a state of slavery similar to that which exists in the Jap puppet states of Korea and Manchukuo. It therefore seems wise that the United States and the United Nations should place themselves on record by positive action in favor of the principle of Asia for the Asiatics.

With the present state of tension in India, with the impending danger of Jap aggression, and because of our relations with the British Government, no one in public life should embarrass our President or State Department or the United Nations by urging a positive policy of this nature at present in respect to India. However, if the United Nations made an agreement in which Chinese sovereignty after the war was recognized and guaranteed and which set out unequivocally that in the future the western powers would not attempt to dominate Chinese trade through control of its ports, as they did for many years past, and would abandon forever any claims to the establishment of International Settlements and other special rights in China, this should have a very strong effect in causing all other Asiatic peoples to accept our declarations of good intentions and good will at face value and to believe in them. It would reinforce our statements and our charters with an effectiveness otherwise impossible. A definite act such as this would be certain to have favorable repercussions in India and Asia as well as in China. China and India have shown their closeness by recent deeds.

Another step that could be taken would be a joint recognition by the United Nations of Korea. For years the Koreans have been oppressed and tortured by the Japanese, but they have never been subdued and they have never lost their national pride and spirit. They still fight the Japanese at every opportunity and overlook no chances to sabotage the Japanese program. The Japanese conquest was a case of pure aggression. Japanese treatment has been horrible and the exploitation continuous. Since we are at war with Japan there is not even any materialistic reason for our refusal to recognize Korea. Every moral and spiritual consideration urges us to do so. It would be a further evidence to the Asiatics that we will permit them to have freedom to develop their own economies and their own political institutions. Both actions would be a body blow to the Japanese claim that they are fighting the white man to liberate Asia and to keep Asia for the Asiatics. Our delay in taking a positive position on this gives support to the Japanese claims and propaganda and gives them a moral leverage in Asia which they should never be permitted to retain, especially since they have no moral standards whatever and their moral claims are a pure fake, which should be exposed to the light of truth at every possible opportunity and the sooner the better.

Actually such a treaty in respect to China is merely a public declaration that the United States recognize an existing fact. China has not fought for over 5 years and undergone countless sacrifices in order to be able to go back to the old type of exploitation. China's achievements and her heroic resistance and her developments are a guarantee that she is able and willing to take a foremost place in the future family of nations.

Everyone wants to build soundly so as to create a long and enduring era of peace and prosperity which will not contain the germs of future conflicts and which will be as widespread as possible. At this time we can little by little be laying the foundation stones for just that. And it is really more important to take these smaller steps now than it is to do nothing save indulge in purely theoretical schemes whose actual operation and whose form and shape will necessarily be dependent upon the condition of the world as it exists at the end of the war and the abilities of war-devastated peoples to carry out their hopes and aspirations.

[Station WHP, Harrisburg, August 31, 1942]

STEPS TOWARD PEACE—CHINA

Last week I was talking about some very definite steps toward a sound and enduring peace that could and should be taken now by the United Nations. These were the abolition of extraterritorial rights by the United States, Great Britain, and the other western powers, in China and the recognition of Korea. I had been studying over the subject matter of that speech for some months and had written it 6 or 7 weeks ago but never used it, because, until the present informal recess there were so many current topics worth discussing. It was a coincidence that last Saturday, August 29, 5 days after the speech, was the one-hundredth anniversary of the Treaty of Nanking, as a result of which foreign nations acquired control over sections of China and extraterritorial rights—that is, rights superior to or in addition to those of the Chinese people themselves. Some friends of mine sent me the New York Times, which editorially took the same view as outlined in my last week's talk, and also printed an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, the noted foreign news reporter. Of course, the Chinese for years preceding the present war had vainly attempted to have these rights ended. Mrs. McCormick gave the latest statements on this whole subject by Prime Minister Churchill and by Secretary Hull, speaking for our own Government. The former said, "On more than one occasion the British Government has expressed its intention to do likewise." Secretary Hull assured Dr. Quo Tai-Chi, former Chinese Foreign Minister, that this Government, "When conditions of peace again prevail, expects to move rapidly by processes of orderly negotiation and agreement with the Chinese Government, toward relinquishment of the extraterritorial rights and other special privileges."

This is a far cry from making a permanent settlement now. It merely leaves one more loose end to be tied up at the peace table. It loses us the benefit throughout India and Asia of a factual accomplishment of our declared intention. Furthermore, it is bound

to create good will if we do willing and voluntarily, of our own accord, now, something which will inevitably happen anyhow in the future. China has already done more than we could have asked or expected of her. No nation has ever done so much with so little. Chinese resistance has been so valiant and miraculous that our leaders drew a wrong inference from the Chinese-Japanese War. They underestimated Japan because of her failure to overwhelm the ill-equipped Chinese, instead of adequately valuing the tenacity and the resourcefulness of the Chinese.

I further quote from Mrs. McCormick's article on this topic: "That China is today one of the four leading powers of the United Nations may well turn out to be the most important fact in the whole picture. But for China, this struggle might be represented as a war between Orient and Occident. China contradicts Japan's cynical pretense to be fighting to restore Asia to the Asiatics and thereby invalidates the rallying cry that stirs the Orient like a wind."

From past experiences we know that the disagreements and the lack of unified policy between the Allies at the time of the armistice in 1918 formed the stumbling block which wrecked President Wilson's plan for a new and better world order. The Allies fought among themselves so strenuously at Versailles and thereafter that the peace settlement was one of inequalities and inconsistencies. The lesson in this seems clear to me. It is that the United Nations should steadily and consistently iron out all differences of opinion among themselves and reach mutual agreements as fast as can be done while the war is in progress with a view to leaving as few unsettled problems as possible so that the peace which is to follow will not be wrecked by squabbles between the Allies themselves as in 1918. That is why I feel so strongly that a definite settlement of the post-war status of China should be clarified and finally determined now by China, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, with the approval of the 24 other United Nations. The same is true in the case of Korea. You may say that this is tacitly accepted but it should be publicly guaranteed by overt act. There should be no difficulty in arriving at a treaty of this nature and it would certainly strengthen the foundation for a future peaceful world. Perhaps in time when the present high feelings and angers have calmed it may be possible to work out a similar result for India. Anyhow, it is along this extremely practical but far-sighted line that our policy should develop.

In great measure the ideals set forth in the Atlantic Charter are ones to which we can all subscribe—although the reservations concerning colonial empires may be subject to disagreement. But if the Atlantic Charter is to be made effective and useful, the practical decisions to carry its principles into effect in specific cases must be reached, and they should be reached as soon as possible. Not all the solutions can be found at once, but we should go as far as we can.

[Station WHP, Harrisburg, October 18, 1942]

EXTRATERRITORIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA

No doubt some of you have heard some of my recent speeches urging the voluntary abolition of extraterritorial rights in China. The United States and Great Britain have now—just this week—done this publicly and voluntarily, and, as I stated before the United States made this move, I feel that it will have most favorable repercussions throughout all of Asia and throughout all the world. Already reports indicate that the Chinese are delighted at the timely achievement of one of the great idealistic and nationalistic aims. Furthermore, this is a direct answer to Japan's propaganda of Asia for the Asiatics. In substance, it means the voluntary relinquishment of the so-called white supremacy in Asia and special privileges for the white race. The fact that this is being done at a time when Japan is destroying Asiatics whenever and wherever possible and forcing them into complete subjection makes our own action even more effective and contrasting. We have put our words into deeds in this specific case and that is what counts.

[Station WHP, Harrisburg, October 17, 1943]

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

The next bill that will come before the House, according to the present schedule, is the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act. This has been under discussion for some months, and I am glad that it is finally going to come to a vote. There is a great deal of misapprehension about what that bill will do. Many people are afraid that it will open up this country to a flood of cheap oriental labor. Such is not the case. If the act is repealed, then the Chinese will merely be placed on the same basis as everyone else. They will be subject to the quota laws which now govern the immigration of all other nationalities, creeds, and races. Under those laws, only 107 Chinese per year can come into this country. If we are a democracy we should treat everyone alike. There is no reason why we should exclude specifically Chinese because they are Chinese and do so by name. The fact that we have done so since 1880 has given Japan its most effective propaganda weapon in Asia.

Repeal of this act will be an instrument in winning the war. But not only from the standpoint of justice, equity, and winning the war, but also from the standpoint of long-term self-interest we should do this now. One of the most momentous events in world history is now happening. That is the emergence of Asia. Asia is beginning to take its place as one of the great economic continents of the world. Of all Asia, China has progressed the furthest. If we can increase and maintain the friendship between ourselves and the Chinese there is the greatest possible opening for a trade area in China that anyone today can envision. It may well be, in my opinion, that if we fail to repeal the Chinese exclusion law now that 10 years from now China may pass an American exclusion act and that would be much more disastrous to us then than is our present Chinese Exclusion Act to the Chinese today.

[Station WHP, Harrisburg, December 5, 1943]

CHINA AND THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

The several radio talks in which I discussed China and the Chinese Exclusion Act stressed mainly the facts that, first, only 105 Chinese would be admitted each year to this country if we replaced exclusion with the quota system. Secondly, that we would only be rendering a belated justice to a great and faithful ally by establishing that ally on an equality with other nations.

Probably I should have laid a heavier emphasis upon the material benefits accruing to this country through friendly relations with China in the post-war world. One of the most significant developments of the age in which we live is the emergence of Asia as a great force in world affairs. Distance makes this less obvious than it should be. For the past 25 years China in particular has started to adapt itself to western ideas and to adopt western mechanism. The oriental philosophy and custom remain substantially the same. The Chinese have not discarded their priceless cultural heritage of generations. When the tyrant's heel is removed from her shores, China, in my opinion, will start an industrial revolution during the twentieth century. It will rival and probably surpass those which took place during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in England and America.

It also so happens that China is more complementary to this country in trade than is any other nation in the world. By that I mean the Chinese want and need more of the things we produce; and they produce more of the things we want and need than is true of any other nation. With a population of well over 300,000,000—nearly three times our own population--China offers the potentially greatest market in the world in the post-war era. A great share of it can and should be ours if we act wisely, fairly, and honestly and are willing to assume reasonable risks.

If we cement our friendship with China by intelligently and soundly helping these 300,000,000 Chinese to help themselves, then we will lay the cornerstone of a long and continued era of prosperity for the United States of America.

Feeling as I do about this, it interested me greatly to read an article in the last issue of the United States News, which gave a brief survey of China's needs and of her plans for post-war development. This program will last for 20 to 50 years. A committee of the Chinese Society of Engineers is busily engaged now in reducing specific surveys to detailed data. The United States News gives the preliminary figures of Chinese needs for the long-range period. They are: 100,000 miles of railway; 20,000,000 tons of steel; 25,000 locomotives; 300,000 freight cars; 30,000 railway passenger cars; 500,000 new automobiles per year for 10 years, or a total of 5,000,000 new automobiles; and 1,000,000 miles of highway. Most of this material we can supply. Probably we are the only nation able to do so. The Chinese have a high reputation for honesty and integrity in business dealings. We must make sure that any loans that we advance to China are used strictly and entirely to construct projects which will create wealth for the Chinese—wealth which they can use to improve their standard of living and have some left over to reinvest and to export. By so doing we will be reasonably sure to get our money back with a legitimate rate of interest. We must encourage—not exploit. We will also keep the wheels of industry busily whirling here at home. We do not want loans for boondoggling, nor do we want currency pegging. The value of any nation's currency in the last analysis depends upon the internal condition of the country—its wealth, its government, its exports, etc. No outside control can keep these currencies above their true worth for any extended period of time. At the end of the last war the United States and Great Britain threw away $9,000,000,000 to learn again that the invariable lessons of history and economics on this were true. But the present administrations in both countries are getting set to try it all over again, this time on an even grander and more extravagant scale. If we content ourselves with providing the others with the wherewithal to establish a sound domestic economy of their own, that will take care of the value of their currencies automatically. We just want to see that any money that is invested will be used to create wealth and permit China to develop. As China grows economically, she will be more and more able and willing to repay.

We achieved great prosperity in this country mainly by supplying our own domestic market composed of 100,000,000 people. I am taking the rough average of population over a period of years and not the present census figures. For over a century the United States had a steadily rising standard of living and its citizens had a steadily increasing purchasing power. All of you know this. I am just calling it to your minds so you can visualize the potentialities of a market of 387,000,000 people if they begin to have these same increasing standards of living and this same growing purchasing power.

So far only the phase of land transportation has been discussed. Various other fields have been suggested. For instance,

the Yangtze Valley now overflows frequently and causes widespread desolation and famines. If the engineers find that it is sound, then a drainage project may prevent this waste and crop despoilment and a great area of agricultural richness will be created adding immeasurably to the wealth of China in particular and of the world in general.

In addition it is estimated that China will want 10,000,000 tons of ships; power plants that will turn out 20,000,000 kilowatts; 80,000,000 telephones; 12,000,000 miles of telephone cable; 1,000,000 new homes a year, plus the furniture and sanitation for them. Also she will undoubtedly want mills of various kinds and the tools and machinery used in them, all of which are the forte of American enterprise.

Why, these figures stagger the imagination.

You can easily see why, in addition to my strong feeling that the repeal of the Exclusion Act was demanded by justice and fairness, and my certainty that its repeal would cause no danger at all of any wide influx of immigration. I strongly believe that National self-interest in the future of America and Americans require that it be done.

For me it paints a picture of busy American factories, American workmen happy, contented, fully employed; living in homes with every new convenience, a rising standard of living for our own people over a long period of years, even though it will take time to get started; something that will give every soldier, sailor, and marine a better job than the one he left—plus more opportunity.

Naturally it pleased me to learn that the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek were included as equals in the recent conference held by the President and the Prime Minister. It is one more step along the road whose milestones to date are (1) abandonment of extra-territorial rights in China, (2) repeal of the Exclusion Acts, (3) recognition of China as a full ally and equal partner. I advocated these long before they were done along with Korean independence.

Where Democracy Needs a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the revolution in Bolivia yesterday is puzzling to many Americans. An editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal of December 19 will give enlightenment on this seemingly amazing development. This editorial furnishes a revealing glance behind the scenes of the so-called good-neighbor policy.

WHERE DEMOCRACY NEEDS A FRIEND

The debate between Senator Butler, Nebraska Republican, and administration spokesmen about BUTLER'S charges that our good neighbor policy in Latin America has become a New Deal boondoggle which is degrading the Latin Americans and injuring our own good name below the Rio Grande, has got sidetracked into a quibble about expenditures which misses the point that needs exploring.

The real question is not whether we've spent $6,000,000,000 in Latin America as Senator BUTLER says, or $1,480,000,000 as Senator MCKELLAR says, or $600,000,000 as Nelson Rockefeller says.

It has remained for a lending Latin American editor to find the real kernel of truth in Senator BUTLER'S charges—and it is a whopping, shocking, disgraceful kernel.

It is, in short, that the New Deal is betraying democracy in Latin America.

Forrest Seymour, 1943 Pulitzer prize winner and associate editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, sensed this on a recent visit to Brazil, and he reported in a dispatch from Rio de Janeiro published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune November 12:

"The people of Brazil are instinctively democratic. President Vargas has put constitutional government out of business. There are those close to the Government or its philosophy who argue that Brazil is too immature politically to master constitutional processes. But there is another point of view * * * that the United States is making a mistake for the long run by subduing its democratic convictions here merely to avoid embarrassing a minor ally. There is no need whatever, they say, for the hush-hush attitude toward basic democratic principles which in some areas of South America we have seemed to adopt."

Those are grave and considered words—but they are, after all, the observations of a transitory visitor to one South American country.

Not so these words in the prominent and responsible Mexican periodical Hoy, from an editorial in the current issue of which the following paragraphs are a translation.

"When Senator BUTLER says that except in three of our countries democracy is something that drips from the lips of governments, but which the people do not even pretend to enjoy—when he concludes from this that it is unwise to help these governments, giving them expensive armaments and strengthening them in many other ways—and, finally, when he asserts that these governments are hypocritical and venal in pretending a friendship for the United States which they do not feel, he is not wrong.

"It is too bad that Mr. BUTLER placed his emphasis upon the improbable enormity of the sums spent by the United States, instead of upon the immorality which reigns in the Latin American countries.

"The material value which the United States has received for its dollars is a question of figures, and can be determined. Harder to measure is the moral question.

"Has not the spirit of the good-neighbor been betrayed by considering as respectable governments the detestable satraps which exercise frightful tyrannies in the majority of our countries?

"Did not President Roosevelt himself drown the Nicaraguan people with disillusionment when he received as a good neighbor, with all imaginable courtesy and friendliness, the president of Nicaragua, confessed assassin of General Sandino? And we can say that of a dozen more presidents.

"It makes one sick to see the propaganda which the office of Mr. Nelson Rockefeller makes for the indescribable Generalissimo Rafael Leonides Trujillo, despot of the Dominican Republic.

"Such propaganda cannot convince us Latin Americans of the democratic sincerity of the United States. It cannot make us friends. It cannot draw us together and create mutual understandings.

"Considering that for the most part the Latin-American satrapies, miscalled governments, have their foundation and force in the friendly generosity shown them by the Government of the United States, the Butler report can be of immense benefit.

"Our attitude should not be that of citizens offended by an unmerited insult. Rather, it has been pointed out that in the majority of our countries all the people live under perverse regimes, hypocritical in their democratic devotion, barbarously cruel, and immoral. The majority of our presidents are assassins, thieves, and dull wits, and their governments are filled with spies, accomplices, and plotters. Whatever the amounts the United States spent to fortify these governments, it was an unprofitable expenditure."

And so the same kind of expediency, of opportunism, of "I'd rather be President than be right" philosophy by which the New Deal tries to be all things to all men in the United States, and which crops up in north Africa and Italy, now permeates our Latin-American policy.

That is the kernel of truth in Senator BUTLER'S charge that New Deal hypocricy is masquerading as good neighborliness, and it is far more important than whether we've spent millions or billions.

Airlines in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Office of War Information has prepared and released for publication in today's morning newspapers a story entitled "America's Airlines in the War."

This story details in part the activities of the civilian airlines under the American flag operating everywhere in connection with our country's war program.

Because the commercial airlines are the only industry under the American flag which simultaneously and without delay can be both commercial and combat, it has been necessary for the censor to withhold most of the thoroughly remarkable accomplishments of our great airlines.

That these accomplishments are remarkable is shown by the statement of Harold L. George when he said:

If it had not been for their (air lines in world-wide air transportation) wholehearted spirit of cooperation, it would have been as nearly impossible as anything can be impossible for us (the Army) to carry out the job in the way it has been done.

This fact is highlighted by the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army on September 27, 1943, that:

Without global air transportation America could not have fought the type of global war it is now waging. Air transportation is what made possible both quick organization of our Army from a peacetime footing to one of wartime as well as the type of war our country is now waging.

Secretary of War Stimson has said:

Civil air transportation is of vital importance to the war effort. Key airline personnel should be encouraged to stay at their posts.

It is a pleasure to commend our country's Air Force and its right arm, the commercial air lines. On the three previous occasions when our Nation's Air Force was called upon, it was unfortunately necessary that Congress criticize. Today, throughout this war, it brings pride to all of us to know that past shortcomings are no longer true, and that we can be proud of America's air power—both military and civilian.

When, in 1916, the armed forces of the United States faced the bandit Villa in Mexico, America owned but eight service airplanes, and these lasted less than 2 months. Our cavalry was massacred at Carizal for want of a single airplane capable of taking the air.

When, in April 1917, we entered World War No. 1, America stood fourteenth among the great powers so far as encouragement to aviation was concerned. As the gentleman from California, the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, stated in his memorable report on his investigation of our aviation in World War No. 1, our country did accomplish miracles, but only after tremendous delay. In fact, though we entered the war in April 1917, original military plans of the American Expeditionary Forces did not call for a single American-built airplane to reach Europe until May of 1918 nor to be on the front lines until August 1918. The men of those days, patriotic, earnest, and sincere in their efforts, made the production schedule, but the American flag, although on schedule, first crossed the western front in American-built airplane equipment only approximately 3 months before the termination of the war. It took approximately 16 months for the production of American ingenuity to appear in the air in combat with the enemy—and even then the production of our factories was a copy of a European design so far as the airplane was concerned.

Further, when in February 1934 our Army Air Force was called upon to fly the air mail, the results were disastrous.

Thus, on each of the first three times that our Air Force was called upon to meet an emergency, America had cause to regret the results first obtained, even though at the end, upon each of these three occasions, our aerial effort became satisfactory.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure today to invite attention to the release of the Office of War Information. On June 7, 1943, 6 months ago, the Office of War Information released a statement as to what our military air transport had accomplished. Today they released a statement of the accomplishments of our civilian air transport.

With all due credit to the great officers and men in our Army and Navy Air Forces, much of the success that has come to our country during this war by force of our air power belongs to the far-reaching decision made by the Congress of the United States, when on June 22, 1938, they enacted the Civil Aeronautics Act and decreed in the very beginning that it was the policy of Congress that an air-transport system should be built, not alone for the Postal Service and the commerce of our country, but also fit for the requirements of our national defense both present and future. This decision of the Congress, followed by timely appropriations, made possible a partnership between the Air Forces of the Army and Navy and the air power of the civilian air lines. The two became a team. The theoretical plans drawn by the Army and the civilian airlines as early as 1936, and brought up to date in 1937, were welded together and made a reality by the farsighted action of our Congress of 1938.

When the Japs struck their disastrous blow at Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the foresight of the Congress was more than justified. The civilian air lines went into military action within a few moments thereafter, flying emergency missions, hauling precious matériel and doing those things which a peaceful nation had neglected to do before the enemy's ruthless attack. This House can be proud of its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as then constituted and headed by the Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, whose leadership in aviation has been felt by this House since 1918. The wisdom and foresight of that body in 1938 made possible the air support that stopped Rommel in 1942 less than 100 miles from the Suez Canal. Had Rommel progressed another hundred miles to the Suez, anything might have happened. The Russians, taken from the rear in the Caucasus, might not have been able to resist and might have collapsed, thus permitting Germany and Japan to join hands in India. Our Nation might thus have found itself in a war of a hundred years duration. Also, had not our Congress provided for civilian air transportation across the Pacific and into Alaska, Dutch Harbor might have fallen and Australia might have been unable to repel the invader.

The destiny of our country was preserved by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and its wise provisions for the partnership of the air lines and the military in the interest of national defense. It was fortunate, also, that ex-military men were in the positions of trust at the head of our Nation's air lines so that our Army could turn over vital missions without question and let civilians run such missions in the days before we had sufficient officers and men in uniform.

Now we have before us the release of O. W. I. It tells some of the things the civilian air lines have done for our country. Let me express the hope that this body will take a leaf out of its book of the past and, in time of war, prepare for peace just as in time of peace it prepared for war.

Our brothers and our sons, when they return at the end of this great struggle, may say to us something like what was said in a letter recently received by Governor Neely, of West Virginia, and quoted by him in supporting necessary legislation for civil aviation: "Dad, what have you been doing for us while we've been away fighting the war?" Let none of us be in the guilty position of not providing now for the needs of our returning heroes—of not now providing for jobs for those boys when they return—not a couple years later. A bread line is no welcome for returning fliers.

It took 3 years to pass the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1926. The act which ultimately became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was introduced in its original form in 1935 and still it took 2 years active work before it was passed in Congress. Let us not have a bread line of returning pilots, mechanics, and Air Force heroes for 2 or 3 years after Germany cracks.

There is a bill before this House now, in fact, it has been too long before this House, called the Lea civil aviation bill. It has been studied by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for approximately 12 months. It has been the principal business before that entire committee during the year 1943.

Let us have action now on H. R. 3420. This O. W. I. release, copies of which are now available to all Members of Congress, tells in plain English what our civilians were able to do at an expense so trifling, throughout the 40 years which the airplane has existed, that it is only as much as this war costs for 2 or 3 days. It is a cheap investment. The O. W. I. has told you the value of our 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act in war. Let us enact H. R. 3420 so that some future Member of this body can stand before you and show what this Congress did for our returning boys. That is the purpose of H. R. 3420.

The Vursell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of December 20, 1943:

THE VURSELL BILL

The Senate frustrated the plot of the fourth termites to steal the soldiers' votes in the next year's election, but it failed to provide adequate means of enfranchising the soldiers. As the Tribune has repeatedly said, Congress must take affirmative action to compel the administration to cooperate with States in dispatching absentee ballots to the Army and Navy or the voting will be sabotaged by Mr. Roosevelt's two ex-Republican stooges as it was in 1942.

Representative CHARLES W. VURSELL, a downstate Illinois Republican, has introduced a bill in the House which provides simple and workable machinery for collecting service ballots. The Senate, after it rejected the Lucas-Green vote-stealing bill, contended itself with urging the States to take "appropriate action" to assure soldier votes. Representative VURSELL recommends three specific actions to the States. They are the advancement of primary dates to permit time for transmitting ballots overseas after the nominations, the amendment of absentee-ballot laws for the same purpose, and the waiver of registration requirements for men and women in the Army, Navy, and merchant marine.

The important part of the Vursell bill is its provisions, requiring the Army and Navy to cooperate with the States. This is essential if Messrs. Knox and Stimson are to be prevented from sabotaging soldier voting as they did a year ago. The Army and Navy are directed to distribute postcard applications to service men and women by Septem-

ber 1 abroad and by October 1 in this country, and to give air-mail priority to transmission of ballots abroad and back to State election officials.

This is a workable plan. It should be taken up by the Republicans in Congress and given their united backing. The Republican Party wants the soldiers and sailors to vote because it is their right and duty as citizens to do so. The fourth term manipulators have already demonstrated that they don't want them to vote unless the votes can be stolen for Mr. Roosevelt.

Lea Aviation Bill, H. R. 3420

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel urging early enactment of the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420:

PASS THE LEA BILL!

Among the paramount duties of Congress, which should be performed at this session, is to provide by law for the post-war development and regulation of aviation.

Because of the war, aviation has received a tremendous development in its technical and operational aspects.

The most efficient planes ever known have been produced for military purposes, including large-scale transportation over land and sea.

This vast mechanical efficiency will be carried over into peacetime and carried further.

The development of huge air forces will return to civil life thousands of young and able men attuned to aviation, including skilled pilots, highly trained mechanics, and experienced supervisors. They should be enabled to continue their profession.

To meet the enormous demands of global warfare, huge factories have been constructed. These will be available for civil production after the war, with the world's most competent workmen.

Inland airfields have been multiplied, and new transocean routes have been pioneered. We should not abandon all such utilities.

The physical basis therefore exists for making civil aviation one of the Nation's giant peace industries.

But the laws relating to aviation lag behind the times, and these laws need to be revised in accordance with the technological advances.

However, the foundation exists for proper legislative action.

It exists in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939.

For our pre-war period these statutes served well.

Under them, American civil aviation experienced a construction and rapid development surpassing that of all other countries combined.

Legally, therefore, all that needs to be done is to combine and revise these statutes, to make them fit the needs of the day; and this is being done in the Lea bill, now in the House of Representatives as H. R. 3420.

An outstanding merit of the bill is that it recognizes that domestic aviation is a phase of interstate commerce, and proposes to establish for it uniform Federal regulation.

It should be obvious that separate jurisdictions by 48 States, with as many sets of unrelated and even conflicting laws, would seriously retard the fullest and best use of what may be called the new aviation.

Likewise, with many new foreign routes surveyed and available, American air traffic to other continents must assume a new importance, and the Federal Government alone is capable of necessary governmental action in this field, and of correlating overseas and domestic air traffic.

A modernized aeronautics act should encompass this situation, and the Lea bill does so.

There may be some points in the pending bill which call for amendment, but these are minor and should be readily adjustable.

The essential matter is the Lea bill itself.

The aviation industry needs it and is wholly united behind it, and the country needs it in the national interest.

Some have said it would transgress State rights.

Among those who believe otherwise are John Berry, a member of the Aeronautical Advisory Commission of Ohio; Wilfrid O'Leary, of the Wyoming State Aeronautical Commission; and C. M. Sharrar, chairman of the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission, all of whom have endorsed the bill.

This is not a question of undesirable centralization.

It is one of regulation of foreign and interstate commerce, which the Constitution vests in Congress.

So let Congress proceed with its constitutional duty, and pass the Lea bill.

Let's Facilitate Voting for Men and Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a brief speech made by me over the Martin Agronsky news broadcast program of the Blue Network of more than 100 radio stations on Tuesday morning, December 21, 1943. In this short speech I offer a few brief and pointed reasons for my support of the Green-Lucas soldiers' voting bill.

The speech is as follows:

Congressman COFFEE. Yes; I am in favor of a Federal ballot for servicemen, Mr. Agronsky. If soldier voting is left to the States it means that soldiers will not be able to vote in 1944. If there are 48 different, complicated, unwieldy procedures, soldier votes regrettably will be counted in the thousands, perhaps only the hundreds. In 1942, under the State set-up, only 28,000 soldiers voted—out of 7,500,000 in the armed forces. That is only 1 soldier out of every 250. You cannot very well expect soldiers in Sicily or marines in New Britain Island to have studied the complex voting requirements of their home States. No matter how good a State voting law is, it cannot compare with a simple, uniform Federal ballot which every soldier can understand. That is why a Federal war ballot as provided in the Green-Lucas bill is so necessary. It is the only way soldiers will vote in large numbers. I know there has been much speculation that soldiers are not interested in voting. But soldiers themselves must decide whether or not they want to vote. The chance to vote has to be there for them. This is not a States' rights issue. Senator CARTER GLASS, that great and venerable champion of States' rights from Virginia, has assured the Nation it is not. If Uncle Sam has the power to raise an Army, has it not the power to protect the voting rights of those in this Army? Soldiers who are fit to die for America are fit to vote in America. They must have the right to choose those whom they want to govern their country. The House of Representatives should correct this slap in the face at 12,000,000 citizen-soldiers. We must give them a simple Federal ballot. We must not have conscription without representation.

H. R. 3892

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to require that psychiatric examinations be given to members of the land and naval forces prior to their trial before certain courts martial. I hope that the proper committee of the House will give consideration to this legislation soon after we return on January 10.

Due very largely to the fact that we have had to raise a huge armed force in a very short time, many men who have been inducted into the Army and Navy have had very unstable psychiatric backgrounds. Other thousands now serving in the various battle fronts are going to return to the United States with shattered minds and nerves. Certainly it is not asking too much to require the War and Navy Departments to give any soldier or sailor charged with a serious offense a psychiatric examination.

A few years ago the State of Massachusetts enacted legislation requiring a psychiatric examination for any person arrested and accused of committing a felony.

The bill which I introduced follows:

A bill to require that psychiatric examinations be given to members of the land and naval forces prior to their trial before certain courts martial

Be it enacted, etc., That prior to the trial of any member of the land forces of the United States before a general or special court martial or prior to the trial of any member of the naval forces of the United States before a general or summary court martial, he shall be given a psychiatric examination under the direction of the court, to determine his mental condition and the existence of any mental disease or defect. The physicians making such examination shall file a report of their investigation with the court, and such report shall be accessible to the trial judge advocate or judge advocate,

assistant trial judge advocates or assistant judge advocates, as the case may be, the defense counsel, and assistant defense counsels who are appointed for such court martial, and to any counsel selected by the accused to represent him in his defense before the court.

World Literacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the wonderful work for world literacy that is now going forward, largely through the use of comparatively new phonetic alphabets. So outstanding has been the progress in this field and so important is world literacy to the cause of international peace and understanding, that I want to insert in the RECORD a letter just received from the Honorable Robert L. Owen. Mr. Owen, in addition to having served with great distinction in the United States Senate as one of Oklahoma's first two Senators, has been a leader in this great new movement for world education. He has developed and perfected the global alphabet, which adopts a standard uniform phonetic alphabet in which all languages of the civilized world and even primitive tribes can be written.

In the accompanying letter Senator Owen explains the progress of the work in literacy that has been accomplished in Russia which, through phonetic alphabets has taught its people with over 200 different languages and dialects how to read and write. He also outlines the work of Dr. Frank C. Laubach who has been so successful in teaching even primitive tribes of Africa and elsewhere how to read and write:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 18, 1943.*
Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: By use of phonetic alphabets, the Soviet Republics of Russia have abolished illiteracy in Russia and enabled the people of Russia with incredible speed to write, read, and print over 200 languages and dialects in Russia. These alphabets differ from each other but being phonetic and comprising only about 30 letters, the alphabets can be learned within 1 day. Within 2 decades, Russia not only abolished illiteracy, but by intensive training in modern arts and sciences, in modern technology, and modern engineering the Russian people have increased their production over 400 percent in spite of the greatest difficulties. Their achievements in mass production of the munitions of war and the patriotism and morale built up by this system is demonstrating its efficiency on the present battlefields of invaded western Russia.

Russia is not alone in this conquest of illiteracy and poverty, but 80 other nationalities speaking 80 other languages are in process and have gone a long way in the last 10 years of abolishing illiteracy in China, India, Philippines, Malaya, southwestern Asia, in Africa, in the Caribbean and in South America. The movement on the Western Hemisphere is comparatively recent and is moving successfully forward under the leadership of Dr. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., and the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York.

This committee was organized by the representatives of over 120 foreign missionary societies now engaged, and for years have been engaged, in teaching the doctrine of fundamental righteousness and human brotherhood throughout the world. They fully deserve the support of the Government, and I appeal to you to call attention again to their invaluable services in the development of a new world of abundance, peace, and justice.

On Thursday, July 8, 1943, you put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my review of Dr. Laubach's book, "The Silent Billion Speak." Your remarks on that occasion were reprinted and the National Committee on Literacy ordered over 20,000 copies, which they sent throughout the world.

May I not now call your attention to a brief quotation from Dr. Laubach's concluding chapter of that book as follows:

"The experiences described in the preceding chapters have made me an optimist in the face of our present tragedy. I have seen how easy it is to win the friendship of people—people anywhere—if only we approach them in a spirit of unselfish sharing. The world is divided into an infini y of small groups, each expecting hostility from the other and therefore on the defensive. There is suspicion between white and colored races, between religions, between nationals and foreigners, between rich and poor, capital and labor, between educated and illiterate, between those speaking different languages, between families and often within families. When we seek to serve groups outside our own, we must prove our friendship and patiently wait for this initial suspicion to disappear, and this requires self-control, for one's instinct is to give like for like, snub for snub, dislike for dislike.

"But self-restraint and tact can replace this defense mechanism with mutual good will. It has been thrilling to discover how quickly such ventures as literacy campaigns, disease control, and agricultural missions melt away these dislikes and suspicions. The glad good news I want to shout from the housetops is that America can work a world miracle, if we care enough and serve selflessly enough—that it is far, far easier than we ever could have dreamed.

"It is not only easy but it is enormously important. For we now seem to be emerging into a new age, when, instead of many little antagonistic worlds, we hope to have world brotherhood and a world government. It is a glorious hope, but it will come only as people of different cultures and backgrounds learn kindly toleration and glory in united diversity. While statesmen feel their way to political world union, we must find great enterprises like the common struggle against illiteracy to bring about confidence and the will to cooperate without which political union will be impossible.

"Everything that is happening today is pushing America more irrevocably, whether she will or not, out into every corner of the world. When the smoke of this war clears away, we will not again draw back in our shell like a snail; not this time. Our youth will pour into 10,000 communities all over this planet to teach and to serve, just as our teachers have gone to the Philippines during these past 20 years and our missionaries have gone to foreign lands. America's influence will be felt to the corners of the earth.

"The Second World War, with its incredible development of air transportation, has shattered American isolationism. Planes that can cross the oceans and return without refueling have thrown every country into our back yard. Turn a radio dial and listen to Chungking, Cairo, Moscow, Sydney. Who is my neighbor? Every man, every race, and every country. No nation is any longer safe until the whole world is safe. We cannot have peace anywhere until there is peace everywhere. Isolation is out. * * *

"We ought right now to be building up a fund for the cause of literacy—a million dollars for Africa, another million for South America, and two millions for Asia—so that we can start helping these countries immediately the war is over.

"Christians across America, as I have told them about literacy have exclaimed hundreds of times, 'This is the most stupendous challenge in the whole world.' It is indeed one of the finest openings ever given the church through which she may bless the whole human race and pour the love of Christ into human society. It is God's awful call to Christians in this awful hour.

"America, you have the chance of 10,000 years to help the world. Our peace and world peace demand that we shall grow large enough and become Christlike soon enough to lavish our love in humble service for the whole world. If we use this rich opportunity to carry Christ to Asia and Africa, then peace-loving China, with a fourth of the world's population, peace-loving India, with one-fifth of all the people in the world, and the meek, song-loving Africans will join us in building 'a kingdom of heaven on earth.' Then at last 'the meek shall inherit the earth.'"

To this appeal of Dr. Laubach as the representative of the World Literacy Committee, I am in deep sympathy and I believe the body of the American people will approve the governmental support implied in the above quotations.

I enclose by separate mail a copy of Senate Document 133, offering the global alphabet as a mechanism by which more economically and, I hope, with usefulness to accomplish this task by substituting, to the extent desirable, a phonetic, stenographic alphabet by which all of these languages can be easily written, read, and printed in the local language. Through this global alphabet all of these nations, including Russia and China, can learn conversational English with high speed and render more effective thereby the principles of Government of the United States and the technological improvements in the arts and sciences developed in the American laboratories and in our agricultural department.

My contribution of the global alphabet I have offered to my Government in the conviction that it has incalculable potentialities in promoting the declaration of principles of the Moscow Conference.

With sentiments of the greatest respect, I am as ever, faithfully, your friend,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Nations at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 20, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to maintain an accurate check of the line-up of nations in today's global struggle. For the sake of information, I include here a recent tabulation:

The second anniversary of United States entry into World War No. 2 finds the nations of the world lined up 44 on our side, 6 with

the enemy, 9 neutral, and 7 requiring special classification.

On our side: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, French Committee, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia; total, 44.

The enemy: Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Rumania, and Thailand; total, 6.

Neutrals: Afghanistan, Argentina, Eire, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey; total, 9.

In special categories are: Finland—at war with Great Britain and Russia, but not at war with the United States. Italy—cobelligerent of the United Nations. Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—occupied without governments in exile and maintaining diplomatic representatives in Washington.

Included on our side are a number of nations who have not actually declared war but have broken diplomatic relations with at least some of the Axis Powers.

Railroads, Maintenance-of-Way, Disparities in Wage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received under date of December 9, 1943, from the Director, Office of Defense Transportation:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1943.

The Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WIGGLESWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of November 26, 1943, in which you inquire respecting reported disparities between wage rates paid by railroads to their maintenance-of-way employees and the rates paid by contractors to employees doing similar work.

It has been common railroad practice for many years to contract with private companies for the construction of new track facilities. Ordinarily, maintenance forces directly employed by the railroads repair, rebuild, and maintain tracks and roadbeds whereas new construction is contracted to outside companies. While the track-laying portion of new-track construction work is similar to the work of railroad maintenance-of-way employees, the largest part of new-track construction involves the use of heavy machinery for excavating, filling, and grading the roadway.

The railroads have no control over the wage rates paid by contractors, since such work is contracted on a unit basis. Although we do not have detailed information on those points, I believe it is true that generally the wages paid by contractors to employees in railroad work are higher than the wage rates which are paid by the railroads to their own employees. One reason for the higher rates paid by contractors is the necessity for assembling large labor forces for relatively short periods of temporary work. In addition, construction companies usually must recruit their employees in urban areas in competition with other employers while many railroad track workers are recruited from small communities where rates are relatively low. Moreover, railroad maintenance workers enjoy a number of advantages not shared by construction workers, such as a considerable degree of permanency of employment, free transportation privileges, and seniority rights.

I invite your consideration of these points which I believe account at least in part for the wage disparity concerning which you have inquired. I should also like to add that the prospects seem quite good that the wage disparity will be somewhat lessened when the present wage dispute involving railroad nonoperating employees is settled.

It is not necessary for railroads to secure approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission for construction contracts such as discussed above. I trust that the above supplies the desired information on this matter. However, if you need additional information, please call upon me.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

Kefauver Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, seldom if ever has a proposal to change the rules of the House found more national favor than the resolution introduced by my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] to provide for the appearance on the floor of members of the President's Cabinet.

Under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include here an excerpt from an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop in the Washington Times-Herald:

The excerpt follows:

Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has proposed via House Resolution 327, to have the President's Cabinet and heads of independent executive agencies appear before the House at least once every 2 weeks for questioning from the floor.

He has worked out a very elaborate formula by means of which the House could keep itself informed of what is going on downtown, and incidentally keep the Executive reminded that Congress is part of the Government, too.

Our very first President, George Washington, and the members of his Cabinet, were several times called before Congress to explain their doings.

Washington also went in person to Congress to make his constitutional reports on the state of the Union.

But the yapping of some fresh Congressmen irritated the Father of Our Country so much that, after one particularly loud committee hearing, he clapped on his hat and said he'd be damned if he'd come back except for the annual report.

By the time Thomas Jefferson became President, a new complication had developed. Jefferson was a poor public speaker. So he decided not to make his annual reports in person but to send them up in writing.

Woodrow Wilson revived the policy of personal reports to Congress, and Franklin Roosevelt has made it standard.

We'd like to see the policy extended to the regular questioning of Cabinet officers and executive agency heads from the House floor, as proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER.

The wisdom of reviving this personal contact between the executive and legislative branches has strong support all through both major political parties.

Representative KEFAUVER is not the first to advocate it, nor does he claim to be.

As a matter of fact, a select committee of the House recommended in 1864 that Cabinet members be authorized to debate on the floor of the House whenever measures affecting their departments were under consideration. We wonder why that didn't go through. It would have been a good thing.

In 1881, a select committee of the Senate recommended the same thing for that branch of Congress. But it, too, fell mysteriously into the wastebasket.

President William Howard Taft, in his message to Congress January 3, 1913, made such a recommendation. Woodrow Wilson, Elihu Root, President James A. Garfield, and John W. Davis are among the other authorities on government who have indorsed such a plan.

Representative KEFAUVER says that the principal reason in the past against bringing Cabinet members to the floor was that Congress objected to so nearly aping the British system, in which Cabinet members are on the floor every day—being members of Parliament.

Today, any cold, realistic analysis of our Government forces the conclusion that the executive branch is overstuffed with blanket authorities and power given it by Congress and ratified by court decisions.

Christmas Message From the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present the following speech I prepared for radio transcription in my district for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Good evening friends and neighbors in Oregon, this Christmas night through the courtesy of KGW and radio transcription, I bring you greetings from the Nation's Capitol. The Congress has adjourned and will convene for the next session, January 10. I voted against adjournment regardless of our need for a rest after a long and arduous session. I urged that Congress remain at its post until it had considered and passed legislation so urgently needed right now covering food subsidies, keeping down living costs and preventing inflation, the soldiers' mustering-out pay, the railroad employees' pay, old-age security increasing the miserly pittance now allowed our old folks, and an adequate tax bill. Our men in uniform are not deserting their battle lines and we in the Congress should not desert our posts in times of great peril to our country, such as those through which we are now passing. We of the far west coast will remain here as time and war transportation regulations will not justify the 6,000-mile journey home and return.

The President has just returned to the Capital from his momentous trip to the Old World cities of Cairo and Teheran. In these ancient cities, decisions were made and compacts arrived at which will shape the destiny of the world for centuries to come and we hope will so chart the course of world events as to insure peace on earth and good will toward men.

One thousand nine hundred and forty-three years ago this day a most significant event took place in another city of the old world just a little way from Cairo and Teheran which has done more than any other event in all recorded history to bring peace on earth and good will toward men. Men and women of the Christian faith everywhere around the world tonight are commemorating that event—the birth of the Christ in a manger in Bethlehem. That night a star appeared in the heavens pointing the way. The three wise men followed it from afar as have wise men everywhere for 19 centuries. It symbolizes the age-old message of the lowly Nazarene, peace and the brotherhood of men. Today, with all the world a battlefield bathed in blood, its message of hope shines all the brighter through the night of darkness that encompasses the world. It was He who said, "Pray for them which despitefully use you." He too gave His own life as a sacrifice on the cross that the world might be saved. Many of our patriot fathers of old went forth in battle and gave their lives that this Nation might have freedom and down through the centuries countless numbers of others have offered their blood on freedom's battlefields that our liberties might endure.

Now again tonight it is "sweat, blood, and tears" as our own American boys are engaged in deadly conflict around the world defending our country and our liberties against foul attacks and onslaughts of cruel and designing enemies who seek to destroy us.

The sons and fathers of America who tonight are on all the continents of the world and on the seven seas and in the airways above the land and the seas are upholding the best traditions of loyalty and sacrifice of their ancestors.

These American boys and young men are proving by their deeds of heroism and sacrifice on the battle fronts that to them the American Creed is a living thing—a command for action. Let me repeat it this Christmas night that all of us may again rededicate our lives to our country and the cause for which our boys are fighting overseas:

THE AMERICAN CREED

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Our American soldier boys are tonight defending with their lives our country against our enemies.

Tonight your hearts are weighted down as are ours here in this nerve center of the Nation, our Capital, with the advent of the Christmas season and knowing that millions of sons and daughters and other loved ones are scattered around the world from the south seas to the Aleutians ready to make the supreme sacrifice if necessary. They are facing cruel, relentless, and strong enemies with cunning designs to strike them down.

Cordell Hull, our distinguished Secretary of State, said:

"Since August (1937) I have proceeded here on the theory that Japan definitely contemplates securing domination over as many hundreds of millions of people as possible in Eastern Asia and gradually extending her control through the Pacific Islands to the Dutch East Indies and elsewhere, thereby dominating in practical effect, that one-half of the world; and that she is seeking this objective by any and every kind of means; that at the same time I have gone on the theory that Germany is equally bent on becoming the dominating Colossus of continental Europe."

We must remember that the crusade for freedom will continue as long as there is avarice, greed, lust for power and hate in the world. Jefferson said in 1787, "The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants." Indeed the tree of liberty is being refreshed today with the precious blood and sacrifice of the men and women of America on the battle fronts everywhere supported by the loyalty and devotion of all of us on the home front.

We are rekindling the fires of our faith in a righteous cause—the defense of our liberties and a free world against the hoards of barbarism. Out of this grim struggle with its ever mounting costs of death and destruction of material values must come not only a quickening of our faith in patriotic fervor, but a spiritual awakening of the great heart of America to an appreciation of the higher values of life not measured by monetary standards.

The war is not over. There are bitter days ahead. We must yet pass through the Valley of the Shadow. Many months, yea perhaps years of blood and tears lie beyond. Let us pray this holy night that the end may be soon. Some day, in God's good time the guns and bombs will cease and when

"The tumult and the shouting dies
The captain and the kings depart
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice
An humble and a contrite heart."

Let us pray this Christmas that out of the consuming flames of war with death and destruction everywhere there will come a rebirth of freedom, a reawakening of faith of our Christian fathers, a rekindling of the fires of the spiritual values of the men and women who prayed to God for guidance at Plymouth Rock and a just and an abiding peace among all the war-torn nations of the earth. Then our boys will not have shed their blood in vain and America's sacrifice will not have been for naught, and the Star in the East will continue to send forth its message "Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward Men."

To all you, our neighbors in Oregon and all of our precious friends, yours and ours, overseas wherever they may be tonight, Mrs. Angell and I pray that you all may have God's richest blessings to help you keep the faith and carry your burden through this Christmastide and that through your tears you may enjoy a full measure of happiness.

I close with this toast given on the floor of the House this week:

A TOAST TO OUR BOYS—WHEREVER THEY ARE

Let's drink a toast to the widening host
Of Americans serving the Nation,
To those millions of lads (and their brothers and dads)
Who are serving our civilization;
To the men from the mills and the farms and the hills
And the cities and mountains and plains,
To the workers and miners and airplane designers,
And crews on the ships and the trains.
Wherever they are—be it near, be it far,
On the land, in the air, on the sea—
With a stoutness of heart they are doing their part
To keep this "the land of the free."
So good luck and God speed them—may nothing impede them
Nor make them delay or digress.
May Christmastime find them with power behind them
To roll up a final success.

Christmas Comes to a War-Torn World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me over the radio:

Good evening; as Christmas approaches the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress is drawing to a close. I am glad that the leadership acceded to our urgings and continued the Congress in session. There is so much legislation of vital importance still incompleted that it would have been a grievous mistake to have recessed.

Important bills unfinished and ready for action are the subsidy program embodied in the Commodity Credit Corporation bill passed by the House; the tax bill which has also gone through the House and is in the Finance Committee of the Senate; the soldiers' discharge pay bill or mustering-out pay, which has been approved by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and is now being considered in the House; the soldiers vote which in a controversial form has passed the Senate but not the House; the railroad pay bill, also through the Senate and now on the House side; social security and old-age assistance. In addition, the House Agricultural Committee is urging the Rules Committee to grant a clearance for a measure which provides a single administrator for war food with control over prices as well as production and distribution. The mere statement of these important measures show that there is much yet to be done here. The personal convenience of the Members of Congress or a much-needed rest after long months of arduous war sessions should not outweigh the necessity for Congress staying on the job until these important legislative measures are completed. They should all be passed before we adjourn.

Our soldiers should be given the right to vote in 1944. Some 10,000,000 or more men and women called to the service of our country will be scattered over the face of the earth when election time comes. It would be indefensible to deprive such a large group of our citizens from the right to exercise one of the greatest privileges we have in a free country, to vote for the officers who will determine the course of our country during this critical period in our history. Many do not appreciate the difficulty involved in providing the machinery and facilities to make possible the voting of 10,000,000 men and women in uniforms whose addresses are changing from day to day on the battlefields of the world. At best the most careful plans cannot make it possible for all of them to vote. Many of them will be in remote places scattered over the earth where it will be difficult to get ballots to them and back to the polls in time to be counted. It is possible, however, with modern means of communication for the Federal Government with all its military facilities, together with civil and State agencies working in cooperation, to provide for the major portion of the men and women in the armed forces to cast their votes. They should

be accorded the privilege of not only voting for Federal officials but also for State and local officers, as well as for measures on the ballots of their local communities. It should not be overlooked that the Federal legislation provides only for the election of Federal officials. It is my purpose to do all that lies within my power, as one Member of the Congress, to see that the simplest and most effective method is provided for them to participate in the Federal, State and local elections to be held next year.

A sound and well controlled and administered subsidy program must be maintained. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the one Federal agency which administers the subsidy program and keeps down living costs. It has done much good and effective work. Its life will soon expire by limitation of law. The bill which recently passed the House had for its purpose the continuing of the life of this corporation so that it might carry on its most important work during these intense war days. There was a provision, however, in this bill extending its life, which banned consumer subsidies. An attempt was made on the floor of the House to remove this provision without success, and the vote on the bill placed the membership of the House in the embarrassing position of having to vote against subsidies or kill the Commodity Credit Corporation. A large majority of the House voted in favor of the bill continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. Many voted for the bill even though they thereby banned subsidies which they did not want to do. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, who led the fight for subsidies, facing this dilemma, voted for the bill, as did I, even though it barred subsidies.

Nothing should be left undone that will prevent the skyrocketing of living costs and prevent our country from a spiral of inflation. Unbridled inflation will undo everything that has been done by the Congress and the administration to preserve our financial structure, to keep the costs of living within reasonable bounds, and to prevent the complete unbalancing of labor and industrial relations including the wage structure. Uncontrolled inflation will bring disaster to all, equal to a doubling and tripling of the tax burden now resting on our people. It will bear heaviest upon the low-income groups who are least prepared to bear it.

We have been confronted here in the Congress with a serious problem of providing mustering-out pay for the men who are being discharged in large numbers from the armed services. In many instances gross injustices have been visited upon these men who have been discharged through no fault of their own and without being provided immediately with adequate funds with which to take care of their needs until they are able to return to their various homes and secure employment. The Senate Military Affairs Committee has approved a bill calling for mustering-out pay for servicemen on a scale ranging from $200 to $500, depending upon the length of service and place of service. In the Military Affairs Committee of the House similar legislation is being considered. I am strongly in favor of this legislation and I hope it will become law soon. In fact I have had a bill pending in the House for a long time providing for continuing soldiers on pay for a reasonable length of time after discharge, in order that they may readjust themselves to civil life and find remunerative employment, and not be made to shift for themselves on being mustered out.

The revenue bill which recently passed the House is being whipped into final shape in the Finance Committee of the Senate. There was a strong feeling in the House which seems to be prevailing also in the Senate Finance Committee that all Federal bureaus and agencies, including the War, Navy, and Maritime Departments, should reexamine their budgets, expenditures and commitments and eliminate every source of waste and unnecessary spending. Every dollar saved will save a dollar in taxes.

We here in the Capital daily are receiving many protests, not alone from our own districts, but from all over the United States, complaining bitterly about the bungling controls here in Washington. There is little complaint from anyone signifying an unwillingness to do his or her full share in sacrifice, personal work or other contributions to speed up our war program and bring success to our cause at the earliest time possible. The only complaint is that the great waste of public funds, manpower, and productive energy and the bungling control of prices and the necessities of life is slowing up our war effort, putting off the day of victory, and thereby causing the death of our boys fighting overseas.

Now as the Christmas season approaches we cannot forget that there are vacant chairs in every home in America caused by the absence of sons and fathers fighting on the battle fronts on every continent, on land, in the air, and on the sea. Many of these chairs will remain vacant forever. Every morning when my mail is placed upon my desk I see long casualty lists which can only sober our thoughts and spur us on to greater endeavor here on the home front to do everything within our power, whatever our lot may be, to bring this great catastrophe to a successful conclusion without the loss of a single hour or the sacrifice of an additional life unnecessarily.

We can even in this grim hour render thanks to Almighty God that we are achieving many victories and that our brave soldiers, with unsurpassed courage and skill, are acquitting themselves with highest honors and are measuring up to the high standards always maintained by the fighting men of this great Republic.

Indeed we can be thankful this Christmastide that we have had a year of victories on every battle front. We have in a great measure solved the U-boat menace. We have achieved supreme mastery in the air in every war theater. We have driven the enemy from the Aleutians, from Africa, from Sicily, and from much of Italy, and Russia, our ally in the north, has forced the Nazis in bitter retreat back almost to her own borders. We and our allies have brought just retribution upon Germany by reducing to shambles and rubble her great industrial centers feeding her war effort. In the South Pacific General MacArthur, with a wholly inadequate force, has achieved marvelous victories, but we must provide him with the men, ships, and planes in that strategic area to put the Japs to rout and send our forces to Tokyo itself and blot out the production centers of the Japanese mainland, which will bring doom to that barbarous, cruel, and treacherous enemy.

If we here safe at home are inclined to complain of the just demands of war upon us, we only need to cast our thoughts overseas into the foxholes or the swamps or the jungles of the South Seas, or in the fogs and unending, uncharted sky lanes overhead, or in the fighting ships on and under the sea, where our courageous men are fighting night and day, or in the igloos of the bitter, bleak northland of the Aleutians and the Arctic wastes, to convince ourselves that the sacrifices we are making here at home are puny indeed and not to be compared with the real sacrifices being made by our fighting men wherever they may be tonight.

May we not this Christmas time here in this great country of ours—America—free from bombs, secure in our homes with food and clothing and shelter ample for all our needs, with our children going about their little tasks in happiness and without fear, return thanks from the depths of grateful hearts to the Creator of us all for being thus privileged to enjoy the blessings of liberty and safety, when around the world millions of innocent men, women, and children are being robbed, outraged, and driven from their homes in slavery or death, or bombed into eternity by war's cruel and devastating holocaust.

While we here secure in the protection of our American homes are returning thanks this Christmas time, out there on the fighting fronts where grim death lurks everywhere the soldier boy, too, is offering up thanks to his Maker. Listen to his plea:

"Here, in a moment of quiet, taken from the work I have to do, I search for words to give You thanks.

"Thanks that here in the shadow of death the strength is given to me to fight to end the things I've seen.

"The children, cringing and slinking away to hide, like some beaten, broken thing, their eyes tense and afraid with the fear that tyranny has planted there.

"The men, with nothing left of life but the thread of hope that freedom may come, some day, to bless their children, if not themselves.

"The women, barefoot, worn, driven like cattle in the fields, desecrated, violated, but strong, because they have the vision of a coming light that may shine for them.

"I have known another world, far removed from this, where men are free. Where the eyes of children are shining pools of laughter, where the women live in decency, and where the blessings of Your hand have guided those who fought and dreamed and built.

"We do not know when death may come, nor who among us will return. But there can be no turning back, no faltering in the task it is our will, and Yours, to do.

"And for the land and people that are ours, for the courage that flows with freedom in our blood, for the strength to fight to end these things I've seen, thank You, God."

As this Christmas season comes to us with sad and heavy hearts in these critical war days, may we all join with this soldier boy and every man and woman wearing our uniform, and thank God for the privilege and the strength to do our full share without stint here on the home front as he is fighting over there to end these things which are tearing the world asunder and threatening to end civilization itself.

This soldier lad is saying again in his own way what the immortal Lincoln said many years ago before laying his life on the altar of his country:

"It is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of Government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuits for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life."

A Republican Newspaper Comments on Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to two editorials recently printed by the Iola Register, of Iola, Kans. These two editorials, I consider, are outstanding. One is in support of an adequate program of subsidies for inflation control. Wisely the editor points out the recent sabotage

of the inflation-control program with these words:

If Congress sabotages the only stabilization program we have, without offering anything else in its place, it will be the costliest disservice ever performed the people of the United States by their own Representatives.

The second editorial, also from this newspaper, declares as follows:

If there is "open rebellion" against O. P. A., it will be from politicians looking for a political issue, not from the people. In spite of their various and sundry howls, they are still just moderately well satisfied to find gasoline in the filling station when they want it, sugar for their coffee if they do a little managing, and hamburger at the meat counter for 26 cents a pound.

I think Congress should note these two editorials well. They come from perhaps as rock-ribbed a Republican county as there is in this Nation.

The editor of the newspaper in flaying the Republicans for their short-sighted policy of inflation, speaks not as a New Dealer, a "brain truster," nor even a southern Democrat. The editor who so ably speaks out in criticism of recent Republican policy to destroy inflation controls is Angelo Scott, son of the late Charles F. Scott, founder of the newspaper, who so ably represented that district in Congress as a member of the Republican Party for many years.

The editorials follow:

CONGRESSIONAL SABOTAGE

I can't understand how Congress can pound ahead so blindly toward inflation, as though it were a matter of only secondary importance.

It seems certain now that Congress will do three things:

1. Pass the antisubsidy bill which will blow the lid off commodity prices.

2. Pass a bill giving the railroad workers what the Office of Economic Stabilization has denied them, thus blowing the lid off the Little Steel wage formula.

3. Pass a tax bill which will not drain off enough purchasing power to reduce the inflationary spending pressure a thimbleful.

Thus far Congressmen, particularly the Republicans, have been in the comfortable position of being able to blame everything wrong on the President and his bureaus, because they have run the whole show. After passing these three bills, if they do, whom will they have to blame but themselves if inflation runs riot?

The Administration has undoubtedly made innumerable errors and mistakes in the details of its stabilization program, but at least it has tried. It has tried consistently and unwaveringly. And it has produced results approximately 100 percent better than were produced in the First World War.

If Congress sabotages the only stabilization program we have without offering anything else in its place, it will be the costliest disservice ever performed the people of the United States by their own representatives.

OPEN REBELLION

My good friend ERRETT SCRIVNER, Representative from this district, has delivered for his maiden speech in Congress a shotgun blast at O. P. A., declaring that, "If the people of Kansas were not fundamentally sound, loyal, law-abiding citizens, infinitely patient, open rebellion against the O. P. A. would now exist."

If that is really the truth, if there is a universal, seething resentment against O. P. A. and all its works, abolling beneath the surface that is on the verge of breaking into "open rebellion" at any moment—I wish someone would tell me about it.

In fact, if the situation as Mr. SCRIVNER describes it actually exists, isn't it a little odd that people haven't told me about it, in view of the fact that I happen to be chairman of the local O. P. A. board? Or did Mr. SCRIVNER learn more about what people think of the O. P. A. in 2 months of political campaigning than I have been able to learn in 2 years as a board chairman?

If people haven't told me that they are ready to rebel against O. P. A., it isn't because they are bashful, I can assure you. They have told me plenty. They have griped and complained and howled in full-throated American style.

But their complaints have been selective and specific. One has complained because he couldn't get a tire, another because a gasoline regulation worked to his disadvantage, a third because it took too much time to keep track of ration stamps received by a grocery store, a fourth because the price ceiling on corn is too low, a fifth because the price ceiling on T-bone steaks is too high, and so on ad infinitum.

In 2 years I haven't had one person seriously suggest that the country could get along without rationing and price control in one form or another. I haven't had one person declare that O. P. A. has completely botched the job and should be thrown out of the window. I have seen no signs of open rebellion against the whole program.

If I am capable of objective observation at all, it is this: The average Kansan today thinks that O. P. A. is about 75 percent O. K. He thinks that about 25 percent of the job has been bungled; and within that 25 percent he can always find one or two pet gripes upon which he will burst forth in a tirade at the drop of a hat. But he readily admits the broad necessity of some sort of rationing and price control, and he is equally willing to admit that O. P. A. has done a fair-to-middling job of accomplishing the main things that had to be accomplished.

O. P. A. has done that. It is the simple demonstrable truth. Why shouldn't the average Kansan admit it? Why should he be on the verge of open revolt against a necessary Government program which is, by and large, getting the job done?

The purpose of rationing is to distribute scarce goods so that each may get his share regardless of his wealth or position. Has O. P. A. accomplished that? Who is getting tires today? Tom Bowlus and Brian Scarborough? Or E. E. Feeback, D. G. Minesinger, Pauline B. Flynn, Geraldine Searsy, Marvin Boyer, and L. W. Smith? These happen to be the last six who did get tires.

Who is getting gasoline? The richest man or the best Democrat—or the rural mail carrier?

The poorest, most humble man in Allen County today, still after 2 years of war, can get a fair and reasonable share of meat, butter, canned goods, shoes, and gasoline and tires if his work entitles him to them. Isn't it some measure of O. P. A.'s success that this should be a fact?

The record on price control isn't quite so good. But let me ask just this one question: If price control blows up, who will be chiefly to blame? O. P. A., Congress, union labor, or the general public? Which of these four groups has been trying the hardest to keep prices down?

Any way you look at it, the complexity of O. P. A. price regulations has had nothing to do with the public's willingness to patronize black markets with union labor's fight to break the Little Steel formula, or with Congress' determination to ban subsidies and tack the higher cost of food to consumer prices.

If there is open rebellion against O. P. A., it will be from politicans looking for a political issue, not from the people. In spite of their various and sundry howls, they are still just moderately well satisfied to find gasoline at the filling station when they want it, sugar for their coffee if they do a little managing, and hamburger at the meat counted for 26 cents a pound.

T. V. A. and the War Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include speech of George D. Munger, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting held at Sheffield, Ala., on November 27, 1943. Mr. Munger gives an excellent summary of the part T. V. A. has been playing in the war program. The speech is as follows:

It is only natural that we who are engaged in lighting rural America should think of T. V. A. as a great power agency. It is a great power agency but that is only one of the Authority's many important functions. The primary purpose of the Authority is to develop the many resources of the Tennessee Valley in the interests of the people. While it is impossible to give a comprehensive description of the accomplishments of the Authority in the few minutes at my disposal, I would like to at least call your attention to some of the high spots.

In order to have an understanding of the work of the Authority, it is necessary to think of the Tennessee River as it existed before T. V. A. It winds for hundreds of miles through Tennessee and Alabama, touching Mississippi, and finally emptying into the Ohio at Paducah, Ky. During the dry season it was so shallow that only very small boats could navigate it. During a rainy season huge torrents came down the river overflowing its banks resulting in enormous losses of life and property. It might have been called a River of Neglected Opportunity.

Today, after 10 years of activity, the river has been harnessed so that its benefits can be made available to the people of the Valley and the Nation. The creation of this change involved the biggest engineering job ever carried out by one organization in this country. Eighteen new dams were built and six existing dams were improved. In terms of materials used, the T. V. A. construction jobs would be equivalent to building 35 Boulder Dams.

Seventy-five percent of T. V. A.'s power is going into war production. This country would not have been able to have achieved its goal in the construction of war planes if it had not been for T. V. A.'s ability to meet the tremendous and unexpected requirements for power by the aluminum industries located in the valley. Another indication of the benefits of low cost electricity to the consumers of the valley rests in the fact that the average domestic use in the valley exceeds by 50 percent that of the country as a whole.

As a result of the Authority's work, the Tennessee River is now an important artery of traffic. A navigable channel now exists

over the 650 miles from Knoxville to Paducah. This connects with nearly 6,000 miles of inland waterways. Huge tows pass up and down the river carrying grain, coal, petroleum products, pig iron, military vehicles, and other products. It is estimated that annual savings to shippers will amount to about $3,500,000.

One way to bring out the multi-purpose nature of the Authority's activities is to refer to part of the war work which it is undertaking.

Long before Pearl Harbor the transition from peacetime service to national defense began. The War Department and T. V. A. agreed on plans to prepare the First World War munitions plant at Muscle Shoals for the production of large quantities of ammonia and ammounium nitrate. The plant was modernized and is now in operation with carloads of ammonium nitrate rolling every day. Another part of the plant is now producing elemental phosphorus for incendiary bombs, smoke screens, and tracer bullets. Still another part of the plant is being used for the production of calcium carbide to be used in the making of synthetic rubber.

The chemical laboratories of the Authority, working in cooperation with engineering colleges in the region, have an intensive program of experiments for the use of raw materials of the valley in this war program. The well-known Walthall process for making alumina from a clay common to this region has been developed. This process is feasible and T. V. A. is ready to build a plant for the production of alumina whenever it is needed. The process for the making of magnesium from olivine is well on its way toward completion. A number of other processes for use in wartime have either been proven or the experiments are promising.

T. V. A. power's contribution to the production of aluminum has already been mentioned, but it is interesting to note that T. V. A. power is going into ammonium nitrate, into vast quantities of TNT, into tons upon tons of loaded shells, and into war chemicals. T. V. A. is supplying one of the largest United States arsenals with power; it is supplying large powder plants and shell-loading plants. Power is going into plants for producing airplanes, ferro-alloys, shells, shell fuses, marine boilers, mine layers, artillery ammunition, antiaircraft ammunition, mine parts, bomber wings, and body parts, not to mention those factories that are making army blankets, army shoes and clothing, and many other things.

The Mapping Division of the Authority is working for the War Department in such faraway States as New York and Texas. The Malaria Control Division is cooperating with the Army in training successive groups of United States Army medical officers for service on the far-off battlefronts. The Authority is building houses for war workers. It is giving technical advice to plants in the valley engaged in the packing of millions of pounds of strawberries for shipment to Great Britain. The T. V. A. Forestry Department is furnishing the War Production Board with essential information on timber resources and current timber products. It is assisting in making useful the vast fish resources in the reservoirs. Last year 6,000,000 pounds of fish were taken from these reservoirs for food; it is estimated that at least 25,000,000 pounds of fish can be produced annually. The Authority is cooperating with the farmers of this region to produce more food and fiber for the war.

I hope that in this brief discussion I have been able to give you a picture of T. V. A.'s over-all program, including some activities about which the public perhaps has little knowledge.

The Tennessee Valley, through its organization of capital and manpower, through its development of its human and natural resources, is making those resources available both in peacetime and in wartime for the Nation's service.

Oregon Helps Feed the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter and report from the director of the western division of the United States Department of Agriculture, showing food production in Oregon for the years 1943 and 1944 with a comparison with the average for 1937 to 1941:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: As you know, food requirements for 1944 are the largest in this Nation's history. Despite war-created shortages and problems, our farmers achieved in 1943 their greatest production—the seventh straight year that they have set a new record for total food production.

If the 1944 food requirements are to be attained, weather willing, it means that more acres must be planted and production practices utilized that will increase yields. In order to get maximum production from the acreage available in 1944, the practice program of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency has been prepared cooperatively at county, State, and national levels to place the greatest possible emphasis on practices that will increase production and also conserve soil and water resources.

Goals for each State were set by farm leaders of the State. The total of these goals is the national goal. The War Food Administration suggested goals for the farm leaders' consideration, based upon food requirements for our military forces, civilians, and lend-lease. State leaders used these suggestions merely as indications of national needs, and set their State goals in line with the State's capacity to produce under present conditions. Although the States made many shifts in W. F. A. suggestions, both up and down, the national goals that resulted are sufficient to set a new production record with average yields.

I know that you are keenly interested in the 1944 goals for Oregon, so I have attached a table showing Oregon's 1944 food production goals and comparing them with preliminary figures for 1943 and the 5-year average, 1937–41. This table illustrates very clearly the enormous task that faces your farmers in 1944, since each of the years involved in this comparison is a year in which new records for total food production were set.

These are production goals, and each farmer will determine voluntarily what he will contribute toward meeting them.

County and community A. A. A. committeemen—farmers themselves, who have just been elected by their neighbor farmers—will present the war-food-needs picture to each farmer, so that he may use this information in determining what his farm will contribute to the war effort. These committeemen will also present to farmers the production aids that are available to assist them and will work throughout the year to help farmers in overcoming obstacles to production.

We are preparing a summary of the job which the farmers of Oregon accomplished in 1943, and I will forward this to you for your information in the near future.

Sincerely,

G. S. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

Oregon

Commodity	1944 goal	1943	1937–41 average	1944 goal as percentage of 1937–41 average
Crops:	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Acres*	*Percent*
Wheat	800,000	823,000	992,000	81
Corn	60,000	52,000	66,000	91
Oats	440,000	446,000	446,000	99
Barley	260,000	292,000	219,000	119
Dry peas	75,000	54,000	4,000	1,875
Irish potatoes	50,000	53,000	36,000	139
Commercial truck crops:				
For fresh market	21,000	14,000	12,000	175
For processing	66,000	53,000	30,000	220
Winter cover-crop seeds:				
Hairy vetch	60,000	80,000	60,000	100
Common vetch	30,000	26,000	20,000	150
Austrian winter peas	37,000	65,000	41,000	90
Common ryegrass	74,000	60,000	51,000	145
Sows farrowed:	*Number*	*Number*	*Number*	
Spring	41,000	46,000	37,000	111
Fall	30,000	38,000	25,000	120
On farms Jan. 1:				
All cattle and calves	[1] 984,000	1,127,000	936,000	105
All sheep and lambs	[1] 1,270,000	1,414,000	1,840,000	69
Raised on farms:				
Chickens	5,900,000	5,975,000	4,634,000	127
Turkeys	1,917,000	2,084,000	1,579,000	121
Production on farms:	*Dozen*	*Dozen*	*Dozen*	
Eggs	40,000,000	41,667,000	36,083,000	111
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	
Milk	1,348,000,000	1,434,000,000	1,374,000,000	98

[1] Jan. 1, 1945.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Plymouth Mail, of Plymouth, Mich.:

SUBSIDIES

"Am looking for you to change your mind about subsidies," said a good friend the other day to the editor. "I note that Congress is considering an appropriation to have the Government pay for all War-bond advertising. Isn't that going to change your mind?"

No, good friend, the editor's mind is not going to be changed. We have always been against Republican or Democratic political subsidies. We have never favored the proposed legislation pending in Congress for the Government to pay for War-bond advertising.

During the first 2 years of War-bond promotion, the Plymouth Mail sponsored every War-bond advertisement that appeared in this newspaper. The total cost amounted to many hundreds of dollars.

This year we asked various citizens and groups within the community to assist in the War-bond advertising campaign.

Let it be said to the everlasting credit of this patriotic city, that we have had but one refusal of cooperation in the publication of War-bond advertising. The Plymouth Mail expects to continue its policy of sponsoring War-bond advertising, in cooperation with the citizens of Plymouth.

What is a subsidy?

It is nothing more than a glorified dole.

If you have no scruples against putting your mother and father in the poorhouse, even though you can take care of them by depriving yourself of a few of the luxuries you have enjoyed, then, of course, it is to be expected that you favor Government subsidies.

Maybe that is a brutal way to state the case, but it is just about as we see this subsidy scheme.

A political subsidy is a charity. It is an unearned payment for something we are not entitled to. In other words, it is legalized graft, paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

The most vicious feature of the subsidy issue now pending before the United States Senate is the fact that vast numbers of people who are getting so much money they do not know what to do with it, are now demanding that Congress force our soldier and sailor boys who are shedding their blood for us, to pay our gluttonous food bill after they have won the war.

Yes; that is just what the present subsidy means. It says the Nation shall go in debt now in order to pay the farmer a little extra money so that we overfed "hawgs" who remain secure in our homes, can eat like gluttons at the expense of our boys in Army and Navy uniforms.

We have the brazen nerve to ask our boys to shed their blood for us and at the same time demand that they pay for the pork chops and apple pie we are now eating when they come home—if they live to come home.

To the farmers around Plymouth we extend our congratulations for their opposition to this proposed cheap, vote-buying political hand-out. We have yet to talk with a farmer around here who is in favor of the subsidy bill now pending in the Senate and backed by powerful pressure groups. To the Members of the House of Representatives who had the good sense to vote against this obnoxious proposal, we say congratulations to you, too. Stand by your guns! The good, old fashioned Americans who do not believe in shoving their fathers and mothers off to the poorhouse for the public to support, are with you 100 percent.

Personal Impressions Gained on Trip to Central and South America With a Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege and pleasure of making a trip to Central and South America with the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Military Affairs Committee.

While on the trip I made certain observations and obtained certain impressions. Our trip was necessarily hurried. My impressions were gained from limited observation and conversation. Perhaps with more time for study and more chance for more leisurely travel my ideas as to what I saw and heard will change. However, I sent to some of my constituents some of the impressions I gained on this trip. They seemed to be very much interested, and several Members of the House who read the report I sent out home were kind enough to say they were interested in what I had to say. Consequently, thinking that other Members might be interested, I am making a part of this statement the report which I sent to some of my constituents. This is the report:

The writer is a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Military Affairs Committee of the House. At the request of the War Department this committee made a trip to Central and South America. The main purpose of the trip was to inspect military installations, especially air installations. At the suggestion of the State Department, we called on three of our Embassies.

This report is merely intended as a report to constituents and friends who might be interested in some of my impressions. I have not the time to write a personal letter to all the people I wish to, so I am getting out this general letter which may be mailed to persons in my district.

We left Washington on November 3 and returned on November 20. We visited Mexico City, Guatemala City, the Canal Zone, Curaçao, Trinidad, Belem, Natal, Fortaleza, Rio de Janeiro, Sao Salvador, St. Lucia, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. These are not all of the places at which we have air bases in South and Central America. It is well known the numerous planes from America fly over this route to Natal and from there to Africa and other points where our fighting forces are located.

The Army has performed a tremendous job in developing and operating these installations along this great airway. Naturally, I cannot tell you about the volume of traffic using these highways as that is military information, not generally known, and should not be broadcast. We found the officers and men working hard. They are working under very adverse circumstances. They are living in a country in which the climate is different, customs are different, people are different, the moral standards and social system are different. The disease and vice problems are, consequently, difficult to handle. Our Army has done a good job in handling these difficult situations which, in a sense, are merely incidental to the main problem of getting planes and men to the battle fronts in various parts of the world. Many of their men and officers have been there over 18 months and none of them have had furloughs to the States. I think we should adopt a policy of giving every man a leave or transfer, after 1 year's service abroad.

In the first place, we should recognize, frankly, that after we left the southern border of the United States there was no country visited by us which is, or even approaches, a democracy. Each of the countries we visited have a dictator of some kind. The usual pattern is for some strong man, working with the army, to get control of the government and hold it until another strong man removes him. In form they have constitutions and laws, but in practice they do not have democracy as we understand it. The form of government is the affair of the individual country, so long as they do not encroach on our rights or in any way injure us, and we should, in good faith, deal with whomever is the responsible governmental group in these various countries.

I believe that this situation is only a reflection of the conditions that prevail in the various countries. The people of these countries have not had the training nor the experience necessary to develop and operate a democratic government. Their education is very inferior to ours, although they are making educational progress. Their morals are quite different from ours. Their environment is totally different. Their sanitation and social system is different. They are gradually developing universal education. They are making slow progress in conquering disease. When I tell you that from 50 to 90 percent of the people in the various countries visited have, or have had, malaria or venereal diseases, you can appreciate how different their situation is from ours. The heat, the jungles, and the insects are still a powerful deterrent to social and political progress by these people.

Some comments on the indirect results of our South American war activities are pertinent.

One of the most impressive observations I made was the diligence, persistence, and ingenuity with which the medical detachments worked on the disease problem. They are continually seeking means to prevent or cure diseases which may be contracted in the Tropics. I need not point out that in countries where social diseases and malaria are prevalent that the job of protecting our Army personnel is a serious one. Also, the standard of sanitation in the countries where we operate is entirely different than it is in our own country. Their standards of sanitation may be compared to what was the prevailing standard in this country a century ago and this very situation is a breeder of diseases of all kinds.

The Medical Corps, together with the engineers, have done an excellent job in draining areas in which Army and Navy installations are located so as to make the area free from disease-bearing insects and a wholesome and healthy place in which to live. But ever present is the general, all-around environment in which the soldier and sailor finds himself, i. e., people who have an entirely different moral standard as to sex problems and a country which is a veritable jungle out of which have been carved the small

cases where American installations are located.

Working on the problem directly as medical men, scientists, and engineers, as well as with the local population, the medical units and the engineers have performed wonders in preventing and holding down the disease rate which might otherwise rise to dangerous proportions.

We cannot help but state that in our opinion the greatest benefit which the South and Central American countries, in which we operate, will obtain from our military efforts, is the training, knowledge, and example which they are getting from the activity of medical and engneerng detachments in handling the problems of disease and sanitation. These countries are learning and seeing by our demonstration that diseases, which are prevalent in their countries, and have been for centuries, can be conquered, both by prevention and by cure. Even the casual observer who visits these countries cannot help but contemplate that if these peoples can conquer the disease problem they may develop into strong, vigorous countries.

When we consider what these countries have accomplished in the face of very adverse sanitation and disease conditions, one can realize what it would mean to their future development if they could reduce the disease scourge to only a trifling percentage. The American medical and engineering activity has indicated to the people of these countries that that very thing is possible. We were informed that the thinking people of these countries realize what a tremendous contribution the Americans are making through their efforts in that regard. They are getting the people to understand that these diseases can be prevented. This type of benefit will remain with these countries for generations to come and might be the very stimulus that will raise them from second-rate powers to great nations.

Another observation which we made and which we believe should be emphasized through the appropriate channels in every possible way is this: That every Central American and South American country should thank God that it has the United States as a neighbor. In the nature of the situation we afford them complete protection against any form of aggression. Should any military aggression be attempted by any foreign power, the United States would feel that in the interest of its own security, and in harmony with the Monroe Doctrine, that they would have to intervene and stop it. The result is that all these countries virtually have the same protection against aggression as the United States has, i. e., our Army, our Navy and our productive power would, in the event of aggression, be used for their protection to almost the same extent that it will be used for our protection.

We can conceive of nothing that will build good will and friendship more than the realization of this fact by not only the governments of all these nations, but by the people themselves. The realization of this situation should also be a stern reminder to these countries that frequently actual aggression is preceded by "peaceful" penetration through immigrants, agents, "friends," and so forth of the country that may look with designing eyes on one or more of these countries.

We should in every way possible develop the friendship of our southern neighbors. Certainly by what we have done for them in the way of defense, in the study and control of disease, and in our help to them in getting material for war purposes and helping in the training of their armies they must realize that we are their friends. I am not one of those who believe that we can buy friendship or good will. We have spent money lavishly in South and Central America. How much is a disputed point. But it is well to recall that none of the ambassadors whom we met with thinks that the lavish spending of money is the road to lasting friendship. Our country has never been picayunish. But we should not be extravagant.

It must be remembered that there is still suspicion about us in the Southern Hemisphere. Government in those countries is looked at, to a certain extent, as a vehicle for graft. They cannot get out of their minds the thought that perhaps some day this great giant from the north may decide to take over some territory in the south. We know that no one here has any such idea. But we must recognize that that view is held by some of our neighbors. The spending of too much money recklessly might give them the thought that in that way we were trying to buy their friendship and later perhaps recoup enough by a territorial grab to repay us for our spending.

The more we can emphasize the help we have willingly and unselfishly given these countries and that our real interest is in having these countries develop into sturdy and independent countries the more will our good-will thermometer go up. Seeing life in these countries emphasized the great missionary work which the United States can do in helping them become modernized in sanitation, disease control, morals, and in business. Our pay will come in the satisfaction we get from knowing that we helped them and that our help and friendship produced the desired results. From this effort will spring the good will and lasting friendship that we desire. That result will help make peace secure.

Fortieth Anniversary of First Airplane Flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as the guest of the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Robert H. Hinckley, I attended the testimonial dinner in honor of Orville Wright on December 17 in the Federal room of the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C. It marked the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.

The Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, as chairman, read a message from the President, which was followed by the addresses of other distinguished guests. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the proceedings on this memorable occasion:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED BY JESSE H. JONES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, AT THE DINNER IN HONOR OF ORVILLE WRIGHT, ON THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST FLIGHT AT KITTY HAWK, N. C.

Mr. JONES. When President Roosevelt's attention was called to the fact that this day would mark the fortieth anniversary of the first air flight in the history of the world he readily agreed that we should celebrate the occasion in a manner appropriate to its importance. The President immediately dispatched a letter to Orville Wright, our honor guest, requesting his presence here tonight, and expressing his own intention to be present, circumstances permitting. As we all know, our President has been out of the country on a great mission to achieve peace, and cannot be with us in person. He is with us in spirit, and I give you his message:

"Forty years ago today a little-noted event at Kitty Hawk, N. C., marked the beginning of a new age. On December 17, 1903, Orville and Wilbur Wright got the first power-driven aircraft to take to the air successfully. I am told they flipped a coin to see which one would attempt the flight. Orville won the toss and was the first to feel the thrill of flying. He flew 120 feet in exactly 12 seconds. Before the day was over, Wilbur had made a flight of 859 feet. The child of the brains of these brothers had been born. Their patience and perseverance had been rewarded.

"Flying is a long step in transportation from the beast of burden. In his constant desire for freedom of movement, man has had to conquer three elements—water, land, and air. Centuries shroud the identity of the brave soul who designed the first boat and set sail in it. Time has wiped out the track of the first wheel and any record of its designer. The name of the Wright brothers—Orville and Wilbur Wright—is known and honored throughout the world. Forty years ago, and before, the world was incredulous about man flying through the air. Witnesses at Kitty Hawk were more curious perhaps than expectant.

"Today, man's imagination has difficulty in keeping pace with the everyday achievements of flying. The gift to the world by Orville and Wilbur Wright has made a broad highway of the skies over which time and distance are cut a hundredfold It is our duty to keep these air highways free and open, in order that all peoples of the world may more and more become good neighbors—better neighbors—and that the instrument of flying shall serve to keep the peace once it has again been achieved.

"Orville and Wilbur Wright did not labor and toil to create an instrument of war. Knowing them as I do, their inspiration was not a destructive weapon. The impelling force which drove them on to ultimate success was to make a contribution to the progress of man.

"When the war is won, it will be our obligation to convert to peaceful pursuits the gains in the field of aviation that war has brought. They are indeed many. We have established air routes about which we would otherwise still be speculating. We have developed airplanes and men to fly them in numbers we would have thought unbelievable. The great capitals of the world will, with the dawn of peace, be as accessible by air as any point in the United States is now by rail. Experiments which would have required decades will have been accomplished in a few years and, if we will, we can use all of these advances for a lasting peace. God willing, we will.

"All of these achievements and all of these hopes stem from the first Wright plane whose basic principles still govern flying. That quaint and fragile machine should be enshrined in the Smithsonian Institution for all time, and I am glad to be able to tell you that Orville Wright is going to bring the Kitty Hawk plane back from England where it has been in the British Museum. The Nation will welcome it back as the outstanding symbol of American genius.

"Our heritage from the Wright brothers, however, consists of more than the first airplane.

"They trained our first flyers. It is particularly fitting, therefore, that the Collier trophy, awarded annually since 1911 'for the greatest achievement in aviation in America, the value of which has been actually demonstrated by actual use during the preceding year,' should on this occasion go to one of their early pupils.

"Many distinguished names are linked with this award, including our guest of honor, and I know he will agree that the present recipient is fully worthy of the honor, since it goes to Gen. H. H. Arnold, United States Army, 'for his organization and leadership of the Army Air Forces throughout the world. No worthier selection could have been made. History will reveal General Arnold's true worth when it withdraws the cloak which now surrounds his activities. The heroism of those who serve with him is written in the skies every day and every night.

"In closing," says the President, "I can think of only one additional tribute to General Arnold. Will you please ask Orville Wright, the great teacher, to act for me in handing the Collier trophy to General Arnold, the great pupil?"

Gentlemen, General Arnold.

General ARNOLD. Thank you, Mr. Wright. I can think of no one else from whom I would rather accept this splendid trophy.

Mr. Jones, gentlemen, in a month of large and stirring events, this is not the first occasion on which I have been moved by a feeling of mixed pride and gratitude. On my way to and from the Tehran Conference, I spent much of my time inspecting our Army Air Force installations, talking with our men and determining preparations made for times and events even more momentous than those we've seen before.

Our bases are nearing completion; our airplanes are streaming to the fronts in ever-increasing quantities; every day sees more and more of the combat units of the Army Air Forces ready for action.

Your faith—and mine—in our airmen should never waiver. We should be grateful and proud of these young men, young in years perhaps, but men in experience, character, and accomplishments. We should be proud of the planes they fly. That combination of men and planes form today the most powerful air force the world has seen.

In adding my name to the roster on this splendid trophy, the National Aeronautics Association honors every man and woman in the Army Air Forces. There are nearly two and a half million of us now devoted to the war on the air front. We are the one component of America's military service that has been in continuous contact with the enemy every day since that savage attack on Pearl Harbor. Our Air Force welcomes the responsible and dangerous role assigned to us, and we glory in the devotion, self-sacrifice, daring, and skill in which the members of our combat crews have accomplished their missions.

I wonder how many of you realize just what it takes to make an air force. The young flyers in the combat crews—the mechanics who serve the planes and keep them in the air—the weather men whose careful predictions make air operations easier—the radio men who keep contact with the planes—the hundreds of thousands of men and women—and—yes, children—working in factories—the engineer troops making our landing fields within gunshot range of the enemy—these and many, many more make up our air force—they all helped win the Collier Trophy.

Yet none of us has as permanent and indisputable claim to the Collier Trophy as my great friend and teacher here, Mr. Orville Wright.

It is as one member of the great Army Air Force team, then, that I accept this trophy, gratefully, and with pride.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, General Arnold.

Many parts of the world are with us tonight. Many messages for Orville Wright have been received from individuals and nations.

I now present Sir Ronald Campbell, Minister of Great Britain, who is with us because of the indisposition of Lord Halifax, and will read a message from Sir Archibald Sinclair, Secretary of State for Air.

SIR RONALD CAMPBELL. It is with great pleasure that I send, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, a tribute to the epoch-making work of the Wright brothers which you are celebrating tonight.

The unique achievement of Wilbur and Orville Wright was recognized from a very early date in Britain, and unstinted homage has ever since been paid in this country to the genius, imagination, courage and resourcefulness which enabled these great American pioneers to discover and reveal the secret of flight. The passage of time has only served to increase our sense of the magnitude of their achievement.

Today superior air power (built up on the foundations laid by the brothers Wright) is enabling the United Nations to stamp out tyranny and oppression, but already we can look beyond victory and see the immense part which aviation is destined to play in the world of tomorow.

It is my hope and conviction that our two countries, in partnership with other nations of goodwill, will work together to secure the great and increasing benefits which the mastery of flight, first achieved at Kitty Hawk 40 years ago, offers freely and abundantly to us all.

Mr. JONES. Sir Ronald, we appreciate your message.

Although the theme of this dinner is "Aviation for Peace," our military services through the years have pioneered in aviation development.

I give you the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox.

Secretary KNOX. We honor here tonight the two Americans who accomplished the age-old dream of flight. Orville and Wilbur Wright opened the Age of Aeronautics with their historic take-off at Kitty Hawk just 40 years ago. One member of that illustrious team is here to accept our congratulations. Mr. Orville Wright by no means rests on his laurels—outstanding as they are—but has continued to be a student of aeronautics. At present he is carrying on scientific research in the interests of his country.

The progress in 40 years in this new field of transportation by air is so fantastic that almost any prediction seems plausible.

As Secretary of the Navy, my interest is naturally in the progress of naval aviation. It was only 32 years ago that the first naval officer learned to fly. Since then, the airplane has revolutionized the fleet and fleet tactics.

At the beginning of World War No. 1 the Navy had only 38 pilots and 239 men attached to its aviation force.

Today, we talk in terms of more than 27,000 planes now in the Navy—of projected aircraft carriers larger than any hitherto constructed. The Navy's training schools for its pilots, navigators, gunners, machinists mates, photographers, metalsmiths, radiomen, and ordnancemen span the country. Not only does battle in the air call for trained men to fly and fight our own planes, but men of the Navy are also trained to fight off enemy planes from shipboard. The ships of the Navy are now two-way threats, with the ability to fight surface actions with other warships—and to fight off enemy air attack.

There is more recent news, however, in a résumé of aviation's place in the Navy in the present war. This month a world's record was set with the flight of the *Mars* from Patuxtent to Natal. This huge new cargo flying boat indicates what is to come in peacetime aviation. It carried the greatest air cargo, the heaviest load ever lifted by a plane and made the longest nonstop cargo flight in history, in all, the *Mars* covered almost 9,000 miles in 55 hours' and 31 minutes' flying time.

The *Mars*, now used to transport personnel and strategic materials to our war fronts, can carry more than double the load transported by the biggest of the oceangoing clippers. Her record, along lines of gas consumption, cost per ton-mile, and so forth, will provide a valuable scale for post-war, globe-circling air lines.

We have today the greatest air lines the world has ever known in the Air Transport Command and the Naval Air Transport Service. We have millions of young men and young women trained in aeronautics, ground work, repair and construction. At the end of the war, many of these will wish to stay in aviation. They will undoubtedly be able to do so—for the war has given impetus to the age of air travel.

We are dependent to a very great extent on superior air power to win the war—and to maintain the peace that follows. We must stay ahead of the enemy in air knowledge now. Men, such as Orville Wright, and other talented, hardworking designers and research men throughout the country will see to it that this is accomplished. We depend on them to win for us all the benefits of peacetime aviation which we will share with our allies and the freed peoples of the earth. May that day be not too far off!

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The country from which our next message comes knows well the value of aviation. I present the Chinese Ambassador, with a message from Tseng Yang Fu, Minister of Communications. Dr. Wei.

Dr. WEI. On this happy occasion when you all gather to honor Mr. Orville Wright on the fortieth anniversary of the first flight by him and his brother at Kitty Hawk, I wish to join you in extending my heartiest congratulation and deepest gratitude to him. Indeed the world is greatly indebted to Mr. Wright for the evolution of man-carrying airplane. Without his pioneering work the history of flying machine would not have afforded such a splendid record of achievement and pageant of progress. As airplane has played so important a role in the present war, which, of course, was not the original idea of the inventor, it will doubtless render a greater service to mankind after the return of peace. China is particularly appreciative of the tremendous utility of airplane especially when her coast and land communications are almost entirely blockaded or cut from the outside world. The potentialities of aviation development in China are very great. As soon as the war is over we will devote our effort to expanding our commercial air transportation.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

* * * * *

The United States Army was the first to buy a Wright plane. It adopted and fostered aviation.

The Under Secretary of War, Robert Patterson.

Under Secretary PATTERSON. Speaking on the future of aviation is like taking a look ahead through strongly magnifying, rose-colored glasses. Only the chronically pessimistic would predict anything but the most glowing future. Certainly only the most courageous would do so before this audience.

To suggest that aviation is on the threshold of anything causes my associates in the Army Air Forces to bristle. By their estimate aviation has long since arrived, moved in, and set up housekeeping—permanent housekeeping.

But I do want to suggest that there is a new threshold. In the field of aviation this war has made the world a scientific laboratory. Two years of war have advanced aviation much more than many years of peace. Still we can see only further horizons.

We received an emergency request from General Eisenhower for currency to be used in Italy and Sicily which the Germans had flooded with counterfeit American money. We loaded 14 tons into airplanes and delivered it in north Africa within 48 hours, after covering an airline distance equivalent to almost four times across the United States.

One of our general officers recently flew from Hawaii to Washington in a transport plane in 20 hours.

We now have a regular cargo-passenger service which operates to one of our distant fighting fronts. This routine operation covers 16,000 miles, on schedule, in 8 days. This, incidentally, works out to an average speed, day and night, for the entire 8 days of 135 miles per hour.

One night at 10:30 p. m., at the crisis of fighting in the Solomons, General MacArthur cabled that they were running out of hand grenades on Guadalcanal. By midnight planes started picking up grenades at the arsenal. By 2 o'clock the next afternoon, 5 tons of grenades had been flown to a west coast airport, transloaded onto overseas heavy planes and were over the Pacific. Within 3 days they were in Australia.

This year aircraft of the Army Air Forces alone will fly across the great oceans—the North and South Atlantic and Pacific—more than 20,000 times.

We now have planes which have dived in excess of 750 miles an hour. This is evidence of the great advance made in structural development and in our understanding of what is popularly called streamlining. The application of that knowledge to planes of large types and the hitching to them of sufficient power will shrink the world and make its unity a practical possibility.

I hope you will accept these achievements and promises for the future in the spirit they are intended. I know they will stimulate you as they do me. But those of you whose job it is to design our planes, or build them or fly them, will, I know, be stimulated not to pleasant dreams of the future, but to put forth your utmost effort on our pressing problem—winning the war.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

We have word from another great people—our gallant allies—the Russians. I present the First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, Mr. Fedor Orekhov.

Mr. OREKHOV. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wright, gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure on behalf of the people of the U. S. S. R. to greet the outstanding representative of science—Mr. Orville Wright, who, together with his brother, Wilbur Wright, has opened a new epoch in the development of air technique.

Orville Wright and his brother Wilbur, 40 years ago accomplished the most remote dream of mankind. This event was one of the boldest deeds of the human mind. It became the brave step into the future, where all the research of mechanical science had been put into the service of mankind.

The Wright brothers have become the most popular inventors and scientists in the world. In my country their names are well known not only to adults but to every school boy and girl.

The contribution of these men to science serves as one of the means in the defense of the world against the Hitlerite armies. But we also have visions of the time when aviation will be put entirely to the service of the peace aims of mankind; when the unique achievement of the Wright brothers will become a means of transportation accessible for all, which will bring more closely the separated territories of the world with one another, which will facilitate the intercourse of our people with peoples of other countries, and thus assist progress generally in agriculture and public economy.

Mr. JONES. This occasion would not be complete without word from that great American, the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Mr. Hull could not be with us tonight, but he has sent us a message which I will read:

"It gives me the greatest pleasure to pay tribute to Orville and Wilbur Wright. Forty years ago today they made the first successful flight in a power-driven airplane. In the space of a generation this achievement has gone far toward changing the face of affairs throughout the entire world.

"To pessimists and critics, the accomplishment of the Wright brothers is a standing rebuke. Their ideas had been discounted as visionary, and the thing they sought to do was believed to be impossible. Yet they kept on, and saw in their lifetime the work of their minds become the foundation of a new era of human activity.

"There are those who say that the airplane has contributed more to the forces of destruction than it has to the work of peace-loving life. I think that the vast possibilities opened by this new form of transport and communication have increased the opportunity of statesmen and of people to knit together a new fabric of international understanding and cooperation. The challenge to our political and economic thinking offered by aviation today is comparable to the challenge which the physical problem of flying offered to the Wright brothers half a century ago. It must be our aim to use air transportation nationally and internationally as a means of serving an ever-growing number of people. It must be our policy to seek arrangements and understandings so that the planes which fly overhead shall always be vehicles of peace and not means of destruction.

"If this goal is achieved, the anniversary of the flight of the Wright brothers which is being celebrated tonight will prove a great milestone on the long road of civilization."

Governor Broughton, of North Carolina, expected to be with us, but found it necessary to send his regrets. Speaking in his place will be the Honorable Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, who represented the Kittyhawk district in Congress for many years. Mr. Warren.

(The remarks of Mr. Warren were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 18.)

Mr. JONES. We have received many messages. I wish we could read them all, but time will not permit.

What has been said here, Mr. Wright, and what has been left unsaid constitutes ample evidence of the esteem in which the whole world holds you and your brother and the invention which you gave to mankind. What we have done here tonight is only a slight token of the esteem in which we hold you.

Your fame will live through the years and the airplane which you gave us will facilitate travel, commerce, and good will in all parts of the world.

There have been many great discoveries but no single one of more lasting benefit to all people than that of the airplane.

This noon, at a luncheon in Dayton, the chamber of commerce awarded a plaque to Orville Wright in his absence. He is a prophet not without honor in his own country.

Due to air communication, for which our guest of honor is responsible, it was delivered in Washington this afternoon, and I have been asked to present it to him.

It is with great pleasure that I give to Mr. Wright this mark of the esteem in which his fellow townsmen hold him.

Gentlemen, that concludes our program for the evening.

Thank you, Mr. Wright, for honoring us and our thanks to all of our guests for being with us.

Somewhere in New Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD the following most interesting poem written by a serviceman in my district, Corp. Ralph E. Torgerson:

SOMEWHERE IN NEW GUINEA

(From somewhere in New Guinea Corp. Ralph E. Torgerson, formerly a commercial artist employed by a Portland oil company, sent friends this poem. The Oregonian Sunday magazine reprints it for its picture of that South Seas fighting front and of an Oregon boy's longing for home.)

(By Corp. Ralph E. Torgerson)

Somewhere in New Guinea, where the sun is like a curse
And each long day is followed by another slightly worse;
Where the brick-red dust blows thicker than the shifting desert sand,
And a white man dreams and wishes for a greener, fairer land.

Somewhere in New Guinea, where a woman's never seen,
Where the sky is never cloudy, and the grass is never green,
Where the dingo's nightly howling robs a man of blessed sleep,
When he crawls into his pup tent for a haven of retreat.

Somewhere in New Guinea, where the nights are made for love,
Where the moon is like a searchlight, and the Southern Cross above
Sparkles like a diamond necklace in a balmy tropic night,
It's a shameless waste of beauty, when there's not a girl in sight.

Somewhere in New Guinea, where the mail is always late,
Where a Christmas card in April is considered up-to-date,
Where we never have a payday, and we never have a cent,
But we never miss the money, 'cause we'd never get it spent.

Somewhere in New Guinea, where the ants and lizards play
And a hundred fresh mosquitos replace every one you slay—
So take me back to Oregon, for that is now my yell,
For this Godforsaken outpost is a sunstitute for hell.

Resolution Granting Furloughs to Men in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 18, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution instructing the Army and Navy to establish a policy of granting to those who have been in active foreign service 18 months or longer a furlough in order that they may return home and rest and visit their families. I recognize the fact that when men are engaged in active military or naval operations it may not be possible to relieve them at the exact moment their 18 months' service expires, and so I have inserted the words "as far as practicable" in the resolution. If adopted, the resolution will have the effect of declaring it to be the sense of Congress that men

shall not be subjected to the intense ordeal of combat service without being granted furloughs, and the War and Navy Departments will be expected to see that the necessary orders are issued to conform to this new policy.

With so many replacement troops prepared, ready and willing to go into combat service, it is not fair or right that the burden of fighting the war shall be placed to such a great extent on the relatively minor group now at the front. This would place on the members of that group one of two alternatives:

First. To fight until they are killed.

Second. To fight until the war is over.

This is creating among them a feeling of unfairness and discrimination. A better policy which would conform to the American tradition of equality would be to hold forth to every serviceman the assurance that his valor and good behavior will entitle him to a rest and respite after he has been in service every 18 months. With the prospect of a long war and many casualties the present policy bears too much of the appearance of a death sentence. The soldier or sailor can only look forward from one period of combat service to the next, not knowing which one will be his last.

It is true that never in any of our wars have we adopted the principle of rotation of service, but this war is different. Our participation in the First World War lasted only 18 months from the time we declared war and our active participation with troops lasted only a few months. The present war is not going to be a short war, and we may as well be doing some long-range planning. The Japanese are fanatics who will die before they will surrender, and it is not inconceivable that we shall be fighting Japan in the Far East 10 years hence. Under these circumstances it is reasonable, I think, that arrangements should be made for the periodical replacement of men at the fronts with fresh troops.

Many of the men now doing duty on the fighting fronts are fathers. I have in mind one instance where in January next the father in the service will have been gone 3 years. Over 2 years ago a baby was born in that home which the father has never seen. Over that family rests a heavy load of grief as the wife and mother is morosely convinced she will never see her husband again. She and others who are similarly situated feel that the war is unnecessarily robbing them of everything they have a right to have. The fathers in the service, especially those who have become fathers while overseas, certainly are entitled to our consideration in evaluating the great human problems created by the war. The argument that a lack of shipping facilities would be a handicap in bringing servicemen home for furloughs is not entirely convincing. In the services of supply ships are constantly going back and forth and some of these which are now returning empty could be used to transport troops. Furthermore, we are consuming much shipping space in bringing large numbers of prisoners to the United States. Why not establish stockades in the countries where the prisoners are captured and keep them there until after the war is over, thus releasing this shipping space for the transportation of the boys coming home on furlough? I believe the resolution I have introduced cannot fail to appeal to the fairness and sense of justice of the American people, and I hope Congress will adopt it.

The resolution follows:

Whereas many servicemen in the armed forces of our country have been overseas for 18 months or more and have been unable to return to their homes on furlough; and

Whereas many of these men have become fathers while overseas; and

Whereas there are many servicemen who have been in training in the United States for over a year who are available to replace such men overseas: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that as far as practicable servicemen who have served continuously overseas for 18 months or longer shall be granted furloughs to rest and visit their families in the United States; it is further

Resolved, That the authorities of the Army, Navy, and other armed services are directed to make effective as soon as is feasible and practicable the policy outlined in this resolution.

The Best Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, of the many plans being proposed for the establishment of a monetary system based on labor, credit, or commodities, it appears that the tried and proven monetary system based on the precious metals will best serve the Nation's needs as explained in the correspondence submitted herewith for printing in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL,
Charleston, S. C., December 18, 1943.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress from Idaho,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I listened to your address on the radio today concerning money. I have long been a student of that question, and I am thoroughly convinced that the money question is the big problem with which we must deal.

While I want money created against economic goods and services, the important thing is that the Government shall create the money and do it with scientific relationship to our needs. It doesn't really matter what is alleged to be back of the money, just so it is created by the Government and is so created on the basis of the needs of all the people. It might be advisable to keep up the fiction of gold and silver as a base for our money, on account of the ignorance of people generally concerning money. In any event, here's hoping more men in Congress will be aroused to the necessity of the Government's taking from the banks of the country the power to create money.

I am enclosing a plan I have worked out for the post-war peace of the world. And you will see from it how important I consider the money question in the scheme of the world's affairs.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. CASTLEBERRY,
Chief Pharmacist's Mate.

DECEMBER 21, 1943.

DEAR MR. CASTLEBERRY: It is a pleasure to receive your letter, and interesting to learn of your interest in the money issue.

Many plans have been suggested for the establishment of monetary systems based on measures of labor and commodities. However, in my studies of the subject, I find that in conducting trade and business, if we are to have a stable medium of exchange, certain fundamental principles of economic law must be met. Money—to be effective in use—must be made legal tender; and if money is to be stable in value, there must be an even increase in the volume of the currency with the growth of population and commerce. In considering this provision of economic law, we find that silver and gold taken together and used for money at a ratio of value fixed by the quantity of production, fulfills this need as to the increase in volume estimated to be 3 percent annually. Credit is a convenient substitute for money, and paper bank credit tokens are now being used for money, which has practically displaced the use of both gold and silver and redeemable paper currency. The necessity for the control of the quantity of money in circulation is exercised by applying an interest charge for the use of money. The interest charge and repayment requirement of bank loans operates to restrain the uncontrolled creation of bank-token money. This plan is very effective in controlling the expansion of the money volume. In times of financial optimism and excessive banking confidence, there is a tendency to expand the volume of bank currency—a condition which brings us to the price issue. We find that under the present system of creating bank money, the stability of values is dependent on the estimation and evaluation of the officers of the banks, if financial conditions are deemed stable and the future outlook appears favorable to the banks. Property values and existing price levels are supported by bank loans that make money available for the needs of business issued through bank loans; but this support is so fragile that some remote credit disturbance can shake the confidence of the banks, with the result that new loans are refused, and existing loans are withdrawn as they mature, with an inevitable decline of prices and values. When this so-called bank money is withdrawn from circulation, there is left insufficient cash in the hands of the people to support prices.

By this plan, in times of financial stress, bank money goes out of existence, and the financial liquid, that must be used in liquidation—cash—falls so far short of the Nation's money requirements that a disastrous financial depression ensues; and the price foundation, on which banks base their loans, is destroyed by their own timidness; and at the very time it is needed most the banks' money and credit-creating machinery cannot be made to operate, and fails to provide the money function; and the Government, to prevent financial disaster, is forced to come to the rescue of its poverty-stricken people left starving in the midst of plenty with relief and "pump priming" legislative measures financed by drafts on the national credit. To anyone who has witnessed the financial developments in this country in recent years, it must be apparent that there is a serious shortage in the element of cash. It is clearly apparent that if gold and silver were made legal tender money—issued into circulation by the Government, and used as a

basis for bank credit—it would provide this country the most stable and dependable money system that can be devised.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Twelfth Member of St. Louis Family Enters Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I called to the attention of the House the contribution the family of Mr. and Mrs. L. M. Van Coutren had made in this war. At that time I stated three daughters were in the WAC, six sons had joined the Navy, and another son was serving in the merchant marine. James, a married son, has just enlisted in the Marine Corps. This is a contribution the family can well be proud of.

The Van Coutrens reside at 1292 Hamilton Boulevard in St. Louis.

Urges Continuation of Regulation W Without Fundamental Change Under Jurisdiction and Administration of the Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much criticism of executive directives, necessary though such directives may be in wartime, that it is gratifying to receive communications endorsing and approving the effectiveness of particular regulations.

I have received such a resolution from the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., and as a portion of my extension of remarks I include this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Whereas regulation W adopted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in order to carry out the President's Executive order of August 9, 1941, and made effective September 1, 1941, to accomplish the objectives of the order, which in part reads: "To keep the cost of living from spiraling upward we must discourage credit and installment buying and encourage the payment of debts, mortgages, and other obligations, for this promotes savings, retards excessive buying, and adds to the amount available to the creditors for the purchase of War bonds," has now been in effect for more than 2 years; and

Whereas we of the furniture trade at retail engage in installment selling to a great degree and in doing so have diligently applied all of the provisions of the regulation as originally written and subsequently amended; and

Whereas the members of this State Association of Retail Furniture Dealers, having conscientiously adhered to regulation W in the operation of their extensive credit businesses, feel that their experiences with consumer-credit control as established in the regulation entitles them to a definite expression as regards the effectiveness of the control on both buyer and seller; so therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee, board of directors of the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., regard regulation W as being particularly outstanding and effective among hundreds of Government directives for the following reasons:

1. Achievement of objectives to a marked degree.
2. Simplicity and ease of understanding.
3. Businesslike and considerate administration by the Federal Reserve System.
4. Universal popularity among the great numbers of American businessmen and consumers whose selling and buying credit is controlled by it.

And be it further—

Resolved, That the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., heartily approves the regulation as now written and administered, that we recommend no fundamental changes be made in the directive for the present, especially in the maximum credit period as now allowed and that we petition the Congress of the United States to continue regulation W, by legislation if required, following the cessation of hostilities under the capable administration of the Federal Reserve System and any contemplated changes in its provisions after the war be left to the judgment of the Federal Reserve System; and be it further—

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C., the Federal Reserve Bank, Twelfth District, San Francisco, Calif., and California Congressional Representatives at Washington.

RETAIL FURNITURE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
H. F. BARGER, *President.*
GEORGE W. FITCH, *Managing Director and Secretary.*
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *December 3, 1943.*

Urges Removal of Obstructions to Facilitate the Restoration of the Sockeye Salmon Industry in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest industries in the Pacific Northwest is salmon, in all of its branches and ramifications. Not so long ago, the sockeye salmon fishery of Puget Sound and the Gulf of Georgia produced a pack valued at $40,000,000.

Food is an indispensable weapon in this war. Every possible encouragement and assistance should be provided for the production of natural foods of every kind, including fish.

Recently, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution urging appropriation of funds by the Congress for the construction of fishways at Hell's Gate Canyon and the removal of other obstructions on the Fraser River, to the end that the sockeye salmon industry of the Pacific Northwest be substantially restored. It is further provided that the cost of the removal of such obstructions be divided equally between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, but let the resolution speak for itself. Here it is:

Resolution re appropriation of funds for construction of fishways at Hell's Gate Canyon and removal of other obstructions on the Fraser River, approved by board of trustees, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, December 14, 1943

The board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce urges the Secretary of State of the United States, and all others in authority, to give their immediate approval and support to the appropriation of funds for the construction of fishways at Hell's Gate Canyon, and the removal of other obstructions on the Fraser River, so that the Sockeye salmon industry of the Pacific Northwest can be substantially restored—the cost to be divided equally between the two nations with regulations providing for like amounts of fish to be caught by American and Canadian fishermen.

At one time the Sockeye salmon fishery of Puget Sound and the Gulf of Georgia produced a pack which, in a good year at present prices, would have a value in excess of $40,000,000, but the fishery has now fallen off to a comparatively small amount.

It is the belief of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, which Commission was created by treaty between Canada and the United States for the purpose of rehabilitating this fishery, that by the construction of fishways at Hell's Gate Canyon and the removal of other obstructions, together with proper regulation, this great industry can be substantially restored and it is estimated that the cost of such fishways and other physical work will be approximately $2,000,000.

This proposed project is of such great value, not only to this region but to the two nations involved, not only because of financial considerations but also because of the desirability of securing this large, nutritious, and palatable food supply, that the work should be undertaken immediately and pressed to conclusion with the utmost expedition.

The Umatilla Dam and Other Improvements in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me in October 1943 at the hearings before the House Committee on

Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, on the proposed construction of the Umatilla Dam in the Columbia River. The statement is as follows:

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I may say that in April 1939 this committee held hearings on this same project, and we printed reports of those hearings here. They pertain to the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington and to the Umatilla Dam. I should like the record to show that those hearings are available, so that it will not be necessary for us to go into all the details and facts again. I think it is well to call attention to them, especially so that the new members of this committee may refer to those printed hearings.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this whole interior country—the Inland Empire, as we call it, comprising eastern Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and some portions of adjoining States—is an immense territory which drains down through the Columbia River to tidewater and then out into trade and commerce. It comprises one-tenth of the area of the United States. It is larger in area than France, and it abounds in immense natural resources. As has been stated here by the gentlemen who precede me, there are immense areas of land suitable for agricultural development in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington and Idaho. Wheat and other grains, hay, livestock, and great quantities of fruit are raised in that region. Sugar beets are also being raised for the production of sugar. A considerable portion of that territory is already irrigated, and many thousands of acres—hundreds of thousands of acres, in fact—are susceptible of irrigation with waters from the Columbia when they are made available and when the additional lands are required to be brought under cultivation and irrigated.

In addition to that, there is a vast area covered with timber. I personally have had a great deal of experience with that, because for some 20 years I was in the survey department of the Government, surveying those lands in Washington, Idaho, and Montana. The finest stands of growing timber to be found anywhere in the world are in that area, not only in the eastern portion of this area but along the western slope toward the Pacific Ocean, in Oregon and Washington. Much of these lands is owned by the Federal Government. Private operators also own large bodies of timber. But more than 50 percent of the lands in Oregon is owned by the Federal Government, so the Government is not only interested in this from the standpoint of developing the country as a whole but also in developing its own properties.

Mr. Chairman, the Columbia River and its tributaries is a key to the opening up of the whole Northwest Pacific area, which, as I have said, is an empire in its proportions containing one-tenth of the area of the United States. It not only furnishes cheap water transportation to the sea but it also furnishes water for irrigation, as well as hydroelectric power. The Pacific coast has had the greatest increase in population since 1940 of any section of the United States, and it is destined to continue increasing in the same proportion in many years to come. This is due to the fact that it is still to a large extent in the process of development and contains all of the natural advantages which are necessary for the sustaining of a large and prosperous population. It has immense natural resources in forests, minerals, nonmetallics, clays, hydroelectric power, water, equable climate, and fertile soil.

With the Columbia River open for ocean-borne commerce, the wealth of this immense territory lying between the Rocky Mountains and Pacific Ocean may be carried by cheap river transportation to tidewater in the port of Portland and from there to all of the ports of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention the following statistics with reference to the part the Pacific coast area is taking in our industrial and commercial developments:

California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona produce the greatest comparative farm wealth in the United States.

Of the first 10 United States farm counties, 9 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 20 United States farm counties, 16 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 100 United States farm counties, 29 are on the Pacific coast.

Two-fifths of all United States lumber; two-fifths of all United States gold (in peacetime); one-third of all copper (one-twelfth of world production); one-sixth of all United States petroleum; one-sixth of all United States natural gas; one-seventh of all United States silver (in peacetime); one-fifth of the Nation's mercury; one-fourth of the tungsten; two-fifths of total United States fish catch (all sources, marine, rivers, lake, etc.).

The following comparison of lumber production of the five leading States of the Union are interesting in this connection:

Latest available figures, 1941—From U. S. Bureau of the Census

Rank	State	Population (feet, board measure)
1	Oregon	6,346,165,000
2	Washington	5,239,224,000
3	California	2,331,040,000
4	Alabama	1,798,383,000
5	Georgia	1,522,311,000
Total United States		33,476,165,000

The Columbia River is the second largest river in the United States, but it is the largest in terms of potential electric power in the United States, and perhaps in the world. Congressman STOCKMAN said a moment ago that it had more than 30 percent of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. My own information is he was too modest in his claim and that it has more than 40 percent, perhaps nearer 50 percent of the hydroelectric power in the United States. So, there is that vast potential hydroelectric power in the Columbia River and its tributaries. Of course, much of that power is not needed at the present time, but, as the colonel said in his presentation of the matter, all the electric power that is now being produced in that area is being utilized. A great portion of it is being used in the war industries, but that is true everywhere throughout the United States in these war days. We are devoting our manpower and our facilities everywhere in the United States, so far as is practicable, to the war industries, to these great industries that are utilizing this power, such as the aluminum, shipping, and metallurgical industries of various kinds. These industries needing large blocks of electric power have established modern plants in the Pacific Northwest. Unquestionably in the post-war period, if we are going to continue prosperous and to employ 10,000,000 soldiers who will be released and 20,000,000 people who will be released from the war industries, we must continue to operate these great plants. We will have the power, and it is the cheapest electric power to be found anywhere in the world. It is true that power is being sold cheaper in Canada—Quebec, for instance—but as far as cost of development is concerned, I do not think there is any power development anywhere that is producing power any cheaper than ours in this Columbia River area, by reason of the continuous, even flow of the Columbia River. If we combine these immense natural resources that we have in minerals, metallics, clays, forestry products, and plastic products, all of which we will need after the war is over, with this vast pool of hydroelectric power right at our door, we can insure prosperity to this area in the post-war period. This electric energy requires practically no cost of maintenance after generators are once installed for it goes on indefinitely.

Mr. SIMPSON. What causes the Columbia River to have such an even flow?

Mr. ANGELL. It is by reason of the great area which it drains and the late season when the snow melts. The snow that falls in the mountains in the vast surrounding territory of the Columbia River watershed melts at different times, thus keeping an even flow in the Columbia.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does it have a more even flow than the Mississippi?

Mr. ANGELL. Oh, yes. It is the best stream in the United States from the standpoint of electric power in this respect. The St. Lawrence, because of the Great Lakes, also has a uniform flow.

Colonel FERINGA. I think it has the greatest potential of electric power.

Mr. STOCKMAN. As an indication of that, the high-water stage on the Columbia does not come until the last of June or the first of July.

Mr. ANGELL. Yes; that is true. Above Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are two big pools or lakes of water that are used when the water is low to help maintain prime power. So, the river keeps fairly uniform prime power the year round.

We on the coast know that this Columbia River development is not a boondoggling, or wildcat scheme. The development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River and the utilization of the water for irrigation and for navigation, and the dams for flood control, will eventually bring to the United States immense quantities of revenue, more than we will ever put into it. I think it is certainly an answer to the argument presented by my good friend, Congressman DONDERO, from Michigan, to say if there are projects anywhere in the United States that will justify themselves, the Columbia River projects will. The utilization of our natural deposits of minerals and other deposits and the products of forests and fields in connection with cheap hydroelectric power developed from the Columbia River and its tributaries will return to the Government many fold the funds expended.

The Grand Coulee reclamation project, which was mentioned by my colleague, Congressman STOCKMAN, contains 1,200,000 acres for agricultural utilization by reclamation, and the water is now available. The Grand Coulee Dam is already completed. The hydroelectric power generated is used to pump water up out of the pool above the dam and up over the brow of the hill, where it is turned into the old bed of the Columbia River. I am told that this vast acreage with water will produce as well as any agricultural land anywhere in our country. It is rolling upland, consisting of a fertile volcanic ash soil.

Mr. SIMPSON. None of it is being farmed?

Mr. ANGELL. Not an acre. It is all lying there, ready, waiting for the time when the Federal Government feels that it is propitious to go ahead with the reclamation project. After the war, when we need additional land for our soldiers and men who will be released from war industries, we will have the water and the land available; all we need to do is build the conduits and irrigation ditches.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is the land owned by the Government?

Mr. ANGELL. Some of it is owned by the Government, but the Government in its program has frozen the values, so the private owners cannot take advantage of the water that is furnished and speculate on the land. The large owners have to turn it in at a

certain fair appraisement, and they can utilize only a restricted acreage themselves and can get water to utilize only such portions of the land, as is brought within the regulations laid down by the Government. So we have there the possibilities for an immense development. The Columbia and the Snake will provide water transportation for this project.

I, like Congressman STOCKMAN, was born in that country and have lived there all my life, although later in life I went to live in Portland, on the lower part of the Columbia. So I know from first-hand information the possibilities of this inland empire, not alone from being reared in that country, but also from 15 to 20 years spent in the Federal service as a surveyor in going over it, as far as eastern Montana. I want to tell you gentlemen who are my colleagues on the committee that I personally feel we will make no mistake in approving the project for the development of the dam at Umatilla.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the Umatilla Dam project, I want to call to the attention of the committee that the engineers' report submitted when the project was last before us, shows that the development was amply justified economically providing the power to be generated from the hydroelectric facilities to be installed were sold. Colonel Feringa, who has presented to the committee the report and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in response to an interrogatory I submitted to him, said that all of the power now being generated by the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects is being utilized. This I know to be true from my own observations. There is a dearth of power in that area at the present time. It is true that war activities are taking the bulk of the power now generated. It is also true that in the post-war period the utilization of our natural resources and reclamation of our farming areas in order to provide employment for our returning soldiers and laborers released from war activities, it will be necessary to keep these projects working. This will require electric energy.

The total load in the area served by Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants is in round numbers 2,000,000 kilowatts. The past history shows that this load is increasing at the rate of about 100,000 kilowatts per year. In the time required to construct a dam and power plant like the Umatilla project, the normal load increase in the area would be about 300,000 kilowatts, and by 1950 would equal the capacity of the Umatilla project.

Congress has appropriated and authorized funds for nine main units at Grand Coulee. Six of these nine will be in production by the end of this year. The limit of prime power capacity at Grand Coulee is in the neighborhood of a million kilowatts, and the authorized Grand Coulee projects are within one machine of the prime power capability of the Coulee Dam. The balance of the power at Grand Coulee is secondary power, which can be used during the high flow season extending from June to October for irrigation pumping.

Unquestionably there will be a demand in the next decade for not only all of the power generated by existing projects but the Umatilla Dam as well, in addition to many other similar developments.

The Bonneville advisory committee provided in the Bonneville Act, which has made a study of the power requirements of the area, has gone on record urging the construction of the Umatilla Dam in order to prevent a power shortage by 1945 or 1946.

The minutes of the board showing this action are as follows:

"EXCERPT FROM MINUTES, BONNEVILLE ADVISORY BOARD, MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 12–13, 1943

"Whereas at its meeting on February 9–10, 1942, this board unanimously adopted a resolution urging upon the War Production Board and other appropriate agencies that immediate action be taken to increase the power supply in the Pacific Northwest by installation of additional generating units at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, raising the city of Seattle's Ross Dam on the Skagit River, completing construction of Rock Island Dam and hydroelectric plant on the Columbia River, and expediting construction of the city of Tacoma's Nisqually hydroelectric project; and

"Whereas the Board requested that appropriate agencies of the Federal Government complete their surveys and investigations of water-power possibilities in the Pacific Northwest with a view of determining which of the many attractive undeveloped power sites are most desirable for early construction to provide additional power for war purposes; and

"Whereas the developments with respect to power requirements and war loads during the present emergency in the Northwest have confirmed the findings and recommendations of the Board adopted at its meeting of February 9–10, 1942, regarding expansion of existing hydroelectric projects; and

"Whereas only part of the Board's findings and recommendations were carried out and as a result the Pacific Northwest is confronted with a more critical power situation than existed a year ago; * * *

* * * * *

"8. Take the necessary steps to insure immediate construction of substantial additional power supply for 1946 and subsequent years by construction of the Umatilla project for navigation, irrigation, and power development on the Columbia River with reservoir at elevation 340 feet above sea level; such Umatilla project, which will involve approximately 3 years for construction, even considering the advance state of the plans, studies, and investigations of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, requiring immediate authorization for construction in order to secure additional power supply in 1946 and to obtain the substantial benefits to navigation and irrigation."

Mr. Chairman, one problem to be determined by the engineers when the Umatilla Dam shall be constructed is its elevation.

From time to time three different pool elevations have been suggested for the proposed Umatilla Dam, namely, elevations 310, 330, and 340.

The present bills before both Houses, calling for an elevation of 310, were based on the first preliminary surveys of the Corps of Engineers.

The current report of the Chief of Engineers (H. Doc. 103, vol. 2, 73d Cong., 1st sess.) provides for a pool elevation of 330 feet.

I understand that drillings and surveys are now in progress to establish the feasibility and cost of a pool elevation of 340 feet.

From a check of the physical lay-out it is obvious that the higher the pool elevation (within the limits of feasibility and cost) the greater are the possibilities for the proposed structure to accelerate the development of the region. Therefore, the consideration of pool elevation warrants the closest attention. In such consideration we must approach any evaluation from two standpoints; namely, navigation and industrial development.

At present the only substantial transportation avenues between the upper and lower Columbia River areas are given by two transcontinental railroads, which are located on both sides of the river.

Any construction at Umatilla will not injure existing rail facilities. With the development of this inland region the railroads will secure increased collateral traffic benefits as well as structural improvement. To insure the fullest development of the region, low cost, high volume transportation facilities must be provided. The completion of the Bonneville Dam has given deep-sea navigation facilities as far as The Dalles. Above The Dalles, because of the existence of rapids, shallow navigation is both limited and hazardous.

The proposed pool elevation of 310 feet will only provide satisfactory navigation as far as Pasco, Wash., a distance of 330 miles from the mouth of the river.

The higher suggested pool elevation will extend slack water navigation to the foot of the proposed Five Mile Rapids dam on the Snake River, whereas the existing bills would leave an intervening reach of swift water between Pasco and the Snake River. The long-range development of the region requires long-range consideration.

Through inquiries I have been advised that growth calculations indicate that by 1950 it is anticipated that the power load on the Bonneville system will be in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 kilowatts. Of this amount of power about one-fourth will be used west of Bonneville, one-eighth in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington areas, and one-sixth adjacent to the dams.

By 1950 these calculations also show that demands on the Bonneville plant will exceed its capability by approximately 300,000 kilowatts.

Experience has shown that the power outputs from multipurpose dams are directly proportional to the pool elevation or varies directly with what has been termed "head." A pool elevation of 310 feet will only provide an average head of 45 feet, whereas a pool elevation of 340 feet will give a head of 75 feet. It then follows that a 330-foot pool will give about 45 percent more continuous power than the 310-foot pool, and a 340-foot pool about 65 percent more.

In addition, there are other points requiring attention. Under flood flows the 310-foot pool will provide a plant which will have its capability reduced to 61 percent of normal because of tail-water elevation, whereas with a 340-foot pool the reduction from this cause would be less than 20 percent. Expressing this idea in another way, the 330-foot pool will give 70 percent more power per machine than the 310-foot pool, whereas a 340-foot pool will produce over double the prime power per machine.

Repayment of the Federal investment depends largely on the quantity of available prime power. Therefore, further consideration is necessary in order to avoid the mistake of providing a secondary power producer instead of a prime power producer. Secondary power has little sale value in the Northwest.

There are other factors also contributing to prime power, such as pondage and machine efficiency. The higher head naturally provides more pondage and also increases machine efficiency. These two contributing factors compound the prime power increases resulting from direct head comparisons.

The 340-foot pool would give a plant similar in type and proportion to the Bonneville plant, whereas the 310-foot pool will only provide a plant of lower capability than given by the direct relationship of pool elevations. Again the higher head also makes it possible to build a generating machine with greater speed and a lower resulting cost per kilowatt installed. The latter consideration has an important relationship with electric rates, which in turn controls the possible amount of future industrial development.

The higher speed machines also will fit the present constructed Federal transmission lines better than a lower speed machine, and thus provide a greater utilization of the existing investment.

A 310-foot pool will have a continuous output of about 60 percent of that of Bonneville, whereas with the 330-foot pool elevation this factor becomes 95 percent, and with a 340-foot pool becomes 110 percent. A 340-foot pool elevation at Umatilla will provide

a power potentiality of 500,000 kilowatts under existing river flows.

In offering these suggestions, I realize that other conditions, such as possible foundations, pool damages, and resulting costs have a pronounced influence on the final decision. No information is presently available to evaluate these other factors; however, when present surveys are completed I trust that the points I have mentioned will be included with the findings, so that in the end the best possible structure will be authorized.

I also realize that finances may dictate step development. However, each step can fit in with the best ultimate structure.

The purpose of these suggestions is to contribute to the best possible solution, as I realize that progress only comes from the fullest consideration of all applicable factors.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the report of the Corps of United States Army Engineers when this project was considered by us last year showed that in their judgment it was justified from an economic standpoint when there was a market for the power to be generated by the hydroelectric facilities which are part of the project, I asked the Bonneville Administration, which is in charge of the marketing of electricity in the Columbia River area, and particularly Bonneville and Grand Coulee, to give me a report as to the market situation for power, and I am in receipt of a telegram from Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, which points out that all of the power now being generated is urgently demanded for civilian activities and war production and that present forecasts indicate for the Bonneville system, which includes Grand Coulee, that a peak load for December 1946 of 45,300 kilowatts in excess of system capacity will be reached, and that in December 1947 the excess will be 324,400 kilowatts. The Administrator also reported that in the Umatilla load district there will be a deficiency of 172,500 kilowatts in December 1946, and 431,250 kilowatts in December 1947, according to present estimates, and that as a result of these demands for power, in the opinion of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Umatilla generating units should be placed in operation as promptly as construction will permit. The telegram received from Mr. Raver, the Administrator, is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 2, 1943.*

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

With reference to your inquiry to our Washington office I believe that construction of Umatilla Dam is logical next step in development of the main stem of the Columbia River and one of most important projects in Pacific Northwest post-war development program. Umatilla Dam is in a very strategic location in Northwest power grid and particularly in relation to lower Columbia market and to emerging heavy industries in middle Columbia area. In this project navigation and power must each be developed on most efficient basis. Power and navigation are a mutually supporting combination. Basis to further development of the area and to development of the power market. Both power and transportation must precede in development of resources, industries, communities, and the promising potential power market. We cannot wait for guaranteed sales in these long-term development projects. Navigation benefits will be provided by low-cost river transportation from Pasco, Wash., to mouth of Columbia, 330 miles. Dam should be of sufficient height to provide power facilities. Present forecasts indicate for Bonneville system a peak load for December 1946 of 45,300 kilowatts in excess of system capacity. Corresponding figure for December of 1947 is 324,000 kilowatts. In the Umatilla load district a deficiency of 172,500 kilowatts in December 1946 and 431,250 kilowatts in December 1947 is presently estimated. Our studies thus indicate that Umatilla generating units should be placed in operation as promptly as the 3-year construction period will permit.

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask permission of the committee to include, if it meets with the approval of Congressman WHITE, who furnished the statement, this statement on Columbia River Improvement and Development, showing these developments and showing the amount of tonnage going by way of river transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; that is all pertinent.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT—EXHIBITS SHOWING THE TYPE OF EQUIPMENT OPERATING ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES, THE VOLUME OF TRAFFIC MOVING, THE EFFECT ON RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES CAUSED BY RIVER NAVIGATION IN THE PAST, AND THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

(Prepared by Portland Traffic Association, Portland, Oreg.)

Statement of equipment now in use by the various companies engaged in handling commercial traffic between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., and upper Columbia River points via the navigable waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries

Inland Navigation Co. and affiliated companies:

Steel barges:	Gallons capacity
No. 12	212,000
No. 501	260,000
No. 502	575,000
No. 503	300,000
No. 50	275,000
Inland Chief	275,000
Total	1,897,000

Tugs:	Horsepower
Keith	2,500
Inland Chief	1,200
Paula	1,500
Mystic	1,250
Megler	360
Ostander	230
Total	7,040

Under construction: Three 300,000-gallon petroleum barges; 1 tug, hull *No. 7*, 4,500 horsepower (to be ready Jan. 1, 1944).

Tidewater Transportation Co.:

Steel barges:	Gallons capacity
No. 1	102,000
No. 4	193,000
No. 5	193,000
No. 6	193,000
No. 7	193,000
No. 8	213,000
Total	1,087,000

	Bushels
No. 101, Carrying capacity, wheat	18,000
No. 102, Carrying capacity, wheat	18,000
Total	36,000

Tugs:	Horsepower
Invader	1,200
Defiance	1,200
Viking	800
Total	3,200

Under construction: One 540-horsepower tugboat (replacing *Mary Gale*, which burned approximately a year ago).

Shaver Forwarding Co.:

Steel barges:	Gallons capacity
Umatilla	220,000
Pendleton	215,000
Total	435,000

	Horsepower
Tugs: *Capt. Al James*	1,040

Under construction: None.

Statement of major traffic, in tons (2,000 pounds), passing through the Bonneville Dam navigation locks

Year	Petroleum products	Grain	Logs and piling, rafted
1934	672	33,608	46,172
1935	994	18,789	46,626
1936	2,857	10,209	45,012
1937	8,007	1,385	400
1938	51,740	27,642	9,265
1939	216,996	49,420	133,785
1940	358,286	43,943	283,148
1941 [1]	409,937	38,844	249,443

[1] Years after 1941 not available account of military secrecy.

Source: Corps of Engineers, War Department, District Engineer's Office, Portland, Oreg.

Statement showing downward trend of railroad freight rates, between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., and inland territory adjacent to the Columbia River and its tributaries caused by competitive effect of water-borne commerce and greatly expanded navigation on the Columbia River

TYPICAL EXAMPLES OF RAILROAD CARLOAD RATES ON GRAIN FROM INTERIOR RAIL POINTS TO PORTLAND, OREG., AND VANCOUVER, WASH. (CENTS PER 100 POUNDS)

The Dalles, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1921 — 12
1922 — 10½
1931 — 11
1935 — 7½
1943 — 7½

Shaniko, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1928 — 22½
1931 — 14½
1939 — 15
1941 — 12
1943 — 12

Condon, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1928 — 22½
1931 — 16
1935 — 15½
1939 — 16
1940 — 14
1941 — 13
1943 — 13

Heppner, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1928 — 22½
1931 — 15½
1939 — 16
1940 — 14
1941 — 13
1943 — 13

Pendleton, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1921 — 20½
1922 — 18½
1931 — 17½
1935 — 18½
1939 — 19
1943 — 19

Goldendale, Oreg.:
In effect year—
1921 — 20½
1922 — 18½
1931 — 14½

Goldendale, Oreg.—Continued.
In effect year—

1933	12½
1939	13
1941	12
1943	12

Typical examples of rail carload rates[1] on refined oil (gasoline and fuel oil)

From Portland, Oreg., to—	Refined oil		Fuel oil	
	Year 1934	Year 1943	Year 1934	Year 1943
The Dalles, Oreg	18	14	13	14
Pendleton, Oreg	28½	17½	22½	17½
Walla Walla, Wash	31½	17½	25	17½
Colfax, Wash	45	30	37	30
Spokane, Wash	45	28½	37	28½
Lewiston, Idaho	47	27½	37½	27½

[1] All rates in cents per 100 pounds.

Source: Tariffs of common carrier railroads on file with Interstate Commerce Commission

"OUTLOOK

"With the continued improvement of the Columbia River above The Dalles for safer navigation a vast storehouse of raw materials will be opened to markets and economic development.

"Through rail-and-water rates on grain are now in effect from central Oregon points via The Dalles thence by Inland Navigation Co. to Portland and Vancouver, Wash. These rates are on a differential basis under the all-rail rates prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. As aids to navigation are completed, and channel improvements made, the interchange point between rail and water will be farther up river at Pasco, Attalia, and Umatilla. When this is done, no reason exists why through rail-and-water rates differentially lower than all-rail cannot be extended to the whole of the inland empire, Montana and southern Idaho.

"Through rates by barge lines and motor-trucks now exist to eastern Oregon-Washington and northern Idaho on petroleum products with interchange at Pasco, Wash. Low rates by rail from Pasco, which added to the barge rates from Portland and Vancouver are the equivalent to through water-and-rail differential rates.

"The millions of tons of potential cargo available, covering such commodities as grain, lumber, fertilizer, minerals, petroleum, etc., have been surveyed from time to time by various agencies and the figures are in possession of the Army engineers.

"The saving in freight rates and future development of the Columbia Basin by the use of navigation on the river should be obvious to any interested agency."

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask the gentleman if he would recommend construction of the four dams on the Snake River?

Mr. ANGELL. I am heartily in favor of those dams in the Snake when the engineers recommend that the proper time has come to take them up, or they could all be done at the same time with the Umatilla if that is the desire of the committee. But they are two separate projects; they should not be considered as one project. The United States engineers have recommended that the Umatilla Dam be the next step taken in the improvement of the Columbia River.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that this is only an authorization.

Mr. ANGELL. This is just an authorization.

Mr. WHITE. You would be in favor of including them in the bill?

Mr. ANGELL. Yes; I would be in favor of including them in the bill. I think that they ought to be covered, however, as has been done by the engineers, as a separate project, so that we may keep them separate from the Umatilla project.

Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, no individual partnership or corporation should be permitted nor should any patriotic American desire to become rich as a result of this war. With millions of our men and women serving in the armed forces for $50 a month, how can Members of Congress and officials of the Government justify excessive profits on the home front?

Under our present laws on war contracts alone by renegotiation nearly $5,000,000,000 has been saved, and in the end if the law is not drastically disturbed, billions more will be recovered.

The argument that this money can be recovered through taxes is not sound.

Mr. Charles G. Ross, special writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch who has made a careful study of this problem, in a recent article says:

There is a strong psychological reason, too, for curbing profits through contract renegotiation instead of letting them pile up for the subsequent attention of the tax collector. It is to the interest of the private-enterprise system that profits should be held down at the start—that not only should war profiteering be avoided, but the appearance of profiteering. The realization of this fact by many industrialists accounts in large measure for the generally cooperative attitude of industry toward the renegotiators.

Another potent reason for direct and prompt rather than indirect and delayed action against swollen profits is that the former method holds down prices. Price rises mean wage increases and the whole vicious inflationary circle. The renegotiation device is definitely anti-inflationary; it is perhaps even more valuable on that account than as an immediate money saver for the Government. In the words of the energetic businessman chairman of the War Department's Price Adjustment Board, Joseph M. Dodge, "the primary purpose of renegotiation is to accomplish sound pricing."

Continuing, Mr. Ross says:

Here are some significant new figures which indicate how price control has worked in war procurement: Bombers (air frames only), which cost the Government $235,000 each in 1942, now cost $160,000; in the same period the cost of fighter planes (air frames) has been cut from $84,000 to $72,000; airplane engines, from $15,900 to $8,000; .50-caliber machine guns, from $953 to $300; attack bombers (air frames), from $81,000 to $64,000; automatic pilots, from $4,500 to $2,200. The remarkable reduction on machine guns is expected to be carried even further in negotiations now under way.

SAVINGS FOR VARIOUS REASONS

These various cuts in price—which have been accompanied with improvement in quality—have come about, of course, from various causes. Patriotic incentive, suggestions from workers, increased manufacturing skill, labor-management cooperation, all have played a part. But the figures reflect also the salutary influence of contract renegotiation on prices.

"The reaction of better than 90 percent of war industry," the War Department says, "is typified by a recent statement of the Emerson Electric Co. of St. Louis to its stockholders, in announcing that net profits after taxes had declined from 5 percent to 1.3 percent of sales. The statement quoted an observation by James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, to the effect that if the private enterprise system was to be preserved, the profits must be taken out of war. 'This quotation,' said the company's report, 'expresses clearly the convictions of this management.'"

There are many large corporations in this country that voluntarily have brought about reductions in profits after they found the cost of manufacturing was lower than anticipated. The great Todd Shipyards Corporation and the Sperry Corporation were two of the first to return large sums to the Government.

Mr. Ross, however, shows the necessity of renegotiation with this statement:

Nine times out of ten, say the price adjusters of the War Department, price agreements are reached with little or no trouble. There is, of course, a recalcitrant fringe of contractors, and in dealing with one of this group the adjustment board falls back on the law which permits the Secretary of War—or the head of whatever department may be concerned—to make his own final determination and enforce it.

Chairman Dodge of the War Department's board tells of two extreme examples of noncooperation. There was one contractor who, because of the war, had renegotiable sales 50 times greater than his total sales in the base period and was making a profit of more than 50 percent before taxes. He said he was entitled to the profit, intended to keep it, and if deprived of it would stop manufacturing goods for the Government. Then there was the case of two owners of a business whose combined salaries jumped from $10,000 in 1940 to $72,000 in 1942, who paid themselves in addition $50,000 in dividends in 1942 "and then claimed that renegotiation, which left them sufficient profit to do this, was hurting the life of their business."

Mr. Speaker, using the tax bill as a medium, there are some Members of Congress who would make drastic changes in the present renegotiation law. This effort should be watched with extreme care so that in the end the present method is not destroyed. There is hardly a Member of Congress who has not at some time pledged his vote to see that no one grows rich as a result of war contracts. Let that pledge be kept.

Facts on Lend-Lease Shipments of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, some valuable and informative information is contained in the enclosed letter

which I desire to read to the House of Representatives. It reads as follows:

FORFIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1943.
The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: As the secretary of the Committee of Forty-eight interested in food production, you requested a statement showing the amount of farm machinery exported under lend-lease to the various lend-lease countries. The information which you wished is furnished herewith.

Between March 11, 1941, and November 1, 1943—a period of 2 years and 9 months—approximately $34,000,000 worth of farm machinery, excluding crawler tractors which are largely used by the military for purely construction purposes, was exported under lend-lease. This lend-lease farm machinery represented no more than about 3 percent of the domestic production of farm machinery during the same period. These exports were primarily to the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. I am attaching a table which shows these exports of farm machinery to lend-lease countries in some detail.

In order to circumvent the German submarine and the lack of merchant shipping, the United Kingdom expanded its acreage under cultivation by 6,000,000 acres. Since British manpower was insufficient for so greatly expanded an acreage, lend-lease farm machinery was essential in order to produce the foodstuffs so vitally needed. Although the lend-lease exports of farm machinery were small by comparison with the total domestic production of farm machinery, the results they helped to achieve were substantial. In 1943, for example, the United Kingdom had the largest acreage under cultivation and the largest harvest in its entire history. Moreover, the United Kingdom now produces locally 70 percent of the food it consumes as compared with only 40 percent in the period before the war. The dependence of the United Kingdom, accordingly, on imports of food from the United States has been sharply reduced and the burden upon shipping has been greatly lessened.

Lend-lease farm machinery, similarly, has enabled Australia and New Zealand to feed American troops at a great saving to the United States in shipping space, in United States dollars, and in United States food resources. To do this, however, it was necessary for Australia and New Zealand to diversify their farming, to increase their production and to convert a substantial acreage from cereal production to the so-called row crops, such as potatoes and leafy vegetables. The cultivation of these row crops on a large scale required a tricycle type tractor which could only be supplied by the United States. As a result of furnishing farm equipment of this kind, American troops in the southwest Pacific theater are now being almost entirely fed by Australia and New Zealand under reverse lend-lease.

The United Nations were virtually completely dependent upon the United States for the production of the farm machinery which was essental to the successful prosecution of the war. This was particularly true in the case of tractors and power equipment. Sweden, France, and Germany all normally produce farm-power machinery but the war effectively eliminated those sources of supply. Moreover, one of the two tractor factories in the United Kingdom and virtually the entire farm machinery industry in Australia were converted to urgent ordnance production early in the war.

If there is any other information I can obtain for you, I shall be very happy to do so at any time.

Sincerely yours,
FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
By LEO T. CROWLEY, *Administrator.*

[Enclosure]

Lend-lease exports of agricultural machinery, March 1941 through October 1943

[In thousands of dollars]

Country:	Value
United Kingdom	20,042
Australia	4,145
New Zealand	2,298
U. S. S. R.	1,439
Egypt	1,392
India	1,235
Algeria	712
British East Africa	410
Brazil	357
Union of South Africa	334
Iraq	230
French Morocco	192
China	91
Peru	79
British Malaya	62
Palestine	44
Canada	39
Turkey	34
Iran	33
Ceylon	31
Gambia and Sierra Leone	23
Southern Rhodesia	20
All other countries	37
All countries	33,879

Food Subsidies and the Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, taking my mail and the press as a barometer, I am convinced the failure of the Congress to continue the food-subsidy program is causing the people great concern. Never before have the housewives shown such an interest in national legislation. They fear the final outcome. Pinched in their efforts now to make the income provide properly for the family, they vision a drop in their present standard of living, less milk for the children and necessities of life for the adults.

Time and again I have voiced my sentiments on this subject. The recommendations for food subsidies come from those who are in control of the battle on the home front. To me that appeal should be the same as a demand from the Army and Navy for more ships, planes, tanks, and so forth. Both have as their purpose winning the war. All listen to the appeals of the Army and Navy. Why not listen to the appeals of the Food Administrator and those associated with him? Last week we passed a subsidy for the farmer—the farm labor bill. I voted for it because we were told it was necessary from a food-production standpoint. Not a penny of the millions voted will be spent in my congressional district. Every farm organization supported it, but when it came to the food subsidy—essential to hold the cost of living down—the farm organizations opposed the bill because it was a subsidy. Here within a few days this group favor one form of subsidy and oppose another. The pressure from the farm organizations was the controlling factor in defeating the food-subsidy program.

Mr. Chester Bowles, the O. P. A. Administrator, whose job it is in part to control prices, discussing the cost of living says:

Just what has been happening to it since Christmas time a year ago? Now, of course, it's always difficult to compare prices on a national basis. Although practically everything you buy is now under O. P. A. ceilings, they vary somewhat in different parts of the country. However, we can talk about averages, and from them get a reasonably accurate idea.

Let's see, first of all, what has been happening to the price of food. A year ago, the prices on meats were higher than they are today. Round steak was 3 cents a pound higher. Pork chops were 5½ cents a pound higher. Lamb chops 2 cents higher. Leg of lamb was 1½ cents a pound higher.

As a matter of fact, meat prices continued to rise gradually throughout the winter and into the spring of 1943. That rise was finally stopped last May. In the following 2 months, with the help of a food subsidy, we were able to reduce the price of meat anywhere from 2 to 6 cents a pound. Today as a result, meat in general is averaging about 7 percent under the figures of Christmas 1942.

Now let's look at fresh fruits and vegetables. A year ago almost none of them was under price control. As a result, prices were rising steadily, until by May you were paying 36 percent more for your fresh fruits and vegetables. Today practically all fresh fruits and vegetables are under price control and we are making steady progress in putting these prices in tight dollars-and-cents terms, community by community. The price of apples has come down on the average of 5 cents a pound. Cabbage, by 4 cents a pound. Lettuce, by 4 cents a head. Through controls on winter fruits and vegetables we hope to keep their prices on an even keel and avoid a repetition of the exorbitant price rise of last Spring. By next May this will mean a very great difference in your food budget in comparison to the prices you paid last May.

The prices of canned goods have been held even during the last 12 months, and they will continue to hold for the rest of this season into late next summer. We were able to keep these prices even by subsidizing the packs of canned goods you now find on your grocer's shelves.

The prices of cereals and other staples are also almost exactly the same this Christmas as last.

Lumping all food costs together, a brief review of the last 12 months runs something like this. During last winter, food prices went up steadily. In May they were checked and then were substantially cut back during the summer. In September and October they were up again very slightly. In November they were down somewhat. Today food prices, taken all together, average out almost exactly the same as last March.

Had it not been for food subsidies, what Mr. Bowles related could not have been accomplished. Is it any wonder he deplores the defeat of this legislation?

Answering the question as to what extent will they in the O. P. A. be able to

continue to hold the cost of living during 1944, Mr. Bowles says:

That's one question that I simply cannot answer until Congress decides whether or not we will be authorized to continue our present price-control program. If Congress decides against the use of food subsidies, food prices are going up. There's no question about that. Moreover, if food prices go up, wages will go up. And if wages go up, we are going to be faced with a substantially higher level of prices on practically everything we buy.

This, as I have suggested many times before, is going to cost the people a great deal of extra money in the stores. It's also going to add to our national debt and further increase our tax problem—in fact, all our economic problems—in the years following the war.

However, let's hope that Congress grants us the money with which to hold the cost of living in line.

We are starting 1944 with a certainty that the New Year will see increased fighting on many fronts. Our hearts and our hopes will be with our sons and brothers and husbands and friends in the armed services wherever they may be. We should never forget that the harder we all bear down in fighting this war to the limit, the quicker this war will be won, and the sooner we stop arguing and fighting among ourselves, the greater our hope for a prosperous and peaceful future.

How can Members of Congress ignore such advice?

We have everything to gain and nothing to lose in continuing a program that has proved so beneficial to so many men, women, and children. Let us continue to provide the machinery to win the battle on the home front.

The responsibility rests with Congress. As for myself, I do not propose to be labeled as one who sabotaged this program.

A Square Deal Needed Now for Star Route Mail Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the rotten competitive system of bidding to secure contracts to carry star-route mail has been a black mark on the American public service system for many years.

Each bidding, the average holder of a contract bids a little lower to retain the contract and yet his competitors may still and often do underbid him. As a result of this cut-throat bidding, the cost of these contracts has been reduced to much less than half of what the carriers received in 1924.

However, the savings thus shown do not represent the net savings made, and what savings have been made by the Post Office Department have been made at the sole expense of the carriers, the service and at the expense of the American taxpayers and the morale of the carrier organization. Numerous defaulted star-route mail contracts are a source of considerable expense to the Department. What is worse, however, is the failure of providing good service and even failure at times of providing any service to the public.

In 1925, the annual mileage for star routes was approximately 90,000,000 miles, and the cost of operation at that time was $12,735,000. The 1939 figures show an annual mileage of 180,000,000 miles—twice as much—and the cost of operation was less than that in 1924, or $10,847,668.

It is high time that the star-route carriers are put on an equitable basis with other postal employees.

As the views of a disinterested authority on star-route facts, I submit the following factual data and information which are excerpts from the speech of Robert E. Lambert, former clerk of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, made at the annual convention of star-route mail carriers at Boulder City, Nev., in October 1940.

The excerpts follow:

The competitive system of bidding for the right to carry star routes has been in vogue for a long time, and while there is much merit in a competitive bidding system in many lines of contractual relationships, there are some very material differences between the work performed under contracts for carrying mail on star routes and the work performed for the Government under other contracts, such as the construction of buildings.

The Government does not enter into contracts resulting from competitive bidding for personal services, and to all intents and purposes the carrying of the mails is a personal service as is recognized in the system established for rural routes. Of course, in addition to the personal service involved there is the matter of furnishing equipment, but it is the personal responsibility of the individual that is controlling in whether he will be engaged to carry rural or star-route mail, not the equipment he may possess.

For all other types of personal services the Government establishes a certain definite pay basis, and in the rural-delivery service in addition to the pay provided for the personal service there is provided an equipment allowance upon a mileage basis giving to the carrier who has a short route the same consideration proportionately as the carrier with a long route. In many instances mail is carried on star routes for less than the mileage allowances on rural routes.

When I first became interested in the Star Route Service I was surprised to learn that in many instances—not isolated cases—the star-route carrier does exactly the same type of service as the rural-delivery carrier—by that I mean they make box deliveries—and in addition to furnishing the same type of service also carry the mail from post office to post office. I have learned many things about the Service since I first became interested in it that anyone must know before they can deal intelligently with it.

As I have stated, no one comes forward to defend the competitive-bidding system as applied specifically to star-route carriers, and there is one very great reason why they do not. That reason is that after the first competitive bidding which gives the successful bidder at most a 4-year contract, there is never again an open and free competitive bidding. No doubt that statement will be challenged, but it is my contention that after the first contract has been performed the price of that contract establishes a price beyond which no bidder can go with any expectation of securing the contract. The result is that the contractor, if he desires to retain the route, submits a bid lower than his previous bid, and any new bidder who seriously expects or hopes to secure the contract submits a bid lower than the present known contract price. Thus over a period of a few years the amount paid for the route becomes less than a reasonable amount for the services performed. And it is my belief that our Government intends to pay a reasonable amount for any and all services performed for it.

There may be a few instances where the present system of competitive bidding for star routes does not beat down the price, but in a great majority of cases the successful bidder for a route that has previously been under contract knows he must enter a bid at a figure less than the former contract price if he expects to be considered. The tendency of reduction in the contract price, whether due to the present competitive-bidding system as is my belief, or otherwise, is definitely proven by the annual reports of the Postmaster General showing comparative costs of the service from year to year. Beginning with the year 1924—and I have not gone back further for fear of making this statement monotonous—the annual report shows:

Average rate of cost per mile of scheduled travel is—

	Cents
1924	13.85
1925	13.37
1926	13.15
1927	12.31
1928	11.99
1929	11.49
1930	11.12
1931	10.38
1932	9.87
1933	9.15
1934	8.16
1935	7.10
1936	6.69
1937	6.52
1938	6.33
1939	6.00
Further reductions are—	
1940	5.82
1941	5.82

Thus from the year 1924 to the year 1939 the cost of the service was reduced more than one-half from the average rate of 13.85 cents per mile to 6 cents per mile. Has the cost of any other service in the Postal Service been so reduced?

I have no doubt that if the Government could readvertise any of its contracts entered into after competitive bidding that the next bidding would show a reduction, for anyone bidding would know that his bid to be considered must be less than the former low bid. And if the jobs of the employees in the Postal Service could be let by competitive bidding I am sure the cost of the service could be materially decreased. I am not advocating that, however, but only wish to point out that should reduction in cost be the paramount issue there are many places in the Service where considerable savings could be made by applying the same system as is now in vogue in the Star Route Service.

The above tabulation does not portray the entire picture by any means so in order that the record may be a little clearer from a statistical standpoint, I have compiled some other figures as disclosed by the Postmaster General's annual reports showing the number of star routes, length of travel one way, and the approximate expenditure per annum of the Service.

The greatest number of routes was in 1933 with 12,596, having a one-way length of 248,295.36 miles, costing the Government $14,300,676. The greatest expenditure, however, in any one year was in 1932 when the sum expended was $14,600,000. It is interesting to note that the mileage traveled has increased each year from 159,573 miles in 1924,

to 299,582 miles in 1939, and that the cost of the service for the greater distance traveled in 1939 was less than the cost of the service in 1924 by $1,900,529.47.

Year	Number of routes	Length of route, one way	Approximate expenditures per annum
		Miles	
1924	10,802	159,573.05	$12,748,297.47
1925	10,906	164,209.19	12,735,000.00
1926	10,991	169,258.34	12,935,000.00
1927	11,215	179,945.44	12,890,000.00
1928	11,472	190,960.59	13,450,000.00
1929	11,695	202,007.34	13,770,000.00
1930	11,788	209,573.29	14,325,582.00
1931	12,089	226,370.32	14,325,000.00
1932	12,443	239,714.24	14,600,000.00
1933	12,596	248,295.36	14,300,363.05
1934	12,237	251,824.26	12,942,233.72
1935	11,853	251,983.00	11,357,220.46
1936	11,663	256,864.00	10,881,747.00
1937	11,572	261,689.00	10,800,073.00
1938	11,393	263,127.00	11,035,259.00
1939	11,462	299,582.00	10,847,668.00

The following significant analysis is added:

It must be remembered that while the Star Route Service is one of the most important of all the postal units, it is a relatively small unit—and has always operated on a low rate.

The rate was low in 1925 when the annual mileage was 90,000,000 miles and cost $12,000,000. Thus you will visualize the conditions in 1939 when in 14 years the mileage had doubled and 180,000,000 miles was costing $2,000,000 less than 90,000,000 miles had cost. No other service has made such a reduction in cost.

Annual mileage, 1925, 90,000,000 miles; cost, $12,735,000.

Annual mileage, 1939, 180,000,000 miles; cost, $10,847,668.

The above table also shows that in one 4-year period the mileage was increased 15,000,000 miles and at the same time approximately $4,000,000 was taken from the total cost.

Annual mileage, 1932, 146,000,000 miles; cost, $14,600,000.

Annual mileage, 1936, 161,000,000 miles; cost, $10,779,347.

Increase in 4 year period, 15,000,000 miles and reduction in total cost during same period, $3,820,653.

There has been more money taken out of the Star Route Service than the present proposed legislation (H. R. 1809) would put back.

Economic Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the mistaken concept, held by many of the New Dealers, that it makes no difference how deeply this Nation goes into debt because, as our economic magicians claim, "we owe the debt to ourselves," apparently has released all restraints on Government projects to be paid for out of our tax dollars. An ever-increasing amount of Government obligations is piling up against you, against me, and against everybody else. Appropriations are being asked for, expenditures are authorized without considering whether the necessary means are available or in what way they may be obtained. If an individual assumes financial obligations, accumulates debts without any regard to his present or future earning capacity, you know where he inevitably ends; yet our New Deal economic magicians would have us believe they can work miracles and do things which every sensible citizen knows cannot be done. The Congress is being flooded with messages from the President and others urging the appropriation of even more billions of dollars for this, that, and the other purpose. Some of these are good purposes, which we all wish some day to see realized. Yet we know from our private lives, from our private experience, that there are many good things we should like to do, that there are many purposes for which we should like to spend money, but which common prudence and just plain common sense decree we shall not.

It has been suggested that the Congress restrict its own freedom of action to the extent that no appropriation would be made without a corresponding measure to acquire the funds so appropriated. As it is, billions and billions of dollars are being asked for with the best intentions, but without any assurance that the required funds will be available. The result is that the public debt is mounting to fantastic heights while the printing press in Washington is working overtime pouring ever more fresh dollar bills into circulation and continued inflation results.

It is interesting to notice how our New Dealers slowly, indeed very slowly, let us in on what is in store for us. It is not so long ago that the public debt was discussed on the basis of accumulated obligations at the end of the war of some $200,000,000,000. Then it got to be two hundred and fifty billions; and now in a recent magazine article Harry Hopkins—good old irrepressible Harry—tells us it may be three hundred billions. At the rate we are going, it may not be two hundred, it may not be two hundred and fifty, nor three hundred billion dollars. The public debt—your debt and my debt—at the end of the war, and, of course, we have to include in the war the period of demobilization and readjustment to a peacetime economy—undoubtedly will be very much more than any of these figures would indicate. Just how much more will, of course, depend on how many years it will still require to finish the job, and, in the meantime, how carefully we scrutinize and spend the dollars of the American people. In the same article Mr. Hopkins also tells us that we are the richest Nation in the world, because we have, during this war, saved up an incredible number of billions of dollars. What an incredible viewpoint. All the savings of this Nation have been exploded, sunk, or given away to doubtful friends all over the globe. If we want our savings back some day, even without interest, we shall have to pay a like amount into the Treasury once more in order that there be the money with which to pay. Unfortunately, miracles do not happen, despite the hocus-pocus of our New Deal economists.

The Congress is now being asked to appropriate huge sums for an international organization created by our Government and subscribed to by the so-called United Nations. It is no secret, however, that a number of these United Nations, even those who would be the alleged beneficiaries of this activity, signed the agreement with the minimum of enthusiasm. I am afraid they do not believe in the expressed noble intention of the framers of the plan. I can think of nothing more unfortunate than if there should develop any justification of the suspicions that we, perhaps in association with a very few of our particular national intimates, are trying to serve our private interests under a cloak of philanthropy. Furthermore, it would in deed be disgusting if the plain duty of every man to love his neighbor, and to act accordingly, were being exploited to serve political ends, war propaganda, or other international questionable purposes. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or the U. N. R. R. A., as it is going to be called, as indicated in the name, has two functions—to bring relief, and to organize rehabilitation. I should like to know how much of the money we will be asked to appropriate will be used for relief, and how much for rehabilitation. No one doubts that the sufferings and the misery in this world as a result of the war will assume hitherto unknown proportions.

There is no doubt that every one of us will be faced with a veritable storm of demands to come to the aid of our distressed neighbors in all other parts of the world. Perhaps many of these distressed neighbors will be right here at home, and not necessarily in far distant lands. In response to a general and world-wide wish that those who suffer shall be helped to help themselves a great organization has grown up. I refer to that magnificent organization we all admire, the International Red Cross, and the American Red Cross in particular. Many other organizations have been moved by religious or philanthropic considerations to organize help to suffering humanity. To mention only one of the many, I refer to such humanitarian activities as those of the Friends. Now, believe it or not, the agreement establishing the U. N. R. R. A., in article 55, contains this amazing provision—I quote:

> Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General.

Here we see a political organization trying to assume a monopoly on the right to help people in distress. Is it strange that suspicion has been aroused? Do these people who try to establish a monopoly for themselves to help people in distress have other purposes in mind than the Christian one of helping the unfortunate? Are there political or economic interests involved rather than humanitarian considerations? If so, are these political and economic interests—those of the American people—thus jus-

tifying the expenditures of vast billions of our money? Moreover, does this Nation want to secure political or economic advantages under the false pretense of nobly bringing relief to people in need?

The second activity of the U. N. R. R. A. is supposed to be rehabilitation. There is no doubt that all nations involved in this terrible war shall need to be rehabilitated. This country will be no exception. Now, what exactly are we planning to do in the line of rehabilitation, and why should we spend our money on putting foreign industries back into shape and creating others, while trying to make our own industries over to peacetime production? What are we trying to do or planning to do? Are we going to dump our surpluses? Are we getting ready to perpetuate a kind of lend-lease throughout the world? Are we being led into some U. S. A.-W. P. A. unlimited arrangement? Are we trying to make investments, acquire financial control of foreign enterprices? Are we trying to create jobs abroad? Are we trying to gain political influence in other countries by virtue of our hold on the economic life of those countries? I think the Congress, before it appropriates billions of dollars—your dollars and everybody's dollars—for such nebulous projects, should try to get at the facts and the real intention of the promoters of this gigantic scheme.

There is another point in which I am interested, and that is how the share of the total expense of the U. N. R. R. A. allotted to this country has been derived. The generosity with which the lion's share of the costs has been granted to us seems to me to reflect the old foreign idea of the rich uncle in America.

To sum up: I want to preserve the right to act as Christians toward every human being, wherever he may be. I want politics kept out of charity, that there may be at least one field of human endeavor left untouched by selfish or wicked designs. Furthermore, before appropriating your money for rehabilitation, I want to know exactly how and why it shall be spent. Finally, I want responsibilities placed where they belong. When our troops invade and occupy foreign lands, they assume the responsibility for the life and the welfare of the people whom they, by force, have brought under their military government. Whatever may be needed to fulfill those obligations should be treated as military expenditures, administered by the Army. Theirs is the full responsibility. Never before has this Nation faced a test like this war. We have a tremendous opportunity to lead the world in the march back to decency, integrity, generosity, and humanitarian endeavor. We have a tremendous opportunity to show that this Nation has been dedicated to the pursuit of happiness and not of destruction. I hope the old American virtues have been preserved. If under the stress of war they have been pushed into the background, let this Nation insist upon their full restoration. Unless the American people insist on that, we can lose at home the war our fighting forces win on the fighting fronts.

Now a word about the season in which we find ourselves.

On this eve of the greatest celebration the Christian world knows, we must resolve that the statement made in the Tehran Declaration shall be something more than words from the lips of three men. They must be made the principles motivating the hearts of the peoples of the world. As men and women are dying and suffering everywhere for the cause of freedom, we must try to see to it that their sacrifices are not in vain, and that these lofty sentiments so oft expressed are not forgotten as soon as the political reasons for their expression have ceased to be.

May God's beneficence, mercy, and His consoling grace rest upon those everywhere in the world who are suffering for the cause of righteousness. More than that, we cannot say and it remains for us and for the other peoples of the world in the future to try to make rise in this world of ours a new spiritual structure of the brotherhood of man.

Activities of Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made today on the subject of investigators for the Committee on Appropriations. As the gentleman says, during the present Congress a resolution was passed authorizing the Appropriations Committee to make studies of the organization and operations of any Government department or agency. Of course, back of this is the desire to eliminate waste and extravagance, stop duplication, and reduce expenditures. The Committee on Accounts provided $100,000 to carry out the provisions of the resolution. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] explained the activities of the committee of which he is the chairman, saying on the whole the system has proven remarkably successful.

I was pleased to get this information but, personally, I feel the proper place for such an organization would be under the Comptroller General, who is an agent of the Congress. It should be permanent. Under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 he is required to make such investigations but has never been given the money to set up the proper organization.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

> The surprising feature of the system is that it has met with no criticism from any source.

Speaking of the activities of his committee. Here the gentleman is mistaken. There is pending before the Committee on Accounts House Resolution 325 introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] seeks by his resolution to authorize duly each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, except the subcommittee for the legislative branch and for the judiciary, to employ examiners and other personnel to enable each subcommittee to obtain adequate information for the efficient performance of its functions. To me the Jensen resolution would duplicate the activities under House Resolution 69 which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] referred to. Of course, if Mr. JENSEN's resolution passed, then it would be necessary to appropriate a large sum of money to employ such examiners and other personnel as the Committee on Appropriations acting as a whole shall deem necessary.

A hearing was held by the Committee on Accounts on the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and at that hearing it was stated that the present set-up was not sufficient. The Committee on Accounts has not up to this time taken any action on Mr. Jensen's resolution because the House has already authorized the Committee on Appropriations to make investigations relative to expenditures. I do not think it would be wise to pass another resolution giving the subcommittees of the same committee power to make investigations which the House has already authorized nor do I think the House would approve of such a resolution. I might say for those interested that there still remains over $75,000 to the credit of the Appropriations Committee under the resolution passed nearly a year ago.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in my district I have a food chemist who has pioneered in many of the problems with reference to soil chemistry and food chemistry, and has made many valuable suggestions. Pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD rather interesting letters received from the Honorable Edward T. Keenan. His letters follow:

KEENAN LABORATORIES,
Frostproof, Fla., April 10, 1943.

Congressman J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: To solve the problems that will be encountered when the last shot of this war is fired, there are three great resources available to the United Nations. These are manpower, machine development, and agricultural productions. When the glorious day of peace arrives we must readjust our civil programs so that millions of persons now engaged in war

activities can return to civil activities with positive assurance of obtaining the necessities of life and a reasonable assurance of obtaining luxuries.

THE GREAT RESOURCE

Of the three great resources, agriculture alone is paramount. But, even as great as the responsibilities of agriculture are today they are a mere trickle as compared with the responsibilities which will face the agriculture industry immediately after the war and in the trying and difficult years which will follow. On final analysis, it is upon agriculture that the home front will be either a success or a failure. It is from agriculture that we will maintain our national morale and the support and good will of our friends and allies.

Boiling the matter down it may be also seen that the problem of maintaining civil order in occupied countries and to restore the standard of living to people who have, during the war, known little better than starvation, will rest upon agriculture. It will be through agriculture that a lasting peace, by removing the fundamental and underlying cause of war, may be assured.

A sufficient food supply for all peoples in all parts of the world will automatically trend to the abolition of all trade barriers and restrictions which breed rivalries and which keeps one group in luxuries and another in ruin and starvation.

NOW IS THE TIME

The inauguration of a satisfactory agricultural program is a matter of the moment. It is the most outstanding phase to be considered in planning for the peace.

The administration of a satisfactory agricultural program for the entire world will demand, and automatically bring into being, a sound world currency for the convenience of exchange of goods. It will be through this program that the gambling and speculation on exchange values will be eliminated.

In our own country we must immediately—today, not after the war—establish a scientific survey in the zoning of agricultural lands and resources according to the natural adaptability, climate, soils, etc. We will thus remove from economic slavery those forced to try to persuade marginal regions to provide a harsh existence.

IS IT PRACTICAL?

The question which now arises is whether such an agricultural program is possible and capable of achievement. All scientific study and investigation points clearly to the fact that such a program for agriculture is possible and practical. It cannot, however, be achieved without a new approach and willingness by a government to apply the knowledge that has been gained through the years, that is evident.

We must face one limiting factor: Our country has available less than 3 acres of tillable ground per capita suitable for growing food for each individual.

Any program, agricultural or otherwise, embracing a globular scope must first take into consideration this fact: The available supply of land that may be profitably tilled is limited. Our one and only hope lies in making the most of these 3 acres.

In looking forward to national continuity, we must accept as fundamental the principle that if we take out of the ground a pound of mineral substance, whether solid or fluid, we have depleted the natural resources of the Nation to that extent.

Further, we must accept as a responsibility if we do this and must be prepared to take our place in history among those who have failed.

God forbid that the coming generations look back upon us as ancestors who were lacking in foresight or courage to provide them with a fit world in which to live.

Nature will not replace the iron, copper, and other resources we remove, but we may plant something, and even though we do reduce the fertility of the soil, nature will usually in a few years return that soil to its natural fertility. Therefore I say that agriculture is the only industry which man may take something from and nature will replace.

Any failure on our part to provide for the maintenance or restoration of the resources of the soil fertility will mean failure to the whole world-wide program of peace.

The necessity for land survey to prevent deterioration is always present. Today we face the fact that our country is worth less than when the Declaration of Independence was signed. Millions of acres have been destroyed through unscientific farming practices. Billions of dollars of potential wealth have been dissipated—gone forever. When the vast prairies of the West were first put under cultivation and added to the wealth of our country a farmer with only crude means produced around 25 bushels of wheat per acre. Today in spite of Government help and manufactured fertilizers, he produces only 10 bushels per acre. This circumstance represents the damage which threatens our national continuity and any program for world peace and economic stability.

Summing these up, we thus see that the true worth of any country is in direct proportion to agricultural products that the country is capable of producing.

History holds to light the disintegration of nations and their passing out of existence because they exhausted their mineral resources and depleted their soils. Today we see the rich agricultural States of the North dotted with abandoned farms, and these States now depend upon imported raw materials from outside sources. We all know of examples of individuals who have exhausted their inheritance and are now destitute.

America has received a challenge—the challenge of the soil. The average yield of corn is 25½ bushels per acre. Agribiologists maintain that the calculated yield should be 225 bushels per acre. As a matter of record, this yield has been reached in cases. The average yield of cotton is about one-third bale per acre. It should be 4⅔. The present yield of wheat is 8.4 percent of its calculated possible yield. And this is the story of the present farming practices.

No human undertaking, which includes the assembling of a people as a nation, has the right to exist unless it constantly tries to improve through services.

From the political standpoint we must recognize that all Government expenditures must be based on the production ability of 3 acres per unit of population, oriented through the probable stabilization of our population at 150,000,000 by 1960. That is our intrinsic worth.

Some time during the next generation events of huge proportions must be faced. There will be radical changes in the proportion producers to consumers. There will be fewer young people in proportion to the old. This period will be followed by a lowering of the middle-aged class; that is, the workers.

During the next few years you and I and others of this generation must provide for the future generations or we go down in history as having shirked our responsibility.

Such a system of National Government is not a phase of sloganized stimulation. Such rantings as Trade at Home, Buy British, Made in Japan, Red Menace, are not constructive, and will not bring prosperity to our Nation. In the long run these slogans, though high sounding, are ineffective. Today we are lend-leasing to Britain and Russia, fighting Japan and Germany, and are not even buying as much of our own products as we need because there is not enough to go around.

Carrying out this program there must be some form of cooperative administration. That part of industry devoted to production of necessities of life must be favored with some form of subsidy wholly and entirely derived from that part of industry devoted to the production of the luxuries of life. In other words, planned economy must be separated into two phases—the production of bare necessities and the production of luxuries and esthetic things.

The production of the bare necessities of life must not be hindered by taxation. The production of luxuries and esthetic things must carry the monetary cost of Government operation.

Very cordially yours,

EDWARD T. KEENAN.

KEENAN LABORATORIES,
Frostproof, Fla., April 12, 1943.

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETERSON: We must never lose sight of the fact that the backbone of the country is the farmer. Let the farm crop fail and banks fail, the railroads fail, manufactures fail. The whole economic structure tumbles. Thus it is, the true worth of a country is its agricultural worth. Putting this in other words, it is in the amount of protein the tillable land can and does produce.

The average requirement for an average human being is 0.7 to 1.0 pound of protein per year. The maximum protein production of any acre of land anywhere in the world is approximately 2,000 pounds of protein per growth cycle. However, the average production is a small fraction of this. For example, the average yield of corn is 25½ bushels per acre, whereas the yield should be 225 bushels. The average yield of cotton is about one-third bale per acre and it should be 4⅔. The average yield of wheat is 8.4 percent of its possible yield.

Different crops produce different amounts of protein per given weight. For example, the protein content of green beans is 2.4 percent, while the protein content of green peas is 6.7 percent, and summer squash 0.6 percent. Proteins in different crops have different units of value depending upon what it's associated with. For example, vitamins. Some crops will produce their maximum amount of protein in 60 days. It takes 100 days for others, while still others require a matter of several months.

But all these factors are well known. Therefore, all may be compensated for in formulating my program. A practical working schedule of my program would embrace the stating of a unit of production. This might be two, three, four, five, or more times the average yield. In other words, there would be a bull's eye to shoot at. This unit would vary from crop to crop, but not area to area. The reason for this is to discourage a farmer from attempting to produce a maximum crop of wheat under the best conditions for growing cotton, etc.

To illustrate this: Suppose Farmer A selected to produce a crop that contained 1 percent protein, and Farmer B elected to grow a crop containing 3 percent protein in the same length of growing time. For the two farmers to be on an equal footing, Farmer B would have to produce 3 pounds of protein to each pound that Farmer A produced to reach equal parity with Farmer A.

The gist of my program is the production of protein should receive maximum encouragement from the Government. Each pound of protein should have a determined and designated value, comparable to the point system as now used for rationing. If a farmer produced 10 percent of his allotted protein requirement, his income tax should be reduced by that much. If he produced his entire allotment, then his entire income tax should be eliminated. If a man should work for hire on a farm for 1 month, then one-twelfth of his income tax should be eliminated. These are only tentative outlines and offered solely to illustrate a plan.

Adoption of some such program will encourage farming and make farming more attractive for offering inducements. There need be no clause that would prevent farmers planting and producing any crop they see fit, or from selling on any market at any price they can get. Agriculture would be more secure, farm labor would be more contented, and the farmer would receive greater returns.

Free enterprise, the one outstanding prerequisite of a democracy, will thus be guaranteed. Stabilized Government budgets will be on a tangible basis because they will be on something of a definite value. It will then be known what our country is actually worth. Expendible resources will not be exhausted without compensation.

The farm question has been a bugbear and a bone of contention to every Congress. It is almost unanimously agreed that the farmer has never received a fair deal. Certain plans have been proposed, but none that I know of have ever considered the industry as a whole, nor was based on any program but what was so flexible that it would not stand the scrutinizing test. With my program a farmer has a goal to work for. He will know in advance what the goal is, what he is going to receive for his efforts, and it will give him the satisfaction of feeling free, unhampered, and protected.

What would be the chance, Congressman, of my appearing before your committee to outline this plan, at my own expense, if necessary.

Yours truly,

EDWARD T. KEENAN.

We Must Keep the Faith With Our Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the year of 1944 comes in under the cloud of the most awful struggle, the most widespread destruction, the most terrible hatred—the most awful war in the history of mankind.

As today we gaze on the world scene we appear to have gone far backward from the boasted civilization which we thought we had achieved after nearly 2,000 years of Christianizing influence.

As we look at this scene and realize that millions of our men and women are scattered on the far-flung battle lines of the world, and as we realize that they are struggling and dying on those far-flung battle lines to maintain that way of life which we call Americanism, and which means freedom, individual liberty, individual values, human progress, we must resolve as a Nation and a people that we will keep the faith with our fighting forces. We must resolve, and we must implement that resolution with appropriate action, that those heroic men and women battling on the seas and under the seas, on the land and over the land, in the far places of the world shall not come back to an America which has lost its freedom; in which the Bill of Rights has been extinguished; in which totalitarianism in some form shall have supplanted that glorious freedom that has made life in America richer and finer and more progressive than any mode of life ever achieved by any people, anywhere on the face of this globe.

We, the people of this Nation, must solemnly resolve that the year 1944 shall see a new determination in the hearts of all Americans to keep America sound, solvent, free. We must resolve that we will maintain free speech, free press, the right of peaceful assembly, the right of petition to our Government, the rights of free industry and private enterprise.

We must resolve anew that in the coming year we will turn our backs on the wild experimentation, on the crazy economic theories, on the machinations of those who would change our form of government into some form of fascistic or communistic dictatorship; who would socialize business and industry; who would crush out individual initiative; who would strangle individual talent and ability. We must turn our faces back to the principles, those great and eternal truths, upon which our forebears founded and builded this great, rich, free Nation, which has been our heritage.

For 10 long years this Nation has been led away from those principles in which the Declaration of Independence was conceived, upon which the Constitution of the United States was based, and upon which our forebears were able to build this great experiment in human freedom and human progress.

For 10 long years this Nation has been propagandized by those who would persuade it that all of the old eternal truths are not truths at all. These New Dealers have insisted that every rule of caution, thrift, and economy was no good. They have insisted that we could borrow irresponsibly and spend irresponsibly and, if necessary, repudiate irresponsibly. These New Deal theorists have proceeded on the immoral and dishonest theory that it is right to tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. Now that they can no longer deny that they have used the United States Treasury in multifarious ways for partisan political purposes, they would be glad to drop the term "New Deal" and take up some honest slogan like "Win the war." The New Deal is a trail of extravagance, waste, political corruption, mismanagement, deception, and inefficiency. It first led to a planned confusion, and that planned confusion has led to regimented chaos.

There is not one of us who does not know, who cannot, for himself or herself, count a score of mistakes and worse committed in our immediate home communities by New Deal administrators and bureaucrats.

What I want to say to you is that when men and women are taken from their peaceful pursuits and are sent out by their Government to fight, to be injured, or to pour out their life's blood upon the battle lines of the world, that is something that transcends every political right and every personal aspiration of every man or woman in the United States. We are dealing in terms of human lives, in terms of human agony, in terms of human grief. We are dealing in terms of destruction so vast that humanity will not recover from it in the next 10 generations. We are dealing with the fate of the world itself; we are dealing with the fate of free America; we are dealing with the lives, the liberties, the happiness, and the progress of millions upon millions of the unborn who are to come after us.

That, my friends, is a trust sacred above every partisan political consideration. It ought to find a response deep in the heart of every man and woman worthy to call himself or herself an American—and it does.

If ever there was a time in human history when men and women ought to rise above selfish desire, above their own lust for place, or power, or profit, that hour is now when millions of our men and women are out suffering and fighting on the battle lines of the world to maintain the kind of America they know and love and want perpetuated.

If the noble purpose for which those men and women are fighting cannot and does not animate and motivate the hearts and hands of those on the production lines at home, then truly the human race has lost something very grand and very essential. If we cannot in this coming year of 1944, subdue and subjugate all sectional and class and industrial conflicts to the end of terminating this war at the earliest possible moment, then indeed have we lost something spiritual and vital from our hearts.

I believe people, the masses of the people, the fathers and the mothers, the brothers, and the sisters, the wives and the sweethearts of those men and women who are struggling through the awful hardships of the battle fronts, do have deep in their hearts the resolution that, throughout the year of 1944, we shall bend every thought, and every effort to helping our fighting forces win the victory at the earliest possible moment.

We are told that the worst is yet to come. We are told that the United States must bear the greatest part of the burden, both in men and in money, to win this world struggle. We are warned that casualty lists will mount to figures we have not before even thought of. Of course, we must meet these terrible trials if they come, and meet them with our chins up and our hearts full of courage, but there is no use for us to attempt to delude ourselves. There will be heartaches and agony of soul in these trials. That is why it seems so incredible that rulers of countries can begin to plot and scheme to do the very thing and to make the very mistakes which followed the First World War. It must be apparent to every thinking person that if we do not lay the foundations of an enduring peace at the end of this war—if we do not make sure that another war will not follow this one within another generation, then we can look forward to race suicide—literally, to humanity blowing itself up in its own devilish insanity. That is why I confess I feel bitter over the fact that we see in evidence already the selfish planning of some of the statesmen of other nations to utilize this war as a new opportunity for grab. It is wicked. It is inexpressibly wicked. That is why I am saying

to you tonight that we must keep America solvent; we must keep America strong; and in God's name we must consider the welfare of America while we are considering the welfare of other nations. We have in our midst a no inconsiderable group of people who apparently are dead bent upon giving away everything we have; of compelling the people of America to share the poverty of all of the other peoples of the world; a group who appear to believe that there is something indecent in the desire to look out for America's interests and to keep America solvent, sound, and strong. Such people are false prophets. They are wickedly false prophets, and I warn you against them tonight.

The hope of the world on this eve of 1944 is that our American system will survive and triumph in this trial of war. If our American system fails to survive as a free system in this great trial of war, democracy, human progress, individual liberties and values will be discredited for a thousand years. We cannot let this happen. We must not let this happen. We do not have to let this happen. What we need to do is for each American in his or her heart tonight to make a personal resolution that each one will do his or her share toward keeping America free. That means to demand of their representatives in Congress that they put a stop to the wild and irresponsible administration of wild and irresponsible bureaucrats and that the conduct of this war be placed entirely in the hands of the military authorities trained for the task of war, trained for the task of defending this Nation, military authorities whose sole purpose will be to defend America, and end this war at the earliest possible moment, instead of trying to carry on a social and political revolution under the cover of the war activities.

Let me again, in closing, urge you to realize the immensity of the sacrifice our men and women in the fighting lines are making and to each one resolve in your heart that you individually are going to see to it, insofar as your influence may extend, whether it be your own immediate family, in your community, in your State, or even further, that we keep America free so that when those men and women come back from the battlefields, they will find that we at home have kept the faith with our fighting forces.

Roll-Back or Consumer Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include, omitting the name of the addressee, a letter addressed to a constituent discussing and expressing my views with regard to inflation or the high cost of living and the inconsistency of a roll-back or consumer subsidy program as a means of control. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.

Upon two things you and I undoubtedly are in accord:

1. We must win the war, no matter what the cost in money, work, or blood, else everything we have and cherish will be lost, including freedom and possibly life itself; and wars cannot be won without sacrifice in which all should share.

2. We want, as far as humanly possible, to avoid what is commonly referred to as inflation by some and as the high cost of living by others.

As to the first, all you and I can do is work, day in and day out, earn and pay, for we are said to be too old to fight.

On the second point our only difference may possibly be in the interpretation of words and the methods to be followed.

As I see it, without pretending to be an economist, inflation is really a condition brought about by the fact the public has an excess of spending money and there is a shortage of goods to buy with it. There can be but two natural remedies—to decrease the amount of spending money and to increase the volume of goods. Spending money can be decreased by (1) higher costs, (2) savings, and (3) higher taxes. The first we do not want, and need not have if existing administrative agencies will courageously use the power they have been given by way of price and wage controls.

The second means of decreasing spending money—at least, in too many instances—is considered old-fashioned and out of date, but you and I know many men who, having had some sad experiences in recent years, now recognize the value of and practice thrift.

The third method is disliked by all, yet advocated by many, some of whom at the same time make an inconsistent plea for roll-back or consumer subsidies.

Of subsidies, as we now speak of them, there are at least two kinds: Production or inducement subsidies—something like time and a half for overtime, about which there is little argument and to which there is little objection. The other is the roll-back or consumer subsidy.

It is this latter we should discuss, since it is this form of subsidy over which much confusion has arisen, for which great lobbying has prevailed, and concerning which there is now much loose talk and exaggerated warnings.

How much does this amount to?

The President's message used the figure of $800,000,000—others suggest more—per year, and we'll use those figures. For each of our hundred and twenty-five million (soldiers excluded), that means just about $6 per year—about 1¾ cents per day. Despite contention to the contrary, if a roll-back of 5 cents per pound on butter is taken off, there is no logical reason or excuse why butter should cost you or me more than a nickel more at the store. The same is true with all other items.

This $800,000,000 is paid by the Government. With income-tax deductions we are learning that when the Government pays we all pay. The Government doesn't have the money, so it must borrow by the issuance and sale of bonds, which you and I buy. On them interest is paid, from taxes, and experience shows that by the time we pay that money back it will have cost us three or four times as much—depending on how long it takes to pay this debt. So, instead of $800,000,000—in addition there are high administrative costs—the roll-back will cost $2,400,000,000—that nickel a pound on today's butter will be 15 or 20 cents when it is finally paid—in 50 years or so.

If our bonds are to be worth anything, our Government credit must be maintained. To maintain credit we must pay our bills. Who is going to pay? You and I, for the rest of our lives; our soldiers for the rest of their lives; our children; our grandchildren; their children and grandchildren. We'll pay it through taxes, for there is no other way it can be paid. Taxes are rapidly becoming an important item in our cost of living. Any steps we take to decrease our tax load means a step toward lower cost of living, and vice versa.

Don't you prefer to give up butter, if necessary, or at least to pay for your butter now, as you go, rather than ask these 10,000,000 soldiers and your children and grandchildren to pay for it later? Without adding part of our present grocery bill we'll all have a large enough debt to pay—at present $167,000,000,000. Each of us (soldiers, too) owes about $1,250. At the end of the war with the estimated debt $300,000,000,000 or more, we'll each owe some $2,200.

I intentionally refrain from discussing relative increases in living costs and wages for there are now so many variant tables from so many various sources that it has become practically impossible to learn which, if any, are presenting a true picture.

Supported by the vast majority of the District, my conclusions and opinions are:

1. Roll-back subsidies in no way contribute to winning the war.

2. Roll-back subsidy is inflationary to the extent it turns loose more money to spend for scarce goods to be added to the almost $50,000,000 now available, from the 1943 income alone.

3. Roll-backs are unnecessary at this time when income is higher than in all history. (Fixed income groups can be protected against higher cost of living if suggested legislation is adopted.) The administration has ample power to hold all prices in line, and if it refuses to do its duty blame for higher costs cannot, in justice, be put on lack of consumer subsidies. The blame must rest squarely on the administration's lack of courageous use of the powers granted it.

4. Roll-backs are not economically sound. The cost is too great. It applies to all persons regardless of need or increased income, directly or indirectly due to war industry.

5. Roll-backs were no brake on spiraling costs, as witness increased living costs and present demands for wage increases while these roll-backs are being paid.

6. Roll-backs are contrary to our American spirit of sacrifice and self-reliance, being, as they are, governmental dole regardless of need. You and I want to pay our own grocery bills while we can. Can't we make at least that small sacrifice?

7. Roll-backs establish a dangerous precedent, and no one knows where the demand will end—with fuel, clothes, rent, entertainment, gas, carfare? Where?

8. Roll-backs already paid were not authorized by any law enacted by Congress, and thus constitute illegal expenditures; and they have not prevented wage or price increases.

I felt impelled to go thus into detail for there has been so much talk of high cost of living and so very little about the high cost of fighting and dying.

If you could have been with me on a recent visit to Walter Reed Hospital you would know what I mean and how I felt after seeing some of the nearly 4,000 men there who had given health, eyes, arms and legs, that you and I might enjoy this unprecedented income in safety and comfort.

Yet I heard not one single bitter word, not one complaint about what the war had cost them. How can we bicker and quibble about 1¾ cents a day—less than we spend for cigarettes or cokes—when these men aren't quibbling about what the war has cost them? Are they and their loved ones to be the only ones to make sacrifices?

The easy thing to do would be to vote for these roll-back subsidies and challenge the administration to do the impossible and keep all prices and wages down; then raise hell because they didn't do it. But the easy thing is not always the right thing, and, as I pointed out, if prices can be kept down at all they can be kept down without the consumer subsidy—by the use of powers already granted.

Sincerely yours,

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER.

Farm Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news letter issued by the Jewell-Mitchell Cooperative R. E. A., of Ionia, Kans. The electrification of our farm and rural homes should be extended as rapidly as critical material from our war effort can be spared.

In fact, material needed for the expansion of the rural electrification program should be given a high priority. Electricity on the farm is more than a convenience—it is a necessity. There is only one answer to the farm labor problem and that is mechanical power. Concrete evidence is presented in this news letter of the additional food supply that can be secured by the installation of electrically powered farm equipment.

An all-out effort must be made to produce every pound of food possible for our own Nation and our allies. It is an essential and important part of our battle for freedom and democracy.

Electricity on the farms will not only furnish badly needed power but it will give our farm people an opportunity to enjoy many modern conveniences and appliances which are now available.

Great progress has been made during the past few years in bringing electric current to farm homes, yet, despite this rapid growth and development, only a small percentage of our rural homes enjoy the blessings of this service. Let us do everything within our power to bring electricity to the farm homes of our Nation.

The letter follows:

MORE POWER TO FARMERS

Our leaders ask for more and more food; we have less and less manpower. Mechanical power is the only answer.

The Jewell-Mitchell co-op has extended electric power to 75 new farm members in 1943, and 35 more will be hooked on before the year's end if we get another car of poles in time.

These 110 farms are being electrified in accordance with the War Production Board's orders, permitting connection to livestock farms having enough animal units to make it worth while, and provided that productive and labor-saving equipment is used.

The county war boards act as local certifying agencies.

We checked up on a few new members this week to see how much help they are actually getting from their electric equipment.

O. C. Bishop, of Downs, got the power just in time to prevent his greatly reducing his herd of 16 milk cows—he'll use an electric milker from now on. Other new members with milkers are Gene Brown, of Beloit, and Ed Schrader, of Osborne.

Many new members installed electric brooders, figuring this would mean extra production without much extra chores. Henry Murray, Clyde Bowles, and Joe Ellert, of Jewell, and E. F. Tolbert, of Beloit had electric service installed in their brooder houses before any other buildings were ready.

Fred Smith, of Jewell, was about ready to quit and move to town—was about old enough to retire anyway. With electric power he raised 500 chickens, 300 turkeys, and will milk 8 cows this coming year.

Rex Divel raised 350 chickens, 70 sheep, is feeding 50 hogs, has 40 ewes, and helps his father farm 500 acres; couldn't be done without electric labor savers.

Francis Wilmeth, Beloit, is milking 5 cows, has 45 hogs, and will increase his poultry production this year. Emerson Worick milks 8 cows, and is getting ready for increased poultry production in addition to his crop farming.

Dave Emmot, Beloit, will milk 14 cows this winter; has 300 hens, will increase poultry production this winter.

Joe Ludwig, Beloit, has 17 milk cows, 80 stock cattle, 300 hens, produced 700 young chickens, 65 pigs. He and 2 sons farm 720 acres. Electricity is helping them keep the chores under control.

Elza Covert, Beloit, did not get his power early enough for brooding; his brooder house with oil heat burned down last spring. He is rebuilding, and will install an electric brooder. Mr. Covert is 66 years old—old enough to retire. He takes care of 320 acres; has 200 hens, 50 ewes, will raise 300 chicks, milks 6 cows; is looking for a motor for grain elevator.

Elmer Covert, Beloit, has his barn and hen house wired; has 50 ewes that were lambing—electric light and heat was very helpful on this occasion.

These are random examples of our new members—many others are doing just as much or more.

H. R. 3270

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave to extend remarks granted upon the unanimous consent request made by the majority leader on December 21, I am exercising my privilege to further extend my remarks with reference to H. R. 3270, the insurance bill, heretofore reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House.

As shown by my statement in the RECORD of December 15, 1943, further arguments on this legislation have been made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] which were more or less specifically addressed to my extension of remarks of December 9, and also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] as generally addressed to the House on the subject of this pending legislation. Therefore, I feel obliged to address these remarks more specifically to the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut and incidentally to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa.

On December 14 the gentleman from Connecticut addressed the House under special order and his remarks appear in the RECORD for that day at pages 10659 to 10664. This statement is, in a sense, advanced by way of rebuttal so that I shall attempt to follow the order used by the gentleman from Connecticut and refer to his arguments as I consider they were developed.

On pages 10659 to 10664 the gentleman from Connecticut takes issue with my statement that this legislation is designed to prevent the Supreme Court from ruling on the case of United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. Generally I am content to rely upon my treatment of this subject as it appears in the Appendix of the RECORD on pages A5377 to A5382. I think I am also entitled to state at this time that the whole statement appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD has been submitted to a limited group of very competent lawyers, both Democrat and Republican, in the State of Indiana, and that to date those who have replied have uniformly agreed that my position upon this legislation is correct as a matter of law.

However, on page 10660 the gentleman from Connecticut questions my analogy, apparently on the theory that the eleventh amendment was a method by which jurisdiction was directly drawn from the Supreme Court, whereas the proposed legislation constitutes an amendment to the substantive law, a carving out of the business of insurance from the provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. I believe a study of the argument of the gentleman from Connecticut will reveal that his objective does not detract from the soundness of the original argument on this subject appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD on pages A5377 to A5385.

Courts, of course, acquire jurisdiction by two methods. The first method is by acts which expressly confer jurisdiction upon courts over certain persons and subject matter, procedural law. In the case of Federal courts, these acts are usually regrouped with the judicial code under all plans of codifying Federal enactments. But it is also true that the jurisdiction thus generally granted to courts cannot become operative, particularly in criminal statutes, until the Congress enacts a substantive statute which defines the wrongful act and thereby sets out the subject matter with reference to which they are wrongful and the person or persons who shall be subject to the

jurisdiction of the court for the purpose of determining whether or not they have committed any of the wrongful acts with reference to the subject matter included in the substantive legislation. From this it must be perfectly obvious that courts may be deprived of jurisdiction either by an amendment of the procedural laws generally defining their jurisdiction, or by a change in the substantive law, either in the subject matter or with reference to the persons originally defined, named, or mentioned as subject to the operation of the substantive law. Consequently, an act such as this, which is intended to say that the Clayton and Sherman Acts shall not be construed to apply to the business of insurance, is legislation falling in the second category, being legislation which as effectively deprives the court of jurisdiction over the subject of insurance or over the persons engaging in the monopolistic practices in that business, as would legislation of the first classification, procedural legislation, expressly designed to deprive the court of jurisdiction over the same subject matter and the same persons by expressly limiting the jurisdiction of the court. Consequently, I am quite certain that I am correct in my original statement, and that it is not I, but my colleague from Connecticut, who does not fully comprehend this question of jurisdiction or the method or means by which courts may be deprived of it.

It is also argued by the proponents of this legislation that it is not specifically designed to prevent the Supreme Court from acting in the case of United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association because it is general in its nature. However, we must remember, at the present time there is but one case pending in the Supreme Court involving an indictment under the antitrust laws against insurance companies. A legislative body is entitled as much as courts are entitled, and in fact, even more so, to look behind the form in which legislation is drafted and consider the factual background in existence at the time the legislation is proposed. If we do this, we will clearly understand that this is not general legislation, but special legislation, applicable to a special class of defendants, namely, the fire insurance companies of the United States who are defendants in the case now pending before the Supreme Court. Maybe we can make this clear by assuming that an indictment was pending in the Supreme Court under the Dyer Act against a red-haired defendant with blue eyes and a limp in his right leg. Surely no Member of the Congress of the United States would have any trouble in deciding that special legislation was being submitted to him to prevent the Supreme Court from passing upon the case of such defendant if legislation was proposed in the following language:

> Nothing contained in the Dyer Act shall be construed to apply to any case in which the defendant shall be a red-haired, blue-eyed person with a limp in the right leg.

I submit that in the final analysis this is all that H. R. 3270 amounts to.

Furthermore, it is argued by the gentleman from Connecticut that this is a simple repealer statute and that, as such, does it not have the intent and purpose which I have attributed to it, and which I think I have demonstrated that it has, in my statement of December 9. I cannot believe that this is true despite the protestations of the gentleman from Connecticut and the members of the Judiciary Committee who make the same statement in their Majority Report thereon. In the first place, I am of the opinion that it is not a repealer statute for the reason if it was not an attempt to come within the precedent laid down in Hollingsworth against Virginia, it would have been very simple to have said in this act the following:

> That nothing contained in the act of July 1890, as amended, * * * shall apply to the business of insurance.

As I have pointed out previously, when I find the words "shall be construed to apply" embodied in present legislation which is addressed to previous legislation, I am driven to the conclusion that there was some reason for the use of the words "shall be construed." And, I am convinced that the words "shall be construed" were deliberately inserted into H. R. 3270 in order to follow the language of the eleventh amendment and bring the case within the ruling precedent of Hollingsworth against Virginia.

But, there is further evidence to sustain this conclusion which the Members of the House are entitled to consider.

As I have stated, if H. R. 3270 simply said "that the Sherman Act shall not apply to the business of insurance," then I think we would have a repealer; but the repeal would not deprive the Supreme Court, or, in fact, the District Court, from going ahead with the pending case in the event the Supreme Court should hold that the business of insurance is commerce. I say this because I feel that section 29 of title I, United States Code, would clearly operate in such an event, and that section, of course, has a saving clause in it.

> SEC. 29. Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities.
>
> The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

Now then, it seems to me that it is clear that the insurance companies who are seeking this legislation did not want a simple repealer; because under the provisions of section 29 of title I, a simple repealer would not prevent the Supreme Court from passing on the insurance case, nor would it prevent the pending case from being tried, if a simple repealer statute was passed. On the other hand, apparently the insurance companies did not have the courage to boldly say to the Congress of the United States, "We do not want the instant case tried," because they did not come to the Congress and say: "Nothing contained in the act of July, 1890, shall apply to the business of insurance. Provided further, that from and after the passage of this act, no penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred prior to the passage of this act"—meaning the proposed legislation—"shall be assessed or adjudged against any defendant by reason of any acts performed prior to the passage hereof."

If H. R. 3270 had been presented to the Congress in the form and language suggested, it would have been very apparent that the action was designed to prevent the Supreme Court of the United States from passing on the pending case, and, further, to save the defendants in the pending case from any consequences of any acts heretofore done by them prior to the filing of the indictment or the passage of such legislation. But, in that event, the cat would have been out of the bag, and it would have been very doubtful if the Congress would ever pass legislation in that form, particularly when it was immediately applicable to only one case and one group of defendants. Therefore, I think it is apparent that very careful study was given to the form of this legislation by some very able lawyers, and that it was most carefully drafted in the language in which we presently find it, so that it could be brought under the ruling precedent of Hollingsworth against Virginia, without this fact being discovered by anyone who did not take the time and trouble to examine the cases decided under the eleventh amendment, and thereby discover the very clear, but cleverly covered, analogy between the pending legislation and the previous decision of the Supreme Court in Hollingsworth against Virginia. In fact, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I think, sensed at least that this might be the purpose of the legislation, although I have no reason to believe that at the time the committee report was filed, the eminent chairman of the House Judiciary Committee had prosecuted his original suspicion to the extent I did, as set out in my extension of remarks of December 9.

At the bottom of page 148 of the hearings, and also at the top of page 150 of the joint hearings of the subcommittees of the Committees of the Judiciary of the Congress of the United States, heretofore published, we find that the junior Member of the other body from the State of Michigan was deeply concerned over the question of whether this act was designed to prevent the Supreme Court from passing on the instant case. On these pages of the RECORD there appears quite a colloquy between members of the joint committee and Mr. Berge, who was appearing for the Antitrust Division of the Attorney General's office. I quote the following from the top of page 150 of the hearings:

> Mr. SUMNERS. The language (referring to the language in H. R. 3270 and the companion bills then before the subcommittees) is almost identical with the language of the eleventh amendment to the Constitution, and the Supreme Court in that case held that the

effect of it was to control the determination of the Supreme Court with reference to a pending case.

From this statement I draw the conclusion, which I feel is justified, that that most eminent jurist, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has given an indication, at least, that I am correct in my statement previously made on December 9—that H. R. 3270 is cleverly drawn so as to bring it within the ruling precedent of Hollingsworth against Virginia and thereby prevent the Supreme Court from passing on pending litigation for the benefit solely of a particular defendant or defendants, the fire insurance companies of the United States. I see no reason to retract my previous statement that such legislation constitutes an unconscionable interference by the legislative branch of our Government with the power of the judiciary to pass upon the pending litigation.

I am aware that the proponents of this legislation all deny that its purpose is that which I attribute to it. I do not question their right to make their denial or their good faith in making it. On the other hand, as far as I am concerned, and the other Members of the House, who will be asked to vote upon this legislation, I think these denials can best be illustrated by a story which I recently heard from a Member of this body:

It seems that a dutiful wife returned unexpectedly one evening, opened the front door and saw her husband kissing the cook. A family argument immediately followed and the husband, rather than making a defense of confession and voidance, pleaded and argued only a general denial. The argument went on well into the night, and finally, about 2 o'clock, the husband, with remarkable candor and intellectual honesty said: "Well, Hannah, it's just this—you can either believe me or your own eyes."

And, as far as this legislation is concerned, I feel justified in saying to the Members of the House that you can either believe the proponents of this legislation. who say it is not designed to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction, or your own eyes and your own mental processes. If you believe the latter, then it is incredible to me that any intelligent person, particularly a lawyer, can conclude that this legislation is not cleverly, adroitly, and deliberately worded to bring it within the ruling precedent of Hollingsworth against Virginia and thereby force the Supreme Court to deny to itself the right to pass upon the case of United States of America against Southeastern Underwriters Association now pending before it.

It is further said by the gentleman from Connecticut that this legislation does not grant an exemption to the insurance business because the insurance business has never been held to be commerce. Again, I am generally content to rely upon my argument previously made on December 9, which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A5382, namely, that what the Supreme Court, or any court, actually does in determining whether a business is commerce is to make a finding of ultimate fact from the evidentiary facts in the record and that it does not reach a conclusion of law upon that question.

As I previously pointed out, I think Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of *Swift and Co.* v. *United States* (196 U. S. 375), at page 398, is authority for my argument. In that case he said:

It is said that this charge is too vague and that it does not set forth a case of commerce among the States. Taking up the latter objection first, commerce among the States is not a technical legal concept, but a practical one drawn from the course of business.

From what I have said and from what Mr. Justice Holmes has said, it follows that if, in a later case, a much more detailed statement of facts is presented to the Court than those which were presented to it in any previous case, where the Court was required to determine whether a business was commerce, then the previous case or cases cannot reach the dignity of ruling precedents; because the finding is always one of ultimate fact and the finding is therefore dependent upon the primary facts before the Court in each case, so that it is improper, as a legal concept to say that, of necessity, the Supreme Court has ever held that the business of insurance was not commerce, unless we can further say that the facts previously presented to it were as complete as those presented to it in a subsequent case.

I do not know, nor am I concerned about, the extent to which the facts in the pending case of United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association differ from those before the Court in any previous cases because I am not attempting to arrogate to myself the right to say what the decision of the Supreme Court may be in the pending case. What I am saying is that I cannot agree with those who say that the Supreme Court has already held that the insurance business is not commerce to an extent which precludes it from ever deciding that the business of insurance is commerce if, in some later case, the primary facts then brought to the Court's attention are such that they will authorize it to conclude, as a reasonable inference from the primary facts, in accordance with the exercise of correct and common modes of reasoning, that, as an ultimate fact, the business of insurance is commerce. I see no reason to recede from this legal position previously stated.

However, in my extension of remarks of December 9, I further said that even assuming that the facts in a later case presented to the Supreme Court were quite similar to the facts presented to it in an earlier case, in which it had concluded that the business of insurance was not commerce, that even then the early case was not a ruling precedent, unless it was also true that in reaching its conclusion of ultimate fact in the earlier case from the primary facts then before it the Court had exercised its judgment and reached a conclusion in accordance with correct and common modes of reasoning. My colleague the gentleman from Connecticut appears to take objection to this conclusion of mine as to the fundamental basic legal considerations involved in any case coming to the Supreme Court under the commerce clause. I therefore feel justified in pointing out that Mr. Justice Peckham, in the case of *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association* ((1896) 166 U. S. 290), at pages 320–322, in my opinion, states the same basic principle of law which I have been advancing in different language. There the Court said:

It is therefore urged that if, by a strict construction of the language of this statute, it may be made to include railroads, yet it is evident from other considerations now to be mentioned that the real meaning of the legislation would not include them, and they must for that reason be excluded. It is said that this meaning is plainly to be inferred, because of fundamental differences both in an economic way and before the law between trade and manufacture on the one hand and railroad transportation on the other. Among these differences are the public character of railroad business, and as a result the peculiar power of control and regulation possessed by the State over railroad companies. The trader or manufacturer, on the other hand, carries on an entirely private business, and can sell to whom he pleases; he may charge different prices for the same article to different individuals; he may charge as much as he can get for the article in which he deals, whether the price be reasonable or unreasonable; he may make such discrimination in his business as he chooses, and he may cease to do any business whenever his choice lies in that direction; while, on the contrary, a railroad company must transport all persons and property that come to it, and it must do so at the same price for the same service, and the price must be reasonable, and it cannot at its will discontinue its business. It is also urged that there are evils arising from unrestricted competition in regard to railroads which do not exist in regard to any other kind of property, that it is so admitted by the latest and best writers on the subject, and that practical experience of the results of unrestricted competition among railroads tends directly to the same view; that the difference between railroad property, on the one hand, and all other kinds of property, on the other hand, is so plain that entirely different economic results follow from unrestricted competition among railroads from those which obtain in regard to all other kinds of business. It is also said that the contemporaneous industrial history of the country, the legal situation in regard to railroad properties at the time of the enactment of this statute, its legislative history, the ancient and constantly maintained different legal effect and policy regarding railway transportation and ordinary trade and manufacture, together with a just regard for interests of such enormous magnitude as are represented by the railroads of the country, all tend to show that Congress in passing the Antitrust Act never could have contemplated the inclusion of railroads within its provisions. It is, therefore, claimed to be the duty of the Court, in carrying out the rule of statutory construction, above stated, to restrict the meaning of these general words of the statute which would include railroads, because, from the considerations above mentioned, it is plain that Congress never intended that railroads should be included.

Many of the foregoing assertions may be well founded, while at the same time the correctness of the conclusions sought to be drawn therefrom need not be conceded.

The points of difference between the railroad and other corporations are many and great. It cannot be disputed that a railroad is a public corporation, and its business

pertains to and greatly affects the public, and that it is of a public nature. The company may not charge unreasonable prices for transportation, nor can it make unjust discriminations, nor select its patrons, nor go out of business when it chooses, while a mere trading or manufacturing company may do all these things. But the very fact of the public character of a railroad would itself seem to call for special care by the legislature in regard to its conduct, so that its business should be carried on with as much reference to the proper and fair interests of the public as possible. While the points of difference just mentioned and others do exist between the two classes of corporations, it must be remembered they have also some points of resemblance. Trading, manufacturing, and railroad corporations are all engaged in the transaction of business with regard to articles of trade and commerce, each in its special sphere, either in manufacturing or trading in commodities or in their transportation by rail. A contract among those engaged in the latter business by which the prices for the transportation of commodities traded in or manufactured by the others is greatly enhanced from what it otherwise would be if free competition were the rule, affects and to a certain extent restricts trade and commerce, and affects the price of the commodity. Of this there can be no question. Manufacturing or trading companies may also affect prices by joining together in forming a trust or other combination, and by making agreements in restraint of trade and commerce, which when carried out affect the interests of the public. Why should not a railroad company be included in general legislation aimed at the prevention of that kind of agreement made in restraint of trade, which may exist in all companies, which is substantially of the same nature wherever found, and which tends very much toward the same results, whether put in practice by a trading and manufacturing or by a railroad company?

It is my contention that when the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Peckham, in the foregoing case, carefully set out certain evidentiary or primary facts in the record then before it and then said "Many of the foregoing assertions may be well founded, while at the same time the correctness of the conclusions sought to be drawn therefrom need not be conceded," it was but saying that, if the conclusions reached from the primary facts could not be sustained when tested by correct and common modes of reasoning, then it was proper for a court to reject the conclusions arising from such reasoning.

Relying not only upon my own reasoning power and understanding of what the law is, but also upon the authority of Mr. Justice Peckham, I submit to the membership of the House, that my previous analysis of this question on December 9 does not constitute "legal hair-splitting," but that, on the contrary, it is a correct statement of the underlying principles of law applicable in any case where the commerce clause is called in question.

If I am correct, then again, I see no reason to recede from my previously stated position, namely, that the proponents of this legislation are not on legally sound ground when they come before the membership of the House and say that the insurance business has never been considered to be commerce; and that therefore they are not attempting to deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction, but they are merely exercising a right to force the Court to follow ruling precedents. Of course, anyone will admit that the Congress of the United States has within it the power to repeal all of the antitrust laws if it wishes or to enact any legislation with reference thereto it may desire. But, when it is confronted with legislation designed to exclude the insurance business from the operation of the antitrust laws or designed to prevent the Supreme Court from ruling on a pending case, the legislation must not be justified upon the legally untenable ground that there are in existence controlling precedents, when actually, as a matter of law, there are no such controlling precedents. In other words, the Congress must not be induced to act by arguments which are not legally sound.

Again, my colleague from Connecticut, on page 10661, advances an argument first advanced by the majority of the Judiciary Committee, on page 6 of the committee report, namely, that the Justice Department is attempting to change the law and that it should have come to the Congress first and asked the Congress to enact legislation bringing the insurance business within the provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. In the first place, this argument is based upon the premise, which I do not admit and which I have just been discussing, namely, that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act do not cover the business of insurance because that business is not commerce. I do not agree with the argument, of course, because I am convinced that the major premise is not sound. But, let us examine further the implications in this charge, which I am sure that my colleague from Connecticut and my other colleagues who signed the majority report on H. R. 3270 have not thoroughly thought out and do not actually mean to advance. However, there are certain very bad implications inherent in this argument which, I for one, do not intend to adopt as my own by a vote in favor of this legislation. I do not believe that other Members of the House would knowingly intend to adopt these implications if they are pointed out to them; and, for that reason, I think it proper to discuss for a few minutes the very bad implications which arise out of a charge tha' the Attorney General is attempting "to change the law."

In the first place, it is the province and the duty of every lawyer to attempt to persuade a court to declare the law, if it has not been declared upon any proposition, or reverse its declaration of the law if the attorney is convinced that a previous statement of the law is incorrect and rests upon premises and arguments which cannot be justified. There is nothing improper in the conduct of any attorney who attempts to do this.

As a matter of fact, as a representative of casualty insurance companies I have more than once appealed cases to the courts of last resort of the State of Indiana for the very purpose of getting the court to announce a new rule of law, which may not previously have been announced in the State of Indiana or to reverse a position previously taken, when I have been convinced that the position previously announced was not legally sound. The last time I did this was in the case of *Coca-Cola Bottling Co.* v. *Williams* (37 N. E. (2d) 702; 111 Ind. App. 502), opinion filed December 5, 1941, rehearing denied April 15, 1942, transfer denied May 18, 1942, in which I attempted to get the Appellate Court of Indiana, and then the Supreme Court of Indiana, by a petition to transfer, to declare as a matter of law in that State, that the preparers of food products, and particularly the bottlers of soft drinks were not negligent when they used certain standards of care in the preparation of their products. I fought this case as strenuously as possible and came within two judges of getting a six-judge appellate court to grant a petition for rehearing, on the proposition that the standards laid down, in the original opinion of the court, made the bottlers of drinks insurers of their products, whereas, under the common law, they could only be liable in case of negligence. I further argued that it was for the legislature to adopt legislation which would make bottlers of drinks insurers of their products, and that until the legislature acted, the courts could not declare legislation that which was not, in fact, legislation; or, in other words, declare a standard of care so high that in its actual operation it made the bottlers of soft drinks insurers of their products. I engage in this personal argument solely for the purpose of pointing out that in that case I was representing one of the largest casualty insurance companies in the United States, an affiliate of one of the largest fire-insurance companies, and my action was applauded and approved of by the counsel for that insurance company and its home-office executives. Yet, actually I was trying to get the courts of Indiana to change the law. There was nothing unethical or improper in that conduct. Therefore, what can the proponents of this legislation possibly mean, in their report to the House, and the gentleman from Connecticut by describing the action of the Attorney General in prosecuting this case as an attempt to change the law? If the attempt is made on behalf of a litigant, the Government of the United States, by arguments advanced before the Supreme Court in the orderly course of judicial process, there is nothing wrong in such action, and no arguments can be made in favor of this legislation by simply saying that the Attorney General is attempting to change the law.

If a litigant and his lawyer and the judges of a court connive by back-room conferences and by the doing of wrongful and collusive acts to persuade the judge of a court or the Justices of the Supreme Court to hand down a ruling by going in their back offices or by attempting to reach them any way except by orderly processes, then, of course, the action of any attorney for any litigant who attempted to get a court to change

the law by such methods would be reprehensible and, consequently, subject to the condemnation not only of the Bar but of the public. Therefore, it follows, does it not, that any person who says that this legislation should be passed because the Attorney General is attempting to change the law, if he is implying thereby something wrongful, must further imply that not only the Government of the United States, not only the Attorney General of the United States, but also the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States are engaging in collusive practices or are about to engage in collusive practices to change the law.

I would like to make myself definitely clear. I do not declare that either the gentleman from Connecticut or that any member of the Judiciary Committee imply anything wrongful in the conduct of the Government of the United States or the Attorney General or the Justices of the Supreme Court when they say that this legislation should be passed because the Attorney General is attempting to change the law. What I have attempted to do, by a resort to reductio ad absurdum, is to point out to every Member of the House that this is a silly argument, which is unworthy of the keen intellects of the gentlemen who advance it. It is obvious that the gentlemen who have advanced such an argument, all of whom are gentlemen of high character and lawyers of high ethics, have simply not thought through the logical implications inherent in their argument; or, of course, they would never make such an argument. These mistakes in logic often occur where men are carried away by the zeal of advocacy, or they may occur where men unthinkingly accept the arguments given to them by other interested parties. My purpose in analyzing this argument has been solely to disclose its absurdity so that the Members of the House may consider this legislation upon its merits and not upon any appeals or arguments, which would place those who advance the arguments in a position which they would never knowingly or willingly assume.

Again, at page 10659 of the RECORD of December 14, and also at page 8639 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 21, the gentleman from Connecticut advances the argument, which is also used by the members of the Judiciary Committee, who support his legislation, on page 11 of the hearings, that both the Republican and Democratic platforms support this legislation. The argument is apparently based upon the fact that the platforms both declared, in substance, that the insurance business should be regulated by the several States.

I shall not concern myself with the Democratic platform or attempt to discuss any obligation which might be imposed upon a member of the Democratic Party by the provisions of his Party's platform of 1940; I shall limit myself solely to a discussion of the statements in the Republican platform of 1940, in the light, first, of the nature of the proposed legislation; second, the understanding or lack of understanding of the law prevailing at the time the Republican platform was adopted in 1940; and, third, the traditional policy of the Party upon this whole question in the days when it was controlled by men who conceived the purpose of the Party—to render a service to the individual citizens of America and the little people of America, and not to condone or uphold the monopolistic practices of vested interests.

In the first place, the Republican platform of 1940 says:

> We condemn the New Deal's attempts to destroy the confidence of our people in private insurance institutions. We favor a continuance of regulation of insurance by the several States.

With reference to the first sentence, I also condemn any witch hunts designed to destroy people's confidence in the policies of insurance which they hold, but I submit that when the fire insurance companies of the United States, even before there has been any trial of any of the facts alleged in an indictment under the antitrust laws against them, come to the Congress of the United States with legislation deliberately designed to prevent the Supreme Court of the United States from ruling upon a case pending before it, and further designed to prevent thereby a trial of the facts alleged in that indictment, before any court anywhere has had a chance to determine whether those facts are true—that in that instance, it is not the New Deal which is destroying the confidence of the people in their insurance institutions, but it is the insurance companies themselves who, in substance, are saying to me, as a person of ordinary intelligence: "We admit that there is truth in the allegations that we are engaged in monopolistic practices which are forcing discriminatory rates upon the small people of America and in favor of the large corporations of America. We admit that there is truth in the allegations that monopolistic practices are indulged in in the fire insurance business to the disadvantage of the policyholders We admit that there is truth in the allegations that insurance agents are coerced through our financial power and through the provisions of our agency contracts to represent only certain companies—otherwise we would not be afraid to go to trial under these indictments because we are prepared to disprove every fact alleged in them."

As far as I am concerned, if a defendant came to me in a criminal action and asked me to do everything in my power to get the legislature to pass a law to keep him from being tried, I would be driven to the conclusion that he had a guilty conscience and that he was guilty of the acts charged against him. No one is doing more to destroy the confidence of the people in the fire insurance companies of America and in the treatment which they are receiving from them than the companies themselves, by reason of the logical implications which arise from their conduct. This legislation is an attempt to prevent a trial; it is just as clear a form of flight as that indulged in by a defendant who leaves the scene of a crime and attempts to disappear in another State. The law has always held that flight was competent evidence of guilt which might be considered by a jury in the trial of a case. The law has held it because human experience has taught us that this is the way guilty humans act. So, I am not violating the Republican platform when I oppose this legislation, because as far as I am concerned, it is not the New Deal, but the fire insurance companies themselves which are destroying the confidence of the people by their conduct in this case.

The second sentence of the Republican platform says:

> We favor a continuation of regulation of insurance by the several States.

It is incredible to me that anyone should not understand the difference between a prosecution under the antitrust laws and the regulation of a business. Only those businesses which inherently involve a great public interest or which, by their very nature, are public utilities rendering a service to the public which would be injured by free competition are subject to regulation. The very fact that an antitrust prosecution is instituted discloses that the business which is prosecuted under the antitrust laws is not one which is subject to regulation. Therefore, the bringing of the antitrust action against the insurance companies involved is not an action of Federal regulation, but the exact opposite of Federal regulation. I accept as truth the assertion that in certain States cooperative action amounting to monopolistic action under the antitrust law is permissible, and that, even further, in certain States practices which might amount to violations of the Federal antitrust laws are mandatory; but a change in State regulation which would prohibit monopolistic practices would not constitute regulation by the Federal Government, nor would it constitute a deprivation of the several States of the right to legislate. And, therefore, again, my opposition to this legislation is not inconsistent with an intelligent construction of the Republican platform of 1940.

Furthermore, it is proper to presume that the Republican platform of 1940 was adopted under the mistaken premise that the business of insurance was not commerce. If the Supreme Court should decide that the business was commerce and has always been commerce, in light of all of the evidentiary facts inherent in the conduct of said business, then the Republican platform of 1940 was simply written under a misapprehension of the law if that platform meant to say that the insurance business was not commerce, and, again, no man can be bound by a mistake of law or fact which was not known to the drafters of his Party platform when it was drafted. To hold otherwise would simply impose upon the members of a party the result of an honest mistake, which the law does not impose upon anyone.

Finally, something should be said about this whole question of whether the insurance business is commerce and the position of the Republican Party with

reference to it. My colleague from Connecticut, in addressing the House on October 21, at page 8368 of the RECORD, referred to the arguments of the "bright young men" in the Justice Department advanced in the case of United States of America against Southeastern Underwriters Association before the District Court of Georgia that insurance business was commerce. My colleague, I think, left the inference that no other lawyers in the past had ever advanced this same argument. He overlooked the fact that Dean Pound, of Harvard University Law School, has advanced this argument; and he overlooked the fact that James M. Beck, a life-long Republican and a former Assistant Attorney General and a former Solicitor General of the United States, contended in his article, The Federal Regulation of Life Insurance (181 North American Review (1905), 191, 194, and 201), as follows:

> The failure of Congress to legislate with reference to insurance does not disprove the existence of the power, for the same inaction is to be noted with reference to many congressional regulations of interstate commerce. * * *
>
> The Supreme Court has never had occasion to consider the validity of a Federal statute to regulate insurance; all previous decisions were predicated upon State statutes.

He further overlooked the fact that Senator Dryden, a Republican, and a United States Senator from the State of New Jersey, in 1906, made an address on the commercial aspects of Federal regulation of insurance before the Newark Board of Trade on January 18, 1906, in which he said that under date of September 11, 1905, he sent a letter of inquiry to some 8,000 bar associations and individuals throughout the United States—included in this number was the entire membership of the American Bar Association of that date—and in reporting on this inquiry, he made the following statement:

> In this inquiry four questions were stated, as follows:
>
> * * * * *
>
> Question 2. Do you hold the insurance business to be a national rather than a local interest, and properly entitled to the solicitude and care of the National Government?
>
> Question 3. As a matter of personal opinion, do you hold the business of insurance to be commerce, or an integral and indispensable element of commerce, in the sense in which this term is used in everyday language?
>
> * * * * *
>
> Out of 7,454 answers to the second question 6,543, or 87.8 percent were favorable. Out of 7,454 answers to the third question, 5,300, or 71.1 percent were in the affirmative.
>
> * * * because of *Paul* v. *Virginia*, and the cases based upon it, involve a fundamental error in their repudiation of the usage and practice of the commercial world, because what was therein said on this point was dictum, and, because the court has refused to be bound by its previous decisions upon constitutional questions, the insurance cases do not abrogate the power which Congress possesses under the Constitution to regulate and supervise.

Therefore it can be seen that in the past those so-called, much maligned reactionaries, the members of the American Bar Association, who were certainly not New Dealers, were of the opinion by an overwhelming vote that the business of insurance was commerce. Certainly there must have been some Republicans among this membership, since there always has been. And certainly no one will denounce the republicanism of Senator Dryden, who, incidentally, was the head of the Prudential Insurance Co., or that of James M. Beck—very few people have ever had the temerity to intimate that James M. Beck was not one of the great Republican lawyers of this century.

Now I am also aware of the fact that in 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt sent a message to Congress urging the enactment of Federal legislation designed to regulate the insurance business, and that the Judiciary Committee of the House, and probably the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, rejected his plea on the ground that the insurance business was not commerce. I do not, of course, deny the existence of this historical fact. What I am trying to say is that there has been in the past, and there need not be now, a uniform opinion among Republicans, particularly Republican lawyers, as to whether the insurance business is commerce; but I am trying to point out two things: First, that if the Supreme Court should hold in the pending case that the insurance business was commerce, the justices who reach that conclusion would not necessarily be reaching a conclusion which is entirely inconsistent with the opinion held by a vast majority of the American Bar in 1905 and the opinions held by a very respectable group of Republicans in the past. I am advancing this argument in order that we may consider this legislation on its merits; that we may really appraise the Republican platform of 1940 in its true worth and that we may understand, as Republicans, that this legislation is not designed to save the country from a new concept invented by the New Deal. I have no love for the New Deal as such, particularly I have no love for its announced policy too often evidenced in its conduct, that the end justifies the means, and that social progress can be made faster than the capacity of the people of the country to appreciate and evaluate it But, I think it is historical Republican doctrine to fight against the growth of monopolies and that the prosecution of monopolistic practices under the antitrust law is an act consistent with Republican doctrine. Consequently, when the New Deal acts in a manner which I consider to be consistent, not only with the best interest of the people of America, but also in a manner consistent with the traditional policy and the present obligations of my party, I refuse to be influenced by a blind hatred or by a present public reaction against the New Deal which it deserves by reason of its past arrogance, political dishonesty, and expediency, waste and administrative mistakes. In other words, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, elected on the Republican ticket, I must support those things which I believe are good for the people, notwithstanding the fact that they are advanced by this Administration, and I cannot permit myself to be blinded by passion or persuaded by arguments, which, when examined objectively and in the cold light of reason, cannot be established as persuasive or controlling over my decisions.

Bringing this Republican doctrine down to date—on December 4, the Honorable Alf M. Landon addressed the Republican junior Senators at Washington, D. C., and in the course of his address, treated upon this question of private monopolies in the following language:

> There has been only one consistent policy and that on the part of a little group planning to establish the totalitarian state. That one unchanging policy has shown itself in tax legislation—in the National Recovery Act—in all kinds of department rulings and regulations. It is the policy I repeatedly referred to in 1936 as hanging a millstone around the neck of the little fellows.
>
> But you naturally inquire how can that be when the administration professes so much love for the little fellow and so much hate for the big fellow.
>
> It is because the dominant New Dealer's plan contemplates the complete elimination of the little fellow and turning the country over to the big fellow, so that Government can then take over all business, industry and agriculture. They know as between monopolies and Government, the people will and should choose the Government.
>
> And of course once that is done the next step is inevitable—regulating and controlling of labor so that the big independent union is no more; the totalitarian state is then established.
>
> The greatest problem of all—foreign or domestic—is how can we enjoy the benefits of mass production keeping our standard of living the highest in the world and at the same time preserve the equality of opportunity for the individual. Government must preserve that opportunity for the individual as it must conserve its natural resources. The New Deal has not found the answer because the little fellow has taken a tremendous beating under the present administration.
>
> The answer is in a combination of many things. Antitrust proceedings under existing legislation—higher inheritance tax to redistribute inherited capital and power—regulations administered to protect the little fellow, and the fostering of cooperatives. Further we must eliminate vested interests in government the same as in business. Third and fourth terms are the meat upon which such vested political interests feed.

As far as I am concerned, I interpret Alf Landon's language as a definite warning against economic monopolies and a definite plea for the little fellow. Since it is demonstrated by the evidence in this record that the fire insurance companies are, in substance, making the little man pay the insurance bill of the big interstate corporation and monopolies, I feel sure that Alf Landon must be on my side of this question.

Now, to be perfectly fair, I want to add that in that same speech, Mr. Landon spoke of States' rights in the following way:

> The restoration of the rights of States and basic American rights of the individual is one of the big issues involved in the next campaign.

However, in my extension of remarks in the Appendix, pages A5382 to A5387, I set out fully my reasons for taking the position that the States' rights doctrine

is not properly applied to this situation, but that actually the States' rights spring from the American concept of the dignity of the individual, and I pointed out that a conduct of the insurance business which injures the individual and benefits the big aggregations of capital, presents a situation which should compel all States' rights people to be opposed to this legislation. Of course, I do not know what Mr. Landon's thinking is upon this legislation, but if he is not in agreement with me, all I can say is that I think he is also guilty of fallacious thinking upon this States' rights proposition, in that a person who cries out States' rights and really means it, in my opinion, cannot consistently support this legislation.

Again, the gentleman from Connecticut, who addressed the bulk of his speech of December 14 against my extension of remarks of December 9, attributes to me certain arguments which I have never made, with reference to the financial condition of insurance companies and the dividends paid. My colleague from Connecticut has overlooked the fact that on page A5333 of the Appendix of the RECORD, I specifically made the following statement:

> I shall not concern myself with arguments of the amount of profit made by insurance companies. I reached this conclusion for several reasons: First, I do not think it is necessary, in order to make my case against this legislation, to get into an extended debate over the fairness or unfairness of those profits; second, such an argument, at its best, always is based upon creating a spirit of envy and constitutes an emotional appeal of hatred and envy which I do not think can ever permanently settle any of our problems. By that statement I do not say that I condone excessive profits which are incompatible with social justice. But, the real question in any case, to me, is not so much what some other man has taken from me as the question of whether I am being treated fairly with all other people and whether rights of mine have been taken from me wrongfully by some other person in the conduct of a business which is fraught with the public interest. In this view, I think I am supported by the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius X. Furthermore, from a practical consideration, there is adequate evidence in this record to refute the arguments of the States' rights proponents without resort to an arousing of the destructive emotions of hate and envy.

Because he overlooked this statement and because apparently he did not analyze the tables which I inserted into the RECORD, the vast majority of the material found at pages 10661 to 10663 of the RECORD of December 14 is not applicable to any argument which I made.

I am aware, of course, that my colleague from Connecticut is generally advancing arguments in favor of this legislation; however, a most casual reading of his speech of December 14 shows that it is intended to be an answer to my statements of December 9. I am entitled to say, in passing, that as yet no figures have been produced by anyone to deny the tables which I used on December 9, or to question the conclusions which I draw from them. In fact, it is proper to observe that consideration by the House of this legislation at this time, before the Judiciary Committee of the House has called upon the insurance companies to appear before it and deny the figures involved in the tables which I used, must assuredly be a premature action which is one more reason for defeating this legislation.

At page 10663 of the RECORD, under table 2 of the tables introduced by my colleague from Connecticut, we find that between 1921 and 1941 the premiums insurers paid declined 38.1 percent, while the fire losses declined 57.4 percent. An explanation of this relationship by Best & Co., which furnished the tables my colleague introduced, immediately follows. I find the explanation interesting, but not very satisfactory to myself. Time does not permit me to analyze the explanation, but I am of the opinion that any Member of the Congress reading the same will reach the same conclusion that I have, namely, that the explanation offers little promise to the policyholders.

I think it is proper now to discuss very shortly the speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] on December 17, which appears at page 10860 of the RECORD. As I analyze this address, I find much in it with which I concur. But I do not agree with the remedy which is apparently suggested. I think that we have had many very bad examples of bureaucratic control since 1932, but I think that the solution lies with the Congress of the United States and with the obligation of the Congress to work out within the framework of the Constitution a more effective check upon bureaucracy run rife and uncontrolled. Remembering that our Constitution requires the maintenance of a system of checks and balances among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, it will take a good deal of thoughtful constitutional study for the legislative branch of the Government to bring the administrative branch within a proper control and at the same time permit it to function as the Constitution contemplated. I have a feeling that a solution for this problem can be found, but it amounts, at this time, to nothing more than a feeling, for the reason that definitive policy will require the application not only of the best legal brains in the Congress to the question but the application of great knowledge of the operation of the Federal Government, which is the particular contribution of the senior Members of the Congress, without regard to party.

Certainly I cannot see how the passage of this legislation will in any way solve the problem. I pointed out in my remarks of December 9 that there is also pending before the Supreme Court of the United States, the case of Polish National Alliance against National Labor Relations Board, and I also referred to this case in my extended and revised remarks of December 13, which appear at page 10648. That case, which is reported in 136 Federal (2d) at 175, being a decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, specifically holds that the insurance business is commerce and that the case of Paul against Virginia and other cases cited by the proponents of this legislation are not controlling. Therefore it follows that even if this legislation were passed, and we must remember that this legislation does not declare that the insurance business is not commerce, but simply declares that the antitrust laws shall not apply to it, it will not prevent the Supreme Court, if it upholds the Polish Alliance case, from finding that the insurance business is commerce. And once such a finding is made, the power of the Congress to regulate the insurance business, as distinguished from the power of the Attorney General's office to bring antitrust actions, will then be clearly established. Consequently, if my colleague from Iowa is afraid of Federal regulation, he must admit that H. R. 3270 is utterly ineffective because it cannot possibly prevent the Supreme Court from deciding that the insurance business is commerce in the Polish Alliance case.

We are therefore confronted with the situation where it must be clear that all of the arguments about Federal regulation and State regulation are utterly irrelevant when addressed to H. R. 3270. That proposed legislation can only have one purpose, namely, to prevent the insurance business from being subject to the antitrust laws. The only reason advanced by the proponents of the legislation and by the spokesman for the insurance companies, a Mr. Williams, in hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the other body, is that the business is of such a nature that monopolistic practices must be permitted to exist and that therefore the antitrust laws should not apply; but if the antitrust laws do not apply and the business is coupled with public interest, it must be regulated, and if there must be regulation, there must be uniform regulation and the regulation must be by a governmental authority which has the power to regulate the business within the scope in which it acts. I do not believe that it is necessary to have Federal regulation, but certainly, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I am not going to be put in a position of saying that if regulation must come from the Congress, I would vote for regulation which would be destructive of the business or of the best interest of the policyholders. No Federal authority can regulate the insurance business until the Congress acts; therefore, when I decry regulation, as a Member of Congress, I admit my inability to draft intelligent regulation which can have embodied in it adequate controls over bureaucratic usurpation of authority.

And, finally, as a Republican, it is incredible to me that I should make this argument against regulation. We Republicans are saying to each other and to other people that we are going to elect a President in 1944; too, we are saying to ourselves and other people that we are going to control the Congress of the United States after the election in 1944. No Federal regulation of the insurance business can possibly be adopted prior to

1945, at which time we are saying, in one breath, that we will be in control of the Government, and in the next, that we are afraid of Federal regulation because it would be oppressive and injurious. What is the matter with Republicans—have we been out of power so long that we can simply do nothing more than to cry out against burdensome governmental regulation, when at the same time and with our next breath, we are saying to the people of the country and to ourselves, we are going to be in control after the election in 1944? Will not the people have the right to say to us, "Well, if you are going to be in control of the Government in 1945, surely you will not even regulate the insurance business, or, if you do, you will not regulate it in a venal or oppressive manner. Yet, you are saying to us, the voters of America, that you are afraid to have the Supreme Court rule upon the question of whether insurance is commerce, because if it holds that insurance is commerce, then it can be subject to Federal regulation enacted by the Congress, but you will be in control of that Congress. Why should we vote for a Party which presents to us such glaring inconsistencies?"

For myself, I refuse, by my vote, to be bound by arguments which, in substance, would have me admitting my incapacity to govern. I do not understand how any Republican can say in one breath that we are going to be in control of the Government of the United States after the election in 1944, and in the next breath, say that we are in favor of this legislation because we fear regulation by a Federal Government of which we are in control. By that argument either we are admitting that we are not going to be elected, which I do not admit, or we are admitting that if we are elected, we will enact bad legislation. Again, this is something which I will not admit.

If my position on this legislation is bad Republican doctrine, then those who think so will have to advance some other arguments than those which I have heard to date.

The Reason Why, As Expressed By a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, so many times we have heard that our boys fighting on the far-flung battle fronts of the world do not know what they are fighting for. I have seriously doubted this contention.

In my many conversations with servicemen I have become convinced that these young men—and women, too—have a pretty good idea of the economic, political, and historical background of this war.

The other day I had an opportunity to visit at quite some length with a warrant officer, junior grade, who is now with the Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces. In the course of our conversation this subject came up, and he permitted me to read a copy of a poem he had recently written.

Woven through his words I could sense that same spirit of adventure that must have stirred the souls of our pioneers. The same disdain of hardship and death and the same undying belief that no matter what happens they have contributed to a cause that will reflect glory on themselves and immeasurable benefits to all mankind.

Seymour S. Guthman is the name of this soldier and poet. Many of us on the Hill knew him when he was a secretary to a Congressman before the war. It is with pleasure that I include his poem in my extension of remarks:

IN MIDST OF BATTLE, A YOUNG SOLDIER SPEAKS

(By Seymour S. Guthman, warrant officer, junior grade)

A rendezvous with Death? Not now!
By my last breath I vow
I shall not die!
For in truth, 'tis Life I seek
On yon blood-soaked peak,
Not Death!
Though the skies are filled
With a thund'rous maze,
And the wind is stilled
In an awful blaze
Of shot and shell
That spits a horrible mass of hell
Too cruel for man or beast to dwell—
I shall not hide away or shy!
For I feel, I feel I cannot die!
If you could know me, you would know
That my very youth's aglow
With feelings firm and muscles strong
That weave and interweave in proud
Caress. They dare not fit a shroud
On these, but Life's eternal song!
But when battle's won and foe is fled,
As the stricken mourners seek their dead
'Midst the horrible silence of gloom—
There in the abyss of doom—
To Death will I manfully say, "Come now,
"I'm ready and eager to keep my vow;
"I've writ finis to the task to do,
"And I'm now prepared for our rendezvous!"
So, when for Freedom I decide to give
This Life, and therewith take eternal leave—
Do not, I pray thee, ever grieve,
For tho it seems I die, I really live!
I live in the thoughts of youth fulfilled,
In the grandeur of hopes that remain serene;
I live—tho my lips are forever stilled—
In those who resolve to complete my dream!
Come now, then, bullet screeching to my heart—
I stand before you as a thing apart!
No fear have I, no trepidation, none—
I stand here peaceful as the setting sun!
The fear of Death I had, I vow, has fled away;
I feel exhilaration, I feel joy, e'en gay;
For a Holy Pact we have, Death and I,
Which says that I may choose when I will die!
When I so choose, I know there will be peace,
And from my petty cares and fears, complete surcease;
I know that Death will take me by the hand
And lead me to a Better Land;
Guide me gently, firm yet mild,
Lead me proudly as a child,
To a lasting haven, a blessed story,
To rest in peace 'til the day of glory!

Ides of March a Taxpayer's Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, centuries ago a soothsayer warned Caesar to beware of the ides of March—March 15.

It is a strange coincidence that today 50,000,000 American tax-paying citizens are approaching this same date with fear and apprehension. These taxpayers do not fear this date because of the amount of taxes due; in fact, the majority of our citizens approach this date with practically no taxes due because of previous payments and withholding. The Treasury estimates that 16,000,000 of our taxpayers have overpaid their taxes and will be eligible for a refund.

Our taxpayers would like to look on this date as a day of annual reckoning or inventorying with their Government. They want to contribute a part of their income to their Government for the protection and blessings which can come only to a free people in a democracy. Then why the fear and the apprehension of the impending and approaching date? The answer is: Our present complex, intricate, and involved tax return.

Since the enactment of the original Federal income-tax statute in 1913, Congress has adopted amendment after amendment on this act until we have a hodgepodge of language that is bewildering to the average taxpayer and cannot be correctly and definitely interpreted even by a Philadelphia lawyer. Our Nation cannot afford to continue the present complicated tax structure. We can and must simplify our tax laws. The day of soothing syrup and palliatives is past. Nothing less than a major operation will suffice. The way to simplify our tax return is to approach the problem realistically and from the taxpayer's standpoint and not from the tax-lawyer's standpoint.

During the past year many suggestions were made for simplifying the tax returns. I offered some of them myself, but the war financing placed extra heavy burdens on the Ways and Means Committee, therefore final action was not completed.

We must be practical, and therefore admit there is nothing that can be done in time to give relief for the date of final filing, March 15, 1944. There are two reasons for this: First, the Treasury must print over 300,000,000 blanks and have them distributed to the taxpayers of the Nation by that date. Second, the returns filed March 15, 1944, are the final returns for the taxable income of the year 1943 and the preliminary return for 1944. Action must commence on simplification of returns for the year 1944. It must begin now. I want to make the following suggestions for study and approval:

First. Simplify and improve current withholding provisions so as to eliminate the need for filing millions of personal income-tax returns. We could adopt a graduated withholding and allow a percentage of income exemption in lieu of exemptions now allowed under section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code. This section allows deductions for taxes, interest, and contributions. The suggested change, if properly drawn, would eliminate the filing of between thirty and forty million returns.

Second. Combine existing personal income taxes into one set of exemptions and one set of rates. Under existing law we have one base and varying rates and exemptions for the regular income tax and a separate base rate for the Victory-tax exemption. Every taxpayer must wade through this nightmare of confusion in order to determine his liability. We can, and should, combine these taxes into one and establish an equitable base and rate that would provide needed revenue.

Third. Repeal earned-income credit. There is sound argument for retaining the earned-income credit, but its retention greatly complicates our tax return and is of little actual benefit to the taxpayer. Under existing law there is a maximum benefit of $84 on an earned income of $14,000. On small incomes, the benefit is inconsequential.

Our tax structure and tax return is now so complex that there is danger of it strangling itself in its own maze of regulations and legal phraseology. Most important of all is its present effect on our taxpayers' morale. There is grave danger that they will become so confused and bewildered that it will result in the break-down of our whole income-tax structure. This could, and would, be most damaging to our war effort on the home front. The present income-tax problem is a very personal one. Not many years ago only a small percentage of our population were directly affected. Today, however, over 50,000,000 of our citizens are directly affected in that they must file returns.

When over 40 percent of our population are directly concerned about a tax matter it must be given immediate consideration. The tax laws and returns must be given immediate consideration. The tax laws and returns must be simplified. It is our No. 1 tax job, and is on the must list.

Be Careful What You Do to Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks earlier today I suggested that Members of the House do a little "home work" during the holidays and study the effect of certain additional amendments to the renegotiation statute that have been proposed in the tax bill as it is being reported in another body since it left the House of Representatives.

I desire, at this time, to call attention, particularly, to the amendment that would make mandatory an exemption for so-called standard commercial articles.

MAKING MANDATORY EXEMPTION OF STANDARD COMMERCIAL ARTICLES

The desire to reduce the area of renegotiation by eliminating cases where it is not necessary is commendable. We can all join in any move to throw out cases where excessive profits do not arise.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House wisely, I thought, proposed giving the Price Adjustment Board the right to exempt contracts on standard commercial articles where it was clear that substantial conditions of competition existed and where the volume of the war orders did not create an abnormal and excessive profit.

The revenue bill, as it left the House, provided a definition of standard commercial articles to provide an effective method for the exercise of this discretionary exemption.

Now, however, it is proposed to make the exemption mandatory.

This, possibly, is the most unfortunate of the amendments to the House bill and it betrays a basic misunderstanding of the nature of many excessive profits in wartime orders. For abnormal profits do not arise solely from the absence of competition; they arise also out of the very great size of the orders. They arise out of volume. This fact is made shockingly clear by the following table, which I have obtained from the price adjustment agencies. Study it carefully.

Analysis of sales and profits of certain "standard goods" industries, the component companies having been renegotiated

	Average, 1936-39	1942	Increase	Percent increase
Perishable tools (19 companies):				
Sales	$29,418,000	$172,011,000	$142,593,000	485
Profit before renegotiation and taxes	$5,025,000	$62,010,000	$56,985,000	1,134
Percent profit	17.1	40.0	22.9	128
Woolen textiles (25 companies):				
Sales	$98,030,000	$237,782,000	$139,752,000	143
Profit before renegotiation and taxes	$3,245,000	$31,985,000	$28,740,000	885
Percent profit	3.5	13.5	10.2	309
Lumber (10 companies):				
Sales	$42,228,000	$106,677,000	$64,449,000	153
Profit before renegotiation and taxes	$4,991,000	$25,908,000	$20,917,000	419
Percent profit	11.8	26.1	14.3	121
Cotton textiles (53 companies):				
Sales	$207,185,000	$548,633,000	$341,448,000	165
Profit before renegotiation and taxes	$8,467,000	$76,209,000	$67,742,000	800
Percent profit	4.1	13.9	9.8	239

These figures will stand reading a second or third time. They tell the story.

In the field of perishable tools volume for the 10 companies renegotiated went up 485 percent and shot their profits up to 1,134 percent of their pre-war average.

Where their profit was 17.1 percent of sales before the war, it became 40 percent of sales in 1942. That was a net increase of 22.9 percent, or an increase of 128 percent on their pre-war rate of profit.

Try to explain that to one of your taxpaying, bond-buying farmers if you make mandatory the exemption of tools—standard commercial articles.

CONSIDER COTTON TEXTILES

Or look at the last group—cotton textiles—who have been working right along in their normal activity, producing a standard commercial article.

The volume of sales for the 53 companies in 1942 shot up to $548,000,000 on war business—an increase of 165 percent on their pre-war $207,000,000 average.

There is nothing wrong with that, of course. We wanted them to increase their output. But that greater volume increased their profits from a pre-war average of $8,467,000 to $76,209,000—an increase of over $67,000,000, or 800 percent.

The average pre-war profit was 4.1 percent of sales, and they made money; the 1942 figure was 13.9 percent on the greatly increased volume. On a war-created business more than two and one-half times their pre-war business in volume their rate of profit increased 239 percent.

You explain why a class of business should make on its war business more than three times the rate of return that it did on its peacetime business—doing the same kind of work that it had previously done.

When this table is broken down and you take individual companies, the figures are even more startling.

Bibb Manufacturing, which appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, makes duck, webbing, twine, tile fabrics, and twills—articles almost identical with pre-war production of webbing yarns, printed cloth, and sheeting. Its 1942 business was about three times its average pre-war sales, 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

Net profit before Federal income taxes averaged $1,196,000 or 7.3 percent of sales for the base period years, compared with $12,593,000 or 25.5 percent of sales for fiscal 1942; net profit after taxes averaged $1,035,000 or 5.6 percent of net worth for the base period years and $4,033,000 or 18.7 percent of net worth in the fiscal year ending in 1942. The company's net worth has increased from $17,221,000 at September 1, 1936 to $21,582,000 at August 31, 1941. With greatly increased tax rates in the year 1942, the

company has over three times the rate of profit on net worth that it had in the base period. Despite the payment of large dividends—$7,700,000 from 1936 through 1942—the company's net worth has increased over $4,000,000 in the 7-year period.

I am advised that the New York office of the Price Adjustment Section of the Quartermaster Corps has proposed a refund of $1,400,000 with respect to the fiscal year ending August 31, 1942. The company has rejected this proposal and the case is now pending as an impasse in the War Department Price Adjustment Board.

The service's proposed refund, as will be noted, leaves the company a total dollar profit before taxes for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1942, of $11,193,000, or more than it earned from 1936 to 1941, inclusive. It leaves the company a profit after taxes of $1,093,000 on $10,962,000 of adjusted renegotiable sales, or 9.9 percent.

OR TIMKEN'S PROBLEM

Another company that has been vociferous against renegotiation is Timken-Detroit Axle Co., represented before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee by Mr. Willard F. Rockwell. This company's wartime products are substantially the same as its peacetime products, having been adapted for service use. During the calendar years 1936–39 on sales averaging $20,210,000 per year the company realized an average profit, before taxes, of $2,116,000 or 10.5 percent. During its fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, on war business amounting to $49,557,000, the company realized a profit, before taxes, amounting to $16,572,000, or 33.4 percent. The company's total profit in its fiscal year 1942 after taxes but before renegotiation would amount to $8,237,000 or 52.6 percent of net worth as compared with its average profit after taxes amounting to $1,904,000 in the years 1936–39.

OR ONE OF THE TOOL MAKERS

Still another company which complained about renegotiation before the House Ways and Means Committee is Vinco Corporation, whose war business is substantially the same as its peacetime business, its products including tools, gages, and dies. The facilities used by this company at the end of 1942 totaled $1,415,000. It is significant that of this amount $1,000,000 represented facilities built and owned by the Defense Plant Corporation and emergency facilities valued at $350,000 under certificates of necessity.

In other words, of the $1,415,000 only $65,000 represented the company's own plant not subject to special privileges.

In 1942 the company's prices on standard items were maintained at O. P. A. ceilings. In 1942 sales were $5,288,000 on which the company realized profits before taxes amounting to $1,730,000, or 32.7 percent. Included were renegotiable sales amounting to $4,292,000, on which the company realized profits before taxes amounting to $1,456,000, or 34 percent.

During the years 1936–39 company's average sales were $159,000, on which it realized an average profit before taxes of $11,000, or 6.9 percent.

In other words, on renegotiable sales amounting, during 1942, to approximately 27 times the average of the years 1936–39 the company realized a profit before taxes amounting to 133 times the average of the prior years.

In making this comparison it should be borne in mind that new capital to the extent of $488,000 was added to the business between January 1, 1940 and the end of 1942. The company's net worth increased from $70,000 on December 31, 1939 to $1,203,000 as of December 31, 1942. Of this increase $488,000 represents new capital and $645,000 represents the profits of the intervening years less dividends amounting to $13,000 in 1940, $113,000 in 1941, and $148,000 in 1942.

At the same time salaries of the company's principal executives increased from $20,000 in 1940 to $71,000 in 1941, and $145,000 in 1942. In its consideration of the case the War Department Price Adjustment Board felt that 1942 salaries were excessive to the extent of $50,000, and consequently disallowed such amount for purposes of renegotiation.

The company's profit in 1942, after taxes but before refund, would have amounted to $480,000, which was 75 percent of its net worth at the start of the year, and one and one-half times the greatest net profit, after taxes, ever realized by the company.

WHEN THE UNITED STATES TAKES THE RISKS

The last-mentioned case also illustrates another factor that is easily overlooked in discussing wartime profits. In this war the Federal Government is taking a large part of capital risks.

Through building of facilities and plants, direct aid, and so-called expediting of production, the Government has invested over $15,000,000,000. The great volume of sales which some of the contractors have turned out has been made possible in many cases by the use of these Government facilities.

The manufacturer thus avoids the property taxes, depreciation, and capital risk which justify his ordinary rate of return.

Relieved of these costs and risks, should his rate of return on a greatly increased volume be more than on his pre-war and nonwar business?

Answer that and you will know what your attitude should be toward the amendment which would make mandatory exemption from renegotiation of all contracts in standard commercial articles, regardless of the size of the order and regardless of who furnishes the plant and the facilities.

The keeping of wartime profits within due bounds is not an easy problem; it is not a simple problem. We cannot escape it, however, and we cannot escape our responsibility to the boys and girls, the men and women of today and tomorrow, to keep from their backs the burden of paying taxes to liquidate excessive prices paid to makers of extraordinary profits on war contracts.

Alphabetical Agencies Created Under the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am inserting herewith a letter that our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] addressed to Mr. E. M. Biggers, of Houston, Tex., on May 4, last, and Mr. Biggers' reply:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1943.

Mr. E. M. BIGGERS,
Houston, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. BIGGERS: I am in receipt of your statement concerning the alphabetical agencies created under the Roosevelt New Deal Party.

I would like to know just what line of business you are engaged in. In the next place I would like to know whether or not you would prefer going back to the conditions which existed in every line of business in 1930–33, when Mr. Roosevelt took charge as President of the United States.

I would then be in a better position to give serious consideration to what you have to say in your statement.

Yours very sincerely,

H. P. FULMER,
Member of Congress.

On June 5, 1943, Mr. Biggers replied to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], as follows:

BIGGERS PRINTING CO.,
Houston, Tex., June 5, 1943.

Hon. H. P. FULMER,
Congressman from South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On May 4 I had a letter from you relative to the alphabetical agencies created under the Roosevelt New Deal Party. Am sorry I could not answer sooner.

I did not send you the folder. It was sent by someone else. For many months I had been wondering about the number of these bureaus. Either there was no record of them, or those in charge did not want to give the information, so I decided to get it.

After printing a limited number to give to friends I thought might also be interested in seeing such a list, I became a bit uncertain, and sent out only a few copies as a feeler to names taken at random from my local mailing list. The response overwhelmed me. By noon the second day I had calls for more than 5,000; before these could be printed the requests had grown into the thousands; and at this date I am nearing the 200,000 mark—every one asked for. I shall continue to bear the burden of supplying free to those willing to distribute and who ask for them.

I have received more than 2,000 letters, and yours is the only one critical. They come from every walk of life and every section of the Nation—small-town merchants about to fold up, large manufacturers fearful of what is in store, postal cards, R. F. D. numbers, farmers, cooperatives, and just plain citizens.

Senators, Congressmen, Governors—those high in the ranks of both parties—have written for copies for distribution. All ask that they be billed for the cost, or enclose checks. A money order for $2 from the mother of three boys in the armed forces—one in Africa, one

in the south Pacific, and the youngest in a Texas training camp. She attempted to carry on the filling-station business her boys had to give up. The O. P. A. was so hard-boiled she closed the business—"improper handling of gas-rationing coupons." It has been my information that no two of these bureaucrats have ever been able to agree on how they want anything handled.

What do you suppose her boys are going to think of that bureau when they return, if they do, from fighting for America?

I have returned every contribution and shall continue to do so. The records are open for the inspection of anyone you care to designate. You will be astounded at the comments. Taxpayers associations in three States; educational groups; the secretary of the South Texas Press Association wrote for 200 copies, and in a few days asked for 350 more to supply the demands.

I am convinced the people in America are awakening to the dangers involved in these damnable bureaus, every one of which at this very minute is high-pressuring the Congress for larger and larger appropriations, not for war purposes, though some of them are so camouflaged, but solely for the benefit of the self-seeking politicians operating them, and who are not interested that our Nation is engaged in a life struggle and too busy to guard the rat holes.

I have but one purpose in supplying these folders: I want to do something to put our Government back into the hands of the people and their duly elected representatives, and to restore faith and confidence in the minds and hearts of the people in their Government. Can this be done under the Roosevelt New Deal Party?

An attempt was made to liquidate the N. Y. A. The War Manpower Commission was created with McNutt in charge, and, according to newspaper reports, the first thing he did was to pick up the N. Y. A. bodily and carry it over to the new board—not a day lost, not a cent saved the taxpayers; another board took care of the faithful.

We see every day where some defeated new dealer is placed in a better-paying Government job than his home voters ousted him from. There's Josh Lee, of Oklahoma; an attempt to pay off Jimmie Allred, of Texas; Flynn, and Brown, and so on down the line. You know them better than I do. Will Congress awaken to such practices before it is too late? Is the Roosevelt New Deal party allowing evil influences to hide behind a false cry of "War" while the Nation is being plundered?

You ask who I am and what line of work I am engaged in. I am the head of a small but very modern printing company. Do not own one dime of stock in any other corporation; draw a modest salary; am able to get along comfortably, and hope to retire in a few years—unless the New Deal party gets us all in reverse.

As to your question, "Whether or not you would prefer going back to the conditions which existed in every line of business in 1930–32 when Mr. Roosevelt took charge as President of the United States."

That is a fair question and I shall answer it sincerely: Yes; I would prefer what we had when Mr. Roosevelt took charge to what we have now, and I am not referring to the war part.

Then we had distress, but we had our rights, we had our liberties, we had our self-respect, we had our initiative, we had self-confidence. We had faith in our Government, and faith in our ability to come out of the depression. The "gimmie" era had not blossomed.

We did not have verboten signs at every turn; we had not been fingerprinted, numbered, regimented. We had not been told where we could work, when we could work, and for what salary we could work. We had not been told what we could plant, how much of the crop we could harvest, where we could sell it, and for what price we could sell it. We had not been told what we could buy, when we could buy it, where we could buy it, and the number of points we had to pay for it.

Had the people of America been warned of the ultimate cost of the hypocritical generosity of those experimenters in Washington, such a foolish program would never have been allowed. But like old age, it crept upon us so slowly and was fed to us so adroitly that we were enmeshed in the coils before we realized what was happening.

Then we were individually burdened with debts, but now look at what we are collectively burdened with, and in addition we have all these damn bureaus on our backs.

Yes; I would prefer a system that allowed me to buy that for which I did not have the money to pay, than a system that forbid me to buy that for which I did have the money to pay. I object to regimentation; object to being ruled by a bunch of fantailed theorists who are attacking everything that has made America great—even the geography, the calendar, the clock, and the unchangeable law of supply and demand.

It is easy to rebuild our lost fortunes, but liberties and human rights once taken away are not easily recaptured.

I note you are chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and as I have long been active in that line, am making some observations:

I objected then and I object now to the slaughtering of some 6,200,000 pigs; hundreds of thousands of brood sows; more than 800,000 dairy cows, not even allowing the hides to be saved because that would lower the price of leather, when at that time shoes were so high most people could not afford a new pair. I objected to destroying hundreds of thousands of acres of growing farm products, the essentials and necessities of life. All this with millions hungry and unclothed. Somehow I feel that God will punish those who do such foolish things.

I protested to our Congressman when two new post offices were erected in this county—right in the midst of cheap gas, cheap and abundant fuel oil—and the heating plants were designed and installed requiring hard coal from Pennsylvania and other States. John L. Lewis was in the saddle, and the railroad boys were whooping it up for more rail tonnage. The New Deal party graciously complied.

Was it right, sensible, or honest? It was extravagant.

We have boards, bureaus, and commissions to deal with production, and we have boards, bureaus, and commissions to deal with surpluses along the same lines. That does not make sense. The real burdensome surplus we have is that of boards, bureaus, and commissions, and a surplus of political gangsters living off the efforts of the producers and the farmers. All the farmer asks is a market, and he will find a way to produce.

I am getting along well in years and have gone through several depressions, some of them much worse than this one, but none so deliberately and purposely drawn out. The others got going in a short time. I lost something like a quarter of a million dollars in this depression, but I did not blame the Government. If this depression had been left alone it would have corrected itself, as the others did. But the New Deal party had to call in a bunch of supereconomists, guinea pig experimenters, and it has been prolonged needlessly.

The Roosevelt New Deal party will go down in history for just what it is: A rotten, selfish, plundering, political machine. I do not believe that any true Democrat can go along with the Kelley-Nash-Mead-Flynn-Hague outfit—every one of them a front-rank new dealer.

The whole policy of the Roosevelt New Deal party seems to be to upset everything that is proven. We were wrong yesterday, therefore we are right today because we are different. If things are scarce we shall make them too plentiful; and if plentiful we shall make them too scarce. If prices are high we shall make them too low, and if low we shall make them too high.

I have in my possession a list of large landowners in Texas who were paid $5,000 and more per year for not producing crops. Many of them are big ranches, insurance companies, and corporations that never did produce crops. Others were paid more for allowing their land to lie idle than they could have made by working it. The tenants went to the cities and got on relief, the lands grew up in Johnson grass and weeds, and thousands of rich bottom farms are now ruined for all time—a high price the landowner paid for New Deal relief.

At the very time our cotton industry was at its lowest ebb, the largest cotton concern in the world (Anderson, Clayton Co., of Houston) began erecting modern gins (electric), oil mills, compresses, and great cotton plantations in Mexico and South American countries, taking away America's cotton business because we were paying a bonus for not producing while foreign countries were paying a bounty to produce. Another indictment that the New Deal party paid a premium on laziness and put a penalty on thrift.

I fear the confusion, turmoil, and strife now prevalent is for a sinister purpose, and that it has been deliberately planned by those who brought forth such bureaus as the N. Y. A., the U. S. E. S., and others equally vicious. There may be those who want things to get out of control so that martial law can be invoked. That will be the final step to a dictator.

I love my country, love its past, I love what its future can be. The same methods that made America great can make it even greater. I have fear of what is in store unless those of you in charge at Washington take back to Congress the control you have surrendered to the President and these selfish bureaus and agencies. I pray that you be given the courage to do so.

With kindest regards to you personally, and the highest possible faith in our Congress to do the right thing when you are given the light to guide you, I am

Yours truly,

E. M. BIGGERS.

At this point I desire to insert a list of 104 parent boards and bureaus created under the New Deal from which it is reported that 2,241 lesser organizations have sprung. The list of the parent organizations follows. This list was compiled by Mr. Biggers:

F. W. A.—Federal Works Agency.
N. R. A.—National Recovery Act.
N. I. R. A.—National Industrial Recovery Administration.
U. S. M. C.—United States Maritime Commission.
H. O. L. C.—Home Owners' Loan Corporation
A. A. A.—Agricultural Adjustment Agency.
C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps.
N. Y. A.—National Youth Administration.
S. S. B.—Social Security Board.
B. W. C.—Board of War Communications.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
F. S. A.—Federal Securities Administration.
N. A. C.—National Archives Council.
T. N. A.—The National Archives.

N. L. R. B.—National Labor Relations Board.
N. H. P. C.—National Historical Publications Commission.
N. M. B.—National Mediation Board.
U. S. H. A.—United States Housing Authority.
U. S. E. S.—United States Employment Service.
F. I. C.—Federal Insurance Corporation.
C. W. A.—Civil Works Administration.
R. A.—Resettlement Administration.
F. P. H. A.—Federal Public Housing Authority.
F. H. A.—Federal Housing Administration.
C. C. C.—Commodity Credit Corporation.
F. C. I. C.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
F. S. A.—Farm Security Administration.
S. C. S.—Soil Conservation Service.
A. M. A.—Agricultural Marketing Administration.
F. R. E. B.—Federal Real Estate Board.
C. E. S.—Committee on Economic Security.
W. P. A.—Works Progress Administration.
F. C. C.—Federal Communications Commission.
O. B. C. C. C.—Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers Council.
R. R. B.—Railroad Retirement Board.
S. E. C.—Securities and Exchange Commission.
T. V. A.—Tennessee Valley Authority.
B. I. R.-T.—Board of Investigation and Research—Transporation.
C. A. A.—Civil Aeronautics Authority.
N. I. C.—National Investors Council.
D. P. C.—Defense Plant Corporation.
R. R. C.—Rubber Reserve Company.
M. R. C.—Metals Reserve Company.
D. S. C.—Defense Supplies Corporation.
W. D. C.—War Damage Corporation.
D. L. C.—Disaster Loan Corporation.
F. N. M. A.—Federal National Mortgage Association.
R. A. C. C.—Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
C. F. B.—Combined Food Board.
U. N. R. R. A.—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.
A. O. A.—Administration of Operation Activities.
E. I. B. W.—Export-Import Bank of Washington.
E. H. F. A.—Electric Home and Farm Authority.
C. P. A.—Council of Personnel Administration.
P. R. A.—Public Roads Administration.
E. P. C. A.—Emergency Price Control Act.
F. P. A.—Food Production Administration.
O. E. S.—Office of Economic Stabilization.
P. A. W.—Petroleum Administration for War.
S. W. P. C.—Smaller War Plants Corporation.
P. I. W. C.—Petroleum Industry War Council.
N. R. P. B.—National Resources Planning Board.
L. O. P. M.—Liaison Office for Personnel Management.
O. E. M.—Office for Emergency Management.
S. S. S.—Selective Service System.
N. W. L. B.—National War Labor Board.
O. C. D.—Office of Civilian Defense.
O. C. I. A. A.—Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
O. D. H. W. S.—Office of Defense and Health Welfare Services.
O. D. T.—Office of Defense Transportation.
O. L. L. A.—Office of Lend-Lease Administration.
O. S. R. D.—Office of Scientific Research and Development.
O. W. I.—Office of War Information.
W. M. C.—War Manpower Commission.
W. P. B.—War Production Board.
W. R. A.—War Relocation Authority.
W. S. A.—War Shipping Administration.
O. P. A.—Office of Price Administration.
B. E. W.—Board of Economic Warfare.
N. H. A.—National Housing Agency.
F. C. A.—Farm Credit Administration.
R. E. A.—Rural Electrification Administration.
S. A.—Sugar Agency.
P. C. D.—Petroleum Conservation Division.
O. P. C. W.—Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.
W. E. P. L.—War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc.
B. C. D.—Bituminous Coal Division.
P. R. R. A.—Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
B. P. A.—Bonneville Power Administration.
N. P. P. C.—National Power Policy Committee.
O. C.—Office of Censorship.
F. R. C.—Facilities Review Committee.
P. W. R. C. B.—President's War Relief Control Board.
C. E. A.—Commodity Exchange Administration.
S. M. A.—Surplus Marketing Administration.
F. S. C. C.—Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.
F. F. C.—Foreign Funds Control.
P. R. P.—Production Requirements Plan.
C. R. M. B.—Combined Raw Materials Board.
C. M. B.—Combined Munitions Board.
C. S. A. B.—Combined Shipping Adjustment Board.
C. P. R. B.—Combined Production and Resources Board.
C. C. S.—Combined Chiefs of Staff.
P. W. A.—Public Works Administration.

How does this orgy of bureaucracy and spending square with what Candidate Roosevelt said in a speech delivered at Sioux City, Iowa, in September 1932, when first a candidate? He then said:

> I accuse the present (Hoover) administration of being the greatest spending administration * * * in all our history, one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayers.

And again in his Brooklyn speech, of November in the same year, when he said:

> The people in America demand a reduction of Federal expenditure. It can be accomplished by reducing the expenditures of existing departments, by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions, and by consolidating many activities of government.

Or again, when in September 1932 he said to the people of Montana:

> But remember well, that attitude—the way we do things—is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

When Mr. Roosevelt took over the reins of Federal Government on March 3, 1933, the national debt was approximately $18,000,000,000. Since that time the national debt has increased almost 1,000 percent, and it is predicted that by July 1, 1945, our debt will have increased by 2,000 to 3,000 percent. Do not be deceived This enormous increase in our national debt is not altogether due to the war, because Mr. Roosevelt had trebled our national debt before Pearl Harbor. We can, in the next 200 years, pay this debt through industry, sweat, and frugality, but it will mean a lower living standard for all our people.

The worst feature of the New Deal, as I see it, lies in the impairment of morale. For years our people have been told that the less they produced the more they would have; that the national debt was, in fact, not a debt, because we owed it to ourselves, and we were taught to look to the Government in Washington to do for us the things that we could and should do for ourselves. And to think that a majority of our people were so gullible as to believe it.

At this point I desire to call to the attention of the House a creed for America's salvation, which appeared in the Land O' Lakes News a year or so ago:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

While the future appears dark, it is by no means hopeless. America can be saved by a return to sound principles of government and by practicing self-denial. While the road ahead is tortuous and hard, we will surmount the difficulties that lie before us, but we can only do so by scrapping the New Deal and all that the New Deal stands for in the American way of life. The New Deal is as alien to American institutions as it is repugnant to the principles of sound government.

It is not surprising that Mr. Roosevelt would have us forget the term "New Deal" and substitute therefor some such phrase as "Win the War." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, to win the war has been the motto and aim of all other loyal Americans since Pearl Harbor, so he is just getting in step with the rest of us. At long last all are now in step on our march on Berlin and Tokyo.

Renegotiation of War Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD the reporter's transcript of my statement before the Ways and Means Committee, during the committee's hearings on the renegotiation of

war contracts, together with the ensuing questions and answers. The matter follows:

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, your committee deserves the thanks of every American for conducting these hearings. You have been tackling one of the most baffling problems of government in war, and that is getting what the military needs, when it needs it, without paying somebody an excessive price for it. You had to cut short your vacation to get back here for these hearings, and you have been very patient and conscientious in conducting them. You have been hearing from industry, and you have heard from the procurement agencies. I want to discuss with you our part in the problem as legislators.

You on the Ways and Means Committee have the job of raising money that we on the Appropriations Committee spend. Yours can never be a simple or easy job; ours could be a simple job—simply dish it out; and sometimes I suspect that is what you think we do. But that makes ours a silly job. Our real job, I have thought, was to spend the money wisely; our real job, I have thought, was to place the money where it was needed and to safeguard it as far as possible against excessive expenditure, even in wartime. From that point of view, then, of our mutual responsibility as legislators, I wish briefly to review the background of renegotiation and to suggest some amendments to the present statute.

The renegotiation statute developed out of a factual situation. After the fall of France, the President asked and the Congress approved the largest defense appropriations in our peacetime history. In 1941 we reported from the subcommittee of which I am a member, and the Congress passed, a War Department bill for more than $10,000,000,000. That fall and winter, before and after December 7, we passed seven supplemental defense bills, all for billions of dollars. There was no hesitation; although there was, as you recall, an attempt to avoid the profit scandals of World War No. 1, which were based upon the old cost-plus contracts. There was an attempt to avoid them by the development of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. But by the time we took up the sixth supplemental bill in March 1942 evidence was piling up that huge profits were being made on defense contracts. There was one company which had business, on which the payments were completed before April 28, 1942—the date of the statute—which had business totaling $51,000,000. Their profits were $31,700,000. They had a capital stock of $1,371,000. In other words, their profits were $31,000,000, their capital stock was $1,371,000.

Other instances like that came to our attention. The Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and the Truman committee were turning in stories that made Americans mad. The Girl Scouts were gathering in old newspapers to sell for salvage at 80 cents a hundred pounds. Newsboys were asking their customers to take their change in War stamps. Yet the very newspapers that they handled carried stories like that of the representative of the Todd Shipbuilding Corporation that their net profits were so large they needed a steam shovel to handle them, or that of the Jack & Heintz case, where a stenographer was paid $39,000 in a month. Bond sales fell off, and the Treasury said we would have to start ringing doorbells, as you remember.

When these matters were discussed with the procurement agencies, they pointed out it was impossible to purchase everything on a hurry-up basis and be too fussy about the contract price. First of all, there was the time element. Some things we had to have in a hurry, regardless of the contract price. Second, there was a lack of cost knowledge. Many new things were to be built or made by firms who had never made them before. Third, there was a fear of a rise in the general price level of wages, raw materials, and transportation. All these things, coupled with a mounting shortage of labor, created a sellers' market and the Government procurement officers were at its mercy. It might also be added that just as a lot of manufacturers were making and selling in fields and on a scale they had never before known, so a lot of Government buyers were buying in fields and on a scale they had never seen before. There was inexperience on both sides.

Now, then, when the Appropriations Committee asked about costs and asked about getting prices down, we were met by the stubborn fact that these conditions existed and the equally stubborn fact that the job must be done. The thing had to go ahead. The war effort could not be slowed down. No one could tell in advance what economies might come about, what skills might develop, and what changes could produce savings. In the meantime, in February 1942 the Supreme Court had handed down the decision in the case of *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Co., Fore River Shipbuilding Corporation, Union Iron Works*, and also *United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation* v. *Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation*, in which it was held that, regardless of how excessive or unconscionable war profits might be, once final payment had been made and a certificate of final settlement issued, the Government could not recover. The case was a shipbuilding case that grew out of World War No. 1. The Court said that if the Government wished to revise a price on the grounds of excessive profits, it must establish the right before the contract had been settled, and that it was up to Congress, not to the courts, to establish the right. That decision carried this sentence:

"But if the Executive is in need of additional laws by which to protect the Nation against war profiteering, the Constitution has given to Congress, not to this Court, the power to make them."

That decision was called to the attention of Congress in various ways. Personally, I saw some comment on it in editorials in various newspapers and, to meet the situation we faced when we were considering the sixth supplemental appropriation bill, proposed renegotiation. The original proposal merely said that none of the money appropriated should be available to make final payment and settle contracts until the contractor had filed a certificate of costs with a satisfactory renegotiation agreement. That was an attempt to avoid overpayment and to provide an opportunity for the Government to pay for war goods on the basis of determined costs. The amendment originally offered to the sixth supplemental bill, as you know, was considerably expanded and developed in the Senate into the basic renegotiation statute and subsequently amended in the revenue act last fall.

Today I have reviewed this because I wanted to bring out the point that in proposing renegotiation it was an attempt to meet an emergency situation. It was an attempt to help this committee solve the problems you have in financing the war effort. Obviously when it came to the attention of the Appropriations Committee that the money we were asked to appropriate would be available to complete payment on contracts where excessive and unconscionable profits were being made, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not try to keep the door open so that the Government could protect itself against the payment of excessive profits.

Thus it will be seen that the renegotiation statute was developed to meet a practical situation. If it had been possible to have normal competitive conditions, there would have been no need for it. The war made a monopoly for whoever could produce, or could be induced to try to produce, what was needed. It is not a peacetime statute and was never so intended. But, as the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania, Mr. DITTER, has said, when the conference report was adopted April 21, 1942, the legislation came within the category of what Justice Cardozo described as "statutes designed to meet the fugitive exigencies of the hour." And on that same occasion, when the conference report came back I said that we should not go back and tell the people that we had solved the problem of handling excessive war profits or excessive prices, and that I hoped some committee would give further consideration to the details and improve the statute as time went on. That, Mr. Chairman, your committee is now doing and, as I said earlier, your committee is to be commended for it.

In my opinion, time and experience have demonstrated certain changes that should be made. Before stating them, however, let me comment briefly on three proposals that seem to me to be difficult if not impossible of acceptance.

First of all, of course, has been the agitation for repeal, leaving recapture to the excess-profits tax law. This has been advocated largely, I think, either by persons who were unacquainted with the situation out of which the statute grew and the condition it was designed to meet, or by persons who wanted to retain some excessive profits. I might say, in that connection, that last year I believe every Member of Congress received a long telegram from one firm, and also received a beautifully illustrated brochure describing the renegotiation statute from this point of view and urging that the statute be repealed. In my district, at least, some State legislators were sent long telegrams urging them to write me asking for a repeal of the statute.

This contractor was and is a very efficient producer—and I do not want anything I say to be taken as a criticism of his plant or what the production business as a whole has done, because his plant has been doing a good job; industry as a whole has been doing a good job—but in this particular instance, it developed that the invested private capital was about $1,800,000, whereas the Government had invested about $28,000,000, and he wanted to make equal money on it all. His largest salary in any year prior to receiving Government war contracts was $35,000; many years it had been $15,000. His annual volume of business was about $1,000,000. But after the Government invested its money and gave him war contracts that boosted his volume to $60,000,000, he put his salary up to $530,000. His complaint was that the renegotiators wanted to make a different rate of profit for him on what he had invested himself and what the Government had invested. So those State legislators in my district were approached on the ground that, if he was not permitted to make large profits, the State corporation tax would suffer. I wrote back to them and explained the situation. Then I said, "It is a strange theory that a firm should be permitted to make excessive profits on war contracts and the Government pay the bill so that the State could share in the loot."

I have always wondered if the expense of the telegrams to the legislators and to the Members of Congress were charged as a part of his operating costs.

So, it is because some of the opposition to the statute comes from people who do not understand it, and some from people who have selfish motives, that I believe the committee should go into the subject very thoroughly before they consider repeal. Not by a mere expression of opinion, but only by an examination of capital structure and prewar earnings, can a company's true war profits

be determined. Certainly no one will advocate repeal that would leave excessive and unconscionable war profits where they could not be touched.

In addition to that, repeal at this time would present a practical problem. You have some companies renegotiated, doing business on a competitive basis with other companies where the renegotiation has not been completed. Repeal with some contracts renegotiated and others not, would mean a discrimination that would be impossible to justify. Moreover, any tax recapture law would have to be retroactive and would be subject to the same objection that has been advanced against that feature in the renegotiation statute, or run afoul of the Bethlehem decision if final settlement had been made.

It is to be remembered of course, that we did not have the present excessive profits-tax law when renegotiation was adopted, and, of course, there has been some misunderstanding about that. As you gentlemen know, the actual levy when post-war refunds are considered, I understand, is 72 and not 80 or 90 percent, as some have thought. Now, the details of the excess-profits-tax law, of course, are known much better to your committee than they are to me. I wonder if some member of the committee, Mr. Chairman, would care to say whether the excess-profits-tax law makes any distinction between profits made on the private capital invested and on the Government capital invested.

Mr. KNUTSON. No.

Mr. CASE. It makes no distinction?

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. CASE. It merges them all together. The reason I raise that question is because the Government has made large investments, has turned these facilities over to private companies to operate, and their income return is based upon their over-all profit. Not merely that, but we have also appropriated large sums for expediting production and that constitutes another charge on the Government which results in giving to industry substantially larger than normal profits. In the War Department appropriation bill which we passed this past summer there was $1,300,000,000 for expediting production. This does not show up in the cost price of the particular items manufactured, but is an additional amount that the War Department used for special tooling, or something of that sort, to expedite production as they found it desirable in any particular case. Is private industry or is the Government entitled to the profits and savings that result?

This illustrates a basic objection to relying upon an ordinary excess-profits tax. It goes to the nature of the profits. It is difficult to distinguish between the profits on war contracts and those on a normal basis when a flat percentage rate is used.

Moreover, as Mr. Baruch has forcefully pointed out, a percentage-of-profits tax is inflationary and tends to spiral prices. The more the job costs, the greater the total in dollars left to the contractor in percentage; 10 percent on $100,000 is only $10,000, but 10 percent on $1,000,000 is $100,000 and on $50,000,000 it is $5,000,000, and war contracts, by their very size, often mean tremendous profits on a very small percentage basis.

Now, any proposal that threatens to leave vast profits on war contracts in the hands of contractors is a threat to the security of independent business in America after the war; for, if there is one thing on which public opinion is united, it is that this is not to be a millionaires' war. And that point needs no argument. There is not a member of your committee, Mr. Chairman, who has not publicly and repeatedly sworn that if war ever came to America again there would be no profiteering if he could prevent it, and I am sure that represents your conviction today. You would not be tackling this problem the way you are if you did not feel that way. I doubt if anyone who examines the actual figures in the cases that have come before you or those in the files of the Price Adjustment Boards would attempt to justify the profits that some manufacturers would retain if left solely to the operations of the excess-profits-tax law.

A second proposal has been renegotiation after taxes. To this, three objections appear. First, there is the inflationary effect previously noted, of any percentage-of-profits formula. Second is the fact that such a plan would make Uncle Sam's war funds pay the taxes of many industries that should be paid out of their normal business. And, third, is the fact that such a proposal would take from the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress the power to levy taxes and in effect, delegate that to an executive agency.

A third proposal for a reconversion allowance raises a very important and worthy question, but, in my opinion, it is a different question than that of proper pricing for war contracts. There are three classes of business in this country today: One is that which has been utterly ruined or destroyed by the war. The retail automobile industry is an example. The second is that which has been injured some and helped some by the war. The third is that which has been made by the war. To allow those businesses which have been either helped or made by the war to get an extraordinary price from the Government for that business and then retain it as a special post-war cushion is highly discriminatory.

Should firms expanded by Government investment also be given post-war credits on the Government's investments in their business? It might be possible by a formula to determine how much a firm should keep, but it is utterly unfair to let the incidence of chance and war business determine what firms should survive and what should die in the post-war world. Indeed, the inevitable result would be to shower further riches on a firm that already had had an extraordinary profit and to kick in the slats the business that had none.

The problem of reconversion and post-war employment is a big problem. It applies to all lines of business. But no man now can tell to what extent certain lines should be maintained on their war level. Indeed, it is entirely possible that the changing currents of the war will shift demand, easing the problem here, and increasing it there. Post-war conversion is an important question, but it is not a question of proper pricing and purchase of war goods.

I do not say, however, that changes should not be made in the renegotiation statute wherever the evidence before this committee indicates changes are desirable. I have sought to point out the basic purposes and conditions out of which it arose as a guide to proper revision, and on that score four specific suggestions appeal to me.

First, there is the matter of court appeal. We asked Mr. Karker, Chairman of the Price Adjustment Board, about this in our hearings on the 1944 Army bill last May. He explained to us that an appeal can be taken to the court after the Secretary's findings have been reviewed. I understand, however, that there is some uncertainty owing to the lack of explicit provision for this in the statute, and, also, that there is some question as to whether a court would have access to the facts. If there is any doubt on this point, the statute should be clarified and made explicit, and not only the right to go to the courts for a review should be provided but the standards should be stated on which judgment would be based. They should embrace such items as pre-war profit history, pre-war production history, ratio of public and private capital invested, and production efficiency; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this committee does have the brains to write such standards. I believe that an opportunity for a full and complete review in the courts would answer most of the complaints that have been raised with regard to the operation of the statute.

Second, there is the size of business exempted. I had thought the exemption would be raised from $100,000 to $300,000 last fall. The amount of excessive profits in war business that grosses under $500,000 in a given year would not be large, and it seems to me that the recapture there might be left to the excess-profits laws without any great injury and with considerable saving in the renegotiation procedure. Small contracts may take as much negotiating as large ones. Care should be taken, however, to guard against evasion through the forming of dummy corporations.

Third is the question of the expiration of the statute. By nature and by the present requirements that renegotiation must be completed within a year, the statute will expire within a year from the end of the war. I think it might be well, however, to be explicit in the matter. Your committee will know how such a time limitation should be phrased.

The renegotiation statute, as far as its retroactive features are concerned, is not a peacetime law. When the monopoly, which war creates for makers of war goods, ends and competitive conditions are restored, we should go back to firm contracts let to the lowest responsible bidder with suitable repricing provisions. Indeed, the statute might very well exempt services where prices are regulated by official rate-making bodies or where price controls exist under other law, subject, however, to review if large quantity procurement or investment of Government capital destroys the premise of proper price control.

No one believes in the desirability of firm contracts more than I. I believe in the sanctity of contracts. I am not a lawyer, but I understand that it is a maxim of law that contracts against public policy can be set aside. Nothing has been or could be more against public policy than that some men should make excessive profits out of war. Nothing could be more against public policy than that while some men give their lives, other men are paid abnormal and unconscionable profits.

The boy who volunteered for induction in the early days of Selective Service so that he could get his year of training in and then go on to his career, will never understand how Congress could cancel that understanding if it does not hold war profits equally liable to adjustment.

After all, it is to be remembered that renegotiation does not touch the man who has not made a profit. It only reprices where he has made some money, too much money, at the expense of bond-buying, taxpaying fathers and mothers who have sent sons to the battlefield.

I have been told unofficially that by the end of this year, more than $5,000,000,000 will have been recaptured or saved to the Government and the taxpayers by the operations of the renegotiation statute. Maurice Karker, Chairman of the Board, has told me that equally great savings will be made in future business by better pricing standards that have been developed as a result. So, realizing a penny saved is still a penny earned, I am confident that the Ways and Means Committee will not be too harsh with a statute that has reduced the amount of money you have to find for the prosecution of the war.

All I am trying to do, personally, is to avoid the expenditure and disbursement of billions

of dollars for profits that should not be paid.

We must keep in mind, I believe, that as legislators we have to meet a condition that exists and not as we would like to have it if we were creating it anew. We cannot get away from the fact that contracts were let on a basis of "We have got to have this and have it quick. We don't know how much it will cost. We will give you a price that will protect you against all contingencies." And then we have to keep in mind that changes in design, changes from machine tooling of parts to drop forgings or castings, often made tremendous economies, so that the original price was far out of line.

I think one of the clearest illustrations was that given our subcommittee last spring by Colonel Browning. A certain firm went into the making of machine guns, at a price per gun a little over $500. Since another firm was getting over $400, it did not seem too far out of line for a new contract at the time. But experience and skill and a reduction in the number of tooled parts required let the company make a profit of more than $24,000,000 on a $51,000,000,000 contract. Under renegotiation the cost was brought down to $280 per gun.

We asked Colonel Browning if that left the company any profit, and he said it left them 20 percent, which had been justified on the ground that the price was lower than that of other makers. Another firm which reduced to $330 was left with 13½-percent profit after renegotiation and a third with a price of $400 was allowed 4 percent.

In closing this statement, I should like to read a few sentences from an editorial that appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, last spring. The Post said:

"It would be foolish to pretend that renegotiation of a contract, which looked pretty good in the first place, is invariably a pleasant experience. The question which those who are renegotiated ought to ask themselves is: 'Is this better or worse than being gone over by a senatorial investigating committee after the war, perhaps lampooned and misrepresented, and certainly pilloried by opponents of our competitive business system?' One answer certainly is that when the great day comes and disillusioned politicians are looking about for 'fat cats' and scapegoats, the war contractor will be in a preferred position if he can say, 'I was put under the microscope by some of the hardest-boiled bug detectors you ever saw, and they gave me a clean bill of health.'

"After all, total war demands a total effort by all classes. We cannot conscript soldiers, draft labor, and ration civilians, yet fail to restrain profits to a reasonable level. In war, when we cannot even guarantee a man the right to his own life, no war contractor can be assured the last dollar of profit from business which was made for him by the war emergency. Furthermore, we know that few American producers want any such advantage."

I thank you.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. CASE, I want to compliment you very highly for the splendid, clear, and constructive statement you have presented here to the committee. I also want to say I think the country owes you a debt of gratitude for the work you have done on this very important problem and the results that have been accomplished, following your effort.

I do not recall that I have made this statement publicly before, but it was my privilege to serve in the Army 2 years during the World War, a year of it through all the hard, bitter fighting in France.

When I came back I was shocked to find that my country, for which I had fought and offered my life, had allowed 23,000 millionaires to be created and countless thousands of others to make tremendous fortunes out of the war effort.

It is your purpose to try to prevent the recurrence of that experience during the present World War, as I understand it.

Mr. CASE. It certainly is, Mr. COOPER, and I appreciate your statement. As a matter of fact, my feelings on the subject grow, in part, out of my World War experience. When I left the post where I took training, I went by the battleship *California* that was being built. I learned that if I had gone into the shipyards instead of into the marines, instead of receiving a dollar a day I could have gotten $18 a day. When the war was over and I heard of some corporation profits, I resolved that if I ever had anything to say about it, war profiteering would never be repeated.

Mr. COOPER. I have the same views you have, and so far as my efforts may be of any value I am going to do everything I can to prevent a situation developing whereby those boys now fighting and dying and offering their lives for the country will come back and find that a great crop of millionaires have been made, and fortunes have been accumulated as the result of this war effort. I think it is a matter that everybody should share in and do their fair part.

You have very appropriately reviewed the background of this reappropriation law and offered this committee some very practical suggestions as to the improvement of it, in your opinion.

Those three amendments which you suggest here, in your opinion, would be as far as we should attempt to go at this time, as I understand you.

Mr. CASE. In answer to that I should say those are the things which have occurred to me.

I noticed in the RECORD this morning that three suggestions have been made in a report filed in the Senate. One of those rather appeals to me. It proposes merging the various adjustment boards into one single price-adjustment board. I think that might be worthy of consideration. At the present time the practice is that by agreement among the price-adjustment boards, the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission boards, the renegotiation of the business of a given contractor is assigned to the particular procurement agency which has the bulk of his business, that avoids having to call for reports to each agency.

The suggestion in the Senate report points out that sometimes a competitor of that man may be renegotiated by a different agency. That suggestion might be worth while considering, to merge these boards into one.

Mr. COOPER. I realize that is a suggestion worthy of careful consideration. In the final analysis, though, a department of the Government having the experience and the knowledge with respect to the greater part of the contract would naturally be in a better position to handle it than some other department would be.

Mr. CASE. Yes; I think that is true. I have not had a chance to read the entire Senate report but I think the suggestion was that the single price-adjustment boards be created by getting the personnel from the different agencies concerned, which might preserve the point you had in mind. I do not want to pass final judgment on the suggestion, however, because I just saw the matter in the RECORD after I came to the office this morning.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to concur in what Mr. COOPER said in reference to your statement. You have given this subject a great deal of thought and, of course, the committee welcomes any suggestions you may have to make.

Did I understand you to say that standard articles on which ceiling prices have been placed should not be subject to renegotiation?

Mr. CASE. I think if the committee finds that adequate price controls have been established with respect to items that are on a normal competitive basis, those products might be exempted, with possibly one exception. That would be if there are large-scale purchases and if those large purchases are also tied up with the Government investment, so that the amount going to the individual enterpriser would be excessive for what he contributed to production.

Mr. KNUTSON. You said, as I understood you, that $5,000,000,000 had been recaptured under the operation of the law.

Mr. CASE. Pardon me. I have been told unofficially it will be approximately that amount or a little more by the end of the year. I think the present amount of recapture and savings on prices total approximately $4,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, the excess-profits tax would have recaptured a very considerable amount of that.

Mr. CASE. Undoubtedly it would recapture a great part of it, as to the contracts subject to the law after it was passed. Of course, at the time we passed the renegotiation law the present excess-profits tax law was not in existence.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Cooper interrogated you with reference to a single price-adjustment board and called attention to the fact that it was necessary to have the secrecy we now have because of the variety of items involved. That would be obviated, would it not, if you had this centralized price-advisory board, by having a subcommittee on naval contracts and another subcommittee on Army contracts, and so on, all of those subcommittees coming under the general direction of the supreme command.

Mr. CASE. I will say that the objective to be sought is to have the same formula or the same scale used throughout, for all industry, so that one industry would not get any better deal with one price adjustment board than with another board.

Mr. KNUTSON. There has been considerable complaint that one department is much tougher on contractors than another department. It would seem to you, would it not, that they should all be treated alike and be renegotiated under the same formula, instead of having six different formulae.

Mr. CASE. I think anything you can do, as I stated, to have the same scale or set of conditions would be desirable.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think so, too. I think your suggestions were very helpful, and I am quite sure I can assure you they will be seriously considered by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I fully concur in what Mr. COOPER and Mr. KNUTSON said about your statement. You have an extensive general knowledge of and familiarity with the subject, and at the same time a fundamental idea as to its approach and the manner in which it should be dealt with, in my opinion. I am sure your statement here will be read and reread by members of this committee, and also that it will be helpful to the committee in reaching a sound and satisfactory and at least a fair solution of this very complicated problem.

I am very much interested in the amendments you suggest. Have you followed the testimony of those appearing, both those representing the boards that renegotiate these contracts for the Government, and those who appeared suggesting either repeal, or amendments to the act? Have you followed that testimony pretty carefully?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, of course, I was not in the city at the time you opened your hearings but I have read the reports of them in the press. I have also attended a couple of your sessions since returning to the city.

During the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill last spring we took considerable testimony from representatives of the War Department Price Adjustment Board.

The CHAIRMAN. There is quite a difference in the conclusions or opinions of those who renegotiate these contracts for the Government and the contractors about the way in which the law has been administered. The hearings have been very illuminating to me, and I believe they have been helpful to each member of the committee. I think they will be helpful in the future, even if the law is not changed.

Even Under Secretary Patterson, and I believe probably Mr. Karker, stated that some amendments would be helpful. You recommend more amendments than have been proposed or suggested by the War Department, or the other departments that have been represented here. Have you, in your prepared statement, included the concrete amendments that you have here suggested?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I did not work them out with reference to the language that should be changed or inserted, but I think the suggestions sufficiently specific to permit your drafting clerks to work out a proper phraseology so that the issue will be directly before you.

Mr. DISNEY. I concur entirely with what the other gentlemen have said about your statement and your efforts and work in connection with this subject. I think the country owes you a lot for your activity in this matter.

Before I ask you any questions I will say that I agree with you that the very worst thing that could happen to this country and to the businessmen of this country, large and small, would be for us to come out of this war with a lot of excessive profits, and then have several years of caterwauling, and furnishing this committee and Congress with misinformation. I think nothing could be worse than that, and we ought to devote ourselves to solving the problem as nearly as we can and avoid that kind of a situation. I think that would be the worst thing that could happen. Nobody wants to see a condition of that kind arise in connection with excessive profits.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, that is true, and I think that the time this committee has given to this hearing is evidence of the fact that it appreciates that situation and has devoted itself to that principle.

Mr. DISNEY. This is really the first chance the committee has had to go into the subject thoroughly. We had a conference last year, but we could not give it the consideration it deserved because time did not permit it.

I agree with you that Congress should not pass unnoticed the decision in the Bethlehem Steel case. I am not sure I agree with you that we ought to wind this thing up at the end of the war and put Government contracts on a firm basis. I may change my opinion about it, but it seems to me that repricing ought to be possible in Government contracts at any time and all times. I doubt very seriously whether we ought to pass that without taking into consideration the Bethlehem Steel case and provide some permanent law on the subject, because it seems to me that repricing should be possible.

Mr. CASE. It has occurred to me that when you are considering this question you might consider whether or not all Government contracts should be made to provide for renegotiation before final settlement.

Mr. DISNEY. I want to refer to one suggestion you made. I want to reiterate what you called attention to as to the action taken by the Appropriations Committee, to the effect that there must be a certificate of cost before the contract should be final. I am convinced that that should be done and we ought not to let a condition arise as it did, under those circumstances, under the law, as it existed in the Bethlehem Steel case.

I like your suggestion about a judicial review and the setting up of some standards. I doubt seriously if we can work it out unless we have some standards, or review which we can work out, and I believe we can provide for that to be done through the boards.

Mr. CASE. I think an examination of the scales which the boards have adopted would carry several suggestions as to what would be useful in setting up standards.

Mr. DISNEY. This gives me some concern. We passed the renegotiation law early last year, and later in the year passed the excessive-profits-tax law, and they are on the statute books. Then we come to this year and pass a 75-percent forgiveness provision, and under this very general statute the boards seem to have the power, and it appears to be almost mandatory, openly to ignore those statutes, and it creates confusion, and it does not seem to be a sound type of legislation.

What are your views on that?

Mr. CASE. So long as there is renegotiation first and then the tax law operates, I do not see that the statutes are ignored.

Mr. DISNEY. It has been urged here that renegotiation, coming before the tax law, is unfair to the contractor.

Mr. CASE. The excessive-profits-tax law, however, it seems to me, is insufficient because it makes no distinction between profits—those that are war profits, and those that are normal business profits, those that are the result of Government investment and those that are the result of private investment. There is also the spiraling of prices when you use a flat percentage for war profits.

Mr. DISNEY. I have not had any trouble at all in deciding for myself between the administrative feature and repricing. What bothers me is the recapture, whether we can take money from a citizen by blanket authority, whether it is possible to do it at all except under the taxing statute, and the taxing power lies in us. I would like to get that clear.

Mr. CASE. The only way I justify that to myself is that we are doing the same identical things with lives under the urgency of war. When we passed the original draft law the understanding was that if a man got a year's training he would be free at the end of a year, and could then go on with his career. Then we extended the draft law, and the boys who went in for a year with the idea that they would get their training out of the way, found themselves in for 18 months or longer. Those who had volunteered for immediate induction could have claimed bad faith on the part of Congress, but it was recognized that an emergency existed. If we could change that contract affecting human lives, we should be able to modify a contract involving property when the Nation's life is at stake.

We also have plant and property seizures under the War Powers Act.

This may be a constitutional question. I do not know. I am not a lawyer. It did not seem to me, however, that we should pass the sixth supplemental bill last year adding $19,000,000,000 to the billions already appropriated and not try to do something about the situation. We knew that hundreds of contracts were outstanding and that on some of them excessive profits were being made. We knew that funds in the supplemental bill, merged with previously appropriated money, would be used to make final payment on many of those contracts. Under the Bethlehem decision, if the contracts were once settled the door would be closed to any price adjustment. So I tried to stick my foot in the door, so to speak, to prevent its closing on the Government. I do not know whether it was constitutional or not, but I think no constitutional question was involved in my original amendment. It merely said that the funds being appropriated would not be available to pay the final dollar on a contract to a contractor who failed to file a certificate of costs and a renegotiation agreement.

Mr. DISNEY. I agree with you on the excess profits. I am disturbed about the question whether we can recapture under this system within the proper constitutional limits. I think that is the thing we should consider, and that it is important to us. Whether we can delegate power to recapture without fixed standards seems to me to be a serious problem, since that part is not administrative, in my view. Repricing is administrative, and we can do that by blanket authority.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I assume that is a question that Congress will pass on in due time.

Mr. DISNEY. Well, it is extremely doubtful under the statute, after they have agreed that they have no case in court.

I do not want to take up the time of the committee. I want to talk with you personally about the matter of recapture. But I agree with you that this money would be worse than to let it go unrecaptured.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, and I only wish to express my opinion as to the value of the contribution of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I thank you.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Dakota has read our printed hearing he will recall that in the hearings I stated that it was a distinguished Republican from the West who offered an amendment to a pending appropriation bill that became the foundation for the present Renegotiation Act.

Do you think we need any statute to authorize the Government purchasing under a repriced contract which they have demonstrated to be out of line?

Mr. CASE. That would depend upon the terms of the contract, I suppose, and the legislation controlling it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You want any Government purchasing agent entering into a contract to insert a clause in it that they can revise the price, or cancel it, either or both?

Mr. CASE. Yes; if that were made a part of the contract at the outset. Of course, renegotiation was being conducted—or repricing, whatever you want to call it—was being followed by the War Department and the Navy Department before there was any statute in such cases as those, where the contractor was willing to reprice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The point is that if all we are going to leave in the law is the repricing, we might as well repeal the whole law, because that does not rest upon the statute. They have that inherent right, anyway.

Mr. CASE. If it is done. Of course, the matter of putting it in the contract has not always been done.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If they make errors of judgment running into four and five billion dollars and do not have some leeway to correct them, they are not doing a very good job.

Mr. CASE. Well, there undoubtedly were errors of judgment made, but, of course, the savings and economies are not entirely a matter of errors in judgment. I have pointed out that there was inexperience on both sides, both on the part of the contractors in making, and on the Government procurement officers in buying, on the large scale and in these new fields. At the same time there have been changes in design. I do not remember the number of parts, but let us take, for instance, the Garand rifle; originally

it was thought that that had to be all machine tooled. Then it was discovered that a great many parts of that could be forged or cast, and the result has been that the volume of production stepped up greatly and the cost of production went down greatly. That was not a matter of error in judgment. It was a matter of development of skill and large-scale production.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That revolves around a definition of error. If I buy a stock for $100 and it goes down to $50, I should think I made an error in judgment, but I might not be condemned, because I might have used, in the light of all the available knowledge at the time, good judgment. But still I should feel that I made a slight error of judgment.

Now, with reference to the matter of review. Is it your idea that these cases would be heard de novo in a court of original jurisdiction?

Mr. CASE. As a layman I plead a little innocence of the term you just used, as to just what I would be answering.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the court going to hear all the facts that the Government agents considered when they arrived at their judgment?

Mr. CASE. Of course, I think that the renegotiation should be a completed procedure as far as the price-adjustment board is concerned before the case goes into court. When the case goes into court, I think it should be heard on its merits, as well as on the law, if that is what you mean.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the renegotiators would have to make a record that the court could see and read and act on.

Mr. CASE. I do not know what the court would require, but it would seem to me that the report of the auditors in the case and their findings would be the facts that would be available for evidence.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would the case be heard, in your opinion, on the record made before the renegotiating agency, or would new testimony be presented to the court?

Mr. CASE. I think that probably involves some legal angles and legal precedents that I am not familiar with, and I doubt if I should answer that question. There certainly are members of the bar on your committee who can answer that, as to whether that is a proper procedure, much better than I.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let us assume that we got a case before a district court, and we have the record before the court that was made before the renegotiating board. The board claims that its action prevents the contractor from having an excessive profit on a war contract. The contractor claims that his profit is not excessive. What does the court then do, take the place of the renegotiating board to pass on what is a fair profit? Or what would the court use to determine the conflicting claims?

Mr. CASE. I think the gentleman had stepped out when I said that I thought that in connection with providing for court appeal, that the provision for court appeal should set up some standards by which the court can go. That would be more or less inherent in establishing the basis for appeal.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Some days ago I suggested to one of our drafting experts that he had better be framing a provision for court review, because there was a lot of sentiment for that action; and he told me he would not know how to write a provision for court review unless we told him what the court was to review.

Mr. CASE. I think probably the committee will have to make some suggestions along that line. But the standards and the scales that these various price-adjustment boards have adopted would be a good starting point for consideration. And I did suggest that I thought those standards should include a consideration of the pre-war financial history of the company, its pre-war production history, the proportion of war and nonwar business, the ratio of invested capital—that is, the ratio of private and public invested capital at the present time—and the company's efficiency record.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You can readily see that we could not undertake to constitute our district courts into renegotiation boards?

Mr. CASE. That may be true, but it may be that you will find there should be something set up analogous to the Court of Tax Appeals.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When Mr. Alvord, who is one of the most modest and one of the best-posted witnesses that appeared before us on any tax matter, was on the stand and suggested court review, I tried to get him to indicate how that could be provided, but he never went into the matter very fully, or satisfactorily from my standpoint.

Mr. CASE. I am sorry I did not have a chance to hear him. I read some accounts of his testimony in the press, but I did not hear him at the time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is all.

Mr. COOPER. On the point mentioned by other members, Mr. CASE, with respect to renegotiating or repricing contracts, that is something that is followed in industry and in business, and was true even before the war; is not that correct?

Mr. CASE. That is true. A private business may suggest, "If you do not give me a square deal on this particular job, that is the last of my business that you will get."

Mr. COOPER. Certainly. That is a matter of common experience among businessmen. I have heard every witness who appeared at this hearing, and I think I am fair in stating that the man who impressed me at least as being the most severe in his criticism of the work of the price-adjustment boards and his experiences under renegotiation, said that that was a matter that was practiced in business; that in his own business he made contracts to supply other industries with his product and it was provided that a readjustment of prices should be had from time to time, a renegotiation of the contract. I certainly got the impression from him that that was a practice that was rather generally followed in industry; one company dealing with another, and had been for years, before this war emergency came on at all. Is it your understanding that that is a practice that is followed?

Mr. CASE. Yes, sir; certainly a great deal. And, as a matter of fact, my acquaintance with the renegotiation idea developed from conversation with one of the officers in the Quartermaster Department who was engaged in renegotiation where it could be done on a voluntary basis. But he said to me, "In my little niche, I am going to get savings this year of about $1,000,000, but," he said, "our trouble is not with those who are willing to come in and reprice voluntarily. There are a few of them that just do not want to come in."

Mr. COOPER. But this man to whom I am referring was making a statement with respect to experience——

Mr. CASE. In private industry.

Mr. COOPER. In private business, not connected with the Government at all. For instance, he said, "If I make a contract to supply my product to another private business and it later develops that I am not going to be able to furnish it at the price originally stated because something has developed that will prevent me from doing that, then we renegotiate the price and agree on another price that is to apply to take care of the situation." I got the impression from him that that practice is rather generally followed in private business.

Mr. CASE. I think it is. I think we all renegotiate prices, if we can.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. That would have to be mutual, would it not?

Mr. CASE. That would have to be mutual; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. One could not do it without the consent of the other?

Mr. CASE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It would have to be a mutual repricing.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Neither the buyer nor the seller could fix a new price alone, but they would have to agree mutually on a new price.

Mr. CASE. Sometimes they agree, on the same basis that I suggested, that "If we do not agree this will be the last business we will do together."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota, our colleague from the Middle West, who, I am very happy to say, took such a large part in this renegotiation of the war-profits problem.

I do sincerely hope, now that we have had some time to study the question, and we have also had the privilege of studying some renegotiated contracts, we may be able to work out something that will be helpful for future renegotiation.

That is all.

Mr. CASE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your very interesting and, I should say, very helpful statement.

Mr. CASE. I thank the chairman and the committee for their patience.

The CHAIRMAN. We may call upon you again as we get further along and we come to a close place.

The Facts on the Soldier-Vote Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi resented remarks of several of the Members on the pending bill to afford the members of our armed forces the opportunity of casting their votes in the forthcoming election. In order to give a clear picture from the beginning of the consideration of the soldier-vote legislation so that the gentleman from Mississippi may not charge that he is being unfairly criticized I will give the history of that legislation.

Originally, the gentleman from West Virginia. Judge Ramsay, introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress the bill—H. R. 7223, Report No. 2265—to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the States of their residence and serving within the continental United States, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. It was reported to the House on June 22, 1942, and a request for a hearing for the granting of a

rule was made to me as chairman of the Committee on Rules to provide for its immediate consideration. There was overwhelming support for the bill but some question was raised as to its constitutionality and about that time I received a letter from the Secretaries of State Association suggesting that a conference be had with Judge Ramsay, author of the bill, and myself. The purpose of such a meeting was to consider the effect of the provisions of the bill and to determine whether some clarifying amendments might not be incorporated that would overcome some of the opposition raised against the bill. A meeting was arranged and representatives of the War and Navy Departments were also invited to attend. After several conferences on the part of officials of the Secretaries of State Association, representatives of the War and Navy Departments, Judge Ramsay and myself, a new bill—H. R. 7416, Report No. 2363—was introduced in the House by Judge Ramsay and the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress reported it favorably and the Committee on Rules granted a rule providing for its immediate consideration. This bill was passed by the House July 23, 1942, and by the Senate on August 25, 1942, and was signed by the President on September 16, 1942, and became a law. Unfortunately, only a small number in our armed forces, approximately 28,000, found it possible to cast their votes in the 1942 elections

Senators LUCAS, of Illinois, and GREEN, of Rhode Island, introduced a bill in the Senate on June 29, 1943, to amend the Ramsay Act, known as the Soldier Vote Act of 1942. In an effort to expedite the passage of the legislation I introduced a similar bill in the House on September 14, 1943, which would give all members of our armed forces the right to vote, and included therein a provision that would also give to civilians who were contributing to the war effort abroad an opportunity to exercise their voting privilege.

It is my understanding that Senators LUCAS and GREEN conferred with the legislative drafting service of the Senate in the preparation of their bill and I had the aid of the House drafting service in formulating my bill H. R. 3210.

Shortly thereafter Representative WORLEY, chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, introduced his bill (H. R. 3436) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from their place of residence. That bill was similar to the Senate bill and to my bill, except that it provided for a commission to carry out the provisions of the law.

Very soon thereafter I obtained a hearing before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. I spoke briefly on my bill and stated that I was not interested whether my bill, Chairman WORLEY'S bill, or any other bill were reported, but that I would support any bill that would give the soldiers, sailors, marines, Coast Guard men, and the other members of our armed forces the right to cast their votes in the next Presidential election.

I know that Chairman WORLEY had given his bill a great deal of careful study, and while he availed himself somewhat of the advice of the House drafting service, the intimation of the gentleman from Mississippi that Chairman WORLEY did not draft the bill is unfair.

The gentleman from Mississippi cannot deny that he has been opposed to the Worley bill, the Lucas-Green bill, and to my bill. It has been noted in the press that the gentleman from Mississippi has frequently been over to the Senate side with respect to this legislation. Of what effect his visits have been I am not in position to state. However, the Senate has reported a bill which the gentleman approves but which does not guarantee or give the members of our armed forces the right to cast their votes. That the gentleman from Mississippi has been opposed to these bills on the grounds of their constitutionality is generally known and I am sure he will not attempt to refute that statement. But, as was made clear by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia during consideration of the legislation in the last Congress, and as is evidenced by a statement I received from him bearing on the effect of the pending bills, this proposed legislation, if enacted, will not in any way tend to abridge any States' rights because the Constitution itself gives Congress jurisdiction over elections of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

I want to make it clear that my purpose and efforts in favoring this legislation are to give the brave members of our armed forces abroad, including our civilian citizens acting in a quasi-military capacity abroad, the privilege of voting which is rightfully theirs under the Constitution. I dislike to answer, indeed it is impossible to answer, in the brief time allotted, the many rash, harsh, and intolerant remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi. I asked for only 1 minute to speak in defense of the position of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, so that the people at home and the boys might better understand the facts and conditions surrounding this situation.